

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 97—PART 15

SEPTEMBER 18, 1951, TO OCTOBER 20, 1951

(PAGES A5639 TO A6972)



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

The Future of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject of the future of small business, delivered by me before the Tennessee Wholesale Grocers' Association, at Nashville, Tenn., on September 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today we are joined in a battle which will determine the future of small business in America. On the outcome of this battle depends the type of economic society we are to have in the future—whether it is to be a free society of independent competitive enterprise or a collectivistic society of giant monopolies and trusts.

The battle revolves around the fate of the Robinson-Patman Act. Will this act be retained as an effective protection of small business against vicious discriminatory practices, or will it be thrown into the junk heap?

In the fight to preserve the Robinson-Patman Act against the sinister influences who seek to destroy it, the wholesale grocers have been in the vanguard. I wish to pay special tribute to the very able vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, Mr. R. H. Rowe, who has spearheaded the fight against the monopolistic forces who are seeking to destroy small business. I also wish to thank Mr. Charles S. Ragland, of Nashville, and Mr. E. H. Harrison, of Clarksville, Tenn., for their splendid testimony before the Senate Small Business Committee in opposition to the latest effort, S. 719, to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act.

What the monopolies, including the big chain stores, are seeking in this fight is the right to go back to the old, vicious discriminatory practices which prevailed before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed in 1936.

What were the practices which the Robinson-Patman Act was designed to halt? Your national secretary, Mr. Rowe, recently described them in very vivid terms before the Senate Small Business Committee. He stated: "In the years prior to 1935, complaints and protests against price and other discriminations granted by food and grocery manufacturers to big mass-buying organizations had reached vast proportions—in effect,

amounted to a national trade scandal. The investigation of large-scale buying and selling methods disclosed that the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. alone was receiving annually from its manufacturer suppliers \$6,000,000 in advertising allowances and off-the-invoice quantity discounts and \$2,000,000 as brokerage fees, making a total of \$8,000,000 in concessions that either were not available to the individual food distributor or available in very much less amounts."

The representative of another trade association in the food field, Mr. Watson Rogers of the National Food Brokers Association, described the discriminatory practices prevailing before the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act in much the same terms. In testifying before the committee, Mr. Rogers stated: "People who were active in the food industry before 1936 can well attest to the serious threat to fair competition that existed. It is a well-known fact that coercive, monopolistic buying power was exercised by certain buyers. Unfair price discriminations, such as false, unearned quantity discounts, secret rebates, allowances, preferential treatment, were rampant. Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, all were subject to discriminatory tactics, threats, and coercive measures which were used to obtain concessions. There was great unrest on the part of small and independent business as well as many of the large concerns."

Because of this great unrest, the Congress, by Senate Resolution 224, Seventieth Congress, first session, directed the Federal Trade Commission to undertake a comprehensive investigation of chain stores and to report to the Congress on the practices leading to their growth.

The investigation undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission more than proved the justice of the complaints by small business. In its final report the Commission found that it had been the persistent practice of the chain stores to seek out and demand special and unwarranted price concessions on the goods they bought. The Commission also found that the chains frequently discriminated in the resale of merchandise by maintaining higher prices in localities where competition was absent or weak, and cutting prices aggressively in those localities where competition was encountered.

As all members of this group know, there was on the statute books in those days a law against price discrimination—section 2 of the old Clayton Act. But I am sure everyone here will also remember that the old law had a fatal loophole. Although the law prohibited price discriminations which injured competition, the old section 2 contained this clause: "Nothing herein shall prevent discriminations in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition." This clause, known as the good-faith defense, rendered the sec-

tion practically null and void as an effective instrument against price discrimination.

In its investigation the Federal Trade Commission pointed out that because of this good-faith defense it was powerless to prevent price discriminations, regardless of their effect on competition, because those making the discriminations could excuse themselves on the grounds that they were merely meeting competition in good faith. Here is what the Commission said: "The Commission has no evidence which would establish that price discriminations by chain stores have not been in good faith to meet competition and there is good cause to conclude that in many cases it has been for that purpose."

It was largely because of this loophole that the Robinson-Patman Act, amending and strengthening the Clayton Act, was passed. Under the Robinson-Patman Act the status of the good faith defense was changed. No longer was it to be a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination; it was to be only a procedural defense.

Without going into all of the legal intricacies involved, the effect of this change was to transform the law against price discrimination into an effective, far-reaching instrument. No longer would the excuse that he was merely meeting competition in good faith permit a manufacturer to give large concessions to a chain store. Under the new act the question of whether or not discriminations were made in good faith was just one of the elements to be considered, not a complete justification.

It has always been a mystery to me that there could be so much misunderstanding and confusion on this simple point. Both of the sponsors of the Robinson-Patman Act have stated that one of the principal purposes of that law was to transform the good faith defense from a complete defense into a procedural defense. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who has long been a mighty champion of small business, has made repeated statements to that effect. Similarly, Senator Joe Robinson, who sponsored the bill on the Senate side, stated during a discussion of this very issue "I think the latitude would be too broad if it were merely said that 'nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition.' The authority thus granted might be employed notwithstanding there was an effort to meet competition in ways that would be questionable."

In order to remove any doubts on the question, the manager of the Robinson-Patman Act on the House side, Congressman Utterback, made a clear and forceful statement on the floor of the House. Referring to the good-faith defense as contained in this new act, Congressman Utterback stated: "It is to be noted, however, that this (the good-faith defense) does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge

of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties."

At this point I wish to digress for a moment and recognize the possibility that, as a lawyer, my legal discussion may strike a group of practical businessmen as nothing more than a lot of trivial legal technicalities. But they are certainly not trivial. In fact they will have a direct bearing on the future welfare, indeed the very existence of every small business in the United States. And as for being technical, I am doing my best to make the issues as clear and understandable as possible. On an understanding of these issues depends the future of the Robinson-Patman Act.

As an indication of the importance of the Robinson-Patman Act to small business I would like to call your attention to some figures on the share of the Nation's distribution business held by the 100 largest chain, department, and mail-order stores during the years of the act's existence. As we all know, the big distributors made rapid gains during the late twenties and the early thirties. But what progress have they made since the Robinson-Patman Act was passed? In 1938 the 100 largest retail trade corporations according to the National City Bank, accounted for around 15 percent of the Nation's total volume of retail sales. Ten years later, they still held only 15 percent. There can be little doubt but that this arresting of the increase in concentration was due in no small part to the Robinson-Patman Act.

Now the question of whether or not the Robinson-Patman Act will continue, in the future as it has in the past, to be an effective form of protection to small business will be determined very largely by the outcome of this present fight on the good-faith issue. If good faith again becomes a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act will have been effectively repealed and survival will be determined, not by efficiency, by low costs, or by sound business organization, but by greater size and power and the ability of the large firms to destroy their smaller rivals through price discrimination.

Although certain big-business interests have for many years carried on a relentless propaganda campaign against the Robinson-Patman Act, no attempt was made in the halls of Congress to repeal it until 2 years ago, June 1, 1949, to be exact. That date marks the beginning of the battle in which we are still engaged. By way of background, I should point out that in the spring of 1948 the Supreme Court had handed down a decision holding that the basing-point system, as practiced in the cement industry, was illegal. The steel and cement industries immediately set in motion a great propaganda campaign to clarify the law with regard to the right of individual sellers to absorb freight. Lengthy hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. A high-price public-relations firm was employed to stir up agitation against the Supreme Court decision. Skilled lobbyists were hired to haunt the halls of Congress. But in all this furor, there was no hint whatever that the big interests behind the drive wished to accomplish anything other than a change in the law regarding freight absorption.

Now the question of whether or not freight absorption should be permitted, and if so to what extent and in what manner, is an exceedingly complex question. It is, however, a question of concern only to firms which either sell or purchase commodities, such as steel or cement, in which freight is a large element in the delivered price. Obviously, to the grocer, the drugstore owner, the tire dealer, or the service-station operator, the question of freight absorption is of

only academic interest, having little if any effect upon his business.

Therefore, when the hearings on this freight-absorption question had been concluded, there was no indication whatever that the bill to be introduced to clarify the matter would in any way affect the protection which the Robinson-Patman Act gives to the small distributor. Thus, those of us who believe in the Robinson-Patman Act were literally astonished when on June 1, 1949, there was introduced on the Senate floor a bill, S. 1008, which would not only have granted producers the right to absorb freight but also would have effectively repealed the Robinson-Patman Act. This bill contained a section which related not only to the price discriminations inherent in freight absorption, but to all other forms of price discrimination as well. Section 3 of S. 1008 provided that a seller may justify a discrimination by showing that his lower price " * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor. There it was, appearing without warning—the good-faith defense of the old Clayton Act. Our feelings were aptly described in the words of Mr. George Frates, of the National Association of Retail Druggists, who said: "The basing point may or may not be of vital importance to our industry, but when an attempt to settle a squabble belonging to the cement, steel, and gasoline giants takes place and the result weakens protective legislation for the small retailer, then we feel like innocent bystanders on whom there has been dumped an avalanche of steel and cement and gasoline."

On the Senate floor I hastily wrote out an amendment which would have protected the Robinson-Patman Act. This amendment would have permitted discriminations to be made in good faith to meet competition except where the discriminations injured competition. This amendment was adopted by the Senate and also by the House of Representatives. Then something extraordinary happened. Although the amendment, which by that time had become known as the Kefauver amendment, was contained in both the House and Senate versions, it was completely omitted in the final bill as reported out by the conferees. Although I protested this action, my protest was overruled, and S. 1008, devoid of any protection to the small-business man, was passed by the Senate.

Fortunately for small business, the bill was vetoed by the President. His record on monopoly legislation all the way through has been good.

But the fight was not over. It had only begun. With the convening of a new Congress, the battle has started all over again. This time our opponents have a new peg to hang their hats on. It is the majority decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. During the time that S. 1008 was being debated, the Federal Trade Commission was trying to get a decision which would make it clear, for once and for all, that the good-faith defense in the Robinson-Patman Act was only a procedural and not a complete defense.

The facts in the Standard Oil of Indiana case were these: Standard Oil of Indiana sold its gasoline to four large firms at a price 2 cents lower than to their other service station customers in the Detroit area. Since the retail margin on gasoline is relatively small, this 2-cent discount represented a very sizable price discrimination. Because of this concession these four outlets were able to sell gasoline at a relatively low price and attract business into their stations, to the injury of Standard's other retail customers. In the source of the trial, these two facts were clearly established: First, that the discriminations did have the effect of injuring competition; and, second, that they were not based upon any increased efficiency or savings in costs, which, of

course, would have constituted a complete defense under the Robinson-Patman Act.

In defense of its action, Standard Oil of Indiana took the simple position that the "good faith" defense had the same force and effect under the Robinson-Patman Act as under the old Clayton Act—i. e., that it was still a complete defense. It seems that there was a small refiner of unbranded gasoline which had either sold, or offered to sell its product, to these four outlets at 2 cents below Standard's regular price. Standard said, in effect, that by granting this discrimination it was merely meeting in "good faith" the equally low price of a competitor, and, moreover, that under the law this was all it needed to show in order to defend its action. The issue went up to the Supreme Court which decided, by a 5-to-3 vote, in favor of Standard Oil of Indiana—good faith was a complete defense regardless of the effect on competition. Incidentally, had Justice Minton, who abstained from voting because he wrote the decision in the lower court, participated in the decision, it would have been by a 5-to-4 vote.

This majority decision is, to put it mildly, remarkable. In a recent minority report, Senator MAGNUSON, Senator LANGER, and myself took issue with this decision, raising the question as to why, if good faith remained a complete defense, the Seventy-fourth Congress bothered to pass the Robinson-Patman Act at all. "If the court's interpretation of the good-faith defense in the Standard Oil decision is correct, all that was accomplished in enacting that law, aside from adding a number of minor provisions, was to change the term 'meeting competition' to 'meeting the equally low price of a competitor'." If this is all that was accomplished, the Seventy-fourth Congress labored and brought forth a mouse. "The chain-store investigation and other reports of the Federal Trade Commission, the extensive hearings and committee reports, the legislative debates, and the acts themselves have all gone for naught. We are now back where we started 38 years ago."

In arriving at their decision the members of the majority did not go back to the legislative record in order to try to ascertain the intent of Congress, they overlooked the opinions of the act's two sponsors, which I have cited above, and they overlooked the statement by the manager of the bill in the House of Representatives, which I have also cited. Instead of restricting themselves to their proper function of interpreting the law from the point of view of congressional intent and purpose, they were engaged in "judicial legislation," imposing upon the country their own concepts of what constitutes desirable economics.

As authority for their decision they cited three persons, none of whom had anything to do with the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act—the first, now deceased, was an associate general counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, who incidentally was quoted out of context; the second was an attorney from the Federal Trade Commission, whose field of work is completely outside the Robinson-Patman Act, and the third was a former Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Antitrust Division, who while occupying that position vigorously supported the enactment of S. 1008, who held that "good faith" should constitute a complete defense for Standard Oil of Indiana's price discriminations.

After the decision was handed down, it did not take long for the opponents of small business to realize that it constituted a very slender reed on which to depend. For one thing, it was, in effect, a 5 to 4 decision, a change in the position by just one of the Justices in any future case would reverse the decision. Moreover, it was abundantly clear that in arriving at its decision the Supreme Court had simply made a mistake in interpreting the law—a mistake which it could be expected to correct in the future.

With these considerations in mind, the strategists for the opposition decided that steps must immediately be taken to prevent the Supreme Court from reconsidering its action. They arrived at a very simple solution—a bill which would freeze the decision of the Supreme Court into statutory law. Once the opinion of the Supreme Court was placed on the statute books, the monopolies would no longer need to worry about any possible reversal. Such a bill, S. 719, was shortly introduced, and an effort was made to rush it through Congress without hearings.

Let us pause for a moment to examine this striking paradox. Less than 3 years ago, following the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case, the present sponsors of S. 719, who now urge us to freeze a decision of the Supreme Court into statutory law were denouncing the Supreme Court to the high heavens, contending that the Supreme Court had usurped the purpose, duties, and responsibilities of the legislators. But now that the Supreme Court has handed them a favorable decision, these same individuals are filled with awe and reverence for that august body. Now the criticisms of 3 years ago are forgotten. We hear nothing but paeans of praise for the highest Court of the land. The wisdom of the Court is extolled to the skies, and we are informed that since the Court has shown the way, it is the duty of the legislators to follow—a most unique statement of the division of powers contained in the Constitution. The formula is clear: When the Court hands down a decision against monopoly, get the Congress to change the law. When the Court hands down a decision in favor of monopoly, get the Congress to freeze the decision into statutory law. As Senator DOUGLAS has said, it is a case of "Heads the monopolists win, and tails the public loses."

During the course of the debate on August 1 and 2 of this year I again introduced the so-called Kefauver amendment, under which good faith would be a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination except where the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This, it proved, was a very difficult amendment to vote against. A Senator voting against it was placing himself on record as being in favor of a practice, even though it resulted in injury to competition and the growth of monopoly. The vote on my amendment which, of course, would have reversed the Supreme Court decision and restored the Robinson-Patman Act as an effective instrument against monopoly, was 38 against and 37 for. I am glad to say we lost only three southern votes. If we had had the vote of just one other Senator, we would have carried the day. Monopoly would have received its greatest setback in nearly half a century.

The fight, however, is by no means over. The companion bill in the House, H. R. 2820, has not as yet been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee. If it is approved by the committee, there is still a good chance that when the measure comes to the House floor, this protecting amendment will be introduced and carried by the full House.

My statement that there is a good chance is based upon my assumption that the small business organizations, including the wholesale grocers, the retail druggists, the independent tire dealers, the food brokers, the petroleum retailers, and others, will continue their fine work of opposing this monopoly legislation. Let me warn you that many thousands of dollars are being spent by the big interests in order to get this legislation passed. Hardly a day goes by but that Senators and Congressmen are contacted by high-priced lobbyists working on behalf of this legislation. But all of their pressure and influence will avail them nothing if you and other small-business men make known your feelings to your own Senators and Congressmen.

The experience we have had in resisting these monopoly bills makes it abundantly clear that when small business organizes itself and focuses its energies on a given issue, it can move mountains. Frankly, the great tragedy of small business in the past has been its lack of organization and its lack of interest in congressional matters. Now, however, I think that most small-business men are beginning to realize that what takes place in Congress has a direct bearing on their own pocketbooks. They are beginning to realize that if monopoly bills are enacted, their very existence is in gravest jeopardy.

It is my profound hope that small business will continue, and in fact intensify, its opposition to measures which would destroy it. Upon this activity rests not only the future welfare of small business but the future of free competitive enterprise as well.

Remember, "The righteous wrath of an honest man avaleth much."

United States Defense Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by Governor J. Bracken Lee, of Utah, and letter from Sheldon Olds, chairman of the Iron County Defense Bond Committee, of Cedar City, Utah.

The actions of the committee and Governor Lee in pushing bond sales in Utah are most commendable, and I take pleasure in offering this record of them for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the hope that what they have done will prove an inspiration to other citizens throughout the country.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF J BRACKEN LEE,
GOVERNOR OF UTAH

From September 3 to October 27 this year, the volunteer United States Savings Bond committees in each State, county, and city of the Nation will conduct a bond campaign with the theme: Defense is our job, too; and the slogan. Make today your D-day—buy United States Defense Bonds.

During the drive, from September 17-22, a simultaneous patriotic effort will be made by 68 Utah communities to achieve for their towns honor designation as United States flag cities for meritorious accomplishment in making the United States Defense Bond payroll savings plan available to employees in their communities. This drive, to be known as Operation Flag City, has the added objective of trying to win for Utah more flag city honors than have been won in the rest of the United States.

Regular saving is a self-reliant way toward attaining a measure of personal security, opportunity to better ourselves, and financial independence. The purchase of savings bonds is one of the finest forms of savings we have. In addition to providing the purchaser with the safest investment in the world today, it gives him a stockholder's share in his government, together with a stockholder's responsibilities.

The Federal Government has its responsibilities too, as the directors of the business in which bond purchasers hold stock.

But when this Government continues its unsound policies of deficit financing, reckless spending, waste, and inefficiency, its stockholders should demand an immediate change in management to protect their investment. The refusal to buy bonds is the ineffective way to voice such a demand, since the Government can obtain money in many different ways to finance its operations. Demands for a change should be made with Congress, which is the appropriating body of government, and with the Executive.

Every citizen has a stake in his government. If we permit the continued growth of government, increased deficit spending, waste, and inefficiency, we will be a party to the inflation, bankruptcy, and ruin which are sure to follow. By purchasing bonds, taking a consistent stand on Government economy (even though it sometimes hurts), and demanding from Congress the necessary governmental reforms, we can insure our country against the disaster that an economic collapse would bring.

I, therefore, call upon all organizations dedicated to community service, and all citizens who are able, to volunteer to help the local committee reach every possible bond buyer. I call upon employers and employees to expand further the payroll-savings plan for the regular purchase of bonds on partial payments. I call upon all others with income to buy savings bonds as regularly as possible at their banks, savings and loan associations, or post offices.

Above all, I call upon everyone, young and old, to exert every effort in demanding that the Federal Government reduce its expenditures, eliminate waste and extravagance, dispense with deficit financing, balance the budget, and pay off the colossal national debt that has been accumulated. The independence that bond purchasers are asked to save for will not be fully realized unless such steps are followed.

J BRACKEN LEE,
Governor of Utah.

AUGUST 23, 1951.

DEAR GOVERNOR LEE: In an effort to bring before the people of Cedar City and Iron County the full story of our country's defense effort, and the great need for a broader and fuller understanding of what democracy means to all of us, the wives, mothers, and sweethearts of all servicemen now serving in the Armed Forces from Iron County have united and volunteered to conduct the 1951 defense bond campaign in our county.

They have done this wholeheartedly and are grateful for the splendid opportunity for the following reasons:

1 They feel that while their men are fighting on the war fronts in Korea they should and could do a little more to help their loved ones in this great battle for freedom of mankind.

2 They hope that by their example and actions they can stimulate the habit of thrift among the people so that they will actively participate in the fight against inflation and all the chaos and misery that will accompany this breakdown of our economic way of life. They recognize that inflation is as dangerous an enemy to us as is communism itself.

3 They hope through this campaign that they might also call attention to the magnificent record that has been made by the men of the Two Hundred and Thirtieth Armored Field Battalion, of which some 140 men are from Iron County. I am sure, once we review this splendid record that we can forgive this feeling of pride that these women have in the achievements of their men.

4. They hope, through this campaign, to encourage the people of Iron County to reaffirm their determination to fight and work for the God-given rights and privileges enjoyed by freemen, to shake off the cloak of complacency and self-satisfaction that

seems so prevalent among the people of America today.

They hope to accomplish this by conducting the following campaign:

1. All wives, mothers, and sweethearts of servicemen will meet together on the morning of Monday, September 3, at the local bank, where, in a shining example of patriotism and loyalty, they plan to each purchase a defense bond.

2. By sending delegations to every civic group, club, school, church and organized group in Iron County to tell their story of the need for greater self control and appreciation that is now needed if our country is to survive.

3. By making a house-by-house canvass of every home in the county so that they might bring their story to every housewife, to encourage her to start saving for the future the bond-a-month way or through the payroll-savings plan.

4. By conducting a complete and widespread publicity campaign to bring the story before everyone.

I am calling this campaign to your attention for I feel that you would like to know of the actions of this patriotic and loyal group of American women who are willing to not only give their men to the fight for world freedom, but stand solidly behind their efforts.

It is hoped that such unselfish actions might serve as a shining example of patriotism for other women throughout the country so that they might be inspired to join in the common fight. We solicit your support in bringing this inspiring story before the people through the good offices of the Governor of Utah, in which you have so distinguished yourself.

Sincerely yours,

SHeldon Olds,
Chairman, Iron County Defense Bond Committee, Cedar City, Utah.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

STATE CAPITOL,

Salt Lake City, Utah, September 10, 1951.

SHeldon Olds,

Chairman, Iron County Defense Bond Committee, Cedar City, Utah.

DEAR Mr. Olds: I have been delayed in replying to your recent letter concerning the bond drive in Iron County because of the fact that I carried this letter to Cedar City and read it in conjunction with your community's program the night of August 31.

As I stated then, I feel that you and your committee have done much in promoting the sale of bonds and certainly have set a shining example of real American patriotism. I certainly extend my sincere congratulations and commendation for this worthwhile effort. Other communities might well emulate your program.

I am making a copy of your letter and sending it to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS with the request that he have it read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it will stimulate official Washington to set a better example for the people.

Sincerely yours,

J. FRANKLIN LEE

A Black Spot on Our Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of August 31, 1951:

A BLACK SPOT ON OUR RECORD

The contrast between our national policy of astronomical expenditures for assistance to foreign nations and of inadequate appropriations for the rehabilitation of destitute American Indian tribes has never been a credit to Congress.

It has become a humiliating and degrading thing to the American people.

Representative NORRIS POULSON, of California, speaks for a growing number of the Members of Congress and for all of the American people when he says with respect to this shameful situation:

"The extravagant gifts to Europe and penny for our Indians make . . . a black spot on our record."

Mr. POULSON's specific reference was to the Navajo rehabilitation program for which Congress has made a niggardly appropriation of only slightly more than \$6,000,000, while voting billions for foreign aid.

The most dramatic and shocking illustration of our contrasting policies in the two fields of rehabilitation has been offered by Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio.

The most desperate situation of the Navajo Tribe, as Mr. Bow remarks, is that of water shortage which is so grave that many Navajo families are on the meager rations of water imposed by the necessity of carrying drinking water many miles.

The flocks of the Navajo tribesmen, utterly indispensable to their livelihood, are dying of thirst.

In the face of these dire facts, the Indian Bureau allotment for the development of new water supplies on the Navajo project is reported by Mr. Bow to be the pathetically insufficient sum of \$15,000.

Apparently, he acutely suggests:

"Navajo Indians would have a far better chance of getting water and the health facilities they need if they moved to Timbuctoo."

In justification of that remark, Mr. Bow offers the following facts:

That American expenditures on projects in the Belgian Congo this year, including waterways, are in excess of \$15,000,000.

That \$11,000,000 will be spent by the United States for projects in Great Britain's colonies.

That France is getting more than \$27,000,000 for her territories, including livestock watering projects.

Irrigation projects, water systems, and similar programs for Algeria, Morocco, the French Sudan, and numerous other foreign beneficiaries of American largess get top rating on the schedule of American expenditure, while our own Indian tribes are deplorable.

It is surely a black spot on the American record, as Representative POULSON says, that politicians so free-handed with our national resources in the remote parts of the world are willing to let our own people thirst and die.

Where Must the Tax Load Rest?

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the misstatements and the misrepresentations that Drew Pearson makes about our tax laws being written by millionaires, and that of course you can expect them to write laws "that will spare the

rich and soak the poor"; and in spite of the tax theory expounded by Walter Reuther in his tax treatise entitled "A Proposal for a Progressive Spending Tax To Cut the Wealthy's Standard of Luxury Before Cutting the American Standard of Living", the facts and figures of the Treasury Department prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the major part of our tax load must be borne by people in the lower income-tax brackets, because if we confiscated in taxes the total income of all persons receiving \$10,000 per year or over it would only increase the present Treasury take about \$5,500,000,000, only enough to operate the National Government for 1 month at its present rate of spending.

The following facts and figures, based upon Treasury reports and Government statistics, prove that our total tax load must rest heavily upon people in the lower tax brackets.

Mr. Speaker, today all persons with yearly incomes of \$10,000 or over receive 12.8 percent of the total personal incomes of the Nation, but under our tax laws are required to pay 42.8 percent of the total personal income taxes collected.

All persons with yearly incomes of under \$10,000—who are subject to the personal income tax—receive 55 percent of the total personal incomes of the Nation, and pay 57.2 percent of the total personal income taxes collected.

All persons not subject to the personal income tax—those who are in the very low brackets or are tax exempt—receive 30 percent of the total personal incomes of the Nation, but pay no personal income tax whatever. They do, however, pay heavily through hidden taxes and excise taxes.

It is easy to see from these facts that the people with yearly incomes of \$10,000 or over pay more than a proportionate share of the personal income tax burden; that people with yearly incomes of less than \$10,000—who pay personal income taxes—pay a little more than their proportionate share; and that persons who receive 30 percent of the personal incomes of the Nation carry none of the personal income tax load.

IMPOSSIBLE TO BALANCE BUDGET BY SOAKING THE RICH

Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government should confiscate all yearly incomes of \$100,000 or over by imposing a 100-percent tax rate upon the same, the Treasury would receive only \$218,000,000 more than it now receives from this group of taxpayers. That extra amount would operate our Federal Government for only 1 day under the proposed 1951-52 budget. If the Federal Government should confiscate all yearly incomes over \$50,000, the Treasury would receive only \$722,000,000 more than it now receives. That extra amount would operate our Federal Government for only 4 days. If the Federal Government should confiscate all yearly incomes over \$25,000, the amount of additional "take" would be a little over \$2,000,000,000. That extra amount would operate the Federal Government for only 10 days. If the Federal Government should confiscate all yearly incomes over \$10,000 per year, the amount of additional "take" would be about \$5,500,000,000. That amount would operate

our Federal Government for less than 1 month at the present rate of spending.

Of course, if such confiscatory taxes were levied, our entire national economy would become paralyzed, and the amount of taxes that could be collected the following year would shrink to almost nothing.

These figures, based upon Government reports, are presented to illustrate the fallacy of the generally accepted propaganda that the Government can balance its budget by a "soak the rich" policy. Even the most lowly in our country, whether he knows it or not, is contributing heavily to the Federal Treasury from which the Congress of the United States votes appropriations for our Federal Government and for all the international adventures in various parts of the world.

THE PROPOSED 25-PERCENT TAX CEILING

Mr. Speaker, what would a tax ceiling of 25 percent do to the yearly receipts of the Federal Treasury if the tax limitation amendment to the Constitution were adopted? This is a very pertinent question. I have secured an answer to this question from the staff experts of the Ways and Means Committee. The answer, in three parts, is as follows:

(a) The Treasury now has a yearly tax take of about \$24,000,000,000 from the personal income tax. A 25-percent tax ceiling would reduce this take only \$2,500,000,000, leaving \$21,500,000,000 still to come in from this source.

(b) The Treasury now has a yearly tax take also of \$24,000,000,000 from the corporation income tax. A 25-percent tax ceiling would cut this tax take in half, leaving only \$12,000,000,000 to come in from this source.

(c) The Treasury now has a yearly tax take of \$800,000,000 from Federal estate and gift taxes. A 25-percent tax ceiling would cut this tax take to \$200,000,000, leaving \$600,000,000 to come in from this source.

The total tax reduction under a 25-percent tax ceiling under present conditions, therefore, would reduce Treasury receipts about \$15,000,000,000, leaving some \$45,000,000,000 Treasury receipts to operate the Government each year.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the statements of such men as Drew Pearson and Walter Reuther, the major part of our tax load must be borne by the so-called poor people.

Arizona Bank President's Report Contradicts Claims of Arizona Project Supporters in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great difference of opinion among Arizona leaders regarding the condition of that State's economy and

the relative importance of the proposed central Arizona project.

Arizona Senators and Representatives, as well as witnesses called by them, have claimed repeatedly that unless their State was awarded the multi-billion-dollar central Arizona project it would face an economic collapse. Without this costly rescue project, they declared, Arizona's banks would fail, business houses would close, farms would blow away in dust, and the roads out of Arizona would be filled with migrating people in worse condition than the displaced persons of Europe.

I have before me a document issued by a most prominent Arizonan which says that this is not the case. In view of previous pleas and testimony made before Congress, his statements are somewhat amazing, and I shall include them here for the consideration of my colleagues.

Let me cite a typical example of the stirring appeals made by Arizona spokesmen for the Arizona project. On May 28, 1951, a distinguished Member of the Senate, who ranks high in his party, told his colleagues—page 5867 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It was testified by witnesses that from 150,000 to 200,000 people would have to seek new homes if the economy of the State is not saved by this project. Banking institutions, stores, and other businesses now both serving and depending upon these people would be seriously affected by these lands going out of productivity, which would result in the loss of homes and work for this large number of people.

A little later on the same day, the same distinguished Senator told on the Senate floor of the dire results which would occur if Arizona's water supply is not supplemented by the proposed project—page 5869 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He said:

It would mean that thousands of people would lose their homes, and this would affect the bankers and businessmen and break down the whole economy of the State of Arizona. But that is not all. It would mean that all these people, farmers and businessmen, would lose their buying power. They could not continue to purchase manufactured articles and supplies from other sections of the United States, and perhaps most significant of all, it would mean that the present sum of bank dollars paid annually in income taxes to the United States Government would dwindle to practically nothing. The mines and other industries of the State would be saddled with all the bonded indebtedness of the State and its subdivisions, and the added burden of all the costs of State Government, including the support of the schools. Thus, the whole economy of Arizona would be seriously affected. It has been estimated, as I have previously stated, that a quarter of a million people would actually have to leave the State. These people would be displaced persons. Where would they go, under ordinary circumstances?

There can be no question that Arizona needs this water to maintain her economy.

Walter R. Bimson is a distinguished Arizona business leader and economist. He is president of Arizona's largest financial house, The Valley National Bank of Phoenix. His bank loans millions of dollars each year to businessmen and farmers. Therefore, it may be assumed that Mr. Bimson keeps in

close touch with the condition of Arizona's economy.

In August, Mr. Bimson issued a report on farm and range conditions in Arizona. This report was widely distributed throughout the United States to bankers, investment houses, and business firms.

I quote from Mr. Bimson's report:

Let us now give you a brief appraisal of our present situation. Last year was a very dry year, quite comparable to this one. Yet we produced last year the largest volume of crops ever grown in Arizona. This year, we shall again produce a record crop. Our dollar volume should be as great, or greater, than last year.

Our bank makes each year many millions of dollars of crop-production loans. Our field men who constantly inspect the crops we finance, have just reported to me that they do not know of a single borrowing customer who will not be able to liquidate his loans entirely this year because of lack of water. We do not have a single farm mortgage on our books that is delinquent, and we do not anticipate any delinquencies as a result of water shortages.

I continue to quote from Mr. Bimson's report:

Our largest single crop is cotton. It is estimated that the cotton crop in Arizona this year will exceed 800,000 bales and, according to a Government report published as of the first of August, there is sufficient water for the fruition of this crop. Government estimates an average yield per acre this year of about one and one-half bales, as against the national average of close to one-half bale per acre.

It is our best judgment that the present water shortage will not this year adversely affect the total production of crops in Arizona. One reason for this is that farmers know in advance how much water they have available under our controlled system of irrigation and plant only as much land as they can adequately water. Furthermore, by more intensive and careful cultivation of the remaining land, they sometimes actually produce as much on this smaller acreage as they do when they farm their entire acreage. For this year, at least, our water shortage, while a matter of real concern, will not result in any critical crop failures or material reductions in total farm productions.

It would seem to me that the Senator previously quoted was slightly confused when he addressed the Senate.

But what of the future?

Asks Mr. Bimson in his report.

Of course, there is no way of predicting next winter's snowfall in our mountain areas. But it is hardly conceivable that there would be no snowfall and, therefore, no run-off into our reservoirs next spring. In the driest winter we have had in 50 years, which was 1902, the runoff amounted to 332,000 acre-feet. Even with an equally low runoff next spring, we would not have a critical situation because our underground water supply, supplementing our stored water, would still permit us to continue a volume of agricultural production higher than normal 5 years ago. A 10-percent decline in the price of farm products would reduce our farm income more than any shortage of water that is likely to occur.

I wonder if the Senator quoted above could have been talking about some other project in some other State, instead of the Arizona project?

The proponents of the central Arizona project have said that Arizona cities desperately need water. The records of hearings on the Arizona bill are replete with statements to this effect.

Mr. Bimson says in his report:

There need be no fear about the shortage of water, either currently or in the future, affecting adversely the growth of our cities. It is quite possible that long-continued drought might reduce our cultivated farm acreage, but drought, no matter how long continued, could not reduce to a critical point, the supply of water for further development and growth of our cities.

The Arizona project plan contains a provision for supplying municipal water.

Regarding income in Arizona, Mr. Bimson states:

The total income of individuals in this State is a little under \$1,000,000,000 a year * * * agriculture and livestock together produce about \$250,000,000, or one-fourth of this total amount. While a curtailment of farm production would adversely affect our general economy to some extent, our sources of wealth and income are so well diversified that we cannot foresee any conditions relating to present or future water shortages that would materially curtail our continued progress.

This last paragraph rather effectively refutes the statements of the important Senator quoted previously and other Arizona leaders who have so tearfully predicted the State's complete ruin.

In other sections of his report Mr. Bimson shows in other ways that Arizona's economy is not in the desperate condition that some proponents of the central Arizona project would have us believe.

I quote from the report:

Our agricultural production in this area is not dependent upon rainfall, but upon the water stored in our reservoirs, caught in the spring when the streams are filled with water from melting snow in the high mountain areas and released during the crop-growing season for the use of our farmers in the valleys.

When we have a heavy snowfall in the mountains our reservoirs are filled to overflowing. Then we have enough water for current needs and sometimes a surplus that will insure an adequate supply for several years.

When the snowfall is light the runoff is light. Our reservoirs are not filled, and we do not have an adequate reserve supply of water. Then we supplement the stored water by a pumping system that draws water from underground sources.

For several years now we have been in a dry cycle. As a result, our storage water is low, and we have been drawing heavily upon our underground water supply. In some areas heavy pumping has lowered the underground water level, necessitating deepening wells and using more powerful pumps. The cost of pumping has increased, but not yet to a prohibitive figure.

We have had many other dry periods in our recent history, and some of them have been just as serious as our present situation. For example, since 1910, when our present water-storage system was started, there have been 11 years out of the 41 years when we have started the crop season with less than 500,000 acre-feet of water in our reservoirs. In two of these years, 1910 and 1940, we started the season with less water than we had this year. As far as storage water is concerned, our shortage this year is not as bad as it has been in other years.

Arizona Members of Congress and other supporters of the proposed central Arizona project have repeatedly stated that thousands of acres of Arizona farm land which are dependent upon underground water must go out of production

if the project is not quickly built. Some irrigation districts, they said, may now water only a small part of their lands because of a water shortage.

In view of these statements it is interesting to note what Mr. Bimson says regarding underground water in his report. I quote:

The effect of pumping on our underground water level is a matter that has been given much study during this dry spell. I have explained how we supplement our surface-water supply by drawing upon our underground supply.

In addition to the pumping that goes on in areas served by the storage reservoirs, there are many farms outside the districts served by reservoirs which are dependent upon underground water for their entire water supply. Nearly one-half of our farm land in Arizona is thus dependent upon underground water. These lands have generally had an adequate supply of water throughout the recent dry period.

That last sentence, to say the least, is slightly in conflict with the statements made to Congress by Arizona witnesses and officials.

Mr. Bimson's report continued:

In some areas, however, the withdrawal of water from the ground has lowered the underground water level very materially, necessitating the deepening of wells. In other areas there has been very little change in the water level.

While it is impossible to obtain accurate figures on all of the wells in the State, we do have accurate figures on all of the wells in the Salt River Valley water users project, which comprises a quarter-million acres of land in the Phoenix area.

In 1910 the underground water level averaged 30 feet. In the following 10 years when there was very little pumping, but constant application of surface water to the land, the water level rose to an average height of 15 feet from the surface. This steadily rising level was a matter of concern because if the level got much nearer the surface it would ruin the crops. Wells and pumps were then installed for the express purpose of lowering this water level to a safer depth.

In the following 15 years the water level was restored to a 39-foot level which was about normal for this area before irrigation began.

From 1935 to 1940 the runoff from the mountain snows was in low volume (except for one good year in 1937) and the pumps were used steadily during that period. This reduced the water level from 39 to 50 feet. The 1941-45 period was a period of good runoff and pumping declined. The underground water level remained constant at 50 feet. Since 1945, however, we have used the pumps more heavily to supplement our meager surface supply of water, and the underground water level has, in this period, dropped sharply to an average of 89 feet, where it stands today.

This situation is probably paralleled throughout the State. It is this rapidly falling water level combined with below-average runoffs of surface water that has resulted in the current discussion of our water problem. The Governor of the State has called several conferences for the purpose of agreeing upon a program of controlling the use of underground water. *Life* magazine picked up this item of news, featured it in a recent issue and many of our eastern friends have been alarmed about their investments in Arizona.

Our concern and the Governor's concern is not with the outcome of our current crops, but rather with the development of a constructive long-range control program.

Arizona is recognized as the most efficient cotton-producing area in the world. It is,

therefore, attractive to out-of-State people who wish to come here to develop new cotton lands. In an effort to conserve existing investments and to prevent overuse of our limited water supply, the Governor has wisely reorganized the need for some reasonable control of the underground water supply.

The pictures painted by the Arizona proponents of a State devastated by economic ruin, and of ranchers and their families trudging wearily out of the State, homeless and helpless, fades a little more under the penetrating light of Mr. Bimson's concluding paragraph regarding cattle ranges.

Mr. Bimson says:

There have been good summer rains in many of the cattle-range areas, although in some other areas the ranges are admittedly very dry. However, this year fewer cattle have had to be moved to better ranges than in many past years. In fact, many out-of-State cattle herds are coming into this State in order to utilize our surplus feed.

Newsprint Shortage Caused by NPA Order M-69 Should Be Stopped

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to another example of the incredible bureaucratic confusion in our Government, and to the serious damage it is inflicting on both our economy and our liberty.

The administration has committed the United States to a "globaloney" sulfur export plan that will seriously curtail the already critical newsprint supply and may eventually cause one small newspaper after another to go out of business in this country. The State Department, through ECA, has set up what is known as the International Materials Conference. The Conference has set up a "sulfur" committee with representatives from 13 countries to consider the problem of how to distribute sulfur, principally produced in the United States, to the rest of the world. This superannuated, superelite, superimposed international agency of a nebulous world government which presumably does not exist has, as the House might expect, decided that if anybody must suffer a lack of sulfur, it must be America.

As a result the committee has graciously directed that the United States export 960,000 tons of American sulfur in 1951, and inasmuch as that decision creates a sulfur shortage that would not otherwise exist, the National Production Authority has issued order M-69, which puts sulfur under a rationing system. Sulfur, which is vital to the production of newsprint, therefore will be available in smaller quantities for newsprint production, and it is estimated that the newsprint supply may be cut as much as 20 percent as a result.

With world newsprint already in short supply in the United States, the sulfur order, which presumably would affect

American and Canadian newsprint producers equally, could have a disastrous effect on publications in the free world at the very instant when other segments of our bureaucratic labyrinth are urging that more newsprint be produced as an effective means of counteracting Soviet propaganda. In any case, small newspapers and publications, which already have to scramble the best they can for newsprint because of existing shortages, will find themselves in a serious predicament, and beyond doubt many will have to go out of business.

I am therefore introducing today a bill (H. R. 5379) increasing by 50 percent the amount of sulfur for the American and Canadian newsprint industry above that provided by NPA Order M69. I have addressed a letter to the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's subcommittee investigating newsprint, my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth], asking for immediate hearings in an effort to unravel the knots which our bureaucratic one-worlders have tied themselves into. We should decide once and for all whether the United States intends to promote freedom of the press and the maximum access to truth or whether this policy is to be laid aside because of a handful of bureaucrats want to play chess with sulfur production.

The National Production Authority has estimated that our 1951-52 supply of sulfur might be as much as 20 percent short of American industrial demands. If a reduction of 20 percent in the supply of necessary sulfur is denied to newsprint manufacturers, we will be faced with a shortage of at least 1,000,000 tons of newsprint. It would seriously affect the economy of the newsprint industry in the United States and Canada, and would certainly cause some of our American newspaper publishers to close their doors.

The Congress of the United States has been working through its various committees for years in an effort to assist the newsprint industry and the newspaper publishing business to find ways and means to increase their supply of newsprint.

In the last 5 years both American and Canadian newsprint manufacturers have spent great sums of money to build new plants and to modernize existing plants in a program to speed up and increase production. The 1951-52 production of newsprint is dependent on increasing quantities of sulfur. To place a curb on sulfur allocations to Canadian and American manufacturers is contrary to the best interest of our Nation and will cause hardships to one of Canada's basic industries.

There is no real shortage of sulfur in the United States. The present shortage is an artificial one created by the present administration. American production of sulfur is now two and a half times that of prewar levels and more than enough to meet every American industrial demand. The State Department through the Economic Cooperation Administration has set up what is known as the International Materials Conference. The purpose of this Conference, according to Mr. Theodore L. Sweet, the

American representative on the International Materials Conference on sulfur is to set up continuing international machinery through which all of the interested governments of the free world can cooperate in the solution of material shortages which are world-wide in scope and effect.

The sulfur committee of the International Materials Conference is made up of 13 countries, 5 of which are members of the United Kingdom. They met early this year and considered the requests of all countries for allocations of American sulfur and decided what was to be done with our American sulfur production. Their figures, which our administration approved, call for the exporting of 960,000 tons of American sulfur in 1951. Having approved these figures for export, we now find that we cannot meet our own industrial demands. Hence, NPA issues order M-69, which puts sulfur allocations under a rationing system. This order also affects Canadian sulfur requirements for they are not considered as exports, nor do they require export licenses.

Under this order, NPA can and does control the amount of sulfur necessary and vital to our defense program, and rightly so. But to curtail American and Canadian sulfur requirements used in the manufacture of newsprint is shortsighted and obviously an unnecessary order.

Newsprint has always had to have a relatively small amount of sulfur used in the process of its manufacture. There is no substitute if we are to have a high-quality product that can meet the standards of strength needed for present high-speed news presses. The entire pulp and paper industry, which once used a much larger proportion of our total sulfur production, now uses less than 10 percent. Only 11 1/2 pounds of sulfur are used to produce 1 ton of newsprint as against 56 1/2 pounds for one ton of kraft paper.

Canada, which depends entirely upon the United States for its supply of sulfur, imports 252,000 tons and uses 77 percent of its total imports for paper manufacturing. Canada produces approximately 80 percent of our newsprint.

Sulfur is one of the oldest and most widely used elements, and it is found in some form in almost every land. The ingenuity and efficiency of the American sulfur industry, risking its capital in exploration and in new methods of production, has made sulfur available in extremely large quantities and at very low costs. The current world shortage of sulfur is not due to any failure on the part of the American sulfur industry to produce.

Mr. L. M. Williams, Jr., president of the Freeport Sulfur Industry, in a letter dated July 17, 1951, to the House Subcommittee on Newsprint, wrote:

United States sulfur productions is, in fact, more than enough to meet the full needs of American industry. These needs are not being met only because of the large exports of sulfur. . . . These exports made at the direction of our Government are equivalent to about one-fourth of our production. . . . Our allies overseas have access to reserves of sulfur sufficiently large to supply all their needs. Production from these sources not only has failed to keep pace with the requirements of these coun-

tries but has not returned even to prewar levels. If the deficit is to be placed at any door, it should be theirs and not ours.

When our State Department through ECA agreed to let the International Materials Conference allocate approximately a million tons of American sulfur for export to foreign countries, we in effect guaranteed to the world a cheap and bountiful supply of sulfur at the expense of our own economy and industry. Ironically, we also loan or give outright to many of the countries the money to buy our sulfur.

As far as I am able to determine, there is no other country which rations or controls its sulfur once it has received the sulfur from us. There are no American controls as to the ultimate use of exported sulfur. A foreign purchaser could buy sulfur for \$26 a ton, American export price, and resell it in foreign markets for \$60 a ton, Italian export price. We could not stop him.

These allocations of sulfur to foreign countries at the low American prices will only perpetuate world shortages, for as long as the rest of the world is guaranteed a cheap supply of sulfur by IMC from the United States supply, they will not reopen their own sulfur plants.

We have no stockpile of sulfur in the United States, nor is there a program of stockpiling contemplated. We have only 10 to 20 years of present production left in our known American sulfur deposits.

When I first began my investigation into sulfur shortages in the newsprint industry and traced the shortages to the International Materials Conference, I found some rather interesting facts that affect many basic materials. The International Materials Conference now has seven committees whose recommendations control the following 13 important products and materials: Copper, zinc, lead, sulfur, cotton, tungsten, molybdenum, manganese, nickel, cobalt, wool, and paper and pulp. It is significant to note that the United States is the largest or second largest producer of these materials under international control, and in every case the United States is the largest consumer.

But it becomes even more interesting to note the vital commodities that are not controlled by this so-called international machinery to solve world shortages.

There is no international machinery set up to control the British monopoly of commercial diamonds, nor the South American monopoly of tin.

Nor is there any attempt by the International Materials Conference to touch the British-Malayan crude rubber monopoly which has been gouging United States tire manufacturers for years.

Nor has there been a committee set up for oil and petroleum. With the British and Dutch having a combined output greater than the United States, the British have felt that there was no need for such international machinery. But now that the British have lost their oil holdings in Iran, our State Department will shortly announce that the United States will soon place her petroleum production into the hands of another foreign committee.

We are in effect, through the International Materials Conference, placing the economy of the United States into the hands of a semi-world government, giving away control of basic materials vital to our American free enterprise system.

To the anticipated charge that this bill will single out the newsprint industry and give it special consideration denied to other industries, I need only point out that all our vital defense industries' demand for sulfur under order M69 are and will be taken care of. This bill takes the newsprint industry out of the non-essential class into which order M69 has placed it. It takes it out of the class as such nondefense industries as detergents, insecticides, fertilizers, rayons, paints, and a multitude of nonessential products which use sulfur in their manufacture.

This bill will place the American and Canadian newsprint industry needs on a par with foreign newsprint manufacturers in Norway, Sweden, and Finland. It places our American and Canadian manufacturers of newsprint on the same footing as the foreign manufacturers now using our sulfur in the manufacture of nonessential products.

My investigation into newsprint shortages has led me to believe that the present administration has gone out of its way to discriminate against our newsprint industry.

Scandinavians have been gouging American newspaper publishers with prices running 200 to 300 percent above the United States and Canadian newsprint price. OPS has placed a price ceiling on newsprint at \$116 per ton, yet they allow the Scandinavians to charge black market prices of \$200 to \$350 per ton.

The International Materials Conference committee on paper and pulp has now decided that American newsprint manufacturers must export part of their production, thus increasing our newsprint shortage. The NPA under Order M45 has ruled that all United States paper manufacturers must set aside three percent of their pulp production for market sales of pulp, once more increasing our United States paper shortage.

I hope that all of these things will be brought to light and cleared up when the House Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee makes a report on its newsprint investigation.

This bill is not intended to be a cure-all for the newsprint industry.

This bill will enable the newsprint industry to have access to the essential raw material of sulfur to meet production demands.

This need is so essential that it justifies special action on the part of this Congress.

Newsprint is too important to the welfare and preservation of our American tradition of free speech and freedom of the press to allow its production to be in any way hampered by restrictive, unjustified and unnecessary bureaucratic controls.

Retirement of Hon. Peyton Ford as Deputy Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared paying tribute to Hon. Peyton Ford, who is retiring as Deputy Attorney General to reenter the private practice of law.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I should like to say a few words of tribute to a well-deserved official of the Department of Justice who is leaving the Government to reenter the private practice of law.

He is Peyton Ford, who has resigned as Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. Ford, with whom I have had many associations in the line of duty, has rendered not only to the Department of Justice, but to the United States a service which, together with his career in the Navy, has certainly earned a "well done."

Mr. Ford came to the Department of Justice in 1946, after serving as a lieutenant in the Navy in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the China-Burma-India areas. During those years he saw much combat.

Although Mr. Ford, in the sense of age, is a young man, his experience is legion.

He was Assistant Attorney General for the State of Oklahoma in the years 1939 and 1940.

Following his duty with the Navy, he was appointed Special Assistant to the Attorney General in 1946 by Attorney General Tom C. Clark, who is now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Ford's capabilities were quickly recognized by the President and the Attorney General with his appointment as Assistant Attorney General to head the Claims Division of the Department of Justice in 1947.

A few months after this appointment, he was elevated to the position of the Assistant to the Attorney General, which title the Congress later changed to that of Deputy Attorney General. In this position he had, under the Attorney General, direct supervision of the Department of Justice.

I have known Peyton Ford to pursue, without regard to his personal time or energies, the fullest efforts for that which would reflect credit not only to the Department but in the best interests of his country. There has never been a time during my tenure as a Congressman and as a Senator of the United States that Mr. Ford has not been available to lend full and complete support to any problem placed before him.

Despite the long arduous hours as Deputy Attorney General and his close liaison work with the Congress and his countless daily routine problems, Mr. Ford has found time to argue several cases before the highest court of the land.

I should like to say that our former colleague, J. Howard McGrath, who is now the Attorney General, voiced my feelings in his formal acceptance of Mr. Ford's resignation when he said: "It is with deep personal regret that I accept his resignation," and added that "During the 2 years I have been Attorney General I have acquired a very

genuine esteem and affection for Mr. Ford and I am deeply appreciative of his fine service and loyalty."

Mr. Ford's successor, A. DeWitt Vanech, has served long and capably in the Department of Justice, and I know he will continue to do a good job.

Encroachment by Government on Private Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the question of further encroachment by government in the fields heretofore reserved to private industry is giving much concern to citizens throughout the entire country.

The matter is discussed expertly, and its implications weighed with authority, in an address made before the Thirty-fourth International Labor Conference of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, Switzerland, by William L. McGrath, president, the Williamson Heater Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, and a splendid American.

Members of the Senate will be interested, I know, in the attitude of representatives of other nations, who are working with representatives of this country in international activities, and I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. McGrath be printed in the Appendix of the Record so that the well-qualified views expressed may be given the wide prominence they deserve.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For the third successive year, I have served upon the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, and I urge you most earnestly to study its report.

The work of this committee is overshadowed by the issues and arguments developed in the committees which are drafting conventions or recommendations covering the items on the current agenda. But it is in the Committee on Application that we endeavor to learn what have been the actual results of the conventions that have been passed. And I can assure you that attending three successive sessions of this committee is indeed an experience in progressive disillusionment.

I did not think, when I first became a member of the United States employer delegation to this conference, that this august body, now an arm of the United Nations, would be guilty of passing so many conventions which it should have realized would have little probability of ratification in most countries. But such is the case.

I did not dream that nation after nation would give only lip service to treaty obligations. But for 3 years now, I have listened to an imposing procession of alibis, pretenses and excuses, offered by countries in an effort to explain why they have not implemented by legislation conventions which they have long since ratified.

My concern over this matter contributed to a discussion, in our committee, in the

course of which some members apparently assumed that I was suggesting the abandonment of conventions. They were wrong in that assumption. But I do think it is high time that we reviewed carefully the whole subject of the nature and purposes of the convention, lest the ILO fall into international public disrepute.

As I understand it, a convention is presumed to be an international law which, when ratified by a nation, stands as a treaty among all nations which likewise ratify it.

What happens then, when the ILO passes a convention? The word is flashed around the globe—great news for the workers of the world. The ILO has enacted another international law to raise living standards everywhere. Union and government men can tell the people what they have done for the workingman.

But what are the actual facts? They are, as you well know, that the convention will apply only in such countries as may eventually ratify it—and even then only if it is backed up by implementing legislation.

I say, therefore, that when we pass a convention that has little hope of general ratification, we are guilty of gross misrepresentation. And we are moving further in that direction year by year, as clearly shown in the ratification chart prepared by the office. In fact, the ratification tables originally prepared by Sir John Forbes Watson, as brought up to date by the office and appended to the Applications Committee report, show that in our entire history we have an average ratification record of only 16½ percent.

It has been suggested that a country should vote in favor of a convention it knows it cannot ratify, on the ground that the passage of the convention would help underdeveloped countries achieve progressive legislation.

My own view is that hypocrisy is a poor foundation for social progress. When a government delegate supports a convention, the natural assumption is that his country could and might ratify it. If he knows, when he casts his vote for the convention, that his country cannot and will not ratify it because it is contrary to his country's laws and principles, he is, in my opinion, guilty of misrepresentation. His vote is deliberately misleading.

This is not only unfair to other nations; it would indeed be a sorry example to set for the underdeveloped countries who are relatively new at these meetings and have presumed that we speak with honesty and candor. If a so-called advanced nation can vote for a convention on a tongue-in-cheek basis, so can they. If nations to whom they look for guidance can make a pretense for political purposes, so can they. And what real progress could be made toward helping underdeveloped countries achieve progressive legislation if the ILO were to degenerate into a form of mutual insincerity?

Is political expediency of the moment to determine the vote on convention ratification?

Can we afford to let what started out so nobly as a real instrument of international law degenerate into a mere medium of propaganda?

A recommendation carries with it no elements of misrepresentation. But lest the workers themselves some day turn against us in disillusionment, we must be more cautious as to conventions.

I pass now to the second phase of this problem, namely, failure to pass implementing legislation after ratification.

It was my impression that after ratification, necessary implementing legislation became a contractual obligation. I note that in the preamble to the ILO Constitution, the member countries are referred to as the "high contracting parties." The constitution also provides that after ratifying a con-

vention the contracting party "will take such action as may be necessary to make effective the provisions of such convention."

In the United States, we have great respect for the sanctity of contract. In our country, an employer would not sign a contract with a union and then say, behind closed doors, "Of course, I have no intention of living up to the terms of the contract. I only signed it because the story would look good in the newspapers." But that seems to have been the spirit in which various member countries have ratified conventions. Some countries are still trying to explain otherwise, after 20 years.

Other countries offer sincere explanations of failure to implement a ratified convention by legislation; explanations with which our committee is reasonably sympathetic, because they are based upon fact. One country says, "We had a change in administration." Another says, "We try and try, but we can't get the law through the legislature." Conditions which have developed in a country since ratification may have made the application of some of the provisions of the convention impracticable. So the explanations continue, year after year, in our committee hearings, following a tedious and familiar pattern.

Nevertheless a contract has been broken; a treaty has been violated. Ratification has been a sham and a pretense, and again the ILO is involved in misrepresentation.

Some countries seem little concerned over the matter, and appear surprised that our committee should take it seriously. One government claimed that it should not be criticized for its shortcomings, because to show its good faith it intended to vote for more new conventions at this conference. Note, too, as stated in appendix I of our subcommittees report, that although ratified conventions are supposed to be brought before the "competent authorities" within a year or at the longest 18 months, only 17 out of the 60 countries who were members in 1940 have as yet done so with respect to all of the conventions passed at the 1949 conference.

The fact is that instead of realizing their contractual obligations as to conventions, under the constitution of the ILO, member countries are to a large extent treating various conventions as if they were recommendations. Would it not have been better for the reputation and standing of the ILO if such conventions had been passed as recommendations in the first place?

There is another aspect of our committee's hearings which concerns me greatly. That is the emphasis placed upon ratification and legislation, rather than upon working and living standards achieved.

Bulgaria has ratified 62 conventions; the United States has ratified 5. Is Bulgaria therefore a more advanced country than the United States? A country may have high living standards, but unless it has passed ILO legislation it gets no credit for them in our committee.

Does the passage of ILO laws represent the sole measure of progress; the sole evidence of the influence of the ILO? In this connection may I quote Mr. Benitez, the employer's delegate from the Philippines. On June 15, Mr. Benitez said, in his address to this body:

"It seems paradoxical that, when delegates convene for their legislative work in the conference, they give the impression that only by the enactment of a law can the ILO fulfill its threefold mission, particularly in the giving of leadership in the field of social policy. Here, I respectfully submit, is where perhaps we need to rationalize and readjust our attitude toward the objectives of the ILO. In the light of the adopted new emphasis in ILO policy, by the sending of experts to the four corners of the world, especially to the underdeveloped regions, and

putting all the accumulated international experience which is available at the service of States members with concrete social and labor problems; in the face of the rapidly growing importance of this new ILO objective, and the keen demand for it from the agricultural nations, the old attitude, that only by law can the ILO give leadership, needs to be discarded.

"Our Government had not ratified a single convention ever since the Philippines became a member in 1948. And yet, I dare say that no single institution has had more influence than the ILO in clarifying our people's thinking with regard to the respective role of the workers and the employers in a democratic society."

The fact is that we have gone out of bounds with respect to conventions. Instead of limiting them to broad principles to which all can subscribe, we have attempted to apply them to the field of specific detailed legislation. Here is where our trouble lies. Here is where we run contrary to the principle of local self-government. This is why we have difficulties with ratification.

In this connection the report of our committee quotes the authors of the ILO constitution as follows:

Subjects will probably come before the conference which, owing to their complexity and the wide differences in the circumstances of different countries, will be incapable of being reduced to any universal and uniform mode of application. In such cases a convention might prove impossible, but a recommendation of principles in more or less detail which left the individual States freedom to apply them in the manner best suited to their conditions would undoubtedly have considerable value."

When we try to tell a country the exact nature of a law it must pass, we are stepping beyond a convention and over into the field of implementation. That, I submit, is something which each country has a right to decide for itself.

It is excellent that nations agree on basic principles. But any effort to interfere with the freedom of countries to pass their own individual laws as they see fit will in the long run result only in nonratification, nonimplementation, and resentment.

Evidence of such resentment is accumulating in the records of our committee.

One government suggested that the Committee on Application should act as a guiding body, rather than as a chamber of inquiry.

Another stressed, as he expressed it, the "right of the congress in a democratic country to pass implementing legislation or not, as it pleases," regardless of previous ratification of the convention to which such legislation would apply.

This amounted in fact to an outright defiance of a treaty obligation, and as such is to be deplored. It was nevertheless a realistic statement of what is the actual situation. I ask you—does there exist any practical operative method of compelling a country which has ratified a convention to proceed to implement it? As one government delegate expressed it, "If the ILO thinks it can force us to pass legislation, it is very much mistaken."

Indeed, some member countries called upon the carpet by our committee did not appear. They had ratified conventions years ago, but had never enacted the legislation needed to put them into effect. Why should they subject themselves to the indignity of being belabored by other countries for failing to do what they obviously have no intention of doing? Their government representatives were conspicuous by their absence, but that very absence indicated how little significance they attached to the matter. Yes, they failed to implement a convention but, as we say in the States, "So what?"

Unless we mend our ways, our practice may some day give rise to the expression, "as meaningless as an ILO convention."

I am told that in many parts of the world it is vital to have face. If we are to have the face of the ILO, we must stop passing conventions which become in fact a travesty upon international law.

Let us couch our findings and suggest our methods chiefly in the form of recommendations. Let us confine conventions to broad principles on subjects that are genuinely adaptable to international legislation, and enact only such as are truly tripartite, easily ratifiable by the majority of countries, capable of implementation under the principle of local self-government, and enjoying the full prospect of broad adoption as international law.

I repeat, I do not suggest the abandonment of conventions. I ask only that they be treated with the respect which they deserve.

Gen. Daniel Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr MARTIN. Mr President, the September 3 edition of *Life* magazine contained an article on Gen. Daniel Morgan. I have received a letter from Mr. Charles F. Hirst, of Scottsdale, Pa., in which he makes a fine historical reference to Gen. Daniel Morgan. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTTSDALE, PA., September 4, 1951.

HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I am hoping that prior to the receipt of these presents you shall have found time and opportunity to at least glance at the September 3 edition of *Life* magazine with special reference to page 53 wherein there is proposed the question "Who gets the general's body?"

Now, I know, Senator MARTIN, that you will be inclined to say "How come writing to me about that?" Well, I'll try to explain.

You will note that the matter discussed at some length in the aforesaid publication has to do with just what should be the correct location for the final interment of the earthly remains of the noted pioneer frontiersman and equally noted general of the Revolutionary War, Gen. Daniel Morgan, commander of the celebrated organization known as Morgan's Riflemen. And, Senator MARTIN, it is well known that you have always been interested in anything having any direct or indirect bearing on the history and records of the military exploits of Pennsylvania's military organizations.

For, although the article published as above mentioned makes no reference thereto, it is a fact that "Morgan's Riflemen" was not a purely Virginian organization but really mainly constituted of western Pennsylvania pioneers.

I also direct your attention to the first paragraph at top of page 59, wherein the statements made regarding the organization of the company of famous riflemen are almost entirely historically at fault, for,

rather than being recruited at Winchester by General Morgan the idea for its foundation was conceived by Gen. George Washington and the greater portion of the personnel was assigned from the "Eighth Pennsylvania," the great and famous revolutionary regiment especially authorized by Congress to be recruited from the pioneer frontiersmen of western Pennsylvania. The confusion of the Virginia connection being no doubt due to the Mason and Dixon's line had not then been surveyed and the fact that a great portion of the Western frontier lands were really in Pennsylvania instead of in Virginia. . . . And it would not be beyond expectation if sometime soon the Senate should be called upon to provide some appropriation for the erection of a memorial to the glorious exploits of Gen. Daniel Morgan and his famous riflemen, which organization really took place in or near Philadelphia at a time when Washington's forces were particularly hard pressed by the British.

So it would reasonably appear that the rightful location for such memorial or monument would be at or near the actual exact spot where the exact recruitment occurred which would thus be in a little private burial plot where once stood the first courthouse, Westmoreland County, Pa., whence on January 6, 1777, the Eighth Pennsylvania began its famous march entirely west to east across our great Keystone Commonwealth, 300 miles across all of Pennsylvania's mountains. This march, considering the hardships encountered, was second only to the march executed by the Revolutionary troops under General Arnold so dramatically described in the historical novel entitled "Northwest Passage."

I am sorry, Senator, to thus encroach on your time, but when it is noted that the issue in the *Life* magazine herein mentioned has a circulation of more than 5,000,000, it certainly merits a little more than merely a passing notice.

I therefore subscribe myself,

Yours very respectfully and sincerely,
CHARLES F. HIRST

Relations Between the United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr FULBRIGHT. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Message to Canada," which was written by Mr. John Park Cravens of the magazine, *Arkansas*, and which appeared in Canada's national newspaper, the *Globe and Mail*, on August 4, 1951. I also ask that an editorial in the same paper commenting upon the article be printed following the article.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO CANADA

I was born and reared in the Ozark Mountains located in the central southern United States. The rivers and mountains were given French and Indian names before the United States Government purchased this mountain range from France in the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.

Near the little town in which I live is Mount Magazine (Magasin in French), named by the French about two centuries ago. It is known as the highest peak between the Rocky and Allegheny mountain ranges. One mile from my home is the river, Petit Jean, named by the French for Little John, an exploring French soldier killed on the river while fighting the Indians.

Years later the Indians left and then came the white settlers, practically all of Anglo-Saxon descent. My forefathers were of Scotch Irish, English, Welsh, and French descent. And in the days of my grandparents it was truly a land of Elizabethan ways, and in some respects is yet. In my clan were the Cravens, the Arvecks, the Rices, the Brooks, the Jacksons, the Harwells, the Patts, the Popes, the Lanes, the Connors, the Carpenters, the McKinnies, the Herndons, the Rogers, and others.

BIRDS FROM CANADA

In my youth I was truly a nature boy roaming the mountains hunting game, fishing in the streams and hunting Indian arrow-heads, pottery, and their various relics when I was not at work at home on my father's farm.

I was an admirer of many types of game birds, and from the north every year came many beautiful specimens of migratory birds to build their nests and raise their young, and some would stay only a few days and continue their flight on to the south. And one day in my youth I asked my father where these birds came from when they would come winging in out of the north, and he replied, "Canada."

Canada. In my youthful heart, mind, and soul for a land there was no name more beautiful. In my mind I associated the beauty of the birds, their songs, their freedom of flight and my admiration and love for them with Canada. And when I advanced far enough in my school grades I began to study about Canada and the British Empire. And many times from the Ozark Mountain tops I would gaze far into the north and think of Canada, that great land so far away.

In these Ozark Mountains when the weather is clear the rising and setting sunsets are beautiful, and in my youth I loved to watch them. But more beautiful of a clear night was when I would go alone to a giant cliff a half-mile from my home and there look toward Canada and see the North Star.

GOD'S NIGHT LANTERN

I thought of the North Star as one of God's great night lanterns to the people of Canada and the northland. Silhouetted against the sky were birds in flight from your land toward the south, and the North Star had lighted up the landmarks and streams to guide the way. Sometimes I would climb to the top of a tall pine tree to get a higher view and wish I could take wings like a bird and fly to your great land for a few hours' visit, and I imagined it would be an enchanted paradise, the land of rainbow waters, and the land where a fairy king with his magic wand gave the birds those beautiful colors and tints.

I have never been to your country, but it has since my youth been a part of my mind, heart, and soul. To me there is no boundary between Canada and the United States when it comes to my loyalty and love.

The birds I loved in my youth and also love today knew no boundary line between Canada and the United States. And may our two countries forever be this way in relationships and spirit, and may persons of my country and your country who in their youths idealized that land beyond the horizon never have that ideal shattered.

At the age of 18 I volunteered as a United States soldier in the First World War. And today I have a 19-year-old son who is a United States soldier in Korea. Oh, be-

loved Canada. I have seen your fighting men who are braver than the bravest of the brave. Oh, sons of the land of the North Star. I will never forget Mons, Vimy Ridge, and Flanders Fields. And since then down through the years every bird I see from your country that has the color of red about it, I think of the blood your sons shed and their lives they gave for your country and my country. Oh, men of Canada. You go into battle with hearts and bodies as strong as your stately forests, your hearts as pure as your driven snows and your rainbow waters, your minds and purpose as clear as your golden sunshine, and you were as free as your fowls of the air, and to protect this freedom you died so willingly, so gloriously, and so bravely. May the eyes of no foreign enemy ever see your stately forests, your rivers and lakes of rainbow waters, your snow-capped mountains, your golden valleys, your beautiful villages, towns, and cities.

GET BETTER ACQUAINTED

And may God grant that only the wings of our birds and our planes will ever fly over our lands. I have never seen any planes other than our United States planes in the air over my native mountains here. I would dearly love to see some Canadian planes winging in from the north. It would thrill me as much as a flock of birds winging in from Canada in the days of my youth. The people of Canada and the United States should get better acquainted and learn more about their neighbor.

Just as God set forth in His plans ages ago for birds of the air during certain seasons to wing their way south so has your country carried on a pride, a tradition, a loyalty, a justice, a culture, and a progress that has lived for hundreds of years. And such lives in the hearts, souls, and minds of all classes of your citizens, and their reverence for these things is godly, and in it there is a strength that can never be overcome by any enemy.

The location of your country and its type reounds with freedom and I believe in the near future years a progress unequalled will come to it.

MILLIONS TO COME

The birds still follow their paths, and always they have an objective. And, too, your great country has an objective I believe the good Lord means for it to reach in His future plans for this world. My opinion is there is a glorious future for Canada. Millions of liberty-loving people seeking homes will turn their eyes toward the vast domains of your country. In the near future years a great general progress and an increase in millions in population will cause Canada to come into her own.

May the flags of Canada, the British Empire, and the United States fly forever as symbols of world leadership, liberty, righteousness, and progress. In conclusion I say: God bless Canada.

God save the king.

JOHN PARK CRAVENS,
Magazine Arkansas, U. S. A.

WHAT A NEIGHBOR KNOWS

Elsewhere on this page today we publish a letter which is poetic in its inspiration, majestic in its conception, and heart-warming in its sincerity toward this Dominion.

"I have never been to your country," writes Mr. John Park Cravens, of Arkansas. Although he has not been here, most assuredly in his heart he has long dwelt among us. It was his mind, guided by the literature he has read and the personal contacts he has made with Canadians, which perceived the immensity of our country and its potentialities. But it was his rich and resourceful imagination which endowed Canada with a

nobility and integrity that now in turn should challenge and inspire us.

"No name more beautiful than Canada," it has seemed to him, when the winging birds came down in their timeless custom, and the North Star whispered to him of a land he had never seen yet vividly knew as only poets can know. His nature reveals itself as he involuntarily employs the sweeping colors for Canada which a cosmic brush bestowed in such bewildering lavishness on his native Osarks.

"So has your country carried on a pride, a tradition, a loyalty, a justice, a culture, and a progress that has lived for hundreds of years." "Millions of liberty-loving people seeking homes will turn their eyes toward the vast domains of your country." It is profoundly moving to know that such deep trust and friendship exist for us who as a nation have too often not had a self-confidence to match these sentiments. May we be worthy of our neighbor's high assessment and his intensely reasonable prophecy. Even better than he knows what we are does he know what we should be.

Money Goes Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, on Friday, September 14 of this year, there appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital a very important editorial entitled "Money Goes Overseas," which I am sure concerns every taxpayer of this country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MONEY GOES OVERSEAS

During the current controversy over how much Federal money should be earmarked for flood relief and rehabilitation in Kansas, we suppose no one questions that Uncle Sam has dollars to spare for the purpose. However, we doubt that the average Kansan has any conception of how much our Federal Government is spending on much less worthy projects in foreign lands. Members of the Congress have been attempting for a long time to round up the figures and reach the grand total, but with little success.

This much, however, is known. Our Government is the biggest dues-paying member of the United Nations and its myriad of affiliated groups. In 1950 alone, the assessments against the United States for the U. N. proper came to \$13,596,243, or almost half the total assessments against all of the participating nations of the world combined.

As Kansans await Federal action on rebuilding dikes for immediate flood protection, and on long-range flood-control projects, Federal money keeps right on flowing swiftly overseas.

In addition to our contributions to the U. N. proper as a membership fee, for example, we are paying our millions for side-issue projects. We are paying \$2,519,907 into the World Health Organization; \$1,316,375 into the International Labor Organization; and \$1,355,000 into the Food and Agriculture Organization. There are dozens of others of lesser consequence as far as the upkeep is

concerned, but they add up to a shockingly high bill which we taxpayers pay.

All these things are in addition to huge expenditures for foreign military build-up and economic development. This money goes chiefly to organizations in which only a relatively few theorists are interested or have any knowledge.

No wonder the people of Kansas wish our Government would be as prompt and generous in sending funds to relieve distress in the flood areas and to provide protection against future floods.

Flood-relief bills are dormant in congressional committees at the same time swift action is demanded on proposals to levy more funds for those in other lands.

"Do it now—time is precious," is the cry raised in connection with almost all foreign spending bills, but as far as flood-relief legislation is concerned, "let 'em wait" seems to be the order of the day. Administration leaders, it is hoped, will join with Members of the Kansas congressional delegation in jarring flood legislation out of its log jam of inertia.

Anglo-American Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a most interesting article entitled "Lest the Dreadful Scales Begin To Dip," by the world-famous economist Barbara Ward, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, September 16. This article is so informative and thought provoking that I wish it could be read by every person both in the United States and in the British Commonwealth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEST THE DREADFUL SCALES BEGIN TO DIP—
ONLY AN INSPIRED ANGLO-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP CAN BALANCE THE WEIGHT ON THE SOVIET SIDE

(By Barbara Ward)

In every great successful alliance there is always an inner core of partner states bound together by the closest ties of confidence and understanding. In the last war Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill became living symbols of this inner strength. In the First World War, France and Britain should have formed a like unit, but only reached it in the last year under the leadership of Marshal Foch. In the Napoleonic wars such a nucleus of close partners was never really formed at all, and that may have been one reason why the war dragged on for two decades. Today we may not face actual war, but the risks of the "cold war" are fateful enough to make unity within the great Northern Atlantic alliance the pivot of western survival. As the partners gather at Ottawa this week the dangers they face are not less than those which threatened Roosevelt or Churchill or the younger Pitt.

Their alliance must be strong. So much everyone will agree. But is it so obvious that they need, like every other group of allied states, a strong, confident, united central core. That central partnership can, of

course, only come into being between the United States and the British Commonwealth. If they cannot coalesce fully, who can? Unhappily for the Western World, unhappily for freemen everywhere, the chances of their partnership becoming really trusting and unshakable are at the moment slender. More still, it seems certain that the coming 12 months will be a period of particular strain in British-American relations.

The starting point is the state of the domestic policies in both countries. The United States will be preparing for a Presidential election. Britain probably will also be involved in or on the eve of an electoral campaign. Such periods are rarely noted for statesmanship and moderation. This time, however, a new twist of misfortune may well be added. Foreign relations, and in particular Anglo-American relations are likely to be an actual issue in the two campaigns.

Aneurin Bevan has already fired the first round in Britain. In his bid for leadership in the Labor Party he expressly asks for a weakening of British ties with the United States and goes on record that a rearméd America may be a greater menace to world peace than an armed Russia. He stands no chance of winning this campaign for leadership, but by forcing the issue he may be able to decide the themes upon which the electoral controversy will turn—and the theme of aggressive capitalist America has already been announced.

In the United States, far-eastern policy can hardly be left out of the Presidential contest, and here again some of the notes have already been sounded. The dismissal of General MacArthur, supposedly under pressure from Socialist Britain, British kowtowing to Communist China, Britain's selfish concern with Hong Kong's trade—all these themes have been developed fully in recent months. There need be no doubt that they will return as partisanship and temper begin to rise.

Nor can one draw much comfort from the hope that since in Britain it is, roughly speaking, the Left that sounds off most loudly against America, while in the United States it is the Right which least loves Mr. Attlee's Britain, the other side of the political arena in both countries will provide a necessary moderation and cancel the extremes. This is, unfortunately, not so.

Enthusiasm for America is far from invariable in conservative circles in Britain. Here the sense of Empire is strongest, and with it longing for the old days of undivided British control. The tendency to think of Americans as anti-imperial interlopers, dies hard. Equally, on the American Left, the picture of Britain as an old empire, seeking, like Fafnir, to lie and possess, is quite as vivid as a more recent interest in Britain's Socialist experiment. In fact, it is true to say that throughout the last 6 years there has always been present in Anglo-American relations some good grievance or misunderstanding which enables both Right and Left in both countries to throw stones at the neighbor across the Atlantic.

As if this running undercurrent of friction were not enough, there is the added difficulty that in neither country does any really effective group work constantly at the task of correcting, explaining, interpreting, and enhancing each nation's views of the other. Hardly any political leader of first-class caliber in Britain has gone out of his way to give the lie to Mr. Bevan's vaporings. In the United States, where the slightest murmur that the Nationalists in China may possibly have lost the civil war through their own fault is pounced upon as clear evidence of Communist sympathies, few people have bothered to correct gross misrepresentations about Britain's trade with China or to point out that Japanese-Chinese trade in the first

months after the Korean war actually expanded.

There may be, indeed there no doubt is, a widely diffused and vague goodwill on the subject of the "English-speaking world," but there appear to be very few really prominent citizens who feel the unity of that world as a first and burning call upon their energies. In America it is easy to start the cheers for the gallant Turks, the gallant Greeks, la bello France, and even Franco's Spain. In Britain, admittedly, it is more difficult to work up enthusiasm for any foreigner, still the Scandinavian peoples and the stubborn Dutch can sometimes raise a cheer. But when it is a question of the two peoples in whom the hinge of the free world is fixed, the Americans and the British, the answer is usually silence—complacent, friendly, embarrassed or hostile, according to the occasion—but silence nonetheless.

Yet will anyone doubt that their alliance is the hinge of the world? It needs very little military and political arithmetic to add up the facts of Soviet power and Soviet ambition and to realize that the universal balance of power is perilously close to swinging down upon the Soviet side. Take away one iota from the Western side and the dreadful scales begin to dip. Let the shaky hands that hold together the Atlantic world be loosened a hairsbreadth and the Soviet side of the balance begins inexorably to move. The balance is on a razor's edge and all that holds it is unity in the West, above all things, unity in the English-speaking world.

Stalin is aware of this fact, even if the English speakers are not. The sound of crowbars and levers at work on the cracks in the Western edifice echoes ceaselessly through Soviet diplomacy, and no breach is pried open more lovingly than the ones which open between Washington, London, Ottawa, and Canberra. The most satisfactory aspect of Soviet strategy in the Far East—from the Kremlin's standpoint—has been to throw British Labor Ministers and American Republican Senators into the same China pot and watch them boil. Disunity is the hope and aim of every Russian maneuver. Even if the West prefers to be blind, the Soviet leaders know the feather-balance of the great scales of power and seek to break down the weight which British-American unity alone can provide.

It is the obviousness of the Soviet interest in Western disunity that persuades many people on both sides of the Atlantic to take a more lighthearted view of British-American differences. "Do not," they plead, "be upset by these surface irritations. Do not be deceived by these apparent disputes. Deep down the links of common tradition and common speech hold firm. And in any case"—at this point a cynical note creeps in—"even if those links were shaky, Uncle Joe would keep us in line. Trust the Kremlin. Every time British-American relations get into a real snarl the Russians do something outrageous—and there we all are back again in step. Do let us forget this highfalutin' stuff about loving each other and defending civilization. It is our security and our national interests we have to defend, and, fortunately, the Soviet Union goes on showing us that our security and the defense of our interests take us along the same road. What more do you want? A utopian love feast? Be your age."

One can perfectly well admit the validity of a good deal of this argument. It is true that fear of the Soviet Union has produced in the Western World a unity and a closeness of cooperation that would have seemed inconceivable in 1945. But is that the whole story?

The last admonition, "Be your age," has a sinister ring. By all means, be your age. But what sort of age is this? An age of simple power politics, in which the defense

of security and self-interest make up an adequate diplomacy? An age in which—as in the late nineteenth century—the only question is how to hold in check the ambitions of another nation-state indistinguishable in structure, aims and outlook from one's self? Is it this sort of age?

If so, the glibbling minimum of unity which constant injections of Russian hostility can maintain in the British-American body politic is no doubt sufficient—unsatisfying but sufficient. But is it that sort of age? Or may it be another sort of age, so sinister and savage and unnatural that the machinations of Bismarck and the imperial ambitions of the Czar seem as harmless as power politics in a small-town party caucus?

There is no need for a long, ambitious survey. The last 6 months will do. The worst, the darkest, the most terrifying pages of the last half year tell of new evils which do not so much disrupt man's history as abolish man himself.

With older and maturer minds the weapons are terror and torture. In the last 6 months we have heard from the few survivors—at the Brussels tribunal examining Soviet slave camps—the details of how whole areas have been stripped of their peoples and the expelled sent in open cattle trucks to the Siberian desert of ice. Not one-third of the former population of the Baltic States now remains. The fact that families are carefully and deliberately separated is only a minor detail in the systematic dehumanization of what were once free and lawful men.

In Hungary this summer a new twist has been given to the horrible tale. Thousands upon thousands of quiet, decent people whose only fault was a possible lack of sympathy for the Communist regime were taken from their homes after midnight and dumped—with barely a suitcase—in camps or in the open fields or, more ominously, removed across the Soviet frontier.

From time to time this dark mass of unrecorded personal misery is lighted up by some lurid individual case. In the last four months the senior Catholic Archbishop in Hungary has been arrested, held incommunicado and brought to trial, where, like a ventriloquist's dummy, he "confessed" that his father was a kulak and he himself had plotted against the regime.

Nor are men from the West immune. In these same months William Oatis, the American newspaper correspondent, has been forced down, in Prague, the same shameful path of self-incrimination. Another American—Robert Voegelé—has returned to tell the tale of what mental and physical tortures are applied to bar man from his final dignity—the dignity of martyrdom.

This ruthless elimination of human personality is not reserved only for those who might be suspected of anticommunism. In the last 6 months Vladimir Clementis, Communist Foreign Secretary of Czechoslovakia, has paid the penalty of those whose communism does not take the form of abject and total surrender of national interest to the new Soviet imperialism. Nationalism and patriotism may not be the strongest defenses of human personality, yet they are strong enough to be marked down in the Soviet elimination of man.

Such are the methods for minds which the Communists feel they cannot bend or mold. But for the young millions growing up within the Soviet orbit the process of dehumanization need not be carried on by torture and terror. Before the mold of genuine, independent manhood has set, it can be melted away in the furnace of mass suggestion and mass hypnosis.

Nowhere is the success of this method being put more sharply to the test than in Germany, where Soviet hopes are pinned on "winning the youth." But the campaign is

universal. Hysteria, revivalism, group emotion, the raving rancor of the lynching crowd, the sinking of the individual spirit in the dark passion of the herd—these are the levers which Communist hands have been manipulating in Berlin this summer.

And as the intoxicated youths march and march, yelling like a cataract at the mention of Stalin, shoulder to shoulder in their colored shirts, while little girls of 8 run shrieking, "Stalin! Stalin!" and fling posies of flowers at his picture, while thousands pledge themselves, in the new hateful Soviet doubletalk, to "fight for peace"—while this passion roars like a Bessemer furnace, the lineaments of man, of reason, of justice, of humanity, of pity melt away.

Not young men and women on the threshold of maturity march in the streets, but automata puppets pulled by strings in the hands of men whose control they eagerly and deliriously accept. The Berlin Festival of Youth should leave us in no doubt about this element of delirious acceptance. No doubt there were questioners and doubters among the millions but in the main the festival was an act of faith, faith in a new de-factored race of beings, bound by mass instinct, only capable of blind instinctive obedience.

It has not been necessary to go 1 day beyond the last half year to produce this terrible picture of dehumanization carried forward by aggressive faith. All these things have happened and are happening. This, and no other, is the age in which we live.

So it is now time to ask whether the kind of British-American relations upon which the optimists appear to rely is adequate to such a challenge. If the strongest and closest supporters of Western civilization can rely upon a unity that goes no further than the grumbling admission of common funk, then the only analogy is of two urchins playing marbles under the awful eye of the angel of the last trump. If British-American partnership is the core of Western survival, and the strength, unity and imagination of the English-speaking peoples the center of Western civilization—and who will deny that this is so?—then anyone who loves the West and prays for survival can do little but sit down and weep when he compares the dark energy and terrible faith of Soviet imperialism with the lackluster, lukewarm, touchy and suspicious alliance which appears—most of the time—to be the best that the United States and the British Commonwealth can offer.

Let us all admit that we contrive to scrape along. Let us all admit that things might be a good deal worse. But the real question is whether the partnership and the energy and the vision are equal to the enormity of the Soviet challenge shown even in the last 6 months. And the only honest answer must be: it is not.

Yet, it is surely not an inevitable answer. There are a hundred ways in which this vital partnership could be made the pivot of free-men's hopes—provided the need to do so were frankly accepted on both sides of the Atlantic. There is nothing wrong with the liberal ideals and aims which inspire America and the British Commonwealth. Democracy, responsibility, freedom, peace, economic co-operation, the raising of backward peoples—all these are so clearly the dream of humanity that Soviet double talk has appropriated the lot. The challenge lies in making these old ideals live, to make the acceptable faith a compelling thing by means of obvious works.

Here, too, the outlook is not discouraging. To give only one example, the Marshall plan did more in 2 years to rebuild Western idealism than a thousand Berlin rallies could ever do, and it should not be beyond the wit of

American and British leaders to see that schemes of comparable vision and generosity—with the economic burden more universally shared—were ready for practical application three times in each decade. In fact, the whole record of Western achievement since the first day of lend-lease proves that there is no vision too great and no generosity too imaginative for Western peoples to evolve, provided the will and the leadership are there for the task.

The worst aspect, therefore, of the Western World today is precisely this lack of leadership and lack of thrusting energy in the two greatest centers of the free world—London and Washington. While electoral campaigns come up behind the political horizon and little men take pleasure in vilification and idle spite, no commanding voice is raised, no nation-wide movement of citizens is stirred to proclaim what all should know to be the truth—that the West faces not a simple aggressor but a conspiracy against man himself, and in these stakes no partnership between the free can be too close and no joint enterprise of theirs too magnanimous in vision, tolerance, and strength.

Newspaper Coverage in Kansas Highest in Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I wonder if I might intrude briefly, for a very few moments, into the prevailing gloom we have been living in during the past week while discussing war and rumors of war and the spending of this Nation's wealth, to bring to our attention a much happier subject.

I am permitting myself to boast about my home State of Kansas—not about its preeminence as a wheat State, but about its record in the field of literature.

Not many of my friends and colleagues perhaps know of our eminence in this line, and I beg their indulgence of my natural desire to tell them about it today, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the El Dorado Times of El Dorado, Kans., entitled "Another First for Kansas."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ANOTHER FIRST FOR KANSAS

Kansas has scored another first, which carries its own meed of credit to the people and institutions of the Sunflower State. This State, according to report by the current issue of Editor & Publisher, has the highest level in daily newspaper coverage of any State in the Nation.

Daily newspaper circulation in Kansas averaged 722 per 1,000 adults in 1950, as compared with the national average of 555. The Parsons Sun discusses this achievement in the following comprehensive way:

"That, we venture to say, is a tribute to the high literacy of Kansas citizens and to their desire to keep informed on events in the world about them.

"Kansas newspapers in all modesty also can take a bow. If their product didn't

merit public attention by thorough and interesting coverage of the news, newspaper readership in Kansas would not be far above the national average.

"Otherwise there is no explanation of why Kansas daily newspaper circulation is 722 per 1,000 when the figure is only 553 in neighboring Missouri, 508 in Oklahoma, and 481 in Nebraska, or 53 in a highly prosperous State like Pennsylvania, or 554 in the sunny State of California.

"This is information in which both Kansas subscribers, bless 'em, and their newspapers can evidence great satisfaction."

Conduct of Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Fair Dealers Only See Mud Coming Their Way," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star today. It deals with the conduct of political parties in political campaigns.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FAIR DEALERS ONLY SEE MUD COMING THEIR WAY—DEMOCRATS FORGET HOW LONG THEY HAVE DEFAMED FOES

(By Gould Lincoln)

Who defames who, or, if you prefer, who defames whom? The Fair Dealers, from President Truman on down the line, are screaming from the house tops that their Republican opponents are using detamatory tactics—literature and speeches. They don't like it. They don't like the experience they had with the Republican defamers in 1950, and they don't want any more of it in 1952.

These screams come with ill grace from the Fair Dealers, the successors of the New Dealers, who have been hurling mud for so many years they seem to think it their exclusive right. Remember what they said about Herbert Hoover, who happened to be President of the United States? Remember the accusation that he was in reality a British protagonist, with no thought of the welfare of the United States? And the Roosevelt attacks on businessmen who had the temerity to be Republicans and oppose some of his pet schemes? According to Mr. Roosevelt, and later to Mr. Truman, every thought of these men was for their own selfish prosperity and against the safety of their country and the happiness of the American people.

WHEN THEY RECOGNIZE MUD

Maybe the Trumanites recognize mud only when it is coming their way. Chairman Guy George Gabrielson of the Republican National Committee, in his appearance before the Senate Rules Subcommittee, known as the Gillette subcommittee, which is seeking some way to bring about "cleaner" elections, asked if it was defamatory to publish flat statements that the Republican Party is the war party, that the Republican Party is the party of inflation. And he asked if it was defamatory for President Truman in his 1948 campaign to tell a Minnesota

audience that "Republican leaders in Congress are the errand boys of big business and special privilege."

What gets under the hide of Mr. Truman and his followers particularly is the charge made by Republican opponents that the Reds were coddled and treated softly by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. It hurts now that the American people—and the administration—have finally come to recognize just what the Reds are trying to do to us. It hurts, too, because there is no possible escape from the fact that step after step was taken by these administrations up until 1946, and even thereafter, which boosted the Reds in Russia and more lately in China. They don't like it, either, when charges are made that individuals in the Government have been disloyal—yet they have been forced to go ahead with loyalty tests to safeguard the country because individuals have been shown to be disloyal, and some of them are now in jail, some are dead, and some are out of the Government.

TRUMAN ALREADY IN STRIDE

The President already is getting into his stride for the 1952 campaign. His recent speech to a group of western political leaders in San Francisco, where he had gone to open the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference, was vituperative. Further, it is the boast of some of his followers Mr. Truman is getting ready another "give 'em hell" campaign. The charges of defamation, therefore, against Republicans, considering the source, are enough to break the soft hearts of the American people—if they didn't make them laugh.

The Trumanites protest, too, against the Republican charges of graft, political influence, milk-coat gifts, deep freezers, waste of the people's money, and so forth. Of course they do. They defend themselves in every way they can. This howl about defamation is the latest wrinkle.

Every one is or should be for "clean elections." The tempo of election campaigns, however, is set by the men at the top. In 1948, the Republican campaign was pleasant and good tempered when Governor Dewey, as a tough prosecuting attorney, might have torn the Truman administration to shreds. Not so the Truman campaign, when the President set out to "give 'em hell." Nor are the Republicans next year going to pull their punches—nor should they.

Death of Hon. Walter P. Stacy, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, Hon. Walter P. Stacy, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, died last Thursday in his home in Raleigh. He was one of the greatest jurists our State has produced, and his fame had spread throughout the Nation. Four Presidents of the United States—Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman—had called upon him to serve on important boards to settle national labor controversies. He had been strongly urged for appointment to the United States Su-

preme Court, and he would have graced that high tribunal.

Judge Stacy made many observations worth recording. One was in defining a liberal as "a person who is not willing for the law to be interpreted as it is written." Another was that "in North Carolina the voice of the people is the voice of finality."

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer paying tribute to Judge Stacy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT ITS BEST

Ever since becoming a State, North Carolina has prided itself justly upon the high quality of its judiciary. For 34 years (the last 30 of them continuous) Chief Justice Walter Parker Stacy, who died yesterday, embodied the North Carolina judiciary at its best.

The son of a Methodist minister, Chief Justice Stacy was born at Ansonville on December 26, 1884, and spent his boyhood in several different towns in the State. He attracted State-wide attention early in life as an outstanding student and debater at the University of North Carolina.

After only 4 years of residence at Wilmington, the only city in which he ever practiced law, he was elected a member of the 1915 general assembly. In 1916 he became at 31 the youngest superior court judge.

In 1920, Judge Stacy was elected as an associate justice of the supreme court, the occasion marking the last time he had opposition for nomination during his 30 years on the court. During his first term he was appointed chief justice, a position he held longer than any other man in the history of the State.

High esteem for Chief Justice Stacy in North Carolina was well nigh universal, but his reputation was by no means confined to this State. He first attracted national attention as the member of a Railroad Labor Board appointed by President Coolidge in 1928 and his service on that Board was so outstanding that he was later named to serve on numerous other labor boards by Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. He served as chairman of boards appointed by President Roosevelt to deal with Nationwide textile and steel strikes and was Chairman of the important Labor-Management Conference called by President Truman in 1945.

Chief Justice Stacy was essentially a judge and his viewpoint was primarily that of an impartial arbiter. However, he had his own philosophy of government and that philosophy was perhaps expressed best in an opinion delivered several years ago in which he said:

"In North Carolina, the voice of the people is the voice of finality."

That same philosophy is reflected in numerous other opinions written by the late chief justice, who was also noted for his impatience with any tendency to thwart justice by resort to technicalities. Although he was a member of a court which was sometimes torn by factionalism, particularly in his early service, he was never part of any faction. His opinions were usually the opinions of a majority, but many of his ablest opinions were those containing dissenting views.

Although he never became the eldest member of the court in point of years, his activity off the bench was curtailed sharply in recent years by physical infirmities. How-

ever, ill health never interfered for any long period with his duties, and during the last year he devoted much of his attention to the additional duties as administrator of all North Carolina courts, a duty conferred upon him by a constitutional amendment adopted in 1950.

North Carolina and the Nation have lost an outstanding judge and a citizen who contributed much to his State and his country. But Judge Stacy's opinions will live and his memory will be honored as long as men read the reports of the North Carolina Supreme Court.

United States Dodging Blame for Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the United States Government is engaged in the old shell game of the carnivals. First you see it and then you do not.

It is strikingly peculiar that one time a quick decision is made and then presto, the situation changes, and a decision cannot be made.

David Kleck, the oil editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States, who has been running a series of articles in those newspapers on the grab of the tidelands by the Federal Government, has come up with another exposé which makes most interesting reading.

Here is the most recent "First you see it and then you don't" in the tideland shell game:

UNITED STATES DODGING BLAME FOR OIL SHORTAGE—PERLMAN CHARGES STATES HALT TIDELANDS OUTPUT

(By David Kleck)

Exploration for oil in the Gulf of Mexico and in bays and in inlets off the Louisiana coast gained momentum for more than 4 years until December 12, 1950.

On that date a decree of the United States Supreme Court, issued incident to a suit filed against Louisiana by the Federal Government, had the effect of halting the search for minerals in the tidelands.

With this same Federal Government, through its Petroleum Administration for Defense, urging a greater production of oil to meet the free world's growing demands, a controversy has arisen as to who is responsible for the "slacker" role" being played by the tidelands at this time of emergency.

ANSWER CONTRADICTORY

Did the Federal Government slow the flow of tidelands oil, or are the States responsible for this situation?

This question is being answered in two contradictory ways.

On Wednesday a letter from United States Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, supposed to be considering tidelands legislation, was made public. The letter charges Louisiana, Texas, and California with resorting to dilatory tactics in blocking development of the much-needed offshore oil resources.

Perleman said a quitclaim bill passed by the House in July, and awaiting action by O'MAHONEY's committee, was designed to enrich the tidelands States at the expense of the other 45 States of the Union.

UNITED STATES SOLICITOR TALKS

Asserting that these three States had blocked and frustrated Federal efforts to complete an administrative set-up for the tidelands, Perleman said:

"World conditions have made immediate and additional development of oil resources vital

"The successful defense of the Nation from foreign enemies may depend on it.

"Three States have been carrying on their campaign to take these resources for years. Hundreds of millions of dollars of these resources have already been taken without Federal consent."

(The Times-Picayune has shown how the orderly development of the tidelands established a daily production of about 18,000 barrels with prospects for doubling or tripling this output. But with the injunctive effect of the decree, new exploration was prohibited.)

KEMP ANSWERS PERLEMAN

On the other hand, in Baton Rouge, La., Attorney General Bollivar E. Kemp, Jr., asserted that the United States Solicitor General was guilty of accusing the tidelands States of adopting his own tactics.

The Solicitor General was merely "trying to get the first blow in," Kemp said.

"He is anticipating that the Federal Government will be accused of these very same dilatory tactics," Kemp added, "and therefore, he is getting in and accusing the States first."

Kemp noted that the quitclaim bill, passed by the House last July, had seen no action in the Senate because Chairman O'MAHONEY had been busy with other matters. Wednesday O'MAHONEY said that he did not know if his committee could consider the quitclaim bill at its regularly scheduled meeting next Tuesday because of Senate business.

WOULDN'T NEED HALF HOUR

Kemp added:

"Exhaustive hearings have been held on the tidelands and O'MAHONEY has said his committee does not need to hold a hearing. The committee wouldn't need over one-half hour to bring the bill out if they could spare the time.

"If Perleman and O'MAHONEY are sincere in their desire for action, they can simply let the committee express itself by a vote at next Tuesday's meeting.

"If they allow a vote on the quitclaim or any other bill, they'll get action immediately. And if they allow the bill to reach the Senate floor and receive the thought of that body as a whole, it'll get quick action.

CHARGES CATCH PHRASES

Kemp further asserted that Perleman had an affinity for catch-phrases and that his letter to O'MAHONEY was just another effort to cloud the issue.

The Supreme Court decree enjoined all operations without permission from the Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman. This official has reiterated several times that he does not have the authority to permit new drilling in the offshore areas.

However, Chapman has made an exception to this rule and authorized one well in the Gulf on the grounds that underground wastage would occur in a particular reservoir without drilling of a second well.

Participants in the tidelands controversy have questioned whether Chapman has the right to issue one permit on the grounds of underground wastage if he allegedly cannot allow wholesale drilling on the grounds of national defense.

STOPPED BY FEDERAL SUIT

Meanwhile, from Texas, a further side of the controversy was supplied by Texas Attorney General Price Daniel who answered the Perleman letter with a wire to O'MAHONEY.

Daniel said:

"Texas, California, and Louisiana were in the midst of a development program which would have assured the continuous production of oil and gas from these lands when we were stopped by Federal suits.

"These suits were deliberately filed in the face of opposition by a majority of the Members of Congress. Congress refused to authorize the filing of the suits and later voted to leave the States with the lands they had claimed in good faith for the last 100 years."

SAYS CONGRESS WILL IGNORED

Daniel said Perleman and other Federal officials had ignored the will of Congress when the bill was vetoed by President Truman. They filed the suits anyway.

"These same Federal officials have been employing dilatory tactics to keep State ownership legislation and a State interim control bill from being reported by your committee," Daniel told O'MAHONEY.

"If immediate development is needed for national defense, it can be obtained with greater speed through continuation of established State operations than through an already overburdened Federal bureau which has no experience in this particular type of development."

Los Angeles' Pressing Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, we who live in the Los Angeles area have become increasingly aware of the importance of our water supply and today fully realize that California is faced with a very serious water shortage. We understand as people from other regions of the United States can never realize just how vital water is to the Southwest and particularly to southern California. If the population, industry and farming in this area are to continue expanding, we will need every drop of water we can get from the Colorado River and all the water which can be obtained from any other source.

The history of the development of water supply for Los Angeles is one of continuous expansion. The original source of our local water supply, the Los Angeles River, has for more than 150 years provided water for the community. This river, an underground river except during the winter rains, supplies about 52,000,000 gallons of water a day for Los Angeles, and it has been necessary for the city to construct a system of underground galleries and some 75 wells to divert the water for our domestic needs.

By 1900, however, Los Angeles was faced by the necessity of obtaining additional water to meet the demands of its expanding population, and the water system was extended. In 1908 construc-

tion was commenced on the Los Angeles-Owens River aqueduct, a 238-mile water carrier which tapped the snow-fed creeks of the east slope of the High Sierras. This project was completed in 1913 at a cost of \$24,500,000, and for a time the water supply was adequate.

By 1930, the population of Los Angeles had increased again to 1,500,000 people, and again the search for more water began. This time the Mono Basin, located 250 miles north of Los Angeles and adjoining the Owens River watershed, was developed to augment the aqueduct supply.

Since 1930, the population has continued to soar, and according to the latest figures, Los Angeles County has a population of 3,813,718, of which almost 2,000,000 represents the city of Los Angeles.

Today Los Angeles, as a member of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California which was organized with 11 member cities, receives in addition to water from other sources, a supply from the Colorado River.

In the last few years in spite of the tremendous development of the water supply for Los Angeles, we have a water shortage in this area which has reached serious proportions due to the enormous industrial, agricultural, and population expansion throughout southern California. In the Los Angeles area we have the largest production center for aircraft in the United States, and many other industries are now operating in southern California on a large scale.

At the same time that the demands on our water supply have been steadily increasing, we are facing the effects of a 5-year dry spell which, unless broken by considerable rainfall this winter, may, in the opinion of many of our water authorities and farmers, turn sections of southern California into virtual dust bowls.

For the past 5 years, our rainfall has been so light that reservoirs are nearly dry in parts of southern California and wells may be pumped for only a few hours at a time in some districts—not at all in others. All districts are rationing water, and in the agricultural areas many owners of citrus and avocado groves are using the little water available merely to keep their trees alive.

The water table has also been going down steadily, further decreasing our supply for southern California, and the present supply of water from the Colorado River and the other sources available to us no longer is adequate to meet industrial, agricultural, and domestic needs.

It is this increasingly serious shortage of water in southern California which has given rise to the bitter controversy between California and Arizona over the water from the Colorado River.

California must receive all of the Colorado River water to which this State is entitled, or we will face a water shortage in the foreseeable future which will curb development and endanger our whole population.

Without an adequate supply of water, the future of civilization in southern California will be doomed as surely as

though struck by war or pestilence. Without water the population not only cannot continue to increase, but many now living in this area would have to leave.

The struggle which has developed between California and Arizona over the distribution of water from the Colorado River is not a new issue, but another chapter in the fight for water in the Southwest. From earliest history the Southwest has depended upon water for life, and water has been the center of violent controversy. Control of water was the key to survival in this arid region, and today, even with all the modern developments to save, salvage, and store water and to utilize every possible water source, there is not enough water in the Southwest to supply the needs of the people.

Arizona wants water from the Colorado River, and California recognizes the right of Arizona to water to which that State is legally entitled. But Arizona now wants more water from the Colorado River than is necessary to supply the needs of its present population. Arizona wants water to develop arid desert regions in that State which are at present largely uninhabited, and have no large centers of population.

Here in southern California our problem is to supply water to a population already residing in our cities and towns and in agricultural areas already developed and producing. Our people work in defense industries which are turning out vitally important materials for our Armed Forces.

Our agricultural area, which depends upon irrigation, in Los Angeles County amounts to 185,000 acres and produces fruits and nuts, vegetables, livestock, and dairying products which are an important contribution to the Nation's food supply.

If Arizona succeeded in obtaining the water it wants from the Colorado River, it would do so by taking away this supply from existing operating projects in California. Arizona's proposals, if approved, threaten to wipe out the rights of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to Colorado River water which would be disastrous for all the people in this area.

California entered into water contracts with the Secretary of the Interior during the period of 1930 to 1934 upon the expectation that California agencies would be entitled to use an aggregate of substantially 5,400,000 acre-feet annually of Colorado River water. Under this expectation, California agencies entered into contracts to underwrite the entire cost of Hoover Dam and power plant and to repay the cost of the All-American Canal, and undertook the financing and construction of other works and facilities to utilize the full amount of Colorado River water covered by Interior Department. All of the main works have been built and are in operation.

These works involve an investment by California of over \$550,000,000, and obviously developments involving such large investments and commitments would not have been undertaken if there

had been any doubt among the California agencies concerned as to the validity of California's rights to Colorado River water.

Arizona proposes, however, to limit the use of Colorado River water by California to about 3,900,000 acre-feet annually, an amount that would provide about 1,500,000 acre-feet less than the minimum needs of present operating projects in California.

California needs every drop of water from the Colorado River to which we are entitled, and we cannot agree to any reduction in that amount when such a reduction will affect our whole population. The entire coastal plain region from Los Angeles County on the north to San Diego County on the south, an area with a present population of about 5,000,000, is using Colorado River water to meet present demands, and is absolutely dependent upon this source to meet all future water needs.

Just because you may have water now by merely opening the tap in your kitchen, bathroom, or to sprinkle your lawn, do not be led to believe that this can always continue without interruption. You all know the old saying that "We never miss the water 'til the well runs dry." Well, that can happen in Los Angeles and southern California unless we continue to fight vigorously for our water rights from the Colorado River. I shall certainly do my part to preserve California's just and legal rights to Colorado River water and to see to it that there is no reduction in the amount of water we are now receiving from this source.

Thumbs Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Yakima (Wash.) Herald of August 17, 1951, in opposition to the proposed Ice Harbor Dam. It is interesting to note that this is the largest newspaper published in the congressional district wherein the dam would be located.

The editorial follows:

THUMBS DOWN

Fisheries experts connected with the commissions of Oregon and Washington and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service insist that major dams on the lower Snake River will destroy a large percentage of the salmon runs in the Columbia River.

Sponsors of the dams hammer on their essentiality in the production of power, as aids to navigation, in the control of floods and for the irrigation of arid lands.

The first of four dams in one unit, and the dam currently being pressed in Congress, is Ice Harbor. Initial appropriations for this barrier have been written into bills, and then cut out of those bills, several times in this and in recent sessions of Congress.

A few days ago an item of \$4,000,000 was put back into the rivers and harbors bill for Ice Harbor Dam. The legislation is now before a conference committee of both Houses. Those for and those against Ice Harbor are concentrating their fire on the conference committee. And the pros and cons cut across party lines, even within the Northwest's delegation in the House and Senate. Why? Because there are sectional and economic "interests" involved, all professing to be interested only in the welfare of the Pacific Northwest region and the Nation as a whole. Politics, as the saying goes, is politics.

Here in Yakima, we are not identified with the primary results of the Ice Harbor bill's success or failure. We participate in secondary or incidental benefits of either an open Snake River or one that is harnessed, of course. We are aware of salmon's value as a food and as a recreational resource. The importance to this entire area of the four-fold benefits from power, inland waterways, irrigation and flood control is recognized, too.

In any direct conflict of objectives and results as arises in the case of Ice Harbor Dam, however, one is forced to examine comparative values. No compromise is practical. The Ice Harbor Dam itself is unfeasible without supporting dams upstream. The only scientific authorities upon whom we may depend forecast the inevitable doom of the salmon if the dams are built. It will be either dams or fish in the Snake River. And we have not been impressed by efforts to discount the alarmed testimony of interested biologists.

We have previously made a choice in behalf of the salmon resource. The arguments against construction of the Ice Harbor Dam are as good today as they ever were. And they are good enough for us.

The simple fact is that we do not need the Ice Harbor Dam as much as we need the salmon in the Columbia River. That is not to oppose additions to the power supply of the region. But there are other and more feasible major sources of kilowatts to be produced. And we cannot become at all enthusiastic about the true value of other auxiliary benefits claimed for this project.

If the conference committee of Congress wants to legislate with both reasonable economy and the basic interest of the Pacific Northwest region in mind, it will reject the Ice Harbor Dam.

Red Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article, which appears in the September 1951 issue of the National Jewish Monthly:

I SAW THOUSANDS SUFFER FROM RED ANTI-SEMITISM—AN EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT BY A CZECH JEW WHO SURVIVED SOVIET CONCENTRATION CAMPS

(By Paul Andich)

AUTHOR TELLS OF JEWISH LIFE CARRIED ON UNDERGROUND DESPITE RED INTIMIDATION

(More evidence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is coming to light all the time. Last June we published a study of this subject by Victor Lasky. Now we present a

deeply moving personal account of actual experiences suffered by one who managed to survive Soviet imprisonment and who made it a point to find out all he could about Jewish life in Russia while he was an unwilling "guest" of that country. It is a rare eye-witness story on the subject from a completely Jewish point of view. It was written exclusively for the National Jewish Monthly. Paul Andich is a pen name, used to protect the author's relatives overseas. He was born in Czechoslovakia in 1921. After the German occupation of Prague in 1939 he escaped to Poland, hoping to reach England and join the Free Czech Army. Prevented from doing this, he found himself trapped in Vilna when Hitler and Stalin divided up Poland between themselves. With thousands of other Jews and Poles he was shipped into the Soviet Union by the Red Army. There he did forced labor in many communities until he was suddenly arrested by the NKVD and sent to a concentration camp in central Asia. No charges were ever made against him. He and other Czech Jews were freed from the camp in 1942 when they agreed to join a Czech Army that was being organized in Russia. After service at the front in the infantry he was transferred to the air force and became a fighter pilot. At the end of the war he was back in Czechoslovakia, but it was in the Russian zone, so he fled to Western Europe as a DP. In 1949 he reached the United States, and now lives with his wife and American-born child in Chicago, where he is a member of B'nai Brith (Editor.)

After working for 3 months in the coal mines of the Donetz Basin, I clearly understood that my only chance for survival lay in getting out of this hell. I therefore sent one petition after another to the local Soviet (communal administration), and finally—after 2½ months—I was granted a personal interview.

Upon entering the office I was taken before an elderly man who smiled encouragingly at me. It was the first time since I had been in the Soviet Union that I had received a friendly smile from a Soviet official. I told him that I felt weak and could not stand the terrible strain of the work in the coal mines, adding that I had been to a doctor who had been unable to diagnose any specific ailment.

The elderly official interrupted me.

"I examined your case, and agree with you," he said. "Beginning tomorrow, you will start work in the automobile factory, Red Star. We will put you on the drill press, and after you learn how to operate it, things will be easier than they were in the mines."

He handed me a paper of official authorization to leave my job in the coal fields. As I started to thank him, he came from behind his desk and walked over to me. "You are a Jew, aren't you?" he said. "You are in a bad spot, but if I can help you, let me know."

WORKERS DISCRIMINATION

In the automobile factory there were several other Jews deported from Poland. The other workers practiced discrimination against us, either from anti-Semitism or because it was expected of them. We Jews always stuck together and freely shared our feeling and impressions.

A few weeks after I began work in the factory, one of these Jewish forced laborers was badly mangled by a machine, and died in a few minutes. We were unable to do anything for him in his brief agony because the Soviet supervisor, with threats and insults, forced us back to our work. But we could not endure the thought that this young Jewish friend of ours should be buried like a dog by unfriendly strangers, so we decided to give him a Jewish funeral.

We knew only one Soviet Jewish worker in the factory, and after work one of us approached him and told him of our intention. When he heard what we were plan-

ning, the man was terrified, and asked us if we realized that any gathering for religious purposes was extremely dangerous. We told him we knew that, but that the deceased had come from a religious family in Poland and that we were willing to take the risk involved in giving him this last religious service.

The Soviet Jew nodded, and whispered an address. When darkness came, two of us went out to the cemetery where our friend was lying in the mortuary. After a long discussion we finally managed to bribe the gravedigger, who then handed the body over to us. We had to dress it completely in order not to arouse the suspicion of the driver who was to take us to the address the Soviet Jew had given us.

"This guy is drunk," we told the driver, "and we have to take him home." The driver nodded, fortunately not much interested. It was a ghostly ride, in the open carriage, across the dark streets of a dirty town, with the corpse propped up between us.

UNDERGROUND SERVICES

We entered a dilapidated frame house, one of thousands of dirty, dark dwellings, worse than the filthiest slum in Western Europe. A little girl was waiting for us and guided us across the back yard into a kind of garage or abandoned workshop, illuminated only by two candles. After placing the body on the floor, we looked around and perceived several shadows near the wall. One of them approached us.

"I am the rabbi," he said. "We are ready for the prayers, the washing and the dressing of the dead. You are strangers in this country and perhaps don't know that all of us here are risking our freedom and the freedom of our families for what we are doing now. Of course, that does not matter. I mention it only in order to impress upon you to be very careful and never reveal this place to anybody under any circumstances."

Then he prepared the body, and the other men silently prayed for our dead friend. When the service ended, the rabbi shook hands with us, we took the corpse, and one of the men drove us back to the cemetery in a farm wagon. I could not refrain from asking him about the other Jews in town.

MANY DEPORTATIONS

"There are now about 30 Jewish families left in Voroshilovgrad," he said. "The others were deported one by one during the last few years. Some day we shall probably meet them somewhere in the Arctic regions, in the Far East, or in Central Asia, because we, too, will certainly be deported."

"Why do they persecute you?"

"Nobody knows the exact reason for this manhunt directed against the Jews," he answered. "Sometimes they accuse us of being capitalists, but, of course, we are all poor working people, living in great misery. At other times they say that we plan counter-revolution when we come together to pray. But we still meet for prayers on almost all of the holidays. Up to now they have not discovered us, but they know that we remain loyal to our faith, and that is reason enough to them for putting us in concentration camps and deporting us. We must hide when we celebrate Chanukah; we have to keep our Menorah buried in the ground. But all these things won't help. Sooner or later we, too, will be driven away. But it really does not matter. Isn't this whole country one vast prison? There is little difference between being in Voroshilovgrad or somewhere behind the Urals."

"I want to join you in your services on Friday evening," I said. He named a street and a house number.

There was a heart-warming atmosphere in the modest home of our host, a young shoemaker whose wife did all she could to help us welcome the beginning of "Shabbos" with joyous dignity, even though we were in hid-

ing like thieves or murderers. I was amazed to find among the people present the elderly man in the local Soviet office who had helped me leave the coal mines. He recognized me and greeted me cordially.

"Do not believe that I am one of them," he said, meaning the Government. "I got this office job because they did not trust me enough to give me the teaching post I wanted after my graduation. It isn't a pleasant or interesting job, but it has given me the opportunity of helping some Jewish families."

I was deeply moved by the humble but inspiring services, and walking home I asked the man if this little community was a rare exception or whether there was still a measure of Jewish life in the Soviet Union in spite of more than 20 years of systematic annihilation of Russian Jewry.

"The Soviets never were friendly to us Jews," he replied, "not only because of the religious factor, but also because they did not consider us to be proletarians. As a matter of fact, under the Czar most Russian Jews were small but independent artisans—shoemakers, tailors, etc. Although there is nothing left of such independent economic activity, we have still not become economically assimilated. The Soviet Jew usually wants to work as a member of an *artel*, a kind of small workmen's cooperative, he avoids the big factories, and almost never works as an agricultural laborer."

"The Communists consider us to be elements standing between the classes of the proletariat and the peasantry, and therefore dangerous to the whole social structure of the state. Our fidelity to the faith of our fathers makes us even more suspect. The few Jews who did become important in the Soviet administration were completely liquidated after the big purges in 1937 and 1938, and after 1939 some units of the Communist Party and its affiliated youth organization did not admit Jewish candidates, although this discrimination was unofficial."

CLINGING TO JUDAISM

"As persecution intensified against us, we intensified our religious activity as our only means of surviving complete destruction. It is interesting that in spite of the enormous pressure against us from the schools and the whole political system, even our Jewish youth became increasingly attracted by our religion, which seems to be an answer to their search for truth, which they cannot find in the official ideals of the State. Having hoped for years that the revolution would bring us freedom from fear and an end to anti-Semitism, we turned back to Judaism when we saw all our hopes frustrated."

"Yes, there is still a Jewish community left in Russia—but of course it has to be carried on underground. You will perhaps be surprised to hear that even in the concentration camps and in the deportation areas there is Jewish activity. Of course, the most important task is to help each other, in this way we try to escape the hardships imposed upon us. We try to maintain contact with Jews who have already been deported or imprisoned, to trace their residences in order to relay news to their relatives. It is a great effort in which we are united, and we wish that the Jewish world abroad could know something about it."

Our conversation was suddenly interrupted by the sound of an approaching police car, and for a moment we feared we would be caught. But the militiamen only forced us to undergo a routine check-up at a nearby tavern. Nevertheless, we left one by one, and in different directions.

My status in Voroshilovgrad was that of a forced laborer removed from the Russian-occupied area in Poland for security reasons. I could not quit my job without authorization, and I received less for my work than the Russian workers. I had to report to the

NKVD (internal security forces) twice a day. But I was free to do whatever I wanted with my spare time. Several months after my first contact with the Jewish families of Voroshilovgrad, I received an order to prepare for transfer within 24 hours.

HARRIED BY NKVD

I succeeded in contacting my Jewish friend in the local Soviet. "They are sending you to Baku," he told me, "where you will work in the oil refineries. They suspect you of knowing too much about present conditions in this town. I will give you the name of the rabbi in Baku who will certainly do what he can for you."

And he did. When I went to see the rabbi, I expected to find an intimidated, afflicted man, like the majority of Soviet Jews I had already met. Instead, I found a real giant, who had a long white beard and hair, which gave him a biblical appearance. "I am one of the few Caucasian Jews who used to live in the mountains," he told me. "The Czar and the Reds did everything they could to annihilate us, and there are very few of us left. But you see that I am still here, and I will help you as much as I can." He generously provided me with food, since it was very difficult for a stranger to find anything to eat in Baku at that time.

But apparently the NKVD found out that I had contacted the rabbi, and in a week I was sent to Yalta to work in a tobacco plant. There was a young Jew among the workers there who shared a barrack with me. It was not hard for me to identify him because the other workers all referred to him as "the Jew." He came from Leningrad, and was a former student at the Institute of Technology there. But he had been expelled from the college after his parents were deported on charges of disloyalty to the state, and he had to work as a laborer to earn a living. After more than a year's agonized search, he finally located his family in Central Asia through the channels of the Jewish community in Yalta.

"Nobody will ever know," he told me, "how many of us disappeared, never to return. What we want is to be left alone, that's all; because we have seen that there cannot be any assimilation, even if we speak Russian and never leave the country. I don't mind working here as a laborer. You can hardly imagine what I suffered at college. There I met with systematic, so-called scientific discrimination. I was barred from all social life; nobody tried to be friendly with me, and I could not participate in any extracurricular activity. Here they call me 'the Jew' and hate me, but at least their anti-Semitism isn't hidden under a pseudo-scientific, socialistic cloak."

Three months after I came to Yalta, he was arrested on charges of political opposition and I never saw him again.

On July 2, 1941, my turn came. I was arrested by the NKVD because, as a foreigner, I was considered to be a potential collaborator of the Germans, who had just invaded Russia. In those tragic days, when the German armies had penetrated deeply into So-

viet territory, the secret police seemed to have nothing better to do than launch a big manhunt for Jews. Many thousands filled newly created concentration camps, or went to prison. But among those who were not taken under the protection of the NKVD, the spark of solidarity was still alive.

When the high holidays came, I found myself in the huge prison of Charkov, existing under the most inhuman conditions. I was in a cell built for 5 but actually shared by 40 persons. Nevertheless, it was the most wonderful holiday in my life, because when I went on my 10-minute walk outdoors in the prison yard, one of the guards handed me a big food package. "An old woman left it for you," he said. "She would not leave her name."

I don't know how, in those days of confusion and danger, the Jews of Charkov could learn the name of a Jewish prisoner in the overcrowded prison of their city, or how they managed to find food for me when there was the most acute shortage, especially in that part of the country. Who will ever know the limits of Jewish ingenuity when there is a question of helping a brother in need?

Problems of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

or

HON. SIDNEY A. FINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I include the following address made by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, on the occasion of the dedication ceremonies for the Hebrew Home for the Aged, 5901 Palisade Avenue, Riverdale, Bronx, N. Y., on Sunday afternoon, September 16, 1951.

I recommend it as a splendid presentation of the subject matter, as well as a deserving tribute to a fine institution, the product of the ingenuity, industry, and faithfulness of the many who have selflessly devoted themselves to the laudatory task of making life peaceful and restful for the aged.

The address follows:

When you dedicate a new institution, you announce to the world that you are making a fresh start. And nothing in all the world is more fitting than to make a fresh start with our older people. That is what you are doing, and all of you who have put so

from various places in the Soviet Union. Many of the foreign-born Jews spoke Yiddish, and the Russians may have assumed it was a German dialect and that those who spoke it menaced Russian security.

"The Russians themselves explained, later on, when most of the Jewish prisoners were removed behind the Ural Mountains for defense work in various camps, that they had arrested the Jews to protect them from the Germans. This explanation is false, because in the first and most dangerous weeks and months of the German invasion, the Jews remained in prison even in highly exposed places like Charkov. They were sent to concentration camps in Siberia, central Asia, and the Far East only when the Soviets needed them as workers in the newly created war plants. The Russians made so little distinction between Jews and Germans that often they put German war and civil prisoners in already established Jewish camps, where both were treated the same."

much of your hearts, your energy, and your money into the fulfillment of the dream of this beautiful new home for the aged have a right to feel that you are rendering a service to others which is in the noblest tradition of religious expression.

I am truly honored to be with you this afternoon. In recent years, since I have been in Washington, I have become more and more interested in the problems of aging in America. But I have an even more personal interest in this institution here in Riverdale. I live in Riverdale, too. My home is only a few blocks from here. So I welcome the Hebrew Home for the Aged, and its residents, as neighbors. I am sure they will be good neighbors, and I am proud to have them here.

This new home is a symbol of the quiet revolution that is going on in the make-up of our Nation. Our population is changing swiftly and inexorably. People live longer today than ever in our history because the great advances in science and the progress in human well-being have made longer lives possible for us. We have more older people in the United States than ever before. And this is even more important: the proportion of older people in our population is steadily growing.

It is still too early for us to be fully aware of what this great change will mean to our country. But we do know this: that it will have an effect on our whole way of life, on our work, our production, our leisure time, our family relationships, and on all of the other things, big and little, that make up our lives.

We have stood before the world as a young and vigorous nation, taking from the Old World the best it had to offer and fusing in this New World a new and youthful civilization of our own. Now we have grown out of the American adolescence. We are mature today.

Throughout our history we have been a lucky people. When we went through the birth pangs of the Republic we were fortunate enough to have the leadership of a remarkable generation of great men—Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Hayn Salomon and Adams and a host of others. In the travail of fraternal warfare we produced a great humanitarian President, Abraham Lincoln. In the depths of the depression we found new hope and new confidence in the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. These were personalities who made their mark on their times, we produced them in the very nick of time.

But now our country is faced with a new responsibility, heavier and more far-reaching than ever before. We are confronted with the necessity of taking the leadership of the free world in a world-wide struggle of ideologies. Not till 10 years ago had history thrust us so squarely into the very middle of the maelstrom of international tensions. Now we are engaged in a great battle for peace, a battle that calls upon all our resources—material, physical, intellectual. The whole world of freemen—and of men who yearn for freedom—looks to us for mature leadership.

And once again we have been the beneficiaries of good fortune. In His own inscrutable way God has granted us the great gift of maturity even as we become launched on the most difficult, most dangerous, most significant period in all our history. The nature of our population has changed, and, with the increasing level of maturity, of stamina, of experience, of calmness, we face the complexities of our time better fortified than ever in all our history.

But this revolution of the birthdays has also raised many problems which we have yet to solve. Mostly, they are human problems. We have not yet learned how to adjust ourselves to the new age structure of our population. We have not yet succeeded in adapting ourselves to the needs of older people or in helping them adapt in turn to

¹ Editor's Note.—We asked the author to explain this statement. Here is his reply:

"It is hard for me to explain the Russian attitude toward the Jews during World War II. From personal experience I know that in the first days of the German attack, a great number of Jews were arrested by the NKVD. Before I reached Aktjubinsk concentration camp, I went through 11 prisons, and everywhere I found many Jews among the prisoners. Almost all of them were arrested in the first weeks after the German invasion. In Aktjubinsk itself I found thousands of Jews, although I do not know the exact number. They were mostly from the Baltic region, Poland, and Rumania, and included some German Jews who had escaped to Russia after 1933. There were also Jews

the society in which they live. To find the answers to these problems is one of our greatest challenges, and particularly for those institutions which are devoted to the welfare of humanity.

I need not tell you that Americans of the Jewish faith have earned for themselves an enviable reputation in the humanities. Your fellow citizens know that American Jews have for generations been in the forefront of the philanthropies, the humanitarian movements, the organizations for human welfare, that are so plentiful in America. It is hardly surprising that Jewish groups should also be among those working hardest on the problems of aging in America. National organizations like the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and the National Council of Jewish Women, and scores of local Jewish groups across the country, have set outstanding examples in the fields of health, recreation, group living, old-age counseling, and community surveys. You have transmuted your great heritage of brotherly love and religious devotion into its modern counterpart: the intelligent, realistic dedicated effort to help those who need help.

I have some knowledge of how much work and thought and love went into the achievement of this new Hebrew Home for the Aged. I know the story of how the home began originally in Harlem and how, through the years, under ever-increasing handicaps the home sought to bring cheer and hope to its residents. And I know how the great dream of a new home, a place of sunlight and happiness and warmth and love, was born, and, finally, when the war ended, how you worked and planned and gave to make the dream come true. Here it is. It is not simply a building of wood and earth. It is a part of yourselves for all the world to look upon and understand and accept—not a monument, but a vessel of love, a living symbol of that great precept which an ancient rabbi called the very essence of Judaism and which we who are Christians call the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.

When I was a boy in Indiana, we did not often have a problem about the old folks. Of course, people didn't live as long as they do now. It is an astonishing thing to remember that the average age of the average American has increased by almost 17 years in a single lifetime. More of our people lived on farms or in small towns. There was room for the old folks and there were things for them to do. Grandpa could help with the milking and the chores and then maybe doze for a little while under the apple tree if he got tired; and Grandma sat in her rocker and darned the socks if her eyesight was good enough, or she helped with the cooking. It was a large, happy, full life, the family was supreme. But things have changed. More and more of us live in cities and the apartment houses that mark our times do not give us much room for large families. We have efficiency apartments and little kitchens and never an extra room for the old folks.

This is one of the byproducts of the urbanization of America. It has transformed the behavior of the American family, by and large, and it has raised a number of special problems for the older folks. After all, we still like the idea of home—no matter how old we are. To older people, I think, the need for a place to call home is even more acute than to others who have grown up without any memory of the large, rambling, easy going life of days gone by. The home, however it may have changed through the years, is still the heart of our hearts, the same place from which we can set out in the daily rounds of life. It is the symbol of privacy and of independence and of security.

Not so very long ago the greatest tragedy that could befall an old person was to be compelled to leave his home and go to an institution. In those days, an institution meant the poorhouse, the traditional county infirmary, the old-age home that was not a home at all but a place of last resort, a place where people went to die rather than to go on living. Too often such places offered no privacy; they provided food that was poor and tasteless, their medical care was inadequate; they were far away from family and friends; and they gave no thought to the ways in which older people might continue to be active and useful. They were not very pleasant places; yet most of them were filled with people who had nowhere else to go.

But even these places, bad as they were (and there are still some of these antiquated, unpleasant institutions in existence), there have been even worse ways in which older people are sometimes forced to live. The last census showed that hundreds of thousands of them are living alone in third- and fourth-floor walk-ups, in dilapidated tenements, without social contacts, starving to death spiritually if not physically. And there is the heavy proportion of older people in the mental hospitals, too often unnecessarily—shunted to one side by the community only because they have worn out before their time, because they have been made old too soon through lack of something to do, something to think about, someone to talk to.

We are going to have to change all this. We are going to have to work out new ways of making life pleasant for people who are heavy with years. This new Home for the Aged is part of the very change that I am talking about. When you look over these grounds, when you examine the structure and layout of these buildings, you realize that this is not the end of the road for the people who will live here. It is the place where life can begin again. It is a place of friendliness, and warmth, and cheer. The beauty of these surroundings, the medical service, the occupational therapy, the social rooms emphasizing participation in life rather than withdrawal from life, the easy access to the community of which you are a part—all these are essential to our new concept of the full life for older people. The key word in the name of this institution is the word "Home." The people who live here are not inmates, or patients, or clients; they are residents. This will be their home.

These residents want to fulfill the great needs of religious conviction which play so strong a part in their lives. They want to be active and do things on their own. They want to remain alert mentally. They want to feel that they belong, that they are wanted and loved, not because they are old but because they are people who deserve to be wanted and loved in their own right. They want the years that lie ahead of them to be years of life and satisfaction, the fulfillment of all the work and hardship and achievement that they knew as they advanced toward the later years.

When we see old people who live listlessly, drawn into themselves, silent, utterly dependent, vegetating until death seems like mercy, then we must say to ourselves, "They did not wish to be like this. We made them that way."

But when we see older people, overcoming the infirmities of advancing years, happy and active, with a continuing interest in the life around them, busy at tasks that are congenial to them, devoting themselves earnestly to their prayers and their families and their everyday activities, then we have a right to say, "We helped them find the satisfactions of the later years. We have learned from them, and we have taught them. They are a part of us, and we of them. Here, in this lovely Hebrew Home for the Aged, we have

searched for the way in which the new years that we have added to our lives may be long, fruitful, happy years. Here is a place where we can fulfill the bright hope that lies in every human heart, the hope that the best years of our lives lie in the future, not in the past."

In this spirit, we dedicate the new Hebrew Home for the Aged. We dedicate it, in all humility, as a house of hope, a house of promise, a house of fulfillment. May all who come here discover new life and new happiness. May they find here that greatest of human aspirations: peace of mind and peace of soul.

Washington's Gavel

REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, 158 years ago today George Washington laid the cornerstone of the Capitol. The gavel used by Washington on that memorable occasion has had a most interesting history over the intervening years and as we observe the anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone, it seems appropriate to repeat the following story of the Washington gavel as told over the signature of W. J. M. in the pictorial magazine of the Washington Sunday Star of September 16, 1951:

WASHINGTON'S GAVEL

By W. J. M.

A priceless historical relic that is little known to the general public, although it has been used time and again in both governmental and civilian ceremonies, will mark its 158th anniversary Tuesday.

It is the little marble-headed gavel used by George Washington when he laid the cornerstone of the Capitol on September 18, 1793. It now is owned by Potomac Lodge, No. 5, of the Masonic order. The gavel was presented to the lodge by Washington.

It has become one of the city's most closely guarded relics, being kept in its own glass case in the vault of the Riggs National Bank branch at Wisconsin Avenue and M Street NW.

Washington was anything but a city when the Capitol cornerstone was laid, but it put on its best pomp and ceremony for the occasion, despite the fact that the parade was broken up in order that the marchers could cross Tiber Creek, single file, on a log that served as a bridge. The procession marched from President's Square to the Capitol along a country road which, generally speaking, followed what is now F Street.

The procession included members of Masonic lodges from Georgetown, Alexandria, and a newly formed District chapter, two bands and members of the Virginia artillery. A 500-pound ox was barbecued as a climax to the festivities.

After the cornerstone ceremonies, Washington presented the gavel to the Georgetown Lodge and the trowel to the Alexandria Lodge. Both articles had been made especially for the occasion by John Duffey, a member of the Fredericksburg (Va.) Lodge. The trowel now is in the museum in the Masonic National Museum in Alexandria.

In making the gavel, trowel, and other articles used in the cornerstone laying, Duffey may have been influenced by more than patriotic motives. A little apple polishing may

have been involved. His daughter was the wife of Washington's landscape gardener. Duffey was a silversmith.

Some years passed before the Georgetown Lodge, which had been organized by 12 men in 1789, realized the historic value of the gavel. But in 1847, President Polk used it in laying the cornerstone of the Smithsonian Institution.

Other Presidents who used it were Fillmore, Buchanan, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Hoover, and Truman.

It has been used as a symbol of authority in the dedication of the Washington equestrian statue, centennial services at Mount Vernon, and cornerstone ceremonies for additions to the Capitol, the Old House Office Building, the Departments of Labor and Commerce, the Washington Monument, Constitution Hall, American University, and numerous churches, schools, and lodges.

So valuable has the gavel become that it is taken from the bank vault only with the approval of the lodge membership. About 100 years ago the lodge ruled that the gavel, when lent, must be accompanied by a committee of three members, who are not to let it out of their sight. It is carried in a special velvet-lined leather case.

It is made of the same marble that was used in the original fireplaces and other decorative pieces in the Capitol. The handle is wood. In 1856, an engraved gold cap was added to identify it as the one Washington used.

Only once has the lodge lost sight of the gavel and then only for a few hours.

In 1899, President McKinley used it at Mount Vernon while presiding over the centennial observance of Washington's death. At the conclusion, he handed it to a Mason nearby and the Presidential party headed for the steamboat to return to the District.

The gavel committee was in pursuit, but guards refused to allow the three to board the boat and they were forced to wait for the next one.

The gavel, in the meantime, had been handed from one to another, but it finally was traced to a merchant who had locked it in his safe. At the committee's request, he opened his store and the gavel was returned to the lodge rooms the same night.

The Georgetown Lodge became the Potomac Lodge in 1811, shortly after it erected its first building, which still stands on Jefferson Place in Georgetown. Its present building, at 1210 Wisconsin Avenue NW, was completed in 1859. Samuel T. Beachman now is lodge master.

In 1922, the Riggs Bank offered to provide extra-safe protection for the gavel because William W. Corcoran, a cofounder of the bank, also was elected master of the Georgetown Lodge in 1827, about the time the historic importance of the gavel was being appreciated.

cles throughout the United States. For the sake of the American taxpayers, who have all they can bear of these scurrilous burdens, I hope we can expose this case quickly enough to stop it.

Many a surprise package has been opened lately in Washington. Out of some of them have come mink coats, deep freezes, gratuitous jobs, and neat bottles of influence bearing the administration label. They are insignificant compared to the iniquitous deal which is my subject here.

We cannot be certain yet just what all will be found when we complete the unwrapping of this newest package, but a variety of things already have popped out.

These include:

First. The Harvey Machine Co. of Los Angeles.

Second. Leo—or Lawrence—Harvey, president of the firm, of Russian descent, whose name may not be Harvey.

Third. A \$46,000,000 loan, approved by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, to the Harvey company for a new aluminum plant in Montana.

Fourth. An attempt by the Interior Department and its Bureau of Reclamation to create a great power shortage in Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Oregon for the purpose of getting control of power and water in those States and establishing new authority for Secretary Chapman and Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus.

Fifth. Suspicious circumstances under which "strange-gage" Navy shell testers were found in the Harvey Co. plant when that company was working on war contracts.

Sixth. Employment of a former Assistant Secretary of Interior and legal counsel for the Bonneville Power Administration by the Harvey Co.

Seventh. Employment of a member of the California State Legislature as public-relations counsel by the Harvey Co.

Eighth. The rise of Lawrence Harvey—or Leo—as a Democratic leader.

Ninth. How Harvey suddenly was offered a gigantic loan to make him the fourth largest aluminum producer in the country, yet he had no working capital, was not a big industrialist, and knew little or nothing about aluminum.

These are only a few of the ingredients which are contained in the disgraceful mess. I shall include many others as I unfold the story.

Lake many other foreigners, including the Russians, the United States gave the Harvey brothers a golden opportunity. They worked, and schemed, and prospered. Their machine company in Los Angeles grew, and when the war came along they received lucrative contracts.

Lawrence Harvey was observing, and in his frequent visits to Washington he saw how loyal supporters and contributors to the administration were favored. He set out to become a prominent member of the Democratic Party and to become friends with those who could do favors for him. He worked hard at it and gave money, and he soon began to be known as a good Democrat.

The Government had spent \$8,200,000 to construct an aluminum plant near

the Harvey Co. After the war, Los Angeles power authorities did not want a large block of the available power of the area to be used in operating the plant. It became war surplus.

Harvey went after it, and he got it for \$1,503,000.

Meanwhile, Harvey's background had begun to interest some State and Federal agencies from another standpoint. The report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities might be interesting reading to any of my colleagues who wish to look further into this situation.

Harvey became a member of the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, and it was widely known that he was active in supporting candidates financially. He took an active part in committee activities.

With money he made off war contracts he was able to finance a deal to purchase an office building in Los Angeles. It was called the Subway Terminal Building. Although downtown, it had not been a financial success because it was a little out of the path of development of the new Los Angeles business area.

Soon after Harvey purchased the building, however, it was filled with Federal Government departments and a large new post office.

It was after the war that reports began to come out about some strange occurrences which had taken place in the Harvey Machine Co. during the time it was working on Navy contracts.

One day in 1943, a machinist in the company told Navy inspectors that he had been ordered to make an off-size testing gage for Navy shells. The Navy and the FBI both investigated. Evidence discovered was turned over to the Justice Department. The evidence included an order written by Herbert Harvey for the off-size testing gages. The Justice Department never prosecuted the company or Harveys.

Lawrence Harvey's political career continued to progress. He employed a member of the California State Legislature to help him with such things as purchasing the aluminum plant and getting favors from both the State and Federal Governments.

Now, with the big aluminum plant in his possession, a legislator-publicity man on his payroll, steadily improving connections in Washington, Harvey was in a position to try for a really big favor. Meanwhile, he had not neglected his political duties, or his contributions, and he was being mentioned in the newspapers as a leading candidate for Democratic National Committeeman from California. With this prestige, he figured he could make real headway.

By this time, Harvey had learned that influence was necessary, and that it had to be bought. He looked around for a good man to advise and assist him in this undertaking. Harvey thought he saw a chance to become a big aluminum operator, but what he knew about making aluminum could be put in a very small aluminum thimble. But he had a plant, and even though it was making no aluminum it qualified him, and he had political connections that were getting better all the time. In this case, the

Secretary Chapman Engineers Another Great RFC Scandal for Harvey Machine Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a vicious new scandal, involving another great RFC loan and perpetrated by high officials and politicians of the administration, is spreading its unhealthy tenta-

know-how didn't have to do with making aluminum. It had to do with political influence.

Harvey engaged the service of C. Girard Davidson to help him become an aluminum mogul. Davidson was formerly with the legal division of the Bonneville Power Administration and was an Assistant Secretary of Interior. He was an old pal of Chapman and Straus, an ardent New Dealer and Fair Dealer and a social planner par excellence.

When he and Harvey got their heads together, Davidson had left the Interior Department and had moved out to Portland, Oreg., to practice law. It was announced in the press that his first client would be his old favored employer, the Bonneville Power Administration.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the picture begins to take shape here. I shall complete it.

Here I think is a good place to mention Robert R. Rose, of Casper, Wyo. He recently was appointed Assistant Secretary of Interior, supposedly to direct the mining activities of the department. Rose is a good Democrat. He has political ambitions. Wyoming's lone Congressman, WILLIAM H. HARRISON, is a Republican. Oscar Chapman doesn't like Republicans, he doesn't like Republican Congressmen especially, and he knew that Rose could get a lot of good publicity as an assistant secretary, dealing with mining and metals in this time of emergency.

Lawrence Harvey was willing and anxious to back Democratic candidates with good dollars. Harvey was interested in being a big aluminum producer. Aluminum was metal. Rose had to do with metals for the Interior Department. It would be interesting to know how much Rose understood about Harvey's ambition to promote an immense steal from the taxpayers. Did Rose take office knowing he would receive substantial financial backing from Harvey when he ran against HARRISON next year in Wyoming? The continuance of this investigation might well disclose very interesting matters along this line.

Meanwhile, Harvey and Davidson were working hard to get a big loan for an aluminum plant in Montana, near the town of Kalspell. And up in Kalspell, Harvey had a strong supporter. This was Don Treloar, a radio-station operator. Treloar is a good friend of Democratic incumbents in Montana, especially one of them who has burning aspirations to be a Senator from Montana. They do not like Republican Congressmen, either, and to beat the Republicans they would need heavy cash contributions. Harvey was a good prospect. Thus, it would be interesting if this investigation were carried into that field. Just what understanding was there between Chapman, Treloar, Harvey, and the ambitious Montana Democrats?

The stage was set.

On August 28, this year, the Associated Press sent the following story out of Washington:

The Defense Production Administration Tuesday approved a loan of \$46,000,000 to the Harvey Machine Co., to build an aluminum plant at Kalspell, Mont., and an alumina-producing plant near Everett, Wash.

The agency said that \$32,000,000 of the credit will be used to set up a three-line aluminum-reduction plant at Kalspell with 54,000,000 tons annual capacity.

Of the remaining money, \$3,000,000 was advanced for the purchase of ore boats and \$11,000,000 for the facilities to produce alumina—the next-to-final stage in the production of aluminum from bauxite ore. The Everett plant will produce 108,000 tons annually.

The loan was recommended early this month by Secretary of the Interior Chapman. It was approved by DPA after agreement by the Harvey Machine Co. of Kalspell to the Government's terms and conditions. The firm is a subsidiary of the Harvey Co. of California.

The terms of the loan, which will be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as the agent of DPA, call for maturity in 20 years and interest at 4½ percent.

The note is payable in equal quarterly installments starting a year after completion of the new facilities.

The company is obligated to provide an equity of \$8,000,000, as follows: \$2,500,000 to be raised before any of the RFC credit is drawn, another \$3,500,000 to be raised within 18 months, and \$2,000,000 in working capital to be available on completion.

The DPA also will require a \$1,000,000 personal-performance bond to be signed by the head of the firm, Leo Harvey, Sr.

Other conditions provide that no dividends are to be paid by the company until the loan is paid off, the Government is to receive through RFC any savings from tax benefits which may be granted, and the Government is to receive half of the net income after taxes from both the subsidiary and parent companies.

One factor influencing the making of the loan, DPA said, was an understanding that Harvey would reserve a "substantial" part of its aluminum ingot output for sale to independent aluminum fabricators who lack their own sources of supply.

The agency also commented that the project will provide an important competitive influence in the primary aluminum industry.

It is interesting to note that Oscar Chapman, probably the biggest political power in the administration, and President Truman's right-hand political aid, was the first to approve the proposed loan, and in fact initiated the proposal.

It is also interesting to note that Chapman and Straus have been having a hard time getting the control they want of the power—in this case hydroelectric and not political—in the Northwest. There is need for more power, and the people of the Northwest have formulated sound programs for developing it. But these programs would not make Chapman and Straus dictators and they are fighting them.

Chapman and Straus have been attempting to force unsound projects down the throats of the Northwest people, and having been rebuffed, they have schemed to override the will of the people, and even the will of Congress.

Their scheme is this: They are doing all they can to make the power shortage worse. If it gets bad enough, they have a chance of getting the projects they want and the control they crave under the stress of the defense emergency.

The Harvey loan comes under this scheme, as well as under the political machinations of the administration. The Harvey aluminum plant would create electric power-eating potlines at the very time when the DPA and the BPA are

most seriously concerned about the Northwest power shortage.

Many publications, including Fortune magazine, have charged that this power shortage is being deliberately created through allocation of electricity to the aluminum industry simply to provide the lever for the building of more dams. It would also put Chapman and Straus in a position to dictate terms of power development in the Northwest.

The Harvey loan was a two-sided weapon in the hands of the Interior Department—for politics and electric power.

Chapman had a tough time getting the Harvey Co. qualified to receive the loan.

It was late last July that Chapman reported the Harvey Co. had notified him it could not provide the necessary capital to take the loan. The company did not have the money, seven or eight million. Chapman, ably assisted by Davidson, found a way.

Chapman produced a proposal whereby Harvey would put up \$3,500,000 and the balance would be raised by selling stock to independent aluminum fabricators.

John Corlett, a reporter for the Boise Statesman, has done an excellent job of exposing details of Chapman's and Harvey's joint endeavors, assisted by Davidson. Much of my information comes from Corlett.

The Harvey's contribution, under the Chapman plan, would be provided in cash, equipment, land, and engineering. Here, that old aluminum plant Harvey got for a few cents on the dollar down in Los Angeles came in handy. It gave him some equipment, land, and engineering, the quality of which is decidedly suspect.

August 23 was the deadline for Harvey to accept the Chapman plan and the terms of the loan. Harvey was not to be found. However, the DPA said it was keeping the door open, and if Harvey was a day late it would not matter.

On August 25, Harvey accepted. Reluctantly, of course. But he was talked into it by Chapman, Davidson et al.

Three days later, on August 28, the DPA approved the loan.

One of the things about the loan that most pleased Harvey was that 85 percent of it would be amortized through taxes.

Davidson had not been heard from much during all the negotiations, but now he popped up in Portland. He told the press that providing he and Harvey didn't get bogged down in paper work, the new plant would be operating within a year.

The plant would draw its power from the Bonneville Power Administration, another Davidson client, and spearhead of the Chapman-Straus drive in the Northwest. Of course, Davidson has long been their spokesman for a Columbia Valley Authority.

Obviously, the loan would help that cause, as well as help the Democratic candidates in the Northwest.

It looked until a day or two ago that Chapman had got his way, that Harvey was on the way to the big league, that

political money would flow into the Democratic coffers in the Northwest, and the taxpayers would be swindled again. But, Mr. Speaker, something happened.

An unidentified person made a formal complaint about the loan to the RFC. The RFC, remembering its recent unhappy experiences, held up the loan papers.

Hasty letters regarding the loan suddenly went from Chapman to Stuart Symington, RFC head, and Manly Fleischmann, chief of the DPA. Chapman suddenly had withdrawn his approval of the loan. He used the excuse that he wanted to study it some more.

Just what will happen, Mr. Speaker, has not been determined. But I repeat that for the sake of the taxpayers I hope this scandalous deal will not be consummated.

Equally as strongly, I hope that a thorough investigation will be made of this matter, and that it will be explained how a politician can walk into the Federal Treasury and take out \$46,000,000 with little or no security.

Melrose Pays Tribute to Admiral Forrest P. Sherman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGLIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Melrose, Mass., under the leadership of Mayor Thomas L. Thistle with the cooperation of the board of aldermen and a citizens' committee paid signal honor to the late Admiral Sherman at an impressive memorial service on Sunday, September 9, 1951.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excellent story of the ceremonies from the Melrose Free Press of September 13, 1951, also excerpts from an illustrated brochure prepared for the service including the order of ceremonies, a biographical sketch, and the text of the bronze memorial tablet:

MELROSE PAYS TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN AT SERVICES

The grateful citizens of Melrose, high ranking Naval officers and members of veterans' organizations, gathered at Memorial Hall on Sunday afternoon to attend memorial services for Admiral Forrest Percival Sherman, who died in Naples, Italy, July 22, 1951, while on a diplomatic mission for the United States.

Congressman ANGLIER L. GOODWIN of Sheffield Road was chairman of the committee in charge of arrangements and the memorial address was delivered by United States Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Rear Admiral Hewlett Thebaud, commandant of the First Naval District, paid sincere tribute to the late admiral, praising the brilliancy of his mind, his never falling interest on what was going on in the world and his commendable characteristics, which personified the time honored tradition of the Navy—an officer and a gentleman.

The Reverend Warren C. Herrick, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, offered the open-

ing prayer, and the memorial prayer was given by Capt. G. L. Markles, USN, Chaplain, First Naval District.

Congressman ANGLIER L. GOODWIN read the remarks that were written by him and incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 25, and Mayor Thomas L. Thistle offered the resolutions passed by the board of aldermen on July 23.

The double quartet of the Melrose Amphion Club sang two beautiful selections and Herbert Irvine presided at the organ.

In dedicating the bronze plaque to the memory of Admiral Sherman, Mayor Thistle told the audience that this was the first time that the city had dedicated a plaque to the memory of an individual. He explained that there were plaques commemorating the heroes of the several wars in GAR Hall and that this plaque would soon be placed in this hallowed hall.

Among those attending the services were former friends, school teachers who had taught the late admiral, former Mayors Charles H. Adams, Robert A. Perkins and Carl A. Raymond. Members of the admiral's family, including his sister and brothers, with their wives and families, occupied the boxes in the rear of the hall.

Two beautiful bouquets of flowers were on the stage at either side of the speaker's rostrum and the plaque was directly in front of it.

The services were impressive and each speaker addressed the audience without introduction.

The color guard of the American Legion Post No. 90 took part in the services, and the members of the post and those of the auxiliary occupied a reserved section.

State Senator Sumner G. Whittier, of Everett, who represents this district, was among those attending.

The members of the memorial committee included Congressman Goodwin, chairman; the Reverend Herrick, Stanley C. Battles, past commander of Melrose Post, No. 90, American Legion; M. Kenneth Taylor, present commander of Post No. 90; and William A. Tomer.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL AT MEMO- RIAL SERVICES FOR SHERMAN

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL paid glowing tribute to the work and high ideals of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman at the memorial service last Sunday afternoon in Memorial Hall. For the benefit of all who may not have been able to attend the exercises the speech is printed in full.

"It is with great yet sorrowful pride that I join you all today to pay tribute to a great soul and a great American. It is eminently fitting that on this memorial occasion we should reflect upon Forrest Sherman's magnificent contribution to the cause of freedom and to the Nation he loved and served so well.

"On Friday, July 13, I called Admiral Sherman and asked him if I could have a talk with him and get his opinion on some questions which were bothering me. He said, 'You will have to see me today because I am leaving for Europe tomorrow for 10 days.' Then he said, 'Why don't you come to lunch with me?' I accepted, and went over to the Pentagon. I found myself at lunch not only with Admiral Sherman but all his deputy chiefs of staff. There were about seven of us all together.

"I assume it was another act of generosity on Admiral Sherman's part. I am sure that he was planning this luncheon with his chiefs of staff, but when I asked him to see me, he invited me to the luncheon. As a result, I asked him many questions so that while the rest of us had a pleasant, healthy lunch, Admiral Sherman had to gulp his between answers to my questions. He seemed well and was as ready as ever with his answers on difficult problems. But this was

the way he always appeared to us who are Members of Congress. He wanted to do his part at all times at whatever sacrifice was required of him to give us the information that we wanted concerning our military services."

UNIFICATION OF SERVICES

"While the measures for unification of the armed services were before the Congress, Admiral Sherman was the representative of the Navy. I was a member of the Armed Services Committee and later of the conference committee that adjusted the differences between the two Houses. During that period of several months, I saw Admiral Sherman from day to day. No one could have been better informed on all the angles of the subject, on all the differences between the branches of the armed services, than he. He always presented the point of view of the Navy clearly and forcefully, yet he was so cognizant of the need of greater unification of the services for more efficiency, more economy and greater strength of operations, that he helped to create language that smoothed out the difference and at the same time moved us forward to a comprehensive bill that ultimately became the Unification Act of 1947."

SUPPORTED NAVY

"At the time there was criticism that he was letting the Navy down. He never let the Navy down. He made certain that the Navy maintained its identity and its important place in our Nation's defense. That Act of 1947 has since been modified and improved. It has served, as it was designed to serve, as a basis for peacetime as well as wartime unified operations. It was built firmly upon the foundation for the unified planning and action which we saw carried on during World War II, and which we see now being carried on successfully in Korea and in the European planning.

"Since 1947, the obvious flaws in that act have been eliminated, we hope, by the Unification Act of 1951. Again Admiral Sherman because of his part in the previous drafting in 1947 played an important role. This spring he presented evidence in his position as Chief of Naval Operations. We listened to him with even more respect than we had in 1947. His stature had grown. The criticism that he had compromised the Navy was completely stilled by his great leadership in the brief period of time that he was our chief of naval operations.

"Admiral Sherman died while on a trip that included two great objectives: the inspection of our naval operations in the Atlantic and in Europe, and the creation of a better understanding in Spain, in England, and on the Continent. His comprehension of our problems of security was well summarized by him in his testimony to the Appropriations Committee of the House when he was testifying this spring. He expressed so accurately and truly our own feeling in these words."

THOUGHTS ON UNIFICATION

"The question was asked him: 'What is the best hope of averting a general war?'

"Admiral Sherman replied: 'That is a question of broad policy. In my opinion, the best hope of avoiding a general war lies in a combination of several courses of action: One is to be sufficiently strong to deter our possible enemies from starting a general war. Another very necessary course of action, it seems to me, is to have alliances which are strong enough, sufficiently well-tested, and composed of allies who are sufficiently determined to act in unison to deal with instances of aggression, such as the one in Korea, more promptly and more effectively.

"On the other hand, if we believe, as I do, that we are facing an opponent who does not want a general war now, but who wants to do everything possible to exhaust us, to drain

off our energies in a small operation here and a small operation there, induce us to do things that will impair our economy, then we want to face the fact that we are in an operation which may become an endurance contest, there ore, it is wise to achieve the level of military strength which we can sustain over a period of years. The worst thing that could happen to us, as I see it, would be to go to a full-out mobilization and not have a fight then go into a period of cut-back trying to save money and pay our debts, and then suddenly find ourselves in a fight."

CONGRESS RESPECTED SHERMAN

"The Members of Congress respected Admiral Sherman not only because of his knowledge and his skill in solving the practical problems that face our armed services today, but also because of his so evident patriotism and lofty ideals. What we need so much today was typified by him and the life that he led. He had the courage to be a good leader of fighting men, but he gave them not only inspiration from his courage, but also inspired them with a greater will to fight and to die if necessary out of love for their country."

MAN OF IDEALS

"Today we hear much about the moral let-downs by all of us. It is true. We have let down somewhat. We have let slip from us some of the ideals on which our forefathers founded our country, but this was not true of Admiral Sherman. In all the petty scraps within the Navy, and in all the fights and compromises between the services in the Congress, he maintained his ideals and the background on which all our work must be done—the security of our country."

"Many times I have thanked God that in this free country of ours, where we have gone from peaks to valleys in military strength, we have always had sufficient numbers of men who love the life in our Armed Forces to give us the necessary leadership when we must quickly ascend another peak. We think first of General Washington in the War of the Revolution, then follow through with Lee and Grant in the Civil War. We come to Admiral Dewey and Theodore Roosevelt in the Spanish War, and then to Pershing and Sims—to mention just two in World War I. And then in World War II, Marshall, Eisenhower, Nimitz, Mitscher, and many others."

"All my lifetime I have been impressed by the fact that when this Nation has known its greatest need for leadership, that leadership, with experience and knowledge, has always sprung into active being. Every American heart has thrilled to the sound of names such as I have mentioned, and the early naval heroes—Barry, Jones, Perry, Lawrence, and others. To this roster now we can add with heartfelt pride the name of Forrest Sherman, who in time of war proved his skill and gave his utmost, and in a period of this Nation's greatest peacetime trial proved equal to every task and to every assignment in freedom's name."

"While I did not have the opportunity to know him in his youth, I have read how he always loved the sea and how he went sailing with his grandfather in New Bedford—how, when his grandfather died suddenly on one of these sails, Forrest Sherman, at the age of 12, faced the crisis and brought the boat safely to shore and summoned help."

EXPERT SEAMAN

"It was that same spirit—the love of the sea, the knowledge of the sea—that made it possible for him by expert seamanship and skillful maneuvering to save the lives of so many of our men when the aircraft carrier *Wasp* was sunk. Sherman lived up to the full traditions of a naval commander when he was the last man to leave that ship. It was his quick judgment, his obvious cour-

age, and his quiet methods that permitted so many men to go down the ropes safely ahead of him."

"He is rightly given the credit of working out the plans by which, under the leadership of Admiral Nimitz, many of the leap-frog operations that ended the war in Japan were made possible. As one who led his class in the Naval Academy, as one who saw the future of aviation, as one who understood the part of the Navy in an operation in the great Pacific Ocean, he used the great brain that the Lord had given him and created the plans down to the last detail that allowed others to carry out in practical form and to successful conclusion the operations that he had prepared so ably and thoughtfully."

"It is a difficult thing for those of us not burdened with military and naval responsibilities to imagine the nature and the scope of the burdens of the chief of naval operations in 1951. It demands the possession of many skills beyond those required by the usual naval career. The chief of naval operations has to be an administrator of superior ability, a diplomat persevering and patient, a scholar of extensive background, a commander of men, and at the same time a source of ideas."

"As America has had world obligations thrust upon her, so her sons in service have had to take up that burden of obligation to the full extent of their individual abilities. A man's service to his Nation at the level on which Admiral Sherman lived is one of awe-inspiring weight and complexity. But Forrest Sherman did endure the heat and burden of his calling with cheerfulness, with vigor, and with remarkable skill."

HAPPY HOME LIFE

"I count among some of my most pleasant experiences during my stay in Washington the several dinners that I have enjoyed with Admiral and Mrs. Sherman at the house on top of the hill near the Cathedral which the Navy assigns to the chief of naval operations. On those occasions, Admiral and Mrs. Sherman entertained cordially, hospitably, and gave each one the feeling that he or she was the guest that they wanted most to have with them. On these occasions and in a few conversations with him, I got something of what his family life with his wife, his daughter, and his grandchildren was like. It was a wonderfully happy one."

"In this memorial service we can draw hope and inspiration for our future in this country from the efforts that Admiral Sherman has made in our behalf and which, like his soul, can be immortal if we labor to keep them alive—the inspiration of patriotic sacrifice, of moral and physical courage, and of everlasting ideals that a true lover of freedom and of the knowledge and the responsibilities that go with freedom can give us. The security of this Nation, on the sea, in the air, and on the land, is ever our objective, as it was his, for on that security the freedom of our Nation and many another nation depends. In the name and in the example which Forrest Sherman has set us, let us resolve to do our full duty in pursuit of these ideals."

MEMORIAL SERVICES, SUNDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 9, 1951, 4 O'CLOCK, MEMORIAL HALL, MELROSE, MASS.

Organ selections: Herbert Irvine, organist. Prayer: Rev. Warren C. Herrick, pastor, Trinity Church.

Resolutions adopted by Melrose Board of Aldermen: Hon. Thomas L. Thistle, mayor of Melrose.

Lamp in the West, by Horatio Parker; Double quartette, Amphion Club of Melrose.

Remarks delivered in House of Representatives at Washington: Hon. ANGER L. GOODWIN, Congressman from Melrose.

A personal tribute: Rear Admiral Hewlett Thebaud, United States Navy, commandant, First Naval District.

Organ selections: Herbert Irvine, organist. Memorial address: Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senator from Massachusetts.

The Navy hymn, Eternal Father Strong to Save, by Dykes (requested by members of family of Admiral Sherman): Double quartette, Amphion Club of Music.

Dedication of Memorial Plaque by Mayor Thomas L. Thistle.

Memorial prayer: Capt. G. L. Markle, United States Navy, chaplain, First Naval District.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Admiral Forrest Percival Sherman was born in Merrimack, N. H., October 30, 1896, and as a boy removed to Melrose with his parents. His father purchased a house, which he supposed was in Melrose, but when the Melrose-Wakefield boundary line was perambulated, it was found to be in Wakefield. Frank J. Sherman had been elected an alderman from ward 1, but the courts disqualified him from accepting the position because he was a nonresident.

Mr. Sherman sold that property and purchased a home at 11 Warwick Road and at the following election he became an alderman, serving for several terms. The family later moved to 187 Porter Street, which Admiral Sherman always considered his home.

Admiral Sherman graduated from the Franklin grammar school and from Melrose High in the class of 1914. He then entered the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and was appointed to the United States Naval Academy in 1914.

While a midshipman he won the Navy "N" as a member of the intercollegiate championship fencing team, was regimental adjutant, and was awarded the class of 1871 prize, Navy dress sword and knot, as the member of the graduating class most proficient in practical and theoretical ordnance and gunnery. Graduated with distinction, second in a class of 203, and commissioned ensign in June 1917, his subsequent promotions were as follows: Lieutenant (junior grade), October 15, 1917; lieutenant, February 1, 1918; lieutenant commander, March 1, 1930, commander, July 1, 1937, captain, January 1, 1942, rear admiral, April 3, 1943, and vice admiral, December 28, 1945.

During the world war, Admiral Sherman served in Mediterranean waters on the U. S. S. *Nashville*. He served later on the destroyer *Murray* which was based in Brest, France, and in August 1919 he joined the U. S. S. *Utah* after which, in September 1920 he was transferred to the U. S. S. *Reid*, flagship of Destroyer Squadrons 1 and 9, Atlantic Fleet. He then commanded the U. S. S. *Bary* from May to October 1921, when he reported for duty as flag lieutenant to Rear Adm. Newton A. McCully, United States Navy, commander, control force, Atlantic Fleet, U. S. S. *Florida*, flagship, serving in that assignment until June 1922.

In June 1922 Admiral Sherman reported to the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla., for flight training. Designated naval aviator, December 22, 1922, he served continuously with naval aviation from that time. In April 1923 he joined Fighting Squadron 2, Aircraft Squadrons Battle Fleet. A year later he returned to Pensacola where he served as an instructor until June 1927, after which he completed the course at the Naval War College. He reported in June 1927 to the U. S. S. *Lexington*, then fitting out, and served on that aircraft carrier from her commissioning, December 14, 1927, until December 1928 when he joined Scouting Squadron 2, based on the aircraft carrier *Saratoga*, being placed in command of that squadron in April 1929. In May he was assigned duty as flag secretary on the staff of Rear Adm. Henry V. Butler, United States Navy, commander,

aircraft squadrons, battle fleet, of which the *Saratoga* was flagship, serving in that assignment until June 1930.

Admiral Sherman was an instructor in the department of seamanship and flight tactics at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., 1930-31. In May 1931 he rejoined the *Saratoga* with duty on the staff of Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, United States Navy, commander, aircraft battle force, U. S. Fleet. In June 1932 he assumed command of Fighting Squadron 1, based on the *Saratoga*. That squadron won the aircraft gunnery trophy in 1932-33. Admiral Sherman personally won the Navy E in both dive bombing and fixed guns. In June 1933 he reported for duty in the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., where he had charge of the Aviator Ordnance Section until June 1936 when he joined the U. S. S. *Ranger* as navigator. A year later he was transferred to duty as fleet aviation officer on the staff of Admiral Bloch, commander, battle force, United States Fleet.

From February 1940 until February 1942 Admiral Sherman had duty in the War Plans Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C. During that period he was a member of the Permanent Joint Board on Defense, Canada-United States, and also served as naval aviation adviser at the Atlantic Conference in August 1941. Following 3 months' duty at headquarters, commander in chief, United States Fleet, as a member of the Joint Strategic Committee, he assumed command of the U. S. S. *Wasp* in May 1942, and was commanding officer of that carrier when she was sunk by enemy action in the Solomon Islands area, September 15, 1942. For his service in command of the *Wasp* he was awarded the Navy Cross with the following citation:

"For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Wasp* and flag captain to the commander of a task force during the occupation of Tulagi-Guadalcanal and subsequent operations. In addition to supervising plans for employment of aerial support to cover the initial landing, Captain Sherman, by his proficient skill and astute leadership, contributed to the relentless fighting spirit and aggressive courage which enabled his group to destroy hostile opposition in the air and on the beach. His outstanding performance of duty was a decisive factor in the success of our forces and was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

Following the sinking of the *Wasp*, Admiral Sherman was chief of staff to Vice Admiral John H. Towers, USN, commander, Air Force, Pacific Fleet, from October 1942 until November 1943, and for services in that assignment was awarded the Legion of Merit with the following citation.

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as chief of staff to commander, Air Force, Pacific Fleet, from October 14, 1942, to 1943. A skilled and aggressive leader, Vice Admiral Sherman coordinated the planning, training, and logistic requirements which produced efficient naval aviation in the Pacific throughout a vitally important period. His resourceful initiative, keen foresight, and conscientious devotion to duty were contributing factors in the advanced state of preparedness of the aviation units of the Pacific Fleet for the central Pacific campaign and the successful prosecution of the war against the enemy."

On November 24, 1943, Admiral Sherman was transferred to duty as deputy chief of staff to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, USN, commander in chief, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, and for services in that assignment was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

Admiral Sherman represented the Navy in the initial conferences with the Japanese at Manila in August 1945, and was present with

Fleet Admiral Nimitz aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokio Bay when the formal surrender of the Japanese was signed September 1, 1945. In October 1945 he was ordered as commander, Carrier Division 1, and in December 1945 as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations), Navy Department, Washington, D. C., where he was responsible for plans, fleet operations and training, intelligence, and joint activities. In January 1948 he was ordered as commander, United States Naval Forces, Mediterranean, which title was changed to commander, Sixth Task Fleet, on June 1, 1948.

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Purple Heart Medal (awarded for wounds received aboard the *Wasp*) Admiral Sherman held the Victory Medal, Patrol Clasp; the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the World War II Victory Medal; the Navy Occupation Service Medal, and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon. The Government of Great Britain made him an honorary companion of the Order of the Bath and awarded him the Oak Leaf Emblem after mention in dispatches. The King of Greece awarded him the Grand Cross of the Order of the Phoenix.

Admiral Sherman was sworn in as Chief of Naval Operations on November 2, 1949, when he assumed the rank of admiral. His appointment quelled public arguments over allocation of budget money and of missions.

All five of Admiral Sherman's brothers have served their country in the Armed Forces: Edward A., of 738 Lynn Fells Parkway, formerly a lieutenant-colonel in the Army, now director of the Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report, who graduated in the same class with Admiral Sherman at Melrose High School; Kenneth, now superintendent of schools in Andover and a former lieutenant commander in the Navy; Col. Paul Dwight Sherman, at present commander of the Marine barracks at Charlestown for the New England area, Frank J. Jr., of Cleveland, a former Army colonel and now an executive with a large soap company in Cleveland, Ohio; and Lt. Comdr. Ernst L., a member of Admiral Carney's staff in Europe.

He has one sister, Miss Mary Sherman, now residing in Andover.

Admiral Sherman leaves his wife, Mrs. Dolores Brownson Sherman, a daughter, Mrs. John Fitzpatrick, and two grandchildren.

Admiral Sherman died in Naples, Italy, July 22, 1951, on the eve of his departure for the United States, after negotiating for United States bases in Spain.

He was buried at Arlington National Cemetery on July 27, 1951, with an impressive salute from all the Armed Forces which he helped to weld into a unified fighting team.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN ON JULY 23, 1951, TO HONOR THE MEMORY OF ADMIRAL SHERMAN

The board of aldermen, at a special meeting on Monday evening, passed the following resolution on the death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy:

"Whereas the untimely passing of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations of the Defense Department of the United States, has, in a very special way, laid a burden of deep sorrow on the hearts of the people of this city of Melrose where he lived as a youth and grew to manhood, and which he always regarded as his home; and

"Whereas it is now remembered that the career of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, from its earliest beginnings, was marked by a constant tenacity of purpose in the attainment of the high goals he set for himself, surpassing brilliance and intrepidity in assisting in the defense of his country in time of war and, during the period of his service as Chief of

Naval Operations, a knowledge and understanding of the responsibilities given to him and an appreciation of their relation to the welfare of his country and the security of its citizens which gained for him the complete confidence of his superiors and, indeed, of all the people of the United States, to a degree which warranted entrusting to him missions of the most vital importance to its continued existence as a free democracy and the maintenance of its prestige among the nations of the world; and

"Whereas it is further remembered that the achievements of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman have not only brought richly deserved credit to himself and distinction to the country which he so faithfully served, but peculiar honor to the community of which it could truly be said that he was its most illustrious citizen: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the mayor and members of the board of aldermen in the city of Melrose, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, acting in behalf of the citizens of said city, do hereby give solemn expression to our sincere regret and sense of irreparable loss in the death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman; and be it further

"Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the records of the board of aldermen and that a copy thereof be prepared and sent to the family of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman as a token of sympathy to them in this tragic hour."

CONGRESSMAN GOODWIN'S TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL SHERMAN IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JULY 25, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the flags in my home city of Melrose, Mass., are at half staff today in honor of the memory of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, who has achieved greater distinction among the illustrious in the Nation's history than any other man who has called Melrose his home. Although born in the neighboring State of New Hampshire, he grew up and went to school in Melrose after the family moved there when Forrest was a boy. The people of Melrose have taken great pride in his career and are shocked and grieved at his sudden death. In their behalf I extend to his widow and family through the medium of the Record sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Graduating from Melrose High School with top honors and from Annapolis second in his class, his notable naval career had its beginning. The pages of naval history will forever record his brilliant exploit as captain in command of the carrier *Wasp* torpedoed in World War II, but there is another incident in his early life which has quite as much of the drama which brings a thrill to the heartstrings but also carries a touch of real prophecy. When a very young boy it was his pleasure to spend as much time as he could with his grandfather, a New Bedford sea captain, who taught him seamanship and naval lore while cruising in Buzzard's Bay. One day while out in a 21-foot catboat the grandfather suffered a heart attack and passed away. Heartbroken, Forrest yet remembered his lessons in the lore of the sea and in the finest naval tradition he lowered the flag to halfmast and brought the little craft with his grandfather's body aboard, safely over the waters of Buzzard's Bay into New Bedford Harbor.

Thus perhaps was written in the stars where no man may read that Forrest Sherman, the boy of 12, was destined to write for himself a brilliant record in the naval hall of fame culminating in the responsible post of Chief of Naval Operations of the United States.

His untimely death came while he was engaged in a diplomatic mission abroad, a mission of great importance to our national defense. His capacity for leadership, his balanced judgment and his qualities of statesmanship, along with his naval learn-

ing and ability, have insured for Admiral Sherman a place on the rolls of the greatest naval leaders of all time.

TEXT OF BRONZE MEMORIAL TABLET

In memory of Forrest Percival Sherman, 1896-1951, Admiral, United States Navy.

Born in Merrimack, N. H., from early childhood he called Melrose his home—educated in the Melrose public schools, he graduated from the Melrose High School in 1913 and United States Naval Academy in 1917—on destroyer duty in European waters in World War I, commanded U. S. S. *Wasp* until she was sunk off Guadalcanal in 1942—awarded Navy Cross for heroism—planned the strategy for United States victory in the Pacific—appointed Chief of Naval Operations in 1949—died in Naples, Italy, July 22, 1951, while on a diplomatic mission for his country.

"He knew to perfection the lethal engineering of his profession and when called upon to be a diplomat he met the requirements admirably—a man who lived always affirmatively during days when great negatives assailed all men of intellectual sensitivities, in all his commands, in all his missions, in all his posts, he served his country well and faithfully."

Erected by the citizens of Melrose, September 9, 1951.

Freedom's Open Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to call to the attention of the House the prize winning essay in the Sixteenth Annual National High School Essay Contest sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This essay was done by Catherine Diederichs, of Missoula, Mont., and in addition to receiving the \$1,000 first prize cash award, she also received a gold medal.

Catherine Diederichs is a graduate of the Sacred Heart Academy in Missoula and she follows a long line of distinguished essayists and orators from the Montana educational institution. To Catherine I want to extend my sincere congratulations and to her family, all of whom are personal friends of mine, and her many friends, my best wishes for a job well done. She is indeed a credit to her school, to Missoula, to Montana, and to the Nation of which she is a worth-while citizen. My congratulations also go to the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for continuing such a fine patriotic contest every year.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am enclosing the following newspaper story carried in the Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., for Tuesday, August 28, 1951, and also the prize winning essay:

NATIONAL ESSAY CONTEST WON BY LOCAL GIRL

Catherine Diederichs, 18-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Diederichs of 711 West Spruce Street, is the winner of the

\$1,000 first prize cash award and gold medal in the sixteenth annual national high-school essay contest sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Announcement that her entry was the winner, on the subject Freedom's Open Door, was made Monday night at the national encampment of the VFW in New York city.

Miss Diederichs entered the competition as a senior at Sacred Heart Academy, from which she was graduated in June. During her academic career she participated in declamation, dramatics, choral club, and journalism. For two semesters she was co-editor of the school paper and cobusiness manager for one semester. In music, after 8 years of study, she gave her senior piano recital this year.

She is employed in the business office of St. Patrick Hospital and her future plans include college, where she hopes to major in business and continue her studies in music.

"Her mature understanding of the problem about which she was writing and her excellent literary style were two of several points which made hers the winning essay," said the VFW auxiliary president.

The judges for the national awards which attracted entrants from every State and Hawaii were James Irving Clump, editor of Boys Life, chairman, Dorothy C. Stratton, national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and Edward Heiligh, NBC radio and TV newscaster and master of ceremonies.

Three other top cash awards, with medals, were awarded to Patricia Nadine Anderson, 17, Yakima, Wash., \$500, second prize, Patricia Anne Hale, 18, Staunton, Va., \$250, third prize, and John Sakellakis, 18, Cleveland, Ohio, \$100, fourth prize.

Miss Diederichs' winning essay follows:

'FREEDOM'S OPEN DOOR

"Man, from the beginning of time, has found himself in a world of many choices.

"He is continually opening and closing doors as he seeks for happiness.

"Two of the basic elements in this happiness are freedom and security—elements for which man through the ages has, paradoxically, suffered and risked his all.

"Just exactly what are freedom and security? Why do they mean so much to man?

"Freedom is an exemption from slavery, imprisonment, and restraint. It is the enjoyment of God-given rights and privileges.

"Security is a freedom from fear, anxiety, and care. It is the consciousness of adequate power and safety.

"Freedom and security mean so much to man because they represent the kind of life that God intended for man—life spent in accordance with the principles underlying the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; life lived, consequently, in the enjoyment of the four fundamental freedoms. Freedom of worship and of expression; freedom from fear and from want.

"With the assurances that freedom and security offer, is it any wonder that man has been willing to travel a hard and bloody road? Is it strange that he has thrown his whole weight against the door that promised to open to him a glorious world?

"But sometimes man in his search for freedom and security has mistaken the door. The eternal stars have looked down upon him crossing the wrong threshold and falling, beaten, without having claimed the treasure he sought. Driven by force, led on by persuasion or tricked by deceit, he has tried one door after another—imperialism, capitalism, socialism.

"Within the lifetime of today's youth, men in Europe attempted to coax or to herd their fellow men through the doors marked fascism, nazism. In the Orient, the door was marked 'Imperialism.' These tempt men no more; they have been recognized for what they are, with their aftermath of slavery and bloodshed.

"Now we are confronted with only two doors totally opposed to each other, yet seemingly alike in many ways. And we must make our choice—a choice that will decide our own, our family's, and our country's future. How shall we know which to defend?

"At a distance they appear alike in general style and contour. 'Good of the common man; advancement and equality for all, the brotherhood of men'—these are the alleged framework of both.

"But let us make a close-up examination of both. This door on the left—the grain of its wood is not like that of the door on the right. 'The good of the common man' here means the complete direction of the common man by a few who call themselves 'the state.' The state decides where a man shall work, what he shall be paid; where he shall live, what he shall say; how he shall worship, when, and where, and if he may join his fellow men in assembly. All this is done, of course, for his own good. He himself cannot know what is good for him; the state alone knows that.

"And the door on the right? Beyond that door the common man has a voice in the choice of those who rule him. He has something to say about rules and regulations which affect him so vitally.

"Another characteristic supposed to be common to both is that of 'advancement and equality for all.' Communism, indeed, makes no distinction as to creed or color—provided the individual is a willing tool in the hands of the politburo. Such a man is the equal of every other tool.

"When this situation is compared with the idea of advancement and equality for all as understood by the builders of the door on the right, what a difference we find. 'All men,' said they, 'are created equal, endowed with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' And they held all men entitled to the fruits of their toil, and of their genius. Religious faith, party affiliation, social standing, nationality—none of these is a reason for privilege or persecution.

"And then the last idea—the brotherhood of man. If all men are brothers, Someone must be their common Father. That Someone is God—the reason for our ideas of justice, of brotherhood, of human dignity. But that Someone is the object of the Communist's hate, the obstacle standing in his way.

"These are the differences we find as we examine the grain of wood in the two doors. And there is another difference, freedom's door is open—there is nothing to hide from the eyes of the searcher. The door on the left is closed, only the few may know what goes on behind it.

"Is the door of freedom perfect? No; termites of prejudice, of dishonesty in public life, of cut-throat competition have made inroads upon it. The American homes, hinges of the Nation, are too often corroded and broken. These evils threaten to leave the door to the mercy of the tempest, which may slam it shut forever.

"Yet, who can see the evils behind the other door if it remains always closed? Some blindly stagger through that unknown arch, others enter in at the other door on the left because they despair, seeing the termites at work on the right-hand door.

"A return to God's law with its emphasis on brotherly love, personal integrity, and the sacredness of the home—this is the remedy for the evils of our day. This is the one counterattacking force which will exterminate the termites. This is the one force which will make strong freedom's open door and in that strength will communism be defeated.

"Therefore, as we stand at the parting ways, as we ponder the principles underlying our way of life, as we consult our reason, we have no alternative; we have only one door to choose—freedom's open door."

Procurement Problems Affecting the Nationalist Chinese Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles which I believe are the last two articles of the Alfred Friendly series on the procurement problems affecting the Nationalist Chinese Government, about which Mr. Friendly has been writing with such clarity and so well in the Washington Post.

The first is Mr. Friendly's article which appeared in the Washington Post of September 14, 1951. The article is entitled "Two Recalled Chinese Officers Have Seen Nothing of Charges."

The other article, entitled "Chinese Clerk Here Discloses Attempted Bribe To Hush Mow," appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, September 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 14, 1951]

TWO RECALLED CHINESE OFFICERS HAVE SEEN NOTHING OF CHARGES (By Alfred Friendly)

The two Chinese Air Force officers ordered by Chiang Kai-shek to return to Formosa to face charges have not yet received any document spelling out the accusations against them, it was revealed yesterday.

Col. Hsiang Wei Hsuan, one of the two accused officers, said yesterday that although 23 days have elapsed since the recall order was issued, "we have not received any document of any kind" and know of the accusations only through what they have read in the papers.

He said he and the other man accused with him, Lt. Gen. P. T. Mow, have exercised "all possible pressure on our Embassy" to obtain official papers from their Government substantiating the charges, but that none have been forthcoming.

The Chinese Embassy, meantime, yesterday made its first official statement on the case of General Mow and Colonel Hsuan since the recall order was issued on August 21.

In light of the violence of the attack made by Chiang on the two men, the Embassy document was surprisingly conciliatory to them. It did not echo the charges in any way, but said only that it was able to give public assurance "that appropriate and effective steps will be taken by the (Chinese) Government in due course to bring to light all the relevant facts of the whole matter and to do full justice to all parties concerned so as to reassure public confidence."

The Embassy noted that the cases had given rise to much publicity and press speculation on the circumstances leading to the dismissal. The cases, it said, "are complex in character and involve questions of personal integrity, military discipline, safeguarding of public funds, and government procurement policy."

The Chinese Government, the statement continued, "is giving careful consideration to all the issues involved and to the public interest" in them here.

The two officers have already begun preparing answers to the charges, insofar as they know them from press reports from Formosa.

One asserted that General Mow had received more than \$39,000,000 in 1945 for the purchase of air force equipment but has not accounted for \$19,000,000 of it.

In partial answer, the officers defy the Chinese Government to show that more than about \$10,000,000 was remitted to Mow for air force purchases in 1945. Evidence of what was sent him, they say, is contained in records of the Bank of China in New York.

A second charge was that Mow espoused the cause of a "disloyal" staff member, Colonel Hsiang, and that there is suspicion that Hsiang was a Communist agent.

Formosa said it had ordered Hsiang sent home first on May 24, 1950, and six times since.

In reply, the officers assert the recall order of 15 months ago only asked Hsiang to come home for consultation "for better understanding" between the Washington office and Formosa headquarters.

If that was a reflection of Formosa's suspicion of Hsiang as a Communist, the officers ask, why did Formosa assign him a year later, as it did, to members on the Chinese armed forces joint purchasing commission here?

In Formosa, meantime, the head of the Chinese General Staff yesterday called for a special military court to try General Mow and Colonel Hsiang.

The Chinese chief of staff is Gen. C. J. Chou, with whom Mow and Hsiang have been battling for almost a year. They have charged him with countenancing graft and corruption for his personal profit.

The Associated Press reported that Chou expressed his willingness to face such charges in court. Through its official news agency, the Chinese Government promised the two officers in Washington a "fair and just trial," if they would return.

It said Mow would be given a full opportunity to voice his accusations of corruption, and said his fears of being executed if he were returned were not justified.

COULD HAVE SUPPLIED PLANES, BROKER SAYS

Claire M. Waterbury, Los Angeles aircraft broker, told the Washington Post yesterday that the company with which he is associated, Aircraft Sales, Ltd., could have supplied 25 Mustang fighters which another concern was negotiating for in a deal blocked by General Mow and Colonel Hsiang.

The Post stated, on earlier information, that Waterbury's ability to produce the planes, which were to be reconditioned, was in doubt.

Aircraft Sales, Ltd., has since supplied four of the planes to the Haitian Government, which has reported its enthusiasm for them and their performance, Waterbury declared. Furthermore, he said, his company is still in a position to supply to appropriate buyers from 10 to 15 Mustangs overhauled in an "as new" condition.

Waterbury called attention to the company's successful experience in reconditioning and overhauling planes for other governments and foreign customers, who have expressed full satisfaction with the aircraft received.

[From the Washington Post of September 16, 1951]

CHINESE CLERK HERE DISCLOSES ATTEMPTED BRIBE TO HUSH MOW (By Alfred Friendly)

A clerk in the Chinese purchasing mission here has disclosed that he was asked to relay an offer of a half-million dollars to Lt. Gen. P. T. Mow to keep quiet and stop his accusations of corruption within the National Government.

Besides the money, the clerk said, the offer included assurance that the Chinese Government would not attempt to extradite him and his chief subordinate, Col. V. S. Hsiang.

Mow is chief of the Chinese Air Force office in Washington and Hsiang is his executive officer. For more than a year they have been waging a campaign against what they consider dishonest and corrupt financial practices in the Formosa government.

In turn, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek accused them of mishandling funds and on August 21 ordered them to return to Formosa to face a list of serious charges.

The employee who said he was approached with the bribe offer stands in close confidential relationship to Mow. He identified the man who made the proposal as a local Chinese, not connected with the Embassy.

From the clerk's account it appears the proposal did not come from the Embassy but rather from certain other representatives of Chiang Kai-shek in this country.

The clerk reported he was approached on August 24, just 3 days after the order recalling Mow and Hsiang, and that the offer was rejected on August 28, the next time he was in touch with the man who made it.

There were no witnesses to the affair, except the two men who met together. The Chinese purchasing mission employee has made a signed statement of what transpired. In part for his protection, however, neither his name nor the name and associations of the person he talked to can be made public.

Here is the story of what happened as described in the clerk's written statement:

On Friday afternoon, August 24, he received a phone call from a Washington Chinese whom he knew, asking that they meet immediately in front of the Empire Pharmacy, 1738 Connecticut Avenue, just a couple of blocks from Mow's office on LeRoy Place.

The clerk went there at once and found the man parked in his car in front of the drug store. The clerk entered the auto and the conversation began.

MOW'S GOOD FRIEND

The man said that although he had had a misunderstanding with General Mow and therefore did not want to approach him directly, he was still the general's "good friend" and was worried about his situation.

He asked if the general and Hsiang were "100-percent sure" they could not be extradited. If not, he implied, perhaps the general might want to consider some arrangement by which he would be assured that no extradition would be attempted. If Mow and Hsiang decided they did not want to continue causing trouble, the problem could be solved and they might also get "maybe \$200,000 or \$300,000. * * * " The man left his sentence unfinished.

He resumed by saying he had information that Chinese Ambassador Wellington Koo and another Chinese general, recently sent from Formosa to Washington to look into Mow's and Hsiang's battle with their home government, had already gone to the State Department to arrange extradition.

STATEMENTS PROVED FALSE

The State Department concurred, he continued, and the matter was to be arranged in coordinated action by the following Monday.

[These statements were false, for it is known that the Chinese Embassy has not made any such representations to the State Department. Moreover, as the Embassy would have known, but as the man making the offer apparently did not, there is no extradition agreement between the Chinese Nationalist and the American Governments. Accordingly, the two officers cannot be extradited. The State Department could order them deported if they lose their credentials as Chinese Government employees, but it could not prescribe where they would be

sent, nor could it turn them over to the Chinese Government.]

If Mow and Hsiang were just a little less than 100 percent sure they could not be extradited, the man continued, they might well consider an arrangement that would give them complete assurance.

HOLDOUT PROPOSED

The man implied this could be done if they gave up their campaign. Then, it could also be arranged, when they turned over to the Nationalist Government the Chinese Air Force funds in the possession of their office, they could hold out a sum that might run as high as \$500,000. A report on that amount, presumably showing its gradual disbursement for office expenses, could be made later to the Chinese Government, the man said.

He advised the clerk that Mow could make known a decision to accept the deal to one or another of certain personal representatives of Chiang Kai-shek now in this country, designating them by name.

The clerk was told to phone the man who made the suggestion at his home at 6 that night and if there was no answer to try again at 7.

The clerk said he phoned both times, but there was no answer.

EARLIER ATTEMPTS MADE

The clerk reported that 4 days later, on August 28, the same man telephoned him to ask what Mow's decision was and to know his attitude. The clerk replied that Mow's attitude, as of that moment, was perfectly normal, that he was working hard and was very busy, too busy to speak to his good friends. When his case had been concluded, the clerk continued, he would be delighted to get in touch with the man. At that the Chinese at the other end of the line rang off without comment.

According to Colonel Hsiang, who was interviewed on the affair, the blunt offer was merely the climax to a succession of earlier attempts, all of them much more discreet, to buy off Hsiang and Mow.

ASSURED OF PAY

One of them, Hsiang said, was made last spring, concurrently with an order from Formosa to close down the Washington office of the Chinese Air Force and turn over its functions to a new agency. Mow was assured that, even though his job would be taken out from under him, he would continue to receive the same pay, disbursed from a different source.

Hsiang has in his possession the document containing this offer, but for the present declines to have it made public.

A few days after this offer, Hsiang said yesterday, a meeting was held at the Chinese Embassy to effect the proposed turn-over. In that gathering, Hsiang made vigorous charges of corruption and the meeting ended without agreements on the reorganization.

Three days later, on May 7, General Mow was handed a cabled message from Chiang Chin-kuo, the Generalissimo's oldest son and head of the Nationalists' secret police. It had been sent in the special care of a relative of Chiang on official business in this country.

Hsiang Held to Blame

The first part of the message gave Mow warm assurances of the high regard in which he was held by his Government.

The second part sought to put all the blame on Hsiang for the difficulties that had arisen. It warned Mow that if he continued to support Hsiang's intransigent ways, Mow's position and reputation would be endangered.

The last part said if Hsiang had difficulties in making a turn-over to the new agency resuming the duties of the Chinese Air Force Washington office, they could be settled and compromised by agreement between Mow and the officer named as the head of the new agency.

"A solution can definitely be found," the cable said. The cable was sent before the recent charges against Hsiang and Mow were made by the Nationalist Government.

Colonel Hsiang interprets the cable as being, first, an obvious attempt to divide Mow and himself, giving Mow a way out of the affair by placing all the blame on Hsiang; and second, providing Hsiang himself a way out.

The suggestion of a way out for him, Hsiang says, is in accord with one of the oldest of the Chinese precepts—when you press an enemy from the front, you always give him a way to escape from the rear, because otherwise he will be forced to fight back fiercely.

The Heart of Italy, Her People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a warm pleasure for me to introduce into this record and to recommend to my colleagues that they read the account of Miss Ursula Scervini entitled "The Heart of Italy, Her People," written after her recent tour of Italy.

Miss Scervini is a student and the daughter of Mr. Frank Scervini, well known espouser of human causes, who made the trip to Italy with his daughter and later visited Israel to further his advocacy and sponsorship of religious freedom throughout the world as the basis for universal peace.

THE HEART OF ITALY, HER PEOPLE

(By Ursula Scervini)

Neapolitan songs and black-haired, brown-eyed, sentimental singers, who gather in groups of two or three along the multicolored Bay of Naples to sing their hearts out for a few liras, a piazza in Capri, where people from many countries meet, who although they speak different tongues all have the same universal thought, the beauty of the Blue Grotto, a carriage ride through the Via Borghese in Rome, shopping on the Ponte Vecchio in Florence, swimming in the cool green Adriatic waters of the Lido, or the indescribable excitement of Venezia's Piazza San Marco—all this and more is what makes up Italy. This is the heart of Italy.

For many years before the war, people from all over the world journeyed to see this boot-shaped land. There were those who had the means to travel in the greatest ease, and others who worked, planned, and saved to take the voyage. Today, it is still the same. The waves of war may have left parts of Naples in shambles and left many homeless but they have not washed away the warmth and gaiety of the Italians or the attractiveness of Italy that draws so many tourists to her shores each year.

Traveling through Italy, one may meet an Irishman at the Vatican Museum in Rome, an Englishman on a holiday at San Remo on the Italian Riviera, a Frenchman on the ferry that goes from Naples to Capri, an American riding in a gondola along the Grand Canal, a Chinese visiting Dante's home in Florence, or a Dutchman in Genoa.

There are many ways of touring Italy. Some people come to see the ancient ruins, or the birthplaces of the great Renaissance painters and writers, or the historic cathedrals. These, of course, should be seen; yet Italy is made up of more than this.

To really see Italy, one must know her people, eat her food and drink her wine and become at heart an Italian. Italy gives to her tourists many things: happiness, excitement, education, and gaiety. Often she gets nothing in return. What does Italy want in return? She wants nothing. It is up to the tourist to give something.

A friendly manner to an Italian waiter, a bit of shared laughter with a guide, the exchange of ideas and conversation with the Italians you meet daily throughout your stay in the country—these are what the tourist should give to Italy. For if you give an Italian a bit of yourself, he will give you something far better—a bit of his heart.

A tour of Italy should be for knowledge not only of her famous sights, but also of the character and personality of her people who will show you what Italy is really made of.

A perfect tour of Italy would begin at Naples. On a cool night after the heat of the day and the weariness of sightseeing, one should take a stroll to one of Naples' famous restaurants, Ciro's or Zi Theresa on the bay, or D'Angelo's, overlooking the bay. Once there you would order the specialty of the house, a Neapolitan pizza. After a few minutes a singer might come over to you and ask for your request. To send him away would be foolish. Find out through him one of the things that makes up Italy's heart. It is music. Neapolitans are famous for singing, whether they sing American or Italian songs. This past summer in Naples, words from the songs September Song, My Foolish Heart, and a Neapolitan song, Anema e Core, were sung by everyone, native singers as well as tourists.

In Capri, one learns of the simplicity and beautiful handiwork of the Italians. In doorways, women sit weaving gold threads in white and black evening shawls, and men sit outside their shoe shops, making gold sandals by hand. Along the shore, teen-aged boys will rush over to you in hopes of taking you out to the Blue Grotto in their boats. Capri shows us that Italians are hard-working people—people who have very little to work with yet turn out a finished product exquisitely beautiful in its own simple way.

Of course we all know of the large-scale industry of Genoa, Rome and Milan, but in places like Capri, Sorrento and small villages in Calabria, where everything is made diligently by hand, we can see what Italy is really made up of. It is made up of hard-working people, who use their extraordinary artistic talents in making laces, leather goods, glassware and numerous other objects for all people to enjoy. In Venezia, one doesn't leave the Isle of Murano's glassmaking shop, or the Isle of Burano's lace factory without making some purchase, that will always bring back to him the wonder of seeing these Venetians turn out these works of art that seem like gifts of God.

In Rome, the big city, one sees many things that make up the character of the Italians. On a Sunday morning at St. Peter's one can see the love of religious that is part of the Italian people. Everyone, young and old, rich and poor, flock to Mass and Holy Communion. They are thankful to God for what He has given them and they pray to Him to watch over their Holy Father, the Pope.

In Rome, from the people's dress, one sees the individuality and knowledge of style and fashion that the Italians have. In the night clubs of Rome, like the Casino delle Rose and the Belvedere delle Rose, one sees the natural gaiety of the Italians. Here they dance and sing and share the warm companionship of their friends.

In Rome, also, the tourist will want to see the Colosseum, the Catacombs, the Swiss Guards at Vatican City, and the opera at the Baths of Caracalla. But besides these, the

tourist should spend an hour at one of the city's numerous sidewalk cafes, observing the people as they pass by.

In Venezia, one sees many things that make up the heart of Italy. People say that there is no other city in the world quite like Venezia. This is true because nowhere else in the world is there a city built on water.

The tall, fair-haired Venetians, full of gaiety and life, all have a love for art and music. In most Venetian homes, whether palaces along the Grand Canal, homes near the Piazza San Marco or poor dwellings on some side-street canal, there will be some work of art, in the form of a painting, a novel or a record.

The Venetians still cling to the old customs of their ancestors. In the summer months, traditional feasts are carried on, with the decorated gondolas filled with Venetians in evening dress, passing under lighted bridges, going from Venice to the Lido.

Since the Venetians are so near the Lido, the playground of the world, they are more cosmopolitan and international than most other Italians. In Venice you find smartly dressed women, well-educated men, and numerous events going on continuously which bring gaiety, excitement, and knowledge to everyone. In Venezia, among other things, you will find the International Film Festival, the Lido Casino, open-air concerts, art exhibitions, and exquisite shops selling the famous Venetian glassware.

A tourist in Venezia should, of course, see the Doge's Palace, the pigeons of the Piazza San Marco, the Basilica of San Marco, the House of Gold, and other palaces along the Grand Canal and, of course, should take the romantically famous gondola ride. However, apart from all this, to complete his tour, the traveler should form a warm and lasting friendship with a Venetian. From this friendship with a Venetian, the tourist will understand the intelligence, emotionalism, and sentimentalism of the Italians.

From the richness of Venice, we go down to the south of Italy, Calabria, with her immense proud mountain ranges. Here the majority of the people have been untouched by the modern machine age. Donkeys are still the main means of transportation, the homes are primitive, and women and children are seen barefoot and overworked more times than not. Families carry their wares to the city markets from the country villages in baskets carried on their heads. This is the primitiveness of the heart of Italy.

Now do we really know what makes up the heart of Italy? It is made up of both old and new. Through its streets you can ride in a horse-drawn carriage in the midst of automobiles, bicycles, donkeys, or motorcycles.

In most other countries the different social classes have nothing in common. Yet in Italy both rich and poor enjoy and understand art and music, gaiety and happiness. The unity of religion also binds the people together.

Almost everyone strives for education in Italy. Farmers and workmen drive themselves in order to send their children to schools. The upper classes take the education of their children as a matter of course. Yet if they had to, they too would labor untiringly to educate their children. In a country that had as its ancestors Dante, Michelangelo, Cellini, Cavour, and other great names, it could not be different.

The contrast of old and new is ever present in Italy—ancient ruins and modern apartments, shoeless people and hand labor in the south with fashionably dressed people and industry in the north. The love, laughter, and tears of the Italian people flourish among the old and new surroundings. This is the heart of Italy.

So it can be seen that it is not only the waters of the Mediterranean, which appear

blue, green, or gray according to the tricks of the sun, or the famous blue skies, or the famous landmarks, that make up Italy. It is her people who make up her most important part.

These people who make the cooking and serving of food an art, who sing from their hearts, understand and appreciate art and music, respect traditional customs, who use the 10 fingers that God gave them to mold into shape the many types of objects that people use for work and play and beauty—these warm-blooded, emotional, sentimental people with the big brown eyes—these make up Italy. They are the heart of Italy.

If you want to see the industry of Italy go to Rome and Milan. If you want to see her excitement, gaiety, and culture go to Venezia. If you want to see her heritage of art and writings go to Florence—for her seaports go to Naples and Genoa. Capri will show you her beautiful simplicity. If you want to smell her perfumed flowers, go to San Remo.

If, however, you wish to see her heart, cherish her people. There you will find the heart of Italy.

Labor's Role in the Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by William S. Tyson, Solicitor, United States Department of Labor, at Little Rock, Ark., Labor Day celebration, entitled "Labor's Role in the Defense Effort":

I am deeply honored by your invitation to participate in the various activities which have been programmed here today to celebrate Labor Day. I am happy to be here with you and to bring to you the greetings and best wishes of our Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin.

Arkansas' nickname of the Wonder State was apparently not just plucked out of the thin air. An extremely strong case can be made out that it is just that. Not because this State has the only known deposit of diamonds in North America or that it produces over 94 percent of the bauxite or aluminum ore mined on this continent. What I believe to be much more impressive and conclusive is the evidence that Arkansas has within its borders vast natural resources which make it virtually self-sufficient.

This beautiful capital city is surrounded by fertile, productive fields, and not far distant can be found vast stands of high timber, coal, oil, and natural-gas deposits, and many other mineral resources. The State is a remarkably healthy place to live, is abundantly supplied with water resources, affords many good industrial sites that lie contiguous or in proximity to railroads, highways, and utilities, offers exceptional recreational facilities, and is so situated that approximately one-third of the population of the United States can be reached with 48-hour freight service.

But perhaps what is more important, the working men and women of Arkansas, of Little Rock—indeed, of all of our country's farms and urban centers—are celebrating Labor Day 1951 as free men and women, as men and women enjoying an ever-increasing standard of living, as men and women confident of their ability to maintain a cherished way of life and assured that the future holds promise of even better things to come.

These are the underlying reasons, I believe, why your celebration here today is in the form that Peter McGuire envisaged, and it has surely exceeded in scope and color anything of which he could have dreamed. Peter McGuire was a delegate to the Central Labor Union of New York in 1882 when he made a motion that one day in the year be designated as "Labor Day," to serve "as a general holiday for the laboring classes" and to be devoted to "the industrial spirit, the great vital force of every nation." He recommended that there be a street parade, "which would publicly show the strength and esprit de corps of the trade and labor organizations."

By 1923, Labor Day had been recognized officially by an act of Congress and by legislation in each of the 48 States. Parades, demonstrations, and meetings have been part of the traditional celebration. It was once noted that "those outside the labor movement test its strength and virility by the way in which Labor Day is observed." If that comment is still true, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind concerning the strength and virility of the labor movement here in Little Rock, Ark.

There is no better illustration of the place labor has won in the life of America than the universal acceptance of Labor Day by the people of the United States. It is unique among our holidays. It does not commemorate a historic event. It did not come down to us as tradition. Yet it ranks with all the other great festivals of our land. It has, in less than two generations, grown to be so much a part of our scheme of things that most Americans have come to cherish it as a matter of course. That is a remarkable development. Within a relatively short time, Labor Day has woven itself into the very heart of this great republic.

To my mind, Labor Day should not simply be a day on which Labor, with a capital L, pauses to assess the accomplishments which have been achieved during the previous year, tremendous and gratifying though they may have been. It should also be, as President Truman has said, a day set aside for "a sober evaluation of the problems that labor, together with all other groups in our country, face in our complex world." And, this year, perhaps, too, it should be a day of tribute from the Nation to its working men and women for their vital contribution to the cause of world peace and freedom.

"The American worker," as the President noted not so long ago, "enjoys an economic, political, and social status solidly established on democratic principles and unequaled elsewhere in the world." It is a status which has been achieved because now firmly imbedded in our national thinking is the realization of the honor and dignity that goes with the creative effort that produces every worthwhile thing we have or use. Perhaps because it is now so intimate a part of the fabric of our society there is a tendency to regard lightly or ignore the dignity attached to human labor in the United States. We forget much too easily that in other times and in other lands manual labor has been scorned. One of the greatest philosophers of the Golden Age of Greek culture wrote that "in a perfect state no artisan will ever be admitted to citizenship," and other leaders of that culture and the succeeding Roman culture echoed that sentiment. And in the last decade, even in highly industrialized countries, we have witnessed the most shockingly brutal attitudes toward human labor. The Nazis made a mockery of human labor when they erected over the entrance of the infamous concentration camp at Auschwitz a sign reading "Work Shall Set You Free." The irony of this expression was that what they meant was freedom through death's door, yet it was a path which many sought in order to escape the brutality of soulless men who regarded machines with far greater com-

passion than they did their fellow men. And, even more recently we have been hearing reports of workers in Eastern Europe enslaved in what is nicely termed "corrective labor camps."

In sharp contrast is the American attitude toward labor. Today the status of the American worker is an enviable one. Of course, it has not always been thus. Not so many years ago the American economy too often witnessed bloody strikes, labor spies, yellow-dog contracts, union-breaking activities, long hours, low wages, and the sight of emaciated working children. It took the ceaseless efforts of the leaders of labor, a great depression, and the dauntless devotion to the Nation's welfare of two Presidents, Roosevelt and Truman, to effect the tremendous changes that have occurred. In the last two decades there has been enacted a moral economic program that has given social and economic justice to American workers. Under that program American working men and women have had guaranteed their right to band together in a union and require that management in turn deal with them, have had guaranteed to them fair labor standards with respect to minimum wages and maximum hours, and have guaranteed, too, among other things, protection when they lose their jobs and when they reach old age. Incidentally, one of the great accomplishments of the past year was to bring about a revision of the old-age and survivors' insurance law that now gives an equitable and fair payment to the insured retired older people of America.

Programs such as these have given recognition to the human dignity of man—they are the essence of true Americanism. But neither labor nor the Nation as a whole can rest upon these laurels. What has been termed the "good fight" is not yet over—if, indeed, it ever is. The struggle for social betterment and economic security continues both defensively to hold the hard-won gains and offensively to achieve others. In view of present world conditions, it is pointedly true today that "Eternal Vigilance is the Price of Freedom." It is also the price of economic security. And, too, it is the price of social progress.

Freedom, economic security, social progress and world peace are today unhappily threatened by the Pied Piper of Moscow who, given the opportunity, would lead the peoples of the world to their own destruction. In the present great world struggle against the slavemongers of Eastern Europe, free labor is going to play a vital role. Manpower and its efficient utilization are going to play a great part in determining the outcome of this struggle, and as to its happy outcome there is no doubt in my mind.

The job ahead is a really challenging one. The shifting of some three millions of working people will have to be effected to carry out the contemplated program. Mass production of defense items is not expected to be reached for another year yet, but tremendous strides in expanding our basic economy to support the defense program have already been taken. Steel capacity is moving toward an annual capacity of 118,000,000 tons by July 1953, primary aluminum production in 1954 is expected to almost double 1950, a proposed 40-percent electric power expansion by 1953 is under way and comparable expansions are planned or underway for many other industries.

The manpower program as it stands now is one that we can meet, aid meet in a free way. Our program is a voluntary one. I might point out that in the last war, Britain had selective service for women. Thirty-eight percent of the women over the age of 14 were in the labor force. In the United States without compulsion, 37 percent of our women were in the labor force. It took at least that margin of 1 percent that the

British had in excess of what we had in the labor force to administer this kind of a program, so that I would say our free method has demonstrated that it is the best system.

While the Russians enjoy a 3 to 2 manpower superiority, the fact remains that the free world's workers far outproduce the enslaved peoples under Soviet rule or domination. The tremendous outpouring of goods from our factories was one of the great contributing factors to the winning of World War II, and is again going to be a great factor in winning the present struggle—possibly, even without an all-out war which all of us fervently pray can be avoided. While we are on this subject of productivity, you may be interested in some estimates of the extent to which the American worker outproduces any other worker in the world. Taking America with a standard of 100, Britain's productive capacity per man is 50; France's is about 33, Italy's is about 15; Russia, according to the last available statistics, was 12—it is probably better than that now, because it is difficult to get information from behind the iron curtain. In other words, an American worker, it is estimated, produces at the rate of eight times the average Russian worker.

Let me say that our trade-unions in America have played a great part in achieving such a high rate of productivity, because the great majority of the American trade-unionists appreciate the fact that productivity per worker is what has given to us the highest living standards in the world. This productivity is going to stand us in great stead in the difficult period in which we find ourselves at the present time.

Every time I hear talk of production and productivity, I am reminded of a little story I heard not so long ago. During the first Russian 5-year plan an American pilgrim was ushered into the director's office of a model factory. He stared wide-eyed at the production chart hanging on the wall. "Oh, yes," said the director, "during the first year we produced only 5,000, the second year, 50,000, the third, 500,000. This year we'll probably make a million."

"Is that so? May I ask what you are producing?" asked the visitor.

The director reached out to the belt conveyor and pulled off a little brass tag for the visitor to inspect. It read "The elevator isn't running."

A story such as this one is pleasant to hear and, we hope, true. But we must not permit such stories or phony sweet talk to lead us down the path of complacency and indolence. It is a path fraught with dangers for the unwary wanderer.

There are, of course, some aspects of the present situation which, insofar as they affect the American worker, leave something to be desired. The danger of inflation is still with us. The balance sheet of labor's gains and losses for this past year is not perfect. But no balance sheet ever is. On the whole, however, a healthy situation is shown and known to exist.

In conclusion, let me say this. You know as well as I do what labor has done to build a better America to live in, but strange to say, you have to keep coming back and explaining to the people, and keep constantly refreshing their minds on it, as there are always some who would like to eliminate the rights of the worker if they could do it by fair means or foul. A strong trade-union movement is one of the best protections that we have against Red or Black totalitarianism. That is why in Germany under the Nazis and in Czechoslovakia under the Communists the trade-unions were the first organizations to be taken over or destroyed. Your organizations must participate on an ever-widening scale in the building of a sound, free economy dedicated to achieving greater security, freedom, ma-

terial well-being and equality of opportunity for all. That is the challenge of today, and I have no doubt that American labor will continue to meet it with the same courage and determination it has displayed in the past.

Customs Simplification Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr REED of New York. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record the following statement of Mr O R Strackbein, chairman of the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, before the Ways and Means Committee, on the customs simplification bill, H R. 1535, August 15, 1951.

The National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, of which I am chairman and for which I speak, is composed of 15 or 16 industries that are equally represented in the council by labor and management. I am also executive secretary of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference which is composed exclusively of national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Most of these unions are also represented on the council.

H R. 1535, the customs simplification bill, is of great interest to us because of its bearing on and reflection of foreign trade policy.

At the very outset we wish to say that we fully support the stated objective of the bill insofar as it seeks simplification of customs procedure and greater economy and efficiency of administration. While the recommendations of McKinsey & Co may not in all instances assure greater economy and efficiency if put into effect, we do not feel qualified to question them for obvious reasons.

On the other hand, we wish to express our deep concern over sections of the bill that are derived from sources other than the McKinsey report. These are provisions that have little or nothing to do with efficiency and economy of customs administration and which, if adopted, would in some cases, at least, lead not to simplification but to a greater volume of work.

There are two principal sources of these provisions that are extraneous to the avowed objective of simplification and greater economy. One is the charter for an International Trade Organization (ITO) and the other the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT. Actually there is little or no difference between these two sources and it would be unnecessary to mention the ITO as a source of the recommended provisions but for the fact that the ITO Charter did not prosper before Congress when it was submitted for ratification. It was subsequently withdrawn from Congress by the State Department after 5 years of work on it.

The present bill, H R. 1535, is a replica of H R. 8304, which was introduced into Congress May 1, 1950, but did not come to a hearing in the Eighty-first Congress. The failure of the ITO Charter to make progress in Congress became evident after H. R. 8304 had been introduced. The withdrawal of the charter took place still later, but before

the present bill, H. R. 1535, was introduced on January 15, 1951.

A reading of the Analysis of the Customs Simplification Act of 1950, distributed by the Treasury Department in 1950 turns up several references to the ITO Charter. One is on the first paragraph on page 6, another, in the last paragraph, same page. A further such reference occurs in the first paragraph on page 22; another in the second paragraph on page 24; yet another on the bottom of page 25. Three additional references appear, one toward the bottom of page 39, a second, near the top of page 42, and a third, in the second paragraph on page 47. This is a total of eight references to the charter.

It is possible, we believe, to substitute GATT for the ITO in all these instances since the two are virtually identical in the class of provisions involved in the bill, H. R. 1535, and its predecessor, H. R. 8304.

The Treasury Department, in its testimony before this committee, did substitute GATT for the ITO, and was justified in doing so because of the nearly identical character of those provisions in ITO and GATT that gave rise to various sections of the customs simplification bill.

We come now to the basis of our objection to those provisions in the present bill, H. R. 1535, which had their origin, first in ITO and then, with failure of ITO to gain ratification by Congress, secondly, in GATT.

It should be borne in mind that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is in effect only provisionally. Its final effectiveness depends upon the appropriate alteration of domestic statutes that presently conflict with some of the GATT provisions.

We are faced in this question with an issue that is highly controversial in character. In the first place, there exist substantial grounds for questioning the validity of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which was negotiated in Geneva in 1947. It may be contended very reasonably and with conviction that no such broad authorization was contained in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, on which the General Agreement is based as is required to justify GATT legally.

Secondly, this was tacitly recognized by the State Department itself when it sent the charter for an International Trade Organization to Congress, which contained virtually all of the substantive and procedural provisions of GATT, for ratification. By contrast, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which is very broad in both its express provisions and in its implications, and repeats much of the ITO Charter, was never sent to Congress for ratification.

The ITO Charter having met with insufficient acceptance in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to lead to a committee report after full hearings, was, as has already been pointed out, withdrawn by the State Department. This was the nearest approach to a congressional test to which any of the provisions of GATT have come. The complete failure of the ITO Charter to gain legislative approval can thus hardly be construed as shedding a favorable light on the legislative acceptance of GATT were that agreement submitted for ratification.

For the sake of clarity it should be said that the reduction of duty rates in the General Agreement is not in question. Clear authority existed for that action, and it is not contested. We refer to the other provisions, among which are those upon which a part of H. R. 1535 is based.

Now we find some of the GATT provisions making their appearance in the customs simplification bill. We do not wish in any sense to suggest that the Treasury Department had in view any objectives other than their stated ones. We do say that when the first bill, H. R. 8304, was drawn there was indeed no particular reason why the Treasury Department should have foreseen the legislative fate of the ITO Charter since the Depart-

ment was not alerted or on notice to be on guard. It was therefore natural enough to include the ITO provisions in H. R. 8304, the original customs simplification bill. The subsequent failure of the charter should, however, have raised some question in the minds of Treasury officials; but since they were in a position of doing something by request, in a field, moreover, which is not their specialty, namely, that of foreign affairs, this oversight may be overlooked. Therefore, we have no quarrel with the customs administration of the Treasury Department.

In the customs simplification proposal they had a good vehicle. Somebody else saw this and asked them to carry a load of extraneous merchandise. In the beginning even this may have been justified, i. e., in H. R. 8304, on the ground that legislative approval of the ITO was believed to be forthcoming, but after the failure of ITO, the Treasury Department should have been relieved of the burden of this extraneous merchandise. It should have been unloaded.

We feel strongly that the true customs simplification proposal should be allowed to go ahead on its own merit and think it should obtain early approval. At the same time we object strongly to the hitch-hiking companions. We think they should be taken off the vehicle, made to stand on their own feet and, if they seek legislative approval, that they do so on their own merits, in their own name and on their own history. We repeat that at the outset they may have been suitable cargo, but not since the ITO Charter met its legislative fate.

We would not feel so strongly if we did not recognize the very great importance of the issue at stake. This is whether it is wise procedure whereunder the executive arm of the Government may make far-reaching commitments in executive agreements with other countries, which involve conflicts with our existing statutes, and then confront the legislative arm with a moral imperative to modify our statutes accordingly. This amounts to moral coercion of the legislative branch by the executive, through the device of placing the legislative branch in the position of either ratifying the action of the executive or running out on an agreement made by the executive. If this process were not halted the executive could completely circumvent the Congress.

If that is what the American people desire and seek, when and after they understand the issue, that is one thing. When, however, this is by way of being accomplished without their knowledge and without full debate—that is another matter, and we object.

So that the sources within the defunct ITO Charter and the provisional General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) from which important parts of H. R. 1535 are derived, may be more clearly seen, the more important of these sources are given below related to the pertinent sections of H. R. 1535, the customs simplification bill.

Section 2 (a). This section provides that the word "materially" be inserted in the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. This means that in order to obtain a remedy a domestic industry, in competition with imports which are dumped in this market, must prove material injury and not merely injury as at present.

ITO source. Article 34 of the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization, paragraph 1, provides as follows:

"The members recognize that dumping, by which products of one country are introduced into the commerce of another country at less than the normal value of the products, is to be condemned if it causes or threatens material injury to an established industry in a member country or materially retards the establishment of a domestic industry."

GATT source: Article VI, paragraph 1, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and

Trade, is identical with the ITO provision on dumping, the pertinent part of which was quoted in the preceding paragraph.

Section 2 (b): This section would conform our law to both the ITO Charter and GATT. Article 34 of the ITO Charter, paragraph 5, and Article VI, paragraph 5, of GATT, are identical and read as follows:

"No product of any member country imported into any other member country shall be subject to both antidumping and countervailing duties to compensate for the same situation of dumping or export subsidization."

Section 2 (b) of H. R. 1535 provides that if an antidumping duty is collected there will be deducted any countervailing duty collected on the same transaction.

Section 2 (c) of the bill makes the same provision where a countervailing duty is collected. Any antidumping duty on the same shipment or transaction will be deducted.

These two provisions carry out the ITO and GATT provisions that no product shall be subject to both duties.

These provisions of H. R. 1535 are obviously no part of customs simplification. It is doubtful that the management firm of McKinsey & Co. made a recommendation on this subject. The section is not so attributed in the Analysis of the Customs Simplification Act of 1950 distributed by the Treasury Department.

Section 3 Special marking requirements: This section, according to the analysis just referred to "goes beyond the ITO charter which provides in article 373 as follows: 'Whenever it is administratively practicable to do so, members should permit required marks of origin to be affixed at the time of importation.'"

The repeal of the special marking requirements was based on a McKinsey recommendation.

Section 8 Temporary free entry: According to the analysis this section, by which the term of temporary free imports would be extended from a total of 1 year to 3 years, would gratify the ECA. Evidently customs simplification has nothing to do with the proposal and the suggestion is probably not in the McKinsey report.

Section 13. Value: McKinsey & Co. recommended the abolition of foreign value as a basis of duty assessment and called for a broadening of the other methods.

However, both the ITO charter and GATT have articles on the subject of value.

ITO source: Article 35, paragraph 2, of the ITO charter says:

"The Members recognize the validity of the general principles of valuation set forth in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5, and they undertake to give effect, at the earliest practicable date, to these principles."

GATT source: Article VII, paragraph 1 of GATT says the same thing in slightly different words. Both documents provide that "they (Members or contracting parties) shall upon request by another (Member or contracting) party review the operation of any of their laws or regulations relating to value for customs purposes in the light of these principles."

The extent to which H. R. 1535 would "give effect" to "these principles" may be seen from several comparisons:

1 Section 402, Tariff Act of 1930: The Tariff Act of 1930 under "foreign value," "export value" and "United States value" calls for merchandise "freely offered for sale."

ITO and GATT: Article 35, paragraph 3 (b) of the ITO charter and article VII, paragraph 2 (b) of GATT both provide that value be based, among other things, on merchandise actually sold or offered for sale.

H. R. 1535: bases "export value," "United States value" or "comparative value" on the

price at which the merchandise is "freely sold or offered for sale."

The analysis previously referred to, on page 20, paragraph (6), says "The appraiser may use actual sales instead of offers in determining 'export value,' 'United States value,' or 'comparative value.'" It will be noted that the existing law does not make a provision for taking actual sales into consideration but only offers. This is in accordance with our commitment to "give effect, at the earliest practicable date, to these principles" (as quoted from the ITO charter above).

We do not at this point comment on the desirability of adding actual sales to offers of sales as a source of price information. That is beside the point. Our interest is in the genealogy of parts of H. R. 1535.

2 Internal taxes: Section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which is the section defining "value," does not exclude internal taxes from value.

ITO and GATT: These two instruments contain identical language, as follows:

"The value for customs purposes of any imported product should not include the amount of any internal tax, applicable within the country of origin or export, from which the imported product has been exempted or has been or will be relieved by means of refund."

H. R. 1535, page 22, paragraph (f), provides with respect to taxes as follows:

"The value of imported merchandise ascertained or estimated in accordance with this section shall not include the amount of any internal tax, applicable within the country of origin or exportation, from which the merchandise undergoing appraisement has been exempted or has been or will be relieved by means of refund."

A reading of the underscored portions of the ITO-GATT version and of H. R. 1535 will disclose the almost verbatim repetition of the former in H. R. 1535. Again, we do not at this point address ourselves to the merits of the proposal but to the origin of it; and the latter is very clear.

3. Usual wholesale quantities: The Tariff Act of 1930 uses the criterion of "the usual wholesale quantities" as the basis of value. This is found in section 402 (c), (d), and (e).

ITO and GATT: Article 35, paragraph 3 (b) (ii) provides that the quantities imported, if not comparable, should be "quantities not less favorable to importers than those in which the greater volume of merchandise is sold in the trade between the countries of exportation and importation."

The identical provision is found in GATT under article VII, paragraph 2 (b) (ii).

H. R. 1535: In defining "usual wholesale quantities," H. R. 1535, page 24, paragraph (5), says that this means "the quantities usually sold in the class of transactions in which the greater aggregate quantity of 'such or similar merchandise,' in respect of which the value is being ascertained or estimated, is sold."

That the concept of "greater aggregate quantity" represents a change from present practice becomes clear when we turn to the Treasury Department's "Analysis." On page 20, par. (9) appears the following statement:

"(9) It (the proposed bill) also defines 'usual wholesale quantities' in such a manner as to mean the quantities in which the greatest aggregate quantity of merchandise is sold, whereas under the present law the usual wholesale quantity is the quantity in which the largest number of individual transactions occur."

The proposed adoption of the ITO-GATT principle would establish the larger wholesale transaction as the basis of value. These might be expected to represent lower prices than lesser wholesale quantities which under present practice figure more prominently in determining "the usual wholesale quantities."

Thus the suggested change is a modification of the present practice to conform such practice to ITO and GATT.

Section 14. American selling price: The American selling price is now used for valuation purposes under paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and under three other paragraphs in pursuance of determinations made under Section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

ITO and GATT: Both ITO and GATT provide that "the value for customs purposes of imported merchandise . . . should not be based on the value of merchandise of national origin." (ITO charter, article 35, paragraph 3 (a); also GATT, article VII, paragraph 2 (a).)

The American selling price as now utilized under the Tariff Act of 1930 is in violation of the principle of ITO and GATT that the value of merchandise of national origin should not be used. This explains the proposal to abandon this system of valuation. On page 24 of the Treasury Department's "Analysis" it is stated in the second paragraph that "the continued use of 'American selling price' for the appraisement of any merchandise would not comply with this provision"—referring to article 35.3 of the ITO, quoted above.

Paragraph (c) of section 14 would drop from section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 the authority to establish the American selling price.

Section 20. Conversion of currency: This section provides for the substitution under stated circumstances of conversion values set up by the International Monetary Fund for the rates now supplied by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

ITO and GATT sources: Article 35, paragraph 5 (a) of ITO and article VII, paragraph 4 (a) of GATT provide that the conversion rate of exchange to be used "shall be based on the par values of the currencies involved, as established pursuant to the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund or."

The Treasury Department analysis on page 39 says, near the end of the first paragraph:

"Provision would also be made for application in the future of any international rules for currency conversion when multiple rates of exchange are maintained, which may be established as provided in the charter for an International Trade Organization now before Congress for consideration."

Since the abandonment of ITO, the similar provisions of GATT should be substituted in the preceding paragraph. This leaves no doubt of the origin of section 20.

Section 23. Conversion of processing taxes to import taxes: This section conforms to ITO article 18, and to GATT, article III. These articles recognize certain principles of internal taxation and provide that no contracting party or member "shall otherwise apply internal taxes or other internal charges to imported or domestic products in a manner contrary to the principles set forth in paragraph I."

Among these principles is the one that processing taxes should not be applied to imported or domestic products so as to afford protection to domestic production.

Section 24. Internal revenue taxes: Section 24, if adopted, would bring certain internal revenue laws which now discriminate against certain imported products into conformity with article 18 of the ITO Charter and article III of GATT. Paragraph 4 of article 18 of the ITO Charter is the same as paragraph 4 of article III of GATT. They provide that—

"The products of any (member country or contracting party) imported into any (member country or territory of any contracting party) shall be accorded no less favorable treatment than that accorded to like products of national origin in respect of all laws,

regulations, and requirements affecting their internal sale, etc."

Section 24 represents an effort to modify our internal revenue laws in a manner to assure equality of treatment of imports and domestic products.

These citations are sufficient to establish the origin of a number of the sections of H. R. 1535 as coming initially from the charter for an International Trade Organization and, after the demise of that document, from the same or similar provisions in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

It is not only possible but probable that some of these Treasury Department's proposals would have been virtually what they actually are even if the ITO and GATT had never been proposed or negotiated. The similarity may in some instances be purely coincidental. For example, the Treasury Department (Customs Bureau) apparently has long hoped to change the existing law which bases value on the price, not of goods sold, but of goods freely offered for sale, in such manner that actual sales, as proposed in H. R. 1535 and as provided in ITO and GATT, may be used as evidence of value.

Also it may be pointed out that although in several other respects, as previously documented, section 13 (valuation) is based on ITO and GATT principles and provisions, neither ITO nor GATT prescribe the abandonment of "foreign value" as a method of valuation. This abandonment was a recommendation of the McKinsey report.

Nevertheless there remain several proposals of H. R. 1535 that are clearly related to ITO and GATT and clearly represent efforts to modify our statutes to bring them into conformity with the provisions of those documents.

As previously stated, we are opposed to this manner of ratification of GATT. The implications of that agreement are too far-reaching, both economically and politically, to make its acceptance a byproduct of the approval of some other piece of legislation.

Only recently it became apparent how the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade had tied our hands against immediate international action. We found, when we sought to abrogate our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia, our sovereignty impaired to an extent that quite obviously was not generally understood. Situations might arise in which such impairment would visit disastrous consequences upon us.

The point is that if we as a country openly and willingly undertake commitments that limit our sovereignty, after full knowledge and debate, well and good, but if this end is about to be accomplished in a roundabout way, without a full disclosure of the intent and the probable consequences and without full debate, we can only oppose any such proposal as strenuously as we know how.

We hope therefore that H. R. 1535 can be freed of the objections mentioned. In that event we would gladly support the bill.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, with the granting of unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the Record, I think the following article inserted in the Washington Post by the Marine

News, New York, would be of interest to the Members of Congress and the country generally.

The article follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—DISTRIBUTION—CIVIC DEVELOPMENT—DEFENSE

Distribution is one of the critical problems of the Nation. Low-cost transportation is an essential in its solution. Bulk materials, agricultural and certain manufactured products move at lowest cost by water. This is made possible through river and harbor development and improvement. No other Federal expenditure contributes more to the welfare of the people and to the building of the Nation than that for waterway development. Only a small part of the public understands the vital part played by waterways in national defense. "This is a war of transportation," said Lieutenant General Somervell, commanding general, Army service forces, during World War II. The value of waterways to the Nation during that period is beyond estimate. The growth of America, its industrial supremacy, the high living standards of its people are due largely to the development of the Nation's unparalleled natural waterways. There are few areas which have not been benefited by harbor and channel improvements, few which cannot be further benefited by continuing waterway development and expansion.

The Slumbering Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we have a big and expensive program to deal with in defending ourselves and the free world from Russian imperialism, masked by the big brother trap of communism.

Americans will cheerfully sacrifice in order to support this program, but they will not condone waste and extravagance in its administration.

The flag of patriotism must not be used to conceal extortion.

Hidden taxes are a fraud and deceit practiced by government upon its own people.

Eventually the people wake up to the fact that taxes do not hit some, but all. And when they realize that they are all in the same boat, they demand an end to spendthrift policies.

The people of Canada are stirring, and there should be a lesson in that fact for us. At least one member—to the credit of the Canadian Government—is honest about the whole problem. You will find his refreshing suggestion in the following editorial from the *Montreal Gazette* of August 20, 1951:

THE SLUMBERING TAXPAYER

Painless dentistry may be an excellent thing. But perhaps some one ought to put the pain back in taxpaying. As far as taxes are concerned, the taxpayer is under too deep an anesthetic.

One businessman in New Jersey had the idea that his employees should be allowed to hold their money for a while. He wanted them to feel how much they were really giving up. Once in a while he gave them their full salary. They were delighted to see how

much they were earning. But inside the envelope was a note. The note informed them how much they themselves would have to pay back in all the taxes that are usually deducted at source.

Perhaps this method was not quite legal, and it is not known just how long it was carried on. But that businessman had something, at least in the idea of letting people pay their own taxes once in a while.

When Mr. Beardsley Ruml, the great tax expert, inspired his pay-as-you-go plan, he undoubtedly had the best of motives. He himself explained that his plan sprang from the "personal and humane desirability of removing from millions of citizens the constant threat of unpaid tax debt." It was his idea to have "current taxpayers."

Perhaps there are few humane measures that governments have been more eager to adopt than Mr. Ruml's pay-as-you-go plan. For people do not really miss what they never really had. If the plan were ever ended, cries and maledictions, and unspeakable groanings of the spirit would arise every year, when the total sum of income taxes had to be raised. But as it is, the money is silently, almost invisibly, extracted month by month or week by week. When income-tax time rolls around, there is only an adjustment to be made.

The Ruml plan has had other effects, which may not have entered Mr. Ruml's expectations. Many cases of organized workers have come to look upon the take-home pay as the only real pay. In their bargaining, they have simply passed the cost of the income tax on to the employer. As such it has become an additional cost of business, and is often passed on to the consumer in the price of what he purchases.

In other words, this tax that is supposed to be direct and obvious, becomes hidden and indirect. It becomes only another item in the cost of living that everybody is always complaining about, as though it were a mysterious disorder, due to the spots on the moon.

Income taxes have not only been made easy for those who pay them. The Government went further in 1919. It raised the tax exemptions so as to remove about 750,000 taxpayers from the rolls. It was estimated at that time that about two out of every three of the working force in Canada would be no longer aware, even by the pay-as-you-go method, of what the Government is spending.

The process of making taxation painless has gone still further. For taxation has become increasingly indirect and hidden. Back in 1945 46 Canadians were paying nearly twice as much taxes directly as indirectly. But by 1949 50 nearly one-half the taxes had become concealed and hidden. This is not, of course, to say that the people were paying less. On the contrary they were paying more, but with even less consciousness of what they were paying. Here again they have been cursing the high cost of living, without being really aware how much of that cost is coming from the taxes they aren't aware of.

Despite the increasing use of anesthesia in tax collecting, Government spokesmen go on saying that it is the public that keeps demanding that the Government should spend more and more. But if the Government is only bowing before public demand every time it increases its spending, it is hard to understand why such extraordinary measures are taken to conceal from the public what the real cost is.

Hon. Paul Martin, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, was once speaking about the need of informing the public of the heavy burdens that each increase in social security will involve. "I believe that we should deal with this thing frankly," he was saying. "As we go along with these various subjects, we should point out their

cost, point out what it means by way of additional responsibility to the citizens."

The approaching cost of old-age pensions raises this point very clearly. It is said that a special tax will be imposed, as the citizen's contribution to the plan. But if this tax is merely another deduction at source, or another hidden tax on goods sold in the shops, the thing will not be dealt with frankly. It will just be another mysterious increase in everybody's cost of living.

Uncle Sam's International Tourists Bureau Within ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, September 13, while on an inspection trip through the Coeur d'Alene National Forest, our party had occasion to stop at the McGee Ranger Station for coffee and a short rest. While there, a motley crew of about 40 or 50 men pulled into the station.

Upon asking their identity, the ranger informed us they were a party of European foresters routed there by the United Nations, and accredited by Secretary Acheson.

The ranger had instructions to show them everything in the Coeur d'Alene Forest, and extend every courtesy to them, giving them every opportunity to "spy out the land" exactly as the foolish Canaanites did to the Israelites spies sent out by Joshua, who returned bearing grains and fruits of the land they shortly afterward invaded and conquered.

I saw the same crew later registering at the finest hotel we have in Coeur d'Alene. Nothing was too good for them.

Inspecting them at closer quarters at the hotel, I found several Europeans, but several had a most distinctly Slavish cast of head and features.

Must we always give our potential enemies carte blanche in spying out our land before the prospective invasion, which the administration seems to fear so highly, and which they are bankrupting this country to forestall?

The following report by the noted economist, Paul O. Peters, gives the answer as to who is footing the bills. In closing, one must remember ECA funds are yours—the taxpayers' money. One must also remember there is no provision in the Constitution authorizing any department of this Government to allocate funds for any such purpose to benefit the nationals of any foreign country.

UNCLE SAM'S INTERNATIONAL TOURISTS BUREAU IN ECA

(By Paul O. Peters)

Just a few days ago the Economic Cooperation Administration announced that Marshall-plan dollar allotments for the first 11 months of the current fiscal year reached the total of \$2,183,720,000. The total so far allocated since the start of the ECA programs to Western Europe amounts to \$11-

659,911,000. Other millions went in aid to Greece, Turkey, China, and countries in the Far East.

One of the generally overlooked money-waiting schemes employed by the managers of the ECA programs to build up so-called better relations with countries we are aiding, appears to be the promotion of international travel, principally at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Every few days, a group of Americans, representing various organizations shove off for Europe to be taken on personally conducted tours to see how effective our help to the Marshall plan countries has been.

At the same time groups of Europeans are being brought to the United States, where at the expense of the American taxpayers, they are taken on tours of our farms, cities, industrial plants and of Washington.

In Press Release No. 2250, the ECA reports that to May 13, 1951, "The ECA program has brought some 500 groups, including teams up to 12 or more as well as the one-man missions, to the United States. They have studied the industrial and scientific know-how which has given this country its high productivity and output."

On June 7, 1951, ECA announced, "Some 80 executives and technicians from the wood-using industries of Western Europe will come to the United States this summer to study timber processing methods developed here."

On June 11, 1951, it was announced by ECA, "About 20 top-ranking metal scientists and engineers from the free nations of Europe will attend the World Metallurgical Congress in Detroit in October, at the invitation of the American Society for Metals and under Marshall plan sponsorship."

NOW HERE IS THE PAYOFF

Under its technical assistance program, ECA will sponsor the dollar costs of the metallurgists from the Marshall plan countries, covering travel and living expenses in the United States. Travel to and from New York will be provided by the participants themselves, their employers or their governments, since this portion of the expense can be met with their local currencies."

Faith and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., of September 8, 1951:

FAITH AND THE FUTURE

President Conant, of Harvard, has consistently shown himself to be willing to face the most complex issues of modern living with a highly independent and resourceful mind. In the most enthusiastic traditions of the scientific spirit he has sought to solve our present problems with a truly creative realism. This is not to say that he has always been successful; many problems have refused to be resolved by the simple logic of the scientific study, requiring as well the weighing of certain imponderables with which the scientist has almost no familiarity. This does not, of course, make a man a poor scientist; it merely handicaps him in the larger interpretation of human life which we have been taught to call philosophy.

While the scientist, then, is at home among those realities which admit of measurement, he is somewhat less advantageously situated when he preoccupies himself with matters distinctly outside this province, being notably unfortunate, it seems, in the field of moral wisdom and its kindred subjects. This is highly regrettable, but attributable, among other causes, to the narrow specialism into which the processes of modern education have wandered or perhaps been forced. It is surely then no offense in our day to tell the scientist that he is not a philosopher, or at least not a good one; he feels with reason that his standing in this class is somewhat amateur anyway. It will surely then not be taken amiss when we tell him at the same time that he is not a prophet either, or once again not a good one.

It was this last role—that of prophet—that President Conant essayed this week in his widely quoted remarks to the American Chemical Society. As one might expect of a chemist talking to chemists he said on this occasion that the physicists, who have pretty much the best of the publicity lately, were the "modern alchemists" and their prophecies regarding our atomic future were open to question. He himself went beyond questioning them, he denied all the wonderful prognostications of the Sunday supplements and went on to some spectacular predictions of his own. All of these were fascinating, some few were comforting, at least one showed a real flaw in the "crystal ball." This last was on the question of population control where a new dawn began with the opening of the birth-control clinics in India and did not end till, in the last decades of the present century, "the attitudes of (the) religious leaders of the world on this subject * * * (were) completely altered."

For some religious leaders we will not speak; the gyrations of their moral systems are too spontaneous to be patterned. For the Catholic Church, however, a prediction on this question would not be in any sense idle—birth prevention by artificial means will remain a sin against the natural law in the days ahead as it has in the days gone by. The same nature which will assist in the production of the new world described by President Conant can be relied upon to keep constant the laws of its existence and upon these immutable laws rests the validity of this moral concept. While Catholics insist upon this position, they must not be thought to be callous to the problems of populations; they are not at the same time readily convinced that the easiest approach, even when scientific, is necessarily the best. It is impossible so to convince them when this approach is also immoral.

For all this President Conant has envisaged for the future a free world in which men will find the peace so fruitlessly sought in our own times; we join his thoughts and his prayers for this better world. Whether an atomic or a solar world we know it will be a better one if it manages to preserve the twin towers of faith and freedom.

An Indian Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Tulsa, Okla., Daily World contains a statement from

Gov. Johnston Murray, of Oklahoma, which I think will be a source of pleasant information to all who read it:

Popular interest and particular resentment were aroused when an Indian soldier was denied burial in a private cemetery in Iowa. The incident was greatly magnified when the President offered a hero's burial at Arlington.

Gov. Johnston Murray, of Oklahoma, part Indian, made one of the most striking comments of the season:

We are a proud people. I am especially proud of the fact that I have never found an atheist or a member of any subversive group among my fellow Indians.

That is a complete statement and vital comment. It is a matter of conviction in this part of the country that Indians are not only the original Americans, but that they, more than the rest of us, consistently stand out against the isms.

From Ottawa to Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Sunday, September 16, 1951, issue of the *Il Progresso Italo-Americano*:

FROM OTTAWA TO ROME

The third of the three great conferences of the democracies dealing with the international crisis brought on by Russian aggression is now under way. At Ottawa, capital of our good neighbor to the north, Canada, the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is considering a number of weighty military questions. Italy is represented by its able Prime Minister Alcide De Gasperi, who also holds the portfolio of foreign minister.

Few, if any, differences will arise insofar as the stock-taking phase of the sessions is concerned. We are certain that though progress will be recognized and registered in the development of an effective collective-security system, there will be no military man of competency who will say that free Europe already has a defense system strong enough to stop Russian aggression.

The real problem at Ottawa is what has to be done to secure such a defense system in time? Here there arise such questions as: How are the commitments for the forces under General Eisenhower to be divided? What is the capacity of the various member nations to carry out what is asked of them? Where are the weak spots to be plugged? Shall Turkey and Greece be admitted to the NATO?

We do not pretend to be military experts. We will not attempt to give detailed answers in a technical sense to the various problems of basic strategy confronting the military leaders of the democracies. But it is clear to us that if world peace is to be preserved, there must be redoubled efforts for positive and effective preparations for victory in war—should that catastrophe become unavoidable. It is likewise clear to us that Turkey and Greece, two nations steeled in the fight for national independence and freedom, should be admitted to full membership in the NATO. We are heartily for any and

every move which will strengthen the Atlantic alliance as a force for democracy, as a deterrent to aggression and as a machine of collective security that will smash any power that dares plunge the world into another conflagration.

THE ITALIAN QUESTION

It is precisely on this account and in this spirit that we must underscore the following the conferences at Ottawa will be judged largely by the extent to which they provide the decisions and the means for rallying to the cause of democracy and peace the full human and industrial resources of Italy. Our esteemed contemporary, the New York Times, summed up the situation rather aptly when it declared editorially a few days ago:

"NATO will not be really strong until France and Italy solve their Communist problems. It will not be safe until Germany is stronger, until United States production and her Armed Forces reach full strength, until Europe is united. Shall we have the time? Perhaps not—but certainly we have no time to lose." (September 10, 1951)

Indeed, it is too late to dilly-dally. These tasks are urgent. They cannot be met by strong words. What the democracies need and what Russia fears is not tough words but tough weapons. Additional rosy reassurances to Italy will not get her great northern factories humming with defense production for herself and her allies. Prime Minister de Gasperi knows, as we do, that even the firmest pledges of support in the future will not boost Italian production, reduce unemployment and thus remove the most fertile field from communism in Italy.

In fact, our country's economy will be more balanced and strengthened if we shift to Italy the production of some of the huge supplies of defense matériel needed by the Atlantic Alliance. Indeed France and even Britain would be greatly aided thereby financially in that it would slow up the dollar drain which has become dangerously heavier on them as a result of the mounting costs of rearmament. Tito himself could benefit greatly in the matter of getting vital equipment in time—if Italy's full productive capacities were harnessed and if he showed some spark of decency and friendship toward the Italian people whose aid and comfort he needs so badly these days.

TREATY MUST GO

But here we come right into the entire question of revising the treaty forced upon Italy and the problem of returning Trieste to the Italian people. One of the most practical and urgently needed ways of strengthening the Atlantic Alliance is through strengthening Italy. But this cannot be done without a drastic revision of the pernicious pact. By now it should be clear even to London and Belgrade that the very spirit and provisions of the Italian treaty are incompatible and in direct conflict with the spirit and provisions of the Atlantic Alliance. The latter is an instrument for peace and justice. The treaty disarming and degrading Italy is a weapon of war, a product of blind vengeance, a vehicle of Communist subversion and Russian aggression.

The Mediterranean is not divisible. A loss of Italian influence or prowess in this highly strategic area can only be reflected in a restriction and reduction of the power of the Allies on the entire front against Communist machinations and Russian aggression. Nor can Italian morale which is essential to general allied good will be maintained, let alone enhanced, as long as Italy burns with a feeling of grave injustice inflicted upon it. We speak here not for Italian interests in a narrow sense. We speak only for the interests of democracy in the widest sense. To continue the restrictive clauses of the Italian treaty is to continue to restrict the growth of the might of the

Atlantic Alliance—at a critical hour when we cannot afford to lose even a moment.

In some respects, the sessions at Ottawa will only begin tasks which will be finished by the next meeting of the NATO Council to be held in Rome in October. We fervently hope that Ottawa will at least lay the sound foundations for just and proper steps to be ratified at Rome for the defense of the Italian people and for their full and effective role in the protection of free Europe and the security of the free world.

Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to first commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] for sponsoring House Resolution 390, which I support wholeheartedly.

The gentleman from Indiana is to be commended for using such language in his resolution which will make possible "a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers."

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his sincere hope that the files of the Department of Defense as well as the Department of State will be available to this committee in making such a full and complete investigation. In this connection, I want to stress that any records or evidence which the Office of War Information had and which may now be in the possession of either the Department of Defense or the State Department, must be made available to any investigation conducted by this select committee.

I join with the remarks of the gentlemen who have spoken before me, giving the details of the Katyn massacre. There is no doubt that this is the worst crime ever committed. The deliberate destruction and barbaric murder of the flower of Poland's manhood was not just a crime against the Polish people. It concerns the entire civilized world. It is the worst crime against humanity and will be so recorded in history's black pages. The entire world should and must know the horrid facts surrounding this crime. It is needless for me to repeat the other appropriate remarks that have been uttered by my colleagues on this floor today.

However, I do wish to point out that someone in our Government in the present administration was responsible for either suppression of evidence or inaction when we consider the following questions:

First. Why was evidence, apparently obtained by our Office of War Information concerning this Katyn massacre, never offered at the Nuremberg trials?

Second. Why did the State Department prohibit the Voice of America from

telling the truth about Katyn? From 1943, when the story broke, up to a time well after the invasion of South Korea, the Voice of America was suppressing truth about Katyn.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a complete investigation following the adoption of this resolution will make it possible for the "truth which has been crushed to earth to rise again and be heard."

Arizona Leaders Angered When Magazine Prints Their Own Drought Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, for several years we in the Congress have been told by Arizona spokesmen that their State was on the verge of economic ruin because of a water shortage. Mostly these cries of despair have come from members of the Arizona congressional delegation and witnesses seeking approval of the central Arizona project.

Attracted by Arizona's dire predictions of her own collapse, Life magazine dispatched cameramen and writers to the scene, and in its August 13 issue published a series of pictures on the subject.

Arizona's cries of despair immediately changed to cries of anguish and anger. Business leaders and officials branded the Life story exaggerated, unfavorable and sensational. Newspapers, bankers, businessmen and civic organizations declared that Life magazine had done the State of Arizona serious harm in publishing the story on Arizona's water situation.

Yet, for several years now many of these same persons have informed the Congress that unless the central Arizona project was approved the State of Arizona would dry up and blow away, and probably a third of the population would be driven from their homes, farms, and stores, hungry, displaced people with neither food nor protection.

I am including here several of these statements which are in conflict with the testimony given by Arizona proponents before Congress.

Leading in the sharp denunciation of Life were the two largest Arizona newspapers, the Republic and the Gazette, both published in Phoenix.

The Arizona Republic on August 22, carried a front-page headline which said: "State's economy safe in drought, leaders say." A larger headline on page 2 of the same issue said: "Drought situation overemphasized by Life, chagrined Phoenixians say."

The news story which appeared under both these headlines follows:

Arizona has a troublesome water situation—but it is not nearly as bad as painted by Life magazine.

This was the view taken Tuesday by Phoenix business and civic leaders, every

one of whom attacked Life for what they termed gross overemphasis of the State's drought conditions.

Leader of the attack on the magazine was Walter R. Bimson, president of the Valley National Bank.

Bimson criticized Life for placing too much emphasis on the fact that Governor Pyle called an emergency committee to set up an effective ground-water code.

In a five-page letter mailed Tuesday to dozens of insurance companies, banks, and bond houses throughout the Nation, Bimson wrote:

"Because of the Life article many of our eastern friends have become alarmed about their investments in Arizona.

"Our concern and the Governor's concern is not with the outcome of our current crops, but rather with the development of a constructive long-range control program.

"Arizona is recognized as the most efficient cotton producing area in the world. It is therefore attractive to out-of-state people who wish to come here to develop new cotton lands. In an effort to conserve existing investments and to prevent overuse of our limited water supply, the Governor has wisely recognized the need for some reasonable control of the underground water supply."

The banker said the Life pictures were made in a "notoriously dry area of Arizona—the Grand Canyon area," and therefore was not truly representative of the State as a whole.

He stated that within the past 2 weeks field specialists from the Valley National had inspected a ranch adjoining one mentioned in Life and found that the general condition of the range is better than in some previous years.

There have been good summer rains in many of the cattle-range areas, Bimson wrote, although in some other areas the ranges were admittedly dry.

"However, this year, fewer cattle have had to be moved to better ranges than in many years past. In fact, many out-of-state herds are being brought into Arizona in order to utilize our surplus feed."

Bimson said there need be no fear that the shortage of water either now or in the future would adversely affect the growth of our cities.

"It is quite possible," he declared "that long-continued drought might reduce our cultivated farm acreage, but drought, no matter how long continued, could not reduce to a critical point the supply of water for further development and growth of our cities."

Even highly industrialized cities, he pointed out, use very little water compared to the amount used to grow crops.

He said that even if the population of Phoenix and Tucson were to double they would require only an additional 50,000 acre-feet of water.

"And this is enough to irrigate less than 10,000 acres of farm land, or about 1 percent of our total farm acreage," he noted.

Bimson said agriculture and livestock together produce about \$250,000,000 annually, or about one-fourth of Arizona's total annual income.

Added the banker: "While a curtailment of farm production would adversely affect our general economy to some extent, our source of wealth and income are so well diversified that we cannot foresee any conditions relating to present or future water shortages that would materially curtail our continued progress."

Among those siding with Bimson on the harmful aspects of the Life article were Joe Refanes, of Refanes, Ely, Beck & Co., Phoenix investment house; John B. Mills, prominent resort and hotel operator, James A. Smith, accountant and president of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce; and R. J. McMullin, general manager of the Salt River Valley Water Users Association.

Mills said the article could have an adverse effect on the State's multimillion dollar tourist business because the magazine had failed to note that the drought does not affect domestic water supplies.

The chamber of commerce is taking vigorous steps to counteract the impression left by the article, Smith said. He disclosed that releases will be mailed this week to 400 newspapers and magazines, to let prospective tourists know that there will be no shortage of water for them.

On August 23, the Arizona Gazette published an editorial which, in view of the statements made by Arizonans before Congress, is both astonishing and perplexing. I hope my colleagues who have been obliged to give their attention to the proposed multibillion dollar central Arizona project will take the time to read the Gazette's editorial, which follows:

IT WILL TAKE MORE THAN DROUGHT TO STOP US

Life magazine's picture of the Arizona drought may have been overenthusiastic, but no one has branded it false. We really are short of water. That's why so many of the people currently lambasting Life happen to be leaders in the fight to bring Colorado River water into the State through construction of the central Arizona project.

Confusing, isn't it? Either we need water, or we don't. And if we don't, why spend hundreds of millions of dollars to bring it here from the Colorado? Just wait until the California propaganda boys who want to stymie the project bill in Congress get their hands on that one.

Actually, the situation is simple enough. We do need more water to prevent a certain number of acres from reverting to desert. We do need more water to insure bumper crops on all the acreage now under cultivation, and to continue the expansion of agriculture in Arizona. But even if we never get a drop of Colorado River water, and even if the drought continues, we aren't going to dry up and blow away.

We have plenty of water for domestic use. As Walter Bimson, president of the Valley National Bank points out, if the population of Phoenix and Tucson were to double, another 50,000 acre-feet of water per year would be required. This amount would irrigate only 10,000 acres of farm land, or less than 1 percent of our cultivated farm acreage.

There is plenty of water available for the limitless development of the tourist trade and for far more expansion of manufacturing. Except in a few locations, the mining industry has all the water it needs. And there is enough water to maintain our agricultural output at close to its present level of \$250,000,000 a year.

If we go through a period of unprecedented population and industrial growth during the next few years, and if the drought continues, it is conceivable that we will have to curtail farming somewhat. But even if agricultural activity were to drop 10 percent, there would still be more than enough left to provide a stable base for our economy.

To a farmer, a drought period may seem to last forever, but like everything else, droughts end. We have had dry spells before, and we will have them after the current droughts break, but Arizona will keep on expanding. The same dry weather which harasses the farmer is the lure that attracts thousands of visitors and new residents to Arizona every year. We gain far more from our dry climate than we lose to it.

Under the circumstances, investors, here and in other States, would be foolish to sell Arizona short. Nor are they doing so to any significant extent. One eastern company has refused to take up some mortgages on a Phoenix subdivision, and other eastern

investors have asked their friends in Arizona to explain the Life article. But local securities are firm, and there is ample demand for Arizona municipal bonds.

Smart investors do not put too much stock in magazine articles which obviously are calculated to be as sensational as possible. Instead, they act on facts. And the facts are that Arizona's over-all economy will grow right through this drought, and any foreseeable future drought. Until the central Arizona project becomes a reality, however, the farm factor in our economy probably will remain stationary.

In concluding these remarks, I wish to quote from a column entitled "Our Amazing Arizona," signed by Columbus Giragi, which appeared in the Arizona Republic on August 23.

Mr. Giragi wrote:

Life magazine is at present about as popular in Arizona, and especially the Phoenix area, as ants at a picnic.

In its August 13 issue, the national magazine used 5 pages to present a picture story of agricultural and domestic water shortages and drought effects in our State.

The powers that be of a large eastern investment company reportedly saw the magazine portrayal, and forthwith canceled a planned program to buy \$3,000,000 in mortgages on a Phoenix subdivision.

Nothing shakes people out of their lethargy faster than a kick in the pocketbook, and Phoenix business leaders responded nobly to the severe jolt—and rushed to man the guns.

Let it be definitely understood that this humble one bemoans the blow to our amazing Arizona which this unfavorable publicity inflicts.

Let it be further definitely understood that we applaud the efforts on the part of our business leaders in resisting the grossly unfavorable publicity.

Mr. Speaker, that seems to sum up Arizona's attitude at this time. Do the Arizona proponents wish to tell one story in Washington and another to the rest of the Nation?

LeTourneau Talks About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks which appeared in Now. The remarks are those of one of the outstanding men of our Nation, Mr. R. G. LeTourneau.

They are LeTourneau Talks About.

R. G. LETOURNEAU TALKS ABOUT WHAT TIME DO YOU HAVE?

We have heard a lot about States' rights and whether it's right or wrong. We all know, of course, that more and more the Federal Government is collecting the taxes and setting a lot of broad policies that could be handled by the individual States. I am not so sure that each State shouldn't collect some of the taxes now assessed by the Federal Government and do its own subsidizing of the farmers, etc., but there is one piece of business that ought to be tended to by the Federal Government, as it affects practically everyone, and is costing the Nation a lot more than most people realize by lost time upsetting train, plane,

and bus schedules, long-distance calls, etc. Few people travel as much as I do (about a quarter million miles per year) so they don't come in contact with it as much as I do, but there are a lot of people traveling from place to place and it affects every one of them. The piece of business I refer to is daylight-saving time. It worked all right during the war because the Government took a hand in it, but since then it's been a mess.

I don't care whether we have daylight saving or not. After all it's not so important because people can get up early if they want to, and I don't see any reason why a manufacturing plant couldn't set the hours up if the majority of the people wanted to without changing the clock, but what I want to know is what time it is going to be in the next town when I arrive there to speak or do some business. What time do I have to leave to make an appointment, and what kind of time does the plane leave on so I won't be late, which is bad; or an hour ahead of time, which means an hour wasted. With all the caution and long-distance phoning ahead which my gang does it still happens quite often. The worst of it all is nobody really gains by it. It would cost nothing to stop the loss. Just make it a Federal law that you do or you don't—either way is all right with most of us just so we know what time it is going to be when we get there.

I've even gone so far as to call up on the phone myself before going and say, "What time are you on?" and the man said, "We are on eastern time. We are on daylight time," but when I got there I found it was central daylight or eastern standard time, whichever way you wanted to say it, but not eastern daylight. A little edict from Washington for the good of the Nation as a whole would help out a lot and cost little. (Or else the governors' conference or the mayors' conference or some patriotic group ought to do something about it.) A friend of mine introduced me this way. You may be able to steal his money and get away with it; but if you try to steal his time, you'll get into trouble. Well, I do like to make the minutes count.

I'm glad my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ took time to leave the heights of heaven's glory and come down to this sin-cursed world to suffer, bleed, and die for my sins. That's why I take time to go hither and yon around this old world to tell others what the Lord has done for me.

A Debate on Reciprocal Trade Agreements Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago two capable gentlemen debated the question of tariffs and trade. That debate is set out in the following report:

RADIO DEBATE ON TRADE AGREEMENTS POLICY BETWEEN JOHN M. LEDDY, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEFENSE AND TRADE POLICY, STATE DEPARTMENT, AND O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON FOREIGN TRADE POLICY, ON AUGUST 19, 1951

Mr. BATES. The Liberty Broadcasting System, from its studios in Washington, D. C., presents Public Hearing.

This is Carl Bates, inviting you to join us tonight in a discussion of tariffs and trade.

What advantages were expected to be gained by the people of this country when the multi-nations agreements were first brought about? Will abrogating our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia have the desired effect? How are the American workers protected from the effects of low-priced imports? These and many other questions we hope to answer in the discussions to follow.

First, may I introduce our two experts for tonight's Public Hearing, Mr. John M. Leddy, Director of the Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy of the State Department, and Mr. O. R. Strackbein, Chairman of the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy.

Now, many Americans, I am sure, have just a slight understanding of the rather complicated tariff policies. Mr. Leddy, will you please give us a simple explanation of what our tariff policies are and how they operate?

Mr. LEDDY. Well, Mr. Bates, our tariff policy today—our whole trade policy—is based on the reciprocal trade agreements program. This was begun in 1934, approximately 17 years ago, and was initiated by Cordell Hull. The whole idea of this program is that we are better off, and the world is better off, if we trade more one with another. In other words, if our exports are larger and our imports are larger, that produces an economic benefit to all of our countries—all of the countries in the free world.

I think you had one question there. What is this multination agreement? I don't think many people understand that, so I would like to explain that, before the war, we used to conclude with other countries individual, separate, bilateral agreements; in other words, there were only two countries to each agreement. Since the war, we have junked all of that policy and established the multilateral agreement in which a large number of countries enter into a single agreement among themselves. Under this agreement, we grant tariff concessions, that is to say, we reduce our tariffs, we bind our tariffs on individual commodities, and all of the other countries reduce or bind their tariffs on the goods that we ship to them. There are about 30 countries which now belong to this multination agreement, which we call the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The short name for it is the GATT, and I think that if we use that name hereafter in this discussion, it will simplify matters.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Strackbein, do you have anything to add to that explanation?

Mr. STRACKBEIN. The question of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade today, I would say, is a highly controversial one. I am very much interested in knowing on what authority the State Department entered into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, otherwise known as GATT. There is no question of the State Department's authority to enter into the bilateral trade agreements of which Mr. Leddy spoke a minute ago, but I would like to know just what explanation he has as to the authority upon which the entry into general agreement was based.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Leddy—

Mr. LEDDY. Well, I would first say it wasn't the State Department; it was the President and the administration. The State Department itself has no authority. The authority resides in the President.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. You know, however, that the State Department is a part of the executive arm and as such is a spokesman for the administration, or at least it would be expected to reflect the administration's policy and to take part in formulating those policies.

Mr. LEDDY. The only reason I like to make that point clear is because there have been frequent criticisms by you, Mr. Strackbein, and others who have opposed the trade

agreements program, that it is the State Department that runs the entire program. That simply isn't the case. Every agency in this Government which has any interest in international trade, including the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, Interior, Labor, and other agencies—all participate in the formulation of our foreign-trade policy. In other words, this is not just a diplomatic policy; this is a sound, basic, long-term economic policy; but all parts of the Government participate.

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). But, Mr. Leddy—

Mr. LEDDY. Let me get to the second part of your question, which is a legal question: Under what authority does the President enter into a multilateral agreement under the trade agreements program? The answer to that is that the Congress has delegated to the executive branch through the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the power to enter into agreements with foreign countries for the reduction or the binding of tariffs and other trade barriers.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. That's it exactly. I want to take it up from there for just a minute. There is no question that such a delegation of power was made by the Congress to the President to raise or lower the duties by 50 percent; but there was nothing in that Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as I see it, that authorized the entry into a general agreement of the character that was negotiated in Geneva in 1947 and which, in a number of instances, conflicted with existing laws of the United States, and which, I may say, requires, to become fully effective a change in these laws. Now, I would like to know by what authority the State Department, whether it is the administration or the President, can carry us to such a position in an international agreement.

Mr. LEDDY. Well, I don't want to get into too much technical detail here, but the President applies this multilateral agreement known as GATT, to the extent of his executive authority. He is not purported to change any domestic law. There is no real constitutional question here. The President has the authority to do what he did under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and if anyone has any question about it, they can always take the matter to the courts.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Well, the courts are not open for this particular question. However, the point that I'm trying to make is this: That the President of the United States has entered into an agreement, an international agreement, which involves conflict with our existing laws. Now, undoubtedly it is expected that the United States will honor its agreements; therefore the pressure upon Congress to modify our laws, of course, becomes very great. There is a moral commitment, and my protest is that such commitments should not be made before Congress has first been consulted.

Mr. LEDDY. Congress authorized the action under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and since this agreement was entered into in 1947, it has extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Yes, but it has not—it has not authorized this kind of an agreement.

Mr. LEDDY. It has not prevented it.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. I want to say this: That I do not believe that the American people know the extent to which we have, in this manner, tied our hands against immediate action, and I think this was highlighted and spotlighted in the recent development in the jailing of Mr. Oatis in Czechoslovakia. The question was raised what sort of countermeasures can we take? One of those suggested was that we abrogate our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia, but on looking into that question, it was found that we

could not do so unilaterally, on our own part, without consulting all the other nations, and that the first opportunity of doing that was the middle of September. In the meantime, Mr. Oatis remains in jail.

Mr. LEDDY. Well, let us go to the merits of the question. Implied in what you have said is that this country should not get involved in international commitments in the international trade field.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. I don't say that—I don't say that at all. I say there are perfectly legal and proper grounds for agreements but not for entering into agreements that conflict with our laws and that have the effect of tying our hands when we later find some matter coming up that demands action on our part.

Mr. LEDDY. Well, the commitment that we are involved in in the general agreement does not conflict with our domestic laws as they now stand, nor can I see that the fact we are, as you say, committed not to take action against Czechoslovakia without the consent of other countries. I don't see how that is illegal under the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. It is my understanding that the General Trade Agreement does conflict with at least 8 or 10 of our laws—

Mr. LEDDY (interrupting). No, sir—

Mr. STRACKBEIN. And cannot be fully effective until these changes are made by Congress.

Mr. LEDDY. That is the point. The executive is applying the agreement only to the extent that they do not conflict—

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). Yes, but they are creating this moral commitment. They are putting the Congress in the position of running out on our agreements unless they modify our laws in accordance with the agreement.

Mr. LEDDY. There is no moral commitment whatsoever. The Congress is perfectly free to decide to change the law or not to change the law. Why don't we debate the question on the merits as to whether the law is good or bad, rather than on whether there is some moral commitment involved.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. I claim that the procedure in itself is bad; that before going abroad and making agreements that involve our statutes, the State Department or any other executive department, any other executive arm of the Government, should first apply to Congress and say "This is what we want to do," instead of doing these things and then coming to Congress and say "We have made such and such an agreement; now please modify this, please modify our statutes to conform them to our agreement. Otherwise we will be in the position of running out on an international agreement."

Mr. LEDDY. Well, Mr. Strackbein, I would question whether many Congressmen or Senators would agree with you. Before 1934 it was the practice of the Congress itself to make the tariff. We found out in 1930 that that system went all wrong—

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). That was based, however, on a constitutional provision, was it not?

Mr. LEDDY. No. Under the Constitution the Congress has the authority to make the United States tariff, to decide what rates—

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). Also to regulate foreign relations—I mean foreign trade—not foreign relations—foreign trade.

Mr. LEDDY. That's true; but what I am saying in that due to the fact that the Congress in 1930 passed an extremely high tariff, which was terribly damaging to this country in its foreign economic relations, Congress itself decided—

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). Just a second—

Mr. LEDDY. Just let me finish what I want to say.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. All right.

Mr. LEDDY. Congress itself decided to delegate hereafter authority to the executive

branch to enter into tariff agreements with other countries on the ground that that was a much more scientific, much more expert and a much more sensible way of proceeding in our relations with foreign governments.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Mr. Leddy, that gave authority to raise or lower the tariff by 50 percent and did not give authority to make all these other agreements involving broad questions of commercial policies on which there might be a great deal of difference of opinion.

Mr. LEDDY. Oh, yes sir; Mr. Strackbein.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Nothing spelled out—that character—

Mr. LEDDY. We have always had in our trade agreements, ever since 1934, long before we entered into this multilateral arrangement, what we called general provisions in our tariff agreements, which set forth a general trade policy governing the treatment that we would accord to foreign goods.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. But Mr. Leddy—but none of them as broad as these commercial provisions in this general agreement on tariffs and trade; and furthermore I dare say that the people didn't even know that you were placing that type of provision that you speak of in the bilateral agreements. It is only when an occasion arises such as the recent one of Mr. Oatis, and when the spotlight is thrown on the situation, that what has been done in the past, begins to come out; and it is then that we begin to examine and see what has been done during all these years; and now, under these circumstances, Mr. Leddy, I repeat that I do not believe that it is good policy, that it is wise policy, for the State Department to enter into agreements that conflict with our laws and then expect the Congress to ratify them.

Mr. LEDDY. Mr. Strackbein, the Trade Agreements Act has been renewed every 2 or 3 years since 1934. On every occasion there has been the fullest possible opportunity for Congress and the people to see precisely what has been done. On this last occasion, the Trade Agreements Act was renewed by an overwhelming majority of both parties in both Houses.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Yes, but after extensive amendments were applied to it, one of which required the abrogation of trade agreements with the Communist dominated countries; as you know.

Mr. LEDDY. That is true; I would like to say a few words about that. We concluded this multilateral agreement, this GATT, in 1947. Czechoslovakia was one of the 18 countries, I believe was the number, which entered into this multilateral agreement. At that time Czechoslovakia was a democratic country with a private enterprise system. The relations between Czechoslovakia and the United States—

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Right at this point—

Mr. LEDDY. Were very friendly—

Mr. BATES (interrupting). Mr. Leddy, will you continue your statement, please, and then Mr. Strackbein—

Mr. STRACKBEIN. All right—

Mr. LEDDY. Yes. It was not till 1948, after the agreement had been entered into, that the Communists took over Czechoslovakia. Since that time—

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Now, Mr. Bates, I must challenge that statement. The agreement was not proclaimed until after Czechoslovakia had gone behind the iron curtain. There were numerous protests made at that time. I made one of the protests myself, so naturally I ought to know. And yet the agreement was proclaimed; nevertheless, it was put into full effect on the ground that we needed a listening post over there, or something of that order; now we have had a listening post for 8 years and what has it—what fruit has it borne?

Mr. LEDDY. Well, I want to keep the record clear. When we concluded the agreement,

when we signed the agreement in 1947, in October, Czechoslovakia was a democratic country and it was not until after the negotiations were over that it became Communist—

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). That is correct.

Mr. BATES. Again, please, let's have just one speaker at a time.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Before the agreement was concluded, before it was proclaimed, I should say, Czechoslovakia had gone behind the iron curtain.

Mr. LEDDY. That is true; that is a technical point. But I would say—I would agree with you that experience has shown that the relations between ourselves and Czechoslovakia in the political field are such that it does not make sense any longer for us to maintain economic obligations toward Czechoslovakia under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and it is the policy of the administration to seek a severance of those obligations so that we will have no international problems even in a technical sense.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Mr. Leddy, that policy was determined by the Congress when it passed the last trade-agreements extension bill. There is a definite provision in that act that says that the United States or the President shall as soon as practicable withdraw and abrogate trade agreements and the concessions with any and all countries behind the iron curtain—so that is no choice of the State Department—that's no policy that was generated in the State Department. In fact, in hearings, as far as I recall, the State Department opposed that provision.

Mr. LEDDY. No, the State Department and the administration suggested that time be given to dissolve these international commitments before actions were taken by the United States—

Mr. STRACKBEIN (interrupting). How much time did you want?

Mr. LEDDY. We did not oppose in principle, and the action that we are now proposing to take goes far beyond the mere withdrawal of concessions. What we are after is to seek a complete severance of all commitments between this country and Czechoslovakia with respect to economic and trade matters.

Mr. BATES. Gentlemen, may I ask this question: If the 30 nations agreement is abrogated in September, what should be the immediate action of the United States of America to deal directly with each country? What new policies might be developed? Mr. Leddy, could you answer these questions?

Mr. LEDDY. Well, what we are attempting to achieve in September is an action by all of the parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade which would sever the obligations between the United States and Czechoslovakia. This would avoid any technical violation by the United States when it raises its tariff against imports from Czechoslovakia, but this does not affect or involve our relations with other countries, parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade. All these other countries are friendly countries and a part of the free world. We do not wish to take action to hurt them.

Mr. BATES. Any comment, Mr. Strackbein?

Mr. STRACKBEIN. No. I think that is a very good reply and I think that it is true that the withdrawal of the agreement from Czechoslovakia would not of itself upset the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. That would not be involved and would not be necessary.

Mr. BATES. I understand Americans returning from abroad are faced with the payment of customs duties on goods brought in to this country, of course. Now, the value of the goods is based on a fair market value of the goods in the country of origin. Now, this market value may be based on very low wages paid to the working people, much

below the American standard of living. How does this affect the American working people?

Mr. LEDDY. I would like to talk to that point. That is an argument that we have heard for many, many years from those who are interested in high tariffs and high protectionism in this country. The argument is that foreign workers receive lower wages than in the United States and therefore that they can cut their sales prices to us well below our cost of production. But I think if you look at the American industry, by and large, you will find that we are out-selling and outcompeting other producers all over the world in industries where we pay the highest wages ever going. The reason for that is because of our productivity. The worker here even though he makes more money per hour, can produce more units, more things per hour, than foreign workers. Now that isn't true for every single industry, obviously, but it is true for a large number of our industries and we export manufactured goods and agricultural products throughout the world because of our tremendous productivity in this country and we can pay high wages because we have great productivity.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. May I comment on that, Mr. Bates?

Mr. BATES. Go right ahead, Mr. Strackbein.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. It is entirely true that in the mass-production industries, such as the automobile industry, the steel industry, the electrical-equipment industry—all these industries where mass production is in effect—that we can undersell the products of foreign producers even though we pay much higher wages. But let me point out that not all the industries in the United States are mass-production industries. There are hundreds of industries in this country, hundreds of industries, vital industries, industries which do not have these great advantages in the aggregate employ millions of people, of mass production and automatic machinery, and so on, and those are the industries that even though they may in some instances have higher productivity than is enjoyed in other countries, nonetheless, do not have this higher productivity in sufficient degree to offset the extremely lower wages paid in many other countries and competition under those circumstances is very injurious to American producers and American labor, and we feel strongly that the proper protection should be given under those circumstances simply to bring the imported products on a competitive parity with those produced in this country. That is all that we ask.

Mr. BATES. Gentlemen—I beg your pardon, Mr. Leddy, did you have more to say?

Mr. LEDDY. Well, I was going to say that sounds like the old argument, that whenever there are differences in cost of production between this country and a foreign country we ought to put a tariff equal to the difference.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. I don't think so at all, Mr. Leddy. I pointed out that relative productivity should be taken into account; but where our relative productivity is not sufficiently above that of other countries to offset the differential in wages, then there should be protection to that extent. Now, assume that in some of these other countries where low wages are paid that automatic machinery has been installed we have sent a great deal of equipment and machinery abroad, modern machinery and modern equipment, and plants all over the world are being modernized. And yet their wages are not coming up, yet the productivity will greatly increase and the advantage that we otherwise had, or previously had, in productivity is fast disappearing in many instances.

Mr. LEDDY. I would just like to point out that the industries you are talking about, the ones that you represent, Mr. Strackbein, are

very largely already protected by tariffs and have been protected for many years. I think the argument between us is that you would like to see a much higher tariff and we would like to see a moderate tariff simply to—

Mr. STRACKBEIN. (Interrupting). I don't subscribe to that difference. We would like to see a tariff, as I say, whatever the level might be, which would give competitive parity between the imported products and the products of our factories produced by our own workmen and our own producers.

Mr. LEDDY. Well, that is a theory that would stop all international trade.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Oh, I don't think so at all—I don't see how that could—you might as well say the trade within the United States would stop under those conditions. Companies within industries compete with one another. We have the minimum wage laws; the wages and productivity are in many instances very much the same. Trade flourishes under those conditions and contrary to stopping trade, it flourishes.

Mr. LEDDY. Yes, but what you are proposing is a system whereby every State in the Union should put up a tariff around its borders in order to even up differences in cost production among the various States.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. I think you are reading something into my words that I haven't said at all. I say competitive parity. Let the goods come in and compete on a fair competitive basis in this country. Let the best goods win.

Mr. LEDDY. All right. Good. Suppose you could say if you let the best goods win, you shouldn't have a tariff at all. After all, the tariff is the means by which the Government is giving special aid to particular industries in order to aid them in competition.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Mr. Leddy, when the advantage that the imported goods have consists in the fact that they pay lower wages, then it is not the best goods that win. It is the goods that price-wise can undercut those which were produced under conditions where higher wages were required, required not only by law but under collective bargaining agreements. Therefore, it does not to me make sense that we should allow goods from the outside to come in to undercut the price and quality for quality cut the price below our own. I don't see how our employment can hold up, how our production can hold up under those conditions.

Mr. LEDDY. I don't see how our production or employment can hold up if we stop our imports, because that, as you very well know, is going to stop our exports, too.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. But we are not stopping, we are not proposing to stop our imports, Mr. Leddy. As you well know—you are the head of this office in the State Department—about two-thirds of our total imports come in totally free of duty. Now, only one-third of them pay any duty at all. So we are not talking about stopping our trade at all. We are talking about establishing fair conditions of trade. Fair condition of trade has been a policy in our domestic field for many years. We have set up minimum wage laws, we have set up the Federal Trade Commission, and the fair trade practice laws, and so on, and the Justice Department has tried to see that competition continues—all of this has actually made for fair trade conditions; and where you have fair competition, it has not in any way stopped, or in any way restricted our trade; on the contrary, it has made the best kind of conditions for commerce to be carried on. All that we ask is that goods from the outside abide by the same principles.

Mr. LEDDY. Well, we would agree to that, Mr. Strackbein. The trade-agreements program is fully consistent with what we are trying to do through the Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission in promoting a wider area of competition. I think the difference boils down to whether or not you

consider that the tariff on a particular product is too low; while we consider that it is not too low. But I would like to point out that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program has a way in which these differences between us can be settled by an impartial fact-finding board. Under the trade-agreements program we have the United States Tariff Commission. When any company or industry feels it is being seriously injured by imports, it is able to take its case to the Tariff Commission and to ask that a full investigation be made and if the Tariff Commission finds that imports are in fact causing serious injury to a domestic industry, then the tariff can be increased, and all I can say is that on a controversial matter of this sort, we think that an impartial fact-finding system of that sort is the best answer.

Mr. STRACKBEIN. Mr. Leddy, the Tariff Commission has had some 20 applications for escape, as you call it, under the trade agreements. In only one instance out of those 20 has the Tariff Commission given any relief at all; and regardless of what you might think, these industries that make applications to the Tariff Commission don't do it for the fun of it. They do it because they are very much concerned about the competition and are injured by it and yet relief has been forthcoming in only one instance, Mr. Leddy, out of 20 applications. Now, we don't think that a very good record and it was for that reason that the amendment changing the escape clause was inserted in the last extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. LEDDY. Well, I think, Mr. Strackbein, that the answer is that you just haven't been able to prove your case before the Commission.

Mr. BATES. Gentlemen, it is time to adjourn our Public Hearing for this week. For the past half hour, we have been discussing the important and controversial subject of tariffs and trade. We sincerely hope that in the course of the discussion we have answered questions that you may have asked. Our thanks go to our two experts, Mr. John M. Leddy, Director of the Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy of the State Department, and Mr. O. R. Strackbein, Chairman of the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy.

From the Nation's Capital, the Liberty Broadcasting System has brought you by tape recording another Public Hearing in an important subject. This is your moderator, Carl Bates, speaking.

Address of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts at Dedication of Littleton Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered by me Sunday, September 16, in dedication of Littleton Monument in the honor of the memory of the heroes of the Revolutionary War, given to the town of Littleton, by Col. and Mrs. Edward Fletcher:

Thank you, Mr. Conant. It is with deep pride and heartfelt appreciation I join with

you and my friends here in Littleton in the dedication of this monument so generously and thoughtfully given by Colonel Fletcher in honor of the memory of the brave men of Littleton who joined with others of Middlesex County to win and establish a free Nation. Through their valor and sacrifice not only this great Nation was born but also the free way of life was established for the first time on this earth.

This ground, this earth on which we stand here, and throughout the hills and green valleys of Middlesex is the hallowed soil of freedom. In itself it constitutes a monument to the freedom which was born here, that never can be shattered. To mark the intimate areas on this precious soil where God-inspired men rushed out to join with others in this first battle for freedom is a noble thing to do. And to carve their names in lasting granite, symbolic of their strength and character, is most fitting. To erect this beautiful monument in their memory, bringing them and their courage, constantly to the generations to follow is not only a most generous act by Colonel and Mrs. Fletcher but also a deed of deep patriotism. In the establishment of this monument, Colonel and Mrs. Fletcher have reached way out into the ever-lengthening dawn of new generations to inspire them with the courage, the spirit of sacrifice, and the strength of character so necessary to maintain the free way of life.

In the years to come who can foresee the challenges to this free life we hold so precious. As the children of these rapidly passing years grow to maturity and sense the meaning of this great monument I know they will resolve to hold fast during their time all that was so dearly won in those stirring days of long ago. I, too, can say in truth never can so many owe so much to so few. The debt to these brave men can never be paid. Colonel and Mrs. Fletcher, I give to you my heartfelt thanks for this patriotic gift and what it means to our great and wonderful country now and in the future.

During our time we, too, have experienced stirring days. We have shown the world that we are determined to keep the faith with these brave men of 1776, and that we intend to hold fast to all that they gained. We know that freedom lost never can be regained. In two great wars and in the cruel, tough fighting in Korea we have shown the enemies of freedom we will not permit our precious way of life to perish on the point of the sword. We have shown the world that the men and women of this day and hour possess the same courage, the same character, the same spirit of sacrifice as did the men whose memory we honor here this afternoon. That which is gained by valor can be preserved only by valor.

In all respect to the fighting hearts of the men who fought to gain freedom I must tell you now that those of our time, of this moment, who face the fire and fury of modern mechanized warfare to preserve and maintain freedom are of great heart, stamina, and character. They are just as brave and just as courageous. In my years of public service I have seen and talked with thousands on the battlefield. I have visited and worked to help thousands of the wounded in the hospitals. I have worked to help them have a future in the free life they have helped to preserve. I know their courage, their spirit, their sacrifice. I know that in their body flows the same forces of determination that commanded the spirits of the men in whose memory this monument is being dedicated. If the generations of the future meet the challenge as well in their time, America need have no fear and freedom will not perish from the earth. I am confident they will meet their challenge for men and women who are free have a noble cause to live for and to die for.

If the only way the faith of these men could be broken and freedom lost was by the

sword I would have no fear for the future and the free way of life. We have shown many times we cannot be defeated by the bombs of an enemy. If we keep prepared, and we must be adequately prepared at all times, we can successfully meet the challenge of any enemy.

Unfortunately, however, there are other ways in which freedom can be lost. Our way of life can be dissipated into nonexistence by foreign ideologies developed and supported within our own boundaries. Communism is one of these ideologies now threatening our way of life here at home. This challenge must be met and defeated.

Freedom can be lost by unwise economic policies here at home, such as the dissipation of the Nation's resources at home and abroad. Freedom can be lost through excessive taxation. Freedom can be lost to the people of this great Nation through an economy planned in such detail that the individual no longer has the privilege of choice. Freedom can be lost by exploitation for selfish gain. There are far too many people in this country who care not for America and the preservation of its liberties, but only to take advantage of the free way of life for selfish gains. Those who exploit this great land and fail to do their duties as citizens and comply with the Nation's laws must be exposed and freedom denied to them. Those who misuse freedom are not deserving of its rights and privileges. Freedom can be lost by lethargy and the failure of the people to be interested in the affairs and conduct of their Government.

Freedom can be lost through the failure of restoring to the Nation the resources and strength absorbed in the battles to maintain freedom. We are told that Okinawa and other island territories are to be returned to the Japanese after a time, in accord with the treaty just signed. How do you feel about that? How do you think thousands of United States Marines who stormed this great Japanese fortress in the bloodiest, fiercest battle of the Pacific, will feel about that? If we are to keep faith with the men who sacrifice to win victory you cannot give away the fruits of their victory. Such action is a gradually weakening process. The island territories conquered at such great sacrifice should not be given back to Japan.

These are some of the chasms in which we can lose our freedom. If we are to keep the faith we must be alert to all of them. We cannot afford to become lax in any of them. We must protect ourselves from these hazards for if we fail, we are certain to lose all that was won by these men we honor today and preserved and maintained by the many courageous men and women who have followed them. It is the duty of each generation to protect the liberties preserved for them by those who preceded them.

In these days of stress when our liberties are threatened again it is the desire of us all to avoid a great war and to live in peace. There is no peace, however, when we know or even fear there are enemies who would destroy our country and our free way of life. We cannot afford to take chances with our country and our freedom. We cannot strive for peace through compromise if in the end we are compromising our freedom. Remember this. Please remember this. Peace without freedom is slavery. This is the meaning of this wonderful monument.

It is my belief that we should try to work out all of our international difficulties by peaceful means. I do not believe, however, we can ever afford to compromise our freedom. Again I wish to emphasize, freedom lost never can be regained.

As we strive for peace we must be alert to all of the difficulties and be prepared to meet any test thrust upon us. The American people do not want war. Never has our country sought war as a way of settlement of difficulties. On the other hand we have

ably demonstrated that we are capable of destroying any nation which decides to make war upon us. If history has taught us anything it has emphasized time and again that the nation which resorts to the sword is destroyed by the sword.

I believe a peaceful world is possible. The nations of the world are slowly moving in this direction. Until there is more international understanding, faith, and a spirit of good will toward men this goal we so greatly desire to achieve will not be reached. Until it is reached we must be prepared to successfully meet any challenge to our way of life. To do less would be to break faith with the men in whose memory Colonel and Mrs. Fletcher have had erected this beautiful monument. Always it will be an inspiration.

Again I want you to know I deeply appreciate being invited to join with all of you in the dedication of this fine monument. I am proud to be your Member of Congress and very proud to represent in the Nation's Capitol, Middlesex County, the birthplace of freedom.

This Is Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Louis Bromfield, a distinguished citizen of Ohio, has written many effective articles on conservation and flood control. He has had practical experience in the solution of the flood-control problems in Ohio. I wish to place in the Appendix of the Record his most recent article, *This Is Your Country*. It refers to the Missouri Valley flood which so recently devastated a large area of our country:

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY—POLITICIANS, ARMY ENGINEERS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED IN PLANS FOR SOLVING MISSOURI FLOODS

Now that the first shock of the flood disaster in the Missouri Valley has abated a little, it seems to me wise for the people to make some solid and sensible plans for the flood control of the great Missouri River in particular and the whole Mississippi Basin as well.

These plans cannot be left to the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior alone. Neither really represents the people of the Nation. Both have potent lobbies in Congress and both are among the most voracious seekers and spenders of the taxpayers' money and at times outdo each other in planning fantastic and improbable projects. Nor can the solution of the problems be left to Congress alone which is very largely uninformed as to problems of erosion, flood control, and agriculture, and is subject to the log-rolling tricks which every year adds millions to the general pork-barrel appropriation burdens of taxpayers.

Many proposals have been made by various organizations and individuals. The general diversity of opinion as to the means of coping with the Big Muddy have produced crops of fanatics ranging from the biggest-dams-in-the-world school, represented by the extremists among the Army engineers, to those who would control floods merely by planting grass and trees. These fanatical elements have done harm at both ends of the stick.

There has also been the dispute over the so-called Missouri Valley Authority plan which would set up an interstate control board to manage the area along lines more or less similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority. While all this hubbub and confusion has been in progress, disasters, huge losses to property owners and added taxes for the overburdened public have been piling up.

VAST WATERSHED AREA

A vast watershed such as the Missouri cannot be controlled by the individual and uncoordinated efforts of the States involved, especially in a huge area which ranges from dry country, in need of irrigation, to rich bottom lands and great cities in need of protection from floodwaters. On its record of extravagance and general inefficiency, the problem cannot be left to the Army engineers (In this respect it should be noted that the Hoover Commission, made up of many of our leading unpolitical and disinterested citizens, recommended taking away all control of our rivers from Army engineers.)

Under the New Deal, the Department of the Interior and its Reclamation Bureau became to some extent a boondoggling agency with the philosophy of spending—just spending—even though the expenditure of \$10 brought back only 50 cents (See the number and fantasy of some of their Rocky Mountain area proposals.) Under the Fair Deal it has become as well a political agency which spends money in given areas to buy the votes.

Two bills are now before Congress for dealing with the flood and irrigation problems of the Missouri Valley, one presented by Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, and the other by Senator MURRAY, of Montana. Neither of them are sound bills, and the Murray bill, as might be expected, has a good many Socialist features and would to some extent put the States at the mercy of the Federal Government.

OHIO SOLVED SIMILAR PROBLEM

The solution of the Missouri Valley problem, in the opinion of many people of authority and information, lies neither wholly in vast and fabulously expensive dams, dredging in order to permit the Queen Mary to dock at Kansas City's perpetually washed-out levees, nor in merely the planting of trees and grass but something in-between. The model for many of the tributary watershed areas of the Missouri already exists in the State of Ohio in the Muskingum, Miami, and other watershed developments which have come to be studied by people from all over the world. It is a plan and system, administered by a public corporation under a board of judges and civilian directors, which includes upriver dams for impounding floodwaters together with reforestation projects and strict soil conservation observation within its borders. The two most commendable and sound facts of its existence are that (1) The Federal Government, save through the Army engineers' control of rivers, has no authority whatever over the project, (2) that it pays taxes on every acre of its lands.

Not all of the Missouri Valley could be managed under the Ohio conservatory pattern—for example, the Badlands area of the Missouri Basin would be unmanageable under such a system—but the whole of the agricultural and grazing areas could follow this scheme pretty closely.

It seems to me that what is needed is a commission, similar to the Hoover Commission, made up of able, experienced, and disinterested citizens with politicians, Army engineers, Department of Interior officials and cranks excluded, to examine the situation and draw up an over-all plan in terms of American democratic procedure with due reference to States' rights. The plan could then be delivered to Congress for action. In-

deed, such a procedure seems to be the only method by which a solution can be reached in which the American people will be protected from Army engineers, bureaucrats, politicians, and finaglers.

Not All Were So Lucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many who oppose Communists in certain labor organizations, in the administration, were not as lucky as Martin Dies.

The following is an editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune of September 14, 1951:

RIGHT FROM THE START

Former Congressman Martin Dies, of Texas, asserts that the salvation of the United States depends upon getting rid of the New Deal administration which coddled the Communists and built Russia to its present stature as a world menace. People will heed Mr. Dies because they know not only that he is right now, but that he was right many years ago when few voices but his own were raised against the Communist peril.

Mr. Dies was the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He was a member of Mr. Roosevelt's party, but he would not take orders from the White House to lay off the Communists. In the years before Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt had helped build up the mass-industrial unions to support his political ambitions. He was indifferent to the fact that Communist organizers were extensively employed in the formation of this labor front. He didn't want the Communists in the unions exposed because that would weaken the base of his political pyramid.

Mr. Dies went after Communists wherever he found them. He found a great many of them within the administration itself. He found that the White House regarded them sympathetically. The President's consort ran with them. The President assured Mr. Dies that communism was no menace, that several of his best friends were Communists, and that Russia was America's natural ally.

Mr. Roosevelt already had three good reasons for soft pedaling Communist influence. An important segment of his political following was permeated with it. It had infiltrated his administration. He and his wife were by temperament receptive to it.

A fourth reason why Roosevelt desired silence on the subject was that he was determined to take the country to war and he would have to accept Russia as an ally.

But Mr. Dies couldn't be dragged away from the trail. The consequence was that he was subjected to such a campaign of organized vilification by the administration as has been directed against no foe of communism since, with the exception of Senator McCARRY. Mr. Dies never retreated. His charges were never controverted. Only when his health became impaired, forcing his temporary retirement from Congress, did he abandon his fight.

Now, with his health restored, Mr. Dies finds himself in the enviable position of a man who was right from the beginning and is acknowledged to have been right. Vindication has rarely been provided with such rapidity by events. The intentions of Russia

toward the United States are now clear to every American—even to the administration which fought Mr. Dies every step of the way. The Hiss, Coplon, Wadleigh, Harry Dexter White revelations, together with innumerable others, have demonstrated the Communist treachery within the Government. The CIO has been forced to clean house in the Kremlin-dominated mass unions.

The signs are that Mr. Dies is on his way back to Washington. Once back in Congress, Mr. Dies will find plenty of work to do, helping to drive the Communists to cover and to save the country, for Mr. Truman stands in the same relation to the Communists as did Mr. Roosevelt. While professing to fight them abroad he is their protector at home, proudly wearing upon his lapel the plastic medal of the order of the red herring, first class.

Resolution on William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is the habit of tyrants to ignore the dignity of the individual who falls within the confines of their power. Laws, rights, truths, these mean nothing to tyrants. Their answer to any outbreak of light within the enveloping darkness of their evil machinations is suppression. Selfish and unscrupulous leaders cannot erect despotism upon the backs of men endowed with individual rights and the freedom of the expression thereof.

An American Associated Press correspondent in Prague, Czechoslovakia, William Oatis, recently came under the heel of tyrannical, totalitarian suppression. At his mock trial, it was charged that he had sought information, that he had sought to find out what was going on. The farce was justly publicized by the free-world press because any free man knew that he was, indeed, doing just that. It is the function of a free press to report, without fear or favor, what is going on whether it pleases those in power or not. The conviction, if such term may be used to describe suppression, only makes plain the fact that a police state can allow no light to be shed which might make men free in knowledge because action follows knowledge.

Thus, freemen everywhere are rising in wrath and objection over this sham trial but all too real conviction of William Oatis. Evil is being spelled out and again referred to as evil so that men may continue in freedom. For this reason I take pride in inserting in the Record a declaration by freemen that: William N. Oatis shall be freed and vindicated, and that evil shall be blotted out wherever it raises its ugly head. The resolution, adopted by Aerie, No. 595, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Grand Junction, Colo., spells out how this may be done.

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his

duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, embassy representative or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous kangaroo court, completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of Government, at which often much "off-the-record" information is discussed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Grand Junction, Colo., Aerie, No. 595, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie, No. 595, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass as well as all satellite-nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 6th day of September 1951.

AERIE, No. 595, GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

Attest:

BURL M. McKEEL,
Worthy President.
ROY O. POWELL,
Secretary.

Czechs Torture John Hvasta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from today's Washington Daily News:

A CALVARY OF AGONY—CZECHS TORTURE YANK, UNITED STATES TOLD

John Hvasta, American and Navy veteran held in a Czechoslovak prison, has been subjected to torture and a Calvary of agony, according to an eyewitness report.

Mr. Hvasta's jail is a filthy middle-ages dungeon, a report released by the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia said.

Committee spokesman, Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, said conditions are probably the same in the jail where Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis is imprisoned.

The report was said to come from an escaped fellow prisoner of Mr. Hvasta. The American, a Hillside, N. J., former United States serviceman, is in the prison at Leopoldov. He has been there since 1948 on a spy charge. Mr. Oatis is in Pankranc Prison on similar charges.

PRISONER ESCAPES

The identity of the author of the report was not disclosed. He said he was a fellow prisoner of Mr. Hvasta in Leopoldov "until the day of my escape."

No one who has not been a political prisoner in Leopoldov can imagine "that in this twentieth century still exists such a torture chamber," he said.

The Communists have covered the windows with tin plates, cutting off fresh air and sunlight and leaving the prisoners buried alive, he said.

"The prisoner is worse than buried alive," he added. "The prisoner is not allowed to see from which side and how many people are finished in the so-called 'Kazamet'."

RESULT WAS TERRIBLE

He said Mr. Hvasta was tortured in January 1950 because Communist spies overheard him telling other prisoners about the existence of real liberty and democracy in the United States.

"The result was terrible," he said. "He had to go through the entire procedure of torture and Calvary of agony. Mr. Hvasta finished in the so-called 'Kazamet'."

This was a windowless dugout in the prison walls, infested with rats and insects, where prisoners went 3 days without food, 3 without water, and underwent 3 more of castigation.

New York Times 100 Years Old Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to felicitate the New York Times, one of the world's leading newspapers, which is today completing the first hundred years of its existence and is now entering upon its second century of recording news events throughout the world. This is an occasion which should be noted wherever freedom of the press still exists, for only in a free world can a newspaper of this caliber make progress and enjoy a century-old existence during which it contributed vastly to the diffusion of knowledge, culture, and civilization.

How different the world of 1951 is from that of 1851. There is probably not a single aspect of our civilization that has not made some progress to a greater or lesser degree, but in the final analysis we may question the degree of happiness and peace of mind it has brought to humanity as a whole and to each nation individually.

I shall leave that for the philosophers and historians to ponder over and to in-

quire into the political, social, economic, technical, cultural, and spiritual changes and revolutions that have taken place in the world generally and in the minds of men in particular over the past 100 years. The New York Times played a vital role in faithfully recording these changes and in influencing the thoughts and actions of America.

The New York Times has also been a great and constructive force in the growth of New York City as a leading world metropolis, a center of business, manufacturing, commerce, education, science, the arts, and so forth. When the first issue of the New York Times appeared on September 18, 1851, New York City had only about a half million population, and my own borough of Brooklyn was then an independent city of only about 150,000 souls. We have gone a long way since then.

As we take time out to look back briefly over the last 100 years and to recount the many services and achievements of this leader in American journalism, let us also look forward in the hope that in its second century of existence the New York Times will record the story of happier events for humanity and a world truly at peace.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the centenary anniversary of the New York Times I am placing in the RECORD an article by Meyer Berger, published in the Times on January 1, 1951, reviewing the history and development of this great newspaper. The article is as follows:

YEAR OF CENTENNIAL OPENS FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES—PANORAMA OF PROGRESS, SINCE SEPTEMBER 18, 1851, SHOWS AFFECTION TO THE AELIS OF ITS FOUNDERS, AND THEIR SUCCESSOR IN 1896

(By Meyer Berger)

The New York Times starts its centennial year today. It will be 100 years old on September 18, 1851.

The newspaper was founded by a group that included Henry Jarvis Raymond, of Lima, N. Y., George Jones, of East Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Edward B. Wesley, of Albany, N. Y.

Later Times backers included Fletcher Harper, Jr., of Harper & Bros., who had started their magazine in 1850. E. B. Morgan, of Aurora, N. Y., a pioneer in Wells Fargo Express, and Leonard Jerome, former Prime Minister Winston Churchill's grandfather.

Mr. Raymond began his newspaper career on Horace Greeley's New York Tribune, and was one of the most distinguished journalists of the period. Mr. Jones worked in the Tribune business office at the same time. They became friends there.

Mr. Raymond had talked for years of the need for a newspaper that would focus sharply on important news and devote less space to personal feuds between owners of competing sheets, or to crusading for causes in which the owners were personally interested, a common journalistic weakness of the fifties.

He wrote the Times' prospectus early in 1851, and Mr. Wesley read his copy on July 4 that year to friends jolling on the sun-warmed ruins of old Fort Putnam at West Point, N. Y. They thought it sound.

The document called for a 1-cent newspaper to be circulated in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Williamsburg. It promised correspondence from intelligent gentlemen permanently enlisted in its support.

It also promised full reports on Government affairs, on religious matters, on agriculture, the sciences, industry, and literary

reviews and intelligence prepared by competent persons, besides impartial reporting on drama, music, and on the arts generally.

The Times, the prospectus said, "is not established for the advancement of any party, sect, or person * * * will seek to be conservative in such a way as shall best promote needful reform * * * will endeavor to perpetuate the good, and to avoid the evil. * * * Its main reliance for all improvement, personal, social, and political, will be upon Christianity and republicanism."

The Republican accent was prophetic; Mr. Raymond was to make history as godfather of the Republican Party.

The Times founders were committed in the prospectus to try to "encourage and advance education, to promote economy, concord and justice in every section of the country, to elevate and enlighten public sentiment, and to substitute reason for prejudice, a cool and intelligent judgment for passion, in all public affairs and in all discussions of public affairs."

Mr. Wesley, a broker, was impressed. He raised \$100,000 for the venture, he and Mr. Jones each contributing \$20,000. Mr. Raymond had no cash to put up but got a substantial share of stock for his talents and for his enterprise.

The first edition of the Times was put out under physical handicap. New York had about 500,000 residents then and was in a building boom. Carpenters and other artificers were overwhelmed by contracts and a little hamstrung by a shortage of building materials.

CENTURY'S CONTRAST IN EDITIONS

There were no windows or light fixtures in the building at 113 Nassau Street when Mr. Raymond opened shop there in early September 1851. He and his staff wrote their stories for the first issue in longhand by waverling candlelight and had frequent resort to matches as cool night breezes swooped through the window frames, playfully snuffing the candles' flame.

There was no telegraph at 113 Nassau Street then, and the Atlantic cable had not been put down; but the Times on September 18, 1851, carried proportionately more national and international news than any other New York newspaper published that day and in the days that came after. It was, perhaps, a little weaker on local items, but that department improved as the staff grew.

Most of the foreign news items had come from London on the Royal Mail steamer *Europe*, then by rail from Boston. Most of it was at least 12 days old, much of it older, but that was fast for those days, and the London representative had put aboard newspaper files from all parts of the Continent.

Today more than 1,000,000 words and the equivalent of about 250,000 more in financial tables pour into the Times over communication devices that might have made Mr. Raymond and his contemporaries gape, but the 1851 staff was almost boastfully proud of the speed it had made with the news it got into that first edition 100 years ago.

BIG EVENTS ACROSS ATLANTIC

Most of the foreign items were culled directly from newspapers of the countries where the stories originated, which was then common journalistic practice. Mr. Raymond preceded these with a crisp summary not unlike the current Times front-page feature, *World News Summarized*.

A good bit of space that first day went to Britain's astonishment over the yacht *America's* defeat of Britain's boat on the Solent. There was a long piece of excitement in Paris over the pending Louis Napoleon-Prince de Joinville contest, and there were many items from other countries, each impressively headlined with the name of the place of origin.

There had been a fugitive-slave riot in Lancaster County in Pennsylvania and Mr. Raymond's staff had gleaned their facts about it from Pennsylvania and Maryland newspapers.

The almost inevitable weather story had the lead under the headline, "New York City," and was offered in neighborly style: "The weather was the theme upon which we hinged an item for our morning edition, but we have been forced to forego the infliction of it upon the public by the proceedings of the Boston Jubilee which our special correspondent has forwarded to us. Never mind, the President [Millard Fillmore] cannot always be lionizing through the country, and as soon as he returns home we shall endeavor to do this important subject full justice."

WHAT WAS HAPPENING HERE

Workmen, the local column reported, were finishing the fountain in Washington Square, which only a few decades before had been a public burial ground out in the country. There was a new steamboat service between Manhattan and rural Flushing (fare, 1 shilling) and the city hall fire watcher had sounded the cupola bell twice to bring out volunteer companies. A Broadway omnibus team had fractured a pedestrian's skull.

A bloomer costume, another local item said, "made its appearance in Sixth Avenue day before yesterday. A crowd of conservatives manifested their hostility to this progressive movement by derision."

This was all front-page stuff. There was a separate heading for news from Brooklyn, then an independent city, and a note from Long Island about a tomato grown by Mr. Frederick Rowland of Hempstead that weighed 2 pounds and 3 1/4 ounces.

Mostly, though, the Times gave its space to graver news, and prospered because of it. In its second year it went to eight pages, twice as many as it printed throughout its first year, and kept growing in prestige, size, and circulation with advancing time.

Mr. Raymond's formula had worked and there were few departures from it in the newspaper's century of existence. It steadfastly remained pretty much a day-by-day account of human achievement. Its files faithfully trace man's errors as well as his stubborn advance toward better living.

The files are packed with national and world history. There is, for example, a comprehensive obituary of Daniel Webster done in longhand by Mr. Raymond himself, and a remarkable record of the Civil War, of events leading up to it, of the Reconstruction, and Abraham Lincoln's administration.

The Gettysburg Address was front-paged, but editorially next day the Times thought Edward Everett's speech at Gettysburg more eloquent and more enduring. Most other newspapers similarly misappraised the Lincoln classic.

Mr. Raymond, physically small, had extraordinary courage. One night in July 1863, after he had editorially called on the law to crush looting bands of antidraft rioters in New York City, they marched on the Times office at 41 Park Row, heavily armed and calling for his blood.

Mr. Raymond and Winston Churchill's grandfather quietly waited for the mob as it poured down from the Bowery whooping and hollering into Printing House Square. Both sat behind the now-rangled Gatling guns ready to spray the rioters, but the hoodlums learned about the guns and swerved off.

When they set fires in the Tribune office across the square Mr. Raymond sent 16 of his men armed with rifles to help police drive off the mob.

The Times' account of the shooting of Abraham Lincoln at Ford's Theater, headlined *Awful Event*, still brings that sad incident into tragically sharp focus. The editors made one major error that night, they

put black borders around all front-page columns, but the President had not died when the edition went to press.

RATTLING THE TWEEED RING

When Mr. Raymond died in 1869 Mr. Jones took over. He clung to Mr. Raymond's basic policies, even in costly crucial periods. He attacked the Tweed ring in 1871 when other newspapers closed their eyes to the ring's unholy plundering of New York City's funds, and coldly turned down a \$5,000,000 cash bribe proffered by Dick Connelly, a Tweed lieutenant sent to call the Times off.

The Times remained almost uncompromisingly Republican until James Blaine was nominated by the party to run for President in 1884. Then, after its warnings that he was unfit for the office of Chief Executive went unheeded, it reluctantly backed the Democrat, Grover Cleveland, who won. From that time on it remained politically independent.

Hard times weakened the newspaper after Mr. Jones' death in 1891. By 1896 its circulation was down to around 9,000 copies a day, and the group of Times men who had bought it from the Jones heirs were in despair. The plant that Mr. Jones had built and expanded at 41 Park Row, once the handsomest newspaper establishment in the city, was shabby, its presses needed replacement, and the revenue from advertising had faded almost to vanishing.

On August 18, 1896, after the Times had gone bankrupt, it was taken over by Adolph S. Ochs, a young publisher who had purchased the Chattanooga Times in Tennessee and developed it as one of the best newspapers in the South.

Mr. Ochs had arrived independently at the same news principles that Mr. Raymond had conceived but which had somehow faded and withered on the New York Times.

"It will be my earnest aim," Mr. Ochs wrote for the issue of August 19, 1896, "that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form, in language that is parliamentary in good society, and give it as early if not earlier than it can be learned through any other reliable medium; to give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect, or interests involved."

The new publisher, a printer by trade, used his knowledge of this art to give the Times a neater, cleaner format. He introduced better and more ample business and financial news features, an illustrated Sunday supplement (now the Sunday magazine) and a weekly section devoted to news and reviews of books.

In 1898, after Mr. Ochs' meager starting capital had been spent in vain effort to compete with the New York World and the New York Journal, both rich publications which spent comparative fortunes on Spanish-American War coverage, he dropped the price of the Times to 1 cent.

This measure of desperation became effective on October 10, 1898. The publisher's contemporaries were sure that the move would prove suicidal; that the price drop would lead readers to think that the Times had cheapened in all respects.

Mr. Ochs said: "It is the price of the newspaper, not its character that will change" and when readers realized that this was fact, the Times won thousands of new readers and increasingly greater advertising volume. It moved out front as one of the world's leading newspapers and stayed there.

Times Tower was finished in 1905 and Times Square took its name from it. Eight years later the newspaper needed a large annex in Forty-third Street, west of the Square. Subsequent additions inspired by circulation and advertising gains and for more space for news-handling, the last finished after the close of the Second World War, gave the Times one of the largest newspaper publishing plants in the world.

Since Mr. Ochs' death in 1935, the newspaper's high-quality news tradition has been furthered under his son-in-law, Arthur Hays Sulzberger. The Times today has more than 1,300 correspondents on full or on part-time assignment, and unmatched communications facilities for handling their copy. Mr. Raymond's entire working force had fewer than 50 men. The Times today employs more than 4,000 men and women. In Mr. Sulzberger's regime, the Times has increased its prestige in the news-gathering field, which has been reflected in its advertising and circulation growth.

A HUNDRED YEARS OF GROWTH

In 1851 the total circulation of New York's 15 newspapers was 130,000 a day. The New York Times circulation, 100 years later, is more than 1,100,000 on Sunday, and in excess of 635,000 daily. In 1950 the Times carried more than 39,500,000 lines of advertising, the highest amount in its century of existence.

Mr. Raymond's Times used a total of 30,000,000 newsprint pages between September 18, 1851, and September 18, 1952. More than 15½ times that amount of newsprint was used for one recent Sunday edition, or just 1 day's press run. The change has been that great.

There have been other remarkable changes in the 100 years since 1851—such changes as the Times' founders could never have conceived in their most fantastic dreaming, yet based fundamentally on their original formula for faithful news presentation.

The decision to create a newspaper that would be as complete a human record as possible has endured for 100 years. Historians who pore over Times pages can easily trace a century of mortal progress and recession there. The acorn and the oak come quickly visible to discerning eyes.

On Tuesday, June 13, 1854, for example, the first four columns in the Times told under the headline, "Japan opened," what Commodore Perry had achieved in commercial treaty negotiations at Yedo, now called Tokyo.

The article was complete with interesting detail on the Japanese resources, habits, customs, and beliefs, all pretty much unknown to the average reader in 1854. A side story told of the burial of Robert Williams of the United States Marine Corps who had died aboard the U. S. S. *Mississippi* during Perry's visit.

Almost 100 years later a Times man hovered over Nagasaki in a B-29 to report in detail the destruction wrought by an atomic bomb. And now in Yedo the Times has its own news bureau equipped to communicate by telephone, wireless or cable with the home office off Times Square.

News of Perry's achievement in Japan was 10 weeks reaching the Times. Today news of that country, of Korea, India, China, Tibet, and other Far East places where history is bubbling, gets to the office in split seconds when such speed is necessary.

One hundred years of important human undertakings everywhere on the globe, under its vast waters and in the skies above it, have been fixed in the Times record in printer's ink to cover one century in the daybook of mankind.

Spiritual Values in Modern Political Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Republican State chairman, Mr. Ray

Bliss, of the great State of Ohio, had a meeting of the Republican chairwomen. It was an inspiration to me to attend this meeting. Mrs. Florence Morris had arranged a wonderful program. My distinguished colleagues Congressman J. HARRY MCGREGOR and Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON also attended the meeting.

The main address was delivered by Mrs. BOLTON. It was keyed to the women and, at the request of the State vice chairman, Mrs. Florence Morris, concerned itself with the spiritual values in modern political life.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include our distinguished colleague's remarks upon this occasion:

SPIRITUAL VALUES IN MODERN POLITICAL LIFE

(Address delivered by Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, before a meeting of the county chairwomen of Ohio in Columbus, Ohio, September 17, 1951)

First I must thank our Republican vice chairman, Florence Morris, for this great pleasure and privilege of meeting with you who are the chairwomen in Ohio's 88 counties, and to share with you the pride Ohio Republicans have in our women members of the Ohio General Assembly, to whom I have listened with such interest.

It is always refreshing to be with Ohio women—whose national committeewoman is Katherine Kennedy Brown. Katherine, it is good to see you.

What a splendid program has been prepared. I share with you your enthusiasm over Senator BRICKER's decision to remain in the Senate. I know you join with me in a determination to give him unfaltering and joyous support.

No one could give you more vital pictures of what campaigns in rural and industrial areas are and should be than HARRY MCGREGOR and BILL AYRES, that is certain. Both men are hard and earnest workers, both are able, both must be returned next year that the people in their districts in the great State of Ohio can be assured of real representation in the Congress.

I have been asked to talk about spiritual values in modern political life.

I am sure you agree with me that only Florence Morris would give anyone such a subject.

Ever since I had her letter asking me to come to this meeting my subject has been consciously and subconsciously with me. It is the result of these processes of mind that I bring to you today with a humility that is combined with a deep sense of privilege.

You are a group of outstanding women. You are in places of great responsibility at a moment when the fate of men hangs in the balance. Because you are women you are instinctively aware that there is but one reality and that is the spiritual. Unless you can translate that knowledge into practical action in every area of life that you contact, to every area of life in which you live, whatever you do will be superficial and in some essential way will fall of accomplishment. I could not talk with you about it, however, if I were not certain that you are doing just this, whether consciously or unconsciously, every hour of the day and night.

We are Republicans, living in a Republic, believing in a democratic way of life. I want to talk about this word "democracy" for a moment because it is essentially a good word; its original meaning was clear, but it has been desecrated, and we have permitted that desecration. We have allowed the New Dealers to bandy it around until everyone has become so confused that perfectly good

Republicans are calling this great country of ours a democracy. Out in the world the U. S. S. R. calls itself a democracy. And who protests? Who uses the technique of constant repetition to show them up for what they are, to counteract Moscow's consummately skillful use of that—the strongest of all teaching techniques—repetition?

Thomas Jefferson founded the Democratic Party—Republican-Democratic Party. Never once in his first inaugural address did he mention the word "democracy" or any derivative thereof, although he made several direct references to the republican form of government under which this Nation operated.

Governor LEHMAN, of New York, in his first inaugural address in 1933, did not use the word either. In 1935 he used it twice; in 1939 he used it or a derivative 25 times. In his annual message of January 1940 he used it 33 times. Ever since the advent of the New Deal this misuse of the word has been deliberate, in an effort to confuse the electorate into believing that the Democratic Party and America's original democratic principles are one and the same. Up in Cleveland we have found that our new citizens join the Democratic Party because they believe just this.

What power there is in a word.

Benjamin Franklin told the people of his day in clear, unclouded language that they had given us "a Republic," adding with great vision and foresight, "If you can keep it so."

Now I want to examine this word "democracy" a little. Let me give you the Encyclopedia Britannica. It says: "Democracy is a form of government based upon self-rule of the people. Democracy is a way of life based upon the fundamental assumption of the equality of all individuals and of their equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Aristotle criticized the decaying Athenian democracy because he regarded it as a perverted form of the state where the citizens at large govern—because such democracy considers only the poor, not the common good, says he.

Democracy, says the Encyclopedia Britannica, presupposes the existence of opposition as a legitimate partner in the democratic process. It rejects any totalitarian or monolithic identification of the state with one party or with one dogma. It means the recognition of the fundamental values of individual liberty and of the equality of all men. Democracy has many shortcomings, but these should not be allowed to foster a spirit of unproductive criticism which, in its wish to put something better, etc., in place of corruption, mediocrity, etc., is not clear about the alternative which turns out to be some form of old authoritarianism, however streamlined it may seem. By its own very essence, democracy can never be perfect because that would presuppose a perfect citizenry.

Democracy as a way of life within any government must have—

1. A popular constitution.
2. A parliament of some kind.
3. Universal suffrage.
4. A disciplined party system.

Through these (Encyclopedia Britannica) there can be equality of persons, who recognize that upon each individual is placed that responsibility which in other systems is placed upon the ruler.

Here in this land of ours, we base our conceptions upon the right of the individual to be free to develop his peculiar faculties—and we place upon him by our republican form of government, the responsibility to protect the freedom of every individual against injustice from his fellows or from his government. Why do we do this? Because an individual, per se, is so important? No. Rather do we endeavor to make possible a life of

individual development because it is the foundation stone of our belief that the individual is made of the very essence of deity. "And He breathed on them the breath of life, and they became living souls"—not our breath, but His.

So we and all members of the nations of earth as individuals are important to the life and the being of God. Hence, this great Republic of ours is of vast importance in the universal plan—and we who are women, we who are Republicans—a party born out of the need of the common people for justice and opportunity—have a tremendous responsibility. We who are women, especially those of us who have the responsibility of leadership in areas outside our homes, have a particular responsibility to go deep into our own souls to discover and rediscover what is truth for us. We need to know what is fundamental to us as children of the living God. We must have a center—firm, strong, immovable—from which we can swing out in any direction without losing balance, for we must always be able to swing back with confidence and inner peace.

Socrates held that: "The end of being is to find out God." Certainly all who believe beyond all shadow of doubt in immortality know with the ancients, that "never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be—never—end and beginning are dreams." We who are Christians have grown up with that awe-inspiring "In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was of God, and the Word was God." That Word is the reason for life upon our earth, set as it is in the great galaxy of the firmament—it is the incarnation, the visible form of the beauty and the being of the Infinite. We who are women have a particular responsibility to that Word. It is we—who are the matrix of God's life in earth—who must keep that Word alive!

To do this we must go deep into our own souls to discover and rediscover what is truth to us.

There is no one formula for this. Each must find her own way. But if you are to carry well the responsibility of your office, you must find it and walk upon the road it reveals to you with courage.

So I would have you use words with a new sense of their importance—with a constant consciousness of their power. Try to think of them as bits of that Infinite Word that was made flesh and dwelt among us. Remember always that it is the essential, basic meaning of words that is of such crucial moment in these days.

We are agreed, are we not, that fundamental values are spiritual values no matter into what areas of living we go.

In His wisdom, the Infinite God has made Himself visible in the beauty, the splendor, and the awesomeness of the firmament. He has made Himself visible upon the earth in majesty, in discipline, in beauty, in darkness, and in light. The earth is His—it is the visible symbol even as we are. Because God is—we are. In the beginning was the Word.

Perhaps you feel I emphasize the word *unduly*—yet—you go out from here to build not only the framework but the structure of a newly reborn Republican organization and party, reconsecrated to protect the essential freedom of the individual and to convince everyone you contact of the inescapable responsibility that rests upon the individual if freedom is to survive.

You who are here today have accepted leadership in your counties. You stand with a lighted torch at the crossroads, hoping that

all who pass that way may choose the road to freedom and ultimate peace. Perhaps the word you speak in greeting gives them the courage to choose well.

Oh, yes; you must be able to answer their questions, you must give them clear, down-to-earth answers. You must use words whose roots go deep, even while they open up windows that give a glimpse of heaven.

You will perhaps speak to them of liberty. Are you ready to give them a sense that liberty is of the spirit—that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (II Corinthians 3:17). Can you persuade them through your own passionate belief that obedience to divine law is liberty? (Judge Skeel—Newton D. Baker.)

Can you give them back their faith in themselves as responsible members of a free society based upon law—not men? Is your own faith like the "bird that feels the light and sings when dawn is still dark"? Is your faith in this great Republic of ours, in its destiny, an active thing—a brave endeavor—a splendid enterprise—not passive, but vividly alive?

Are you ready as a Republican leader in your community to give leadership, when John Buchan defined as "courage and wisdom with a great carelessness of self." Is your strong center of your life secure? Is your belief in fundamental freedom based upon liberty under law impregnable?

Ella Wheeler Wilcox wrote:

"This is the weightiest moment of all time, and on the issues of the present hour a nation's honor and a country's peace, a people's future, aye, a world's, depends."

In 1781 George Washington wrote: "We must not despair, the game is yet in our own hands, to play it well is all we have to do. And I trust the experience of error will enable us to act better in the future. A cloud may yet pass over us, individuals may be ruined, and the country at large, or particular States, undergo temporary distress, but certain I am that it is in our power to bring these matters to a happy conclusion."

We are privileged indeed to be in positions of responsibility in the political life of these United States at a moment when woman's understanding of the world's need of spiritual consciousness can have great bearing upon the future.

Indeed, we must not despair over the fact that the morale of our people has fallen into the mire. Rather must we permit the errors of omission and commission to enable us to act better in the future.

Knowing that the strength of a nation is the morale of its people, let us take hold of our own party—quietly, purposefully, prayerfully, and with complete faith in the power of the word, whether spoken or unspoken, giving to it our strength, our courage, our confidence in victory for the right, rightfully presented. Yes, we have been the minority party 10, those many years, but let us remember that it is the minority that have stood in the vanguard of every moral conflict, who have achieved all that is noble in the history of the world.

IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD

The moment is upon us when we must assume the responsibility that is ours to keep the Word of the Infinite alive.

May the God of all give us strength and purpose, endurance and faith, humility and courage that we may truly serve Him on the political pathways upon which we have set our feet. May His blessing be upon us each day as we go forth and each night when we commend our souls to Him in sleep that we may contribute to the coming of peace.

Pay Boost for Federal Employees Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when many young Americans prepared themselves in serious competition to win jobs as clerks or stenographers with the Federal Government. Such jobs represented steady income and security. Many folks dedicated their lives to these humble careers.

That was "once upon a time."

Today those jobs are underpaid and insecure.

Government workers are poor relatives sitting at the end of Uncle Sam's table with no recognized union to give them the collective-bargaining rights enjoyed by workers in private industry. They must beg the Congress for a little more to eat, hoping that the Congress will recognize that their incomes are lagging far behind the rising cost of living and take steps to close the gap.

Both the House and Senate have approved bills providing for an upward adjustment in pay for Federal workers. These bills are close enough to have their minor differences ironed out without delay.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation as soon as possible and to make the increases retroactive to July 1, 1951, the beginning of the fiscal year.

Big government is like big business. Its success depends primarily upon the skill and the morale of its workers. To get and hold the best employees, it must provide incentives. A worker who is treated fairly by his employer, and that includes adequate pay and opportunities for promotion, becomes an efficient and confident worker with pride in his job and loyalty to the firm that are definite assets to any enterprise.

This morale is lacking in the operations of the Federal Government today, for reasons understood by every man or woman who works to support a family.

In the following facts we see the cost of our neglect.

During the past year for every 10 persons who have entered the employ of the Federal Government almost 4 persons have left that service.

No private business could survive with such a rate of turnover attended by all the added costs of training successors.

All of us are concerned with the heavy taxes that are being levied upon us and with the mounting public debt.

Perhaps too many employees have been taken on by some Federal agencies.

But this is no reason for holding the regular and essential employees to substandard wages. It is unreal and unfair to pass the blame for waste in Government to those workers without whom Government could not function, and

whose income is anemic by present standards.

Remember too that Federal employees do not have the insurance of unemployment compensation to tide them over the reductions in force that make them jobless and without income while they search for other employment. Thousands of VA employees are in this very situation today. They have received notices of dismissal, but they will not have unemployment compensation to assist them over the job-seeking interlude that will follow.

Again, the Government worker has much more taken from his pay for retirement purposes, than the worker in private industry.

Indifference to the plight of Federal employees has forced them to drastic measures to alleviate the squeeze under which they exist.

In San Francisco they inserted the following ad in a newspaper and I quote:

Postal employees desire part-time work to provide decent living conditions for families, not possible under present salaries

Conscientious, intelligent, industrious, versatile help offered

Field covers various occupations, baby sitters to truck drivers

Available day or night.

Duration of employment bearing on adequate post office pay increase by Congress.

Permanent employment possible.

For information write box 3001, San Francisco 19

After all, it is the duty of the Federal Government to collect revenues, to provide for the common defense, to protect our borders, to maintain a postal service, to conserve and utilize our natural resources, to maintain regulatory agencies for the health and well-being of our citizens, to care for and rehabilitate the disabled and displaced veterans of our various wars, among other obligations.

These responsibilities cannot be fulfilled properly with underpaid employees who themselves become the victims of gnawing worry and discouragement.

Gentlemen, I move that we do something substantial this week to recognize those faithful employees who serve the Nation

To compensate for past oversights, I believe that the minimum increase for all should be \$500.

It deserves to be the first order of legislative business to be enacted this week.

McSweeney on a Snowball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial:

McSWEENEY ON A SNOWBALL

A bureaucratic government, into which category the Federal Establishment of the United States has degenerated gradually over many years, has enormous opportunity to perpetuate itself—which means to

preserve appointees' jobs and continuously create new ones for political workers

It perpetuates itself by direct and indirect political pressures, primarily by creation of public support through dissemination of "publicity" and "information."

Thousands of men and women are employed by Federal agencies to write "news" and prepare "information." These materials not only find their way into the columns of newspapers and magazines, but are picked up as factual and educational by the writers of textbooks. So the voters of tomorrow as well as today are conditioned to the idea of paternal government.

It is virtually impossible for the advocates of a contrary philosophy of government to present their case with equal force, for the bureaucrats have at their service the far-flung resources of the Federal Government and the prestige the stamp of government bestows

The net result of the whole business is that men and women living out of taxpayers' pockets use taxpayers' money to sell the public on maintaining present bureaus and creating new ones for "improving" the lot of the people

Clevelanders saw the process at work on Labor Day, when John McSweeney, of Wooster, spoke to an A. F. of L. crowd of 50,000 at Geauga Lake Park

McSweeney is a loyal Democrat who was defeated for reelection to Congress last year. He was one of the lame ducks taken into the bureaucratic nest in Washington under President Truman's wing. McSweeney is a special assistant to Price Stabilizer Mike DiSalle

McSweeney made a political speech. He not only pleaded the cause of a particular brand of controls legislation, but he sang the praises of DiSalle and other bureaucrats

His job, theoretically, is to carry out duties specified by Congress. But at Geauga Lake he made a political speech, at the expense of the taxpayers he was bamboozling, for the Plain Dealer's Washington Bureau learned that it is the system for the DiSalle bureau to pay transportation and \$9 a day expenses

Senator Jenner of Indiana has pointed to another example by asking a Senate committee to ascertain who paid the expenses of five Government appointees who attended a recent meeting of the Democratic Party at French Lick. Mike DiSalle was one of the five on that political mission

The use of tax moneys by Federal jobholders for feathering their own nests constitutes one of the most difficult and serious problems facing the American public.

It is obvious that Federal jobholders are going to show their own work only in the most favorable light, that both sides of controversial projects and policies will not be fairly presented by them. It is obvious, too, that expenditure of tax money for whipping up support for additional tax expenditures is evil. However, the problem is not a simple one

For at least 30 years Congress has been struggling with it. An act of July 11, 1919, provided "No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly . . . to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill."

However, special acts setting up particular agencies make provision for dissemination of information, and it is often impossible to draw a line between information and political propaganda. Likewise, it is often impossible to distinguish between political activity and official business

On March 30, 1950, the Comptroller General, who is a creature of Congress, reported to the House Lobbying Committee the following "Perhaps an even greater evil in public expenditures for lobbying consists not

so much in direct appeals to the Congress, but in campaigns put on throughout the country at large for the purpose of inducing the electorate to put pressure on Congressmen and Senators."

And that's what we saw on Labor Day. McSweeney spent some money appropriated for stabilizing prices to whip up public support for bigger and more odious price-control laws and expenditures.

This is one of the reasons why bureaucratic government always grows like the snowball. And we'll see it happen to the Price Stabilization Bureau—it will grow, and grow, and grow while prices go higher and higher. The more it spends, the less it will stabilize, but the more public passion it will arouse in its own behalf.

Lysander Smith, May His Tribe Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Lysander Smith, Binghamton, takes from our midst a newspaperman the like of whom there are too few today.

If all newsmen would take a page from the book of Lysander Smith, the world would be a far better, and safer place in which to live.

This gentleman came from the diminishing school of factual reporting, from among those reporters who feel that smear, innuendo, and propaganda have no place in the realm of newspaper corresponding.

Lysander Smith hated off-color descriptions of people and events. He strove only to do what the truly American reporter should do, to give the facts, unvarnished and untinted.

Cub reporters too often grovel and fawn about the knees of opinionated editors and bigwig publishers. They prefer crumbs from the tables of the mighty instead of climbing, in dignified fashion, the ethical rungs in the ladder of their profession.

Lysander Smith went about his daily work for long years, patiently determined to be a credit to his contemporaries, and an asset to truth in the world of journalism.

He will be sorely missed by those of us who depend upon the integrity of the newspaper fraternity, not to twist, not to misrepresent in distorted columns, the accurate recording of our daily deeds and words, but to cover with dexterity, with honesty, with tolerance, and with clarity the actions of those duly elected by the people.

Lysander Smith's name should be emblazoned on the frontispiece of every newspaperman's primer as a lasting symbol of fair, above-board, straightforward reporting.

An American newsman, hostile to the poison-pen, refusing to succumb to the left-wing journalism of smear, so popular with some, a star reporter and a fine gentleman of the ultra-American school was Lysander Smith, newspaperman extraordinary.

Soil Conservation Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain information and statistics about soil conservation expenditures:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 24, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your requests of August 10 and 17, 1951, to James M. Hunt of the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch, and the attached letters in regard to the funds expended for conservation.

This is the information about which you wrote the Secretary of Agriculture on July 25. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture wrote you on August 8 that the work of compiling the information was under way. The tabulations for a number of States are completed but unless we hear from you to the contrary we will wait until the material is completed for all States, at which time it will be sent to you.

We wish to point out, however, that the data available in the Production and Marketing Administration relate only to the assistance under the agricultural conservation program, and do not include any information with respect to the work of the Soil Conservation Service or other agencies dealing with conservation. We will therefore be able to furnish you the data which you requested from Mr. Paul H. Walser, State conservationist, Temple, Tex.

Your letters from H. T. Price, B. P. Vance, and Paul H. Walser are attached.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD K. HILL,
Acting Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Temple, Tex., August 1, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: This morning we have received a letter forwarded from College Station requesting information on how much money in the last fiscal year was spent for soil-conservation purposes in each of the counties in the United States. As you know, our work is done in soil conservation districts, many of which are not on county lines. For this reason, it will be extremely difficult to determine the expenditure of Soil Conservation Service funds on a county basis.

I believe that your letter must have been intended for the Production and Marketing Administration which does expend its funds on a county basis so I am forwarding your letter to Mr. Vance for reply.

If I have misinterpreted your letter please let me know. I send best regards and good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. WALSER,
State Conservationist.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., August 14, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your memorandum of August 6 with which you enclosed correspondence from Mr. Paul Walser, State conservationist, SCSS. Information had been requested on the amount of funds expended for conservation activities in all Texas counties as well as in the counties in the United States.

As pointed out in a letter dated August 7, these data are available in the office of Mr. James M. Hunt, Chief, Division of Statistics and Economics, ACP branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Washington. I am sure that he will be glad to furnish the figures for Texas counties as well as for all counties and parishes in the United States.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., August 7, 1951.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of July 25, 1951, in which you requested information on the amount of assistance given farmers and ranchers in all counties in the United States for performing soil and water conservation practices during the 1951 fiscal year.

We do not have this type of information for all counties in the United States in this office. I suggest that you contact Mr. James M. Hunt, Chief, Statistical and Economics Division, ACP Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Washington, who is responsible for getting the type of information you desire and who will be glad to assist you.

Very truly yours,

R. T. PRICE,
Executive Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., August 29, 1951.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In response to your letter of July 25, 1951, we have secured a report from each of our seven regional offices, itemizing by appropriation and county the amounts of funds obligated by the Soil Conservation Service during the fiscal year 1951. Since our accounting records are not maintained on a county basis, we have had our State and regional offices estimate the county breakdown of all the money obtained during the year.

In addition to the county breakdown we have shown an obligation of \$185,810 for "various" purposes with an explanatory footnote. We have also shown the obligations for the District of Columbia during the 1951 fiscal year. We hope that these figures will provide you with the analysis you desire.

Sincerely,

H. H. BENNETT, Chief
P. S. We are returning herewith correspondence attached to your memorandum of August 28.

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951

Item	Total	Soil-con- servation research	Soil con- servation operations	Land utiliza- tion and re- treatment of submarginal land	Water con- servation and utiliza- tion projects	Flood control
Various	\$185,810	\$1,721	\$101,034	\$35,115	\$61	\$79,989
District of Columbia	1,206,763	151,871	959,415		21,012	122,957

¹ Includes the Service printing and reproduction expense of \$101,720; expense of the National Engineering Standards Unit, headquartered at Lincoln, Neb., \$60,301; miscellaneous research expense, \$1,710; and \$19,016 for basin investigations and comprehensive planning on the Arkansas-White-Red watershed covering 9 States. It is not possible to equitably distribute these items on a county basis.

State and county	Total	Soil con- servation research	Soil con- servation operations	Land utiliza- tion and re- treatment of submarginal land	Water con- servation and utiliza- tion projects	Flood control
Arkansas*						
Arkansas.....	\$2,097		\$2,007			\$90
Ashley.....	14,349		14,389			
Baxter.....	13,766		13,766			
Benton.....	28,804		23,876	\$4,961		57
Boone.....	21,091		21,091			
Bradley.....	18,364		18,364			
Calhoun.....	10,165		10,165			
Carroll.....	29,545		29,545			
Chicot.....	1,115		1,115			
Clark.....	26,915		26,915			
Arkansas—Continued						
Clay.....	\$21,712		\$21,712			
Cleburne.....	21,975		21,951			\$24
Cleveland.....	22,083		22,083			
Columbia.....	35,250		34,801			449
Conway.....	26,133		25,954			179
Cranehead.....	30,231		30,231			
Crawford.....	22,077		21,896			181
Crittenden.....	2,071		2,071			
Cross.....	30,862		30,862			
Dallas.....	23,263		23,263			

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5685

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951 - Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reforestation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reforestation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Arkansas—Continued							Louisiana—Continued						
Desha	31,820		1,790			330	Pointe Coupee	\$22,306		322,306			
Drew	21,967		21,967				Rapides	30,862		30,862			\$175
Faulkner	35,601		35,555			159	Red River	21,708		21,006			702
Franklin	26,691		26,512			181	Richland	16,419		16,419			
Fulton	16,816		16,816				Sabine	26,566		25,041			1,545
Garland	17,590		17,460				St. Bernard	7,545		7,545			
Grant	21,555		21,528			8	St. Charles	7,544		7,544			
Green	20,121		20,121				St. Helena	16,846		16,846			
Hempstead	30,610		30,203			407	St. James	15,083		15,083			
Hot Spring	11,703		11,703				St. John the Baptist	7,545		7,545			
Howard	20,192		19,881			611	St. Landry	23,523		23,523			
Independence	22,857		22,857				St. Martin	17,903		17,903			
Izard	22,183		22,183				St. Mary	16,995		16,995			
Jackson	31,731		31,731				St. Tammany	17,801		17,801			
Jefferson	5,897		5,761			136	Tangipahoa	18,664		18,664			
Johnson	18,579		18,598			181	Tensas	15,009		15,009			
Lafayette	23,006		22,311			702	Terrebonne	15,136		15,136			
Lewis	2,631		2,631				Union	36,087		36,087			
Lee	36,246		25,809	110,967			Vermilion	11,630		11,630			
Lincoln	28,538		28,531			21	Vernon	15,170		14,416			754
Little River	20,757		20,085			702	Washington	28,802		28,802			
Loyd	37,111		37,233			181	Webster	43,682		26,015	16,965		702
Lyon	15,581		15,151			130	West Baton Rouge	10,821		10,821			
Madison	17,121		17,713			8	West Carroll	16,314		16,314			
Marion	20,087		20,087				West Feliciana	16,633		16,633			
Miller	16,001		15,302			702	Winn	16,158		15,983			175
Mississippi	2,087		2,087				Oklahoma						
Monroe	1,788		1,788				Adair	16,460		16,279			181
Montgomery	14,162		14,162				Alfalfa	21,381		21,381			1,000
Moravia	31,556		29,317	5,013		196	Atoka	23,091		23,091			702
Newton	1,951		1,918			31	Beaver	21,173		20,153			1,000
Osage	31,465		23,287	8,178			Beckham	457,946		23,639			434,307
Perry	10,557		10,401			176	Blaine	41,997		40,997			1,000
Phillips	40,116		31,965	8,181			Bryan	21,709		21,007			702
Pike	13,196		13,196				Caddo	94,366		40,981			53,385
Poinsett	5,139		5,139				Canadian	33,649		32,707			942
Polk	21,577		21,138			439	Carters	33,824		25,172			8,472
Pope	15,892		15,717			175	Cherokee	18,993		18,885			108
Pratt	12,751		29,888	12,511		11	Choctaw	23,001		22,299			702
Pulaski	15,921		15,716			188	Cimarron	23,665		22,666			999
Randolph	34,955		34,955				Cleveland	21,801		20,802			999
St. Francis	38,109		26,911	11,185			Coal	39,099		18,397			702
St. James	11,401		11,076			28	Comanche	23,150		22,416			702
Scott	20,721		20,511			171	Cotton	14,312		13,610			702
Sevier	22,256		22,251				Craig	16,923		16,418			208
Sevier	16,771		16,590			181	Creek	20,362		19,661			701
Sharp	17,131		16,631			702	Crittchen	67,101		41,829			25,275
Stone	20,172		20,172				Delaware	23,321		23,303			18
Sumner	21,528		21,528				Dewey	21,730		21,731			999
Texas	21,117		21,117				Ellis	25,211		24,215			999
Union	26,908		26,908			40	Garfield	24,662		21,563			999
Van Buren	32,491		25,811	6,576		107	Guyton	65,897		20,397			45,500
Washington	20,911		20,898			10	Harvey	84,189		39,874			44,365
White	15,137		15,137				Grant	21,610		21,611			999
Yell	26,709		26,510			169	Greer	23,139		23,139			
Louisiana							Harmon	23,169		22,467			702
Acadia	21,838		21,838				Harper	21,728		21,729			999
Allen	9,693		9,693				Haskell	23,082		22,629			453
Ascension	15,297		15,297				Hughes	23,972		23,044			928
Ashumpton	11,397		11,397				Hickman	41,735		11,013			702
Axoches	21,866		21,712			151	Harrison	21,503		20,801			702
Baton Rouge	15,913	10,935					Johnson	30,668		22,366			8,302
Battleground	18,812		18,117			67	Kay	45,408		41,169			999
Bossier	39,001		39,001			517	Ketchikan	999					999
Bossier	29,053		28,351			702	Keweenaw	61,286		11,687			17,588
Caddo	23,598		23,818			750	Kiowa	25,717		25,202			515
Cadillac	13,717		13,465			282	Lafayette	15,069		14,157			912
Caldwell	17,789		17,789				Landolt	22,316		21,317			999
Cameron	11,711		11,161			219	Logan	61,467	335,416	21,921			1,000
Cathlamet	14,701		11,625			77	Love	23,323		23,691			702
Clatsop	41,965		23,721	20,995		216	McClain	40,727		20,075			20,652
Clatsop	15,891		15,891				McClintock	72,516		11,296	28,518		702
De Soto	20,151		25,971			1,181	McIntosh	41,652		11,807			815
East Baton Rouge	21,650		21,650				Major	23,511		22,215			999
East Carroll	17,156		11,166				McNabb	33,771		23,277			10,497
East Feliciana	16,013		16,013				Maya	23,063		23,063			10
Evangeline	18,110		18,110				Murray	40,099		20,159			19,749
Franklin	21,659		21,659			150	Muskogee	32,501		28,851	3,401		215
Grant	15,296		11,926				Noble	21,098		21,099			999
Greene	15,490		15,390				Nowata	21,631		22,611			999
Harris	13,751		13,251				Oklahoma	28,887		27,888			999
Harrison	21,250		21,250				Oklahoma	21,719		21,720			999
Jefferson	7,511		7,511				Oklmulgee	30,062		29,138			711
Jefferson Davis	11,181		11,181				Osage	25,275		21,323			952
Lafayette	11,188		11,188				Ottawa	23,675		23,675			999
Lafayette	11,023		11,023			91	Pawnee	21,938		21,938			1,000
Lamar	11,529		11,529			21	Pawnee	47,351	23,011	23,325			996
Lincoln	27,392		27,392				Piedmont	20,127		19,221			802
Louisiana	11,950		11,950				Pontiac	28,511		27,709			1,000
Madison	18,051		18,051				Pottawatomie	36,611		35,611			702
Morehouse	23,685		23,685			685	Pottawatomie	21,090		20,388			702
Natchitoches	25,170		24,188				Roger Mills	400,312		31,240	16,919		349,193
Orleans	0						Rogers	21,673		21,811			862
Ouachita	26,873		26,873				Seminole	30,362		29,362			1,000
Piquemines	0						Sequoyah	21,738		21,557			181

1 Serves sugarcane lands of Louisiana.
2 Serves the Cross Timbers of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.
3 Serves the entire United States.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Oklahoma—Continued							Texas—Continue 1						
Stephens.....	\$43,017		\$21,502			\$21,515	Gillespie.....	\$12,626		\$12,281			\$315
Texas.....	31,957	\$39,492	21,405			1,000	Goliad.....	22,481		22,481			
Tillman.....	26,963		26,291			702	Gonzales.....	34,248		34,248			
Tulsa.....	30,570		30,101			475	Grav.....	21,276		17,854	\$2,720		702
Wagoner.....	13,943		13,391			552	Gravson.....	73,893		26,338			47,545
Washington.....	20,036		25,036			1,000	Gregg.....	12,601		11,028			1,573
Washita.....	53,818		22,530			31,288	Grimes.....	22,156		21,451			705
Wood.....	47,907		46,907			1,000	Guadalupe.....	21,853		21,853			
Woodward.....	22,743		21,743			1,000	Hale.....	40,249		40,084			165
Texas							Hall.....	31,821		31,110			702
Anderson.....	35,328		25,476			9,852	Hamilton.....	27,631		27,631			
Andrew.....	4,686		3,505			1,091	Hansford.....	21,073		22,073			1,000
Angelina.....	22,294		20,635			1,659	Hardenman.....	24,172		23,470			702
Aransas.....	6,155		6,155				Hardin.....	11,656		9,998			1,658
Archer.....	28,972		17,729			11,243	Harris.....	6,209		4,681			1,528
Armstrong.....	18,250		17,549			701	Hartson.....	28,081		26,977			1,104
Atascosa.....	27,153		27,153				Hartley.....	9,413		6,693	2,720		1,000
Austin.....	25,339		25,161			178	Haskell.....	27,061		26,897			164
Bailey.....	26,937		26,772			165	Hays.....	17,006		16,885			121
Bandera.....	25,716		25,716				Hemphill.....	24,473		19,498	2,720		2,285
Bastrop.....	22,415		22,088			327	Henderson.....	80,035		15,723			14,312
Bayliff.....	17,067		16,622			445	Hidalgo.....	55,708		55,708			
Bee.....	24,300		21,300				Hill.....	80,051		82,249			47,802
Bell.....	68,921	\$25,461	41,460				Hockley.....	32,462		32,320			133
Bexar.....	30,545		30,545				Hood.....	19,220		14,478			4,742
Blanco.....	20,329		20,067			262	Hopkins.....	25,449		24,499			950
Borden.....	17,262		16,927			335	Houston.....	25,555		22,142			3,413
Bosque.....	28,632		28,660			72	Howard.....	16,793		16,448			345
Bowie.....	23,898		23,197			701	Hudspeth.....	47,317		47,317			
Brazoria.....	24,221		23,235			986	Hunt.....	49,712		27,815			22,397
Brazos.....	22,413		22,248			165	Hutchinson.....	16,108		15,908			1,000
Brewster.....	15,383		18,383				Irion.....	2,287		1,942			345
Briscoe.....	25,513		24,512			701	Jack.....	35,731		14,478			339,253
Brooks.....	16,034		16,034				Jackson.....	4,599		4,599			
Brown.....	71,545		30,827			40,718	Jasper.....	5,207		5,548			1,639
Burleson.....	18,526		18,361			165	Jeff Davis.....	18,123		18,123			
Burnet.....	24,765		24,593			172	Jefferson.....	80,652		28,963			1,659
Caldwell.....	12,240		12,212			28	Jim Hogg.....	10,733		10,733			
Callahan.....	15,950		15,950				Jim Wells.....	17,364		17,364			
Calloway.....	26,578		17,942			8,636	Johnson.....	89,074		29,276			33,698
Cameron.....	44,063		44,063				Jones.....	31,165		29,602			1,563
Camp.....	5,267		5,586				Karnes.....	24,081		24,081			
Carson.....	17,073		16,043			1,030	Kaufman.....	77,070		35,432			41,638
Cass.....	22,650		21,940			701	Kendall.....	26,907		26,893			14
Castro.....	30,794		30,427			367	Kenedy.....	3,496		3,496			
Chambers.....	13,730		12,114			1,616	Kerr.....	16,925		16,760			165
Cherokee.....	30,466		28,807			1,659	Kerr.....	22,895		22,816			79
Childress.....	24,040		24,039			701	Kimble.....	14,963		14,618			345
Clay.....	35,410		21,700			13,710	Kine.....	15,099		15,122			487
Clintman.....	14,679		14,364			315	Kinney.....	4,794		4,794			
Coke.....	26,295		25,950			345	Kleberg.....	9,670		9,670			
Coleman.....	40,286		24,252			22,034	Knox.....	24,907		24,532			435
Collin.....	348,642		21,072			327,570	Lamar.....	28,432		27,730			702
Collingsworth.....	30,297		29,596			701	Lamb.....	29,234		29,089			165
Colorado.....	24,765		24,538			227	Lampasas.....	17,891		17,808			83
Comal.....	17,393		17,393				La Salle.....	18,962		18,962			
Comanche.....	27,821		26,962			859	Lavaca.....	5,775		5,775			
Concho.....	30,063		27,553			2,510	Lee.....	17,844		17,642			202
Cooke.....	64,530		24,310			40,220	Leon.....	31,743		28,544			6,000
Correll.....	34,540		34,540				Liberty.....	18,661		17,088			1,573
Cottle.....	24,922		24,221			701	Limestone.....	38,203		29,308			8,895
Crane.....	3,598		3,595			3	Lipscomb.....	30,279		29,279			1,000
Crockett.....	2,692		2,678			14	Live Oak.....	30,901		30,901			
Crosby.....	30,516		30,451			165	Llano.....	15,292		14,947			345
Cullbertson.....	11,408		11,408				Loving.....	9,184		9,184			
Dallam.....	86,514		21,191	\$64,323		1,000	Lubbock.....	30,575		30,404			171
Dallas.....	86,623		25,091			61,532	Lynn.....	28,768		28,490			272
Dawson.....	10,113		18,768			345	McCulloch.....	140,498		24,061			116,427
Deaf Smith.....	20,785		20,137			648	McLennan.....	63,677	\$30,569	33,004			104
Delta.....	10,295		9,594			701	McMullen.....	15,583		15,583			
Denton.....	92,250		33,406			58,844	Madison.....	14,507		13,243			1,264
De Witt.....	29,174		29,174				Marion.....	9,688		9,688			702
Dickens.....	16,995		16,637			358	Martin.....	16,747		16,402			345
Dimit.....	20,907		20,907				Mason.....	25,590		24,585			1,025
Donley.....	27,932		27,251			701	Matagorda.....	22,702		22,502			200
Duval.....	32,375		32,375				Maverick.....	21,228		21,228			
Eastland.....	24,128		23,850			278	Medina.....	31,510		31,510			
Ector.....	3,863		3,595			268	Menard.....	30,477		27,429			3,048
Edwards.....	12,170		12,063			107	Midland.....	16,747		16,402			345
Ellis.....	105,884		35,446			70,438	Milam.....	35,316		35,258			58
El Paso.....	18,829		18,829				Mills.....	54,908		23,671			31,237
Erath.....	31,689		30,828			261	Mitchell.....	25,506		26,161			345
Falls.....	27,345		26,188			1,157	Montague.....	65,471		23,317			42,154
Fannin.....	60,007		29,365	26,016		4,620	Montgomery.....	17,271		15,745			1,528
Fayette.....	23,061		22,989			102	Moore.....	22,414		21,414			1,000
Fisher.....	25,621		25,456			165	Morris.....	8,705		8,008			702
Floyd.....	32,337		31,980			357	Motley.....	26,796		26,094			702
Fourt.....	24,172		23,470			702	Nacogdoches.....	28,258		26,599			1,659
Fort Bend.....	24,424		25,038			480	Navarro.....	115,232		29,067			86,165
Franklin.....	9,400		8,698			702	Newton.....	5,207		5,345			1,659
Freestone.....	40,022		22,051			17,971	Nolan.....	26,146		25,670			476
Frio.....	31,701		31,701				Nueces.....	16,882		16,882			
Gaines.....	27,945		27,601				Ochiltree.....	27,219		23,490	2,720		1,000
Galveston.....	6,432		5,100			1,332	Oldham.....	7,573		5,381			992
Garra.....	17,425		17,253			172	Orange.....	7,124		5,465			1,659
Gillespie.....	30,111		29,780			331	Palo Pinto.....	30,117		26,165			952

* Serves the high plains of Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, also, the north high plains of Texas.

* Serves the Blackland and Grand Prairie sections of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5687

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil con- serva- tion re- search	Soil con- serva- tion op- erations	Land utiliza- tion and retri- ment of submar- ginal land	Water conser- vation and utiliza- tion projects	Flood control
Texas—Continued						
Panola.....	\$21,343		\$22,692			\$1,651
Parker.....	41,312		30,764			10,578
Parmer.....	22,518		22,241			287
Pecos.....	6,157		6,157			
Polk.....	16,714		15,120			1,594
Potter.....	35,541	\$431,131	3,380			1,033
Presidio.....	13,832		13,812			
Rains.....	9,281		7,622			1,659
Randall.....	8,374		4,919	\$2,720		735
Reagan.....	2,805		2,022			283
Real.....	4,792		4,792			
Red River.....	27,336		26,634			702
Reeves.....	35,589		35,589			
Refugio.....	8,062		8,062			
Roberts.....	17,391		16,349			1,012
Robertson.....	33,596		36,772			161
Rockwall.....	14,620		6,186			8,434
Romulus.....	7,540		6,905			635
Rusk.....	27,204		25,545			1,659
Sabine.....	17,374		15,675			1,659
San Augustine.....	18,611		16,982			1,659
San Jacinto.....	10,438		8,910			1,528
San Patricio.....	26,979		26,979			
San Saba.....	31,498		22,716			8,782
Schleicher.....	26,956		21,118			2,838
Seminole.....	17,583		17,996			287
Shackelford.....	22,227		19,810			2,417
Shelby.....	22,460		20,801			1,659
Sherman.....	6,693		5,693			1,000
Smith.....	35,777		33,161			2,616
Somervell.....	5,654		5,512			142
Starr.....	22,136		22,136			
Stephens.....	20,820		18,296			2,564
Stirling.....	14,429		14,081			345
Stonewall.....	15,189		15,095			161
Sutton.....	19,718		19,556			163
Swisher.....	30,174		29,884		2,720	570
Tarrant.....	85,137		24,118			60,719
Taylor.....	24,765		20,671			4,092
Terrell.....	2,891		2,891			
Terry.....	34,571	\$17,516	16,680			345
Throckmorton.....	24,765		24,140			325
Titus.....	15,227		12,525			702
Tom Green.....	36,040		29,828			6,212
Travis.....	27,112		27,074			348
Trinity.....	12,211		10,680			1,588
Tyler.....	11,657		9,908			1,659
Upshur.....	24,815		22,817			998
Upton.....	2,925		2,925			218
Uvalde.....	28,301		28,301			
Val Verde.....	18,431		18,431			
Van Zandt.....	49,187		27,145			21,712
Victoria.....	26,024		26,024			
Walker.....	12,788		11,260			1,528
Waller.....	16,516		15,847			669
Ward.....	12,245		12,245			
Washington.....	23,380		23,225			161
Webb.....	6,201		6,201			
Wharton.....	4,880		4,680			200
Wheeler.....	27,329		26,627			702
Wichita.....	29,678		28,976			702
Wilbarger.....	28,587		27,885			702
Willacy.....	16,601		16,601			
Williamson.....	41,700		41,697			3
Wilson.....	21,016		21,016			
Winkler.....	12,861		12,858			3
Wise.....	97,808		18,014	26,677		53,118
Wood.....	21,965		22,722			1,583
Yonkers.....	15,635		15,290			345
Young.....	59,869		9,826			49,544
Zapata.....	5,728		5,728			
Zavala.....	22,506		22,505			
Kansas						
Allen.....	35,728		35,728			
Anderson.....	19,109		19,109			
Atchison.....	20,708		20,708			
Barber.....	13,017		12,573			444
Barton.....	20,526		20,081			445
Bonham.....	20,555		20,555			
Brown.....	27,820		27,820			
Butler.....	26,664		26,220			444
Chase.....	13,476		13,032			444
Chautauque.....	5,084		4,639			445
Cherokee.....	13,417		13,417			
Cherokee.....	8,935		8,935			
Clark.....	11,215		12,800			445
Clay.....	22,147		22,147			
Cloud.....	25,706		25,706			
Conley.....	25,098		24,653			445
Comanche.....	7,312		6,808			444
Cowley.....	21,477		21,031			444
Crawford.....	26,062		26,062			
Decatur.....	22,089		22,089			
Dickinson.....	18,180		18,180			
Dominion.....	21,162		21,162			
Kansas—Continued						
Douglas.....	\$25,010		\$25,010			
Edwards.....	19,211		18,706			\$445
Ellis.....	14,255		13,811			441
Ellis.....	14,722		14,722			
Ellsworth.....	15,455		15,011			
Finney.....	20,076		19,611			444
Ford.....	19,156		18,712			441
Franklin.....	28,211		28,211			
Geary.....	15,598		15,598			
Geary.....	9,512		9,512			
Grant.....	20,305		20,305			
Grant.....	11,207		10,762			445
Gray.....	12,721		12,277			444
Greely.....	7,085		7,211			441
Greenwood.....	11,206		10,740			516
Hamilton.....	13,844		13,400			441
Harper.....	15,208		14,641			441
Haskell.....	11,891		11,447			441
Haskell.....	16,078		15,641			441
Hodgeman.....	7,255		6,830			
Jackson.....	19,573		19,573			
Jefferson.....	21,109		21,109			
Jewell.....	21,921		21,921			
John.....	2,856		2,856			
Kearney.....	13,099		12,655			444
Kennett.....	6,001		5,556			445
Knowlton.....	13,126		13,682			444
Lambert.....	53,572		53,572			441
Lane.....	7,488		7,043			445
Lavenworth.....	12,901		12,901			
Lancaster.....	13,382		13,382			
Lane.....	16,818		16,818			
Larson.....	11,529		11,529			
Lyon.....	32,305		31,860			445
McPherson.....	21,139		21,139			441
Marion.....	21,063		21,063			445
Mart Hall.....	42,074		42,074			
Meade.....	11,446		11,446			444
Miami.....	25,153		25,153			
Mitchell.....	18,791		18,791			
Montgomery.....	15,133		14,688			445
Morris.....	19,688		19,688			
Morton.....	84,036		84,036	\$75,969		441
Nemaha.....	21,366		21,366			
Neosho.....	30,588		30,588			444
Ness.....	11,891		11,446			445
Newton.....	14,982		14,982			
Ogden.....	31,965		31,965			
Ogden.....	12,892		12,892			
Ottawa.....	13,497		13,497			
Pawnee.....	20,890		20,445			445
Phillips.....	17,996		17,996			
Pottawatomie.....	23,089		23,089			
Pratt.....	7,820		7,376			444
Rawlins.....	22,406		22,406			
Reno.....	18,966		18,966			441
Republic.....	17,087		17,087			
Rice.....	15,854		15,410			444
Riley.....	50,082	\$30,319	19,733			
Rooks.....	12,580		12,580			
Rush.....	9,956		9,511			445
Russell.....	13,007		13,007			
Schick.....	21,560		21,560			
Scott.....	11,724		11,724			441
Sedgewick.....	23,606		23,606			441
Seward.....	8,007		7,562			445
Shawnee.....	14,588		14,588			
Sheridan.....	14,644		14,644			
Sherman.....	11,715		11,715			
Smith.....	11,712		11,712			
Stafford.....	8,455		8,013			441
Stanton.....	7,402		6,957			445
Stevens.....	13,128		12,984			441
Sumner.....	20,010		19,595			445
Thomas.....	15,521		15,521			
Trego.....	15,441		15,441			
Wabunsee.....	11,643		11,643			
Wallace.....	1,654		1,654			
Washington.....	16,917		16,917			
Wichita.....	13,813		13,369			444
Wilson.....	31,421		30,976			445
Woodson.....	21,329		20,885			441
Wyandotte.....	975		975			
Total.....	1,901,169	\$30,319	1,772,115	75,969		22,736
Montana						
Beaverhead.....	3,739		3,739			
Big Horn.....	16,106		16,106			
Blaine.....	35,090		32,607	3,002		
Broadwater.....	26,102		26,102			
Carbon.....	27,994		27,994			
Carter.....	24,043		24,043			
Cascade.....	31,583		31,583			
Chouteau.....	33,838		33,838			

⁶Serves the North High Plains of Texas and part of Rolling Plains of Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas

⁷Serves the South High Plains of New Mexico and Texas

⁸Territory covered: Riley.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Montana—Continued							Nebraska—Continued						
Carter	\$18,783		\$13,860	\$1,715	\$3,208		Holt	\$19,475		\$19,475			
Daniel	15,269		15,269				Hooker	3,175		3,175			
Dayton	24,199		14,773		8,426		Howard	19,695		19,695			
Deer Lodge	2,300		2,300				Jefferson	17,708		17,708			
Fallon	18,323		16,179	2,144			Johnson	30,107		30,107			
Fergus	38,443		31,584	3,859			Kearney	24,099		24,099			
Flathead	19,063		19,063				Keith	17,606		17,606			
Gallatin	31,122	\$6,216	24,906				Keva Paha	2,940		2,940			
Glacier	16,980		16,980				Kimball	12,944		12,944			
Golden Valley	13,203		13,203				Knox	19,331		19,331			
Granite	3,186		3,186				Lancaster	89,628	\$37,004	38,141			\$13,193
Hill	18,065		18,065				Lincoln	10,245		10,245			
Jefferson	6,934		6,934				Logan	4,779		4,779			
Judith Basin	17,054		17,054				Loup	2,942		2,942			
Lake	36,369		36,369				McPherson	2,762		2,762			
Lewis and Clark	20,554		20,554				Madison	12,864		12,864			
Liberty	1,941		1,941				Merrick	19,174		19,174			
Laurel	12,209		12,209				Morrill	21,089		21,089			
McCone	15,733		15,733				Nance	18,660		18,660			
Madison	23,113		23,113				Nemaha	26,895		26,895			
Meagher	4,114		4,114				Nuckolls	24,856		24,856			
Mineral							Otoe	35,027		35,027			
Missoula	5,745		31,097		-26,252		Pawnee	24,087		24,087			
Musselshell	10,077		12,218	3,859			Perkins	6,107		6,107			
Park	20,321		20,321				PHELPS	22,125		22,125			
Petroleum	10,857		10,425	6,432			Pierce	17,831		17,831			
Phillips	21,969		16,395	5,574			Platte	15,641		15,641			
Pondera	20,763		20,763				Polk	17,760		17,760			
Powder River	5,581		5,581				Red Willow	21,626		21,626			
Powell	18,257		18,257				Richardson	35,045		35,045			
Prarie	28,975		11,235	10,291	7,449		Rock	3,919		3,919			
Richland	31,547		31,547				Saline	15,249		15,249			13,163
Roosevelt	16,416		16,416				Savary	16,236		16,236			
Rosbehnd	26,380		26,380				Saundera	24,271		24,271			13,493
Sanders	26,082		26,082				Scotts Bluff	21,512		21,512			
Sheridan	15,512		15,512				Seward	33,696		33,696			13,493
Silver Bow	3,186		3,186				Sheridan	20,584		20,584			
Stillwater	3,402		3,402				Sherman	16,483		16,483			
Sweet Grass	2,112		2,112				Sioux	25,817		25,817			
Teton	19,106		19,106				Stanton	20,948		20,948			
Toole	9,888		9,888				Thayer	18,936		18,936			
Treasure	21,895		21,895				Thomas	3,194		3,194			
Valley	31,501		25,501	6,003			Thurston	15,572		15,572			
Wheatland	4,524		4,524				Valley	19,004		19,004			
Wibaux	9,547		9,547				Washington	30,598		30,598			
Yellowstone	39,333		39,333				Wayne	19,248		19,248			
Total	1,011,007	\$18,216	969,081	42,879	-7,160		Webster	25,036		25,036			
							Wheeler	4,392		4,392			
							York	24,731		24,731			
							Total	1,762,374	\$57,289	1,615,256	9,063	-191	80,957
Nebraska							North Dakota						
Adams	38,051	10,295	18,756				Adams	18,033		18,033			
Antelope	17,772		17,772				Barnes	18,910		18,755			155
Arthur	1,851		1,851				Benson	21,422		21,267			155
Barnet	9,319		9,319				Billings	13,163		5,332	7,831		
Blaine	4,786		4,786				Bottineau	36,871		36,871			
Boone	26,622		26,622				Bowman	12,345		12,345			
Box Butte	20,241		20,241				Burke	24,338		24,338			
Boyd	13,542		13,542				Burleigh	27,931		27,931			
Brown	6,860		6,860				Cass	58,461		58,461			156
Buffalo	25,653		25,653				Cavalier	30,415		30,160			155
Burl	23,706		23,706				Dickey	31,246		31,191			155
Butler	27,215		13,722			\$13,493	Divide	14,267		11,257			
Cass	43,364		20,872			13,492	Dunn	17,345		17,345			
Cedar	18,811		18,811				Eddy	20,088		19,932			156
Chloe	10,948		10,948				Emmons	4,974		4,974			
Cherry	6,831		6,831				Foster	21,579		21,424			155
Cheyenne	11,616		11,616				Golden Valley	22,430		19,792	2,647		
Clay	22,165		22,165				Grand Forks	39,075		38,920			155
Colfax	12,423		12,423				Grant	11,875		11,621	254		
Cumming	17,110		17,110				Gries	18,806		18,740			156
Custer	25,473		25,473				Hettinger	26,658		26,658			
Dakota	5,242		5,242				Kidder	13,072		13,072			
Dawes	22,518		18,539	3,979			La Moure	38,639		38,475			155
Dawson	23,993		23,993				Logan	3,739		3,739			
Deuel	8,414		8,414				McHenry	26,759		26,604			155
Dixon	14,350		14,350				McIntosh	3,952		3,952			
Dodge	12,846		12,846				McKenzie	46,461		32,765	13,698		
Douglas	18,952		18,952				McLean	26,350		26,350			
Dundy	12,836		12,836				Meeker	6,853		6,853			
Edmore	12,039		12,039				Morton	43,013		43,013			
Franklin	13,855		13,855				Mountrail	20,584		20,584			
Frontier	20,927		20,927				Nelson	18,570		18,414			156
Furness	27,069		27,069				Oliver	13,850		13,850			
Gare	25,257		25,257				Pembina	26,473		26,318			155
Golden	21,033		21,033				Pierce	19,909		19,754			155
Graceland	11,298		11,298				Ramsey	20,010		19,854			156
Grant	13,683		13,683				Ransom	20,291		17,309	2,982		155
Greene	3,174		3,174				Renville	13,929		13,929			
Groesbeck	12,729		12,729				Richland	39,040		37,672	1,368		155
Hill	23,554		23,554				Rolette	18,034		18,778			156
Hemlock	18,988		18,988				Sargent	20,942		20,787			155
Hulman	22,361		22,361				Sheridan	8,006		8,451			155
Huges	13,553		13,553				Sioux	11,209		7,715	3,494		
Hitchcock	20,182		20,182										

* Territory covered, Gallatin

* Territory covered, NB-R 1 Adams, Webster NB R 2 Lancaster, Pierce, Adams, NB R 3 Lancaster and Missouri Basin Counties.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5689

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reclamation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reclamation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
North Dakota—Con							Wyoming—Continued						
Slope.....	\$5,737		\$1,966	\$3,771			Crook.....	\$51,058		\$51,045	\$13		
Stanley.....	26,034		26,034				Fremont.....	70,408		70,408			
Steele.....	11,886		11,730			\$156	Goshute.....	53,107		53,107			
Stutsman.....	22,004		21,969			155	Hot Springs.....	17,423		17,423			
Towner.....	18,987		18,832			155	Johnson.....	2,304		2,304			
Trall.....	28,346		28,190			156	Laramie.....	19,342		19,342			
Walsh.....	43,881		43,725			156	Lincoln.....	42,618		42,618			
Ward.....	46,080		46,080				Niobrara.....	19,528		19,528			
Wells.....	18,909		18,753			156	North.....	3,004		3,004			
Williams.....	147,013		35,309		\$111,704		Platte.....	13,066		13,066		31	
Total.....	1,327,077		1,175,078	36,255	111,704	4,040	Sheridan.....	21,337		21,337			
South Dakota							Sublette.....	53,336		53,336			
Armstrong.....	53		53				Sweetwater.....	32,785		32,785			
Aurora.....	8,547		8,547				Teton.....	123,162		1,546		\$121,616	
Beadle.....	30,497		30,497				Union.....	23,594		23,594			
Bennett.....	409		409				Wahkiakum.....	14,748		14,748			
Bon Homme.....	21,125		21,125				Washington.....	30,003		30,003			
Brookings.....	23,982		23,982				Weston.....	9,941		1,636	8,307		
Brown.....	30,782		30,782				Total.....	781,887	11,86,436	632,984	20,851	121,616	
Brule.....	10,288		10,288				California						
Buffalo.....	10,308		10,308				Alameda.....	93,699	12,71,924	11,911,290	10,486		
Butte.....	22,734		22,734				Alpine.....						
Campbell.....	10,161		10,161				Amador.....						
Charles Mix.....	28,964		28,964				Butte.....						
Clark.....	21,928		21,928				Calaveras.....						
Clay.....	9,637		9,637				Colusa.....						
Codington.....	17,551		17,551				Contra Costa.....	21,089		21,089			
Corson.....	3,676		1,199	2,477			Del Norte.....						
Custer.....	67,577		16,265	1,764	49,547		Eldorado.....	30,287		30,287			
Davison.....	350		350				Fresno.....						
Day.....	32,608		32,608				Glenn.....						
Deuel.....	16,019		16,019				Humboldt.....						
Dewey.....	161		161				Imperial.....	13,101		13,101			
Douglas.....	240		240				Inyo.....						
Edmunds.....	173		173				Kern.....	25,067		25,067			
Fall River.....	175,335		19,891	6,802	148,642		Kings.....						
Faulk.....	289		289				Lake.....	91,132		91,132			
Grant.....	11,527		11,527				Lassen.....	8,800		8,800			
Gregory.....	23,916		23,916				Los Angeles.....	259,489		92,003			\$167,486
Hauke.....	13,264		13,264				Madera.....						
Hamlin.....	16,173		16,173				Marin.....						
Hand.....	21,304		21,304				Mariposa.....						
Hanson.....	15,029		15,029				Merced.....	26,988		26,652			336
Harding.....	15,863		15,863				Modoc.....	37,103		37,103			
Hughes.....	462		462				Monterey.....						
Hutchinson.....	526		526				Mono.....	9,796		9,796			
Hyde.....	72		72				Montevideo.....	64,629		64,117			1,492
Jackson.....	14,851		11,702	3,149			Napa.....	49,473		49,473			
Jewell.....	17,318		17,318				Nevada.....	27,122		27,122			
Jones.....	2,355		2,355		2,325		Orange.....	5,386		5,386			
Kingsbury.....	17,610		17,610				Placer.....	87,699		87,699			
Lake.....	983		983				Phumas.....						
Lawrence.....	18,003		18,003				Riverdale.....	113,050	12,15,315	97,745			
Lincoln.....	30,053		30,053				Sacramento.....						
Lynman.....	24,018		17,173	6,845			San Bruno.....	37,338		11,917			5,421
McCook.....	16,717		16,717				San Bernardino.....	38,247		38,247			
McPherson.....	457		457				San Diego.....	170,437		170,437			
Marshall.....	16,377		16,377				San Francisco.....						
Meade.....	31,735		31,735				San Joaquin.....						
Mellette.....	164		164				San Luis Obispo.....	3,711		3,122			589
Miner.....	158		158				San Mateo.....	23,788		23,788			
Minnahada.....	28,486		28,486				Santa Barbara.....	255,417		61,159			194,258
Moodys.....	20,769		20,769				Santa Clara.....	80,820		75,399			5,421
Pennington.....	37,972		32,219	5,753			Santa Cruz.....	39,285		32,960			6,325
Perkins.....	11,121		11,121				Shasta.....						
Pottet.....	145		145				Sierra.....						
Roberts.....	15,755		15,755				Siskiyou.....	53,068		42,306	10,762		
Sandborn.....	19,572		19,572				Solano.....						
Shannon.....	219		219				Sonoma.....	75,704		75,369			335
Spink.....	23,670		23,670				Stanislaus.....						
Stanley.....	4,217		144	4,073			Sutter.....						
Sully.....	145		145				Tehama.....	48,680		48,680			
Todd.....	8,205		8,205				Trinity.....						
Tipp.....	30,230		30,230				Tulare.....						
Turner.....	16,156		16,156				Tuolumne.....						
Union.....	34,975		34,975				Ventura.....	38,570		38,570			
Walworth.....	369		369				Yolo.....						
Washabaugh.....	3,891		3,891				Yuba.....						
Washington.....	17,208		17,208				Subtotal.....	1,832,045	87,238	1,341,092	10,762		381,663
Yankton.....	5,673		5,673		210		(Irrigation).....			11,230			
Ziebach.....							Total.....	1,832,045	87,238	1,352,382	10,762		381,663
Total.....	1,143,500		903,321	41,990	198,189		Idaho						
Wyoming							Ada.....	59,245	10,13,102	11,832			99
Albany.....	29,153	\$6,436	22,717				Adams.....	99		34,211			99
Big Horn.....	71,707		71,707				Bannock.....	78,128		77,980			148
Campbell.....	20,637		15,182	5,755			do not follow county lines and very generally the benefit goes to counties in which no courses are actually located.						
Carbon.....	14,116		14,116				Irrigation.						
Converse.....	42,158		35,413	6,745			California research: Riverside County—Benefits all of California South of Tehachapi.						
Territory covered: Albany.							Idaho Research: Ada County—Benefits southern Idaho.						

11 Territory covered: Albany.
 12 California research: Alameda County—Benefits irrigated areas generally but mainly those west of the Mississippi River.
 13 Irrigation funds shown under Alameda County are administered from Berkeley, Calif., but cover work in all of California and Nevada on snow surveys. The nature of that work makes it impracticable to distribute the cost on a county basis. Snow courses

do not follow county lines and very generally the benefit goes to counties in which no courses are actually located.

14 Irrigation.
 15 California research: Riverside County—Benefits all of California South of Tehachapi.
 16 Idaho Research: Ada County—Benefits southern Idaho.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Idaho—Continued							Oregon—Continued						
Bear Lake	\$14,468		\$14,369			\$99	Linn	\$34,877		\$34,620			\$257
Benewah	13,050		13,000			50	Malheur	343					343
Bingham	20,791		20,544			247	Marion	74,212		74,041			171
Blaine	148					148	Morrow	17,967		14,234			3,733
Boise	14,989		14,890			99	Multnomah	24,440		24,354			86
Bonnev	38,997		38,948			49	Polk	96					86
Bonneville	46,113		45,896			247	Sherman	10,861		10,604			257
Boundary	12,807		12,788			49	Tillamook	47,546		47,032			514
Butte	99					99	Umatilla	90,705	\$21,216	65,308			4,181
Camas	99					99	Union	36,083		35,912			171
Canyon	148					148	Wallowa	28,294		27,951			343
Caribou	2,630		2,482			148	Wasco	65,426		61,500			3,925
Cassia	1,641		799	\$644		198	Washington	429					429
Clark	99					99	Wheeler	3,682					3,582
Clearwater	13,715		13,665			50	Yamhill	85					85
Custer	49					49							
Elmore	17,532		17,384			148	Total	813,622	21,216	716,118	\$32,680		43,528
Franklin	35,102		35,003			99	Washington						
Fremont	58,110	\$10,470	47,492			148	Adams	6,590					6,590
Gem	10,365		10,286			99	Asotin	17,098		17,037			49
Gooding	29,135		29,086			49	Benton	52,797	\$10,266	42,333			198
Idaho	247					247	Chelan	71,737		71,688			49
Jefferson	20,820		20,721			99	Chillam	49					49
Jerome	59,459		59,409			99	Clark	52,539		52,490			49
Kootenai	65,739		65,640			50	Columbia	24,807		19,465			5,342
Latah	51,005		50,947			148	Cowlitz	26,930		26,481			49
Lemhi	3,285		3,186			99	Douglas	43,237		42,990			347
Lewis	15,041		14,942			99	Ferry	13,763		13,704			49
Lincoln	26,098		26,049			49	Franklin	5,753		2,059			3,694
Madison	25,134		25,035			99	Garfield	8,838					8,838
Minidoka	49					49	Grant	43,950		43,603			347
Nev Perce	48,450		48,311			148	Gray's Harbor	16,957		16,908			49
Oneida	34,772		19,216	15,457		99	Island	49					49
Owyhee	148					148	Jefferson	22,896		22,847			49
Payette	49					49	King	42,244		42,195			49
Power	17,979		17,831			148	Kitsap	16,821		16,772			49
Shoshone	148					148	Kittitas	76,682		76,533			149
Teton	9,163		9,113			50	Klickitat	50,959		50,781			198
Twin Falls	148					148	Lewis	47,074		46,876			198
Valley	1,403		1,354			49	Lincoln	42,152		41,954			198
Washington	38,918		38,770			148	Mason	149					149
Subtotal (Irrigation)	885,743	23,572	829,297	16,101		4,940	Okanogan	102,135		101,937			198
Total	885,743	23,572	841,130	16,101		4,940	Pacific	24,563		24,513			50
Nevada							Pend Oreille	26,570		26,520			50
Churchill							Pierce	81,753		81,704			49
Clark	13,160		13,160				San Juan	6,429		6,379			50
Douglas	31,249		31,249				Shaght	56,400		56,350			50
Elko	91,486		91,486				Skamania	15,048		14,999			49
Esmeralda	3,923		3,923				Snohomish	83,867		83,817			50
Eureka							Spokane	67,626		67,428			198
Humboldt	13,377		13,377				Stevens	47,160		47,061			99
Lander	512		512				Thurston	34,459		34,410			49
Lincoln	28,154		28,154				Wahkiakum	18,690		18,630			50
Lyon	32,583		32,583				Walla Walla	55,377		55,381			1,996
Mineral	15,760		15,760				Whatcom	45,987		45,938			49
Nye	26,765		26,765				Whitman	131,023	\$14,625	105,513			10,883
Ormsby	5,286		5,286				Yakima	128,630		128,382			248
Pershing							Total	1,563,356	24,891	1,498,558			39,907
Storey	606		606				Hawaii						
Washoe							Hawaii	43,946		43,946			
White Pine	35,897		35,897				Honolulu	54,125		54,125			
Total	298,748		298,748				Kalawao ^a						
Oregon							Kauai						
Baker	64,808		64,379			429	Maua ^a	45,622		45,622			
Benton	85					85	Total	143,693		143,693			
Clackamas	171					171	Alaska ^a						
Clatsop	86					86		96,173		96,173			
Columbia	40,539		40,453			86	New Mexico						
Coos	86					86	Bernalillo	58,679	\$3,496	53,672			1,511
Crook	3,838					3,838	Catron	29,145		28,618			527
Curry	86					86	Chavez	99,361		99,828			2,533
Deschutes	28,559		24,777			3,582	Colfax	53,609		49,254			4,100
Douglas	3,478		3,135			3,478	Curry	38,090		36,253	1,727		110
Gilliam	23,825		19,986			3,839	DeBaca	23,581		22,480			1,101
Grant	26,013		22,175			3,838	Dona Ana	39,864	\$17,991	20,673			1,300
Harney	343					343	Eddy	61,074		58,062	1,074		1,938
Hood River	6,485		2,903			3,582	Grant	27,170		25,624			1,546
Jackson	817		646			171	Guadalupe	22,889		21,380			1,529
Jefferson	36,412			32,600		3,752	Harding	31,317		22,549	5,546		3,222
Josephine	37,920		37,834			86	Hidalgo	40,875		40,875			
Klamath	54,378		54,307			171	Lea	37,586		37,586			
Lake	30,584		30,155			429	Lincoln	37,472		35,380			2,092
Lane	20,083		19,912			171	Luna	4,425		4,425			
Lincoln	171					171	McKinley	10,240		5,111	2,915		2,214
							Mara	15,207		11,944	510		2,753
							Otero	50,990		49,287			1,733

¹⁷ Idaho Research: Fremont County—Benefits southern Idaho and northern Utah.
¹⁸ Oregon Research: Umatilla County—Benefits the lower rainfall areas of the Columbia Basin.

¹⁹ Washington Research: Benton County—Benefits northeastern Oregon and eastern Washington.

²⁰ Washington Research: Whitman County—Benefits the higher rainfall areas of the Columbia Basin.

^a Included in Maui.

^a Includes Kalawao.

^a Territory not divided into counties.

^a Territory served: Entire State of New Mexico, and all irrigated areas in Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and the other Western States.

^a Territory served: Entire State of New Mexico.

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
New Mexico—Con.							Utah—Continued						
Quay	\$70,766		\$76,252			\$3,514	Garfield	\$31,728		\$31,728			
Rio Arriba	75,511		54,787	\$15,839		4,885	Grand	12,751		12,751			
Roosevelt	56,046		56,046				Iron	51,230		51,230			
Sandoval	67,977		25,672	37,139		5,166	Juniper	23,222		23,222			
San Juan	51,266		51,266				Kane	21,235		21,235			
San Miguel	81,433		75,968			5,465	Millard	60,973		60,973			
Santa Fe	50,272		40,237	1,786		2,249	Morgan	15,437		15,437			
Sierra	20,378		25,863			3,515	Piute	21,072		21,072			
Socorro	58,061		52,686			5,375	Rich						
Taos	41,337		41,070	258			Salt Lake	53,538		53,538			
Torrance	35,904		35,254			650	San Juan	14,280		14,280			
Union	87,582		60,667	21,232		5,683	San Pete	50,547		50,547			
Valencia	41,228		36,305			4,923	Sevier	37,181		37,181			
Arizona							Summit	27,099		27,099			
Apache	21,945		21,945				Tooele	49,833		36,085	\$13,748		
Cochise	146,541		72,392	72,591		1,558	Utah	31,517		31,517			
Cocconino	19,369		19,369				Wasatch	82,401		82,401			
Gila							Washington	20,918		20,918			
Graham	52,118		50,161			1,957	Wayne	72,515		72,515			
Greenlee	21,043		21,043				Weber	14,379		14,379			
Maricopa	238,955	263,917	228,420			218							
Mohave	3,621		3,621				California						
Navajo	41,175		41,175				Los Angeles	1,261	\$622	639	(9)	(3)	(2)
Pima	61,551	211,084	49,867				Kern	630		311	(9)	(2)	(2)
Pinal	103,215		96,873			6,342	Imperial	630		311	(9)	(1)	(2)
Santa Cruz	16,859		14,516			2,343	Alameda	630		311	(9)	(1)	(2)
Yavapai	62,673		62,673				Idaho	4,118	1,555	2,563	(9)	(9)	(9)
Yuma	18,295		18,295				Kansas	9,461	7,375	2,076	(9)	(9)	(9)
Colorado							Montana						
Moffat	20,996		20,996				Yellowstone	8,912	777	8,165	(9)	(9)	(9)
Routt	31,841		34,831				Gallatin	15,672	778	12,894	(9)	(9)	(9)
Rio Blanco	14,167		14,167				Nebraska	10,765	9,000	1,765	(9)	(9)	(9)
Garfield	21,462		21,462				Nebraska	16,159	4,452	11,707	(9)	(9)	(9)
Mesa	110,465	219,259	101,230				Oregon						
Delta	1,829		1,829				Malheur	8,858	8,858		(9)	(1)	(9)
Montrose	76,351		76,351				Jackson	12,470		12,470	(9)	(1)	(9)
San Manuel	37,916		37,916				South Dakota						
Montezuma	60,143		60,143				Brookings	9,008	6,417	2,591	(9)	(9)	(9)
Rio Grande	31,142		31,142				Texas						
Alamosa	18,519		18,519				Travis	9,233	7,290	2,033	(9)	(1)	(9)
Costilla	8,017		8,017				Hudspeth	8,317	7,227	1,090	(9)	(1)	(9)
Lamar	90,087	211,712	78,315				Potter	7,651	6,561	1,093	(9)	(9)	(9)
Weld	122,146		91,838	30,288			Washington	4,128	1,555	2,573	(9)	(1)	(9)
Logan	42,120		42,120				Wyoming	14,183	7,708	6,675	(9)	(9)	(9)
Washington	30,191		30,191				Illinois						
Sedgewick	40,618		40,618				Adams	17,762		17,762			\$567
Kiowa	27,232		27,232				Alvander	5,829		5,831			198
Yuma	36,532		36,532				Bond	17,195		16,997			198
Cheyenne	14,713		12,839			1,874	Boone	11,906		14,708			198
Powells	52,998		50,538			2,460	Brown	13,939		13,761			198
Bent	37,676		35,391			2,285	Bureau	15,210		15,012			198
Boca	71,879		1,503	69,568		3,808	Calhoun	11,163		11,205			198
Las Animas	69,188		55,653	6,630		7,265	Carroll	11,921		14,726			198
Huerfano	30,305		27,962	2,343		2,343	Cass	11,083		13,885			198
El Paso	39,199		38,012			1,187	Champaign	60,191	41,577	18,598			18
Teller	9,149		9,149				Clinton	16,813		16,615			198
Lincoln	6,839		3,910			2,929	Clark	16,790		16,772			18
Elbert	61,644		63,311			1,230	Clay	15,779		15,761			18
Jefferson	31,905		31,905				Clinton	16,589		16,491			198
Douglas	45,177		45,177				Coles	6,421		6,393			18
Arapahoe	38,638		38,638				Cook	198					198
Chaffee	32,111		32,111				Crawford	19,102		19,083			18
Kiowa	2,636					2,636	Cumberland	10,539		10,521			18
Kremont	17,889		17,889				De Kalb	18,790		18,502			198
Gunnison	39,365	218,996	30,369				De Witt	18,686		18,588			198
Park	4,289		4,289				Douglas	16,664		16,646			18
Pueblo	10,692		57,881			2,811	Edwards	11,880		14,871			198
Custer	22,018		22,018				Edwards	14,911		14,893			18
Otero	104,737		90,983	11,762		1,992	Elmhurst	15,536		15,518			18
Boulder	62,444		62,444				Elyette	13,555		13,457			198
Adams	44,225		44,225				Ford	17,853		17,655			198
La Plata	46,377		46,377				Franklin	13,029		12,828			198
Archuleta	26,687		26,687				Fullton	10,480		10,183			198
Espey	19,877		19,877				Gallatin	15,922		15,903			18
Saguache	27,780		27,780				Greene	20,023		19,825			198
Crowley	1,172					1,172	Grundy	11,595		11,597			198
Utah							Hamilton	12,276		12,256			18
Beaver	25,943		25,943				Hancock	20,878		20,680			198
Box Elder	49,810		49,810				Hardin	9,010		8,992			18
Caine	57,290	35,177	22,113				Henderson	16,274		16,076			198
Carbon	23,004		23,004				Hennepin	25,011		24,843			198
Daguerre							Hoquiam	19,187		18,989			198
Davis							Jackson	16,115		15,917			198
Duchesne	46,804		46,804				Jasper	16,029		16,011			18
Emery	26,123		26,123										

²⁶ Territory served: All irrigated counties in State.

²⁷ Territory served: All of Arizona, New Mexico, southwest Texas, southern Utah, southern Colorado, and southeastern Colorado.

²⁸ Territory served: 4 Counties in Grand Valley of upper Colorado River Basin.

²⁹ Territory served: All irrigated counties in the United States.

³⁰ Territory served: All counties where meadows are irrigated in the Western States.

³¹ Territory served: All irrigated counties in the State and all canal lining projects in all irrigated areas in the United States.

³² Territory served: All irrigated counties in southern and central valleys of California.

³³ Territory served: All irrigated counties in the State.

³⁴ Territory served: All irrigated counties in eastern Oregon.

³⁵ Territory served: All irrigated counties in lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

³⁶ Territory served: All irrigated counties in the High Plains area of Texas.

³⁷ Territory served: All irrigated counties in eastern Washington.

³⁸ Territory served: Research: All counties where mountain meadows are irrigated.

³⁹ Operations: All irrigated counties in the State.

⁴⁰ Amount shown for Soil Conservation Research are listed opposite the counties in which the research station is located. Benefits derived from these research studies have a much wider geographic location. The respective amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research, from an application standpoint, would be distributed as follows: Champaign County, Ill., State of Illinois; Tippecanoe County, Ind., State of Indiana; Story County, Iowa, State of Iowa; Ingham County, Mich., State of Michigan; Hennepin County, Minn., region-wide; Boone County, Mo., State of Missouri; Coshocton County, Ohio, State of Ohio; Dane County, Wis., region-wide; La Crosse County, Wis., Wisconsin; Minnesota, and northeast Iowa.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Illinois—Continued							Indiana—Continued						
Jefferson	\$19,623		\$19,425			\$198	Grant	\$12,258		\$12,258			
Jerry	6,712		6,514			198	Greene	16,807		16,807			
Ju Davis	24,145		23,947			198	Hamilton	22		22			
Johnson	16,001		16,073			18	Hancock	1,123		22			\$1,101
Kane	15,633		15,475			198	Harrison	0		14,554			
Kankakee	16,304		16,106			198	Hendricks	22		22			
Kendall	10,679		10,481			198	Henry	1,123		22			1,101
Knox	13,264		13,066			198	Howard	0		0			
Lake	198					198	Huntington	646		646			
La Salle	16,956		16,758			198	Jackson	1,101					1,101
Lawrence	9,478		9,460			18	Jasper	20,531		20,527			204
Lee	14,580		14,382			198	Jay	0					
Livingson	18,455		18,257			198	Jefferson	16,730		15,229			1,101
Logan	198					198	Jennings	1,101					1,101
McDonough	22,918		22,720			198	Johnson	9,716		8,615			1,101
McHenry	19,261		19,063			198	Knox	22,392		22,392			
McLean	25,771		25,573			198	Kosciusko	0					
Macomb	14,597		14,399			198	Lafayette	646		646			
Macoupin	17,343		17,145			198	Lake	19,624		19,420			204
Madison	18,214		18,016			198	La Porte	204					204
Maun	15,918		15,720			198	Lawrence	1,101					1,101
Marshall	5,511		5,313			198	Madison	12,500		12,500			
Mason	15,494		15,296			198	Marion	22		22			
Massac	15,824		15,626			18	Marshall	203					203
Maund	15,420		15,222			198	Martin	16,608		15,507			1,101
Merced	14,967		14,769			198	Miami	0					
Monroe	8,730		8,532			198	Monroe	18,363		17,267			1,101
Montgomery	16,304		16,106			198	Montgomery	15,432		15,432			
Morgan	16,112		15,914			198	Morgan	19,898		19,698			
Moultrie	16,785		16,587			198	Newton	25,143		24,940			203
Ogle	19,460		19,262			198	Noble	20,943		20,943			
Peoria	27,924		27,726			198	Ohio	0					
Perry	12,490		12,292			198	Orange	10,906		9,805			1,101
Putnam	17,927		17,729			198	Owen	14,419		14,419			
Pike	17,156		16,958			567	Purke	0					
Pope	9,011		8,813			18	Perry	11,006		11,006			
Polaski	5,439		5,241			18	Pike	17,063		15,962			1,101
Putnam	5,510		5,312			198	Porter	203					203
Randolph	14,115		13,917			198	Posey	0					
Riedland	10,766		10,568			18	Polaski	0					
Rock Island	14,832		14,634			198	Putnam	12,326		12,326			
St. Clair	22,401		22,203			198	Randolph	22		22			
Saline	20,383		20,185			18	Ripley	17,758		16,657			1,101
Sangamon	199					199	Rush	1,123		22			1,101
Schuyler	21,971		21,773			199	St. Joseph	203					203
Scott	14,127		13,929			199	Scott	16,153		15,052			1,101
Shelby	20,808		20,610			199	Shelby	1,123		22			1,101
Stark	21,500		21,302			199	Spencer	17,213		17,213			
Stephenson	23,843		23,645			199	Starke	203					203
Tazewell	19,506		19,308			199	Steuben	9,802		9,802			
Union	10,172		9,974			199	Sullivan	16,868		16,868			
Vermillion	17,047		16,849			18	Switzerland	15,762		15,762			
Wabash	16,223		16,025			18	Tippecanoe	49,728	\$12,469	21,257			
Warren	17,044		16,846			199	Tipton	22		22			
Washington	15,296		15,098			199	Union	22		22			
Wayne	11,272		11,074			18	Vanderburgh	12,106		12,106			
White	15,999		15,801			18	Vermillion	13,639		13,639			
Windsor	19,419		19,221			199	Vico	11,489		11,489			
Will	14,705		14,507			199	Wabash	15,556		15,556			
Williamson	11,153		10,955			199	Warren	21,198		21,198			
Winnebago	20,010		19,812			199	Warwick	1,101					1,101
Woodford	17,196		16,998			199	Washington	18,559		17,458			1,101
Total	1,579,015	\$11,577	1,520,989			16,419	Wayne	8,588		8,588			
							Wells	0					
							White	0					
							Whitely	646		646			
Indiana							Total	845,405	28,469	789,783			27,153
Adams							Iowa						
Allen	22,312		22,312				Adair	22,144		22,144			
Bethlehem	1,100					1,100	Adams	14,186		14,186			
Benton	21,967		21,663			204	Allamakee	13,978		13,902			174
Blackford	0		22				Appanoose	17,257		17,252			
Boone	22						Audubon	21,260		21,260			
Brown	1,101					1,101	Benton	17,027		16,853			174
Carroll	17,002		17,002				Black Hawk	15,017		14,843			174
Cass	20,433		20,433				Boone	17,849		17,675			174
Clark	19,213		19,213				Bremer	8,317		8,163			174
Clay	7,251		7,251				Buchanan	18,808		18,694			174
Clinton	22		22				Buena Vista	37,065		37,020			20,065
Crawford	6,741		6,741			1,101	Butler	16,264		15,090			174
Daviess	20,766		20,766				Calhoun	16,097		15,923			174
De Kalb	11,997		11,997			1,101	Carroll	20,799		20,595			174
De Kalb	22		22				Cass	22,083		22,083			
Dubois	17,628		17,628			1,101	Cedar	14,318		14,144			174
Elkhart	20,243		20,243				Cerro Gordo	10,392		10,218			174
Fayette	22		22				Cherokee	204,705		14,196			190,898
Floyd	17,679		17,679				Chickasaw	8,716		8,642			174
Fountain	21,137		21,137				Clarke	15,464		15,290			174
Franklin	22		22				Clay	27,964		27,964			19,891
Fulton	19,938		19,938				Clayton	20,725		20,551			174
Gibson	14,201		13,190			1,101							

* Amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research are listed opposite the counties in which the research station is located. Benefits derived from these research studies have a much wider geographic location. The respective amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research, from an application standpoint, would be distributed as follows: Champaign County, Ill., State of Illinois; Tippecanoe County, Ind., State of Indiana; Story

County, Iowa; State of Iowa; Ingham County, Mich., State of Michigan; Hennepin County, Minn., region- and service-wide; Boone County, Mo., State of Missouri; Coshocton County, Ohio, State of Ohio; Dane County, Wis., region-wide; La Crosse County, Wis., Wisconsin; Minnesota, and northeast Iowa.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5693

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil con- serva- tion re- search	Soil con- serva- tion op- erations	Land utiliza- tion and reforma- tion of submar- ginal land	Water conser- vation and utiliza- tion projects	Flood control
Iowa—Continued						
Clinton	\$14,655		\$14,481			\$174
Crawford	22,873		22,873			
Dallas	17,159		17,285			171
Davis	16,467		16,293			171
Decatur	15,858		15,858			
Delaware	15,429		15,255			174
Des Moines	15,608		15,414			174
Dickinson	23,115		13,169			9,946
Dubuque	14,021		13,847			174
Emmet	11,580		11,412			174
Fayette	18,780		18,612			174
Floyd	15,190		15,016			174
Franklin	20,165		19,991			171
Fremont	22,033		22,033			
Greene	18,466		18,292			174
Grundy	13,025		12,851			174
Guthrie	20,028		19,854			174
Hamilton	22,835		22,661			174
Hancock	17,631		17,457			174
Hardin	18,210		18,036			171
Harrison	22,735		22,735			
Henry	19,228		19,054			171
Howard	171					174
Humboldt	21,151		20,977			171
Ia	54,061		50,877			43,181
Iowa	16,509		16,335			174
Jackson	13,240		13,066			171
Jasper	25,694		25,520			174
Jefferson	21,617		21,443			171
Johnson	18,211	\$431	17,703			174
Jones	19,025		19,451			174
Keokuk	18,999		18,825			171
Kossuth	17,001		17,127			171
Lee	18,908		18,733			175
Linn	15,363		15,188			175
Louis	15,178		15,003			175
Lucas	23,687		23,512			175
Lyon	4,101		4,101			
Madison	18,122		18,117			175
Mahaska	19,915		19,740			175
Martin	21,707		21,532			175
Marshall	13,280		13,105			175
Mills	20,856		20,856			
Mitchell	5,829		5,654			175
Monona	417,356		9,773			157,583
Monroe	16,102		15,927			175
Montgomery	23,862		23,862			
Muscatine	15,449		15,274			175
O'Brien	31,867		11,976			19,891
Osceola	14,470		4,525			9,945
Page	22,815		22,815			
Palo Alto	8,698		8,523			175
Plymouth	32,492		12,601			19,891
Pocahontas	17,310		17,135			175
Polk	15,345		15,170			175
Pottawattamie	41,368		41,368			
Poweshock	16,626		16,451			175
Ringgold	15,206		15,206			
Sac	36,393		16,327			20,066
Scott	14,271		14,095			175
Shelby	20,020		20,020			
Sioux	8,579		8,579			
Story	46,088	10,301	15,612			175
Tama	11,319		11,144			175
Taylor	26,521		26,521			
Union	15,400		15,400			
Van Buren	21,929		21,754			175
Wapello	13,548		13,373			175
Warren	16,819		16,644			175
Washington	21,428		21,303			175
Wayne	19,567		19,567			
Webster	20,274		20,099			175

³⁰ Amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research are listed opposite the counties in which the research station is located. Benefits derived from these research studies have a much wider geographic location. The respective amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research, from an application standpoint, would be distributed as follows: Champaign County, Ill., State of Illinois; Tippecanoe County, Ind., State of Indiana; Storm

County, Iowa, State of Iowa, Ingham County, Mich., State of Michigan; Hennepin County, Minn., region- and service-wide, Boone County, Mo., State of Missouri; Coshocton County, Ohio, State of Ohio, Dane County, Wis., region wide, La Crosse County, Wis., Wisconsin, Minnesota, and northeast Iowa.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reforestation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reforestation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Minnesota—Continued							Missouri—Continued						
Dakota	\$25,130		\$24,880			\$250	Cedar	0					
Dodge	18,346		18,096			250	Chariton	0					
Douglas	318		68			250	Christian	0					
Faribault	327		77			250	Clark	\$20,027	\$20,468				\$159
Fillmore	38,571		38,321			250	Clay	14,676	14,676				
Fitchburg	18,633		18,383			250	Clinton	0					
Goodhue	36,729		36,476			250	Cole	0					
Grant	2,003		68			1,935	Cooper	0					
Hennepin	36,635	\$28,128	8,257			250	Crawford	159					159
Houston	16,623		16,273			250	Dade	0					
Hubbard	318		68			250	Dallas	0					
Isanti	325		75			250	Davies	16,125	16,125				
Itasca	350		100			250	De Kalb	16,148	16,148				
Jackson	327		77			250	Dent	159					159
Kanabec	325		75			250	Douglas	0					
Kandiyohi	350		100			250	Dunklin	19,971	19,971				
Kittson	2,035		100			1,935	Franklin	17,285	17,285				159
Koochichung	100		100				Garrison	0					
Lac qui Parle	6,967		6,707			250	Gentry	23,265	23,265				
Lake	75		75				Greene	0					
Lake of the Woods	100		100				Grundy	0					
LeSueur	24,134		23,884			250	Harrison	18,608	18,608				
Lincoln	15,020		14,770			250	Henry	0					
Lyon	16,902		16,652			250	Hickory	0					
McLeod	350		100			250	Holt	0					
Mahnomen	8,583		6,648			1,935	Howard	0					
Marshall	2,035		100			1,935	Howell	0					
Martin	15,990		15,740			250	Iron	158					158
Mcker	9,572		9,322			250	Jackson	0					
Millie Lakes	325		75			250	Jasper	0					
Morrison	318		68			250	Jefferson	158					158
Mower	333		83			250	Johnson	38,413	38,413				
Murray	333		83			250	Knox	158					158
Nicollet	860		83			250	Laclede	0					
Nobles	83		83				Lafayette	10,444	10,444				
Norman	26,330		24,404			1,935	Lawrence	0					
Olustee	19,790		19,438			352	Lewis	158					158
Otter Tail	24,261		22,296			1,935	Lincoln	6,714	6,556				158
Pennington	20,672		18,137			1,935	Linn	0					
Pine	325		75			250	Livingston	0					
Pipestone	83		83				McDonald	0					
Polk	20,455		18,520			1,935	Macdon	0					
Pope	14,861		14,611			250	Madison	0					
Ramsey	325		75			250	Marion	0					
Red Lake	13,015		11,080			1,935	Marion	15,840	15,682				158
Redwood	333		83			250	Mercer	0					
Renville	350		100			250	Miller	0					
Rice	25,324		25,074			250	Mississippi	0					
Rock	16,961		16,961				Monitron	0					
Roseau	2,035		100			1,935	Monroe	158					158
St. Louis	75		75				Montgomery	158					158
Scott	10,711		10,461			250	Morgan	0					
Sherburne	15,968		15,718			250	New Madrid	0					
Sibley	350		100			250	Newton	0					
Stearns	7,018		6,768			250	Nodaway	25,170	25,170				
Steele	22,297		22,047			250	Oregon	0					
Stevens	2,003		68			1,935	Ossage	0					
Swift	7,149		6,800			250	Ozark	0					
Todd	318		68			250	Pemiscot	26,192	26,192				
Traverse	2,003		68			1,935	Perry	158					158
Wabasha	20,394		20,054			250	Pettis	0					
Wadena	318		68			250	Phelps	158					158
Waseca	23,091		22,841			250	Pike	18,165	18,007				158
Washington	19,380		19,130			250	Platte	0					
Watsonwan	333		83			250	Polk	0					
Wilkin	24,086		22,151			1,935	Pulaski	0					
Winona	26,930		26,580			350	Putnam	0					
Wright	19,619		19,369			250	Rails	10,485	10,327				158
Yellow Medicine	6,957		6,707			250	Randolph	0					
Total	829,000	28,128	752,578			48,354	Ray	16,284	16,284				
Missouri:							Reynolds	0					
Adair	159					159	Ripley	0					
Andrew	0						St. Charles	18,662	18,504				158
Atchison	0						St. Clair	0					
Audrain	159					159	St. Francois	158					158
Barry	0						St. Louis	0					
Barton	0						St. Louis city	0					
Bates	0						Ste. Genevieve	158					158
Benton	0						Saline	0					
Bollinger	0						Schuyler	158					158
Boone	64,867	27,207	30,801	\$8,706			Scotland	17,399	17,241				158
Butler	0						Scott	0					
Caldwell	0						Shannon	19,574	19,416				158
Callaway	54,696		30,018	23,778			Shelby	0					
Cass	25,676		25,617			159	Stoddard	0					
Carroll	0						Stone	0					
Carter	0						Sullivan	0					
Cass	0						Taney	0					
							Texas	0					
							Vernon	158					158
							Warren	158					158
							Washington	158					158
							Wayne	0					

⁹⁹ Amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research are listed opposite the counties in which the research station is located. Benefits derived from these research studies have a much wider geographic location. The respective amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research from an application standpoint, would be distributed as follows: Champan County, Ill., State of Illinois; Tippecanoe County, Ind., State of Indiana; Story

County, Iowa, State of Iowa; Ingham County, Mich., State of Michigan; Hennepin County, Minn., region- and service-wide; Boone County, Mo., State of Missouri; Coshocton County, Ohio, State of Ohio; Dane County, Wis., region-wide; La Crosse County, Wis., Wisconsin; Minnesota, and northeast Iowa.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5695

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Missouri—Continued							Ohio—Continued						
Webster.....	0						Wood.....	\$11,823		\$11,823			
Worth.....	\$18,724		\$18,724				Wyandot.....	19,217		19,217			
Wright.....	0						Total.....	1,513,212	\$77,776	1,396,881			\$69,553
Total.....	515,690	\$27,207	483,666	530,481		\$1,273	Wisconsin						
Ohio							Adams.....	5,341		5,572			272
Adams.....	20,255		19,874			381	Ashland.....	8,796		8,797			
Allen.....	21,511		21,511				Baton.....	22,222		21,950			272
Ashland.....	18,338		18,328				Baxter.....	9,170		9,170			
Ashland.....	13,044		13,044				Brown.....	5,899		5,899			
Athens.....	18,101		18,101				Buffalo.....	29,130		28,888			279
Auglaize.....	15,821		15,821				Burnett.....	2,692		2,692			272
Belmont.....	16,747		16,747				Calumet.....	11,111		11,211			
Brown.....	20,541		20,541				Chippewa.....	19,681		19,409			272
Butler.....	15,135		15,135				Clermont.....	21,427		21,055			
Carroll.....	20,611		20,611				Columbus.....	16,125		15,863			272
Champaign.....	20,410		20,429			381	Crawford.....	19,472		19,400			
Clermont.....	15,536		15,536				Dane.....	40,236	10,961	29,574			272
Cinton.....	15,628		15,628				Dodge.....	28,904		28,641			
Coshocton.....	17,982		17,982				Dorsey.....	10,114		10,114			
Crawford.....	22,238		22,268				Douglas.....	9,131		9,131			
Cuyahoga.....	118,129	77,776	40,353				Dunn.....	21,000		21,137			272
Darke.....	20,850		20,479			1	DuSable.....	15,753		15,481			272
Daviess.....	18,932		18,932			1,674	Eaton.....	0		0			
DeKalb.....	0		0				Franklin.....	16,818		16,818			
Delaware.....	11,800		11,800				Grant.....	0		0			
DeWitt.....	21,613		21,241			381	Green.....	28,888		28,900			272
Dodge.....	21,092		20,679			12	Green Lake.....	21,023		21,023			272
DuSable.....	10,875		10,474			382	Iowa.....	11,134		11,134			
Dunklin.....	21,271		22,889				Iowa.....	22,649		22,649			271
Durham.....	11,477		11,477				Iron.....	0		0			
Ellsworth.....	19,488		19,488				Jackson.....	18,047		17,776			271
Franklin.....	17,491		17,491			1,280	Jefferson.....	19,968		19,697			271
Greene.....	16,616		16,616				Juniata.....	18,977		18,906			271
Greene.....	17,888		17,888				Kennett.....	1,181		1,181			271
Hamilton.....	10,228		10,228				Keweenaw.....	9,389		9,389			
Hancock.....	21,988		21,988				La Crosse.....	59,187	14,714	11,672			271
Harrison.....	25,462		25,080			382	Lafayette.....	16,631		16,631			271
Harrison.....	15,709		15,709				Lambert.....	12,846		12,846			271
Henry.....	0		0				Lincoln.....	16,128		15,857			271
Highland.....	20,246		19,864			382	Madison.....	10,573		10,573			271
Hocking.....	18,091		17,619				Madison.....	20,671		20,400			271
Holmes.....	17,496		17,496				Manitowish.....	0		0			
Huron.....	18,380		18,380				Manitowish.....	14,722		14,722			
Jackson.....	16,897		16,897			382	Marquette.....	680		680			196
Jefferson.....	14,596		14,596				Monroe.....	24,646		24,375			271
Jones.....	19,379		19,379				Monroe.....	11,610		11,610			
Knox.....	9,263		9,263				Monroe.....	271		271			271
Lawrence.....	15,242		15,242				Monroe.....	9,766		9,766			
Licking.....	24,301		24,301				Ozaukee.....	484		484			271
Logan.....	15,537		15,537			382	Polk.....	17,570		17,570			271
Lorain.....	17,243		17,243				Portage.....	19,453		19,082			271
Lucas.....	0		0				Portage.....	11,610		11,339			271
Madison.....	10,347		18,965			382	Portage.....	11,577		11,286			271
Mahoning.....	4,301		4,301				Price.....	12,038		11,767			271
Manion.....	18,021		17,642			382	Price.....	484		484			
Medina.....	19,201		19,201				Richland.....	20,480		20,218			271
Meigs.....	17,434		17,434				Rock.....	15,869		15,598			271
Meigs.....	16,835		16,835				Rock.....	11,982		11,711			271
Miami.....	16,641		16,641				St. Croix.....	21,691		21,420			271
Monroe.....	17,076		17,076				St. Croix.....	23,692		23,692			271
Montgomery.....	11,991		11,991				St. Croix.....	2,467		2,467			271
Morgan.....	18,092		18,092				St. Croix.....	17,064		17,064			
Morrow.....	23,869		23,869			382	St. Croix.....	5,653		5,653			
Muskingum.....	25,812		25,812				St. Croix.....	15,127		14,856			271
Noble.....	16,387		16,387				St. Croix.....	21,528		21,257			271
Ottawa.....	0		0				St. Croix.....	22,121		21,850			271
Paulding.....	12,304		12,304				St. Croix.....	271		271			271
Perry.....	18,405		18,405				St. Croix.....	11,396		11,125			271
Pickaway.....	20,200		19,908			382	St. Croix.....	8,882		8,611			271
Pike.....	16,930		16,930				St. Croix.....	9,742		9,742			
Portage.....	30,225		14,969			15,286	St. Croix.....	10,132		9,861			271
Preble.....	10,662		10,662				St. Croix.....	22,373		22,373			
Putnam.....	0		0				St. Croix.....	10,785		10,785			
Richland.....	11,600		11,600				St. Croix.....	12,285		12,285			
Ross.....	15,668		15,286			382	St. Croix.....	21,400		21,119			271
Sandusky.....	16,202		16,202				Total.....	1,038,708	54,803	971,500			12,405
Scioto.....	19,963		19,581			382	Grand total,						
Seneca.....	18,956		18,956				Region III.....	9,982,267	299,318	8,512,157	\$39,801		1,106,991
Shelby.....	19,461		19,461				Alabama						
Stark.....	8,737		8,737				Autauga.....	15,103		15,103			
Summit.....	20,271		14,985			15,286	Baldwin.....	20,558		20,558			
Trumbull.....	10,367		10,367				Barbour.....	12,851		12,727			124
Tuscarawas.....	21,367		21,367				Bibb.....	12,148		12,148			
Tuscarawas.....	18,117		17,735			382	Blount.....	22,752		22,752			
Van Wert.....	0		0				Bullock.....	10,222		10,182			40
Vinton.....	15,845		15,463			382	Butler.....	18,368		18,368			
Warren.....	18,057		18,057				Calhoun.....	14,472		14,472			
Washington.....	17,184		17,184				Chambers.....	15,306		15,306			125
Wayne.....	21,124		21,124										
Wilbur.....	17,476		17,476										

¹⁰ Amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research are listed opposite the counties in which the research station is located. Benefits derived from these research studies have a much wider geographic location. The respective amounts shown for Soil Conservation Research, from an application standpoint, would be distributed as follows: Champaign County, Ill., State of Illinois; Tippecanoe County, Ind., State of Indiana; Story

County, Iowa; State of Iowa; Ingham County, Mich., State of Michigan; Hennepin County, Minn., region- and service-wide; Boone County, Mo., State of Missouri; Coshocton County, Ohio, State of Ohio; Dane County, Wis., region-wide; La Crosse County, Wis., Wisconsin; Minnesota, and northeast Iowa

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Alabama—Continued							Florida—Continued						
Cherokee	\$14,379		\$14,379				Marion	\$18,422		\$18,422			
Chilton	12,869		12,869				Nassau	3,672		3,672			
Choctaw	16,551		16,551				Okaloosa	23,111		23,111			
Clarke	16,638		16,638				Orange	11,920		11,920			
Clay	17,350		17,350				Pasco	20,100		16,960	\$3,140		
Cleburne	14,286		14,286				Pinellas	20,469		20,469			
Coffee	14,750		14,750				Polk	19,416		19,416			
Colbert	14,636		14,636				Putnam	10,259		10,259			
Conceh	17,136		17,136				Santa Rosa	21,819		21,819			
Coosa	14,699		14,699				Sarasota	14,503		14,503			
Covington	23,296		23,296				Seminole	24,676		24,676			
Crenshaw	15,120		15,120				Sumter	32,594		18,302	14,292		
Cullman	25,811		25,811				Dade ^a	12,508	\$12,508				
Dale	14,750		14,750				Palm Beach ^a	12,280	12,280				
Dallas	29,443		29,443				Suwannee	19,458		19,458			
DeKalb	22,301		22,301				Union	11,671		11,671			
Elmore	18,752		18,752				Volusia	17,148		17,148			
Escambia	25,201		25,201				Wakulla	120		120			
Etowah	14,379		14,379				Walton	22,393		22,393			
Fayette	17,486		17,486				Washington	22,106		22,106			
Franklin	13,173		13,173				Georgia						
Geneva	12,617		12,617				Appling	14,905		14,905			
Greene	17,026		17,026				Atkinson	8,084		8,084			
Hale	15,664		15,664				Bacon	7,245		7,245			
Henry	15,012		14,843			\$169	Baker	8,287		8,160			\$127
Houston	19,313		10,110			203	Baldwin	9,301		8,453			848
Jackson	14,636		14,636				Banks	12,712		12,437			275
Jefferson	15,854		15,854				Barrow	12,977		12,129			848
Lamar	15,612		15,612				Bartow	12,354		12,208			146
Lauderdale	20,595		20,595				Ben Hill	9,114		8,690			515
Lawrence	23,563		23,563				Berrien	7,245		7,245			
Lee	40,801	\$26,500	13,915			129	Bibb	8,083		7,245			848
Limestone	15,132		15,132				Bleckley	13,005		12,157			848
Lowndes	12,558		12,558				Brantley	6,034		6,034			
Macon	36,615		14,679	\$21,926		10	Brooks	12,269		12,269			
Madison	21,902		21,902				Bryan	1,151		1,151			696
Marengo	28,094		28,094				Burke	14,810		13,902			848
Marion	10,359		19,359				Burke	13,687		13,508			179
Marshall	25,856		25,856				Butts	8,180		7,332			848
Mobile	18,381		18,381				Calhoun	8,761		8,634			127
Monroe	12,850		12,850				Candler	9,108		8,260			848
Montgomery	12,082		12,082				Carroll	20,528		20,528			
Morgan	20,502		20,502				Charlton	7,742		7,742			
Peru	19,070		19,070				Chatham	8,616		8,539			77
Pickens	14,051		14,051				Chattoahoochee	127					127
Pike	16,698		16,698				Chattooga	9,091		9,050			41
Randolph	17,382		17,382			32	Cherokee	41,142		9,569			31,573
Russell	14,813		14,813			219	Clarke	8,795		7,084			811
St. Clair	13,451		13,451				Clay	9,325		9,198			127
Shelby	13,486		13,486				Clayton	9,033		8,948			85
Sumter	16,540		16,540				Clinch	7,556		7,556			
Talladega	21,801		21,801				Cobb	100,099		14,388			85,711
Tallapoosa	15,744		15,744				Coffee	13,352		13,352			
Tuscaloosa	10,616		10,616				Colquitt	18,645		18,645			
Walker	13,427		13,427				Columbia	13,503		13,228			275
Washington	14,084		14,084				Cook	8,488		8,488			
Wilcox	14,763		14,763				Coweta	16,257		16,130			127
Winston	13,531		13,531				Crawford	9,095		8,592			503
Florida							Crisp	7,908		7,825			83
Alachua	28,829		28,829				Dade	7,050		7,050			
Bay	3,445		3,445				Dawson	8,330		8,182			138
Bredford	3,541		3,541				DeCATUR	9,593		9,498			105
Brevard	21,224		21,224				DeKalb	17,626		16,975			651
Calhoun	8,448		8,195			2	Dodge	12,416		11,698			848
Charlotte	6,663		6,663				Dooly	13,240		11,115			95
Citrus	18,386			18,386			Dougherty	8,571		8,444			127
Clay	13,901		13,901				Douglas	8,632		8,505			127
Columbia	23,074		23,074				Early	15,118		14,991			127
De Soto	20,083		20,083				Echols	3,002		3,002			
Dixie	8,187		8,187				Effingham	7,862		7,670			212
Escambia	20,814		20,814				Elbert	11,673		13,358			275
Franklin	24					24	Emanuel	10,572		18,724			848
Gadsden	21,518		21,463			55	Evans	8,846		7,998			848
Gilchrist	15,418		15,418				Fannin	23					24
Glades	17,286		17,286				Fayette	11,418		11,291			127
Gulf	15,875		15,875			88	Floyd	21,241		21,152			89
Hamilton	13,929		13,929				Forsyth	21,714		17,596			6,118
Hendee	23,793		23,793				Franklin	18,085		17,810			275
Hendry	20,841		20,841				Fulton	20,520		20,501			139
Hernando	33,123		16,387	16,736			Gilmer	15,314		15,207			137
HIGHLAND	20,132		20,132				Glascok	9,970		9,129			801
Hillborough	23,743		23,743				Glynn	6,148		6,148			
Holmes	15,503		15,503				Gordon	13,195		13,049			146
Indian River	7,946		7,946				Grady	15,181		16,397			114
Jackson	38,398		38,095			253	Greene	30,514		10,159	10,704		684
Jefferson	21,691		21,691				Grinnell	10,843		15,134			105
Lake	8,294		8,294				Habersham	15,298		15,134			86
Lake	21,644		21,644				Hall	22,257		22,171			848
Lee	32,466		32,466				Hancock	16,402		15,554			
Leon	26,512		26,512				Harris	12,024		12,024			
Levy	18,422		18,422				Hart	14,825		14,698			127
Liberty	83					83	Hart	13,653		13,358			275
Madison	17,970		17,970				Heard	11,568		11,438			127
Manatee	21,872		21,872				Henry	11,639		10,227			812

^a Auburn, Ala. Specifically: The upper and lower Coastal Plains of Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and the northern part of Florida. Broadly: This project affects the "civic" program in the entire southeastern region and in the humid portion of the western Gulf region. For example, results of studies at Auburn with rearing winter

legumes are being used on farms in all States in the Southeast and in parts of Louisiana and Texas.

^b Serves Marl and Rockland areas of southern Florida.

^c Serves Everglades region of southern Florida.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5697

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Georgia—Continued							Kentucky—Continued						
Houston	\$10,148		\$9,316			\$832	Bourbon	\$881					\$981
Irwin	8,308		8,308				Boyd	13,366		\$14,366			
Jackson	16,026		15,200			826	Bovle	10,037		9,085			352
Jasper	22,698		10,092	\$11,758		818	Bracken	11,441		11,050			382
Jeff Davis	7,070		7,070				Breathitt	8,678		7,828			850
Jefferson	14,152		13,415			737	Breckinridge	15,106		15,106			
Jenkins	14,046		13,228			818	Bullitt	8,771		8,771			
Johnson	13,564		12,716			848	Butler	16,919		16,919			20
Jones	20,181		13,669	5,724		848	Caldwell	14,502		14,502			
Lamar	19,376		12,757			619	Callaway	5,808		5,492			406
Lane	7,970		7,970			849	Carlisle	14,955		14,955			
Laurens	19,573		18,724			849	Carroll	15,235		14,795			440
Law	7,174		7,047			127	Carter	6,893		6,893			
Liberty	72,672	\$51,836	20,836				Cassey	10,574		10,574			
Lincoln	7,952		7,677			275	Christian	12,693		12,693			
Loup	7,521		6,833			688	Clark	9,025		8,136			889
Lowndes	11,903		11,903				Clay	9,134		8,343			790
Lumpkin	8,941		8,798			144	Clinton	8,101		8,101			
McDuffie	9,591		9,316			275	Crittenden	7,100		7,100			
McIntosh	9,536		9,336				Cumberland	11,156		11,156			
Macon	13,063		12,938			125	Davess	11,129		11,129			
Madison	12,548		12,284			265	Edmonson	20					20
Marion	8,407		8,280			127	Filho	6,389		6,389			
Meriwether	13,028		13,801			127	Estill	15,661		14,814			850
Miller	8,951		8,824			127	Fayette	25,419		25,419			850
Mitchell	9,412		9,298			114	Fleming	19,093		19,012			81
Monroe	8,164		7,332			832	Floyd	2,260		2,262			8
Montgomery	13,705		12,856			849	Franklin	8,855		8,005			850
Morgan	17,105		15,892	364		849	Fulton	8,460		8,460			
Murray	16,160		16,023			146	Garrard	14,280		13,430			850
Muscogee	8,201		8,074			127	Gallatin	8,406		8,406			
Newton	11,883		11,041			849	Grant	16,089		15,803			886
Oconee	53,125	\$43,888	8,137			849	Graves	16,164		16,164			
Oglethorpe	15,705		12,129	3,411		212	Grayson	11,517		11,497			20
Paulding	21,813		17,363			4,450	Green	12,568		12,548			20
Perch	13,050		12,214			836	Greene	6,389		6,389			
Pickens	27,176		18,322			8,854	Hancock	8,479		8,479			
Pierce	14,005		14,005			127	Hardin	22,660		22,660			
Pike	8,485		8,358			127	Harrison	13,780		12,599			981
Polk	12,064		11,996			849	Hart	14,674		14,051			20
Pulaski	13,787		12,938			849	Henry	11,101		10,536			568
Putnam	23,690		8,707	14,144		849	Hickman	19,185		19,185			
Quitman	3,495		3,338			127	Hopkins	29,147		29,147			
Rabun	2,252					275	Jack-son	8,434		8,434			357
Randolph	7,545		7,418			127	Jefferson	9,990		9,990			
Richmond	9,032		8,757			275	Jessamine	9,214		8,394			850
Rockdale	5,962		5,113			849	Johnson	6,975		6,975			
Schley	8,584		8,457			127	Kenton	11,000		11,096			804
Scriven	14,522		11,357			165	Knox	16,129		15,516			613
Seminole	11,980		11,862			127	Laine	12,123		12,123			
Spaulding	18,558		18,470			82	Laurel	11,580		11,580			
Stephens	8,873		8,598			275	Lawrence	10,423		10,423			
Stewart	7,471		7,344			127	Lee	8,413		7,562			851
Sumter	8,213		8,086			127	Leslie	851					851
Talbot	8,546		8,419			127	Letcher	672					672
Talulero	12,114		11,919			195	Lewis	6,764		6,710			54
Tattall	14,157		13,308			849	Lincoln	12,737		12,268			469
Taylor	13,790		13,663			127	Livingston	2,266		2,266			
Telfair	14,720		13,871			849	Logan	22,192		22,192			
Terrell	15,260		15,133			127	Lyon	7,553		7,553			
Thomas	8,115		8,115				McCracken	17,977		17,977			
Tift	21,723	\$5,937	11,786				McCreary	6,566		6,566			20
Toombs	8,954		8,105			849	McLean	14,752		14,752			850
Trenton	8,814		7,065			127	Madison	13,634		12,784			913
Trout	15,860		15,733			127	Magee	8,461		8,461			
Turner	12,462		12,462			849	Marion	17,065		17,065			
Twigs	9,093		8,244			127	Marshall	13,143		13,143			
Upson	12,591		12,464			24	Mason	9,543		8,947			596
Walker	13,387		13,361			849	Meade	9,381		9,381			
Walton	12,556		11,707				Menifee	8,760		7,829			931
Ware	14,005		14,005			772	Mercer	6,998		6,715			273
Warren	13,148		12,576			849	Metcalfe	6,658		6,650			8
Washington	13,146		12,297			571	Monroe	8,784		8,784			
Wayne	12,412		11,841			127	Montgomery	11,170		10,314			856
Webster	8,286		8,159			849	Morgan	11,461		10,592			869
Wecker	9,093		8,244			127	Muhlenberg	7,651		7,631			20
White	16,228		16,101			125	Nelson	15,810		15,810			
Whitfield	36,127		15,059	20,043		643	Nicholas	12,413		11,432			981
Wilcox	14,099		13,456			275	Ohio	10,725		10,705			20
Wilkes	12,711		12,436			849	Oldham	8,650		8,650			
Wilkinson	8,954		8,105			67	Owen	13,403		12,553			850
Worth	8,665		8,508				Owsley	9,428		8,677			851
Kentucky:							Pendleton	16,709		15,803			906
Adair	7,780		7,780				Perry	8,651					851
Allen	6,997		6,677			20	Powell	8,804		7,953			851
Anderson	9,004		9,380			224	Pulaski	11,683		11,683			
Ballard	7,553		7,553				Robertson	15,271		14,290			981
Barren	17,964		17,944			20	Rockcastle	8,784		8,784			
Bath	14,898		13,917			981	Rowan	14,461		13,532			929
Boone	11,672		11,544			28							

* Fleming, Ga. Specifically: The Bladen soil belt of Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida. Broadly: This project will get useful information for all Coastal Plains areas where drainage problems occur.

* Watkinsville, Ga. Specifically: The middle and lower Piedmont areas of Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina. Broadly: The Southeast and the humid portions of the western Gulf States. For example, soil and water losses measured on runoff plots at Watkinsville have been widely used by operations personnel in all States of the Southeast and in humid areas of the western Gulf region.

* Tifton, Ga. Specifically: The middle and lower Coastal Plains of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina and northern Florida. Broadly: The Coastal Plains areas of the Southeast and the western Gulf region. For example, runoff plots at Tifton will give us the first measured soil and water losses we have had in the Coastal Plains. This information will be widely useful on sandy soils.

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Kentucky—Continued							Mississippi—Continued						
Russell.....	\$6,822		\$6,822				Warren.....	\$13,673		\$13,673			
Scott.....	16,864		16,013			\$851	Washington.....	17,043		17,043			
Shelby.....	14,010		14,010				Wayne.....	15,698		15,698			
Simpson.....	8,322		8,322				Webster.....	18,911		18,042			\$869
Spencer.....	9,381		9,381				Wilkinson.....	3,580		3,580			
Taylor.....	14,827		14,807			20	Winston.....	38,748		16,383	\$22,365		
Todd.....	9,415		9,415				Yalobusha.....	118,816		14,204	62,367		52,245
Trigg.....	5,287		5,287				Yazoo.....	13,618		13,618			
Trimble.....	6,052		6,052				North Carolina						
Union.....	9,645		9,645				Alamance.....	17,318		17,318			
Warren.....	24,461		24,461			20	Alexander.....	14,491		14,491			
Washington.....	6,400		6,400				Alleghany.....	14,498		14,498			
Wayne.....	8,102		8,102				Anson.....	30,449		30,439			10
Webster.....	14,520		14,520				Ashe.....	11,981		11,981			
Whitley.....	1,706		1,706				Avoye.....	2,396		2,396			
Wolfe.....	9,463		8,658			\$35	Beaufort.....	29,564		29,564			
Woodford.....	8,987		8,136			851	Bertie.....	21,462		21,425			137
Mississippi							Bladen.....	15,430		15,380			
Adams.....	18,068		18,068				Brunswick.....	9,849		9,849			
Alcorn.....	14,895		14,895				Burke.....	14,863		14,863			
Amite.....	15,597		15,597				Cabarrus.....	14,963		14,947			10
Attala.....	16,868		16,868				Caldwell.....	13,655		13,655			
Benton.....	68,453		20,030			48,423	Camden.....	12,225		12,203			22
Bolivar.....	20,392		20,392				Carleton.....	7,371		7,371			
Calhoun.....	61,942		15,742			46,200	Casswell.....	38,527		15,380	22,970		177
Carroll.....	79,165		11,525			64,640	Catawba.....	19,414		19,414			
Chickasaw.....	81,515		15,081	\$37,304		29,130	Chatham.....	14,604		14,604			
Choctaw.....	27,984		18,882	9,102			Chowan.....	12,835		12,913			22
Chaliborne.....	17,777		13,777				Clay.....	15					15
Clarke.....	16,463		16,463				Cleveland.....	15,757		15,757			
Clay.....	18,042		18,042				Columbus.....	33,043		33,043			
Columbia.....	19,330		19,330				Craven.....	15,145		15,145			
Copiah.....	14,700		14,700				Cumberland.....	15,145		15,145			
Covington.....	15,410		15,410				Currituck.....	7,130		7,108			22
De Soto.....	30,277		12,660			17,611	Davidson.....	17,015		16,999			16
Forrest.....	15,730		15,730				Davie.....	13,566		13,550			16
Franklin.....	13,040		13,040				Duplin.....	13,833		13,833			
George.....	16,218		16,218				Durham.....	13,461		13,461			
Greene.....	15,365		15,365			1,118	Edgecombe.....	14,267		14,267			
Grenada.....	15,640		14,222				Forsyth.....	18,751		18,683			58
Hancock.....	15,121		15,121				Franklin.....	14,305		14,305			
Harrison.....	14,877		14,877				Gaston.....	15,135		15,135			
Hinds.....	30,350		30,350				Gates.....	10,447		10,425			22
Holmes.....	69,359		16,188			43,161	Grainville.....	16,649		16,580			63
Humphreys.....	12,014		12,014				Greene.....	13,207		13,207			
Issaquena.....	1,230		1,230				Guilford.....	10,903		10,903			
Ithawamba.....	15,919		15,919				Hallix.....	20,194		20,111			83
Jackson.....	12,926		12,926				Hannett.....	13,328		13,328			
Jasper.....	15,410		15,410				Henderson.....	8,918		8,918			
Jefferson.....	13,880		13,880				Hertford.....	12,343		12,321			22
Jefferson Davis.....	17,087		17,087				Hoke.....	14,742		14,742			
Jones.....	16,943		16,943				Hyde.....	8,118		8,118			
Kemper.....	17,052		17,052				Iredell.....	21,036		21,023			13
Lainayette.....	140,711		14,407			126,304	Jackson.....	42					42
Lamar.....	14,916		14,916				Johnston.....	17,326		17,326			
Lauderdale.....	17,052		1,052				Jones.....	11,814		11,814			
Lawrence.....	14,727		14,727				Lee.....	20,259		20,259			
Leake.....	17,306		17,306				Lenoir.....	11,410		11,410			
Lee.....	14,988		14,988				Lincoln.....	17,104		17,104			
Leflore.....	21,084		21,084				Melbourn.....	16,535		16,535			
Lincoln.....	17,642		1,642				Mason.....	5,013		5,013			27
Lowndes.....	22,867		22,867				Martin.....	14,685		14,510			145
Madison.....	18,009		18,009				Mecklenburg.....	20,525		20,525			
Marion.....	16,238		16,238				Montgomery.....	14,434		14,419			15
Marshall.....	87,380		17,570			69,810	Moore.....	16,994		15,994			
Monroe.....	10,280		10,280				Nash.....	15,653		15,653			
Montgomery.....	62,576		15,362			47,214	New Hanover.....	7,308		7,308			
Neshoba.....	17,498		17,498				Northampton.....	13,234		13,150			84
Newton.....	21,064		21,064				Oswald.....	9,592		9,592			
Noxubee.....	22,402		22,402				Orange.....	14,394		14,394			
Oktibbeha.....	32,002	\$15,124	16,783	95			Pamlico.....	9,794		9,794			
Panola.....	55,378		26,418			28,960	Perquimans.....	17,556		17,534			22
Pearl River.....	14,162		14,162				Pender.....	13,900		13,900			
Perry.....	15,974		15,974				Perquimans.....	11,514		11,492			22
Pike.....	17,301		17,301				Person.....	12,893		12,795			98
Pontotoc.....	54,756		16,199	722		37,835	Pitt.....	18,902		18,902			
Prentiss.....	15,548		15,548				Polk.....	15,342		15,342			
Quitman.....	16,598		16,598				Randolph.....	14,605		14,605			
Rankin.....	16,867		16,867				Richmond.....	14,042		14,042			
Scott.....	18,800		18,800				Robeson.....	21,473		21,473			
Sharkey.....	2,899		2,899				Rockingham.....	14,753		14,604			149
Simpson.....	17,195		17,195				Rowan.....	15,619		15,603			16
Smith.....	15,793		15,793				Rutherford.....	19,790		19,790			
Stone.....	15,730		15,730				Sampson.....	11,410		11,410			
Sunflower.....	10,063		10,063				Scotland.....	15,953		15,953			
Tallahatchie.....	73,150		24,427			48,723	Stanly.....	15,556		15,540			16
Tate.....	60,894		12,757			48,137	Stokes.....	20,200		20,033			167
Tippah.....	78,590		17,658			60,932	Surry.....	31,498		31,392			16
Tishomingo.....	465		465				Sylvania.....	59					59
Tunica.....	14,515		14,515				Tyrell.....	8,360		8,360			
Union.....	116,242		18,185			98,057	Union.....	19,805		19,790			13
Walthall.....	17,276		17,276				Vance.....	23,219					102

* State College, Miss. Specifically Black Belt areas in Mississippi and Alabama. Broadly Blackland areas in Texas. For example, soil and water losses under soil

rotations on runoff plots are giving information that will be widely used on farms in Blackland area.

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reclamation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and reclamation of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
North Carolina—Con.							Tennessee—Continued						
Wake	\$53,616	\$28,426	\$25,190				Weakley	\$23,583		\$23,583			
Warren	13,961		13,801			473	White	19,005		19,005			
Washington	14,305		14,176			29	Wilkinson	2,211		2,211			
Watauga	13,300		13,300				Wilson	17,132		17,132			
Wayne	10,611		10,611				Virginia						
Wilkes	13,795		13,779			16	Acequia	6,480		6,480			
Wilson	13,328		13,328				Albemarle	12,066		12,066			
Yadkin	13,395		13,779				Alleghany	11,457		11,457			
South Carolina							Amelia	14,558		14,558			
Abbeville	16,037		15,639			398	Amherst	8,824		8,824			
Aiken	35,308		34,972			236	Appomattox	10,913		10,844			\$80
Allendale	11,284		11,041			251	Augusta	80,363		22,300			64,063
Anderson	28,125		28,065			360	Bedford	12,614		12,413			201
Bamberg	23,705		23,705				Boletont	24,055		21,027			28
Barnwell	16,619		16,429			190	Brunswick	13,978		13,904			64
Beaufort	8,151		8,131			21	Buckingham	8,611		8,611			
Berkley	12,515		12,515				Campbell	16,743		16,585			188
Calhoun	18,985		18,985				Caroline	7,927		7,927			
Charleston	20,121		20,121				Carroll	14,251		14,247			4
Cherokee	18,382		18,782				Charles City	5,443		5,443			
Chester	17,411		17,411				Charlotte	14,136		13,914			222
Chesterfield	19,100		19,100				Chesterfield	16,595		16,595			
Columbia	13,247		13,247				Craig	6,801		6,801			
Colleton	35,057		35,057				Culpeper	7,262		7,262			
Darlington	39,114		39,114				Cumberland	15,522		15,522			
Dillon	15,578		15,578				Dumfries	16,737		16,696			41
Dorchester	16,640		16,640				Elizabeth City	2,483		2,483			
Edgefield	16,949		16,559			390	Facey	10,410		10,410			16
Fairfield	18,228		18,228				Floyd	15,057		15,041			
Flournoy	21,792		21,792				Fluvanna	5,474		5,474			
Georgetown	11,673		11,673				Franklin	16,085		15,853			232
Greenville	28,306		28,306				Fredrick	7,914		7,914			
Greenwood	17,852		17,631			219	Giles	7,094		7,094			
Hampton	27,423		27,297			126	Gilchrist	12,892		12,892			
Horry	21,617		21,617				Gloucester	5,809		5,809			
Jasper	6,322		6,345			165	Goehland	14,191		14,191			
Kershaw	17,727		17,727				Greene	4,804		4,804			
Lancaster	18,228		18,228				Greenville	8,538		8,491			47
Laurens	21,692		21,692				Habitat	11,286		11,055			231
Lee	20,815		20,815				Hanover	8,117		8,117			
Lexington	18,991		18,991				Henrico	8,013		8,013			
McCormick	10,036		9,777			179	Horry	5,689		5,689			231
Marion	28,530		28,530				Isle of Wight	1,409		1,409			
Marlboro	17,613		17,613				James City	13,965		13,965			
Mecklenburg	26,404		26,404				King and Queen	2,483		2,483			
Monroe	49,602	\$24,626	24,575	\$2		479	King George	3,820		3,820			
Murphy	31,216		31,216				King William	6,033		6,033			
Pickens	16,621		16,315			306	Lancaster	3,820		3,820			
Richland	19,221		19,221				Lancaster	4,298		4,298			
Saluda	19,331		19,331			30	Landon	16,214		16,214			
Spartanburg	43,911		43,911				Landon	13,853		13,853			
Sumter	19,680		19,680				Landon	12,807		12,807			47
Union	16,666		16,666				Landon	14,729		14,729			
Williamsburg	53,790		53,790				Landon	4,801		4,801			
York	24,670		24,670				Mecklenburg	15,672		15,672			198
Tennessee							Montgomery	15,117	\$28,814	15,117			100
Cannon	17,869		17,869				Nashville	8,105		8,105			26
Carroll	5,571		5,571				Nelson	12,177		12,177			
Cheatham	11,795		11,795				New Kent	5,411		5,411			
Chickasaw	11,666		11,666				Norfolk	21,014		21,014			27
Clay	21,934		21,934				Northampton	6,480		6,480			
Cokeville	17,225		17,225				Northumberland	4,298		4,298			
Columbia	14,148		14,148				Nottingham	12,621		12,621			
Craig	28,598		28,598				Orange	18,431		18,431			
Craig	2,221		2,221				Pape	12,807		12,807			218
Gibson	21,270		21,270				Patrick	14,679		14,679			231
Hamilton	7,217		7,217				Putnam	7,911		7,911			
Harden	31,561		31,561				Prince Edward	13,439		13,439			
Haywood	19,435		19,435				Prince George	11,936		11,912			21
Jackson	14,189		14,189				Princess Anne	8,749		8,749			35
Knox	1,973		1,973				Prince William	15,388		15,388			
Lauderdale	17,492		17,492				Putnam	17,931		17,931			
Madison	11,301		11,301			11	Rappahannock	7,262		7,262			
Madison	41,474		41,474				Richmond	9,550		9,550			
Marion	3,947		3,947				Roanoke	18,081		17,873			208
Montgomery	22,258		22,258				Rockbridge	15,096		15,096			
Meigs	7,154		7,154				Rockingham	22,052		19,295			9,657
Obion	22,896		22,896				Shenandoah	15,443		15,443			
Oxford	13,921		13,921				Southampton	20,463		20,463			48
Pickett	11,667		11,667				Spotylvania	7,709		7,709			
Putnam	24,333		24,333				Stafford	6,402		6,402			
Robertson	22,127		22,127				Sumner	7,419		7,419			29
Rutherford	24,225		24,225				Sumner	7,419		7,419			47
Shelby	27,070		27,070				Swain	2,483		2,483			
Smith	22,389		22,389				Swain	9,550		9,550			
Sumner	24,614		24,614				Westmoreland	15,417		15,417			
Tipton	22,073		22,073				Wythe	2,483		2,483			
Trousdale	13,355		13,355				York						
Van Buren	8,053		8,053										
Watauga	18,261		18,261										
Grand total							Grand total						

* Raleigh, N. C. Specifically: The flue-cured Tobacco Belt of Piedmont North Carolina and Virginia. Broadly: The results at Raleigh will apply in areas of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, and Maryland where flue-cured tobacco is grown on sloping land of the Coastal Plain. For example, row arrangement methods worked out at Raleigh are useful on all sloping land where flue-cured tobacco is grown. Also, the allotment at Raleigh covers drainage work in the Coastal Plain. Results of the drainage work are of greatest value in North Carolina and Virginia Coastal Plains areas. These are broadly useful in all Coastal Plain areas in the Southeast and in parts of the Northeast where drainage problems occur.

* Clemson, S. C. Specifically: The Piedmont areas of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. Broadly: The entire region and parts of the western Gulf and the Northeast. For example, tillage studies at Clemson gave information that can be widely used in areas where sloping land is used for row crops.

* Blacksburg, Va. Specifically: The mountain and valley areas of Virginia and North Carolina. Broadly: The Southeastern, parts of the Northeastern, and humid portions of the western Gulf regions. For example, a special method of plowing and managing a green sod of perennial grass and clover developed at Blacksburg will be useful wherever sod is used in crop rotations.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil con- servation research	Soil con- servation operations	Land utiliza- tion and reforma- tion of submar- ginal land	Water conser- vation and utiliza- tion projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil con- servation research	Soil con- servation operations	Land utiliza- tion and reforma- tion of submar- ginal land	Water conser- vation and utiliza- tion projects	Flood control
Connecticut							New Hampshire—Con.						
Fairfield	\$29,205		\$29,205				Coos	\$22,490		\$22,490			
Hartford	19,890		19,890				Grafton	21,025		21,025			
Middlesex	20,436		20,436				Hillsborough	22,015		22,015			
New Haven	27,804		27,804				Merrimack	22,276		22,276			
New London	21,242		21,242				Rockingham	22,157		22,157			
Tolland	19,341		19,341				Sullivan	19,104		19,104			
Windham	20,099		20,099				Stratford	17,121		17,121			
Total	158,116		158,116				Total	201,978		201,978			
Delaware							New Jersey						
Kent	26,042		25,303			\$740	Atlantic	11,805		11,618			\$187
New Castle	27,545		26,795			740	Burlington	16,594		16,407			187
Sussex	49,902		45,769	\$3,946		187	Bergen	10,703		10,703			
Total	103,489		97,858	3,946		1,685	Camden	16,083		15,896			187
Maine							Cape May	9,413		9,226			187
Androscoggin	13,017		13,017				Cumberland	17,403		16,713			790
Aroostook	110,198	\$4,175	106,313				Essex	3,618		3,618			
Cumberland	19,251		19,254				Gloucester	27,088		26,318			750
Franklin	19,578		19,578				Hudson	3,618		3,618			
Kennebec	18,274		18,274				Hunterdon	20,715		19,622			1,123
Knox	5,104		5,104				Mercer	23,613		23,052			561
Lancaster	7,646		7,646				Middlesex	34,315	\$18,384	15,212			719
Oxford	15,014		15,014				Monmouth	34,086	15,575	19,017			374
Penobscot	33,201	4,174	29,032				Morris	22,428		21,866			562
Piscataquis	15,666		15,666				Ocean	12,917		12,700			187
Sagadahoc	5,592		5,592				Passaic	11,416		11,416			
Somerset	22,512		22,512				Somerset	17,017		16,111			936
Waldo	17,296		17,296				Salem	17,963		17,888			75
Washington	13,069		13,069				Sussex	22,023		21,836			187
York	18,926		18,926				Union	3,805		3,618			187
Total	314,642	8,349	306,293				Warren	21,071		20,324			750
Maryland							Total	358,776	31,950	316,826			7,910
Allegany	25,335		13,900			11,435	New York						
Anne Arundel	19,970		19,970				Albany	19,510		19,510			
Baltimore	28,608		28,214			394	Allegany	39,956	93	39,788			75
Calvert	18,307		18,307				Broome	28,117		27,900			187
Caroline	22,569		22,569				Cattaraugus	33,121		30,500			2,621
Carroll	26,433		26,109			324	Cayuga	33,706		33,706			
Cecil	22,274		21,524			750	Chautauque	28,511		28,436			75
Charles	25,974		25,974				Chemung	92	92				
Dorchester	16,767		16,767				Chemango	21,257		21,257			
Frederick	32,532		32,532				Columbia	15,572		15,572			
Gartlett	24,793		11,818			12,975	Concord	21,726		21,726			
Harford	30,500		28,253			2,247	Delaware	13,184		11,761			1,423
Howard	24,515		24,515				Dutchess	28,017		28,017			
Kent	15,215		15,215				Essex	250,783		36,797			213,980
Montgomery	19,817		19,817				Fulton	13,448		13,448			
Prince Georges	432,608	50,931	401,677				Genesee	22,659		22,659			
Queen Anne's	21,558		21,558				Green	187					187
St. Marys	19,856		19,856				Herkimer	17,940		17,860			
Somerset	25,732		25,732				Lewis	24,346		24,346			
Washington	24,492		20,350			3,142	Madison	43,952		43,952			
Wicomico	27,393		27,393				Liveston	22,770		22,770			
Worcester	22,503		22,503				Montgomery	19,685		19,685			
Total	948,831	50,931	897,900			31,277	Oneida	38,683		38,683			
Massachusetts							Onondaga	30,900	8,056	22,844			
Barnstable	12,256		12,256				Ontario	25,919		25,919			
Berkshire	23,706		23,706				Orange	187					187
Bristol	13,985		13,985				Orleans	18,722		18,722			
Dukes	12,253		12,253				Oswego	17,271		17,271			
Essex	25,577		25,577				Otsego	23,100		23,100			
Franklin	18,949		18,949				Rensselaer	17,608		17,608			
Hampden	19,313		19,313				Saratoga	22,026		22,026			
Northampton	41,275		41,275				Schenectady	17,671		17,671			
Hampshire	18,832		18,832				Schoharie	22,695		22,695			
Middlesex	27,795		27,795				Schuyler	31,809		19,729	\$11,080		
Nantucket	6,436		6,436				Seneca	30,338	5,515	20,100	1,661		
Norfolk	15,454		15,454				Steuben	31,667	757	31,910			
Plymouth	14,921		14,921				Suffolk	1,769	1,769				
Total	250,752		250,752				Sullivan	750					750
New Hampshire							Tioga	25,172		25,172			
Belknap	16,562		16,562				Tompkins	49,361	18,764	26,790	3,807		
Carroll	16,929		16,929				Ulster	187					187
Cheshire	22,290		22,290				Washington	25,389		25,389			
							Wayne	30,179		30,179			
							Worming	133,226		26,601			106,625
							Yates	22,323		22,323			
							Total	1,320,531	35,076	936,572	22,580		320,303

ESTIMATE OF TERRITORY SERVED AND VALUE BY COUNTIES

New Jersey:	
Atlantic	\$1,012
Bergen	977
Burlington	2,527
Camden	1,707
Cape May	2,134
Cumberland	2,350
Essex	898
Gloucester	2,360
Hunterdon	983
Mercer	2,022
Middlesex	8,651

New Jersey—Continued

Monmouth	\$3,875
Morris	955
Ocean	1,012
Passaic	1,011
Salem	1,741
Somerset	983
Sussex	1,863
Union	854
Warren	955
Total	\$3,950

Includes \$918 of R-RO.

Includes \$3,851 of R-RO.

Includes \$3,725 of R-RO.

Data furnished by Dr. Neal.

Includes \$918 of R-RO.
 Serves Southern Maryland area; also the Coastal Plains area of New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland.
 Includes National Cartographic Laboratory and National Nursery, totalling obligations of \$380,549.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5701

August 15, 1951.

To: Mr. G. O. Lathem, Chief, Regional Budget and Finance Division, Soil Conservation Service, Upper Darby, Pa.

From: J. L. McGuinness, research project clerk, Soil Conservation Service, Bailey Hall, Ithaca, N. Y.

Subject: County distribution, 1951 obligations

Re your letter of August 10 under the above subject, attached is the breakdown of counties in which our 1951 funds were actually obligated. Our breakdown of personal obligations is based on an estimate of time actually spent within a county except that brief reconnaissance surveys, etc., have not been considered.

We believe that our obligations should be prorated over all the counties of the State rather than charged to the counties in which they were made since the results of our work are applicable to the entire State. Broome County, which has no charge on the attached sheet, will have just as much use for the results of our research as Tompkins County, where we spent over \$16,000.

Obligations by appropriation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control	State and county	Total	Soil conservation research	Soil conservation operations	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	Water conservation and utilization projects	Flood control
Pennsylvania:							Vermont—Continued						
Adams	\$27,407		\$25,650			\$2,247	Rutland	\$33,483		\$33,483			
Allegheny	18,317		17,508			749	Washington	30,127		30,127			
Berk	37,682		34,686			2,996	Windham	18,761		18,761			
Bradford	3,788			\$3,788			Windsor	27,017		27,017			
Bucks	749					749	Total	317,420		317,420			
Cambridge	15,278		15,278				West Virginia						
Cannon	12,435		11,686			749	Barbour	20,843		20,843			
Chester	51,916		48,020			2,996	Berkeley	18,431		18,431			
Clinton	21,659		21,659				Bosque	5,355		5,355			
Columbia	15,239		17,220				Barton	18,791		18,791			
Cumberland	24,315		24,315				Brooke	13,236		13,236			
Dauphin	5,992					5,992	Cabell	17,602		17,602			
Delaware	2,247					2,247	Calhoun	15,572		15,572			
Delaware	749					749	Clay	6,571		6,571			
Elk	26,376		26,376				Doddridge	16,761		16,761			
Fayette	1,498					1,498	Fayette	16,390		16,390			
Franklin	12,876		10,629			2,247	Garmer	16,164		16,164			
Fulton	21,461		21,461				Grant	28,613		16,311			\$12,302
Indiana	22,474		22,171				Greenbrier	22,363		22,363			
Jackson	28,768		28,768				Hampshire	29,851		15,794			14,058
Lackawanna	187					187	Hancock	14,982		14,982			
Lancaster	29,840		22,199			7,641	Hardy	15,545		19,040			3,515
Lebanon	20,206		17,772			2,434	Harrison	16,851		16,851			
Lefebvre	22,345		21,596			749	Jackson	18,748		18,748			
Luzerne	187					187	Jackson	18,539		18,539			
Monroe	13,838		13,089			749	Kanawha	16,607		16,607			
Montgomery	749					749	Lewis	22,203		22,203			
Northampton	749					749	Lincoln	19,637		19,637			
Northumberland	20,486		20,486				Loran	5,963		5,963			
Perry	7,440		6,691			749	McDowell	6,355		6,355			
Philadelphia	749					749	Marion	16,331		16,331			
Pike	26,232		26,232				Marshall	17,701		17,701			
Potter	2,434					2,434	Mason	27,101		18,983	\$9,018		
Schuylkill	1,498					1,498	Mason	14,934		14,934			
Somerset	26,745		26,745				Monroe	28,089		15,787			12,302
Susquehanna	25,735		25,735				Mingo	7,757		7,757			
Tioga	21,529		21,529				Monongalia	18,275		18,275			
Warren	22,878		22,878				Montgomery	21,129		21,129			
Washington	749					749	Morgan	17,241		17,241			
Wayne	22,464		20,956			1,498	Nicholas	17,513		17,513			
Westmoreland	21,877		21,877			7,490	Ohio	7,750		7,750			
Wyoming	46,340		38,850				Pendleton	16,228		16,228			
Total	687,737		631,333	3,788		52,616	Pleasants	12,554		12,554			
Rhode Island:							Pleasants	12,966		12,966			
Bristol	5,409		5,409				Preston	20,570		20,570			749
Kent	12,627		12,627				Pottam	16,893		16,893			
Newport	15,203		15,203				Raleigh	15,650		15,650			
Providence	17,081		17,081				Randolph	21,433		21,433			
Washington	16,729		16,729				Ritchie	14,618		14,618			
Total	67,039		67,039				Ross	19,339		19,339			
Vermont							Summers	16,720		16,720			
Addison	27,005		27,005				Taylor	12,162		12,162			
Barnington	18,780		18,780				Tucker	13,322		13,322			
Caledonia	19,809		19,809				Tyler	16,761		16,761			
Chittenden	18,148		18,148				Upham	16,917		16,917			
Essex	10,999		10,999				Wayne	17,552		17,552			
Franklin	27,755		27,755				Webster	11,158		11,158			
Grand Isle	13,143		13,143				Wetzel	11,845		11,845			
Lamoille	16,885		16,885				Wirt	12,254		12,254			
Orange	35,293		35,293				Wood	15,841		15,841			
Otsego	20,314		20,314				Wyoming	5,155		5,155			
Total	900,070		848,126	9,018		12,920							

Maj. Gen. George A. Horkan, New Quartermaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned of the selection of Maj. Gen. George A.

Horkan by President Truman as the new Quartermaster General of the Army. Upon completion of Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman's tour of duty as head of the Army's Quartermaster department, General Horkan will assume his new assignment, contingent, of course, upon Senate confirmation.

General Horkan's record in military service has been such that I am certain the Senate will act speedily on his confirmation. His succession to the high position will give the Army another fine Quartermaster General. The country

has been fortunate that through World War II and the period following the most capable of officers have held the place. Both General Gregory and General Feldman built the Quartermaster Corps into an efficient administrative organization that gave the Army at home and overseas the best in technical services. In combat and in peace the Quartermaster Corps under General Gregory and General Feldman developed new techniques that contributed to the greatness of our Army.

I had the pleasure of being under General Horkan's command when I served as an enlisted man at Camp Lee. I know of his great ability. I have followed his record closely. In various important assignments, including that of chief quartermaster in Europe, he has acquitted himself as an officer of the highest integrity. His ability as an administrator has been proven in his many tasks. The Quartermaster Corps will continue its fine record under his leadership, and because of his progressive spirit I am certain it will increase in efficiency.

Under leave to do so, I herewith include with my remarks an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Saturday, September 15, 1951:

HE SOUNDS GOOD

Some stories of some generals and their off-duty relations with the great and small of industry have had a none too savory aroma. But there is one story kicking around that provides a pleasant change of pace.

It's about Maj. Gen. George A. Horkan, named this week by President Truman to be the Army's new Quartermaster General.

General Horkan, who learned his ethics here at Georgetown University back in 1915, commanded the Quartermaster Corps' operations at Camp Lee, Va., during the war. While there, he made a lot of friends with the big-shot industrialists supplying the Quartermaster Corps.

Around 1946 he was assigned to the Office of the Quartermaster General here. He collected more friends among the country's businessmen in the course of doing his job here.

Just before he left in 1948 to become chief quartermaster in Europe, a group of these industry acquaintances—none of whom were doing business directly with him—got together, kicked in several hundred dollars to present him with a handsome watch as a going-away present and a token of their esteem.

With an eye on values some military men have not been too aware of lately, General Horkan accepted the watch, then politely handed it back with a request that it be reconverted into cash and the money used to establish an annual award to the outstanding GI student at the Quartermaster School at Camp Lee.

It wasn't much money—only some \$300. The Horkan award, made each June at Camp Lee, isn't anything fancy—only an engraved pen-and-pencil set to the top GI scholar. But it brightens a side of the military ledger that could stand a little emphasis right now.

General Horkan's appointment is now before the Senate for confirmation. If the above is an index to the man, the Senators should have no trouble coming to a favorable decision.

How Pearson Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register of September 10, 1951:

HOW PEARSON MANEUVERS

As we have said before, there is a distressing number of newspapers publishing the columns of Drew Pearson. Some of the publishers using the column admit to their readers that they won't vouch for the integrity of Mr. Pearson or even certify that to the best of the publisher's knowledge the columns are anything but journalistic garbage.

"The writer of this column is given the greatest possible latitude," explain these publishers, "and the opinions of the writer are not necessarily those of this newspaper."

This ridiculous editor's note disclaims the columnist who is being given the use of the newspaper's space and circulation. The absurdity of the editor's note is not always apparent to the reader who is vaguely tainted with that old nonsense about not agreeing with what the other fellow has to say but defending to the death his right to say it.

Nobody in his right mind subscribes to that idea. The law of the land does not entertain it. Fact is, the publisher of any statement is strictly liable, by law, for any assertion he publishes. This responsibility, incidentally, includes even the innocent printers who may have a hand in putting it into type. So, it is far from every man's right to say anything he pleases. More accurately, it is the right of every man to speak the truth and defend his statements once he has made them.

The reader may be fooled by an editor's note such as the one which appears over Pearson's columns in some papers. But the lawyers are not. And the libeled person may sue every newspaper in which the offensive column appears, although the publisher denies from hell to breakfast that he subscribes to the columnist's statements. If the publisher is leery of his columnist's accuracy and credibility, he ought not to publish the column. And that is as it should be. Well, what about this Pearson fellow? Does he tell lies? Is he credible?

This much we can say for sure. His writings are not morally sound. He is an old hand at stating a fact in such a way as to suggest something improper and untrue. That is an old stratagem of this trade—and other trades and professions—but it is none the less a sort of lying.

A recent example of Pearson's methods came to light in an excerpt from his radio broadcast of June 17. Said Pearson:

"In (Senator JOE) McCARTHY's file as a (Marine) Reserve officer today, there is a red card which says, 'This officer cannot be assigned active duty.'"

Pearson continued: "There was no red card in George Marshall's file and he never would have permitted one to be there. . . . McCARTHY is now known on Capitol Hill as 'Red Card Joe,' the man who has a red card in his file stating that, although a Reserve officer, he cannot be called to active duty."

Pearson of course, creates the impression that McCARTHY, unlike all other Reserve officers, has wrangled an exemption from active service or else has been found unworthy of it, and, secondly, that this unworthiness is somehow connected with a red card in his file.

The implication is clear enough. Senator McCARTHY asked the Commandant of the Marine Corps for an explanation.

The head of the personnel section replied: "At the beginning of the Korean hostilities it was considered that Members of the Congress would render more valuable service to their country in the Congress than they could serving on active duty in the Marine Corps, and it was therefore decided that Members of Senate and House of Representatives would not be ordered to active duty

at this time. Accordingly, the records section was instructed to make suitable notations in the record of all Members of Congress who have Reserve status. . . .

The unfinished business cards which we use are of three colors—pink, green and blue. They are used indiscriminately and it happened that the card in your record is pink."

And that is the story of "Red Card" Joe McCARTHY.

Without going into the controversy of McCARTHY's methods in Congress, we can say without contradiction that Pearson and the publishers who handle this column are guilty of the sort of "smear" tactics they usually impute to the Senator himself.

Whatever else they may want to say about McCARTHY, they should not stoop to belittle the military record or status of a much decorated former Marine who wears the Purple Heart.

A Brighter Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of September 15, 1951:

A BRIGHTER PROSPECT

The agreement of the Big Three Foreign Ministers on the general terms of a peace contract with Western Germany, to bring that area and its people into the western defensive line-up against the threat of the Soviet Union, has wider implications than a unilateral settlement with that part of Germany which is still free.

Such a settlement with Western Germany can very easily outline the shape of things to come, a gradual withering of the powers and services of United Nations, and a growth of balance-of-power pacts concluded without Soviet interference, or Soviet veto.

Britain, France, and the United States learned something to their advantage at the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco. They learned that it is possible to operate and negotiate outside of the framework of United Nations and make satisfactory settlement among belligerent nations if resolute action is taken.

Western Germany is essential to the strength, safety and security of Europe. In any other camp except that of the west it would be as dangerous as a time bomb. Associated with the western nations and arrayed against the Soviet Union there is assurance the Soviet Union there is assurance that the aspirations of the west Germans will not grow beyond the union of all Germany. The moderating influence of France and Britain and the United States would always prevail in this kind of arrangement and rampant nationalism would not stir the German people to the frenzied war hysteria of the past century.

There is the danger, of course, that the Soviet Union, seeing the last grand chance to keep the whole European continent in a ferment for another generation, might launch an aggression in Western Europe or the Balkans before the final rapprochement of the west Germans with the Big Three could be consummated.

Many diplomats of the western nations now profess to see something more than im-

provision in the development of American foreign policy. The adroit handling of the Soviet Union by Dean Acheson at the San Francisco conference, the patient negotiation of John Foster Dulles to make the Japanese treaty possible, have contributed to a new hope that the United States, acting in concert and leading the other western powers, can bring off a stable world situation without the all-out war that terrifies the people of Europe.

Indeed, here at home, the anti-Acheson forces are singing mighty small since millions of Americans saw Acheson slap the Russians down at San Francisco. All these things have brought the western powers closer to harmony on the question of a settlement with Germany.

The big stumbling block is Korea, and there are hopes that the Chinese Reds, having seen the big brother of all the little Reds slapped down, may be inclined to make United Nations take the blame for their involvement, while coming to a settlement with the west by the means of an accord with the Big Three.

These developments are by no means certainties, but they are strong possibilities emerging from a strong stand taken by the United States.

A Tax Break—Finally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert C. Ruark which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of Tuesday, September 4, 1951. Mr. Ruark explains eloquently the very real difficulties confronting many of our people engaged in small business, the professions, and the arts in endeavoring to provide a source of income for the years after their retirement. Senator IVES' amendment is identical with my bill, H. R. 4373, which is presently pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

A TAX BREAK—FINALLY

(By Robert C. Ruark)

I wish to blow a kiss today to the New York State Bar Association, which has been responsible for a chunk of legislation that may provide a little cheer for me and a few hundred thousand kinfolks—men of the small businesses, professions, and the arts who have not formerly been allowed to declare a depreciation on their own bodies as wage earners.

A bill is up for consideration by the Senate Finance Committee that is the fruit of some years of research by the bar associations tax experts. It is called the individual retirement plan, and is based on postponement of taxes on a portion of yearly earnings, thereby offering some security to people who work for themselves and, accordingly, have no boss to mail them pension checks in their old age. They have been prevented from adequate saving by the extraordinarily high taxes on earned income.

It is a very simple plan. It permits postponement of Federal income taxes on earnings paid into retirement funds maintained by a man's personal, agricultural, labor, busi-

ness, industrial or professional associations for the eventual security of their members. A man would be allowed to set aside 10 percent of his annual income, up to \$7,500.

Distribution of retirement income from such a trust, the bill proposes, is made when the participant is 60, either in a lump sum, in installments, or as an annuity. The postponed taxes fall due when the member begins drawing on the fund. The Government gets its whack, in the end, and thereby loses nothing, but in the meantime the luckless self-employer is at least permitted to hive up a few bob against the day he runs out of gas and wants to take it easy.

There is also an important amendment to the bill permitting a fund member to take out his savings before reaching 60 if permanent disability forces his retirement.

In all aspects, the proposed bill is fine. It allows an individual, first off, to provide his own social security. It eases his current tax pains while still permitting the Government to collect its full tithe eventually—thereby also providing a certain security for the Government. It lessens the likelihood of tax dodging by people who earn their money in cash. And it recognizes, finally, that the human being is easily the equal of a machine, and should be entitled to some provision for the fact that a human body deteriorates and depletes itself.

This is the first legislation that I know of which is pointed at that consideration. The Government allows a 27½-percent tax forgiveness on oil wells, because of the depletion quotient. It allows a capital gains on stock transfers and resale of property, and it will allow you to write off a depreciation on buildings and machinery.

But up to now the guy who runs his own business or plays baseball or paints pictures or hammers a typewriter or removes an appendix has been smacked right on the button by the tax people. Individual enterprise actually has been penalized by undue tax emphasis on earned income, and especially the enterprise of such people who must compress their major earnings into a relatively short span of years, people like actors and writers and athletes.

I have been hollering for years for some sort of Government intercession on behalf of the individual, and now it seems we finally have the necessary machinery in an amendment to the proposed Revenue Act of 1951, introduced by Senator IRVING M. IVES (Republican, New York). It has attracted widespread disinterest in the Congress so far, and I would sure like to see a little action.

I still figure that a man is as good as a house or a truck or a dirty old oil well, and it is about time the Government recognizes that the individual shows wear and tear for every day he toils. He should be allowed to provide for his own future, against the coming day when he just don't want to work any more.

Reduction of Meat Rations in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief news article ap-

pearing in the Washington Daily News for September 18, 1951. The article is entitled "Meat Rations Cut."

The article states that the meat ration for the individual consumer in Great Britain is to be reduced again—this time to 25 cents a week. The article illustrates once again what happens to the supply of meat for the consumer when unwise governmental regulations are imposed upon the meat industry.

Mr. President, this statement was prepared by the senior Senator from Nebraska; and it is in his behalf that I ask unanimous consent to have the rows article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT RATIONS CUT

LONDON, September 18.—Britain's meat ration will be reduced next week. Raised only this week to 30 cents worth weekly per person, the ration will be cut to its former figure of 28 cents worth. It will be reduced still further beginning October 7—to 25 cents.

A Tribute to Greater Chicago Lodge, No. 3, Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to Greater Chicago Lodge, No. 3, of the Loyal Order of Moose. For the third successive year, this lodge has won, in competition with nearly 2,000 lodges engaged in international competition, highest honors in the community-service field. Many people, many organizations are devoted to the ideal of public and community service. Lodge No. 3 is a leader among these. Its members go far beyond the gesture of paying lip service only; they take action, and theirs is a record of fine accomplishment.

One of the distinguished members of Greater Chicago Lodge, No. 3, is Mr. Robert F. Hurlough, director of news for radio station WGN and Midwest director of news of the Mutual Broadcasting System in Chicago, Ill. I take pleasure in adding to my remarks a portion of the commentary which he made on August 22, 1951:

GOOD NEIGHBORS, AMERICAN STYLE

(By Robert F. Hurlough)

We are speaking to you tonight from Buffalo, N. Y., where we have made the presentations of civic awards to the outstanding lodges of the international fraternity, the Loyal Order of Moose.

It is of great importance that we recognize and understand the position of the fraternal and veteran organizations in connection with their place in society. As a matter of fact, there are many who do not understand these organizations, and have absolutely no appreciation of the vast accomplishments of fraternal and veterans groups—not only within

the narrow scope of immediate membership, but far afield as well.

Certainly we would need more time than we can possibly take here to catalog the positives in American fraternal life. But we are happy to announce that, this afternoon, Greater Chicago Lodge, No. 3, Loyal Order of Moose, was voted the winner—for the third successive year—of the top award in community service. This gold award of the fraternity was won in competition with 1,600 other lodges in the United States, Alaska, and Canada. The accomplishments of the Greater Chicago Lodge, No. 3, seem of such importance that, as good neighbors, we should all have an appreciation of what is being done to aid in community service.

It is, in a sense, rather astonishing: for the civic-affairs committee of No. 3 was among the first groups to recognize the appalling situation in regard to the growth of the narcotics menace to young people in Chicago. It went to work immediately on a very large scale to explore the subject in detail, and to work in the Illinois Legislature to bring about the legislation that now makes it a penalty—ranging from 1 year to life imprisonment—for peddling dope to minors in the State of Illinois. Judge Gibson Gorman, of the newly established court to deal with the increased narcotics problem, has stated that this stronger law will be of real benefit in the Chicago fight against the dope ring. No. 3's civic affairs committee has also been at the forefront in trying to find a sensible answer to the continuing problem of how to deal with the young dope addict who needs treatment for possible rehabilitation.

In addition, the usual support of the Red Cross, the cancer drives, the community fund, the public clinics, and dozens of such known, worth-while causes are augmented by aid to summer camps for children, off-the-street clubs, and special parties for underprivileged children. Members of lodge No. 3 serve with other public-spirited groups in solving our own problems in the American way. From X-ray machines and iron lungs, to rebuilding broken bodies and combating juvenile delinquency, all these fraternal and veteran groups, as well as service clubs, play their parts in trying to be good neighbors.

This great humanitarian service is too often overlooked by the many people who simply do not understand, and cannot appreciate, the extent of the accomplishments of these organizations. It is a part of America which is wholesome; for millions of Americans expend their time and energy in civic affairs and charitable works effected through their fraternal and other groups, even as they enjoy those very recreational and social features that, in days gone by, were organizations' sole reasons for being.

It seems proper that we, too, can be good neighbors, and realize the vast amount of good accomplished by these organizations that have accepted the challenge of helping others through voluntary rather than through controlled programs which seem more foreign to our way of life. Good citizenship is taught through the belief in God and the brotherhood of man. Tolerance of race, creed, and political beliefs within the framework of the American Constitution is the key-stone in the arch of fraternalism. From all this, you can see that the fraternal club down the street or the vets' club is a beehive of activity which is, for the most part, unknown to many neighbors. And this is true across the nation.

That Chicago's Lodge, No. 3, Loyal Order of Moose, should be the winner of the top honor in community service in this international competition within the fraternity is something of which Chicago can be proud, and every town or city has as much reason to be pleased that such groups do exist to aid in supporting the necessary charities and the needy. Surely such initiative, self-help, and consideration for the needs of others are qualities kindred to the very virtues that built America—and should be encouraged.

America's Great Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at noon on Friday, September 7, while out on the Pacific coast for the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty, it was my pleasure to address the Commonwealth Club at its regular luncheon meeting in the Palace Hotel in San Francisco, Calif. It was a privilege to address this distinguished forum of political, economic, social, professional, and spiritual leaders of California.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prepared text of my talk, and that it be preceded by a list of officers, governors, and study group chairmen of that distinguished organization. It is the type of great American group of which I wish we had counterparts in all of the States, if that were possible.

There being no objection, the list and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICERS

President, Ray B. Wiser.
Vice President, Justice M. T. Dooling, Jr.
Secretary, Henry J. Brunnier.
Treasurer, J. K. Moffitt.
Chairman, Executive Committee, A. H. Moffitt, Jr.
Executive Secretary, Stuart R. Waid.
Assistant Executive Secretary, William L. Hudson.

GOVERNORS

David D. Bohannon, Justice A. F. Bray, Monroe E. Deutsch, Paul C. Edwards, Prof. Claude B. Hutchinson, James A. Johnston, A. H. Moffitt, Jr., Richard R. Perkins, Prof. Edgar E. Robinson, Dr. Ernest G. Sloman, Roy Sorenson, Justice Homer R. Spence, Max Thelen, E. T. Thurston, Clarence E. Todd.

STUDY GROUPS

Administration of Justice, Gardiner Johnson.
African Problems, Norbert Einstein.
Agriculture, Donald R. Rush.
Atomic Bomb, Hilary H. Crawford.
City Planning, Col. Henry C. R. Akin.
Delinquency, J. C. Russell.
Economics, Monte Dornham.
Education, George B. White.
Forests and Recreation, F. P. Cronemiller.
Government Finance, Louis J. Kroeger.
Highways and Transportation, Harmer E. Davis.
Immigration, Edwin E. Grant.
Industrial Relations, Walter M. Warren.
International Relations, Col. James S. Hughes.
Latin America, Hon. Henry S. Waterman.
Legislation and Elections, Herbert Hanley.
Liquor Problems.
Mediterranean Problems.
Mineral Industries, Parker D. Trask.
Municipal and County Government, A. H. Sagehorn.
National Defense, John M. Scott.
Pacific Ocean Problems, Walter H. Hettman.
Propaganda, William A. Boekel.
Luncheon Program Committee, Francis V. Keesling, Sr.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILEY—AMERICA'S GREAT CHALLENGE

I am indeed proud to address this distinguished audience today. It is most fitting to do so in the city where, on June 26, 1945, there was signed a historic document by fifty nations. That document began in epic passages:

"We, the people of the United Nations—determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights . . . to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising under treaties . . . can be maintained . . . to promote social progress . . . to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security . . . to insure that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest . . . do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

It is concerning the challenge to that Charter, the challenge to free nations, the challenge to you and me—that I should like to address you today.

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADERSHIP

I realize that I am speaking to leaders today, not just leaders in the economic, political and social life of San Francisco and of the great State of California, but leaders in public respect. Men and women look to you of this audience for guidance and direction. So, there is no one who hears my voice today who is not challenged to contribute to the leadership for which America and the world hunger. What, however, constitutes leadership in the face of today's and tomorrow's challenges? We will ponder the answer to that question too.

THE WORLD-WIDE CLASH

This is for you and for me a time of great adventure, oh yes, of greatness, if we will it so. The officials of many lands have been busily engaged in a new, yet an old task—that of treaty-making.

The difficulties which have beset us are obvious. They are symptomatic of the world-wide clash of two contrasting ideologies—two rival ways of life—the one, the Marxian way; the other expressed for us in the Judeo-Christian concept of man's dignity, expressed for others in the other great spiritual faiths of mankind.

The sparks of that clash—a clash between freedom and slavery—are everywhere to be seen. In the flame of battle in Korea, in the political struggle of Iran; in the fighting in Malaya and Indochina; in the threatening moves around Yugoslavia; in the tinderbox of Berlin.

These and other areas of the world check-board are the scenes of this conflict, the arenas of battle, a battle here of words; elsewhere of steel. The basic arena however is in the minds of men, and it is about that arena that I shall later speak.

In recent days, the world spotlight has been on the arena here. Here we have watched at close hand the arena of diplomacy in which the security and freedom of the Pacific are at stake.

THE REVITALIZATION OF WESTERN EUROPE

Over in Western Europe is another great arena—one from which I just recently returned. Within a period of but 2 weeks we of the Foreign Relations Committee visited seven major cities: London, Paris, Frankfurt, Athens, Ankara, Rome, Madrid. We talked to high leaders of six other lands besides. We conferred with General Eisenhower regarding the challenge he was facing as commander in chief of the North Atlantic Treaty forces.

I had been in Europe in 1947 and in the course of those 4 years that had elapsed since then I saw in 1951 a great change, a great growth and development. I saw the wheels of industry humming, the fields pouring

forth their foodstuffs. More important, however, I saw a new vitality in European morale. I saw a force which was lifting men of different nations out of their consciousness of self. It was helping them to become servants of the general European and world welfare. I saw men possessed as never before with a sense of moral responsibility, of personal dedication. Hope and faith had returned.

There is the key to success in this great struggle—forgetting self and thinking of others, rising above pettiness to meet the great challenges.

In Lake Success, N. Y., scene of the United Nations Security Council and Assembly, we see still another of the great arenas of earth.

A MEETING WITH MR. VISHINSKY

It was on my journey from Europe in 1947 on the *Queen Elizabeth*, that I met one of the individuals who was returning to Lake Success to represent the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Vishinsky. I relearned from him then one of the key differences between his way of life and ours.

I had been asked whether I would like to meet Mr. Vishinsky. I stated that I would indeed be glad to meet him; and so a meeting was arranged. Seeing him, I grasped his hand firmly, and I said "Mr. Vishinsky, I pray every night that the peoples of our two respective countries may fulfill their great responsibilities and be able to consummate a lasting peace." Mr. Vishinsky for a moment did not reply. His hand was gripped tightly in mine. Then, slowly he spoke: "I do not pray."

There is the juxtaposition of our two contrasting approaches.

No, Mr. Vishinsky and his colleagues do not pray, but everywhere about us on this earth today—in free lands and behind the iron curtain—there are men and women who do pray, men and women who do realize their need for divine guidance and direction.

WE ARE TURNING A CORNER OF HISTORY

They realize, as you and I do, and should, that we are at present passing through one of the great crises of history. Or rather to put it another way, we are turning a corner in history. To use the phrase of another day, we are in a new Armageddon, greater by far than the mighty conflicts which have raged before.

Fortunately, that conflict has largely been one of ideas and words thus far, and we pray that through ideas and words, we may successfully resolve it without force of arms.

But let no one despair. Who would want to live in a period of mere ease and contentment? This is an era, as I have said, of great challenge. These days call for strong men and women—with character and moral stability, men and women who know the cause of freedom, love that cause and will give their all to it.

Winston Churchill once spoke of the English people as living "their finest hour." It is for us to live our finest hour in turn in meeting the tremendous challenge which is ours. It is a time for greatness. Will we qualify?

OUR CIVILIZATION FOUNDED ON SPIRITUAL VALUES

Remember, we are striving to maintain western civilization. It is a civilization which consists of more than refrigerators, home permanents, washing machines, television sets, vacuum cleaners, and convertible cars. We are fighting basically for spiritual values, for which down through the centuries men have been willing to sacrifice their all.

We are fighting for the concept that every man is the brother of his fellow man, that truth and justice should and must prevail.

We are striving in the firm conviction that each individual shall have his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are striving for the concept that the state must be the servant of the people, rather than its master. We are striving for the right of all people to realize their destiny to be free.

"I OF MINE OWN SELF" * * *

We pray, but Mr. Vishinsky does not. Ours is the Judeo-Christian concept which the Master expressed—the concept which was lived so dynamically by George Washington when he prayed at Valley Forge, by Abraham Lincoln when he "went to his knees," when all else failed. It is the concept which American boys are living today as they pray on the hillside of Korea.

It is the concept as stated by the Master—"I of mine own self can do nothing; it is the Father who worketh in Me." But, ranged against it is the Soviet concept implying that I of my own self am totally sufficient and that by material force and power I can achieve all of my objectives. The Soviet concept that believes that this is but a mechanical universe and that cannot conceive of any God of the Spirit—with the result that under such a government, men are serfs, the state is supreme.

Communism is not really a creed or a faith or a belief. It is a disbelief. Life under it has no meaning; life is a temporary thing without continuity. The individual under it has no worth except as a part of a collectivized machine. The individual isn't free to adventure. He must conform in every detail to the closed thinking and the iron rules of the state.

Is that what you and I want—for ourselves and for our children? Of course not. Is that what other free peoples want? Of course not.

Each free nation today is groping for the path to enduring freedom, not slavery. Whole new countries—only recently born—are seeking a new destiny for themselves—rather than slavery beneath the Soviet heels.

THE ABUNDANCE OF AMERICA

Here on these blessed shores, our country is growing as never before. Each year, we are adding 2,500,000 more new souls to our population. Think of the tremendous material needs and requirements of these young folks. Think of the schools we want and must build for them, the playgrounds, etc. Think of the clothes, the food we will so gladly provide for them. But think even more of the great faith in this Republic, that it is up to you and to me to instill in them. Think of the moral values which they must learn at our knees, if they are to be adequate to the responsibilities of their generation.

THIS IS A TIME FOR STRAIGHT THINKING

This is a time for straight thinking, constructive thinking. It is no time for hysteria or panic. Never before has there been a greater flowering of man's intellectual attainments of arts and sciences, social and physical. But never before, I believe, has there been a greater need for realization of the spiritual virtues of the universe.

THE UNFORGETTABLE EXPERIENCE OF PALOMAR

It was in 1948 that I came to your great State and visited Mount Wilson. There I had an experience which I shall never forget—in viewing the giant glass eye of Palomar, the 200-inch telescope which reaches out into near infinity to behold this universe, to record celestial events that happened millions of light-years ago.

Through the 200-inch telescope and its photographs, and through its companion, the Schmidt telescope, we have seen that our Milky Way contains billions of stars. But we have seen other star families, so to

speak, 100,000,000 of them dwelling in outer space. Each of these 100,000,000 Milky Ways is separated from the nearest star family by distances so vast that light often takes a million years to travel merely from one family to its closest neighbor. Each is restless, moving at 100 to 200 miles a second. But there are greater telescopes in the making, and they will record even more the majesty of this universe.

Who among us could contemplate these awesome facts and say, "I do not pray"? Who among us could conceive the great divine mystery of the universe and say, "I do not pray"?

My friends, now is, indeed, a time for prayer and a time for rededication, each in our own way. The papers speak about fears and neuroses. That is not the answer to the challenge of today.

Let me recall to you that in another climactic moment of American and world history—1861 to 1865—there was a humble man in the White House who exercised three techniques for adequacy. He utilized—

1. Humor.

2. Prayer.

3. An all-consuming dedication to the Republic. He lost himself in love and preservation of the great values of which he was the trustee.

We in turn can utilize all three of these techniques in our personal lives.

But are we doing so? Do we all have that consuming love of the Republic? The newspapers and radio tell us a different story—a story of milk coats and deep freezers and corruption and communism.

THE KEY ISSUE OF OUR TIMES

On this score, no doubt, many of you heard and were profoundly impressed, as I know I was, by the recent speech delivered in Des Moines, Iowa, by a great adopted son of California, a great American, the Honorable Herbert Clark Hoover. Former President Hoover pointed out in this address that the great issue of modern times is this: Decency versus indecency, morality versus immorality. This issue runs deeper than party politics. It goes to the very bedrock of the problem facing the American way of life.

Abraham Lincoln, too, had warned us that the greatest danger was the danger from within. So today, as dangerous as are the 175 poised divisions of the Red army, infinitely more dangerous is the menace that exists on our own shores.

And I refer not only to those individuals who have fallen hook, line, and sinker for the Communist line. I refer not only to the Alger Hesses, the Elizabeth Bentleys, the Judith Coplans, the Klaus Fuchs, the William Remingtons, and all of the other poisoned individuals, some of whom have now confessed and sought to repair their ways. I refer to those individuals who profess to oppose communism as such but who have been impacted by the Marxist dogma, the dogma of materialism, of selfishness, or any dogma that entails the notion that there is no harm in getting what you can, so long as you are not caught at it, whether you are a public official or in private life. The dogma that you can break the law's spirit just so long as you are smart enough not to break the law's letter. That is a cancerous attitude which destroys an individual and then can destroy a society.

Let us, my friends, not allow it to do so. Let us not allow this Eden to fall.

OUR BIG JOB

This is your job and mine—bigger than the job of making money or seeking personal power or prestige. This is the one big job for all of us.

Let's not sell America short.

As I cross this great continent I know that here today we are literally the light of

the world. We must not put that light under a bushel. We must ever see that it burns more brightly, radiating throughout the globe its beneficent principles of fearlessness and justice. What nation in all history has set such an example?

AMERICA'S NOBLE EXAMPLE

What nation pours billions and even more important, precious lives of its sons into a conflict, gains victory, and then takes the lead in seeing to it that the peace is based not on vindictiveness but on justice? What nation pours tens of billions abroad to revive its foes of yesteryear? What nation spurns all territorial grasping?

Ours. These wonderful 48 States; this blessed America.

No, let's not sell this country short. Nor, let us sell short the cause of freedom, the cause of other like-minded nations, our friends and partners.

Now, as each of us has witnessed the events of the last few days, there have come to mind these questions:

WILL THE SPIRIT OF THIS TREATY BE FULFILLED?

When this task is done, when this treaty has been signed and ratified, will it succeed? Or will it be another Versailles? Will it really vitalize the relationship between the high contracting parties?

No one knows the ultimate answers to those questions. No one can peer beyond the veil of the future and weigh its imponderables. But this we do know, that if the contracting nations do have the faith, the vision, and devotion, they can make of this treaty a great instrument which will save the various peoples forever from the scourge of war.

CREATING CHECKS-AND-BALANCES SYSTEM

I have often stated that one of the great underlying reasons why imperial Japan started on her path to Asiatic conquest was that there was no check and balance against the powerful Japanese Army chieftains. If the prewar Japanese Diet, however, had exerted a checkrein on that army, if the Emperor had, or if any other constructive force in Japan society had, the Japanese and all their victims would have been spared untold suffering.

Today, however, we trust that we have helped set up within Japan this dynamic system of checks and balances. Moreover, we trust that throughout the world we have set up a system of checks and balances so as to hold back the Russian tide. Let us continue to maintain that system here in our land—three separate and coequal branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—each performing its legal functions, none usurping the rights of the others.

Checks and balances—there is a key for the continuing success of this constitutional republic. Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. Power must ever be checked.

CONCLUSION—A NEW DAWN

Here, in this city of San Francisco, we trust that we are checking power in an appropriate way. We trust that we are helping to usher in a new dawn for human society—a new dawn for the fulfillment of the Judeo-Christian concepts which we hold so dear, a new dawn for the unfettered spirit of man.

It has indeed been a pleasure to be with you today.

After being with you today and meeting more of your fine citizens here on the coast I have an ever stronger faith that you will be adequate to your responsibilities, as I hope my associates and myself may be adequate to ours.

Thank you.

National Airlines Asks for Reduction of Its Mail Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

NATIONAL AIRLINES,

Miami, Fla., September 18, 1951.

Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN,

Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company has just asked the Civil Aeronautics Board to reduce the amount of mail pay we receive from the Government.

Feeling that you, as a Member of Congress, will want to know about this unusual case, wherein an airline has voluntarily sought to lower its compensation for transporting the United States mail, I am enclosing a copy of a statement by National's president, G. T. Baker, announcing the basis for this important decision.

It is my hope that you will find this announcement to be of interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MORRIS,

Vice President.

MIAMI, FLA.—National Airlines, Inc., has asked the Civil Aeronautics Board for a reduction in mail pay from the Government, it was announced today by President G. T. Baker. National is believed to be the first trunk line to make such request in airline history.

"In view of National's growth and increasing economic self-sufficiency," Baker said, "we have taken the lead in voluntarily seeking a reduction to the 45 cents per ton-mile rate which the CAB recently established for four of the other major airlines."

"This step has been made possible," he continued, "by the airline's success in building up its traffic and its revenues over the past few years. With record net earnings for the fiscal year just ended, National now stands fifth among all scheduled airlines in terms of net operating income. We believe the revenues lost through the reduction in mileage mail pay will be more than offset by revenues from increased mail tonnage as a result of the new ton-mile rate and also from operation of the company's present routes, interchange agreements, the new DC-6 daylight coach operations just inaugurated, and from the eight new DC-6Bs to be delivered in 1952."

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, National received mail pay at a temporary rate which yielded \$0.117 per mile, one of the lowest per mile rates in the industry. Mail pay, according to Baker, has been of decreasing importance as a source of revenue, representing only 7.08 percent of total revenues in fiscal 1951, as compared with 11.22 percent for the previous year. In 1951, he pointed out, the airline paid more in Federal income taxes than it received from the Post Office.

"Airmail pay has helped the airline industry to operate profitably and to build up its fleets," Baker said. "The public's foresight in supporting the air-transport industry during its initial growth period by mail payments has helped to create a vitally important airlift-in-being, if and when a na-

tional emergency requires its use. The scheduled airlines of the United States can boast the greatest airlift capacity in the world. Without it, we could not hope to meet the demands of a war crisis."

"Now that National is in a position to do so, we want to reduce the burden on the taxpayer by seeking this rate reduction."

The scheduled airlines fleet now totals nearly 1,200 planes. More than 500 are four-engine aircraft, 132 are postwar two-engine aircraft and 537 are prewar two-engine aircraft. They have a combined capacity of more than 11,000,000 ton-miles daily (a ton-mile is 1 ton flown 1 mile).

In the Korean War, scheduled airlines carried 69 percent of the passengers and 52 percent of the cargo from the United States to Japan in the period from July 1, 1950, to February 28, 1951. Civil air carriers were also used to replace military transports diverted to the Berlin airlift.

Tass Thumbs Its Nose at News Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of September 17, 1951:

UNITED STATES SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH SAYS TASS THUMBS ITS NOSE AT NEWS PRINCIPLES

It is strange how so often the trouble-makers in this world get special consideration and special treatment that is denied the decent people who never do any injustice to anyone. It is equally strange how so often the good people who mind their own business and break no rules of conduct are abused and discriminated against in favor of the bad actors.

This strange pattern happens so often that to one who loses faith it might seem that you have to be bad in order to get the favors, that honesty and good will do not pay off in spite of what our mothers told us as children. Maybe there is something to the old saying that "it is the creaking wheel that gets the grease."

Take, for instance, the comparative cases of William N. Oatis, the American reporter imprisoned in Czechoslovakia, and that of the Russian pseudo news agency in Washington called Tass. Oatis was jailed in Czechoslovakia by the Communist puppets of Soviet Russia on trumped-up charges.

He is now serving a 10-year sentence after a rigged trial. For what? The Czechs say for spying. But the rest of the world knows that all Oatis was doing was trying to do his job of reporting the news to the rest of the world.

Now take a look at what happens to a certain Russian Communist agency in Washington, specifically the Washington office of Tass. Tass claims to be a public news agency. And under this false claim it enjoys the full privileges of the House and Senate press galleries, just like any accredited American member of the press galleries.

But Tass actually violates the rules of the United States Congress saying that the press galleries are to be restricted to those who are bona fide correspondents of repute in their profession.

The governing group of the press galleries, in interpreting these rules has barred representatives of United States Government agencies. Although the employees of Tass are registered as agents of the Soviet Government, and as such are not bona fide correspondents, they are given special favor and treatment in violation of the rules.

Tass is not a public news agency. It is financed, controlled, and used exclusively by the Soviets. It is nothing less than a part of the world-wide Russian Communist conspiracy. Yet its employees have the privilege of not only sitting in the press galleries of Congress but attending some briefing conferences at the Defense and State Departments and the White House.

Now either the rules of the press galleries should be enforced or they shouldn't. Surely what is good enough for American reporters in America should be good enough for Russian agents in America.

The Tass representatives are Communist agents, not newspapermen. They don't qualify for membership in the press galleries of Congress.

They should be kicked out—not as a matter of reprisal, for that would violate the principle of free flow of information between the peoples of the world and lower our own country to the cut-throat level of the despicable Czechs who have imprisoned Oatis—but rather as a matter of applying the rules of the press galleries to all alike.

It is time we stopped letting the Russian Communist agency Tass thumb its nose at the rules and get away with journalistic murder.

Forty-fifth Anniversary of Saturday Democrat, Holyoke, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FOSTER FURCOLO OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, last week the Saturday Democrat, a weekly newspaper published and circulated in Holyoke, Mass., celebrated its forty-fifth anniversary. Holyoke is not in my district, and I do not believe the Saturday Democrat has any appreciable circulation in my district, although it is widely read and circulated in Holyoke.

I know all of us are interested in freedom of the press, and we are aware of the great part the press has always played in helping to preserve our liberties and our American way of life. We all should have great respect for the publisher and editor and other employees of any newspaper who give their best efforts to that end.

The guiding light and genius of the Saturday Democrat is Lionel Boucher. He is a man of great integrity, and he has the courage of his convictions. He is a credit to the fourth estate and also to this country. I do not want to let the occasion go by without paying my tribute to him.

I think all of us, whether we be Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, can join in extending good wishes to the Saturday Democrat on its forty-fifth anniversary. Whether we agree or disagree with the viewpoint of the newspaper is

not so important as the fact that the newspaper has been true to its principles and has always courageously fought for its beliefs. Lionel Boucher has done that all his life, and I know will continue to do so.

The Ice Harbor Peril Rises Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. WALTER NORBLAD OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Astorian-Budget of Astoria, Oreg., in opposition to the proposed Ice Harbor Dam:

THE ICE HARBOR PERIL RISKS AGAIN

We wonder if the Senate Appropriations Committee realizes that in allowing \$4,000,000 to start Ice Harbor Dam it commits the taxpayers of the United States to a gigantic boondoggle that would cost nearly a billion dollars.

The House Appropriations Committee realized this in its wise decision to eliminate the Ice Harbor item in its consideration of the Army civil functions bill.

One might ask how this boondoggle could cost nearly a billion dollars.

The answer is very simple.

Ice Harbor is but the first in a series of four dams on lower Snake, all of which must be built to make any one of them of any value. Proponents of Ice Harbor will admit this themselves if planned down. Estimated cost of these four dams is about \$500,000,000—half a billion dollars the taxpayers can ill-spare.

The other half billion represents the value of the commercial salmon fishery that would be destroyed plus value of public investments in protecting this fishery that would be rendered worthless.

The salmon fishery is estimated by competent Federal authorities to be worth \$400,000,000, and much of this value would be wiped out by the four lower Snake dams. Millions of additional dollars have been invested by the Federal Government and the States of Oregon and Washington in protecting and propagating the salmon runs that spawn in the Snake. This investment obviously would be wasted if Ice Harbor and its companion dams wipe out the Snake River salmon runs, as competent fisheries biologists fear they will.

We doubt that the members of the appropriations committee of the Senate have realized the consequences of that trivial-seeming \$4,000,000 to start Ice Harbor Dam. No doubt \$4,000,000 seems peanuts to them, particularly so when the proponents of this dam present it under the fictitious guise of a necessary project for the national defense.

Actually Ice Harbor Dam is not vital to national defense. Its proponents admit this indirectly when they confess that three companion dams, which would take years to complete would be necessary for Ice Harbor to be of other than negligible value, either for power or for its real purpose, subsidizing river boats and barges.

A study of the power situation in the Columbia Basin would show that projects already under way will double the power output of the basin.

Why, if the national emergency demands more power quickly, is it not common sense

to finish the power projects already under way, with their vast capacity, before throwing vital dollars into this long-range, expensive boondoggle of doubtful value?

McNary, Chief Joseph, Albeni Falls, Hungry Horse, other Federal-aid private power projects now a-building, should be rushed to completion rapidly and every dollar the Federal Government can spare should go to such projects.

In fact, Grand Coulee Dam itself is not finished until its total generator capacity is installed, and this has not yet been done.

We cannot believe that the Senate Appropriations Committee fully understands the Columbia Basin situation or the terrible cost of Ice Harbor Dam in both Federal expenditure and destruction of a resource, or it would never have approved that \$4,000,000.

Fortunately the House Appropriations Committee understood and the House itself so voted. Perhaps in House-Senate conference common sense can be made to prevail over pressure from greedy inland-empire interests who want that \$500,000,000 spent in their bailiwick and care not what the cost to the Nation and to the industry they will damage so irreparably.

The Answer to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. DANIEL A. REED OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the price-control legislation that has been enacted by the Congress is in no sense an anti-inflation bill. So far as controlling inflation, it is a subterfuge and a fraud. I have called attention repeatedly to the fact on the floor of the House that inflation cannot be controlled until the expansion of the currency is stopped.

There can be no stability in business, no control of prices, no certainty in contracts, under our elastic and unsound currency. The importance of a sound currency has been recognized by sound statesmen in all countries, especially by our own statesmen. For instance:

There is a great impropriety, not to say injustice, in compelling a man to receive a part of his debt in discharge of the whole. (Robert Morris.)

Arguments are unnecessary to show that the scale by which everything is to be measured ought to be fixed as the nature of things permit of. (Robert Morris.)

Again:

There is scarcely any point in the economy of national affairs of greater moment than the uniform preservation of the intrinsic value of the money unit. (Alexander Hamilton.)

The money of the United States, and every kind or form of it, whether of paper, silver, or gold, must be as good as the best in the world. It must not only be current at its full face value at home, but it must be counted at par in any and every commercial center of the globe. * * * The dollar paid to the farmer, the wage earner, and the pensioner must continue forever in equal purchasing and debt paying power to the dollar paid to any government creditor. (William McKinley.)

DEFINITION OF SOUND MONEY

With reference to this question of excess of money supply as the child of inflation, I am, under leave to extend, inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 19, 1951, as follows:

AN ANSWER FOR MR. WILSON

Speaking in defense of price controls the other day, Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson was reported by the New York Times to have posed this question: "Has anyone got another plan . . . for keeping inflation under control?"

Well, we have such a plan

But first, since so many discussions of inflation suffer from vague terminology and mixed-up definitions, perhaps we had better set forth more precisely what is this inflation we are talking about. And maybe make a guess or two at what Mr. Wilson is trying to talk about, too.

Judged by its context, Mr. Wilson's question was based on the theory that rising prices, or anyway the tendency of prices to rise, constitute inflation. What he wants to stop is rising prices, or anyway the tendency of prices to rise too rapidly. So, though he professes to dislike price controls in principle, he sees no other method of dealing with "inflation"—his concept of inflation—except to have the Government pass an edict that prices may not be higher than such and such.

If one were to accept Mr. Wilson's definition that rising prices are inflation, it's easy to see how some such direct attack on prices themselves might seem a logical remedy. But even accepting this definition and this approach some difficulties pop up.

The first difficulty of this approach is that even to make it work by its own theory all prices would have to be put under control—the prices for all goods, services, and labor, however seemingly remote or minute. For this sort of inflation obviously affects all prices. If you fix some by edict and leave others free you only twist the economy into an unmanageable shape. In short, you have to have a completely controlled economy.

The second difficulty is that after you accept the theory that what you are trying to do is just to keep prices from being "too high" you have no way of deciding what is "too high." Even at the present ceiling levels many prices are "too high" for many people. If the Government can wave its hand and reduce the price of an article from a dollar to 90 cents, why not reduce it to 85 cents, or 50 cents? If the thing can be done, it occurs to us to suggest that the present ceilings are not nearly low enough, the control rules not strict enough.

In other words, if you were to follow this approach then the thing to do would be to apply price rules to everything and roll the ceilings back to whatever level is necessary to bring all of the inflation out of the economy.

But this, of course, is not the plan we intend to suggest. It is a sidetrack which Mr. Wilson has invited us to explore; if it leads to an absurdity, it is because once you start on this approach, absurdity is the only place you can get to. Yet this is the sidetrack to which we think that the national effort to deal with a serious economic problem has been switched.

This misdirection, we think, comes about because we have to deal with a problem of inflation but have given the name to something else and then proceeded to try to deal with the something else. To get at the problem we need a clearer definition of inflation. And with it a clearer idea of what is meant by control.

Inflation is a monetary phenomenon. It stems solely from an extraordinary increase

in the supply of money. Whether that money supply is augmented by clipping coins, by printing press currency like greenbacks, or by bank deposits based on Government securities is immaterial. We have inflation only when we have the phenomenon of an increased supply of money units.

Since the basic fact of inflation is an inflated money supply, the tendency of prices to rise, as the supply of goods and services is measured in a more plentiful monetary unit, is only a symptom of inflation. Just as a rising temperature is an indication of infection, so rising prices are an indication that inflation is affecting the economy. But rising prices are by no means the inflation itself.

Once this is recognized, the whole question is put in a different light. It is then possible to devise a rational and effective approach to the problem of inflation.

On the face of it, price control can then be seen as no way to deal with inflation. It is not only an answer to inflation; it is almost irrelevant. And hence Mr. Wilson is not really asking for another plan. Because he is missing the point, what he proposes is not a plan for dealing with inflation at all.

Since inflation is a monetary matter, then nothing at all in the way of a control in nonmonetary fields can be applied as a remedy control. Indeed, it ought to be clear that control is not the desired word. What we want is prevention, or, failing that, the ending of inflation.

In our opinion, the thing to do about inflation is not to have it. Or anyway not to have any more of it.

This is not an impossible task, and although it may be politically difficult, that is nothing beside the impossibility of Mr. Wilson's way. All that is necessary is a conscientious national effort by the administration to stop financing Treasury deficits by pumping Government securities into the banking system.

We certainly agree with Mr. Wilson that inflation is an enemy possibly even more dangerous than Russia. But it is an enemy that can be conquered. If the Government will stop inflating the money supply, there will simply no longer be a problem of controlling the runaway prices which Mr. Wilson calls inflation.

knowing this, is attempting to put the responsibility on Congress and on the Republicans.

That is not where it belongs. Why are the inflationary pressures going to be so great? For one reason, because the administration is putting the emphasis on surface controls and neglecting the real and basic causes of inflation. And because, also, the administration failed to act until inflation had gained an almost unstoppable head start.

This accusation is backed by the testimony of a responsible member of the President's own party—Senator BURNETT R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who told the Senate on June 25 that

"Last year the Congress approved a bill giving the administration the authority to freeze prices or to roll back prices to a base period of May 24 to June 24, 1950. The administration did not desire to do this, but apparently wished prices to rise so that increased taxes could be collected from larger incomes, and thereby attempt to balance the budget."

Senator CAPEHART asked if he understood Senator MAYBANK correctly. MAYBANK replied, "That was one of the reasons. Another was that there was an election impending."

Senator MAYBANK also said, on page 7327 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28

"The Congress gave the administration ample power

"I am a Democrat and I will always be a Democrat. However, in justice to the Republican members of the Senate who voted for the control bill last September, I wish to say that they joined with us in writing a strong law. It has never been used. I would suggest that the abuse of Congress results from an attempt to permit those who are responsible for the failure to act promptly under the law to avoid their own responsibility. They have not met their own responsibility to the consumers of the country. If the consumers of the country have any quarrel they have it with the way the law has been administered."

That is the record, and the President's political smoke screen cannot obscure it.

The Responsibility for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of Monday, September 3, 1951, entitled "The Responsibility for Inflation":

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR INFLATION

The exchange of letters between Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, and President Truman has brought from the President an admission that he cannot guarantee that the cost of living will decline even if Congress changes the controls law to conform to the administration's wishes.

Mr. Truman concedes that the inflationary pressures are probably going to be so great that it will be hard to hold the line even with the strongest kind of law.

In other words, it is clear that prices are going to rise, regardless. And the President,

Know Your Waterways—Coastal Feeder Canals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous unanimous consent of the House, I wish to submit a copy of an article which was published in the Washington Post by the Marine News, of New York, N. Y., as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—COASTAL FEEDER CANALS

In locating plants along the coastal waterways, industry has largely chosen sites on feeder canals. As examples, the new \$50,000,000 plant of the Aluminum Co. of America is on a tributary channel at Port Lavaca, Tex., 20 miles off the main Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; United States Steel is building a \$400,000,000 plant on the Delaware at Morrisville, Pa., 26 miles above Philadelphia. Feeder channels help develop new sections, benefit and strengthen industry, and help the general welfare. The reasons are ele-

mentary and simple—water transportation is lowest cost transportation for certain bulk materials and commodities. And almost all waterside plants also have all rail transportation for bringing in certain materials and distributing finished products. For transportation completeness and economy, it is ship to rail—rail to ship. Working together they can achieve economies for the people, earn profits and good will for themselves, and aid strength to the Nation.

American Foreign Policy Has Become the Most Threatening Item of Expense the American Taxpayer Must Bear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the September 18, 1951, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune and is of timely interest:

THEY WANT MORE

American foreign policy a few years ago was a rather abstract thing, as far as the public was concerned.

We let a few statesmen handle the problem, and nobody cared anything further about it.

We still let a few statesmen handle the problem, and still, few people care little or nothing about it.

But foreign policy has become the most threatening item of expense the American taxpayer must bear.

It has developed from an abstraction into a constantly growing, constantly grasping menace to the American system.

At this moment, secret talks are being held in Ottawa, Canada, between the principal nations of the North Atlantic alliance.

One of the major objectives of the European members, especially Britain and France, is to try to prove, according to the Wall Street Journal, that the United States is not carrying its full fair share in rearming the West against Russia.

These European sleight-of-hand artists who always find a place on the diplomatic staffs of their nations, expect to prove by charts and figures that they're doing more proportionately for Western defense than the United States.

They're going to prove that Secretary of State Acheson should go back and ask Congress for more funds for Europe, not as a gift, but rather as payment of a debt—what the United States owes to the common defense.

British and French technicians are working on a formula to determine accurately what our share should be.

That formula beyond doubt will be a masterpiece of some kind. We don't need a crystal ball to tell now that America's share is going to be much, much larger than the people of America have been told by our leaders.

One of the most outrageous frauds ever foisted upon the people of America, by our statesmen in collaboration with Western Europe, has been the old story that we owe Europe a constant debt for "absorbing the first shock of World Wars I and II."

Actually, the statesmen of old Europe owe the American people more than any apology, more than any amount of money ever may rectify, for creating two World Wars in our century, and failing utterly to do any real

and sensible thing to avert either of them or the possibility of world war III.

Now, they tell us we're not pulling our share.

We have just voted \$60,000,000,000 for defense, and \$7,000,000,000 for foreign military aid in the next year. Congress will vote another \$5,000,000,000 soon for the Korean war; we'll be paying them more billions for economic aid—as we've been doing for years—our total foreign hand-outs in the last 10 years total \$103,000,000,000.

Britain's expanded war budget calls for four and one-half billions this year, with no hand-outs to the Western European alliance. France's military budget is half of Britain's.

And, besides all this, they want continued economic aid from the United States.

These demands are becoming incredible. Unless our affairs with regard to the Russian menace are handled better than this, there will be little of America left worth defending in another decade.

We do not say this lightly. We believe that the spirit of a people can become so confused, so broken within a short time by economic and political stress, that even the insane, half-baked ideas of communism may find fertile ground, as they do in one nation after the other.

Added to all this, we read, in the U. S. News & World Report, "Americans in Europe find that dollar aid buys few friends."

"Instead of being grateful for past and present generosity Europeans are inclined to blame the United States for their troubles. Anti-American sentiment is growing among all of this country's Western European allies."

The Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of Members of Congress to the following editorial in the Amherst (Mass.) Journal of September 14, 1951:

THE POSTAL RATES

The way in which Congress is kicking around the question of postal-rate increases leads one to believe that the problem is a difficult one. The various committees are subject to such unfair pressures from the groups with axes to grind that a clear and simple solution is proving illusive. The solving of the \$530,000,000 annual deficit has become cluttered with confusions.

The line of demarcation between justifiable subsidy and the bowing to pressure interests is proving difficult to locate. Far away from such pressures, however, the problem does not appear to be so knotty. Any analysis of the several components of the postal deficit seems to lead to some rather obvious conclusions.

It is proposed that air-mail rates be increased from 6 cents to 8 cents. No one has appeared with a really valid argument against this move. Several times during the lesser economies of the past, this 8-cent rate has prevailed, so there would seem to be nothing illogical about the move.

The proposal to increase the first-class letter from 3 cents to 4 cents is something else again. This type of mail is handled at an average cost of 28 cents per item, and is the

only class of item handled at a profit by the whole Post Office Department. To load on the burden, then, would seem to be poor judgment of the highest order.

The postal card, however, receives the same first class treatment and shares in the same costs. It thus makes sense to increase the charge for cards to 2 cents as the first step in stopping a leak. It is logical, therefore, that we bid a somewhat nostalgic good-bye to the time honored penny post card.

The division called second-class mail is a low-rate privilege which is enjoyed by newspapers, magazines and periodicals that use the mails as their delivery service. A certain amount of subsidy would seem justifiable because, in a sense, it is a subsidization of the general taxpaying public. Were the charge to be higher, some of it, at least, would be passed on to the subscribers, so the end result would be much the same.

But in all fairness, it must be stated, quietly to be sure, that the pittance which it costs to deliver the Amherst Journal to its subscribers is so low as to be beyond belief. In no possible way can it be justified and the newspaper industry in general should be ashamed if a finger is lifted in protest against an increase in the rates of this class mailing.

The third-class matter is the great transgressor. It is by way of this class postage that the enormous volume of printed advertising matter floods today's mail boxes. Most of such matter is unasked for and unwanted. The ridiculously low rate holds open the door for a Government subsidized, and definitely wasteful and bothersome type of advertising. The citizen thus makes up a deficit which was created by something he did not like in the first place.

Naturally, this type mailing occasionally contains worth-while material. Such items are so easily recognized that the sender and the receiver should each be willing to share the cost of delivery at a more reasonable rate.

The fourth and last class of postal service concerns the mailings usually called parcel post. This is the Government's small freight division, and much has been done with rate revisions in recent years to bring the charges more in line with the private freight industry. Several technical changes seem likely, but they should pass more or less unnoticed.

It is easy to be all wise at a distance and to propound a solution without sharing in the responsibility of the decision. But the answers seem so obvious that the Amherst Journal must add its small voice to a good-bye to the penny post card, to a reasonable increase in the cost of deliveries of the Journal and to a rousing increase in the rates which have tended to create the present third-class absurdity.

Congratulations to the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 18, 1951:

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NEW YORK TIMES

The Star congratulates the New York Times on its one hundredth birthday anniversary today. It is a newspaper which has

every reason to be proud of an honorable past—which is the subject of a book, *The Story of the New York Times*, reviewed elsewhere on this page. It has reason to be proud of the mere fact of survival in a century which saw the promising birth of so many newspapers now dead and gone, or whose memory has been kept alive through absorption by other newspapers. But its greatest source of pride should be that the Times is a better newspaper today than it ever was and that its success and prestige have been achieved without compromising the principles of clean and objective journalism which are a part of its tradition.

The Times is one of the good examples in the world of journalism of the proposition that freedom of the press under our Constitution carries with it the obligation of public responsibility. Its careful and thorough coverage of the day's news without conscious bias, and its reasoned and judicious editorial comment on that news reflect this consciousness of responsibility. It has been rewarded by material success and the respect of readers around the world.

There are three men—Henry J. Raymond, the founder, Adolph S. Ochs, who bought the paper in 1896 and until his death in 1935 was publisher, and Arthur Hays Sulzberger, the present publisher—whose concept of the responsibilities of proprietorship has played so important a part in molding the character of the Times. But thousands of men, over a century, have helped to build the Times, have felt the discipline of high purpose and have responded with loyal devotion to the cause of sound journalism. They are the ones who have made the Times.

Prohibition of Import of Fats and Oils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning, from the National Creamery Association and the American Butter Institute, an important message in which they have conveyed their opposition to proposals to weaken the restrictions on foreign butter and other dairy and fat imports, or placed in the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, Public Law No. 96, of the Eighty-second Congress.

I, for one, have been deeply interested in this subject in my dual capacities as: (a) United States Senator from Wisconsin—famed for its creamy-rich butter and other dairy products; and (b) as ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in which capacity I am naturally particularly interested in the promotion of world trade and economic strength of the free nations.

I believe that the letter to which I have referred presents a graphic picture of the present serious butter situation as it exists in our country today. It conveys facts worthy of the deep consideration of our tariff experts—facts which I have previously cited in connection with dairy problems. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* at this point and be thereafter referred to the Senate Banking Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

AMERICAN BUTTER INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR, Included in the Defense Production Act of July 31, 1951, is the provision that "imports of fats and oils, including butter, cheese, and other dairy products are prohibited until June 30, 1952, if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that such imports would impair or reduce domestic production, interfere with orderly marketing or storage, or result in any unnecessary burden or expenditure under any Government price-support program. The President shall exercise the authority provided in the provision."

At present, hearings are under way on S. 2104, the request made to modify or repeal this provision. The butter industry, represented by the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, and reflecting the sentiment of farmers and processors, is opposed to any weakening of the safeguards embodied in this section of the Defense Production Act.

The reasons for this position are:

Increased sales of butter to the Government. The August 15 report of the United States Department of Agriculture shows butterfat to be 94 percent of parity. Butter prices are dangerously close to the support level. Any import of foreign butter will necessitate sales of domestic stocks to the Government, under the price-support program. The August 1951 report of the dairy situation states, "Stocks of butter increased rapidly during June and July, reaching a total of about 105,000,000 pounds on July 31. The total is still below average though relation to the current rate of consumption is larger than usual." During 1950, industry storage stocks of butter amounted to approximately 38,000,000 pounds. The total storage figure, reported by United States Department of Agriculture, for the same period in 1950 was 230,652,000 pounds of which 192,000,000 pounds were owned by the Government. At present, only about 200,000 pounds of butter are now under Government ownership, through support-program sales.

Milk production will be jeopardized: Beef cattle are now 147 percent of parity. Veal calves are 148 percent of parity. In 1944 there were 25,818,000 milk cows on farms. Milk cow population has dropped steadily through the years and the estimate for 1951 is 22,668,000. These figures are taken from the Dairy Situation released by the United States Department of Agriculture on August 30, 1951. Dairy herds have historically supplied approximately 40 percent of the beef and 75 percent of the veal for the consumer's table. Many dairy herds, because of the disparity between meat and milk prices, are being slaughtered. Although population in the country has increased, milk production has decreased in 1951 over 1950 a full 1 percent. Aggravation of this condition will result from removal of import bans on butter and other manufactured dairy products to the detriment of milk production and agricultural welfare.

Return to milk production is a 3-year job. A 3-year period is needed to bring a dairy cow into efficient production. It is now more profitable to feed a dairy calf for 6 months and sell this calf for veal than to continue raising the calf to a producing milk cow. Herd replacements are necessary for sound dairy production. Further discouragement to raise calves to mature milking cows will result if imports of manufactured dairy products are permitted.

Fluid milk supply threatened: Manufactured dairy products, such as butter, cheese, evaporated and dried milk, utilize more than 50 percent of the Nation's production. During seasons of high production these products absorb the surplus to provide a

market for all milk produced. During seasons of low production, these products provide a source of supply to fluid milk consumption areas. Butter is the "balance wheel" of the dairy industry. Cows producing cream for butter manufacture in late spring and early summer months provide milk for fluid markets and other manufactured dairy products during the fall and winter months. Imports of butter, which will discourage farmers from producing cream, will dry up the supply of milk for urban markets when it is most needed.

We therefore urge retention of the provision of the Defense Production Act banning import of fats, oil, and dairy products as it affects butter.

Very truly yours,

W. A. GORDON,
Executive Secretary, National Creameries
Association, St. Paul, Minn.

RUSSELL FIFER,
Executive Secretary, American Butter
Institute, Chicago, Ill.

Washington Not Confidential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, last Sunday in the Washington Star appeared an article by our beloved and distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, entitled "Washington Not Confidential." I feel very strongly that this article is of such a type and nature that it should be read by everyone who is interested in the Capital of our great country, and I dare say that means everyone in the country. I regret that the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* is not received by all the people of the United States, but I must point out at the same time that it is available to all through the libraries which exist in our country. Because of the significance of this article, and because of its timely nature, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

WASHINGTON NOT CONFIDENTIAL

(By Frederick Brown Harris, pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

Anything which blackens the Capital casts a shadow on the Nation to which it belongs and of which it is a symbol. Washington is a mirror which reflects the Republic. In that looking glass are naturally revealed telltale signs of the dangerous malady infecting the whole country whose symptoms may be summed up in two words: Moral sag. But lewd gossip, true or false, labeled "Confidential" must be seen in the perspective of what is left out; the black it paints must be measured with the good ignored.

There is faith there, as well as filth. There is virtue as well as vice. There is splendor as well as shame. There is nothing ever confidential about goodness. It is evil which whispers on dark corners and hides from the light of day. This is no attempt to whitewash Washington. It is by no means a cathedral of cloistered virtues. What city is? It does have its peculiar temptations in these crucial times just because it is a city set upon a hill in a fear-haunted world, where all roads lead to it. To call a perverted and

putrid trip to foul cesspools and catacombs of corruption "Seeing Washington" is to libel not only the city but the Nation to which it belongs.

Even the dirty linen which during recent months has been so conspicuously flapping on the national clothesline is not necessarily a sign of the coming collapse of our moral structure. It may indicate, as former President Hoover recently suggested, the fact that "moral stamina still survives in our people whose strength is in character and in truth and in decent living."

We must not be dominated in our mood nor dimmed in our faith, nor deceived in our appraisals by men with muckrakes who would yank up a plank even in a garden walk and holding a magnifying glass over the loathsome things that there creep and crawl, cry, "Look, here is the beautiful bower of which you boast."

St. Paul easily could have written a treatise on the underworld of those ancient cities he knew so well. Listen to the frank catalog of what lurked in the shadows. He speaks of "thieves, drunkards, extortioners, fornicators, effeminate abusers of themselves, men leaving the normal feeling for women to burn in their lust toward one another; those who have reprobate minds filled with all unrighteousness, maliciousness, envy, murder, deceit, malignity, innovators of evil things, without natural affections, whose tongues work deceit and under whose lips is the poison of asps." That is Corinth and Ephesus and Rome "confidential," as the New Testament records them. Nevertheless, Paul, who penned it, exclaimed: "There are saints even in Caesar's household." His epistles have come down the years as the chariots of the Lord, not because he tells of the moral sewers, but because he displays lives transfigured and transformed by the renewing of their minds.

It is no stop-the-press news that modern cities reek with the same disgusting abnormalities and licentiousness which have plagued humanity since long before Paul's time. But it is no wonder that, discussing a certain book exuding its phosphorescent rottenness on newsstands all over the country, a group of hard-headed, seasoned reporters in the National Press Club were heard to exclaim about this much-talked-of tome: "Where in heaven's name did they find all this putrid stuff which we have never seen in this city?" The answer is, of course, that much of it is a carbon copy of police records and of criminal blotters. As its authors confess, the pages were deliberately freighted with malodorous contamination in order to sell the book.

As an antidote to the almost total depravity a despondent reader might assume in the world city it depicts, let us page the prophet Elijah. Long, long ago, he got a very wrong notion. Evidently he had been reading some reports of confidential evil. What he saw sent him under a juniper tree praying for death. He had come to the conclusion that he was the only one who had not been defiled and debased, who had not bowed down to the altar of false gods. But he was not so lonely in his goodness as he imagined. What he needed to bring him back to sanity was a sense of proportion. His reason had been almost unsettled by disgusting evidences of decadence within the nation. To his surprise, he was shown multitudes of quiet homes where God-fearing folk were keeping the faith. God assured His prophet: "I have yet left me 7,000 in Israel, knees which have not bowed unto Baal." And so in his arithmetic of virtue Elijah was off in his calculation of the national defection from righteousness by no less than 6,999.

That suggests the utterly fallacious and unfair picture which has nothing to say of what millions of normal, decent people see and find in the entrancing city which belongs to all America. For it contains

moral and spiritual beauty which matches its cherry blossoms and its monuments and its broad, tree-lined avenues. The unfortunate impression has been given that parents allowing their daughters to venture to the Capital in Government employ, in search of learning or culture, or even to witness its architectural glories, are sending them into a modern Sodom, steeped in moral turpitude, where sordidness is the norm. Anxious parents are given to believe that concealed by the monumental buildings and glittering attractions is a slimy, evil-eyed octopus whose tentacles sweep the city to drag all purity down to the depths. Of course, the fact is that there is an underworld of debauchery; but there are also spires of the spirit.

These smut-scenting reporters passed by hundreds of spires and church portals in their quest for obscenity. There is nothing confidential in the fact that there are listed in the telephone books of the Capital, in addition to its schools and colleges, almost a thousand churches of all faiths. Through these portals an army of young men and women, who come from the cities, towns, hamlets, and countryside of America, from sea to shining sea, constantly pour, to find uplifting fellowship and inspiring programs which harness activities to whatsoever things are pure, excellent, lovely, and of good report.

Those who come from decent backgrounds and with passion to be true to worthy traditions and to wear the white flower of a blameless life will find Washington as safe a city as can be found in America, or out of it. To the parents of America we would say: Do not hesitate to send your youth to Washington, your Capital. But be sure—be very sure—to send them to the churches that wait to receive them. Send them with the prayer in your heart and in theirs which was so often on the lips of a great leader who loved Washington and thought of it as the fairest of fair cities, and who, gazing at the effulgent beauty of the illumined Capitol dome against the night sky, often was heard to exclaim: "God, make us worthy of America at its best." In the Nation's Capital that is the prayer and the goal of untold thousands pouring out their lives in character-building institutions, including the churches, tolling 7 days a week to send out influences of sweetness and light in a radiant and wholesome "Washington nonconfidential."

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of Members of Congress to a resolution on William N. Oatis that has been presented by Aerie No. 148 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Springfield, Mass.

The order is well known to be a loyal, patriotic organization. I am proud to say that the Springfield Aerie is composed of very fine citizens who are interested in civic and world affairs. They seek fair play and justice for all.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was

brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous kangaroo court, completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world, and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Springfield, Mass., Aerie, No. 148, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free people of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie, No. 148, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet News Agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 5th day of September 1951.
Attest.

JACOB KOCH,
Worthy President,
JOHN J. O'SHEA, Sr.,
Secretary.

The Crime Problem in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I got off the train this morning there were being held by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the various alternatives of racing wire news service legislation, S. 1563, S. 1564, S. 1624, and S. 2116.

I am delighted that these hearings are being held and I want to express my sincere congratulations to the members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and in particular, to its able chairman, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for holding these hearings.

We all recognize that in the closing weeks of a congressional session there inevitably pile up a great many complex

and important bills before each of the standing committees. I am very glad indeed, therefore, that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has found the time amidst its busy schedule to take action on this particular racing wire problem.

We of the Senate Crime Committee proved during the life of our group that the organization known as Continental Press is the key to the Nation-wide multi-billion-dollar-bookie empire. Destroy Continental Press, and any successor organizations, and you have crippled not only off-the-track gambling on a nationally syndicated basis, but you have helped smash the bank roll which supports a great variety of other organized crimes.

At this time, Mr. President, I have in my hands a series of resolutions adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General at its forty-fifth annual meeting in Seattle, Wash., on August 4 through 8, 1951. Among the resolutions adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General were a series relating to crime control, including interstate gambling. These resolutions were sent to me by Mr. Frank Bane, executive director of the Council of State Governments. The present president of the National Association of Attorneys General, I might note, is the Honorable Roy H. Beeler of Tennessee, which interestingly enough is the home State of our own distinguished battler against crime, the former chairman of our special committee (Mr. KEFAUVER).

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Attorneys General resolutions on crime control be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask that it be followed by these materials: First, the text of an editorial carried in the September 13, 1951, Janesville, Wis., Gazette, regarding my personal comments on the new pattern of American crime; second, the text of a write-up in the Christian Science Monitor of September 11, on the recommendations conveyed by the American Bar Association Commission on Organized Crime. I believe that the bar commission, headed by Judge Robert Patterson, of New York, former Secretary of War, is to be congratulated for helping to continue to throw the spotlight on this important problem. While one may not agree with all of the commission's conclusions, there is one conclusion I think every American attorney can heartily support, and that is that the commission, itself, be carried on for another year, as it recommends. Keep up the good work, Bob Patterson, and your associates. Finally, excerpts of an editorial in the Burlington, Vt., Free Press as reported in the issue of the Christian Science Monitor referred to above. This is a splendid editorial pointing up the moral responsibilities of public officials and citizens alike.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

XII. CRIME CONTROL

Whereas organized crime has become so widespread and far-reaching, so arrogant in

its attitude, so ruthless and so menacing that it presents a test to the very existence of established government; and

Whereas the Special Committee of the United States Senate To Investigate Organized Crime, and crime commissions of State and local character have forcefully exposed the illicit and illegal operations of racketeers and hoodlums in this Nation who operate in violation of State and local laws; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed certain legislation pertaining to the use of interstate commerce by such criminal operators; and

Whereas we recognize that the responsibility to suppress and control organized crime rests mainly with State and local governments but that where effective assistance can be given by the Federal Government, the Congress should take action which will prohibit the shipment, dissemination, or use in interstate commerce of all information, devices, and things which can or may be used in violation of State laws, and

Whereas much has been accomplished by the Senate investigating committee in exposing interstate operations of criminal activities throughout the country; and

Whereas these revelations and recommendations are not permanent remedies in themselves; and

Whereas the work so ably commenced by the Senate investigating committee will not be complete until the Federal, State, and local governments shall have erected more permanent safeguards against the operations of organized crime, and now is not the time to relax or abandon the committee's work; and

Whereas in further aid to the respective States and localities in their fight against organized crime, the Federal Congress should strengthen its laws in certain fields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Forty-fifth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General:

1. That Congress should enact a wire service law to prohibit the transmission of gambling information across State lines by telephone, telegraph, radio transmission, or other means of communication, as recommended by the third interim report of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

2. That the Congress should prohibit the use of the mails in furtherance of any and all gambling transactions and strengthen its present laws in that regard.

3. That the Congress should strengthen its internal revenue laws as recommended by the Senate investigating committee so as to require more complete reports by those operating in violation of Federal and State laws and by forbidding the charging off of expenses and losses resulting from gambling activities; and in addition thereto, to provide for the exchange of information and evidence obtained pertaining to the violation of such laws with the tax authorities of the various States for use in State courts.

4. That the Congress should strengthen the antinarcotics laws as recommended by the third interim report of the Senate investigating committee.

5. That the attorneys general approve the action of the Attorney General of the United States in setting up a racket squad in the Department of Justice with duties as set forth in the third interim report of the Senate investigating committee.

6. That the Congress strengthen Federal laws pertaining to alcohol and liquor control as recommended by the third interim report of the Senate investigating committee and, in addition thereto, to prohibit the sale of stamps or licenses of the Federal Government in those States where State laws prohibit activities and operations thus federally licensed or stamped.

7. That there be further action of the Congress or the Bureau of Internal Revenue requiring the name and address of the owners of slot machines and similar gaming devices to be listed on tax payment applications and licenses.

8. That we urge the Congress to introduce and pass legislation which will define a gambling device per se and which will make it unlawful and will prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of all such gambling devices per se; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the congressional delegation of each State and to the Attorney General of the United States and to the members of the Special Crime Investigating Committee of the United States Senate.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of September 13, 1951]

WILEY SEES CRIME IN A NEW PATTERN

As a member of the Senate crime investigating committee, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has had opportunity to dig into the sordid facts of crime in the United States and has reached some interesting conclusions.

In his weekly newsletter he states "As fast as new laws are devised, the criminals change their habits and patterns. Back in the 1920's, the criminals made literally hundreds of millions of dollars from bootlegging. We all recall, too, the murderous gang wars of the postwar Chicago era when the rival bootlegging mobs battled it out on the streets. We remember the machine-gun massacres.

"But that situation has changed. The modern criminal has turned 'respectable' and 'polite.' He moves in the 'best of circles,' he dresses well, he lives in the best of neighborhoods, he contributes generously to charities. But if you investigate deeply enough, you will find that undercover, he meets with the same old mobsters of old. You will find that he has invested his ill-gotten moneys in legitimate business and often is using his bankroll, moreover, to finance various types of illegal operations. You will find, too, that he isn't paying his fair share of income taxes. This is the 'modern criminal,' and it is up to us to use modern tactics against him. Constantly improved laws and an ever-ready zeal to prosecute wrongdoers must be an answer to our hoodlums."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 11, 1950]

STIFF ANTICRIME LAW OUTLINED TO PUT I.D. ON BETTING RACKETS
(By Mary Hornaday)

Finding "obvious deficiencies" in the gambling laws of the 48 States, the American Bar Association Commission on Organized Crime has urged the preparation and submission to the States of a model antigambling law.

Established last September when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, asked cooperation of the bar association in the work of his crime investigating committee, the commission, headed by Judge Robert P. Patterson, found the gambling laws of many States so poorly drawn and the proof demanded so unrealistic that evasion is easy. Penalties provided are frequently so slight, the commission states, as to amount to the quasi licensing of gambling.

The committee report to be submitted to the bar association's house of delegates next week says: "This code should be designed to prohibit modern forms of gambling and modern methods of conducting gambling operations."

RIGID BETTING CURBS

"It should not overlook the importance of communications to present-day bookmaking and betting operations. It should provide for rigid prohibitions of the use of telephone, telegraph, radio, and television facil-

ities for the dissemination of gambling information as well as the taking and placing of bets and wagers.

"Nor will the model code fail to include separate and effective sections on lotteries, the policy game or numbers rackets, slot machines, and gambling establishments. It should incorporate the recommendation made by the Senate committee and found in the laws of Minnesota and Wisconsin, that liquor, food, and other types of licenses of establishments which permit gambling on their premises be forfeited."

The commission also suggested:

Preparation of State statutes to make possible greater State supervision over local law enforcement agencies; the adoption of uniform law enforcement policies, and an improvement in the functioning of local law enforcement agencies.

A vigorous campaign by State and local associations to eliminate the lawyer who actively cooperates with criminals, advises them how to evade the criminal law, or otherwise participates in the activities of those violating the criminal laws.

EFFICIENT STAFFS VITAL

Appointment in each State of official crime commissions adequately financed and staffed to make thoroughgoing and continuing analyses of local problems of organized crime and the efficiency of law-enforcement agencies in combating them.

Formation of continuing independent citizens' groups in States and in metropolitan centers to keep the public advised as to crime conditions within their communities and the effectiveness of public officials in dealing with them.

State investigations cited as having provided valuable information are those conducted by the various crime study commissions appointed by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, and the five-man commission appointed by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

In its research on gambling, the commission found that except for pari-mutuel betting at race tracks in 27 States, and all forms of gambling in Nevada, gambling is everywhere illegal in the United States. But only half the States have specific statutes outlawing bookmaking. They make no provision for the type of bookmaking operated by agents who take bets by word of mouth or over the phone. Only five States have specific legislation directed against policy or the numbers game.

STRONGER LEGAL CHECK

In addition to recommending action to strengthen the hands of the States in dealing with organized crime, the commission also urged support for many pieces of legislation introduced in the Eighty-second Congress by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee to strengthen the powers of the Federal Government.

It especially recommends support for bills which would control the transmission in interstate commerce of sports news essential to gambling operations, prohibit transmission of bets and wages across State lines, and provide better means of reaching the income of gamblers and racketeers through Federal taxation.

The commission will ask the association to disapprove proposed Washington legislation providing mandatory penalties for narcotics offenses. In practice, the commission said, the mandatory provision and removal of the discretion from the judge actually lessens penalties instead of increasing them.

The formation of a Federal crime commission urges continuing investigation of organized crime in interstate commerce, either through a joint committee of the Senate and the House or through a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press]

CRIME AND CORRUPTION

The Senate Crime Committee, under Senator KEFAUVER, has completed its 15-month investigation of crime throughout the Nation and made a final report calling for action to clean up America. The conditions which it revealed should awaken every good citizen to do something about it.

Have we become calloused to immorality, crime, and corruption, or are we just so busy with our own private affairs that we don't pay any attention to public problems?

Herbert Hoover, speaking last week in Des Moines, appealed for a return to the old virtues lest the lights go out of America. He warned of the decay of integrity and the rotting of patriotism.

Hoover showed great concern over disclosures of dishonor in high places and the frustration of Congress in groping for some sort of code of ethics which might protect the citizen from his own officials.

There is one encouraging sign, said Hoover, "Moral indignation is on the march again."

Let us hope that is true. It is not as evident as we would like to see it. There is still too much inclination to be easy going about dishonesty and covering up on the part of public officials who are concerned primarily with their own personal profit rather than with serving the public.

There is still a tendency to consider that public official smart if he feathers his own nest when he has the chance. The fact that he does it at the expense of the taxpayers doesn't seem to arouse the indignation that it should.

When politicians are willing to give protection to criminals, in return for financial support and votes, the core of our political system is rotten.

When those in places of power are willing to accept bribes for their favor, we should hang our heads in shame in this country.

For we, the people, are responsible for this sort of thing. By our votes we can remove corrupt public officials and replace them with honest men. There are still honest men who will not condone that sort of thing, even though it may sometimes seem they are rare.

The difficulty with us is that too few have the moral stamina to resist the temptations which come with money and power.

Hoover is right when he says we need to return to the old virtues. It is time to stop acting as if we had outgrown the Ten Commandments. It is time to stop and take stock of our spiritual values. Too many of us are on the verge of moral and spiritual bankruptcy without realizing it.

Just as a chain cannot be any stronger than its weakest link, so the public morality of a nation cannot be any stronger than the spiritual strength of its individual citizens.

Imprisonment of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the distinguished journalistic fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi, to the Department of State, regarding the William N. Oatis case. A copy of this letter,

commenting on the outrageous imprisonment of this American newspaperman without cause, was forwarded by the fraternity to the Embassy of Czechoslovakia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIGMA DELTA CHI,

PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTIC FRATERNITY,
Chicago, Ill., August 21, 1951.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,

State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The executive council of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity with a membership of 20,000 in all fields of American journalism, strongly condemns the imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of an American press association correspondent. We recognize the precedent set in his case as a grave threat to press freedom which is in more danger than had been heretofore realized if a journalist can be convicted of espionage for endeavoring to report the truth.

Sigma Delta Chi joins in urging that the United States Government realize a solemn obligation to be unrelenting in its efforts to bring about the release of William Oatis by every legitimate means at its command, and to obtain assurances from all nations with which we maintain diplomatic relations that the rights of American citizens abroad will be protected.

This council realizes the complexity of the problem that William Oatis presents. It does not urge hasty or impetuous action which might result in welding even tighter the iron barrier prohibiting a free flow of news between the West and the East. It commends such action as that initiated by the Department of State in terminating trade concessions heretofore granted to Czechoslovakia. And it urges most strongly that representations in behalf of the imprisoned journalist be made emphatic, and frequent enough to impress upon the Czech Government and others dominated by the Soviet Union that the United States does not consider this to be a minor incident.

This council further urges that full publicity be given to whatever efforts are made to convince the Czech Government that the imprisonment of William Oatis is an affront to all people who believe in freedom of expression and who rely on such men as Oatis for the facts that make it possible to be alert to what is going on in the world.

Finally, this council favors constant vigilance in devising and finding ways not now apparent for righting the grievous wrong done to this member of the journalistic profession.

To that end it offers whatever cooperation and support this organization can extend to the State Department and others who may be in a position to deal with the forces which have silenced an outpost of press freedom.

Most respectfully yours,

The Executive Council of Sigma Delta Chi: Carl R. Kesler, editorial writer, Chicago Daily News, chairman; John M. McClelland, Jr., editor, Longview (Wash.) Daily News; Charles C. Clayton, editorial writer, St. Louis Globe-Democrat; Lee Hills, managing editor, Miami Herald; Alden C. Waite, president and general manager, Southern California Associated Newspapers; Robert U. Brown, editor, Editor and Publisher; Lyle Wilson, Washington Bureau manager, United Press; Ted Barrett, Dallas Morning News; Mason R. Smith, editor, Tribune Press Governor, N. Y.; Ed Dooley, managing editor, the Denver Post; Prof. Clifford F. Weigle, Institute for Journalistic Studies, Stanford University; Victor E. Bludorn, executive director, Sigma Delta Chi.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the New York Times today, September 18, celebrates its one hundredth birthday. The story of the Times is a fascinating one, with many ups and downs and continued success since 1896, when it was purchased by Adolph Simon Ochs. Throughout its life the Times has been a paper of courage, honor, and greatness.

The people of Tennessee, and particularly those of Chattanooga, have an especial interest and pride in the growth, development, and tremendous success of the New York Times. This is true not only because we of Tennessee acclaim a remarkable newspaper, but because Adolph S. Ochs came from Chattanooga, Tenn. As a young man, he purchased the New York Times, in 1896, and, along with Mr. Sulzberger and General Adler, is responsible for its greatness today.

Mr. Ochs was founder of the Chattanooga Times, which is still owned by the Ochs family, and this newspaper, in its field, has attained and maintains the same high caliber and progressive attitude as the New York Times.

The story of Adolph S. Ochs is a legend in Tennessee, and especially in Chattanooga, and it is the story of how, as a young man, without means as the result of the panic of 1893, he came from Chattanooga to New York, secured control of the New York Times, carried it through many turbulent periods, and built it into one of the world's great newspapers. He is an inspiration to all of us.

Adolph Ochs' brother, Milton Ochs, and many members of his family, are leading citizens in Chattanooga. Adolph Ochs and his family have made great contributions to the development of Tennessee. The Lookout Mountain National Park, the Ochs Memorial Temple, the Ochs Highway up Lookout Mountain, and many other civic improvements, are testimony of the continuing interest of Adolph Ochs in his home State. We of Tennessee are proud of Adolph Ochs and the Ochs family, of the Chattanooga Times, and of the New York Times.

The story of the New York Times is accurately told in the well-written book by Meyer Berger, published this week. His article in last week's Life Magazine is an excellent summary of this fascinating episode in American history. I should like to include all of the article in the Record, but since it exceeds the two-page limit, I ask unanimous consent to include the latter part of the article, which begins with the history of the New York Times when Adolph S. Ochs came into the picture.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DRIFT TOWARD THE ROCKS

When Jones died in 1891 the Times was on the rocks. Charles Ransom Miller, editor in chief, a learned man with no more business sense than a tree stump, got some Wall Street money, but only enough to rent the plant and to keep an ever-shrinking payroll going. As the staff decreased, news fell off in quantity as well as in quality. Miller desperately tried to stuff space with cheap fiction and assorted claptrap. The Times lumbered toward bankruptcy and extinction.

The saving day was August 13, 1896. On that day the Times was sold at receivers' auction to a group of Wall Street men headed by Spencer Trask and to a stranger to New York named Adolph Simon Ochs, a 38-year-old Tennessean who secretly, in letters to his family, had confided that he was a scared "greenhorn" in New York and that ownership of the Times had been beyond his wildest dreams.

Ochs was the son of poor German immigrants. He had had little formal schooling. He had been a barefoot newsboy in Knoxville, Tenn., then a printer's devil, a journeyman printer. In 1878, at the age of 20, he had borrowed \$250 to start as publisher of the Chattanooga Times and had converted it into one of the best papers of the South. He had lost all his profits in real-estate investment and had come to New York. Just before he got the Times he had wandered around borrowing a few thousand here, a few thousand there, trying to keep afloat. A few weeks before the sale of the Times he had invested \$5 in a bicycle suit and had studied the big city from the seat of a hired wheel. When the time for the great deal came he had \$75,000, all borrowed, to put into it.

Though he had extraordinary business genius and rare newspaper sense, the new Times boss was singularly Micawberish and occasionally a little naive. His first act after he had been formally installed in what had been Jones' office on August 18, 1896, was characteristic. He wrote to his wife, Effie, and to his infant daughter, Iphigene: "The first New York Times letter sheet I use carries my love to those who are dearer to me than the prize I have won. . . . An army of men stands ready to carry out my wishes. I have succeeded way beyond my fondest hopes, and with God's help will maintain the position with credit. I am a lucky fellow." The prize was a shabby wreck with presses shot, fixtures worn, supplies and equipment short. The army was a dispirited staff with morale all but entirely rubbed off. Joseph Pulitzer of the World and William Randolph Hearst of the Journal, who had brought the new "yellow journalism" to New York with great profit to themselves, were inclined to write Ochs off.

They didn't know the man. A master printer, he changed the hang-dog typographical look of the paper overnight. He tossed out the junk that Miller had used to stuff holes with, and used his small working capital for more news. He introduced new financial features, jacked up Wall Street coverage, and within 7 weeks had cut expenses drastically by eliminating waste. Within a month he had added a Sunday magazine supplement based on the news and a Saturday book review.

The day after Ochs took over on Park Row he ran his declaration of journalistic principle on the editorial page. He pledged that, maintaining the Raymond and Jones tradition, he would present news "in language parliamentary in good society." He prom-

ised that he would "give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of any party, sect, or interest involved." In other words, the Gray Lady was not, under any circumstances, going to turn gaudy.

While Hearst and Pulitzer kept the New Yorkers emotionally high-pitched and jumpy, Ochs shrewdly accented the calm and sober viewpoint. Trade papers, clergymen, and editors began applauding the miraculous resurrection of the Times. Across the country, the editor of the San Francisco Argonaut, wrote: "Realizing that the sewer and morgue fields were fully occupied by the World and the Journal, Ochs determined to issue a clean paper for a change. Very much to the surprise of himself and New York, he is making a success of it."

The Tennessee "greenhorn" offered a \$100 prize for a Times slogan that would stress the virginal purity of the newspaper's news content. Before the contest ended he used some of his own, including, "It will not sell the breakfast linen." The prize went to D. M. Redfield, of New Haven, Conn. ("All the world news, but not a school for scandal"), but the winning slogan was junked. Ochs had made up one he liked better. He had taken a Philadelphia newspaper's "All the news" and had added "that's fit to print."

GAMBLER'S CHANCE

But the real crisis for the brash young man lay ahead. Aware that the newcomer had remarkable newspaper genius, Pulitzer tried to smother him with lanky invective. When the Spanish-American War broke, the sensation journals, spending money wildly for lavish coverage, all but overwhelmed the still impoverished Times. For a while it seemed that Ochs might have wasted his toil.

He took a desperate gambler's chance. Early in October 1898 he dropped the Times price from 3 cents to 1 cent, though the World and the Journal still sold for only 2 cents. While his friends thought him financially crazy and all suspicious onlookers cried that he was deserting his dignity to compete with the scandal sheets, a tight-lipped Ochs announced, "It is the price of the paper, not its character, that is changed."

He all but held his breath until the tide turned. It did—dramatically. Circulation tripled, and so did advertising. By 1900 he had increased readership from 9,000 to 82,000. In another year the figure had leaped to 102,000, and advertising lineage passed the 5,000,000 mark. On August 14, 1900, Spencer Trask, who had backed Ochs in the reorganization of the Times, reluctantly released the certificates that gave Ochs, by the terms of their contract, majority control of the newspaper. The Micawber strain showed through the night this deal was completed. "The contract I made in 1896," he wrote to Effie, "is ended. My title is perfect. Now I am monarch of all I survey, and none my right to dispute."

The decades from the hour when Ochs took complete control of the Times until he died in 1935 brought the happy maturing of the Gray Lady. Ochs' own success shook neither his poise nor his principle. He kept plowing back into the Times a major portion of the profits, striving for an ever better world coverage. When he had to borrow more than \$2,500,000 to raise Times Tower in what is now Times Square, he proudly refused to give banker creditors a detailed account of his finances—something to be expected, he exclaimed, only from a prospective bankrupt. As his name became known the world over, rich men and great institutions sought his friendship but never dimmed his own clear view of himself. Invited to judge a Yale-Harvard debate in 1903, he politely begged off though he stood ever in awe of anything scholarly. "I turned down the debate bid," he confided to his

sister Nannie, "on the theory that the higher a monkey climbs the more he shows his tail." Every once in a while he would get off a pun about the danger of an Ochs, trying to play up to the lions, turning out, instead, to be an ass.

The Times printed its last Park Row issue on New Year's Day in 1905. That night Ochs worked his new presses and linotypes in the Tower for the first time, without losing stride. By now this Mr. Micawber from Tennessee had real right to gloat that he, a near-bankrupt, had brought a dying newspaper to new life and housed it in the finest newspaper plant in the world—all within less than 9 years.

Working for him now as managing editor was Carr Vattel Van Ande, a remarkable man steeped in science, mathematics, and newspaper-making, whose cold, professional stare was secretly referred to as "the death ray." Ochs had hired Van Ande away from the New York Sun, and the two men made probably the keenest journalistic team in history. In April 1904, by arrangement with the Times of London, they scooped the rest of the world on the Japanese-Russian naval engagement off Port Arthur, getting the report by the first wireless war dispatch ever sent from a correspondent's craft at sea. Three years later they ran the first wireless press dispatch ever sent across the Atlantic on the Times' front page on October 18, 1907. Pioneering or keeping pace with every forward leap of wireless and radio, they were unmatched in their news pursuit of aviation and exploration—from Commodore Robert E. Peary's discovery of the North Pole in 1909 to Roald Amundsen's discovery of the South Pole.

Although the Times, like most other newspapers, missed out on the Wright brothers' flight at Kittyhawk in 1903, it made up for that lapse after Van Ande came to the paper. On May 29, 1910, he snatched the Glenn Curtiss Albany-New York flight story from under the nose of the World, which had put up \$10,000 as prize for the flight. Van Ande secretly hired a special reporter-filled train to follow the plane's progress down the Hudson, a trick the World had overlooked. The Times reported every phase of this pioneer air journey and made the most of it.

TITANIC SCOOP

Van Ande's mathematical genius and his general knack for figuring anything out by cold formula dismayed opposition. When the liner *Titanic*, on maiden voyage from England, flashed a call for help from mid-Atlantic on Sunday night, April 14, 1912, and then fell silent, the Times' news boss believed that she had gone down. Other editors, believing, as they repeatedly read and heard, that the *Titanic* was unsinkable, waited for further word from her. While they waited, Van Ande—acting on the logical conviction that the ship's silence meant she was gone, with most of her 2,180 passengers—put out a Times story that scooped the world. The story, of course, stood up. When rescue ships put into New York a few days later, his coldly calculated, leak-proof coverage gave the Times a 15-page version of the greatest sea disaster in history that no other publication even remotely matched. This achievement became part of indestructible Van Ande legend.

The managing editor's handling of World War I news was a companion piece. He studied every available military map, anticipated major campaigns, accurately shifted his correspondents to vantage points. From beginning to end he outdistanced and outguessed all competition.

Thriving under such leadership, the Times was yet almost wrecked by an event late in World War I. One Sunday night in September 1918, Charles Miller, whom Ochs had retained as editor-in-chief, wrote a piece advocating consideration of Austria's first bid

for a "nonbinding" peace discussion. Whipped by desire for the enemy's unconditional surrender, public reaction was immediate and frightening. Wrathful letters, telegrams, and cables lashed the editorial as cowardly and as pro-German. Anguished and panicky aids tried to persuade Ochs to announce that he had not seen the editorial before it got into print—which was true. Ochs refused. "I have always accepted public praise and public approval of the many great editorials Mr. Miller has written for the Times. When there is blame instead of praise I must share that too."

The public's temper tantrum passed. The Times survived and prospered with the coming of peace. By 1921 its circulation under Ochs had soared to 330,802.

The brilliant editing of Van Ande won the Times triumphs in fields usually remote from journalistic beats. It was Van Ande who first publicized Albert Einstein and who first gave newspaper readers some knowledge of the potentialities of atomic energy. In 1922 the managing editor leaped on a dispatch about the opening of Tutankhamen's tomb in the Valley of the Kings near Luxor and exploited it so deftly in the Times that it became a conversation piece across the Nation. It appears that among his other talents Van Ande numbered Egyptology. At his office desk late one night he deduced from photographs of hieroglyphics taken from the Pharaoh's tomb that Horemheb, Tutankhamen's military chief, had slain the king. The deduction was confirmed. Only the Times could have scored a scoop on a story 3,000 years old.

From a competitor's viewpoint, the Times could be just as irritatingly competent on the hottest news story. On Friday, May 13, 1927, a rising young executive in the Times organization, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, extemporaneously dictated by telephone a historic oral contract binding the Times to buy a flight story from a young pilot of whom few people had ever heard. Nine days later the newspaper had the most exciting adventure story in modern history, which it front-paged with the banner headline: "Lindbergh does it. To Paris in 33½ hours."

In the late twenties the Gray Lady kept wagging a warning finger in the paper's financial columns. Repeatedly Alexander D. Noyes, the financial editor, had glumly insisted ruin was inevitable. The Nation was, of course, in no mood for old-fashioned strictures. When the collapse came late in 1929, the newspaper itself was better equipped than most to survive the depression that followed. After his real-estate venture in Chattanooga, Ochs had never invested in anything but Government bonds, in the Times and its paper-mill holdings.

Looking to the future, Ochs had once expected that Julius Ochs Adler, one of his sister's sons, might eventually take over. His ideas had been changed in 1917, however, when his daughter had married Arthur Hays Sulzberger, then a boyish lieutenant of artillery. Ochs had not rejoiced at this: he had wanted someone with newspaper background for Iphigene, and young Sulzberger, though of distinguished ancestry—one of his forebears on the maternal side was George Washington's bodyguard—had no printer's ink in his veins. Ochs had begun putting him through a grueling apprenticeship at the Times just about the time Adler came back from the war in France—with several decorations for bravery—to resume his chores on the paper.

By the thirties Ochs was failing physically. Most of the men he had grown up with were already gone. He underwent a serious kidney operation, then lapsed into melancholia. A white mane had developed above his square face, and he was flattered when friends saw in him a likeness to George Washington. He began neglecting to read the Times each

morning. He even stopped opening his mail. He no longer appeared at his desk.

Early in April 1935, at 77 years of age, Ochs miraculously snapped out of melancholia literally overnight. He dropped into General Adler's office, astonishingly chipper, though he had wasted, and his clothes hung on his frame. He announced that he was going to Chattanooga to straighten out affairs on his Times there.

At 1 p. m. on April 8, just after he got back to the scene of his first journalistic venture, Ochs fell unconscious as he sat at luncheon with his brother Milton and R. E. Walker, a Chattanooga Times editor. He died 2 hours later in a local sanitarium, victim of a cerebral hemorrhage.

At Ochs' death, the newspaper that was virtually his creation, had achieved a daily circulation of 465,000. The wreck he had bought 40 years ago, with such brash pride, was now, in fact, the most prestigious newspaper in the world. His will left controlling interest in the Times in trust to the Sulzbergers' son and daughters.

THE LINDBERGH EXILE

The first major news beat after Sulzberger became publisher traced back more than 8 years to the hour when he had dictated the Lindbergh contract by telephone. One afternoon in December 1935, Lindbergh summoned Lauron (Deak) Lyman, the Times aviation man, to the Dwight Morrow home in Englewood, where the flyer then lived. The two men had been warm friends for years; Deak had covered the Lindbergh baby kidnapping story and the Hauptmann trial. To Deak, and to Deak alone, that wintry afternoon in the Morrow parlor, Lindbergh confided that he was taking his family into voluntary exile in Britain, because, since the death of his first son, he was constantly bothered by crank letters and threats against his wife and remaining child. The Times, by agreement with Lindbergh, broke the story on Monday morning, December 23, when the flyer was at sea with his family. The item brought international uproar. Deak's reward was a Pulitzer prize, one of the 22 now held by the Times.

In 1936 Sulzberger cleared decks for action. He shortly disposed of some minor magazine investments of the Times, discarded the rotogravure section, ran picture spreads in a greatly improved Sunday magazine, put more photographs into the daily newspaper. A News of the Week in Review feature for the Sunday paper, launched in January 1935, became instantly popular. So did new food and style pages—features that Ochs had tended to shy away from. An annual fashion show was instituted to stimulate fashion advertising. Then came Sunday, and finally daily, crossword puzzles.

The new publisher assembled a younger executive staff. Edwin James as managing editor, Charles Merz as editorial chief, Turner Catledge as executive managing editor, Lester Markel as Sunday editor. More and more women were hired for major editorial jobs—the most notable being Anne O'Hare McCormick, named to the editorial board. Both foreign and domestic news staffs were expanded. Sulzberger as publisher and General Adler as general manager assumed a closer relationship, socially and professionally, with their aides than the Victorian Ochs had allowed.

Nominally Democratic in Ochs' reign, the Times has gradually achieved complete political independence. It opposed a third term for Roosevelt in 1940 because it disliked his court-packing plan and as Sulzberger put it, "his expressed desire to send Congress home." The paper went back to supporting Roosevelt in 1944, charging Dewey with failure to repudiate isolationists in the Republican Party who were fighting lend-lease and universal military training legislation—for which the Times had consistently pleaded.

Both during and since World War II (while General Adler went to New Guinea in command of the Sixth Division) the new publisher has flown in and out of the great trouble spots of a warring world. He took just pride in the Times' first-rate coverage of the war. Two Times men—Byron Darn-ton and Robert Post—died in combat. Another Times man, William L. Laurence, was spirited away from the office by the Army one morning in 1945 to act as secret biog-rapher to the atom-bomb project, and wrote the eyewitness account of the A bomb at-tacks on Nagasaki.

In November 1944, touring the Pacific bat-tle areas, Sulzberger and Catledge saw the first B 29's take off from Saipan to batter Tokyo, and that same night came under at-tack as Japanese ships screamed down to blow up a bomb-packed B-29 on the airstrip. Snipers zinged at them later on Peleliu, but the publisher seemed to enjoy the excite-ment. Catledge, a dry-humored Mississip-plan, later confessed that through it all, he was "calm quite beyond the call of impulse." The Gray Lady plainly took the war as might be expected.

All through World War II Sulzberger had fused with plans for postwar expansion. By February 1948 the Times had a great new wing on its Forty-third Street home, giving it 50 percent greater production capacity, air conditioning, greater recreational and dining space, and the greatest press capacity in its history. On one recent Sunday it ran off more than 1,000,000 380-page papers, each weighing more than 4 pounds. This edition alone took \$265,300 worth of newsprint and \$2,635 worth of ink. At that, 30 columns of advertising were left out because the presses couldn't handle that much more.

The quest for self-improvement goes on restlessly and ceaselessly. Late at night, in his tower bedroom in the Forty-third Street building, Sulzberger keeps tuned in on radio station WQXR, which he bought for the paper. On sleepless nights he jots down endless memoranda on instructions for changes in the ways of the Times.

But, however remote the massive modern institution is from Henry Raymond's candle-light shop of a century ago, the most im-portant ways of the Times probably will never change. Recently a harassed citizen called the Times. Frenzied with anxiety over the likelihood of an atomic disaster blowing the world to pieces, he asked what the Times would do in such an awful event. The Times voice was coolly assuring: "The Times will give complete coverage."

It was really the voice of the same old Gray Lady.

Communism and Its Method of Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking article written by one of New Jersey's leading lawyers, Judge Fred G. Stickel, Jr., of Newark, which appeared in the Caldwell Progress on August 10 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDGE SAYS

Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, was the prosecutor at the famous Nuremberg trial, before an

International Court, of Nazis accused of violating international law. A realist and always in touch with the stream of life, he was never more so than when in his concur-ring opinion in *State v. Dennis*, he in beau-tiful language described communism and its method of operation. *State v. Dennis* was the case involving the Communist leaders convicted before Judge Medina of violation of the conspiracy provisions of the Smith Act, enacted by the Congress of the United States.

The Justice's words should be widely cir-culated and not merely encased in an opin-ion reaching, in the main, only lawyers. I hope my example in making it available to the readers of the Caldwell Progress will be followed by other publications. Here is what he said:

"Communism, the antithesis of anarch-ism, appears today as a closed system of thought representing Stalin's version of Lenin's version of Marxism. As an ideology, it is not one of spontaneous protest arising from American working-class experience. It is a complicated system of assumptions, based on European history and conditions, shrouded in an obscure and ambiguous vocabulary, which allures our ultrasophis-ticated intelligentsia more than our hard-headed working people. From time to time it champions all manner of causes and grievances and makes alliances that may add to its foothold in government or em-barrass the authorities.

"The Communist Party, nevertheless, does not seek its strength primarily in numbers. Its aim is a relatively small party whose strength is in selected, dedicated, indoctrinated, and rigidly disciplined members. From established policy it tolerates no deviation and no debate. It seeks members that are, or may be, secreted in strategic posts in transportation, communications, industry, government, and especially in labor unions where it can compel employers to accept and retain its members. It also seeks to infil-trate and control organizations of profes-sional and other groups. Through these placements in positions of power it seeks a leverage over society that will make up in power of coercion what it lacks in power of persuasion.

"The Communists have no scruples against sabotage, terrorism, assassination, or mob disorder, but violence is not with them, as with the anarchists, an end in itself. The Communist Party advocates force only when prudent and profitable. Their strategy of stealth precludes premature or uncoordinated outbursts of violence, except, of course, when the blame will be placed on shoulders other than their own. They resort to violence as to truth, not as a principle but as an expedient. Force or violence, as they would resort to it, may never be necessary, because infiltration and deception may be enough.

"Force would be utilized by the Com-munist Party not to destroy government but for its capture. The Communist recognizes that an established government in control of modern technology cannot be overthrown by force until it is about ready to fall of its own weight. Concerted uprising, therefore, is to await that contingency and revolution is seen, not as a sudden episode, but as the consummation of a long process.

"Communist technique in the overturn of a free government was disclosed by the coup d'etat in which they seized power in Czecho-slovakia. There the Communist Party, dur-ing its preparatory stage, claimed and re-ceived protection for its freedoms of speech, press, and assembly. Pretending to be but another political party, it eventually was conceded participation in government, where it entrenched reliable members chiefly in control of police and information services. When the Government faced a foreign and domestic crisis, the Communist Party had established a leverage strong enough to threaten civil war. In a period of confusion the Communist plan unfolded and the un-

derground organization came to the sur-face throughout the country in the form chiefly of labor action committee. Com-munist officers of the unions took over trans-portion and allowed only persons with party permits to travel. Communist printers took over the newspapers and radio and put out only party-approved versions of events. Possession was taken of telegraph and tele-phone systems and communications were cut off wherever directed by party heads. Communist unions took over the factories, and in the cities a partisan distribution of food was managed by the Communist orga-nization. A virtually bloodless abdication by the elected government admitted the Com-munists to power, whereupon they insti-tuted a reign of oppression and terror, and ruthlessly denied to all others the freedoms which had sheltered their conspiracy."

Remember the foregoing when ultraso-phisticated but dumb intelligentsia or prop-agandists in whatever guise seek to sell you communism as an agency of peace or well being or as something superior to govern-ment of, for, and by the people. It was Vishinsky, who in 1948, wrote, "In our state (the Soviet state) naturally there can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on for the foes of socialism."

No contract is stronger than the intention and integrity and honesty of purpose of the participants. Hence, in evaluating any pro-posal, contract, agreement, treaty, or other instrument emanating from or executed by Russia, as long as the Communist Party, very small in comparison with the popula-tion of Russia and its satellites control such countries through the ruthless men compris-ing the Politburo, bear in mind that a Com-munist resorts to truth as an expedient, not on principle, that his underlying philosophy is that the end justifies the means and that no instrument or promise is binding upon him unless it continues to serve his purpose. To be governed by this approach may well mean continued sacrifice, and for an indefi-nite time, to make and keep ourselves and the Western World strong but it is far bet-ter to make such sacrifices than to allow ourselves to be lulled into the slavery of communistic control or by inertia and tem-porary relief from sacrifice to encourage communism to strike. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Dismissal of Homer G. Richey From Faculty of University of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday regarding action taken by the president of the University of Virginia, indicating that at that university one cannot accuse persons falsely and not be held responsible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR RICHEY LOSES POST AT VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

CHARLOTTESVILLE, Va., September 17.—The University of Virginia today relieved one of its professors from his assignment in the Woodrow Wilson school of foreign affairs,

The instructor, Homer G. Richey, had accused three colleagues of left-wing teachings. University President Colgate W. Darden announced the dismissal. He said the act had the unanimous recommendation of the council of deans.

In a letter to Richey, Darden said: "The manner in which you have attempted to arouse passions of people . . . against your colleagues, the school of which you are part, and the university under whose control it functions, is unworthy of one holding your position."

Richey directed his charges against John Gauge, director of the foreign affairs school, and Alfred P. Fernbach and Charles Micaud, associate professors.

A faculty committee investigated last spring and cleared the three. The board of visitors also found no evidence to substantiate the accusations.

Obligations of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., last night.

The Senate will note that the editorial is based on remarks of a distinguished member of the Federal bench, Hon. Paul Leahy, who was speaking to a group of foreign citizens in the process of becoming naturalized Americans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIS AMERICANUS

The easiest way to become an American citizen is to be born one. You don't have to earn the privilege, you don't even have to want it. You aren't required to stand up before a judge, take an oath, and listen to him tell what makes a good citizen.

Maybe you should be, maybe we all should. Some of us native Americans show only the most rudimentary notions of what American citizenship implies. It wouldn't hurt us to listen in some time when a group of foreigners are being naturalized.

Here is what United States District Judge Paul Leahy told such a group that a good citizen of this country should do:

Vote at all elections.
Serve on a jury when asked.
Respect and obey the laws.
Pay taxes understandingly.
Work for peace.
Avoid all group prejudice.
Support our system of free public education.

Try to make the community better.
Practice and teach the principles of good citizenship.

That's a large order, particularly the little item reading: Pay taxes understandingly. How many of us vote at all elections? How many always respect and obey all the laws? (Don't raise your hand if you've ever received a traffic ticket—or deserved to.) How many lack prejudices against other groups, or even try to avoid them?

But Judge Leahy is right: These are important obligations of American citizenship. And another important obligation he men-

tioned to the new citizens Monday is the duty not only of practicing free speech, but of understanding it. "The price of free speech," he said, "is that you must hear unpopular statements." The good citizen pays that price willingly.

Cicero once told of how Publius Gavius, on being seized and beaten in Messina, uttered no cry of pain but after each blow spoke the words: "I am a Roman citizen." Our own country can be greater than Rome ever was if we so conduct ourselves that every American, anywhere in the world, can say with equal dignity. "Civis Americanus sum."

Progress Through Interstate Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Progress Through Interstate Cooperation," published in the New Jersey Law Journal of September 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS THROUGH INTERSTATE COOPERATION

Demonstrating what Governor Driscoll has on many occasions referred to as "the amazing vitality of our States," New Jersey this year adopted legislation authorizing a record number of interstate compacts. Seven such laws were enacted during the regular session of the legislature.

Supplementing New Jersey's comprehensive civil defense law, which has been described by the Council of State Governments as one of the most complete in the country, the first of these measures (Public Law 1951, c. 8) ratified, on behalf of New Jersey, the Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact proposed by the Northeastern Interstate Committee on Civil Defense of the Council of State Governments. The purpose of the compact is to provide mutual aid among the States in meeting any emergency or disaster from enemy attack or other cause, natural or otherwise, including sabotage and subversive acts and direct attacks by bombs, shellfire, and atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological means and other weapons.

A second measure (Public Law 1951, ch. 2) approved the interstate compact between New Jersey and New York for mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency, which was agreed upon by Governor Driscoll and Governor Dewey on December 12 of last year. Pennsylvania has recently adopted legislation approving this compact. The purpose of this interstate agreement is to provide for mutual military aid and assistance by the military forces of a signatory State to the military forces of the other signatory States or of the United States, in the event of invasion or other hostile action, disaster, insurrection, or imminent danger thereof. This includes, among other military missions, the military support of civil-defense agencies and the protection of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, communications facilities, and other vital installations, plants, and facilities. It also provides for fresh pursuit, in case of an emergency, by the military forces of a signatory State into another State, of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies, or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to over-

throw the Government of the United States or of a signatory State. The over-all objective, clearly, is to provide a means whereby a State and its neighbors can cooperate with one another and with available Federal forces in quickly and efficiently meeting an emergency until such time as the Federal Government can bring its full strength to bear.

Four other compacts which have been authorized relate to the development of additional transportation facilities across the Delaware River. The first of these, authorized by Public Law 1951, chapter 288, expands the jurisdiction of the Delaware River Joint Commission and represents a major step forward in the Governor's program for the development and improvement of the Delaware River Port District. The commission (henceforth to be known as the Delaware River Port Authority) would, among other functions, be authorized to establish, maintain, rehabilitate, construct, and operate a rapid transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail, and baggage between points in New Jersey communities within the port district and within a 35-mile radius of the city of Camden and points within the city of Philadelphia. The authority would be authorized to undertake the project after it had filed with the Legislatures and Governors of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, a detailed report on the contemplated project and after the two Governors had filed with the authority their written consents to the project. The port district would include all the territory within Delaware and Philadelphia Counties in Pennsylvania and all the territory within Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean, and Salem Counties in New Jersey. The supplemental compact authorized by Public Law 1951, chapter 287, would authorize this authority to construct, finance, operate, and maintain a vehicular tunnel under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River between Camden and Philadelphia.

An additional compact in this group, authorized by Public Law 1951, chapter 285, would permit the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority to enter into an agreement which would provide for the financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of a bridge across the Delaware River providing a connection between the Pennsylvania turnpike system and the New Jersey turnpike.

A further measure, Public Law 1951, chapter 284, authorizes a supplemental compact between New Jersey and Pennsylvania enlarging the jurisdiction and authority of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. The jurisdiction of this agency, with respect to the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, improvement, maintenance, repair, and operation of bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River, would be extended to north of the boundary line between Bucks and Philadelphia Counties in Pennsylvania, as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of the river.

The seventh of the interstate agreements would create a Delaware River Basin Water Commission for the purpose of developing, utilizing, controlling, and conserving the water resources of the Delaware River Basin. Public Law 1951, chapter 283, authorizes the Governor, on behalf of New Jersey, to enter into such a compact with Delaware, New York, and Pennsylvania. Similar legislation has not as yet been adopted in the last two named States. The major objective of the measure is to assure an adequate water supply to meet the domestic and industrial requirements of political subdivisions and metropolitan areas within the four States.

Interstate cooperation of this kind, to provide mutual assistance, including the pooling of resources and the extension of

facilities, is firm evidence that within the framework of alert State governments and our Federal system it is possible to meet complex interstate problems without new or additional burdensome taxes and without the need for Federal intervention.

Russo-Polish Relations and the Murders in the Katyn Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the following speech made on the Voice of America program of April 25, 1951, which reached the iron-curtain countries, gives facts in support of the charge that the Russians were responsible for the murders of the 15,000 Polish officers and soldiers in the Katyn Forest:

This week, in the quiet sanctuary of the spirit which no police inquisitor can enter, the Polish people are observing a gloomy anniversary. They are remembering that fateful moment, on April 26, 1943, when the Kremlin suddenly broke off all relations with the Polish Government-in-exile, giving as pretext the fact that the Government had ventured to ask for an impartial commission of inquiry of the International Red Cross to find out how four-thousand-odd Polish officers had died in the Katyn Forest, and what had happened to an additional eleven-thousand-odd who had vanished without a trace. Because the Kremlin blocked an impartial inquiry, the name of the Soviet Government has not been cleared to this day and the mystery of the death and disappearance of 15,000 Polish officers has remained unsolved. Private committees have since been set up, notable among them being the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, whose chairman, Arthur Bliss Lane, was formerly America's Ambassador in Poland. That committee has been gathering evidence for years, the official Soviet Government report, the official German Government report, the official Polish Government report, testimony from medical doctors from many lands who examined the rotting corpses in the Katyn Forest, testimony from Polish Army officers who survived the holocaust, testimony from all who have evidence to offer. Today, on the eighth anniversary of the rupture of Soviet-Polish relations, and approximately a decade after the murders in the Katyn Forest occurred, the American committee announced that it is setting up a commission of jurists and lawyers to examine all the accumulated evidence and establish the ascertainable facts for all the world to pronounce judgment.

The Polish Government with which Stalin broke off relations on April 26, 1943, was the Polish Government in exile, with public headquarters in London, and underground headquarters inside Poland. In was this Polish Government which had preserved Poland from collaboration with Hitler, which had resisted Hitler even in those terrible days of 1939, when Stalin was allied with Hitler in the partition of Poland. It was this Government which, as soon as Hitler attacked Stalin, generously agreed to forgive and forget the Russian aggression. It was this Government whose underground forces had unceasingly harried the German lines of communication that ran through Poland

into the Soviet Union. It was this Government which had led the two heroic insurrections in Warsaw which will go down in history as two of the brightest pages in man's long struggle against tyranny. But, by 1943, the tide of battle was turning in Russia, and Stalin was already laying the plans for the annexation of all his neighbor states through Soviet puppet governments. For the Poles he had set up a puppet council at Lublin, and was seeking for a pretext to break off relations with the Polish Government in exile and the Polish underground army. The pretext he chose was as sinister as the act of rupture itself.

The London Polish Government had for some time been pursuing its simple duty of trying to learn the whereabouts and fate of some 15,000 Polish officers of all ranks from generals to noncoms, who had been taken prisoner by the Red army, when it attacked Poland from the east in 1939. These officers had originally numbered 15,400, but for 18 months now only 400 continued to communicate with their families, while 15,000 had disappeared without a trace. General Sikorski, General Anders, General Berling, and Ambassador Ciechanowski had repeatedly inquired about their whereabouts and repeatedly asked for their release to officer the new Polish Army being built up under the Stalin-Sikorski agreement. Repeatedly, Stalin, Molotov, Vyshinsky had answered that these men had been released, that they were on their way to the recruiting centers, that they had crossed some remote frontier, that they would soon turn up. The answers were contradictory, but always agreed that the men had all been released. Finally, on April 13, 1943, the German Government announced that it had uncovered the corpses of 11,000 Polish officers, buried in the Katyn Forest on the east bank of the Dnieper, 10 miles from Smolensk in the German-occupied area of the U. S. S. R. Stalin, who had all along been reporting that all Polish officers had been released, now accepted the German figure of 11,000 corpses, but reported that they had been abandoned in a Russian retreat, and captured and killed by the Germans.

The world did not know what to think. Among the United Nations there was an inclination to believe the statement of the ally, Stalin, and to regard the whole exhumation of bodies as a trick of Hitler to sow dissension among the Allies. The Polish Government, pursuing an elementary duty of any government to its citizens, asked for an impartial inquiry into the fate of these men, by the International Red Cross. Instead of readily agreeing, in order to remove a horrible suspicion and brand the true perpetrator of a genocidal crime, Stalin treated the request as a pretext for breaking all relations with the Polish Government, and recognizing in its place his future iron curtain puppet government which could be counted on to ask no embarrassing questions about the fate of any of its citizens, either in prisoner-of-war camps, concentration camps, or mass graves.

Now, 8 years later, many matters still remain unclarified in this fearful episode. But slowly the evidence has accumulated and the outlines have become increasingly clear.

The first startling fact that emerged was that only 4,144 bodies were actually uncovered in the Katyn forest. Yet Generalissimo Stalin, who rejected all other claims, has repeatedly accepted the statement that over 10,000 bodies were exhumed. Only 4,144 bodies have been turned up, and the fate of the remaining 10,000-odd missing Polish officers remains a sealed mystery from that day to this. Somewhere in the Russian land they lie buried, presumably near the other two officer-prisoner camps in the Smolensk region. If the Soviet Government were anxious to clear up the mystery, it would not find it hard to locate the rest.

The second piece of evidence comes from 12 international scientists, invited by the German Government to visit the mass graves in April 1943. True, some of these scientists were from German-occupied countries like Denmark, Finland, and Belgium, and might then have been under duress. But the might of Hitler is broken, and an international court of inquiry could easily get them to talk freely now, if the Kremlin would but consent. And not all of the scientists were from German-occupied countries. For instance, there was Professor Naville of the University of Geneva, whose bona fides no one has called in question.

The third piece of evidence is an array of letters, diaries, newspaper clippings, etc., found on the bodies of the corpses, bearing dates only up to April and May 1940, when the Red Army still had possession of Smolensk. No document was found on any corpse bearing a later date than May 1940. That was the month in which each of them was shot, a bullet in the base of the brain. Stalin asserts they were shot by the Germans in August 1941. Yet they were wearing their winter issue clothing, woolen socks, scarves, and in no officer's pocket was there a scrap of paper dating later than early May 1940.

Fourth, there is the testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet who was taken to the Katyn Forest by his German captors. An American officer, he voluntarily reported to the United States Army that he had seen convincing evidence of the Russian origin of the mass murder. Not wishing to complicate Russo-Polish relations as long as there was any hope that Stalin would permit a free Polish Government, the United States Army long delayed the release of Van Vliet's report. But it would gladly have permitted Van Vliet to testify at any impartial hearing, if the Soviet Government had shown any readiness to have this fearful mystery cleared up. On September 18, 1950, the Department of Defense finally released, or rather declassified, Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report.

Fifth, there is the evidence of the Soviet Government's strange and contradictory actions at the Nuremberg war crimes trials. Surely, if this was a Nazi crime, Nuremberg was the place to clear it up. The Soviet representative, Colonel Pokrovsky, actually made the charge, and we quote: "In September 1941, 11,000 Polish officers who were prisoners of war were killed in the Katyn Forest by the German Fascist invader."

But when it became apparent that the accused prisoners at Nuremberg would be allowed to summon witnesses and documents in their defense and that a genuine investigation might take place, the Soviet prosecutor once more blocked an all-sided clarification of the mystery, and this point in the indictment was withdrawn.

Thus, 8 years have passed. The circumstantial evidence piles up. The Government which should be most interested in establishing its innocence, if it is innocent, blocks all impartial international inquiry. The only certain thing that emerges is that on April 26, 1943, the Kremlin broke off its relations with the Polish Government-in-exile for the mere request of an International Red Cross inquiry. Only four-thousand-odd bodies have been accounted for and 11,000 Polish officers are still vanished without a trace. And the setting up of the Polish Lublin puppet government began the procedure of virtual annexation of neighboring countries, "liberated" or ally, which violated every promise of the Atlantic Charter which guaranteed that there would be no sound and just peace at the immediate end of World War II. The rupture of relations with the Polish Government was fateful not only for the history of Poland. It was the first huge step in the Kremlin's aggressive expansion by occupation, which the whole world now knows as the cold war.

How to Help Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, our constituents make up the Nation's biggest and most effective lobby. They constitute a good lobby, working in the interests of good government, through improvement of the services rendered by our Government to all the people. They are interested in helping us to strengthen the moral fiber of the citizens in every community of the land.

With the thought in mind that our constituents can be of definite help to the Members of Congress whom they send to Washington to represent them, I have written for the Nation's Business of September 1951 an article entitled: "How To Help Your Congressman," which reads as follows:

HOW TO HELP YOUR CONGRESSMAN—YOU MAY NOT KNOW IT, BUT YOU BELONG TO THE NATION'S BIGGEST LOBBY, THE PEOPLE BACK HOME

(By O. K. ARMSTRONG)

Back in 1933, when I first entered the Missouri State Legislature, a veteran member, wise in the ways of the Ozark hills people he represented, said to me:

"Son, you'll get a lot of letters. Better read 'em all. And especially the ones written with a pencil on tablet paper."

Through several terms as a State representative, I learned the wisdom of that advice. The letters written on tablet paper, I discovered, came from farmers, housewives, laborers—the people at the grass roots. Such folk don't know much about political theory, perhaps, but they do know what they want, and in the simple, direct language that is their own they express their opinions and make known their needs. Putting these letters together, along with statements made for or against specific bills, I got an accurate cross section of opinion in my district.

Now, as a freshman Congressman, I find the rule still holds. My State assembly district covered only a part of my home town of Springfield, Mo., and the county, while my congressional district includes 11 counties. In the State legislature, we dealt with problems of education, roads, crime, social security, municipalities, and other local matters. In Washington, the problems are national and international in scope. But the task is the same—to find out how each proposal will affect the individuals and families in the local communities. For the sum total of those local communities is America.

Americans in my part of the country write L. E. and say:

"I think you ought to know how I feel about this matter," or "I want your help on this problem. I voted for you, and now I need your advice. Please send me full information."

Does a Congressman read on and find out how a constituent feels about the matter, and what help and information he needs? I'll say he does. That is, if he expects to understand the tides and cross-currents of opinion at home, and if he expects to earn his salt as a Representative of his people.

I don't mean that a Congressman can read every word of every letter. One hundred letters a day are not unusual when a specific proposal affects a local area one way or another, or when a great national issue strikes full blast.

The highly controversial subject of universal military training brought mountains of comment from the grass roots. During the hectic days after President Truman's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, some Members received as many as 1,000 telegrams, letters, and phone calls a day. It would be physically impossible for one person to read all of them, to say nothing of doing anything else. But some member of his office staff will read each message, and inform the Congressman of its content and significance.

I checked this matter with several veteran Members of the House. The case of able and picturesque ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, first elected in 1910, and now chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is typical. DOUGHTON receives an average of from 200 to 250 communications a day.

"You bet I read my mail," DOUGHTON told me, with his genial grin. "And I answer it, too. Maybe that's one reason I've been around here so long."

Of course, the bulk of DOUGHTON's mail deals with taxation, while that of CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, deals with national defense, and so on around the list of committee chairmen. FRANCES P. BOLTON, from Ohio, has made a specialty of legislation in behalf of hospitals and health services. Her recent bill to provide Federal funds for training nurses brings in about 60 letters daily from interested young women.

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, former commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at one time topped the list of Congressmen in volume of mail, due to the heavy correspondence from his comrades in this organization. He still averages around 125 letters a day from veterans alone, who contact him from all parts of the world. One veteran in Geneva, Switzerland, recently asked him about out-patient facilities in that part of Europe.

Contrast this state of affairs with the easy life of a Congressman half a century ago, when many Members found time to answer in longhand the half dozen or so letters a day, borrowing committee rooms for their office work.

No man on Capitol Hill would want fewer messages from constituents, but it would help if these simple rules were followed:

Be explicit, with full names, addresses, serial numbers of veterans or those in the armed services. State the exact nature of the problem or request. It isn't necessary to threaten the Congressman with defeat at the next election. And though it may sound inconsistent from a Congressman—be brief.

Why are the folks back home more vocal in their advice, requests, and demands than ever before? Why do they keep such close check on their Congressmen? There are three reasons:

1. The people today are better informed on public questions than any previous generation.

Fifty years ago, more than half the population depended on a weekly newspaper for their news. Today, they have daily newspapers, the radio, and magazines to keep them abreast of the latest developments at home and abroad. Many business and professional men and women attend civic clubs and organizations where they hear current problems discussed.

"My constituents know more about what's going on than I do," mourned one of my colleagues recently. "And why not? They've got time to read and listen to the radio—and I haven't."

2. There's the enormous expansion in the work of Congress. I did a little research along this line and was astonished to learn:

At least half the legislation before Congress today deals with subjects not even in existence four decades ago.

Social security, retirement benefits, air-mail subsidies, Federal-aid highways, Federal power projects, displaced persons, occupation costs, and the United Nations, to list a few. It's a far cry from the days of Andrew Jackson when the major interests of Congress were the sale of public lands and the fight over the Bank of the United States.

Many veterans in the present Congress remember when the sessions lasted only an average of 9 months in the 2-year term. Members spent the rest of the time at home, making speeches or attending to private business. Their mail dealt largely with free seeds, postal matters, and bills for the relief of constituents. George B. Galloway, legislative research expert in the Library of Congress, explains the heavier loads this way:

"The tremendous increase in the contacts a Congressman must maintain with his constituents began with World War I. A succession of crises in our national life, a severe depression, the recovery efforts, another world war and more crises, all imposed on Congress vast new responsibilities undreamed of in quieter days."

3. People have learned the value of teamwork in their communities, and when they want something done in Washington, they try out that teamwork on their Congressmen. Both within geographical areas, and in the like-minded group spread out over the whole country, citizens are working together as never before.

It's the same in country or city. The most powerful organization in rural Missouri is the Missouri Farmers Association. A lot of people talked about governmental reform in my home State, but little came of it until the MFA appointed a special committee to make a definite study. The committee came to the legislature with the facts and recommendations, and things began to happen—for the better.

I would not contend that all groups are unselfish and public-spirited in their requests. Many exist only to get something from the Government by organized pressure. The point is that whether good, bad, or in between, organizations interested in legislation send in the largest class of mail dumped on the Congressman's desk and their representatives form the largest number of personal visitors to his office.

"Write or see your Congressman." Any Member among the 435 on the Hill will tell you that slogan really caught on.

That brings us to the question of legislative agents. Lobbyist has a sinister sound. It should not have, for lobbying is legitimate business, useful both to the Congressman and his constituents.

I realize that there are many lobbyists in Washington, representing all sorts of interests, but I'd like to debunk the idea that Members of Congress are influenced easily by these gentry. As for pressurized stuff, after listening to the oratory of the House a Member grows immune to all high-octane talk, from colleagues or lobbyists alike. He learns to shun the mercenary, the phony, the pleader for a cause for which the lobbyist would not work unless he was well-paid.

"What's the most effective lobby known to Congress?" I put this question to TOM MURRAY of Tennessee, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member. His answer was:

"The constituents back home." Representative MURRAY pointed out what every Member, whatever his party or length of service, well understands: The citizens and voters within his home district have first call on his time and services. It would be a rare secretary, indeed, who was not told: "Answer the constituents' letters first, and send me every constituent who enters the office."

I can assure you this is the normal functioning of our form of government. Under

our system of representation, each Member has the primary duty to reflect the sentiments of the people in the communities of his district.

The right to lobby lies deep in the Constitution, where the founding fathers made it clear that the right to petition the Government must never be denied. The humblest citizen can be his own lobbyist. He can try to influence legislation by informing and pleading to his heart's content. When he becomes one of a group organized to lobby, his agent must be registered to give proper recognition to his activities.

"The legitimate lobbyist performs an important function," explains Representative CHAS. HOLIFIELD, of California. "Every group in American life today faces big problems in their relationship to the Federal Government. It's easy to understand how this is true for veterans, pensioners, business and industry, professional men and women, labor unions and so on. Each group selects experts to organize facts and present them to Congress through reports, personal interviews and hearings. No Congressman has the time to dig out such facts for himself. The group's agent does it for him, and thereby does all Congress a favor."

A lot of fine organizations would get better results if they entered the field of legitimate lobbying. Particularly is that true of those that would like to reverse the trend that has swept our Nation toward steadily advancing centralization of government in the hands of the executive, corresponding loss of responsibility in States and local units, astronomical rise in Federal expenditures, mounting public debt and increasing concentration of private property and resources through taxation.

Suppose the taxpayers who foot the bills were organized down at the community level in each congressional district. Suppose their experts worked out a proposed budget, in advance of the official one, and laid it on the desks of the 435 representatives and 96 Senators. Suppose their spokesman could say, "We represent the biggest bloc of votes in your State and district. In fact, every person in your area is a taxpayer, and our organization speaks for them. Here are our recommendations for saving money and reducing taxes."

That would get action. For no Congressman would yield to the pressure of lobbyists for minority groups seeking heavier expenditures if he faced the overwhelming pressure of taxpaying constituents for sensible economies.

I've had one rude shock in this, my first session of Congress. Often I have visited and interviewed other Members, holding the illusion that they had time for statesmanlike study of the issues, great and small. But I was mistaken. Today Members must hurry from conference to committee to conference again, to lunch, to session, to office, to conference—and to a few hours of sleep.

Each Congressman must assume duties for his district comparable to those of business executives drawing \$25,000 and up—less taxes—a year. He must help make decisions involving the expenditure of billions of dollars, and shape policies that affect the lives of every person in the Nation.

I'm not suggesting that my colleagues be paid more salary, but that they be given other relief. Coming into this thing fresh from the outside, I can point to possible reforms without inhibitions that might stop more experienced and therefore more cautious men, I would recommend two things: First, that a Congressman's workload be lightened. In the last Congress, 18,328 bills were introduced and 5,716 reported to the floor. The workload of committees has more than doubled since 1946, in terms of measures considered. A large share of this load consists of private bills.

Several thousand bills to stay the deportation of aliens illegally in this country fall

on the necks of the Judiciary Committee each session. Power should be delegated to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to handle such matters. Other departments should be given authority to deal with private measures. Small claims should be adjusted by agencies involved, and large claims by the courts. Greater home rule for the city of Washington would release a lot of time and energy of the "city councilmen" on Capitol Hill.

Second, Congress could stand a few more reforms. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 brought needed improvement, but there's still room to save wear and tear on the Congressmen. More adequate staffs should be provided the standing committees to assure continuous review of the activities and expenditures of executive agencies. One new worker should be added to the staff of each committee to do what no member can humanly do today—make a concise analysis of all bills, with a weather eye for their effect on each district.

We could save many hours by installing an electric voting machine. It takes about half an hour to call the roll of the 435 names, including calling a second time those not answering, and recalling Members who show up at the last minute. The automatic roll-call tabulator would do the job in less than 30 seconds.

Any steps taken to free Congressmen from the crushing burden of details will pay dividends in better service. You may have heard of the pompous fellow who, on reaching Washington and bedding down in a good hotel, phoned his Representative.

"Send over your office boy, and I shall instruct him," said the visitor.

"I, myself," wearily answered the Congressman, "am Washington's prize errand boy."

Tax Increases on Automobiles, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Compounding an Injustice To United States Auto Users," published in the Automotive News, relating to the proposed excise-tax program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPOUNDING AN INJUSTICE TO UNITED STATES AUTO USERS

We did as well as beer and garbage disposal units, but we lost out to plug tobacco and snuff.

Well might the automotive industry thus sum up its experience under the proposed excise tax program now going through Congress.

Such a travesty on justice has rarely been perpetrated on the American public.

How supposedly erudite Congressmen can justify such tax increases on automobiles, trucks, trailers, parts, and gasoline—the mainstay of the American economy—is beyond comprehension.

Does Congress still believe that autos are the luxury of the rich? That trucks and truck trailers are still only adjuncts to the railroad and waterways? That gasoline is a fluid which shouldn't be exploded in combustion engines?

Do snuff and plug tobacco, on which excise levies will be lowered under the present program, rate as more essential than automotive transportation?

Other items on which excise would be lowered are fountain pens, sporting goods, and mechanical pencils. Do any of these compare with automobiles, trucks, and gasoline?

Furthermore, we note that the congressional committees make no mention of an excise on railroad cars or water scows, yet plan to boost the levy on trucks and truck trailers from 5 to 8 percent.

We note, too, that the excise on auto parts would be upped from 5 to 8 percent. Yet we see no evidence of a levy on railroad or airplane parts.

Does Congress realize that the auto parts tax is really a levy on human misery, a levy on lower-income groups who must repair their autos since they can't afford new ones?

Even to keep the present automotive excises would be bad enough. But to increase them is compounding an already grave injustice to the workingman, the farmer, every one who uses auto transportation.

Retirement of Brig. Gen. Linus Hoban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I know that many Senators are now receiving letters concerning the members of the National Guard and the reserve components, because many of the members of the National Guard are being taken from their units and transferred to other outfits and to other parts of the world.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "General Hoban Retires," published in the Evening News of Harrisburg on September 14. General Hoban is a very outstanding officer of the Twenty-eighth Division. He was the deputy division commander.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL HOBAN RETIRES

An outstanding officer of the Twenty-eighth Division is about to retire from active duty, in the person of Brig. Gen. Linus Hoban, veteran of the two major wars in which he served with distinction, and recalled to duty with the Pennsylvania outfit a year ago as the National Guard division was brought back into Federal service.

General Hoban, in civil life a well known member of the bar in his beloved anthracite region, and for many years a judge of the courts in his native Lackawanna County, has been assistant division commander ever since the Twenty-eighth Division was reactivated following its return from World War II. Last September when it was again called to duty, again he gave up his peacetime pursuits and entrained for Camp Atterbury with the troops.

In the retirement of General Hoban the Army loses an experienced combat veteran, and one who has served his country long and faithfully. Even as he returns to civilian life, two more National Guard divisions have been alerted for active duty, the Thirty-seventh of Ohio and the Forty-fourth of Illinois, with the announcement that still another one will be called out in 1952.

Oil for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement of my own on the subject Oil for Education.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

OIL FOR EDUCATION

On June 7 of this year I had the honor to introduce on behalf of myself and 10 other sponsors, the oil-for-education amendment to Senator O'Mahoney's bill (S. J. Res. 20) on submerged coastal lands, frequently erroneously termed "tidelands." An enormous amount of interest has been shown in this amendment. The sponsors now number 18 (the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KFFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and myself).

Editorial commendation has appeared in newspapers in every section of the country, including such well-known journals as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Atlanta Journal, the Denver Post, and the Washington Post.

Representatives of leading education, farm, labor, and public welfare organizations have expressed their interest in the proposal and have requested that hearings be held on it. Many have advised me of their active efforts in support of it.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled four times that these submerged lands beyond the low-tide mark are not the property of the adjoining States but belong to the Federal Government. The decision in the California case was handed down on June 23, 1947, and the decisions in the Louisiana and Texas cases were announced on June 5, 1950.

Senator O'Mahoney's bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, to which this proposal is an amendment, undertakes, as I understand it, to continue the orderly development of oil and gas deposits in these Federal submerged lands until such time as the Congress takes action to follow up the Supreme Court decisions on this matter by determining the use to be made of the revenues deriving therefrom. Like the sponsors of our amendment, Senator O'Mahoney has stated his belief that Congress should not legislate away what the Supreme Court has said is the property of the people of the United States. The distinguished Senator is to be commended upon his efforts to protect the interest of all the people. We believe, with the Senator, that these resources should not only be developed now, but we also believe that Congress should act simultaneously to make a determination of the use to be made of the revenues therefrom.

THE PEOPLE'S PATRIMONY MUST BE RESERVED

It is inconceivable, now that the Court has adjudicated the question of title, that the Congress should deed the bulk of these vast national properties to three adjoining coastal States—California, Texas, and Louisiana—as is proposed in the so-called quitclaim bill (H. R. 4484) which recently passed the House. Congress cannot afford such generosity as to give away oil resources estimated as worth forty billion dollars or more. There may also be fabulous stores of gas under these lands. This vast national patrimony belongs to the people of the entire Nation and must be used for their benefit and the benefits of succeeding generations. Senate Joint Resolution 20 is exceedingly generous to the coastal States in allocating to them—and our amendment does not change this—37½ percent of the revenue deriving from lands under the sea within the 3-mile limit.

THE ENDOWMENT OF EDUCATION

The amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20 which we have proposed provides that the balance of these particular royalties and all of the royalties from undersea oil beyond the 3-mile limit out to and including the great Continental Shelf shall be paid into the United States Treasury and used in all the States for educational purposes. This is the policy that the Congress followed in the Morrill Act in 1862 which provided grants of public land for the establishment of our great system of land-grant colleges. Applying the same policy to this great new public "land resource" at the bottom of the sea would be like placing an oil well on every school and college campus in America.

Our amendment proposes that during the present national emergency the royalties from these undersea oil deposits may be used for urgent national-defense purposes determined by the Congress. After the termination of the emergency these revenues shall be devoted exclusively to grants in aid of primary, secondary and higher education. A National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education will be created to develop plans for the allocation and use of these royalties for educational purposes. The report and recommendations of the council will be submitted to the President and he in turn will transmit them to the Congress not later than February 1, 1953. The council will consist of 12 persons with experience in the field of education and public administration, 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House and 4 by the President of the United States.

A HISTORIC NATIONAL POLICY

The dedication of Federal land resources to the endowment of education is one of the oldest and wisest of our national policies. From the earliest beginnings in colonial times many of the colonies earmarked public lands for the support of schools. The earliest case was in Virginia in 1618. Colleges started with the aid of land grants in the various colonies include Harvard in Massachusetts, William and Mary in Virginia, Yale in Connecticut, Princeton in New Jersey and others in South Carolina and Georgia.

After the American Revolution we were faced with a situation which was similar in some respects to the present demands of the three coastal States for the national property in the submerged lands lying beyond the low-tide mark. Individual States laid claim to the territories west of the Appalachians. In 1780 the Congress passed a resolution containing a pledge that these western lands would be disposed of for the benefit of all States. In 1785 and 1787 ordinances were passed by the Congress which specifically set aside a portion of the public lands west of the mountains for school pur-

poses. In speaking of the ordinance of 1787 Daniel Webster declared:

"I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked and lasting character than the ordinance of 1787 . . . it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of Government to support schools and advance the means of education."

Many of the great State universities were started with the aid of the public lands dedicated to education by the ordinances of 1785 and 1787. In the next three-quarters of a century many additional laws were passed by the Congress setting aside Federal lands or the proceeds thereof for educational purposes in the several States. None of these laws were, however, as general in effect and as important as the Morrill Act passed by Congress in 1862 and signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. This act granted to each State 30,000 acres of Federal land or land script for each Senator and Representative in the Congress to which the State was entitled for the establishment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts. States in which there were no Federal public lands, or which did not contain a sufficient amount of public land to satisfy the grant, were issued land script which could be sold by the State and redeemed by the purchasers of the script from public lands located in other States.

FRUITS OF THE POLICY

After the land-grant colleges had become fairly well established throughout the Nation with the assistance provided by the land grants under the Morrill Act, many of the States experienced difficulty in supporting these colleges. In a number of subsequent acts the Congress provided for the further endowment, support, and extension of the services of these institutions. Thus, from a far-sighted and intelligent use of a portion of the national domain there has arisen a system of great educational institutions upon which the higher education of a major portion of our population primarily depends. No one can estimate what this wise use of public-land resources for education has meant to the development and progress of the United States. Benefits accruing to the Nation from this Federal endowment of the State land-grant colleges have been great beyond measure. These institutions of learning have contributed importantly to the rise of the United States to its present position of strength and world leadership.

The proposal embodied in the oil-for-education amendment is, therefore, entirely in accordance with our continuing national tradition of devoting the proceeds of public lands to the support of education. The adoption of this proposal would be a historical action comparable to the ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and to the Morrill Act of 1862. In fact, from the point of view of the resources involved, the oil-for-education proposal would probably in the course of time far exceed the sum total of receipts from all previous Federal grants of public lands for educational purposes.

Every teacher, every parent knows the desperate financial condition of education all over the United States—of grammar schools, high schools, and colleges.

EDUCATION'S BIG CHANCE

This oil offers education's big chance—the means provided by Providence for meeting without additional taxes a large part of education's pressing needs. It is our big chance to turn the trend away from the illiteracy and deficiency in education that has caused the rejection of over 300,000 young men by the armed services since the fighting in Korea began—the equivalent of over 17 Infantry divisions. Our potential enemies outnumber us many times in manpower. Our industrial and military superiority must

rest largely in the education and scientific training of our people.

The action of the Supreme Court in holding that the resources in these submerged lands belong to the people of the entire country presents to the Congress an opportunity and responsibility which cannot be ignored. I am sure that we will discharge this responsibility in a manner which is in keeping with the vision and statesmanship of many previous Congresses in endowing education from the proceeds of public lands.

Role of the Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the Congress prepares to enact a tax bill, the subject of the American cooperative movement and its relationship to the economy becomes ever more important. One of the leading writers on agricultural subjects and one of the foremost experts on the cooperative effort in this country is Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, staff writer for the St. Paul Pioneer Press. Mr. Stedman, in a recent article entitled "The Co-ops' Role," has presented a reasoned and constructive argument in behalf of the cooperative program. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stedman's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CO-OPS' ROLE

In the world crisis, big government, big business, and the cooperatives seem cast in key roles. All three reflect the effectiveness that can come from the pooling of human efforts. Between big government and big business stand the co-ops. Though seeming weak by comparison, these can exert an important offsetting influence on both.

Abroad, the cooperatives have a key place in struggles to heal the physical and moral wounds of war. In Europe, they represent a hopeful middle way between feared extremes. There they stand—against dictatorship, against state monopoly of thought and business, and for self-help, for the freedom of people to manage their own affairs, and for the individual dignity and worth of human beings. From Scandinavia to the Mediterranean and in far-away India they are a breakwater, helping to turn back tides of communism.

At home, a great role has been played by the co-ops in checking the exploitation by organized business of unorganized farm people. The co-ops are in the markets every day, fighting agriculture's battles in the American way.

And now they are up against a new middle-way task. For here some kinds of business have become so tightly organized as to represent a new kind of monopoly—that is, monopoly of opinion. Why, for instance, were all the rural electric co-ops' generating plants everywhere in the United States stigmatized in a Nation-wide advertising by the power industry as socialistic? Do all the millions of Americans who are associated in the private power industry think that way? Certainly not. That was a monopoly of opinion talking. Why is the St. Lawrence seaway up against solid railroad opposition? Would all railroads be adversely affected? No; a few

might be, and some might be helped. But the monopoly of rail opinion is industry-wide. There are also signs of interlocking directorates of opinion on such issues. The result is a blockade of public improvements of high importance to national defense and prosperity. And to overcome that blockade, America might be pushed to extremes of public ownership or other isms, unless moderation and free opinion can prevail.

Whence can come the free expression to offset such monopolies of opinion? From the rank and file of citizens. And perhaps also from sundry organizations that, like the cooperatives, spring from the people themselves. Perhaps these can guard against the isms and strengthen the freedoms of America.

Atomic Proposal of Hon. Brien McMahon, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in this afternoon's Washington Evening Star, in reference to the speech delivered yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. McMAHON'S ATOMIC PROPOSAL

As chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, Senator McMAHON speaks from an exceptionally authoritative and well-informed position when he speaks on the subject of A-weapons. Accordingly, even with allowances for possible rhetorical exaggerations and for the debatable character of his military recommendations, there is every reason why the Nation at large—and the world at large, for that matter—should attach major significance to the address he delivered yesterday.

It is an extraordinarily revealing address. It is also, in some respects, sensationally challenging. And in its own way, although it deals with a decidedly grim and portentous field of human endeavor, it is highly reassuring, and almost optimistic, in that it lends strong confirmation to numerous past indications that the United States is making spectacular progress in the design, development and production of nuclear armaments, including the hydrogen bomb—progress of a sort that promises not merely to revolutionize warfare but to render it so terrible that the men of the Kremlin would have to be insane (which they apparently are not) to embark on full-scale armed aggression against the free world.

This progress has so impressed Mr. McMAHON that he has not hesitated to say that "the sky is the limit on the number and variety of atomic weapons which the United States can produce" if it chooses to do so on an all-out basis—a basis on which the manufacture of a single A-bomb would cost less than a single tank. As for the weapons themselves, he is convinced that they are such a deterrent to aggression and such a "paramount instrument of victory" that the Nation should decide at once to undertake their mass production. To that end he has proposed that the Government spend \$6,000,000,000 a year on them—or about six times as much as it is spending at present. At the same time he has urged that this

increase be offset by a comparable decrease in the billions being expended on "small arms, bullets, incendiaries, hand grenades, and the like." He has summed up his argument for this policy by declaring that "for every dollar spent upon atomic defense we can save \$5 on conventional defense" and that "the first important savings can come next year."

What Mr. McMAHON has emphasized throughout his address is his firm belief that with real atomic armed forces equipped with a sweeping variety of A-weapons ("one model that takes the place of a thousand bazookas, another that makes unnecessary a hundred depth charges, and yet another that would substitute for TNT stacked as high as Pike's Peak") the United States can buy security and peace at far less cost than with its present conventional defenses. And so, hinting strongly at the kind of nuclear armaments now within the Nation's reach, he has come out for the following: (1) An Army with an abundance of atomic artillery shells, short-range atomic guided missiles, radiological devices, and the support of light planes capable of hurling atomic devastation on the enemy in battle positions; (2) a Navy with nuclear-powered submarines, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers ready to launch atomic-attack planes on both strategic and tactical missions, ship-based atomic artillery, ship-based atomic-guided missiles, atomic mines, and target-seeking atomic torpedoes; and (3) an Air Force with nuclear-powered bombers, atomic missiles of every type, the hydrogen bomb, and everything else needed to destroy any enemy's industrial heart.

Quite obviously this proposal—aimed at cutting down on conventional weapons and the number of foot soldiers—is as controversial as it is novel, and its true validity can hardly be assessed until our top defense and atomic authorities are heard on the subject. Even so, at very least, Mr. McMAHON's address—which contains a sobering reminder of the Kremlin's potentialities in this deadly field—constitutes an impressive challenge to orthodox military thinking in an age when nuclear armaments unquestionably are upending all past concepts of strategic and tactical warfare. Certainly, more outspokenly than any official statement has done before, it has made clear that those armaments have revolutionary variety—so much so that the Nation may yet find it wise to spend \$6 billion yearly on them.

Moreover, in advocating such an expenditure, Mr. McMAHON has made a telling point in emphasizing the "wonderfully auspicious" fact that the atomic material in our weapons stockpile will last thousands of years and be a fabulous asset for peace if war is averted. His own belief is that the course he proposes—which includes parallel action in the propaganda field and in the United Nations in an effort to detach the Russian people from the Kremlin and bring about universal disarmament—will avert war, or at least insure the survival of the free world if war comes. He may be wrong, but still his views deserve the most careful attention.

Credit for the San Francisco Conference on the Japanese Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on Sep-

tember 10 carried a splendid editorial concerning the San Francisco Peace Conference. This editorial pays appropriate and deserving tribute to two great Americans, our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and our Ambassador, John Foster Dulles. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

The San Francisco conference was a crucial battle in the cold war with Russia. The Conference resulted in a tremendous gain for the United States and those making common cause with it and a tremendous set-back for Russia and its allies.

Two men deserve the lion's share of the credit for this happy issue. One is John Foster Dulles who by dint of 11 months of patient negotiating achieved a draft which 49 nations were willing to sign. The other is Dean Acheson who as Secretary of State was instrumental in winning support from key countries for the proposed draft and as presiding officer brilliantly prevented the Communist minority from perverting parliamentary rules for the defeat of the majority's purposes as Communists have been able to do in so many previous conferences.

For these distinguished services to their country and the cause of peace Dulles and Acheson deserve the Nation's hearty thanks.

National Political Realignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since discussions of political realignment have been occurring in the United States, considerable editorial comment on that subject has appeared, particularly in the South, where the comment on that subject has been exceedingly favorable. In connection with that matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dispelling Political Confusion," which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger on September 18. The editorial shows an admirable attitude in regard to that matter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISPELLING POLITICAL CONFUSION

The new committee formed in Washington to consider a national political realignment makes its primary appeal, both in its declaration of purpose and in its sponsoring personnel, to voters who resent excessive federalization and socialist trends. It makes a secondary appeal to all thoughtful citizens who believe that a political label should truthfully describe what basic political principles are behind the label.

It is not always easy to calculate whether the radicals or conservatives profit most or lose most because party labels mislead so many voters; it is certain, however, that the country as a whole suffers greatly from the fog of confusion that has enveloped both political parties.

Two outstanding Jerseyans are conspicuous among the leaders of the new movement, which evidences down-to-earth practicality in announcing as the first step toward its program a businesslike survey to apprise the voters of the latitude afforded in each State for managing and altering the legal political parties.

Former Gov. Charles A. Edison, a Democrat who served as Secretary of the Navy under President Roosevelt, and former United States Senator Albert W. Hawkes, a Republican who was also president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, are not of one mind politically, but they find the new committee broad enough to command their enthusiastic support.

It goes without saying that this committee hopes to bring about a profound change in the national political scene, presumably during the 1952 election as well as thereafter. The committee, evidently fully aware of the very real obstacles in the path of such a movement, has avoided sweeping promises and commitments. This very attitude of restraint may commend the committee to many thoughtful citizens who believe that both political parties should be more plainly identified with clear principles.

Debts of the Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the September 16 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News:

DEBTS OF THE NATIONS

The United States public debt is more than twice the total of the public debts of all the nations of Europe, excepting the Soviet Union.

The United States public debt stood at \$256,676,566.707 on August 31. The population of the United States is about 154,000,000.

Much of this public debt was acquired in financing international adventures in every part of the world, but particularly in Europe, where more than \$100,000,000,000 has been poured out in loans, grants, gifts, and other aid in the last 35 years.

The public debt of European nations is less than \$125,000,000,000. The total population of the European nations is more than 325,000,000.

The Soviet Union, which has a population of about 200,000,000, does not have a public debt under its system of state finances. In 1947, Russia had an external debt of \$26,208,000,000, almost all of which the Soviets do not acknowledge because they regard it as largely a debt of czarist Russia.

The public debt of European nations as compiled from international monetary fund reports is as follows:

Country	Reported population	Public debt in United States dollars
Austria	6,755,000	1,714,700,000
Belgium	8,421,000	4,863,000,000
Denmark	4,100,000	1,113,000,000
France	41,500,000	11,808,700,000
Greece	7,740,000	190,000,000
Ireland (Eire)	2,997,000	171,300,000
Italy	45,373,000	5,812,710,000
Luxemburg	280,000	97,270,246
Netherlands	9,620,000	5,167,833,600
Norway	3,181,000	1,233,279,834
Portugal	8,402,000	300,000,000

Country	Reported population	Public debt in United States dollars
Sweden	6,833,000	2,406,180,000
United Kingdom	50,300,000	73,903,000,000
Czechoslovakia	12,916,000	1,704,428,340
Hungary	9,400,000	540,675,000
Poland	23,781,000	3,512,479,000
Rumania	16,530,000	245,402,000
Yugoslavia	15,700,000	704,402,000
Finland	3,835,000	628,725,620
Spain	27,503,000	4,395,301,820
Switzerland	4,547,000	2,016,416,650
Totals	428,025,000	124,435,215,057

¹ Communist Iron-curtain countries.

Devaluation of currency has enabled various countries to reduce the total of their debts in American dollars. The French debt is a case in point. The French debt formerly was reported at \$21,000,000,000. Devaluation of the French franc to a rate of 350 to \$1 brought the French debt down to about 12 billion in American dollars.

The public debt of Germany is uncertain. It is estimated at \$663,367,000. The finances and obligations of Germany have not been stabilized, so it is impossible to fix Germany's public debt.

The public debt of Japan is in a similar position. As of last December 31, it was \$762,360,000. Thus, the estimated public debt of the two major enemies of World War II is some 200 times smaller than that of one victor nation—the United States.

The public debt of Canada is \$16,950,000,000 for a population of 13,300,000.

Figures on the public debt of Latin-American nations are not available. These countries owe more than 1½ billion dollars in foreign dollar bonds, but information on their domestic debts is not available. Figures on public debt in Africa and Asia are fragmentary.

It is estimated the \$256,000,000,000 debt of the United States exceeds that of all the nations of the world by tens of billions of dollars.

Members of Congress have cautioned that the United States cannot long stand the drain of supporting international ventures. Members have warned in the preparations of the new tax increase bill that the Government is scraping the bottom of the taxation barrel.

Total Annual Income of the People of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Department of Commerce made its annual report on the total annual income. This report was prepared as a result of a study of national income and production, conducted by the Department's Office of Business Economics. A United Press dispatch of September 16, 1951, analyzes this report. It reveals that the total annual income has increased from \$87,000,000,000 in 1929 to \$239,000,000,000 in 1950, or an increase of 175 percent. Finally, the report emphasizes that—

Real product per man-hour in private industries was well over half again as large last year (1950) as in 1929.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INCOME UP TO \$239,000,000,000 IN 1950

WASHINGTON, September 18.—The Commerce Department reported today that Americans had raised their total annual income from \$97,000,000,000 in 1929 to \$239,000,000,000 last year, an increase of 175 per cent.

The figures were in a study of national income and production conducted by the Department's Office of Business Economics.

The Department said the outstanding feature of developments during the period "was the tremendous growth of the United States economy," which was registered in the face of "a series of violent economic fluctuations."

The study showed that the Nation had increased its gross national production from \$104,000,000,000 in 1929 to \$283,000,000,000 in 1950. The Department said part of the increase was because of a gradual increase of manpower resources.

"More importantly, however, it has stemmed from sizable gains in productivity per unit of manpower utilized, owing chiefly to the technological improvements and increased amounts of capital equipment utilized by the Nation's industries," the Department statement said.

"Real product per man-hour in private industries was well over half again as large last year as in 1929."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in connection with the foregoing article, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Minnesota Union Advocate on August 23, 1951. The editorials are entitled "Road to Ruin" and "Good Old Days?" All these relate to the studies of annual income.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROAD TO RUIN

To read the New York Journal of Commerce, the Wall Street Journal, the Chicago Journal of Commerce and the speeches of outstanding Republicans like Joe McCarthy, Homer Capehart, Robert A. Taft, Kenneth Wherry, and Col. Robert McCormick one is almost persuaded that this country has gone to the dogs economically. Or talk with the average businessman and he'll tell you how bad things are. The New Deal was plenty tough but the Fair Deal is worse, so they say.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the thousands of little "me, too" fellows scattered all over the country seldom make any references to specific examples of national insolvency, and when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation closed its doors a couple weeks ago after lending billions of dollars to millions of home owners without losing a dime for Uncle Sam, very few newspapers thought it important enough to be mentioned, despite the fact that it turned back over \$8,000,000 in earnings above the cost of operation.

And now another agency of the Government has issued its annual report, and here's another new item that will appear in only a few daily newspapers. The agency in question is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, set up right after the bank crash of 1933 by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. The American Bankers' Association fought the bill from its introduction until the

President signed it; the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers fought it tooth and nail, and columnists and editors railed against it as a socialistic venture that would wreck the economy of the Nation.

And here's the record: The agency was set up January 1, 1934, to make sure that no bank depositor would lose a penny in the event a bank had difficulties. All deposits up to \$5,000 were insured by the Corporation, and under the system of deposit guarantee the banks participating pay assessments into the deposit insurance fund. Last year the limit of insurance was raised to \$10,000—and every bank in the country boasts of this guarantee of security. And here's something to remember also. In the 17 years before the New Deal gave the bank depositors of this country a deposit insurance law there were 15,145 bank receiverships with almost incalculable losses to millions of people. In the 17 years since only 245 federally insured banks have gone into receivership; another 170 have been assisted by the insurance corporation to merge with stronger banks—and no one has lost a penny. And what is more—the last vestige of Government subsidy to the agency has been removed by payments of more than \$370,000,000 to the United States Treasury, returning capital advanced to set it up and covering interest on this capital as well.

No one should forget that the Depositors' Insurance Corporation was established over the vigorous objections of the American Bankers' Association, the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, but one of these days these very institutions will be claiming the honor of having originated the idea of a depositors' insurance law—just as Russia now claims to have originated the law of gravity.

GOOD OLD DAYS

People have railed against taxes ever since the system was originated and no doubt they will continue to complain until the crack of economic doom. And some delight in looking back to the good old days when taxes were more bearable and life was less harassed by world problems of rehabilitation, international relief and welfare, the Marshall plan, and point 4.

But it wouldn't be a bad idea to just think back to what other things accompanied the low-tax scale of long, long ago. And it really wasn't so long, long ago either.

In the fiscal year that ended June 30, 1933—just after the patron saint of the Republican Party went back to his Palo Alto home in California—Federal taxes totaled only \$1,600,000,000. But did this low percentage bring joy and happiness to the millions? Was life more livable for the folks who made up the great population of the United States of America? Not at all. Those were the days when "Hoovervilles" were springing up all over the land. Those were the days when returned World War I veterans sold apples on the corners close to the breadlines and the soup kitchens the Republicans have forgotten to remember.

And the total personal income of the people that year was only \$46,000,000,000 so after the United States Treasury took its annual bite out of the national personal income only \$45,000,000,000 remained to buy the necessities of life and to lay a little away for a rainy day.

In contrast to all this the national personal income of the American people is presently \$250,000,000,000 a year. On June 30, 1951, Federal taxes collected for 1950 reached an all-time record of \$50,000,000,000. Subtract this from the \$250,000,000,000 total before taxes and the people still have \$200,000,000,000 to buy the necessities of life, TV sets, new cars, giggle juice, and OPS-upped steaks, chops, and cereal-packed hamburger. And even allowing for the tre-

mendous drop in the buying power of the United States dollar, the common folks are still at least twice better off than they were the year Herbert Hoover pouted and mumbled something to the effect that prosperity is just around the corner.

The good old days when farmers burned wheat because it was cheaper than coal may seem very desirable just now from the standpoint of the Federal tax differential but no one in his right mind would want to go back to them. And the man who tries to argue that those times were better than this living moment is either dishonest, drunk, or mentally deficient.

How Good Is Our Alaskan Defense?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How Good Is Our Alaskan Defense?" by Don Shannon, published in the magazine section of the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on September 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW GOOD IS OUR ALASKAN DEFENSE?

(By Don Shannon)

Westerners are looking anxiously toward the north these days—toward the huge Territory of Alaska, which sprawls across the shortest air route from Soviet Russia to the continental United States.

The object of this long-distance scrutiny is a large hunk of ice, land, tundra—one-fifth the size of the United States—and its panoply of tiny, wind-swept islands, purchased from Russia in 1867 for 2 cents an acre.

With Alaska's unpredictable former owner only 54 miles across the Bering Strait, and Salt Lake City only 2,100 air miles from Anchorage, Americans in the West are becoming acutely aware of the importance to this area of adequate Alaskan defenses.

Alaska, as military men have pointed out, can be both a vital base for enemy interception and counteroffensive measures and, if permitted to fall into enemy hands, a pistol pointed at our Nation's heart.

In these days of big, long-range bombing planes and atomic weapons, the prospects of such a pistol in enemy hands looks highly menacing to potential targets in western America.

How likely is such a situation? How good are our Alaskan defenses?

The real answers to these vital questions are locked in the security of confidential and secret files in the Pentagon. But in speculations in the public interest, at least one western Senator has stated flatly that Alaska could be cut off by a small airborne force and used as a bombing base against the United States. Military leaders, under questioning by a Senate subcommittee sent to inquire into Alaskan defenses last fall, didn't deny such a possibility too strenuously.

All concerned with the problem here in Washington agree that while Alaskan defense authorities are alert and realistic in their planning, an invasion there could be contested only in critical areas in the heartland of Alaska's 586,400 square miles. This

means that in the event of a war with a country strong in air power, enemy bombers based on the Alaskan shield, could well be a menace for America's industrial heart in the Midwest, and the population centers in the West.

Fortunately, congressional leaders are aware of the vulnerability of Alaska and its defense problems. Last fall, a three-man subcommittee, headed by Senator LESTER L. HUNT, Democrat, Wyoming, flew to Alaska and launched an intensive study of the Territory's state of preparedness.

They reported to the Nation in February that the shortage of combat troops left the Alaskan area open to attack. "It is impossible for the military to hold all of the country and the Aleutian chain," the investigating Senators reported. "Certain areas must be left undefended so far as ground troops and military installations are concerned."

Conditions are largely unchanged since the report was issued, reported Senator HUNT recently. He observed that the only positive results were measures to preserve unmanned airfields. He also predicted a speed-up in needed military housing, but no more troops. "We need all the men we can spare in the Far East," he explained.

One of the few officials in Washington who appear to be really concerned about the problem is E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, Alaska delegate in Congress. He claims that airfields without ground protection are worse than no air bases at all, since an invader could take them over and put them to work against the continental United States immediately.

"The Air Force constitutes more of a danger than a protection under present circumstances," BARTLETT said recently.

The Alaska delegate blamed part of the lack of ground troops on inadequate housing. The housing problem received wide publicity 2 years ago when military men were reported living in hovels for which landlords charged Fifth Avenue rentals. The situation has improved some since then, BARTLETT said, but not enough.

"There is no feeling of urgency in any phase of defense planning for Alaska," BARTLETT said.

BARTLETT has some historical precedent for concern about Alaskan defense efforts. As late as 1939, the only military or naval installation in Alaska was a gold rush days infantry post of 200 men, in spite of numerous warnings by Alaskan Delegates. During World War II, the only part of the American continent to be invaded was the Aleutian chain, and enemy operations there resulted in desperate and costly defense efforts. "Today, Alaska is even more important strategically than during the Second World War," declared Alaskan Gov. Ernest Gruening in a 1948 appeal for statehood. "And it is as little defended against future eventualities as it was then."

Alaskan residents are acutely aware that Russia, as a potential enemy, is a threat of far greater magnitude than the Japanese before Pearl Harbor. In Siberia, visible from the Aleutians on a clear day, the Russians have been working assiduously for years, building up agricultural, industrial, and military installations behind an iron curtain of security. Long-range Russian snorkel submarines are based in Pacific ports, and an undisclosed number of Russian air-ports have been built in the Siberian northlands.

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force and former Alaskan commander, also knows the danger of Alaska's becoming a stepping stone to disaster.

General Twining told an Armed Forces Day gathering in Portland, Oreg., recently that too few Americans are aware that Portland is closer to the heart of Alaska than to St. Louis. He reminded his hearers that Gen. Billy Mitchell pointed out the short line to America's West 30 years ago but Mitchell's

warning that "he who holds Alaska holds the world" has been almost unheeded up to the present.

"Our northern frontier has assumed a critical importance that can only continue to increase," Twining declared. "Before World War II—more than 15 years ago—a Soviet airplane flew nonstop into southern California. For some reason that incident was conveniently forgotten. Impressive advances in the performances and ranges of aircraft have occurred since that date. And 2 years ago the Soviets achieved an atomic explosion. Despite these facts it has been very difficult to awaken public opinion to the necessity for appropriate action."

One western Senator who expressed alarm over the Alaskan situation is HERMAN WELKER, Republican, Idaho. WELKER, an Air Force veteran, visited the area during defense maneuvers last February.

"Although our troops are not too strong numerically, I think they could repel a land attack because of the tundra and ice and rugged terrain," he said.

"I am more concerned about an airborne attack which could cut off the whole Territory and put us on the defensive. Our weakness in air power there is shocking."

WELKER declared that it was "sheer stupidity" to send American troops and arms to Europe with Alaskan defenses in their present condition.

The Idaho Senator also scored the housing provided for the territory's garrison. "As of February 1951, it was wholly inadequate and disgraceful."

On the credit side, the Air Force points to the completion of most construction work on a radar warning screen by the end of this summer.

The Air Force also calls attention to "Operation Firestep," conducted this spring, in which air, ground, and naval forces held the first combined maneuver in Alaska's history. As a demonstration of how an invasion might be met, paratroopers were airlifted from Fort Bragg, N. C., to participate in mock battles.

With the aid of Eskimo National Guardsmen, defending forces pushed back three ground attacks on Elmendorf Field, near Anchorage. The "enemy" came up with a most potent psychological weapon. They offered safe passage through their lines and an airlift to a "comfort camp" at Laguna Beach, Calif., to all those surrendering.

An offer like this would look good in a real war in the far north. But the West, once comparatively secure behind its oceanic and mountain barriers, doesn't like to contemplate it, because an air war in the short polar routes above Alaska would be our war and we would be watching with real concern the progress of the fighting and the exhibition of enemy aerial strength above Alaska's frozen tundra.

Yes, westerners are coming to realize that Alaska is our real first line of defense, and all of us are hoping that a powerful shield is being constructed back of the island stepping stones of the sprawling territory, and that our powder is dry and our radar net alert.

Secretary of Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like

to list below an Associated Press wire release of this date:

WASHINGTON—A proposal for the Government to place all of its financial operations under one head—the Secretary of Finance—was made today by Representative SIEMINSKI, Democrat, of New Jersey.

He introduced a bill calling for the unification of the fiscal functions of the United States.

The measure would also provide for a so-called Joint Chiefs of Staff to serve under the new Secretary.

These places would include the present Secretaries of the Treasury, Labor, Commerce, and newly created Secretaries of Industry and Credit. The latter classification would include the Federal Reserve Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Export-Import Bank.

SIEMINSKI told reporters such unification would guard America's financial position in the world.

I here express my thanks to the Associated Press reporters who interviewed me. I was quite honored by their courtesy and understanding in spite of their warning that, "In 20 years your idea will be adopted by some Joe Blow under his name." I asked, "Why?" "Because," they said, "it's too logical, makes too much sense, keeps pace with America's leadership in the world, and, besides, you're only a freshman."

On further thought, I am withdrawing the bill and presenting a joint resolution for the House and Senate on the proposition.

In closing, I am not unmindful of the gallant fight waged by the late Senator Borah in modernizing the Department of Commerce. However, times are such, I believe, as to merit a reappraisal of the financial functions of the United States. Since Senator Borah passed on, the Department of Defense has come into being. The Department of Finance, I trust, is ready to be born and certified.

U. N. Supporter Showing Signs of Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, John S. Knight, publisher of the Detroit Free Press and other great dailies, is apparently beginning to doubt the wisdom of departing from the principles laid down in our Constitution. Mr. Knight, like many another great man, has been on and off, in and out, the New Deal and its policy of surrendering at least a portion of our national sovereignty to some sort of one-world organization.

In a thought-provoking editorial published in last Sunday's Detroit Free Press he points, as I did in less pleasing words, in perhaps less cogent reasoning in January of 1942, to some of the dangers of playing with the idea that so-called world statesmen of other nations know better what is good for this country and its people than did those who framed our Constitution.

Read, then reread, that editorial, which I quote:

PROTECT LIBERTIES, UNITED STATES WARNED ON ANNIVERSARY OF CONSTITUTION

Monday, September 17, is the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of the ratification of our Constitution.

There will be widespread observance of the event throughout the country with churches, schools, and patriotic organizations staging programs designed to focus attention upon the importance of the Constitution to the individual citizen.

The Constitution is your and my guarantee that we cannot be deprived of our individual liberties without due process of law; that we can express ourselves freely without fear of prosecution; that we have certain inalienable rights which no budding local, State, or National dictator can strip away at his whim.

The Constitution is a moving, human document. Fifty years before latter-day reformers advocated antiprejudice laws, the Constitution was amended to forbid discrimination because of race or color.

The wise men who wrote the Constitution sought to avoid the injustices of European tyranny and thus brought into being a system of checks and balances as between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

They believed that such a form of government would best protect the individual against lust for power and legislative hysteria.

As Donald Richberg wrote recently in the *Freeman*: "The founders of our Republic were so fearful that the tyranny of a majority would eventually destroy our liberties that they prohibited the Government itself from making any laws that would limit free speech, a free press, freedom of religion or freedom of association, or would deny anyone time-honored protections, such as trial by jury, or would deprive anyone of essential enjoyments of life, liberty, or property."

From the start, there was much scoffing at the Constitution. The Tories, both in England and the United States, freely predicted that it would never work.

As late as May 23, 1857, Lord Macaulay wrote to an American:

"Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the Twentieth Century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference; that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire, came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

The British thought the United States could not survive the War of 1812; later they expected the Union to be torn apart and destroyed by the Civil War.

Happily, these dire forebodings did not materialize. The rulers of England underestimated the vitality of our young Republic in 1812 much as they misjudged the character and magnificent courage of the immortal Lincoln in 1861.

The Constitution has served us well; withstood many assaults and still remains the keystone to our arch of freedom.

CONSTITUTION CIRCUMVENTED

But let us not minimize the dangers which still beset us.

From the very advent of the New Deal, the Constitution was under attack from both the right and left. The thought control intellectuals considered it outmoded and inadequate to meet changing conditions: the late Gen. Hugh Johnson brushed it aside when the National Recovery Act was rammed

through a bewildered and compliant Congress.

Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court by adding men who shared his beliefs and philosophies. Although this device failed, he was later to gain his objective through deaths and resignations from the Court.

Finley Peter Dunne said many years ago that the Supreme Court follows the election returns. This was never so true as when the New Deal was in full flower.

In the Roosevelt era, the American people became conditioned to government by edict; to accepting bureaucratic rulings rather than court decisions; to trusting the personal diplomacy of Roosevelt beyond constitutional limitations.

In his memoirs, Winston Churchill says that he, and not Roosevelt, drafted the Atlantic Charter. "I am glad it should be of record," said Churchill, "that the substance and spirit of what came to be called the Atlantic Charter was in its first draft a British production cast in my own words."

Churchill then tells of prevailing upon Mr. Roosevelt to make commitments that no American President had the right to undertake. He goes on to say:

"The fact alone of the United States, still technically neutral, joining with a belligerent power in making such a declaration was astonishing."

To quote Felix Morley, "It certainly was." On January 11, 1944, President Roosevelt told Congress that agreements reached at both Cairo and Tehran would be submitted to the Senate, adding that he was thoroughly conversant with the provision of our Constitution. He said also that there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments.

The Yalta deal which gave Russia certain preeminent rights in Mongolia and Manchuria without China's knowledge was mentioned in Roosevelt's last message to Congress on March 1, 1945.

"I am aware," said Roosevelt, "of the constitutional fact" that political arrangements made at Yalta "must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate."

But, as Felix Morley says: "This scrapping of the open-door policy has never been approved by, or even submitted to, the Senate."

Thus was the Constitution circumvented.

RIGHTS OF THE MINORITY

Another constitutional protection that has largely disappeared is the famous right-to-work principle.

With widespread acceptance of what Donald Richberg calls the union closed shop, in many cases the right to earn a living is conditioned, as Richberg says, "by paying dues to a private organization and becoming practically, if not legally, subject to its laws and discipline."

"If a worker voluntarily joins and remains in a union, this is government by consent of the governed. But if he is forced to join, and forced to stay in, this is government without consent, which the Declaration of Independence denounces as tyranny."

Richberg makes the point that those who advocate the union closed shop argue very earnestly and sincerely that the rule of the majority is the American way—and the democratic way—which makes it possible for men to live and work together effectively and peaceably.

He concedes this is partly true but points out that in our democratic American way of life there are also rights of minorities and of individuals which must be maintained and which a majority is not permitted to deny and destroy.

"Is the right to work," Richberg asks, "without being compelled to join a union, one of those democratic rights?"

Actually, there is no democracy in a situation where the right to work depends upon compulsory union membership; where one cannot withdraw without sacrificing his job.

Yet few people seem concerned over the extension of this arbitrary power, nor is there any agitation to make it unlawful to compel an American citizen to join a union in order to earn a living.

Thus, the Constitution is being conveniently ignored.

TREATIES SUPERSEDE THE LAW

A third major threat to constitutional government is legislation by treaty.

How many people know that a United Nations treaty, ratified by the Senate and signed by the President, automatically becomes the law of our land?

For instance, the United Nations declaration on freedom of information and the Covenant on Human Rights contain provisions which could abolish some of our basic freedoms.

One of the United Nations conventions would restrict freedom of the press in the United States, making our own constitutional guarantees meaningless and of no effect.

This condition is at variance with that in most other countries, which reserve the right, even after a treaty has been signed, to determine to what extent, if at all, they intend to implement its provisions.

Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, is making a vigorous fight to safeguard our system of representative government against the dangers of legislation by treaty.

He said recently that "article 6 of the Constitution provides that a treaty when ratified becomes the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

But, he adds, "the traditional American theory of government was and is that our basic rights are retained by the American people even as against government itself, and are not subject to change or modification unless the Constitution be changed by the people themselves."

His theory is that "since the people expressly reserved these 'retained rights' and did not grant their control to any agency of government, our governing officials have no constitutional power to take them away, or modify them, whether by treaties or otherwise."

This is interesting doctrine, but the fact remains that these "rights" can be taken away by the simple method of ratifying a U. N. treaty which is not binding upon other nations in the same sense that it is upon the United States.

The subject of "legislation by treaty" or "government by treaty" is extremely complicated but in effect it simply means this:

The well-meaning proponents of the Covenant on Human Rights or the Convention on Genocide would have the United States ratify treaties which, if enforced would give the United Nations authority over our National, State and local governments but, as George Sokolsky points out, "not to give it similar authority over the administrations of other countries."

Thus, the Constitution can be circumvented if the United States Senate and the President proceed to ratify and sign the U. N. treaties now under discussion.

U. N. SHORT OF ITS GOALS

In this country, it has become the fashion to celebrate United Nations Day and make fine speeches about the accomplishments of an organization for which there was both an idealistic and a practical need.

Without saying that the U. N. has been a failure in every field, even its most staunch supporters must concede that it has fallen far short of its most important task—that of preserving world peace.

The dangers inherent in government by treaty as proposed under U. N. procedure should cause every thoughtful and patriotic

American to reread and restudy the Constitution of the United States so that he may be sure in his own mind that in striving for a world ideal, we are not yielding some of our precious liberties to a supergovernment shaped in an Old World design.

The Constitution was written by men who understood better than we the price of liberty and the blessings of free institutions.

Let's not scrap it for something that may destroy our heritage.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

It is encouraging, decidedly so, to find a great daily, a great editor like Knight, finally making a plea for adherence to the Constitution; to, though he probably would deny it, a more reasonable acceptance of the views of the isolationists, the nationalists, like your humble servant

United Nations makes war, American youth pays the price From the Dowagiac Daily News of September 14, 1951, comes the following article:

BURIAL SERVICE PLANNED FOR TWO WAR VICTIMS

The bodies of two local boys, killed in action in Korea, Sgt. (1c) Ted Terkos, 24, son of Mr. and Mrs. Nick Terkos of this city, and Sgt. Donald William Webber, 19, son of Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Webber of Sumnerville, are arriving home this week-end for final interment.

Services for both boys will be held Monday, Sergeant Terkos' in Chicago Monday morning at 9 o'clock and Sergeant Webber's Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock in the Kiger Funeral Home in Niles.

Sergeant Terkos, who fought on Okinawa at the age of 18 with an infantry division, in World War II, was an Army reservist and died in Korea on February 5 of this year, less than 3 months after he was recalled to duty. He went overseas within a short time after his recall and was assigned to the Seventh Infantry Regiment of the Third Division. He died in an Army hospital in Korea from bullet wounds.

He was born in Dowagiac June 18, 1926, the third son of Nick and Beatrice Warren Terkos and was graduated from Central High School with the class of 1944. He was one of the most popular students in the high school. He was inducted into the Army on September 18, 1944, and by the end of the following April was taking part in the bitter fighting on Okinawa. He was discharged in 1946. His marriage to Patricia Healey, of Chicago, took place in September 1946. He later reenlisted in the Army, serving for 1 year after which he was placed on the inactive reserve list.

Besides his widow and parents, he leaves his little daughter, Diane Rosemary, and three brothers, Pete, James and William, all of Dowagiac. His wife lives at 8604 South Ada Street, Chicago.

The body will be at the Brady funeral home, 1018 West Seventy-ninth Street, Chicago, where services will be held at 9 a. m. Monday morning followed by solemn requiem high mass at St. Killian's Church at 9:30 a. m. Monday. The church is at Eighty-seventh and May Streets. Burial will be in St. Mary's cemetery.

Sgt. Donald W. Webber, 19, who was president of the 1949 graduating class of Central High School in this city, was killed September 26, 1950, in Korea, while fighting with the Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiment of the Second Division. He was the second Cass County boy to be killed in Korea.

He was born in Sumnerville, October 20, 1930, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Webber, and attended the Sumnerville School before coming to Dowagiac to attend high school. He was a letter man in football, baseball, and basketball in high school and

was president of the senior class at the time of his enlistment in the Army in January 1949. His family last saw him at Christmas time of that year.

They believe that he went to Korea in July 1950, but never heard from him again after he sailed or after his arrival at the front.

Besides his parents he leaves eight brothers and sisters including a half-brother, Kenneth McLaughlin, and Robert, Carol, Mary, Betty, Beverly, Frances, and Ruth Webber, all at home; his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Webber and Mrs. Myrtle Canfield, of Niles.

Funeral services will be held Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock in the Kiger funeral home in Niles. Full military rites will be conducted by the VFW post of Dowagiac followed by interment in Silverbrook Cemetery.

The body is expected to arrive by train in Niles Saturday morning accompanied by a military escort.

Resolution of Geary County Flood Control Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore approved, I am enclosing copy of resolutions adopted by the Geary County Flood Control Association on September 11, 1951. In view of the damages incurred in the State of Kansas by reason of the recent floods, I am sure Members of the House will be interested in the views expressed in these resolutions.

GEARY COUNTY FLOOD-CONTROL ASSOCIATION RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 11, 1951

Whereas agricultural and urban lands in Geary County, Kans., together with the improvements located thereon and the personal belongings of the residents have suffered damage by floodwaters in the major flood disasters of 1903, 1915, 1935, 1941, 1951, and also extensive damage in six other years and three times in 1951 in addition to the major flooding of July 11-13, and

Whereas these floodwaters have come from the Smoky Hill, Saline, Solomon, and Republican Rivers, and from Lyons and Chapman Creeks, and

Whereas the river channel on the Kansas and the Smoky Hill Rivers would have carried away more water from this vicinity if the Republican and the Blue Rivers were controlled; and

Whereas there are climatic conditions which cause more rainfall than it is possible for the soil to absorb and this excess runoff must be held in reservoirs if floods are to be prevented. Now, therefore, in order to prevent this frequent personal and property loss be it

Resolved by the people of Geary County, Kans. That the Congress of the United States should authorize and make appropriations for—

1. Plans contained in the Pick-Sloan plan for the Kansas River Basin covering projects of the (a) Corps of Engineers for reservoirs on the Blue River, the Republican River, and the Delaware River; and of the (b) Bureau of Reclamation for reservoirs on the Solomon and the Saline Rivers.

2. Plans contained in the Department of Agriculture Missouri River Basin plan for the

upstream phases of Federal flood-control activities including stabilization measures for small water courses; be it further

Resolved, That we consider the present reports and recommendations of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture dealing with flood-control measure and which reports are now before Congress as ample to deal with the situation, and that no further delays should be caused by taking time for new studies; be it further

Resolved, That we express our appreciation to the President, the Federal agencies, the Congress, and Senator FRANK CARLSON, Senator ANDREW SCHOMPPEL, Representative EDWARD H. REES, for the attention they have given the problem, and that we express our hope that they will continue their efforts until all of the protective and conservation measures are completed.

ROBT A SCHERMEHORN,
President, Geary County Flood-
Control Association.

Readjustment of Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am vigorously opposed to a 60-percent increase in postal rates for newspapers and magazines. There seems to be a great misconception as to the real purposes of our postal system. The purpose of the postal system is to serve the needs of all of the American people. It should not be confused with a profit-making enterprise or a project to benefit only a certain locality for such is not the purpose of the postal service. Neither should we accept the theory that this increase will merely be paid by the publishers; in the end, it must be passed down to the recipients of that mail.

Perhaps no single factor has contributed so much to the education, culture, and freedom of the American people as has the ready dissemination of news to all the people, not just the wealthy and privileged. Wealth in America has never been, and should never be, a requisite to the obtaining of information as furnished so adequately by the press of America. I fear that certain people in high places have allowed their antagonism to the press of America to influence their judgment when they advocate such an enormous increase in postal rates.

The attempt to stop this free flow in information shows a fear on the part of those who would do this. The American people, rich and poor alike, should have ready access to the news on all sides of every question. Freedom of the press can be curtailed in more ways than one; censorship may be accomplished directly or indirectly. One of the indirect methods of censorship is to make the transmission of newspapers and other periodicals so expensive that they are beyond the financial grasp of the people of low income.

Since the postal service is a service to all the people it cannot be considered in

the same light as the construction of a great dam or irrigation project, or as the donation of aid to foreign countries, for these appropriations benefit only certain segments of the people. The postal service benefits us all. Certainly there are indirect subsidies in the postal service. No one denies that our postal service has subsidized air mail, but this subsidy has benefited us all, and has benefited national defense through the rapid growth and development of aviation.

Our rural free delivery system in America has been of inestimable value in making and keeping us a free, united people. Not one thinking person in America would want to do away with it. Yet it has never paid its way. Each year our Government bureaus and departments and the Congress send billions of pieces of mail free through the postal system. While some of this mail may be of doubtful value, the postal service must transport and deliver it without compensation and as a public service.

We know that more expensive buildings are built and maintained by the Postal Department than are really necessary, but local pride demands it. In a sense, this is a subsidy to the community in which they are built and operated.

I am in no way objecting to these various direct and indirect subsidies by our Post Office Department; on the whole, they are operated for the good of America. The citizens of the United States demand these services and subsidies. Since the Government is the people, such subsidies and services are proper, but let us not blame the Postal Department for their expenses.

The statement that there is a \$550,000,000 deficit in the Post Office Department is certainly erroneous and misleading, and is an unjust criticism of the efficiency of the postal system. If the proponents of this absurdly large increase in the rates of newspapers and magazines would sincerely make an accounting and show how much of this money is spent in subsidies directly or indirectly, all for the benefit of the American people, we would have an entirely different picture. But apparently their desire to force through this 60-percent increase has so prejudiced them that they have not given us the full and correct picture.

Although some increase may be justified, I will not vote for this large increase in postal rates that will in many instances prevent the poor people, especially those in isolated areas, from receiving their newspapers and magazines, and also wreck certain small publications.

To eliminate some of the confusion surrounding the postal deficit, it might be wise to make each department pay an approximate sum for the use it makes of free and privileged mail. This sum would be added to the appropriation of each department. This would not reduce the cost of this service, but it would show what agency was spending the money. It would also help to show what the real deficit is.

I suggest that some nonpartisan and unbiased commission study the postal

system to determine exactly how much we are spending for these various subsidies so that the American people can know exactly what they are getting and what they are paying for. When we have that information, we will then be able to find just what increases are necessary in the postal system. And the people will then know what they are getting for their money and can decide whether it is worth the price.

Escape From Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 17, 1951, demonstrates that the time may not be too far distant when freedom will be reestablished in the totalitarian states:

ESCAPE FROM TYRANNY—THE STORY OF A YOUNG COUPLE WHO MADE IT THROUGH THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Donald P. Knodel)

With all Russian propaganda organs blaring full blast, refugees continue to slip through the iron curtain into Western Germany. Many motives drive them to seek escape, but basically there is always the affront to human dignity suffered at the hands of tyranny, compounded with economic and physical hardship.

Such a case was that of Ivan Petrov and his pretty wife, Natalie, who, thanks to the efforts of the American Embassy in Tehran, recently arrived in Munich. Petrov had been wounded and decorated during the war, but now after a struggle with Soviet politics and economy he found his pockets empty, his career ruined (he and his wife had been teachers), his sister forced to work hopelessly in a labor camp far from home, and his self-respect rapidly diminishing. He decided that BBC and Voice of America broadcasts could not be entirely wrong about the west, and he began to make plans looking in that direction.

After the decision had been made, the question became one of method. Travelling through Czechoslovakia and Poland into Germany, he would be forced to cross three borders, all mined and patrolled. The fact that his wife would accompany him seemed to eliminate such a route, and he applied, the before, for leave to visit one of the rest camps on the Caspian Sea. After packing small suitcases and an ordinary lunch, they waved good-by to their smiling friends at the station. They had not dared tell them their real purpose.

In the early hours of the morning the train reached a water stop on the Turkestan steppes. Ivan and his wife waited until the train began to move, then jumped off and disappeared into the night.

Their lunch was their only source of food—one kilogram of chocolate, two kilograms of bread and a half liter of vodka. Guided by a compass and an ordinary map, they struck out in the direction of the Azerbaijanian border. It was winter, and the night wind across the steppe went through their cotton clothing like a knife. As dawn approached they hid themselves in a ravine, then as the sun beat down upon them from overhead they suffered from its

heat. The second evening, without food and 20 hours without water, they struck out again. Natalie was weak, and the cheap Soviet ersatz shoes they wore no longer protected their feet, but they managed to walk more than 25 miles before daylight forced them once more to go into hiding. On this high plateau where they now traveled a walking man could be seen for miles.

When nightfall made it safe for them to continue Natalie had lost strength to the point that she felt she could not go on. Ivan promised, threatened, and through the use of various ruses finally persuaded her to try walking with her arm over his shoulder. Finishing the last of the vodka and praying that their compass was not inaccurate, they hobbled along slowly and painfully. It began to rain, but, although it soaked their clothing, they were overjoyed to see it freeze on the low shrubbery about them. By breaking off branches and sucking them they obtained their first water in more than 50 hours.

During the third day they slept as if dead, and when they awoke found their mouths swollen and blistered. Natalie cried and begged to be left, but as the sun set and the chill wind began to carry small flakes of snow hope was reborn. Half-carried, half-walking Natalie accompanied her husband through the darkness for what must have been a minimum of 20 miles. During the night, at a point Ivan calculated as close to the border, they saw fresh tracks of men and dogs on the ground now lightly covered with snow. In spite of their condition, their discovery drove them on at a run until they dropped exhausted. Had they been seen they would have been shot.

In the morning a horseman passed near by. He was an Afghan. Petrov raised his head to shout, but no sound would come from his swollen throat and mouth. Hours later, after following the horse's tracks into a small village, the two refugees fainted as Afghan women and children crowded around them. The only common word in the two vocabularies they spoke was "Bolshevik." As soon as Petrov uttered it a rider was dispatched for a government official. Two days later, nursed back to normal strength with bread and a strange tea, they were on their way in rattling luxury by automobile over tortuous roads to the district police headquarters. From there they were sent to Tehran where they were given opportunity to tell their story to American officials at the Embassy. Two months later they were flown to Western Germany.

Petrov has told stories of terrorism affecting many people, including close acquaintances and his own family. Soviet officials seem to have a fixed rule not to allow Russians who have been in the west full liberties, once they have returned to the homeland. It applies to both soldiers and civilians. If they are allowed to mingle freely with the citizenry in western Russia, it is feared their "stories of prosperity" in the defeated countries of Austria and Germany will cause widespread dissatisfaction with the Soviet standard of living. Petrov's sister was shipped to Germany by the Germans in 1941. After 1945 she remained in the same camp in Eastern Germany under the government of the MVD. One day in 1947 the inmates were told to get together food and clothing for a 3-day journey. Hopes were high that at last they would be returned as free citizens, but they were doomed to disappointment. Their criminal status had not been changed, and to this day she has been held as a prisoner. She now works on a canal project in the Middle East, whence she is permitted to write to her relatives, but her letters, either because of censorship or as a result of her condition, are those of a woman with a broken spirit.

Petrov feels that the peasantry is 100 percent against the Communists and that 85

percent of the entire population is dissatisfied but helpless under the police system. He suggests that the United States adopt more aggressive radio propaganda. Appeals coming from private individuals in the United States are more effective than those under Government auspices, but by far the best method of agitation, he believes, is to make arrangements for broadcasts to their native country by recently escaped Russians. Appeals by such people under such circumstances would arouse quick and warm response.

Undermining of Constitution Imperils Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, September 17, was the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of the ratification of our Constitution and appropriate ceremonies were held in the Library of Congress commemorating this event.

It seems to me that in talking to a great many of the residents of my congressional district, they appear to be concerned about the gradual drifting away from the principles laid down in the Constitution.

The remarks of Mr. John S. Knight in his Editor's Notebook column of Saturday, September 15, in the Chicago Daily News is a very thought-provoking article on our Constitution. The editorial entitled "Undermining of Constitution Imperils Liberty," is as follows:

Monday, September 17, is the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of the ratification of our Constitution.

There will be widespread observance of the event throughout the country, with churches, schools, and patriotic organizations staging programs designed to focus attention upon the importance of the Constitution to the individual citizen.

The Constitution is your and my guaranty that we cannot be deprived of our individual liberties without due process of law; that we can express ourselves freely without fear of prosecution; that we have certain inalienable rights which no budding local, State, or National dictator can strip away at his whim.

The Constitution is a moving, human document. Fifty years before latter-day reformers advocated antiprejudice laws, the Constitution was amended to forbid discrimination because of race or color.

The wise men who wrote the Constitution sought to avoid the injustices of European tyranny and thus brought into being a system of checks and balances as between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

They believed that such a form of government would best protect the individual against lust for power and legislative hysteria.

As Donald Richberg wrote recently in the Freeman:

"The founders of our Republic were so fearful that the 'tyranny of a majority' would eventually destroy our liberties that they prohibited the Government itself from making any laws that would limit free

speech, a free press, freedom of religion, or freedom of association, or would deny anyone time-honored protections, such as trial by jury, or would deprive anyone of essential enjoyments of 'life, liberty, or property.'"

From the start, there was much scoffing at the Constitution. The Tories, both in England and the United States, freely predicted that it would never work.

As late as May 23, 1857, Lord Macaulay wrote to an American:

"Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor . . . I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both . . . Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire, came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

The British thought the United States could not survive the War of 1812, later they expected the Union to be torn apart and destroyed by the Civil War.

Happily, these dire forebodings did not materialize. The rulers of England underestimated the vitality of our young Republic in 1812 much as they misjudged the character and magnificent courage of the immortal Lincoln in 1861.

The Constitution has served us well withstood many assaults and still remains the keystone to our arch of freedom.

BOTH RIGHT AND LEFT ATTACK OUR BASIC LAW

But let us not minimize the dangers which still beset us.

From the very advent of the New Deal, the Constitution was under attack from both the Right and the Left. The "thought control" intellectuals considered it outmoded and inadequate to meet changing conditions, the late Gen. Hugh Johnson brushed it aside when the National Recovery Act was rammed through a bewildered and compliant Congress.

Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court by adding men who shared his beliefs and philosophies. Although this device failed, he was later to gain his objective through deaths and resignations from the Court.

Finley Peter Dunne said many years ago that the Supreme Court follows the election returns. This was never so true as when the New Deal was in full flower.

In the Roosevelt era, the American people became conditioned to government by edict; to accepting bureaucratic rulings rather than court decisions; to trusting the personal diplomacy of Roosevelt beyond constitutional limitations.

In his memoirs, Winston Churchill says that he, and not Roosevelt, drafted the Atlantic Charter. "I am glad it should be of record," says Churchill, "that the substance and spirit of what came to be called the Atlantic Charter was in its first draft a British production cast in my own words."

Churchill then tells of prevailing upon Mr. Roosevelt to make "commitments" that no American President had the right to undertake. He goes on to say: "The fact alone of the United States, still technically neutral, joining with a belligerent power in making such a declaration was astonishing."

To quote Felix Morley: "It certainly was."

On January 11, 1944, President Roosevelt told Congress that agreements reached at both Cairo and Tehran would be submitted to the Senate, adding that he was "thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution." He said also that "there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments."

The Yalta deal which gave Russia certain preeminent rights in Mongolia and Manchuria without China's knowledge was mentioned in Roosevelt's last message to Congress on March 1, 1945.

"I am aware," said Roosevelt, "of the constitutional fact" that political arrangements made at Yalta "must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate."

But, as Felix Morley says: "This scrapping of the open-door policy has never been approved by, or even submitted to, the Senate."

Thus was the Constitution circumvented.

RIGHT TO HOLD JOB NOW BEING QUALIFIED

Another constitutional protection that has largely disappeared is the famous "right to work" principle.

With widespread acceptance of what Donald Richberg calls the union closed shop, in many cases the right to earn a living is conditioned, as Richberg says, "by paying dues to a private organization and becoming practically, if not legally, subject to its laws and discipline."

"If a worker voluntarily joins and remains in a union, this is 'government by consent of the governed.' But if he is forced to join, and forced to stay in, this is government without consent, which the Declaration of Independence denounces as tyranny."

Richberg makes the point that those who advocate the "union closed shop" argue very earnestly and sincerely that the "rule of the majority" is the "American way"—and the "democratic way"—which makes it possible for men to live and work together effectively and peaceably.

He concedes this is partly true but points out that in our democratic American way of life there are also rights of minorities and of individuals which must be maintained and which a majority is not permitted to deny and destroy.

"Is the right to work," Richberg asks, "without being compelled to join a union, one of those 'democratic' rights?"

Actually, there is no democracy in a situation where the "right to work" depends upon compulsory union membership, where one cannot withdraw without sacrificing his job.

Yet few people seem concerned over the extension of this arbitrary power, nor is there any agitation to make it unlawful to compel an American citizen to join a union in order to earn a living.

Thus, the Constitution is being conveniently ignored.

U. N. TREATIES COULD LIMIT UNITED STATES FREEDOM

A third major threat to constitutional government is legislation by treaty.

How many people know that a United Nations treaty, ratified by the Senate and signed by the President, automatically becomes the law of our land?

For instance, the U. N. Declaration on Freedom of Information and the Covenant on Human Rights contain provisions which could abolish some of our basic freedoms.

One of the U. N. conventions would restrict freedom of the press in the United States, making our own constitutional guarantees meaningless and of no effect.

This condition is at variance with that in most other countries, which reserve the right, even after a treaty has been signed, to determine to what extent, if at all, they intend to implement its provisions.

Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, is making a vigorous fight to safeguard our system of representative government against the dangers of legislation by treaty.

He said recently that "article 6 of the Constitution provides that a treaty when ratified becomes the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

But, he adds, "the traditional American theory of government was and is that our

basic rights are retained by the American people even as against Government itself, and are not subject to change or modification unless the Constitution be changed by the people themselves."

His theory is that since the people expressly reserved these retained rights and did not grant their control to any agency of Government, our governing officials have no constitutional power to take them away or modify them, whether by treaties or otherwise.

This is interesting doctrine, but the fact remains that these rights can be taken away by the simple method of ratifying a U. N. treaty which is not binding upon other nations in the same sense that it is upon the United States.

The subject of legislation by treaty or government by treaty is extremely complicated but in effect it simply means this:

The well-meaning proponents of the Covenant on Human Rights or the Convention on Genocide would have the United States ratify treaties which, if enforced, would give the United Nations authority over our national, State, and local governments but, as George Sokolsky points out, "not to give it similar authority over the administrations of other countries."

Thus, the Constitution can be circumvented if the United States Senate and the President proceed to ratify and sign the U. N. treaties now under discussion.

LIBERTY MORE IMPORTANT THAN ONE-WORLD SCHEMES

In this country, it has become the fashion to celebrate United Nations Day and make fine speeches about the accomplishments of an organization for which there was both an idealistic and a practical need.

Without saying that the U. N. has been a failure in every field, even its most staunch supporters must concede that it has fallen far short of its most important task—that of preserving world peace.

The dangers inherent in government by treaty as proposed under U. N. procedure should cause every thoughtful and patriotic American to reread and restudy the Constitution of the United States so that he may be sure in his own mind that in striving for a world ideal, we are not yielding some of our precious liberties to a supergovernment shaped in an old-world design.

The Constitution was written by men who understood better than we the price of liberty and the blessings of free institutions.

Let's not scrap it for something that may destroy our heritage.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

The Proposed Aluminum Industry for Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today requesting the Department of Justice to investigate charges which have been made concerning the proposed Government loan of \$46,000,000 to the Harvey Machine Co., of California.

I am also introducing a bill today, Mr. Speaker, which seeks to provide for the establishment of a clearinghouse of information in the Department of Justice, to furnish agencies of the Federal Gov-

ernment with information concerning the qualifications of Government contractors. My purpose in doing this is to make available to all Government agencies the qualifications and standings of any individual, partnership, corporation, or business seeking to do business with the Government.

A copy of the bill follows:

A bill to provide for the establishment of a clearinghouse of information in the Department of Justice, to furnish agencies of the Federal Government with information concerning the qualifications of Government contractors

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide all agencies of the Federal Government with full, complete, and accessible information concerning certain persons who have heretofore contracted or may hereafter contract with the Federal Government, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to establish and maintain within the Department of Justice clearinghouse of information as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. (a) The clearinghouse established pursuant to the first section of this act shall contain such information (including information with respect to credit, integrity, loyalty, efficiency, and performance) concerning each person who contracts with an agency of the Federal Government as the Attorney General shall deem appropriate.

(b) Each agency of the Federal Government shall, from time to time, submit to the Attorney General such information concerning persons who contract with such agency on or after the date of the enactment of this act as the Attorney General may require in accordance with subsection (a).

(c) Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, the Attorney General shall submit to each agency of the Federal Government a request for such information as he deems appropriate in accordance with subsection (a) concerning persons who have contracted with such agency within the 10-year period immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this act, and each such agency shall within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act furnish to the Attorney General the information so requested.

SEC. 3. (a) Upon the request of the head of any agency of the Federal Government for information concerning any person who has contracted or may contract with such agency, the Attorney General shall furnish to such agency any information concerning such person which is available in the clearinghouse established pursuant to section 2 (a).

(b) If any information requested by the head of any agency of the Federal Government pursuant to subsection (a) is not available in the clearinghouse established pursuant to section 2 (a), the Attorney General, upon the further request of the head of the agency, shall conduct such investigation as may be necessary to secure the information requested and shall furnish such information to the agency.

SEC. 4 For the purposes of this act—

(1) the term "person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, and any other business entity; and

(2) the term "agency of the Federal Government" means any department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, and any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

SEC. 5 The Attorney General shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

To the best of my knowledge, the Harvey Co. is the only company which

has made a firm commitment to the Bonneville Power Administration to locate in the Flathead Valley of Montana in the vicinity of the Hungry Horse Dam. Furthermore, this industry was to be a permanent addition to Montana's economic structure and would furnish employment to Montana people on a year-round basis.

On July 18, 1950, I asked Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, the following question:

What is your opinion of the Harvey outfit?

Dr. Raver answered:

I have been sizing them up * * * they are a typical small business. As I see it I think we ought to do everything we can to encourage this company to keep its head above water and I think they have a whale of a lot of initiative.

I had assumed that in considering the application of the Harvey Machine Co. that the Department of the Interior would conduct a complete investigation before arriving at an agreement. I made very plain and unmistakable what my position was in meetings with Secretary Chapman on July 31, 1951, and with Mr. Charles Wilson, Defense Mobilization Administrator, on August 22, 1951, when I stated to both, in the presence of witnesses, that I was exerting no political pressure but that any agreement entered into with the Harvey Co. must be on a strictly business basis; that all the cards should be laid on the table; that any agreement must be able to withstand a congressional investigation; and that the Government's interests must be fully protected. I also stated that I wanted a decision as to whether the Harvey Co. was in or out so that the people of Montana would know where they stood on this company coming into our State.

Ever since I have been able to secure the authorization and the funds for the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam in my district, I have been doing all I could to see that new industries would come into our State to use the power which will be available in 1952 when the Hungry Horse Dam is completed. When it was brought to my attention that an independent company was interested in constructing an aluminum plant in the Flathead Valley, I urged that it be given every consideration not only because I wanted new industries in Montana but also to further independent and small businesses.

For months there have been one decision after another on the acceptance of this company's proposal and finally on July 31, I told Secretary Chapman that this matter must be settled one way or another; that I wanted to see a final decision made immediately because we needed aluminum and I wanted to see an aluminum plant started in the Flathead Valley this summer. If a decision was not reached soon, I felt that construction could not start this year because of winter weather setting in. At no time during these past months has there been any reference to the allegations made by Mr. Pearson.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks copies of letters I

have sent to the Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman; Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Howard McGrath, Attorney General; and Congressman PORTER HARDY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1951.
Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of Interior,
Interior Department.

DEAR OSCAR: It is my understanding that Mr. Drew Pearson in his broadcast of Sunday, September 16, made a statement to the effect that there were some questions about the status of the Harvey Machine Company, its proposed loan to build an alumina plant in the State of Washington, and an aluminum plant in the vicinity of Kalispell, Mont., and that this loan would not be granted.

You will recall, Oscar, at the final meeting in your office on July 31, 1951, and in the presence of Under Secretary Searles, Senator Murray, Congressman Jackson of Washington and King of California, Mr. Don Treloar of Kalispell, Mont., that I stated that any agreement entered into between the Harvey Machine Company and the Government should be on a strictly business basis; that all the cards be laid on the table; and that any agreement made must be able to withstand the light of any Congressional investigation or scrutiny. In other words, any agreement should be able to stand on its own feet with the Government's interests fully protected. With this, you wholeheartedly agreed as well as did every other person present.

You will recall also that at that time you made the statement that if the Harvey Machine Company did not go into Montana, there were other aluminum companies interested in moving into the Flathead area and they would be given immediate consideration. In other words, this power from Hungry Horse Dam was to be used in Montana for the development of industry within the State and particularly in the Flathead area. The people of Montana and I are still relying on the promises made by you and Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, that this is still the case and that this power from Hungry Horse will be used in Montana for Montana development.

In the light of the statement made by Mr. Pearson, I am, as you can readily comprehend, very much disturbed. Will you please send me a letter at your earliest convenience stating just what Mr. Pearson had in mind and just what is the status of the Harvey proposed aluminum plant in the Flathead area at the present time.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

(Copies to: Hon. Stuart Symington, RFC Administrator; Hon. Charles Wilson, Defense Mobilization Administrator; Hon. James E. Murray, United States Senate; Hon. Henry Jackson, House of Representatives; Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of Bonneville Power Administration; Mr. Don Treloar, KGEZ, Kalispell, Mont.; Hon. Richard Searles, Under Secretary of Interior; Mr. Melvin Ruder, Hungry Horse News, Columbia Falls, Mont.; Mr. Perry Melton, Treasure State Labor Journal, Kalispell, Mont.; Mr. Frank Trippett, Kalispell News, Kalispell, Mont.; Mr. Malcolm Glover, Daily Interlake, Kalispell, Mont.; Mr. Alex Warden, Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont.; Mr. G. M. Moss, Whitefish Pilot, Whitefish, Mont.; Mr. Howard Miller, Times-Monitor, Kalispell, Mont.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1951.
Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator of the RFC,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR STUART: It has come to my attention that Mr. Drew Pearson on Sunday, September 16, made a statement in his weekly broadcast to the effect that there was something questionable about the Harvey Machine Co. and that the \$46,000,000 loan for an alumina plant in the State of Washington and an aluminum plant in Montana, would not be granted. This comes as a surprise to me and I am writing to you for definite information as to the truth or the inaccuracy of Mr. Pearson's statement.

I have made it very plain in meetings with Under Secretary of Interior Searles, Secretary Chapman and Mr. Charles Wilson, Defense Mobilization Administrator, that any agreement entered into between the Harvey Machine Co. and the Government must be on a strictly business basis, that all the cards should be laid on the table, and that the Government's interests must be fully protected. These statements were made in the office of Secretary Chapman on July 31, 1951, and in the presence of Senator Murray, Congressman Jackson of Washington, King of California, and Mr. Don Treloar of Kalispell, Mont., and they were in full agreement with me. These statements were repeated by me to Mr. Charles Wilson in his office on August 22, 1951, in the presence of Senator Murray, his administrative assistant, Charles Murray, and my secretary, James Sullivan.

I am deeply perturbed about this statement by Mr. Pearson and I am writing to you to request that you give me at your earliest convenience an answer to the allegations made by Mr. Pearson last Sunday.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1951.
Hon. PORTER HARDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives.

DEAR PORTER: I am very much perturbed by certain allegations which have been made in the press and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to the proposed awarding of a contract to the Harvey Machine Co. of California. This company has been interested in the building of an aluminum plant in the Flathead Valley of Montana and has been seeking a \$46,000,000 loan.

Because of allegations made, which I had no knowledge of, I feel very strongly that your committee should investigate this matter early so that the truth may be unearthed and the facts given to the Congress and the public.

I therefore request that your committee start an immediate investigation and that you go into the allegations made in the greatest possible detail.

Must close now but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1951.
Hon. HOWARD McGRATH,
Attorney General,
Justice Department.

DEAR HOWARD: I am enclosing herewith copies of letters I have sent to Secretary Chapman and Stuart Symington, Adminis-

trator of the RFC, relative to allegations made by Drew Pearson in his radio broadcast of Sunday, September 16, as well as in his newspaper articles of September 18 and 19. My letters to Secretary Chapman and Mr. Symington are self-explanatory.

I am therefore requesting that you conduct a complete investigation of these allegations and that a public report be made immediately on the same so that all the facts in this will be made known not only to the people of the United States but to the Congress as well.

Enclosed herewith also is copy of a speech made by Congressman SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, contained in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on pages A5658-A5660 with reference to the Harvey Machine Co. I would like to request that you also conduct a complete investigation of the statements made by Congressman SAYLOR and that the answers to the same be made known to the public.

My impression of Mr. Pearson's article is that any one department of the Government is restricted in getting files from another; therefore, I am this afternoon introducing a bill in Congress to give authority to the Justice Department to be a clearinghouse for all individuals, corporations, companies, etc., who have had, or will have contracts with any Government agency so that if one department wants to find out anything respecting such, they can get such information from the Justice Department. In view of these statements, it is my intention to press for immediate action on this bill so that not only this company's record can be made known but all other companies who may have had any dealings with the Government.

Congressman HENRY JACKSON of Washington, joins with me in requesting a full and complete investigation.

May I hear from you at your earliest convenience on this. With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

In my letters to the Attorney General and Congressman HARDY, I am requesting a full and complete investigation of this matter:

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting at this point in the RECORD two columns by Mr. Drew Pearson covering this matter. They appeared in Mr. Pearson's column in the Washington Post of September 18 and 19, 1951:

[From the Washington Post of September 18, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

CHAPMAN FLAGS DOWN RFC LOAN

The United States Government last week was on the verge of lending \$46,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to the Harvey Machine Co. to set it up in business as a bigtime aluminum producer.

Suddenly alert Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman raised a red flag. He sent hasty letters to Stuart Symington, of the RFC, and Manly Fleischmann, head of Defense Production, withdrawing his approval of the \$46,000,000 until he could examine certain new facts.

Inside reason was a mass of evidence which this column placed on Chapman's desk. The Navy turned this evidence over to the Justice Department for prosecution at one time.

Justice never prosecuted, on the grounds of "inability to prove to a jury that the Navy Department was seriously injured." However, these and other facts in the long and secret record of the Harvey Co. more than justified Secretary Chapman's hasty stop

order against one of the biggest Government loans of the present era.

What will amaze the taxpayers is that Government investigators, who presumably can read the newspapers and knew of the proposed \$46,000,000 loan to Harvey, did not turn over their files to other branches of the Government. It's also amazing that some system hasn't been set up inside the Government whereby different bureaus can compare notes regarding prospective recipients of loans and war contracts.

If such a system existed, here are the facts they would have found without having a private newspaperman dig them out:

Strange gage

In early 1943, M. M. Suddock, a thread-grinder operator working for the Harvey Co. which was then making Navy shells, reported to Navy inspectors that he had been instructed to make an off-size testing gage for 20 mm shells. He consulted other thread grinders and they agreed that the size of the thread was unusual.

On the strength of this, the Navy launched a thorough probe both through its own agents and FBI Agent K. A. Vosburgh. This disclosed a number of irregularities. In May 1943, the records were turned over to James E. Harrington, Chief of the Justice Department's War Fraud Section.

The probe centered around Herbert Harvey, brother of Leo Harvey, president of the firm. The Navy report states that he denied any knowledge of the order to make off-sized testing gages.

Finally Navy inspectors showed Harvey the original instructions for the manufacture of the faulty gage. In Herbert Harvey's own handwriting was penciled the notation: "Make five more like this one."

[From The Washington Post of September 19, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

LOAN BLOCKED

In these days of multi-billion-dollar defense budgets, forty-six millions may not seem a lot, but several hundred thousand little fellows have to chip in their withholding taxes every week to raise it. Furthermore, the proposed \$46,000,000 loan to the Harvey Machine Co. of Los Angeles, by the RFC to make aluminum is one of the largest loans considered in the present cold-war period.

Despite this, such a bonanza to Harvey was officially recommended August 28, and has only now been held up because of new information unearthed by this column.

Aforesaid information shows that the Harvey company was criticized by the Navy during the war, and was in constant hot water with the Air Force. The Navy complaint was based on Harvey's alleged making of oversized shell gages.

The full story of how the Harvey family came within a hair's breadth of getting this huge Government loan is one of the most amazing stories of this amazing Capital.

It began shortly after World War II, when by systematic contributions to the Democratic Party, the Harveys "bought in" first in California, later on the National Committee. They also played up local demand for war factories, thus got Congressmen from California, Washington, and Montana all throwing their weight around for the Harvey loan.

California Congressmen were for the Harveys because their plant was located near Los Angeles, Montanans because the new aluminum plant was to be near Hungry Horse Dam in that State. And Washington Congressmen were for them because another plant was to be near Everett.

With this backing, the Harveys camped out in California Congressman King's office as if they owned it, became so insolent with War Assets Administrator Jess Larson that he almost threw Leo Harvey out of the office, and so riled Secretary of the Interior Chapman that he described Harvey as "impossible."

However, each time a Government bureau balked at Harvey's terms, he would unloose the congressional wolves, which came swarming down on the executive branch of the Government yelling monopoly and claiming that all Government orders were going to three aluminum firms—Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser.

To help little business

This desire to help little business and broaden the present semimonopoly of aluminum was the chief and justifiable reason why men like Larson and Chapman stuck with the deal.

But the most amazing feature of these many months of dickering was that no one inside the Government ever thought to check with the Army, Navy, and Air Force regarding Harvey's wartime performance. Nor did the armed services take the trouble to warn the RFC, Interior Department, or Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a statement by my colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 18, 1951:

SECRETARY CHAPMAN ENGINEERS ANOTHER GREAT RFC SCANDAL FOR HARVEY MACHINE Co.

(Extension of remarks of Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, September 18, 1951)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a vicious new scandal, involving another great RFC loan and perpetrated by high officials and politicians of the administration, is spreading its unhealthy tentacles throughout the United States. For the sake of the American taxpayers, who have all they can bear of these scurrilous burdens, I hope we can expose this case quickly enough to stop it.

Many a surprise package has been opened lately in Washington. Out of some of them have come mink coats, deep freezes, gratuitous jobs, and neat bottles of influence bearing the administration label. They are insignificant compared to the iniquitous deal which is my subject here.

We cannot be certain yet just what all will be found when we complete the unwrapping of this newest package, but a variety of things already have popped out.

These include:

First. The Harvey Machine Co. of Los Angeles.

Second. Leo—or Lawrence—Harvey, president of the firm, of Russian descent, whose name may not be Harvey.

Third. A \$46,000,000 loan approved by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, to the Harvey Co. for a new aluminum plant in Montana.

Fourth. An attempt by the Interior Department and its Bureau of Reclamation to create a great power shortage in Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Oregon for the purpose of getting control of power and water in those States and establishing new authority for Secretary Chapman and Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus.

Fifth. Suspicious circumstances under which strange-gage Navy shell testers were found in the Harvey Co. plant when that company was working on war contracts.

Sixth. Employment of a former Assistant Secretary of Interior and legal counsel for

the Bonneville Power Administration by the Harvey Co.

Seventh. Employment of a member of the California State Legislature as public-relations counsel by the Harvey Co.

Eighth. The rise of Lawrence Harvey—or Leo—as a Democrat leader.

Ninth. How Harvey suddenly was offered a gigantic loan to make him the fourth largest aluminum producer in the country, yet he had no working capital, was not a big industrialist, and knew little or nothing about aluminum.

These are only a few of the ingredients which are contained in the disgraceful mess. I shall include many others as I unfold the story.

Like many other foreigners, including the Russians, the United States gave the Harvey brothers a golden opportunity. They worked, and schemed, and prospered. Their machine company in Los Angeles grew, and when the war came along they received lucrative contracts.

Lawrence Harvey was observing, and in his frequent visits to Washington he saw how loyal supporters and contributors to the administration were favored. He set out to become a prominent member of the Democratic Party and to become friends with those who could do favors for him. He worked hard at it and gave money, and he soon began to be known as a good Democrat.

The Government had spent \$8,200,000 to construct an aluminum plant near the Harvey Co. After the war, Los Angeles power authorities did not want a large block of the available power of the area to be used in operating the plant. It became war surplus.

Harvey went after it, and he got it for \$1,503,000.

Meanwhile, Harvey's background had begun to interest some State and Federal agencies from another standpoint. The report of the California Committee on Un-American Affairs might be interesting reading to any of my colleagues who wish to look further into this situation.

Harvey became a member of the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, and it was widely known that he was active in supporting candidates financially. He took an active part in committee activities.

With money he made off war contracts he was able to finance a deal to purchase an office building in Los Angeles. It was called the Subway Terminal Building. Although downtown, it had not been a financial success, because it was a little out of the path of development of the new Los Angeles business area.

Soon after Harvey purchased the building, however, it was filled with Federal Government departments and a large new post office.

It was after the war that reports began to come out about some strange occurrences which had taken place in the Harvey Machine Co. during the time it was working on Navy contracts.

One day in 1943, a machinist in the company told Navy inspectors that he had been ordered to make an off-size testing gage for Navy shells. The Navy and the FBI both investigated. Evidence discovered was turned over to the Justice Department. The evidence included an order written by Herbert Harvey for the off-size testing gages. The Justice Department never prosecuted the company or Harvey's.

Lawrence Harvey's political career continued to progress. He employed a member of the California State Legislature to help him with such things as purchasing the aluminum plant and getting favors from both the State and Federal Governments.

Now, with the big aluminum plant in his possession, a legislator-publicity man on his payroll, steadily improving connections in Washington, Harvey was in a position to try

for a really big favor. Meanwhile, he had not neglected his political duties, or his contributions, and he was being mentioned in the newspapers as a leading candidate for Democratic national committeeman from California. With this prestige, he figured he could make real headway.

By this time, Harvey had learned that influence was necessary, and that it had to be bought. He looked around for a good man to advise and assist him in this undertaking. Harvey thought he saw a chance to become a big aluminum operator, but what he knew about making aluminum could be put in a very small aluminum thimble. But he had a plant, and even though it was making no aluminum it qualified him, and he had political connections that were getting better all the time. In his case, the know-how didn't have to do with making aluminum. It had to do with political influence.

Harvey engaged the service of C. Girard Davidson to help him become an aluminum mogul. Davidson was formerly with the legal division of the Bonneville Power Administration and was an Assistant Secretary of Interior. He was an old pal of Chapman and Straus, an ardent New Dealer and Fair Dealer and a social planner par excellence.

When he and Harvey got their heads together, Davidson had left the Interior Department and had moved out to Portland, Oreg., to practice law. It was announced in the press that his first client would be his old favored employer, the Bonneville Power Administration.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the picture begins to take shape here. I shall complete it.

Here I think is a good place to mention Robert R. Rose, of Casper, Wyo. He recently was appointed Assistant Secretary of Interior, supposedly to direct the mining activities of the Department. Rose is a good Democrat. He has political ambitions. Wyoming's lone Congressman, William H. Harrison, is a Republican. Oscar Chapman doesn't like Republicans, he doesn't like Republican Congressmen especially, and he knew that Rose could get a lot of good publicity as an Assistant Secretary, dealing with mining and metals in this time of emergency.

Lawrence Harvey was willing and anxious to back Democratic candidates with good dollars. Harvey was interested in being a big aluminum producer. Aluminum was metal. Rose had to do with metals for the Interior Department. It would be interesting to know how much Rose understood about Harvey's ambition to promote an immense steal from the taxpayers. Did Rose take office knowing he would receive substantial financial backing from Harvey when he ran against Harrison next year in Wyoming? The continuance of this investigation might well disclose very interesting matters along this line.

Meanwhile, Harvey and Davidson were working hard to get a big loan for an aluminum plant in Montana, near the town of Kalspell. And up in Kalspell, Harvey had a strong supporter. This was Don Treloar, a radio-station operator. Treloar is a good friend of Democratic incumbents in Montana, especially one of them who has burning aspirations to be a Senator from Montana. They do not like Republican Congressmen, either, and to beat the Republicans they would need heavy cash contributions. Harvey was a good prospect. Thus, it would be interesting if this investigation were carried into that field. Just what understanding was there between Chapman, Treloar, Harvey, and the ambitious Montana Democrats?

The stage was set.

On August 28, this year, the Associated Press sent the following story out of Washington:

"The Defense Production Administration Tuesday approved a loan of \$46,000,000 to the Harvey Machine Co., to build an aluminum plant at Kalspell, Mont., and an aluminum producing plant near Everett, Wash.

"The agency said that \$32,000,000 of the credit will be used to set up a three-line aluminum-reduction plant at Kalspell with 54,000,000 tons annual capacity.

"Of the remaining money, \$3,000,000 was advanced for the purchase of ore boats and \$11,000,000 for the facilities to produce alumina—the next-to-final stage in the production of aluminum from bauxite ore. The Everett plant will produce 108,000 tons annually.

"The loan was recommended early this month by Secretary of the Interior Chapman. It was approved by DPA after agreement by the Harvey Machine Co. of Kalspell to the Government's terms and conditions. The firm is a subsidiary of the Harvey Co. of California.

"The terms of the loan, which will be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as the agent of DPA, call for maturity in 20 years and interest at 4½ percent.

"The note is payable in equal quarterly installments starting a year after completion of the new facilities.

"The company is obligated to provide an equity of \$8,000,000, as follows: \$2,500,000 to be raised before any of the RFC credit is drawn; another \$3,500,000 to be raised within 18 months, and \$2,000,000 in working capital to be available on completion.

"The DPA also will require a \$1,000,000 personal-performance bond to be signed by the head of the firm, Leon Harvey, Sr.

"Other conditions provide that no dividends are to be paid by the company until the loan is paid off; the Government is to receive through RFC any savings from tax benefits which may be granted, and the Government is to receive half of the net income after taxes from both the subsidiary and parent companies.

"One factor influencing the making of the loan, DPA said, was an understanding that Harvey would reserve a substantial part of its aluminum-ingot output for sale to independent aluminum fabricators who lack their own sources of supply.

"The agency also commented that the project will provide an important competitive influence in the primary aluminum industry."

It is interesting to note that Oscar Chapman, probably the biggest political power in the administration, and President Truman's right-hand political aide, was the first to approve the proposed loan, and in fact, initiated the proposal.

It is also interesting to note that Chapman and Straus have been having a hard time getting the control they want of the power—in this case hydroelectric and not political—in the Northwest. There is need for more power, and the people of the Northwest have formulated sound programs for developing it. But these programs would not make Chapman and Straus dictators and they are fighting them.

Chapman and Straus have been attempting to force unsound projects down the throats of the Northwest people, and having been rebuffed, they have schemed to override the will of the people, and even the will of Congress.

Their scheme is this: They are doing all they can to make the power shortage worse. If it gets bad enough, they have a chance of getting the projects they want and the control they crave under the stress of the defense emergency.

The Harvey loan comes under this scheme, as well as under the political machinations of the administration. The Harvey aluminum plant would create electric power-eating potlines at the very time when the DPA

and the BPA are most seriously concerned about the Northwest power shortage.

Many publications, including *Fortune* magazine, have charged that this power shortage is being deliberately created through allocation of electricity to the aluminum industry simply to provide the lever for the building of more dams. It would also put Chapman and Straus in a position to dictate terms of power development in the Northwest.

The Harvey loan was a two-sided weapon in the hands of the Interior Department—for politics and electric power.

Chapman had a tough time getting the Harvey Co. qualified to receive the loan.

It was late last July that Chapman reported the Harvey Co. had notified him it could not provide the necessary capital to take the loan. The company did not have the money, seven or eight million. Chapman, ably assisted by Davidson, found a way.

Chapman produced a proposal whereby Harvey would put up \$3,500,000 and the balance would be raised by selling stock to independent aluminum fabricators.

John Corlett, a reporter for the *Boise Statesman*, has done an excellent job of exposing details of Chapman's and Harvey's joint endeavors, assisted by Davidson. Much of my information comes from Corlett.

The Harvey's contribution, under the Chapman plan, would be provided in cash, equipment, land, and engineering. Here, that old aluminum plant Harvey got for a few cents on the dollar down in Los Angeles came in handy. It gave him some equipment, land, and engineering, the quality of which is decidedly suspect.

August 23 was the deadline for Harvey to accept the Chapman plan and the terms of the loan. Harvey was not to be found. However, the DPA said it was keeping the door open, and if Harvey was a day late it would not matter.

On August 25, Harvey accepted. Reluctantly, of course. But he was talked into it by Chapman, Davidson et al.

Three days later, on August 28, the DPA approved the loan.

One of the things about the loan that most pleased Harvey was that 85 percent of it would be amortized through taxes.

Davidson had not been heard from much during all the negotiations, but now he popped up in Portland. He told the press that providing he and Harvey didn't get bogged down in paper work, the new plant would be operating within a year.

The plant would draw its power from the Bonneville Power Administration, another Davidson client, and spearhead of the Chapman-Straus drive in the Northwest. Of course, Davidson has long been their spokesman for a Columbia Valley Authority.

Obviously the loan would help that cause, as well as help the Democrat candidates in the Northwest.

It looked until a day or two ago that Chapman had got his way, that Harvey was on the way to the big league, that political money would flow into the Democratic coffers in the Northwest, and the taxpayers would be swindled again.

But, Mr. Speaker, something happened.

An unidentified person made a formal complaint about the loan to the RFC. The RFC, remembering its recent unhappy experiences, held up the loan papers.

Hasty letters regarding the loan suddenly went from Chapman to Stuart Symington, RFC head, and Manly Fleischmann, chief of the DPA. Chapman suddenly had withdrawn his approval of the loan. He used the excuse that he wanted to study it some more.

Just what will happen, Mr. Speaker, has not been determined. But I repeat that for the sake of the taxpayers I hope this scandalous deal will not be consummated.

Equally as strongly, I hope that a thorough investigation will be made of this matter, and that it will be explained how a politician

can walk into the Federal Treasury and take out \$46,000,000 with little or no security.

Mr. Speaker, I want all the facts known about the Harvey Co. and any and all other companies having dealings with the Government of the United States. I want this done at once by the FBI, the RFC, the Department of the Interior, and by the proper congressional committees.

The Future of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an interesting and challenging editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, September 19:

A HYBRID CREATURE

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, has been busy for many months promoting the idea of a coalition between southern Democrats and Republicans, he has now got his idea off the ground to the extent of organizing the Committee To Explore Political Realignment. Meeting at a week-end conference, a hundred like-minded Americans from 17 different States are reported to have canvassed the possibility of building up fresh voting strength to stop the encroachment of socialism and the all-inclusive centralized superstate. That is an admirable objective. We doubt very much, however, that Mr. MUNDT's procedures are the way to achieve it. Alliance with southern Democrats seems to us as impractical as it is unprincipled.

Let us deal with the practical aspects first. The assumption of the would-be Republican joiners is that in the South they could pick up enough electoral votes to swing the balance in their favor. Thus in 1948 Governor Dewey lacked 77 electoral votes to gain a majority, and the States of the solid South provided a potential 127 votes. What is forgotten is that Governor Dewey would not have been the candidate of a Republican-Dixiecrat coalition, whoever would have been the standard-bearer of this strange amalgamation would hardly have carried such industrial States as New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New Jersey, or Connecticut—all of which, with their 25 electoral votes, Governor Dewey brought into the Republican column. If the Republican Party, following Mr. MUNDT's tactics, were to win the South, it would lose much of the North. What is more, it would lose its soul.

For the alliance, obviously, could only be sealed at the price of a complete abandonment of the traditional Republican stand on civil rights. The Dixiecrats with whom Mr. MUNDT seeks an accord are not just southerners who happen to favor a restriction on governmental power, they are, by and large, those who hold an extreme position on the Negro question and who for this reason assail Federal authority. Any agreement between Republicans and Democrats of this ilk would either be so much a matter of expediency as to be meaningless or would involve so complete a betrayal of principle as to be scandalous. As Representative CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, has recently said, "This is indeed a sorry mess of pottage for

which the party of Abraham Lincoln is asked to sell its birthright."

To say all this is not to imply that centralization and bureaucracy cannot be checked. It is not to imply that the Republican Party cannot win or even that it cannot amass very considerable voting strength in the South. A vigorous party, vigorously led, presenting a program that appeals to forward-looking elements in all parts of the country for its soundness and practical wisdom, will do infinitely more to thwart socialism than the hybrid creature that Mr. MUNDT is trying to bring to birth. The people are looking for character, integrity, statesmanship in the party which they call to lead them. A clever maneuver is certainly no substitute for these

GOP Has Three-Way Chance To Defeat

Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most talked about questions before the public today concerns the problem of who are going to be the candidates for President of each of the major parties.

Mr. John S. Knight, publisher and editor of the Chicago Daily News, has analyzed in a complete and illuminating manner the chances of the Republican Party to win in 1952.

His editorial entitled "GOP Has Three-Way Chance To Defeat Truman" dated Saturday, September 1, is as follows:

My old friend Herb Graffis of the Chicago Sun-Times says flatly that "Harry Truman will run for the Presidency again and he'll be reelected."

This observation deserves more than casual attention because Herb is a much better "ear to the ground" political dowsner than some of the pundits who write for his newspaper.

Herby says the President is "getting great campaigning" in all the Truman jokes. He compares them with the stories that used to be told about Henry Ford and his flivver. "You know how those stories ruined Henry," writes Herb. "They came so near to breaking him, Henry had only a few hundred million when he died. The Truman stories will do Harry just the same sort of damage."

I'll go along with Herb's contention that Truman will definitely be a candidate for reelection and even concede that, as things stand today, Harry will be tough to beat.

However, three things can happen that might upset Herb's prediction of a Truman victory:

1. If General Eisenhower gets the Republican nomination, Truman is through.

2. If the Republican party gets off its Duff, replaces some of the stone-age party hacks at the top with younger, abler and more progressive leaders, revamps its strategy and makes a fighting campaign, the GOP could win with Taft.

3. If the American people can be aroused to a high pitch of moral indignation against political fixes, graft, waste, corruption, blundering policies and the perversion of this Republic's ideals by peddling socialism as democracy, the Republicans might win with any reputable, able, forthright candidate.

IKE IS PEOPLE'S CHOICE, BUT IS Mired IN EUROPE

Of these three possibilities, the Eisenhower phenomenon is most interesting.

Even the red-hot American League pennant race and the West Point cheating episode haven't entirely replaced Ike as a topic of conversation.

Most of the professional politicians in both parties admit that Ike is the people's choice for President. But as they point out so realistically, how can Eisenhower make a success of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and be a Presidential candidate at the same time?

With every passing day, the probability of Eisenhower's returning to the United States in time to clinch the Republican nomination appears more unlikely.

NATO is being held together only through Ike's personality, tact, drive, and enthusiasm. On this point, David Lawrence says that "if the crisis in Europe appears to be in 1952 what it is now—aggravated by Russia's hostile behavior—the chances are that General Eisenhower would feel inclined to say not only that he could not accept the nomination but that he would not serve if elected."

The Eisenhower boosters counter this argument by claiming that the general could be even more helpful in developing Allied solidarity from the White House, while calming dissident elements and furnishing the leadership for unity at home.

Of course, no one can predict with any certainty what Eisenhower will do, but the odds at this time lie in the direction of Ike's remaining in Europe until he thinks the job there has been done.

GOP TOP LEADERSHIP IS UNLIKELY TO REFORM

Possibility No. 2—that of revitalizing Republican leadership at the national level—seems even less likely than that General Eisenhower will be persuaded to be the Republican candidate.

If Ike were nominated, GOP Chairman Guy Gabrielson and his staff of antiquated thinkers could go fishing for the duration of the campaign without in any way affecting the outcome.

Ike would win because—well, just because he is Ike, and the people like him.

But if the Republicans nominate Taft, Warren, or Joe Donakes, they will need efficient organization, resourceful strategy, and a slam-bang, knock-'em-down, drag-'em-out campaign to get out the vote.

From where I sit there isn't too much indication that top-rung Republicans on the national committee have the talent to organize effectively, the ability to think clearly, the imagination to "sell" their wares, or the energy to punch their way out of a paper bag.

The other day I was talking with a young Republican Congressman who had won a surprise victory last fall over a labor-endorsed Congressman in a highly industrialized district.

He was elected where others had failed time and time again because he threw all the orthodox rules of campaigning in the ashcan and went out to meet and sell "the folks."

I asked him how much help he had received in Congress from older Members who were in a position to show him the ropes and advise him on pending legislation.

"D— little," was his reply.

It then developed that the only time party leaders seemed interested was when his vote was needed on some hotly contested policy issue.

At all other periods in his budding congressional career, he was given to understand that he was "just another" freshman Congressman.

This little incident, undoubtedly a typical experience for new Members of Congress, seemed to me to be a damning indictment of party leadership.

Whether the Republican mahouts recognize it or not, their biggest hurdle in 1952, with any candidate other than Eisenhower, is the widely held view that the Democratic Party represents the little guy while the Republicans are the party of the rich.

This impression was artfully created by Roosevelt and furthered by Truman, with the aid of some of the shrewdest smear artists in the business.

No demagogic attack or appeal to prejudice is too low for the crystal schemers who rule the Democratic high command.

Democrats HARRY BYRD and PAUL DOUGLAS can attest to that.

It would seem, therefore, that the problem facing the Republicans is not only one of perfecting a better organization, but of re-dedicating themselves to the hallowed principles of truth, courage and integrity, while exposing the shallow hypocrites of the vote panders who are selling us into socialism.

TAFT could make that type of campaign.

MORAL INDIGNATION YIELDS TO FAST BUCK

That brings us to possibility No. 3, namely, that a wave of moral indignation might sweep Mr. Truman out of the White House.

This seems even less probable than either possibilities No. 1 or No. 2.

So long as people have plenty of money to spend—and there is every evidence that the inflationary boom times will continue through 1953—somehow moral indignation always runs second to making a fast buck.

To quote Herb Graffis again, "We've gone so far in considering compromise with plain honesty as inevitable in politics that it is tough for any of us to change our ideas."

That characteristic may help to explain why Truman can insult the marines, buddy around with Harry Vaughan, write unprintable letters to his critics, have Democratic Chairman Bill Boyle involved in the RFC scandals, live with the ghost of Pendergast, and still see his popularity rating slowly moving up the scale.

Administration press agents are cleverly planting articles in various magazines to the effect that (1) Truman is really a great President, and (2) Truman can't lose in 1952.

The latest of these biographer friends is Jonathan Daniels, who says in the September issue of the American magazine that, "despite efforts of his opponents to make Mr. Truman seem still the piano player and the busted haberdasher, Mr. Truman can win the votes of those who elected him in 1948, and others besides."

While Truman doesn't have the election in the bag, as Herb Graffis and Jonathan Daniels seem to think, the Republicans can't win this one with a batch of bum Truman jokes and a campaign of platitudes.

Remember 1948?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

California Leads the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial

from the Orange (Calif.) Daily News of August 22, 1951:

CALIFORNIA LEADS THE NATION

Much to the surprise of no one, but to the great satisfaction of all in California, comes the news that the Golden State once more is the farm leader. With an income last year of over \$2,300,000,000 we topped the previous year's returns by a good 6 percent and outran Iowa, our most persistent rival.

In addition to the actual value of production, California's leadership in other phases of farming are clear cut and worth noting. Wages paid on farms in this State, for example, are substantially above the national average. California farms enjoy a greater degree of mechanization than those elsewhere, and, probably most important of all, more California farms are served by electricity than those in other States. This latter fact will be highlighted during Farm Electrification Week, which opens August 26.

Certainly, the farmers of California and the entire Nation could never have achieved the enormous production of food, feed, and fibers which have sustained much of the world in peace and war without the aid of that silent servant—electricity. With farm output in our State continuing to expand there is every reason to expect that 1951 will again find California at the top of the list in farm production.

Drive for Flood Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial from the Kansas City Star of August 16, 1951. This article proposes a very sensible approach to the urgent problem of flood insurance. I hope to have a chance to vote for legislation which will help in providing disaster insurance. I also favor appropriations to assist the present Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma flood victims in their rehabilitation problems by paying for a portion of their losses.

In my opinion the Congress should immediately enact legislation which will provide for—

First, Immediate indemnity to flood victims for a portion of their losses;

Second, Liberal term loans for restoration of homes, farms, and businesses;

Third, Loans to local and State governments for assistance in rehabilitation;

Fourth, Funds to set up a system of disaster insurance; and

Fifth, An effective long-range plan for flood prevention which will give adequate consideration to the conservation and maximum use of all the resources of the entire Missouri Basin.

DRIVE FOR FLOOD INSURANCE

A workable flood insurance plan should come out of the havoc of this year. The big question, now, concerns underwriting by the Federal Government.

Private companies are looking into the possibility of offering insurance on a strictly private basis. From the recent Kansas City

flood meeting came a recommendation for a Government supported plan. The proposal, developed later, would keep insurance in private hands with the risk underwritten by the Federal Government.

The problem of flood insurance is cost. Obviously the only persons who will buy it are those exposed to flood, which leaves the companies with a high risk proposition. Unless the cost can be held to a reasonable level, there is no point in talking about flood insurance. In advance of more definite information we are guessing that this is a program requiring Federal support. So far, at least, private flood insurance rates have been wide of the mark.

If the Government is to accept responsibility for aid on major flood losses it would be good business to sponsor an insurance plan. For the future, the insurance premiums would pay at least a substantial part of the cost of major floods.

The plan for Government participation has been developed with considerable care. The job was assigned to Sam Roberts, the city director of research and budget, who worked closely with insurance men. Recommendations follow the principle of the war damage insurance of the last war but they would give much more responsibility to the private companies. Properly, flood insurance should be included with fire and all related coverage in the companies' policies. Of course Government underwriting would probably involve rules that would reduce the profits, but profit isn't the first consideration.

A vast section of American industry and population must be protected against devastating flood loss. The soundest protection is adequate flood control, but under the best circumstances that is the work of many years. In the meantime the 1951 flood has been a frightening spectacle to all the exposed people from coast to coast. Most of the larger inland cities are located on rivers.

Looking ahead to the finest flood control systems there will still be a place for flood insurance. There is no practical way to assure absolute protection against any conceivable flood. Fartetched as it may be, there is always the possibility of a flood bigger than anything seen before.

Whether an insurance program is strictly private or supported by Government, the risk will be spread wide over many river valleys. With moderate rates it should produce very large income. The high risk comes only from the occasional disaster of the 1951 type.

When you consider the part that insurance plays in our economy it is amazing that so many years have passed without adequate flood coverage. The negligence is in a class with the long failure to provide flood control.

If private companies can provide the insurance at reasonable rates, that's fine. If not, this is the time for Government to take hold.

Constitutional Amendment To Clarify Treaty-Making Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, encroachments by the executive branch of Government upon the powers reserved to the legislative branch under the Constitution are nothing new in American history.

The process by which the Congress has abdicated many of these powers has been going on for nearly 20 years. Some of the powers thus surrendered are of the utmost significance, affecting the liberties of the American people.

Chief Executives in recent years have assumed in their essence the powers of making war and peace; powers which hitherto had rested in the Congress of the United States.

Only Congress can declare war, under the Constitution. No treaty can bind the American people, under the Constitution, until after it has been ratified by the United States Senate. Indirectly, too, the House of Representatives must approve, by reason of the fact that the House holds the purse strings of Government.

Through the years, the executive branch has found means of circumventing the specific provisions of the Constitution with respect to making war and peace. It has found ways of negotiating and implementing treaties without reference to the Congress.

More than a year ago, the present occupant of the White House declared war in Korea. He did so without consulting the Congress. He accomplished this by calling the Korean war a police action.

His predecessor in the White House found a way of negotiating international treaties in complete disregard of the Congress. He called them Executive agreements.

More than one supine Congress conceded him unilateral powers in treaty making. Collateral authority for implementing those treaties, called Executive agreements, went to him by default. Funds for vast expenditures under many of those international agreements were provided without argument.

Today the unilateral power of the Chief Executive to make war and peace, and to make treaties, is generally accepted. Even in Congress, protests are heard only from a minority. Constitutional checks and balances with respect to the conduct of foreign affairs have broken down.

Who at this late hour is so bold as to deny that most of our external troubles are the fruit of this earlier congressional weakness? Let me remind you of Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Only a few days ago we witnessed the spectacle of the Big Three Foreign Ministers—Dean Acheson, Herbert Morrison, of England, and Robert Schuman, of France—sitting down to negotiate the terms of a treaty with Western Germany.

That treaty will not be passed upon by the Senate of the United States. Why not? Because it is not called a treaty; it is called a contract. The reason given is that Germany is not yet unified, and is not a sovereign nation. Treaties, it is said, can be negotiated only with sovereign nations.

Japan was not a sovereign nation until the peace treaty was signed at San Francisco. Japan was an occupied country, just as Western Germany is today.

Then why is the contract planned for Western Germany not a treaty in fact? Why is it not a treaty in exactly the

same sense that the Japanese peace treaty is a treaty?

The only difference I can see is that the treaty with Japan may be ratified by the Senate, while the contract with Western Germany never will reach the Senate.

All of these things point up one single fact. The check upon treaty-making powers has departed from the hands of the direct representatives of the people.

President Roosevelt started this trend toward making treaties on his own responsibility. President Truman has continued it. Treaties are now being made by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State is an appointive officer. He is not directly responsible to the people of the United States.

The present situation is a measure of the success of those who seek to dominate the executive branch of government, in virtually every one of its departments. Whatever its background, the treaty-making power rests today in irresponsible hands. The record of the State Department proves it.

Our present freedom by no means constitutes a guaranty of our future liberties.

This power to make treaties in the form of Executive agreements is becoming an accepted fact. The time is here for the elected representatives of the people to exercise the eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty. It must be exercised in connection with a single provision of the United States Constitution. That provision was reasonable enough in the days before the breakdown of constitutional checks and balances on the treaty-making power. It says:

All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

The language of this provision has been the subject of controversy among authorities on international law since the ratification of the Constitution by the Thirteen Original States.

By the plain intent of the founding fathers, the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. The Constitution is the guaranty of American liberties. If a treaty also becomes the supreme law, by some interpretation, it must hold equal status with the United States Constitution.

We have an instance directly in point. It is the Fujii case—*California State Statutes v. United Nations Charter* (1950, 217 Pacific 2d 481).

It is not my purpose to raise a question on the merits of this case. A United States district court of appeals held that provisions of the California alien land law, which restrict ownership of land by aliens ineligible for citizenship, are unenforceable under the Charter of the United Nations.

The United Nations Charter, in form and effect, is a treaty. Here was an instance in which a high Federal court held that a treaty overrides a right guaranteed by the Constitution to the people of California, as well as to those of all other States.

One agency of the United Nations already has drafted an agreement imple-

menting the Charter treaty, which in the opinion of many people would destroy the freedom of the American press. Other agreements, already made or in the making, could abridge the liberties guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States.

In view of the situation with respect to the treaty-making power, as I have outlined it, I have introduced a House joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, to cure what has come to be a defect in that instrument of all our liberties.

The amendment is shorter and less complicated than some I have seen, and more comprehensive than some others. I believe it to be in a form easily understandable by all of the people, and yet strong and comprehensive enough to provide adequate guaranty against any abridgement of their liberties, either now or at some future time.

I have submitted the amendment in the knowledge that the present Congress will not knowingly countenance any abridgement of American liberties through abuse of the treaty-making power. I have submitted it, too, in the belief that no man can foresee what some future Congress and some future administration might do.

Wall Streeters and London Counting Houses Real Architects of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is pretty generally recognized on Capitol Hill that the real architects of our foreign policy are the international bankers of Wall Street and the London counting houses, including the international law firms that serve them.

It is ironical that this should occur in an administration that started out 18 years ago with the slogan of driving the money changers out of the temple. It was Wall Street and the evils practiced there that made that slogan possible; but all that has come from it is a continued harassment of business throughout the Nation which was guilty of few of the evil practices attributed to Wall Street, and itself often suffered from those practices. The farmers, miners, and industrialists have been made the goats of the New Deal-Fair Deal propaganda, while the money changers have taken over the temple.

TAKING FREE ENTERPRISE TO PROMOTE SOCIALISM

Free enterprise in the United States is being taxed to the point of confiscation to support Socialist regimes in Europe which are committed to the destruction of free enterprise everywhere; and a goodly portion of our tax money funneled to Europe under the Marshall plan

and the Atlantic Pact goes to pay interest on foreign bonds owned by the international bankers. By manipulating our currency, they are subsidizing imports from slave labor countries 60 percent, discounting the value of our exports 37½ percent, buying our choicest stocks and bonds at 37½ percent discount and selling them at 60 percent premium.

THE BOGEYMAN WILL GET YOU

Communist Russia has been deliberately built up as the bogeyman to frighten us into permitting these international racketeers to drain away our wealth, destroy our domestic economy, and shackle us with a Fascistic power state.

The tools with which our despoilers work and the vehicles on which they are riding to power are supplied by the United Nations and a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable currency. If we hope to save our country, we must get out of the United Nations and replace the Laski-Keyness-Marxist so-called managed currency with a sound, honest, dependable monetary system which will maintain and protect the solvency and integrity of the people's money and guarantee the redemption of our currency at face value, on demand.

The appended Washington News letter of September 19, 1951, shows how some of the international bankers are feathering their nests at the expense of the American taxpayers.

THIRTY-EIGHT AND FOUR-TENTHS PERCENT OF \$12,794,420,000 IN AMERICAN ECA AID WAS FUNNELED THROUGH LETTERS OF COMMITMENT TO 64 UNITED STATES BANKS AND BANKING HOUSES

Of a cumulative total in American dollar commitments for ECA aid to Europe, the Far East area, and Yugoslavia to August 31, 1951, reported at \$12,794,420,000, letters of commitment were issued to 64 American banks and financial institutions to August 30, 1951, in the cumulative total since the commencement of the ECA programs for \$4,915,186,387.

This amount represents 38 4/10 percent of all ECA commitments for American dollar aid to Europe, the Far Eastern areas and Yugoslavia.

TEN BANKS FEATHERING THEIR NESTS

There are approximately 14,500 banks and financial institutions in the United States, and the percentage of banks feathering their nests through ECA letters of commitment (which means guarantees of advances for the purchases of commodities by foreign governments) is less than one-half of one percent.

The 10 largest banks and the cumulative total of letters of commitments issued to each were:

Chase National Bank, New York, N. Y.	\$769,830,541
National City Bank of New York, N. Y.	619,109,308
Bankers Trust Co., New York	424,673,949
Guaranty Trust Co., New York	361,150,763
Bank of America, N. T. & S. A., San Francisco	352,833,264
Irving Trust Co., New York	351,522,106
J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., New York	341,949,529
Manufacturers Trust Co., New York	301,455,805
Bank of the Manhattan Co., New York	208,565,898
French American Banking Corp., New York	206,422,885

Total to 10 banks..... 3,937,513,053

The 10 big banks here listed handled approximately 30.8 percent of the gift dollars poured into Uncle Sam's international gift shop through the Economic Cooperation Administration.

There are signs that the big banks themselves are awakening to the dangerous inflationary forces generated by giving away American dollars. The Guaranty Survey, published monthly by the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, in the September issue said in part commenting on Secretary Acheson's revelations of plans to spend \$25,000,000,000 for foreign assistance in the next three years:

"Coming at a time when the Marshall plan, the greatest project for giving away money ever devised in time of peace, is nearing its close, the new program raises the question of whether this outpouring of billions of the American taxpayer's money is ever to end."

As an extremely small taxpayer, we wonder too.

1951 Courthouse Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, people of the Seventeenth District are greatly disturbed over current trends in national and international affairs according to the reports received from over 600 constituents with whom I talked at my annual courthouse conferences during the past 2 weeks.

Many persons criticized the State Department for interfering in our military strategy and told me they wonder if a real all-out effort is being made by our leaders to settle the Korean dispute.

Those who met with me at the six courthouses of the present Seventeenth District and with Congressman FRANK T. Bow and myself at Millersburg asked why this Nation continues to spend money for weapons of war and yet our fighting men in Korea are not permitted to use those arms to defend themselves.

The rising cost of living and soaring taxes are also foremost in the minds of the citizens from the district. Most people said they are willing to bear the burden of higher taxes, but want to make certain their money is well spent. They insist that each expenditure by the Federal Government, both civilian and military, be carefully examined to make sure it is necessary.

OPPOSE FEDERAL CONTROLS

Increasing Government controls over our economy were opposed by the majority of those I interviewed. They object to direct controls over both individuals and industries being brought about by directives issued by executive bureaus in Washington.

Most people who discussed the subject of controls commented that the enforcement of control directives means an increasing number of special inspectors and enforcement agents on the Government payroll. Alarm was expressed at the vast number of personnel already employed by the Federal Government.

The complexity of the control program baffles many Seventeenth District businessmen and consumers alike who contend that the bulk of the regulations controlling prices and wages are not only difficult to understand but almost impossible to obey.

An interpretation of these directives was requested by some farmers and industrialists who in some instances find it almost impossible for them to continue their business.

Interest was shown in the new social-security law, new veterans' legislation and the proposed tax-increase measure. The subject of draft deferments was often brought up, and it was the consensus of opinion that a uniform rule for induction coupled with a policy of individual attention being given each case should be established for the counties of the Seventeenth District if not for the entire State.

Many personal problems were also presented to me. From the opinions expressed by the people I received much valuable information that will aid me in carrying out my congressional duties.

These opinions are valuable since they were presented without pressure and represent the thinking of loyal citizens

Government Expenditures Soar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Government expenditures this year, including the cost of the foreign-aid bill, have soared to a total of \$90,000,000,000. This figure is only for the first 8 months of 1951 with several appropriations bills still being considered by Congress.

The President told the Nation in January that we could get by on a \$72,000,000,000 budget which is now exceeded by \$13,000,000,000. This proves to many of us that the budget submitted to Congress by the executive department does not tell the entire story behind Government expenditures each year.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Federal Government has as hard a time sticking to its budget as does the average housewife in this period of rising prices.

About \$69,000,000,000 of this total amount will be used for defense and foreign aid; \$15,000,000,000 is allotted for frozen expenditures including pensions and similar items which vary little from year to year; \$6,000,000,000 will be applied to the interest on the national debt.

KOREAN REHABILITATION

Even if the fighting stops in Korea that country will continue to be expensive to us. It has been estimated that we have already spent \$10,000,000,000 to resist Communist aggression and to this will be added future occupation costs and money needed to put Korea back on her feet.

It will cost from two to three billion dollars to repair the war damage in Korea. First, however, food, clothing and medical supplies will be sent for immediate needs, then will come housing and road building.

CONSUMER COMMITTEE CONSIDERED

Legislation has been introduced in Congress to establish a Committee on Consumer Interest, which would study and investigate all problems affecting consumers in this period of emergency.

This is a recognition by Congress of the difficulties confronting consumers, especially those on fixed incomes, who are faced with rising prices on every item they purchase.

In carrying out its duties, it is proposed that the committee shall give special attention to prices charged for food, fuel, and clothing and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other goods.

People Oppose Rearmament in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the way to peace is not through armed might. Reports reaching this country from the common people of Europe show very clearly that they live in fear of the rearming of Western Europe under General Eisenhower. Such fear is understandable after two devastating wars and still no peace.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including interesting excerpts of a letter from a lady in Germany, which appeared in the Sharon (Wis.) Reporter on August 30, and prepared by its able editor, Mr. Roy Ruchlman. It is from sources such as this the Members of Congress can really ascertain the facts about our foreign-aid programs.

Elsewhere in this issue of the Reporter is an article in which Representative LAWRENCE SMITH is quoted: "Communists promise bread and peace," he said, in effect "We give them guns for more war."

The effect this very thing has had on peace-loving peoples of Europe—Germany in particular—is brought home to Sharon in a letter received some weeks ago by Miss Louis Rota. The local Methodist ladies had helped a German family, by sending them clothing. Some correspondence has resulted from this Christian act.

Addie Saenger's outlook on life is pathetic, even now, when her family is better off than some. Her apparent misunderstanding of America's good intentions and desires for peace and world betterment are a bit startling.

"The past year passed quietly for us, we had no special sickness, enough to eat and to wear," she wrote. "Plenty of work, but when a person is well he enjoys that. We thank God for that, but we do not forget our obligation to those still in need."

After describing privation she observed in a visit to the English zone, Addie wrote: "The cursed Prussian militarism should be completely destroyed. Even children's playing with toy soldiers is considered a crime."

The children are bright and "learn well, but they are so thin and undernourished. Their clothing, in spite of all the patching, hardly holds together any more." There is hardly enough for potatoes, after the rent is paid, and it's soup from them, morning, noon, and night. Berries and mushrooms, and wood from the forests help. But the sick and aged must beg.

"What should we that now, after only 5 years there should again be rumors of war, and we be required to furnish soldiers? Is that not a crime? The Americans and their allies have changed their opinions since Nuremberg."

"Why should we fight? A soldier fights for his fatherland and his freedom. We have neither any more—and who will give it to us? Our land is torn, and bled to death. Each demolishes it and plunders, according to his own desires. Our homes are destroyed, families separated."

Here in America, we pour billions into Europe for its recovery. Yet Mrs. Saenger speaks for many of her people, perhaps, when she writes:

"The conquering troops need much money. The few divisions we have here are paid four to five million marks a year—and that is half of Germany's tax money. Where should more come from, if the western powers should send more troops? Then we should be poorer yet than the Soviet Union. Should we fight for that?"

"Victorious troops need much room. Today most of them live in our villages, with two and three rooms allotted a family. Our own people must live in barracks, 8 and 12 to the room. Our tax money goes to provide them maids, chauffeurs, bureaucrats, and luxurious home furnishings."

"Shall we help to destroy our country more? For we are living in the midst of the next battlefield. Should we consent to be put into uniform like the Russians beyond the Elbe? Shall we be forced to shoot our brothers? Shall we expose ourselves to the vengeance of the Russians when the Americans retreat?"

"Do they think the Soviets will stay at the Elbe and stand at the Rhine? They will not stand at the Channel, either, and England should beware. If war should come again, the diplomats who brought on the chaos would also have to stand in the front lines."

Addie Saenger continued: "The common man everywhere does not want war. The kind folks who helped us through our hunger years by sending packages showed it. . . . Our governments are puppets—lesser people, appointed to fill positions, influenced to act for their own advantage and for those greater diplomats. Are they the embodiment of a very active devil?"

Her spark of hope was exemplified thus: "Then there must be a spiritual power to work against him. A renewing of the world must come from within. Each individual must begin in his own heart to wrestle against the evils within. Everlasting peace cannot be produced with bombs and cannons. The unfortunate chain of wars will continue until people become rational."

Rights of Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, Washington newspapers last evening reported a piece of news which I

read with mixed emotions—amusement, bewilderment, and a tinge of anger.

This news item concerned addresses given before sessions of the National Association of Postmasters.

I was amused because it seemed to me, reading the item, that someone had gotten their speakers mixed, resulting in somewhat conflicting statements tossed at the postmasters. Then I was bewildered by the interpretation some of the speakers placed on United States statutes. My slight tinge of anger came later, after I had had time to think about the news item.

According to one news report, Chairman Robert Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, "outlined to the postmasters just what they could and could not do under the so-called Hatch Act, which bars political activity by Federal Government employees."

This quite sensible bit of information was followed by:

Joseph Lawler, Deputy Postmaster General, reminded the delegates they did not surrender all of their rights when they took their oaths as postmasters.

"There is no law," said Mr. Lawler, "which would prevent you from making a contribution to a political party. There is no law that you cannot exercise your right to vote. There is no law to prevent you from supporting the man who appointed you and wherein your loyalty lies."

Many times, in the course of his address, Mr. Lawler stressed the importance of considering the man who appointed them to their respective offices.

Therein lies my amusement and my bewilderment, Mr. Speaker.

How did it happen that Mr. Ramspeck and Mr. Lawler were scheduled as speakers at the same session of the postmasters' convention, if they were to vary so widely on what they told their audience? Here was Mr. Ramspeck telling the postmasters of the limitations imposed by the Hatch Act; and here was Mr. Lawler, in effect, telling the same postmasters to do right by our little Neil, there is no law against it.

"Wherein your loyalty lies," said Mr. Lawler. Some of those postmasters—many of whom have served long and faithfully—consider that their loyalty is due the American people, whom they were appointed to serve in their important posts.

My tinge of anger was aroused when I read for a second time the last paragraph of that news story:

Jack Redding, Assistant Postmaster General, told the postmasters that the Republicans are using vilification, libel, slander, and downright lies in an effort to promote themselves into political power. He told the delegates that the Republicans were talking about them and asked them what they were going to do about it.

What vilification, Mr. Redding? What libel, what slander and what downright lies, Mr. Redding? And just who told you that the Republicans were talking about the postmasters in any connection? Please be more specific.

There are two ways of viewing this whole business, as detailed in the news item I have been quoting—from the viewpoint of Mr. John Q. Citizen, who uses the facilities of the Post Office Department every day; and from the viewpoint of the postmasters themselves.

John Q. Citizen might say to himself: "Now look at this. The postmaster is the fellow who is responsible for the operation of the post office right here in my home town. He is the man who sees to it that the mail is delivered and sent out on time, and who is the top dog, generally, of the Post Office Department here in my town. Is he interested in me, as a customer, and in proper conduct of his business here; or is he interested in supporting the political ambitions of someone over in the next county?"

The postmaster himself, perhaps on the job for many years and doing a good job, too, might take this view: "Maybe I have been wrong all these years. Maybe I was off the beam when I did my best to hold down expenses here in my own post office, trying to do my small bit toward holding down that postal deficit. Maybe I should have been out campaigning for the guy who appointed me, and service be hanged. I owe my loyalty to the political party machine, not to the millions of Americans who use the postal system. I heard it myself, from a Deputy Postmaster General."

It is a sad day in America, Mr. Speaker, when our Post Office Department can ask the American taxpayers to ante up to offset an annual operating deficit—expected to exceed \$500,000,000 this fiscal year—then ask the American people—most of them those same taxpayers—to pay higher postal rates, and at the same time inform the local postmasters that they owe allegiance to a political machine rather than the American people.

Federal Aid to Indiana Welfare Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a column written by Clifford B. Ward for the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, August 22, 1951. The point of view set forth therein is certainly the attitude of the majority of Hoosier people.

Oscar Ewing's decision as an administrator to withhold Federal aid to Indiana's Welfare Department, without bothering even to get a legal opinion on his act from the United States Attorney General, is an example of bureaucracy running riot, as one of the Supreme Court Justices said a few years ago in connection with another matter. Mr. Ewing confuses himself with the Government and needs to be straightened out by a Federal court decision.

The money which Mr. Ewing is withholding from Indiana is not Mr. Ewing's money, nor the money of people from other parts of the country. It is money which came out of the pockets of Indiana persons who pay tax to the Federal Government.

Mr. Ewing, like a lot of the Washington bureaucrats, has forgotten one elementary fact about our Constitution, namely, that the Federal Government exists only as a result of the delegation of powers to it by the various State governments. Those powers not

delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the various States. It is the States which determine what the Federal Government may do. It is not a case of the Federal Government telling States what to do, unless the right to do so has been expressly given to the Federal Government by the States.

WHY SPEND IN THE DARK?

The people of the State of Indiana have decided through their State legislature that they want welfare funds to be subject to public inspection. They do not want all the details of individual relief cases made available to everyone, but at the same time, they do not want a huge spending agency operating entirely in the dark. Actually, the secrecy of relief in individual cases is a myth in most cases. The butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker in the relief client's neighborhood all know he is on relief and to what extent. Usually investigators thoroughly canvass a man's neighbors and friends to determine his eligibility for relief. The persons a relief client would have reason not to want to know his relief needs know them very well.

But the wisdom of Indiana's law is not for Mr. Ewing to pass upon, nor for the Federal Government to pass upon. The people of Indiana are the boss and they have spoken through their legislature. They want welfare funds made a matter of public, not private business.

CAN MR. EWING VETO?

Some welfare officials are afraid that the average citizen, earning his own way, will raise a big commotion if he finds that a person whom he doesn't know is getting relief when he seems to be undeserving of it. Well, of course, the average citizen, earning his own way, has a perfect right to raise a commotion if someone who is undeserving is getting aid. It is his money that is being spent. He worked for it and he was forced to turn it over to the Federal Government. Why shouldn't he know for what purpose his money is being spent?

The question before the people of Indiana is a legal question. Can Mr. Ewing, an individual in Washington, personally veto a law passed for Indiana's own good by the people of this State? Have we come to a pass where State governments are governed by the fiat, the ukases, memorandums, etc., of Washington bureaucrats? It is a question which the Federal courts must decide and decide quickly before the time arrives when Indiana cannot carry the whole relief load.

A Free Press Must Be Kept Free if This Republic Is To Be Perpetuated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the framers of our Constitution knew what a suppressed press was because they were denied that right in the Colonies, and when these Colonies had won the Revolution and came to set up a government, here is what they said about a free press: The first section of the Bill of Rights is found in the first amendment to the Constitution, which reads:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the rights of the people peaceably to assemble, and to

petition the Government for redress of grievances.

For 160 years we maintained this great right of liberty. The press has brought the news to the people in every corner of the country, and in thousands of cases the newspapers and magazines have been the only means of education of our citizens. I know in my own case, living in the great West, the only printed document we had was a monthly paper, called the Farm, Home, and Fireside. It cost 25 cents annually and our whole neighborhood used the same copy.

In recent times the newspapers and magazines have performed a giant task of informing the people about their affairs. In fact a few newspapers are indispensable in order to know the many great events that are happening daily.

I do not think the American people want to muzzle this press. I think they want to keep it free and not have its freedom dispensed by a government foreign to our own. The fact is that there is a great attempt being made at this very moment to muzzle this press and make it subservient to the views of the United Nations. In the Covenant of Human Rights shortly to come before the Senate of the United States, the United Nations has given a new definition of a "free press." In the question of a free press this document reads:

Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression, subject to such limitations as are pursuant to law or are reasonable and necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others.

Under this United Nations, a perfect enemy of this republic in disguise, it is to be the sole judge of whether a newspaper has violated the law. The law was concocted by the United Nations, and if the Senate adopts this covenant as they did the Charter of this dangerous Organization, the question of whether an editor or newswriter has violated that law is not to be decided in our courts, but in a foreign court, the Court of the United Nations.

You will at once see by referring to the definition above cited that a free press is so hedged in with qualifications and exceptions and directives, that a free press will no longer exist. Do the American people want that? Well, they will get it if they complacently drift along under the guise of peace. Everyone wants peace, but what will peace amount to if to get it we must give up our liberties? Millions of good citizens of this country have been kept from thinking this United Nations action through. All they hear is that this great organization will bring peace if it is supported. That is, we will not have to go to war abroad, but will wake up and find we have to have a war here at home. American citizens who have devoted their lives to the perpetuation of our own institutions which they have built through the wars with tears, sweat, and blood are not apt to give them up when they realize they have been lulled to sleep by a false promise of peace.

Right at this moment the newspapers of the United States have a job to do, and I believe they will do it. They must

advise the people of the danger to the Republic of this organization which is seeking assiduously to place us in a world organization and surrender to that organization the sovereignty of our own Government. There are millions of good citizens of this country willing at this time to give up our sovereign power if they can have world peace. There are, however, a great many more American citizens who will fight to the last ditch before this Republic is wrecked by peace-makers and muddled-thinking directors of this world-government movement.

This United Nations has had a great head start in the crusade to build a world government. They have had the Treasury of the United States behind them to hand over \$50,000,000 annually to propagandize the churches, school children, and the people of the United States. The people are just now emerging into a renaissance from this indifference, and from now on the going of this anti-American organization is going to have rougher going. The greatest power the people have in this fight is the newspapers. My plea to the people is, Keep a free press and put up a fight for it when we can plainly see any attempt being made to muzzle it.

That same mania for peace at any price came close to stopping the Revolution here in America. Great numbers were willing to submit to the tyranny of England if they could only have peace. Fortunately for us today, who at this moment have liberty, there were a few men in 1776 who didn't want that kind of peace. Patrick Henry, of Virginia, wrecked these Tories in his great speech on liberty, and that speech now rings in the ears of this generation. It ought to be committed to memory by every citizen of this Republic. If only our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution could be circulated among the churches and our school children equal to the present circulation of the Universal Human Rights document, there would be no danger to fear from any quarter the destruction of our form of government.

Dilatory Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HEBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, on this date 158 years ago, in the year 1793, George Washington laid the cornerstone of the building in which we meet, the Capitol of the United States.

The laying of that cornerstone symbolized the generous attitude of two States, Maryland and Virginia, in graciously giving up what belonged to them to the several other States of the Union into which they had been welded.

The land which formed the District of Columbia belonged to the States of Maryland and Virginia. Without force or compulsion or act of Congress and de-

cision of the Supreme Court under the theory that the power and might of the Federal Government was paramount to mere ownership, these two States delivered to the United States their own ground in order that a National Capital might be established.

It seems a rather ironic tragedy that on the exact anniversary, the exact date of that cornerstone laying, that on the very same site, at this very moment the subject of taking away from States that which belongs to them and giving the land to other States, should be discussed.

But it is a fact

Today the other body in committee is discussing the so-called tidelands issue. Before the committee is the thrice-passed House bill which gives to the States that which is already theirs. Also before the committee is another bill giving the right to the States to control their own land until the matter is settled legislatively.

It is strange that among them are others who advocate taking away from the States the land which is theirs and giving that land to the 45 other States.

It is rather in contrast to the situation 158 years ago when two States voluntarily gave their land to the several other States in the Union and today when representatives of the Federal Government are attempting to take away by force, if you please, the land of three States and then deliver that land to the several other States which have come into the Union.

Today it is Louisiana, California, and Texas. Tomorrow which State—only God knows.

The New Orleans States, which had conducted a consistent fight for constitutional government and whose editor, William H. Fitzpatrick, had been awarded the Pulitzer prize for his splendid editorials on control of government by treaty, has again enlarged on this question of tidelands, which I submit for your reading.

It tells the story poignantly.

DILATORY TACTICS

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman is rubbing salt into the wounds of Louisiana, Texas, and California.

These States are clamoring to put their offshore oil fields to work to supply vital defense needs, but are prevented from doing so by the Federal administration and its friends in Congress.

That in itself has understandably chafed the States, but now Perlman is adding insult to injury by blaming them for sabotaging results that rightfully should be credited to Washington.

Here is a skeleton history of the offshore oil situation.

1. The States' historic claim to oil lying under their coastal waters was uncontested until the 1930's.

2. Then a controversy developed because Federal officials who previously had operated on the assumption that the oil belonged to the States had a change of heart and contended that it was the property of the Federal Government.

3. To settle the controversy, Congress enacted legislation in behalf of the States' claim in 1946, but it was vetoed by President Truman on the grounds that the matter was then before the Supreme Court to adjudicate.

4. The Court later held that oil under the offshore waters is the property of the Federal Government, but that the matter of who owns the underwater land from which the oil is taken is a matter for Congress to legislate. The Court's ruling prohibits oil explorations in the offshore area except with the approval of the Federal Government.

5. The Federal Government, in the form of the Interior Department, in all but one case has refused drilling permits in the offshore area pending the enactment of federally proposed enabling legislation which would delineate the Department's authority over offshore minerals decreed by the Court to be Federal property. There is no hope at this time that Congress can agree on such legislation. Neither House has passed on such a bill.

6. However, the House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill that would clarify the ownership status of the oil and also of the underwater coastal lands. It is called the quit-claim bill. The States would get clear ownership of both land and accompanying minerals for as far out to sea as 3 miles from the coastal low-water mark. This bill has rested for more than a month in the Senate's Interior Committee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming.

7. O'MAHONEY has sat on the House-passed bill, which is similar to the one that the Senate passed in 1946 and which was vetoed by President Truman, on the excuse that other more pressing defense matters have occupied his time.

Against this background Solicitor Perlman writes a letter to Senator O'MAHONEY saying that the States of Louisiana, Texas, and California are blocking development of the offshore oil resources through dilatory tactics.

Plentiful oil would start flowing in short order from the offshore fields if this action is taken.

If Secretary of the Interior Chapman would authorize drilling permits in the offshore area, as he did several months ago for one applicant who contended drilling was necessary to prevent wastage.

The Late Middleton Beaman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I desire to pay tribute to the memory of the late Middleton Beaman, legislative counsel of the House of Representatives for 30 years. Mr. Beaman's career is briefly summarized in the following article from the September 1949 issue of the American Bar Association Journal which manifests the high regard in which the legal profession of the country held Mr. Beaman.

MIDDLETON BEAMAN DOCTOR OF LAWS
(By Harry W. Jones, editor-in-charge)

The recent retirement of Middleton Beaman, after more than 30 years of continuous service as legislative counsel to the House of Representatives, provides the occasion for a brief account of the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Congress and for a few sentences in appreciation of Mr. Beaman's unique contribution to the legislative development of the law of the United

States. In this instance the man and the office seem inseparable, since the Office of the Legislative Counsel was, in a very real sense, built around Mr. Beaman and created as the direct result of work which he had been doing on an informal basis for overburdened House committees. Lawyers familiar with the work of the office, and with the traditions of devoted and resourceful public service which have come to characterize its activities, were happy to hear that the new legislative counsel to the House is Allan H. Perley, an assistant legislative counsel since 1925 and one of Mr. Beaman's closest associates in the House drafting service.

The events leading up to the establishment of the Office of the Legislative Counsel were traced in detail in an interesting 1929 law review article by Frederic P. Lee, one-time legislative counsel to the Senate (The Office of the Legislative Counsel, 28 Columbia Law Review, p. 380). The facts, in summary, are these. In 1916 the directors of the Legislative Drafting Research Fund of Columbia University undertook to give Congress a practical demonstration of the value of skilled legislative drafting in the sound development of the statute law. Middleton Beaman, then a member of the fund staff and former law librarian of the Library of Congress, was asked to take on the demonstration assignment. For 2 years Mr. Beaman furnished technical drafting assistance on this lend-lease basis, particularly for the House Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Ways and Means.

The demonstration was a complete success. A regular congressional drafting service was established by express provision in the Revenue Act of 1918, and Mr. Beaman was invited to remain as the first legislative draftsman for the House. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 2, 1949, containing tributes to Mr. Beaman from the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, and other members of both parties, is eloquent evidence of the respect and regard which Mr. Beaman earned during his long period of distinguished legislative service.

Understandably enough, Mr. Beaman has never had the time to sit down and write anything in the nature of a systematic treatise on the science and art of legislative drafting. If his new and unaccustomed leisure gives him the opportunity to prepare such a volume, it will undoubtedly rank with such classics in the field as those of Lord Thring and Sir Courtenay Ilbert. In the meantime, the lawyer interested in the legislative development of the law will find it profitable to examine Mr. Beaman's testimony 4 years ago at the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. (Hearings, pp. 413-430, April 27, 1945.)

Certain of the high lights in Mr. Beaman's informal statement to the joint committee should be required reading in these days in which many State legislatures are considering ways to extend and improve their technical bill drafting services. Legislative drafting work must be kept on an entirely nonpolitical basis. Mr. Beaman's description of his own experience in this respect will undoubtedly astound certain of the more cynical critics of congressional processes:

"Since I was appointed some 26 years ago I have never had anybody ask me my politics. I do not know the politics of any man in my office. There has been no pressure of the slightest degree to secure a job for anybody."

The effective legislative draftsman must not take it upon himself to decide the issues of policy which are before the legislative body for decision. Mr. Beaman's disclaimer of a general "policy" mission is clear and unequivocal:

"Our office has nothing to do with policy whatsoever. We try to find out what the committee wants to do and help them do it."

Here is a useful reminder that the lawyer who has a legislative committee or body as his client must be willing to accept the basic judgments of value and expediency which are compelling to the elected representatives and must act on the principle that the clear and consistent expression of legislative intention is always in the public interest, even if the objectives which the proposed statute seeks to attain do not coincide with the personal preferences of the working draftsman.

Perhaps the most instructive part of Mr. Beaman's testimony before the joint committee is his discussion of the familiar misconception that the job of the legislative draftsman is essentially a recording assignment, an exercise in English composition:

"By far the greater part of our work is not the writing down of the words on the paper; it is the analysis, the finding out in the light of the existing legal and factual situation, of what it is that is intended by the person for whom we are working. That is the reason why we feel we can function most effectively in what we call our complete job, when we have been at all the committee meetings, so we really know what it is they have decided, and so we can bring to the attention of the committee the subsidiary questions of policy which our study and analysis have brought to light, and which should be decided by the committee."

And again:

"The number of contingencies that a lawyer has to guard against in the case of a will or contract, while sometimes they are very numerous, are mere flyspecks compared with the contingencies that must be considered in the case of a statute."

The most appropriate academic ceremony of 1949 was certainly the action of Columbia University at its last commencement in conferring the degree of doctors of laws on Mr. Beaman. Universities are in the habit of granting the doctor of laws degree in recognition of achievement in many fields, few of which have anything at all to do with law or the laws. But Middleton Beaman, in a literal and unique sense, is richly entitled to the designation, doctor of laws.

Old-Age Fund Thirteen Billion in I O U's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative BLATNIK, and I have placed on the Speaker's desk Discharge Petition No. 4 to bring to the floor H. R. 2678, old-age social-security legislation so long neglected. Thousands of our elderly citizens of the United States are in dire need, yet we are spreading our tax dollars around the world, over one hundred and twelve billions since World War II ended.

The existing social-security system has proved itself wholly inadequate to meet this problem. There are now over thirteen billions in I O U's in the social-security trust fund of hard-earned dollars collected from employers and employees

for old-age security. These dollars are paid by the general public in its costs of goods the public buys. The billions collected for this purpose are spent as received by the Federal Government to meet current expenses and these I O U's put into the Treasury. If a private insurance company did this it would be prosecuted. Eventually when these trust funds are needed additional taxes will have to be levied on the public to meet the payments coming to our retired workers.

I most sincerely urge that every Member of the House interested in providing adequate security for our elderly citizens sign Petition No. 4 to bring H. R. 2678 on the floor for consideration before the House adjourns. There are already 146 signatures on the petition with only 72 needed to bring the legislation up. It will come up under an open rule permitting any germane amendment to be made.

An interesting article on the status of the present old-age security system by Earl Richert, a Scripps-Howard staff writer recently appeared in the press, a copy of which I include as part of these remarks:

OLD-AGE FUND THIRTEEN BILLION IN I O U'S—
RECEIPT USED BY FEDERAL TREASURY FOR
GENERAL EXPENSES

(By Earl Richert)

WASHINGTON, August 23—The social-security system so far has been better than a whole flock of gushing oil fields for Uncle Sam.

Since the program started on January 1, 1937, it has poured a net of \$13,000,000,000 into the Federal Treasury—that much more taken in than paid out in benefits and for administering the program.

Practically all of this money, of course, has been spent for general expenses of Government. And the social-security fund on July 31 consisted entirely of interest-bearing Government I O U's, except for \$189,000,000 in cash for immediate needs.

Counting interest which the Government has theoretically paid on the money borrowed, the social-security fund today stands at \$14,742,000,000.

Four years ago the fund's total assets were \$8,700,000,000. Thus, it has been growing lately at the rate of about \$1,500,000,000 a year.

Last fiscal year, despite a 70-percent increase in the benefit payments to individuals, the fund jumped \$1,800,000,000. This happened in part because the social-security tax rate also was increased. It's now 1½ percent each from employee and employer on the first \$3,800 of annual income, having started at 1 percent each on the first \$3,000.

Social-security-fund receipts in the year ending June 30 totaled \$3,400,000,000, with \$3,100,000,000 coming from social-security taxes and \$300,000,000 in interest from the Government. Expenditures were \$1,400,000,000 in benefit payments to individuals and \$70,000,000 for administrative expenses, leaving a net to Uncle Sam of over \$1,800,000,000.

Government interest, as shown by last year's \$300,000,000 figure, is getting to be quite a sizable source of income for the fund. The Government by law must pay interest on money borrowed from the trust funds at a rate equivalent to the average interest it pays on all its securities. Last year the Government paid an interest rate of 2½ percent under this formula. But now the rate has gone up to 2¾ percent.

Approximately 2,600,000 persons are now drawing social security, with the average

payment to persons over 65 being \$43.32 per month. Altogether, 82,000,000 persons now have some rights to benefits from the fund.

Altogether, 82,000,000 persons now have some rights for benefits from the social-security fund

There has been considerable discussion in Congress about increasing social-security benefit payments because of the inflation of the last year. But so far nothing has been done. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, has introduced a bill to increase benefit payments by \$5 per individual.

Meanwhile the Senate has voted to increase Federal contributions to State old-age relief programs by \$3 per person. But so far the House has not acted on the proposal.

At latest count there were 2,760,000 persons drawing old-age relief—more than are drawing social security. The average old-age relief payments are \$43.11 a month—practically the same as the average social-security payment. But the old-age payments vary widely, from a low of \$18.39 per month in Mississippi to \$67.52 in California.

How long will it be before the rapidly increasing number of old people start drawing more out of the now \$14,700,000,000 social-security fund than the below-65 people pay in? The experts have been debating that for years, with no conclusion. It all depends on economic conditions and what Congress does.

Retribution for the Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 390 to investigate the Katyn massacre of 4,000 Polish soldiers purportedly by the Russians, is just another of such ill-advised and bootless meanderings into foreign affairs which the advice of the founding fathers, the fixed policy of this country for 160 years, and the Constitution, have so urgently advised against.

Ill-advised because, after all, the internal actions of other countries are none of our business unless they directly affect our own governmental policies or the welfare of our people; and also for the reason we have no more right to investigate their murderous and wicked acts than they had to investigate our gangster killings in Chicago.

Bootless, because even if the Russians should be adjudged guilty of this atrocity, there seems to be no possibility of accomplishing any more punitive retribution than the resolution to free William Oatis, passed by the House 6 weeks ago, accomplished. After all, these wonderful and patriotic Poles are dead; William Oatis is not. Nor could a highly successful venture add much to the world consciousness of the guilt of this atavistic, barbarous, and murderous horde. The blood of untold millions of their own people and kin cries to Almighty God night and day for vengeance, not to mention the anguished cries of the murdered and displaced persons in the Russian rape of the Baltic provinces.

The minds of the Christian peoples of the world reel before the awful crimes of the Russian gangland, but one must remember that the palladium of our faith states clearly:

That whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

Moreover, that though the mills of the gods grind slowly, they grind exceedingly fine. There is greater reason to expect that the future retribution of these sadistic and murderous hordes shall be accomplished with greater precision before the bar of Almighty God, rather than through the ineffectual processes of any House committee, and with considerably less danger of undesirable international repercussions.

Address of Rear Adm. Lamont Pugh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address by Rear Adm. Lamont Pugh, Surgeon General of the Navy, delivered at the dedication ceremonies of the United States Naval Hospital in St. Albans, Long Island, N. Y., on August 15, 1951:

We have gathered here at the midway mark of the twentieth century with a background of circumstances very similar to those that tried the mettle of men and women during the days of the French Revolution. Of those days Charles Dickens wrote

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

Those words written of a former era constitute a startlingly accurate picture of today.

To rise above these uncertainties and contradictions, it is our duty to make as clear as possible where we are going and in what we believe, at least with respect to our own limited role in the drama of events, and to have faith in ourselves and in our mission. Thus we shall be able to interpret this occasion in a manner that focuses our present thoughts and gives guidance to the future.

If the formalities observed apropos the dedication of a building that is to house an institution or part of an institution conform to the conventional formula, there is almost certain to be inherent in those formalities, either explicit or implicit, or at least there should be a solemn promise to our colleagues, to ourselves, and to posterity, that our aims in the use of that institution will be of a high order and that we will seek to attain through it the highest objectives. Above all we should dedicate ourselves to a noble purpose and a noble course of action. To give a dedication definite significance and meaning requires today deep soul searching and sincere reflection.

The events which gave rise to this occasion can be retold very quickly. In World War II

we found it necessary to expand the number of hospital beds available to the Navy in this metropolitan area. When local private and municipal hospitals proved unsuitable or unavailable to meet the Navy's need, it was decided to build a new naval hospital. This site was acquired from the St. Albans Golf Club in April 1942 at a cost of \$565,000.

The firm of York & Sawyer was commissioned to prepare the architectural and engineering plans for a 1,500-bed hospital, 250 beds to be in permanent construction and the rest in temporary wards.

A shortage of steel postponed the permanent construction. However, 36 temporary ward buildings were completed, and the hospital was established November 24, 1942. When commissioned February 15, 1943, there were 1,500 beds and 1,150 patients on board. Thirty-seven ward buildings with 1,210 beds were built later.

After the war, when we knew that the Brooklyn Naval Hospital site would be required by the naval shipyard, the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved the construction of a 1,000-bed permanent hospital on this site. Funds for new permanent construction became available in fiscal year 1947 to provide 606 beds on a 1,000-bed chassis, as well as administration and subsistence buildings for a 1,000-bed hospital. Work on this new permanent construction was begun by Thompson & Starrett on October 20, 1948, and has now been completed. The total outlay of funds represented in this investment is approximately \$15,000,000. This is thus one of the largest and finest installations in the medical department of the Navy, and our wise and careful management of it must justify the cost.

Goethe once said, "Three things are to be looked to in a building, that it stand on the right spot; that it be securely founded; and that it be successfully executed." Certainly that the first two of these conditions obtain here there is no question. Fulfillment of the third condition, or that it be successfully executed, is our solemn responsibility and high privilege.

I wish to congratulate and thank the architects, York & Sawyer, who ably planned these magnificent buildings, and the firm of Thompson & Starrett, Inc., who executed the plans so competently. The fate of the architect is often a strange one. How often he expends his whole soul, his whole heart and passion, to produce buildings into which he himself will never enter. They nevertheless are, in a sense, his monument. And it may be said of many architects, as it was said of Sir Christopher Wren, "If you would see their monuments, look about you."

The Medical Department of the Navy appreciates the vitally important services rendered by its sister department, Yards and Docks, and of course the Medical Department is not unmindful nor does it lack in its appreciation of the reassuring support it has received from the line components of the Navy toward the realization of its acquisition of a new hospital here at St. Albans.

I also want to congratulate and thank the foremen and craftsmen, a part of whose life and character has been indelibly and everlastingly inscribed in these walls. Perhaps one of the most wonderful things in the world is the thrill of creating something, of seeing it grow under one's shaping hand from a mass of piled and disordered materials into a finished whole. Probably we have been too much concerned in America with obtaining dollars quickly and have tended to forget the superior satisfaction that singularly accompanies the realization of having achieved a goal by one's own efforts, the thrill of having produced something for its own sake.

This hospital is created from the best materials and has the finest equipment for the care of the sick that modern science and

ingenuity can provide. We, as well as the taxpayers who made it possible, shall always have reason to be proud of it as one of the best structures of its kind in the Nation.

But the significance of these imposing buildings is not in their architecture, their equipment, and fine appointments, but in what we do with them. When medicine was very young, Aristides said, "Not houses finely roofed, or the stones of walls well-built, nor canals and dockyards, make the city, but men able to use their opportunity."

Those who in the years that lie ahead will work here as doctors, dentists, nurses, corporals, and civilian assistants, will have the opportunity not only to provide the most enlightened scientific treatment of the sick and injured but even to achieve a certain nobility. The success of this temple of healing will rest not only on the scientific skill of those who practice medicine, surgery, and nursing here but also on their personal interest in patients and their realization that spiritual and psychological power is a valuable part of therapy; their realization that the practice of medicine is, as has been observed by Sir William Osler, an art, not a trade, a calling, not a business; a calling in which the physician's heart will be exercised equally with his head. In this sense St. Albans can become an imposing monument to the healing arts, not a great impersonal machine, but a life-preserving haven from the storms those admitted here will have faced for their country, whether their disability be in the nature of physical trauma, the ravages of infectious disease, or "the veiled sleeve of care." We therefore should dedicate ourselves to using this hospital as a means to give our fighting men courage and confidence in their fellow men as well as the benefits of scientific medicine.

Here as elsewhere in the Navy there will be challenging opportunities to practice big-league medicine. The medical problems encountered in battle aboard ship, in high-altitude planes of sonic speed, on snorkel submarines, in amphibious landing operations, and with the Marine Corps in the field, require physicians with highly developed military medical skills as well as administrative ability. I am convinced that military medicine as such should be recognized by the establishment of its own American Specialty Board. This Board would deserve professional distinction and would confer a fitting honor upon those military doctors who belong, according to Mr. Winston Churchill, to the noblest profession of man. We here dedicate ourselves to the task of practicing military medicine in a way that will render it worthy of such an honor.

To this end we should solemnly promise ourselves that we will become as proficient as we can as quickly as we can in those phases of medicine that are primarily military. Our physicians will, during their naval careers, be able to practice all phases of medicine known to civilian practice. However, under existing world conditions we must above all be able to serve especially as physicians in military combat. It must never be forgotten that our cardinal mission and reason for existence is medical support of military operations.

In the battle formations of ancient times the charioteers were in front, the physicians in the rear with the flute players and fortune tellers, and the cowards were in the middle. Today the physicians are in the front line, both in peace and in war. They must always be ready for full-scale war. At sea, of course, we are all in the same boat or boats, but with landing forces ashore, and when serving with the Marines our doctors advance right along with our hospital corpsmen, whose mission it is to render first aid and to bring the wounded to the hands of a doctor in the midst of battle and not after

the battle is over, as has in times past been the custom. The measure of efficiency and effectiveness brought to this mission by our hospital corpsmen has been such as to affix the stamp of immortality to their name, particularly in the annals of the Marine Corps.

St. Albans will be a major element in that great medical organization which seeks to support the armed services upon several important counts. I say armed services advisedly because we have now advanced to a state of unification where the hospitals of either of the three branches of the Department of Defense may admit and treat patients of a sister service in any of the hospitals coming within the sphere of administrative responsibility of a given service, regardless of the uniform the patient has elected to wear.

But to come back to the several functions performed by a military hospital, I want to say that, aside from the paramount mission of treating injured or ill patients and of returning these patients to duty as expeditiously as circumstances will permit, a vitally important purpose of these hospitals is concerned with the training of physicians, dentists, Medical Service Corps personnel, nurses, and corporals for duty with service personnel at sea or in the field. It is my contention that it is no more reasonable to think of providing this highly specialized and vitally essential type of training to personnel of the medical departments of the armed services in civilian hospitals than it is reasonable to think of training aviation personnel for combat duty by having them fly airplanes for a commercial airline. To perform these functions effectively military hospitals must remain under military control. Our medical operations must be integrated closely with the operations of the Navy and Marine Corps and be sensitive to their changing military plans. Operating bed capacity and operating staffs have to be planned and changed according to the changing military situation in the world. Patients must be distributed to our hospitals and returned to duty under military orders.

We could not efficiently manage this organization for the discharge of its specialized mission if, as has been advocated in certain quarters, our hospitals were subject to a Federal medical administration which would manage all or almost all Government hospitals. Such an administration would not be sensitive to changing combat needs. Our patients and physicians would be largely outside our military commands. This, I think, would be inimical with our bringing to our respective services the quality of medical coverage the line echelons of the several branches have come to expect from and deserve of their medical departments—indeed, the kind of service the American people have every right and reason to expect and demand of their uniformed forces.

The effectiveness of the system we have has been time and again thoroughly demonstrated by the speed and smoothness with which we have mobilized to meet various emergencies. There is no better standard by which to gage or judge the quality of an organization than by its past performance. The manner in which we arose to meet the demands of the Korean situation I think is a fair illustration. If our supply system, hospitals and personnel had been under another Federal agency there would, I believe, have been delays, false moves and a lack of coordination between the Navy's Operating Forces, as well as those of the Marine Corps, and the Medical Department upon which those forces so faithfully confidently rely for medical care and support. Our national security would, I fear, have been seriously weakened had the Medical Department been compelled to share its control with others.

It is therefore a high honor to me, as Surgeon General of the Navy, to dedicate

this hospital to the health and welfare of those privileged to wear the uniform of the United States Navy and Marine Corps, or that of our sister services the Army and Air Force, to the community of Greater New York, and finally to the support of our national security.

In a sense we are rededicating this hospital with its new permanent facilities. As an institution in different physical form it has already been dedicated by many brave men and women who fell in their country's service, those who suffered a shattering of their physical and mental health, and who here have recovered soundness of body and peace of mind.

We should moreover also rededicate ourselves to continuing the struggle to crush those aggressive forces which make this suffering and pain necessary. Although we have won a few minor battles in Korea, we cannot forget that the font and inspiration of aggression is still strong and must be resisted with unrelenting energy.

I congratulate you, Captain Walker, upon having been awarded the opportunity and privilege to command this wonderful institution after your tour of commendable duty in the Pacific theater of war. I extend best wishes to all officers, enlisted men, and civilian personnel on your most able staff. And I assure you that all of us at headquarters in Washington will extend to you the best support, guidance, cooperation, and counsel of which we are capable.

It occurs to me that the dedication of this hospital is, in a sense, comparable with the launching of a ship. Thus prompted, the thought expressed by Ella Wheeler Wilcox in the first stanza of her poem, *The Winds of Fate*, strikes me as an appropriate one to leave with you at this time, and so I quote:

"One ship drives east and another drives west

With the self-same winds that blow,
'Tis the set of the sails and not the gales
Which tell us the way to go."

PMA Promotes "Family-Type Farm" Meetings—For What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is something suspicious about the "family-type farm" meetings that are being promoted by the Department of Agriculture and sponsored by local PMA officers in the rural communities. The farmers are not being fooled as to the purposes of these meetings; they agree that it is a political move on the part of the Democrats in preparation for the 1952 Presidential campaign.

Mr. Speaker in one of my finest counties—Rock—170 farmers assembled for one of these meetings, and to the consternation of the PMA officials they voted 82 to 23 against the PMA payment checks for doing "those things which are good farm practices anyway." A very pertinent editorial on the meeting was printed in the *Janesville Gazette*, and under leave to include it, I shall insert it at this point. Members who are interested in

the New Deal farm program will find it informative.

FARMERS VOTE NO HAND-OUTS

It is to the everlasting credit of farmers in this rich dairyland that they see the writing on the wall and will rise to turn away the hand-outs being fed out from Washington. At a mass meeting of 170 Rock County farmers Thursday night they voted 82 to 23 against the present PMA payment checks for doing those things which are good farm practices anyway.

It is inherent in the man who tills the soil that he defend his independence and protect his personal freedom, yet so many in the past 20 years have sought Government aid that they have lost much of that independence. Now, taking the manna from the great white father in Washington, for a considerable period, the practice has become habit and the habit is hard to break, despite the damage it is doing.

The farmer is like the small house builder. Having turned over his rights to Government agencies for loans he now finds that he must kowtow to Washington if he is to build a home. That is where the Government checks are signed.

Many farmers are questioning, "Why these mass meetings in every county in the Nation?" The Department of Agriculture has called them "mobilization" meetings. Its directive to the Production Marketing Administration (PMA) officials told them the meeting was called to learn how the PMA and other agricultural agency programs are serving the family-type farm and what farmers themselves could suggest to improve these programs.

First off, it was granted that 98 per cent of the farms are family-type farms. Thus the object appeared to simmer down to PMA effectiveness for all farmers in this area. After listening to descriptions of PMA programs for a sleepy 45 minutes, the farmers appeared to question the need for such a meeting.

They did not mention the fact that 1952 is a presidential year and that those county meetings all over the United States can have deep political significance, but the prodding of Government men here by independent thinkers indicates that farmers generally may be very critical of the present programs.

Farmers here have plenty of suggestions for the PMA and the other agencies. They don't want a theorist in Washington deciding long in advance what price shall be placed on their produce. They want soil conservation demonstrations, accurate information on marketing prospects, visible demand and carry-over, instead of misinformation on advance crop estimates, and so forth. They want an end to abuse of present practices, including incentive payments for lime, fertilizer, grass seed, and practices that are simply good farm procedure.

With few exceptions they favor continuation of soil conservation promotion, but it is gratifying to taxpayers to learn that dirt farmers recognize the abuse that is being made of most of the sensible aids in the conservation picture. Farmers report that some Government agents actually solicit their signatures on papers guaranteeing benefit payments.

Farmers do not have to call on agencies for contour planting surveys and engineering. If they happen by accident to plow around a hill instead of over it they may be eligible for benefit payments, according to one of the agency men present at the mass meeting.

The Janesville Gazette has consistently publicized the need for good soil practices and has aided wherever possible the cause of soil conservation. On the other hand, it opposes, and will continue to oppose, the hand-outs and abuses which cost the taxpayer needless millions in taxes.

Meanwhile, in view of the 1952 campaign, one might logically ask, Why the hundreds of mass meetings? Why this campaign of purported concern over the "family-type farm," which includes all but 2 percent of the farmers? What is the "family-type farm?"

What has the defunct Brannan plan to do with this picture? Or is there to be another name for the President's persistent pet?

Why this mystery? What is Brannan aiming at? PMA appears to be due for expansion as the over-all superimposed control organization of all agricultural agencies. Does this mean more or less of the wasteful duplication of costly services to the farmer?

Washington wants to know how PMA and the other agencies are doing. The PMA agents said they were asking opinions of the farmers which would be sent to Washington to be used as a basis for establishing policy.

But when asked what plan the Agriculture Department has for the "family-type farm," the PMA agents said there is none.

Thus the meeting became more or less a voicing of fears as to how PMA would use these opinions, protests that Rock County farmers do not need or want incentive payments, and demands for realistic aid in the way of accurate information, demonstrations of soil conservation, and more logical pricing of crops.

These are all sensible projects, but from what can be read between the lines, the meetings are more concerned with some new aids, or hand-outs, to the small "family-type farm" to encourage them further.

There are services needed from Government, but continuation of the kind of thinking spelled by the duplication of PMA and other agencies means simply more hand-outs, less freedom for the individual farmer, more control of methods, planning, and prices.

The Internal Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there was delivered by Hon. Hiram Bingham, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board of the United States Civil Service Commission, an address before the general session of the section on criminal law of the American Bar Association, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on Tuesday, September 18 of this year. Mr. Bingham's address is one of the finest that it has been my privilege to read. I think the address is worthy of earnest consideration and review by every Member of this body and every Member of the House of Representatives, and all the citizenry of the United States. I commend it highly to their reading, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject of this general session—The Protection of Individual Rights and Government Security in Times of Stress—covers a very broad field. The problem of insuring the safety of the United States Government and at the same time not infringing on the

Bill of Rights in the Constitution, as amended, is difficult.

The Congress has passed a number of acts relating to the control of subversive activities. The President has appointed a commission to study this particular subject. He has also created by Executive order the Loyalty Review Board, of which I have the honor to be chairman. We are not concerned with the affairs of any individual who is not in the Government service unless he is applying for admission to that service. We have nothing to do with the problems of the Subversive Activities Control Board which was created by the Congress with the passage of the McCarran Act in 1950. We are not concerned with registration of Communists, exclusion of undesirable aliens, outlawing the Communist Party, academic freedom, or the problem of administering rules to accomplish the maintaining of national security and individual freedom outside of the administration of the civil service. We are concerned with reviewing and adjudicating cases involving the loyalty of Government employees and applicants for appointment.

The Constitution of the United States, as amended, guarantees to the individual certain rights such as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures, but it does not grant the right to hold a Government job. That is a privilege—not a right. The privilege is based on the power of the President and the heads of departments to appoint Government officials. The courts have decreed that the power to appoint is also the power to dismiss.

For nearly a century after the Government was established the power to dismiss was unrestricted and the privilege of holding office depended on the unrestricted pleasure of the President and the heads of departments. When the Republicans came into power in 1861 it was possible for President Lincoln to dismiss all employees of the Government, and it was necessary for him to spend many days, weeks, and months in considering the claims of those who wished to be appointed to Government jobs. When the Democrats came back in power with the election of Grover Cleveland, most Republican officeholders lost their jobs without being given any explanation for the change. In 1912 Congress passed the La Follette Act giving employees a legal right to receive a notification of charges which might lead to dismissal and the opportunity to answer those charges in writing, but a right to ask for a hearing.

The first time an ordinary individual secured that right was by the Executive order of March 1947 which established the Loyalty Review Board. This gives the individual charged with disloyalty the right to be heard by a panel of a departmental or agency board, the right to be accompanied by counsel or other representative, the right to appeal to the head of the department or agency from an adverse decision of the lower board, and finally the right to appeal to the Loyalty Review Board. It is our duty to see that the rights granted in the Executive order of March 1947 have not been denied to the individual. It is obvious that the Loyalty Review Board is concerned with the protection of very few individual rights.

It should also be borne in mind that the Loyalty Review Board is not concerned with crime. The individuals who come before it are not being tried in a court of law; they are not accused of treason or of any criminal act; they are being charged with conduct which brings into question their loyalty and the advisability of their being employed by the Government. If their record, their statements, and the manner in which they answer questions regarding their acts cause a panel of a loyalty board to have reasonable doubt of their loyalty, the President does not wish to have them employed by the Gov-

ernment. No employer wants an employee whom he cannot trust. It is vital in these times that the United States Government should not take any unnecessary chances on the devoted loyalty of its servants. On the other hand, we must try and carry on our operations without hurting individuals any more than is unavoidable.

To protect their interests as far as possible, it is provided that all hearings shall be conducted in private; that no reporters shall be present; that no one except the individual and his counsel and one witness shall be present at any one time; and that no publicity shall be given out regarding the results of any particular hearing. Occasionally, these rules have been infringed and for one reason or another stories have appeared in the public press. Since it is our practice to permit the individual and his counsel to have a transcript of the proceedings, there is no way in which we can prevent him from giving such matters to the press if he chooses to do so. There have been occasions where the counsel of the individual concerned has published a commentary on the proceedings, generally throwing as unfair a light as possible on what took place.

Our Government was set up to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty. In order to assure that the blessings of liberty are provided for the individual citizens the Government must be strong and secure. The history of the contemporary world shows that nations devoted to communism do not protect the liberty of the individual citizens and that the subjects of such nations do not enjoy any of the blessings of liberty which are provided in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution. Consequently, it is the duty of the Government to do everything in its power to keep communism from securing a foothold in the United States.

Our Government cannot be blind to the technique followed by the Communists in endeavoring to get their members into public office where they can abstract information from official records that may be useful to Russia.

We know that such information has been obtained through agents of the Communist Party in public office or who had friends in office willing to be helpful. Members of Communist-front organizations are often quite naive or innocent persons who are blind to the real enemy interests they are serving by being obliging to their friends.

There is no question that the Government of the United States, the largest employer of free labor in the world, has the right to deny employment to any who may not be either necessary or desirable. It is obvious that the Government must be the sole judge as to whether or not an applicant for employment or one already in the service meets the required standards.

The first duty of the Civil Service Commission is to determine whether an applicant is suitable, trustworthy, competent, and reliable. The name of the individual is passed over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to see whether there is any question of the individual's loyalty. Loyalty means something more than adherence; a loyal friend is one that will go the limit in friendly service. Loyalty means more than adherence; loyalty means devotion, willingness to sacrifice. Where there is reasonable doubt as to whether an individual will put his country above his personal interest his employment constitutes a potential danger to the security of the Government.

Under the direction of the President, the Attorney General has prepared a list of more than 100 organizations whose record has caused him to believe that they are subversive and not primarily loyal to the United

States Government. If the FBI finds that an individual has been a member of one or more of these organizations, it is its duty to institute a field investigation to find out as much as possible about the individual, his friends, and his activities. When the FBI has completed the investigation it does not pass upon it but delivers the results confidentially to the department or agency concerned with the applicant. It then becomes the duty of the Regional Loyalty Board or the agency concerned to examine the FBI report and determine whether it is serious enough to warrant further action. In that case, an interrogatory is prepared and sent to the individual concerned, asking pertinent questions which have arisen in a study of the results of the field investigation. The individual is asked to answer these questions within a reasonable period and under oath. If the answers do not appear to be satisfactory or if further investigation is believed to be necessary, the individual is asked to appear before a panel of the Board accompanied by an attorney or other representative and is invited to bring witnesses to substantiate his statements. Eventually he may appeal to the Loyalty Review Board. It then becomes my duty to appoint a panel to hear the case after it has been fully studied by one of my trained and experienced examiners. I appoint a panel of 3 from among the 25 members of the Loyalty Review Board who live in different places in the United States and who have been selected from among distinguished citizens in Boston, New York, Chicago, Denver, the Pacific Coast, the Territory of Hawaii, the North, the South, the East, and West. The panel tries to hold a hearing where it is most convenient for the individual involved. We furnish the panel with transcripts of all the testimony that has been taken and with the confidential reports from the FBI. We also furnish the panel with the results of a careful study of all this evidence made by the examiner and we endeavor to make it possible for him to sit with the panel during the hearing. The panel finally presents me with a signed statement of its decision. It then becomes my duty to inform the individual of this decision and also to inform the department or agency concerned with his employment or application. Every effort is made to keep the proceedings as private as possible. No one who applies for a job with a reputable organization likes to have it known if he fails. No one likes to have his loyalty called in question. Nevertheless, since the American Bar Association has already gone on record as believing that no one who was affiliated with the Communist Party should have the privilege of practicing law, you can certainly recognize the danger to the United States of permitting Communists or those associated with them to have the opportunity of working for the Government.

You may be interested in a bit of history.

In the early days of the Second World War when it became apparent that there would be a rapid increase in the number of civilians employed by the Government, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued an Executive order authorizing the Civil Service Commission to adopt appropriate rules and regulations providing expressly for character investigation of the applicants.

Pursuant to this order, the Civil Service Commission adopted the war service regulations which became effective March 16, 1942. One of the sections provided that an applicant may be denied examination and an eligible be denied appointment if there were reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States. The regulations also provided that reasonable doubt as to loyalty was sufficient cause for removal from the service.

Under these regulations, an employee named Friedman was held ineligible because there was reasonable doubt as to his loyalty. He appealed, hearings were held, and the Commission reaffirmed its determination that he was ineligible. Friedman appealed to the courts. The district court refused to interfere with the decision of the Civil Service Commission. Appeal was then taken to the circuit court which declared that the war service regulation which permits the removal from Federal service of one concerning whose loyalty to the Government the Civil Service Commission entertains a reasonable doubt undoubtedly was reasonable and proper, and the making of it was well within the scope of the authority conferred on the Commission. The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the circuit court.

By the time the war was over there had arisen a lack of uniformity in the application of the various laws and regulations. The Congress requested the President to study the matter and a commission was appointed to make recommendations. On the basis of these recommendations, the President, on March 21, 1947, issued Executive Order 9835 setting up a procedure for establishing loyalty boards in all Government departments and agencies, providing for the FBI to furnish them with pertinent material regarding employees and applicants, giving individuals the right to appeal from loyalty board decisions to the heads of departments or agencies, and giving a further right of appeal from such decisions to the Loyalty Review Board whose duty was also to provide rules and regulations for the loyalty investigations and the determination of eligibility for Government employment. The Attorney General was directed to prepare a list of subversive organizations, membership in which might constitute one of the reasons for the ineligibility of any given individual.

The standard for ineligibility was changed from that of the war service regulations of 1942 and made to depend on reasonable grounds to believe that an individual is now disloyal. This standard has been recently changed by Executive Order 10241 dated April 28, 1951, which restores the old standard of 1942.

One of the first cases to receive public attention under Executive Order 9835 was that of Miss Dorothy Bailey in which the circuit court upheld the *modus operandi* of the Loyalty Review Board. Not long ago the Supreme Court refused to overrule the action of the circuit court.

Miss Bailey was denied employment because Government officials found reasonable grounds to believe her disloyal. She was not given a trial in any sense of the word and she does not know who informed upon her. Her situation has appealed powerfully to the American sense of what is fair, and aroused the sympathy of some editors and commentators.

However, the Constitution places upon the President and the Congress responsibility for the welfare of our country. Furthermore, the circuit court pointed out that we are now "in an adversary position to a government whose most successful recent method of contest is the infiltration of a government service by its sympathizers." This justifies the President's Executive order.

The essence of Miss Bailey's complaint is that she was denied employment without revelation by the Government of the names of those who informed against her and of the method by which her activities were detected. Concerning this, the court said: "Even in normal times and as a matter of ordinary internal operation, the ability, integrity, and loyalty of purely executive employees is exclusively for the executive branch of the Government to

determine, except insofar as the Congress has a constitutional voice in the matter. All such employees hold office at the pleasure of the appointing authority; again except only for statutory limitations. Never in our history, even under the terms of the Lloyd-La Follette Act has a Government employee been entitled as of right to the sort of hearing Miss Bailey demands in respect to dismissal from office. These well-established principles give perspective to the present problem."

Appellant did not get a trial in the judicial sense, "but," says the court "the question is not whether she had a trial, the question is whether she should have had one" * * * "We are dealing with a major clash between individual and public interests. We must ascertain with precision whether individual rights are involved, and we must then weigh the sum of those rights, if there be any, against the inextinguishable necessities of the Government." This, as a matter of fact, is what concerns this session this morning.

Let me quote further from the majority opinion of the circuit court. Justice Prettyman said: "Never in our history has a Government administrative employee been entitled to a hearing of the quasi-judicial type upon his dismissal from Government service. That record of a hundred and sixty years of Government administration is the sort of history which speaks with great force. It is pertinent to repeat in this connection with the Lloyd-La Follette Act, sponsored and enacted by advocates of a merit classified Government service, expressly denies the right to such a hearing. Moreover, in the acute and sometimes bitter historic 100-year contest over the wholesale summary dismissal of Government employees, there seems never to have been a claim that, absent congressional limitation, the President was without constitutional power to dismiss without notice, hearing, or evidence, except for the question as to officials appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate."

One of the best results of the loyalty program has been to discourage Communist sympathizers from trying to get Government jobs. In this time of stress and potential infiltration of Russian agents, we are justified in taking every precaution to protect our safety and security.

There has been considerable misrepresentation of the way in which the President's loyalty program has worked. Some critics have stated that college students are afraid to attend speeches made by well-known Communists and are afraid to join organizations of an extreme or radical nature.

Let me take this opportunity to say that, so far as I am aware, no one has been branded as disloyal or rated ineligible for Government employment simply because when he was in college he joined a radical organization or expressed radical opinion in debate. We all know cases of young men who joined organizations in college which have appeared to us to be more or less unpatriotic and tinged with disloyalty, but who, when they were a little older and wiser and had become informed as to the nature of the organization, had ceased to take any active part or interest in it.

The Loyalty Review Board has carefully followed the opinion of the Attorney General that it is only when membership in a questionable or subversive organization is clearly an informed membership and also an active membership that the weight of evidence is likely to be conclusive in raising reasonable doubt of the individual's loyalty. After a man has graduated from college and is seeking a Government job, it is fair to assume that his active membership in a

subversive organization is an informed membership.

After graduating from college an individual may be presumed to be intelligent enough to understand what he is doing. If he is then taking an active part in an organization that is affiliated with the Communist Party, there can be a very reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States. The advisability of permitting him to have Government employment is very dubious.

The National Federation of Federal Employees has given its full support to our program. Its president has gone on record as approving our standard. The vast majority of Government employees know they have nothing to fear.

By discouraging Communists and Communist sympathizers from applying for Government jobs and by excluding from the Government service a considerable number of undesirables, the President's loyalty program has promoted the security of the Government in this time of stress without trampling on the rights of individuals. It has, for the first time in our history, made it possible for Government employees and applicants for Government positions to have at least two hearings before carefully selected panels while being attended themselves by attorneys or representatives of their choosing. The privilege of working for the Government has not been denied to its citizens unless a panel of impartial members of loyalty boards, after giving them a chance to be heard and to present fully their side of the case, has decided the question of eligibility and found the individual ineligible for that privilege.

In conclusion, let me once more remind you that the subject of this general session—The Protection of Individual Rights and Government Security in Times of Stress—covers a very broad field, most of which has nothing to do with the Loyalty Review Board because that Board is not concerned with the rights of any individual who is not in the Government service unless he is applying for admission to that service. The Loyalty Review Board is only concerned with the protection of those rights which have been granted to individuals by acts of Congress and Executive orders relating to the privilege of working for the Government.

Rt. Rev. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News of Tuesday, September 18, 1951:

MONSIGNOR SHERLOCK IN INSPIRING SERMON
AT ANNUAL HOLY HOUR

The complete text of the inspiring sermon presented by Rt. Rev. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock, archdiocesan superintendent of schools and former curate at St. Mary's Church, at the annual holy hour of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the Archdiocese of Boston, held Sunday in St. Mary's Church, is printed below.

The entire discourse is being printed in today's Telegram-News because of the unusual complimentary comments made by hundreds who heard the former St. Mary's curate pre-

sent the talk at the holy hour in observance of Ozanam Sunday.

Monsignor Sherlock conducted the holy hour, the intention of which was to ask God's blessing on the efforts of all Vincentians throughout the world and to pray for the beatification of Frederic Ozanam, founder of St. Vincent de Paul Society.

In his talk Monsignor Sherlock told Vincentians that in view of the dwelling of God within their souls, they should strive to make more vivid and clear the meaning of this doctrine in their daily lives.

The complete text follows:

"Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (I Corinthians iii. 16.)

"At this moment we are in the middle of one of the more precious hours of our lives. Our days are crowded with the demands of living. Business, the concerns of home, the demands of those projects in which we are engaged, the very exactions of our recreations, make thinking difficult while prayer and meditation take on the semblance of the impossible. This afternoon, despite the claims upon us, we have come together in this beautiful place to pause awhile, to adore God in the Blessed Sacrament and to meditate a little. We see the discrepancies between our actual lives and the pattern set for us by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and with resolution, and at least some confidence, we set ourselves to the task of making our lives conform more closely with the will of God.

"We come together also as men with a great tradition and, in a reminiscent mood, we trace our lineage back to a brilliant figure of a century ago whose zeal with tolerance, whose brilliance with understanding, whose enthusiasm, erudition, eloquence, and exactness were the handmaidens of goodness and sanctity. In the midst of our meditation we pray that the Church may, one day soon, recognize, with the splendor of beatification, the founder of our society, Antoine-Frederic Ozanam.

"The text I chose, that likens us to temples and that bluntly says that God dwells within us, is an ancient text. It claims the same antiquity as all those other quotations from St. Paul that we know and love so well and yet the words have a challenging ring. The sentence says so much that we stagger a little under its impact. We tend, in our lack of realism, to think of God at a distance yet St. Paul makes our heart a home and puts God there as its rightful tenant.

"Years ago, when we were much younger, we were bothered by a catechism question that caused our fancies to leap into images of God moving through the atmosphere around us. We were asked where God was. And with brevity that was accurate, and yet never quite satisfying, we learned to answer "God is everywhere." We thought of the mills and factories where our fathers worked and said "God is there." We thought of the streets and passageways of our city or town and said "God is there, too." We thought of fields where we played, the rivers where we swam, the air where only birds could make their way. We let our imaginations run out among the planets, through the distant vistas of sun-drenched days and the star-lit distances of mysterious nights and said, "There is no place on sea or land, in earth or in heaven but He is there."

"And yet we said 'God seems so different in different places.' We recognized that God had different ways of being. We said, in our own way, that God really was different in heaven. Throughout these limitless spaces that we knew imperfectly we felt that God was present by His power and by the things He did. His power kept us alive. His direction kept the stars in their courses.

But somehow we knew that in Heaven God's presence must be different. We made our way to the parish church and said, as we genuflected before the Tabernacle, 'God is here in a special way, veiled by the appearance of bread, but,' and we pretend the word was accurate, 'more real.'

"We saw a great difference in the way God existed. The presence that we recognized when we said 'God is everywhere' was true but a little vague. But when we said 'God is in the Blessed Sacrament,' or 'Some day I shall see God face to face in Heaven' we thought of God more intimately, as one more 'special' and, for ourselves at least, more 'real.'

"St. Paul, however, adds to our knowledge one more point. He tells us, in many ways, 'God has a special residence in the souls of those who love Him.' This is no mere figure of speech. It is not a poetic expression for some parallel truth, no 'symbol' of a spiritual condition. This Pauline doctrine is a simple truth whose implications and consequences are infinite. When we think of ourselves in the words of the text as 'Temples of God' when we repeat the words the 'Spirit of God dwells within us,' we are talking literally. What we mean is that the God whose power is responsible for the exquisite perfection of flowers and birds, whose intellect designed the rugged grandeur of the mountains and the restless movement of the sea, whose omnipotence is suggested by the far reaches of the universe, the immeasurable masses and unimaginable distances of stars—and galaxies of stars, God who sent His Divine Son from Heaven to die on a cross for our sins, this God, of Heaven and of Earth, sets up His throne within our hearts, if we but love Him.

"It is of some value to take up a few ideas, now old to us, we have been hearing them so long, and see how they look in the light of this doctrine of the indwelling of God in our souls. Let us look for a few minutes at the Sacrament of Baptism.

"We know that, on a definite day in our lives, we were brought to the church and there, in the presence of certain people called sponsors, the priest poured water on our forehead, said some words from a sacramental formula, and a tremendous change took place. We have been accustomed to thinking of this as a washing process, and indeed, so it was. The age-old figure used to explain what happened likened the soul to a garment, soiled and grimy because of original sin. When the priest poured the water and said the words 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' the soul was purified, cleaned, washed. The garment, up to now dark and dirty, was washed whiter than snow, to remain clear and spotless until, at some later date, we might stain it again by deliberate actual sin. The figure is a good one and remains in our memory for these many years.

"Actually, however, a more wonderful thing occurred. When, as tiny infants, we were brought to the church for baptism, our soul was an empty house. Due to a sin committed by our first parents and transmitted from generation to generation, the Creator of heaven and earth was, as it were, excluded from a rightful home. Just as surely as the Christ Child was shut out of the unfriendly inn at Bethlehem on the first Christmas night, so, when we were born, God was excluded from our souls by original sin. Baptism was the opening of the door that God might literally come in. More than that the Sacrament of Baptism was God moving into our souls to live there, through the years, so long as we would have Him.

"Sin, venial and mortal, takes on added meaning when we look at it with the eyes of St. Paul. Instead of thinking of sin as a blot

or, in the case of mortal sin, a total blackening of a white soul, sin becomes an action which directly affects God. Considering ourselves in a state of grace, venial sin becomes a pushing of God part way out of our souls. Never rejecting God entirely, venial sin lessens His presence in our soul. So it is that continuous venial sin never actually empties the soul of God, but can so decrease His presence there that we may picture ourselves as all but empty, a mere tenuous divinity occupying the spiritual space that should be bursting with God, His love, and His goodness. This presence of God within us is the very life of the soul and, in times of stress, its very stamina. So it is that we can picture the habitual sinner, whose sins are slight, as weakening himself so that in the face of temptation he lacks the strength actually in mortal sin. With mortal sin, we have not the mere blackening of the soul but rather the emptying of it, driving God out, leaving the soul an empty house, the most desolate sight in the world of the flesh or of the spirit.

"At this point I would pause awhile and suggest that you sum up in your minds what we have said thus far, that God lives within us in a special way, that at this moment, thinking of ourselves as individuals, God has set up a special residence within my heart, that I am never without Him, while I am in a state of grace; that He entered my soul at baptism, to remain here until I should deliberately eject Him by mortal sin; that He awaits the day when He may return at my nod of penance and contrition.

"In view of the doctrine of the dwelling of God within our souls, we should strive to make more vivid and clear the meaning of this doctrine in our daily lives. In the first conference we concluded on a solemn note, the note of sin and hoped-for sorrow.

"When we look upon the other side of this picture, when we examine the man who tries to live a holy life, the doctrine gives glorious meaning to our devotions and acts of virtue. The buoyancy that is characteristic of those who have made a good confession, is really a patent symptom of a great spiritual event. The man who, after serious sin, has unlocked the doors of his soul through penance, and has brought God back into his soul, cannot help but reflect this change from night to day, from vacuity to fullness, in the cast of his countenance and the spring of his step. God has returned home, home to this soul.

"So with the man who day by day, in his business, his leisure, his civic association, and his home life, strives to do good deeds and follow the laws and counsels of his church, he finds himself housing more and more of God. The figure fails when we think of God quantitatively, but the point is true that high saintliness consists in increasing God's presence in our souls by constantly increasing acts of virtue and sound devotion.

"I have often wondered how we might be brought to understand the reality of this doctrine more than we do. Forgetting yourself I suggest that you think of people about you in this beautiful church here today. What you are compelled to say is this: 'If the man next to me is in the state of grace, if he is free of serious sin, then God is in his soul. God is there in his soul, a few inches away from my elbow, not just in the sense in which God is everywhere, but in a special way, somewhat analogous to the way in which God resides in the blessed sacrament. When this man next to me goes out of this church this afternoon he will carry God with him along the streets of the city. God will enter his home with him when he climbs the steps and opens the door. God will be within him, in this special way, when he tells his wife about the devotions tonight. Tomorrow when he goes to work, he will be carrying God with him on the bus or the train. God will enter

with him into his office or factory. If my neighbor is a surgeon he will bring God with him to meet the patient and the nurses in the operating room. If my neighbor is a policeman God will walk the lonely streets of the city with him during the dreary hours of early morning. If the man next to me is a teacher, God will be within him as he works with children and youth in the classroom. If he is involved in the civic life of the city he will be bringing God to assist in every transaction of his busy day.'

"And this again is no pious figure. It is the literal truth because he is a temple of God, a bearer of the Holy Spirit.

"This living of God within us is so real that you would be logical, if not conventional, to genuflect before this neighbor of yours, not worshipping the man who sits beside you, but rather, adoring the God who has chosen to live within him at a tabernacle of the most high.

"When we read the history of the beginning of the church, like many another commentator through the centuries, we are astonished at what we see.

"There were a few unimportant people, a tax collector, a doctor, and a group of fishermen who gathered about a Leader in an obscure part of a Roman province in the Near East. In three centuries, a very brief time in the light of history, their religion had become the official cult of the Roman Empire, the greatest empire that had existed up to that time. Historians, with only historical learning, have said that this fact was the most impressive evidence of the church's divinity. The fact seems astounding.

"And yet in the light of this doctrine of God within us, does it seem so amazing? If you think of the first little group cherishing God in their hearts, moving through the lands that form the Mediterranean Basin, carrying God from house to house, from town to town, allowing God to speak through their tongues and through the examples of their daily lives, it is not too surprising that the religion of the empire changed from paganism to Christianity in so short a time. On the contrary, recognizing the doctrine of the indwelling, it may seem strange that the transition took so long. These saints of old did not live of themselves. They could say with St. Paul 'I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me.'

"There is a point that follows from what we have been saying and which we must not pass over lightly. There is an old philosophical postulate that says, 'operation follows essence.' What this means is that you can tell the nature of a thing or of a person by watching how it or he behaves. Our Lord expressed it when He said you can't gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. We advert to this principle when we say that we expected a man to act the way he did. He was an honorable man inside, consequently he spoke with forthrightness and honesty. His operations or conduct agreed with what he was like inside.

"So it is in this matter of the indwelling. If God is within us, if we strive to be good, to increase God in our souls, then our lives must reflect that fact. The example we give to those around us is an immeasurable force, constantly moving men nearer to God or away from Him. From day to day, in the office or in the barber shop, in the factory or on the golf links, wherever we may be, we are influencing people for better or for worse. For the most part this influence is unconscious on our part. I have known a man whose whole life was changed from less than mediocrity to sainthood because of the example of a small group of children. The children are grown men and women today and yet they have no idea of the grace their example was to this older man. And they

will never know it until one day they are told it by God Himself in their own particular judgment.

"Having God in one's soul, and then living the life consistent with having God in one's soul, is our way of cooperating with God to extend His kingdom on earth. People must be better for having known us. In fact, God must enter the souls of others because we are literally God-bearers who have brought God in our souls to others. "Our own lives change miraculously if we appreciate this doctrine. I shall never be alone again. If I am marooned in the most remote wilderness I may have God with me. I need not say 'Oh, if I could only get to a church to pray close to God'.

"I need talk with no distant power but rather look within myself and find the Creator of all things there within me.

"If I face a crisis in my life, in business or in matters of the soul, I never face it alone. If I am confronted by temptation, God comes with me up to the very point where I make my decision. If I choose the temptation and the matter is serious then God leaves because I pushed Him out. If I choose the right, God remains within me, and His presence is greater than before. If the actual grace to do good is before me God within my heart helps me to increase the virtue of the deed.

"If I have been able to stir up in your minds some realization of the importance of this fact that God dwells within us, I shall be very happy. For this knowledge will affect your lives as little else can and your lives being changed, the world about you must necessarily change, too. It is a truism to say, 'You can change the world,' provided God moves with you through the highways and byways of tomorrow, seeking those for whom He died, teaching and exhorting through the example of your own Christian lives. God Himself hath said it: 'You are the temple of the living God—I will dwell in you and walk among you; and I will be your God, and you shall be my people.'"

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an address I gave to the annual meeting of the Crawford Electric Cooperative held in Bourbon, Mo., on Friday, September 7, 1951:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to meet here today with the Crawford Electric Cooperative. This annual meeting provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of what your group, the REA, and the Southwestern Power Administration have accomplished in making available electric power to millions of families previously unserved with this vital power, and it is also a good time to take a look at what remains to be done and make plans for future action.

All of you have certainly heard it said many, many times that we live in an age of electricity. This is a truism that we take for granted. We can scarcely imagine the chaos, confusion, and disaster that would result were our people suddenly to be deprived of this vital source of light, heat, and power. It is hard to believe that the incandescent electric lamp was invented only 72 years ago and that the first electric station to supply

light and power—the famous Pearl Street station in New York—started operation less than 70 years ago.

The demand for electricity has grown constantly since that date. No other source of light is even considered for modern illumination. The use of electricity for cooking has become commonplace over the last few years. More and more household appliances run by electricity are being used in American homes. American industry is constantly finding new applications for electricity and is steadily increasing its consumption. Many modern industrial processes, such as production of aluminum, would be impossible without large amounts of electric power.

This growth of the use of electricity in the past 70 years is truly phenomenal. But it should be recalled that up to 15 years ago the farmers of the Nation were almost completely bypassed in the applications of electricity. What was commonplace for many city dwellers in the way of electric appliances—lamps and tools—was unknown to the great majority of farm families who could only envy their city cousins. Light for rural families was furnished most often by kerosene lamps and lanterns. You and I well recall how they were often smoky, smelly, and a real fire hazard, particularly when set down in a barn filled with hay. All milking had to be done by hand. The hand pump, the broom, mop, and dustpan were the implements used by the farm wife to try to keep her home clean. If food was to be kept, it had to be canned; much food, indeed, was wasted for lack of refrigeration.

Such was the picture for the great majority of farms before 1935. Up until 1925 only 3 percent of all farms received the benefit of electricity. By 1935, still only 11 percent of the farms were electrified. The slow development of electrification in rural areas up to that point was due largely to the high cost charged for line construction for extension of electric power into the country, and the high rates charged to the farmers. As would be expected, private companies constructed only those lines which would be most profitable to them. The result was that, in 1935, 89 out of every 100 farms were beyond the reach of power lines. Those that had electricity found the cost distressingly high.

The change in rural living that has occurred since 1935 is astounding. While 15 years ago 89 farms out of every 100 were without electricity, today the percentage is almost exactly reversed. Nearly 90 farms out of every 100 do have electricity. Only some 10 percent of American farms still are without this great source of light and power. The annual survey of the REA on the number of farms that are electrified indicated that on June 30, 1950, a little more than a year ago, over 5,000,000 United States farms were receiving central-station service. Since then, rural electrification has kept growing. Today there are only about 800,000 farms remaining to be electrified.

From 1935 and the beginning of the REA program, more than 4,500,000 farms have received central-station service. More than half of these have obtained their electric current since the close of World War II. Nearly 60 percent of these 4,500,000 farms have received their electricity as a result of the REA program.

Every year finds new uses for electricity on the farm. More and more chores are made easier by electric power. Electric milking machines, churns, cream separators, brooders, feed grinders, wood saws, insect sprayers—these are but a few of the pieces of equipment that have become commonplace on the modern American farm. The work of the home is equally lightened by electric water pumps, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and electric stoves.

In Missouri, over 70 percent of all farms are electrified. This is less than the na-

tional average but more than that of our neighboring States of Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma. The challenge now is to electrify the remaining farms. With the fine example of such groups as the Crawford Electric Co-op as a guide, there is little doubt that it will be done.

What has brought about this remarkable development of rural electrification over the past 15 years? To understand this, we should look briefly at the history of the REA, one of the most successful examples of cooperative endeavor known to us.

REA was first established in 1935, first as a part of the work-relief program. It was soon discovered, however, that delays involved in starting the program, and the technical obstacles of a major electrification program made it impractical as a work-relief measure. By changing REA from a work-relief agency to a loan agency, which was done in August 1935, a much more useful and extensive electrification program could be carried out. This action established promotion of rural electrification as an orderly lending program on an interest-bearing, self-liquidating basis.

That in the beginning the program was opposed by many private power interests can be readily understood. They were not ignored, however, in the formulation of the REA program. In fact, before the program was started there had been an informal conference with representatives of commercial electric companies. These companies appointed a special committee to make a survey of the extent to which further development of rural electrification might be brought about promptly in cooperation with REA. Their report, released on July 24, 1935, suggested that there were few farms requiring electricity that were not being served—this at a time when 89 percent of American farms were without electric power—and that any additional rural customers must come largely from those using electricity for household purposes. This industry report suggested the expenditure of \$100,000,000 of Federal funds for the construction of 78,000 miles of new lines for 351,000 customers. It was also proposed that REA and other Federal agencies provide \$124,000,000 worth of credit to customers for wiring, electrical appliances, and service extensions to be paid for by the customers. Little attention was paid to rates in this report.

The REA itself took a broader view of its function. It saw its duty to be in the direction of making low-cost power available to the largest possible number of rural consumers. Thus it rejected the industry program as being too limited and not giving sufficient attention to low costs to the consumers. It concentrated on farmer organizations, municipalities, and consumer non-profit organizations as borrowers for the construction of power lines and facilities.

This procedure was supported by Congress. In 1936 REA was established as a positive 10-year program of promoting rural electrification by lending funds for the construction of rural electric systems. In 1944 REA was continued as a permanent agency.

REA serves principally as a banker to its borrowers. It operates no facilities and grants no subsidies. Its loans are repaid from the income of its borrowers. These borrowing organizations are locally owned and managed. Of course, there has been no intention to make the REA program a profit-making proposition. Its main objective has always been to extend electric service to farm families who had hitherto been without it. To this end, in addition to its lending function, the REA does give technical advice when needed in the operation of the borrower's facilities.

Let us examine the accomplishments of the REA a little more closely. By July of this year, REA had advanced a total of over \$1,827,000,000 to its borrowers. At the same time the borrowers had returned to the Gov-

ernment about \$298,000,000 in principal and interest payments. Of this amount, over \$33,000,000 represents payments made ahead of schedule. Only a single foreclosure has been made on the property of a borrower in the 16 years of REA's existence. It is significant that this one failure, which occurred at Ocooke Island in North Carolina over 10 years ago, was of a commercial company and not a co-op. The failure came as a result of storm damage which destroyed the company's facilities and the failure of the company to take any action to reestablish itself. The project has since been taken over and is being successfully operated by a rural cooperative.

Authorizations for loans have been approved for a total of nearly \$2,500,000,000 to over 1,000 borrowers. Ninety-two percent of these borrowers are cooperatives. These borrowers now have rural electrical facilities in operation which include 1,100,000 miles of line serving about 3,500,000 farms in 48 States. In Missouri, the 49 REA borrowers, all but one of which are co-ops, operate some 56,000 miles of line and serve some 182,000 farms. Of this Missouri total, the Crawford Electric Cooperative is operating over 1,500 miles of line serving over 4,000 rural consumers, and your recent plans for expansion will increase this to nearly 2,000 miles of line and service to over 5,000 consumers.

Thus far over 80 percent of the loans approved by the REA have been for electric distribution facilities, rather than for generation or transmission. It has been the policy of the REA to lend for generation and transmission facilities only when borrowers are unable to secure an adequate supply of power at a sufficiently low rate, or when a saving would result. Only 18 percent of loans have been made for this purpose.

The REA program has been so successful that it has served as a stimulus for the spread of private power to rural areas. Indeed, while about 2,700,000 farms have received electric power as a result of the REA program, a goodly 1,800,000 farm families have received electricity for the first time during these 15 years from private power. This is a far cry from the meager estimate of 351,000 potential additional rural customers made by private power companies back in 1935.

Why has the REA program been so signally successful? I should like to suggest three basic reasons. First, REA-financed cooperatives operate on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost to their members. Secondly, directors of REA-financed cooperatives are elected because of their known interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They service without compensation and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service. Thirdly, members of REA-financed cooperatives are also interested in keeping costs at a minimum. For example, they help reduce operating expense by voluntarily reporting potential causes of service interruptions such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters, and many make out their own bills.

While the REA is the outstanding example of the extension of electric power to millions of our citizens as a direct consequence of conscious public policy, it is by no means the only case where the Federal Government has been concerned with the extension of electric power, as you no doubt are well aware. We need only think of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, Grand Coulee, and Hoover Dam to know the contribution which Federal power projects have made. Of the total production of electrical energy in the United States, some 300,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1950, about 40,000,000,000 were derived from Federal projects, with another 20,000,000,000 from other publicly owned generating plants. This is 20 percent of the total.

In addition to the REA, one Federal power agency that is of particular importance to this area is the Southwestern Power Administration, an agency of the Interior Department. The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for electric power and energy generated at the reservoir projects of the Army Corps of Engineers in Arkansas, Louisiana, Kansas, and Missouri south of the Missouri River, and Texas and Oklahoma north of the San Antonio River.

The commendable objective of the Southwestern Power Administration has been stated as follows: "To encourage the most widespread use of the surplus electric power and energy generated at the reservoir projects in the area at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles." To this end its program includes the negotiation of power sales contracts with Federal agencies, public bodies, rural electric co-ops, and, it should be particularly noted, privately owned companies. Its program also includes the construction of transmission lines, substations, and related facilities to insure and maintain reliable service to customers. At present SPA has three projects which in 1950 generated a total of 417,000,000 kilowatt-hours with sales totaling \$2,307,000. Ninety-three percent of the sales were to 4 private-utility companies and 7 percent to 8 rural electric co-ops and one municipality.

Public and private power interests can work together, although as you know by your own experience, private power has shown little willingness to cooperate in Missouri. One notable event that demonstrates the possibility and effectiveness of cooperation was the contract signed in July 1950 between the SPA and two Oklahoma private utilities for integration and interconnection of facilities. Under this 20-year contract, the utilities will distribute SPA power to Federal preference customers, namely, rural co-ops and municipal and other Government installations.

It should be recognized that the REA in itself is a good example of the way in which public and private power interests merge. The borrowers of REA funds are not Government agencies. And their entire equipment—electric wire, meters, transformers and all—are privately owned. REA itself does not own, operate, or control a single piece of electric equipment. As many persons have noted, private enterprise is flourishing under the REA program. For example, REA co-ops in 1950 paid out about \$35,000,000 for power purchased from commercial utilities in order to serve their farmer consumers. More than 60 percent of the power purchased from suppliers other than REA borrowers was obtained from commercial companies, and the remainder from public agencies. This proportion supplied by commercial companies has grown steadily in the years since the end of World War II. REA co-ops are indeed good customers of the private utilities.

In fact one of the most serious problems facing the REA borrowers today is how to get enough power to meet the ever-growing demands of their farmer customers. The demand for power on the farm has increased by leaps and bounds. For example, in the year 1949, the average farm connected to REA-financed system used 1,608 kilowatt-hours, compared to an average of 600 in 1941.

The entire country is facing a power shortage and the farmer is sharing the shortage. A survey made about a year ago showed that 22 percent of the REA co-ops did not then have enough power to meet their current needs, and another 26 percent reported that they did not have enough power in sight to meet their anticipated growth. This lack of power sources is a continuing threat to the progress of rural electrification. In fact, the 1950 report of the REA points out that growth of consumption and extension of

rural lines have been actually retarded here in Missouri as well as in Minnesota, Utah, and the Dakotas, due to inadequate power supplies.

Missouri co-ops are facing power shortages, and if the power to satisfy the growing needs of Crawford Electric and other co-ops is to be available, it will be essential that the present plans of the Sho-Mo Power Cooperative, which serves you, be carried out. These plans call for construction of an interconnecting transmission system which will make available low-cost power from the Government's Norfolk Dam in Arkansas, and from the Central Electric Power Cooperative, of Linn., Mo., of which Sho-Mo is a member. In order to get full benefit from the hydro-steam combination and from the transmission line interconnections, a lease-operating agreement has been worked out with the SPA. The SPA has agreed to operate and maintain the new transmission grid at a rental sufficient to amortize the loan. If the system can be completed as planned and the SPA agreement carried out, substantial savings in power costs will result for Crawford Electric and other co-ops.

To provide for Missouri's growing power needs, it is also essential that the SPA's program for transmission lines known as the western Missouri project be completed. This program was attacked in Congress on the grounds that the proposed lines were duplications and that the area was already adequately served. Obviously neither of these contentions are supported by the facts. The area does need additional facilities and also desperately needs a dependable source of electric energy at a reasonable cost. Despite my vigorous opposition, an amendment was adopted by the House of Representatives denying the use of funds for the completion of this project. Fortunately, this crippling amendment was rejected in the Senate and has been eliminated by the conference committee report of the bill. However, the \$1,500,000 requested to complete this project have been reduced to \$810,600. At this point, it is difficult to determine how much this drastic reduction will delay final completion of the western Missouri project.

The various electrification programs in which the Federal Government has taken part have done a great deal to strengthen the American economy, particularly, as we have seen here, American agriculture. Electricity has increased productivity tremendously. From 1935 to 1948, the index of gross production per farm worker, for example, shot up from 95 to 152, or 60 percent, an average increase of more than 4 percent per year. During the same period the manufacturing and mining index per worker rose from 93 to 121, or 30 percent. A large part of this increase must certainly be attributed to the increased availability of electric power. There are now literally hundreds of uses of electricity on the farm, only a few of which I have mentioned. Not only has electrification made farm operation more efficient, it has often resulted in better food products and more sanitary conditions. Nowhere is this more in evidence than in the dairy industry, which has benefited enormously from electrical milking machines, feed processors, butter- and cheese-making machinery, and efficient refrigeration.

The increased use of electricity due to public and cooperative power projects has done more than increase the productivity of electric power consumers. Its benefits have been far reaching. Farmers' income and wealth have been increased. The purchase of countless electric appliances, tools, and other equipment has been a boon to small-town merchants and farm-supply stores, and to manufacturers and distributors of these items as well. Little wonder that REA has received such widespread support.

The problem of rural electrification is not yet completely solved. The farms and homes not yet electrified are in many instances difficult to reach, in isolated areas. Even more remains to be done in bringing telephones to rural Missouri. The 1950 census indicated that 46.4 percent of the farms in Missouri have telephones, but in the Eighth Congressional District, only 6,675 farms, or 25 percent, had telephones at that time. REA has been authorized to undertake a rural telephone loan program to meet the great need of rural people for adequate telephone service only since 1949. But already the program is well under way and it is so be hoped that it will prove as quickly successful as the electric power program. By July of this year, three telephone loan applications have been approved in Missouri. These projects will provide telephone service to 1,700 new subscribers and improved service to over 1,600 present subscribers.

If public power agencies, cooperatives, and private utilities all work toward the goal of assuring all Americans access to reliable electric energy, there can be little doubt that this goal can be achieved in the not too distant future. Not only must electricity be spread to the more remote regions of our land, we must also make sure that the power capacity be increased sufficiently to meet not only the growing demands for electricity from well-established and new consumers alike, but also to meet the extra demands of a high-level national defense program. This demand for electricity requires the contribution of private and public power agencies alike. Together they can furnish the power needed for a sound American economy and a strong American defense.

The Key To Peace of Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the Guest Editorial from the Hartford Times of September 18, written by His Excellency, the bishop of Connecticut, the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien.

Bishop O'Brien has known Connecticut intimately since childhood. He has not only an eloquent appreciation of its natural beauties but an objective view of its industrial life as it should be assessed against the greater panorama of man's overriding needs in today's material world. In this moving essay he reminds us, as we need each day to be reminded, that "the key to peace is the invention of God."

Mr. President, here is a thoughtful and important piece of writing that I feel should be carried far beyond Connecticut and shared among all Americans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GUEST EDITORIAL

(By the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien)

(Bishop O'Brien was born in New Haven and is the second Connecticut-born man to head the diocese of Hartford. He was graduated from St. Thomas' Seminary, took philosophical studies at St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, N. Y., and studied the-

ology at the American College in Louvain, Belgium. He was ordained there in 1923 by the late Cardinal Mercier. He was assigned to St. Mary's Church in Windsor Locks and later to St. Thomas' Seminary and became its president in 1934. In 1940 he was made auxiliary bishop. He was named bishop by Pope Pius XII, April 17, 1945, succeeding the late Bishop Maurice F. McAuliffe.)

THE KEY TO PEACE OF SOUL

Mark Twain once wrote what was intended as a bitter satire on the ignorance and superstition of the so-called Dark Ages. By the device of transplanting a Connecticut Yankee to King Arthur's court and having him bring the blessings of modern industrialism to the benighted England of the sixth century, he placed in violent contrast the supposed light and glory of the machine age and the alleged darkness and degradation of an age of faith. It was an amusing book, not particularly well based historically, but undoubtedly expressing the sincere views of the great American humorist who was an adopted son of the Nutmeg State.

Would Mark Twain change his opinions today? When he wrote A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court, it was still believed in superior intellectual circles that the human race, fortified by the discoveries of science, had entered upon an era of steady progress upward. The earthly paradise was at hand, delayed only by such hampering relics of the past as supernatural religion and faith in God. The god of the machine, the god of physics and chemistry and electrical research, would solve all problems. In a little while, there would be everlasting peace and joy upon the face of the earth. Could Mark Twain hold such beliefs in the present era of insecurity and anxiety when the words of Jeremiahs have a renewed and fateful meaning, "Thus saith the Lord: We have heard a voice of terror, there is fear and no peace?"

Anyone who wishes to witness a climax of the industrial age need not go into the laboratories or factories of our time. He need only stand at the gateways of the great Charter Oak Bridge which spans the Connecticut River at Hartford. There on a summer Sunday he will see the proudest products of the industrial age and the mass production of the industrial age, the automobiles, pass in unending procession. Forty thousand cars, powered by that marvelous exemplar of scientific genius, the internal combustion engine, will pour by him in the course of the day. He may be vastly impressed.

But if he is more interested in the souls of men than in the machines which carry them, he will ask skeptically, "What are all these drivers and riders getting out of their passage? What is in their minds and hearts as they speed along the highways?" In too many cases the answer must be that they find nothing in their aimless travel save a brief respite from the gnawing anxieties of everyday life. Shadowing their minds, they have dark forebodings of future calamity and, weighing down their hearts, the heavy pressures of lives become too complicated and insecure to be borne.

Why do so many human beings live in anxiety? Why has life become so complicated and insecure? Certainly, here in the State which we all love, it is not for lack of gifts of nature and of man. Connecticut contains within her borders fair hills and lush valleys, broad rivers and sylvan lakes, busy cities, lovely country towns and primeval wildernesses seemingly as untouched and fresh as when the Indians were the only inhabitants. She has a proud history of science and invention, of literature and art. Her factories turn out a multitude of products, ranging from the clocks of Waterbury to the airplanes of East Hartford. Her sons and daughters, descendants of many nations and possessed of many skills, stand economically in the forefront of the world. Why

then is there no peace of mind and heart for so many who are our brethren?

The answer is old and it is simple. They have lost the key to true and lasting peace. It was taken from them by the so-called wise men of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who rejected God and the ordered laws of God and offered to humanity for adoration the golden calf of materialism. Of the first golden calf which the Israelites adored instead of God, the prophet Osee said, "It is the invention of Israel. A workman made it and it is no God." The modern golden calf is much the same. The inventions of men are not necessarily evil in themselves. For the most part they are potentially good. But when they are made into idols, the good perishes. As the Book of Wisdom says, "The invention of idols is the corruption of life. For neither were they from the beginning, neither shall they be forever. For by the vanity of men they came into the world; and therefore they shall be found shortly to come to an end."

The key to peace, for the world and for men, is not to be found in some new idol which is the invention of men. The key to peace is the invention of God. It is Christ and the supernatural religion which Christ left on earth. "My peace I leave unto you," said the Son of God. "My peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth, do I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, nor let it be afraid." Only those who have been granted the grace of a strong, abiding supernatural faith in Christ and Christ's religion know what that peace really means. Too many know it not. The glitter of the golden calf still blinds them and the clamor of the world hinders their hearing His words. "These things have I spoken to you that in Me you may have peace. In the world you shall have distress. But have confidence, I have overcome the world."

The Tidelands Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a timely and informative article entitled "Federal Government Claims No Inland Waters, Tidelands, Nor Harbors; Seeks Control Only of Mineral Lands Submerged by the Open Ocean," written by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] at the request of the North American Newspaper Alliance, and widely published throughout the Nation on Sunday, September 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CLAIMS NO INLAND WATERS, TIDELANDS, NOR HARBORS; SEEKS CONTROL ONLY OF MINERAL LANDS SUBMERGED BY THE OPEN OCEAN

(By JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Senator from Wyoming)

There is no tidelands controversy. The Federal Government is not now and never has attempted to "grab" any lands in any State covered by the tidewaters. In other words, the Federal Government is not and never has sought to seize from any coastal State the rich oil deposits of the tidelands.

Quite the contrary, some of the coastal States are seeking to snatch from the jurisdic-

diction of the Federal Government lands which are submerged by the open ocean which now, as from the foundation of this Government, are within the jurisdiction of the Federal authority.

The issue has been consistently, and I am persuaded, deliberately misrepresented by those who seek to invade the Federal domain. This has been done in the face of the most explicit declaration of Federal policy by the spokesmen of the Government and particularly by the former Attorney General, now Justice of the Supreme Court, Tom Clark. In opening the argument of the California case before the Supreme Court, he said in simple words that the case did not involve, and was not intended to involve, lands covered by tidewaters, by the waters of any harbor, inlet, or bay, or by the waters of any rivers or lakes. Thus the issue in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases before the Supreme Court involved only one controversy, namely, whether the States of the Federal Government had jurisdiction over lands submerged by the open ocean. The Court rules that such lands had always been within the domain of national sovereignty.

Much has been said in this argument about the State boundaries and the 3-mile limit. That the oceanward boundaries of any State or nation are an attribute of national sovereignty is demonstrated by the fact that the 3-mile limit was fixed in international law at a time when 3 miles was the distance a cannon ball could be shot from a seventeenth-century cannon. Under the Federal Constitution, the States cannot wage war. Only the United States can do that.

In our time, however, a cannon can shoot much further than 3 miles. In September 1945 President Truman issued a proclamation asserting jurisdiction for the United States and all its people over the Continental Shelf which is an area that extends beneath the open ocean in some places as far as 100 miles from shore.

That State boundaries mean nothing to those who are seeking to gain control of the wealth beneath the open ocean for certain coastal States is indicated by the fact that the so-called quitclaim bill now pending in Congress asserts that the coastal States are entitled to claim this area. It also attempts to vest in each coastal State a minimum "out" in all the revenues to be derived from the Continental Shelf.

Thus the record clearly shows that what is represented as a raid by the Federal Government on State property is in fact a raid by the coastal States upon lands which are not only within the Federal jurisdiction, but the wealth of which belongs to the people of all the interior States as well as to those of the coastal States.

This effort to persuade the Congress to give away to the coastal States lands beneath the open ocean comes at a time when all the taxpayers of all the States are digging deep into their pockets to maintain the military power, naval and air, sufficient to defend the open ocean. The \$59,000,000,000 National Defense Appropriation Act, the burden of which will be borne by people in every county and city of the United States, is a sufficient reason, it seems to me, why Congress should not permit the jurisdiction over the open ocean and the lands beneath it to be impaired.

This is particularly true since, as a matter of cold fact, the Federal Government is not now and never has sought to take away from any coastal State any producing well within any harbor. For example, every single well drilled to date by the city of Long Beach, Calif., is acknowledged by the Federal Government not to be taking oil from lands in which the Federal Government has paramount rights and the Federal Government is not claiming any such wells.

The same is true of the interim bill for administration of the submerged lands, Sen-

ate Joint Resolution 20, which I introduced on behalf of Senator ANDERSON and myself, and which has the unqualified approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General. This bill would not take away from the city of Long Beach a single oil well. For that matter, it would not take away from any State a single well nor a foot of submerged land to which a State or any subdivision of a State has title within any bay, harbor, or inlet.

Moreover, it passed, it would enable drilling, production, and exploration to be renewed immediately.

Drive Politics Out of the Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr MEADER Mr Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives passed H R 2982, increasing postal rates. Today, the House begins consideration of measures to increase pay for postal employees.

The operating deficit of the Post Office Department for recent years has exceeded a half billion dollars annually. The bill we passed yesterday is expected to bring in additional postal revenue for fiscal 1952. However, the bills, which are expected to pass, raising the pay of post office employees, will increase the cost of the Post Office Department by approximately \$250,000,000.

During the debate on these post office measures, the question of efficiency and economy of operation of the Post Office Department has played a prominent part. It has been argued that the post office service should be operated in a businesslike and efficient manner. On the other hand, it has been argued that the Post Office Department should not be expected to pay its own way because it is a public service.

This is a basic question upon which the policy of the Congress has never been too clear. I believe it is important that this policy should be clarified. This is particularly so in the light of the rapidly increasing intrusion of the Government into many fields of activity hitherto left to our citizens in private enterprise in this country. If the Government is to engage in business, should not its operations be conducted in an efficient and businesslike manner?

Because of the foregoing, it seems to me extremely important that a thorough and penetrating investigation should be made by the Congress of the Post Office Department in line with the recommendation in the minority report on H R. 2982, being House Report 547 of the Eighty-second Congress, first session. However, it seems to me that recommendation does not go far enough. It urges a review of subsidies to special segments of our population, the general efficiency of the Post Office Department, and the accounting system by which costs and revenues are recorded. It seems to me that such an investigation should ex-

plore the basic and fundamental problem which underlies the foregoing and other aspects of the Post Office Department; namely, the extent to which politics controls the operation of the Post Office Department.

The country was shocked by the disclosure of the sale of post-office jobs in the State of Mississippi by the Democratic Committee of Mississippi. The Investigations Committee of the Senate condemned these practices in no uncertain terms. That committee criticized the Post Office Department for its failure to notice and take action with respect to this corrupt and illegal sale of Federal jobs. The committee, in its conclusion No. 7 contained in Senate Report 445 of the Eighty-second Congress, first session, found as follows:

7. The Post Office Department is primarily responsible for selecting applicants for post-office positions from the civil-service eligible lists. If, as in this case, the Post Office Department seeks the advice and recommendations of the Mississippi Democratic Committee or any other group or individual, it cannot avoid its responsibility for failing to appoint qualified personnel in a legal and proper manner. The testimony is in conflict as to what, if any, actual notice the Post Office Department might have had concerning the sale of post office jobs in Mississippi prior to the public disclosures in this case. However, in view of the widespread and open selling of these jobs in Mississippi over a long period of time, the Post Office Department, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, should have discovered and put an end to this illegal practice long before the matter was brought to public attention in February 1951. The Post Office Department did, however, act vigorously and promptly to uncover the sale of postal jobs after the matter was brought to its attention by Congress.

There are indications that the use of the Post Office Department for political purposes, and the exaction of contributions from applicants to postmaster-ships to political campaign funds, is not confined to the State of Mississippi. I regret to say that my own State of Michigan which has prided itself on clean politics, seems also to be besmirched with what I regard as improper activities on the part of a political committee. There has come into my hands a letter on the stationery of the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan, addressed to an applicant for a position as postmaster, which reveals in a more subtle and less obvious way a policy on the part of the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan to exact contributions from applicants for positions in the Post Office Department. I include that letter at this point in my remarks. For obvious reasons, I have deleted names, dates, and places which might serve as a foundation for reprisal.

DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, Mich.

GEORGE S. FITZGERALD,
National Committeeman.
Mrs. MINNIE C. SCHWINGER,
National Committeewoman.

Our State chairman has just recommended your appointment as postmaster of _____, Mich., to _____. As you know, there are still several steps to be taken before

your appointment is finally confirmed, but judging from past experience you can now be reasonably sure of the final appointment.

In checking our contributor files, I do not find your name listed in our Democratic Green Book as a 1951 contributor.

Contributions to the Democratic Party are strictly voluntary and certainly your appointment is not contingent on a contribution. Yet strong party organization is essential to our American form of democratic government and we can't have such organization without a broad financial support from all members of our party.

I am sure that no lengthy argument is needed to convince you of the importance of contributing to the party of your choice. For your convenience, I enclose a pledge card and business-reply envelope and hope that you will soon join the several thousand other Democrats who now pay their party dues by this method.

Receipts for all contributions are issued by the national committee as well as the State central committee.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. HUNT,
Finance Director

Lest it be assumed that this was an isolated instance, I include another letter from an applicant for a position as postmaster, indicating the widespread existence of a practice of issuing appointments as postmaster to those who contribute substantially to the Democratic Party campaign funds:

HON. GEORGE MEADER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to ask your assistance, in regard to being appointed postmaster. I received my rate from the Civil Service Commission, and was No. 1 on the list for appointment, having a 10-point preference for my service disability. The law states that a veteran with a service disability should receive the appointment, unless he has a bad record, and not eligible for the appointment for the position, which is not my case.

I have been informed that the now acting postmaster has contributed about \$200 to the Democratic committee at ——— for his appointment. If this is the way the Civil Service Commission makes its appointments, what is the sense of conducting any examinations, or allowing any service-connected veterans' preference?

The acting postmaster, I understand, was rated third on the examination.

Yours very truly,

A further indication of the moral consequences of the injection of politics into what ought to be an efficient public service is indicated by a press dispatch, under date of June 2, which appeared in the Monroe Evening News, and from which I quote:

CURIOSITY DIMS MAN'S CHANCE FOR NEWPORT POSTMASTERSHIP

Curiosity, a human frailty, got the better of Julian Zochowski's judgment, and it probably has cost him appointment as postmaster at Newport. Zochowski has been acting postmaster for the last 14 months and previously had been a substitute carrier and clerk for a year and a half, building up a reputation which made his appointment a virtual certainty when he placed third in an examination for the post in February.

Now he stands little chance to receive the appointment. It all happened this way:

Assistant United States District Attorney James S. Soltesz, of Detroit, said a complaint was made several months ago that a letter

from Senator HOMER FERGUSON to a Newport resident had been opened. It was about the time applicants were expecting information on their standings in the civil-service examination.

Official-looking decoy letters were sent through the Newport office, and Zochowski, in a hearing in Federal court at Detroit yesterday, admitted opening one of the decoy letters. He immediately revealed it, curiosity satisfied.

"I knew I was due to get the job, but when the others got those letters, my curiosity just overcame me," he told Soltesz yesterday. "I don't know why I did it."

Zochowski was asked to come to Detroit for a talk Thursday and returned yesterday for the court hearing. A misdemeanor charge of opening mail without authority was placed, and he pleaded guilty. Soltesz said He is now under bond but has not been relieved of his duties as acting postmaster.

Perhaps one of the worst effects of the injection of political considerations into the business of carrying the mail is the deterioration of morale throughout the personnel in the postal service. I have received communications, both written and oral, from postal employees who are sincere, devoted, hard-working people who love their work and wish to be proud of the institution of which they are a part. I doubt that there has been any time when the morale of the postal service has been as low as it is today. The order of the Postmaster General, curtailing delivery service, directory service, window service, and imposing increasing hardships upon postal employees, issued as everyone knows for the purpose of clubbing Congress into an increased appropriation for the Post Office Department, has had its inevitable reaction on the clerks and mail carriers who actually do the burdensome work. They are no longer proud to belong to the organization, which once had as its shining motto.

Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night shall stay these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

Political exhortations, such as were quoted in the RECORD yesterday, made by the Vice President in an address to the Association of Postmasters, and political pep talks by Joseph Lawler, Assistant Postmaster General, and John Redding, Assistant Postmaster General, together with the disclosures I have referred to above in Mississippi and Michigan, cannot help but make the rank and file of the post-office workers feel disheartened and discouraged in spite of their affection for the service of which they once were proud.

Mr. Speaker, an investigation of the Post Office Department should be undertaken at once, and it should be broad enough to include an examination of the injection of politics of a low order into what ought to be an example of how the people, through their Government, can render a public service with an efficiency and an economy comparable to the operation of a private enterprise.

I earnestly urge that the House of Representatives take action to explore this vital subject forthrightly and without delay.

American Young People Are Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the young people of America are thinking these days more than most of us realize.

Evidence of this is a letter which I have received from 15-year-old Marie Genest of Waterville, Maine. I invite the attention of the Senate to her letter, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERVILLE, MAINE, September 17, 1951.

Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: I am 15 years old and attend my second year at the Waterville High School.

I am also very much interested in the world of tomorrow and it's people.

I think that unfunny funny books do very much damage and little if any good to American youth.

I ask you to please bring it up before the Senate for me.

Thank you.

Yours respectfully,

(MISS) MARIE GENEST.

Weekly Domestic Round-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARMAR D. DENNY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Chester Potter:

WEEKLY DOMESTIC ROUND-UP

(By Chester Potter)

WASHINGTON—Say the word "sulfur" to the average man on a bus or housewife in the kitchen and the chances are they'll reply: "and molasses."

They probably have never taken that old-time spring tonic but have heard or read about it. And that is the limit of their knowledge of sulfur.

Yet, sulfur—one of the basic chemical elements—is an indispensable ingredient in everything we eat, wear, or use.

And it is also one of the most critically short necessities of our defense and home-front programs. Ways to increase the supply and to distribute what we have most efficiently have been the subject of top-drawer international conferences.

When you realize the extent to which sulfur figures in the everyday life of peoples, it is easy to understand why it is on the top-drawer list.

It is used in the manufacture of the paper on which this story is printed; for all kinds

of paper; the farmer is its biggest user—for fertilizer; there are 35 pounds of it in the average automobile; 18 pounds in each ton of steel, and 65 pounds in each ton of rubber. It takes a pound of sulfur to make another pound of viscose rayon and there's two-fifths of a pound in every barrel of crude oil.

Sulfur is used in the manufacture of industrial explosives, paints, and pigments, the refining of metals and in almost all chemical processing.

It is essential in the production of foodstuffs, gasoline, soaps and detergents, clothing, containers, and construction materials.

"In the United States, approximately 70 pounds of sulfur are consumed annually for each man, woman, and child," says the Freeport Sulphur Co., second largest producer in the world.

That is 2 pounds more than the per capita consumption of beef in this country annually.

This gives an idea of the relative importance of sulfur in our everyday life. Now, for the first time since World War I, there is a shortage of this vitally important basic chemical element.

Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, in his second quarterly report to President Truman, reviewed the part this country has played in organizing in Washington the International Materials Conference, with 27 producing and consuming nations participating. Seven committees were set up to deal with critical materials. One of these was the "sulfur" committee.

(In Government releases, the word is spelled "sulfur" but the producing companies spell it "sulphur" and so does the dictionary.)

The committee has drawn up a proposed method for distribution and has made proposals for increasing production. Out of that came an announcement earlier this month from the International Materials Conference of a unanimous agreement to allocate the world supply to 30 countries and areas.

Early in June, the National Production Authority ordered sulfur suppliers to ship sulfur only when authorized by NPA and to limit consumers to last year's rate of consumption. NPA said "at the present rate of use there just isn't enough sulfur to go around."

Dr. James Boyd, Defense Minerals Administrator and Director of the Bureau of Mines, also says the "sulfur situation is critical." He added that the problem "is the kind that can be solved" and that private industry and not the Government can provide the solution. The industry, he said, is "doing all it can to step up production."

And while industry is "doing all it can," Freeport Sulphur has announced that "farmers this year may have to get along with about 20 percent less fertilizer because of the growing shortage." One-third of the more than 5,000,000 tons of sulfur produced in this country—about half the world production—ultimately goes into fertilizer.

The shortage first developed last year, when 350,000 tons had to be taken from reserves to meet demands. But at the first of this year, the reserve stockpiles held only 6 months' supply, which should not be touched. Freeport says "current needs will have to be met from current production."

Reasons for the shortage, says Freeport, are: Greater demands from abroad; a disproportionate increase in domestic requirements; the low price of brimstone (native sulfur), which has tended to discourage development of higher-cost sources; and the difficulty of finding new sulfur deposits.

Almost all of this country's sulfur comes from the Gulf coast. In 1897, a company looking for oil found sulfur in a salt dome.

Since then, 12 domes have been located and 5 of these have been depleted.

"Extensive explorations have failed to uncover any additional fields of sulfur similar to those from which sulfur is now being mined," NPA says.

The principal source of sulfuric acid, aside from native sulfur, is pyrites, metal sulfide minerals containing 25 to 50 percent sulfur. That was once this country's principal source and is still a major source in foreign companies.

But obtaining sulfur from pyrites is more expensive than getting it from the domes. So, NPA is now granting certificates of necessity to firms which are converting to pyrites burners and other sources of sulfuric acid, and is discouraging construction of plants which require sulfur burners.

Sulfuric acid also is being obtained from sulfur recovered from sour gas and petroleum refining. Still another source is from smelter gases and from coal.

Freeport recently announced that it is building a sulfur mining plant at Bay Ste. Elaine, in Louisiana. This project, not to be completed until late 1952, lies along a desolate and exposed stretch of coastal marsh, subject to severe storms, hurricanes, and high water.

More than half the dome is under water and the rest is in unstable marshland—floating islands of decayed grass resting on ooze. To meet these obstacles, Freeport is building its plant on barges at Grand Ecaille, 75 miles away, and will float it to the site.

A Code of Ethics for Men in Public Office?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is futile to write a code of ethics for men in public office when the Commander in Chief does not, by acts rather than words, hew to the line.

Note the following from the Chicago Tribune of last Monday, September 17:

CHAIRMAN BOYLE'S PRETTY STORY

William M. Boyle, who rose from Pendergast police commissioner to the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee, recently denied that he used political influence to obtain RFC loans. Let's see:

The loans that put Boyle on the spot were those to the American Lithofold Corp., of St. Louis. Boyle was on the payroll of this company shortly before he became national chairman. Later it was disclosed that when he quit drawing money from the concern, his law partner replaced him and got \$13,000 for supposed services that an official of the company was unable to describe.

Boyle's connections with the company were brought to light in July, when a Senate committee was investigating RFC loans. Boyle admitted, but sought to minimize, his fees from the company, and at the same time entered a blanket denial that he had sought to get Government money for his clients. President Truman came to the defense of his man with a statement on August 9, in which he said, in part:

"I have examined the facts concerning William Boyle's alleged relationship to RFC loans to the American Lithofold Corp. of St. Louis. The facts I have obtained indi-

cate that Mr. Boyle had nothing to do with the approval of those loans by the RFC.

"I think it would be highly improper for the chairman of a national political committee to use his contacts with Government officials for his own private gain. I would not condone such conduct for a moment."

Last week the Senate investigations subcommittee called before it J. E. Toole, a former loan official of another Government lending agency, the Small War Plants Corporation. Toole went to work as treasurer of American Lithofold in 1944, after the SWPC had lent the company \$1,671,000 on his recommendation.

He testified that the corporation again needed money in 1949, applied to the RFC, and was turned down by both the St. Louis office of the agency and headquarters in Washington. Toole then pulled out his diary and read an entry for February 28, 1949:

"Got the bad news of the loan decline from Charlie Griffin (an RFC loan examiner) at 10.45 and went immediately to Chauncey Dodd's office and discussed ways and means to meet this second decline."

"After lunch, Cecil Green (Washington lobbyist for the firm), R. J. Blauner (president of the company), and I went to see Bill Boyle, who phoned Harley Hise, chairman of the RFC, and we (R. J. and me) were in the office at 4:30 p. m."

Toole and Blauner won a reconsideration of the loan that day. It was granted on March 3. Toole testified that nothing had happened to cause the RFC to change its previous views on the unsuitability of the loan, aside from Boyle's intervention.

That's the story, although there are some interesting details concerning intervention by other Pendergast operators to get another loan for the company, and to steer business to it from liquor companies subject to Government regulation.

Mr. Truman said in August that it would be "highly improper" for the national chairman to do what Boyle did, and that he would not condone it for a moment. What does he say now?

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION REGARDING FLOOD CONTROL

The recent superflood on the Missouri River resulted in a billion dollars in damages, unprecedented loss of life, crops, and homes and property, notwithstanding the billions of Federal funds thrown into giant-size flood-control dams and levees, the billions of our topsoil wealth forever lost to Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, the destruction of bridges and highways, and the wastage of our water resources.

All of these 1951 happenings should convince every person interested in our country's future, of the woeful neglect and grievous errors that have been made in regard to the control of our waterways and the general preservation of our natural resources. More and more people of the Midwest, who have not heretofore given the question a thought, are coming to the sound conclusion that our big billion-dollar dams are worth

but little as aids to flood control and comparatively little contribution to natural-resources conservation, that heretofore our Federal authorities have commenced flood-control projects at the wrong ends of our larger rivers, whereas they should have spent the larger part of the public moneys up on the hillsides where the rains first hit the earth, after which their efforts for flood control should continue downstream to the rivers' ends. That it is reliably estimated by the United States Government engineers that not less than 75 percent of the over-all flood damage in the country in 1951 occurred back on the hillsides where there were a million small floods running down in gullies and eroding our fertile hillsides and resulting in irreparable loss to the production of foodstuffs. And experience has proved that these millions of small rivulets and gullies and creeks and tributary streams can be controlled. And that floodwaters from these small rivulets and gullies and creeks and streamlets should be controlled by retarding and slowing down the water runoffs in the construction of thousands of small dams on the hillsides, by terrace farming, by retaining lakes and ponds, by grassed runoffs, by "upstream engineering" methods and improved soil-conservation practices in fields and pastures—all of which, in turn, is the best help for flood control on our larger Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Therefore be it

Resolved by the Clarinda Kiwanis Club (representing a membership of 100 men engaged in business, professions, labor, and farming in and about the community of Clarinda, Iowa), That we oppose all acts of Congress appropriating any more funds for the construction of big dams, unless like-sized sums be appropriated for flood controls and conservation practices on the hillsides where the millions of little floods start; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose any further so-called MVA's and CVA's on the plan of TVA; the objection to all such "valley authorities" being that they are Fascist dictatorships in their essence and deprive the various States of local democratic powers reserved to them under the Constitution.

W F STIPE, *Chairman,*
DON DRAKE,
RAY FINLEY,
E E FREELAND,
M E MONTGOMERY,
HAROLD E. DAVIDSON,
A. B. TARRANT,

Members,
Public Affairs Committee of Clarinda
Kiwanis Club

Code of Fair Conduct for Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following excellent editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News:

CODE OF FAIR CONDUCT FOR INVESTIGATIONS

How can the fundamental rights of private citizens be protected from reckless abuse by Congressmen and Senators without, at the same time, unduly hampering the investigative power of Congress?

This is not a partisan issue that disturbs all good citizens.

Several keen students of the problem have recommended the delegation of certain types of inquiries to bodies outside of Congress. Regardless of the merits of such arguments and the numerous precedents cited for congressional delegation of the investigative function, it is clear that Congress would not abdicate its responsibility. Congress is too zealous of its power and prerogatives to consider such a new approach to the problem.

Obviously a ban on special committees is no solution. This would have no effect on minimizing abuses, assuring fairness of investigations or protecting witnesses.

Another proposed reform is the voluntary adoption of self-imposed rules by individual committees to guide their conduct, and such measures have been taken by certain committees. Such action is to be commended for its vision and pioneering in the field of committee reform.

However, it seems evident that rules imposed by individual committees themselves, while a step in the right direction, are not the final answer. No half-way measure should stand in the way of congressional action establishing rules for proper procedure for all committees.

SHOULD ADOPT CODE OF FAIR CONDUCT

A code of fair conduct for all investigating groups, adopted by House and Senate as part of their standing rules, would have the effect of avoiding confusion and promoting uniformity. It would give Congress and the country a yardstick by which to test the performance of every committee investigation. A code of procedure for administrative agencies has been established. Why not a code for congressional committees?

This is precisely the solution offered by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee in Senate Concurrent Resolutions 44 and 45.

These resolutions go directly to the core of the general criticism against congressional investigating committees which are centered around these points:

(a) Congressional investigations frequently assume the aspects of a trial of an individual without safeguards of regular court proceedings.

(b) Legislators appear in the role of judges and combine the functions of prosecuting and judging which should be separated.

(c) The witnesses may be exposed to such penalties as loss of their jobs, character assassination, or injury to their reputation, as a result of the attendant publicity.

(d) Appearances before investigative committees are not subject to procedures laid down by Congress.

(e) Legal rights of individuals guaranteed by the Bill of Rights are abridged by congressional investigations. Another objection—somewhat intangible, but of great danger to a democracy—is the fact that conformity to prevailing ideas is enforced by fear of censure before a congressional committee. In this connection the question is raised whether some investigations do not impose tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling which John Stuart Mill once described as tendency of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them."

WOULD GIVE ACCUSED CHANCE TO REPLY

In brief, Resolution No. 44 provides only that insofar as practicable a member of Congress who intends to name an individual or an organization in a derogatory manner shall first notify the individual or organization of the nature of the charges to be made. The individual or organization may then file with the clerk of the House or the secretary of the Senate a sworn statement, if he

so desires, giving his side of the story—and his sworn statement shall be read on the floor and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the charges.

Resolution No. 45, in substance, provides:

1. That a person or organization shall be notified of the nature of the charges against him, of the matters to be inquired into, and of the derogatory material to be presented.

2. That he be given an opportunity to present evidence in his own behalf.

3. That he be permitted counsel, who shall be entitled to question him within appropriate limits in order to bring out all pertinent facts.

4. That he be permitted to file a limited number of interrogatories to be answered by witnesses who have testified to derogatory materials.

5. That he be permitted to file at the conclusion of the evidence a rebuttal statement.

There are also outlined safeguards regarding subpoenas, safeguards for information in executive session, safeguards for the private affairs of individuals.

RESOLUTION TAKES HEED OF TELEVISION

This resolution takes heed of television, which is a new method of communication but one that is here to stay and with which we shall have to deal, just like any other method of communication. In other words, these same rules would apply, whether the hearing is conducted in executive session, covered only by the press, or covered by the press, still cameramen, radio, newsreels, television, and so on. The resolution places the responsibility upon the chairman of the committee to see to it that none of the communication devices annoy the witnesses. If the chairman decides they do, then it is his responsibility to see that the annoyance is ceased.

Senator KEFAUVER does not claim for these resolutions any finality of draftsmanship. They deal with problems that have worried everyone and the proposed resolutions are the best solutions that a number of Senators, thinking and working together, could produce as a starting point. Undoubtedly, there will be many more ideas on the subject—and Congress would do well to welcome them all as these resolutions pass through committee and floor consideration; partisanship should be kept out. The resolutions deal with matters regarding things that are very fundamental in the lives of our citizens and our country—and there is no place for partisanship in such fundamental matters.

Boston District Office, Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and memorandum:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: With reference to our telephone conversation this morning, the following facts are submitted per your request.

While the district office was in operation here in Boston it occupied 89,183 square feet

of space. At the present time we are trying to relocate the Boston district office in Philadelphia through various consolidations into 65,000 square feet of space. This has created a tremendous problem in arranging the activity to permit working areas large enough for efficient operation. These working areas must of necessity, under the circumstances, be kept at an absolute minimum since most of the space is occupied by equipment of one type or another. As I understand it, some consideration is being given to double-decking our 5-drawer steel file cabinets which house the basic insurance records. If this is done it will mean that the file clerks will have to operate from ladders. Since the beginning of this move to Philadelphia the space assigned to the Boston district office has been reduced on three different occasions. I have no way of knowing at this time whether further reductions in space assignment will be made.

As of July 1 this district office had assigned to it 833 people. Of this 833 people 278 have transferred or are in the process of transferring to Philadelphia. Of these people transferring to Philadelphia by far the majority are doing so only because there is nothing available at the moment here in Boston and I feel sure that many will return from Philadelphia as they find jobs in this area. Of the remaining 555 employees 92 have been successful in finding other jobs. The balance, 463, are floundering badly in Boston since this has always been a very critical labor market. From talking with some of the employees who have surveyed the Philadelphia area we find that living is more expensive in that area than locally here in Boston, particularly in the matter of rents because of the number of industrial concerns in the area with their higher pay scale. It has always seemed to me that there was some move afoot to completely drain this New England area of possibilities for gainful employment for its population.

It would be difficult to try to draw to your attention any hardship cases of personnel because of this shift of activities. You must realize, of course, that we have a large number of disabled veteran employees and as I mentioned above, throwing 463 into this poor labor market will cause untold hardships to all of these people. I do not think it necessary for me to expound to any length on the less efficient service that will be rendered by the Veterans' Administration. These facts have already been proven in investigation.

I hope these facts and figures that I have set forth here, which I am submitting at your request, will prove to be beneficial.

Very truly yours,

A FRIEND

SEPTEMBER 18, 1951.

Re Veterans' Administration, Boston district office, insurance division.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Two young men who were employed by the Boston district office of the Veterans' Administration wanted you to know the following:

The space at the Atwater-Kent Building in Philadelphia is insufficient for the Veterans' Administration.

The addressograph unit, which was due to report to Philadelphia September 17, is not to report now until September 24, as space had to be found for this unit. This unit is to be located across the street in the Philco Building—they believe it is called.

The result will be that bills will have to be carried across the street from the above unit to another insurance division unit to be verified, then returned back to the addressograph unit to be sent out.

Strength of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
August 14, 1951.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Armed Services
Committee, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VINSON: You may be interested in the views of just another naval officer, although retired, relative to the action of your committee on S 677.

In my opinion, it is not only the right, but the duty of Congress to prescribe the strength of the Marine Corps. That strength should be in consonance with the duties and responsibilities which the Congress has specified. If these functions are not a duplication, the strength of the corps will not be a duplication.

In this connection, it seems to me the time has come to be realistic. We might as well recognize that there are those who have tried to abolish the corps, notwithstanding their loud claims to the contrary. The objections to S 677 are merely a continuation of that effort.

As to membership in the JCS, the Commandant has specialized training and experience, particularly through operations with the other services which are not paralleled by any other member of the JCS. Nor does any other member have the same experience or qualification in marine specialties, particularly amphibious operations. The inclusion of this officer would, in my opinion, add significantly to the sound judgment and the over-all value of the JCS.

In closing, may I say that the statesmanship and sound judgment of your committee and yourself, as evidenced, for example in Report No. 686, and Unification and Strategy, is a source of confidence and encouragement to citizens and taxpayers like myself.

Very sincerely yours,

Admiral J. W. RIVERS, Jr.,
United States Navy (Retired)

Crime on the New York-New Jersey

Water Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, ever since the start of the hearings before the Special Crime Investigating Committee, I have urged a complete study of crime on the New York-New Jersey water front. Unfortunately, such a study has not been completely made up to this time. I now send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this issue, along with certain printed ma-

terial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAN UP THE WATER FRONT—STATEMENT BY
SENATOR WILEY

I want to commend those of my colleagues who serve on the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee who have introduced Senate Resolution 207 which would provide for \$150,000 for the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to continue the investigation of crime throughout the Nation. Among the sponsors of this resolution are my able associates from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART; from Ohio, Mr. BRICKER, from Maine, Mr. BRWSTER, from Missouri, Mr. KENNEDY, and from New Hampshire, Mr. TOLSON.

To me, it seems very unfortunate that the Senate or any of its committees should even consider delaying action on a proposal of this sort. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is a lot of money, but it is small, indeed, when one thinks of the tremendous amount of good that could be accomplished by such a sum, the amount of good in terms of increased tax revenue which could be secured for Uncle Sam from those criminals who have evaded their fair share of liability thus far. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is small, too, when one considers that one State in the Union, New York, alone has provided a quarter of a million dollars for its State crime commission. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is small in relation to the estimates that American gambling and affiliated crime syndicates cost us some \$20,000,000,000 a year. I repeat—\$20,000,000,000.

But you cannot reckon the cost of crime in terms of money alone. A single innocent individual whose business is muscled into by gangsters, a single individual whose life is threatened by hoodlums, a single individual who is beaten or killed by the mob—such an individual cannot have his losses reckoned in terms of money alone.

When one thinks of the hundreds of thousands of individuals, yes the millions affected by crime, one sees how inconsequential is the sum that is being asked.

WATER FRONT IS PARTICULAR KEY ISSUE

I have repeatedly pointed out that one of the worst situations in America today prevails along the New York-New Jersey water front. I have spoken to private citizens and public officials alike who have wrestled with the problem, and they have stated and restated the fact that nothing short of a complete Federal investigation can possibly meet this challenge head-on. The New York City Anticrime Commission, the New York State Anticrime Commission, public officials in New Jersey cities and at the State level in Trenton, have all pointed out that water-front crime is an interstate matter which can hardly be adequately dealt with by separate municipalities and separate States, even assuming the most complete voluntary cooperation between them. They do not have the income tax power and data that Uncle Sam possesses, they do not have the unlimited jurisdiction; they do not have the prestige.

It is Uncle Sam whose job it is to clean up the water front and then to have the job carried on by State and local officials.

The water front is an international problem, too, because obviously hundreds of millions of dollars of world shipments are involved.

Often I have stated that organized piracy alone on the water front would make Captain Kidd green with envy. I have stated

that the water front is a breeding ground for practically every known vice, whether it be the numbers racket, usury, organized prostitution, alien smuggling, dope smuggling, kick-backs, etc. Down through the years, there have been a considerable number of exposures of water-front crime. But invariably they have fallen short of the mark. Somehow, the same condition persists year after year. Somehow the unholy alliance between some questionable elements in labor and in the shipping business continue to exact a staggering toll on the ultimate American consumer.

UNCLE SAM MUST SHOW WHO IS BOSS

Well, I for one feel that the time is long overdue when the United States Government must indicate to the organized hoodlumism of the water front who is going to be boss, the big shots in water-front crime or Uncle Sam. The present situation on the water front is a cancerous one which can be suicidal for New York-New Jersey shipping if it remains unchecked. It is somewhat paradoxical that the west coast, which I have just visited in connection with the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty, faces the problem of a Communist stranglehold on the water front, while this section of the east coast faces the problem of a criminal stranglehold.

WATER-FRONT SITUATION GETTING WORSE

Now I want to be fair to all the many honest individuals who are working on the water front, including both employers and employees. The public should not assume that every man connected with the water front is to be suspect. The greatness of that Atlantic port area is an awesome thing. At the same time, however, I am merely stating a fact when I say that aspects of the New York-New Jersey water-front situation smell. The situation smells bad. It smells very bad, and the smell is getting worse all the time. I use blunt language because the time has come for us to speak bluntly, and, more important, to act decisively on the plain facts.

NUMEROUS GROUPS HAVE EXPOSED WATER FRONT

I was tremendously interested to read in the September 12 issue of the magazine *People Today*, issued by the Hillman Publications of New York, a write-up entitled "Who Is Mr. Big?" This write-up follows a notable series of other contributions on this problem. I refer to—

(a) Mr. Malcolm Johnson, 1949 Pulitzer prize winner, whose sensational exposures of the water front set an inspiring example of what can be done by a courageous reporter, editor, and newspaper in combating crime.

(b) *Fortune Magazine's* comprehensive article on the water-front racket in the June 1951 issue was a brilliant job of reporting and analyzing.

(c) The Columbia Broadcasting System which set a new high in radio documentary features by its broadcast of tape-recorded interviews on the water front and elsewhere in its Nation's Nightmare series.

SOME CONTEND THERE IS A MR. BIG, OTHERS DOUBT IT

It is the conclusion of all of these various news-gathering and reporting organs that there is a single kingpin of water-front crime, a Mr. Big. There are others who disagree and who contend that water-front crime is so vast, so complicated, so rough that no single individual could or does control it.

I believe that the article in *People Today* was, however, an important contribution to public thinking about this issue, and so I am having it appended to my statement in the hope that it will contribute to a further awakening of public opinion and to a further complete review of this whole problem. I, for one, cannot subscribe to all that this article alleges, but I do think that the article is a courageous job.

ALL INDIVIDUALS ENTITLED TO LEGAL RIGHTS

Let me make this point quite clear: I personally have always felt that individuals accused of crimes are entitled to a fair break in a thoroughly legal and American manner, and so I am anxious that there be a thorough, careful, judicious examination of the facts about any single "Mr. Big" or any other group of individuals alleged to be in control of crime. There must be no smearing.

Now, I should like to conclude this presentation of these comments:

For all the work that has been done on the crime problem we always come back to the single conclusion that basically it is up to the individual citizen to do his part in helping to stamp out crime. In turn it is upon the individual's moral standards that the ultimate hope for victory in the crusade against crime rests.

SENATOR WILEY'S ARTICLE IN LOOKOUT MAGAZINE

It is for that reason that in the August 1951 issue of the magazine *Lookout*—a periodical of Christian education for older young people and adults, published in Cincinnati, Ohio, I was happy to contribute an article on the subject *The Christian in Public Life*. I took as my principal point of comment the recent disclosures by our Special Crime Investigating Committee, and I analyzed their meaning in terms of American morality. I ask that this article be appended to my comments following this statement.

Just yesterday I placed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, beginning on page A5711 materials on the crime problem. I shall continue to do so because the war against crime must carry on. There can never be a let-up or else the battle can be lost.

Criminals, as I have pointed out repeatedly, are accustomed to riding out storms. They know how to lay low, so to speak, until the heat blows over. I am hoping that the heat on the water front can be continued indefinitely so as to smash the rackets there for good.

[From *People Today*]

THE REASON WHY CRIME INVESTIGATORS AND THE PRESS CAN'T EXPOSE MR. BIG BY NAME

(*People Today* is armed with information on the Nation's top racket tycoon. *People Today* doesn't dare state his identity. We are in the same position as Malcolm Johnson, New York Sun reporter who covered crime on the water front and wrote a book about it; in the same position as Dan Bell, who wrote *Fortune's* water front rackets article in the June 1951 issue; in the same position as CBS which, in its current Nation's Nightmare crime series, finds itself unable to name Mr. Big. The reason: There is not sufficient legal evidence to convict him, even though an informed circle of prominent people, including honest law-enforcement officers, well know his identity.)

THE STORY OF HOW MR. BIG GRABBED ABSOLUTE CONTROL OF NEW YORK'S CRIME-INFESTED WATER FRONT

It is frequently said that New York's water-front accounts for more murders per square yard than any other part of the United States. It also boasts of every other crime in the book—narcotics smuggling, organized theft of valuable cargo, alien smuggling, extortion, bookmaking, loan sharking, payroll padding, wage kick-backs. The New York water front unquestionably is the most concentrated single area of United States crime.

Who is the behind-the-scenes director of this gangster jungle? Who is the real boss of the water front?

Ordinary longshoremen have known his name for years. His identity also is known to newspaper reporters, water front labor experts, some city officials, the district attorney, some investigators of other law-enforcement

bodies. They know his history well, and they express no doubt that he is the kingpin. One of them has said, by way of comparison with Mr. Big, "Frank Costello is just a whipping boy. There is no doubt that Mr. Big's powers extend beyond the water front, beyond the city, beyond the State."

Yet those who know Mr. Big are convinced that he has come such a long way from his beginnings and has so shrouded himself in respectability that today he actually regards himself as a somewhat saintly character.

Mr. Big was spawned in New York's Greenwich Village, home base for the mobs around the turn of the century. He began his illustrious career as an ordinary truck driver in the days when trucks were horse-drawn vehicles. He is said to have had a police record; but if he had, it is no longer in the files. He first became a figure on the water front around 1917, when he joined a mob which controlled the piers from Fourteenth Street north to Thirty-fourth Street, where Owney Madden's mob took over. The domain controlled by Mr. Big's mob was known as *The Beef*, because the principal commodity handled on those piers was beef and other meat—a gold mine during World War I and postwar years when huge shipments were made to feed our Army and later the peoples of war-devastated countries. Shortly after Mr. Big appeared, a rival hoodlum was killed by two gunmen who, water front investigators say, were hired by Mr. Big. Some time later, one of the gunmen was killed in Hoboken. And not long after that, the mob leader was killed, and Mr. Big took over *The Beef*.

This gave him his first substantial wealth. He immediately—as gangsters today do—invested in legitimate enterprises. Mr. Big's investments brought him into close association with the late Sam Rosoff, who was engaged in city contracts. Investigators say that a deal for rubbish collection in the city was negotiated with high city officials, during the tenure of Jimmy Walker, at a club at Fourteenth Street and Eighth Avenue. In any event, Rosoff soared to prominence after Walker became mayor. His published obituaries said his city subway contracts amounted up to \$50,000,000.

Mr. Big, investigators say, has varied interests: He is reported to have been the financial backer of a former world heavyweight champion fighter. As a big truck owner, he was a rum runner during prohibition. And in the 1930's he poked his gluey finger into unions far from the waterfront, although still in Manhattan.

Today he moves in the most prominent business and social circles, frequently dines at El Morocco, lives luxuriously, far removed from his waterfront empire.

"NO CRIME ON WATER FRONT," SAYS ILA'S JOSEPH RYAN

The life of Joseph Patrick Ryan is inextricably interwoven with the New York waterfront. It has been in the past, and it undoubtedly will be in the future, for Ryan has been elected lifetime president of the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL.

Ryan has been labeled by the press as virtual dictator of the waterfront, known by investigators as the core of United States crime. But Ryan, despite his fast rise to control of the ILA, is definitely not Mr. Big. Member of a desperately poor family; he grew up in the Chelsea District of Manhattan, quit school at the age of 12 to go to work. He got his first waterfront job as a longshoreman in 1912, joined the ILA the same year. By 1918 he was an international vice president, by 1927 he was president, and by 1943 his union made it official for life, at \$20,000 annually, plus expenses of \$800 a month for which he does not have to account.

With the possible exception of John L. Lewis, Ryan has been attacked more bitterly

and more often than any labor leader in history. In 1946 a citizens' water-front committee in a published report quoted a leading stevedore operator describing management-union negotiations: "We call in Ryan once a year or so and say, 'Joe, how much of a raise do you need to keep the boys in line?' " The committee report described the ILA as undemocratic and notoriously graft and racketeer ridden. There is little doubt that the union leadership has been unable or unwilling to take the lead in . . . wiping out the grafts and rackets which sustain them.

To such charges Ryan turns a deaf ear and a blind eye. He sees no evil, hears no evil, speaks no evil of the water front. Gangsterism, rackets, organized crime? "Ridiculous," snaps Ryan.

Ryan, burly red-faced, his once bristly red hair now iron gray, likes the luxuries that come with his position and wealth. He likes good food and eats in the most fashionable restaurants. He likes expensive but conservative suits and shirts, expensive but far from conservative ties, bulky rings and cufflinks. He neither swears nor smokes, but he does drink. He is a good family man, and a church-going man.

Ryan loves to make speeches, and the one he loves best begins: "I glory in the friends I have made in high places." He isn't fooling. In 1923 the Joseph P. Ryan Association was founded as a private social club. At the annual gala dinners (\$15 a plate) he hobnobs with the very best people, even though known water front criminals also attend. Back in 1931 these names were listed as honorary chairmen of the shindig: Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York; the late Mayor Jimmy Walker, Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City, and William Green, president of the A. F. of L.

At this year's annual gala, the guest list was every bit as distinguished. Chairman of the arrangements committee was William J. McCormack, president of the Penn Stevedoring Co., which handles the Pennsylvania and Erie Railroad piers, and of the Transit-Mix Concrete Corp., with offices on the thirteenth floor of a building at 136 E. Fifty-seventh Street. Mr. McCormack, who is active in Democratic political circles, has been repeatedly called in by the city as an authority on the water-front ever since 1948 when then Mayor O'Dwyer appointed him to mediate the tugboat strike. Last December Mayor Impellitteri congratulated him for successfully mediating a tug contract that runs through 1953. McCormack, however, was an old and good friend of Ryan's, rating a high place on the guest list long before he became the city's favorite water-front arbitrator.

Vice chairman of arrangements was Harry M. Durning, collector of customs of the port of New York since 1933.

An almost limitless list of other guests were present, including Mayor Impellitteri; Police Commissioner Murphy; Chief Magistrate John Murtagh; John A. Coleman, governor of the New York Stock Exchange; Thomas J. Curran, president of the New York County Republican Committee; Robert F. Wagner, Jr., Manhattan Borough president.

At the same dinner there were other guests prominent in somewhat different circles: Willie Cox, an Elmira penitentiary alumnus, and Mike Clemente, boss of East River piers, also an ex-convict.

And in his own very exclusive circle—"Mr. Big."

NATION'S NIGHTMARE; CRIME

A number of staffers at CBS know who Mr. Big is. They found out in the course of gathering material for their August 16 crime-on-the-water-front broadcast, one of the hard-hitting, authentic, documentaries in the Nation's Nightmare series on crime.

Determined to pick up where the Kefauver committee left off, Hubbell Robinson, CBS

veep, conceived of the documentary as a public service—and shocked people across the Nation out of their customary apathy. CBS's vast staff went into action in six key crime fields, narcotics, casino gambling, racetrack gambling, policy and numbers, water-front crime, and sports gambling.

They came up with nightmare shockers, none more sensational than the water-front exposé. Its sparkplug was Irving Githin, 33-year-old ex-science reporter and teacher, who has produced and written the entire series. Working with him day and night were CBS reporters, among them Dave Moore, 32, a Peabody award winner, whose work with the tape recorder has largely been instrumental in shaping *Nightmare*. For days Githin and Moore were deep in the recording of the actual voices of men on the water front who named names, cited chapter and verse on crime, and told who was responsible.

For the first time in history, CBS has made it possible for people to eavesdrop on the water front, hear the sordid story of Mr. Big's rise to power. Heeding the insistent demand of listeners, CBS will repeat the water-front documentary on September 27, at 9:30.

WHO CAN NAME MR. BIG?

The crime that is bred on New York's water front, the crime that crosses State boundaries and international borders is far too complex and far too enormous for city or State law enforcement agencies. They have neither the resources nor the money to cope with the tightly knit, skillfully organized, well-heeled, politically protected, lawyer-guarded mob.

But the United States has a body of men, presumably competent to deal with the mob, and to determine the identity of Mr. Big. It is the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

The committee, however, for reasons unknown, has not called on men of the caliber of Joseph P. Ryan and William J. McCormack. Why hasn't the committee called these men, and others equally well informed on water-front problems—men like Harry Durning, New York port customs collector; A. F. of L. President William Green; Joseph Peter Grace, president of Grace Lines. These are men whose activities have brought them in direct contact with the water front, men who must be aware, at least, of the graft and corruption that breeds on the water front and ultimately exacts a levy on every American citizen.

Surely these men have information which, if properly checked by Federal authorities, could lead to the identification, apprehension, and conviction of Mr. Big.

[From the Lookout for August 1951]

THE CHRISTIAN IN PUBLIC LIFE

"Ultimately, success in the war against crime depends on the uplifting of standards of public and private morality, a rededication to basic spiritual values, which will entail righteous indignation over crime and corruption. To this end, the committee looks with confidence to the great force of religion and morality as applied in all phases of life and to sound education of the generations which follow."

These words are found on page 188 of a committee print of the third report of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. For over one year, we members of the committee (popularly known as the Kefauver Committee) have visited the length and breadth of this Nation, seeking out instances of crime and corruption. I personally have investigated in Washington, Kansas City, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, and some other cities. Following each of our disclosures, following all our legislative suggestions for reforms, the committee has come back to the basic point that it is upon religion that the

ultimate solution of crime and corruption depends.

This is no new conclusion. As a matter of fact, this solution—man's return to God—ever has been available to us poor mortals. What miracles we could achieve if we but realized it and made use of the dynamic force for human happiness, for peace and prosperity, that is inherent in Christianity, if we but applied spiritual principles in every phase of our daily lives.

"Sound education," such as the Crime Committee recommended, means obviously more than teaching the A B C's to the Nation's young—more than stuffing heads with geography, chemistry, grammar, etc. Sound education involves, basically, the inculcation of moral principles on the minds of our Nation's youth.

Now, there can be few greater satisfactions than the joy of helping to mold the minds of youngsters along creative, constructive lines. My own dear wife for many years taught in Sunday school, as did other members of our family. Every moment devoted to this task was in itself a blessing, a joy, a measure of personal fulfillment, a measure of service to God and to one's country. In Acts 5:28—as my readers so well know—are related the words of Peter to the council: "We ought to obey God, rather than men."

And so, I salute the tens of thousands of Sunday-school teachers throughout the Nation for their obedience to our Lord, for their inspiring contribution to the service of God and, yes, indeed, the service of their fellow men.

The more I have worked with the crime committee the more I have been convinced that if we did a better job of teaching our youngsters at mother's knee, in Sunday school, in grade school, high school, and institutions of higher learning, the dreadful problems that we face today would present themselves rarely. Problems of gambling as a \$20,000,000,000 industry, of criminals infiltrating into legitimate business, of wild teen-age youngsters arrested on narcotics jags, of scandalous basketball sell-outs, of bloody gangland slayings, of corruption of public officials, of casinos running wide open, of thousands of homes broken because the breadwinners' pay envelopes have been used to put money down on horse races, could have been kept from developing had more emphasis been placed on the right kind of teaching.

You and I and all like-minded Americans must recognize that the best way to smash crime is to stop it before it starts. How? By spiritual education of the highest order.

But this conclusion on our part need not be based solely on revelations of the Senate crime committee. You and I know from the revelations of other Federal, State, and local investigating groups that the problem of public morality is one of the most challenging problems of our age, if not the most challenging.

You have read the stories of shady practices in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. You have read of the mink-coat gifts, the deep-freezer gifts. You have read of other disclosures that indicate there has been a decay of men's spiritual core.

Well, then, I repeat, how are we to solve the problem? By a rededication to spiritual values, a personal and mass moral reinvigoration on the basic principles of the Gospel.

It is not enough for the Christian to worship his Creator in his church. There falls upon him the obligation to put his creed into his deed 7 days of the week, to let his "light so shine before men" that they may see his good works, and that they may emulate his example.

The Christian has an obligation, particularly in relation to his elective officials, to secure the finest and most honest public-spirited citizens available. Let him reject

those individuals who, unlike Caesar's wife, are not above suspicion. Let him turn out from office those individuals who have associated with gamblers and racketeers. Let him turn out those lax law-enforcement officers—sheriffs, police chiefs, district attorneys—who have winked at instances of gambling and racketeering in their midst.

Are these tasks easy? Of course not. They are difficult. They take time, energy, often financial contributions for the cause of good government. But these things must be done if you and I are to be worthy of the description "Christian" in its broadest, most ethical, most spiritual meaning.

In the face of this challenge, I am not one of those who are discouraged or disheartened. To be sure, I cannot rejoice over the appalling conditions that we of the Crime Committee have found. But I can rejoice in the certain and sure knowledge that our people will be adequate to the task of solving this problem, and that the forces of God in our country will be in the vanguard of those bent upon cleaning up that which we have exposed.

Family Farm Policy Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clovis (N. Mex.) News-Journal of September 16, 1951:

CURRY FARMERS REJECT FFPR PLAN

(EDITOR'S NOTE—The News-Journal is printing herewith the complete text of the letter concerning the Family Farm Policy Review from Curry County farmers to Agriculture Secretary Brannan. Written by Earl E. Hartley at the request of the farmers, the letter was signed by scores of county residents and turned over to the Agriculture Mobilization Committee with the request that it be submitted to the USDA along with the committee's report on a series of meetings held in the county to discuss the FFPR. Copies will be sent to the four New Mexico Members of Congress, with the request that the letter be read in both the House and Senate and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

FAMILY FARM POLICY REVIEW—COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FARMERS OF CURRY COUNTY, N. MEX.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the past few days we have been asked to review and make recommendations concerning material contained in a USDA pamphlet of June 11, 1951, entitled "Family Farm Policy Review." This pamphlet contains 8 pages of introduction and 121 pages of other material on 12 different agencies of the Department of Agriculture. Very few of us have had an actual opportunity of reading this pamphlet, but we do feel that our local agriculture mobilization committee has made an honest and under the circumstances, an efficient review of this pamphlet for our discussion and information.

We do appreciate the opportunity to make a record of some of our opinions concerning the Department of Agriculture and the work which it is doing. In this day when we are bearing an ever-increasing tax burden, we are of the opinion that every agency of the

Government should be closely scrutinized with the idea of cutting out nonessential work and eliminate waste of manpower and waste of our tax funds. In this connection you may be interested to know that we are far more concerned with retaining our freedom than we are in any plans of security.

In order to direct our remarks to the specific problems and recommendations presented in the above-mentioned pamphlet, we are subdividing our comments and recommendations along the same line as the subdivisions in the pamphlet.

I. Agricultural Research Administration

We appreciate the need for continued research on better and more efficient farming methods and on the control of pests and plant and animal diseases. However, we feel that the field work on these projects should be channeled through the land-grant colleges and State extension services. We are also of the opinion that the USDA is now meddling in enough of our daily affairs. As a matter of fact, our present thinking is that they are doing too much meddling. Even though research and home managing, farm housing and farm family living, etc., sound good in writing, we prefer to handle these matters on a local basis. After all the folderl that we have seen coming out of Washington, D. C., we are convinced that the farmers of Curry County are far more capable in their collective thinking than are the Bureau employees in Washington, D. C.

II. Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Here, too, we find references to worthy projects and emphases on extending this Bureau's work further afield. In our opinion, the work of this Bureau and whatever it has to offer the farmers should be channeled through the land-grant colleges and the State extension services. Any suggestions, such as made on page 17, of extending field staffs curdle our blood. We feel that we cannot overemphasize the fact that we know there are entirely too many employees in the USDA.

We are aware of the socialistic thinking that is emphasizing extension of social-security provisions and other so-called social-security practices to the farms. We are also aware of the fact that social security is not worth the costs and the bookkeeping efforts that are required, and we definitely do not want any of its provisions extended to the farms. The less interference that we have from Government employees in the actual operation of the daily affairs, the better we like it; and we would be very much opposed to having any bureaucrats trying to draw our farm-lease agreements, such as suggested in paragraph 10 of page 18.

III. Cooperative Extension Service

We are satisfied with the Cooperative Extension Service as it now operates. We like to think of the county agents, home demonstration agent, and other workers of the Extension Service as being our own land-grant college. If these workers are in other places, dominated and controlled by special organizations, then we would favor releasing them from control of any special groups.

However, we are convinced that we have enough employees in this field to take care of the work. We are further convinced that they need no supervision from Washington, D. C., and any attempt of the United States Department of Agriculture to take over the control of the State extension service would be in our opinion, a reprehensible thing.

IV. The Office of Information

Surely, such an office as this should be more than a clearinghouse for the other United States Department of Agriculture agencies to avoid duplication in publications. Excessive verbiage in the pamphlet that we are discussing is demonstration enough for us that we already have too many writers,

and we are opposed to your hiring any more. Above all, we do not desire that this agency have any field employees. We are wholeheartedly in agreement with the present prohibition on maintenance of field offices by the Office of Information.

V. Production and Marketing Administration

(a) Agricultural conservation program: We of this community recognize that if we are to show good faith in our criticism of excessive Government expenditures, we must show a willingness to eliminate some of those expenditures that are being expended on behalf of the farmers. For several years we have received annual compensation checks in payment for carrying out certain annual practices. The practices for which these payments are made now recognized by the farmers of this area as being good farming practices, and we are confident that these practices will continue in use until such time, if ever, that better practices are developed. We are of the opinion that the payment which we receive for doing these annual practices is no longer necessary. We therefore recommend that all payments for annual practices be eliminated immediately. We also recommend the discharge of all United States Department of Agriculture employees whose work might be eliminated by the discontinuance of these payments.

1. We are pleased with the work of our local committeemen, but we have no desire to have any additional administrative funds provided for their work.

(b) Production adjustment programs: We note that the problem here is in connection with market quotas and acreage allotments. Although we have no particular desire to be told how much of any product we can market or how many acres that we can seed of any commodity, we recognize that if we are to retain price supports, we must also maintain quotas or acreage allotments. In this connection, we are of the opinion that grain sorghums should be added to the list of basic commodities.

1. We are not particularly interested in this area in subsidy payments on perishable commodities. However, we feel that we are helping pay the bill and that so long as we are paying the bill, we are of the opinion that any perishable commodities receiving subsidy support should be controlled under market quotas.

(c) Price support and stabilization program: Under the Government's price-support program based upon parity, the farmers have enjoyed an excellent marketing arrangement for their nonperishable products. If we were given the choice of selecting one phase of the USDA farm programs that we desired to retain, it would be price-support program. The arguments presented on page 45 favoring direct payments in lieu of price-support program are, in our opinion, without foundation in fact or practice. We are wholeheartedly in favor of retaining the present price-support program for nonperishable products and, if it were within our power to do so, we would immediately discharge all of the Government employees including the Secretary of Agriculture for even suggesting that we change to a direct subsidy payment. We note that the very next paragraph suggests a limitation upon the maximum subsidy payment that could be made to any one person. Obviously, if we were placed on direct subsidy payments without any means of controlling the market price of commodities, and then were limited by arbitrary ruling as to the amount of subsidy an individual could receive, based on his being an individual and not related to his capacity to produce, we would immediately become the most subservient group ever to exist under the symbol of a free Government. Let there be no question in your mind—we shall never favor direct subsidy payments in lieu of price supports.

1. From our experiences with the price-support program, we are convinced that the Government has not and cannot lose any money in supporting grain prices based on parity. To our way of thinking, this is the best means available to the farmers of America to secure adequate prices for their products and at the same time retain their freedom and independence.

As to the remainder of comments from pages 47 through 57, we have nothing to offer except to remind you that we are opposed to any increase in personnel and administrative expenses for the USDA.

VI. Soil Conservation Service

We recognize that the Soil Conservation Service has helped place in practice many valuable conservation practices on our farms and ranches. However, a majority of these practices have been accepted by the farmers and ranchers in the course of their own planning and, if it were necessary to cut out the Soil Conservation Service, we are of the opinion that the loss to the farms and ranches would be small.

We certainly have no need for interference from the Soil Conservation Service in the operation of our soil-conservation districts by any suggestions from them that we compel our neighbors to practice conservation features. In our opinion, if the practice has proved its worth, our neighbors are intelligent enough to adopt it without 51 percent of us being able to force them to adopt it.

One of the most reprehensible suggestions made in the entire pamphlet is contained in page 63 where the suggestion is made that the soil-conservation program use land acquisition and redistribution into so-called family farms. We sincerely hope that Congress will do nothing by way of legislation to implement such a program. In our opinion, the Federal Government owns entirely too much land in this Nation and it is our recommendation that the 7,000,000 acres now owned and operated by the Soil Conservation Service be placed on the market and resold to private owners. It is our recommendation that the practice of the Soil Conservation Service of acquiring additional land for development be discontinued immediately.

VII. Forest Service

We, upon the Great Plains, have no contact with the Forest Service. However, we seriously doubt the need or advisability of Government acquisition of forest lands as suggested on page 78.

VIII. Farm Credit Administration

In our brief study of this phase of the pamphlet in question, we find very little quarrel with this program. We have long recognized the need of special loan programs and credit programs for farm and ranch operations. Wherever those needs cannot be met by private institutions, or wherever private institutions refuse to meet those needs, we see nothing wrong in the Government meeting those needs through farm-loan programs. Our experience with these programs shows us that the loan program and its provisions are based on sound financing and that the programs are paying their own way. We do not desire a gift in the form of a loan any more than we do in the form of a subsidy payment. Our chief interest in the loan programs is that they be kept on a sound financial basis.

IX. Farmers Home Administration

Our comments concerning the Farm Credit Administration are equally applicable to this Administration. So long as the loan program is kept within the bounds of the borrower's ability to repay, we favor its extension.

X. Rural Electrification Administration

Here again it has been demonstrated that a sound Government lending program has extended the use of central-station electric

service to approximately 90 percent of the rural homes in America without loss to the Government. We believe that the same sound principles can be used in extending telephone service to those same rural homes, therefore, we recommend the continuance of this program.

XI. Federal crop insurance

We recognize that crop insurance is in the experimental stages. In our opinion, it can and should be extended over a wider area, and extended to cover other crops.

XII. Commodity exchange

Comments and recommendations under this heading concern matters with which we have had little or no experience. We prefer to leave recommendations on this item to those more directly concerned and additional legislation, if any, to the good judgment of our Congressmen.

We trust that the above comments and recommendations will be given your very careful consideration. Most of the items mentioned have to do with our field of business, and we believe that the man in the business is best qualified to know what is good for his business.

Sincerely,

CURRY COUNTY FARMERS.

What Washington Should Know: Italy Will Be a Good Ally if She Is Justly Dealt With

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record as part of my remarks the translation of a speech delivered in Italian by Mr. Nicolò LoFranco, of Chicago, Ill., the prominent editor and publisher of *L'Italia*, an Italian newspaper of wide circulation in the Middle West.

Mr. LoFranco delivered these highly informative and thought-provoking observations at a banquet held in his honor on the occasion of his return to his home city, from an extended trip abroad. Mr. LoFranco dwells upon the domestic and foreign problems confronting Italy, and the necessity of increased and better understanding with our Nation in the mutual desires of both countries to effect a lasting and enduring peace.

I direct the attention of all those who are interested in the settlement of world problems, to the remarks of Mr. LoFranco, a student of world affairs, with emphasis on the part played by Italy. These observations coming on the heels of the announcement of the future visit of Alcide De Gasperi, Premier of Italy, will throw further light on the discussion of Italo-American relations which have been most cordial and friendly, except for a brief period during World War II. Herewith follow Mr. LoFranco's remarks:

Washington political circles and the periphrastic opinion reflected in the press were shocked by the outcome of the Italian municipal elections. Surprised are many, that the Communists were not routed; that as to

numbers they were found not inferior to what they were in April 1948 elections, which decided the salvation of Europe for it was on the outcome of these elections that the United States solely depended for support of their anti-Soviet policy.

If Italy happens to fall into the hands of Stalin's commissars, home-grown and imported, then the balance of power between the West and the East is projected into the open.

With the Mediterranean area open to the Bolsheviks, the defense of world civilization will crumble and along with it world peace, the enduring peace which Washington hopes to obtain from the sacrifices which the American citizens are onerously bearing with difficulty.

After 4 years of exclusion of Communists from the government in Rome and after so much support from the Marshall plan, the candid and sincere hoped for a striking re-covering of the Italian people and for their immunization from disease and pestilence.

The recent elections demonstrate that the danger persists amid the raging of superficial judgments of the commentators who know little or nothing about which they speak or who, pretending to know some things in order to suit their own conveniences, explode the assinine anger of their sponsors who believe they have purchased Italy with cash.

Nothing is more ugly and insulting to visualize the Italian and American people as bound only in friendly ties by the dollar sign.

Nothing is more deceiving and more bitter than the disillusionment that the Government of Italy and its people, can be humiliated and degraded by the foolish talk and drivel which comes from the mouth of Winston Churchill.

Elections or no elections, propaganda or no propaganda, dollars or no dollars, poverty or not, the Italian does not know how, nor is it in his makeup to be a Communist. The Italian people are not and will not be a communistic satellite. They have suffered from injustice from the early dawn of the beginning of the postwar period, but they have delivered themselves by their own efforts from fascism.

Italy was an obstacle to communism which was then assailing Europe, she freed herself from communism which could not hold up its head in the face of events which overcame the Fatherland; I predict that she will liberate herself even now from the Communist infection which is working over a good part of its territory.

If there is thought given to an Italy which is anticommunistic on its own account, in the interests of Christian civilization and the world, there should be made an attempt to understand full well Italy and the Italians. Those who are not a part of her should become more alive and more conscious of her worth.

But it must be taken into account that there exists today an Italian nation—an Italy valued and respected just as its history makes her, just as she is a part of history and of the entire world civilization.

If the United States and basically the Congress and those leaders who are the guardians of the Constitution, think of Italy in terms of a colony and vassal state then a very rude and strange awakening will surprise the American officials who are listening to senseless statements which are swallowed whole, without investigating the motive and prejudices of the authors.

At this hour, there should be by this time greatly modified, the concept that in the second war there were victors and vanquished. In the 10 years of war and postwar there have come forth elements who condemn, others who absolve, or in one way or another, those that engulf themselves in the stormy petrel of destruction. If the second war concludes with the third, and in the third war the

future defense of the United States calls for the useful and most necessary alliance with Italy—the necessity of stopping the impending Marxist course—Italy will come back into its own and will go into aggressive action at the first encounter with communism. The real credit for having resisted communism is due Italy. She was instead fatally carried into the depths. Although the war brought about an Italy not conquered, the question is raised: Who won the war? No one. Who conquered Italy? No one.

Today the so-called victory has passed into a defensive picture projected by the so-called victors.

Italy has a formidable position in Europe—and hence is in the Atlantic Pact. It follows that in the talks which follow, the Italy of the Mediterranean and the Adriatic, because of the gift of nature—a geographic position which God gave it and which God alone can take away, must be consulted. Hence, it is clear that if Communism increases in Italy and infects it, the world is lost. The Americans engage in recrimination saying "but we have sent over to you millions and millions."

But millions are not enough. A nation does not live alone on money. It is otherwise, and Italy is a nation that wishes to be a nation whom the world must respect as a nation. Hence, let us discard the painful memory and the infamy of a lamented and fateful war.

Even during the badly administered occupation of Italy remembering only because of the arbitrary and odorous nature of a social uprising and protest, the intrusion of the United States into Italian life was, for itself most expensive and nonproductive. There was freed simply a territory which happened to be first on the map of the Atlantic and second by virtue of the story book *Four Freedoms*.

For there was imposed the unconditional surrender with the word of honor given by Eisenhower to Badoglio, that the armistice clauses would be tempered with mercy, and would be followed with formal procedure only made urgent by the then precarious allied situation. In addition too, there were provided by Italy, an important number of divisions of fighting men, but for whom, allied divisions would have suffered worse and sadder days.

Its captured fleet, in fact directed by naval chiefs, sailed into the Pacific in strong force to sustain the weakened forces of the allies. The derelicts were abandoned to a degraded condescension, to the benevolence of those who, strange to say, were the bombardiers of yesterday, cruel and severe, who continued to be but a rabble of people, for example, the German surly and the Japanese silent and puzzling.

With a mob of criminals and exiles, blood-thirsty assassins, there came a government—a monstrosity in Italy the like of which only the plotters themselves enjoyed. Not only did the liberators not liberate even a diled fig, but also a noble people heavily afflicted, was left in search of bread, with a minority that scorned laws and good morals, and pillaged private homes and public treasure. In addition, there was premeditated a civil war procured and helped with pound sterling and dollars.

Thus can Italy be pictured an Italy crippled and deformed by the Paris Pact where there was forced upon her, the infamy of confessing that she was a conquered nation, forced to sign a shameful diplomatic document which forever brands her.

No Atlantic Charter for Italy, no freedom by the dozens. Forgotten is the word of honor of Eisenhower, the proclamation of reassurance by Roosevelt, nothing, nothing, nothing.

It is sufficient to consider Italy in rags and impoverished, begging for alms. But with

alms one does not restore the soul of a people crucified. For carved out as if of granite, is a cowardly treaty that renders it a slave upon whom someone vents one's spite. Farther isolated from the society of nations, deprived of its initiative, of its preservation and salvation, deprived of light and of guidance, the Italian people were thrown madly into a civil war. Then the Russian demagog quick to see the opening, jumped into the struggle and became prominently identified with it. From the outset there went on ill-advised English-American maneuverings. Then with the threat of Moscow becoming more accentuated America asked the Italian cabinet of Rome to expel the fellow travelers; and these were thrown out. The verdict given at the polls on April 18, 1948, marks the ostracism of the Bolsheviks.

Nevertheless, abroad, in the eastern sphere where matures the conscience of self preservation, there occur the world developments of an American policy, the mold of which takes form in the fashion of the humanity of tomorrow. The Marshall plan becomes perfected into the Atlantic Pact. If Europe breaks apart economically and yields, the enemy will invade it and also the waters and reaches which lead to the American shores. The United States unconsciously passes from a protector to the one to be protected. The other nations are the ones who must run to its defense.

The war in Korea makes more manifest and more terrifying, this danger. Entering automatically into the global strategy, comes the participation of Italy and not in a minor sense but in a greater sense, because, if it becomes a question of fighting in Europe, Italy cannot stand in the position of subaltern. The Italian nation that God took to his heart from the continent opposite Africa and along the vital lines which from Gibraltar via Suez, joins up with the Indian Ocean, the Pacific, even up to the Yellow Sea which laps Korea. Thus centralized, the defense of the United States made necessary in the Mediterranean and through this into the precious Tripolitanian bases, Italy becomes her most logical and secure ally—Italy necessarily through its terrain on which it lies for the superhuman guarantees which it possesses. Italy although human—what does Italy possess, although in the chains of the Atlantic Pact, it should be a link fastened firmly to the other links in the chain.

Therefore, it is easily seen, in the contention of the English—in the proceedings of the United Nations, in the complications of the Atlantic Pact and in the Mediterranean intrigues, etc.—the possibility that in order to make the Atlantic secure, it is vitally necessary to make the British link secure. Further, that to give additional strength to this chain there must be supplied the security of Italy. The United States has much need of an Italy completely armed and voluntarily combatant. But it must be an Italy which must feel itself entirely sovereign and not uncertain as to its future.

Italy will not return as a nation of and by itself and for the world as well, unless it is given justice, if first, there is not wiped out the shame and insult inflicted at Paris.

The precarious state of affairs which has produced a low standard of living in Italy reveals to the mentally alert and to those of open heart, that Italy must be freed from the oppression of the Treaty of Paris. That treaty was imposed in a moment in which it seemed to adjust once and for all a world order including the Russian sphere.

It was contemplated, thereby, to be a treaty such that the sacrifices of Italy would only be borne temporarily, such that, soon and within a short space of time, she would be legally received into the United Nations where it was intended that equals should be numbered among equals. The signature of Italy to this infamous Treaty of Paris was illegally and unlawfully obtained, based

upon a promise that a spirit of justice would intervene to correct the harsh terms, dictated only by military necessity.

It is true that in the meantime, there came the Russian desertion followed by the progressively increasing arrogance of the Muscovite who has upset all peace efforts. It is true that Russia opposes the admission of Italy into the United Nations. Italy knows this and is deeply resentful of Russia.

But it is more resentful of its allies who are aware of the absolute necessity of wiping out, in effect, that same treaty from which Russia also obtained illicit and unjust and deceitful gains. The Allies continue in the conduct of the former cruel dictator and do not realize that their aberration is tantamount to suicide. With Russia turning everything "topsy turvy" how does it come about that the one thing that remains stable and intangible is this Treaty of Paris? Russia violates all agreements, yet the Allies in return contest and suspend every other covenant. The tyranny of the Paris Treaty should not be the only thing reflected in unbreakable laws.

The infamy of the deprivation of Italy's colonies is completed in the viciousness of the treaty. England carries on its deception and through devious ways drives back into the barbarous lands, civilized in truth by the Italian liberator.

Again, should the Italian people be grateful for the indecent and corrupt treatment received at Trieste?

The responsibility of the Americans is of transcendent importance. The United States should give thought to the necessity of having an Italian ally strong and secure, capable of protecting it from the left-handed blows of England.

Is it convenient to England and France, considering the ambiguity of their conduct, to have an Italy, a colony in subjection, unarmed and defeated such that it cannot serve with virility, in an alliance with the United States; but it cannot be admitted that it is agreeable and suitable to the United States to have an Italy mutilated, abnormal, hence superfluous and an encumbrance.

Cannot the United States raise anew an Italy to the dignity of a nation, to the power of an ally? Yes, if Washington proceeds logically. The Italian people are upset and as a result of their confusion, the Russian enemy is pleased. When the stubborn Soviet delayed the course of American diplomacy at Lake Success, we nullified the Russian veto in the Security Council with subsequent deliberations taking place in the General Assembly. Why does not the United States give thought to disarming Russia of her veto which leaves Italy waiting outside the door? The United States has now concluded a treaty of peace with Japan guaranteeing its sovereignty, its independence, its equality, its solidarity, its well-being—and why does Russia exclude herself? If she is not necessary to a Japanese peace, neither is she necessary to an Italo-American peace.

Italy has assumed the obligation of fighting under the Atlantic Pact. With what shall she fight? Exposed to disaster at its frontiers at the hands of an infuriated horde rushing down upon her, what can the weakened forces of Pacciardi's (Italian Minister of Defense) organization accomplish? There is also lacking cohesion between those already armed and those that can be armed. If the internal struggle is kept in its bitter state because of the political situation of the Government, which gives encouragement to the influx of foreign propaganda on the one hand and opens up wider disagreements on the other, what help then can Italy bring to the global defense?

Why did they take away its army? Why did they deprive it of its navy? Why did they demolish the fortifications of Italy? Why did they take away from it its confines,

its headwaters, the capacity of defending itself?

The paths of immigration are barred, and America can open so many. Population is on the increase, mouths of those needing food are increasing. Hunger is acute. The limitations of the Treaty of Paris, the weight of the reparations, the controls and the limitations coordinated to fit in with the plans of the Allies and now to the necessity of armaments have shut down or weakened industry. The harbors are deserted, the factories idle. The exports are subject to the directions of others.

The redistribution of land is impossible because in Italy, there are those who wish it and those who do not wish it. The taxes are oppressive, aggravating the inability of those that cannot pay, those who ought to pay and do not pay. All this brings about a dissolute and insolent luxury class. The Italian Government does what it can, but within the limits of the Treaty of Paris. It is forced to rely on the diplomats and on the supply of urgent moneys from abroad. What, then, do the elections indicate when we find a country with such difficulties? The problems are always there, grave and pressing, the threat of a Russian invasion is always at hand.

What is to be the result? Today Nazi Germany and Japan both uncertain and unreliable, veritable enemies of the democracies, are being rearmed and reestablished. Then why not rearm and reestablish Italy, which has demonstrated greater faith and appreciation of democratic principles? For Italy can be trusted. She can be relied upon to keep the faith.

Ansonia (Conn.) Eagles Condemn Communist Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the case of William N. Oatis, now imprisoned in Czechoslovakia, demonstrates too vividly the impossibility of objective relationships with unscrupulous and unreasoning Communists.

The Ansonia (Conn.) Aerie of Eagles has adopted a resolution of condemnation for the tactics of the Czech Communists in the suppression of free speech and personal liberty through the imprisonment of Oatis.

This expression by the members of this wonderful fraternal organization to which I am proud to belong deserves public attention by publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court" completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principles of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of Government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ansonia Aerie, No 1996, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie, No 1996, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet News Agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 13th day of September 1951, by Aerie No. 1996, Ansonia, Conn.

Attest:

W. NEWELL QUELLISON,
Worthy President.
THOMAS HINE,
Secretary.

Need for Development of Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD deGRAFFENRIED

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. deGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles, one taken from the Birmingham News of September 11, 1951; one from the Birmingham News of September 12, 1951; and one from the Birmingham Post-Herald of September 13, 1951. It was my pleasure to attend the meeting covered by these articles, which forcefully portray the acute need for development along this waterway.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of September 11, 1951]

TAPPING OF VAST POTENTIAL OF BIG WATERWAY Is Aim

Creation of a vast new industrial potential from Walker County through Birmingham and on to the Port of Mobile was in process here today.

Gathered at Birmingham's Chamber of Commerce for organization and activation of the Warrior-Tombigbee Improvement Association were representatives of business and

industry from cities and towns along the water route spanning the lush valley.

Paul Cooper, secretary of the waterway committee of the chamber of commerce, said the representation included nearly 75 from out of town, together with Birmingham business and industrial interests.

What adequate development of the water system would mean in potential new industry, especially of the heavy type, is difficult to overestimate, most of its ardent advocates believe.

The plan is to put the influence and the work of the Warrior-Tombigbee Improvement Association behind a program to promote fullest development of the route and thus make available to new and existing industry, a transportation system which would create an estimated 2,000,000 tons of freight annually.

Figures show more than 2,600,000 tons moved over the system in 1950. With a 9 to 10-foot channel, uninterrupted by seasonal conditions, the movement could be multiplied and availability of such facilities would attract an influx of heavy manufacturing to the valley, it is pointed out.

Function of the association, to be financed individually and by business and industry, is promotional only.

Army engineers have estimated cost of the development program at between \$150,000,000 and \$2,000,000,000. But its value as a defense facility and in time of national emergency would be incalculable, the group here today believes.

Officers were to be elected and details of the organization perfected at the chamber of commerce meeting, Mr. Cooper said.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of September 12, 1951]

AIM TO MAKE VALLEY "GARDEN SPOT"—BODY FORMED TO MAKE WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE ATTAIN GREAT DESTINY

(By Robert W. Kinney)

Warrior-Tombigbee Improvement Association, designed to make of the valley which the combined streams traverse, "the garden spot" it was destined to be, was organized here yesterday afternoon.

DeVane Jones, Tuscaloosa attorney, was elected interim chairman.

Mr. Jones immediately called upon the sponsors, including eminent business and industrial representatives from cities and towns along the route, to elect immediately and forthwith a permanent president, preferably by October 1, to attend the incorporation details and set the ball rolling toward ultimate objectives of the association.

These are, in addition to making available a year-around navigable waterway system from Walker County to the Port of Mobile, which, it is believed, will attract fabulous new heavy industries—power production, industrial water supply, and stream antipollution, and recreational facilities, and national defense.

Revision of temporary constitution and by-laws was placed in the hands of an elected committee. The need repeatedly was stressed for quick and positive action to make a reality of an ambition long in the minds of men outstanding in business and industrial circles of the State.

Seven districts were created. Each will nominate two men for members of the executive board. The districts are Bessemer-Fairfield, Birmingham, Demopolis, Tuscaloosa, Jackson, Jasper, and Walker County, and Mobile.

Already nominated from Demopolis are Jerome Levy, temporary chairman and in charge of yesterday's meeting, and John Spight, Jr.

Nominated from Tuscaloosa were Frank Pitts and George Shook. Mr. Shook also received the nomination for vice president.

Mr. Jones, as interim chairman, gave the ball to Birmingham. It is, he said, up to the moving spirits within the State's greatest industrial city, to supply the momentum and the enthusiasm necessary to a successful conclusion of what the meeting agreed was the No. 1 project of the year.

William P. Engel, president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, said he had lived in Birmingham a great many years without having understood much about or attached a great deal of significance to the waterways development program.

But now, he declared, nothing is more important than that this opportunity to contribute to the fabulous industrial expansion, the recreational opportunities, and the defense arm it will offer, be grabbed here and now.

These convictions, he said, have come after an intensive study of the possibilities of the river system which included a river trip and a survey of present and potential tonnage.

Hugh P. Bigler, executive vice president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, outlined aims and objectives of the organization. Now, he said, is the time for action. And nobody, he declared, is more enthusiastic as to potentialities than he.

Mr. Bigler said studies had shown conclusively that where there is the greatest amount of deep-water traffic, there is a corresponding increase in rail and highway traffic. This is a fact that has greatly fired his enthusiasm, he said.

The proposed constitution and bylaws, subject to revision, provide that the principal office shall be in Birmingham, and that:

"This association is organized for educational and benevolent purposes, including the continued development of the Warrior-Tombigbee and Mobile waterway system, development of navigation, flood control, water conservation, and allied interests."

Major function will be promotional, which includes seeking of necessary appropriations, arousing interest and cooperation on a State-wide basis and presentation of facts and figures in support of the over-all program.

Officers will include a president, vice president, and secretary-treasurer.

From EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED, congressional representative from the Sixth District, came the personal pledge of continuing interest and work in behalf of the project by himself and the entire Alabama delegation in the House and Senate.

From BURTON BELL, Atlanta, of the division office of the Army Corps of Engineers, came assurance of interest and cooperation from Gen. L. A. Pick, head of the Corps of Engineers, and associates.

Earlier it had been pointed out that the river system last year handled 2,602,623 total short tons of freight, and that a survey had indicated another 2,000,000-ton minimum as readily available with ample depth and non-interference because of weather conditions.

Potentialities of the development, however, from the standpoint of attracting new heavy industries, national defense, and recreation were given the most emphasis.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post of September 13, 1951]

**RIVER CITIES PROMOTE DEEP CHANNEL PLAN—
OUTLET TO SEA IS KEY TO AREA GROWTH**
(By Don Cummins)

Cities along the Warrior-Tombigbee waterway yesterday proved they mean business when they say they want their river system improved all the way down to Mobile Bay.

Representatives from the cities got together at the Chamber of Commerce Building here to organize the Warrior-Tombigbee Improvement Association which will work a deep-water channel from above Birmingham to the Gulf.

"It's the project of the year," Hugh P. Bigler, executive vice president of the Birm-

ingham chamber, told the meeting. He said the future of Birmingham and the industrial growth of the entire area depend upon an outlet to the sea.

He added up the benefits of a successful program by showing that flood control, navigation, sufficient water for domestic and industrial water system expansion and pollution control would be a great boon to Alabama.

Bigler said the case of Houston, Tex., showed that where there was a heavy river traffic there was also heavy freight and truck traffic.

United States Representative EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED, of Alabama's Sixth District, told the meeting that Alabama Congressmen in Washington were behind the development of the river system.

He pointed out that they were successful in obtaining \$24,000 for a preliminary study of the river system by the United States Corps of Engineers.

He told his listeners that flood control and navigation was a necessity but it would take a lot of work by all interested parties.

William P. Engel, president of the Birmingham chamber, explained the increasing interest of industrial firms throughout the Nation in whether the district had deep-water navigation.

Others who spoke in support of the program and the necessity for its completion were: Devane Jones, Tuscaloosa; Jerome Levy, Mobile; George Shook, Tuscaloosa; Ernest Woods, Montgomery, and Burton Bell, representing the United States engineers, Atlanta.

It was agreed that each interested community would nominate two members to the executive board who would act as trustees of the association.

Two permanent officers were elected. George Shook was elected vice president and Preston B. Ralston, secretary-treasurer. Both are from Tuscaloosa.

The permanent president will be elected by the Birmingham group before October 1.

The Power To Make War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September the Illinois division of the American Legion held their annual convention in Chicago, and one of the resolutions adopted urged a constitutional amendment to forbid police actions such as the one now taking place in Korea.

The editorial comment on this resolution which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American on Thursday, September 13, is very much to the point and reflects the considered thinking of the greatest majority of Illinois residents.

The editorial in the Chicago Herald-American is as follows:

THE POWER TO MAKE WAR

The Illinois American Legion's resolution urging adoption of a constitutional amendment to forbid "police actions" such as the one in Korea is a demand from men who have fought for America that the war-making power be returned to Congress.

The Constitution clearly invests the power to declare war in Congress.

But it does not expressly forbid the President to start wars by ordering American forces to "resist aggression" or to "restore order" in troubled regions.

By taking advantage of that omission, President Truman got us into the "police action" in Korea, which already has cost us more than 80,000 battle casualties.

And so long as the omission stands any President will be able to involve the United States in war, anywhere and with anyone, at his personal whim alone.

Administration defenders of President Truman's one-man decision to fight a war in Korea have argued that it is no longer practical for Congress to decide whether the Nation shall go to war.

They say formal declarations of war are "obsolete."

It is true that in countries ruled by dictatorships wars can be started by the dictators without consulting the people or their representatives, but this country is not a dictatorship.

Under the Constitution government rests on the consent of the governed.

How can it be argued that the most fateful decision our Government can make—the decision to engage in war—can be taken by the executive department alone, without the consent of the people through their Congress, unless we are ready to abandon self-government and invest our Presidents with the personal power of life and death?

The power to plunge the Nation into war is the power to risk the Nation's destruction.

No one man should have the power, and no man should want it.

But since it has been demonstrated that one President does want it, and others after him may want it, too, then the Constitution should be amended, as the Illinois Department of the American Legion so wisely proposed, to make the assumption of such power by any President forever impossible.

Tribute to Harry Strunk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I attended and took part in the program for the eleventh annual meeting of the Republican Valley Conservation Association held in McCook, Nebr., on August 31, 1951. The Republican Valley Conservation Association is an organization composed of representatives of most of the towns in the upper reaches of the Republican River Basin in Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas, and as its name implies, its objective is the conservation and utilization of the natural resources of the basin. It was organized 11 years ago by my good friend, Harry D. Strunk, owner and publisher of the McCook Daily Gazette, who has been unanimously elected its president every year since the association was organized.

The Republican Valley Conservation Association is a strong organization which has been of invaluable assistance to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal and State agencies concerned in the conservation and utilization of the natural re-

sources of the basin. Its guiding light has always been its president, Harry Strunk, whose activities in conservation work date back to long before the organization of the association—back to about 1911 when he first came to McCook to start his newspaper.

Because of his outstanding contribution to all forms of conservation over a period of many years, I was extremely happy to see Harry Strunk receive some of the recognition he so richly deserves at the meeting of the association in McCook on August 31. At the banquet climaxing the meeting, Mr. Strunk was presented the Department of the Interior Conservation Service Award by Goodrich W. Lineweaver, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. The award was the first of its kind given to any man in the Western States. It was accompanied by a letter written by Acting Secretary of the Interior R. D. Searles for Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, and I would like to quote the text of this letter in its entirety:

In recognition of your lifetime of work in behalf of the conservation and utilization of the natural resources of the Republican River Basin and the entire Missouri River Basin, I take pleasure in presenting to you the Conservation Service Award of the Department of the Interior.

You richly deserve this award because of the invaluable contribution you have made to the development of the natural resources of the Missouri River Basin, particularly the Republican River Basin. Your ceaseless and untiring efforts to bring about the accomplishment of our mutual objective of controlling the waste water of the valley and using it for beneficial purposes have not gone unnoticed by us in the Department. We know something of the sacrifices you have made of your time and means to accomplish this end, and we feel that the Department, as well as the people of the valley, is deeply indebted to you for the service you have rendered. You have indeed lived up to the motto of your newspaper, the McCook Daily Gazette—"Service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy in this world."

Had it not been for your perseverance in the face of almost insurmountable difficulties, it is doubtful whether the present state of development of the Republican River Valley would have been achieved. We hope that in the not too distant future your dream of a valley in which "every drop of water that falls will be conserved and utilized for the benefit of the greatest number of people" will be realized, and we will continue to do all we can to bring it about.

Please accept the enclosed Conservation Service award in recognition of your outstanding contribution to the work of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the McCook Daily Gazette of September 1, written by Ora Spald, managing editor of the Gazette, and a news story from the Gazette of the same date:

A TRIBUTE TO THE BOSS

Harry Strunk came into his own last night. He was awarded a conservation service award by the United States Department of the Interior. It was the first award of its kind given to any man in the Western States.

The boss doesn't know about this editorial. We didn't tell him because we knew he'd never permit it to be published. And it's from no effort to get in good with him that

we publish this. It's simply because we are proud of our boss and want him to know it.

It's high time somebody gave Harry formal recognition of his long service to the people and institutions of the Republican Valley. True, he has been commonly accepted as the man most responsible for reclamation work in our valley, and a form of recognition has come in his constant reelection—for 11 years—to the presidency of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, an organization he helped found in 1940.

But not until last night was an appreciation of his lifelong labor wrapped up in one formal package. We agree wholeheartedly with the Department of the Interior when it said he richly deserves the award. Perhaps it is because we work with him that, more than others, we can realize how much he deserves it. We know the many long hours he spends, at no profit to himself but to the detriment of his own health and welfare, constantly serving the people of this valley in the way he thinks will benefit them most—by bringing reclamation here.

We have seen many persons who acknowledge that reclamation is a good thing for this valley, but whose support of the idea, while enthusiastic, cannot begin to be as unswerving as his. We believe that the reason the Republican Valley today stands as the most outstanding example of conservation work actually completed is due largely to the single-mindedness of our boss. All great things require the endeavor and inspiration of someone who can think of little other than getting the job done, and brooks no thought of letting down.

Our boss is a controversial figure. He has come in for much criticism in his dogged attempt to get the job done. But, whatever men think of Harry Strunk, they cannot mitigate the contribution he has made. We think those who have thought unfavorably of him have not understood him as we do. They would think otherwise if they knew him well.

It is with real, down-deep feeling, then, that we say: Congratulations, boss; we're happy for you. (Ora Spald.)

STRUNK IS HONORED BY SERVICE AWARD FOR CONSERVATION

(By Ora Spald)

Harry D. Strunk, president of the Republican Valley Conservation Association and publisher of the Gazette, last night received high honor for a lifetime of work devoted to reclamation and conservation in the Republican River Basin.

At a banquet in the Keystone Hotel climaxing the eleventh annual meeting of the RVCA, Mr. Strunk was awarded the Department of Interior's Conservation Service award by G. W. Lineweaver, Assistant Reclamation Commissioner for the Bureau of Reclamation. The award is the first given to any man in the Western States.

A letter accompanying the award read by Lineweaver was abundant in praise of Mr. Strunk's "ceaseless and untiring efforts to bring about the accomplishment of . . . controlling the waste water of the valley and using it for beneficial purposes." The letter said: "You have indeed lived up to the motto of your newspaper. . . . 'Service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy in this world'."

The presentation ceremony highlighted yesterday's all-day meeting of the RVCA, which included Mr. Strunk's reelection for the eleventh year as president of the organization. All other officers and directors were also unanimously reelected.

An overflow crowd heard brief addresses by four reclamation-minded officials at the banquet last night, introduced by M. O. Ryan, national counselor for the RVCA, who was master of ceremonies.

In a report on progress in the Kansas River Basin, H. E. Robinson, district manager for the Bureau of Reclamation, revealed that yesterday appropriations had been authorized for work on new dams in the Kansas River Basin. The dams are the Kirwin, Webster, and Glen Elder on the Solomon River and the Wilson on the Saline River. Construction on at least one of the dams will begin during the current fiscal year, he said.

He also predicted negotiations for irrigation along the Driftwood and Frenchman Rivers west of McCook may begin in the next few months.

Robinson underlined the contribution of dams already constructed by the Bureau in preventing floods. The Bureau has completed four dams in the Kansas River district—Bonny Dam in Colorado, Cedar Bluffs in Kansas, and Medicine and Enders in Nebraska—with work on the Trenton Dam 50-percent completed.

Robinson told the 150 guests that without the Medicine Creek Reservoir, the city of Cambridge this year might have suffered a flood similar to the one of 1947. In describing how reservoir construction paid off, he told of the extensive indescribable destruction caused by the recent flood in Kansas and explained that the havoc might have been worse had it not been that the Cedar Bluffs Reservoir stored and stopped 275,000 acre-feet of water.

Lineweaver joined Robinson in lauding the work of the RVCA. He described the recent validation by the district court of a repayment contract between the Frenchman-Cambridge irrigation district and the Bureau after months of litigation as "a significant influence of this area on the other 17 western reclamation States." The contract has been described as a "guinea-pig document" after which other repayment contracts may be patterned.

Lineweaver described the RVCA as a "good example of cooperation in action—plus pressure" for the accomplishment of conservation work. He pointed to the amusing reality of a Democratic administration "pouring more than \$65,000,000 into the Republican Valley" as proof of cooperation.

A philosophical framework for reclamation work was provided by the remarks of C. Petrus Peterson, treasurer of the National Reclamation Association, who envisioned conservation as "man's attempt to better his environment."

The 71-year-old, white-headed Peterson said it was God's charge to man that "he be the ruler of all living things" and pictured the creation of a new race, the assimilation of all foreign peoples, in the State of Nebraska.

Representative CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, Nebraska, told his listeners he was "proud to be called a conservative" because the description fell within the meaning of conservation, which he called "the opposite of destruction and waste."

CURTIS characterized the RVCA as "great leadership" in the fight to conserve "our greatest resource—the good earth."

Know Your Waterways—Only 2½ Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks

in the RECORD, I wish to place in the RECORD an article by the Marine News, of New York, N. Y., recently published in the Washington Post, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—ONLY 2½ PERCENT

The amount provided for harbor and channel improvements in the Army civil functions bill passed on June 13 is but \$14,164,500, a little over 2½ percent of the bill's total, \$514,427,400. The remaining 97½ percent is for Nation-wide flood control, the Panama Canal, maintenance of harbors, channels and flood-control works, cemetery expenses, and some miscellaneous items. Year after year this bill is largely labeled in the press and elsewhere as the river and harbor bill, with the grossly misleading inference that the total amount is for harbor and channel improvement.

The meager \$14,164,500 would not pay for a medium-sized office building, or 20 blocks of New York City subway, yet it is all that is provided for use along the entire Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, all the Great Lakes and all major rivers.

Much of the Nation's commercial and industrial activity and a vital part of its defense depends upon shipping. Shipping is dependent upon properly developed, integrated, and maintained harbors and channels.

When he was Secretary of Commerce, former President Herbert Hoover said, "Through the improvement of our waterways, it will be possible to distribute industry and population better, because the waterway tends to place many towns and cities upon an equality in transportation."

America is developing, expanding, and increasing its strength. It is important and logical that waterways develop and expand with the Nation. Expenditures for that purpose are not extravagance; they are an investment in the building of a nation.

(Marine News, 26 Water Street, New York, N. Y., George H. Palmer, president and publisher.)

Savings Bond Must Be Made a Truly Sound Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of savings bonds as a sound investment has been considered by many of the thinking people in America and Mr. Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Sun Times, qualifies as an outspoken and interested writer on this subject.

His recent column entitled, "Savings Bonds Must Be Made a Truly Sound Investment" which appeared in the Chicago Sun Times on September 4 is as follows:

SAVINGS BOND MUST BE MADE A TRULY SOUND INVESTMENT

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

Recently I asked a man high in the council of the administration in Washington what a person like myself should do about the big Defense Bond drive which got under way Monday and is to last through October 27.

Without attempting to quote his exact words his reply was about as follows:

"Someone has to buy the Government's bonds. If individuals don't, the banks will;

if the banks don't, the Federal Reserve will. As a last resort, if the Federal Reserve won't, the Treasury itself will and will simply print the notes necessary to pay for them.

"It is highly desirable for the common good that as large a portion of the bonds as possible be in the hands of individuals. If the people don't buy the bonds, we shall simply have more inflation. There won't be any more goods. People merely will be bidding prices up.

"It seems obvious to me that you have to get behind the Defense Bond drive."

I said to this man for whom I have a high regard and who has nothing but the interest of his country at heart:

"I presume you are right as far as you go but your phrase 'the common good' begins to fall apart when examined in the light of the individual's good. What you say has been true at any time in the last 10 years and yet the facts are that the patriotic men and women who bought savings bonds and war bonds have been suckers while the less patriotic, coldly analytical men and women who invested their money in good stocks, real estate, or commodities have ridden the inflation train and found it acceleratingly profitable."

NO SOLUTION SEEN

My friend admitted the truth of this charge but hastened to add that he didn't know what he or anyone could do about it.

I told him that for my part if I saw just the slightest indication of a sincere determination on the part of the administration or of Congress to correct the fundamental situation, I, for one, would feel that I should go along, buy bonds myself and urge others to do the same, but unfortunately, the facts of the situation did not warrant taking such a position.

Congress has weakened rather than strengthened the controls necessary to hold inflation in check. Congress has trimmed appropriations only slightly and has dilly-dallied in a shameful manner over the tax bill and today promises us an admittedly inadequate revenue measure with few of the inexcusable loopholes plugged.

President Truman, for his part, has dared anyone to trim his staggering budget. He and his many departmental and agency heads have shown little appreciation of the danger of inflation, little determination to make sure that the value of savings bonds will not continue to decline.

Under such circumstances, what should, and what could be done? My own feeling is that all straws point to an eventual, inevitable crisis. "If such is the case," I told this man who advises the President, "I am convinced that the sooner it comes the better."

My friend shuddered at this thought. He rejected it completely, unwilling to agree that if something bad was coming, it is better to face it today than tomorrow.

Apparently, however, I am not alone in my views regarding savings bonds. The House Appropriations Committee recently, in turning down a request for an extra \$2,000,000 to help finance the Treasury Department's forthcoming savings bond sales campaign, declared that "some new ideas are needed to make savings bonds sell better."

DEMANDS "NEW THINKING"

Noting that sales had shown a marked drop compared with a year ago and that redemptions had been running ahead of sales by \$840,000,000, the committee commented: "It is high time for the Treasury Department to inject some new and more effective thinking into its bond sales program."

The committee reaffirmed its belief in savings bonds "as one of the major means of financing the Nation's defense program and as an effective weapon against inflation" but suggested that the success of the sales program would be "determined by its quality and not by the quantity of money poured into it."

The committee failed to explain what is meant by that remark but my own view is clear. Quality indeed is what we need. Not quality of a sales campaign but quality of the bonds. We need bonds which will not depreciate in their purchasing power a great deal more than they appreciate as a result of the rather modest interest (a maximum of 2.9 percent) paid on them.

All sorts of suggestions have been offered for making the savings bonds more attractive to individuals. Some of these may have merit, others obviously have not. But certainly first and foremost comes the necessity for protecting the value of the bonds.

The public should not be asked or expected to buy bonds for \$75 today with the promise that with interest they will return \$100 after 10 years if that \$100 is going to be worth only \$53 in 1961 purchasing power. This is exactly what happened to the bonds sold 10 years ago. (In addition, the Government takes back in taxes 20 to 31 percent—more probably under the 1951 tax act—of the \$25 earned as interest.)

Must Congress and the administration wait until the public shows very decisively that it will have no more of this raw deal before taking adequate measures to make the Federal bonds the good and sound savings medium which they should be?

Investigation of Sporting Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced House Resolution 412, to create a select committee to investigate all phases of football, basketball, baseball, boxing, racing, and all other sporting events. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD six newspaper articles referring to conditions in various sports that warrant an investigation.

The articles follow:

[From the Keene Sentinel of September 12, 1951]

BAN ON RADIO, TV SHOWING OF FIGHT IS INSULT TO SPORTS PUBLIC

(By Justin Gallagher)

Tonight one of the most ballyhooed championship fights in years is scheduled to be held in New York between Randy Turpin of England and former middleweight titleholder, Sugar Ray Robinson.

Yet only a pitiful handful of this Nation's sum population of boxing fans will see that fight at the Polo Grounds or on theater television.

Hundreds of thousands of fans will not enjoy the time-honored privilege of hearing the bout on the radio or the more recent privilege of watching it on television.

A certain few cities will have fight televised in theaters. Everyone else around the country will have to catch the outcome on late news broadcasts or wait for their morning newspapers.

This is a body blow to the American public which has done pretty well over the years in supporting all branches of sports, including boxing.

If this practice of holding major sports events behind an iron curtain continues, we believe that the game, not the fan, will ultimately suffer most. How long can a fan be expected to remain interested in any sport

he is denied the right to hear about on the radio or watch on television?

And once a fan loses interest, newspapers will cease feeding him his daily fare of sports news he now demands. And if the newspapers ever clamp down, every money hungry sports promoter will go out of business over night.

This newspaper, along with every other, has given considerable space to the Turpin-Robinson fight. We have done so because there is a great deal of interest in the bout. It is our firm belief, however, that interest among fans will lessen appreciably with each passing boxing show they cannot hear or see.

When reader interest flags, sports publicity, at least on a reputable newspaper, will diminish accordingly.

Publicity must keep pace with reader interest, not ahead of it or behind it.

It is not the intention of this piece to become involved in the wrangle whether television and radio are good or bad for sports, though we do range ourselves alongside those who hold that those media will, in the long run, do more to benefit than hurt the game.

The issue at hand, as we see it, is the flaunting of what most sports fans consider their prerogative—privilege to hear or see the fight.

[From the New York World Telegram]

DEWEY ACTION MAKES FARCE OF RING PROBE (By Joe Williams)

Gov. Tom Dewey has directed his personally appointed boxing commissioners to investigate the circumstances surrounding the death of George Flores, the youthful prize fighter who was wounded fatally in Madison Square Garden last week.

The Governor directs the commissioners to "determine if there were any precautions that could have been taken and if it (Flores' death) was in any way avoidable." The Governor adds that the death of the young prize fighter was a "tragedy."

There are many who will agree that it was a tragedy, indeed, particularly the young prize fighter's wife and infant. There are many more who will not agree that turning this matter over to the commissioner, presumably for final disposition, is either bright or proper.

Since the formal certification of the dead youngster's physical fitness and fighting qualifications were entirely in the hands of the commissioners to begin with, it hardly seems likely these gentlemen would go to extraordinary lengths to place themselves in an embarrassing position. This is not a procedure which is uniformly practiced by the human race.

What is needed here is not an investigation by the boxing commissioners but an investigation of the boxing commissioners. What the Governor's attitude amounts to is an invitation to official whitewash and the dismissal of another ring fatality as just one of those deplorable occurrences that couldn't be helped.

If this is as far as the Governor intends to go, then the time has come to abolish prize fighting in this State, for it is a warning that conditions will get worse before they get better. It is almost a certainty that even an impartial investigation would confirm that all the routine precautions were observed, but that would tell only a part of the story. There are precautions which the book, from which the commissioners work, do not prescribe.

IS THERE A LAW AGAINST COMMON SENSE?

Despite contrary belief, there is no rule in the book which imposes a 30-day lay-off for a fighter who has been knocked out. Young Flores had been stopped twice in a month's time when he was booked into the Garden semifinal which led to his death. And he was only 20 years old. Plain com-

mon sense, if not simple humane considerations, should have been sufficient to convince the commissioners this youngster had no business fighting at that time.

In explanation of this shocking indifference, would the Governor be satisfied with the information that the book was not violated? I doubt that anybody who has regard for human life or interest in the ring as a sport (and they are many) would be. Yet this is the sort of thing that may be expected from the Governor's casual directive to his hand-picked commissioners.

A 30-day rest for knocked-out fighters can be no guaranty against ring fatalities. Actually, it is a minor safeguard. Laverne Roach, for example, laid off a full year following a brutal beating at the hands of Marcel Cerdan, yet when he returned he was knocked out and expired from the resultant injuries—or, what is more likely, from the original injuries which had never healed.

But a compulsory rest period is at least indicative of concern. Following the ring deaths of Laverne and Sonny Boy West, battered gladiators were drydocked for just such a period, this on recommendation of the medical advisers. Would the governor expect the commissioners to ask themselves why it was discontinued?

A FULL-SCALE INQUIRY IS IN ORDER

Reports that Dr. Frank Ferlaino, who headed up the medical board when it was first appointed, resigned because of obstructive tactics seem well authenticated. This is a serious matter. Who (and for what purpose) would maneuver to impede a professional man who was working to minimize injuries? Does the governor anticipate the commissioners will look into this curious matter at this late date?

What we need and should have is a full-scale investigation of the prize ring, including, or even beginning with the commissioners' conduct of the business. Their character and integrity are unquestioned. Admittedly their assignment is not a simple one. Two of them serve for free. Only Eddie Egan, the chairman, is salaried. All have other business interests. It would be reassuring in this crisis to learn that they are well qualified. Now is an excellent time to find out.

The latest medical theory is that young Flores' death was caused by the jarring impact when his head hit the ring floor. There is surely no disposition here to question scientific findings. But I have seen any number of fighters hit the floor with just as much violence and suffer no more than stunning shock, and I have to wonder if the condition of the stricken fighter at the time isn't a vital contributory cause.

Perhaps if young Flores had not been punched around in his two previous fights, both within the month, he might have been able to shake off the effects of the impact. It seems to me that if the commissioners had been more knowing and more aware they simply would not have permitted this youngster with his recent background and uncompromising reputation as a punching bag to enter the ring no matter what the medical tests showed. If there was negligence that's where it was and if the governor expects the commissioners to admit it—well, then I will finally begin to understand how he lost to Mr. Truman.

[From the New York Daily News of September 13, 1951]

MOB OF 1,500 SMASHES DOORS TO SEE TV FIGHT

CHICAGO, September 12—A riot broke out tonight at the State-Lake Theater as thousands of persons fought for seats 3 hours before the Robinson-Turpin fight was to be shown on television.

A mob of 1,500 broke three heavy glass doors and surged into the theater. Many

did not have tickets but the management made no attempt to oust them.

The fight was scheduled at 14 theaters in 11 cities.

The crowd began gathering long before sundown and became more unruly as time passed. Finally it went completely out of hand, a policeman said, crashed through a line of 10 cops, broke the inch-thick doors and streamed inside.

"I don't see how those people avoided being hurt," the policeman added. "They crawled over and under each other to get inside."

Forty minutes later the Loop area was hit by a lashing thunderstorm that forced many of those still outside to run for shelter.

The fight was a complete sell-out for the television showings at three theaters here, spokesmen said.

PITTSBURGH, September 12—Fight fans jammed the sidewalks in front of the Fulton Theater tonight 3 hours before the start of the television showing of the Robinson-Turpin fight. With the 1,700 available tickets sold out Monday, ticketless fans offered as high as \$10 for \$2.60 seats.

PHILADELPHIA, September 12—Hundreds of persons thronged tonight around two theaters which have been sold out for more than a week for TV showings of the Robinson-Turpin fight.

A dozen policemen held back crowds at the Royal Theater in south Philadelphia, where lines extended for blocks waiting for some 1,500 already-sold seats plus standing room.

At the Stanley Theater, where 2,000 seats and standing room were sold 9 days ago, scores of additional personnel were hired to cope with the throngs, officials said.

CLEVELAND, September 12—Max Mink, manager of the Palace Theater here, said tonight the televised Robinson-Turpin fight was a complete sell-out.

Mink said there was a line nearly two blocks long to get into the theater. The fight drew so much attention that excursions from as far away as Toronto, Canada, purchased blocks of tickets.

BALTIMORE, September 12—The Century Theater was packed to its 3,200 standing-room-only capacity tonight by fight fans eager to see the only local telecast of the Turpin-Robinson fight. A crowd of 8,000 formed a line around the block an hour and a half before the Century opened.

BOSTON, September 12—An orderly crowd of about 1,900 jammed the Pilgrim Theater tonight to watch the televised Robinson-Turpin fight. Several hundred milled outside as 10 policemen kept watch.

[From the Daily News of September 12, 1951]

THE POWERHOUSE (By Jimmy Powers)

I cannot understand why fans are not told in advance just who is going to referee and judge a prize fight. In baseball the chief umpire and all his assistants are revealed well ahead of the opening pitch. In the Army-Navy football game, and all other headline grid contests for that matter, the men with the candy-striped shirts and little tin whistles are identified.

Sure there is heavy betting on big baseball, basketball, tennis, international polo and football competitions. But the officials are chosen in advance. This is the healthy way.

When you cover ring appointments with secrecy and flash them on the public at the

last moment—ostensibly to circumvent "fixing"—you invite what you are trying to prevent.

If you have so little confidence in your list of referees and judges—get a new list.

In England, where only one man—the referee—decides the winner of a prize fight, the officials are announced long before the first going sounds.

MAN ON HIS METTLE IF PICKED IN ADVANCE

That used to be the custom in America. George Blake was brought to Cleveland to work the Stribling-Schmeling bout. His presence was publicized almost as widely as that of the contestants. It puts a man on his mettle to be chosen in advance. If you wish to "fix" a judge or an official under current cloak-and-dagger conditions you merely pick a weak man and then use political clubhouse pressure to get the appointment through an acquiescent boxing commission.

Blake, incidentally, received what I believe is the largest fee ever paid a referee—\$2,500. I covered the fight and, as I recall, Blake stopped it with less than a half minute to go in the 15th and final round. He gave it to Schmeling on a TKO. It was the correct move.

A judge in New York gets \$10 and a referee \$25 when receipts are \$600 or under. The scale jumps to \$25 for the judge and \$50 for the referee when the receipts range from \$2,000 to \$7,500.

Up to \$15,000, the main event referee receives \$75 and the referee for supporting bouts, \$50. The normal top pay for a referee is \$200 in a show drawing between \$100,000 and \$200,000.

For the Turpin-Robinson middleweight bout tonight the commission is empowered to make special rates for officials. Based on past custom, the referee tonight probably will receive \$250. That is the pay given in all world heavyweight title bouts.

Good officials should be selected, those who have flawless records. And their names should be given out long in advance.

I am Boy Scout enough to believe that the average official is honest. Some come up with weird decisions because they have an anti-sluggish fixation, or are unconsciously prejudiced against cutie boxers. Others are fooled by the great roar of the crowd rooting for a favorite. Still others, for all their experience, get panicky.

I'll never forget Ruby Goldstein, a highly competent man, going all to pieces in the last round of the Fusari-Graziano fight. Rocky pushed Fusari into a ring corner, jammed his head under the top strand, practically sat on Fusari's knees horseback style, choked him by pinching his Adam's apple between his thumb and mitt, and flogged him with his right hand.

Goldstein, instead of pulling off Graziano and penalizing him for his multiple fouls, stopped the fight and gave it to Graziano. That was nothing short of sheer panic. Next day, when Ruby saw the photos and Graziano astride his struggling victim, he shook his head. "I wouldn't believe it happened until I saw the pictures," he muttered.

I think the referee of the second Pepsadler fight succumbed to stage fright. I prefer to think that's what happened. As for the recent Gavilan-Graham affair, here again is a referee, Mark Conn, who is absolutely honest. I think he made a wrong guess on the winner. He seems to be one of those officials who put a high premium on spectacular light punches and discount unspectacular but damaging body blows.

FIGHTS THAT TESTED REFEREE'S NERVE

I often wonder what some of our starry-eyed, hysterical, points-conscious, Egan-briefed babies would do if they were in the ring when Mike O'Dowd knocked out Al McCoy after flooring him seven times; when

Jess Willard was floored seven times in the first round by Jack Dempsey; when Louis Firpo was floored seven times in the first round and twice in the second with Dempsey spilling through the ropes into the press row as an added charge; when Carnera was on the canvas 12 times before Baer knocked him out in the eleventh?

I am aware of modern knockdown rules but nevertheless there have been exciting modern bouts with the tension mounting until every man in the house seems charged with 100,000 volts of electricity. All this calls for a calm, judicial mind, a referee who will not be fooled by a Fancy Dan laying back to fight the last 10 seconds of each round as Willie Pep does. It calls for steel nerves, sharp eyes and the knack of closing the ears to the roar of a crowd shrieking at every move of its favorite and ignoring the point scoring of the rival boxer.

A referee should be discreet. He should be cautious and keen and full of good old-fashioned horse sense.

Hey, you know what? A guy like that probably doesn't hang around just any old street corner.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of September 6, 1951]

BLAME FOR FLORES' DEATH SHOULD BE EASY TO TRACE

(By Dan Parker)

It should be easy for the district attorney's office and the boxing commission to establish responsibility for the death of boxer George Flores in the investigations these agencies propose to make.

Everyone concerned, of course, was aware that the commission had gone on record last year as favoring a month's lay-off for boxers after a knock-out—a recommendation that was ignored twice in the case of Flores, who died from injuries received in a bout at Madison Square Garden August 29. This premise being correct, the agent who booked Flores for the ill-fated bout, the IBC matchmaker who signed him, any physician who passed him, and the boxing commission representatives who approved of the match would all seem to be culpable.

The frantic attempts to cover up trails that might lead to the guilty ones would be ludicrous if the whole affair wasn't so sordid. The boxing commission says Flores had no manager of record. In boxing circles, Lippy Breitbart was spoken of as his manager, but was said to be fronting for a Coney Island gambler. None of the several seconds who worked behind Flores will admit he was the one who berated the victim for his poor showing as he sat dazed in his corner after being counted out. Responsibility for making the match is also clouded in a buck-passing duel. Billy Brown, the assistant matchmaker, reputedly put in this post by Frankie Carbo and Eddie Coco, closed the match, but Al Weill is the head matchmaker and it is reasonable to assume that he approves of all pairings made by his department. One story is that Weill sought this match to win support from the "amateur managers' bloc" in the Fight Managers Guild, which is seeking to have him ousted by the IBC. There are four subordinate officials on the commission, Executive Secretary Dan Dowd and Deputy Commissioners Jack Duberstein, Tony Durso, and Ralph Halpern, who are empowered to approve bouts and one of them must have sanctioned the hasty return match with Roger Donohue, who had knocked out Flores at White Plains on August 15.

The story is that Dr. Vincent Nardiello, noting irregularities in the process of examining Flores for the Garden match, demanded that his record card be produced as is required. This would have established immediately that Flores was ineligible for the Garden match because he had been knocked

out, not once, but twice within a period of a month. When the card wasn't forthcoming, it is reported that Dr. Nardiello expressed the opinion that Flores should not be allowed to fight until he had rested for a month. But the medical advisory board, its personnel now reduced to Dr. Charles Muzzicato, an instructor in radiology in the Goldwater Memorial Hospital, passed on the boxer as physically fit because an encephalograph showed no evidence of a brain injury. The final link in the chain of responsibility seems to have been forged by the boxing commission itself which approved of the match. Of course, no responsibility attaches to Jim Norris, head of the I. B. C., since he is a millionaire sportsman and in the business strictly for aesthetic reasons.

Dr. Muzzicato said yesterday that Flores was a perfect specimen when he entered the ring for the fatal bout. Practically every fighter who is killed in the ring looks like a perfect physical specimen going in, but rippling muscles and a slim waistline are all too often camouflage for a brain that has been damaged by repeated head blows which this delicate organ wasn't built to absorb. No one should know better than Dr. Muzzicato that a fighter's physical appearance has nothing to do with the condition of tiny blood vessels in his brain that have been ruptured by punches to the head and this would be particularly true of a boxer knocked out 2 weeks previously. Another point that should be obvious is that Dr. Muzzicato isn't able to function all by himself as a medical advisory board. Governor Dewey should either reappoint the eight other members whose terms have run out and guarantee them against interference by boxing racketeers, boxing commission personnel and promoters, or abolish the board.

Now, if someone will pour all the white-wash into the East River, which needs it badly, the investigations may proceed and, for once, come up with a finding other than the stereotyped "No negligence indicated."

Washington and Baltimore papers report that several influential racing men have approached George Mahoney, former chairman of the Maryland State Racing Commission, and sounded him out on his availability for the post of "Turf Czar." The story is that recent revelations about jockey rings, added to what the Kefauver investigations brought out about tieups between racing and the underworld, have alarmed some of the turf's important people and they have decided that what the dear old game needs is a czar who will make everyone toe the mark. I thought George's name was anathema to all race-track owners because he had committed the unforgivable sin of taking action against horse doping instead of following the time-honored procedure of refusing to acknowledge its existence or covering up any cases that accidentally came to light.

If racing fans were permitted to elect a czar, Mahoney would probably win unanimously, as he is the only racing commissioner I've ever encountered who had their interests, rather than those of the track owners and influential operators, at heart. Racing has more supervising bodies than our own bureaucratic Government, all of them engaged in fulsomely praising the game and themselves, and berating anyone who doesn't agree that a pari-mutuel machine is God's greatest gift to humanity. If the sport is threatened by adverse legislation—and I can't imagine the States which are partners in this fat racket passing laws that would cut down their sucker money revenue—the various mutual admiration groups which now rule the turf wouldn't be of much help, since they always proceed on the theory that there's nothing wrong with racing; that the fault is with those who criticize it.

In such a situation, George Mahoney, who stands for turf reform and who has entree

to the White House as the Democratic National committeeman from Maryland, would be a handy man for the breed improvers to have around as a chestnut saver. But he'd certainly make a strange bedfellow for them in view of their intense hatred of him for giving the public the most revealing look it has ever had at how the racket is operated from the inside.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, September 7, 1951]

STOP MURDER IN BOXING, EX-RING MD DEMANDS

A former chairman of the State athletic commission's medical advisory board today made a fervent plea to the public to "stop the slaughter in boxing."

Dr. Frank R. Ferlino told the World-Telegram and Sun by telephone from Naples, Maine: "The public must decide whether boxing is to be sport or slaughter, skill or kill."

For the first time Dr. Ferlino revealed the recommendations to safeguard boxers the medical board had urged on the State athletic commission in 1949 and 1950. Dr. Ferlino also admitted he resigned because of the commission's "lack of cooperation."

DIES AFTER KNOCKOUT

Dr. Ferlino's appeal came amid continued indignation stirred by the death of George Flores, 20-year-old welterweight who died after being knocked out in last Wednesday night's semifinal at Madison Square Garden.

Dr. Ferlino was appointed to head the newly created medical board in late 1948. With the eight other members, he worked out a set of recommendations to save lives and reduce injuries. These included improvements in boxing gloves, ring mats, mouthpieces and taping of hands.

Also, the board urged that boxers who were knocked out should be given a 6- to 8-week rest period, then thorough neurological and brain examinations. (Flores met his death just 2 weeks after a previous knockout.)

RESIGNED IN 1950

Dr. Ferlino resigned in July 1950, convinced most of these proposals had been shelved or acted on only half-heartedly by the commission, headed by Lt. Col. Edward P. Egan.

"If our recommendations were followed," the 50-year-old physician declared, "boxing would become safer. That might mean less knockouts and perhaps a little slower footwork. But it would also mean that fewer men would die."

Dr. Ferlino was seconded immediately by Dr. Henry K. Kenwell, a surgeon who also resigned from the MAB. Reached by telephone at his home in Buffalo, Dr. Kenwell expressed "sympathy with what Dr. Ferlino was trying to do."

However, Dr. Kenwell warned it might be difficult to reconcile the public's boxing taste with necessary precautions.

"How are you going to accomplish these ends if someone has to be beaten badly to please the crowd?" Dr. Kenwell asked.

RESEARCH ASKED

These are the recommendations as explained by Dr. Ferlino today:

1. Intensive research to improve gloves through padding or structural changes to prevent lacerations or unusual contusions caused by fists rather than blows.

2. Similar study to replace the felt mats under the canvas. We felt some composition rubber might give more protection to heads striking the canvas.

(The back of Flores' head hit the ring floor solidly when he fell.)

3. New mouthpieces designed to protect teeth, mouth, and lip tissues and reduce the impact of the all-important chin-knock-out punch. This is the most lethal of all

blows because power is directed backward to vital structures at the base of the brain.

WOULD LESSEN BLOW

4. Taping of hands from well below the knuckle points to the wrists (as in foreign countries and certain States) instead of ending the taping just above the knuckles. This would lessen the power of the blow.

5. A system that keeps detailed medical histories and accident reports on each boxer—to detect previous injuries that might prove fatal if the boxer fought again. Examining doctors would make a thorough and detailed check of all boxers, emphasizing neurology, to detect early or latent brain injuries, to nip in the bud the punch-drunk fighters.

6. Any boxer who's been knocked unconscious should be given a mandatory rest period of from 6 to 8 weeks. Then he should get a neurological examination and clearance, together with an electroencephalogram (a picture that indicates whether brain waves are normal). Together, these two are better than either alone.

Watch This Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. Speaker, the present meeting of postmasters in our Nation's Capital has proved beyond any shadow of doubt that these offices should be taken out of politics once and for all.

The present meeting has degenerated into a political rally for the present administration.

The low point was reached when an Assistant Postmaster General attacked former President Hoover. Of course, such an attack cannot affect President Hoover in any way, but it certainly points up the small-mindedness and vituperative skill of some administration appointees.

WATCH THIS COMMITTEE

Whether some 22,000 postmasters in this country are to be taken out of politics and given a chance to go ahead on merit depends pretty largely on the action of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service within the next day or two.

The committee has finished suspiciously brief (one day) hearings on a bill, to remove postmasterships from political flinching, and now is preparing its report. We have it the committee will try to kill the bill largely owing to the usual prejudices of JOHNSTON of South Carolina, McKellar of Tennessee and Langer of North Dakota.

By way of background, the recommendation to clean up postmaster appointments came from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report. It has the backing of the Post Office Department itself, the Civil Service Commission, and, of course, ex-President Hoover. The bill covering this recommendation and including other post-office reforms was introduced by Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont.

The total aim of the bill is simply to put the United States Post Office, now losing

incredible sums, on a basis comparable to commercial enterprises.

Most important to employee morale, however, is the provision covering appointment of postmasters. Candidates now take civil service exams, and the names of the three highest are sent to the Postmaster General. He selects one name, sends it to the Senate for confirmation. And that's where the politics comes in. Unless that name is connected with the party in power, the Senate usually refuses to confirm and asks Civil Service for another name.

The Hoover Commission, with milkop mildness, said this practice "created a political barrier to promotion within the (postal) service and thus deprived it of a great incentive to do good work."

AIKEN's bill removes Senate confirmation from the above procedure.

We recognize that politicians enjoy cleaning up politics the way small boys enjoy visits to the dentist. But let the committee recall two recent malodors in the public nostrils, the sale of postmasterships in Mississippi and the shameless post-office payroll padding in Boston; there are limits to what the public will tolerate.

Pigeon-holing or rejection of the Aiken bill may well breach that tolerance.

Need for Morality in the Internal Revenue Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which in itself points to the need of morality in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

As a member of a Ways and Means Subcommittee investigating the Bureau's activities, I was shocked at some of the revelations we received during our recent meeting in New York. With taxes at an all-time high, the American people will not sit idly by while influence is used by our tax collectors in obtaining revenue to operate this Government. The kind of deals that have been reported to have been going on in New York, Boston, St. Louis, and San Francisco revenue offices is shameful. I warn that if all the influence peddlers are not cleaned out of these offices, we may have a taxpayers' revolt in this country and the gravity of such an act could result in a national disaster.

I include with these remarks the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, September 18, 1951:

PATTERN OF SCANDAL

Hardly a day passes without new scandals touching the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Reference to it as the Bureau of Internal rotteness is unjustified. It is unfair to the majority of honest and able public servants in the agency. But the multiplying reports of irregularities, fraud, and extortion by bureau officials across the country point up the necessity for a more drastic clean-up than President Truman has yet ordered.

Indictment of Denis W. Delaney, former collector of the port of Boston, for alleged acceptance of bribes adds one more to the sorry

list. The public should not convict any of the accused before they have had a fair trial. But in several cases, even where no illegality has been proved, unethical conduct is admitted or established by strong evidence. The peddling of personal or political influence forms a pattern repeated so often as to become monotonous—and extremely ugly.

The case of William M. Boyle, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, fits into this pattern. He has admitted serving briefly as counsel for American Lithofold Corp but has denied helping it obtain a loan from Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Now an official of the firm testifies that Mr. Boyle, while unpaid vice chairman of the committee, helped arrange an interview for Lithofold officials with the RFC's Chairman.

A number of officials have been fired or suspended—since the Kefauver, Fulbright and other investigating committees got on the trail. But Mr. Truman still appears to be giving more heed to his political buddies like Chairman Boyle than to outraged citizens.

Making an appointment may or may not involve pressure. Mr. Boyle should have his day in court. Yet his connection with Lithofold throws a shadow on him as a counselor of the President. For this company's story gets more unsavory the further it is unrolled. One phase of its activities alone must set some kind of record. This is its remarkable penchant for intimate relations with employees or former employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

One, a former chief of the alcohol tax unit in New York, solicited orders for Lithofold from liquor firms under his jurisdiction. Another, while chief collector in St. Louis, took a lively part in Lithofold affairs and had some interesting relations with RFC. Two other bureau men became vice presidents of the printing company.

Out in California two bureau officials were indicted for selling worthless copper company stock to individuals seeking favors in connection with income taxes. A third was fired under charges of an even more smelly hold-up. Reports of other cases continue to roll in.

The latest involves one former Bureau chief and four other politicians from Missouri. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS declares they took American taxpayers for a ride costing \$362,000. That was the profit made out of a little deal with two Government agencies. They rented storage space from the War Assets Administration for \$20,000 and leased it to the Commodity Credit Corporation for \$382,000.

Public wrath should insure unrelenting investigation and effective prosecution of every punishable offense in this amazing chain. But more is required. The President should abandon his tolerance of laxity and root out the moral rotteness which cannot be reached by law. Some of this decay is due to long incumbency by one party. But some comes from the fact that tax collectors' jobs have too often been prize plums on the patronage tree. Both parties have had a hand in that practice; both should take a hand in ending it.

The Arab States and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the New York

Times of today, September 20, 1951, should prove of interest to Members:

ISRAEL NEEDS HELP

The political difficulties of Premier Ben-Gurion in trying to form a government in Israel are matched by the economic difficulties facing the state itself. Despite a most rigid austerity regime that has banned the importation of all luxuries and even some near necessities, Israel has an overwhelmingly adverse balance of payments. This situation is due to the continuing flow of immigrants that has more or less doubled the population of Israel in the past 3 years and is still going strong.

This population growth represents a great potential asset; but for the present it constitutes a heavy drain on the country's economy because most of the immigrants nowadays are poverty-stricken refugees from the Middle East, and north Africa. Furthermore, Israel itself has been an undeveloped land for centuries and does not possess the economic strength necessary to support the newcomers until they can support themselves. Therefore, all of Israel's energy (apart from that diverted to military purposes to ward off possible Arab attack) is now being devoted to building up the capital resources of the country and to expanding its productivity, even at the cost of a sharp decline in the standard of living for the present and the immediate future.

The peculiar problems facing Israel have been recognized by the United States Congress in the Mutual Security bill that is now in conference. A special authorization of \$50,000,000 has been voted by both Houses for the relief of immigrant refugees—matching a similar sum included for Arab refugees in the countries neighboring Israel. In addition, Israel will receive a share—in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000—of the general economic aid authorized for the Middle East. The Export-Import Bank has allocated a total of \$135,000,000 to Israel, but the principal source of funds for Israel's necessary capital development is the \$500,000,000 bond issue now being floated privately in the United States. Proceeds from the sale of these bonds will go toward expansion of the potash, textile, chemical, building and other industries as well as to irrigation, transportation, communications, and electric power projects.

From the outset the United States has had a friendly feeling toward Israel as a genuinely democratic nation that can be a force for stability and progress in the Middle East. We have also proved our good will toward the Arab world many times over; and if friendliness toward Israel means hostility to the Arab states that is only because the Arabs would have it so. It is to our interest that a peaceful relationship be established between Israel and her neighbors, and there is no reason why that cannot be achieved once the neighbors realize that Israel is here to stay.

Broadcast of Boston Symphony Orchestra Concerts and Cultural Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Boston FM Station Opens

October 6; Six Colleges and Symphony Pack It," published in the New York Times of September 20, 1951. That is the type of thing which is very encouraging by way of an educational program on the radio, and I hope the same thing may be possible on television. I have joined in a resolution with three other Senators, to try to see that a suitable frequency is held open on television to make possible the same accomplishment on television as has been realized on the radio.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOSTON FM STATION OPENS OCTOBER 6; SIX COLLEGES AND SYMPHONY BACK IT

Boston, September 19—A powerful non-commercial FM radio station featuring "live" programs of Boston Symphony Orchestra concerts and of cultural programs provided by Greater Boston universities and colleges will begin broadcasting here October 6.

Ralph Lowell, trustee of Lowell Institute, announced tonight that the station, WGBH, would present on its initial broadcast the first Saturday evening performance of the Boston Symphony's seventy-first season.

The orchestra is affiliated in the new venture with Lowell Institute and the six Boston universities and colleges that have been members of the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council since it was organized in 1946 to promote adult education by radio and television in the New England area. The participating schools are Harvard, Boston College, Boston University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northeastern University, and Tufts College.

Station WGBH, with studios in Symphony Hall, will operate at 89.7 megacycles on the FM band on channel 209, with 20,000 watts effective radiated power.

Mr. Lowell said the programs would include "regular courses recorded in the classrooms of colleges and universities, forums on world affairs * * *, comprehensive interpretation of news and events by faculty specialists; full-length drama, * * * educational programs from other colleges and universities throughout the country; and special features from the British Broadcasting Corp., Radio-diffusion Française, the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., and other international broadcasting services."

Parker Wheatley, who has been director of the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council since its organization, will serve as general manager of the station. Mr. Wheatley said that the Boston Symphony programs would not be fed to any FM network reaching the New York area.

Tape recordings will be made of a number of educational programs for broadcast over New York's municipally-owned station WNYC.

An Olson Who Didn't Need a Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, add one more to the long list of "get rich quick" boys who flourished under Mr. Truman's regime. In New York, a gentleman named Olson managed to get along very

well without Johnson. As district supervisor of the Alcohol Tax Unit, he managed to earn a good deal of money, about \$100,000 in a year and a half, by "doing nothing in particular."

Mr. Olson's story is an interesting case history indeed. He was first an assistant collector of internal revenue in Brooklyn. He resigned, and subsequently was appointed to the Alcohol Tax Unit post. In this pleasant spot, he permitted a gentleman who was listed in the Senate Crime Committee hearings as a buddy of Frank Costello to retain a liquor dealer's permit for months after it was to have been revoked.

No less interesting was Mr. Olson's time schedule on the job. He said that he spent only some 2 or 3 hours a day because he thought "If I put in an 8-hour day, I would just be butting in. I don't know what else I would do, except sit around."

Before he finished with his various jobs, Mr. Olson had tied up with a wine company, tried to get into a television outfit run by the Costello pal, and otherwise managed to occupy himself gainfully. Wonder if Mr. Truman would say he earned his salary.

Suspension of Import Duties on Zinc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, by introducing a bill to provide for suspension of the import duties on zinc, I wish to call to the attention of Congress the need of this metal for the national defense.

We all realize that recent strikes resulted in a decline in domestic copper production. Copper is now in short supply because of its vast use in defense work. The strike which further cut the supply has yet to be settled finally. Yet we have every assurance that copper production will be maintained with a resultant increase in the amount available for industrial use. Copper, the main component of brass, is needed as never before. Congress has in every way encouraged its production, especially by suspending the duty on imports.

Without a corollary supply of zinc, the available copper will not be fabricated into brass products. And zinc is not now available in sufficient quantity. The domestic producers are not able to fill the need. Make inquiry of the Federal defense agencies to receive confirmation of this statement. We need then, to encourage the importation of zinc by suspending the import tax now levied. This is not proposed to be done for longer than 2 years or the duration of the national emergency.

In the processing of brass, 30 tons of zinc are needed to combine with 70 tons of copper for 100 tons of the finished brass. Without zinc, brass production will falter.

Truman Says Budget Opponents Are Ignorant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman's latest contribution to the national welfare is a brilliant oratorical effort reciting that "Our budget is as tight and solid as we can make it," that those who criticize it are spreading misinformation out of ignorance or with malice aforethought or to frighten voters.

This species of name calling is part of the same propaganda technique which the President utilized in the famous red-herring episode, when he labeled the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss revelations as nonsense. Surely, no man in public office with any real appreciation of the responsibilities involved in his position would attempt to assert that any government budget is tight and solid. No official ever submitted a budget which did not allow room for eliminating some items. Certainly, no public official since the beginning of the New Deal ever did. He would be ostracized from the society of his fellow Democrats if he dared.

This effort to silence criticism of the fantastic spending policies of the administration will fall harmlessly to the ground, of course, in the light of the Hoover Commission's factually documented data and the daily evidence of loafing in virtually every Government agency from Washington to Hawaii. But the people of our country must decide for themselves how long they will continue to permit their tax dollars to be expended by men who resent honest criticism and dismiss every effort to save government funds as malicious.

Rice Kettle and the Red Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in Wonsan, northeast Korea, last fall, a sign read, "Communism—highest form of democracy." In a Hamhung prison yard, 75 miles farther north, the phrase was practiced as follows:

One by one, 150 Korean men and women stepped to the edge of an open well, hands tied behind back. Each in turn slumped forward, men with bullet in back of head, women with skulls crushed by stone blows. The open side of a huge bronze rice kettle sealed the red well.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very excellent article written by the distinguished port director of the city of Milwaukee, Hon. Harry C. Brockel. This article, published in Government Service magazine in its September 1951 issue, describes briefly but clearly the case for completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record, and that it be followed by two straight-shooting editorials from the Milwaukee Journal, a long-time champion of this great project.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Government Service of August 1951]
NEW LIFE FOR MIDWEST IN ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—PROJECT INEVITABLE; GREAT THINGS SEEN FOR INDUSTRY, TRADE

(By H. C. Brockel)

For the last three decades, America's most distinguished statesmen, diplomats, engineers, and business leaders have emphatically answered yes to the question: Should the St. Lawrence seaway be built? Though legislation authorizing completion of the project has again apparently died in Congress, proponents are confident that the seaway will be built eventually.

President Truman, following in the tradition of every President since Taft, recommended the project urgently to Congress. Twenty distinguished Senators of both major political parties introduced legislation to authorize execution of our agreement with Canada for the seaway development.

The State Department has given the seaway high place in its international program to demonstrate to the world that nations living side by side can peacefully develop projects whose benefits transcend international boundary lines and to prove that America is sincerely determined to strengthen international relationships and achieve permanent peace, by peaceful commerce between nations.

The seaway has two great economic justifications—low cost water transportation and low cost hydroelectric power. The St. Lawrence is the greatest undeveloped source of hydroelectric power in North America. Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of electrical energy are running unused into the Atlantic because of our failure to harness this tremendous resource. President Truman has emphasized that our whole economic and military future requires further development of our power resources, including the vast potential energy of the St. Lawrence.

The States bordering the Great Lakes want the seaway as a transportation resource. By extending deep-draft ocean shipping into lake ports, Midwest farms and industries will be able to use cheap water transportation on a scale hitherto impossible. Industry in the Great Lakes basin could import raw materials in large quantities, at minimum cost, by substituting a direct water haul for a costly rail haul. Midwest agriculture and industry alike will be able to tap new markets abroad.

There is nothing new or experimental in the seaway project. For more than a century,

Great Lakes ports have been engaged in direct trade with Europe through the St. Lawrence River. Between 1920 and 1940, a substantial shipping trade developed between lake ports and northern European harbors in spite of the handicap of the present 14-foot canals in the St. Lawrence River. Briefly interrupted by World War II, direct steamship services between the Great Lakes and Europe have been resumed on a tremendously expanded scale, with six ocean steamship lines regularly engaged in the trade and with close to 100 ocean sailings scheduled for 1951.

Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Toronto and Montreal are now served regularly by these important services, with other ports of call included as cargo movement warrants.

The history of the now well-established shipping service between lake ports and overseas destinations proves beyond doubt the large freight savings possible by use of direct steamers, which eliminate transshipment charges at seaboard ports and costly rail hauls to and from the interior.

The St. Lawrence is not an inland waterway or an artificial waterway—it is a natural highway into the heart of the continent. It is basic in water transportation that ships will penetrate inland as far as possible before discharging cargo. This is proved by the inland location of many great seaports, and by ocean shipping operations a thousand or more miles inland on rivers such as the Yangtze and the Amazon. A single factor—the rapids in the St. Lawrence between Ogdensburg and Montreal has obstructed this principle of water transportation on the St. Lawrence. These rapids are now passable by locks only 14 feet deep and 260 feet long, which limit the size of ships using the route to those dimensions.

The project thus contemplates nothing but a modernization of an existing transportation route. Ninety-five percent of the 2,400-mile sailing distance between Milwaukee and the Atlantic is now fully available for deep-draft shipping.

The cost of the engineering works in the St. Lawrence River will be shared by Canada, the United States, and the State of New York. The net cost of the project to the National Government will be a little more than \$300,000,000, or about one average day's war expenditure during World War II. This nominal expenditure is economically justified by tremendous potential savings in freight charges and electric power rates. The Department of Commerce, as recently as December 1948, estimated that traffic through the seaway including both general cargo and bulk freight would range from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons a year.

The Department of Commerce estimated that freight savings of \$7 to \$10 a ton could readily be derived on shipments moving from overseas to Lake Michigan ports, even allowing for St. Lawrence seaway tolls on the basis of \$1.25 a ton. Even on the basis of the present 14-foot draft operations, limiting ocean carriers to about 1,600 tons of cargo west of Montreal, net freight savings of \$5 to \$10 a ton have been repeatedly demonstrated by the use of existing services.

Aside from the seaway's economic value, another factor of even greater importance is the future security of the United States and Canada. Before World War II, our military leaders urged the completion of the project for the national defense. Shortly after the end of World War II, the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised Congress that, from our experience in World War II, the project is absolutely essential to the national security as a shipbuilding resource, as an additional transportation facility, and as a new source of power.

It is a national misfortune that the seaway was not developed before World War II.

With it, Midwest industry and agriculture could have made a more effective contribution to the war effort, and much money and perhaps many lives could have been saved.

Our wartime shipbuilding production approached 70,000,000 tons. Sixty-five percent of the steel, machinery, and other component parts of these ships originated in the Great Lakes area. However, only about 2 percent of the completed ships were constructed on the Lakes, although we have sheltered harbors, skilled workmen, vast industries, and great steel production. Small ships were constructed in lake ports and sent to sea through the Mississippi River at great expense. The shipbuilding potentialities of the Great Lakes have hardly been scratched. The bottleneck has been the difficulty of getting the ships to salt water.

Had the seaway been developed, we could have constructed, in lake harbors, escort carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and merchant ships. These ships could have been loaded in lake ports with foodstuffs, munitions, and materiel of war—and if this seems like mere speculation, remember that Detroit was ranked as America's No. 1 arsenal, and was closely followed in war production by Great Lakes industrial centers such as Cleveland, Chicago, and Milwaukee.

Convoys could have been assembled in lake ports and sent to Europe with an ocean crossing 1,000 miles shorter via the St. Lawrence than from Atlantic ports. The submarine hazard would have been reduced by one-third, in terms of distance, and shipping losses could have been reduced in proportion to the saving in ocean mileage by use of the St. Lawrence.

The war has depleted our natural resources. We find ourselves with rapidly dwindling supplies of iron ore, petroleum, manganese, copper, lead, and other strategic materials necessary in war and peace. A strategic stockpiling program is now planned, based upon industrial requirements and the national defense. These critical materials should be transported and stored as effectively as possible, in sheltered interior locations, where they will be used in volume. This means the industrial area surrounding the Great Lakes.

Considering the exposure of our coasts to naval and air attack, it is sound national policy to locate strategic industry in the interior and, at the same time, provide it with the advantages of ocean transportation by extending deep-draft shipping into the Lakes.

The seaway will check the drift of population from the Midwest to the seaboard. In recent years, there has been a mushroom growth of new industry along the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast. The employment offered by these new industries has encouraged many people to migrate from the Middle West to the seaboard, resulting in a rapid growth of population around the sea-coasts and a gradual decline of population in the interior. Between 1930 and 1940, many Midwestern States actually lost population. This trend was accelerated during the war.

States tributary to the Great Lakes normally account for 35 percent of our national exports. The foreign trade of the United States does not originate or terminate in our great seaports but is in large measure traceable to the import requirements and the export production of the farms and factories in the heart of the country. Much of our overseas business is highly competitive and must seek the most economical transportation route.

In spite of its distinguished support, the seaway has strong opposition. The principal objectors are seacoast ports, which fear the loss of transfer business between ship

and rail; the eastern trunk-line railroads, which are hostile to Great Lakes water transportation; utility interests, which object not to the St. Lawrence power development, but to the fact that it will be publicly rather than privately controlled; and finally, the coal industry, which opposes hydroelectric developments as a threat to coal markets.

The early canal builders opposed the development of the railroads; when Edison invented the incandescent bulb, the gas industry declaimed the impossibility of electric lighting, the railroads opposed the Panama Canal bitterly, as impracticable, just as they today oppose the seaway. Nevertheless, the railroads were built, the automobile succeeded the buggy, electric lights have become commonplace, and the Panama Canal has joined the Atlantic and the Pacific. In each case benefits have exceeded expectations, and predicted disasters have not materialized.

History will prove the justification for the St. Lawrence, and its accomplishment is merely a matter of time. The case for the seaway has been proved and re-proved so often that its merit is axiomatic. It is not the St. Lawrence waterway which was on trial in Washington. The issue before Congress again was whether the national interest would prevail or whether the self-interest of certain powerful and articulate groups would determine national policy. The seaway is inevitable. The only question is—how long can delaying tactics obstruct it?

American postwar planning is geared to a philosophy of expansion—greater production, full employment, expanded foreign trade, an enlarged merchant marine. The St. Lawrence seaway will help us to obtain every one of these objectives. An expanded foreign trade will cement friendly foreign relations. We need new trade routes and new traffic to support our merchant marine, the largest in the world. Full employment and full production must be geared to a greater volume of commerce and transportation. No project before the American people today will do more to accomplish these objectives than the seaway.

Not only lake ports but the inland communities of the Middle West will share in the benefits of the improved and cheaper transportation through the seaway. Untold thousands of new jobs will be created in lake ports and throughout the Middle West due to expansion of shipping operations, shipbuilding, and the multitudinous aspects of foreign trade.

To our lake ports, the seaway will mean the movement of large volumes of new commerce with added business for railroads, truck lines, stevedores, warehousemen, brokers, banks, and all of the innumerable enterprises associated with maritime activity. The seaway will act as a magnet to bring new industry to the shores of the Great Lakes seeking the most advantageous locations, with a corresponding enhancement of property values.

The project will open a new chapter in banking history with considerable expansion of foreign trade financing in the Middle West. Above all, the seaway will mean new foreign trade opportunities for midwestern industry and new markets for midwestern farm produce.

Secretary of State Acheson has said that the seaway will increase the wealth of the United States by developing one of the greatest natural resources in the world—the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. He has pointed to the mutual benefits which will be derived by Canada and the United States in terms of new economic strength and added security for both nations. He describes the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system as "a great highway of commerce stretching for 2,400 miles from Newfoundland into the industrial and

agricultural heart of the United States and Canada."

Secretary Acheson thus joins his powerful voice with those of his distinguished predecessors, with the Presidents of both parties, and with our greatest military leaders in the unanimous conviction that the seaway will open the Great Lakes area with its vast industrial and agricultural resources to ocean shipping; will give power-deficient areas a new low cost source of electrical energy; and will add immeasurably to the national welfare and the national security.

Gen. George Marshall, other members of the Cabinet, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recently urged upon Congress immediate construction of the seaway as an essential feature of the long range mobilization of the United States. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, urged that the seaway be built for navigation, for power, and for the national defense.

Wilson told a congressional committee that the seaway, in his opinion, would pay out as a private enterprise and that he would not mind developing it as a private venture. This is a remarkable statement about a Government project coming from one of the Nation's top-flight industrial leaders, and is compelling evidence of the great economic merit of the project.

The opposition to the project is powerful and well financed, and has delayed congressional action on the project for another period of time. However, the project may be approaching completion without American participation, as the Canadian Government has issued a number of strong statements indicating that if the American Congress turns its back on the project, Canada will immediately carry it to completion with Canadian financing.

Even the bitterest opponents of the project concede that it must inevitably be built. As Freeman Lincoln, writing in a recent issue of Fortune magazine, well said, "The things that are right and necessary in this world eventually are done. The seaway is one of those things."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 19, 1951]

ETHICS ON THE SEAWAY QUESTION

Just when it appeared that opponents of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway had exhausted every trumped up reason for opposing the project, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference came up with a new one.

Now the project is unethical. Yes, sir, that's what it is, unethical.

"At a time when the need for higher ethics in Government is being seriously discussed throughout the country," says a current letter from the Conference, which is a bitterly antiseaway group, "it is doubtful if any proposal before Congress was ever wrapped in more Machiavellian cynicism than this proposal's supporters are giving it."

What is the Machiavellian cynicism? It seems that seaway proponents are looking forward to the day when there will be enough shifts in the membership of the House Public Works Committee to give the seaway backers a majority. That, implies the Conference, is crooked politics.

It sounds good—until you realize that it comes from a group which has lobbied and wooed a House committee to keep the seaway proposal from coming to the House floor. Why? Because, by every count possible, it has been obvious all along that if the seaway project could reach the House it would get a majority vote. The same thing holds true of the Senate.

The Conference has a strange sense of ethics. It's ethical to keep the majority from voting, apparently. But it isn't ethi-

cal to break up a minority of House Members on the Public Works Committee which won't let the majority vote on the floor of the House.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 17, 1951]

SHORT-SIGHTED SEAWAY FOES

The St. Lawrence seaway project will be permanently postponed, if the AFL railway employees' department has its way. Michael Fox, president of the union group, has announced his organization's opposition to any effort to revive congressional consideration for the seaway.

Fear of the loss of thousands of jobs in the railroad industry motivates this obstructionist feeling, we conclude from the union president's statement.

This perpetuate-the-job philosophy of labor is outdated, short-sighted, and unprogressive. More enlightened unions are coming to see that intelligent self-interest forbids labor from opposing real progress in any form.

Labor's interests cannot be divorced from those of the whole population, and any technical improvement in manufacturing, any great transportation development which strengthens the country as a whole will, in the long run, improve the lot of labor.

What sort of living standards would the workman have today if labor had successfully blocked modern methods of mass production because the introduction of machines would result in the loss of thousands of jobs?

Temporary dislocations may follow a change in the way of doing things, it is true. It is possible that railroads will lose somewhat immediately after the seaway is opened, if it is ever built.

But if the seaway brings a great expansion and prosperity to industry in the Midwest and in other affected regions, as there is every reason to believe it will, then there will be more traffic than ever for the railroads. Many products are better suited to transportation by train than by the slower water-borne carriers. Many markets are out of reach of water transportation entirely, and must be served by rail or highway.

The big question for the railroad employees, as for other citizens, should be: Does America need the St. Lawrence seaway? The overwhelming weight of evidence says that we do.

Carolina's Clemson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Clemson A. & M. College is located in the district it is my honor to represent. Clemson ranks with the best in America in technical, agricultural, and military training. It is the largest college in South Carolina and is noted for having one of the most beautiful campuses in the country, at the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Clemson furnished more officers for the Armed Forces during World War II than any other college in America with the single exception of Texas A. & M. Clemson has contributed greatly to the recent remarkable progress of South Carolina.

Under the able leadership of Dr. R. F. Poole and a faculty unsurpassed, Clemson will continue to play an important role in the progress of the State and Nation.

It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I incorporate in my remarks a splendid article which appeared in the September-October issue of the Grace Log. This internationally respected publication is well known the world over. Published in New York City by the W. R. Grace & Co., it is widely read in export, import, and travel circles. South Carolina is grateful for this tribute by the Grace Log to an outstanding institution.

CAROLINA'S CLEMSON

Tucked away in a serene and verdant corner of South Carolina and surrounded by the gently rolling foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, the Clemson Agricultural College exudes that pleasant atmosphere of unhurried academic pursuit so often and appropriately characterized by the term "ivory tower." Almost 200 acres of fresh green lawns, broken here and there by clusters of giant shade trees and ivy-draped, red-brick buildings basking under the warm Carolina sun, lend further credence to the impression that here the relentless urgency of the mundane world quietly is brushed aside in favor of calm intellectual endeavor.

Nothing could be further from the truth. For Clemson College was born of the fervent desire of a practical man to impart the most practical of scientific knowledge. Throughout the 60 years of its life the college has been nurtured in the tradition of "service now" to the people of the State of South Carolina. Today it is embarked on scores of programs and experiments designed to bring a fuller and more prosperous life to those same people not only a decade hence, but next year and next month. No matter what city, hamlet, or rural hillside a South Carolinian may call home, nor how he gains his living, he cannot escape the beneficial influences of his State school of agriculture and mechanics.

Clean, sturdy beef and dairy cattle graze today on improved pastures where yesterday the rich, red earth lay barren and exposed to a baking sun. Curving rows of healthy cotton plants circle the hillsides which once were gullied and unsightly patches of stunted crops. Twenty-five years ago cotton farmers had to be content with an average of less than half a bale of lint to the acre; today they are moving steadily toward an average of a bale to the acre.

A quarter of a century ago farmers were getting about 12 percent of their total cash income from livestock—about \$15,000,000; last year the \$72,000,000 which came from livestock and their products represented about 22 percent of farmers' cash income. A few years back, South Carolina was importing milk in a vain endeavor to correct diet deficiencies, while now fine herds of Holstein, Swiss, Jersey, and Guernsey cows provide the children of the State with ample quantities of this essential food. Within the course of a few years, the practice of indiscriminately cutting and burning the forests, which cover nearly half the State, virtually was eliminated, and in its place selected cutting and replanting substituted so that forestry today is one of South Carolina's major sources of income and her estimated \$500,000,000 worth of forests a carefully protected and nurtured asset.

Once dependent upon its two major crops, cotton and tobacco, the State is on its way toward an economically healthy diversification and no longer alternately flourishes and stagnates according to the price vagaries of a single market.

The most rabid of Clemson's many enthusiastic supporters would hesitate to give the college all the credit for these and the many other revolutionary changes which have been wrought upon the physical face and basic economy of the State of South Carolina. It is enough to say that without the leadership, the trained men, and the enthusiastic cooperation of Clemson College such progress would have been made slowly, if at all. The college has served as the dependable rallying point around which progressive farmers, cooperatives, Federal and State governmental agencies, and industrial and business enterprises could join in common efforts to seek a fuller utilization of the rich natural resources of the State.

A remarkable document was responsible for the founding of Clemson College—the will of Thomas G. Clemson. A Philadelphian by birth, Mr. Clemson married the daughter of South Carolina's great statesman, John C. Calhoun, and adopted his wife's native State for his own. Benefiting from the excellent technical education he had received at a school of mines in France, Thomas G. Clemson was determined that his accumulated wealth should be poured into a similar educational institution in his own land. His will, opened after he died in 1888, began with this preamble: "Feeling a great sympathy for the farmers of the State, and the difficulties with which they have to contend in their efforts to establish the business of agriculture upon a proper basis, and believing that there can be no permanent improvement in agriculture without a knowledge of those sciences which pertain particularly thereto, I have determined to devote the bulk of my property to the establishment of an agricultural college upon the Fort Hill Place. My purpose is to establish an agricultural college which will afford useful information to the farmers and mechanics, therefore it should afford thorough instruction in agriculture and the natural sciences connected therewith, it should combine, if practicable, physical and intellectual education . . . terminating in thorough theoretic and practical instruction in those sciences and arts which bear directly upon agriculture."

The Fort Hill Place to which the Clemson will referred was the home of John C. Calhoun and the plantation house still stands in the very heart of the Clemson campus, whose classrooms and laboratories are the realization of Thomas G. Clemson's dream.

Clemson's contributions to the people, and more directly, the farmers of South Carolina, fall into three overlapping categories. The college itself offers an excellent undergraduate program in agriculture and some work on the graduate level so that its students are well prepared to farm their own lands and to serve as trained leaders in their communities. The agricultural experiment station utilizes thousands of acres on which tests are made of soils, crops, fertilizers, insecticides, irrigation, and, in brief, every phase of South Carolina farming. Through the extension service the results of these experiments and practical on-the-spot help is offered to every farmer in the State.

The Clemson agricultural student has at his disposal hundreds of acres of nearby land planted in a wide variety of crops and clovers, well-equipped laboratories, an ultra-modern dairy farm, a beautiful new agricultural engineering building—housing almost every type of farm equipment—and a faculty composed of experts.

Upon being graduated he is prepared to step off the campus and onto a farm without the usually difficult—and frequently financially painful—switch from the purely theoretic to the practical side of making the earth produce. Many of South Carolina's most progressive and prosperous farmers are

former Clemson students—the surest test of the quality of the training provided.

While still engaged in undergraduate tasks many of the students have an opportunity to work closely with the agricultural experiment station. The station is operated as a dependent branch of the college and many members of the Clemson College faculty also are listed on its staff. The main offices and laboratory of the station are located on the Clemson campus and there are five substations placed strategically throughout the State to offer each of the major soil and climatic areas an experimental station capable of adequately testing crops and soils in the particular region.

Working on the frontiers of agricultural science the several experiment stations are quick to tackle every problem which arises to plague the farmer and are constantly on the alert for wealth-producing new crops or new, money-saving agricultural methods. A recent listing of study projects of the experiment stations includes tests on corn varieties and irrigation of pastures, the flavor of milk and the yield of okra seeds, trichomoniasis of turkeys, and brown rot of peaches. Cotton and tobacco, still the major crops of South Carolina, get a lot of attention at the experiment stations but the great peach-growing and truck vegetable areas are not neglected. At the Edisto station tests were run recently on new strains of all 11 grains grown in the area. Samples of the most promising varieties of oats, wheat, and barley were then sent to 50 high schools throughout the State so that farmers and students could see the grains growing side by side and draw their own conclusions as to the advisability of sowing each.

At the truck station the Santee variety of early cucumber has been developed and consistently has produced from 30 to 40 percent more than the best standard varieties. Cantaloupes, sweetpotatoes, sesame, peppers, cabbages, and potatoes are the subject of careful scrutiny for the benefit of the Carolina farmer.

A major campaign is now under way with agricultural diversification as its goal. The emphasis is on increasing the amount of acreage in pasture, and correspondingly the numbers of livestock. The experiment stations are making many studies of various combinations of grasses and clovers. Careful tests have been run to determine seeding cost, optimum quantity of fertilizer, and yields in terms of grass and clover tonnage and also in terms of the increased weight of livestock which feeds off the pastures. Yesterday the acreage devoted to improved pastures was counted in the thousands, today in the hundreds of thousands.

Theory may help dictate the types of experiments run, but only the most practical of solutions are acceptable. The Carolina farmer, like most of his counterparts the world over, is slow to change unless overwhelmed with evidence that he is cheating himself by not doing so. Thus, the experiment station translates the results of many of its studies into dollars and cents terms: "Results from the 4-year experiment show an average increase of 33 bushels from irrigation . . . giving a return increase of \$52 per acre . . . [which] is more than twice the annual cost of . . . irrigation." Or: "The yield in treated fields [poisoned for boll weevils] averaged 1,385 pounds of seed cotton per acre as compared with 493 pounds in the untreated fields, or a gain of 892 pounds. . . . Value of gain, 892 pounds at 10 cents per pound * * * \$89.20; cost of poisoning * * * \$44.25." That's the kind of language universally understood. It produces results.

The extension service is the link between Clemson College and the experiment station on one hand, and the farmer on the other.

A county agent and usually one or more assistants are stationed in each of South Carolina's 46 counties. The agent's job is to maintain close contact with the farmer, to visit him in his fields, to make suggestions when he is confronted with a problem. County agents conduct demonstrations which give the farmer a close-up view of new processes or recently developed varieties of crops. They make soil tests and insect counts to aid the farmer in his fertilizer and insecticide program. They conduct tours so that a farmer may observe at first-hand both the good and the bad in his neighbors' fields and profit thereby. They are responsible for general supervision of the 4-H program in which thousands of young boys and girls are introduced into the art of scientific farming.

Since it is impossible for the county agent to maintain direct contact with every farmer in his territory, a system of neighborhood, community, and county committees have been created. Through these organizations the advice of the extension service is passed down the line so that no farmer need be deprived of the advice and help of the service. These committees help plan farm programs. They outline their own needs and then formulate plans for fulfilling them. This year nearly 9,000 men and women of South Carolina are giving unselfishly of their time to strengthen the extension program.

Backing up the county agents is a roster of specialists—men who have earned, through their study and its practical application, the right to speak as authorities in their particular fields. These men offer constructive help in such fields as cotton ginning, dairying, horticulture, marketing, pastures, poultry, and soil conservation. Travelling frequently throughout the State they pass on the facts they have learned and the doubts they have acquired to the farmer who can put such knowledge to work.

The need for agricultural progress—for more food and better food, and more and better raw materials for industry—becomes ever more pressing. The South Carolina triumvirate—Clemson College, and its associated agencies, the experiment station and the extension service—are meeting the challenge. They are showing how "the good earth," though long mistreated, may be made to produce again. Thomas G. Clemson, by providing for the founding of Clemson College, sowed well the seed of progress in South Carolina.

The Japanese Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Japanese Treaty," from the September 24, 1951, issue of the magazine, the Freeman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAPANESE TREATY

Even though the Soviet Government did not succeed in throwing half a dozen monkey wrenches and a barrel of emery powder into the works at San Francisco, it does not follow that the Japanese Peace Treaty will

necessarily be a good one for the United States.

Why? In the first place, as Senator JENNEX, George Creel, and others have pointed out, the treaty might be used to eulchre an American-controlled anti-Soviet army out of the Japanese islands. President Truman, in his September 4 speech in San Francisco, dwelt specifically and lovingly on the necessity of bringing Japan under the principles of the United Nations. The Soviets, of course, are members of the United Nations, with full power on the Security Council to sabotage and stymie the desires of the United States. If the Japanese Peace Treaty were tied to the U. N. Charter, as the wording of the document would seem to permit, control of American troops stationed in the Japanese islands could very well pass to an international high command dominated—or at least rendered completely impotent—by the Russians and their stooges. Thus MacArthur's good work could be undone in a single moment of negligence or duplicity in the gyp joint presided over by croupier Trygve Lie.

True, the mutual-aid treaty between the United States and Japan, the text of which was released shortly after the big treaty had been signed, would seem to protect American garrison rights in the Japanese islands. But even in this mutual-aid treaty there are the vaguely deferential concessions to possible U. N. usurpation. The United States Senate had no part in the mutual-aid treaty preparation. Senator JENNEX has objected to the way the State Department insists on formulating treaties without taking the Senate into its confidence, as it should do under the Constitution. The text of the Japanese mutual-aid treaty was kept as classified material and hence unavailable to Senators.

If Senators JENNEX and CAIN have their way, the Japanese Treaty faces a good coming-over before it is ratified by the Senate. The more alert Republicans insist that Japanese bases be reserved for American, not U. N., troops until such time as the Communist menace has been dissipated in the western Pacific. They also insist that Free China should be included in any far eastern settlement. Moreover, as the more alert Republicans see it, the Japanese Treaty should not be used to validate Soviet claims to the Kuriles and South Sakhalin. There is no reason to make a treaty with Japan the engine for legalizing the dirty work of Yalta and Tehran in the eyes of an unsuspecting world.

As we go to press, the Russians have just finished howling their grievances to the skies over the Golden Gate. Their propaganda has reached to New Delhi and to other receptive ends of the earth. They may not be satisfied with the results of San Francisco, but they have gained some of their ends nonetheless. At the very least San Francisco will do its added bit to establish in the eyes of the world that the United States is a prime welsher. The absence of the Free Chinese high lights the fact that we have helped deliver Manchuria and the Chinese mainland to a totalitarian power—which was precisely what we went to war with Japan to prevent. The absence of MacArthur high lights our deplorable way of honoring heroes, patriots, and prophets. It would be a most sardonic sequel to this history of welshing if the Japanese Treaty were to be made the instrument of delivering Japan itself over to the Communists. On the record the Japanese can hardly be blamed if they secretly suspect the worst.

The main hope of the free world is not what the U. N. may do under the Japanese Treaty. The main hope is that the Japanese people, by regaining at least some measure of responsibility and autonomy, will

proceed to do something about combating the inroads of communism for themselves. If MacArthur continues to be honored at Tokyo it may not matter so much that he is treated with dishonor in Washington.

Harvey Machine Co. Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Government loan of \$46,000,000 to the Harvey Machine Co. of California is a subject of considerable comment, both in the press and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, placed extensive remarks in the RECORD in regard to this matter.

The Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, of Montana, together with the eight other Republican Members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, has asked the chairman, the Honorable JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona, to have the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs undertake an early investigation of this entire matter.

I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter from Mr. D'EWART and the other Republican members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House, addressed to the chairman of the committee, the Honorable JOHN R. MURDOCK:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 20, 1951.

Hon. JOHN MURDOCK,
Chairman, Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JOHN: We would like to call to your attention the remarks inserted in the RECORD of September 19 on pages A5730-A5734 by Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD concerning construction of an aluminum plant in western Montana which, it is proposed, would use power from Hungry Horse Dam, a Bureau of Reclamation project.

You will note that Congressman MANSFIELD's insertion deals with charges as to the good faith of a certain contract between the Harvey Machine Co. of California and the Federal Government, which contract, it is reported, has been approved by Secretary Chapman, but since held up. It was a member of our committee who first brought this matter to the attention of the Congress.

These charges concern a reclamation power project, construction of which was authorized by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, and the construction of an aluminum beneficiation plant that is directly connected with development of strategic minerals and is also within the jurisdiction of your committee.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is charged, under the Reorganization Act, with the responsibility of writing policy in connection with the construction of power projects undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation, the marketing of power from these projects, and the development and beneficiation of strategic and critical

materials. The charges which are contained in the insertion by Congressman MANSFIELD deal with these matters and are wholly within the jurisdiction of your great committee. Therefore, it seems to us, considering the seriousness of the charges made, the delay in providing the strategic material that may result therefrom, and the publicity, all of great importance to Montana and the Nation, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should undertake an early investigation of the charges made in the insertion placed in the RECORD by Congressman MANSFIELD.

Very truly yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, FRED CRAWFORD, A. L. MILLER, FRANK BOW, HAMER H. BUDGE, NORRIS POULSON, E. H. JENISON, JOHN P. SAYLOR.

Wetback Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Wetback Control" which appeared in the Washington Post for Saturday, September 15, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WETBACK CONTROL

The wetback problem—the problem created by the presence in the United States and the continued entry of hundreds of thousands of farm workers who have streamed illegally across the Mexican border—continues to bedevil our relations with Mexico and our own agricultural economy. In July, when the President reluctantly signed the pathetically inadequate Ellender-Poage bill regulating the employment of farm workers from Mexico, he urged Congress to adopt additional measures necessary to control illegal immigration. Congress has not yet done so, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service finds itself helpless for want of personnel and funds to cope with the problem. It is a problem particularly acute in September, the great harvest month.

A supplemental appropriation of \$6,500,000 has been sought for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and is now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee. At best, however, it cannot become available for some weeks. Accordingly, Senator HUMPHREY has introduced a joint resolution to provide \$600,000 as a stopgap fund for the service. Immigration officials appear to have found, for the first time, an effective way of dealing with the Mexican migrants. Last year they picked up about 510,000 of them and put them on the south side of the Rio Grande River; the sole result was that the migrants went a little way downstream and swam across again. Lately, however, the Immigration people have been putting the Mexicans into planes and flying them, with the cooperation of the Mexican Government, to points 500 or 600 miles inside Mexico, whence they find it difficult to return.

This airlift operation is an ingenious adaptation to a difficult problem. Since it

seems to be working well, it ought to be continued. The service needs money for the planes, for detention centers, for an expanded border patrol, and for finger-printing the aliens in order to determine whether they are returning. The United States has a double obligation to make this border protection effective—a treaty obligation to Mexico, both countries having pledged themselves to do everything in their power to eliminate the wetback traffic, and an obligation to American farm workers whose work opportunities and living standards are being depressed by ruthless exploitation of the poverty and helplessness of the aliens.

There is, moreover, an obvious peril to national security in the ease with which aliens can come across this country's southern border. There is very little use in all the elaborate screening of European aliens required by the McCarran Act if hostile agents can come in at will from Mexico. Senator McCARRAN, who tried not long ago to make our flesh creep by the extravagant assertion that there are some 5,000,000 illegal aliens in the United States, should know where the chief loophole lies. That loophole can and should be plugged promptly by giving the Immigration and Naturalization Service the funds it needs to do its job effectively.

Random Thoughts on World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I sent to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared regarding certain comments which have been made on the problems of taxes and world security by a distinguished businessman and world citizen who resides in Basle, Switzerland, a commander in the French Legion of Honor, and nominee for the Nobel peace prize, Mr. Emil Dreyfus. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement and appended material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANDOM THOUGHTS ON WORLD PEACE

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

From out of the land of Switzerland have come many of the finest contributions to the economic, political, social, and spiritual life of western civilization. A country small in size and in population, varied in the tongues and origins of its people, Switzerland has contributed in an inspiring degree, highly disproportionate to what one might otherwise expect of a nation of its limited resources. It has given to the world a model example of how diverse component peoples can, with industry and loyalty, make of their rugged but beautiful land an Eden of prosperity and an island of peace in a chaotic, confused, war-ridden world.

The city of Basle, in particular has contributed much to what we know as western civilization. It is, therefore, with particular interest that I call attention to the contributions made by a famous resident of Basle, Mr. Emil Dreyfus, a founder of the Celanese Corp. of America, a man experienced in the problems of industry and state, a man profound in international outlook. Mr. Dreyfus is a commander in the

French Legion of Honor, and is a nominee for the Nobel peace prize.

In his monograph entitled "Random Thoughts," published in Basle in November 1948, he compiled a number of observations which he had made during the critical 12-year period from 1936 to 1948. Mr. Dreyfus addressed himself particularly to the problem of the present world-wide distribution of raw materials as well as the matter of world stabilization of the currency.

There is much in Random Thoughts which provides a keen basis for discussion. I myself hold views different from many of the conclusions. I do believe however that this very interesting and significant collection of observations down through the years—many of them prophetic in character—makes an important contribution to thinking on the most critical of all issues—the preservation of the peace of the globe, the sparing of mankind's peoples from the horrors of both another war or another depression. Those objectives cannot be met of course unless we lay the basis for justice and equity among nations.

I am always happy to review distinguished judgment from here and abroad, whether or not it agrees with my own thoughts provided I feel that such judgment is sincere, constructive, noble in purpose, as I know these ideas of Mr. Dreyfus are.

There follow certain materials from Random Thoughts. I have selected those which I feel are particularly pertinent at the present time. I wish that it might be possible to submit some of Mr. Dreyfus' views on international organization in great detail.

The items that follow relate to:

1. The problem of high taxes, a matter affecting virtually all of our western nations, a matter peculiarly appropriate in view of the fact that the Senate is right now debating the \$5,500,000,000 tax increase bill.

2. The problem of Soviet Russia, a matter which engages my particular attention as ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and conferee on the multibillion-dollar mutual-aid bill.

The quotations from Random Thoughts, by Emil Dreyfus, are as follows:

"THE TAXPAYER IS EXHAUSTED"

"Excessive taxation under certain conditions is nothing short of confiscation. The more the State intrudes into private business and private economy, the less it seems to understand it.

"It is impossible today for either industry or commerce to build up a reserve fund sufficiently large to protect the position of the enterprise. This lack of reserve could cause the ruin of many firms and leave them in the greatest distress if a business depression were to occur. This is the process of killing the hen that lays the golden eggs.

"All the individual works for today is to pay his taxes, the same goes for business, and the big taxpayer has taken on the function of a collector.

"And in addition to this excessive taxation the Government does not allow the individual to provide adequately for his heirs. The Government having taken away most of the individual's revenue and his gains, the latter may not even bequeath to his loved ones means that will adequately provide for them after he is gone, for inheritance taxes are almost prohibitive.

"We must not be surprised therefore if the individual has no more ambition or desire to improve his financial situation. His spirit of enterprise has been destroyed.

"The Government must stop exploiting the individual and do its duty, which is to protect the interests of the individual. The value of an ounce of gold passed from \$22 to \$35—showing in what times we are living. In some countries an ounce of gold went up to \$80 and \$90. Russia simply went bank-

rupt and devalued her currency at 100 rubles to 10. That was an easy way out, but let us hope that other countries won't think of doing the same. An honorable government does not resort to such methods.

"The Government is the principal partner in all private or business enterprise, it is the most important partner in all revenue, capital, or profit. Consequently, rather than destroy all these by exorbitant charges, it ought to cooperate in their preservation. Today, the Government is actually enjoying all of its prerogatives and is assuming none of its responsibilities. Whenever losses are to be sustained, the Government does not participate in these losses.

"The Government must not try to substitute itself for the businessman. It must leave the individual free to attend to his own business, to make it thrive so that by means of the taxes he pays, he may make his own share of contribution to the Government; but these taxes must be fair and reasonable.

"The Government takes everything away from the individual, and the latter must constantly start all over again to try and build up his lost assets.

"The enemy groups use other mediums: wars, revolutions, internal disorder, and chaos. They take over control wherever they can and give to this type of despotism the name of democracy.

"We must rebuild for the entire world a new democracy, honorable and sincere, with capable leaders, so that we might prove to the entire world that this system can be valued and can command national and international respect.

"During the war the government burdened the individual with very heavy taxes, and now that the war is over, it has become accustomed to all these resources and cannot get away from the habit. It disregards the fact that conditions have changed, that we are no longer at war, and that such high taxes are no longer necessary. The government continues to apply these very heavy taxes which paralyze the economic set-up as if it were a chronic disease.

"It is just as if you had a plant, your labor went on strike, and, after giving them satisfaction, they struck again, and again you satisfied their demands, and this occurred repeatedly until some day business went bad, and you, having had no opportunity of constituting a reserve for bad times, asked your labor to accept a cut in their income, and they refused. Now the result is the same, when a government refuses to cut down its tax requirements.

"The government leaves no respite to business. With its demands in taxes it does not allow business to build up a reserve for bad times, for periods of strikes and depressions, and, if these occur, they are not in a position to protect their position. And the government, not having itself built up any reserves, is not able to come to their rescue in bad times.

"The Government is making debts by the billions. Who owes all this money? And to whom is it owed? Who is the Government? Does the Government not consist of all the production and business enterprises as a whole, of their executives and their employees? We shall have to amortize these billions of debts some day. Now, when we undertake to grant billions of loans for the recovery program, when we formulate a Marshall plan, where do we get the money? Is it the Government that produces the money? Is it not rather the businessman and the working people?

"In our times, when it is customary to do everything on a large scale, we must not be led to suppose it is right to have unreasonable taxes. The taxes to-day are a quasi-confiscation of the savings of the individual—savings earned by honest and hard work.

"It is very wrong to think that it is a crime to be rich, and this attitude should be condemned. Why should an individual not be allowed to prosper and build up reserves? Does not the sum-total of all individual fortunes constitute the wealth of a country? Is it not preferable to see the citizens of this country become the heirs to these fortunes, rather than see them being dilapidated?"

"THE VETO RIGHT IN THE UN MUST BE ABOLISHED"

"The purpose of creating the United Nations Organization at its inception was to allow the nations to meet, discuss, and come to agreement on a formula for world peace. Subsequently, the five big nations, assuming certain powers which it had never been intended to give them, decided to give themselves the veto right, believing that with this right they would be in a position to stop any motion that might not suit their plans and safeguard their own private interests and their own policies.

"This was a serious mistake—not to say a crime—toward the lesser powers. But the big five pursued their own aims, thinking they would be able to control the entire world and dictate to it. Soon it was realized that such a system was unworkable and that on the contrary it could only lead to failure. Indeed, almost daily for the past 3 years the veto has been used by the Russians, and the decisions of the U. N. have been sabotaged to the detriment of the great and lesser powers. This proves that the veto right should never have been authorized, either for the great powers or for the lesser.

"In an organization such as the UN all countries, great or small, should have the same rights. Otherwise, we revert to the old power politics, parties, and policies, where nations work one against the other and where a peace program for the whole world becomes a myth. The veto right, therefore, must be abolished in the U. N.

"SOVIET RUSSIA CLAIMS TO BE DEMOCRATIC"

"As we read the diaries of certain statesmen recently published, we realize that at the meetings that were held of allied personalities in Moscow the cause of democracy was not favorably presented to the Russians. Serious mistakes were made in the economic, geographic, and military field.

"We wonder why Russia was allowed to take over such great expanses of foreign territory before her frontiers were definitely set. Was it intended to allow her to become so oversized so that communism might fall of its own weight?

"Without consulting the United Nations, Russia has seized a large number of countries against the will of the peoples of these countries. She has progressively taken over Poland, Rumania, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Czechoslovakia. We realize there is no means of satisfying her appetite under any conditions, and we ask ourselves this question again: Why were the frontiers of Russia not defined at Yalta, Moscow, or better still, Berlin?

"We of the democracies are at a great disadvantage compared with Russia. Stalin, with the help of his Politbureau, is able to make his decisions immediately. Whereas we have to discuss and deliberate for months before we can take a stand. Stalin in his sphere is the all-powerful master. All submit to his command. In his statist Russia he is the most important capitalist, the greatest industrialist, and the biggest businessman. In fact, he is the sole dealer for the whole of Russia.

"Such a unique position allows him, by means of terror and dictatorship, to conquer the smaller nations, ruthlessly dominate them and exploit them in order to extract from them every possible thing. This

method can only provoke world revolution against tyranny, a revolution in which the democracies are already morally engaged and theoretically at war, since it has been proved to them beyond doubt that the communistic system leads to a leveling down from beneath and to the debasement of civilization and the human being.

"In all her agreements Russia wants nothing but the advantages and no obligations. Stalin is like Hitler, who used to say, 'All is just that helps Nazi Germany.' Stalin acts autocratically, does nothing but what pleases him, even if it inflicts the gravest injustice on the peoples of other countries or of his own.

"When the Russians, like the western allies and with the same machines, had the occupation currency printed and exchanged this currency against merchandise and American dollars, there was no adequate control and to this day we do not know the extent of the profits they reaped from these manipulations. No one knows the exact amount of the enormous benefits they derived from them. All we know today is that the American taxpayer is bearing the consequences of it, because the currency is devalued to the advantage of the Russians and we do not know to what extent.

"The gradual seizure of the Balkan states by the Russians is a history so painful that it should be treated in a separate work. Certain ministers of these countries committed their governments in agreements of doubtful nature without regard for the will of the people of these countries which they were representing. The Russians have no consideration for the smaller nations. It has always been so even before the war, during the war, and after it. So we must not be surprised to see them falling victim to Russia's ambitions for expansion. The smaller nations have been penalized through no fault of their own. They have been gagged with all sorts of restrictions and prohibitions. Under the dictatorship of the big powers they have suffered humiliation, whether or not they had taken any part in the latest war.

"And how about the countries that hitherto have been spared the onslaught of communism? Is it not strange that in the face of all these facts they are not making any effort to guide the world into the right path? What may one deduce from such an attitude, except that they have not been able to find within their own parties and politicians leaders, impartial and in good faith, who have the courage and the will to guide the nations toward a better world.

"We do see here and there some little prophets predicting certain situations. They warn the people but do nothing that is really effective, confining themselves to words. And, no matter how good are their intentions, they are without any real experience and have no definite program. They never had in the past and have none for the future.

"Some countries made the great mistake of recognizing communism as a political party. This was due to the attitude of some of their leaders whose aims were purely personal and whose object was the getting of votes. These leaders thought that by making a lot of promises they would get more votes, be they from Communists or any others.

"Where communism is concerned one may not remain neutral; one must be for or against it. We have nothing to gain from such an element, and they cannot be reasoned with.

"We must set up a universal front against communism. To accept such a system will be the end of democracy. It is a struggle for our own existence and a fight for survival.

"The democracies have been too lenient and easy-going with communism. They were not on their guard and did not suspect the extent to which this movement would gain power. They were friendly toward the Communists, and they helped them out of their difficult conditions. The Communists have thanked them by turning against them and trying to annihilate democracy with the very weapons, material, and funds they received from them. Their conduct is criminal.

"It is quite obvious that communism and socialism are evolutions that have outlived their purpose. In all countries where these have been applied there has resulted nothing but confusion and chaos. They are radical systems that stop at nothing to achieve their aims, that cause millions and millions of innocent people to lose their lives in wars, revolutions, misery, sickness, and hunger. Russia wants her people to believe that communism is the only system that can work successfully. She blames all other systems for the misfortunes of the world. In order to avoid all counter-revolutions within her country, she conceals from her people the true conditions in all other countries. In 1917, in order to dominate the world, she put to death the elite of her own classes.

"Russia realizes that she cannot be self-sufficient. Consequently, she takes whatever she can from her neighboring countries and by terror and force she keeps her hold on them. The world should not allow such usurpation. If it does not rise up against it, the Communists will end up by destroying not one country, not several countries, but the entire world. And with the atomic bomb, the cosmic rays, the rockets, and bacterial warfare, such a destruction would strike faster than lightning.

"The democracies, therefore, must completely eliminate communism, not only within their own frontiers, but within other countries, by going to their aid whenever they are called.

"It has been positively proved that there is not room for the two theories in the same economic system. Communism cannot exist in a democracy, no more than democracy can exist in communism. Communism is civilization's worst enemy and the greatest provoker of anarchy. Its aims are quite destructive, and, if we let it gain momentum and dominate the world, there will be no more decent world.

"We must, therefore, outlaw this ideology, for there is nothing ideal about it. It is nothing but a criminal enterprise which can only end up with the annihilation of the whole world. As long as our countries are affected by it, the danger will be imminent.

"When the working people are discouraged and disappointed by events, they join the ranks of the Communists, not knowing who their real enemies are. In the democratic and liberal countries they seek to compensate their disappointment by voting for the Communists when they go to the polls.

"The question of communism is an extremely delicate matter, but it should be tackled in the interest of the entire world, if we are to have any peace. And perhaps it will be the U. N. which will finally solve this problem.

"It is a system based on immature principles and rudimentary and primitive concepts. It is quite unripe and has nothing to offer that will develop the people and allow them to progress. The peoples living under such a regime are depressed, and they cannot bear to see other peoples who are living under other systems more favorable than theirs progress, develop, and live happily. So that the Communists in their misfortune seek to debase the peoples of other systems.

"All of these utopias such as bolshevism, communism, fascism, and other unreasonable evolutions leave destruction in their wake many, many years after they are gone, and it is with the utmost difficulty that the peoples are able to recover their former condition and resume the normal mode of life of a democracy.

"With communism it is like an ant hill. All must work and no one has the right to think. It destroys a civilization which it took centuries to build. If we want to combat communism, we must give the greatest opportunities possible to the individual to use his initiative and imagination so that communism might have no attractions for him

"We must forget our internal quarrels and, united all on one front, rise up against this terror, which only demands power and only wants the spoils. At a time when danger is at our door we must endeavor to improve our own methods. We must put an end to internal corruption, for the enemy makes use of such weaknesses as this to show to its people how bad the deficiencies of our system are.

"There is no doubt but that a great part of German militarism and of the Nazis have joined their forces to those of the Communists. It is not likely that Stalin would have dared to take over the countries as he did if he had not had their support. The German motto applies here 'robbers quarrel among themselves and plot together'. The doings of Hitler and Stalin are an example of this. It would be inadmissible to allow an entire civilization to pay the price for such criminal deeds

"The Fascist elements in other countries close their eyes and pretend they see nothing. They take advantage of such situations to bolster up their own financial position and tighten their monopolistic hold on all the raw material in the world. Thus they are indirectly working for the cause of our enemy. With their vertical and horizontal trusts they have done nothing but bring about inflation in the values of merchandise and deflation in the value of currency all over the world. By so doing, they are giving to the working people weapons to be used against them; for the worker in revolt turns to communism for relief.

"Consequently, if we do not eliminate communism it will swallow us up."

One Way To Crash the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent commentaries on the success of the Communists in establishing their way of life comes from the fantastic story out of Czechoslovakia. The Czech engineer who shot his train and its passengers across barricades through an unused railroad siding to enter the American zone of Western Germany bordering on the Czech frontier reached his decision because he could no longer tolerate life in Red Czechoslovakia.

As of this moment, there are no records of any one trying to reverse the procedure by ramming through the iron curtain from the west going east. If all the barriers were let down tomorrow, half the population of the "satel-

lite countries" of the Soviet Union would stream across the borders to the free world. How is Uncle Joe going to explain away the daring exploit of the Czech who would not be checked by border guards, barricades, boundaries, or fear?

A G-Man on Every Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "A G-Man on Every Program," by Wheeler McMillen, published in the Pathfinder news magazine for September 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A G-MAN ON EVERY PROGRAM

(By Wheeler McMillen)

D Howard Moreau, the acute editor of the Hunterdon County Democrat at Flemington, N. J., has noted a conspicuous phase of these tax-spend-elect-and-control times that has received less remark than it deserves. Mr. Moreau publishes one of America's most distinguished local weeklies

If you go to conventions, you will be able to observe the now almost universal phenomenon of which Mr. Moreau speaks in an editorial, A G-Man on Every Program. To his editorial I gladly devote this space:

"A few years ago when Hitler was in the height of his power, we heard a lot about 'thought control' as it was conducted under the Nazi regime. We were given to understand that America would never have anything like this.

"But we are not so sure it will not come—or that in a subtle way we do not have thought control of sizable proportions already in operation, getting our people conditioned for further raids on their earnings and savings, more bureaus and bureaucrats and for the 1952 elections

"If you belong to any kind of trade or professional group, fraternity, or veterans' organization—or to a church, it might be interesting for you to study the program of the next State or national convention or conference of that organization. You can safely bet your bottom dollar that the program will carry the name of several Government men, if it is a meeting of any size or will continue more than 1 day. If it is a comparatively small meeting, it will have at least one Government man as a headline speaker.

"And this G-man speaker will be a clever fellow. He'll have a good line of stories, a pleasing personality and usually will deal with a crisis in one form or another. For our Government, ever since that charmer of all charmers sold us the New Deal, has always faced some kind of emergency. And the present aim—the aim of all Socialist regimes, is to keep us in a state of emergency, for only thereby will a free people be induced to give up their freedom and be divested of their savings in return for some kind of 'security.'

"These G-men speakers will usually put on an act to show how busy they are, how overworked their department is, and how they can ill afford the time away from Wash-

ington to make a speech. But you'll find they will eat a hearty dinner, because it won't interfere with a speech which has been delivered a good many times before. And they'll have time to shake hands and stick around to receive the glad handclaps of admiring folk who'll say: 'What a grand speaker. Ain't we fortunate to have men like this in Government service?'

"It is all part of a build-up for bigger and bigger Government, to take more and more of our weekly pay checks and the earnings of our farms and business, to support more and more speakers, who in the aggregate strip us of more and more of our rights, liberties, and privileges as Americans.

"Tommyrot?

"All right. Take a look at the program of the next convention of your favorite organization. Attend one of its meetings. Take careful notes on the speeches and see if you are not made conscious of a studied attempt to do your thinking for you, to reduce your resistance as an individual and to line you and your group up in support of big Government.

"The Nazis made no secret of their thought-control program, but Ribbentrop had no patent on the idea. Nor has Russia a monopoly on the Politburo."

Newspaper Business: The Death of a Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article entitled "Newspaper Business: The Death of a Formula," published in Fortune magazine of September 1951:

NEWSPAPER BUSINESS: THE DEATH OF A FORMULA

(Just the other day United States newspapers were making juicy profits. They're still doing prodigious business, but the publishers are crying that they are being pushed to the wall. What happened? The soaring price of newsprint is one thing, but only one.)

As a business United States newspapering today looks healthier and actually is weaker than it has been for years. The signs of apparent vigor are everywhere. Papers by the dozens are moving into sparkling new quarters (see the Prudent Publishers, Fortune, August 1950). Circulation is at an all-time high. Not only has advertising lineage increased substantially every year for the past nine, but the newspapers are also getting a larger share of the advertising dollar at the expense of other media.

Yet newspaper costs have been rising faster than revenues since 1946, in some years very much faster. The graph on the opposite page [not reproduced] indicates how a large paper that made 15 percent net before taxes in 1946 would, if it reflected the general experience of the industry, earn less than half the dollar profit in 1950 and less than a third the percentage return on gross revenues—not to mention today's larger tax bite. These trends could mean that the large American dailies would soon be running without any profit at all. And as the manager of a large evening paper observed grimly, "It won't take any 5 years, either."

It was this cost-revenue picture that led the publishers to shriek with rage when Ca-

nadian newsprint went up \$10 on July 1, to \$116 a ton. ("The increase," said publisher John S. Knight, "is without economic justification. Politically, it's stupid. Morally, it smells.") Now newsprint is, indeed, the largest single cost item of any daily paper of, say, 25,000 circulation or over. But a closer look raises doubt whether the rising price of newsprint is truly the villain that so many publishers profess it to be. Instead, it begins to appear that the formula on which American newspapers have operated for 50 years may need to be scrapped.

There is a tinge of poetic justice about the newspaper situation today, after so many years when the publishers held the whip hand over the mills. Following an all-time price peak of \$135 a ton in 1921, an outburst of mill building both in the United States and Canada (but especially in Canada) cut the price nearly in half within 5 years and presented the industry with what looked like permanent overcapacity. For 15 years, down the sickening slope of the great depression and up the slow recovery climb, the industry sweated with that excess capacity. Six of the top seven Canadian producers were in some form of hock; over a third of United States capacity was either dismantled or converted to other types of paper on which there was a chance to make more or at least to lose less. By 1939, United States output was down from a peak of 1,700,000 tons to less than a million, while the Canadian industry limped along at about 70 percent of capacity. Indeed, one of the largest United States publishers submits that the newspapers during the 1920's and 1930's subsisted largely at the expense of the impoverished newsprint industry.

TOO GOOD TO LAST

The publishers never had it so good as during this period. In the 1930's they could buy newsprint in any quantity for \$40 to \$50 a ton simply by lifting a telephone; and one newsprint maker unkindly characterized the publishers' long-term contracts with the mills as mere "options to buy if the price went down." During World War II the OPA-controlled price rose no higher than \$61, though three further increases (to \$84) were permitted between VJ-day and the lapsing of price control. Only after the war did prices show any real climb, gradually reaching the present \$116 level for Canadian output.¹ However, as illustrated in the chart on page 166, in no year since 1939 have newsprint prices kept up with the rise of commodities in general.

On the supply side also the publishers appear to have been treated well, even during the postwar years. True, the Canadian producers built no new mills, but by technical improvement and capacity operation they managed to squeeze nearly 700,000 more tons per year—an increase of 15 percent—out of existing facilities. Furthermore, the United States has been getting an increasing share of this increasing total. Whereas before the war United States publishers imported a little over 70 percent of Canadian production, then running about 3,500,000 tons, this year they should receive approximately 90 percent of a 5,300,000-ton output.

On one thing the publishers have always agreed, that newsprint should be plentiful and cheap. The political leverage of the newspapers (which has frequently induced congressional inquiries and diplomatic negotiation), coupled with the overcapacity of the newsprint industry, served to main-

tain this happy situation until the rationing of World War II began.

But it was inevitable that newsprint prices would climb once controls were off, given both the demand situation and the tight organization of the Canadian newsprint industry. Over half the newsprint capacity of Canada (a country notably uninhibited by United States antitrust concepts) is in the hands of four companies; the smaller producers commonly quote their prices as the average of the prices of the largest two or three; and Robert M. Fowler is today alternately president of the Newsprint Association of Canada and, with a quick twist of his cap, newsprint controller for the Canadian Government.

VOLUME HAS TO BE BOUGHT

Moreover, in a booming economy it is next to impossible for a commodity to remain both plentiful and cheap unless it is in a technological revolution (which newsprint was not). For the boom will generate increased needs that require increased capacity; and the increased capacity will be provided only if prices are high enough to warrant the new investment. The efforts of the publishers to prevent newsprint price increases merely resulted in no new capacity being built. Only one new newsprint mill—the Coosa River project in Alabama, built cooperatively by a group of southern publishers—has been completed since the war; the second, a moderate-sized mill in British Columbia, will not be finished before 1952.

The main deterrent has been capital costs, which could have been overcome only by price increases earlier and larger than actually occurred. Most United States and Canadian newsprint mills were built during the 1920's at costs of \$25,000 to \$35,000 per daily ton of capacity. Allowing for depreciation on the one hand, and rebuilding and improvement on the other, a well-maintained mill might still be carried on the books at about the original figure. But a brand-new mill built today involves capital costs of around \$100,000 to \$125,000 per daily ton, or \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 for a 200-ton-a-day operation of minimum economic size, without even counting such possible costs as power development or the purchase of timberlands. Allowing for full 6-day three-shift operation at present newsprint prices, invested capital would turn over only once every 3 years, and it could easily take decades to recoup the investment. At today's price levels, an efficient mill built in the low-cost days can make \$35 to \$40 per ton, net before taxes; but a brand-new mill needs first of all an investor who is not only very rich but also somewhat foolish.

The paper industry, which is not foolish, has reacted to the situation by concentrating investment in other types of pulp and paper where the cost-return ratio is happier. In the postwar period the Canadian paper industry alone has put in some 800,000 tons of new pulp capacity for such products as wrapping paper, drinking cups, and frozen-food containers, most of which could have gone into newsprint but did not. Instead, the Canadians apparently decided to squeeze more newsprint production out of existing mills, while at the same time boosting the newsprint price toward what they considered a reasonable level. Hence the \$10-a-ton jump that roused the publisher's fury.

THE FORMULA PLAYS OUT

The outcries of the publishers were genuine, for the increase really hurt. Because of it the Hearst papers passed a dividend, noting that the additional cost of newsprint would almost exactly equal their net after taxes for the preceding year; and the former owner of the St. Louis Star-Times blamed rising newsprint costs for the sale of that paper to the Post-Dispatch. Some prominent papers broke into the loss column as a result

of the increase, and even the most profitable had their net drastically pared.

But the newsprint price increase is especially important because it is a certain kind of cost. For half a century the newspaper business, as a business, has operated on a formula: raise circulation, and leave advertising rates per reader alone. Many a publisher probably never recognized it as a formula, for it worked so well so long that it seemed like an order of nature. But American newspapers, usually founded to express a point of view rather than to make money, have seldom generated any distinguished economic thinking. F. M. Flynn, president of the New York Daily News, explained the Canadian reluctance to expand newsprint production by observing, "I guess they simply would rather do business with businessmen." And the progressive publisher of a prominent eastern paper added, "There hasn't been the caliber of men going into the business side of newspapering that you find in the soap business, or the steel business, or the auto business."

While it worked, the old formula did beautifully on both the revenue and the expense side. A circulation increase brought additional revenue not only from the sale of copies but also from advertising, since the advertising rate per line could on the whole be raised in proportion to the increased circulation. And some costs—editorial and composition costs are the clearest examples—did not go up at all with a rise in circulation, while others (such as distribution costs) did not go up proportionately. That is not to say that this group of costs remained stable, they have increased, and sharply, as a result of general wage levels, union organization, etc. But these increases bore little relation to a rise in circulation.

Now the formula is petering out because the "intractable" costs—of which newsprint is by far the greatest—have become so large a proportion of total expense. For this group of costs increase in ironbound proportion to the total circulation and the size of each copy. The old formula still works well for small papers of up to, say, 20,000 circulation, whose newsprint bill generally runs 15 percent of total expense or less, and whose only newsprint worry is (or should be) the problem of supply rather than price. One of the anomalies of the existing newsprint situation is that with most small papers supply comes first and price second, while with most large papers the reverse is true.

The newsprint burden of the papers mounted as they grew in circulation and size—a growth that raised total daily paper circulation from 40,000,000 to 53,000,000 since 1939, in addition to increasing the number of pages per copy. In 1950, according to Editor and Publisher, the newsprint costs of the average daily of above 100,000 circulation amounted to about 37 percent of total cost, while press running time accounted for another 4 percent. Inasmuch as newsprint prices have risen 16 percent since late in 1950, newsprint should now comprise at least 40 percent of total cost, even assuming stringent economies in the meantime. In short, the large newspapers are approaching the point, and some have already reached it, where at least half of their total costs are not benefited by any further circulation gains.

The New York Daily News serves as an extreme example. When the recent newsprint price increase is fully felt, newsprint will amount to nearly 55 percent of the cost of publishing the News. This is almost as great as a department store's cost for the average merchandise that it carries; but for its outlay the department store gets completed merchandise, the News only the rawest of raw material. To the reader, newsprint is the least important commodity in a newspaper, the humble carrier of the words and

¹ So far, only one United States mill (Crown Zellerbach) has been allowed to match the latest \$10 Canadian increase. But the fact that Canada supplies over four-fifths of United States needs makes a general United States raise appear certain.

pictures; yet in the economy of the Daily News it has become by far the most important.

TRIMMING COSTS

The publishers have reacted with a variety of stratagems. Many have tried to save newsprint by cutting waste in the pressroom, tightening up on the return of unsold papers, and slightly reducing the page size, but often some of these steps have been overlooked. For example, it is desirable that page widths should divide exactly into the width of the paper rolls used by the supplying mill, to avoid wasteful trim. A number of papers have changed their press rolls from the traditional 66 inches down to about 64, primarily to use less paper, but at times to effect an increase in newsprint supply. However, a recent study of 15 small midwestern dailies showed that none of them had done so, though it could better their newsprint supply by about 5 percent; and such a stand-out paper as the New York Times is only now considering it.

The bite has also been put on the newspaper buyer. Before World War II the usual revenue breakdown was one-fourth from circulation, three-fourths from advertising. Today, the price of most daily papers having jumped from 2 or 3 cents to 5 and Sunday papers from 10 cents to 15, the average large newspaper derives about a third of revenue from circulation.

EVERYTHING BUT ADVERTISING

The one thing that has seemed sacrosanct is the milline rate, or price of advertising per line per million readers. For example, according to the Editor and Publisher Yearbook for 1950, the milline rate for United States evening dailies actually decreased a trifle between 1939 and 1949, though other advertising media were displaying less timidity. The publishers' reluctance to recognize that it costs a great deal more to reach a given number of readers today than it did a decade ago is not confined to competitive-newspaper cities; the monopoly papers, fearing the outcry that would follow significant rate boosts, seem to prefer to exploit their advantageous position by expense trimming (e. g., fewer editions, cutting return privileges on unsold copies, and so forth).

As though the level milline rate were not enough, the publishers have a special albatross necklace in the problem of local vs. national advertising rates, the lowest rate for local advertisers generally running 35 to 40 percent less than the national. The national advertisers, who know a bargain when they see it, have responded with heavy co-operative campaigns in which the advertising is placed locally at local rates, but financed at least in part out of a company's central advertising appropriation. If the publishers are to raise the average milline rate significantly, their first point of attack must be upon this rate differential. For in the long run the cost to the newspaper of one line of advertising will not differ from that of another.

MORE DOLLARS FOR LESS SPACE

That the survival of the large daily newspaper in the United States depends on sharply increased advertising rates seems blatantly obvious. Indeed, the newspapers would be far better off if a rate increase of, say, 30 percent cut lineage enough to produce precisely the same revenue, for a lineage reduction also brings with it a significant drop in newsprint use, composition costs, etc.

Raising the rates is, for the monopoly-newspaper towns, larger a matter of nerve, plus the conviction that advertisers should not and in the long run will not expect newspaper advertising to be the one commodity that still goes at prewar bargain rates. For the competitive cities, Editor Erwin D. Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor, suggested "a little unlawful conspiracy in re-

straint of trade." Canham was concerned primarily with making more newsprint available for friendly countries whose need is far more desperate than our own—just as the London Economist was thinking of editorial problems when it accused the United States press of suffering from "a surfeit of newsprint." But both remarks apply equally to the central economic problem of United States newspapering, which is to get more money for less advertising space.

The hopelessness of the present course can be illustrated by the example of the Boston Herald-Traveler Corp., chosen here solely because it is one of the few newspaper enterprises making public financial statements. Surely it is not too much for a newspaper or any other business to have a fighting chance, even at today's tax rates, of equaling the net profit after taxes that it made 5 years ago. Yet if present operating margins and tax rates were to prevail, the Herald and Traveler would face the impossible task of raising 1950 revenue of about \$16,500,000 to over \$50,000,000, in order to make the same stockholder dollars as in 1946.

At the moment, some publishers are taking comfort from a number of hopeful, but probably illusory, signs of change in the newsprint situation. Several factors—chief among them has been the tendency toward relaxation at the apparently approaching cease fire in Korea—could easily bring a drop of 5 to 10 percent in newspaper advertising, which tends to rise and fall with general business activity. The figures for June 1951 (the latest available), already show an advertising lineage decline of about 3½ percent below June 1950. Such a drop is likely to be accompanied by an almost identical percentage decline in United States newsprint use. At the same time Canadian newsprint production is running about 200,000 tons ahead of last year, and the average publisher's inventory of newsprint on hand or in transit is creeping up toward a reasonably comfortable 40-day level. Given the present delicate balance between newsprint demand and supply, these factors might be expected to relieve the upward pressure on newsprint prices or even bring a price decline.

NOTHING TO HOPE FOR

No such happy event is likely to occur, for several reasons. In the first place, the enormous United States newsprint consumption of the past several years has been possible only because of the higher percentage of Canadian output shipped to the United States, which was in turn due to the fact that some of Canada's traditional foreign customers did not have the hard currency to spend on newsprint. Those customers, their pockets now jingling with dollars from the United States defense program, would be glad to buy perhaps 300,000 tons more Canadian newsprint annually; and the Canadians would be glad to see their United States market shrink a bit. Thus a moderate decline in United States demand could probably be offset by increased overseas takings.

Moreover, if worst came to worst the newsprint makers certainly have no compelling reasons to wreck the industry's price structure by overproduction. A slight decline in operations, now running above theoretical capacity, might even be welcome; and there is plenty of cushion underneath, since the break-even point of an efficient newsprint mill is probably around 75 percent of capacity. Furthermore, a portion of existing newsprint capacity could easily and cheaply be switched to certain other printing papers—among them so-called super-newsprint and other calendered (i. e., polished) stocks approaching book paper in finish—for which there is a strong United States demand at good prices. Hence there seems little hope for a decline in newsprint prices. If they change at all within the next year or so, the direction is still likely to be up.

The most horrid possibility, from the publishers' point of view, is by no means the most remote—that advertising revenue will falter at the same time that newsprint prices advance once more. If so, the large American newspapers as a group would go on a nonprofit basis, and failures would be numbered by dozens.

It is strange that American newspapering, on which there are so many hot and ready opinions, should have been considered so seldom by the public as part of the United States economy. In the concern that the press be free, it has been all but forgotten that it must also be self-supporting and prosperous. Bankruptcy was never the route to independence, nor faulty economics the key to vigilance and effectiveness. Economically speaking, the large American daily newspaper has reached the end of a formula and must evolve a new one.

WHAT THE NEWSPRINT INCREASE CAN MEAN

Here is the 1950 cost-revenue breakdown for a hypothetical large daily, whose showing is neither best nor poorest among papers of this size. Since the paper used 60,000 tons of newsprint in 1950 at \$100 a ton, the price increases of \$6 and \$10 last December and last July have added \$960,000 to annual costs and nearly wiped out operating net. The publisher would, of course, strain every nerve to slash costs and increase revenues, but how did the newspapers get themselves into such a fix?

Revenues (In thousands)	
Advertising.....	\$11,800
Circulation.....	5,200
Total revenues.....	17,000
COSTS	
Newsprint (including ink).....	6,000
Composition.....	1,450
Pressroom.....	675
Stereo and engraving.....	500
Editorial.....	1,900
Advertising expense.....	975
Circulation expense.....	2,200
Administration and general.....	1,375
Business office and plant.....	925
Total costs.....	16,000
Net before taxes.....	1,000
Increase in annual paper cost since Dec. 1, 1950.....	960

The Supply of Nickel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Daisy Chain in Nickel," published in the Washington News of September 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DAISY CHAIN IN NICKEL

As usual in times of materials shortages, a gray market is inevitable—also, elusive and tough to fight. There is always a group of shady dealers ready to take advantage of dwindling supplies and corner the mar-

ket, forcing up prices regardless of the country's needs or welfare.

This has happened to nickel. A manufacturer recently told a Senate inquiry that the nickel supply "went out like a light" soon after the Korean war started, and then began reappearing on the market at exorbitant prices.

A Senate subcommittee on gray markets, headed by Senator BARRY MOODY, of Michigan, has now exposed the vicious racket in nickel and nickel anodes. It is a shocking report.

With no more than a telephone for business equipment, the gray marketers, some of whom never saw a nickel anode until a few months ago, have all but taken over control of a substantial portion of the market. They do nothing but add to the price—with the result that nickel finally reaches the consumer at a cost nearly seven times higher than normal market value.

Nickel has thousands of industrial uses. In electroplating alone, 5,000 independent job platers employ 40,000 workers. But now these small-business men are priced out of the nickel market, with nickel selling at \$4.50 per pound when normal prices are about 67 cents.

Nickel anodes, says the report, have been slipping out of the distribution back door into a daisy chain of illegal trafficking at successively higher prices. Large companies are able to pay the premium prices, but small-business men are left desperate. They cannot afford the prohibitive prices and face bankruptcy if they try to compete with the big firms.

The report blames the situation in part on the "fuzziness" of OPS price-control rules on nickel. An OPS regulation puts a ceiling price on nickel scrap at 40.5 cents a pound. But to escape this ceiling, it is only necessary to cast the scrap into anode form. It can then be sold at the highest price at which nickel anodes were sold by the dealer during the base period.

The committee has called this to the attention of OPS officials, who have "indicated" they will close the loophole. But it will take more than that to end the abuses and racketeering in the nickel as well as other gray markets.

The big companies which have been paying racketeering prices for gray-market materials may not be wholly blameless themselves. As the committee report said, "these practices reflect credit on no one concerned." But, primarily, it might help if the names of the shady dealers and fly-by-night "brokers" were turned over to the Justice Department and Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Shortage of Electric Power in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "United States Official Sees Critical Lack of Power," a United Press dispatch from Absecon, N. J., published in the Christian Science Monitor of September 20, 1951. I commend the reading of the article to those in this country who are vigorously opposed to the development of power on the St. Lawrence River.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES OFFICIAL SEES CRITICAL LACK OF POWER

ABSECON, N. J.—A Government power expert said the Nation faces such a critical power shortage that "some industrial demands will be without electric service" by the end of this year.

Thomas E. Marburger said that furthermore the power shortage probably will become increasingly acute until there is "a staggering shortage of 4,000,000 kilowatts by the end of 1953."

Mr. Marburger is director of the materials and equipment division of the Defense Electric Power Administration. He made the statement in a speech prepared for the Valve Manufacturers Association.

He attributed the mounting electrical shortage to increased industrial, commercial, and domestic demands since the outbreak of the Korean war and to materials shortages. These factors, Mr. Marburger said, have been steadily whittling down the margin of power reserve which electric utilities try to maintain to protect their customers.

"By the end of 1951," he said, "the operating margins will be decreased below the danger point and some industrial demands will be without electric service."

Mr. Marburger listed several areas in which industrial customers already are having their electrical service interrupted from time to time or are likely to experience interruptions soon. Among those areas were the steel-making section of Pittsburgh, the Pacific Northwest, the Carolinas, and the Gulf coast.

"At present, we face critical power shortages," he said. "At no time during World War II did the electric power supply picture look so threatening as it now appears for the fall and winter of 1952."

He said reduced material allotments for the electric industry probably will leave the Nation with a shortage of at least 1,500,000 kilowatts in 1952 and a further shortage of another 2,500,000 kilowatts in 1953.

Add those figures together, he said, "and the result is a staggering shortage of 4,000,000 kilowatts by the end of 1953."

Danes Warn on Trade Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Danes Warn on Trade Ban, Term Cutting Relations With East Unsound, Citing Need of Polish Coal," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on September 9, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DANES WARN ON TRADE BAN—TERM CUTTING RELATIONS WITH EAST UNSOUND, CITING NEED OF POLISH COAL

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

COPENHAGEN.—Danish officials and economists are disturbed over the American stand on east-west trade. To them the problem is primarily one of economic realities and

pressures, rather than of ideologies. But they also believe that cutting off trade relations with the east is politically and even strategically unsound.

Thorvald Kristensen, Danish Minister of Finance, told this reporter last week that he considers continued trade with the eastern countries "very important." He cited as the most immediate practical reason the fact that Denmark's hopes for increased coal imports from Great Britain had been disappointed. Denmark's most important supplier of coal—at the most advantageous price—is still Poland.

Mr. Kristensen added that it was not desirable politically to break off relations with the satellites. Doing so, Danish official and industrial observers feel, could easily be exploited by the Communist propaganda machine to drive the satellite populations more and more deeply into the arms of the Soviets.

In a series of interviews last week spokesmen for the economic and political sections of the Danish Foreign Office, several industrialists, and the editor of an independent newspaper agreed with that view. All of them stressed the fact that they regard the Atlantic Pact as the most powerful instrument to prevent war and not primarily as an alliance to wage war.

Meanwhile, they add, the period of tension must be expected to continue indefinitely. In the course of this uncomfortable but necessary interim phase, the argument continues, it is vital that all the Atlantic Pact countries maintain sound and expanding economies and that, at the same time, some minimum of normal contact be maintained with the eastern countries.

Trade relations are considered here the best form of such contact. Danes point out, in addition, that to deprive them of Polish coal would be likely to hinder their own defense preparations more than shipments of nonstrategic goods could assist Poland's military preparations.

One industrialist, who is an active member of the home guard, said: "Of course, we are flatly opposed to sending any war materials to the potential enemy." But he added that he saw no reason why Americans should have to insist on elaborate restrictions. "I think there should be assurance enough in the fact that we know that the nearest Soviet air base from which we can be attacked is only about 30 flying minutes away."

The coal problem is serious. Denmark gets 2,000,000 tons of its coal from Poland and only 800,000 tons from the United Kingdom and about 250,000 tons from Western Germany. Much has been said about replacing the Polish coal with shipments from the United States, but a Danish economic expert in the Foreign Office offered these facts:

Only 700,000 tons of coal are being shipped from the United States this year. The long route greatly increases the price, which even normally is above that of Poland. Payments have to be made in dollars—Marshall-plan-sponsored or otherwise—and dependence on the United States would increase, contrary to ECA aims.

All this is made more serious by the fact that Denmark is undergoing a period of some economic difficulties aside from the coal problem. Within 2 years world prices on all the goods Denmark must import have risen about 50 percent. At the same time the world prices on the items which Denmark exports have gone up only 3 percent. Denmark must buy all its raw materials and fuel while it exports mainly food and dairy products. Food prices are usually last to rise. This has left Denmark with an increasing gap in its balance of trade.

The long-range plan, Danish economic advisers say, had been for 15 percent of the country's trade to be with the east, if a sound economy was to be assured. Last year the figure reached 11 percent. But now, largely as a result of American restrictions, it

is down to 5 percent. This comes at a time when the more and more rapid build-up of the Armed Forces, construction of barracks and depots, and the resulting increased need for imported raw materials demand a firm economy

Import Controls on Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr HUMPHREY Mr President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles relating to import curbs on cheese and fats. The first, entitled "Farm Groups Urge Repeal of Import Curbs on Chc. sc," appeared in the Minneapolis Star on September 15, 1951. The other, entitled "Repeal of Dairy Trade Curb Asked," was published in the Minneapolis Tribune on September 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows.

[From the Minneapolis Star of September 15, 1951]

FARM GROUPS URGE REPEAL OF IMPORT CURBS ON CHEESE

Two big organizations advocate repeal of imposing import controls on cheese and other fats and oils.

The National Farmers Union and the American Farm Bureau Federation asserted that in the end the American farmer would suffer rather than profit by the restrictions. But representatives of dairy cooperatives and domestic cheese manufacturers demanded retention of the controls. They contended that domestic cheese makers must have protection from foreign imports.

The conflicting views were presented to a Senate banking subcommittee on a proposal to eliminate an amendment to the Price Control Act. That section authorizes restrictions if imports of cheese or other fats threaten domestic output.

Interpreting the provision as mandatory, the Agriculture Department has cut imports of cheese about 40 percent.

Both the farm organizations held there is sufficient legal machinery, without the amendment, to restrict imports that actually threaten the American producer.

In addition, they stressed that the amendment runs counter to all United States policies for collaboration in a free world.

"The immediate effects of the restriction will be to seriously damage agricultural interests of friendly countries," John A. Baker, legislative secretary of the Farmers Union, declared.

E. W. Gaumnitz, executive secretary of the National Cheese Institute, argued that present legislation is inadequate.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of September 13, 1951]

REPEAL OF DAIRY TRADE CURB ASKED

WASHINGTON.—The administration Thursday will begin an all-out fight to repeal the Andresen-Thye amendment to the controls bill on grounds it is a threat to the Nation's reciprocal trade program.

The amendment, drafted by Representative AUGUST ANDRESEN, Republican of Minnesota, and introduced in the Senate by Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican of Minnesota, requires import controls over dairy products, fats, and oils.

The controls must be imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture whenever imports hurt domestic production, interfere with orderly marketing or storing, or increase costs of farm price-support programs.

Under the amendment, the Secretary early in August banned imports of butter, butter oil, and nonfat dried milk and set import quotas that cut imports of both cheese and casein.

As a result of complaints from Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and 10 foreign governments, a Senate banking subcommittee tomorrow will begin hearings on a bill repealing the controversial section.

Acheson and the complaining governments charge that the amendment violates international trade agreements.

Specific complaints have been received from Canada, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, Norway, Argentina, and Australia.

Acheson contends the restrictions will result in retaliatory restrictions by foreign countries against American agricultural products. He said many American farm products, including apples, citrus fruits, cotton, and tobacco, depend heavily on overseas markets.

Protection Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Road to Disaster," which appeared in the September 1951, issue of the Elks magazine, the national publication of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROAD TO DISASTER

Much of the muddled thinking which has prevented the people of the United States from taking decisive action to protect themselves against the treasonous conspiracy of American Communists arises from a gross misapprehension of the true nature of the so-called Communist Party. It is not a party at all.

It is a conspiratorial organization. It is a military organization in discipline and methods. It is organized, led, inspired, trained, and financed by Soviet Russia for just one purpose—to destroy our political, social, and economic institutions and to set up a Communist dictatorship.

To mask this unchanging purpose, the Communists have carefully cultivated the protective coloration of a legitimate, democratic political organization in order to use democratic freedoms as a tool to destroy those same freedoms.

Many Americans have allowed themselves to be confused and deluded by this Communist line. There are many who persist

in their error despite everything that has happened in the past few years alone to put the Communist Party in its true light. Among them are those who call themselves liberals, who recognize the Communist threat but fear that if Communists are curbed it may lead to the suppression of freedom for all. Then, there are those who are so blind, so naive, that they see no danger at all from the Communists, and therefore no necessity to act against them.

We agree, without reservation, that constitutional guarantees of freedom must be preserved and respected scrupulously unto the least important citizen of the Republic. The question then is whether we are running the risk of jeopardizing the freedom of all when we silence the Communists. We don't think we are, and we believe that to think otherwise is the height not only of illogic, but also of absurdity. It is, also, the sure road to disaster.

If the Communist Party were in fact a bona fide political organization committed to reforms through orderly political action, instead of an agent of a foreign power committed to overthrow this Government by force and violence, there would be no argument about its right to exist and to try to persuade a majority of the voters to its way of thinking.

It is time that all loyal Americans who are still confused by Red propaganda took a good look at the Communist Party in its real light. It is time that the activities of the Communist Party are recognized for what they are—treason, and it is time that we acted accordingly against those who are engaged in treason.

Responsibility of Bank Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's the Directors' Responsibility," published in the American Banker of September 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S THE DIRECTORS' RESPONSIBILITY

The obvious conclusion which must be reached from the steadily recurring news of bank defalcations of major size is that too many banks are cutting corners on their auditing, or have no audit procedure worthy of the name.

In small banks, particularly "one-man shops" the lack of sound internal examination and control is all too prevalent, although it must be admitted that the large banks themselves have not solved perfectly the problem of policing the officer or employee who is tempted to embezzle. From the nature of things absolute perfection may not be possible. But the larger banks do have sufficiently large staffs to enable them to divide the responsibility of handling cash and keeping the books and to make auditing a separate function.

Where this division of work and of responsibility does not exist, it behooves bankers interested in the health and public respect of the independent banking system to take thought.

POSSIBLE APPROACHES

There are, of course, a variety of possible approaches:

By groups of banks or associations: Examination of their member banks used to be a regular function of the big city clearing houses. And the principle might be adopted under State or national association leadership of making auditing a cooperatively supported function of country groups or regional clearing houses in country bank areas.

By the surety companies: Just as boiler and safety inspection have been made a service of casualty companies in the industrial field, security inspection might be made a requirement of favorable rates in the bank surety field.

By more detailed examination procedures: National, Federal or State bank examiners might be directed toward ascertaining the validity and actual existence of a bank's "inventory" of assets and its liabilities as well as to "examination of the books."

By State and Federal banking legislation: Minimum requirements for directors' examinations or for audits by "outside" accountants might be established by statute. When New Jersey revised its banking law in 1948, it provided that the entire board of directors of a bank must be responsible for the examination, instead of a committee of them, and that they must engage an outside "public accountant" to examine the bank once a year at an unannounced date and report directly to them. The law also provided that no employee or officer of the bank or of any other bank may be engaged to assist this accountant, and that the accountant's report must be read and commented on by the entire board as to quality of assets and any adverse matter. A copy of the report and the directors' comment must be kept on file for the State bank examiner's use. The measure has worked out very well, despite some initial opposition to its requirements.

By FDIC regulation or policy: The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has found itself "holding the bag" in a number of defalcations which were so large as to wipe out the capital of banks or to require "shot-gun" mergers.

We are aware that the National Association of Bank Auditors and Comptrollers has declared war on fraud and is earnestly leading its members into better thinking on internal audit and control. The weak spot in the situation, however, may be the thousands of banks which are not NABAC members, or which are still unaware of the deficiencies of their procedures. The American Bankers Association also has interested itself in the problems of bank auditing. Undoubtedly, many banks have and are improving their internal protective procedures. But certainly more intensive efforts by these and other banking associations are necessary to get more action among the laggards.

INDEPENDENT BANKING PROBLEM

Independent unit banking has a very real interest in this problem of preventing defalcations. There are two reasons why. One is that frequently, when a bank closes because of a whopping big loss, it is picked up as a branch of some neighboring institution with FDIC aid and blessing since there is seldom fresh local capital to set up a reorganized bank. The other is that branch banks perforce must have their own internal examination or inspection systems which tend to discourage crookedness among employees, though cases do continue to occur.

We do not know what direction bank thinking may take in dealing with the scandalous parade of defalcations and embezzlements which are making work for the newspapers and the courts. More legislation or regulation by the governmental banking authorities is a distasteful prospect. Yet we certainly risk it unless enough, which means

all, banks singly or jointly achieve a better standard of self-examination than appears in effect today.

DIRECTORS RESPONSIBLE

Basically, it is the bank directors' responsibility. Directors' examinations are a general bank legislative provision. But these may be merely a cursory counting of cash or going over the books. Something needs to be done to establish minimum standards or alternative procedures.

The needs of the situation are best served, it appears to us, when banks make their directors' examinations the responsibility of an independent department or of outside accountants skilled in bank examination work. In each case, the auditors should be responsible to and report directly to the board of directors and be hired by them, rather than by the bank's officers. If we were the officer of a bank, we would want it that way.

And if we were the director of a bank, large or small, we would consider very carefully the financial liability of directors who fail to require sound regular examination procedure. Shareholders may not always complacently accept embezzlements and defalcations which wipe out all or part of their equities as "acts of God." It is poor economy to save a few thousand dollars over the course of the years by cutting corners on audit and examination quality, and then losing the bank (or some of its good name) in a scandal which a better auditing policy would have prevented.

Handling of Migrant Problem by Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands an excellent article published in the September 1951 issue of the magazine *Wisconsin Welfare*, the official publication of the Wisconsin Welfare Council. The council is an organization of citizens, agencies, and groups concerned with social welfare, started in 1881. It is supported by memberships and Community Chest contributions.

This particular article is a most interesting treatment of the problem of humane, practical, and efficient handling of the needs of thousands of migrant workers who arrive each summer to help out with the harvesting and processing of Wisconsin's agricultural crops. The article is specific, frank, factual, and completely constructive.

Not so long ago, on August 27, our colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] placed in the *Record* an article concerning a Minnesota town's treatment of migrant workers.

I ask unanimous consent that as a sort of companion piece, so to speak, to that article, the statement I am now presenting be printed in the Appendix of the *Record*. It was written by Mrs. Rebecca C. Barton, director of Governor Kohler's Commission on Human Rights, and co-

chairman of the Wisconsin Committee on Children and Youth.

There being no objection, the article and list were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

HOME IS WHERE THEY FIND IT

(A report on Wisconsin migrants by Rebecca C. Barton, director, Governor's Commission on Human Rights, cochairman, Wisconsin Committee on Children and Youth.)

PAST TENSE

Migratory workers cannot remain forever in the descriptive classification of the displaced persons in American society. Many groups and organizations, ranging from local to national, are making earnest efforts to improve their lot. Wisconsin alone is taking giant steps toward adjusting the estimated 12,000 workers who arrive each summer to help with Wisconsin agriculture. This particular report tells the story from the point of view of only one of the interested groups. It does not presume to tell the whole story, but merely that part concerning which it happens to have first hand information and experience.

In the fall of 1949 the Governor's Commission on Human Rights first started functioning as a State agency with State funds and with the statutory duty to help make Wisconsin a better place in which to live. Its function was established as promoting understanding and fair play between people, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, and thus increasing opportunities for a full life for members of minority groups whose lives are too often circumscribed by prejudice and discrimination.

A plan for migrant welfare

In the light of these stated objectives it was natural for the Commission to concern itself with the plight of the migratory workers in Wisconsin. During the summer of 1949 some unfortunate incidents involving migrants had been publicized widely. Because it was obvious that these migrants were often regarded as economic assets but human liabilities, the Governor's Commission on Human Rights took the initiative in formulating a six point program for migrant welfare:

- 1 Study and research in order to determine the nature and extent of the problem.
- 2 An interagency migrant committee in order to coordinate the migrant work of various State departments.
- 3 Consultant service to organizations and communities desiring information and advice on setting up services for migrants.
- 4 A community demonstration project in order to explore the possibilities of providing suitable educational and recreational programs for migrants both on the adult and child level.
- 5 Use of conferences, radio and press as media for communication and education.
- 6 Remedial legislation in order to provide adequate protection for a disadvantaged group.

Although there is still much to be accomplished for migrant welfare, by way of encouragement the Commission offers a brief summary of the headway which has already been made in the last 2 years toward each of these six objectives, in turn.

Progress being made

- 1 In April 1950 the Governor's Commission on Human Rights submitted to Governor Rennebohm for his approval the text of its informational bulletin: *Migratory Agricultural Workers in Wisconsin—A Problem in Human Rights*. The edition of 3,000, published in June 1950, was exhausted in a year's time, due to widespread demand both from in-State and out-State organizations and individuals. The factual material and

recommendations were considered by the special national migrant committee set up by President Truman in June, 1950.

2 In May 1950, Governor Rennebohm established the State's first interagency migrant committee which immediately started operating as a clearing house and a medium for coordination of State services.

3 The Governor's Commission on Human Rights has worked with State-wide church and civic groups, such as the Wisconsin Council of Church Women, the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs, the Wisconsin League of Women Voters, and with the University of Wisconsin in order to provide informational background and facilitate some form of State aid or service to communities. It has also acted as adviser in six communities in the process of formulating local or county committees and programs.

Waupun project

4 As early as the fall of 1949 the Commission started a concentrated piece of work with community leaders in Waupun toward establishing a pilot project for migrants for the summer of 1950. At the request of the Mayor of Waupun, the Commission helped the community organize a council on human relations and acted as liaison between this council and the various State resource groups. The resultant 1950 summer school for the Texas-Mexican migrant children was the first of its kind in Wisconsin. Two university-graduated teachers were on the staff of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights and worked under the joint guidance of the commission, the university, and the Community Council of Waupun. One of the interesting developments was the intelligence testing given to the migrant children.

At the request of the governor's commission, the school of education of the University of Wisconsin supplied two qualified testers who became so caught up in the assignment that they worked one night with the children and parents until 10 p. m. In addition, Waupun's city council authorized and financed public recreation programs for town and migrant youth and adults. On the whole, the total program was so successful that it was continued in the summer of 1951, with expanded services and sponsorship. [At the suggestion of the governor's commission, for example, the division for children and youth of the State department of public welfare was called in to do a community consultant and survey job.] Summer-school students at the University of Wisconsin raised \$500 to help finance the second summer's project.

5. As cosponsor of the Governor's Conference on Children and Youth in April of 1951, the Governor's Commission on Human Rights arranged a workshop on migrant welfare for community leaders. In addition, it presented the subject at four conferences of different State organizations.

Legislation enacted

6 Since health is basic to satisfactory living and working, and since it is dependent on adequate housing and living conditions, it seemed wise as a first step in remedial legislation to concentrate on improving the standards of migrant camps. After receiving the approval of the plan from Governor Kohler, the governor's commission worked with interested members of the interagency committee who caused the introduction of bill S 597 into the 1951 legislature, calling for the registration, inspection, and licensing of all migrant camps by the board of health. This bill passed both Houses by large majority votes, was signed by the governor on July 13, and became law on August 4.

Although several other State agencies have also done what they could with their limited staff, funds, and statutory authority, to help meet migrant problems along such lines

as have been outlined above, it is generally recognized that the most important contributions have come from the communities themselves, often at the cost of a tremendous amount of civic time and energy. While Waupun and Sturgeon Bay in Door County were the only two area focal points for migrant programs in the summer of 1950, by the summer of 1951 there was sufficient public education and concern to account for multiple activity.

PRESENT TENSE

In Racine County a migrant committee is now set up, on a broadly representative basis. It consists of both Catholics and Protestants, lay and professional workers. The county nurse, the county school supervisor, a librarian, and representatives of the Mayor's Committee on Human Rights and the Racine Mexican Club are included.

Activity in Racine County

As a first step in the summer of 1951 a member who represents the St. Vincent de Paul Society took an unofficial census which estimated that there were 130 Texas-Mexican families in the area, with 156 children of school age. Next a county school board gave permission to use a rural school; a rural school principal and a county school teacher offered their services; a Racine ninth grade girl of Mexican background served as interpreter. Ranging in age from 6 to 13, the children responded enthusiastically to their varied program of English, arithmetic, games, and singing, and made rapid progress both in learning English and in teaching it to their parents. In addition, the Catholic church has provided a new prefabricated building as a center not only for religious needs of the Mexican Catholic children but also for the teaching of English and handicraft.

Adults were not overlooked in the program plan. The bookmobile of the Racine Public Library was on the job. There were family nights with movies and singing, attended by as many as 100 people. Little doubt could remain that this particular group of migrants feels welcomed by the community.

What Sheboygan is doing

The story repeats itself in Sheboygan County which is also starting migrant projects, initiated by a county migrant committee and supported by the Sheboygan Press. When it was discovered that 80 Texas-Mexicans, hired by a large absentee sugar refining company, were living in unsanitary conditions, crowded into 19 one-room huts in two camps, appeals for improvement under the provisions of the new migrant camp bill were made to the board of health. Official investigations and recommendations followed promptly. Meanwhile, public-spirited citizens prompted by church and clubwomen visited the migrants to determine their needs and wishes. They offered friendship by means of family nights and picnics, clothing, and gifts, and a school for the children held out of doors in July and in a town hall later in the season when migrants returned for sugar-beet harvesting.

Surveys conducted

Although representative county committees are also established in Columbia County and in Wisconsin's smallest county of Pepin, the planning followed a different pattern in these cases. At planning meetings held in Portage and in Durand respectively, the committees decided that their first job was to get thoroughly informed on the status of their migrant groups, including their location, numbers, and apparent needs. First-hand surveys were then projected with the voluntary help of a variety of people, including church women of various faiths, employers, clergymen, welfare workers, and county board members. Coming as a result of such wide cooperation, these surveys are yielding valuable information as a groundwork for 1952 summer programs.

These various communities are revealing the following trends which are encouraging for future State progress in migrant welfare.

1. Emphasis on facts as the only sound basis for planning.

2. Expansion beyond town or city to county-wide organizational structure.

3. Inclusion of cross-sectional representation on committees, to encourage maximum participation and maximum skills from both lay and professional people, from employers and from church groups of various denominations and faiths.

4. Utilization of ready and willing resources, as needed, on the State level, as well as the municipal and county level. (For example, Sheboygan called on the services of the board of health; Racine and Pepin called on the Governor's commission on human rights; Columbia called on the Governor's commission and the division for children and youth of the department of public welfare.)

Aiding migrants in Door County

All these trends are reflected clearly in the dramatic progress made in Door County. In the summer of 1950 a modest beginning to a gigantic task was made by the tireless efforts of the county council of church women. But by 1951 problems of adequate aid to 7,000 cherry pickers loomed so large and offers of help came so generously that enlargement of personnel and plan seemed advisable. In addition to six workers from the home missions council, a Catholic priest and two Mexican sisters helped with the migrants. The Door-Kewaunee regional library played its part. Two schools were conducted in different parts of the county, as well as a recreation center in Sturgeon Bay and family nights at various camps. The mayor of Sturgeon Bay established a special migrant committee. In addition, a representative of the Governor's commission on Human Rights was invited to a planning meeting. At the suggestion of the Governor's commission, Door County leaders then called upon the services of the division for children and youth to help them evaluate their problems in terms of community resources and future expansion plans.

Faced with an influx and a variety of seasonal workers, including Jamaicans, Indians, and Texas-Mexicans, the residents of Door County are making remarkable strides in meeting the attendant problems with a fine mixture of common sense and humaneness. According to Door County planners, it is good business to treat the migrant decently because he is an economic asset; it is still better business to do so because he is a human being. Apparently there are a growing number of Wisconsin communities who will say "Amen" to this belief.

FUTURE TENSE

Prognosis is always risky to make. However, there are a few certainties. Generally speaking, it seems evident that the problems of welfare and human rights for migrants are large enough to enlist as many willing hands as possible. There is plenty of work—and plenty of credit—to go around. The surface has only been scratched as yet. Seven counties out of 71 doesn't make a record conducive to complacency.

Cooperation of all groups essential

Voluntary efforts have accomplished wonders but cannot be expected to carry the full burden in terms of skilled leadership and financial support. The employer needs to recognize his stake in the over-all satisfactory adjustment of the migrant. The State and the Federal Governments also have responsibilities in aiding community efforts. A straw in the wind is the fact that State school superintendents convened in Washington June 21-22 to discuss ways and means of increasing educational opportunities for migrant children during the regular school year and summer vacation period.

This Conference on the Education of Children of Migrant Farm Workers attempted to survey and gather data from States which had attempted to face realistically certain aspects of the migratory problem. The coordinating of effort on the local, State, and national level should afford the possibility of approaching the problem of the education of migratory children in a more effective manner as it relates to (a) the identification and study of procedures, practices, and projects operating in the field; (b) the recognition of barriers and obstacles inherent in the problem; (c) the utilization of local, State, and national resources, and (d) the development of a philosophy of acceptance of responsibility for education of the migratory child on the local, State, and national level.

Here in Wisconsin will come new legislative proposals and increased efforts to coordinate planning through the interagency committee. More trained social workers alerted to migrant problems are essential. Another possibility will be a State council of county migrant committees which can meet periodically to exchange ideas and information and to offer concrete proposals for State and Federal aid.

As a lay and professional planning group appointed by the Governor to prepare for and then to follow up the recommendations coming out of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, the Wisconsin Committee on Children and Youth will concern itself with migrant welfare through its county committees. As a backlog for action will come a demand for more extensive research which will not only pinpoint the needs but will provide more understanding of the migrants in relation to differences of culture, background, and language. Thus the abstraction-migrant will become a flesh-and-blood migrant.

With coordinated efforts and with increased understanding, the people of Wisconsin will come to regard their 12,000 migrant visitors as human assets as well as economic assets, and will take pride in getting their left hand to agree with their right hand. The migrant shelters will become houses, and the houses will become homes.

Proposed Modification of S. 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the other body has enacted S. 75 making it materially different from H. R. 1500, and the act S. 75 has come over to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in due course and in the usual order. Therefore, I as chairman of the committee, must call up for consideration in the committee the Senate act S. 75 instead of my own bill, H. R. 1500 upon which extensive hearings have been held, involving all matters germane to the act S. 75.

Since S. 75, the central Arizona project, was enacted by a two to one vote in the other body, in a materially different form from the House version, comity requires a consideration of the Senate measure by the House committee. Knowing the opposition which this legislation has encountered, I have sought to modify the measure in a watered-down way, hoping to make it acceptable to the

committee and the House. Members of my committee—both opponents and proponents of the original bill—have studied the modified version, and several former opponents have indicated their support of the proposed modification.

The act, S. 75, embodying the proposed amendments printed below is my proposal for action of the House committee. It does not authorize an appropriation of a dime or any other sum of money at this time for this project for any of its features. It does authorize the electrical features of the project, but prohibits any appropriation of money to be made for them during the present national emergency. In regard to the irrigation features of the project, this proposed bill prohibits the appropriation of a penny for them until after a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States, in which the United States is a party and the rights of the States in controversy have been settled. This bill prohibits any appropriation for them even after suit, unless and until the reclamation features of the project are reviewed by Congress after a court decision, and after a full consideration of the feasibility of such reclamation features in the light of the then conditions, the Congress specifically and by a future act authorizes appropriations of money for the irrigation features after water rights have been determined. In short, the purpose of this enactment is to provide a justiciable case so that the controversy over Colorado River water may be finally adjudicated, and I have it on the highest authority that there is no other method by which this case can be taken to and maintained in the Supreme Court for the greatly desired and needed judicial determination.

No one who sincerely wants a court settlement can afford to vote against the measure as herein proposed. No one who has objected to the central Arizona project because he fears that it is not economically feasible need oppose this bill on such grounds, because the irrigation features which were objected to must await action by Congress after a suit before they can be built. To summarize, if the act, S. 75, should pass the House in the form printed below, it will accomplish the following five things.

First. Authorize appropriations, only for electrical features agreed by proponents and opponents to be urgently needed, feasible, and in the national interest. But such appropriations are prohibited during the national emergency.

Second. Bar appropriations for all irrigation features until and unless Congress finds them feasible and authorizes such appropriations therefor after the termination of a lawsuit in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Third. Broaden section 12 and include all relevant compacts, contracts, and statutes.

Fourth. Create a justiciable issue by authorizing all features barring appropriations for irrigation features until after a suit, and reserving power and power revenue for operation of all features including irrigation features to be generated by the electrical features.

Fifth. Place the burden of bringing a suit on Arizona.

In my consultation with those interested in the legislation, including the Arizona Senators, I am assured that if the bill in the form printed below is enacted by the House that the two Senate sponsors, the Arizona Senators, will accept the House version in lieu of the Senate version and will not ask that dissimilar bills be sent to conference. Every thoughtful person contrasting the act S. 75 and the greatly modified proposal below will see that not only has a material change been made but the entire reclamation phase of the project has been postponed and awaits future action by Congress after the necessary High Court decision. Accordingly, the purpose of the modified proposal which I am submitting to consideration of my House committee is to furnish a justiciable issue for that necessary judicial determination.

The language of the proposed act S. 75 modified by suggested amendments is as follows.

S. 75

An act authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters to provide essential supplementary supply of water to irrigated lands, for municipal and domestic use, and for the irrigation of public and other lands within the United States, and for the generation, use, and sale of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking, and other beneficial purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, subject to the terms of the Colorado River compact and the water delivery contract between the United States and the State of Arizona, executed February 9, 1944, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain (1) a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, which dam shall be constructed to an elevation of not more than 1,877 feet above sea level, (2) a related system of main conduits and canals, including a main canal and pumping plants for diverting and carrying Colorado River water from Lake Havasu to the Salt River above Granite Reef Dam, a canal from the Salt River to the Gila River above the town of Florence, Ariz., and thence a canal to Picacho Reservoir, and thence a canal to the Santa Cruz River flood plain, (3) such other canals, canal improvements, laterals, pumping plants, and drainage works as may be required to effectuate the purposes of this act, (4) complete plants (other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy), transmission lines, and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder for use in the operation thereof and for sale in accordance with Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto); and (5) such appurtenant dams and incidental works, including interconnecting lines to effectuate coordination with other Federal power projects on the Colorado River or its tributaries, flood-protection works, desilting dams, or works above Bridge Canyon and a dam on the Gila River in New Mexico and such dams on the Gila River and its tributaries in Arizona as may be necessary in the opinion of the Secretary,

for the successful operation of the undertaking herein authorized and to effect exchanges of water to insure an adequate supplemental supply to lands presently or heretofore irrigated from the Gila River including and below Cliff Valley in New Mexico and from the tributaries of the Gila River by supplying water from the main stream of the Colorado River to lower lands now receiving water from the Gila River or its tributaries, thus releasing Gila River and tributary water for use and exchange on other lands served by the Gila River and tributaries and other exchanges of water which may be agreed upon by the users affected. *Provided*, That this authorization shall not include (a) any works, dam, or reservoir at the Glen Canyon site or any other site in the Upper Colorado River Basin, or (b) any dam, reservoir, or works in the Lower Colorado River Basin which would flood the Glen Canyon site.

Sec. 2 The Secretary shall have the authority to acquire, by purchase, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for said purposes. *Provided*, That anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary shall not have the authority to condemn established water rights or the water to the use of which such rights are established, or works used or necessary for the storage and delivery of such water to the use of which rights are established, or the right to substitute or exchange water without the consent of the holders of rights or those entitled to the beneficial use of such waters as may be involved in the proposed exchange.

Sec. 3 The estimated cost of the construction of the said works shall be determined by the Secretary. The Secretary shall also determine (a) the parts of said estimated cost that can be properly allocated to flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife conservation, respectively, and any other purposes served by the project which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law, the sums so allocated, together with the expenses of operation and maintenance attributed by him to such purposes, to be nonreimbursable, and (b) (1) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and which shall be returned to the United States by the users of water for irrigation purposes; (2) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be returned to the United States by revenues derived from sources other than the delivery of water for irrigation purposes; (3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to power and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues; and (4) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes and which shall be returned to the United States.

Before any construction work is done or contracted for, the Secretary shall first determine that costs allocated to power, municipal water supply, irrigation, or other miscellaneous purposes as herein provided shall be returned to the United States. *Provided*, That the repayment period for costs so allocated shall be such reasonable period of years, but in no event to exceed 75 years, as may be determined by the Secretary.

Sec. 4 Electric energy developed at any of the generating plants herein authorized shall be used first for the operation of pumping plants and other facilities herein authorized, and for replacement purposes, and the remainder thereof sold or exchanged to effectuate the purposes of this act. In the production, sale, exchange, and distribution of electric energy generated by any of the works herein authorized in excess of that required for the operation of said pumping plants and other facilities, the Secretary shall be governed by the provisions of this act and the Federal reclamation laws. The Secretary is authorized to supply water for municipal and

domestic purposes in accordance with the provisions of this act and said laws.

Sec. 5 Contracts for reimbursement of irrigation costs shall be such that they will provide for an identical cost per acre-foot at the several points of delivery of water from the main canals and conduits herein authorized, and from such other points of delivery as the Secretary may designate. Such contracts shall provide for equal annual payments of definite sums of money, the aggregate of which equals the allocations made pursuant to subsection (b) (1) of section 3 of this act. Such contracts shall be made with the State of Arizona or the State of New Mexico, or with public or private corporations, irrigation or other districts, municipal or other political subdivisions thereof, in accordance with the reclamation law. No person shall have or be entitled to have the use for any purpose of any water delivered hereunder except by contract made as herein stated.

Sec. 6 The works provided for by the first section of this act shall be used: First, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control, second, for irrigation and domestic uses and satisfaction of present perfected water rights, and, third, for power. The title to all works herein authorized shall forever remain in the United States and the United States shall until otherwise provided by law control, manage, and operate the same. *Provided*, That the Secretary may in his discretion enter into arrangements for the operation or use of a unit or units of said works with the States of Arizona or New Mexico or any irrigation district, reclamation project, or other subdivision or agency thereof.

Sec. 7 The rights of the United States in and to the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries for the use of which the works herein authorized are incidental, convenient, or necessary as well as the rights of those claiming under the United States shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact.

Sec. 8 The United States in constructing, managing, and operating the works herein authorized, including the appropriation, delivery, and use of water for the generation of power, irrigation, or other uses, and all users of water thus delivered and all users and appropriators of water stored by said reservoirs or carried by said canals, including all permittees, licensees, and contractors of the United States, or any of its agencies, shall observe and be subject to and controlled, anything to the contrary herein notwithstanding, by the terms of the Colorado River compact and the water delivery contract between the United States and the State of Arizona dated February 9, 1944, and by the laws of the State of Arizona or the State of New Mexico governing water rights wherever the same may be applicable.

Sec. 9 Nothing herein shall be construed as modifying or affecting any of the provisions of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

Sec. 10 This act shall be deemed a supplement to the reclamation law, which said reclamation law shall govern the construction, operation, and management of the works herein authorized except as otherwise herein provided.

Sec. 11 Nothing herein shall be construed as interfering with such rights as the State of Arizona or any other State now has either to the waters within its borders or to adopt such policies and enact such laws as it may deem necessary with respect to the appropriation, control, and use of waters within its borders, except as modified by the Colo-

rado River compact or any other interstate agreement.

Sec. 12 If any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of this act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right of the State of Arizona in addition to its other uses from the main stream to the use of water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, and to adjudicate claims of right asserted by such State or States, or by any other State or States, under the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) and contracts made pursuant thereto, the California Self-Limitation Act (Cal. Stat. 1929, ch. 16), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Mexican Water Treaty and any and all relevant compacts, contracts, and statutes, consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in such action or actions. Any State of the Colorado River Basin may intervene or be impleaded in such suit or suits. Any such claims of right affected by the project herein authorized and asserted by any defendant State, impleaded State, or intervening State under said compact and statutes, or by the United States may be adjudicated in such action. In any such suit or suits process directed against the United States shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States.

Sec. 13 There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the construction of (1) a dam in the Little Colorado River at the Coconino Dam site, (2) a dam with elevation as described in section 1 of this act and incidental works, including a power plant, in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, and (3) transmission lines and incidental structures for the fullest economic development of electric energy generated from water at works constructed hereunder for use in the operation of the project and for sale as provided in section 1 of this act. No moneys shall be appropriated for the construction of any features of the project not named in the foregoing provisions of this section, until and unless the appropriation of such moneys is authorized by Congress, after the termination of a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States in which the United States is a party. *Provided*, That during the existence of the present national emergency, no construction of any part of the project authorized by this act shall be undertaken, no contract for any such construction shall be entered into, and no money shall be appropriated for the construction during such emergency of any such part of the project. *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, the present national emergency shall be deemed to have ended when the exercise of existing Government controls over wages and prices has terminated and when the exercise of mandatory controls over the allocation for domestic use of materials necessary for the construction of such project shall have ended: *And provided further*, That power sales contracts shall be made with a view to the reservation of generating capacity sufficient for the operation of all features of the project and that rates for power shall be fixed in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; and that revenues derived from the sale of power shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318).

Sec. 14 (a) In aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works authorized by this act, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this section, (1) all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related

structures, as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, or maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works, and (2) such easements, rights-of-way, or other interest in and to tribal and allotted Indian lands as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, maintenance, relocation, or reconstruction of said works, facilities, and properties: *Provided*, That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribal constitution or charter to the contrary.

(b) As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this section, the Secretary shall determine the just and equitable compensation to be made therefor. Such compensation may be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any of the generating plants herein authorized. In fixing such rights to electric energy, including the rates and other incidents thereof, the Secretary shall not be bound by section 4 of this act. Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff. The amounts of money determined as compensation hereunder for tribal lands shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the credit of the appropriate tribe pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat 560). The amounts due individual allottees or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such other officer as shall be designated by the Secretary, for credit on the books of such agency to the accounts of the individuals concerned.

(c) Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or the construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the individuals whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this section. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

(d) Whenever any Indian cemetery lands are required for the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on other lands that he may select and acquire for the purpose, and to remove bodies, markers, and appurtenances to the new sites. All costs incurred in connection with any such relocation shall be paid from moneys appropriated for the purposes of this act. All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands within any cemetery so relocated shall terminate and the grant of title under this section take effect as of the date the Secretary authorizes the relocation. Sites of the relocated cemeteries shall be held in trust by the United States for the appropriate tribe, or family, as the case may be, and shall be nontaxable.

(e) The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as, or have the effect of, subjecting Indian water rights to the laws of any State

Celebration of First Train Order by Telegraph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the cleverest and most challenging address I have ever read. As a former railroad-train dispatcher, I enjoyed it thoroughly. It was delivered yesterday in Harriman, N. Y., by Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at the one hundredth anniversary celebration of the sending of the first train order by telegraph.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This celebration of the anniversary of sending of the first train by telegraph by Charles Minot from this spot 100 years ago gives us a welcome opportunity to pay tribute to a real pioneer and to raise the curtain of time for a review of progress in railroad-ing, in communications and in our Nation. The year is 1851.

Millard Fillmore is in the White House. The agitation over slavery is moving toward its climax. The feeble and aging Daniel Webster, now Secretary of State, is at the height of his fame and of the controversy over his historical oration on behalf of Henry Clay's Compromise of 1850 designed to forestall a civil war and preserve the Union.

The echoes of the hundred-gun salutes in leading cities in joyous celebration of the compromise have barely died away before there is rioting in northern cities over the fugitive-slave law.

And more fuel is added to the flames by the installments of a serial story appearing in a Washington weekly newspaper. It is being dashed off by a little mother sitting at her kitchen table between taking care of six children. Her name is Harriet Beecher Stowe and her serial is Uncle Tom's Cabin. Despotism is causing trouble abroad.

Louis Napoleon, after serving as President of France for 3 years, makes himself Emperor Napoleon III. For approving this coup

d'état, Queen Victoria dismisses her Foreign Minister.

The Spanish consulate in New Orleans is wrecked by sympathizers with Cuban independence.

Louis Kossuth leads a revolt for the independence of Hungary from Austria. Russia intervenes. Kossuth escapes, is brought to the United States by a naval vessel and greeted by enthusiastic crowds over the Nation. There are Kossuth hats, Kossuth overcoats, Kossuth beards, Kossuth streets, and Kossuth clubs.

Secretary of State Webster prepares to send a bristling note to Austria telling her that the people of the United States always sympathize with democratic revolutions, especially with the Hungarian uprising against government imposed from without.

Cyrus McCormick receives a gold medal at the Crystal Palace exhibition in London for his reaper.

John James Audubon, James Fenimore Cooper, and J. M. W. Turner die. James Russell Lowell is traveling in Europe.

Among the books being published this year are *Child's History of England*, by Charles Dickens, the *House of Seven Gables*, by Nathaniel Hawthorne, and *Moby Dick*, by Herman Melville.

A new newspaper, the *New York Times*, edited in a windowless, candle-light building, makes its first appearance. The first issue carries four columns of foreign news which, the publisher is proud to boast, is, thanks to steamship and railroad, only 2 weeks old.

The Illinois Central & Rock Island Railroad is trying out a new lawyer—by the name of Abraham Lincoln.

The vigilantes are organized in California and Maine goes dry.

In the field of transportation, canals are connecting the East and the West and the South. The success of the Erie Canal, built 26 years ago, has led to the recent building of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, the Illinois and Michigan Canal, and 800 miles of canals in Ohio and many other projects.

But things are booming on the railroad front. Some people are even saying that railroads may some day supplant the canals.

It is only 25 years since the first railway corporation began to operate a railroad in the United States—a 3-mile road to haul stone from a quarry in Quincy, Mass., for the construction of the Bunker Hill Monument. It used horsepower and iron plates on wooden rails. It is only 21 years since the first common carrier railroad was started in Maryland, first powered by sails and later drawn by horses. On Christmas Day of that same year the first steam railroad began running out of Charleston.

And now in this year 1851 we have 11,000 miles of steam railroads in operation, nearly three times the number of miles of canals.

The locomotives burn wood. The more progressive railroads are substituting whale oil for candles in their lamps and headlights, although few of them travel at night. Sleeping cars are coming into use. But there are still no dining cars. In this year of 1851 a train running from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Boston makes history by hauling the first refrigerated car carrying several tons of butter.

The second of the two lines connecting the Ohio River and Lake Erie is being completed this year.

Chicago is to be linked by rail in 2 more years.

President Fillmore, Secretary of State Webster, and other notables come from Washington in May to make the first trip on the New York & Erie Railroad linking the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes, hailed as the first long-distance railroad trip ever made in the United States.

Secretary Webster in a way invents the observation car on this trip. The famous orator, wracked by rheumatism and hay

fever, and 69 years old, only a year from his death, insists on being seated in an easy chair tied onto a flat car.

Included in the party of 300 is Gen. Supt. Charles Minot, of whom more later.

It takes 2 days with a night stop-over to make the trip from Piermont, 26 miles north of New York City, to Dunkirk on Lake Erie, a distance of 446 miles. The first trip linking the Atlantic to the Great Lakes over one unbroken line of railroad is completed. The successful run is celebrated with a barbecue of oxen, sheep, fowl, and loaves of bread 10 feet long.

Agriculture and industry everywhere are calling for the iron horse to carry their produce and products to markets. The westward expansion is accelerated day by day.

In the field of communication, great strides are being made although in some parts of the world semaphores are still being used for telegraphing. Russia, for example, is operating a system out of St. Petersburg employing 220 stone towers located 5 miles apart, manned by 6 men each and costing millions of rubles. In America various semaphore systems have been in operation. A proposal to Congress to build a semaphore system from Washington to New Orleans has been abandoned mostly because of the opposition of the portrait painter, Samuel F. B. Morse, who argued for the adoption of his electric telegraph system. It is now 7 years since Morse sent his "What hath God wrought" message over the newly completed telegraph line between Washington and Baltimore on the Baltimore & Ohio right-of-way.

Already small telegraph companies are stringing up wires in many parts of the country.

The possibilities of cooperation between the railroads and the telegraph are arousing the interest of men in both fields. But no railroad man grasps these possibilities as comprehensively as Supt. Charles Minot, of the New York & Erie Railroad—now the Erie Railroad.

Minot, the son of a Massachusetts Supreme Court justice, has abandoned the law for railroading and is an expert telegrapher himself. He has persuaded the directors to build a telegraph line along the Erie right-of-way, training the depot masters and clerks to act as operators.

Now comes the great day in September when Superintendent Minot is to give his conclusive demonstration of the utility of the telegraph in railroading and is to take an action that will make his name go down in history as a most significant contributor to railroad progress.

The telegraph has been used on the Erie heretofore to facilitate freight and passenger handling and incidental business, but never in train dispatching.

Minot is riding an express train westward and is scheduled to meet an eastbound express here at Harriman, N. Y., where we are gathered today to celebrate his feat.

He waits here a few minutes. Then, apparently being an impatient man, as I understand many railroad executives are, he telegraphs up to the next stop at Goshen, 14 miles away, to ascertain if the train has arrived there. Discovering that it has not, he wires Goshen to hold up the eastbound express for further orders. This is the first telegraphic train dispatching in history. He then instructs the conductor and the engineer of his train to proceed on to Goshen regardless of the opposing train.

Now, since the advent of railroading, engineers have been running their trains according to the timetable. Whenever an emergency disrupts their schedule, they send a flagman trotting down the track ahead with a red flag. Minot's engineer has visions of a disastrous collision. He can't see committing suicide. His reply is: "Do you take me

for a damned fool? I won't run by that thing."

Whereupon Superintendent Minot takes the throttle himself and speeds ahead to Goshen.

No collision; no catastrophe.

The first train order by telegraph is a success.

So now we are here a century later to celebrate that event and the stimulus it gave to communications, to railroading, and to the general growth of our Nation.

In doing this we are only adding to the well-deserved tribute bestowed when Mrs. E. H. Harriman, the mother of W. Averell Harriman, erected a tablet to Charles Minot's memory here at Harriman in 1912.

Despite Minot's success, there was plenty of distrust of this new medium for dispatching trains. Two years later, for example, when Andrew Carnegie was a telegraph operator on a railroad, he discovered that the officials were so skeptical that they permitted only the superintendent to give a train order by telegraph.

For a long time the telegrams on the Erie began with "Dear sir" and ended with "Yours respectfully."

More than 10 years were to pass before the telegraph came into general use for dispatching.

From then on the telegraph and the railroads worked so well together that they were referred to as the Siamese Twins of Commerce.

The Iron Cord and the Iron Horse teamed up to revolutionize America.

The telegraph came to serve as the nervous system of the railroad. It virtually doubled the capacity of a single track road. It flashed time signals, storm and damage warnings over entire systems.

At the peak of telegraphy on the railroads, around 1910, 80,000 telegraphers, including station agents, were employed.

In 1882, railroads began to employ another invention—the telephone—for dispatching and other uses, and today there are 900,000 miles of telephone wire as compared to 550,000 miles of telegraph wire. The number of telegraph operators is about half the figure of the peak year. Today 70 percent of all train orders are transmitted by telephone.

In addition to serving the needs of the railroads themselves, the railroad telegraph systems were indispensable in building up the commercial telegraph industry. Even today the railroads act as agents for Western Union in 10,000 communities and transmit 4,000,000 public telegrams a year.

But perhaps railroads and telegraph have a relationship ahead of them that is far more dazzling, not to say dizzying, than anything that has gone before. Certainly a whole new world of cooperation between the two is opened up by the possibility recently advanced by Norbert Wiener, professor of mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In his book, *The Human Use of Human Beings*, Professor Wiener gives us a glimpse of what may be ahead:

"Let us admit that the old idea of the child that in addition to traveling by train or airplane one might conceivably travel by telegraph, is not intrinsically absurd, far as it may be from realization. . . . The difficulties are, of course, enormous. In other words, the fact that we cannot telegraph the pattern of a man from one place to another is probably due to technical difficulties, and in particular, to the difficulty of keeping an organism in being during such a radical reconstruction. It is not due to any impossibility of the idea."

Well, suppose Professor Wiener's theory works out. Presumably you would walk into a railroad station and simply be asked to be telegraphed to Chicago. If this system works, if you can telegraph a person, you can probably telegraph freight likewise. Railroads

can tear up their tracks and rely entirely on their telegraph wires. The big gun of the railroads will not be the engineer—it will be the telegrapher.

Personally I am vastly intrigued by this idea. I am wondering what I would look like in Morse code.

Suppose that the telegrapher on some occasion violates rule G and mixes up some of his dots and dashes? You might arrive in Chicago with a misplaced eyebrow, or a few teeth missing, or your hair might be brunet instead of blond. But what would that matter compared to the speed of your journey—the speed of electricity—thousands of miles a second? Certainly you can afford a few changes in your physiognomy in the light of that.

But perhaps this idea isn't any more daring than the idea of sending the human voice and the human image thousands of miles through the ether without any wires would have seemed to Supt. Charles Minot in 1851. And after all, when you get the voice and the image, what more do you want?

And we must remember, too, in considering Professor Wiener's idea that when the bill to appropriate money for Morse's telegraph line was up in Congress in 1842, 22 Members thought to ridicule it to death by voting to include experiments in mesmerism. The bill passed by a close vote of 89 to 83. Seventy Congressmen didn't vote at all, many of them leaving their seats to "avoid the responsibility of spending money for a machine they could not understand."

In pondering Professor Wiener's idea we must also remember that the Czar of Russia as late as the year of Charles Minot's feat considered the telegraph dangerous. And even some American newspapers helped spread the rumor that the newfangled telegraph lines were responsible for the cholera epidemic of 1849.

After telegraphy and telephony, the next big step for the railroads was radio.

It was in 1915 that railroads began experimenting with the use of radio which had already proved so valuable in dramatic disasters at sea.

Beginning in 1930 the trend was to carrier current or induction radio in which signals are carried on telephone lines along the tracks without physical contact. A dozen roads are using this system today.

But the real advance in radio communication on the railroads dates from 1945 when the Federal Communications Commission established the railroad radio service designed to use space radio or signals traveling through the ether without relation to wires. Very high frequency channels were allocated in the 152-182 megacycle band.

Today one-half of all the larger roads use radio. Up to date the Commission has issued authorizations for 400 land stations and 5,200 mobile units. The number of stations authorized has increased by more than 60 percent during the past year.

Radio is rapidly becoming a foremost tool for enhancing the safety and efficiency of railroad operation.

Radio can be used for communication from caboose to engine, from train to train, from train to wayside crews, from train to wayside stations to connect with an entire system over perhaps hundreds of miles. The value of radio is pointed up by the fact that some of today's trains are 2 miles long or more than twice the length of the entire routes of three American railroads.

Radio has proved particularly useful in increasing the efficiency and economy of yard and terminal operations.

Congratulations are due the Erie Railroad for its leadership in the use of radio. It is a curious historical coincidence that the railroad that first used the telegraph for dispatching should also be in the forefront in employing this new art of radio to speed

its operations. It is now using radio over its entire main line from Jersey City to Chicago. In its train service it has 62 base stations and 350 mobile units. In its yard-terminal service it has 4 base stations and 36 mobile units.

I appreciate the problems that must be solved before radio's full potentialities can be realized in railroad operation. However, the scarcity of channels in the radio spectrum makes it necessary that the widest possible use be made of them. I am sure that an industry that has solved as many difficult problems as the railroads have will soon discover the techniques for the fuller application of radio in its operations.

So important has radio become in modern life that the supply of channels isn't nearly big enough to meet the demand. Besides the railroads, other users of radio in our safety and special category now include ships, airplanes, police and fire departments, electric and gas companies, highway and forestry agencies, streetcars, taxicabs, highway trucks and busses, geologists, newspaper reporters, lumberjacks, motion-picture directors, manufacturers, distributors, and individuals.

Railroads cannot afford to let tracks or rolling stock remain idle or to get less than the maximum utilization from them. Neither can the Nation afford to let valuable and scarce electronic highways remain idle. Conservation is imperative.

Radio, like railroading, is a dynamic field and new ideas are constantly arising. I shall discuss a few of these ideas.

For example, there is the possibility of multiplexing on the mobile service frequencies allocated for railroad use—putting several voice circuits on a single radio signal. There is a possibility that such an innovation could do two things: First, provide a larger number of talking channels than the present railroad allocation under present techniques can provide; and, second, permit greater flexibility in the use of those VHF channels. This would be an especially desirable improvement in a particularly congested area. In the world's largest terminal area at Chicago, for instance, there are 200 freight yards with 8,000 miles of track which handle 40,000 cars a day. Experimentation should provide valuable information on this possibility.

Another idea attracting increasing interest is the use of microwave frequencies which are higher in the spectrum—above 1,000 megacycles. Radar operates in these frequencies. The Commission has allocated some of these frequencies for experimentation by the railroads. If such experimentation provides us with adequate information, we can greatly increase our present supply of usable frequencies.

The rapid expansion of the usable spectrum space in the last few years encourages us in these hopes. We are using frequencies now that seemed to be beyond the pale of possibility only a few years ago.

If equipment and techniques can be developed to employ channels in the as yet largely unused microwave region of the spectrum, I can foresee many new applications of radio in railroad operations.

Facsimile, to eliminate all possibility of error in the instantaneous transmission of complicated messages, tabulations, or diagrams might come into wide use.

Radio teletype so that train orders or other messages can originate at any point and be received directly on teletypewriters which will type the messages is another possibility.

Microwaves could be used to bring readings to a central point of pressure gages, speedometers, and other indicators.

Whole yards or terminal areas might be made visible to a dispatcher by television. The television cameras located at strategic points throughout the area and perhaps even along the main line would bring the operations to a battery of screens in his con-

trol room. The activities of yard crews, the freight house handlers, the track men and the signal gangs could all be observed by the appropriate executives.

Then, as the art of radio advances, since we have guided missiles and robot airplanes, why not automatic, unattended or robot freight and passenger trains? A complete push-button operation with the train traveling from coast to coast without engineer, fireman, or brakeman, but controlled all along the route by dispatchers using radio signals?

The Casey Jones of the future would not be a flesh-and-blood hero but a robot—a tiny control box of vacuum tubes and wire.

Can you imagine anybody writing a song about a contraption like that?

And how will these robot trains be powered?

Since the middle nineteenth century year of Charles Minot's first telegraphed train order we have progressed from wood-burning steam locomotives, to steam coal burners, to Diesels and to Diesel electrics.

Today with an atomic submarine already under construction and with Chairman BRIEN McMAHON of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee proposing an atomic army, an atomic navy, and an atomic air force, there can be only one answer—the atomic locomotive.

It will, of course, be equipped with radar to detect all obstructions or emergency signals ahead.

I am sure that if Charles Minot were railroading today he would look forward enthusiastically to operating such a radio-controlled, radar-equipped, and atom-powered train.

In the 100 years since Charles Minot sent the first train order by telegraph the Nation has grown from 23,000,000 to 154,000,000. The railroads have grown from 11,000 miles of road to 224,000, employ more than 1,000,000 workers and haul more than 2,000,000 freight and passenger cars.

Passengers on some trains who, unlike Daniel Webster on the Erie 100 years ago, aren't interested in the scenery can divert themselves by watching movies, listening to the radio, watching the television, or picking up a telephone and calling their friends anywhere around the globe.

Communication remains the nervous system of our railroads. Freight and passengers will move with increasing speed and safety as the art of railroad communication is developed from year to year.

We honor Superintendent Charles Minot for the impetus he gave to safer and faster railroading when he pioneered telegraphic dispatching back in 1851. He took a great forward step that redounded to the benefit of his road, of his industry, and his Nation.

We, in communications and in railroading, can continue to honor him in the future by emulating his imagination, his vision and his boldness in the application of new ideas to problems peculiar to our own time.

Dedication of the Holy Cross Diocesan Seminary in La Crosse, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared relative to a very important historic event which occurred in the city of

La Crosse on September 16, with the dedication of the new \$3,000,000 Holy Cross Seminary there. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEDICATION OF THE HOLY CROSS DIOCESAN SEMINARY

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

It is most fitting that, in this critical hour of the history of the world, the people of Catholic faith of Wisconsin should have in the city of La Crosse on the 16th day of September participated in ceremonies dedicating a new seminary to the service of God and man.

Thirty-four archbishops and bishops, hundreds of monsignori, priests, and religious, and thousands of members of the laity took part in the impressive program in that fine city.

This was not merely an important event in the lives of those of Catholic faith; it was a symbolic act of faith for all men and women who worship the Lord.

And so, while the news came from overseas of the new ravages of communism against religion in the iron-curtain lands, and wherever bolshevism has taken a foothold, there came the answering news from the city of La Crosse. It was good news, inspiring news: that men and women of great zeal, of great devotion, of untiring energy had sacrificed of themselves to build this beautiful, distinctive seminary for the training of ministers of the Lord.

I had hoped that it might be possible for me to be at La Crosse in person in accordance with the kind invitation which I had received, but the pressure of other legislative commitments prevented me. I was, however, very glad indeed to send my warmest personal greetings.

At this time I am appending certain items to my statement by way of sincere tribute on this noble event.

A. First is a news report from the Sunday, September 17, issue of the Milwaukee Journal regarding the dedication ceremony.

I should like to note that the news of the dedication went out on the wire services throughout America and the world. It is the type of constructive, wholesome news which we could use a lot more of.

B. The second is the text of a personal letter written by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII to His Excellency, Bishop John P. Treacy, of La Crosse. It had been my pleasure in Rome recently to confer with His Holiness in conjunction with a Foreign Relations Committee trip abroad.

C. Next is the message of President Truman to Monsignor Hayden, rector of Holy Cross Seminary.

D. Then the official invitation by Bishop Treacy to dedication ceremony.

E. I should like also to include the text of the news article published in the diocesan newspaper, La Crosse Register, conveying the greetings which my colleague, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and I were happy to convey.

I repeat, we of Wisconsin of all faiths rejoice in this new seminary which will help send forth dedicated young men to bring the word of God unto all the world.

Moscow papers, please note.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 17, 1951]

EIGHTEEN THOUSAND VIEW DEDICATION OF LA CROSSE SEMINARY—HIGH OFFICIALS OF CATHOLIC CHURCH PARTICIPATE IN COLORFUL CEREMONY HELD IN OPEN AIR

LA CROSSE, Wis.—Thirty-four members of the American Catholic hierarchy, hundreds

of clergy and a crowd of about 18,000 persons witnessed the dramatic dedication of the \$3,000,000 Holy Cross seminary near here Sunday.

The weather was perfect as the throng knelt in the open air on the 87-acre seminary plot on a hillside along the Mississippi River.

Archbishop Edward F. Hoban, of Cleveland, Ohio, celebrated the mass, with priests of the La Crosse diocese assisting. A choir of 1,700 youths from high schools and academies sang.

The five unit seminary, first constructed by a Midwest diocese in a decade, was dedicated by Bishop John P. Treacy, of La Crosse, as a monument to the poor. He explained that it had been made possible by the contributions and the sacrifices of the 95,000 Catholics of the diocese.

THREE-DAY PROGRAM HELD

Archbishop Richard L. Cushing, of Boston, delivered the sermon. A long procession of bishops, monsignors, priests, and Knights of Columbus in full dress preceded Bishop Treacy to the outdoor altar.

Police made the estimate of the crowd at the ceremony, which opened a 3-day celebration to mark the opening of the imposing stone-and-steel structure where 350 candidates for the priesthood may be trained at one time.

Seventeen persons of the La Crosse diocese were accorded papal honors at their services Sunday afternoon. About 20,000 persons went through the 800-foot structure on escorted tours.

Archbishop Cushing praised the American priesthood and said that its contribution to the Nation's welfare was possible because it was not politically dominated.

"The Catholic priesthood is not a department of state—priests of God are not civil functionaries. To form Christ in others is not the mission of Caesar's men," the Boston prelate said.

PATRIOTISM MORE EFFECTIVE

"It is precisely because their education in this institution will be independent of the state and of state control, that the priests who come forth from the seminary will bring to their country a patriotism more dedicated because more free, a patriotism more effective because more independent of partisanship, a patriotism more loyal to Rome than the alumni of American seminaries. No group of citizens excels them in loyalty to America."

The Most Reverend William T. Mulloy, bishop of Covington, Ky., and Francis P. Matthews, Ambassador to Ireland and former Secretary of the Navy, spoke at a solemn investiture of 11 Knights of St. Gregory and 6 women who received pro ecclesie et pontificis medals for their work in the church.

Elevated as knight commanders of the Order of St. Gregory the Great at Sunday afternoon's ceremony were W. Leo Murphy, La Crosse, and Bernard A. Kennedy, Prairie du Chien. Initiated as knights of the Order of St. Gregory the Great were Dr. Edward P. Crosby, Stevens Point; John C. Malalepsy, Wisconsin Rapids; Judge Lampert Hansen, Sparta; John E. Schnabel, Wisconsin Rapids; Rudolph B. Horschak, La Crosse; Albin J. Groves, Viroqua; Michael Bilbow, Eau Claire; Dr. Walter A. Richardson, Wausau; and Archibald F. Lelck, St. Francis.

Women honored were Mrs. Frances Andrezewski, mother of priests, La Crosse; Miss Mary M. Zimientz, La Crosse; Miss Mary M. Roach, Eau Claire; Mrs. Helen Lyga, Independence; Mrs. Emma Zimmer, Spring Valley; and Mrs. Mary McGarty, La Crosse.

MADISON BISHOP SPEAKS

William P. O'Connor, bishop of Madison, was speaker at a mass Monday, designated as youth day.

In his sermon prepared for delivery to the gathering, Bishop O'Connor said that "the

youth who has heard the call to the priesthood is aware of a deep dissatisfaction with all the objectives and ideals the world has to offer and has a persistent desire to spend his life in unselfish pursuit of what he considers the true values of human existence." He added:

"What a challenge to young men in these days of arming and fighting in a world aflame with the fires of revolution in the thought and conviction that the church whom they serve puts not her trust in political power, large armies or stupendous and fantastic armaments, or any human or material means of conquest, but trusts in and relies under God entirely, upon her bishops and priests."

"When the history of these tragic days is written, no more historic figures will stand out from its pages than the great spiritual leader of Christendom, our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII. And when the Red leaders of the enemies of God and man shall have faded into the oblivion of time, the names of the valiant heroes of Christ's army will be held in honor and veneration."

More than 10,000 women are expected to participate in Tuesday's ceremonies, which will feature a 5,000-voice women's choir from the 150 parishes in the diocese. Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, of New York, will preach.

PONTIFF GRANTS PAPAL BLESSING

To our venerable Brother JOHN T. TREACY, Bishop of La Crosse

We have been informed, venerable brother, that on the 16th day of the coming month of September, the imposing project of the establishment of Holy Cross Seminary, representing years of zealous labor on the part of bishop and clergy and the generous cooperation of the Catholic people of your diocese, will have happily come to realization with its formal dedication by our representative the apostolic delegate.

It is fitting that this important milestone in the history of diocese of La Crosse should be commemorated with solemn liturgical ceremonies and we note with pleasure that this occasion will be honored by the presence of distinguished prelates and a large participation of your clergy, religious and devoted laity. We would add our personal word of cordial congratulation to you and to your collaborators with the prayerful trust that this seminary may give a new impetus to the flourishing Catholic life of the diocese and prepare holy and zealous laborers for the vineyard of the Lord, to the ever greater increase of the Kingdom of God and the salvation of immortal souls among the flock committed to your pastoral care.

With these sentiments, honorable brother, we invoke abounding heavenly blessing upon the faculty and students of this new institution of sacerdotal formation, so appropriately placed under the patronage of the Holy Cross of Divine Redemption, and we impart from our heart to you, to the assisting prelates, and to all your beloved clergy, religious and faithful participating in the dedicatory functions, our paternal apostolic benediction.

From the Vatican, July 23, 1951.

PIUS PP. XII.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Washington, August 30, 1951.

Very Rev. Msgr. THOMAS F. HAYDEN,
Rector, Holy Cross Seminary,

La Crosse, Wis.

DEAR MONSIGNOR HAYDEN: My hearty congratulations and warmest personal greetings to you and to all friends of Holy Cross Seminary on the notable occasion of the dedication of its new building.

It has been one of the glories of this country that wherever the pioneers went in extending our frontiers they made generous provision for the institutions of religion.

The church and the school appeared wherever the settlers made their homes.

In that noble tradition, the people of the Diocese of La Crosse have borne witness to their faith by gifts and sacrifices which have made possible the rearing of this fabric.

May I, as a dedicatory message, express the hope that Holy Cross Seminary in its new home may continue from generation to generation its magnificent work to advance the Kingdom of God through the training of young men for His ministry.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

To My Beloved Clergy, Religious and Faithful:

Health and greetings in the Lord

The great days of dedication of our new seminary are at hand. May I extend to you all—clergy, religious, and devoted faithful—a most cordial invitation to join with me in these historical events wherein we solemnly dedicate to the greater honor and glory of Almighty God and the extension of His Kingdom in our diocese, our new seminary. Most sincerely do I invite you all to be present at Holy Cross Seminary in La Crosse at 11 o'clock on Sunday morning, September 16, to share in the solemn services of the blessing and dedication of the seminary. Solemn pontifical mass will be offered at the great outdoor sanctuary by Archbishop Edward F. Hoban, of Cleveland. The sermon on this occasion will be preached by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston.

At 4 o'clock in the afternoon, you are cordially invited to be present at the conferring of papal honors on the men and women of the diocese recently honored by our Holy Father. The addresses on this occasion will be delivered by Bishop William T. Mulloy, of Covington, and Francis P. Matthews, former Secretary of the Navy.

This same cordial invitation is extended to you to accompany the children of the diocese on Monday, September 17, at 11 o'clock, when they will raise their voices in praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God at pontifical mass to be celebrated by Archbishop Moses E. Kiley, of Milwaukee, the sermon to be delivered by Bishop William P. O'Connor, of Madison.

With the same cordiality and heartfelt greetings, I extend to you an invitation to be with us on Tuesday, September 18, at Holy Cross Seminary at 11 o'clock in the morning when the third mass of dedication will be offered, the mass to be sung by the women of the diocese. The celebrant on this occasion will be Archbishop Leo Binz, coadjutor of Dubuque, and the sermon will be preached by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, national director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

After the masses and throughout the days of dedication, conducted tours will be made throughout the building. As abundant provisions have been made for the care of a vast throng on the grounds of the seminary, let no one stay away because of the fear of overcrowding. Let us all join in a great hymn of thanksgiving during these triumphal days, raising to the courts of heaven not only our hymns of praise but our petition that out of this great building, erected through the generous offerings of our devoted people, a great and noble priesthood may issue therefrom. Let us petition further that through our united prayers a lasting and Christian peace may descend upon this troubled world.

Hoping that as your bishop I may have the joy and pleasure of having you with me during the days of dedication, I am

Devotedly in Christ,

JOHN P. TREACY,
Bishop of La Crosse.

Given at the bishop's office, La Crosse, Wis., on the Feast of St. Lawrence, 1951.

This letter is to be read at each mass in every church and chapel in the diocese of

La Crosse on the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost, September 9, 1951.

By order of the Most Reverend Bishop:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. GEORGE A. HAMMES,
Chancellor.

[From the La Crosse Register]

BOTH WISCONSIN SENATORS SEND CONGRATULATIONS ON NEW EDIFICE

The two United States Senators from Wisconsin extended warmest congratulations and praise to the builders of Holy Cross Seminary in letters addressed to all the people of this diocese.

Senator JAMES H. MCCARTHY, in his letter to Bishop Treacy, stated that the efforts of bishops, priests, and lay people of the diocese of La Crosse in constructing Holy Cross Seminary represented a major victory over atheistic communism. The text of his letter to Bishop Treacy is as follows.

"Today the very existence of Christianity is seriously threatened throughout the world by the insidious dialectical materialism of Hegel, Marx, and Lenin. Thousands of non-thinking persons are consciously or unconsciously contributing to the further spread of such doctrines. This has resulted in the mental and physical enslavement of hundreds of millions of people, especially during the last 6 or 7 years.

"In the light of such tragic facts, the valiant efforts of the bishop, priests, and lay people of the diocese of La Crosse, who have contributed so heavily of time, effort, and financial help, stand out even more as a guiding light to those of us who have dedicated ourselves to combating the anti-Christian materialism and communistic atheism which exists in the world today.

"Even though apparently outnumbered and overpowered in some sections of the social and political areas within the United States, those of us who are devoted to the principles of God can take heart that we have on our side truth, light, and God Himself. These forces of God and truth will win.

"It is with these humble thoughts in mind that I pay tribute to the achievements of those who have given the diocese of La Crosse, Wis., and the Nation this seminary."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, in his letter, stated that the seminary will play a tremendous role in the future religious life of the diocese. "From it will come forth the continued spiritual leadership for the Wisconsin of tomorrow." Below is the full context of Senator WILEY's letter.

"I am delighted indeed to convey my warmest congratulations to His Excellency, Bishop Treacy, and to all the devout folks in the diocese—laymen and religious alike—who have by their sacrifices and devotion brought about this monumental achievement. I know that each of the folks who contributed so long and so much toward the fulfillment of this great project will feel satisfied and repaid in more than full measure in viewing this noble edifice.

"What a tremendous inspiration it is indeed that here in this country men and women filled with the zeal of their faith should erect this seminary to the service and glory of God, while abroad in so many countries the forces of atheistic anti-religion are so bent on destroying all vestiges of man's devotion.

"This new seminary will play a tremendous role, I am sure, in the whole future religious life of the diocese. From it will come forth the continual spiritual leadership for the Wisconsin of tomorrow.

"I wish that it might be possible for me to schedule being in La Crosse to be on hand for the dedication ceremonies, along with the church dignitaries who will journey there from all over the Nation, together with members of the public. I expect to be in La Crosse

on September 6, but thereafter I am afraid I will have to be on hand continuously here in Washington. Please, however, accept my warmest felicitations to all concerned."

RFC Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman recently stated that the Republicans had no issues. If corruption in Government is not an issue in which the people are interested, I would like to ask the President why Rome fell. Does he mean to infer that the people are willing to let this country fall the same as Rome fell? Mr. David Lawrence has written a very good article on this subject:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

TRUMAN'S ETHICS QUESTIONED IN STAND ON RFC CONTRACTS

WASHINGTON, September 20.—President Truman needs a new code of ethics if upon further reflection what he said at his press conference today isn't soon reversed.

The President declared, for instance, it was all right for the officials and workers in the Democratic National Committee to introduce people to such lending agencies as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation just so long as they didn't get any fees or payment for establishing such contacts.

But doesn't Mr. Truman realize that an introduction from the Democratic National Committee member or its personnel carries with it far more influence than an introduction to a private bank which has an altogether different attitude toward its depositors' money than RFC officials seem to have had?

For one thing, it is the rule under the Truman administration that most all important appointments have to be cleared through the office of the Democratic national chairman. So long as appointments to office are made on such a political basis, every appointee is bound to respect the wishes of at least consider with greater weight the introductions or contacts brought about through Democratic National Committee help.

ASKS FOR REPUDIATION

It has been disclosed that William M. Boyle received fees as a lawyer just before he became Democratic national chairman and that his law partner continued to receive fees after a loan was obtained from the RFC by a St. Louis printing concern. That same loan had previously been denied by the RFC three times. The Senate testimony shows that suddenly after some telephone conversations between the RFC office in St. Louis and a friend of Mr. Boyle in which reference was made to the committee, the RFC loan was granted. The friend was E. Merl Young, whose wife used to work at the White House and got a mink coat. Mr. Young admitted he was a volunteer worker on the Democratic National Committee at the time the St. Louis printing company loan was being sought.

Yet, Mr. Truman washes his hands of the whole business and says that while nobody, not even a volunteer worker, should get fees if he is a part of the Democratic National

Committee, nevertheless it is the duty of the committee personnel to help anybody who comes along and wants an introduction to Government lending agencies.

The President overlooks the fact that there are Republicans as well as Democrats paying taxes and that their money also is being loaned by the RFC. To allow a lending agency intrusted with public funds to be in any way related to a national political committee which engages in this type of political influence is something that ought to be repudiated instead of condoned.

Coming on top of the various scandals in the RFC, uncovered by the Senate investigating committee, Mr. Truman's attitude at his press conference gives an impression of casualness which is either the product of the Fendegast school of politics or the manifestation of a curious naivete.

STRONGER THAN PROSPERITY

Mr. Truman cannot seriously believe that the American people will accept his indifference to unethical conduct on the part of members of his political family and that prosperity will erase all opposition to his administration at the polls next time.

For the history of politics shows that morality is a deeper cause of concern and can wipe out the prosperity advantage of any incumbent party. To say, for example, that a mayor or governor or Democratic member of Congress can be a crook and yet if the people are prosperous he will be reelected is to reflect on the intelligence of the men and women who today compose the American electorate.

Mr. Truman's attitude toward the wrongdoing that surrounds his administration is one of bold indifference. He calls it all a sin or a misrepresentation. But the facts that are coming out of the congressional committees will be weighed by the voters. The big issue of 1952 may be reminiscent of the slogans of yesteryears when the people were asked to "turn the rascals out!"—and usually did.

The Social Sciences and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a timely and able address on the subject The Social Sciences and the Law, delivered by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] at the New York University Law School on September 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE LAW

May I express my appreciation to Dean Niles for the opportunity to participate in this symposium. I consider it a real honor to have been asked to take part in it. Having enjoyed for a brief period, many years ago, the privilege of teaching law, I have a keen interest in the problems of legal education. Sometimes I regret ever having left the teaching profession.

Although I have long since lost touch with the current developments in the schools of law, my experience in politics has enhanced my appreciation of the importance of a sound legal education, fortified by a thorough grounding in the social sciences. I endorse

completely the remarks of Dean Emeritus Vanderbilt regarding the objectives of legal education, especially his views concerning the lawyer and public service. Likewise, President de Kiewit's statement is an excellent analysis of the fundamental values and purposes of legal education.

Since I have spent the past 8½ years in the National Congress, an arena which few professors care to enter, it occurred to me that my observations today might properly be related to that experience. All of us, I suppose, are inclined to overemphasize the importance and the difficulties of our own activities—whatever they may be—but I shall try to be as objective as I can.

By way of justification of such an approach, I think you will all agree that when one considers the troubled state of the world today, it is quite evident that the basic difficulties arise out of our failure to solve certain problems in human relations, rather than from any lack of progress in the physical sciences. In fact, it seems to me the tremendous advances made by the physical scientists have intensified the difficulties involved in maintaining tranquillity among peoples. The pressures and imbalances arising from scientific discoveries, and their application to industry, have increased much more rapidly than our knowledge of how to resolve the friction among peoples resulting therefrom. In a word, the science of politics has not kept pace with the natural sciences.

Since first entering the Congress in 1943, I have been a member of the committee having jurisdiction of foreign relations. The overriding problem which weighs upon the minds of most of the members of the Congress, is the problem of peace among the peoples of the world. The physical scientists have succeeded in making war so destructive that our civilization threatens to destroy itself, unless we can find some solution to the problem of war. As an illustration of the significance of war in our present circumstances, more than 80 percent of our national budget this year will be expended on account of past wars and military preparations for the future. The dislocations arising from the drafting of men into the armed services and the loss of soldiers in Korea, cannot, of course, be measured.

There are some who believe that the nuclear physicists have already created, or are about to create, such powerful weapons of destruction, that no nation will ever again provoke a war. I hope that this theory may prove correct. However, it seems to me we should not rely upon such a theory, but should intensify our efforts to find a solution through the voluntary application of rules of conduct acceptable and enforceable by the community of nations. The alternative to such a solution is likely to be a solution by force, a prospect which I do not wish to accept.

The quest for a solution to the problem of war by reason, rather than by force, naturally falls within the province of the social scientists, especially the legal and political scientists. This is the principal reason why I have urged in the Congress that the social sciences should be an important object of research by the National Science Foundation. I may add that the Senate was surprisingly unresponsive to the idea of authorizing research in the social sciences and only a few days ago the Committee on Appropriations very nearly abolished the Foundation by denying it adequate funds.

If the solution of our international problem is to be through law and reason, rather than by force, the United States—as the most powerful of the free nations, and dedicated to the concept of freedom and justice through law—must assume and provide leadership in the undertaking. To a great extent, the future of the world is dependent upon the wisdom, the foresight, and the

patience of this Nation. It is when one contemplates the awful seriousness of this responsibility, that one becomes acutely conscious of the inadequacy of our preparation for the task. Nevertheless, we cannot escape the responsibility and must, therefore, set about preparing ourselves for the role. It is in this preparation that the social scientists can make their contribution.

From among the many aspects of this undertaking, there are two or three to which I should like to draw your attention. One of the foremost in importance, it seems to me, is the reluctance of the more talented and intelligent of our citizens to enter politics as a career. By politics, I mean the elective branches of the Government primarily, although I do not exclude the executive.

The young law graduate, one might think, would be attracted to politics as a career, inasmuch as his studies concern primarily the relations and institutions involved in man's existence as a member of an organized community. I should like to suggest that some competent social scientist should analyze this phenomenon and try to find a way to help us overcome the aversion that able and intelligent Americans seem to have to politics.

The founding fathers of our Nation, Washington, Jefferson, and their associates, were the outstanding men of their day. They were well educated, with great energy and imagination. They were men of ideas and they considered it an honor and a duty to serve the society which they had created. They were politicians. Why is it that today when we are the most powerful Nation of the world, with a unique opportunity for great achievement, our ablest citizens, except in time of war, are reluctant to seek or accept public office?

This problem of competent political leadership has become especially critical in recent years, because of the chaotic international situation into which unavoidably we have been drawn. During the nineteenth century, when we were in fact isolated by geographical location and were beneficiaries of the Pax Britannica, we had relatively little need of intelligent public leadership. However, now that the natural scientists have so dramatically modified our isolation and two World Wars have destroyed the power of Britain, we find ourselves thrust almost overnight, into the middle of an explosive and dangerous world revolution.

If we are to be successful in preventing the Russians from having their way with the world, it seems to me apparent that we must find a way to attract into the service of our Government the very best brains and talent we produce, the talent which, for 75 years, has devoted itself to business, to the natural sciences, and to the professions.

A further problem which arises out of these same dynamic circumstances, is the adjustment of our constitutional process to the demands of our international responsibilities. Our system of government was designed primarily for the protection of the individual from oppression by the power of the State. It was well designed for that purpose. By dividing the power of the Government among the three branches and by an intricate system of checks and balances, the individual citizen of this country has enjoyed as much, if not more, liberty and opportunity than the citizen of any other major nation of the world. With one tragic exception, we have preserved internal peace and order under law for more than a century and a half; no mean achievement in this quarrelsome world.

Again, however, this achievement was possible, largely because we were not seriously threatened by any external enemy nor concerned with exerting our influence in world affairs. Now that these favorable circumstances have changed and we find it advis-

able to use our power in foreign affairs, it becomes necessary to find a way to endow the executive branch of our Government with unusual power. In order to rearm and to negotiate with foreign nations, we are delegating power to the Executive which hitherto has been exercised by the legislature or retained by the people. This process of delegating power offends the instincts of our people and the sensibilities of our legislators and they resent it. I believe it is the subconscious suspicion and fear of arbitrary power which accounts, in part at least, for the violent criticism of the executive branch which has recently risen to dangerous heights.

That there are imperfections in our Government no one can deny. However, it seems to me that there has been generated among our people a distrust of, and resentment against, their Government far beyond that which may be warranted by the events of the last 3 years. The people exercised freely their right to elect their executive in 1948, and their representatives in the Congress in 1948 and 1950. They will have another opportunity to make their choice in 1952, but, in the meantime, the Government must go on. We cannot have a moratorium upon effective action until that decision is made. Perhaps it is too harsh a judgment, but I am afraid that to the world we appear to lack political maturity at a time when the civilized world can ill-afford such conduct on our part.

As President de Kiewit has so aptly said, "Political maturity in a people is directly dependent upon the nature and degree of its social understanding. Social knowledge is self-knowledge, and self-knowledge is the basis of maturity." Sometimes I feel that we Americans have been too successful, too quickly, in our domestic affairs, with the result that we are inclined to impatience or even petulance when confronted by complex and difficult problems in foreign relations. How to develop the political maturity necessary to enable us to exercise leadership among the nations effectively, should be a major concern of all social scientists.

In conclusion, may I indulge in an observation—speculative or intuitive perhaps—but, nevertheless, one which I believe to be sound. We all are prone to emphasize the difficulties and shortcomings of our own government, and the successes of our enemy. However, our country, in spite of some glaring mistakes, has performed reasonably well. I believe that our basic concept of society is so superior to that of the Russians that, if a total war can be avoided, time is definitely upon our side. I am convinced that if we are patient, steady, and resolute in our leadership of the free world, the Russians will not voluntarily provoke a world war. In short, I believe that the chances for success in creating a more rational and peaceful international order are good enough to warrant the utmost effort on our part to bring it about.

Two-Party Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the great newspapers of America is the Commercial Appeal, published in Memphis, Tenn. Consequently, I should like to call attention of Members of Congress and other interested citizens to an edi-

torial which appeared in the September 20 issue of the Commercial Appeal in connection with the project of political realignment. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO-PARTY ALLIANCE

Conservatively minded Americans, regardless of political affiliation or place of residence, may well be interested in the move to form a two-party alliance to promote limits on the power of the Central Government. The formation of a bipartisan committee composed of able and well-known figures to explore the practical possibilities is a logical first step.

The movement, sparked to a considerable degree by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota Republican, envisions a working coalition of citizens of similar convictions inside both major parties. It would make itself felt in both parties at their conventions and otherwise as its members endeavored to reach the same major objectives without giving up names and labels. The immediate aim would be to obtain in 1952 an administration opposed to socialism and bureaucratic domination in American life.

The proposal now in hand is better than any effort to form a third party. Third parties have never fared well in this country, for one thing, and, if one did, presumably the glib opportunists now in charge of the so-called Democratic administration would rush in, join and try to take it over. It is more feasible to organize and utilize the powerful sentiment now alive in both parties to check the present trend and reestablish limited government in and from Washington.

It is clear that the two-party alliance will face problems in connection with local issues and elections, but that would be true if there were a third party or in any other case. There is no question of the substantial dislike among millions of Democrats and Republicans, North, East, South, and West, for Fair Deal policies and programs. The fact has been illustrated time and again by a coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans in Congress. The members of the coalition were evidently speaking the sentiments of their constituents or they would not have come back time after time.

The problem is to organize this opposition to the Fair Deal so that it can make itself felt effectively in the choice of a President and through him in the Federal Government and the administration of it. It is something new and different but something new and different is desperately needed and Americans have traditionally devised new means of meeting a need.

Investigation of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] was present earlier, but had another engagement which he had to meet. He asked me on his behalf to request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses, one by Gov. Earl Warren before the American Bar Association on September 19, and the other

by our colleague, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] before the American Bar Association, both addresses on the subject of the investigation of organized crime.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The address by Gov. Earl Warren is as follows:

There need be no mystery about organized crime. It is as simple as A B C. It is nothing but criminals working a system to prey upon legitimate business or to operate illegal enterprises in defiance of laws designed to maintain decency, safety, and good order in the community.

The answer to it is equally simple. It can be wiped out any time the people desire to do so. It is neither inherent in our governmental system as now established nor in society as now constituted. On the contrary, it is merely a reflection of the public conscience of the community or State where it exists. It cannot be detached from other phases of community life or of governmental conduct. It exists on exactly the same level just as certainly as water always finds its level. It rises and falls from that level with the will of the public. I would challenge anyone to name a city that is a sink of organized crime and that has otherwise an honest and efficient city administration. The two do not mix any more than oil and water mix.

Organized crime can be prevented wherever there is a determination to do so. Where it now exists, it can be wiped out overnight. If there is a combination of public demand and simple, honest enforcement measures.

Who has not known of a wide open town closing tight as a drum overnight on a mere nod of the head of a police chief when the public becomes thoroughly aroused. And who has not known of such a place reopening as miraculously with another nod when in the jargon of the underworld "the heat is off."

If this can be done, who can argue that it cannot be done permanently for an honest purpose?

Organized crime is not just a big-city product. It is often found in small cities to a disgraceful degree. But it need not exist in any city. And in a great many cities it does not exist. It is not uncommon in metropolitan areas where a number of cities join each other without a visible boundary, that one is a cesspool of vice and crime while its neighbors are almost entirely free of it. There is but one reason for this difference.

It is a rule of thumb that organized crime does not exist anywhere unless someone is being paid off. It is not always the same public official. Sometimes, of course, it is a chief of police, a sheriff, or a prosecuting attorney, but quite as often it is someone higher in city or county government or in the political machine that dictates appointments or controls elections.

I know something about these things. I spent many years in law-enforcement work. It became my duty to send a good many faithless public officials to the penitentiary. On the other hand, I had the pleasure of knowing innumerable fine, honest, and conscientious law-enforcement officers, district attorneys, chiefs of police, and sheriffs. They are among the finest people I know. Most of them were more zealous in the enforcement of the law than the people to whom they were accountable under the law. I would say as a general rule, where policemen and other law-enforcement officers obtain their positions through an efficient merit system; where the department is adequately manned, and equipped; and where the officers are trained for their jobs, and adequately paid, they have a zeal for their work, and would

like nothing better than to be given a green light to keep the community free of rackets of all kinds. They start with self-respect and would like to retain an honorable status in the community for their wives, their children, and themselves. But they are not always permitted to do so by those higher up. I once had an experience with a chief of police in my county when I was the district attorney, which I know is repeated time and time again throughout the country. He was an honest man, but was having a difficult time dealing with vice and petty rackets because of city hall influences. I had been taking him to task for these conditions. Finally he said to me, "Earl, wouldn't it be wonderful to be chief of police if the people we work for—the mayor and councilmen—would give us hell every day for not doing a better job of law enforcement?" "But," he continued, "they don't do that. They just gripe about our picking on their racketeering friends."

This is not an uncommon thing. It goes on in numerous cities throughout the Nation every day. I am firmly of the belief that the usefulness of more chiefs of police is destroyed in this manner than through bribery. But the result is the same. Organized crime fastens itself on the community and eventually corrupts both the citizenry and the government. A chief of police usually serves 15 or 20 years in a department before becoming chief. He likes his job, of course, and he does not look forward with pleasure to the day when he must either step down or out of the department. The temptation always is to please those who have the power of appointment, even though their demands are not always in strict accord with duty. It can be said, of course, that a chief under such circumstances should resign. Perhaps he should, but even honest men sometimes temporize to hold a job that is a life ambition. From minor oversights to very bad community conditions is a natural progression. Such a state of affairs is well expressed by a homely poem called *The Down and Out*, which I learned as a boy and which says in one part:

"I started out to be honest with everything on the squire, but a man can't fool with the Golden Rule in a crowd that don't play fair. You don't go down with a short, hard fall, you just sort of shuffle along and lighten your load of the moral code, till you can't tell the right from the wrong."

You may think I am inclined to be soft on crooked police, but I am not. I despise them. They are traitors. I have sent them to jail. But I have known so many fine men in this work that I believe it to be unfair as well as unrealistic to charge them with greater responsibility for conditions than rightfully belongs to them.

Since the Federal Bureau of Investigation started the National Academy of Police Science for local law-enforcement officers, and also stimulated police training in many other ways, and since the advent of the merit system in recruitment and promotion, I believe police work is akin to a profession and with a little encouragement would actually be one. It could and should be as respected as the bar, and if so established, would perhaps do more to wipe out organized crime than any other one thing.

The American concept of law enforcement is local. I hope it will always remain so. Local law enforcement has not broken down. It just hasn't worked satisfactorily in many communities, as other functions of government have failed to work in the same places. On the other hand, there are many hundreds of cities where organized criminals would starve because they wouldn't be permitted to operate.

We don't need and don't want a national police force superimposed on our law enforcement structure. There is no particular virtue in such an institution, and there is

much to be feared in it. It would be mimicking those totalitarian states that are destroying human freedom wherever the police state lays its withering hand.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation with its jurisdiction over particular crimes of an interstate character, and with its identification bureau, its laboratories, its National Academy of Police Science, and its other educational and cooperative services, can give to local and State law enforcement all the assistance needed for the job to be done well. America is fortunate to have such a great law enforcement agency as the FBI. It has met every test that has been applied to it, and is an inspiration to every honest law enforcement officer in the Nation.

Neither should we transfer to the various State capitals the primary responsibility for law enforcement.

One of the great privileges of American citizenship is to be permitted to administer the laws of the State and to protect life, property, and human rights through community action. To relieve citizens of the responsibility of doing so would at the same time deprive them of a cherished American right.

Our system of law enforcement is based upon cooperation between local, State and Federal Government, not upon chain command. That system has served us well for 175 years. It can continue to serve us well if we preserve the rights that have insured our freedom.

On the other hand, it must be made to meet the challenge of organized crime, the menace of which is one of the major problems of contemporary political life. During the past 30 years organized criminal gangs and syndicates have emerged in many parts of the country and in some instances have gradually extended their activities throughout whole States and even larger areas. The menace involved in this development has not been generally understood by our people until comparatively recently.

People could not become excited over the danger involved in a bet with a bookmaker, the playing of a nickel slot machine, the buying of a lottery ticket or participating in the numbers racket.

The ordinary man thought of these things as the pettiest of violations. This misconception concealed the truth; that they inflicted tremendous financial loss on the American public and had become a source of corruption and political degradation in many cities of the country.

Recently, however, investigations and reports of crime study commissions, congressional investigating committees and other agencies, both official and unofficial, have served to dispel some of these popular misconceptions concerning commercialized crime. As a result of the activities of such investigating groups and agencies the general public has become increasingly aware of the great size and ugly shape of organized rackets. The underlying motives, the methods and techniques of the business of crime have become better known. Its insidious relations with Government and politics have become plainer. Public interest has become deeply roused. The public now properly expects the leaders in community life, and particularly the members of the legal profession, including the bench as well as the bar, to give serious study to those measures and reforms which may be necessary and advisable to control and eventually to eliminate organized crime. It is fitting that the legal profession should point the way to the achievement of the kind of justice and government to which we all aspire.

There is no quick or easy solution to the problem of organized crime. The only ap-

proach is through general improvement in the organization, personnel, and techniques of police and prosecution. Organized crime cannot be killed as St. George slew the dragon with the thrust of a spear. It must be starved and smothered in a thousand rat holes, which can only be accomplished by the constant effort and vigilance of honest, professionally competent public servants who are freed from the hampering influence of political interference.

We would do well to reexamine our entire law-enforcement structure in the light of historical experience and the kind of weakness which it exhibits. We should remove the obstacles of obsolescence, duplication and overlapping of authority which now impede the enforcement of law. We should reconsider the respective roles of the State and local government in the administration of justice and determine the extent and in what manner local officials should be held accountable for the discharge of their duties and their enforcement of the laws of the State. Following this course it is reasonable to expect that in due time we shall achieve the divorce of politics from crime, and improvement in the standards of personnel, professional competence and efficiency of our law enforcement and prosecuting officials, the establishment of discipline, morale, and a tradition of integrity and the development of uniform policies of enforcement and a cooperative spirit of public service in the agencies concerned with the administration of justice. The corruption in law enforcement which is so appalling cannot be eliminated in any other way, for dishonesty is not of itself the cause of the weakness in local law enforcement. Dishonesty, rather than a cause, is an inescapable incident of irresponsibility and of public neglect. It is the result of ignoring the elementary principles of sound administration.

In strengthening our defenses and meeting the menace of organized crime the crime commission has proved to be a useful and effective institution. In 1945, acting on my recommendation, the California Legislature, authorized me as Governor to appoint from time to time crime commissions for study and report upon any and all aspects of the problem of crime. Two years later the legislature appropriated the money which permitted me to finance a commission to study the subject of organized crime. This commission was in operation for nearly 2½ years and it produced remarkable results. With a modest budget, with a staff of no more than five men, without any power of subpoena or compulsory process, the commission succeeded, nevertheless, in making real headway against organized crime in our State. The commission detected and successfully broke up a bold attempt to organize the slot-machine racket on a State-wide basis. The commission seriously crippled the bookmaking racket in California by persuading the public utilities commission of the State to order all communication companies to refuse service when there is reason to believe such service is used for an illegal purpose, thus breaking up the communication network upon which syndicated bookmaking so largely depends. The commission focused public attention upon unhealthy conditions in many a community in the State with good effect. In some instances criminal prosecution resulted and a number of important racketeers and unfaithful public servants were sent to the penitentiary.

In other instances unreliable officials were dropped from the public service. Although most of its activity was necessarily limited to the territory of the State, nevertheless, the conditions encountered in the State could not be explained except by the activities of national crime syndicates with head-

quarters outside the State, and led to wider inquiry in this natural way, the information gathered by the commission on organized crime throughout the country was so complete that the commission was able to publish a report which has been confirmed at nearly every point by the subsequent and broader investigations of the Senate Crime Investigation Committee. The commission saw and pointed out the tremendously stimulating effect upon organized crime of the favoritism shown to racketeers and gangsters by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the matter of income taxes. It reported and documented incidents of extortion perpetrated by officials in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in California and Nevada against delinquent taxpayers on which charges have now resulted in the indictment of some of the officials involved. Although the district attorneys, the peace officers of the State and I had tried repeatedly to get a measure through the legislature making slot machines subject to seizure on sight, it was the publicity given to the slot-machine racket by the commission, and the consequent rousing of public opinion, that finally got the statute passed. As a result, the racket is dead. The slot machine has virtually disappeared from California. On the commission's recommendation and on mine, the State legislature also amended the State income-tax law so as to disallow the deduction for tax purposes of the expenses incurred in carrying on a criminal business, and the legislature has authorized the franchise tax board, which formerly relied entirely on the Bureau of Internal Revenue for fraud investigation, to set up its own organization to investigate and prosecute criminal evasion of State income taxes. These enactments are calculated to cut the profits of organized crime as far as it is possible to do so by the action of State tax agents. The Senate Crime Investigating Committee made recommendations to Congress similar to many of these measures. It is indeed a matter of regret that so far none of them have been passed.

This year the legislature, at my request, has appropriated funds to finance a new commission on organized crime, and I have appointed its members this very week. As a result of a recommendation of the old commission, the legislature conferred the power of subpoena and the power to swear witnesses on the new commission. The next year is likely to prove a rough one for the organized rackets in California.

I have stated that the control of organized crime is the responsibility primarily of State and local government. It is also true that the existence of organized crime is made possible in large part by the shortcomings of local law-enforcement officials and administration. But the Federal Government also has responsibilities in the matter which are not always discharged well, either. This is not said to avoid responsibility, but when the Federal Government permits, as it has, professional criminals operating interstate rackets to so enrich themselves as to enable them to overwhelm local law enforcement and government by the sheer power of money, the Federal Government contributes materially to the situation.

One subject that needs review, if we are ever to have adequate protection against the major rackets, is the practice of fines and the sentencing procedure as administered by both State and Federal courts. In dealing with gamblers and others who are in the business of crime for profit the courts are frequently so preoccupied with what they consider to be the trivial nature of the offense that they commonly impose light fines, losing sight of the fact that the basic purpose of the criminal law, when applied to the pro-

professional criminal, is deterrence, and that there can be no deterrence if the activity remains both safe and reasonably profitable.

A case in point is that of a notorious California gambler, described by the Kefauver committee as one of the more "loathsome characters" the committee had encountered. This man is boastful of being a gambler and of having lived outside the law all his life. A few years ago he was charged in the Federal district court in our State with possessing and transferring a large number of counterfeit gasoline ration coupons of the OPA, and with a second count of obtaining a large quantity of gasoline by passing off the counterfeit coupons on a gasoline station operator. He was arrested by the marshal and released on \$1,000 bail consisting of cash which he peeled off a roll he had in his pocket. In due course he entered a plea of not guilty to both counts and his case was set for trial. Before the trial date his case was advanced and he withdrew his pleas of not guilty and entered a plea of guilty to the charge of obtaining the gasoline by means of the counterfeit ration stamps, the charge of possessing the stamps being dismissed. Thereupon the court delivered judgment, the sentence being that the gambler pay a fine of \$75 together with the cost of the action which amounted to \$28. When the case was over, the United States owed the gambler \$897 change from the \$1,000 he had posted as bail.

This case may well be compared with that of a young lady who appeared on a similar charge in the same district court only 2 months later. This girl had been a clerk in one of the OPA offices and she and her boy friend were charged with having stolen a quantity of gasoline ration stamps (genuine ones) from the OPA office where she worked and with having obtained a large amount of gasoline with the stolen stamps. Both of the defendants were required to plead guilty to both counts—stealing the stamps and obtaining the gasoline. On March 28, 1946, judgment was pronounced. The sentence for each defendant on this occasion was 5 year's imprisonment in the penitentiary on each count, the sentences to run concurrently. If 5 years in prison was necessary to deter a young lady from stealing gas stamps, one wonders how a \$75 fine would deter a wealthy, professional criminal from counterfeiting them.

There is only one way to break through the restraints that are imposed upon local enforcement agencies by the alliance of politics and crime. That is through the pressure of an informed public opinion. All of us must realize that we can no longer afford corruption in our midst or moral obtuseness in our public officials. Facing the dark and dangerous times that lie ahead for our country and for the whole world, all of us, as citizens, are becoming more and more aware that we cannot ask our young men to fight and, if need be, to die for a way of life that worships the words of our forefathers and rejects the faith that gave them substance. We have a right to expect equal courage, integrity and energy from our law enforcement officials as from our fighting men. It is plainly evident that there is a growing demand from the public that officials, and especially law enforcement officials, exhibit these qualities. It is this fact which is based upon the fundamental, moral integrity of our people, more than any other, which is the most hopeful development in meeting the menace of organized crime and which will lead eventually, I am sure, to the thorough and permanent elimination of organized rackets from our country.

Senator Albert W. Hawkes and Edward A. O'Neal Head New Political Realignment Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr MUNDT. Mr President, due to the widespread interest which has been expressed in the newly organized Committee To Explore Political Realignment, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release announcing the selection of its new officers.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE POLITICAL REALIGNMENT NAMES OFFICERS

Former United States Senator Albert W. Hawkes, New Jersey Republican, and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Edward A. O'Neal, of Florence, Ala., a Democrat who, for 16 years served as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, were elected cochairmen of the recently formed Committee To Explore Political Realignment at a meeting held Saturday in the Hotel Mayflower. It was announced yesterday. Formation of the committee was announced last Monday, September 17, by United States Senator Karl Mundt, South Dakota Republican, who has been advocating political realignment for the Nation for more than a year.

At its meeting, the committee added Felix Morley, of Washington, D. C., educator and author, to its membership along with Mr. O'Neal.

In accepting the joint chairmanship of the committee, Senator Hawkes and Mr. O'Neal expressed the hope that through its activities a program will evolve for a practicable method of achieving political realignment on a national scale so that like-minded Americans, North and South, can join in supporting candidates for public office who believe in and will work for a National Government in conformity with traditional American principles.

They stated "It is the purpose of our committee to study all methods which have been suggested and others which will be brought forth whereby a genuine and long overdue political realignment can be brought about on a national basis, not by attempting to create a new party, but by welding together the conservative, traditional American segments of the existing parties in the 48 States, the parties of the voters, North and South, who have sent to Congress and kept in Congress, the Senators and Representatives who, for years, have not hesitated to cross party lines to oppose socialistic measures and to fight side by side for measures designed to strengthen the doctrine of home rule by the States and the communities as against the bureaucratic tyranny of an all-powerful Federal Government.

"Our committee has no intention of sponsoring candidates. Our job is to develop ways and means by which national political realignment on a State level can be brought about. When our task of exploration is completed we will make public the carefully considered program we hope to recommend. And when that time comes, we will be pre-

pared to go out and do our utmost as good Americans to make the plan a reality."

Other members of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment, in addition to Senator Hawkes, Mr. O'Neal, and Mr. Morley, are: Former United States Senator Edward R. Burke, Nebraska Democrat, who is chairman of the executive committee of the group; Charles Edison, of West Orange, N. J., former Secretary of the Navy, former Democrat Governor of New Jersey, past president, National Municipal League, and chairman of the board of Thomas A. Edison, Inc.; Donald J. Cowling, of Minneapolis, former president for 35 years of Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., former president, Association of American Colleges, and a member, 1937-40, of the National Republican Program Committee; Horace A. Hildreth, Lewisburg, Pa., president, Bucknell College, and former Republican Governor of Maine, and Donald R. Richberg, of Charlottesville, Va., executive director of the National Emergency Council, and later Chairman, NRA Board, both under President Roosevelt, and now professor of constitutional law, University of Virginia, and member, Washington, D. C., law firm of Davies, Richberg, Beebe, Busick, and Richardson.

President Truman's Challenge to the Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Challenge to the Bar," commenting upon the letter which President Truman sent to the convention of the American Bar Association in New York City, which letter I inserted in the RECORD yesterday. It is an editorial which sets forth much more eloquently than did my remarks of yesterday in praise of that letter, an evaluation of the President's message to the American Bar Association.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO THE BAR

It must be set down as a notable occasion indeed when the President of the United States invites the American Bar Association to scrutinize and criticize the security measures adopted by his own administration. This is precisely what President Truman did in his eloquent letter of Tuesday to the association's criminal law section. In effect, he asked the members of the bar to take up the task which Senator McCarran prevented the Nimitz Commission from performing. The request affords heartening evidence of his own profound concern over striking "the difficult balance between security and individual rights in these trying times." His letter contains, moreover, an admirable restatement of the utility of freedom as an indispensable element of national security.

"Although the Nation has always united against any external peril, blind obedience

to authority has never been characteristic of Americans. Rather, they have been questioners, doubters, experimenters, and very often articulate dissenters. This attitude is perhaps our most valuable national asset. It has promoted our moral and spiritual welfare. It has made possible great material advances. It has forced discussion, examination, and reexamination of policies on every level. The free interchange of opinion and criticism thus made possible is in a very real sense the most important element of national security we possess, for it provides a greater likelihood that we will take the right course than does any system in which policies are determined by a few leaders whom none dares criticize."

Yet this vital element of security is threatened today, in part by legislation, in part by Executive measures which whittle away the procedural right that constitute the substance of American liberty. Members of the bar association, who are in a peculiar sense the trustees of these procedural rights, are strategically situated to weigh the inroads made upon them and to judge whether these genuinely serve the interests of security.

Study of the methods employed in legislative hearings and in the Government loyalty program are especially needed. The President urged the lawyers to make such a study. He urged them also to discharge their traditional function of providing legal defense for those accused of abhorrent political crimes—even if they must risk "the obloquy of the uninformed" in doing so. This is a challenge to the bar—a challenge which its members can ignore only at a peril to the great institutions they serve.

Southern Democratic Leader Urges Dixie Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr President, for the information of the country and the Congress, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an interesting newspaper clipping which was mailed to me by a good Democratic friend in Alabama. It reports the observations of a highly respected and influential southern Democratic leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HARRIS URGES DIXIE BOLT IF TRUMAN RUNS—
COULD VOTE GOP TO PROTECT SOUTH,
AUGUSTAN SAYS

(By Ken Turner)

Former House Speaker Roy V. Harris, of Augusta, Monday virtually called for a Georgia and southern bolt of the Democratic Party if President Truman is renominated for the Presidency in 1952—even if it costs the South valuable congressional chairmanships.

Mr. Harris, a leader in Georgia's Democratic Party, outlined a two-point program designed to stop Truman in 1952.

He said if Mr. Truman is renominated and the platform includes the civil-rights programs "the votes of the people of the South must be denied to the national party."

Two propositions are open, he said. They are:

1. Vote with the Republicans on a trade to protect the South against the civil-rights program.

2. Give the electoral votes of Georgia and other Southern States to somebody besides Mr. Truman, thus setting the stage for throwing the election into Congress.

Mr. Harris said the "latter course of action seems to be more plausible for the Southern States to follow."

Taking note of the fact that Georgia and the South have many important chairmanships in Congress, the Augusta political leader declared "the time has come when the people of the South must quit selling their birthright for a mess of political potage. Heretofore we have been selling out to the northern Democrats for a few political jobs and for committee chairmanships in the Congress. It is time to quit selling out."

Mr. Harris said that the people of Georgia and every other State can control the Democratic Party in their own State.

Address by Hon. Herbert R. O'Connor, of Maryland, Before the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 22, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the splendid and thoughtful address of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] before the American Bar Association in New York on September 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Success stories have always been favored reading by our people. The rise to eminence in the professions, in business, and in Government, when recorded for posterity, has ever been an inspiration to our younger generations. Justifiably, it is a source of pride to citizens on every level.

In yesterday's issue of a leading newspaper in the Nation's Capital there appears a success story which is of particular significance today. The editor's note, prefacing the factual account, will best explain it. The front-page notice on the authority of the editor declares:

"This is the story of a man of importance and influence in Washington. He is a financial success in a multi-million-dollar local business, a contributor to many worthy causes, the employer of hundreds of workers. He is the first name intimate of policemen, lawyers, and leading citizens."

Is it an outstanding public official about whom the daily articles resolve; is it a learned professional man, a captain of industry or finance who has reenacted the thrilling rise to fame and fortune of which the literature of American progress is replete? Perhaps if I read the remainder of the editor's note the matter will become clear. The editor continues:

"His illegal numbers game is patronized daily by tens of thousands. He has been a hidden power and a secret force in this city. Citizens need to know those who, for good or evil, influence their daily lives."

This history of a man who has risen to wealth and power through illegal activities happens to concern a Washingtonian. He could just as well be a resident of your town or city, no matter what section it be. The Senate Special Committee Investigating Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce went

into all sections of the country, into metropolitan areas and into relatively small communities. It visited the East and the South, the North, and the far West. Everywhere it found conditions, and prosperous racketeers and mobsters, that could form the basis for just such an account as is now being published in the Washington newspaper.

One warily approaches the subject whose many facets have been grist in the mill of his listeners in their adult lives. Many of you have seen, in all their alarming detail, the ugly aspects of crime in various communities. However, the even more violent threat to the rights and the safety of our people presented today as the result of the superstructure erected by the crime overlords whose operations extend into virtually every town and hamlet cannot be as well known because of the far-flung areas covered.

Every civilization is confronted by critical problems which threaten its existence. Whether it be the black plague or religious wars of renaissance Europe, or the onslaught of natural forces like the 7-years' drought, something always tends to keep the life of society hanging precariously in the balance. I don't know how long a list would encompass all the giant evils which confront America today, but it would most assuredly include organized crime.

It is for this reason that the symposium on the menace of organized crime is not less important than any subject matter taken up for consideration by members of this great association.

If the challenge of organized crime, with its threat to the security of our people, is to be met successfully in our time, the inspiration and impetus for such solution will rest upon the legal profession of our States and localities.

Not only does lawlessness abound and is it an affront to constituted authority but the more serious threat is to the processes of justice itself which are the target of attack by the public enemies within the gates of our cities and towns. Ours is a government of laws and not a government of men. Therefore, it is cause for deep concern when syndicates of hoodlums and racketeers have hurled defiance at the very portals of the hall of justice.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the committee's probe has been the realization that crime has moved faster than control of crime. Viewed with long perspective, the four reports of our committee are only appendices to Lincoln Steffens' Shame of the Cities of 1904. The connivance of crime and politics which he saw the Senate committee could not fail to observe. The abdication of popular Government to entrenched opponents which he found the committee had exposed to our view.

In peering through the lattice work of crime and politics, we have viewed the widespread deterioration of respect for law and the erosion of Government responsible to the people. The enormity of the crime evil lies precisely in public unawareness that these are the consequences which follow nonenforcement of law.

You know better than others that in the final analysis it is only our respect for law, and for the protection of the rights of individuals of every class, which will maintain the integrity of our Nation and keep us from the degradation and the collapse into which so many once free peoples have fallen.

Sensational events crowd each other so continually on the public scene today that already the findings of the crime committee, sensational as they were, are passing from the minds of our citizens. But the point that representatives of the legal profession might take to heart, is that there actually is a real crime problem in our land. We must face the fact that its tentacles reach into towns and cities and that its corrupting influences know no limitations of office or class.

Because of the pendency of a celebrated trial just beginning here in New York one must refrain from even mentioning the details. But if honest, alert citizens who want to preserve the integrity of their city and State and Nation will take the trouble to interest themselves they will find that there is crime, serious crime, close to home, crime that calls for detection and prevention if we are to leave to our children and to future generations a country of which they can be proud, a law-abiding community in which their persons and their possessions will be safe.

One could not live with this problem for a year and a half without concluding that its solution, in large part, rests in the hands of local law enforcement. The States, the municipalities, and even the smaller units not only have the right but, we say deferentially, they have the responsibility of combating the lawless elements who would make a mockery of the courts and of enforcement agencies.

Nor will it be a solution if only a majority of the States strengthen their protective processes. If weak links in the chain are allowed to exist you can be sure that organized criminals will find them and will act accordingly. Syndicated crime is so resourceful that overnight it can change its basis of operations to an area where it can operate unmolested. So versatile are these public enemies that they can change their methods and move their locations with startling rapidity and with remarkable ingenuity.

Furthermore, they switch from one type of crime to another, according as the public tastes or the people's whim change. During the prohibition period, when bootlegging enabled them to realize almost incredible profits, they centered in that field of activity. In recent years they have concentrated on illegal gambling activities from which their income has been tremendous. Because it was good business for them to do so they have piled their trade where laxity, inefficiency and public indifference allowed them to hold sway. To insure continuation of their operations unmolested they have not hesitated to bribe and to corrupt public officials and have considered such "expenses" as routine and as justifiable. In fact, in their accounts and in their income-tax returns they blandly record such illegal payments. With a frigid sneer at the law and a cold glance at feeble law enforcement they define such bribes as "ice."

Authoritative estimates indicate that \$20,000,000,000 a year are drawn from the American public by organized gangster syndicates. The profits to the hoodlums are fantastic. So enormous are they that the criminals cannot find enough outlets in illegal trade in which to invest. Accordingly they have now infiltrated into legitimate enterprises and have acquired diversified corporate holdings. From this point of vantage they hope through use of gangster tactics where needed to get a strangle hold on industrial and commercial ventures upon which the general public must depend in their regular pursuits.

It can be expected that if exclusive attention is given to suppressing their activities in present-day illegal gambling they will doubtless turn to the handling of narcotic drugs. In the past several months the Senate committee has played its searchlight upon this newest crime problem. Here is crime at its devastating worst. Here is a disease which like a cancerous growth, will spread malignancy throughout the land. It will produce a high death rate to its victims and will bring misery and tragedy to the victim's loved ones.

The sinister aspect of the dope traffic is that a large percentage of addicts are the youth of our day. Teen-agers in increasing numbers are falling prey to the habit. Encouragement is being given them by peddlers who derive lucrative returns from their illicit

trade. And even greater danger looms up as the gangster clan views this newly developed area as fertile growth for its future operations.

While it is true that local law enforcement is the pivotal point for adequate law-enforcement activities an obligation unquestionably rests upon the Federal Government.

The facilities of interstate crime are being used regularly and extensively by criminal syndicates. If the lawless element is resourceful enough to utilize the instrumentalities of commerce then the Federal Government has the obligation of meeting that challenge head on. Neither the founding fathers in drafting our Constitution nor the United States Supreme Court in its interpretations have left the Central Government helpless in dealing with criminals whose operations spread over State lines. In past years the menaces of kidnaping and of traffic in stolen automobiles were met by adequate and constitutional statutes at the Federal level. There is no constitutional reason for a "twilight zone," a jurisdictional haven for big-time criminals who may consider themselves beyond the reach of Federal and State authorities. The power is available to reach them if we will but devise the means.

And that brings me to the third of the powerful allies to whom decent citizens must look for intelligent leadership—the American bar.

In an effort to devise the means by which to thwart the efforts of violators the lawyer is most sorely needed so that the plans may be worked out without impairment to the constitutional rights of individuals and without scrapping those fundamentals of government which have stood the test of time. Now when law enforcement at the local level needs powerful support, the lawyer can best draw the blueprint. Because it has been revealed that no individual State or locality can overpower the widespread crime syndicate, the Federal Government must meet its responsibility. But the lawyer's advice as to how that obligation must be met will be invaluable in the days ahead.

The Congress in this and other investigative proceedings would do well to follow a code of fair conduct. Such a uniform system would maintain the rights of individuals called as witnesses and who should have opportunity to consult and to be advised by lawyers before and during examination. Character assassination in committee hearings should be guarded against and every safeguard erected to preserve the legal rights of the citizen.

The conditions under which congressional hearings are conducted should be carefully studied, while public hearings are of the greatest value in eliciting facts such proceedings should be on a dignified basis. The preservation of a calm, judicial atmosphere, in which individual rights are protected, outweighs many other considerations. Even though a congressional hearing is not a judicial proceeding it is to be hoped that the participants will emulate the example of an orderly judicial trial and that sensationalism or the spectacular will be conspicuous by its absence.

To the great credit of the American Bar Association, let it be said that throughout the Senate crime investigations the standing committee of this association under the able leadership of Robert P. Patterson has been of extreme assistance. Helpful advice and needed support were given generally to the committee's recommendations. Therefore, it is not necessary to tell this association what it should do, but rather to express the hope that it will not lessen its interest or its efforts.

Fortunate also in this discussion today is that the viewpoint of the States should be expressed by a forthright and a sincere advocate of law enforcement and of high standards in official life. The distinguished Gov-

ernor of the State of California long since has shown his awareness of the place of the State in combating the menace of organized crime. He can be expected to continue zealously as this never-ending crusade carries on.

I would be less than frank and would be concealing information if I did not report to fellow members of the Bar Association of the indefatigable efforts of the Senator who conceived the plan for this Nation-wide survey. One of the brightest pages in the Senate's history in recent times will record the high-minded purpose and the unflagging zeal of the man whose efforts have been second to none of our generation in arousing the American public to the dangers of organized crime. I stand in tribute to the Senator from Tennessee, **ESTES KEFAUVER**.

Though our committee has now relinquished its task, we by no means have concluded that the job is finished. Organized crime may always be a disagreeable by-product of our affluent and fluid national life. We may be confronted with this ugly national phenomenon in any community, small or large, which will tolerate its existence. It is a basic social problem extending even beyond the reach of statutory law or administrative enforcement. Controversial questions which are involved in this many-sided problem have professional interest for you. But over and above these considerations there remains a moral challenge which involves definite responsibilities for the entire citizenry.

Emancipation Day Celebration of the McDonald Community League at Mc- Donald, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address I delivered at the Emancipation Day celebration of the McDonald Community League, McDonald, Pa., last Saturday, September 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, DELIVERED AT THE EMANCIPATION DAY CELEBRATION OF THE McDONALD COMMUNITY LEAGUE, McDONALD, PA., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1951

It is a great honor to join your fine, public-spirited organization in these important exercises.

The historic background of this meeting is most impressive and deeply significant.

For more than 60 years, here in McDonald, you have observed this date as the anniversary of one of the greatest forward steps in the advance of human freedom.

Year after year you have honored the memory of the Great Emancipator, a plain man of the people, who rose from poverty and hardship to a place of glory among the world's immortals.

We meet to commemorate the proclamation issued by President Lincoln on September 22, 1862, from which I now quote:

"I proclaim and declare that on the 1st day of January A D 1863, all persons held as slaves, within any State or designated

part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward and forever free."

Those were dark days of tragedy and crisis. The fate of the Union hung in the balance. The opposing forces were engaged in mortal combat. The tide of war had not yet risen to heights from which victory could be envisioned by the North or the South.

Gettysburg was 9 months away. Appomattox was 3½ years and many bloody battles in the future.

But in the great heart of Abraham Lincoln there was true allegiance to those principles held sacred by the founders of our Republic.

The finger of God beckoned to Abraham Lincoln, calling him to serve as a benefactor of the whole human race.

He gave new life and true meaning to the words that will live forever—that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Emancipation Proclamation, which followed in due course on January 1, 1863, struck the chains of bondage from more than 3,000,000 human beings. Two years later the adoption of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution enabled America to assume its rightful place as the laud of the free for all its people.

Since those memorable days the Negro, in spite of difficulties and handicaps, has achieved greater progress in a shorter span of years than any people in all world history.

Your people have succeeded as educators, lawyers, physicians, and clergymen. You have achieved greatness in science, art, and music. You have won a place of increasing importance in business, insurance, and banking. You are represented by outstanding figures in diplomacy and Government. As craftsmen and industrial workers you have contributed to the productive strength of our country in peace and war.

The Negroes of America have proven their loyalty and patriotism in every war in which our country has been engaged. From the first shots fired in the Revolution to the present conflict in Korea they have given their lives to preserve the ideals of freedom. The loyalty of the Negro has never been questioned.

The great names of Negro achievement are known to all and are honored by every true American—Booker T. Washington, in education; George W. Carver, in science; Ralph J. Bunche, in diplomacy and law, to mention but a few.

But equal in importance, if less known to fame, are thousands of modest, hard-working Negro men and women who are serving their fellow men with outstanding ability and the highest integrity in many fields.

In every city and town, in every community, their example is an inspiration to their fellow citizens, regardless of color, creed or national origin.

We have every right to be proud of the many fine boys and girls who have grown up here in Washington County and have gained success in their chosen business or profession.

I want to tell you about some of them because they reflect great credit upon all the people of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Many of you recall Charles West, who was known as "Pruner" West when he was a football star at W. and J. He is now a prominent physician practicing at Alexandria, Va.

Then we had another star athlete in Washington, Clarence Mansfield, who is now a member of the medical college of the University of Chicago and is one of the outstanding physicians of that city.

George Jefferson, another Washington boy, chose the legal profession as his career and

is now one of the most respected members of the District of Columbia bar.

Fred C. King, who was raised in Burgettstown, is principal of the Davis Street Junior High School in Jacksonville, Fla., one of the largest schools in the South.

Another school principal is a former McDonald boy, Commodore Bennett, now a resident of Manassas, Va.

We are all proud of Miss Violet Banks, of Washington, who is having great success as a concert pianist and vocalist and was formerly a member of the faculty of Morgan College, Baltimore, Md.

A Burgettstown girl, Miss Arline Young, is a distinguished educator. She is a member of the faculty of Texas State University for Negroes and formerly was a teacher at Howard University.

Randal Hooe, whose father was a minister in McDonald, is now a successful preacher in Steubenville, Ohio.

Lorenzo Carter, of McDonald, was a practicing dentist in Charlestown, W. Va., until his untimely death a few years ago.

Sam Harris, another McDonald boy, who recently graduated in chemistry at the University of Pittsburgh, is now engaged in chemical research with the Pittsburgh Coal Co. at Library.

There are many more who could be added to this imposing list. To all of them, whether I have mentioned them or not, I offer my congratulations and best wishes in grateful recognition of the honors they have earned by their own efforts and their service to their fellow citizens.

In these days of unrest and perplexity, when the godless philosophy of communism seeks to gain mastery over the minds of men, we must be vigilant and determined in defense of our sacred ideals.

We must be on guard against those who abuse the privileges of American citizenship.

We must be united in opposition to those who preach intolerance and spread hate and prejudice among our people.

It is difficult to understand why some misguided Americans, white and Negro, have turned their backs on Americanism and have embraced the poisonous teachings of communism.

It is difficult to understand why anyone who has enjoyed the wonderful advantages that America offers can get so far away from decency and self-respect.

Yet we must admit with deep regret that it has happened—and no race in America is without some examples.

We know that communism has poisoned the minds of some men and women who have had the advantage of a college education and were gifted with rare talents that could be used for the benefit of their fellow man.

Such men, white or Negro, should be grateful for the opportunity to help build a greater and happier America.

But instead they are doing all they can to tear down and destroy everything that has helped to create harmonious race relations, mutual respect and sympathetic understanding.

I am glad to say with the greatest pride, that the real leaders of the Negro race have been strong and vigorous in their condemnation of communism and all who have accepted its destructive, Godless philosophy.

In the great American family there are many races and creeds. We have many differences and many problems. But we will make progress so long as we keep in mind the goal toward which we are striving—equal freedom and equal opportunity—working together for the welfare of the Nation and all its people.

We will never reach that goal if we depend upon those who seek to gain political power by false promises.

We will never reach that goal if we depend upon government for security and an easy way of life.

I therefore want to sound a note of warning:

Don't let selfish politicians of any party sell you a bill of goods. If you do, they will get the goods and you will pay the bill for their empty promises.

For too many years the American people have been paying a staggering price because they have been misled into thinking that the Government can make everyone safe, secure, and happy.

Never once in all the history of the world has that promise been fulfilled. In every country where the people abandoned self-reliance and depended upon government, misery and suffering have come upon them.

That is the reason freedom and opportunity have been blotted out in such a large portion of the world today.

In his last public address, 5 days before he fell victim of an assassin's bullet, President Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party, made this significant statement, and I quote:

"If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time."

The leadership of our Nation today has forfeited the confidence and respect of the American people.

Corruption, communism, and confusion are widespread in your Government. Every day in our newspapers and on the radio new scandals are revealed.

The American people are awake to the danger. They now realize that the glittering promises of something for nothing were false promises. They now realize that they are paying too high a price for government that condones corruption, coddles communism, and creates confusion.

They realize that no government should require a citizen to work one day of every three to pay his tax bill.

The ever increasing tax burden is robbing your children of the educational opportunities enjoyed by the successful men and women I mentioned earlier in my remarks.

When I think about the future of freedom in America I am not worried about conquest by any foreign foe.

I am not worried about Communist aggression against our shores or the danger of atomic attack.

The worst threat to American freedom is the breakdown of the moral and spiritual fabric of our people.

Turning again to the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln, I quote from one of his great speeches which has a warning for the American people today:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea-coasts, our Army and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle."

"Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

"Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your limbs to wear them."

"Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

The fundamental truths of human progress are everlasting and unchanging. They apply equally to all races of mankind. They are firmly established on the Golden Rule,

the Sermon on the Mount, and the teachings of the Holy Bible.

You cannot legislate righteousness, tolerance, or good will into the hearts of men.

Those qualities must be created by a deeper understanding of the rights and privileges of American citizenship as well as its responsibilities. They must be strengthened by adherence to the principles of religion.

There is no liberty where the laws of God are neglected or denied.

As good Americans, we must rededicate ourselves to the principles of individual freedom, equal justice, equal opportunity, good will, tolerance, and the love of God.

Address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, delivered at the annual convention of the American Bar Association, at a luncheon meeting of the association section on international and comparative law, and the junior bar conference, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on September 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, AT A LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION SECTION ON INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW, AND THE JUNIOR BAR CONFERENCE, IN THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N. Y., SEPTEMBER 18, 1951

I am happy to welcome the members of the American Bar Association to New York and to be with you at this meeting devoted to the subject of foreign affairs.

The most important thing on earth is to win our struggle against imperialist Communist aggression without total war.

You and I know that America will never launch such a war. We also know that no other nation is in a position to launch it except the Soviet Union.

The danger of total war lies less in calculated Soviet strategy than in the chance that the Kremlin will make a bad guess. In their unremitting assaults on the free world they might attack an area thinking we would not defend it. Then when we sprang to its defense, the Soviet would find they had started a war they did not expect and could not stop.

This can happen wherever there is a power vacuum—wherever there is a country too weak to defend itself and apparently without friends willing and able to defend it. This is exactly what happened in Korea. There is no excuse for this to happen again and I propose to you that we build a strong and total foreign policy in the Pacific before it is too late.

Specifically, I believe it is vital to the defense of the United States and the continued existence of the free world that we start immediately to build a well-rounded and complete Pacific mutual defense alliance.

The defense of Europe is now well on its way. After a political fight that split both parties, we have set our course. While much remains to be done, the world now knows that an attack on Europe would bring an immediate and devastating response. There are a few European vacuums left, a few danger spots where the situation is still unclear, as in Yugoslavia. Nevertheless great progress has been made.

But we cannot fly on one wing or rest our defenses on one flank alone. The Pacific is equally critical.

I am convinced that decisions which may decide our whole future as a Nation will be made in the Pacific in the next few months. The Pacific is the active firing line in the battle against communism. Right now we have a full-scale war in Korea and five Communist-inspired and Communist-led revolutions in the Philippines, in Indonesia, in Malaya, in Indochina, and in Burma. In the last 2 months I have visited the front lines in five of these wars and I assure you that the struggle for freedom is very grim and very real.

As a nation we have made some terrible mistakes in the Pacific but we also still have the most tremendous opportunity we have ever faced. It is hard to speak with restraint on an issue about which I feel so strongly, but in view of the nonpolitical nature of this audience I will do my best.

For 4 years I demanded that our country take the drastic steps necessary to prevent the fall of the Government of China. But we failed to act and tragedy befell the Chinese as the Reds moved in. Then the British made the monumental blunder of recognizing the Mao Tse-tung government. We shall all pay for many years for those blunders but we may still regain much if we move now.

Four years ago I warned, at a meeting in this very hotel, that if we withdrew our troops from Korea we would create a power vacuum and the Communists from North Korea would sweep over the country. The warning was ignored. Our country did withdraw its troops, and the Reds moved in last year.

The worst thing about the Korean blunder was that the Government of the United States, in effect, issued an engraved invitation to Stalin to launch his conquest. It was solemnly announced in Washington that Korea was not within the defense perimeter of the United States. In plain English—or plain Russian—that meant that neither the United States nor the United Nations would defend the 20,000,000 people of the new Korean Republic which we ourselves had created.

Normally Stalin does not need more than one engraved invitation to take a country. He accepted this one and his North Korean puppets moved in last year. I am positive that the most astonished and incredulous man on earth was Mr. Josef Stalin when the United States did a backward somersault, announced that we would defend Korea and moved swiftly and decisively in the United Nations for action by the free nations of the world. That decision was right. It was necessary. I supported it wholeheartedly the day it was made and I still do.

The point is, and it should be made terribly clear, that we should stop issuing engraved invitations for conquest to Stalin. We should create no more power vacuums into which he will inevitably move. We should not ever again, so long as this struggle goes on, endanger any free people by publicly announcing that we will not help them defend themselves.

On the contrary, I propose that instead of improvising our foreign policy in the Pacific from day to day we will develop a new, whole, well-rounded, firm policy so that everyone,

and particularly the Kremlin, will understand what we will defend. Such a policy can prevent wars and it is the only one that will.

For example, everybody knows that we would defend Hawaii and Alaska. I believe the United Nations would join us in that defense. For that reason we know that unless Stalin has decided on world war III he will not drop one bomb on either of those Territories.

Everybody also knows we would defend Guam and Wake Island. We have an enormous and strategically powerful base on the Island of Okinawa and no one is going to attack Okinawa unless he wants to invite total retaliation.

In the same way we have now negotiated mutual defense treaties with Japan, the Philippines, and Australia and New Zealand. Each of these treaties is merely the translation into formal documents of what I am sure is in the hearts of most Americans. Our long relationship with the Philippines and Australia and New Zealand make them almost as close to us as our own territories and people.

The defense of Japan is equally necessary for the simple reason that Japan and Germany are the prime targets of Russian imperialism. If the Soviet could get either one she could gain the balance of industrial power for her side against the free world.

These treaties of mutual defense were necessary and urgent as full notice of our intentions to the world. They are a good beginning. But standing alone, I warn you in all solemnity that they are dangerous, being either too much or too little.

These four countries are widely separated—Japan in the north, the Philippines in the center, Australia and New Zealand in the extreme south. In between these countries are lands of vital importance to their defense. In other words, we are going about this business by bits and pieces and putting ourselves as a nation into a dangerous position.

I believe we must have a total defense in the Pacific or we will wake up some unhappy day finding our defenses back in Hawaii or on the shores of California.

Let's be perfectly frank about it: We Americans do not want to fight any war. In particular, we do not want any war waged on American soil. But if we have to fight, we want to make sure that we have friends all over the world and lots of them. We need friends who are able to fight and friends who are numbered by the hundreds of millions.

Specifically now, what about the Philippines? The island of Formosa is essential to the defense of the Philippines. They suffered major air attacks in the last war from Formosa and that island commands the sea lanes west of the Philippines.

And yet in these troubled times our National Government has been on-again off-again on Formosa four times in 2 years. We need a firm and broadly developed policy concerning Formosa, establishing its permanent position as a part of the free world.

Take Japan: From a military position let's realize that there are Russian divisions 3 miles from the coast of Hokkaido, one of the main four Japanese islands. The Japanese have no army, navy, or air force with which to defend themselves. The defense of Japan is going to be our job for some time to come.

All Japan's overseas possessions are gone. She is reduced to the four main, comparatively barren islands. Her population has increased in the last decade from 70,000,000 to 83,000,000. Coal and iron and salt are essential to Japan. All of these minerals

used to be available to them in large quantities and cheaply from Manchuria.

Today Japan pays \$3 a ton for salt in San Francisco and \$19 a ton to ship it home. Today she pays \$10 a ton for coal in America and \$20 a ton to get it across the Pacific. With little iron ore, Japan is scraping the bottom of the scrap heap.

Despite the most intensive production of food in the world, Japan still has to buy 20 percent of her rice from overseas.

Will Japan be forced into the arms of Red China to get the minerals and food she must have to live? If so, the price tag would include a stiffer political price with every shipload. Concession after concession would force Japan into Soviet control without Stalin ever having to strike a military blow.

There is a free area where Japan can get all her essential minerals and food. It is southeast Asia. There is one of the richest areas in the world, some of it still not fully developed. Burma, Thailand, and Indochina are land rich. They have been able to export large amounts of rice in the past, as did Korea and Formosa under Japanese rule. They should again be able to produce a surplus to exchange for the industrial products of Japan.

If these areas are cut off I do not see how Japan could avoid becoming a poor relation depending on us for her very existence. That is a condition which would be intolerable, both to the Japanese and the American people.

What about Malaya and Indonesia? They are vital to our own defense if for no other reason than that between them they produce 90 percent of the natural rubber and 86 percent of the tin of the entire world. Admittedly we can use synthetics, but only in part. Large amounts of tin and natural rubber are essential to the industry, transport and defense mechanisms of this country and the other free nations.

Then look at Indonesia for just a moment, in human terms. The former Dutch East Indies is a new country, only a year and a half old, the baby among free nations. Yet it has half as many people as the whole United States and in population is the sixth largest nation on earth.

The people of Indonesia are Moslem and they are naturally opposed to communism. They made the great decision at San Francisco and joined with the free world in signing the treaty of peace with Japan. These great and rich islands are almost subcontinents and it is vital that their people remain free.

Southeast Asia is the cornerstone of the defense of the Pacific.

But at this moment there are areas in southeast Asia where a power vacuum exists.

At this moment there are no commitments by the free world as a whole or by the United States, which would defend those critical areas in the event of an all-out Communist attack.

They are doing very well against armed Communist revolutionary forces from within. They are doing it at a terrible price. A hundred thousand British-led troops are fighting the bitterest of jungle warfare against Communist bandits in the jungles of Malaya.

France is spending one-sixth of her total national budget and has more than 120,000 troops in Indochina defending that area from the Communist armies of Ho Chi Minh. If you are one of those who sneeringly say the French won't fight, I invite you to go and visit that grim area where one of the greatest soldiers of our time, General de Latre, changed a defeat to victory by sheer leadership and personal courage last December.

In the Philippines and in Indonesia, with all the problems involved in creating new

governments for great new nations, they are also forced to wage unremitting warfare within their own borders against Communist treason and armed guerrillas.

You have to see those brave and thrilling struggles at first hand to realize the intensity with which these new nations are struggling to maintain their integrity and their liberty. But having seen it, you cannot fail to gain a profound respect for those who are in the front lines of freedom all over the Pacific. They are fighting our common enemy. In every sense of the word they are now our allies. I am personally convinced that they will win their struggles, every one of them—unless they should be overwhelmingly attacked by outside forces.

Are we going to allow that outside attack to occur? That is the simple question upon which the fate of the whole Pacific may turn.

I say the answer is as clear as day. We must make a mutual defense alliance of the Pacific from Japan through southeast Asia on down to Australia and New Zealand. It should be one single treaty, all for one and one for all.

More than 270,000,000 people live in this area. That is almost exactly the same number of people there are in free Europe. It is nearly twice as many as there are in the United States. We will never survive in this world if we are successfully defended on one side and naked on the other. We will never survive in this world if we commit ourselves to defending parts of an area, leaving other equally vital parts open for aggression at Stalin's convenience.

If we do keep this Pacific area free, none of our allies will be forced to trade with Red China on her terms and they are all defensible.

We must draw a line in the Pacific and put it in a treaty for all to see—just as we have done in the Americas and just as we have done in Europe. We must draw that line while we still have brave allies who are not only willing to fight but are actually fighting and winning right now.

I believe that with adequate preparation such a program would be acceptable to the free world. Such a treaty is specifically authorized by the Charter of the United Nations. I believe that with such a program and with a united and firm commitment the Pacific nations will never be invaded and we will not get into world war III by accident or by a miscalculation in the Kremlin.

If we make firm allies in the Pacific as we have in the Atlantic and the Americas, we shall have the majestic power of more than 850,000,000 people armed in the common defense of human liberty.

If the treaty I propose should be successfully negotiated, America would then be part of the most powerful alliance on earth.

We would have not only the industrial power of the world but we would have actually more human beings on our side, tied by treaties of defense than there are in all the miserable slave states under Communist control.

With such tremendous might on the side of freedom, it would be more than any tyrant would ever dare attack. It would be the greatest alliance in history for peace.

I also believe that the cracks in the Communist tyranny would then grow larger and larger and the iron curtain would ultimately crack up.

I realize perfectly well that this treaty is a new concept in American thinking. We have never regarded Burma or Indonesia as a part of the defense of America. I frankly confess that I do not think they so regard themselves. But the ugly nature of Communist aggression is becoming clearer every day to the peoples of the Pacific and I am personally confident of their steadily mount-

ing desire to maintain their position in the free world at all costs.

We have gone so far along the road of collective security that it would be a tragedy to go 80 percent of the way and fall because we neglected to achieve the final and vital 20 percent.

A great deal of hard diplomatic work remains to be done. Surely no goal can ever be so precious as to build a force on the side of freedom so mighty and so united that it can win through this dreadful period without a total war.

I hope our people will demand that our Government proceed at full speed to build such a treaty. It is worthy of our every effort. With the whole-hearted support of the American people it can succeed.

Intercollegiate Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the faculty of the College of William and Mary concerning the effects of intercollegiate football on that college. This is a courageous and clear analysis of the effects of the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics by the colleges of the United States, and should receive the prayerful attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT BY THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

We, the members of the faculty of the College of William and Mary, deeply troubled by the recently disclosed academic irregularities in the physical education and athletic departments of the college and by their consequences, feel it our solemn duty to the students, the alumni, and the citizens of Virginia to declare publicly our convictions about the causes of what has happened and the steps we propose to eliminate these causes as quickly and as completely as we can.

We are agreed that the fundamental cause is an athletic policy which at William and Mary, as at many other American colleges and universities, has proceeded to the point of obscuring and corrupting the real purposes of an institution of higher learning.

For over a decade the College of William and Mary has been laboring under conditions imposed by an increasingly ambitious intercollegiate athletic program. These conditions have been increasingly detrimental to the educational ideals to which the college is dedicated. The insidious influences of the athletic program have eaten at the most vital elements of academic life. If permitted to continue, they must inevitably render the college impotent to perform its educational obligations. The flagrant violations of academic principles during the past 2 years which are now public knowledge can only be regarded as unmistakable symptoms of deep-seated, unhealthy conditions which could if unchecked destroy the very integrity of the college.

The recent revelations clearly demonstrate that certain dishonest academic practices

have been followed by duly appointed members of the athletic and physical education staffs for the purpose of securing and retaining coveted athletes. Many other isolated indications of the serious effects of the athletic program have become too obviously manifest to members of the faculty during the past several years. We do not intend here to present proof of such instances.

More significant and of far greater value, we believe, will be an exposition of the ways in which we have experienced the disastrous effects of the present athletic policy on essential elements of college life at William and Mary.

We have seen an exaggerated athletic program steadily sap the academic standards of the college. William and Mary exists to educate intelligent, informed, and balanced graduates, able to make sound judgments and to discriminate among values, and prepared to follow their various careers as responsible, progressive citizens of their communities. To this end a curriculum has been carefully planned—and is being constantly revised—to provide a thorough course of study in the humanities and the natural and social sciences. Entrance to this program presupposes high standards of admission, and its successful completion demands a high level of achievement. If this educational goal is to be fully attained, it must be the primary purpose of all college activities; all else must be contributory and subservient. Anything short of this goal would be unworthy of the ancient traditions and honorable history of the college.

Steadily and inevitably the intercollegiate athletic program has usurped a dominating position in the college. Instead of a healthy and indispensable extracurricular activity, it has become a commercial enterprise demanding winning teams at any cost, even the cost of dishonest academic practice. It has demanded that admission requirements be lowered, and sometimes dispensed with, so that promising athletes can be given the respectability of college enrollment. Limited scholarship funds which should aid young men and women of intellectual promise and financial need must go to athletes whose sole recommendation for such aid is their athletic prowess. Once on the college rolls, the athletes must somehow be kept there. Their schedules must be arranged without reference to the normal procedure leading to graduation, but rather to enable them to meet the minimum requirements for continuance in college and for eligibility in intercollegiate athletics. Courses most vital to the attainment of the educational ideal of the college are avoided in the search for the easy course. Athletes participating in certain varsity sports are prevented from making a free choice of a course of study open to other students. For example, the regimen of football players makes them unable to enter a program of premedical study. There is pressure, for special consideration for athletes on the score of heavy athletic duty. The tragic consequence is illustrated by the graduation records of the past 9 years: Football players as a group have been only a little more than half as successful as the rest of the student body in completing the requirements for the degree. They have been exploited on the gridiron under the pretense of being educated.

We have seen this athletic program violate the most elementary standards of honesty and right conduct. It has tarnished the bright tradition of the honor system which William and Mary has cherished for generations. The failure of certain individuals in responsible positions to maintain the highest standards of honor has weakened the moral fiber of the college and of its students and alumni. Athletes knew that these were

those in high positions at the college who were committing, or being accessory to, acts of dishonesty. The deception which has been practiced by responsible officials and students participating in athletics was known to many other students who were tragically disillusioned by it. How, they asked, could the college try to maintain a rigid code of honor in certain areas of college life and expect the student honor councils to enforce this code when acts of dishonesty in another area were subjects of frequent discussion within the student body. Honor is indivisible. One set of principles cannot be applied in one relationship and not in another. There is no double standard of honor.

We have seen this athletic program ravage the morale of our student body, including the athletes themselves. Many students feel that subsidized athletes form a special privileged group set apart from their fellows. They see athletes recruited on the basis of financial assistance well beyond the amount available to nonathletes and with little regard for need or scholastic ability. The athletes themselves, victims of a pernicious system, appear to be looked upon on the campus as almost a segregated element. The impression prevails that there is a special set of rules for them—a "double standard" which operates in the areas of admissions, discipline, financial aid, and academic standards. Many students sense that the college has been dishonest in its administration of the athletic program. It is known that the athletic department has violated rules to which the college has publicly subscribed, rules of the Southern Conference regarding the length and nature of off-season practice and the recruiting of players. That these violations have been condoned has caused on the part of many students a loss of confidence in and respect for the college.

Another effect of the athletic program upon student morale springs from the staggering cost of that program. Big-time athletics is an expensive undertaking which demands greater and greater outlay for more and more salaries, for equipment, for additions to the athletic plant. It appears that the necessary money is usually forthcoming. But at the same time it seems that the college is incapable of financing essential improvements which are of greater concern and would be considerably more beneficial to the whole student body. The result is a distortion of values, cynicism, and a feeling of real resentment.

We do not seek to evade our share of responsibility as a faculty for having failed hitherto to halt the insidious growth of these evils. Determined action at an early stage would have prevented or at least diminished much of the harm that has occurred. We have not done successfully that which we ought to have done. Sporadic attempts to investigate the causes and eradicate them have been effectively thwarted by veiled suggestions of intangible and nebulous pressure groups, and by an understandable shrinking from the harmful effects which result from public exposure of the internal difficulties of the college.

Deploping these conditions, we, the undersigned members of the faculty of the College of William and Mary, intend now that the college shall have a sound and healthy program of athletics. The foundation of such a program must rest upon the unequivocal statement of section XIII of the regulations of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools: "Faculty control of all phases of intercollegiate athletics is required. The financing of athletics should be a function and responsibility of the institution and under the control of the administration." The principle of faculty control has not

hitherto been practiced. It must be practiced in the future.

The athletic policy we must formulate and the program we must put into effect must be truly extracurricular; it must take its rightful place as a beneficial but distinctly subordinate activity of the college. It must be an activity of the general student body; participants must be attracted, admitted, and governed by the college exactly as are all other students. It must be and remain a program harmonious with the atmosphere, purposes, and ideals of the college. To this goal, and to the proud and honorable traditions of the College of William and Mary, we pledge and dedicate ourselves anew.

To institute the full implications of this policy at the College of William and Mary and to insure strict adherence to its explicit meaning, be it therefore

Resolved—

That the following committees of the faculty, hitherto appointive, be established as elective committees of the faculty, and their specific duties and powers defined in the bylaws of the faculty: (1) A committee on admissions, (2) a committee on athletics, (3) a committee on scholarships and student aid, and (4) a committee on academic status;

That these committees be elected annually by the faculty from its own members;

That these committees be given full authority to determine the policy to be followed in all matters which fall under their jurisdiction;

That each committee be required to make a full annual report at a regular meeting of the faculty of the college; and

That copies of this statement be sent to the board of visitors, alumni, and students of the college, to the Governor of the Commonwealth, and to the public generally.

Charges Against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The RFC: A National Disgrace," which appeared in a recent number of the Idaho Daily Statesman, published in Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE RFC: A NATIONAL DISGRACE

Under the law of the land, a man is still presumed to be innocent of an offense against society until proved guilty—a point it might be well to reemphasize in this great era of charges and counter-charges, of political jockeying and partisan infighting.

But there is, at the same time, something to be said for taking note of a train of suspicious circumstances, all of which point in the same direction, and all of which add up to something which definitely suggests the far side of the open and above-board.

We were thinking of this in observing the latest round in the continuing investigations into the affairs of the RFC in general, and those of Democratic National Chairman William Boyle in particular.

One fact, in the entire sequence of events, stands out—both with reference to Boyle, and to other instances where RFC loans have been called into question.

That is the curious circumstances that time and again such loan transactions have been plainly colored with the ugly tint of political favoritism—the direct result of purposeful "interest" on the part of highly placed officials of the national administration.

A company wants an RFC loan; on two separate and distinct occasions the RFC examiners report that such a loan would be a poor risk; a couple of the company's officials arrive in Washington and closet themselves with at party bigwig; a discreet telephone call is made, a few days later better than half a million dollars of taxpayer money is tossed to the company in question; a few weeks after that the party official concerned begins to draw large retainer fees for legal services, from the loan recipient.

A large hotel company in Florida is in financial straits; it applies for an RFC loan; a few days later a group of RFC expeditors (E Mer! Young variety) call on the agency directors, a contact in the White House attends a quiet dinner party, a few days later the RFC announces a major loan to the hotel chain in question; shortly after that a director of the RFC accepts hospitality from a vice president of the company; the White House character turns up at a lavish Miami Beach hotel with his entire family, and spends a couple of pleasant weeks in a suite, with everything on the house.

When the President of the United States is informed of this sort of procedure, he angrily denounces "character assassins," and declares that all of his people are "honorable."

Actually, short of mental cases, any honest and law-abiding citizen of this country with an interest in decent government has no great difficulty in seeing through the sham, and in detecting the all-too-familiar stench of political corruption.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which has long outlived any real usefulness, which no longer even presumes to concern itself with its original function of helping small, depression-hit businesses get back on their feet, has in recent years become nothing more than a gigantic boodle operation, where public money has been shoveled here and there for everything from a plush saloon in the Southwest to putting Henry Kaiser in the automobile business.

Congress, which means both Democrats and Republicans, should have the courage and the collective integrity to face up to the facts of this matter once and for all, and put an end to what has become a crying disgrace to the principles of free government.

There is a fine line to be drawn between the openly crooked and the "it's-just-barely-legal."

This line is microscopic in dimension in the case of the long series of outrageous RFC transactions, despite the breast beating and bland assertions of child-like innocence on the part of the opportunistic mob of individuals who have been implicated all along

The New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, among the many tributes to the New York

Times on the occasion of its one hundredth anniversary is an excellent statement in the Christian Science Monitor, which, like the Times, represents American journalism at its best. In an editorial commenting upon the fact that the Times has become one of the world's great newspapers, the Monitor refers favorably to the Times' policies. The concluding comments are as follows:

During the second half of its century, under the guidance of Adolph S. Ochs and his successor, Arthur H. Sulzberger, it has achieved a reputation for objectivity which has won the respect even of those who would like to have seen it lose its heart more readily to the causes and crusades they espoused.

Reason, objectivity, and thoroughness, though not the most existing qualities in the world, are not to be undervalued in our overheated world today. It is good to find the New York Times at the end of its first century standing as a firm bulwark against the divisive, hysterical thinking which is willing to hear the facts on only one side of every question. If it sacrifices catchpenny popularity thereby, it makes up for this by the esteem it was won from the large-minded on both sides and in far places.

There Stands the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, as time goes on I am more convinced that the farmer, by his historic habit of speaking out for truth and voting as he independently pleases, has become an important power in the land. There is considerable evidence, however, that there are strong moves on to channel the farm thinking through Federal agencies rather than through farm organizations. Because I feel so strongly that it is absolutely necessary to the American way of life that the farmer be allowed to remain in his free status, I insert in the RECORD an article entitled "There Stands the Farmer," which appeared in the American Farm Bureau Newsletter on September 17, 1951:

THERE STANDS THE FARMER

It may be said by some that the farmer is selfish, but his actions are more frequently in the public interest than are those of nearly any other group. Perhaps the reason for this is that he is free to give his opinion without any fear of reprisal. It would be a pity if this freedom ever became badly endangered.

So long as the farmer is free from having to go to someone for permission to do things and so long as he can express himself through his own organization, he is going to continue to express his views. But lately there are signs that an attack is quietly being made on these last strongholds of agricultural freedom of thought and action.

As the planners find it more and more to their liking to endow appointees to tell farmers what to do and when, as they make regulations that force farmers to go to them for favors—the favors being permission to do the things they would ordinarily do under a free enterprise. As those things de-

velop more and more farmers will hesitate to speak their minds.

You don't shoot Santa Claus, nor do you kick the teeth in on the guy that gets you materials or permission to build a hen coop. Maybe you know that he is dangerous. Maybe you know that he is a parasite on the body politic, but you get cautious when tomorrow you may have to go to him, cap in your hand and say "please."

Then there is the effort cropping up again to have the channeling of farm thinking through Federal agencies rather than through farm organizations.

We do not want to be obstructive, and when the Government asks us to cooperate on surveys that indicate farm thinking, many of us see no evil. But the evil is there. Out of the cooperation of farmers comes the conclusions that are basic to new legislation. The conclusions can be slanted very easily and sometimes are. Any good or even ordinary disciple of propaganda can write a questionnaire designed to get the kind of an answer wanted. The next step is to publicize them widely and make it tough for anyone who wants to tell Congress different.

We have long contended that it is no job for Federal agencies to tinker with policy. Some disagree. If you want to hand everything over to Uncle, we know of no better way . . . When laws should be changed, let the people change them; not the politically indebted.

So we see in the future two threats to farmer independence, and we don't like what we see. So long as people say what they think, it is still a free country. It becomes less free when they begin to keep quiet out of fear of reprisal . . .

The farmer, by his historic habit of speaking out for truth and voting as he independently pleases, has become a power in the land. The way to lose all power is to let today's trends run their courses. When planned economy rears its socialistic head, let the Nation know it is not unopposed. Let the Nation say: There stands the farmer, battling again for the dignity of the individual. (Massachusetts Farm Bureau publication.)

Pilgrimage of American Churchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, during this week the city of Washington will be host to a most unusual but important gathering, the Pilgrimage of American Churchmen. Among the participants in this pilgrimage will be men and women who have distinguished themselves in Christian service.

The purpose of this pilgrimage is to demonstrate to all the world that belief in God and in religious principles has served continuously as the fundamental basis of our American government and our democratic way of life.

Among the notables who have endorsed the pilgrimage and will participate in its activities are President Harry S. Truman, who will deliver the principal address, on Friday evening, September 28, at the National City Christian Church; Andrew H. Phelps, vice president of Westinghouse Electric Corp. and

president of the Association for a United Church in America; Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University; Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister of Christ Church in New York City; Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers; Dr. Harold Cooke Phillips, minister of the First Baptist Church of Greater Cleveland; the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean of the National Cathedral, Washington; Dr. Arthur S. Fleming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University; Miss Ruth Custis Kitchen, chairman of the women's department, Philadelphia Council of Churches; Gen. and Mrs. Carl R. Gray, General Gray being Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and the list could be greatly extended, of men and women prominent in religious leadership in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women who will gather here for the pilgrimage will not come on a casual or routing sight-seeing tour. Their purpose will be for a rededication of the leadership of the Nation to its original intent and responsibilities.

The cooperation of governmental officials with sponsors of the pilgrimage has been spontaneous and generous. They have arranged a series of presentations of carefully chosen exhibits for the occasion. Speakers of national reputation will be present with short addresses at these exhibits. I feel that to participate in the pilgrimage will be an experience of rare value.

Many beautiful buildings in Washington, the possession of all Americans, and the repositories of our priceless heritage of art, music, literature, history, law, and religion, will be visited, with appropriate ceremonies. Among these will be the National Gallery of Art, where on Friday morning there will be a special presentation of religious art, by Dr. Raymond S. Stites, curator in charge of education; the Library of Congress on Friday afternoon, where in the Coolidge Auditorium there will be a discussion of the religious significance of the basic documents of the founding fathers by Dr. Harold F. Carr, minister of Lakewood Methodist Church at Lakewood, Ohio; there will be a worship service late Friday afternoon in historic Christ Church, Alexandria, the church of Washington and Lee.

The address of President Truman, on Friday night, will be of special interest. Dr. J. Warren Hastings, minister of the National City Christian Church, and Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden, minister of the First Baptist Church, will be co-chairmen of the service. The President will speak at 8 p. m. The program will be broadcast over the major networks. Newsreels of the program will be made from the church.

On Saturday morning, Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, will address the pilgrimage at 10 a. m., Saturday, September 29, at the Jefferson Memorial. He will speak on the inspirational contributions of Thomas Jefferson. Music will be provided by the 40-voice choir of the National Presbyterian Church, under

the well-known direction of Theodore Schaefer. Dr. Gene Stone, executive secretary of International Christian Endeavor, will be chairman of the meeting. Stanley W. McClure, park historian, will tell of the significance of the memorial.

At noon on Saturday, members of the Pilgrimage will gather on the east steps of the National Capitol, where they will be joined by several Members of the Congress, both from the Senate and the House, for a brief ceremony. This meeting will emphasize the importance of religious ideals in government. It will be covered by the press, radio, and television. The Voice of America will cooperate in carrying our messages of spiritual significance to the ends of the earth.

At 2 p. m., Saturday afternoon, Dr. Theodore Distler, president of the Franklin and Marshall College, will speak at the Lincoln Memorial on The Religious Faith of Abraham Lincoln. The Washington Community Chorus under the able direction of Warner Lawson, of Howard University, will conduct a 100-voice choir. Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, will repeat the Gettysburg Address. Cornelius Heine, park historian, will tell about the memorial. Chairman of this meeting will be Dr. Ernest Bryan, president of International Christian Endeavor.

The chief social event of the pilgrimage will be the dinner in the Hall of Nations, Washington Hotel, 6:30 p. m., Saturday, September 29.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished church men and women of all faiths who will make up the Pilgrimage wish to demonstrate to all the world that belief in God and our religious principles is the foundation of all our cherished liberties, the basis for our democratic way of life and government. They will be visiting the places in our National Capital which remind them of this great truth.

They will be reminded that Washington was a very eminent churchman, a vestryman in the Episcopal Church; that Thomas Jefferson was a deeply spiritual man, following a gospel drawn from the teachings and ethics of Jesus; that Lincoln was a profound believer in God and a man who turned to God in prayer when the problems of state were extremely serious and grave, worshipping in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church and called in a bishop of the Methodist Church, Dr. Matthew Simpson, frequently to pray with him; that numerous others of our great statesmen held strong religious convictions and drew inspiration and strength for their tasks from communion with God.

I urge my colleagues in this House to participate in any of the meetings of the Pilgrimage, particularly to be present at the gathering on the Capitol steps at noon on Saturday, and to cooperate with our visitors in every possible way to indicate our belief in and support of those great moral and spiritual values that have made and preserved for us our great Nation.

Let's Launch an American Peace Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Cowles, of Look magazine, has just written an article which I think every Member of Congress should read. It is thought provoking, it is newsworthy, and it is important at this critical time in our relations with Asia. While we must continue to rearm, I feel that the suggestions advanced by Mr. Cowles merit the most serious consideration, because peace—not war—is the most significant factor in our time.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks Mr. Cowles' article, which appears in the September 25 issue of Look: LET'S LAUNCH AN AMERICAN PEACE OFFENSIVE

(By John Cowles)

Many highly intelligent Europeans and Asians, individuals who loathe Russian totalitarianism and believe completely in the democratic ideal, fear that through ineptness the United States is going to blunder into war with Russia, or that we will become so provoked at Russia's exasperating conduct that we will ourselves precipitate war.

It is difficult for Americans who have not recently talked with political and intellectual leaders in Europe and Asia to realize how widespread this view is. After circling the globe, I am convinced that American foreign policy needs to be clarified and amplified.

Much of the world thinks that the United States has only one idea, that of confining Russian communism by military might. Many Europeans and Asians say we keep pressing for arms and more arms although every armament race in history has resulted in war.

EMPHASIS ON PEACE

Even though we continue arming just as rapidly as we possibly can, we ought to place much more emphasis, I believe, on the kind of a peaceful world that we envisage, the kind of a world that will be possible only if Russian aggression is not permitted to plunge the world into an atomic holocaust.

Through our default we have let the Russians monopolize the subject of peace, and embrace peace for propaganda purposes as if it were their exclusive property.

The failure of the United States to make effective propaganda use of its deep desire for peace has resulted in much of the world suspecting that America has deserted her traditional role as a nonaggressive, peace-loving nation.

If America would only seize the initiative from Russia and conduct an American "peace offensive," we would rob the Russians of their single most powerful propaganda weapon. The whole free world, including America, wants peace. Let us say so, louder and longer than the Kremlin.

DISARMAMENT MUST COME

But peace, to be genuine and long lasting must be accompanied by universal world disarmament.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and the American representatives in the United Nations ought, it seems to me, to proclaim at every opportunity that the United States favors universal disarmament under effective international control.

We ought to say that we would stop rearming and would progressively disarm just as rapidly as we had positive and continuing proof that Russia and her satellite nations were also disarming in good faith.

Of course, this would require an elaborate system of international inspection and control, comparable to what the United States proposed several years ago in connection with atomic control, which proposal the Russians rejected.

Probably there is not one chance in a thousand that the Russians would agree to the kind of effective international control which we should, of course, insist upon before we stopped rearming. However, if we kept talking affirmatively of the American desire for disarmament and peace, it would greatly strengthen our position psychologically throughout the world.

THE WRONG KIND OF TALK

We could lose nothing by urging this kind of peace, because it would be peace on our terms. If Russia conceivably should agree to U. N. inspection and control of armaments, then the free world would have the peace it so deeply desires. If Russia refused the American offer, and kept refusing it, as she probably would, then the world would be repeatedly reminded that it is Russia which is the aggressor and warmonger.

Instead of talking peace, many of our American Government officials talk democracy and free elections and civil liberties. Aside from the British Commonwealth and a few countries in northwestern Europe, those concepts have little popular appeal. Most people, especially in the Near East and Asia, have no idea what the words even mean.

We also keep talking about the virtues of private capitalism and free enterprise. We forget that capitalism as practiced in the rest of the world (again excluding in some degree the British Commonwealth and a handful of small countries) has meant the exploitation of the masses by a few rich people. The United States is the only major country where capitalism has functioned in an economically fluid and socially mobile society and where the people generally have benefited from the widespread increase in wealth which capitalism has produced.

A NEW LOOK AT ASIA

We also need to refresh our memories about Asia.

First, most of the people of the world live in Asia, more people than in all the other continents combined.

Second, most Asians can neither read nor write, and live in almost indescribable poverty, barely above the starvation level.

Third, most Asians have colored skins. If most Asians have any impression about white foreigners, it is simply that white foreigners have exploited them in the past and presumably want to in the future.

Fourth, most Asians have determined that hereafter they will govern themselves. They have also decided that henceforth they are going to follow their own ideas of social justice. This means, for example, that they will no longer pay excessive, if any, rent to any landlord.

Our missionaries taught the Asians that their poverty was not a God-given curse which they must passively accept. What is happening throughout Asia today is in a sense a flowering, although not quite in the anticipated form, of the seeds planted by American missionaries during the last half century.

OUR BASIC MISTAKE

Of course, Communist agitators, Kremlin trained in many instances, have exploited the situation for Russia's benefit. Our basic American mistake was that when World War II ended we did not publicly proclaim that our sympathies lay with the Asians, and that the United States was as desirous of

seeing an end to European colonialism and exploitation as were the Asians themselves.

The average Asian has no more comprehension of the ideology of Marxist communism than he has of the Einstein theory. The people's poverty and misery is so deep that they simply have concluded that any change would be for the better. Communists are manipulating the movements in many parts of Asia, but the impulse for revolution springs from the people themselves. Such social revolutions cannot now be suppressed by foreign bayonets.

We have got to rethink our whole policy toward Asia, just as Britain did after Britain finally concluded that she had no alternative but to give India her freedom. Britain then moved promptly and acted gracefully. Today India has more good will toward Britain—her former ruler—than toward the United States.

STRONGHOLD IN INDIA

Today India, with 360,000,000 people, is the last important stronghold of democracy in Asia. We will be making a blunder almost as calamitous as the one we made in China if we don't support the Nehru government in India even though we may be irritated over what we think are inconsistencies or weaknesses in Nehru's attitude.

Recently when Nehru criticized certain clauses in the proposed American peace treaty with Japan, our Government officials unofficially cracked the whip at India and in effect warned that those who were not with us were against us and therefore must be presumed to be in the Russian camp. Such an attitude is utterly foolish.

Our Government officials might also do well to remind themselves that even American foreign policy is sometimes influenced by domestic political pressures. India, too, has its local problems to consider. As one who has talked recently with Nehru and other Indian leaders, I feel certain that Nehru detests Russian totalitarianism. Must Nehru endorse as infallible every position that is taken by the American State Department in order to prove that he is not pro-Communist?

If the United States is so foolish as to undermine Nehru's already weakening regime in India, the government or the chaos that comes after it in the world's second most populous nation may be far less to our liking.

World War II destroyed the balance of power both in Europe and in Asia. In Asia we may in time achieve a new equilibrium if we will support and strengthen India and Pakistan. Pakistan is a highly promising new nation, of great potential importance.

In Europe the only possible way that we can regain an equilibrium is to bring about the economic integration and political unification of France and Western Germany. The accomplishment of that should be given priority over everything else.

Creation of a European army along the lines that General Eisenhower has proposed is of paramount importance in achieving this unification. The Schuman plan for the international control and pooling of coal and steel is also essential, and should be supported in every possible way. While the Schuman plan is a long step in the right direction, it is only the first step. We must, if we want to restore equilibrium to Europe and eliminate the possibility of Russia's overrunning that continent bring about the complete political as well as economic integration of France and Western Germany.

POINT 4 IS A VITAL PROGRAM

Probably the most effective way to help the economically backward nations of Asia is our point 4 program of technical assistance, which shows underdeveloped countries how they can help themselves. With relatively little money, provided it is wisely

spent, we can do a great deal toward strengthening friendship for the United States and increasing the productivity of potential allies.

If we intelligently spend for point 4 technical aid, only a small fraction of the dollars that the administration is apparently planning to spend in Spain, our chances of averting war or of winning it if it comes will be far greater than any possible benefit we might secure from helping Franco.

EUROPEANS SUGGEST MODERATION

Some intelligent Europeans also think that we in the United States are currently planning to spend an excessive proportion of our national income on armament, and are asking the European countries to do likewise. They say that this policy will not only accelerate world-wide inflation but multiply social problems both in Europe and in the United States of America. Some well-informed foreigners believe that the whole world, including the United States, would be better off if we moderated the speed and size of our rearmament program. They suggest that if the United States spends for armament in the next few years the huge amounts now scheduled, America's economy will have been hamstrung by Government controls and made anemic by inflation.

The American people might do well to consider with open minds some of the criticisms that many European and Asian political and intellectual leaders are making of our current policies.

It is possible that all wisdom does not reside in the United States of America.

Show People With a Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, the doors of Variety Manor for Emotionally Disturbed Children will be opened officially in Dayton, Ohio. This type of hospital is rather new in its field and has facilities for caring for 25 children with emotional disturbances. It is the hope of this hospital to aid these children to become worth-while citizens.

Variety Manor is the main charity project of the Dayton Variety Club. Variety Clubs International with tents in most of the major American cities along with Mexico City, Toronto, London, Tokyo, and Dublin, last year spent a grand total of \$2,600,000 in charity—and practically all of this for handicapped and underprivileged children. Since the first Variety tent was founded in Pittsburgh some 20 years ago, more than \$17,000,000 has been spent by Variety on charity.

I would like to call the attention of this distinguished body to the following article in the Dayton Daily News which gives a poignant story of the humanitarian work carried on by Variety Clubs International:

SHOW PEOPLE WITH A HEART

(By Bernard J. Losh)

Scattered over the United States and Canada, Mexico, and England there are 39 Variety clubs. Each club is known as a

tent. In Dayton the club is known as Tent No. 18.

Membership of the clubs is made up basically of men in some phase of show business but the latitude is wide enough to include figures in sports and members of the press. In addition to "tents" the clubs have another designation, unofficial but singularly expressive, "The Heart of Show Business."

The esteem in which this unofficial name is held because of what is implicit in the words, is illustrated by the Variety club's official insignia. It shows a typical carnival barker, a big man with mustache, silk hat, checkered vest, huge diamond shirt stud and all. Below the figure it says, "My hat represents the dignity of the business. My mustache represents strength. My diamond tells the world that, regardless of conditions, I am doing well. My big hulk of a body is necessary to hold the heart of show business."

There is moreover, a governing philosophy above all other Variety dogma—"The show must go on." In translating that, it means that no showman, actor, or actress is ever stranded or hungry, if there is a Variety tent anywhere within reach. Reducing it to still simpler terms it means that Variety's sympathies, individually and collectively, are always with the under-dog, with the less fortunate, with those who are not getting a fair share from life.

The ultimate reduction of dogmas and creeds and tenets—to help others—has become a fixed purpose so strangely embedded into the very marrow of Variety that it is now as widely known as a charitable organization as it is an association for show people.

In 1933 there was in this city what was known as a Showman's Club of Dayton. On November 12, 1936, the club, with a membership of 21, was presented its charter and inducted into Variety Clubs International.

From that day to this the club has supported all civic charities, given donations regularly to all hospitals, to religious orders regardless of creed or color. Individually and anonymously its members have carried on their own good works, doing such things as buying clothing for underprivileged children, providing roller skates for orphans, setting up a feast for a holiday, giving radios and television sets to veterans in hospitals and one member welcomes orphans into his motion-picture show at any time without charge.

The Dayton tent has only recently decided to assume a major project. It has taken over the historic Canby home, a stone mansion situated between the Dayton Art Institute and the Masonic Temple and is turning it into Variety Manor for Emotionally Disturbed Children.

(This enterprise was started off in usual Variety fashion. Fifteen thousand dollars was needed to get the wheels turning. One member went to the bank, signed a note for \$15,000 and the initial money was at hand. No questions asked.)

Variety Manor will have two purposes, (1) a permanent State receiving hospital for emotionally disturbed children, operated at an annual cost of \$100,000 to be financed by the State, and (2) a child-guidance-center clinic operated at an annual cost of \$50,000, to be paid by the Community Chest. Variety assumed the responsibility for the 10-year lease and upkeep of the buildings and the 2 acres surrounding them and is paying \$15,000 toward a \$33,000 charge for renovating the buildings.

The project has been approved by the Children's Bureau of the Social Security Administration of Washington, D. C., the Division of Mental Hygiene of Ohio, the Division of Children's Services for Ohio, the Montgomery County Medical Society, health councils, children's bureaus, and charitable agencies.

There will be facilities for hospitalizing 25 children at Variety Manor.

The beginning of the first Variety Club or Tent No. 1 is an oft-repeated story. Late in the afternoon of the day before Christmas, 1928, people were pouring out of the Sheridan Square Theater in Pittsburgh.

At exactly 5 o'clock the manager of the house went into the theater nursery. He saw a package on one of the chairs. Stepping closer to examine it he saw it was an abandoned baby. Next to it was another package containing five freshly laundered diapers.

A note pinned to the baby's blanket said "Please take care of my baby. Her name is Catherine. I can no longer take care of her. I have eight others. My husband is out of work. She was born on Thanksgiving Day. I have always heard of the goodness of show business and I pray to God that you will look out for her. A heartbroken mother."

Regarding the circumstance as a happy one rather than as a calamity, the 11 men of Pittsburgh, later to band themselves into the first Variety Club, adopted the child as a living symbol, a reason for their existence as a club. The child was named Catherine Variety Sheridan, was subsequently placed with carefully selected foster parents, given a thorough education by Variety, graduated from college with high honors, and is today an accomplished young lady. All the necessary steps have long ago been taken so that only her foster parents know the full story.

Every one of the 39 tent sponsors, directs and pays for a charitable project of distinctive importance. By way of example, at Cincinnati, Variety has a founding home; at Dallas, Tex., a boys' ranch accommodating 100 underprivileged boys at a time; at Boston, the Children's Cancer Research Foundation where hundreds of children have been successfully treated, free; at Los Angeles, a boys' club that has a huge craft shop, gymnasium, and facilities for outdoor sports; at Miami, the Variety Children's Hospital, called the finest children's hospital in the world; in Mexico, an orphanage, and so it goes.

Each year Variety International makes its Humanitarian Award to the man or woman who, in the majority opinion of a large and impartial committee, gave the most outstanding service to humanity during the preceding year. Included among those honored to date with the humanitarian plaque are Father E. J. Flanagan, Dr. George Washington Carver, Sister Elizabeth Kenny, Cordell Hull, and Gen. Evangeline Cory Booth.

Why do the gentlemen of Variety undertake all this charitable work anonymously? No one ever gets—or expects—any individual recognition. What lauds and encomiums stem from Variety's good works comes to the membership as a whole? What actuates them?

There is perhaps a single activity here at the Dayton tent which may aid in understanding.

On the bar of the Dayton Variety Club, which has its quarters in the Moraine Hotel, there is a gallon glass jar. It seems it is always half filled with money, even though it is emptied every week or so. There is some silver in it—nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars—to be sure, but there is a lot of folding money in it, too—bills—the currency of the realm, some fives, tens, and now and then, a twenty.

The jar isn't nailed down or padlocked or glued to the bar. Anybody could pick it up and walk away with it. Nobody ever has.

There's something else unusual about this jar, too. There are no placards or other signs or injunctions soliciting anybody for anything. Yet, standing there, mute and even inconspicuous, it gets a great deal of attention from Variety Club members. No one is applauded if he puts in a \$20 bill. There are no wry or accusing looks if one falls to favor it with any notice at all.

To members of the Dayton Tent, No. 18, the glass jar represents the way to untainted charity. Neither the gift nor the giver is ever profaned by the expectation of public or private thanks. The glass jar is a powerful reminder to Variety members that there is need in the world for their liberality, kindness, their good will, tolerance, and love and pity. The money goes to Variety's heart fund.

That's as close to an answer as anyone will ever get when you put the question "Why Variety?"

On the back of the membership card which every Variety member carries is a two-stanza verse titled "Creed of Variety."

"Good fellowship means when accounting
Man's worth when his busy life ends,
Not by dollars and cents do we judge him
But by number and worth of his friends.

Variety claims you as a brother,
Be loyal through thick and through thin.
When on lists of life's lasting friendships
Be sure to count each member in."

There are no names mentioned in this brief review of Variety. This is so because Variety members want it this way. It is in keeping with their solemn tradition of anonymity.

Address of Hon. Harris Ellsworth, of
Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have included a very fine speech by Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, which was recorded for use at the Jackson County Republican picnic, July 24, 1951. The greetings brought to my fellow Republicans on this occasion by Mr. ELLSWORTH are very worthy of every thinking person's careful consideration. Not only does my good friend and colleague point out the great difference in achievements of our two foremost political parties, but he conclusively points out how the Republican Party in the present day issues stands for a free representative government with freedom for the individual. It is recommended reading for all of us who are determined to maintain our way of life.

Greetings, fellow Republicans; even though I cannot be with you in person on this occasion, I am very pleased to bring you a recorded word of greeting and a discussion of the issues of the day.

There is a well-known and much-used formula for the preparation of a talk by a Republican to a group of fellow Republicans. The general idea is to condemn everything done by our opposition, the Democrats, and to point with pride at the achievements and policies of our own party. I have a world of ammunition from which I could easily put together a talk along those lines. I could give you facts and figures to prove that the present administration is the most outrageously spend-thrift one in the entire history of our country. I could point out that the civilian functions of our Federal Government now cost more than 30 times the total cost of such services 25 years ago. I think I could

easily prove to you that the present Democratic administration has calmly looked the other way in the presence of more treason, graft and corruption than we have ever seen in high places in this country. I could tell you the story of the administration's diplomatic failure in the Orient, and I could dwell at some length upon the fact that although we have appropriated more than \$100,000,000,000 for the national defense during the past 5 years, we were told at the outbreak of the war in Korea that we were almost without armament.

Then I could with considerable pride point to the efforts of the Republicans in Congress. We have consistently fought for economy in Government and achieved savings running into many billions when we controlled the Congress in 1947 and 1948. That Congress, you will remember, is the only Congress since 1932 which balanced the budget for two successive years.

The Republicans in Congress have done a good job—a provably good job. The Democratic administration, particularly during the years since World War II ended, has done a very bad job—a provably bad job.

Such a discussion would doubtless be of some political value, but that type of story is being told repeatedly and is being unfolded to you as you read and hear the news and comment upon the events of the day. In my opinion, however, it is far more important that we Republicans have a better understanding of the present world conflict and of the issues which now distinguish our two great national political parties. This is no time for mere criticism. We must grapple the basic issues which divide the world and divide our country.

We are living in a time of the greatest human conflict ever seen on this earth. I was about to use the term revolution, but that word does not apply since it means a revolt from something. Today's conflict instead represents the head-on clash between two systems of government.

Throughout all human history, individuals or groups of individuals have sought positions of power over their fellow human beings. Throughout all the ages whenever such power has been achieved, it has been abused, and when unbearably abused, it has been overthrown. There have been oppressors with various titles: kings, emperors, dictators—but the oppressed, usually with great sacrifice and pain, have reasserted their rights and the dignity and freedom of the individual has been restored.

Until our time, supreme power of the few over the many, for example, that of a king over his subjects, has been localized, that is, limited to certain areas. But with the end of World War II, the masters of the Russian people sitting in the Kremlin began to believe that their dream of world conquest and control might in fact be accomplished.

The formula used by the Russian Communist dictator is as old as time. He merely recognizes the fact that the teeming millions of the world have the normal human urge for the improvement of their lot, so the Communist holds out hope to them in the form of a supposedly new political philosophy. He trades heavily upon the term, "the people's government." He trades on the universal dream of something for nothing with the idea of taking from those who have and giving to those who have not. His is a brand of imperialism of dimensions which staggers the imagination. There is, however, nothing new in the Russian dictator's operation except its size. The formula is as old as the earth itself. It enslaves the people by promising them benefits and rules them when they have become slaves.

Right now we say we are fighting communism, but what we really mean is that we are fighting the politically imperialistic effort of the Russian dictator. The propagandized glories of communism only represent the

little understood bait used to lure the people into slavery. Briefly stated, communism is a theory of political and social organization, the essential feature of which is central government control of all human activities, but especially of economic activities.

Socialism is merely communism without the vulgarities of violence, revolution, and blood. It has a softer doctrine, attractive to the intelligentsia because of its idealism, but socialism is essentially the same as communism in its effect so far as the individual is concerned. Socialism represents control of the individual by the State, robbing him of his freedom and his individual dignity, just as communism does.

No matter how beautiful the words and the logic, either a Socialist government or a Communist government is government of the many by a very few with those few possessing supreme power.

On the other hand, however, the one system of government which has actually provided for the people the benefits claimed by the proponents of socialism and communism is a government such as ours which is actually controlled by the people through their freely elected representatives and executives. Contrary to the loss of individual freedom in a Socialist or Communist state, individual freedom and dignity is enhanced in a free, representative government. A weakness of our free system happens to lie in the quality which is its greatest asset—freedom. Unfortunately, a free individual is as free to act foolishly as he is to act wisely. So it is with free governments. The people in a free state are at liberty to vote themselves into bondage. Abraham Lincoln recognized this fact and stated it with great clarity when he said, "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

It seems to me that under the present Truman administration our great free country may in fact be headed for destruction. Many of our most intelligent citizens are now advocating numerous Government actions, which while seeming to be idealistically beneficial for the people are in fact steps toward statism, and if enacted would curtail freedom. The administration would like to place the medical profession of our country under Government control. They want to place the economic life of our country, region by region, under complete Federal control by means of the control and operation of natural resources by means of so-called valley authorities. The administration leans heavily toward the idea of the Government owning the very homes in which we live. It seeks the right to build and operate manufacturing plants. In fact, the tendency toward socialism of the Truman administration is real and unmistakable.

The governments of many of our allies who are supposed to be fighting with us against world conquest by the Kremlin are themselves socialistic. The United Kingdom is frankly so, France is leaning heavily in that direction, and the free system of government as we have known it here does not exist in fact in many of the other countries.

How then can these governments of the so-called free world carry to those hundreds of millions in the perimeter countries, who represent the balance of power in world control, a convincing story in opposition to the religion of communism as promulgated by the Kremlin and its satellites? How can we sell such perimeter countries as Korea, China, Burma, Malaya, the Philippines, India, Iran, Iraq, and other peoples away from the idea of embracing militant communism when we ourselves, as our version of the true and better way of life, offer only a dilettante brand of the same thing; namely, socialism. The world is roughly divided into three population groups with somewhere near equal population in each. The Western World, or the

so-called free world, has nearly 800,000,000 people, the Kremlin controls nearly the same number, and the perimeter, or undetermined countries, nearly as many.

The United States is admittedly the strongest power in the free world. It is the leader. Our philosophy of government and our system of government is admittedly successful. We have something to sell not only to our friends and the neutrals, but ultimately even to our present enemies. We have something to sell, that is, if we maintain our free representative system intact and advance our ideas with vigor and integrity.

The importance of the philosophy of the Republican Party, therefore, becomes startlingly apparent. Our forthright opposition to socialism, our concept of free government under the Constitution, our concept of a free and vigorous economy, our insistence upon the freedom and dignity of the individual, are vital and living things. They represent our political creed—the principles of government for which the Republican Party stands. These principles are exactly opposite to those of socialism or communism. They offer a genuine proven way under which oppression by a dictator and his gang cannot exist. How futile and foolish we must appear to the Communist world and to those areas which are presently the target of aggression by the Communists when we offer as a substitute, and as our way of government, only a less dynamic version of the same thing the Communists are advocating.

The United States must lead the fight against communism by boldly advocating the principles of free representative government with its guaranty of freedom for the individual. The Republican Party stands positively and uncompromisingly for that program. We can, by the triumph of our set of principles, not only prevent our own destruction as a free government, but in so doing we can take a real program and real policies in opposition to communism to the rest of the world. Our failure to promote and win success for these ideals in our own country will not only result in the loss of freedom here, but will inevitably forecast the final world triumph of the schemers in the Kremlin.

The Public Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, pending before the Committee on Ways and Means are four bills which would remove the secrecy provisions in the public welfare section of the Social Security Act.

There are many reasons why one of these bills should be reported out of committee, for action by the House, and I believe the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of September 23, 1951, documents fully the most compelling one.

In these days of ever-increasing governmental costs, I do not believe there is any valid reason why the public should not know how its money is being spent:

THE PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW

A special session of Indiana's Legislature has been called for this week. Its purpose is to find some way out of the predicament in which the State finds itself as a result

of defying the Federal Government's insistence on secrecy as regards the public relief rolls.

When a State accepts funds from the Government, matching on a 50-50 basis its own expenditures for direct relief to the indigent dependent children, unemployables and others, the State must abide by conditions laid down by the Government. One of these conditions is that the State must "provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients [of relief] to purposes directly connected with the administration." Last summer Indiana's Legislature amended its own law, eliminating the secrecy provision, and the Federal Security Administration cut off Federal relief grants.

Indiana has taken its case to court. There are legislative proposals in Congress designed to uphold Indiana's stand in the matter and requiring the payment of Federal funds. A number of other States are closely watching the outcome, for there is considerable public sentiment—aroused by a few relief scandals—behind the movement to end the secrecy attaching to relief rolls. The Senate, reflecting this sentiment, has approved one rider on a tax bill by a vote of 38 to 30, which would have the effect of leaving to the States the decision on publicity for relief rolls. The House has not yet acted on this rider, and other bills are pending which may come to a vote.

The secrecy provision is based on the theory that there is some sort of stigma attached to being on the relief rolls. And there is the possibility—though it seems remote—that public access to the names on relief rolls would facilitate their use for purely political purposes. But both of these theories, and others which have been advanced in support of the secrecy requirement, should be challenged. For there is another principle at stake which is more important than any of these suppositions. That is the right of the people to know how relief money is being spent and to whom it is being paid. For it is the people who put up this money. It is their own money. It should be contrary to sound public policy to clothe in secrecy the expenditure of huge sums to public funds, paid out to support citizens.

There have been a number of scandals in connection with public relief, which showed that people were on the rolls who had no legitimate right to be there. But, in general, the absence of scandal has been a noteworthy feature of public relief administration. Perhaps the secrecy has helped to cover up cases of maladministration of relief funds. Be that as it may, we have gone so deeply into the field of public relief, the principle is one that has become so firmly established and the money involved has reached such great proportions, it is high time that the whole matter be re-examined.

The people who are taxed to support public relief have rights that are more persuasive than the theory that to reveal the names of relief beneficiaries is to embarrass them.

No More Fallbrook Water Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct attention of the House to the following excellent editorial from

the Los Angeles Times of Friday, September 21, 1951:

NO MORE FALLBROOK WATER CASES

"For no practical reason whatever"—In such condemnatory terms has an aroused congressional committee described the filing of Federal suits aimed at the private water rights of some 14,000 owners in the Fallbrook area.

The strong language used by the committee, headed by Democrat CLAIR ENOLES, is added proof of the indefensible nature of the "confiscation" suits filed by the office of United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath and exposed by the Times in May.

Strong language, however, is not enough, and the committee knows it.

TWOFOLD PURPOSE

Specific legislation has been introduced in Congress this week to accomplish a twofold purpose—first, to solve the specific problem of division of water in the Santa Margarita River in the Fallbrook region and, second, to prevent a recurrence of such a seizure attempt by power-seeking Federal officials.

The committee's report, following 2 days of hearings at Fallbrook August 13 and 14, severely criticized the effort of the United States Attorney General to seize the water rights under a doctrine of "paramount" and "sovereign" rights.

It declared the local people and the Federal taxpayers have been put to great provocation and expense to serve no useful purpose.

This report and the accompanying effort to pass remedying legislation should convince Attorney General McGrath and his assistants, William A. Veeder and A. DeVitt Vanech, that they made a costly and inexcusable blunder in attempting to grab the water rights of citizens whose titles in many cases went back almost 100 years.

QUESTION TO BE FACED

But, judging from previous defiance and attempted "face saving" they probably will not.

In case the Attorney General, in spite of the overwhelming proof that the confiscation suits are unjustified, fails to take corrective action, a very practical question must be faced.

Will Attorney General McGrath, pending congressional action, continue to serve complaints and summonses on the farmers of the Fallbrook area?

This is vitally important, because it is recognized that it may be virtually impossible to get a congressional enactment on the Fallbrook matter during these final, hectic, rushing days of the congressional session. Such a failure would not denote a lack of interest; it simply may not be possible to comply with all the rules of procedure and get anything done before adjournment.

In the event that Congress cannot act now, the issue would go over to the session opening in January.

But what happens in the meantime?

Every single complaint that is filed means heartache, worry and expense for some family along the Santa Margarita River. The more filings there are, the more worries and expenses there are, too.

It seems almost as ridiculous as the suit itself for the Attorney General to keep process servers hastening around the country serving complaints which certainly are going to be nullified by congressional action.

A GESTURE OF DEFIANCE

It is safe to say "certainly" because every Congressman who has come in contact with the Fallbrook suits and studied them has become aroused against the unprecedented action of McGrath and his aides. When the corrective Fallbrook legislation gets on the floors of the House and the Senate, and is explained, there can be no doubt of its passage.

Hence, any continuation of the serving of complaints will be simply a gesture of defiance and a wanton waste of the taxpayers' money.

The Congressmen most familiar with the situation should exact a promise from Attorney General McGrath to hold in abeyance the filing of further complaints until Congress has expressed its decision in the matter.

Such a course is needed, in addition, because the deadline given defendants in the case for answering the suit is November 1. Unless there is an extension of time or a truce in the serving of complaints, hundreds of persons will be compelled to hire counsel or face forfeiture of their rights to the Federal Government.

Congress needs to get tough about this. The committee itself says 90 percent of the defendants should not under any circumstances be sued and that there is no earthly reason for them, to be named as defendants.

McGrath and his underlings can be made to conform to a reasonable and realistic program. They are, after all, subject to the authority of the representatives of the American people who hired them.

The Fallbrook case already is bad enough. It must not be allowed to get worse.

What the Farm Implement Industry Means to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the Nineteenth Illinois District, I represent both a great agricultural area as well as industrial. It might be said to be the farm-machinery capital of the world. A large proportion of the people in my district are dependent for their livelihood on this vital industry. When it prospers the cities where the plants are located prosper. When they are hurt, their employees suffer.

For example, there is not a citizen in my home town of Canton, Ill., who does not know that when the Canton Works of the International Harvester is running full capacity, Canton prospers. When employees are laid off and the plants shut down, it seriously affects the entire community. The same is true in Rock Island, Moline, and East Moline where International Harvester, John Deere, J. I. Case, and the Minneapolis-Moline farm-equipment plants are located, and other communities similarly situated in my district.

Not only those directly connected with the farm equipment industry are affected, but the consuming public as well. If the plants are not permitted to manufacture the required amount of farm machinery to produce the food and fiber this Nation needs for daily life and for the defense effort, we may be faced with the bitter fact of rationing and its accompanying scarcities we all so sadly remember.

While I fully realize in our mobilization program there is bound to be a shortage of vital steel for civilian industry, certainly when our food and fiber

supply is almost wholly dependent on farm machinery and their accompanying repair parts, in this mechanized age, this important industry should be considered just as an essential part of our defense effort as the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

The farm-machinery industry actually uses only 3.8 percent of the total steel produced. But what is happening to the farm-equipment producers so far as steel allocation is concerned? After a careful analysis of requirements for farm machinery for next year, the Agriculture Department requested 690,000 tons for the last quarter of 1951 but were allotted only 528,000 tons. If that level is continued it means in 1952 they can only produce 65 percent of the farm machinery requirements, if not less.

There is a grave possibility that next years allocations will be even smaller, in spite of the fact, if the food and fiber goals are to be met, according to the recent Nation-wide farm-to-farm survey of the Department, it will require an increase in production of new farm machinery of 115 percent over 1949, and 120 percent over 1949 in the production of repair parts.

What does this mean to the farmers with their sons being drafted and the existent manpower shortage due to labor going into defense plants? Unless they can get the necessary machinery to produce the required food and fiber, they simply will not be able to meet the necessary goals although willing to work longer hours.

What does it mean to the laboring man? If this industry does not receive a sufficient allocation of steel to run full capacity, men and women employed in those plants will have to be laid off.

I have already mentioned what it means to the consumer. The threat of scarcity and its accompanying hoarding and higher prices is hovering in the background, ready to pounce on every citizen of this country. We must not let such a situation develop.

We have been bountifully blessed with good crops in this country for the last few years but some of our reserves are at a dangerously low level. A drought year or two could wipe out these reserves. You cannot gamble with the food and fiber production required for our people here at home and our men abroad. To meet our food and fiber requirements is essential not only for our defense effort but our economy as well.

Congress is well aware of this fact. Both the House and Senate have set up committees to study this problem and I have repeatedly urged that the necessary action be taken. I have also called this problem to the attention of Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, Director of the Mobilization Board, Mr. Wilson, as well as National Production Authority officials, all of whom have the authority to determine to whom the steel production should be allocated.

It seems to me that all of us, the consumer, the farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer and the employee, and you my colleagues, should especially urge Secretary Brannan, of the Agriculture

Department, who acts as the claim agent, charged with obtaining sufficient steel for this industry, to immediately recognize the urgency of this problem and take the necessary steps to correct this situation.

You cannot turn on and off production of farm machinery like a water faucet. It requires lead time and planning ahead. It takes from 9 months to a year to get into production and final distribution of many farm equipment items. Moreover, as everyone knows, farming is seasonal, and unless necessary farm machinery is on hand at the time needed, a whole year may be lost.

When an insufficient amount of steel was furnished for farm machinery production in the early 1940's, we all remember the rationing and scarcities that resulted. We did not catch up with the machinery requirements until 1947.

While we may be in fair shape right now, these machines deteriorate and new ones will be required. This is not based on speculation nor to keep an industry in full production, but upon the requirements as established by the Agriculture Department. Our population and food requirements have increased substantially in recent years. The present goal for agriculture production is higher than any production level we have ever required. It is approximately 44 percent higher than the 1935-39 average production level. We should not let history repeat itself and have to bargain under the counter for scarce items, if obtainable at all.

I include, as part of my remarks, a very pertinent editorial from the Moline (Ill.) Daily Dispatch, of September 20, 1951, which throws much light on this subject:

FARM EQUIPMENT PLANTS REFUSED ENOUGH STEEL

There's a controversy raging in Washington over the allocation of steel to the farm implement industry. Washington being a multi-ring circus of controversies, this one has received scant public notice.

But for the people in the Middle West—and particularly in the quad-city area—the issue is of tremendous consequence.

Here's the situation:

The National Production Authority, the ruling body on the distribution of scarce raw materials, is cutting down the allocations of steel to the farm equipment industry. The allocation during the third quarter of this year is 673,000 tons. The allocation during the fourth quarter is 528,000 tons. The reduction amounts to about 50 percent of 1949 allocations.

This is being done despite a recent detailed finding by the Department of Agriculture that "farmers now need 15 percent more new farm machinery than they receive in 1949 and they require 20 percent more repair and replacement parts than were available to them in the same period."

And, in another Department of Agriculture document, there are the following statements:

"The 1951 goal for agricultural production is higher than any production level we have ever achieved. It is 44 percent higher than the 1935-39 average production level and 4 percent above last year's production. The goal was determined by Department of Agriculture specialists after intensive study of civilian, military, and export requirements."

Food and fiber are indispensable to a strong and healthy nation. They are basic

matériel in military preparedness. And farm products are instruments that win friends and promote sound foreign relations.

It is obvious, that is to all but the National Production Authority, that our economy depends upon American agriculture.

This situation doesn't make much sense. One governmental agency makes a case for the expansion of the farm industry as part of defense mobilization, and another agency cuts down the one major raw material, steel, needed for that expansion.

And this is going on at the same time the NPA increased the allotment of steel to the automobile industry from 1,879,000 tons in the third quarter to 3,464,000 tons in the fourth quarter.

Figure that one out, if you can.

The implications of the issue to us locally are obvious. A continuing reduction in steel will mean a corresponding reduction in employment in this area. The old story of no steel, no jobs is well known.

Smaller payrolls mean human inconvenience and suffering. They mean smaller buying volume. And so it goes.

From the facts as we know them, it would seem logical for the people of the Middle West to make their voices heard with the NPA. The allocations are already set for 1951, but allocations for the first quarter of 1952 are not to be set until October 8.

If the arguments by the Department of Agriculture are insufficient to convince the NPA that steel allocations to the farm equipment industry should be increased—not decreased—perhaps the added weight of opinion from the grass roots will help.

This is one issue on which the farmers, labor, and industry should be able to get together. It affects all of their livelihoods.

Aims and Principles of Federation of Americans of Central and East European Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call attention to a statement of aims and principles which was issued to govern the activities of the Federation of Americans of Central and East European Descent. This inspiring document sets forth the basis for future action on the part of these 20,000,000 loyal Americans, with emphasis on the expansion of the underground movements behind the iron curtain and a return to the population distribution before Russian conquest in the event these unhappy countries are liberated.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this statement:

STATEMENT OF AIMS AND PRINCIPLES OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICANS OF CENTRAL AND EAST EUROPEAN DESCENT ADOPTED AT THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING, AUGUST 17, 1951, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1. To exert every effort to defend the Constitution of the United States of America, preserve and promote our American way of life. To engage and exercise every measure of effort and resource toward the decisive defeat of Russian Communist imperialism

which in its venomous essence poses a mortal threat to the moral and intellectual Christian foundations of western civilization in which is posited our priceless American way of life.

2. To coordinate and implement the common and mutual activities of the numerous member organizations represented herein within the scope of a unified political action oriented toward the systematic realization of this basic objective and the simultaneous world-wide extension of the spiritual and material blessings engendered in our Bill of Rights, the formula of self-determined freedom, and the Atlantic Charter.

3. To serve and assist through such unified political action the appropriate agencies of our Government and various collaborating American anti-Communist organizations in the dissemination of authentic information on Soviet Russian tyranny and atrocity behind the iron curtains of Central Europe and Asia, in the promulgation of necessary steps aimed at the formation of a global network of anti-Communist alliances, notably within the Soviet empire, in the formulation of political objectives adapted to the historic requirements and aspirations of the peoples available as our natural allies, and in the persistent counteraction of sinister Communist and other antidemocratic influence and groups in our domestic environment.

4. To promote the security and welfare of the United States by insisting upon policies which are shaped in terms of a scrupulous and forthright observance of the sacred principles embodied in the aforementioned monuments to the liberal human spirit and which will insure lasting peace to all the nations of the world, including those of Central and Eastern Europe, numbering approximately 150,000,000 people.

5. To urge our Government to seek the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to the nations which have been forcibly deprived of them and to secure the exercise of the fundamental right of self-determination for those nations which have not in the past been accorded this right, particularly in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

6. To impel, on the happy occasion of the liberation of all peoples from the yoke of Soviet Russian imperialism, governmental action to fulfill the guaranty of free and unfettered elections in these countries under the supervision of the United Nations and with strict regard for conditions of population distribution existing prior to the institution of the Russification policy bent on the extinction of the national identities of the respective enslaved countries.

7. Recognizing the twofold need, viz: ridding all countries involved of implanted Soviet influence, together with ultimate solution of territorial boundary disputes, it is urged that strict priority of action be extended to the former consideration.

8. To abet forcefully the realization of the preceding objectives and concomitantly contribute to the prevention of a generally disastrous world war III through the vigorous advancement of psychological warfare, with particular emphasis on substantial improvements in the status and function of the Voice of America, resounding proclamations of American friendship and support of the liberation movements simmering throughout the wide peripheral European and Asiatic area of non-Russian peoples imperialistically subjugated in the Soviet empire, and demands for true representation of these enslaved peoples in the councils of the United Nations.

9. To secure maximum and unstinting aid on the part of our Government for the manifold operations and the potentially unlimited expansion of the underground movements behind the iron curtains of Europe and Asia.

There Are Giants in the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Joseph Alsop from the Washington Post of September 16, 1951:

THERE ARE GIANTS IN THE LAND

(By Joseph Alsop)

A few days ago, the weekly meeting of the Armed Forces Policy Council—the statutory committee of the top men in the defense establishment—seemed to be starting as usual. But when all the Secretaries of Departments and Chiefs of Service Staffs were in their hierarchical places George C. Marshall spoke from the head of the council table.

He was, he said, laying down his heavy burden at long last. He had asked the President to relieve him as early as last March. He had only agreed to stay on until the completion of the Japanese peace treaty, a risky corner to turn. He was glad to go, and glad to pass on his burden to his successor, whom all would warmly support. And so, motioning Robert A. Lovett into the Secretary of Defense's chair, the great old man rose, shook hands with his associates and quietly left the council room and public life.

This quiet departure, so modest yet so deeply moving, affords an excuse for saying something that is not news, yet needs to be said. In these dark times, it is only too easy to notice and to write about only what is depressing and squalid. At home, the fundamental deficiencies of American political life are now under attack, as never before in the lifetimes of any of us, by a shabby crew of adventurers and opportunists. Abroad, dark clouds ring the whole horizon, and at any moment the fearful storm of war may break over the world. In these circumstances, the sane, healthy, and hopeful things sometimes compete too weakly for attention with the lurid, the horrible, and the menacing.

To true up, then, it is good to take the occasion of General Marshall's retirement to celebrate the fine thing, and more particularly the fine men, that American public life has produced in these last years.

In one of his Princeton lectures, George Kennan paid tribute to such giants of our past as John Hay, Elihu Root, and Charles Evans Hughes, as being men who embodied that pattern of integrity of mind and spirit, moderation, and delicacy of character, irreproachable loyalty in personal relations, modesty of person combined with dignity of office, kindness, and generosity to all . . . who were weaker and more dependent, which constitutes the finest (American) contribution to the to the human species and comes close to . . . our national ideal and genius."

Kennan need not have looked backward to find such men. One of them, in a superlative degree, was Marshall himself, the towering soldier, the masterly administrator, the leader of granite character and unimpeachable integrity. If his political judgments were not always wise, the fact may be explained by another passage in Kennan's lecture, where he quotes Gibbon's remark on the great Byzantine general, Belisarius: "His imperfections flowed from the contagion of his times; his virtues were his own."

In the case of Marshall, he had been formed in the rigid antipolitical tradition of the old

Army. What is remarkable about Marshall is not that he was at first somewhat at sea in handling political issues of the war, but that he went on to become a great Secretary of State.

Nor is Marshall alone in belonging to this great American pattern that Kennan has so well described. The Army can also boast of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, a very different man from Marshall, yet a man great enough to lift up the spirits of a continent and promise leadership to a people. And among the civilian administrators, how many there have been in these last years who would be the boast of any country—among the dead, Henry L. Stimson, the dedicated and destroyed James V. Forrestal, and Harry L. Hopkins, to whom history will be more just than his contemporaries, and among the living, such men as Marshall's worthy successor, Robert A. Lovett, John J. McCloy, and W. Averell Harriman, to name only three.

Think also of what these men and others like them, Charles E. Wilson is a new addition to the list—have accomplished in these last years. Think how the menace of Nazi tyranny and Japanese conquest was first hurled back and destroyed. Think how, when the war ended, the new menace of Soviet imperialism, left with no balancing challenge by the collapse of its evil competitors, threatened to flow out over a weakened and enfeebled world. Think how this menace, too, has been confronted, halted, and, we hope, turned back.

Remember that these men did these things, not alone, but as the chosen agents of the American people, with the power of the American people as their strength and their resource. So long as the American people do not change, and so long as the American people can find such agents of its will, what is cheap and squalid at home, what is threatening and dark abroad, will be defeated in the end.

Make Newspapers Pay Their Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Make Newspapers Pay Their Way," published in the Cleveland Press of Cleveland, Ohio, Friday, September 21, 1951:

MAKE NEWSPAPERS PAY THEIR WAY

Postal income is now running more than \$500,000,000 a year behind expenses. The House of Representatives bill raising postal rates will add only about \$120,000,000 to this income—around \$127,000,000 after 2 years.

But right after the House refused to boost postal rates to an adequate level, it voted to hike the pay of postal employees. This is justified but it will add some \$250,000,000 a year to the Post Office budget.

Net result. Annual deficit of around \$650,000,000, instead of \$500,000,000.

It's like the mountain climber who slid back two steps for every one he took upward. He wound up in a hole.

Biggest bone of contention in the postal-rate bill is the charge for second-class mail. That's newspapers and magazines. With them, the postal service has been running up its biggest deficit—more than \$200,000,000 a year.

First-class mail and air mail pay their way, but no other classes. The low rate for newspapers and magazines amounts to a Government subsidy. Most of them complain constantly about Government spending.

Here's a legitimate place to knock off some of that spending.

The Post Office Department asked for an increase of 100 percent in second-class rates. The House committee proposed a 60 percent increase, spread over 3 years. The House cut this to 30 percent.

Even the Senate has dragged its heels on an adequate postal rate program. The Senate bill proposes to add \$100,000,000 to the department's income. But the Senate, too, raises newspaper mailing rates only 30 percent over 3 years, although it proposes to hike magazine rates 60 percent.

Second-class mail, and all other classes of mail, should pay their own freight—and on an even basis for all users.

Some publishers have been lobbying against higher postal rates.

But a lot of papers—including this one, over a long period—want no part of a Government subsidy.

We like the attitude of the publisher of the *Colfax* (La.) *Chronicle*. In reply to invitations to protest higher second-class rates, this publisher wrote: "Ain't gonna do it."

"We don't think everybody's tax money should be used to mail our newspaper," he said.

That goes for this newspaper, too.

West Bitter Haven for Red Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Michael L. Hoffman, from the New York Times of September 19, 1951:

WEST BITTER HAVEN FOR RED REFUGEES—MANY JAILED LIKE COMMON CRIMINALS AFTER ESCAPE FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES—UNITED STATES POLICY IS CONFUSING—TREATMENT DIFFERS ACCORDING TO LOCALITY—LOSS OF USEFUL NEW ELEMENT IS DEPLORED

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, September 13.—If a person has the nerve, stamina, and luck to escape across the Czechoslovakian border into United States occupied Germany, he stands a better than 2-to-1 chance of being jailed promptly like a common criminal.

Along the length of the iron curtain, where it crosses Europe, it is only in the relatively minuscule area of Trieste that United States authorities take direct responsibility for receiving refugees and trying to help them on their often rough introduction to what they have been told is the free west. And in Trieste, whether for lack of funds, space, or outlets, the overwhelming majority of refugees face nothing better than the prospect of long months in a crowded camp from which no one can show them the road to freedom.

Elsewhere, once the refugee has spent a varying length of time in a German or Austrian jail, he must clear himself of the criminal charge of crossing the frontier illegally. If he is lucky, he may be able to communicate with the International Refugee Organization, in which case, if he is luckier still,

he may be found eligible for resettlement overseas.

Then starts the long wait for visas, transport and sponsors in the receiving country. Only a few of the new refugees ever register with the IRO, which is going out of business in a few months.

NOT GETTING MUCH HELP

After many months of pious pronouncements that "no one seeking political asylum is refused protection by the United States," repeated warnings of the dangers inherent in this situation by responsible officials and sincere efforts of United States authorities in Europe to get a sensible policy established, the treatment of the new refugees from communism is confused and contradictory. They are not getting much help.

Theoretically, the United States Government has retained jurisdiction over illegal border-crossers who claim to be political refugees. There are such persons who are criminals by western as well as Communist standards—thieves, murderers, black marketers, and the like. Nobody worries much if these persons are left to the mercies of German or Austrian courts. But some procedure must be in force to weed them out from the genuine political refugees.

Because every person who crosses the frontier of the west clandestinely is a lawbreaker, all who escape get treatment more consistent with the presumption that they are criminals than with the presumption that they are political refugees. Few of them are guilty of anything more than crossing a frontier that, on the Communist side, has become more like the no man's land between two opposing enemy lines than the frontier of a civilized nation supposedly at peace with its neighbors.

The fact that, technically, they are law-breakers has been permitted to dominate the procedure instead of the politically more significant facts that they are invaluable sources of information, bitter enemies of communism and, in most cases, valuable workers, technicians, or farmers who would do credit as immigrants to any western nation.

DIFFERENT PROCEDURES BARED

A recent private survey of the procedure in nine German sections along the frontier revealed that United States officials responsible for the treatment of refugees were following different procedures in each locality. These officials all were under the United States High Commissioner for Germany. Among United States occupied Austria, Germany, and Trieste there never has been any consistency of principle or practice in the treatment of refugees.

In one district, a United States judge was sentencing every illegal border crosser to 15- to 30-day jail terms. He was following the letter of the United States law for the zone, which made border crossing illegal. In another locality, the United States resident officer examined every new arrival, and sent him to the nearest court. Many border-crossers are kept in common jails for several days before trial.

In another locality most of the new refugees are turned over promptly to German authorities despite nominal United States responsibility for such cases. Some of them subsequently get hearings before the United States resident officer, who may release them, set bail for their release, or send them to a German jail to await further processing. Refugees seldom have money for bail.

Amid this confusion of practices, both Army Counter-Intelligence and Military Intelligence Service, separate organizations that often compete or work at cross-purposes, try to get what information they can out of the new arrivals, and sometimes keep them in jail for weeks for questioning. The standards of most of these jails are low. The United States takes no responsibility for the health or care of the new arrivals, who are

crowded in with tramps, prostitutes, and the day's haul of common criminals.

TOTAL INFLUX KNOWN

Nobody knows exactly how many refugees are filtering across the barbed wire and mine-studded frontier of communism, facing the west. Nobody is responsible for finding out. J. Donald Kingsley, Director General of the International Refugee Organization, who consistently has warned Western governments of the existence and seriousness of the escaped-refugee problem, probably is in a good position as anyone to estimate the flow. Mr. Kingsley gives this estimate for the last 4 months.

For Germany, Austria, and Trieste, 1,200 to 1,400 a month; for Greece, 500 a month.

Only a small percentage of the refugees register with IRO, and many never show up at the check points because they know it usually means jail. That the number who are missed in Germany, for instance, is substantial is suggested by the fact that as far west as Belgium, three persons on an average day register with the IRO without having been in contact previously with any official German or Allied body.

Because the treatment they receive seldom encourages them to make themselves known to western authorities, much valuable intelligence data undoubtedly is lost. Those who are arrested, or who present themselves voluntarily, according to responsible United States officials, are easily the best source of information about conditions behind the iron curtain—better than all the United States embassies.

This correspondent has just examined a file of 20 interviews with new arrivals. They contain information ranging from the size and armed strength of the underground army of deserters that is growing in Poland to detailed accounts of the private lives of Rumanian Communist bosses.

From this raw material, not only the Voice of America, but all of the armed services draw much, if not most, of the knowledge needed in the battle to keep resistance to communism alive in the suppressed peoples around Russia's rim.

The files also contain innumerable curious points about life under communism. For instance, gasoline in Rumania is reported to be cheaper than in the United States, while a pound of coffee costs nearly half of the average worker's monthly salary.

However, once the refugee has been tapped for his contribution to the West's knowledge of his homeland, he is told, figuratively and sometimes literally, that the West has no further interest in him. In the last year, the IRO has been authorized to accept the new refugees for resettlement. But the standards for immigrants are severe in all countries. In most, they are set by nationality laws that exclude most central Europeans, or by economic considerations that restrict entry to skilled workers of a few professions.

In the absence of an international resettlement program, the refugees are left stranded—once they get out of jail—in those sections of Western and central Europe that already have too many people, too little work and too many problems.

Plans are under consideration for a large-scale migration program for Western Europe that, by relieving the population pressure, would make absorption of the refugees easier. But these plans do not envisage a direct attack on the refugee problem as such. So far, they have not acquired the substantial financial backing that their implementation would require.

MOST ARE YOUNG MEN

Partly because only the hardy can make it, a large proportion of escaped refugees are young men. The most frequently heard desire expressed by these young persons during the first hours of sojourn in the West is to join the United States Army and fight

Communists anywhere, preferably in the land from which they just came.

The United States Army is authorized to accept 2,500 recruits of non-United States nationality. Apart from the fact that this number is too small to make a dent in the refugee problem, the screening process is long, complicated, and poorly adapted for applicants who can prove virtually nothing about their past—for obvious reasons.

Nearly everyone who has been in touch with the new refugees agrees that a great opportunity is being lost to the West by not making it possible for more of these young men to become respected members of the western armed forces.

Whether one considers the treatment they receive when they first stagger across the frontier, or the problem of their ultimate resettlement, the conclusion is inescapable that, from start to finish, the policy and administrative machinery of the United States Government (and the western governments in general) is hopelessly unadapted to deal with the new escaped refugees from communism.

They are being shoved into the corners and cracks of a policy that is not designed to deal with their problems and into which they stubbornly refuse to fit. After 4 years of experience, the high-level analysis of the problem and the high-level decisions that alone can bring about fundamental changes in the situation still have not been made. Until they are, officials on the spot can do little but temper the harshness of the letter of the law.

Exportation of Sulfur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department's action to export one-fifth of our sulfur, which is an essential ingredient of fertilizers, jeopardizes the income of American farmers and the food supplies of American housewives.

According to the Department of Agriculture, commercial fertilizers account directly for about 25 percent of our total farm production. This year fertilizer will be 600,000 tons short of farmers' needs because not enough sulfur is available after exports.

Despite this critical need for sulfur in the United States, the State Department has arranged for about a million tons of our sulfur to be exported, and has given the British most of the say on where it will go.

The United States produces a little more than 5,000,000 tons of sulfur a year, which accounts for 90 percent of the world's supply. Other countries can produce their own sulfur, but they do not do it because they can buy it cheaper from us. To satisfy this foreign demand we are exhausting our sulfur supplies. Known deposits of sulfur in this country will be gone in less than 20 years at the present rate of production.

In the face of these facts, our State Department set up the International Materials Conference Committee on Sulfur last March and made a million tons of our sulfur available to it for distribu-

tion in the world markets during a 1-year period. The British Commonwealth has 5 members on the 11-member committee, while the United States has only 1. Norway, the second largest producer of sulfur, did not become a member of the committee because the Norwegians are too smart to let the British get control of their sulfur exports.

Farmers use about 25 percent of the sulfur we produce. Used in fertilizers it greatly increases crop yields. For example, if the million tons of sulfur which the Truman-Acheson crowd is putting under British control were used in fertilizer, it would produce an estimated additional billion pounds of beef, or 4,000,000,000 quarters of milk, or 125,000,000 bushels of corn. It would increase farmers' income by boosting acreage yield and at the same time make more food available to consumers at lower prices.

The administration should withdraw immediately from all of its deals to dispose of sulfur at least until the needs of American farmers are met. It was Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Brannan who got us into this sulfur mess, and now it is up to them to get us out of it.

1950 Profit Rates Higher Than 1940's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article taken from the New York Times for August 13, 1951, entitled "1950 Profit Rates Higher Than 1940's."

1950 PROFIT RATES HIGHER THAN 1940'S—DESPITE GREATER TAX AND COST, ONLY 3 OUT OF 25 INDUSTRIES FAIL TO SHOW INCREASE—ALSO EXCEED 1949 FIGURE—FTC REPORT SHOWS EARNINGS OF LARGER COMPANIES NOW LEADING SMALLER ONES

WASHINGTON, August 12.—Despite higher taxes and costs, profit rates in all but 3 out of 25 major manufacturing industries were substantially higher in 1950 than in the prewar year of 1940, a Federal Trade Commission report to Congress showed today. In all but six industries, 1950 profit rates showed an increase over 1949, too.

The report contains a comparison of the level of profitability of the four largest companies in an industry with the rates of all other companies reported for that industry. During the postwar period, profit rates of the larger concerns (the four largest corporations in each industry) were generally higher than those of the smaller corporations.

The report is the fourth in the Commission's series, each comparing prewar and postwar rates of return, after taxes, for more than 500 corporations in 25 narrowly defined and homogeneous manufacturing industries.

FIFTY PERCENT OF TOTAL ASSETS

The combined assets of the industries covered by the study accounted in 1940 for 50 percent of the total assets of all manufacturing industries.

The three industries which failed to show a higher profit rate in 1950 than in 1940 were cigarettes, cigars, and plug, smoking and chewing tobacco.

Industries which showed the most striking increases in their rates of return from 1940 to 1950 were motor vehicles, from 17.3 to 31.7 percent; matches, 5.3 to 17 percent; industrial chemicals, 14.4 to 23.7 percent; rayon, 8.6 to 17.9 percent; flat glass and glassware, 11.7 to 21.3 percent, and petroleum refining, 6.7 to 14.3 percent.

Other industries showing a higher profit rate in 1950, compared to 1940, were: dairy products, bread, biscuits and crackers, wool carpets and rugs, linoleum and felt base, paper and allied products, soap, cleaning and polishing preparations, tires and inner tubes, abrasives, asbestos and miscellaneous non-metallic mineral products, blast furnaces, steel works and rolling mills, primary smelting and refining nonferrous metals, tin cans and other tinware, engines and turbines, office and store machines and devices, electrical machinery, equipment and supplies, and motor vehicle equipment.

SIX INDUSTRIES DECLINED

The six industries that showed a decline in profits from 1949 to 1950 were dairy products, cigarettes, cigars, plug, smoking and snuff tobacco, and biscuits and crackers.

In the comparison of 1949 and 1950 profit rates, the most striking increases were shown in soap, which rose from 6.6 to 18.2 percent, the exact reverse of its decline from 1948 to 1949; matches, from 6.9 to 17 percent, and tires and tubes, from 9 to 17.1 percent.

In 16 of the industries the large concerns (the four largest in each industry) tended to show a higher profit rate during the 1947-50 period than the smaller corporations in the industry. These are medium-sized and do not include the distinctly smaller-size corporations.

These 16 were: dairy products, biscuits and crackers, cigarettes, cigars, linoleum and felt base, paper and allied products, industrial chemicals, rayon, soap, tires and tubes, flat glass and glassware, tin cans and other tinware, office and store machines and devices, electrical machinery, equipment and supplies, motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment.

Profit rates during the postwar years tended to be higher in the smaller than in the large corporations in six industries, as follows: bread, wool carpets and rugs, petroleum refining, blast furnaces, steel works and rolling mills, nonferrous metals, engines and turbines.

NO DIFFERENTIATION IN OTHERS

In the remaining industries there was no clear differentiation during the postwar period between profit rates of the large companies and those of the smaller corporations.

Comparing the level of profitability as between the prewar and postwar periods, the report said: "An outstanding characteristic of the industries studied is the continuation into the postwar period of the relationship which existed between the largest and the smaller companies during the prewar period. If the large corporations were more profitable than the smaller ones in the prewar period they continued to be more profitable in the postwar period, and if the reverse was true in the prewar period it continued to be true in the latter period."

In four industries the relationship which existed in the prewar period was reversed in favor of the large corporations. They were dairy products, rayon, office and store machines and devices, motor vehicles and equipment.

There were only two industries, wool carpets and rugs and petroleum refining, in which the smaller corporations were less profitable in the prewar year, but more profitable in the postwar period.

Scot's-Eye View of TVA**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is ever interesting to see ourselves as others see us, and in this spirit, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the September 18, last, issue of the Nashville Tennessean entitled "Scot's-Eye View of TVA."

This article deals with the views of a visitor from Scotland to our great Tennessee Valley region and to the TVA. It is a great tribute to the TVA, but more than that it is a fine tribute to the determination and industry and spirit of the people of our section. We of the Tennessee Valley region are gratified that the virtues which we ourselves take pride in possessing should thus be recognized by a visitor from foreign shores. I highly recommend this article which follows:

SCOT'S-EYE VIEW OF TVA

Lost those of us who live right in the heart of the Tennessee Valley Authority ever forget just how impressive its accomplishments have been. It is always a profitable experience to hear what visitors to the TVA region have to say.

In this respect, one of the most interesting commentaries that has come to our attention recently is an article in the Edinburgh, Scotland, Evening News by Mr William Ballantine, who visited the TVA area in an American tour during the summer.

"Looking back on the days I have spent in Tennessee Valley," says this Scotch newspaperman, "I think I have been more impressed by the spirit that the leaders of the Tennessee Valley Authority have induced among the people of the valley than the actual engineering achievements that lie to their credit. After 18 years farmers, industrialists, work people and journalists speak of these men with something approaching hero worship."

Going back to the time the TVA was set up Mr Ballantine recalls that "people were streaming out of the area in the hundreds in search of work. The small farms were finished. The towns in the valley were fast losing whatever industry they possessed. Throughout America this area was being written off."

Even the establishment of the TVA, he points out, was greeted with doubt and disillusionment. There simply was no confidence that the Federal Government, through this fledgling organization, could do what the people had been unable to do on their own.

But fortunately, Mr Ballantine tells his readers in Scotland, TVA went to work on the sound principle that "if the valley was to be saved, it would have to be saved by the people themselves, using all their experience and knowledge with the new tools which TVA was making available."

The result of all this, as Mr Ballantine interprets it, was that the residents of the TVA region made full use of the new power and advice which was made available, started believing in themselves again, attracted many new industries and brought prosperity back to their fields.

Putting the finishing touches on the picture as he saw it, the Scottish observer concluded with these words:

"It has been a heartening experience to have lived for days with the men of TVA and caught something of their great enthusiasm for the job they are doing, to have met and talked with groups of farmers from one end of the valley to the other, and seen the fine thing that they are bringing to life in a once almost derelict land, and to have caught something of the spirit of the leaders of industry in towns no bigger than Inverness and Oban who are building a new prosperity for themselves."

Applying what he found here to his own country, Mr. Ballantine suggests that the people of the highlands might well take heart from the experience of the people of the Tennessee Valley.

And we—these very people of the Tennessee Valley—might also find new encouragement in this reminder from abroad that the transformation right here in our midst is a source of admiration throughout the world.

Polish Alliance Pledge**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Times Leader, the Evening News, Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) entitled "Polish Alliance Pledge":

POLISH ALLIANCE PLEDGE

In pledging their lives and assets in defense of the American flag in the event of a Communist onslaught, district 7 of the Polish National Alliance, representing 35,000 Americans of Polish extraction in eastern Pennsylvania, set an excellent example for fellow countrymen:

While members of the alliance are naturally interested in the land of their forefathers, their chief concern is for the preservation of the American way of life. The organization was founded with the idea of making staunch Americans out of Polish immigrants as speedily as possible. With a membership of more than 300,000 and assets in excess of \$60,000,000, it is the largest organization of its kind in the world. Its president is Charles Rozmarek, a Wilkes-Barre native, who maintains headquarters in Chicago.

Affairs of the alliance are now largely in the hands of the second generation. But the determination of the founders to promote United States citizenship, liberty, education, and the public welfare remains. Among other things, the organization maintains a college at Cambridge Springs, Pa.

America owes a great debt to the Polish National Alliance and similar organizations for paying the way for the assimilation of newcomers. Without their programs, the process of Americanizing these elements in the population would take centuries instead of one generation. This is an achievement that is not fully appreciated by the public.

The role of the Polish National Alliance is far more important than the average group because of its size and the influence it wields through the Polish American Congress which turned to the alliance for leadership. The action of district 7 in adopting this resolution by unanimous vote typifies the spirit of loyalty to the ideals of America as well as to the country itself.

No Factual Basis for Removal of Pacific Northwest Aluminum Plants**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith a letter sent to the Honorable Charles Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, today, signed by members of the Pacific Northwest congressional delegation, relative to a proposal to move existing aluminum pot lines from the Northwest to other sections of the United States. The letter explains in detail why the proposal is completely unworkable. Since drafting the letter I have been advised that the Defense Electric Power Administration was never consulted regarding this proposal. I am informed that had they been consulted they would have advised that there is a power shortage generally throughout the United States. In short, that there is no place to move the plants where power would be available in abundance at this time. I am sure that when all the facts are made available to Mr. Wilson this proposal will be abandoned. The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1951.

HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: We desire to meet with you at the earliest possible time to discuss a matter of utmost importance. Before our meeting we would appreciate your close attention to the contents of this letter.

We are deeply concerned with your suggestion that it may be necessary to move existing aluminum potlines from the Pacific Northwest to other areas. This suggestion has created a great deal of furor and confusion in the Pacific Northwest. The furor results from the possibility of losing an industry important to the economy and the confusion results from lack of knowledge as to the motives behind such a proposal.

While we are confident that your sole desire is to increase production of aluminum and do what is best for the defense effort, you should know that other motives have been ascribed to your proposal. Here are some of them.

This is an attempt—

1. To prevent an independent aluminum producer from coming into the area and becoming a competitor to any one, or all, of the Big Three productions.

2. To prevent one of the present big producers from obtaining a continuous and low-cost source of power for its expansion program.

3. To generate strife between public and private power agencies serving the Northwest area.

4. To retard or halt the further development of hydroelectric power resources in the Pacific Northwest.

5. To create the impression that there is not, and never will be, electric power in the Northwest for further expansion of the aluminum industry.

We have no evidence that these alleged motives are true, and reiterate our belief that you personally are interested in only one objective, namely, to insure maximum production of aluminum and other critical

defense materials. Accordingly, we have analyzed your action on this premise and have come to the strongest conviction that the program implied in your wire to Kaiser & Reynolds would produce a result directly contrary to that you desire.

First, let us assess the argument for leaving in the Northwest all aluminum production facilities now capable of operation and proceeding on the expansion program as scheduled. Then let us evaluate the alternative you have suggested.

In doing this, Northwest possibilities and probabilities must be balanced against: (1) The probability of obtaining an adequate power supply in another section of the country, (2) the costs of moving production facilities to a new location, and (3) the loss of aluminum production during the transition period.

Aluminum plants presently located in the Northwest consist of some 22 potlines with an annual capacity of 386,000 tons, or approximately 50 percent of our national production. In full operation they consume 763,000 kilowatts. Of this 571,000 is firm power; 192,000 interruptible—all covered by contractual arrangements with Bonneville Power Administration. To this date loss of production in the Northwest is far less than has already occurred in the Southeast from the same causes—low water conditions.

Further reductions in the Northwest are entirely conjectural. Stream flows normally decline at the close of the summer runoff period. In that regard this year is no exception. Stream flows usually pick up with the fall rains, beginning September 15 to October 15. Hydrological information from the Northwest indicates water conditions are above critical and in no event will reach the "most critical" state this year.

Whereas it is always prudent to formulate plans for meeting "most adverse conditions," normal rains may make the situation look entirely different within 15 to 30 days. For example, in 1948 it was necessary to interrupt aluminum production for about 30 days under circumstances identical with those now prevailing. In subsequent months, however, there was power available surplus to the demands of the entire grid system.

The odds are 20 to 1 against the Northwest experiencing most adverse conditions this year. Records show that only once in 20 years is a minimum flow to be expected.

Assuming the worst should happen, the Northwest systems in the next 6 months will lack 500,000 kilowatts of meeting their total demand. While a shortage of this magnitude is improbable, plans must be formulated to meet it in the unlikely event it occurs.

Total loads in the region break roughly as follows: Aluminum, 788,000 kilowatts, heavy industry, 800,000 kilowatts, commercial, domestic, and light industry, 2,280,000 kilowatts.

The possibility of effecting reduction in commercial, domestic, and light industry is minor—not more than 100,000 kilowatts. Major portion of the deficit, therefore, must come from aluminum and heavy industry. To take the entire deficit from heavy industry, other than aluminum, however, would have disastrous effects upon employment and the economic life of the Northwest. Hence, aluminum must bear a heavy share of any cuts that prove necessary.

Original assumptions indicated a possible maximum cut of 600,000 kilowatts in Northwest power consumption, of which aluminum might reasonably be expected to bear about half. More recent hydrological information, however, points to a maximum cut of 800,000 kilowatts or about 250,000 kilowatts for aluminum. On this assumption loss of production for the 6-month critical period could amount to 62,500 tons—something less than 10 percent of our national production.

For purposes of comparison, later on, it is desirable to express this loss in terms of pot line capacity. On a 6-month basis—the critical Northwest water period—this is equivalent to the production of about six lines. On the assumption, therefore, that your proposal is to relocate that portion of the Northwest capacity that, under most adverse conditions, could not be operated the year around you would have to dismantle six pot lines and set them up elsewhere.

Against these potential losses of production in the Northwest (62,500 tons, or six pot lines for 6 months in a minimum water year, we can estimate with fair accuracy the losses involved in moving pot lines to other locations. Competent engineers have advised us that the direct dollar cost of moving and setting up a single pot line ready for operation at a new location is approximately four to five million dollars. The time involved in physically moving a pot line is at least 9 months—9 months of lost production equals 27,000 tons of aluminum per pot line moved. Actually it would require nearer 18 months to get a line in operation—judging by present delivery experience on transmission lines and transformation equipment which in the final analysis are controlling factors. Eighteen months of lost production equals 34,000 tons less per pot line moved.

In summary, a pot line left in the Northwest might represent a loss of 11,000 tons of production out of its annual capacity of 22,000 tons; while a moved pot line represents a certain loss of 17,000 tons and a probable loss of 34,000 tons.

As a basis of direct comparison, if six pot lines were inactivated in the Northwest in the winter of 1951-52 we would lose 62,500 tons of production, while six pot lines removed to another location would result in a certain loss of 102,000 tons and a probable loss of 204,000 tons. When we also consider that these six pot lines, if left in the Northwest, would produce some 66,000 tons of aluminum in the summer of 1952, the impracticability of moving them is readily apparent—even without taking into account the twenty-five to thirty million dollars cost of removal and reinstallation, plus the additional cost per ton of the aluminum itself attributable to the difference between Northwest power rates and those obtainable in any other locality.

Further, all information available to us indicates that no supply of power exists anywhere in the United States adequate to support another aluminum plant. A check with the Defense Electric Power Administration has verified this statement. In fact, we are advised that huge shortages already exist in the Southeast and Southwest and that a general shortage throughout the country is in prospect.

That being the case no pot line can be moved without a supplemental source of new power. Presumably such a source would be new steam plants or dams elsewhere in the country, which brings us to our final point.

New electric-energy facilities are under construction in the Northwest which will alleviate this situation within 2 to 3 years—in fact in less time than new facilities could be constructed elsewhere. We refer specifically to Albeni Falls, Hungry Horse, and Cabinet Gorge Dams, which will materially improve the Northwest power situation in 1952 and 1953, and to Detroit, Meridian, and McNary Dams, which will almost entirely relieve it in 1954. Chief Joseph, the Dalles, and Ice Harbor Dams, while not coming into production before 1955, assure that this problem will not again face us. Further, there is now before the Congress a proposal to construct 400,000 kilowatts of steam capacity in the Northwest, which would assure absolute firming of all existing and projected Northwest loads, including aluminum, by 1954.

We do not deny that the Northwest power situation has become critical. In our considered judgment, however, your proposal as reported, is no solution to the problem. On the contrary, it could be very harmful to the national defense, to the Northwest economy, and to the economic future of the Nation.

It seems obvious to us that our solution lies in another direction, namely, active and concerted support of Northwest power facilities already programed. We would appreciate an early opportunity to discuss these matters with you.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
HUGH B. MITCHELL,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Members of Congress.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senators.

Korean Ill Wind and the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article taken from the Christian Science Monitor of August 8, 1951, entitled "Korean Ill Wind and the Marines."

KOREAN ILL WIND AND THE MARINES (By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Korea has been the Marine Corps' salvation, as some military experts see it. A year ago, this elite organization was wasting away, methodically being whittled down for the sake of economy. As its size was reduced, its functions were absorbed. Marine aviation was cut to the vanishing point. When the conflict commenced in Korea, the corps was unable to assemble a single, full-strength division and the closest Marine troops to Korea were thousands of miles away.

Today the Marine Corps is a revitalized service, and congressional plans have progressed to the point where at least a 300,000 and perhaps a 400,000-man corps will be allowed under law, including a stronger Marine air arm. Moreover, the outlook is good for including the commandant of the Marine Corps either as a full-fledged member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or as a consultant to it.

For this improved position, the Marines are thankful and the country is fortunate. In the uncertain, dangerous days ahead, despite the imminent truce in Korea, the need for a stronger, expanded Marine Corps is more evident than ever.

Though it shouldn't have been necessary, the Marines proved their usefulness and value in Korea. In this, the publication of a letter which characterized the Marines as the Navy's police force, played a measurable role. Even such a once-upon-a-time critic of the Marines, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, became an ardent leatherneck backer. Korea, said General MacArthur to one Marine general, would once and for all solidify the corps' position in the country's military structure. If this prediction proves correct, the country gains in strength and security.

What have the Marines done in Korea to achieve this?

1. The Inchon landing. From a scant 12 months' perspective, this almost impossible feat has gained the reputation of being the outstanding amphibious assault of military history. A month after the Marines landed and captured Seoul, the downfall and destruction of the North Korean Army were complete. Any fair-minded observer who has studied this operation will agree that only the Marines with their background, experience, and day-by-day training could have brought it off. Amphibious warfare is specialized work for which only the Marines and the Navy are prepared.

2. The now-classic Hungnam evacuation, or as the Marines call it, "the attack toward the sea." Outnumbered 10 to 1, isolated for 10 days, the Marine division fought its way out of a Chinese trap to freedom, bringing all of its equipment with it. If any battle proved that the average American can be trained to be a superb soldier, that battle did.

3. The Marines' specialized version of close air support. Flying from two small Navy "jeep" aircraft carriers, the Marines demonstrated techniques of using airplanes for ground fighting which proved far superior to the Air Force system. The Marine aviators were themselves experienced ground fighters, and understood the problems and language of the foot soldier. Secondly, their planes and weapons were designed for the task. Napalm, the jellied gasoline fire bomb, was their specialty and was used with consummate success in Korea.

4. The individual marine. In Korea, he used four weapons almost forgotten in the 1951 fog of atomic clouds and jet smoke: his rifle, his hand grenade, his bayonet—and his intelligence. Well-trained, well-led, well-equipped, the leathernecks' consistently excellent performance in Korea reawakened the American people to the need and usefulness of this elite organization.

We have talked with many marines and naval officers, all of them battle-tested officers. The consensus is that a larger but still volunteer Marine corps, protected by law, with the commandant seated as a consultant to the JCS, is a wise move. Few of them, however, wish to see the corps divorced and given autonomy from the Navy. The corps is inextricably joined with the Navy, and if their unique abilities are to be maintained, it must remain as part of the Navy.

No credence is given to the idea that an expanded corps will constitute a second army. The specialized Marines, say the experts, will be the ever-ready fire brigade ready for instant service anywhere the Navy takes them. If another perimeter war breaks out in Iran or Indochina, Denmark or the Dardanelles, as it did in Korea, at least two divisions of marines will be on the spot and landed to protect American interests until the Army arrives.

Recently military writers have repeated the theme that militarily, Korea has been worth while. In the case of the Marines, this over-glib statement is even more true. There might have been no victory in Korea without the Marines, and there might have been no Marines without Korea.

New Uses for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

given before the Engineering and Human Affairs Conference at the Princeton University Bicentennial Conference, Princeton, N. J., October 2, 1946:

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES: THE COMING TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION ON THE LAND

(By H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.)

Productive land is unlike any other natural resource. It is characterized by the element of life placed by nature in the thin mantle of fruitful soil occurring over a limited portion of the earth's surface. It is this life-producing quality that makes some lands productive, and it is the absence of this quality that makes some barren.

Productive land is further differentiated from other natural resources in that it must be maintained and used simultaneously, that is, it must be kept intact while in use. All other natural resources, with very few exceptions, must be taken from the earth—separated from it—in order to be used by man. The exceptions are certain forms of wildlife and those natural areas which, because of their esthetic values, are kept in their original state.

Productive land is much more limited than commonly has been supposed. It occurs only on the surface of the earth, and only on part of this surface. It is not permanent. Once the fertile topsoil is washed or blown away, it cannot be restored or replaced in any practical way for generations. And what is left—subsoil—usually is far less productive, or sterile, and less stable. There are no undiscovered reserves of productive land of any substantial area.

We cannot dig deeper into the earth and find new productive soil. We cannot pump it from wells, plant it with seeds, or dig it from mines. We must keep what we have or do without. Assorted residues of sand and gravel left stranded along streamways are of small value.

Productive land is the only natural resource without which we cannot live. We are completely dependent on it for the food we eat, except fish. We also depend on it for a very large share of our clothing and shelter. We cannot get enough to feed ourselves or provide our clothing from the oceans. On any large scale, hydroponics would be utterly impractical. We might conceivably turn sometime to some form of synthetic food, as pills, plus a roughage; but this appears to be a fantastic extreme, still far away, and likely, if it ever comes, it will be decidedly unpopular.

There is no doubt about the need for protecting productive land. Year after year, for generations, man has been steadily engaged in ruining millions and millions of acres of this basic resource. Every hard rain falling on unprotected, cultivated, or overgrazed sloping land washes additional tons of soil downslope, downstream, into the rivers, reservoirs, and oceans. There is no practical way of bringing this back. And every hard wind, blowing across bare, dry soil, whether sloping or level, adds to the damage. Wind lifts the fine soil particles into the air and often develops huge dust storms that destructively scatter the substance of the land. What is left behind, frequently, is infertile, shifting sand that smothers out vegetation on neighboring good land.

When the world was younger and our population much smaller, we could, perhaps, stand such waste, but that time is past. It is not defeatism to say that the world is fast maturing and must assume now a mature responsibility for its resources. It is not limiting the horizons of the future to say that land exploitation must stop. It is simply a matter of common sense and self-preservation. Besides saving soil and water—the two go together—soil conservation results

in increased yields per acre. It is also easier and cheaper to farm on the contour than up and down hill.

Today, throughout our world, there are left only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land, the productivity of a great deal of which is only fair to medium. Some of it is poor. Yet we must count on all of it to feed a population reported to be in excess of 2,000,000,000, and still increasing.

The United States is somewhat better off, from the standpoint of productive land, than most nations. Even though we have ruined more good land in less time than any other nation in recorded history, we had the advantage of an unprecedented supply to begin with. Now we have little margin left, but we still have enough productive land if we take care of it. We cannot hope to maintain our present standard of living if we lose must more; eventually, if the losses should continue, the Nation would suffer even more seriously.

There are about 480,000,000 acres of really good, high-class cropland left in the United States. This includes, in addition to that now in crops, about 100,000,000 acres that need drainage, irrigation, clearing, or other improvements. All but about 70,000,000 of these 480,000,000 acres of high-grade land is subject to erosion if it is not protected. We have no reason for complacency.

Our record shows that we have ruined, for further practical cultivation, about one-fifth of our original area of tillable land. A third of what remains has already been badly damaged, another third is highly vulnerable, and the erosion process is still going on.

How did we get into this predicament? Why was this allowed to happen? Why didn't you hear about it sooner? There are a number of reasons, but probably the following are the main ones:

First, we began losing land to erosion when the world was still young. Those were the days when there was always more land—a great deal more—just over the hill or across the ocean. People came to regard land as limitless and inexhaustible. This deceptive idea persisted as time went by, and it was probably not until the United States was settled all the way to the Pacific coast that people began to have any real doubts about the myth of land plenty.

Second, the apparent abundance of good land for so many generations gave rise to a careless and prodigal attitude. There was nothing of any compelling nature to cause a landowner to take care of his land or have concern about maintaining its productivity. New land somewhere could almost always be had.

Third, in modern times, the leaders of thought and nations—and nearly everybody else—too often have had little or no personal knowledge or understanding of the land. They have been trained in law, finance, philosophy, administration, military science, economics, education, or some field other than agriculture, and especially that part of agriculture having to do with maintenance of the base, meaning the land. With few exceptions they have had neither the incentive nor the training to look at the landscape around them and understand what was happening. The ancient and unchallenged myth of land plenty came down to them too, through the ages, and was accepted as truth.

Fourth, too much of the land traditionally has been in the hands of the untutored and the inept. In very recent years and in a very few countries, this situation has been changing, fortunately, for the better. However, over most of the world, land is still being used by men with little specialized or adequate training for the job. Too many land users have operated on a trial-and-error basis and have been influenced predominantly by habits handed down from the past, whether good or bad. Some have placed greater faith in superstition than in science. Under the

names of peasant, farmer, rustic, and country fellow, these individuals have been synonymous, for generations, with all that is naive, uneducated, and backward. Possessed frequently of such virtues as thrift and diligence, they have nevertheless often assumed a scornful attitude toward education and the educated, and too often the farm has been the last resort to which men, unsuccessful in other fields, have turned. In short, the most precious natural resource on earth in too many places has habitually been in the charge of those who have had no greater qualifications for the trusteeship than the coincidence of inheritance or birth on the land.

Fifth, too few farms produced surplus capital for the owner over a period of years. On the contrary, the farm often has been no better than a marginal or subsistence enterprise. Even in the United States the farmer rarely has had the personal resources to undertake research or seek out technological improvements. He has generally been almost wholly dependent on outside help, from Government or private corporation, to provide him with improvements in machinery, materials, and methods.

Sixth, our agricultural scientists failed completely, over bygone years, to recognize land for what it is—an impermanent and complex resource. They considered soil permanent and synonymous with land. As a result of this mistake, both agriculture and the land suffered. Soil is but one part of land. For all practical purposes, land must be regarded in terms of all its component parts of soil, slope, climate, and susceptibility to erosion. The early scientists largely ignored erosion, paid little attention to slope, called the weather inevitable, and took soil samples right and left. In the main, however, agricultural science was not greatly concerned about the land. In large degree it was more interested in the health and breeding of livestock; improvement in strains of grasses, legumes, grains, and fibers; and modernization of machinery and equipment. All of this was beneficial, but it did neglect the capital stock of agriculture and the source of production—the land itself.

Seventh, in agriculture, as in other enterprises, we often wait until we are sick before we call the doctor. There is an element of human nature about this, and it has operated on the land. We did not practice preventive medicine, and now we must try to cure a malady—erosion—that has gotten into our system and weakened us.

So much for history. There is little to be gained by a review of past shortcomings except as it will help us avoid similar pitfalls in the future. Today we are profiting from the lessons of the past. We know now:

1. That productive land is neither limitless nor inexhaustible. On the contrary, we have learned that the area of productive land is steadily shrinking before the onslaught of erosion.

2. That land must be expertly cared for if it is to be maintained in a productive state.

3. That productive land must assume an ever more prominent position in the thinking of the people and their leaders. As the source of food for all people, rural and urban, it must have the regular, intelligent consideration that such indispensable wealth merits.

4. That, since society as a whole depends absolutely on the produce of the land for its present and future existence, society as a whole must share in the responsibility and cost of maintaining land in a productive state. The individual landowner or operator has neither the resources nor the ability to carry the burden alone, and he has control only for a lifetime.

5. That science must inevitably devote an increasing share of its attention to the problems of maintaining the substance and improving the yield of productive land.

6. That action is imperative. Time is running out between the impending pincers of an increasing population and a dwindling area of productive land.

7. That the technological key to future consideration of land development is scientific analysis of each parcel of land of any important extent to determine: (a) the type of production for which it is best suited physically and economically, as between row crops, forage, trees, grain, or wildlife; and (b) the conservation measures, such as terracing, strip cropping, and contouring, necessary to maintain it in a permanently productive state under maximum use.

8. That practical treatment must be based on this analysis—the character of the land and its needs.

Lands vary widely from place to place and even on parts of the same farm or field. Every variation in the combination of soil, slope, climate, and susceptibility to erosion means a variation in the use and treatment necessary to keep the land permanently productive. Thus, engineering measures are used to supplement agronomic and fertility measures wherever necessary, and vice versa, according to need, adaptability, and economic limitations.

This is the basic principle underlying the new land technology developed in the United States during the past 14 years by the Soil Conservation Service (first called Soil Erosion Service). It is being applied to an ever-increasing area of land by American farmers, acting with the assistance of Service technicians. By the middle of 1947 more than 100,000,000 acres in all parts of the United States will be farmed in this modern conservation way; that is, each of the 100,000,000 acres or more will be used according to its individual capabilities and will be treated according to its conservation needs.

In the United States, land technology is spreading through a new democratic device known as the soil-conservation district. The district is a subdivision of State government, brought into being by a process of referendum among the landowners and operators involved. In practical application it is a legal organization of landowners and operators within a designated area for the purpose of developing and carrying forward a mutually desirable program of soil and water conservation. Its principal advantages are in the encouragement of local initiative and in the greater strength that comes with organized numbers farmers and ranchers working together.

In soil-conservation districts the farmers themselves decide what they want to do to improve their land and water resources and how they want to go about doing it. Then they proceed along this course, working together, and utilizing all the available facilities and services they can command. In almost every instance, districts are obtaining technical guidance from the Soil Conservation Service.

On August 15 there were more than 1,670 districts in the United States, voluntarily voted into existence by the farmers themselves. These districts encompassed more than 900,000,000 acres and approximately 4,000,000 farms. Farmers are continuing to organize districts at the rate of approximately 25 per month.

Although democratic soil conservation districts are being employed in the United States to further the application of land technology other nations may choose to utilize other means. A number, however, including the Union of South Africa, Mexico, and parts of Australia, have adopted the soil conservation district method.

In the long run, the overwhelming urge of mankind for survival will dictate that every remaining productive acre be handled in such a way that it will continue to produce indefinitely. In the meantime, other

factors are combining to speed up the application of technology to the land. From the standpoint of the individual and the Nation alike, the development and application of soil and water conservation technology (the tool of soil conservation science), is good business. It results in greater yields and greater returns per acre for the capital and labor expended. Moreover, it maintains or improves the basic strength and self-sufficiency of individual and nation. It probably can prevent at least half the potential famines of the future.

By increasing the per-acre, per-farm, and per-nation supply of food and fiber, conservation technology can provide the basis for an improved standard of living and simultaneously reduce the hunger and discontent among peoples which so frequently leads to discord, dictatorships, and war.

For these and other reasons, the application of land technology is certain to spread around the world, either voluntarily or by decree. By the year 1996 this world journey probably will be well advanced. By that year or before, it will have accomplished changes in agriculture tantamount to a beneficial revolution on the land.

Almost certainly, productive land will have become a major factor in national and international deliberations. In all probability there would have been better international relationships if we had worked together more on ways and means of keeping land productive.

Production in the agricultural areas of the world will be more diversified; there will be pronounced increases in the acreages devoted to livestock and trees.

Agricultural production will be restored or improved in millions of communities throughout the world, solving in large measure some of the most difficult problems of food distribution and human nutrition now confronting mankind.

The nutritive value of food produced on land rich in the constituents of plant nutrition undoubtedly will be greater than that from impoverished land, which has been stripped of its topsoil by erosion, with everything the topsoil contains—available elements of nutrition, both minor and major, all that man puts into the topsoil, and everything else. With so much eroded land around the earth, is there any wonder that malnutrition and famine are so widespread?

Development of land and water resources for agriculture, as by drainage or irrigation, will be governed primarily by factual, technological elements of land use and land maintenance rather than by promotional, exploitive, or political standards.

Also, people will learn that it is easier on machine, horse, and man to farm according to conservation standards than to follow haphazard methods not fitted to the land. Less fuel and time, for example, are required to operate a machine, on the level, on the contour, than up and down slopes, and there is less wear on the machine.

The heavy costs of erosion, now running to approximately \$3,844,000,000 a year in the United States alone, will be sharply cut.

Farming will become an expert profession; the inept and inept will be forced off the land. It is not impossible that the prospective farmer of the future will be required to satisfy society that he is qualified by training and experience to take on the trusteeship of a piece of productive land.

Most important, man will have learned the true value of his most precious natural resource. Tragically, throughout history, the land has been the most neglected.

On this job of safeguarding the land, thousands of farmers, in addition to various local, State, and Federal agencies, are vigorously pushing ahead with the work. Each individual so engaged is a part of the biggest job, I think, in engineering and human affairs ever undertaken anywhere.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a resolution on William N. Oatis, which was adopted by Wilkes-Barre Aerie, No. 352, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles on September 11, 1951.

I further wish to state that a similar resolution was adopted by Hazleton Aerie, No. 193, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles on September 4, 1951.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel, and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press, and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of Government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Wilkes-Barre Aerie No. 353 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 353 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet News Agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 11th day of September 1951.

STEVE J. GARDICK,

Attest:

Worthy President,

JOHN T. CORRIGAN,

Secretary.

The Hand of the Truman Administration Is in the Pocket of Every American Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, every month the taxpayers of the United States are having their earnings transferred to foreign nations by the Truman administration. Inflation is on the march—an income tax without exemptions. It is a creeping system of confiscation. Not a sound and logical step has been taken by the Truman administration to stop this menace. All that the administration is doing is to pour gasoline on the fire, and then refuse to use the fire department.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the Record Paul O. Peters' article: Expenditures for 2 Months of Fiscal 1952 for Foreign Aid and Mutual Defense Exceed \$710,000,000 With Big Spending Yet To Come:

EXPENDITURES FOR 2 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1952 FOR FOREIGN AID AND MUTUAL DEFENSE EXCEED \$710,000,000 WITH BIG SPENDING YET TO COME

Careful examination of the Daily Treasury Statement for September 17, 1951, shows that expenditures for the international obligations and adventures of the United States for the first 2 months of the fiscal year 1952 were in excess of \$710,000,000. The support of the President's point 4 programs alone cost our taxpayers, as shown by the table following, over \$4,500,000,000.

Expenditures from funds appropriated to the President for international-development expense

[Expenditures July 1, 1951, through Aug. 31, 1951]

Agriculture Department.....	\$389,013.75
Commerce Department.....	142,767.48
Executive Office of the President.....	12,434.10
Federal Security Agency.....	145,999.97
Interior Department.....	209,338.13
Labor Department.....	39,051.15
State Department.....	3,716,401.91
Other departments.....	1,269.24

Total for point 4..... 4,656,275.73

Economic aid to Korea was distributed by several Federal agencies from funds appropriated to the President, as shown by the table following:

Economic aid to Korea

[Expenditures July and August 1951]

Agriculture Department.....	\$264,801.86
Defense Department (Army).....	3,190,258.88
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	93,150.44
General Services Administration.....	178,565.61
State Department.....	299,946.00

Total (net)..... 3,769,591.57

Deduct.

Included in the expenditures for the months of July and August was a disbursement by the State Department of \$2,250,000 as a loan for the construction and furnishing of the United Nations headquarters in New York.

Largest portion of the expenditures for the 2 months were reported for the Economic Cooperation Administration, the amount being \$325,091,515.82. Disbursements for Mutual Defense Assistance accounted for over \$240,000,000.

The complete story of the spending is shown by the table which follows:

Details of Federal expenditures for foreign aid, mutual defense, international development, Korean economic aid, including loans

[July 1 through Aug. 31, 1951]

Project and agency:	Amount expended
International development, point 4.....	\$4,656,275.73
Korean economic aid.....	3,769,591.57
State Department loan to United Nations.....	2,250,000.00
Export-Import Bank loans and guarantees.....	21,719,518.42
Economic Cooperation Act:	
Agriculture Department.....	46,806,640.30
Commerce Department.....	1,562,641.87
Defense Department (Army).....	1,710,014.99
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	325,091,515.82
Federal Security Agency.....	16,365.92
General Services Administration.....	252,177.37
Labor Department.....	94,837.32
Mutual Defense Assistance:	
Agriculture Department.....	866,331.49
Defense Department:	
Office of Secretary.....	106,589.38
Air Force.....	48,328,432.81
Army.....	160,609,873.97
Navy.....	16,796,651.68
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	22,210,429.26
Assistance to Greece and Turkey:	
Agriculture Department.....	23,436.85
Commerce Department.....	769.00
Defense Department:	
Army.....	6,698,266.86
Navy.....	188,340.54
China Aid Act of 1948:	
Agriculture Department.....	1,544,531.70
Commerce Department.....	3,784.81
Army.....	239,777.34
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	3,690,015.75
Federal Security Agency.....	128,228.49
General Services Administration.....	7,393,474.34
State Department.....	364,388.76
Other.....	2,557.14
India Emergency Food Aid: Agriculture Department.....	10,559,799.16
Relief in occupied area of Germany.....	152,259.45
Relief of Palestine refugees.....	2,000,000.00
Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance.....	6,972,873.14
Army:	
Agricultural commodities and raw materials.....	2,630,364.96
Government and relief in occupied areas.....	13,607,911.89
Total reported disbursements, 2 months of the fiscal year 1952.....	713,048,882.28

The foregoing compilation does not include the cost of maintaining, supplying, and paying the Armed Forces in Korea and other parts of the world, estimated at approximately \$1,000,000,000 a month.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Central Valley Project**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, a special Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation participated recently in the Central Valley project celebration in California. The purpose of these water festivals was to call attention to the first complete and integrated operation of the vast Central Valley project, constructed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, which extends a distance of nearly 500 miles in the very heart of the great State of California.

As our subcommittee visited various communities, we were impressed with the lack of water supplies even though this great project will bring tremendous benefit to the thirsty lands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. Again and again farmers and businessmen told us that the program of water development is several years behind schedule and that additional projects are needed to meet the growing demand for water and power in California.

In view of our findings, I am pleased to include the following editorial from the Redding Record-Searchlight of August 21 entitled "Never Big Enough," which stresses the need for additional water projects in California and quotes from an address given at Bakersfield by the Honorable Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. The editorial is as follows:

NEVER BIG ENOUGH

California is such a fabulous State that even the giddiest forecasts of big things to come turn out to be underestimates.

Our Central Valley project, which seemed to be such a tremendous undertaking when they started work at Shasta Dam in 1938, is now in operation, and the State has grown so much meanwhile that the CVP won't come anywhere near meeting the needs. Indeed, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE contends the State has been dishing out water which it had already committed to the project, with the result that there is not enough water available in the CVP to take care of present commitments. If that's so—and it certainly seems to be—it will be necessary to get more water right away from the Trinity, the American or some other stream.

Reclamation Commissioner Michael W. Straus discussed this point in a speech at Bakersfield as the 10-day CVP water celebration came to a close. Said the Commissioner:

"We are always planning and building the biggest this or that and a lot of people are always telling us we are crazy and wasting the public's money, and building white elephants much too big, and that they'll never be used. Then later Reclamation always finds out that it was wrong and its critics were wrong and we built the works too small to meet the needs.

"When Hoover Dam was built millions of people said it was too big. Since then we've added Parker Dam and Davis Dam below Hoover on the Colorado and haven't come near catching up with the water and power demands of southern California or Arizona; so soon we'll have to build Bridge Canyon Dam on the Colorado above Hoover.

"On the Columbia River we switched from a low dam to the high dam at Grand Coulee—the biggest concrete structure ever built by man—without even a pause in construction. They're now short of power and water up there and half a dozen great dams are rising on the Columbia River system above and below Coulee.

"Right in northern California for your project we added a million acre-feet of storage behind Shasta Dam, to a chorus of catcalls. Then we insisted that the size of Folsom Reservoir on the American River—now under construction by the able Army engineers, and the next storage to be added to the Central Valley project—be tripled, and it has been. And that's not enough.

"Some day perhaps we'll all learn not to be so impressed by our own works and our own superlatives that we become timid and sell this country and our future short. And those are a few of the reasons both your Federal Government and your Governor are now in agreement that we cannot rest until every drop of water now wasting from California's Central Valley to the sea is dammed up, conserved, and put to work to meet some of California's requirements."

Plight of Our Indian Tribes**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this means of complimenting the junior Senator from Nevada, Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, upon his comprehensive and informative statement on Saturday last concerning the pitiful plight of most of our Indian tribes. Senator MALONE's statement was made in connection with the introduction of a bill by himself, calling for orderly and systematic abolition of what he terms "a system outmoded by more than 100 years."

Specifically, Senator MALONE would free the Indian tribes from bureaucratic rule by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs, and would grant to the Indians equal opportunities with American citizens of other nationalities.

Senator MALONE believes, and rightly so, that the Indians should be given the opportunity to manage their own affairs, on an equal basis with other Americans. He points out that the original idea was that Federal control of the Indians' affairs was to be a diminishing thing; but, rather, more and more restrictions, regulations and outright control have been exercised through the years. Rather than "work itself out of a job," Senator MALONE explains, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has asked for increasingly greater appropriations through the years to administer wider and wider powers over the Indians in their role of wards of the Federal Government.

I was particularly interested in the section of Senator MALONE's statement dealing with the Wind River Reservation in my own State of Wyoming. It so happens that I was one of a four-member special subcommittee who visit-

ed the Arapaho Ranch on that reservation just a few weeks ago, during the recent recess of the House, to hear testimony on charges of mismanagement leveled at the ranch manager by a former employee. I do not intend to discuss that testimony in detail here and at this time. But I do wish to point out that this hearing underscored the lack of control exercised by the Arapaho Indians in the management of their own affairs. Directly or indirectly, the Bureau of Indian Affairs holds the whip hand in the management and operation of the Arapaho Ranch, and the Indians themselves not only have no control of the ranch management, but indeed very few Indians even are employed on the ranch, none in key positions.

Witnesses for the ranch management testified that Indians had not been given key positions because none could be found who were capable of filling such positions. But there was no evidence presented which showed that any concerted effort has been, or is being, made to train Indians for those posts. Just how can the Indians be expected to become capable if they are offered no opportunity and given no incentive to learn?

It is my belief, shared by Senator MALONE, that the Indians given equal opportunity, are capable of managing their own affairs with a minimum of assistance. If a real effort were made to help the Indians help themselves, it would be a surprisingly short time before those people could take their proper place in American affairs. Rather, they have been kept in a subservient position, blocks have been thrown in way of their advancement.

The Indian should be given the opportunity to increase his earning power, and to enjoy the fruits thereof. He should be afforded the opportunity to better himself in his own way and to the best of his ability.

The original purpose of Federal control over Indian affairs should be followed, as a diminishing thing. Instead, in recent years, most efforts have been exerted with a view to perpetuation of ward status of the American Indian.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House the statement of Senator MALONE, which starts on page 11911 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Saturday, September 22, 1951.

**A Government Must Be Above Suspicion
To Be Trusted****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "We Need Another Theodore Roosevelt to Clean House in Washington," as appearing on September 14,

1951, in the San Rafael Independent-Journal, published at San Rafael, Calif.

Nearly every day, now, we pick up a newspaper or magazine and read of another Government employee or person in high political circles being charged with misconduct in connection with official duties.

Because the charges have been made does not necessarily mean they are true. However, an investigation naturally results, and the publicity surrounding the charges has a demoralizing effect upon the general public.

One scandal after another concerning the integrity of high officials can only lead to mistrust and suspicion. If our people cannot have complete confidence in their leaders, our country can suffer irreparable harm.

It would appear that we need men of the caliber of Theodore Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge who enforced the laws to their fullest extent, removing those persons from public office who did not fully live up to the trust placed in them by the people.

I believe the editorial referred to above is very appropriate in this regard, and is indicative of the thinking of the public wherein unqualified persons holding high positions in Government are concerned. It is as follows:

WE NEED ANOTHER THEODORE ROOSEVELT TO CLEAN HOUSE IN WASHINGTON

We are reminded that on this day, September 14, 1901, Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States.

We only wish that there was another T. R. on the horizon, but we'll come to that later.

The feeling of the country was indeed mixed when "The Big Stick" took office. The majority of the people had high hopes of some needed reforms.

But party bigwigs, while pretending to cheer with the people, actually were nursing dark fears. Suppose the pugnacious charger of San Juan Hill kept all his campaign promises? One of them in particular kept them awake at nights. Even caused some of his behind-the-scenes supporters to wake up screaming.

Theodore Roosevelt had promised to appoint only men who were qualified for their jobs and who were unassailably honest. Not in the loose term politicians have applied for ages—the ability to stay on the fresh-air side of jails. But honest in the strictest sense of the word. As a candidate stumping throughout the country, T. R. had bore down on the old-fashioned meaning of honesty with all his Rooseveltian weight, which was considerable.

Most of the party leaders wanted Government to continue by crony, by party hackism and by favoritism.

Every ward heeler, every national chairman of the party, every State and National leader, every Senator secretly hoped that T. R. would make an exception in his case when he threatened to replace every hack with a qualified public servant.

Even a Supreme Court justice entertained this illusion when he went to see T. R. about his son.

"Prove his fitness for the job," T. R. was heard to bellow.

A Senator wanted to retain one of his friends in office, a reliable person at campaign time but not so reliable at other times. The Senator even buttressed his request with a signed resignation from the doubtful one.

When T. R. saw the resignation, he said, "Splendid," and called for his secretary.

"Wire him immediately that I accept his resignation."

The great editorial voice of that era—William Allen White, of the *Emporia Gazette*—recorded for history the effects of this new and refreshing policy. He wrote:

"The turning down of crooked men by the President, even in Kansas, has done wonders to brace up the moral tone of the State. It makes clean politics everywhere. There is no doubt that in the purchase of good influence, President Roosevelt's new rule has been an admirable investment."

And then Allen added, "There is no doubt that the country has not had in a generation such a moral uplift as it is having under the administration of President Roosevelt. And all because of one simple rule he has made in appointing men to office—that they must be morally clean before the recommendation of any Senator or Congressman can secure their appointment."

Would that we could editorially point with cheer in this year of our Lord 1951, to a new resolve in the White House to appoint only qualified men. Honest men. And a resolve to clean house of incumbents who were neither honest nor qualified. What an exodus from Washington, D. C., there would be of conniving, grasping, petty ward heelers and baggy-bottomed politicians from Missouri.

As we said at the start, we recall Theodore Roosevelt's inaugural on September 14, 1901, with a great deal of wishfulness.

Stockpiling Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if any portion of our 1951 cotton crop is to be stockpiled by the Munitions Board, as has been urged in many quarters, it should be stockpiled solely because reserves of quality cotton are necessary to meet our defense needs of the future.

As evidence of the quality of the current crop, I submit two statements given to me last week. The first is based on tests at the United States Government laboratory at Stoneville, Miss., and by two reputable private testing firms. The second statement is in the form of a letter from Mr. W. M. Garrard, Sr., general manager of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association of Greenwood, Miss., the largest cotton cooperative in the country. Mr. Garrard is widely recognized as one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the grade, staple, and quality of cotton.

The statements follow:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1951.

Based on fiber and spinning tests made by the United States Government and private laboratories, the 1951 cotton crop harvested thus far is of the highest quality in many years from several standpoints. With few exceptions, tests made by United States Government laboratories on cottons from widely scattered points where harvesting is well under way, indicate that the fiber-breaking strength is from 6,000 to 12,000 pounds per square inch higher than last year. Uni-

formity and fineness have also been more desirable and much improved over last year. The number of neps is also much lower than usually expected. The exceptions are on those samples from known extreme drought areas of low production.

The two private laboratories contacted on this matter confirmed the above findings. These two laboratories normally test thousands of samples from all over the belt for both the trade and many spinning mills. Reports to date indicate that the 1951 crop is the best recorded, from a fiber-property standpoint, since the newer methods of testing have been used. Results indicate that breaking strength over the belt is averaging about 7,000 pounds per square inch over the 1950 crop.

(Source: United States Testing Co., Memphis, Tenn.; Barrow-Agee Laboratory, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.; U. S. Government Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss.)

STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

Greenwood, Miss., September 19, 1951.

HON. FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Briefly stating my observations on stockpiling for the Armed Forces, let me say that the official record developed at the Government's Stoneville laboratory indicates the breaking strength on Mississippi Delta cotton this year gives an average of 85,458 pounds per square inch. This average was obtained by testing samples that were sent to Stoneville from 48 various sections of the Mississippi Delta.

The laboratory also reported splendid uniformity in fiber and a Micronaire average of 4.4 for fineness. The nep count was not determined, as there are no facilities at Stoneville for obtaining nep count. This high breaking strength, uniformity, and fineness, as well as the fact that the lint is much freer from neps than usual, indicates the current crop is the finest quality crop that has been grown in this section in the past 10 years.

Furthermore, all the tests that have been made that we have received or heard of indicate the quality of the crop in the Cotton Belt is practically equal to the quality or spinning value of the Mississippi Delta cotton.

Government specifications for both yarn and cloth, as well as other fabrics used by the Government, are extremely exacting, so much so that the growth in many years is unsuitable for Government cotton material, due to the exacting requirements of Government orders.

Last year our Delta crop, as well as the crop from other sections, was definitely deficient in spinning value and would not have met Government Armed Forces specifications.

The staple on the cotton throughout the entire belt is a trifle shorter in length than normal, due to the extremely hot weather during the late summer. However, Government orders do not usually require cotton any longer in staple than is being produced this year, and as the quality of the crop is so superior to the crops normally grown, it becomes an ideal crop for stockpiling.

The cotton that is stockpiled may not be used for several years. It is a well-known fact that cotton does not deteriorate in the bale where it is properly warehoused, so if this crop is stockpiled by the Government, the Government can be assured of having a quality of cotton that will be suitable in every way to be used on Government contracts for cotton material.

There is a surplus of cotton this year. There may not be a surplus next year or the

following year, and there is certainly no way of ascertaining the quality of future crops, but this year when there is a surplus and when the quality is superior, it does seem an ideal time for the Armed Forces to stockpile a certain portion of their future needs of cotton.

Yours very truly,

W. M. GARRARD,
General Manager.

Letter of Hon. Guy George Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter which Chairman Guy George Gabrielson, of the Republican National Committee, sent to Senator CLYDE R. HOEY, chairman of the Senate committee investigating RFC matters.

It will be noted that, immediately upon being informed that his name had been mentioned in connection with RFC matters, he wired the chairman of the committee asking permission to appear and testify under oath. Mr. Gabrielson also came to Washington the same evening his name was mentioned in the Senate so that he would be available to testify the next day. Upon being notified by Senator HOEY that he could not be heard immediately, Mr. Gabrielson sent the following letter setting forth pertinent information on the subject, which I feel should be made available to all readers of the RECORD:

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: I regret that your subcommittee is unable to hear me today. Since delay would only accentuate the rumors and innuendo concerning my business relations with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I am submitting the basic facts to the subcommittee in this letter, which I am also releasing to the press. I again request the privilege of appearing under oath at the subcommittee's earliest convenience to answer all questions, and appreciate your assurance that the opportunity will be forthcoming.

The rumors and innuendo are unfounded. I am convinced they have been spread deliberately to confuse the public in the hope of protecting crooks within and without the Truman administration. Because I am chairman of the Republican National Committee, those circulating these rumors and innuendo would blacken a reputation for morality and integrity built up over 60 years. They stop at nothing in their frantic efforts to protect their corrupt hides from the political and legal repercussions of their wrongdoing.

This campaign of blackguarding—and the timing is important—was launched in a libelous attack under congressional immunity 3 days after I made a political address at Elgin, Illinois, discussing the shocking moral climate of the Truman administration and urging voters to turn the rascals out.

Shortly thereafter, on last March 27, I released to the press a six-page letter addressed to all Republican leaders detailing the facts surrounding an \$18,500,000 loan to

Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., of which I am president and general counsel. I recapitulated these facts as follows.

"The RFC loans to Carthage Hydrocol were all granted before I became chairman of the Republican National Committee. The first loan was granted before I became the company's president. In connection with the loan my part and the part of my firm was in assisting in the preparation of the loan application and in discussing the application with the staff of RFC. Neither influence nor pressure were used in obtaining the loans. The compensation I have received was solely for legitimate services as legal counsel and president. In no manner, directly or indirectly, have I received a fee or any other compensation for securing the RFC loan. I have no financial interest in the company. I am proud to be its president and to participate in the development of a new industry with tremendous potentials to our national defense and the utilization of a natural resource."

The March 27 letter also explained prophetically that I was giving all the facts because "this is not the first time, nor will it be the last as long as I am in politics, that it will be used as the basis for an attempted smear."

Those who would destroy my reputation to save themselves were unable to challenge these facts, so the attack shifted. Now they insinuate that because I am the unpaid chairman of the Republican national committee, it is improper for me to carry out my duties as president of a huge new industry, for which I am paid a salary of \$15,000 a year and a retainer of \$10,000 a year to my law firm—both approved by the RFC.

Had I desired to shirk my responsibilities to stockholders who have now invested nearly \$29,000,000 in this company, and to the taxpayers whose Government loaned an additional \$18,500,00 which must be repaid before the stockholders start getting their money back, it would have been easy to do so.

I could have followed the all-too-customary practice of retaining a former administration official, or a friend or law partner of an administration official, to represent Carthage Hydrocol in discussions with the company's banker—the RFC. The testimony before your subcommittee indicates that this might have been to the company's advantage.

But I am proud to say that neither my stockholders nor myself desired influence or advantage. We wanted the continuing problems which arise between banker (the RFC) and debtor (Carthage Hydrocol) settled solely on the basis of merit. It was obvious that merit alone would be the criterion when, in addition to being the Carthage Hydrocol president, I was also active in Republican politics and eventually became Republican national chairman.

It was also my duty, to the best of my ability, to do everything within my power to preserve the security of this Government loan in conducting the affairs of the company. I have been its president for 5 years, and have an intimate knowledge of its problems and potentials.

Of course I have discussed the affairs of the company with RFC officials since becoming Republican chairman. The RFC properly maintains a continuing check on the activities of the companies it helps to finance. The approval of RFC must be obtained for many steps in the operation of the business, routine and otherwise. A total of 30 resolutions and letters of amendment involving Carthage Hydrocol have been issued since the loans were granted, 10 of them since I became Republican chairman.

When the RFC was administered by a board, members were given various loans to police. Mr. Harvey Gunderson was assigned to Carthage Hydrocol, and on at least two occasions I discussed with him and his tech-

nical staff the progress of construction, details of financing, and other matters in which the RFC had a proper interest. I did this not as a Republican chairman, but as the president of a business entrusted with large sums of private as well as government capital. It was my duty to do all in my power to make these investments secure.

I have called on Mr. W. Stuart Symington twice since he became RFC Administrator. My purpose was to request him to order a thorough check of all RFC files relating to Carthage Hydrocol. I asked that if he found anything improper, to say so publicly, and if he did not, to also say so publicly. I still hope that he will do so, and if he does not, I hope that your subcommittee will ask him to do so.

On one of these calls, during a discussion of additional funds to be supplied by stockholders, I told him that the executive committee of Carthage Hydrocol might apply for a 1-year postponement in the start of repayments on the principal of the RFC loans. Interest payments have been met and will be met when due. The purpose of our application for deferment of the principal repayments conformed to the spirit of the loan application. We have encountered mechanical failures in operation of the plant, and we desired to conserve its working capital to protect the soundness of the Government's investment. Mr. Symington indicated he favored a different approach, and if that is decision, our stockholders will see that the repayments are made as scheduled. But even should this application be granted, it doesn't represent any compromise or reduction in either interest or the loan principal. No request has been made, nor will be made, for an increase in the loan.

Now how absurd can blackguarding get? As the chairman of a party out of power since 1933, I certainly had no voice in naming the RFC Board or its present Administrator. The Republican National Committee isn't consulted on appointments to office in this administration. Nobody in the administration owes me anything, except understandable resentment that my party and I are doing our utmost to expose the graft and corruption, and the moral and ethical decline shown to exist by the already established record.

Can this subcommittee, or anyone else, explain how I could be expected to exert influence or receive a favor? Am I to be tarred with the stick of opprobrium properly applied to those in high public or political office who are in a position to render favors, and who accept huge fees for those favors?

I submit that partisan politics exceeds its bounds when it attempts to destroy integrity and reputation without justification. For this reason, I renew my request for the earliest possible hearing by this subcommittee, and I submit that after hearing all the facts, the subcommittee has a nonpartisan obligation to tell the people the truth.

Sincerely yours,

GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON

Code of Ethics for Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on September 13 to 15, 1951, the North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs held their annual convention at Carolina Beach, N. C. Among the resolutions adopted was a report from the State YDC committee on

political ethics. This report resulted in the adoption of the following resolution on a code of ethics for political campaigns, which, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Be it resolved, That the members of the North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs accept a code of ethics for political campaigns as a standard and guide for their own individual conduct during campaigns; and be it further

"Resolved, That a code of ethics for political campaigns be recommended to the public as a guide and standard for proper political conduct."

The committee submits the following:

"A CODE OF ETHICS FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS"

"This code of political conduct is submitted to the stewardship of the newspapers and radio stations of North Carolina, to be used periodically as an influence on public opinion in the maintenance of proper and ethical conduct by those campaigning for public office.

"Elections must be conducted with the view of obtaining honest and able officers to exercise the will and serve the good of the democracy, and this cannot be achieved if campaigns are to degenerate to name calling, character assassination, and deliberate distortion of fact. A fair and honest presentation of the issues should be more important to every candidate than the winning of public office.

"It is hoped that the responsible leadership of all parties will insist on adherence to this code, and that the press and radio will bring to the attention of the public this code at the beginning of all political campaigns, during the course of campaigns when violations occur, and on the eve of every election.

"No code of conduct or set of rules for human behavior can be all inclusive, nor does this code of ethics particularize all political behavior which is unethical. This code is prepared as a permanent reminder to candidates and to the voting public that honor and fairness in the method of obtaining public office are essential to the fulfillment of our democratic institutions, and that an unprincipled, dishonest, or unethical campaigner is unfit for public office.

"I

"It shall be deemed unethical to use, or allow to be used, written or verbal, any statements or material against an opponent consisting of falsehoods, half-truths, misleading statements designed to imply rather than inform, composite and misleading pictures, or distortions of fact in any manner or degree. If any charge against an opponent's character or motives must be made, it should be direct, specific, and open, by the candidate in person.

"II

"It shall be deemed unethical to use, or allow to be used, back-street tactics, or gossip, rumor, or whispering campaigns which suggest anything detrimental about an opponent, or the opponent's connections or associations. The only ethical conduct for a candidate, faced with such improper conduct on the part of any of his supporters, or anybody acting in his support, shall be to (1) openly disassociate himself and discredit the rumor and the tactics, or (2) openly and directly make the charges or statements being circulated by such improper tactics.

"III

"A candidate is responsible for all campaign literature or advertisements published in his behalf, and it shall be deemed unethical for advertisements or campaign literature to be issued except over the name of the candidate, the name of one of his campaign managers, or a committee appointed by him for such purpose.

"IV

"It shall be deemed unethical to make any appeal, of any nature, in any degree, to racial, religious, or other prejudices. It shall be deemed unethical to stir up fear and distrust between the races, or to inject in any manner or degree the question of race relations since a discussion of race relations during a political campaign can serve no good purpose. An appeal to prejudice is not an appeal to reason, is deliberately a design to mislead and confuse, and is directly contrary to the standards set by the great leaders of North Carolina since the turn of the century.

"This is not to be interpreted as a denial of the right to discuss direct political issues which might involve race relations, and if any such issues are involved, in order to avoid the dangerous possibility of having prejudice inundate reason, it shall be deemed unethical to inject the issue other than as follows: The candidate shall publish his official statement, regarding such issue, consisting of (1) a clear, concise, open, specific charge as to any position he feels his opponent or opponents might have toward the issue pertaining to race relations; and (2) a clear, concise, open, specific statement of his own position. This will enable the voting public to have a full and fair picture of the issues involved, while avoiding the injection of appeals to prejudice by whispers, innuendo, half-truths, and falsehoods.

"V

"Elections must not be bought and sold, and any attempt to purchase influence or votes is unethical. Specifically the practice of paying any sum for votes, or any sum to any person for influence, is unethical. It shall be considered unethical to continue the practice of paying ward workers to transport voters beyond the actual cost of such transportation. The putting out of sums of money in every ward or precinct is expensive and enforces an evasion and violation of the statutes regulating campaign expenditures. It places premium on money rather than the issues and the ability and character of the candidates. It should be stopped, and it shall be deemed unethical for a candidate, or the supporter of any candidate, to expend, or allow to be expended, money in such a manner.

"VI

"Finally, no code of conduct is obligatory, and none has been universally adopted. A code of ethics is a guide for those who desire to conduct themselves properly. This code of ethics is a spotlight for the public in illuminating improper and unethical political conduct, and a simple reminder to all that principles of religion, honest common decency, and fair play should govern political campaigns."

The Death of Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the New Leader of September 10, 1951, entitled "The Death of Heroes":

THE DEATH OF HEROES

(The Secret Army, by Bor-Komarowski, reviewed by Stephen Naft, former member of

the Polish Socialist Party, author of Questions for Communists.)

In this story of the life and death of the Polish "underground" army, its supreme commander, General Bor-Komarowski, tells of the heroic deeds of the army formed after the total destruction of Poland's regular forces in 1939.

Composed of untrained civilians, old men, women, and schoolboys, formed with an initial capital of \$3,600, with no arms, no arsenals, no munition factories, the Polish Home Army finally reached 380,000 fighters. They obtained their arms by attacking, with home-made bombs, isolated Nazi army and police outposts; during the Nazi occupation, they succeeded in derailing 700 trains, damaging 6,930 locomotives, 19,000 railway carriages, and 4,326 trucks, sabotaging 4,700 airplanes, blowing up 38 bridges, and executing 5,733 Nazis, most of whom had been previously condemned to death in secret session by the Polish underground for atrocities committed against Polish civilians. This in addition to 25,000 casualties inflicted on the enemy in open combat while losing only 15,000 men.

But of still greater significance is the attitude of the Kremlin and the Polish Communists toward the Polish people fighting for its freedom against the common enemy after 1941. The Polish Communists made no move against the Nazis while they were Stalin's allies, but joined the fight—in small, separate armed groups—when Russia was attacked. On July 29, 1944, when the Red army stood across the river before Warsaw, the Kremlin appealed to the Poles to rise against the Nazis. The appeals were printed in leaflets dropped from Soviet airplanes and worded very emphatically: "Poles, the time of liberation is at hand. Poles to arms."

Every Polish homestead must become a stronghold in the struggle against the invader. There is not a moment to lose." Convinced that the Soviet army would come to their assistance against the incomparably better armed Nazis, the Poles were soon bitterly disillusioned. While Nazi tanks and airplanes gradually destroyed the city in 63 days of fighting, the Red army calmly observed the extermination from across the river without moving a finger. They even refused to let British and American planes, ready to aid the Poles, land on territory occupied by the Red army. Stalin, bent on the destruction of Poland, was pleased to have the Nazis do the dirty work of physical extermination, and when the fighting Poles' munitions ran out, the Bolsheviks denounced them as adventurers and provocateurs.

After the defeat of the Nazis in the west and the occupation of Warsaw by the Red army, Stalin was proclaimed the liberator of Warsaw and Poland, and Nazi terror was followed by Communist terror. Thousands of the surviving prominent Poles, potential leaders of a future resurrected Poland, professors, scientists, doctors, lawyers, former government officials and administrators, and officers simply disappeared—spurious verschwinden—never to be heard of again.

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a Neckyoke Jones Says column published in the

Sheridan (Wyo.) Press on September 12, 1951:

NECKYOKE JONES SAYS

"Did you seen where Hightail Harry Truman sez the good ol' U. S. is simply rollin' in wealth?" I requires of Greesewood. "I seen that," he refines, "but that ain't the way I hearn it. Accordin' to a hull passel of fellers who kinda knows the score—some of the things which Harry thinks is assets is about like havin' a second mortgage on a band of antelope. The figgers show that what Harry is blowin' make FDR's spendin' look like little casino. Harry's steamboat is costin' taxpayers over quarter of a millyun a year—which makes livin' a life on the briney-o kinda expensive. There is talk of a lot more taxes—and ifen things is so rosey for wyo do they figger on boostin' the ante? The govmint is borryin' more money—why? Ol' Seniter bird of Verginney—who is a Demmycrat has called the turn on spendin'. Seniter Joe O My Honey of Wyomin' says the govmint has got to quit spendin' extravagant like—but O My Honey allus votes for the full amount of every thing Hightail asts for. It ain't hard to unnersstand now how come a neetle store in Independence, Mizsourey, went busted." Greesewood is a reglier fyncianler. Hoplin' you are the same, I am,

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

The Greenwood Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Indianola (Miss.) Enterprise, the Nation's newest daily newspaper.

The people of Indianola, Miss., have enthusiastically joined in the Greenwood plan, originated in Greenwood, S. C., and described to the House a few weeks ago by our colleague, Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN.

The editorial follows:

JOIN THE BATTLE AGAINST WORLD COMMUNISM

This is an invitation to every American to join in the battle against world communism. To give local citizens this opportunity the chamber of commerce has organized a Greenwood plan committee with John Henry Price, Jr., chairman, Mrs. Norma Lewis, W. W. Gresham, Chick Hosch, and Jim Billings. This committee has been set up to stimulate thinking and solicit ideas on how best to pierce the iron curtain and promote world freedom and peace. For clarity in our strategy, we must be clear in our own thinking on the subject. We must learn to draw a sharp line between the dictatorships and the peoples being dictated to. Every time we assail the Russians or the Poles or the Hungarians when we mean their masters, we are playing into the Kremlin's hands. It was primarily the German failure to make such a differentiation that drove the Russians, as the war progressed, to rally around the regime they hated. "If Russian people had a voice in the government of Russia," President Truman said recently, "I am sure we would have no trouble in getting along with them." And last year Governor Dewey in one of his campaign speeches declared: "The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of the So-

viet Union. * * * We know they are not the authors of the Kremlin's aggressive ambitions. They're its victims." Russia, like the small nations under its heel, is in effect an occupied country. Democratic statesmen should grasp this central fact—and let the oppressed peoples know that they have grasped it. From this time forward they must speak loudly and clearly to the masses in Communist areas over the heads of their governments. They must use every occasion to assert—

That they do not blame the Russian people for the peace-wrecking tactics of the Kremlin clique;

That credit for Russia's war record belongs to its population, not to Stalin nor his gang.

That our concern for human rights does not stop short at the iron curtain but embraces the Soviet masses;

That we share the aspirations of the Russian people for freedom and are eager to help them earn it.

That we seek the friendship of the Russian people.

Thus, taking a leaf from the Bolshevik book, we shall begin to forge a united front with these people for peace and democracy.

The United Nations and other international bodies providing resonant sounding boards for reaching world opinion. The Communists are past masters in exploiting such opportunities, and we have given them little if any competition. But once we shed our inhibitions, we can beat them at their own game.

We must find the means and the wisdom to carry to Stalin's victims the truth that we seek, not enmity and war but friendship and peace; that we have no purpose beyond their liberation.

Write down your ideas for broadcast behind the iron curtain. Any personal incidents that prove the American way of life, and hand them to any one of the committee members.

There will be international prizes offered for the best ideas. All entry must be into the chamber of commerce office by October 12.

The Military Boot on the Other Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time when House and Senate conferees are meeting to try to iron out differences in the huge appropriation bill for the National Military Establishment, the following editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, the leading newspaper of Wisconsin's capital city, is most pertinent and timely.

So far as I have been able to find out, Defense Department officials did not present any new or sensational information to the Senate committee to justify a \$5,000,000,000 increase. It is time the scare technique in appropriations is brought to a halt.

The editorial follows:

THE MILITARY BOOT ON THE OTHER FOOT

Democratic Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is using an old Truman administration trick when he charges that anyone who debates or questions the \$61,000,000,000 military budget is playing into the hands of the Communist enemy.

That gag is covered with moss.

It works like this:

Mr. Truman or one of his bureau chiefs makes a request for a huge sum of money. With the request go dire warnings that something horrible will happen unless every single penny is quickly and meekly appropriated by Congress.

Never—no matter how fantastic the financial demand—must there be a question. Vote all the money, or Russia will attack, or prices will rise, or we'll nosedive into an economic depression.

Congress—notably Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois—fought nobly this week in an attempt to make reasonable economies in the military budget.

DOUGLAS raised the question of whether administrative officers should receive flight pay. He suggested that military-travel allowances should be no more than the money actually spent. He thought that \$2,900,000,000 was quite a bit for expediting production.

These are reasonable observations, but the Truman administration spokesman, Senator O'MAHONEY, used the same old technique of trying to frighten fellow Congressmen into giving the administration its way. Senator O'MAHONEY says he wants to avoid substituting our judgment for that of the trained military experts.

It's a funny business. In the MacArthur case, the Truman administration belloyed that civilian control of the Military Establishment was absolutely vital. But when the Military Establishment wants money, a civilian Congress is ordered to appropriate the cash without question.

Dark Clouds Over Fair Macedonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, early this month approximately 1,500 Americans of Macedonian descent from the United States and Canada attended a meeting at Columbus, Ohio, which saw that group calling for a free Macedonia under the protectorate of the United Nations.

Mr. Metody Chanoff, of Canton, Ohio, was reelected president of the central committee of the Macedonian Political Organization. This six-man committee is made up of American Macedonians from Missouri, Michigan, Indiana, and Canada.

On September 2, 1951, an address was delivered to the meeting by Dr. F. K. Kruger, of Valparaiso University. I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to include in my remarks the address by Dr. Kruger.

DARK CLOUDS OVER FAIR MACEDONIA

(Address given by Dr. F. K. Kruger, of Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., at the thirtieth annual convention of the Macedonian Political Organization of the United States and Canada, on September 2, 1951, in Columbus, Ohio.)

Once again you have invited me to address your annual convention as a guest speaker, and I want to assure you that I appreciate the honor which you have conferred upon me.

Many years have passed since I was with you at a similar occasion, and the face of the world has changed considerably—unfortunately not for the better. Today that part of the world which is still free and that

which is enchained against its will are faced with a terrible menace, more frightening than any one of us has experienced in his lifetime. There exists an old Latin phrase which, with reference to the spiritual aspirations of mankind, says: "Ex oriente lux—i. e., out of the east comes light." But today we are compelled to say, "Out of the east comes darkness." You know, of course, that I refer to the terror of communism. It makes little difference in principle whether this dark cloud, the harbinger of terrifying thunder and devastating lightning, which threatens to engulf not only central and Western Europe, but eventually the whole world, hangs over Russia and her satellites or over a country which calls itself Yugoslavia, but which should properly be designated Greater Serbia. The man who for the time being rules that unhappy land, namely Tito, has again and again after his break with his former master, Stalin, avowed that he has remained a true Communist who is determined in the long run to carry out the program of communism among all the people who are in his power. This is one very good reason why American citizens of Macedonian birth or descent, who love the country of their adoption and the principles for which it stands, a country where thousands of them with their children have found a haven of refuge from the tyranny of past and present Serbian overlords—this, I say, is a strong reason why they oppose Tito's rule and ardently wish and hope to see their folks across the ocean released from his yoke.

I know that in spite of alluring invitations to join Stalin's or Tito's wonderful communism, they have, with the exception of a negligible few deluded or ambitious persons, from the very beginning steadfastly rejected Stalin's ideology and held to the American and Canadian, that is, the western way of life, the life of freemen.

Communism is absolutely and without the slightest reservation rejected and attacked by your Macedonian organization in this our country, and your organization is the true representative body of the spirit of Macedonian patriots in their homeland. You know who the so-called leaders of Communist Macedonia of today are. Did you find their names recorded in the past struggle for the freedom of your people? No, they were foreigners to the liberation movement of your countrymen, of whom many sacrificed their possessions and their very lives for the noble cause of freedom and justice. The rulers of the communistic regime in Macedonia are Macedonians only by accident of birth, but in their hearts they are self-seeking tools of the communistic dictators in Belgrade, educated and trained in either Belgrade or Moscow. Most of them have only recently arrived on the stage of Macedonia by the grace of the little Caesar in Belgrade, their words are prompted by him, and the strings of the actions of those puppets are manipulated by him.

We know what the so-called paradise of the Communists is. The majority of the Americans and Canadians of Macedonian descent are religious people. They believe that Christianity is and should be a vital part of our civilization. But what do the Communists think of religion? It can be summarized in the sentence coined by Karl Marx, the Allah of communism, repeated by Lenin, his prophet, and subscribed to by Tito, the ardent disciple of Marx and Lenin, "Religion," so Marx exclaimed, "is opium for the people." Lenin said in 1905: "Our program necessarily includes the propaganda of atheism." And in 1909 Lenin wrote as follows, "Marx said 'religion is opium for the people'—and this postulate is the cornerstone of the whole philosophy of Marxism with regard to religion." Finally, the program of the Communist International, adopted at the sixth world congress of communism stated: "One of the most im-

portant tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the wide masses is the task of systematically combating religion—the opium of the people." How then, I ask, can any Christian subscribe to Tito's rule?

Another reason for the rejection of Tito's dictatorial rule over Macedonia is his treatment of the agrarian question. Macedonia is a land inhabited for the most part by peasants. About 80 percent of its population is engaged in agriculture or the raising of cattle. In spite of the desire of the Communist government in Belgrade to industrialize that part of Macedonia which is under its rule and in spite of all the special privileges granted to industry at the expense of agriculture, such industrialization has not proceeded far, even though there has been some increase in the tobacco manufacturing and the antimony, chrome, and quartz mining of the Skopje region. The fate of the small self-reliant farmers of Macedonia under Tito's communistic regime is not much different from that of the peasantry in Russia and its satellite states. The peasants are cajoled and pushed hard and relentlessly to make impossibly large contributions to the Belgrade government in order to support industry and for the purpose of forcing them to abandon their small private landholdings and to become dependent farm laborers on the collectivized state farms, where they are exploited by the Communist functionaries.

An American correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune sent a wireless report of the condition of the Macedonian peasants to his newspaper which was printed by that paper in its issue of May 29, 1951. We quote from his report made after investigations on the spot "Many peasants in Yugoslavia," so the report reads, "are in a bitter mood over the Communist collective farms set up extensively in this region. In Strumica peasants who had been in collectives for 5 years laughed at the idea they had joined voluntarily. Some stated they wanted to quit their collective but could not. They left reporters suddenly when militiamen appeared in the distance. A down-and-out peasant said, 'We pray day and night that this will be over. We work like horses, and they give us nothing. What should we live for? We should throw ourselves into the Vardar River'."

Two reports to the New York Times of July 26 and 28 by its correspondent in Belgrade, Mr. M. S. Handler, confirm the situation as reported by his colleague of the Herald Tribune. Tito's government is alarmed over the movement of the peasants to leave the collective farms, especially in Croatia and Macedonia. Mr. Handler says in his cautiously worded cablegram from Belgrade: "The Yugoslav Communist Party believes, as all other Communist Parties, that a Socialist state must be based upon the alliance of peasants and workers, and this can be achieved only through socialized agriculture and nationalized industry. Therefore the party feels that any trend among the peasants to abandon collective farming can be regarded only as a direct attack upon the Socialist economic system and a danger that must be combated."

There is in Macedonia the same story as in the Russian-ruled eastern part of Germany, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. The peasant of Eastern Europe has his roots in the soil which he and his ancestors have tilled for generations. He is proud of the small property of land which he owns and which he desires to pass on to his children.

Tito's statement that he intends to leave the peasants in possession of their farms if they so desire is a deliberate lie. Under existing circumstances he might feel it wise to go slower than some other Communist countries, but let nobody be deceived; as an avowed Communist he will eventually col-

lectivize all farms and reduce the free peasants to unhappy slave laborers on the land of their forefathers.

Furthermore, Tito is obviously a supernaturalistic Communist. In this respect he is in no way different from the Karageorgevich kings of old Serbia and their "black hand." Tito's ambition is the same as was theirs, viz, to keep the Croats, Slovenians, and Macedonians under his iron rule against their will. He wants to assimilate them by force and alienate them from their chosen way of life and their cherished traditions; he wants to make them subservient to the foreign as well as the domestic policy of Serbia; he denies the non-Serbian people in his state the right of self-determination, a right which our glorious American Declaration of Independence terms a natural and inalienable right of all human beings. I am sure that the Macedonian Organization of the United States and Canada is perfectly willing to abide by the majority decision of the Macedonian people themselves, provided it is expressed through a truly free popular election, or in other words by such a procedure as is customary in our own United States.

We have the assurance of our United States State Department that the present support of the Tito government will be extended to it only as long it is willing to oppose the mutual enemy, the Russia of the Communist Kremlin. The United States is not inclined to repeat its previous mistake and to replace uncle Joe by cousin Tito. In an official bulletin, called Aid to Yugoslavia and issued in November 1950, our United States Department of State, while explaining at length its aid to Tito, says definitely and clearly: "Since Yugoslavia announced in 1948 that it would no longer submit to domination by the Kremlin, the United States has been extending limited economic assistance. This does not mean that the United States approves or endorses the internal policies of the Yugoslav Government."

The American and Canadian citizens of Macedonian descent, as stated previously, are no less determined opponents of the communistic rule of the Kremlin than Tito. They even trump his card. For they are opposed to any kind of communism, including Tito's. And with great satisfaction they have taken notice of the official and explicit announcement of our United States Department of State that our Government does not approve or endorse the internal policies of the Belgrade regime.

On February 11, 1951, some 200 representative exiles from 10 countries of Communist Europe, including refugees from Yugoslavia, issued a declaration of liberation, signed at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. This document is an echo of the American Declaration of Independence. It demands the restoration of man's natural rights to the people of Eastern Europe and their liberation from foreign rule. It goes on to say that "the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are firmly resolved, upon their liberation, to join the community of free nations and to establish government of the people, by the people and for the people."

I have the assurance of your leaders, my Macedonian fellow-American citizens, that for the well-being of your relatives and brothers-in-blood across the ocean, your organization subscribes to these aims, viz, to the establishment of a free and autonomous Macedonian state, which would arrange its domestic affairs according to democratic principles and which desires to live in peace with all its neighbors. An autonomous Macedonia would welcome to become a part of a Balkan confederation and of any honest and effective world organization for the peaceful development of mankind. For this goal, I understand, you are determined to work, as you have worked in the past, with all legal means at your disposal.

Let us hope that the day will not be far that many of you, now assembled in the capital of the State of Ohio, will witness the unveiling of a statute of liberty in the capital of a free and independent state of Macedonia.

Left-Wing Unmorality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, liberalism in its original concept was felt to be a movement which would benefit the people as a whole. Liberalism during the last 20 years in the United States has developed into a left-wing liberalism which is causing the original concepts of liberalism to fall into disrepute.

Liberalism was originally sold to the people of America as a panacea which would benefit the underprivileged of the country, and we have forgotten an accepted truth which the experience of the ages has proven, that the people are most in danger when the means of injuring their rights are in the possession of those of whom they entertain the least suspicion.

The new mode of left-wing liberalism espoused by the Democratic Party is bringing on despotism. In the words of Alexander Hamilton in the Federalist Papers, America must remember "that a more dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mark of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the people; commencing demagogues and ending tyrants."

David Lawrence, in his editorial of September 28 in U. S. News & World Report, entitled "Left-Wing Unmorality," has brought back to our present generation the importance of the advice of our founding fathers. Mr. Lawrence's editorial appears below:

LEFT-WING UNMORALITY

(By David Lawrence)

Time was when only the conservatives—the right-wing groups—were supposed to be guilty of using public funds and public authority as a means of exploiting the people. Special privilege, monopoly, graft in high places were the poisons against which liberalism and progressivism were recommended as a healthy antidote.

But now materialism has become bipartisan.

The left wing has been revealed to be composed largely of selfish, greedy groups with a lust for permanent power. For 20 years these groups have masqueraded under such alluring labels as the "New Deal" and the "Fair Deal." But they have been unmasked now as controlled by just another set of unscrupulous politicians who use public funds

for political propaganda and for vote-getting and feed their henchmen at the trough of taxpayers' money. The worthy achievements of liberalism have been sullied by a record of shocking indifference to graft and to the conduct of public business on a basis of favoritism.

The American people as they read almost daily the disclosures in Congress are indignant at the lack of morality shown by the party in power.

Left wingism started out years ago as the virtuous defender of human rights and liberties. It has become in America, in Britain, in Australia, and New Zealand a crass materialism which buys large blocs of votes in the electorate through special privileges extended to pressure groups and really ignores the long-range or over-all interest of the people.

"Left wingism" is now in the most dangerous stage of its evolution. It is impatient with the slow workings of democracy. It fails to understand that the science of good government is basically the art of adjusting majority and minority views with a tolerant rather than an intolerant attitude toward the minority.

"Left wingism" has arrived at the coercionist stage. It wants to limit free speech and abolish congressional immunity from libel because it really can't tolerate opposition criticism and what the great liberal, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once called "freedom of the thought we hate."

The President of the United States only last week intimated in a public speech that all publications which distribute to their subscribers by second class mail are disqualified from publishing editorial comments opposing the rates charged by his administration and disqualified also from criticizing any of his policies involving grants of taxpayer's money.

Left-wingism has eaten away from the operations of Government all semblance of true liberalism. President Truman still rants about his interest in the people but he has failed to clean out the corruption in his administration now disclosed to view by Congress.

Unlike President Coolidge, Republican, who appointed bipartisan attorneys of great prestige and gave them the green light to prosecute relentlessly the Teapot Dome scandals, Mr. Truman calls the recent revelations about his administration just a smear and misrepresentation. His spokesmen point to Republican scandals of the past as if this justifies what the Democrats are doing now. At his press conference last week Mr. Truman actually condoned the use of political influence by would-be borrowers of Government funds and said he saw nothing wrong in the flow of introductions to RFC officials given such borrowers by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and his corps of assistants and volunteer workers. He never made a graver mistake. For these are the insidious devices of machine politics. The appointees owe their jobs in many instances to recommendations by the Democratic national committeemen.

There is no evil so readily understood or so quickly repudiated by the American electorate than unmorality in public office. It was a Democratic President—Grover Cleveland—who proclaimed that public office is a public trust.

It looks, too, as if the Nation also has been to some extent infected by the end-justifies-the-means doctrine of the left wing. Cadets cheat at West Point and immediately there arises a wave of condemnation of the method of conducting the examinations or of the severity of the penalty. What kind of an America is this which makes excuses for dishonesty and rationalizes unmorality as natural behavior? With what kind of an opiate has left-wingism drugged us in the name of liberalism?

May America awake from its recent orgy in so-called liberalism. But let it not then permit the same sort of materialists to take over the Republican Party.

Let America insist instead that there be nominated on both tickets for President in 1952 two leaders—honest men, moral men—who really believe that public office is a public trust. We should elect as President a man who is ready to make every sacrifice to keep his administration clean by his devotion to a truly American ideal—old-fashioned honesty, old-fashioned decency, and old-fashioned morality.

Man and the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the annual meeting of the Kansas Crop Improvement Association at Manhattan, Kans., on February 2, 1950:

I am glad to be back out here in the heart of the Nation's bread basket and to have this opportunity of meeting with the Kansas Crop Improvement Association.

The plowing up of much of the virgin land of Kansas is still recent enough to be remembered by many. Production of wheat to help feed the allied armies of two world wars has effectively demonstrated the capacity of Kansas land to fill the breach in time of critical national need.

This Kansas land must be kept in good condition. It is basic to our welfare; it cannot be spared.

But drought and dust storms have shown us how nature can strike back when man takes the welfare of the land too much for granted and fails to protect it. So do gullies and stiff clay stripped of its topsoil.

If we are to have the production we want when we need it, and if we are to avoid dust storms and gullies and dwindling yields on erosion-denuded slopes, we must look closely to the future and the kind of relationship that will have to be maintained between man and the land. Nationally and world-wide, conservation of the land from now on is one of the really urgent, basic problems of our time—probably the most urgent. We who are living today and the next few generations to follow must learn the science of soil conservation and get the habit of practicing it as a technique essential to our continuing welfare. We must conserve our remaining supply of productive land while we use it. People are fast making up their minds to this. A few scattered obstructionists, for some strange purpose, are still delaying progress as well as their scheming permits. But their numbers are thinning.

It is not going to be enough to merely safeguard the land for the next 10 years or the next 100 years; we must safeguard it—conserve it—permanently. The alternative will be a falling standard of living, a declining civilization, hunger, famine, and international misunderstanding.

LESSONS FROM ABOARD

This lesson is brought home forcefully to anyone trained to observe such matters if he travels to some of the other countries of the world. There he will find it written on

much of the eroded land, and etched in the worried faces of people struggling to produce their food and other soil-derived necessities I have seen these things in different parts of the world. Last fall, I spent some time studying erosion conditions and soil and water conservation methods in southern France, Italy, and north Africa. I made the trip primarily in the hope of finding something that might be helpful in our own national program of soil conservation, feeling that we must not overlook anything of importance. I found very little, however, that we can make any use of under present conditions.

Over there, I observed the length that people will go in order to get a living from some of the world's oldest lands still in agricultural use, including costly and back-breaking measures for holding soil—such as the building of stone walls to support strips of steep land. We saw much wonderful work in parts of Italy and France, notably staircase benches supported by well-constructed rock walls, filled in behind with soil brought in by the basketful. The Italians—and French, too—are exceedingly skillful in the use of rock, not only in the construction of walls but for building structures for torrent control in the mountains.

The work required in establishing some of this bench type of agriculture, translated into our American labor costs, probably would amount in many instances to \$15,000 or \$20,000 an acre. Such an outlay on farm land clearly is out of the question for us, now or at any time we can foresee, even in the most eroded parts of the country. As a matter of fact, we are not in need of this type of conservation at this stage of our development, except in occasional special cases.

In Italy, along the roads we traveled, every available patch of land—practically every square foot—is in use. From the beaches of the Adriatic and the Mediterranean on up to the crests of the Apennines and the Alps, thousands of little patches are cultivated on slopes so dizzy steep I wouldn't venture into them. Practically every slope where man can hang on is in cultivation of some kind. Some of you—born and reared in Kansas—would be startled at the tedious and back-breaking effort which more often than not must go into any kind of agricultural production.

In the forested areas, when trees are cut, the leaves of oaks and some of the other trees are saved for stock feed, and the twigs, along with the weeds of the fields, are scrupulously saved and bundled for fuel. When you talk to an Italian about the cost of such operations, the reply is likely to be something like this: "Why consider the cost of food when to have it means life and not to have it means death?" Although we have not yet reached anything like that degree of land scarcity in this country, we still have to consider carefully the cost of our conservation work on the land. And we must, also, consider the greater cost—in dollars and human effort—if for any reason we should be so short-sighted as to postpone or upset in any way our going program of soil and water conservation, or to weaken or emasculate it with substitutes and magical remedies for speed or any other imagined advantage.

But in Italy where there is no rock, there are no rock walls—and for this reason most of the sloping land is without adequate protection. There is very little contouring, no strip cropping—not much in the way of modern soil and water conservation. Consequently, there is a great deal of subsoil farming, and erosion goes on eating into the very base of the nation's life.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

The term "conservation" has become a very popular word in our vocabulary during the past few years. In fact, it has become so popular that it is used rather loosely by some. Thus, some farmers may think they

are practicing "soil conservation" when they build a few terraces, construct a fish pond, pile rubbish in a gully and forget it, let a wheat field lie fallow for a season, or fertilize their land for this year's crop and forget it next year. These are only beginnings. True conservation must be total conservation, so far as the land is concerned. Soil conservation is not a job that you can do today and forget tomorrow; it must be maintained. It is not a job that you can do in one field and not do in the next field, when there is any natural relationship with respect to runoff from the adjoining areas. So, what is done at one place over the entire farm is done with the view that it may beneficially affect other parts of the farm or other farms downstream.

At this point I think it would be a good idea to explain what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation, which is spreading across the Nation with such steady and remarkable progress.

Modern soil conservation is based on sound land use and treatment of land with all the proven appropriate measures that are needed to keep it permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing, it means contouring, strip-cropping, and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover and green manure crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as may be feasible, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they are developed.

Modern soil conservation, moreover, consists of doing these and still other necessary things. Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for drainage; if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree-planting, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter; if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, it calls for drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls, also, for the use of the best of most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient and adaptable tools available to farmers.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil conservation education must be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. Moreover, modern soil conservations calls for the maintenance of all effective work which is put on the land. These painstakingly and scientifically planned and applied conservation measures are not just for a single year or cropping season. Like savings bonds or savings deposits in the bank, they increase in value and return on the original investment as the years go on.

ONLY ONE WAY TO DO THE JOB

In short, there is only one formula for doing the soil and water conservation job properly—scientifically. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production. This is nature's way. And it is the way the farmers of Kansas and the Nation are going about getting the conservation job done through their farmer-voted and farmer-managed soil conservation districts, set up under State enabling law. It is through these democratic units of State government, assisted by technicians of the

Soil Conservation Service and other agencies at the districts' request, that the big soil and water conservation job on the farm lands of the Nation is being done in an effective and lasting manner never before accomplished anywhere so far as I have been able to discover by critical examination of the situation in various countries and by examination of the literature of the world.

A PROGRAM OF CONSERVATION ACTION

To complete the soil- and water-conservation job in time—bringing conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every acre of land still needing this protection and improvement—calls for a program of positive action. It is a program in which groups such as your Kansas Crop Improvement Association have a natural interest. It includes, among other points:

1. Completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit—by 1956, if possible. This scientific, acre-by-acre inventory of all the land on every farm of the Nation is the foundation on which rests effective and lasting soil conservation. It is the basis of sound farm planning which, in turn, is the guiding blueprint for sound soil and water conservation.

2. Completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil-conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work. This calls for establishing as a recognized agricultural goal in the United States a scientifically developed soil-conservation district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm and ranch in the Nation at minimum public cost.

3. Active participation by all interested rural and urban groups—professional, business, and patriotic—in achieving nation-wide conservation.

4. Making a real conservationist of every farmer and rancher—the kind who understands what he is doing and how conservation benefits himself and his children's children.

Soil conservation, as nearly a million farmers are now practicing it, is using and protecting each acre of land in such a way that it will produce maximum amounts of needed products of good quality while retaining or increasing its productive capacity. With our growing population and continuing erosion on untreated land, we should not be satisfied with anything less than this. We do not need to accept less, because we now know how to treat the land so that it will do this for us. And as our population continues to grow, I think we shall not be able to afford less.

WHAT CONSERVATION FARMING CAN DO

Using the land according to its capability means—when we have the capability information for the land—that the least productive and more hazardous croplands are the first that could (and should) be retired from cultivation or the first to be placed in lengthened rotations, if a downward adjustment in the acreage of certain crops seemed desirable. It would mean, too, that land not suitable for cultivation could, without any guessing, be retired from cultivation altogether, and turned to grass that would produce meat and improve the soil at the same time. Some land would go to trees for needed wood products or merchantable timber. Greater yields per acre—and, therefore, more profitable yields—can be obtained from the most productive land at less, or at no greater, cost for seed, fertilizer, labor, machinery, and management. To state this efficiency of conservation farming another way, the same amount of seed, fertilizer, machinery, and management will produce a better return from the most productive land (that is, land of capability classes I and II) than from less productive land (classes III and IV, principally).

This is not theory or guesswork; rather, it is a statement of facts proved by the multiple experiences of conservation farmers reported from Kansas and every other part of the country. Moreover, conservation farming almost invariably calls for diversification of crops, often including more land in grass and trees. In this way the economic stability of the farm business is improved and the farmer is in a better position to operate successfully in a period of hazardous markets. All of these things tend to emphasize the fact that soil conservation, as we practice it in the United States, is important during periods of declining markets and hazardous prices as well as during periods of expanding markets and rising prices.

GRASS IN CONSERVATION FARMING

As you know, the Department of Agriculture in laying special emphasis just now on grass and legume crops in its efforts to encourage production better geared to current needs. These protective crops, of course, have had a fundamental place in the soil and water conservation program ever since the Soil Conservation Service began working nearly 20 years ago as the Soil Erosion Service—and in the work of the erosion-control experiment stations before that. I am sure that you members of the Crop Improvement Association need no sales talk from me on the importance and general desirability of more grass in our agriculture, but perhaps this is a good time to summarize the situation briefly with respect to this important element of conservation.

People sometimes ask me, "Why do we need grass?" And I tell them, "Well, I, for one, like to eat T-bone steaks, but it takes grass to make good T-bones; and besides that, grass protects the land from erosion, improves the soil, saves water, reduces floods, and cuts down on costly reservoir siltation."

More meat, milk, and butter are needed by many thousands. In order to produce enough of these basic, nutritious foods, we need more grass and legumes over much of the country. Grass is needed, first, to protect the surface of the land against rainwash and wind. Its roots improve the structure of the soil, and, what is very important, grass in the rotations is much better than straight grain or row crop farming. Land recently in grass or legumes will usually resist both blowing and washing much better than land deficient in organic matter. Moreover, such land stores up rainfall better than hard-used soil deficient in organic matter and is easier to plow. And, too, grass is profitable over the years, for livestock or cash seed production.

GRASS SEED NEEDS

Right now, as you know, we are short on some important grass seed. Take bromegrass, for example: Only about half as much of this seed was produced in 1949 as the 1943-47 average. A little more crested wheatgrass seed was harvested in 1949 than in 1948, but that was only a little more than a third of the 1943-47 production. The need now is for much more of these seeds. And so it is with buffalo grass, big and little bluestem slender wheatgrass, Sutter's grass, and others. Our reports from soil conservation districts show that virtually every farmer who has gone out and collected seed has disposed of it at a nice profit to neighboring farmers or to seedsmen.

In this activity seed of many native grasses, never harvested before, have gone into the trade, developing new markets while improving the agriculture of the country.

One of the main problems on which the Soil Conservation Service has concentrated its efforts during the past year or more is increasing the quality and quantity of grass and legume seed production in soil conservation districts. During the years immediately ahead, there are indications that a good many farmers are likely to make ad-

justments in their cropping programs, probably such as would increase the acreage in grasses, legumes, and grass-legume mixtures, and decrease the acreage of crops that may be in surplus supply. It now appears that this could be the greatest shift in the use of the Nation's farm land since the beginning of World War II. The Soil Conservation Service, as a part of its cooperative work with soil conservation districts, is endeavoring to give the fullest assistance possible to farmers in the districts—and to all others concerned—in order to make the safest and most desirable shifts in land use.

Man and the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the annual meeting of the Kansas Crop Improvement Association at Manhattan, Kans., on February 2, 1950:

In its soil-conservation nurseries, together with its field collections, the Soil Conservation Service has produced and distributed 13,000,000 pounds of grass and legume seed, consisting largely of little-used seed (little used until the Service got in to the field) and seed of native grasses domesticated through the activities of the Service. By encouraging farmers and contractors, the Service collected last year 1,851,000 pounds of native grass seed. Moreover, as the result of its efforts in spreading the use of various kinds of grasses and legumes in soil-conservation districts, the Service was responsible directly and indirectly for production, in 1949, of 198,587,000 pounds of such seed—or enough to seed 9,272,000 acres.

AN EXAMPLE FROM KANSAS

To illustrate, when a complete conservation plan was worked out for the 640-acre farm of Mr. George L. Whitcomb near Cedar Point, Kans., in the Chase County soil-conservation district, it was decided that 100 acres of the farm would be more profitable in grass than in cultivated crops. The 100 acres included partly eroded, sloping land and partly flat bottomland subject to frequent flooding. In 1949 bromegrass seeded on 90 acres produced 39,400 pounds of seed valued at about \$10,000. Mr. Whitcomb reported, and intermediate wheatgrass on the other 10 acres of the 100 acres produced more than 1,500 pounds of seed. In addition, he averaged 7 tons of grass silage to the acre last year on land used for that purpose, and reported 7 months of pasturage from this combination of grasses.

Everybody stands to gain through more of this kind of conservation farming. And this is the kind of well-balanced, diversified conservation farming that is spreading across the farm and ranch lands of Kansas and the rest of the country with remarkable speed. Even the most optimistic of those of us who pioneered in the soil conservation field could not have foreseen what has come to pass here at the turn of the half-century.

EFFICIENT CONSERVATION THROUGH FARMERS' DISTRICTS

I think it has been amply demonstrated now that the most efficient way of carrying on the soil and water conservation job, in

Kansas or anywhere else in the country, is through the splendid working together—the group action—of farmers in soil conservation districts. It seems to be agreed more and more among agricultural and other leaders that the effectiveness of the districts in advancing the Nation's conservation job has come about, as much as anything, because they are in an ideal position for the landholders to work together and take advantage of counsel and assistance from one another, as well as from other local, State, Federal, and private sources, such as those represented by your own Crop Improvement Association. It would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of the effective work and leadership of the more than 10,000 soil-conservation district supervisors who are serving your own and other communities throughout the country unselfishly, without pay, and without obligation to anybody but the farmers in the districts. If you are not already acquainted with the district supervisors in your locality, then I urge you by all means to get to know them.

These districts represent, I am convinced, the greatest land movement of all history. Virtually all of the Soil Conservation Service's technical and certain other assistance, including that in flood control, is made available to farmers through their soil-conservation districts, of which there now are nearly 2,200 distributed throughout all the States, Territories, and insular possessions. They already include—since the first district came into existence as recently as 1937—more than three-fourths of the Nation's farms and three-fourths of its farm land.

Kansas, I am happy to remind you, is close to the top of the list from the standpoint of soil conservation district organization, with 96.7 percent of the State's total area within the boundaries of 101 districts as of January 16, 1950.

Farmers in soil-conservation districts are working together as farmers never worked before. They are, in numerous instances, lending one another machinery and seed. They are planning together; sometimes they make contributions to improve local road conditions, etc. This helps speed up the work—get more acres planned and treated.

NEIGHBORS WORKING TOGETHER

Another important way for speeding up soil conservation is the use of natural neighbor groups in planning and applying conservation practices. Soil conservation districts and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service have, for several years, been placing emphasis on the use of the natural neighbor group to gain a better understanding, acceptance, and adoption of the conservation way of farming. Past experience indicates that the natural neighbor group approach is the best method to develop conservation farmers—farmers who understand why they should farm the conservation way, who do farm that way, and who will continue to farm that way. It is one of the best methods for moving ahead soundly and surely.

In nearly all areas we are finding groups of farmers who, because of their neighborliness, work together neighborly and naturally. These groups are often relatively small—often not more than 8, 10, or 20, altogether. Sometimes the members of a group are more or less unaware of the neighborliness enjoyed in their mode of living. They work together in ways that they themselves do not always clearly recognize. And they have their leaders—leaders who are neither appointed nor elected. These are simply locally outstanding men who have won the confidence of their neighbors and to whom their neighbors turn for help and advice. Some of these leaders appear to be unconscious of their leadership, they seldom speak of themselves in any sense of leadership.

In varying degree a variety of neighborly interests bind such groups together. Sometimes church interests serve as the catalytic agent, or the school, or other kinds of meetings or common associations. Neighborhood needs, especially in the form of emergencies, often bring the groups closer together. But they are natural neighbor groups, nonetheless, not large artificial groups, as the farmers of a township. And they are not community groups, such as communities bound together by geographic ties or other associations well understood by everybody.

They will work together on any common problem, because they either are used to working together or can easily be induced to work together. And an important feature about them is that they can be located. Their members and leaders can be identified, but it takes both experience and training either to recognize them or to locate their leaders.

These natural neighbor groups offer an ideal means for planning and carrying out a soil-conservation program. Such groups have demonstrated innumerable times that they will work together effectively and take joint action in the furtherance of soil and water conservation. At this time the Soil Conservation Service is cooperating with about 30,000 of these groups in the soil-conservation districts of the Nation. Not only do such groups help to speed up the conservation program, they assure more permanency to the conservation work applied to the farms of the members. They cooperate and advise each other on maintenance as well as in the application of conservation farming methods.

FARMERS ARE ASKING FOR MORE HELP

When we started out on an action plan for soil conservation in 1933 it often was difficult to get some farmers to cooperate. They wanted to wait to see how soil conservation worked out on some other farmer's place or were just "not interested" at the time. Sometimes our field technicians, desiring to see work moving along in all localities, talked many times with some farmers and ranchers without results. There has been a change. On file with the soil-conservation districts of Kansas there were, as of June 30, 1949, 7,116 requests for the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service to help the farmers prepare conservation farm plans over and above what our conservationists were able to prepare. In the country as a whole the backlog of requests for plans exceeded 200,000 at that time.

It is better to have plenty of requests for plans, of course, but it is not too good for a farmer to have to wait too long on the technicians.

The total number of requests the districts have received for farm conservation plans in the State amounts of 34,400, covering 7,740,000 acres. As of June 30, 1949, 3,106,000 acres of the planned area in soil-conservation districts had been treated.

SOME SOIL-CONSERVATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Soil conservation district organization, of course, is not an end within itself. A district program that exists only on paper isn't worth the paper it is written on, neither is a farm plan for soil conservation, where its provisions are not applied to the land. Complete, final figures were not yet available when I left Washington, but preliminary estimates were that up to January 1, 1950, farmers and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service, working together out on the land throughout the country, in soil-conservation districts alone, had prepared cooperatively some 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans. These plans covered by that date, as estimated, 220,000,000 acres, and 114 million acres had been treated with needed conservation measures.

By last July 1 (the beginning of the present fiscal year, and the latest date for which

these figures are available), detailed soil conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made of 304,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning had been made of an additional 177,000,000 acres. These figures do not include the additional millions of acres which had been surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has participated.

NOW WE ARE MOVING AHEAD FASTER

We have been moving forward in this vital task of soil and water conservation at a quickening pace, and there is no good reason at all why we cannot continue to do so, depending on the availability of technical and other manpower, machinery, and materials—and good, persistent cooperation from every person and organization capable of doing anything worth while in aid of this basic program. This is what I mean: In the fiscal year 1941, we surveyed, planned, and applied to the land about 1 percent of the total remaining soil conservation job. In the 1949 fiscal year, the rate of progress had more than trebled—about 3½ percent of the remaining job was completed. Today, about 19 percent of the job has been finished for the country as a whole; and we are exerting every effort to add enough farm plans for soil conservation by the end of this fiscal year, or July 1, 1950, to bring the amount completed close to 25 percent.

So, we feel very confident that by putting our shoulders to the wheel, all of us working together—really working together with confidence in one another and in the best spirit of cooperation—the basic conservation measures could, with adequate facilities, be applied to our lands needing treatment within 20 years. After that, of course, continuing maintenance would be necessary, along with any worthwhile improvements in conservation methods and devices that may come from research. This last stage—the maintenance and improvement stage—will be a smaller task from the standpoint of technical, educational, financial, and other assistance to farmers. Over the country as a whole, the soil conservation districts already are way out in front in providing themselves with machinery, seed, and other materials for going ahead with the job.

In the fiscal year 1949, to illustrate, more than 16,000 private contractors were engaged in soil and water conservation work in soil conservation districts over the country. About 95 percent of all the equipment used in the districts was owned and operated by contractors.

SOIL-CONSERVATION CREDIT

There also is the matter of credit and financing soil-conservation work in those cases where it may be needed. Private as well as public lending institutions are demonstrating more and more their interest in the fact that conservation treatment of the land should not have to be held up for want of a little credit to tide the landowner over the initial stage of applying his conservation measures, whether they be the building of structures or the installation of any needed practices.

Already, progress is being made in this field, and the promise is good for further expansion of credit to conservation farmers.

THE PROFITABLENESS OF SOIL CONSERVATION

In a sample inventory taken by the Soil Conservation Service to show 1945 income from conservation-treated farms as compared to similar farms on which much less conservation work had been done, 1,872 representative farmers and ranchers reported. In the western dry-farm grouping of Kansas, Washington, and Idaho, the conservation-treated farms showed an average increase in direct returns from conservation farming over those from the nonconserva-

tion farms of \$6.22 an acre. Based on reports from district farmers all over the country, it has been estimated that in 1948, for instance, the Federal Government retrieved the entire amount spent by the Soil Conservation Service and, in addition, made a 77 percent profit in increased income taxes paid on increased returns as a result of farmers' applying effective soil-conservation measures to their lands. The estimated gain included increased revenue derived by retailers, processors, and distributors who profited directly from handling the increased production.

SOME EROSION AND LAND-MANAGEMENT FACTS

With such inviting financial incentives alone to soil conservation, there certainly is no good excuse for us to delay, as a Nation, State, or community, in finishing the job of safeguarding our productive land just as fast as we have the time and facilities to do so. After allowing about half of our original supply of productive land in the United States to be damaged severely by soil erosion, waterlogging, and accumulation of alkali—many millions of acres of it so severely as not to be capable of further economic cultivation in the immediate future, we have approximately 460,000,000 acres of good cropland left. About 70,000,000 acres of this 460,000,000 acres must be cleared, drained, irrigated, or otherwise improved before it can be tilled and planted to grain or intertilled crops. And around 70,000,000 acres of the land currently in cultivation is too steep, too shallow, or too erodible for further cultivation. All but about 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 acres of it is subject to severe erosion if it is not safeguarded in time. And we still are losing around 500,000 acres of our productive land each year through the ravages of soil erosion.

We have enough good, productive land left in this country to meet our foreseeable needs if we safeguard it and use it right, but only if we do that. We have, on the one hand, a limited, decreasing supply of good land and, on the other, a rapidly increasing population (now at around the 150,000,000 mark in the United States and estimated at around two and a quarter billion in the world). So, whatever anybody may tell you, the significance of our shifting land-population-food-production equation over the long run cannot be ignored. You can't take the mathematics out of this direct relationship between man and the land.

And I should like, also, to emphasize as strongly as I can, regardless of anybody's claims to the contrary, that we still haven't learned how to build new topsoil, or even a reasonable substitute for it, on any substantial scale, within any brief time.

TEAMWORK WILL GET THE JOB DONE

To finish the soil and water conservation job in time is going to take continued teamwork, the kind of coordinated soil conservation effort that is now getting under way in Kansas and all over the country; while, as never before, an almost endless list of interests in our society and economy are contributing importantly to its advancement. This list includes, besides the landholders themselves, bankers, merchants, millers, and manufacturers; contractors and machinery dealers; nurserymen and seedmen; press, radio, and motion picture theater owners; teachers, ministers, lawyers, and doctors; garden and other women's clubs; 4-H Clubs, Vocational Agriculture, Future Farmers; veterans' organizations and sportsmen's groups; chambers of commerce and other civic organizations; railroads and other big industrial interests; farm organizations, State departments of agriculture, State colleges and universities and experiment stations, State game and fish commissions, and many more.

All of these and other interests, public and private, have recognized the importance of

conserving and productively using our irreplaceable, life-sustaining land—along with grass, timber, and wildlife—and they are devoting their time and money to encouraging this action. Together, we are meeting the land's challenge to man who lives by its bounty.

Soil Conservation in Our World Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the University of Cincinnati Evening College, Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 1, 1950:

Soil conservation, scientifically applied to the land, according to modern standards, is the great need and hope of our civilization. Even though there has been phenomenal advancement in invention, manufacturing, mining, transportation, and other industrial activities in recent years, the world is still basically dependent on agriculture. And a prosperous and lasting agriculture utterly depends on an adequate supply of productive land, properly used and so protected that it will remain permanently productive. Without this foundation there can be no assurance either of economic stability or social progress—and no guaranty of adequate nutrition, prosperity, or peace anywhere on earth. But as long as there is enough good land and an adequate supply of water to make the land productive, people thereby have the means to overcome these deficiencies. Without such resources, real and lasting progress is unlikely or impossible.

Soil conservation, then, is mandatory everywhere if our civilization is to avoid a tragic decline, economically and culturally. We must conserve our remaining supply of productive land while we use it. It will not be enough if we merely safeguard the land for the next 10 years or the next 100 years, or if we do only a half-way or incomplete job. We tried the incomplete method for about a hundred years in the Southeastern States. The job was not done properly. Using an incomplete, unscientific, single-practice method—principally terracing—much more harm than good was done, because of the physical facts involved.

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

I have never been able to understand just why our historians have told us so little about the disaster that befell so much of the land of some of the older countries of the world.

Pliny, who died in A. D. 79, advised farmers tending hillside fields to run their furrows across the slope and to provide channels to draw off the water into drains. Seventeen hundred years later, Thomas Jefferson was recommending horizontal cultivation to his fellow Virginia farmers in the New World, then being brought under the plow.² Over much of Asia and Africa, and in parts of Europe and America, too, there are people living today in poverty and bare existence on

lands that once supported much larger numbers.

The significance of scientifically applied soil conservation, as is being done here in the United States, is brought home forcefully to anyone who has the opportunity to visit other parts of the world and observe the condition of the land and the methods of farming still prevailing in great areas. There one can see, as I have seen, the bitter lessons of history written on the eroded countryside and etched in the worried faces of people struggling to produce their food. I spent a short time last year, for example, studying erosion conditions and soil and water conservation methods in southern France, Italy, and North Africa.

Over there I observed the lengths that people go in order to get a living from some of the world's oldest lands still in agricultural use. I was impressed with the costly and back-breaking measures employed in building on precipitous slopes stone walls to support little slivers of land for crop production. I made this trip primarily in the hope of finding something that might be helpful in our own national program of soil conservation, feeling that we must not overlook anything of importance. I found very little, however, that we can make any use of under present conditions.

I saw much wonderful work in parts of Italy and France, notably the staircase benches supported by well constructed rock walls, tediously filled in behind with soil brought in by the basketful. The Italians, and French, too, are exceedingly skillful in the use of rock, not only in the construction of soil-holding walls but for building structures for torrent control in the mountains. But the work required in establishing some of this bench type of agriculture, translated into our American labor costs, probably would amount in many instances to \$15,000 or \$20,000 an acre. Such an outlay on farm land clearly is out of the question for us, now or at any time we can foresee, even in the most eroded parts of the country. As a matter of fact, we are not in need of this type of conservation at this stage of our development, except in occasional very special cases.

In Italy, along the roads we traveled, every available patch of land—practically every square foot—is in use. From the beaches of the Adriatic and the Mediterranean on up to the crests of the Apennines and the Alps, thousands of little patches are cultivated on slopes so dizzy steep I wouldn't venture into them. Practically every slope where man can hang on is in cultivation of some kind.

And, in the forested areas, when trees are cut the leaves of oaks and some of the other trees are commonly saved for stock feed, and the twigs, along with the weeds of the fields, are scrupulously saved and bundled for fuel. When you talk to an Italian about the cost of such operations, the reply is likely to be something like this: "Why consider the cost of food when to have it means life and not to have it is death?"

Certainly, food is man's first basic need, as it is of all animal and plant life. Clothing and shelter are man's secondary necessities, in degree conditioned by climate and custom. Everything else which he uses may be considered to be dispensable, actually, because it is primarily for his convenience or enjoyment. Without food, however, man starves. And all of his food, except a small amount from the sea, comes from one source, and from one source only. That is from productive land. So does the principal part of his clothing and shelter, all his wood, cotton, wool, leather, vegetable oils, and the others. Clearly, then, the one indispensable resource on which mankind depends for existence and survival is productive land, along with the water that makes it produce these foods and other essentials.

LAND ALSO MAJOR SOURCE OF ORIGINAL WEALTH

Over and above that elementary role which it plays in human affairs, the land is the source of a very large share of our original wealth. Manufacturers and industrialists, bankers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, writers, and the rest of us—in Cincinnati, Washington, or elsewhere—are directly affected by what happens to the source of that land-wealth. We are affected as consumers of the things that are produced from the land, and we are affected in our income. It would be most convenient for the rest of us if we could pass all the responsibility for care of the land to the farmer, but clearly we cannot do that.

A suit of clothes or a cake of soap is manufactured in Cincinnati, but the wool or the animal fat or vegetable oil which goes into the finished products was produced by the land on an Idaho sheep ranch or a farm in Ohio, North Carolina, or somewhere else. Many people, beginning with the farmer or rancher himself—are dependent wholly or partially for their income—their living—on the processes involved in getting that bar of soap or suit of clothes into your home or mine. There are railroad men, truckers, and water carriers, millers and weavers, advertising men, stenographers, bankers, package manufacturers, salesmen, wholesalers, retailers, and many more. These producers, processors, and distributors are in turn, buyers of goods and services on their own account. They patronize doctors, dentists, lawyers, barbers, and beauty parlors, they go to the movies, ball games, and shows. They buy homes, radios and television sets, automobile tires, shoes, newspapers, and electric light bulbs. They hunt and fish, play golf, and take pictures. Their taxes help to build roads and bridges, hospitals and battleships.

Back of all this economic chain is productive land. People finally are coming to understand that the poorest farmer usually can produce, even between gullies, at least some food for himself and his family. But it is when he isn't able to produce enough in addition to take care of a number of city families that the rest of us begin to suffer. And fertile soil that sluices off to the oceans down the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers no longer can provide goods or wealth to load boats and trains in Cincinnati or New Orleans, or bring business to the markets of these and other cities.

SOIL CONSERVATION PROMOTES OUR WHOLE ECONOMY

Modern soil conservation, then, does much more than safeguard land. It leads to increased and lasting productivity of the land and thereby promotes the whole economy and common welfare wherever it is practiced. Probably most regions of the world can be improved in some degree by safeguarding the land and increasing its productivity through soil and water conservation and land use.

Before we consider the growing interest in soil conservation, I think I should explain the meaning of modern soil conservation now spreading across the Nation.

MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION DEFINED

Modern soil conservation is based on sound land use and treatment of land with all the proven appropriate measures that are needed to keep it permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; and contouring, strip cropping, and stubble mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover and green manure crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting

¹ Pliny, Natural History, XVIII, 49.

² Bennett, H. H., Thomas Jefferson, Soil Conservationist. U. S. Department of Agriculture, miscellaneous publication No. 548, 1944.

good management to them after they have been developed.

Modern soil conservation, moreover, consists of doing these and still other necessary things. Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for drainage, if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation, if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind stripping, tree planting, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter, if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, as in parts of the West, it calls for drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient tools available to farmers.

SOIL-CONSERVATION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IMPORTANT

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also a continuing, vigorous program of soil-conservation education must be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten through college. Moreover, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work which is put on the land. These measures are not just for a single year or cropping season. Like savings deposits in the bank or savings bonds, they increase in value and return on the original investment as the years go on.

In short, there is only one correct formula for doing the soil- and water-conservation job. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual need or condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production. This way accords with the methods of nature, just as do other physical facts, such as the fact that water will not run up hill. And it is the way the farmers of the Nation are going about getting the conservation job done on the only basis having any chance for permanency.

It is being done through farmer-voted and farmer-manager soil-conservation districts, set up under State enabling law for such purposes as doing the job faster, with the best chance for maintenance. It is through their democratic units of State government, assisted by technicians of the Soil Conservation Service brought in at the districts' request, that so much of the big soil- and water-conservation job on the farmlands of the country is being effectively done.

HOW PERMANENT SOIL CONSERVATION IS PUT ON THE LAND

Perhaps I should explain briefly, also, how soil conservation is applied to the land. When the Soil Conservation Service is requested, through established procedures and channels, to assist a soil-conservation district, our technicians work on those farms whose operators' applications for district assistance have been approved by the district's elected farmer supervisors, or directors. First, a land-capability survey is made of the farm, resulting in a map which shows—field by field and acre by acre—the condition of the land and its capability for production, whether for row crops like corn, pasture, timber, or wildlife. Thus capability classes I, II, and III are good cropland, classes V and VI are suited for pasture or timber, and so on through the eight classes.

Then the technician and the farmer together go out on the land and develop a soil-conservation plan cooperatively, acre by acre, for the entire farm. It is of the utmost importance that the technician get out on the land with the farmer, so that the job can be done properly (it cannot be done in an office or through the use of printed directions),

This farm-operating blueprint, while aimed first at the maximum protection of the land, takes into full account such economic needs of the farmer as the income he must have to support his family and operate at a profit, his market situation, and so on. The plan specifies the best use to be made of each part of the farm, year by year; the crop rotations; the building of needed ponds or terraces; the development of good pastures, the planting of trees for windbreaks or woodlots; and other things.

Some of the conservation measures are the kind that the farmer can put into practice himself, with little further technical assistance; but, generally, the complete plan of coordinated conservation practices is by necessity sufficiently complex as to require expert technical help in putting them on the land. These include measures in agronomy, engineering, forestry, biology, hydrology, and others. Patently, no ordinary farmer busy with his own vocation of growing crops or raising livestock can also be a skilled engineer, forester, and several other experts rolled into one—any more than he can be his own doctor, dentist, or lawyer. Soil Conservation Service technicians, then, assist the farmer with the technical job of putting his conservation measures properly into effect. The farmer provides all the materials and labor, and likewise maintains his structures and practices once they have been installed on the land.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY OF CONSERVATION FARMING

Soil conservation, as nearly a million farmers (and a rapidly increasing number of farmers) now practice it, is nothing less than using and treating each acre of land in such a way that it will produce maximum amounts of products of good quality while maintaining or increasing its productive capacity. With our growing population and continuing erosion on untreated land, we should not be satisfied with anything less than this. We do not need to accept less, because we now know how to treat the land so that it will do this for us. And, as our population continues to grow, I think we shall not be able to afford less.

Soil Conservation in Our World Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the University of Cincinnati Evening College, Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 1, 1950:

Using the land according to its capability is the very basis of sound and lasting soil conservation. The Soil Conservation Service is making the essential conservation surveys as fast as its facilities permit, and is the only agency prepared to make them. The Service technicians are recruited from civil-service lists. They are mostly graduates of agricultural colleges and are required to have a year's training under our experienced technicians before being put in charge of technical work.

In this way, and only in this way, can we ever achieve permanent soil-conservation work.

Greater yields can be obtained from the most productive acres at less, or at no great-

er, cost for seed, fertilizer, labor, machinery, and management. To state this efficiency of conservation farming another way, the same amount of seed, fertilizer, machinery, and management will produce a better return from the most productive land—that is, land of capability classes I and II—than from less productive land—classes III and IV, principally.

There is no theory or guesswork in this; it is a statement of fact proved by the multiple experiences of conservation farmers reported from Ohio and every other part of the country. Moreover, conservation farming on the basis of complete conservation farm work plans developed by farmers and technicians almost invariably calls for diversification of crops, often including more land in grass and trees—and more meat, milk, and butter on the table. In this way, the economic stability of the farm business is improved, and the farmer is in a better position to operate successfully in a period of hazardous domestic or world markets. All of these things tend to emphasize the fact that soil conservation, as we practice it, is important during periods of declining markets and hazardous prices as well as during periods of expanding markets and rising prices.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY IS STRENGTHENED

Anything which helps the individuals of a country in any substantial number also helps the country as a whole. This certainly can be said of the kind of soil conservation farming I have been talking about, because, as we have seen, it supports the economic stability of the farm enterprise, has invariably proved to be profitable to the farmer, his community, and to the Government; and contributes greatly to maintaining a high standard of living—nutritionally and otherwise—in addition to providing a long list of public benefits such as reducing flood damages and preventing siltation of reservoirs, streams, and harbors.

We must keep our armed services and national defense machinery strongly built up, certainly; but we dare not neglect our domestic economy, either. We do, after all, have to pay for ships and atom bombs; and we can do this only by having an efficient economy in agriculture as well as in industry and trade. And there can be, of course, no efficient agriculture without, as already pointed out, a base of good land.

POPULATION AND INDUSTRIAL PRESSURES ON THE LAND

Constantly increasing population and a still shrinking supply of productive land will eventually make greater efficiency in food production more and more imperative. In addition, we appear to be moving with increasing speed along lines of development which promise much toward the substitution of organic materials, like organic plastics, for metals and other inorganic raw materials in industry. That, of course, would mean additional pressure on the same land which has to produce our food and other essentials. These needs already are exerting themselves on the world's limited supply of productive land and will continue to do so with such force as to challenge our utmost technological capacity. Every passing year demonstrates the growing importance of this relationship.

The productive land out of which these materials are produced is limited, just as definitely as are the supplies of minerals which we dig out of the ground. And we cannot stockpile soil as we can tin, tungsten, lead, and zinc. Nor can we replace it, or even rebuild a reasonable substitute for it. All of us decry the extravagance with which we have used some of our mineral resources; yet, even to this day, there are far too many otherwise well-informed and sound thinking people who are utterly complacent about the way we have exploited our soil resource. Moreover, they are unmind-

ful of or ignore the further important fact that the cost of production per acre on land that continues to be exploited and eroded goes up while, on substantial areas, the yield per acre goes down. This does not mean famine, but it does mean expense and higher costs for food and other essentials produced by the land.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO AVOID

Certain misconceptions about soil conservation still seem to confuse the thinking of some otherwise well-informed people. We need to be on guard against such misinformation. Some of these misconceptions, or loose assertions, briefly stated, are—

1. That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2. That there are short cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that farm plans are too technical for farmers.

3. That soil conservation costs more than it is worth.

4. That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

All that one needs to do to clear one's thinking with respect to these notions is to look about the country or talk with farmers who are carrying on modern soil conservation. It is easy to see in most parts of the world complete refutation of such specious reasoning in the eroded and unproductive countryside.

As for soil conservation farm plans being too technical, that is sheer nonsense on a par with saying a farm tractor is too complicated for a farmer. It amounts to "talking down" to the farmer.

UNITED STATES IS WORLD'S SOIL CONSERVATION LEADER

The United States which, paradoxically, was wasting its heritage of productive soil, before the beginning of scientific soil conservation, faster than any other country we know anything about, has become the world's leader in soil and water conservation. Beginning with the 10 soil erosion experiment stations authorized by Congress in 1929, we have progressed through a period of conservation demonstration work on actual farms and watersheds (starting in the Soil Erosion Service in 1933) to the point today where the farmers of the Nation are fast shouldering the major responsibility for the conservation program. This is being done through soil conservation districts, which the farmers themselves organize under State legislation passed by all 48 States, the territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and our insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These farmer-voted and farmer-managed districts already number nearly 2,200, include more than three-fourths of the Nation's farms and a total of 1,200,000,000 acres. Ohio is in the forefront among the States, with 78 soil conservation districts covering more than 85 percent of the State by January 1, this year.

These districts represent, I am convinced, the greatest land movement in all history. They are democratic units of State government, responsible only to the residents of the district who elect from among themselves their own officers, usually called supervisors. Not only are these districts voluntarily and enthusiastically going ahead with the conservation job with all the dispatch that available technical and other facilities will permit, but they likewise are helping very greatly to strengthen the concept of local responsibility. They are essentially group-action devices through which strong local leadership develops. They draw together, as at the hub of a wheel, the services and facilities of cooperating governmental and private interests alike, local, State, and Na-

tional. And the soil conservation districts also are responsible for such tangible results as the creation of new markets for manufacturers of equipment and tools, nurseries, seed producers, and others.

SOME SOIL-CONSERVATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Soil Conservation Service makes virtually all of its technical and certain other assistance, including that in flood control, available to farmers through their soil-conservation districts. Preliminary estimates show that up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone. These plans covered an estimated 220,000,000 acres and an estimated 114,000,000 acres had been treated with needed conservation measures by that time, in the districts.

These figures do not include other millions of acres surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has assisted. And up to the start of the current fiscal year (July 1, 1949) detailed soil-conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 304,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning had been made of another 177,000,000 acres.

OTHER COUNTRIES DRAW ON OUR METHODS

The foregoing brief summary of our national soil-conservation program gives you an idea why it is that so many countries are looking to us here in the United States for soil and water conservation leadership. During the last few years, 159 agriculturalists had been sent here by other countries to spend a year in training under Soil Conservation direction, and 377 other representatives from various countries had come for varying lengths of time for training or study. These agriculturalists came from 82 countries all together. And 48 of these countries are now doing work of some kind in soil conservation. Some countries have soil-conservation services and soil-conservation districts.

The need now is for a greater action over wider and wider areas in more and more nations. This will require decisions by the leaders of nations, who somehow must be helped to understand that soil and water conservation invariably is economically and socially advantageous.

THE COST OF EROSION

The estimated cost of erosion in the United States even today—after all the progress that's been made in combating it—is much more than a billion dollars a year. The cost for the world as a whole has never been calculated, or even estimated. That is the cost of such items alone as direct losses to farmers, increased flood damage, silting of reservoirs, rivers, harbors, and drainage ditches, and damage to highways and railways. Add to these items such other costs as reduced trade and tax revenues from depleted agricultural lands, and you have an ever clearer conception of what soil erosion does to undermine national and world economy and welfare. Even more important, I think—and this is what has been so generally overlooked—the cost of soil lost cannot be estimated fully on any money basis. You must add to the money loss the value of food as it affects life and civilization. Estimates are difficult to make—they have to do not only with the cost of controlling erosion but with the cost of not controlling it.

OUR CHALLENGE TO SPREAD CONSERVATION UNDERSTANDING

It is my hope and expectation now, after a lifetime of effort in this direction, that our leaders will see to it that the program of soil conservation which I have described and which is moving ahead with a remarkable degree of effectiveness, as a sound investment and boon to the welfare and security of our own and other nations, is safeguarded and continued. We are faced with the im-

portant educational-technological task of spreading the understanding of this vital matter more widely and rapidly. It is a challenge to all of us. Everyone has a proper part he can play.

On this job there is every reason why everybody—every agency, State and Federal, every business and professional man and woman, and all the farmers—should be working earnestly together, and no single reason why they should not. It's going to take all of us, doing the very best we know how, to get this big job done on time. We must arrange our affairs to help one another, not to waste our efforts through duplication. There is no point in wasting time over agency prerogatives, for there is no time to waste. We will all gain by pulling together as a team in a friendly, cooperative way, with confidence in one another, helping one another—getting ahead with the job.

Water Conservation at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the pleasure of visiting the office of the Modesto irrigation district. While there I was given a pamphlet which contains a brief story of the district. The legal foundation for the organization of irrigation districts in California is found in the Wright Act, which was passed in 1887. The author of the act, Hon. C. C. Wright, was then representing Stanislaus County in the assembly, and the Wright Act is the bible of the irrigation districts. The district came into being on July 23, 1887.

The first water storage was in La-Grange Dam. This dam was built in 1893 at a cost of \$543,000. The dams mentioned in this statement were built and are jointly owned by the Turlock irrigation district and the Modesto irrigation district. The Turlock district is now serving 181,000 acres and the Modesto irrigation district is serving 81,203 acres. In 1923 the districts completed the construction of Don Pedro Dam. This is a large dam, having the storage capacity of 290,000 acre-feet. Of course, much more water passes through this dam for irrigation and hydroelectric development than the mere capacity of the dam. During the summer months when irrigation is at its peak this dam is receiving water from the melting snows of the high Sierras, to replenish what is taken out.

On looking at the financial statement of this district, one gets a feeling of pride to realize what the farmers who own this district have done. For instance, on December 31, 1926, Modesto district had an outstanding bonded debt of \$4,593,000. On December 31, 1950, the outstanding bonded debt was \$495,000. Also, the tax rate in 1924 was \$6.40 per \$100 valuation. The rate in 1950 was \$1.50. This is particularly eloquent in view of the fact that these irrigation districts, in developing this project, have no write-offs. They cannot

write anything off for flood control, salinity control, or recreation, or any of the things that are written off in the dams that are constructed by the Department of Interior. They must pay the full amount of the cost.

Many persons in the Middle West and East do not quite understand this irrigation development or how it is being carried out. All this has been done by the farmers who own the district. They first had a meeting to determine whether they wished to organize the district. Then they held a meeting to determine where they could find a source of water. Then they considered the cost. In other words, they built the district from the ground up and every step in the proceedings was developed and paid for by themselves, including the expert advice and guidance which they received from hydraulic engineers, financial experts, and others. No Government agent or agency told them what to do or how or when to do it. The farmers did everything themselves. They considered the need for water, the benefits they might obtain from irrigation, the cost of the proposed project and their ability to pay. The results show that they were on solid ground before they took each step. The financial statement shows that the men who conceived, built, and operated this district exercised sound-business judgment, which is eloquently reflected in the financial condition of the Modesto irrigation district.

This district is typical of many others in California which have been organized under the Wright Act and developed along the same lines as the Modesto irrigation district has been developed. I have not the financial statement of the Turlock irrigation district, which is a joint owner of the dams which the MID gets its water, but I am confident that it would indicate almost an identical state of prosperity and financial stability.

Know Your Waterways—No Drama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an article recently published in the Washington Post by the Marine News of New York, as follows:

Know Your Waterways—No Drama

Harbor and channel improvements suffer from lack of drama. As most of the work is beneath the surface, it is not visible nor in the public eye. A towering building pierces the sky. A majestic bridge stretches across a great river. A mammoth dam holds back a sea of dangerous or useful water. Such structures are seen, pictured, and talked about. On the contrary, an important channel or harbor improvement can be completed with the surface of the water appearing as it always did. Only those intimately con-

nected with the project know what was done. Only a few know about its benefits; the public is almost entirely ignorant of them. Thus it is, that useful harbors and channels are developed with great benefits to the people and largely without their knowledge. As a consequence, such improvements lack the public support that their worth entitles them to.

Harbor and channel improvements made so far have helped to make America great and strong. Continuing development will help carry the Nation on to further greatness and strength.

"American Jews Have a Right To Be Proud of the Way in Which They Have Helped Build America"—Hon. Oscar R. Ewing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave it gives me pleasure to insert as a part of my remarks a stirring address delivered by the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, of New York, Administrator of the great and far-flung Federal Security Administration, on Sunday, September 16, 1951, at the dedication of the Temple Israel Center of White Plains, at White Plains, N. Y.:

I am deeply honored—as a neighbor who lives just across the line from you, in Riverdale—to take part in these happy ceremonies of dedication. Your congregation has a long and honorable history in White Plains; for more than a generation you have maintained a house of worship, of learning, and of service to the community. Your president is an old and good friend of mine, and I congratulate you on having placed your temporal affairs in the hands of a distinguished citizen, Henry Rapaport.

In some other lands, it might seem strange for the dedication ceremonies of a Jewish temple to be addressed by a man of another faith. In our land, the custom is so common that it hardly attracts attention. It testifies to the strength of our religious feelings—of your feelings toward Judaism and of mine toward Christianity. We have come to recognize that Jews and Christians have a common heritage, a common spiritual tradition, a common devotion to ethical principles of truth and justice and peace. We have learned to understand that the troubles, the injustices, even the persecutions, of the past can be dead and buried if we approach one another with clean hearts and clean hands—if we judge one another for ourselves and not in the light of prejudice and bigotry—if we recognize the worth, the dignity, and the importance of the individual human being in the eyes of God and man.

This we see as the very essence of our faith, and we know that it is also the essence of our democratic heritage. For Americans are both a religious and a democratic people. We have learned the great secret of freedom—that freedom of worship is the touchstone of all our liberties.

ALL ARE VICTIMS OF PERSECUTION

We have seen this truth demonstrated, to our horror, by those who are the enemies of freedom: we witnessed the destruction of religious liberty in Germany under Hitler.

For the Nazi destruction of so many millions of Jews was accompanied, let us not forget, by a simultaneous persecution of those Christians whose untrammeled love of God, whose insistence on the brotherhood of man, made them also the victims of the Hitler terror. And today we see the other face of totalitarianism, the Soviet Union, trample upon the religious convictions of Jews and Christians alike.

We know now, better than ever before in all our history, that democracy is the great protector of religious freedom. But we also know that religion itself provides the spiritual force of our democracy. We prove our faith in God, which is religion, by showing our faith in man, which is democracy. Our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, the words we live by, the great men we revere, the historic deeds of which we are proud—all these bear witness to the spiritual force of our democracy. From those first stirring words of our Declaration of Independence—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . ."—through the deeply moving simplicity of Lincoln at Gettysburg—"that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom"—right down to the words with which we express ourselves today, there has been this constant reiteration of the deep faith on which our Republic is built. We have no State religion, and we would not want one. But we have the abiding, the universal, the essential spirit of religion, and without this we know we would be lost.

DEMONSTRATION OF PATRIOTISM

So today Americans render a truly patriotic service to their country when they foster the religious spirit. Today you are dedicating the Temple Israel Center of White Plains, which will house your Jewish religious school, your Jewish community center, and your synagogue. This is not only a translation into steel and stone of your ancient and venerable Judaic faith. It is also a tangible demonstration of your American patriotism, your fulfillment of civic responsibility, the evidence for all the world to see of your faith in yourselves and in your future as a vital part of the American democracy.

American Jews have a right to be proud of the way in which they have helped build America. You and your forebears have fused the living strength of Jewish culture into the new American civilization that has made of a thousand cultures something new under the sun. Jewish contributions to this American civilization have been varied. But I believe that, when we look back over the history of our Nation, we come to the inevitable conclusion that the greatest of all Jewish contributions has been the Jewish sense of civic responsibility, expressed through philanthropy and communal activity. American Jews have set an example for all their fellow-citizens in the multiplicity and simple humanity of the communal tasks which they have undertaken and carried through so successfully.

In a time of trouble like our own all humanity carries a heavy burden. Where there is injustice, where there is inequality, where there is discrimination, where there is dictatorship, where people live in fear and hunger, there is a weight upon the conscience of every person on earth. To us as Americans, who have been thrust into the leadership of the free world, this burden has become very real, and we have, I think, written a brand-new chapter in history in these last few years, as we have conceived and brought forth our breath-taking programs to bring a greater measure of well-being and safety to other peoples. The Marshall plan, the point 4 program, and all of the other activities which Americans have initiated, will be

recorded in history as the first tangible steps, on a gigantic scale, which any nation ever took to help other nations get back on their own feet—not by the temporary palliative of immediate relief, but by the hard-boiled, realistic business of helping people raise more food, build more shelter, and establish a going economy. That we have benefited because of this should not make us ashamed. We are the more free when other people are free; does this reflect on our own desire for freedom? We are the more prosperous when other people are prosperous; does this reflect on our own desire for prosperity? Of course not.

WE ACCEPT OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

There is no doubt that the need for making ourselves strong, combined with the need for making the free world more secure economically, has placed a heavy burden on the American citizen. His taxes have gone up, and, in our defense effort, he is compelled to forego a few of the luxuries to which he had become accustomed. It stands to the credit of our Nation that, amid all the political controversies and arguments of these times, there is virtually no serious complaint about these burdens which we have democratically assumed. We have accepted the responsibilities of our citizenship and the responsibilities of our world leadership.

On top of this common responsibility, however, American Jews have carried a double—a triple—burden. In these terrible years that came as an aftermath of the Hitler horror, they eagerly assumed the task of helping to rescue hundreds of thousands of their brethren who somehow managed to survive. Governments, especially our own Government, did part of this job; but no government could match the voluntary outpouring of money and work that came from American Jews in this work of rescue. At the same time, they have helped to build a new state along the shores of the Mediterranean, a valiant new sister republic, a thriving democracy, a land of hope and promise, where unfortunate people could begin their lives anew. I have been to Israel myself, and I have seen with my own eyes the miracle—not of rebirth—but rather of birth itself. And, as I traveled through the cities and the fertile valleys, across the barren hills and desert sands, I felt that one of the warmest satisfactions of all was this: That this was made possible because my own fellow citizens help these people begin their lives anew.

DEDICATED TO THE LOVE OF GOD

Yet the greatest tribute I can pay to you is to recognize that, even as you have devoted yourselves to this work of philanthropy and humanity, you have not let your own spiritual needs languish. You are not the less American because you have taken an interest in other people on the other side of the world. Indeed, you are the more American for it. And you have continued to maintain and build up your own institutions here in your own America.

This beautiful building stands in mute testimony of your deep roots in American soil. It is the expression of both your Judaism and your Americanism. It is—with all the churches and synagogues of our land—the symbol of our humble faith in God and of our proud respect for our fellow men.

The members of this congregation need no words of advice from me. They have wrought better than any man could direct. They have dreamed, and worked, and planned, and now they have fulfilled their dream. Let us therefore simply say, as we celebrate the completion of Temple Israel's Center, that we dedicate this structure—you and I, Jew and Christian—to the brotherhood of man, to the arts of peace, to the achievement of ever greater freedom, and above all to the love of God.

De Gasperi's Visit Points Up Need To Help Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, now honoring us with his presence, brings plenty of his troubles to Washington, and he has a right to ask us for help in their solution.

In spite of \$2,500,000,000 in American aid during and since the war, Italy is still in difficulties, politically and economically. Principally she has too many people and too few jobs. We must help de Gasperi to find homes outside of Italy for surplus Italians. We could easily, without any skin off our backs, increase the present pitifully small Italian immigration quota and take in at least 50,000 more Italians, say for a period of 5 years at the rate of 10,000 a year. Nationals of Italian origin have served us well as immigrants. Their brain and brawn have helped build up our economy. Our example would be followed by others—Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Latin American countries and South Africa—all of whom need the skilled and unskilled labor that Italy can supply. Italy just cannot with safety hold its 46,000,000 people. Outlets must be found. Postwar Italy lost, in addition to its empire, the Dodecanese Isles, Trieste, and Venezia Giulia. Some substitute lands must be found to which Italians can emigrate, otherwise Italy will burst at the seams.

I hope de Gasperi will get from our procurement agencies defense contracts for Italian factories. To the extent that American defense dollars can be spent abroad Italy should get her fair share. That would mean more jobs for idle hands.

The United States has championed de Gasperi, therefore we cannot let him go back to Italy empty handed. Both Communists and Fascists would make political mincemeat of him should we fail to give him definite aid.

Above all, the peace treaty needs to be modified. It is imperative that de Gasperi bring home definite pledges in this regard. With a new peace treaty along the softer lines of the one given Japan, Premier de Gasperi could go home in triumph. Removal of treaty limits on military strength would enable him to put many of the jobless into the armed forces.

The problem of Trieste is another important sore spot. I hope de Gasperi can persuade our State Department to take the initiative in urging Tito and Yugoslavia to reach an amicable understanding with Italy on Trieste. Rome is ready and willing to meet with Belgrade anytime, anywhere. I do not believe our State Department should longer content itself by merely endorsing once more the Three Power—United States, Great Britain, France—Declaration of March 1948 favoring the return

of the whole Free Territory to Italy. We should urgently request Tito to see the light and urge him, especially in view of our aid to him, to cede Trieste completely back to Italy.

As a signatory of the North Atlantic Treaty, Italy is expected to collaborate in the defense of Europe. She cannot successfully do so unless the disturbances among her people concerning Trieste are quieted.

Italy's task at such defense is impaired by peace treaty clauses which limit numerically her Armed Forces, which prohibit submarine and speedy craft construction, which prevent coastal fortifications and preclude scientific research on military matters and drastically limits the size of her air force.

These prohibitive clauses should be amended, and reparations particularly to Russia and her satellites ought to be stricken from the peace treaty.

Flood Control Is Sound Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following timely editorial from the Kansas City Star, issue of August 8, 1951:

START FLOOD CONTROL NOW

This Congress can restore hope to the flooded thousands and flooded industries by a full-scale start on flood control. It can act on the whole program in Kansas and Missouri—do everything that can be done this year—and still the cost will be small. All the money that could be spent intelligently this year would probably be little more than the cost of the 1951 flood to Manhattan, Kans., alone.

There is real hope of action in the interest shown by Congress. Within the last week the members of the key House Subcommittee on Flood Control and other members of the Public Works Committee came out to see for themselves. We have had other visits by influential Senators and House Members. Most Members of Congress from both Kansas and Missouri are genuinely aroused. If there is to be any action this is the time.

Except for a very few projects, we are starting from general paper plans that haven't even been authorized by Congress. The desperate need of the flooded valleys is definite action on flood control which means both reservoirs and levees. Recently the people who wait for action have heard a lot of theoretical argument over labels for the plan. Some call for Pick-Sloan, some for MVA, and some for the Hoover report.

The only plans that are anywhere near the action stage are those that have been drawn for specific locations. Roll them together and give the plan a new label, if you like. We would be glad to settle for the name of "emergency flood-control program" or anything else. We can argue later about labels or methods of administration.

Here are the things that can be done this year:

At this end of Kansas the two projects that have been authorized and studied are the Tuttle Creek Dam on the Blue River

and the Toronto Dam on the Neosho. Farther west several dams planned by the Bureau of Reclamation have been authorized. So have floodway plans for Wichita and Hutchinson. All these could get underway this year. The preliminary work that can be done the first year is comparatively inexpensive.

The greater number of proposed dams affecting the flooded areas of Kansas and Missouri have never been authorized. This Congress can start action by authorizing all of them and appropriating the money for the detail engineering studies. At best none of these would be ready to use any construction money until next year.

Probably the experience of this biggest flood will show the need for additions of some dams that don't even exist on paper. Some of the smaller rivers have caused damage on a scale to justify major protection. There should be an over-all study for future guidance.

The rivers of this area—the Kaw system, the Marais des Cygnes-Osage and the Arkansas system—have served an ultimatum with the demonstrated power of their floods. The cost of reasonable protection is only a fraction of the price of the damage in one terrible year. And these building costs could not reach their peak for several years.

This part of the United States looks to Congress for the kind of action that says it shall not happen again.

Unwarranted Attacks on the Corps of Army Engineers and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the so-called investigation of the Corps of Army Engineers, Civil Works program, and the report issued on September 18 by a subcommittee on appropriations, condemning the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, constitutes one of the greatest farces in the history of Congress.

It seems to be a part of the program to discredit and destroy the Corps of Army Engineers, one of the finest and most reliable agencies of this Government.

It was just a camouflaged repetition of the attacks made on this project by the railroad lobbyists who are opposed to all waterways development. Never have I seen so many false, misleading statements made in an investigation before a congressional committee.

These railroad lobbyists who seem to be back of, if not conducting, this investigation, have viciously opposed this project from the beginning. One of the reasons for their opposition was the fact that it would tend to get rid of the one-way freight rate with which the people in every State south of the Ohio River and west of the Mississippi have been robbed and plundered for more than 50 years.

It was finally brought out that such a regulation was in violation of the Constitution and unjustified from every stand-

point. The result was that the Interstate Commerce Commission in its recent order wiped out this unlawful, discriminatory, dishonest, one-way freight rate. Therefore, from that standpoint, we have won a great victory in this fight.

But this report attempts to prevent the Army engineers from proceeding with the planning, as well as with the construction, of this vital missing link in our national defense program.

This hearing is so full of fakery and misinformation that I am surprised that any Member of Congress would sign a report based on such misrepresentations.

This project is vitally necessary to our national security, as well as to our internal transportation system; and it is going to be completed, regardless of this organized opposition of selfish interests.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Ike Writes Sweetland on Oregon Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower is so frequently spoken of by both major parties as a potential presidential candidate in the 1952 elections, I am including as part of these remarks a timely news item from the Oregonian of September 18, 1951, reporting on a letter addressed by the general to Monroe Sweetland, Democratic national committeeman. The item follows:

IKE WRITES SWEETLAND ON OREGON PRIMARY

Monroe Sweetland, Democratic national committeeman for Oregon, confirmed Monday night that he has exchanged personal letters with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower concerning the Oregon preferential primary situation.

General Eisenhower, supreme commander of the allied European defense organization, is regarded with high favor by some Oregon Republicans and Democrats as a presidential candidate in the preferential primary next May.

One group of Democrats, sparked by State Senator Tom Mahoney has filed a 1,000-name petition to establish the general's candidacy.

SWEETLAND WRITES GENERAL

A group of Republicans, led by State Representative Mark Hatfield, Salem, has collected a similar number of names, but has held off filing the petition until the legal air concerning a man running on both tickets has cleared.

Eisenhower, who is not a registered member of either party, has taken no part in either drive.

His two-page letter to Sweetland was marked "Personal and confidential." It was in reply to a letter from Sweetland.

Sweetland issued, when queried, the following statement about the letter:

"It is correct that I have received from General Eisenhower a discussion of the Oregon preferential primary situation. His letter, dated September 5, is personal and confidential, and I am bound neither to release it nor discuss the detail of its contents.

"All I can say about it is that his letter displays again his high devotion to the Na-

tion's interests and to the best in the Nation's military tradition in his refusal to admit, or imply, or to leave open to interpretation, any partisan political loyalty because it might interfere with the job which the country has assigned him.

"The most important position in the American Government today, second only to the Commander in Chief, is that of General Eisenhower in organizing the bulwark against communism in Western Europe."

UNSCRUPULOUS ACTS HIT

"Those who, for reasons of personal political ambition, or hostility to the President, try to traffic here in the prestige of General Eisenhower do so in utter disregard of the Nation's interests.

"Unfortunately, the peculiarities of Oregon's election law lend themselves to these unscrupulous activities, promoted many months before filing time, and carried on without the slightest sanction from the conscientious supreme commander of SHAPE."

Cooperation for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following timely editorial from the Kansas City Times, issue of August 9, 1951, calling attention to the need for common action in preventing floods:

UNITING AGAINST FLOODS

From the devastation of flood the people of this area are rising with a greater show of unity than we have ever seen before. Of course they still hold their own ideas on methods behind the labels of MVA or Pick-Sloan. A large share of the farmers put first emphasis on a bigger soil conservation program that includes many little retention dams on the creeks. Others directly exposed in the city or farm areas of the valleys are likely to think first of big dams.

Whatever the approach or belief in theory the main goal is the same. It is a goal of a better and more prosperous country with its flood waters harnessed to become the servant instead of the enemy of man. And right now the call is for action.

This week the Missouri Farmers Association threw its powerful influence on the side of action and thereby set an example for unity. As the representative of thousands of farmers the association has put its emphasis on stepped-up soil conservation with direct flood control starting from the small creeks. For flood-control management it takes the MVA approach. But it is also calling for a quick start on dams and levees that are far enough along in the planning stage to be started soon. A similar approach has been taken by Howard A. Cowden, president of the Consumers Cooperative Association. "Floods call for common action," he said in a signed editorial in the association's publication.

In Missouri the CIO holds firm to its stand for an MVA but it has gone on record for action on the dams and levees that can be started or authorized now. It reserves its right to work for its own views on administration while the construction is under way.

These organizations are setting the pattern of unity for a flood-control program—one that can start now with an excellent chance of winning the race with the next big flood.

Between the sincere soil conservation and big dam advocates the principal argument is on emphasis. The future of this part of the country calls for both. We must do everything possible to control the floods all the way from the little creeks to the big reservoirs. And we must save the land. As the MFA resolution pointed out this flood's devastation to the land may be more costly in the long run, than the damage to all other property. Once washed away the land is gone.

The Department of Agriculture's soil conservation and retention dam program has been accepted and supported in the Missouri Basin but it still waits on action by Congress. It goes hand-in-hand with the plan for reservoirs and levees. Speaking before the MFA convention Secretary Charles F. Brannan gave an excellent outline of the possibilities in stepped-up soil conservation.

When the structures of flood control are rising in the valleys the management problem can be solved along practical lines. The first point of the MFA advocates is management here in the basin and that isn't particularly controversial. The Pick-Sloan supporters have recognized the fact that a completed flood-control system serving various purposes will require management on the ground. They think in the general direction of a legalized interagency committee with power to act. We see nothing here that can't be handled by a reasonable spirit of compromise and common sense. As the program moves along practical consideration will probably influence the final decisions.

In the meantime the believers in flood control and soil conservation are rallying for a program starting where it can start this year. That is the powerful basis for unity and out of unity should come action. Straight ahead lies the goal of subdued flood waters turned to the service of man.

Tidewater Channel Hearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of date September 17, 1951, as follows:

TIDEWATER CHANNEL HEARING

Efforts to obtain congressional authorization of the tidewater-to-Gulf channel will be resumed at Washington Tuesday, so that plans and specifications costing not more than \$1,000,000 can be prepared. The first move must be made before a House public works subcommittee, and a battery of New Orleans civic and agency officials will be on hand to testify concerning the benefits of the project for wartime shipping, its savings in time and cost, and its importance to peacetime prosperity for the Mississippi Valley.

The channel has received, several years since, the endorsements of all Federal officials and agencies entrusted with powers of investigation and recommendation and has received Presidential approval. It has received repeated endorsements from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and has been approved by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, Mississippi River Commission, and similar bodies. Nothing

more can be done on preliminaries, and on vast preparatory work of a local nature, until a congressional commitment is forthcoming. Hopes along that line were disappointed last year.

The project appears eminently to meet the test of "works indispensable or incident to the war effort." The sum necessary for blueprinting, surveying, etc., will be reduced in proportion to the economic practices that should be inherent in all governmental activities. We hope sincerely that this beginning will be made possible, pending further decision on the vital question of actual construction.

Protection of Individual Rights and Government Security in Times of Stress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the American Bar Association, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, Tuesday, September 18, 1951:

This opportunity to address the members of the American Bar Association on the topic of Protection of Individual Rights and Government Security in Times of Stress is, by way of understatement, a most welcome one. I firmly believe that our greatest—and I emphasize, greatest—internal danger is that of the paralysis of fear gripping this country. The split personality we present is hardly conducive to any feeling of national dignity. On the one hand we make a great to-do of the strength of our democratic institutions, of our foundation of government by law, of the development of our industrial, social, and economic power under those principles, and on the other hand, internally, we cringe, not before the thought of the impact of an atom bomb, but before the thought of the impact of ideas. Courage to travel to the moon, yes—as we seem to be doing—but courage in the market place of ideas, no. We are surrounded by distrust—distrust of ourselves, distrust of our Bill of Rights, distrust of law. In this distrust of the law to protect us internally, we fashion more laws which, in turn, we again distrust, and so on, and so on. That is why I welcome this opportunity to talk to you as lawyers, and that is why I am so pleased to participate in this morning's session.

The American Bar Association has recognized the crucial nature of this problem and must be aware, as so many of us are, that, unless we address ourselves to the examination of the topic before us, we shall witness the tragic demoralization of the democratic process. I congratulate the American Bar Association for this movement in the direction of coming to grips with the problem of internal security and individual rights at this time in our Nation's history.

Lawyers, more than any single group of men, understand the nature of the complexity of this problem before us. Reasonableness as a concept in law, and hence in society, needs the protection of the lawyer to defend it from being swept away. I have talked with many of my constituents—student, worker, businessman, housewife—and many of them are afraid; afraid, not of any spy lurking under a bed, or in a closet, or in the guise of an instructor (they do not feel that the Communist ideology is a passionate-eyed brunette whose charms are irre-

sistible), but they are afraid of being accused of heresy should they depart from the expression of any but the most orthodox of opinions. In short, they are afraid to speak their mind.

One of the most vital functions of the lawyer today is to dissipate that climate. That climate is being thickened by a basic misunderstanding of the nature of our laws, a basic misunderstanding of the purpose of the Bill of Rights, and a confusion in the minds of both our legislators and a portion of the people whom they represent in the meaning of law itself.

For example, we have bills before the Committee on the Judiciary which call for the removal of all statutes of limitation on the commencement of prosecutions for offenses arising from espionage. What is proposed is to reduce the individual to helplessness before the powerful arm of the State.

We have bills requiring the Attorney General to compile and maintain a list of subversive organizations, which list can be compiled without hearings by fiat, merely on the individual definition of an officer in the employ of the State.

We have bills providing that peacetime espionage be punished by death.

We have bills prohibiting justices of the United States from testifying as to the character or reputation of any person or on matters of opinion—all this despite the common-law right to the defense of good character and despite the sixth amendment guaranteeing a defendant compulsory process of witnesses at a fair trial.

We have bills providing that advocating, merely advocating, the overthrow of the Government by force or violence shall be a capital offense at all times.

I quote a paragraph from one of these bills.

"Whoever, with intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any such government, prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, sells, distributes, or publicly displays any written or printed matter advocating, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence, or attempts to do so * * * shall be punished by death."

We have a bill redefining "treason" to include "the weakening of the Government of the United States, whether or not by force or violence," with the usual penalty for treasonable acts—death.

We have bills curtailing the right to bail, a bill to provide a bail of a million dollars for each day a convicted Communist wishes to remain free pending appeal, and a bill to revoke the citizenship of anyone refusing to testify as to his possible subversive activities.

Pardon me, Uncle Sam; your contradiction is showing.

In the name of containing totalitarianism, we keep increasing the cult of state and keep advocating the granting of more and more power to the state and stripping the individual of more and more of his rights, bitterly fought for over the centuries. After all, what is totalitarianism but the cult of state? As has been said, "We have enjoyed so much freedom for so long that we are perhaps in danger of forgetting how much blood it cost to establish the Bill of Rights."

I do not contend that there is no need for internal security, no need for us to be watchful against acts of espionage and subversion, but I do contend that when it is fear, rather than caution, that dictates our legislation, then that is a subversion of a much more dangerous kind.

There was so much talk a little while ago—much of it, unfortunately, politically insincere—that the United States was a haven for subversives and saboteurs, that no law exists to meet the need for internal protection. I therefore ordered prepared a committee print which I have with me now and which is a

compilation of all the provisions of the Federal statutes relating to the internal security of the United States. It contains, not only United States laws relating to subversive activities generally, but also such provisions as appear in the appropriation acts, the Federal loyalty program, the Security program, and the Internal Security Act of 1950, especially applicable to Federal employees. The compilation contains 75 closely type-written pages of protective statutes. Had any of the politicians to whom I made reference earlier taken a bit of trouble or time to examine this compilation, fewer headlines would have been printed on the laxity of our internal security laws.

In times of stress, it must be admitted that the balance is very difficult to strike. Where does the necessary protection for the state stop, and where do the individual rights begin? What are the real risks, and which are the ghosts? Where does the advocacy or the conspiracy to advocate subversive activities against the Government merge into the overt act? What is sadly lacking is a definition of terms. The lawyer has the duty and the responsibility and the challenge to fashion them.

Justice Black stated in his dissenting opinion in the case of *Dennis v. The United States*:

"There is hope, however, that in calmer time, when present pressures, passions and fears subside, this or some later Court will restore the first amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society."

Let us take that statement in conjunction with an earlier one made by Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Whitney v. California*:

"Fear of serious injury alone cannot justify suppression of free speech and assembly. Men feared witches and burnt women. It is the function of speech to free men from the bondage of irrational fears."

We find ourselves faced with the question, Do we remove the armor of the Bill of Rights at the time when the fighting is heaviest? Does not the individual need the guaranteed constitutional rights at the time when they are most threatened? Is not that the very purpose for their inclusion in the Constitution?

If the test of reasonableness were applied, we could perhaps strike the balance between Government and the individual in times of stress. Let this test be applied to the proceedings in Congress as well. I have introduced two bills which bear directly on the protection of individuals against the tyranny of government, and yes, carelessness of those representing government. One of them is H. R. 3440, providing that no Senator or Representative shall be immune from civil liability for any defamatory statement inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when such statement was not actually made in the Chamber of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

While the Constitution holds that "for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place," I do not believe that it is so absolute a privilege that it should extend to words inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD either by revision of remarks or by extension when they are not actually spoken in either Chamber.

Eminent constitutional authorities have held that no man ought to have a right to defame others under color of performance of the duties of his office. Irresponsible charges made in the privacy of a congressional office and attached to a statement made on the floor carry with them congressional immunity. The abuse of this immunity has resulted in unwarranted attacks on the reputation of citizens and has, in addition, undermined public confidence in the legislative body. It has nurtured the

growth of fear and suspicion. Too frequently defamatory speeches have been made outside the Capitol and subsequently inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Assuredly, such insertion should not accord any protection against a suit for libel or slander.

In these days of rapid news dissemination—the newspaper, television, and the radio—the individual can be and has been publicly defamed even before an opportunity for denial is accorded him.

Statements written in an office, but not actually stated on the floor or in committee, do not face the challenge of rebuttal on the floor. It is my firm conviction that such statements so inserted in the RECORD should not be accorded the same privilege of immunity.

While it is true that, broadly speaking, congressional immunity is necessary for the independence of the legislative body, so that its Members may be free to pursue their legislative duties, I can see no interference with the proper discharge of such duties if the cloak of immunity is lifted from words not actually spoken on the floor of the House or Senate or in committee.

I believe strongly that the provision I have offered is a completely necessary safeguard against abuse without removing the benefits which have and do flow from the constitutional provision granting general immunity.

The other bill I introduced is House Resolution 221, which, if enacted, would authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations with the view of drafting a code of procedure for the conduct of hearings and examination of witnesses before committees of the House of Representatives.

I believe that the irresponsible conduct of some investigations in the House and in the Senate have injured the fabric of our law and have in very many instances added to the stress of the times, permitting emotionalism to take the place of logic and loose generalizations, the place of facts. The rights of witnesses, in some instances, have been jeopardized because of the absence of properly defined rules of procedure. With the televising of congressional hearings, many legal aspects of the rights of witnesses present themselves. The question of what constitutes a committee quorum has not been resolved. The right to counsel has not been firmly established. What does and does not constitute contempt of Congress has not been concluded.

Congressional hearings are essential to the proper functioning of the Congress. There should be, however, most particularly now, no confusion or doubt as to the proper procedure to be followed.

Every problem I have touched on is within the particular and special province of the lawyer. We must look to the lawyer because of his practice and precision in the uses of evidence, in his familiarity with prosecution and defense and his familiarity with the diverse strains of our culture. In short, his background, his special training and experience equip him to recognize the fundamental nature of the problem before us.

The dangers of subversion and sabotage are well known and are advertised, but the dangers in combating these dangers in an atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and hate are not so well known. To court popularity, many resort to the enlargement of our fear of internal security. But I, wherever I can, like to quote from a letter to the House Un-American Activities Committee written by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., professor of the Harvard University Law School, in a discussion of the Mundt-Nixon Act:

"How many Communists are there in the United States? The United Press said 70,000 in 1947, out of a total population of 143,382,000; and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover recently gave a lower figure of 60,000 Communists.

Thus Communists form one-twentieth of 1 percent of all the people in our country. The odds are 1,999 to 1 in favor of free institutions. Suppose a football stadium holding 40,000 people. The chances are that 20 of them would be Communists and 39,980 would not. Remember, too, that it is not a question of 20 dynamiters or 20 men with concealed weapons, for then they could be arrested at once under the ordinary criminal laws. Just 20 unarmed persons who have not violated any existing Federal or State law or conspired to violate any existing laws. But they have learned bad ideas about politics from foreigners and foreign books, they are thinking bad thoughts about these bad ideas, they are telling them to each other and to any outsiders who are willing to listen. And hence we are told that without this new sedition law we are helpless to prevent them from harming the other 99.95 percent of us, who have on our side only the city and State police, almost every newspaper and school teacher and professor and preacher, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, never forgetting the marines.

"Shades of Valley Forge and Iwo Jima. If we no longer want to be the land of the free at least let us be the home of the brave."

What we need so crucially now is a healthy skepticism, which the lawyer can bring, definition, which the lawyer can fashion, precision, which the lawyer can use; reasonableness, which the lawyer understands, so that neighbor can talk freely to neighbor and a friend remain a friend, even though he may approve of the entry of Communist China into the United Nations or even though he may approve cease fire at the thirty-eighth parallel, and where one is presumed to be a loyal, patriotic American citizen without first having to publicly announce that he is not a Communist and to point to his proof—the loyalty oath he signed.

Parchments and Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very inspiring article that was written by our Senate Chaplain, entitled "Parchments and Principles," published yesterday in the Washington Star. I am sure that Members of the Senate will receive the same spiritual uplift from this article that we receive each day as we listen to the inspiring prayers of Chaplain Harris.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARCHMENTS AND PRINCIPLES

(By Frederick Brown Harris, pastor, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U S Senate)

Preserving precious documents which guarantee the people's liberties is one of the sacred tasks of the Nation. Of course, such holy archives must be kept from the implous hands of vandals and of avowed enemies of the state. It was well, when the Redcoats threatened America's newly founded Capital on the Potomac, that the cher-

ished Declaration and Constitution were hidden for a while in an idle grist mill across the river and later concealed farther south in old Virginia. Even during World War II these priceless documents were buried in a Kentucky vault. But a greater danger than destruction or mutilation by violence and malice always has put in jeopardy these revered emblems which a nation of freemen has regarded with a reverential awe almost akin to that which the ancient Hebrews had for the Ark of the Covenant.

An increasing peril has been that deterioration would dim them beyond recognition. The "powers of the air" were against them. Signs of inner decay have been manifest for many years. Disturbing fear has haunted the minds of the keepers of the shrine that time's remorseless impartiality in turning all things to dust finally would accomplish gradually and silently what no visible force could do. For, heedless of the impressive exhibit set up in the marble-columned Library of Congress, insidious battalions of disintegration were carrying out their destructive mission. Then, more than a decade ago, after a scientific survey a strategy of protection was adopted by ingenious patriots. Now it is assured, so far as human eyes can peer down the vista of the coming years, that the generations following still may view the original documents which are the charters of their freedom. As the Librarian of Congress declares:

"Every resource of science and technology has been applied in the effort to make these precious documents as permanently secure as the principles they proclaim."

It was fitting, indeed, that in the presence of a great throng the Declaration and the Constitution in their new containers, immersed in helium gas for a new lease of earthly immortality, should be sealed with pomp and ceremony as the eyes of the Republic were upon those hallowed scrolls. While the President of the United States and the Chief Justice of the United States, and distinguished representatives of the Congress lent their voices and hands to the ritual of the occasion it could be said, even as was declared when the documents first were placed in that setting more than a quarter of a century ago: "The impression upon the audience proved the emotional potency of documents with a great tradition."

But surely no thoughtful American could witness this moving pageant of patriotism without thinking of the deeper problem of preserving also the principles which make the parchments the hope of any future worth having, for us and all humanity. The battle for the parchments has been won; the battle for the principles is on as never before in all history. In the onslaught of atheistic materialism we face today a diabolical conspiracy against all that these documents symbolize. They are our banners in this titanic struggle between light and darkness; they speak of the mandates, not of an all-powerful state but, of "the laws of nature and of nature's God."

As today America marshals her moral and material might against all that the madmen of the Kremlin plot against the dignity of man, what better battle cry could be found than the closing sentence of the Declaration: "With a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence"? Back of both the Declaration and the Constitution, sanctified by daily prayer during the debates in which they were wrought out, is the voice of George Washington, as he cried out in those days of decision: "Let us raise a standard. * * * The event is in the hand of God!"

Recently, a radio commentator said: "The Constitution is the source of our freedom." That is a misleading statement. The Soviet constitution promises as much as our own; but in all its fair promises it ignores and even denies the author of liberty.

As we seal for a new tenure of permanence the two documents we need to remember, lest we forget, that our right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness comes not from government but from God. That is the reason, and the only reason, why no government has the right to take those rights from the people. The Declaration trumpets, "Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." It is God who assures them. A just government simply secures them. That is the meaning of the flag which flies above the Stars and Stripes on all naval ships during divine services. It is out of the sense of God that we get a sense of the worth of man.

While we are rightly always pointing out that those who kneel around the cradle of our Republic passionately believed in the separation of church and state, let us remember that they did not believe in the separation of religion and state. That is different. Because we do not recognize the difference, we are tragically strangling our educational system by leaving out the fundamental meaning of life itself—God. America is doomed on all counts unless, to use Lincoln's great phrase, it goes forward "under God." The only possibility for democracy is Deity.

Alas, that secularism, which is a lack of faith in spiritual verities, in this decisive day is draining the moral strength of the Nation. Everything that makes America invincible in the global struggle now raging is rooted in God and comes from God. We have preserved the parchments which declare that. We must preserve the principles or for us the handwriting will be upon the wall: "Thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting. Thy kingdom is divided and given to another."

We have stopped the decay of the parchments. We must stop the decay of the principles, or the parchments will outlast the Republic.

Iowa Farmers Repudiate Bureaucratic Schemes Hatched up in the Department of Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to read into the RECORD the minutes of a farm meeting held in Mills County, Iowa, in my district. They are as follows:

MILLS COUNTY, IOWA, FARM FAMILY POLICY REVIEW REPORT

The mobilization committee, including J. F. Wearin (chairman), Ray W. Jones, B. F. Buffington, and Richard S. Goos, met and reviewed the family farm program as suggested by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The committee unanimously agreed that a deadline of September 15, 1951, to have the county report finished and into the State office did not give enough time to do a thorough job on a survey of this kind.

A preliminary meeting was called for August 14, 1951, at the soil conservation office. The purpose was to invite various leaders over the county to attend and voice their opinion as to how the county-wide meeting should be conducted. Those invited were the following: J. F. Wearin, Mills

County PMA chairman; Paul Carlson, Production Credit Association; B. F. Buffington, Mills County PMA vice chairman; Richard S. Goos, county extension director, Ray W. Jones, SCS unit conservationist; D. N. McGrew, SCS district commissioner; J. F. Wearin, Jr., SCS district commissioner; C. K. Stewart, FHA representative; Fay McManigal, farm bureau president, Ned Turner, farm bureau officer; Ed Hopp, farm bureau officer; Gordon Steiner, farm bureau officer; Ormand Schoening, farm bureau officer; Ira Turner, Methodist Church layman; Myron Jones, Mills County PMA committeeman; Lee Honeyman, GI instructor; Lucille Stubbs, extension home economist; Mrs. Dewey Deitchler, farm bureau women leader, Mrs. Charles Wilson, Jr., farm bureau women leader; Mrs. David Angus, farm bureau women leader; Mrs. Edgar Jackson, farm bureau women leader; F. A. Wortman, newspaperman; William Brown, newspaperman; Wayne Bennett, Iowa Power & Light Co.; Horace Greenwood, lumberman; C. Rollin Buffington, farmer; William Rathke, district Rotary president; Carl Z. Lincoln, farmer; Richard W. Green, farmer; Deun McLain, farmer; Patrick Martin, Catholic layman; Edwin Leu, Lutheran layman, Ruel Harman, farmer, Leonard Duval, farmer.

This group drew up some points they thought should be considered and elected a committee to prepare those resolutions for the county-wide meeting. The committee named included: Edwin Leu, chairman; Fay McManigal, D. N. McGrew; Myron Jones; and Lee Honeyman.

Edwin Leu is president of the Mills County Fair Board, active in farm bureau and extension work, and is a leader in his community.

Fay McManigal is farm bureau president, has served on several farm bureau State committees, does an excellent job of soil-conservation farming, and is in the PMA program.

D. N. McGrew is a SCS district commissioner, past farm bureau president, active in PMA work, and is one of the most efficient farmers in the county.

Myron Jones is a PMA township committeeman, past farm bureau vice president, former vocational agriculture instructor, SCS cooperator, and very active in church and community affairs.

Lee Honeyman is a GI instructor and farmer. He is on the extension program planning committee, has been on several different farm bureau county committees, and cooperates with the SCS and PMA programs.

These men met and drew up the resolutions included in this report.

Minutes of the county-wide meeting are included in this report.

MILLS COUNTY MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE OPEN MEETING, AUGUST 30, 1951

The meeting was called to order by B. F. Buffington, acting chairman of the mobilization committee, in the Community Building at 8 p. m. on August 30, 1951.

Present: Mobilization committee members: B. F. Buffington, Ray W. Jones, Richard S. Goos, farmers' resolutions committee, Edwin Leu, Lee Honeyman, Myron Jones, Fay McManigal; many other leaders over the county.

Mr. Buffington introduced Edwin Leu, chairman of the resolutions committee that had been appointed at the meeting on August 14 to study the questionnaire sent out by the USDA and to draw up a set of resolutions pertinent to the questions asked. Mimeographed copies of the resolutions suggested were given out for consideration by those attending. Mr. Leu suggested that each be considered and adopted or rejected individually, explaining that these resolutions were the result of, and based on, the arguments presented at the meeting August 14. He asked that they be considered on a national

basis instead of a few individual cases, or as they affected local conditions. He pointed out that the entire booklet Mr. Brannan sent out was outlined as a family farm program and that the resolutions presented were pointed toward that aim. He also told those in attendance that if they cared to add anything to the resolutions, or change them in any way, that it was their privilege, adding, "This is still a democracy, and we hope to keep it that way." He then presented Resolution 1 for consideration:

Resolution 1 Reduce duplications between agencies at county, State, and National levels

Mr. Leu explained that the committee had found the programs of various departments were overlapping considerably, and yet each was asking for additional funds to enlarge their programs. He called upon Ray Jones to cite instances of this overlapping.

Mr. Jones cited the Market News Service for one. At present it is handled through the FMA, the BAE, and the Market News agencies. Mr. Leu commented that the office of information was requesting press service also, which would be another duplication. Mr. Jones stated that the farmers definitely wanted market news, but could see no necessity of having several agencies dispensing it.

Mr. Leu called attention to the duplication of loan agencies, stating that it seemed unnecessary to have both the Farm Credit and the FHA in the banking business for farmers, and that it was logical that these agencies could be combined, resulting in more efficiency and economy of operation.

Mr. Jones noted, also, that three departments were requesting funds for research farms, and stated expansion of research farms seemed unnecessary, and questioned the advisability of three different agencies pursuing research along the same lines. He also stated that much of the research done by these farms is at present done as well by individual farmers, without subsidy, and with the advice and technical help of the existing agencies in the county, such as Soil Conservation and Extension Service. With information available from these sources, he felt that pilot farms were not needed. However, if they were needed at all, it did not seem that they were needed by three different agencies. It appeared that all were shooting at the same goal, and foolishly spending money in duplicate efforts.

Mr. Leu stated "These are but four instances of overlapping, but it is hard for us, in such a short time, to find all the overlapping in this 122-page report. Since obviously the USDA themselves don't seem to know where they are overlapping, it is difficult for us to point out all the overlapping instances in one evening."

Mr. Leu then asked if anyone wished further discussion on the first resolution, and if not, moved that the resolution be adopted, suggesting that the instances cited be attached to the resolution as explanation of its purpose. Myron Jones seconded the motion. Motion carried, with no dissenting vote. Explanation to be attached to resolution.

Re Overlapping: (1) BAE, FMA, Market News, (2) Farm Credit and FHA finance agencies, (3) Research farms requested by three agencies, (4) Office of Information request press service, now supplied by FMA.

Mr. Leu then presented Resolution 2 for consideration.

"Resolution 2 We favor expansion or limitation of agencies as called for from the grass roots by congressional action."

Mr. Leu explained that the arguments that let up to this resolution were along these lines: "Should various members of agencies, or departments, go ahead and ask for the expansion or limitation, or should certain individuals, or should changes be made through Congress? In other words, should the Government agencies expand from within

in at the discretion of those in charge, or should the changes be requested by the people of the Nation, and decided upon by Congress? It appears that politics are involved, and they have a tendency to expand from within, constantly adding people to the payroll without proper authorization." Comments followed:

Fay McManigal, "I think limitation and expansion of agencies is not the problem in our county that it is in most places. At any rate, the expansion that seems to be desired on a State and national level has not been sought in this county."

Dick Goos "Our Constitution was drawn up with the provision that Congress should make the policies, and that agencies should administer them. It seems clear that agencies were not intended to make policies."

Myron Jones "I note that, on page 9 of the condensed report, this is said, 'More direct service could be provided if additional administrative funds were authorized for expanding the use of township committeemen. They could assist individual farmers to develop their own conservation progress, and encourage nonparticipating farmers to carry out conservation measures.' I don't think the committeemen themselves desire this expansion. They do not have the time, in the first place, to give this individual help, and are not qualified and equipped to do so. The Soil Conservation Service is equipped and qualified to give this assistance and it should be left for them to take care of."

Edwin Leu "The question seems to be this: Should expansion come from a need that arises, or should some politician decide it should be that way? Some of these agencies were born during a war period, or other period of crisis, and continue to be carried forward, and expanded, because they create jobs, far beyond their period of usefulness."

Dick Goos "Mr. Burdick made a pertinent statement the other day. He said 'Government agencies are like 'old soldiers, they never die.' However, neither do they fade away."

Edwin Leu "Does Resolution 2 need to be changed in any way, or thrown out completely? You know this is still a free country. If you want to say 'No,' go ahead. We would like to have a good argument here. How do you feel about it, Mr. Greenwood? Does it hit the nail on the head?"

Mr. Greenwood "I think you are definitely on the right track, and I am heartily in favor of it."

Mr. Leu "In other words, we are in favor of expansion only as the need for it is expressed at home by the people and not as coming from Washington."

Mr. Leu then moved that Resolution 2 be adopted, suggested that explanatory notes be added to this resolution, also. Mr. Greenwood seconded the motion. Motion carried, with no dissenting vote. Explanatory material added to Resolution 2—Expansion or limitation of agencies: (1) Research necessary, but duplication of effort not, (2) page 9 on consolidated report regarding extra funds for FMA local committees.

Mr. Leu then presented Resolution 3.

"Resolution 3 We believe that the role of members of the Department of Agriculture should be limited to giving requested assistance, and that policy making for the Department should be initiated by farmer demand."

Myron Jones referred to page 10 of the condensed report and Ray Jones to page 45 of the original USDA report for instances. Comments followed.

Edwin Leu "The committee felt that members of various agencies should be limited to assistance requested, and that the policy within the agency should be made by the farmers themselves, through their authorized representatives, Congress. We refer specifically to the Brannan plan as a plan that did not originate from the

farmers, but was thought up in Washington."

Fay McManigal: "When we decided to put this in here, we did not know of any farmers who had got together and asked for the Brannan plan, and did not know anything about it until it came out in the newspapers, as given out by Washington. We did not feel it should be initiated except by demand from the farmers. I think this resolution has a place here, and even Mr. Brannan himself will understand it, if he reads it."

Edwin Leu: "A hint to the wise should be sufficient."

Fay McManigal: "I talked to a man this week who said that Brannan himself admitted that he had not read the 122-page report."

Myron Jones: "It is a matter of record that he was not even in the country when it was released."

B. F. Buffington "I move that Resolution 3 be adopted as it stands, with explanatory references attached."

The motion was seconded by McManigal. Motion carried. No dissenting vote.

Explanatory references to be attached to Resolution 3—Re Policy by members of department: (1) Consolidated 4 and 8 because of similarity (2) page 10—Brannan plan.

Mr. Leu then presented Resolution 4.

"Resolution 4 We are not in favor of pilot or demonstrational farms as requested by the Department."

Comments followed.

Edwin Leu "We have something on this in Resolution 1. However, to make it specific, we have made this resolution more to the point. These pilot farms were to be in connection with four different projects: Soil areas, farm housing, testing experimental results, and soil-conservation research."

"The committee feels if the idea is good, it will be adopted by private owners, and will secure the assistance or develop it under some supervision that already is available, such as SCS or Extension, and will serve the same purpose as a pilot farm in the area. If it's a good idea, and he gets rich, all the neighbors will follow him. If it isn't, they won't. Pilot farms in connection with farm housing tend to deal with establishing a uniform standard of living. Mr. Jones, will you elaborate on the resolution?"

Myron Jones "The committee looked up these requests for pilot farms and felt after studying the question, that the pilot farms were not necessary."

Ray Jones "The point of the pilot farm is to make, in each area, a model farm, with all of the buildings perfectly set up, and scaled to the operation of the farm, etc. Now you know, and I know, that they are very nice, but why are they justified? Such a small percent of the farmers have the economic resources to remodel their farms to conform. Information is available through the Extension Service to give assistance to farmers interested in remodeling. There is plenty of technical information available and practical assistance to fit the individual problem, that these pilot farms serve no purpose, except that they are nice to look at. Few farmers can use any of them. There may be places in the United States where these things are necessary, but, thank God, that is not in this part of the country."

Fay McManigal: "You know they would have 25 laborers, 10 supervisors, and Lord only knows how many at a State level. This is a perfect example of the motive involved. If they could get these pilot farms wherever they want them, they could just about take care of everybody with a job."

Ray Jones: "Perhaps they have value, but what value?"

Edwin Leu: "It doesn't look like we are doing any arguing. Surely someone wants to present some different views."

Mr. Greenwood: "Farmers call my attention to the things they are interested in, that they see in the information now available."

Ray Jones: "Loads of information is now available for the asking; more than any farmer can use."

Fay McManigal: "I asked for information at the Iowa State College about building a machine shed. They asked me what I wanted to put in, and the approximate size of the machinery, and figured it all out for me. The lumber companies will do the same thing, and are glad to. It just looks like a way to give somebody a job."

Mr. Leu then moved that resolution 4 be adopted. Motion seconded by Art Goehring. Motion carried, with no dissenting vote.

Edwin Leu: "I guess we're ready to take up resolution 2. (Somebody hold McManigal.) On second thought, I'll call on McManigal to open this discussion."

"Resolution 5: We believe that the relationship between Extension Service and the sponsoring agency under strict divided finances results in a better educational program than complete severance of the two organizations."

Fay McManigal: "I get accused of a lot of things, and I would certainly like to have anyone who doesn't agree with me, speak up, but first I would like to ask a question: 'Why was this put in the form at all?'"

Edwin Leu: "As I understand it, Extension can be handled by any farm organization in the area. Up to a year ago, the county appropriation was handled through the Farm Bureau. However, in this county, I know the Farm Bureau and the Extension parted relationship in finances then, to the extent of having separate bank accounts. Mr. Goos, perhaps you can clarify this somewhat."

Dick Goos: "This was to avoid criticism that Farm Bureau was spending tax money which was not true. This year, it has gone a step further, and with this new bill where most counties get \$5,000 county appropriation instead of \$3,000, it is necessary to put the money we get from the county in one bank account, and the money from the Farm Bureau in another. In our county this year, Farm Bureau will contribute \$2,985 to the extension program. These bank accounts are carried this way to get away from any criticism, as to the use of the county funds."

Fay McManigal: "Our State has an outstanding record for Extension Service with this relationship existing. The program has gone forward, salaries increased, personnel added, through the years, but this is the first time there has ever been an increase in the county appropriation. The farmers, through Farm Bureau, have footed the bill for this expansion all the time, so I still want to know why this was included in this form."

Dick Goos: "Our governing body, the Farm Bureau board of directors, is locally controlled. Our salaries are set by them."

Fay McManigal: "The cost of the extension program has far exceeded the appropriation by the State and the county, and we have had to take up the slack out of Farm Bureau dues. Here we get criticized for taking money, when in reality we are giving it."

Dick Goos: "Local people have control over the salaries and the program. They decide what the program will be, and it works very effectively."

Fay McManigal (reading from p. 27 of full report): "Extension Service should be free from any operating relationship in any State and county with any general farm organization to assure that it is recognized as a public educational agency available to and operating in the interests of all farmers on an equal basis." Now, in other words, they infer if you don't belong to farm bureau, you are not entitled to extension service, and I defy anybody to show me where they have ever been denied any extension service because they are not farm bureau members. In fact, we went around to every township in

the county holding township meetings last year, and at those meetings stressed that everyone was perfectly welcome to avail himself of the extension services. In fact, we urged them to come in and use them. We felt if they come often enough, those who were not members might eventually feel we had something on our side of the house too. It looks to me like it would be very convenient for the USDA to get rid of farm organizations if it were possible for them to do so."

Leo Honeyman: "The reason this resolution was put in here this way was: 'We believe we are better serviced in the relationship with the farm bureau as it is. We believe these objectives would be more apt to be reached under the present relationship than under the alternative they recommend. They emphasize local participation and leadership, and we think the recommendation to divorce farm bureau and extension would work against those objectives'"

Fay McManigal: "I don't think either is perfect, but getting better all the time. If the USDA doubles this kind of stuff (indicating the report) next year, we will need to double farm bureau membership. They don't state where they will get the money to carry the program. They would have to raise more taxes to replace the approximate \$3,000 allotment from farm bureau to the program."

Edwin Leu: "Any more remarks concerning this resolution?"

Myron Jones: "I make a motion we continue to operate as we are, and add to the resolution that it is a saving to the county as it is."

B. F. Buffington: "I am not so sure the farm bureau should have to pay for the extension program. Perhaps the tax basis is fairer. Since the program is available to everyone, why should Farm Bureau members have to pay for the program?"

Fay McManigal: "I think the fact that it is operated under local control makes for more efficient management."

Lee Honeyman: "I suggest you add to the resolution 'makes for better financial efficiency due to local control.'"

Edwin Leu: "I move that resolution 5 be adopted, with this addition"

Motion was seconded by Fay McManigal. Motion carried with no dissenting vote. Resolution now stands: "We believe the relationship between extension service and the sponsoring agency under strictly divided finances results in a better educational program than complete severance of the two organizations, and makes for better financial efficiency due to local control."

Edwin Leu: "What? No dissenting votes? This is heaven. There hasn't been an argument tonight."

Edwin Leu then presented Resolution 6.

"Resolution 6: We disapprove of the Department of Agriculture conducting research on personal problems such as establishing standards of living for the farm family."

Comments followed:

Edwin Leu: "Is anyone in the house able to define the living standard for any farm family? Would you be satisfied to use the standard of living of a family in the Ozarks as your own, or would you prefer to adopt the standard of living of some wealthy banker in the east? Do you think it is possible for anyone in the Department of Agriculture to set out any standard of living we can all live by?"

Ray Jones: "Information along this line is available to all through the extension department. What more do we need? Isn't that right, Miss Stubbs?"

Miss Stubbs: "Yes, the information is available to those who desire it, and we are glad to help anyone who wants assistance, but you can't go into someone's home and say, 'Here, you must live like this.'"

Ray Jones: "Every individual selects his own living conditions, and must have the de-

sire to raise his standard of living, before he will do it. If he has the desire, he will raise it, and the information to help him do so is available if he desires it."

June Fickel: "It is not a lack of wanting to raise one's standard of living. It is just an economical impossibility to do so. Many people have the desire to raise their standard of living but it is just not possible. They haven't the money to do it."

Myron Jones: "How would establishment of this agency by USDA help to do so?"

June Fickel: "It wouldn't."

Lee Honeyman: "All this smacks of regulating the size of the farm, and promoting what they call family farms. However, there would be considerable disagreement about what the size of a family farm should be, and who could decide what it should be. We are not in favor of any activity on their part to promote family farms. If this idea were carried far enough, they could work to the decided disadvantage of any farm in any sector, and I don't think it is anything for the Government to determine."

Edwin Leu: "Can anyone here decide how large a family farm should be, or how to determine the living standard for a farm family?"

Ray Jones (reading from report): "It is the philosophy of the credit agencies of the Department of Agriculture that the living of the farm family has the first claim on farm income. That is, loans must be repaid from income over and above that necessary for the family to live. But what is the essential content or minimum standard of living that American farm families ought to have? Does it include an automobile, recreation, and so forth?"

Edwin Leu: "No one in this group seems to think they can define a standard of living for the Government to go by. We all feel a better standard of living should be promoted, but feel that is more or less overstepping into private territory. A person should have the personal freedom to determine his own standard of living."

B. F. Buffington: "The standard of living would depend on the size of the family, and that would be a little hard to limit."

Edwin Leu: "I think determining the size of the family would be stepping into private territory."

B. F. Buffington: "The question is still pertinent—if you limit the size of farms. Obviously, a large family would have to have a large farm, and a small family could not operate a large farm efficiently. Of course, they could with hired help, but that would be getting away from the idea of the family farm. You just can't say what size a farm should be and have it practical for all families. You just can't shove them around. Or, I guess you can. They do it in Russia. They did it in Germany."

Allen Wortman: "You might suggest a note be issued to Mr. Brannan to get in touch with Mrs. Sanger to help him set the standard size of the family, and they be made to conform with the size of the farm, to maintain the desired standard of living."

Edwin Leu then made a motion that resolution 6 be adopted. Seconded by Honeyman. Motion carried, no dissenting vote.

Edwin Leu: "Now are there any more resolutions to be put before the house? There may be other things we need to take action on. I wouldn't want to be quoted as an authority on what all we should take up."

Myron Jones: "At our PMA committee meeting we had representatives of SCS which was very agreeable to PMA. I understand they set up standards for ACP payments and check the work. I wonder if it would eliminate duplication if some of that was put in SCS."

B. F. Buffington: "In this country, the SCS has gone out and checked the practices we would pay on. We pay on their recommendation. Of course that has worked very much to the benefit and assistance of PMA."

PMA was not qualified technically and had not the time to check these practices. SCS could probably handle these payments just as well. They could probably handle the corn the same as PMA. I think the technical part of the conservation service should be done by SCS. However, in all counties, it is not as smooth as it is here."

Ray Jones: "All agencies here agree upon practices. However, in some counties they don't agree. On some things, in some counties there is not an accepted specification for ACP payments and consequently there is a terrific amount of confusion. In our particular county there is no disagreement. In some counties a man may lay out terraces according to the advice of the SCS but the PMA man who checks it says 'I don't like terraces that shape. They must be this shape before I will approve payment on them.' In those counties they can't get together on anything."

Ray McManigal: "What will the result of meetings like this be in such counties?"

Ray Jones: "Out of eight counties I have talked to, only three have been able to get enough people together to even discuss this thing."

Ray McManigal: "What will happen when the results of these counties' attempts to answer these questions are turned in?"

Ray Jones: "Who knows?"

Ray McManigal: "I think it's wonderful we get along like this in this county, but are we going to bury our heads in the sand because we are so happy about the situation in our county?"

B. F. Buffington offered a resolution for consideration as follows: "We approve a reduction in appropriation of funds for the agencies under USDA rather than an enlargement of their operation."

Edwin Leu recommended this be called Resolution 7, and put to a vote. Buffington moved it be adopted. Seconded by Goehring. Motion carried, no dissenting votes.

Honeyman asked if this could be too much of a blanket resolution and if it was desirable to cut appropriations of all agencies.

Edwin Leu: "In other words, are we slighting our own agencies? Any comments?"

B. F. Buffington: "Of course we are, but some of our payments on practices are ridiculous. Part of our PMA program at the present time is very open to criticism, because we are making payments on a basis that is not desirable and not necessary, and in some cases not beneficial. There was a time when they helped, but they are no longer needed."

Art Goehring moved that the resolutions be sent to our State and National Representatives and Senators. Seconded by Greenwood. Motion carried.

Edwin Leu: "Any other matters before the house?" I believe we accomplished some of the aims brought forth at the first meeting. It was felt that discussing what should be brought up at this meeting would take up the entire evening, unless a committee was appointed to study the more salient points, and draw up some resolutions regarding same. Whether they will accomplish anything in the end or not, I don't know. They will probably do as they please, anyhow. If there is no more business, a motion to adjourn is now in order."

It was moved by Jack McGinnis to adjourn. Seconded by Ray Jones. Motion carried.

RESOLUTIONS

No. 1: Reduce duplications between agencies at County, State, and national levels.

Reference:

1. BAE, PMA, Market News.
2. Farm credit and FIA finance agencies.
3. Research farms requested by three departments.

4. Office of Information request press service, now supplied by PMA.

No. 2: We favor expansion or limitation of agencies as called for from the grass roots by congressional action.

Reference:

1. Research necessary.

2. Page 9 of consolidated extra funds for PMA local committee.

No. 3: We believe that the role of members of the Department of Agriculture should be limited to giving requested assistance, and that policy-making for the Department should be initiated by farmer demand.

Reference:

1. Consolidated 4 and 8 because of similarity.

2. Page 10, Brannan plan.

No. 4: We are not in favor of pilot or demonstration farms as requested by the Department.

Reference:

1. If idea is good will have pilot or demonstration farm by many private owners.

2. Page 2, D1, soil areas.

Page 3, 5, farm housing.

Page 4, C1, testing experimental results.

Page 14, C3, soil-conservation research.

No. 5: We believe the relationship between extension service and the sponsoring agency under strict divided finances results in a better educational program than complete severance of the two organizations.

Reference:

1. Page 27, 2, full text.

2. What would do without board of directors.

No. 6: We disapprove of the Department of Agriculture conducting research on personal problems such as establishing standards of living for the farm family.

Reference: (1) Page 6, 6, full text.

No. 7: We approve a reduction in appropriation of funds for the agencies under USDA rather than an enlargement of their operation.

Litigation Between Arizona and California To Determine Their Respective Rights to Benefits of the Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, much of the present controversy between Arizona and California over the waters of the lower Colorado River involves legal questions which I as a nonlawyer am not well qualified to discuss, but on consultation with eminent lawyers some facts have been impressed upon my mind which I must indicate. At the present point all seem agreed that a final determination of water rights by the Supreme Court of the United States is not only desirable but necessary. Some Members of Congress now studying the legal aspects of the question have said that they feel that Arizona now has a justiciable issue which would enable her to take the matter to the high Court for adjudication and a definitive judgment as to her right to use water out of the Colorado River. Arizona lawyers deny that such a justiciable issue is present in the absence of an authorization by Congress. For that reason, I am urging legislation which will give us an authorization sufficient for the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction and render Arizona a decision as to her rights.

I have repeatedly said to my committee, "I am extremely anxious for the Su-

preme Court to tell Arizona how much water she has yet coming to her out of the main stream of the Colorado River and to tell California how much water she has coming to her out of the main stream of the Colorado River, under existing law." By existing law I mean the Colorado River Compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the California Self-Limitation Act of 1929, the Mexican Water Treaty of 1945, and all other relevant acts, statutes, and contracts.

It is my understanding that the Supreme Court of the United States has original jurisdiction over controversies between States, and that that constitutional grant of power cannot be modified by congressional act. It is my further understanding that the Supreme Court has declared that it will not render advisory opinions or declaratory judgments between States. Such being the case, I cannot see my wish accomplished to have the high Court tell Arizona how much water she is entitled to use under existing law out of the main stream of the Colorado River, unless and until a case is maintained in the Supreme Court over which the Court will take jurisdiction and render a judgment. It is the purpose of the modified form of the act, S. 75, which I am proposing, to create the justiciable issue so that respective water rights may be determined.

Not being a lawyer, I have consulted the many eminent attorneys who have appeared as witnesses in this long controversy before the various committees. In the Eightieth Congress, before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee of the House, considering House Joint Resolution 225, and others, the Colorado River Basin States Committee, all eminent western water authorities and many of them outstanding lawyers, gave testimony and filed a brief. The members of the Colorado River Basin States Committee are listed on page 287 in the hearings, serial No. 23, of the Eightieth Congress. That committee is composed of two representatives of each of the five States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. All of the members of that committee and their lawyers are agreed that there is not now for either California or Arizona a justiciable issue within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Arizona has twice brought suit, *Arizona v. California* (283 U. S. 423 and 298 U. S. 558). In each case, the Supreme Court dismissed the complaint and in each case one of the grounds was that Arizona had no authorized project, and hence there could be no threat of injury based upon an inchoate claim to water which has not been and might never be appropriated or put to use, and since the Court could not in an interstate suit render a declaratory judgment or advisory opinion, it had no jurisdiction.

In other words, it would not decree a water right for an unauthorized project although there were involved engineering designs, canal lines, and lands to be irrigated in each case.

So that if there is any thought that Arizona could establish her right with-

out an authorization, it is clearly erroneous.

As was well stated by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, on the floor of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, February 21, 1950:

The Supreme Court has clearly announced in case after case that a controversy is not a mere request for a judicial opinion as to the effect of any law or of any compact. A controversy is something very much more definite and complete.

In the case of *Missouri v. The United States* (200 U. S., 496), at page 521, it was clearly held that the Court will not grant relief against a State unless the complaining State shows an existing or presently pressing injury of serious magnitude.

Again, in the case of *Alabama v. Arizona* (291 U. S., 286) the Supreme Court said:

"The Court will not grant relief against something feared as liable to occur at some future time. This Court may not be called upon to give advisory opinions or to pronounce declaratory judgment * * * Its jurisdiction in respect of controversies between States will not be exerted in the absence of absolute necessity."

In the New River case, *United States v. Appalachian Electric Power Company* (311 U. S., 337), it was held:

"To predetermine, even in the limited field of water power, the rights of different sovereignties, pregnant with future controversies, is beyond the judicial function."

It seemed clear, Mr. President, to the members of the committee that the Constitution of the United States has been correctly interpreted by the Supreme Court and that there was no possibility of obtaining an adjudication of the basic controversy between California and Arizona except by the authorization of the project. When that authorization is made and not till then, Mr. President, there will be a controversy within the meaning of the Constitution which the Supreme Court can adjudicate. The Congress cannot solve this problem; it cannot repeal the interstate compact which it has approved. The compact stands. The road to unity, the road to the settlement of the controversy, is the road which is provided in this bill by which authority to make the United States a party is granted, for lack of which the Supreme Court once declined to pass upon the case and by the authorization of the project which creates a constitutional controversy. By this bill, Mr. President, we provide that the compact may be construed by the Supreme Court.

Senator O'MAHONEY also very correctly stated:

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT NOT POSSIBLE

Mr. O'MAHONEY Mr. President, there is one decision of the Supreme Court which, it seems to me, is particularly pertinent. The suggestion was made that a declaratory judgment under a recent statute might be made by the Supreme Court. That precise point was raised in the case of the United States against West Virginia, which is reported at Two Hundred and Ninety-fifth United States Reports, page 463. In that case the Supreme Court dismissed a bill brought by the United States Government to enjoin West Virginia and certain corporate defendants to which the State had issued permits from constructing a hydroelectric dam in a river alleged to be navigable and for a declaratory judgment that the rights of the United States in the stream were paramount. The holdings of the Court were to be found on page 473 of the report.

I read:

"There is presented here, as respects the State, no case of an actual or threatened interference with the authority of the United States. Until the right asserted is threatened with invasion by acts of the State, which serve both to define the controversy

and to establish its existence in the judicial sense, there is no question presented which is justiciable by a Federal court."

With respect to the power of the court to render a declaratory judgment, the Supreme Court said, at page 475, volume 395, United States Reports:

"No effort is made by the Government to sustain the bill under the Declaratory Judgment Act of June 14, 1934 (ch. 512, 48 Stat. 955). It is enough that that act is applicable only in cases of actual controversy. It does not purport to alter the character of the controversies which are the subject of judicial power under the Constitution."

Mr. President, it is utterly impossible, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the committee to expect a declaratory judgment. I may say that the distinguished and able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, shares that opinion, as is evidenced by the fact that the amendment, in the form of sections 12 and 13 of the bill, was worked out and presented to the committee by the distinguished Senator from Colorado and by the chairman of the committee. The outstanding qualifications of the Senator from Colorado as a lawyer are recognized by all.

So, Mr. President, by providing for the authorization of this project, the committee seeks to bring about the conditions which will in turn create a justiciable controversy which the Supreme Court can settle. Then we shall understand, clearly and definitely, and with authority, what the respective rights of California and Arizona are to this water.

As my committee has previously so well stated, this controversy has held up the development of the entire Colorado River Basin for many years. Today between nine and ten million acre-feet of water are wasting to the sea. In Arizona and in southern California an acre-foot of water is conservatively estimated to produce \$40 in gross crop value annually. Certainly all irrigation waters used consumptively in Arizona during the last 10 years have averaged more than \$40 per acre-foot of water used in gross crop value. Will the American people permit thousands of rich acres in this land of sunshine to remain desert or return to the desert while such a volume of life-giving water wastes to the sea? In the legislation that I propose I am not asking that any appropriation be authorized at this time, nor at any time until after the Court has established Arizona's water rights in that river and the feasibility of the diversion established at such later date. I cannot too strongly urge Congress to move now that his controversy on which so many thousands of peoples today and millions in the future depend be quickly decided.

Construction of Connecting Water Link Between Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers Should Start Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include a statement by me before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on September 19, 1951, in behalf of an appropriation with which to begin construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway:

Mr. Chairman, for the past 144 years the question of the construction of a link connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers has been before the public. Even before that, the Tombigbee River was used as an avenue of commerce by citizens of the United States beginning in 1802. And, even before that date, it was used by the Spanish and Indians.

In the year 1807 a proposal was made by one James Lyon, a candidate for Congress from the State of Tennessee, that the Tennessee River be linked with the Tombigbee River by a canal. He proposed that this canal be built from Bear Creek, a tributary of the Tennessee, which rises in the southeastern part of Franklin County, Ala., to the Tombigbee River.

This proposal in its various forms was before the Congress for many years, but the reports of the engineers all indicated that it was not feasible to construct this connecting link by way of Bear Creek.

When Pickwick Dam was built in the late thirties, the water on the Tennessee River was raised above the dam, by more than 50 feet, and when that was done the United States engineers found that it was feasible to construct this connecting link, not by way of Bear Creek, or by way of the upper reaches of the Warrior River, both of which proposals were before the Congress at that time, but by way of Yellow Creek.

The members of the committee have just heard General Clorpening say that the construction of this canal is recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

I would like to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the able members of this committee, that the insistence for the construction of this canal in the early days was primarily on the part of people living in middle Tennessee and north Alabama, who desired a connection with the then thriving city of Mobile on the Gulf of Mexico.

The desirability of such connection is even greater today than it was in those early days, because in the meantime, the great Tennessee River has been improved for navigation, flood control, and power development, and in the meantime, as we all know, one of the great pillars of our national defense has been constructed at Oak Ridge, Tenn. I refer, of course, to our Atomic Energy Plant at Oak Ridge. Also, to the north and west, there is now under construction near Paducah, Ky., another atomic energy plant. The great aluminum plant of Reynolds Aluminum Co. was constructed in 1940 at Listerhill, near Sheffield, Ala. Many other industries have come to this area of north Alabama and Tennessee. The only connection they have with the Gulf is that down the Tennessee and Ohio Rivers to Cairo, Ill., thence down to the Mississippi to New Orleans.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has so well and forcefully pointed out, the construction of this canal between the Tombigbee and Tennessee would cut the water distance between Oak Ridge and the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile, Ala., by more than 800 miles.

I hope that I have not given the impression that I regard the Tombigbee Canal as a matter of local interest, because it is not. It is a matter of the greatest national interest and it is truly the missing link in our inland waterway system. Its construction will allow the transfer of water-borne traffic from one major city to another of this country, with unbelievable ease and I believe it is from the standpoint of geography one of the most unusual projects in this country or in the world.

Since I have been in Congress, I have actively supported every effort that has been made to get this waterway under construction. It is my pleasure here today to join my efforts with those of the Senior Senator from Alabama, the Honorable LISTER HILL, and with the efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who has for years advocated the building of this waterway. Also present here today, is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] who has during the time I have been in Congress, ably and actively advocated and espoused the building of this waterway, realizing the great advantages that will accrue to this Nation and to his section of Alabama by the construction of this waterway. I want to associate myself with the remarks which he has just made in this connection. Also, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] the gentlemen from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER and Mr. SUTTON] have appeared here.

This is one of those fortunate projects that will have an immense value to the national defense and at the same time an equal value to our domestic economy.

The value of this project to my congressional district has a double aspect in that the Tombigbee itself flows through Pickens County in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, and the largest tributary of the Tombigbee, the Warrior River, which has its headwaters in Cullman and Blount Counties in the seventh district and which is navigable with a 9-foot channel to Coyle, in my home county of Walker, joins the Tombigbee at Demopolis, Ala. On the Warrior River are located the greatest coal and iron deposits of the southeast.

I also want to thank your committee for its kindness in allowing the work on the great dam at Demopolis, Ala., to go forward. This dam is of great significance to the improvement both of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, as it will improve navigation on both rivers by eliminating three or four dams now across the Tombigbee and Warrior, and the new dam will have a lock of the size equipped to handle the large barge cargoes that move over our modern waterways.

Message to the People of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Cardinal Spellman's radio message to the people of Poland broadcast by Voice of America, which appeared in the Polish American Journal on September 1, 1951:

CARDINAL SPELLMAN'S RADIO MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF POLAND BROADCAST BY VOICE OF AMERICA

With "mourning Poland" the free world mourns the death of His Eminence Adam Cardinal Sapieha, archbishop of Cracow, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, said in a broadcast beamed to that country by the Voice of America.

His Eminence paid tribute to the late cardinal's extensive works of mercy through the formation of Caritas, which has now been taken over by the Communist regime.

Cardinal Spellman's address follows:

"But a few days ago the citizens of the United States received from Cracow the sad news that the shepherd of that ancient Polish diocese had at last laid down his pastoral staff

which he had used for more than a quarter of a century to guide with love and zeal and courage, with charity and justice the lambs who had been entrusted to him by Christ, the Supreme Shepherd of our souls. Adam Stefan Cardinal Sapieha had closed his eyes in death. After 84 years of consecrated life, spent for his God whom he served with unselfish devotion, and for his Poland which he loved with passionate dedication, the venerable prelate brought to an end one of the most distinguished careers in contemporary ecclesiastical annals.

"One can well understand why the 23,000,000 Catholics of Poland are overwhelmed with grief in this hour when God has called from their midst the familiar and beloved figure of their father, of their leader, of the friend of their poor and of their suffering, of the fearless defender of their God-given rights and liberties. And yet, it is not only the citizens of Poland who today are in mourning for Cardinal Sapieha but God fearing and freedom-loving men and women all over the world who realize that in death there has been silenced a voice which dared to cry out in the wilderness of confusion and in the dark hours of a double enslavement, the warning of his Master, 'render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are God's'.

"Like his holy predecessor in the See of Cracow, St. Stanislaus Szczepanowski, who was martyred at the altar by a tyrannical king because he proclaimed the laws of God's morality, your beloved archbishop, Cardinal Sapieha, never ceased to declare the rights of God and to defend the rights of the little people of Poland against the aggressor and the usurper whether he came from the West or the East. You, the faithful of Cracow, you the people of all Poland beheld your great deceased archbishop as he had the dauntless courage to resist the Nazi invaders who sought to treat you as an inferior race and to destroy the century-old and glorious traditions of Poland. But very few in the entire expanse of Poland could equal or approximate the patriotism, the love of Poland of this aged prelate who now has his eyes on a Poland which once more drags the chains of bondage. No one, and most certainly not those more recently come into your midst when the horrors of war and pestilence are a matter of the past, no one can begin to match his works of mercy on behalf of the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the homeless, the disease ridden, the widowed and the orphan. To serve God's poor and afflicted this tireless man of God organized and built that great vehicle of God's mercy known as Caritas. From one end of Poland to the other, Caritas became the symbol of divine compassion for the multitudes of uprooted humanity. It was the manifestation of God's everlasting love in action among the masses. Through it the bishops and priests, religious and lay of Poland collaborated in a great crusade of sacrifice to help all the suffering inhabitants of Poland without regard for ethnic origin or religious persuasion. It was sufficient to know that they were hungry, thirsty, sick or homeless. And, my dear Polish brethren, it was the great privilege of us Catholic Americans to cooperate with Cardinal Sapieha and Caritas in those frightful days with our gifts of money, food, clothing, and medicine.

"Incredible though it may seem, because of these works of mercy performed for you, my brethren of Poland, Caritas and Cardinal Sapieha and the legions of those who worked with him in this great enterprise, were branded 'enemies of the people' and one of the first steps taken by the real enemies of the Polish people was the liquidation of Caritas. Now this dastardly maneuver saddened the heart of your dead Cardinal—not merely because Caritas was suppressed but because his great heart and his generous hand and his brother bishops of Poland were prevented from distributing bread to those

who were famished and clothes to those who were in rags and medicine to those who were fever ridden.

"While the soul of the great Sapieha was torn asunder by the spectacle of the physical needs of his cherished flock, it was even more tortured—aye, almost paralyzed by the spiritual dangers which were, and still are being systematically elaborated with almost diabolical ingenuity to stamp out in the hearts of Poles, especially of the innocent children and youth, belief in God Himself, and to tear away from the chair of Peter, the center of Christian unity, the noble church of Poland which for centuries has been the eastern bastion of the Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church. Cardinal Sapieha, who a half-century ago lived in Rome in close proximity to blessed Pius X, beheld similar movements at that period in other parts of the world. He had the inestimable privilege of understanding and imbibing the spirit of that blessed pontiff who was saddened at the assaults made in his day on the citadel of faith. With the experience of years, Cardinal Sapieha learned that the church is an old anvil which has worn out many a hammer. From Peter's tomb to the ancient See of Cracow he brought these convictions, deeply rooted in faith and fashioned after the heroic example of blessed Pius. No wonder that he was so courageous and fearless in facing the church's enemies—but likewise, it is no wonder that he feared the sly, surreptitious introduction of synthetic, State-controlled movements masquerading as religion in the guise of schism. He knew that the so-called national church with its specious allurements of freedom, is ultimately and inevitably the instrument of the vilest type of enslavement, the slavery of the spirit to autocratic political commissars. The unity of doctrine and discipline and worship was always uppermost in his thoughts and prayers. Time and again he cried out so wisely to his priests and people: 'Remember that you will never build a better Poland by betraying God.' And time and again he implored Poland to recall its glorious, unflinching devotion of a thousand years to the Vicar of Christ, the successor of Peter the Fisherman, for whom in ages past its bishops, priests, and laity had suffered confiscation and proscription and exile—the loss of material goods—and even life itself. But they never betrayed Peter.

"In these days, with mourning Poland, the free world too will mourn as the last remains of Cardinal Sapieha, a champion of freedom, are interred on the Wawel near the bones of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot who came to these United States in our hour of national need and helped us by his military genius to win our freedom and independence. Sapieha, great son of the church and of Poland, will be borne to his tomb near the sepulchre of Poland's poet of freedom, Adam Mickiewicz, who envisioned Poland crucified as Christ was crucified, for being the standard bearer of faith and idealism. And while the clergy and faithful will chant their hymns of requiem about the grave of their fearless cardinal-archbishop, the voice of another Polish poet, Krasinski, will sing and will resound mysteriously and reassuringly to your Poland again crucified but destined once more to rise, the verses of his immortal poem, Dawn-Przedswit:

"And I heard a voice that called in the eternal sky:

As to the world I gave a Son,
So to it Poland, thee I give,
My only Son He was—and shall be,
But in thee, my purpose for Him lives.
Be thou then the Truth, as He is, everywhere
Thee I make my daughter!
When thou didst descend into the grave
Thou wert, like Him, a part of mankind,
Thy name is: All Humanity!

"Fear not, my brethren of Poland. The night may be long but the dawn with its

message of victory must come. As Poland in the darkness climbs again the steep road of her Calvary she becomes, in this mysterious era of iniquity, once more the symbol of all humanity. Keep burning the lamp of faith. Remain loyal to your bishops, the successors of the apostles all of whom were martyrs. Show love and reverence to your priests in this hour of their tribulation. Suffering and imprisonment and exile and martyrdom are no new experiences for the bishops and priests of Poland. Anyone who knows Polish history knows that to be true. And anyone who has ever been behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp needs no further proof of this assertion. The bishops of Poland with God's unfailing help will carry on from the point where Cardinal Sapieha was stopped by death. They will continue in his name to remind you in your hours of trial and temptation, 'You will never build a better Poland by betraying God.'"

What Reservists Can Expect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in common with all other Members of Congress, I have been deeply and seriously concerned over the mounting evidence of inequity and injustice suffered by reservists, particularly inactive and volunteer reservists, in the handling of our manpower needs by the Armed Services since the Korean outbreak.

A very great obligation rests upon us here in Congress to get to the bottom of the matter, and to make certain that the Department of Defense and the various Services correct these adverse conditions.

There is a great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to what is in store for the reservists. The United States News and World Report, in its September 28 issue, undertook to outline what reservists can expect, barring all-out war. It is an interesting summary, even if the picture is not wholly reassuring. Eight complaints of reservists, listed at the end of the article are identical with the complaints which I have in my files in hundreds of letters from men recalled to active duty.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT RESERVISTS CAN EXPECT—FOR MOST: 17-24 MONTHS, IF IN; NO CALLS, IF OUT

Serious concern about what the future holds for them is being felt once more by 2,500,000 reservists and their families.

Men in Reserves still are being called by all of the armed services. Widespread hope, built up, that veterans might be released after a year of active duty is fading. Hardships, big and small, are being undergone by many. A feeling that reservists are discriminated against appears to be spreading. Congress, trying to offer some relief, is up against a need for more and more experienced men in the Armed Forces, and by specialized needs of each service.

What reservists are concerned about most at this time is shown in the chart covering gripes in hundreds of actual letters from reservists in recent weeks. Underlying them all is a feeling of uncertainty about just what is in store next for those in service and those at home.

Yet, there are certain basic points that the individual can be sure of in policy decisions now reached by Congress and the armed services.

Men now in uniform, for example, can count on this much:

Organized reservists and men from the National Guard are going to be retained on active duty for 24 months. That applies to officers and enlisted men alike. There is one exception—Air Force men in units recalled prior to June 19, 1951, will be released after 21 months of service.

Most men with Organized Reserve status went on active duty between October 1950 and April 1951. They will be coming home between October 1952 and April 1953, if in the Army or Navy; between July 1952 and January 1953, if in the Air Force. Some Air Force units that were recalled after June 19, 1951, will serve the full 24 months.

Inactive and volunteer reservists, those who were not drawing drill pay for Reserve training when they were recalled to duty, must be released after they have served 17 months, provided they served 12 months in World War II. Most of them served from 2 to 5 years in the last war. The attempt to cut their current service to 12 months by law appears to be blocked.

In this group most men went on active duty between August 1950 and February 1951. They must be released during the period from January to September 1952. Actually, nearly all enlisted men will be released a few months ahead of time. The Army promises to get home by Christmas 1951, most of its men who saw service last winter in Korea. Officers, by contrast, will be held usually for the full 17 months, probably getting home in the eighteenth month after they were recalled.

Reservists at home, not yet called, face widely varying chances of being taken. Their chances depend most on what service they belong to and what military skills they possess. Age, rank, number of children, jobs, and physical condition have a bearing, too, but are less important if a man happens to be the kind of specialist that the Armed Forces need at the moment.

In general, it is true that most World War II officers who are not active members of Reserve units can relax a bit, if they have not been tapped so far. Yet not one of the services is willing to give up its hold over these men. It will be at least 6 months or a year before any wholesale resignations of commissions are permitted, for example. At present, all World War II commissions are still outstanding, fully effective for recall purposes.

In more detail, the outlook is this:

The Air Force has 220,000 officers and 70,000 enlisted men still left in its Volunteer Reserve. This group includes all the World War II officers who accepted AAF Reserve commissions in 1945 and 1946. About 21,000 of these officers—more than 1 out of 10—are likely to be picked for active duty in the year that ends next June 30. They can be held for 17 months under present law.

That is the estimate made by an Air Force general before the Senate Appropriations Committee recently. If the air arm gets its wish to expand, however, it may need a larger number of World War II officers from this group by mid-1952.

Enlisted men in the Volunteer Air Reserve who are veterans of World War II are not going to be recalled against their will, according to present AF plans. This promise could be broken with any big expansion, but this appears unlikely because AF training of new enlisted specialists is rising fast.

The Navy, meanwhile, has 140,000 officers and 475,000 enlisted men in its Volunteer Reserve, subject to call.

Enlisted men of this group who are not veterans of World War II probably will be called in eventually. There are more than 100,000 of these. Veterans of World War II, however, will not be called after next January 1. Between now and then, some veteran petty officers will go back on active duty.

Officers in the Volunteer Reserve are not being called in any great numbers, but the Navy refuses to agree not to recall any such officers in the future. Several thousand, out of a pool of more than 140,000, probably face recall in the year ahead. But more than 100,000 Navy officers, once members of the Volunteer Reserve, are going to inactive service and, barring big war, will not be called.

In the Navy's Organized Reserve, the few remaining officers are still being recalled on a fairly definite basis. Some enlisted men, too, will continue to be called up from this group, although the Navy has cleaned out virtually all enlisted men from its original pre-Korea Organized Reserve.

The Army, at the same time, plans to limit its recalls largely to members of its Volunteer Reserve. There are about 84,000 officers and 43,000 enlisted men in this group. Veterans among the enlisted men are promised they will not be called up for the present limited war. Of the officers, estimates range from 3,000 to 9,000 to be called by mid-1952. But the Army is not making any promises on the number of officers to be required.

Men in the Organized Reserve Corps of the Army are in a different situation. There are 75,000 officers and 130,000 enlisted men here who attend drills, draw pay, and are required to report for at least 15 days of field training each year. Army policy has been to call to active duty as few of these Reserve units as possible. The ORC, in the Army's view, represents a last-resort emergency force that must be ready to defend the United States itself and act as the nucleus for a fast-expanding Army if big war comes. That is why only a few in these units have been recalled, while inactive reservists, getting no drill pay or training, were being ordered to Korea.

This policy of the Army has been less understood and more criticized than almost any other policy involved in the Reserve recall program. There is no official hint of any change in the policy as yet. But the possibility remains that next spring, as the need for replacements rises, the Army may turn to this group of organized reservists for men to replace the flood of trained men returning home.

The future, to sum it up, holds continued uncertainty for reservists and their families. If all goes well and no big war occurs, most of the officers and enlisted men of World War II who have not been recalled are going to be left at home. Men most likely to be called are those in the Navy's Organized Reserve, and the pilots, navigators, bombardiers, and radar technicians in the Air Force's Volunteer Reserve. Once in, their tours of duty are likely to be 17 months.

National Guard men are in a similar position. Most will stay at home, but some are certain to be called—the Army just ordered up two more guard divisions and plans to recall another in the months ahead.

That is how the Reserve program looks now. It has changed many times in the past, and will change again if any big break comes in the war.

NEW GRIPES OF RESERVISTS

1. Men drawing drill pay in the Army's Organized Reserve stay at home while unpaid volunteer and inactive reservists are called up instead.

2. National Guard men, who joined so they could serve with their friends from home,

and guard units now being "cannibalized" to get replacements for Korea.

3 Navy regulars get the shore billets and school assignments in the United States, while reservists get sea duty and Korea.

4 Reserve officers, in case after case, find themselves recalled to do jobs that "any intelligent high-school graduate could do without trying."

5 Many reservists are not serving at the specialties for which they were recalled, after sacrificing jobs and family life to perform those specialties.

6 Regulars are getting temporary promotions to higher ranks while reservists are ordered to active duty at their old wartime grades despite 6 years of Reserve duty.

7 Draft calls were low all summer—but there had been no let-up in the recall of reservists who have already fought in one war.

8 Reserve enlistments are being extended for a year. The Government, after "breaking its contract with reservists," is treating them as draftees.

The Menace of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to participate in a symposium before the American Bar Association at its annual meeting in New York to discuss the menace of organized crime.

The distinguished former chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who conceived and directed the activities of the crime committee throughout most of its existence, delivered an impressive address on that occasion. His observations are worthy of the utmost consideration of all citizens everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During recent years, the principal attention of the American people, lawyers, and Government officials has been given to subjects other than to the increase in the strength of organized crime. The growth of crime, the new aspect it has taken, its economic impact, and the fact that it has been increasing its political influence have not until recently been considered as it should have. This is due partly to the fact that during the last 12 or 13 years our attention has been given mostly to preparing for war, fighting and winning the war, and thereafter we have been deeply involved as the leader of the free nations in a conflict with an even more sinister kind of totalitarianism.

We have recently found that during these days of preparation and waging of war that because of controls, scarcity of materials, large amounts of money in circulation, and public apathy, a condition was ripe for the criminal element to amass large fortunes and infiltrate into legitimate businesses and to enhance their influence in politics. J. Edgar Hoover, some time ago in a statement before our committee, pointed out that we were in a state of moral depression and

the extent of organized crime in the United States was a national disgrace.

I shall not relate in detail the findings of our Senate Crime Committee. This has been touched upon by the very able recent chairman of the committee, Senator HERBERT O'CONOR, and, of course, you are intimately familiar with the picture. Suffice to say, we found organized criminal gangs firmly entrenched in large cities; that they operate on a syndicated basis in many regions; that the gangs are interlocked by close personal relationships between the leaders; and by interlocking ownership of operations. The sinister economic and moral influence of these gangs has reached alarming proportions. Their influence in politics at all levels and the extent of their infiltration into legitimate businesses are greater than any of us dreamed. That is the picture.

Much has been done to remedy the situation in the last 2 years but the big part of the job remains to be done. Let it be said in the beginning that this is not a partisan matter in any sense of the word. Criminals have no political philosophy other than the protection of their operations. It is often found that they work both sides of the street. We all recognize the duty of joining together without regard for politics in eliminating the influence of the criminal whether he be found in a Democratic or Republican jurisdiction.

I appreciate the fact that today I am talking to the people who more than anyone else can do something about this problem. The lawyers of America are the leaders of public opinion. You are the political leaders. Lawyers constitute the majority of the membership of Federal and State legislatures. And, of course, as prosecutors and judges, lawyers have exclusive jurisdiction.

I shall always have a soft spot in my heart for this association because you have to a considerable extent spearheaded this fight against organized crime. The most encouraging event which occurred during my tenure as the chairman of the Senate committee was the creation of the association's Commission of Organized Crime, of which Judge Robert P. Patterson is chairman. Judge Patterson and Judge Morris Ploscowe, the executive director of the commission, and everyone of the other distinguished lawyers and judges who constitute its membership have been of tremendous help to the Senate committee. We have operated on the basis that we were partners in this effort. During the time when I was chairman of the committee, we had several meetings. We considered jointly the recommendations for Federal legislation and the suggestions for State action. Then at a recent meeting in Chicago, one of the members of the committee's staff had the opportunity of sitting down with the members of Judge Patterson's commission and of discussing in detail the entire legislative program of the Senate committee. The suggestions we received at these various meetings were of great benefit to the Senate committee in arriving at its conclusions regarding the bills to be introduced and pressed for enactment in Congress. To be able to draw upon the wealth of experience and ability represented by Judge Patterson's commission in connection with all aspects of our work was of immeasurable value to all of us.

During the course of the crime committee's work, one basic fact presented itself in bold relief, namely, the fact that the enforcement of criminal law is primarily a State and local responsibility. Even when channels of interstate communications and commerce are used, these activities are in a large measure a violation of local criminal statutes. It would be impossible and indeed quite unwise for the Federal Government to undertake to enforce laws against the usual

kind of vice, gambling, and corruption that we found in so many places. The Federal Government can never be a satisfactory substitute for local self-government in the enforcement field. Moreover, the Federal Government can do little to assist local citizens in the removal of local officials who do business with the gangsters. And there is little the Federal Government can do to correct the diffusion of responsibility and buck passing which takes place between independent law-enforcement agencies operating in the same county or area.

However, the Federal Government must—and I think it is now—assist in providing the leadership and guidance in the struggle against organized crime. It must continue to do this because the criminal gangs are well entrenched and have Nation-wide ramifications. It must continue to work for better cooperation between Federal and local officials in dealing with these problems. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that the channels of interstate commerce are not used to facilitate the operations of organized criminal groups. It is, of course, up to the Federal Government to see that gangsters and racketeers are stripped of as much of their ill-gotten gains as possible through vigorous enforcement of the income-tax laws.

There are many things that can be done by the Federal Government which will break up the power of large interstate syndicates and tend to reduce crime to purely a local basis. The committee has in its third interim report made 22 recommendations for action at the Federal level. These include sizeable special racket squads in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and in the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has had a small racket squad functioning since 1947. It has now been enlarged.

The committee also acclaimed Attorney General McGrath's proposal of having a special grand jury deal with organized criminal conditions in each judicial district each year.

The committee recommended that the Treasury Department establish a special frauds squad to deal with the income-tax obligations of organized racketeers and gangsters and that it maintain on a current and continuing basis a list of known gangsters and racketeers, and that proceedings leading to their prosecution be streamlined and speeded up. The committee is happy to report that the Treasury Department has complied wholeheartedly in these recommendations.

Several recommendations were made for tightening up the tax laws so as to secure fuller reports of transactions by racketeers and also to prevent them from deducting certain losses and expenses as operating items. The committee found that many racketeers kept only scant books or no records at all and that they frequently charged off as operating expenses such items as protection. In Florida, it was called "ice," in California, "juice." The committee's recommendation would require the keeping of daily records and it would put teeth in the present code provision requiring the keeping of records. The committee also recommended that those making profits from illegal transactions in excess of \$25,000 per year be required to file a net-worth statement. This would be a great help to the Internal Revenue agents in preparing net-worth cases.

There are also recommendations to prevent the mails and other communications facilities from being used to further illegal transactions. To get the gangsters out of the liquor business, the committee asks that wholesale licenses be renewable every 2 years. The committee recommended that moral fitness be one of the elements considered by the Interstate Commerce Commission in applications for certificates of

convenience and necessity. This is aimed at keeping the racketeering element out of the transportation business. The committee recommended that laws to facilitate the deportation of criminals and other undesirable aliens be tightened. Many of our leading hoodlums are not natives of this country and should be deported.

The committee found that light or suspended sentences were being dealt out too frequently against vicious narcotic peddlers and recommended that penalties for violations be increased. The committee recommended that the statute passed in the Eighty-first Congress prohibiting the interstate shipment of slot machines should be extended to include other types of devices which are susceptible to ganster control, such as punchboards, roulette wheels, etc.

The committee also found that it was quite apparent that the agencies needed more personnel and, in some cases, salaries are not sufficient.

A great deal of attention by the committee in its investigations was given to the wire-service operation which is indispensable in big time book-making operations.

A bookmaker, whether operating in the rear of a cigar store in Atlantic City or in a wide-open "horse room" in Scranton, Pa., or in Brooklyn, must have prompt horse-racing information. He must know the exact odds on all horses at every race track and such other information as may be of interest to bettors. When a race is over, he must know which horses won. Without this news he cannot operate.

Our investigations revealed that Continental Press, Inc., which is controlled to some extent at least by remnants of the old Capone mob in Chicago holds a virtual strangle hold over the entire system of racing news distribution in the United States. Its system of operations is carefully designed to have a facade of legality, each detail worked out in a manner that creates an impression of innocence. But as soon as we dug under the surface, we found that there is a hidden interrelation among the various segments of the system that is equivalent to monopolistic control.

On the surface, Continental does not sell news to bookmakers. It deals only with distributors who purport to be independent of Continental. Each distributor is a separate corporation with its stock owned by individuals who pretend to have no connection with Continental. The news is obtained by Continental either from the tracks or from a distributor who obtains it from the tracks. The men who actually obtain the news ordinarily do so surreptitiously through ingenious signal systems set up at the tracks. They are mysterious characters acting in a capacity which we lawyers refer to as independent contractors. Their employers claim not to know them personally and cannot tell you where they are. All the employer knows is that the news comes in by telephone and the news-gatherers are paid by check sent to general delivery or similar addresses.

The news is circulated through the system over telegraph wires leased from Western Union.

The distributor pays Continental for the news at a rate fixed arbitrarily by Continental. Apparently, each distributor pays on a different basis and none has much to say about the amount due from it. At the end of each year, all of the distributors' profits are paid over to Continental as supplemental rent. So far as we could ascertain the stockholders never receive dividends. During the famine period recently created by the heat of our committee, the distributors have stopped paying rent because they could not afford it. Continental has never attempted to collect the arrears.

The individual bookmakers obtain the news over the telephone from the distribu-

tor under a convenient arrangement whereby the bookmaker does not need to reveal his identity. He merely gives his code number and he pays his rent in cash over the counter each week. The amount he pays is what the traffic will bear.

The system is essentially one in which everyone pretends not to know who anyone else is or what he is doing, but a share of each bookmaker's profits is smoothly siphoned off and fed along over the lines to the coffers of Continental Press, Inc. It is like a huge octopus extending its tentacles into nearly every nook and cranny in the United States. No one can make book without its news and it charges what it wants.

The reason I have described this news system in detail is to show you one way in which organized crime has established nation-wide control over one racket through the use of interstate facilities and channels.

As it would be difficult for local governments to cope with a problem of this nature, we have felt that Congress should enact a bill which strikes at the problem directly by prohibiting the transmission of such news by anyone not found to be of proper character and where the major part of their business is in furtherance of illegal transactions as is the case of Continental Press.

The Committee, under the able chairmanship of Senator O'Connor, of Maryland, held extensive hearings which showed further the necessity of the enactment of the legislation recommended in the third interim report of the committee. The committee, under Senator O'Connor's chairmanship, showed that the pattern of criminal operations in the larger cities applied with equal force in smaller cities and even in rural communities. In the committee's final report, Senator O'Connor, on behalf of the committee, made 12 additional recommendations.

The problem of narcotics was gone into extensively in the hearings conducted by Senator O'Connor and many of these recommendations deal with methods of handling the narcotics' problem. They include stiffening of the sentence of narcotic violators; increasing the staff of the Narcotics Bureau; promoting narcotics education; increasing the facilities for the treatment of narcotic victims, requiring notice to seaman's and longshoremen's union of narcotics convictions; canceling sailing papers of narcotics violators; and urging our representatives in the United Nations to work toward the adoption of measures that will prohibit the growing of opium poppy plants in any country in the world.

The final report of the committee recommends having special squads trained to deal with narcotic violations.

Also, the final report took cognizance of the good work of the Attorney General's Crime Conference of February 1950, and urged that it be made an annual affair.

Early in its investigations, the Senate committee was greatly impressed with the necessity of better cooperation, liaison, and exchange of information between the Federal and local enforcement agencies. The Senate committee was called upon from time to time for suggestions as to how best to set up local crime commissions; how information can be secured from the 26 various Federal investigative groups and many inquiries came in regarding the new techniques of criminals. So, the committee in its third interim report recommended the establishment of a Federal Crime Commission. It was envisioned that the Federal Crime Commission would hold hearings in various parts of the country but would not have subpoena power. Subpoena power would be exercised when necessary by the proper congressional committee. The Federal Crime Commission would make a continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate crime organ-

izations. It would make reports to appropriate committees of Congress. It would correlate information of value from the 24 Federal investigative agencies and would advise local enforcement officers of information other than that which was strictly classified. We envisioned that it would maintain files and records as a national clearinghouse of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce, and that it would be in a position to make suggestions designed to expedite, facilitate, and encourage better and more intensive law enforcement at all levels of government. The Commission was to be composed of three outstanding citizens, who were not otherwise employees of the Federal Government.

The Departments of Justice and Treasury opposed the creation of this commission on the ground that it might lead to the establishment of a so-called national-type police force and the formation of this commission has met with substantial opposition in the Congress.

This recommendation is, of course, not intended to infringe upon the authority and jurisdiction of the FBI or of any other Federal agencies and every Senator on the committee would stand up and fight to the last breath any suggestion that we create anything suggestive of an American Gestapo. We hope that the commission such as I have described may eventually be approved by Congress but, knowing that this enactment will be delayed, the committee in its final report made an alternative suggestion which seems to us to be free of the objections which have been raised against the Federal Crime Commission.

Our second proposal is for the organization of a privately constituted National Crime Coordinating Council in the form described in the committee's final report.

In a number of cities throughout the country there are crime commissions whose function is to serve as watchdogs over law-enforcement conditions. They are privately financed and staffed by skilled investigators, frequently with FBI training. They have no official powers but they perform an effective function, sometimes by cooperating with enforcement officers and other times reporting to the community any evidence of laxity. In other words, it is to keep the searchlight on.

The local crime commission movement is something that should be encouraged so that every community that has a serious crime condition will have one. Our plan is to establish a privately operated national organization which will promote the creation of local crime commissions and at the same time serve as a coordinating body and information clearinghouse among the local commissions.

In order to guarantee that the National Crime Coordinating Council will not "die aborning" we have proposed that Congress make a grant to it of \$100,000 to start it off. Thereafter, we contemplate that it will be financed by a private fund or foundation. With a view to giving it national prestige, we have proposed that its chief executive officer be appointed by the President of the United States from a panel of five nominated by the council itself.

The members of the council would be representative of the local private crime commissions throughout the country with the present commissions acting as the charter members. The mechanics of drafting the charter and setting the wheels in motion would be handled by the Attorney General of the United States. Once the council is rolling, it would be on its own.

I think it will be impossible to overstate the importance of having an organization of this character to maintain a public awareness of the existence of organized crime. It is imperative that a system like this be

worked out for full cooperation of enforcement officers at all levels of government in the fight against the cartel of crime. This council on a voluntary basis could do most of the things we envisioned for the Federal Crime Commission. We are most hopeful that the members of the bar will support us in this objective.

Bills have been filed to carry out the Federal legislative program recommended by the committee. The Departments of Justice and Treasury have put into operation the recommendations as to them. For this, we applaud them highly.

The bills in Congress are in committee and it will take time for the program to be enacted.

Reference has previously been made to the proposal for amendments to the Internal Revenue Code so as to see that racketeers keep books and are prevented from defrauding the Government. These proposals have been presented to the Finance Committee of the Senate. We are, however, not satisfied with the approach to this problem made by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee. I personally think it would be a great mistake to adopt the idea presented in the current tax bill. The plan of the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, as set forth in the tax bill, is to require the payment of an excise tax by gamblers and bookies and then to tax them 10 percent of their winnings. Some supporters of the bill contend that the requirement of an excise tax would enable local law enforcements to spot bookies and gamblers and prosecute them under local laws. Other exponents of the bill apparently think that gambling would still flourish under this system because they anticipate that approximately \$400,000,000 annually would be brought in by taxes. Since it is a tax bill, I assume that revenue agents would be more interested in collecting the tax rather than eliminating the gamblers.

This program would be a tragic error for the reasons that in the eyes of the public, including the gamblers and the local law-enforcement officer, it would be a quasi legalization of their illegal operations. It would add immeasurably to the burden of local law-enforcement officers at a time when they need our cooperation and assistance. It would be a partial sanction by the Federal Government of gambling at a time when there is a wholesome and moral awakening to the evils of this vice. It would give the Internal Revenue Agency an impossible task of keeping up with the operations of each professional gambler, and it would thereby tend to transfer responsibility for policing gambling operations from local to Federal authority, and this would, of course, tend to break down our system of local law enforcement. Further, I think it dangerous philosophy to have to rely upon taxing illegal operations to provide revenue for the Federal Government.

Our investigation showed that wherever gambling was eliminated, legitimate business was greatly increased. Money spent at the gambling table went for food, clothes, and things that were worthwhile. If we get behind our program of dealing with gamblers, requiring them to keep books, not allowing improper charge-offs, and encouraging local law-enforcement, gambling will continue to be reduced more and more, and the result will be that more money will find its way into legitimate channels of commerce where it will be reflected in taxes to the Federal and to local Governments. No good can come from the approach of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees. I shall offer an amendment to substantiate our program for this quasi legalization.

The suggestions for local legislation and law enforcements have been dealt with by Judge Patterson and others on this program. But I must add that we of the committee were especially impressed with the necessity for uniform State laws, the necessity for eliminating overlapping jurisdiction and diffusion of responsibility between local enforcement officers. We are impressed with the progress that has been made and with law enforcements at recent State legislative sessions. We are impressed with the good accomplished by State conferences called by States' attorneys general and by the work of the States' attorney general associations, and other groups.

The lawyers of America must carry the chief burden in this great effort. The lawyers not only have the main responsibility of seeing that proper legislation is passed, seeing that the laws are enforced, but also of molding public opinion so that conditions which cause crime and steer the lives of young people into careers of crime are remedied. These include, of course, recreational facilities, educational opportunities, proper juvenile court techniques, elimination of slums, and modern laws dealing with juvenile offenders. Also, it falls directly upon the lawyers the duty of better policing your own ranks, to ferret out the lawyers who are doing business with the gamblers and the racketeers. It is, of course, an honorable thing to see to it that any alleged law violator is given his constitutional rights and is represented by a competent attorney. But we found that an integral part of most of the crime syndicates is the syndicated lawyer. In many cases, the lawyer is a part of the illegal operations. In some cases, he counsels with the criminals as to how they can violate the law and get away with it. In other cases, the syndicate or its head, employs the lawyer on a retainer basis to represent all of his employees in any criminal proceedings in which they may become involved. These are, of course, flagrant violations of the code of ethics. Some few of these lawyers have been called before the grievance committee and have been disbarred and prosecuted, but the majority of them are continuing to operate just as they have done for years. If you want the chapter and page of their operations, you will find it in hearings of our committee.

There is a big job for all of us to do at every level of government. It will take time and continuing public interest. Woodrow Wilson once said, "The American people can cope with any problem when they know the facts." I believe the American people now have the facts, and having the facts we will continue to see affirmative action taken against the lawless element of the country at the Federal level, at the State level, and at the local level.

It is imperative that we and the Government work with your lawyers and cooperate in this cause. It deserves and must have our best thought and our most diligent effort. I have confidence that in the lawyers of America this responsibility is placed in good hands.

Loyalty, Security, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered

over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, September 24, 1951:

We are spending a lot of money to raise and equip armed forces that will protect us from attack by a certain nation. We hope and believe that this strength will discourage aggression against the United States or any other country.

This a defense in terms of physical power.

The potential enemy, however, has developed methods of attacking us from within. His agents and their fellow travelers are constantly working to undermine our free American institutions and supplant them by a dictatorship controlled from abroad.

We are sufficiently familiar with the steps being taken to guard us against a military attack. But what is being done to protect us from subversive activities here, inside the United States?

This is a difficult problem. If we are too easy about it, dismissing it as an idle threat, we invite conquest. If, on the other hand, we adopt suppressive measures, we shall turn this Nation into a garrison state in which liberty will be smothered.

From the founding of this Nation the American people have been devoted to freedom. We have been equally jealous of our national security. Although peace-loving because we are learning to solve our problems without resort to violence, we have never hesitated to defend our country from the danger of domination by outside forces. Until recently, it was possible to safeguard both freedom and security without many serious conflicts. But this has changed since World War II, as the true character of the international Communist movement has been revealed to the American people. Public opinion has swung from the admission of a Trojan-horse problem, to increasing recognition of a clear and present danger.

Without freedom, the America that we have known and cherished, cannot exist, for freedom is an absolute essential to the American way of life. But, without security, there can be no freedom. If security must come first, freedom may suffer. If freedom is given top priority, it may be used by our enemies to destroy us.

Our own Bill of Rights assigns obligations for every liberty that is granted. How the two can work together is our problem.

The Communist movement is a threat to our national security for the following reasons: (1) The Communist Party is not an ordinary American political party, but is a closely disciplined organization with a rigid doctrine; (2) it is founded upon and strictly follows the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; (3) it stands for the overthrow of our system in favor of a socialistic form of government bossed by the Communist Party with no criticism tolerated; (4) the American Communists admit that they follow the Russian and World Communist program in almost every detail; (5) the Communist Party admits of no possible compromise, stating that all must bend the knee to it; (6) in countries now dominated by the Communists, justice has disappeared.

The Communists have been trying to smuggle their members and their dupes into the agencies of the United States Government. The Federal loyalty program is designed to protect Federal departments and bureaus from such infiltration. How to maintain the constitutional rights of Government employees while detecting and firing the few who are disloyal is a baffling question. Any Federal employee who gives confidential information to foreign powers, can be punished under existing legislation. But what of the employee who does his job in such a way as to favor the interests of a foreign power? The only practical solution is to have discreet and fair men in charge of Federal personnel who will steer clear of carelessness or persecution. The

overwhelming majority of our civil servants are loyal and intelligent. The few who are accused of violating security, should be given a full hearing with the right to counsel, and other constitutional safeguards.

The Communists at large pose a much greater problem.

Congress in recent years has passed a number of statutes aimed at subversive activities. The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, and the Vothris Act of 1940, require the registration of individuals and organizations acting as agents of foreign powers. The Alien Registration Act of 1940 forbids any activity designed to bring about the forcible overthrow of our Government. But these have not been effective in dealing with the secret methods of the Communist Party.

You and I are not concerned about political and economic programs that are discussed in the open. Ideas can be fought with ideas. Not so conspiracies. They demand legislation. Investigations by the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States House of Representatives over a period of many years, have shown that we must have laws to bar Communists from employment in defense plants, prevent disclosure of confidential information to Communists, deny them passport privileges, register their action and front groups, compel the labeling of their propaganda as Communist and to deprive their organizations of tax benefits that are accorded to charitable institutions, etc.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 was passed by the Congress over the President's veto. Perhaps the law needs some changes, as experience may reveal, but the need for some such legislation is beyond question.

By way of meeting the problem in another manner, the President issued an Executive order on January 23, 1951, establishing a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

As the President said in part and I quote: "The Commission will undoubtedly wish to focus its primary attention on Federal laws and procedures. But I do not believe the Commission should limit itself to reviewing Government actions. Instead, I hope it will consider afresh, in all its present day ramifications, the recurrent question of how a free people protect their society from subversive attack without at the same time destroying their own liberties."

"We in the United States have a special responsibility for leadership in these critical times, when free men the world over are strongly resisting the challenge of the Communist drive for world domination. We must guard our freedom well, guard it from armed assault, guard it from subversive infiltration, guard it from internal suppression and the deadly imposition of conformity. For the shining freedom we have enjoyed in this country has been the shining goal for millions in other lands, and the results of freedom in this country have been the shattering reply to the false claims of Communist imperialism." End of quote.

Most people think of the FBI as the principal factor in protecting the American people against the operations of enemy agents. In this respect I think it well to mention a few of the answers given by J. Edgar Hoover, concerning the activities of the Bureau which he has directed for so long and with such excellent results.

What is the chief job facing the FBI today?

The FBI's main job is to give the American people maximum protection against violations of Federal laws and subversive agents.

Whom does the FBI investigate? On what basis does it determine who shall be investigated? Is a letter of accusation enough to cause an investigation? Is the accuser investigated, too?

The FBI investigates only those complaints or accusations, which, if true, would constitute a Federal violation coming under its primary jurisdiction, or matters assigned to it by a higher authority. There must be a factual basis for the investigation or else a directive from some higher authority. A letter, even if anonymous, receives consideration if it contains information, which, if true, would come within FBI jurisdiction. The facts in each case determine how much confidence should be placed in the person making the accusation.

The FBI is interested in actions, not thoughts, in deeds, not beliefs, what a man does, not what he thinks. Every charge that the FBI has invaded the realm of thought is investigated; so far, not one has proved true.

The FBI is responsible to the President, through the Attorney General and the Budget Bureau which checks fiscal operations. It is responsible to the Congress and each year must justify its activities before appropriations committees.

What answer do you make to the charge that the FBI has too much power in our democracy; that recent developments, in which innocent persons have been accused on the basis of FBI information, are dangerous to civil liberty?

The FBI is an investigative body operating within the law; it does not prosecute criminals or even recommend prosecution. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches watch its activities carefully, as do the American people through an alert and free press. An FBI report, like a reporter's notebook, contains information of all kinds, and it is unfortunate that some of this raw material is occasionally translated into sensational headlines by the newspapers. But the record of the FBI based upon the merit and personal integrity of its agents, is well known. It is the servant, not the master, of the people.

But the FBI cannot do the job alone.

The newspapers and all other media of communication must keep us fully informed on all phases of current issues without revealing top military secrets to the enemy.

We must remind ourselves over and over again that the life we live in the United States and which we prize so highly is founded on freedom with responsibility.

We do not expect and do not want the Government to be the absolute guardian of our liberties, for that would be shirking our personal obligation to make democracy work.

We must be clear-headed about the whole problem.

We must know what communism is and what disguises it assumes before we can expose it. But this does not give us the right to call a man a Communist simply because he believes in equal rights or public housing or otherwise expresses an opinion different from our own.

We are still a growing Nation and we should uphold the Jeffersonian view of American history. "Rebellion, dissent, and experimentation."

For instance, we are entitled to know what textbooks are being used in our schools, but how can we tell the teacher, a specialist in education, what texts ought to be used? We are apt to think that the words "to teach" mean to indoctrinate with the teacher's views. But the professional definition is "to encourage students to think, to ponder, to investigate, to weigh arguments pro and con." Otherwise, how can the youth in our schools and colleges, or ourselves for that matter, learn and correct some of the weaknesses in our own system which are apparent to others? How can we know the true nature of our enemy's strengths as well as his failings?

We must not be afraid.

Intelligent and balanced protective measures are necessary.

Loyalty, security, and freedom will best be served if we follow the middle road which avoids dangerous indifference to the left of us and the equally dangerous hysteria to the right of us.

We like to speak of our confidence in the powers of truth to win acceptance in the market place of public opinion. We firmly believe in free speech. The decision we make must be on the advice of our own people, not on the disguised counsel of the few in our midst who are working for a foreign power.

The job of keeping our Nation free and secure, is based to a large degree on the application of our own common sense.

Thank you for listening.

Unanswered Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed at the pressure which is being put on the Congress to increase our foreign aid.

At the recent NATO Conference at Ottawa, it was disclosed that our European allies claimed that their economy will not stand their share of the European defense program. A committee was appointed to find a burden-sharing formula which would enable our allies to meet defense needs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the fact that overburdened American taxpayers are also vitally concerned with our Government's lavish spending. This year we are moving deeply into deficit spending.

It was with the idea of protecting our people from undue waste and expenditure that I wrote the following letter, dated September 14, to Secretary of Defense Lovett. Here appears the entire letter:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1951.

Mr. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, my apprehension concerning certain features of the mutual-defense program impels me to write you about matters which have come to my attention.

Recently, I was advised that the construction of communication roads for the NATO in Europe are being undertaken, or considered, which will cost American taxpayers in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars.

The French Government, I understand, contemplates levying a 20-percent tax on the cost of this construction which leads from Atlantic port cities to forward areas. Is this report in substance true, Mr. Secretary? If so, why are we paying taxes for supply roads which we build for France and for the defense of the French?

If my information is reliable, the reaction on the American people would be extremely adverse to our entire defense program.

Another matter is shaking the faith of the people in the mutual-defense-aid program. When the Atlantic Pact was being proposed, Secretary of State Acheson was

asked the question, Does the treaty call for American troops to be called in Europe in time of peace? The answer was an unequivocal "No." The people will remember this clear and unevasive reply and cannot see how it could have been given in good faith.

The Secretary's misstatement of fact aroused the American people to suspect that the true program for troops to Europe had not yet been disclosed.

Just how many divisions, Mr. Secretary, are contemplated for Europe? It now appears that the First Armored Division has been earmarked for Europe. Is this in addition to the six combat divisions now in Europe, or earmarked for Europe? If the First Armored Division is to be the seventh American division in Europe, have the Joint Chiefs of Staff certified that its dispatch to Europe is essential as is required by Senate Resolution 99? If so, could a copy of the certification be made available to me?

These two matters are disturbing, and I am hoping that you will clarify them and place the situation in a more favorable light.

Believe me, our people are watching the flow of troops to Europe, determined that it must be held to the minimum requirement and that the NATO nations themselves must do their full part toward the defense of Europe, keeping in mind that none of the Western European nations are spending as much as 10 percent of their national income for defense, whereas we are spending, or authorizing the spending, of about 30 percent of our national income for defense, and this despite the fact the production of the NATO nations is now 142 percent of what it was in 1938, before the war.

With high esteem
Sincerely yours,

CARROLL REECE.

Since sending this letter, no reply whatsoever has been received from the Department of Defense. I was wondering, however, if the administration intends to pay the 20-percent-construction tax on half a billion dollar program to France as one of the means of increasing our foreign aid. And if the administration does pay the 20-percent tax—\$100,000,000—do they intend to let the American people in on the deal?

Mr. Speaker, it has been predicted on the floor of the Senate that within the next 3 years our European allies will call upon us for some \$45,000,000,000 in addition to our own military contribution. I might add that our aid to Europe this year is equal to the entire defense budget of all our European allies. For our own military preparations in the fiscal year 1952, \$67,000,000,000 has already been appropriated. Our national debt of \$257,000,000,000 is twice the national debt of all European powers combined, not including Russia. Our Federal budget carries a \$100,000,000,000 appropriation this fiscal year, which is some \$40,000,000,000 more than the administration calculates it can collect in taxes. The States and various local levels of governments have budgets aggregating eighteen billions. This means government is eating up more than one-third of our national income. Our economy is being dangerously exhausted. If our economy is destroyed the last bulwark of free government everywhere will be destroyed. We are standing in the twilight zone of disaster. We must carefully chart our course.

I think it is time the American people put a stop to the administration's deficit spending program.

How Much Will Little Dams Hold?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the recent devastating floods in the Kansas City area and in northeastern Oklahoma have caused the people of this country and particularly us in the great middle Southwest, to be more concerned than ever before as to the best manner in which to prevent future occurrences of this unprecedented disaster.

Too many people have concerned themselves with what they term "flood control." It is my sincere belief that we should be more interested in flood prevention than in flood-control programs. There is an old saying that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I believe that a good flood-prevention program is worth eminently more than a more extensive flood-control program, and certainly should be preferred to an extravagant and lavish expenditure of public funds to indemnify losses sustained from floods. In the long run, I think it can be demonstrated that flood prevention is the cheapest method and by far the best for our people and their protection.

Mr. Elmer T. Peterson, in a recent article in the Daily Oklahoma, published at Oklahoma City, Okla., August 22, 1951, under the title "How Much Will Little Dams Hold?" gives some most interesting revelations and results of a study he has made of the situation. I commend it to all who would be interested in protecting our economy by flood prevention.

Mr. Peterson's article follows:

HOW MUCH WILL LITTLE DAMS HOLD?

(By Elmer T. Peterson)

This desk has received an unusually heavy mail during the past 2 or 3 weeks. Most of it concerns the problem of flood control, which has gotten to be one of the hottest subjects in this part of the country, due to the recent floods in Kansas and previous inundations in Oklahoma.

It is hoped, therefore, you will be patient if this column seems to devote unusual space to the subject of floods and erosion. Experience shows when floods quit coming the people tend to forget about them almost completely, so if anything is to be said it has to be said before the subject gets cold.

In the recent Kansas City flood conference those who ridicule the agricultural flood-control program, as being successfully worked out in the Washita Valley, put all their emphasis on this point.

"The soil-conservation program is fine, and we are for it, but it can't take the place of the big dams. The reason is that you have to have reservoirs to impound the runoff water, and, of course, the big dams are the only thing that will do that."

The only trouble with this argument is that it is 100 percent wrong.

Those who use this argument just don't know what they are talking about.

If impoundment of runoff water is the one big thing, as the big dam promoters loudly declaim, the little detention dams of the USDA agricultural flood-control program beat the big dams at their own game.

A typical little detention dam in the Mill Creek portion of the Washita Valley project is engineered to impound 5.22 inches of runoff. But the Denison Dam could not impound more than 1.31 inches of runoff if its own watershed were visited by a heavy rain. This calculation is made from the specifications of the Army engineers as to their own structure.

The bigger the dam the less likely it is to hold the runoff of its own respective watershed in proportion to area. So the figures indicate.

Even when we get into the smaller watersheds the USDA program is superior.

The Army and USDA engineers were asked to make estimates and specifications on their own respective methods of controlling floods on the little Washita—a creek that flows into the big Washita, near Chickasha. Here are the respective figures:

	Army	USDA
Number of reservoirs	1	34
Drainage area, square miles	195	190
Flood storage, square feet	52,000	50,100
Recreation, permanent pool, acres	1,950	2,100
Flood pool, acres	3,650	5,100
Bottoms, inundated, acres	11,850	11,600
Bottoms protected, acres	3,371	8,000
Cost, proposed plans, completed	\$6,000,000	\$1,983,000

The Army plan would use rich, productive bottom land while the USDA plan would use waste land.

If you were to be offered an automobile by Mr. A at a given price, and Mr. B would offer a much better car for less than one-third the price, which would you buy?

This question is sometimes asked:

"A few of the men in the United States Soil Conservation Service are still saying 'There ought to be big dams, too.' How do you account for that?"

This is the deepest mystery of all. They have in their own records the indisputable proof that the little-dam program is far better than the big-dam program, in every way. Why don't they use their own facts and figures and make an aggressive fight for what they know is best?

Is it because they are all in one big family at Washington and have to go along and appease the big-dam promoters? Do they feel helpless in the drift of events? The writer's experience is that they are fine, capable, efficient men, earnestly devoted to their cause. They would not do such a thing unless the pressure were too great to withstand.

The actual performance of the little dams, plus surface treatment, is such as to clinch the argument. And now it is becoming increasingly plain the big dams, by backwater sedimentation, actually do great harm and suits are being brought because of this fact. One cannot endorse the big dams without likewise endorsing the bad effects of them. If you will examine the Washita River between its mouth and Chickasha, you will see what has happened since the big dam was built.

Reservist Resents Calling for Police Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter which appeared in a readers' column of the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News. It

deals with the recalling of reservists, and I feel it is worthy of the attention of this body.

RESERVIST RESENTS CALLING FOR POLICE ACTION

The Naval Reserve program as it stands today is in a dire need of reorganization and at this very moment, Government officials are investigating and planning a Reserve program, which in all respects closely parallels the one recently misused. We neither condemn nor condone the Navy's call-up policy. We realize the Reserve program is a necessary part of the present defense set-up. However, we do not sanction flagrant violation of a man's freedom by a group of Washington politicians.

The majority of reservists presently on active duty have been called involuntarily recalled and are veterans of World War II. They joined the Reserves with the understanding they would be called in event of an all-out war. If the action in Korea has been labeled a police action, and it has by the President, then why were these men called to active duty?

Why were reservists called who were struggling with new families, who were in vital defense positions and were attending accredited colleges? When we left our homes and colleges we were laughed at, and it was reiterated over and over again: "Sucker, I'm glad I didn't join the Reserves." Our only sin was that in event of all-out war we wanted to be the first to return to the defense of our country.

We offer the suggestion that to heal the wound of bitterness that these veterans be discharged as soon as practicable. We cannot understand why we are required to serve 17 months on active duty when there are younger men being deferred at home for going to school or being married with no children. A mistake has been made but let's not bury it or give it the old Washington white-wash, because it's tattle-tale gray with somebody's blunder.

CHARLIE,
Inactive Reserve.

Samuel Williston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of September 24, 1951:

"SAMMY" WILLISTON

This is by way of a birthday greeting to a fine fellow who might think he's out of circulation, but isn't. He is Samuel Williston, fondly called "Sammy" by thousands of former Harvard law students. He is 80 years old today.

Although he was learned in the law, the author of textbooks on certain branches of law, like sales and contracts, which have become standard works, it was not for this that he was beloved by his many students.

He was an excellent teacher, and one of the main reasons he could be that, was that he also was a fine human being who exuded friendship and humor. Some people say he was the greatest teacher Harvard Law School ever had. At any rate, it seems to have been the consensus that no class with "Sammy"

was ever dull. Rather, they were remembered as thoroughly enjoyable.

So it is a sincerely happy birthday wish for "Sammy" not only from the Herald, but from thousands of former students as well.

National Commander Ewing W. Mays, of the Disabled American Veterans, of Little Rock, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter received by me from an active veteran constituent in my district in which he requests that I bring to the attention of the Members of Congress from Arkansas the outstanding work being done on a national level by their native son, National Commander Ewing W. Mays, of the Disabled American Veterans, of Little Rock, Ark.

I think the matter is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress and for that reason I am having it included in the RECORD:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
New Haven, Conn., September 20, 1951.
Hon JOHN A MCGUIRE,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: As our Representative in Congress, we want you to personally contact every Member of Congress from the State of Arkansas and tell them that we in New Haven DAV Chapter No 31, located in the largest city in your district, are proud of their native son, Ewing W Mays, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, who visited us here at New Haven, Conn. on September 16 and 17.

Ewing Mays, as you know, is an Arkansas amputee veteran who lost both of his legs in combat in Italy in World War II when he was struck by a 210 millimeter shell. He was elected national commander of the Disabled American Veterans at the national convention which concluded in Milwaukee on August 19.

Making his first official visit to the East since his election, he spent 4 days in Connecticut, two being in the Third Congressional District which you so ably represent.

With his slow Arkansas drawl, his hearty laugh, and his obvious overcoming of major physical handicaps, this 31-year-old World War II veteran won the heart of everyone with whom he came in contact.

Pleading for more membership in the DAV, and greater interest and activity by the existing membership, National Commander Mays alerted us to the efforts constantly being made to have Congress remove, by legislative enactment, many benefits presently enjoyed by disabled veterans which are legitimately a cost of war just as much as firearms and ammunition.

His visit was certainly an inspiration to all who met him and Arkansas can justly be proud of its native son so, in our behalf, please let your colleagues in Congress from Arkansas know our thoughts relative to Ewing W Mays, that seriously disabled veteran who has rehabilitated himself and is

now going about the country as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans inspiring, aiding and assisting his less fortunate comrades, and while doing so, is bringing fame and credit to his native State of Arkansas.

Sincerely yours,
RUSSELL E. SULLIVAN,
Past Commander.

Monopoly Breeds Communism—State- ment by C. Wilson Harder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by C. Wilson Harder, president, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.:

MONOPOLY BREEDS COMMUNISM

It is important for every American citizen to know that today powerful influences, inside and outside of Government, are using strong pressure to break down our antitrust laws. These are the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Robinson-Patman Act.

Possibly many who are scuttling these important laws fail to realize that every nation that has gone communistic did not have antitrust laws. Furthermore, those nations legalized monopolies and cartels.

When the people in those nations rebelled against this concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, the result was either communism or its half-brother, socialism.

In the United States, the press, the pulpit, the businessman and the politician cannot say too much in opposition to communism. Our Armed Forces are today killing Communists. This slaughter is, however, not solving our problem. It is like cutting off the leaves of poison ivy and not killing the roots. We must dig deep to root out the real cause of communism.

To determine this cause let's look at the histories of other nations.

Russia was the first nation to go communistic, but for generations the individual Russians had little opportunity to engage in free enterprise. Court nobles not only owned the land he tilled, but also prevented individual enterprise from developing the great mineral and forest reserves of the country. In despair, Russians turned to communism.

In Germany it was the Krupp, Thyssens, and a few others, operating monopolies and international cartels, interlocked with monopolies in other nations, who brought about a half century of unrest among the German people and disturbed the peace of the world. The German people even resorted to accepting an Austrian paperhanger, by the name of Hitler, to take over. Because of the power granted Hitler by the German people, German monopolists invited Hitler to save their skins, yet they eventually lost control.

Italy went through misery under Mussolini who was put into power by the Italian monopolists. Spain is in the same throes of misery today.

Millions of Chinese are Communists today, yet they never read Marx or Lenin. Most of them are unable to read. They rebelled against a system of strict monopoly control of land and business, with a great amount

of their business monopolies interlocked with foreign monopolies. Russia encouraged the thought that the Chinese could be nothing more than slaves under such control, thus they accepted Stalin's dictates.

For generations the entire Japanese economy was controlled by 11 Zaibatsu families who put into power the warlord Tojo. Under the direction of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a magnificent job was accomplished in breaking the stranglehold of that monopoly. Since his removal Japanese monopolists, aided by American monopolists, are moving into positions of power again. It is very possible that a continuation of this trend will drive the Japanese people, in despair, to communism.

England has gone down the road to socialism, the halfway house to communism. This was due to a legalized monopoly system that permitted the nation's resources to be controlled by a few. Today many of their industries have been transferred into a government monopoly as a substitute for private monopoly. Monopolistic tactics employed against the colonies of Great Britain have caused a great divorcement of them from the mother country.

In 1943, after a trip to England, Senator WILLIAM BENTON from Connecticut, reported on a luncheon he attended. Present was Lord McGowen, Chairman of the Imperial Chemical Co., Ltd., one of the world's big monopolies, and who sits on the Board of one of the largest concerns in the United States. Lord McGowen stated "I see no hope for collaboration between the Americans and British unless the United States repeals their Sherman Antitrust Act. Can we in England look forward to that?"

Thirty years ago, Lenin stated that victory for communism in the United States would come from within. He noted with emphasis that the greatest obstacle in the path of communism was the number of small businesses existing at the time.

The truth is that Lenin was more prophetic than we should care to admit. We are in danger—from within—of going down the road to communism. But first let's see what we have.

The American independent business way of life is a pattern whereby all citizens have a right, through ingenuity and ambition to go into the market place and win a business and permit fair competition as the guiding factor to control prices and create the necessary employment that is needed for citizens of our Nation to have jobs. As a result of this system, our people have achieved the most widespread and fairest sharing in the material benefits of business of any people any time, and they are as free as ever were the citizens of any land.

But what is happening?

Hundreds of millions of dollars are spent yearly attempting to educate the American people that monopoly control means greater purchasing power and lower prices for consumers—that it means more of the good things of material life and more assured freedom for everyone.

Instead of seven restaurants in a community, the monopolists claim, one restaurant is more efficient and economical. Yet these monopolists do not say how the people who are thrown out of jobs by the change from seven outlets to one will earn money to patronize the restaurant, or how industries who supplied the seven outlets will continue to be able to exist.

These monopolists do not tell the people, perhaps because they do not realize that, if their argument is sound, then it is but one little, logical step to the claims of communism—that the state take over the one restaurant, eliminate the profits, and sells at even lower prices.

This trend away from our free, competitive enterprise system and toward monopoly, has gone far.

Today because of the concentration of our economic power in the hands of a few, we are finding ourselves in the plight of being dependent upon Government for subsidy. We depend upon employment created by having a defense program, also by the tremendous give-away programs to other nations. Without them our unemployment rolls would skyrocket.

In order to promote the fiction of continued prosperity in an age of growing monopoly, we are wasting the assets inherited from our founding forefathers. Such assets were created upon a system of freedom in the market place. That we are in a ticklish position is not denied. We cannot go along the same path we are traveling without falling into the pit of communism. We cannot reverse our trend immediately without creating a potentially very damaging upheaval.

The real danger today is that, while we are wasting these assets, Government is not putting forth the effort to enforce, broaden, and strengthen our antitrust laws, in order to bring about security for small business, the farmer, labor.

Today we find the large majority of our defense contracts going to less than 50 concerns in our Nation, with only crumbs peddled out in the way of subcontracts. In addition, with the prime contractor making a profit off the subcontractor.

In our so-called give-away programs, we find the major portion of the products and materials channeled through the same concerns in our Nation and we find the shipments going to monopolistic set-ups in foreign nations, with little benefits directly derived by the citizens of those nations. This condition, naturally, not only makes the citizens of foreign nations easy marks for communism but at the same time discourage them about the United States, and, by promoting higher taxes here, makes our own Nation just so much easier for communism.

As we have pointed out, our one hope is the preservation, strengthening, and enforcement of the antitrust laws, which some are trying to scuttle. Why? Because these laws not only guarantee our economic freedom, but they work to provide each last citizen his fair share of a constantly expanding production.

But Government has been lax in its duty on these laws. One example is that Government today is spending approximately \$60,000,000,000 to defend the Nation against armed Communist aggression. More billions are being spent to arm the free nations. The Department of Justice is spending many millions to weed out communistic subversives in our country. Yet at the same time, less than \$10,000,000 is asked to enforce the Nation's antitrust laws. And the money appropriated is not always spent efficiently, even though it is nowhere near the amount needed to do a good job.

It is the solemn duty of Congress, elected by the people to see that all Government agencies properly carry out such duties. Yet it is in Congress and important Government agencies that we find much support for movements to scuttle these laws. It is in Congress we find calls to modernize the laws, by people who would be the first to say that we should not modernize the Ten Commandments, that we must enforce them.

All is not, however, hopeless. To the credit of those in Government, they have recently established a Small Defense Plants Administration to assist in making corrections. Legislation has been introduced in Congress to forbid shipments under the Marshall plan, to nations permitting monopoly control of such products. To date this legislation has not been enacted into law. However, such action does indicate a need for such corrections and it shows that some outside of Government are attempting to make correction.

If this hopeful trend is not strengthened, and we are forced into a clash of arms with Russia, undoubtedly the battle would end with Old Glory flying over the Kremlin, but that would not in any way end communism. The monopolists would then be in control of our country, and shortly we would find rebellion among our people that would result in Government ownership. Our system of free enterprise would be lost forever. It would have fallen to communism or a similar system by some other name.

The United States today stands alone in the whole wide world with antitrust laws to protect and promote the American business system that has proven beyond doubt that it is far superior to that of any other business system known to history. These laws are our greatest fortress. However they are not being enforced and strengthened.

Consequently, we are in grave danger, because of our negligence, of communism slipping through the back door. We are also in the same danger as many of the formerly free peoples of the world who, discouraged under monopoly business systems, traded what remained of their God-given birthright of free will for a mess of pottage.

Today in America is found the strange paradox of certain people actively engaged in cultivating communism. They are not only the poor maniacs that parade on May Day with clenched fists and carrying red cards. Those doing the most in preparing the seedbed for the harvest of communism are found holding office in government, finance, and industry.

More potential communism is spawned within the walnut-paneled luxury of offices where monopoly procedure and protection is devised than in a grubby cell headquarters in the skid-row section of some city.

Whether these people are activated by malicious greed, by fear, or stupidity, it makes little difference. They are as much assassins of the American system as a Bolshevik.

It is a matter of history that Benedict Arnold was a very charming and polished gentleman. No one, more than 175 years later, knows exactly the reasons for his treachery or how he justified his actions to himself. But he, as modern Benedict Arnolds are doing today, escaped the consequences of his crime. Today, the infamous spirit of Benedict Arnold again stalks the land when unfair methods are exercised to drive independent business out of the market place, discourage ownership of small farms, or deprive labor the right to work.

Our antitrust laws are the only real fortress the world has against communism. They are the real weapons of democracy and those who seek to destroy them deserve no more consideration from their fellow citizens than any other wartime saboteur. Great influence cannot be permitted to be used as a shield against punishment for great evil.

Naturally, it must always be recognized there is no crime in bigness. Every business has a right to grow—but definitely not through the cannibalism of monopoly. The time for action is now. The Nation's main streets have too long suffered from the greed of a few outside of Government, plus the indifference and negligence of many in Government with regard to enforcing our antitrust laws.

This situation is the same as if your local authorities permitted known bandits to freely roam over Main Street.

Unless a show-down and exposure is immediate, the generation of Americans now developing may very easily be forced into the slavery of industry, agriculture, or labor monopolies, solely because there will be no opportunities left for the starting of any venture on Main Street or the continuation of existing independent enterprise. Thus we will continue to move toward the state of communism.

Is Our Aid-for-Dependent-Children Program Developing Into Reverse Sociology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the September 8, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains a challenging article entitled "The Relief Chiselers Are Stealing Us Blind," by Paul Molloy.

Mr. Molloy has conducted an extensive research in the field and from numerous sources he has gained information Nation-wide relative to the manner in which the vast sums appropriated by Congress as aid for dependent children, have been distributed and the abuses that have followed in the wake of the operation of the program.

I am informed that, as a result of these abuses, the number of dependent children on relief rolls has increased from approximately 600,000 in 1941 to approximately 1,600,000 in 1951. It is also my information that approximately one-third of the total amount appropriated by Congress for the current fiscal year will go to the chiselers, those taking unfair advantage of the present law. This means that approximately \$117,000,000 of this year's appropriation will go to the chiselers, those who are defrauding the American taxpayers.

These startling facts and the many other equally glaring revelations in Mr. Molloy's article should challenge the attention of every Member of Congress and cause us to seek a remedy. The corruption that has developed simply must be stopped.

Mr. Molloy's article in the September 8 issue of the Saturday Evening Post has created so much interest, that the Saturday Evening Post of that date was again on sale on all newsstands in Oklahoma beside the issue of September 15. I understand that this is perhaps unprecedented.

In the Molloy article, it is stated that—

A similar situation exists in several other States, although Oklahoma presently has the unenviable distinction of having more children on relief rolls than any other State. More than 55,000 children are receiving aid each month; this represents about 8 percent of all children in the State, and is more than twice the national average. The per capita public-welfare bill in Oklahoma is the second highest in the Nation, only Colorado spends more per inhabitant than does this oil-rich section of the Southwest. During the last fiscal year it cost each Oklahoman \$33.12 to maintain public-assistance expenditures, and out of every welfare dollar spent, 18 cents went toward ADC.

Oklahoma is not proud of this record and I am sure that no other State is proud of the tremendous sums of money that are being spent as aid for dependent children insofar as it goes to the cheats and chiselers. Oklahoma wants to take the lead in attempting to eradicate the evils and abuses which have crept into

the administration of this program and particularly to eliminate those who take unfair advantage of the humanitarian desires of the good people of this country to aid and assist dependent children. I hope Oklahoma will be the first to relieve the taxpayers of the leeches who are now preying upon the public in this fashion.

I also call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune of September 5, 1951, entitled "The Widening Rat Hole." Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune has referred to the articles above-mentioned in a letter to me. The Tulsa Tribune has led a fight for many years to eliminate chiselers who are living off the aid for dependent children. In his letter to me of September 5, 1951, Mr. Jones states:

At a time when Congress is trying to find every possible means of squeezing unprecedented taxes out of the people, I believe that a Federal policy that penalizes States for revealing relief rolls and rewards States for hiding them is plainly asinine. We are already seeing the results.

But this is a little worse than simple Government waste. This is reverse sociology. This is the cultivation of the weeds at the expense of the wheat, the encouragement of great propagation of the unfit.

I think it is time Congress met this issue squarely. I can't recall an instance in human history where a political system purged itself of evil while it prevented the people from seeing what was going on.

Following these observations of mine, you will find the Tulsa Tribune editorial to which I have just referred.

The Saturday Evening Post article mentions different remedies of the evil which have been suggested and there may be others equally or more appropriate. But we must find the proper remedy and apply it before these abuses are allowed to continue much longer. Everyone is interested in the humanitarian phase of this problem. We are all interested in these unfortunate children. Yet I ask, is our aid to dependent children program developing into reverse sociology?

The Tulsa Tribune editorial follows:

THE WIDENING RAT HOLE

The eyes of the United States are on Tulsa and Oklahoma today. We are proud that Tribune reporter Paul Molloy has an article in the Saturday Evening Post, which went on sale this morning. It is entitled "The Relief Chiselers Are Stealing Us Blind." It summarizes information Molloy obtained last winter in a series of articles for the Tribune on the aid-to-dependent-children racketeers in Tulsa and other Oklahoma cities.

The Molloy article comes at an opportune time. For a major fight is brewing in Congress over whether the American people shall have the right to know the identity of persons who are accepting Federal relief funds, or whether these names shall continue to be hidden in secret rolls, known only to the politicians and case workers.

Present Federal law prohibits Federal relief moneys from going to any State that permits the publication of these lists. Indiana has permitted this publication, and in July Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing cut that State off from Federal funds. Illinois funds are also in danger, since its legislature also voted to make public the rolls. Thus States which sought to discourage the racketeers are being penalized by the Federal Government. What does this mean to the American taxpayer?

It means that at the present time President Truman is asking for a public welfare budget of one and one-third billion dollars. This is three times the average annual amounts spent from 1943 to 1947 and is requested at a time of full employment and record national income.

The issue is fundamental. For the first time in history people are taking money from the Federal and State treasuries under the legalized cloak of secrecy. The taxpayer is not permitted to know who is getting his money. Women are making a racket of bringing illegitimate children into the world, for if the children are sufficiently starved and neglected the mother can enjoy a free and comfortable living. People who can work are refusing to work. Unworthy people are on the rolls with the connivance of fiscally politicians or through the inefficiency of lazy case workers. All this is being done in the name of social welfare.

Worst of all, we are encouraging the breeding of large numbers of low-powered and defective human beings. While these flourish the citizen who pays his own way is burdened with steadily increasing taxes. He may decide to have fewer children, because he is no longer able to educate or provide advantages for many. Thus we cut the production of children of able parents, while we cultivate the children of drones. If this continues, is there any doubt that within a generation the I Q average of Americans will start skidding?

The Oklahoma State Medical Association has long offered free medical care and hospitalization for disabled persons on the relief rolls who could be cured and returned to work. According to Dr. George Garrison, past president of the society, fewer than 5 out of 100 "disabled" relief recipients have elected to take this treatment.

No one seriously suggests that families which have suffered disaster should be denied relief funds. But it has been conclusively demonstrated that a large part of the funds voted to relieve genuine distress will be gobbled up by chiselers as long as they hide behind an iron curtain that can be pierced only by politicians and their appointees. The more relievers there are the more social workers can be given jobs. And more relievers mean more voters who will be beholden to the officeholders who got them on the rolls.

Already arrangements have been made to republish the Molloy article widely. We hope it helps stiffen the backbones of Congressmen who are now considering the folly of Federal secrecy. If this policy is not reversed, we face the certainty of a weakened America.

Rural Electrification in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech I delivered before the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Des Moines, Iowa, September 19, 1951:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN IOWA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MARCHES ON

I am honored to be invited to appear at this fine meeting of the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperatives. It is pleasant to come home and see so many good friends. It was only a short time ago that the first project in Renwick, Humboldt County, Iowa, was energized

and the second REA project was established at Gowrie, Webster County, Iowa, in 1936. This plant was known as the Gowrie Rural Electric Cooperative. I am proud to acknowledge that I had a little to do with getting this project under way—as its attorney.

What a challenging experience. An endless amount of time was consumed in applying for the loan and going through the hundred-and-one details necessary in order to perfect it. Naturally we became discouraged. Yet looking back at it, maybe we were a little impatient. Here was something entirely new established for the first time in our county. We started from the ground up.

The best indication, however, that the foundation of rural electrification was laid well can readily be seen by looking at its magnificent accomplishments today.

Think for a moment what has been done. Here we have all the blessings and conveniences of electricity. No one need tell you what that means. Back-breaking drudgery is gone. Long hours of endless labor from sunup to sundown have been replaced by a new magic servant—electricity.

THE UNTOLD BENEFITS OF ELECTRICITY

I have seen and heard again and again what it has meant in our Iowa households since the electric switch was turned on for the first time. This was the beginning of a new era in farm life. As this great service came into their homes after years of waiting, many rejoiced that life would be made much more enjoyable.

But with all its importance, rural electrification is not without its humor and I'd like to tell you the story of our good friend, Anton Holmer. For a long time, like many of the rest of you, Anton was without electricity on his farm. Then one day, the benefits of this great magic servant came to Mr. Holmer. He was a man who had imagination. So what did he do? When he got electricity, he put a radio out in his barn so he could have music as he pulled the cows' teats—and presto—the cows immediately gave more milk. Or at least that's what Anton said.

But most of you are concerned with the hard drudgery of farm labor without this ingenious tool of electricity. I am sure that the case of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Denger in Wright County could be duplicated by any of you in your homes today. Nevertheless, it is well for us to recall that when the Dengers got their electricity not too many months ago, there was great joy and happiness in their farmstead. Overnight, it became a modern home. No longer did they have to carry water in back-breaking drudgery. Now every convenience of a city home is theirs on their farm near Dows. Mr. Denger's comment certainly was a true one when he said, "This is the most wonderful thing I have known for this farm."

A HIGHLY TECHNICAL THING

If someone had said many years ago that farmers could operate their own electric systems and hire the necessary technical help, he would have been laughed at. Yet look at the cold facts of the operation of our highly successful project.

Electricity is easily one of the most complicated things in modern life. A high degree of specialized training and very complicated skill is essential in order to operate these systems. Yet the plain fact of the matter is, the farmers of Iowa have done an outstanding job in making this very complicated tool their handy and useful servant. Truly, we have shown by actual accomplishment what can be done when there is a will and determination to put it over. We have had the wisdom to secure competent engineering guidance, and many a farmer has himself become a competent electric specialist.

This is a good time to take stock of the magnificent success that our people of Iowa have accomplished in rural electrification in the last 16 years. When our rural-electricity program began in this State in 1935, only 14 percent of our farms were receiving the benefits of central station electric service. In 1935 only 32,047 farms in Iowa had such service. And what is our record today?

IOWA'S ACHIEVEMENT IN RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The last summary available to me was for April 1, 1950. At that time 90.8 percent of our Iowa farms, or 184,109, were receiving central-station electric service. That was an increase from 14 percent in 1935 to nearly 91 percent. And by now I have no doubt the percentage exceeds 95.

This is no accident. It is a perfect example of how we can do things for ourselves. When the opportunity and the tools are available our people make good. Iowa's remarkable record in rural electrification proves conclusively what I mean.

They say that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We must guard the things we have won if we are to preserve our present gains. Among people like ourselves, all that is necessary is to know clearly how we reached our present goal and what should be done to preserve our gains. Therefore, let us review the record of great achievement before we ask ourselves: "Where do we go from here?"

THE BIRTH OF REA

As you know, REA was born in 1935. This great institution came into existence under unusual circumstances. The first funds to promote this program came out of a Federal relief act. Farms needed power. Workers needed jobs. By Executive order, REA was created to do both.

It was soon seen that rural electrification was a big job and could only be done by careful planning over a long period of years. Accordingly Congress supplanted the Executive order of 1935 and passed the Rural Electrification Act in 1936. This congressional law set up a long-term development program, implemented by later legislation.

At this time, the cost of erecting power lines was extremely high. According to the Federal Power Commission survey when REA was established, it cost nearly \$2,000 to build a mile of rural line. Consequently, the first big job confronting REA was to build good power lines that would make possible the rendering of electric service at a price people could afford to pay. Before long that very thing was accomplished. By careful and skillful engineering a new kind of construction was developed to meet the exact needs of rural electrification. REA cut previous costs nearly in half. Instead of \$2,000 for a mile of line, costs went down to about \$1,000 a mile of line, and sometimes, considerably less than that.

RECENT REA ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN IOWA

The first REA loan in Iowa was approved in September 1935, and the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on December 15, 1935, by the Central Iowa Power Co. of Des Moines.

Up to July 1, 1951, REA had approved \$117,041,340 in loans in Iowa to 55 borrowers, 53 of them cooperatives. The loans enable these borrowers to finance the construction of 55,979 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 135,354 rural consumers. Some of these facilities already are in operation, and additional lines are being built as rapidly as possible.

By July 1, 1951, REA had advanced \$98,143,152 as loans in Iowa, and as of June 1, 1951, the State's borrowers were operating 52,638 miles of line serving 131,443 farms and other rural consumers. From these figures, it's apparent to me that considerable work is under way right now to complete Iowa's rural electrification.

CONSUMPTION OF ELECTRICITY IN IOWA

The average monthly farm consumption on REA-financed lines in Iowa increased from 79 kilowatt hours in December 1941, to 288 kilowatt-hours in December 1950, nearly a four-fold increase. This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to bring about a more comfortable way of rural living. In the same period the national average went from 61 kilowatt hours to 161 kilowatt hours per farm, less than a threefold increase. You see Iowa farmers enjoy and appreciate electricity a bit more than others.

WHAT IOWA BORROWERS HAVE PAID

The latest REA debt-service summary, covering all transactions to April 1, 1951, shows that the Iowa borrowers have paid \$15,954,959 in principal and interest on their Government loans. This includes \$2,540,884 paid on principal in advance of the date due. Thirty-nine borrowers were ahead on their payments, and not one was delinquent.

Truly, this is a remarkable record. Borrowers of the State of Iowa are thus not only ahead on the payments, but also their credit record is entirely in the clear. We are justly proud of this. No wonder the Congress considers Iowa rural electric cooperatives sound credit risks.

ATTEMPTING TO SERVE AN ENTIRE AREA

After the establishment of the rural REA projects the next important step was the process of developing sound, well managed local REA cooperatives. It did not take too long to learn that job. The outstanding financial success today is ample tribute to how well it was done.

One remarkable thing about rural electrification is the principle of area coverage. This means serving everyone, and not the lucky few. Unlike rural electrification in the old days when power lines only went down the main highways and omitted most farmsteads on secondary roads, REA systems cover the entire area. The big and small, the rich and the poor, the owner and the tenant, all these have the benefit of the sound engineering program of the REA and the blessings of electricity.

LOWERING WHOLESALE RATES

The next big job that confronted Iowa co-ops at the outset was how to get rural electricity at a price people could afford to pay. In the old days, in other States, wholesale rates of 2 and 3 cents a kilowatt-hour were common. Iowa was more fortunate in this regard. Rates of 2 cents per kilowatt-hour or 17 were not uncommonly quoted for Iowa projects, as the REA co-ops were getting under way.

Now compare those rates with the steady drop since 1940, when the average cost of power purchased by Iowa borrowers from private suppliers was 1.26 cents per kilowatt-hour, average. In 1950, this rate had dropped to an average of 1.10 cents per kilowatt-hour. If the old high wholesale rates had continued, there would be no big rural electrification program today. Such high wholesale rates would have made the retail rates so high as to restrict the wide-scale use of electricity. So here again the cooperatives and the REA developed a sound program of wholesale power rates which soon brought down the higher rates that had been in existence previously. As a result retail rates dropped markedly. New sources of power were developed and the utilities fell in line. The result is, that rural electric service has been the cheap and willing servant of all Iowa farmers.

THE WIDESPREAD USES OF ELECTRICITY

When rural electrification service was first introduced on our farms, people merely thought of using it for light. But once electricity became available, its endless uses on

the farm manifested themselves immediately. Electricity is useful in town. It is even more useful on the farm. Factories showed the way here. Machines, which were formerly driven by steam or operated by hand, were converted to electricity. Mass-production methods were pioneered by its use. Farmers soon learned that they, too, could use these same methods, in modified form, to serve their particular needs.

From pumping water to grinding feed, electric motors became the real servant upon the farm. Cooling milk, hot beds for spring seedlings, drying hay, pumping water for stock and poultry, electric chick brooders, elevators for grain, are just a few of the many uses of electricity. Electric-milking machines and separators, ditch irrigation, running water for livestock, water tanks, elevators, electric corn shuckers, grinders, ensilage cutters, these are other samples of the hundreds of ways in which farmers, helped by electric specialists and by their own resourcefulness, put electricity to work to save time and labor. And at the same time obtain new sources of income. It is not unusual to find a dozen or more motor-driven, labor-saving devices on a farm.

When an electric line is built out to a farm, a completely different tool is made available to the family which lives and works there. Most farm tools have only one or a few uses. Electricity as a tool, however, has hundreds of uses on the farm and in the home, and more are being discovered and used every day.

In the poultry-raising areas, as you know, running water from electric pumps and electric poultry house lights are all important. In the brooding houses, all-night lighting to prevent crowding cut mortality to practically zero. Quick-freeze cabinets handle thousands of pounds of poultry at a time. An electric milker does the work of many people. There is no need for me to go on.

REACHING THE REST OF IOWA

We can take justifiable pride in our great rural-electrification accomplishment in Iowa. For truly a jump from 14 percent to 91 percent of all our farms having the benefits of high-line electric service is a remarkable record.

The mere statement of that achievement, however, shows the job that lies ahead, namely, reaching that other percent who do not enjoy the blessings of electricity at present.

We all know that there are many fine Iowa citizens who have been waiting patiently for a long time, and still do not have the benefits of electric service. In some cases, their patience is worn rather thin with delays, which, although explained, are a poor substitute for electric service. They, too, are just as anxious as anyone—before his farm received electricity—to obtain such service at the earliest possible date.

I know how diligently cooperatives are working to obtain the necessary funds and materials for extensions or new developments to make this service possible. For my part, I want to pledge to you every aid that is in my power to complete this big job before us.

With all of the background we have had, we will find ways and means of reaching these unserved rural people. If other States are approaching 100 percent in rural electrification, we will not be satisfied with anything less in Iowa.

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

The question that presents itself to all of us is, "What lies ahead?" From the vast experience had in developing sound rural electric cooperatives, there should be no question in our minds as to what the future holds in store. We have forgotten many individual difficulties and differences and have

molded our rich experiences together into a friendly and forward-looking effort. The result is that Iowa and the rest of the country are richer. As long as we all work together for the common good, there is little need to worry about the future.

It takes no imagination to realize that this great electric revolution of the farm is just beginning. It has tremendous appeal and opportunity, not only for the present generation but also for the youth who will be the rural citizens of tomorrow. Many farm boys and girls have inspired their elders to try new ways of farming and have introduced new uses for electricity.

The potentialities of electricity for heat, light, and power application are only beginning to be grasped by the majority of American farmers. As the cost of power goes down, and as farm people realize more fully what electricity can do for them, it will be applied in endless ways to make better living and more comforts in the home and on the farm.

DIFFICULTIES IN DEVELOPMENT OF REA COOPERATIVES

Today one of our problems is the utilization of electricity by REA co-ops in Iowa of the power to be produced at the Randall Dam and others, on the Missouri River in South Dakota. There is no difference of opinion among us that Iowa REA's should have their share of the benefit. But there has been some difference of opinion as to how, and by what method it should be used. Unfortunately, some rancor has developed among a few, which I sincerely hope will not be the pattern for all of us. There is no need to become heated or angry about a proposition that must be solved, not by emotion but by practical realities.

What are these realities? They are political, economic, and engineering realities. What is the present political reality? Let me quote the policy laid down by Congress as to distribution of electric energy.

"Where private utilities and/or REA and/or municipal plants have existing adequate transmission facilities, or where they agree to build same, and will enter or have entered into a wheeling contract to wheel Federal hydropower to preferred customers and other power users in line with such contracts as already exist in many areas, then the taxpayers' money should not be spent to build transmission lines." The Congress has sustained this policy on several occasions.

The economic reality that will govern is the answer to the questions—What method of distribution will be cheapest and best in the long run for Iowa farm consumers, and should Iowa cooperatives continue to control the distribution of the electric current they sell?

The engineering reality is one which we must necessarily submit to competent electrical engineers who are expert in their field and are practiced in the science of electric transmission. They will know the best kind of method from an engineering standpoint.

Surely a calm and reasonable consideration of these realities, uninfluenced by our emotions and prejudgments will evolve an answer to such difference of opinion as may exist.

Because before this there have been differences. A long and stony road was traversed before our splendid present REA cooperatives were established. It is instructive to remember some of the major battles that were fought, in order to shed light on problems that now seem as large and difficult and bitter today. For it must be remembered that in the early days, as well as when REA developed, each one of these controversies—and some of them were very bitter ones, as many of you recall clearly—were

the stuff out of which the present splendid cooperatives were established.

First consider the whole REA job. When this program was first started, few people dreamed that new, fledgling cooperatives could succeed in covering whole areas. Yet, over a period of time the good and the bad were mingled together and out of it our present fine system evolved.

Consider all the engineering obstacles that were surmounted and successfully overcome. We have mentioned previously the early titanic problem of wholesale rates. And so, too, the endless other difficulties that presented themselves from time to time.

At times many of us got pretty hot under the collar and yet, look at the results today in solid achievement.

The history of the overcoming of these obstacles is very important. Whenever real difficulties beset our communities, it is proper and in accordance with the best tradition of the American way of life, to discuss them fully and frankly. However, we should use the ancient maxim of "disagreeing without being disagreeable."

In the long run, cooler heads and wise counsels prevail if all of us "just keep our shirts on." No man in advance knows the answer to these tremendously difficult problems. But one thing is certain. If we have an open and vigorous and free discussion, so that there is a "competition of truth on the marketplace"—to quote the late Justice of the Supreme Court, Oliver Wendell Holmes, the best policies and practices of our State are bound to prevail.

WHAT REA HAS DONE IN THE UNITED STATES

It is refreshing to look over the entire REA program to see what the farmers and the people of rural America have done for themselves since REA was established in 1935. Here is the record.

By July 1, 1951, REA had approved \$2,427,204,114 in loans to 1,076 borrowers. They include 986 cooperatives, 41 public power districts, 24 other public bodies, and 25 commercial power companies. At that time, REA had on file or in process in the field, additional loan applications totaling \$322,850,000 for new system construction and various line improvements. Most of these applications are for expansion of existing systems financed by REA.

Over 1,000 of these REA borrowers now have rural electric facilities in operation. Their facilities include more than 1,100,000 miles of line serving about 3,500,000 farms and other rural consumers in about 2,600 counties of 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. Additional lines are being built more rapidly now than ever before, to reach the less accessible places.

Of all the loans thus far approved by REA, over 80 percent have been for electric-distribution facilities. REA makes generation and transmission loans when borrowers are unable to purchase an adequate supply of power or when saving would result. Approximately 18 percent of the REA loans have been for construction of generating plants and transmission lines. About 1 percent of the loans have been made to power-system operators for relending to their consumers to finance installation of wiring, plumbing, fixtures, electrical equipment, and appliances, and irrigation facilities. The pattern of power production, distribution, and use is by no means uniform over the entire Nation. The important thing is to produce the juice for use in a way beneficial to those who need it.

As citizens of Iowa we have a right to be truly proud of this magnificent accomplishment. Proud of the entire rural electrification program. For truly, we are a vital and integral part of this stupendous achievement. All America, and the world, is now taking cognizance of this splendid addition to our rural farm culture.

Politics in the Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 25, 1951.

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: I wish to join in the request of Senator FERGUSON that the committee of which you are chairman conduct an investigation of the solicitation of political contributions from applicants for positions in the post office in the State of Michigan.

As you will observe from my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, September 20, 1951 (A5751-5752), the investigation which I believe should be made is somewhat broader in scope than that requested by Senator FERGUSON. However, this narrower subject is included within the broader one and would seem to me to be a logical first step.

I also wish to assure you of my cooperation in every respect in the conduct of such an investigation should your committee decide to undertake it.

I am transmitting to you herewith certain correspondence received by me on a confidential basis and other material. I trust that such of the correspondence as was transmitted to me in confidence will be received on that basis by your committee. In addition to this material I have received other information in the nature of leads which I would be glad to pass on to your investigators if they will contact me.

I only wish to add that I have followed the work of your committee in connection with the Mississippi job sales and your current hearings on Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans and wish to commend you for the forthright, impartial, and thorough manner in which those investigations have been and are being conducted.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER

Flood Plan Is Another Socialistic Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensburg (Ind.) Daily News of September 19, 1951:

FLOOD PLAN IS ANOTHER SOCIALISTIC SCHEME

A radical departure from traditional American programs in aiding victims of disasters is contained in the proposal of President Truman for spending \$400,000,000 for relief and rehabilitation in Kansas, Missouri, and other stricken States.

Mr. Truman endeavors to justify the plan on the ground that the Nation is aiding peo-

ples in other lands and that quick rehabilitation is needed because of the defense effort.

In the past the American Red Cross has assumed the major role in helping victims recover from their losses. Those who needed help were given it to the extent that their basic requirements—food, shelter, clothing, and household furnishings—were supplied. Those who could help themselves did so.

Under the President's plan, the criterion of need would be abandoned. The Federal Government would indemnify everybody, except the larger commercial and industrial enterprises, for losses, regardless of needs.

This kind of indemnification program was set up in Canada after the disastrous floods in Winnipeg last year. Mr. Truman's plan is the first move in this direction in the United States.

While the President's proposal is pending before Congress, the Red Cross has gone forward with its traditional disaster relief and rehabilitation program.

It has been active in the valleys of the Kansas and Missouri Rivers since the second week in July when the floods struck. A campaign has been launched to raise \$10,000,000 for relief and reconstruction. It already has committed and is disbursing \$2,000,000.

In the disastrous Ohio River flood in 1937 the American Red Cross collected voluntary donations and gave assistance of some type to 236,000 families. It cost the Red Cross \$25,000,000, which would be equal to twice that amount now. Over \$7,000 was subscribed for Red Cross flood relief in Decatur county alone.

The Federal Government already has made a grant of \$25,000,000 for rehabilitation in the Kansas-Missouri area from a fund that was not available in 1937.

Most of this has now been allocated and much has been disbursed to pay for clearing away debris, restoring water and sewer systems, repairing highways, and rehabilitating schools and other public facilities. Only a small portion of it has been earmarked for relief of individuals.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation also has been active in the flood area. Nine temporary offices have been opened through the area to process applications for RFC loans to rebuild houses and reestablish small businesses. More than 1,500 applications have been received for loans totaling \$15,000,000.

By the middle of last week the RFC had approved 449 loans for \$3,080,000. The Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and other lending agencies also are extending Government credit to the flood victims.

In short, the flood victims in Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, and Oklahoma are receiving far more help and greater credit assistance than those who experienced the Ohio River flood in 1937 and the disaster is not nearly so far reaching. If the need is as great as indicated by Mr. Truman, the Federal loaning facilities could be easily expanded or loans of private institutions could be underwritten.

The proposal for an expenditure of \$400,000,000 for the area would set a precedent which would prove very dangerous for several reasons.

1. It would mean that the Government would be required to aid financially in every future disaster.

2. It would result in abandonment of the principle of definite need as the basis of aid and would tender assistance to individuals that are able to help themselves.

3. It would mean that the Federal Government would, in large part, supersede the American Red Cross as the agency for dispensing flood and disaster relief.

4. It would place disaster relief in a status that political manipulation would be easily achieved.

5. It would represent another gain in the program of socialization of the United States which the bureaucrats at Washington are seeking to foist upon the American people.

A timely move would be the organization of a system of flood and disaster insurance by private insurance companies of the Nation. It might be possible for the Government to give some financial support to the program or extend some guarantees until the program has gained a firm financial status. Then the companies should operate independently and should charge on the basis of experience tables and anticipated losses.

Citizens of the United States want to tender all necessary assistance to the unfortunate people in the four flood-stricken States. But they do not regard it necessary to abandon traditional American principles relating to disaster relief in the interest of state socialism.

Oklahoma Farm Bureau President Insists That Relief Rolls Be Protected but Open for Public Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I received a letter from Mr. John I. Taylor, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, dated September 7, 1951, in which he insisted that the relief rolls be protected but kept open for public inspection.

The recent article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of September 8, 1951, entitled "The Relief Chiselers Are Stealing Us Blind," dealt with investigations and research of only one phase of the relief program. It dealt with that portion of public relief which involves appropriations and expenditures for aid to dependent children. The revelations in that article are shocking and show a disgraceful situation, which is more or less nation wide.

However I dare say that a proper investigation of conditions would reveal other startling facts with reference to the abuses in the field of old-age assistance program and general relief, which come under the public assistance programs and for which Congress and the States appropriate huge sums of money annually.

In my humble opinion, the real basis of these abuses and the impositions by those who have taken unfair advantage of the generosity of the public may be found in the fact that there has been an inclination to make a political football out of the relief programs. It has afforded an opportunity for a lot of political hangers-on to get jobs at the expense of the taxpayers. We are all too familiar with the tremendous overhead expense of administering these programs. Those who possess political influence have in many instances obtained appointments for members of their family, relatives, or friends, regardless of whether or not they were competent. Many case workers have turned

out to be veritable political snoopers. In most instances, the case workers have been conscientious, but in too many instances, they have allowed political pressure to influence their actions, or it has influenced that of their superiors. In many instances, the oldsters could perform the duties of case workers and fill positions of others who administer these programs, which would take that many off the relief rolls immediately.

Apparently the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, through its President, expresses its belief that the relief rolls should be opened for public inspection, in order that it may be determined who, if anyone, is on these rolls improperly. At the same time, Mr. Taylor would have the law protect these rolls from all improper uses, and I think that could be done. Opening the rolls for public inspection may not be the best approach to the solution of the evils that have developed in the administration of the relief programs, but it certainly is one that challenges the best thinking of which we are capable. Some State legislatures have already taken action in this direction, and I believe that we will witness a salutary result in those States. If there are other approaches, they should receive the careful attention of the Congress, and of all who are interested in this program.

The Oklahoma Farm Bureau president's letter follows:

THE OKLAHOMA FARM BUREAU,
Oklahoma City, September 7, 1951.
HON. GEORGE SCHWARTZ,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Recently I received from a Member of Congress a mimeographed statement on reasons why the existing Social Security Act provides that public assistance records be kept confidential.

In reviewing this document, the main contention is that if these rolls were made public, they would be used by business concerns and politicians to further their own ends. In connection with these reasons, is there any reason why the Congress could not insert into the law a very stringent penalty for the use of these rolls by anyone? This penalty should be made severe enough that it would not be violated.

It is still our opinion that these matters will never be cleaned up on a State basis even though the State has full authority to accept or reject any applicant for assistance. This is a national matter involving the expenditure of Federal funds and should be open to public scrutiny. We do not believe that the reasons stated in this document will stand the light of day, nor do we believe that public assistance rolls will be cleaned up of undeserving persons until they are opened to the light of day.

We continue, therefore, to insist and urge that you lend your best efforts to enacting into law such provisions as will protect these rolls and at the same time that they will be open for public inspection.

A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post is a shame and disgrace to the State of Oklahoma and doubtless could be carried to many other States of this Nation. We believe the solution of this whole problem lies in this suggested approach. We respectfully urge that you take appropriate action.

Very truly yours,

JOHN I. TAYLOR,
President.

The Present Opportunity of a Governmental Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, as other Members of Congress I received considerable mail from the classified civil-service employees of the Government in relation to their increased compensation.

In acknowledging this I considered it a favorable opportunity to make a closer contact with these employees, and in turn to have them feel a more emphatic tie-up with the problems we as Congressmen are confronted with in Washington.

In doing this, as the letter shows, I endeavor to impress upon their minds the result on our economy of these tremendous appropriations at home and abroad, and the inevitable taxes that will follow. And so on through the other points of the letter as a reading will show.

These cards were from a very small percentage compared to the number of governmental employees in my district. I felt the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would afford a greater number of them an opportunity of getting a congressional viewpoint, not only in my own district but others as well.

The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1951.

DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for your card advising me of your feelings concerning the increase in salary for classified rated governmental employees.

From the newspapers and radio you are aware that the legislation in which you are interested was passed by the House and now will go to the Senate-House conference. Here minor differences in the viewpoints between the two bodies will be adjusted. The bill contained a retroactive clause which sets July 1, 1951, as the effective date of the increase. Any delay in final action will not be of financial loss to you.

Now, may I say a few words to you.

Our governmental employees cannot help but be aware of the terrific appropriations to activities not only at home but throughout the world. These funds all come out of our pocketbooks whether directly or indirectly. They are all inflationary. Personally, I am for keeping them at an absolute minimum—national safety alone being considered.

Maybe we can do something in a concerted action to stabilize prices at present levels if we take every precaution not to create artificial demands on items of which there are either real or apparent shortages. Such situations when started go like forest fires. Merchandise does seem to be in good supply judging from sales advertisements and shop window displays. As for food, meat seems the most unsteady and unpredictable. However, if we prevent unusual demand, it will ease off.

Avoiding inflation should be our constant effort. You as a governmental employee can help. You are the one who should be a sales person for these contributions to real Americanism. No one wants to return to the material standards of the horse and buggy

and 14-cent egg days, but there has been nothing yet evolved to replace our old ideas and practices of honesty in thought, word, and deed. These are basic and of highest concern today. In our everyday lives we should endeavor to strive to keep America great, to stand firm against those who would destroy the things we have had preserved for us and wish to pass on to the children of today.

Now the legislation of the Congress on your salary may not be ideal in your every wish. Congress feels it has made a good over-all step, and I sincerely hope that this is your feeling. Will you kindly accept my few words on our current situation as—not a lecture to you—but a desire for you as a fellow governmental employee to accept leadership in the things that mean so much to us. In this connection we must also watch our application to everyday duties so that those who are helping to pay our salaries will feel that we are constantly endeavoring to do a good job in whatever our task in governmental service may be.

Thank you again for writing to me.

Sincerely,

Your Congressman,

WALTER M. MUMMA,
Member of Congress.

Has Anyone Thought About Slowing Down This Spree?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News for September 21, 1951:

HAS ANYONE THOUGHT ABOUT SLOWING DOWN THIS SPREE?

In spite of the fact that, according to Government officials themselves, we are close nationally to a shortage of manpower, the Federal Government is hiring more and more civilian employees.

The very fact that we may be short of workers when the defense program hits its full stride appears to have inspired a number of United States bureau heads with a zeal for "stockpiling" several thousand employees every week. The last total we saw was 2,489,500 civilians on the Federal payroll with new hiring progressing at the rate of 1,500 per day.

And it's the same with plans for civil works projects, some of which may get a face lifting to make them appear to be military projects. It seems that bureaucrats want to obligate the Government for more than a billion dollars to build "plants and facilities for war production purposes." This in spite of the fact that private industry declares that it is fully capable of handling much more than present war production.

There is no doubt that pay-as-we-go taxation to keep the national debt from swamping the entire national economy would be far easier if the bureaucrats would abandon such schemes that smack too much of socialism for the appetite of a majority of thinking American citizens.

While national administration leaders are clamoring for more controls to halt spiraling inflation the Government itself is hiring in too many instances two and three employees

for one-man jobs and, at the same time, pricing private industry out of the labor market. To most Americans, this sort of thing just simply doesn't make good, hard sense.

But of one thing we may be sure. This merry-go-round won't stop until the American public demands it. The only way to demand it is to tell Congress through our elected Representatives and Senators.

A great deal has been and is being said by national leaders regarding the necessity for making the country strong to resist the enemies of freedom. We're for that, and we believe practically all other good Americans are for that, too. But we can't increase our strength by putting more people on the Federal payroll than are absolutely needed. One man for one job is enough.

Know Your Waterways—Informing the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by the Marine News, of New York, N. Y., which was published in the Washington Post, as follows:

Know Your Waterways—Informing the Public

We are certain that less is known about the Federal waterway system than about any other great asset of the Nation. As the outstanding publication in the marine field, with more than 11,000 circulation, we believe that we can serve no more useful or patriotic purpose than keeping to the front the genuine necessity for constantly improving and extending the Nation's waterways, both in the interest of economical transportation and national defense. Publicizing our waterways cannot be left to hostile, selfish interests. Unless such propaganda and misinformation are refuted and constructive facts made known beneficial waterway development will be delayed and existing facilities will not be used to the limit of their capacity. The loss will fall on the public. It is incredible how little is known, even among many well-informed, about the benefits that come to the people through their waterways. Picture the helplessness of the Nation should all harbors and channels vanish overnight. It would be a mortal blow to much of the Nation's defense, industry, and commerce.

Chicago Tribune Again Blasts \$19,019,000 Hand-out to Grandview, Mo., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD herewith another editorial from the Chicago Tribune protesting the \$19,019,000 authorization to the cow-pasture airport at Grandview, Mo., balliwick of the Truman family and political insiders, including the late Boss Pendergast.

I have protested this shoddy deal from the beginning, and will continue to protest it.

This is the second editorial on this subject called to my attention in the Chicago Tribune, and is in addition to the many editorials from Iowa and elsewhere that I inserted in the RECORD August 20 and September 13.

Please notice that although the appropriation for the \$19,019,000 authorization has not yet been enacted, the boom is already under way for the benefit of at least one machine politician with an inside track.

The editorial from the Tribune follows:

CASHING IN

A reader sends us a brief report from the Kansas City Star of September 11, stating, "The purchase of 80 acres of land just outside the city limits of Grandview for the development of a business section and the construction of 245 residences was disclosed today by Knos A. Axtell, lawyer, who represented the buyer and seller in the transaction." The purchaser is listed as Frank Morrell Construction Co., of Scarsdale, N. Y., and Washington.

The story notes that the reported price of \$500 an acre represented a sharp increase over prices in previous land acquisitions.

Grandview, Mo., is the site of Mr. Truman's old family home. The family farm of 394 acres is situated there. By something less than coincidence, Grandview turned up as the site for a \$19,000,000 military airport in the \$5,800,000,000 military construction bill approved by Congress recently. It was explained that this was an ideal situation for the headquarters of the central air defense force and Continental Air Command.

Axtell is one of Truman's political cronies. He was hand-picked by Truman to run in the crooked Democratic primary of 1948 when Truman wanted to get rid of Congressman Slaughter. Axtell owns a 320-acre ranch across from the airport site and has bought an additional 120 acres in the last 5 years. His purchase for the Morrell organization indicates that a vast development, with large increases in property values, is under way at Grandview, in which he and the Trumans will profit. Axtell has already started to cash in.

The Grandview deal is such a flagrant instance of profiteering on the strength of the Soviet menace trumpeted by Truman that it is hard to believe that anyone could be so barefaced about corruption. Nobody is likely to be surprised by all this. For our part, we called the turn in editorials of August 14 and 25. Once you catch on to the methods of this administration, as pretty nearly everybody has, you no longer stand to be surprised. They are shameless.

Rehabilitation of Flood-Stricken Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Kansas City Times of

September 19, 1951, which follows, speaks for itself:

A FLOOD PLAN HEARING AT LAST

This much is certain: The worst disaster in American experience deserves immediate and full consideration by Congress. Then let the aid question be settled on the merits of the case. That can be done only by the wholehearted cooperation of the key men in Congress.

After prolonged and costly delay a hearing now is to be started by a House appropriations subcommittee. It will be a secret hearing with the public barred. Yet we trust it will mark an effective start. From the leadership of Congress we have heard far too little to indicate an active interest. Time is running out and more delay should not be allowed to smother the voice of the Midwest.

The latest tip on the prevailing attitude comes from Representative NORRELL, of Arkansas, who was named chairman of the subcommittee to start action. NORRELL said the Government agencies had given him incomplete figures. Then he raised a preconceived objection on the grounds that an aid program would stir up demands on other past floods and set a precedent for the future.

Perhaps this statement only indicates advance caution. We hope so. Taken literally it would show critically serious unfamiliarity with the Midwestern devastation or the proposed aid program.

If this had been just another flood, nobody would have even suggested Federal aid. In his message the President was talking about a terrible disaster far beyond anything this country has known. The Red Cross or other private agencies have the resources to take good care of little flood disasters. There have been many of them in the Missouri basin without any demand on Congress. But here is a devastation measured in the billions of dollars. Compared with the resources of any private agencies the losses are astronomical. The only power great enough to cushion the economic shock and give material aid is the Federal Government.

The case checks to Congress. It is spending billions on billions around the world. It is just now starting the secret hearing for a great part of the United States that is vital to the agricultural and industrial economy of the Nation.

As for the precedent, anyone who has even read the aid bill should know that it carries its own answer for the future. Part of the proposed \$400,000,000 would go into a revolving fund to start Government underwriting of private flood insurance.

We have even heard some congressmen say that the program would commit the Government to aid on losses from every tornado or hurricane. We would think any Member of Congress would know that individuals and businesses are already protected by wind insurance. It is the normal companion of fire insurance.

So far there is no general insurance protection against the greatest hazard, which is a flood. The risk is so concentrated that private companies can't offer the protection at practical rates. American property in the tens of billions is subjected to this one risk without normal insurance protection.

The President's plan simply proposes Government underwriting which would enable the private companies to offer reasonable flood-insurance rates. Given that kind of protection the Government wouldn't have to concern itself with future aid claims. In normal years of smaller floods such a program could be expected to pay its own way. Even a rare catastrophe of the 1951 scale should not put too great a burden on a national insurance program.

Until the Government completes its flood-protection systems throughout the country there is no other practical way. It can't move the large share of the American cities

that are now taking the risk in river bottoms.

This part of the United States asks no blank check. It asks a fair hearing on the merits of the case. If this issue is smothered by stalling tactics it will be a national disgrace. Action is long overdue.

Children America Forgot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, sacrifice is demanded, and expected, from every adult when our country finds itself at war or threatened with war. But I think everyone will agree unnecessary sacrifice should not be expected from the children. Yet the victorious war effort of World War II unquestionably took a toll of sacrifice from America's children through reduced school facilities. And in these feverish days of building up the Nation's defenses against the threat of a possible world war III, new threats exist to the proper functioning of our schools in the countless communities where workers have had to move in to take their places on the assembly lines in the defense industries or in the ranks of our Armed Forces.

In these communities, and in the communities close to military installations, schools once more are being swamped by the children of defense workers and military personnel. Planning has failed and as a result, here in the United States in the year 1951, an estimated 3,000,000 children have shockingly bad schools, if any.

The plight of these children is presented with dramatic impact in an article in the current Parents' magazine. Written by Stacy Jones, able and well informed Washington writer, it is entitled "Children America Forgot." I believe every Member of Congress will want to read it. Under permission granted by the House, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for it is a vital national problem on which Congress will want to take prompt action. The article follows:

CHILDREN AMERICA FORGOT

(By Stacy Jones)

If you were living today with your service-man husband near the Tinker Air Force Base, in Midwest City, Okla., you might be helplessly anticipating the prospect of sending your child to class in an abandoned coal bin come the beginning of this school year. If husband Fred were stationed at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, near Dayton, Ohio, Fred, Jr., would be learning his multiplication tables in a once-abandoned building, constructed when Ulysses S. Grant was President of the United States. In winter, in this building, heat comes courtesy of a pot-bellied stove. In any season of the year there is no plumbing at all. Whether it's June or January, each time a child wants to go to the toilet he has to cross a busy highway to get there.

If you were married to an engineer about to go to work in the H-bomb plant of the

Atomic Energy Commission, to be set on 200,000 acres along the Savannah River in South Carolina, your child would not fare any better. He might find no classroom in the countryside near the project. Although the H-bomb plant is expected to bring in at least 25,000 children of new families within the next 3 years, all the available classroom space on the development is already choked to capacity. If you and your husband found a home across the river in Richmond County, your child wouldn't be any better off as to schools, because Richmond County, already pressed by Federal personnel from Camp Gordon, from two Veterans' Administration hospitals, from an arsenal, from Clark Hill Dam, has 6,000 children without classrooms now. They are meeting in churches, on the stages of auditoriums, in private houses, and in empty storerooms.

As an atomic scientist, your husband might be ordered to Paducah, Ky., where the Atomic Energy Commission is presently constructing a \$350,000,000 gaseous diffusion plant to manufacture uranium 235. But in the area around sleepy little Paducah, the school population has been shrinking steadily for the past 10 years. Old buildings have been abandoned in favor of consolidated schools. The schools' ex-personnel has been looking for, and finding other work. Today, with the new AEC plant in the process of being built, it is true that Paducah has been shocked wide-awake. In all good faith, the town is frantically attempting to reexpand its educational facilities to meet the inevitable influx of new hordes of school-age children. But Paducah is running up again the hard wall of a complicated economic problem. The high wages of the Atomic Energy Commission itself have lured school janitors and school bus drivers and school teachers away from their old board-of-education jobs into new and much more lucrative Federal positions. (The AEC pays \$12 a day to ex-janitors whose wages, previously, had been about \$4 a day.) So next fall, Paducah, Ky.—home of this country's newest uranium 235 plant—may have inadequate school staffs and have to use temporary schoolhouses.

In many defense-affected areas the classrooms which do exist are already miserably overburdened. Many of the schools operate on half time, with two shifts of students using the same desks every day.

Luckily, this critical state of affairs is not Nation-wide. Although there are children without proper schools elsewhere, it is endemic primarily to America's defense-affected vicinities—small towns where new defense plants or military posts are being reactivated or expanded. The arrival of thousands upon thousands of defense workers and/or military personnel with families has completely flooded the schools in these communities.

But the appalling statistics of this children's crisis are a measure of its national importance: Right this minute, at least 810,000 sons and daughters in these United States are without schools. They are being packed in with the 2,200,000 other pupils who, as of now, comprise the total student population of all the defense-affected areas in the country. This means that, as a direct result of Federal activity, more than 3,000,000 American children don't have proper schools. They are children America forgot in its rush to build defense plants and army installations. Nobody knows how many more millions will be drastically affected as the Nation's defense activities continue their mushroom growth.

Who is responsible for the shameful failure of the most scientifically and culturally advanced country in the world to provide adequately for its own children's education—and so, for its own future? Last year, Congress officially accepted the responsibility. It admitted that it wasn't fair to expect communities, in which huge new defense plants were being built and communi-

ties where army camps are being expanded, to finance the construction and maintenance of additional schools needed to take care of the new, sudden influx of children. Besides gorging the schools in defense areas with more children than they can handle, the Federal Government further handicaps the very same schools in another way. When it moves into a locality with an army camp or a defense project, it removes the suddenly Government-owned land from the district's tax rolls. A congressional committee has calculated that land which the United States owns now inside America's school districts would—if the Government could be assessed for it—bring into these money-strapped communities about \$186,200,000 annually in school taxes. In its last session, Congress passed an act which provided that the Federal Government should pay its fair share in the erection of the new schools needed in the defense-affected areas throughout the country. But when appropriations time came around, Congress voted less than a tenth of the sum to which the act's formula would have entitled the country's defense-affected school districts. Even if the funds are doubled by a supplemental appropriation, almost nothing in the way of school construction can be accomplished by the beginning of the next school year.

Briefly, this is the legislative case history of the defense-affected schools' scandal. Public Law 815, the act which provides Federal aid for school construction in defense-affected areas, accepts the Government's responsibility to pay for such new schools in proportion to the number of children it forces on any given district. The appropriation of \$46,500,000 voted for this year proved to be shockingly inadequate. Under the law's formula \$350,000,000 would have been needed.

So the United States Office of Education got an assignment in arithmetic. Seven hundred and forty-eight defense-affected districts had filed applications for aid on more than 1,000 school building projects. In all, these districts asked for about \$200,000,000—or about \$150,000,000 less than the \$350,000,000 sum to which the law would entitle them. Although most of these crowded districts have already borrowed and taxed themselves to the limit, they proposed to spend, anyhow, about \$100,000,000 of their own money.

From these figures, you can calculate the pay-off. The Office of Education is over \$100,000,000 short of funds which have been requested by the distressed school districts. This department is required to allot whatever money is at its disposal in order of urgency of need. In practice, it works out so that the very worst cases get some financial aid from the Government, but the others get none at all. One harassed education official said, "I feel like a father who has 10 barefoot children, and only enough money for 2 pairs of shoes."

Actually, here is how those precious, woefully inadequate \$46,500,000 are being spent. Funds were set aside to meet the most pressing demands for new schools at military bases and \$2,500,000 went for temporary school buildings, chiefly at the Savannah River and Paducah AEC developments. This left only \$31,500,000 to fill \$200,000,000 worth of requests from 748 districts. Out of this, tentative allotments were made to 75 cases.

The President has recommended a supplemental appropriation of \$50,000,000. But even with this, the United States Office of Education would still be short \$103,000,000 of what the schools asked. At this writing, the fate of the President's recommendation is unknown.

Fortunately, the schools fare somewhat better under Public Law 874, which is aimed not at school construction, but at school

maintenance and operation in defense-affected areas. Congress appropriated \$28,500,000 for these matters, to be divided pro rata. More than 1,000 eligible districts will get about three-quarters of the money to which the law's formula entitles them. But this doesn't solve the problem of how to operate and maintain a school for whose existence Congress failed to provide.

Around the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, where school children must cross a heavily-trafficked Ohio State highway to go to the privies, the Government not only removed taxable property from the rolls, but it also left a school bond issue standing against the remaining non-Federal property. On top of this, tax-exempt Federal housing was constructed in town, and federally owned plants were leased to private companies which were also exempted from taxation.

There is yet another legal loophole which fouls up the country's attempts to provide decent education for its defense-affected children. The law requires that a school district's application for funds be based on average daily attendance for the current year. Obviously then, a town like Paducah, which will house the AEC's new uranium 235 plant, can only helplessly anticipate the arrival of thousands of new school children in time for next term. It cannot request funds for children who will be, but are not yet, in attendance at its schools.

As the mother of a school-age boy or girl and the wife of a defense worker or a military man, you would face educational set-ups just as shameful as the ones in Paducah and the Wright-Patterson Air Base at many, many smaller camps throughout the country. The Chanute Air Force Base, for instance, is the sole business of Rantoul, Ill. Next year, school attendance will probably be eight times as large as it was in 1940. The town has long ago outgrown its schools.

Let's say your husband is an instructor in the weather school on the base. You, your husband, and your two sons rent an apartment with two bedrooms in a converted private garage in town. You have no yard and no front porch to call your own, so your boys play after school in vacant lots.

Rantoul's elementary school is, naturally, full up. So your sons travel by bus to temporary classrooms on the base. These classrooms were hastily created by putting up flimsy partitions in the hospital wards. Each room might hold 20 children in reasonable comfort. But there are 35 kids in Jimmy's room and 45 in Frank's. The partitions aren't soundproof, so the children are inevitably distracted by what goes on next door. There is practically no blackboard space. It's unbearably hot on sunny fall days.

All the children must go without outdoor recess and play because their shouts might disturb the convalescent men in the hospital buildings. There is no gymnasium or auditorium, and, therefore, no physical education or visual-aids program. Because the kids have no cafeteria either, your boys travel home again for lunch. But since they are in different classes they come and go at different times. So you prepare breakfast and lunch for them separately as a daily routine.

Moreover, you have been informed that the hospital ward classrooms are only loans from the base. In case of an epidemic, they will have to be reconverted for the use of patients within 24 hours. But, epidemic or not, the school board has been on notice that it will have to return the rooms to the base by this fall.

Rantoul and 21 other Illinois school districts which are similarly affected asked for Federal aid for schools. Rantoul was lucky. The town received more than \$1,000,000 for a new school. But Rantoul turned out to

be one of only four to get construction funds.

On the Pacific coast, with its heavy concentration of naval and Air Force bases, school conditions in defense-affected communities are as bad, if not worse. A distracted mother in Atomic City, Idaho, a hamlet near another AEC project, wrote recently to President Truman. She told him that the mothers in Atomic City had to drive their children 26 miles to a high school, 28 miles to a grade school, and 32 to a junior high. She begged him, in the name of the town, for a local school. In Roswell, N. Mex., the dilapidated school building outside Walker Air Force Base has coal stoves and outdoor toilets.

Detroit is another good—or more accurately a bad—example of a metropolitan area which has never recovered from its tremendous growth during World War II. Within 10 miles of Detroit's city hall, schools exist where wells and outside privies are used in lieu of toilet facilities.

It is inevitable that these intolerable school conditions will permanently scar the children who are suffering from them now. Earl James McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, puts it like this: "When a child becomes 6 years old and finds no school to go to, there is no way we can repair the damage 3 or 4 years later. America's children cannot be put into educational cold storage for the duration of the emergency and then later be moved into an academic hothouse for forced growth."

Well, why doesn't Congress appropriate enough money to meet its own formula for Federal aid to schools in defense-affected areas, you may well ask? What happened to that other \$150,000,000 which Congress might have voted for school construction this year, but did not? The answer is obvious, ironical, and it could be fatal to the future of this country—unless every outraged American citizen brings the tragic case of this country's forgotten children to the attention of his home-district Congressman at once.

In the vast hurried build-up of military installations, atom-bomb projects, and industrial plants all over the country, Congress has short-changed the children in defense communities.

Congress has apparently not yet recognized that the most powerful nation in the history of the world will be only as effective in securing the peace as the minds of men can make it. The 3,000,000 children, caught now in the cultural and intellectual trap of defective schools, are the men and women of America's tomorrow. If we continue to sacrifice their schooling—the making of their minds—to expediency, we may well be sacrificing the future of this country.

Write or wire to your Congressman urging him to vote the appropriations necessary to meet the school needs of these forgotten children.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Program No. 50 of the series of broadcasts by me to the people of Pennsylvania entitled "Happenings in Washington." This program was broadcast on September 24, 1951

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM No. 50

(By United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

There are several matters I want to discuss with you today—some of the things that people in official circles here in Washington are talking about.

But first I want to tell you one outstanding conclusion I have reached after working for nearly 3 months on the toughest job I have encountered since I came to the Senate.

As most of you know, I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and the job I have referred to was that of helping to write the new tax bill.

When the committee had finished its work on the bill I was convinced, more than ever before, that if we are to avoid further tax increases that will reach the point of confiscation—if we are to have the national economy from collapse—we must stop the high-speed Government spending that is now going on.

I can see no escape from national bankruptcy if we rush headlong into a spending program that will cost the taxpayers at least \$100,000,000,000 each year for the next few years.

Of course, you all know that we are going to pay more taxes next year and for some years to come.

To meet the high cost of his spending program, President Truman wanted the Nation's tax bill increased by \$10,000,000,000.

The House of Representatives, after intensive study by the Ways and Means Committee, cut the President's figure down to \$7,200,000,000.

Then the Senate Finance Committee went to work.

The economy-minded Democratic and Republican members of the committee were determined to cut the additional tax bill down to the lowest possible point, consistent with efficient service and the needs of national defense.

We cut wherever it was possible. We straightened out certain inequities in the excise taxes. We plugged up some of the loopholes to eliminate opportunities for tax evasion.

And the net result was a revised tax bill which again reduced the President's request for \$10,000,000,000 to under \$6,000,000,000.

In my opinion, that is the maximum amount that can be piled up on top of the high taxes we are now paying.

I believe it is an amount sufficient to operate the Federal Government and leave a cash surplus at the end of the current fiscal year if we apply sound common sense to Government spending.

President Truman does not agree with that conclusion. He believes that we should increase tax rates all along the line and go right on spending, because, as he said the other day, "the United States is now at the peak of its prosperity."

That was the theme of his speech at the recent cornerstone laying of the new General Accounting Office Building.

In that speech he said, in effect:

"We've got plenty of money—more than we ever had before—even though we are paying high taxes and high prices for everything we buy. Government spending is nothing to be frightened about. We can afford it, and, therefore, we can keep right on taxing and spending more and more."

We can all recall when the President had a different story to tell. We can recall his solemn warning that the American people

would have to make great sacrifices now and in the years ahead. He told us how burdensome the new taxes would be. He said the people would have to give up some of the things they normally enjoy. He called upon every citizen to tighten his belt and do without things in order to help build the Nation's defensive strength.

But that serious outlook was completely forgotten in his speech at the General Accounting Office Building.

I wonder how many of you read that speech?

It has caused a great deal of discussion, because its main purpose was to pour ridicule on those who see grave danger to the Nation unless Government spending is reduced.

The President certainly picked an odd place to make such a talk. In case you are unfamiliar with its function, the General Accounting Office audits the accounts of the various executive departments and agencies. Its new office building, one of the largest in the world, will cost more than \$25,000,000 by the time it is completed.

Stop and consider what that means.

Government has grown so big and Government spending is so enormous that it costs \$25,000,000 just to provide office space for the 12,000 people needed to audit the books and accounts of this bureaucracy.

Here, at the cornerstone laying of this testimonial to the run-away size of Government spending, the President of the United States assured the folks that his administration is keeping the financial affairs of the country sound, solvent, and well managed.

Those who do not agree with him and claim there is waste and extravagance in his administration, the President said, are just telling—and I quote his exact words—"a pack of lies."

I wonder how many of you believe that in a budget of \$70,000,000,000 that a truly careful and prudent administration could not manage to save five or six billion? Do you believe that those who try to save the taxpayers' money from waste and extravagance should be ridiculed and abused?

Well, that speech is still being talked about in Washington.

Now, let's go briefly into another thing Mr. Truman said. For one thing he said this—and I quote him directly:

"A man will go into a night club and throw away \$40 or \$50 and think nothing of it. But let him get a tax bill for \$30 and hear him scream."

Mr. Truman must be a little mixed up.

In this day of the great bureaucracy almost no one who files an income tax return pays as little as \$30. Everyone who works for a living, even the young farm hand, the young office clerk, the helper in a factory, all pay bigger direct income taxes than \$30. That, of course, is only a part of what they pay. Everyone pays a lot more than \$30 a year in the excise taxes we know about—on cigarettes, gasoline, cosmetics, electrical appliances and a long list of other things.

On top of that everyone pays a lot more than \$30 a year on still another classification—the hidden taxes which, for most American families run into hundreds of dollars each year.

Mr. Truman knows about these taxes, of course, all of them.

So when he sneers about the man who "throws away" \$50 in a night club and screams about a \$30 tax bill, he tries to make people forget that all of them, even the smallest earner, pays a lot more than that under his administration.

He didn't mention that the person who does patronize a night club occasionally must pay Mr. Truman's Treasury Department a 20-percent excise tax on the amount of his bill.

And he seemed to forget that millions of our people, who feel the pinch of high taxes

and high prices, can't afford to go to night clubs even if they wanted to.

But let me tell you this—and I talk as one who has devoted long study to the matter. No matter what Mr. Truman says when he dedicates cornerstones, there is plenty of waste in that \$70,000,000,000 budget.

Money can be saved. Money should be saved. And as long as I remain in the Senate I shall fight to save it. The money which the Federal Government takes and spends is your money, earned in the sweat of your brow. I am determined that, so far as I can prevent it, your money shall not be wasted.

One of the most objectionable conditions here in Washington is the attitude of so many bureaucrats to always soak the taxpayer.

Let me give you one example of what I mean.

The other day, while the Senate Finance Committee was in executive session working on the tax bill, we had several representatives of the Treasury Department sitting in with us.

In every instance, no matter what issue was before us, the Treasury spokesmen resolved everything for the benefit of the Government and against the taxpayer. Finally I could stand it no longer. I told one Treasury spokesman "I am tired of you giving the Government the benefit of every doubt. You forget the people are your employers. You're not the bosses; the people are the bosses. As employees I think it is your duty to resolve at least some doubts in favor of your employers, the American people."

Perhaps I shouldn't have said that in the executive session, but I could not restrain myself any longer. This attitude on the part of the bureaucrats has disturbed me gravely.

Believe me, it should make the American people angry.

If things were done differently, then the Federal departments and agencies would think of the people first. Then they would not try to spend every dollar they can get their hands on and taxes would not be pushed higher and higher.

But this happy state will never come until the American people make their views clearly and emphatically known to their representatives in Washington—both in the Congress and in the executive departments and agencies.

In the course of working on your tax bill, the very able and distinguished Senator from our neighboring State of Delaware, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, offered a proposal to eliminate the income tax exemption enjoyed by the President, Vice President, and all Members of Congress on certain expense accounts. In the case of Members of Congress, that expense account amounts to \$2,500. For the Vice President, it is \$10,000. In the case of the President of the United States, it is \$50,000 a year.

I voted with Senator WILLIAMS to knock out these exemptions. But, unfortunately, we were beaten in committee, 7 to 5.

Now, here is an interesting angle of that Mr. Truman sneers at people who, he says, scream when they are given a \$30 tax bill. But Mr. Truman gets \$50,000 to spend as he pleases, without accounting to anyone—and it is entirely tax exempt. This \$50,000 is in addition to his \$100,000 a year salary and of course, in addition to his regular expense account for running his office.

If Mr. Truman did not have the \$50,000 exemption, he would have to pay the Government \$36,350 on his regular salary of \$100,000. That would mean a total income tax of \$89,136, the same as any other citizen must pay on an income of \$150,000. These figures are on the basis of existing law. They will be much higher in the new tax bill.

I waited hopefully for a message from the White House to go ahead and tax the \$50,000. But Mr. Truman never got around to sending it. He was too busy sneering at people who object to \$30 tax bills.

They are also talking in Washington about Mr. Truman's political speech in San Francisco on the very eve of the assembly which opened the Japanese Peace Conference.

Virtually all the nations of the world were gathered for the signing of the peace treaty. In the American delegation were Democrats and Republicans, working together as a team. Politics was forgotten. The United States of America was showing a united front.

At that time and at that place, when the nations of the world met to advance the cause of peace and freedom, Mr. Truman elected to inject partisan politics into the atmosphere. At a large meeting of Democrats he delivered a rip-snorting stump speech. He attacked the Republican Party. He discussed the 1952 political campaign, and even offered his party a slogan for the next Presidential election.

This speech made front page headlines in the newspapers, providing reading matter for the statesmen from nearly 60 foreign nations.

Here in Washington they are talking about that speech—the bad taste and the bad timing in delivering it. They are saying it is one more example of the prime fact about Mr. Truman, that he is a politician first, last, and all the time.

They say it is another example of the often proven fact that when affairs of state and partisan politics compete for Mr. Truman's attention, affairs of state suffer.

If we have to have prosperity, full employment and a market for our products at the cost of excessive Government spending, never-ending emergencies and the lives of our boys who are dying in Korea, we are in the most desperate situation in the history of the American Republic.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capitol. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Participation of Educators in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement and attached articles relative to the teaming up of the Wisconsin State government with faculty of the University of Wisconsin in the service of the public and related matters. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement and the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSITY TEAMWORK

The State of Wisconsin has long pioneered in a great many innovations in governmental procedure. It has set standards in public administration and related fields which have become a model for the rest of the Nation.

One of the interesting phenomena of recent years in our State has been the considerable extent to which our State government at Madison has drawn upon the talented faculty of the University of Wisconsin, also located in that capital city.

The reciprocal advantages of university professors participating actively in government are clear to every observer. On the one hand, the university faculty gets the

benefit of invaluable, practical day-to-day experience with legislative and executive branch affairs—experience which can thereafter be communicated to the student body upon the return of the faculty to their regular teaching assignments. On the other hand, the State government gets the benefit of the keen minds, the broad intellectual backgrounds of the university faculty.

We all recognize that it is possible, of course, for the wrong type of university professors to be chosen for some governmental post, on Federal, State, or local level. Each of us, no doubt, is familiar with some case wherein an individual suited to academic life but lacking practical judgment might do very poorly in a governmental post. The same thing could, of course, happen in the case of individuals selected from other fields of endeavor. However, I should like to point out that in the experience of our Wisconsin State government at Madison many of its university personnel selections have proven exceptionally fine.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate because we have seen a considerable amount of publicity about the wrong type of Government appointments. And so I should like to mention this pattern of sound types of selection. I feel this advisable in all fairness to our institutions of higher learning and their faculties throughout the land.

We recognize, too, that university faculties often represent many different shades of political opinion. Provided that such shades are all within the American framework of devotion to the free enterprise system and our constitutional Republic, there certainly could be little objection to drawing upon the great pool of skill available in the Nation's universities.

What brought this subject to mind was an article by Mr. John Wyngaard in his popular *Under the Capitol Dome* column as printed in numerous Wisconsin newspapers on Friday, September 21. That article is appended hereto.

I have also an illuminating article from the July 1951 issue of the famed educational publication issued by the Bruce Publishing Co., the *American School Board Journal*. This article is entitled "Experts in Public Service." It was written as a guest editorial by Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, the distinguished president of Mount Mary College, of Milwaukee.

Dr. Fitzpatrick has presented very clearly and concisely a statement on what constitutes an expert in public service. He has written it particularly from the standpoint of local schools and boards of education, but I believe that the general principles which he has stressed are applicable in many other situations, and they help shed light on exactly how experts should be used.

One individual once stated that experts should be put on tap, rather than on top, which implies that when utilized intelligently where their talents are best suited, experts can perform on an invaluable basis, but if misused in some unsuitable position, particularly in top level spots, they can do considerable harm.

Dr. Fitzpatrick's excellent article, therefore, appears following Mr. Wyngaard's column.

[From the Janesville Daily Gazette of September 21, 1951]

UNDER THE CAPITOL DOME

(By John Wyngaard)

STATEHOUSE AND UNIVERSITY TEAM UP; ADVANTAGE MUTUAL

MADISON—The transfusion of University of Wisconsin minds and men into the operations of the State government, a mile up the street, is an aspect of statehouse affairs that has had little recognition.

More and more frequently today a legislative committee that faces a difficult or complex job of research will think of the university's staff. More than likely President E. B. Fred will get a call from the committee chairman asking for the loan of a specialist, or for suggestions about a man who could help, which to Dr. Fred is tantamount to a request for one of his faculty members.

Example

Last winter a legislative standing committee charged with analyzing pension bills realized it couldn't keep up with the flow of those measures with its existing staff. It got a University of Wisconsin mathematician.

The other day Senator Robert P. Robinson, chairman of that committee, publicly testified about the value of Professor Larson's work.

A few weeks ago the new judicial council was looking for a competent man to handle its office. Dean Rundell of the law school, suggested Prof. Jack DeWitt, of his faculty, and DeWitt now is secretary of the council. Several years ago Governor Rennebohm wanted a good man to revive the executive office research bureau. One of his other staffers had just completed study under Prof. W. H. Young, of the university political science department, and recommended him. Rennebohm consulted Fred, and downtown came Mr. Young to become one of the key figures of the executive establishment.

Prof. W. D. Knight, of the university's commerce faculty captained the research work in taxation for the legislative council last year, and with his university students and graduate assistants, expects to continue on the job this year. Prof. Harold M. Groves, university economist, is a member of the advisory committee guiding that investigation.

The meaning

There are many other examples, indicating that the capitol and the campus are growing to understand each other better and pooling their energies for the common good. Prof. M. G. Toepel of the university came downtown to head the legislative library last year. Professors Feinsinger and Witte of the school have worked with legislative committees on labor legislation. Last year Prof. Scott Cutlip of the school of journalism, looked over the State's public information services, at the request of the executive office.

The advantages are mutual.

[From the American School Board Journal of July 1951]

EXPERTS IN PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Edward A. Fitzpatrick)

There is plenty of evidence all around us that we do not understand the function of the expert in a democracy. This is particularly true as men presumably expert are appointed to public office. What status should the judgment or opinion of experts have in public life?

THE PROBLEM OF THE NONEXPERT

Let us remove first the problem of the untrained, uninformed, or stupid person elected or appointed to a position of authority. There is a too ready assumption made by the public as well as public officers that election by the "peepul" or appointment by a board immediately confers on such a person all the knowledge, skill, and insight necessary for the job, and to issue authoritative pronouncements from the "chair." This is true of superintendents of schools, of heads of religious communities, and notoriously of the military forces. The absurdity of such a practice has but to be described to be perceived—but there is no

immediate likelihood that it will be discontinued in the foreseeable future.

WHAT IS AN EXPERT?

Now let us take the case of the "expert." Let us exclude the pseudoexpert, the "magnavox," the owl who just looks wise, and the other members of this species. By the expert we mean the person acquainted by special training and experience with a specific field—too often not very broad—who knows the methods of research of the field, its history, and is acquainted with its application. He has done some work following carefully tested techniques which his fellow workers in the field have been able to verify or accept as probable. The area of expertness is in the field of knowledge. In the field of human relations there may be some skill in handling people, but it is likely to be the result of trial-and-error or intuitive rather than, in any genuine sense, scientific. This is particularly true in the field of school administration.

LIMITED CHARACTER OF EXPERTNESS

It should be noted that expertness is often very limited in character, and in the field of school administration the varieties of knowledges and skills called into play are numerous. One danger is that the administrator may be deluded into believing that his opinions in the field of his nonexpertness should have the same acceptance as they do in the field of his expertness. Another danger is that his presumed expertness in knowledge is one thing but its application to a particular situation may be an entirely different problem.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE SUPERINTENDENT

Now let us take the practical problem of the school administrator and his board of education. First, the very implications of its organizational set-up. Final decision legally and practically rests with the board as to policy. No matter how expert the superintendent thinks he is or what authority he thinks he has, the final decision on all questions of authority rests with the board. The obligation of the expert is in every case to convince the layman on the board, and the people he represents, as to the wisdom of a proposed policy. Until he has done this, he has no right to act on policies; when policies are once determined he is expected to implement them.

WHAT A REAL EXPERT DOES IN PREPARATION

Let us look at the problem from the standpoint of the expert. If he is a genuine expert he will take care to collect all the information available, he will test it for consistency and for suggestiveness. He will formulate his proposals of policy on the basis of his facts and in the light of experience. His colleagues will also review them as *advocatus diaboli*. He and they should be able to see more objections and loopholes than any school board member could find or conjure up. The true expert will realize that rarely is any problem an open or shut matter in the world of human nature with its individual difference in a world of amazing diversity of conditions. He will know, too, to what extent a given policy proposal is a calculated risk, and he will know the conditions.

HELPING A BOARD TO UNDERSTAND

This is the preparation which the expert will give to his problems. That at times superintendents will bluff, will lobby with a few members in advance, have teachers or parents see board members on a personal basis, need not detain us, but to note the fact and to condemn it. When a superintendent goes before a board after such preparation, putting his cards on the table, he must not assume that the board will act as the superintendent recommends. He

has now to translate his pedagogical and scientific lingo into terms which the board and the people can understand. He must translate his ideas into terms of schools No. 1, No. 2, and all the others. He must frankly face the quality of his teachers and his supervisors. He must place the proposal in its budget setting. He must patiently meet the misunderstandings or mistakes of the parents or board members.

THE SUPPORTS OF AN EXPERT'S PROPOSALS

Proposals have not behind them the authority of the superintendent. They have behind them only the factual information, the order of thinking, the insight, and the practical sense that went into them. That is what will make them expert, and all his Carnegie personality, his membership in the Rotary Club, his authoritative jargon, his appointment, his degrees—all count for nothing. To repeat, his proposals have supporting them only their intellectual worth and practical wisdom which is broader and more secure than mere personal expertness.

NO NEED FOR UNANIMOUS VOTES

There is a false assumption that all proposals to a city school board or a State board of education should be carried by unanimous votes. As the secretary of the Wisconsin State Board of Education I worked up educational proposals when I felt there was an educational need, and often presented them when I knew some members of the board would very likely vote in the negative. If such a policy is not adopted we get opportunistic administration and the administrator trailing far behind his board and his people. The responsibility is on the superintendent for leadership.

EXPERTS IN OTHER FIELDS

I do not want to close without illustrating from other fields a sound theory of the use of experts. I walked into the Philadelphia City Hall one day when there was a hearing on the rates charged by the Philadelphia Electric Co. The discussion was on the cost of certain street lamps. A distinguished professor from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, qualified as an expert, and asserted "as an expert and from my long experience in the field, and so forth, and taking into account many items which my expert knowledge shows me must be included," the lamps were worth a definite amount, let us say \$25. He was testifying for the public utility. But a distinguished lawyer from the University of Pennsylvania Law School objected and asked how could that be: Here are the very bills in payment of these posts and they are for \$12.50 each. That is one kind of expert we should keep out of school administration.

Another expert is described in Harrington Emerson's *Twelve Principles of Efficiency*. A railroad was having difficulty with its boilers because of the water that was used. A chemist was engaged. He tested the water in all the places, located the watering place of the highest deposit content, proposed a plan for a new building, and so forth. When one of the maintenance of road foremen heard about the report, he pointed out that only 1 percent of the engines took water at that place. While the chemist was right as to the chemical composition of the water, he was woefully wrong in his recommendation in the field where he was taken as an expert and—was not.

THE ONLY SECURE BASIS FOR POLICY

School superintendents and cities are as susceptible to fads, slogans, fashions, in education as human beings are in other areas. So-called expert opinions are often rationalizations of prevailing slogans. There is particular danger in education, and what is called "expertness" is the cloak for deception and for promotion to a larger superintendency.

The only secure basis for any new school policy is the facts, experiences, insights, formulated and stated, which are presented in support of a proposal—and the final judge is not—and should never be—the expert but the layman guided by common sense, a willingness to suspend judgment until all the information is in, a curiosity in discovering the real reasons, and an objective judgment based on his best light.

POSITIVENESS AS RELATED TO IGNORANCE

A final point is a point of human psychology. A person appointed to a position of responsibility and authority is almost certain to be more positive in his opinions and acts in direct proportion to his ignorance or lack of knowledge. He is constantly engaged in protecting his ego and himself. Consequently his orders are all very positive and very brief—brief because no reasons are given. He is quick to charge insubordination, and any opposition is taboo. He is not receptive of ideas, nor willing to hear a frank discussion. He is always willing to have members of the staff accept responsibility for reports, but if they are readily accepted they become "my" policies. There is in short, a real danger that the title of expert is likely to be assumed most blatantly by the least qualified as a defense mechanism, and the real expert is likely to be marked by humility, strength, and freedom.

Address by Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi Before the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Prime Minister, of Italy, Alcide de Gasperi, delivered a very able address today to the National Press Club at a noonday luncheon. He pointed up Italy's most pressing problems. He frankly answered questions of the press at the conclusion of his address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Premier Gasperi's address be printed in the RECORD, together with a short sketch of his career.

There being no objection, the address and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PRIME MINISTER ALCIDÉ DE GASPERI BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 25, 1951

This is a joyful gathering for me. It is like seeing old friends again. In my younger days I was a newspaperman and you know we like, even love, the things we liked when we were young.

I am now in government, but I always feel I still belong among you. Perhaps because there is a feeling in me that in democracy a newspaperman's job offers more security than a job in the government. I thought of this when I read an opinion of Thomas Jefferson. He once said, "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should prefer the latter."

So let me now speak to you as one member of the press to others. The fact is that you and we and our friends are engaged in a joint venture fraught with many perils. But we

are certain of succeeding if we dedicate to it our intelligence and resources with the boldness and imagination which we have.

In you, in us, and in our friends, devoted to democracy, respect for the individual and the other ideals of western civilization, there is a deep-seated urge for peace. This desire for peace is one of the major reasons for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it is one of the strongest bonds which join us together in our common venture. We have joined together and are building together, for we know that as we grow steadily stronger, the threats to peace will become progressively weaker. Our will for peace, supported by our joint resources will, we earnestly hope and expect, prevent war. But if our hopes and expectations should not be realized, we will be there to meet and check aggression.

Our joint aim is clear, we must together mobilize these resources and progressively strengthen ourselves as quickly as possible to weaken the threats to the peace.

As in a family, a partnership or community, we all have the same fundamental common aims, but we each have different capacities and assets and our contributions to the common cause must differ. What can Italy give?

I would first of all ask you not to look only at the dark side of the picture. True, we are poor in coal, in oil, in iron ore, and almost all other raw materials, and grossly overpopulated in relation to our resources. In fact Italy's existence for years, when viewed only from a statistical standpoint, has seemed an impossibility.

Now take coal, for instance. In your country you produce more than 550,000,000 tons of high quality coal per year. In Italy itself we annually produce 1,000,000 tons of poor grade coal. And look at steel. You produce more than 40 times more per person in the United States than we do in Italy. In different degrees, there are similar differences in the case, of oil, iron ore, and other materials.

Italy has, however, rich resources in the ability and willingness of its industrious people to work. The people of Italy had created an outstanding industrial structure. Shattered by the rule of a dictatorship and by the ensuing war, Italy has nonetheless, with the most generous help of the United States and other friends, started on the long hard road to recovery. Democracy has been reestablished and maintained, under new and constant assaults from those who would create another dictatorship and so too, has its industrial plant. But with Italy's economic situation it has been almost a superhuman task to satisfy our people's demand for an improved standard of living. The Communists have, of course, used every trick and device to exploit our economic situation for their own purposes. We have met their challenge.

We have increased production in factories and on farms. We are driving ahead with land reform and with other reforms as hard and as fast as it is feasible. You have helped us do this. But we have to struggle against one major problem of which of course, you are certainly aware, but which will never be sufficiently stressed, namely, overpopulation. I shall not quote any more figures. I shall simply say that this structural problem has been tackled in every possible way.

We realize that we must leave no stone unturned to reduce unemployment in Italy and to raise the standard of living of our people. But we have too many people for the size of our country and its availabilities. In the past, heavy immigration from Italy was—if I may say so—not only a benefit for Italy but also for her friends. Through a free and unfettered movement of persons we can help each other, and by the interblending of our civilization, our ways of living and our peoples, we can make it more possible to work together to achieve our great common

aims of peace, freedom and security for our children and our children's children.

Moreover, surplus manpower in one of the Atlantic Treaty countries can be turned to the benefit of the common effort.

The people of the United States are already producing for defense at an astounding rate and are expanding their plan to produce more. If common defense is to be ensured, the people of Italy and the peoples of the other Atlantic Treaty countries could also produce more, wherever there is available plant and manpower. On a practical and selective basis, we can share the task with you.

The real problem is not military or economic aid for Italy and the other Atlantic Pact countries. The real problem is how do we mobilize our resources for our common goals in as short a time as possible? By, for example, utilizing labor and plant in Italy, for the production, say, of precision bearings for military aircraft and vehicles, electronic items for radar, oil for military aircraft and vehicles, rather than building new plants here, would we not get the goods sooner?

There is also the moral aspect of the problem. I mean that starving or discontented people cannot produce properly, they cannot be strong as a defense force, or cannot effectively resist the lure of the extremists. Many of the people in our country who voted Communist are not followers of Marx and Lenin. They are simply people who do not have enough to eat or people who do not feel secure about work and their standard of life. These conditions must not be made worse, but must be improved in the interest of our security.

The desire of the Italian people to contribute to the fullest extent possible to the speedy mobilization of the defense of the Atlantic community cannot, however, be fully exploited until certain moral requirements are fulfilled. I refer to the clauses of our peace treaty, awkward and obsolete shackles on the dignity of a democratic nation.

The same can be said of Italy's admission to the United Nations.

We are trying to make a clean slate of this bitter inheritance of the past, so that we can build for the future and work with confidence and determination. In this spirit we hope that the Trieste question will find a solution according to principles of justice and on the basis of the assurance which we have repeatedly received.

I have tried to outline the problems which directly affect the life of the people of Italy, both politically and economically. When they are solved, Italy will be able to play her full role as a member of united Europe which she has always promoted.

Much still remains to be done, and it will be done. For we stand united and I trust that, through our joint action, peace and freedom will be secured for the world and its civilization.

ALCIDE DE GASPERI

Born in Pieve Tesino (Trento) on April 3, 1881, married to Miss Francesca Romani, father of four daughters.

Doctor of philosophy and philology.

Publicist

From 1908 to the downfall of the Austrian Empire, as a student, a journalist, and a politician, he was intensely active on behalf of the Italian cause.

Member of the Austrian Parliament from 1911 to 1918. After the annexation of the Trentino by Italy he was elected in 1921 to the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

In 1926 he was forced to leave—after 20 years—the editorship of the newspaper *Il Nuovo Trentino*, suppressed by Fascist authorities. In 1926 he was arrested and jailed.

He took part in the underground anti-Fascist movement.

In 1944 Minister Without Portfolio, in 1945 Minister for Foreign Affairs.

In 1945 and 1946 President of the Council of Ministers and Interim Minister for Foreign Affairs. President of the Council of Ministers and Interim Minister for Italian Africa in 1946-51.

De Gasperi has been continuously at the head of the government from December 10, 1945.

In August 1951 he once more became Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The Lone Sentry's Reverie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Mitchell Pilcher, of Montgomery, Ala., recently had published in the New York Times a sonnet, *The Lone Sentry's Reverie*, which describes the thoughts of an American soldier whose "thoughts of home, after the night watch in a weary land," help him to drive out "night's remnant fear," as he daydreams "by a roadside in Korea":

THE LONE SENTRY'S REVERIE

The day brings hope with thoughts of home,
after

The night watch in a weary land—the air
Seems full of gentle whispers, like soft laughter

When happy children tiptoe on the stair.

The sky is a mirage of sunlit hills

Of home, clear as the redbreast's trumpet
call,

When to his note the rolling meadow thrills,
And lavish Autumn's harvest gladdens all.

Across the miles, now seated for the meal,

The family looms and baby brother's head
Bows with the rest, and grateful smiles reveal
Thanks for the proffered food when grace
is said

A lone sentry drives out night's remnant fear,
Daydreaming by a roadside in Korea.

Columbia River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Mid-Columbia Community Conference at a meeting held in the city of Kennewick, Wash., on August 18. The resolutions definitely express the feeling of all the organizations and representatives, in all walks of life, in the entire Pacific Northwest, regarding the development of the Columbia River and all of its allied func-

tions. The resolutions voice the sentiments of the senior Senator from Washington.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recorded below you will find the resolution as adopted by the Mid-Columbia Community Conference in its concluding session on Saturday, August 18, 1951, in the city of Kennewick, Wash. This conference represented more than 300 delegates from 47 cities in the three States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. The following resolution was adopted by acclamation of the conference. We trust that you will accept it for what is it, the free expression of free-thinking people at the grass roots level as to their thoughts, wishes, and desires in regard to our western development program.

"RESOLUTION"

"This conference does hereby wholeheartedly endorse the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia River and its tributaries as proposed and agreed upon and last set forth in schedule T, a defense program, by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army. In so doing, we realize any talk of the Columbia River must necessarily include the Snake River as an integral part.

"We urge the early appropriation by Congress of funds needed to start carry on, or complete work now authorized on Albeni Falls, The Dalles, Ice Harbor, Chief Joseph, and McNary Dams. We urge the early authorization by Congress for construction of Hell's Canyon Dam. In each of these dams consideration must be given to their multiple-purpose functions including the supply of power for national defense, the irrigation of lands now idle, navigation requirements, fishing interests, and the preventing or minimizing of disastrous floods. We also urge the appropriation of funds for the accelerated study of salmon conservation and propagation in the interest of promoting the fishing industry.

"We realize the continued growth and development of the Northwest is now threatened by lack of power at a time when only a fraction of the potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries has been developed, and that unless additional power facilities are developed, present facilities will not care for existing defense requirements in years of water shortage just as power for defense is now endangered during this coming winter.

"The development of the Columbia River and its tributaries is not a question of political policies or parties but rather a question of the best interest of all the people. The development must be in a coordinated, unified manner with priorities based on sound engineering practices and economic justification. We know all costs of the development, or power and irrigation are repaid by the people of the Northwest and that existing projects are proving sound investments. We also realize private capital and State governments have not shown themselves able or willing to carry on projects of the size here in question and the work must necessarily be carried on by the Federal Government.

"We strongly urge the communities represented at this conference to be present at the hearings of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee to be held this fall at a time to be announced.

"We thank the city of Kennewick and its chamber of commerce for their hospitality as hosts to this conference.

"We thank the Army engineers and the Inland Navigation Co. for their assistance in making possible the trip from Pasco to

the McNary Dam down the Columbia River and the inspection of the dam. We also thank the representatives of the press and radio for their fine coverage of this conference.

"It is the sense of this conference that the spontaneity of the interest shown by representatives of the many cities and communities of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington expresses the strong and unified support of the multiple purpose Columbia Basin program as herein previously adopted."

Missouri River Basin Development and the Pick-Sloan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, for several years it was my pleasure to meet monthly with an organization known as the Missouri River Basin Interstate Committee, an unofficial organization. Its purpose and objective was to foster and promote the Pick-Sloan plan of development of the Missouri River.

Mr. President, an article entitled "Pick-Sloan Plan Is Best for Area, Editor Declares," written by Rita Robison, a staff writer, appeared in the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune-Herald of August 30, 1951. It gives the views of an outstanding construction authority of national reputation on the so-called Pick-Sloan plan on which is based the authorization for construction of the Missouri River Basin project in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Mr. H. W. Richardson, who is the editor of Construction Methods and Equipment, a nationally known magazine of particular interest to the construction industry, has completed a tour of the Missouri River Basin, and has viewed first-hand the progress and objectives of the program which is being prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation, of the Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers, of the Department of the Army.

Mr. Richardson's views are of particular interest not only to Wyoming, but to the other States in the Missouri River Basin, as well as to the Congress and the people of the country as a whole. The article is as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**PICK-SLOAN PLAN IS BEST FOR AREA, EDITOR
DECLARES**

(By Rita Robison)

A conviction that the Pick-Sloan plan is probably the best that could be devised for the development and conservation of water resources in the Missouri Valley was voiced by H. W. Richardson, construction authority visiting in Casper Wednesday.

Mr. Richardson, editor of Construction Methods and Equipment, published by McGraw-Hill in New York City, is completing

a tour of the whole Missouri Basin which began in Omaha and took him through Nebraska, the Dakotas, Montana and Wyoming.

"The Kansas City floods have stirred up another wave of demands for a Missouri Valley authority, more studies, surveys and planning ad infinitum. We have the planning, studies, and surveys that have been made over a good many years, especially the last decade," explained Mr. Richardson.

"The Pick-Sloan plan is not based on snap judgment or inadequate information. Congress directed both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to make separate and complete studies of the basin. The reports were identical in general principles, so it was simple for the agencies to meet in Omaha late in 1944 to consolidate the plans. Congress approved the Pick-Sloan plan, and is now making appropriations yearly for its execution."

WYOMING TO BENEFIT

Mr. Richardson explained the meaning of the plan as multi-purpose, giving local flood protection and developing water supply, power, recreation, irrigation, underground water replenishment and navigation possibilities of the entire basin. Of the 108 proposed dams, only 8 are on the main stem of the Missouri River, with the rest on tributaries and smaller streams.

He added: "For Wyoming, this will mean additional irrigated land, several beautiful recreation spots, replenishment of dwindling ground water supplies and flood control.

The editor answered critics who claim that the Pick-Sloan plan is a monstrous extravagance forced on the United States by the two agencies by pointing out that this long-range development is the direct responsibility of the citizens through their Congress.

"From a construction standpoint, the methods are the cheapest and best, because every project is built by private contractors who bid competitively. The Army Engineers design and act as supervisors of the whole project, but have no part in the actual construction." He advanced this point in argument against a Missouri Valley Authority based on the TVA.

MORE STUDIES USELESS

More studies, planning, and talking are useless. I doubt if any other agency, including a Missouri Valley Authority, could come up with a better plan for conservation and utilization of Missouri Basin water. The TVA is a little government all its own, whose financial manipulation sometimes is hard to follow. It is a big step in socialized government.

"Whatever success the TVA has had is largely due to the fact that it is a small basin homogeneous in topography, economics, and type of people in contrast to the vast Missouri Valley, which takes in one-sixth of the entire United States. It varies tremendously in topography, rainfall, economics, land use, and people. There is everything from the highly industrialized Kansas City-St. Louis area and the rich farm land in the lower valley to the sparsely settled and arid areas of the upper valley."

Speaking again of costs, Mr. Richardson pointed out that the TVA set up its own construction organization which has all the possibilities of inefficiencies inherent in our complicated bureaucracy.

In a tribute to the independent westerners, Mr. Richardson doubted if the people, especially in the upper valley, would desire to see another Government agency controlling their destiny.

PEOPLE HAVE AUTHORITY

"If you people of the Missouri Valley do not like what the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are doing in developing the basin, don't blame the agen-

cies. They are acting at the direction of your Congressmen, who have approved the general plan and appropriated money for each and every project separately.

"You people of the basin have the final say through your own spokesmen in Congress."

Payment for this long-range development is made partly by citizens of the entire United States, by benefited land-owners, and by power sales. Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Army Engineers, and W. G. Sloan, planning engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation, are the men who devised the plan and are executing it under the direction of Congress.

Construction of American Freight Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Congress passed legislation some months ago authorizing the construction of 35 mariner-class fast freighters. An appropriation was made for that construction, but apparently since that time, although the Maritime Board has gone ahead with its plan and has designed probably the most modern type of freighter in the world in order to supplement our merchant marine, apparently there has been some difficulty in connection with the question of the allocation of steel, which the Senator from Washington cannot quite understand, because the adjunct of these 35 fast freighters is just as much a military necessity as a tank or a gun or an airplane. In any event, it has caused a great deal of concern in maritime circles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this matter, published in the Marine News of September 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The honorable Congress of this Nation directly represents 150,000,000 people in these 48 sovereign States, which comprise the great Union of the Republic of the United States. It is their sworn duty to cause proper legislation to the best interest of the good citizens of this country, and to safely protect this, our beloved land.

The great Congress has been defied, besmitten and chastized for daring to do their duty under the Constitution, for daring to authorize ships to be built for use by our armed forces and for our Nation's commerce; ships that can outrun the enemy's submarines, ships that are high in speed to supply our armed forces at our far flung military outposts, ships that are very badly needed. And who is the culprit who dares the Congress and the wishes of the people of the United States of America? Who? A little unknown quantity in shipping experience, and as far as shipping needs are concerned, a nobody, a one Manly (?) Fleischmann.

Congress passed necessary emergency legislation for the construction of 35 mariner class fast freighters—the C-4 type—and the President signed. The Federal Maritime Board was directed to complete construction of these vessels with all possible speed, in accordance with the defense mobilization

program to arm the Nation against the Communist plans for world conquest.

Admiral Cochrane, who knows what he is doing when it comes to ships, called for bids and awarded the contracts to build vessels in accordance with our law and the wishes of the Congress. The shipbuilders and the hundreds of allied contractors engaged to expedite the construction of these vessels set up their production schedules far in advance. This was in accordance with the War Production Board's directives. The builders let out subcontracts to cover the necessary needs in completing the construction of these much needed 35 vessels. Everything was set, the green light was on, patriotism was guiding these Americans.

Bang. What happened? Mr. Manly (?) Fleischmann, who holds down two jobs in the Federal Government, must have gotten confused between jobs and decided to defy the wishes of the 532 Americans serving in our Congress and run the war (insofar as these ships are concerned) to suit himself. Here is his trick in stopping the building of these ships. One hundred and fifty-one thousand tons of steel were needed to build these vessels. Mr. Fleischmann decided to cut the program down 33 percent. Now, mind you, he would only grant 102,000 tons of steel—a reduction of 49,000 tons. The production schedules of all the firms involved was thrown right out the window—disrupted and befuddled as a matter of fact. Mr. Fleischmann said: "We don't need the ships at this time."

It is the duty of Congress to determine whether this act of Mr. Fleischmann's is sabotage, ignorance, or sheer stupidity. Who is he to defy our Senators and Representatives? Who is he to weaken our sea supply lines to our Armed Forces? Who is he to say, "We don't need the ships at this time"?

Mr. Fleischmann's arbitrary act not only interferes with our production schedules but tends to undermine the people's confidence in our national legislative body. This is really dangerous. Congress must haul this man before them and have him explain his mistake before the proper committee to explain this faulty act that is causing the restriction in vessel construction. Who advises this man? What is his philosophy? Find out, and remove him from Government if necessary. Congressman HART, please correct this terrible blunder. You are real Americans.

Experience of Lt. Rolly G. Miller in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Malcolm Epley appearing in the March 19, 1951, edition of the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram. It includes a letter written by Lt. Rolly G. Miller to his mother from Korea. I was impressed by Lieutenant Miller's understanding of the reasons for the military campaign we are leading in Korea. The letter stands as a monument to the patriotism of Lieutenant Miller, for he was killed in action in Korea on May 31, 1951.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEACH COMBING

(By Malcolm Epley)

On the desk is a letter from a soldier in Korea that is different.

The writer is Lt. Rolly G. Miller, who is in C Battery, Eighth Field Artillery Battalion, supporting the Third Battalion of the Twenty-seventh Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Division, Korea.

A Poly High grad, he is the son of Mrs. Edwin J. Cook, 4819 Trimble Court.

Mrs. Cook sent the letter because it seems "quite a contrast from some of the letters I have read from the boys."

Here are some excerpts:

"I'm back with the infantry, with my old company which took so much punishment in holding Sobukson in September. Of course there are some new faces—Captain Mac and I were very close and he is gone—and some new men in ranks, but most of the old noncoms and the company officers are the same. It's funny how a severe action kind of makes you feel like a family, and that's pretty much the way it is.

"We're going to cross the river and take the bull by the horns shortly. We'll be in the assault wave, and I'm proud to go with this company of Wolfhounds.

"So many things of a critical nature have been said of this campaign it would take volumes to hold them. We are fighting a godless thought. However right or wrong may be the means, we're combating this ideology. If we accomplish nothing more than proving to the world we'll fight with the little guy to protect his dignity as a human being, I feel we have done enough to justify the sacrifices we have made."

After remarking that every American will have to learn that advantages we enjoy shouldn't be taken for granted, this lad wrote:

"This experience will do the country good. . . . If only they (Americans) can realize that it's more than a sacrifice we have to endure; that it's a duty we must perform and that it's an honor to be selected to do it.

"Some of us will wear uniforms and have to fight. Others will, of course, fight with tools and wrenches at home. But I would feel so much better if I knew that we are all fighting with understanding - with love for the poor little guy who doesn't know anything except that his house is now just a little pile of black rubble and that most of his family is dead, and with ruthlessness for the ideology behind these atrocities. . . .

"Over here . . . you learn to understand people who are different from you. There are so many good points, as well as bad, in everyone. By working and fighting alongside these peoples of different colors, creeds, and backgrounds we are, at the same time I hope, beginning to learn how we may better live with them. Everything is so tremendously significant when you ponder it for a while."

There's an undertone of optimism in Lieutenant Miller's letter, seeming to spring from his rare discernment of the reasons he is where he is and is doing what he is doing.

He voices a philosophy that needs wide dissemination, at home and over there, because we've got to make the awful sacrifices of Korea pay off constructively.

It is common to ask: "What are we fighting for?" and in the question there must be terrible tragedy for those who have lost relatives or friends in Korea. Have they given everything for nothing?

The answer to that question is yet to be written, and we who live when the fighting ceases must write it. The Long Beach soldier in Korea, penning a letter to home folks while waiting for the call to "cross the river and take the bull by the horns," has indicated what can make Korea a glorious achievement and not a meaningless slaughter.

Men like Lieutenant Miller will win the military victory, but making that victory, but making that victory worthy of its terrible cost is the task of all of us. The men who fight always do their part well—it is the others who fail.

Responsibilities of a Party National Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What He Is Not For," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Saturday, September 22, 1951. The editorial relates to a press conference held by President Truman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HE IS NOT FOR

The very worst side of President Truman's old Pendergast background came out in his press conference when he was asked to comment on the latest disclosures in the Boyle-RFC case.

Turning to Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, who brought up the question Mr. Truman asked: "What's a party chairman for?"

The way to answer that brazen question is to say what a party chairman is not for.

He is not for calling up a Government agency such as the RFC on loan matters.

He is not for influencing an independent Government agency to grant a loan which it had declined to grant.

He is not for interposing political pressure in situations which should be decided on merit.

He is not for creating a double standard of treatment in the Government—one treatment for those with political friends and another for those lacking political friends.

He is not for using his party connections as a sandbag to curry financial support or other aid from citizens who wish to do business with the Government.

Harry Truman knows all this.

His cynical retort can be taken as a temperature reading on the hot water in which his Democratic national chairman finds himself.

The best that can be said for this callous crack is that it was not the President of the United States speaking.

This was the machine-drilled local politician from Jackson County.

Premier Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a happy reflection for me to note that Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, yesterday was enthusiastically welcomed in a joint session of the Congress.

I was particularly impressed with the humility and sincerity of this 70-year-old statesman who stated:

We would not come to you urged only by material needs. If we did, we would not deserve consideration nor your friendship. But as freemen to freemen we wish to tell you we are grateful to you because by demanding the revision of our unfair peace treaty, you have acknowledged that an effective and staunch alliance cannot exist without equality of rights and full recognition of the independence, sovereignty, and dignity of a nation.

Here is the expression from a people who are grateful for the great American aid given them and who offer to fight side by side with our American boys with no strings attached.

We could answer that offer of friendship by passing a resolution now urging the modification of the unjust Italian Peace Treaty signed in Paris on February 10, 1947.

For the information of my colleagues I offer the following article written in the New York Times of Sunday, September 16, 1951, by Arnaldo Cortesi:

ITALY'S "INDISPENSABLE" PREMIER—A PORTRAIT OF ALCIIDE DE GASPERI, WHO VISITS WASHINGTON FOR THE SECOND TIME NEXT WEEK

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME—Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, whose talks in Washington next week with President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson will have profound bearing on the future of Italy and the defense of Western Europe, is a different man from the one who first visited the American Capital in January 1947. Then he was a comparative newcomer to the international stage, the head of the government of a conquered country still occupied by Allied troops. He was an unknown quantity, a political question mark, whose worth and capabilities were still to be tested in the school of experience.

Today Signor de Gasperi is an acknowledged key figure in the world-wide struggle of democracy versus communism. His achievements in Italy have proved him to be the strong leader of a country of great strategic importance. When he took over the premiership in 1945 the country was in a state of chaos. Wages were running a losing race with prices. The Communists were in the Government and rapidly becoming masters of the state from the inside. Riots and bloodshed were almost daily occurrences and the Italians trembled under the constant threat of a left-wing uprising. The prostrate people were desperate enough to heed the counsels of desperation.

Against these odds, de Gasperi set to work. The overwhelming victory of his party in the crucial elections of April 1948, was a testimonial to his effectiveness. It slammed the door in the face of Communist hopes and

firmly aligned Italy with the Western democracies. Since then the country has, under his leadership, largely recovered from the wounds of war and is now a full partner of the west in the Atlantic Pact. That a due share of the credit for recovery must be given to American aid does not detract from the part played by de Gasperi.

The Premier's political thinking is dominated by his belief in the necessity of sparing the world the scourge of another war and is based on three profound convictions: (1) that communism must be prevented at all costs from advancing on the home front; (2) that Italy must collaborate with the United States to the full extent of her possibilities; (3) that the Atlantic Pact must be made into a successful instrument of peace. As a corollary to this last, the western nations must speed their rearmament and be in a position as soon as possible to oppose a solid military, as well as political, front to possible Russian aggression.

Moreover, the Italian leader is convinced that free Europe must unite for its own protection. Speaking of Italian-American collaboration, he recently lamented that the United States has not sufficiently pushed the idea of a United Europe. "I am satisfied, of course, with the financial assistance that has been given us," he said, "but closer psychological cooperation is desirable. America must help Europeans to find themselves. I know the difficulties and delays that arise in Europe, but the men of the American democracy must insist with skill and patience. It is necessary to awaken and feed the idea of a united Europe. In propaganda we must take the offensive."

The same belief in taking the psychological initiative applies to de Gasperi's major objective of combating the efforts of communism on Western Europe's home fronts. He does not share the pessimism of those who think that Italian communism showed materially increased strength in the provincial and municipal elections of last May and June—in fact, he has cited figures to prove the contrary. Nevertheless, he feels that the admittedly large Communist strength in certain West European countries could be lessened by a more intense propaganda effort on the part of the west.

"Nobody should be surprised," he said to this correspondent shortly before his departure, "if the Communists succeed in convincing many people with their international propaganda that the Atlantic Pact represents a danger of war instead of a guaranty of peace. The spectacular agitations carried out by an efficient organization must in the end penetrate some minds. Every time there is a holiday in a large European city Communist manifestations for peace are staged, resolutions in favor of peace are voted, money for peace is collected.

"On our side, ministers and generals meet in private conferences, and arms are unloaded. All well-informed persons know that beyond the iron curtain a large number of divisions are arrayed and every possible energy is devoted to the production of arms. But the great mass of the people cannot peer through the iron curtain and, seeing only one side of the picture day after day, end by believing that everything is peaceful there and that only on this side is anyone concerned with military affairs. I am aware that this is only one aspect of the question, but the fact remains that we need more propaganda, more psychological dynamism, more dialectic and polemic force."

This attitude toward home-grown communism contrasts with the criticisms that have been leveled at de Gasperi from some quarters where it is felt that he did not take a strong enough line with the Italian Communist Party. His view is that in a democracy

any party must have the full protection of all constitutional guarantees as long as it is not outlawed—and outlawing the powerful Italian Communists would encourage them to make infinite trouble.

He points out, in his own defense, that the west is not free of blame for the present strength of the Communist Party in Italy. "The Communists," he said, "participated in my first three cabinets—as long, in other words, as the democratic states collaborated internationally with the U. S. S. R. and as long as Italy, a conquered country, was faced by a coalition of the United States, Britain, France, and the U. S. S. R., which imposed an extremely harsh treaty on her. Then, nobody gave us a helping hand, as is being done today with Japan. It was in this period that the Communists consolidated their positions in France and Italy."

It is not to be expected, of course, that all parties should be enthusiastic about de Gasperi's policies. He is the target, in fact, of much criticism from both right and left on nearly all issues. One of the chief of these is land reform, for which there is much pressure, matched by vigorous and vociferous opposition; his critics charge him with delay when decisive action is called for, though, in fairness to de Gasperi, it should be added that the land problem is so complex that it does not admit of easy improvisations.

Again, on internal policy, the right charge that he is weak toward communism, is matched by the left assertion that he has set up a police state, in which the *celere* (motorized police) is free to tyrannize the workers. Of unemployment, the right claims he does not spend freely enough on productive enterprises and that the refusal to countenance wholesale dismissals of surplus workers perpetuates the problem it seeks to cure. Here the left charges that he doesn't want to cope with the situation and that what little has been done is inspired by the United States.

Inflation is another cause of dispute. Government credit restrictions, though not considered bad in themselves, seem excessive to the right, working particularly to the disadvantage of small industries. The left says that they have proved inadequate to check price rises and are hampering production.

The Atlantic Pact and Italy's share in it also comes under attack. The right feels that, in the negotiations, de Gasperi has shown little skill in wresting concessions from the West. To the left the pact together with ECA is the means of chaining Italy to the chariot of "American warmongers." Similarly, on the question of treaty revision, the right feels revision is a moral question that would permit Italy to regain an equal footing among nations, while the left declares that revision would only mean increased armaments, hastening the day of East-West conflict.

For all the criticisms, de Gasperi has often been called indispensable. Many Italians may feel that he really is, for he has been a member of the Cabinet since December 1944, is now at the head of his seventh Cabinet, and has been President of the Council of Ministers—his official title—uninterruptedly since December, 1945. Only Clement Attlee of Britain exceeds him, in the western democracies, for continuous tenure.

Indispensable or not, de Gasperi would be the last man to refer to himself as such, either in earnest or in jest. He is extremely modest and possesses a humility which makes him more conscious of his shortcomings than boastful of his virtues. He thinks of himself as a man, neither better nor worse than the majority of his fellows, who has been elevated, more by force of circumstances than by any extraordinary merits of his own, to a position of leadership. Though his manner has of

late become more authoritative, power has not turned his head, and he is as far as any man in the world from believing that his true or fancied indispensability bestows any rights upon him beyond that of working hard for what he conceives to be the welfare of the Italian people.

In physical appearance Signor de Gasperi strongly resembles Eamon de Valera of Ireland. He is a tall, thin, bespectacled, clean-shaven, hollow-cheeked, slightly stoop-shouldered man with graying blond hair, a prominent nose and a very wide mouth. Now a vigorous 70, he looks young for his age, though his health is not perfect (he suffers from a stomach ailment.) He can, when occasion demands, deliver an extremely effective speech, but in a country that overflows with turgid oratory he is not accounted an outstanding public speaker. He lacks the personal magnetism, the theatricality, the bombast, that Latin people seem to love and that are generally associated with the men who have risen high in their political favor.

He is a devout practicing Catholic and makes no secret of the fact that his policies are inspired by Catholic principles, but is far more independent of ecclesiastical influences than his opponents say. He strongly resents any interference by church authorities in political affairs, and has visited the Pope only once since he became Premier. He is aware that many Italians, though deeply religious, are strongly anticlerical and that it is therefore good politics to avoid even the appearance of being under the thumb of the church.

His independence has been repeatedly proved by the manner in which such organizations as Catholic Action and the Civic Committees—both of them lay bodies dedicated to the defense of Catholic principles—have been openly critical of some aspect of his government's policies. Despite this, one of the favorite refrains of Communist propaganda against de Gasperi is the statement that he is a mere puppet in the hands of the Vatican.

Among the personal qualities that have enabled de Gasperi to rise to the top of the political heap and stay there, first place must be given to his intellectual integrity. He once told this correspondent that the secret of his political success lies in the depth of his convictions. "I am most certain," he said, "that if Christian Democracy [his own party] were to crumble, democracy in Italy would fall to the ground and freedom would be in danger. No effort, no sacrifice, must be spared to avoid this."

He has been dubbed a master of compromise for the consummate skill with which he solves apparently insoluble political situations. But he has never compromised with his principles. He was hardly out of his teens when he was arrested in Innsbruck by the police of the Austro-Hungarian Empire for agitating in favor of an Italian university in that city. Thereafter he dedicated his youth to the union of Trento and Trieste, then ruled by the Hapsburgs, to Italy; and in 1926 he was arrested by the Fascist police and sentenced to 4 months in prison, but he was no sooner released than he was working again for the overthrow of a regime that he considered ethically evil, politically unsound, and pregnant with great misfortunes for the Italian people.

Today de Gasperi's love of democracy and personal freedom amounts to a positive passion. Democracy has been the guiding principle of his life, a thing to be fought for and cherished not only when one is one of the "outs" but also, and especially, when one is one of the "ins." Some people who pay lip service to democracy maintain that there is a conflict between the principle of democracy and the principle of authority. De Gasperi will admit no such thing and is resentful when anyone suggests it. Anything that is contrary to democracy is repulsive to him.

Another of the Premier's outstanding qualities is his transparent frankness. This is perhaps the result of an early training in journalism. At the age of 24 he was the editor of the Italian Irredentist newspaper *Il Nuovo Trentino* in Trento (then a part of Austria-Hungary), which he ran on a shoestring, often skipping his meals to save the money with which to pay his printers' wages. Even today he is more of a journalist than a diplomat, often amazing foreign ambassadors by the open-hearted candor with which he speaks to them. Till they learn to know him well, they usually suspect a trap and do not believe him.

Most Italians are impressed by the simplicity of de Gasperi's life and habits. He has been poor ever since his student days, when he subsisted largely on free soup distributed by a charitable institution in Vienna. He now lives in the same house, and in exactly the same way as when he was a minor employee at the Vatican library, eking out a salary of \$40 a month by sitting up at night to do translations from German into Italian at a minuscule fee per page. He spends almost no money on himself.

It is said that just before he left for Washington in 1947 a friend noticed that his luggage was not up to the dignity expected of a Premier. It had been cheap when bought a quarter of a century earlier and had reached a terrible state of dilapidation. The next morning de Gasperi received a complete new set of expensive luggage from an anonymous donor. It was this luggage that permitted him to cut a dashing figure on his first visit to America. He has not discovered who sent it to him.

He is a home-loving man. His wife will occasionally interrupt him while he is presiding over a Cabinet council with some such telephone message as: "Don't be late for lunch today; we are having polenta (a corn-meal mash) and sausage." At his wife's insistence he sometimes leaves his work early, but she is a long way from curing him of his habit of lingering at his desk until long after ordinary mortals are having their afternoon naps or have retired to bed for the night.

One of his great sorrows is that he has no son, and he has lavished his love and affection on his four daughters, Maria Romana, Lucia, Cecilia, and Paola. He superintended every phase of their education, to the extent of personally giving them singing lessons. He grounded them thoroughly in the classics and brought them up without any highfalutin' notions. For recreation—when he can get away from the cares of his office and his family—he is fond of playing bocce (an Italian variety of bowls), of singing the mountaineer songs he learned as a boy in his Alpine birthplace, and of walking.

The people who know de Gasperi best praise his gentleness and goodness of heart. He is fiercely attached to his friendships and shows lasting gratitude to anyone who has occasion to do him a favor. This quality is thought by some to lead him astray. His critics, in fact, maintain that his reluctance to hurt anyone has caused him to put up with Cabinet Ministers and other officials of whom he would have been well advised to rid himself, and that his tolerance is responsible for delay in necessary reforms.

As de Gasperi made ready to leave for Washington, the problem of Trieste offered a perfect example of how his critics from both extremes tend to cancel each other. Conservatives are saying the Government has not shown enough firmness in demanding the return to Italy of the whole Free Territory. Leftists answer that Trieste has become an anti-Russian military base and demand that it be made truly free by withdrawing all foreign troops.

However, the fact that de Gasperi's critics balance one another so evenly should not cause Americans to underrate its importance

for the stability of his regime. It is probably difficult for people who live 5,000 miles away to understand the depth of emotion with which Italians regard Trieste. A solution unfavorable to Italy would certainly cause such a revulsion of feeling that Italy's further presence in the Atlantic Pact would be open to question and de Gasperi and his Christian Democratic Party would be in danger of being swept out of office.

For that reason it is the sincere hope of all lovers of democracy in Italy that the Premier may return from Washington with assurances that Italian hopes in Trieste will not be disappointed. Washington officials should keep in mind de Gasperi's value to democracy, as they give consideration to the issues he raises.

Technical Skills for Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, from the *Scientific Monthly* of October 1950:

For the first time in history, conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife are being scientifically coordinated on the basis of land capability and need. I believe I can say that the national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving these interlocking natural resources. Research, education, surveys, and the successful application of conservation measures have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and of the need for keeping the land permanently productive. No longer do we, in our thinking, planning, and action (work on the land), put farmland erosion off in one pigeonhole by itself, forest depletion in another, or floods and siltation under one heading and wildlife depletion under still another.

These are related things. Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animal should—and under natural conditions do—exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness. It is like mandate of nature that the land must be treated and used according to capability and need if it is to endure. This law of nature, man too often has overlooked while busy with his daily affairs, or has entirely failed to understand because of confusion, war, and greed. The practical application of this principle is being demonstrated today on a progressively wider scale from year to year all over the Nation, through the Nation's soil and water-conservation program.

The program of the Soil Conservation Service was developed out of a balanced relationship that exists in nature among land, water, plants, animals, and climate. Productive land, with the water that enables it to produce, is the one basic resource without which we cannot live. Without it there can be no life as we know it—except marine life—no forests, no food and fiber crops, no grass or other plant life. Recently we have even drawn on the life-giving soil for certain "miracle" drugs which science has developed as a further boon to mankind. Moreover, productive land is the source of the major part of all our wealth.

A large share of our scientific endeavor is directed in some way toward improving

man's welfare—his health, his comfort, his wealth, or other needs or satisfactions in life. Scientists, therefore, are concerned about the land of the farmers' fields—although it was not always so. They are concerned, also, about our timberlands, our grasslands, and our marshlands. Except for fish, we are dependent on the land for the food we eat, for a very large share of our clothing, all our wood, and for many other things. Hence our most noteworthy scientific advancements in such matters as, for instance, crop and livestock improvement, or disease and pest controls, can be of limited worth at best if the productive land base of our plants and animals is not safeguarded.

PRODUCTIVE LAND UNLIKE OTHER RESOURCES

Productive land is unlike other natural resources such as mineral ores, coal, and oil. It is characterized by the element of life—fruitfulness—placed by nature in the thin mantle of productive soil occurring over a limited portion of the earth's surface. This life-producing quality, and the water that makes it so, in a sense, set land off in a category by itself. Productive land is further differentiated from other natural resources in that it must be used and maintained simultaneously. All other natural resources, with very few exceptions, must be taken from the earth—separated from it—in order to be used by man. And their utility, in large degree, calls for complete transformation, as iron ore into steel, and coal and petroleum into warmth and power.

Productive land is much more limited than has commonly been supposed. It occurs only on the surface of the earth and only on part of this surface. It is not permanent—it is not a renewable natural resource. It cannot be stockpiled or shipped in from other countries like rubber, tin, or copper. Once the fertile topsoil is washed or blown away, it cannot be restored or replaced in any practical way for generations. And what is left—subsoil—usually is far less productive, less stable, and less absorptive of rainfall. There are no substantial undiscovered reserves of production land anywhere. And we cannot dig deeper into the earth and find new productive soil. We cannot pump it from wells, plant it with seeds, or dig it from mines. We must keep what we have or do without.

We occasionally hear loose discussions of the practical possibilities of remaking topsoil from ray, erosion-exposed subsoil. In my opinion it cannot be done short of geologic time. Subsoil can, in many instances, be improved, of course, by growing grass and legumes, for example and by adding manure, compost, lime, fertilizers, and so on. Sometimes following such treatment good crop yields are obtained, but this is a matter of improving the subsoil, not of making new topsoil. I have spent a lifetime, as a practicing soil scientist, studying the soils over much of the United States and in other parts of the world. These studies support but one conclusion—that topsoil is one thing and subsoil is another.

SOIL CONSERVATION REQUIRES TECHNICAL SKILLS

All of which brings us to the further premise that we must treat and use our remaining limited supply of productive land in a way that will at once protect it and increase its productivity by conserving the soil itself, its available elements of fertility, and all that man and nature have put into it. This conservation of our remaining land and water resources is the most important problem confronting American agriculture, and it is not a problem that can wait until farmers solve it by some trial-and-error method, for that might easily be too late. This is an urgent problem that demands the best efforts of the Nation's scientists and of all who farm the land. It is a job that requires scientific knowledge, technical skill, and understanding cooperation.

It is true that many soil-conserving measures, especially annual farm practices, are so simple that farmers need no direct technical assistance in applying them. Putting lime or manure on the land, weed control, and growing protective cover crops are among those good farming measures that usually involve no particular difficulty and call for little or no technical help. But the principal soil conservation methods generally are used in combination with one another, and each must fit the land in a properly coordinated pattern to be effective and enduring. Based on painstaking scientific research and on wide practical use, such measures must conform in their application with the principles of hydrology, engineering, and agronomy. Under varying conditions of climate, topography, and drainage, the wrong thing done—or the right thing left undone—on any part of many farms can do serious injury to the entire farm.

Clearly, then, the over-all job of conservation involves such complex problems as erosion control, drainage, improvement of soil fertility, woodland management, control of running water, and wildlife conservation. But most farmers are not specialists in these fields, any more than they are their own doctors, lawyers, and dentists. Soil and water conservation is a job that demands the skill and knowledge of experienced technicians who have special training in the art and science. Experts trained in the specialized fields of agricultural science make up the personnel of the Soil Conservation Service, which makes virtually all its assistance to farmers available through the farmers' own soil conservation districts, and at their request.

At this point, I think it would be well to consider for a moment just what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation. Modern soil conservation is based on sound land use and treatment of land with all the proved appropriate measures that will keep it permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; and contouring, strip-cropping, and stubble-mulching the land as required, along with supporting practices of crop rotation, cover crops, green-manuring crops, and so forth, wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Modern soil conservation consists of doing all these and still other things. Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs; if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter, if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, as often happens in parts of the West, it calls for drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. Modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops, as well as the most efficient of adaptable tools available to farmers.

It likewise includes, for flood control and reservoir protection, treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller watersheds where floodwaters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, puts water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in ground-water reservoirs, and otherwise benefits general farm, industrial, and municipal water users.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a support program of research that will provide for the welfare of the land at all times and provide farmers with the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil conservation education should be made a part of our teaching, probably from kindergarten on through college. Moreover, modern soil conservation calls for the continued maintenance of all effective work which is put on the land, not just for a single year or cropping season.

In short, there is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job—a formula consisting of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual need or condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production.

Carbondale Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following article concerning the Carbondale, Pa., centennial celebration, from the *Scrantonian* of Sunday, September 23, 1951:

SIXTY THOUSAND SEE PIONEER CITY END JUBILEE—RODEO, PUBLIC DANCE AT CITY HALL CLOSES WEEK-LONG CELEBRATION

(By William J. Carey)

Celebration-conscious Carbondale wrote a slam-bang finish to its first 100 years as a city Saturday afternoon by staging the biggest and most colorful parade ever witnessed in the Up-Valley before a turn-out estimated by police at more than 60,000.

With labor, industry, and veterans' organizations collaborating, the 90-minute march through Central City streets went into the history books as a fitting tribute to the community which now begins another century of progress and development.

The occasional rain-threatening clouds, which appeared in the skies as the parade began, were offset easily by the festive spirit prevalent throughout the city. The centennial weather record remained intact during the afternoon, giving the community seven full days of ideal weather without the slightest drop of rain.

High-lighting the stirring march were musical units from the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars posts from all sections of Pennsylvania as well as high-school bands in the county and local music-making groups.

Parading were members of Legion and VFW groups augmented by representatives of other service organizations, together with Carbondale's Gold Star Mothers.

Pageantry in its finest was offered in the dozens of floats presented by industrial organizations. The Delaware & Hudson and the Erie Railroads entered replicas of early predecessors of the modern locomotive.

Comedy was sprinkled liberally throughout the line of march. Two make-believe Indians, war paint, feathers and all, set the huge throng howling with laughter as they gave out with 1951, movie-version war whoops.

Another humorous incident was a Carbondale taxi concern whose exhibit included a horse-drawn buggy heralding the vehicle

as its first cab. On the horse's rear quarters was the company's phone number inscribed with red paint.

Spotlighted on a beautifully decorated float was Miss Kay Pope, a 17-year-old high-school senior, who reigned as centennial queen by winning a competition against 60 other Carbondale young women. She was surrounded by 16 court princesses and Grace Fotia Devita, contest runner-up, who was acclaimed "Miss Centurama."

The history-making parade was an impressive climax to the week-long celebrations which saw Carbondale's citizenry joined by thousands of area residents and out-of-State visitors, swelling the community's population considerably.

Last night the Pioneer City's business district was congested by the largest throng in its history as public dancing—modern and old time—was enjoyed by thousands along a three-block area on Main Street, with City Hall as the midway point. Three orchestras were featured and selections ranged from Auld Lang Syne to Sweet Violets.

At Russell Park, meanwhile, an old time Western rodeo attracted a crowd of more than 5,000. The show, engaged by the centennial committee for a 2-day run, was augmented by a carnival which also reported tremendous business.

At the centennial headquarters, Fred L. Lang, special events chairman for the anniversary programs, reported the entire project is a solid financial success.

Lang said that it will be several weeks before an audit will be completed and the fiscal report made public.

A portion of the cost of the centennial undertaking was raised through the public sale of stock certificates selling at \$1 each. It is understood that stockholders will be returned a goodly portion of their investments.

Pioneer City hotels and taverns last night were turning away prospective patrons in droves. One businessman described the trade "as the heaviest ever seen in Carbondale." Patrons at bars were lined 10 deep and back room tables were something only an idiot would attempt to find available.

The centennial festivities attracted visitors from all over the world—some from Greece, Italy, England, as well as hundreds from virtually every State in the Union. Mayor William L. Monahan's city hall once was the Mecca of most of the visitors and the city's chief executive undoubtedly set some sort of a record for hand-shaking during the week.

While the community's vehicular and pedestrian travel also established new records, police reported an astoundingly low number of violations. Only one man was arrested on a suspicion of pickpocketing, but the charges were dismissed. In a lone vehicle mishap, three Eynon women were slightly injured Thursday night.

The Up-Valley community was scheduled to resume normalcy today, but judging from the celebrating mood of the populace during the wee early hours of this morning, it appeared unlikely that the town will get back on an even keel until Monday.

Censoring Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following article by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, Mass., which appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser, September 23, 1951:

SOME TELEVISION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE BARRED FROM SCREEN

(By the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston)

With television starting its biggest season, innumerable letters of complaint from angry and indignant parents already are arriving at my office pointing out that some television programs have sunk to a new low in breaking the laws of morality and decency.

These parents want to know what action they must take to halt this serious menace to America's morals and how to protect their children against the evils of television.

At the moment, there seems to be only two things left for parents to do. Fathers and mothers must immediately impose rigid censorship restrictions in the home over indecent, immoral, and downright filthy television programs, or be guilty of committing serious sins against the laws of Almighty God.

Secondly, parents must write letters of protest to the sponsors of such programs.

I am not going to mention by name any programs in particular, or any personalities. The offenders, and the public itself, should know to whom I refer.

In general, I speak of programs where semi-nude women are depicted in "angle" close-ups followed by insipid "wise remarks" by comedians too unskilled to be entertaining by sheer good humor.

I speak of programs where the sacredness of the home and the family is held up to ridicule with immoral remarks by ill-bred comedians. I speak of programs which portray everything indecent in life, but fail to afford any moral to better living.

I speak of the many programs featuring suggestive dances; the programs featuring comics with disgusting gestures. I speak of the horror programs which glamorize murder.

Imagine children hovered about a television set, eyes glued to all of this filth and horror.

Imagine children seeing the sacredness of womanhood being defiled before their eyes by the dress, the actions, and remarks of a seminude woman aided and abetted by a sleazy comedian's suggestive repartee.

Would the sponsors permit their own children to view this filth? It seems highly improbable.

And what of the entertainers themselves? Would they condone such actions by others before their own children?

What has happened to the television industry? It seems tragic that a medium which could—and to a degree does—afford an avenue for so much that is good and uplifting in this world, is permitting a false concept of entertainment to lead it so rapidly toward official censorship.

One of the New York newspapers recently devoted an entire double spread in color to forecasting what is in store for television viewers this fall.

To quote the article: "Video, where sex appeal must be put across in close-up shots, faces the problem of estimating how far below 'see' level female performers may take the V-neckline plunge."

Some sponsors, program directors and entertainers themselves evidently believe that the secret to success in the television field is to make the program as filthy as possible.

If these so-called television experts could read the mail from an irate public, they would soon change their point of view.

Even adults who wouldn't blink an eye at such carryings-on in a night club or on the musical comedy stage, bitterly resent the

same type of material when it is presented in their homes for their children to see.

And it all seems so unnecessary. Television, a fascinating medium in itself, certainly can provide adequate and popular entertainment for adults and children alike without pandering to the lowest animal instincts.

Until television came along, the fashion in entertainment was to feature indecent poses of women's legs. Now that fad has appeared to be passé and the emphasis is being placed upon the neck line.

Several months ago I pointed out the harm television was doing to itself by not censoring its own programs. I pointed out that this great industry was preparing its own way for inevitable official censorship.

Today my predictions are that much nearer an actuality. It seems regrettable, because no one wants censorship for any industry unless it becomes absolutely necessary.

There are television programs that do credit to the industry. These programs, and they cover a wide field of music, dancing, comedy, drama, mystery, etc., prove that television—if directed wisely—can accomplish wonders not only from an educational and religious standpoint—but also as a truly entertaining medium.

One thing remains certain: the television industry is destined to suffer by its own mistakes through an aroused public whom it is trying desperately, but erroneously, to satisfy.

For the time being we recommend rigid home censorship of television and extensive protests to the firms that sponsor these immoral programs.

Golf's Vagaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "Golf's Vagaries," published in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., September 19, 1951:

GOLF'S VAGARIES

Although Joe Gagliardi of Winged Foot Club in Mamaroneck did not win the national amateur golf championship, Westchester is proud of how close he came. He was the first Westchester player since Willie Turnesa, of Elmsford, to reach the finals, and a defeat of 4 and 3 in 36-hole play is close.

We don't believe in alibis and have none to offer in extenuation of the Westchester's defeat on the Pennsylvania course. And we think it sportsmanlike that although Mr. Gagliardi was suffering with an abscessed tooth which required treatment between tournament matches, at no time did he mention this as an excuse, and it was only learned from other sources after close of tournament play.

But, as a side issue, we might call attention to the fact that here in Westchester's climate about the best any golfer can do is play for 6 months of the year, whereas in the South and Southwest play the year 'round is possible. Too, we imagine that Mr. Gagliardi as the father of five youngsters has a few domestic responsibilities not incumbent upon his more youthful adversary.

Golf, after all, is a funny game. Temperament—and temper—along with psychology, digestion, reflexes, vision, coordination, personal habits, and age—all of these have a

direct bearing upon how well one plays the game.

Notice, for example, that Mr. Gagliardi in his earlier rounds knocked off such giants of the greens as the 1950 champion and the 1949 champions and the junior national champion, only to go down before a comparative unknown in the final round. Golf, we repeat, is like that.

For these and other reasons, we emphasize that Westchester has full reason to be extremely proud of its representative at the national amateur tournament.

And yet, lest the rest of America be under the misapprehension, let it be mentioned that between winning the metropolitan amateur championship and going to the finals in the national amateur championship, Mr. Gagliardi failed to survive even the early rounds of the Winged Foot Club championship.

In other words, the woods of Westchester are full of good golfers. And, so that we may not appear too boastful, they are also full of poor players. That's what makes golf so interesting.

Statisticians say that there are more than 300 kinds of ball games. Most of us, we are sure, have seen at least 800 different kinds of games played with golf balls.

The Katyn Murders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, two speeches by members of the new Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacres have already broadcast the information of its organization behind the iron curtain. The testimony and evidence to be gathered on these mass murders will further reveal to the world that Russia's leaders possess criminal minds:

TALKING OVER THE CURTAIN

A campaign is getting started in Indiana to raise funds for the Crusade for Freedom, which finances Radio Free Europe in its broadcasts over the iron curtain. A question which will be asked frequently during the campaign is whether we know the broadcasts are being heard behind the curtain.

Radio listening in Russia and its satellite nations is restricted, it's true, and there are no Gallup polls to test whether the people are hearing Radio Free Europe. But there are concrete pieces of evidence which show being heard—and that they are making an impression on the people.

For one thing, there is testimony by word of mouth, gathered by correspondents of Radio Free Europe. There is evidence from those who have escaped through the iron curtain who say the messages are being heard and are developing resistance to the Communist overlords.

The antics of the Russian broadcasters themselves prove Radio Free Europe is becoming extremely troublesome to the Soviets. Why else would they make such frequent attacks upon it? Why else would they announce that all its German employees are to be executed when they liberate West Germany? And why else would the Communist press publish such vigorous attacks on it?

There is specific evidence in abundance. The broadcasts have been listing the names

of Hungarian political police. A refugee who recently escaped from Hungary reports that as a result, the regime now changes the names of the men and reassigns them to new posts as quickly as their identities are revealed by Radio Free Europe.

The Crusade for Freedom program will not do the whole job in Eastern Europe. It will not by itself bring about the liberation of the Czechs or Hungarians or others now under Soviet domination. But there is positive evidence that it is being effective in keeping the spark of freedom alive in those countries, and giving hope to the many who await the day when they can break the shackles of communism.

Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

EXPOSE MURDERERS OF 15,000 POLISH OFFICERS

We make speeches about Poland expressing our admiration for its heroic people and vaguely promising to help them regain their independence in the fugitive future.

American citizens of Polish descent, although thankful for our kind words, would feel better if we followed through with a little action for a change.

The mass murder of 15,000 Polish officers in the spring of 1940, their methodical liquidation in secret, and in brutal violation of the protection guaranteed to them as prisoners of war, is one of the most horrifying crimes in history.

After due process of law hundreds of Nazi and Jap war criminals were executed and thousands more imprisoned, but the cold-blooded killers of Poland's leaders have never been brought to justice.

Why?

Is it because—as in the United States itself—we are afraid even to point an accusing finger at gangsters and grafters who are powerful while we bear down heavily in the name of justice against the small fry?

Are we becoming the victims of our own double talk, recognizing crime only when it is convenient for us to do so and ignoring the more flagrant violations?

The moral leadership which we profess becomes a mockery and a hypocrisy as long as we "choose not to see" the extermination of 15,000 Polish officers done in a deliberate effort to murder a nation.

This reveals a fear of Red Russia.

And it is a confession on our part that we believe the Kremlin to be responsible for this massive atrocity.

In spite of recent examples to the contrary, most Americans believe in truth and honesty and heed the voice of their conscience. It is they who are insisting that all crime be investigated relentlessly and the perpetrators thereof be indicted even though they cannot as yet be called before the court of world opinion in this instance to answer for crimes which stagger the imagination.

A feeble effort was made at the Nuremberg war-crime trials in Germany, to get at the facts in the case of the Katyn massacre. But when it became evident that the accused Nazis at Nuremberg would be allowed to summon witnesses and documents in defense of the charge that they were guilty of this hideous crime and thus reveal the Red Rus-

sians to be the guilty parties, the Soviet representative suddenly moved to block any further investigation. This part of the general indictment was therefore withdrawn, aided and abetted by the craven compliance of our own representatives in that period when American foreign policy was turning itself inside out in order to appease the Communists.

In the final reckoning, it is the American people who decide right from wrong in the conduct of our own affairs and in our dealings with other nations, and not a select few in Government who think that vital information should be withheld from the people.

Already, as we piece together the bits of information that come to use over the efforts to conceal or play down certain facts, the evidence points more and more to the need for Congress to assume the initiative.

A report made by two American Army officers has become lost in the files of the Department of Defense or the Department of State. Mystery is being added to mystery.

Evidence from all sources—admittedly incomplete—shows that the Communists are guilty. There are several questions which they cannot answer, namely:

1. If the prisoners were being taken far beyond Smolensk, why did they disembark at Katyn?

2. If the murders took place in August 1941 and were committed by the Nazis, as the Russians allege, why did the prisoners have no mail, newspapers, or diary accounts beyond April 1940, and, why were the bodies of the prisoners dressed in heavy winter clothing?

3. If the Nazis were responsible for the massacres, why were the hapless Poles tied up and shot in a typically Russian manner never used by the Germans, why did the prisoners have wounds made by four-edged bayonets, used only by the Russians, and why were the victims tied with Russian-manufactured rope?

4. Why did the Russians know nothing of the fate of the Poles until after the German revelations, when they suddenly knew everything?

And why, above all, is the Kremlin afraid to permit an honest investigation on the scene?

We in the United States must not allow ourselves to be placed in the position of condoning this enormous crime against humanity by our silence. Eight years have passed, years in which we temporized, evaded, and otherwise failed to speak up for justice.

The familiar technique of delaying, in the hope that people will forget, will not work.

There is a restless undercurrent of protest that will not be satisfied until those responsible for this terrible savagery are identified and exposed to the contempt of the world.

To the credit of the Congress, it has passed, unanimously, House Resolution 390, creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Katyn Forest massacre.

This is a good start. I hope it will not wind up as an empty gesture.

No one, outside of the Politburo, wants war. The free world, after an overextended sleep, is starting to apply every measure short of war to stop the spread of Communist imperialism.

One of our best weapons is truth, carried home to the Russian people. If we plead the cause of justice and humanity and the right of every human being to be protected against the excesses of the State, we shall help to bring the Katyn murderers, who also hold the Polish and Russian people in bondage, ever closer to the day of reckoning.

While building up our physical strength, we should not overlook the influence of moral rearmament.

Unmask the crimes of the Soviet regime. Hearten the people of Poland and all others who look to us for something more than arms or economic assistance.

Find and accuse those who deliberately murdered the 15,000 Polish officers.

This will be the first step toward enlisting the cooperation of decent-minded people the world over in the struggle to make the Kremlin pay for its rape of civilization.

Thirty Dollars for Night Clubs and Thirty-Dollar Tax Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman recently set some sort of new record for glibness in talking about taxpayers and taxpayers' money. In the demagogic campaign speech he delivered at the dedication of the new \$25,000,000 Government General Accounting Office Building here in Washington, Mr. Truman said:

A man will go to a night club and throw away \$30 or \$40, and think nothing of it, but let him get a tax bill for \$30 and listen to him scream

I would not want anyone to give up his time-honored right to complain about paying taxes. If people couldn't blow off steam that way sometimes, they might explode.

This masterpiece of "logic" and rebuke to grumbling taxpayers suggests some interesting questions: Who is there left these days to enjoy the privilege of "screaming" about a Federal income tax bill of only \$30? How many persons with an annual Federal income tax of \$30 are prospective night club patrons—prosperity, that is, from an income standpoint?

The facts are that most any individual could earn under the 1950 Federal income-tax schedule and still get a tax bill of not more than \$30 is \$4,850 a year. But in order to have the privilege of screaming about a \$30 tax bill, that individual would have to list seven exemptions. Just how often, one wonders, does a \$4,850-a-year man, with a wife and five kids, throw away \$30 or \$40 in a night club and "think nothing of it"? Incidentally, if the House-approved tax boost is finally adopted—and it is less than Mr. Truman is demanding—the maximum annual earning figure in this example would be cut to \$4,800.

A married man with two children—four exemptions in all—could earn no more than \$2,850 a year under the 1950 income-tax schedule and still have the right to "blow off steam" about a \$30 tax bill.

A married man, listing only himself and his wife as exemptions, could have a \$30-a-year income tax only if his annual income did not exceed \$1,525. With that sort of income these days, a couple would not throw away \$30 or \$40 in night clubs often, even on their honeymoon.

A single man, with no dependents, might be regarded as the most likely prospect for the extravagant night-club flings the President was talking about. But even this carefree individual would

find his style severely crimped if the Government levied only a \$30 income tax on him because he could not have earned more than \$850 in 1950. Next year, under the House tax boost, the ceiling for a \$30 income tax will be lowered to \$825 in annual income for a single person.

Perhaps it could be assumed that a \$5,000-a-year man, with no dependents, is still able to "go to a night club and throw away \$30 or \$40 and think nothing of it"—if he were so disposed. But one thing is certain: That same individual would surely welcome the privilege of paying a \$30 annual Federal income-tax bill. Under the 1950 schedule, he actually paid \$724. If the House tax boost is adopted, he will pay \$846 in 1951 and \$915 in 1952.

Just where does Mr. Truman find any basis for talking about \$30 tax bills in the same breath with \$30 to \$40 night-club speecs?

The night-club portion of his remarks may accurately reflect the thinking and habits of Washington bureaucracy, though some of the recent disclosures of gifts of mink coats, hams, free hotel rooms, and deep freezes suggest that it is not the bureaucrats who pick up the check. But millions of hard-working, financially hard-pressed Americans rightfully resent the flippant suggestion by the President that they think nothing of tossing away \$30 or \$40 in a night club.

And even more millions of these Americans will be amazed at his suggestion that there will be many \$30 tax bills left to scream about under the night-club-style spending habits of the Truman administration.

With his remarks about the possibility of an explosion, however, I am in complete agreement. I am confident the blow-up will occur on election day, November 4, 1952.

What Are the Effects of Controls on Ethics?—Does the Passing of a Law Make a Moral Act Immoral?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the April 1951 issue of Faith and Freedom, written by Mr. Frank Chodorov:

THE MORALS OF CONTROLS

(By Frank Chodorov)

The impression is abroad that price fixing and wage fixing are economic matters. That is partly so. These controls—mark the word—aim to constrict human behavior, and human behavior is surely the concern of ethics. This should not be lost sight of in the welter of economic argument.

MORTALITY, POLITICS, ECONOMICS

An analogy is in order. When a robbery is committed, the victim is impoverished and the robber is enriched, and thus the act has

an economic aspect; also, it is political because punishment is involved. Our main concern with robbery is the injustice of it, and injustice is a moral concept. In like manner, controls are political because the law is involved. They deal with prices and wages, which are economic matters. Yet it cannot be denied that they direct themselves to human behavior, are intended to control it, and therefore must be treated from the point of view of morals.

The very word tells its story. What do these controls aim to control? Nothing but the way the individual orders his economic life. By its provisions for enforcement and punishment, the law concedes that it is in conflict with normal behavior. Furthermore, the extensive machinery set up for detection and punishment is an admission that the law does not have the approbation of public opinion. Putting it plainly, the law has written into the human being, in his pattern of thought and behavior, and evil that did not exist before the law was enacted. It proposes to root this newly discovered demon out of him.

To understand the character of this demon, we must apply ourselves to the nature of man, as revealed in his way of making a living, and there we find the pernicious habit of selling his labor (or labor products) to the highest bidder. Putting it in reverse, man is wicked because he offers more for his satisfactions than the law allows. That is what price controls imply.

Whence comes price? Since we see no evidence of it in the animal world, we must conclude that it is purely a human invention. And, mark you, it is a concept that appears only when men associate; a lone human on a desert island would never think of price. Price is a product of social integration, a habit of men that could hardly be termed immoral.

THE LAW OF PARSIMONY

He is an odd creature, this human being, in that he entertains a multiplicity of desires. All other living creatures are well satiated with a meal and a mate. The human, however, starts only with food, raiment, and shelter; from the modest beginning he climbs from one satisfaction to another until, at long last, he cannot get along without baseball and Bach.

There is a fly in the ointment; every satisfaction acquired by man entails an expenditure of labor. There is no other way, and because labor induces an unpleasant feeling of weariness and irksomeness, man is parsimonious about it, he seeks to satisfy his desires with the least expenditure of labor.

It is that law of parsimony that accounts for man's labor-saving devices. By far the most important of these devices is his indigenous system of specialization and exchange. Having learned by hard experience that very little can be gotten out of the job of jack-of-all-trades, man trains himself into proficiency at a particular trade and comes up with a greater abundance. But specialization is possible only when men live in communities. The shoemaker cannot wear all the shoes he makes, and the farmer would be in a bad way if he had to eat all his onions. There must be some way for the shoemaker to exchange his surplus for the surplus of the farmer. So, man invents a market place where the various specialists can exchange their respective abundances for their mutual benefit. The market place and society are synonyms. Whatever other impulse drives man to seek association with his fellow being it is a certainty that the prospect of improving his circumstances through specialization and exchange is an attraction.

HIGGLING AND HAGGLING

That is where price comes in. It is not germane to this discussion to go into the

intricacies of price, with which are involved the question of money and the theory of value. It is only necessary to remember that price is a result of the human inclination to satisfy his desires with the least expenditure of labor. It is normal for each specialist to ask more; it is normal for the opposite specialist to offer less. This is called the higgling and haggling of the market place. At some point in this normal process there is a meeting of minds, and at that point price is established. This normal way of doing things has now been declared abnormal by the law; it must be suppressed.

The principal function of price is to tell the various specialists how best they can serve one another. A high price gives notice that a need is felt and urges labor to make up the deficiency; a low price tells labor that it ought to apply itself to something else. Price is the automatic regulator of voluntary cooperation. It is the essential cog in the market place, and the market place makes possible the practice of association. If we take this practice as the starting point of all morality, then we must concede an important place to price in ethics. It is as much an ethical as an economic concept.

In itself, price is moral. It is mechanical. But, it is possible for man to manipulate this mechanical director, and if there is any immorality in the price mechanism it must be in the manipulation. When artificial shortages are created, the price indicator will record the fact, because it is automatic and mechanical; if there is anything immoral in the high price, it is in the creation of an artificial shortage. If the Government, which has a monopoly of making money (the agreed-upon measuring stick the price), increases the amount of money in circulation, then price becomes deceptive; just as a yardstick is deceptive if somebody should surreptitiously snip off an inch or two. The deception, not the price, is immoral. In either case (artificial shortages or the creation of new money), the price indicator goes up and labor is required to give up more to acquire less.

Right now, shortages are being created by the diversion of production to war purposes. At the same time, to finance war and other governmental ventures, money is being created by the printing-press process. Price is therefore going up. There is a general feeling of hurt because it takes more effort to satisfy desires or because certain desires must be abandoned in order to satisfy the basic ones. That general feeling of hurt is what we call social unrest, and the Government is trying to assuage it by throwing the blame on price. The waste must continue, more money (or bonds) must be printed, and yet, price must be held in leash.

TO LOCATE THE DEMON

The insatiable human appetite for a richer and fuller life clashes with the pattern of behavior demanded by law. The conflict arises despite the best intentions of the citizenry to be law abiding. In one way or another the evil in man will show itself in the market place, and every expression of it will call for more and more restrictions on human behavior: Wage controls; rationing; allocations; job-freezing, warehouse, and pantry investigations. The moralist cannot help asking himself: Is there a demon in the human being that must be driven out of him, or is the demon in the constrictions?

In physics we recognize a constant cause-and-effect relationship which we call the law of gravitation. We learn about it by watching nature. The apple always falls downward, and we assume that it will never fall upward. We don't monkey around with the law of gravitation because we have found by experience that it is fatuous to try it; step-

ping off high places invariably brings results. Not even Congress can change that.

RUSSIA OFFERS A LESSON

In economics and in morals we have not yet gotten around to identifying such invariable relationships. In these fields we hold that political force can manage everything. It is within the power of the policeman, we believe, to mutate man into the image of a plan, provided the policeman's club is big enough and he is capable of wielding it. And we stick to this conviction despite the evidence of consequences. Nowhere has this theory been put to greater test than in Russia; there the constrictions on human behavior have been implemented with the severest of police measures. Nevertheless, even the commissars have admitted the existence of a black market and have been compelled to officially recognize it. Their experience ought to warn us that controls do not control.

WHAT MADE IT BLACK?

What is the black market? It is not a place; it is a state of mind resulting from an invariable in human conduct. It is the same state of mind that existed before the law made it black. The butcher always wanted the highest wages for his services, and the housewife always offered him as little as she had to get meat, but now, thanks to the war effort and Government fiscal measures, there is a shortage of meat and a plentitude of money; a lot of housewives are bidding for the small supply and she must go along or her family will go without meat. The butcher's helper always considered himself underpaid, just as the butcher always considered him overpaid; now, rather than close up shop or work harder himself, the butcher must compete with the armament plant for the services of the helper. Buyer and seller, employer and employee, all acting on the normal impulse to get along in life, keep pushing one another into a perfectly natural, though illegal, arrangement.

AN AGE-OLD PROBLEM

Is the black market, or the state of mind underlying it, immoral? If we admit that, we equate morality with legality. If we say that there is no good or bad but what legislation makes it so, the ten commandments would be without validity until sanctioned by Congress.

It is a noteworthy fact that the black market rests on behavior that in ordinary circumstances we esteem and commend. On the other hand, the black market encourages practices of an immoral nature, law or no law. It brings out the worst in us. Deception, falsification of reports, compelling the buyer to pay an exorbitant price for something he does not want in order that he may get what he does want at the legal price—all such practices are repulsive to our innate sense of decency. A lie is a lie and no law can make a moral person out of a liar. If we try to exonerate the liar on the grounds of necessity, we condemn the law that makes lying necessary; we imply that the immorality is in the law.

Another black-market practice that conscience cannot condone is the bribery of officials. The enforcement agent is, after all, only a human being; like everybody else, he is ever intent on improving his circumstances with the minimum of labor. The law presents him with opportunity. We might say that he ought to be above temptation, but censure is tempered by the dictum that only those who are without sin are justified in casting stones. Bribery is wrong, not because the law says it is, but because the briber pays for nothing except permission to break the law. Our conscience, not the law, stamps the transaction as unjust, immoral.

But, if morality has any roots deeper than the law, judgment on bribery must take into consideration the law that makes it possible.

Perhaps the doctors of theology who have proficiency in the field ought to apply themselves to the morality of economic controls. For the ordinary person, seeking to adjust his inner compulsions to the dicta of the law, the problem defies solution. Does the law take precedence over the will to live? It is an old problem, one that has plagued man since he began making laws. It will be recalled that Caesar found the Jews very difficult, not because they refused to recognize his authority or failed to pay him tribute, but because they denied his divinity. Higher than Caesar was God.

Caesar has now decreed controls; are they moral?

"A Lot of People in the United States May Not Know That a Lot of Air Force Fellows Like Me Are Way Up Front Directing Sabre Jets and Other Air Ships Supplying Close Support to Infantry—We Radio the Pilots Where the Targets Are and Send Them in To Get the Communist Chinese and North Koreans"—
Corp. Richard F. Webb, Battle Report, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am handing to the House reporter a copy of the fifty-second Battle Report, Washington. This is the National Broadcasting Co.'s teledocumentary projected weekly over their network and coaxials by Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, and such other public officials as he, each week, brings to the television screen.

The purpose of Battle Report, Washington, which Dr. Steelman projects, is to have various top-flight governmental officials make personal reports with respect to their individual activities to the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, I was unable—while in Mobile—to introduce the tremendously important statements which were made on Battle Report, Washington into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In consequence thereof, I have received more than a dozen letters asking why I did not continue to insert these reports in the RECORD. These letters came to me from both men and women located in areas in the United States not yet reached by television, while others were from people who received the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but who have no television sets. All wrote to tell me of the great interest which they find in—and the appreciation they have for—Dr. John R. Steelman's weekly telecast. Several declared, in substance, that the Battle Report, Washington program was, to

them, the most interesting and informative material carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—apart from the recordings of the actual procedures in the House and Senate itself.

In the weekly telecast made on August 24, Dr. Steelman brought to the television audience, the Honorable John Allison, conference deputy to John Foster Dulles at the Japanese Peace Conference in San Francisco; Maj. Gen. George E. Armstrong United States Army; the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Brig. Gen. Marshall Roth, United States Air Force; and Corp. Richard F. Webb, United States Air Force.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Allison, who opened the program, declared:

I have noted that at some point in every Battle Report, Washington there comes a time to talk of peace—for peace is the ultimate objective in all battles of all wars.

Mr. Allison then went on to outline the tremendous benefits that will accrue to the world by virtue of the Japanese Peace Treaty—effected after 4 years of war and 6 years of occupation.

He pointed out that democracy cannot be imposed from without, that it must come from within. He said that we must give the Japanese the opportunity to let democracy grow, that while the Soviet Union talks loudly and longly of peace, when the time comes to make peace, it draws back.

It claims to be—

He continued—

the champion of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, but when the time comes to make a great Asiatic nation free and through a peace treaty to bring to an end the government of one people by another—it holds back

Dr. Steelman's next guest was Maj. Gen. George E. Armstrong, USA—who discussed in detail the medical service rendered to our fighting men in Korea. His talk was accompanied by motion pictures—which showed the Army medics giving first aid to the wounded men while under enemy fire—gyroscopes and MATS' C-47 transport-type aircraft picking up the wounded on the battle-front—transporting them to the base hospitals behind the lines.

The only criticism I heard of the Medical Service, at any time—

General Armstrong told the audience—

was the oft-repeated phrase that "the medics are too daring and take too many chances with themselves."

Mr. Speaker, in common with General Armstrong, I say that if this be a criticism of the Medical Corps—it is a criticism which I fervently hope will forever and always be pointed at the United States Army Medical Service.

The report of Hon. Charles E. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, gives assurance to every man in this House that we may be sure that everything that we are doing in behalf of the democratic countries of Europe by way of lending aid and assistance to keep them free and independent is highly appreciated.

Secretary Brannan's report—brief and candid as always—on conditions in England, France, the Netherlands, Holland, Belgium, West Germany, and Yugoslavia, all of which countries he visited—gives assurance to the Members of this House that we have true firsthand advices of a type that will enable Congress to legislate wisely—as well as with precision, economy, and dispatch.

Of more than passing interest was the wonderful talk of Brig. Gen. Marshall S. Roth, United States Air Force, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Development. General Roth's statement that "tomorrow's victories in the air are being won today in the Research and Development Laboratory. American industry and science, together with the research and development facilities of the Air Force are presently engaged in a challenging battle. The ammunition in this battle is scientific and technical know-how" certainly gave to the viewers—listeners of Battle Report, Washington, on August 24, an insight into what had and will in the future be accomplished in the use of weapons.

It was President Truman in his endeavor to force peace upon the aggressors who made the statement that—"the United States now possesses weapons of such magnitude and so fantastic that they could destroy civilization."

General Roth spoke in some detail about the work that was being carried on at the various Research and Development Centers of the Air Force—located in diverse parts of the United States. It is not surprising to learn subsequent to General Roth's disclosures as to what is being accomplished by current research studies, why the Air Force, just last week, established a combat unit for handling and using pilotless aircraft in battle combat.

Mr. Speaker, I would particularly direct the attention of my every colleague in this House to the splendid work that has been accomplished under the direction of the Chief of Staff and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Development, United States Air Force. It is the type of work being done by these units that will positively secure the defense of this Nation and the peace of the world against aggression * * * and do so with a minimum of cost to the taxpayers of these United States.

You know, Mr. Speaker, few Battle Reports, Washington are ever telecasted without including on the program one or more of the enlisted personnel of our armed services—the Army, Navy, Marines, or Air Force. These men are brought to the screen to tell us, in their own words, of their personal experiences. I doubt very much if any person who ever talked to the American people over television told a more fantastic tale than that recited by Corp. Richard F. Webb, of the United States Air Force.

Robert McCormick, the NBC commentator, in presenting Corporal Webb, stated that:

The entire garrison at Bolling Air Force Base here in Washington turned out this afternoon to see a 19-year-old Korean war veteran—with one of the most weird true stories yet to come out of the war—honored with the Purple Heart and Silver Star—That you may hear from his own lips his almost in-

credible tale, here is Air Force Corp. Richard F. Webb.

Corporal Webb responded in like language by saying:

A lot of people in the United States may not know that a lot of Air Force fellows like me are way up front directing Sabre jets and other air ships supplying close support to infantry. * * * We radio the pilots where the target are * * * and send them in to get the Communist Chinese and North Koreans

The rest of the corporal's story—about how in 1947 after an injury a titanium plate about the size of a silver dollar was placed in his head—about how, recently, in the dead of night 12 Koreans surrounded him—knocked him flat on his back—stomped a foot on his throat—and pulled the trigger on a rifle.

Read his statement—of how the bullet entered his forehead—glanced off that metal plate inside his head—and of how, when he was picked up by the medics, it was found that he had been jabbed by a bayonet which had glanced off his shoulder blade. That is only part of the story. His subsequent experiences—even more hair raising—are all authenticated, and he is now back in the United States all O. K.

Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions taken opportunity to tell of the tremendous Nation-wide interest exhibited in this television broadcast, Battle Report, Washington, and I again repeat that this Nation is to be congratulated upon having a public official busied as is a man such as John Steelman and a corporation such as the National Broadcasting Co.—whose interests in public affairs are such that they bring to the Nation, at great cost and personal sacrifice of time, the wonderful information sent over the air each Sunday under the title, "Battle Report, Washington."

In order to make this more available to the American people, I again ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include therein as part of the extension, the fifty-second Battle Report, Washington, as it was telecasted over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network and coaxials.

The producer-director of this program is Ted Ayers; the production assistant, Jean Montgomery; technical director, L. A. McClelland; commentary, Robert McCormick; script by Lou Hazam; film editor, Bill Brooks; floor manager, Joe Tully, art director, Joseph Ferrier; and sound by Jim Martensen.

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON, NBC TELEVISION, AUGUST 24, 1951

Mr. McCormick, in a week that has seen two conferences vital to world peace collapse—these British-Iranian oil negotiations and the Korean peace talks—NBC Television News brings you its fifty-second report on the battle against world communism.

Washington—where the Senate put itself on record, 81 to 0, urging boycott of Communist Czechoslovakia until it frees American newsmen William N. Oatis

On Battle Report tonight—a top report on where we stand on the forthcoming Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco—the Surgeon General of the United States Army, who was checking up in Korea only 9 days ago, the Secretary of Agriculture, just back from a tour of Europe, an up-to-the-minute summation on what we're doing

about the development of new air weapons, and an airman just decorated a few hours ago for bravery on the ground. But, first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, as you all know, two very discouraging events have taken place during this week. Negotiations for the peaceful settlement of disputes, in both Iran and Korea, have been suspended. It is a critical hour, calling for all our reserves of patience, firmness, and determination.

Meanwhile, men are still fighting and dying in Korea.

At Kaesong, it is not difficult to surmise what goes on behind the scenes in the Communist camp, to picture the evil schemes being hatched by the enemies of freedom. We have seen their obstructionist tactics many times since 1945 delay the realization of genuine world peace. We have listened to their distortions, their evasions, and their downright lies. It has long since become evident that Communist negotiators aim not only to deceive the outside world but also their own people. They aim to make the slaves and dupes who carry the burden believe that their rulers really want peace when world disorder is their goal.

But, regardless of what tactics are used, we of the free world will continue to strive to build a peaceful world. We will continue our aid and cooperation to all nations who seek it, in the age-old battle against hunger. We will continue to build our military strength and to improve it by study and research—and will work tirelessly to provide the best of care to all our men in the field.

During the next 2 weeks treaties with the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan will be signed. At San Francisco, of course, the Soviet delegates will attempt to delay the signing of the Japanese Treaty by their well-known tactics. You will have an opportunity to see them on your television set. But the treaty will be signed, and an era of friendship and equality between east and west will begin.

Tonight you shall hear from the men who are foremost in these struggles for peace. They will report progress. And, in spite of the grim picture we see tonight, their work will continue until all men can know a world of peace and plenty.

Mr. McCormick. Japan—at the height of World War II.

And here—convinced of Japan's defeat only a few weeks ago—these Japanese soldiers finally surrender and are flown to Tokyo—just in time for the peace treaty conference that will get under way in San Francisco September 4. Soon to leave with the United States delegation to that peace conference, is our next guest. With a career in the Far East that goes back some 25 years—much of it spent in Japan before and after the war—he will serve as the conference deputy to John Foster Dulles. For some pertinent observations, then, on the forthcoming Japanese Peace Conference, here is John Allison.

Hon. JOHN ALLISON. At some point in every battle report there comes a time to talk of peace, for peace is the ultimate objective of all battles and all wars. The time has now come to talk of peace with Japan. The United States has issued invitations to 50 nations to come on September 4 to San Francisco to conclude and sign a peace treaty with Japan. In cooperation with the United Kingdom a draft of a treaty has been forwarded to all of the nations invited to San Francisco and it is this treaty which will be before the delegates to that Conference. This is not the product of any single person or single country. All the nations in the war against Japan have had an opportunity to make suggestions regarding this treaty and many of them have done so. Everyone has

had his say and now the time is approaching when words must be translated into action.

After 4 years of war and 6 years of occupation, it is time for Japan to be brought back as an equal, sovereign member of the family of nations. It is important to all of us that the 83,000,000 Japanese with their vigor, their willingness to work and their knowledge of modern industrial techniques, be given an opportunity to contribute to the economic recovery and the political stability of Asia. It is important that Japan become a dependable member of the free world, but this must be done on a voluntary basis. The free world does not operate by compulsion. It does not want slaves. Only the free choice of the Japanese people to throw in their lot with the free world will be of importance. We do not want to, in fact we cannot, force them to do so.

The treaty therefore which will be before us at San Francisco is a treaty of reconciliation, a treaty of opportunity. We have learned by bitter experience that treaties of vengeance, that treaties which impose upon the vanquished, conditions which the victors would not accept for themselves, become merely scraps of paper. The treaty we expect to sign at San Francisco is one based on reality and on trust.

It is not a perfect treaty. Those of us who have been most closely concerned with the development of the treaty know perhaps better than anyone else its faults. It is a human document bringing together the ideas of many men and many countries. No one, least of all the United States, will be perfectly satisfied. All nations who participated in the drafting of the treaty will be able to see evidences of their work. All can agree that if not a perfect treaty, it is a good treaty.

Is Japan ready for a treaty of reconciliation and trust? Is Japan a democratic country? Only time can tell. We can point out that after 6 years of occupation, over 80 percent of the farmers of Japan own their own farms. While before the war the figures were almost reversed; there are 6,000,000 members of trade unions in Japan today as against some 400,000 before the war, women have the vote and are taking interest in political life; there is a free press; the Japanese Parliament is no longer a rubber stamp but made up of active representatives of the Japanese people. These are the results of the occupation which will last and which make it possible for true democracy to grow. Democracy cannot be imposed from without. It must come from within. We must give the Japanese the opportunity to let democracy grow.

The Soviet Union talks loudly and longly of peace, but when the time comes to make peace it draws back. It claims to be the champion of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism but when the time comes to make a great Asiatic nation free and through a peace treaty to bring to an end the government of some people by another, it holds back. If peace is wanted, here is an opportunity to get it. The treaty we are inviting the nations to sign will restore peace. It gives Japan back to the Japanese. It threatens no one. We hope nations who really want peace join with us in signing this treaty in San Francisco.

Mr. McCormick. Korea is far from "just simmering"—as these pictures prove. With American battle casualties passing the 81,000 mark this week, latest reports from the front indicate renewed Allied attacks—most of them designed to take vital hills overlooking enemy positions. Southern Koreans, in a 5-day battle that won approval from General Van Fleet for their gallantry, took an important Communist ridge that dominates the area north of Yangu. As one of them put it afterward, "We can now look down the throats of the Communist forces for miles." Meanwhile, the Air Force continued

to attack the enemy's massive motor truck supply effort. Our next guest has but recently returned from talking to the wounded in the combat areas of Korea, and checking up for himself on medical services rendered them all along the line. That you may hear his impressions first-hand, our cameras now turn upon the Surgeon General of the Army, Maj. Gen. George E. Armstrong.

Major General ARMSTRONG. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to discuss the Army Medical Service as it is functioning in Korea in its ultimate mission of rendering medical care for the fighting soldier. Just 9 days ago I left the Far East filled with pride for the wonderful work being done by the men and women who comprise the Army Medical Service in Korea. With each passing day this pride, if anything, grows within me, and will, I know, for me, be a lasting reminder of the unselfish devotion to duty of all those who are bound together by the tradition of military medicine.

During my tour in Japan and Korea, I was fortunate to meet and talk with almost everyone of the senior commanders, from General Ridgway on down, and with each of my senior medical officers. These men, all of whom had extensive combat experience during World War II, as well as during the Korean conflict, indicated to me, without exception, that the medical service being given to their troops was the most outstanding they had every known throughout their military careers. Of more importance to me, and I am sure to you, is the fact that scores upon scores of younger combat officers, as well as hundreds of soldiers, with whom it was my pleasure to talk, told me that the biggest morale factor they carried into combat with them was the fact that they knew that if they were hurt a medical aid man would be immediately on the job to give them first aid, and that steps would be taken almost instantly to remove them to a medical installation where they would receive more complete care. Specifically, I talked with over 150 battle casualties. I asked each one how long it had been, after he was hurt, until he was given medical aid. Almost each of these lads told me that he had received this aid in a matter of minutes after being wounded. There were exceptions to this statement, however, and when a boy told me that he had not received aid for about 30 minutes or so, he always followed this up by explaining hastily that the reason was because his company aide man had been hit before him, or had been killed.

You will be interested, as I was, to know the approximate time it takes for a man to be transferred from an aid station into one of our surgical hospitals, where he is able to get complete medical attention. Generally speaking the wounded men have been transferred from the aid station to a military hospital and have been placed on the operating table within 2 hours from the time of being hit. These steps were achieved by whatever means at hand. In some instances helicopters, in some, jeep ambulances, at other times in ambulances themselves and also frequently in C-47-type transport aircraft. It was truly a phenomenal and wonderful thing to be able to see this quick and efficient evacuation of the wounded taking place. There were certain exceptions, however, which were heartbreaking. In one of these sectors I visited, where the fighting was particularly heavy, and the terrain impassable, it necessitated a 6-hour litter haul to a spot where a helicopter could land in order to pick up the wounded men. From that point on, however, the 2-hour cycle I have just mentioned followed completely.

I am sure that most of you know about the blood program which the American Red Cross carries on, and which gives blood needed by those injured at the front. I had

long been curious to know exactly how far forward this blood was sent in order to be administered to a wounded man. In Korea I found out. Normally the most forward point is the Mobile Army Surgical Hospital—which incidentally is generally the first hospital a soldier enters after evacuation. From this point, however, when a call comes in for a helicopter to be sent to a forward area in order to pick up a wounded soldier, if it is indicated, blood is taken in, and the aid men administer it to the wounded soldier at the aid station where he had been brought for the purposes of evacuation. If his condition is such that time will not permit the total transfusion at the aid station, it is continued while he is en route back to the surgical hospital. I am most satisfied that the blood which we are contributing is reaching our men as soon as is humanly possible.

When our boys are brought into the MASH units—a complete chain of medical care and, if necessary, evacuation goes into effect which sees the lads either returned to duty, or flown to the United States from one of the large general hospitals in Japan. This evacuation chain, and its links of ever-increasingly fine medical installations is the core of the Army Medical Service operating in the Far East. The results are such as to make me completely confident that as far as human energy and resources are concerned, the Army Medical Services is supporting these men who are fighting to the ultimate.

I can illustrate this best, and finally, when I tell you that the only criticism I heard of the medical service, at any time, was the oft repeated phrase, that "the medics are too brave and take too many chances with themselves." If this be criticism, it is a type which I fervently hope will always be pointed at the Army Medical Service.

Mr. McCORMICK. Exercise Southern Pines—where 54,000 United States troops are fighting aggressor forces in the midst of a 2-week mimic war. Most of the defender group in North Carolina—where these, the biggest maneuvers since World War II are taking place—will soon be moved to Europe to join General Eisenhower. Purpose—to help increase the free world's strength there in the fight against Soviet communism. Already arrived, to play their own specialized part in this struggle, is the Army's Second Armored Division. But to truly strengthen democracy Europe against the Red threat, more than guns alone are necessary. Food, vital to the support of any military effort, can often spell the difference between victory and disaster. What is the food outlook for Europe? (whose fields were so recently pocked by the bombs of war?) Just returned from Europe—and ready with his answer—is our own Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN. Everywhere we went in Europe there were bumper crops about to be harvested. Farmers are getting back on their feet.

Over-all, combining economic progress with the attitude of the many people we visited, I came away from Europe with the feeling that they want to resist communism stoutly and that they are getting in a good position to do so. Everywhere there was great friendliness for the democracies of the West.

I was tremendously pleased with the recovery which has been made possible by Marshall plan aid. I was pleasantly surprised to see how much of the debris of war had been cleared away and how many new buildings were going up. Agriculture there has recovered remarkably and is turning out more than the prewar volume—although, per capita, there is not as much food as prewar because of the steadily increasing population, due in part to the influx of people escaping from behind the iron curtain.

I can assure you that the people that we have sent over there are competent. They

are doing a good job. Our money is being well spent. We are making progress in combating communism through helping to build a strong and stable agriculture in Europe. The basic agricultural problems are: land consolidation, modern farm buildings, more fertilizer, better seeds, more mechanization, and more farm credit.

Mr. BRANNAN. I went right out in the fields and pastures and talked to the farm people. The people were friendly and eager to learn, their homes are clean and well kept, and the whole family works hard.

In the United Kingdom net agricultural production is about 50 percent higher than before the war. England has increased her cultivated crops, such as potatoes, and she is increasing her hog production.

We went from England to France. I believe that France has the greatest possibility for increasing agricultural production of any country in Europe. France is making progress in mechanization and in the use of fertilizers.

In the Netherlands, Holland is tops not only in the amount of fertilizer that farmers use but also in their methods of applying it. In fact, all over Europe I was surprised at the great yields per acre—larger than ours in many cases.

In Belgium, as in Holland, almost every foot of land is put to use.

Most of the European farmers have many small parcels of land in scattered locations. They lose much time going between their numerous fields and most of the plots are too small to accommodate power-driven machinery. With the aid of ECA, many of these countries are helping farmers to consolidate their scattered tracts into more workable units.

Western Germany is making good progress in land consolidation but much remains to be done. Western Germany is making progress in packaging and distributing its dairy products and is working hard to improve the diets of her people. For example, with ECA help, they have just built the first freezer lockers in Europe.

Yugoslavia has great possibilities for increasing her food production. The people of Yugoslavia are very grateful for the food which we sent to overcome the losses occasioned by last year's great drought. That food has not only served a humanitarian purpose but has also assisted Yugoslavia to maintain its independence in the face of constant pressure from behind the iron curtain which bounds Yugoslavia on three sides.

Austria and Holland appear to have specially good extension services. 4-H groups that have been established with the help of Marshall plan aid are carrying on projects about like those of American boys and girls.

The war destroyed much of Europe's livestock industry, the backbone of agriculture there. The animals that were left were mostly scrubby and diseased. Hence Europe has had to place much emphasis on rebuilding herds and obtaining the necessary animal feeds.

With more land consolidation and greater mechanization, particularly small farm tractors, they will be able to increase their agricultural production significantly. But these countries will always be food importers.

I am convinced, after seeing conditions at first hand, that the money we have invested in the Marshall plan countries is doing a job for us. Communism has nothing like it to offer these people. The Marshall plan is bringing economic progress, giving the people faith and hope in the future, providing the foundation for the great preparedness job that is being carried out under the very able leadership of General Eisenhower. In short, I'm optimistic about results, but I know that a lot of work remains to be done.

Mr. McCORMICK. B-29's. These are the bombers that literally made history in World

War II, and are now—as you see them—winging their way through North Korean skies for assaults on the Reds. This formation, escorted by jet fighters, had as its target a Chinese supply depot. Since the sky is overcast, they release their bombs by radar. The B-29—the bomber of yesterday and today.

But now, take a look at tomorrow. This is the Air Force's B-47, a six-jet medium bomber that can be successfully refueled in midair. To keep up front with weapons like these * * * to make Uncle Sam's air punch as powerful as anything the bear can dream up * * * is the job that concerns our next guest. To tell you about it, we focus now upon the Air Force's top development expert, Brig Gen Marshall Roth.

Brig Gen MARSHALL S. ROTH. Tomorrow's victories in the air must be won today in the research and development laboratory.

American industry and science, together with the research and development facilities of the Air Force, are presently engaged in a challenging battle. The ammunition in this battle is scientific and technical know-how. The objective is to develop weapons of air warfare that are superior to those of any potential enemy. However, victory in this battle will not be achieved simply by developing weapons which in themselves are the acme of technical perfection. The degree of technical superiority acceptable in an air weapon must be balanced against three factors:

1. What do we need to do the job?
2. How much time do we have to do the job?

3. What can the Nation afford in terms of money, materials, and manpower?

In order to insure the finest weapons at the least cost to the Nation's economy, the United States Air Force has centralized all of its research and development activities.

At Headquarters, United States Air Force, the Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, is responsible for planning, coordinating, and directing this vast program for the Chief of Staff.

To carry out the development directives issuing from Headquarters Air Force, the Air Research and Development Command has recently been established. From its headquarters in Baltimore, Md., it controls the complex activities of the various development and test centers ranging across the United States.

At Dayton, Ohio, is located the Wright Air Development Center. At this center the responsibility for monitoring the development of weapons systems, that is, aircraft, guided missiles, along with the engine, armament, airborne electronics systems and the myriad other equipment necessary for flight. All-weather flying development and certain phases of light testing also are carried on there. At the Rome Air Development Center, near Rome, N. Y., development of ground electronics equipment, such as that vital in the air defense of the United States, is being pursued.

The Cambridge Research Center at Cambridge, Mass., is engaged in scientific research in electronics and geophysics. This research will lead to the development of advanced equipment and techniques for communication and aircraft control and warning systems.

At Tullahoma, Tenn., the Arnold Engineering Development Center has recently been dedicated. When complete, this center will provide facilities which can conduct supersonic research impossible in present conventional wind tunnels. From this research will come the data necessary for the design of the supersonic aircraft and jet engines of the future.

As aircraft and guided missiles reach the flight test stage, they are tested at one of the three Air Force test facilities. The flight testing of guided missiles is directed

from the Air Force missile test center at Cocoa, Fla. This center has two test ranges: The long-range proving ground located at Cocoa, Fla., and a smaller test site located at Holloman Air Force Base at Alamogordo, N. Mex.

Flight testing of the latest high performance aircraft and test vehicles is conducted at the Air Force flight test center at Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.

Typical of the type of flight tests carried on at Muroc is the flight test of the X-5 research vehicle. This aircraft is the latest in a series of special research aircraft whose purpose is to obtain most economically the flight data necessary for the design of advanced types of aircraft of the future. The distinctive feature of this aircraft is that it employs a wing whose angle of sweep-back may be changed while the plane is in flight.

This project and the rest of the USAF research and development program are directed not only toward keeping today's Air Force armed with the best in equipment but also in planning on a long-term basis. All of this must be achieved with a view to providing the maximum security to the American people at the lowest cost.

Mr. McCORMICK. The entire garrison at Bolling Air Force Base, here in Washington, turned out this afternoon to see a 19-year-old Korean war veteran—with one of the most fantastic stories yet to come out of the war—honored with the Purple Heart and the Silver Star. That you may hear, from his own lips, his almost incredible tale—here is Air Force Corporal Richard F. Webb.

Corp. RICHARD F. WEBB. First, I'd like to tell you something a lot of people back in the United States may not know . . . that a lot of Air Force fellows like me are way up front directing the Sabre jets and other airplanes supplying close support to infantry . . . we radio the pilots where the targets are and send them in to get the Communist Chinese and North Koreans.

I had been with a rear echelon organization and volunteered to move up with my aircraft warning and control outfit to strategic position where we could do more damage to the enemy. We arrived at a point just below Taejon.

The first couple of days were quiet. About midnight of a pitchblack night, we began to hear enemy shells. The enemy had completely surrounded our position. We left our open position there and sought cover.

I gave my carbine to a lieutenant and then it dawned on me that neither my mechanic nor I had weapons to defend ourselves with. I went back to our original positions, planning to get weapons for us. Just about that time, about 12 North Koreans surrounded me—all of whom I could almost touch. I was in somewhat of a sitting position and the leader of this group shoved his hand inside my coat. Whether he was trying to find a weapon—or wings, thinking I was an officer—I don't know. Then he asked me in English: "You GI?" I answer "Yes." I'm so used to hearing that question from South Koreans—not thinking anything of it. He proceeded to knock me flat on my back, stomped a foot on my throat and stuck the muzzle of his rifle on my forehead and pulled the trigger. What a noise.

In 1947, I was in an auto accident in which I fractured my skull. And as a result of this, a tantinum plate (a metal plate about the size of a silver dollar) was placed over my injured skull.

Now, it was this plate that saved my life when that North Korean pulled the trigger. The bullet entered the forehead and glanced off that metal plate. Then to be sure I was dead, evidently, I was rolled over and a bayonet jabbed into my shoulder. The bayonet glanced off my shoulder blade.

I lay there, playing dead from that time, about 2 hours in all. Then, when I fig-

ured I was safe I got up and got a canteen and found a jeep that hadn't been wrecked, and started out. It was pitch dark. I missed a turn, and went over a 3-foot embankment. My jeep got halfway up and teetered back and forth. I found an old overcoat in the seat, stuck it under the right rear wheel and climbed up onto the main road. The jeep went out of control and plunged headlong over a 20-foot embankment. The jeep came to a stop on the bottom and again the good Lord was watching over me because I didn't even have a scratch.

In the proceeding drive, I had almost run over a group of South Korean soldiers. I kept down below the underbrush along the side of the road so I couldn't be seen. Pretty soon I heard the patrol coming. All of a sudden I found myself facing 20 or 30 weapons aimed right at me. Someone hollered, "You GI?" I thought to myself, "Oh, brother, the last time I answered 'yes' I got shot." I decided to take a chance and answered, "Yes." Still not trusting them, I asked who their commanding officer was. They didn't understand English. So I said "You know Colonel Kim?" I trusted him and went forward to their patrol. I had to kneel down so they could bandage by head, since they were so short. After dressing my wound, they helped me to walk toward our lines. And we got back okay.

Mr. McCORMICK. So, until we turn our cameras upon the Nation's Capital again next Friday to report on the battle of democracy against world communism, this is Robert McCormick putting a period on your fifty-second battle report, Washington.

Come-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post of September 9, 1951:

BUTCHER WITH PLASTIC HAND TYPIFIES VETS' COME-BACK

(By Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs)

A middle-aged man stood up at a recent Washington meeting of persons interested in veterans, and said:

"I run my own butcher shop. A few years ago I lost my right hand in an automobile accident. I thought that meant the end of my business because customers might be squeamish about looking at an artificial hand. But nothing of the sort happened. When this plastic hand was put on, nobody knew the difference."

This happy butcher is one of thousands of nonveterans who are reaping benefits from a program that was aimed primarily at helping veterans. His plastic hand was developed under the auspices of the Committee on Prosthetic Appliances for Veterans.

Three years ago an advisory committee on prosthetic appliances was established, with the duty of overseeing development of artificial arms and legs for the men of World War II. The dynamic chairman of the committee is the regular conductor of this column, Col. Robert S. Allen, who is himself a veteran amputee.

Colonel Allen was General Patton's chief of combat intelligence. Wounded in an ambush, he lost his right arm but was out of the hospital and back on duty in less than 2 weeks. His courage and determination in overcoming this handicap have been an inspiration to every amputee. Thousands of disabled veterans know him from his visits, and so do the Government officials concerned with veterans' care.

Under a law passed by the Eightieth Congress, the Government spends up to \$1,000,000 a year for research in prosthetic appliances. The results have been remarkable. For instance, the weight of artificial arms and legs has been reduced tremendously through use of light metals and elimination of unnecessary parts.

Today many thousands of amputees who a few years ago would have been doomed to wheel chairs are leading vigorous, useful lives. Many others, like the butcher with the plastic hand, who would have been forced to bear a terrible psychological burden, now face the world with optimism and confidence.

Technical Skills for Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, from the Scientific Monthly of October 1950:

There are three basic steps in getting soil conservation properly applied to the land. First is the making of a scientific land inventory, which we call the land capability survey. This inventory is made by Soil Conservation Service conservation surveyors, in cooperation with farmers, and it covers entire farms.¹ It shows the kind of soil, the slope, degree of erosion, and other factors which, together with climate, govern the whole safe use and producing capacity of land. This information, in the hands of landholder and technician, serves as an accurate land base for the development of scientifically accurate farm plans. It shows—held by field and area by area—the condition of the land and its capability for production, whether for row crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife. Thus capability classes I, II, and III represent cropland, valuable in the order named; class IV is best for grass, but can be cultivated occasionally; classes V, VI, and VII are suited for pasture or timber; and class VIII is best for wildlife and parks.

Next, the technician and the farmer, with a land-capability map of the farm, go out on the land together and develop cooperatively a complete soil-conservation plan for the entire farm. It is of the utmost importance that the technician get out on the land with the farmer, a worth-while farm plan cannot be made in an office or through the use of printed directions. This farm operating

¹ This soil-conservation survey was developed by the Soil Conservation Service. The first survey was made in the Piedmont section by H. H. Bennett and Glen Fuller in 1935. (Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station Bull. 191, May 1935.) The existing surveys pertaining to land cannot be used for soil planning.

blueprint, although aimed first at the maximum protection of the land, takes into full account such economic needs of the farmer as the income he must have to support his family and operate at a profit, his market situation, and so on. The plan specifies the best use to be made of each part of the farm, year by year, the crop rotations; the building of needed farm ponds, terraces, and so on; the development of good pastures; the planting of trees for windbreaks or woodlots; and other things ranging from land clearing to removal of stone fences.

Finally, the soil- and water-conservation measures called for in the plan are applied to the land. As already pointed out, some of the conservation measures are the kind that the farmer can put into practice himself, with little further technical assistance, but generally the complete plan of coordinated conservation practices is of necessity so complex as to require expert technical help in putting it to work on the land at the proper place and in proper adjustment. The farmer provides all the materials and labor and maintains his structures and practices once they have been installed on the land. If technical help is needed on the maintenance job, that, too, is provided for in the arrangement between the soil conservation district and the Soil Conservation Service.

Each conservation measure is specifically designed to fit the land on which it is used. Furthermore, each measure is designed to support or complement another one, or several other measures, wherever support is needed, whether in the same field or in an adjoining field, above or below. Also, conservation work on one farm is planned and carried out with an eye to the needs of the next farm and to farms downstream. This viewpoint is essential, for the process of erosion has no respect for boundary lines. Gullies don't stop at fence lines, farm lines, or even county or State lines. Neither do dust storms nor floods. And the costly process of sedimentation never concerns itself with the interests of water users dependent on unprotected reservoirs.

WATER CONSERVATION

At this point, I want to say something about water conservation, a matter that has been of acute interest and concern to many of us during the past year. Drought, of course, had much to do with the much-publicized eastern water shortage, but there are other matters, I think, that should be looked into, such as planning ahead for watershed protection for all new installations, and for remedying conditions, where necessary, on the watersheds of existing reservoirs.

In the Soil Conservation Service, when asked for suggestions, we always look first at the land within those watersheds where water shortages have occurred. We examine the condition of the land and how it is being used, from the standpoint not only of soil wastage but of water wastage, too. We look at all the land to see if any of it is being seriously affected by erosion, such as is most commonly caused in humid areas by (1) cultivating excessively steep land without adequate protection, (2) overgrazing, and (3) burning. All these abusive practices contribute to wastage of both water and soil. It is the excessively rapid runoff of water that produces erosion. And, what is of great importance in reservoir maintenance, is the prevention of filling up with the solid products of soil erosion. Washed-in soil takes up the valuable reservoir space needed for water. We cannot drink soil.

Much of the water that is prevented from immediate runoff soaks into the ground, partly to seep out below into our streams and reservoirs, partly to be available for plant growth, and so on. Water conservation, in

short, is part and parcel of soil conservation everywhere.

More and more farmers are coming to realize that they need special technical help in planning and applying adequate soil and water conservation programs for their farms. This growing national consciousness of the essential place that such conservation has in our whole economy—a consciousness shared also by many and varied urban groups and interests—is evident in the great progress we have made as a Nation in soil and water conservation within a comparatively few years.

THE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

These districts are organized by the farmers themselves under State legislation enacted by all 48 States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and our insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. As of June 1, 1950, 2,247 of these farmer-managed districts already had been formed, embracing more than three-fourths of the Nation's farms and a total of more than 1,237,000,000 acres. Nine States are entirely covered by soil conservation districts: Alabama, Delaware, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Vermont.

The soil conservation districts represent, I am convinced, the greatest land movement in all history. They are democratic units of State government. They are essentially group action devices through which strong local leadership develops. They draw together, as at the hub of a wheel, the services and facilities of cooperating governmental and private interests alike, local, State, and national. And the soil conservation districts also are responsible for such tangible results as the creation of new markets for manufacturers of equipment and tools, and for the sale of the products of nurseries and seed producers.

A soil conservation district organization, of course, is not an end in itself. A district program that exists only on paper is not worth the paper it is written on. Neither is a farm plan for soil conservation where its provisions are not applied to the land. Up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone. These plans covered some 220,000,000 acres, of which more than 112,000,000 had been treated with needed conservation measures by that time. These figures do not include other millions of acres surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has assisted.

Up to the first of this year, also, detailed soil conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 322,000,000 acres. The primary objective of our broad program of conservation is, of course, to bring conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every parcel of land still needing it. And a primary requisite to achievement of such a goal is completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit. This scientific, acre-by-acre inventory of the land is the foundation on which rest effective conservation planning, treatment, and use of land for the permanency of the land, as well as the optimum development and maintenance of its water, timber, wildlife, and other land-related natural resources.

INCREASING PRESSURE ON THE LAND

The economy and efficiency of soil conservation farming, and the chain of economic and other benefits it brings, have been proved wherever it has been practiced. Thus, it enables the farmer to produce needed crops or livestock at minimum cost on his good land, and to adjust his production to changing market and other conditions. He therefore becomes a better and more stable customer for business and the professions in the city and contributes to the Nation's high stand-

ard of living—nutritionally and otherwise—and to such public benefits as reducing flood and situation damage.

Anything that helps any substantial number of individuals of a country also helps the country as a whole. This certainly can be said of the kind of soil conservation farming we have been discussing. We must keep our armed services and national defense machinery strongly built up, certainly; but we dare not neglect our domestic economy either. We do, after all, have to pay for ships and atomic bombs; and we can do this only by having an efficient economy, in agriculture as well as in industry and trade. And there can be, of course, no efficient agriculture without a base of good land.

Constantly increasing population and a still shrinking supply of productive land will eventually make greater efficiency in food production more and more imperative. In addition, we may be moving along lines of development which will call for increased production of organic materials, such as organic plastics. That would mean additional pressure on the same land that has to produce our food and other essentials. These needs already are exerting their influence on the world's limited supply of productive land and probably will continue to do so with such force as to challenge our utmost technological capacity. Every passing year demonstrates the growing importance of this relationship.

It is true that we have made remarkable progress in the field of soil and water conservation, but we need to move ahead still faster in order to get the big remaining job done in time. Lasting soil conservation is vitally important everywhere. It is mandatory here in America if we are to avoid eventual national decline in our economy. The margin between land deterioration and conservation has been narrowed within recent years. By increasing our present conservation operations on the land, we can—and should—get the principal basic measures of soil conservation applied to the land within 20 to 25 or 30 years.

We now know pretty well what the problem is, where it is, and how to solve it. We have perfected the tools of conservation—the methods and techniques and the knowledge for applying them with scientific reliability—and we have the farmers' soil conservation districts through which to work. We are moving ahead at a progressively faster rate year by year. In 1942, to illustrate, we completed the soil conservation job on 5,000,000 acres; in 1949, the same thing was done on 22,000,000 acres.

All we need now are additional facilities and the decision to go ahead fast enough to do the job on a scientific, permanent basis before it is too late—before we have wasted too much land. Unfortunately, we still are wasting land, even though we have learned that it is easier and more economical to conserve soil and water than it is to use those costly methods that impoverish land and waste rainfall as so much runoff to the sea. The more quickly the job is done, the easier it will be and the less it will cost.

MORE UNDERSTANDING COOPERATION NEEDED

We are faced with the important educational-technological task of spreading the understanding of this vital matter more widely and rapidly. It is a challenge to all of us, and each one has a part to play. From every conceivable angle—economic, social, cultural, public health, national defense—conservation of natural resources is an objective on which all much agree. The public and our society as a whole have a vital stake and, therefore, an enduring responsibility in these resources. It will take the best efforts of us all, working together on the conservation job, to get it done before it is too late.

**Dr. Bosworth's Address to the Montana
Tuberculosis Association**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to be able to attend the annual meeting of the Montana Tuberculosis Association held in Helena, Mont., on September 8, 1951, and to meet with my friends, both white and Indian, who have done so much to combat tuberculosis in my State of Montana.

I was tremendously impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the main address delivered by the renowned Dr. Howard W. Bosworth, M. D., medical director, the Barber Sanitarium, Los Angeles, Calif. Dr. Bosworth, one of the country's leading authorities in the field of tuberculosis, honored us by coming to Montana and we deeply appreciate his giving us the benefit of his wide knowledge. To many of us, his talk was the highlight of the convention.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting Dr. Bosworth's address at this point in my remarks:

Due to the speed with which we live, our sense of values sometimes becomes quite distorted. Ever since Biblical days, the words "leprosy" or "leper" have struck fear into the hearts of most people. Leprosy has always been dreaded; shunned by all, and universally believed to represent a living death. Years ago laws were passed requiring isolation of this disease, and institutions for isolation were provided for those who contracted it. In San Francisco not long ago one person with leprosy arrived from abroad and the event made newspaper headlines throughout the country. Yet leprosy is a disease suffered by relatively few people and one which has a very low degree of communicability.

The dangers of leprosy are far less than the dangers of tuberculosis, and yet today, we who are in this crusade, have to fight the apathy of the world in order to secure the measures necessary for the control of a disease that kills many times more people and causes an economic loss so great that it cannot be estimated. A disease which kills nearly 50,000 people a year in this country and causes untold suffering, is still a disease which too few people take seriously. Tuberculosis can be eradicated within a generation. We have the tools with which to do it. It is only apathy that will prevent this from happening.

In his presidential address to the National Tuberculosis Association, a short time ago, Dr. William Shepard estimated that this country spends \$174,000,000 a year for the care and control of tuberculosis, and that we now lose over \$200,000,000 a year in the net future earnings of the heads of families who die of tuberculosis. Think what a saving it will be when we do eradicate tuberculosis. On all sides we hear the same story. We could eliminate this disease, but we need beds, we need money, we need more workers, and we need to preach the gospel of tuberculosis until it reaches everyone in this land. The same kind of apathy that allowed the World War, the same apathy that allowed a Pearl Harbor, is the same kind of apathy that you must fight today, year after year, if we are going to bring people to the realiza-

tion that we can and we must control this disease. Not many years ago, if a bed were available, a case of tuberculosis could be treated and rehabilitated for \$1,000 to \$1,500. Now the cost is double that. The longer we wait, the greater the cost, and the greater the loss. Today, fearing another war, we are spending billions of dollars for defense. Time magazine for August 20 of this year stated that in Julius Caesar's day, the average cost for killing a man in war was 75 cents. In World War I, it was \$21,000; in World War II, it was \$75,000, and the cost is still going up. It is hoped that by spending these billions for defense, that we can prevent another war and save the lives that would be lost by such a conflict, and so, paradoxically, we spend nearly \$100,000 to kill an enemy—one man—but we object to paying \$3,000 or \$4,000 to save the life of one tuberculosis patient. Is it truly the apathy of the public, or is it our own fault that we have not succeeded in our own program of education?

I have talked to many men in public life, city councilmen, county supervisors, State legislators, national Congressmen, and a few Governors. While every one of them have been interested in keeping the tax rates down and living within their budget, not one of them but who has been willing at any time to spend as much money as necessary for the control of tuberculosis, providing the people they represent want it and ask for it. After all, these public servants are our own representatives, and for the most part they do as we ask, but unless we educate the population whom they serve, and make known the real facts, we cannot justify taking short cut to demand that they appropriate money when it is contrary to the wishes of the people themselves. That is a challenge to every tuberculosis association in this country. You can call it propaganda or education, but it simply means to take to our people the hard, honest facts concerning the economics of tuberculosis control.

OUR PAST METHODS

We might at this time review our past methods in order to evaluate the work that has been done up to date before we set out on "the road ahead."

The tuberculosis control program has not been a one-group program. In the United States alone the crusade against this devastating disease has been the greatest national cooperative health movement that has ever existed. It has been so well organized that the work of our groups, agencies, and individuals, have been coordinated into one great plan of action, with each supplementing and complementing the work of others. It would be well if everyone of us who works in a local or State association could take a brief look at the over-all national picture so that we could better understand our own place in this vast plan.

Tuberculosis is an international problem and not confined to the boundaries of a certain country or small area. Each one of us is just a small part in the whole picture of this great movement. The World Health Organization is at the top of the list but because of lack of funds and certain political interference, has had troubles of its own. In spite of this it is doing a splendid piece of work. Then we have the various national and continental organizations exchanging information and aid because science knows no national boundaries.

In most countries where the organization is strictly scientific, however, such as South America, the crusade is not well balanced or financed, and as a result the movement lags far behind the work being done in the United States. Those who believe that tuberculosis should be completely under medical control would do well to examine the records of those countries where it is done this way. After all, it is a combination of medicine, of public

health, and of community interest and cooperation with the representatives from these groups that makes for a well-balanced program.

In this country we have the official agencies which would include the United States Public Health Service, the State health departments, your own local health departments, and your own institutions, also the school systems throughout the land. Then there are the military groups, the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans Administration. Of the voluntary agencies we have, the tuberculosis association at the State and national levels, and as an integral part of these we have the medical section of the national, and medical sections of many State associations operating under the name of the Trudeau Society. We have the National Conference of Tuberculosis Secretaries whose members lives are also dedicated to the control of the disease.

The medical societies throughout the United States have their stakes in this movement, and the hospital associations are now awakening to their responsibilities. The American Public Health Association has always been interested in this type of program. The medical schools in colleges and the research centers throughout the United States are now taking more and more interest in control measures, and recently the drug manufacturers have taken an active part in tuberculosis research. In one generation we have come a long way in our organization of the control pattern. From now on, under this control pattern, if we have the cooperation of the public, we should more rapidly achieve the objectives for which we are working.

Within this framework of organizations, it has been demonstrated that the problems which face us can be solved. There is one danger however. When so many different groups are all working toward the same objective, methods are bound to differ. If we lose sight of our objectives and waste time in quibbling over the various methods to be used, we will always weaken our campaign and retard our progress. I say this with considerable feeling because my trips throughout the different parts of the country have made me realize that in some areas petty jealousies and disagreements between the different cooperating agencies have interfered in the forward progress of the campaign.

Specifically, there are places where the voluntary agencies do not work well with health departments. There are other associations where the health educators or the secretaries or the lay groups find there exists considerable friction between them and their medical societies. Then there are certain individuals in medicine who not understanding our programs are extremely critical of public health attitude in our voluntary organizations feeling that it is another wedge to so-called socialized medicine. Most of these individuals in their hearts are just as interested as we are in eliminating tuberculosis, but for the most part they do not have the broad viewpoint necessary to understand the entire pattern of the campaign. After all, tuberculosis control is preventive medicine, and everyone who is working in this movement in any organization believes in preventive medicine. In order to have harmony, when once we have agreed upon our objectives, it is necessary to work out the best methods and those which are satisfactory to all, which is by no means impossible when there is a sympathetic understanding between those who are interested. Every community has a slightly different problem to its neighbor, and slightly different techniques can be worked out to meet these individual problems, and our central organizations are constantly on the watch for the good points of these programs in order to give

every other section of the country the advantage of the thinking that has gone into these results.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PAST 50 YEARS

Perhaps we should stop for a moment to think what we have accomplished during the last 50 years, starting when tuberculosis was a leading cause of death in this country. A continued campaign of education has been most effective in disputing the ignorance concerning the disease thereby bringing about earlier diagnosis and less exposure of contacts with the resulting lower incidence.

What about the medical side of treatment. In the earlier days patients were sent to sanatoria that were little more than pest houses. Today they are sent to hospitals. We have learned that many cases need more than just bed rest and will respond to different forms of collapse therapy and to surgery. And surgery has improved so tremendously in the last few years that we are no longer hesitant to remove a lobe or an entire lung if it is so indicated. With the recent advent of our antibiotics, we find we have a great help in chemotherapy, although as yet streptomycin, PAS, Tibione and some of the other drugs do not cure tuberculosis, but they do have an inhibiting effect upon the bacilli to give us an opportunity to utilize other measures in treatment which we would not have dared to have done a few years before.

The tremendous strides in surgery and in the treatment of the disease have now made possible the saving of thousands of lives of advanced cases that a few years ago would have been condemned to death. All this improvement in treatment is due to clinical, surgical and bacteriological research, and we may well be proud of the fact that we are leading the world today in these methods.

All of these accomplishments taken together have caused us to drop the death rate in tuberculosis during this 50-year period from 200 per 100,000 to under 26 per 100,000. This curve in death rate plotted for the entire time is almost a straight line, giving us the information that is necessary to predict future diminishing death rates during the coming generation.

Such predictions, however, are not so easy as one would think. The accomplishments of treatment and of tuberculosis control, it is true, are lowering the death rate, but we must not be misled or lulled into complacency, and we must remember that we are prolonging the lives of many thousands of active tuberculosis cases through our present methods of treatment.

Our case finding procedures are finding tuberculosis earlier and treating it successfully, and while the death rate is dropping, the incidence of tuberculosis is actually an unknown figure and may not be dropping at anywhere near the rate that we have previously supposed.

We are not yet ready to say that tuberculosis is no longer a health problem. When a polio case is reported, it causes great concern in any community as it should, yet while there were 42,000 cases (not deaths remember) of polio reported in 1949, there were 50,000 deaths from tuberculosis, and for every death there are many individuals exposed to the disease, and a fair percentage of those exposed will contract it. The estimates of the number of beds needed for tuberculosis for every annual death have varied all the way from 2½ to 10 beds providing we plan to isolate in homes or institutions every new case and every active case that exists. Such a program would, of course, speed up the elimination of the disease in much faster time. Tuberculosis can be controlled as a public health problem. It is not like polio whose mode of spread is still unknown. The cause and the mode of spread of tuberculosis is known and we can control it.

THE PRESENT PATTERN

Knowing the cause of tuberculosis, there are seven basic points to keep in mind for the control of the disease. They are the weapons that to date have brought us to the point where we can now see daylight ahead. The first is health education of the general public. The second is better medical education of the physician and the nursing profession. The third is case finding. The fourth is isolation, treatment, and education of the patient. The fifth, rehabilitation. The sixth, research, both social and scientific, and the last, the cooperation of all agencies. No one group has been responsible for this entire program. It is the coordinated effort of all the groups that are interested in our part of the health program that has achieved the results up to the present time.

There is a very close liaison between the National Tuberculosis Association, the United States Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration, and there are joint committees working on mutual problems of these organizations at all times. The National Tuberculosis Association, the National Conference of Tuberculosis Secretaries, and the American Trudeau Society through joint thinking instigate much of the national planning and serve as pilots for the State associations. The State associations in turn transmit much of this information to the locals and particularly in strong associations such as we have in California, try to give service to the smaller associations who have much more limited resources than those in the larger cities.

As a part of the National Tuberculosis Association, the medical section, the American Trudeau Society, is responsible for a program of professional education which includes the publication of the American Review of Tuberculosis. Medical research and therapy is one of its greatest interests, and at the present time around \$170,000 is being spent annually on research, and it is hoped that if the additional percentage that the board of directors voted at a recent annual meeting is turned over to research, that over \$200,000 per year will go into the various studies pointed toward the complete elimination of tuberculosis through proper treatment. We realize that \$200,000 is a small amount, but when one is aware of the fact that the small research program we had, served to stimulate some of the national pharmaceutical houses to carry on their investigative work which eventually brought out the streptomycin program which cost millions of dollars, we realize that a little pump priming can do. It is only a little over 3 years ago that these same pharmaceutical houses made available to the American Trudeau Society over \$1,000,000 worth of streptomycin to do the original clinical evaluation of this antibiotic. Government agencies cooperated, and from this study has come one of the great cooperative efforts in the study of antibiotics and chemotherapy products on both a research and a clinical basis.

The Veterans' Administration, under the leadership of Dr. John Barniwell, has done one of the greatest pieces of coordinated research that has ever been done. Every 6 months, for the past 3 years, the directors and usually the head of the research department of every veterans' hospital that is treating tuberculosis, are called together to give a complete report of the cases that they have treated with these various drugs. Protocols for selection of cases and for treatment have been set up. Jury panels have evaluated hundreds and hundreds of cases. Some of these panels have been run by the Veterans' Administration and some by the United States Public Health Service. They have all cooperated in this big coordinated program, and we have within 3 years time done studies that heretofore would have taken from 10 to

15 years to have accomplished. The whole picture of treatment has changed, and different types of the disease which heretofore were considered fatal, are now successfully treated.

As a result of this we now have two definite points of attack, and there is a race between the Public Health control measures on one side, which have done much to reduce our mortality rates, and on the other side the scientific treatment of the disease, which brings the elimination of tuberculosis almost within our grasp. We have another possibility which may become a part of our future program, and that is the vaccination against tuberculosis with BCG. This vaccination is not as specific as vaccinating for smallpox. Neither is it a substitute for control measures or techniques, and there is still considerable controversy in regard to the value of vaccination in certain areas of the country, as it affects some of the control measures and indications that go with it. It is wrong to believe, as some would have us believe, that we can eliminate beds for tuberculosis by vaccinating the entire population. We have not yet reached that stage. The time may or may not come when we can prevent the spread of the disease by using this form of preventive medicine. In the meantime beds will still be needed for those who should be under treatment and should be isolated. I could go on at length telling you about the various research projects that are now under way, but the time is getting short, and I want to go on to some of your specific problems in your community.

MONTANA'S PROBLEMS

You have here a large State, much of which is a rural population. I need not tell you that you have one of the greatest Indian problems in the country, and you have many producing mines which in spite of all the precautions that can be taken cause silicosis and a predisposition to tuberculosis among many of the workers. Your cities are scattered and your problems are different in different areas. In looking over your annual report, I find that the greatest amount of tuberculosis is in those areas where there are Indian reservations and in those areas where there are mines, and it would seem that these are the centers from which the disease is spreading. I assume that these are the points that you are attacking as your first objectives. Your death rates in the rural areas are much lower than the national average. This should not deceive you, however, as such conditions have deceived most of us. In an article called *The Rural Challenge* in the October 7, 1949, *Public Health Reports* by Dr. Milton I. Roemer, he points out that we can attack, and eventually control, most of the tuberculosis in the urban areas but there will still be a large reservoir of tuberculosis in our rural areas and that because of the expense of case-finding hospitalization, and rural health programs, this will be a permanent reservoir of tuberculosis unless we give more and more attention to assistance to our rural populations. Today, the large communities are getting the most attention. The time will come when we will realize that the rural communities are just as important in our health programs.

What, then, are some of the responsibilities of your State association? It is true that the various State associations should benefit from the information and leadership of the national organizations. It is the responsibility of the State to seek out the needs of the local areas in order to find the weak places where more help is needed. Field service should be provided to all the locals, particularly the smaller ones.

It is the responsibility of the State organization to thoroughly organize the State into either country or district tuberculosis associations. We must always keep in mind the fact that the great strength of the tubercu-

losis movement lies within the local associations in the home communities. Unorganized territory is still a problem in many of our States. In California we have no unorganized territory. We do have certain very sparsely settled mountain counties where the seal sales are only a few hundred dollars and where the State has to give additional service, but the fact that there is an association in those areas has stimulated interest, has assisted in providing part-time health departments, and has done much toward stimulating community health organization in those small, isolated areas. A State association is not a local association and it should not have to handle the details of a local association. These details should be handled at a local level under the guidance and help of the State. The more organized territory there is in any State, the stronger the State association will be. In those areas where there is very little tuberculosis, the tuberculosis association should spearhead the movement toward a health council and should support the development of a part-time, and later, a full-time health department. Strong health departments always result in healthier communities.

The State associations should give assistance to the State health departments and other agencies. This does not mean that the health departments should slough more work onto the voluntary associations, as the trend should be in the other direction, that is, for the voluntary association to assist with those things for which tax money is not available until such a time as the official agencies can take over when the demonstration has been completed. From both the State and local associations, contributions can be made to research, and in some States our research program is sponsored within the State itself. In order to preserve a better understanding and balance between public health projects and strictly medical problems, and a greater interest in the whole tuberculosis program, the State Trudeau Society should be very closely integrated with the State Tuberculosis Association. Following somewhat along the lines of the national organization, the State Trudeau Society, subsidized in part by the tuberculosis association, can stimulate medical education and research, and can be of tremendous help in advising a State board on programs along medical lines. As more and more State Trudeau societies are being developed, they are following along this pattern with excellent results.

It is the responsibility of the State association to evaluate the work of the local associations and to advise accordingly. When new locals are started, it is often necessary to subsidize them until they are self-supporting. If a local association is falling down in its program, there are times when it is necessary, if the local does not change its plan of operation, for the State to refuse a seal-sale contract and reorganize a new local in that particular community.

There is always a certain amount of suspicion of the State association by some locals, but the State association is there to help and to assist, and when there is a mutual understanding between the two organizations, particularly if the directorship in the State organization is actively interested and well distributed throughout the State area, this suspicion usually disappears. The National Tuberculosis Association puts out literature which it would be well for all of us to know. The Tuberculosis Association, Its Organization and Administration, is one. Building a Community Program for Tuberculosis Control, is another, and the recent Evaluation Guide for Tuberculosis Associations, if honestly used is a good mirror to show us our failings as well as our achievements.

We have spent much time on the past and its achievements, the organization and the tools with which we work. Now, what about the future? What should our program be, and what may we expect to accomplish?

THE ROAD AHEAD

Using the standard tools and methods that have proved so successful, just how can you apply them in your State? The first is health education. I cannot stress this point enough because almost every failure of a tuberculosis association to reach its objective is due to the fact that the public has not been thoroughly educated. Health education for the general public should be well integrated, starting in the public schools and carried on through the public press and through all civic organizations. Much literature and many moving-picture films and slides are available to help, but the message should be taken to the people through direct contact such as speakers' organizations in local communities. In order to do this job right a tremendous program of organization is necessary, but it can be done, and it is the cornerstone of all of the rest of the program.

The second point is better medical education of the physician and the nursing profession. Postgraduate courses, medical symposia should be planned in connection with county medical societies and local tuberculosis associations. The programs should not be limited to tuberculosis because, frankly, they have little appeal, but by combining tuberculosis with some of the other problems in medicine a good attendance is usually secured. Emphasis should be placed upon the reporting of cases and the early diagnosis, and the follow-up of the case-finding programs. Public-health nursing is extremely important, and the public-health nurses should be well-grounded in tuberculosis, as they contact this more than any other of the communicable diseases in their work. And what is more important, there should be enough of these nurses available in every community to carry the load.

Case finding has been given a great emphasis through miniature X-ray films, but that is only a part of the picture. Rapid tempo X-rays are splendid, but every doctor's office should be a case-finding center, every hospital should X-ray all admissions, and here again, case finding can be successful only if there is a good organization behind the X-ray surveys, and a good program of health education which precedes them, and an efficient follow-up system on all cases found. Simply sending an X-ray truck or machine into a community and setting it up does not take very many X-rays, but a community organization developing this program in advance, furnishing hostesses and bringing people into the machine, is much more effective. In Los Angeles we recently tried an experiment and at one of our trucks a tuberculosis association employee asked everyone what brought them in to have their X-ray made, and it was interesting to find out that 22 percent saw it in the street, around 49 percent read it in the newspapers, between 11 and 12 percent were told by a friend, 5 percent were recommended by a doctor, about 6 percent saw it in posters, 5 percent were contacts, none were referred in by their churches, one saw it in television, and one just didn't know. Such a check at a machine will give you an idea of the efficiency of your organization campaign, and it may surprise you with the result, but no case-finding program is worth much unless there is a follow-up on cases.

Therefore, the fourth step is isolation, treatment and education of the patient. This means that there should be sufficient beds available. The minimum requirement of 2½ beds per death is barely enough in any community to meet the real needs. Without our Indian population, your State would

probably be able to meet this requirement, but with the problems involved as a result of the reservations, you do need help, and need it badly. The National Tuberculosis Association has recently taken a greater interest in this problem and I hope will be of some assistance in the future. In the meantime the problem is in your laps to meet as best you can.

The fifth step is rehabilitation. While Federal rehabilitation funds are now available in every State, it is hoped that this program can be speeded up to the point that the rehabilitation starts a short time after the patient has entered the institution and carries through until he can be restored to an economic status that will insure his continued health. Rehabilitation has been a stepchild of the tuberculosis movement for many years because of the difficulty of showing tangible results. It is common-sense reasoning, however, from the economic viewpoint, to stress suitable rehabilitation for patients in need of this type of service to prevent future reactivation of the disease and to improve the economic status.

The sixth point is contributing to medical research. The future of medical research lies in three fields. The first is along the routine lines of better methods for studying the tubercle bacillus and its effect, and for the development of better laboratory procedures along these lines. When one realizes the short period of time that has elapsed since Koch discovered the tubercle bacillus and the refinement of laboratory methods now in use for discovering the presence of this bacillus and for taking it apart and studying its component parts with equipment such as the electron microscope, along with its performance under different conditions, we realize we have come a long way, but there is much more ahead of us, and more and more fields are being opened constantly for investigation if we had the workers and the money available to support their projects. The second field lies in immunization against the disease. At the present time, considerable work is being done with BCG vaccination. Programs are under way to vaccinate millions of people in the European study. In this country a large number of studies are in progress, and several foundations are being developed for the study of BCG and the production of the vaccine which, as yet, is being produced commercially by only one licensed laboratory.

Experimental work has not yet progressed to the point that we can be sure that BCG is a definite protection, although we believe it has some protective powers, but there are many, many investigators who believe that vaccination will only be a small part of our program of prevention and actually will not be anywhere as effective as proper control methods have been in the past and should be in the future.

The third and perhaps the greatest branch of research, at least the one which is most spectacular, is a search for a specific drug, chemical, or antibiotic which will kill tubercle bacilli. To date there are many which will kill them in the test tube but which for various reasons either cannot be used or are ineffective in the human being. Definite progress has been reported, as we know, with antibiotics, promine, paraminosalicylic acid, and now much work is being done in synthesizing chemicals by changing the composition of the molecule in order to see what effect it will have on the tubercle bacillus and how it will be tolerated by the human body. The appeal of this research is great, but again there is tremendous shortage of qualified research workers who are interested in tuberculosis, and much money is needed for fellowships in order to train proper men to carry on this work. Clinical research is, of course, progressing at a rapid pace. It took the atom bomb to

awaken the people to the potentialities of mass research in one project, and this project is one which is capable of destroying all life on this planet. If we could only awaken our people now to the potentialities of mass research for prolonging life and eliminating disease it is within our power to do this, and I wonder whether we are going to meet that challenge.

Finally the last step is cooperation of all agencies. The tuberculosis association can spearhead the drive, but the voluntary associations should work with the public agencies and with all community organizations for the improvement of health in the community. Development of community health councils and full-time health departments will pay big dividends and should head your list.

Such a program as I have outlined is a long term program; one that may take years to accomplish. A program based on this outline cannot help but reduce the tuberculosis incidence in any community, and with patience and hard work it can be done. You people in Montana have come a long way. You have limited funds, large areas, few health departments and few tuberculosis associations, and you have great responsibilities. I am sure that you know better than I the weaknesses and the strength in your present program. You like all of us are staggering under a terrific load of taxation and unless tuberculosis has struck in your own family or close to you, it is difficult sometimes to become really fired up in this campaign, and unless you get close to it and see at close hand what it does, it is just another appeal among hundreds for help. Everyone here, I am sure, feels that he is doing his part to eradicate this disease, but are you giving everything you have to this movement? A tuberculosis association is not a social organization. It is a working group with the determination that nothing can stop its progress toward preventing any more broken lives, broken families and the tragedies that go with tuberculosis. If Montana can wipe out tuberculosis, so can the United States, and the reason we can do it is because each of you who are at the center of planning, thinking and working in your community, will have done your part to accomplish this job.

Recently I saw a new patient just admitted to our hospital. She was a mother with three children. Her husband is a patient in the tuberculosis unit of the Veterans Administration hospital and he is not going to live. This girl is desperately ill, and she, too, may not live. The children are scattered among relatives. This was a happy family only a few years ago, facing life with all the optimism of the world, and now what does life hold for any of them? Even the children have been infected.

Not long ago I sat at the bedside of a young doctor who was dying from tuberculosis. He had cured once before, but not long enough, and the demands made upon him from his country practice when he went back too soon, caused him to break again—and in spite of all we could do, he died. He left a widow and a son, and a community that needed and worshiped him.

I have been at the bedside of many who were dying from tuberculosis, and as each one passed away, leaving brokenhearted friends and relatives, I have grown more bitter. Not one of these deaths was necessary. Every one could have been prevented. They didn't have to catch tuberculosis, but they were exposed to it by someone else who had it. Only the apathy of people slows up the progress in eliminating this disease. No one is safe until every case is found and placed under treatment.

Fifty thousand deaths a year, fifty thousand heartbroken families, all from a disease which can be controlled if we will do it. If anyone can visit a tuberculosis ward in a large general hospital and see in long rows,

beds of patients, many of them suffering a living death, and then cannot dedicate his or her life to fighting this disease, they are callous indeed. Tuberculosis is no respecter of persons. Any one of these patients except for the grace of God might be you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the fight against tuberculosis is a religion. I wonder, if you have not already done so, will you combine your own religion, whatever it may be, with the religion of tuberculosis control, rededicate your lives, join this crusade, redouble your efforts, and help us fight this disease until it is no more?

The Soil: Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, Farm and Home Week Agronomy Day, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., February 3, 1950:

THE SOIL—OUR HERITAGE

It is most appropriate, it seems to me, that you have made soil conservation a definite part of your Farm and Home Week program. There is much we need to be thinking about, talk about—and do something about—in this basic field of agricultural betterment through soil and water conservation.

There is good opportunity at this time for all of us to serve in the cause of soil and water conservation, and with this opportunity go certain obligations and definite responsibilities. As the concept of soil conservation has grown and fixed itself in our American agricultural pattern, these responsibilities have grown in proportion. I am talking about the broader responsibilities, notably the responsibility of positive and vigorous leadership in bringing conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every acre of land still in need of it—in Kansas, the United States, the world. It is the kind of cooperative leadership that is so well demonstrated here at Kansas State College, where all of us whose agricultural work brings us into the State have the fortunate opportunity of working with your leaders like Dean R. I. Throckmorton and President "Milt" Eisenhower and others.

BIG CONSERVATION JOB TAKES TEAMWORK

This conservation task we have set ourselves to is no simple one, as I am sure you well know. There still are many obstacles to be overcome before the goal can be attained completely. The job is big and urgent. It takes, first of all, some degree of conservation mindedness on the part of the farmers on the land. And it takes continued teamwork on the part of those agencies and groups which have something to contribute. I have reference, for example, to soil-conservation districts; State, local, and Federal agencies, local groups and public-spirited individuals; and business interests ranging from bankers to seed dealers. Safeguarding our productive land is in the interest of everybody; we all depend on it, city people as well as the farmers.

HOW WE HAVE BEEN SPENDING OUR HERITAGE

When our forefathers came to America, they found a land that was unbelievably rich in soil, forest, mineral, and other natural resources. The American colonies soon be-

came a source of revenue for the mother country. Most of the wealth was produced directly by seemingly limitless acres of new, fertile land reaching westward from the Atlantic Ocean. Surely, our forefathers thought, that beautiful storehouse of wealth, wide open to unrestrained exploitation, never could be exhausted; and, indeed, quite beyond the wildest dreams of those early Americans, the richest and greatest Nation of all time has grown out of that land in only a few generations.

For 150 years we pursued an agricultural policy that contained too much of the habit of plow up, wear out, and move on to a new piece of land. There was too little thought of the day of reckoning that would surely come as the penalty for such spendthrift ways in the management of our irreplaceable land resource. As a result, we allowed nearly a third of our original supply of topsoil to wash or blow away—washed down the rivers to the oceans or widely and wastefully scattered by the wind. Floods like those which have harried parts of the Mississippi Valley already this year, and droughts like that of the 1930's so sharply remembered out here, helped to speed up this soil waste. Because of our thriftless ways in the use of our God-given heritage of productive land, such as probably no nation before us ever felt heir to, we permitted half or more of the cropland of the United States to be damaged, chiefly by erosion—many millions of acres so severely as not to be capable of further economic cultivation in the immediate future.

THE SOIL—CONSERVATION ERA

Fortunately, we now have entered a new agricultural era in the United States. This is the soil-conservation era, which, for the first time, finds conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife intimately tied together and coordinated on the basis of land capability and need. This is a basic tenet of modern soil conservation. Any sound conservation program, intended to be permanent, must always be guided scientifically by the kind and needs of the land. Such a program requires the support of continuing research in order to give the land all the advantages of progress in science.

We now can say, I believe—and events like this one here this week bear me out—that national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving these interlocking natural resources. Research, education, surveys, scientific farm planning, and the successful application of conservation measures have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive while in use. We are determined now to husband carefully what remains of our soil heritage.

TREAT THE LAND ACCORDING TO CAPABILITY AND NEED

Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals all should exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness of these essential resources which distinguish the earth from a barren planet. So, to safeguard the land, it must be treated and used according to capability and need. This accords with nature's law, which man too often has overlooked or has been unable to see because of lack of understanding. This concept, I firmly believe, is of the order of importance with the discovery of the utility of the wheel and of fire.

There was a time, as already indicated, when productive land was so plentiful, in this country and elsewhere over the earth, that people saw no need for concern over the possibility of its decline. But that time is past. Nations, and even civilizations, have declined or perished, because of land impoverishment through misuse, neglect, and erosion. Now, we must assume serious responsibility for the care and sound use of the land that we have left. Land exploit-

tion, land and water wastage, must stop. Failure to stop these losses eventually would lead us into the most serious trouble, because of the utter indispensability of productive land.

Good soil cannot be stockpiled like tin or manganese; it can't be mined from the depths of the earth or dredged from the floor of the oceans. And it can't be grown. Hydroponics on any large scale seems utterly impracticable. As for "food from the sea"—it is important, of course, but it remains to be proved that all the oceans can be made to produce, in any practical way, anything even approximating our annual United States crops of a billion bushels of wheat and 3,000,000 bushels of corn, together with great quantities of tobacco, potatoes, rice, timber, and the others. And I should like, also, to emphasize as strongly as I can, regardless of anybody's claims to the contrary, that we still haven't learned how to build new topsoil, or even a reasonable substitute for it, on any substantial scale, within any brief time.

CONSERVATION IS OUR COMMON CONCERN

The conclusion, then, is as logical as it is inescapable. That conservation of the soil and of the water which makes the land produce is a basic consideration to those phases of agriculture having to do with crop improvement, livestock development, and home betterment. Every bushel of wheat or corn comes from the soil and from nowhere else. Every pound of beef and pork and mutton comes from productive land and from nowhere else. Good Kansas farm homes are just as attractive and comfortable as the acres around them are capable of yielding the necessities to provide for the luxuries which go to make up a prosperous and satisfying farm enterprise. So, conservation is our common concern—be we soil conservationists, agronomists, educators, bankers, machinery dealers, or housewives who shop to supply the family table. Every man, woman, and child in Kansas and throughout the country depends on productive land for virtually all their food, as well as a large part of their clothing, and for all of their wood, leather, and many other necessities.

So it is important that all of us—especially those of us who are engaged in agricultural work in any way—keep always in mind various basic facts which bear on our common problem and so largely determine our success in solving it. And we need to be alert to certain misconceptions that still seem to prevail in the thinking of some, and be prepared to help dispel them. Some of these misconceptions, briefly stated, are:

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO DISPEL

1. That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.
2. That there are short-cuts to conservation, or that farmers can or should do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance.
3. That soil conservation costs more than it is worth, and that dollars-and-cents considerations are all that are at stake.
4. That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

One thing which is important to the progress of the whole conservation action program is a general understanding of the technical practices and measures which farmers are using in their soil conservation districts, and the necessity for the kind of on-the-farm technical assistance which they obtain through their districts from the Soil Conservation Service, along with the research findings from the State agricultural experiment stations, with most of which the Soil Conservation Service is now cooperating. Accordingly, I think it is entirely appropriate that we consider again what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Modern soil conservation is based on sound land use and treatment of land with all the proven appropriate measures that are needed to keep it permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; it means contouring, strip-cropping, and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover and green manure crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences on the contour, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures and ranges, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Modern soil conservation, moreover, consists of doing these and still other necessary things. Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for drainage; if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter, if water soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, it calls for drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient tools available to farmers.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil conservation education must be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten through college. Moreover, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work which is put on the land. In short, there is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm or ranch according to their individual need or condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production.

AGRONOMIC TECHNIQUES INDISPENSABLE TO SOIL CONSERVATION

It is quite apparent, I think, that the most advanced agronomic information as well as sound engineering and hydrologic techniques are basic to carrying on this modern soil conservation. Such basic principles must be used in the management of the land, whether that land is growing row crops, small grains, or grass. As all of you so well know, many crop failures by individual farmers can be traced directly to their failure to observe proved agronomic, engineering, and hydrologic principles in seedbed preparation, methods of planting, quality of adaptable seed, weed control, water control, or some other fundamental within their control that has to do with sound soil and water conservation. In most cases this information, as well as information on forestry and other specialties, has been developed through research and practical experience. But we still are not getting it applied fast enough on enough farms.

We know, too, that organic matter is important to maintain or improve soil structure; yet we have seen wheat grown continuously on some lands that should have the benefit of a grass-legume rotation. We have gone through two world wars, each emphasizing the need for wheat; and Kansas has led all the States in meeting this need. At the same time, much Kansas soil shows the bad effects of continuous cropping to wheat without rotation. And there is also great need for stubble-mulch tillage to make use of soil-protecting crop residues; level terraces to hold water and get better plant

growth; and, in the eastern areas particularly, measures like strip cropping, terraces, grassed waterways, and so on both to control erosion and conserve water.

Then there are various related problems, such as the need of efficient drills that will seed mixtures of range grasses for regrassing the many thousands of acres that need to be in grass. And we need, in many areas, more seed-cleaning equipment for grass. Better distribution and storage facilities are essential so that in years like 1948, when a large quantity of native grass seed was harvested, this seed can be stored safely until it is used. Price fluctuations in grass seed like brome can be hard on a producer if such facilities are not available.

GRATIFYING ADVANCEMENTS IN KANSAS

I am not unfamiliar with some of the many things you have been doing out here in Kansas in the field of agronomy that are contributing so importantly to the progress of conservation farming. I am thinking, for example, of the improved grass strains developed at the Soil Conservation Service Nursery here in cooperation with the State experiment station and the Kansas Crop Improvement Association. The success story of your Auchenbach brome, for instance, is too widely known for me to need to discuss further its merits and how it is contributing so substantially to your grass-improvement program. The good work in maintenance of soil fertility and use of grass and legumes in crop rotations and the use of fertilizer, especially nitrogen on bromegrass to produce more seed, might be mentioned also. Your pure-seed development and seed-increase work likewise has been most important in these respects.

And I am sure that just about everybody in Kansas—along with a great many people elsewhere over the country—knows about the interesting and significant wind tunnel experiments here at the experiment station, in which we are cooperating under the 1946 Research and Marketing Act. From what I have learned of this basic research on wind erosion control, begun late in 1947, I feel confident that most helpful information is going to come of it in finding the most effective tillage, planting, and other methods adapted to representative soils subject to blowing. In this connection, if you haven't seen it, I recommend for your reading a little eight-page leaflet by the Soil Conservation Service, called *Dust Storms Come From the Poorer Lands*.

"The most important thing we found out in this study about land failure," the leaflet points out, "was that most of the land that failed was poor land at the time it was first placed in cultivation. Likewise, it was learned that most of the abandoned land which was later reclaimed was a better class of land to start with. In other words, most of the dust storms of the thirties came from the poorer land. While some of the better land was abandoned during the 1930's and did blow to some extent, it was usually not severely and permanently damaged and was later reclaimed and placed back in cultivation."

NEED TO COMPLETE NATIONAL LAND INVENTORY

There you have in a nutshell what we are getting at when we so strongly urge going ahead with our land capability surveys as fast as we can. The primary objective of our broad program of conservation action is, of course, to bring conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every acre of land still needing it. But a primary requisite to achievement of such a goal is completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit—by 1956 if possible. This scientific, acre-by-acre inventory of the land is the foundation on which rests effective conservation planning, treatment, and use of the land for the permanency of the land.

The Soil: Our Heritage**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, Farm and Home Agronomy Day, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., February 3, 1950:

THE SOIL: OUR HERITAGE

(By H. H. Bennett)

We don't have to wait for another drought to put this basic information to work. For example, using land in accordance with its capability can best be accomplished when we shall have ascertained these capabilities through a Nation-wide survey of the land of the Nation. This information would enable us to retire from cultivation to grass or trees those lands not suitable for tilled crops.

Actually, we may, in this way, be coming to the best opportunity we will ever have in our lifetime to get land out of cultivation that shouldn't be in cultivation. Such a prospect would point to an even greater responsibility for conservation—a greater need in this part of the country, for instance, for more grassland-livestock agriculture, because you can't safely summer-fallow some of the steeper land.

In such event, we would need more forage crops, readjustments in our rotations, and more livestock to put our agriculture on a sounder basis. Conservation farming, on the basis of following the complete conservation farm plans used by farmers and ranchers in their soil-conservation districts, almost invariably calls for diversification of crops, often including more land in grass and trees. In this way—and this is most important—the economic stability of the farm operation is improved, and the farmer is in a better position to operate successfully in a period of hazardous markets. I was interested in an introductory statement appearing in a new Department of Agriculture bulleting which came over my desk a couple of weeks ago.¹ It said, in part.

"Wherever it is feasible to substitute forage crops on acres now producing corn, cotton, or wheat and to utilize them profitably through livestock, opportunities exist for combating the threat of surplus production of these crops. Adjustments of this type also work toward improving the national diet, conserving soil resources, and lending greater stability to farm incomes."

SOME BENEFITS OF CONSERVATION FARMING

Our observation of conservation farmers' experience over the years confirms this economy of soil conservation, and its numerous other advantages. We know, to illustrate, that the same amount of seed, fertilizer, machinery, and management will produce a better return from the most productive land (capability classes I and II) than from less productive land (such as capability classes III and IV). Soil conservation treatment similarly saves seed and fertilizer in treatment of wet lands, irrigated lands, and range land, and does away with the costly need for replanting. Our investigations have shown, moreover, that conservation farming utilizes

the soil as a storage reservoir for water, thereby providing the moisture or at least part of the moisture needed by growing crops during dry seasons; and this is reflected in enriched soil and improved crops. In cases of prolonged drought, this water conserved often will mean the difference between successful production and crop failure.

Our studies of farmers' actual operations have shown, also, right here in Kansas, that less tractor fuel is required to operate farm equipment on the contour than uphill and downhill; and contour farming causes less strain and wear on equipment than plowing up and down the slope. In irrigated areas, soil conservation methods mean reduced erosion and better and less expensive use of available water. In wet fields, conservation methods remove excess water by drainage, help to maintain a desirable soil structure, minimize unfavorable soil baking, and permit favorable soil aeration. All of these things tend to emphasize the fact that soil conservation as we practice it here in this country is important during a period of declining markets and hazardous prices as well as during one of expanding markets and rising prices.

It is fortunate that we have advanced so far in developing sound soil and water conservation methods and techniques and in setting up the facilities through which to put them into effect. We have been moving forward in this vital task of soil and water conservation at a quickening pace, although there is, as we all realize, the need for speeding up the application of conservation on the land, and the demand from farmers and their districts for technical assistance has continued to outrun the increase in our facilities for providing such help, here in Kansas and all over the country.

SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Virtually all of the Soil Conservation Service's technical and certain other assistance, including that in flood control, is made available to farmers through their soil-conservation districts, as you know, and today I think this is the best way to get the job done effectively. These districts represent, I am convinced, the greatest land movement of all history. Today—after only 12½ years since the first district was formed in August 1937—soil-conservation districts have been organized through the democratic processes provided by State enabling acts in all 48 States, as well as in our Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These districts already include more than three-fourths of the Nation's farms, including a total of 1,200,000,000 acres.

And Kansas farmers and ranchers well may be proud of their standing in the national district column, with approximately 97 percent of the State's land now within the boundaries of its 101 soil-conservation districts. That is how close you are to joining the nine States and two insular possessions which are 100 percent covered by districts.

I want to repeat what I have said over and over—that soil-conservation-district organization, of course, is not an end within itself. A district program that exists only on paper isn't worth the paper it is written on; neither is a farm plan for soil conservation, where its provisions are not applied to the land. I feel sure that most of you are acquainted with the conservation work which has been accomplished in your Kansas districts, without my taking time to review those accomplishments. But I do want to call attention to the large amount of sound, permanently effective conservation work which already has been done in the country as a whole.

SOME SOIL-CONSERVATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Preliminary estimates available when I left Washington showed that up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil-

conservation plans had been prepared in soil-conservation districts alone. These plans were developed by farmers and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service working together out on the land. By that date, these plans covered an estimated 220,000,000 acres, and 114,000,000 acres had been treated with needed conservation measures by that time. These figures do not include other millions of acres surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has assisted. Up to the start of the current fiscal year (July 1, 1949) detailed soil-conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 304,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning had been made of another 177,000,000 acres.

GRASSES AND LEGUMES STRESSED IN CONSERVATION PROGRAM

During the past fiscal year (1949), our Service was called on to assist 154 more soil-conservation districts than during the preceding fiscal year. The conservation planning and application of practices in districts increased over that of the year before, again reflecting the continued progress of the district conservation program throughout the country. For the past several years, one of the most important agronomic activities of the Service was the harvesting, planting, and use of grasses and legumes in cooperation with the districts.

In 1948, the Service directed the harvest of approximately 3,000,000 pounds of native grass seed (mostly little and big bluestem and Indian grass), mainly in Oklahoma. These seed were largely used in flood-control and soil-conservation activities carried on cooperatively by the Service working through the independent soil-conservation districts. That was an exceptionally good year for seed production of those native grasses in that region.

In 1949, the Service was responsible for harvesting 1,851,000 pounds of native grass seed. Most or all of these grasses were domesticated by the Soil Conservation Service. Many thousands of different kinds of grasses and legumes—species, varieties, and strains, were brought from their native state into our soil conservation nurseries, where their growth habits were carefully observed for possible conservation use at some place in our American agriculture. At present, 31 of the 40 native grasses and legumes thus domesticated have a promising place. Many of them can now be bought on the market. Some 15 years ago, not one of them could be bought anywhere. Nine are in process of domestication.

In addition to this harvest of native grass seed for furthering the national soil conservation program, 198,000,000 pounds of other grasses and legume seed were harvested last year through the direct and indirect efforts of the Soil Conservation Service in working with soil conservation districts. These figures relate to seed most of which were used in soil conservation districts on farms which have been planned by the Soil Conservation Service at the request of district farmers. Altogether, enough seed were harvested in the above manner to plant 9,272,000 acres, over and above the millions of acres already seeded as the result of previous harvests.

Since these grasses and legumes are very largely essential for carrying out the best possible job of soil conservation, an adequate seed supply is a matter of major concern, now that the use of grass, legumes, and grass-legume mixtures is spreading over the country so rapidly. It is not meant by this that the seed supply is adequate, but the supply would be considerably further from adequacy but for this continuing seed-increase effort of the Service. When the Service finishes its job of helping get these important grasses and legumes introduced into trade channels, it steps out of the seed

¹ Will More Forage Pay? Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 702, p. 1.

business so that commercial seedsmen can take over.

The domesticated natives included such grasses as blue grama, sideoats grama, slender grama, big bluestem, little bluestem, western wheatgrass, switchgrass, big bluegrass, Indian rice grass, sand dropseed, and salt sacaton. Some of the more important previously domesticated and introduced grasses and legumes, which have recently been spread so widely and into so many new areas are: *Sericea lespedeza*, crested wheatgrass, smooth brome, Suiter's grass (tall fescue), wild winter pea, vetch, blue lupine, and Hubam clover.

OTHER AGRONOMIC CONSERVATION MEASURES

The increased production of grass and legume seed is being reflected in improved cropping systems. That, of course, is the measure of its worth. The need for improved rotations also has received major emphasis, with particular stress on those for ground cover at the critical time of the year to prevent erosion, improve soil structure, increase the soil supply of organic matter and nitrogen, furnish grazing for livestock, and green manure for a variety of crops. The practice of strip cropping on sandy soils subject to wind erosion is being stressed as an important part of our program, and stubble-mulch farming in adaptable areas continues to be of major importance, in many districts being accepted as an indispensable practice of soil conservation. Our observation has been, too, that the availability of improved equipment, as shown by the sale of larger numbers of subsurface tillage implements, and the interest shown by farm-equipment people is having a favorable influence in the spread of stubble-mulch tillage for erosion control.

At the same time, pasture and range development and improvement continues as a fundamental part of our soil- and water-conservation work. Not only is the relationship between soil conservation and raising livestock a natural one, but this modern, progressive kind of farming likewise promotes the development of high-quality herds. Good cattle, sheep, or hogs and good productive land go together just as naturally as scrub stock goes with poor land. The conservation farmer or rancher knows from experience that profits are increased when his abundance of economically produced feed and forage are sent to market on the backs of quality animals.

In a study the Soil Conservation Service made some time ago to find out what conservation farming does to a farmer's production, we got back some interesting and significant information as to the trend toward more grass crops and livestock. Here in Kansas, for instance, the 203 reporting farmers supplied these first-hand figures: An average increase of 15½ percent in their hay and pasture acreage after developing their conservation plans; a 28-percent increase in the number of dairy cows, an even greater increase in number of beef cattle, and also a big increase in poultry. I have been pleased to note that numerous Kansas soil-conservation districts have established seed plots in order to increase seed supplies of needed grasses and legumes. Also, that State Conservationist Fred Sykes reported last summer, after a trip to several of your branch experiment stations with Dean Throckmorton, that plans were developed to make adaptation and observational grass planting at these stations.

HOW CONSERVATION FARMING PAYS

Other studies, with uncounted individual reports from farmers and ranchers, confirm the fact that this kind of soil- and water-conservation farming pays good dividends—to the land owner or operator, to business and his community in general, and to government. The Soil Conservation Service, to

illustrate, took a sample inventory to show 1945 income from conservation-treated farms as compared to that from similar farms on which much less conservation work had been done. Reports were included from 1,872 representative farmers and ranchers, including a number of Kansas farmers. The over-all per acre increased income from soil conservation was \$4.90.

It is estimated, moreover, that in 1948 (the only year for which we have the figures) the Federal Government got back the entire amount spent by the Soil Conservation Service and made a 77-percent profit besides in increased income taxes paid on increased returns as a result of farmers' applying effective soil-conservation measures to their lands. This estimate was based on reports from district farmers all over the country. The gain included increased revenue received by retailers, processors, and distributors who profited directly from handling the farm products involved.

A great many public benefits are coming from conservation farming, as, for example, lessened flood damages and reduced siltation of reservoirs, streams, and harbors. Thus in our normal conservation work, as previously stated, the objective is to keep our agricultural land permanently productive while in use.

In our flood control operations, more emphasis is put on the task of slowing down runoff. For both purposes, we terrace sloping land, plow it on the contour, strip crop it, control gullies, take steep, highly erodible land out of cultivation and put it under the protection of grass or trees, and so on. Protection of farm water outlets with grass, protection of grain land with stubble-mulch farming, and building up the fertility of the soil likewise aid both flood control and soil conservation operations. In watershed flood control work, of course, we go considerably further with special measures.

WE MUST KEEP AT THE JOB

So it is that we are going about the vital task of safeguarding our remaining soil heritage. We have been moving forward in this task at a quickening pace, and there is no good reason at all why we cannot continue to do so, depending on the availability of technical and other manpower, machinery, and materials—and also good and persistent co-operation from every person and organization capable of doing anything worth while in aid of the program. I can't say this too often.

But we must keep steadily at the job of taking the best possible care of the land. There is no time or place for lagging or postponing. It is my hope and expectation now, after a lifetime of effort in this direction, that our leaders will see to it that the program of soil conservation which is moving ahead with a remarkable degree of effectiveness, as a sound investment, and with greater speed than the public seems to be aware of, is safeguarded and continued. The attention given to this important matter by leading agricultural groups like your own gives me great encouragement in this hope.

Progress in Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, distin-

guished lecture series, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., March 7, 1950:

PROGRESS IN SOIL CONSERVATION

(By H. H. Bennett)

THE PROBLEM

A prosperous and lasting agriculture depends on an adequate supply of productive land properly used and so protected from erosion that it will remain permanently productive. Without such a lasting agriculture, there can be no assurance of permanent prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere on our earth.

As long as people have enough productive land they can continue producing their food and fiber, and many of the raw materials of industry. If, on the other hand, the land is neglected or unwisely used, it will be wasted or severely damaged by erosion, and the certain consequences will be poverty, hunger, and national decline. That has been the tragic result in many of the world's older agricultural areas.

For these and other reasons lasting soil conservation is mandatory everywhere. It is mandatory here in America, if our Nation—our civilization—is to avoid tragic decline, economically, socially, nutritionally.

LAND SUPPLY

We now have left in the United States approximately 480,000,000 acres of good land, counting all that is in cultivation and all that can be brought into cultivation by irrigation, drainage, and other feasible means.

In recent years we have been using for crop production and rotational pasture around three hundred fifty to four hundred million acres annually. Something over 70,000,000 acres of this farmed area is unfavorable for use as cropland and should be diverted to grass or trees.

And all but about 100,000,000 acres of the 480,000,000 acres of good land is susceptible to severe damage by erosion, waterlogging, and floods. Such hazards can be overcome only through modern soil conservation and flood-control operations. This means that the soil conservation work must be scientifically fitted to the land according to kind and need and the flood control done all the way from the crests of enclosing divides on down to the main channels of the watershed drainage systems.

SOLUTION OF THE LAND PROBLEM

Solution of the land problem calls for the use of every acre of every farm and ranch throughout the Nation according to the kind of land and the needs of the land. This is a physical requirement that cannot be avoided. And there is no need to avoid it, since there are always safe uses to which land can be put in order to keep production within the limits of market requirements.

This may sound simple, but carrying it out is not everywhere a simple matter by any means. It means, among many other things, that some of the acres devoted to cultivated crops should be permanently turned to grass or trees and that other acres will sometimes need to be planted, at least temporarily, to a protective cover of grass. It means also that all land, whether used for crops, grazing, timber, or wildlife, must be adequately and permanently protected.

Unfortunately many millions of acres are not being used wisely in this country—and in most other countries. They are not being used according to natural capability and are not being protected with essential conservation measures. As a consequence many millions of acres here and elsewhere are eroding or are being damaged by waterlogging, accumulation of alkali, and in other ways. In some parts of the world land is still being permitted to decline in productivity or to be ruined for further cultivation faster than it is being safeguarded with conservation

measures. This is true in most countries; it is tragically true in a great many countries. Unfortunately it is true also here in the United States, although in our soil conservation work we are ahead of other countries having physical characteristics similar to ours.

The margin between land deterioration and land conservation has been narrowed within recent years here in the United States. We are making real progress with our national program of soil conservation, although we are not yet going fast enough. Still we have reached the point where our goal of a permanent agriculture is almost in sight. By increasing our present conservation operations on the land, we can—and should—control erosion and related processes of land impairment within 20 to 30 years, that is, if we all work together helpfully and with confidence in one another, and are provided with the facilities. We now know pretty well what the problem is, where it is, and how to solve it. We have made a splendid start toward solving it. All we need now is the decision to go ahead fast enough to do the job on a scientifically applied, permanent basis before it is too late—before we have wasted too much land. Really we should not waste so much as one single acre more. However, we still are wasting land, even though we have learned that it is easier and cheaper to conserve soil and water than it is to use those wasteful methods that impoverish land and waste rainfall as so much runoff to the sea.

The tragic fact must not be overlooked that still we are losing around 500,000 acres of land each year as the result of needless erosion and waterlogging, with a still larger area damaged in lesser degree.

MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION

Modern soil conservation is not directed merely toward maintenance of the status quo. It is dynamic and progressive. It leads to increased and lasting productivity of the land and thereby promotes the common welfare wherever it is practiced. All regions of the world probably can be improved and some currently poverty-stricken areas may be advanced to a state of relative prosperity by safeguarding and increasing the productivity of agricultural land through soil and water conservation.

Modern soil conservation does much more than safeguard land. It directly or indirectly results in a wide variety of fundamental benefits. It both increases the yields per acre and lowers the cost of production on most farms, and this, in turn, starts a whole chain of benefits, such as increased farmer income; increased taxes for support of local, State, and Federal Governments; increased trade for both rural and urban communities; and increased employment for professional, skilled, and unskilled workers.

It results in large savings, such as reduced siltation of streams, ditches, harbors, and costly reservoirs; lessened damage to fills, cuts, and culverts of highways and railroads; diminished damage to oyster beds and breeding and freedding grounds of fish, crabs, and other valuable aquatic life, and reduced flood crests on both major and minor streams, thereby lessening destruction of or damage to farm and city property, livestock, highways, railroads, manufacturing plants, and other property.

It helps to alleviate drought damage to crops, pastures, and meadows. It encourages a more flexible and diversified type of agriculture with a sound physical basis for making annual adjustments in the amounts and kinds of production needed to stabilize the national and world economies. It helps create a greater pride and satisfaction in farming, along with the greater material returns. It encourages the sons and daughters of farmers to stay on the farm, and become partners with their parents in the farming business. And last, but not least, it appar-

ently helps to improve the health of all the people.

Some indication of what soil conservation means to those who practice it in this country is indicated in a recent letter from a Texas farmer who said, in part:

ABILENE, TEX., December 19, 1947.

DEAR DR. BENNETT: As there is a lot of talk . . . about the benefits of soil conservation . . . I would like to say a few words in behalf of soil conservation.

. . . I was born and raised on a farm in the Ozark hills in northeast Arkansas. . . . I moved with my parents to Red River County, Tex. . . . in the fall of 1919 and farmed with them until I married in the fall of the next year and rented a farm close by . . .

We . . . started out with very little money, but lots of determination. Bought our housekeeping outfit and farming tools . . . on credit and my father let me have a pair of mules to work . . . That fall I went to the bank and borrowed money to buy the mules.

I was renting the farm . . . and continued to rent . . . for 8 years.

We then decided to try our luck further west, so I rented a farm near Stith . . . Jones County, Tex. . . . Made three crops on this farm, then moved across the road on another farm and made four crops, then moved to a farm 1 mile west of Abilene in Taylor County and lived there 3 years, at which time we were approved by the Farm Security Administration to buy a farm.

We . . . located a farm of 160 acres . . . that we could buy for the amount of money that was allowed by the FSA . . . the total of our loan was \$7,678.

So in the spring of 1939 we began farming as landowners. And now comes the part of my story that I am most interested in. My family at this time consisted of one daughter and two sons, the daughter being 17 and the boys 11 and 9 years. The daughter is married . . . and the boys are both in college . . .

. . . I am a natural-born farmer, as you can see, although I have worked a little at other jobs at different times, such as mining, cotton ginning, barbering, teaching school, and so forth.

The first thing I did after we moved on our farm was to begin a soil conservation program.

I had always advocated soil conservation and practiced it as much as my landlords would let me, so when I moved to my own place I began to put into practice what I had been talking. I went to the SCS office and got the boys to run me a set of terrace lines and had the terraces built by the county machinery, paying for them myself.

The SCS boys worked out a complete plan for my farm, located tank (pond) site, helped plant clovers, vetch, peas, and so forth.

This was one of the first farms to be put under a soil conservation plan in the Button Willow watershed and there are now 37 of the 41 farms in the watershed that are carrying out soil-conservation programs.

. . . Until recently I have been a supervisor of the Middle Clear Fork Soil Conservation District. . . .

When we bought this place we had 40 years in which to repay the FSA loan, but we paid it out the seventh year, and this was made possible through the soil-conservation plan that has been carried out on the place.

As proof of the above statement, this year I made 18 bushels of wheat to the acre without the aid of fertilizer and one of my neighbors just across the fence made 9 bushels and another on the other side used fertilizer and made 11 bushels.

Now you may be wondering just how much time and expense the Government has been out on my farm. Well . . . the SCS boys have spent around 8 days' work on my

place, first and last. Now at \$10 per day that would be \$80 expense to the Government.

Back to the statement about my wheat, the county average this year was 8 bushels, but I think the county average over a 10-year period is 12 bushels. So you see my place is making one-third more than the average.

Did I hear you say have I paid the Government anything in return for the \$80? Well, to be exact, I just paid a little over \$600 income tax year before last, over \$500 last year. . . .

Since paying for my place I bought 200 acres more land adjoining it last fall, and have just completed 6 miles of terraces this fall on it. My plan calls for reseeding part of it back to native grasses with a complete pasture program, such as mesquite and prickly pear eradication and water control.

I am a believer in diversified farming and have always kept a small dairy herd, a few brood sows, and raised plenty of feed for them.

So my advice, as a farmer to a farmer, is get your soil- and water-conservation program started now and watch your income increase.

Yours truly,

W. O. DAWSON

COMPLEXITY OF THE SOIL-CONSERVATION JOB

If there is any activity of mankind that requires the most scrupulous use of all that land science and hydraulics can provide, it is the work of keeping our land permanently productive and making the best use of our water supply.

There are in the neighborhood of a hundred soil and water conservation measures now being used in the program of the Soil Conservation Service to halt erosion, conserve rainfall, and improve the land. These measures include terracing, contouring, strip cropping, cover cropping, crop rotation, stubble mulching, range and pasture improvement, wood-land improvement, gully planting, establishing grassed waterways, constructing farm ponds, adjusting land use, using organic and mineral fertilizers and lime according to need, drainage, irrigation, and so on. Each measure is used, as the situation demands, to meet a definite land need or to produce a specifically desired result. Usually, combinations of several measures are essential, used wherever necessary in mutual support of one another to obtain the most effective conservation.

A hundred years of farming experience in this country has definitely proved that no single practice, applied arbitrarily on a whole field or farm, will control erosion and maintain soil productivity permanently, except perhaps the planting of an entire area to grass or trees.

Single-practice soil-conservation programs have never been successful on cultivated land in terms of real and lasting conservation. They can't be successful in the great majority of cases because a single conservation practice is almost always inadequate to cope with the diverse and complicated requirements for sound land use and protection, imposed by nature. Some single practices, such as contouring, rotation, stubble mulching, or manuring may bring some temporary benefits to entire fields or farms, but they can't get the job done on anything approximating a permanent basis, except on the relatively small areas of the very best quality land (land of capability class I).

It is not the passing benefits of a single season or a few years that means success in the battle any country must wage to keep its good land productive and to make the best use of its less productive land—of all its agricultural land. It is the long range—the lasting—benefits that will be reaped by all the people of a country, their children, and their children's children, that really count. A permanently productive agriculture is the

goal; not just temporary gains in crop production or income.

The record of experience proves that most farmers are no more prepared to solve their difficult problems of erosion and water control alone than they are prepared to solve all their legal and medical problems. There probably is no more reason to assume that all farmers can witness a demonstration of complex soil and water conservation work and thereby equip themselves to do similar effective work than there is to assume that they can equip themselves to practice successful surgery by witnessing a surgical operation.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NECESSARY

Practically all farmers need specialized, experienced scientific assistance on the ground to solve their land and water problems. Without such assistance, they cannot successfully bring their agriculture to full fruition.

Effective and lasting soil conservation work demands the utmost in technical excellence. A trained, experienced soil conservationist prescribes for the land just as an experienced physician prescribes for his patients. In a sense, Soil Conservation Service technicians are land doctors. These men have learned that halfway measures and improperly selected practices will not get the job done and that such measures often do more harm than good over a period of years.

Each conservation measure is specifically designed to fit the land on which it is used. Furthermore, each measure is designed to support another one, or several measures, wherever support is needed, whether in the same field or an adjoining field, above or below; also, conservation work on one farm is planned and carried out with an eye to the needs of the next farm and to farms downstream. This viewpoint is essential, for the process of erosion has no respect for boundary lines. Gullies don't stop at fence lines, farm lines, or even county or State lines; neither do dust storms, nor floods. And the costly process of sedimentation never concerns itself with the interests of water users dependent on an unprotected reservoir.

To hope that anything less than a scientifically planned and properly executed conservation program for each field, each farm, and each watershed will give the needed permanent protection to the land is to hope for the impossible; and, what is more important, any acceptance of the idea that there can be a shorter and easier way of doing the job is dangerous. Not only will it delay getting this most necessary agricultural work done, but it may confuse those who have already attended to the needs of their land.

For example, it is frequently necessary to build graded terraces on sloping cultivated fields in humid areas, in order to carry excess rainfall safely off the land. The terraces must always be built with sufficient channel capacity and with the proper gradient (slope toward the side of a field) to handle the estimated volume of runoff at a rate of flow that will not produce scouring of the channelway. Moreover, the terraces must be spaced at proper intervals and at the best locations in a field to take care of all the runoff water. They require protected outlets; otherwise erosion is likely to begin at the outlets and cut gullies up the terrace channels far back into the fields. And even after the water has been moved safely off a field by means of such a terrace, or diversion system, a stabilized place must be provided for its final, safe disposal. This, again, calls for a complete survey and adequate technical engineering and agronomic planning to properly locate and construct the terrace outlet waterway.

Improperly built and inadequately maintained terraces, as well as terraces that are built on slopes that are too steep, usually do more damage to the land than no terraces

at all. If a terrace ridge is too narrow or too low, or if the channel is inadequate to take care of the runoff from intensive rains, costly and ruinous erosion will surely follow. The terraces will break or overtop and damage the land below as well as the land on which the terraces are constructed. The rate of land damage, also, is usually increased rather than reduced when drainage systems, strip cropping, and various other practices are improperly applied.

For a farmer to be able properly to solve all these problems having to do with but a few of a hundred major soil conservation practices, it will be necessary for him to have a high degree of proficiency in engineering, hydraulics, agronomy, and land science. Few farmers have such training. Most farmers are not engineers, or hydrologists, or agronomists, or soil scientists, or foresters. They are farmers; and being a farmer is a full-time job in itself. So when it comes to dealing with a difficult erosion problem—and most erosion problems are difficult—most farmers need the help of guidance of a trained soil conservationist in order to arrive at the correct solution and get the best returns from their conservation efforts.

Whether the actual conservation operations are carried out by farmers or by contractors, there is no substitute for accurate knowledge of the land and its needs. Ill-advised or half-way conservation measures can lead only to unnecessary expense and waste of soil and water, such as can no longer be afforded in this or any other country.

We have learned these underlying principles of soil conservation through experience; there's no guessing about it. The Soil Conservation Service started out on a demonstration basis; but we changed as quickly as possible to our present method of furnishing technical assistance to each farmer, on site. We made this change because it became evident that demonstrations, even though highly useful for preliminary educational work, would not get permanent conservation on the land quick enough.

QUALITY OF SOIL-CONSERVATION WORK

There is no substitute for quality and completeness in the protection, development, improvement, and proper use of our land and water resources. Each acre of land must be used according to its individual capabilities and treated according to its needs; because each acre of land, like each human being, is different from any other acre. To get the best from it, it must be handled in just the right way. Likewise, each watershed, whether large or small, must be used and treated according to its specific physical peculiarities. If we are to properly conserve, develop, and use the water and land resources of that particular watershed—any watershed.

If there were some simple remedy for our land and water problems that could be applied everywhere, according to a standardized treatment or formula, the job would be relatively easy. But there are as many variations in soil- and water-conservation problems as there are in the landscape, the climate, and the types of agriculture that farmers choose to practice. There is no cure-all, no short to the solution of these problems. Nothing less will suffice than a painstaking study of each acre, each field, and each watershed, and the appropriate application of all needed conservation measures that the study indicates as necessary to get the job done right. To ignore these facts is to invite further damage to the land, as well as to waste time, opportunity, and money.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GETTING THE CONSERVATION JOB DONE IN TIME

What are the steps which hold the greatest promise for bringing about permanent conservation, as well as safe and orderly management of the farm lands of a country? Can these objectives be achieved without

serious disruption of the economy of a people?

The answer to the last question is "Yes." As to the steps which give the greatest promise of success in protecting and developing our farm lands, there are several. No single one of them, however, seems adequate by itself to bring about the desired results, in time, on most land. It is the appropriate combination of essential steps which provides the greatest assurance of accomplishing the end we want.

Among the more important things that should be done at the earliest possible time in this country are the following:

1. Set up a timetable for the establishment of those basic measures needed for the conservation of our soil and water resources, according to capability of the land and availability and need of the water.
2. Adjust research in conservation to specific problems encountered in field work and intensify research on these pressing problems.
3. Encourage and promote a comprehensive program of conservation education through all available educational agencies and institutions.
4. Complete land-capability surveys of the country and analyze the information to provide land facts needed for future farm planning and action, and for other programs, such as a sound basis for farm credit, farmland assessments, etc.
5. Encourage continued organization of soil-conservation districts, in order to develop conservation programs with local leadership and direction.
6. Improve the conservation credit structure.

Progress in Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H H Bennett, United States Soil Conservation Service, distinguished lecture series, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., March 7, 1950:

PROGRESS IN SOIL CONSERVATION

(By H. H. Bennett)

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

From every conceivable angle of consideration—economic, social, cultural, public health, national defense—conservation of natural resources is an objective on which all should agree. It is also a need which all should recognize. The public—our society as a whole—has a vital stake and, therefore, an enduring responsibility in these resources. Exercise of the public responsibility in the sustenance of agricultural land is of such obvious importance to the general welfare of all people, it would seem that an adequate program of soil conservation and prudent use of water would always be the first order of business in all nations.

With the understanding that can be developed through education, there should be little or no opposition to sound conservation action, persistently carried out. There are likely to be, spottedly, misconceptions, unwise proposals for alleged short-cuts and panaceas, and occasional bickering arising out of ignorance and the common error of

taking things for granted. These deterrents represent a type of human behavior that probably can be dealt with most effectively through the educational process.

Public interest in making the wisest possible use of all of a nation's natural resources is, in a sense, of greater importance than the individual's interest, but both are tied together in such a completely complementary way, there is no point in pursuing the subject beyond indicating that no man should have the right, legally or otherwise, to wrecklessly destroy or unnecessarily waste any resource on which public welfare is dependent. Willful destruction of those resources essential to life amounts, in the end, to a form of inflicting fatal privation.

Productive land occupies a position of such basic importance to everybody that some individuals have come to favor public control in the use and management of land. They contend that because of man's utter dependence on the limited supply of land, the question of how land is to be used should not be left entirely to individual discretion.

Our American experience, however, seemingly has developed a majority feeling to the effect that our soil-conservation efforts should proceed along lines of cooperative action, without the use of compulsion at any point, at least until there has been time for adequate education and action. The present national program of soil conservation, under which the Government supplies, on request, technical assistance and certain materials to soil-conservation districts, has become highly effective and very popular. Excellent progress has been made without public use of anything stronger than persuasion and cooperation. There have been, however, many instances where farmers have not brought themselves immediately into active cooperation in this conservation program. Delays have resulted from such action on the part of farmers, and, in turn, these have caused difficulties and hardships for their neighbors, but such situations have usually cleared up through the educational process.

Under State laws many of the soil-conservation districts have been given legal authority to impose land-use regulations through the process of local referenda, but the authority has rarely been exercised. At this time it appears to be the feeling of the great majority of soil conservation district supervisors that many of the farmers who move slowly at first later on become the most enthusiastic and effective kind of conservationists. Accordingly, they see no need to propose the use of compulsion. Moreover, they have been impressed by the fact that nearly everywhere farmers are requesting technical help for the establishment of soil-conservation practices on their land faster than such assistance can be provided.

While there is universal recognition of the need for increased speed in soil conservation, it appears to be generally believed this can be obtained without resort to any form of regulation.

Too long a delay in getting soil conservation on the land, however, could bring about public demand for increased speed through the use of some measure of land-use regulation. It is not difficult to understand how the refusal of a farmer to protect his own land from erosion can do serious damage to an adjoining farm, as where, for example, uncontrolled gullies pouring out infertile sand, gravel, or subsoil clay, spread these materials over lower fields which have been given all the protection the neighboring farmer can provide through his own endeavors.

It would seem that some means of protection is justified on the part of the farmer whose lands are being damaged in any such manner. If, however, the farmer owning the gullies feels that he is unable to control them because of financial circumstances, or

because of lack of manpower or knowledge, it might be advantageous to both parties if some satisfactory arrangement could be worked out to get the job done cooperatively. On the other hand, different circumstances might call for public action of some kind, particularly where there is evidence of willful carelessness on the part of the farmer who refuses to do anything to protect his neighbor's land by protecting his own.

One serious difficulty in such instances is that it is not always easy to determine whether or not failure to act arises out of willfulness, lack of concern, lack of education, natural tendency to move slowly, or what. In a good many instances, where obstinacy seemed to be the principal difficulty farmers have been persuaded to take corrective action or have somehow come to understand, through their own observations or matured consideration, the error or injustice of their actions, with the consequence that they have gone vigorously about the job of remedying the situation.

From the standpoint of the Government's obligation to help farmers with their erosion problems, there seems to be general agreement. A few people, however, try to make the point that the Government should not concern itself with helping a farmer protect and improve his farm land any more than it should pay part of the cost of operating a privately owned and normally run manufacturing plant.

The exceedingly important difference such objectors fail to see is that the Government's interest in the continuing productivity of the land is never-ending. Government dies if the land is ruined for further production. In other words, land is the individual's property for the moment and the Nation's most priceless and indispensable resource for all time. There is much difference here, but the interests of both should be protected.

Over and above these considerations, productive land is the principal source, directly and indirectly, of the income required for the support of most nations.

A CONSERVATION TIMETABLE

Inasmuch as the time factor is so important in reckoning the rate and amount of land damage, it would seem, as already indicated, highly advantageous to establish a timetable for conservation operations, so that the necessary conservation progress from year to year could be clearly set forth, and adequately provided for. And, in all probability, a definite goal would prove advantageous from the standpoint of emphasizing the point that the quicker the job is done, the easier it will be and the lower its cost.

Enough is now known about the size of the job, as well as the speed required to complete it, to establish such a timetable. Furthermore, by looking at the whole soil-conservation and land-use job remaining ahead, it should be possible to determine much more clearly just how much of it should be done, and how much of it can be done, in any one year or any given number of years. There would seem to be reason for serious consideration now of an advance schedule, covering the years ahead, which would lead to the permanent protection of our productive land before it suffers irreparable damage on a very large scale. Such an advance schedule, if it could be agreed on, would provide for much more economic conduct of the necessary conservation job.

As pointed out, most farmers need trained technical aid in installing water-disposal systems and other conservation measures that are exacting to build or apply. Today the technicians available for this work are being taxed to the utmost. The widespread and growing recognition of the hazard of erosion and other forms of land depreciation, and of the advantages of conservation, has sharply increased the demands of farm-

ers for this kind of technical service. Even now, there are not enough technicians to meet current demands.

With about 115,000,000 acres of cropland being damaged at a critically rapid rate, and approximately 120,000,000 acres of additional cropland being damaged at a serious rate, there is clearly no time to waste on postponement. Within the next 20 to 25 years, this area will have lost an important share of its capacity to produce, unless it is protected in time. Such loss is more than the Nation can afford, and it is unnecessary. We now have good reason to feel that the necessary basic conservation measures could be applied to the land within 10 to 25 years.

At the current rate of soil-conservation treatment, however, some 40 years would be required to make the necessary shifts in land use and apply the needed conservation measures on the farms still untreated. In short, the present technical resources available are inadequate for the size of the job ahead, even though the Soil Conservation Service, during the past 17 years, has gathered together a technical staff of thousands of trained and experienced soil conservationists. It has taken years of training and experience, actually doing conservation work out on the land, to build up this technical staff. It is the largest and most experienced group of conservation technicians ever brought together. Yet, this group is not large enough. It should be increased, and it will take time to train properly a sufficient number of additional technicians to satisfy the current demands of farmers in soil-conservation districts; and it will take still more time to train and increase this staff if we are to speed up the rate of conservation work so as to get the job done in the next 20 to 25 years.

ADVANTAGES OF DEVELOPING SUBMARGINAL LANDS

Tracts of eroding or naturally poor land are often a physical hazard to adjoining areas of good land or a barrier to their economic development. Although the size of individual parcels of such submarginal lands may not be large, the damaging effects of such tracts often extend to much larger total areas of interspersed good land. These submarginal lands are one of the chief obstacles to widespread conservation in many localities. There are almost always other reasons, of course; but often the submarginal lands are the key to the situation. When such submarginal lands become a festering point in an otherwise sound farming community, and if there is no apparent chance of solving the problem while the lands remain in private ownership, then it would seem appropriate to seek another remedy.

When desirable in the public interest, the Government could very well afford to purchase and improve (1) such areas as would be permanently lost for agricultural production if retained in private ownership or (2) such areas as would constitute a permanent erosion hazard to adjoining productive land if left in private ownership. Once such lands have been protected, and developed in accordance with their capability for safe use (almost invariably this is a limited use, because of the highly vulnerable nature of these lands), they should be kept in Government ownership and management in such a way as to provide the greatest possible benefit and use to neighboring private landowners and to the community—until necessary and satisfactory arrangements can be worked out for safe return through sale, under restricted use, to those who can show evidence that they will efficiently manage and maintain such improved lands.

In the course of making essential shifts in land use in accordance with the capabilities of the many different parcels of land, it sometimes becomes desirable to enlarge the size of farms in order that they can be operated efficiently and profitably. In other

words, farms may simply be too small to provide their owners with an adequate income. Such situations often lead to exploitative farming. Under these circumstances, it would seem to be in the public interest to purchase nearby tracts of submarginal agricultural land, particularly areas of excessively eroding land, for protection, improvement, and subsequent sale to farmers in need of additional acreage. Wisely and promptly handled, such purchase, development, or improvement, and sale would not only help prevent permanent damage to the lands purchased but also to adjoining lands. This would help the owners establish economically sound units that would produce permanently under a conservation farming system.

Inasmuch as soil conservation districts are vitally concerned with the conservation and proper use of lands within their boundaries, they should be a prime factor in all activities involving the purchase, development or improvement, management, and final disposition of lands which cannot be placed under effective conservation use while in private ownership.

Each district, with whatever assistance is available, could determine what lands need to be placed in public ownership and restored or protected with public funds. However, since the districts have very limited authority or ability to raise funds, any activity involving the purchase and improvement of any significant acreage would probably have to be financed by other public agencies. The agency or agencies best able to assist the district in such activities would depend on the magnitude of the job, the pattern of purchase, the best future use of the land, and other factors. Present sources of assistance include county, State, and Federal conservation agencies having authority to buy land.

In some instances it may be advisable to purchase and improve submarginal agricultural lands in furtherance of flood control operations. In this connection it may be desirable to have flood-control legislation provide more adequate authority for the management and disposition of acquired lands. In any event, after development or satisfactory improvement, it would be desirable, in most instances, to transfer title or management authority to state or local agencies—to soil conservation districts in particular.

A good many of the submarginal areas now administered by the Soil Conservation Service are paying their way; some that were largely tax delinquent when acquired are turning considerable sums into the county and the Federal Treasuries as the result of their earned income—in some instances more than the lands ever earned.

WHY THE EROSION PROBLEM WAS NOT RECOGNIZED

How did we get into this predicament with respect to our land? Why was it allowed to happen?

There are a number of reasons for our long delay in recognizing the menace of man-induced erosion and in starting an effective program of prevention and control, but the following are probably the main ones:

1 Man began losing land to erosion when he first started farming it or began intensive grazing, but for countless generations there was always more land in the next valley or across the mountains. Land was so readily available, people came to regard it as limitless and inexhaustible; it was easy to view the situation that way. This erroneous conception persisted, especially among people of newly settled countries, as time went by, and it was probably not until North and South America were settled all the way to the Pacific coast that people began to have any doubts about the myth of land plenty.

2 The apparent abundance of good land for so many generations gave rise to a careless and prodigal attitude. There were no prevailing attitudes to cause a landowner to take care of his land or even be concerned about maintaining its productivity. New land, everybody thought, could almost always be had somewhere else.

3 Even in modern times our leaders have too often had little or no personal knowledge or understanding of the land. They have been trained in law, medicine, finance, trade, philosophy, astronomy, military science, economics, political economy, education, or some field other than agriculture, and especially that vitally important part of agriculture having to do with maintenance of the agricultural base—the productive land. With few exceptions, until recent years, they had had neither the training nor the incentive to look searchingly at the landscape around them and understand what was happening to it. The ancient and unchallenged myth of land plenty came down to them, too, across the ages and was unfortunately accepted as truth.

4 In many parts of the world too much of the land traditionally has been in the hands of inexperienced, untrained operators. During recent years, this situation has changed for some countries, fortunately for the better. However, over most of the world, land is still being used by men with little specialized or adequate training for the job. Too many land users have operated on a trial-and-error basis and have been influenced predominately by habits handed down from the past, whether good or bad. Some have placed greater faith in superstition than in science. In short, the most precious natural resource on earth in many parts of the world has habitually been in the charge of those who often have had no greater qualifications for the trusteeship than the coincidence of inheritance or of birth on the land.

5 Too few farms have produced surplus capital for the owner over a period of years. On the contrary, the farm much too often has been no better than a marginal subsistence enterprise. Even in the United States the farmer rarely has had the personal resources or training to undertake research or seek out technological improvements. He has generally been almost wholly dependent on outside help, from Government or private sources, to provide him with improvements in machinery, materials, and methods. Too often he has not even thought of including in his calculations any cost for depreciation or maintenance of his basic plant—his farm land.

6 Our agricultural scientists failed almost completely, for the most part, over bygone years, to recognize land for what it is—an important and complex resource. Too often they considered soil permanent and synonymous with land. As a result of this error, both agriculture and the land suffered. Soil is but one part of the land. For all practical purposes, land must be regarded in terms of all its component parts of soil, slope, climate, susceptibility to depreciation by erosion and other processes of deterioration. Some geologists saw very clearly what was going on, as N. S. Shaler and T. C. Chamberlain, but no one drove ahead to get necessary funds and legislation for research or control.

Many of the early scientists largely ignored erosion, paid too little attention to slope, called the weather inevitable, and allowed the problem to go untouched. Only a few recognized the difference between the tediously slow process of geological erosion and the exceedingly rapid process of man-accelerated erosion following the removal of nature's stabilizing cover of vegetation and the plowing of the land.

In the main, agricultural science was not greatly concerned about what changes were

taking place on the land. It was primarily interested in the process of soil formation, in soil classification, and in the mapping of soil types; in the chemical and physical composition of soils; the health and breeding of livestock, improvements in strains of crops; and in modernization of machinery and equipment. All of this was important and beneficial, but it did lead to serious neglect of the capital stock of agriculture and the source of agricultural production—the land itself.

7 In agriculture as in other enterprises, we often have waited until we were sick before calling the doctor. We did not practice preventive medicine, and now we must try to cure a malady—erosion—that has gotten into our system and weakened the land and ourselves.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

It is my conviction that the farmer-voted and farmer-managed soil conservation districts, through which the Soil Conservation Service makes available virtually all of its technical and certain other assistance to landowners and operators, represent the greatest land movement of all time. It is through these democratic units of State government that the soil and water conservation job on the farm lands of the Nation is being done in an effective and lasting manner—as never before achieved anywhere.

The districts are in an ideal position for the landowners and operators to work together and take advantage of counsel and assistance of one another, as well as of other local State, Federal, and private sources.

Back at the time when the districts were getting under way, I never would have believed that in the short space of a dozen years—starting in 1937—every one of the 48 States, as well as our Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, would have enacted these district laws, so promptly taken advantage of by the landholders. More than three-fourths of the Nation's farms are now within the boundaries of the nearly 2,200 soil-conservation districts already established, by what usually has been the overwhelmingly favorable vote of the landowners themselves. The districts now cover nearly 1,200,000,000 acres, including more than three-fourths of the Nation's farm land. Nine States are completely covered by districts and many others nearly covered. Up to July 1, 1949 (the beginning of the present fiscal year), farmers and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service, working together out on the agricultural lands of the country, in soil-conservation districts alone, had prepared cooperatively some 800,000 complete soil conservation farm plans. These plans covered by that date over 200,000,000 acres, of which more than 100,000,000 acres had been treated with conservation measures in whatever combinations were required to give adequate protection to the land.

GROUP ACTION

Not only are farmers in soil-conservation districts becoming more neighborly and helpful to one another in conservation work, but groups of farmers, living in more or less compact neighborhoods within districts are contributing in a most encouraging manner toward speeding up conservation work by planning together and working together, loaning one another machinery and seed, and cooperating in other ways. These groups are normally bound together by ties of neighborliness and common interests. The groups usually range from 4 or 5 to 15 or 20 families, sometimes more.

The Soil Conservation Service is now working with some thirty thousand of these natural groups. An increasing number of governing bodies of soil-conservation districts are finding that it is comparatively easy to

organize and determine the membership of these groups and seek out their leaders, and to interest them in conservation. In a great many instances these groups, under these leaders, are coming together in planning and application meetings. They are helping the district supervisors and their own neighbors in routing equipment, distributing seed, and meeting seasonal farm needs. It has long been known that people like to work together. Many people work in groups far more effectively than as individuals. There is a certain stimulus to morale in the act of working with friends and neighbors for a common beneficial purpose.

Recently the leader of a typical neighbor group in Texas said, "We like this group way of doing things. One helps another and is helped in return. One learns what another is doing and wants to do likewise. . . . we save in transporting seeds for the whole group. . . . hauling fertilizer. Naturally it speeds up the application. . . . since working together we become more interested. . . . it makes for better group spirit."

Group action is a perfectly natural instrument for getting soil conservation accomplished. It brings out the initiative of the people themselves and makes highest use of their natural desire to help one another solve common problems. Group leaders are more and more becoming right-hand men to district supervisors, not necessarily by official designation but by their unselfish work in assisting the district to reach people more rapidly and more effectively.

The Leadership of Marriner S. Eccles of the Federal Reserve System, 1935-51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting a review by Dr. Walter E. Spahr covering the essentials of Marriner S. Eccles, the Reserve Board, the Treasury policies since 1934. It presents some of the fundamental contentions in New Dealism, and provides some factual evidence to refute these contentions:

THE LEADERSHIP OF MARRINER S. ECCLES OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, 1935-51

(By Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University; executive vice president, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

Marriner S. Eccles' book, *Beckoning Frontiers: Public and Personal Recollections* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, April 1951), pages xii, 449, viii, edited by Sidney Hyman of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation, provides an account of the Eccles family and fortunes and of his life in Washington as a Treasury official in 1934 and as a Governor and Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 1935-51. It describes the economic and political theories developed by him, particularly during the years of the economic recession and depression, 1929-33, and his efforts to make his theories effective in Washington. It outlines his efforts to reconstruct the Federal Reserve System in accordance with his theories, which involved making the System an integral part of New Dealism and of Presidential policies until Eccles lost influence

with the President, and his contentions thereafter as to the desirability of establishing the independence of the Federal Reserve System. It provides an account of some of his other activities in Washington up to the time of the severance of his connection with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in June 1951.

SIGNIFICANT THEORIES ADVOCATED BY ECCLES

The book reveals that Eccles embraced (1) the theory (held until the latter part of his official life in Washington) that the Federal Reserve System should become an integral part of the policies and a tool of the executive branch of the United States Government; (2) the under-consumption theory of the business recession of 1929-33, if not of business recessions in general, his contention being that there was too much saving and not enough spending; (3) the theory of a compensatory economy, that is, Government action to offset wide fluctuations in business activity; (4) the stagnation theory—the notion that, since our geographic frontier had disappeared, economic stagnation confronted us unless radical and revolutionary policies such as he urged, which in the main characterized the New Deal, were pursued; (5) the contention that the Federal Government should become much more potent as against State and local governments and private enterprise in the management of the people's affairs; (6) the contention that "the" problem is more one of distribution of income than of production; (7) the notion that trouble arises unless all current income is spent; (8) the contention that the only way out of the economic recession and depression following 1929 was by a program of adequate Government spending; (9) the idea that a new kind of thinking and a new kind of prophet were called for—those that embrace what he calls "logical radicalism"; (10) the contention that there should be a redistribution of purchasing power and a better allocation of income between investment and other expenditures; and (11) the notion that economic principles change over relatively short periods of time.

Considering the fact that, for most of his years in Washington, Mr. Eccles was Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and tended to be the dominant influence in directing its policies, probably the most significant feature of his theories, policies, and leadership is in his efforts to make the Federal Reserve System an instrumentality of the Executive rather than an independent agency dedicated to the purposes, appropriate to a properly constructed central banking system, and to those provisions in the Federal Reserve Act of that nature.

THE ECCLES THEORY THAT THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM SHOULD BECOME AN INTEGRAL PART OF EXECUTIVE POLICIES

That portion of his book which deals with his activities from the time he entered the United States Treasury in February 1934 until Vinson and Snyder became, successively, Secretaries of the Treasury, and, as compared with Eccles, obtained the ear of the President, reveals his efforts to make the Federal Reserve System an integral part of New Deal and Executive policies. The latter part of the book, which deals chiefly with events during the administration of President Truman and particularly those of Vinson and Snyder as Secretaries of the Treasury—roughly during the years 1946 to 1951 (p. 421)—shows a marked reversal in basic contentions on the question of the importance of maintaining the independence of the Federal Reserve System. This reversal seems to be emphasized after Eccles learned of President Truman's failure to reappoint him Chairman of the Board. He recognizes that this reversal has been attributed by some to personal pique (p. 458), because of the President's refusal to reap-

point him as Chairman of the Board, but he places himself in the position of one who believed then that "we should . . . adjourn political considerations . . . and consider honestly and openly the economic facts of life" (p. 459).

The efforts of Eccles to make his theories effective and to convert the Federal Reserve System from an agency, designed to be an independent one in nature, to an arm of the Executive, began in the main with his testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance in February 1933 (Investigation of Economic Problems, Hearings Before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 72d Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to S. Res. 313, February 13-28, 1933, pp. 703-733), which he regarded as a sounding board for "a new kind of thinking" (p. 82). His description in his chapter Cross-Examination of that hearing deals with his general program of how best to obtain economic recovery and prosperity, and reveals relatively little in the form of specific statements as to how the Federal Reserve System was to be made an integral part of Executive policies. Nor does it reveal clearly (in the appropriate places, pp. 106-107) that in that hearing he advocated the issuance of fiat money (hearings, pp. 720-723). To the Eccles proposal to give away money to the States, Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, remarked that the suggestion "seems to me to be preposterous" (hearings, p. 716). Said Senator Gore, of Oklahoma: "It seems like every scheme you suggested was for the Government to advance money to somebody" (hearings, p. 732).

From page 730 of the hearings:

"Mr. ECCLES. I am a capitalist.

"Senator SHORTRIDGE (California). Well, I am a capitalist. But I am on the gold basis."

Says Eccles in his book (p. 104), of that hearing:

"When it came my turn to be called before the Finance Committee, I challenged all that had been said up to that point and was practically alone in doing so. . . .

"What I said was received with astonishment by those who expected all bankers to wear the old school tie, and with relief by the few members of the committee who saw that I wore a western tie."

"The urgency to overhaul the Federal Reserve System," by the Banking Act of 1935, particularly title II of that act, so that the system could aid the President in his work-relief program, is pointed out on page 187 of the book. As of December 17, 1934, Eccles indicates disapproval of Senator Glass' "persistent efforts to maintain the independence of the Federal Reserve banking system" (p. 194).

On page 258, he says: "Since the Federal Reserve System is called on to do what it can to maintain economic stability it has a vital interest in the fiscal policies pursued by the Government. On the other hand, the Treasury Department, which borrows, taxes, and spends, must be assured that the Reserve System, within the limits of its power, will create monetary and credit conditions of the sort that will help the Treasury carry out its responsibilities."

All that was a notion or theory of Mr. Eccles. The Federal Reserve Act does not provide that the system "is called on to do what it can to maintain economic stability"—and what does economic stability mean—nor does it provide that the Treasury must be assured by the Reserve System that it will, within its power, create monetary and credit conditions that will help the Treasury carry out its responsibilities.

Another example of the Eccles theory that the Federal Reserve System should be employed to foster New Dealism in the following (p. 266): "With the New Deal's great victory 1 week before (in November 1936), those of us in public office, each in his own sphere, felt we could at last write the full ticket of things we thought would best serve the needs of the country."

The repeated visits of Mr. Eccles at the White House, in connection with his efforts to foster New Dealism and to suggest programs for the Treasury and other departments of Government, reflect in part his efforts to make the Federal Reserve System an instrumentality of the Executive and a means of furthering its policies. Avoidance of the President's office and of other policy-making officials, in an effort to maintain the independence of the Reserve System of political and Executive control, was definitely not a part of the thinking or procedures of Mr. Eccles. Indeed, his efforts were to make the Board of Governors and the System a potent force in fostering the New Deal for which he seemed to regard himself as a prophet (p. 113) and a precursor of the Keynes theories (p. 132). His book indicates that he not only wished, and endeavored, to do all within his power to make effective what he calls his logical radicalism but that he worked persistently to make the Federal Reserve System an important tool with which to effect his aims. Said Eccles (p. 122): "Unlike Hamlet, I did not curse my fate that I was born to set the world aright. I had asked my questions for 3 years, reached what I thought were true answers, and, never being given to modesty, I felt that those answers could set the world aright if only men in high places listened to them."

One of the characteristics of the Eccles book is that while it shows his efforts to make the Federal Reserve System an integral part of New Dealism and of Executive policies, one finds scattered through it passages on the virtues of the independence of the System. For example, from page 270: "The only real security against these forces [political pressures of the moment]—all of which aim to get the short-run benefits at the price of long-run trouble—lies in a single strong, independent, nonpolitical, but public body [Board of Governors] that would attract to its membership the best talent in the land, that would have the respect of the country as do the Federal courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission; that would have continuity in its position of independence, that, because of this, could make decisions free from the political winds that call for expedient decisions rather than right ones in the field of monetary and credit policy." From page 254: "But Roosevelt agreed with me that such action would be highly inappropriate. It would violate the organic conception of the Board of Governors as an independent agency of the Government."

Although that principle of independence is stated on still other pages, the picture revealed by the book, and by evidence not in it, is one showing how the System was made a tool of the Executive by Mr. Eccles and those who cooperated with him in that enterprise.

Instead of the Reserve Board making its recommendations directly and exclusively to Congress, who created the Federal Reserve System and to whom the Board of Governors is required to report, Eccles pursued a practice of presenting a high percentage of his proposals to the President for prior approval and for recommendation by the President to Congress. If the President did not adopt an Eccles recommendation, the latter often did not carry it to Congress directly. This procedure made Eccles and the System subservient to the President.

For example, from pages 282-283: "I would very much like to see you [the President] put squarely up to Congress the responsibility for acting or failing to act, not only in improving the present unsatisfactory set-up with respect to Federal banking supervision, but in providing authority to deal with such emergencies as may arise." As a further example (p. 285): "Following this discussion [of May 15, 1939, on how to head off the

Brown bill], the President called in one of his secretaries. As if to quiet my doubts as to what he would do, after more than 2½ years of indecision on this point [of bank unification], he dictated in my presence a memorandum to Senator Wagner. * * *

"It was with a buoyant mood that I left the White House that day."

From page 289: "On July 9, 1936, I called at the White House and presented this issue [of changing reserve requirements] to Roosevelt, though under the Banking Act of 1935 the Board could change the required reserve without his approval. Yet I felt the country would hold him responsible for whatever was done. Therefore, as the liaison officer between the Board and the President, I explained why we proposed to order a 50-percent increase in the required reserve."

From page 292: "I insisted that he [Morgenthau] and I see the President before anything was done. * * *

"I assured the President that if in a week's time we did not stabilize the price of Government securities through open-market operations, I would be the first to favor what Morgenthau wanted done. * * * Roosevelt gave me the week's grace for which I asked."

"Thereafter new instructions were sent to the New York Reserve Bank [the agency which executes the orders of the Federal Open Market Committee] which could not be misinterpreted."

From one of his letters to the President (p. 317): "If the Secretary of the Treasury were to make a public address very shortly explaining the soundness of this case, it would pave the way for others to follow up."

"Once he has presented the case officially for the administration, it will be much easier for the rest of us to follow up, acting under his leadership and avoiding the appearance of dissension within the ranks or encroachment upon the Treasury's domain."

From his page 318: "My associates on the Board of Governors strongly opposed my getting any further involved in a counterattack on the views expressed by Senator Byrd. They said that I would drag the whole Reserve System into a partisan political fight and thereby destroy its role as an independent agency. To this I replied that I should continue to join issues with Senator Byrd—not for the sake of defending the political fortunes of the President, but to defend the economic ideas that had brought me to Washington and kept me there so long. Furthermore, in doing this, I would try to make it clear that I was expressing my own views and not those of the Board."

From his page 320: "I had not yet left the radio station after the broadcast when a call came to me from the White House, Steve Early was at the other end."

"Mortimer," he said, "I want you to know how much the boss appreciated your speech. Here you are, with much less reason to stand up for him than many others, yet you were the only one who did it."

From his page 355: "Long before the report [to Congress by the Federal Advisory Council, Reserve Board, and presidents of the Reserve banks, page 353] was made public, I had shown it to the President and explained it was a substitute for the blast the Federal Advisory Council wanted to issue [a statement, says Eccles, page 353, "that raked administration and Reserve policies from stem to stern"]."

From a letter to the President, January 17, 1941 (p. 357): "Unless I have the benefit of guidance that only you can give to us here, the confused situation makes for complete frustration and discouragement. After 7 years of battling for New Deal objectives, I do not propose to give in to the banker viewpoint, and I feel a deep sense of injustice at any such false imputation."

When Eccles reaches his chapter on "A House Divided," beginning on page 382, of a book containing 499 pages, he reveals how the Board of Governors had fallen under the domination of the Treasury. Said he (p. 382): "By the fall of 1943 my work in Washington had largely settled down to a routine administrative job. The pattern of war finance had been firmly established by the Treasury, the Federal Reserve merely executed Treasury decisions."

Up to this point—in general—he had worked to make the Federal Reserve System an integral part of New Deal policies, and, as a part of such effort, he had attempted to dominate Treasury policies. Failing in the latter, and finding instead that the Federal Reserve System, as a result of his policies, was at that time geared to, and in high degree controlled by, Treasury policies, he began to rebel. This rebellion seemed to find its first outlet, as revealed by the book, in his efforts to unify the banks of this country—that is to force all State commercial banks into the Federal Reserve System.

From his page 384: "Shortly after Roosevelt returned from the Tehran Conference, I had a chance to discuss Federal Reserve matters with him. I told him that the Board of Governors had come to have few or no responsibilities beyond the discharge of mechanical duties, and that under these circumstances there seemed little point in my remaining on the Board once my term expired, in February 1944."

From his page 421: "Theoretically there should be no clash between these two objectives [the functions of the Treasury and Federal Reserve System], but one did arise after the war over the continuance of the cheap-money policy of the wartime period (heavy deficit financing). This conflict has continued up to the present time. * * *

"With the end of the war in sight, I felt that the fixed pattern of rates used to finance our huge war expenditures was no longer justified, that the Federal Reserve should adopt monetary and credit policies appropriate to postwar conditions in the economy rather than policies, which the Treasury desired, that were based solely on the cost of carrying the public debt."

From his page 422: "But the suggestion of change stirred up a hornet's nest of opposition in Treasury circles. * * * Indeed, it was the continued domination of Treasury policy by a Morgenthau staff, with its chronic bias for cheap money in all seasons, that lay at the source of this and many other difficulties."

From his page 424: "The Secretary of the Treasury [Vinson] implied that we were proposing to stage a sit-down strike in refusing to carry out Treasury policy. On the other hand, it was clear that if we carried out Treasury policy we would default on the obligations Congress imposed on the Reserve System in the field of money and credit."

From his page 425: "As I now look back over this period when I was Chairman of the Board of Governors, I regret that the Federal Reserve did not take a more independent position despite Treasury resistance. There was no justification for our continued support of the Treasury's wartime cheap-money policy."

From his page 430: "Secretary Snyder correctly insisted that the field of money and credit was the primary responsibility of the Reserve Board and that I should speak for the Board and not for the administration when the President's inflation-control program was considered by Congress."

From his page 431: "The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, then under the chairmanship of Senator Taft, was the first congressional body to hold hearings on the President's message. * * * Had I been in any way sensitive to political currents, I

suppose I would have softened my words. But speaking on behalf of an independent agency and with no political ax to grind, it seemed appropriate to speak the truth as I understood it."

With this description of the Board of Governors as an independent agency and with Eccles stating that he had no political ax to grind, one sees an almost complete reversal in the policies and contentions of Mr. Eccles. It may be recalled that in pressing for his earlier policies he had stated (p. 266) that the Treasury "must be assured that the Federal Reserve System, within the limits of its power, will create monetary and credit conditions of the sort that will help the Treasury carry out its responsibilities," and that, in respect to having no political ax to grind he had pointed out (p. 357), how he had been battling for 7 years "for New Deal objectives."

From his page 431: "They [the bankers] contended publicly that the existing powers of the Board were more than adequate for the needs, even though they privately knew those powers could not be used by the System so long as it was required to support the Government securities market at existing prices." The question not answered by Eccles is, Who required the Federal Reserve System "to support the Government securities market at existing prices?"

By 1947, in connection with his efforts to force prosecution of the Transamerica Corporation, San Francisco, as a monopoly, Mr. Eccles found that it was Secretary Snyder rather than he who had the ear of the President and that the Treasury was in a position to control the action of the Board of Governors in ways extending beyond the question of the support of the prices of Government securities. On his page 447 he relates how the Attorney General wrote him as follows: "The Secretary of the Treasury had asked that he be advised of any matter pertaining to Transamerica that may come to the attention of the Attorney General. Upon receipt of your letter, I felt obliged to send it to him."

On December 1, 1949, Eccles wrote to a Senate committee as follows (p. 460): "Under these conditions [of Treasury domination] it can hardly be said that the Federal Reserve System retains any effective influence in its own right over the supply of money in the country or over the availability and cost of credit, although these are the major duties for which the System has statutory responsibility." Continuing his thought, on page 461, he points out that if Congress permits the present arrangement to continue "Congress should recognize that the responsibilities for monetary and credit policies are with the Treasury and not with the Federal Reserve System."

"Treasury financing," says Eccles (p. 462), "can be carried out successfully within the framework of a restrictive credit policy, provided the terms of the securities offered are in accordance with that policy."

From his page 481: "... I reluctantly went along with a cheap-money policy during the war years when we faced the need to finance huge budgetary deficits. But there was no justification for such a policy in the period between VJ-day and the present. ... There was no justification for the Treasury's insistence that the Federal Reserve System adhere to a policy of purchasing Government securities at the will of the holders and at fixed prices. Such action did not assure confidence in the credit of the Government."

From his page 492: "... What we [the Board of Governors?] wanted was an orderly market in which the Federal Reserve maintained control, but where freedom of action would be permitted so as to reflect more nearly the real demand by private investors."

One reason for price increases in the last 7 months of 1950, says Eccles (p. 493), was that the existing supply of money "was greatly expanded by an abnormal and rapid growth in bank credit made possible by the Federal Reserve supporting the Government security market on the basis of the Treasury's cheap-money policy."

On page 485, he points out that the members of the Federal Open Market Committee, which includes all members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "are responsible only to Congress for carrying out their statutory responsibility." That statement is far removed in principle from his contention advanced in 1936 (p. 289) that he was "the liaison officer between the Board and the President" and his statement (p. 292) that "Roosevelt gave me the week's grace for which I asked" to stabilize the price of Government securities.

On page 486, Eccles says that "as Chairman, it would be difficult for him [McCabe] to oppose it [Treasury policy] publicly without resigning." If the Board is responsible only to Congress, as Eccles was able to say by the time he reached page 485, it is not clear as to why the Chairman of the Board would be compelled to resign because he opposed a policy of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Eccles statement implies that the Chairman's responsibility is to the President rather than to Congress as he contended on page 435.

Reviewing President Truman's call to the White House, January 31, 1951, of the Federal Open Market Committee, which includes the Board of Governors, Eccles remarks (p. 486): "This is the first time in the history of the Federal Reserve System that a President called either the Reserve Board or the Federal Open Market Committee to the White House for the purpose of discussing or influencing their policies. Until this instance the dictum laid down by Woodrow Wilson and reported by Senator Glass in his book *An Adventure in Constructive Finance*, had been adhered to by all our chief executives. Glass had asked Wilson, the 'father' of the Reserve System, why he did not establish closer relations with the Reserve Board he had created. To this Wilson is quoted as saying: 'The very moment that I should attempt to establish close relations with the Board, that moment I would be accused of trying to bring political pressure to bear'."

It seems reasonable to infer that Eccles in 1951 found himself in agreement with the Wilson theory as to the proper relation between the Reserve Board and the President. But that theory was not the one followed by Eccles throughout most of his career as Chairman of the Board during which he made many visits to the White House and in high degree laid the Federal Reserve System in the lap of the President.

From his page 494: "The pattern of recent events—referring to President Truman's call of the Federal Reserve authorities to the White House, and the fact that Secretary Snyder, rather than the Board of Governors, had the ear of the President—made it clear that the release of the letter—by the White House to the effect that the Board would support the Treasury program—was a final move in a Treasury attempt to impose its will on the Federal Reserve. If swift action was not taken to offset the effect of the move, the Federal Reserve would no longer have a voice in deciding monetary and credit policies. It would lose the independent status Congress meant it to have and, in its most important function of open-market operations, it would be reduced to the level of a Treasury bureau."

On page 496, he states, apropos the same episode, that "It is most unfortunate that this widely important matter of money and credit which Congress has placed in the Federal Reserve System has been raised in

a manner which only needlessly adds to confusion."

On page 497, Eccles contends that "We [the Federal Reserve authorities] should publicly inform the President, the Treasury, and the Congress of what we propose to do, and then do it. Otherwise the public will get the impression that we have capitulated and lack the courage to discharge our responsibilities. If Congress objects to our actions it can change the law."

Thus Eccles, when he reached the end of his career as a member of the Board of Governors and the end of his book, finally came around to the principle which many men, better grounded than was he in principles of good central banking, urged as sound in 1935 when title II of the Banking Act of 1935 was being debated before committees of the House and Senate. It required the years 1935 to 1951 for Eccles to learn the truth of what so many well-trained, experienced, and objective men tried to make clear to him and Congress in 1935. The late date at which he appears to have learned the importance of the independence of a nation's central banking system is the great tragedy revealed by the Eccles book, and it is a tragedy for which the people of this country, who could and should have had better treatment, have paid, and will continue to pay, dearly.

At the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, March 27, 1935, this reviewer, as a witness and as a part of his testimony, introduced in the record (pp. 770-772) a statement signed by 69 monetary economists in which they warned (p. 771), in respect to the provisions of title II of the Banking Act of 1935, that "the Federal Reserve administrative authorities, instead of being given the independence which is appropriate to the officers of a nonpolitical central commercial banking system, will be brought under the direct control of the President. ... The Board can become a politically controlled Board with little opportunity to exercise independent judgment."

"The lessons of central banking teach us that the further a central banking system is removed from political domination, the better it is for the country."

"All measures designed to correct weaknesses in the Federal Reserve System should seek to increase, rather than destroy, its independence of political influence. They should increase, not reduce, its commercial nature. They should assure, not impair, its liquidity. And they should free it from Government financing rather than link it more closely to the fiscal needs of the Government."

Many experienced and well-advised men issued similar warnings both before the House Committee and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency which held hearings from April 19 to June 3, 1935. Those who agreed in principle with the 69 monetary economists have been proved correct as to the unsoundness of those provisions incorporated in title II of the Banking Act of 1935 which permitted and invited the impairment of the independence of the Federal Reserve System by a Reserve Board willing to permit and to foster such impairment.

But that law, unwise as some of its provisions were, did not require the Board to sacrifice its independence. What the Board did to impair its independence was done voluntarily. On this aspect of the picture, Mr. Joseph H. Frost, chairman of the Frost National Bank, San Antonio, Tex., made the following pertinent and accurate observation—he also had opposed passage of title II before the Senate committee in 1935—in an address in Washington, D. C., May 10, 1951:

"Congress has not passed legislation of any kind which would relieve the Federal Reserve Board of the responsibility of main-

taining the solvency of the currency. Therefore, the Board is still an independent entity, legally fully empowered to make its own decisions and still responsible for the preservation of the integrity of the currency.

"We should never hear a complaint from the Board to the effect that the System was coerced or compelled to buy \$24,000,000,000 worth of Government bonds to support the deficit policy of the Government. The Board itself voluntarily adopted the policy of a fixed maximum-interest rate and bought the bonds to accomplish that purpose."

"Undoubtedly there should be a close and cordial relationship between the Board and the Treasury Department, but both should recognize the impossibility of maintaining any fixed rate of interest in the market for Government bonds and at the same time protecting the soundness of the currency. It is appropriate and desirable that the Federal Reserve Board should receive suggestions and recommendations from the Treasury Department, and that they should further receive advice from such bodies as the Federal Advisory Council, the representatives from the American Bankers Association, the Council of Economic Advisers, etc., but, after having received advice and information from all available sources, the decision as to policy must be made by the Board on their own responsibility, and it should be of such a kind as will carry out the principal purpose for which central banks are responsible.

"No, the Board should not blame either the Treasury or the commercial banks for the results of their own free-will decisions, but should alter their policy to the extent necessary to achieve the classical purpose of all properly conceived central banks, which is the protection and preservation of the solvency and integrity of the people's money."

Considering that the Eccles policies impaired the proper independence of the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve System, and weakened greatly the quality and purchasing power of the dollar, the following statement from his page 476 provides strange reading indeed. "The dollar must be defended. To do otherwise would be a great tragedy."

ECCLES EMBRACES THE UNDERCONSUMPTION THEORY OF BUSINESS RECESSIONS

Examples of the endorsement by Eccles of the underconsumption theory of the business recessions of 1929-33 and 1937-38 are the following:

Page 77. "The time came (in 1929) when there were no more poker chips to be loaned on credit. Debtors thereupon were forced to curtail their consumption in an effort to create a margin that could be applied to the reduction of outstanding debts. This naturally reduced the demand for goods of all kinds and brought on what seemed to be overproduction, but was in reality underconsumption when judged in terms of the real world instead of the money world."

Page 184. "I prepared a memorandum for the President. It addressed itself to the old question of how consumer income and expenditures could be increased to a size that would warrant the full utilization of the capital goods industries."

Page 299: "Soon thereafter (in 1937) the inflated price bubble burst for want of purchasing power to sustain it, and the slump started in earnest."

Dr James A. Estey, in his *Business Cycles* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1950), second edition, probably states with accuracy the typical opinion held by the most careful scholars in the field of business cycles and oscillations regarding the underconsumption theory (or theories) when he says (p. 249): "The underconsumption approach . . . is the natural approach for the man in the street. It sounds plausible and wins ready

acceptance. For this reason, it has a practical importance, perhaps out of proportion to its scientific content. Not only is it the background of the more fantastic schemes for sharing wealth and of such movements as the Townsend Plan, but it furnished the momentum behind much that is most characteristic of the New Deal."

In discussing what he calls "Naive Underconsumption Theories," Estey says (p. 250): "The simplest form of the underconsumption theory is that the economic system cannot distribute enough purchasing power to enable the output of industry to be sold at a price that will cover costs (including a reasonable profit)." Although there are varieties of the underconsumption theory, it seems that, in the main, the Eccles variety is that referred to by Estey.

If Eccles should conclude that he had adequate support for his belief in the accuracy and adequacy of his underconsumption theory of business recessions because Keynes and his followers also embraced an underconsumption theory, it would be this reviewer's opinion that if Eccles would study the contentions of Keynes and the relevant facts he would find that Keynes, in his book, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, produced a piece of deductive reasoning rather than a series of conclusions resting upon supporting evidence. Keynes used an underconsumption theory in his explanation of the business recession of 1929-33, but he had no tenable theory of business cycles. He confused symptoms of a business recession with causal factors. What he did was to dress up a layman's underconsumption theory in a scientific jargon and attempt to pass it off as science. Factual evidence to support his basic theories appears to be lacking and, insofar as it exists, it refutes them. The highly experienced and reputable staff of the National Bureau of Economic Research, which organization has probably collected the most evidence and provided the most scholarly analyses of the evidence on, and theories of, business fluctuations, have not been able to support Keynes or the underconsumption theory of business cycles or recessions.

Said Dr Arthur F. Burns in his booklet, *Economic Research and the Keynesian Thinking of Our Times* (National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, June 1946), page 20: "Since Keynes works with an artificially simplified business cycle, it is not surprising that his explanation collides with the facts of experience." Burns continues (p. 21): "Keynes' adventure in business cycle theory is by no means exceptional. Fanciful ideas about business cycles are widely entertained both by men of affairs and by academic economists. That is inevitable as long as the problem is attacked on a speculative level, or if statistics serve merely as a casual check on speculation. To develop a reliable picture of the business cycle of actual life it is necessary to study with fine discrimination the historical records of numerous economic activities—not merely investment, or employment, or public finances, or banking operations, but all these and many others." Work of the proper type in this field, says Burns (p. 21) "is costly and time-consuming, it means much turning back, revising, rethinking, redoing, it often leads to disappointments and taxes patience. But there is no reliable shortcut to tested knowledge. Public thinking about business cycles can be confused by hurried and ill-digested statistical inquiries, no less than by speculative excursions from the dreamland of equilibrium or from the caprices of common sense."

Had Mr. Eccles undertaken the type of analysis provided, for example, by Dr. Norman J. Silberling in his book, *The Dynamics of Business* (McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1943), chapters 13 and 14, he

doubtless would have found himself dealing with a multitude of causal factors, leading to the crash of 1929, reaching far beyond the simple and generally untenable underconsumption theory which he (Eccles) has advanced. In any event Silberling did not find an underconsumption theory adequate as a basic explanation of the crash of 1929.

The underconsumption theory (or theories) has a long history. In general, it is a basic doctrine in the philosophy of Socialists and almost invariably gives rise to programs for redistribution of wealth and government dictatorship in high degree—all characteristics of the Eccles programs.

As a part of his underconsumption theory Eccles embraced the oversaving theory. Up to the crash of 1929 there was, he contends, too much thrift and not enough spending.

Page 74: "We did not as a nation consume more than we produced. Far from it. We were excessively thrifty."

Page 75: "This vast effort [construction of buildings, roads, etc., prior to 1929] was not the work of a profligate economy. It was the result of an economy that in the aggregate was, if anything, too thrifty."

Page 83: "The difficulty is that we were not sufficiently extravagant as a nation."

As one looks at the installment buying and the great volume of private debt accumulated prior to the crash of 1929 and at how these debtors suffered when a period of adverse economic conditions arrived, the lack of foundation for the Eccles notion that we were too thrifty and did not spend enough would seem to be obvious.

"Thrift and economy," says Eccles (p. 83), "means less consumption." The facts seem clearly to contradict that contention. They appear to be that no individual or nation gets into trouble through the practice of thrift and economy, that it is by thrift and economy that people grow prosperous, and that it is from debt that cannot be repaid that serious trouble arises.

Says Eccles (p. 20): "Later on, too, I was to challenge in a direct way a further belief held by my father and his friends that there would always be a shortage of capital in the land and that therefore saving was a good in itself." The answer to that is that so long as capital bears a price it is scarce, and so long as there is a positive rate of interest there is a scarcity of loanable funds. It seems safe to assume that Mr. Eccles has not yet seen a situation in this country or abroad in which capital has ceased to bear a price or a positive interest rate ceased to exist. It was his father, not he, who was correct in his contention.

Perhaps the explanation of the fact that Eccles developed or embraced theories which careful scholars over a period of many years have been unable to substantiate or have repeatedly demonstrated to be false is supplied by him in his statement (p. 82) that "Wherever possible I preached the doctrine I formulated over a period of months."

ECCLES EMBRACES THE THEORY OF A COMPENSATORY ECONOMY

On page 79, Eccles sets forth his theory as to "A policy of adequate governmental outlays at a time when private enterprise is curtailing its expenditures."

Page 252: "The Government must be the compensatory agent in this economy. It must unbalance its budget during deflation and create surpluses in periods of great business activity."

Page 257: ". . . The primary emphasis of my own thinking was on the use of the tax instrument as a major device for achieving economic balance."

Eccles does not recognize the bankruptcy of the theory of the compensatory economy as revealed in the fact that it has been chiefly a one-direction program involving profligate Government spending and waste, and deficits for all but three fiscal years since

1930. He does not explain how it happened that we had a quick, sharp recovery, 1921-23, from the deep and severe recession of 1920-21, with practices just the opposite, in practically every major respect, of those he insists were necessary for recovery in 1933 and after. He does not explain in any adequate or careful manner how we recovered from other recessions and depressions without following his prescription beyond offering the observation that in earlier instances the frontier had not disappeared. He makes no mention of the fact that we began to move toward recovery, following the low point of the index of industrial activity in July 1932—a recovery that was interrupted by the Presidential campaign and the fears for the currency and liquidity of the banks generated by Roosevelt and his currency manipulators.

He provides no analysis of the unprecedented jump in the index of industrial recovery, April to July 1933, when Roosevelt was supposedly launching an economy program as pledged during his campaign. He fails to make clear that if a program of a compensatory economy is to be carried out in accordance with the theory, as outlined by Eccles and others, it would require Executive dictatorship. He complains at various places in his book that the program was not successful for this or that reason, but he seems not to realize that the answer lies in the fact that we have not had a dictator who, of necessity, would be required to know precisely what to do and when to do it and who would have to have the power to make his will effective.

So long as we have our three major divisions in our United States Government, that Government cannot make such a program effective. Even if all branches of that Government could be united under a dictator, we would, possibly, still have the 48 States and private initiative with which to contend.

The theory of a compensatory economy is unworkable in practice, in this or in any other country. The economy of a nation, the mechanism of government, and the behavior of people are not as simple in operation as that theory implies. The compensatory economy is one of the gadgets of those who seem to think they can manage a people's affairs better than can the people themselves by pushing this button and that. It is the theory of the would-be dictator. Since such people are out of place in what is supposed to be our system of government, there is no prospect of success for the theory of a compensatory economy. Furthermore, no dictator has ever made a success of the plan.

ECCLES EMBRACES THE STAGNATION THEORY AS APPLICABLE TO THE DEPRESSION AND RECOVERY FOLLOWING 1929

From his pages 71-72: "Those who held these views (that there are self-corrective forces that raise us from our depressions) overlooked the fact that as far as the geographical frontier was concerned, it had largely ceased to exist. Its development in the first instance was based on the availability of free or very cheap land, an abundance of raw materials, and cheap immigrant labor to exploit. But none of these elements was present in the thirties. As far as the technological frontier was concerned, there was another oversight. It was not understood that developments in this field take place in a climate of high prosperity, when purchasing power of the masses increases their demands for a higher standard of living and enables them to purchase more than their bare wants. In the America of the thirties what hope was there for developments on the technological frontier when millions of our people hadn't enough purchasing power for even their barest needs?"

The stagnation theory is as old as economic depressions. Every severe depression seems to have produced its pessimists. Such

thinking has been a manifestation of the panic in the minds of men who, apparently, have not been well informed regarding the history of economic depressions and recoveries and who, consequently, have lacked perspective.

Thomas Malthus, in the early nineteenth century, produced a pessimistic theory as to the future of England just as she was entering the threshold of an era of unprecedented prosperity.

Those economists who, after the recession of 1937-38, offered testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee (in 1939) to the effect that the United States had reached the period of "economic maturity," that the plant capacity of industry was too great for our economy, that the steel industry was overbuilt, and so on, made a sorry record for themselves and did a great disservice to their country. Whether their perspective was as bad as events have proved it to be or whether, regardless of perspective, they were bent upon doing their part to further "the revolution" in this country, seems to be a debatable question. In any event, they endeavored to show how private enterprise was responsible for the recession of 1937-38, how unwise and inept was management of private enterprise, how imperative was the need for more and extensive Government planning and management. The Eccles contentions are in general the same in nature.

Apparently no place in his book does Eccles accept the fact that the initial upswing in business activity from the low point of a depression comes, in a natural recovery, from the producer rather than from an increase in demand. He appears to take the position that production cannot revive unless and until demand increases. Therefore the Government must step in and create the demand. A careful study of statistics on business recoveries should reveal that the lead is often, perhaps generally, supplied by the producer without there being any increase in demand. Indeed, a natural recovery tends to begin while demand is still declining. It starts under these conditions because the persistent, though declining, demand finally reduces inventories to a point which invites further production to meet this persistent, though declining, demand. With inventories and costs reduced as against this prevailing demand, the producer will in due course begin to produce again. His activity creates a demand for labor, raw materials, transportation, financing, and so on.

It seemed reasonably clear that inventories and costs had been reduced sufficiently by July 1932 for producers to start producing as indeed they did. The index of industrial production, adjusted for season variation, reached its low of 58 (1923-25=100) in July 1932. In August, the index rose to 60; in September to 66; in October to 67; in November it was back to 65—the Roosevelt election and fears of his policies caused businessmen to wait to see what he would do; in December it was 66; in January 1933 it was 65; in February it was 63; in March it was 59. The unadjusted index in March 1933 was 60 as compared with 56 in July 1932.

The index, adjusted, of factory employment reached its low of 58 in July 1932 and rose to a higher level in the months following, but settled back to 57 in March 1933. Factory payrolls similarly began to rise in September 1932. Freight-car loadings, index adjusted, began to rise in September. Department store sales, index adjusted, began to rise in September. It was the producer, not the consumer, that led the way. His increased production from July to August created purchasing power that made possible an increase in department store sales in September. These are in general typical statistics of a natural recovery generated by producers, not because of an in-

crease in demand but because of a persistent, though declining, demand operating against producers whose inventories are low or exhausted and whose costs have been reduced sufficiently to promise profitable operation.

It is because economic recovery is self-generating in this manner, if not obstructed and, even more easily, if encouraged, that one sees revealed the false premises upon which the stagnation, underconsumption, and compensatory economy theories rest.

In the history of economic doctrines, the optimists, as distinguished from the pessimists such as Malthus, Eccles, various witnesses before the Temporary National Economic Committee, and others, are conventionally classified under the heading of the liberals. There should be ground for reflection in that for those pessimists who have concluded that the principles as to the importance of the freedom and independence of the individual are outmoded, impractical, and the illusions of unprogressive people, and that the State should take over.

The clock cannot be turned back to demonstrate what would have taken place had the planners stayed out of Washington and had the natural forces of recovery been permitted and encouraged to operate. But there are some outstanding facts worthy of serious consideration: The recovery of 1921-23 came quickly and effectively in the absence of the nostrums prescribed by the planners in the 1930's. It came under a program of Government economy, with the budget balanced and with debt retirement each year, with the tax burden and Government receipts reduced, with encouragement to private enterprise, without currency manipulation, and without the creation of a huge bureaucracy to manage, to ment, and to live at the expense of the producers of real wealth.

The recovery, following the recession beginning in 1929, started in July 1932 before the planners could throw their disturbing programs into gear.

The recovery of April-July 1933, under a policy of economy, was sharp.

When the planners got in power and set their plans in motion, the economy showed disturbance and stagnation in several important respects. The velocity of bank deposits, which reflects confidence, sagged steadily after 1937, remaining every year thereafter, and up to the present, below the level reached at the depth of the depression in 1932. The flow of new capital into industry as late as 1937 was still below the low level of 1931 (the lowest being in 1932). Loans of all banks in the United States continued to decline until June 1935. Unemployment is estimated to have fallen not lower than 7,700,000 (in 1937) and to have been 9,480,000 in 1939 before we entered into an armament program of World War II. (The estimate for 1940, all figures based upon the 1940 census, is 8,120,000. Statistical Abstract of the United States, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1950, p. 174.)

The positive results the planners can show are persistent deficits in the Federal budget, a huge public debt, crushing taxation, a bureaucracy wasting and eating out the substance of this Nation. The planners should also claim the sharp business recession of 1937-38, since that occurred under what, up to that time, they called their planned prosperity.

Such prosperity as we have had under the planners has rested in high degree upon scarcities fostered by the Government (killing of pigs and various restrictions on productive activity), upon destruction of wealth by war and by the giving away of real wealth resulting in an unusual scarcity of goods for civilian use (as revealed by the high prices), upon the blood of our boys, and upon a devaluated currency. No nation prospers in a real sense, or as much as otherwise would have been possible, by destroying wealth, by

making its goods artificially scarce, by giving away its wealth, by sending its young men to their death, and by depreciating its currency.

FUNDAMENTALS THAT ARE OVERLOOKED OR IGNORED

Much of the Eccles "logical radicalism" reveals that he overlooks or does not believe in the importance of various fundamental forces, principles, and concepts which have contributed so much to the progress of this Nation.

The vital importance of protecting human freedom against an oppressive State seems to be ignored in this book. There is no concern expressed over the fact that our Federal Government, which, under our Constitution, is one of delegated and restricted powers, has been converting itself into a Government of general powers. The strong tendency in the Eccles book, despite the existence of a chapter entitled, "Incentives to Self-Help," and a statement (p. 389) that he is really very much opposed to "still further intrusion of the Government into the field of private credit," is to take all important problems to Washington. It seems to be taken for granted that there is need for a governmentally managed economy and that it is an eminently desirable system for us to have.

The question of constitutional Government appears not to be a consideration in the theories, programs, and policies outlined in this book. In writing on pages 393-394, in defense of the Employment Act of 1946, Eccles says: "It would merely be a recognition of the facts (1) that the Congress has step by step authorized the assumption by the Government of numerous responsibilities affecting industry, commerce, agriculture, and labor." There is no suggestion that there is a possibility that such step-by-step encroachment by Congress might be unconstitutional or unwise.

When Sir George Paish, long a close student of business fluctuations and economic crises, visited the United States in 1937, he said: "Long experience has caused me to come to the conclusion that the economic crises of the world which come from time to time are the result rather of political action than of economic action, and can be avoided only when the statesmen of all nations have a greater understanding of economic law and have some appreciation of the consequences of their own actions. . . . It may be said that the statesmen of the world, taken as a whole, have, since the war, and especially in recent years, acted in such a manner as to bring the world machine almost to a standstill." (The New York Times, February 4, 1937.)

Mr. W. T. G. Hackett, economic adviser, Bank of Montreal, recently said in an address (published in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of April 19, 1951): "A look at the 'terrible thirties' in the light of history will, I think, convince any fair-minded observer that the world-wide dislocations of the time were as much due to interference, by governments, with the processes of international trade as to the shortcomings of business enterprise."

"The postwar years have shown with compelling clarity that economic well-being cannot fully be underwritten by governmental action. . . . Significant is the fact that antideflationary measures are politically easy, but that anti-inflationary measures are politically difficult. Moreover, governmental medicines for low purchasing power, being usually popular and palatable, tend, like some other potions one can think of, to become habit-forming. The result has been, I suggest, that the depression-born emphasis on ever-abundant purchasing power as the touchstone of material well-being has left us some legacies of rather dubious value. We have perhaps been in

danger of forgetting, at times, that what is not produced cannot be consumed. The link between effort and reward has been weakened. And the idea that government is the residual guarantor of welfare seems to have encouraged the tendency to run to Government for protection against the ordinary as well as the extraordinary hazards of enterprise.

"* * * There are a few perhaps more sharply defined lessons which may be drawn from wartime and postwar experience. One is that it is very difficult to achieve stability by fixing the symbols of stability. Another is that it is just as difficult for human beings in government as it is for their fellow creatures elsewhere, to formulate long-range plans for a future in which the apparently inevitable has an awkward habit of not happening and in which the unexpected frequently does."

He concludes: "What I . . . suggest is, first, that governmental action is subject to definite limitations, political and psychological as well as economic, and, secondly, that for many years to come we shall have little need of the philosophies and practices of the dismal triad."

Said Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, in his *Gold for Europe* (Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., London, 1950, p. 3): "As a result (of 'the disastrous attempts to direct economy by legal and administrative interference with the currency structure,' p. 2), all international trade is involved today in a permanent crisis which keeps all politicians and economists fighting for breath. Anyone who lived through those happy days before the First World War—when the international exchange of goods took place without friction under the free play of private enterprise, and when the state confined itself to a few general regulations—sees today with horror how governments labor in vain to restore international trade by a succession of regulations and interference. This continual government interference simply results in the dampening down of all enterprise on the part of those engaged in trade. The efforts of businessmen, formerly concentrated solely on the organization of production and markets, are exhausted today largely in a struggle against state bureaucracies, who have to carry out the instructions of politicians."

That such opinions, expressed by these keen and experienced observers, might be correct is not recognized as a possibility by Eccles. His cure for what these men regard as too much interference and mismanagement by Government is more interference and more management by Government.

The Eccles book does not reveal a realization on his part that there is a vast difference between a correct analysis of how the greatest good for the greatest number is obtained and the development of a Robin Hood attitude and program.

Although he reveals that he was aware that there was a widespread fear that he was helping to socialize or communize this Nation (p. 232), he denied that there was any valid basis for that fear. Nevertheless, his program provided real justification for it. When a central banking system becomes a tool of the Executive and is used for the advancement of its political program, when the people lose control of the public purse by having an irredeemable currency thrust upon them; when the planners and Government managers take over to the extent that has come to pass in this country, the Nation is not only on the road to, but is already deeply involved in, socialism.

The Eccles book reveals him to be a leader among those who have hacked away at the foundations of our republican form of government—among those who have regarded themselves as leading a revolution against both our economic and political system. "The depression," said Eccles, Oc-

tober 27, 1933 (pp. 129-130), "represented the end-phase of an organization, both economic and political, which has existed about 150 years the world over."

The book reveals that Eccles had become frightened and had lost faith in the alleged virtues of private enterprise, free markets, a fixed monetary standard, and a redeemable currency. He states (p. 84) that the president of a western railroad had said of him: "Poor Eccles, he must have had so terrible a time with his banks that he is losing his mind." And that another associate had remarked: "All of us know you are overwrought by the general economic situation." But those remarks were recorded in the book not because Eccles supposed there could be any accuracy in them, but as examples of his belief that their authors lacked vision and were thoroughly wrong in not being as excited and as ready as he to become "logical radicals." The teachings of the past as to the virtues of freedom for the individual, for private enterprise, and for markets, with the Government acting as an umpire rather than as a manager, producer, and distributor, were no longer valid in the opinion of Eccles, and should be discarded. The Government, he in effect contended, needed to become the people's boss—to apportion the people's income between investment and expenditures, to distribute purchasing power (p. 130), to juggle the Federal budget, currency, and taxes to accomplish the purposes deemed desirable by the Government planners and managers.

The book seems to show no concern on the part of Eccles regarding the dangers in a huge bureaucracy which feeds upon the people and wastes their substance. There is no fear, apparently, that the tax and debt load can become so heavy as to be destructive.

While Eccles stresses the desirability of maintaining full employment, he does not deal with the question as to how that aim can be fulfilled and how at the same time the purchasing power of the currency can be preserved. Said W. T. G. Hackett, cited above, on this point: "The theories of planned stability, while offering us a formula for full employment, have yet to come up, in practice, with a recipe for full employment plus a dependable dollar." He remarked further: "Thus I leave with you . . . the great unsolved problem of full-employment economics. How can we maintain full employment and at the same time evolve wage policies which by their tie-in with productivity will help to maintain the value of the wage earner's dollar?" Eccles shows himself to be unaware of the fundamental issue pointed out by Mr. Hackett.

Similarly, while Eccles insists (p. 400) that "the basic long-range problem . . . is to avoid deflation by providing a flow of necessary purchasing power to those who would use it to increase their standard of living," he does not face the problem of how deflation is to be avoided, once a boom develops, without embarking upon a policy of progressive depreciation of our currency. He has nothing more fundamental to suggest than Government controls, such as tax policies to reduce "idle savings" and to "induce more spending," and the employment of wartime controls.

There appears to be no recognition of the fact, or of the significance of it, that the deep depression of the 1930's was practically world-wide and that it engulfed the many countries involved regardless of their form of government or of the extent to which the various governments regulated or participated in activities in which private enterprise would operate if free to do so.

At no place in the book is concern expressed over the extent to which government management of our people and economy has engulfed the supposedly relatively free people of this Nation. The significance of that apparent lack of concern over this trend of

events is high lighted by the following statement made by Earl Browder in his booklet, *Keynes, Foster and Marx, Part I, State Capitalism and Progress* (Published by Earl Browder, 7 Highland Place, Yonkers, N. Y., 1950), pages 29-30: "State capitalism leaped forward to a new high point in America in the decade 1939-49. It became overwhelmingly predominant in every major phase of economic life, and changed the face of politics."

"After the war, with the lifting of some forms of state control, there was a certain slowing up of the tempo of this development, but not a change in direction. State capitalism, in substance, if not in formal aspects, has progressed further in America than in Great Britain under the Labor Government, despite its nationalization of certain industries, which is a formal stage not yet reached in America; the actual, substantial concentration of the guiding reins of national economy in governmental hands is probably on a higher level in the United States of America."

SOME NOTABLE OMISSIONS FROM THE BOOK

Although Eccles condemned the easy-money, low-interest-rate policy of the Treasury during and after involvement in World War II (pp. 143, 483), he did not point how he, too, had contributed to the situation for which he condemned the Treasury. Said he (p. 143): "... The Treasury Department seemed unable to recognize that 1940-45 was not 1934, that a policy that was correct in the period from 1934 until 1940 was a source of lasting mischief in the war years and beyond them." As an example, not mentioned, of his contributions to the source of lasting mischief, the Reserve Board, in December 1942, in cooperation with the United States Treasury, engaged, by a manipulative transaction, in an illegal issuance of \$660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes as fiat Treasury currency, which money had the power to support, at the reserve ratios then prevailing, approximately \$9,900,000,000 of additional deposits in our banking system.

Eccles does not discuss the fact that he repeatedly and persistently fought to open up the Federal Reserve banks as a dumping ground for United States securities by seeking an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act authorizing direct purchases by the Federal Reserve banks in unlimited amounts from the Treasury—one of the worst practices known in central banking. It was only after a hard fight that Senator Tamm and his associates were able, in March 1942, to place a limit of \$5,000,000,000 on such direct purchases (section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act). Eccles mentions the fact (p. 123) that he recommended such direct purchases in 1933, but his subsequent campaign for that procedure is not mentioned thereafter. Each time the question of renewing the direct-purchase provision arose in Congress—in 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1950—some representative of the Reserve Board, usually Eccles, battled to make permanent the authority of the Reserve banks to purchase Government securities directly from the Treasury—a notoriously unsound practice in central banking. In 1950, the temporary \$5,000,000,000 direct-purchase provision of the Federal Reserve Act was again extended by Congress (to July 1, 1952) under pressure by the Reserve Board.

The following is from the testimony of Chairman Eccles (mimeograph copy) before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, March 3, 1947, illustrating his effort to persuade Congress to make permanent the temporary \$5,000,000,000 direct-purchase provision:

"Nothing constructive would be accomplished by the proviso that the Reserve system must purchase Government securities exclusively in the open market. . . .

"What is involved in the proposed bill is not a question of monetary theory or policy,

but simply a question of efficient, economical, and businesslike management of the public debt.

"One suggestion which has been put forth is that the authority should not be a part of the Government financing machinery. . . . It is better not to place an arbitrary limit of, say, 2 or 8 years on the authority. . . ."

There is no discussion of the evils of an irredeemable currency or of the virtues of a redeemable money. At no place does he mention the fact that in 1933 he advocated a fiat money. This should have appeared on pages 108-107 of his book to conform with his actual testimony (hearings, pp. 720-723). He praises Congressman Goldsborough for his intellectual leadership in the House Committee on Banking and Currency (p. 200) and for his "breadth of vision" (p. 235), but he does not inform the reader that Goldsborough had introduced a fiat money bill in January 1933 and was, in fact, one of the most extreme of the "wild money" men then in Congress. While praising Goldsborough, whose monetary proposals it would be difficult to match for wildness and demagogery, Eccles was very critical of Chairman Steagall (p. 181), of the House Banking and Currency Committee, who, with Senator Glass, endeavored to fight off the programs of the fiat currency men and those who, through title II of the Banking Act of 1935, proposed to make the Federal Reserve System an instrumentality of a governmentally managed economy.

At no place in his book does Eccles condemn the issuance of Federal Reserve notes against Government securities. Indeed, he regards such procedure as both necessary and desirable despite the lessons to the contrary provided by the history of money and of the practices of good central banking.

He does not indicate that, as the Chairman of this Nation's central banking system, he was willing to state, at the close of an address by this reviewer on Surrender to Inflation, and as a prelude to his own address on the same subject before a meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City, September 23, 1948, that the gold standard in this country did not stop the deflation following the crash of 1929. He could have stated with as much validity and wisdom, that good rails on a railroad did not prevent a certain wreck, on those rails, for which they were in no sense responsible. Nowhere in his book does he point out, in a similar manner, that our system of irredeemable currency did not prevent the great decline in the purchasing power of our dollar, particularly since 1929, or the sharp business recession of 1937-1938, a recession that was sharper for the 12 months it ran than that experienced during any 12 months of the recession of 1929-32. He does not point out that the longest recession and depression on record in this country occurred under an irredeemable currency, 1873-78. It lasted 65 months as compared with the 43 months of 1929-1933.

The book does not indicate how Eccles and the Board of Governors, in direct violation of the clear wording and history of section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act, which prescribes the method to be used in dividing the earnings of the Reserve banks, began, in 1947, to turn over to the United States Treasury a large percentage of the earnings of those banks. This illegal practice was defended by Eccles on the ground that section 16 of the act, which authorizes a tax on Federal Reserve notes, permitted his procedure. His distribution of these earnings is not a tax on Federal Reserve notes under section 16—it is merely, and incorrectly, alleged to be such. A reasonable and accurate interpretation of the meaning of section 16, such as that given by the Board's own counsel on October 15, 1915, would make clear the absurdity of the Eccles contention that section 16 could be used to override sec-

tion 7. This episode is mentioned because it is a fair sample of the high-handed methods sometimes used by the Reserve Board, under the Chairmanship of Eccles, to accomplish its desires regardless of the law. It is symptomatic of the philosophy of and urge toward dictatorship revealed in the Eccles book.

ECCLES ON DEVALUATION OF THE DOLLAR

From page 124: "In my testimony before the Senate Finance Committee [February 1933], I had argued that there was no need to devalue the dollar in terms of gold, or increase the price of gold in order to raise commodity prices. Devaluation by itself would not bring about any increases in prices. Prices could be raised only if the Government created effective purchasing power by a spending-lending program based on deficit financing."

From pages 137-138: "I had met Warren [of Cornell University] before in Ogden. I've already said I was unimpressed by his plan to increase prices by increasing the price of gold. Warren was no doubt an able agricultural economist, but he had much to learn about the way the money and credit system operated. . . . I was surprised to find that Rogers [of Yale University] was as much opposed as I was to Warren's plan. He believed, as did I, that the only way commodity prices could be raised was by increasing the means of payment in the hands of those who were willing to spend their money. What was needed was an increase in both the volume of money and its turn-over."

"My new-found ally [Rogers] and I argued the case against Warren in a 3-hour meeting. We did not change his view in the least. He had already sold his plan to Roosevelt as a result of Morgenthau's support. Roosevelt, in turn, was to secure its ratification by Congress." This seems to refer to events in January 1934.

From a publication entitled "Five Next Steps in the Program of the Committee for the Nation to Rebuild Prices and Purchasing Power" (Committee for the Nation, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, released for publication April 6, 1933), page 1: "From the standpoint of farm and business relief, it is of the utmost importance that the United States shall increase the price paid by the Treasury for gold to correspond with the increased purchasing power of gold. Setting this higher value will increase the price of commodities."

On page 3 of that publication, item 3 of that committee's recommendations reads: ". . . Discontinue the efforts to keep the dollar at its former gold parity."

Item 4, page 3, reads: "It should be announced forthwith that prior to lifting the embargo on gold at a future date, it will be the policy of the United States to revalue gold. It is the opinion of the committee that in the revaluation, the United States Treasury should raise the price of gold from \$20.67 per ounce to a new price of \$36.17 per ounce. This is an increase of 75 percent—an arbitrary temporary level, estimated to bring the commodity price level to a 1926 base."

Item 5, page 4: "With a revaluation of gold, the income of agriculture will be restored so that it can again buy from industry."

One of the signers of that statement, listed on page 6, was "M. S. Eccles, First Security Corp., Ogden, Utah."

That publication states, page 5, that "The undersigned are the first 100 to subscribe to the Committee for the Nation's program as outlined in the 'Five Next Steps' and to authorize the use of their names as endorser."

The Eccles book does not mention the Committee for the Nation, either in the index or otherwise.

Eccles writes of the effects of devaluation as follows, page 124: "What dollar devaluation succeeded in doing was to attract the gold of the world to American shores, in exchange for which foreigners received more

dollars. A substantial increase in our exports resulted as the new supply of dollars was spent on the purchase of American goods. But ultimately the policy brought us more than three-fourths of the gold of the world, for which we had no use."

Although Eccles refers to the increase in exports, he does not mention imports. The facts, according to official reports, are these: Following the devaluation, January 31, 1934, and calculating to the peak of the increase in exports and imports before both were carried downward in the business recession of 1937-1938, merchandise exports increased from \$183,000,000 in February, 1934, to a high of \$333,000,000 in October, 1937, an increase of 104 percent. Merchandise imports increased from \$133,000,000 in February, 1934, to a high of \$307,000,000 in March, 1937, an increase of 131 percent.

The Eccles statement that we had no use for the gold we received after devaluation means that paper money and deposits without gold security are as good as those backed by gold. His statement puts him in the outright fiat money school. It means—if he understood the implications of his statement—that we could meet adverse balances of foreign payments as well with fiat paper money as with gold. The facts are all to the contrary. Gold is our most universally marketable commodity. Its usefulness is beyond effective questioning.

LACK OF PRECISION IN THE WRITING

Eccles states (p. 84), that a banker had said he "talks loose." Following are some samples of the loose or unprecise statements to be found in his book:

Page 74: "Those who in the thirties suggested that this was so were the very same men who in the twenties announced on all sides that there could never be another depression."

Page 75: "In the twenties we replaced by a large margin every physical loss we had suffered in the war."

Page 81: "The only way we could get out of the depression was through Government action in placing purchasing power in the hands of the people who were in need of it."

Pages 101-102: "The business leaders who appeared before the Finance Committee were quite prepared to see the [Federal] debt grow when it meant the preservation of their own interests. * * * But they were against the use of Government credit for the relief of the distressed and the employed. * * * [They] argued that the only way to relieve the pressures on the unemployed was by means of the 'trickle down' method."

Page 104: "When it came my turn to be called before the Finance Committee, I challenged all that had been said up to that point."

Page 108: "I pointed out that during 4 years of depression everyone, in an effort to protect himself, did what proved to be the wrong thing for the economy as a whole."

Page 259: "Yet the total effect of what they did ran counter to the best interests of everyone, including themselves."

Page 405: "As in all other areas, nothing was done in this one to curb the inflationary forces that were at work."

Page 465: "Such a settlement would have brought about a condition of peace in the world."

SUBJECTIVE STANDARDS OF APPRAISAL AND LACK OF PRECISE AND VALID DEFINITION

A characteristic of the dictator is that his standards of approval are subjective—they are in accordance with his desires and his ability to enforce them. Objective standards are those that apply to all, as, for example, prices in a free market in which the will of the individual is of imperceptible importance. The objective standard is that of the scientist.

The subjective standard is a strong element in the Eccles book. Closely related is

the frequent lack of scientific definition—that is, a definition that any scientist could understand and find valid and useful.

On page 133, he writes of his "gospel of logical radicalism" but does not define the term.

He writes (p. 212) of "business stability" as a desirable objective, but does not define the term in any precise or useful way. "Stability" is an illusive term, as F. E. Desauter has made clear in his important and scholarly book on Stability (the Macmillan Co., New York, 1949).

On page 258, Eccles writes: "High surtaxes on private incomes had the social objective of checking the creation of great fortunes." The meaning of social objective is not defined.

On page 263, he writes of wealthy stockholders evading their fair share of taxation without specifying what the standard of fairness is. He does not indicate whether a proportional or progressive tax provides an objective standard of fairness, but he appears to accept the progressive rate as proper without indicating how high the rate could go before it becomes unfair. Nor does he indicate who is to determine, and on what basis of justice, what the proper degree of progression would be to be fair.

On page 372, he writes of the equality of sacrifice implicit in a certain tax program, but he does not define equality of sacrifice or demonstrate how such a concept, after precise definition, could be applied.

On page 382, he writes of a stable economy but does not define the term. He perhaps comes closest to a definition of what he means by a stabilized economy, on page 394, when he writes of the Government helping to sustain and stabilize it (the economy) at a high expanding level of prosperity. But sustain and stabilize and high, as used in that sentence, are all vague concepts.

On page 393, he writes of using fiscal and monetary measures "for the purpose of maintaining economic stability through maximum production and employment." No one can know what "maximum production and employment" mean and it seems reasonable to suppose that unusually heavy production and employment, as in time of war, could hardly mean "economic stability" in any useful or desirable sense.

Also on page 393, he writes that "the Federal Government has a large measure of responsibility for maintaining a satisfactory level of business activity and employment." Satisfactory to whom? And where in the Constitution is such responsibility specified?

On pages 466-67, he writes: "The purchasing power of the dollar can be defended only when the amount of money available to those who would spend it, including the Government, does not exceed the supply of goods and services available." How does one count the supply of goods and services against the supply of money? How does one count automobiles, airplanes, a railway train, a war tank, a trip to a distant land, a visit to the theater, and so on, against the supply of money? And what would one have if he could do that? Furthermore, the money supply has various rates of turn-over. Prices are affected not alone by the supply of money but also by the rapidity of the turn-over of the dollars. Still further, prices are determined through time, not by the supply of money in existence at any particular time. Goods exchanged today may have been priced months ago. Goods being produced today may have been priced in the past or they may be priced in the future. Probably few goods that are exchanged today are priced today. Goods and services are like a stream flowing against a counterstream of money and credit which has a varying velocity; and prices, sampled today, were made largely in the past and only in part today.

EMOTIONS VERSUS INTELLECT AND PRINCIPLES VERSUS PERSONALITIES

The Eccles book is replete with expressions denoting emotion whereas the method of science calls for the use of the intellect. When mind replaces emotion, the writer uses such expressions as "it appears," "it seems," "the evidence seems to show," "it is my opinion"—words implying judgment based upon evidence. Running heavily throughout the book are such expressions as "I feel," "I felt." While in some cases it is clear that he uses the expression "I feel" as synonymous with "I believe"—which it is not—in many instances the expression "I feel" accurately reflects an emotional, rather than an intellectual, basis for the observation made.

Personalities occupy an important place in the book. Whereas the scientist endeavors to deal with issues in an impersonal manner, much of the writing in this book is in the area of personalities. The fact that the index is built on persons rather than on issues suggests the importance of persons as compared with issues in the mind of Mr. Eccles.

Those persons sympathetic with his programs or who aided him are praised, those that disagreed with him are described or characterized in caustic terms. The following are samples:

"As one listened to what they [characterized as spokesmen for creditors] and the business leaders said, it seemed that a moth flying out of one mouth flew into a second one and nourished it" (p. 93).

"Thomas Jefferson Coolidge [Under Secretary of the Treasury], a Boston banker, whose economic concepts, I was to discover, belonged to the previous era" (p. 137).

"Relations with encrusted old-timers in the Reserve System were complicated by an undercurrent of uncertainty as to what the Senate ultimately would do [about the appointment of Eccles as Chairman of the Board of Governors]" (p. 187).

"You can tell your banker friends to go to hell" (p. 199).

"Spahr gained the signatures of some 66 well-known professors in various universities, all of whom endorsed the statement of opposition he presented in person at this time. I do not know who subsidized the committee then or during its later career as a common scold. * * * Ironically Professor Spahr was a latter-day successor at New York University to Prof. Joseph French Johnson, whom Glass frequently assailed in 1913 for opposing the Reserve Act of that year" (p. 200).

"Warburg [James P.] was wedged in at this moment to speak his lines" (p. 206).

"All [witnesses opposing title II of the Banking Act of 1935] spoke in the same fuzzy way that hinted at dark and sinister things" (p. 209).

"I do not believe it was a mere coincidence that he [Senator Glass] was engaged in gathering in numerous honorary degrees from leading universities, some of whose trustees had a keen interest in seeing title II defeated" (p. 217).

"This is one case where the public result of Morgenthau's fragile feelings was highly beneficial" (p. 222).

"This change had its origins in Senator Glass' skimpy knowledge of what the procedure entailed in practical terms" (p. 226).

"When Roosevelt gave one of these pens to Senator Glass [as the Banking Act of 1935 was signed], someone present commented in a stage whisper 'He should have given him an eraser instead'" (p. 229).

"I knew he [Glass] would pose as the man who saved the bankers of America from being communized by the New Deal, and that he would also pose as the man who, in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, labored to save America by his fight against the work relief bill" (p. 232).

"Many times during the fight I asked myself what position Glass would have taken on the proposed changes in the Reserve System if someone he liked had advocated them" (pp. 234-235).

"When the first act was over and the unctuous voice of Milton Cross announced" (p. 243).

On pages 313-316, Eccles records part of a letter he had written to Senator BRAD. Instead of printing the pertinent parts of BRAD's reply to enable the reader to judge for himself the merits of the Senator's reply, Eccles writes (pp 316-317): "On January 16, 1939, with the Christmas moratorium ended, the Senator returned to the attack. The pellets in the buckshot spray he issued on that day were drawn from Poor Richard's Almanac, Bartlett's Quotations, Will Rogers' aphorisms, condensed versions of the lives of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, and the history of the Federalist Party, and of the English people in modern times.

"Though I was somewhat baffled by the character of this reply, it was not unexpected."

From page 370 "Morgenthau * * * was, I believe, somewhat piqued that as Secretary of the Treasury he was not made head of the committee.

"If you abide by their [the bankers'] counsels or wait for their leadership, you will never do anything in time to safeguard and protect private banking and meet the changing needs of the economy in such a way as to avoid still further intrusion of the Government into the field of private credit, to which I am really very much opposed—an intrusion which the public has demanded in the past because private banking leadership has failed" (p 389).

"Some Republicans hoped I would serve their cause out of sheer pique because I had not been reappointed chairman of the Board of Governors" (p 458).

Mr Eccles performed some services in Washington and has proposed some measures not yet made effective which this reviewer would support provided they rested on the foundation of constitutional Government, a careful protection of the freedom of the individual and of private property against the encroachment of the Federal Government, free markets, the practice of economy by the Federal Government, a fixed monetary standard and a redeemable currency, the maintenance of the independence of the Federal Reserve System, verified economic principles as to how to bring the greatest good to the greatest number of people. Unfortunately, the Eccles book does not provide that sort of foundation. Instead, it employs the subjective standards of the dictator and urges a program characteristic of a highly developed governmentally-managed economy. This is, clearly, what he means by his "logical radicalism."

They Were Not There, They Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the stooge of a Binghamton editorial writer was the author the other day of a poison-pen letter designed to infer that your Congressman talked big at home but took no action to save the penny postcard in last week's House debate.

Actually, your Congressman presented a preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause of the whole works which would have killed doubling the penny postcard if the House had wanted to

This newspaper has blacked out in blind fury every decent reference to your Congressman for a long time. Complimentary references my way are blue-pencilled at the source when some greenhorn infrequently has the naïveté to report the truth for publication. Sabotage on the home front could not be more effective coming from admitted subversives.

The fact is, I made a lengthy speech against raising all postage rates. This newspaper long ago fired their Washington correspondent, so they could not by any stretch of the imagination have been on the scene of action.

They just took their usual dirty crack at me and threw accuracy out the window. No wonder we are in deadly peril of communism right here at home when you have the spectacle of those who pose as Americans refusing to give standing room to elected representatives of American voters.

Westchester-Rockland District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I include the attached article entitled "Westchester-Rockland District," New York State Business Facts, published by the State of New York Department of Commerce, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the New York State Business Facts]

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Businessmen have frequent need for basic information about a community, a county or an area to aid them in their problems of operating, planning, and marketing. In 1945, the New York State Department of Commerce, recognizing this need, prepared the New York Means Business series of data books, one for each of the 11 economic areas of the State.

The sustained demand for these data books, of which over 150,000 copies were distributed, plus the availability of more recent census and other statistics, necessitates the issuance of a new series. The current New York State Business Facts series, of which this is a part, has been prepared to meet this need. Information has been drawn from the 1947 Census of Manufactures, the 1948 Census of Business, and the 1950 Census of Population. Many other sources of information not readily accessible to the businessman have also been utilized.

The New York State Business Facts series might be regarded as an all-purpose information kit. It is designed to provide, in minimum space, the maximum useful material on population, wealth, income, business activity, and facilities for each area as a whole, as well as for its principal communities. This booklet, therefore, offers a con-

venient springboard from which a business inquiry may be launched. The ultimate answer to a specific problem will frequently depend upon more detailed and specialized information than a publication of this type can possibly provide. For example, the businessman who is selecting a location in which to open a new establishment should get first-hand information through local contacts about the prospective localities and obtain additional statistics bearing on his special field of interest.

A short descriptive statement provides a bird's-eye view of the area's residents, where they work, what they produce, and what they buy. A study of the tables which follow will give the prospective resident of the area an indication of the living conditions in the various communities. The facts presented with respect to population growth, sales per store, and relative prosperity of the community will help a retailer or seller of services to select a location with the best prospects. In the statistics relating to the labor force, the manufacturer will find data of significance in selecting an industrial location. The sales manager may gauge his market potential from the statistics of population, payrolls, retail sales, and farming.

The New York State Department of Commerce stands ready to aid the businessman in his search for information. We welcome your inquiries.

HAROLD KELLER,
Commissioner of Commerce.

WESTCHESTER-ROCKLAND DISTRICT

The Westchester-Rockland district, while it is closely linked with the economy of New York City, has an important economic life of its own. Westchester County's 435 square miles of rolling hills, fine beaches, landscaped highways, country estates, and model residential villages gives this wealthy suburb its unique character. It is, however, far from being exclusively rural or residential. More than half of its 623,000 inhabitants reside in four large cities: Yonkers, Mount Vernon, New Rochelle, and White Plains, all in the southern portion of the county. Among its 927 manufacturing plants are some of the principal establishments in the metropolitan New York area, producing nationally known brands of rugs, automobiles, copper wire, elevators, and hearing aids.

Rockland County, on the west shore of the Hudson River, has, in the main, retained its suburban character, although it has developed a number of industries. About one-sixth of its 178 square miles consists of State parks which bring a substantial volume of resort trade to the area because of their proximity to New York City. The 89,000 inhabitants of Rockland all live in rural areas or in villages with populations of less than 6,000. These communities manufacture a variety of products including pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, paper cartons, and sewing machines. A number of firms also engage in textile dyeing and finishing.

Situated at the narrow southern extremity of the State, the Westchester-Rockland district is the funnel for major rail, highway, and water routes to New York City. The main line and two branches of the New York Central Railroad and the main line of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad operate in Westchester County. Rockland County is served by the Erie Railroad and the West Shore division of the New York Central Railroad. These rail lines, and nine intercity bus companies not only link the area with upstate New York, the New England States, and the West, but also provide commuter service during rush hours for those who work in New York City.

Westchester County's 1,194 miles of improved highway include some of the finest parkways in the country, such as the Bronx River Parkway, Taconic State Parkway, Hutchinson River Parkway, and Saw Mill River Parkway. Rockland County has 426

miles of improved highway. With the Hudson River bisecting the area, there is ready access to the State's inland waterways and to the port of New York. Scheduled airline service to New York City and upstate New York is available at the Westchester County airport.

The availability of both space and labor force in the Westchester-Rockland District and the stimulus of war production during World War II have resulted in rapid industrial growth in the past decade, particularly in Westchester County. Factory employment in the area expanded by 68 percent from 1939 to 1947 as compared with a 46 percent gain in New York City. The area's increase in number of establishments was even more striking, almost doubling in the 8-year period.

Westchester County ranks seventh among the counties of the State in manufacturing employment. Yonkers, its largest city, is the eighth most important industrial center in New York State. The area's largest industry, like that of New York City, is the needle trades, employing about one out of every six factory workers. There is a wide diversity of manufactures in both durable and nondurable goods fields. The production of textile-mill products, primarily carpets and rugs, ranks a close second to apparel in employment. In Yonkers is the world's largest carpet factory, which is also the leading plant in the county and employs over 6,000 workers.

The machinery industry is the third largest manufacturing activity in Westchester County. Yonkers is the site of a nationally known manufacturer of elevators and escalators. Several major establishments producing copper wire, cable, and electrical equipment are located in Mount Vernon, Hastings on Hudson, and Yonkers. Tarrytown's auto assembly plants employ thousands of workers. Elmsford is the home of a major producer of hearing aids and Port Chester of nuts and bolts. Yeast and alcohol, pharmaceuticals and dyestuffs are products of firms in Tuckahoe, Peekskill, and Hastings on Hudson, and coils for television sets are manufactured in New Rochelle. One of the leading magazine publishers in the East is situated in Pleasantville.

The manufacture of chemicals and allied products is the outstanding industry of Rockland County, employing about a third of its factory workers. The leading employer in the county, located at Pearl River, produces penicillin and other biologicals. Cosmetics are produced in Suffern, and formaldehydes and insecticides at West Haverstraw. The apparel industry, the second largest manufacturing activity, is made up of numerous small shops in Suffern, Haverstraw, Nyack, and Pearl River. Several concerns engaged in dyeing and finishing silk and other fabrics for New York City's huge dress industry are located in Garnerville. Sewing machines are manufactured in Nyack. A large plant at Pearl River makes printers' and bookbinders' machinery.

The area's 712,000 persons represent one of the wealthiest consumer groups in the country, due primarily to the relatively large proportion of high-salaried executives, managers, and technical workers living in Westchester. This high level of income is only partially reflected by retail sales per capita because of the nearness of the huge and concentrated shopping facilities in New York City. In 1948, retail sales per capita in Westchester County averaged \$1,053 as compared with \$1,952 for Manhattan and \$981 for the upstate region. In recent years, a trend favorable to local shopping has developed in Westchester County with the opening of suburban branches by a number of famous New York City department and specialty stores. The competition of New York City's stores is more evident in Rockland County's per capita sales of \$747.

The 9,493 retail establishments in the Westchester-Rockland district grossed \$707,004,000 in 1948 with Westchester County alone accounting for 88 percent of the establishments and 91 percent of the sales.

Yonkers, the largest city in the area, is also the outstanding trading center, accounting for 19 percent of the retail sales and 25 percent of the wholesale receipts in Westchester County. The other leading trading centers in Westchester are White Plains, Mount Vernon, and New Rochelle. Rockland County's shopping centers include Nyack, Haverstraw, and Spring Valley.

Agricultural activity is relatively unimportant in the Westchester-Rockland district. Most of Westchester's farm lands are located in the more sparsely populated northern section. The richest farm lands in Rockland are in the central and southeastern parts of the county. The 1,129 farms in the district sold about \$5,000,000 worth of products in 1945. Westchester County's major farm products are horticultural. Its nurseries and hothouses supplied the metropolitan New York market with \$1,212,000 worth of flowers and shrubs in 1945.

The area caters to almost every type of recreation interest. Rockland County's Harriman and Bear Mountain State Parks, only 45 miles from New York City, attract thousands of visitors the year round and offer facilities for swimming, boating, picnicking, horseback riding, roller skating, camping and skiing. Scores of fine parks are scattered throughout Westchester County. In addition to the four public golf courses, there are no less than 60 private golf clubs in Westchester. There are many boat and yacht clubs along the sound and on the Hudson River as well as beaches for both fresh- and salt-water bathing.

Ten institutions of higher learning are located in Westchester and one in Rockland. Degrees in liberal arts are offered to women at the Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, the College of New Rochelle, Good Counsel College in White Plains, and the Marymount College at Tarrytown. For men, New Rochelle's Iona College, the Maryknoll Seminary, and the St. Joseph's Seminary and College at Yonkers offer liberal arts degrees. The University of the State of New York provides a 2-year technical course at its Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences in White Plains. Briarcliff Junior College at Briarcliff Manor, and Concordia Collegiate Institute at Bronxville offer 2 years of study at the college level. In Rockland County, the Missionary Training Institute at Nyack gives courses leading to a degree in music.

The St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent article entitled "New Life for Midwest in St. Lawrence Seaway," by Mr. H. C. Brockel, which appeared in the August edition of the magazine Government Service. Mr. Brockel is the director of the Milwaukee Port Authority, with whom I have had the pleasure of working on such legislation as the St. Lawrence project, the Great Lakes shipping law enacted last year, and other matters of major importance to the Great Lakes

region. He is an exceptionally able and conscientious public official devoted to the general welfare, and it is a pleasure to include his article in the RECORD. It follows:

NEW LIFE FOR MIDWEST IN ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(By H. C. Brockel)

For the last three decades, America's most distinguished statesmen, diplomats, engineers, and business leaders have emphatically answered "Yes" to the question: Should the St. Lawrence seaway be built? Though legislation authorizing completion of the project has again apparently died in Congress, proponents are confident that the seaway will be built eventually.

President Truman, following in the tradition of every President since Taft, recommended the project urgently to Congress. Twenty distinguished Senators of both major political parties introduced legislation to authorize execution of our agreement with Canada for the seaway development.

The State Department has given the seaway high place in its international program to demonstrate to the world that nations living side by side can peacefully develop projects whose benefits transcend international boundary lines and to prove that America is sincerely determined to strengthen international relationships and achieve permanent peace, by peaceful commerce between nations.

The seaway has two great economic justifications—low-cost water transportation and low-cost hydroelectric power. The St. Lawrence is the greatest undeveloped source of hydroelectric power in North America. Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of electrical energy are running unused into the Atlantic because of our failure to harness this tremendous resource. President Truman has emphasized that our whole economic and military future requires further development of our power resources, including the vast potential energy of the St. Lawrence.

The States bordering the Great Lakes want the seaway as a transportation resource. By extending deep-draft ocean shipping into lake ports, Midwest farms and industries will be able to use cheap water transportation on a scale hitherto impossible. Industry in the Great Lakes Basin could import raw materials in large quantities, at minimum cost, by substituting a direct-water haul for a costly rail haul. Midwest agriculture and industry alike will be able to tap new markets abroad.

There is nothing new or experimental in the seaway project. For more than a century, Great Lakes ports have been engaged in direct trade with Europe through the St. Lawrence River. Between 1920 and 1940, a substantial shipping trade developed between lake ports and northern European harbors in spite of the handicap of the present 14-foot canals in the St. Lawrence River. Briefly interrupted by World War II, direct steamship services between the Great Lakes and Europe have been resumed on a tremendously expanded scale, with six ocean steamship lines regularly engaged in the trade and with close to 100 ocean sailings scheduled for 1951.

Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Toronto, and Montreal are now served regularly by these important services, with other ports of call included as cargo movement warrants.

The history of the now well-established shipping service between lake ports and overseas destinations proves beyond doubt the large freight savings possible by use of direct steamers, which eliminate transshipment charges at seaboard ports and costly rail hauls to and from the interior.

The St. Lawrence is not an inland waterway or an artificial waterway—it is a natural

highway into the heart of the continent. It is basic in water transportation that ships will penetrate inland as far as possible before discharging cargo. This is proved by the inland location of many great seaports and by ocean shipping operations a thousand or more miles inland on rivers, such as the Yangtze and the Amazon. A single factor—the rapids in the St. Lawrence between Ogdenburg and Montreal—has obstructed this principle of water transportation on the St. Lawrence. These rapids are now passable by locks only 14 feet deep and 260 feet long, which limit the size of ships using the route to those dimensions.

The project thus contemplates nothing but a modernization of an existing transportation route. Ninety-five percent of the 2,400-mile sailing distance between Milwaukee and the Atlantic is now fully available for deep-draft shipping.

The cost of the engineering works in the St. Lawrence River will be shared by Canada, the United States, and the State of New York. The net cost of the project to the National Government will be a little more than \$300,000,000, or about one average day's war expenditure during World War II. This nominal expenditure is economically justified by tremendous potential savings in freight charges and electric power rates. The Department of Commerce, as recently as December 1948, estimated that traffic through the seaway, including both general cargo and bulk freight, would range from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons a year.

The Department of Commerce estimated that freight savings of \$7 to \$10 a ton could readily be derived on shipments moving from overseas to Lake Michigan ports, even allowing for St. Lawrence seaway tolls on the basis of \$1.25 a ton. Even on the basis of the present 14-foot draft operation, limiting ocean carriers to about 1,600 tons of cargo west of Montreal, net freight savings of \$5 to \$10 a ton have been repeatedly demonstrated by the use of existing services.

Aside from the seaway's economic value, another factor of even greater importance is the future security of the United States and Canada. Before World War II, our military leaders urged the completion of the project for the national defense. Shortly after the end of World War II, the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised Congress that from our experience in World War II, the project is absolutely essential to the national security as a shipbuilding resource, as an additional transportation facility, and as a new source of power.

It is a national misfortune that the seaway was not developed before World War II. With it, Midwest industry and agriculture could have made a more effective contribution to the war effort, and much money and perhaps many lives could have been saved.

Our wartime shipbuilding production approached 70,000,000 tons. Sixty-five percent of the steel, machinery, and other component parts of these ships originated in the Great Lakes area. However, only about 2 percent of the completed ships were constructed on the Lakes, although we have sheltered harbors, skilled workmen, vast industries, and great steel production. Small ships were constructed in lake ports and sent to sea through the Mississippi River at great expense. The shipbuilding potentialities of the Great Lakes have hardly been scratched. The bottlenecks has been the difficulty of getting the ships to salt water.

Had the seaway been developed, we could have constructed in lake harbors, escort carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and merchant ships. These ships could have been loaded in lake ports with foodstuffs, munitions, and matériel of war, and if this seems like mere speculation, remember that Detroit was ranked as America's No. 1 arsenal, and was closely followed in war production by Great

Lakes Industrial centers such as Cleveland, Chicago, and Milwaukee.

Convoys could have been assembled in lake ports and sent to Europe with an ocean crossing 1,000 miles shorter via the St. Lawrence than from Atlantic ports. The submarine hazard would have been reduced by one-third, in terms of distance; and shipping losses could have been reduced in proportion to the saving in ocean mileage by use of the St. Lawrence.

The war has depleted our natural resources. We find ourselves with rapidly dwindling supplies of iron ore, petroleum, manganese, copper, lead, and other strategic materials necessary in war and peace. A strategic stockpiling program is now planned, based upon industrial requirements and the national defense. These critical materials should be transported and stored as effectively as possible, in sheltered interior locations, where they will be used in volume. This means the industrial area surrounding the Great Lakes.

Considering the exposure of our coasts to naval and air attack, it is sound national policy to locate strategic industry in the interior and at the same time, provide it with the advantages of ocean transportation by extending deep draft shipping into the lakes.

The seaway will check the drift of population from the Midwest to the seaboard. In recent years there has been a mushroom growth of new industry along the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast. The employment offered by these new industries has encouraged many people to migrate from the Middle West to the seaboard, resulting in a rapid growth of population around the seacoast and a gradual decline of population in the interior. Between 1930 and 1940 many Midwestern States actually lost population. This trend was accelerated during the war.

States tributary to the Great Lakes normally account for 35 percent of our national exports. The foreign trade of the United States does not originate or terminate in our great seaports, but is in large measure traceable to the import requirements and the export production of the farms and factories in the heart of the country. Much of our overseas business is highly competitive and must seek the most economical transportation route.

In spite of its distinguished support the seaway has strong opposition. The principal objectors are seacoast ports, which fear the loss of transfer business between ship and rail, the eastern trunk-line railroads, which are hostile to Great Lakes water transportation, utility interests, who object not to the St. Lawrence power development, but to the fact that it will be publicly rather than privately controlled, and, finally, the coal industry, which opposes hydroelectric developments as a threat to coal markets.

The early canal builders opposed the development of the railroads, when Edison invented the incandescent bulb the gas industry declaimed the impossibility of electric lighting, the railroads opposed the Panama Canal bitterly, as impracticable, just as they today oppose the seaway. Nevertheless, the railroads were built, the automobile succeeded the buggy, electric lights have become commonplace, and the Panama Canal has joined the Atlantic and the Pacific. In each case benefits have exceeded expectations, and predicted disasters have not materialized.

History will prove the justification for the St. Lawrence, and its accomplishment is merely a matter of time. The case for the seaway has been proved and re-proved so often that its merit is axiomatic. It is not the St. Lawrence waterway which was on trial in Washington. The issue before Congress again was whether the national interest would prevail or whether the self-interest of certain powerful and articulate groups

would determine national policy. The seaway is inevitable. The only question is: How long can delaying tactics obstruct it?

American postwar planning is geared to a philosophy of expansion—greater production, full employment, expanded foreign trade, an enlarged merchant marine. The St. Lawrence seaway will help us to obtain every one of these objectives. An expanded foreign trade will cement friendly foreign relations. We need new trade routes and new traffic to support our merchant marine, the largest in the world. Full employment and full production must be geared to a greater volume of commerce and transportation. No project before the American people today will do more to accomplish these objectives than the seaway.

Not only lake ports but the inland communities of the Middle West will share in the benefits of the improved and cheaper transportation through the seaway. Untold thousands of new jobs will be created in lake ports and throughout the Middle West due to expansion of shipping operations, shipbuilding, and the multitudinous aspects of foreign trade.

To our lake ports, the seaway will mean the movement of large volumes of new commerce with added business for railroads, truck lines, stevedores, warehousemen, brokers, banks, and all of the innumerable enterprises associated with maritime activity. The seaway will act as a magnet to bring new industry to the shores of the Great Lakes seeking the most advantageous locations, with a corresponding enhancement of property values.

The project will open a new chapter in banking history with considerable expansion of foreign trade financing in the Middle West. Above all, the seaway will mean new foreign-trade opportunities for midwestern industry and new markets for midwestern farm produce.

Secretary of State Acheson has said that the seaway will increase the wealth of the United States by developing one of the greatest natural resources in the world—the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. He has pointed to the mutual benefits which will be derived by Canada and the United States in terms of new economic strength and added security for both nations. He describes the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system as a great highway of commerce stretching for 2,400 miles from Newfoundland into the industrial and agricultural heart of the United States and Canada.

Secretary Acheson thus joins his powerful voice with those of his distinguished predecessors, with the President of both parties, and with our greatest military leaders in the unanimous conviction that the seaway will open the Great Lakes area with its vast industrial and agricultural resources to ocean shipping, will give power-deficient areas a new low-cost source of electrical energy, and will add immeasurably to the national welfare and the national security.

Gen. George Marshall, other members of the Cabinet, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recently urged upon Congress immediate construction of the seaway as an essential feature of the long-range mobilization of the United States. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, urged that the seaway be built for navigation, for power, and for the national defense.

Wilson told a congressional committee that the seaway, in his opinion, would pay out as a private enterprise and that he would not mind developing it as a private venture. This is a remarkable statement about a Government project coming from one of the Nation's top-flight industrial leaders, and is compelling evidence of the great economic merit of the project.

The opposition to the project is powerful and well financed, and has delayed con-

gressional action on the project for another period of time. However, the project may be approaching completion without American participation, as the Canadian Government has issued a number of strong statements indicating that if the American Congress turns its back on the project, Canada will immediately carry it to completion with Canadian financing.

Even the bitterest opponents of the project concede that it must inevitably be built. As Freeman Lincoln, writing in a recent issue of *Fortune* magazine, well said, "The things that are right and necessary in this world eventually are done. The seaway is one of those things."

Oil and Gas Possibilities in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the demands of the defense program on our reserves of oil and natural gas are tremendous. Curtailment of imports of foreign oil will add additional burdens on our supply. Undoubtedly, exploration and drilling for oil and gas by our major oil companies, and by the independents will be stepped up.

Alabama's oil production resources are being constantly expanded by exploration and drilling in Choctaw and Clarke counties.

It is significant that on February 20, 1950, a natural gas well of commercial proportions was brought in 4 miles south of Hamilton in Marion County, Ala., in the Seventh Congressional District. This well gives promise of the possibility of a commercial gas field in Marion County. This first well has a potential of more than 2,000,000 cubic feet per day, though its conservation capacity is figured at 400,000 cubic feet per day.

Dr. Walter B. Jones, State geologist for Alabama, in an article in *World Oil*, dated July 1, 1950, and styled "Oil and Gas Progress and Prospects in Alabama," divides Alabama into seven prospective districts, and includes practically all of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here, in district No. 2, and about it, among other things, he says:

In addition to the Hamilton gas field, there was small production of gas in the Fayette gas field in 1912 to 1914. Almost every well drilled in the area reported shows of oil or gas or both.

Another important feature in this province is the series of three wells drilled by Glenn D. Rose on a structure between Manchester, Walker County, and Poplar Springs, Winston County. The first well encountered gas in Mississippian Limestone, was acidized and gaged 750,000 cubic feet of gas per day. The other two wells had good shows of gas, giving promise of commercial possibilities, and shows of oil, all in limestone.

The writer considers it a favorable prospect.

Further in the article referred to Dr. Jones says when speaking about his Dis-

trict 2—Seventh Congressional District of Alabama:

Elsewhere the Appalachians, similar areas produce both oil and gas. For this reason, and for reasons given above, this is considered to be the second best area in the State to look for production.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is rich in many natural resources. Its reserves of high-grade coals will last a thousand years. Its clays and gravels are among the best. Its brown iron ore deposits are not surpassed anywhere in this country. The easy fertility of its soil, combined with its sunshine and rainfall make it a great farming district. It has great deposits of limestone which are used for building purposes. To all of these, and including its streams and timber are now added a favorable prospect for oil and gas.

Under leave already granted, I include Dr. Jones' article, to which I have referred:

OIL AND GAS PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN ALABAMA

(By Dr. Walter B. Jones, State geologist, University, Alabama)

With the completion of M. W. Davies et al one on the right bank of the Alabama River in the southern tip of Clarke County, Humble Oil & Refining Co has brought in Alabama's second oil field. At present, there are 42 producers in the Gilbertown field. Recent completion of a small gas well near Hamilton, in Marion County, gives promise of a commercial gas field. Last year, a shallow salt dome was discovered near McIntosh, Washington County. Thus postwar predictions of important events in oil and gas exploration in Alabama are coming to pass.

PROGRESS

Clarke County discovery. The Davies well is very important, not so much for the amount of oil it produced in its 2 days on pump (86.4 and 100 barrels per day), but for the considerable thickness of beds containing oil. It is also of interest that the producing horizon is the glauconitic sand member of the Tuscaloosa formation, Upper Cretaceous age. The horizon is productive elsewhere in the Gulf Coast region. Until the Davies well, the Tuscaloosa sand section had been dry in the score or more wells which penetrated it. In the Davies well the first oil show was encountered at 4,275 feet. From that depth to 7,342 feet, 91 oil shows and one gas show were observed. Most of these were in thin layers and beds of sand and shaly sand, too thin to produce. However, 16 drill-stem tests were made, at various depths from 4,275-85 feet to 7,314-21 feet, before the seventeenth test brought in the well at 5,419-29 feet.

Not much is known about the structure of the new field. It is thought to be an anticline, with north-south axis, parallel to and along the eastern margin of an extension of the well-known Jackson fault. Actually, the structure may cross the Alabama River into the northwestern part of Baldwin County. It is apt to extend across the cut-off, separating Clarke and Baldwin Counties.

The Davies 1 is in a swampy area, accessible only by water, except during very dry weather. Every item required for drilling and completing the well had to be shipped in by barge. The rig was located on a mound raised about 15 feet above the swamp floor. About 150 yards of causeway, similarly thrown up, connected the rig to a terminal at the river's edge, where a Bailey bridge permitted access from barge to ramp. Until more is known about the trend and produc-

tion possibilities of the structure, it is unlikely that access roads will be undertaken.

The oil from the new discovery is heavy and black, with asphaltic base, of 14 gravity, corrected. Plans for marketing the oil are not known. Oils showing in some of the sands were much lighter in color and of much higher gravity, giving promise of future production of higher quality oil.

Hamilton gas field: Also new to Alabama's oil and gas industry is the gasser, Lewis 1-A, about 4 miles southwest of Hamilton, Marion County, brought in by Harry L. Cullet, February 20, 1950. While the well had a potential of more than 2,000,000 cubic feet per day, its conservation capacity is figured at 400,000 cubic feet. The productive sand is Bethel sandstone, Mississippian age. The structure is thought to be a warp with northwest-southeast trend, perpendicular to the axis of the Appalachian geanticline.

OIL SHOWS FOUND

While not very important in itself, for the gasser is a minimum one, it is significant that several good oil shows were encountered both above and below the gas horizon. The field may produce both oil and gas. Only future exploration can give the answer to that question. Cullet is drilling a second well and contemplates others. The discovery well was completed at 1,835-1,845 feet.

Gilbertown field: This field was rather fully described in *World Oil*, September 1, 1947, and data will not be repeated in detail here. Production is against or close to a fault plane extending in a general east-west direction, on the north flank of the Hatch-etigbee anticline. On September 1, 1947, there were 21 producers in the West, and 9 in the East Gilbertown area. No more drilling has been done in the West Gilbertown area, under lease to Hunt Oil Co. However, the East Gilbertown area has been the scene of great activity, which brought the number of producers from 9 to 21. At this writing eight permits have been granted for additional wells, three to Carter Oil Co., two to Magnolia Petroleum Co., one to R. G. Houser, one to Robert Locke, and one to R. L. Lawrence. The area of proven production has been extended eastward, until it now spans about 4 miles.

In West Gilbertown, most of the wells produce about 50 barrels per day. In the east, a majority of the wells produce the allowable of 100 barrels per day. In the west, 13 wells produce from fractured zones in the Selma chalk Upper Cretaceous age, and 8 from the underlying Eutaw formation, also Upper Cretaceous. In the east, one well produces from both the Selma and Eutaw, while the rest have been finished off in the Eutaw. Chalk wells are about 2,600 feet deep, while Eutaw wells range from 3,200 to 3,500 feet. In the Eutaw formation, about six petroliferous horizons have been encountered in about 200 feet of beds.

The oil is black, asphaltic base, and 17 to 20 gravity.

Up to now, all production has been sold to Hunt Oil Co. which operates a pipeline extending through the field to a terminal on the right bank of the Tombigbee River near old St. Stephens, whence it is shipped by barge to Tuscaloosa. There it enters a refinery operated by Placid Oil Co., a subsidiary of Hunt Oil Co., and is made into various asphalt products, with excess light hydrocarbons sent elsewhere for blending into gasoline, etc. Reported capacity of the refinery is 4,000 barrels per day. The pipeline also takes oil from several wells just across the line in Mississippi.

Production from the Gilbertown field for April was 48,785 barrels, and it is likely to show a sharp increase in the next few months.

Varying amounts of salt water are produced along with oil in most of the wells.

Single wells or clusters are served by separators, and the salt water is disposed of into Wilcox (Eocene) sands. The field has water drive, though a small amount of gas is present in a few of the wells in the East Gilbertown area.

Porosity in the Eutaw formation is about 32 percent and permeability averages 150 millidarcys.

McIntosh salt dome: In 1949 the seismograph outlined and a coredrill outfit drilled into a shallow, piercement type salt dome near McIntosh, Washington County. At the point encountered by the drill, the salt core was 422 feet below the surface. Its discovery came as no surprise, for it had already been established that a deep salt basin existed in southwest Alabama. Inasmuch as no further work has been done, the diameter of the core and whether or not oil and/or gas is present must remain in doubt.

PROSPECTS

In order to accurately appraise the oil and gas possibilities of Alabama, based upon data now at hand, the State may be divided into provinces. These will be discussed in the order of their estimated importance.

1 In this area the Gilbertown field and new discovery in Clarke County are located, as well as the McIntosh salt dome. In 1945 the Boykin 1 in the northern part of Mobile County, just south of Calvert, strongly indicated the existence of a deep salt basin. Presence of the long and widely known and important geologic features, the Hatchetigbee Anticline and Jackson Fault, in this province, lent encouragement to much exploratory work, beginning more than 65 years ago. Even so, a period of approximately 60 years elapsed before Hunt Oil Co. brought in Alabama's first commercial oil well in the Gilbertown field. Most of the wells drilled in the area, prior to 1944, were without shows of either oil or gas, notable exceptions being those drilled near Mobile and at Fort Morgan, on a narrow sand spit along the southern border of Mobile Bay, all of which had gas shows. Actually, not enough drilling has been done in the area to interpret accurately its subsurface conditions and to evaluate its potentialities.

Upon the surface of this region are formations from Eocene to Recent age. All of these beds extend southward in fairly uniform thickness and characteristics, as do all of the Upper Cretaceous formations, except the basal one, the Tuscaloosa. Here the abnormalities begin, and become successively more complex downward. The few very deep wells have shown some basis for correlation with well known beds in Louisiana and Texas. Among prominent, heretofore unsuspected beds, are marine sections in the Lower Tuscaloosa formation, underlain by a considerable thickness of beds assigned to the Lower Cretaceous, which are not known to outcrop at the surface. In the Eutaw, Tuscaloosa, and underlying beds are many sand members which are ideal for oil or gas.

In this area was drilled Alabama's deepest well to date, Humble Oil & Refining Co.'s Jessie H. Williams, 2, Washington County, which went to 15,659 feet, stopping in the Lower Cretaceous.

Known structures in the province, along with two productive areas, have led the writer to believe that this is the best area in the State to look for oil and gas. In addition to normal structures, such as anticlines, fault zones, and salt domes, there is a possibility of getting production from sand lenses along the outer margins of the province.

EARLY GAS PRODUCTION

2. This province includes most of the Warrior coal basin and the area to the west and south where the coal measures plunge underneath the Upper Cretaceous beds. Structures are fairly common in this province. In

addition to the Hamilton gas field, there was small production of gas in the Fayette gas field in 1912 to 1914. Almost every well drilled in the area reported shows of oil or gas or both, mostly in formations of Mississippian age.

Another important feature in this province is the series of three wells drilled by Glenn D. Rose on a structure between Manchester, Walker County, and Poplar Springs, Winston County. The first well encountered gas in Mississippian limestone, was acidized, and gaged 750,000 cubic feet of gas per day. The other two wells had good shows of gas, giving promise of commercial possibilities, and shows of oil, all in limestone. Rose abandoned the project in 1947, and nothing has been done there since. The writer considers it a favorable prospect.

ASPHALT BEDS

Another factor having an important bearing on the potentialities of this province is the existence of asphalt beds in the Hartselle sandstone and in the Gasper and Bethel formations, at their outcrops along the northern margin of the province. The asphalt is the residue left from evaporation of crude oil at the outcrop. It is reasonable to believe that some of the oil was trapped in structures to the south, and that oil fields will be developed from these horizons.

Elsewhere in the Appalachians, similar areas produce both oil and gas. For this reason, and for reasons given above, this is considered to be the second best area in the State to look for production.

3. The area outlined in province 3 is not too well known. What information is available leads to a belief that the area contains a shallow salt basin, extending into adjacent parts of Georgia and Florida, and that oil might be found there. Outcropping in the area are beds of Eocene and Miocene age, covering beds of Upper Cretaceous age, which in turn rest on crystalline rocks of the basal complex. Whether or not beds of the Lower Cretaceous exist in the area cannot be known until a deep test is drilled. Even lacking adequate exploration, it is thought that future prospecting will justify its assignment to third place in potentialities.

4 This province includes most of the Tennessee Valley, where beds of Mississippian age outcrop over most of the area, with a few small patches of Silurian beds along the northern fringe. On the southern margin of the province are Coal Measures, which also cap mountain tops in the eastern part.

In 1865 two wells were drilled in Lawrence County to a supposed depth of 700 to 800 feet, the first to be drilled for oil in the State. It was reported that one well had oil shows. In 1890, goyer 1 was drilled in the same county. At a depth of 1,509 to 1,529 feet, oil was reported to have risen 400 feet in the casing. Eight barrels were drawn out, and casing was ordered. Ultimately the casing arrived and was set. No oil showed up. The well was then shot with 100 quarts of nitroglycerin, which lifted the casing to the top of the derrick. Still there was no oil, and the project was abandoned. The oil recovered was green in color and 46 gravity. Recently, B. E. Davis drilled a well at or near the same spot, with shows only in the Hartselle, at a shallow depth. It is now thought that the goyer 1, which had no casing in the hole, received its oil from the Hartselle, and not from lower beds.

EARLY PRODUCTION

Also in this province, at West Huntsville, gas was produced on a small scale, from wells about 385 feet deep, in 1905-08.

Practically all wells drilled in this province have reported shows of oil or gas or both. The area does have possibilities, and is assigned to fourth place on its record.

5 This is a province of unknown possibilities. The northern part of the area com-

prises beds of Upper Cretaceous age, covering folded and faulted Paleozoics on the west and crystalline rocks on the east. It is likely that this part of the area has little actual chance of making a commercial field. However, the chances are much brighter in the lower part of Butler County, and in Conecuh, Covington, and Escambia Counties. It is possible that this part of the area may rival Province 3 or even 2 in importance. It does have a sufficient thickness of cover. However, there has not been enough exploration to properly evaluate its position.

6. In this province are highly folded and sharply faulted Paleozoics, lightly covered along the southern margin by basal beds of the Tuscaloosa formation on the west, and thinly blanketed crystallines on the east. While oil and gas may occur here in commercial quantity, the chances are not very bright.

7. This is the area of crystalline rocks, in which neither oil nor gas would be expected to occur.

Amendment of United States Code— Copyrights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced, H. R. 5473, would amend section 1 of title 17 of the United States Code, "Copyrights." Under that statute as presently constituted the public rendition of a musical composition upon a coin-operated machine, such as jukeboxes, does not constitute a public performance for profit unless an admission fee is charged.

The purpose of my proposed amendment is to place owners, operators, and distributors of coin-operated machines—so-called jukeboxes—on the same basis as all other commercial users of music. Under this amendment, jukebox operators of two or more machines would be required to pay compensation to copyright owners for the right to perform their musical works publicly for profit.

The proposed amendment would continue to exempt from any obligation to pay royalties the proprietors of small taverns and other establishments where coin-operated music machines are placed. Instead, responsibility for payment would be upon the owners, operators and distributors of such machines who control several or many such machines by placing them singly in various establishments or by sharing in the proceeds.

I am happy to join with my distinguished colleague in the Senate, Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, in sponsoring legislation which would compensate American composers and authors for the widespread use of their music for profit upon coin-operated machines.

The measure I have introduced does not differ in substance or aim from S. 1553, the bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee. My bill does, however,

contain some variations in phraseology from S. 1553.

After discussing the measure with the eminent chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and with the committee's legal staff, I feel that these changes serve to clarify the intent of the legislation without modifying its essential purpose.

Will Some One Please Answer This Fair Question—Why Must This Outrage in Korea Continue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AUGUST 28, 1951.

HON. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Less than 6 months from the time of his enlistment in the Army our only son was put on the front line in Korea. Needless to say we are heartbroken over the whole business. First, I would like to explain a few things to you to make you see why we are especially bitter about this. In the first place we didn't want him to enlist. He was just out of high school, had never been away from home and we felt he should have at least a year away at school before he entered the service. He couldn't see it that way, however, because so many of his friends had gone in either the Navy or Air Force. If he insisted upon enlisting we felt that either of these branches would be best. But he couldn't pass the physical for either of these branches because he was too small. He is only 5 foot 3 inches and weighs about 109 pounds. But the Army took him all right. We then wanted him more than ever to go away to school and wait to be drafted, feeling that he had nothing to gain by enlisting. But, oh, yes. They told him at the Army recruiting office that if he enlisted he could get in just what he wanted because so few were enlisting. How they can lie to these boys the way they do is beyond my comprehension. So they put him in the combat engineers, demolitions. Of all the places to put a boy who was too small for the Navy. One wonders where they find men to run things in an Army who would do that. Not that he is any better than any other boy. I certainly don't mean that, but it just doesn't make good sense, now does it? Are you surprised that we feel as we do? It does really seem as if he has been pushed around an awful lot since the Army got him. He wanted to go to carpentry school or any other number of things and never wanted to be in the combat engineers. As his dad said, "The kid wasn't good enough for the Air Force or Navy, but he was good enough to be given a rifle and put on the front line in Korea." If he was in an Army that was fighting to preserve our country or our traditions I think I might feel entirely different than I do. But there is not one bit of sense in our troops being on the other side of the world fighting in a country we don't own or don't want.

Why must this outrage in Korea continue? Our being over there in the first place was

a tragic mistake, and after more than a year of fighting and pure hell for our boys, and over 90,000 casualties, we are no further along than when it started. I wrote to Mr. Truman when we found out our boy had to go over. The reply came from the office of the Adjutant General and was about as cold and formal a letter as one might expect to get and said exactly nothing. How can pressure be brought about to get those boys out of that place? It isn't humane to leave those kids over there through another Korean winter.

I am going to copy down some excerpts here from the few letters we've received since our boy got there: "Well they finally got us all split up. I don't know what my address is yet but I sure hated to leave all my buddies. I was more homesick last night than I have been since I joined the Army. I am going to the front line and I guess they haven't called a cease-fire yet as they had made us think. (Note: up until the day he left for the front line they had told them there had definitely been a cease fire—more lies). Boy, when I get home I am never going further away than Omaha. You don't realize how nice home is until you are so far away and can't get back. I really miss all of you, but please don't worry about me. I can take care of myself and I want everything just the same when I get back. Will be here for a long while but the time will pass before you know it and we will all be together again. I am just waiting for the truck to come and take us up. We were supposed to go up last night but some bridges were washed out and we were cut off from the front lines." From another letter: "We got to our company last night. This is sure a hole up here. We are on the front line now and I don't think anyone could realize what a desolate place this is until they came here. I know I didn't. We need 36 points to get rotated out of here and that means 9 or 10 months on the front line. I think of you folks all the time and hope you are fine. I haven't had any mail for 3 weeks but it will probably catch up with me in a week or so."

A later letter: "Boy, some of these guys have surely been through hell. This is going to be hard to take for 10 months or so. Guys in the Air Force and Navy don't know how good they have it. They at least have a bed or a cot all the time, hot food, and clean clothes. We are on the move all the time. Sometimes we sleep in fox holes and sometimes we have to sleep on the ground, and in pouring down rain it is pretty rough. This outfit has been on the front 95 percent of the time. Some of these boys have been up here 7 or 8 months without any rest, and that is plenty rough. I think the combat engineers are as rough as any other outfit there is, and yet nothing is ever said about the guys who go ahead of the tanks and clear mines while the Chinks have the road zeroed in and throw everything they have at you, and you can't even jump in a hole. Will you send me some snapshots of your folks if it wouldn't be too much trouble? How is Jet? (Note: Jet is his dog) Mom, will you do me a favor? Will you talk about me to her once in a while so she won't forget me?"

Everyone you talk to and everywhere you go you hear the same thing about this Korean mess, and that is that we have no business being there, and we should get those boys out of there. If it made any sense at all it would be different, but what is it for? No one knows. Nothing is done about it, but something should be done. Isn't it possible to do something about this tragic situation? This cease-fire hokum has been such a farce that even a child can see through that. It is very obvious that our leaders don't want peace any more than the other side does. Is there a single right or just reason for keeping our boys over in a place so wretched and

living in conditions so terrible that we wouldn't even subject our dogs to? And should they have to go through such torture when they aren't even old enough to vote? It is criminal and an outrage. They should be back in the United States. We need them here, and this is where they have every right to be. Let the ones who want war fight it. Believe me, Mr. JENSEN, I am very earnest about this thing. I feel so keenly about the injustice of the whole business that there isn't anything I wouldn't do to help get a movement started to demand the return of our boys to our country. I think we should help the Korean people to the extent that the other U. N. do, but no more. That is, I do feel we should send them supplies, money, and equipment, but I most emphatically do not think we should send them our boys. Please do everything humanly possible to try and rectify the ghastly mistake that was made when we first got our necks thrust in this mess.

Believe me, I am most sincerely grateful that you have read this through.

Respectfully yours

Address by Brig. Gen. H. M. Milton II, at Dedication of ORC Armory, Scranton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by Brig. Gen. H. M. Milton II, at the dedication of the ORC Armory, Scranton, Pa., on September 18, 1951, which is the first ORC Armory completed in the United States:

It gives me great pleasure to be here tonight at this dedication of the Scranton ORC Armory—concrete evidence to members of the United States Army Reserve and to you guards, that the Organized Reserve Corps, part of our country's defense in depth, is here to stay.

With completion of this armory, the units and individuals of the Organized Reserve Corps in the Scranton area are assured of an appropriate place to train for their vital mission of being ready for service in time of emergency, and are assured that the work to which they have dedicated themselves as citizen-soldiers will go forward.

Our Nation has moved into a critical period in its history. Our military forces are fighting in Korea in a conflict which has resulted in more than 200,000 Reserve officers and enlisted men being called to active military service. You of Scranton know already the part your sons, brothers, and husbands are playing in this emergency. This armory will assure that others who may be called to duty in the future will be better prepared for the mission they have willingly and patriotically assumed. There are many problems to be overcome before we achieve adequate preparedness. The principal problem is money with which to provide armories and equipment; of money to support Reserve troop program units; of money with which to give them some payment in token of a nation's gratitude.

The problems of money are being solved to some extent. This armory shows that.

Here, you as reservists can literally get your feet on the ground. You have the facility and you will have the supplies and equipment that will train you to be more proficient in the art and science of soldiering. I am reminded of the mythological Greek, Leonidas, the great wrestler whose strength was literally drawn from the ground on which he stood. Standing, he was an invincible wrestler. His opponents learned of his strength and defeated him by lifting him aloft where his feet could not touch the ground. Here is the ground from which your strength as reservists will stem.

The Congress is very much aware of the need for a strong and active Reserve Force. This armory was built from a \$13,000,000 fund appropriated in 1950 for construction of 44 armories and purchase of 8 additional buildings suitable for armory use. At present we are engaged in working out the details for the 1953 armory construction program calling for expenditure of \$16,000,000 for armory construction or purchase.

Many of you may not be aware that the Congress is now holding hearings on a proposed new law to govern the Reserve forces of our Nation. This blanket legislation, sometimes referred to as the Magna Charta of the Reserves, will govern all phases of our military activities.

It will establish a Ready, a Standby, and a Retired Reserve for all civilian components of the Armed Forces, and equalize benefits among the Reserve and Regular Forces. As presently considered, the new law will include in the Ready Reserve all members of the existing Organized and part of the Volunteer Reserve of the United States Army Reserve and will place all other members of the ORC in the Standby Reserve. Each reservist will know his general status with respect to when the active Army will need him in any emergency.

Under present planning, men coming out of their period of obligation under universal military service and training will be placed in the Ready Reserve to serve the remainder of their Reserve obligation. After a specified time in the Ready Reserve they will, if they so desire, move to the Standby Reserve, as will present ORC members, and finish out their Reserve obligation there. Those who have completed their service to the Nation, or who are otherwise unable to continue in the Ready or Standby Reserve will move into the Retired Reserve, if eligible.

Studies are currently being undertaken by the Army, at the request of Congress, to work out a satisfactory promotion system for reservists, and study is being given to offering some form of contractual agreement to reservists called to duty outside of a state of war. Should a contract with a reservist on active military service be terminated before the contracted time has expired, that reservist would receive severance pay. As the bill now reads the contract for actual service would run for not to exceed 5 years. I emphasize that this is still legislation to be acted upon in both houses of the Congress.

These legal preparations for the welfare of the reservists of our Nation are recognition of the role you play in the national defense. As reservists you are truly the Nation's defense in depth. I realize that for some of you there is pay for your Reserve duties, and that for many of you there are retirement benefits to be looked forward to. But I know, as does the rest of the Nation, that the modest pay you receive and the retirement benefits are not the reason you joined or remain in the United States Army Reserve. Americans do not talk much about patriotism, nor are they ardent flag wavers, but I know that practically every reservist is in the corps for patriotic reasons.

You are in for the same motive that impelled the poet to write:

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!"

I am reminded of a story, written in poetic form, of a hero of ages long gone, who seized a discarded and broken sword, called to his followers the word "Excelsior," and turned victory into defeat. His predecessor had discarded the worthless sword and died in anonymity—but he, with courage and a broken blade snatched victory from defeat and won a hero's fame. Emerson in his "Essay on History" made the statement that "the ages must instruct the hours, and the hours explain the ages." When you think of the troublous times in which we live, the two parables of the sword and the ages have a peculiar significance.

Here we have a greatly diversified Nation. We have developed our mines, our farm lands, our arid and barren regions and our forests until we are the envy of the world. This is the land our history books tell us was once scorned by Europe. Only the improvident or the seekers after individual freedom came to our shores. We mixed the bloods of all into one nation and through our own exertions made it the mightiest Nation the world has ever known.

But natural resources were not what made this a great Nation. Other areas of the world have resources in greater abundance. But they have not produced a nation such as ours. The answer lies in our people. Here, and in no other place, has man found means to live with the minimum restraint to himself. This is the criteria to which history has taught us to aspire, and having reached a degree of success, this Nation, like a successful individual, finds itself confronted with envy. Envy so great that it would throw civilization back into the dark ages rather than to see our Nation continue its progressive role. Hence, America finds herself in a critical period—not only critical for itself but for all civilization. For as General Bradley has said, we seek nothing for ourselves that we do not seek for others.

Historians in coming ages will explain that America preserved its own culture and civilization by following the advice of John Philpot Curran who declared that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is regrettable that this vigilance has led us to the brink of war and that our comrades must fall on foreign battlefields. But the American heritage must be preserved at all costs. As evidence that you believe this as firmly as I do, I need only point out that you are here in uniform, and ready to take up arms if needed. You have left the comforts of your homes to take part in the dedication of an armory in which you will train to gain advancement in the profession of arms which you as civilians embraced of your own free will.

Do not feel that you are not serving your Nation in this time of peril by remaining at home while others of the Reserves are fighting the common enemy in Korea. We at home are the second line of defense. The poet Milton wrote what could well be our motto: "They also serve who only stand and wait." We all have a tiring but nevertheless important role of waiting. During this period granted us we must prepare for the future. God grant that by being eternally vigilant we may turn aside the horror of outright war . . . that by being powerful and steadfast we may bring fear to the heart of the aggressor and so spare our beloved land from war's fiery blast. Many of us have seen war at first hand and we know that in the future our homes will not be spared. Therefore let us arm our-

selves with weapons and with knowledge of their use and like Jefferson swear eternal enmity to all forms of tyranny over the mind of man, and by being vigilant keep the enemy from our shores.

We are here tonight to dedicate this armory to the strength of our beloved America. Even more, we are here tonight to dedicate this armory to you, our country's sons and daughters, who stand ready to take up arms in her defense. Here you will train, and God willing, your sons and daughters will train to preserve America. In a greater sense you are training here to preserve yourselves, for you, the people of this land, are America. In this building and with you who will use it, lies America's future. That there will be a glorious future, just as there has been a glorious past we may all rest assured. As long as we have our citizen-soldiers as a bulwark against evil forces this Nation cannot be overthrown.

I think it peculiarly appropriate at this time, when America is meeting aggression head on, that we should gather here to dedicate this armory for the use of peace-loving men and women, who, nevertheless are determined to bear arms if necessary in defense of the freedoms and beliefs for which Americans have always fought, and for which, under God, they will always fight.

Sofiero Castle to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote the King of Sweden and thanked His Majesty and His Majesty's government and people for their courage and kindness in giving asylum to 16 Polish refugee seamen and flyers. In the letter I urged the King not to be concerned by any grunts snorted from the direction of the Russian bear demanding the return of these unfortunates to Communist-dominated, Soviet-controlled Poland where they would be slaughtered. I am pleased to list below the reply to my letter from Sofiero Castle, Sweden:

SOFIERO CASTLE,

Hälsingborg, September 14, 1951.

Mr. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SIEMINSKI: I am desirous by His Majesty the King to thank you most heartily for your kind letter of August 13, which His Majesty has read with keen interest. Your letter ought to have been answered long ago, but a change of personnel has caused a delay, which I sincerely regret.

His Majesty appreciates the frank sentiments contained in your letter and sends you his best greetings.

Yours sincerely,

CARL-FREDRIK PALMSTIENA,
Private Secretary to His Majesty the King.

Mr. Speaker, it might also be of interest to know that my message to the King appeared in one of the largest newspapers in Sweden, under a United Press release. A letter from one Richard

Sieminski—do not know him—in Sweden tells me the letter made quite an impression on the public. I would like to thank the State Department and especially Jack McFall for their part in this exchange of good will. And to Carl-Fredrik Palmstierna, private secretary to His Majesty the King—much obliged, chum. Give the King our best.

Impact of United States Foreign Policy on the Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address I delivered last night to the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, meeting in Seattle, Wash. Due to the fact that the tax bill was under consideration in the Senate, I was not able to be present in person in Seattle, but I delivered the address from my Washington office over a transcontinental telephone hook-up arranged by the Associated Traffic Clubs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATED TRAFFIC CLUBS OF AMERICA, SEATTLE, WASH., SEPTEMBER 25, 1951

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Fitzgerald, delegates to the convention, first of all let me say that I regret not being able to be present in person at your Seattle meeting. Voting on the important tax bill on the floor of the Senate made it necessary to cancel my airline reservations last night.

No prudent person can ignore the impact of our foreign policy on our domestic economic system. Government spending today is a most inflationary factor in our economy and has been to a large extent the additional pressure making necessary economic controls.

As citizens of this constitutional republic, we are faced with a challenge unparalleled in our history.

During our 175 years as an independent people, we have heretofore been challenged on several occasions by those who would destroy us or limit our horizons.

Slow to anger, naive at times in our trust in others, we have, when sufficiently provoked, opened the throttle wide to make the all-out effort necessary to defeat the enemy and bring about a complete victory at the earliest possible date. This determination was perhaps best expressed by Admiral David Farragut, at Mobile Bay, August 5, 1864, when he said:

"Damn the torpedoes; go ahead."

To win past victories the necessity of which was clear to all we accepted the drafts of manpower, the sacrifices of our Armed Forces, the controls of our economy, the taxes upon individuals and upon business, as part of the common effort. We were never certain as to how long it might take, but even during the dark days following Pearl

Harbor and Bataan the overwhelming majority of the American people were never in doubt that ultimate victory would be ours.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, which heard testimony for approximately 2 months, I was shocked to hear witness after witness, high in the councils of our Nation, tell why we couldn't win a victory in Korea over Communist aggressors who have been designated by the United Nations as outlaws.

Among the reasons given were fear of what Communist China might do, fear of what the Soviet Union might do, or fear of what our allies might do or say. This Nation was not built by men motivated by fear, but by those motivated by faith and courage.

For the first time in our history, we have wartime casualties, taxes, economic controls, and manpower mobilization while in a twilight period which is neither peace nor war. There are some high in the councils of the Government who tell us this condition may prevail for 10 years.

Our challenge is how to meet the menace of aggressive communism while we maintain our constitutional representative government and our free-enterprise system. That we will win, none of us should doubt, but if in the winning we sacrifice that which has made America great, it will be at such a price that future generations may wonder if more intelligence would have found a better way.

In this country, as yet, the people run the Government rather than the Government running the people. But we have trod the path of big government about as far as a free people dare go without taking stock of the situation and determining what our future course of action should be.

Our budgets have grown to such astronomical figures that it is hard for our citizens to grasp the full significance of the amounts being spent and proposed.

Our budget for the fiscal year 1952 approximates what our total public debt was at the end of the fiscal year 1942.

As a boy I grew up part of the time in Washington where my father represented the Sixth District of California in the House of Representatives for the 12-year period 1903 to 1915. In 1910 the total appropriations for all functions of Government, including the military, reached \$1,044,433,622. It was front-page news all over the country. We had become a "billion-dollar Government." For the current fiscal year, the President has proposed a \$71,500,000,000 budget.

Our foreign policy has a direct relationship to our military policy. Our Armed Forces under the proposed budget for the next fiscal year will take approximately \$60,000,000,000 out of a \$71,500,000,000 total.

The total value of all farm production in the United States for 1950 was an estimated \$30,400,000,000. The budget submitted by the President for this fiscal year will be more than double that amount for the Federal Government alone. State and local costs of government are in addition.

After years of savings the American people have accumulated in their savings banks, building and loan associations, and the Postal Savings System \$59,690,000,000. This entire amount would not quite pay the annual cost of our armed services.

In the 152 years from the day George Washington took the oath of office as President of the United States, through the second 4-year term of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the total cost of the Federal Government amounted to \$180,000,000,000. In the 7 years of this administration, the cost will amount to over \$320,000,000,000.

Last year, the United States Government raised in Federal taxes \$50,300,000,000 which was the largest "take" in our history. It exceeded 1945, the high year of World War

II, by almost \$4,500,000,000. Despite this high income into the Federal Treasury, the President has asked for \$10,000,000,000 more in new taxes and the Congress will approve a bill approximating \$6,000,000,000 of that amount.

My State of California, now the second largest in population in the Union, and endowed with vast natural resources, fertile farms, and diversified and prosperous industry, has a total assessed valuation of \$15,000,000,000. California's share of the national debt on a per capita basis, amounts to over \$18,000,000,000. Our national debt stands at over \$256,000,000,000 and the interest alone now amounts to over \$5,500,000,000, which is greater than the total Federal tax receipts in 1940, which amounted to \$5,300,000,000.

Since Columbus discovered America, the total world's gold production has amounted to approximately \$42,000,000,000. Preliminary estimates are that next year the Federal Government will have a budget of more than double that amount.

Never have so many people had so much at stake as do the people of America. We do not want to be faced with the Hobson's choice of aggressive communism or state socialism. Neither is suited to America's present or future needs. The former could be imposed upon us if we were defeated by the Soviet Union. The latter, however, might result if we were the victor rather than the victim. No policy which would place the albatross of state socialism around the neck of the American people is the solution to the problems which confront us.

Our job then is to seek alternatives which do exist.

Every American citizen having a sense of responsibility fully recognizes the fact that the free way of life is being challenged by international communism. He knows that the victory for International Communism would be more costly in human liberty, in looting and in reparations than even those vast astronomical figures we have discussed.

I believe that our people are prepared to carry the heavy burdens of necessary defense expenditures and for the essential functioning of the Government. They have a right to expect, however, that all unnecessary fat will be cut off the budget and that a full dollar's worth of value is received for every dollar spent in the military as well as the civilian establishment.

Our economic system is tied with Siamese-twin attachments to our constitutional form of government. If one is destroyed, they both perish. There is no need for either catastrophe to happen if we get off the perpetual defensive and take the offensive.

There are too many people who have had our hospitality or advantages joining forces with Moscow and her satellites in spreading their views on "what's wrong with America."

Those who believe in our system should start a crusade to tell "what is right with America."

We, of course, will not close our eyes to the liability side of the ledger, but as citizens with our feet on the ground and common sense gained from experience and observation we know that America's assets in freedom of religion, speech and press, and in agricultural, educational, fiscal, industrial, and governmental categories, to mention but a few, greatly exceed our liabilities.

Seventy-eight million life-insurance policyholders own policies with a face value of an estimated \$228,000,000,000.

Individuals who still believe that thrift is a virtue, also own directly or through institutions for their account some \$56,790,000,000 in savings institutions and \$2,900,000,000 in the postal-savings system. A substantial

part of the \$35,000,000,000 of time deposits in commercial banks is theirs. They also have a stake in annuities and pension funds, amounting to an estimated \$5,000,000,000, and a direct stake in the social-security system (Federal, State, and local) of \$29,000,000,000.

We have more stockholders and home owners than any other nation in the world.

To permit this solvent, going concern of ours to be liquidated by the strong-armed action of international communism or to consent to the voluntary bankruptcy proceedings of state socialism are both unthinkable and unnecessary. We need an alert and determined citizenry if the battle is not to be lost by default.

We must not let complacency destroy the spirit that has developed a great world power out of a small colony in less than 175 years. We must not build or depend upon military or economic Maginot lines.

This Nation has never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. Our economic as well as our political system broke away from old-world patterns.

Short-sighted European-style capitalism built the gallows for its own execution by allowing and encouraging monopolies, cartels, low wages, and great aggregations of capital narrowly held.

The lifeblood of our system to the contrary is competition, productivity, good wages, and widespread ownership of our economic structure.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that here in America we have political and economic freedom. Here our people, since the founding of the Republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political need of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life—as an inmate of a State prison.

The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low unit costs. American agriculture, labor, and industry must not be undermined by the dumping of goods produced by low-paid labor abroad while outside markets are closed to our products.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life. High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

In the growth of our economy there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business has the right to strangle the economic life of 150,000,000 Americans and by so doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes.

More recently, first through the Labor Relations Act of 1935 and later through the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Government has sought to establish a

national labor policy that would be fair and equitable not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

While some well thought-out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population, and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our mines, factories and transportation systems and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want and any irresponsible man to have.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it, such is not the case. This is economic nonsense and squirrel-cage thinking. Government spending has been and is, a major inflationary factor.

I make no claim that we can "unscramble the eggs" of Government finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We have embarked upon a program of helping to establish a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world may be secure to ourselves and to our children. This has led to the development of a collective security system represented in part by the United Nations organization, the North Atlantic Alliance and the more recently negotiated Pacific pacts. The success of any such a collective security system rests upon the emphasis placed on the word "collective."

To date the system leaves much to be desired. When aggression took place in Korea on the 25th day of June 1950, the United Nations under the leadership of the United States, promptly took action to resist this act of overt aggression from the Communist world.

We gain nothing, I believe, by misrepresenting the facts to our own people or to the people of the free world. Despite statements to the contrary from those holding high positions in our own Government and in the United Nations Organization, it is not true, and I underline the word not, that the free world sprang to arms to resist aggression.

Fifteen months have now passed, and fighting is still going on in Korea and casualty reports are still coming in. Yet a year and a quarter after the aggression commenced, the United States of America alone is supplying more than 90 percent of the forces engaged in the Korean operation.

Of the 60 members of the United Nations, only 15 of them have sent combat forces to Korea, and all of them together have supplied something less than 35,000, which happens to be the approximate number offered by the Republic of China on Formosa, 4 days after the aggression started. Yet the offer of the Republic of China was declined by the United States and the United Nations partly because of the fear that it might cause the Chinese Communists to intervene. This they did 5 months later on their own account.

I believe that the executive branch of the Government has been derelict in not accomplishing a higher measure of support from the other United Nations members than is represented by the 10-percent contribution already mentioned.

Certainly neither the American Congress nor the American people are willing to accept any such basis as a precedent for future collective security action. The sooner this fact is understood in the chancelleries of the free nations of the world, the sooner we will be on a more realistic basis insofar as collective security is concerned.

In 1945, there were approximately 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain. Today, there are over 800,000,000 people in the Soviet orbit.

If international communism is allowed to digest this great mass of humanity, the balance of power in the world will be upset and other nations in close proximity to the Soviet orbit will find themselves under relentless pressure. Given time to consolidate their position, the rulers of the Soviet Union and its satellites will be able to liquidate non-Communist elements within their boundaries.

For more than a decade, the Soviet Union has used its embassies and consulates as centers of espionage and fifth column activity. The time has long since come and passed when notice should be served upon them that their representatives in the United States will receive the same treatment accorded ours in the Soviet world. We should get on a quid pro quo basis now and if they are not willing to accept the same terms and conditions for their officials here that they extend to ours there, we should take the inevitable step of withdrawing our ambassadors and send theirs home forthwith.

In addition, for more than a decade, the Comintern has sent its agents abroad throughout the world to undermine the economic and political life of the free nations.

The time has come when the free people of the world should recognize the fact that behind the iron curtain now and as yet unliberated are literally tens of millions of people who have the same yearnings for freedom that we have. A real effort must be made to enlist as the allies of freedom, the oppressed people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Communist China and indeed of the Soviet Union itself in the cause of freedom. If these people had the moral support of the free world and the realization that they were not permanently abandoned to their Communist masters, they would be a tremendous ally in the years ahead. The encouragement of moral support and material aid could be done at a far less cost than 10 years of the type of cold war now contemplated.

It is Communist doctrine that the free world and its economic system contains within it the seeds of its own destruction. It has long been my belief that it is far more likely that the Communist world contains within its structure the seeds of its own destruction. Sufficient intelligence must be given to find the cracks in the iron curtain.

In order to enlist free people everywhere, it is essential that we have a foreign policy which we and they can understand.

We must reassert the moral leadership that we lost at Yalta. There we gave to the Soviet Union that which was not ours to give. It was done without the knowledge or approval of the American people or the American Congress. It was done without the knowledge or consent of our long-time friend and war-time ally, the Republic of China.

This agreement and those which preceded and followed it, contributed to the loss of the freedom of the people of Poland.

Since the Soviet Union has long ago violated its part of the Yalta agreement and all other agreements, when it suited their purpose so to do, the time has come when the Government of the United States should denounce the Yalta agreement and serve notice that never again will we barter away human freedom in a secret conference by an agreement contrary to our constitutional requirement of the ratification of treaties by the Senate of the United States.

If we now declare that our foreign policy is based on human freedom, and what ad-

vances it we support and what retards or destroys it we oppose, we will furnish new hope to the oppressed people of the world, new courage to our free allies and have the basis for a workable policy that will be entitled to bipartisan support in the Congress and the overwhelming approval of the American people.

If we will use some of the same courage and common sense that motivated the men that sat at Philadelphia and gave us the Declaration of Independence and later the Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Address by Hon. Hugh G. Grant, Former Ambassador to Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent radio address of that distinguished citizen and public servant of the United States, the Honorable Hugh G. Grant, former Ambassador to Albania:

RADIO BROADCAST BY MR. HUGH GRANT GIVEN ON AUGUST 15, 1951, OVER WGAC IN AUGUSTA, GA.

STAFF ANNOUNCER: Once again WGAC is pleased to present Mr. Hugh Grant, former United States Minister to Albania and Thailand. Mr. Grant has spent the last few days in our Nation's Capital at the invitation of His Majesty, King Zog, of Albania. This evening Mr. Grant will give an account of his visit in Washington—Mr. Grant.

"I have returned to Augusta, Ga., today from Washington. As previously announced over the radio and in the Augusta press I went to Washington upon invitation of His Majesty King Zog of Albania, who is making his first visit to the United States. The King is in exile in Egypt, his country having been overrun first by the armies of Mussolini while I was serving as United States Minister to Albania in 1939. Next came the Nazi hordes of Hitler and finally near the end of World War II, the Red armies of Stalin. Albania is behind the Russian iron curtain today, presenting one of the most tragic situations of all the conquered countries of Europe.

"The meeting with King Zog in Washington was the first since my last audience with His Majesty on the day before the Italian military invasion of Albania on Good Friday, April 6, 1939. Under King Zog's immediate direction the small Albanian Army resisted the Italian invaders driving them back to their ships at Durazzo but were soon overwhelmed by superior forces. To escape capture by the Italians the King sent his Queen and their 2-day-old son out to Greece at day-break on the day of the Italian attack and that night when all was lost for the small Albanian forces with the Italian Army marching on the capitol, Tirana, King Zog with his principal officers and cabinet ministers followed the Queen to Greece. The King related to me how from Greece he and his party went to Turkey, thence to Scandinavia, France, and finally to England. The King was in England during the early part of the great war and for some time

thereafter. He was active in trying to bring about, from London, an organization of Albanian military forces that might eventually have kept Albania out of the hands of the enemy and as a part of the free Western World. But there were many political obstacles in the way over which King Zog had no control and the plan never materialized. Finally the King made his way to Egypt where he has many powerful friends. The King is an astute courageous military leader, highly educated, cultured and intensely loyal to the cause of complete Albanian independence. When Albania is free again the King would have the people decide what sort of government they want. What King Zog desires is to see Albania free of foreign domination and to take her place among the freedom-loving nations of the world. The King is ready to do anything that he can, involving any sacrifices, in order to bring this about.

"King Zog is still a young man in his early fifties and, as I saw him on several occasions in Washington during the past few days, as youthful looking as he appeared during that last audience I had with him on the eve of the Italian attack.

"King Zog's party in Washington comprised his nephew, Prince Tali, who was a youth when I was in Albania, a distinguished Egyptian, Pasha Mirahil, legal adviser to His Majesty and to His Majesty King Farouk of Egypt, Colonel Selmani, Mr. Von Blomberg, of Boston, and Mr. Sagiri, aide-de-camp to King Zog. I cannot go into the details of my conversations with King Zog, but it is sufficient to say that His Majesty is exceedingly well versed in the political knowledge of Continental Europe, the Balkans, of which the King's country, Albania, is an important part, and the whole Middle East. King Zog is on friendly terms with the political leaders of many nations in those areas, especially of the important Middle East. The King is an avowed enemy of communism and I believe I will not betray His Majesty's confidence when I say that he believes the Russians are very vulnerable, especially in the Balkans, including Albania.

"The King is a warm and true friend of the United States. His Majesty's attitude toward this country reflects the views of his fellow countrymen. In the first place, the Albanian people, representing the oldest race in Southeastern Europe, throughout the ages have preserved their national instincts despite invading foreign armies and military occupation of long duration. Through all of their national tribulations the Albanians preserved their own language, their national customs, their love of freedom. They are a home-loving, hospitable people, they are ardent individualists, as we Americans are. Again the Albanian people are deeply grateful for the attitude of the late President Woodrow Wilson, who vigorously sponsored the full political integrity of Albania at the Peace Conference of Versailles, following the end of World War I.

"When the time came for his majesty King Zog to choose a queen, while I was serving the American Government in Albania, incidentally, he chose a very beautiful and charming lady, the Countess Geraldine Apponyi whose mother was an American, father Hungarian. From that union there is a son, the Crown Prince of Albania, now 12½ years old. He was born 2 days before Mussolini's Fascist Legions attacked Albania in April 1939. The Crown Prince today, King Zog told me proudly in Washington, is now taller than his father who is slightly above 6 feet. The King also informed me that he hopes to educate his son in the United States.

"The King's suite at one of the leading hotels in Washington was a busy place since he had many callers. Among his visitors were leading personalities from countries

of the Middle East and from other countries in Europe which are not now behind the Russian iron curtain. There were also prominent high American officials, who called on His Majesty. Among these American callers were two prominent Southerners who are nationally known. It was my privilege to be present when the King conferred with Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, of the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina. Mr. RICHARDS is chairman of the powerful House Foreign Affairs Committee. Mrs. Richards, a charming lady of an old southern family, accompanied her husband. Later it was my privilege to introduce to King Zog, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN of Alabama. Senator SPARKMAN is a prominent member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and delegate from Congress to the United Nations. The Alabama Senator was also a member of the small group of Senators of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which recently made a tour of several European capitals, including Madrid. The purpose of the visit was to make an appraisal of United States defenses in Europe. The committee submitted a report to the Senate while I was in Washington.

"Albania, which is now blocked off from the Western World by the Russians, is a place of great strategic importance from a military standpoint. It is the western gateway to the whole Balkan area. Italy used Albania in 1939-40 as a jumping-off place against Greece. Albania is also important in the control of the Mediterranean because of its location on the Adriatic Sea near the entrance to the Mediterranean. May I suggest that you get out the map of your old geography and look up Albania. It is a small country but very important to the Western World in its struggle with the Communists. When I said goodbye to King Zog, yesterday, before leaving Washington, I invited His Majesty to visit this section of the old South, including Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama. I urged him to come, saying I could assure him of a warm, hospitable, true southern welcome. His Majesty thanked me cordially and said he would be happy to accept, if not on this present visit, which is likely a short one, then at a later date when he hopes to return to the United States for a second visit."

"If Fighting Has To Be Done, the Basic Mission of MATS, a Major Command of the United States Air Force, Is To See That It Is Not Done in the Rubble of American Cities"—Gill Robb Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gill Robb Wilson, noted commentator and aviation feature writer for the New York Herald Tribune, recently published an article entitled "Military Air Transport System Called Lifeline of United States Forces."

I was particularly happy to read this splendid tribute paid to a major command of the United States Air Force—which has done so much distinguished service in helping our Ground Forces in Korea.

How many, many times—from my home and elsewhere in Mobile—I have seen the great C-54's, and other of our MATS planes take off from our own Brookley Field—and start on their flights to Tempelhof, Germany.

Recognizing the capacity of our strategic airpower to carry combat to the heart of the enemy countries—and the capacity of our tactical airpower to defend us against the invading bombers—in speaking of MATS, Mr. Gill Robb Wilson writes:

Rarely is the Military Air Transport System mentioned in a definitive capacity other than the flying of transports hither and yon. This is unfortunate since it foreshortens understanding of our capability in national security at a time when confidence is necessary.

This is a splendid observation made in recognition of a great segment of our splendid air service by one most capably equipped to make such observation and comments.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much of interest contained in this article that I ask the indulgence of my colleagues to insert the same in the record of this day's proceedings.

The article reads as follows:

THE AIR WORLD—MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM CALLED LIFELINE OF UNITED STATES FORCES

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.—Military air transport is the significant measure of a nation's ability to fight on its own terms and in places of its own choosing rather than on terms and choices dictated by an enemy. No single defense service can go further to keep war from American shores than can the Military Air Transport Service of the United States Defense Establishment.

This is accomplished through the mobility and flexibility conferred upon Army, Navy, and Air Force by the global pattern of weather information, radio communications, and crucial supply furnished through MATS.

Because of its activities in famed instances of air lift such as the Hump, the Berlin blockade, and the Korean war, MATS has come to be thought of more as a glorified aerial trucking company than as a means of national flexibility to keep war from the backs of the American people.

MEASURE OF CONFIDENCE

One hears of the capacity of strategic air power to carry combat to the heart of enemy country, and of the capacity of tactical air power to defend against invading enemy bombers. But rarely is MATS mentioned in a definitive capacity other than the flying of transports hither and yon. This is unfortunate since it foreshortens understanding of our capability in national security at a time when confidence is necessary.

Organizationally, MATS is a major command of the Air Force. It is manned by some 72,000 personnel, operates from 70 air bases along 70,000 miles of airways connecting 37 different countries. In charge of the air weather service, it collects weather data from some 1,100 points over the globe and disseminates the charted information to all friendly sources. MATS likewise maintains a global communications system, operates the far-flung network of American air rescue facilities, furnishes in-flight information to all aircraft, and supports an air resupply service and communications system.

All of this adds up to world-wide capability in support of American and Allied

forces. It means that the Army can fight in Korea without fear of running short of ammunition 7,000 miles from home. It means that the American mission in Turkey is in daily contact with the Pentagon Building. It means that a strategic air group can leave the United States and set up for business in Asia or Africa within hours. It means that a group of jet-fighters can ferry to Europe in hours rather than weeks.

SUPPORTS LAND ARMIES

In volume and tonnage, MATS does about 75 percent of its operational flying to support land armies. This is understandable since the numbers of personnel in armies are always more numerous than in navies or air forces. Yet it does not follow that support of armies is the priority mission. MATS priority is reserved for Strategic Air Command.

In 18 instances during the last year, MATS has been called upon to hustle some strategic air group to some distant area where its presence was considered of strategic, tactical, or diplomatic value. Such a project, if carried out with precision and smoothness, is one of the acid proofs of logistics. A strategic air group, composed of some 1,500 men and several tons of line maintenance equipment, can move perhaps a quarter of itself (flight crews and crew chiefs) in its own aircraft and be operational within the same 24-hour period against an enemy.

WHERE LUFTWAFFE FAILED

But if the group is to remain operational at its distant base, the remaining three-fourths of its personnel and maintenance tools also must quickly catch up. This is the function of MATS and any one who has been privileged to watch the fine timing and precise loading of such a movement has seen a stirring example of air logistics at its best.

During the Stalingrad campaign, the German Army commander notified Hitler that he could maintain his forces if provided with 300 tons of supplies daily. The Luftwaffe was given the task of providing airlift in that amount. The best the German Air Force could do was an average of 50 tons daily, and the German Army surrendered.

MATS is the guaranty that under similar circumstances American forces will not be helpless to win their campaigns in the backyards of the enemy. If fighting has to be done, MATS' basic mission is to see that it is not done in the rubble of American cities.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial was published in the Irish Press concerning House Resolution 82, which was introduced by Congressman FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. The editorial presents a strong argument in favor of the passage of this resolution by the House when it comes before us for consideration. The resolution urges that a plebiscite be held throughout Ireland to determine whether the six counties in the northeast should remain separate from the rest of the country or not.

The question whether any given part of a nation should be permitted to secede

or separate itself from the rest of the nation is one for all the people of that nation to decide, as the editorial so clearly indicates. A minority group in any democracy is frequently required to subordinate its desires to the will of the majority, and so it should be in the case of Ireland.

The fact that Great Britain, our ally in two world wars, happens to be the nation responsible for the partitioning of Ireland against the wish of all the people of Ireland, and forced a separate government on the six-county area, which did not ask for it nor want it, should not deter this House from expressing its belief in democratic methods and principles. The editorial sets this forth with great vigor, and for that reason I am incorporating the text of the editorial in my remarks.

The editorial reads as follows:

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

Some time next month the House of Representatives of the United States will have an opportunity of expressing itself on Ireland's right to unity and to sovereignty over all its territory. Thanks to their fidelity to principle, a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee have passed the Fogarty resolution for discussion and decision by the House. The support given to the resolution by Congressmen will be a test for all true Democrats.

It is easy for an assembly like Congress to demand freedom for the victims of America's enemies. But here is a matter in which principle asks for courage as well. The wrongdoing of one of America's friends is in question. By now it ought to be clear that the covering up of betrayals of democratic principles lest an ally be embarrassed pays dividends only to an aggressor. Half of Europe is in subjection because men feared to speak against a cobelligerent. Ireland's case gives an opportunity to the representatives of freemen to abandon this evasion of their responsibilities.

British propaganda will provide some arguments for those who wish to dodge the issue. The old pretense will be put forward that the six-county area has the same democratic right to decide its destiny as the Irish Nation has. But no Congressman can accept that argument unless he is ready to concede to Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut or any other group of States the right to attach themselves to Canada whenever they disagree with a vote of the people of the United States. It will be said that Ireland, Britain, and the six counties were all consenting parties to partition. Ireland never was. By a succession of deceptions and threats, over which even Russia might pride herself, the British secured Irish signatures to agreements which were from the beginning falsely described. These agreements were disowned by the Irish people at the first free opportunity and no binding contract ever lay.

The argument that this is a domestic question for Britain is invalid from the word "go." It is no more a domestic question than the fate of Belgium was a domestic question for Germany in 1940. The issue is a little nation's right against an empire's power.

There is one piece of evidence, provided by the supporters of partition themselves, which answers all those who advance these arguments; that they will not consent to have this national issue decided by a national plebiscite. Their refusal to accept this, the one democratic solution, is an admission (a) that Ireland was dismembered against the opposition of the overwhelming majority of her own people, and (b) that

that dismemberment is being maintained despite an opposition which has never slackened and never lessened for the 31 years partition has lasted.

Members of the United States House of Representatives have no doubt whatever that a 20-percent minority in Czechoslovakia had no right to hand over the national territory or any part of it to the Russians, or that 20 percent of Poles had no right to decide the destiny of that nation. A 20 percent minority in Ireland is equally debarred from deciding the status of Ireland or the extent of Irish sovereignty.

Resolutions and Declarations Adopted by the Nineteenth General Congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, at its nineteenth general congress, held at Plymouth, Mass., September 10-13, 1951, adopted certain resolutions and declarations, which, in their wise and sturdy Americanism, are what might have been expected of the descendants of the Pilgrims. The chairman of the committee on resolutions was our friend and former colleague, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, and a delegate to the Congress from the District of Columbia. The other members of the committee were: Dr. Roger Shaw, of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Henry Bourne Joy, Michigan; Frederick Foster, Boston, Mass.; and Mrs. Robert McLure Fairleigh, Kentucky; with Standish Bradford, also of Boston, general counselor of the society, ex officio member.

The delegates at the congress—triennial in character—were more than double the number in any previous congress. Col. Walter M. Pratt, Massachusetts, governor general of the society, and Walter Lester Glenney, New Jersey, secretary general, were reelected.

There are about 40 State societies of *Mayflower* descendants, scattered through the country, with something like 8,000 members. The State societies—that in Virginia being the last one organized—are federated under the general society. Lineal descent from a passenger—or passengers—on the historic *Mayflower* in 1620 constitutes eligibility for membership.

Believing them to be of sufficient merit to entitle them to be given the widest dissemination, under leave accorded, there are included, as a part of these remarks the indicated:

RESOLUTIONS AND DECLARATIONS

The nineteenth congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants adopts the resolutions and declarations hereinafter set forth:

"We are profoundly grateful for the Pilgrim achievement and heritage; and on this spot, made forever sacred by the presence and labors of the Pilgrims, we would renew our pledges of allegiance to their memory and consecrate ourselves anew to the great faith and principles which motivated their lives, and which contributed so largely to the founding of the American civilization and the American Nation.

"Ever mindful of the best interests of our country; and because of the grave and unexampled perils which now threaten it; and believing that the problems of this day should be dealt with in the spirit and courage evinced by our Pilgrim ancestors in dealing with the trials and difficulties of their day; and with the thought, also, that the views and declarations herein set forth are fully just and appropriate and should receive the hearty approval of all loyal Americans: Be it

"Resolved, as follows:

"EDUCATION

"We reaffirm and reemphasize the resolution adopted by the eighteenth general congress registering the general society's unalterable opposition to, and condemnation of, the introduction of subversive ideas in American education, and urging the teaching of American history, geography, and government in a full and adequate manner.

"In this general connection we denounce and condemn the writings and utterances of subversive writers, and speakers, who, for evident sinister purposes, attack our American institutions and way of life, and strive to minimize and discredit the deeds and character of the men and women, who, in unprecedented peril and sacrifice, founded and preserved this, the last best hope of humanity, the United States of America.

"WORLD GOVERNMENT

"We condemn, as wholly impracticable, and as calculated to destroy the Constitution and self-government of the American people, the proposals embodied in the idea of world government.

"THE AMERICAN FLAG

"We oppose any effort to place above the American flag the flag or emblem of any other nation or political authority.

"INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

"We commend the work of those congressional committees which have been, and now are, engaged, in sincere effort, in the investigation of subversive activities and agencies, and of crime; and, as to crime, we would urge that all official inquiries should fully include and comprehend offenses against the ballot.

"COMMUNISM

"We believe that no Communist can be a true American, and that no true American can be a Communist. We urge the elimination from every public place or authority of any person who may be duly shown to be pledged to the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, or otherwise disloyal and treasonable; and that only those be placed or kept on guard—whatever their race or origin—who are in spirit and practice loyal Americans.

"NATIONAL EXPENDITURES

"We express our gratitude to all those in Congress who are making earnest and continuing effort to bring about indispensable economy in our national expenditures, and relief to the overburdened American taxpayer; and we suggest that the State societies join the general society in giving full encouragement and support, in every proper manner, to the Members of the House and Senate who are striving to effect these results through the amendment of appropriate

tion bills, and by means of other appropriate processes.

"MORAL STANDARDS

"We truly believe that 'righteousness exalteth a nation'; and so believing, we deplore the lowering of moral standards and ideals, so prevalent in the public and private life of this day and generation; and we also believe that the time is ripe for reconsecration and rededication by the people of America to the great principles and integrities of the founders and preservers of the Republic."

Use of Influence in the Making of Loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the September 26, 1951, column written by David Lawrence.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"EVERYBODY'S DOING IT" DOCTRINE—GABRIELSON ABOUT TO BE OFFERED UP AS A POLITICAL SACRIFICE. RESIGNATION WON'T CLEANSE SITUATION IN RFC DEALINGS

(By David Lawrence)

A new code of ethics seems to be required for Republican national chairmen, though it is based on an entirely different set of circumstances than the case of Democratic National Chairman William Boyle.

Guy Gabrielson, head of the Republican national headquarters, happens to be president of a company which needed a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. So he naturally went about it directly without intermediaries. Now he is being accused of impropriety because the headlines tell how Mr. Boyle, the head of the Democratic headquarters, has been approaching the RFC by telephoning introductions to officials for his clients who sought loans.

It turns out that Mr. Boyle is being questioned by a Senate committee not only as to his own activities but as to whether he derived any financial benefit from the contacts which his law partner had made with the RFC after he became national chairman.

The two cases are entirely different but many Republican Senators are highly displeased with what Mr. Gabrielson did—mostly because it enables the Democrats to point the finger of blame in his direction. It thus tends to absolve—at least in the headlines—Mr. Boyle of any impropriety. For if everybody was doing it, the doctrine espoused in some quarters here is that this makes it all right.

Actually, as Senator TAFT—who doesn't agree with his colleagues about the matter—puts it, there is a vast difference between the Boyle and the Gabrielson cases. For one thing, as Representative CLAIRE HOFFMAN of Michigan, Republican, remarks facetiously, Mr. Gabrielson ought to resign for dumbness—that is, for thinking a Republican national chairman would have any influence or pull with the Democratic-controlled RFC.

But Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, Republican, who has been emphatic in his expressions in the Senate disapproving what Mr. Gabrielson did, says that everyone knows that there may be a change some day in the political complexion of the administration here and the appointive power may shift to the next Republican administration. Then presumably a member of the RFC Board of Directors—this was before a single administrator had been appointed—might be worrying about what might happen when his own term expired in the middle of a Republican administration. Influence with a Republican Party chairman might come in handy. The theory is that the RFC members who pay any attention to politics at all would be just as likely to want to feather their nests by standing in with a Republican national chairman as with a Democratic.

Primarily, the Republicans who are crying out against Mr. Gabrielson are indignant that the revelation about his negotiation of a loan tended to take the edge off the juicy scandal headlines from which the Republicans in Congress were expected to benefit in connection with the Boyle case. Along came the case of the Republican national chairman to spoil their publicity. The public, indeed, carelessly bunches the two together.

Under the circumstances, whether Mr. Gabrielson really did anything wrong or improper has become secondary. He is about to be offered up as a sacrifice on the altar of political righteousness, and it isn't often that a Republican finds himself in a position to help the cause of his party by gracefully withdrawing from the picture on that score.

Mr. Gabrielson doubtless knows that, unfortunately, his resignation will not altogether cleanse the situation. For, if the truth were known, national committeemen of both parties are pretty influential citizens in their respective States and while it may be that not any of the others had dealings with the RFC, it is also possible that some of them are lawyers who practice before Government departments. Pretty soon all these investigations are going to take the joy out of life for the practical politician—and maybe, in a wave of curiosity as to what really constitutes ethics, the spotlight will be turned on all the Members of Congress and members of the State legislatures whose law offices or law partners at home receive legal fees from corporations and labor unions and other interests which have legislative matters up with Federal and State Governments.

Answering Time Magazine's Vicious Attack on Congress for Aiding Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it would have been in order for me to rise to a question of personal privilege, or to the privilege of the House, to answer the vicious attack on me and other Members of Congress made by Time magazine on August 27.

If this were merely a personal attack on me, I do not think I would take up the time of the House to even refer to it.

But since it was a malicious smear of an overwhelming majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress for doing their duty as they saw it toward a small group of hopelessly disabled veterans, I feel that it is my duty, as a Member of the House and chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to give the country the real facts in the case.

In addition to its malicious attack on me, in which it published a distorted picture of your humble servant, this article attacks the Members who voted to override the President's veto of a bill to take care of a small number of old veterans who are either blind or so hopelessly disabled that they have to have an attendant, and brands the Members who so voted as "liars and hypocrites."

That epithet applies, of course, to Members of both Houses of Congress, since the bill was passed over the veto in both Houses by a majority of more than 7 to 1—318 to 45 in the House and 69 to 9 in the other body.

The measure merely gives to these old, hopelessly disabled veterans, who are either blind or so helpless that they have to have an attendant, the same compensation that is provided for veterans of the Civil War, veterans of the Indian wars, and veterans of the Spanish-American War.

The only difference is that there is an income limitation on these veterans that does not apply to the others, and there is also a restriction barring the ones who are suffering from their own misconduct, which does not apply to the veterans of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, or the Indian wars.

Mr. Speaker, I have no apology for the efforts that I have made to take care of our disabled veterans. I can simply say that I, as chairman of the Veterans' Committee, have done my best to take care of them in a reasonable way. So far as I am concerned, I will never submit to seeing these helpless old men, who honorably served their country in times of war, seek the shelter of a poorhouse, or their widows and orphans begging bread from door to door, especially while our Government is giving billions of dollars to foreign countries, and subsidizing Time and Life magazines, as it did last year to the extent of \$137,200, to carry such vicious propaganda to the peoples of foreign countries.

I am reliably informed that Henry Luce, who owns both Time and Life magazines, drew a subsidy of \$137,200 last year for distributing these magazines in foreign countries. That money came out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of the United States, including these disabled veterans, which the bill in question is designed to help, and for the support of which Time branded the Members of the two Houses of Congress who voted to override the veto, as "liars and hypocrites."

I trust the proper committee of Congress will investigate this proposition and put a stop to this wasting the money of American taxpayers in this way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Bigness in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 24, 1951.

This editorial seems very timely, in view of the fact that roughly 2 months have passed since the Small Defense Plants Administration was created under the terms of the Defense Production Act amendment. Not one word has been heard concerning the appointment of the Administrator to head this important agency. Is it any wonder that some small-business men are beginning to express their doubts as to whether any benefits can be expected from SDPA and the concentration of defense contracts in the hands of very large business continues?

BIGNESS IN DEFENSE

From the beginning of the defense program it has been clear that the awarding of billions of dollars in armament contracts might help big business grow bigger while small business starved. Despite all the warnings and the clamor calls to protect small business, exactly this appears to have happened.

A report of the Senate Small Business Committee shows that 40 percent of the prime defense contracts awarded in the first year after the invasion of Korea went to only 10 manufacturers. The same report shows that nearly two-thirds of defense contracts have been awarded to 50 of the giants.

As the committee said, this record reveals "a considerably higher concentration of defense contracts than during World War II, when 10 large manufacturing companies controlled 30 percent of the war contract dollar volume and 100 companies controlled two-thirds."

Congressional policy is clearly against the undue concentration of defense contracts. So are the official statements of Defense Department policy. In a directive issued last winter, then Secretary of Defense Marshall called for "broadening the industrial base of procurement programs," and instructed that "the concentration of contracts with a few leader suppliers is to be avoided unless the necessity therefor is clear."

Despite these repeated statements of policy, big business evidently continues to get the lion's share of the defense contracts. That big business must get a big share is understandable, since many of the defense contracts are of such a magnitude as to rule out smaller firms. But when 10 firms get 40 percent of all contracts, when 20 firms get 50 percent, when 50 firms get 64 percent, it is time to ask whether the procurement officers are faithfully carrying out their explicit orders.

John D. Small, chairman of the Munitions Board, told a Senate subcommittee that small business received 22.5 percent of all defense contracts during the first 10 months after the invasion of Korea, and that this proportion has risen in recent months. Let us hope that this trend, if it is a trend, will continue.

Nevertheless the Senate Small Business Committee reports that "the top 50 concerns have received many contracts for which there

were alternative sources of supply equally competent to perform the work satisfactorily."

It declares that many of the giants refuse to subcontract to smaller producers, but "hoard" their contracts even though their own backlog of unfilled orders is piling up.

It warns that "the trend of concentration of defense contracts must be immediately reversed if a top-heavy imbalance is not to undermine our economy, retard our mobilization effort, and entrench monopoly beyond hope of dislodgement in our time."

Will defense officials heed this warning? Or will they go on paying lip service to the principle while violating it in practice?

Grim Pointer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit an editorial from the Winfield Daily Courier, Winfield, Kans. This is in connection with the recent flood in Kansas as it is affecting some industries. It follows:

GRIM POINTER

Last Saturday the grim conditions in Kansas flood areas were pointed up by the announcement that the Morrell packing plant at Topeka would not be reopened. It would cost too much, the company said, for rehabilitation.

In consequence, approximately 1,200 employees of the plant will receive severance pay. They will then be out of work and will have to find new employment.

If a large packing company feels unable to rehabilitate a plant in the Kaw Valley, what must be the condition of many smaller firms and individuals? The answer can only be that in many instances the conditions are desperate.

Only those who have seen the havoc in such towns as Marion, Florence, Manhattan, Argentine, Armourdale, and others can have any idea of what has taken place. In some instances destruction was so complete surveys may be needed to establish property lines.

Because of the situation in these Kansas towns and communities Winfield people should be responsive to these pleas for aid. The local veterans' organizations are gathering relief goods and the response here should be good. The response should be especially good here as Winfield knows only too well of the horrors of a flood.

District of Columbia Chapter of the American Marketing Association Honors Government Personnel for Outstanding Work in the Field of Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the pleasure of attending the first

annual awards dinner of the District of Columbia chapter of the American Marketing Association. At that meeting awards were presented to the following for their work and research on certain phases of marketing:

Earl W. Carlsen and Donald R. Stokes: Prepacking apples at point of production.

George H. Goldsborough: Coordinating the marketing of Florida citrus fruit.

William C. Truppner: Procedures for defining census areas in tracted cities for presentation of retail trade and other data.

C. J. Otten, assisted by A. L. Owen, N. G. Paulhus, S. D. Clark, and A. B. Lowstuter: The wholesale produce markets at Boston, Mass.

The program chairman was Paul H. Bolton, vice president of the District of Columbia chapter of the American Marketing Association, and vice president of the National Association of Wholesalers.

The toastmaster was Cyrus S. Kauffmann, president of the District of Columbia chapter of the American Marketing Association.

The awards presentation was made by Floyd Hosking, chairman of the awards committee, and vice president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation.

The guest speaker was the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, who delivered a significant address on the subject, Agriculture Looks To Marketing Research. I know of no subject which has aroused greater interest in Congress than marketing research, and I am sure that Secretary Brannan's splendid address on this subject will be read with interest by many Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the same herewith.

I am sure, also, that the remarks of Mr. Hosking in presenting the awards can be read with interest and profit by all Members of Congress, and I am including them also as a part of my remarks.

It will be of interest to Members of Congress that three of the four awards made on this occasion were based upon work done under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

I want to take this occasion to commend the District of Columbia chapter of the American Marketing Association for initiating this awards program. As time goes on I am sure that it will result in great interest and even more significant contributions in the field of marketing research.

AGRICULTURE LOOKS TO MARKETING RESEARCH
(Talk by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at meeting of Washington, D. C., chapter of American Marketing Association, Tuesday, September 25, 1951)

I am very happy to be with you this evening at this meeting of the Washington chapter of the American Marketing Association.

It is with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I note your program includes as its feature event a matter that is very near and dear to my heart. I'm referring to the fact that there will be a presentation of awards recognizing outstanding research in marketing performed by Federal agencies.

I can assure you that this strikes me as a most refreshing note in a public atmosphere

wherein the customary gesture toward those in public service seems to consist of nothing but avalanches of criticism and ridicule. It is essential, of course, that a democracy keep its government workers exposed to public scrutiny, even when that results in unwarranted ridicule. But just the same, a pat on the back for Government workers received from their contemporaries outside the Government goes a long way to make a job more pleasant and to offset some of the unwarranted criticism.

I believe that this action on your part emphasizes the degree to which our interests in marketing work coincide. In speaking of "our" interests, I mean the interests of the American Marketing Association and the Department of Agriculture.

Basically, we feel that we have a good, sound marketing system. It is a system that has helped to bring about the highest level of agricultural and industrial productivity the world has ever seen. It has helped to raise the Nation's useful employment, and in so doing has helped to raise the Nation's standard of living to its present pinnacle of progress.

We do not seek to revolutionize this system that has demonstrated its sound character. Rather, as a basic aim, we seek to improve and preserve the system we now have.

This basic aim with respect to marketing is entirely consistent with the Department's basic aim with respect to farming. That is, we are seeking to strengthen and preserve the family farm enterprise as the backbone of American agriculture. In both areas—marketing and farming—we seek to reduce costs, increase efficiency, and promote constructive competition.

To illustrate this, I want to relate a bit of the story of how the Department of Agriculture grew into its present marketing activities.

From its very beginning the Department of Agriculture has been concerned with marketing. The first congressional appropriation for agricultural work in 1839 authorized the Commissioner of Patents to expend the sum of \$1,000 for the collection of agricultural statistics and for other agricultural purposes. Facts and figures on production and supplies of agricultural products are as important in the marketing as in the production of farm produce. The original authorization was continued and included in the first legislation establishing the Department of Agriculture as a separate entity in 1862.

Through the years since the establishment of the Department, however, the great preponderance of interest and research in the Department has been directed toward farm production problems. That holds true even today.

But there has always been recognition of the fact that the production job was not completed on the farm—that farm produce had to be taken to the consumer before the job was complete.

Several factors tended to prevent the Department from directing major attention to marketing problems. One was the multiplicity of production problems awaiting attention. Another was the rather strong feeling in many quarters that the Department had no right to concern itself with problems beyond the farm.

As farmers and their customers drew farther apart and the marketing of agricultural products became more specialized and complex, the Department did receive additional assignments relating to marketing. Many of these had to do with regulatory matters assuring the public of sanitary and health protection, or assuring farmers of fair trading practices in the market places that grew larger and became farther removed from the farm. Others had to do with service problems, such as the dissemination of market

news and the promulgation of grades and standards for trading farm products.

As time went on more and more of the research and extension functions of the Department inevitably involved marketing developments, as illustrated by the farm cooperative movement. This concern was also extended to the quality of products, which I think is well illustrated by an experience described by Dr. P. V. Cardon, the present head of the Agricultural Research Administration, who is here with us tonight.

As I understand the story, he walked out of the main building of the Bureau of Plant Industry a few years ago and observed a wreck along the Baltimore Pike. Going to the scene, he noticed that a large trailer truck had overturned and some of its contents spilled out on the road. The contents were peaches.

He thought he noted something familiar about those peaches. On close inspection he found that they were baskets of a new and improved variety that had been developed by the Bureau. But the peaches lying on the road were green, solid, and unattractive. They had not been allowed to mature. They had none of the merits and virtues that were promised by the new variety. The long and arduous work of the plant breeders had been worthless if these peaches were to reach the market in this condition.

Dr. Cardon was impressed by the fact that further work had to be done if the consumers were to get the benefit of the investments that had been made in developing the desirable attributes inherent in those peaches.

Farmers, with the help of science, have striven to raise the quality and uniformity of their products to supply the huge urban population that has grown in this country. Through plant and animal breeding, through fertilization and cultural practices, through improved harvesting methods, and with constant vigilance to protect the produce until it was delivered to market, they have tried to provide what they believed consumers wanted.

But all too often the quality was lost in long and devious marketing channels or reduced costs on the farm were absorbed in the marketing system before they could be passed on to consumers. Developments of this nature, observed many times in many places, finally overcame the highly controversial objections to agricultural scientists dealing with agricultural marketing problems. The Department, however, did not quickly acquire funds for this type of work. It was the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 which resolved the issue by authorizing and directing the Department of Agriculture to do marketing research, service, and educational work. At this point I would like to acknowledge the courage and foresight of the several Congressmen with us this evening who exercised commendable leadership in making this possible.

The first appropriation for these new, specialized marketing activities was made available in September 1947, just 4 years ago. Today we are able to see some of the results of this program of activity.

As the Department approached the job of launching a new marketing research and service program intended to provide benefits for marketing comparable with the notable achievements that had been attained for farm production, it was impressed with the magnitude, the scope, the variety, and the complexity of the problems involved. There was no clear-cut definition of marketing. Indeed, we do not have a completely satisfactory one yet.

One reason for this is that the marketing job in agriculture tends to be somewhat different from that of industry. If we interpret marketing to mean all the activities and services performed with farm production be-

yond the farm gate, it encompasses processing, storage, packaging, and other functions frequently classified as production functions by industrial plants. In addition, it includes the assembling, transporting, distributing, and pricing functions that are universally accepted as aspects of marketing.

In view of this situation, I feel it is appropriate to indicate briefly the several categories of work that are being conducted under the new marketing legislation as a means of showing how the Department has interpreted what constitutes marketing work for agricultural products.

On the theory that effective marketing in a competitive system requires full knowledge on the part of both buyers and sellers, a substantial share of the program is devoted to increasing the information available to participants in the market. Among the activities directed toward this end are the assembly and dissemination of reliable facts on supplies, stocks, movements, locations, disappearance and prices of products, the preparation of current market news on receipts, deliveries, and quotations at the principal market points, and the conduct of consumer education on what is in season, how to judge quality and how to use the products.

Another phase of the work is oriented about the products that move through the marketing system. It is largely directed toward maintaining or improving the quality of the products as they move from the farms to consumers. It seeks to reduce waste and spoilage of products, which we find are very costly items in marketing margins. It seeks also to minimize quality deterioration as a means of increasing consumer satisfaction and benefits by way of more highly nutritional diets.

Here are some examples of our work to improve quality which were made possible by the Research and Marketing Act. A new type of crate for shipping lettuce and carrots keeps these products in better condition from farm to market. And the new crate permits 18 refrigerator cars to haul what formerly required 17. Arizona and California growers are now using the new crate, and savings in crate breakage alone is estimated at \$300,000 a year.

The use of recently developed electrical equipment for loading out delivery trucks from wholesale stores and warehouses permits two men to do the work of three.

Department researchers have worked out a low-cost mechanical method for dumping field crates of apples which reduces bruising as much as 60 to 70 percent. They have also found that food distributors can reduce the handling costs of fruits and vegetables by 20 to 80 percent through more efficient use of their hand trucks, skids, pallets, and other equipment.

A rather surprising recent discovery is that a lot more ice than necessary is used in shipping lettuce. Western shippers can save about \$440,000 a year by using 10 pounds less ice per crate and still get the product to market in better condition.

Grades and standards have been developed and improved to more accurately identify quality and thereby expedite the trading of farm products. Improved standards also enable the market to reflect quality premiums back to the producers. We cannot expect farmers to strive harder for higher quality production unless they are compensated for their efforts.

Another part of the program is directed toward improving the market place itself. More than 60 different cities in producing areas have requested the Department's aid in studying the adequacy of their market facilities and recommending plans for improvements of such facilities which will reduce their cost of operation and deliver

the products in better condition to the consumers.

Detailed studies have been made in some 35 localities, and new wholesale market facilities have been built or are in the process of construction in 15 of these places. The inadequacy of many of the wholesale produce markets of the country has been the subject of five Federal investigations over a period of 40 years. The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 instructed the Department to work with the localities that need improved facilities and help them to determine the specific nature of the facilities needed in each place. This was the first organized effort to do anything about this problem, although the problem has been widely recognized ever since World War I.

In cooperation with food retailers, our specialists working under the marketing research program have developed an improved check-out counter which increases the productivity of the checker in a retail self-service food store by some 38 percent, thus effecting a considerable reduction in the cost of performing the check-out operation, speeding up the flow of people through the check-out counters, reducing the congestion in the store, and increasing the efficiency of the parking lot. Within less than 6 months after the report on this study had been released, these counters had been installed in more than 1,000 retail food stores.

In a sense all of the work conducted under the Agricultural Marketing Act has as its ultimate goal the reduction of marketing costs through increased operational efficiency. Most of the work I have been describing might be classified as indirect approaches to this goal. Some work goes more directly to the problem by studying the costs and margins themselves. This includes the measurement and comparison of them from place to place, from time to time, or from firm to firm. The analysis of these measurements helps businessmen to identify the points of inefficiency in their operations so that they can be corrected. Such analysis also helps the research workers to direct their efforts to the places where they can do the most good in assisting business operators.

As our research has provided a greater insight into agricultural marketing, I have been struck with the similarity of problems confronting farm and market enterprises.

For example, the hundreds of thousands of retailers selling farm products, like the millions of farmers producing them, are essentially small enterprisers who are completely occupied with their business operations. They have neither the time nor the opportunity to conduct their own research or to keep abreast of research results appearing in technical publications. But when research shows how they can operate more efficiently and the results are brought to them through practical demonstrations, they are quick to adopt new ways.

Likewise, the numerous urban fresh produce dealers cannot individually plan and construct modern facilities. They need the help of experts to make the blueprints and organize the tremendous undertakings necessary. This help can be furnished by agencies dedicated to public service because the benefits derived from aiding these dealers to establish more satisfactory, less costly markets are shared by the producers and consumers as well as the tradesmen themselves.

It has not been my intention to suggest or imply that we in the Department of Agriculture regard ourselves as being pioneers or as being unique in our interest and activities in marketing research. With the recent growth of our marketing work, however, we have felt an increased sense of mutual interest between us and the American Marketing Association and the Wide-

spread institutions and organizations represented in the association membership.

I am gratified to note that members of the Department participate actively in the affairs of the association, both in the Washington chapter and in the national association. This evidence of professional standing and professional association of the staff members increases my confidence in their ability to do marketing work objectively and competently. It is also a source of gratification to me to note the prominent parts played in our association by officers who have in the past been members of the Department's staff.

I want to express my appreciation once more for the refreshing, constructive approach you have taken toward the research work carried on by Federal agencies. The awards you present are a very healthy gesture that reflects credit on your organization and its members.

In conclusion, I want to state my conviction that the results appearing from marketing research indicate that science can do for marketing as much as it has done for agricultural production.

REMARKS BY FLOYD J. HOSKING, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON AWARDS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION, SEPTEMBER 25, 1951

Distinguished and honored guests, fellow chapter members, ladies and gentlemen:

Mr. Kauffman's introduction reminds me of a bill I received not long ago from a prominent Washington physician. When paying it I scribbled across it in a large, bold hand, "Inflation isn't coming, it's already here."

President Kauffman, your kind remarks about the work of the Committee on Awards to Government Agencies makes me feel I am one of you. I can hardly wait to hear what I am going to say.

Before commenting on the award program, I want you to know that the man who should be up here tonight is George Travis, the chapter's 1950 president. He will not be here this evening because his association is having its annual convention—it's the old story that work comes before pleasure. It was under his guidance—his direction—that the award program was planned, developed, and executed. His policy was abetted by the American Marketing Association's vice president, Dr. White of the United States Department of Commerce. When George asked me if I would help him by accepting the chairmanship of the committee I accepted gladly. I was then, and still am, impressed with the potential benefits such a program can bring, not necessarily to this chapter—that's incidental—but primarily to the personnel in Government service who have struggled through a long research study.

The Washington chapter through its awards program has taken on the worthwhile obligation to arouse greater interest and appreciation on the part of those interested in marketing, to recognize and promote outstanding research, and to foster higher levels of achievement in the field of distribution.

I am not going to make the claim that too few compliments are given by top Government executives to their scientists and specialists who doggedly, day after day, pour out their hearts, and in many cases their health, on assigned projects. Regardless, more recognition will not hurt. Efforts of businessmen are rewarded by profits; efforts of Government researchers by the knowledge of progress and achievement that has been brought about by their work. Tonight this chapter wants to show its gratitude to Government personnel whose work in 1950 has been found to be of outstanding quality.

Such a program is akin to the boss putting his arm around a worker's shoulders, to a complimentary slap on the back, or to a chief's remark, "A job well done."

Mr. Kauffman, as chairman of the Committee on Awards to Government Agencies, I wish to present to you, to the chapter, and to the award winners, the findings of the full committee. Because there are many guests here this evening, may I name the members of the committee.

Raoul Blumberg, advertising manager, Washington Post.

Stanley F. Cohen, Washington editor of Advertising Age.

Daniel M. Koplik, American Public Relations Association.

Robert R. Nathan, lawyer and economist, and president of Robert R. Nathan Associates.

Meryl Sullivan, National Canners' Association.

You will note that no Government personnel were on the committee, although several members of it have worked for the Government at one time or another.

I am not going to bore you with the details of the committee's work, except to point out several salient features.

1. Every Government agency in Washington, D. C., was informed of the program.

2. Twenty-six entries were received from six Government departments, including the United States Department of Agriculture, United States Department of Commerce, United States Department of the Interior, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Economic Cooperation Administration.

More papers were received from the United States Department of Agriculture than from any other Government agency. While this reflects the success of the work financed under the Research and Marketing Act, it is also the result of extra efforts by USDA personnel, especially by Mr. Roy Lennartson and others.

3. A number of Government department heads wrote letters advising the committee that no work in marketing or market research which met the criteria or standards established by the committee would be submitted, including Department of Defense, United States Tariff Commission, Department of the Air Force, Federal Communications Commission, National Labor Relations Board, United States Treasury Department, Federal Power Commission, Department of the Navy, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Library of Congress, and General Services Administration.

4. The tremendous job of reading and evaluating the individual papers was sandwiched in with our daily work. Some of the papers were carried in brief cases all over the United States. For example, three papers were read in San Francisco, and several others in New Orleans, Miami, and Chicago.

5. The committee concluded that many of the papers were of outstanding merit, four particularly. The titles of these four, together with the names of the authors, are listed in the program which was placed by your plate. All of these papers were so good, the committee recommended to Mr. Travis and Mr. Kauffman that one paper receive first prize and the others honorable mention.

Let's examine the list. You will observe that three of the winning papers were prepared in the United States Department of Agriculture, and one in the United States Department of Commerce. Two deal with specific commodities (oranges and apples), one with a market or market function, and the other with an aspect of market research. One paper was prepared by a group of researchers, two men wrote another, and the other two were one-man jobs.

Now, by prior arrangement, we have all the award recipients at this long table be-

fore me. Referring to your program, we will name the authors and papers in order. The first on the list is: Earl Carlsen and Donald R. Stokes, *Prepackaging Apples at Point of Production*. Will Mr. Carlsen stand?

Mr. Earl W. Carlsen, a graduate of the University of Minnesota, is director of research of the Washington State Apple Advertising Commission, Yakima, Wash. We are honored that you traveled thousands of miles to be here with us tonight. Will Mr. Stokes stand? The coauthor, Mr. Donald R. Stokes, who majored in economics and horticulture at Michigan State University, is marketing research analyst of the Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture. Their study, authorized by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, was carried on during the 1949 and 1950 apple-shipping seasons under a contract between the Washington State Apple Advertising Commission and the United States Department of Agriculture. Under the supervision of the Production and Marketing Administration and in close cooperation with local industry and marketing agencies, the work uncovered numerous ways of reducing costs of materials, through the development of several new packaging techniques, and demonstrated savings in merchandising. A market survey revealed that it was relatively more profitable for store operators to retail prepackaged apples than bulk apples because of greater sales, lower costs, and lower average spoilage and markdown losses. It is a pleasure to give each of you, for the excellence of your paper, the award of honorable mention. Thank you, Mr. Carlsen and Mr. Stokes.

The second paper on the list, *Coordinating the Marketing of Florida Citrus Fruit*, was prepared by George H. Goldsborough. Will Mr. Goldsborough stand? His paper was also conducted with funds provided by the Research and Marketing Act. When this study was written, Mr. Goldsborough, educated at Cornell University and the University of Maryland, was an agricultural economist in the Farm Credit Administration, now he is employed by the Sugar Branch, Production and Marketing Administration. The project was designed to help the then sick Florida citrus industry evaluate cooperative action in building an industry-wide marketing organization and program. His study, among other things, recommended that a central association for the Florida citrus industry be established to negotiate contract terms with processors in the interests of growers of fruit marketed for processing. The study made a significant contribution to the Florida citrus-marketing problem. It also includes analyses of considerable value to other agricultural industries which are trying to solve their price and marketing problems through joint effort. The committee takes pleasure in extending to you, for your significant contribution in the field of marketing, an honorable-mention award. Thank you, Mr. Goldsborough.

The third item on the list before you is William C. Truppner, *Procedures for Defining Census Areas in Tracted Cities for Presentation of Retail Trade and Other Data*. Mr. Truppner is out of the city on defense work and Mr. Harvey Kallin will accept his award. Will you stand, Mr. Kallin? Mr. Truppner's document provided the criteria, as well as the mechanism, for defining areas within our large cities which would be helpful in developing comparability of marketing data. In doing his work, Mr. Truppner and the Bureau of the Census worked closely with the census advisory committee of the American Marketing Association.

On the basis of Mr. Truppner's work, census community areas or retail trade areas have been established and provided for more than 20 major cities or metropolitan areas.

of the United States from Boston to Honolulu and Minneapolis to Miami. The 1948 Census of Business data have been tabulated for areas in a number of these cities. This project was undertaken and completed under Mr. Truppner's direction when he was chief of the business division of the Bureau of Census. At present Mr. Truppner is with the National Production Authority. For his contribution we are happy to present him, through you, Mr. Kallin, an award of honorable mention. Thank you, Mr. Kallin.

The last of the four studies on your list, The Wholesale Produce Markets at Boston, Mass., was done largely by C. J. Otten, but on various phases of the work he had assistance from A. L. Owen, N. G. Paulhus, S. D. Clark, and A. B. Lowstruter. Will Mr. Otten and his collaborators stand?

Since 1917 there have been five Federal investigations into the inefficiencies of wholesale produce markets, two by the Federal Trade Commission and three by the United States Congress. As a result, the United States Department of Agriculture was directed in 1946 to make studies of wholesale produce markets throughout the country. At the request of the wholesale trade organizations and city and State officials, a study was made of the wholesale produce market of Boston.

Mr. Otten's study revealed the existence of wasteful handling methods in the Boston market due largely to the fact that no concerted action has been taken over the years to keep the market facilities abreast with the city's growth and changing distribution patterns. Let me spend a minute here describing the market. The principal district is the old Faneuil Hall area which has been in existence since the days of Paul Revere. Stores in this area do not have rail connections, streets were congested, buildings were too small and not properly designed for the handling of perishable foods. As Boston grew it became impossible to transact all wholesale produce business in the Faneuil Hall area. However, instead of providing complete facilities in another location, an attempt was made to remedy the situation by having the railroads build facilities for handling produce in several parts of the city. Separate facilities were established in Cambridge to handle produce brought in by farmers. This approach to the problem of congestion resulted in breaking up the total wholesale market in such a manner that retail grocers and other buyers could not obtain a complete line of produce at any one of the locations. Cross-hauling was tremendous, cartage costs were high, and much produce deteriorated in the marketing process.

Mr. Otten's study of this market revealed the magnitude of these defects. He and his staff proposed as a solution the consolidation of the wholesale business into one new perishable-produce market area. The facilities proposed included 450 wholesale store units, covered stalls for 100 farmers and truckers, direct rail connections to all wholesale stores with additional tracks with unloading facilities for nearly 1,000 cars at one time, parking space to handle 2,250 trucks at one time, wide streets, and ample room for expansion. A specific site consisting of 170 acres was recommended at the intersection of two super highways which would give ready access to all parts of the metropolitan area. And here's the astounding finding: The total cost of these facilities could be paid from the annual savings of the new facilities compared with the old in less than 4 years.

Since this report was made the necessary legislation has been enacted by the State of Massachusetts creating a public benefit corporation with authority to buy the land,

construct the facilities, and lease them to the members of the trade.

Mr. Otten, it is with great pleasure that the Committee of the Washington Chapter of the American Marketing Association award you first prize for this outstanding work.

Mr. Kauffman, this completes the work of your committee.

Know Your Waterways—Competition and Interdependency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include an article from the Washington Post, published recently by the Marine News of New York, N. Y., as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—COMPETITION AND INTERDEPENDENCY

When the Federal Barge Line was established on the Mississippi River system in 1924, former President Markham, of the Illinois Central Railroad stated that, "The Illinois Central, of course, recognizes that the barge line offers competition paralleling it on the Mississippi River, but our interests are clearly identified with the interests of the people of the Mississippi Valley . . . if it is a good thing for the people of the Mississippi Valley, it in some way will probably operate as a good thing for the Illinois Central system. If it supplies additional transportation that is needed and may be needed in the future that we cannot supply, or if it supplies a cheaper transportation than we can supply and makes for prosperity of the people in that section of the country where our own interests are bound up, it in some way may work back to our own selfish interests. Perhaps it will increase the population, increase the amount of business everybody does down in that territory. If it does operate in that way we are going to reap some benefit, too."

Localities served by two or more methods of transportation pay rates determined by competition to the great benefit of consumers. While purchasers may pay the same price for commodities or tonnage however delivered, they would pay a higher price if their communities were served by only one system of transportation. Railways are among the largest users and beneficiaries of harbors and channels, and there is much vital interdependence between water and rail transportation.

Arizona Exposes Her Own Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the Los Angeles Mirror of September 22, 1951:

ARIZONA EXPOSES HER OWN SCHEME

Arizona has just pulled the rug from under her own phony arguments for the central Arizona project.

This State-wide tumble is a classic case of double talk backfiring. For years Arizona Congressmen have sought support for their preposterously impractical irrigation scheme by weeping into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over their allegedly desperate water situation.

Recently a national picture magazine, impressed by their tears, sent a team of photographers to Arizona. They ran five pages of pictures echoing the Arizona claims of a parched and wasted land.

Then what d'you think happened?

Arizona's biggest bankers and newspapers rose up en masse and denounced the pictures as faked and the story of drought as a complete exaggeration. All of which makes Arizona's Congressmen, who said the same thing, look like a pack of liars.

Read what Arizona's big boys had to say: "Arizona has a troublesome water situation," the Arizona Republic reported, "but not nearly as bad as painted by Life magazine."

"That was the view taken Tuesday by Phoenix business and civic leaders, every one of whom attacked Life for what they termed gross overemphasis of the State's drought conditions."

The newspaper quoted Walter R. Bomson, bank president, as stating that the general condition of the range is better than in previous years, with cattle being shipped in from outside the State to eat surplus feed.

(This doesn't square with the statement of Congressman PATTEN, recently quoted as saying, "Arizona desperately requires her share of the river waters now, to preserve her way of life.")

The real icing on the cake, however, came in the Republic's Our Amazing Arizona column, which said that the greed of Arizona's own ranchers was the root cause of Arizona's water troubles.

"Before a law curbing (excessive drilling) could become operative, human greed asserted itself and well-drilling went on around the clock," the columnist wrote. "Pumps sucked at the diminishing underground supply to irrigate old and new agricultural lands. It has been—and still is—a mad scramble for the quick buck which can be garnered for subsidized agricultural products."

There you have the real story. The truth will come out—even out of Arizona.

Now, even Arizona admits that it is Arizona water hogs, wastefully driving new wells beyond the limit of prudence, who have depleted the normal water table. By their own admission, the State's No. 1 resource has been squandered in a mad effort to make the most of Government crop subsidies.

But even on top of that, a leading State banker says things aren't so bad, with the ranges in better shape than in previous years.

In the face of these facts, Arizona has had the colossal gall to ask the United States taxpayers to spend \$1,000,000,000 to bring water to 240,000 acres at a cost of \$2,000 an acre, so the water hogs can continue to milk the United States Treasury.

It is small wonder that the bald-faced duplicity of this attempted Treasury raid has caused a reaction in Congress which moved Congressman Abe Murdock hastily to abandon plans to seek approval of the irrigation project.

Seldom has the truth so completely exposed a nonsensical scheme as the unguarded reaction of leading Arizonians to the "drought" picture story.

The Great Quabbin Reservoir**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which has been directed to my attention as a tribute to the courage and wisdom of Massachusetts officials who decided to create the great Quabbin Reservoir—largest in the world—which is published in the current issue of the Lincoln-Mercury Times.

The following article entitled "The Biggest Drink of Water," by Mr. Robert Hodesh, describes the effects of this decision and its impact on four historic communities which had to be erased to make way for progress—and drinking water for the city of Boston:

THE BIGGEST DRINK OF WATER

(By Robert Hodesh)

Close to the center of the newer maps of Massachusetts there is a large blue area, as irregular as an ink blot, which represents Quabbin Reservoir. Although this lake was created for the sole purpose of supplying drinking water to Boston and vicinity, it is large enough to be dotted with 110 rocky and mountainous islands. It is 21 miles long and there is not another man-made reservoir in the world as large.

If Quabbin Reservoir was the result of damming some remote and sparsely settled valley of the United States it would probably not be known as anything more or less than another lake—although, of course, a beautiful one in any setting. However, one does not flood so large an area in so thickly settled a part of the country without doing a great deal more.

In order to clear the way for developing the reservoir, the State legislature had to pass a death sentence on four old towns—Dana, Prescott, Enfield, and Greenwich—which had occupied the valley for a long time. Their earliest houses were built by men who had come into the wilderness from the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the middle 1600's on land granted them as a reward for fighting in the war against King Philip, last of the great Indian leaders in the East.

Roots that are sunk so deeply and securely into the past are not easily torn out—especially not in New England, where the past exerts enormous influence on the present and has greater importance than the future. The source of New England pride is antiquity. In the four towns erased by Quabbin Reservoir, as in all New England rural areas, there were families whose lives were an accumulation of memories, of old splendors, of historic triumphs and glories, and on all these they based their character and their integrity.

The homes, many of them, were made a century or two ago, when love of craftsmanship was the principal motivation of builders. Much of the furniture had become priceless antiques, and the dinner plate and silverware had become collectors' items. All of these established a continuity with the past which would never have been broken except through some unforeseeable upheaval like the flooding of the land.

Therefore, when progress, or the future, or the demands of commerce, as represented by

an act of the Massachusetts Legislature, decreed that the visible evidences of the past were to be destroyed and removed, a momentous turn came in the lives of the valley's residents. The emotional implications of Quabbin appealed to writers of fiction, and one result was the appearance of novels based on the situation.

It was necessary for the metropolitan water commission, which built Quabbin, to displace 2,500 persons, destroy 650 houses, and disinter the 7,500 ancestors of the inhabitants who were buried in 34 cemeteries. The latter job was handled with skill and respect, each individual history being investigated and records carefully made.

A number of the more beautiful houses were reassembled in other parts of the country. One is in Deerfield, Mass., itself a museum of architectural treasures; another has been added to the beauties of Charleston, S. C.; there is another in California.

When the dams were built and it was time for the people to go, there were many farewell parties and ceremonies. The town selectmen had to bring an official end to their own corporate existence, which was a little like signing one's own death certificate. Square dances were held in the town halls before the end, but they were probably the saddest civic parties in the towns' histories.

Now a lake with 180 miles of shoreline rolls over the valley. Thousands of tourists stop annually at Winsor Dam and visit the tower on Quabbin Hill, or drive into the lovely Pelham hills to see the island-studded lake from the heights.

The stories of how the towns came to an end are in marked contrast to the reports of a celebration on Borton Common in 1848, when Boston got its first water supply. There was a salute of a hundred guns and all the bells in the city were rung. The governors of the New England States were there, along with the president of Harvard, and an impressive array of the Nation's great. Among the happiest celebrants, history relates, were members of temperance and total abstinence societies.

The dams were closed only a few years ago and the valley has swallowed its allotted amount of water. This monument to great engineering and great sorrow holds 415,000,000 gallons of water for Boston. No greater tribute was ever paid to a city's clean living habits.

Address of Hon. John J. Koehler**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, last evening at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, a testimonial dinner was tendered to Hon. John T. Koehler, retiring Under Secretary of the Navy. Many of Mr. Koehler's associates in Government, representatives of the shipping industry, leaders in maritime unions, and Members of the House of Representatives were in attendance. Many sincere tributes were paid to the high character, superior ability, and lasting accomplishments of the distinguished guest of honor.

It is a genuine pleasure to include under extension of my remarks the ad-

dress delivered by Mr. Koehler on this delightful occasion:

It is very difficult for me to put into words my deep appreciation to those of you who arranged this dinner and to all of you who took time out of crowded schedules to be here. I can best sum up my feelings by saying simply, "Thank you very much for the friendship and good will which inspired this affair."

I leave the Navy with reluctance and regret. I have been a part of the Navy for almost 10 years and, during that time, I have come to know it intimately and well. I have served as lieutenant commander and commander, as counsel for the Bureau of Ships, as assistant general counsel, and as Assistant Secretary. I was a part of the Navy when it reached the zenith of its formidable striking power in World War II and, in contrast, I was a part of the Navy during the lean years of 1948 and 1949. Although I would be the last to admit, at least in the presence of Members of the legislative body, that a certain amount of financial adversity may well be as beneficial to military departments as it sometimes is to men, nevertheless the Navy has lost that lean and hungry look and is well on the way to regaining that strength which is so essential to our national security.

As most of you know, the primary function and responsibility of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy is in the field of procurement. Although procurement as such for the Military Sea Transportation Service is but a relatively small part of Navy procurement demands and activities, it was in the area of procurement for MSTs that I first became acquainted with the maritime industry and the direct bearing of that industry upon the ocean-shipping requirements and responsibilities of the Armed Forces. These responsibilities were entrusted to the Navy as a part of the unification program and the mission was assigned to MSTs. My short tour of duty with the Maritime Administration also gave me an opportunity to learn a good deal about merchant shipping affairs in general. Consequently, when I returned to my Navy duties, more especially to the concerns and tasks of MSTs, I was better equipped to cope with its responsibilities and obligations.

The Korean affair has provided an ideal testing ground of the need for and the effectiveness of MSTs in serving the ocean transportation requirements of the Armed Forces. It was inevitable that, in discharging its responsibilities, MSTs would be on the receiving end of a considerable amount of criticism. Most of this criticism was the result of perfectly understandable apprehensions on the part of private industry concerning the possible adverse effect of a shipping organization run by a military department. At least in the early days of the organization, we were accused of empire building and of making unwarranted encroachments on private industry. On several occasions, I urged industry not to accept these views and, at this time, I believe it is fair to state that, despite all the pressures and urgency of action which have been required in carrying out the Korean task, MSTs has not, in the true sense of the word, been in competition with private shipping. On the contrary, I think we have been reasonably successful, in carrying out our defense responsibilities, in making the fullest utilization of the tools and facilities of private industry and in establishing close collaboration with other Government agencies.

Since most of us here this evening have a direct and immediate interest in ships and shipping, I think it would be appropriate at this time for me to restate for you the basic principles which have guided the Navy, and thus MSTs, in its relations with the maritime industry.

First of all, it appears clearly to be outside the province of the military to think of merchant shipping and its allied industries in any light other than that of adequacy and availability to meet national emergency shipping requirements. If the requirements of readiness, of type, and of numbers of merchant vessels are to be met in time of crisis, there must be in existence a substantial privately owned merchant marine which, because of its commercial peacetime utilization, constitutes a ready weapon for immediate use as an auxiliary for military purposes. It is, therefore, an essential obligation of the military to encourage, promote and aid a strong, adequate, privately owned merchant marine.

Since August 1949, the Navy, through MSTs, has attempted to discharge its responsibilities for the sea transportation requirements of the military departments and has attempted to live up to its obligation to promote a healthy American merchant marine. It was natural that some conflicts were bound to arise but we believe that we have kept them to a minimum. Moreover, as I said on an earlier occasion, where disagreements and conflicts do arise, it would appear far more desirable that they be resolved by cooperation and collaboration than by the imposition of legislation which might well rob the present arrangement of that flexibility and freedom of action which is so essential for national defense purposes.

The Hungnam evacuation in December 1950 is an excellent illustration of the flexibility of the present arrangement and the manner in which MSTs utilize the tools of private industry. In that operation, as you all know, 105,000 fighting men, 100,000 civilians, 17,500 vehicles, and 350,000 measurement tons of material were safely redeployed despite enemy fighting, bad terrain, worse weather and inadequate shoreside facilities. This successful redeployment by sea of an army could not have been accomplished without the fullest cooperation of all concerned, including the ships and crews of the American merchant marine which were a vital component of that redeployment. To my mind, there is no better example, no more practical illustration of what we have all meant by cooperation and collaboration between the Navy and the merchant marine.

Another basic principle which has governed the Navy in this particular field has been a recognition of the need for coordination of the activities of the military and civilian agencies of Government responsible for ocean transportation. To this end, we have spent many months negotiating with representatives of the Department of Commerce and of the Maritime Administration of that Department. It gives me no little satisfaction to know that an agreement now exists between the Departments of Commerce and Defense which makes provision for an orderly, efficient, and effective use of ocean transportation in times of peace, in times of limited emergency, and under full emergency conditions. In my opinion, this agreement is of great importance and is very necessary. It represents a new approach to a problem which has been with Government and industry during two world wars. It recognizes the new placed assigned to the Navy in the all important field of transporting men, equipment and supplies to foreign shores whenever the interests of the United States so require.

This particular agreement, recently signed by the Secretaries of Commerce and Defense, recognizes the dual responsibilities of MSTs and the National Shipping Authority of the Department of Commerce with respect to the efficient use and operation of merchant vessels. It provides for the fullest practicable use of privately owned shipping. It establishes a formula for the allocation of mer-

chant vessels to MSTs by NSA as the rise and fall of military requirements dictates. Finally, but not the least important of the considerations which inspired it, the agreement provides for the maintenance of a nucleus MSTs fleet to meet military exigencies at all times and under all conditions.

Those of us in the Departments of Commerce and Defense who were responsible for the negotiations and ultimate form of this agreement believe that it effects a balancing and preservation of interests between MSTs and private industry on the one hand, and, on the other, between MSTs and the Government agency entrusted with merchant shipping responsibilities at the civilian level. It goes without saying that the agreement requires the closest kind of cooperation and coordination between industry, MSTs, and the National Shipping Authority if it is to serve the purposes for which it was designed, namely, to further our national defense effort.

I would feel delinquent if I failed to say a few words about the foresight and the understanding approach which characterized the efforts of those who sought to bring about a working agreement of this kind. I would like to thank Secretary Sawyer, Under Secretary Rentzel, Vice Admiral Cochrane, and Mr. Holler of the Department of Commerce, for their continuing interest and effective aid. Mr. Rentzel and Admiral Cochrane in particular spent tedious hours aiding in the formulation of the agreement between their department and ours. I should like to add a word of appreciation for the assistance given to this undertaking by Mr. Grover Plowman, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

I believe that it is also appropriate for me to mention, however briefly, the Committee on Transportation and Storage of the Office of Defense Mobilization which has Mr. Rentzel as its chairman. This committee concerns itself, at the policy level, with all fields of transportation affecting the national defense and thus covers land and air as well as sea transportation. While it has carried on its work without fanfare, there is every indication that this committee will prove to be of the greatest possible value, particularly if we should find ourselves engaged in all-out war.

In closing, I should like to pay my respects to those who have assisted me in carrying out that part of my responsibilities involving ocean transportation problems or, if you will, the business end of the work load of MSTs. At the command level, of course, the late Admiral Sherman gave to MSTs vitality, strength, and direction. At the operational level, Vice Admiral Bill Callaghan and his able assistants carried out the policies of the organization in a manner which has commanded the respect and admiration of all of those who have realized the extent of the load which he and his people were required to carry at the height of the Korean action, a task which is still with us. With respect to my own staff, Frank Haley and Captain Lee, my naval aide, have given me sound advice and counsel. Mr. Haley, because of his intimate knowledge of ships and shipping, kept me on the right track on innumerable occasions.

I am deeply appreciative of the assistance I have unfailingly received from all of those with whom I have been associated. No job in Government, whether it be carried out in times of complete stability or in periods of great tension, can ever be well done without the cooperation and support of those who make up the team. I shall always be grateful for the cooperation and support I have received and my sincere thanks go to the many people who have contributed so much.

A Tribute to Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on August 4 the Toronto Globe and Mail, one of Canada's leading newspapers, carried an interesting letter from a prominent citizen of Arkansas, Mr. John Park Cravens. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Cravens' letter, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO CANADA

I was born and reared in the Ozark Mountains located in the central southern United States. The rivers and mountains were given French and Indian names before the United States Government purchased this mountain range from France in the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.

Near the little town in which I live is Mount Magazine (Magasin in French), named by the French about two centuries ago. It is known as the highest peak between the Rocky and Allegheny mountain ranges. One mile from my home is the River Petit Jean, named by the French for Little John, an exploring French soldier killed on the river while fighting the Indians.

Years later the Indians left and then came the white settlers, practically all of Anglo-Saxon descent. My forefathers were of Scotch, Irish, English, Welsh, and French descent. And in the days of my grandparents it was truly a land of Elizabethan ways, and in some respects is yet. In my clan were the Cravens, the Arvecks, the Rices, the Brooks, the Jacksons, the Harwells, the Parris, the Popes, the Lanes, the Connors, the Carpenters, the McKinnies, the Herndons, the Rogers, and others.

BIRDS FROM CANADA

In my youth I was truly a nature boy roaming the mountains hunting game, fishing in the streams and hunting Indian arrowheads, pottery and their various relics when I was not at work at home on my father's farm.

I was an admirer of many types of game birds, and from the north every year came many beautiful specimens of migratory birds to build their nests and raise their young, and some would stay only a few days and continue their flight on to the south. And one day in my youth I asked my father where these birds came from when they would come winging in out of the north, and he replied, "Canada."

"Canada." In my youthful heart, mind and soul for a land there was no name more beautiful. In my mind I associated the beauty of the birds, their songs, their freedom of flight and my admiration and love for them with Canada. And when I advanced far enough in my school grades I began to study about Canada and the British Empire. And many times from the Ozark mountain tops I would gaze far into the north and think of Canada that great land so far away.

In these Ozark mountains when the weather is clear the rising and setting sunsets are beautiful, and in my youth I loved to watch them. But more beautiful of a clear night was when I would go alone to a giant cliff a half-mile from my home and there look toward Canada and see the North Star.

GOD'S NIGHT LANTERN

I thought of the North Star as one of God's great night lanterns to the people of Canada and the northland. Silhouetted against the sky were birds in flight from your land toward the south, and the North Star had lighted up the landmarks and streams to guide the way. Sometimes I would climb to the top of a tall pine tree to get a higher view and wish I could take wings like a bird and fly to your great land for a few hours' visit, and I imagined it would be an enchanted paradise, the land of rainbow waters, and the land where a fairy king with his magic wand gave the birds those beautiful colors and tunes.

I have never been to your country, but it has since my youth been a part of my mind, heart and soul. To me there is no boundary between Canada and the United States when it comes to my loyalty and love.

The birds I loved in my youth and also love today knew no boundary line between Canada and the United States. And may our two countries forever be this way in relationships and spirit, and may persons of my country and your country who in their youths idealized that land beyond the horizon never have that ideal shattered.

At the age of 18 I volunteered as a United States soldier in World War I. And today I have a 19-year-old son who is a United States soldier in Korea. Oh, beloved Canada I have seen your fighting men who are braver than the bravest of the brave. Oh, sons of the Land of the North Star. I will never forget Mons, Vimy Ridge and Flanders Fields. And since then down through the years every bird I see from your country that has the color of red about it, I think of the blood your sons shed and their lives they gave for your country and my country. Oh, men of Canada. You go into battle with hearts and bodies as strong as your stately forests, your hearts as pure as your driven snows and your rainbow waters, your minds and purpose as clear as your golden sunshine and you were as free as our fowls of the air, and to protect this freedom you died so willingly, so gloriously and so bravely. May the eyes of no foreign enemy ever see your stately forests, your rivers and lakes of rainbow waters, your snowcapped mountains, your golden valleys, your beautiful villages, towns and cities.

GET BETTER ACQUAINTED

And may God grant that only the wings of our birds and our planes will ever fly over our lands. I have never seen any planes other than our United States planes in the air over my native mountains here. I would dearly love to see some Canadian planes winging in from the north. It would thrill me as much as a flock of birds winging in from Canada in the days of my youth. The people of Canada and the United States should get better acquainted and learn more about their neighbor.

Just as God set forth in His plans ages ago for birds of the air during certain seasons to wing their way south so has your country carried on a pride, a tradition, a loyalty, a justice, a culture, and a progress that has lived for hundreds of years. And such lives in the hearts, souls, and minds of all classes of your citizens, and their reverence for these things in godly, and in it there is a strength that can never be overcome by any enemy.

The location of your country and its type resounds with freedom and I believe in the near future years a progress unequalled will come to it.

MILLIONS TO COME

The birds still follow their paths, and always they have an objective. And too, your great country has an objective I believe the good Lord means for it to reach in His future

plans for this world. My opinion is there is a glorious future for Canada. Millions of liberty-loving people seeking homes will turn their eyes toward the vast domains of your country. In the near future years a great general progress and an increase in millions in population will cause Canada to come into her own.

May the flags of Canada, the British Empire, and the United States fly forever as symbols of world leadership, liberty, righteousness, and progress. In conclusion I say:

God bless Canada

God save the King.

JOHN PARK CRAVENS.

MAGAZINE, ARK., U. S. A.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence that Mr. Cravens' tribute to Canada and the people of the Dominion was well received, the *Globe and Mail* on the same date commented favorably upon Mr. Cravens' statement. The editorial is as follows:

WHAT A NEIGHBOR KNOWS

Elsewhere on this page today we publish a letter which is poetic in its inspiration, majestic in its conception and heart warming in its sincerity toward this Dominion.

"I have never been to your country," writes Mr. John Park Cravens, of Arkansas. Although he has not been here, most assuredly in his heart he has long dwelt among us. It was his mind, guided by the literature he has read and the personal contacts he has made with Canadians, which perceived the immensity of our country and its potentialities. But it was his rich and resourceful imagination which endowed Canada with a nobility and integrity that now in turn should challenge and inspire us.

"No name more beautiful than Canada," it has seemed to him, when the winging birds came down in their timeless custom, and the North Star whispered to him of a land he had never seen yet vividly knew as only poets can know. His nature reveals itself as he involuntarily employs the sweeping colors for Canada which a cosmic brush bestowed in such bewildering lavishness on his native Ozarks.

"So has your country carried on a pride, a tradition, a loyalty, a justice, a culture, and a progress that has lived for hundreds of years." "Millions of liberty-loving people seeking homes will turn their eyes toward the vast domains of your country" It is profoundly moving to know that such deep trust and friendship exist for us who as a nation have too often not had a self-confidence to match these sentiments. May we be worthy of our neighbor's high assessment and his intensely reasonable prophecy. Even better than he knows what we are, does he know what we should be.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of this country are greatly concerned over the imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of William N. Oatis, who represented the Associated Press bureau in Prague. This matter came up for consideration at the meeting of the Oskaloosa, Iowa, Aerie of the Fraternal Order

of Eagles, and a resolution was adopted that I wish to bring to the attention of Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this resolution:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press Bureau chief, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel, and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information, which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous kangaroo court, completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech government showed its scorn for the principles of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency, Tass, have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That Oskaloosa Aerie, No 276, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No 276, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency, Tass, as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

The Economic Revival of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very enlightening and instructive article that appeared in the *New Republic* on August 20, 1951, by Solomon Barkin, on the subject of the economic revival of New England.

This up-to-the-minute report by Mr. Barkin is a very timely and informative

statement of the facts as they really are by one who has given considerable thought and study to this subject matter.

In his position as director of research of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, he is in a position to speak from authority backed by a wealth of actual experience.

The article follows:

THE ECONOMIC REVIVAL OF NEW ENGLAND
(By Solomon Burkin)

The New England economy faces problems in many respects similar to those of old England. The major manufacturing industries of the region are contracting. Its business leaders are more concerned with protecting accumulated capital and the status quo in general than in promoting regional progress. Businessmen and local governments in these six States are, on the whole, meeting the challenge of the times with less vigor and imagination than are their opposite numbers in old England. The solutions to the problem of economic stagnation in New England are fairly palpable and require no regime of austerity, but the determination to find them is faltering and the organizations are less available for achieving these goals.

The need for a structural readaptation of New England's economic activities to modern trends and the rebirth of alert business leadership is boldly spelled out in the report on the New England economy recently released by a group of New England economists recruited from each of the six States of the region. It is the first over-all, detailed study in 15 years candidly to analyze the problems and outline the opportunities in New England. This report was prepared at the request of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and publication of it was paid for by the Federal Government.

CIO unions in the area and liberals like Chester Bowles have expressed alarm in the postwar years at the failure of the people in the region to face up to the facts about industrial contraction and have pressed for such an investigation.

But it is characteristic that until a Federal agency stepped into the picture, it was not possible to obtain agreement on a coordinated study by a group within the region. Attempts by the New England governors to set up a New England Development Authority compact were defeated by the utility interests who feared that an attack on the high power rates in the region would result. More intensive studies of the problems raised by this committee are being made under national guidance by a Federal interdepartmental agency on New England-New York resources, and by the Committee on New England organized by the National Planning Association.

The failure of local people to initiate a movement for the revitalization of New England's economy is symptomatic of the absence of enterprising management. The committee report stresses that family enterprises have favored dynastic control, with a resulting decline in the quality of management and the disappearance of the kind of enterprising spirit which activated the early Yankee businessmen and traders.

The committee deplors the lethargy and complacency which prevail among New England industrialists. They have not, with few marked exceptions, taken up new ideas, processes, products, and techniques. Plant and equipment have been permitted to drift into obsolescence. New supervisory and managerial talent here have not been recruited. New England industry has made less use of research than other regions. Owners have drained their companies of

their capital. Speculators have been allowed to buy older companies to wring them dry, use them to advantage in tax calculations and sell them as real estate. Relations between employers and unions have been devoid of originality or willingness to depart from habit-worn patterns.

Instead of tackling technological and social problems with the ingenuity inventiveness and shrewdness which produced the flowering of New England, its industrialists have taken a defeatist position, insisting that the handicaps facing them are insuperable. Enterprise had been discouraged by the persistent talk of differentials on labor, materials, transportation, fuel, taxes, etc. New England Congressmen rose almost as one man against an industry decentralization amendment to the Defense Production Act. Although New England's electric-power rates, both to retail consumers and industrial users, run from a third to a half more than the national average, Senator AIKEN of Vermont has been obliged to carry on single-handed the fight for public-power development and the advancement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Proponents of this project propose that New England be assigned a substantial bloc of the 2,200,000 horsepower capacity that will be generated near Massena, N. Y. Power "brown outs" have handicapped industries in New England in recent years.

Only a very few declining New England communities have undertaken to create diversified types of employment—and in these cases only when virtual bankruptcy, due to total shut-down of textiles or some other similar old-line industry, occurred. State governments have fallen down badly in aiding small business. There are only scattered illustrations of genuine promotional effort by local groups to obtain new enterprises. Nor have the industrial leaders taken advantage of the defense program to expand and modernize their plant capacity and to strengthen the newer industries. No plans are in the making for developing employment for the larger number of older persons displaced by the contracting industries. Groups are rekindling the extension of natural-gas lines which would reduce fuel costs. The committee concludes that the New England States have not made the most of their assets either in economic terms or in respect to the natural resources of the area which could be developed without such large appropriations as projects in the West or the South have required.

Besides suffering from unenterprising management, New England's financial wealth is substantially concentrated in trusts and insurance companies. These institutions put "safety first" in investment policy. They are inclined to close down businesses to preserve their capital rather than risk additional funds to revitalize a concern that has run down but could be put back on its feet. The investors are more often rentiers than venturing businessmen. The bolder financial interests have invested outside of New England in new areas where profits seem more assured and have sent their more promising managers to those places. A recent RFC report on the ownership of a Texas oil concern read like the social register of Back Bay Boston. New England has not been offering funds for new businesses in its region in proportion to its needs. The beneficiaries of New England fortunes have shown little regard for the economic future of the region.

A particularly baffling factor in the decline of New England is given only a sort of discreet but hasty glance in the report made for the Economic Council. American vitality rests on initiative and opportunity. New England's dominant economic groups have lost the former and restricted the latter. Through their economic controls the older population repressed the newer "ethnic

and religious groups." Although these groups constituted a growing proportion of the population, their vigor, alertness and vitality were not encouraged. Even as of the current date, few men stemming from this stratum of immigration are owners of significant regional manufacturing enterprises. Members of these racial groups have built sound local businesses, but almost entirely devoted to serving their own community. The discrimination exercised by the "Yankee" has deprived New England of the versatile pioneering spirit of these people. Only since the last war have there been an impressive number of cases of people descended from these new groups coming prominently to the fore in the local industrial scene. New England has paid the price for the undemocratic attitudes of its dominant groups.

The committee of economists who prepared and signed this stimulating and helpful report has not proposed any mechanism by which economic progress can be brought about in New England. Clearly a central agency is needed which will investigate possibilities, promote and push new enterprise, and rekindle a faith in the future of the region in the minds of the men who control the capital reserves and the vested interests, such as railroads, banks and power companies. Interstate compacts as a method of getting things done have failed repeatedly.

It is painfully clear that without action by the Federal Government nothing positive or important will get underway. The State governments will not fall into line until the power lobby, the port of Boston group and their friends, have been ousted from the driver's seat on all basic issues affecting the region. The committee report spells out some important first steps that must be taken, including the location of a steel mill in the region, which would make possible new metal fabricating plants.

Regional and community institutions of learning and more extensive aid from the United States Department of Commerce are suggested as means of improving technical and managerial competence. The committee recommends venture-capital corporations to promote new local enterprises. Even here, however, without Federal aid and guarantees, nothing substantial is practically feasible.

We can join in the above and other recommendations offered by the committee, including the high national minimum standards of working conditions and a local stockpile of public works to meet recessions. But the guarded statements on power will hardly produce lower rates. Nor do we believe that the need for stimulating economic growth in New England justifies the shifting of the tax burden from the high-income groups to those less able to pay. Economic incentives may have to be created in ways such as those provided by the DFA.

New England can grow. Its opportunities are many. The rich reserve of human talent must be tapped by encouraging enterprise, particularly among the newer ethnic groups. The large universities can do more to stimulate more local settlement of its promising graduates. The secondary-school system must be reoriented to provide the training necessary for the growth of the newer industries. Many new industries are being built on the research conducted by the major New England universities, they can be located in New England. The contiguity to Canada's rich resources promises new developments. A more concerted program which commands the confidence and support of, and promises benefits to, all the people can succeed. Perhaps an organization must be founded by the everyday people of New England, headed by the progressive elements including the trade unions, to lead in the industrial and economic growth of the region.

The Cotton Farmer**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Greenville (Miss.) Democrat-Times:

LOOKING AT THE SOUTH

(By Hodding Carter)

CONDEMNING FARMERS IS RANKEST HYPOCRISY

In some quarters there has developed of late a habit of hopping on the farmer, and particularly the cotton farmer, as being a money-lusting parasite fattening on the purses of his fellow Americans.

Right now the loudest noise is being made in the direction of the cotton South because of the cotton growers' anger and worry over the 10-cent a pound price decline that followed the crop estimate of more than 17,000,000 bales. These critics say that the cotton crop will bring a half billion dollars more than a year ago, so what are the farmers crying about?

Well, I don't think that question is hard to answer. To begin with, a half billion more dollars reflects only the size of the crop, which will be about 7,000,000 bales more than a year ago. That bumper crop has been produced because the Government urged the farmers to go all out for cotton as a patriotic response to the demands of national defense. That crop is being produced at the highest cost in history—cost of fertilizer, cost of labor, cost of poisoning, cost of equipment—not to mention cost that can't be computed, arising from the return of pasture and diversified crop land to cotton. The end result for the cotton farmer is less money and more expense.

Sure he's aroused. If the farmer were unique in wanting to make money, if he were robbing a nation which everywhere else was holding the line, if the South's income were as high as the Nation's average instead of less than 70 percent of the average, if the South's cotton were selling at or over the world price, if the price of raw cotton were responsible for the high cost of cotton goods—if all these if's were facts, then the rest of the Nation would have a right to complain.

But the critical industrialist or labor leader is the rankest kind of hypocrite when he condemns the southern cotton grower for accepting Government price supports or putting part of his crop into the Government loan in the hope that it will cause prices to rise in proportion to production costs. American industry has for generations been accepting governmental aid in the form of protective tariffs that mitigated principally against the farmer. American industry has waxed fat on governmental cost plus contracts. American industry fixes its prices and it doesn't go broke because of price collapse or bad weather or overproduction. American labor is protected, as it should be, by wage and hour laws. And labor's earnings during and since the war years have risen out of proportion to the cost of living.

But the cotton farmer is a traitor and a leech and a fat profiteer. Maybe so. But I won't believe it, not as long as I can read or see or think; not as long as I can count cotton millionaires on one hand and business, industrial, and professional ones by the hundreds; not as long as nature can play hob with man's hopes as it has in my own section this year. In short, to hell with it.

United States Morals Ebbing, Food**Officials Say****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on the important problem facing the Nation regarding the decline of public morals in official life, I include an article appearing in the Washington Post of September 26, 1951, by Thomas Winship, as follows:

UNITED STATES MORALS EBBING, FOOD OFFICIAL SAYS

(By Thomas Winship)

"Wrongdoing has brought the United States to a most shameful period," Austin S. Igleheart, president of General Foods Corp., said yesterday.

"And, sad to tell, the tendency is toward shamelessness," he said, saying a complacent public was partly responsible for recent headlines on crime, corruption, and influence peddling.

He said "many Americans have either lost their sense of unrightness or have willfully been doing what they know to be wrong—the more so, since the rest of us have inclined to let them get away with it."

Igleheart spoke at a Statler Hotel breakfast of the National Association of Food Chains. Some 1,800 delegates are attending the association's eighteenth annual convention, which closes Thursday.

He called upon the food industry—"which has more contact with producers and consumers than any other industry"—to help make a real "fight for internal morality. * * * You and I have to be healthy of soul. We cannot sit on our backsides and slide uphill."

The bulk of Igleheart's speech was based on an improbity poll he recently conducted among members of the Association of Food Chains.

"Improbity is a big word," he said, "but it takes a big word to cover all the moral and spiritual relapses you are hearing about these days. Everything from shoplifting and dope peddling to black marketing * * * from cribbing by cadets and bribery of legislators to perjury by Communists * * * from the giving and taking of deep freezers and mink coats to the outright sale of political jobs * * * and from sheltered gangsterism to selfish opportunism."

The poll, he said, showed that thefts have increased in food stores.

He quoted one answer. "Increased stealage is only part of a new pattern of things. Embezzlement, returned checks, not only those that are no good, but those that float constantly for lack of sufficient funds—a growing habit of regular clientele."

Said another answer: "Our managers have asked for help, and we have assigned one man to survey the situation. We now prosecute. We have noted a desire to secure packages of Canadian bacon and luncheon meat without cost."

Igleheart said the main impression he got from all the answers is that "many of you think there is something wrong with present government."

Interpretation of the answers, he said, serve to lump the bad influences under these four headings: "(1) Poor leadership, (2) Santa Claus of the false philosophy of something for nothing, (3) bad examples set by unscrupulous politicians and by delinquent parents, (4) weakening of religious training in homes and schools."

In a morning panel discussion, a top Office of Price Stabilization official told the chain-store operators that the Government's meat program is deteriorating and that failure of Congress to set slaughtering quotas may be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

The Senate Banking Committee yesterday approved a modified plan for slaughter quotas.

Edward F. Phelps, Jr., Assistant OPS Director, said his agency cannot maintain workable beef controls under existing conditions.

There are some of the "less ethical people in the meat business," he said, "who do not care what they pay for cattle so long as they get supplies."

At yesterday's luncheon meeting, Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State College, described the food distribution curriculum instituted last year at Michigan State.

Russia on the Run**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct attention to an article by Mr. Virgil Pinkley, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Mirror. The article analyzes the cold war and is especially encouraging because the writer was a very distinguished foreign correspondent before becoming editor and publisher of the Mirror. The article follows:

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

(By Virgil Pinkley)

History seldom has seen a country make as many mistakes in so short a time as Russia.

A quick cut-back to the year 1945 will prove this conclusion.

At that time Soviet armies were hailed as defenders of democracy. The popularity of Russia throughout the world was at an all-time high. The name Joseph Stalin was on almost every lip. We, and our closest allies, were ready to grant Moscow many concessions. We did.

That was 6 years ago. What is the situation today?

Russia is supported only by her slave states. Even in these countries underground opposition grows.

Today we and other nations no longer quake when Moscow speaks or threatens. An outstanding example of this new attitude was the Japanese Peace Treaty negotiations wherein 48 nations voted against Russia and the poor, miserable, unfortunate vassal states of Poland and Czechoslovakia.

WE TALK BACK

Today the President, our leading political figures and top military men slam broadside after broadside at Russia. We and our friends physically stand up to the Kremlin. We talk back. We meet demands with equally tough counterdemands. We even fight propaganda with propaganda.

In short, we are on the offensive. The play has been taken away from Joseph Stalin and company on most matters.

When World War II ended Russia faced among problems the following:

1. Germany.
2. Japan.
3. The need to secure petroleum and steel.

4. A tighter economic and political control over Western Europe. This was to be followed, of course, by military control.

5. Spreading and strengthening of communism.

6. Prevention of military strength by the United States and other leading powers.

7. Gaining access to the Mediterranean.

8. An iron-clad control of the Balkans and Central Europe.

9. Support in the United Nations.

It is true that Russia has won over Red China and Northern Korea. Additionally an uneasy occupation has been installed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

RUSSIA LOSES GROUND

But Russia has lost ground in solving or overcoming virtually all the other major problems.

Today Western Germany is with the west. That includes nine-tenths of the industrial output of all Germany, most of the wealth and three-fourths of the nation's population. The danger for Russia of eventual war with Germany is greater than from any other quarter. History and geography dictate this.

Japan is on our side. Russia has lost out completely in dictating any part of the Japanese peace treaty or in having any voice in the affairs of that nation.

Since the war Russia has gained very little petroleum or steel.

BLINKERS ARE OFF

Communism has been dealt a series of body blows. The greatest of all has been in the United States. At long last we have taken off the blinkers and rose-colored glasses. We now know communism for the godless, ruthless, totalitarian, imperialistic creed that it is.

Since the United States is the world's leading Nation, our action on communism will determine largely what the remainder of the non-Communist world does.

In Italy and France Communist Party membership has been cut in half. In the Low Countries and throughout Scandinavia communism has lost favor.

Soviet moves have brought about the greatest peacetime rearmament in history.

WHAT WE HAVE DONE

The Kremlin's policies have brought about the North Atlantic Pact and the creation of General Eisenhower's armies in Western Europe. They have caused us to mobilize military forces well in excess of 3,000,000, to build an Air Force of at least 95 groups, to take united action in Korea, bring hundreds of ships back out of mothballs or rush construction on others. Our whole arsenal of atomic weapons has been broadened and made much deeper. We have created stockpiles of atom bombs that otherwise never would have been made. Our defense production is being stepped up greatly and more is to come.

MORE RED TROUBLE

America's policy with relationship to Greece and Turkey blocked the Soviet march to the Mediterranean. Now these nations are to join the Atlantic Pact. They, as Yugoslavia, are a thorn on Russia's exposed flank. We have backed all this up with a powerful Navy in the Mediterranean and large airfields across North Africa from which most of Russia could be bombed.

Moscow's mad bid for world power has forced us to increase our land, air, and sea forces in Western Germany, Austria, and the British Isles.

Russia has lost control of Yugoslavia. We soon will have excellent new air and sea bases in and around Spain. Italy is growing in strength and joins the side of free nations.

It is a mistake to underestimate the strength of an opponent, it is almost as serious to overestimate the strength of an

adversary. We have done the latter with respect to Russia for too long.

Not that Russia isn't powerful, or the danger of communism very great. But Russia no longer can conquer the world and the Soviets no longer can ride roughshod over freemen.

Grave Markers of Returned War Dead To Be Inscribed To Show Korean Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from the Department of Defense dated September 20, 1951:

GRAVE MARKERS OF RETURNED WAR DEAD TO BE INSCRIBED TO SHOW KOREAN SERVICE

The Department of Defense will begin immediately to inscribe the word "Korea" on grave markers and headstones of United States dead returned from Korea, or whose death is attributable to service in Korea, Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett advised President Truman today.

"You asked that I develop an inscription for inclusion on grave markers and headstones of United States dead returned from Korea or whose death is attributable to service in Korea," Secretary of Defense Lovett said in a letter to President Truman informing him of the Defense Department action.

"At my request the service Secretaries considered the matter and agreed upon the use of the word "Korea" as an appropriate inscription. Accordingly, I am directing that this practice be placed in effect immediately," Secretary Lovett said.

Use of the word "Korea" will satisfy official requirements and limitations and at the same time will permit the Department of Defense to comply with requests of next of kin in connection with inscription recognition of cause as well as place of death, Secretary Lovett said.

Secretary Lovett's directive was made retroactive to permit addition of the Korean designation on grave markers and headstones of United States dead previously laid to rest. National cemetery regulations prescribe that the inscription on Government headstones may contain the name, date of birth and death and abbreviations of military awards held, a religious emblem, and the war in which service was rendered.

The regulations do not apply to the graves of servicemen buried in other than national cemeteries. These markers and monuments are of private concern and may be marked in whatever manner the family or relatives determine.

Eating Up the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what does a corrupt administration pro-

duce? It produces moral, intellectual, and material waste. It produces inflation. Inflation destroys not only material resources but it destroys courage, ambition, initiative, great purpose, and ideals. It lowers the standard of living; it breeds communism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the following article by a distinguished reporter, Frank Tripp, which appeared in the Olean (N. Y.) Times Herald, September 24, 1951:

This is a story of a man who understands inflation better than all of the economists in the world. He is an authority on it, and a victim of it, with no trick solution to offer.

He has come to the conclusion that all the common man can do about inflation is to produce enough to keep up with it. Expert manipulation to control and correct it has accomplished little for him.

Instead he believes that the dog house in which he abides in his old age was created by man's meddling with the laws of nature and supply and demand. There are no charts, graphs, or promises in his analysis. His is a simple, cruel experience story, a course in inflation that anybody can understand.

He once owned a profitable business of many years standing. When he reached 80, the country's economy was stable. What has since happened to it was unforeseen. He had accumulated as much as he felt he needed to see him through.

He didn't aspire to be wealthy, had a wife but no family and enough to live comfortably, he thought. So he sold his business and retired. His friends envied him the life of leisure and travel that he planned.

His then sufficient nest egg consisted of investments, ready cash, a little modest rental real estate, and his home. It all looked as secure and enduring as Gibraltar. Today, well past 80, only his home is left and he lives meagerly off the controlled rent that he gets from his second floor. He had to eat up his future.

He saw the dollars he had saved halved in purchasing power, then halved again while things he bought soared higher, many beyond his reach. He saw his life's competence disappear four times as fast as he expected and was helpless to prevent it.

He sold his car, quit his clubs, stored his beloved golf sticks, sat on his porch, and saw the changing world pass by. When you ask this man who learned the hard way, a way that would have crushed a lesser philosopher, when you ask him for the answer, he gives a simple one. He doesn't fly off in a tirade; he rationalizes his predicament and takes half the blame upon himself.

He just says that in our pyramiding economy no man can preserve what he has without producing a considerable part of what he meantime consumes. He says that these days, when a man thinks he has enough to retire is the time he should stay in the harness and accumulate four times as much.

This man's plan failed because he was producing nothing in a period that cost him his dollars many times faster than he had earned them. His plan had worked in America for 100 years—back when people didn't think that society owed them a living.

His plight should make people think; those who care not how little they produce for the dollars they are paid; who loll in serene confidence that the Government will support them.

It is their ilk who ruined this man; they and the self-seeking politicians who want their votes. Inflation is a child of the welfare state, of its waste and the high prices that its taxes create; plus the moral irresponsibility it has engendered among the people, says this man who paid, and knows.

It is a fraud that comfort and security can come from anything but one's labor, he says; that America can survive on anything but the productivity of its people, a swindle that the way to beat the rap is to cheat the boss, revile, and pester him.

Already men are retiring on social-security and old-age pensions to learn the sad facts of this story. Men who didn't plan long enough and big enough on their own; who trusted their fate to government and thought it didn't cost them a cent. Millions will fall for the hoax.

They forget that they are the government and pay the shot, down to the bread they eat; that that's what inflation is. They forget that every day they do not produce more than they consume, another has to do it for them; while they eat up their own future and that of their children.

The humbug cannot go on forever. Some day everybody's future will have been consumed—like the man in this story. Because too many are living off the labor of too few.

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column entitled "Neckyoke Jones Says," published in the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press on September 15, 1951:

NECKYOKE JONES SAYS

"Did you seen where the Johnny Bulls is buyin' a millyun bushel of wheat from Uncle Joey Staleen?" I inquires of my ol' pardner, Greasewood. "Yessir," he resloops, "an' I unnerstand that the Brittish is goin' to give raw rubber to Uncle Jo in payment. This will fix it so Uncle Jo kin make tires for airplanes an' sech stuff—which he is givin' to the Chine Commies who is killin' British soljers. Now, I also seen that Clem Atleo—the Sochillist, has told the British folks they don't need to worry about Persian oil, because he's got it fixed to git all the oil they need from your good ol' Uncle Sap. He don't say what the Limeys will use fer money, but you kin bet that it'll most likely have the American eagle on it—because there is a cupple of gimme guys over from England right now negoshatin'. Like as not it won't be long before we'll have to give coupons fer gasoline—an' taxes continues to rise. This seems kinda queer to me—all ol' this here British bizness—but then mebber it's me that's plumb loco." This internashinul bizness has sure got Greasewood euchered. Hopin' you are the same, I am,

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

The Charles River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Saturday, September 22, 1951:

CHARLES RIVER INSPIRES NEW ENGLAND'S WRITERS

(By John Bunker)

BOSTON—The Charles has been a river of writers.

Not a few of the literary greats have lived, worked, and found inspiration along or near its banks. Longfellow wrote a poem to the Charles. Oliver Wendell Holmes gazed from the windows of his Back Bay home out across its tranquil waters—loved to walk along the river to freshen his thoughts.

But more interesting than these and other celebrated men and women of letters are the "unknowns" and the "forgottens" whose prolific literary careers are threads in the Charles River story.

Among the Indian artifacts, spinning wheels, flintlocks, stuffed birds, and assorted other relics which fill the Natick Historical Society rooms at South Natick by the Charles is a collection of books by an author named Horatio Alger.

Youngsters today who can rattle off the names of Dick Tracy, Roy Rogers, Gene Autry, and other heroes of contemporary moppetdom have never heard of Horatio Alger, much less of the intrepid heroes of his pen who thrilled the boys of Dad's day and inspired untold thousands of youngsters with the Alger success formula of "pluck and determination . . . honesty and perseverance."

MORE THAN 100 BOOKS

During his last years, Alger lived with a sister at Natick and spent much time strolling along the river. Ofttimes he was seen sitting under the huge tree where John Eliot preached to the Indians.

Alger was a fabulous character on the American literary scene. Although he turned out more than 100 books in a career of 30 years and was more popular than any of his contemporaries, he has been snubbed by literary critics and historians. Except for Herbert R. Mayes, he has attracted no biographers.

Son of a preacher who held to the strictest of old orthodox religious views, Alger went to Harvard, where his father thwarted the great romance of his life and persuaded him into the ministry.

But his heart wasn't with the preaching profession. When editor William T. Adams published one of his early stories for boys—lauding his style and asking for more—Alger zoomed almost overnight to the heights of writing success.

Magazines that published his stories enjoyed big circulations. His books went into many printings. Fathers counseled children to model their lives after the heroes of his fiction. He made plenty of money, gave it away as fast as he made it, and spent much of his life as resident of a New York newspaper boys' home—to gather local color and help the boys.

Always he dreamed of forsaking his success with boys' books and produce a great novel of immortal proportions. That was in his thoughts when he came to Natick and sought inspection along the banks of the Charles late in his career. The great novel never came because his writing talent was of a different mold, which both reflected and affected the tenor of his life.

COMMEMORATIVE HYMN

The styles of Alger's books are discernible from the titles. Read, borrowed, and reread by the youth of Victorian America were Andy Grant's Pluck, Slow and Sure, Frank and Fearless, Brave and Bold, A Debt of Honor, and dozens of other stories in which his young heroes surmounted in-

numerable obstacles and discouragements to win success and acclaim.

For 14 years his father was pastor of the First Unitarian Church near the Charles River in South Natick. For the church's fiftieth anniversary the elder Alger asked his son to compose a commemorative hymn. Horatio obliged, reading the composition in person. When the reading was over the congregation forgot all rules of decorum and broke out in vociferous applause.

Few of them had probably read Shakespeare, but for all Alger was a household word.

The Charles has inspired considerable poetry.

It incited Thomas C. Amory in 1888 to write a poem of some 350 verses called "Charles River."

The beauty of the Charles stirred James B. Wiggins into composing an unstinted poetic tribute many years ago when the lower waters of the stream were less urban than they now are. But his sentiments still are true of the river in its farther reaches.

"Charles River doth gather its waters forever,

By the green hills of Norfolk 'tis hurrying down,

It gathers its rills and it swells to a river By farm and fair homestead and beautiful town.

Then a song for Charles River,

A mirror forever.

Its beauties and bounties

The pride of three counties.

Its waters are pictures and music to me,

The handsomest river that flows to the sea."

BUSY UNKNOWN

Among the literary "unknowns" who lived and wrote near the Charles were a ministerial trio of Needham amazingly prolific with books on religious subjects—all in the days before typewriters, electric lights, and the other conveniences for literary production.

The Reverend Harvey Newcomb, a Needham minister, turned out no fewer than 178 books as a side line to preaching. One of his works, a 784-page Cyclopedia of Missions had an extensive circulation.

An equally industrious pen was wielded by the Reverend Abijah R. Baker, whose Catechism Tested by the Bible was must reading in his time and sold half a million copies in the 1870's. His wife, Harriette Newell Baker, managed to pen no less than 200 books in addition to her household duties and won an admiring commendation from President Lincoln for the stories she wrote for children.

Busy as these writers must have been, they were matched by the flying pen and prodigious output of William T. Adams, a native of Bellingham by the Charles.

LAUNCHED ON CAREER

Famous in the latter half of the nineteenth century under the pen name of Oliver Optic, author Adams produced 116 full-length novels and some 1,000 magazine and newspaper stories. Along with his writing, he edited two popular children's publications of that period: Our Little Ones, and Student and Schoolmate.

It was Oliver Optic who launched Horatio Alger on his career.

Catering to a boy's love of adventure and at the same time employing the strong moral themes that were expected in books of the Victorian period, Oliver Optic authorized 15 series of action novels, each of which included six or more volumes.

These "unknowns" and "forgottens" of the nineteenth century literary scene, the romantics and satellites, as it were, of that star-filled era of American letters, provide an intriguing and, for would-be authors, an inspiring chapter in the story of the Charles—river of romance.

Address of Lord Mayor of London at Williamsburg, Va.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the address which was delivered by the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Denys Lawson, Baronet, in Williamsburg, Va., on Friday, September 14, 1951.

This occasion was the first time a Lord Mayor of London has ever left England while in office to visit the United States. The Lord Mayor, the Lady Mayoress, and the official party were the guests of colonial Williamsburg, which has been restored by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The mayors of the capital cities of each of the Original Thirteen Colonies were also guests on this historic occasion. The Lord Mayor spoke from the portico of the restored colonial capitol.

The address follows:

Far more accomplished speakers than I would feel diffident in daring to address you in this city where one of the supreme masters of English oratory, Patrick Henry, delivered one of his most famous speeches; and for me this is perhaps made doubly disconcerting by the reflection that you have invited me, the representative in my own distant city of the authority of the King of England, to speak to you in the very spot which was once the headquarters of Gen. George Washington in his victorious campaign against the garrisons of King George. I hasten to point out, therefore, that my office has not always been identified so closely with the cause of authority. There was among my predecessors as lord mayor of London a certain John Wilkes, whose name is a symbol of liberty in both our countries, and who, in the course of a turbulent but glorious career, was once outlawed and thrice charged with seditious libel. In all honesty, I cannot say that I envy Wilkes all his claims on the interest of posterity. I have never underrated the advantages of friendly relations with the police. There is one occasion in his life, however, which must always have a special place in the historical daydreams of a lord mayor of London, and to which my mind has continually returned as I have passed through this beautiful city, this gracious home of freedom. I mean that memorable day when John Wilkes, as lord mayor, stood before King George III to present the solemn remonstrance of the city livery against the vain and presumptuous policy of attempting to coerce the American people. On that day London, of whose abiding being I am for a briefer moment the immediate embodiment, earned the right, which today I claim, to salute your Nation. And it was John Wilkes also, still as lord mayor, who stood up in the House of Commons to show that even then freedom had a common language on both our sides of the Atlantic. "Have we," he demanded, "any right to tax the Americans? * * * The fundamental laws of human nature, and the principles of the English constitution are equally repugnant to the claim. * * * The words liberty and property, so dear to an Englishman, so pleasing to our ears, would become mockery and insult to an American. * * * The Americans will defend their property and their liberties with the spirit of freemen, with the spirit I hope we should. They

will sooner declare themselves independent, and risk every consequence of such a contest than submit to the yoke which administration is preparing for them."

We did not quarrel over petty matters 200 years ago; the great issues of human governance were at stake; but neither did we quarrel as two united peoples ranged solidly against each other. There were always among us men like Wilkes who knew you were fighting our battle; and there were always among you men who saw beyond the bitterness and strife to the essential unity of aim and belief which inspired two nations cradled in the common law. I am not thinking only of the most obvious achievement; that the struggle represented the birth pangs of your illustrious Republic, which is now the mightiest force working for human advancement in our distracted world. I mean that we too in Britain can now look back upon the issue of the struggle without regret, because, though we lost an empire, we learned also by experience the true principles by which another empire might be held together, until it merges itself into a yet larger and nobler conception. At the second attempt, we found a way to reconcile the liberty of our kindred communities overseas with continued allegiance to the ancient Crown; and a family of sovereign nations has grown up, each absolute mistress of its own affairs, but all trusting one another to come to the aid of the common cause—whenever the liberty of any member of the family is threatened. I have just visited three of the members of this great Commonwealth of Nations, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. I have found in them all the same deep affection for the mother country and for the people of the United States of America, also for one another; the same unswerving resolution to stand together in defense of peace, liberty, and justice in world affairs; and, not least, the same clear-eyed recognition that the ideals we hold sacred in our Commonwealth are also sacred in your Republic and that the whole future of humanity depends upon the strength and intimacy of the bond that unites us and you. We—American citizens and subjects of the Commonwealth—we are the peoples of the rule of law; and in comparison with that link the fact that our constitutional forms are different and we own no common political authority is of no account.

Here in the Old Dominion we stand in the presence of the most ancient tradition of North America, and I salute that tradition, not merely because it is ancient, but because any American tradition which goes back to 1633, when this city was founded under the name of the Middle Plantation, is necessarily one that my country may claim to share. The great tides of mingled political and religious controversy, which is the seventeenth century swept England, and out of whose interaction our modern system of parliamentary government arose, swept Virginia also. Your Governor and two houses of the colonial legislature exactly reflected the King, Lords and Commons of England; there were the same stresses between them, and the rival conceptions of political philosophy had very similar ups and downs.

At the end of the century when our struggle in England issued in the compromise we call constitutional monarchy, you renamed your city after the same King William whom we in the city of London remember as the founder of our most famous and powerful institution, the Bank of England. Your college of William and Mary has been since 1693 a brilliant member of that international republic of learning which, I am glad to say, has never been dissolved by the disputes of politicians, and is the perpetual interpreter of the common heritage of the English-speaking nations. It was with profound emotion—what man with any historic sense could fail to be moved—that I took my place in the procession this afternoon from your court

house of 1770 and saw the state sword of the corporation of London, itself dating from 1690 and our ancient symbol of justice, beside the civic mace of Williamsburg to the capitol. I was no less touched to sit down at luncheon with the representatives of capital cities from all the 18 States on whose original compact your Nation was founded, and to be accepted as a brother mayor among all those mayors of proud and honorable lineage. Here, I thought, is the thing that nothing can alter in the much dispersed family to which we all belong—the self-government of English-speaking men in cities. The love of our own home town is the beginning of the love of our country, which again must be deep and true before we can rise to the love of humanity; and it is by learning the art of governance on the smaller stage of civic affairs that a people becomes fit for the heavy responsibility of controlling its own destiny and may hope to point the way to what we all dream of, the parliament of man, the federation of the world. So, gentlemen, it is in this gathering of municipal officers, carrying the same sort of emblems because they still do the same sort of work on both sides of the Atlantic, that I find the most hopeful and encouraging sign that the American way of life and the British way of life fit together in a natural harmony. We are the peoples that build upwards from the level of the common man and work-a-day affairs. We believe that all authority must be in touch with the small things, the human things, from which comes its life. We stand inflexibly together against the opposite doctrine, that the rights and liberties of men are concessions made to them by exalted power, not answerable to them, but dispensing or withholding indulgences according to its arbitrary will. I do not need to remind you that we are confronted by vast communities in the modern world who do construct their politics thus, from the top downwards, and even believe that the rights they thus derive may be legitimately called liberty. With great price they buy that freedom—the price of surrendering the mastery of their soul. But we—we who through all the ages have been governing ourselves in parish meeting or town council, till out of these humble beginnings came Parliaments and Congresses—we were born free.

So long as we retain our unity, we shall, with God's help, defend and enhance our common heritage of true freedom.

Welcome—To Jail

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

WELCOME—TO JAIL

Americans read with elation of the number of persons who brave the dangers of the iron curtain to escape from Communist-dominated lands to supposed freedom in Western Europe. Yet a correspondent in Geneva points out that under present circumstances the first thing that happens to probably more than two out of three of these escapees is that they are thrown into jail like common criminals.

A few of them are fugitives from punishment for ordinary crimes. Certain others may be spies. But most of them are ordinary workers, some are trained technicians, some

farmers; all have information and an evident distaste for communism.

All are guilty, technically, of having crossed a border illegally. Hence the prospect of jail if they report to or are found by officials in the American-occupied zones. There they are questioned by military intelligence officers and eventually turned out to try to find a living.

A number of things could be done to improve this situation. First, there should be a less degrading kind of detention instead of jail while the escapees are being screened. Second, there should be a uniform procedure in the various districts along the frontier. Third, there should be some organization or organizations which can assist those who are worthy among these refugees to become placed where they can support themselves, serve society, and aid the free cause.

The International Refugee Organization, which dealt with the displaced persons problem after the war, is being dissolved. There is need for a new agency of this type to give iron-curtain refugees a better introduction to the West. The Iron Curtain Refugee Campaign conducted by the International Rescue Committee is doing a much-needed job in this respect so far as privately contributed resources can go. But the job is bigger than that.

It requires official attention and ultimately congressional support in such matters as finances, modification of immigration laws, and possibly authorization of a larger number of foreign enlistments in the armed services. The United States is missing an enormously important opportunity in the cold war if it does not arrange for better treatment of those who risk shooting by the border guards in order to come over to the anti-Communist side.

Tax Aid in Home Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News and World Report of September 21, 1951:

WE'VE BEEN ASKED ABOUT TAX AID IN HOME SALES

What tax changes is Congress making that affects home owners?

Tax laws are to be changed so that profit from sale of a home will not be treated as a capital gain, provided the seller turns around and buys another home, costing as much or more than he got for the old house, within a year.

Is that assured?

Yes, it seems to be. The House has voted in favor of it in the new tax bill. The Senate Finance Committee agrees. There is little or no opposition.

What does this mean?

Under the coming tax law, if you own a home and sell it at a profit, the profit will not be taxed provided you buy or build another home of the same or greater value. In the past, the tax has discouraged many people from selling and building or buying again. If they sold, then they were taxed up to a 25-percent maximum of the profit from the sale. Most old houses offer a profit because they were built before the big price rises. But, because of higher prices, a new house usually costs at least as much as the

return from an old one. So the home owner, under the old rule, doesn't come out as well as it appears on paper. For part of his profit goes for taxes.

What will be the effect of the change?

One effect might be that more old houses will be offered for sale, with sellers then being in the market for newer homes.

Will the tax change apply in all cases?

No. To take advantage of this tax change, the home that is sold must have been the principal residence of the seller. And the house that is bought must be used as his main residence. Thus, the savings on capital-gains tax will not apply to rental houses. There, the profit would still be taxed.

Suppose the new house costs less than the old one?

Then a tax would have to be paid on part of the profit. Suppose, for example, that you bought a house for \$12,000 in 1940 and sell it now for \$20,000. If you buy a new home for \$20,000 or more, you would not have to pay a tax on your profit. But, if the new house cost \$16,000, you would have to pay a capital-gains tax on the \$4,000 of the profit that is not applied to the new house's cost.

Is the rule the same when a new home is built?

Construction of the new home must start within 1 year of the sale of the old one for the tax advantage to apply. But the builder is given 18 months after sale of the old house to move into the new one. All building costs during that 18-month period count toward the purchase price of the new home.

What if a new home is bought before the old one is sold?

It works the same there. The new tax provision applies so long as the new home is bought 12 months before or after sale of the old house.

Does the tax change apply to past sales, too?

As now written in the tax bill, the change would apply only to the sales of homes made on or after January 1, 1951. If, for example, you sold your house on January 15 of this year, you would get the benefit of the new rule by the purchase of a new house any time between January 15, 1950, and January 15, 1952.

What is included in the cost of a new home?

In general, that means the purchase price, including mortgages and other indebtedness that the buyer assumes, and the cost of improvements and additions paid for by the buyer. Commissions and other purchasing expenses paid by the buyer also are included in the cost of the new house. But, in figuring the selling price of an old home, no deductions may be made for commissions and other selling expenses, as the new tax bill now stands. Adoption of this new capital-gains-tax rule by Congress will wipe out one important objection that many persons have to selling their old homes and buying new ones. Estimates are that the Government will lose in taxes about \$112,000,000 a year by the change.

Advancing Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Security Industrial Association, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, September 26, 1951:

As chairman of a congressional subcommittee which during the past 2 years has been probing into the ramifications of the growth of monopoly power in various segments of the economy, it is appropriate that I address my remarks tonight to some of the consequences of as well as the solutions to the problem of undue concentration of economic power as they affect the distribution of the procurement dollar. While many of you represent large and important industrial concerns, it is my hope that you will hear with me in this discussion, for I assure you wholeheartedly that our interests are one in preserving our competitive system and advancing free and private enterprise. I believe, too, that we can both go far toward this end if we examine dispassionately the economic structure of our present industrial society and postulate our mutual objectives with clarity.

In the first part of my statement I point to the great growth of industrial concentration in our economy and that it bodes ill. In the latter part of my statement I offer a remedy whereby great industrial entities might divest themselves of or "spin off" some of their subsidiaries without prohibitive taxation. The remedy is a voluntary one. There are no sanctions, no coercion, no death sentence.

I think we can all agree that one of the biggest factors in America's large productive capacity, her mechanical ingenuity, and her inventive genius has been the unlimited opportunity afforded by a free and competitive market. When, however, this competitive market shows signs of stricture within its four corners, when the race of competition slows down to a mere procession trailing faithfully behind a leader, or when competitive adversaries have unfurled the white flag of a negotiated truce, there arise serious implications to the advancement of a free-enterprise society. Accordingly, it is with a high degree of alarm that one really interested in the maintenance of competition and the equitable division of military orders views the economic phenomenon recurring again and again in various segments of the economy. Let me illustrate what I am referring to by turning to several concrete examples.

In the field of soap four companies account for almost 80 percent of the output in the industry. In the manufacture and sale of rubber tires and tubes Goodyear, Firestone, United States Rubber, and B. F. Goodrich, the four largest rubber companies, account for more than 75 percent of the value of shipments in the entire industry. Four corporations mine 80 percent of the value of all primary copper produced in the United States. Industry after industry can be named which is under the hegemony of a big three or a big four: Liquor, aluminum, steel, tin cans, meat, cigarettes, glass—to only name a few. A report prepared for the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power at my request by the Secretary of Commerce indicated that in some 150 different industries 4 companies control more than 50 percent of the industry's output.

How difficult it is for competition to exist and for small business to share in the procurement dollar where the industrial structure has become rigidified to the extent that a few large concerns dominate the industry as a whole. Experience in antitrust cases has shown that the predominant concerns themselves soon recognize that their best interests lie in forsaking price competition and in acting in harmony and in union. In the tobacco industry, for example, while the big three tobacco companies charged identical prices for only about one-third of the time during the 7 years immediately following the accession of Lucky Strike to the competitive scene, the practice of price competition was soon completely abandoned. As Drs. Stocking and Watkins observed in their book recently published

under the auspices of the Twentieth Century Fund entitled "Monopoly and Free Enterprise":

"But, as has frequently happened in other fields, the leaders of the industry soon learned that price competition as a matter of tactics did not pay. Reynolds' rivals apparently recognized that its newly achieved preeminence in the industry was no passing phenomenon. And the big three apparently realizing that their separate interests were dependent on their collective welfare and that a prolonged price war presaged mutual defeat and frustration. They accordingly concluded they could best promote their several interests by charging identical prices in accordance with the price leadership principle."

So frequently has price leadership replaced price competition throughout much of American industry that the charging of identical prices has now been elevated in business parlance to the status of "meeting competition" in order to disguise the true nature of the phenomenon.

If, in markets which have become dominated by a small coterie of industrial concerns, there is a dearth of competition among industry leaders, it is even more probable that smaller companies will become mere satellites of their more powerful brethren. In the electric lamp industry, for example, a court only a short time ago concluded that "General Electric has at least the power to intimidate other businesses from selling their products to purchasers who might compete with it." In the cement industry, the Government, in a recent proceeding under the antitrust laws, proved that the large cement companies had sold cement in recalcitrant price cutters' sales territory at such low price levels that the dissident companies were compelled to restore their prices to orthodox levels. With these and other striking examples confronting them, it is today almost foolhardy for a small, independent company to challenge the avowed policies of the market leaders, whether in the field of military procurement or otherwise.

The situation facing potential newcomers in these industries is frequently even more precarious. In the production of titanium pigments used in the manufacture of paints, former United States District Judge Rifkind recently indicated in the National Lead case that "It was more difficult for the independent outsider to enter this business than for a camel to make its proverbial passage through the eye of a needle." In the aluminum industry, it was only by dint of prolonged Government efforts that two new competitors to the giant Aluminum Company of America were established in business at the end of World War II.

Additional elements in today's industrial structure threaten to blunt even further the impetus toward real competition and to prevent the just distribution of procurement orders. Through large-scale vertical integration, the power of many companies has become enhanced, not only in their own industries, but in fields hitherto occupied by their customers. Thus, some 17,000 independent fabricators of aluminum and aluminum products are dependent for their raw materials almost entirely upon Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser companies which themselves own and operate fabricating facilities with capacities far in excess of their rawingot production. In the manufacture of steel products, the most pressing problems facing the stamping industry, according to Tom Smith, president of the Pressed Metal Institute, "is the accelerated encroachment through subsidiary organizations of a majority of metal producers into the stamping business." So far have the major steel companies preempted the steel barrel and drum business that the September 1944 issue of Iron Age, in commenting upon the fact that some 87 percent of the entire barrel and drum business had been corralled by the

steel mills, contrasted the present plight of the industry with its status prior to 1939 when the barrel industry was "a rather volatile business firmly in the hands of a large number of highly individualistic entrepreneurs. Most of these fabricators had started on a precarious shoestring and were justifiably vocal in their pride of success in the classical Horatio Alger, pluck-and-luck traditions."

Many large concerns have also branched out into entirely unrelated fields of endeavor where there exists little logical basis for their operations. The Bordon Co., as a prominent instance, is engaged in the sardine and fish-oil business, the pharmaceutical business, and in producing pet foods and plastic materials. Manufacturers of distilled spirits have become owners of breweries and producers of pharmaceuticals. The great United States Steel Corp. is in the steamship business, operates a water company and cement plants, and manufactures prefabricated houses, while the Bethlehem Steel Co. operates a shipyard in New York Harbor.

To those who have perchance leveled criticism at this alarming tendency for a few companies to dominate an entire industry, to replace competition with cooperation, over, or subsilento, and to integrate forward, backward, and into alien fields, has come the heated reply that these activities have resulted from the trend toward economic efficiency. If the price of efficiency, however, is the demise of free enterprise and a competitive system, then all the principles upon which this economy of ours has been operating since its inception have been grossly in error. I suspect, however, that the persistent claim of increased efficiency derives from an effort to confuse and obscure the true issues.

Certainly there exists no better evidence for dispelling the notion that the growth of economic concentration has had as its companion the increase in economic efficiency than a report prepared by the industrial engineering firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis after a detailed and prodigious scrutiny of the United States Steel Corp. Dr. George Stocking, testifying before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power in May of 1950, pointed out that these consulting engineers found United States Steel "was slow in introducing the continuous rolling mill; slow in getting into production of cold rolled steel products; slow in recognizing the potentials of the wire business; slow to adopt the heat-treating process for the production of sheets; slow in getting into stainless steel products; slow in producing cold-rolled sheets; slow in tin-plate development; slow in utilizing waste gases; slow in utilizing low-cost water transportation because of its consideration for the railroads; in short, slow to grasp the remarkable business opportunities that a dynamic America offered it. The corporation was apparently a follower, not a leader, in industrial efficiency."

Doctor Stocking further characterized the contents of this report as "the most devastating indictment by experts of big business on the charge of inefficiency that has ever been made public."

There can be little doubt that the economic factors which I have discussed have tended to dull competitive forces. More and more, decisions relating to price and production policies of industry are being determined not by the competitive forum of the market place but by the large concerns which themselves dominate the market. Competition among these huge entities has become illusory, competition from smaller organizations has been all but stilled.

These factors have greatly disturbed me ever since the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power undertook its intensive investigation of the concentration of economic power. I also know that they have alarmed many of you who are seriously interested in advancing free enterprise. At a conference

held under the auspices of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Chicago last June, for example, Clarence Randall, President of the Inland Steel Co., made some pungent comments relating to the dependency of a free-enterprise system upon a truly competitive market place. Mr. Randall's cogent remarks, which were printed in full in the September issue of the Atlantic Monthly, are so frank and candid that I am taking the liberty of reading a lengthy excerpt from them this afternoon. Said Mr. Randall, and I quote:

"But the free-enterprise system isn't just a 'hunting license.' It carries with it its obligations; and on that I hear talked about less and would like to hear talked about more—and frankly and openly—is that the free-enterprise system must be policed by a free market.

"Free enterprise has a tendency to make each of us selfish. We are held on the beam toward the protection of the public welfare by honest, direct, vital, real competition; and any man who directly or indirectly, by private agreement or private understanding, attempts to limit the free market for his goods is asking for nationalization."

"If you want to bring on the end of free enterprise," Randall warned, "just continue to take part in the limitation of free markets. We can't have the benefits and not accept the responsibilities. We have to play the game honestly with regard to the free market."

What I have said this afternoon, I have not spoken in a critical manner. I do not blame anyone, nor do I accuse anyone of any wrongdoing. I am merely calling attention to a state of facts and to an economic situation in which we are, at the moment, inextricably bound.

I say that it is no wonder that the procurement dollar has gone mainly to a few large concerns. Faced with the economic organization that exists, it is not strange that military procurement statistics reflect the economic organization of the country as a whole. It is extremely disturbing to realize that since the start of the Korean war 10 large manufacturing concerns have handled 40 percent of the total dollar volume of defense contracts and that 50 companies alone have obtained practically two-thirds of the dollar volume of defense contracts. This is but a repetition of the phenomenon which occurred in World War II, when 10 large companies secured 30 percent of the dollar volume of war contracts and 100 companies about two-thirds. While it is imperative that military procurement officials do everything in their power to rectify the distortion which is reflected in these statistics, and distribute the good gospel of procurement equitably to all businesses, one must be chary of placing too much blame upon defense officials who are confronted with an economic structure over which they have no control.

I know many of you wish that practicable solutions could be found whereby the complex economic structure of many corporations could be satisfactorily dissipated and effective competition restored to stagnant markets. I have spoken to numerous operators of large entities whose organizations are highly integrated, and they have told me in confidence "We'd like to truncate some of our operations or branches, but how can we do it without great loss to our stockholders?" They dare not admit this in public, as it might be a sign that they had made a mistake in gathering unto themselves all these operations, in the first instance. What they want is feasible legislative remedies for the economic quandry in which they now find themselves.

While at the present time many legislative solutions for the undue concentration of economic power are still under careful study, I believe that inducing voluntary cor-

porate simplifications by means of sound tax legislation may provide at least a partial answer.

The present revenue bill, as it is now under consideration in the Senate, would permit voluntary divorcement of corporate subsidiaries through corporate reorganization and a division of stock among the shareholders of the parent corporation without subjecting such stock to immediate and prohibitive taxation.

While there are certain areas which need clarification in the bill as presently drawn, I certainly endorse the principle enunciated by this proposed statute.

It is imperative that all Federal legislation be consonant with the objectives of the anti-trust laws. This is especially true in the field of taxation. For example, at the present time, the Department of Justice is prosecuting a suit to require the du Pont Co. to dispose of its stock in the General Motors Corp. Had du Pont sought to divest itself of this stock voluntarily the distribution of stock would have been subject to severe taxation and consequent loss. The situation is therefore incongruous. There are probably many similar examples where a corporation might be anxious to dispose of its interests and yet be deterred because of the applicability of the internal-revenue laws.

Whether the bill as it is being considered in the Senate will cover the du Pont situation which I have used as an illustration I do not know because the bill is not clear in all respects. However, it will encompass many instances where it is highly desirable that large entities simplify their corporate structure and divest themselves of integrated and conglomerate subsidiaries.

A program of corporate reorganization involving the combination or integration of smaller corporate units into one large corporation can be readily accomplished on a tax-free basis under existing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. A corporate reorganization may, however, be equally necessary to effect the division of a large corporation into smaller units. Except in situations falling under the Public Utility Holding Company Act, existing provisions of the code make it cumbersome, if not impossible, to achieve this result without prohibitive tax consequences. The proposed amendment would liberalize sections 112 and 113 of the code to facilitate the division of large corporate organizations into smaller units without recognition of taxable gain to stockholders.

The proposed amendment affords to corporations generally the exemption now accorded to public utilities under supplement R of the code (secs. 371-373, 371(c) in particular). Supplement R was enacted in 1938, as a complement to the Public Utility Holding Company Act, to facilitate the process of break-up of huge concentrations of wealth and power in the national utilities. Experience had under this act has been eminently successful. While bitterly opposed at its inception, it is today almost universally agreed that the Public Utility Holding Company Act procedures for corporate simplification have benefited all concerned. Stockholders who obtained securities in corporations which were divorced from the parent corporation have had their assets enhanced. Corporations which simplified their organization have operated more efficiently and profitably. The public has obtained lower rates for its utility services.

The economic disadvantages of concentrations of industrial wealth are no less serious than in the field of utilities and present a constant national problem. Our antitrust laws are a partial safeguard against corporate combinations where monopolistic practices are involved. By the same token, legislation which removes obstacles in the way of voluntary corporate reorganizations,

designed to subdivide a large industrial organization into smaller units, is economically desirable. The proposed amendment removes the obstacle of prohibitive taxation in such corporate reorganizations.

The proposed amendment will not result in loss of revenue to the Government. The distribution of stock in the reorganization will not enable untaxed distribution of the earnings and profits of the distributing corporation, but such earnings and profits are divided between the smaller units emerging from the reorganization and are taxed to stockholders when distributed.

What I have said this afternoon is most important in the long-run picture of military procurement as well as in the general operations of the civilian economy. We must give procurement officials a competitive economy in which to obtain their purchases. Not only will this result in the fair and equitable distribution of procurement orders but it will advance what we are all really fighting to preserve—a free enterprise system.

National Outlawing of the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, Thursday, September 27, 1951:

NOBODY SEEMS TO BE HOME

This veterans' spokesman has carried on an unending effort to have the Congress outlaw the Communist Party in the United States as a group organized in a conspiracy to overthrow the country's legal government by the use of force and violence. As time has gone by, most of the major veterans' organizations have come around to our way of thinking. Although the Congress has failed to give the problem much thought and indeed, as some Government officials have given aid to the conspirators by trying to sell our sovereignty down the river through other means, there is yet a heartening reply to our campaign.

In Massachusetts and in other States that have already enacted or have pending resolutions the enactment of which would outlaw Red Party members, there has been a notable lack of Communist activity. Some say that the Reds have gone underground. Others insist that the Comms have cleared out to find more fertile fields of endeavor, but a Nation-wide survey by the Federal Bureau of Investigation gives some of the answers and they all sum up to the fact that if you fight demons hard enough, they will return to the depths whence they came.

In Boston the party has apparently closed up shop, and as nearly as can be determined, open activities have ended for the Communists in Louisiana, Alabama, North Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia. Investigation discloses that while offices have been maintained nominally in Florida, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Connecticut, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Washington, telephones have either been disconnected or there is nobody around regularly to answer them. But perhaps of greater significance is the fact that Commie national headquarters in New York City has had to move its business from fairly large offices at 35 East Twelfth Street

to a little room on the fifth floor at 29 West One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, apparently for want of funds to maintain more elaborate quarters.

Party leaders are said to have admitted their trials in attempting to keep their heads above water. They have been harassed, they say, and have been denied the right to accommodations where mass meetings can be held and funds can be collected. Party work has had to be curtailed and economies practiced. Much subdued, the Reds are in bad financial straits. Things have been made so tough for them that they cannot operate.

No stronger argument for the national outlawing of the Communist Party can be made than this FBI survey. All that is needed is for Congressmen to recognize the difference between liberty and conspiracy and then have courage enough to clamp down the lid upon a terrible evil.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama Has 13 Percent of the Forest Lands of Alabama, and in 1950 Had 13 Percent of the Forest Fires of Alabama, and Approximately 13 Percent of the Timber Area Burned in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the past 10 years have seen what a generation ago would have been an undreamed of drain on our natural resources, including our forests. The end is not in sight.

Present demands on our resources make it imperative that we become more conservation-minded.

Forestry is a major concern of Alabamians. It is one of our major industries, one of our major crops.

Our Alabama forests are today being recognized more than ever before as a major source of the wealth of our people. The new School of Forestry at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn, Ala., is a recognition of that fact.

The recent session of the Alabama Legislature appropriated money to establish a new tree seedlings farm to furnish the demand of Alabama timber growers for additional baby trees with which to replant and reforest some of Alabama's vacant acres.

Fire is, of course, one of the greatest enemies of our forests. It is an enemy which stalks our woodlands almost entirely as a result of human carelessness.

The Division of Forestry of the Department of Conservation of the State of Alabama is charged with the duty of protecting the forests of Alabama from fires, within the limits of its authority, and within the limits of its appropriation to provide such protection. Its report for the calendar year 1950 shows that Alabama forests suffered 9,947 destructive forest fires, each of which burned on the average of approximately 42 acres of forest lands, for a total of 415,826 acres.

Cleburne County had the largest percentage of its total forest acreage

burned, the percentage being 6.37 percent of 196,528 protected acres or 12,523 acres. Its 114 fires each averaged destroying 110 acres of forest lands.

On the other hand, Limestone County with 81,716 protected acres had only one fire and it burned only 14 acres, thus to

give Limestone County the best record in the State in 1950.

Crenshaw County had the largest individual fires in the State. Its 88 fires destroyed an average of 139 acres each.

Mobile County had the largest acreage destroyed by fire—35,461 acres.

Escambia County had 731 destructive forest fires to give it first place in that regard.

At this point, I insert a table prepared by the State Division of Forestry of Alabama for 1950 which substantiates the conclusions I have set forth:

State of Alabama, division of forestry, department of conservation—monthly fire report by forest ranger districts, December 1950

District	Ranger district	County	This month			To date				
			Number of fires	Area burned	Average size	Number of fires	Area burned	Average size	Area protected	Percent burned
1	13	Cherokee	5	133.9	26.8	36	669.6	18.6	197,200	0.31
1	28	De Kalb	8	325.0	40.6	55	1,880.5	34.4	280,800	.75
1	31	Etowah	17	531.8	31.4	121	2,609.0	24.0	154,940	1.88
1	39	Jackson	17	260.5	17.6	142	4,229.6	29.8	471,280	.89
1	47	Madison	5	11.0	2.2	33	541.1	16.4	149,023	.36
1	50	Marshall	14	366.3	26.2	155	3,293.7	21.1	143,226	2.31
2	20	Calhoun	14	109.4	7.8	92	2,282.0	24.8	243,100	1.07
2	33	Franklin	17	398.1	23.4	108	1,951.8	18.1	248,116	.79
2	41	Lauderdale	10	32.8	3.3	40	1,661.8	33.9	148,400	1.12
2	42	Lawrence	7	118.1	16.9	31	783.6	25.3	103,265	.70
2	44	Limestone	1	14.0	14.0	1	14.0	14.0	81,716	0
2	52	Morgan	9	163.7	18.2	51	2,947.7	40.0	110,700	1.84
3	25	Cullman	6	123.0	20.5	103	2,614.5	25.4	216,700	1.21
3	32	Fayette	8	145.5	18.2	60	2,207.6	36.8	250,500	.85
3	40	Lamar	15	1,135.0	75.7	133	7,109.0	53.5	230,000	3.01
3	40	Madison	18	1,237.1	68.7	150	9,150.6	57.6	295,200	3.10
3	64	Walker	32	780.0	24.4	350	9,569.2	27.3	364,900	2.62
3	67	Winston	11	180.0	16.4	163	5,676.0	34.7	213,111	2.65
4	1	Jefferson	82	2,718.6	33.2	650	16,006.2	24.6	622,400	3.06
4	8	Blount	13	581.0	44.7	136	6,315.0	46.4	212,800	2.97
4	11	Calhoun	21	726.0	34.6	100	4,304.8	43.0	101,164	2.67
4	17	Clay	12	201.8	16.8	112	5,391.7	48.1	180,958	2.98
4	58	Shelby	20	1,798.0	89.9	290	10,840.5	37.4	385,600	4.71
4	63	St. Clair	18	816.0	45.4	153	13,291.5	86.9	259,192	5.62
4	61	Tallapoosa	23	1,632.1	71.0	111	7,695.1	69.3	191,036	3.99
5	4	Montgomery	1	13.0	13.0	19	1,475.0	77.6	213,200	.09
5	4	Autauga	5	117.0	23.4	81	6,471.0	80.0	282,400	2.78
5	14	Chilton	31	1,011.0	32.6	240	11,397.0	47.5	388,259	4.25
5	27	Dallas	14	252.0	18.0	129	4,574.5	37.8	201,692	1.67
5	45	Lawndale	9	316.0	35.1	28	812.0	29.0	210,500	.37
5	53	Perry	2	8.0	4.0	31	2,180.0	70.3	206,370	1.06
6	12	Chambers	1	10.0	10.0	62	4,367.9	70.5	126,400	3.40
6	18	Cibola	16	554.4	34.7	114	12,528.0	109.9	196,528	0.37
6	22	Cosa	13	376.6	29.0	127	8,042.8	63.3	281,300	2.66
6	20	Elmore	4	80.0	20.0	31	2,207.1	64.9	174,700	1.27
6	43	Lee	21	463.3	22.1	170	4,389.6	25.6	163,000	2.66
6	56	Randolph	11	598.0	54.4	100	6,244.0	62.4	181,400	3.44
6	62	Tallapoosa	14	372.5	26.6	226	3,851.0	17.0	226,900	1.68
7	7	Bibb	21	166.0	7.9	102	1,006.0	9.9	212,388	.42
7	35	Greene	2	18.0	9.0	79	5,004.4	63.3	218,800	2.29
7	36	Hale	4	35.8	9.0	37	1,619.0	43.8	173,369	.92
7	63	Pickens	41	1,172.0	28.6	110	6,508.8	47.1	341,700	1.93
7	63	These losses	0	0	0	408	8,807.5	24.0	612,534	1.60
8	6	Barbour	15	509.0	33.9	180	8,667.5	48.2	294,500	2.95
8	8	Bullock	7	248.0	35.4	93	3,320.0	35.7	117,300	2.83
8	46	Madison	12	300.0	25.0	62	4,656.0	75.1	187,264	2.48
8	55	Pike	2	77.0	38.5	68	2,403.0	35.3	188,600	1.38
8	57	Russell	0	428.0	47.6	134	4,960.2	37.0	184,800	2.70
9	10	Butler	17	126.2	7.4	231	3,073.1	13.3	312,700	.98
9	23	Covington	8	296.5	37.1	140	4,715.0	33.7	372,644	1.26
9	21	Crenshaw	2	116.0	58.0	88	12,229.4	139.0	214,400	5.70
9	26	Dale	9	175.0	19.4	66	1,986.0	30.1	138,760	1.43
9	19	Coffee	4	330.0	82.5	68	3,216.1	47.6	191,200	1.69
9	31	Genevieve	7	356.0	50.9	43	2,929.0	68.1	156,220	1.87
9	37	Henry	6	89.0	14.8	56	2,267.3	40.5	162,360	1.40
9	38	Houston	14	280.6	17.9	104	2,195.1	21.1	120,200	1.83
10	15	Cherokee	19	435.0	22.9	187	6,183.1	34.7	462,700	1.40
10	16	Clarke	4	23.0	5.8	89	871.2	9.8	644,100	.14
10	48	Marion	15	706.5	47.1	109	6,197.5	56.9	277,300	2.24
10	60	Sumter	2	4.5	2.3	45	552.8	12.3	267,400	.21
10	66	Wilcox	11	101.2	9.2	135	1,260.2	31.6	298,300	1.48
11	21	Concord	12	356.8	29.7	350	8,099.1	22.6	358,700	2.26
11	51	Escambia	48	700.2	14.6	731	22,813.8	31.2	452,109	5.04
11	51	Monroe	38	181.0	15.1	288	7,552.3	26.2	402,100	1.63
12	2	Mobile	35	3,860.4	110.6	465	35,460.7	76.4	624,542	5.67
12	5	Madison	3	1,042.5	347.5	471	22,705.5	48.3	858,138	2.67
12	65	Washington	3	145.5	48.5	185	22,609.6	122.2	611,200	3.71
Total			945	31,078.2	32.9	9,047	415,826.1	41.8	18,044,933	2.50

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama has 13.1 percent of all the forest lands of Alabama—2,389,027 acres out of 18,044,938 acres.

In 1950 it had 13.6 percent of all the forest fires of Alabama, or 1,352 out of the total 9,947.

In 1950, 12.3 percent of the forest-fire destruction in Alabama was in the Seventh District—51,183 out of 415,826 acres destroyed by fire.

Thus the number of forest fires, and their destructiveness, in the Seventh District was within 1 percentage point of the State averages, to make the Seventh District what we might term average in these respects.

State Aid Granted to Catholic Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the *Christian Science Monitor*, Saturday, September 22, 1951:

STATE AID GRANTED TO ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN FRANCE

(By Reuters)

PARIS—The French National Assembly has passed two bills granting state financial aid to Roman Catholic private schools.

This was a victory for Premier René Pleven's month-old government which has been fighting to subsidize private schools despite fierce opposition from Communists and Socialists. Until now it has always been a general principle of the French Republic not to finance private schools.

First bill—passed at its second reading by 378 votes to 236 within a few hours after its successful passage through the Senate—enables students at private primary schools to benefit from state high-school scholarships. It was a Government-sponsored bill.

The Assembly has voted 327-259 to pass a private member's bill indirectly subsidizing private schools. The bill, sponsored by Roman Catholics, Gaullists, Conservatives, and some radicals, awards an annual subsidy of about \$18 for every child between 6 and 14 years old.

Parents can choose whether the subsidy should be used to educate their children in either state or private schools.

The subsidization will cost the state \$420,000,000 a year.

Soil Conservation Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service before the Kiwanis Club luncheon, Aurora, Ill., June 13, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION IS GOOD BUSINESS

It always gives me great satisfaction to have the opportunity of talking about soil and water conservation with business and professional people like you members of the Aurora Kiwanis Club.

Being engaged, as you are, in every-day, practical matters concerning the community, you are naturally interested in the solid facts and figures on this or any other undertaking that has to do with community betterment and with State or national welfare. As a practical soil conservationist, I likewise am concerned with facts—not with theories or guesswork—about the vitally important business of safeguarding our basic soil and water resources while we make profitable use of them.

There are some, perhaps, who feel that only farmers need be interested in soil conservation; but it's my conviction we should all be very deeply interested, whether we live in the greater Chicago area, in Dallas, Tex., or elsewhere. Modern soil conservation farming is not limited in its effects and benefits just to the farms on which it is practiced. It is closely related to the profitability of industry, the well-being of municipalities, and the health and welfare of all the people.

I believe I can say that our national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving our interlocking resources of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife. Research, education, land inventories, and the successful use and profitable results of soil conservation have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive. The practical application of this concept is being demonstrated on a progressively wider scale from year to year, in Illinois, here in Kane County, and all over the Nation, by farmers in soil-conservation districts, striking at the root of the evil with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service. This modern, democratic approach, by enlisting the cooperative effort of landholder, Government, and the public together, is proving beneficial to individuals and the public alike.

PRODUCTIVE LAND'S IMPORTANCE IN OUR ECONOMY

It would be most convenient for the rest of us if we could pass all the responsibility for soil conservation back to the farmer—

the Illinois or Iowa corn farmer, the Kansas wheat grower, the Texas cattleman, or the Alabama cotton grower—and let the matter rest there. But our economy isn't built that way. The land is still the source of a very large share of our original wealth. Manufacturers, bankers, storekeepers, doctors, teachers, ministers, writers, and all the rest of us, in Chicago, Aurora, Dallas, are directly affected by what happens to the base of that land wealth—our productive land. We are affected, basically, as consumers of the things that are produced from the land; and we are affected, also, with respect to our income. Some, even, are affected through malnutrition arising from lack of good land in some places for the production of nutritious food.

The importance of productive land in our economy hardly can be overemphasized. A suit of clothes or a pair of shoes is manufactured here in the Chicago area, but the wool or leather which goes into the finished product probably was produced on a western ranch, perhaps 1,600 miles away. And many people, beginning with the rancher himself, are dependent wholly or partially for their income—their living—on the processes involved in getting that suit of clothes or pair of shoes into your clothes closet or mine. There are railroad men and truckers, weavers, leather workers, advertising men, stenographers, bankers, package manufacturers, salesmen, wholesalers, retailers, and many more. I hardly need to go into detail for you who live and do business here in one of the greatest wholesale and shipping centers of the Nation or the world.

The same situation is true of every package of bacon, piece of furniture, or other item processed or manufactured in the great plants of this business area. These producers, processors, and distributors are, in turn, buyers of goods and services on their own account. They patronize doctors, dentists, lawyers, garden supply shops, and nurseries; barber shops and beauty parlors. They go to the movies and ball games. They buy houses, automobiles, radios, television sets, newspapers, electric irons, and light bulbs. They ride on Pullman cars. They hunt and fish, play golf, and take pictures. Their taxes help to build roads and bridges, ships and airplanes.

AMOUNT OF PRODUCTIVE LAND IS LIMITED

So it is that every interest in the country has a stake in getting the quickest possible solution to this problem of safeguarding our remaining productive land—which is the source of all but a small fraction of our food, as well as of all our wood products, leather, wool, vegetable fibers and oils, and many other things. Although we in this country are not in danger of going hungry any time soon because of our land's running out, the amount of productive land we have left is much more limited than is commonly supposed. I realize that is a fact which may be a little hard to appreciate, out here in your fertile prairie farm belt, with something like 85 percent of your Illinois area composed of farm land.

But the fact remains that we have left in the United States as a whole only about 460,000,000 acres of good, first-class land, counting all the good land that is in cultivation now and all that can be brought into cultivation by presently feasible means. In recent years, we have been using for crop production and rotational pasture around 350 to 400 million acres annually. Something over 70,000,000 acres of this farmed area, however, is unfavorable for use as cropland and should be diverted permanently to grass or trees. All but about 100,000,000 acres of the 460,000,000 acres of good, productive land, in use or available, is or would be, without protection, susceptible to severe damage by erosion, waterlogging, and floods.

Illinois is exceptionally well off from the standpoint of its area of arable land. Our

capability survey shows that more than 65 percent of the State's land falls in classes I, II, and III—land which is suitable for continuous cultivation, with careful conservation treatment of classes II and III lands. Fifteen percent consists of class IV, a borderline grade which can be cultivated safely only occasionally, and about 20 percent consists of classes V, VI, and VII, land suited only to growing grass or trees.

Yet erosion has been severe on a million acres of Illinois farmland and serious erosion has occurred on around 35 percent. This means that, altogether, more than 14,000,000 acres have been either seriously or severely damaged in Illinois. I myself have been seriously disappointed when I have traveled across northern Illinois—where the land is commonly described as flat as a table top—and have observed the hundreds of tons of fertile soil being carried by winter rains from the bare and unprotected surface of almost imperceptible slopes, when it would have been so easy to prevent this loss by growing winter cover crops on these cultivated fields.

DOING SOMETHING ABOUT LAND WASTAGE

Because eroded land is scattered around somewhat—a gullied field here, a sheet-eroded slope there—we sometimes are inclined to overlook what is happening to our productive land, and to discount its importance. But with good land like yours, worth from \$125 an acre up, 14,000,000 acres seriously or severely damaged brings us to a couple of billion dollars worth of Illinois farm land that's wastefully depreciated. What would happen, I wonder, if anything like that kind of preventable damage and depreciation were eating away at your industrial plants and stores, your machinery, buildings, railways, and so on? You would do something about it; that's what would happen most certainly, especially if the damage should get worse and spread more and more, like erosion damage does with every rain where land is not protected.

And for precisely the same reason—because it's good business to protect and prolong the productive life of the soil on which our biggest business of agriculture depends—we are doing something to halt the dissipation of our irreplaceable soil. We are doing it—Nation-wide and State-wide, community by community, farm by farm—through modern conservation farming.

Today you will find this relatively new but already tried and true kind of farming in constantly wider use as far as United States land extends in any direction, from right here in Kane County, Ill., northwest to Alaska, northeast to Maine, southeast to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and southwest to Hawaii. I am talking about soil and water conservation farming which landholders of the Nation are carrying on themselves through their farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation districts, with the technical help of the Soil Conservation Service and the support and assistance they draw from various other sources, governmental and private. And now many other countries also are adopting this conservation pattern in their agriculture.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Before we look further into the progress of conservation farming, in Illinois and elsewhere, I think we should stop a moment and see what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation.

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; and contouring, strip-cropping, and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, and so forth, whenever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing

water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs; if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation, if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter; if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, as in parts of the West, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of adaptable tools available to farmers.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal and other kinds) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where flood waters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil-conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. And, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work which is put on the land in order to keep the land permanently productive. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season.

ONLY ONE CORRECT CONSERVATION FORMULA

There is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job—regardless of what anybody may try to tell you. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs as determined by condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife. This is a fixed physical fact of the order of the fact that water will not run uphill on its own power.

If there is any activity of mankind that requires the most scrupulous use of all that land science and hydraulics can provide, it is the work of keeping our land permanently productive and making the best use of our water supply. There are in the neighborhood of a hundred soil- and water-conservation measures now being used in the program of the Soil Conservation Service to halt erosion, conserve rainfall, and improve the land I have just mentioned a few of them. Each measure is used, as the situation demands, to meet a definite land need or to produce a specifically desired result. Usually, combinations of several measures are essential.

A hundred years of farming experience in this country has proved definitely that no single practice, applied arbitrarily on a whole field or farm, will control erosion and maintain soil productivity permanently, except perhaps the planting of an entire area to grass or trees. And we cannot live by grass and trees alone. Except where the land is covered with grass or forest, single-practice soil conservation cannot be successful, in the great majority of cases, because it almost al-

ways is inadequate to cope with the diverse and complicated requirements for sound land use and protection, imposed by nature. Some single practices, such as contouring, stubble-mulching, rotation, or manuring, may bring some temporary benefits to entire fields or farms; but they cannot get the job done on anything approximating a permanent basis, except on the relatively small areas of the very best quality land (land of capability class 1).

TREAT EVERY ACRE AND EACH WATERSHED

So I want to emphasize as strongly as I can, that there is no substitute for quality and completeness in the protection, development, improvement, and proper use of our land and water resources—in Illinois or anywhere else. Each acre of land must be used according to its individual capabilities and be treated according to its needs; because each acre of land, like each human being, is different from any other acre. Likewise, each watershed, whether large or small, must be used and treated according to its specific physical peculiarities, if we are properly to conserve, develop, and use the water and land resources of that particular watershed—any watershed.

If there were some simple remedy for our land and water problems that could be applied everywhere, according to a standardized treatment or formula, the job would be relatively easy. But there is no cure-all, no short-cut to the solution of these problems. Nothing less will suffice than a painstaking study of each acre, each field, and each watershed, and the appropriate application of all needed conservation measures that the study indicates as necessary to get the job done right. To ignore these facts is to invite further damage to our diminishing supply of productive land, as well as to waste time, opportunity, and money for the landholder, the whole community, the entire Nation—everybody.

Soil Conservation Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Kiwanis Club luncheon, Aurora, Ill., June 13, 1950:

Some will say, "It must be profitable." Well, sure, it is profitable practically without exception under normal conditions and if done in time. And looking out ahead, we cannot hold on to our sloping land—the great majority of ours is sloping—unless we protect it. And looking beyond that, land means food, and food means life and national strength.

THE GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION IN SOIL CONSERVATION

There seems to be pretty general agreement now as to the Government's obligation to help farmers with their erosion and land-use problems. Actually isn't that one of the fundamental things government was set up to do—to help the people take care of the country's resources, both physical resources and human resources? A few people, however, still try to make the point that the Government should not concern itself with helping a farmer to protect and improve his farm land, any more than it should pay part of the

cost of operating a privately owned and normally run manufacturing plant. The exceedingly important difference such objectors fail to see is that the Government's interest—local, State, or Federal—in the continuing productivity of the land is never ending.

The nation dies if its land is ruined for further production. In other words, land is the individual's property for the moment, but it is the Nation's most priceless and indispensable resource for all time. So there is the doubly compelling need of protecting the interests both of the individual and the Nation.

HOW FARMERS ARE CARRYING SOIL CONSERVATION FORWARD

The efficient and successful manner in which we in this country are moving ahead with this vital soil- and water-conservation work will prove to be, I am convinced, one of the brightest chapters in the Nation's entire history. Hundreds of thousands of farmers are practicing modern soil-conservation farming, through their soil-conservation districts which they organize under State enabling law. These districts are local units of State government for conservation, and are managed by local farmers, locally elected from among themselves for their nonpaying jobs.

Between 10,000 and 12,000 of these district governing officials, called directors here in Illinois, give unselfishly of their time and energies in the furtherance of soil-conservation work throughout the country. They are on nobody's payroll, and are obligated to no group, to no Federal or other outside authority. The Federal Government supplies technical assistance to the districts through the Soil Conservation Service, but only at the request of the districts to meet the demands of district farmers for such technical help. The districts also draw on other local, State, or Federal sources for assistance, governmental or private, as previously indicated, such as ACP payments, educational facilities of the Extension Service, information from the agricultural experiment stations and State agricultural colleges—with which our Service cooperates in its research work—advice and assistance from State departments of conservation, and so on.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP ACTION

In short, the soil conservation districts seek the support and facilities of everybody who can contribute something to district progress—and thereby to public betterment—including business establishments, civic organizations, schools and churches, banks, railroads, and a long list of others.

Also, groups of farmers, living in more or less compact neighborhoods within districts, are contributing in a most encouraging manner toward speeding up conservation work by planning together and working together, lending one another machinery and seed, and cooperating in other work. These groups, normally bound together by ties of neighborliness and common interests such as you Kiwanians can well understand, usually range from 4 or 5 to 15 or 20 families, sometimes more. The Soil Conservation Service now is working with thousands of these natural groups.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Actually, of course, the soil conservation district as such is essentially a group-action device—a genuine grass-roots organization, operated in the fullest accord with democratic principles. It is this kind of voluntary cooperation, initiated and carried on by the landowners themselves without any outside interference of any kind, that is getting the soil conservation job done.

As of May 1, this year (the latest date for which figures were available from the districts), 2,236 soil conservation districts already had been formed by landholders in the

48 States, the territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These districts include more than three-fourths of the country's farms and a total of more than 1,225,000,000 acres.

Illinois' 94 districts covered 87 percent of the State by that date, or nearly 31,150,000 acres, and included 93 percent of your farms and 92 percent of your farmland. You will find these democratic local units of State government operating today in 97 of this State's 102 counties. Illinois thus is among the leading States in the soil conservation districts column. I hope it may not be too long before you join the 9 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands which are 100 percent within districts, and the many other States which are nearly covered.

SOME SOIL-CONSERVATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

District organization, of course, is not an end within itself; for any district that existed only on paper wouldn't be worth the paper it is written on. Neither is a farm plan for soil conservation, where its provisions are not applied to the land. I am happy to say there are few, if any, districts like that and a very few such farm plans. I am sure there are none in Illinois.

Up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone—by farmers and Soil Conservation Service technicians out on the land together. These plans, fashioned to meet the farmers' economic situation and their ability to put them into effect honestly, covered some 220,000,000 acres. Of this quarter of a billion acres thus planned—farm by farm and acre by acre—112,000,000 acres had been treated with needed conservation measures by that time, in soil-conservation districts. These figures do not include other millions of acres surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has assisted.

COMPLETE NATIONAL LAND INVENTORY NEEDED

Up to the first of this year, also, detailed soil-conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 322,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning on another 180,000,000 acres. These land-capability surveys constitute a scientific land inventory, made by our Service's conservation surveyors in cooperation with district farmers, and cover entire farms. It shows the kind of soil, the slope, degree of erosion, and other factors which, with climate, govern the whole safe use and producing capacity of land.

This scientific inventory of the land, which should be completed Nation-wide at the earliest practicable date, not only is the foundation on which rests effective conservation planning and treatment, but can be beneficially used for other planning purposes. We could use it for evaluation of land for loans, which would be sounder and more equitable if made on the basis of the land's capability for production. Land capability also could be used as the basis for beneficial adjustments in all types of agricultural credit, land tenure, and shifts in crop acreage, and it might well be used as a guide for the wise expansion of rural road building, rural electrification, and the orderly development of other community enterprises, especially those planned for permanency.

The record of soil conservation district accomplishments here in Illinois likewise is good, but you can obtain specific State and local figures on conservation surveying, planning, and treatment without my bringing them all the way out here from Washington to you. The important thing is that we have made progress—remarkable progress—in the comparatively short while we have been seriously at the soil and water conservation job. I truly believe—and many agree with me—that this Nation has made more actual progress in solving its land con-

servation problems during the last few years than any nation or people ever made in such a short time. It was only 20 years ago that we took our first positive step toward a national program of soil conservation, through congressional authorization for establishing a number of erosion control experiment stations; and the first soil conservation district didn't come into being until 1937.

HOW WE ARE SPEEDING UP CONSERVATION WORK

Also, our soil conservation work is speeding up, within the limits of available technical and other facilities. The records for 1949, to illustrate, show that the Soil Conservation Service helped farmers of the country to complete 18 percent more conservation work on the land than in the preceding year. In the fiscal year 1942, the Service helped farmers in districts complete the conservation job on 5,000,000 acres. In the fiscal year 1949, the job was carried out on 22,000,000 acres. Twenty-two million acres of land efficiently treated—treated scientifically and practically to the very best of man's accumulated knowledge and ability, and this on the basis of permanent work.

The public has not fully understood this well enough. It is time some of these facts were known. They are the best answer to such criticisms as we sometimes hear that the way the Soil Conservation Service goes at the job is all right, but too slow, or that soil conservation costs too much. I am the first to agree—and have been so proclaiming for 15 years—that we need to push ahead continually faster with the conservation job, if we are to get the basic work done in the next 20 to 25 years. And, obviously, it should be done in that time. We are still losing some 500,000 acres of productive land each year in the United States through continuing erosion. But neither I nor anybody else who really knows anything about soil and water conservation will seriously propose that we sacrifice the lasting quality of this vitally needed conservation work for the sake of slapping some half-way measures on the land in a few years less time. Such measures may be temporarily helpful, but they are not of the permanent type.

FARMERS' DEMANDS OUTRUN CONSERVATION FACILITIES

The continuing need, as it will be for some years yet, is for more technical and other manpower, machinery, materials, etc., directed to the conservation job, in order to pick up the lag and keep pace with farmers' demands which consistently outrun the availability of such facilities. This is quite different from the situation in the early demonstration project days, when we sometimes actually had to go out and try to convince the farmer on the idea that soil conservation is a good thing for his land and for his farming business.

Right here in Illinois, for example, there was a backlog of 9,158 applications for such district assistance last January 1. With an average of 3¼ permanent service employees per work unit in the State, a waiting workload like that obviously cannot be overtaken in a week or a month, although the district directors and service personnel are equally determined to get to every waiting farmer at the earliest possible date.

It is to this end that our Soil Conservation Service operations have been very largely decentralized out of Washington, thus bringing them as close to the problem out on the land as we have been able to move them. Thus, in 1949, only 14 percent of our personnel worked in the Washington office, with 87.6 percent out in the work units and other field offices—out with the farmers close to the job. And the remaining 11 percent of our people in State and regional offices included, of course, a substantial number of technical, cartographic, and other personnel directly engaged in or concerned with field

activity along lines of quality work, maintenance, and improvement.

SOIL CONSERVATION IS ECONOMIC AND PROFITABLE

As to the cost of the kind of soil conservation I have been talking about: Experiences of hundreds of thousands of farmers, under the most widely varying conditions over the country, confirm the fact that soil conservation is a profitable investment. It increases income for the farmer and for those who handle what he produces, improves business in general, and safeguards health and general community welfare. It pays back more than it costs to the farmer, to business and professional people in town where he trades, to transportation interests, and to local, State, and Federal governments which derive their revenue from taxes on production and earnings. I wish I had time to cite you some of the individual examples of this, which are legion, in Illinois and elsewhere.

How acre-by-acre soil and water conservation pays was shown, for example, in a sample inventory the Soil Conservation Service took to show 1945 income from conservation-treated farms as compared to that from similar farms on which much less conservation work had been done. In one of the two sampled areas here in Illinois, in Jefferson County, 26 conservation-treated farms had \$7.83 an acre more income, according to the farmers' books, in that 1 year alone than did 26 comparable farms where comparatively little or no conservation work had been done. In Madison and St. Clair Counties, 24 conservation-treated farms showed \$9.48 more income per acre than did an equal number of comparable farms with much less conservation work on them.

For the North Central States of Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin together, the 1-year's per acre income increase from conservation on 257 typical farms over that from 255 comparable farms was \$6.37, and the national figure was \$4.90 an acre—including western range land, irrigated lands, etc. Meanwhile, we have kept close check on the cost to the Federal Government for giving the technical and certain other assistance which makes such increased returns possible. In the 1949 fiscal year, this was only \$1.80 an acre. That includes everything—technical assistance to farmers, administrative expenses, research, paper and typewriter ribbon, everything. In some parts of the country, naturally, the per-acre cost is higher than it is in others; but even if it were \$5 an acre, I think you'll agree that is a mighty small cost for expert help in safeguarding the permanent productiveness of land worth \$125 an acre or whatever the value may be.

WHY FARMERS STICK TO THEIR CONSERVATION PLANS

You can see, from this, why it is that so many farmers want to get their district conservation plans. Also, why a farmer very seldom discards his conservation plan once he has started it, except in cases of changes in farm ownership, death, etc. It's his own plan, and it makes him money. It is just good business for him to follow it.

SOIL CONSERVATION RETURNS TO KANE COUNTY AND TO NATION

And, as I said earlier, soil conservation is good, dollars-and-cents business for all of us. It has been estimated by our Washington office that in 1948, for instance, the Federal Government retrieved the entire amount spent by the Soil Conservation Service and, in addition, made a 77-percent profit in increased income taxes paid on increased returns as a result of farmers' applying effective soil conservation measures to their lands. That included the extra income tax (conservatively estimated) paid by retailers, processors, and distributors, who profited by the conservation farmers' extra production and spending.

Some of you probably are familiar with economic studies made by E. L. Sauer, University of Illinois economist, which showed that soil conservation district type plans increase farm income. I was interested in reading in the special soil conservation issue of The Kane County Farmer of March 22, 1950, where Chairman Wendell Rolston of the Kane County Soil Conservation District had translated that increased income into terms of local benefit here in your own county. At an average of slightly more than \$5 an acre, his special project report on the district's sixth anniversary pointed out, the local district program already had added \$167,845 annually to Kane County's agricultural income. He added, significantly, that is far beyond the total cost of the entire program.

A PROGRAM OF POSITIVE ACTION

So you see this matter of soil conservation being good business is something that comes right home to your own inventories and pocketbooks. To complete the soil and water conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which groups such as yours have a natural interest. It includes, among other points, (1) Completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit, (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work—with a scientifically developed soil conservation district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm in the country at maximum public cost, (3) active participation by all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation, and (4) making a real conservationist of every farmer in the country.

To get this big job done in time is going to take the continued teamwork of all of us. The margin between land deterioration and conservation now has been narrowed to the point where our goal of a permanent agriculture is in sight. Through unflagging research, education, and group action in getting conservation on the land, we can and will do this job we have set out to do.

Operation Comeback: American Legion National Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared along with certain attached materials regarding the splendid essay contest entitled "Operation Comeback," sponsored by the American Legion. The contest was designed to show how physically handicapped can overcome their disabilities. I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the appended essays be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATION-WIDE ESSAY CONTEST PROVES VICTORY OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on several previous occasions, I have commented regarding the important matter of rehabilitation of America's physically handicapped. At this time, I want to pay tribute to one particular

organization which has done a superb job down through the years in rehabilitation work. I refer to the American Legion whose latest example of service of America's veterans and America as a whole, is in the form of its Nation-wide essay contest entitled "Operation Comeback."

This contest was opened to all handicapped, honorably discharged veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean campaign. By means of the contest, the Legion has focused the attention of the American people on the courageous come-back made by our handicapped citizens, particularly the heroic men and women who saw service in their country's uniform.

If one were to attempt to write a fiction story, one could not convey the powerful human interest and drama which these essays in Operation Come-back have told. One could not duplicate the drama of these brave souls fighting courageously to come back—to occupy their rightful place in the human family in spite of their handicap.

The contest offers food for every American's serious thinking. Reading the essays should make every American humble. Certainly very few, if any, of us have any trouble in the world which can possibly compare with the great suffering which these men and women have gone through, but which they have bravely overcome.

ESSAYS ARE ENCOURAGING

The essays provide a wonderful source of spiritual encouragement. Why? Because they tell how firm is the reliance of these handicapped veterans in divine providence. The essays are inspiring too in that they attest to the loyalty of members of their families, particularly wives and children who have stood by the servicemen throughout their darkest days of rehabilitation.

I'd like to quote briefly from an introduction to a collection that was made of all of the various heart-warming materials that were published in connection with the contest. This collection was made by the National Public Relations division of the American Legion. I might mention, incidentally, that the director of that division is our own able former Senate Sergeant-at-Arms, the Honorable Edward F. McGinnis. The assistant director is Mr. J. Norman Lodge, formerly of the Associated Press.

This is the introduction to the compendium:

"OPERATION COME-BACK

"This is Operation Come-back, a contest of letters for handicapped honorably discharged veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean campaign. Through the generosity of an anonymous donor in New York City, \$10,000 was made available for the prize moneys and administrative expense. More than 100,000 pamphlets were printed and sent to all departments. The response was 586 attested letters embracing all the ailments and injuries that can befall mankind.

"A responsible board of judges was secured. Preliminary seeding of letters was done by representatives of the American Legion's rehabilitation staff, the VES and other bodies interested in the handicapped. The final judging, for 20 announced prizes was from 100 of the better letters. This closeness of the contest is attested by the fact that the veteran who led the winners had a percentage of 89.3 while the two tied for twentieth place were rated at 84.1.

"Judging was on a basis of extent of handicap, 40 percent; spiritual come-back, 20 percent; economic come-back, 30 percent; and presentation and neatness, 10 percent, the latter to give the uneducated as fair a chance as the college man.

"Every letter received was a sermon in itself. Fortitude, American spirit, personal suffering, and morale recovery was manifest in every letter. Handicaps were not limited to war wounds. The letters were coded so that the home State of the entrant was not

known to the final judges. Every possible means was utilized so that fairness would be paramount. Now the winners are known."

I wish that it were possible to name all of the folks inside and outside the Legion who contributed to Operation Come-back—men like T. O. Kraabel, head of the Legion's National Rehabilitation Division and his staff. They performed a grand job. I know that every handicapped person in the United States, man, woman, and child, veteran and nonveteran, will be the better for this contest having been conducted. Remember, the contest is based on concrete deeds and accomplishments of the individual involved.

WISCONSIN PRIZE WINNER

I am naturally particularly delighted that one of the four principal winners is Mr. Douglas Davenport, of New Lisbon, Wis., who has performed an amazing recovery from the shrapnel and sniper wounds which he suffered in France in 1944. Mr. Davenport, aged 43, is chairman of the county draft board, county civil defense director, operates a dairy bar and recreation center, and makes a splendid contribution to the community in many other respects. I know that the American Legion Department of Wisconsin must be very proud indeed of men like him and his disabled buddies. Mr. Davenport, incidentally, served as adjutant of his Legion post and as county Legion commander.

I know, too, that every one of the 4,000,000 Legionnaires and members of the Legion Auxiliary are proud of the work which their organization has performed in rehabilitation, as in so many other fields.

Fortunately, the Legion's activity is a part of a great drive conducted by many civic sources to be of genuine service to the handicapped. Recently, a powerful motion picture on the problems of blinded veterans' rehabilitation was produced by Universal-International Pictures. It was based on the book Lights Out, by Baynard Kendrick. It is based on Mr. Kendrick's years of devoted work with the blind, particularly with servicemen who had lost their sight.

NEPH WEEK

Another of the important means of aiding the handicapped is National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week which will be celebrated this year beginning on Sunday, October 7 and extending through the following Saturday.

This week is not just another commemorative event. It has proven the rallying point for the great task of assuring vocational justice for the disabled. In thousands of communities throughout the land, NEPH Week has permitted the focusing of public attention on the need for giving the handicapped a fair break by permitting them to use their remaining skills in appropriate jobs, skills which they have in countless instances proven to be exceptional in character.

We know that placing the disabled in jobs is not just a matter of fair play to these men and women; it is a matter of plain horse-sense insofar as the employer is concerned. Why? Because the handicapped worker proves himself to be a better worker, with higher morale, more diligence, a man or woman who uses his remaining skills to an exceptional degree.

America's handicapped don't want pity, they don't want maudlin sympathy, they don't want anything artificial in their behalf. They do want to be given a fair break. Insofar as our veterans are concerned, a grateful Nation has provided them with certain statutory rights and benefits, as a part of their legal entitlement for having saved this country on the field of battle. Often their statutory awards and pensions have fallen far behind the rising cost of living. Certainly, the Congress by its act of keeping pensions adequate in purchasing power, can

help fulfill its responsibility for the handicapped.

There follows now the American Legion release on the contest and the four prize-winning essays. Each of the essays is simple, clear-cut, very frank in its contents. There is nothing phony about what these men and women have written, because it is straight from their hearts, straight from their daily lives and it will go straight to every American's heart. The essays are "strong meat." Let them remind us all of the bitter price of war, but the "bright victory" over the darkness.

[Press release of the American Legion,
September 23, 1951]

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 23—Two blinded veterans, a multitortured prisoner of the Japs and the victim of a direct hit of an artillery shell which caused paralysis, today were named winners of \$1,000 each and a fully paid trip to the national convention of the American Legion at Miami, October 15-18 as a result of their entries in Operation Come-back, a contest of letters for handicapped veterans.

The winners are: Thomas C. Hasbrook, a blinded veteran of 6001 Haverford Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Charles A. Boswell, also blinded, of 111 Hermosa Drive, Birmingham, Ala.; Lewis Astor Moore, a victim of Japanese atrocities, of 107 Hillside Circle, Gadsden, Ala., and Douglas B. Davenport, a paralytic as a result of a direct shell hit, who lives in New Lisbon, Wis.

There were 16 other winners in this Nation-wide contest, four receiving \$400 each; four being enriched by \$200 each; four by \$100 each; and four by \$50 each.

The contest, which closed September 1 with 586 entries, produced a sermon of personal suffering, morale building and fortitude with each letter. There were double and triple amputees, paraplegia, polio, tuberculosis, and the entire gamut of other ills that befall mankind.

The four first-place winners will be presented their checks at the Miami convention. The others will be mailed to the winning contestants.

Final judges for the contest, which opened in June, were: Dr. Ross T. McIntyre, former Presidential physician and presently the head of the President's Committee for the Employment of the Physically Handicapped; Dr. Verne K. Harvey, Medical Director of the United States Civil Service Commission; Perry Faulkner, Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service of the Department of Labor; and T. O. Kraebel, director of rehabilitation of the American Legion, all of Washington, and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, William Randolph Hearst, publisher, and Dr. Edward Sheekman, all of New York City.

Handicaps were not limited to war injuries. In fact, one of the first-place winners, Mr. Hasbrook, suffered his handicap in Camp Lejeune when a land mine exploded while he was training on a combat course.

Among the winners was one former member of the WAVES who suffered multiple sclerosis but gamely made her come-back physically, economically, and spiritually. Presently she is working in the Crime Prevention Bureau at Chicago. She is Mrs. Ellen Hayes Ahearn of 61 East Goethe Street, Chicago.

All judges agreed that judging the letters was the toughest assignment they had ever encountered.

The contest money was provided by an anonymous donor in New York City.

Eventually a large number of the letters will be reproduced in booklet form and distributed to hospitals in the hope that other handicapped persons will benefit by the come-back of these veterans who had a rebirth after life seemingly had passed them by.

OPERATION COME-BACK

One thousand dollars each, plus a fully paid trip to the American Legion national convention at Miami, Fla.: Thomas C. Hasbrook, 6001 Haverford Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Lewis Astor Moore, 107 Hillside Circle, Gadsden, Ala.; Charles A. Boswell, 111 Hermosa Drive, Birmingham, Ala.; Douglas B. Davenport, New Lisbon, Wis.

Four hundred dollars each: Peter J. McKenna, Jr., 2911 Seventh Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Ralph J. Anslow, 6823 Marcell Avenue, Glendora, Calif.; Douglas R. Stringfellow, 566 Twenty-fourth Street, Ogden, Utah; Ralph L. Andres, Rural Route, Fairbury, Nebr.

Two hundred dollars each: Joseph Press, 156 Goffe Terrace, New Haven, Conn.; Jephtha C. Tankley, 93 Princeton Way NE., Atlanta, Ga.; Edward J. Hoyceyk, 601B Allenhurst Road, Buffalo, N. Y.; Irvin P. Schloss, 2901 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

One hundred dollars each: William Kleinmanns, 581 Highland Avenue, Ridgewood, N. J.; Robert J. Sterling, 17 Flint Street, Manchester, N. H.; John R. Collins, Ashland, Ill.; Robert C. Harris, VA Hospital, Topeka, Kans.

Fifty dollars each: Clayton L. McCleskey, 702 Magnolia Drive, Waycross, Ga.; Charles J. Delong, 126 Brantwood Drive, Montgomery, Ala.; Otho E. Hawes, 2953 Portland Street, Eugene, Ore.; Robert D. Melcher, 3450 Carmous Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Ellen Ahearn, 61 East Goethe Street, Chicago, Ill.

HOW I OVERCAME MY PHYSICAL HANDICAP

The story of my "come-back" is not a story of great financial success but one of great joy for being alive and able to serve my comrades and community to the fullest extent.

While on duty as a private with Company E, One Hundred and Ninth Infantry, Twenty-eighth Division, I was wounded on August 25, 1944, while attacking the town of Elbuef, on the Seine River in France.

The Germans hit a tank point blank with an "88" which was a few yards to my rear. I then lost my "rear side." One ragged piece of shrapnel entered my spine at the lumbar-sacral joint and caused me to be paralyzed from the waist down, a second piece tore a large hole in the sacral region which took over 2 years to heal. A third large piece tore off (and damaged other organs), which I have not used since. A fourth piece went through my left leg below the knee, fracturing the tibia and leaving me with a drop foot. A fifth fragment tore away a large part of the right thigh. A German sniper took several shots at me while I lay waiting 6 hours for aid, one of which hit me in the left elbow.

During 2½ years of hospitalization, in eight Army hospitals the piece of shrapnel was removed from my spine and the motor controls partially returned, leaving a sensory paralysis. I was finally discharged with a permanent colostomy and lack of control of my bladder. The VA recognizes 290 percent in disabilities and I am on an "out-patient" status.

In less than 90 days the county service officer who was commander of the American Legion post, and the district attorney, who was county commander of the Legion, secured my appointment filling a vacancy as clerk of circuit court. I have been re-elected twice.

Prior to entry in service I was a traveling salesman for a soap company. Knowing that I could not travel with rubber sheets, urinal, and a supply of dressings, I returned to my wife's home town of 1,400 people, thinking I would be an invalid.

I now have a feeling of usefulness in the community and have tried to repay everyone by giving extra service in any way I can. In

the 4 years since my discharge I have had the pleasure of serving the county as clerk of circuit court (4 years), chairman of the draft board (3 years), chairman of civil-defense program, the city as alderman (2 years), acting city clerk upon death of clerk; my Legion post as adjutant (1 year), county service officer (2 years), county commander (last year), correspondent Forty and Eight.

I have kept myself so busy that I do not have time to think about my pains or myself and am enjoying being useful.

Respectfully submitted.

DOUGLAS B. DAVENPORT,

New Lisbon, Wis

HOW I OVERCAME MY PHYSICAL HANDICAP

The pronouncement of a Navy doctor—"You'll never see again"—was like a death sentence. The land mine which had exploded in my face on the combat-conditioning course at Camp Lejeune seemed unimportant. At 23 I would never again see the faces of my loved ones—my home town—even sunshine.

I remember sitting on the ledge of a twelfth-floor hospital window thinking that the easy way out would be to lean over—but I knew that the coward's way was not right with God and not fair to my wife and family. The strength which upheld my wife, which helped her to face her plight without self-pity, made me realize that I needed the peace of mind which she found in her religion. From her example, I learned that spiritual guidance helps one over life's rough spots.

Before leaving the hospital, I learned to type, studied Braille, and played bridge with my doctor. My month's association with able, alert blind people at the seeing eye school convinced me that I, too, could enjoy life, and there I found a pal and a means of safe conduct in my seeing-eye dog, "Ray."

When my former employer offered me a job, I jumped at the chance. I worked as a clerk-typist, not as the laboratory technician I had been before entering the Marines. I had to show my fellow employees that, with the exception of my eyes, I was just as normal as before. I worked successfully as clerk, secretary, disc jockey, and public-address-system announcer, journalist, and public speaker. My present responsibility as public-relations representative for one of the world's leading pharmaceutical firms is many times greater than that which was mine before entering service. My wages are trebled.

Ample incentives for working hard were arranged for me at home. Within a year after my accident my daughter arrived. She and her three younger brothers create a happy, noisy household. These youngsters played an important role in my come-back. They keep me from becoming lazy, take my mind off myself, keep me up to date.

Blindness endowed me with more understanding, sympathy, and interest in my fellow man than I had before. I found myself wanting to do something for others because so many help me. The Veterans' Administration drafted me to visit disabled veterans in my State. This led to work with the Blinded Veterans Association—eventually, to its national presidency. I made speeches on aiding disabled veterans, Americanism, and the meaning of blindness. I became interested in government and ran successfully for a seat in my State assembly. Exactly 5 years after I lost my sight I was named by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men.

If I have overcome my handicap, I am humble, for I know that I was only able to do so because of a rich heritage of things which are America.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS C. HASBROOK,
Indianapolis, Ind.

HOW I OVERCAME MY PHYSICAL HANDICAP

I entered the United States Army in 1939 at the age of 16 while still a high school student. When World War II broke out I was stationed in the Philippines. I fought in the Battles of Corregidor and Bataan. I was taken prisoner at the fall of Bataan in April, 1942. The next 10 days were spent on the Bataan death march. Six of these were without food.

The following 2½ years were spent in a series of Japanese prison camps. Here the food consisted of rice and sweet potato vines. I was forced to work exceedingly hard building bridges, planting rice and burying the dead. The lack of food was surpassed only by the lack of medicine and sanitation. My bed was mother earth and my bathroom was a slit trench which I helped dig. After 6 months the terrible prison conditions took their toll on my health. First came the dreaded malnutritional disease, dry beriberi, in my feet and legs. The terrific shock of this killed most of the nerves in my eyes causing an extremely limited vision. In September, 1944, I escaped during a massacre of American prisoners and made my way to a hospital in New Guinea.

Upon returning to the United States I was sent to Valley Forge General Hospital where tests showed my vision to be 20/200. From here I was sent to the Rehabilitation Center for War Blinded Soldiers at Avon, Conn. I was given extensive training in insurance here before being discharged in March, 1946. I started to work in the general insurance business and a grateful Government gave me every assistance. It furnished me with reader service for 2 years, a sound scribe, magnifying glasses and any aid which I could use to overcome my handicap. The Veterans' Administration gave me 2 years on-the-job training and 1 year self-proprietor training.

I could not possibly have attained the success which I have had had it not been for the assistance of the Veterans' Administration and my wife whom I met while in service and who is also a disabled veteran. After 5 years my vision has dropped to twenty-four hundredths, however, I have advanced as far in 5 years as most insurance men do in 20. I have built a medium-sized general insurance agency which represents 15 large fire and casualty companies and which gives me an annual net income of ten to twelve thousand dollars.

I am vice president of a group insurance company, a director of a life-insurance company, a director of the Alabama Association of Insurance Agents, and I helped organize and am a director in a fire-insurance company. I also hold membership in the following social organizations: Blinded Veterans Association, the Moose lodge, church (which I attend every Sunday), the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion Post, 213, which another veteran and I organized and in which I have served as an officer three times.

LEWIS ASTOR MOORE.

GADSDEN, ALA.

HOW I OVERCAME MY PHYSICAL HANDICAP

Shortly before the Battle of the Bulge, the tank in which I was carrying supplies to my company, was struck by a shell. As I climbed out, another shell exploded, filling my chest and face with fragments, and blinding me. On reaching the States 4 months later, I learned I would never see again.

Thus ended all my dreams for the future, for I had entered the Army so soon after college that I had been unable to begin a career. I had played football and baseball at college, and had planned a career in professional baseball. Now I had no means with which to provide for my wife, small daughter, and the baby we were expecting.

The next few weeks were the darkest of my life. I had always been so active, independent and self-reliant. How could I adjust

myself to a world of inactivity, pity, and despondency? Just as my spirits reached their lowest ebb, I began the rehabilitation program at Valley Forge Hospital. Trained men taught me to type, to read and write Braille, to walk through traffic unaided, and helped me regain my self-confidence and self-reliance.

At this time, I was introduced to golf, a game that was to play an important part in my rehabilitation. Golf was one sport I had never tried, and I had no illusions about the ability of a blind man to play it. But from my first swing of a driver, I realized I had found the answer for my love of competitive sports.

After Valley Forge, at Avon, Conn., I underwent a more intensive program. Because of my love for, and knowledge of sports, I decided to enter the sporting-goods field, and took training courses in that line.

Getting home at last to my family, I began the arduous task of convincing the world that a blind man can hold a job. Finally I was given a chance to sell sporting goods for a department store. There my knowledge of athletics and the training I had received, earned me a promotion to manager of the expanding department. Now, I handle all invoices, correspondence, go to market to buy merchandise, keep a close check on inventory, wait on customers, and know the prices of all items in stock.

After 7 years of blindness, I feel that my rehabilitation is complete. Neither my wife nor I have let my blindness keep us from living a normal life. We dance, attend movies, play cards and golf together. I have won 5 national and 1 international golf tournaments in the past 5 years, and my golf has taken me from Maine and Canada to California. I am also active in Lions Club, Sight Conservation, church, and Cub Scout work, and frequently make speeches at schools and clubs. In 1949 I was selected Hero of the Year by the National Disabled Veterans Association.

I have found that blindness is not a handicap, it's just an inconvenience.

Respectfully submitted by,

CHARLES A. BOSWELL.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The Banker and Soil Conservation**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the eleventh annual Pacific Northwest conference on banking, Washington State College, Pullman, Wash., April 8, 1950:

THE BANKER AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Your decision to make soil conservation the subject of today's program of your Pacific Northwest Conference on Banking seems to me to be doubly significant: In the first place, I can think of no group, short of land-owners and operators themselves, which has a more direct, concrete interest in the permanent security of our productive land. And I can think of no part of the entire country which has a richer heritage of good land than this Pacific coast area.

You, the bankers of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, California—or any other State for that matter—will always be concerned with both the value and stability of

the land. In the long run, I am certain that each of you will be interested in every parcel of farmland in your territory, and in the country as a whole for that matter. Regardless of the current price of farm commodities, irrespective of the various factors that may temporarily send land values up or down, there is always the common denominator of the real, productive worth of each acre of land—its base value. You who are serving agricultural or timber-producing communities—and what bank out here isn't—are vitally concerned with the ability of the land to go on producing wheat and peas, furit or livestock, sawlogs or pulp.

Every time you are asked to make a loan—be it a long-term mortgage or intermediate credit financing—on real property beyond the city limits, you must ask yourselves: Is it a good farm or just a poor, rundown piece of land? Will it produce? If it will, it is a sound piece of property—and dependable security—in both boom times and slack. Our productive land altogether comprises our principal capital asset. It produces all but a fractional part of our food, most of our fiber; and all of our wood, leather, and vegetable oils and fats. Earnings from the land—the continuing flow of new wealth—move constantly back and forth through your hands. So you are as a matter of course interested in a dollars-and-cents way that will insure, guarantee, or do whatever is the equivalent of assuring the continued productivity of the land.

WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT CONSERVATION

The very circumstance of my being here today bears me out in this observation. I am not a banker; but every one of you is a potential conservationist—as practitioner, advocate, or both. All of us have a common interest in safeguarding, through proper use and protection, our capital assets of productive land and the water which makes land produce. There is much we need to be thinking about, talking about, and doing something about in this regard. I hope we will stick pretty closely in this discussion to what we can be doing toward furthering the application of real and lasting conservation to the land, whether it is here in the Palouse of Washington and Idaho, the triangle country of Montana, the Willamette Valley of Oregon, or the Sacramento Valley in California.

All of us can do more about soil conservation—bankers and other businessmen, educators, and other professional people, soil conservationists, and farmers—if we work at the job hard enough. And we are sharply reminded of this challenge to our best efforts in scientific conservation skill, financing, and downright hard work on the land by every new dust storm that is reported out of the Great Plains; every flood marching down the Columbia, the Mississippi, or other river; and every decline of an irrigation, drainage, or other producing agricultural area as the result of erosion, water-logging, or the accumulation of toxic salts.

In presenting this conservation challenge to bankers and everybody else, I am not unmindful of the widespread constructive interest and many concrete actions bankers of the Pacific Northwest—and the rest of the country—have taken toward the furthering of soil and water conservation. This extremely helpful support from the banking industry has ranged from the Nation-wide conservation activities of the American Bankers Association to the constant plugging over the year for more soil conservation here in the Palouse by Manager Charles E. Funkhouser of the Palouse branch of the Old National Bank. As many of you know, that has included talking soil conservation to his customers, putting up cash contest prizes, and otherwise promoting conservation interest in the local schools, and financing the novel conservation signs you see along the highways out here.

It was only the middle of March that Mr. A. G. Brown, Director of the ABA's Agricultural Commission, and Mr. H. P. Burdette, chairman of the Commission's soil-conservation committee, called on me to discuss the bankers' interest in soil and water conservation—and specific things bankers can do by taking conservation into account in their basic operating policy. It was heartening to me as a soil conservationist to hear their enthusiastic comments on the importance of soil conservation to agriculture as seen from the bankers' point of view. This is what Mr. Brown told me, among other things:

"I think the bankers all over the country recognize the great importance of soil conservation. In most places I have been, I find that our bankers are taking a more lively interest in this side of agriculture, and are anxious to explore ways in which they can help the program along in their relations with farmers and ranchers. Among other things, I find more and more bankers are giving additional credit, where it is needed, when a farmer comes in and shows he is taking care of his land with soil conservation farming; because that is about as good evidence as anybody can get that a man is a good risk."

Mr. Brown pointed out that the Agricultural Commission of the ABA is working on the matter of extending credit, also, for soil conservation improvement work, and that it attributes a great deal of importance to conservation from the credit standpoint. I likewise was greatly interested in learning from these gentlemen that the American Bankers Association has recognized the importance of good farm-forestry practices by setting up a special committee on forestry. As I understand it, this committee is not concerned with the big commercial timberlands, but rather with farm woodlands as a source of farm income. That is of particular interest to you people out here, and I might add that our Soil Conservation Service work through the farmer-voted and farmer-managed soil conservation districts has long put much emphasis on this very point and has done considerable work in this direction.

CONSERVATION ERA

In this new soil conservation era, as I prefer to call it, conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife are, for the first time in history, being tied together and scientifically coordinated on the basis of land capability and need. I believe I can say that the national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving these interlocking natural resources. And at this point, before we take up further specific points bearing on banking and soil conservation relationships, I think it would be well to consider for a moment just what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation. In the first place, the work of the Soil Conservation Service is based on the findings of a few specialists who, while making soil surveys in the old Bureau of Soils, came to understand that land differences must be given full and due consideration in any work that might be undertaken for sound land use and adequate protection of land from erosion, water-logging, etc. They understood, also, that under normal climatic conditions, nature not only built soil, but was able to keep land permanently productive.

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; and contouring, strip-cropping, and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building

farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION

Modern soil conservation, moreover, consists of doing these and still other necessary things. Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs, if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for windstripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter; if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of adaptable tools available to farmers.

It likewise includes, for flood control and reservoir protection, treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use and small structures in the smaller watersheds where floodwaters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give the farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil-conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college.

Moreover, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work which is put on the land to keep it permanently productive. Such measures are not just for a single year or cropping season. There is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs as determined by condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production.

This is the kind of modern soil conservation farming which hundreds of thousands of farmers and ranchers are practicing. The banks of the Nation are serving these farmers more and more as they move ahead with their conservation work, through their soil-conservation districts. They do this with technical assistance which they request from the Soil Conservation Service. They also draw on other local, State, or Federal sources for assistance, governmental or private, such as ACP payments, educational facilities of the Extension Service, information from the agricultural experiment stations and State agricultural colleges with which our service cooperates in its research work.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Approximately 2,300 soil conservation districts already have been formed by landholders under State enabling laws in the 48 States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These districts include more than three-fourths of the country's farms and a total of more than 1,210,000,000 acres.

Although your west coast country as a whole is not yet as well covered by districts as are some other sections of the United States, I hope it won't be too long now before the greater part of your farm and

pasture lands likewise will be in districts, and thus in better position to move ahead faster with needed soil-conservation work. I know it can be done, because 94 percent of Washington's farms, for example, already are in soil-conservation districts. Montana's districts (including the grazing districts with which we also cooperate) take in nearly 80 percent of its farms and 70 percent of its farmland.

In other words, if you are in an agricultural section, most of you will not have to travel far to find a soil-conservation district. If you should have to go far, let me suggest that one of the most constructive contributions you can make to the conservation cause in your territory is to familiarize yourselves with these farmer-operated local units of State government and encourage the landholders of your own localities to get busy and organize such districts themselves. And another suggestion is that you get acquainted with the districts already established.

The local district supervisors, or directors, are responsible, progressive individuals you will find satisfaction in dealing with; and I am sure you will find them more than glad not only to explain their conservation program but to take you out and show you what is going on in the fields, pastures, and farm woodlands of their districts. So will our Soil Conservation Service technicians who are providing technical help to the districts—that is, of course, within the limits of their time.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

I won't bore you with a long string of figures, because you can obtain local accomplishment figures at any time from our local, State, or Portland regional offices. But I do want to call attention, briefly, to this record of accomplishment Nation-wide; because district organization, of course, is not an end within itself, and a district program that exists only on paper isn't worth the paper it is written on. Neither is a farm plan for soil conservation, where its provisions are not applied to the land.

Up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone. These plans covered some 220,000,000 acres, of which more than 112,000,000 acres had been treated with needed conservation measures by that time, in the districts. These figures do not include other millions of acres surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has assisted. Up to the first of this year, also, detailed soil-conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 322,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning on another 180,000,000 acres.

AN INVENTORY OF THE LAND

These land-capability surveys constitute a scientific land inventory, and one which can be invaluable to bankers in agricultural areas. This inventory is made by the Service's conservation surveyors, in cooperation with district farmers and ranchers, and covers entire farms. It shows the kind of soil, the slope, degree of erosion, and other factors which, with climate, govern the whole safe use and producing capacity of land. This information, in the hands of the farmer and technician, serves as an accurate land base for the cooperative development of scientifically accurate farm plans. It shows for the entire farm—field by field and area by area—the condition of the land and its capability for production, whether for row crops, orchards or vineyard, pasture, timber, or wildlife. Thus capability classes I, II, and III are good cropland, valuable in the order named; class IV is best for grass but can be cultivated occasionally; classes V and VI are suited for pasture or timber; and class VIII is best for wildlife or parks.

The Banker and Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the eleventh annual Pacific Northwest conference on banking, Washington State College, Pullman, Wash., April 8, 1950:

This scientific inventory of the land, which should be completed Nation-wide at the earliest practicable date, not only is the foundation on which rests effective conservation planning and treatment, but it has numerous other benefits, current and potential. One is that it supplies the basis for optimum development and maintenance of our water, timber, wildlife, and other land-related natural resources. This information, similarly, would enable us to retire from cultivation to grass or trees, on a sound basis, those lands not suitable for tilled crops. In this way we have the opportunity to take improperly used land out of cultivation and put it to more adaptable and long-time profitable uses, as for timber production.

Of more direct interest and concern to you as bankers, evaluation of land for taxation or loans would be sounder and more equitable if made on the basis of their capability for production. Land capability could also be used as the basis for beneficial adjustments in all types of agricultural credit, land tenure, and shifts in crop acreage; and it might well be used as a guide for the wise expansion of rural road building, rural electrification, and the orderly development of other community enterprises, especially those planned for permanency.

This matter of developing expanded conservation credit facilities is most important, and it offers a real opportunity to private and public lending institutions alike to translate soil conservation into their every-day business operations—where it counts. The Soil Conservation Service makes available technical help to landowners and operators in conservation surveying, planning, assistance in establishing initial conservation measures on the land, and in their maintenance; but the landholder bears the cost of materials, labor, machinery operation, and so on. This may entail financing over and above the ordinary operating expenses of the farm, particularly where earth moving or structural work is involved, such as land clearing, irrigation, or drainage improvements, terracing, building farm ponds, etc.

Almost always, experience has proved, the conservation work repays the cost many times over, returns frequently starting the first year after the planned treatment has been applied. Clearly, conservation treatment of the land should not have to be held up for want of a little credit to tide the landowner over the initial stage of applying his conservation measures. And with any decline in national farm income, as compared to war years, credit for soil conservation might become even more important than at any time heretofore.

Suppose, for example, a farmer's district farm conservation plan calls for applying the basic measures over a period of 4 years, and he wants to finance the work as it is done, the way you finance building construction to meet materials and payroll costs as construction progresses. What the farmer

needs, then, is, say, \$500 the first year, \$1,000 the second year, and similar amounts the last 2 years; but he wants to pay it all off after all the work is done, in an agreed-upon number of years, during which his conservation measures are bringing him in increased income. Of course, he will have been keeping up the interest payments year by year in the meantime.

Government credit agencies are favorable to soil conservation financing and have been pushing it, but it takes private banking support, too, in order to swing a job as extensive and important as this is. Some progress has been made toward improvement of credit facilities for farmers who want to adopt or expand soil conservation work; but there still are many communities where adequate credit at reasonable rates of interest is unavailable for such purposes. The solid results obtained from investments in conservation farming, in terms of increased income, prove that such investments usually pay for themselves; so private banking is on sound ground in extending such conservation credit, as an investment. I feel that you are going to find it safe in granting longer-term loans to conservation farmers and to soil conservation districts for their equipment purchase and the like.

I am happy to say that some banks already have been broadening their credit operations in this conservation field, and the tendency is increasing. Permanent measures of soil protection, scientifically applied to the land, are beginning to be regarded as capital assets in a few places. In some places, I am told, about all the bank asks in making a loan to a farmer is whether he has SCS soil conservation plan on his farm. I was in Tippecanoe County, Ky., last year, where the soil conservation district farmers work together in efficient neighborhood groups, as they are doing more and more throughout the country. I visited one community where our servicemen had worked with fifty-odd farmers on drainage improvements. One field I remember had produced its first crop of corn in some 15 years—estimated at 100 bushels an acre.

These farmers had tried to go it alone at first in getting this long-needed and profitable conservation work done on their lands, but it took group action and conservation financing to get the job done. A local banker told me and a group of farmers along the roadside in the drained area that his bank in La Fayette had set aside money for soil conservation loans where the only collateral required from the borrower was a farm conservation plan the Soil Conservation Service had helped him prepare.

I know from reports I have received from our people out here that similar financing of soil- and water-conservation work has been practiced by some of your banks. In Oregon, for example, where, as everybody knows, President E. B. McNaughton, of the First National Bank of Portland, has been an active soil conservation supporter for many years, I have heard of considerable activity along this line. Not only have a good number of bankers in that State pledged themselves in support of the establishment of conservation practices that require financial assistance, I understand, but they have gone on record as agreeing that making loans for that purpose is a good and profitable business. I might mention, also, such instances reported to me as Mr. Alvin Kelley's activities as cashier of the Republic Bank at Republic, Wash., in arranging for financing of certain projects of the Curlew Soil Conservation District; and financing by the bank at Tillamook, Oreg., of equipment purchase and operations in soil conservation districts of its area.

Soil conservation districts' operations over the country, incidentally, have opened up a whole new field for the financing and op-

eration of such heavy and special machinery as draglines, land levelers, grading machines, and so on. In the fiscal year 1949, to illustrate what I mean, more than 16,000 private contractors were engaged in soil and water-conservation work in soil-conservation districts, a proportionate share of them here in the West. Of all the equipment used in the then 1,961 active districts, about 95 percent was owned and operated by contractors, with districts operating the other 5 percent on cooperating farms. Soil Conservation Service equipment on loan to districts was 2½ percent of the total being used at that time. The primary equipment operated by contractors—some 38,000 pieces of nine different types—was estimated to have a new replacement value of around \$250,000,000 to \$300,000,000 alone, not including many other kinds of small farm machines they were using.

Among other conservation financing opportunities which are of particular interest in this part of the country, sound farm woodland conservation development and management might be mentioned. These may range from financing additional land or tree planting stock to financing logging equipment or portable sawmills. It is important, of course, that payment terms be such as not to force wasteful cutting of the timber.

The total outstanding farm mortgage debt in the United States reported in preliminary estimates, as of January 1, 1950, was \$5,450,000,000. Anything which improves the security of such a sum unquestionably is good business—good banking practice. As President Chester C. Davis, of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, said in speaking before the Graduate School Seminar of the United States Department of Agriculture on January 16, 1947:

"Every dollar of new capital that goes into carrying out such a soundly conceived (conservation) farm plan will repay the investor or lender in short order through increased yields and lower production costs. The farmer or land owner or mortgage lender will have a better farm 5 or 10 or 20 years from now than he has today to operate or to secure his loan, an assurance altogether lacking in American agriculture as a whole right up to now."

"In the farms we have studied," he added, "we have yet to find a case where money could not have been advanced to meet the costs of the conservation program as they arose, and be repaid entirely by the increased income from the improvements with plenty of margin to spare. Soil improvements, given only a little time, pay their own way, and more, without dipping into the income that would have been produced on the farm without the soil-building program. I know of no other type of farm mortgage credit that is so obviously self-liquidating as a loan for soil improvement."

In spite of the excellent progress we have made in our Nation-wide program of soil conservation in the comparatively few years since it started, at least 500,000 acres are ruined for any further cultivation every year in the United States, along with a much larger area damaged. And a proportionate share of that costly waste of productive land is contributed by your own agriculturally rich western States, as I am sure you know. In 1948, here in Washington, for example, in addition to the destructive floods, serious erosion occurred in various important areas, including this fabulous wheat-producing Palouse area.

TWENTY DOLLARS WORTH OF TOPSOIL TO PRODUCE \$2.50 OF WHEAT

Our Soil Conservation Service technicians, cooperating with specialists of Washington State College here, made more than 1,200 measurements of erosion losses in Whitman County alone. It was found that on many

farms a ton of soil was lost by erosion for every bushel of wheat produced. In other words, it cost, in many instances, more than 20 bushels of rich soil to produce 1 bushel of wheat. In many parts of the country, the price of topsoil, if you buy it by the bushel and haul it, runs around \$1 a bushel. If this is the value of a bushel of topsoil, then the cost of growing \$2.50 worth of wheat (1 bushel) in 1948 was \$20.

Altogether, it was estimated that, in 1948, 160,000,000 tons of soil were washed out of fields within the drainage basins of the Snake and Columbia Rivers. It was estimated that the equivalent of 66 80-acre farms went down the Columbia River every day for a month. That run-away soil, you will agree, could provide no security for a mortgage or any kind of a bank loan; nor can it ever again yield up its wealth in crops for the benefit of the farmers, business, or anybody else. It's lost, just as other millions of tons of once productive soil have disappeared down the waterways from Montana to California. No State, no nation, no business can withstand such losses indefinitely, neither can farmers.

And there certainly is no valid excuse for our permitting such dissipation of our capital landwealth to go on. We have perfected the tools of soil and water conservation in tried and proved practices and measures adapted to every kind of land we have. We have the most effective means ever devised for using those conservation tools to the best effect, through the soil conservation districts. And conservation farming has so thoroughly demonstrated its economy and profitableness wherever it is used that to ignore such an incentive to practicing it is just plain foolhardiness, in my opinion.

I could take up the time of this entire conservation session talking about how conservation farming pays, in an unbroken chain of dollars-and-cents and public benefits extending from the farmer on the land through his community to the entire State and Nation. In this same Palouse country, to give you one near-by illustration, some of our technical men, cooperating with specialists of the staff of the agricultural experiment station here at Washington State College, have studied the books of conservation farmers and compared them with the books of a group of similar farmers who haven't become too deeply interested in conservation as yet. Results of 2 years' performance studied show that these conservation farmers outstripped the nonconservation farmers on an average (on the farms studied) by \$22 an acre better income per year.

Based on reports from district farmers all over the country, it has been estimated that in 1948 (the only year for which the calculation has yet been made) the Federal Government retrieved the entire amount spent by the Soil Conservation Service and, in addition, a 77 percent profit in increased income taxes paid on increased returns as a result of farmers' applying effective soil conservation measures to their lands. The estimated gain included increased revenue derived from the profits of conservation farming, plus the extra income paid by retailers, processors, and distributors who profited directly from handling the increased production from soil conservation farming.

These and many, many more illustrations I could give are, I am sure, convincing indications to you as practical men of finance of the economic advantages and desirability of having a 100 percent, nationwide soil and water conservation program in effect on the land as quickly as we can. We have been moving ahead steadily, and at a faster pace than we could have dreamed of 15 years ago, but there is no question but that we need to go forward with this vital work still faster in order to get the big job done in time. If the technical and other necessary facilities are made available, we figure that the

job of applying the basic conservation measures on the land could be completed in about 20 years. After that, of course, would be the continuing job of maintenance, and the improvement of measures through continuing research.

The active interest shown by the banking fraternity, out here in the West and elsewhere over the country, unquestionably has contributed substantially to the progress already marked up in this whole conservation movement, and I know will continue to do so. I wish I had time to mention the many examples of this which have come to my attention from your own States. Off-hand, I think of a few such instances as these:

State bankers association activities, such as the Washington Association's conservation-farmer awards plan developed some years ago and the Idaho Association's plans for banker-farmer meetings throughout the State this coming spring and summer, as announced by Chairman Hart Hansen of its agricultural committee; donation of prize money for the North Palouse Soil Conservation District's jingle contest a couple of years ago by the Palouse branch of the Old National Bank of Spokane and the State National Bank of Garfield, Wash., newspaper advertisements carried for years by the Waterville, Wash., branch of the National Bank of Commerce of Seattle; the active backing given the Latah Soil Conservation District by the First Trust & Savings Bank of Moscow, and the Idaho First National Bank of Moscow, purchase of affiliate memberships in the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts by the Bankers' Association in Whatcom and Skagit Counties in Washington; time taken by bankers like Mr. Kelly of Republic, Wash., to serve as honorary member and financial adviser of the district board of supervisors; financing of the local soil-conservation district's 1948 annual report in booklet form by the bank at Wenatchee; arrangement for and remodeling of office space for the Sprague-Harrington Soil Conservation District by the Harrington, Wash., branch of the Old National Bank; encouragement for renters to develop conservation plans on land owned by bankers like Mr. E. C. Johnson of the State National Bank at Garfield, Wash.; and how Mr. Elmore Busch of the Old National Bank at Rosalia, by urging one of his farmer customers to go to his soil-conservation district and get information about a conservation farm plan, prompted the supervisors of the Pine Creek and Southwest Spokane districts to get our Service to set up a 3-days-a-week branch office provided by Rosalia businessmen to service local farmers.

I want to emphasize again, in calling attention to these constructive conservation services which bankers can render and are rendering, the important use which every one of you bankers can make of conservation farm plans. When Mr. Brown and Mr. Burdette were in to see me, they said they feel that the conservation plan made by the districts with assistance of our Service technicians would constitute an important and useful part of the individual farmer's credit record with his banker, and would enable the banker, in turn, to be of more assistance to the farmer in getting his plan applied and maintained. Of course, the local banker's obtaining a copy of an individual farmer's plan would be a matter between the banker, the farmer, and the district, but Service representatives assisting districts will help the banker get a copy of the farm-conservation plan where mutually agreeable arrangements can be effected.

Meanwhile, I should like to suggest in this connection that it would be most helpful if every banker who deals with farmers and ranchers would have a representative farm plan, possibly bordered by a few photographs of principal local conservation measures as

they appear on the land, framed and hung over his desk. Then if a farmer from within a soil-conservation district comes in, but doesn't have a district farm plan of his own, the banker can talk to him about the advantages of such a plan. And if the farmer customer is not in a district, the banker can talk of the advantages of getting such a district organized so that such conservation facilities will be available to him and his neighbors.

I know that many of you have seen and used the fine booklet issued by the agricultural commission of the American Bankers Association in 1947, on What Bankers Can Do About Soil Conservation. But any of you who may not have referred to this excellent publication will find it to your advantage, I think, to make it one of your every-day reference items on your desk. It sets out in understandable fashion most of the A B C's of banker cooperation in soil conservation, including use of these farm plans. And Mr. Brown has just written me that the ABA agricultural commission expects to stress to all agricultural committees of State bankers' associations the desirability of having banks contact their local soil-conservation districts and getting a copy of the farm-conservation plan to put in the farmer's bank-credit file.

Let me say again, that to complete the soil-and water-conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which groups such as yours have a natural interest. It includes, among other points: (1) Completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit; (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil-conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work—with a scientifically developed soil conservation district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm and ranch in the country at minimum public cost; (3) active participation by all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; and (4) making a real conservationist of every farmer and rancher in the country.

This is a goal I know we can achieve by working untiringly together.

Adjustment of Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to urge the adoption of H. R. 244, as reported by the committee, and hope that amendments to reduce the salary adjustments will be defeated.

This bill, H. R. 244, was introduced by me on January 3, 1951, the day the Eighty-second session of Congress convened. My action in introducing this bill was prompted by the very critical need of our postal employees for an immediate and substantial adjustment in their salaries in order that they might meet the increased cost of living. Their last salary increase was effective November 1, 1949. I desire to direct the attention of the Members to the fact that this salary increase was only \$10 a month and failed in a large degree to

meet the needs of the postal employees at that time.

The committee, after extensive hearings and due consideration, has made certain amendments to the bill but has retained the major principles that were the original basis for the bill. As amended, the bill provides the following:

Salary increase: (a) Grants to 500,000 postal employees salary increases of \$400 for all such employees paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters, who will receive a 20-percent increase. Hourly employees will receive a 20 cents an hour increase.

Raises entrance salary: (b) Eliminates the first three grades for all employees and renumbers the remaining grades in sequence, beginning with No. 1. This increases the entrance salary by \$300. When combined with the provisions for salary increases it raises the entrance salary for clerks, carriers, and motor-vehicle employees from an annual rate of \$2,670—\$1 31½ per hour—the present rate, to an annual rate of \$3,370—\$1.66½ per hour. Rural carriers presently receive permanent appointments and are appointed in grade 3. Their entrance salary will be increased by one grade.

Grade increases: (c) Grants two grade increases to those employees who have entered the postal service since July 1, 1945, and have not received any grade increase by operation of law counting increases under this bill. Grants one grade increase to those employees who have received only one such grade increase. Employees advanced in grade under this section will still retain their time in grade toward their next promotion.

Other provisions: (d) Provides that increases under this act shall not be counted as equivalent increases in compensation within the meaning of the Classification Act of 1949, so that employees who might be transferred to the Classification Act, such as transfer of buildings to GSA, will not be denied within-grade increases when due.

(e) Is retroactive to July 1, 1951, but shall not apply in the case of employees who have been separated from the rolls on the date of enactment, with the exception of those who are in the Armed Forces or who have retired since July 1, 1951.

There has been reference made to provisions in the bill which have been termed erroneously, in my judgment, "fringe benefits." These are not fringe benefits to those who are directly affected by them. In the first place, there are those who term the retroactive date of July 1 a fringe benefit. The retroactive date was placed in the bill to assure postal employees that despite the fact that time might be taken in the final enactment of their salary increase it would be retroactive to the beginning of the present fiscal year and they would not be placed at a disadvantage solely because of delays in legislative procedure. The retroactive date would probably have been more realistic to the situation had we made it retroactive to January 1 of this year, and there was ample testimony before the committee to justify such a retroactive date.

The elimination of the first three grades is no fringe benefit, since I am sure that the Congress generally was of the belief that at least the first two grades had been eliminated by Public Law 428 of the last Congress. Through interpretation, however, it was determined that the first two grades were eliminated only for regular employees. The bulk of employees, such as clerks, carriers, motor-vehicle employees, and railway-mail clerks, enter the postal service as substitutes, and they are today still entering in grade 1. In addition, the so-called Whitten amendment requires that all employees now be hired on a temporary basis. This means that except for postmasters and rural carriers, who have been administratively excepted from the Whitten amendment, all employees now must enter in grade 1. This bill eliminates grades 1, 2, and 3 for all employees and renumbers the grades so that the new salary schedules present uniformity and accurately reflect salary rates. By the elimination of grades 1, 2, and 3 and the \$400 salary increase, the entrance salary to the postal service is increased by \$700. Based upon testimony given by the Postmaster General, such an increase in entrance salary is necessary in order to attract and maintain the high type of employees necessary to carry out this important Government function.

The provision in the bill which will promote employees to one or two additional grades if they have not had such promotions by action of law will correct an inequity that has existed since 1945. This inequity resulted from a failure on the part of Congress to increase the entrance salary for employees in the postal service when a general salary adjustment was made for those on the rolls in the amount of \$400 a year. While this does not completely eliminate the inequity, it does recognize our obligation to do so and is a fair and reasonable adjustment for the employees who were not eligible for such promotion merely because they did not enter the postal service by a specified date.

Basically, of course, this is a salary increase bill to meet the increased cost of living with which our postal employees are faced. I am pleased, however, that the committee as well has concurred in the provisions of my original bill which will remove some long standing inequities to certain groups within the postal service. It is my sincere hope that the Members of the House will pass this bill without amendment and I want to give them the assurance now, both as the author of the bill and as a member of the committee, that all of its provisions have been carefully reviewed and, in the judgment of the committee, are merited by the employees.

I also want to point out that the House is considering today a bill which is complementary to this bill, H. R. 4255. This bill was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison] and will bring about an adjustment in the salaries of postmasters and supervisors made necessary by the successive cost of living increases that have been made in the postal service which have

distorted the pay schedules of the postal service. Both the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison] and myself introduced this legislation in the Eighty-first Congress and hearings were held, but because of the complexities of the problems involved, action was not then completed on this legislation.

There is presented, however, in the committee recommendation on H. R. 4255, a pay adjustment schedule for postmasters and supervisors which will eliminate to a large extent the inequities that have developed. This bill contains salary schedules for postmasters and supervisors in addition to the cost-of-living increase provided in H. R. 244 and adjusts salaries within a range of \$400. There is a limitation of total increase for any individual postmaster or supervisor, when combined with increases in H. R. 244, not to exceed \$800. This bill, since it is predicated upon the adoption of H. R. 244, as reported by the committee, is another reason why both bills should be passed without amendment.

Soil Conservation and Our Democratic System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, Roanoke, Va., May 3, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION AND OUR DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM

Today the future of thousands of communities throughout the Nation—and the continuing welfare of the Nation itself—hinges on the success of our efforts to safeguard our productive land and the water that makes land productive. Every interest in the country—the family, the school and church, business, industry, and civic groups—has a stake in getting the quickest possible solution to this problem. Further, when we think about it, we realize that there is not one individual in all the country who hasn't everything to gain from conservation and wise use of the land and nothing to lose.

I think I should say in the beginning that to me productive land is our base; for everything we do, all we share, even whatever we amount to as a great people and an enduring Nation, begins with and rests on the sustained productivity of our agricultural lands.

It is the thousands of communities throughout the country that represent the very foundation of our life, liberty, and security. When one or two, or twenty, or a hundred communities start going downhill because the land around them no longer supports the people, then the democratic system begins to suffer. When the people of the communities are deprived of the good standard of living they have been accustomed to, because of impoverishment of the land, they become dissatisfied, restive, unhappy. Some of them suffer from malnutrition because

they do not have proper land for producing healthful food.

LAND AND PEOPLE

You of the Federation of Women's Clubs understand, I am sure, the significance of the community in relation to the well-being of State and Nation. As individuals, your basic work is performed in your own home towns or country districts, among people you know well; yet you must continually think out and plan projects that have an important bearing on the security and future life of the Nation as a whole.

You know a good deal about our country's democratic system. You know, too, that it is not just government. It is what Thomas Jefferson called "the spirit of our citizens" which can make "government a model for the protection of man in a state of freedom and order." Those words are as true today as they were a century and a half ago, when Washington and Jefferson were laboring to set a young nation on the right track and at the same time doing all they knew how to do to prevent loss of soil from their Virginia farms.

Today we have the same problems, but in far greater magnitude and scope. And, in addition, we have many other problems. But none is more urgent than the saving of our productive land. If we should allow our source of livelihood—our land and the water that makes land productive—to be wasted to the point where the spirit of our citizens would become broken and apathetic, or wrathful from fear and want, then we could no longer say that we live in a "state of freedom and order."

I do not believe any such thing is likely to happen to us, certainly not in the foreseeable future. We can avoid it altogether, I am convinced. I know we can, if we speed up our soil-conservation program throughout the whole country, allow nothing to interfere with its progress, and devote time and effort to educating the people, especially the youth, in the fundamentals and absolutely necessity of conservation.

LAND AFFECTS ALL OF US

Wherever you go, tomorrow or in years ahead, whatever you plan to do, you can scarcely avoid becoming more and more aware of the importance of productive land in the economy of our Nation and the world. People have always depended on the land and other natural resources for their very existence.

From our earliest days here in the United States we have been blessed with such natural wealth in the form of productive land, water, forests, grasslands, and wildlife that too many among us have come to look on these basic essentials as inexhaustible. But we have learned that this is not true, and we have started programs to conserve and make the wisest possible use of these resources. Now, as they are becoming increasingly scarce in relation to our needs and our growing population, I think we can feel hopeful that our national interest in conservation is going to mount steadily.

While it is not meant that we are going to go hungry any time soon, nevertheless we must keep in mind the fact that we definitely do have a limited supply of productive land, and we must from now on take scrupulously good care of all of it. We must keep this in mind ourselves and take steps to see that others—all our people—understand it. We have surveyed and studied our land rather thoroughly in the past few years. We now know with considerable accuracy how much we have for production of cultivated crops, for forests, for livestock, and other essential uses. There isn't a great deal to spare, in proportion to our needs, and there isn't any to waste.

It is, I think, extremely important that all the people know the facts about our soil and water resources. Some may ask: How does this land problem concern me? I am not a

farmer. Isn't it the farmers' business to look after the land?

It is, of course, the farmers' job—something farmers should look after. But suppose they don't? Or, suppose not enough of them look after the land in time, or look after it well enough? Suppose they don't know what to do. Who, then, is affected?

The answer is clear: Teachers, scientists, lawyers, doctors, and the members of all the other professions will be affected; and manufacturers, also, and the people who run the railroads and airlines; and bankers, merchants, and still others. Probably the housewives and their families will be affected most. All these will be affected as consumers, distributors, processors of the things that are produced on the land. What happens to the wheatlands of the Great Plains, the ranges of the West, the cotton fields of the South, and the orange groves of Florida, California, and Texas is quickly reflected in the business of Pittsburgh, Denver, Minneapolis, Richmond, and Roanoke.

Shredded wheat, Camels, Ivory soap, Stetson hats, Florsheim shoes, and Cannon towels all come originally from the soil. So do newspapers, baseball bats, pancakes, and a long list of other articles we use and depend on from day to day. Think of all the people who depend wholly or partially for their income—their living—on the processes involved in getting grains of wheat from Kansas or the Dakotas to the breakfast tables of New York, San Francisco, and Roanoke in the form of biscuits, hot cereal with cream, and hot cakes. There is the farmer, and the manufacturer of the machinery the farmer uses. And there are truckers, millers, advertising men, stenographers, bankers, bakers, carton manufacturers, ink makers, salesmen, wholesalers, retail workers, railroad workers, and so on and on. All of this long chain of farming, manufacturing, processing, packaging, marketing, and distributing is made possible because seed planted in the soil multiply, become edible and nutritious, and ultimately reach us in the form of usable products.

There is even more to the chain. The farmer, the trucker, the railroad engineer, the stenographer, the carton manufacturer, and all the rest who contributed to producing the shredded wheat and the flour of which the hot cakes and biscuits are made also buy goods and services. These people go to doctors, dentists, lawyers, barbers, and beauty parlors; they go to movies and ball games and the opera and the symphony. They buy newspapers, radios, automobiles, electric light bulbs, washing machines, and houses. They hunt and fish and make pictures. Their taxes help to build roads, bridges, hospitals, dams for irrigation projects, battleships.

And back of it all is productive land.

I am afraid millions of people never think of all these products, and hundreds of others, in their relation to the land of our country. Instead, most of them associate such things with the stores where the processed articles are bought. Wholesome-looking, attractively packaged things appear on store shelves. They are for sale. They can be had for so much money. Why should the purchasers be bothered about what happened before the articles got into the store?

People will begin bothering themselves only if the articles become scarce, if the price gets too high, or if the quality becomes too poor. And all these things can happen—have happened locally—where there's a shortage of productive land.

Even more important, we can change from a strong nation to a weak one if we neglect our land. History as written has more or less overlooked what has happened to nations that allowed their productive land to wear out—to wash or blow away.

WHAT MAN WILL DO TO AVOID HUNGER

There are numerous illustrations throughout history showing to what extremes man

will go under the lash of hunger in order to get a patch of ground for the production of food. Prodigious labor, raiding, robbery, murder, and war can be included in the list.

On the steep slopes of Lebanon there can be seen today the remains of stone-walled terraces, some of which were probably built more than 3,000 years ago at great cost in labor.¹ These terraces were built in order that the ancients could farm the land—every possible acre. Much the same sort of thing can be seen in Peru and about Tenancingo, Mexico, and in the hills and mountains of France, Italy, and the islands of the Mediterranean and neighboring seas.

I wish more people could see what I saw on a recent trip to Europe and Africa. It would help, I am sure, to understand better the full significance of productive land and to what lengths man will go to find a spot on which to produce some food for himself.

In Italy, for example, every available patch of land along the roads I traveled—practically every square foot—is in use. From the beaches of the Adriatic and Mediterranean on up to the crests of the Apennines and Alps every usable sliver of land that I saw was devoted to crop production. Tens of thousands of little patches are cultivated on slopes so dizzyly steep I wouldn't venture into them. Mountain sides have been propped up with staircase benches supported by rock walls and filled in behind with soil brought in by the basketful. The work required in establishing this bench type of agricultural land translated into American labor costs probably would amount in many instances to \$15,000 or \$20,000 an acre.

And in forested areas when trees are cut, even the twigs are saved for fuel, along with the weeds of fields.

When population presses on the land, people often become more thrifty with respect to nearly everything but soil—the very thing they should do most to save.

When one talks to Italians about the cost of their stone-walled terraces, the reply is likely to be something like this: "Why consider the cost when land means food? Food is life, lack of it is death."

In a sense, they are right, of course. In America we have not approached any such land scarcity. And quite properly we always figure carefully the cost of our conservation work on the land. There are many reasons why we must be practical and realistic in all that we do, but I am bothered sometimes by the fact that we seldom consider the cost of not controlling erosion.

SOIL LOSSES

Within the last two decades we have built up a broad program for soil and water conservation, but we are still losing every year approximately 500,000 acres of cropland through misuse of land and wasteful methods of farming. I don't mean that 500,000 acres of United States territory is actually disappearing into thin air every year; but I do mean that that much cropland is being so damaged it will not be of any further practical use for growing cultivated crops in the immediate future. And this damage is the result of uncontrolled and unnecessary soil erosion. Already we have ruined for practical cultivation about a fifth of our original area of tillable land. Around a third of what remains has been badly damaged, and there is another large area on which erosion has already started. In addition, our surveys show that still other areas have suffered severely by waterlogging, accumulation of toxic salts, strip mining, and deposition of the debris of erosion.

When white men came to America, the United States was covered, on an average, with about 9 inches of productive topsoil. In the intervening years, that average soil

¹ Lowdermilk, W. C. Conquest of the Land Through Seven Thousand Years. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, SCS-WP-32. 1948

depth, across the country, has been reduced to something like 6 inches—by erosion of cultivated land. On millions of acres the subsoil has been exposed; and in countless places much of the subsoil, too, has been severely eroded or cut to pieces with big gullies.

This concerns you and every American. And I am glad to be able to say that we can do something about it—and are doing something about it.

But, first, let me point out that we now have only about 460,000,000 acres of good, first-class cropland left. We must take care of this. About seventy or eighty million acres of this land must be cleared, drained, irrigated, or otherwise improved before it can be used for growing either small grain or intertilled crops. And, of the land now in cultivation, around 70,000,000 acres is too steep, too shallow, or too erodible for further safe cultivation. Of our good cropland, all but about eighty to one hundred million acres needs soil conservation treatment in varying degree to keep it safe from erosion while used for crop production.

As I said, this is everybody's job. It affects us all, and we can all do something about it. But as a Nation, or State, or community, we will conserve our remaining productive land and use it wisely only if there is a truly effective popular demand for such a course of action. The men and women and young folks of the towns and cities must help develop this demand, for they now constitute by far the largest segment of our population. If people will take the trouble to learn the facts about the land of their community, their State, their Nation, and then lend real support to conservation action—not with just talk and argument alone—then we will get results. What we want and need is permanent results in conservation, results right out on the land, and in the minds of the people. There must be conservation education. People must be brought to abhor land wastage as a disease. In our increasingly complex civilization, I see this as one of the public's urgent responsibilities. It also is an opportunity of great significance, for what can be of greater satisfaction than helping to speed and perpetuate a movement for conservation and improvement of the land that supports us?

OUR NATIONAL PROGRAM OF SOIL CONSERVATION

We do not need to become destitute of good land in the United States, in Virginia, or any other part of the country. We still have enough good land to get along quite well for a long time, if we take good care of it. We already have a national program of effective soil and water conservation underway, and we have made great progress in recent years. We need only to continue and intensify our efforts along the line of present work in order to establish a permanent conservation type of agriculture in this country. But we dare not "let down," get tired of all the work involved, decide it isn't necessary, and allow all our efforts to slide into the oblivion of wasted endeavor.

Soil Conservation and Our Democratic System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, Roanoke, Va., May 3, 1950:

I truly believe—and many agree with me—that this Nation has made more actual progress in solving its land conservation problems during the last few years than any nation or people ever made in such a short time. It was just 20 years ago that we took our first positive step toward a national program of soil conservation. Through congressional authorization, we were enabled to establish a number of erosion experiment stations in various areas over the country to study in a really scientific way the processes and depredations of erosion and to work out methods of prevention and control. This, I think, was an historic milestone in the world's advancement of conservation science and technique. I consider it as of greater importance to mankind than the purposeless building of all the pyramids in Africa and Mexico or even the most worthy erection of all the monuments to our great men and women. These commemorations of our great leaders represent a splendid expression of our appreciation of their achievements and will have good and stimulating effect on our people. The difference is that protection of our basic natural resources lies at the very base of continuing national existence.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

In the 20 years since we began developing soil and water conservation techniques, with a view to getting those techniques used on the land, we have, I think, come a long way toward our goal. We have developed the science of soil and water conservation. We have put soil and water conservation measures on more than a hundred million acres of land for farmers and other people to see and measure the advantages and benefits. We now have as a great field for this work some 2,200 soil conservation districts, covering about 1,200,000,000 acres and including about 4,500,000 farms and ranches, or more than three-fourths of all the farms and ranches of the Nation. Twenty-two of these districts are in Virginia; they cover nearly 22,000,000 acres of the State's land—86 percent of the total—and include 142,799 Virginia farms. Just because farmers have organized these districts does not mean that all the land in them has been protected as yet. Really, we have just made a good start. The big job is still out ahead.

Farmers in these 2,200 soil conservation districts, throughout the country, are working together, planning together, pooling their resources, and helping one another as they never have done before. They have organized their own soil conservation districts—voted them into existence under State laws—to conserve and improve their land, to stop soil erosion, and to adopt land uses based on scientific principles.

It is this kind of strictly voluntary and understanding cooperation, initiated and carried on by the farmers and ranchers themselves, without any outside interference or dictation, that is doing so much toward getting this tremendous job done, and done on time—before we lose too much of our remaining productive land. And this kind of cooperation is probably the most effective way—if not the only way—to bring about permanency of the conservation practices we are putting on the land. No one has shown me anything even approximately as effective as the soil conservation districts for getting this work on the land and keeping it there.

PROGRESS

The Soil Conservation Service, which I have had the honor to direct since its incep-

tion more than a decade and a half ago, makes virtually all of its technical assistance and certain other assistance, including that in flood control, available to farmers through their soil-conservation districts. Up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone. These plans covered 220,000,000 acres of farm and ranch land, and 114,000,000 acres had been treated with needed conservation measures by that time, in the districts. These figures do not include other millions of acres surveyed, planned, and treated through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has assisted. And up to the start of the current fiscal year (July 1, 1949), detailed conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 304,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning had been made of another 177,000,000 acres. We need these land surveys because it is the only way we can scientifically determine the capabilities and needs of the land. The data collected by the surveys are used in farm planning in such a way that what we do fits the land and the farm.

Our soil-conservation work is speeding up. The records for 1949 show that the Soil Conservation Service, working with farmers in the districts throughout the country, completed 18 percent more conservation work on the land than in the previous year.

You might, I believe, like to hear something about soil-conservation progress in Virginia. I hope everyone in this audience is familiar with at least some of the soil- and water-conservation practices that are especially adapted and needed in this State. That is an important step in educating ourselves and others for appreciation of well-cared-for land—to be able to see the land as our basic and utterly essential resource and know when it is properly used and cared for, or when it is being misused and damaged.

In Virginia's 22 soil-conservation districts, containing more than 14,000,000 acres of farm land, 20,166 farmers now have complete soil-conservation plans for their farms. And 18,337 Virginia farmers, whose farms add up to a total of 3,281,892 acres, are carrying on complete conservation farming, according to plans, right now, this spring, as they prepare to produce this year's cultivated crops, manage their woodlands and pastures, and use that much of Virginia's farm land according to conservation practice designed to be permanent. This more than three and a quarter million acres now undergoing conservation treatment is only a little more than a fifth of the farm land in the State's soil-conservation districts. I sincerely hope that in another year the amount of farm land completely treated for soil and water conservation will have doubled, or tripled.

As you can see, we still have a tremendous amount of work to do in the Virginia soil-conservation program. We are moving ahead, but still not fast enough. For one thing, our district farmers need encouragement. Any time and effort the citizens, both urban and rural, can devote to helping and encouraging them will be well spent.

Of course, many other Virginia farmers have started soil-conservation work. There now are many excellent soil-conservation practices well established on the farms of the State. Of the cultivated land 278,000 acres are contour farmed, cover cropping is used on more than 231,000 acres. Farmers have strip cropped nearly 131,000 acres and are practicing stubble mulching on more than 267,000 acres. About 500,000 acres of the farm woodlands of our State now are managed and utilized for soil and water conservation and for sustained yield of woodland products. And, I hope you will look, this spring, for some of the 630,000 acres of green pastures in the State's soil-conservation districts—for that acreage has been greened up by methods designed to

renovate old, worn-out, eroded pastures, or to make new pastures with grass and legume seedings mostly on fields severely damaged by years of the wrong kind of cropping and farming methods. The district farmers also have built 1,720 farm ponds, 4,600 miles of terraces, and have completed conservation drainage of 54,300 acres of their farm land for more efficient use of water and to control soil erosion. Much other valuable work has been done on the farms in the districts, but these are a few practices I hope Virginia people will look for and appraise this spring and summer, and in the fall after harvest, and next winter when the conservation practices will still be visible, especially in their erosion-control values and their effectiveness in community improvement.

EVERYBODY CAN HELP

To me it is encouraging that the women of the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs are sincerely interested in promoting soil conservation, as well as other good works, in this State. I know this is the case, because for the past 4 years your Federation has been conducting a conservation camp for people who have participated in a conservation contest or some other conservation activity. I know that some of the Soil Conservation Service technicians located in Virginia have had a part in this excellent work, by giving instruction both in the camp's class room and in the field. The conservation tours, which have been arranged for the entire camp, have reached out to the work of farmers in soil conservation districts. This is the kind of support and co-operation for soil conservation that helps. It is a civic group taking the initiative, and at considerable cost and effort making it possible for people to be really useful in promoting land conservation.

It is because I know of your interest and desire to help this work which means so much to us all, that I feel I can speak plainly to this group today. Although our progress in soil conservation is encouraging, it still is not going fast enough. Instead of getting 20-odd million acres of land in soil conservation districts treated with conservation measures each year, as we have been doing in recent years throughout the country, we should be completing the treatment of considerably more than that each year, in order to finish the application of the basic soil conservation measures on time, before we lose too much good land. This could be done by 1970 or 1975 if everybody takes a hand.

We can, and we should, move ahead faster toward this urgent goal of soil and water treatment of every important area of land in our country that needs treatment. Essential to progress is teamwork of all elements of our society. People working together through the active participation and efforts of all interested segments of the public, rural, and urban alike, will accomplish far more than can be done in any hit-or-miss manner, without plan or definite goals. I believe there should be some serious thinking and discussion, by all individuals and groups, as to just how and where a particular individual or group can expend effort most advantageously in helping to speed this indispensable work on our land and make it permanent.

We know now what our land problems are. We have perfected efficient tools for practical and scientific soil and water conservation, and we have the soil-conservation districts through which to put these tools to work most effectively. We shall have nobody to blame but ourselves—the citizens of the United States—if we permit our land and water resources to go on wasting away any longer. This is still the most urgent, basic, and important job confronting the people of the Nation and the world.

CONSERVATION EDUCATION, URGENT AND ESSENTIAL

Education undoubtedly is the most powerful force for good at the ready disposal of mankind. Certainly, this is true in a democracy such as our own. Conservation is done by people. It will not be done unless the people understand how to do it and why they should do it. And our soil-conservation endeavors of today will not be permanent unless the people of both today and tomorrow are well informed about our limited land resource and the urgent need for taking good care of it.

We have many educational forces working today. We have our schools and newspapers and magazines, radio, the churches, public forums, and numerous other agencies that do a great deal toward forming public opinion. Many of these agencies could rightfully be called educational institutions. But we have only one institution that reaches practically all the people, in all the big and little communities where our democracy has its roots, and gives them—or can give them—systematic instruction on the fundamental arts and sciences essential for their becoming well-informed citizens. That institution is our public-school system, supplemented in some places by parochial and private schools. These schools, in which almost every boy and girl of the Nation spends a major part of his or her early formative life period, are the backbone of our educational system. The knowledge, thoughts, and habits of American youth are molded largely by the classroom training of these schools. I don't think I am exaggerating when I say that the future welfare of thousands of our communities, of our Nation—even our civilization—may well depend on whether or not the boys and girls of our schools are given the opportunity to develop the right conservation attitudes and habits as they move from grade to grade in these schools.

I do not claim to be an authority on teaching. But I do have some definite ideas about what we should teach in the way of soil conservation—if we really want soil and water conservation to be a permanent thing in our country. I would like to mention some of those things to this audience in particular, because you are closer to these schools, through the children, than any other adult group, and because your influence is a thing to be reckoned with in our educational system, especially at the community level. And too, I know that in recent years the sponsoring of soil conservation has become an important phase of the work as set forth in the resolutions of the National Federation of Women's Clubs. This year, I believe, one of your new resolutions has to do specifically with education for soil and water conservation in the schools.

SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF CONSERVATION EDUCATION

I think that every child, whether living on a farm or in a city or town, should be taught some of the fundamentals about our soil and water resources, and the need for their wise use and conservation, as rapidly as they are capable of understanding the concepts and facts. And, this really is very early. We teach honesty, cleanliness, thrift, virtue, and self-reliance as a matter of course. We teach the principles of democracy, tolerance, and free thought and speech as fundamentals of our American way of life. I think we ought to teach conservation of soil and water in the same way that we teach these other fundamental principles and practices. Conservation of our indispensable soil and water, and our other natural resources, must become a part of our way of life. The issue is: Shall we continue to exploit and deplete the land and other resources we have left; or, shall we conserve them while we use them?

The answer, of course, is: We want to conserve them while prudently using them. We must then make sure, without delay, that the youth of the Nation are trained as citizens who will insist on conservation, will demand it, and will practice it while they live or help others practice it.

I would like to enumerate a few of the fundamental principles of conservation which I think should be taught to every child as soon as he is able to understand the simple principles involved.

1. Most of what we eat comes from productive land. Most of our food, clothing, and other things we need and use are manufactured through the complex forces of sunlight, air, water, and soil synthesized by the plants that grow in the soil. This thin layer of productive soil that covers part of the earth's surface is the main source of our sustenance.

2. Our other natural resources are not indestructible. They can be wasted or ruined for further practical purposes by imprudent use. In fact, many of these resources already have been seriously depleted or impoverished, especially our productive land.

3. We do not need to waste our land while we use it. We can conserve the land and make much of it still more productive while using it, if we but follow conservation methods instead of wasteful methods of land use.

4. Many farmers are already conservation farmers and more are taking up the practice of soil and water conservation every day. In our country we have the scientific knowledge necessary to enable all farmers and ranchers to become conservationists. Although we have a highly successful nationwide program of soil and water conservation under way, many farmers still follow the more difficult, wasteful, and exploitative way of farming, and for this reason we are still losing good land every year.

5. Our water resources, like land, are being wasted, too, by overuse and failure to check losses by excessive runoff. This loss of water can be stopped only by putting more of the right kind of soil- and water-conservation practices in the right places. These fundamental matters should be thoroughly instilled into the mind of every child as a part of his normal way of thinking. Nor should we stop there. All young people in rural areas should be taught some of the techniques of soil conservation as rapidly as they are able to grasp and apply them. And the teaching should go on through high schools into our colleges. We should never stop teaching it. It should be taught, wherever feasible, even to all adults, regardless of where we find them. What we really want to do is to get soil conservation into the bloodstream of our youth—into their habits.

Education for soil and water conservation is taking the long view instead of the short one. It is building for a good life in our Nation throughout the centuries to come. It is my hope and expectation now, after a lifetime of effort for soil conservation, that the people will see to it that our soil-conservation program which is now moving ahead with such remarkable effectiveness does not become ineffective and wasted for lack of conservation education among the people. Lastly, there is no logical cause or excuse for not providing this future security to our Nation, our States' economy, our community welfare. Our soil-conservation program, in Virginia and in all the country, helps all and hurts no one. While safeguarding the land, it returns, in addition, more dollars to the Federal Treasury than are taken out of the treasury as a working fund.

In the year 1728, Col. William Byrd II, when surveying the Dan River Valley of Virginia, wrote in his diary: "Rivers roll down their waters to the sea as clear as

crystals." I think it is conceivable that streams in our watersheds may again run clear, and in that event he will not have proved a poor prophet when he further wrote, "Happy will be the people destined for so wholesome a situation, where they may live to the fullness of their days with much content and gaiety of heart."

Could Eisenhower Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr JENISON. Mr. Speaker, while it might be said that the choice of a Republican candidate for President is a purely partisan problem and therefore not a proper subject for consideration in the RECORD of the Congress, such is not the case. Americans, as a people and a Nation, are weighing all the candidates with the hope of finding the most suitable leader in the critical years ahead. They should. And they should have the benefit of all the available information on those who may be considered.

For that reason I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revealing article published in the September 24 issue of the Freeman, entitled "Eisenhower: The Bait and the Trap." Written by Lawrence E. Brown, it relates the Eisenhower boom to the Republican dilemma as regards the basic issue of national survival.

Under permission granted by the House, I present it for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. It follows:

EISENHOWER: THE BAIT AND THE TRAP

(By Lawrence E. Brown)

The maneuvers to capture the Republican nomination for Eisenhower are reminiscent of those that so disastrously captured it for Willkie. There is the same synthetic publicity accepted as evidence of mass popularity, the same approval by the liberal and forward-looking elements of the Republican Party (that is, by the eastern suburbs), the same slightly craven despair of the professional politician who wants to win with anybody and accepts a candidate's own publicity as evidence of his political strength.

There is even a faint resemblance between the men as individuals: The same air of boyish masculinity, the same public doubt concerning their understanding of political realities, the same narrow competence inflated out of all proportion by public misunderstanding of their real responsibilities. Despite their outward air of craggy, individual strength both men have owed their fame to others—Willkie to the Wall Street group which made him a prominent lawyer, Eisenhower to the leftist faction of the Roosevelt administration which gave him his stars and his commands.

There is, however, a deeper similarity in the two candidacies. Both represent the efforts of the same faction of the Republican Party to cooperate with the foreign policy of the Democratic administration. The backers are men who profess objection to some of the domestic policies of the administration but approve its foreign policy. Their public plea, of course, is that only an

internationalist and forward-looking candidate can win the election. Privately they argue that the Republicans must nominate a "popular" figure, a man with glamour. The substance of their view, however, is their unwillingness to conduct a campaign on any issue at all.

They know that to exclude foreign affairs would be to exclude all real issues and merely replay 1940, 1944, and 1948. Hence their plea for a candidate with glamour. Willkie was supposed to have it. Eisenhower is said to have it. With this quality, it is argued, a candidate can get votes on his personality, not his clarity of purpose or understanding of the crisis in which his country finds itself. But the trouble with glamour is that though it may lead to popularity, which is only a fancy name for favorable publicity, it does not win elections.

Eisenhower, like Willkie, would be a natural candidate for the Democrats, but again that position has been preempted. Even more than Willkie, he is one of those candidates whose professional support is from people who are for him because they think some other people are for him. You meet many of the first, but few of the second. It might seem that so synthetic a candidacy would collapse after a little sober analysis by the professional Republican leaders. To envisage the kind of campaign Eisenhower could wage against Truman at once exposes its absurdity. Why should anybody vote for the obedient subordinate and reject his responsible superior?

HOW CAN EISENHOWER ATTACK?

Wherein can Eisenhower attack the Democratic administration? For those policies which he himself executed without a murmur? Obviously, he can not mention foreign policy beyond the vague cooperative generalities of Willkie. Can he campaign on domestic policies only? Hardly with success. First, he is marked as a man with no experience in domestic matters. Secondly, there is no domestic question that does not promptly bring in foreign questions. Taxes, the draft, Government spending, labor policy; none of these can be separated from the foreign crises that have sometimes been the cause and always the excuse for more than a decade of domestic issues. No candidate committed to the foreign policy of the Democratic administration can do more than be petulant about domestic questions. He would have raised the same vast sums for the same foreign purposes, but somehow he would have made the taxes lighter. He would have drafted and controlled the economy for the same objectives as his opponent, but he would have done it better. It is not difficult to see who would win the American voters in that kind of campaign.

It might be supposed that the impossibility of winning with Eisenhower would gradually dampen the ardor of his more practical backers; but it almost certainly will not, for the very good reason that to win is only their secondary objective. Their primary objective, as in 1940, is to continue the Democratic foreign policy. If Eisenhower can win, that will be fine. If he cannot, he will have accomplished what is to them his principal function: The occupancy of the Republican presidential nomination to be sure that no opponent of the Democratic foreign policy gets it.

This campaign within a campaign needs more attention than it gets. Its object is to prevent foreign policy from becoming an issue, and the Republican candidacy of Eisenhower is merely the certain insurance of success.

To suggest that the fate of the United States—its continuance as an independent nation or its submergence under Soviet conspiracy and ultimate conquest—hinges upon the presidential election of 1952 is to evoke undesired echoes of nineteenth century campaign oratory. It is curious that in the past,

when no election result could have touched the survival of the Nation, it was the style to say that it could, while today with the Soviet colossus bestriding the earth, fashion decrees that this fact must be considered irrelevant to an American political campaign.

This is the substance of the campaign for Eisenhower. It is also the accepted view of many eastern Republicans and, for entirely different reasons, of many of the one-time isolationists of the Middle West. It is also the view of most of the press and the radio. In this view it must be assumed that both parties are equally committed to defense of the United States against Soviet attack, equally unanimous in this commitment, and equally willing to employ what seems from moment to moment the best strategy of defense.

DEMOCRATS AGAINST AMERICA

The trouble with this view—which is the substance of the bipartisan foreign policy—is that the rise of the Soviet Empire cannot be separated from domestic American politics, because that empire was created not by its own might but by American domestic politics. Soviet world power did not just happen, nor could the Soviet Government have achieved it by its own efforts. That empire is the creation of the faction that for years has steadily increased in power within the Democratic Party. Despite the administration's verbal attacks on Communist aggression and its childish prosecutions of the inconsequential riff-raff of the official Communist Party, this faction is still able to protect its key men in the Government and to influence the major lines of American foreign policy.

These are the men who kept British and American armies out of Eastern Germany and the Danube Basin, not as the most expedient way of defeating Germany, but in order to give these lands to the Russians. These are the men who used lend-lease and UNRRA to increase Russia's postwar military potential. These are the men who turned over Asia to the Soviet empire preliminarily at Yalta and finally with Marshall's arms embargo against the Chinese Nationalists. These are the men who have blocked every attempt to remove Soviet agents from key policy positions in the government. These are the men who always oppose "Communist aggression" in speeches and always aid it with such of the political power of the United States as they can discreetly use for that purpose. These are the men who with another 4 years of power safely in their grasp can accomplish the final destruction of the United States before an irresistible Soviet world empire.

The fact that the Democratic Party as a whole never had such purpose is without bearing. Within the pro-Soviet faction there were enough men, powerfully enough placed in the government and the Democratic Party, to manage American policy in such a way that the Soviet empire grew to be the mighty power they desired it to become. They may have thought they were serving world peace or idealism, or the welfare of humanity, or that they were merely promoting their own political or military careers by working harmoniously with an obviously powerful element in the Roosevelt administration. Whatever their motive they created the Soviet empire and then disarmed the United States.

These are the facts, and any difficulty in understanding the motive of such men does not change them. It is not the motives of a prominent man of today but the commitments of an obscure, ambitious careerist of 20 years ago that are decisive. These men still control the dominant faction of the Democratic Party in all questions concerning Russia, and since the President appears to be their intellectual and moral prisoner, there is no possibility of loyal Democrats regaining control of their party.

True, the country does not know this; therefore, foreign policy seems a troublesome issue to many short-sighted Republicans who themselves have rarely thought through the process by which the United States became a groveling suppliant to Chinese and Korean agents of the Soviet Empire. True, the people as a whole know only that Russia has become an immense power and that we have become weak; that ever since 1943 the Soviet Empire has grown constantly stronger and more threatening. But they also know that everything that brings politics into their drily lives—high prices, the draft, Government controls, the Korean casualties, high taxes—in one way or another always comes back to the power and menace of this immense empire and the wordy but altogether ineffective counteractions of the administration. All they know, in essence, is that something is terribly, dangerously wrong.

The problem has not yet the status of a political issue because everyone who raises it is treated as a sorehead, a publicity seeker. It is not a party issue, and until it becomes one the evidence will be rarely printed and more rarely considered. But once it becomes a party issue, the overwhelming evidence placed against the public certainty that it is not right for us to be shamefully weak and the Russians dangerously strong will make it the most powerful political issue in many generations of American politics. Nor can there be any serious doubt about the way the American public would vote on that issue.

From the mere view of party advantage the question, therefore, arises why the Republican Party does not set to work to build this issue—the betrayal of American interests to the Soviet Empire—into the central theme of its 1952 campaign. Surely, say the naive apologists for the administration, if the facts were so damning, the Republican Party would not leave this field to the scattered efforts of a few Senators and Representatives. These apologists overlook the basic fact that in the realities of American politics there is no Republican Party, and until there is a nominee for President whom self-styled Republicans must either repudiate or support, there will be none. Until then, nothing can be a party issue.

REPUBLICANS AGAINST THEMSELVES

There are also two major factions within the Republican Party, the eastern internationalists and the one-time isolationists of the Middle West. That fact explains the reluctance of most prominent Republican politicians to force the issue of foreign policy into the election of 1952.

The difficulty that faces the one-time isolationists in raising this issue is not so grave as that which inhibits the eastern Republicans, but it is still a difficulty. A serious examination of the administration's pro-Soviet policies brings in question the entire policy of the United States in the recent war and even to some extent in the earlier war. It raises the question of war as an instrument of national policy, and this the one-time isolationists desire to avoid. In their hearts they object to the consequences of both wars, but instead of objecting to the political goals toward which the two wars were directed—a distressing, cold-blooded issue to raise in the emotional atmosphere of a democracy—they keep silent about their real grievance and object to war as such. Foreign wars, they see, have involved the United States in manifest disasters, and it is hard for them to credit the reality of a kind of war quite outside their experience. The United States was never before in danger, and they find it difficult to sense that it now is.

So this naturally nationalistic wing of the Republican Party are left in the quagmire of semipacifism because of their fallacious conclusion that no war can be really necessary to the life and welfare of the United States.

Thus they back into approximately the same position that the eastern internationalists occupy frontally and by choice—that no war of national interest should be fought because the purpose of world politics is not national welfare and survival but collective security and international peace.

But it is primarily the eastern internationalists among the Republicans who are unable to make Democratic betrayal to Russia the central issue of the 1952 campaign. These are the Republicans of the suburbs of the large eastern cities. They are by no means all the eastern Republicans, but they are the most vocal and command the most money and the best press. They are not only fearful of a strong nationalistic policy; they would deplore it as morally wrong. They have been well trained by the past literary generation to be more than a little ashamed of their own country and acutely conscious of whether they were fully abreast of the current intellectual style. Since for many years the intellectual fashion has been not only internationalist but even covertly leftist, only a Babbitt could be so hopelessly outdated as to concern himself with gaining crude practical advantages for the United States. That the survival of a state depends on the maintenance of its advantages would be too immoral a fact for them to recognize.

Naturally these Republicans demand that the party nominate a man with internationalist views, who will accept the current clichés of the eastern press and the slick-paper magazines about collective security and international cooperation. They cannot make a real issue of the rise of the Soviet Empire. They cannot admit to themselves that this empire is an immense power and a deadly menace. To do so would not only make nonsense of their pet international theories but establish the sound political judgment of men they have been taught to despise. It simply cannot be made respectable to expose the Soviet Empire and its American apparatus for what they really are. Too many prominent intellectual, literary, and academic figures would emerge tinged with political idiosyncrasy if not with treason. Too many eastern Republican politicians would look imbecilic for sitting on the sidelines through such a gigantic betrayal. If the truth about Hiss was hard for the eastern intelligentsia to take, the truth about the entire Soviet apparatus would be staggering.

BABBITT UP TO DATE

From these basic considerations comes the formula that the Republican candidate must appeal to the "forward-looking elements," the body of "liberal opinion" supposed to be attached to neither party. To do this, of course, he must be an internationalist and possess that vague but indisputable quality of intellectual respectability. He must have no part of the repute of a JOE MARTIN, a MCCARTHY, or even a TAFT. At the moment Eisenhower best fills the bill. The political fallacy of this opinion—which the Republican Party has accepted with known results since 1940—is not in point here, but the real meaning of the definition of the desirable candidate.

What is the practical mechanism for determining what Republican candidates could fill these specifications? Who presumes to speak for the forward-looking elements? Manifestly the liberal commentators of press and radio. Their names are familiar: Elmer Davis, Lippmann, the Alsops, Doris Fleeson, Stokes, Childs, Mellett, Pearson, Eleanor Roosevelt. Beyond these there are a few technically anonymous sources of similar views, the publicly unidentified editors of the Washington Post, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

This group is the generator of what is accepted as liberal and internationalist opinion. Certainly it does not come from such "reactionaries" and enemies of the U. N. as

Fulton Lewis, Pegler, Sokolsky, Lawrence, Sullivan, Frank Kent, the editors of the Washington Times-Herald, the New York News, Chicago Tribune, the Hearst and Scripps-Howard papers. Could these men establish a man as either a liberal or an internationalist?

These two lists contribute the bulk of the political comment reaching almost all of those Americans directly reached by any political comment at all. The first interpretation of political events, the first character estimates of a man, reach public attention through these men and women. Roughly speaking there are no other important sources of political information available to the American people.

Now, since the second group listed above are considered completely reactionary, "liberal" political opinion is confined by simple mathematical elimination to the first group. They and they alone can speak for "liberalism" and the "forward-looking elements."

The question remains concerning intellectual respectability. Who can confer or withhold this label? Who has pictured Senator Vandenberg as a great statesman and Senator TAFT as muddled and reactionary? Who has unceasingly built up George Marshall and unceasingly belittled Forrestal and Louis Johnson? The point is not whether these views of American public men are correct or erroneous, but that they are held by people who think of themselves as liberals and internationalists—including a large group of eastern Republicans. The further point is that these are precisely the estimates of public men which the first group of commentators has promulgated for many years.

These being the sources of "liberal" and "internationalist" public opinion, these being as a whole the group that proclaims who is and who is not intellectually respectable in American politics, it is obvious that, if the Republican Party wants a candidate who conforms to these specifications, he must be a man generally acceptable to this group. Yet these political commentators have for nearly 20 years been almost the intellectual proprietors of the Democratic administration, thereby gaining a public importance that opposition could never have given them. For them to approve any Republican candidate except one foredoomed to defeat or certain to continue the same administration under a different party-label would be well beyond the elastic limits of human nature. Even if there were no question of harmony of political objective, their mere livelihood and public prestige require them to work for the continuance of the same basic administration in Washington.

This is the nettle that the Republican Party must grasp or it will again fritter away its efforts in a senseless, foredoomed election. It cannot have a candidate who will be considered liberal and intellectually respectable unless, like Willkie, he is already a prisoner of the Democratic administration or, like Dewey, doomed by the boredom and indifference of the reactionary Republicans.

Furthermore, if the Republicans want a candidate who will please the "liberal" commentators, what sort of campaign can he wage? For what can he attack the administration that will not bring down their abuse upon him?

Probably he could talk about Government corruption in minor offices—he could not mention the cost of the President's establishment. It is not liberal to get personal in politics except against the enemies of the Soviet Empire. Probably it would be permissible to deplore high taxes and Government expenditures. He could argue for restricted free enterprise and deplore the march toward statism. But can such a campaign win an election? Obviously no one is going to get very angry about it one way or the other. No one is going to feel that it is really vital to cast his vote for the Republicans. Those who do not object to the

present administration are not ignorant of these things. Reminding them of what they already know and discount will gain no votes.

Nor would this sort of campaign be of any use with those opposed to the administration. They, too, are a little cynical about political virtue. It is not for sins but for vast crimes that they detest this administration, even though they sense them rather than know them in precise detail. To go to people who are mortally worried for the life of their country, who are sick with dread at the prospect of the vague disasters that this administration seems to bring ever nearer, to go to these people with chatter about RFC scandals, the need for sound money and a free economy, or with opposition to creeping socialism, or any other superficial, wordy campaign that would not shock the liberal commentators, is simply to conform them in their despair.

THE WAY TO DEFEAT

For the Republican Party to refuse to pitch its whole campaign on the Russian policy of the United States is to insure its defeat. The vast growth of Soviet power is implicit in every problem disturbing Americans. Everyone is aware that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations had something to do with the growth of that power. Some think they deliberately aided its growth, knowingly contrary to the interests of the United States. Others think they honestly miscalculated, honestly blundered, but generally did the best they could. But everyone is aware that Soviet power has become immense. Everyone is aware that this power today is a danger. For the Republicans to ignore this danger, to fail to make it the central thesis of their campaign, is to ignore the only issue to which people will pay serious and consistent attention because it is the only issue they know is real. It is the only issue upon which the Republicans can get enthusiastic voters, and without them the election might as well be conceded.

A campaign on the pro-Soviet record of the Democratic administration would at once be labeled "dirty." It would be the "McCarthyism" so deplored, and so dreaded, by the Democratic high command and by every "liberal" commentator. This might seem on its face to recommend it to the Republicans—as it perhaps does to the bulk of the Party—but it seems to terrify the pundits of eastern republicanism. They are willing to win but not at that price. Yet that price may be the survival of their country.

MacArthur Chosen as Favorite Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Douglas MacArthur is the greatest American of this generation. In spite of his removal from command he is still considered by Joe Stalin as the No. 1 enemy of communism. No smear campaign can shake the faith of our people in General MacArthur. The following is an Associated Press story from New York:

MACARTHUR CHOSEN AS FAVORITE HERO

NEW YORK, September 23.—American boys and girls have picked Gen. Douglas MacArthur over the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Babe Ruth as their favorite hero, past or present, according to a boys athletic league survey.

Salary Increases for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to urge the adoption of H. R. 339, the bill presently under consideration that provides a much-deserved increase for Federal employees who are subject to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, dentists, doctors, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, officers and employees in the Foreign Service, and officers and employees in or under the legislative branch.

Our committee conducted extensive hearings with respect to this legislation as well as the other two bills which were approved by the House on September 20, 1951. It was established that, in order to provide Federal employees with an increase which would offset the increased cost of living since 1939, it would be necessary to provide a 20- to 25-percent increase in salary.

More than one-half of the Federal employees covered by this legislation are today receiving less than \$3,200 per annum. The members of our committee, including myself, believed that a flat increase of \$400 annually, retroactive to July 1 of this year, would offset a major portion of the increased cost of living.

This flat increase would provide a 15- to 20-percent increase for most of the Federal employees who are receiving less than \$3,200 a year.

Never before in the history of our country have Federal employees been called upon to supplement their salaries by seeking additional employment on Saturdays, Sundays, and nights to the extent they are today. In most metropolitan areas private industry pays from \$400 to \$600 more in salaries to their employees occupying comparable positions. I do not believe that the Government service should lag this far behind private industry in the treatment of its employees.

The committee rejected the proposal for a percentage increase on the ground that lower paid employees would not receive an adequate salary adjustment. It is the employee in the lower bracket who is starting out to raise a family and who today is most seriously affected by the increased cost of living. Such employees are entitled to a greater measure of consideration than is accorded those in the higher salary brackets who received more substantial pay increases under the adjustment provided in the Classification Act of 1949.

We in the Congress have a high moral responsibility toward those who work for our Government. They are entitled to more than just a subsistence wage. They are entitled to the same standard of living that others enjoy.

Recently, I have heard many general criticisms concerning Federal employees and the charge has been made that they

are idlers, lack integrity and do not give full measure of work for the pay they receive. Nothing could be further from the truth. These unjust criticisms have a tendency to undermine the morale of Government employees. In many cases this criticism has driven efficient employees from the Government to seek employment in private industry. In addition, this unfair and unwarranted criticism has made it increasingly difficult to attract employees into the Federal Service.

Increases in the compensation of Federal employees cannot be opposed upon such an untenable argument. The \$400 annual increase which is provided for in this legislation is the least that should be granted, in order to make the minimum adjustment which is necessary in the take-home pay of Federal employees.

I trust the Members will support this legislation and not agree to any amendments other than the elimination of Section 1 (e) which provides that nondefense Government agencies should absorb the cost of this legislation within their 1952 budgets. This is an unfair provision which was adopted by our committee by a narrow margin. I am hopeful that the House will eliminate it from this bill. The amendment was designed to reduce the cost of the legislation, but, in fact, it will provide that many of the employees who are entitled to the increases will never receive them. Only by a reduction in personnel will sufficient funds be available, in most nondefense departments and agencies, for the payment of the salary increases provided in the bill. Salary increase legislation should not contain such an unworkable provision.

Use of Atomic Weapons in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent address by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at the Federal Bar Association's dinner in honor of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on September 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be among this distinguished company, and I appreciate your inviting me.

The many members of the legal profession here tonight know what it is to spend weeks writing a law brief, only to find that, when the finished document has at last been placed before the court, its issues and problems cannot be forgotten and still dominate the mind. I happen to have just finished preparing a brief which cost me some months

of work and study—as a matter of fact its roots go back more than half a decade—and I submitted this brief to the United States Senate last week. Since I am human enough still to be thinking about it, perhaps you will permit me to address myself to its subject matter and to expand somewhat upon my remarks to the Senate.

I proposed an atomic army and an atomic navy and an atomic air force, in place of the conventional defenses we now maintain to the tune of fifty or sixty billion dollars a year. I asked that we get about the business of building up our atomic bone and muscle and cutting away what will become excess military fat.

It was my suggestion that we spend at least six billions per year upon atomic energy, and thus for every dollar so spent save \$5 worth of the conventional armaments we will no longer require. I pointed out that atomic weapons actually numbered in thousands or tens of thousands are capable of being made, and if they are mass-produced, each one will come to cost less than a tank. I also pointed out that atomic fire power is hundreds of times cheaper, dollar for dollar, than such ordinary explosives as TNT.

My argument to the Senate was simply this. We can best deter the Kremlin from war, we can best buy time to wage peace, we can best guard our economy against the inroads of limitless military spending, we can best do these things by stepping up our atomic effort at least to the \$6,000,000,000 per-year level and by cutting down our conventional effort to a figure many billions lower than the sixty to eighty billions that otherwise threaten to become the price of survival.

Since my brief is being considered in the court of high strategy at the Pentagon, and in the supreme court of American public opinion, it may be well for me to mention some of the things I did not say. Certainly I did not say, for example, that we can ever afford to do without conventional forces. On the contrary, I expressly stated my belief that, although conventional forces are far more expensive than the atomic weapon, we will always need them. We will always need them if for no other reason than to compel an enemy to mass his troops, and thus convert those troops into a target worth our use of a tactical A-bomb.

Those who would like to think that a future war could be fought in comfort, from the back seat of a Cadillac, will find no support in my remarks.

Neither did I say that the atomic weapon can perform military miracles. On the contrary, I indicated that it is a military white elephant unless delivered accurately on target, and delivery is an expensive and difficult proposition. It is for the very reason the atomic weapon is not magic that I called for its production on a huge scale, just as we would mass produce a superb conventional weapon.

Likewise I declared my opposition to any one-weapon theory of warfare. Because no single type could ever do the military job, I advocate a sweeping variety of atomic weapons, an atomic shell, an atomic mine, missiles with atomic warheads, nuclear-powered submarines, radiological agents, torpedoes with atomic payloads, tactical A-bombs and strategic A-bombs, and, of course, the accomplishment of the most terrible instrument of all, the hydrogen bomb. We must have one atomic model that makes unnecessary a hundred depth charges, another that takes the place of a thousand bazookas, yet another that would substitute for TNT stacked as high as Pike's Peak.

Only thus can we bring about a real revolution in deterring power; only thus can we be sure of buying time in which to multiply our efforts for peace.

By the same logic I hold no bias in favor of the Army or the Navy or the Air Force

as the service ideally suited to use atomic weapons. As I put it to the Senate, we must have truly balanced, well-rounded, and versatile forces, with each arm equipped to exploit the atom to the utmost.

Today the United States Atomic Energy Commission has in being or under development or study literally dozens of different types and kinds of special purpose atomic weapon models. Some are for one branch of the service, some for another, some for all three. This is just as it should be.

In my Senate address, I deliberately avoided any reference to the nuclear-powered aircraft. Such an aircraft, I believe, is feasible. It will become a reality in the future. But it is not sufficiently immediate—not near enough on the horizon—to be included in the picture of an atomic army and an atomic navy and an atomic air force that I tried to paint. For similar reasons I deliberately avoided referring to possible tactical uses of the hydrogen bomb. These, too, are something which any realist must anticipate in coming years. Yet I wanted to bridle over backward in confining myself to the weapons and strategy and tactics and timetables that are visible, not in any way remotely, but soon.

The so-called wonder weapons I am talking about are not something to be fulfilled in the dim and misty future. They are not something today little more than a gleam in the eye of scientist wizards. They are down-to-earth hardware proven, demonstrated, and confirmed under combat conditions 6 years ago at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They are practical gadgets actually proof-tested at Bikini and Eniwetok and Las Vegas—or to be proof-tested this fall and next winter and next summer and the year after.

You may ask me this question: If I am right in holding that we can purchase far more security at far less cost by stressing atomic energy, why were we forced to appropriate \$60,000,000,000 in the present fiscal year for national defense? My answer to you is quite simple: Except for the atomic stockpile already in existence and already planned, I estimate that we would have been compelled to spend as much as \$100,000,000,000 upon conventional forces in order to balance and checkmate Russia's armed power. Already the 3 cents in the military dollar we now devote to atomic weapons buys 25 or 50 cents worth of security. That is why I propose we multiply our atomic program; a mere 3 cents in the military dollar for our best and cheapest weapon impresses me as unreasonably and imprudently small.

Of course, I must caution that our Armed Forces cannot fight on promises alone. They cannot fight in 1952 with atomic material which will not exist until 1954. There is a lead time of about 3 years involved here—3 years before atomic plants and factories begun today can start producing the end product. In the meanwhile our conventional forces must be maintained at a level consistent with the likelihood of war and the threat from Russia.

But as early as next year important savings can be made—by cutting back upon the conventional arms and the conventional forces which themselves would not be ready for 3 years. The year after next, still greater savings are feasible on the same basis, until the transition from conventional to atomic defenses is complete.

What I propose is basically as simple as using gunpowder instead of crossbows, steamships instead of sailing ships, machine guns instead of muskets, tanks instead of horsemen. It is inevitable that atomic firepower will someday replace conventional firepower in American's arsenal. I want this process speeded up and accelerated. For the sake of the free world's security, for the sake of preventing war, for the sake of rescuing our people from the enlarging burden of debt and taxation, I want the United

States to put aside costly preatomic defenses and take up the cheap superweapons that forced imperial Japan to surrender with millions of troops still in the field and still undefeated.

The way to start such a program is to start it. The way to get ahead is to make sure that at least six billions for atomic munitions is available next year. Work upon the added atomic plants must start at once.

This is the best weapon we have got. Let us make the most of it just as fast as we can. If we do, we can save important amounts next year, bigger amounts the year after, and still more the year after that.

As a matter of fact, we have no choice whatever but to build our defenses around the split atom. Here is the only way we can fully exploit our superior science and technology and industrial know-how. It is in this area that we enjoy a clear-cut advantage over the potential enemy. In sheer bone-crushing manpower—in the ordinary conventional weapons—the Soviets have a giant capacity to generate military power. There is no certainty that we could forever match them tank for tank, gun for gun, division for division. But in the atomic type of competition where it is brain against brain, test tube against test tube, process against process—we can continue to outstrip the Soviets and deter them from war as far as the eye can see into an uncertain future.

Stalin, observing our advantage in the atomic field, had sought through propaganda to disarm us of that advantage. He has sought to convince the world that his best weapon, the conventional Red army, is highly moral whereas our best weapon, the unconventional atomic bomb, is highly immoral. We would be less than honest with ourselves if we did not recognize that Stalin's propaganda has had a measure of success.

One reason for this success is a belief that the atomic weapon must inevitably destroy the guilty and the innocent alike—that in knocking out a war plant it also knocks out noncombatants. Actually our military men have always regarded the bomb as a precision weapon to be used only against specific targets vital to the enemy war machine. If any proof were needed, it may be found in the fact that we spend as much as \$250,000 on each bomb-sight—so that in war, we could aim with precise accuracy at a precise military objective.

But do you think that the citizens of a slave state, knowing their dictator had launched an aggressive war, would remain in the vicinity of a crucial war plant? Would they report for work despite their knowledge that the plant might well attract an atomic bomb? Or would they seek refuge in safer surroundings—far from the centers of war production?

I would expect freemen to stick at their industrial posts. I would expect the citizens of a democracy to confront any peril without flinching. But I would also expect the members of a slave state, unless chained by their lathes, to put as much distance as possible between themselves and any vital munitions works servicing an aggressive war machine.

Apart from these factors, however, a stepped-up atomic program in the United States means stepped-up ability to strike at enemy troops—at soldiers in uniform. Such a program can reduce the phony appeal of Stalin's propaganda to the effect that atomic weapons are only good against civilians.

This leads me to the problem of deterring not only a big war but little wars as well. Along with Winston Churchill I believe that our already existing atomic stockpile has been the main factor in preventing Stalin from starting a full-fledged global conflict. But the atomic stockpile has not prevented Stalin from starting little conflicts in Greece and Indochina and the Malay States and Korea.

There are those who tell us that we must constantly maintain huge outmoded forces like those used in World War II—just to win the little conflicts. If this theory is right, we can never hope to hold down the military budget—we can never hope to survive at bearable cost.

I believe that we can work to the point where cheap atomic weapons will help us deter or win the little wars no less than the big war. I believe that the time will come, if we set about to make it come, when the tactical A-bomb in great numbers and wide varieties can hold at bay whatever small armies threaten to attack anywhere along the margins of Communist power.

By the same logic the defense of Western Europe appears in a fresh and hopeful light. People on the Continent have long feared that, if war came, the Red army would overrun their homes and cities. They have been horrified at the thought of being first occupied by Russia and then liberated by the United States after a fearful struggle across the broken remnants of European civilization. Now our friends abroad may hope to keep out and hurl back the Red army, not only with their own troops and planes but also with the help of the tactical atom.

Former Secretary of Defense Marshall, in one of his last actions before leaving, officially assured me that the potentialities of future improved weapons in defending Western Europe are under close and continuous study by our military planners, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as General Eisenhower. With the aid of atomic energy we may truly anticipate the date when, at minimum money cost, the forces of freedom will own the power to contain and defeat any thrust from the East.

There is another tactical use for atomic bombs which I must mention because it may well turn out to be our best shield and protection against an aggressor's atomic attack upon America's own cities. The United States Air Force has officially announced that it cannot hope to intercept and shoot down more than 30 percent of enemy planes carrying atomic weapons to America. Our civil-defense program, although dangerously lagging today for want of appropriations, is another means of partially coping with the enemy's atomic threat. There remains the method of launching a rapid and massive atomic counterattack directly at the bases and military springboards from which the aggressor strikes. The lives of millions of Americans might be spared if, before an enemy could loose atomic destruction upon them, his own offensive force were itself crippled with American atomic bombs.

But there is another and pleasanter reason why I advocate that we step up atomic production. The material used in bombs is the very same material which can also be used to fuel the peacetime industrial reactors that will drive dynamo and propel commercial ships. Plutonium and U-235—the stuff of atomic weapons—never become obsolete either for military purposes or for peaceful purposes. Each pound of this material which we acquire is a precious asset which not only makes us strong from a defense viewpoint but which also promises startling progress under conditions of peace—if we can achieve peace.

By concentrating upon the reactors which help produce atomic energy material, we take out know-how insurance for peace as well as for war.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a strange and somber world in which we must all ponder military issues the better to wage peace. It is a sad paradox that hideous atomic weapons offer themselves as the instrument to serve our noblest purpose—detering Stalin until at last his enslaved millions break their

chains and join hands with us in peaceful progress and brotherhood.

It is not for the defense of ourselves alone that we must multiply atomic production. Neither is it only for the defense of the free world. It is to gain time for all men of good will, on both sides of the iron curtain—time for them to unite in a common struggle against the tyranny of the Kremlin.

The earth's peoples must be told that an expanded atomic program is a reluctant alternative forced upon us by the aggressive attitude of the Kremlin, that our first desire is for peace.

The sole source of our danger lies in the fact that the Russian people may believe the lies of the Soviet Government that we are plotting to destroy them. If we take away this weapon of fear from the Kremlin leaders, if the Russian people are convinced of our peaceful intentions, the Soviet Government will never be able to undertake a war of aggression against us. The Soviet strategists continually denounce us as warmongers to keep their people in line.

In expanding our atomic program, we must again remind the world that the first and basic objective of our foreign policy is peace. We must again remind the world that these hideous weapons can be stripped from the arsenals of nations just as soon as the Kremlin masters decide that they want peace instead of war.

We can be sure that the word "peace" pays terrific dividends because the Communists use it constantly. They have convinced many thousands of honest people, who should be our friends, that we are imperialists plotting aggression and war.

If the world misunderstands our motives and our purposes, it is our duty to set the record straight. I believe that the announcement of a dynamic and generous peace program by us will be the finest weapon we can use in the struggle against Communist warmongering. I believe that if we talk peace, the peoples of the earth will believe us.

One place to talk peace is in the General Assembly of the United Nations, scheduled to meet next November in Paris. There let us galvanize the world through the boldness and sincerity of our insistence upon a fresh attack against the twin evils of our time—poverty and war.

I want to close by quoting four lines from *The Arsenal of Springfield*, by Longfellow:

"Were half the power that fills the world
with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps
and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from
error,
There were no need of arsenals and forts."

Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time when attention is being focused on the problems of Italy through the visit of her great leader, Premier Alcide de Gasperi, it is fitting that the Member's attention be drawn to the following resolutions on the Italian Peace Treaty and the return of Trieste

to Italy which were recently adopted by the grand lodge of the State of New Jersey, Order of Sons of Italy in America.

As the sponsor of the House Joint Resolution 224, Eighty-second Congress, urging that the Government of Italy be relieved of its obligations under the harsh treaty of peace of 1947, I am deeply gratified at the declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France as to their willingness to renounce those provisions which hamper Italy's cooperation in western defenses. I know that the members of the Grand Lodge of the State of New Jersey, Order of Sons of Italy in America, and all the other American citizens and groups who have been demanding the revision of the unfair peace treaty are most happy at this recognition of Italy's hard-earned right to a position of equality in the freedom-loving family of nations. Those of us who have been striving for revision of the treaty have acted in acknowledgment of the fact that, as Premier de Gasperi pointed out in his eloquent address to the Congress, "an effective and most staunch alliance cannot exist without equality of rights and full recognition of the independence, sovereignty and dignity of a nation." It is in the common interest of all the members of the free world that no member be prevented from doing its full share in the common defense. It is therefore essential that an equitable solution to the Trieste issue based on the Anglo-French-American declaration of 1948 be reached so as to strengthen the unity and defense of Western Europe.

The text of the resolutions approved by the grand lodge follows:

Whereas our Government together with the Governments of Great Britain and France solemnly and spontaneously promised in March 1948, the return of Trieste to Italy, having recognized the unquestionable "Italianity" of that city, and

Whereas irrespective of the convenience of drawing Tito of Yugoslavia to our side, for which there is, however, no firm guaranty in the future, and

Whereas justice, democracy, and the will of the inhabitants of that territory impose upon our Government the moral obligation to fulfill its pledge to Italy, and

Whereas by now urging Italy to settle the Trieste problem through direct negotiations with Yugoslavia, our Government fails to carry out its solemn pledge. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on the 7th, 8th and 9th days of September 1951, at the Forty-seventh Annual Convention of the Grand Lodge of the State of New Jersey, Order of Sons of Italy in America, held at Atlantic City, N. J., that the grand lodge of New Jersey (with membership of 8,600 persons) respectively urge the President of the United States and the Congress to reassure Italy for the United States without reservation and without qualifications that Trieste shall be reunited to its motherland, thus strengthening the resolve of the Italian people to share with us in all the sacrifices which both the United States and Italy will be called upon to make as members of the North Atlantic Pact; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the

United States Senate, to the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and the Secretary of State of the United States.

Whereas the Italian Peace Treaty is a gross miscarriage of justice and contrary to every principle of fair play for which the United States stands; and

Whereas the material and moral assistance of Italy is necessary to combat the evil of communism; and

Whereas Italy cannot give such assistance if she is to remain chained and shackled by said peace treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on the 7th, 8th, and 9th days of September 1951, at the Forty-seventh Annual Convention of the Grand Lodge of the State of New Jersey, Order of Sons of Italy in America, held at Atlantic City, N. J., that the grand lodge of New Jersey (with a membership of 8,600 persons) respectfully urge the President of the United States and the members of the Senate of the United States, to bring about the revision of said peace treaty so as to accord by its terms a more humane, reasonable, practicable and just consideration of most important matters which are of importance not only to Italy, but to all democratic nations; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Secretary of State of the United States, and to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, chairman, Crusade for Freedom. The Crusade for Freedom merits the support of all the people of the free world in our constant fight against communism. General Clay's fine address is a clear, forceful statement of the background and purpose of the crusade. I commend its reading to my colleagues.

Mr. Attorney General, General Parker, and friends, I am very grateful that you have come here today and that I have the opportunity to tell you a little bit about this Crusade for Freedom. It is a very simple story that I have to tell you, and I only hope that you can get some of the thrill out of that story that it has meant to me.

When the war ended in 1945, we didn't feel it necessary to embark upon a propaganda program because we had reason to believe that we were approaching a world of peace. Those of us in Europe soon found that a great wave of propaganda was coming from Eastern Europe, dominated by Communist thinking, purchased by Soviet money, as a part of the campaign to penetrate politically and to capture politically all of Europe.

In those days we had no Voice of America. Fortunately, our Government soon saw the wisdom of conducting a campaign of truth to dispel the campaign of falsehood, and the Voice of America was most effective in stemming the tide. However, it could not do it alone. It was the voice of Government, and as the voice of Government it had to operate within the rules of Government, within the dignity of Government.

In Germany we found that the Soviets were using their German puppets to speak to the German people, and that it was very difficult, indeed, to counteract their voices with foreign voices. Thus, as early as 1945 we started on a little program of our own in Berlin. There the great radio station Berlin was in Soviet hands. All we had was a 2½-kilowatt generator, which could only be heard by those who would hook their receivers onto their telephone wires. We expanded and increased the power of this set until we finally had a very powerful 50-kilowatt set, which was able to meet the voice of Radio Berlin. On this station we used selected Germans, Germans who had proven their faith in freedom and democracy by combating Hitler, and through those Germans we carried a message to East Germany which, in a subsequent poll, proved that our radio-band list had increased from 15 percent to 85 percent of the listeners who could be reached in the poll. This was a slugging match.

When I came home in 1949, I felt that there needed to be something else to complement the Voice of America, that there needed to be free radio stations in Europe to be used by those who had escaped from behind the iron curtain and who could, in their own language, describe to their fellow countrymen the life which existed in free countries.

I found in New York that a group of men under the leadership of former Ambassador Grew had developed the same thought and had created the National Committee for Free Europe for this purpose. It had been able to secure some funds from foundations and from a few individuals. However, to be effective, it needed the mass support of the American people. And thus was launched the Crusade for Freedom, the symbol of the crusade being the freedom bell, for throughout the world all time the bell has been the rally sound of people who were struggling for their existence. It has the same significance throughout the world.

Last year, as the Attorney General has said to you, 16,000,000 people signed the scroll of freedom and contributed over \$1,300,000, all of which went into the erection of Radio Munich, the most powerful radio station in all of Europe. In addition to Radio Munich, a short-wave station is operating at all times. However, the power behind that station is insufficient for it to override the effort of the Soviet and satellite countries to prevent it from reaching would-be listeners.

We need—and we need badly—two more stations as powerful as Radio Munich, one of which will be beamed 11½ hours a day, as is Radio Munich, to Czechoslovakia and to Hungary; the other will be beamed to Poland. We are already assembling staffs of Hungarians and Poles, recognized in their own countries, who will become the staffs of these broadcasting stations. In fact, we have so much confidence in what the American people will do that we have already ordered the equipment for these two radio stations.

Just a few days ago, we tried another experiment. It is very difficult for people living behind the iron curtain to know where to turn on their dial and when to turn on their radio to hear the radio stations of the

free world, not only the Voice of America and of Radio Free Europe, but BBC, the French radio, and many other of the European radios who are continually giving programs in the interest of freedom. Therefore, we printed these messages, on one side a message of freedom subscribed to by representative organizations from the free countries, and on the other side a radio schedule of the frequencies and times of all radio broadcasts in Europe. After careful experimenting, we had found that balloons could be used under the proper meteorological conditions to carry these messages within a comparatively short distance or within the area in which it was desired that they be placed. We have released experimentally one set of these balloons over Czechoslovakia, and we have just released another set over Poland. We already know from the underground that the balloons and the messages reached their destination and that thousands of the cards have escaped Soviet capture and have been distributed among the Czech people. We know that eight Soviet airplanes have been assigned the task of shooting these balloons down to prevent them from reaching their destination.

The Soviet fire and fury against Radio Free Europe, to which the Attorney General referred, and their action against the balloons is, to my mind, an indication of how effective these tools are. I might add that this year we are also organizing to undertake a similar program in Asia.

Once again I would like to make it clear that there is no competition between Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America. The Voice of America is essential; it has done a splendid job. It cannot be operated except with the dignity of government. It could not send balloons into a friendly country. The Crusade for Freedom has no such inhibitions. We can undertake the down-to-earth slugging contest. We can use the people known by the people behind the iron curtain to corroborate the story carried by the Voice of America.

I would like to say briefly that there are specific advantages to be gained from this program. Perhaps they are intangible, but nevertheless they are real. We must remember that in the satellite countries freedom ceased to exist in 1939. Many of those who knew freedom and who loved freedom have disappeared, first in the concentration camps of Hitler and now in the concentration camps of Stalin. Thousands of others have had to flee their countries to save their lives. That means that the younger generation knows of freedom only as it hears it from the outside. That means that if freedom is to be kept alive in these countries we must reach these young people. That we have done so is proved by the many evidences which we received from the underground. Suffice it to say that if war came tomorrow, the carrying of information behind the iron curtain has developed conditions under which, instead of being able to rely on hundreds of thousands of satellite troops, those troops, and perhaps additional Russian troops, would have to be maintained in striking distance of the satellite countries instead of being used in the war. And when stability comes, when it becomes apparent that there can be no hostile movement of troops against any country unless it is met with troops from other countries, then indeed these voices will have the opportunity to be raised to demand free elections, to restore democracy in the countries which have lost democracy.

Hope is essential to those who would still fight for freedom, and the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe combined to carry this hope. I would only like to add one thing. To be personal is perhaps bad taste, and yet

I hope you will forgive me. I have been a singularly lucky person, and within my life I have received honors far beyond merit for any services I may have rendered. When I heard the first voice over Radio Free Europe, a Czech voice, carrying a message to Czechoslovakia, and I knew that I was one of the 16,000,000 Americans who had made that possible, it was the most satisfying experience of my life. I do not apologize to anyone in asking them to help the Crusade for Freedom or to join the Crusade for Freedom, for if we believe in freedom, we are willing to do our part. And if we are willing to do our part, it is a high privilege to become a crusader in the cause of freedom.

My Report on the Japanese Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, days have merged into weeks since the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco. Many of the other congressional observers have already reported on their impressions of what took place there. I have not. The implications of that treaty are so serious, so far-reaching, that it is difficult, even at this date, to bring its full significance into view.

At the outset, it is necessary to understand that the participating signatory nations foregathered at San Francisco for one purpose, and for only one purpose: To sign the Japanese Peace Treaty. The negotiations, the give-and-take, the concessions, the reservations—in fact all the preliminaries which go with the arrangement of a treaty—had been taking place between these nations for at least a year; perhaps for longer than a year. There was to be no debate at San Francisco. There were to be no amendments, no changes, at San Francisco.

What took place in the great west coast city can, and should be designated as "the above-surface phase of the Japanese Peace Treaty." We—the Congress and the people of the United States—know what happened during this phase. We do not know what happened during the below-surface phase, during which the treaty was slowly built into what emerged at San Francisco.

Let us examine briefly what we know before calling attention to what we do not know.

The signing of the treaty went almost according to plan. I say "almost" because the attitude of the Government of India, to whom this Congress and this Government had just granted a multi-million dollar "famine" loan, cast a shadow over the preliminaries.

Russia opposed the signing. Whether or not this expected move was made to encourage or discourage the swift acceptance of the treaty by this Republic is still a matter of conjecture. Russia has often employed the "double bluff" in its diplomacy. That is: It starts by opposing something which it really advocates.

Then, when the other nations—accustomed to resisting all Communist moves—rush to do what they think Russia does not want, they do exactly what Russia does want them to do.

As expected, the Soviet satellites echoed—almost word for word—the speeches of the Soviet delegation.

The alert listeners, the colorful participants, the precisionlike presiding of our Secretary of State, the tensions, the exchanges—the entire meeting—was ably, yes brilliantly, covered by American press, radio, and television.

Millions of Americans, and other millions of Europeans and Asiatics—through American informational media—were familiar with the palatial California home which housed the Soviet delegates, the very features of the chief British spokesman, and every word spoken in public by the presiding officer.

Truly, in the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, America had once again produced "the greatest show on earth."

Yet, with all of this tinsel, there was real triumph and real tragedy at the Japanese Peace Treaty meeting.

The triumph may well be that 49 nations have aligned themselves against further Soviet encroachment in the Pacific. That could still be a false triumph if Congress should learn some day that, of these 49 nations, the United States would have to carry more than 90 percent of the load of expendable men and money in future Pacific wars as we are today carrying in Korea.

The tragedy of San Francisco was and is that Gen. Douglas MacArthur—the prime factor in current good relations between Japan and the United States—was absent. It was General MacArthur who ably beat Japan, the enemy, to her knees. It was General MacArthur who governed Japan wisely and well in the interval between World War II and the Korean war. It was General MacArthur who, up to the time his abrupt dismissal, had kept communism in Japan at constant ebbtide.

General MacArthur, aside from the invitational difficulties advanced by our State Department, had his own reasons for staying away from San Francisco.

These are my general observations on what took place at the Japanese Peace Treaty meeting. What, then, are my specific recommendations?

My specific recommendations are:

First. Congress and the people should know the whole truth about the Japanese Peace Treaty; not the partial truth.

Second. The treaty should not be approved hastily. Every paragraph, every sentence, every word must be carefully scrutinized to prevent the lot of the American people from becoming increasingly difficult to endure.

Third. General MacArthur should be called to testify before open committee sessions of the appropriate congressional committee or committees upon the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Fourth. The treaty should not be approved if it gives Formosa to the Chinese Reds, or, in any other way, breaks up

the existing perimeter of our Pacific defenses against the encroachments of the Soviet Union.

Fifth. The treaty should not be approved if it carries any specific or implied promise that Red China should be admitted to the United Nations. Such an admission might bring Red China into membership on the Security Council.

Sixth. The treaty should not be approved if it makes our one-time ally, Chiang Kai-shek, an international outlaw.

If and when Congress and the people are satisfied that it is not a second Yalta, then, and then only, should the Japanese Peace Treaty be approved in the way our Constitution provides.

Whether the Japanese Peace Treaty is approved or whether it is rejected, let everything that is done be done openly, for all the people to see and understand. It has been 6 years from VJ-day, September 2, 1945, to September 21, 1951. If this treaty is a right thing, those who made it should not be ashamed of it. If it is a wrong thing, boys who are only 12 years old today should have the chance to know why, in 1957, they will be called upon to die.

The Greatness of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to call to the attention of my colleagues the following speech delivered by Mr. Millard Cass, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor and executive secretary of the National Labor-Management Manpower Policy Committee, at a Labor Day banquet in Henryetta, Okla., September 3, 1951.

I am particularly pleased to include in the RECORD this address by Mr. Cass, who is a former classmate of mine at the University of Virginia Law School:

THE GREATNESS OF AMERICA

(By Millard Cass)

Labor Day is a good time to take stock of ourselves.

We in the United States have made more progress in 200 years than the world made in the preceding 6,000 years.

For many centuries man has fought for food and freedom. Yet throughout thousands of years he failed to achieve either goal.

In 200 years we have achieved a standard of living that is the wonder of the entire world.

We have harnessed the forces of nature to do our bidding. * * *

We have conquered time and distance. We have taken the chains off the back of man and put them on nature. Man is now the driver rather than the driven.

We in the United States did not invent or even develop all of the great devices that make life easy for us. We do, however, make

more of them, use more of them, and distribute them more widely than any other people. The average American enjoys more luxuries and takes for granted more necessities than the wealthy people of other lands can obtain under any circumstances.

We in the United States have only 6 percent of the world's land area and 7 percent of the world's population. Yet we own: 72 percent of the world's automobiles, 58 percent of the world's telephones, 53 percent of the world's radios and television sets, 30 percent of the world's railway mileage; and we consume: 50 percent of the world's rayon, 43 percent of the world's rubber, 55 percent of the world's coffee, 47 percent of the world's steel, 54 percent of the world's oil, 42 percent of the world's aluminum, 38 percent of the world's cement, 25 percent of the world's sugar.

Two-thirds of the world's population have yet to enjoy what we regard as the simplest needs of civilization. They have barely enough to eat to sustain life. Their diet usually lacks food elements essential to health. Malnutrition is general and starvation common. Hospitals are few and badly overcrowded. Poor sanitation and an acute shortage of doctors, nurses, and drugs give these people an average life term of only 30 years. Illiteracy is widespread. Agricultural methods are primitive, and industry is practically nonexistent.

Our advances have not been limited to material things. We have more churches, schools, and libraries than any other nation. There is more laughter and singing here than anywhere else. There are friendliness, good will, brotherhood, and human sympathy among us. We give freely to any worthy cause. We forgive our enemies quickly and generously after the battle is over—be it an athletic contest or a war. We believe deeply and sincerely in the dignity of the individual. We have recently made great progress toward tolerance and understanding toward eliminating prejudice and discrimination. We are a deeply religious and moral people.

Why have we achieved so much more than the rest of the world? Why have we made material progress that dwarfs the accomplishments of other nations? * * *

We here in the United States have been greatly blessed * * *. We have abundant natural resources, a temperate climate, and, in general, all the natural advantages. * * *. We have a large country with lots of space. We have not yet faced the population problems that have beset others. We are separated by thousands of miles of ocean from the problems and misunderstandings that have plagued the Old World. We have been very lucky. For these blessings of God we are very grateful and very humble.

There are other countries, however, that also have been blessed with great natural resources and natural advantages. Yet over thousands of years they have not equaled the development that we have achieved in the short period of our history. We have become the greatest Nation on earth, while many of them are underdeveloped and backward areas.

There must be something, therefore, besides natural advantages which has been responsible for our great development. It is that something in which we can take pride.

I believe we owe our remarkable progress to a number of factors: It is our great democratic system, with its emphasis upon the rights of the individual, and the responsibility of Government officials to the voters. It is our freedom of speech, press, and religion. It is the supremacy of the civilian authority over the military. It is our free-enterprise economy, with its incentive for initiative and reward for achievement. It is hard work, perseverance, integrity, cooperation, and a sense of responsibility. It is the

fact that we had to work for what we got—that we had to carve our Nation from the wilderness. It is that we are a country of small homesteads instead of great feudal estates. It is our strong, free, democratic trade-unions which have encouraged industrial efficiency and promoted industrial democracy. It is that our country was founded and peopled by men and women who came here especially to live in a democratic society with a free and dynamic economy.

We have the most diverse population in the world. We are, as President Truman recently reminded us, a Nation of immigrants. Our attitude was once expressed by President Coolidge: "Whether one traces his Americanism back 3 centuries to the *Mayflower* or 3 years to the steerage is not half so important as whether his Americanism of today is real and genuine." Immigrants helped us grow strong and great. They made invaluable contributions in every field of endeavor. They helped teach us how to live at peace with all groups, all races, all creeds, and all nationalities.

We have succeeded also because we have realized that freedom requires sacrifices. You must give to get. You must pay for liberty—sometimes with work, sometimes with blood.

Our way of life has passed the tests of peace and war, prosperity and depression. Our political and economic systems have stood the test of time. They have accommodated themselves to changing technological conditions. Established in the age of hand labor, they have been equally effective in meeting the needs of our highly mechanized way of life. Our political and economic systems have * * * adjusted themselves to the changed relationships that grow out of being neighbors to people who once were 6 months away. * * *

The fact that our enterprise has remained free does not mean it has been unrestrained and uncontrolled. It has been regulated when the public interest required. We created national banks, put the control of our mails in the National Government, established free public schools, and restrained unfair competition and monopoly. We developed a national system of old-age pensions and created Federal-State systems of public employment services and unemployment insurance. We provided control of railroads, shipping companies, and airlines, inspected mines and meat, developed crop limitations where needed and farm subsidies where required. We established a public health service. * * *. We have set standards for the wages, hours, and working conditions of persons employed on many Federal contracts. * * *. We have Federal control of atomic energy. Public utilities, corporations, and insurance companies are subject to regulation. Municipalities frequently own their water supply, gas resources, electric power, or transportation systems.

As you can see, our economy is not absolutely free. Nevertheless, both our economy and our speech are the freest of any organized society in the world. Our great strength lies in our ability to limit them only where necessary and to restrict them only when the welfare of the public requires. In other words, we have adapted our democracy and our economy to meet the changing needs of the times, but we have maintained their essential character of freedom. That is why individual initiative has flourished under them, but individual greed has not been allowed to strangle them. We have remained freemen, politically and economically.

It is sometimes good for us to take a look at what American workers, American businessmen, and American farmers have achieved. * * *

No real champion ever rested on his laurels, however. That is true of the American

people. We are way out in front of the world. But we are still striving for a better way of life for all our people. We have the best Nation on earth, but it is not perfect. We shall, therefore, continue to try to improve the lot of all Americans.

Our production is still not large enough to satisfy our demands in peace or war. Small business needs continuing protection from monopolies. Too many of our people lack the benefits of our modern civilization. We are robbing our children of their heritage by wasting our natural resources. Millions of families are living in housing below our American standards. Millions more share their homes with others. Too many people are needlessly injured or killed at work and at play. The best medical care is out of the reach of many millions of our citizens. Consequently, the general health of our people has not kept pace with the remarkable progress of medical science. Our schools in many areas are too crowded and inadequately staffed. We still have too much child labor. We have a large amount of crime. The fruits of our great development are often denied to Americans because of prejudice and intolerance. In all of these areas there is room for great improvement. They are areas in which we should concentrate on making progress. If the past is any key to the future, I am sure we shall overcome our defects.

We find ourselves in a paradoxical situation. We are, on the one hand, confronted by the possibility of the most destructive war in the history of the world. On the other hand, we are on the threshold of * * * mastery of nature and ourselves. This situation is readily illustrated by the development of atomic energy. It has brought with it terror throughout much of the world. It has also brought with it real and valuable advantages.

Atomic energy can be used to preserve life or to destroy it—to produce medicine or to produce missiles.

We have already received numerous benefits from atomic energy.

Some of the most significant are in the fields of biology and medicine. For example, scientists have used radiiodine to treat people with an overactive thyroid gland. Surgeons have used radiophosphorous to locate brain tumors. The same radioisotope, phosphorous, has curbed excessive production of red blood corpuscles and has gained some degree of relief for patients with leukemia. * * *. Radioisotopes are proving of great value as "tracers," helping scientists to understand life processes and mechanisms which have been only partly understood until now. * * *

Much progress has also been made in the field of agriculture. Largely through atomic energy, more has been learned about fertilizers and their application in the last 3 years than in the previous 50. We are using radiocarbon to study how plants manufacture sugar from carbon dioxide and water with the aid of the sunlight. Radioisotopes are being used in research on plant diseases. * * *

In the industrial field, we have developed a very simple technique for measuring the thickness of materials. This offers economies to the manufacturer and better quality to the users. Lubricating oils have been improved by better understanding of what a lubricating oil does in minimizing friction. * * *. And, of course, there is the potential development of atomic power for industrial use.

On the other hand, we are developing newer and more terrible bombs and other weapons. Considerable progress has been made in the development of atomic engines, to propel submarines. * * *. There have been preliminary proposals to look into the

possibility of the dual production of cheap power and plutonium for weapons. And, as you know, the Atomic Energy Commission is carrying out the directive of the President to look into the possibility of building a hydrogen bomb.

We are trying to prepare simultaneously for defense and for peace. * * * The field of atomic energy alone gives you some idea of the kind of world in which we could live if peace were assured. I hope that, unlike Moses on Mount Nebo, we shall journey into that promised land.

We are on the threshold of the greatest era since the dawn of civilization. Life can be made rich, full, healthful, and happy for mankind. The future has great hope and great promise. Given peace, we can look toward horizons unlimited. All of us must work and strive for peace. In a world in which communism exists, any peace must be based upon strength—political, economic, and military. That is why we are arming for peace. That is why we are producing for defense. * * * We are the most powerful and most advanced country. The world looks to us for leadership. We are as aware of our responsibility as we are of our power. We are prepared to lead the world to peace through the United Nations. We can only hope that the whole world will join with us.

In Mussolini's Steps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of this body should read the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald and see how it deals with the recent action of the administration in seeking to control the press of this country. The editorial appeared in the World-Herald on Friday, September 21, 1951, and is as follows:

IN MUSSOLINI'S STEPS

Freedom of the press is greatly cherished in America and is widely regarded as the strongest bulwark of all the other freedoms.

For that reason nobody, not even the lefties in Washington, ventures to attack it openly. Occasionally, however, little men who have been irritated by editorial criticism come up with snide and roundabout plans for limiting the press.

One such is now in the works. It is sponsored by the Office of Price Stabilization.

Under the present economic stabilization law, advertising is considered a proper business expense, and must be acknowledged as such by the OPS when it figures its price ceilings. The amount of advertising that may be done by each company, and charged as a part of the cost of its products, is left strictly to the judgment of the responsible executives of that company.

That system has proved irksome to some of the OPS bureaucrats.

They have asked Congress to give them the power to decide how much advertising each company under its supervision may charge to its selling cost.

Theoretically, of course, this law would affect only nonjournalistic enterprises. That's the slick part of it. In practice it would give the bureaucracy the right to decide how much advertising revenue news-

papers, magazines radio and television stations, or any other medium of expression, might receive.

As the Chicago Tribune recently pointed out, when Mussolini grabbed power in Italy, one of the first things he did was to limit the amount of money Italian business could spend on advertising. That wiped out freedom of the press in Italy. From that time on, until the dictator finally was strung up by the heels, every Italian newspaper and radio station was under the Fascist thumb.

You say it couldn't happen here?

Why not? Bureaucrats are alike the world around, and they easily become drunk with power. This one ill-advised law, if passed by Congress and approved by the Supreme Court, might be used in such a way as to force the entire American press to surrender to the administration or go bankrupt.

Know Your Waterways—Dangerous Neglect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the Record, I wish to submit an article from the Washington Post published by the Marine News, New York, N. Y., as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—DANGEROUS NEGLECT

With a coast line (Great Lakes included) of more than 30,000 miles the Nation has less than 200 improved harbors, and many of these have insufficient area and depth.

Of the \$498,382,400 total provided for the Corps of Engineers in the Army Civil Functions Appropriation Act passed on June 14, only \$14,164,500, about 3 percent, is for actual harbor and channel development at these 15 locations along a 30,000-mile coast line and at one point in Alaska:

Wrangell Narrows, Alaska.....	\$247, 000
San Diego River and Mission Bay, Calif.....	510, 000
Intracoastal waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.....	2, 150, 000
Savannah Harbor, Ga.....	370, 000
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.....	775, 000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Algiers route).....	3, 900, 000
Baltimore Harbor and channels, Md.....	800, 000
Fall River Harbor, Mass.....	200, 000
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic River, N. J.....	690, 000
New York and New Jersey Channels.....	1, 414, 000
Hudson River Channel, N. Y.....	250, 000
New York Harbor, N. Y., entrance channels and anchorage areas.....	400, 000
Houston ship channel, Tex.....	500, 000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Galveston District).....	800, 000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.....	465, 000
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla.....	693, 500
Total.....	14, 164, 500

Two projects recommended by the Budget Bureau and estimated to cost \$1,621,000 were eliminated by the House Appropriations Committee; eight other projects were reduced by \$4,025,500; the all-important Hous-

ton Ship Channel being cut from \$1,500,000 to \$500,000.

Economy in Government was never more important than now. But almost complete elimination of expenditures for these permanent and indestructible assets which add to national strength, help the general welfare and are a vital link in the Nation's transportation system is not economy; it is dangerous neglect.

Protection Against News Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of September 26, dealing with the menace to the Nation's free press imposed by the President's official decree empowering Government classification of news and information. I include also several of my own thoughts on this subject, including a recommendation that a permanent committee of the House and Senate be delegated to review any classified document which is the subject of formal protest by the press or radio:

IRON CURTAIN DESCENDS ON PRESS—NEW SET OF REGULATIONS ISSUED IN DECREE WITH PHRASEOLOGY AS SWEEPING AS ANY EVER USED IN A DICTATORSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

The iron curtain seems to have descended on the relations between the executive branch of the United States Government and the outside world.

A new set of regulations, in the form of an official decree, has just been issued with phraseology as sweeping as any ever used in a dictatorship. It constitutes, as the President admits, "for the first time, uniform standards for classifying and protecting security information throughout the executive branch of the Government."

But who is to say what is or is not "security information"? Why, the officials themselves, of course—the political appointees of a political administration. There is no penalty against the official or the agency of Government who, under the guise of "security," may be guilty of suppressing news to which the American people are entitled.

The new decree completely cuts off the Congress of the United States as well as the entire press—except as the Chief Executive may permit.

It cuts off "security information," arbitrarily classified, from every means of communication, written or oral, between persons in the employ of the Federal Government and the public, unless Government officials happen to know offhand what is or is not classified. Those officials will have to develop fantastic memory powers to obey the new rules. After 1 month of classifying hundreds of thousands of words, it will be impossible in such a maze of red tape for officials to be sure that they are not violating the President's official decree. Hence, the easiest course will be to say nothing to anybody—not even to a Senator or Representative—lest the ax fall on that employee for violating an Executive order.

In cynical disregard of the true effect of the new regulations, the President says:

"The order applies only to officials and employees of the executive branch of the Government. The public is requested to cooperate, but is under no compulsion or threat or penalty to do so as a result of this order. . . . there is no element of censorship, either direct or implied, in this order."

Certainly there is no censorship imposed in the form of a penalty on publication itself, but there is a penalty—and a severe one—in the censoring of the news at the source.

The American people have boasted to other nations that there is a "free flow of information" in the United States and that the Constitution declares Congress shall make no law "abridging the freedom of the press."

But the President apparently can make such a law by means of an Executive order bottling up at the source whatever news he wishes.

Everybody is anxious that really secret information of a military nature be suppressed. The American press through two world wars cooperated by voluntarily withholding from print all such information, whenever requested. But the new iron curtain order applies to every department or agency of the entire executive branch of the Government, and to every single person among the more than 2,500,000 employees, no matter in what bureau or city he or she is stationed.

Granting that certain regulations are necessary to protect really secret information of a military nature there is no reason why the Post Office Department or the Agriculture Department or the employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service or the clerks in any other department should be restricted in their telephone conversations, their letters or their communications with persons outside the Government.

What is conspicuously lacking in the new regulations is a system of checking against abuse. Each department head and the subordinate he delegates to perform the task of classifying information is a law unto himself. An interdepartmental committee on internal security is provided, but it has no real power of its own and it cannot exercise any effective check against abuse.

The potential enemies which the President fears might get information are not named, but it is suspected that perhaps the Republicans in Congress and the opposition press generally are now in that category, too.

For some strange reason, instructions are included in the iron-curtain order specifying how classified documents shall be destroyed. It must be by burning and not necessarily in the presence of more than one official. Just why it is necessary to give orders at this time in the new regulations as to how to destroy secret public documents is hard to explain. Since there has been no uniform system of classification in effect anyhow, the problem of destruction of documents ought to be academic, at least for some years to come. It may be that the Truman administration is getting ready to purge the records of anything that an incoming administration in 1953 may find politically damaging if there is a change to a Republican President.

The iron-curtain regulations deserve a thorough investigation by a joint committee of Congress composed of the committees on executive expenditures. For Congress still controls the purse strings. This means control over the use of Government money and over the conduct of officials who in the name of security would institute a complete censorship of Government information at the source. This new executive order is unprecedented in American history.

POINTS AGAINST THE CENSORSHIP ORDER

First. It is unnecessarily sweeping, giving authority to classify weather forecasts or crop reports, if some overzealous official may so desire.

Second. There is no appeal, anywhere, from capricious classification of routine news;

Third. Every department and agency is given blanket authority to cover up all mistakes and errors, simply by classifying the reports revealing those errors;

Fourth. Any report may be related to national security, on the ground that in some aspect it might reveal a developed program to the enemy.

One solution is to delegate a permanent standing committee of the House and Senate to review any document classified, when the press or radio files formal protest against such classification. This would at least provide a check against arbitrary and capricious classification of nondefense material.

In its present form, the order constitutes a violent and utterly un-American form of press censorship.

The order does not become effective for 30 days from September 26, 1951. In these 30 days, Congress may set up a safeguarding committee of review, by joint resolution.

Solicitation of Political Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reply to a statement attacking me because I called the attention of the House of Representatives on Thursday, September 20, to the apparent solicitation of political contributions by the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan from applicants for positions in the Post Office Department.

This attack is replete with inaccuracy, distortion and error. At least eight errors are contained in this statement with respect to which I wish to clear the record:

First. The statement infers that my comments have been issued through the Republican National Committee. This is untrue. All comments I have made publicly have been in the form of written statements which I have issued through my own office to the press or have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Second. The statement says that I charged that the Democratic Party in Michigan is selling jobs in the Post Office Department. I did not make this charge. I did charge that the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan seemed to be exacting contributions from applicants for positions in the Post Office Department, and supported this charge with a letter from Howard P.

Hunt, finance director of the Democratic State central committee, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Third. The statement, having set up a straw man by putting words in my mouth which I never uttered, proceeds to characterize what I did not say as a political smear. If calling attention to improper methods of raising campaign funds through the solicitation of contributions from Federal employees is a political smear, then perhaps the word should stand. I merely suggest that those who engaged in such actions smeared themselves, and that any public official whose attention was drawn to such activities, and who neglected to urge that they be investigated, would have been derelict in his duty through winking at improper activities. My own characterization of the activities in question has been far milder than that of members of the Democratic Party itself.

Fourth. It is charged that I have reached conclusions before the evidence is in. The only conclusion which I have reached is that politics in the Post Office Department is bad business, and that the activities indicated by the letter of the Democratic State central committee ought to be investigated. If I had concluded that illegality or improper political activity had been established, there would have been no need for, and I would not have urged, an investigation by a congressional committee.

Fifth. The statement further implies that my demand for a congressional investigation was in response to a telegram from the chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Michigan. I point out that my request for investigation was made about noon on Thursday, September 20, 1951, and that the telegram referred to is dated 9:08 p. m. the same day, and was delivered the following day. It undoubtedly was prompted by the correspondence and information I had supplied.

Sixth. The statement further charges that I have chosen to place all Michigan postmasters under suspicion because I refused to divulge the name of the person who corresponded with me in confidence and who, after my request, declined to have his name made public at this time for fear of reprisals. I will not be taunted into revealing the name of this informant to those who have a definite interest in suppressing evidence this informant might give or in punishing him for communicating with me.

Seventh. Whether or not the Senate Investigations Subcommittee ought to expand its inquiry to include all fundraising activities by both Democratic and Republican Parties in Michigan for the past 5 years is, of course, a matter for that committee to determine. However, this appears to be a red-herring technique to divert the attention of the committee from the more specific question of whether or not the Democratic State central committee is engaged in the solicitation of political contributions from post office personnel.

Eighth. The statement further recites that, so far, the author's inquiry has disclosed that only eight persons have

contributed a total of \$130.50. However, a quick check of the names of the 76 applicants for positions in the post office, whose appointment has been recommended since April 23, 1951, against the July 15, 1951, edition of the Green Book of the Democratic State central committee, lists contributors as follows: Of the 36 recommendations for appointment to postmaster, 13 are listed as contributors in the Green Book; of the 23 persons recommended for appointment as acting postmaster, 4 appear as contributors in the Green Book; of the 17 rural mail carriers recommended, 2 appear as contributors in the Green Book. It should be noted that these contributions, from evidence in my possession, are not necessarily connected with the letter of Howard P. Hunt, Democratic State central committee finance director.

A further check of the records of the Democratic State central committee by a disinterested investigative agency might disclose the connection, if any, between the Hunt letter and contributions recorded since the July 15 issue of the Green Book.

It is important to note that the practice of soliciting political contributions from post office employees on the part of the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan is not new, and should not surprise officeholders of the Democratic Party in Michigan.

October 28-29, 1948, the House of Representatives Committee on Campaign Expenditures received sworn testimony in the city of Detroit from 21 postmasters, 4 acting postmasters, and 3 postal administrative officials, all of whom testified that they had been called on the telephone, often on Government property, by a man who identified himself as John R. Franco, chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan. The report of that committee, filed with the House of Representatives on December 30, 1948, recited as follows:

Evidence and data developed by the committee investigation were referred to the United States Department of Justice, as specifically required by the terms of House Resolution 461 of the Eightieth Congress.

Testimony adduced before the subcommittee in the hearing has been printed separately and is available upon request.

Inquiry at the Department of Justice and a search of newspaper files up to the present time, has failed to reveal what, if any, action was taken as a result of the recommendations of the committee which called attention to the various Federal statutes which seemed to be involved in the political contribution solicitation which was the subject of the committee's investigation.

House Resolution 461 recited in part as follows:

The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

Premier de Gasperi's Visit to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Premier de Gasperi has received a well-deserved welcome during his visit in the United States. The courage and steadfastness of this modest leader have kept Italy on even keel through 6 years of postwar turmoil and the constant effort of professional Communists to stir up trouble. His determination has led the Italian people through the difficult period of reconstruction. His devotion to democracy and freedom has inspired Italy to link its fortunes with those of the free world.

All who heard the sincere words of the Prime Minister as he addressed both Houses of Congress were impressed with the willingness of Italy to take a full part in the mutual defense of the North Atlantic area. In case of aggression, Mr. de Gasperi promised the Italian people would stand by and make their contributions to the common defense. Morally and materially, however, Italy is hampered in this respect by the Italian Peace Treaty.

This treaty was drawn up in times that have since entirely changed. It contains clauses which smack of rancor and a desire for vengeance—clauses which place severe restrictions on Italian sovereignty.

Especially since Japan has received a treaty called a peace of reconciliation, the Italian Peace Treaty is a source of bitterness among Italians. They feel their dignity as a free nation is impaired. Even more serious, however, is the fact that the treaty is out of keeping with the facts of international life today. Italy and the United States and the other free nations of the world are trying to cooperate in a supreme effort of collective security. But as Mr. de Gasperi said:

An effective and staunch alliance cannot exist without equality of rights and full recognition of the independence, sovereignty, and dignity of a nation.

As of today, the Italians have neither equality nor the dignity of full independence.

The present treaty limits the number of men and the amount of arms which Italy can muster to defend itself against Communist aggression. Italy may not have more than 300,000 men in military service. This is less than half the number which could be provided if the limitations were removed. England and France, with similar populations, already have armies more than twice that size. The Italian air force is allowed only 350 planes. The navy must be kept under 68,000 tons and can have no submarines. Unless these limitations are removed

Italy cannot do its proper share in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This is the opinion not only of the Italians themselves but of military technicians generally.

Italy's current difficulties are not solely those arising from an unjust and outdated treaty. Prime Minister de Gasperi in his speech to the Congress also alluded to the unemployment problem. There are 2,000,000 Italians currently out of work. That is an intolerable situation at a time when the need of the Western World is for production and more production. It is true that the European recovery program was successful in reducing unemployment by 500,000 from the high-water mark of two and a half million. Defense contracts can provide work for still more. But while 2,000,000 workers remain out of jobs the Communist threat in Italy will not slacken.

There is a way that we can help solve this dangerous problem with no additional expenditure but actually with profit to ourselves. The Prime Minister said Italy was looking for places abroad for some of its willing and industrious and able people. The United States could provide one outlet. The present quota of Italian immigration to this country is less than 6,000. That number can be increased. Not only is the United States capable of absorbing many more of these hard workers, but it will need them badly as the rearmament program swings into high gear. By liberalizing the immigration quota for Italy the United States will gain able hands to help increase its own strength and, at the same time, it will bolster the economic fabric of Italy and Western Europe.

The warm reception which Premier de Gasperi has received reflects the friendship between the United States and his country. Let us now act to cement this natural and historic relationship by carrying out quickly and completely the promised revision of the antiquated Italian peace treaty and by welcoming an increased number of Italian immigrants to these shores.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger commenting on De Gasperi's visit:

DE GASPERI'S VISIT

Italy is a poor nation, but it is also a strategic nation. It lies astride the Allied lifelines through the Mediterranean and its friendliness or animosity is of vital importance to the world conflict with communism. Italy can either be an asset or a liability in this conflict.

Italian Premier de Gasperi is now in Washington talking with key Government men over the role which his government can play in the vital battle ahead. De Gasperi is anxious for an important anti-Communist role, one that will involve the rewriting of the Italian peace treaty which placed undue emphasis on demilitarization and one that will give Italy more economic freedom.

It is well on the occasion of de Gasperi's visit to judge the needs of Italy against her

potentialities as an ally in the battle against communism. It would be absurd to place too much emphasis on Italy's potentialities.

Italy can make two important contributions and these are more dependent on herself than on the aid she receives from outside sources, particularly the United States.

First, Italy can make an enormous gift to allied defense in manpower provided that other nations are in a position to equip this manpower. This involves the rewriting of the Italian Peace Treaty.

Second, Italy's most important contribution can be in remaining non-Communist.

The second point is by far the more important from the standpoint of freedom's defense and it is significantly one which de Gasperi's regime alone can cope with irrespective of outside aid.

De Gasperi's government has pulled through victoriously twice after two tight squeezes at the polls. Most of the credit for these victories can be attributed to the help which anti-Communist countries, particularly the United States, gave to de Gasperi's party. But while some minor reforms have been made in Italy, the Communist cause still enjoys a gratuitous stimulus from the lack of basic land reforms from which the nation has traditionally suffered.

The United States wants to keep Italy on its side in the impending world struggle. It is willing to help Italy with her problems. But it is only reasonable to expect that in return Italy will aggressively pursue a program that will guarantee the freedoms that Italians dearly love and the security which Italy can provide the rest of the free world.

these agreements lost freedom for many nations, including Poland.

2. That the United States and its democratic allies be put into a state of military readiness with utmost speed, so that their combined forces shall be ready to meet the military might of Russia, which has been readied from the day of the termination of World War II.

3. That the greatest possible financial and military aid be given Spain, Italy, and Turkey, inasmuch as these nations hold key positions in the struggle with communism.

4. That the United States immediately withdraw its recognition of the present Polish Government in Poland, because it does not represent the Polish people, but is merely the obedient pawn of Stalin, yielding to his every wish and demand.

5. That the Polish nation be given the hope of freedom and, therefore, a greater will to resist, through the recognition by the United States of the Polish Government in Exile as the only true and legal government of Poland, which it already is, in fact, in the eyes of Polish people.

6. That the Katyn murders and their perpetrators be brought to full light and that the responsible criminals be made to answer for the greatest single crime in world history.

WALTER MAZNICK,
Chairman of Resolution Committee.
HARTFORD, CONN.

Operations of OPS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, there is growing dissatisfaction—even outright resentment—with some portions at least of the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization, reflected in the mail received by many Members of Congress.

For example, I received only recently a letter from a banker at Lander, Wyo., enclosing five envelopes sent his bank by the Denver office of the OPS. Each of these envelopes was postmarked at 5:30 p. m. on September 21, 1951. Each envelope contained one copy of some change or regulation of the OPS, but each envelope bore a notation that 10 copies were enclosed.

I include as part of my remarks a portion of the Wyoming banker's letter:

The envelopes are enclosed for your inspection and that of your colleagues, to show reason why it is so necessary for the Congress to vote billions of dollars to run the business of the country, then taking it away from the taxpayer in such chunks as to have so little left that he can only provide for his family on a day-to-day basis, but not for any future adversity which, when it comes, under our present system, will be ruinous and chaotic to the people of our country, and it is very doubtful that our Government could again come to the aid of its people, except, perhaps, by utter confiscation and strict regimentation, because it seems to me at this time that our Government is rapidly approaching the stage of borrowing and taxing its people beyond a safe saturation point which, if not stopped, will result in a condi-

tion against which we are fighting all over the world.

From the enclosed, you can see why it is necessary to raise postage rates to private industry, also, why paper has jumped sky high, and why there is a shortage of help, as I presume five different clerks stuffed one sheet in each of the enclosed envelopes.

Furthermore, I wish you would endeavor to obtain the reason for the OPS sending regulations to us and undoubtedly the other more than 14,000 banks in the country, that do not pertain to our business in the slightest. I have them stacked a foot high already, on a counter in the bank readily accessible to our customers, and I have yet to find one customer sufficiently interested to pick one up and read it. Certainly they have a motive in sending the regulations to us, and perhaps it is that they think we bankers have nothing to do but to read them and after digesting their meaning, educate our customers. Well, to me it seems that the banks have already been burdened with enough free service to the Government, especially when we see the Government's waste and criminal extravagance.

Another thing, Mr. Harrison, they are continuously moving the cost of our postal service upward and the amount of service downward. In other words, it costs us more to get less service. This bank for years maintained a box in the post office here, and would get two drops of mail on Mondays through Saturdays and one drop on Sundays. About a year ago free delivery was started in the town, which undoubtedly increased the expense of the local post office, but I doubt very much if its receipts were increased thereby, consequently they must have a larger deficit than before they started free delivery, and they have it even though they have cut down on some of the service to boxholders, one of which comes to mind, that no mail is put in boxes on Sundays, and they say the reason for that is that they are not going to give the boxholders who pay rent any more service than those who get their mail delivered to them free. If that is not a case of the tail wagging the dog, what is it?

I am in complete sympathy with this Wyoming banker on both scores, Mr. Speaker.

Just why does the OPS persist in sending various regulations, changes in rules, and other material to the bank when such information has no connection whatever with the banking business? Probably the same sort of thing is true in other instances aside from banks. And if they insist that this stuff must go to the bank in question, just why could it not all be included in one piece of mail instead of five, all originating from the same office and posted at the same time?

As for his complaint about diminishing postal service at an increasing cost, this same lament could be echoed by many thousands of individuals and businesses the country over.

I believe it is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress give serious consideration—and now, without further delay—to the proposition that the Post Office Department needs overhauling, by congressional action if there are no other means by which such overhauling can be instituted. It has been pointed out that great savings could be realized by modernizing and streamlining the Department's administrative methods on all levels. An anticipated deficit of more than \$500,000,000 this fiscal year makes this an imperative matter. This habitual deficit is on the increase and must be

Polish Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution recently adopted by the Polish Army Veterans Association of America, District IV, of Connecticut:

POLISH ARMY VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, DISTRICT IV, OF CONNECTICUT

The Polish Army veterans and its auxiliaries for the department of Connecticut, in convention assembled in Derby, Conn., on the 15th and 16th of September 1951, deeply disappointed that the allied victories in World War I and II, toward which Polish Army veterans and their auxiliaries gave so much, have been dissipated through the shortsightedness of the leaders of the democratic nations, and regretting in particular, as Americans of Polish origin, that the country of their forefathers, Poland, was tragically sacrificed on the international political arena to gratify the greatest enemy of democracy, Soviet Russia, and regretting the tragic retreat before Russians at Yalta and Tehran, which have today brought worldwide chaos and the uncertainty of survival before the onslaught of Russian imperialism, diabolically concealed beneath the mantle of international communism, and being cognizant that these errors and their tragic consequences have brought the world to the brink of disaster and being cognizant that action is imperative have, therefore, resolved, as follows:

1. That the United States reject as invalid the agreements at Yalta and Tehran, since

stopped. In 1947, the total deficit was \$263,000,000 or 20 percent of the revenues; in 1948, the total deficit was \$310,000,000 or 22 percent of the revenues. The anticipated deficit of more than \$500,000,000 this fiscal year probably will not be the end of the trail unless we take action.

I know that the House and Senate have passed bills to boost postal rates, and the conference committee probably will split the difference between the two measures. The same thing is true of bills increasing the pay of postal workers.

I voted for both bills in the House, Mr. Speaker. I believe that increased postal rates would help offset the deficit, but I realize also that the increased pay for the postal workers will more than cancel out increased revenue from the higher rates.

If this seems a contradictory position, let me add this: I believe that many times the amount represented by the pay increase to postal employees could be saved by streamlining Post Office Department operations, from the top level down to the smallest country post office in the land. To effect such changes, the services of long-time, experienced employees will be needed, but the postal service is losing these valued employees at an increasing rate because of the differential between postal service salaries and those paid by private industry.

I want to see the United States postal service improved, not merely restored to its former high degree of efficiency. But to attain that goal, we need to modernize the system, throw out the outmoded methods of operation and unnecessarily complex and duplicating administrative details. Present-day methods of business management, budgeting, accounting, and auditing should be applied to the Post Office Department to assist in this effort for modernization, efficiency, and economy.

Veterans' Automobile Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City Mo., September 24, 1951.

Re S 1864

Hon EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mrs ROGERS: In view of your appointment as a conferee to consider the House-approved and Senate-approved versions of S. 1864, the veterans' automobile bill, I take this opportunity to advise you that the Fifty Second National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States,

held in New York City, August 26-31, 1951, endorsed the provisions of the House-approved version.

It is hoped the conferees will agree to the House version and report it favorably at the earliest practicable date. All that you may do in that direction will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards, I remain,
Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Italy's Hour of Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to express the great joy of my thousands of constituents of Italian descent with the splendid ovation given Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, by the Congress and other United States Government officials. Just as the entirely unofficial and practically spontaneous tide of letters from private American citizens to their relatives and friends in Italy succeeded in urging the latter to vote in favor of democracy during the Italian elections in 1948, the people of Italy today are hoping and praying that their pleas to the United States voiced by their Premier will receive a similar response from all Americans. Through the counsel and leadership of Premier de Gasperi, Italy has been transformed from a postwar state of chaos, riots, and inflation to a nation of toilers who have gone a long way toward reconstruction and social justice. Public order has been restored and the level of purchasing power strenuously defended.

However, the economic deprivations experienced by Italy after World War II have caused considerable hardship for both the industrial and agricultural populace. As a consistent proponent of cooperation with the western democracies against the Soviet Union and international communism, Premier de Gasperi can maintain the leadership of his people only if he can avoid starvation and discontent, as these conditions would make them easy prey for the Communist propagandists. He has the arduous task of decreasing the masses of unemployed in his small, overpopulated country. Italy's poverty in raw materials is more than leveled by her rich resource in the ability and willingness of its industrious people to work.

The idleness of the more than 2,000,000 people could be overcome by granting defense contracts to Italian factories and by giving Italy a fair share of the American defense dollars which are going to foreign nations. By revising the peace treaty to permit Italy greater rearmaments, she could utilize the material assistance granted by the United States to aid in her industrial development and

to build a stronger barrier against any future threats of aggression as well as to avert further economic strife. We all know the industriousness of the Italian people and their country's readiness and determination to cooperate in the foundation of a more just and humane world. Italy committed herself unreservedly to the cause of the western democracies led by the United States when she became one of the original signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in April 1949. She is now a military ally of the United States and has promised to contribute forces to the command of General Eisenhower.

I believe that it is therefore our obligation to readily respond to the plea of the Italian premier for the type of assistance which will enable his country to manufacture arms for the defense of Europe and maintain the economic stability essential to the independence, sovereignty and dignity of a nation. By contributing arms and manpower for the defense of Europe, Italy will be aiding us by alleviating the demands on our industrial resources and relieving many of our military personnel for assignment elsewhere or return to civilian life. What Premier de Gasperi has asked the Congress in effect is that we give his country the authority—through revision of the peace treaty—and a helping hand—through material assistance—to carry her own share of the burden of defending herself and other Western European nations.

There is another inconsistency in the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty which should be rectified without further delay. The vexing question of control of Trieste should be solved and an end put to the interim military occupation of the territory. This is a burning issue with the people of Italy and we cannot expect to maintain their respect if we do not uphold the declaration of the Americans, British, and French before the elections of 1948 that Trieste would be returned to Italy. Such action would not only be an important factor in Italy's defense, but would also consolidate the western coalition and hasten the day when Europe could defend her peace and freedom by herself. I hope that the State Department will endeavor to arrange negotiations between Italy and Yugoslavia on this important matter and that a settlement will be reached which would solidly establish the bulwark of European unity behind this common alignment of forces. The uniting of Europe would relieve the United States of its sacrifices in men and arms.

Another of Italy's principal problems is her overpopulation. Even with increased production she would have a high percentage of unemployment, because it is impossible to provide sufficient opportunities in this small, densely populated country. We could easily assist in this matter by permitting the issuance of immigration visas to Italian nationals in a number corresponding to the portion of the Italian quota which was not utilized during the 6 war years. During the period June 30, 1939, to July

1, 1946, there were 36,709 unused Italian quota numbers which were authorized by existing immigration laws. Priority could be given to workers whose skills are needed in the United States and in fields which are not overcrowded, such as masonry, tailoring, et cetera. In my congressional district alone there are thousands of American citizens of Italian descent who would welcome the arrival of their relatives and assist in having them find gainful employment. It was the intention of our immigration laws to permit a certain number of Italian nationals to enter the United States and I believe that we could help avoid an economic crisis in Italy by utilizing this unused portion of the Italian quota.

The United States has championed Italy's offers of cooperation with the western democracies and we cannot disappoint Premier de Gasperi and the Italian people in their present appeal to us.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by Aerie No. 2424, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Medina, N. Y., urging the Federal Government to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of William N. Oatis:

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information, which is the definition of the work of a free press, and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous kangaroo court, completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency, Tass, have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our National seat of Government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Medina, N. Y., Aerie No. 2424, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 2424, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency, Tass, as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 20th day of September 1951, Aerie No. 2424, city of Medina, State of New York.

Attest:

LEO J. SHEPARD,

Worthy President,

CHARLES O. ALBONE, Sr.,

Secretary.

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the International Labor Organization, delivered by George Delaney, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, at the A F of L convention in San Francisco, Calif., on September 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At previous conventions, my predecessors and I have discussed the various conventions and recommendations adopted by the International Labor Organization as well as its other activities during the preceding year. However, there is another question concerning the ILO which seems to me to merit your particular attention now, and to warrant a temporary departure from this practice of the past.

You will find a discussion of the current and recent operations of the ILO in the report of the executive council to this convention. Rather than try your patience and attention with a repetition of this material, I will confine myself here to a subject which stands sorely in need of a thorough ventilation—a subject which bears serious implications for the future work of the ILO, and for the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the free world.

That subject concerns the attitudes and the tactics lately displayed by United States employer representatives in their operations both within and outside of the International Labor Organization.

During the past 2 years or so, these operations have shown all the earmarks of a studied, deliberate campaign to discredit the ILO, and thereby to undermine one of the most vital phases of American foreign policy in this period of world crisis—the strengthening of democracy throughout the

world through the promotion of the living standards, the rights, and the freedoms of the many, rather than the few.

Let it be noted that this campaign has not been carried out in any honest, open, and above-board manner. They have not ventured a frank challenge of that policy which United States participation in the ILO seeks to promote, nor have they advocated an outright end to that participation. They continue to profess their sympathy with the aims of the ILO and their belief in continued United States participation in the organization. But their actions and their methods contradict all of their pious professions of intent.

The recent record would seem to indicate that the purpose of the employer participation is not to promote the aims of the ILO, but to prevent their accomplishment.

Their design for the ILO is that of an empty institution, rather than an effective instrument of progress. They favor the form, but they oppose the substance. They will support the ILO, so long as it accomplishes nothing of consequence. They will adhere to its principles, so long as no effort is made to put those principles into practice.

Their efforts to neutralize the ILO as an effective ally of economic and social advancement have lately been reinforced by an insidious propaganda campaign within this country. The methods employed in this campaign are not new to any of us here. They belong to a pattern which we have seen employed against every progressive measure which we have ever sought to advance. They are in the old familiar style of reaction, tried and tested in many a famous battle against the cause of human welfare—unvarying and only too often victorious.

In their programs of resistance to every enlightened effort to promote the wider adoption of twentieth-century standards, there is no room for serious, responsible arguments on the merits of the specific issues involved. They proceed by indirection, employing all the techniques of misrepresentation and deception—peddling confusion and groundless fear—exploiting the gullibility of the public, with a vicious disregard for truth or simple honesty.

They have made flagrant use of all of the old goblins, ghosts, and phony phantoms which generations of wild-eyed conservatives have conjured up to frighten the people out of their rights and hopes for the future.

All of the agencies in the interlocking directorate of reaction in this country—die-hard private groups, the extremist press, and moss-backed Congressmen—have been pressed into service in the effort to build a lasting road block in the path of progress. Let me give you one good example of their technique of chain reaction.

Both in this country and at the meetings of the ILO, the employer delegation has persistently raised the bug-a-boo of the possibility of ILO conventions being used under the treaty power of the Federal Government as a means of bypassing Congress and invading the rights of the various States. On July 15 of this year, the Cincinnati Enquirer ran a newspaper story based on an interview with Mr. William McGrath, president of the Williamson Heater Co. of Cincinnati, who has been an employer representative at the last three ILO conferences. It might be noted in passing that Mr. McGrath is not one of those employers who stoops to such indignities as bargaining collectively with his employees—his firm is strictly nonunion.

On July 20 the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] inserted this newspaper story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Washington Times-Herald then promptly chimed in—chanting “me-too” on the points made by Mr. McGrath. McGrath's statement is so

typical of the fictitious propaganda used by the employer group that I feel impelled to deal with it at some length.

In this story McGrath—described as “a sober Cincinnati businessman”—is reported to have stated that—

“Americans have found a new way to hand over their freedom—without firing a shot and with the United States Constitution nodding approval. . . .

“Uncle Sam has found a new way of cutting his own throat . . . we can—and do—legislate ourselves into collectivism by international treaty. For treaties . . . are now being cooked up to control our everyday lives and make a joke of the Declaration of Independence.”

McGrath offers three points in support of his little horror story. First, he says that “America is the only country in the world which unreservedly makes any treaty supreme to any law of the land . . . even municipal ordinances.”

Presumably, he regards article VI of the Constitution as a shocking piece of socialism, designed to strip us of our liberties.

Second, he states that—and I quote from the article, “Treaties are now being dreamed up by international dreamers which would regiment us if we sign them. . . . And only half of our Government—the Senate—votes on a treaty.”

For his third point, McGrath practically backs up and shouts “Boo!” Here is what the article says: “Any time America sits down in international conferences . . . our negotiators are a free enterprise island in a sea of socialistic planning. Even well-meaning treaties come out of such sessions in a form likely to upset our constitutional liberties.”

Of course, McGrath does not undertake to quarrel with the purpose of the ILO—which he describes as “laudable.” He only implies that it would be very dangerous if we tried to do anything that might tend to fulfill that purpose.

Here is his version of what goes on at the ILO:

“The ILO . . . passes resolutions, recommendations, and conventions. The first two are nice friendly suggestions that every country ought to turn into law. Conventions are actual draft of laws, and each country is supposed to submit the convention for ratification to its own lawmakers. For the United States such ratification, by the Senate alone, automatically creates supreme law.”

Then he tries to show what horrible things can happen under this system. He says that, and again I quote.

“Some of the proposals being pushed at ILO include ideas like Nation-wide collective bargaining (which would mean actual communism, with a small “c”), abolishment of all private employment agencies, and legalization of the closed shop. In the latter case a treaty to this effect could, theoretically, slip through the Senate alone and create law that Congress as a whole has rejected.”

McGrath's article is correct in stating that the ILO passes resolutions, recommendations, and conventions. It is also correct in stating that conventions are draft treaties which may be ratified. But that is about where it begins to part company with the truth. The rest is pure fancy.

This whole argument that the Federal Government is going to be able to do by treaty what it cannot do by legislation is nonsense. It is based on the ridiculous premise that the President can persuade two-thirds of the Senate to do something by treaty which a simple majority of the two Houses of Congress would not approve as legislation. Furthermore, it completely overlooks the fact that subsequent legislation could override any treaty, and that Congress can at any time reverse by legis-

lation any action which has been taken by treaty.

Let's take a look at these conventions which McGrath says are going to nullify the Declaration of Independence, and regiment, socialize, and communize this country. There are nine ILO conventions now pending before the Senate, and recommended for ratification. Of those six deal with maritime matters where there is no question of the power of the Federal Government to legislate. The other three are No. 63, dealing with labor statistics, No. 88, dealing with the Public Employment Service; and No. 87, the Convention on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize. None of these would require additional Federal legislation because the United States is already in compliance with them—or would their ratification repeal any existing legislation.

Going back to the newspaper story, McGrath refers to an alleged ILO proposal to bring about Nation-wide collective bargaining, as an idea being pushed by “international dreamers.” This is no dream of internationalists—it is the nightmare of an isolationist named McGrath.

I have no idea where he got the idea for this particular bit of fiction—possibly from the recommendation on collective agreements adopted at this year's conference, although there is no mention in the recommendation of Nation-wide collective bargaining. If so, it should be made clear that the conference adopted a recommendation, described in the same newspaper story as a “nice friendly suggestion,” not a convention, which is a draft treaty.

His story next mentions an alleged proposal by the ILO to abolish all private employment agencies. He probably means convention No. 96, which has not yet been transmitted to Congress by the President. This convention provides for two methods of dealing with private employment agencies: one, their progressive abolition; or, as an alternative, their regulation. The country ratifying the convention may choose either method it desires.

The significant thing about this is that the United States employers voted for that convention at the 1949 conference. Mr. McGrath has now reversed his position and points to the convention as an example of communism in the ILO. That is very peculiar, considering who voted against the convention. There were 19 opposing votes. They were cast by the full delegations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, one government delegate from Haiti, and one from Mexico, and the government worker delegates of Argentina (the Argentine employer voted in favor.)

Finally, the news story refers to legalization by treaty of the closed shop. This is as phony as it is ridiculous. There are only two conventions which might conceivably be involved, No. 87 and No. 98, convention No. 87 on freedom of association, adopted in 1948, has nothing whatsoever to do with union security. Nor does convention No. 98, on the principles of the right to organize and bargain collectively, cover union security one way or the other. After a long argument at the 1949 conference during which the employers attempted to get antiunion security provisions in convention 98, the following report was adopted:

“The convention finally agreed to express in their report their view that the convention could in no way be interpreted as authorizing or prohibiting union security arrangements, such questions being matters for regulation in accordance with national practice.”

Furthermore, convention 98 was not even submitted to the Senate for ratification. It was considered as appropriate in part for action by the several States and, therefore, not appropriate for ratification. It was

transmitted by the President to the Senate and House of Representatives without any specific recommendation. It was also transmitted by the Secretary of Labor to the governors of the 48 States.

Employers have argued for some time that the ILO was adopting too many conventions on too many subjects. At this year's conference a preliminary discussion was held on a proposed convention covering the minimum objectives of social security. This was intended as one comprehensive convention covering various fields of social security. The position of the United States employers on this was rather strange considering their argument that the ILO is adopting too many conventions. They supported a move to have nine separate conventions instead of one.

American employers are very fond of drawing comparisons favorable to themselves, showing how much more enlightened and progressive they are than their counterparts in other countries. I am sure that, generally speaking, they are right about that. However, I am equally sure that it cannot be proved by the nature of United States employer representation in the ILO. Far from showing themselves to be more enlightened than employer delegations from other countries, they have continually resisted the adoption of sound and progressive measures by the ILO.

On the one hand they scream that ILO conventions will interfere with the internal affairs of this country. Then, untroubled by petty considerations of consistency, they turn about and try to use the ILO to export their own peculiar international dream of a compulsory open shop to an unwilling world.

It should be noted that the NAM and the chamber of commerce appear to be following a policy of including as many nonunion employers as possible in their delegations to the ILO. Our representatives, and those of other countries that have long since recognized the economic necessity of collective bargaining, are compelled to sit and listen to their expressions of tender regard for the worker's treasured right not to be represented by a union.

They have not as yet carried this line of reasoning to its logical conclusion by promoting conventions which would guarantee such allied freedoms as the worker's inherent right not to have anything to eat, his right not to have a place to live, his right not to get a decent wage, and all of those other sacred rights which the ILO has heretofore neglected to promote—but at their present rate, they will get around to that eventually.

This summer, a convention and a recommendation concerning equal pay were adopted by the conference. Now the principle of equal pay is not generally considered to be a revolutionary one in this country, and it is a pretty sad thing if all the representatives in the United States, the cradle of democracy, cannot support it. What happened? United States employers supported the principle in their speeches—but they voted against it. They objected because it was in the form of a convention. But did they support the recommendation on equal pay that was also up for adoption? No; they abstained.

It frequently appears as though the United States employer representatives go out of their way to antagonize representatives from other countries in the ILO, and to sabotage the goodwill which the United States is seeking to promote by its association in free discussion with Government, worker, and employer representatives from the free nations of the world. For example, one of the employers' representatives made a speech at this year's conference discussing proposed conventions dealing with minimum wages and holidays with pay for agricultural workers. Considering where this speech was

made it was a classic example of how not to win friends and influence people. A couple of quotes from statements of representatives from other countries in response to this speech will give you some idea of the general reaction.

A worker's representative from Brazil said: "As the worker's delegate of a new country which is doing its best to set an example to others, I say that we cannot agree with the statements made here by the United States employers' delegate, who is not in any respect representative of the democratic people of our sister nation. His remarks are beyond doubt inspired by the same state of mind which has been manifested in other statements which endeavored to deny all the rights of the workers.

"It is not by such an attitude that we shall uphold the principles of social justice.

"I was very much struck by the remarks made by the United States employers' delegate. I was also very much disappointed. I was disappointed because the United States is the standard-bearer of democracy and of social justice."

The Government delegate from Mexico said:

"I wish to say to the United States employers' delegate that we do not want his advice. We have not asked for it because our agricultural reform is evolving without foreign interference."

Workers' representatives in the ILO have always tried to cooperate with both the Government and employer delegates as much as we can without compromising our principles. In this critical period we have considered it desirable to present a united front to the rest of the world and to keep external signs of friction to a minimum. There is no inherent reason why this should not be possible. Surely the economic interests of American employers lie in the direction of improved labor standards in backward areas of the world. They stand to lose as much as we do when workers are paid starvation wages, worked long hours, and otherwise exploited in other countries—for it means that they are faced with the competition of foreign employers who can undercut them in the market places of the world because of this advantage of cheap labor. And surely American employers have as much to lose by the spread of communism among the underprivileged masses of the world.

At such a time as this, when the world trembles under the heavy tread of communism on the march, can they think of no more important a contribution to the cause of democracy than silly double talk about the workers' inherent right not to exercise his right of association? Can they seriously believe that by frustrating the work of the ILO they can strike a blow for free enterprise? Communism advances through the gaps left by the failure of free societies to live up to their social and economic responsibilities. The irresponsibility lately displayed by employer representatives to the ILO must be counted as an asset to the side of those who seek to overthrow freedom where it still lives today.

In more normal times perhaps we could laugh this off as just another phase of the old pattern of NAM and chamber of commerce tactics and policies as we have known them for decades past. But today, every such demonstration no matter how far removed from the actualities of American economic life, is seized upon by the enemies of freedom, and used as a weapon against us. The words and acts of those who—no matter how falsely—purport to represent the views and interests of American employers as a whole in these conclaves of world opinion have delivered such weapons into the hands of the agents and missionaries of world communism.

I am under no illusion that anything which we might say or do here can persuade the NAM and the chamber of commerce to abandon the course of reaction in world affairs. Nor do I consider it desirable for responsible groups in American society to air their internal differences before the gaze of a confused and troubled world.

But to remain silent would be to allow a vocal minority in this country to do a more thorough job of misrepresenting the United States in the eyes of the world than the Communists could ever hope to do. We cannot permit their tactics and methods—reflecting as they do upon the motives and purposes of this country in its foreign and domestic policies—to pass without repudiation.

It is important that we should recognize these employer tactics for what they are. If the ILO is not to become a travesty on its original design, they must not be permitted to go unchallenged. On this depends the larger question of whether the ILO is to become a powerful instrument of progress under freedom, or a mere impotent, empty shell.

If the aims of an enlightened American foreign policy are to be realized, and if our ideals of freedom, democracy, and social justice are to ultimately prevail throughout the world, the International Labor Organization must continue to receive the full support of the people of the United States.

Our Second Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLINTON D. MCKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific coast tuna industry does an annual business of more than \$100,000,000 and employs more than 23,000 people. Frozen tuna imports are rocketing to an all-time high, dealing a knockout blow to a fleet of tuna clippers that may well be called our second line of defense in the Pacific. The following story of their conversion to war service in the early days of World War II was recently broadcast over radio station KSDO in San Diego, by Mr. D. W. Wells, a San Diego tuna fisherman, who is one of the unsung heroes in the battle of the Pacific:

One factor which I believe has been grossly overlooked in this matter is that of national defense. One might inquire—what has the production of tuna to do with national defense other than the fact that tuna is a highly nutritive food product? Let's review some very recent history.

On December 7, 1941, a large part of the San Diego tuna fleet was at sea engaged in fishing operations. Within a period of a few days, wheels were set in motion which, within a minimum period of time, gave the Panama Canal a protective floating picket line. This at a time when our seaward defenses of the canal were acknowledged to be highly inadequate. Almost overnight, tuna boats were converted to naval vessels and were pressed into service.

Many of the boats which were fishing in the vicinity of Panama at the time were ordered directly to Panama and were placed into service without even the formality of returning to their home port.

Shortly thereafter, the Navy saw fit to accept the offer of service which was tendered

by the owners and operators of the fleet, and we witnessed here in San Diego a remarkable transformation. The bulk of the boats in the tuna fleet suddenly changed color from white to gray, and pluids and gabardines were discarded by a large portion of the men of the fleet in favor of Navy blue. I was privileged to be among them and can attest to the fact that this all took place in a period of 5 days and on the sixth day these boats and their crews were bound for Panama to reinforce the defenses there.

Later these same vessels were pressed into service transporting foodstuffs in the South Pacific. What other vessels were more suited to the specialized job of carrying refrigerated cargoes than these? I think it should be noted as a matter of record that the Navy thought so highly of these tuna boats that it saw fit to construct 26 additional boats which were carbon copies of the tuna clippers. Since V-J day these vessels, known as YP's, have been purchased from the Navy for use as fishing boats here.

Today some 20 of the YP's, plus 150 other large clippers, lie idle at their piers unable to compete with foreign competition. Within a few months, if corrective measures are not taken, the present critical condition will evolve into a state of economic chaos and not too long after that will be well along toward a condition of complete collapse.

Should these events take place, as they certainly threaten to now, the United States will lose a 3,000-mile cordon guarding the western approaches to this hemisphere. During normal periods of operation, the more than 200 large vessels of the tuna fleet, operating in offshore waters from San Diego to Peru, constitute a bulwark to our western frontiers which costs the Government and the taxpayer not one penny. The nature of the tuna fish is such that the heaviest concentration of vessels centers around one of our most valuable and vulnerable assets—the Panama Canal.

Are we to sit back idly and permit this highly effective, tax-free asset to our national defenses to be scuttled? Are we to sanction the elimination from our defense facilities a potential force of over 200 auxiliary naval vessels? I for one say "No" and trust that all those within the hearing of my voice will join me in communicating these facts to their Congressmen.

Maritime Administration Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I have received from Mr. S. P. Jason, one of the commissioners of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, concerning monthly allowance formerly paid to cadet-midshipmen attending the State maritime academies:

FAIRHAVEN, MASS., September 20, 1951.
Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a commissioner of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy I am calling your attention to the unfairness of the Independent Officers Appropriation Act, Public Law 137, passed by the Eighty-second Congress.

As you know this act contained the appropriation for the maintenance of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy and as it has been passed it has eliminated the monthly allowance formerly paid to cadet-midshipmen attending this school. Because I am acquainted with these pupils, I realize what the consequences of this will be. It will mean that boys from our families of limited means will be unable to complete their courses and will be deprived of the opportunity of becoming officers in the United States Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, and Naval Reserve. Many parents now find it necessary to borrow on their savings to get the \$600 for the entrance fee and without the monthly allowance they will find it financially impossible to keep their boys in the academy. We have created a stumbling block in the path of deserving boys of our Commonwealth and Nation and by so doing deprived our country of the services of these fine boys. Graduates of this academy have established an enviable record for distinguished service in maritime and naval history throughout the world. It is short-sighted economy to scuttle the opportunity of boys of moderate means at a time when technically trained manpower is playing so vital a part in our national defense and well-being.

Two weeks ago I had the privilege to attend the graduation of the class of 1951 in Faneuil Hall in Boston. Here from the stage of that fine, old, historic place I witnessed with pride this fine group of American youth take their oaths as licensed third-class mates in our merchant marine and as ensigns in the United States Merchant Marine, the United States Coast Guard, and the United States Naval Reserve. Here is a well-trained group who will be immediately available for active duty in the service of the country whenever the occasion arises. My pride was turned to chagrin however, when I saw the members of the lower classes and realized that most of these boys would be unable to finish their courses and graduate due to Public Law 137 which has deprived them of a monthly allowance so financially necessary to them.

In passing legislation of this type Congress has shown a lack of vision and deplorable business sense. We are pouring millions into the war in Korea, we are spending more millions to educate and train the people of Europe and Asia while we take from our youth this opportunity to train and serve. We subsidize the businessman, the farmer and the banker, but we refuse to underwrite the potential services of highly trained maritime manpower so necessary in keeping these same businessmen, farmers and bankers in operation. Without a large, strong merchant marine to carry on our commerce we would be a third-rate nation and in order to have such a merchant marine we must have finely trained officers to man it. To have our academies established so that they are only within the reach of sons of families of wealth is not in the American tradition.

The responsibility for developing and maintaining a well-trained merchant marine falls on the legislators of Massachusetts and other coastal States. We cannot expect legislators from inland States to be interested in building up this service. It is up to us on the coast to see that maritime schools are fostered and encouraged and I am calling upon you as an elected representative of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to start action at once and through the joint effort of all the Massachusetts Members of Congress correct this flagrant discrimination.

Respectfully,

S. P. JASON,
Commissioner,
Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

Hon. James T. Patterson's Plan for Safety on the Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut, I wish to include in the Appendix of the Record the text of his remarks on the very important subject of highway safety. This well thought-out and constructive speech on a subject close to all of us is to be delivered today at the Elks-News Safety Council banquet in Naugatuck, Conn.:

PREVENTION OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS (By Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON)

We are concerned here tonight with the alarming volume of avoidable traffic accidents and what we may be able to do to reduce it. Effective traffic safety activities are not only humanitarian and socially constructive, they are economically important and vital to the program of national defense.

Before I turn to the national aspects of the street and highway safety problem, I wish to pay brief but deserved praise to the many Connecticut officials in State and community departments of government who are constantly working to make our roads safer and to protect the lives of our citizens who use them. I'm referring to officials like Col. Ed Hickey who does such an outstanding job as State police commissioner, to Charles F. Kelley, commissioner of motor vehicles, to G. Albert Hill, State commissioner of highways, and, of course, to Ed Dooling, who sparks our local effort.

Also let me compliment the Connecticut Safety Commission—its chairman, Robert I. Catlin, and its director, William M. Greene. This highway safety coordinating agency, through its studies, reports, and cooperative efforts, has stimulated wide interest in traffic-accident prevention. It provides a State-wide program to do something about it. We're not meaning to rest on our laurels—quite the contrary. But it is a fact that, last year, Connecticut had the second best record in the Union in the rate of traffic deaths per 100,000 vehicle miles of travel. It was third best in the Nation in the rate of traffic deaths per 100,000 population. Naugatuck has earned national recognition for its accident-prevention program.

Naturally, we're glad that our situation is better than that in many places but, I'm sure you will agree, there's plenty of room for improvement. Our safety record can be a great deal better if we determine to make it so.

Nationally, the city and rural traffic problems are about the same as they are here and they have to be solved in about the same way.

The promotion of traffic-accident prevention may appear to lack some of the glamour that is often unwisely associated with campaigns against rare crimes and relatively minor disasters. But, from the standpoint of conserving life, limb, and property, it's the Nation's No. 1 job. Careless drivers and careless pedestrians have made the traffic accident our worst single death-dealing agent.

I wonder whether enough people across the Nation are conscience stricken, as they ought to be, with the brutal, appalling facts? These facts have to be driven home again and again until a motorist or pedestrian will suffer acute personal shame to be the guilty party to an avoidable traffic accident.

Who can help being dismayed at last year's reported total of over 8,000,000 motor-vehicle accidents? That means that, on an average, one out of every six motor vehicles in this country was involved in an accident of some kind last year. Ten percent of those accidents resulted in deaths and injuries. In all, 1,200,000 men, women and children were injured and 35,000 lost their lives. The economic loss was more than \$3,000,000,000. And the saddest part of it is, most of those accidents could have been prevented. Most of them never should have happened.

Think of it this way: One out of two persons now living in the United States has been or will be injured in a motor-vehicle accident before he dies—unless the present rate is greatly reduced.

Unfortunately, the rate is not declining. In fact, this year the trend is upward and it looks as though traffic accidents might kill 3,000 more than last year. The enormity of this carnage is not just depressing, it's alarming. Why, last year alone, the fatalities from motor-vehicle accidents exceeded by over 10,000 the total of Americans killed in action and who died from wounds in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War, and so far in the Korean conflict. It's over two-thirds the number of similar deaths in World War I and more than half as many Americans as were killed in action or died from wounds on the average for each year in World War II.

The National Safety Council predicts that the millionth traffic death may occur before Christmas this year. That will be nearly twice the number of American deaths from action or wounds in all of our wars in all of our history.

We can't blink the truth that, collectively speaking, the traffic accident threatens to get completely out of hand and it may do just that if we don't marshal all of our corrective forces to control it.

There are a great many factors responsible for this outrage. Chief, of course, is the take-a-chance attitude of too many people. That becomes increasingly dangerous in vehicular congestion and right now we've got 50,000,000 motor vehicles piling up nearly one-half trillion vehicle-miles on our vast system of streets and highways. These astronomical figures are part of our Nation's pride. They reflect the mobility that is an essential of our way of life, a vital member of that ingenious trio—mass manufacture, transportation, and consumption—that forms the backbone of our economy.

Mussolini crowed that he was able to make the trains run on time. Here we take such punctuality for granted, just as we take for granted the efficiency of all of our methods of transportation. And, of all our mechanical means of transportation, the motor vehicle is the most common and indispensable. Once a luxury, now a necessity, by sheer force of numbers it is clogging our inadequate highway arteries and, in too many careless and irresponsible hands, creates grave traffic hazards.

To illustrate how rapidly and widely the motor vehicle has come into use, at the turn of the century, Michigan, world center of automotive manufacture, boasted of 360 cars on its roads. In 1950 there were over 2,400,000 motor vehicles and nearly 3,000,000 licensed drivers in that State. That's a good example of how spectacularly a great industry can develop in the free-enterprise climate of this country. Concurrently with the development grew a vast complexity of traffic problems. At first, motorists followed the rules of the road for horse-drawn vehicles. Then gradually some elementary motor traffic regulations were adopted with New England States taking the lead. By the end of World War I, it was evident that the

automobile was here to stay. Interstate highway transportation created a major problem. States set up barriers that actually prevented a vehicle of one State from entering another State unless certain requirements were met. Motor vehicle laws were a hodgepodge. The need for uniformity was asserting itself.

Tentative, helpful steps were taken in several directions in the early twenties. They were brought into line, for the first time, by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, called in Washington in 1924 by Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce. In this and subsequent conferences, progress was made in provision for a coordinated coast-to-coast program for traffic safety. Advance was made toward development of the Uniform Vehicle Code, the Model Traffic Ordinance for Cities, and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

These early efforts paved the way for the meeting of the first President's Highway Safety Conference, in Washington, in 1946, which produced a comprehensive national plan for across-the-board action to prevent traffic accidents. The Conference is non-partisan in make-up and includes the ablest national experts in every field of traffic safety. In the States where its Action Program has been effectively applied, and Connecticut is a good example, the traffic death rate per 100 million vehicle miles of travel has been forced down.

This is proof that the conference plan is sound. It recognizes that uniform, cooperative effort by the States and communities is the way to tackle the traffic problem. Generally speaking, it's not a matter for congressional action. It can't be solved by bureaucratic decree or executive fiat in Washington. It's definitely a job that has to be done back at the cross-roads.

But this doesn't imply that traffic safety is a simple challenge, easily met. It isn't. It's extremely involved and there's no panacea for it.

Take our highways for example. In this respect, we're not equipped to safely and efficiently handle the press of today's traffic. Our roads were inadequate for the purpose at the time of Pearl Harbor when we had only 34,000,000 vehicles in operation. Since then, they have been permitted to deteriorate still further. Now, superimposed on normal traffic, we are faced with the heavy demands of the military and of defense cargoes which must be expeditiously moved. The Bureau of Public Roads has reported serious deficiencies in our military strategic highway network which is roughly the national system of interstate highways, plus some added mileage. The Bureau says, and these are approximate figures, that more than 93 percent of the roads in the system are inadequate for even peacetime needs. Of the 40,000 miles involved, 24,000 rural miles have surfaces too narrow for passenger cars and trucks to pass with safety. Over 7,000 miles have sight distances so short that passing is dangerous; over 650 grades are so steep as to seriously reduce the speed of truck movement. Further, and of grave concern to authorities charged with the movement of military vehicles, is the fact that over 7,500 bridges are too weak for some of the loads known to be moving over the system now.

This means that a vigorous program of highway construction and maintenance is important to traffic safety. Of course this cannot be a continuing accomplishment without the regular provision of adequate funds. At the moment, the outlook is darkened by an increasing pinch on basic materials. We know, for instance, that steel allotments for road construction have been cut in succeeding quarters and that deliveries from the mills are badly delayed. This is causing a lot of worry in Washington and

out in the States where highway department officials are wondering what is going to happen if they can't do the job that needs to be done. A drastic curtailment of reconstruction and maintenance could only mean a still further breakdown of our already over-taxed highway plant. That, of course, would be a blow to the defense program and to essential civilian activities, so dependent upon motor transportation. It would cripple highway safety progress by increasing the already incalculable number of chances for accidents.

With respect to the national defense, it seems to me it is imperative that we step up all traffic safety activities to conserve manpower, equipment, materials, and highway facilities. Further, it is necessary that harmonious arrangements, compatible with the States' motor-vehicle laws and with the condition of our highways, be made to insure the safe and efficient movement of increasing amounts of defense material and military traffic. It's gratifying to know that the Department of Defense has already worked out a cooperative arrangement with the States governing applications for permits for oversize, overweight, and other unusual movements of particular concern to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. I understand that this is a better procedure than was in effect in World War II and that the States find it works more effectively.

In the civilian-defense field, traffic safety and efficiency are exceptionally important. The Federal Civil Defense Administration has selected the Traffic Institute of Northwestern University to develop traffic-training programs that will result in help to communities, in the event of enemy attack, to continue their transportation systems and to have their commerce and industries function as normally as possible. Experiences abroad in the last war and now in Korea have shown how essential military and civilian street and highway movements can be blocked by unregulated foot and vehicular traffic. Priorities must be provided for emergency movements of vehicles for fire fighting, rescue, first aid, demolition, and other urgent activities requiring specially trained personnel. I am informed that plans for traffic training and policies to govern in transportation emergencies are now advanced. We pray they may never have to be employed but if they are, their ultimate effectiveness will depend, of course, upon how seriously they have been accepted and applied by the people in our cities and local communities. The burden of direction rests on our State and local civil-defense officials and its corps of trained volunteers. If an attack ever comes, the final test will be in the measure of our calm, common-sense compliance with their commands.

Another helpful step in civilian protection has been the Civil Defense Agreement between the United States and Canada. This provides that if there is an attack, civil defense activities, including those affecting highway facilities and equipment, of the two countries shall be coordinated for the protection of persons and property. The agreement specifies that this defense coordination shall apply as if there were no border. That, as well in keeping with the traditional friendship of these two great neighboring countries.

Thus we see that there is wide emphasis on the essentiality of highway transportation. It is to our national advantage to expand and strengthen it. It is urgent that we make our highways safer.

Colonel Hickey knows as well as any man that traffic accident prevention springs from sound education, engineering, and enforcement—and, in his case, enforcement with a capital "E." An impressive commentary on one phase of this work was made to the President's Highway Safety Conference last June by Police Chief John M. Gleason, of Greenwich. Chief Gleason, as you may know,

is immediate past president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and is currently on a mission to Germany for our Government. Here's what he said:

"It is all well and good to be engaged in safety work where most of it is done on paper or from the platform, but any person who has gone out on the highways and by-ways at all hours of the day and night and lifted people out of cars in pieces, literally, and has worked in blood up to his elbows and held men, women and children on emergency tables while they were sewed up, and without injections, does not need any selling on safety. * * * You get it from the grass roots. You do not learn it from a book. You see the results of drunken driving and carelessness * * * first-hand * * * Then you go to a home and tell a mother that her son has been suddenly killed. * * * That is regular police duty."

This is indeed the picture that our police officers are seeing over and over and over on our highways. It's what makes traffic safety one of the most positive challenges to public action in the United States. And don't get the idea that it's primarily a big city problem. As a matter of fact, it's more of a rural problem, although, of course, many city drivers are involved in rural road accidents. Statistically, last year, there were 10,200 people killed in town and city traffic accidents as compared with 24,800 in rural traffic accidents. As might be expected, pedestrian deaths were greater in the congested centers, with 5,500 killed in the towns and cities as against 3,200 in the farm areas. There's no reason to believe that careless driving in the city is rarer than it is in the country but the wide open spaces seem to inspire a type of speeding and recklessness that ends in more fatalities and serious injuries.

My point is that no community or county in the Nation is exempt from the traffic-accident problem. It is with us wherever we have a street or a public road. This means that there's a powerful need everywhere for community groups, like your safety council, to organize in support of really effective traffic safety programs.

I thought this was well underscored by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its recent policy on traffic safety. Here's what this national organization, comprising about 2,700 local chambers of commerce and an underlying membership of over a million and a quarter businessmen had to say:

"The elements of a traffic-safety program of communities and States should be those recently developed and approved by the President's Highway Safety Conference. Businessmen and their organizations should give sustained support to the street and highway traffic safety program."

The significance of this policy is in its premise that businessmen should lead sustained support to a balanced program.

This is the concept that I think should be emphasized when we survey ways and means to prevent traffic accidents. National standards, such as the Uniform Vehicle Code and others, are extremely helpful as guides to common action but the real responsibility is focused squarely on State and local administrative departments and legislative bodies. It is necessary that they work together with a carefully coordinated plan of action. The highway designers, the traffic engineers, the police, the motor vehicle and driver licensing officials, the courts and the schools all have urgent responsibilities in executing the laws and ordinances adopted by the State, city, and county legislatures.

We know it's impossible to combine all of these agencies of Government into a single department. We wouldn't want to if we could. Therefore, there's a definite requirement for a coordinating body such as the Connecticut Safety Commission that has the support of the Governor and mayors and

includes a number of policy-making members with intimate knowledge of the traffic safety problem. Such an organization is needed to develop a cooperative program for concerted and continuing action by official departments and agencies. It spearheads the whole, united effort and it must be backed up by organized public support. A group such as yours is an integral part of organized action in support of an official, coordinated program. By taking a more and more active part in a sustained program to cut down traffic accidents, you will make a valuable contribution to the welfare of your community, your State, and the Nation.

Without going into detail I would like to observe, in passing, that there are official State highway safety coordinating committees, commissions, or agencies now operating in 40 States. Efforts are under way to establish them in the remaining States. Nationally, the State and Local Officials' National Highway Safety Committee acts as a coordinating body to help bring about joint planning by, and closer cooperation between, State and community officials concerned with traffic problems. The committee is made up of ten national associations of State and local officials and works closely with many other national organizations interested in traffic safety.

Therefore, nationally, in the States, and in the local communities there is at least an organizational framework of official and non-official highway safety agencies. It seems to me a wholesome start has been made to correlate the efforts of State and local officials and organizations into a militant program to reduce traffic accidents.

The basic lesson which we must teach, enforce, and practice ourselves, is good driver and pedestrian behavior. As I have said, to get it across we need to organize for continuing action in support of a balanced traffic safety program. The objectives are to save lives, prevent injuries, and reduce economic waste. No business can conduct its affairs successfully if waste is not cut to a minimum. What is true of business is true of the Nation. We cannot afford to squander our resources. Nationally, we can save billions of dollars, millions of injuries, and thousands of lives by eliminating the preventable motor vehicle accident. Isn't it worth working for?

Development of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Missouri Waltzes to Billion Dollar Blues," by Albert H. Jenkins, which appeared in the *Machinists Monthly Journal* for October 1951.

This article deals with the recent disastrous floods in the Missouri Valley and the expensive problem they have created for our country. It demonstrates the need for an over-all program for the development of the Missouri River Basin and control of these destructive recurring floods, which continue to cause irreparable damage to our economy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI WALTZES TO BILLION DOLLAR BLUES (By Albert H. Jenkins)

Another huge and expensive problem has been dumped in Uncle Sam's lap. Or rather, it has been there a long time, but has been given new urgency by the disastrous Missouri flood.

Something must be done about it quickly and on a vast scale, but what? That's what people in the Missouri Valley think and deeply feel, as they survey the wreckage.

A billion dollars' damage. At least a million farm acres flooded, with homes, barns, and other buildings washed away, and livestock drowned. Millions of tons of good topsoil gone down the river never to return. Railroads and other industries hit a terrific blow. Forty-one human lives lost, and lucky it wasn't more.

No man's mind can fully grasp the size of the disaster. In one industrial area, alone, it has been compared to the results of an atomic bomb.

The flood is over, except for an enormous "mopping up," but everyone knows it could come again at any time, and perhaps still worse. It's too big a problem for that region alone to handle. It's up to Uncle Sam.

A VAST EMPIRE

Even he is staggered when he looks at the size of the problem. The valley of the Missouri River and its tributary streams stretches far and wide through 12 States. Most concerned are Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, South and North Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana. It's a vast "empire," far bigger than most nations, and floods are only part of the still bigger problem which must be solved to make that broad area safe and rich for this and future generations.

Almost everyone agrees on that, but people differ on what's to be done, and how. Various plans have been proposed but only three have powerful support. These three are:

1. The Pick-Sloan plan, named after Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Army Engineers, and Glenn Sloan, former regional engineer of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.
2. The Missouri Valley Authority plan, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority, and embodied in a bill recently introduced by a group of 14 Senators, headed by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.
3. The Department of Agriculture plan, which, in general, can be described as between Pick-Sloan and Valley Authority.

HOW SITUATION AROSE

A little history will help explain how these plans came about, and the differences between them.

For about a century, the Army engineers have been Uncle Sam's chief reliance for flood control. They have spent billions of dollars in attempts to control the Mississippi, Missouri, and other rivers.

Critics of the Army engineers say they have looked at the flood problem from too narrow a viewpoint. For the most part, they simply built levees and embankments along rivers, to hold high water and keep it from flowing over nearby land. When the engineers built dams, it was charged that they produced as little public electric power as possible, thus favoring the power trust.

At any rate, the Army engineers felt the Missouri Valley flood problem was theirs, as such things always had been. They made it evident that they resented anyone else invading their field in the valley.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation has an old interest in problems closely allied to flood control, because it has

long built dams to hold water for irrigation purposes. Incidentally, many of these dams also provide cheap public electric power, largely for the farmers on the irrigated lands.

WERE BITTER RIVALS

A bitter battle began some years ago between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau. Each wanted to undertake gigantic tasks in the valleys of such great rivers as the Columbia and Missouri. Each charged that the other didn't know how to do the job, and they attributed to each other selfish motives.

Then came what has often been called the shotgun wedding. The Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau compromised their differences, to ward off a threat from a new competitor.

The success of TVA produced demands for a Columbia Valley Authority and Missouri Valley Authority. If those demands succeeded, neither the Engineers nor the Bureau would be boss in the valleys. They would have to take orders from a Federal authority—a board which would supervise all public work done in a valley, do most of the planning, and actually carry on most of the work which the Engineers and Bureau consider theirs.

In the great Columbia Valley of the Northwest, the two old rivals settled their differences by saying: "You build this dam, and I'll build that one." "You do this job and I'll do that."

As a result, some critics claim, there is no adequate planning for the valley as a whole, and the results may prove costly to future generations.

SUDDENLY BECAME FRIENDS

In the Missouri Valley, the engineers and Bureau came even closer together after the late President Roosevelt in 1944, proposed a Missouri Valley Authority. The two old rivals suddenly became good friends, and proposed the Pick-Sloan plan.

Its size staggers the imagination. It includes 150 big dams, irrigation of 5,000,000 acres, partial irrigation of 2,000,000 more annual production of 13,000,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, deepening of 750 miles of the Missouri for navigation, and construction of 1,500 miles of levees.

One dam, alone, would form a lake with a shore line longer than Lake Erie's. To clear the ground for this new lake and many others, thousands of farms and town families would have to move to other locations. A heavy price to pay, but worth it if the Pick-Sloan plan is the right one for remaking the vast Missouri Valley.

Many millions of dollars have already been spent building dams under the Pick-Sloan plan, and its friends say this kept the flood from being still worse.

Friends of the authority plan and the Department of Agriculture plan charge that the Pick-Sloan plan neglects such things as "soil conservation" and "reforestation" which help the ground absorb falling rain and melting snow, and thus make them run off more slowly, and decrease floods.

Pick has often publicly stated that soil conservation and reforestation are good things, but that they don't help much in preventing flood. Recently, however, he has been talking in a more friendly way about such things, perhaps in hope of softening some of the opposition to the Pick-Sloan plan.

VALLEY AS A WHOLE

The valley-authority plan requires little explanation, because it has been made familiar by TVA. Its friends say it is the way to make sure that all the problems of a great valley are treated as a whole.

The Department of Agriculture plan differs from both Pick-Sloan and valley authority,

both in the method of administration, and in emphasis on the relative importance of various parts of the problem.

A spokesman for the Department explained that its plan would set up a basin commission, which would plan and program the work in the Missouri Valley, but would not actually do the work. Thus the commission would not supplant the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, as a valley authority would.

The commission, however, would assign jobs to the Army engineers, Reclamation Bureau, and other Government agencies, and thus correct the unbalance and distortion of the Pick-Sloan plan.

"Any unified program, either ours or the valley authority," the Department spokesman said, "is better than the Pick-Sloan plan, which would do only part of the job. We want to see all land and water resources in the Missouri Valley developed in a comprehensive way."

"The Water Policy Commission, appointed by President Truman, studied the entire problem and recommended basin commissions such as the one we propose."

A GOVERNOR'S VIEWS

The Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau—particularly the former—have a lot of influence with Congress, and their plan is backed by a majority of the governors of the Missouri Valley States. A former governor of one of those States explained their stand this way:

"The members of a valley authority would be appointed by the President. The State with the greatest interest in the problem might not be represented on the authority, or have any say in its decisions."

"Some of our State governments fear the authority would take control over the water in their States, whose constitutions say the control of water is in the State governments. Water, of course, is far more important to the farmers of a western State than most people in the East understand. If this water problem could be solved under the valley authority bill, there would be less opposition to it."

"Also, we fear a valley authority would go into a State and build dams we don't want. The Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau can't build a dam until they get an O. K. from the government of the State in which it would be located."

"Anyway, we want action on the Missouri Valley problem, and I don't believe it is possible to get any valley authority bill through the kind of Congress we have now."

MURRAY'S PLEA FOR MVA

An argument for the Missouri Valley Authority was made by Senator MURRAY, in introducing the bill sponsored by 14 Senators. The bill is similar to one he introduced several years ago. After reviewing the enormous damage done by the latest flood, MURRAY said:

"How long must this go on? Will we continue to allow the uncoordinated efforts of the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau to try to make a go of their shotgun wedding, and to parcel out projects on the Missouri River and its tributaries?"

"Can we continue to permit those two great agencies to flounder and fail in providing a comprehensive plan of flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, reforestation, and recreation?"

"The basic wealth of the United States consists of our vast expanses of rich agricultural lands, our extensive forests, our mineral resources, our great system of rivers, and potential electric-power resources."

"The American people are the trustees of this great heritage. Acting through their Government, they have the sacred responsibility to preserve these riches for succeeding generations."

POINTS TO POWER TRUST

"Some years ago, I joined with a number of other Members of this body in presenting a bill to provide a unified, integrated program for control of these floods and the development of the Missouri River system. But, because of the pressure of powerful lobbies in Washington, that measure has been ignored."

"The great stumbling block seems to be power. If Congress would surrender to the private power lobby and provide a program of river development under which all electric power would be delivered directly to the private utilities at the bus bars, the fight against proposed river authorities would end."

It is obvious that the Missouri Valley fight involves not only electric power but also another kind of power—of various Government agencies and their chiefs. They seem to be thinking too much of building up their rival personal "empires," instead of building up the Nation's great "empire" in the Missouri Valley.

It's too big a thing for such selfish rivalries. All should be thinking only of the interests of the people of that vast valley, and of the entire country.

Time, dispute, and discussion have brought the opposing sides somewhat closer together. Is it too much to hope they will finally agree on the kind of program the valley and America ought to have? But the floods won't wait. The time for action is now.

A Free Press Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Toledo Blade of September 25, 1951, on the subject of a free press gallery. This, of course, refers to our Press Gallery here in the Congress.

This editorial expresses my own personal view and, I believe, the view of many of the Members of this House that "the American press ought to stand by its belief that the free flow of information in the world is desirable, and not lift a finger to check it out of spite, even though the spite be justifiable."

A FREE PRESS GALLERY

By rejecting the demand made in the name of the American Society of Newspaper Editors that representatives of Tass, the Soviet press agency, be barred from the press galleries of Congress, the standing committee of correspondents has indicated that reporters covering Washington news are maintaining greater mental stability in these trying times than some of the editors who employ them.

The move to toss the Tass men out was launched about a month ago by Alexander F. Jones, president of the ASNE, whose authority for committing the organization to such an undertaking has not been brought to our attention.

In a widely publicized statement entitled "A Call for Courage," Mr. Jones asked for their expulsion on the grounds (1) that Tass is not a news service in the American sense but a propaganda organ of the Soviet Government; (2) that the Soviet Union does not

accord our newspapermen the privileges which Tass representatives enjoy in this country, and (3) that it makes him mad to see them walking into the White House for press conferences while Bill Oatis, the Associated Press correspondent in Czechoslovakia, is kept in jail.

Now, if it takes courage to get mad, it is to be assumed that Mr. Jones has his quota. But we don't quite see how losing our temper, even collectively, is going to help Bill Oatis or serve the best interests of the United States in the struggle with the Soviet Union. And except for some quibbling over the press gallery rules which the standing committee probably understands better than any outsiders, supporters of the ouster move have confined their argument pretty largely to indignation.

Their reasoning runs along these lines and in these words: "American newspapers * * * can get off their dead posteriors and start to fight." "I say throw them out." "Throw 'em out, I say—and right where they'll land the hardest." "It is little short of idiotic to call any of these birds newspapermen." "Let's get shed of them." "The galleries should be purged of Tass."

Happily, not all of our American editors have succumbed to this communistic urge to purge. Those who have kept their heads instead of losing their tempers have pointed out that such retaliation is hardly likely to get Bill Oatis out of a Czechoslovak jail and that admission to the press galleries of Congress can hardly facilitate spying since the transcripts of its proceedings are published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, anyway.

But the chief objection to this ASNE move is not that it's just a futile game of tit for tat which won't do our press or our country any good.

Simply for propaganda purposes, as Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times has said, it is desirable for us to be able to tell all people everywhere, "Look, a representative of Tass can attend a presidential press conference in the United States. That is how free we are and how little we are afraid."

Even more important, the American press ought to stand by its belief that the free flow of information in the world is desirable and not lift a finger to check it out of spite, even though the spite be justifiable.

In undertaking to crack down on the Tass representatives in retaliation for the brutal treatment given Bill Oatis, aren't ASNE officials, who haven't submitted their proposition to a vote of the membership, trying to exercise a governmental function just as they accuse Tass of doing?

Thirty-third Anniversary of the Battle of the Meuse-Argonne

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that 33 years ago today the great Meuse-Argonne drive started in France. At that time we had the largest Army on the front in a battle that we had ever had up to that moment.

There are a number of men in the House and in the Senate who were in that great battle, which heralded the beginning of the end for Germany

We thought we were fighting a war to end wars. I hoped and prayed for years that that was what we were doing, but the things that have gone on in the last 30 years have given many of us a distinct and terrifying shock. I never thought I would live to see such a topsyturvy, uncertain, and explosive world as we live in. Everyone knows that there is not a boy today between the ages of 10 and 17 that can make any plans for his future. I hope we may find some way to level off the world on a peaceful basis, and that the dream we had in 1917 will come true sometime during our lives.

Crime on the Water Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement I have prepared and certain other material regarding crime along the water front, a situation which has been described by experts as the most critical area of illegal operations in America today. I ask unanimous consent that the statement and this material be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and the materials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPOSURE OF WATER FRONT SITUATION (Statement by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY)

Last Thursday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning on page A5755, a statement regarding the need for a continuing probe of interstate crime with particular reference to crime along the New York-New Jersey water front.

This is a situation in which I have been interested for many years. Long before there was such a thing as a Special Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I urged that the water front be investigated. When the crime committee was set up, I urged again that it be investigated. When the crime committee received a 4-month extension earlier this year, still again. When the Senate Commerce Committee took over the special committee's jurisdiction, I urged still again.

In every instance, I received kind acknowledgment from my colleagues. I was advised of their interest in the situation, but they cited the reason that sufficient time and resources were not available for the study.

Now, once more I renew the appeal. In my judgment, the situation along the water front is crying to high heaven for cleaning up. This is not a job, of course, for Uncle Sam alone. It is a job for cities in the New York-New Jersey area, for the State governments at Albany and Trenton, and for the Federal Government in Washington. We here cannot shirk our responsibilities any more than any other level should shirk its responsibility, or any more than honest union leaders and businessmen should shirk theirs. The situation is an international one, and not just a local, State or National problem. It will never be cleared up unless a lot of people show a lot of guts.

At this time, I have the text of the Columbia Broadcasting System program in the Nation's Nightmare series, describing graphically and principally by the means of tape-

recorded interviews, the outline of this situation. I had mentioned this splendid, hard-hitting Nation's Nightmare series in last Thursday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also have the text of an International News Service article written today by Mr. Malcolm Johnson, the distinguished winner of the 1949 Pulitzer Prize for his exposure of crime along the water front. This article and the transcript of the powerful CBS broadcast, are appended hereto.

NATION'S NIGHTMARE

(Alarm ringing.)

Mr. Downs This is an alarm sounding in a police station somewhere in the United States. The alarm is meant for you. It's a warning to wake up, to shake loose from the grip of the Nation's nightmare, the nightmare described by Senator HENRY O'CONNOR.

Senator O'CONNOR. Our Senate Crime Investigating Committee has found alarming instances of syndicated crime and of unhealthy alliance with law-enforcement officials. The remedy is in the hands of the people who must act before it is too late.

(Music)

ANNOUNCER. The Nation's nightmare. The CBS radio network and its affiliated stations, in cooperation with law-enforcement agencies throughout the country, present a new documentary series on the pattern of organized crime in America, its shape, its form, who runs it, and what can be done about it. Every voice and sound you will hear has been recorded from real life.

Now, here to report to you on the Nation's Nightmare is the noted CBS newsmen, Bill Downs.

Mr. Downs For many weeks now we've been looking into the dirty corners of organized crime in America. The picture has not been pretty, but, if you were to ask us, what is the worst single spot in the United States today, where does organized crime most endanger the public safety? we would give you our unanimous answer—the New York-New Jersey water front. The record of racketeering, exploitation, extortion, conspiracy, and murder is so foul that it's hard to believe, even when you have the documented proof before you; but it's true—shamefully, unquestionably true. On this, the fifth program of the Nation's Nightmare, we look into crime on the water front.

(Fog horn blowing.)

(Boat whistles under.)

The New York Harbor, the greatest port in the world; 11,000 ships enter and leave it every year; \$16,000,000,000 in cargo pours through its gates every year. Nature outdid herself in the New York harbor. It's shore line is 755 miles long, fronting on good, deep water. Within the master port lies a network of smaller ports, channels, rivers, and bays. The perfect harbor, the experts say. The perfect harbor, the mobsters and criminals agree. The perfect harbor for getting away with murder.

GUMK. We're passing under the Brooklyn Bridge. We are now rounding the tip of Manhattan Island. On your right is—

Mr. Downs. Come aboard the little sightseeing boat that circles Manhattan Island. Come aboard for a trip around the port of New York. Come and meet the people who control the port. You're steaming down the East River, heading for the mouth of the harbor and the Statue of Liberty.

GUMK. On your left is Brooklyn.

Mr. Downs. Brooklyn water front controlled by Albert Anastasia, "lord high executioner" of Murder, Inc.

VOICE. We're passing under the Brooklyn Bridge. On your right is the lower East Side.

Mr. Downs. Lower East Side controlled by Mike Clementi, lieutenant of "Socks" Lanza, one conviction, associate of now-executed murderer, "Squint" Sheridan.

GUMK. There is the Fulton Fish Market. We are now rounding the tip of Manhattan Island.

Mr. Downs. The water front from the Fulton Fish Market, on the East Side, to Pier 9, on the West Side, the famous tip of Manhattan Island, controlled by "Socks" Lanza, pal of "Lucky" Luciano, ten arrests, now out on parole after conviction for extortion.

GUMK. Directly ahead of you, out in the harbor, is Staten Island.

Mr. Downs. Water front controlled by Alex Dibrini—one conviction, organized for the International Longshoremen's Association, the ILA, now up before the New York State Crime Commission.

GUMK. Off to your left is the Jersey shore. There's Jersey City.

Mr. Downs. Three groups fighting for control. Upper hand is being held by the Morris Manna mob, fronting for Albert Anastasia.

GUMK. We are now going up the Hudson River. On your right is Greenwich Village.

Mr. Downs. Piers 14-52, Hudson River, controlled by the remnants of the Dunn-McGrath mob. Ed McGrath, organizer for the ILA, ex-convict, two-time loser, Hot Springs guest of Joe Adonis, ex-partner of murderer Johnny "Cockeye" Dunn, who was a pal of Meyer Lansky and "Bugsy" Siegel.

GUMK. On your left is Hoboken.

Mr. Downs. Controlled by convicted bootlegger Edward Florio, organizer for the ILA, successor to Charlie Yanowsky, notorious hijacker and gunman murdered in 1948, who was a pal of Mickey Cohen and "Happy" Melzer.

GUMK. And on your right is the Chelsea section, which runs from Fourteenth to Twenty-third Streets.

Mr. Downs. The Chelsea area, piers 53-62, split between Timmy O'Mara, one of killer Owney Madden's mob, and the Ding-Dong Bell mob.

GUMK. On your right is upper Times Square and upper midtown Manhattan.

Mr. Downs. Controlled by the Mickey Bowers mob, home of local No. 824, ILA, widely known as the Pistol Local.

The New York-New Jersey water front, the greatest port in the world. The greatest concentration of mob power in the world.

(Whistle)

HIRING BOSS. No. 1 deck gang. No. 1 hold gang. No. 1 dock gang. Only you regular men step out (Voice continues under.)

Mr. Downs. There is organized crime on the New York water front because conditions are right for it. Those conditions start with the outmoded way in which men are hired for work on the water front. You are listening to that hiring. It's called the "shape up." Twice a day, at 7:55 a. m. and at 12:55 p. m., a group of 200 to 500 longshoremen line up in a semicircle before the pier where the ship is to be loaded or unloaded. The hiring boss, whom you hear, picks out the gangs of men who will work for the next 4 hours. After that they are out of a job unless selected again in the next "shape up." The hiring boss, himself a member of the Longshoremen's Union, has absolute power in picking the men. When the mobsters control the hiring boss it breeds crime and worse. Assemblyman John R. Brook, of Manhattan, has tried to get the "shape up" abolished. He was opposed by the shipping interests and by the Longshoremen's Union. He can tell you about it.

Mr. BROOK. The men are caught in a net from which they cannot extricate themselves. The ones who work are the ones who have been able to curry favor with the pier boss, who have probably paid the highest tribute, who have patronized his friends and relatives, who have borrowed on their future earnings from his money-lenders at rates that impoverish him and deprive his wife and children of necessary food and clothing. They must do his bidding or else—no work; and "no work," no pay.

Mr. DOWNS. Who are some of these hiring bosses who have absolute power over the men on the piers? Let's look at the most important four docks on the New York waterfront, the piers between Manhattan's Forty-second and Fiftieth Streets on the Hudson River, the piers controlled by the Mickey Bowers mob. James Walsh is manager of the New York City Anticrime Committee. He can tell you about these men. [Pause.] Pier 84, berth of the American Export Lines, the *Constitution*, the *Independence*.

Mr. WALSH. Hiring boss, Danny St John, ex-convict, over 20 arrests, one prison escape, tried twice for murder in the first degree. Jury disagreed both times.

Mr. DOWNS. Pier 88, berth of the French Line, the *Ile de France*, the *Liberte*.

Mr. WALSH. Hiring boss, Toddy O'Rourke, 10 arrests, sentenced to 5 years in Sing Sing for grand larceny, a parole violator.

Mr. DOWNS. Pier 90, berth of the Cunard Line, the *Queen Mary*, the *Queen Elizabeth*.

Mr. WALSH. Hiring boss, Jimmy Clifford, 14 arrests for robbery or assault, 1 year probation for jostling, 18 months in the penitentiary for grand larceny.

Mr. DOWNS. Pier 92, also the Cunard Line. Mr. WALSH. Hiring boss, Jimmy McNay, alias Jimmy Heyer, seven arrests, sentenced to the reformatory for unlawful entry and to Eastern State Penitentiary for 7½ to 15 years for gang robbery.

Mr. DOWNS. These are the hiring bosses in one section alone. All are members of the Pistol local. Not all hiring bosses have records, but enough of them do to make anyone cry out—why? Why are they permitted to hold positions of life and death over the jobs of longshoremen? Ask the longshoreman who works under the hiring boss. He can give you the real answer. Only he won't. He won't if he knows what's good for him. We wanted to record several longshoremen for this program. No one would talk to us. We finally convinced a number of longshoremen in different parts of the port to talk by guaranteeing that we would not play their voices on the air—they might be identified. You are going to hear their stories, but through the mouths of intermediaries, professional actors. Here are your intermediaries.

Mr. QUINN. My name is Bill Quinn. I've heard the water-front tape recordings. Believe me, they're true. I'll repeat them for you, word for word.

Mr. GOSFIELD. I'm Maurice Gosfield. I've heard the records, too. We'll try to catch the flavor of the recordings without revealing the people who made them.

Mr. DOWNS. Ask the longshoreman what would happen to him if he talked. What would happen if he registered a protest? One longshoreman told us this. Here are his words in the voice of Bill Quinn.

Mr. QUINN. Well, you can always have an accident. They're very convenient. You could be walkin' and a guy could be raisin' a boom on a crane. The boom weighs about a thousand pounds, and I could just pull a lever and raise it and snap what we call the dog on it, and down the boom . . . no more you! Either that or they put you in a barrel and just throw the cement in, and sink you. And, then, the mud in the Hudson, it has a suction of about 12 feet so after you hit bottom you go 12 feet into the mud and they ain't gonna find you no more.

Mr. DOWNS. But that's necessary only in extreme cases. There's an easier weapon. Longshoremen, no matter how rough, are generally good family men. The mobsters, working through the hiring boss, can starve them out. Mr. Gosfield.

Mr. GOSFIELD. Well, if you make a squawk you're deprived of work, definitely fired, and you can't go to work on any other pier. You gotta keep your trap shut. You gotta play the game.

Mr. DOWNS. We asked Ed Florio, organizer for the ILA, in Hoboken, and at the same

time employer of men as a boss leader, his opinion about the records of some of the men and about crime on the water front. This is what he said.

Mr. FLORIO. This is Ed Florio, from Hoboken, ILA organizer for the State of New Jersey. They call me an ex . . . ex-convict and I was only arrested once. I was only convicted once, which is conspiracy, in bottling in the . . . during prohibition and I think that any man that drank liquor during prohibition was as guilty as I am for tryin' to make it. As for us being racketeers, you gotta work hard. We use men with records. If we didn't—if we didn't employ them what—what could they do? Use a gun again and go out—go out and do the same thing and go back again? No, we don't do that. We try—we try to re—to rehabilitate the men—the man that has the record. We don't specifically go out looking for them. We always have some . . . some higher-ups call us up—will you please do 'em a favor or somebody . . . somebody always intercedin' for them and we try to help the boys out.

Mr. DOWNS. There are an estimated 35,000 longshoremen working in the New York area. The average longshoreman worked around 1,000 hours in 1950. At \$2 an hour that's an annual wage of around \$2,000. The favored few make out better. On certain rare occasions, an outsider gets a first-hand view of what's going on. Bob Green, reporter for the Jersey City Journal, was at the city desk one Saturday when he got a call from a longshoremen's union local, saying that elections had just been held and new officers were taking over. It was Saturday. The local had 800 members. Only 35 could squeeze into the union headquarters. Bob Green became suspicious. He investigated and this is the story he turned up.

Mr. GREEN. Three men entered the headquarters of local 1247, ILA, 329 Grand Street, Jersey City, longshoremen's union local in Jersey City. They were Morris Manna, a prohibition mobster and former member of the alcohol mob, Barney "Cokeye" Brown, with a long record of many years served in jail, and George Donahue. Seated in the headquarters of the union were Anthony "Slim" Lucey, secretary-treasurer, and Frank "Siffe" DiLorenzo. Manna was the first to speak. He went over to DiLorenzo. He said "You're through." Then, they told DiLorenzo to start running, get out, and keep going. He went. The next one that they turned their attentions to was Anthony "Slim" Lucey. "Lucey, open up the safe," they said. "I'm not going to do it," said Lucey, who had already signed his resignation. He was rewarded for his efforts with a gun butt across the front of the mouth.

It knocked out seven of his teeth and knocked him to the ground. They took several pieces of newspaper, put them on the ground, set fire to them, on the floor of the union headquarters. Lucey's shoeless feet were forced into the fire and held there for several minutes. He suffered severe burns of the feet. That is how three mobsters took over a Local 1247, 329 Grand St., Jersey City, of the ILA, Jersey City.

Mr. DOWNS. Once the mobsters have taken over a union local or a pier through the hiring boss, once they have driven out the honest union officials, they proceed to make life miserable for the longshoremen. A dozen different rackets flourish, all aimed at fleecing the longshoreman of his skimpy pay. Compulsory gambling . . . if you don't play the numbers or bet with the bookie, you don't get called at the next "shape up." Kick-backs are extorted, especially from Italian, Negro, and Puerto Rican workers. The "loan shark" racket flourishes. You pay 10 percent interest per week; 520 percent a year, if you are unfortunate enough to hold a loan that long. Numbers, bookmaking, kick-backs, loan-sharking are controlled by the mobs. But that's not where they make

their big money. The big money comes from organized theft. One of our informants told us how it works. Mr. Gosfield, would you repeat the recording for us?

Mr. GOSFIELD. Yer see, there's two kinds of thefts. There is the commercial thief and there's the guy who steals for home consumption. They . . . take piers 84-87. Up there it's strictly commercial. They steal by the hundred thousands dollars' worth. Yer see, they work with the checker, the feller who checks the cargo when it comes off the ship. Yer see, the checker has a tally book that shows where every piece of cargo is on the ship before the ship arrives. Well, let's say they want to steal five hundred thousand dollars' worth of watches from Switzerland. Well, they know what they want before the ship gets here. The checker is supposed to get the longshoremen to put the valuable cargo in certain spots on the dock. When they want to steal a certain article, the hirin' boss tells the checker and the checker has him put it somewhere else. The checker never marks the cargo as comin' off the ship. See? It never did arrive in this country, so it's lost somewhere between here and France or wherever the ship comes from. Do yer follow me?

Mr. DOWNS. The cost of water-front theft and pilferage to insurance companies is \$60,000,000 a year and that's only part of the take. Organized theft is the big money-maker for the mobs. Second place is held by a little-known twenty-million-dollar dodge run by the so-called public loaders. Few steamship or company officials will make any direct accusations about water-front crime. They might have a costly strike on their hands the next day, a strike called by the mobsters with the man having no alternative but to follow orders. The honest union official, the honest businessman, doesn't stand a chance. But there's another reason why he won't make a statement, a much more vicious reason. James Walsh, of the New York City Anti-Crime Committee, had run up against that reason. Here he is.

Mr. WALSH. The big thing we're up against is the attitude of too many of the businessmen on the New York water front, who feel it's good for business to hire criminals. They say they're not reformers. They're in business to make money. If they had the choice between hiring a tough ex-convict for a boss' job or a man without a criminal record, they'll take the ex-con. The reason? They say the ex-con will keep the men in line and get the most work out of them.

Mr. DOWNS. The water front is a jungle where men spend their lives in fear, where the big eat the little, where the secret channels of influence, corruption, and crime flow just beneath the surface. One longshoreman probed that jungle for us and showed us how it works. The legitimate guy is in the middle. Mr. Quinn will repeat the recording for you.

Mr. QUINN. Yer see, the big boys need the tough guys. They need the tough guys to keep me in line so I don't get too brazen, upset their way of runnin' things. They—they also need the police department to keep the tough guys in line. If the tough guys go too far the police cut them down; and then they use the politicians to see that the police don't go too far and they've got the politicians' cuz—well, they kin use their muscle men to line up the vote for him. It's a three-ring circus. The legitimate guy's in the middle.

Mr. DOWNS. The boss of the International Longshoremen's Union is big, burly Joseph P. Ryan. He is president of the union for life. His constitutional powers put him in absolute control over union matters. He appoints and can fire the union organizers, men like ex-convicts Ed Florio, and Ed McGrath, and Alex Dibrizzi. Mr. Ryan defends the "shape up" hiring system.

Mr. RYAN. When I went to work longshorin' in 1912, you stayed on the pier from 7 o'clock in the mornin' to 7 at night, to protect your job because the hiring stevedore could come out any hour, 15 minutes after the hour or 5 minutes after the hour, blow the whistle and if you weren't there you lost your opportunity to secure work. These men, through the collective bargaining, through their collective strength, have changed that condition that now, if they are not hired at 7 55 in the morning, or at 12 55 at noon, they go home till the following morning at 8 o'clock and nobody can take their place.

(Music under.)

Mr. DOWNS. Once a year, at a fancy mid-town New York hotel, the Joseph P. Ryan Association gives a testimonial dinner to the man they call "Our Standard Bearer, Joseph P. Ryan." At that dinner you can find some strange combinations. Do these important people know about the guests at the other tables? At one table you'll find the mayor of the city of New York, the Honorable Vincent Impellitteri. At another table you'll find ship-jumper Jerry Anastasia, brother of the notorious Albert Anastasia.

The chairman of the arrangements committee is the wealthy and influential businessman, William J. "Bill" McCormack, president of the Transit-Mix Corp. and the Penn Stevedoring Co., and you can see John A. Coleman, former chairman of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange, while a member of the reception committee is Willie Cox, who did time in Elmira for biting off the ear of his neighbor. High police officials, high government officials, turn out for the dinner, for that dinner is a symbol of political power, a symbol of the votes that come out of the water front and its associated industries. This perhaps is the ultimate reason behind the water-front problem. It is politically dangerous to interfere with the set-up. So almost everybody in New York-New Jersey rides the water front merry-go-round, and the merry-go-round goes like this.

(Whistle.) The mayor says it's a job for the police and the DA. (Whistle.) The DA says the steamship companies and unions must take the responsibility. (Whistle.) The steamship companies say it's a job for the police and the mayor. (Whistle.) The police say the water front is as quiet as a church. (Whistle.) The commissioner of investigation says it's a labor-management problem. (Whistle.) The union says everybody spreads rumors, none of it is true. (Three blasts of whistle.)

Mr. DOWNS. We have only started to look at the water front crime picture. We haven't mentioned the ship-jumpers' racket, the dope smuggling, the phony social security cards. But there is something even more ominous. There is a single individual so big, so influential, that he cannot be touched and that individual is the power behind crime on the water front. That individual makes politicians, police, and union officials jump. That individual is "Mr. Big." We think we know his name. People who really understand the water front know his name, too. They all agree on who is "Mr. Big." Bill Keating is assistant manager of the New York City anticrime committee and a former assistant district attorney of New York. He can tell you about "Mr. Big."

Mr. KEATING. "Mr. Big" is an important, respectable businessman. He is a church-goer. He contributes to charitable causes. He is a close friend of governors, mayors, and important political figures past and present. He started out on the lower West Side of New York. His first work was driving a one-horse wagon in the market. He became involved in a struggle for power in one of the locals of the Teamsters Union. Early in World War I, he was involved in the loading of meat for the American troops in Europe and made a fortune at it. It was a rough business. Three contemporaries, Mickish

Keating, Tanner Smith, and "Rubber" Shaw were murdered. With money to back him, he stepped in and took over more and more unions on and off the water front. He found himself in a handy little position.

On the one hand he controlled certain key union locals. On the other hand he owned and operated the very businesses that those key unions serviced. This put him in a beautiful position to make even more money. He obtained juicy city contracts. He expanded his empire into more and more unrelated businesses. Politically, while he has been identified with one party, he plays both sides of the fence and he sees to it that each party gets a share of whatever labor support he can deliver and that each party gets a share of campaign contributions. No one has been able to prove that "Mr. Big" has committed a crime, but win the confidence of any old-time longshoreman, any veteran newspaper reporter, any cop who knows the West Side, and he'll tell you the name of "Mr. Big." Who is "Mr. Big"?

Mr. DOWNS. Well, who is "Mr. Big"? We can't tell you his name because there's not enough legal evidence to back up what every seasoned waterfront investigator knows, but we are convinced he's the real power behind the throne. What can be done about crime on the water front?

Well, the New York City anticrime committee, a group of private citizens organized to fight the gangsters, is a start. Spruille Braden, former ambassador to Argentina, heads the organization. He can sum it up for us.

Mr. BRADEN. The port of New York, the greatest port in the world, is being strangled by inefficiency but, even more, by crime and by political corruption. This is not a local matter. It affects every citizen in every one of the 48 States. These conditions have existed for over 30 years and they must not be permitted to endure any longer. The organized gangsters and racketeers must be driven off the water front. The archaic means of hiring, defended by the International Longshoremen's Union and the shipping interests, must be improved. The pattern of police connivance and political corruption must be cleaned up, and the power is behind the throne, the shadowy people who hide behind the cloak of respectability—they must be exposed. This is your problem. You must do something about it now.

Mr. DOWNS. Will you do something about it? Or will you let the rackets go on, the violence go on, the murder go on. The murder of good people, honest people, who only seek to lead a decent life on the water front of the greatest port of the Nation, the murder of men like Walley [Alluoto], who only 3 months ago, was about to become hiring boss on pier 3, in Hoboken. The mob did not approve of him. He might interfere with the operation of their racket. They killed him at union headquarters in Hoboken. Do you want to know what kind of a man he was? His widow, Mrs. Elizabeth Alluoto, can tell you. She speaks for the record. She did not want her voice impersonated by any actress. She speaks to you.

Mrs. ALLUOTO. They didn't come any better—he is greatest. Oh, he thought the world was his when he could talk about the kids, how they went to school, and where they went to school and how he hoped to see them graduate and how he felt that they were getting some place in the world, that in the future he hoped that they'd never have to work as hard as he and I did. His last thoughts, his dying thoughts, was his home. He had someone very close to him pay the telephone bill and the gas and electric bill, and he was dying.

How this could have happened, I don't know. I don't know. I can't—I can't accept it as yet. I've been out to the cem-

tery and I know it's so, yet I can't believe it. I keep waiting for that key in the door. [Cries.]

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard program No. 5 of the Nation's Nightmare, narrated by Bill Downs, presented transcribed as a public service by the CBS radio network, written and produced by Irving Gitlin.

Special acknowledgments to the numerous longshoremen, who risked their lives to give us the information used in this program.

(By Malcolm Johnson)

WASHINGTON, September 26.—Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, said today that it was time for the United States Government to end organized crime and racketeering on the New York-New Jersey water front.

Describing the water front as presenting one of the "worst situations in America today," WILEY said he was urging the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to launch an intensive investigation immediately after the congressional recess, probably in mid-October.

The Wisconsin Senator said he personally regretted that the Senate Crime Committee, of which he was a member, had not explored water-front crime more fully, but that since this committee had expired he was now urging the job on the Commerce group.

But if the Commerce Committee intends to act, WILEY declared, it must move promptly, because time is running short. It should ask for and get the necessary money to finance a thorough, vigorous investigation, he said, during the next 2 weeks.

Indicating that other authorities in the past had ducked the water-front crime problem, WILEY declared:

"It is Uncle Sam's job to clean up the water front and then to have the job carried on by local and State officials.

"Once the congressional session is over, the Senate Commerce Committee should begin some real spadework to get at the bottom of organized piracy and other crimes on the New York water front."

Since the Crime Committee's expiration, WILEY said that a mass of material on water-front crime had been turned over to the Commerce Committee headed by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado.

JOHNSON has informed him, said WILEY that his committee is now busy with hearings on legislation recommended by the Crime Committee, but is giving consideration to the proposal for a new waterfront probe.

WILEY said that the water front poses an international problem, involving hundreds of millions of dollars in shipping.

He declared:

"The time is long overdue when the United States Government must indicate to organized gangsterism on the waterfront who is going to be boss, the big shots in waterfront crime or Uncle Sam.

"The present situation is a cancerous one which can be suicidal for New York-New Jersey shipping, if it remains unchecked.

"It is paradoxical that the west coast, which I have just visited in connection with the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty, faces the problem of a Communist stranglehold on the water front, while the east coast faces the problem of a criminal stronghold."

WILEY said:

"An unholy alliance between questionable elements in labor and the shipping business is exacting a staggering toll on the ultimate consumer."

He was referring, he said, to the numerous rackets on the New York waterfront costing untold millions of dollars a year.

WILEY said a vigorous, honest Federal investigation should endeavor to track down and expose a mysterious businessman who has been identified as the "Mr. Big" of the dock rackets.

Wiley said that he had been informed of the identity of "Mr. Big," but that he considered the over-all problem as much bigger and tougher than unmasking one individual.

"We must attack the basic problem," said Wiley. "Unless the basic problem is solved, there will always be some top boss in the racket, call him Mr. Big or what you will."

Wiley expressed regret that Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, to whom he also appealed for a probe of labor racketeering on the docks, was apparently unable or unwilling to make such an investigation.

Food Donations Run Out Before Line of Caterpillar Strike Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following clipping taken from the Wednesday, September 26, issue of the Peoria Star entitled "Food Donations Run Out Before Line of Caterpillar Strike Needy".

FOOD DONATIONS RUN OUT BEFORE LINE OF CATERPILLAR STRIKE NEEDY

An estimated 700 persons, all Caterpillar employees or members of their families without money to buy food because of the strike at the East Peoria tractor plant, showed up to claim 320 bags of groceries Tuesday afternoon.

The groceries or money for them had been donated to the city fire department and were distributed from the central fire station.

After standing in line for 2 hours, those who could not be taken care of were turned away empty-handed.

"We didn't expect nearly so many," exclaimed Fire Chief Dan Donahue. "Only 250 Caterpillar employees registered with us, and we expected to give more than one sack of groceries to some of the needier ones."

As it turned out, those who registered got one sack of groceries, and of those who didn't register, many got nothing.

Collection and distribution of more food is planned. Fire officials will meet today to discuss holding another show, only on a much larger scale, to collect food for the needy families.

Charles W. Baumflek, chairman of the fire and police commission, who was instrumental in arranging for the distribution, said he was amazed at the turn-out.

"These people are really hungry," he said. "They would have to be to come up here and stand in line for a small package of food."

There were people standing in line who several months ago were making charitable donations themselves. Young mothers with two or three children waited patiently while their husbands collected the parcels handed out by firemen.

It wasn't an easy job for the firemen. Many of them handed the packages to friends and neighbors. The remarks of one fireman summed up the whole situation.

"This isn't charity," he said. "It's just giving a helping hand to a neighbor who suddenly finds himself in a tight spot."

Money for the food was collected last Saturday during a variety show held in front of Brook's Fashion Store, 221 South Adams Street. Commissioner Baumflek, who is also manager of Brook's Fashion Store, made arrangements for the show with Roy King, well-

known Peoria singer, radio station WEEK, and Chief Donahue.

Peorians gave \$400 in cash donations and some food. With the \$400, Chief Donahue and Assistant Chiefs Rudy Kneer, Ray Miller, James Barden, and Ed Nash, went shopping. The firemen displayed an eye for bargains that would amaze most housewives.

With only the \$400 to go on, they gathered together more than \$1,000 worth of food. Into each package they stuffed beans, bread, bacon, puffed wheat, pork and beans, flour, spaghetti, peas, margarine, condensed milk, corn, sugar, potatoes, apples, cottage cheese, and milk. Each family received a half gallon of milk. Those with three or more children were given a full gallon.

Persons who registered beforehand received their parcels as local radio personalities, Bob Burton of station WEEK, and Robin Weaver of station WIRL, read off their names over the fire station's loudspeaker system.

After these packages were given out, some 80 remaining parcels were handed out to others who had not registered. Their names were recorded, however, to avoid duplication. Several cases of milk remained after the food supply was exhausted, and the milk was handed out to the remaining Caterpillar workers.

"We can't stop now," Chief Donahue said later. "I'm convinced these people need help in a hurry."

The fire chief appealed for additional donations. Food, and cash with which to purchase food if needed. If donations cannot be delivered to the central fire station, a telephone call to the fire department will bring firemen to pick up the donations. All parceling and distribution will be taken care of by firemen.

Needy Caterpillar families, who have not been given food, are requested to telephone the fire department operator and register their names, addresses, badge numbers, and number of children in the family. When enough donations are gathered, the fire department will announce another distribution date.

To Think of Peace as Well as War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear indication in Stephen Spender's *To Think of Peace as Well as War*—New York Times magazine, August 12, 1951—appended hereto, how the world trend can be reversed. Today we see that actions begin in the minds of men; the ancients knew that "energy follows thought." Thus a sharp, continual, conscious focus upon the objective of world stability and peace would release a flood of energy and practical effort in that direction. World policy makers might well ponder this concept:

TO THINK OF PEACE AS WELL AS WAR—THIS IS THE WAY TO AVOID THE GREAT DANGERS OF SABER-RATTLING AND TIMOROUS PACIFISM
(By Stephen Spender)

There is an uneasy, almost superstitious fear in many people's mind that war is brought closer by their thinking about it. Catchwords like "the cold war," "the war of nerves," and so on, partly imply the idea of a kind of mental war already taking place. It is as though thoughts were actors in a

Greek tragedy going on inside our heads; an interior tragedy bound in the long run to break out into external terror and destruction. Is there a truth in this widely held belief: is war brought closer by people thinking about it?

It is true that thinking about violence may lead to a state of mind in which people actually wish for it, even will war. The atmosphere may become so tense that the real thing seems almost a relief, like hearing the name of the fatal illness from which a friend is suffering. Metaphors about storms which are a release after the ominous waiting in thundery air drop into the minds of people with weak nerves.

The enormously enlarged plans for rearmament which have been announced by the western governments since Korea show that we certainly are preparing for war. But the purpose of these preparations, we are told, is not war but peace. This makes it all the more urgent that the material preparations should not produce a widespread state of mind which becomes an impalpable force within the situation, tending to war, perhaps even making it inevitable. This result would, of course, be to defeat the purpose of our preparedness. Yet the danger of a war mentality spreading so that it becomes an impalpable factor working in ways which may well be beyond the calculations of statesmen is serious. In 1935 a political philosopher remarked to me that he had never known an armaments race to begin without its leading inevitably to war. We are faced by a situation in which we have to see that this does not happen now.

Obviously, certain forms of public discussion increase the chances of war. For example, politicians and journalists in the democracies who take advantage of freedom of the press and of speech to proclaim to the world that we should launch war in order to forestall a hypothetical attack on the west are increasing the chances of war by demanding it, and also by giving the east an excuse for launching an attack for precisely the same reasons.

Aggressive talk is one kind of danger. It has its opposite—a timorous pacifism. The neutralist, pacifist discussion which goes on in Europe is really the counterpart of the outbursts of saber rattling in the United States. And just as dangerous, for both encourage the opponent to attack—the one by warning him that if he does not attack us he may be attacked; the other by telling him that if attacked we will not defend ourselves. Both these kinds of thinking are the results of fear. Fear is always dangerous because the frightened person finally discovers that it is better for an imaginary fear to materialize than for him to go on being afraid.

If one is tempted to believe that thinking about it increases the chances of war, it is well to remind one's self that not thinking about it is also dangerous, just as if rearmament is dangerous, disarmament can be dangerous also. A refusal to envisage war and to rearm did not save Britain and France from attack by Hitler.

What we need is neither to think obsessively nor to refuse to think obsessively, but to think calmly and clearly about why we are rearming, and with a determination to avoid catastrophe. Thinking about war, like thinking about any other realistic problem must be a detached means of appraising risks and a rejection of two temptations—escapism on the one side, an impulsive rushing into catastrophe on the other.

At present the entire world seems plunged into an atmosphere of apprehension. We go about in a mood of oppressive realism like characters in a play by Ibsen. This being so, I have heard people express the wish that the present postwar period might resemble the 1920's, which were suffused partly with the idealism of the League of Nations and partly with the gaiety of the bright young

things and the excitement of new ideas in literature and art coming from Paris and Berlin.

Yet the optimism, idealism, and gaiety of the 1920's did not prevent the foundations of the Second World War being laid in a decade which notably failed to solve the main problems of the postwar epoch. These problems were in part the economic conditions which led to unemployment, in part the stultified nationalism of nations which, though weak, refused to merge their sovereignty in the international rule of the League of Nations.

Looking back, it is quite clear that the failure of the period after World War I was a failure of the peoples of the West to be realistic. Without a realism almost as oppressive as our own today the climate could not be created in which the West would make the tremendous economic and political changes necessary to prevent the Second World War. To regret the 1920's is to regret a decade of fatal illusions which led straight into the economic and political disasters of the 1930's, when war gradually became inevitable.

So, if a certain manner of thinking about war makes it more probable, a refusal to think about it at all creates an atmosphere in which it is impossible for statesmen to take measures necessary to prevent war.

The state of affairs most likely to encourage modern warfare seems in fact precisely that of the twenties and thirties, when half of civilization was dreaming unrealistically about peace and refusing to face the issues of the postwar world, while the other half—the so-called have-nots—were thinking with brutal realism about the means whereby they might fall upon these deluded, softened-up haves.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, despite the First World War, the idea of a world in which wars would be unnecessary became so widespread that the greater part of civilization was lulled into a wholly false sense of security. Even after 1933 the world outside Germany, Japan, and Italy was one that had advanced beyond the stage of solving its problems of economic and political rivalry by means of bombs and armies. Large-scale warfare had become so unthinkable to most people that they could not bring themselves to face the measures needed to meet the ill-will of a small minority who had not advanced to the same stage of civilization.

The lesson of recent years is that we have to think in terms of measures which may be used against us. Only a few years ago it was plain that three-quarters of the world had developed beyond the stage of war-mindedness. But World War II showed that we had overestimated the stage of development which the world as a whole had reached. The result has been a set-back, a relapse into universal violence. This is discouraging, not only because it is an enormous waste and diversion of our material resources, but also because it causes us to have to think in barbarous ways which we had outgrown.

However, if we were too optimistic before, there is a danger of becoming too pessimistic now. After all, what has happened is that we have been forced to recognize a state of affairs which is cruder and worse than we had thought. Nonetheless, love of peace and the achievement of many millions of people whose minds have developed beyond the stage of war are not lost.

We have acquired a more realistic understanding of the world, and this can be cause for hope rather than discouragement. The peace of the world could have been saved after 1918 if the western peoples then had shown a little of the grim political realism which is almost universal now. Therefore, our realism, which involves us in being discouraged, may save us from a third world war.

The thinking of ordinary people is not, of course, going to decide the final issue one way or the other. But it may provide the mental environment in which statesmen can decide the peace. Moreover, if a democratic world safe from wars and revolutions is really going to spread its civilization over a larger part of the world than the little areas of Western Europe and North America, the democratic peoples will have to think very hard and very long—as with the fear of God in them—carrying in their minds the problems which make a Chinese coolie or a Slav worker turn to communism, and prepared to pay the price in thinking and material sacrifice which will make freedom identical with bread.

What is required of us is that within our own minds we turn the thinkability of war into the thinkability of peace. We must live, as it were, under an endless sentence of war and yet never forget that to bow to this sentence means the end of civilization.

Soil Conservation and Flood Control— Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, Washita River watershed flood-control dedication celebration, near Cordell, Okla., July 8, 1948:

SOIL CONSERVATION AND FLOOD CONTROL

I am especially glad of this opportunity to join with you in this flood-control celebration with Cloud Creek subwatershed of the Washita Valley. It was a long time before the type of flood-control work being done here—although long needed—was finally recognized formally through congressional approval, in the Flood Control Act of 1936.

I also am proud that I was able to have some part in the events that resulted in making upstream watershed conservation a recognized part of our national flood-control program. And it naturally gives me much satisfaction to come out here into such a watershed and see our broadened flood control approach being put into action, the way I saw the work being done on a trip over part of the watershed yesterday, and the way you can see it for yourself here in this reservoir detention phase of the work.

This illustrates what I have long felt is the true situation about floods, namely: Flood control is a job which begins where the rains fall and runoff starts, and ends only when that runoff has safely reached the ocean.

We have come here today to give recognition to one of the most important developments in our agricultural history, but on this particular occasion the purpose of our visit is twofold. First, we are here to see for ourselves the things that are being accomplished in a program which has been designed to reduce flood damage on the tributary watersheds of the Washita River. A second reason for our coming is to focus the attention of the Nation on this program, for the people of the Washita River watershed, aided by their government, have set out on a tremendous undertaking which, when completed, will be

a good job done and a strong inducement to the people of other watersheds to take hold of the flood-control work in earnest.

Today we are observing the unfolding of a new plan of attack on the forces which take the lives of human beings, destroy crops, damage or ruin agricultural land, and take heavy toll of rural and urban property. We are tackling this problem at the very beginning, on the small watersheds far upstream where the raindrops first begin their journey from the land to the sea. From time to time I have pointed out that floods are no more than raindrops, infinitely multiplied and allowed to concentrate into uncontrolled torrents, which sweep destructively over the banks of streams.

If, in a flood-reduction program, we can force this water, or even a considerable part of it, to delay its race to the sea, we have won a part of our objective. Our aim, then, is to hold back as much as possible of the surplus water so as to reduce the height and destructiveness of floods.

We do not claim, in setting out on this undertaking, that we can control major floods with this kind of work alone. Some of the peak flow can be cut down, and this will help, but for the heavier floods there will be needed additional controls in the way of reservoirs, levees, and other main channel operations.

These major engineering operations are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers. It is our belief that a combination of these programs—the main channel program supplemented by the upstream program—can get the job of preventing and controlling floods accomplished.

At this point, I think it should be mentioned that the two programs have been planned by congressional action, not as any process of substitution of one for the other, but rather for the one to supplement and aid the other. I happen to know when and how the flood-control bill was first changed to add on the upstream phase of the work—and that change didn't take place altogether accidentally. I am referring to the occasion, about the middle 1930's, when it was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of War that efforts be made to permit the soil and water conservation efforts of the Department of Agriculture to become a supplemental part of the flood-control program. There was considerable discussion of the matter, but the suggestion was finally accepted—and here it is going into action right before us.

I want to add this point, that it has seemed to me the job of the Department of Agriculture follows closer along the line of flood prevention, while the major engineering operations of the Corps of Engineers follow more nearly along the line of control of floods—after the water gets down into trunk stream channels. This makes a perfect fitting together of the two phases of a comprehensive, completely coordinated program of flood control.

CLOUD CREEK DETENTION DAM

This dam we have seen here today is symbolic of a comprehensive program of proper soil and water use and treatment already well under way. It is true that it is the first such structure, built entirely for flood control, to be completed in such a program. But the program of which it is a part has been going on for months. Other such dams are under construction even now and still others are under contract and are soon to be started.

FLOOD-CONTROL SURVEYS

Congress has authorized more than 600 watersheds for preliminary flood-control examination and survey to determine whether the benefits to be derived from such a flood-control program would justify the cost. The Department of Agriculture has completed preliminary examinations on 154 watersheds

or portions of watersheds, and it has furnished 18 survey reports. Congress has authorized programs of watershed improvement on 11 watersheds in various parts of the country—of which this is one. Some work has been done in each of these 11 watersheds.

FLOOD-CONTROL ACTIVITIES OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE¹

The survey work and the operations by the Soil Conservation Service are carried on through our seven regional offices under the general direction of my office in Washington. The Division of Water Conservation in Washington and, respectively, in these seven regions directs the preliminary examinations and surveys and the preparation or work plans.

Turning back a few decades to the time when the land was in virgin condition, there were overflows occasionally, but they were not so violent as now. The land had not been plowed for cultivation. The rains that fell soaked into the ground, nourishing the plants and replenishing the underground water. The streams, because their sources were undisturbed and there was little silt dislodged from the hillsides, ran clear. Nature was in balance.

There are those in this audience who can remember the way the land here looked in those days. Some of you—like John Cassady of Cheyenne—can remember the settling of the Washita. There was much tall grass, roaming buffalo, and clear streams with open channels.

The forces that made these rolling, grass-covered hills and plains have not changed.

The change that has taken place, to the everlasting detriment of the land, has been made by man himself, and man has been the loser.

The situation changed sharply during World War I. The Nation needed cotton and wheat to fight a war. Prices of these and other farm commodities soared to high levels. That brought about the clearing off of a limited amount of timber and the plowing up of hundreds of thousands more acres of grassland in the Washita watershed. And the land yielded its bounty in response to the need.

But following 1917 we have seen the costly disadvantages of using the land without consideration of its character and adaptability. We have seen much of the precious topsoil of the Washita Valley washed away with each rain. We have seen stream channels so choked with the debris of erosion as to reduce their capacity to carry water, by hundreds of thousands of acre feet. We have seen the flood waters drown crops and scour the land of the watersheds. Some of you have even known the tragedy of the loss of relatives and friends as floods swept down the tributaries of the Washita.

Many of you have been concerned for a long time over this wasting away of the valley's soil resource while, at the same time, the problem of flood damage was on the increase. Recently it was called to my attention that one of the chambers of commerce in the Washita watershed made a study of erosion conditions in the area as early as 1930. Many of you realized at that time, I am sure, that this part of Oklahoma was losing something of great value to its economy and that this wastage—of good land especially—was playing a part in adding to the severity of the floods that were seriously hurting the whole watershed area.

It is appropriate, I think, to recall two events that influenced our efforts toward both soil conservation and flood control. On

the night of April 4, 1934, a 10-inch rain brought death and destruction to the locality of Hammon. Twelve persons died that night in the waters that rushed down Kiowa, Sandstone, and White Shield Creeks and on down the Washita. On May 12, 1934, that same year, only 38 days later, there occurred the worst of all the famed black blizzards during what is commonly referred to as the Dust Bowl days.

The flood served to spur the residents of the Washita Valley to more determined effort to get a flood-prevention program started. The duster, carrying millions of tons of soil from the unprotected fields of the great plains, sent its black clouds across the Capital of the Nation and far out over the Atlantic Ocean. These things and their numerous companion disasters elsewhere served at least one purpose: They helped impress the people of the country, and its lawmakers, of the vast cost of needless land abuse.

In the years that followed, you people of Oklahoma were busy. You worked out a plan designed to halt the devastation on the Washita, and you called on your Representatives in Washington for assistance. Your efforts, combined with similar efforts from other localities, resulted in the 1936 Omnibus Flood Control Act adopted by the Seventy-fifth Congress. This act defined and unified the flood-control activities of the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture. As already indicated, it made the Department of Agriculture responsible for flood-control operations on the watersheds, on the upper reaches of the tributaries where the floods actually begin. It made the War Department, through its Corps of Engineers, responsible for the larger flood-control structures on the main stems of our streams.

The Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service were the Department of Agriculture agencies designated to carry out its flood-control activities, the former working mainly in those areas where agriculture is importantly developed and the Forest Service in the upper headwater areas, occupied to a large extent by national and State forests.

WASHITA SURVEY

The Flood Control Act also authorized the two Departments to conduct surveys of the Washita to find out whether flood-control operations, both upstream and down, would produce benefits that would justify the spending of public funds.

The Department of Agriculture survey covered studies of various phases of the watershed problem: As the agricultural history; type of land, climate, especially rainfall, and the effects of changing conditions on the economy of the watershed. The survey report showed, among other things, that some 900,000 acre-feet of soil had been lost between about 1918, when the growing of clean-tilled crops showed a marked increase, and 1938; approximately 1,100,000 acres had suffered severe erosion; around 2,000,000 acres had suffered some erosion—from slight to moderate; about \$2,250,000 annual flood damage, with farmers bearing about 96 percent of the loss; approximately 2,700,000 acres in cultivation; some 250,000 acres, formerly cultivated, abandoned; and about 207,000 acres in need of permanent revegetation.

These results reflect erosion conditions in the 1928-39 period. In many parts of the Washita watershed the conditions later became much more severe than the earlier figures reflect. Some of the land that was classified as suitable for cultivation, with protective measures, in 1938 has now been so damaged it is impracticable to cultivate it further. Such areas have also become sources of quicker runoff and increased production of sediment.

The survey party took into account, as well as possible, the estimated benefits that

would result from the spending of public money to correct these conditions, and these were most encouraging. The estimates, based on 1938 price levels, were as follows.

Benefits to farmers and ranchers, approximately \$5,000,000 annually; and reduction in flood damage, \$357,000 annually.

For each dollar invested, the estimated overall benefits were put at \$3.85.

By 1948 prices and costs, the damage to land and crops would be doubled or more. Benefits likewise would be increased greatly in dollar value. By any measurement, flood damages are costly and should be reduced as much and as rapidly as may be practicable.

WASHITA VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

About the time the flood-control report was being prepared, the citizens of the Washita Valley gathered at Chickasha and formed the Washita Valley Improvement Association. This organization announced that its purpose was to promote the improvement of the Washita Valley through flood control, soil conservation, and proper use of land and water. The objectives of this organization and its efforts to carry out these objectives are a tribute to the vision and the courage of the people of the Washita Valley.

SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Probably most of you here know how soil-conservation districts are organized, how quickly they have spread over the country, and how cooperatively and effectively the farmers in districts are going about their work. For the information of the others and to reemphasize again the responsibilities of the men who manage the affairs of these districts, I want to say that the districts, in my opinion, represent the foundation stones on which the soil-conservation program rests. These districts in most States are units of State government. The men who serve on the district boards here in Oklahoma are landowners who are chosen by ballot. The basis of this program is as democratic as it has been possible to make it, and that is the way it should be.

In setting out on this nation-wide districts program, the people of Oklahoma helped lead the way. Your legislature was quick to act in adopting the State soil-conservation district law and quick to start the first district in the Southwest in operation. That, I think, is typical of the way you people do things down here. You move in a straight line, and fast.

When the standard district law was submitted to the States in 1937, I would have been gratified indeed if 10 States had adopted it within 10 years. But all the States adopted it within less than 10 years. Now our Territories have adopted soil conservation district acts, and a number of foreign nations, too.

These districts, including those in your own Washita Valley Council of Soil Conservation Districts, cover more than a billion acres. They include almost two-thirds of the farmland and about three-fourths of the country's farms and ranches. Oklahoma is near the top of the list in district organization, with 93 percent of the State within the boundaries of 77 districts by May 1 this year. They include more than 33,000,000 acres of Oklahoma's approximately 36,000,000 acres of land in farms. Many of you here today are soil conservation district supervisors and know the solid foundation on which your districts have been built. You don't need for me to remind you of the liberal contributions of time and effort which enter into successful soil conservation district organization and direction, reflected in such concrete accomplishments as the Washita flood-control program which brings us together here today.

Such accomplishments, on the farms in the Washita Valley, throughout Oklahoma,

¹ Bennett, H. H., Soil Conservation, McGraw-Hill, 1939; Soil Conservation and Flood Control, pp. 506-616. See also Outdoor America, April, 1947, p. 8.

the Southwest, and the United States, speak for the success of this unique soil conservation district organization. It is too soon for the July 1 figures to be in, but I can tell you that during 1947, for example, farmers in soil conservation districts applied, with Soil Conservation Service assistance, an average of around 25 percent more conservation practices to their lands than during the preceding year. This progressive accomplishment was realized in spite of the fact that the Service had less technical help for districts and had to spread it among many more new districts. That explains why there were about 45,000 more applications filed by district farmers in 1947 for conservation surveys, planning, and treatment than new plans could be prepared, bringing the backlog on file to around 200,000 formal farmer requests for conservation plans. Of course, thousands of those have been serviced in the past 6 months, but added thousands of new applications have been made.

Up to January 1, this year, farmers and our technicians, working out in the fields together, had prepared throughout the Nation more than half a million completely coordinated conservation plans of whole farms and ranches in soil-conservation districts. These plans cover more than 160,000,000 acres, and the acreage on which conservation treatment had been applied totaled more than 76,000,000 acres in districts alone. In order to get a comprehensive idea of how we are progressing with the basic soil and water conservation job, we need to add the additional millions of acres planned and treated under other programs in which our Service has participated, plus the large acreage taken care of the first half of this year. In addition, nearly 270,000,000 acres of detailed conservation surveys had been completed by the first of the year—surveys which are necessary as a foundation for sound farm planning and treatment, just as flood-control surveys must precede actual operations.

The galloping rate at which Oklahoma farmers and ranchers are moving ahead with their soil-conservation work likewise is shown by the figures on accomplishments to January 1, this year. They showed about 34,500 active plans in the districts alone, with 7,750,000 acres planned and nearly 4,000,000 acres treated. I noted such items as these going to make up that healthy total of application of conservation measures on the land—1,250,000 acres of contour planting and a million acres of cover crops, close to 2,000,000 acres of stubble-mulching and 45,000 miles of terraces and diversions; more than 3,500,000 acres of conservation range stocking and 15,500 farm and ranch ponds; more than half a million acres of range and pasture seeding, and numerous other measures applied.

Together, in the right combinations suited to the capabilities of the land, these measures provide the only complete and lasting conservation of our productive land. I refer to the treatment of each acre according to its needs, and the use of every acre for the purpose to which it is properly suited. There is no substitute for this acre-by-acre soil and water conservation planning and treatment, no practical or economical short cut—no other way to do the job properly, scientifically, and most effectively.

And it is only by this means, in the long run, that we can be sure of permanently safeguarding the good land we have left before it is too late. If we had embarked on such a common-sense and foresighted program 50 or 100 years before we woke up to what was happening to our land, we wouldn't be faced with the situation we are today—of still shrinking productive land acreage at a time when our own and the world's population is increasing rapidly, with the end not yet in sight with respect to heavy drains on our land to meet world-wide food and other demands.

Soil Conservation and Flood Control— Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, Washita River watershed flood-control dedication celebration, near Cordell, Okla., July 8, 1948:

We have left, for example, only about 460,000,000 acres of high-grade cropland in the United States, as well as can be determined. But all but about 100,000,000 acres of it is subject to erosion or other forms of depreciation, when used without safeguards. And from 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 acres of it needs clearing, irrigation, drainage, or other improvements to make it productive.

Around a fourth of the cropland is being damaged at a critically rapid rate by erosion. Much of this approximately 115,000,000 acres will be permanently damaged and some of it ruined for further cultivation every year it is cropped without protection. It ought to be protected—and can be—with treatment like that which so many of you are carrying out in the Washita Valley, during the next 10 to 15 years, or not later than by about 1960. Still another area of cropland of about the same extent should, for the same reason, receive adequate protection by not later than about 1970. Additional millions of acres on which erosion is beginning or is likely to begin at any time must not be neglected, nor must we overlook the millions of acres of range land also affected.

You know, without my reciting figures for you, how your own Oklahoma lands have suffered, some of them in only half a century of agricultural use. I am convinced from what I have seen and from what I know in general about your soil-conservation progress out here that you are alert to the urgency of the situation. The job still ahead is such a big one, however, that you cannot afford to relax for a single season or for a single day in pushing ahead to its completion.

RETARDATION OF RUNOFF

At the outset I pointed out that our purpose today is to recognize an important milestone in our campaign against floods and erosion damage. I would like to emphasize the importance of this occasion. In this new treatment of agricultural land to assist in the control of surplus rainfall, we have started a new program. For the first time in history, we are going into the small watersheds, far upstream and out on tributaries of our main waterways, and there we are seeking to provide relief from floods to the small farmer or landowner who year after year has been undergoing hardships through crop and soil losses. Frequently, the accompanying flood damage along these upper "little waters" accounts for 75 percent of the total watershed flood damage. That gives you an idea of their importance. We have developed in this program a unique combination of soil-conservation, engineering, and forestry practices designed to safely dispose of surplus water and also to make the best practical use of the water that otherwise would be wasted.

Our main objective is to retard the discharge of water from upstream areas until it can be absorbed by the land or carried off without destructive effects. And while

we are thus retarding runoff, we are at the same time, and by the same means, reducing the effects of erosion; and we are storing in the soil for later use the water that may mean a good crop instead of a poor one or a failure. Also, we are, by the same operation, reducing the rate of sedimentation of stream channels, ditches, reservoirs, and productive bottomlands.

In our normal conservation work the objective has been to keep our agricultural lands permanently productive while in use. In our flood-control operations more emphasis is put on the task of slowing down runoff. For both purposes, we terrace sloping land, plow it on the contour, strip-crop it, fill gullies, take steep, highly erodible land out of cultivation and put it under the protection of trees or grass, and so on. Protection of waterways with grass, protection of land with stubble-mulch farming, and building up the fertility of the soil also aid both flood-control and soil-conservation operations. In doing these things, we are prescribing for our agricultural land the treatment that it needs to make it permanently and continually productive. We do this in much the same way that a doctor diagnoses the needs of a patient and seeks to restore him to the peak of health.

In watershed flood-control work we go considerably beyond the normal requirements of soil and water conservation. Our aim is to hold back for a longer time the water that falls on cropland or rangeland. So in this program we give special attention to measures, including engineering, that help to hold back water and slow down its flow.

Let us suppose that 50 to 80 percent of the landowners of a small watershed (such as this one) have treated their land with a coordinated soil-conservation program. They have terraced their farmlands and are tilling their fields on the contour. They have adopted soil-protecting and soil-improving rotations, and they are using all the other measures that their land needs for the maintenance of its productivity permanently. There still, however, would be damaging runoff and sediment loss (water-transported erosion material) from the area. The sediment mostly comes from the areas of unprotected land, treatment of some of which lies beyond the means of individuals or even groups of landowners. To retard this runoff and hold back the sediment may require special measures which may offer little benefit to the farmer on whose land they are built, but which are of great value to other farmers and residents downstream. Such measures are not often planned or applied in soil-conservation districts outside of flood-control project areas.

For example, we are now standing near the site of a small detention reservoir, designed by the flood-control technicians of the Soil Conservation Service working in cooperation with the local soil-conservation district. There will be many such reservoirs in the Washita project. Each is designed to impound water temporarily and release it at a rate which will not exceed the capacity of the channel below.

This reservoir is designed to provide enough storage capacity for the runoff from the heaviest rain that may fall over a 25-year period, or 900,000 gallons a minute. This reservoir was constructed to reduce this rate of discharge to 25,000 gallons a minute. This slower rate of runoff will continue for days instead of the whole reduction taking place in a few hours.

All the ordinary soil- and water-conservation measures, applied over this entire sub-watershed of 5,900 acres, probably would not accomplish this end in themselves. There would still be a need for a structure of this kind to keep runoff, after a heavy rain, low enough for the stream system to handle it without damage.

OTHER FLOOD-CONTROL TOOLS OF THE SOIL CONSERVATIONIST

In addition to the reservoirs, there are provisions for structures for waterway stabilization and gully control. Both contribute toward runoff retardation also. These include earth gully-plugs, drop-inlets, drop structures, and flumes. Such structures are designed not only to stabilize the grade of the waterway or gully, but to hold back sediment while the erosion above is being controlled through the establishment of vegetative protection. Many of these structures may not be needed for ordinary soil-conservation purposes.

Floodwater diversions are built to divert hill-land runoff and thereby prevent floodwater and sedimentation damage to highly productive bottomland. Flood-control waterways are used to carry hill-land runoff safely through cultivated areas, thereby preventing floodwater and sediment damage to productive cropland. They may serve as outlets for floodwater diversions or other flood-control structures.

In some places it may be necessary to straighten, clear, or enlarge the stream channel in order to reduce the frequency of flooding of adjacent cultivated land.

Cooperative roadside erosion control also contributes to the stabilization of roadside ditches, especially through proper shaping and by establishment of vegetative protection. This is an effective means of reducing the rate of sediment production. It also materially reduces the cost of road maintenance.

Revegetation of critical floodwater and sediment-source areas, such, for example, as critical slopes in fields, is another important tool in this program. There are many areas of land which have been so severely eroded that their usefulness for cultivation has been ruined. Where these areas are larger than a few acres, or are very numerous, it may be beyond the means of an individual farmer or a group of landowners to stabilize them. The revegetation of these areas, and the control of sediment produced by them while this is being accomplished, will be a public benefit in reducing sediment damage to lower-lying land, stream channels, ditches, and reservoirs.

Ordinary soil- and water-conservation measures are for the protection and improvement of the land on which they are applied, and consequently the principal benefit is received by the operator or owner of the farm on which such work is done. Therefore, it is only proper that the farmer should bear the principal cost.

On the other hand, the special measures and structures used in aid of flood control are designed to benefit bottomlands along the major tributaries and their branches and to keep sediment out of stream channels and reservoirs. Because these are public benefits, the public should bear the major part of the costs, so long as they are justified by the benefits to be expected.

This program of watershed improvement is good business, and I like to think of it in that way. When any of us invest our money in an enterprise, we want it to be a safe investment, and we want it to yield a reasonable rate of return. This program is good business for the farmers and the ranchers, and it is good business for the merchants and the professional men—everybody—in the communities involved. The measures used in this program fit in well with soil-conservation measures. Together these programs protect land, crops, livestock, and buildings. They aid in holding and building up soil fertility, often increase production, and make farming operations easier.

BENEFITS

I have mentioned the benefits that are considered when a flood-control program is planned. I will give some examples which have been passed on to me from some of our field technicians.

Below the two detention reservoirs on this Cloud Creek watershed are 179 acres of bottom land which will be protected directly by these dams. Protection of this land from flooding will mean that 11 acres now idle will be turned into irrigated cropland, 7 acres of pasture will become cropland (4 acres of it to be irrigated); 141 acres will remain in cropland and its productivity will be greatly increased; 5 acres will remain in pasture, and 15 acres of brushland can be cleared for pasture as needed. Conservatively, we estimate that the production from this 179 acres will be increased from 35 to 40 percent as a result of the installation of these measures.

In this particular watershed, in addition to the two detention dams, there will be six drop inlets, nine earth gully plugs, 3.7 miles of flood-control diversions, one-half mile of roadside waterways, and four soil flumes. You have observed that this work is nearly finished in this watershed.

When the combined flood-control and soil-conservation programs have been applied to the land in the watershed—more than 4,000 acres—I am confident that you will find the value of the land has been doubled, some of it tripled.

One of the farmers here, E. E. Weaver, tells our field men that he has tried alfalfa in one of these bottom-land fields year after year. Invariably it has flooded out. The man who farmed the place before him tells the same story. But now Mr. Weaver can grow alfalfa on his bottom land and it will not be destroyed by floodwaters.

Another farmer, Dave Merkey, estimates that this program will increase the value of his farm by from \$3,000 to \$4,000. Wheat on his bottom land produces 30 to 50 bushels an acre when it does not flood out. When the land overflows, he gets nothing.

There will be benefits from this work on below here, on South Cavalry Creek and on Main Cavalry Creek. I am told that there are 170 acres of bottom land on South Cavalry and 482 acres on Main Cavalry which this work will help protect. We call these secondary benefits.

Getting such a program as this on the land is only a part of the problem. Keeping it there, to yield benefits year after year, is likely to be more of a problem than getting the various practices installed. There is where the soil conservation district can perform one of its greatest services. And that is why it is as equally important to make a conservation farmer or a conservation rancher as it is to build a conservation farm or ranch. These flood control and soil-security investments must be protected. Such protection must come from the men and women who own and operate the farm and ranch lands. These individuals understand that land has strength and weakness in varying degree and that it must be used only according to its capacity to produce in lasting safety.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYS

Fortunately, we know that soil conservation farming and ranching yields immediate benefits. We know that farm yields can be expected to go up a certain percent on the average, and that reaching benefits also will increase.

A study of soil conservation effects on 275 farms in the Upper Washita Soil Conservation District showed that, when the program of application was from 70 to 100 percent complete, the following per-acre increases in yields were reported: Grain sorghum 34, corn 29, cotton 21, and forage from grassland 18 percent. Cultivated land was reduced 5, and grazing land was increased by 6 percent.

In the Cross Timbers portion of the Washita watershed, the operation of 191 farmers on 38,827 acres of land was studied in the same way. The program of soil conservation on these farms meant 24 percent more cot-

ton, 22 percent more grain sorghum, 40 percent more corn, and 39 percent more forage in the pastures. Cropland was reduced by 14 percent; grazing land was increased by 30 percent. A total of 1,400 acres of idle land was put back to work.

So you can see that soil conservation is paying its way. Every farmer or rancher is a businessman. And as businessmen every one of them is ready and eager to realize more return from his work and his investment. The fact that in applying a program of soil conservation he is putting his agricultural plant on a sounder, more secure basis is a still further inducement to the owner and operator. It would be a small man indeed who would not find satisfaction in knowing that he was caring for his land in the way it ought to be cared for, and in knowing that, in addition, he was making possible the permanent use of his acres for generations to come.

PRODUCTIVE LAND AND HUNGER

Let's look for a moment beyond the limits of the Washita watershed and consider how this program affects others. It is my feeling—as I frequently repeat—that everybody is or ought to be concerned with the permanency of our productive land, because it is the source of our food, most of our clothing, all of our wood supplies, and of an increasing number of the raw products of industry. It is my conviction that of all the problems confronting the world today the toughest of them is how to feed a rapidly increasing population from a limited and diminishing supply of productive soil. Over a vast area of the earth's surface the population has surpassed or caught up with the food-producing possibilities of the land, or the number of people is moving rapidly in that direction. There are millions of people alive today who have never known and never will know what it is to have enough to eat. Year by year the number of hungry millions, because of present methods of food distribution and improper use and protection of the land, is likely to continue on the increase.

The stark truth is that we are running out of productive land. We are wasting it rapidly and unnecessarily. It is a grave indictment against our thoughtlessness in America that we have been using up, or destroying, what we had with such recklessness.

Hungry people are discontented people, quarrelsome, unneighborly. Hunger breeds lawlessness and strife wherever you find it. Hungry people cannot be happy, peaceful people, and the world is not likely to achieve permanent peace until its people can be properly fed.

That is my reason for saying that a long-range program of soil and water conservation is one of the greatest needs of our world. Never before in man's history has an acre of good land been so important as it is today. We have in the world today 4,000,000,000 acres of land that can be cultivated. It is not all good land. Some of it is of medium quality, or poor. But it must produce the food that 2,250,000,000 people need to sustain life. The number of people on earth is growing at the rate of about 20,000,000 annually. So the per capita acreage is growing smaller and smaller—while our population grows and our soil washes away.

Even here in the United States we are permitting the loss of our land at the rate of 500,000 acres a year, according to our measurements and estimates. This is in spite of the highly successful efforts that we already are putting forth to halt this waste. So you see how urgent and basic is this soil conservation task we face.

RESEARCH

Since 1920, the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State experiment stations, has been conducting research in soil and water conservation as an aid to our action program on the land. Since 1934 the

Soil Conservation Service has been helping farmers and ranchers to apply soil and water conservation practices to the land. This work is being done now through the 2,000 soil conservation districts already organized, and it is accomplished by the farmers and ranchers themselves, along with the assistance given by technicians of the Soil Conservation Service working in the districts. During the fiscal year of 1947, the farmers and ranchers of this Nation applied soil conservation practices to 20,000,000 acres of land. This treatment included the use of all needed changes in land that we know about.

We have been making encouraging progress, but we still have far to go. About 85 percent of the land in the United States that still needs acre-by-acre conservation treatment—that is treatment according to the kind and capability of the land—is yet to be treated. That is a big job. It is a challenge to the men and women of the Nation.

In getting this huge job done, we have on our side some very effective weapons. We have a constantly growing understanding of the problem on the part of individuals and organizations in all segments of society—educational and religious, agricultural, commercial, and professional. We have the organization of soil conservation districts, set up by law to accomplish this specific task, and these districts are led by aggressive, intelligent local leaders who are going ahead with the job. We know how to do the job, and where the job is, and what it takes to get it done. We have scientific, practical, and economical techniques that come from 20 years of study and experience on the land. We have effective programs for every part of the Nation and for nearly every type of land. And, finally, we have in the Soil Conservation Service the first and by far the largest corps of trained, expert soil conservation technicians in the world.

Aligned against us are the forces of injured nature that have a long start on us, because of our heedlessness over the years. I am confident that we will win in this fight, just as we win in every fight in which our people are aroused. In this effort watershed treatment in aid of flood control has a big part. The structures that we are using in this program have been designed with engineering precision to do special jobs in holding back a part of the surplus water for a time. They are built at public cost, because the public shares in their benefits. They are devised to help protect life, agriculture, and property from damage, and investigation in the case of each structure has made certain that benefits will justify the cost. This is no hit-or-miss program. It has been carefully studied, carefully planned, and it is being executed with the same care and skill. We know that this program will accomplish what it is designed to do.

I think it is entirely fitting that we gather here today to recognize the contribution that this type of agricultural operation will make toward the continued prosperity and the security of the Washita Valley. This flood-water detention dam, and these other structures designed for flood-damage reduction are monuments to the vision and the faith of the men and women who live in this valley. You have fought long for this program. You have studied the means for its accomplishment, and you have worked hard for the things you are seeing here today. It is my earnest wish that this program here will be duplicated in many watersheds over the United States, so that the people of the Nation may enjoy the benefits of this new program which you of the Washita Valley in Oklahoma have so ably helped to inaugurate.

With your leave, I am going to join you in your rightful enjoyment of these prospective and deserved benefits. They are good for my soul, too; for this way lies security, good will among people, peace.

Educational Privileges to Veterans of the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the statement I made before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Tuesday, September 18, during their consideration of S. 1940, a bill to grant educational privileges to veterans of the Korean war.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy extended by your committee in permitting me to make a statement concerning S. 1940 pending before your committee.

I am chairman of the House select committee which has been engaged in investigation of the veterans' educational and training program for the past year. The committee is concluding its investigation of the educational phase of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and is in the process of preparing a final report. The comments which I will make regarding S. 1940 are made in the light of the experience gained by the committee in its year-long investigation.

As the present conflict continues and the armed services expand, it is apparent that a sizable number of veterans will be eligible for education and training under any new program. The abuses and shortcomings of the World II educational program are now apparent to us all. Now is the logical time for the Congress to consider the entire field of veterans' education and make such adjustments as are necessary and correct the mistakes of the past before extending educational benefits to future groups of veterans.

I am convinced that it will be necessary that an entire new law be written if the desirable features of the veterans' educational program are to be retained and the inefficiency, waste, and abuse which has plagued the World War II program is to be removed. My committee expects to approach the task from that standpoint and is preparing a draft of an entirely new bill which will suggest some fundamental changes to the present program. I believe that it is a hopeless task to amend and patch the present act in an effort to correct certain fundamental weaknesses which exist in the program.

S. 1940 proposes to extend the benefits of the present program to Korean veterans with a number of modifications. Some of these modifications appear desirable; yet others promise to bring about further administrative complexities. I do not believe that the Congress can make a major improvement in the veterans' program by amendatory legislation to the present act; however, I shall be guided in my comments by the draft bill under consideration and would like to discuss specifically certain points in the bill, as well as certain of its omissions.

The draft bill proposes to amend Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, by adding at the end thereof a new subsection Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, would be further amended by adding at the end thereof a new part, known as part X.

The method of this legislation creates necessity for consideration of the basic authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Constant controversy has resulted in the present program, since the unlimited

authority of the Administrator established by Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, as follows, "All decisions rendered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under sections 701-703, 704, 705, 706, 707-715, 716-721, of this title and sections 30a, 485 of title 5 of the regulations issued pursuant thereto, shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and no other official or court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review by mandamus or otherwise such decision," extended to all persons, parties, corporations, business concerns and educational institutions, whether public or private, profit or nonprofit, training veterans and rendering services under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Presumably this all-inclusive authority was established by the Seventy-third Congress in order that the Administrator might be in a position to render a final decision on the hundreds of thousands of individual claims for disability compensation which originate under his jurisdiction. Since the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 amended Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, the sweeping authority of the Administrator was extended to all functions and transactions under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The Administrator was placed in a position of contracting with educational institutions and ruling on the finality of those contracts and was authorized to make final decisions concerning the legislative intent of the law, the meaning of regulations promulgated by him and any other questions which arose under the act. Educational institutions and individuals were precluded from judicial review and when the Administrator's authority was contested in court, the courts upheld his authority and ruled that they had no jurisdiction.

The unique authority enjoyed by the Administrator has been seriously questioned by a number of other congressional committees and Members of the Congress. The General Accounting Office has repeatedly called attention to the fact that decisions of the Administrator are not subject to their review and that the General Accounting Office is ineffective in dealing with the Veterans' Administration, since regardless of the merits of their case it can be resolved by an administrative decision by the Administrator which may or may not be based on legislative intent.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in its seventh interim report, published July 31, 1950, referred to the Administrator's authority with reference to the National Service Life Insurance Act as follows:

"Section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act stands out, among similar grants of authority by the Congress, as being the most absolute and the most definite in its finality.

"This subcommittee recommends that the Congress review the extent to which it has relinquished its control of public expenditures under the absolute authority granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs through section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act."

In its ninth interim report, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported on its administrative studies of the Veterans' Administration leave policy and overpayments of subsistence in the Veterans' Administration. That committee again called attention to the unrestricted authority of the Administrator:

"The Comptroller General again has called attention to the unlimited authority which the Congress has bestowed upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. These broad powers have prevented the Comptroller General from taking direct action with respect to expenditures resulting from the interpretations of the Veterans' Administration as herein reported."

This question has been repeatedly debated on the floor of the Senate and on October 12, 1949, Senator HUMPHREY commented on the attitude of the Veterans' Administration in exercising its unlimited authority and ignoring the intent of Congress. Senator HUMPHREY's statements were as follows:

"In other words, the bill, if enacted into law, will definitely prescribe certain regulations as to the amount of authority the Veterans' Administration has in promulgating regulations. Somebody might say, 'Why should we do this?' I will tell the Senate why. A conference report on an appropriations bill came to the floor of the Senate, and the Senate disagreed with certain language in the report. Thereafter the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings in order to write the kind of language that would protect not only the veteran but the school and the Government. That language was carefully written. It was discussed with the Veterans' Administration. A proviso was placed in the appropriation bill which we thought in view of the hearings, in view of the constant conversation and talk we had had on the subject, would clarify this situation once and for all. But, Mr. President, despite the language, despite the hearings, despite the time devoted to this matter, and despite the complete understanding we had, the Veterans' Administration in instruction 1 (a) simply ignored what we had done and ignored the whole background and the legislative intent of the proviso which we incorporated."

During the same debate, Senator DOUGLAS made the following observations:

"Is not one of the great difficulties with our whole system of administration the fact that the various Government departments, instead of going to the Attorney General to obtain a legal opinion, have set up their own legal departments, with solicitors and lawyers in them, named by the heads of the departments, and then they ask their subordinates as to what they can do, and in nearly every case they receive opinions in support of what they contend to be their powers."

On the same subject, Senator CHAVEZ made the following statement:

"This law should be interpreted the way it was intended by Congress. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so well pointed out, the reason the Veterans' Administration acts in the way it does is that the interpretation of the law comes from within the Administration. The law is interpreted by those who are working for the Veterans' Administration, and not by those who are interested in interpreting the law for the benefit of the ones whom Congress intended to benefit."

This matter again came up in the Senate on August 27, 1951, in connection with S. Res. 124, which the Senate was considering as a result of a failure by the Veterans' Administration to interpret Public Law 610 in accordance with its legislative intent. With reference to S. Res. 124, Senator HUMPHREY made the following statement:

"First of all we passed a specific bill on this subject, which was cosponsored, as I recall, by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR], and in the House by Representative TRAGUE, of Texas, I believe. The bill was passed unanimously and it was signed by the President. Despite that the Veterans' Administration counsel decided he knew more than the Congress, and continued to rule just as he had ruled previously. Then we had a conference report in connection with an appropriation bill, which spelled out the language we wanted, the legislative intent, and again the Veterans' Administration legal counsel said, 'We are right and the Congress is wrong.'"

"So what the resolution amounts to is a directive to the Veterans' Administration to administer the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, pertaining to its educational features as

the law is written, as the legislative intent of the Congress is written in the report and as it is found in the debates on the House and Senate floors. The resolution provides that the law shall be administered, notwithstanding the legal counsel, as it was intended to be administered by the Congress."

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress summarized the situation as follows:

"The requirements of the Federal Register Act are that the rules and regulations of the Veterans' Administration be published. Compulsion is absent, however, and lack of enforcement by judicial review may leave claimants in many cases without a remedy other than an appeal to Congress."

"While no specific exemption was afforded the Veterans' Administration in the Administrative Procedure Act, the saving of existing provisions of law precluding judicial review in most cases contributes to the situation whereby claimants must take their cases to Congress."

With reference to interpretations made by the Veterans' Administration of Public Law 610, Eighty-first Congress, the Legislative Reference Service made the following comments:

"I believe that Congress created wording commensurate with that intent in the enactment of section 2, Public Law 610, and that the Administrator can avoid his responsibility in effectuating that intent only on the basis of a technicality. . . . Acknowledging his power, I believe the Administrator has acted arbitrarily in this situation and that he should have issued instructions commensurate with the intent as expressed in the report, despite his protestation that 'If the Congress does not want me to do what I am doing they certainly have the right to change it.' When Congress indicates its disfavor of his administration of a program and enacts remedial legislation designed to effect a change the Administrator fails to effectuate this policy. This is indicative of the determination of the Administrator that he rather than the Congress shall establish policy and it further indicates a determination on his part to operate outside the purview of Public Law 610 if possible."

We have witnessed a situation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs interpreting the intent of Congress, entering into contracts with educational institutions and making all final decisions concerning questions which arise under these contracts. My committee has studied cases of repudiation of contracts, questionable interpretations made by the Veterans' Administration and regardless of the merits of the case the decision of the Administrator is final. It is obvious that some person or agency must be empowered with authority to administer the act and I do not disagree that it was perhaps wise that the Administrator be given final administrative authority in deciding individual pension claims. I do believe that we have a dangerous situation where an administrative officer of the Federal Government and in fact all employees under him enjoy the right to make a final administrative interpretation in their dealings with the educational institutions of this country and in many cases State agencies and State schools, under a law which precludes further judicial review. Before extending the educational benefits to additional groups of veterans I think that it is wise that the Congress thoroughly consider this question before continuing the Administrator's broad authority to make final determinations in connection with the veterans' educational program. I firmly believe that the new act should not amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and continue the Administrator's broad and final authority, but should be a new and separate act defining specifically those areas in which the Administrator should have final authority and reserving the

right of judicial review in all instances not specifically covered by the act.

S. 1940 can be properly considered as a substantial extension of the present education and training program; however, a number of major modifications are proposed.

Section 1 proposes to restrict eligibility for training to any person who had passed his twenty-third birthday on June 27, 1950, or the date he entered service, whichever is later. Such a person would be eligible for 1 year of training. Persons under 23 years on June 27, 1950, or the date they entered service would be allowed eligibility for training up to 48 months. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 originally contained a similar provision, however, in that case the age limitation was set at 25 years. The administrative complexities which grew out of this proviso caused the Congress to remove the restriction and authorize eligibility for training without regard to age limitation. Such a proviso becomes an administrative difficulty, since it is impossible to establish definite criteria by which to determine whether a person did actually interrupt his education or training to enter the Armed Forces. Obviously a person who was taken from college could prove that he interrupted his training. It might be more difficult for a young man who delayed entering college because he knew he would be required to serve in the Armed Forces to prove that his education was impeded by service in the Armed Forces. The veteran who planned no formal education, but who was attempting to learn a business on the job would probably never be able to convince the Veterans' Administration that he was in a training stage as a beginner on his job. I do not believe that such an age limitation should appear in the law. I believe that any new program should provide for some educational assistance, which together with a reasonable contribution on the veteran's part would allow the veteran to undertake education or training. I believe that a modest program making aid available to any veteran who wishes to help himself is more desirable than a more expensive program limited to a relatively small number of veterans whom the Veterans' Administration would administratively determine to be eligible for unlimited benefits.

Section 4, page 7, lines 17 through 22, provides that wherever there are established State apprenticeship agencies expressly charged by State laws to administer apprenticeship training, whenever possible the administrator shall utilize such existing facilities and service in training on the job when such training is of a year's duration or more. The requirement that apprenticeship agreements be utilized if training exceeds 1 year is a new criteria for determining whether the program should be an apprentice training program or on-the-job program. This requirement will have the effect of disqualifying on-the-job training programs in excess of 1 year which are not otherwise covered by apprenticeship agreements and will disturb the balance between organized apprentice training and other training on the job as it now exists.

Section 4, page 8, prohibits enrollment of a veteran in a profit school which has less than 25 equivalent full-time students or one-third of the equivalent full-time students enrolled (whichever is larger) paying all of their own tuition. This proviso in effect precludes enrollment of a veteran in any school which has less than 25 students. I agree with the apparent intent of the provision to require that veterans enroll in schools which have a substantial number of non-veterans; however, the wording of the paragraph excludes all small schools. Before World War II, a majority of the Nation's small privately owned schools, such as barbering schools, cosmetology schools, music and arts schools, and small business schools were 1- or 2-teacher schools with 25 students

or less. This proviso creates an artificial and unfair barrier to the small private school.

Section 5 requires that the veteran pay one-half of his tuition and requires that the Administrator pay the remaining half, not to exceed \$300. It is the apparent purpose of this provision to require the veteran to pay part of his tuition out of funds paid him for subsistence purposes in order that the veteran will have some interest in the quality and price of training which he receives. This objective is very desirable and should be one of the fundamental objectives of the new bill. I do not believe that this requirement will achieve its purpose in its entirety, since the amount which the veteran pays will be relatively small. The school and the Veterans' Administration will not be relieved of the administrative difficulties of preparing and processing vouchers, keeping records pertaining to the one-half paid by the Veterans' Administration. The educational institution will be faced with the additional problem of maintaining a separate account for the individual veteran, as well as the Veterans' Administration account. This additional obligation will represent a sizable burden in institutions of higher learning with thousands of veteran trainees.

I expect my committee to advocate a plan whereby a total payment is made to the veteran at the end of a month of training and the veteran makes direct payments to the school for tuition, books, fees, and other charges. Such a plan will eliminate the necessity for a contract and the necessity for the vouchers procedure and will make the veteran responsible for conduct of his own affairs. At the same time, it will create an incentive for the veteran to secure training at a reasonable price, since he will keep any funds which remain after his training bills have been paid.

The proviso of section 6, page 12, beginning at line 7, which requires that the veteran make a report of income for 12 months when he enters training and for each 12 months thereafter is not clear. The law does not indicate whether a total report of estimated earnings will be made, whether an average monthly report of estimated earnings will be made, or whether an estimate of each month's estimated earnings will be made. It appears that the Veterans' Administration will pay subsistence to a veteran enrolled in on-the-job training based on a 4-month adjustment plan, so long as the total of estimated earnings and subsistence do not exceed the ceilings specified on page 12.

Under the present program the veteran submits reports of actual earnings each 4 months and a projected estimate of the next 4 months' earnings at the same time. If by examining the report of earnings the Veterans' Administration determines that he received too much subsistence a recovery is made by the Veterans' Administration. Apparently, this section of the bill contemplates the payment of subsistence based on a projection of earnings and no effort will be made to later determine what the actual earnings were and make adjustments in case of an overpayment of subsistence. It appears that such a plan is merely legalizing overpayments, rather than establishing the administrative machinery necessary to cope with them. We have witnessed the action of the Veterans' Administration to legalize overpayments developed in connection with leave of absence in schools and it now appears that overpayments in on-the-job training would be legalized rather than collected if this proviso is to take effect.

Paragraph (b), page 12, line 22, establishes full-time training in a trade or technical course at 36 hours per week. The Congress has previously established full-time training in trades or technical courses at 30 hours a week and I have no reason to believe that 80 hours a week is incorrect. There is no

educational precedent upon which to base 36 hours per week training in trades and technical courses and I do not understand why the Veterans' Administration persists in suggesting 36 hours per week. The Service-men's Readjustment Act of 1944 was silent with regard to defining full-time training and the Veterans' Administration administratively determined full-time training in trades and technical courses to be not less than 25 clock hours per week. This definition remained in force for approximately 5 years and could have been changed at any time by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. However, in 1950 he recommended to the President, who in turn recommended to the Congress, that full-time training be established at 36 hours per week. The matter was considered at that time and was settled at 30 hours a week. For some unknown reason it again appears in this bill.

S. 1940 continues the requirements for agricultural training established by Public Law 377, Eightieth Congress. While Public Law 377 made provision for a trainee who performs his course as the employee of another, this part of the law has not been placed into effect except in a few States. In those States the program proved to be unsatisfactory and turned out to be a labor subsidy program for large farm and plantation owners and was in no way satisfactory. It is the general consensus of opinion among the State departments of education that this plan is not workable, therefore it should be removed from the law.

Paragraph (d), line 4, page 22, proposes to apply certain criteria to any school operated for profit. I believe that the basis of application for these criteria should be whether the school and the course is part of an accredited public school system or is recognized by an established accrediting association. If the school or course is not accredited it should be required to conform with these criteria regardless of whether it is public or private, profit or nonprofit. Certainly a proprietary nonprofit school should be required to comply with the criteria. The Congress should take this opportunity to further strengthen these criteria in certain areas where they have proven inadequate.

POINTS OF OMISSION

1. S. 1940 does not clarify the relationship and relative authority of the Veterans' Administration and the State approving agencies. This weakness was inherent in Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress and has caused difficulty in the administration of the program. The authority to approve educational institutions as being qualified and equipped to train veterans was properly vested in the States. The Veterans' Administration is required to reimburse schools for services rendered in training veterans. Such a plan creates a joint Federal-State program. Public Law 346 did not clearly define the relative authority of the State and Federal Government and the obligations and responsibilities of the State approving agencies are not clearly outlined. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is precluded from interfering with the operation of a State approving agency or State educational institution and this restriction might be interpreted to mean that the Administrator cannot act so long as the school is approved, regardless of evidence of fraud or violation of the law. The new act for Korean veterans should clearly settle these issues.

2. I have mentioned previously the final authority of the Administrator to render decisions which are not subject to judicial review. This situation was partially corrected by Public Law 610, Eighty-first Congress, which amended Public Law 346 in that a Veterans' Education Appeals Board was established which could review tuition claims by schools and certain other acts of the Administrator and make a final administrative determination. S. 1940 does not extend

the authority of the Veterans' Education Appeals Board to the program proposed for Korean veterans.

3. S. 1940 proposes that the veteran will pay one-half of his own tuition from funds received directly by him from the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans' Administration will pay the remaining half. Apparently it is contemplated that the Veterans' Administration will negotiate a contract under which it will disburse one-half of the tuition received by the school. Reclaims for erroneous payments could be effected under this contract. In cases where veterans were overcharged or made erroneous payments of tuition and other charges from funds paid to them by the Veterans' Administration there appears to be no recourse, since S. 1940 does not establish authority for recovery of tuition payments illegally secured from veteran trainees.

4. Public Law 346 and S. 1940 are both silent regarding Veterans' Administration and State employees owning interest in private schools or receiving profits or payments from private schools which are under contract with the Veterans' Administration for the training of veteran trainees and which are under the direct supervision of State employees. S. 1940 does not propose to restrict a Veterans' Administration employee from leaving the Veterans' Administration and immediately becoming associated with a private school under contract with the Veterans' Administration. It has been a common practice under the present program for contract officers to establish a very favorable rate for a school and then leave the Veterans' Administration to take a job with the school at a much higher salary. The new law should prohibit ownership of private schools by Veterans' Administration and State employees and those employees should be prohibited from receiving payments, profits or gifts from such schools. Such employees should not be allowed to enter the employment of a private school under contract with the Veterans' Administration for a period of 1 year following termination of their employment with the Veterans' Administration.

5. The status of veterans having eligibility under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress and also accruing eligibility under the proposed program should be clarified. Current Veterans' Administration regulations provide that a veteran who initiated a course of training under Public Law 346 prior to July 25, 1951, and who was called into active military service prior to July 25, 1951, or the last date for his regular reentrance into training may re-enroll under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, upon discharge from military service. No provision is made for the veteran of World War II who has been called to active military service during part of the period of his entitlement to enrollment under Public Law 346 and who had not initiated a course of training. This veteran should have the privilege of electing benefits under Public Law 346 or the new program and should have a period equivalent to the period of eligibility for training which he lost as a result of military service during which he could elect training under either program.

6. S. 1940 does not provide specific penalties for conspiracy and fraud by schools or veterans for acts of bad faith and gross misconduct in the use of his entitlement on the part of veterans. The new law should establish severe penalties for those schools and veterans who abuse the privileges established by the law.

In summary, I believe that any new act passed by the Congress should make the following provisions:

1. The program should be reoriented from a subsidized educational program to an educational assistance program. Entitlement to education should not be limited to those who can prove that they interrupted their education. A modest amount of aid should

be given any veteran who desires to help himself, rather than a large amount of aid to a limited number of veterans.

2. The program should be self-policing. It can be made so by requiring the veteran to make a contribution to his own training, rather than the Federal Government attempting to pay the total cost as it does under the present program.

3. The new act should prohibit the enrollment of a veteran in a school which does not have a substantial number of non-veterans and a school should be required to operate successfully for a period of 1 year prior to receiving approval.

4. The administration of the program should be simplified. This can be accomplished by eliminating the conception of fair and reasonable tuition rates and making the payment directly to the veteran at the end of the month of training. From this payment, the veteran will pay his own bills, thus eliminating the necessity for a contract and a vouchering procedure.

5. Supervision of schools and standards for approval should be strengthened.

6. Strict penalties for criminal acts should be established for criminal acts, the rights of a veteran who willfully misuses his entitlement should be withdrawn and Veterans' Administration and State officials should be prohibited from owning interest in a school under contract with the Veterans' Administration or becoming associated with such a school during a period of 1 year following termination of employment by the Veterans' Administration or the State approving agency.

7. The new act should provide for judicial review of decisions of the Administrator affecting educational institutions and State schools and agencies.

8. The relative authority of the Veterans' Administration and the State approving agencies should be clearly defined and the obligation of the State approval agency should be spelled out in the law.

Soil Conservation and National Security— Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, tenth anniversary celebration Shenandoah Valley Soil Conservation District, Staunton, Va., August 23, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

It is stimulating and refreshing to come down from Washington at this time, when so many sober activities are occupying everybody's attention, to take part in this inspiring tenth anniversary celebration of the Shenandoah Valley Soil Conservation District. I wish everyone who is helping to shoulder our grave national responsibilities these days could have such an opportunity. I am sure it would further strengthen our common purpose and clear away any possible doubts in anybody's mind as to the direction our whole thinking and action must continue to take for the preservation and free growth of true democracy in a world split by conflicting ideologies.

When Chairman J. S. Cochran, Jr., of your board of supervisors, wrote inviting me down

here today, he reminded me that your district is situated in the heart of what you consider the garden spot of America—the valley of Virginia. It is a wonderful spot and that is the way to feel about it, even if many other spots in America are locally felt to be pretty good places.

PRODUCTIVE LAND AND MOBILIZATION

The one thing that is uppermost in everybody's mind today is mobilization of our manpower and economic resources for national security, come what may. As the President pointed out in his midyear economic report to Congress on July 26: "The productive strength of the American economy is basic to our domestic well-being and our international security." I couldn't help but think of the statement in your own State soil conservation districts act (and similar basic pronouncements in the districts laws of other States) that "the farming and grazing lands of the State of Virginia are among the basic assets of the State, and [that] the preservation of these lands is necessary to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of its people."

Without a lasting agriculture, there can be no assurance of permanent prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere on earth. And a prosperous and lasting agriculture depends on an adequate supply of productive land properly used and so protected from erosion that it will remain permanently productive. As long as people have enough productive land they can continue producing their food and fiber, and many of the raw materials of industry. If the land is neglected or unwisely used, the consequences will be national decline. That has been the tragic result in many of the world's older agricultural areas.

Lasting soil conservation of the kind you are putting into effect here in the Shenandoah Valley Soil Conservation District, with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, is mandatory everywhere. It is mandatory here in America, if our Nation—our civilization—is to avoid ever weakening while the enemies of our democracy multiply and gird themselves for new marches on democracy everywhere.

OUR WORLD LEADERSHIP RESTS ON THE LAND

None of us can say, of course, how long the present international emergency will last. Some people seem to think it will be short-lived. Let us fervently hope it will be. Then there are those who take the other extreme view, that we may just as well count on being in a continuing state of emergency, from the standpoint of defending our own and others' democratic life, for many years to come. We hope just as earnestly that such will not be the case; but, in any event, we certainly have to build and plan on the long-time basis against any eventuality. The United States definitely is in the position of world leadership, politically and economically, among the democracies, and naturally will be expected to retain that position with all the responsibility it involves. To do so, we must maintain our productive capacity, safeguarding our productive resources of land, water, timber, oil and other minerals, and so on, and using them wisely.

We must maintain, first of all, the productive capacity of our land—which produces all but a very small part of our food, all of our timber, leather, and wool, all of our vegetable fibers and oil, tobacco, and many other essentials. This we must do regardless of whether peace or war lies ahead. Right now, those responsible for our national security are thinking in terms of doubling our stockpiling of metals, drugs, and other raw materials. We cannot stockpile productive soil, in the sense of shipping it into this country from other countries. But we can and must safeguard our remaining productive land. This is an inseparable and essential part of our first line of national defense, because men with guns and

bullets can't fight without food, and there can be little food from poor land

CONSERVATION FOR PEACE OR WAR

Already, in the few short weeks since the Korean trouble started, threatened so-called surpluses of certain farm commodities have become comforting stores of essential food and fiber. When we have had repeated experiences of this nature, you wouldn't think anyone would be so foolish as to suggest that we sometimes don't need such things as soil conservation to help keep our agricultural producing plant in condition of top efficiency. Yet I am sure all of us have heard just such loose talk, both when there were a few extra bushels of wheat or other commodities in the granaries or when immediate demands for national defense or economic-aid programs have been pressing and properly of first consideration.

We have been told, for example, that we shouldn't spend money on soil conservation in periods of ample crop production because soil-conservation farming increases yields. If that illogical line of reasoning were carried to its ultimate conclusion, then we likewise wouldn't spend money on crop and livestock improvement, pest and disease control, or on any other agricultural research and improvement at such times. Instead, we would close down our State experiment stations, agricultural colleges, and the United States Department of Agriculture until such time as we might figure we needed their services again. The truth is that maximum per acre yields always are the basis of good agriculture, whether the market is up or down. Also, they mean the capacity of increased total production as may be needed.

Those who would have you abandon your conservation farming in wartime and other periods of maximum need for agricultural commodities are no less shortsighted. During World War II conservation farming demonstrated its effectiveness, year after year, in giving maximum production of needed crops, with minimum labor and machinery wear, and the most economical use of seed and fertilizer. Those are among the multiple benefits realized when the land is treated and used, acre by acre, according to its need and capability.

KEEPING OUR POWDER DRY

Meanwhile—and again keeping in mind the long-time need as opposed to short-sighted land exploitation for the sake of imagined expediency—the kind of practical, scientific conservation farming practiced in your own and more than 2,260 other soil conservation districts over the country builds up a sound reserve of productive capacity. It keeps our powder dry. It is true that during the last war a considerable amount of land damage resulted from cropping too much land that should have been left in grass. But, even including the plowing up of several million acres of hazardous lands in the drier areas of the Great Plains for growing wheat, the over-all damage certainly was nowhere near what it might have been had we gone through the war and postwar farm production strain without benefit of any conservation farming knowledge and practice.

Other millions of acres, moreover, were farmed the safe conservation way for maximum, profitable production; and this same land is in sound condition to give maximum production next year and the next, as the need may dictate. Examples of how this conservation principle works out were to be found this past spring in the spotted drought areas of the southern Great Plains. The trouble from wind erosion and dust storms this year was not, generally, in the old Dust Bowl of the 1930's because farmers there had turned largely to conservation farming in the intervening years. And, almost invariably, individual farms and fields under conservation treatment and operation in the 1950 drought areas suffered comparatively little land and crop damage, alongside untreated lands.

FLEXIBILITY OF CONSERVATION FARMING A SIGNIFICANT ADVANTAGE

The practical flexibility of conservation farming becomes of increasing significance as we look ahead and think about our national well-being and security. Assuming that we shall not forever be faced with international emergencies, we still have to think about better living for our own grown population. That is, enough of the right kind of food—including ample amounts of meat, dairy, and poultry products—for everybody, for our children and our children's children. From this stable, peacetime viewpoint, the importance of soil and water conservation again is self-apparent as the basis for sustained high-level production at relatively low cost.

The population of the United States already has passed the 150,000,000 mark, as shown by preliminary figures from the 1950 census. We have seated nearly 2,000,000 more people at the dinner tables of America every year for the last 10 years and 20,000,000 more each year for the world as a whole. Yet the supply of productive land from which to feed and clothe this steadily mounting number of people is sharply limited. Right here in the United States we have left only about 460,000,000 acres of good, productive cropland, including approximately 70,000,000 acres that would have to be cleared, irrigated, or drained before it could be cropped.

Although we are better off than most other countries with respect to the good land we have available—and infinitely better situated than some countries—we have no productive land to spare if we look forward to a permanent high standard of living and national security. Not with the future population trend continually pointing upward—to as high as 250,000,000 people in the United States in the next 25 to 50 years on the basis of recent past population growth.

The main forces operating to reduce both the area of productive cropland and the productivity of cropland are soil erosion, overcropping and leaching. Of these, soil erosion is by far the most dangerous and most widespread. Soil erosion is also the most damaging force affecting the Nation's range and pasture lands. On the other hand, the main forces operating to improve production from our croplands are soil and water conservation, improved plant varieties, insect and plant-disease control, and mechanization. Of these, soil and water conservation is by far the most important, for the reasons I have already explained. At this point, I think it might be well for us to stop and consider for a moment what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use.

It means contouring and terracing land that needs such treatment, and strip cropping and stubble mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs. If it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter. If water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities—

alkali—as in parts of the West, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of available adaptable tools.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal and other kinds) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where floodwaters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping. As a part of the modern soil conservation job, city sewage should be kept out of the streams and treated for use on the land, as some cities now are doing.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil-conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. And, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work, that has a chance for permanency. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season. They are the basis of land permanency, and that is necessary if we are to have a permanent agriculture.

ONLY ONE RIGHT WAY TO DO THE CONSERVATION JOB

A hundred years of farming experience in this country has proved definitely that no single practice, applied arbitrarily on a whole field or a farm, will control erosion and maintain soil productivity permanently, except perhaps the planting of an entire field or farm to grass or trees. And we can't live by grass and trees alone! Except where the land is used for grass or forest, single-practice soil conservation can't be successful in the great majority of cases, because it almost always is inadequate to cope with the diverse land conditions and complicated requirements of sound land use and protection, imposed by nature. Some single practices, such as contouring, stubble mulching, rotation, or manuring will bring some temporary benefits to entire fields or farms; but they cannot get the job done on anything approximating a permanent basis, except on the relatively small areas of the very best quality land (land of capability class I).

No, there is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job right—regardless of what anybody may try to tell you. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs as determined by condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife.

PROGRESS IN SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

That is the kind of conservation farming you have been putting into effect with success and satisfaction here in the Shenandoah Valley Soil Conservation District for the last 10 years. It is the kind of conservation farming that is safeguarding and improving our country's farm and ranch lands at a progressively increasing rate each year. In 1942, to illustrate, the Soil Conservation Service assisted the districts in completing only 1 percent of the unfinished part of the Nation-wide soil conservation job; but in 1949 the annual rate of progress went up to 3.4 percent of the unfinished job. We finished the job on 5,000,000 acres in 1942 and on 22,000,000 acres last year.

This was an increase of 340 percent, but we had an increase in facilities of only 43 percent.

Soil Conservation and National Security— Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, tenth anniversary celebration, Shenandoah Valley Soil Conservation District, Staunton, Va., August 23, 1950:

Your Shenandoah Valley district has been in operation for 10 years. The first soil conservation district anywhere came into being only 13 years ago this month, in my home county of Anson County, N. C. When we reflect on this comparatively short time that these districts have been at the job, I think the progress that has been made—both from the standpoint of district organization and soil- and water-conservation work actually done on the land in the districts—is nothing short of remarkable. Do you realize that, as of July 1, this year, the districts covered 1,250,000,000 acres in the 48 States, Alaska, and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and included 4,750,000 farms? In fact, 80 percent of all our farms are now within soil conservation district boundaries, as is three-fourths of the land in farms of the United States.

WE ARE MOVING AHEAD FASTER EVERY YEAR

Your districts' accomplishments in getting soil and water conservation on the land likewise are something to be proud of, especially when we keep in mind that the kind of conservation you are applying is carefully planned, acre-by-acre conservation which has been put on the land to stay. Final figures for the last fiscal year (to July 1, 1950) have not been checked yet, but conservation preliminary figures show the following for the past year's district work done, and the total to date. How we have increased again the yearly rate of conservation surveying, planning, and treatment is apparent from these figures:

[Approximate totals]

	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1949	Cumulative to July 1, 1950
Detailed conservation surveys	30,000,000	25,800,000	337,000,000
Complete farm plans—number	130,000	115,000	870,000
Acres planted.....	36,000,000	32,280,000	240,000,000
Acres treated.....	26,000,000	22,000,000	125,000,000

The record of soil-conservation-district accomplishments here in Virginia likewise is good, in the Shenandoah Valley District and elsewhere. But as I don't have even the preliminary fiscal year figures for the State, I shall not undertake to review for you the facts on your own work with which you already are more familiar than I am anyway.

THE DISTRICT AND PRACTICAL DEMOCRACY

All of these figures are most satisfying, of course; because they show the steady

progress we have been making, in Virginia and throughout the country, in getting the vital soil- and water-conservation job done. But, over and above the tangible physical accomplishments we can add up on an adding machine, there is another contribution which your soil-conservation districts are making to the national welfare and security that simply can't be measured by slide rule or calculator. I am referring to the soil-conservation districts as living, working forces of practical democracy in action.

Now this may sound to some of you like a bit of high-flown theorizing that is pretty far afield from the actual conservation job with which we are concerned. But, actually, this local, democratic philosophy underlying the districts is basic to the whole concept of sound and economical soil and water conservation. In the early days of our national soil-conservation program, it soon became apparent that the Government as such never could hope to get the job done through limited Federal efforts alone. That is why the soil-conservation-district idea was conceived, to insure that full opportunity and responsibility for conduct of a system of agriculture of such magnitude and importance be lodged with the landholders where it belongs, and with no strings attached.

And that is exactly how it has worked out, with most gratifying results. Certainly the soil-conservation-district movement is the greatest land movement in all history. Your district organization, as it has stood the test of 13 years of peacetime and wartime experience under just about all possible conditions, definitely has proved itself to be superior to anything else we know anything about in coping with our basic land problems in a democratic fashion. Your districts are farmer-voted and farmer-managed. Between 11,000 and 12,000 soil-conservation district supervisors are giving unselfishly of their time and energies in the furtherance of soil-conservation work throughout the country. They are on nobody's payroll, and are obligated to no Federal or other outside authority.

THE CONTRAST IN NONDEMOCRATIC NATIONS

In order to appreciate what this kind of democratic leadership means in the Nation's basic agricultural economy—really means in terms of what we mobilize and fight for when pressed to it by others—you need only to study the contrasting situation in so many other countries, where what the government says is law, with little or no opportunity for individual freedom of action, assurance of stability, or hope of security. I have observed these things in different parts of the world myself, and, of course, we read about them every day. Only recently, for example, I read an enlightening discussion of the land situation in Soviet Russia, in which that country's relatively limited amount of land that could be made to produce economically for its big population was emphasized.¹ But what struck me most was this statement:

"Despite Soviet propaganda about tractors on farms, Russian agriculture is moving toward the Chinese level of exploiting manpower rather than toward the American level of using horse-tractor power. In line with this is the report that Mao, China's Communist chief, has promised Stalin 5,000,000 of his surplus men for farm work. They would fit naturally into communism's expanding man-pulls-plow paradise. But neither Stalin nor Mao can make it rain. That being true, Russia with a mounting population and a static farm output, has no safe food margin, and could be acutely endangered by another series of dry years."

We can be eternally grateful that we have no man-pulls-plow economy in America.

We never did have, and never will have so long as we maintain our productive land and other resources in healthy condition to defend our individual freedom and national democracy against the assaults of communism or any other weird isms. Rather, we enjoy an economy in which even less and less horseflesh is hitched to our plows, as machines take over draft and other heavy tasks. It is an economy that depends on individual freedom and initiative, and the exercise of individual responsibility.

SOIL-CONSERVATION-DISTRICT METHOD IS BEST

The soil-conservation-district method of farming is the best approach we know about for encouraging the intelligent exercise of those prerogatives in the conduct of the Nation's biggest business of agriculture. This fact has been demonstrated beyond any question in the 13 years of district operation by the scores of thousands of soil-conservation-district landowners and operators like those of you in the Shenandoah Valley district.

I also am convinced that the district method would be the best approach that farmers of the world everywhere could take for getting to the point where they have more voice in the affairs of their government and less discontent with the overlords. Bona fide soil-conservation districts are in operation as going programs in several other countries—as the philosophy of conservation spreads faster world-wide.

SATISFACTION AND SECURITY IN CONSERVATION FARMING

Soil-conservation districts bring farmers together in moving ahead with sound conservation treatment of the land. The district provides a recognized central point for carrying forward effective conservation work.

Also, when the farmer has a sound plan for conservation operations for a period of years ahead, as he does have as a soil-conservation-district cooperator, not only is he likely to do a better job of farming, but he has the satisfaction of knowing that his efforts will increase his security, in the face of whatever international or other unfortunate incidents the Nation may have to pass through. That is what makes the democracy we fight for, the more secure the individual, the more secure the community and the Nation. It gives the farmer pride and satisfaction to be able to look forward to the future security of his family. His farm, under sound conservation management, gets better all the time instead of worse. He sees that he is going to be able to pass his land on to his children in better condition than it was when he began farming it.

THE PROFITABLENESS OF SOIL CONSERVATION

Certainly not least among the benefits of soil-conservation farming to be considered when we think of national welfare and security is its profitability. This kind of farming has been shown consistently to raise the individual landholder's income through more economical operations and greater per acre returns. This, in turn, is reflected in better business in town where the conservation farmer trades. And we also know that revenues to local, State, and Federal governments are increased proportionately from such higher farmer earnings—revenues which pay for, among other things, jet bombers and bazookas. I could make an entire speech on this significant aspect of soil and water conservation, because the individual examples and other reported figures supporting these facts are too numerous even to be counted.

FLOOD CONTROL AMONG IMPORTANT PUBLIC BENEFITS

The public benefits of soil and water conservation—which in turn impose public responsibility for helping to do the job—are many. There is the matter of flood control, to mention one which I know is of interest to you, and of reducing reservoir siltation

and stabilizing ground water and our other water supplies. Everybody here, I am sure, is familiar with the effective emergency flood-control job that was done down this way after the June 1929 flood damage that occurred on North River and Briery Branch. The work that was done—and which could not have been done so efficiently and economically had it not been for the quick response and cooperation of the local district landowners and others involved—was outstanding. I know nobody would discount the public value of this work of restoring the stream channels by removing the thousands of tons of debris and thus protecting your valuable bottom lands against damage from future freshets.

Meanwhile, as you are aware, the important long-time Potomac watershed-treatment program, including the Shenandoah watershed, is going forward steadily, with the Soil Conservation Service working with your soil-conservation districts on farmlands and the Forest Service doing the fire protection and cover protection work in the national forests of the watershed. I hardly need to emphasize to this audience the high importance of all such water conservation and management undertakings to local, State, and national well-being and security.

Such are the compelling reasons why we must push ahead as fast as we can, without sacrificing the lasting quality of the work we do, with our tremendous soil and water conservation job. As I said at the beginning, we don't know how long we may be faced with emergency conditions—possibly only a few weeks or months, maybe 25 years. But we do know that, emergency or no emergency, we are determined to go forward as a democratic American people, enjoying the highest standards of living as may attain and keeping our national security intact at all times.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO GUARD AGAINST

Your soil-conservation districts have an important responsibility in all this. There is much we need to be thinking about, talking about, and doing something about to reach and hold our objectives. We have been making splendid progress in soil and water conservation, but the major part of the basic job is yet to be done. Especially do we need to be on guard against and work to dispel certain misconceptions, or loose assertions, about soil conservation that still seem to confuse the thinking of some otherwise well informed people. Briefly stated, some of these are:

1 That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2 That there are short cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that farm plans are too technical for farmers.

3 That soil conservation costs more than it is worth.

4 That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

TEAMWORK FOR A CONSERVATION PROGRAM OF POSITIVE ACTION

The job we have to do calls for the closest teamwork of all interests in our society: farmers, business, and professional people; private and public financial institutions; magazines, newspapers, radio, and television; chambers of commerce, sportsmen's, women's, young people's, and other groups, schools and churches, local, State, and Federal agriculture, forestry, and other agencies and farm organizations—everybody. I know all these interests are working together here in the Shenandoah Valley District, as they are in districts all over the country.

To complete the soil- and water-conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which all such groups have a natural interest. It includes, among other points: (1) Completion of the national land

¹ Russia's Parched Land Drives Her to Aggression, Randolph Leigh, Washington Sunday Star, July 30, 1950.

capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit; (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil-conservation districts and strengthening district responsibility and work—with a scientifically developed soil-conservation-district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm in the country at minimum public cost; (3) active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; and (4) making a real conservationist of every farmer in the country.

Conservation of our productive land, water, timber, wildlife, and other indispensable natural resources is not a matter which is of interest only to our own generation. It is the foremost factor on which hinges the very survival of all the generation to come after us. We must, through education in the schools and everywhere else, establish the conservation concept so firmly in our national consciousness that it never can be uprooted—so that, a hundred years from now, conservation will be practiced universally.

The safeguarding and perpetual wise use of these life-supporting resources is the only insurance we can have of continued national security for our free people in free America.

Slaughter Quotas on the Meat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPP

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPP. Mr. President, during last week's hearings on the question of whether or not to impose slaughter quotas on the meat industry, we heard some convincing arguments against such a regulation. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the statement made by Mr. Everett C. Seal, of East Falls Church, Va., before the Committee on Banking and Currency on September 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EVERETT C. SEAL BEFORE THE
SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE,
SEPTEMBER 18, 1951

My name is Everett C. Seal. I am a partner with Mr. T. M. Brown, trading under the name of Brown's Meat Market, located at 6856 Lee Highway, East Falls Church, Va. We are a small, independent business. Both Mr. Brown and I are World War II veterans and have had many years experience in the meat business. Brown's Meat Market was at one time under the sole proprietorship of Mr. T. C. Brown, the father of Mr. T. M. Brown. Prior to my entry into the military service in May 1941, I had been employed for 13 years by Mr. T. C. Brown.

The store on Lee Highway is our only retail outlet. We do not wholesale meat. We have a slaughtering house in Luray, Va., where, before quotas were imposed, we were able to slaughter all the beef we needed to satisfy our growing business. We have been planning to expand our slaughtering facilities at Luray for 2 years, so that we will be able to meet all our customers' needs without buying from the big packers. This expansion is now under way.

I have gone into the details of our operation so that there will be no doubt in the minds of any of the committee as to how we operate and whom I represent. I am appearing solely as a representative of Brown's Meat Market, and in the hope that I may be able to present to the committee some facts that they otherwise might not have as to how slaughtering quotas have affected a small independent business, and how they will affect us if they are imposed on us again.

Our business is located near the Arlington County-Fairfax County line. The community of Falls Church, and the part of the two counties near us has shown considerable growth during the past 10 years, and particularly during the past 2 or 3 years. In 1940 the population of Falls Church, according to the census figures, was 2,576. In 1950 the same figures showed an increase of 4,959, or a total population of 7,535. Therefore, our population has almost tripled in the last 10 years.

The same thing, to a lesser degree, is true of Arlington County and Fairfax County. The census figures show the population of these two counties has increased almost two and one-half times in the past 10 years. In the last year, these two counties have increased by about 25,000 people. There isn't any doubt that this condition will continue. These counties issued a total of 8,000 building permits during 1950, and some of these dwellings are just now being occupied.

This population growth has of course increased our business. In 1949 we killed 199,050 pounds live weight of beef. In 1950 that figure was 225,297 pounds, an increase of over 25,000 pounds. During the first quarter of 1951, our figures again rose over the same period for 1950. In the first quarter of 1950 we slaughtered 54,605 pounds live weight. For the same period in 1951, the figure was 86,470 pounds. I am giving the committee these figures to show that our growth has been normal, due to the increased population, and due to the fact that we have always tried to give quality at the lowest possible price. I will point out how quotas hamper us in this in a few minutes.

On March 31, 1951, I received word that we would start operating under a slaughtering quota. Our quota for the month of April was fixed at 100 percent of our live weight slaughtered in April 1950. This amounted to 16 head of cattle. Since this figure was far below what our normal slaughtering had become, I immediately went to Richmond, Va., and talked to Mr. Andrew J. Francis, who, at that time, was in charge of the Meat and Livestock Division of the OPS there. He told me to submit a letter stating my case, which I did. I have attached this letter to my statement as exhibit I. I told Mr. Francis in my letter that we were slaughtering at a rate of about 32 head per month and that we did not believe 16 head would be adequate to meet the needs of our customers.

Mr. Francis also suggested I go to Washington, D. C., and see Mr. Don Leach, of the OPS, with a copy of the letter I had written him. Mr. Leach was most courteous. However, he could not give me any encouragement. It was suggested in Mr. Leach's office that I fill in with packers' beef, and as I stated then this would not be satisfactory because up until this time we had been able to kill all the meat that we needed. I presumed that the packers were operating under the quota same as the small independent slaughterers and would not have extra meat available. Furthermore, we had managed, due to volume, certain operating economies, and the fact that our personnel were trained in all aspects of our business, to keep our price on most cuts about one-third below chain stores. If we bought packers' beef, we would not have been able to sell at that low a price.

Mr. Leach also requested the dimensions of our slaughtering facilities which are located in Luray, Va. On April 4, 1951, I wrote a letter which gave all the information he required. Some time later in April, I visited the offices of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, to see if I could get any assistance in getting relief from the OPS, and Senator BYRD kindly wrote a letter, on April 25, in our behalf to Price Administrator DiSalle.

On May 1, we received notice from the OPS that our slaughtering quota for the month of May would be 90 percent of our livestock slaughtering for May 1950, and on May 4, I received a letter from Mr. John A. Lennartson, acting head of the adjustment section of the Livestock and Meat Distribution Branch of OPS denying our application for relief on the grounds that relief to us would not be consistent with the objectives and principles of their program. I have attached that letter as exhibit II to my statement.

My partner and I decided it would be best to fill in with packers' beef, providing it was available, in order that our customers would not find empty showcases and refrigerators 1 and 2 days a week when they came in to make their purchases; also, to try to hold our customers for the future, as we felt that this was only a temporary measure and by having beef available for our customers in a legitimate store at legitimate prices, we were keeping down black market in our community.

We were able to buy some dressed beef from a few of the larger packers. There is still a question in my mind as to how the larger packers were able to furnish this extra beef when all quotas were supposed to be based on 1950 business. The most satisfactory method of obtaining beef for our customers, however, was to buy and slaughter it ourselves, so I wrote Mr. Francis on May 10, asking him to reconsider our case. That letter is attached as exhibit III. I pointed out in the letter that the OPS, by forcing small independent slaughterers to buy packers' beef was going to force prices up. It seems to me that this is exactly the opposite result from that intended by the Congress in setting up the OPS.

On May 10 Mr. DiSalle wrote Senator BYRD in answer to the Senator's letter of April 25 on our behalf. His letter merely reaffirmed the decision of which Mr. Lennartson had already written me, but Mr. DiSalle recognized the problem brought on by the tremendous population increase in northern Virginia, to which I have already referred. I have attached Mr. DiSalle's letter as exhibit IV.

Finally, on May 19, I received a letter from a Mr. Clarence P. Moore from the OPS regional office at Richmond, Va. This letter, which I have attached as exhibit V, was in answer to my letter of May 10. It again denied our application for relief, and stated that "it seems very important that meat distribution be confined to the same channels as existed during 1950." I hope I have succeeded in showing the committee that this is the exact result that we were trying to achieve by having our quotas raised. By being forced to operate at approximately one-half our normal volume, we were obviously disappointing one-half of our customers. It seemed to us that the quota system, as applied in our particular case, would encourage customers who were unable to buy beef from us or our competitors to turn to black-market supply.

I would like to turn now to the effect this quota system had on our business during the time it was in effect. I have already pointed out that we showed a good increase in live weight slaughtered during the first quarter of 1951 as compared with the first quarter of 1950. During the 4 months of 1941 while quotas were imposed—that is, from April 1 through July 31, we slaughtered

66,736 pounds, which was 8,000 pounds less than we slaughtered during the same 4 months for 1950, and was 20,000 pounds less than we slaughtered during the first 3 months of 1951.

We bought 23,614 pounds of dressed beef from big packers during April, May, June, and July of 1951. Presuming this beef would dress an average of 59 percent this would give us a total live weight of 40,023 pounds. By adding this figure to what we were allowed to kill under the quota system, we get a total of 106,759 pounds, or about 32,000 pounds over the 1950 figures. This shows that our rate of slaughtering would have been about the same as during the first quarter of 1951.

As I have already pointed out, being forced to buy beef from the big packers could only result in pushing our prices up, and when the price ceilings were revised in May, we were forced to raise our beef prices about 6 cents per pound. I am glad to report that I believe we will be able to lower our prices on beef within the next 30 days, providing we can still operate as we have been doing for the past month.

There is another disadvantage to being forced to buy from big packers, and I am sure those of the committee who are experienced in the beef business are familiar with it. It is not easy to buy only one species of animal from packers' salesmen. The packers are not interested in selling beef to new customers unless they are able also to sell their other products.

As I have already stated, we are seeking to expand our facilities so that we will be able to offer a full line of our own products. At the present time, for instance, we rely on the big packers for some of our sausage products and smoked meats. When we have our new facilities at Luray, we will not have to do this. Obviously, with our business cut to one-half of what it should have been, we were hesitant about going ahead with our expansion plans. This brings me to another example of what the small independent retailer faces in dealing with the big packers.

Just prior to May 30, I ordered smoked hams from one of the big eastern packers, at their quoted price of 61 cents per pound wholesale. The very next day one of the larger chain stores in the Washington area advertised the same ham, in one-half or whole, for 59 cents per pound retail. In order to compete with that price we would have been compelled to lose 2 cents per pound. It certainly seems to us that quotas tend to destroy the ability of the small-business man to take care of himself in a competitive market. I should add here that, in normal times, we are not too concerned about the competition from the chain stores in the Washington area. We find that most people prefer having their meat cut on the counter before them, so that they can see what they are getting, rather than buying meat already packaged from a self-service bin. We believe that there will always be a majority of people who prefer personal service in a butcher shop.

There is one further and very important example of how quotas operate to encourage monopolies in slaughtering. Normally, a business such as ours can give a good account of itself at a stock sale. Our buyer is well experienced, and, in my opinion, he is one of the best in the business. For example, I recall that he bought a beef from under the noses of the big packers' buyers at 28 cents a pound on the hoof. Dressed down the animal graded choice. It is through experience of this sort that the small slaughterer can hold his own against big packers.

Under the slaughtering quota system, however, the situation is drastically changed. We buy in competition with Armour, Swift, and other big packers. They are given a Nation-wide quota and may pick and choose stock sales across the country. They can buy in markets where beef is

plentiful, and can stay out of markets where beef is in short supply. On the other hand, we are restricted, because of our size, to a very few markets within a 80-mile radius of Luray. This means that the big packer, by shifting his quotas from region to region, can always get a price advantage over the small operator. Unless we absorb this difference somewhere along the line, it must be reflected in the retail price on our counters.

I have already given the committee the important correspondence I have had with OPS, but the record would not be complete without listing my final two communications. I do not know whether Mr. Moore's conscience bothered him about our case, but in any event on September 12, after I had requested to be heard by this committee, I received a letter from Mr. Moore. This letter advised me that they still had my application for relief but would not act on it due to the fact that the quota system was forbidden by law. He assured me, however, that he would be glad to take it up again if and when the quota system came back in. That letter is exhibit VI to this statement.

Last Saturday, the regional office at Richmond apparently intended to send me some further bulletin, for I received an empty sealed envelope on that day. I assume that I will hear again from the regional office asking why I have not responded to some form or other that they intended to send me.

I firmly believe that if the legitimate slaughterers will be allowed to operate without the restriction of the quota being imposed upon them there will be plenty of meat available and no need for the American housewife to have to buy from the black market. But if the quota is restored, I personally feel that you will see black-market stores being operated around the corner because it will create a shortage, as I have found from previous experience.

I would like to state how well our business has operated during the past 30 days without having to operate under the quota. We have been able to have plenty of meat for all our customers and are now able to continue selling choice porterhouse steaks at \$3.37 per pound less than OPS ceiling price.

As a small independent slaughterer, I would like to suggest that in order to keep down black market you allow all licensed slaughterers to operate without a quota. And I feel that if the OPS would stop keeping such a close watch on the legitimate slaughterers and keep a closer watch on the illegitimate slaughterers that would help too. Instead of having legitimate slaughterers fill out a lot of forms to be sent in each month, OPS should require the stock yards at which place the cattle are sold in each State to send in a report on who is buying the cattle. If any of the buyers listed are not licensed to slaughter, these are the slaughterers for the black market and should be prosecuted. Also you would be able to tell who is paying over ceiling price in the stock yards for the cattle. By doing this I am sure that you will find that you can keep the meat in the proper channels.

After hearing my testimony I hope that the committee will agree with the small independent slaughterer when he says that by imposing the slaughtering quota it will be creating black market and a monopoly for the large packers.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee.

EXHIBIT I

BROWN'S MEAT MARKET,
East Falls Church, Va., April 2, 1951.

Re RR-F.

Mr. ANDREW J. FRANCIS,
Meat and Livestock Division,
Office of Price Stabilization,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. FRANCIS: I am writing you in connection with my visit to your office this

morning regarding relief in our slaughtering quota.

The reason I am asking for relief is because of the increase in our business this year over last year which has been brought about in a large degree to the increase in population mainly due to service personnel being moved into the Washington metropolitan area.

Our quota for the month of April, according to last year's slaughtering record, is 16 cattle or 13,795 pounds. Since January 1 of this year we have slaughtered around 32 cattle a month, or approximately 28,000 pounds per month.

Our business is run on an honest basis and is open to inspection at any time.

My partner, T. M. Brown, and I are both World War II veterans and have worked hard since our discharge from the service to make our business what it is today.

In order to keep our present customers satisfied and hold our business for the future, we are asking you if there is any way our quota can be increased accordingly.

Thank you for your interest and attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

EVERETT C. SEAL.

EXHIBIT II

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1951.

Mr. EVERETT C. SEAL,
Brown's Meat Market,
East Falls Church, Va.

DEAR MR. SEAL: Careful consideration has been given to your application for adjustment in your slaughter of livestock during 1950 under section 9 of Distribution Regulation 1 (formerly Distribution Order 1).

The facts presented in the application indicate that it would not be consistent with the objectives and principles of the livestock and meat-distribution program embodied in Distribution Regulation 1 to approve your application.

Under the circumstances, we are therefore required to deny your application.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. LENNARTSON,
Acting Head, Adjustment Section,
Livestock and Meat Distribution
Branch, Food and Restaurant Division.

EXHIBIT III

BROWN'S MEAT MARKET,
East Falls Church, Va., May 10, 1951.

Mr. ANDREW J. FRANCIS,
Meat and Livestock Division,
Office of Price Stabilization,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. FRANCIS: I am again writing you regarding relief in my slaughtering quota requested April 2.

I have here on my desk a letter of May 4, from Mr. John A. Lennartson, acting head, Adjustment Section, Livestock and Meat Distribution Branch, Food and Restaurant Branch, OPS, Washington, D. C., denying my application.

I am hereby appealing to you this decision of Mr. Lennartson.

It seems to me that the object of the OPS is to lower the price of meat, while in my case, by forcing me to fill in with the packers' beef (provided it is available), you are forcing me to raise rather than lower my prices.

I am sure that my customers would like to hear of this particular situation. You may be assured that this establishment shall not be accused by its patrons of profiteering because of the action of Mr. Lennartson of the Adjustment Section.

I would like to know why the slaughtering quota has been imposed and, furthermore, why the 10 percent cut is necessary when it is common knowledge to all phases of the meat industry that there are plenty of cattle to be had.

The press has asked me to release my individual case, but in respect to the courtesy shown to me by you and your staff I feel it best to await your reconsideration of this matter.

Hoping to receive your immediate reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

EVERETT C. SEAL.

EXHIBIT IV

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C. May 10, 1951.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in reply to your letter of April 25, 1951, addressed to Mr. Don Leach, Meat and Livestock Division, concerning an application made by Brown's Meat Market, 6856 Lee Highway, East Falls Church, Va., for an adjustment of their 1950 quota bases under section 9 of Distribution Regulation 1.

The facts presented by the applicant indicate that it would not be consistent with the objectives and policies of the livestock and meat distribution program embodied in Distribution Regulation 1 to grant their request. Therefore, the request for an adjusted base for 1950 has been denied.

We are well aware of the steady increase in population in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area, including Arlington and Fairfax Counties of Virginia. The general supply of meats is apparently fully adequate for the area at this time. However, if the supply should become critically short, steps will be taken to either divert meats from other areas or increase quotas for all slaughterers supplying the area or both, depending upon the general meat and livestock supply picture at the time.

We appreciate your interest both on behalf of Brown's Meat Market and the growing population of northern Virginia. However, reconsideration of the Brown's Meat Market application appears unjustifiable at this time.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL V. DiSALLE,
Director.

EXHIBIT V

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Richmond, Va., May 19, 1951.

BROWN'S MEAT MARKET,
East Falls Church, Va.
(Attention Mr. Everett C. Seal)

GENTLEMEN: Due to the fact that Mr. Andrew J. Francis is now assigned to the Richmond district office, there has been a delay in reply to your letter of May 10, however, we are well acquainted with your request for additional quota and can say no more at this time than that our review board gave it a full and fair consideration before passing along our recommendations to the Washington office for final action.

As mentioned to you at the time you visited our Richmond office, it seems very important that most distribution be confined to the same channels as existed during 1950, and we must be careful that we do not assign additional quotas to one person that will need to be deducted from some other operator.

As this program unfolds we appreciate the fact that situations will change, and if you can find justifiable reasons for reviving your request for additional quota we will be very glad to discuss the matter further.

Yours very truly,

HORACE B. GANS,
Regional Price Executive,
By CLARENCE P. MOORE,
Director of Food Division.

EXHIBIT VI

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Richmond, Va., September 12, 1951.

BROWN'S MEAT MARKET,
East Falls Church, Va.

GENTLEMEN: This is in reference to your application for adjusted quota for the slaughter of livestock.

Inasmuch as Distribution Regulation 1, amended on August 1, 1951, by amendment 7, no longer requires the use of quota bases by slaughterers of livestock, we will not process your application at this time. Your present registration is still effective and you may slaughter without limitation the species of livestock you are now authorized to slaughter or have slaughtered for you in a given establishment. Other species may not be slaughtered in the given establishment without authorization from the Office of Price Stabilization.

Should you wish to have this application acted upon later, kindly notify this office by letter, and processing of your application will be resumed.

Very truly yours,

HORACE B. GANS,
Regional Price Executive,
By CLARENCE P. MOORE,
Chief, Food Branch.

Our American Land—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, entitled "Our American Land: The Story of Its Abuse and Its Conservation":

OUR AMERICAN LAND: THE STORY OF ITS ABUSE AND ITS CONSERVATION

(By Hugh H. Bennett)

THE PROBLEM OF EROSION

What is erosion?

Soil is not permanent. Under many conditions it is extremely unstable. When wind or water moves across bare earth they usually carry some soil with them. They may move it hundreds of miles or only a short distance, but eventually they carry away large amounts of soil, unless it is tied down.

Dense plant growth helps to slow down this soil movement. This gives nature time to replace what little soil is removed by erosion. Nature does this by constantly forming new topsoil from underlying subsoil and rock. This slow process, known as natural erosion or geologic erosion, goes on unnoticed over hundreds of years. This type is not dangerous usually; it may be beneficial to man and the earth. Many fine agricultural areas have been formed in this way.

But where land is cultivated or left bare, another and faster kind of erosion occurs. This is accelerated erosion, and it is caused by man's carelessness. When land is cultivated there is no dense growth of plants to protect the soil, and erosion may be a thousand times faster than on protected land. Accelerated erosion damages grasslands when the grass is thinned out by overgrazing. It damages woodlands left bare

by overcutting, overgrazing, and burning. This is what we now know as soil erosion, and unless it is checked, it may ruin most of our good land.

What has happened to our land?

Man seems to have a habit of wasting the gifts of nature. Nowhere has our waste been greater, however, than in our misuse of land. A survey made in 1934 indicated that we had let erosion badly damage or ruin about 282,000,000 acres of the country's crop and grazing land. Another 775,000,000 acres of our crop, grazing, forest, and other kinds of land had eroded to some extent. This is tragic, because so many farm families have lost the means of earning a living. It is tragic because productive land is the basic resource from which future generations must live. Generally the worst erosion has taken place on the farm lands of southern United States, where erosion goes on at all seasons. Much of the topsoil has been removed from large areas across the Nation and the less productive subsoil is being farmed in many places.

How fast is our land being damaged?

Today the Corn Belt is one of the larger areas being rapidly damaged. Throughout the country about 110,000,000 acres of cropland, on farms that cover around 260,000,000 acres, are now being damaged at a critically severe rate. This means that yields from about a fourth of the land now used for crops will be considerably lower within 10 or 12 years if present farming methods are continued. But prompt action can prevent most of this potential damage.

Another fourth of the land now used for crops is eroding at a less rapid but still serious rate. The present productive level of this land will decline within 15 to 30 years unless it is farmed with effective conservation methods.

Present erosion damage to the remaining half of our land now in crops is going on at rates much less serious. This does not mean that the land is producing all it can. Better farming methods, in fact, would increase production on much of it.

We are too close to the danger line

We can get along from now on with the good land we have left, but we can't keep our present standard of living if we lose much more. We now have around 480,000,000 acres of good cropland in the United States. This includes, besides that now in crops, about 85,000,000 acres that need clearing, drainage, irrigation, or other improvements. That's all we have. And all but about 95,000,000 of this 480,000,000 acres is subject to erosion if it's not protected.

So we have no more land to lose. Actually we need more good land for crops now. Too many farmers are working poor land that should be turned back to grass or woodland. More waste of good land would amount to a national crime on the part of those who are responsible—meaning ourselves.

Yet we are allowing about 500,000 acres to go down to ruin each year.

If a foreign nation should invade this country, every man, woman, and child would immediately rise to the defense of our land. We would throw the enemy out regardless of cost. Now we have gone to war against erosion.

What is productive land?

Land means different things to different people. A sailor may say that land is that part of the world not covered with water. Some geographers agree. So does Webster, who says land is "The solid part of the surface of the earth, as distinguished from water . . . especially from oceans and seas." By this standard, something like 28 percent of the earth's surface is land.

Soil conservationists, however, take a different view as to land. They are concerned with it because it is the source of the food and fiber crops we need. Soil conservationists must consider not only the land itself, but other things: Soil types, slopes, fertility, rainfall, and temperature. Their job is to protect the land from erosion and exhaustion according to its needs, and see that it is used according to its capability to grow things.

Most land produces things of value to man. It may be cotton or corn, pasture, timber, or wildlife. Whatever it produces, if we use it according to capability and protect it according to need, we maintain its productiveness.

Where the slope of fields is steeper than 8, 10, or 12 percent, the conservationist knows that the land is not safe for regular plowing. Trees and grass are better crops for land of this sort because they hold the soil in place. In regions of heavy rainfall, terraces to control runoff are built more sturdy than in areas of gentle rains. If yields drop off, the conservationist uses manure, lime, soil-building legumes, rotations, and fertilizer to restore life to the soil. He plants raw gullies to grass, trees, or vines; or, if these will not grow well, he may use small dams or other mechanical measures to stop soil washing.

This is treating land according to its needs and using it according to its capability.

SOIL CONSERVATION

What is soil conservation?

Soil conservation is proper use and care of the land. It means using the land to produce the greatest amounts of the things most needed, and at the same time protecting it so it will not lose its productiveness. The conservation measures used are being constantly improved by careful research at soil conservation experiment stations throughout the country, to meet different soil problems. All land is not alike. Each field or acre must be used for things it is best suited to produce, and protected according to its needs.

All measures that help keep the land productive are tools of conservation. Terraces, contouring, organic matter, grass, crop rotations, fertilizer, legumes, shrubs, trees, drainage if the land is too wet, and irrigation if it is too dry—all of them are conservation tools. It is conservation whether the practices are used separately or together. In other words, soil conservation includes any and all measures that will make the land produce more without damaging it.

Some of the soil troubles that conservation helps prevent are:

1. Topsoil washing or blowing away.
2. Covering good land with erosion debris.
3. Exhaustion of plant food in the soil by overcropping and leaching.
4. Accumulation of toxic salts.
5. Too much water—wet lands.
6. Lack of water—dry lands.
7. Burning of organic soils (peat land).
8. Improper cultivation.

The basis of soil conservation is wise use and proper management of all land.

How do you conserve soil?

There are many things you can do:

1. Use suitable erosion-control practices to stop soil washing and blowing.
2. Hold the rain that falls on the land, for use of crops, trees, grass, livestock, and for other purposes. You may want to hold it where it falls, or divert it to other fields or disposal areas, or store it in ponds.
3. Use manure, fertilizer, and lime where needed, in the right amounts and at the right time.
4. Use tillage, mulching, and cropping practices to protect your land and save rainfall.
5. Drain waterlogged fields.
6. Plant trees, grass, or legumes on areas too steep or shallow to plow; also on land too poor to grow field crops.

7. Quit growing clean-tilled crops on land that washes or blows easily.

8. Flood fields where toxic salts have accumulated, to leach out the salts.

9. Protect organic soils (peat land) from fire by flooding, or by raising the water table.

10. Where it is available, open up new land under conservation practices when needed to increase cropland.

11. Increase feed crops in safe grazing areas to eliminate overgrazing when grass is thin and short.

These, and other sound farming and ranching practices that protect the land and increase production, are the tools of soil conservation.

Soil conservation is the scientific use of land.

SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Soil-conservation districts are local units of government, operating under State laws. They are set up and run by farmers to protect farm and ranch lands from erosion, conserve rainfall, and improve productivity. They have the authority to ask and receive help from State and Federal Governments.

The first of these districts—Brown Creek soil conservation district in Anson County, N. C.—was organized August 4, 1937.

By January 1950 all 48 States, as well as Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, had passed district laws, and 2,220 districts had been set up. They include 1,207,812,000 acres and 4,666,463 farms.

In these self-governed districts farmers are cooperating to protect their lands. The work of each farmer on his own farm fits into a district-wide plan. They often work in groups, helping each other to apply good land use and conservation methods to their lands. Teamwork is the key to the success of soil conservation districts. It speeds up the work.

The Soil Conservation Service, and other Federal and State units, furnish technical, educational, and other aid to the districts.

WHAT SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS ARE DOING

By December 31, 1949, soil conservation districts had made cooperative agreements with more than 725,511 farmers, covering 202,000,000 acres. In each case the farmer agreed to use conservation farming on all of his land. The district agreed to furnish technical aid, and in some cases machinery, seeds, and other help. A conservation plan, based on the needs and capacities of the land, and the means of the farmer, was made for each farm. The Soil Conservation Service did the technical planning for these farms and helped apply the plans to the land. Various other agencies assisted in other ways.

Work has been completed on 112,339,569 acres of this land. In 1942, soil conservation practices were applied through soil conservation districts to 7,943,000 acres. During the year following, 9,805,000 acres were similarly treated; in 1944, 10,156,000 acres; in 1945, 13,012,000 acres; in 1946, 19,332,928 acres; in 1947, 21,650,526 acres; in 1948, 20,895,561 acres; and in 1949, 24,702,266 acres. In all, a total of 132,000,000 acres has been treated.

The conservation plans are very thorough. They provide for use of each field or other area according to its capability and treatment of each acre according to its needs. In some cases it takes several years to install all the conservation work needed. Hence, the complete treatment lags behind the total acreage planned. For example: A farm plan may call for terraces and contour cultivation on 50 acres. The farmer may be able to complete terraces on only 10 acres each year. In the meantime he uses contour cultivation in the other fields. The treatment is not complete, however, until the terraces have been built, which in this case would take 5 years.

Many different conservation measures are used. Each piece of land is different and needs different practices. Some fields need

only one or two practices, while others need several. The figures below show various practices that have been planned and actually carried out in soil conservation districts:

TABLE 1—Important items of soil conservation work

Conservation measures		Planned	Applied to the land
Terracing.....	Miles.....	1,455,649	667,639
Strip cropping.....	Acres.....	9,187,190	5,320,971
Contour farming.....	do.....	32,082,100	20,661,506
Cover cropping.....	do.....	19,680,444	12,324,182
Farm and ranch ponds.....	Number.....	213,925	161,546
Tree plantings.....	Acres.....	1,129,841	554,111
Pasture and range seedings.....	do.....	14,475,197	6,157,682
Stubble mulching.....	do.....	40,709,107	32,657,821
Diversions.....	Miles.....	40,306	23,506
Farm drainage.....	Acres.....	7,750,742	4,620,784
Field windbreaks.....	Miles.....	12,659	7,222

Conservation work outside of districts

A lot of work has been done by the Soil Conservation Service outside of districts, including the making of more than 114,000 other conservation plans. Cooperating with the Extension Service, our technicians drew up plans for 9,320 widely scattered demonstration farms, as well as 105,000 other plans for demonstration areas and CCC camp areas, for erosion control on highways, and so on.

Our American Land—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, entitled "Our American Land: The Story of Its Abuse and Its Conservation":

DISTRICTS PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

Most soil conservation districts have both short-time and long-time plans. Some erosion problems are so acute that they can't wait. Work on those critical areas must be done now to save some of the lands. In many localities they are the areas of first priority. Other problems can wait a few years without so much danger. So in most districts the supervisors try to start work first with those farms which need it most.

Each district has a work program that covers all of the jobs that need to be done. Each district also has a work plan that shows how each job is to be done. The first step is to have the Soil Conservation Service make a conservation survey, which shows land conditions. From this are determined the capability of the land and what needs to be done. Then the supervisors make their district work program, and then their general work plan for the district. After that, a conservation farm plan must be made in full detail for each farm. This is done by Soil Conservation Service technicians.

While work on individual farms is going ahead, however, long-time plans are developed for the whole district. Such plans show what is needed to protect all the farm-lands in the district. For example, they show things like these:

How much land of various kinds is in the district; what lands should be retired from cultivation; how much should be planted to grass, trees, or other permanent vegetation;

what lands should be brought into cultivation; where and in what amount the livestock or cash crops should be increased or decreased; how many miles of terraces are to be built; amount of land to be drained; the number of ponds to be built.

Then the district supervisors, with technical assistance, can work out how much horsepower, tractor power, and manpower it will take to do the job.

The long-time plans are based on the land condition survey, and show what machinery, seeds, planting, stock, lime, fertilizer, and other materials, as well as technical aid will be needed to finish the job. They are the blueprints for the future.

Long-time planning of one soil conservation district

The Broad River Soil Conservation District, including 8 Georgia counties in the Piedmont hill section, found among other things that much land which was being farmed there was not suitable for cropping. It also found 180,000 acres of idle land in the district. Some of this idle land was suitable for crops; most of the rest was good for pasture, meadow, and woodland. The district's program now calls for changes in the use of this misfit and idle land. Here are some of the land use changes the supervisors of the Broad River district plan to make:

	Acres
Cultivated land at time of planning	473,502
Land recommended for continued cultivation	369,333
Land to be taken out of cultivation	104,169
Recommended for kudzu and sericea lespedeza	47,350
Recommended for permanent pasture	52,085
Recommended for woodland	2,387
Recommended for wildlife areas	2,387
Idle land at time of planning	180,000
Recommended for cultivation	30,000
Recommended for kudzu and sericea lespedeza	67,500
Recommended for permanent pasture	24,000
Recommended for woodland	24,000
Recommended for wildlife areas	4,500

When these changes have been made, there will be 75,000 acres less cultivated land in the Broad River District, but the district will have 217,000 acres more pasture, woodland, and meadow. The land left in crops will be the best land and with conservation farming it will produce more per acre. This will be partly because it is the best land, and partly because it is used properly.

Detailed farm plans

The Broad River District had completed plans on 4,698 farms by December 1949. These farms make up about 37 percent of the total land area of the district. The figures below show some of the changes in land use that are being made on these 4,698 farms

Land use	Before planning	After planning	Change
	Acres	Acres	Acres
Cultivated land	254,114	233,650	-20,468
Permanent hay	2,831	49,190	+46,659
Pasture or range	49,550	83,290	+33,740
Woodland	136,671	171,948	+35,277
Idle land	47,013	0	-47,013

These farms are losing 20,468 acres of cultivated land. But they are gaining 95,676 acres of permanent hay, pasture, and woodland. Every acre of idle land has been put to work. These are the kinds of land-use changes that are being made in soil-conservation districts throughout the country.

They are changes that eliminate misfits and put the land to those uses for which it is suited.

The supervisors of the Broad River district also have figured out what equipment, materials, and labor are needed to carry out the plans. Here are their figures for four big jobs:

The job: Terracing, 360,000 acres. Needed: 360,000 horse-hours, 972,000 motor-hours, 3,132,000 man-hours.

The job: Pasture improvement, 228,000 acres. Needed: 4,962,660 horse-hours, 3,360,000 man-hours, 6,740,000 pounds of seed, 228,000 tons of lime, 57,000 tons of superphosphate.

The job: Stock, water and fish ponds, 1,200 ponds. Needed: 80,000 horse-hours, 30,000 tractor-hours, 180,000 man-hours, 60,000 feet of pipe, 1,800,000 fish.

The job: Farm drainage, 8,000 acres. Needed: 80,000 horse-hours, 8,000 tractor-hours, 412,000 man-hours, 1,680,000 feet of tile, 16,000 cubic yards of concrete.

Farmers in two-thousand-and-two-hundred-odd districts throughout the country—like those in Broad River—are going ahead with their day-to-day task of conserving the soil, but they are not fooled as to the size of the conservation program. They know there is a lot of work to do, but a highly encouraging thing is that this does not scare them. On the contrary, the challenge to save the soil or perish, plus the fact that they now know how, spurs them to action.

Districts are doing the soil conservation job every day, while planning for the future. The Soil Conservation Service is helping the districts in many ways, but chiefly with technical assistance.

LAND CLASSES

Simple land standards

At last, we have simple maps that are easy for a man to use in making his farm plans. They are called land capability maps, and are also known as conservation survey maps. These maps divide land into eight classes. The best class of land (class I shown on these maps) can be cultivated safely with no special care except ordinary good farming methods. The poorest class (class VIII) is not suitable for cultivation, grazing, or forestry, but may have some value for wildlife.

The Soil Conservation Service makes such a map of each farm before the farm plan is started. The map, serving as a base, shows how much land there is of each class and where it is. Here are descriptions of the eight land classes.

Land suited for cultivation

Class I: Very good land that can be cultivated safely with ordinary good farming methods. It is nearly level and easily worked. Some areas need clearing, water management, or fertilization. Usually there is little or no erosion.

Class II: Good land that can be cultivated safely with easily applied practices. These include such measures as contouring, protective cover crops, and simple water-management operations. Common requirements are rotations and fertilization. Moderate erosion is common.

Class III: Moderately good land that can be cultivated safely with such intensive treatments as terracing and strip cropping. Water management is often required on flat areas. Common requirements are crop rotation, cover crops, and fertilization. Usually it is subject to moderate to severe erosion.

Land suited for limited cultivation

Class IV: Fairly good land that is best suited to pasture and hay but can be cultivated occasionally—usually not for more than 1 year in 6. In some areas, especially those of low rainfall, selected land may be cultivated more than 1 year if adequately protected. When plowed, careful erosion-prevention practices must be used.

Land not suited for cultivation

Class V: Land suited for grazing or forestry with slight or no limitations. It is nearly level and usually there is little or no erosion. It is too wet or stony or is otherwise not suited to cultivation. This land needs only good management.

Class VI: Land suited for grazing or forestry with minor limitations. It is too steep, eroded, shallow, wet, or dry for cultivation. This land needs careful management.

Class VII: Land suited for grazing or forestry with major limitations. It needs extreme care to prevent erosion or other damage. Usually it is too steep, rough, shallow, or dry to be seeded to range or pasture plants.

Class VIII: Land suited only for wildlife or recreation. It is usually extremely steep, rough, stony, sandy, wet, or severely eroded.

MAKING A CONSERVATION FARM PLAN

How farmers and soil conservationists work together

The first thing they do is look over the farm. They walk together from field to field, studying each patch and parcel of land as they go, and checking with the land capability map. They see what each field is used for, and what the map says it should be used for. They also examine the pastures and woods.

The farmer tells the technician what he grows, what kind of farming he wants to do, what livestock he has, and what machinery he has, and so on. The technician points out in every field, pasture, and woodlot, what needs to be done to stop erosion and keep the land productive.

Fences and farm roads may need to be moved in some places so that they follow the contours of the land and fit in with terraces and contour farming. Field boundaries will have to be changed in some places so that each field will have land of mainly one class. Some cropland—the less favorable usually—may have to be changed to pasture, meadow, or woods. There may be some idle land that can be irrigated, drained, or cleared of brush or trees to prepare it for growing crops.

The land that is to be used for growing cash crops is selected. Then the land needed for growing feed for the livestock is selected. Crop rotations are worked out for these fields. All of this land will usually come from classes I, II, and III.

If there is any class IV land on the farm, it will generally be used for permanent meadow or hay. The land for pasture or woodlots will come from classes V, VI, and VII, if there is any land of these classes on the farm.

The farmer and technician agree on the erosion control practices to use on each field, and list them for the year ahead. Terraces may be needed on some fields. Contour tillage and strip cropping may do the job on others. Cover or green-manure crops or stubble mulch may be needed on some fields. Some pastures may need contour furrows or a water-spreading system. If ponds are needed, the sites for them have to be chosen. If the farm is in a region where rainfall is heavy, one of the most important jobs is to plan waterways to carry off excess water. The sites for waterways must be chosen and plans made to keep them from gullying, and other practices must be carefully considered and decided on.

When the details are agreed upon, they are put down in a written plan, which includes a simple farm map. This plan, known as a co-operative agreement, is signed by the farmer and the district supervisors. The farmer then is ready to install the conservation practices with the help of the soil conservation district and Soil Conservation Service technicians.

This method of working out conservation farm plans according to the capacity and needs of the land is the only practical way to get the right kind of program on the land. Farmers like this cooperative method; they

understand it. They are the final judges as to what is to be done on their land.

One of the big advantages of this kind of planning is that it is done out on the land, where the problems are. Each piece of land is carefully studied, and then the farm as a whole is studied. This is scientific planning for sound land use and effective land protection.

As a result, these conservation farming plans fit the land, fit the farm, and suit the farmer.

Our American Land—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, entitled "Our American Land: The Story of Its Abuse and Its Conservation":

THE JOB AHEAD

Conservation needs for the United States

The Soil Conservation Service has made a State-by-State survey to see how much conservation work remains to be done to control erosion and conserve rainfall. It shows that, in spite of the work already done, a vast job still lies ahead.

Table I, below, shows part of what the soil-conservation job is:

TABLE I.—Important items of soil-conservation work

The job	Amount yet to be done	Labor needed	Tractor-drawn equipment needed	Horse-drawn equipment needed
	Acres	Man-years	Equipment-years	Equipment-years
Contour planting.....	124,691,000	10,253	—	—
Use of cover crops.....	31,120,000	18,369	2,019	9,241
Use of crop rotations.....	212,780,000	6,558	2,194	2,188
Strip cropping.....	96,465,000	20,255	932	3,762
Terracing.....	90,698,000	277,496	69,344	130,278
Liming pastures.....	84,448,000	24,851	808	23,786
Mowing pastures.....	111,272,000	27,603	12,102	38,225
Stock-water development (number).....	1,202,000	81,358	16,123	17,370
Shelterbelts and windbreaks.....	2,260,000	24,190	2,025	3,010
Stream bank management.....	831,000	11,356	1,129	201
Tree planting in gullies and on erodible fields.....	11,655,000	145,241	10,467	909
Protected outlets for disposal of controlled water (as that from ends of terraces).....	6,291,000	131,253	27,562	58,580

What the land is good for

The conservation-needs survey also shows what our farm lands are best fitted for. There are about 1,142,000,000 acres of farm land in the United States. About 40 percent of this area is suitable for cultivation. About 80 percent of that arable area will require protection. Around 55 percent is best suited to grazing and woodland use. The remainder for the most part is in roads and farmsteads.

When all needed shifts in land use are made, and the land is adequately safeguarded, we will have in the United States a total of about 460,000,000 acres of good

cropland suitable and safe for producing our food and fiber crops.

This land must be protected.

PRINCIPAL CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Here are explanations of the major conservation farming measures.

Contouring: Plowing, planting, cultivating, and harvesting sloping fields on the level; that is, farming on the contour, around hillsides with curving furrows to fit the lay of the land, instead of straight furrows up and down hill. The curved furrows catch rainfall and allow much of it to soak into the ground. This conserves water and reduces the amount of soil that is washed away. Part of the water that soaks into the soil is used later by crops. Another part is added to the underground water supply to feed springs, wells, streams, and ponds.

Contour furrowing: Plowing furrows on the level to hold rainfall so it can help the growth of pasture and range grasses.

Cover crops: Dense crops that prevent erosion of cultivated areas at times when there are few or no other plants to protect the land from wind and water erosion. Legumes are widely used as cover crops.

Fertilizing land: Use of manure or fertilizer on land that needs additional plant food to stimulate plant growth.

Crop rotation: Alternating production of various crops on a piece of land, to keep the soil productive and improve it. In a good rotation, one crop, or series of crops, helps the next crop. For example, nitrogen—needed for plant growth—is added to the soil by legumes, such as clover, alfalfa, and cowpeas. These plants have the power to take nitrogen out of the air and through their roots store it in the soil. After they have rotted, the nitrogen can be used for growth by plants that do not have the power to fix nitrogen, such as corn, cotton, and potatoes. Rotations often are used with strip cropping by shifting the close-growing strips and the tilled strips at fixed periods. In this way the soil is improved by the same cropping system used to stop erosion.

Strip cropping: Planting strips of close-growing plants—like grass or clover—between alternate strips of clean-tilled row crops, on or nearly on the contour. The strips of close-growing plants hold water and keep it from eroding the cultivated strip below. They also catch soil picked up by water from the plowed strips above, straining it out of the runoff. Wind strippling is planting alternate strips of clean-tilled and thick crops at right angles to the prevailing wind. Field strippling is planting alternate strips of cultivated and thick crops roughly at right angles to the main slope of the land.

Terracing: Ridging land on or nearly on the contour. The farmer builds up low barriers—ridges or embankments—of soil across sloping fields to intercept rainfall. Terraces with slight grade slow down runoff water, guiding it to safe disposal at the sides of the fields. This controlled excess water runs off too slowly to cause erosion. Level terraces, suited to dry country, hold all the rainfall on the land.

Diversion channels: Channels with a ridge on the lower side. The ridges sometimes are larger than field-terrace ridges and are farther apart. Otherwise they are much the same. They are built across slopes to divert damaging or wasteful runoff. They are used to check erosion much the same as terraces.

Protection of water-disposal outlets. Protected channels and outlets carry off excess water from terraces and near-contour crop rows. These waterways are stabilized against erosion by grasses, legumes, and vines. They include meadow strips, grassed ditches and diversion ditches, and grassed areas at the ends of field terraces.

Green manuring: Turning under grain, legume, or grass crops while green, or soon

after they mature. This is done to improve the soil by adding to the supply of organic matter.

Perennial hay production: Using land not suitable for cultivation to grow hay. The land should not be plowed as a rule, except to renew planting. This is different from temporary plantings of perennials like timothy and alfalfa on land used for cultivation, as is often done in crop rotations.

Pasture development: Developing new pastures with selected grasses and legumes, and combinations of grasses and legumes. It includes fertilization, liming, drainage, irrigation, fencing for grazing control, and other measures.

Pasture improvement: Using measures that increase growth and improve quality of forage grasses. It includes such measures as rotation grazing according to carrying capacity; stock-water ponds placed to encourage even grazing; spacing of salt and bedding grounds for the same purpose; reseeding; liming and fertilizing; basin listing and contour furrowing; water spreading; weed control; and fire protection.

Drainage: Removal of excess water from wet land by ditches or by tile drains. Such artificial waterways must be kept free of silt by protecting the watershed from erosion. Open ditches must be kept free of plant growth and debris that stop drainage.

Irrigation development and improvement: Management of water brought to the site by canals and ditches to help the growth of crops. It includes building and improving water distribution systems on farms; land preparation, such as leveling and contouring; measurement and control of water; development or improvement of springs and wells; and disposal of waste water.

Gully control: Using plants and mechanical measures to stop eroding gullies. These measures reduce the rate of water flow within gullies or by diverting water away from heads and sides of gullies. It is done by using: (1) Grass, vines, trees, and shrubs; (2) fumes and other devices to lessen the cutting power of waterfalls; and (3) dams for catching silt.

Field and gully planting: Planting eroded or erodible land, which is unsuitable for cultivation, to trees, shrubs, grasses, vines, or other useful plants and siltation and aid production of fish and other pond wildlife.

Pond management: Use of suitable measures to protect ponds from erosion and siltation and aid production of fish and other pond wildlife.

Stubble mulching or mulching: This practice is also called subsurface tillage. It means leaving crop residues and soil-improving crops on the ground instead of turning them under with plows or burning them. These materials include grain stubble, straw, cornstalks, crotalaria, lespedeza, and other protective crops. Mulching protects the soil from erosion and baking, cuts down erosion and evaporation, helps the soil to soak up more rainfall, and aids growth of useful bacteria in the soil. The practice requires implements that do not turn the soil upside down.

Shelterbelts; windbreaks: Plantings of trees and shrubs in strips usually 1 to 10 rows wide. The main purpose is to deflect wind currents, thereby reducing wind erosion and snow drifting. Such strips of trees and shrubs also conserve rainfall and protect fields, gardens, livestock, orchards, and buildings.

Water spreading: Controlled spreading of runoff water from the foot of slopes and from gullies and washes over nearby land that needs it. This is done by dikes, dams, and other means for directing water from one place to another. The object is to make use of all water in low-rainfall areas, rather than waste it.

Woodland harvesting: Cutting for lumber, pulp, and other uses, according to sound

forestry practices. Such cutting helps sustain yields and promotes rapid growth. Also to salvage dead or damaged trees.

Improvement cuttings: Cutting woodland mainly to encourage growth. It is also done to increase the utility of the forest for other uses than wood production, such as watershed protection.

Management of odd areas: This means development of odd portions of farms and ranches, such as fence corners, rocky areas, and sinkholes for wildlife purposes. It includes use of plants suitable for that purpose.

Meanings of some conservation terms

Sound land use: Using every acre according to its capacity, with methods that maintain productivity. Such use is based on factors of: (1) Soil, slope, kind and extent of erosion, and liability to erosion; (2) climate; and (3) economic problems. Good land use puts all land to work, instead of permitting some of it to lie idle. It means the safe use of land for useful and suitable crops.

Carrying capacity: The amount of livestock an area of pasture or range will feed through a grazing season, under average conditions, without permanent damage to land or grass. Grazing capacity is determined by range surveys.

Grazing season: Part of year animals can be profitably grazed without permanent damage to land or grass.

Farm-conservation plan: Plan for use of all land on a farm according to its needs and capacity, and the farmer's desires and facilities.

Soil-saving dams: These are dams, built of earth, rock, or other local materials, across gullies or natural watercourses to catch silt, slow down runoff, and reduce erosion.

Runoff: Part of rainfall (including melted snow) not absorbed by the soil or not lost by evaporation—that is, the part that runs off the land into neighboring drainageways.

Technicians: Technically trained men who assist with the soil-conservation job of treating all the land of farms according to capacity to produce and according to needs. To do a complete job of this kind requires the joint (properly coordinated) contribution of land specialists, agronomists (crop specialists), foresters, engineers, wildlife specialists, and whatever other specialists may be needed to carry out the complete farm job.

Exhaustion of plant food: Excessive removal of plant nutrients (plant food constituents) in the soil in the agricultural products taken off the land.

Permanent pasture: Areas used continuously for pasture (for grazing) or meadow (for hay).

THE DEMAND FOR CONSERVATION

The farmers of the United States in growing numbers are asking for help in putting conservation on their land—mainly technical help. Ten years ago, when conservation farming was new, few knew about it; today hundreds of thousands realize its value and want it. The thousands and thousands of requests on hand show that American farmers understand fully the importance of conserving their own and the Nation's soil and water resources.

Farmer applications for assistance

By December 31, 1947, 850,518 farmers had applied for farm plans through the 1,855 soil-conservation districts then operating. This does not include the large number of requests from groups of farmers. In 1945, 118,878 individual requests were received from farmers for conservation plans for 33,000,000 acres. In 1946, 172,520 farmers, operating more than 45,000,000 acres, asked for such plans. At the same time the number of groups asking for help was steadily increasing.

In addition, one or more practices were applied at the request of farmers on hundreds of thousands of farms not covered by farm plans.

Filling the requests from farmers, of course, means that the districts in turn must get aid from the Soil Conservation Service or other agencies. The Service is now helping virtually all of the soil-conservation districts in the country. This aid will be extended to all districts and increased as rapidly as possible.

HERE'S WHAT THE FARMERS SAY

Throughout the United States soil-conservation work has brought real and material benefits. Farmers and ranchers who have received these benefits have agreed on their value. East, west, north, and south, they have voiced their approval of soil-conservation methods and the resulting gains, in group meetings and in letters.

In 1943 more than 9,300 farmers, who operated 3,972,173 acres, reported on the benefits derived from soil conservation.

Of the 9,300 farmers who reported 8,931 said that their crop yields had been increased by the conservation farming methods they were using. They estimated that their average yield increase for the major crops grown throughout the country was 35.7 percent. This means that every 3 acres farmed the conservation way was producing more than 4 acres farmed the old wasteful way.

Furthermore, 6,261 of these farmers reported that work on their farms had influenced 38,636 other farmers to start conservation farming. Furthermore, 3,628 of these district cooperators have actually helped 18,170 neighbors to plan and apply conservation work on their farms.

Here, in their own words, are what some of these thousands of farmers and ranchers have to say about the soil-conservation program:

W. J. Waits, of Pickens, Miss., Holmes County Soil Conservation District, in 1937, grew 80 bales of cotton on 250 acres. In 1944, he said, he produced 45 more bales on 75 acres less land, and made a total increased income of \$17,200.

Frank Kalina, of Pawnee City, Nebr., Turkey Creek Soil Conservation District, said he about tripled his income by conservation methods.

G. V. Carpenter, of Forest City, N. C., Broad River Soil Conservation District, wrote: "If the soil-conservation people had not advised me, I would have lost my farm."

Carl Lindblad, of Wolsey, S. Dak., Carpenter County Soil Conservation District, reported: "My farm was so severely eroded by wind that it was impossible to carry on any farming operations, but with the help of the soil-conservation people and equipment my farm has again been made productive."

D. J. Lay, of Westminster, S. C., Upper Savannah Soil Conservation District, writes that his lint cotton yields have increased 275 pounds per acre as a result of conservation. He reports other increases, and adds that in 1 year his benefits from increased production amounted to \$6,118.

Ralph E. Kamper, of Freeburg, Ill., Shiloh-O'Fallon Soil Conservation District, reports that erosion has been stopped, and wheat production increased 7 bushels per acre by conservation, and adds: "These contour fields are much easier to work, as well as being easier on the equipment."

Donald Rook, of Grand Junction, Colo., Orchard Mesa Soil Conservation District: "Sugar beets on conservation-improved soil have given an average yield of 16 tons per acre in 1943 and 1944. On the same type of soil without the proper treatment, the average yield has been 8 tons."

W. H. King, of Smyrna, Tenn., Rutherford County Soil Conservation District: "Before I started conservation farming this farm produced approximately 25 bushels of corn

per acre; now it produces 35 and 40 bushels. Cotton was 1,000 pounds an acre, now 1,500 pounds; wheat 10 bushels an acre, now 15 bushels. I have been able to increase my beef herd from 14 to 30 head."

A. B. Parker, Americus, Ga., Lower Chattahoochee River Soil Conservation District: "Before the soil conservation district program was put into effect on this farm, 13 tons of peanuts were produced, which was all the cash crops from this land. Last crop year, from the same land, we sold 51 tons of peanuts, 5 tons of blue lupine, 6 tons of crotonaria, and 1,000 bushels of wheat. We paid \$11,200 for this farm and it is our belief on a conservative estimate we could sell this farm now for \$22,400."

Harry V. Burens, Englishtown, N. J., Freehold Soil Conservation District: "An annual yield increase of about 30 percent . . . erosion on sloping ground was controlled 100 percent."

J. W. Whittenton, Forrest City, Ark., South Crowley Ridge Soil Conservation District: "In 1935 I had no fences, very few work stock, and no tractor, and had to buy feed most every year. In 1937, the Soil Conservation Service started me to farming my land like it should be farmed . . . now I have plenty of work stock, three tractors, and other tools all paid for . . . my gross income in 1936 was \$7,000 and in 1944 my gross income increased to \$18,500, and I still have feed and seed to sell."

Hugh Darnell, Porter, Okla., Arkansas-Verdigris Soil Conservation District: "When I bought the farm in 1939 . . . the total cash from crops was \$861 (for 1 year). During the 6 years I have followed my conservation plan the productive value of my land has increased from \$20 per acre to \$45 per acre. My total cash income from the farm in 1944 was \$5,802.82."

L. L. McAllister, Greensboro, N. C., Haw River Soil Conservation District: "In 1940 my farm was not making a dime of profit and hadn't made a profit for several years. That fall I started following recommendations of the Soil Conservation Service. Crop yields increased. Lost motion was reduced."

Per acre cost of production went down. An actual profit was realized in 2 years' time. Details of how would be too long to recite. On the next farm the combination would be different anyway. The important thing is that I began to make money instead of losing money. . . . Upon inquiry at your local office, I found that the total cost of helping me plan and carry out a conservation system was approximately \$135. . . . The Government invested \$135 in me and the land I farm. So far I have paid into the United States Treasury a total of \$2,511.98 on account of income the farm produced. I will pay about \$1,000 more this year. I can't see into the future, but my production cost is low enough so that I can reasonably expect to pay something every year."

Victor Lasky Writes the Strange Story of the Hollywood Ten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Victor Lasky, the well-known writer and coauthor of *Seeds of Treason*, has recently spent a month in Hollywood. He

has written an article for the September issue of *Cosmopolitan* magazine entitled "The Strange Story of the Hollywood Ten." Following is a report on the article as it appeared in the August issue of *The Exhibitor's Digest*:

The Communist Party has taken a licking in Hollywood.

That is the conclusion of Victor Lasky, editor, newspaperman, and one of the Nation's foremost authorities on communism, in an article which will appear in the September issue of *Cosmopolitan* magazine.

Mr. Lasky, coauthor of *Seeds of Treason*, recently spent a month in Hollywood. He attended the hearings in Washington of the House Un-American Activities Committee. His article is entitled "The Strange Story of the Hollywood Ten."

Mr. Lasky points out that even in the heyday of Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry the overwhelming majority of people connected with the movies detested the Communist Party.

He also reports that the Reds never had much success in influencing the actual content of the movies. For one thing, none of the major producers—the men with the final word—was ever pro-Communist, and very few of the directors were. The writers and actors were not in a very good position to be able to influence the finished content of a movie as it would finally come from the cutting room.

"Today the movie industry is working energetically to rid itself of the 'Commie' label and to keep the Communists out of the studios. As a result, the Communists and pro-Communists are openly repentant, on the scrap heap, or on the run. Hollywood, it seems, has learned a painful lesson from the revelations at the trial of the Hollywood Ten—and the lesson will be remembered for a long time to come."

Radio Address of Jim Wyatt, over KOIN, Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a transcript of a portion of one of the many outstanding broadcasts made by Jim Wyatt over KOIN, Portland, Oreg. This particular broadcast was on August 31, 1951.

The more one examines the world situation, the more clear it becomes that a great element is lacking on the western side. That element is inspiration.

A weakness of the western position is the weakness of being antismething. The Western World bristles with guns and arguments in the name of anticommunism, but behind it is a motivating influence of fear.

The Korean fiasco presents a stern object lesson. First there was the fear of calling it a war, and declaring so, and then there was the fear of taking steps to win it.

For its part, the Communist world waves a banner of inspiration to underprivileged people around the world who figure they have nothing to lose. Under the gleaming heraldry of its promises, the people may trade over from political corruption into political slavery—but that is something that they

find out later. What is offered to them at first is the bright hope of Communist promises against the background of meaningless lives. The West has not yet offered them a rival inspiration.

The brave banner of human dignity and freedom which should be unfurled has become lost somewhere along the fear-conscious military assembly line. The Western World is still looking for inspired leadership, but fearful utterances from those in high places will not provide that inspiration. That which is needed is the inspired hope to shape the minds of men.

It is inspiration which lifts men from the doldrums of their fate to believe in those causes for which, if necessary, they stand alone with torch upraised against the blackest terror. It was not so much to New York's massive monuments of material that the people of this land were taught to look with pride and honor—but rather to the inspired words of Emma Lazarus graven on the Statue of Liberty in that harbor.

"Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me

"I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The cause of human dignity and freedom has burnished history's finest hours. Victory has not always gone to the powerful, but to the inspired—as with Washington's bedraggled army at Valley Forge—as, in a modern day, when Winston Churchill rallied his bent and bleeding nation to stand alone against the conquering German Goliath.

The trumpet call of human dignity and freedom can yet find echoing strains in every corner of the world. "It is for us the living" said Lincoln "to be here dedicated to the great work which they, thus far, have so nobly advanced."

These inspirations are the missing factor in the current world-wide struggle for the minds of men. For the best that is in men's minds is not motivated by either guns or butter. It rises rather to that cause which puts meaning and purpose into life, and if need be, cloaks death itself with the noble mantle of service.

The great tradition of human freedom and dignity which the Western World has born and nurtured through the darkest valleys of the tumbling centuries—that is the banner to be unfurled. That is the standard to which all men may repair, and were it so, this timidity toward a Tartar tyrant on a teetering throne would vanish in the rising consciousness of our own true and historic worth.

That is the true fortress of our impregnable strength.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Senator Butler Called the Turn" from the Kearney Hub, of Kearney, Nebr. This editorial has to do with facts concerning the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State, and refers to a speech recently made in Kearney by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BUTLER CALLED THE TURN

Some citizens may wonder why the Senate is dragging its collective feet on granting statehood to Hawaii. United States Senator HUGH BUTLER of Nebraska, however, explained the situation in a recent speech.

Senator BUTLER was chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs about 4 years ago, when the statehood question first came up for serious consideration.

Despite a lack of knowledge of the state of affairs in Hawaii, some Members of the Senate wanted to grant the Territory immediate statehood. Others, however, had heard the Communists had secured control of the major unions and also had a big toe hold in one of the major political parties.

Senator BUTLER spent 3 weeks in Hawaii in 1948, holding public hearings, and members of the committee staff were there for a much longer time, making investigations quietly.

In his report, Senator BUTLER listed the names of the entire executive committee of the Communist Party for the Territory of Hawaii. His report caused quite a sensation at the time, and the Senator was criticized by those most active in advocating statehood for Hawaii.

But a few days ago, the FBI took into custody a group of 7 Communists in Hawaii on a charge of conspiring to bring about revolution and overthrow of the Government. Of the 7 arrested, Senator BUTLER had named 6 of them in his report, 3 years ago.

In Hawaii, the Communists control the one big labor union, the International Warehousemen's and Longshoremen's union, whose top boss is Harry Bridges, the Australian Communist, now under sentence of deportation. The Reds also control the union which supplies labor for the sugar and pineapple plantations.

By encouraging members of the Longshoremen's union to join political clubs of the two major parties, the Reds succeeded in having some 15 Reds placed as delegates, and sufficient other "fellow travelers" to take an active part in the affairs of one of the parties.

Jack Hall, one of the seven men arrested, still is regional director of the longshoremen's union, and, not until he was out on bail could negotiations be continued to secure a wage contract in the sugar industry.

It is so evident that a house cleaning will be necessary before Hawaii can seriously be considered for statehood.

Springfield (Mass.) Auto Club Celebrates Fiftieth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that the Automobile Club of Springfield, Mass., is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary this week. There is to be a parade of antique automobiles and other events. Mayor Daniel B. Brunton has proclaimed this week Auto Club of Springfield Week.

The Springfield club is the oldest of its kind in New England and is 1 year

older than the American Automobile Association. Its record of achievement in the field of serving motorists is well-known.

I know that all Members will want to join with me in extending best wishes to the club.

Sergeant Szary's Penalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to the type of justice meted out by the courts of the District of Columbia. I especially want to point out the judicial value placed upon human life by the District bench in Washington, D. C.

In February 1951 Master Sgt. Stanley Szary, of Bolling Air Force Base, confessed to District police that he was the slayer of his wife, Mrs. Wilma Daniels Szary, formerly of Shreveport, La. Mrs. Szary had been beaten to death by her husband when she was late in returning from a shopping trip.

The coroner reported that at least eight of her ribs had been broken, her liver and a kidney were ruptured, and she suffered a cerebral hemorrhage. The undertaker told me that the face of the young woman was horribly mangled. The sergeant readily admitted that he had beaten her until she collapsed.

At first authorities viewed this crime seriously. He was, however, indicted for second-degree murder, and the case went to Mr. William T. Arnold, assistant United States attorney, for prosecution. Szary was permitted to plead guilty of manslaughter instead of being tried for murder, and this plea was permitted over the objection of the major instigating officer, who felt the case was serious enough to demand trial for murder.

Judge Sweinhart, of the District bench, accepting the plea of guilty, felt that a \$1,000 fine was sufficient to atone for this particularly heinous crime.

Upon payment of the fine from money raised by the sale of joint property of this man and his slain wife, Szary was released. And, upon the recommendation of someone, I am told that he was promptly restored to active duty.

Someone else must have thought that the assistant United States attorney working for the prosecution did a good job in handling the Szary case; he has since been promoted.

I understand that the judge's light sentence was passed on Szary's plea that someone had to take care of his children, and thus in spite of the plea of the family of the deceased young woman that he is not the proper person to take care of children of tender age.

A welfare investigation disclosed that the parents of Mrs. Szary, Mr. and Mrs.

W. D. Daniels, of Shreveport, La., are well qualified and anxious to care for the children of their slain daughter although the children are now in the custody of the convicted man. This investigation found the Daniels to be upstanding citizens who occupy positions of respect and responsibility in their community; but are without influence, apparently, such as to demand consideration from the office of the United States attorney in the District of Columbia.

I doubt if those in authority in the Armed Forces sense the significance of this case. Certainly they had a right to rely normally upon the appraisalment of the importance of this crime as placed by the District courts upon it. With merely a fine of \$1,000 for killing the wife, a mother with two small children—one a baby just a few months old—the military authorities could easily assume that this offense was in line with the gravity of reckless driving, bootlegging, and petty larceny. Such naturally would be the public acceptance of the judicial appraisalment of a particularly lurid and vicious crime.

The Armed Forces have entertained a laudable desire to maintain a high moral standard among enlisted men and it is commonplace for them to refuse to accept as enlisted men those who in the indiscretions of early life commit minor juvenile delinquencies.

I certainly have no quarrel with such a policy but rather choose to commend them most favorably for this policy. I doubt that those in military authority are aware of the Szary case.

Recently committees of Congress have been investigating crime conditions in the District of Columbia and making recommendations to Congress. Perhaps this is one case which will receive a prompt and full investigation by the appropriate committee.

What is the value of the life of a wife—mother of two small children—in the District of Columbia?

Defending Extravagance Is Still Popular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to insert an editorial from the Waukesha Freeman, of Waukesha, Wis. G. H. Koenig, its editor, has well expressed the major reason for the constantly mounting Federal spending.

Members of Congress, of course, have a great responsibility. Congress, after all, does have the power of the purse. But once the executive department has made its request for funds, all the weight of Government and of various pressure groups are marshalled in support of that

request. Individual Members of Congress who stand up against such requests too often become mere ants in the path of the steamroller. There can be no real Government economy without the cooperation and active leadership of the President. Such cooperation and leadership do not now exist.

DEFENDING EXTRAVAGANCE IS STILL POPULAR

President Truman's attempt yesterday to dispel the fears of the American people over his administration's reckless fiscal policies is as presumptuous as it is misleading. Speaking at the dedication of a new building for the general audit office, the President seized an opportunity to lash out at criticism of monumental spending and mountains of debt and give assurance that the country is "stronger economically than ever before." He added that his critics are only trying to "frighten voters—particularly as visions of election dance through the heads of gentlemen who are politically inclined."

The fact is that criticism of our idiotic fiscal policy, which is in defiance of all reason and experience, is not something that has been trumped up in advance of the 1952 Presidential election. This reckless policy was conceived and nurtured as early as the 1930's and has been handed down from one Presidential term to another. Regardless who becomes the country's next chief executive, the spendthrift ways the Washington Government has fatuously pursued will not disappear for the very reason that President Truman can even now stand up and proudly defend them. High-level spending, public debt and governmental waste and extravagance have become so much a part and parcel of the National Government that President Truman finds it appropriate to excuse each and all of them in bristling language and is so bold as to say the criticism is based on "misinformation."

It is axiomatic that no real curtailment of waste can be achieved by Congress without White House leadership. Instead of providing that leadership the Truman weight has been used to frustrate congressional attempts at reduction. Publicly, he has urged his heads of bureaus and departments to cut down nondefense expenditures but privately he has permitted them to classify almost every activity as linked with defense. There is no lack of detailed authoritative blueprints for cutting the nondefense cost of Government. Any number of organizations and individuals, from the Hoover task forces on down, have indicated the way in precise terms, not just generalities. In each case they show how many billions of dollars can be pared without damaging any essential governmental function. It is true that some cuts have been made by Congress when appalled by the size and scope of the President's proposed budget. But these cuts have been of a relatively minor nature. The big economy issues have been avoided.

Moreover, this is not a partisan fight. A Democrat, Senator Byrd, has long been the most consistent advocate of tough economy in Government—no Republican has worked as hard in this direction. And lately, a comparative newcomer to the Democratic ranks of the Senate, Senator DOUGLAS, has taken up the torch. As it happens, Senator DOUGLAS subscribed almost completely to the late President Roosevelt's New Deal program, and he approves of much of President Truman's version of it. However, he abhors waste and extravagance in Government and says so on every possible occasion. This, incidentally, has put both Senators BYRD and DOUGLAS in the White House doghouse. Because they have the courage to express their views the President is bitterly hostile to both. Reform

can only come when those in positions of leadership like the President will throw their weight on the side of economy, smaller budgets, and debt retirement instead of defending the policies which stand in the way of such achievement.

Individual Initiative of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at Worthington, Minn., on Wednesday, September 26, 1951, at the Turkey Day festival.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What has made the United States the great nation that it is, and how can we keep it so?

America was founded on ideals of human freedom. It has been built on the bedrock of individual initiative. These are the prime factors that have given us the know-how in industrial achievement so that our people generally today enjoy more of the material comforts than any other nation in all history.

This freedom and initiative have made us the mightiest nation of our time. With our economic and military strength, backed by the spirit of our people, we have become the recognized leader of the free nations of the world in a struggle against a philosophy which would destroy human liberty and which would dull the creative spirit of man.

There are those, even in America, who think that this foreign ideology is better than the American way. They forget that in the United States the people are sovereign. Back of the iron curtain the people are slaves to an all-powerful state.

A free people have a strength which cannot be matched by those who are dominated by government. A free people have resources of faith in themselves, in their institutions, in their future, which cannot be equalled by those who must blindly follow the whims of a dictator. A free people will fight for freedom and liberty, as all generations of Americans have done.

They will work for it, too, because there are rewards for initiative. There is opportunity for betterment. The young hired man on the farm can always aspire to be a farm owner in his own right. Frequently he gains that ambition. Our schools and educational institutions are based on the ideal of equal opportunity and the humblest youth can achieve a professional career or operate a business of his own. There is still a chance for him to become President.

Every citizen is secure in his home. He may worship God in the church of his own choice, with dignity and without interference. He can freely express his opinions and there will be no secret police to turn in a report or drag him from his home in the dead of night. He can listen to his radio, and he is pretty certain to have one, and he can drive his automobile on fine city streets or on modern highways along a quiet countryside. He can read a newspaper and draw

his own conclusions from what he reads, for the press is free and its readers are free.

These are all rather commonplace factors in American life. We take them for granted. But have you ever stopped to consider how very uncommon they really are? Where else in the world today do you find that orderly freedom, that basic security, that opportunity? They are symbols of this Nation's greatness because all of them minister to human needs and human aspirations. All of them are the fruits of freedom and initiative.

They would not fit into the scheme of things if the Communists had their way, but it is not only the Soviet schemers in the Kremlin who threaten that way of life. There are some dangers we need to overcome within our own country if we wait to keep this great America of ours.

One of the biggest dangers to individual initiative is too great reliance on the Federal Government for assistance, direction, and control of our everyday lives. Self-reliance is one of the best of all American traits. Every time we look to Washington for some benefit or some new service, which we ought to be doing for ourselves, we chip off a little of our individual initiative. Our Government becomes more all-inclusive, more powerful, more far-flung and costly. And with this accumulating loss of individual initiative and self-reliance we lose, also, a part of that other great factor which has made America great—our freedom.

Closely related to such increased dependence on Government is another danger, which to all of us is immediate and apparent. That is the danger of excessive taxation. It is an old saying that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Excessive taxation will quickly destroy free enterprise and stifle the energy, the creativeness, and the will to achieve upon which our industry, our agriculture, our whole capacity as a people are based. One of the most compelling tasks to which citizens of this country, and those they elect to public office, must devote themselves is reduction in the burden of taxes. We can only tax less if we spend less. Thrift, economy, and efficiency are pretty fundamental virtues. Our Government in Washington needs to learn these fundamentals.

Thirdly, we need to keep an appropriate balance among the economic segments of the Nation. It is a magnificent tribute to our farm people that, although they make up only 16 percent of the whole population, they have utilized the know-how, the initiative, and the hard work which are the foundation of America's greatness in all fields, to produce sufficient food and fiber to meet the needs of a nation of 150,000,000 people, and some to spare.

There is reason for concern that our farm population, one-sixth of the total, received from farming operations only 7 percent of the total national income last year. In other words, one-sixth of the people doing a job at the very foundation of our strength and security in this critical time are receiving roughly one-fourteenth of the rewards in terms of take-home pay.

The agricultural price-support program is intended to give the farmer parity with other groups, while recognizing that he faces many hazards and uncertainties in his operations. That program is sometimes attacked, but it is basically right. It was recently attacked in a way that is both unfair and untrue by a gentleman in Washington who happens to be steeped in the idea of controls at the Federal level.

The Price Administrator, Mr. DiSalle, has been quoted as saying that he cannot control inflationary food prices, or give relief to the consumer, because the price-support program keeps the level of farm prices too high.

That statement is not in harmony with the facts. In fact it simply isn't true.

Prices received by farmers have been declining for the past 6 months, while the retail cost of these foods was unchanged from May to July, and is now on the upward trend. The farmer's share of the dollar that consumers spend for farm foods is less right now than when Mr. DiSalle first took office, and the consumer is paying more than he did. These facts are clearly shown in the price indexes of both the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics and Department of Labor.

With the exception of beef and mutton, which have been above parity, only one or two farm commodities have reached parity prices. Let's just take a look at the record.

Wheat was selling for \$2.21 on February 15. It dropped to \$2.05 on August 15. Parity is \$2.41.

Potatoes were \$1.03 on February 15, and had gone up to \$1.17 on August 15, but since the parity price is \$1.80, potatoes are at 65 percent of parity.

Milk is lower in price too. It averaged \$4.63 a hundred on February 15 and was down to \$4.45 on August 15. That is 95 percent of the parity price figure of \$4.79.

Eggs at 49.7 cents a dozen, on the average, are at 91 percent parity; chickens at 83 percent.

These parity figures clearly show that the agricultural price support program, to give the farmer not more but an equal share with the laboring man, the merchant, the industrialist, and professional man and woman, has not been responsible for the inflationary trend in the costs of living.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture has, moreover, concluded on the basis of extensive research that the substantial stocks of food products and feed grains, stimulated by and resulting from price support programs, has been an important influence holding down inflationary increases in retail food prices since the beginning of the Korean crisis. The agricultural program, from every point of view, has been a stabilizing, and not an inflationary, factor. It is time that our bureaucrats looked at the facts and stopped giving false information.

Let me cite a fourth danger about which we must be concerned if we are to keep America great. Our strength as a nation will vanish, our economic well-being will be worthless, our individual initiative and freedom will become tarnished, free enterprise will fall prey to all kinds of collectivist schemes if we try to sustain the American way of life without character and without faith.

Recent investigations in Congress have brought to light all sorts of shocking conditions, ranging from the peddling of influence in high places in our Government to outrageous evidences of powerful criminal rackets operating at the expense of our people. I need not recite the sordid list.

Some people of little faith, aided and abetted by enemies of our country, say that we are doomed, that these shocking revelations prove the depravity of our country. I have great faith in America. I believe that we are bringing these things out in the open in order to clear out the rubbish in our national life. Crime and corruption cannot stand the light of day. Those who think the Government of the United States is for sale are being tried at the bar of public opinion. You and I know what the verdict will be. It is not now true, nor has it ever been, that anything goes.

Let us not minimize these dangers or these symptoms. Let us rather determine to meet the supreme obligation upon our generation to keep America great not only by destroying these evil forces but by conserving the American way of life.

Stopping Unnecessary and Unauthorized Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Government of this country has spent over \$260,000,000,000 more than it has collected, continually spends money not appropriated and requires deficiency appropriations and the Administration is asking for additional billions of dollars to spend that the Government does not have, all of these moneys going to bureaus and often spent by the bureaucrats without regard to waste, authorization, and the intent of Congress. The Congress has been further requested to authorize the spending of "what we don't have" to spend tens of billions more money than the Treasury will collect as income, even in the face of the Government now being in debt for more than \$260,000,000,000.

Should the Congress continue the administration in its spending of billions more than the income, as requested by the administration?

With such a program of spending is there any wonder that bureaucrats waste and spend other than authorized, spend and give away for purposes not intended by the Congress, for the bureaucrats have the whole appropriations made available to them all in one lump, all at one time and with nothing to worry them as to how it is spent until the next fiscal year and after it and more has been spent. This is before the report of irregularities and abuses comes from the Comptroller General and only after the money is spent and gone from the Treasury.

It is the same old pattern and practice year after year with little done, not even the proverbial locking the barn door after the horse is stolen—each year the door seems to remain open for the same abuses, waste, and misspending. And after the money is gone little investigation or none at all.

While hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been lost to the Government by the spending of these bureaucrats, yet many pass over such conduct by facetiously saying it is simply Yankee shrewdness doing business with the saps in the bureaus.

We should stop this year-after-year waste and spending of funds by not waiting until the moneys are actually gone, by not permitting the same people in the Government to waste the taxpayers' money, and release no further appropriations to such people in the bureaus.

I do not believe that appropriations should be paid and given to the bureaus for spending in one annual lump sum. Business concerns would be bankrupt if they gave millions of dollars for a year's operation and paid no further attention

to the spending of the moneys until the following year.

It seems that much of the abuses, misspending, and waste of the taxpayers' money, might be stopped by only paying and releasing the moneys to the bureaucrats in quarterly installments. And if the bureau does not justify its spending in the previous quarter, the next quarterly installment should be reduced and the personnel responsible separated from Government service. With such procedure, waste and misspending of the taxpayers' money might be stopped, for under the present system the bureaus can spend all that is appropriated and sometimes more.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the quarterly release and payment of appropriations would save hundreds of millions of dollars and would be a saving to the taxpayers now, rather than investigation after the money is gone. I am introducing the following bill to make appropriations available in quarterly installments:

A bill relating to the spending and quarterly payment of appropriations for the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That all appropriations for the use of the executive branch of the Government shall be made available for spending to each department in four quarterly installments on the 1st day of July, October, January, and April of each calendar year, and only after report to the Congress and appearance before the House Committee on Appropriations detailing the expenditures of the previous quarter by each department and its intentions for spending for the next succeeding quarter, and then made available for spending by the department in such amounts as the House Committee on Appropriations shall approve for the next succeeding quarter.

President Wilson and the League of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, historical evidence continues to accumulate which indicates that if President Wilson had been in his normal good health at the time of the League of Nations debate, compromises would have been reached which would have resulted in the United States joining the League of Nations. This has been a contention of mine for many years, and I naturally was very much interested to find that this belief received support in a recently published book about President Wilson's Secretary entitled "Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era." This matter is dealt with in an editorial dated September 23, which appeared in the Worcester Telegram, and because of its historical interest I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE WILSON ERA

Senator LODGE a few years ago said he believed that if President Wilson "had been in his normal good health, compromises would have been reached which would have resulted in the United States joining the League of Nations." That belief gets some support, at least by implication, in a recently published book, *Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era*. The author is John Morton Blum, assistant professor of history at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He writes:

"From October 1919 until his death Wilson was a sick man. * * * It was a wonder and a tragedy that he lived. After a month of complete inactivity he began to resume some of the duties of his office. * * * Fortunately his mind was unimpaired, but besides physical pain, arteriosclerosis brought its companion affliction of emotional instability. There is no question but that for at least a month Wilson was incapacitated within the meaning of the Constitution."

Americans at the time knew that Mr. Wilson was seriously ill, and they suspected that he was not really up to his task. But they didn't know that they were practically without a President for a while. It was a dangerous situation and it would have been even worse, if we had been in the midst of war instead of in the early part of a postwar period.

It is idle to speculate on the probable consequences of an American entry into the League of Nations in 1919-20. But we certainly know that the American rejection of the League did not promote world peace and did not keep America out of another great war.

Mr. Blum shatters the familiar Democratic complaint that the wicked Republicans killed Mr. Wilson's League for selfish, partisan reasons and so betrayed the world. He shows, by document after document, that it was Mr. Wilson's stubbornness which prevented a workable compromise on the League issue. But Mr. Blum is no carping critic. He says that Mr. Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference "aimed high and strove valiantly, everything considered, he did well, possibly none could have achieved greater justice."

Valiant he was. But he was too bitterly partisan about it; and bitter partisanship is catching. As Mr. Blum shows, both sides in the League fight were too eager to win an election. The Wilson era was a tragic one.

Farm-Policy Review: Economics or Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, representative farmers in eastern Illinois have called my attention to the manner in which a branch of the Federal Government apparently has been endeavoring to create an atmosphere of apparent favor for a bureaucratic program that is not the product of the farmers themselves. Under permission granted to me by the House, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions adopt-

ed by 100 farmers from one of the counties I have the honor to represent, as well as a letter from a farmer in a second county, and a newspaper report of a meeting in a third county.

Sincere friends of agriculture have labored for many years to develop and support a farm policy based on economics rather than politics. Recently there has been a gigantic effort to drag the farm problem into politics, which would be a tragedy for the farmers and the country. In order that the Members of Congress may be advised of what seems to be going on in the agricultural sections of the country, I am including first a letter from an Effingham County farmer, together with the text of the resolution adopted:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1951.

Mr EDWARD H JENISON,
Congressman, Twenty-third District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: I am enclosing a copy of the resolutions adopted by the 100 farmers assembled recently to act upon the family farm policy review program.

The publicly stated purpose of this family farm policy review was to get the opinions of grass-root farmers but when the farmers of Effingham County expressed their opinions in resolutions with instructions that copies be sent to our United States Senators and Congressman, United States Department of Agriculture, and Dean H. P. Rusk, University of Illinois; I am informed that the State PMA office advised the county PMA chairman that he need not send copies to the above-named persons.

When an administrative department of our Government seeks to make policies, then seeks to get their approval by citizens, who have had little or no information about same, no adequate time or opportunity to study and discuss them, and they then advise against complying with a mandate from a group of citizens as expressed in resolutions, I ask, is this the type of Government policy that our boys are going through hell in Korea to defend?

Please read the resolutions enclosed. Thanks.

At the Effingham County family farm policy review held at the Effingham County Courthouse September 6, 1951, the State mobilization committee's seven-page questionnaire was not filled out but the following resolution was unanimously adopted

"Resolved by the farmers assembled in Effingham, Ill., on Thursday, September 6, 1951, at the call of the chairman of the Effingham County Agricultural Mobilization Committee for the purpose of discussing the family farm policy review, That we nor any other group or any individual are unable to correctly evaluate or render a valid decision upon any subject about which they do not have full information and then sufficient time to give it careful study. Very, very few farmers in the county have had an opportunity to read and study, or even to see, the family farm policy review provisional report and tentative recommendations. In fact, farmers were told by the chairman of the county committee that they had no copies for farmers, that they were only for members of the county committee; be it further

"Resolved, That in our opinion neither the Department of Agriculture nor any other administrative department of our Government has any authority to spend their time and taxpayers' money in surveys for policy-making purposes. Also, that an unbiased survey

and report of its own activities by any agency very rarely occurs; be it further

"Resolved, That stated in the first paragraph of the questionnaire prepared for use at this meeting, in referring to the recommendations in the provisional report, is this statement: 'In general, they involve major changes in policy or law, or major additions to the present activities of the Department and its agencies.' When only the provisional report lists the proposed major changes or major additions to the present activities of the Department and its agencies, a report that only a very few farmers ever heard of, copies are not available for farmers to read and time offered to study the many major changes and major additions proposed in its 121 pages, to study their relationship to each other, their probable effect upon all citizens and their merits under our Nation's Constitution and the basic principles upon which our Nation was founded and under which it attained its greatness, therefore it is humanly impossible for we family farmers to intelligently answer the questions listed in the questionnaire; be it further

"Resolved, That a family farm policy review should be discussed by the farm family. The call of this meeting was not addressed to the farm family, and the wording of the call gave no indication that the farm family was invited or expected to attend the meeting. No time or opportunity is provided for the farm family to read and study the provisional report and recommendations as a family and thereby arrive at a farm family decision as to their farm family answers to the questions on the family farm policy review. Therefore, any answers given to this questionnaire cannot be from the farm family, nor could their answers express their true opinions when they are not fully informed of the extent or implications of the proposed 'major changes in policy or law, or major additions to the present activities of the Department and its agencies'. be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the State mobilization committee in lieu of the questionnaire and that copies be made available to the press and radio and be sent to both Senators, EVERETT DIRKSEN and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Congressman EDWARD H. JENISON, to the United States Department of Agriculture, and to Dean H. P. Rusk, at the University of Illinois"

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter expressing a similar sentiment, and coming from a farmer in Crawford county. It will be noted that the letter indicates a similar reaction to the program in neighboring Lawrence County. The letter follows:

ROBINSON, ILL., September 15, 1951.
The Honorable EDWARD H. JENISON,
Twenty-third District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: Last week I attended one of Mr. Brannan's farm family meetings. There were about 40 people present. After some discussion, it was moved and seconded that the meeting be postponed. The PMA chairman flatly refused to entertain a vote on the matter, saying that he had had orders from higher up not to permit a postponement. These orders were a result of Lawrence County's action in postponing their meeting.

The Congress is our only hope for curtailing the dictatorial actions of the Government agencies, and I believe that if you would check among your farm acquaintances in the other counties in your district, that you would find that this action

of Mr. Brannan's meets with the disapproval of an independent and freedom-loving people.

Mr. Speaker, when the farm-policy meeting was called for Richland County farmers at Olney, the local daily newspaper reported the result as follows:

[From the Olney (Ill.) Daily Mail of September 11, 1951]

RICHLAND FARMERS REJECT UNITED STATES FARM POLICY REVIEW

Fifty Richland County farmers demonstrated the independence for which they are famous at a meeting of the Richland County Agriculture Mobilization Committee in the court house convention hall last night.

The meeting, called to obtain a county poll in the United States Department of Agriculture's Family Farm Policy Review, developed into a rejection of the poll and a refusal to answer the 26 questions in the review.

After considerable discussion a motion was made by Harry Taylor and seconded by Ben Bohren to refute the Farm Policy Review. On a show of hands only four of the group who were not employed by the United States Department of Agriculture voted against the motion. All others voted in favor of the rejection.

The meeting was opened by Bernard Shick, Richland County chairman for the Federal PMA, who read a report of what the PMA was doing and planning to improve the farmers' lot and a report was made by Farm Advisor Edward Barnes on the history of the Farm Bureau Movement and what it has done and is doing in Richland County.

Chairman Shick then passed out the Farm Family Policy Review question sheets and asked the farmers assembled to fill the report out as he announced the 26 questions, one by one, on the poll.

After the questions had been stated, Barney Coen took the floor and said that the questions were such that he felt incapable of answering them properly in the short time allotted, and asked Mr. Shick if he and the others present could take the questionnaires home and study them and return them within a week or so. Mr. Shick stated that it was impossible as the reports had to be completed that evening so that the report could be made as a definite time limit had been set for making the report to Washington.

Mr. Coen then said that he had read in the newspapers a criticism of the poll made by the Illinois Agriculture Association, and asked if anyone had a copy of the IAA statement.

Otto Shafer said he had a copy of the letter from I. E. Paret, public relations director of the IAA and Farm Advisor Barnes was asked to read it.

The letter, which was generally published last month, condemned the poll by the Government for many reasons, including the framework of the questions, and stated that the IAA contends that the Department of Agriculture is attempting through the Farm Family Policy Review to engage in policy making rather than confining the activities of the department to its proper roll of administering the laws which Congress enacts.

The letter went on to say that "we do not believe a tax-supported governmental agency can produce an unbiased report of its activities"

"We question," the IAA statement continued, "the sincerity of top agricultural officials and others who, in such a short period of time, would seek suggestions and recommendations from all rural people on so many complicated phases of agricultural policy affecting farmers."

"We see no provisions in the program to adequately acquaint farmers prior to the meeting with the problems and policies to be discussed. While this study—Family Farm Policy Review—proposes to strengthen the position of farm families in America, it is the belief of the Illinois Agriculture Association that its intended purpose is to strengthen and expand Government agencies to the end that they become dominant and stronger with corresponding weakening of the influence of farm families in determining policy."

The IAA statement concluded that "because of the unsound procedure involved in the family farm policy review the Illinois Agricultural Association is unalterably opposed to the program and methods employed in its activation." "We believe," F. E. Morris, vice president of the IAA, said in commenting on the report, "the attempt of the Secretary of Agriculture in this so-called family farm policy review program is thoroughly political."

"It may be a 'practice run' to establish the precedent for further attempts at policy making by the USDA. It will also provide some basis for broadening the responsibility and authority of the PMA. In addition it may well afford the Secretary of Agriculture sufficient grounds for informing Congress that PMA has sampled the true thinking of farmers Nation-wide and knows what they want," Morris added.

"Among the proposals in the 121-page Family Farm Policy Review are many phases of the Brannan plan, according to IAA officials. One of these is the advocacy of direct Federal payments to farmers rather than price supports."

"Other proposals include free management service for small farms, study of legislation to permit the Federal Government to buy land, redivide it into family farms and resell, greatly expanded Federal crop insurance, and greatly expanded farm purchase and production loans."

"The Illinois Agriculture Association, which is a nongovernmental organization supported by dues from its membership, has consistently fought attempts by the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies to enter the field of determining public policy."

"The 1950 annual meeting resolutions of the IAA declared 'We also detest the growing tendency of the Department of Agriculture to impose official thinking upon the people whom they are appointed to serve and deplore the use.'

Ray Milone, Harry Taylor, Mike Flock, and Ben Bohren took the floor and spoke against the poll, stating that farmers were being rushed and pushed into answering this questionnaire without being given time to study the questions, many of which they could not understand and many of which they knew nothing about.

Harry Taylor stated that he had not marked "Yes" or "No" on any question except the Nos. 25 and 26 questions, and he had marked "No" on them. No. 25 asked, "Do you believe that the carrying on of this family farm policy review is a proper function of the Department of Agriculture?" No. 26 asked, "Do you believe that a more detailed and extended study of Department's program and policies should be undertaken?"

Ben Bohren read an article on farmers being penalized for not cooperating on liming, and said that they are nearing socialism when they tell us what we can plant and do, and it was time to call a halt to this program which we pay for anyway as taxpayers.

Barney Coen, in a concluding statement, told Mr. Shick that the action and attitude of the group was no reflection on him and others who worked with PMA, and that they were attempting to do a good job for Richland County farmers despite orders from higher up. A general consensus of those

present agreed with Mr. Coen's statement regarding Mr. Shick and the other Richland County PMA workers.

Several of the speakers expressed the farmers' need for Federal help in many ways, especially on advice, crop reports, certain types of fair support, etc., but that dictatorial and political policies were what the farmers opposed.

The "peaceful revolt" last night is similar to the action taken by farmers in many other counties in Illinois, where the Illinois Agricultural Association's condemnation of the United States Department of Agriculture's political methods has been followed.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem apparent from the reaction of the farmers themselves that they resent such an obvious political intrusion into the farm problem by an agency of the Federal Government. Discussion of the farm problem at the farm level is sound procedure, but the farmers are right when they protest being called together to give rubber-stamp approval to a preconceived plan. The farmers may take heart in the fact that the Congress will look to them, and to their farm organizations, for counsel on the farm program and not to any group of farm politicians seeking to perpetuate themselves in power.

Oil and Aluminum in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been saturated with the pleas of certain segments of our population for a proper and adequate defense for the protection of our national security. A vocal segment of the Nation has tried to arouse the apathetic segment to action. The success of this attempt is still rather in doubt but there is one thing not in doubt, and that is the sophistry of a part of the vocal segment which is shouting defense of the Nation from the roof tops.

There are those who demand adequate defense of the Nation as a means of political gain and as a ruse for the further socialism of the country and the destruction of constitutional government.

This is a general charge but I back it up with two specific instances which I submit for your consideration.

Strange enough, the Department of the Interior is involved in both instances.

In one instance it is the demand for oil and in the other the demand for aluminum, but both demands are made in the name of defense which is the popular theme song of the moment and the most appealing to an unsuspecting citizenry, which, unfortunately, remains too apathetic or disinterested to examine the record and prefers to accept catch phrases as substitute for logic.

Take the case of oil for instance.

We are told that oil is necessary in the national defense and who can deny such a statement.

We are told that millions of barrels of oil are to be found under the tidelands of Louisiana, California, and Texas.

We are told that this oil is necessary for our defense but the oil cannot be produced unless the tidelands are stolen from the States and handed over to the Federal Government which has no right to them but all this must be done in the name of defense.

We are told that litigation instituted by the several States is holding up the production of this oil and naturally those who do not know the facts are convinced that the States and the House of Representatives, which shares the belief that the tidelands belongs properly to the States, are interfering with the defense program. But, in truth and fact, are they?

We are not told that the litigation could be easily eliminated by the Department of Interior acknowledging that the tidelands belongs to the States.

We are not told that if the President had not previously vetoed legislative clearance of the title of the tidelands to States, there would have been no interruption in the defense program as far as the production of oil is concerned.

The American people are not told these things because such honesty would completely remove any reason, by whatever yardstick, for the theft of the tidelands and defiance of State sovereignty.

The New Orleans States, in another splendid editorial, again rings the welkin and tears away the mask of hypocrisy from the faces of those who would cry "defense" from their throats and simultaneously shackle defense with their hands.

Who is really guilty of hampering the defense program?

Who is really the guilty party?

Read this editorial from the New Orleans States very carefully and there will not be any doubt in your minds:

OIL AND ALUMINUM

Among the materials vitally needed for defense purposes, oil and aluminum rank near the top.

The demand for these two items is insatiable at this time, while the Nation is building planes, ships, and all types of armament to defend itself if global war should come, and to demonstrate such strength that our enemies would hesitate to provoke a global war.

It would seem, then, that a major piece of business of the Government in Washington would be to boost oil and aluminum production.

But—as unrealistic as it is—one of the administration's chief officials concerned with the production of oil and aluminum is responsible for a curtailment of their output instead of a boosting of it.

He is Secretary of Interior Chapman.

This newspaper on previous occasions has discussed separately his activities in the oil situation and in the aluminum situation. Because of the great importance of oil and aluminum in the present defense picture, we think the public should be aware that Mr. Chapman had a hand in throttling both of these essential materials.

Thousands of barrels more of oil would be available from known wells in the offshore deposits of the Gulf of Mexico if Mr. Chapman's department would choose to issue, instead of refuse, drilling permits to companies prepared to continue operations that

have been halted by the federally instigated tidelands controversy.

The Interior Department was able to issue a drilling permit to one oil company in the offshore area on the excuse that drilling was necessary to prevent wastage. Why couldn't more permits be issued on the excuse that the defense effort needs oil?

In the aluminum field, five plants fed by cheap hydroelectricity from tax-free, tax-supported Federal plants in the Pacific Northwest have had to cut production drastically because of a power shortage caused by drought. The Interior Department has encouraged the location of those plants in the Northwest. Mr. Chapman even went so far as to stretch the standards by which the availability of power is measured so that the Aluminum Co. of America could be enticed to locate in the Northwest instead of New Orleans.

Until Mr. Chapman changed the standards, the availability of power had been estimated on the basis of worst year of drought in the Northwest region. The change was made to the median year—which had the effect of boosting the estimate of power available. On the basis of the new estimate, there was room for more industry in the Northwest.

But 6 months after Alcoa had been lured to the Northwest, the median year estimate proved unsound. A drought considerably worse than the median cut short the water supply. Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson is talking now about a possible shift of some of the aluminum plants to other areas.

We don't see how our defense effort has a chance to succeed if officials like Mr. Chapman help to shape its course. His department can take credit for putting a dent in the oil and aluminum supply.

Mr. Speaker, now there is the question of aluminum in national defense.

The production of aluminum is tied up with the question of public power. That is where the catch is.

It takes power and plenty of it to produce aluminum. There is plenty power available, especially in Louisiana, for the production of aluminum, but unfortunately, Louisiana offers power from private enterprise and not Government subsidy. Those in power in this administration are dedicated to a vast public-power program to the destruction of private enterprise.

So what happens?

A deliberate shortage of public power is created in order to build up a demand for public power under the guise of national defense.

Some months ago when the Alcoa people were supposed to be looking around in various parts of the country for a site to establish an aluminum plant, the people of Louisiana came forward with a sincere desire for cooperation and made every effort to interest the Alcoa people. At that time I had no reason to challenge the sincerity of Alcoa. I have learned much since.

At that time it was pointed out by me on this floor of the plot of the Department of the Interior to compel the Alcoa Co. to go to the Pacific Northwest through a tender of cheaper power through the devious channels of public power which is the admitted forerunner of socialization of our national industries. I believed then that Alcoa was strong enough to resist such pressure and would not become part of the scheme.

It is a tragedy, and not an exceptional one, that where an economic advantage

is offered private enterprise, private enterprise succumbs to the temptation and turns its back upon the very people who fight the battle of private enterprise.

That is the way it was with Alcoa. They wanted to go to Louisiana as long as the Government did not offer cheaper power at public expense. Alcoa was a strong advocate of private enterprise and the principles of a free economic system as long as Alcoa could not get its own foot in the door of socialized public power, for which the people of this country pay for in the form of taxation. The result was that Alcoa, after making sugary apologies to the people of Louisiana, and meaningless promises to review the Louisiana situation, raced to the Pacific Northwest to grab the Government subsidized power to its own benefit.

It was all for defense.

It was for defense alright, but not for national defense. It was for the defense and protection of those who would march us down the road to socialism and are doing it with the aid of private enterprise itself.

The inevitable happened.

The production of aluminum today is stalemated because of lack of power in the Pacific Northwest.

Today there is no power and there is therefore no aluminum.

I find no solace or consolation in being able to say "I told you so" but I do find a burning desire within me to continue the fight of free enterprise against socialism in government and to continue to bring to your attention such virile editorials as the one to which I now invite your attention from the pages of the New Orleans States:

DROUGHT SHORT CIRCUITS THE BUREAUCRATS

Do you remember how the Federal Government lured a proposed \$45,000,000 aluminum plant from New Orleans to the Pacific Northwest with below-cost electric power as bait?

That was last March. The Aluminum Co. of America was looking at the natural advantages of New Orleans in picking a site for their plant—those same advantages which had just attracted to this area a \$79,000,000 Kaiser Corp. aluminum plant.

Quite probably the Alcoa Co. would have come to this area, just as Kaiser did, except that the Federal Government, through its Department of Interior, went out of its way to provide the Pacific Northwest with an arbitrary advantage that outweighed the natural advantages of New Orleans.

That was electric power from the tax-free federally sponsored Columbia River power system at a rate below that which can be obtained from taxpaying private sources here.

In order to offer this cheap-power bait to Alcoa, Secretary of the Interior Chapman had to strain the hydroelectric facilities that were already serving a large collection of essential industries in the Northwest.

Part of the supply for the Alcoa plant was to be 60,000 kilowatts of interruptible power—that power which could be cut off in time of drought—from the Bonneville Dam.

At the time that the tug of war for the Alcoa plant was going on between the Northwest area and the New Orleans area, reporter James Free, of the New Orleans States' Washington bureau wrote:

"Until recently, the Interior Department—figuring potential Bonneville power on the basis of worst year in the past—had stated that no additional power was available there for defense projects.

"Chapman, noting that there have been 20 normal or median years out of the past 26 years at Bonneville, changed the standard of availability from a base of the worst year to the median year.

"And, on this new basis, Chapman found that the interruptible power could be made available for defense plants."

In other words, Mr. Chapman changed the rules so as to favor the Pacific Northwest. This newspaper was critical of his tactics, of the unfairness of the Federal Government being in business in competition with private enterprise, and of the arbitrary discrimination against the natural advantages of New Orleans.

Now it develops that we and the defense-minded people of this Nation could be critical on another serious score. Mr. Chapman's stretching of the availability standards—changing the base from "worst" year to "median" year has already proven to be unsound as well as unfair. The drought of the past few months has drastically reduced water in the streams on which the hydroelectric plants are located. No water means no electricity.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that a 245,000-kilowatt cut-back was ordered by the Bonneville Power Administration. That constituted its entire interruptible load. Affected by that cut-off are three aluminum companies—including Alcoa—whose five plants produce about 50 percent of the Nation's light metal.

Ironically, the Bonneville Administrator was reported in the Wall Street Journal to be considering buying steam power to substitute for the hydroelectric shortage. In that area, industrial users of Government power pay 2 mills per kilowatt. Steam-made power will cost from 8 to 10 mills, even up to 15 mills per kilowatt.

The steam-generated power that was offered by private enterprise in the New Orleans area would have cost Alcoa 3 or 4 mills per kilowatt, thanks to the abundance of natural gas in these parts to make steam.

The bureaucrats who have been concentrating aluminum and other essential defense plants in the Northwest without proper regard to the limitations of the hydroelectric power supply are responsible for a set-back in defense production at a time when it is vitally needed.

A Bold Policy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Dewey Anderson, executive director, Public Affairs Institute:

A BOLD POLICY FOR PEACE

(By Dewey Anderson, executive director, Public Affairs Institute)

In doing the twofold job of preparing adequate defense and negotiating for peaceful solutions of world problems, America needs the guidance of a great declaration of purpose. It must state our aims clearly and challengingly enough to appeal to all people everywhere.

Fundamentally, our purpose should be that of bringing about a necessary and peaceful change in the conditions and hopes of men throughout the world. This is in

the great liberating tradition of our country. The peaceful revolution in the American process of liberation is too little known or felt in the world today. It should be given a chance to reshape the character of men and events everywhere as it is doing at home. It is more needed today than ever before.

In order that the constructive and dynamic forces of our American achievement may become effective in the affairs of nations, we call for a new American policy in the world today. We call for a truer and more adequate expression of our deep longing for peace and our belief in freedom and human dignity. We must make it clear that our necessarily great rearmament does not blind us to the need for economic and political aid to others.

Specifically, such a new United States policy should make several things clear to the people of the world, and thereby bolster their faith in our sincerity and strengthen their will for cooperation and the peaceful adjustment of differences. These things are:

1. That the American people realize that peace and freedom cannot forever survive want and hunger. We know that men must eat before they can even dream of freedom, and that without food and freedom there can be no good hope for peace among men. We therefore accept the obligation of devoting a considerable part of our daily earnings to help other people start on their march toward freedom from want. We ask only that this contribution be used effectively for those who need it most.

2. That the American people seek no control of other governments or destinies. We repudiate any efforts to use the contribution of the American people for such purposes. In evidence of our good faith we offer all this portion of our daily bread, in whatever form it is given, for distribution through the United Nations, and not through agencies of our own Government. In further evidence we offer to share this contribution with people whose governments are antagonistic to our own Government.

3. That the American people can always be counted on to help our fellow men achieve political independence. This tradition is evident in our recent efforts on behalf of the people of India, the Philippines, and Indonesia. We are aware, too, that independence is not enough; we are interested in helping other people obtain, in addition to political independence, those conditions of security and economic improvement upon which both their national independence and their individual freedom must rest.

4. That the American people believe in the United Nations and want it to be strengthened. We believe the U. N. holds the world's best hope for resisting aggression, obtaining peace, and bringing economic strength and progress to all. So that this world organization may truly represent all the people of the world we ask for a return to the Jeffersonian principle of recognition by the United States of all Governments in actual power. We find that the new American doctrine of non-recognition has unnecessarily increased world tension, has aroused improper expectations that American recognition automatically brings financial aid, and has created an incorrect and unfortunate impression that our aim is world control. We believe that all governments which pledge themselves to the U. N. Charter should be admitted to membership in that organization.

5. That our fellow men are dealing at all times with an American people and an American Government dedicated to peace. We want them to know this particularly in these times, when great military burdens are being laid upon them and upon us, and when irresponsible individuals in and out of our Government are discussing preventive war.

We want them to know that the American people are in control of their own Govern-

ment. That they desire to be friends with all people, including those in Russia and China. That they do not want another world war. That present military preparations were called forth only by the Communist aggression in Korea. That those preparations are, and always will be, solely for resistance to aggression. That the moment our fears of further aggression are ended, if they can ever be, the American people will insist on world disarmament in all types of weapons.

We call for the revision in present policy which will accomplish these five objectives. We deeply believe that there can be unity among the peoples of the world, especially if America is allowed to contribute the human values and dynamic forces it has developed.

Michael Straus and Company Plot To Destroy Reclamation Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Central Valley celebration in California, it became apparent that the Bureau of Reclamation has marked for destruction two leading western reclamation organizations.

These are the National Reclamation Association and the Irrigation Districts Association of California, two reputable groups comprised largely of distinguished reclamationists, engineers, attorneys, and farmers who believe that enterprise is a means of protecting and developing western economy, and not a tool for creating a socialistic state.

Even before Reclamation Commissioner Straus and Interior Secretary Chapman traipsed out to California last August to spout their own greatness, and to discredit westerners who were honestly deserving of public approbation, they had planned to sabotage the NRA and the IDA.

Their forthcoming assault will be directed especially at certain officials of these associations who have dared to suggest that Mike Straus is not the greatest living American capable of tying his own shoes. Nobody dares to defy or criticize Mike Straus, not even his boss, Oscar Chapman, and for their heresy these reclamation association officials will be the subject of concentrated smears spewed out by the Bureau's infamous propaganda machine.

A clear indication of the approaching Bureau purge was witnessed at the Straus (Michael) festival in the Central Valley. In commemorating the opening of this great development, it would have been merely ordinary politeness to invite the founders and original planners of the project. But this did not happen.

Mike Straus handled the invitations, and he omitted the westerners who began the Central Valley project before he was born. If any of these pioneers attended at all, they stood in the crowd, ignored by the bright Interior Depart-

ment boys basking in the spotlight on the speaker's platform.

Hearing Mike Straus and company there, one would have thought they not only discovered irrigation, but personally produced the water.

In addition to keeping out the engineers and State and National officials who conceived the Central Valley project, Mike Straus saw to it that his critics in the NRA and IDA were not permitted to participate in the festivities through the medium of official invitations.

Uninvited to the main ceremony, held at Tracy, were:

Charles L. Kaupke, California director of NRA and an officer of IDA.

Philip A. Gordon, president of IDA.

Abner M. Crowell, vice president of IDA.

Judge J. E. Sturrock, a vice president of NRA.

Other officials of both organizations were similarly ostracized, but Mike Straus had his sights trained particularly on the four mentioned.

Art Cramer was the general manager of the Tracy celebration, and he submitted the names of Kaupke, Gordon, and Crowell to the Bureau as being among the important guests to be invited. Mike Straus eliminated their names.

The case of Judge Sturrock, who is from Texas, is a special one. The judge, who has fought for honesty in reclamation, has for some time been marked for slaughter by the Bureau. Mike Straus issued the condemnation order. As he now operates, Straus cannot afford to have his hand exposed by reclamationists who believe that projects should be somewhat feasible, both as to engineering and cost.

The NRA will hold its annual convention in Amarillo, Tex., October 17, and some time ago a committee appeared at Mike Straus' Washington office to extend to him a courteous invitation to the convention. Perhaps it was the word "Texas" which made Mike Straus see red, for Texas is where Judge Sturrock lives. At any rate, Straus' own courtesy, if any, left him, and he took the occasion to shout out a personal diatribe on Judge Sturrock. The NRA committee left in disgust.

The NRA members come from 17 Western States, and it so happens that these are the same 17 States in which Mike Straus wants to be supreme dictator. If he and his Bureau can gain control of the water and power in these States, their is no doubt he will be their Stalin. Irrigation water and hydroelectric power are the life-blood in about 90 percent of this vast area.

The absurdity of Straus' snub to Kaupke, Gordon, and Crowell becomes more obvious when you consider that the IDA itself covers more than 4,500,000 acres in California alone, while in all the 17 reclamation States the Bureau projects cover only about 5,000,000 acres. In addition to absurdity, the ostracism of these three men, and other officials of both associations, reveals Mike Straus' true motive, which is the destruction of them and their organizations.

Straus could not very well eliminate Harry E. Polk, president of the NRA,

from the California shindig. He would have done it, no doubt, had not his own advisers reminded him that he had not yet quite achieved the position of supreme dictator.

But Straus has plans for Polk, too. The essence of them is to relegate Polk to oblivion. For several years Polk has stood with NRA members who had the conscience and the courage to criticize the malpractices and confiscatory tactics of the Bureau. Straus made a strenuous effort to oust Polk from the presidency last year, and he will stage a repeat performance in Amarillo.

The man Straus wants as president of NRA is Clifford H. Stone, an erstwhile justice of the peace and pseudo-reclamationist, from Colorado. Stone is completely a vassal of Straus, and barks happily at sight of him. If Stone should become president of NRA, Straus would have virtual control of it.

Polk, Sturrock, Kaupke, and other leaders of NRA are fully aware of Straus' scheme, and they are not going to be bludgeoned into submission. That would be tantamount to selling out their own people, their associations, and their States to a group of rogues who are bent on destroying all free enterprise in the West.

Straus and his socialistic conspirators are pursuing a course of divide and conquer to accomplish one of two objectives: First, bring about a drastic change in the administration of NRA which will assure its complete subservience to the Bureau of Reclamation; or, second, wreck the NRA completely. Needless to say, Straus prefers the latter.

The showdown will come in Amarillo, for Straus accepted the NRA invitation and will be on hand with a score of his stooges, all traveling at taxpayers' expense. The Bureau propaganda which will flood Amarillo will all be aimed at wrecking NRA and making Straus the king of western economy.

But Polk, Kaupke, and Sturrock will be there, too. They do not need an invitation from Straus to attend.

Common Sense, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Father James Gillis, entitled "A Little Common Sense, Please." It is an article which should be read by all Members of the House.

A LITTLE COMMON SENSE, PLEASE
(By Father James Gillis, C. S. P.)

The American citizen has a right to expect of his Government a certain degree of wisdom and enlightened self-interest in its dealings with the rest of the world. That expectation has in recent years been again and again disappointed. So perhaps we shall have to lessen our demands and ask merely for a little common sense.

Of high statesmanship we have none. In the game of diplomacy we are outclassed. But the very least we can ask is that in our dealings with other nations we shall not act like simpletons. We—that is to say those who acted for us—blundered at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. They seem not to have known the rudiments of horse trading, not to say of the delicate and difficult science and art of diplomatic negotiation. As one acute observer said at Yalta, "We had all the cards in our hands but we threw them away." Why? Is there some cryptic merit in being asinine?

We seem to come out second best or even last in every contest with the diplomats and propagandists not only of our enemies but of our allies. England, for example, is financially broke and politically a has-been; but she still tells us what to do and in almost every case we do it. We have neither the nerve nor the sense to tell her to stop trading with Soviet China while we are fighting Soviet China.

We seem to be playing a diplomatic comedy—or even a farce—and everyone at or near the top of the Government seems anxious to get into the act. For example, when the San Francisco conference was about to meet, Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court came up with the suggestion that the United States should recognize Red China. Everybody knew that Gromyko was coming with orders from the Kremlin to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery of the conference.

So a Justice of the Supreme Court of the land hands him the implement. The reason alleged by Mr. Justice Douglas was that to recognize Red China would be to produce a rift between Red China and Red Russia. But on the very day that curious piece of strategy was proposed, a message from Mao to Stalin was published in which the Chinese dictator tumbled all over himself in adulation of the demigod in Moscow.

At any rate, why should so exalted a personage as a Supreme Court Justice, presumably aloof from politics and diplomacy, intrude in the business of the Department of State? Has the constitutional and traditional repugnance of the judiciary from the executive been relegated to innocuous desuetude?

On the very day of the opening of the conference, Senator CAIN, of Washington, threatened to introduce a resolution to the effect that the treaty of peace with Japan (6 years late, by the way) would not be ratified by the Senate if it provided for the cession of any territory to a nation that refuses to sign the treaty. That nation, of course, is Russia. The treaty read that Japan "renounces all right, title, and claim" to the Kurile Islands and the southern half of Sakhalin. But the joke—Russian joke—is that since the end of the war Russia has been occupying these two strategic points (described by the Senator as "daggers pointed at our defense of the Pacific"). Possession is nine points in the law. Would the Senator suggest that we go into the Kuriles and Sakhalin and push Russia out? It was with our consent and connivance that she moved in. Shall we tell her that what we did 6 years ago is now to be undone?

To continue with the news of the day of the opening of the peace treaty conference. There was an item in the papers informing us that while the other conference—the cease-fire conference in Korea then in its eighth week—was still dragging along without success and apparently without hope, the Reds had gathered 5,000 planes in Manchuria. General Ridgway himself set the figure at 1,000. One thousand or 500, was that what the Korean and Chinese Reds had in mind when they concocted the notion of a cease-fire conference?

What has got into us? Are we deliberately playing the part of imbeciles? Who is direct-

ing these crazy maneuvers that make us the laughing stock of the world? Again I ask, if we cannot get high statesmanship, is it too much to hope for just a teeny-weeny bit of common sense?

Let us have one more sample of our blundering. During the congressional investigation of the recall of General MacArthur, Senator BRACES produced a document dated April 21, 1945, a report of a group of specialists in the War Department under Colonel Michela. It contains 12 conclusions and a recommendation. Among the 12 conclusions were these:

"The United States should make no political or economic concession to Soviet Russia."

"The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic War would destroy America's position in Asia."

"It should be reiterated that the United States Army is by no means united in believing it wise to encourage the Soviet Union into the Asiatic war."

If those warnings had been heeded we should not be in our present predicament. The military men were wiser than the statesmen. But why were the statesmen so stupid as not to see what everyone else, soldiers, civilians, professionals, and amateurs knew perfectly well? Has some order gone out from somewhere that our foreign policy must be in all cases contrary to common sense? What is at the bottom of all this? Can it be that there are traitors in our midst?

Freedom Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a sermon which was awarded first place in the 1951 spiritual mobilization sermon contest. It was preached by Rev. Kenneth W. Sollitt, minister of the First Baptist Church in Mendota, Ill., on July 1, 1951:

FREEDOM UNDER GOD—WE CAN GO ON MAKING A GOD OF GOVERNMENT, OR WE CAN RETURN AGAIN TO THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD

In 1776 John Adams wrote the following letter to his wife:

"The 2d day of July 1776, will be the most memorable epoch in the history of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, bells, bonfires and illuminations, from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore. * * * I am well aware of the toll and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is more than worth all the means; and that posterity will triumph in this day's transaction."

John Adams' words were prophetic. Patriotism has triumphed in this day's transaction. The anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence for 175 years has been to loyal Americans the great anniversary festival. It is still being commemorated as the day of deliverance.

PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT THE LAND

The Declaration of Independence was preceded on June 7 by a resolution presented

to Congress by Richard Henry Lee, of the Virginia delegation. It read:

"Be it resolved, That these United Colonies are, and of a right ought to be, free and independent States. That they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown; that all political connection between them and Great Britain is, and ought to be totally absolved."

The resolution was debated. A committee of which Thomas Jefferson was the guiding spirit drew up the Declaration of Independence. It was signed by delegates from all the colonies except one on July 2, the date to which Adams referred in his letter, and finally acted upon on July 4. Up in the steeple of the statehouse the old bell ringer had waited all morning to ring the Liberty Bell if Congress should adopt the Declaration. Finally the news reached his ears and he rang the bell on which more than 20 years before had been engraved the words from Leviticus 25: 10 "Proclaim liberty throughout the land and to the inhabitants thereof."

A LOW ESS OF FREEDOM

On this one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary the faint echoes of that bell awaken in the hearts of every loyal American responsive chords. We are a freedom-loving people. At least we think we are. We are sure not to want to do anything we are told to do and to want to do everything we are told not to do. We simply do not want to be told because we love our liberty. We spend more than any nation in the world to pass laws, more than any nation in the world to enforce laws, and more than any nation in the world to break the laws we have paid to have passed and enforced, because somehow we like to think of those laws as having been made for the other fellow.

But freedom loving as we think we are, 175 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence we have less freedom than we have ever had in our history. Why? What is happening to the descendants of Hancock, Adams, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry? Can it be that the illusion that we could restrict the freedom of others and at the same time increase our own was the beginning of the end of freedom for America?

Our forefathers believed and acted upon the belief that, as Samuel Webster put it in 1776: "The true design of civil government is to protect men in the enjoyment of liberty." For 175 years we have focused our attention so much on "the enjoyment of our liberty" that we have been perfectly willing to pass all kinds of legislation limiting the other fellow's liberty for our benefit. The old melting pot that was America has become a pressure cooker. "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" has become Government of the people by pressure groups for the benefit of minorities. "Give me liberty or give me death" has been shortened to just plain "Give me." We have not seen that Government cannot give us what it does not first take from us, that a Government strong enough to give us everything we want is a Government strong enough to take from us everything we have, and that in the process of taking away and giving back we have built up a vast expensive bureaucracy which threatens to wreck our national economy. During March and April of this year 53,500 civilians were added to the Federal payroll. That is more than 1,000 persons per day for each business day of the 2 months. In 1950 the national debt reached \$1,865 per man, woman, and child in our country, or a total approaching the assessed valuation of all of our property.

FAMILIAR FLOWERS

I was in a small hotel in Vermont one day when one of the guests, a foreigner unfamiliar with our American ways, brought the proprietress of the inn a beautiful bouquet

of flowers. The proprietress of the inn was delighted beyond words—until she discovered that her gallant and thoughtful guest had picked the flowers out of the garden in back of the inn. Whenever the Government hands you a bouquet you can be perfectly sure that it was picked out of your own garden. But we go right on accepting the bouquets in the vain hope that some day we will gather flowers that somebody else planted and brought to bloom. Why have we lost our cherished freedom? Because we have sought freedom man's way instead of God's. We have forgotten that "Our fathers' God" is the "author of liberty." Jefferson just made out the order for it.

"ME-FIRST-ITIS"

America has a bad case of "me-first-itis." We have wanted freedom, as we have wanted everything else, for ourselves as individuals instead of for all Americans. We have wanted freedom, but not freedom under God. Yet freedom under God is the only real freedom there is.

There is a difference between freedom as conceived by the person who wants something for himself or his immediate friends at the expense of others, and freedom under God as conceived by the founders of this Nation.

In 1876 when throughout the Nation America celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, an Episcopal clergyman, the Reverend Daniel C. Roberts, of Brandon, Vt., wrote a prayer hymn which was sung for the first time on the Brandon, Vt., village green. That hymn took account of the fact that God cannot be left out of our thinking with regard to our liberties, or there will be no liberty for any of us. We are free men and women only as we seek our freedom according to the laws which He has laid down for His children to follow. This is what we mean by freedom under God being the only real freedom. It is a fact which we have tended to forget in recent years. But when we try to nullify God's laws, either as individuals or as a nation, we break, not the laws, but ourselves. Realizing this, we ought to begin the road back to freedom by praying with the author of this hymn:

"God of our fathers, whose almighty hand
Leads forth in beauty all the starry band
Of shining worlds, in splendor through the
skies,

Our grateful songs before Thy throne arise.

Thy love divine hath led us in the past;
In this free land by Thee our lot is cast;
Be Thou our Ruler, Guardian, Guide, and
Stay,

Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen
way."

Then, if God's word is to be our law and His paths our chosen way to freedom, there are four principles of freedom inherent in the universe as God has created it which we need to know and understand:

First, let us understand that freedom is never liberty to do as we please; it is only the right to do as we ought.

We are all familiar with the story of the Good Samaritan. One of the characters in that story interpreted freedom thus: He looked upon a man who had something he wanted and said, "What he has is mine and I am free to take it." This is the philosophy of thieves, lobbyists, seekers after special privilege, and all who think that the world owes them a living. The priest and the Levite passed by and interpreted freedom in these terms: "What I have is mine and I am free to keep it." This is the philosophy of all selfish souls. But the Samaritan came by saying in his heart, "What I have is God's and I am free to share it." Each man inter-

preted freedom differently but only he who did what he knew he ought was really free.

We are not told the ultimate end of these different characters. Doubtless the thief was apprehended and his freedom taken from him. The priest and the Levite became the slaves of their own selfishness. They probably died of stomach ulcers and likely few people attended their respective funerals. The Samaritan only was a freeman.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN IS OBSOLETE

Of course the Samaritan was old fashioned. By today's standards he should have let the man die by the side of the road while he telegraphed to Washington for Federal aid. He should have written to his congressman in Jerusalem saying, "Our district is badly in need of a new 'Good Samaritan Hospital' to be built along the road between Jerusalem and Jericho. I suggest that it be financed by a special tax on thieves, priests, and Levites. On second thought, you better exempt the priests for obvious political reasons." And it might be that in the course of time his congressman would get him the hospital—plus an expensive BHBE (that is Government shorthand for Bureau of Hospital Building and Equipment)—plus socialized medicine—plus new and bigger tax bills each year, taxes which the thief would not pay, from which the priest would be exempt, out of which the Levite would crawl through some legal loophole, leaving the full burden on the shoulders of the Samaritan and the stockholders of the Good Samaritan Oil Co. of Jericho. Then nobody would be free, even to do what he ought, for the only person disposed to do what he ought would be impoverished by excessive taxation. Only the congressman would benefit. He would be re-elected by a grateful constituency for giving them a "free" hospital.

FREEDOM IS COMMINGLED WITH RESPONSIBILITY

That is our situation today. We have passed laws and set up bureaus until we are no longer free even to do what we ought. For example, we ought to make money in our businesses. As one of our labor leaders once said, "The one unpardonable sin of management is not to make money." for labor can make money only when management does. But for a business to make money today amid all the tinkering with our economic system that is going on is not easy. We ought to provide for our old age so we will not need to be a burden to society. But who can save these days? And even those who are able to buy bonds and pay insurance premiums or have pensions find that their money, when they get it, is worth less than half what it was when they put it away. In fact, if we want to be free men and women, we ought to control our financial destiny instead of placing it in the hands of politicians who became politicians after becoming business failures.

Secondly, we need to understand that all rights imply corresponding responsibilities. The right of a city to have a pure water supply implies the responsibility on the part of the citizens of that city not to drown cats in the reservoir. The right of police protection is dependent upon keeping the police incorruptible. If you can bribe them, so can those who would do you harm. The right of good government is dependent upon the responsibility of good citizens at the polls, for bad officials are always elected by good voters who do not vote. The right to be a free people depends on the willingness of the people to assume the responsibilities of freedom. There is no such thing as pure freedom. Freedom is always commingled with responsibility.

This brings us to the third thing which we must understand about freedom as God has ordained it: If we will not assume the responsibilities of freedom, we shall be de-

prived of the privileges of freedom. There must be control in any society. Those who will not control themselves must be controlled by others. If we will not assume the responsibilities of self-government, there are always those who will govern us for their own ends.

Finally, our only real freedom then lies in our ability to choose our own masters. If we say we will have no master, someone must inevitably master us. That is the lot of thieves and anarchists. If we say we will have no master but our own selfish interests, we become the slaves of our own selfishness, like the priest and the Levite. If in our selfishness we go so far as to demand of the state that it solve all of our problems, make all our decisions, provide us cradle-to-the-grave security, and be a god to us, then we have chosen for ourselves complete and abject slavery. We have no freedom under God.

It all adds up to what Paul said in his second letter to the church at Corinth (II Corinthians III: 17): "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Liberty is where the spirit of the Lord is and nowhere else. There are not two ways to freedom, only one, and that is God's way.

Paul is here contrasting the multiplicity of rules and regulations which had become the shackles of Judaism, with the joyous spirit of free people who had but one master, the spirit of the living God. Freely they had chosen the Lord. Joyously they followed him, not because they had to, but because they wanted to. And always He led them in the free air to green pastures and in the paths of peace beside still waters. The multiplicity of laws was forgotten and a few principles of abundant living like the Beatitudes and the Golden Rule were adopted in their stead. They walked in the spirit of the Lord and where the spirit of the Lord was they found liberty.

A GOD OF GOVERNMENT OR A GOVERNMENT OF GOD

Today America stands at the crossroads. There are but two ways for us to go. We can go on making a god of government, or we can return again to the government of God. The one road leads to the slavery which has always been the lot of those who have chosen collectivism in any of its forms, communism, socialism, the welfare state—they are all cut after the same pattern. The other road leads to the only freedom that there is.

"Blest is the nation whose God is the Lord," for "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." But "choose ye this day whom ye will serve, * * * As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

"O Lord, our God, Thy mighty hand
Hath made our country free;
From all her broad and happy land
May worship rise to Thee.
Fulfill the promise of her youth,
Her liberty defend,
By law and order, love and truth,
America, befriend!"

"O suffer not her feet to stray;
But guide her untaught might,
That she may walk in peaceful day,
And lead the world in light.
Bring down the proud, lift up the poor,
Unequal ways amend,
By justice Nation-wide and sure
America, befriend!"

"Through all the waiting world proclaim
Her gospel of good-will,
And may the joy of Jesus' name
In every bosom thrill.
O'er hill and vale, from sea to sea,
Thy holy reign extend;
By faith, and hope, and charity,
America, befriend!"

Workers Have Most to Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Workers Have Most To Lose," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORKERS HAVE MOST TO LOSE—LEFT WING HAS FOLLOWED CONSISTENT PATTERN OVER THE YEARS DESIGNED TO HELP MONOPOLIES AND LARGER BUSINESSES

(By David Lawrence)

It's a curious commentary on the handling of tax legislation that, whenever a revenue bill is under consideration, the left wing is found striving for higher and higher excess-profits-tax rates.

The assumption is that this is a means of soaking big business, and presumably the left wing is the friend of little business.

Actually it works out just the other way. Nearly every excess-profits-tax law enacted under the various Democratic administrations has been of major assistance to the well-entrenched companies and has dealt a severe blow to the smaller competitors.

If the system of free enterprise in America means the removal of unfair competition, then the left wing has followed a consistent pattern over the years designed to help the monopolies and the larger businesses. These big institutions usually have a better base period for computing excess profits than the smaller ones. Also they have large reserves. When the smaller companies are able to make a little money during prosperous periods, the Government takes most of it away from them. As a consequence, when the prosperity ends and deflation begins, these smaller companies usually have not accumulated sufficient reserves to meet the change in economic conditions.

During the last war, Congress definitely took care of postwar deflation. Provisions were inserted in the law allowing refunds to companies that might suffer severe losses in postwar years. No such provisions permitting refunds are in the new law. In the present period of tension there is no postwar period in sight. Hence, in case of a sudden deflation, the companies that started up in the last few years and have begun to obtain a fairly substantial part of the total volume of business done in a particular industry will find themselves in financial difficulties. Extensive unemployment may result from their failures and in many cases they will be swallowed up in forced mergers with large companies.

To maintain highlevel employment it will be necessary to look ahead to the period of deflation that may come in 1953 when the present armament program tapers off. It will be much more expensive then to finance, by means of grants and loans, new work projects of the WPA variety than to protect new businesses now.

This is the time to be thinking of what happens when the present period of tension undergoes a change, as might occur if there is an overthrow of a government in any of the satellite countries and it begins to be apparent that Soviet imperialism is weakening.

It is one of the unexplained factors of present-day legislation that labor-union leaders whose workers have the most to lose from unemployment are the very ones who are pressing Congress to raise the excess-profits rates virtually to the point of confiscation.

The rates in the proposed law about to be enacted are higher than anything encountered in either World War I or World War II. Not only have the regular corporation tax rates been raised to a point far beyond any other rate of its kind heretofore, but the excess-profits rate combined with the regular corporate rates will exceed in severity the rates in effect from 1941 to 1945.

Labor-union leaders may have the idea that, if the rates are high enough employers will diminish their resistance to wage increases and fringe benefits. This may be true of the so-called monopolies, but it is not true of the marginal competitors which are trying during the present boom to get a foothold in their respective industries.

There is, of course, back of this pressure for high rates an effort to squeeze every dollar possible in the mistaken belief that this will avoid for Congress the necessity next year of taxing the lower incomes. But even if 100 percent of the income of individuals earning more than \$10,000 a year were confiscated in taxes, the Federal Government would still be operating at a huge deficit. Taxes are rapidly approaching the saturation point.

What the new tax rates may do to incentive is something to which little thought is usually given by the "left wingers," some of whose ideas of a "planned economy" include Government ownership, nationalization, and forms of state socialism if the economic situation should become chaotic. The responsibility of the "left wingers," however, for bringing on such a period of chaos in a democracy is not always clear when the catastrophe has happened. Hence what is taking place in the Senate these days in connection with the pressure for higher and higher excess-profit taxes is more significant, ideologically speaking, than appears to meet the eye.

Tribute to Emil Rieve by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding a gathering of 1,500 rank and file leaders of New England locals of the Textile Workers Union of America, to do honor to their president, Emil Rieve.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

On September 29, 1951, about 1,500 people, rank and file leaders of the New England locals of the Textile Workers Union of America, are gathering together in Boston to do honor to their president, Emil Rieve.

I want to use this occasion as a springboard for saying some things about Emil Rieve at a time when the idea of democracy is being challenged with guns and words.

Rieve and democracy have a good deal in common. I know of no union leader—in fact, it would be hard for me to think of a man in public life generally—who has made a greater contribution to the strengthening of our democratic way of life than has Emil Rieve.

As the leader of a large international union, Emil Rieve knows better than most what it takes for unionism to survive and even to grow, in an industry like the textile industry. It has been hard, tough going, and I know from our subcommittee's investigations in the southern textile industry that the union still has a long way to go before the benefits of unionism can be brought to the textile workers of that region.

Under Rieve's leadership, however, the workers in a large segment of the industry know the meaning of democracy from the daily facts of life. They are participating with their employers in arriving at the decisions that affect their conditions of work and their pay and their dignity as human beings.

The scope of Rieve's leadership, however, has gone beyond the very important task of wages, hours, and working conditions. Rieve has been one of the founding fathers of the CIO and has been a pillar of strength in the successful ouster of Communist influence in the CIO.

As vice president of the CIO, he has been chairman of its economic policy committee which has had much to do with formulating CIO's position on the problems affecting our domestic economy.

In World War II, Emil Rieve was a member of the War Labor Board, and in the present defense mobilization period, is a member of the Wage Stabilization Board.

He has represented the CIO on many important international assignments. He is on the executive board of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the world organization of democratic unions.

In every way then, we have in Rieve an outstanding citizen of the labor movement, of the United States, and of the world. It is good that the occasion of this testimonial dinner provides his admirers, among whom I include myself, with the opportunity of honoring his great qualities.

The Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, one of the great stories yet to be adequately told is the magnificent contribution being made to the economy of this country by physically handicapped persons. Many of these are doing jobs that seem almost impossible for them to do with their disabilities.

Recently there was a very interesting story in the Birmingham News telling of the accomplishments of two blind veterans; also a story in Modern Industry entitled "The Handicapped." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record these two articles, together with a news item regarding the proclamation of Governor Persons, of Alabama, designating October 7-13 as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week in Alabama.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Birmingham News]

TWO BLIND ALABAMA VETERANS WIN NATIONAL LEGION HONORS

Two Alabama World War II veterans, one in Birmingham and the other in Gadsden, have won out over what many think are insurmountable handicaps.

The victories in Europe and in Japan had a hollow sound to them, for they still had battles ahead in which no kind of victory appeared in sight. Their battles were with themselves. And they have proved they are "Masters of their fate and captains of their souls."

The Birmingham man is Charles A. (Charlie) Boswell, of 111 Hermosa Drive. Blinded by German shellfire, his story since has been one victory after another. His success has been told in many publications and thousands have seen him speak.

Becoming interested in sports in high school and the University of Alabama, where he was a noted football player, he has retained that interest. Blindness did not stop him.

He started golf after the war and has won one international and five national tournaments. In 1949 the National Disabled Veterans Association named him Hero of the Year.

Boswell's letter tells how his blindness ended hopes for a professional baseball career and left him without means to provide for his wife, small daughter and the baby they were expecting.

He studied Braille, took up golf, found a job selling sporting goods for a local department store, worked his way up to manager of the department. He writes:

"After 7 years of blindness, I feel my rehabilitation is complete. Neither my wife nor I have let my blindness keep us from living a normal life. . . . I have found blindness is not a handicap, it's just an inconvenience."

The Gadsden man is Lewis Moore, of 107 Hillside Circle. A survivor of the Bataan Death March, he lost his sight from a nutritional disease suffered in a Japanese prison camp.

Selfless, he gives credit to the Veterans' Administration and his wife, also a disabled veteran, whom he met in the service. But those who know him realize without his own will to succeed he could not have established a general insurance agency which nets him \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year.

Despite the fact his vision has steadily weakened, he has conducted his insurance business and taken an active part in social and veterans' organizations.

These two handicapped veterans, Boswell and Moore, have won \$1,000 each and a fully paid trip to the national convention of the American Legion at Miami, October 15-18.

They are two of the winners out of 586 entries in Operations Come-back, a contest of letters for handicapped veterans. They are two of four in the Nation who won the top awards for letters written telling how they have overcome their handicaps.

The contest was conducted by the American Legion and the winners announced from Legion headquarters in Washington Saturday. An anonymous donor in New York City provided the money for the contest and awards.

Other two first-place winners are Thomas C. Hasbrook, also a blinded veteran, of Indianapolis, Ind., and Douglas B. Davenport, a paralyzed veteran, of New Lisbon, Wis.

There were 16 other winners in this Nation-wide contest, 4 receiving \$400 each, 4 \$200 each, 4 \$100 each, and 4 \$50 each.

Charles J. Delong, of 126 Brantwood Drive, Montgomery, is one of the \$50-award winners.

The contest closed September 1. Each letter produced a sermon of personal suffering, morale building, and fortitude. There were double and triple amputees, paraplegia, polio, tuberculosis, and the entire gamut of other ills that befall mankind.

The four first-place winners will be presented their checks at the Miami convention. The others will be mailed to the winning contestants.

Final judges for the contest, which opened in June, were Dr. Ross T. McIntyre, a former President's physician; Dr. Verne K. Harvey, medical director of the United States Civil Service Commission, Perry Faulkner, Chief of Veterans Employment Service, Department of Labor; and T. O. Kraabel, Legion rehabilitation director, all of Washington; and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, William Randolph Heart, and Dr. Edward Sheckman, all of New York City.

Handicaps were not limited to war injuries. Mr. Hasbrook, a first-place winner, suffered his handicap when a land mine exploded while in training at Camp Lejeune.

Among the winners was a former Wave, who suffered multiple sclerosis and made a comeback. She is Mrs. Ellen Hagen Ahearn, who is now working in the Crime Prevention Bureau in Chicago, Ill.

All judges agreed judging the letters was the toughest assignment they had ever encountered.

Eventually the letters will be produced in booklet form and distributed to other handicapped persons in hospitals.

[From Modern Industry of September 15, 1951]

THE HANDICAPPED—JUDGED BY WHAT THEY CAN DO, NOT WHAT THEY CAN'T, THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED ARE A MAJOR RESERVE OF SKILLED MANPOWER

Physically handicapped workers are one of the four reserves on which industry must depend for more manpower as the effect of billions for defense begins to make itself felt strongly by the end of this year.

A sense of community responsibility, patriotic desire to give work to men injured in World War II, and plain humanity have moved many companies to investigate, and then hire the physically handicapped.

Humanitarianism has seldom paid off so well. Employers have found out over and over again that handicapped workers tend to be tops in productivity, diligence, and attitude. Hundreds of them agree with the slogan, "It pays to hire the handicapped."

By the end of 1952, when the Government estimates that industrial production will be up 20 percent over what it was at the end of 1950—100 percent of that period's civilian production and 20 percent added war production—sheer need for workers will compel many more managements to change their attitudes about hiring the handicapped.

THE FOUR-LAYER POOL

Growth in size of the Armed Forces will almost equal the number of young workers to be added in the next 15 months by the influx from schools and colleges. The rest of the needed workers must come from other sources—women (mainly wives with children, for whom special facilities must be provided), older people now in retirement, minority groups usually the last hired and first laid off—and from among the physically handicapped not now used at all, or used at less than their full skills and abilities.

Training to upgrade workers will help supply the skills that first come into short supply and, in tight labor markets, always remain the hardest to find. But training programs are slow in getting under way in most industries in the current defense effort. Government funds are not available for training to the extent that they were in

World War II, and the manner of letting defense contracts this time makes it harder for employers to absorb training costs.

This reason alone may make many companies turn to the handicapped more quickly, because, for many of the handicapped, free training is already on tap—all they need is jobs.

This point will be stressed in the annual National Employ the Handicapped Week, October 7-13. It's a campaign established by Congress 6 years ago and backed up with a comprehensive year-round program of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security of the Labor Department.

Experience of companies that have hired the handicapped should encourage managements that have never given thought to the problem or have shied away from it because they feared they would need to change jobs or make allowances for handicapped workers.

The fact is that comparatively few adjustments—of tools, jobs, workplaces—are necessary. In most companies, there are so many jobs that can be done without change by people with various handicaps, that the only task is fitting the person to the task.

The United States Employment Service and its affiliated State employment services use methods of fitting people to jobs—selective placement—to perform its work in this area. And big companies that hire the physically handicapped on an equal basis with the unhandicapped find it no problem because they, too, have highly developed selective placement programs.

USUAL PROCEDURES FOR RIGHT PLACEMENT

Western Electric Co., for example, hires many handicapped workers in its Hawthorne Works in Chicago, yet insists it has no special hire-the-handicapped program. Its normal procedures carefully measure every job and every applicant—physically, emotionally, for skill, experience, education, and the like—then fit worker to job. No change is needed in such a procedure to fit a physically handicapped worker to an appropriate job. Physical requirements of any job are one of the measurements of that job, one of the elements in the job description, against which the description of the worker is matched.

It is only the rare company that need go out of its way to change jobs to fit the handicapped. G. Barr & Co., of Chicago, whose president George Barr has only one leg, is an exception. It hires only the handicapped.

Other companies, occasionally, will have a whole plant or a whole shop manned by the handicapped, because some such workers, feeling they have long been discriminated against socially and economically, find it easier to work only with others who have had similar experience.

That kind of operation is commonly considered not best for the handicapped worker himself, however, and obviously presents extra problems for the employer.

Some companies can, and do, take as many physically handicapped as apply for jobs, because they have placement techniques adequate for the task. But they fear to publicize their activities lest they get more than their share of applicants and find it impossible to place them all.

Good news for all employers, small or large, is the fact that through State and Federal employment services he can get placement services that are up to the level of the newest and best that can be obtained. These placement services—accurate job descriptions and analysis and equally skilled worker analysis, including physical demands and physical abilities—are of course only for the placing of the handicapped.

The experience of Leeds & Northrup Co., Inc., in hiring the physically handicapped should answer the questions of many em-

ployers, regardless of size, who are considering recourse to this incompletely tapped source of manpower. Leeds & Northrup started taking on the handicapped in a small way, in its Philadelphia plant, some years ago.

The experiment turned out so well, for both worker and company, that the management now has made it a conscious and deliberate policy. Thereby it has won a regional award of the National Employ the Handicapped Committee for its outstanding record.

Of its entire labor force, about 5 percent are physically handicapped as defined by the Pennsylvania State Employment Service. They range from workers with heart murmurs to polio victims, include many who are blind, deaf, mute, or lack an arm or leg.

MOST NEED NO EXTRA ATTENTION

An occasional job has been reengineered to make it suitable for a blind worker, for instance. But the bulk of Leeds & Northrup's handicapped employees do exactly the same work as those without handicaps, in practically the same way and with the same tools and machines.

The company has found its workmen's compensation rates have not gone up, because the handicapped are many times more careful than the average worker. The very fact that people discouraged by previous poor prospects have been given a chance to hold normal jobs has put most of them up among the most stable workers on the payroll. Their absenteeism is low and their productivity, as measured by incentive earnings, ranges from average to far above average.

Chief ingredients in Leeds & Northrup's success with the handicapped have been:

- 1 Foreman understanding and agreement with the aim, and foreman patience in acousting workers to their jobs and helping them become adjusted to normal job routine.
- 2 The appreciation of the handicapped employee for the opportunity to make a living with self-respect rather than from charity or philanthropy.

With increasing use of the handicapped, no employable worker, no matter what his disability, need have the latter feeling.

STATE TO HONOR HANDICAPPED—ALABAMIANS ARE URGED TO LEND ASSISTANCE

Praising the physically handicapped of Alabama as capable workers, Gov. Gordon Persons has issued a proclamation designating October 7-13 as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week in the State.

The proclamation urged Alabamians "to cooperate and to lend their assistance and encouragement in the observance of the week in order to enlist public interest in and support of programs for the employment of the physically handicapped."

ONE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWELVE HANDICAPPED

As of August 31 the Alabama State Employment Service, a division of the State Department of Industrial Relations, had a total of 41,097 job seekers on file, of which 1,712 were listed as physically handicapped.

Governor Persons' proclamation asserted the "physically handicapped of this State have demonstrated that they are capable workers when placed in jobs suited to their training, abilities, and experience and therefore as a group constitute a valuable segment of manpower."

NATION NEEDS SERVICES

"The Nation as a whole needs the services of every person capable of productive work in the task of mobilizing to meet the requirements of defense and to maintain the civilian economy," the Governor's proclamation said.

Questions of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when does Mr. Truman start a purge of his executive department heads? Internal Revenue? Office of Price Stabilization?

Does anyone count the number of Government publications going out of Washington every day? Better not ask the question. Mr. Truman might name somebody to a full-time job doing it.

Address by President Truman to the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an address to the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen at the National City Christian Church in Washington, D. C., on Friday, September 28, 1951, by the President of the United States:

THE TEXT OF TRUMAN'S TALK TO PILGRIMS

I am happy to have the privilege of speaking to this meeting of the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen. You have come to the Nation's Capital to visit its monuments and to look at the basic documents on which our Government was founded. Many people come to Washington to do these things, but you have come here for a special purpose. You have come here to emphasize the fact that this Nation was founded on religious principles.

You will see, as you make your rounds, that this Nation was established by men who believed in God. You will see that our founding fathers believed that God created this Nation. They believed that God was our strength in time of peril and the source of all our blessings.

If we go back to the Declaration of Independence, we notice that it was drawn up by men who believed that God the Creator had made all men equal and had given them certain rights which no man could take away. In beginning their great enterprise, the signers of the Declaration of Independence entrusted themselves to the protection of divine providence.

To our forefathers it seemed something of a miracle that this Nation was able to go through the agonies of the American Revolution and emerge triumphant. They saw, in our successful struggle for independence, the working of God's hand. In his first inaugural address, George Washington said, "No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand, which conducts the affairs of men, more than the people of the United States."

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM STRESSED

Another fact which you will notice in the course of your pilgrimage is that the makers of our Constitution believed in religious toleration. There was the highest type of religion, forbidding the use of coercion or force in matters of the mind and spirit. Religious freedom was a part of their religious faith.

It is said that when Benjamin Franklin left the Constitutional Convention he was asked, "What have you given us?" He answered, "A republic, if you can keep it." Millions of Americans since then have believed that the keeping of our Republic depends upon keeping the deep religious convictions on which it was founded.

From the worship and teachings of the synagogues and churches of our land have come a moral integrity, a concern for justice and human welfare, a sense of human equality, a love of human freedom, and a practice of brotherhood which are necessary to the life of our national institutions.

It is fitting and proper that at this time of international peril and uncertainty we should look back to these beginnings and rededicate ourselves to these ideals.

It is not enough, however, simply to look back. It is not enough to congratulate ourselves upon the religious spirit of our forebears. We must ask ourselves if we truly believe the things which they believed. We must examine our conduct to see whether we are carrying out in our daily lives the ideals we profess.

This is not easy. Our religious heritage imposes great obligations upon us. It does not permit us to be self-satisfied and complacent. Indeed, if we accept the faith which has been handed down to us, our task as a nation is much more difficult. We cannot be satisfied with things as they are. We must always be striving to live up to our beliefs and make things better in accordance with the divine Commandments.

LESS EXCUSE FOR WRONG

The people of Israel, you will remember, did not, because of their covenant with God, have an easier time than other nations. Their standards were higher than those of other nations and the judgment upon them and their shortcomings was more terrible. A religious heritage, such as ours, is not a comfortable thing to live with. It does not mean that we are more virtuous than other people. Instead, it means we have less excuse for doing the wrong thing.

Our religious heritage, in my opinion, imposes great responsibilities upon us as we face the problems of today.

It means first of all that we must constantly strive for social justice in the life of this Republic. It means that we must fight against special privilege, against injustice to those of low income, against the denial of opportunity, against discrimination based on race, creed, or national origin.

Our religious heritage also means that we must struggle to maintain our civil liberties. No nation which hopes to live by the law of God can afford to suppress dissent and criticism. You may remember that Israel persecuted the prophets. The prophets had unpleasant things to say about what was going on in ancient Israel. They criticized social injustice and the wasteful luxury of the privileged few.

They criticized the way in which the ancient Hebrews had turned away from true religious principles. They said that Israel would be punished for its misdeeds. The prophets were not popular, and the kings and the priests of Israel tried to deny them freedom of speech. But the prophets were right, and Israel was punished as they had said it would be.

We must always keep the way open for self-criticism. We must not stop up the

mouths of those who are saying unpopular things. We must preserve the Bill of Rights so that the voice of protest and dissent may always be heard. We must not try to destroy people by fear and slander, because if we do we shall weaken the moral fiber of our country.

DEEDS CALLED REAL TEST

Another great lesson which our religious heritage has for us today is that we must not be led astray by self-righteousness. We must remember that the test of our religious principles lies not just in what we say, not only in our prayers, not even in living blameless personal lives—but in what we do for others.

It is all too easy for church-going people to be satisfied with a superficial standard of morals. It is all too easy to sit in judgment on the shortcomings of others. It is all too easy to feel morally superior because we go to church and profess to follow the faith of our fathers.

We must remember that in His ministry on earth, Jesus delivered His strongest condemnations against those who were superficially good. The scribes and the Pharisees he attacked were the respectable people of His day. They were the leaders of the community who set the standards for others. To them He said, "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

Self-interest can blind us today, just as it blinded the scribes and Pharisees of Biblical times. We must always be on our guard against this danger.

If we are to respond to our religious heritage, we must be guided by the principle of charity—charity in the Biblical sense of love for one's fellow man. This is the greatest virtue, without which other virtues are of little worth.

We must work for morality in public life and in private life. We must stamp out crime and eliminate corruption. We must have high standards of personal conduct.

But even if we do all these things, that still is not enough. The final question that will be asked of us, as individuals and as a society, is "what have we done for our fellow man?" What have we done to ease his burdens, to give him greater opportunity, to help him in time of trouble, and to make the world a better place for him to live in? For unless we can answer those questions, we will not have carried out in our lives the religious heritage which has come to us from our forefathers.

Today, our problem is not just to preserve our religious heritage in our own lives and our own country. Our problem is a greater one. It is to preserve a world civilization in which man's belief in God can survive. Only in such a world can our own Nation follow its basic traditions, and realize the promise of a better life for all our citizens.

DOUBLE PERIL IS NOTED

Today, the whole human enterprise is in danger. On the one hand, we have to resist the expansion of a power that is hostile to all we believe in. It is a power that denies the rule of law, the value of the individual, and belief in God. It is a power which has become militant and aggressive, using the weapons of deceit and subversion as well as military might.

On the other hand, we must do all we can to prevent the outbreak of another world war. Such a war, using modern instruments of destruction, would be more terrible than anything we have ever experienced. It would make a battleground of the crowded and complex cities of the modern world. It might well shatter our whole economic and social system, and plunge mankind back into barbarism.

This is the great problem we must meet. We cannot yield to Soviet communism without betraying the ideals we live for. We cannot have a new world war without jeopardizing our civilization.

In this perilous strait our greatest source of strength, our greatest hope of victory, lies in the God we acknowledge as the ruler of all. We turn to faith in Him to give us the strength and the wisdom to carry out His will. We ask Him to lead us out of the dangers of this present time into the paths of peace.

In this crisis of human affairs, all men who profess a belief in God should unite in asking His help and His guidance. We should lay aside our differences and come together now—for never have our differences seemed so petty and insignificant as they do in the face of the peril we confront today.

It is not just this church or that church which is in danger. It is not just this creed or that creed which is threatened. All churches, all creeds, are menaced. The very future of the word of God—the teaching that has come down to us from the days of the prophets and the life of Jesus—is at stake.

For some time, I have been trying to bring a number of the great religious leaders of the world together in a common affirmation of faith and a common supplication to the one God that all profess. I have asked them to join in one common act which will affirm those religious and moral principles on which all agree.

A BOND OF BROTHERHOOD

Such an affirmation would testify to the strength of our common faith and our confidence in its ultimate victory over the forces that oppose it.

I am sorry to say that it has not yet been possible to bring the religious faiths together for this purpose of bearing witness that God is the way of truth and peace. Even the Christian churches have not yet found themselves able to say, with one voice, that Christ is their Master and Redeemer and the source of their strength against the hosts of irreligion and the danger of a world catastrophe.

Despite the barriers that divide the different churches, there is a common bond of brotherhood that underlies them all. We must continue our effort to find those common ties, and to bring the churches together in greater unity in a crusade for peace. In this way, we shall come closer to the one God who is the father of us all. In this way, we shall find greater power to meet the troubles of our time.

The way to such unity is long and hard. But we must continue to strive for it. And we must ask God's help. If we really have faith, perhaps God will give us what we are not able to attain by our own efforts.

God grant that we may speak together, as brothers, of His power and His mercy, and bear witness of Him against those who deny Him.

May God unite the churches, and bring us peace.

Federal-State Supervisory Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by Mr. Elliott V. Bell, editor and

publisher of Business Week, at the golden jubilee meeting of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, at the Hotel Jefferson, St. Louis, Mo., on Thursday, September 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE SUPERVISORY RELATIONS
(By Elliott V. Bell)

I have agreed to wind up this symposium with a few words on the relations between State and Federal supervisory authorities. But before I get into that, I'd like to make one or two comments about bank supervision in general as it appears to an ex-supervisor who is now on the boards of two banks.

The principal point I want to make is this. The people you supervise don't always understand you. All too frequently they don't know what your proper function is, what your powers and responsibilities are or what their obligations under the law are.

This is especially true of bank directors and trustees, most of whom are not experts in either banking or banking law.

I would like to make the suggestion that wherever practical each State banking department prepare a little pamphlet summarizing some of the main points of the law, outlining the chief duties and responsibilities of directors and describing the organization and function of the banking department. There should be one of these pamphlets prepared for each type of institution supervised and each time a new board member is elected he should be mailed a copy of the appropriate pamphlet.

A fertile source of misunderstanding, of course, is the bank examination. The average director thinks an examination is just a kind of audit to see whether all the cash and securities are really there. The average bank management hates to have anything called to the attention of the board of directors that would cause them to start asking troublesome questions. So when the examination report raises any disturbing points, management is apt to explain that the examiner in question is frustrated or got out of bed on the wrong side—anything to suggest that the criticism is merely a personal idiosyncrasy of the examiner. Most directors, not understanding that an important purpose of an examination is to disclose whether a bank is being reasonably well run, will quickly accept management's brush-off of the examiner's comments—a few harsh words are said about bureaucrats in general—and the whole thing is forgotten for another year.

In some States directors receive from the banking department a notice when an examination report is sent to the bank with which they are associated. I would suggest that such notices be made a general practice and that they be expanded to describe briefly the scope and underlying purpose of examinations. I would also suggest that directors be required to sign a statement that they have seen the examination report and read the examiner's comments.

On the side of the supervisory authorities, much improvement is needed in examination work. In the larger States, the examiner is apt to be the only contact a bank has with the Department from 1 year's end to another.

Occasionally examiners, particularly those who have been on the job too long, get to thinking they really are the whole department and maybe God's special representative too. They begin to demand as a right all sorts of special attentions and deference; they hand out special rulings with the greatest of ease, and make banking law as they go along. Often the banker, particularly in a small community, thinks it better to put

up with this kind of petty tyranny than to complain and risk having to deal with a resentful examiner henceforth.

Examiners should be more closely supervised and from time to time should be required to take refresher courses and examinations on the banking law and on the duties and responsibilities of bank examiners.

Finally it must be constantly borne in mind that for most people a bank supervisor is an awesome and mysterious character. Those whom we supervise all too often come in contact with us only when they are in some kind of trouble.

The bank supervisor should constantly emphasize that he is always available to the citizen who has legitimate business to do with the department. Everyone who comes to the department, even if he has been called in for disciplinary action, should be treated with the utmost courtesy and sent away with the conviction that the people in the banking department are hard-working, conscientious public servants.

Now for the matter of Federal-State supervisory relationships. The greatest single weakness in bank supervision in this country today, in my judgment, is the continued failure to work out closer and better relations between the State and Federal supervisory authorities.

The events of the great depression should have taught a bitter lesson to the banking world. The shocking record of bank failures was a direct consequence of overchartering of banks in the boom period of the twenties and competition in laxity among supervisory authorities of that time.

I believe the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency remembers that lesson. I believe the Federal Reserve banks have not forgotten it. Whatever differences of opinion may arise from time to time over the methods and tactics it occasionally uses, I believe we all agree the FDIC has exerted an important influence on the side of good banking. I believe our State bank supervisors are also mindful of the teachings of the great boom and crash of the twenties and early thirties.

There is, however, one supervisory agency that either learned nothing from this past experience or chooses recklessly to ignore the teachings of banking history.

That agency is, of course, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board came into existence in 1932 but did not begin to play an important role until some time after banking holiday of 1933. Its whole experience has been in a period of recovery and actual inflation.

Anybody can look good while prices are rising, for the rising tide of inflation covers up any mistakes. But good times never last forever. It is a sound principle of bank supervision that we should be strict in good times in order that we may be more lenient in hard times.

Yet we find the Federal Home Loan system encouraging savings and loan associations to shift from State charters to Federal charters in order in order to avoid the restraints of State supervision—in other words, competition in laxity.

We find the Federal Home Loan Bank Board waging what can only be called a war of aggression against State policy with respect to branches. In cynical disregard of State laws, State supervisors, State institutions and the traditions of the dual banking system, the Home Loan Bank Board has repeatedly authorized branches where State law and policy would not have permitted them and has granted branch powers across State lines. I believe these policies of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to be unwise and unsound. I believe it is correct to say that they are condemned by all other supervisory agencies both State and Federal.

It is to be hoped that the National Association of State Bank Supervisors and the

National Association of State Savings, Building and Loan Supervisors will continue their efforts to arouse Congress to the need for legislation to define the branch privileges of Federal savings and loan associations and to moderate the present ill-advised course of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Meanwhile it is important, I think, that we do not allow our irritation at the provocative actions of this one Federal agency to affect our efforts to strengthen the cooperation with other and more experienced Federal agencies.

Federal-State cooperation in the field of bank supervision, it seems to me, calls for the following:

1. The States should recognize a paramount national interest in matters relating to the price, the quantity, and the availability of money. That means State supervisors should be willing to take their lead from the Federal Reserve in matters of interest rates and reserve requirements.

The Federal authorities, for their part, should recognize that a State has a right to decide whether independent, chain, group, or branch banking is best suited to the needs of its people and if branch banking is permitted the extent and area to which branch operations should extend. No national interest requires the Federal Government to seek to invade the rights of the States in this matter.

2. State and Federal supervisory agencies should compete with each other in the raising of standards not in lowering them. They should never seek to induce banking institutions to change from State to Federal charter or vice versa in the expectation of obtaining laxer supervision.

3. Every effort should be made to provide for uniformity of practices and of standards, particularly in the matter of examinations, and to minimize inconvenience to banks under two jurisdictions. I am hopeful that the Federal Reserve System will soon make a start in accepting State examinations of member banks as they now accept national examinations.

4. No supervisory agency—State or Federal—should make a major change of policy affecting others without first consulting with the supervisors concerned.

5. Means of regular and frequent consultation between the Federal supervisory agencies and officials of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks should be developed. Such regular discussions would, I believe, make for a better continuing relationship and be in the public interest.

Our dual system of State and Federal bank chartering is in harmony with our dual system of government. Admittedly it does not have the theoretical efficiency of a single unified system any more than our Republican form of government has the stream lined directness of a dictatorship. But like our other free institutions, the dual banking system of America has served our people well—far better than they could ever be served by a glorified Nation-wide RFC complete with mink coats, refrigerators, snake farms, perfume, and just a small, a very small ham.

There will always be men, some crafty, some just stupid seeking to destroy the dual banking system. Some, like the present most active enemies of the system, do it because they have more ego than understanding, some attack it out of simple bureaucratic lust for power; some because they are full of bookish theories but lacking in real experience; some because they are basically hostile to our free institutions and want to centralize all power in Washington as a step toward their own pet brand of totalitarianism.

But there is nothing new in all this. Freedom must be fought for every day and the institutions of a free society can never be taken for granted. It is a part of the larger

responsibility of the State bank supervisors that by their conduct and example, they should champion every day the dual banking system which has served our Nation so well.

Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr HUNT. Mr. President, there has been called to my attention a brief but excellent editorial in the magazine the New Age of September 1951, under the caption "Teaching," written by Mr John H. Cowles, sovereign grand commander of the Supreme Council, Thirty-third Degree Scottish Rite Free Masonry of the southern jurisdiction. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEACHING

Teaching bears a close analogy to salesmanship. The salesman deals with many varieties of human nature, mostly adults, the teacher deals with a wide variety of human nature, mostly young persons in the formative years. It is taken for granted that both the teacher and the salesman know their respective "lines" or "wares." The next step is to induce the customer to want what the salesman has to sell or the teacher has to impart but in the case of the teacher the "customer" is called a pupil or student.

Like salesmanship, teaching is also both an art and a science. The art of teaching, like the art of selling, presupposes a considerable degree of tact and common sense. But at this point comes a break in the analogy between selling and teaching, because the salesman is free to use his judgment if he is an out-of-doors salesman working on a commission basis and not an indoor one restricted by rules, the teacher, having no voice in the making of rules, is sometimes restricted in the exercise of tact and common sense, because so often school boards and school administrations, jealous of their power, have made a fetish of rules. But if they themselves had to observe them, they would find that several were needlessly restrictive in their work. Rules are supposed to be to human relations what oil is to machinery—to aid in smooth operation—but there is a wide variety of lubricants for a wide variety of purposes and machines. So in human relationships there must be flexibility if rules are to aid the teacher rather than hinder.

The salesman has reports to make out for the home office, but, unlike the teacher, he does not have 30 to 40 papers to correct and detailed bookkeeping regarding each child's health and standing—a mass of detail heaped on top of preparation of the next day's work. Bookkeepers should do this work and thus leave the teachers free for the important work of teaching and preparation. Also, and very important, is the size of the classes. These have been running from 30 to 40 pupils per classroom. Educators are agreed that no teacher can give proper personal attention to that many children and that classes not in excess of 20 pupils is a goal that must be aimed at and reached if our schools are to do their best work.

Teaching is not a commercial enterprise for financial gain. True, teachers must have re-

muneration, and a liberal one at that. But those who enter the teaching profession do so as a calling, a high and exalted calling, with serious responsibilities in molding the lives of the next generation. It is the work of one who has the crusader's spirit, and the great teachers have invariably had such a crusader's outlook. Their pay-off has come 20 or 30 years later when their former pupils and students have reached successful places in business and the profession and have looked back to call such teachers "blessed."

JOHN H. COWLES,
Thirty-third Degree,
Sovereign Grand Commander.

Initiative in the Air as a Means to Victory and to Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an admirer of Gen. Nathan F. Twining, the Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force. An able officer with a distinguished record, General Twining is also an air statesman. As commanding general of the Thirtieth Air Force in the Pacific and of the Fifteenth Air Force in Italy, as Commander of the Mediterranean Allied Strategic Air Forces and of the global Twentieth Air Force—after July 1945—General Twining proved himself a great air strategist, and gained the broad experience that is fundamental to the penetrating analyses of the world situation which he contributes to military planning today. A man of superb administrative ability, General Twining has strengthened both the Air Materiel Command and the Alaskan Command during tours of duty preceding his assignment to Headquarters, USAF. Experienced in teamwork and joint operations, it is greatly to General Twining's credit, and a distinction that becomes him, that he commanded the Allied Air Forces of various nations in the Mediterranean theater during the war, and as first commander in chief of the Alaskan Command, after October 1947, he commanded United States Army, Navy, and Air Force units in one of the most important regions of the world today. From that latter position, he had a close look at Russia, and at the nature of the defense we must build against that unfriendly neighbor.

Out of his wide experience General Twining has recently culled some words of warning important to every serious-thinking American:

Today world events are moving toward a climax that may bring new hopes for peace—or a world-wide war.

General Twining reminded us in an address at the annual dinner of the Boston Stock Exchange last Monday, and he repeated the age-old warning that is too often ignored:

Among nations as among men, the best protection against a criminal is the power

and the determination to strike back swiftly and decisively. Today—

General Twining finds—

the people of the United States have the determination and they are building the power.

This power can be built because our industrial production is great and Congress has risen to the challenge. General Twining is fully appreciative of the work of the House and the Senate in investigating our entire defense problem. But the power can be built also because, thanks to American genius and engineering skill, we have the force and the weapon with which to reach the very heart of our enemy's power—the United States Air Force, and the atomic bomb. From earliest time, victory has been won most quickly and most surely by the destruction of the most critical targets—by isolating and disarming military forces as well as by destroying them. Today, the industrial support which any modern armed force must have in order to continue fighting can be destroyed most readily through the judicious application of air power.

Like every responsible Air Force leader, General Twining emphasizes that a strong Air Force is essential not merely to win victory in a war that might come, but to maintain peace—if peace can indeed be maintained.

If we build now the force we need to provide protection for ourselves and aid for our allies it is still possible that we may never have to use such a force in war.

Until lasting peace is brought to the world, however, we must continue to build up our Air Force. General Twining, in his Boston speech, made some shrewd and high level observations on the importance of atomic weapons in this growing Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard within the last few days the warning of Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett that atomic weapons promise no new, inexpensive, or magic way to win wars. General Twining made no assertion that there is. But to atomic bombs, carried by medium or light bombers, we can now add atomic weapons for use against enemy ground troops as well as against more concentrated targets. The result is increased versatility in our atomic attack, a versatility that introduces the most revolutionary period in the entire history of warfare.

Against this larger concept of modern warfare and strategy, General Twining put the action in Korea in proper perspective. There has been no all-out struggle for air supremacy in Korea.

We are not attacking enemy air bases and they are not attacking ours. Battles between jet fighters are less destructive, so far, than the encounters of World War II.

This situation may not remain true indefinitely—or, if it does, it may be so to our own peril.

Whenever an air force is forced to abandon an aggressive strategy, its days are numbered. Like the wars on horseback of the previous century, the air wars of this century must be fought and won at full tilt.

They must also be fought and won by an air force equal to the challenge. It takes 3 or 4 years to build a modern air

force. The Air Force we have today is the one we bought 3 and 4 years ago. The Air Force we need today is the one we failed to buy at that time. We must build today the Air Force that will win tomorrow's victories. Only by doing so will we maintain initiative and be able to gain and hold supremacy in the air.

Mr. Speaker, with these words of solemn warning, General Twining ended his brief but telling remarks, still reasserting, to be sure, that "our goal is always to return to the peace and prosperity for which this country was founded."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include General Twining's succinct analysis of the task before us in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The remarks are as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. N. THAN F. TWINING, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE BOSTON STOCK EXCHANGE, SEPTEMBER 24, 1951

Today world events are moving toward a climax that may bring new hopes for peace—or a world-wide war. With the possible exception of a few men in the Kremlin, no man knows which it is to be. In this country we all want peace and we will continue to hope for peace as long as hope can be justified. But the rulers of the Soviet Union preach peace, while they instigate war.

These rulers came to power through assassination and terror. They remain in power by the calculated enslavement and liquidation of millions of their fellow Russians. There is no reason to believe that they will show any greater sympathy or concern for the people of other nations than for their own.

We can expect that they will continue to use force against us and our allies whenever and wherever they can increase their power. But it is reasonable to believe that they will not strike the United States directly until they have completed their preparations for a powerful and devastating blow. And it is unlikely that these rulers of Russia will move directly against us unless and until they are convinced we can no longer strike them a staggering blow in return.

Among nations as among men, the best protection against a criminal is the power and the determination to strike back swiftly and decisively. Today the people of the United States have the determination and they are building the power.

The building of military power on this huge scale will absorb a high percentage of our industrial production. The cost of our military program is so great that it must be constantly examined to insure that all expenditures are wise and prudent. This is the task not only of the services, but of the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and of the Congress.

We have been impressed by the thoroughness with which the committees of Congress charged with this task have gone about their work. The House of Representatives specializes in fiscal matters and Representative MAHON's committee has performed the duty well. I have been especially impressed by the work of the Senate Committee on Military Appropriations which has just been concluded. The hearings of this committee were conducted in a masterful manner by Senator O'MAHONEY and they were completed in 3 months. The open record is a volume containing almost 2,000 pages—despite the fact that much of the testimony was not printed because of its secret nature. Senator O'MAHONEY would never accept half an answer when he wanted a full answer to any question.

Your own able Senator SALTONSTALL was a member of this important committee. His able colleague, Senator LONCE, assisted the

committee and the Senate by testifying and by personally investigating our entire defense problem. As long as we have men in key legislative positions who are as competent as these our defense program will be thoroughly examined and wisely handled. We will have enough of the right kind of power to prevent aggressors from achieving their murderous aims.

To protect themselves against retaliation, the rulers of Russia have taken full advantage of their strong geographical position. They have developed the principal sources of their military power deep within the great continent of Eurasia. No other nation is so well insulated against attack by land or sea.

Except for American pioneering in the development of long-range air power the prophecies of the geopoliticians might have come true. The rulers of an industrialized and militarized Russia might easily have dominated the Eastern Hemisphere and eventually the entire earth. But their great land area and their hundreds of divisions cannot save their industry and armament from destruction by a superior air force. There is reason to hope that until they are convinced they can prevent us from building and maintaining a superior air force they will not begin the greatest of all wars.

The ability of an air force to penetrate to the most vital targets is of first importance. To concentrate the destructive power of an air force against targets that happen to be close at hand would be wasteful and indecisive. Warfare can no longer be confined to the small battlefields of yesterday. Modern air war and the demands of total war have widened the field of battle from a few miles to thousands of miles—from artillery range to bomber range.

As always in war, the quickest and cleanest victory will be won by the strategist who proceeds directly to the most critical targets. Since the earliest days of organized warfare, decisions have been won by isolating and disarming military forces as well as by destroying them. Decisions have been won by cutting off reinforcements, by denying supplies—and finally, by destroying the industrial support which any modern armed force must have in order to continue fighting. These things can now be accomplished much more readily through the judicious application of air power.

For no modern war can be fought without massive industrial support and supply. The installations necessary for manufacture and supply on such a scale must also be massive. They are highly vulnerable to attack from the air. When the most critical targets are selected—and this is an art we are just beginning to learn—their rapid destruction can have only one result: to reduce enemy military forces to impotence.

The power of the atomic bomb has greatly increased the advantages of deep penetration to those targets that are most vulnerable and at the same time most vital. We will continue to improve the range, the speed, and the altitude of planes that can deliver our best weapons to the most desirable targets. And we must produce these planes in sufficient numbers to saturate and overwhelm enemy defenses that are constantly being improved.

Our ability to do this is indispensable to our hopes for peace and to our plans for victory if peace becomes impossible. We have many vital industrial plants in this country that cannot be moved or hidden or dispersed. So has an enemy. We have no choice but to insure that we can reach these vulnerable and vital installations and hit them harder and more often than he can hit us. Such an ability is a strong influence for peace and guarantee against defeat.

But we have other responsibilities and other opportunities. We have the responsibility to furnish all possible protection for our allies. Most of these allies are far more

vulnerable to air attack than we are. Some of them are also vulnerable to ground attack, which we are not. We now have a growing confidence that our atomic weapons will help to save our allies from destruction by enemy air forces and from capture by enemy ground forces.

The effectiveness of these weapons has been improved by new methods of construction. It will also be possible to carry some atomic weapons on smaller planes. Our ability to do this will provide us with greater versatility in our atomic attack.

I must point out, however, that the Air Force's ability to use atomic weapons in support of friendly ground troops is by no means limited to delivery by these smaller planes. The medium bomber, especially the jet bomber, is the most reliable vehicle for delivering the most effective bombs against targets within medium bomber range.

The principal reason for increased interest in new targets for atomic weapons is a simple one. We must capitalize on our increasing atomic superiority. The Atomic Energy Commission is on the threshold of greatly increased production. We can now plan toward a wider use of atomic weapons against enemy ground troops as well as against more concentrated targets.

The combination of air power and atomic power has introduced the most revolutionary period in the entire history of warfare. The proper application of the new weapons and new means of delivery is receiving serious and intensive study. An air campaign can now be as destructive as the most bitterly fought surface invasion and in a much shorter period of time.

Do not be deceived by the apparent indecisiveness of the daily air encounters over Korea. Serious and critical as they are, they do not yet represent an all-out struggle for air supremacy. We are not attacking enemy air bases and they are not attacking ours. Battles between jet fighters are less destructive, so far, than the encounters of World War II. There are several reasons for this. While air combat is revolutionizing warfare, the jet engine is changing the old tactics of air combat. Jet planes can absorb much more damage than the old-fashioned fighters and manage to get home. This is true because their vulnerable area is smaller and because their fuel is less inflammable. In addition, these battles in Korea are being fought at speeds very near the speed of sound. The smooth handling of aircraft and the delivery of accurate fire at such a speed is still a problem. But it is a problem that is gradually being solved. We hope that some of our improvements will soon be demonstrated. Unfortunately, the enemy is learning also, and we can expect that the steadiness in his fighters at some speeds will also improve. Lately he has been ranging further and further below the Yalu and committing more and more MIG's to combat. The air battles in Korea are becoming more and more critical and more and more important.

It is true that the struggle for air supremacy is not decided entirely by fighter planes in air combat. In the air campaigns of the past we have destroyed more enemy planes on the ground than in the air. But success in air combat is highly important. In Korea it is practically our only means of keeping the enemy off the tails of our planes, attacking enemy troops and off the backs of our own troops on the ground. The challenge to air combat is a challenge that must always be met, even though the odds are against us. Whenever an air force is forced to abandon an aggressive strategy, its days are numbered. Like the wars on horseback of the previous century, the air wars of this century must be fought and won at full tilt.

As we have pointed out many times in the past, the Air Force we have today is the only

we bought 3 or 4 years ago. The Air Force we need today is the one we failed to buy at that time. In this country we have the means and the ability again to produce and maintain the farthest-ranging, hardest-hitting Air Force in the world.

In the first two wars of our country's history the aggressive tactics of our seamen helped to save the day. Their bold forays into the far Atlantic made it possible for us to endure costly defensive wars on the ground. We have also been able today to project American spirit and skill into the stratosphere that reaches beyond both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Our ability to maintain control of the air above us and above our allies must be included in any effective bid for peace or, if necessary, for victory. To maintain this control effectively we must always be able to invade an enemy's air space more decisively than he can invade ours. And we must be able to accept challenges to air combat, no matter what the odds, just as we are doing in Korea today.

In order to furnish dependable aid and support to our troops on the ground we have to keep the initiative in the air. This is being accomplished today only by the skill and spirit of the pilots and crews of the Far East Air Force.

If we build now the force we need to provide protection for ourselves and aid for our allies it is still possible that we may never have to use such a force in war. This is the most important of all facts today. Even as we fight to bring peace to the Far East we must build to bring a lasting peace to the world. Our goal is always to return to the peace and prosperity for which this country was founded.

Removal of Crosses in Honolulu Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two telegrams protesting the removal of the crosses marking the graves of veterans buried in the National Memorial Cemetery at Honolulu. The first is from Brig. Gen. Henry Darlington, chaplain, Reserve headquarters of the New York National Guard. The second is from Rev. Lawrence Reilly, executive secretary of the Christian Antidefamation League, Inc., of Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., September 29, 1951.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We consider it important all Christians voice outrage at removal of the cross of Christ from graves of our Christian dead. It is our sincere belief that our soldier dead are entitled to have the symbol which they loved and for which they died to mark their resting place. Thank God we live in a country that can still combat the atheistic principles of Soviet Russia, whose fellow travelers have inspired this dastardly action. Isn't it paradoxical that while building a temple for the four chaplains that we permit Anna M. Rosenberg to remove the symbol of Christ?

If we permit this, we are taking away from the sorrowing mothers the thought that their sons no longer lie buried under the symbol of the cross. It is tragic to needlessly waste the lives of the flower of our youth in Korea, without going further and desecrating the cross. We urge your help in stopping this anti-Christian, bigoted, and intolerant action.

Rev. LAWRENCE REILLY,
Executive Secretary, The Christian
Anti-Defamation League, P. O. Box
1116, Detroit 31, Michigan.

NEW YORK, September 29, 1951.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.

Consider it imperative that all Christian people voice their outrage at the removal of the cross of Christ from the graves of our Christian dead buried on the hill of sacrifice, Hanau's National Memorial Cemetery, overlooking Honolulu. This action savors of an atheistic Soviet Russian attack against our Christian belief. Please protest to Congress, to all Christians, and in every way possible to have this sort of thing stopped before similar action is taken in all cemeteries.

HENRY DARLINGTON,
Chaplain, Brigadier General Reserve
Headquarters, New York National
Guard.

Proposal to Publish Income-Tax Returns of United States Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Cheap Political Trick," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of September 28, 1951, relating to the President's appeal for the enactment of a law to expose the total incomes of all top United States officials.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A CHEAP POLITICAL TRICK

Yesterday's appeal by President Truman for enactment by Congress of a law to expose the total income of all top United States officials bears the nauseating taint of a wormy and overripe political apple.

The President told the lawmakers it should be spread on the public record how much money, gifts, or loans are received by those responsible for running the Nation. Such legislation, he contended, is an important step to prevent improper conduct and guard against unfounded suspicions. Further, the little man acclaimed, the truth should be known partly because there has been a deliberate effort to discredit the Government service.

What nonsense. What political skulduggery? Who does Mr. Truman think he's fooling?

The record already is clear and it is being added to daily. It is a record of corrupt and dishonorable practices by many persons in the Government service. It is a record of total disregard for ethical standards by many in high places. It is a record of the ebb of public morality to an all-time low and an alarming deterioration in integrity of government.

The sordid story is not new. For months on end there has been a gradual unraveling of the "goings on" of many in places of trust. Mr. Truman has been fully aware of the revelations which have been unearthed largely by committees dominated by his own political party. In most cases he has met the revelations with a stony callousness and in some instances has gone so far as to label the charges asinine.

Why his sudden and grandiose move before the Congress? It certainly constitutes belated recognition of exposed corruption and political intrigue. And it can have but one interpretation--in the face of a steadily growing public wrath it is a deliberate attempt by the administration to cover up for failure to act in the past.

Mr. Truman is going to find it difficult to pass the buck to Congress. The American people are fed up with the kind of furtive undercover work that has been going on in Washington and there is a widespread disposition to place the blame for much of the sorry mess upon the President himself. It is contended that his obstinate loyalty to unworthy cronies binds him to their weaknesses and that this trait in the person of the President, who is expected to set an example of high moral standards, has encouraged his subordinates to indulge in questionable practices.

No misguided sense of loyalty can shelter any administration from going all out to correct the shabby practices which have been exposed and to get rid of those who have engaged in these practices, whether or not they are technically illegal. There is a certain sense of fitness which should characterize every public servant and if he does not possess this quality he has no business on the Government payroll.

The trouble with Mr. Truman's action yesterday is that it's too little and far too late. Of course, the mess must be cleaned up and public demand for correction of the exposed practices should be marked by an ever-rising crescendo.

The clean-up can't be accomplished by any cheap political trick by Mr. Truman. Nor can it be attained by incessant condoning of the exposed practices, which most certainly no longer are "red herrings" or asinine. It's going to take a thorough housecleaning in Washington--a complete eradication of those wormy individuals who have wriggled and squirmed their way into the national scene.

Taxation of Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared opposing the Senate and House proposals for the taxation of gambling. I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the appended editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, OPPOSING LICENSING OF GAMBLING

The American people do not quite realize as yet the unfortunate consequences of the Senate's action in sustaining the decision of its Finance Committee and of the House of

Representatives for the taxation of illegal gambling.

There have been some brief references in the public press, but not very much, to the fact that in H. R. 4473, there will be a tax of \$50 on each person who is engaged in wagering, a tax of 10 percent on the amount spent in an organized lottery where the people are not all present when the lottery is operated, and a tax of 10 percent of the amount that is bet with bookmakers.

I want to invite the attention of our people, however, to the very able presentations made on September 27 on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished first chairman of the Senate Crime Committee, Mr. Kefauver, by the able second chairman of that committee, Mr. O'Connor, and by my colleague, Mr. Hunt, on pages 12231 to 12244 of the RECORD.

My colleague from Tennessee pointed out very clearly.

1. These proposed Federal taxes, particularly the occupational tax on bookies, would, in effect, put the stamp of the United States Government's approval on gambling, a so-called occupation and activity, which is outlawed in 47 of the 48 States.

2. The proposed taxes are unenforceable.

3. Our Crime Committee suggestions on the other hand were both sound, desirable, and constitutional.

Supplementing the remarks of my colleagues, I say that surely the United States Government is not in such straitened financial circumstances that it must, in effect, "take a cut" and become a partner in illegal operations. If Uncle Sam is to start collecting taxes on illegal gambling, will he soon be asked to collect taxes on the illegal sale of narcotics? Or on a hundred types of other foul crimes just in order to collect revenue? Where will we draw the line?

Unfortunately, the Senate did not go along with the Senate Crime Committee's substitute amendment, which was defeated that day by a vote of 29 for to 49 against. The substitute amendment would have had the great advantage of, in effect, taxing illegal gamblers completely out of business. It would have first of all prevented the charging off of all expenses paid or incurred as the result of illegal wagering. That act in itself would have crippled America's gambling. It would have required gambling houses to keep detailed records of each wagering transaction, and it would have achieved other noteworthy advances against organized crime. But unhappily the substitute amendment was defeated.

On the following day, Friday, September 28, the Senate also defeated, unfortunately, by voice vote, the O'Connor amendment barring the deduction of business expenses incurred in illegal wagering, the Kefauver amendment relating to the keeping of records of illegal activity, the Kefauver amendment requiring records to be kept by wagering houses, and the Kefauver amendment eliminating that part of the tax bill dealing with wagering.

SENATE SHOULD HAVE FOLLOWED EXPERT ADVICE

It seems to me most curious that (a) the Senate rightly appoints a Special Crime Committee in May 1950, (b) that group makes a study of criminal operations throughout the Nation from then until September 1, 1951, (c) that group submits recommendations to the Senate (d) but whereupon the Senate turns down the expert recommendations of our special committee. I realize, of course, that the special committee's suggestions were considerably controversial and in many respects, quite novel. I realize, too, that the tax recommendations made by the Crime Committee by no means comprise all of that committee's suggestions. I am hoping that the Senate will adopt a more favorable attitude when it comes to those other recommendations which we made, particularly, on the subject of the rac-

ing wire news service. I do want to point out, however, that the Senate has had in effect a golden opportunity, as I see it, in connection with consideration of this tax bill—a golden opportunity to strike a body blow against organized crime in this country. To my way of thinking we have missed this opportunity, and we will not have it soon again. That is very unfortunate indeed.

COMPULSORY NET WORTH STATEMENT

The only bright spot in the picture as I see it occurred on Friday, September 28, when the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. George, announced that he would take to conference the modified Hunt amendment providing for the filing of a net worth statement by individuals who during the previous taxable year, received a gross income of \$10,000 or more from one or more unlawful trades or businesses. I wish that the original provision dealing with a period of 5 taxable years had been retained. That would have enlarged our dragnet against these criminals. However, I hope that the modified amendment at least will be retained in conference.

Now, insofar as the other amendments are concerned, let me say that it would not be fair if I were to give the impression that there are no advantages whatsoever to the approach which has been endorsed by the able members of the Senate Finance Committee and by the full Senate. I respect in particular the good intentions of the members of that committee. However, I think that such few advantages as do exist for their stand are more than outweighed by the disadvantages—moral and otherwise. Proponents of the bookie occupational tax and similar taxes contended that historically, under our tax law, we do not recognize any difference between income gained legally and that gained illegally. Yet we do recognize, for example, that a man cannot deduct expenses for committing a murder or performing some other crime against public policy.

It seems to me, moreover, that the evidence is quite clear that the payment of the Federal tax by an illegal operator has been regarded by that operator as a sort of "legal license." He has come to regard himself as a legitimate businessman who pays his Federal taxes, even though by this very act, he is signifying that he is violating State and local law.

LET'S ENCOURAGE RESPECT OF STATE AND LOCAL LAWS

I agree with my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. Hunt], who pointed out that it was in effect somewhat hypocritical to say the least for the United States Government to collect a one-hundred-and-fifty-dollar tax on slot machines at the very time those slot machines were outlawed in the respective States. Either Uncle Sam is trying to promote respect for State and local laws or he does not care whether those State and local laws are followed at all. I want to commend at this point the masterful argument made last Friday by my able associate from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], who pointed out the moral implications of this problem.

I repeat. It is inconsistent for us to tell the States and localities on the one hand: "Go to it boys. The crusade against crime is your problem," and then on the other hand for Uncle Sam to tax, and in effect, legitimize the very illegal operation that he wants the States and localities to end.

That is an unfortunate message to splendid crusaders against crime like Dan Sullivan in Miami, Virgil Petersen in Chicago, Spruille Braden in New York, and to other public and private battlers against vice throughout the land, particularly the folks in voluntary anticrime commissions of the type I have mentioned and applauded in numerous public statements.

Now, I shall conclude my presentation.

EDITORIALS FROM TWO PAPERS

Quite a few American newspapers have commented on this Federal Government inconsistency and on the disturbing moral implications of the taxing and in effect—licensing of organized gambling. Two such newspapers are the Washington Times-Herald and the Milwaukee Journal. While these papers ordinarily are poles apart in their editorial thinking, they are united on this issue as are so great a number of our citizens. There follow then, three editorials from these papers, the first two are from the Thursday, September 6 and Thursday, September 27, issues of the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Tax on Gambling Unwise" and "Tax or Gambling License Fee." A third editorial is from the September 12 issue of the Washington Times-Herald, and it is entitled "Uncle Sam's Cut."

I hope that these and other editorials, together with the fine expressions of the American Bar Association on Organized Crime, will help awaken all of the Congress and all of the people to a realization of the implications of the Senate's and House's actions in the tax bill. In turn, we Senators who cosponsored the Senate Crime Committee's suggestions will carry on the battle for the objective which I have stated, namely the complete routing of organized crime.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 6, 1951]

TAX ON GAMBLING UNWISE

For 15 months the Senate Crime Investigating Committee has been exposing and denouncing gambling as a crime and a sin, but it apparently hasn't convinced the Senate Finance Committee.

The Finance Committee has voted to give gambling at least the aura of legitimacy by putting a tax on it. The committee accepted without change a House plan to levy a 10-percent take on bets handled by bookmakers and other commercial gamblers and a \$50 occupational tax on anyone who handles bets or numbers games.

Treasury Department officials have indicated doubts that the taxes can be collected but the Senators think that they will bring in \$400,000,000 a year.

Money isn't to be sneezed at in these days of high Government spending—but neither should it be sought at the expense of legitimizing crime. Gambling is illegal in most States. To treat it as a legitimate occupation, as a tax plan would, is to invite gamblers to break the law under Federal auspices. It is, further, to give official recognition to an activity that the Crime Committee has proved the big source of funds financing crime and corruption in America.

If the Senate Finance Committee doesn't care about the moral sources of tax money it shouldn't stop at gambling. Why not tax gang killers \$100 per murder or forgers \$1 for each check they manage to slip by a fraud victim? Why not tax prostitutes and narcotics peddlers and embezzlers? Crime is big business—if we're going to tax it, let's get it all.

We hope that the Senate isn't as indifferent as the House and the Finance Committee to the moral issues involved here. The job of Government isn't to make crime respectable—its job is to make it difficult or impossible.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 27, 1951]

TAX OR GAMBLING LICENSE FEE?

If the Senate approves the House plan to tax gambling and the tax becomes law, it may be the opening wedge for legalized gambling in many of the 48 States.

The mere assessment of a tax by the Federal Government, of course, would give a cloak of legitimacy to activities illegal in

most States. But the measure could have even more widespread effects.

It is estimated that the tax will raise \$400,000,000 a year—if anyone can figure out a way to collect it fully. The plan exempts gambling licensed by States—such as parimutuel betting and Nevada's wide open legal gambling. The sight of the Federal Government cashing in on a new source of revenue could conceivably lead States to legalize gambling so that they could do the collecting themselves.

This, of course, is what many professional gamblers hope. Their take on gambling could easily cover licensing fees and taxes if they could escape some of the graft payments they now have to make to stay in business.

The gambling tax plan, much as the Government needs money, is an unwarranted legitimization of an activity that is illegal in most States. It deserves defeat by the Senate or, failing that, a Presidential veto.

Certainly the Senate Criminal Committee has produced enough evidence of the corruption that thrives with gambling. Certainly Federal law should not give that corruption back-door support.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 12, 1951]

UNCLE SAM'S CUT

The Senate Finance Committee has voted for a 10-percent tax on bets placed with a bookmaker and for a \$50 license fee on bookmakers. The House had already approved these taxes. They are expected by those who favor them to bring something like \$400,000,000 a year to the Federal Treasury.

In all the States but Nevada and perhaps one or two others, the kind of betting to be taxed is illegal. Thus the bill is intended to take for the National Government a share of the profits of a business declared to be criminal by almost all of the States, and the backers of the proposal make no bones about this. They recall that the Federal Government taxes incomes, no matter how obtained, and ask why it should be squeamish about extending this profitable system.

The question arises why the principle shouldn't be extended even a little farther. The State treasuries also are short of funds, and might pick up a good many million dollars by taxing some of the activities and occupations which the Federal Government has outlawed.

A lot of people are said to cheat the National Treasury on income taxes. The States might turn this to profit by imposing a tax—say 10 percent—on the amounts obtained through fraudulent returns. The rate, of course, should not be so high as to discourage income tax cheating but, even so, might be expected to yield a good many millions of dollars for the support of State penitentiaries, universities, and lunatic asylums.

Then there is counterfeiting. As the profits of this form of enterprise approximate 100 percent of the gross receipts, a 25 percent State tax could be borne by the enterpriser without driving him into legitimate business. A 5 percent tax on bootlegging, so we have been informed by some good friends from Tennessee, would solve the State's fiscal problems forever. The profits derived from violating the Mann Act are also ripe for taxation by the States.

All of this illustrates the moral flexibility of our Federal system. This advantage seems not to have been sufficiently stressed by the authors of the federalist papers; foresighted though they were, they lived in the horse and buggy age and couldn't foresee all the ethical splendors that lay ahead. It didn't occur to the fathers that the Federal Government's meat could be the State governments' poison, but we of the New Deal era are wiser and know that all is for the best and most moral in the best and most moral of worlds.

Administration of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago, our colleague, WILLIAM C. LANTAFF, of Florida, inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a report condemning the administration of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, of Puerto Rico, as a complete dictatorship.

Let me say that the attack levied in the report was not only unfair to Governor Muñoz-Marin under whose leadership the Puerto Rican people have been endeavoring to better their economic and social conditions, but I am of the opinion some special interests are attempting to benefit through misrepresentation.

The report was originally represented as being rendered by the TIES Association of Miami, and it was indicated that the survey resulting in the report was made under the sponsorship of TIES. The later developments indicate that, although the report was written by Chester Wright, Miami public relations man and recently elected president of TIES, that organization had taken no official action toward making the survey.

According to my information, TIES is a reputable organization of professional people, the letters standing for Technicians, Industrialists, Economists, and Scientists. Its purpose seems to be to keep its members apprised of business conditions and opportunities. TIES, according to my information, has never engaged in political battles and has always been a quiet and conservative organization limiting its activities to those of a laudable purpose.

Before the current session of Congress is concluded, and after I have had the opportunity to conduct some research, I intend to go into the matter of the Chester Wright report in some detail in order that the Congress which has the responsibility for passing upon general legislation affecting Puerto Rico may know the truth about Governor Muñoz-Marin's administration, but for the time being, since our colleague from Florida has inserted Mr. Wright's report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an effort to keep the RECORD straight and complete, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, as an extension of my remarks, an article which appeared in the Miami Herald, September 14, by Jack Thale, Herald staff writer. The article is as follows:

PUERTO RICO PROBE ORDERED—MUÑOZ ATTACK LAID TO POLITICAL FOES, BUSINESS INTERESTS

(By Jack Thale)

Business interests and political foes of Governor Muñoz-Marin were linked by the Herald Thursday to now-famed accusations that the Puerto Rican chief executive is operating a dictatorship under the American flag.

Leonard D. Long, a South Carolina contractor who in recent years has built more

than 10,000 low-cost dwellings on the island, emerged as a key figure in a tangled behind-the-scenes story.

Evidence sifted by the Herald indicated Muñoz had long in mind when he suggested that a private businessman may have inspired the highly critical report read by Chester M. Wright at a meeting of the TIES association here a week ago.

The Wright report touched off repercussions in Miami, Washington, San Juan, and various Latin-American countries. And the uproar was mounting.

While the Puerto Rican Legislature was setting up a committee to investigate the original and real motivations of the Wright report and additional civic and business leaders were coming to the defense of the Muñoz administration, a Herald investigation brought to light the hitherto unrevealed facts that:

Wright made his 2-week survey as an individual and not, as he previously announced, on an official survey for the TIES Research Foundation. Wright is president of the companion TIES organization of business and professional people.

The trip was suggested by Arthur E. Curtis, Miami publicist, who said Long is one of his industrial clients, and that the Charleston contractor has been having a lot of trouble with the Muñoz government.

Two men in Puerto Rico whom Curtis suggested Wright contact were Long and Jesus Pinero, former governor of Puerto Rico and political foe of Muñoz, who now works for Long.

While the various developments were taking place in Washington and San Juan on the report that created a sensation in Latin-American circles, the Herald learned steps were taken Thursday by the public affairs committee of the Miami Chamber of Commerce to have directors of the organization officially condemn the Wright report.

Coincidentally, the chamber officials learned during their discussion of the report that a chamber official had been approached earlier this summer with a proposition to make a survey of conditions in Puerto Rico for a fee of \$50 a day and all expenses.

Alfred B. Canel, director of the chamber's foreign trade committee, said, without naming any names, that the offer had been made to him and that he had turned it down after consideration.

Curtis, however, said no fee had been paid to Wright for his report. Wright said the money for the combined vacation and "survey" trip for himself, his wife and son "came out of my bank."

"However, I may yet join up with Arthur Curtis in the fight he is making for his client, Long," Wright added.

Wright, who had previously announced that he would make another "just as hot" report on Puerto Rico to the TIES meeting today, said Thursday he had decided to put off the second report. He said he would make it next week.

He conceded he had made a "mistake" in labeling his original report as "a report by Ties." He explained he should have called it a report "to" TIES. He said the organization had taken no official action toward making the survey, but that he had told Russell Edwards, president of the companion TIES research foundation.

Mimeographed copies of the report which Wright distributed last Friday set out that it was made "pursuant to prior agreement with the officers and according to a decision that a survey of Puerto Rican conditions was not only warranted but was urgent. It is now offered as a public document bearing the approval of the TIES research foundation."

Discussing how he happened to make his 13-day survey trip—this first visit to Puerto Rico—Wright said Curtis had suggested that he ought to check into "what's going on down there."

Wright, who said his interest in Latin-American affairs dates back 30 years although he speaks little Spanish, said he made the trip a sort of busman's holiday. He and his family stayed at the luxurious new Caribe-Hilton Hotel.

Wright said he talked to two or three people a day in his survey, estimating he spent about half his 13 days vacationing and half surveying.

Pinero, who was appointed as Puerto Rico's first native-born governor immediately preceding Muñoz' election as the first elected governor, was his host one Sunday during a trip through the Puerto Rican countryside, Wright said.

He said Pinero told him he was working for Long, but that they had no other discussion about the South Carolina contractor.

The TIES president said Pinero contributed only an infinitesimal part to his final report.

Wright said he had dinner with Long one night. He said Curtis had suggested he contact the contractor, but had not paved the way for the meeting.

"You don't need anyone to pave the way to meet Long in Puerto Rico," Wright commented. "You aren't there 10 minutes before you know about Long."

Wright said Thursday he stood by his original report and "I'm not backing up from it a bit."

He said that by the report he hoped "to wake up the Department of the Interior to a sense of responsibility about what is going on down there and to help Puerto Ricans achieve freedom of the press, which they don't have."

Four days after Wright's original report, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman labeled the charges as "kind of silly," Muñoz previously had termed them "fantastic."

Chapman, pausing briefly Tuesday in Miami en route from Venezuela to Washington, told the Herald that Muñoz program of economic betterment for the island was "the healthiest thing that was ever tried down there, something which is going to increasingly pay its own way."

The Puerto Rican Legislature, which had been called into special session by Muñoz, spent most of its time Thursday talking about the Wright report instead of the legislative business for which it had been convened.

So deeply stirred were the legislators that some went so far as to propose a drastic press punishment law which would authorize the legislature "to prosecute any person who furnishes or publishes information that obstructs the plans of the government of Puerto Rico."

That the attitude of the Puerto Rican government would be strongly against any such measure was clearly indicated, however, when Muñoz was asked whether such a motion was approved.

"It should be unnecessary for me to answer that question," he told reporters. "However, I am going to answer it."

"It is obvious the legislature would not approve nor would the Governor sign any law of such a nature."

A leading banker-industrialist with extensive interests in Puerto Rico and Florida also rallied in Miami Thursday to the defense of the Muñoz government.

"The present government in Puerto Rico, under the leadership of Luis Muñoz-Marín, has provided better housing, raised the standard of living, and made vast inroads upon our unemployed multitudes by encouraging many new industries to locate in the island," declared Pedro J. Serralles, chairman of the boards of the Pan American Bank of Miami and the Crédito y Ahorro Ponceño bank chain in Puerto Rico.

Serralles, who served in the Puerto Rican Senate with Muñoz, is the eldest member of a family which operates the largest privately

owned sugar plantation in Puerto Rico. The family also owns and operates a huge rum distillery whose products are sold widely in the United States.

Muñoz came to power through "free, open, and honest elections" and his political and economic policies have been in line with those in the United States, Serralles said.

After taking over the regime of the former Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell, an erstwhile New Deal braintruster, Muñoz "speedily removed from the island the ultraradical factors which might appropriately have been called communistic," Serralles commented.

Political Influence in the Bureau of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Moral Defense Program Needed for America," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 30, 1951, relating to the use of political influence in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A MORAL DEFENSE PROGRAM NEEDED FOR AMERICA

With each day's news, more and more Americans wonder where we as a nation are headed. Our is an age in which public trust seems to be increasingly regarded as a private opportunity.

Most of us still believe in the maxim: "That which is morally wrong can never be politically right." Yet dissent comes from high places. Cast a glance at a sobering scene.

Democratic National Chairman Boyle sees nothing unethical or improper in accepting fees from clients doing business with the United States Government while he served as unpaid vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He seriously expects the public to believe he had no more influence with Federal agencies in Washington than any average citizen. President Truman still stands by him, and, in the opinion of many, timed his proposal to publish all official incomes on the day Boyle was to testify so as to divert the headlines.

Republican National Chairman Gabrielson admits seeking extension of an RFC loan, too. He also sees nothing wrong about it. Various RFC officials have been fired or have resigned. Others have confessed accepting expensive gifts from firms seeking RFC loans, and some could see nothing wrong about that.

Now the chief of the north California Internal Revenue Bureau and eight others have been suspended. The St. Louis collector of internal revenue, James P. Finnegan, who quit under fire, faces a grand jury probe. A GOP leader in Staten Island has resigned in the midst of a fixing and shake-down scandal in which a district attorney has been superseded. A similar sordid picture is found in Atlantic City * * * and one could go on and on, with the rotten Gross case in New York, the jail scandals in Camden, the football and basketball exposés, all over and above the revelations of the Kefauver committee.

The moral climate of America is at a low ebb. When men at high levels cannot tell right from wrong, it is time for them, and many of the rest of us, to become reacquainted with our churches and Sunday schools and the simple faith of our fathers.

Let us not forget that those who seek to corrupt are as guilty as those corrupted; that the giver of a bribe is as venal as the taker; that the patron of the racketeer contributes to the pollution of his own community, and that in the last analysis the ethical standards of a democracy will be what the people—each and all of us—insist upon.

We are spending billions to defend American principles against enemies from without. What America needs now is a moral defense program to protect those principles against destruction from within.

The Tax Load

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under this title the Bridgeton Evening News has commented on a recent and excellent statement by former Assistant Secretary Roswell Magill, and the analysis given should be of great interest to all the Members.

This article is written by Wylie E. Middleton, who for some years has been doing very clear thinking and very clear writing on current problems of government.

I think it worthy of note that when this excellent editorial was written, Mr. Middleton was about to celebrate his ninetyeth birthday. He is doing more and better work than most people half his age.

The above-mentioned follows:

THE TAX LOAD

Mr. Roswell McGill, a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and now head of the Tax Foundation, in a recent subject of taxation, asserted that local, State, and national taxes now take one-fourth of the income of a man earning \$3,500 and if the Government got all the money it wanted—\$10,000,000,000 more from the individual income tax—it would have to take \$6,000 out of the salary of a man earning \$10,000 a year and if he earned \$15,000 it would take \$11,000. It would have to take all taxable income over \$4,000, yes, a 100 percent income tax on taxable incomes over \$4,000.

This is a startling but very plain statement and should convince thousands of individuals that instead of working for their own wages they are working first of all for the Government and they will get what is left.

Thousands of these people thus working for the Government do not realize the truth of these figures because they have not stopped to analyze them, but Mr. McGill's figures should open their eyes to the situation and set them to doing some analyzing for themselves. If what they discover does not start them to work to remove the cause of this tax burden, then they well deserve to be lied by the Truman policy.

Despite all statements to the contrary by such experts as Mr. McGill, President Truman continues on his course, refusing to yield a point or even to admit that those who

differ with him have any knowledge on which to base their conclusions or even know what they are talking about. His Government budget is a good one merely because he says so.

In a recent address at the dedication of the new accounting building in Washington, the President took occasion to say that his huge budget, which Congress is desperately trying to find the money to meet, is a good one and has been pared down and made as economical as it is possible for a budget to be made and that those who argue to the contrary are merely conducting a smear campaign.

That this is a misstatement of the truth, is proven by the fact that Mr. Truman has not adopted and put into operation the full report of the Hoover Commission for the reorganization and more and more economical conduct of the national Government, a report which Mr. Truman approved himself.

Congress has cut one and one-half billion dollars from this budget, but it should have cut much more. Instead of lying awake nights to think where the money could be found to meet the budget, it should have let the President lie awake nights trying to find a way to bring his budget within the money Congress was willing to give him.

Congress has been remiss in that it has done too much talking about cutting the budget, but not enough actual cutting.

Talk does not reduce the tax load.

W E M.

Less Steel for Farmers Hurts Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch of September 24, 1951:

LESS STEEL FOR FARMERS HURTS DEFENSE EFFORT

Unless the National Production Authority changes its absurd policy of cutting down the amount of steel available to the farm-equipment industry, American farmers about this time next year will begin feeling a serious pinch in new equipment and in parts for repairing old equipment.

But that isn't all.

Less farm machinery will mean less farm production. Less production means less food and fiber for the domestic market, for the armed services, and for the foreign market.

And less farm machinery means less for export to the free nations we're trying to help. And that in turn means a cut-back in overseas production of food and fiber.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that the farm-equipment industry will need from 2,700,000 to 3,000,000 tons of steel next year to produce machinery which the farmers must have.

The allocation for the third quarter of this year was 673,000 tons. The allocation for the fourth quarter is 528,000 tons. And the NPA has announced it intends to cut the allocation even more for the first quarter of 1952.

Indications are, therefore, that the farm-equipment industry will get less than 2,000,000 tons total next year if the NPA doesn't awaken to the facts.

That's only two-thirds or less of what the Department of Agriculture says is minimum for production needs.

What are the facts?

Increased farm production is needed for our Armed Forces.

Even with partial mobilization military food and fiber needs are greater. Military kitchens must be backed up with 7 to 9 month stocks, civilians need only 7 to 9 days.

Men in uniform eat far more than civilians—for example, twice as much meat.

Right now the military requires that 9 percent of the Nation's canned fruits and vegetables be set aside to provide for 3,500,000 men—only 2½ percent of our population.

Increased farm production is needed to feed civilians.

Our country is growing, and that means the need for food is growing. The civilian population of the Nation consumed 14 percent more food in 1945 than it did in 1940. It consumed 16 percent more in 1950 than it did in 1945. By 1955, it is estimated, the consumption rate will be 12 percent greater than it is this year.

Increased farm production is needed to help keep friendly nations friendly.

The Nation's volume of agricultural exports this year required the cultivation of an estimated 50,000,000 acres of land, representing about one-sixth of the total of all cultivated crops in the Nation. We cannot fail to continue to help feed the people who are on our side against the Communist bloc.

Increased farm production is needed to fight inflation.

Food is the biggest single item in the family budget. In recent years the consumers have been spending a little more than a fourth of their disposable income—income after taxes—for food. What happens to food prices, then, has important influence on family spending, affecting the entire price and wage pattern of our economy.

The increasing demand for food naturally acts to advance food prices unless supplies also increase. With consumers' disposable incomes on the rise and the supply of durable goods going down, there is more pressure than usual behind food prices. And the surest way to lessen that pressure on prices is abundant production.

Those are some of the big facts which the NPA should have to swallow before cutting back steel supplies for farm machinery. And there are many other facts, if Defense Production Administrator Charles Wilson's boys will take a close look.

Sure, there's a steel shortage. At least, they tell us there is. Sure, we have to pick and choose among steel consumers in the interest of national defense.

But, as Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, Iowa, told the Senate in a bitter and blunt speech the other day, "food is quite as important as guns."

The NPA makes a serious mistake if it does not recognize that.

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the Record a letter I received from the State Department in response to my inquiry in regard to our national policy on the subject of the unification of Ireland. I did not receive it in

time to call it to the attention of other members who might have felt it was pertinent in the debate concerning House Resolution 82. I mainly wanted the information for the benefit of my constituents who were writing me on this subject, and I thought other Members might still be interested in it:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR Mr. CURTIS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of September 21, 1951, inquiring whether the Department of State has adopted any policy in regard to the unification of Ireland.

The Department of State has long been aware of the questions arising from the political status of Northern Ireland and has given the most careful consideration to the bearing of those questions on the relations of the United States with the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, two of this country's closest friends. The Department is convinced that a real and lasting settlement can only be achieved by the Government of the two countries directly concerned. It is believed that this is not a matter in which the United States could properly or usefully intervene.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,

Assistant Secretary

(For the Secretary of State).

Henry Bell, an Outstanding Leader of Texas and Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a great man and leader of Texas and the Nation, Mr. Henry Bell, died in Texas recently. It is accurate to say Mr. Henry Bell's death is a great loss to our Nation. People throughout our Nation knew and admired him and feel keenly the great loss which has been sustained because of his passing. I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an appropriate and fitting tribute to him:

HENRY MARSH BELL

"The record of a generous life runs like a vine around the memory of our dead, and every sweet, unselfish act is now a perfumed flower"—R. G. Ingersoll.

Somehow we die a little too when we say good-bye to a congenial and treasured friend. The empty void that is left us in our aching hearts by the absence of our vanished comrade seems to be beyond repair. The poignant pain of parting makes us wonder at the wisdom of the great Architect of fate. Why should a great and useful man be taken in his prime when so many walk the earth with aimless, selfish uselessness and render no service to mankind to pay the rent for the space they occupy?

Yet in the midst of sorrow, the faith that we must keep to sustain us in such hours calls us to carry on as he would have us do. Henry Bell, struck down at the peak of his power for good in east Texas, would tell us now if he could speak, to get on with the job of building a greater east Texas, to make our lives finer in their ministry to others and to widen the area of our interests.

This patron of progress who was the inspiration for so many projects and movements for the upbuilding of his home town and his State, had a rare zest for living. Whether he was dealing with a problem of finance for his bank, giving a helping hand to a Negro school, urging the football team to new victories, aiding the chamber of commerce toward new goals, or conferring with the rector of his church, he was always understanding, helpful, and inspiring. His memory is a benediction.

He left us a lesson that other great souls have tried to teach us, to increase our wholesome interests in life, to be a constructive part of all that is good around us, and that happiness comes from helping others. There are those who take no part in any worthwhile activity. They have narrowed the sphere of their interests until they are only partially alive. They are wasting their lives and killing time. Henry Bell lived a busy, useful, interested, wholesome, many-sided life that carried his influence into an endless variety of activities and touched the lives of the great and the humble in a wide circle.

Henry Bell's memory will never die. It will go marching on to call east Texans to new heights of achievement, its rallying call still clearly heard by those of us who knew him well.

The charm of his personality cheered and blessed everyone who came within the warm glow of his genial heart. We thank God that we were privileged to enjoy his friendship and that east Texas had him as a beloved leader for a little while.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

Railroad Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter recently received from the four brotherhood chiefs relative to the pending railroad retirement legislation.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 26, 1951.
To all Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

HONORABLE SIRS: The four transportation brotherhoods—Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen—favor the enactment of the amended bill, H. R. 3669, reported favorably by the majority of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Retired railroad employees and survivors of deceased railroad employees are sorely in need of an increase in their fixed low incomes on which they are now struggling against the highest living costs in the Nation's history to live in decency and with some slight degree of comfort. This national appeal for financial aid from this group of retired railroad employees who devoted the working years of their lives to the task of handling the commerce of this country, including the transporting of our soldiers, supplies, and weapons of war in two world conflicts we believe is entitled to sympathetic and immediate consideration by the Congress of the United States, with (1) no increase in present tax rates or taxable wage limits, and (2) with preservation of the financial soundness of the railroad retirement system without impediment of possible de-

feat by injection of controversial "fringe" amendments of questionable soundness.

We originally suggested a 25-percent increase in benefits, but actuarial testimony presented before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce persuaded us to modify our original proposal in order to keep the fund within the realm of actuarial soundness.

The work performed by transportation employees is extremely hazardous. The number of accidents is high and occupational disability frequently results in disqualifying such employees from service. In such cases benefits are paid under the Railroad Retirement Act. No similar benefits are paid under social security or other retirement systems. Involvement to any degree with other pension or old-age retirement systems is of grave concern to the transportation brotherhoods.

The Transportation Brotherhoods pioneered in the development of the present railroad retirement system to which their members look with confidence and security for financial assistance when seriously injured in line of duty or when they have reached the winter of life. Our railroad retirement system is maintained without one penny of cost to the public and without interference with other pension or old age retirement systems, and we express the sincere hope that the Congress will not enact legislation that will in any manner arbitrarily involve our railroad retirement with other pension or retirement plans.

The thousands of men and women now dependent upon railroad retirement benefits are in need of an increase, which Congress should provide without delay. If any of the controversial fringe amendments now pending—whether intended to expand or contract the rights or benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act—are considered by Congress to be of sufficient importance to warrant serious consideration, then may we suggest that Congress grant immediate increases in benefits and later provide an opportunity for a thorough investigation of all controversial matters at which all interested parties will be accorded an opportunity to be heard.

Respectfully yours,

J. P. SHIELDS,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood
of Locomotive Engineers.

D. B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive
Firemen and Enginemen.

R. O. HUGHES,
President, Order of Railway Con-
ductors.

W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad
Trainmen.

Tribute to Emil Rieve, General President, Textile Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, in Boston, the Textile Workers Union of America paid tribute, at a testimonial dinner, to Mr. Emil Rieve, president of that organization. It seems only fitting, then, at this time, for the Members of Congress to laud the achievements of this man who has pi-

oneered in the field of labor in an effort to create one of the finest groups in the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

When other labor organizations insisted that it was impossible to build a textile union, they proved themselves wrong; and now, with the accomplishments of Emil Rieve, the Textile Workers Union numbers 450,000 strong. Wages have more than tripled during his administration.

More than that, though, Mr. Rieve has served in two of our Nation's greatest crises. During World War II, he worked unceasingly as a member of the War Labor Board. Now, with our country again engaged in a major defense effort, he contributes tirelessly, once more, as a representative on the Wage Stabilization Board.

Emil Rieve has added to the principles of all labor—national and international—as well as to the standards of our democracy. He is a real American, with the heart of a humanitarian, who works for the people.

Defense Rebuilds Economy in South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Monday, October 1, 1951:

DEFENSE REBUILDS ECONOMY IN SOUTH—MILITARY RESEARCH PROGRAMS ASSURE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT, INDUSTRIAL SURVEY SHOWS—BECOMING ARSENAL OF UNITED STATES—BUT GREATEST BENEFITS ARE SEEN IN NEW TECHNOLOGICAL SKILLS DEVELOPED AMONG PEOPLE.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., September 30.—The South's development as a primary field of research in military programs for national security already assures the region of a major role in future scientific and industrial activities, the Southern Association of Science and Industry reported today.

In releasing a survey of the South's total research forces "that are rebuilding the economy of the region," the association declared "the South, which one knows militarily, only for its generals and its gun cotton, is fast becoming the Nation's arsenal for superweapons and industrial essentials."

"The South is busy converting the byproducts of military research programs into new developments for industry and agriculture," H. McKinley Conway, Jr., director of the association, declared.

NEW TECHNOLOGICAL SKILLS

"There is ample evidence," he said, "that the greatest economic benefit to the South from all the big military projects lies not in the millions spent for construction and operation, but in the development of new technological skills among the people of the region."

"These projects have brought into the South large numbers of the Nation's top scientists, and their influence is being felt throughout the scientific community particularly the universities."

"In many a hitherto sleepy southern town, research chemists now rub shoulders along the sidewalks with tenant farmers who are rapidly being swept from their perpetually

losing struggle into a world of new economic opportunity.

"Also, this expansion of high-level technical effort has made it possible to reduce the export of the South's most valuable resource, which is the more talented young graduates of its colleges and universities."

The report cited such vital military research centers as the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., the hydrogen plant at Ellenton, S. C., the long-range proving ground for guided missiles near Melbourne, Fla., the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., the rocket and jet propellant installations at Huntsville, Ala., and Dalmierfield, Tex., and testing laboratories along the Atlantic Coast for underwater weapons and special climatic conditions at sea and in the air.

AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT MADE

The auxiliary equipment which includes electric motors, refrigerating units, turbines, compressors, jet combustion chambers and nuclear fission tools, all built and operated on a scale that exceed anything in American industry will attract many of the country's top engineers and further the cause of science in the South, the association reported.

The association noted that since the beginning of the defense mobilization program prompted by the Korean war, more than 150 new million-dollar plant additions have been reported in 14 Southern States, with some units involving investments of more than \$50,000,000 each.

It also pointed out that 65 southern colleges and universities are now authorized by the Atomic Energy Commission to receive radio-isotopes from Oak Ridge for use in various experimental programs. More than 4,000 shipments of radio-isotopes have already been made from Oak Ridge to scientific groups in the Southern States, the report added.

Reinforcing these military-sponsored technological advances as they affect the southern economy, the association reported, is a rapid expansion of regional industrial research that has resulted in the establishment of 40 consulting laboratories to assist local businessmen, whereas there was not one major consulting laboratory in the South a decade ago.

The report cited the development and growth of multi-million-dollar agricultural and industrial enterprises based on new synthetic fibers and plastics made from the chemical processing of corn, cotton, and oat wastes, new techniques for utilizing forest products as animal feed, fuel, and newsprint; a mushrooming petio-chemical activity that is expected to reach an investment figure of \$1,500,000,000 by 1955.

The report also set forth that from 1930 to 1947 there were established in the South more than 16,000 new manufacturing plants and that in the past decade the region has added more than 1,000,000 new jobs in manufacturing. In such significant economic indexes as wages, electric power consumption, and telephone installations, the association reported, the South has led the Nation percentage-wise in increases.

Retain the Andresen Amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention and to the at-

tention of Members of the House that the Andresen amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 is being attacked by foreign-government trade associations, embassies, and American importers. I supported this amendment and vigorously urged the adoption of it because it was the best method of giving our dairy industry and our cheese industry much-needed relief, particularly the processors of foreign-type cheeses which have been undersold by the imports.

A continuation of unlimited importing of foreign types of cheese would bring very disastrous results to our domestic producers. Foreign cheese in many instances is not made under the strict laws and standards that protect the health of our Nation. Our labor costs are many times higher than those of foreign competitors. The volume of blue-mold cheese from Denmark alone and Italian varieties from Argentina and Italy came very near annihilating this American industry. To date no action has been taken by the Tariff Commission in this regard. Meanwhile, the Andresen amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 does give them a measure of relief. The Department of Agriculture DFO No. 3 under this act sets up quotas that far exceed being just fair to the exporting countries.

The American producers of variety cheeses—other than Cheddar—consists of some 40 companies, located mostly in rural areas, offering the only local employment to perhaps 5,000 families. The milk supply of the United States producers comes from farmer patrons which could easily number as many as 20,000 farmers across the Nation.

The following is an example of the effect unrestricted imports of foreign varieties of cheese have had on an outstanding company in my district: This company has been in the business of manufacturing variety cheeses since 1934. It grew to have almost 100 employees working the milk from 385 patron farmers. The importation of like varieties of cheese from Europe has forced them to reduce the number of employees to 54 and patron farmers to 255. They carried inventories averaging in excess of 1,000,000 pounds of cheese per month until mid-year 1949 when the volume of imports forced it to reduce employment, production and inventories by roughly 50 percent. The sheer weight of importations during 1950 and the first half of 1951 came very close to wiping out what was left of this company's business.

The following figures clearly demonstrate the fate of the United States industry as of the moment—compiled from reports of the United States Department of Agriculture:

United States production blue mold cheese		Imported Roquefort	Imported blue mold cheese
1948.....	8,280,000	852,000	977,000
1949.....	8,141,000	1,392,000	1,301,000
1950.....	7,050,000	1,641,000	3,492,000
January to April 1951.....	2,100,000	608,000	2,270,000
Average 1939 to 1950.....	9,028,000	1,306,000	888,000

Therefore, the Andresen amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950

must remain in force and effect if our dairy and cheese industries are to survive and furnish steady employment to our people.

An Open Letter From Robert C. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend National Weekly contained, in its issue of September 18, an open letter from Mr. Robert C. Townsend, in which he calls attention to a clause in the Social Security Act tending to discourage millions of citizens from taking available jobs.

I agree so thoroughly with Mr. Townsend that I include his letter with these remarks, and I have introduced H. R. 5427 in an effort to have the matter discussed in the proper committee, and eventually to have the situation corrected. The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Despite the fact that the demand for workers is at an all-time high, there is a clause in the present Social Security Act that discourages millions of United States citizens from taking the jobs that are available.

Despite the fact that living standards were never higher for the majority of the people of the United States, there is a clause in the present Social Security Act that has the effect of making poverty compulsory for millions of United States citizens.

This clause that provides that Federal-State welfare agencies "shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming * * * old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, or aid to dependent children.

Under this clause, as it is interpreted by most State welfare agencies, every dollar earned by a welfare recipient must be reported and is deducted from his or her dole.

The results are: (1) welfare recipients have no incentive to become self-supporting, (2) if they do take a part-time job their income from the assistance program is adjusted downward so that their total income remains at the poverty-level of assistance allowances.

I do not think that I am being an alarmist when I say that it is urgent that this clause be amended immediately, more than 5,000,000 United States citizens are caught on this "treadmill of poverty."

The clause that must be corrected is clause 7 of subsection "a" of section 2 in the Social Security Act, and its counterparts, clause 7 of subsection "a" of section 402, clause 8 of subsection "a" of section 1002, and clause 8 of subsection "a" of section 1402.

The clause should be amended in such a way as to require Federal-State welfare agencies, in determining need, to disregard the first two-thirds of the welfare recipient's earned income. In operation, this policy would require welfare agencies to deduct \$1 from the welfare allowance for each \$3 earned by the welfare recipient, thus permitting the recipient to gradually become self-supporting if he or she is able to do so.

Details of how such a policy would work are contained in the banner story on this page.

I cannot urge you too strongly to devise such an amendment to the Social Security Act. While you are working on this reform measure, millions of man-hours are being lost to industry, and millions of citizens have no way of escaping their poverty, because of this defect in the Social Security Act.

ROBERT C. TOWNSEND,
Treasurer of the Townsend Plan for
National Insurance.

Mrs. Mabel Cory Costigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles, one which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News and the other in the Denver Post, both reflecting the passing of Mrs. Mabel Cory Costigan, an outstanding American woman.

It was my pleasure to know Mrs. Costigan during her lifetime. She was loved by all who knew her. She was patient, kind, and devoted to her duty in assisting her husband, the late Senator Edward P. Costigan, who represented my State from 1931 to 1937. She will be missed by her many friends.

The articles follow:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News of September 24, 1951]

WE LL MISS HER QUIET, FIRM VOICE
(By Robert L. Chase)

The soft, quiet counsel of Mrs. Mabel Cory Costigan will be missed for a long, long time in Colorado.

Already it seems strange and unreal to think of tasks being undertaken and human causes organized without the firm and steady hand of Mrs. Costigan helping somehow to guide the project.

Mrs. Costigan—as was the late Senator Edward P. Costigan—was a liberal when that name meant something. And nothing in life ever swerved her from the chosen course.

I first met Mrs. Costigan just over 20 years ago when her husband was a candidate for the United States Senate.

Senator Costigan had long before chosen the road he was to travel. He had chosen when he defended the miners accused at Ludlow. And Mrs. Costigan had chosen with him, chosen as she always chose to stand stanchly beside him through anything that might come.

There had been a beautiful romance, which began when he was class president and she class secretary at East High School. All through their years together, Mrs. Costigan was a real but silent partner.

She was always completely with him in everything he undertook, yet never obtrusively.

Occasionally, though far too infrequently, it was my good fortune to come in contact through the later years with Mrs. Costigan. Always it was when there was something to be done for people, for ordinary people, for underprivileged people, for outnumbered people.

Always there were two things you could be certain about. Mrs. Costigan would make

her decision entirely without regard for her own personal gain—often without regard to her own personal cost. And she would take her stand without the slightest personal animus—usually with a smile.

Sometimes people got an idea Mrs. Costigan was too quiet, too kind to stand up for her own beliefs if enough pressure could be applied.

How wrong those people were.

Not that Mabel Costigan ever lost her temper, ever pounded the table, ever screamed or shouted.

But she could shake her head, usually sadly, and say "No." And no it was, when she said "No."

Mrs. Costigan did not like to be used. She had been a liberal when it meant something to be a liberal. She had seen the world taken over and had seen it twisted out of shape and out of meaning. And she didn't like that.

But Mrs. Costigan never lost faith in people, never lost her willingness to fight the good fight for anybody she believed was right and needed her help.

The list of people who will miss her kindly counsel, her help, is a long one.

[From the Denver Post of September 23, 1951]

Mrs. COSTIGAN

The quiet power of righteousness as a social and political force was never better demonstrated than in the life and work of Mabel Costigan, one of Denver's most distinguished women. Her distinction was not achieved in the limelight of public office or the noisy arena of affairs. It derived, rather, from unobtrusive but tremendously effective work in behalf of better citizenship, wider political consciousness among both men and women, and social betterment for all.

Mrs. Costigan and husband, the late Senator Edward P. Costigan, were among the earliest pioneers of liberalism in this area, when to be a liberal or progressive was to be suspected of subversive designs on the traditional beliefs of grandfather and great-grandfather. They lived to see their own faith almost universally accepted.

A gentle and lovable woman, Mrs. Costigan continued almost to the end of her life to contribute from her own wisdom and devotion, to the political and social education of women, to a quickening of their citizenship. No one more truly deserves the title, "Great Lady."

Still Worst Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the only metropolitan Democratic newspaper in the Pacific Northwest, the Oregon Journal, of Portland, Oreg., entitled "Still Worst Congress":

STILL WORST CONGRESS

The Eighty-second Congress (which we gave a "worst" tag last May) will have to get on its horse if it makes its date with that long-deferred vacation October 1. Right now prospects aren't good.

To be frank, the Congress is paying for the rash of investigations, bickering, great debates, and political horseplay that have been its trade-mark since last January.

About all the unwilling Congress has to show for 9 months of stalling around (we almost said work) is a scaling down, some good, some bad, of the administration's requests for measures designed to grapple with international crises and internal pressures such as inflation.

And with the military appropriations bill, foreign aid, tax legislation, aid to Nationalist China, statehood, and the Japanese and other treaties still on the hook, this scaling down and dodging process continues.

Here's the record:

The Eighty-second Congress already has scaled down the war housing, Voice of America, National Science Foundation, civilian defense, and economic controls program. Some, like the housing, civil defense and economic controls programs, have been scaled down almost to the vanishing point.

The Congress is now busily scaling down the foreign aid bill from the \$8,500,000,000 requested. This may prove to be most costly economy.

It is scaling down the \$10,000,000,000 tax bill to around \$6,000,000,000, despite the fact that the Treasury is running up a deficit of around \$4,000,000,000 already, with the worst yet to come.

And there is a thinly veiled threat on the part of some die-hard Republican Senators to stall the ratification of the Japanese Treaties until after the first of the year, important as speedy approval is. Thus another time-wasting great debate, rivaling the affair MacArthur and troops-to-Europe issue, may be in the offing, possibly extending into the 1952 political campaign.

On the record the Eighty-second Congress does not deserve a vacation. It hasn't earned it. At least it is consistent about one thing. It is living up to its "worst Congress" reputation.

Be a Good Sport, Uncle Sap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent editorial from the Wadena Pioneer Journal, of Wadena, Minn. The writer of this editorial is our former colleague, Hon. Harold Knutson, who was a Member of the House of Representatives for over 30 years. His comments, I am sure, will be of great interest to his former colleagues in the House:

BE A GOOD SPORT UNCLE SAP

Uncle Sap, do you know that it's only 95 days to Christmas? Have you remembered to notify all the friendly countries abroad to get their orders in early for further help from us? Really, Uncle, some of our friends are in desperate straits and must have more help immediately. Ma England finds that she can't make both ends meet on a 35-hour-loaf week, now that everybody gets free teeth, eyeglasses, coffins, shrouds, and the many other blessings given them by their Socialist government.

She wants you to let her again welsh on what she owes you and you should give her the nod so as to not mar a perfect record for welshing that for 30 years has never known frustration.

Now, Uncle, don't spring a sour note by telling us that Ma England has already had \$35,500,000,000 from us since the war began.

You old tightwad it didn't cost you anything. All that jack came from the pockets of the American people and it only amounts to \$230 on each of us so "wattall." That's peanuts for us who are all supposed to be millionaires, and you know, old top, we must not destroy that illusion.

Uncle, it's so satisfying to be pointed out as a rich American when walking the streets of London and Paris, not to mention Norway, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Portugal, Yugoslavia, and scores of other little cousins we had never heard of and didn't know existed till after the war was over and they started fighting for a place at the free-lunch counter.

It will never do to let these friends know that we have to work to get the money you are so generously spreading among them. That might hurt our credit in case we should ever find it necessary to borrow from them.

Here's your chance to again show the world that you are not the dollar-chasing, money-loving old "bustard" you've so often been called by our less fortunate friends.

Uncle, be a good sport. Give the poor devils everything they ask for, as you have been doing the past 30 years. It only costs us 30 cents out of every dollar we take in to play Santa Claus to the world. Raise the ante and take 50 cents if necessary; pursue proud Americans will never know the difference, but once they find that their beneficence makes it possible for millions of foreign friends to live without working it will swell their hearts with joy, and to the exclusion of such sordid things as taxes "Wattall" you waitin' for—only 95 days to Christmas.

Democratic Administration Keeps Prices Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the cry against high prices by Democratic spokesmen cannot be reconciled by New Deal administrators. When the prices on basic commodities begin to go down, Mr. Brannan rushes in to keep them up.

Mark Sullivan, well-known writer, cites several examples in his article that appeared in the Washington Post, September 30, 1951. I include it as part of my remarks:

ADMINISTRATION AIDS INFLATION

(By Mark Sullivan)

PROPS FOR PRICES

The present status of the price level and of inflation can be stated broadly, if perhaps over-simplistically, in two sentences. Prices are crying to come down, many important commodities having already come down markedly. The Government in Washington strives almost desperately to prevent prices from coming down.

The contending forces are illustrated concretely by recent developments about rice, reported in a dispatch from Lake Charles, La., to the Wall Street Journal. The price of rice has been declining sharply. Two years ago it was nearly \$7 per 100-pound bag, and as late as last June it was \$5.50. Today the

average price is estimated at about \$4.50. Likelihood of a still lower price is suggested by the size of this year's crop, coupled with the fact that a large portion of last year's crop remains unsold.

In this situation the Department of Agriculture steps in to support the price by taking a large quantity off the market at an artificial support price fixed by the Department at \$5 per 100-pound bag. "The Agriculture Department spokesmen are busily exhorting growers to hang onto their rice and put it under Federal price-support loans."

"The extraordinary nature of these loans is stated simply: 'By putting their rice under price support, the growers can hardly lose. They get a federally guaranteed bank loan at the \$5 a bag rate. If the market price rises above that point before the end of next April, the farmers can take back their rice and sell it. If the price doesn't go over the \$5 average, the growers can simply leave their rice under the loan and keep the money.'"

What the Department of Agriculture is doing about rice it is also doing about cotton and by the same or other methods is striving to prevent prices of many farm products from coming down.

Within roughly a year past a large number of important commodities of various kinds have fallen markedly in price, some almost sensationally. Examples are Tin, from a peak of \$1.83 a pound to \$1.03, rubber, from roughly 87½ cents a pound to 52 cents; cotton, from roughly 45 cents a pound to 34 cents; wool, from \$3.80 a pound to \$1.90, hides, from 43½ cents a pound to 30 cents.

Many of these commodities, and others that have fallen in price, enter into manufactures. But the effect of a fall in raw materials on prices of manufactured goods is offset by wages of labor, the tendency of which has been upward.

There has recently been a tendency for farmers to recognize that price support of farm crops at artificial figures by the Department of Agriculture is dubious economically and politically. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan recently warned farmers that Government policies favoring farmers are "being threatened by the attitude of the bulk of the people toward farmers." Many farmers and some farm spokesmen expressed willingness to forego some of the advantage which farmers receive through Government policies and practices. But usually they add a qualification, they are willing to sacrifice provided other groups sacrifice correspondingly.

When the new economic controls measure was before Congress last summer, the farm bloc in Congress fought bitterly against the "rollback" which the Administration price control agency had decreed in prices of beef. When the Administration agency dealt with wages of labor it moved in a contrary direction and used a contrasting terminology. During 1950 wages of labor in many industries had been raised an average of some 10 percent. The control agency decreed that such workers as had not shared in the 10-percent raise should now receive it. The action was called a "catch up" provision. It was natural that farm spokesmen should see discrimination in a "rollback" for them accompanied by a "catch up" for labor.

Some sacrifices on the part of labor accompanied by some on the part of farmers would go far toward checking a rising spiral of prices and accompanying inflation. The situation is complicated by the fact that we are on the eve of a campaign year for the election of a President, the whole House of Representatives, and a third of the Senate. There is so far no evidence of any formidable organized movement on the part of consumers in support of their interest.

The Proposed Aluminum Industry for Montana—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 1951, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A6001 to A6005, a statement on the proposed Harvey loan, letters to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and Administrator Stuart Symington of the RFC, requesting an answer to certain allegations made by columnist Drew Pearson in the press and over the radio, letters to the Honorable PORTER HARDY, chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and also to the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, requesting immediate investigation by the Justice Department and Congress of the charges made.

On September 20 I received an answer from the Honorable Stuart Symington dated September 19 and on the day of receipt of Mr. Symington's letter I addressed the following letter to the Honorable Manly Fleischmann, Administrator, Defense Production Administration, asking for a complete investigation:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1951.

HON. MANLY FLEISCHMANN,
Administrator, Defense Production Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MANLY: I am in receipt of the following letter from the Honorable Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, dated September 19, 1951:

"HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MIKE: Thank you for your good letter of September 17 about Mr. Drew Pearson's allegations concerning the Harvey Machine Co.

"As you understand, the role of the RFC in this matter is merely as fiscal disbursing agent. The loan was originally authorized by DPA on advice from the Interior Department.

"The only information we have is that a few days ago we were instructed by DPA to hold up any further action on this loan until further notice. The reasons for this were not made known to us, and the only thing I can do is to refer you either to Secretary Chapman or Mr. Manly Fleischmann.

"With best personal wishes, I am

"Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON"

I have already written to Secretary Chapman and in view of Mr. Symington's letter, I am writing to ask you to conduct a complete investigation of the allegations made by Mr. Pearson. I am enclosing herewith copies of letters I have sent to Secretary Chapman, Mr. Symington, Attorney General McGrath, and Congressman PORTER HARDY on this matter.

Must close now but with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

On September 21, I received a telegram from the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie 234, Kalispell, Mont., and am incorporating it and my reply at this point in the RECORD:

KALISPELL, MONT., September 20, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,

House of Representatives:

The Kalispell area Fraternal Order of Eagles at its regular meeting voted unanimously their desire that you exert all within your power to secure the Harvey aluminum plant for this territory. Also to commend you on your efforts in the past and the present in this vital matter to this territory.

FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES AERIE,
BOB FINLEY, *Secretary*.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1951.

MR. ROBERT FINLEY,
*Secretary, Fraternal Order of Eagles,
Kalispell, Mont.*

DEAR BROTHER FINLEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 20 which I was delighted to receive.

I am doing everything in my power to have this matter settled at the earliest possible moment so we can get an industry into Montana. I feel that in view of the allegations raised, that the only alternative at the present time is to have this matter investigated as quickly and as thoroughly as possible, so that the public will know all the facts and we will be able to go ahead with the development of the Flathead.

Must close now but with best personal wishes to you and all my other brothers in Aerie 234, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P. S.—I am sending you a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains my remarks on this matter.

M. M.

On September 24 I received a letter from Mr. Don Treloar, of Kalispell, Mont., enclosing a copy of a telegram signed by S. I. Rapson, chairman, Flathead County Republican Committee, which I am inserting at this point in my remarks:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1951.

Regarding statement of Representative Saylor concerning political implications of Harvey loan, citizens Flathead County appalled to see this matter being turned into political football. Establishment this company in our valley never been political issue here. Republicans, Democrats joined together to encourage Harvey company's aluminum plant as it would provide critically needed winter payroll and bring balance into heretofore purely agricultural economy. In name of justice, we urge you to use the powers of your office to bring about consummation of this loan at earliest possible moment.

S. I. RAPSON,
Chairman, Flathead County Republican Committee.

On September 25 I was notified by the Honorable PORTER HARDY that his subcommittee would begin an immediate investigation of the proposed Harvey loan and also the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest in connection with it.

The official notice, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Daily Digest, of September 25, 1951, follows:

ALUMINUM PLANT INVESTIGATION

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: The Subcommittee on Government Operations announced today

that it will begin immediately an investigation of the proposed Government loan of \$46,000,000 to the Harvey Machine Co., of California, for the construction of an aluminum plant in the Flathead Valley of Montana. The investigation was requested by Representative MANSFIELD in a recent letter to Subcommittee Chairman HARDY. Certain allegations of impropriety on the part of the Harvey Co., in the conduct of World War II business for the Government, have been made by a widely known columnist, also charges of political influence in connection with the proposed loan have been raised by Representative SAYLOR. All facts concerning the loan will be explored by the subcommittee, though it has no advance information whatever regarding the charges which have been publicized.

Another phase of the loan which will receive attention concerns the announcement of last Saturday by Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson that several aluminum companies had been requested to move their plants from the Pacific Northwest by reason of a power shortage in that area. It is known that the new Harvey plant was to receive its power from the Bonneville Power Administration. The subcommittee will seek an explanation of why a certificate of necessity granting tax benefits and a defense loan were approved for a new facility to be constructed in an area where power is reported to be short.

On September 26, I received the following communication from the Honorable Stuart Symington:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, September 25, 1951.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
*House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MIKE: Thanks for my copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, September 19.

As you undoubtedly know, the RFC had no position in the Harvey loan. At that time the Executive order was not signed and we were merely acting as fiscal agent.

I do hope to see you soon.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

On September 28, I received the following answer from Attorney General McGrath in response to my request for a complete investigation by the Justice Department:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1951.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
*The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated September 19, 1951, relating to the Harvey Machine Co., with which you transmitted a copy of your letter dated September 17, 1951, written by you to Mr. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, and a copy of your letter dated September 17, 1951, to Mr. Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With your letter also was the extension of remarks of Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR made in the House of Representatives on September 18, 1951.

Specifically, you refer to allegations made by Mr. Drew Pearson in radio broadcasts and newspaper articles and request that an investigation be made and a public report submitted. For your information, the Department conducted an extensive investigation in 1943 with reference to certain allegations relating to the Harvey Machine Co., upon completion of which it was concluded, based on the investigative reports received by the Department, that there were no viola-

tions of Federal criminal statutes. It is the long-established policy of the Department to decline to divulge information relating to pending cases or those which have been closed by the Department after a determination that prosecution should be declined, and I know that you will appreciate the wisdom of that policy and the reasons for declining your request.

You also request that we investigate and answer the comments of Congressman SAYLOR. It would appear, in our judgment, that those remarks reach areas of controversy into which the Department believes it inappropriate to intrude, and, accordingly, it is regretted that we cannot comply with that request.

We wish you to know that this Department, wherever appropriate, is pleased to make available to the various departments and agencies of the Government such information as will assist them in the performance of their duties. You will appreciate, of course, that this observation is intended in no way as a comment on the bill which you introduced in the Congress to provide that the Department of Justice shall act as a clearing house for the exchange of interdepartmental information.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD McGRATH,
Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, this brings up to date all the information I have on an aluminum industry for Montana.

I want to repeat again that I want a permanent industry for the Flathead to relieve the terrific unemployment problem that has plagued the Flathead every winter and which will be accentuated by the completion of the Hungry Horse Dam next year. I also want to repeat that, in accordance with the statute authorizing the Hungry Horse, the power generated there must be used "primarily in the State of Montana" for its development and for the security and future of my people.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard rumors to the effect that there is a possibility that Hungry Horse power may be diverted to the Spokane area to assist aluminum production there. I sincerely hope that this is not true because if that should happen Montana would be left holding the bag. Hungry Horse power belongs to the citizens of Montana and Montana needs the industry this power will generate. I intend to fight for this power to be used in Montana and there will be no compromise of any sort in this battle.

Thatcher Ferry-Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

MR. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since the completion and opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 one of the most important projects designed to serve the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama has been that of the permanent ferry across the Canal, at the Pacific entrance, and the connecting road

running from the ferry's western terminus to connect with the national highway of Panama extending from the western boundary line of the zone northwardly to the Costa Rican boundary.

When the original treaty—1903—between the United States and Panama was negotiated—and which provided for the construction, maintenance, operation, and sanitation of the Panama Canal—no provision was made for the passage of persons and vehicles across the Canal. This may have been due to oversight, or with the idea in mind of hardening that matter separately when the Canal was completed. In any event, after such completion, for many years both the Republic of Panama and the Canal Zone suffered greatly through this lack. Makeshift arrangements for crossings were made; but these were altogether inadequate; and the whole situation proved both disadvantageous and unjust to Panama and its citizens; and the civil and military functions of the Canal Zone greatly suffered.

To correct the conditions thus presented, in the fall of 1929—Seventy-first Congress, first session—Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, then a Member of Congress from the Louisville, Ky. District, introduced and pressed to enactment a measure—H. R. 4293—entitled "A bill to provide for a ferry and highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal." The sum of \$1,000,000 was authorized by the bill—and expended thereunder—for the establishment of a permanent ferry across the Canal at or near Balboa, in the Canal Zone, to a suitable point on the opposite side, adequate for the service of all public and military needs; and, for the same purpose, the building of a highway from the western terminus of the ferry to the town of Arraijan, in Panama, on the Canal Zone-Panama line.

Hearings were had on the measure, at which Congressman Thatcher and Col. Harry Burgess, then Governor of the Panama Canal, appeared and explained its provisions and urged enactment. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—at the time charged with jurisdiction of Panama Canal legislative matters—unanimously reported the bill favorably; and its passage by the two Houses followed; and it became a law when approved by President Hoover on May 27, 1930. The pen with which the bill was signed going to Congressman Thatcher, who yet has it in his possession, together with a number of other pens used by Presidents of the United States in signing measures successfully sponsored by him; altogether a unique and interesting collection.

The ferry and highway were officially named in honor of the author of the legislation, Thatcher Ferry and Thatcher Highway.

At first, two ferry vessels were built and operated under the appropriation authorized; and more recently a third vessel was placed in the ferry service, bearing the name of a long-time President of the Panamanian Republic, the *Presidente Parras*. The other two are named, respectively, *President Roosevelt*—Theodore—and *Presidente Amador*, the first President of the Republic.

During the construction period of the Panama Canal Mr. Thatcher served several years as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission—which had direct supervision of the construction of the Canal—and in charge of the civil affairs of the Canal Zone, as Governor. In these capacities, as well as Representative in Congress, he rendered highly useful, able, and honorable service.

The million dollars authorized by the Thatcher Act was expended for the construction of the necessary slips, ramps, ferry approaches, and vessels; and the building of the indicated highway. Both the latter and the ferry constitute links in the Inter-American Highway, extending through North America to the city of Panama, completed with the exception of a few sections in Mexico and Central America. The ferry and road, under the terms of the act, are toll free, and wholly maintained by our Government.

In passing it might be well also to recall the fact that Governor Thatcher—while in Congress—was the author of the act which provided for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Gorras Memorial Laboratory in Panama City, with annual congressional appropriations for such maintenance and operation. The Republic of Panama generously donated the necessary buildings and grounds as the home of the laboratory, which was established following the Executive approval of the act May 27, 1928. The institution is devoted to study and research concerning the cause and prevention of tropical diseases—both human and veterinary—and has come to be regarded as one of the outstanding sanitary science agencies of the tropical world.

As the western half of the Republic of Panama produces most of the agricultural, horticultural, and livestock products of the country, and as the city of Panama, the capital, is situated on the east bank of the Canal, the Thatcher Ferry and Thatcher Highway have physically united the two great segments of the Republic and have served, and are serving, the Government and people of Panama in an indispensable manner. Similarly, the interests of the Panama Canal, the Canal Zone, and our Military Establishment are being served. The traffic thus resulting has been of a very heavy character. In this general connection, I am including as a part of these remarks—the courtesy of extension having been granted me—a very interesting article appearing in the Panama Canal Review of August 3, 1951. The Review is the newly established official publication of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal:

TEN MILLIONTH CAR CROSSES CANAL BY THATCHER FERRY

Some lucky motorist has a grand prize of at least one free round-trip across the canal by Thatcher Ferry awaiting him or her.

The prize is being offered by dredging division officials to identify the ten millionth car transported across the canal since Thatcher Ferry was opened September 1, 1932. The car was the second to be driven aboard the ferryboat *President Roosevelt* on the east-west run at 10:15 o'clock on the morning of June 29.

The monumental milestone in ferry operations caught the dredging division's people

somewhat by surprise. It was not until some days after the ten millionth car used the ferry that the figures were tabulated and it could be identified.

Another big marker in ferry operations is near—the fifty millionth passenger—and Thatcher Ferry checkers will be warned in advance to identify the distinguished passenger.

SERVICE STARTED IN 1923

Ferry service across the canal has been provided on the Pacific side since 1923 when the Army started a tug-and-barge service to supply its posts in the vicinity of Culebra and Empire on the west side of the canal. It operated only between the east and west wing walls of Pedro Miguel Locks.

After the Army posts on the west side of the canal were closed, the ferry operations were transferred to the dredging division. It first used a gasoline-powered tug and a barge. At that time 10 round trips a day were made except on Tuesdays and Thursdays when only four round trips were scheduled. This service was vastly improved about three years later because of increasing traffic to points in the interior. A steam-powered tug replaced the gasoline tug and continuous service was provided from 6 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night.

A continued increase in vehicular traffic across the canal and the construction of Thatcher Highway, which began in 1930, required additional facilities. Accordingly, two ferryboats, the *President Roosevelt* and *Presidente Amador*, were built by the mechanical division (Industrial Bureau) and were commissioned July 28, 1931, and used for a few months at Pedro Miguel. After the ferry slips were built on opposite sides of the canal at La Boca by the municipal division, the service was transferred from Pedro Miguel to Balboa when Thatcher Highway was opened in September 1932.

INTERIOR TRAFFIC INCREASES

The transfer resulted in a marked increase of traffic to the interior and it soon became necessary to increase the 24-trip service with only one ferryboat in operation on week days, to continuous service with both ferryboats in operation.

With the beginning of the third locks project in 1939 and the huge development of military installations on the west side of the canal during the same period, it became necessary to augment Thatcher Ferry service. This was done by instituting a ferry service across Miraflores Lake. This was started in August 1940 and continued through June 1942 when Miraflores bridge was opened.

Until the prewar construction program was begun, Thatcher Ferry service was ample for the vehicular traffic across the canal. However, during its heyday in the early forties there were usually long lines of cars waiting at each end of the ferry line, especially on holidays and weekends.

TWO BIG FERRYBOATS BOUGHT

In order to provide increased service, two larger Diesel-electric ferryboats which had been in operation between New York and New Jersey were bought by the canal. The first one, the *Governor Moor*, was lost at sea in January 1942 while being towed to the Isthmus. The second, the *Nawau*, arrived safely in November 1942. After considerable repairs and alterations it was renamed the *Presidente Porras* and placed in service in February 1943.

The top year in ferry operations came during the fiscal year 1941 when 992,000 cars and 5,590,000 passengers were ferried across the canal by Thatcher Ferry and 422,000 vehicles and 1,500,000 passengers used Miraflores Ferry.

After Miraflores Bridge was opened to cross-canal traffic in 1942 the ferry business slumped badly. Miraflores Ferry was closed, except for a 3-day period in 1943 when the bridge was out of service, and the number of cars and passengers using Thatcher Ferry

dropped to 480,000 and 3,200,000, respectively, in 1943.

OVER 500,000 CARS ANNUALLY

The business showed a slight increase after that when the novelty of crossing the canal by bridge had worn off and while gasoline rationing was in effect. Since 1943 the traffic over Thatcher Ferry has settled down to a comparatively steady business with 500,000 to 600,000 cars a year and between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 passengers.

Thatcher Ferry, aside from its astronomical statistics, has made an amazing safety record. Not a single passenger has been injured as a result of ferry operations and the few dented fenders have resulted largely from inept driving.

It has made countless "mercy missions" or emergency trips but it has yet to record a birth aboard one of the ferriboats, a record surpassed several times by the Panama Railroad.

Corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the public is in revolt because of recent disclosures in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Twenty years of entrenched government is sufficient to sow the seeds of corruption and the Democratic administration is reaping the fruits of its own political power. The Sunday Star for yesterday calls the turn on this situation and I include it as part of my remarks:

CORRUPTION IN THE CITADEL

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, with all of the power that it exercises over the most intimate financial affairs of the people, should be a stronghold of integrity. To an extent that applies to few other agencies, this branch of the Government should be manned by people who are above and beyond suspicion. This is why the disclosures of widespread corruption within the Bureau have come as such a shock to most people. The adverse effect of the revelations could hardly have been greater if, overnight, it had been revealed that the FBI was staffed by men with sticky palms.

What has reduced the Bureau of Internal Revenue to this low estate? What has happened to the agency which, under the late Elmer Irey, won such wide acclaim as the arch foe of gangsters and grafters, and which locked the prison doors on such unsavory characters as Al Capone and Waxy Gordon?

There can be little argument as to the answer. The Bureau has been corrupted by the intrusion of a brand of politics which makes no adequate distinction between political loyalty and personal integrity. The posts of collectors of internal revenue traditionally have been treated as political plums. But they have not traditionally been handed out on a purely political basis. Merit and personal character have been regarded as essential qualifications.

It is impossible, however, to avoid the inference that merit and character have had scant consideration in some recent appointments. What other conclusion is possible in light of the fact that Internal Revenue officials in Boston, St. Louis, New York, Newark, San Francisco, and Los Angeles have

been fired or have resigned under pressure? One expects to find an occasional bad apple in any barrel. But when there is such extensive rottenness as this, it cannot be explained away on any theory of chance.

In the course of time Federal grand juries no doubt will get to the bottom of the mess, and the officials who have been guilty of actual law violations presumably will be tried and, if convicted, sent to jail. It is a significant—and disturbing—fact, however, that most of the suspensions and resignations have been the result, not of a determined and energetic housecleaning within the bureau, but as a consequence of disclosures by outside agencies, such as the California Crime Commission and the King subcommittee of the House. It is entirely possible that, had it not been for this external prodding, there would still have been no clean-up within the bureau.

The new Revenue Commissioner, John B. Dunlap, seems to be moving energetically to get rid of the shady officials in the bureau. And he says that the President has assured him of "100 percent support" in keeping the bureau "above reproach."

But something more is needed. It is not truly a question of keeping the bureau above reproach, for the bureau has already been seriously discredited. It is necessary, of course, to drive out the grafters and the incompetents. But if the bureau is ever to regain its lost standing, there must be some assurance that one bevy of political hacks and chiselers is not going to be replaced by another equally undesirable group. The Hoover Commission has said that political appointments are "one of the chief handicaps" of the bureau, and a dismissed collector has stated that politicians pressured him into hiring incompetent agents.

If President Truman wants to revive public confidence in this bureau and it is a bureau which must enjoy public confidence if it is to function, he ought to give unqualified assurance that no one will be appointed to office in the bureau simply because he has been a loyal ward heeler or because he has been generous in contributions to ward-heeler politicians.

Why Not a Bounty on Unnecessary Federal Employees?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, farmers have long had the protection of State bounty laws which provide a financial incentive for getting rid of noxious animals or birds of prey that destroy crops or farm animals.

Perhaps this same bounty idea could be applied profitably to the problem of decreasing the swarms of Federal office- and job-holders who today are devouring the Nation's substance. Suppose key supervisory and personnel officials in the multitudinous executive departments, bureaus, agencies and commissions were given a cash incentive to reduce the number of their employees—say \$500 "a head" for every nonessential worker removed from the Federal payroll.

Think it sounds silly? Well, it couldn't possibly be as silly as the existing situation under which these key supervisory and personnel officials actually have a

personal financial incentive to increase the number of their subordinates.

Let me quote a statement which I made in speeches a couple of years ago regarding the Hoover Commission findings:

They (the Hoover Commission task forces) found in many instances personnel supervisors are compensated according to the number of employees they have under them, rather than on the basis of efficiency and economy displayed in their conduct of the work they supervise.

Nothing has happened since the publication of the Hoover report to indicate any change in that basic philosophy and procedure which makes it personally profitable for bigger bureaucrats to create more and more lesser bureaucrats. On the contrary, the swelling Federal payrolls reported by Senator Byrd's Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures show that the situation is unchanged. And besides the personal financial incentive affecting the personnel supervisors there is the political incentive for the administration to increase payrolls, based on the Fair Deal theory that each person on the Federal payroll represents four votes for the party.

Here is the latest report by Senator Byrd's committee. The total number of civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government is now past the two and one-half million mark for the first time in 5 years. The civilian payroll for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1951, totaled \$7,719,076,000, a 17 percent increase over the previous year. Indications are that the payroll this current year will approach, if not exceed, \$10,000,000,000—compared with the World War II peak of \$8,300,000,000.

Of course, there are thousands of necessary, conscientious, and capable Federal employees. But there are also thousands of unnecessary ones, thousands who lack the competence to make good in private employment, thousands who waste hours in department cafeterias and lounges or in needless paper shuffling. And one of the most disturbing features of the situation is the failure of the present Democratic-controlled Congress to approve payroll-reduction amendments to appropriation bills.

Why should not Congress provide a reverse incentive so far as Federal jobs are concerned? I am considering introduction of legislation to pay a \$500 "bounty" to the responsible supervisory or personnel officials for each Federal employee he actually and permanently separates from the Federal payroll; also a provision that any such supervisory employee who added a new and unnecessary employee in his department or agency would himself be fired. The bounty payments could be made from payroll appropriations already voted by Congress.

Even if the \$500 bounty were in the form of an increase in the annual salary of the supervisory officials, the taxpayers would still be far ahead financially. The Byrd committee reports that the average annual salary of Federal employees is approximately \$3,600. Suppose 1,000 employees were removed under this bounty system and that the responsible supervisors received a total of \$500,000 in

bounties. Since the 1,000 discharged employees would represent \$3,800,000 in aggregate annual salaries on the basis of the average, the net saving to the taxpayers would still be \$3,100,000 a year.

Is it not at least as important to protect the national economy from the predatory raids of the tax eaters as it is for the farmer to protect his crops and other property from birds of prey or noxious animals?

One Example of Military Spending That Could Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Petaluma (Calif.) Argus-Courier, under the date of September 22, 1951.

The largest peacetime military appropriations bill in the history of our country—amounting to nearly \$80,000,000—is under consideration by the Congress. None of us doubt the necessity of building up our Armed Forces for national defense—especially in view of the emergency conditions which presently exist. However, I am advised that in excess of \$4,500,000 has been allocated the Armed Forces to conduct advertising campaigns to promote their recruiting programs. Considerable doubt has been expressed as to whether the medias presently used by the services attain necessary and complete coverage.

Also, in view of the fact that our young men are being drafted to meet requirements of the Armed Forces, it would seem that an adequate recruiting program could be conducted with less expense.

The editorial in reference to above, entitled: "Military Spending," is based upon the unnecessary features of such spending. I call it to your attention as not only being very appropriate—but containing sound reasoning on the question of military appropriations. It is as follows:

MILITARY SPENDING

In a time of world tension military spending mounts rapidly. The services expand their civilian arms excessively, military procurement is extravagant, and whatever Congress grants the services never seems to be as much as they need or want. It is difficult for anyone except military experts to know exactly what is needed, and so Congress is disposed to grant the armed services what they seek. And anyone who dares to suggest that too much money is being appropriated is likely to be assailed by some easy spender or demagogue as one who would leave the country wide open to the enemy.

An Associated Press dispatch carries the story of an Army and Air Force plan for an extravagant recruiting program to be carried on this fall and winter. The services would pay \$668,000 to a singer and sports broadcaster for network programs. Several members of the Senate Appropriations Com-

mittee have denounced the plan as excessive and unwarranted, and one has said that he would ask that a ban against the proposed expenditures be written into the military appropriations bill.

Most of the services carry on more or less elaborate recruiting programs. They maintain recruiting stations in many communities throughout the Nation. The personnel who man these stations are chair soldiers, who might well be doing more effective work for the Nation in an essential military field. With a draft program a recruiting program hardly seems necessary. The armed services can obtain all the men they need through the draft.

Here is one example of military waste that can be attacked without fear of being assailed as a Communist sympathizer. We suggest, however, that it is not the only form in which the military services are being extravagant, and that Congress should scrutinize every military spending program as carefully as any nonmilitary spending program. We should get rid of the idea that a military appropriation is untouchable.

The armed services themselves would benefit from any pruning of their budget that can be done without impairing their military effectiveness. For they not only contribute to inflation because of the size of their spending program, but they are also the victims of inflation in that they, too, are caught in the tide of rising prices. The cost of maintaining one soldier has increased tremendously since World War II.

We have placed most of our emphasis on cutting nondefense expenditures, when we should be emphasizing cutting all expenditures.

Prophecy To Be Fulfilled?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have received from a constituent the following letter dated September 7, 1951:

Hon. ANGIER LOUIS GOODWIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I enclose a clipping which recently came to my attention.

I thought it would be of interest to you.

It would appear that the prophecy of Senator Hill of 73 years ago is about to be fulfilled, unless our congressional leaders take prompt steps to correct this condition.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD PAGE.

On September 11, 1951, the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item, an enterprising newspaper published in my district, printed as an editorial on its first page this prophecy of former Senator Hill. It appears that the subject matter of this 73-year-old speech has aroused widespread interest and so under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the editorial herewith for the benefit of my colleagues:

PROPHECY TO BE FULFILLED?

(Extract from a speech made by Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill in the United States Senate, March 27, 1878)

But, sir, I have said I do not dread these corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain,

and control them; but there is a corporation we may all dread. That corporation is the Federal Government. From the aggression of this corporation there can be no safety. If it is allowed to go beyond the bounds, the well-defined limits of its power. I dread nothing so much as the exercise of ungranted and doubtful powers by this Government. It is, in my opinion, the danger of dangers to the future of this country. Let us be sure we keep it always within its limits.

If this great, ambitious, ever-growing corporation becomes oppressive, who shall check it? If it becomes wayward, who shall trust it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust it? As sentinels on the country's watchtower, Senators, I beseech you, watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and rights, all States and people, and all liberty and hope its playthings in an hour and its victims forever.

Recommendations by New Mexico Cattle Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD excerpts from the resolutions adopted by the New Mexico cattle Growers Association at their quarterly meeting in Gallup, N. Mex., on September 7 and 8, 1951. This is an association of fine, progressive businessmen engaged in the largest industry in the State of New Mexico, and the resolutions adopted by them after deliberations are of such importance that I felt attention should be called to them for the information of all the Members of Congress and of the departments affected.

The association: First, deplores the loss of over 100,000 acres of forest land through fires, in part accelerated by failure of the Forest Service to permit full utilization of forage and recommends full and complete investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture; second, commends the Department of Agriculture for its new so-called three-step method of evaluating range and forest conditions and recommends fair trial of this new method before putting further grazing limitations into effect; third, recommends against any system of program planning such as that apparently envisioned by the so-called family farm policy review; fourth, recommends that a uniform code of administration for all public grazing lands be enacted before consolidation of such grazing lands in one administration as recommended by the Hoover Commission; and, fifth, recommends enactment of legislation providing compensation for damage incurred to deeded land by the exploration of federally reserved oil and gas minerals therein.

The following are excerpts from the resolutions:

FOREST FIRE DESTRUCTION

Whereas destructive fires in national forests of New Mexico and Arizona have burned over more than a hundred thousand acres

of valuable grazing and timber lands since the first of the year; and

Whereas this loss of forage and timber will be felt for many years in the southwest, and will result in serious soil erosion on vital watershed lands of this region, and

Whereas the tremendous cost to the United States Government in controlling these fires can only lead to requests for increased appropriations for the Forest Service, and

Whereas the livestock industry of this State has repeatedly warned officials of the United States Forest Service that their policy of drastically reducing grazing on forest lands would create a serious and destructive fire hazard, through the growth of waste and uncut grass and forage which serves as a tinder box during the summer fire season, and

Whereas we recognize that an undue fire hazard was caused this year because of drought conditions, but feel it important to point out that the most serious fires occurred where the raising of livestock had been most drastically curtailed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we ask the Secretary of Agriculture in the interest of conservation and increased meat production to make a full and complete investigation of the serious fire hazards now being created on western ranges of the national forest, with a view toward preventing this continued destruction to our lands and this important natural resource

FOREST SERVICE RESEARCH

Whereas the United States Forest Service in recognition of the fact that their current analysis of forest range conditions and trends have not been accurate, has recently developed a new, so-called three-step method of evaluating range and forage conditions, and

Whereas leading range research men in the Forest Service report that the new system will give a true and correct picture of the relative improvement or deterioration of rangeland conditions, and

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture is to be commended for recognizing the need for a new and improved scientific method of rangeland analysis, and should also recognize and seek advice and counsel of all classes of land users on a local level while conducting further experimental work of this kind, and

Whereas, acknowledgment on part of high officials of the United States Forest Service, that past and recent methods of evaluating rangeland conditions have been inaccurate. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby petition the Secretary of Agriculture to direct the Chief of the United States Forest Service to cancel future reductions in grazing permits on forest lands until such time as the three-step method can be put into operation and given a fair trial in the field.

FAMILY FARM POLICY REVIEW

Whereas the livestock industry of New Mexico has been and is well served by the extension research and instruction services of our land-grant college and the Federal agencies cooperating therewith; and

Whereas the livestock growers of New Mexico individually and collectively now take an active part in the formulating of research and extension programs which are of mutual benefit to all, and

Whereas we believe that the agricultural interests of this State are best served by extension and research programs developed by the people of New Mexico at the local, county, and State level in cooperation with State and county agricultural specialists cooperating with the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas we see no advantage in a system of program planning which would destroy this State and county relationship such as the family farm policy review, with our ag-

ricultural specialists and which would tend to involve the agricultural people of New Mexico in a system of direct line Federal controls and directions.

We, therefore, register protest against moves already taken, proposed or intimated that would subject the members of this organization to further control and direction by agencies in which we have no representation

We further protest such movements or organization of such Federal agencies which tend to usurp the freedom of the agricultural interests of this State, individually or collectively, in drawing up their own agricultural extension, research, and instruction programs.

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, S. 1149

Whereas Senate bill 1149 has been introduced by Senator Aiken and others for the purpose of putting into effect certain recommendations of the Hoover Commission report applying to the administration of public lands; and

Whereas the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association recognizes the need for economy in the Government and realizes the advantages of combining the various public grazing lands under a single unified administration, and

Whereas a consolidation of the existing varied and confusing methods of administration under one agency would serve only to cause more confusion, uncertainty, and lack of stability in the livestock industry, and

Whereas we have endorsed the suggestions for an act to establish a uniform Federal grazing act, proposed by the stockmen's grazing committee. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association urge that a uniform code of administration for all public grazing lands be enacted previous to consolidation of all such grazing lands in one administrative agency as proposed by S. 1149.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE IN EXPLORATION OF RESERVED MINERALS, H. R. 2191

Whereas H. R. 2191 introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman HARRISON of Wyoming provides for a 3-percent royalty payment to reimburse land owners for surface damage to lands which result from oil operations, these lands having been patented with a reservation of oil and gas to the Federal Government. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge and recommend that our Congressmen and Senators from New Mexico work for passage of this legislation.

Treaty With Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, at 10 o'clock this morning, October 1, 1951, the American Ambassador to Denmark, Mrs. Anderson, and Ole Bjorn Kraft, Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, signed a treaty on behalf of their respective governments. This treaty had to do with commerce, navigation, and mutual friendship.

This is the first such treaty to be entered into with a North Atlantic Pact

country since the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty.

But it is not the first such treaty between United States and Denmark.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago—on April 26, 1826—Henry Clay, as Secretary of State, signed just such a treaty for the United States. It is important to note that, for a century and a quarter, it was not deemed necessary to change one word of that 1826 pact.

One hundred and twenty-five years have brought about a need for commercial and navigation adjustments. Those years have wrought no significant alteration in regard to the mutual friendship between these nations.

The orderliness of thought, the deeply ingrained respect for law, of the Danish people is something which the people of the United States may, today, consider and emulate. We, the people of the United States, can balance that great contribution by continuing our respect for and admiration of the Danish people and their understanding government.

It is my prayer that the treaty which was signed this day by the representatives of the Governments of the United States and Denmark may long endure for the mutual advantage of both nations.

United States Seizes Trio in \$100,000,000 Gold-Smuggling Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an AP story which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of September 30, 1951, entitled "United States Seizes Trio in \$100,000,000 Gold-Smuggling Operations":

UNITED STATES SEIZES TRIO IN \$100,000,000 GOLD-SMUGGLING OPERATIONS

New York, September 29 —Federal agents have arrested three men who the Government said today are members of a \$100,000,000-a-year gold-smuggling ring menacing the finances of the United States and other countries.

Assistant United States Attorney Louis I. Kaplan said the Government is watching 50 or 60 persons suspected of buying gold at United States prices and selling it abroad at twice what they paid for it.

The three arrested men purchased \$2,000,000 worth of gold for black-market sales in foreign areas, Mr. Kaplan said. The attorney described them as "a small part of a vast smuggling ring."

They were charged with violating the 1917 Trading With the Enemy Act which makes it illegal to hold or earmark gold in amounts exceeding \$100.

"They represent a small phase of a vicious black-market operation," Mr. Kaplan said, "which is dangerous to the finances of the United States and other nations."

The three Brooklyn men arrested yesterday were identified as Emil Popper, 54; Robert J. Carroll, 41, and Samuel Diamant, 55.

United States Commissioner Isaac Platt released Popper and Diamant in \$15,000 bail each, and Carroll in \$10,000 bail.

Mr. Kaplan said the men obtained the gold through filing false statements with the Treasury Department on the use of the gold, supposedly purchased for the legitimate manufacture of jewelry.

He said Popper originated a jewelry manufacturing firm in Brooklyn, Carroll joined with him, and they were awarded a Treasury license approving the daily purchase of 150 ounces of gold.

Mr. Kaplan said none of the gold they purchased was ever used for making jewelry.

SHIPPED OUT OF COUNTRY

Instead, Mr. Kaplan said, they delivered it to Diamant at a profit to them of \$3 an ounce, or \$450 a day.

Diamant would accumulate quantities of the gold, ship it out of the country or resell it to others for shipment, the prosecutor said.

Federal agents said the ring smuggled gold concealed in new automobiles, lubricating oil, suitcases, and chicken fat, sending it to such black markets as Rotterdam, Bombay, Tangiers, and Uruguay.

The investigation of the ring began last winter with the arrest of Saul Chabot, 51, as his car loaded with \$150,000 worth of gold was being put aboard the liner, *Queen Elizabeth*, Mr. Kaplan said.

On June 28 Chabot was sentenced to 5 years in prison. Mr. Kaplan said sentences of 10 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine may be imposed on the three Brooklyn men if they are convicted.

W. Averell Harriman's Statement Regarding Our Wartime Military Relations With Soviet Union Are Misleading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 27, 1951, W. Averell Harriman, Special Assistant to the President, published a statement regarding our wartime relations with the Soviet Union. In reading this statement it seems to me that the only logical interpretation of various statements made by Mr. Harriman would be that there was close military cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States during World War II.

From the evidence of other competent people this was not the case. Therefore, I have written the following letter to Mr. Harriman:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., September 27, 1951.

HON. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,

Special Assistant to the President,
Executive Office of the White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HARRIMAN: With reference to your statement released August 17, 1951, and notarized July 13, 1951, regarding our wartime relations with the Soviet Union, I am wondering whether you would care to give me your comments on my observations as they concern some of your statements.

In this statement you say:

"The primary objective of the American and British Governments in our relations with the Soviet Union during the war was to keep the Soviet Army as an effective fighting force against Hitler. We sought to do this through the shipment of essential supplies and through the coordination of our military strategy. . . . The principal strategic talks took place when Churchill visited Moscow in August 1942 and at Tehran in November 1943. At this latter conference, Stalin was informed of our plans to land in France, and he undertook to attack shortly after we got ashore in order to prevent the Germans from diverting divisions from the eastern front to the west."

A'so:

"In accordance with Stalin's agreement at Tehran, the Russian armies launched a major offensive on June 22 and tied down and broke through this formidable Nazi force."

"These tremendous and courageous operations by the Soviet Army and the fact that Stalin had honored such a vital military commitment influenced the attitude of British and American representatives in subsequent negotiations with the Soviet Union—and built up favorable opinion for the Soviet Union among the people of the United States and other western allies."

Also, in speaking of your raising the subject with Stalin as early as 1942, you state:

"Shortly thereafter we established exchange of combat intelligence."

Also:

"Concurrently with our negotiations for the conduct of the war, President Roosevelt sought to come to an understanding regarding postwar problems with the Soviet Union."

And:

"At Tehran, in addition to the military matters . . ."

It would seem to me that any reasonable persons would interpret the various quotations from your statement, as set forth above, to mean that there was close military cooperation between the United States forces and the Soviet Union during most of World War II.

From this standpoint, I think that you are misleading the American public the same way they were misled all during the war when our people were told or were given the implication by the administration that our military forces and the Russian military forces were working in close cooperation.

In support of the above opinion, I would like to quote you from the report of General of the Army Dwight Eisenhower in his "Report by the Supreme Commander to the Combined Chiefs of Staff on the Operations in Europe of the Allied Expeditionary Force, June 6, 1944, to May 8, 1945," where on page 83, General Eisenhower states:

"Now that the time was approaching for what, we trusted, would be the final blow to Nazi Germany, a closer coordination with the Russian High Command and mutual understanding of our respective plans became essential. Our first liaison with Moscow had been effected late in 1944 when air operations necessitated the establishment of a coordinated bomb line, but little further had been accomplished. The only link between my headquarters and that of Marshal Stalin was through the medium of the Allied Military Mission in Moscow, and it appeared most difficult to learn of Soviet intentions. [Up to the end of 1944 I had received no information on matters affecting the Russian grand strategy. Although I had expressed my willingness to afford any such information concerning my own over-all plans as the Red army might desire.] At Christmas time, however, following upon a message which I sent to the Combined Chiefs of Staff explaining the difficulty with which I was faced in attempting to evolve plans while still igno-

rant of the Russian intentions, President Roosevelt secured from Marshal Stalin his agreement to receive our representative in order to discuss the correlation of our respective efforts in the forthcoming spring.

"Accordingly, in January, my deputy, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, accompanied by Major General Bull (G 3) and Brigadier General Betts (G-2), journeyed to Moscow for this purpose. The conference proved conspicuously successful. In the course of a discussion ranging over many aspects of the forthcoming campaigns, Marshal Stalin was acquainted with the nature of our own plans, including the timing. He, in turn responded with a full explanation of the great four-pronged offensive, involving from 150 to 160 divisions, which the Red army was preparing to launch. I further gave us an assurance that, in the event of the main offensive being halted by bad weather, the Red army would still conduct local operations, which he believed would so pin down the German armies as to permit no major movement of divisions from east to west during the difficult period of the spring thaw. As events showed, the success of this gigantic offensive proved even greater than had been anticipated. In the meantime, fortified by Marshal Stalin's assurances, we were able to proceed with our own operational plans."

You will note I have enclosed in brackets the most significant sentence there, showing that General Eisenhower had received no information up to the end of 1944 affecting Russian grand strategy. Also, General Eisenhower states that at the end of 1944 he was still ignorant of the Russian intentions.

General Eisenhower's thoughts on military cooperation seem to be at great variance with your opinions.

I would also like to quote you from the book by Capt. Harry Butcher, entitled "My 3 Years With Eisenhower," wherein on page 714, under date of December 5, 1944, Captain Butcher says:

"One thing that was bothering him (Ike) was that although a great deal depends upon the date and scale of the anticipated winter offensive of the Russians, actually he knows nothing definite of their plans."

And, on page 735, under date of December 25, 1944, Captain Butcher says:

"General Ike's most cheering present was the knowledge coming from General Marshall that the President had sent a message to Stalin of the Supreme Commander's desire to send a qualified staff officer to Moscow to exchange information essential to our mutual efforts."

And, on page 753, under date of January 29, 1945, and only 3 months before peace was declared, Captain Butcher says:

"At last a direct contact has been made with Stalin so that the two great forces closing in on Hitler can act with proper intelligence."

I would also like to refer you to a statement made by Ambassador Warren R. Austin, on November 14, 1949, shown on page 945 of the book entitled "A Decade of American Foreign Policy, Basic Documents, 1941-49," wherein Ambassador Austin said:

"During the war we sent a military mission to Moscow to transmit military and technological information to the Soviet forces. That service continued throughout the war despite a complete lack of reciprocal treatment from the Soviet Union."

It would seem to me that, on the basis of the above statements which completely contradict any notion of anything resembling close cooperation between our military forces and the Soviet military forces, your statement should be clarified so that the American people are not misled.

Very truly yours,

TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN,
Congressman, Eleventh District, Illinois.

News Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the new secrecy order promulgated by the President extending to all Government agencies the authority to classify information and refuse to reveal what they consider to be a threat to security, opens a wide avenue to the destruction of the freedom of the press, one of our fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The ease with which it can be interpreted by officials to permit suppression of information that might endanger their own security or that of the administration in power has been amply illustrated by past performances of the present and immediate past administrations.

Who is so blind that he cannot see what will happen if this order is permitted to stand? Have we forgotten the deliberate suppression of information regarding the commitments made at Yalta, Telurran, and Potsdam; the delivery of China to the Reds, now being revealed by the McCarran committee after it is too late; the road blocks thrown in the way of the Committee on Un-American Activities in its attempt to blast subversives from executive departments? There is no question in my mind, but that future news will be doctored or treated to meet the wishes of the administration. The iron curtain will be pulled down so there will be a complete blackout of any news which might be unfavorable to the administration. It will permit the administration to sweep its political dirt under the carpet. What a God-send this would have been to former officials of RFC. How convenient it could be to Charlie Brannan, Oscar Ewing, and others to cover up their use of taxpayers' money to promote their Fair Deal socialistic schemes. Who could fashion a better tool for use in shutting off the disclosures now being made which might prove harmful in the coming election?

The natural results of the secrecy order will be that of making it impossible for the citizens to have the right to criticize their Government. It seems to me that bureaucrats are becoming more and more sensitive and are unable to tolerate criticism. There are some things that the executive department, as well as the Members of Congress, should not, in the interest of national security, make known. However, the Presidential order could be interpreted and used by the sensitive bureaucrat to cover up political dirt and wrongdoings in his department.

Mr. Speaker, it has become more and more the order of the day for the Government to feed out propaganda to the favored few newscasters and political writers and sharply criticize those who disagree with the policies of Government. This political smear and propaganda technique plus reprisals does have its

effect upon some timid souls. I hope the free press of the country will show this order up for what it is. It ought to be rescinded.

A Moral Code for Congressmen of the
United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN Mr. Speaker, this country was founded by a group of people who loved and wanted liberty. The main foundation was built upon the idea that the people themselves must retain all power to govern themselves. They were breaking away from the oppressive European system that had for centuries delegated all power to kings and dictators, and they had conceived the great hope of mankind, that the individual citizen was the important factor, and that these individuals should govern themselves and be a free people.

With great courage and with this divine inspiration toward a new ideal, they came to a new continent and founded our Government.

It was these seeds of thought and the deep-seated desire in the hearts of these men that finally found fruit and culminated in the adoption of our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. In the history of the human family, and excepting only the Holy Bible, the above two documents represent the most sacred proclamation ever devised by man.

In this new kind of government, when a republic was established in America, of all of the offices created by our Constitution the office of Congressman was intended to be the closest to the people and it was this divine conception that gave birth to a free and a new Nation. It was the purpose and the very foundation of this new type of government that these representatives of the people, the Congressmen, who must be elected from the people and by the people each 2 years, should in truth and in fact be the voice and the guiding spirit of the people.

Under this new republic, and by the provisions of the Constitution, the Congress of the United States was given inherent power to write all public laws of a national scope and these laws written by the Congress govern and must be obeyed by the President of the United States, all executive departments, the judges of the courts, and by every individual citizen. They gave to the Congress of the United States the power to enact laws, prescribing the exact duties of all Federal officials; the power to levy taxes, to declare war; to amend and enact new laws, making the entire conduct of this Government subject to the will of the Congress of the United States, which was in turn the voice of the people themselves.

Under this system, through the Congress which had these vast powers, and

as the Congress was next to the people and the voice of the people, the people therefore retained, in fact, the power of government over the President, over the executive departments of the Government, and over the courts of the United States.

The provisions in our Federal Constitution gave the Congress the power to levy taxes, to make appropriations for the payment of all salaries of all Federal officeholders and the power to prescribe the duties and limitation of all other Federal offices. It is clear that by retaining these vast powers in the Congress it was intended and it is a fact that the people who elect and control the Members of Congress, do retain all these powers to themselves.

Considering the size of our Federal Government, the wealth and natural resources of this country and its position of leadership in the world, with these vast powers over all branches of the Government reposing in the Congress of the United States, we can begin to grasp the importance of the office of Congressman under our system of government.

To be a Member of the Congress of the United States, with this vast power and with unlimited opportunities for service to the people that contribute so much to the life, liberty, and happiness of our people, we can begin to get some idea of the importance which should attach to a high code of honor and moral conduct that should govern each individual Member of Congress.

Along with these powers and opportunities for service which the Constitution gives to a Congressman goes the tremendous responsibility that should rest upon each individual Member.

Any man who occupies this exalted position should at all times be conscious of and fully realize that he has an opportunity to uphold the traditions of a free nation and a free people in a system of government that has proven itself to be the best ever designed by man.

The Congress of the United States has more power for good or evil than any institution in the history of the world.

When a Congressman acts or speaks, he should realize that he speaks for and represents, not himself, but for, in fact, approximately 400,000 people, and that when the Congress as a whole enacts a new law, it is speaking and acting for more than 150,000,000 people who have put their trust and confidence and faith in the elected Members of Congress.

The things we do here in the Capital of the United States as a Congress, form the pattern for the Christian and freedom-loving people, not only throughout the United States but throughout the world.

Therefore, each Member of Congress must continuously work to make himself better and wiser and a more courageous man. He must search for the deep, underlying moral fiber of justice, honor, and righteousness that runs through all national issues. He must at all times forget himself, and say to himself, "I represent a free and a Christian people, that would not have me use my sacred trust for any small or evil purpose. I should work hard and inform myself in order that I may be led by the hand of

enlightenment and wisdom rather than stagger down the dark and unknown paths of ignorance. I must at all times be guided by the deep desire of a good people, who put their trust in God and seek His divine will."

The spotlight of public opinion is upon the official conduct of each Member of Congress. This is as it should be and they should never conduct themselves so as to be guilty of any sordid or corrupt act which, if done, would be a shock to the American people. These leaders placed in positions of power by the people should set an example to all other Federal officeholders and to the people themselves.

A Member of Congress should at all times be sober and discreet and moderate in his acts and speech, in representing a sane and free people. Before he speaks he should have something good and wholesome to contribute to his colleagues.

Since coming to Congress I have had the rare opportunity of becoming acquainted with other Members from every section of the Nation. I can truthfully state, and it should be known by the American people, that these men are almost universally men of high moral character, with a sincere desire to uphold the best principles of this American Government of ours, that they are devoted to the principles of honor and justice, and many of them have through long years of service acquired knowledge that makes them specialists in the art of national legislation.

A resolution has been introduced in Congress by our colleague, Mr. BENNETT of Florida, being House Concurrent Resolution 128, that sets forth a code of ethics that should be adhered to by all Government officeholders and employees, including Members of Congress, and this resolution has been referred to a committee of Congress, of which I am a member. This resolution is as follows:

1. Government employee should—
1. Put loyalty to God and country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.
2. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all Governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.
3. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay.
4. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.
5. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not, and never accept favors or benefits from persons doing business with the Government.
6. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office. (A Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.)
7. Engage in no business with the Government either directly or indirectly.
8. Never use any information coming to him in public functions as a means for making private profit.
9. Expose corruption wherever discovered.
10. Never seek to influence another to violate these principles.

It is my opinion that we should give favorable consideration to this resolution, with certain amendments and additions which we can write into this code

of ethics in our committee, and when adopted, I believe that it will be a wholesome thing for Members of Congress, for all Federal officeholders and employees of the Government, and to adopt these resolutions will make a notable contribution to the public services which we all seek to render.

Of course, any moral code cannot be all-inclusive, and each Member of Congress in many instances will have to be guided by an enlightened conscience, yet it is definitely a step in the right direction. It will help us to establish a clean and pure Government, and when this resolution is brought before the Congress of the United States, I recommend its adoption.

If we Members of Congress are truly worthy of moral leadership, this will spread to all other public officials that run this Government; it will inspire our people with the noble purpose and design of this Nation.

It is necessary that the United States not only be the most powerful Nation in the world, it is just as necessary that our moral conduct and high ideals make us worthy of the leadership of an enlightened and Christian world.

During the past 6 years since the close of World War II a crisis has descended upon this country. Within the next 3 or 4 years, in my opinion, events will occur that will determine the outcome of this crisis in the Nation and throughout the world. This period in our national history will determine whether this Nation can endure as a free, Christian Nation, or whether we and the rest of the world will be ground down by the heel of cruel dictators and lose the blessings of justice, and freedom for all mankind.

We in Congress have a large part in laying the plans and directing the course of events that will determine these issues.

New weapons of destruction have been developed that are hundreds of times more powerful than anything heretofore known. The forces for evil and the forces for good are battling over the face of the earth for the possession of the minds and souls of man. Our enemies have possession of some of these destructive weapons; we have many more of them. All good men everywhere are striving to maintain the peace of the world.

Ruthless dictators may plunge us into another war. We must have supremacy in the air, on the sea and in all branches of our Armed Forces, in order to protect these divine principles of freedom, justice and Christianity.

On the other hand, this is a moral struggle that is engulfing the world, and if we win and if righteousness, justice and freedom prevail, we who are the leaders in this Government and who guide our Nation's destiny, must recognize that we ourselves here in Congress must be worthy and must justify ourselves for such moral leadership.

Once during the Civil War a man said to President Lincoln, "Our forces will win because the Lord is on our side," and Lincoln replied, "What I am concerned about is, 'Are we on the side of the Lord?'"

Constitution Being Undermined From Right and Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a challenging article by John S. Knight, editor of the Chicago Daily News, on the subject of our Constitution. Mr. Knight charges that the Constitution is being undermined by those on both right and left. I commend it to the attention of the House.

UNDERMINING OF CONSTITUTION IMPERILS LIBERTY

Monday, September 17, is the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of the ratification of our Constitution.

There will be widespread observance of the event throughout the country, with churches, schools, and patriotic organizations staging programs designed to focus attention upon the importance of the Constitution to the individual citizen.

The Constitution is your and my guaranty that we cannot be deprived of our individual liberties without due process of law; that we can express ourselves freely without fear of prosecution, that we have certain inalienable rights which no budding local, State, or national dictator can strip away at his whim.

The Constitution is a moving, human document. Fifty years before latter-day reformers advocated antiprejudice laws the Constitution was amended to forbid discrimination because of race or color.

The wise men who wrote the Constitution sought to avoid the injustices of European tyranny and thus brought into being a system of checks and balances as between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

They believed that such a form of government would best protect the individual against lust for power and legislative hysteria.

As Donald Richberg wrote recently in the Freeman.

"The founders of our Republic were so fearful that the tyranny of a majority would eventually destroy our liberties that they prohibited the Government itself from making any laws that would limit free speech, a free press, freedom of religion, or freedom of association, or would deny anyone time-honored protections, such as trial by jury or would deprive anyone of essential enjoyments of life, liberty, or property."

From the start, there was much scoffing at the Constitution. The Tories, both in England and the United States, freely predicted that it would never work.

As late as May 23, 1857, Lord Macaulay wrote to an American:

"Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. . . . I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, soon or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both. . . . Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference; that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire, came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

The British thought the United States could not survive the War of 1812; later they expected the Union to be torn apart and destroyed by the Civil War.

Happily, these dire forebodings did not materialize. The rulers of England underestimated the vitality of our young Republic in 1812 just as they misjudged the character and magnificent courage of the immortal Lincoln in 1861.

The Constitution has served us well, withstood many assaults and still remains the keystone to our arch of freedom.

BOTH RIGHT AND LEFT ATTACK OUR BASIC LAW

But let us not minimize the dangers which still beset us.

From the very advent of the New Deal, the Constitution was under attack from both the right and the left. The "thought control" intellectuals considered it outmoded and inadequate to meet changing conditions, the late Gen. Hugh Johnson brushed it aside when the National Recovery Act was rammed through a bewildered and compliant Congress.

Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court by adding men who shared his beliefs and philosophies. Although this device failed, he was later to gain his objective through deaths and resignations from the Court.

Finley Peter Dunne said many years ago that the Supreme Court follows the election returns. This was never so true as when the New Deal was in full flower.

In the Roosevelt era, the American people became conditioned to government by edict, to accepting bureaucratic rulings rather than court decisions; to trusting the personal diplomacy of Roosevelt beyond constitutional limitations.

In his memoirs, Winston Churchill says that he, and not Roosevelt, drafted the Atlantic Charter. "I am glad it should be of record," says Churchill, "that the substance and spirit of what came to be called the Atlantic Charter was in its first draft a British production cast in my own words."

Churchill then tells of prevailing upon Mr. Roosevelt to make "commitments" that no American President had the right to undertake. He goes on to say "The fact alone of the United States, still technically neutral, joining with a belligerent power in making such a declaration was astonishing."

To quote Felix Morley: "It certainly was." On January 11, 1944, President Roosevelt told Congress that agreements reached at both Cairo and Tehran would be submitted to the Senate, adding that he was "thoroughly conversant with the provision of our Constitution." He said also that "there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments."

The Yalta deal which gave Russia certain "preeminent" rights in Mongolia and Manchuria without China's knowledge was mentioned in Roosevelt's last message to Congress on March 1, 1945.

"I am aware," said Roosevelt, "of the constitutional fact" that political arrangements made at Yalta "must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate."

But, as Felix Morley says: "This scrapping of the open-door policy has never been approved by, or even submitted to, the Senate."

Thus was the Constitution circumvented.

RIGHT TO HOLD JOB NOW BEING QUALIFIED

Another constitutional protection that has largely disappeared is the famous "right to work" principle.

With widespread acceptance of what Donald Richberg calls the union closed shop, in many cases the right to earn a living is conditioned, as Richberg says, "by paying dues to a private organization and becoming practically, if not legally, subject to its laws and discipline."

"If a worker voluntarily joins and remains in a union, this is 'government by consent

of the governed.' But if he is forced to join, and forced to stay in, this is government without consent, which the Declaration of Independence denounces as tyranny."

Richberg makes the point that those who advocate the union closed shop argue very earnestly and sincerely that the rule of the majority is the American way—and the democratic way—which makes it possible for men to live and work together effectively and peaceably.

He concedes this is partly true but points out that in our democratic American way of life there are also rights of minorities and of individuals which must be maintained and which a majority is not permitted to deny and destroy.

"Is the right to work," Richberg asks, "without being compelled to join a union, one of those democratic rights?"

Actually, there is no democracy in a situation where the right to work depends upon compulsory union membership, where one cannot withdraw without sacrificing his job.

Yet few people seem concerned over the extension of this arbitrary power, nor is there any agitation to make it unlawful to compel an American citizen to join a union in order to earn a living.

Thus, the Constitution is being conveniently ignored.

U. N. TREATIES COULD LIMIT UNITED STATES FREEDOM

A third major threat to constitutional government is legislation by treaty.

How many people know that a United Nations treaty, ratified by the Senate and signed by the President, automatically becomes the law of our land?

For instance, the U. N. Declaration on Freedom of Information and the Covenant on Human Rights contain provisions which could abolish some of our basic freedoms.

One of the U. N. conventions would restrict freedom of the press in the United States, making our own constitutional guarantees meaningless and of no effect.

This condition is at variance with that in most other countries, which reserve the right, even after a treaty has been signed, to determine to what extent, if at all, they intend to implement its provisions.

Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, is making a vigorous fight to safeguard our system of representative government against the dangers of legislation by treaty.

He said recently that "article 6 of the Constitution provides that a treaty when ratified becomes the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

But, he adds, "the traditional American theory of government was and is that our basic rights are retained by the American people even as against government itself, and are not subject to change or modification unless the Constitution be changed by the people themselves."

His theory is that "since the people expressly reserved these 'retained rights' and did not grant their control to any agency of government, our governing officials have no constitutional power to take them away or modify them, whether by treaties or otherwise."

This is interesting doctrine, but the fact remains that these "rights" can be taken away by the simple method of ratifying a U. N. treaty which is not binding upon other nations in the same sense that it is upon the United States.

The subject of "legislation by treaty" or "government by treaty" is extremely complicated but in effect it simply means this:

The well-meaning proponents of the Covenant on Human Rights or the Convention on Genocide would have the United States ratify treaties which, if enforced, would give the United Nations authority over our national, State, and local governments but, as

George Sokolsky points out, "not to give it similar authority over the administrations of other countries."

Thus, the Constitution can be circumvented if the United States Senate and the President proceed to ratify and sign U. N. treaties now under discussion.

LIBERTY MORE IMPORTANT THAN ONE-WORLD SCHEMES

In this country, it has become the fashion to celebrate United Nations Day and make fine speeches about the accomplishments of an organization for which there was both an idealistic and a practical need.

Without saying that the U. N. has been a failure in every field, even its most staunch supporters must concede that it has fallen far short of its most important task—that of preserving world peace.

The dangers inherent in government by treaty as proposed under U. N. procedure should cause every thoughtful and patriotic American to reread and reread the Constitution of the United States so that he may be sure in his own mind that in striving for a world ideal, we are not yielding some of our previous liberties to a supergovernment shaped in an Old World design.

The Constitution was written by men who understood better than we the price of liberty and the blessings of free institutions.

Let's not scrap it for something that may destroy our heritage.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Well Done Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the National Tribune, the newspaper of veterans of all wars. This timely editorial discusses frankly and fairly the action of Congress in passing H. R. 3193 over the President's veto.

So much misinformation and misunderstanding of the provisions of the measure have been broadcast to the public that I commend the editorial to your careful reading and study.

The opposition to this measure by the press of the country, with an obvious intent to confuse the public as to the real benefits accruing to those veterans who are so wholly incapacitated as to need the aid and attendance of another person is indicative of the prevailing opposition to any and all benefits relating to veterans and their dependents.

I appeal to all of you who have the disabled veterans' interests at heart to fight against this lethargy and callousness toward the men who have fought our wars. We must not forget their sacrifices for us.

The editorial follows:

WELL DONE NOT ENOUGH

Last week the Senate of the United States put the finishing touch on President Truman's veto of H. R. 3193, a bill that will now provide a pension of \$120 monthly for veterans, principally of the world wars, who require regularly the constant aid of

an attendant—men who are blind and bedridden or so nearly so that they have no means of earning a livelihood. The vote was 49 to 9 and was a heartening affirmation of a similar vote in the House of Representatives on August 17 when the body overrode the objections of the Chief Executive by 318 to 45.

A month ago we detailed here the editorial discussion of the House action by the public press and by editors of news magazines which was practically unanimous in its disapproval of the thinking of the House membership. It is indicative of either ignorance or of vehement opposition to any benefits relating to veterans and their dependents that the same sort of caustic criticism has followed Senate approval of the measure. Without exception the news vehicles of the Nation have commended the President for his courage in disapproving the legislation, they have applied to it various nasty connotations such as "pension grabs" and have taken to task those Congressmen who so believed in the necessity for the bill that they overwhelmingly enacted it into law.

Whenever this sort of thing happens, we suffer from mixed emotions. We recognize that our country attained its present stature among nations because of its independence and for the reason that debate on differing opinion has in large measure developed the path we have traveled to greatness. There can be no doubt that each of us has a right to think independently and to reach individual conclusions, and yet, because elected representatives in the Congress are chosen by the people to voice their sentiments, we sometimes wonder whether or not those who vote one way or another on public policy do not at times misrepresent those who send them to Washington. Certainly it is obvious that no Congressman can become fully informed about every matter he must pass upon when the rolls are called, and so most of them depend upon the reports to the floor from committees specially set up to make a study of particular questions and they cast their votes in accord with what seem to be proper recommendations. Therefore, when some Members of the House and Senate very consistently oppose committee suggestions on matters having no relation to party politics—and the question of veterans' benefits has yet to fall within that category—we are wont to believe that nonconformist voting is controlled alone by prejudice.

Under those conditions, it becomes a task indeed to decide not to make a blacklist of opponents of those rights of the veteran class which historic policy and expert testimony dictate must become a part of the law of the land. There can be no question but that the reactions of news writers are shared by some Members of the Congress or votes would be unanimous, and yet we find invariably that decisions on so-called veterans' legislation cross party lines. We find likewise that opinions differ among men who have themselves served their country in uniform. Admitting that we also entertain some prejudices, we take an open-minded look at the objectors' arguments, perhaps get a little hot under the collar and then attempt to examine objectively the votes of the minority even while entertaining some degree of satisfaction that our own ideas have been sustained overwhelmingly and and that those of our comrades who require assistance have won the day.

It is significant, we think, that of the 45 who voted in the House to sustain Mr. Truman's veto of H. R. 3193, 21 were war veterans and that 4 of 9 similar votes in the Senate were likewise cast by former servicemen. These constituted more than 46 percent of the entire opposition and lead to the justified conclusion that the complaints of news commentators that the Congress is

the victim of a vicious and highly organized veteran lobby is a lot of hokum. Substance is given to that claim when one considers that far less than 20 percent of all veterans are associated with any organized movement among men who at some time or another went to war. Therefore, we say that all of this great praise of the President for his courage and outrageous castigation of Congressmen for their lack of it is pure propaganda bunk manufactured in the diseased minds of people who oppose everything for which organized veterans strive.

Then, we feel it wise to examine a little further into the opposition vote. In this instance we can pass up the nonvoters for a variety of reasons, and we find that the non-veteran opponents are mostly motivated by political expediency, by mere constitutional objections to veterans' legislation of any description and by that overworked motive of economy that they practice invariably at the expense of veterans while being ever willing to help all of the other poor in the world. But among the 25 war veterans in both Houses we must look for other reasons. Some, but not by any means all, had rugged war service yet they were born with silver spoons in their mouths or they have attained such success in life that they have not had to rub elbows with the unfortunate, and they permit themselves to be influenced by their own good fortune. There are also those who adhere stanchly to the wishes of their party leaders for partisan reasons. Some never did see any real service in uniform, while still others grew up in the propaganda age of radical social change and, having reached substantial security themselves, are thoroughly in sympathy with that other idea so generally depicted in the press which contends that no veteran not crippled in action has more call upon the public generosity than the rest of the unfortunate and underprivileged.

In our effort to be charitable, we have not and we probably shall not at this time attempt to place our finger upon the dissident few and try to make examples of them by preparing a blacklist, but at the same time we warn our veterans to study closely the voting records we have printed. Those who failed to cast a ballot to override this and other Presidential vetoes are not the best friends that our veterans have ever had, and they must be considered potential enemies of their cause. Under conditions as they exist today when billions are being appropriated to build up new armies from our youth, as we prepare to enlarge materially all of our armed services at almost untold expense, it is not only the height of folly to treat disgracefully with those who have borne arms in the past and who now need a helping hand from their Government but it is also extremely wise to demonstrate to future cannon fodder and to their families that it is the firm intention of our people to treat kindly and sympathetically with the human wreckage of war. Nothing can be more inconsistent than to demand that young men and women come to the defense of the Nation in time of peril and at the same time try to economize at the expense of those who have become dependent upon the public generosity in part, at least, for the very reason that they made great sacrifices when the country was endangered in another period of stress. All of this talk about leveling things off and resorting alone to social-welfare benefits for non-service-connected veterans and their dependents for the reason that "soon almost every young man may be a veteran" or because "everybody gives in the same measure in total war" is a lot of poppycock. It is demonstrably false and it is antiveteran nonsense.

We do not now condemn without giving them an opportunity to explain those who

have voted against veterans, but we think that more courage in opposing the recent veto was shown by those Congressmen who had the greater understanding and followed the yardstick of precedent that has paid dividends. It is not easy to disagree with a party leader when politics are involved, but high principle is what won in this instance, and those who stood by our needy veterans have helped to perpetuate a system which recognizes that there is a vast difference between public service in uniform and out in times of emergency and that the care of veterans and their families in adversity is as much a part of the cost of wars as is the expense of all others of the weapons required to win them. "Well done" is not enough in the way of reward when they have reached the time of greater need.

Coals to Newcastle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, once again the American taxpayer is about to pay a 25,000,000-ton coal bill for V^e tern European countries. It is certainly carrying coals to Newcastle when we ship it from this country to Europe where adequate coal supplies are available. When will the present administration give the American taxpayer some relief from this diabolical situation:

COALS TO NEWCASTLE

According to the estimates of the Economic Commission for Europe, the 1951 shortage of coal for Western Europe will run to about 40,000,000 tons. In the immediate future this deficit can only be filled by exports from the United States. Coal shipments are expected to attain a figure of 25,000,000 tons—the highest amount in history with the exception of the first postwar year of 1946—and, even so, there will be an outstanding shortage of 15,000,000 tons.

This is the kind of situation that makes for the so-called dollar gap. This phrase is much more understandable when rendered underproductivity. There is enough coal underground in Europe to fill Europe's requirements. The trouble involved in getting it out lies with the inefficiency of the operation. European figures for tons per man-hour are far below the American figure. In addition to wider use of machines, the need in Europe is for an increase in the allocation of manpower to the mines. In Britain there has been an over-all drop in the number of workers in the mines, France and Belgium have closed down marginal diggings in mistaken anticipation of a coal surplus for 1951; and in Germany a low rate of investment in the mines combines with a steady drift of workers away from some pits, and a reluctance to move to the most productive veins.

Shortage of miners, of course, is a sociological problem connected with individual desires for an easier way of life. As such it is not easily amenable to democratic control. But, if the miners cannot be forced underground, at least certain inducements can be provided to keep them there or to attract newcomers. Italian mine workers, for instance, are kept away from England by labor-union prohibition. It is reported that thousands of German miners are living in

barracks away from their families. Here a housing program would, at no great expense, accomplish much toward making the miner's lot more attractive. Other measures are necessary, and those measures need to be taken before Europe becomes permanently saddled on the back of America.

Brief on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association has prepared a brief on Communism: Marxism-Leninism, its aims, purposes, objectives, and practices. The document is a concise but full treatise on the subject. The exhaustive research and work of the committee in preparing this brief is fully evidenced by the excellent manner in which the facts are presented. It is a document that should be read by every American citizen to the end that all would be better fortified in the battle that has been joined against the insidious practices of those who would destroy our rights and our freedoms. The committee that prepared this brief is entitled to the highest commendation of the American people.

I place this brief in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and earnestly request that all who have the opportunity of reading it pass it on to their neighbors:

COMMUNISM: MARXISM-LENINISM, ITS AIMS, PURPOSES, OBJECTIVES, AND PRACTICES

This brief is produced to explain why the American Bar Association has resolved to expel and recommended the disbarment of all lawyers who are members of the Communist Party of the United States or who advocate "Marxism-Leninism".¹

¹ The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION I

Whereas the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism call for the establishment in the United States of a dictatorship "untrammeled by law", and

Whereas the American constitutional system and the American principle of individual rights and duties would be violated by such a system, and

Whereas such concept is incompatible with the obligations of a lawyer as an officer of the courts of the United States and the several States. Be it now, therefore

Resolved, That the American Bar Association proceeding only the manner provided in its constitution and bylaws expel from its membership any and every individual who is a member of the Communist Party of the United States, or who advocates Marxism-Leninism; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be referred immediately by the president of the association to an appropriate committee of the association for prompt action.

RESOLUTION II

Be it resolved, That resolution I be referred to all State and local bar associations with the recommendation that they expel from their membership any and every individual who is a member of the Communist Party of

Implicit in this action by the Association is the conviction that Communists and communism constitute a menace to the integrity of the American constitutional system which the association through its membership is sworn to uphold and defend

In the debate on the resolution it became evident that there is widespread ignorance and confusion throughout the United States concerning the nature of communism and concerning the objects and purposes of those people in this country and elsewhere who embrace and follow Communist teachings. In large part the confusion is deliberately created by the Communists themselves. The advancement of the Communist movement in America depends for success upon a general misunderstanding of Communism and of Communist aims on the part of those outside the fold

If the real purposes, aims, tactics and practices of communism were as clear to all Americans as they undoubtedly are to the Communists themselves, the popular revulsion of patriotic Americans against all who follow the conspiratorial cult and the Communist "line" would stop this subversive movement in its tracks

Hence, the purpose of this brief is to acquaint the American people with what communism really is—not by way of objective interpretation but essentially by letting communism speak for itself through its official spokesmen in their authoritative texts:

The Communist Manifesto (C M), Marx and Engels

State and Revolution (S R), Lenin
"Left Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder" (L W), Lenin

Foundations of Leninism (F L), Stalin.
Problems of Leninism (P L), Stalin

"History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" (S H) (Bolsheviks) authorized by the Central Committee of the C P S. U. (B), edited by a Commission of the Central Committee of the C P S. U. (B) and edited by a Commission of the Central Committee of the C P S. U. (B) and published by International Publishers (N. Y. Inc. Copyright 1939, published 1938)

The Communist Manifesto (36 pages—price 10 cents) was published in 1848—but it became and is the Old Testament of and for all Communists. It states the basic theory of communism

Lenin implemented the theory of Marx into actual revolution and (1917) his two books became the new testament of and for all Communists. (For extended reading see Lenin's Collected Works—some 60 volumes.)

Stalin in his two basic volumes has extended the "theory" of Marx and practices of Lenin into the present practical application that now controls the thoughts and actions of 800,000,000 people of the world

The History is a short course—required reading for all Communists, has been translated into some 200 languages and dialects. From time to time in new editions as historical materialism may require, the facts of history are changed or obliterated. It is the

the United States or who advocates Marxism-Leninism; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this report be sent to all State and local bar associations in the United States for the information of the members thereof.

RESOLUTION III

Be it resolved, That the American Bar Association recommend that all State and local bar associations or appropriate authorities immediately commence disciplinary actions of disbarment of all lawyers who are members of the Communist Party of the United States or who advocate Marxism-Leninism (Adopted by House of Delegates, ABA, February 1951).

² For the sake of brevity the initials of these books will be used in this brief.

party bible and replaces the necessity of reading the Old and New Testament.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO (1848)—THE THEORY OR PHILOSOPHY OF MARX AND ENGELS

Seizure of power and retention of power throughout the world by the proletariat is only a matter of time. The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in one single sentence: Abolition of private property."

"And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois, abolition of individuality and freedom. And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at."

"In a word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so, that is just what we intend."

"The charges against communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination."

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i. e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class."

The manifesto then lays down 10 preliminary steps to be attained before the dictatorship of the proletariat takes over.

1 Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes

2 A heavy progressive or graduated income tax

3 Abolition of all right of inheritance.

4 Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels

5 Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

6 Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state

7 Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan

8 Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries, gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.

10 Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of child factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc

The final paragraph of the manifesto:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win

REVOLUTION—FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Is the dictatorship of the proletariat to come into power by revolution in the sense of a peaceful political or economic change within the framework of any government, or does revolution mean force and violence?

We have already said above and shall show more fully later that the teaching of Marx and Engels regarding the inevitability of a

³ As defined by the authors: (1) We are all "bourgeois," (2) we are now living in the epoch of imperialism; (3) "peasants" are human beings as distinguished from "bourgeois," "workers," and "intelligentsia."

violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. It cannot be replaced by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through withering away, but, as a general rule, only through violent revolution. * * * The necessity of systematically fostering among the masses this point of view about violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' teaching.

The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution (Lenin, S. H. 19-20).

It is clear that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and the most ruthless war waged by the new class against the * * * enemy * * * the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, and victory over the bourgeoisie is impossible, without a long, stubborn and desperate war of life and death, a war which requires perseverance, discipline, firmness, inflexibility, and unity of will" (Lenin, L. W. 9).

"It follows that for revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or at least a majority of the class-conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; secondly, that the ruling classes be in a state of governmental crisis * * * and makes it possible for the revolutionaries to overthrow it rapidly" (Lenin, L. W. 65).

Stalin confirms.

"Can such a radical transformation of the old bourgeois system of society be achieved without a violent revolution without the dictatorship of the proletariat?"

"Obviously not. To think that such a revolution can be carried out peacefully within the framework of bourgeois democracy * * * means one of two things. It means either madness, and the loss of normal human understanding, or else an open and gross repudiation of the proletarian revolution" (Stalin, P. L. 20).

"Lenin always taught that without a revolution of the working class capitalism cannot be overthrown" (S. H. 168).

Finally, as to the Marx, Engels, Lenin definition of "Revolution" (Lenin is contemptuously castigating his "fellow travelers", (the Mensheviks) who argued for "Revolution" as a theory to be accomplished by peaceful means):

"Have these gentlemen ever seen a revolution? Revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritative thing possible. It is an act in which one section of the population imposes its will on the other by means of rifles, bayonets, cannon, i. e., by highly authoritative means and the victorious party is inevitably forced to maintain its supremacy by means of that fear which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. (Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day had it not relied on the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Are we not, on the contrary, entitled to blame the Commune for not having made sufficient use of this authority?) And so, either—or; either the anti-authoritarians do not know what they are talking about, in which case they merely sow confusion; or they do know, in which case they are betraying the cause of the proletariat. In either case they serve only the interests of reactions" (Lenin, S. R. 53).

IS THE REVOLUTION LIMITED TO CONTINENTAL RUSSIA?

"International imperialism with all the might of its capital and its highly organized military technique, which represents a real force, a real fortress of international capital, could under no circumstances, under no possible conditions, live side by side with the

Soviet Republic, both because of its objective situation and because of the economic interests of the capitalist class which was incorporated in it, it could not do this because of commercial ties and of international financial relationships. A conflict is inevitable. This is the greatest difficulty of the Russian Revolution, its greatest historical problem; the necessity to call forth the world revolution" (Stalin, P. L. 20).

Stalin quoting Lenin (Collected Works, Russian edition) says:

"We are living," Lenin writes, "not merely in a state but in a system of states, and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. This means that if the proletariat, as the ruling class, wants to and will rule, it must prove it also by military organization."

"Clear, one would think!" (Stalin, P. L. 67.)

Stalin quotes Lenin again on world revolution:

"Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity, come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states" (Collected Works) (Stalin, P. L. 69).

Again he quotes and states:

"The existence of two diametrically opposed social systems gives rise to the constant menace of capitalist blockade, or other forms of economic pressure, of armed intervention, of restoration. Consequently, nothing but a victorious socialist revolution in a number of countries can provide the guaranty for the final victory of socialism, that is to say, guaranties against restoration. * * * Leninism teaches that the final victory of socialism, in the sense of full guaranty against the restoration of bourgeois relations, is possible only on an international scale" (Stalin, P. L. 71).

"Imperialism has not only made revolution a practical necessity, it has created favorable conditions for a direct attack on the citadels of capitalism" (Stalin, P. L. 13).

"The main task of contemporary communism in western Europe and America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly the concrete path, or the particular turn of events that will bring the masses right up to the real, decisive, last and great revolutionary struggles" (Lenin, L. W. 78).

"We do not know which spark will kindle the conflagration" (Lenin, L. W. 79).

"Then there is the question: can a country in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, consider itself fully guaranteed against foreign intervention, and consequently against the restoration of the old order, without the victory of the revolution in a number of other countries, a question which must be answered in the negative" (Stalin, P. L. 62).

"What is needed is the ability to find at any moment that particular link in the chain which must be grasped with all one's might to gain control of the whole chain and pass without a hitch to the next link" (Lenin) (Stalin, P. L. 190).

POWER AND POWER ALONE IS THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPT OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Both in theory and in practice the ultimate aim of communism is the establish-

ment throughout the world of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The question of power is the fundamental question of revolution. The seizure of power is only the beginning. Therefore, the important thing is to retain power, to consolidate it and make it invincible. What is required to attain this end? At least three main tasks confronting the proletariat on the morrow of its victory must be fulfilled. They are: (a) to break the resistance of the landed proprietors and capitalists now overthrown and expropriated by the revolution, and to liquidate every attempt they make to restore the power of capital; (b) to organize construction in such a way as will rally all toilers around the proletariat and prepare the way for the liquidation, the extinction of classes; (c) to arm the revolution and to organize the army of the revolution for the struggle against the external enemy and for the struggle against imperialism.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary in order to carry out and fulfill these tasks" (Stalin, P. L.).

"The supreme principle of the dictatorship is the preservation of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, in order that the proletariat may continue to retain the leading role and state power" (Stalin, P. L. 24).

"It by no means follows that during the period of construction, the coercive side of the dictatorship has fallen away, or can fall away. The organs of suppression, the army and other organizations, are as necessary now in the period of construction as they were during the civil war period" (Stalin, P. L. 27).

"You will have to go through 15, 20 or even 50 years of civil and international war" (Marx) (Stalin, P. L. 47).

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on violence against the bourgeoisie" (Stalin, P. L. 41).

"The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a concept of the state. The dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily include the concept of violence. There is no dictatorship without violence. If dictatorship is to be understood in the strict sense of the term Lenin defines dictatorship of the proletariat as 'power based directly on violence' (Collected Works) (P. L.).

"To put it briefly: the dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a domination that is untrammelled by law and based on violence and enjoys the sympathy and support of the toiling and exploited masses (cf. Lenin, State and Revolution)" (Stalin, P. L.).

"THE PARTY" IS THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, AND ARE THE MASSES THE PARTY?

"One of the most important ideas of Marxism on the subject of the state, namely, (1) the idea of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'.

"The state, that is, the proletariat organized as the ruling class" (Lenin, S. R. 23).

"The proletariat needs state power, the centralized organization of violence" (Lenin, S. R. 23).

"Only the class conscious minority (that is, the party, J. S.) can lead the broad masses of the workers. That it is precisely in this sense that by the dictatorship of the proletariat we mean, in essence, the dictatorship of its organized and class conscious minority" (Stalin, P. L. 36).

"Not a single important decision is arrived at by the mass organizations of the proletariat without directions from the party" (Stalin, P. L. 36).

"The party, with a membership of several hundred thousand, leads the Soviets, with their national and local ramifications, which embraces several millions of people" (Stalin, P. L. 39).

"Any other conception of leadership is syndicalism, anarchism, bureaucracy or anything you please; but not Bolshevism, not Leninism" (Stalin, P. L. 53).

"Every army at war must have an experienced staff if it is to avoid certain defeat. All the more reason, therefore, why the proletariat must have such a general staff if it is to prevent itself from being routed by its accursed enemies. But where is this general staff? Only the revolutionary party of the proletariat can serve as this general staff. A working class without a revolutionary party is like an army without a general staff. The party is the military staff of the proletariat."

The disciplined party, says Lenin, will not enroll:

* * * every professor and student.
* * * every sympathizer and striker (Lenin, F. L.).

"Only the Soviet state organization can definitely destroy at one blow the old, i. e., the bourgeois administrative and judicial apparatus" (Stalin, F. L.).

"The Soviet power combines the legislative and executive functions in a single state body" (Stalin, F. L.).

"It follows that the existence of factions is incomplete with party unity and with iron discipline * * * the parties of the Communist International * * * cannot afford to be liberal or to permit the formation of factions. The party is synonymous with unity of will, which leaves no room for any factionalism or division of party control" (F. L.).

The peasants, the largest class and the great majority of the people in Russia, are not part of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The peasants, says Stalin, are the "proletariat's greatest reserve power" (Stalin, F. L. 42).

"Its quintessence (that is, of the dictatorship—J. S.) lies in the organization and discipline of the advanced detachments of the toilers, of their vanguard, their sole leader, the proletariat" (Stalin, F. L. 26).

"Now we must consider the dictatorship of the proletariat from the point of view of its structure, of its mechanism, of the role and significance of the belts, the levers, and the directing force, the totality of which comprise the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat and with the help of which the daily work of the dictatorship of the proletariat is accomplished" (Stalin, P. L. 29).

The organizations are. First, of all these are the workers' trade-unions. They are not party organizations. They constitute a school of communism. They unite the masses of workers with their vanguard.

Secondly, we have the Soviets. The Soviets are mass organizations of all the toilers of town and country. They are not party organizations. The Soviets unite the vast toiling masses with the proletarian vanguard.

Thirdly, we have cooperative societies of all kinds. These are mass organizations of toilers, not party organizations.

Fourthly, there is the Young Communist League. Not a party organization.

Lastly, there is the party of the proletariat, its vanguard. The party's strength lies in the fact that it draws into its ranks all the best elements of the proletariat from all the mass organizations of the proletariat. Its function is to combine the work of all the mass organizations of the proletariat, without exception, and to guide their activities toward a single goal, that of the emancipation of the proletariat. Only the vanguard of the proletariat, its party, is capable of combining and directing the work of the mass organizations of the proletariat. Only the party of the proletariat, only the party of the Communists, is capable of fulfilling this role of chief leader in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Stalin, P. L. 29 to 32.)

"The party realizes the dictatorship of the proletariat. The party is the direct governing vanguard of the proletariat; it is the leader" (Lenin). In this sense the party takes power, the party governs the country" (Stalin, P. L.).

"The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be contrasted with the leadership (the 'dictatorship') of the party. It is inadmissible because the leadership of the party is the principal thing in the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Stalin, P. L. 45).

"Here in the Soviet Union, in the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the fact that not a single important political or organizational question is decided by our Soviet and other mass organizations without direction from the party must be regarded as the highest expression of the leading role of the party. In this sense it could be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is in essence the 'dictatorship' of its vanguard, the 'dictatorship' of its party, as the main guiding force of the proletariat" (Stalin, P. L. 34).

"The political party can organize only a minority of the class in the same way as the really class conscious workers in capitalist society can represent only a minority of all the workers. That is why we must admit that only this class conscious minority can lead the broad masses of the workers" (Collected Works, vol. XXV, p. 347, Russian edition) (Stalin, P. L. 35).

The Short History in its "Conclusion" states:

"The history of the party teaches us that to leave the proletariat without such a party means to leave it without revolutionary leadership, and to leave it without revolutionary leadership means to ruin the cause of the proletarian revolution.

"The history of the party teaches us that the ordinary Social-Democratic Party of the West-European type, brought up under conditions of civil peace, trailing in the wake of the opportunists, dreaming of 'social reforms,' and dreading social revolution, cannot be such a party.

"The history of the party teaches us that only a party of the new type, a Marxist-Leninist party, a party of social revolution, a party capable of preparing the proletariat for decisive battles against the bourgeoisie and of organizing the victory of the proletarian revolution, can be such a party.

"The Bolshevik Party in the U. S. S. R. is such a party" (S. H. 353).

"* * * in the Soviet Union the Bolshevik Party and the State are inseparable" (S. H. 285).

Comment:

(a) Executive, legislative, and judicial powers is confined to the party. Actually it is confined to 10 men who having seized power retain it. There is no majority rule. There is Government only by and from a select few of the minority—the Politburo.

(b) When Lenin seized power from the people who overthrew the Czar in 1917 the Bolshevik Party membership did not exceed 40,000 or 45,000.

In the February 1951 meetings of the American Bar Association, when the house of delegates was considering the resolution to authorize this document a delegate suggested that he had looked up the definition of Bolshevik, and it meant the majority. It does.

Bolshevik—majority.

Menshevik—minority.

By force and violence the Lenin-Stalin Party became the majority and liquidated the minority—the Mensheviks.

The first all-Russian Congress of Soviets met June 3 (16) 1917. The Bolsheviks had 100 delegates. The Mensheviks, Social-Democrats, and others 700 or 800 delegates (S. H. 192).

The Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party met secretly July 26 to August 3, 1917. "At

that time the party had a membership of about 240,000" (S. H. 195-6).

(N. B. Of those present only the names of Comrades Stalin and Molotov are names now extant.)

The seventh congress opened March 6, 1918. "This was the first congress held after our party had taken power * * * the membership at this time was not less than 270,000" (S. H. 218). However, the delegates represented only 145,000 party members (id.).

The eighth congress met in March 1919. It represented 313,766 party members (S. H. 232).

The ninth congress met in March 1920, 611,978 party members (S. H. 254).

"In March 1922, the party held its eleventh congress. It was attended by 522 voting delegates, representing 522,000 party members. The reduction in the membership was due to the party purge which had already begun" (S. H. 260).

"The party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunist elements" (F. L. 118).

In April 1923, the party held its twelfth congress, 386,000 party members (S. H. 282).

In May 1924, the party held its thirteenth congress, 733,881 party members.

"The marked increase in membership * * * was due to the admission of some 250,000 new members under the Lenin enrollment" (S. H. 269).

Lenin died January 21, 1924.

Stalin's vow

"We vow to you, Comrade Lenin, that we will not spare our lives to strengthen and extend the union of toilers to the whole world" (S. H. 269).

The fourteenth congress opened in December 1925, 643,000 party members.

"The reduction was due to a partial purge, a purge of the party organizations in universities and offices to which anti-party elements had gained entrance" (S. H. 276).

The fifteenth congress met in December 1927. In October preceding * * * 724,000 party members voted for the policy of the Central Committee; 4,000, or less than 1 percent for the block of Trotskyites and Zinovievites" (S. H. 285). Zinoviev (later liquidated) and Trotsky, formerly commander in chief of the Red army, and "the chief instigator and ringleader of this gang of assassins and spies was Judas Trotsky" (S. H. 327), were expelled.

The sixteenth congress met June 26 1930—1,260,874 party members (S. H. 320).

The seventeenth congress met in January 1934—1,874,488 party members (S. H. 320).

Apparently as far as the "History" is concerned it was not necessary to meet again. However, it did meet in March, 1939.

"One cannot but recall Lenin's golden words uttered at the Eleventh Congress of our party 'Among the masses of the people, we (Communists—J. S.) are but drops in the ocean'" (Stalin P. L. 59).

Thus the word "Bolshevik"—now "The Party" means the "Majority"; i. e. a "minority" holding control by

(a) "Firm discipline" (S. H. 42).

(b) "The finest members of the class" (S. H. 48).

(c) "Democratic centralism"—Government from the top down—"the subordination of lower party bodies to higher party bodies." (S. H. 49, 89).

(d) The "purge": "Condemnation of all the opposition groups" (S. H. 254).

"This resistance to the party policy was one more reminder that the party needed to be purged of unstable elements. Accordingly, the Central Committee in 1921 organized a party purge, which helped to considerably strengthen the party. Lenin advised that the party be thoroughly cleansed 'of rascals, bureaucrats, dishonest or wavering Communists, and of Mensheviks who have repented their ficade' but who have remained Mensheviks at heart" (S. H. 259).

One hundred and seventy thousand were purged in 1921.

"The party became more closely welded and better disciplined." (S. H. 250) better "disciplined" from the top. The first stage is the purge—(S. H. 295, 360)—the final—liquidation.

However, after a purge and/or liquidation—and death from natural causes, if any, the party requires new members upon whom it can depend to keep the leader in control.

New members are "admitted," but only "on the basis of a strictly individual enrollment of 'people really advanced and really devoted to the cause of the working class, the finest people of our country, drawn above all from among the workers, and also from among peasants and active intelligentsia, who had been tried and tested in various sectors of the struggle for socialism'" (S. H. 329).

THE PRACTICES OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Reading the Communist manifesto was, before the Short History, a must for Communists.

However, assuming the Communist reader could not digest or even read all of the manifesto, or could not read, he was then and now compelled to believe implicitly in the 10 postulates and to believe in but one formula—the dictatorship of the proletariat—where the powers of government, the executive, legislative, and judicial are combined in one body. He must believe that to function the dictatorship of the proletariat shall be controlled by the party; that as a member of the party or a party organization he must obey every edict from the top; that discipline, the purge, liquidation are essential elements of party power.

As in the past, a Communist today must believe that he who makes the laws shall likewise execute the laws and the party in power sit in judgment on its own action.

The individual Communist belongs to the state—not the state to him.

And he does believe it is his duty to the party—not to God, because he has no God—to serve mankind by establishing for him all over the world—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It was logical, therefore, that there be set up in 1919 (March) the Comintern—a Communist-controlled international organization which through long-range planning would prepare the way for the dictatorship of the proletariat in all alien lands.

Stalin in stipulating as a condition to recognition of the Soviet Union, by the United States, that the Comintern would not pursue its objectives in this country, was only zig-zagging and zagging entirely in accordance with Soviet policy (S. H. 73).

Supposedly dissolved during World War II, this international organization now operates as the Cominform under direct orders and financing from Moscow (See congressional committee reports).

Hence, the Communists have "strenuously fought and preserved the viewpoint that it is obligatory to combine legal and illegal forms of struggle, that it is obligatory to participate even in the most reactionary parliament and in a number of other institutions that are restricted by reactionary laws. (Insurance societies, etc.) (Lenin, L. W. 21.)

"It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs (Lenin, L. W. 38).

"When conditions are such that it is often necessary to hide leaders underground, the development of good, reliable, experienced, and authoritative leaders is an especially hard task, and these difficulties cannot be successfully overcome without combining legal with illegal work, without setting the

leaders, among other ways, also on the parliamentary arena" (Lenin, L. W. 47).

Every effort must be made to save the Left Communists and the West European and American revolutionaries, devoted to the working class . . . from deviation from Marxism (Lenin, L. W. 53).

To the one's hands beforehand, openly to tell the enemy who is now better armed than we, whether and when we shall fight him is being stupid, not revolutionary . . .

These politicians of the revolutionary class who are unable to maneuver, to compromise in order to avoid an obviously disadvantageous battle are good for nothing (Lenin, L. W. 58).

In "parliament and every other type of reactionary institution, you must work inside them, precisely because in them there are still workers who are stupefied by the priests and by the desolation of village life; otherwise you run the risk of becoming mere babblers" (Lenin, L. W. 42).

"Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are very bad revolutionaries" (Lenin, L. W. 76).

"What is the difference between revolutionary tactics and reformist tactics? Some are of the opinion that Leninism is opposed to reforms, opposed to compromises and to agreements in general. That is absolutely untrue. Bolsheviks know as well as anybody else that every little bit helps, that under certain conditions reforms in general, and compromises and agreements in particular, are necessary and useful" (Lenin, L. W. 100).

"The revolutionist will accept a reform in order to use it as a means wherewith to link legal work with illegal work, in order to use it as a screen behind which his illegal activities for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie may be intensified" (Stalin, L. W. 101).

So the Communists have (a) infiltrated the labor unions, (b) worked "within parliament", (c) placed their personnel in key positions within the Government; (d) organized front after front; (e) recommended in current official literature more and more infiltration in all schools and universities, (f) infiltrated the press—the radio—the movies—the publishing houses; (g) organized smear campaigns upon both the living and the dead; (h) rewritten their own history of the Soviet Union and distorted our factual history; (i) accepted the benefits of our Bill of Rights in order to destroy our Constitution and form of government, (j) attempted to disorganize our courts and bring judges and justices into disrepute.

In this connection, in 1934, the International Labor Defense (Comintern) issued its pamphlet No. 5 entitled "Under Arrest—Workers Self-Defense in the Courts":

"HOW TO DEFEND YOURSELF IN COURT—WHAT TO DO WHEN ARRESTED AND QUESTIONED"

"FOREWORD"

"This pamphlet is being issued in order to better prepare our whole organization to give leadership to workers on what to do when arrested and questioned, and how to defend themselves in the courts of the capitalist class justice."

A few excerpts are taken from the pamphlet:

"The dignity and 'sanctity' of the courts, are a means of paralyzing the struggle of the workers against capitalist institutions.

"The class struggle goes on in the courtroom as well as it does on the picket line, in the shops, and in the mines. The worker must learn to carry into the courtroom the same determined militancy that brought him there.

"Even though capitalist law makes what you have done a crime, you must plead 'not guilty,' never plead 'guilty.'"

There is a specific section which deals with the conduct to be observed in the courtroom, part of which reads as follows:

"MAKE THE COURT YOUR FORUM"

"Bring out the class issues at the trial. If you are charged with criminal syndicalism, i. e., with teaching or advocating the overthrow of government by force or violence or charged with membership in an organization that advocates and teaches such a doctrine, and then the proof by the district attorney consists of speeches that you made, articles that you wrote, newspapers that you read and support, then it is absolutely necessary for you to use the court for a clear and correct explanation of the economic and social views which you hold, of the facts of the class struggle as applied to your case.

"It is important that you insist upon answering questions put to you in your own way. Do not allow yourself to be bulldozed by the prosecutor and judge who may demand of you a 'Yes' or 'No' answer. You either answer your own way, or not at all."

Note how well the instructions in that pamphlet were followed by defendants and their counsel at the historic trial before Judge Medina and a Federal court jury in New York. Observe the conduct of the Mass Workers during the trial in picketing the court house, jamming the court room, flaunting party line banners and chanting Communist slogans. It was all right out of the book.

WHAT DO THESE GENTLEMEN THINK OF THE UNITED STATES

"Marx splendidly grasped this essence of capitalist democracy, when, in analyzing the experience of the Commune, he said that the oppressed were allowed, once every few years, to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class should be in parliament to represent and repress them.

"To decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and oppress the people through parliament—this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in the parliamentary-constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics" (Lenin, S. R. 40).

Lenin quotes Engels on Marx:

"The ultimate political aim is to overcome the whole state, and therefore democracy as well" (Lenin, S. R. 67).

"Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i. e., exclusion from democracy of the exploiters and oppressors of the people—this is the modification of democracy during the transition from capitalism to communism" (Lenin, S. R. 73).

"In Western Europe and America parliament has become an object of special hatred to the advanced revolutionaries of the working class" (Lenin, L. W. 45-46).

Lenin argues that it is impossible "to bring about victory of the Soviets over parliament without getting our 'Soviet' politicians into parliament, without disrupting parliamentarism from within, without preparing the ground within parliament for the success of the Soviets' forthcoming task of dispersing parliament" (Lenin, L. W. 61).

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

To those not familiar with and who do not fully understand the language of dialectical materialism, as employed by the Communists, it might well appear that the present constitution of the Communist Party of the United States is within the framework of our system of government. To the uninitiated it might be argued convincingly that the Communist Party of the United States is a "political party."

The precepts of our own Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are known to most of us. (Cf. The Key to Peace—Clarence Manion, dean of the College of Law at Notre Dame.)

Most of us will probably agree that our political Old Testament is the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed" (preamble).

Our New Testament is the Constitution of the United States:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America" (preamble).

In contrast, note the preamble to the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States:

"The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism."

The application for party membership when in use contained the preamble:

The membership card of the Communist Party of the United States of America under "Rights and duties of party members" did provide that the members shall "strive to master the program and policies of the party, the principles of Marxism-Leninism."

To make it more difficult to prove that Mr. X is a member the membership cards have been abolished, the membership list is "underground."

However, irrespective of what the body of the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States may seem to say, the members must endorse and absorb the dialectic "principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism."

WHAT IS MARXISM?

Lenin defines it.

"A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Lenin, S. R. 31).

WHAT IS LENINISM?

Stalin defines it.

"Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution, or, to be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, and the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular" (Stalin, F. L.).

"Leninism is a school of theory and practice which trains a special type of worker for the party and the state and creates a special Leninist style. What are the special features (a) the wide outlook of the Russian revolutionist and (b) American practicality."

"Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward. The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the working-class movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of a Communist society" (S. H. 355).

WHAT IS THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT?

Stalin defines it:

"To put it briefly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a domination that is untrammelled by law and based on violence and enjoys the sympathy and support of the toiling and exploited masses" (Stalin, F. 4, supra).

Comment: If it be suggested that nothing has been said about the Constitution of the

U. S. S. R., the answer is that little need be said. Its constitution is camouflage for the unwary.

The U. S. S. R. is governed under that constitution precisely as directed by Stalin and the Politburo. We need pay no more attention to that constitution than does the party's own Short History.

The Eighth Congress of the Soviets (not the Party) adopted a new constitution in November 1930 (S. H. 341-6).

"The Soviet Country thus acquired a new constitution a constitution embodying the victory of socialism and workers' and peasants' democracy" (S. H. 346).

In the Short History, the word party referring to the Bolshevik Party is always spelled with a capital "P." The word "democracy" is spelled with the lower case "d." Dealing with historical materialism the spelling is significant. To the Communist, democracy is a front for capitalism and with the small "d" it is purged. The party with a capital "P" is power—power over and destructive of democracy.

No matter the language used in the body of the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States, to assert the claim that it is a political party the member must accept the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

You may now understand why the American Bar Association has resolved to expel and recommends the disbarment of all lawyers who are members of the Communist Party of the United States, or who advocate Marxism-Leninism.

The advocate of Marxism-Leninism, whether or not a party member, is a Communist and as such must believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat. He must and does, no matter what he says, believe in the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. He has ceased to be an American.

The Communist Party of the United States is not a political party.

It is dominated by Moscow and exists above or below ground awaiting the day of the Revolution.

Perhaps before closing we should "explain" another confusing term—"dialectical materialism."

The Short History devotes pages 105 to 131, inclusive, in explanation of "dialectical and historical materialism" and uses words only to make other words more confusing.

However, being material, if not scientific, we proceed.

In life and time there is neither God nor truth.

Facts are what you make them, if they qualify "in the market place," that is the truth for today. Tomorrow it may be a different market place and an entirely different truth.

Two and two do not make four if the leader determines the answer is three or five.

Being materialists the truth is what those in power say it is.

In history facts, dates, individuals, groups, ideas, and reasons are changed to fit the present occasion, and in the next publication realigned to meet the then present occasion.

Obtain Orwell's "1984" from your library or book seller. Read it and compare it with the stated plans that Marx, Lenin, and Stalin have for us.

But with each set of changing truths, remember that the fact finders have their vision fixed on the terminus of the long road ahead—the ultimate goal—the dictatorship of the proletariat "all over the world."

The writers of this brief enjoy the following quotation from Lenin above all others.

"We want the Socialist revolution with human nature as it is now, with human nature that cannot do without subordination, control, and 'managers.' But if there is subordination, it must be to the armed vanguard to the proletariat" (Lenin, S. R.).

Perhaps that is why "in Russia we abolished the bourgeois legal bar, but it is

returning in the guise of Soviet legal defenders" (L. W.).

CONCLUSION

Adolf Hitler in *Mein Kampf* told the world precisely what he was going to do. Nobody believed him until he did exactly what he said he was going to do. Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin are just as frank. "Clear, one would think," says Mr. Stalin (P. L.). And Stalin is doing precisely as they and he have spelled out the words.

Since the Communist Party of the United States is an integral part of the conspiratorial whole of communism, it is not a political party in any conceivable sense of that expression.

While all members of the Communist Party of the United States are Communist conspirators, all Communist conspirators are not members of the Communist Party. The most important, dangerous, and influential Communists or fellow travelers may be forbidden by their leaders to hold official membership in the party. They may and do have special work to do (cf. Hiss, White, and the like).

The safety of constitutional freedom in the United States demands, first, an exposure of Communist tenets and objectives—Marxism-Leninism—and, secondly, resistance to the advancement of their principles and the promotion of these objectives by any person, party, group, or organization.

Communism, Marxism-Leninism—establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is definitely not a reform movement to make mankind happier, more prosperous, and free. It is a system which destroys freedom and establishes the complete slavery of all who are subject to it. Violence—force—is the only law it recognizes. Violence to obtain power and force to retain it.

Under the thesis of the Communist writers, supra, the individual will have lost both his liberty and his property. His very life hangs precariously on the whim of the dictator.

It was precisely to protect these three basic rights that the American constitutional concept was established by the founding fathers. The avowed purpose of communism is to destroy by force all that our constitutional system was designed to protect.

How can anyone after reading the official Communist writers, seriously contend that the Communist movement is a legal or constitutional project in the United States—where our Federal Constitution and that of all the States expressly calls for the protection of life, liberty, and property?

While they are ridiculing our courts, exciting and inflaming our "minority groups," infiltrating Government departments, labor unions, schools, the press, movies, and radio, you may depend upon the Communist conspirators to promote socialism and socialistic enterprises with their whole heart and to the full extent of their extensive resources. Pointing as they are toward the all-powerful state, they may be depended upon to support the increased domain of government in business, in credit, in transportation, in communication, in housing and power projects. If these socialistic enterprises were not conducive to the advancement of the Communist cause, the Communists would not support them—but they always do.

The conflict between communism and the American Republic is a conflict of basic ideas. It is a war of faith and freedom against despair and despotism. The American constitutional system was, as James Madison said, staked upon our faith in the capacity of

¹ *Dowd's case* (339 U. S. 382, 94 L. ed. 925, 956); *Schneiderman v. U. S.* (330 U. S. 118, 87 L. ed. 1796); *U. S. v. Dennis* (183 Fed. (2d) 201); *U. S. v. Dennis* (U. S. Advance Sheets, June 1951), *Martin v. Law Society of British Columbia* (3 Dom. L. rep. 173).

mankind for self-government. Our Government, rightly restricted by constitutional provisions, checks, balances and Bill of Rights, was given a very narrow, very special assignment. It was not designed to control all of us all around the clock, because the men who designed it were confident that the overwhelming majority of their fellow Americans would always be capable of controlling themselves according to the moral law of Him who created them. Our political and governmental coercions were meant to operate on the periphery of our society; for the eccentric few who had lost the moral power to control themselves. To construct such a system required great faith in God and in man. If our forefathers doubted and distrusted any one thing it was the power of government itself which Washington said was "like fire, a dangerous servant and a fearful master." They had faith in personal freedom as the gift of the Creator and they were confident that freemen under a constitutionally restricted government would build the best of all known civilizations.

It is this citadel of faith and freedom that the Communists now proceed to undermine with their materialistic dispensation of despair. The man whom God made in his own image the Communists would remake into a soulless serf. Read their Communist manifesto and see what they have in store for us—and how much of it they have already accomplished—right here in the United States of America.

That is why the American Bar Association became the vanguard in resolving to oust the fellow travelers of communism and Marxism-Leninism from its rolls, and recommended disbarment by the local bars.

Otherwise, unless we, the people of the United States establish an impassable barrier, as stated by one of the distinguished authors of the God That Failed, the final battle will be between Communists and ex-Communists—because the latter understand precisely the dictatorship of the proletariat—freedom versus slavery.

Defense Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter which was received from a serviceman's wife protesting the provisions of the defense appropriation bill, section 628:

WEST POINT, N. Y., September 24, 1951.
Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The defense appropriation bill contains a provision (sec 628) which may force the services to close their commissaries if the food prices are raised. The closing of these commissaries will cause a hardship for servicemen and their families.

In establishing the present pay scale for the armed services the advantage of low commissary prices was taken into consideration.

If this provision is approved and the prices are raised, causing the commissaries to close, it will amount to a substantial reduction in pay to the servicemen. If this happens a new bill should be approved by both

Houses at once—a new pay raise for the armed services based on the rise in the cost of living.

Little good has been gotten out of the past two pay raises. Quarters allowances were raised from \$37.50 to \$67.50; our rent was raised to \$67.50. Then the allowance was raised from \$67.50 to \$85; so up went our quarters rent to \$85. If the rent had stayed at the \$37.50 level the servicemen could say they had a pay raise; actually they haven't gained a cent.

If the prices in the commissaries are raised 20 percent then the pay should be raised 20 percent or higher.

If the Senators and the Representatives could change places with the service wives for a month, then they would see how foolish the provision is.

I hope you will consider the above facts when the bill comes to a vote.

Yours truly,

(Mrs.) LEVY H. COOK.

In Defense of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, September 26, 1951, Hon. Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, delivered an address at a meeting which was held under the auspices of the Alabama State Agricultural Mobilization Committee at Montgomery, Ala. It is a most informative and interesting address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

(Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan)

It is a real pleasure to have a part in this meeting devoted to one of the most urgent tasks in American history—the mobilization of our agriculture for the defense of freedom in the United States and in the world.

Let me express my pleasure also at being here in the home city of Alabama's distinguished senior Senator, LISTER HILL, who has served in the House and Senate for nearly 30 years. I want to pay tribute also to your very able junior Senator, JOHN SPARKMAN; and to GEORGE GRANT and the other members of the Alabama delegation in the House. The farmers of Alabama and of the Nation are fortunate in having two great friends of the caliber of LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN. No State in the Union is represented by more diligent Senators, nor by men more deeply concerned about the genuine welfare of American agriculture.

The whole Nation is fortunate in having the benefit of their knowledge and energies as we mobilize for defense—as we gather our resources—and as we defend our freedom.

We have made progress in these tasks. We have made so much progress that the plans of those who seek to grind the whole world under the heel of Communist domination will have to be modified.

That could not have been more evident than it was in San Francisco this month.

Out there a group of free nations of the world signed a peace treaty with Japan—a treaty that is unique in history. It is not a document of reprisal, involving huge reparations and other crippling penalties. It is a treaty that will help a defeated people—will help them regain stature and self-respect in the family of nations.

What these free nations did at San Francisco marks a great step forward in international relations.

But that is not all. These free nations gave the Soviet Union and its satellites a real diplomatic licking.

And the man who chiefly administered that licking was Dean Acheson, who has guided with a sure and steady hand the foreign policies of our country in the most critical years of our entire history.

After San Francisco, even most of his critics had to admit that Dean Acheson had done a superb job.

We've made a lot of progress—on the diplomatic front—on the military front—and on the economic front.

Yet the very fact that we have made this progress is one of the reasons why the present situation is critical.

Our enemies are confused and uncertain, and you can never tell what a confused, uncertain enemy is likely to do.

This is no time to relax. This is a time to increase our defense efforts. So I am happy to have this chance to discuss with you the part that agriculture plays in our national mobilization.

It's a good idea at a moment like this to step back and try to look at ourselves from a distance. Otherwise, as the saying goes, we might not see the forest for the trees. We might not see the whole picture—and it is absolutely vital to an understanding of agriculture's role in defense that we do see the whole picture as clearly as possible.

In recent months we've been reading about the plans scientists have for building a space platform, a station of some sort a few hundred miles off the earth.

Not being a scientist, I don't know whether such a platform in space is a practical possibility or not. But for the purpose of stepping back and looking at ourselves—of getting the whole picture of what's taking place on this globe—let's suppose we have such a platform. Let's suppose that we are on it. We're looking at the earth through giant telescopes. We direct our gaze first toward certain areas in Asia. What do we see?

We see a great mass of people seething with unrest. We see four persons out of five living as peasants on the land. We see them working long hours, working with the crudest kind of agricultural implements or no implements at all. We see them cultivating two or three acres and turning over up to nine-tenths of their crop to the landlord.

We see a mass of people, hungry and malnourished, their bodies preyed on by disease, their minds unawakened by education.

We see, in short, a fertile field for the seeds of communism—an eager willingness to turn to any person or any idea that promises a better life.

That's why we must tell the wonderful story of democracy to the whole world. We must show the power of democracy to solve these bitter problems. And we must live democracy here at home as an example of hope for the less fortunate everywhere.

In some areas of the world circumstances have led to the imposition of ruthless, cold-blooded Soviet dictatorship—and there's little that the people of those areas can do about it now.

Now that they are enslaved they are trained by their masters to look only to the state. They live, they work, and they die for the state.

So we see in much of Asia a vast seething lake of communism, a lake that is seeking to push outward, to overrun other lands—like the flooded rivers in the Middle West last summer overreached their boundaries and spread destruction over a large area.

That is the danger the free nations are defending against. Just as the people of the Midwest fought the flooded rivers with dikes, sandbags, and levees, and now seek more effective permanent protection, so the free nations of the world are working today to build up military dikes, economic levees, and permanent measures in defense of freedom to hold back this restless, dangerous Communist lake.

We can turn our telescope on Korea. We see one of the finest armies that ever existed fighting under the flag of the United Nations, determined to hold and drive back the flood wherever it attempts to surge forth.

We can turn our telescope to Indochina. There we see the traditionally fine French soldiers fighting their bitter and bloody battle against another part of the Communist lake.

We can turn to Western Europe. There we see the biggest united effort of all—a total of 12 nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization building a network of dams in economic, cultural, and military fields to preserve the cradle of western civilization against the major threat of the Red flood.

Are we going to succeed in this mighty effort in defense of freedom? Are we building fast enough and strong enough so that the Red lake will be contained—so that it will not break through and have to be drained in blood?

The next few years may provide the answer.

And that brings us to the purpose of this meeting tonight. That brings us to agriculture and its role in defense—and to the mobilization committees and your role in defense.

It is hardly necessary to say that agriculture has an important part to play in the defense picture—in the military aspect and in all other aspects.

Preparedness is not merely steel and manpower.

Preparedness is also food and fiber.

Neither war nor peace can be won without food and fiber.

American food and fiber are both muscle and hope.

It is the great good fortune of this Nation that we have a strong and healthy agriculture.

Only about one working person out of eight in the United States is actually engaged in farming. The other seven have been released from the need to cultivate the land—released by the productivity of our agriculture for work in manufacturing, mining, transportation and other industries. Our Nation is able to use most of its available manpower to build the tremendous industrial economy which gives us our position of leadership in the world today.

From time to time we have all heard a great deal about the alleged advantage in manpower the Soviet Union and its satellites possess over the United States. In terms of population numbers alone it is perfectly true. The Soviet Union and its puppet states comprise about 800,000,000 persons—about one-third of the population of the entire world. This is immense manpower. It impresses one just by its size—especially when we compare it with our own population of a little over a 150,000,000 persons—or with the 275,000,000 persons in the free nations of Europe. The Communist world outnumbered the United States and free Europe almost two to one.

But the United States and free Europe—though outnumbered two to one—outpro-

duce the Soviet bloc in terms of industrial output by about three to one. We in this country produce about as much industrial output as all the rest of the world combined.

Let us never forget that without an efficient agriculture which has released seven-eighths of our manpower from the need to cultivate the soil, we could not have the industrial or the military might that we possess today.

Nor is this all. The fact that we produce an abundance of food helps to make American labor the most efficient labor in the world. It helps make the American fighting man the best all-around fighting man in the world.

The fact that we produce an abundance of fiber is also vital. This year, as you well know, farmers were asked to increase their acreage of cotton by more than 50 percent—and I want to congratulate farmers and the mobilization committees on the way they went over the top.

There were very good reasons why the Nation needed this big increase in cotton production. Cotton is a war crop. It is used to make light, strong, weather-resistant and water-repellent fabrics, yarns and thread. It is used in airplane and balloon fabrics and parachute cloth. It is used for tenting and for clothing the Armed Forces. And cotton linters are used in making smokeless powder, plastics and photographic film. A bale of cotton linters provides enough smokeless powder for 100,000 rounds of rifle ammunition, over 20,000 rounds of machine gun ammunition, 2,700 antiaircraft shells, or 85 rounds of heavy tank ammunition.

These facts are all part of the whole picture of agriculture's role in defense.

Our agriculture, as I have already said, is strong and productive. Farmers are geared up to the job of producing a good 50 percent more per man-hour than they did before World War II. We are producing this year a third more food and fiber than we did in 1940—with fewer people in agriculture and only about the same acreage in cultivation.

There are a good many reasons behind the ability of our agriculture to produce more. Farmers have put back into their business a large share of the income they have earned in the past 10 years. In 1940 American farmers used about \$5,000,000,000 worth of equipment. This year, they are using \$17,500,000,000 worth of equipment. Even allowing for price increases, agriculture is now using two and a half times as much farm equipment as it did in 1940.

This has a great deal of meaning as a factor in farming efficiency. It means that a man can do his field work when conditions are right. He can finish plowing when otherwise he would be caught by a rainy spell. More often now, he can get the weeds out of the fields before they do too much damage. He can harvest his crops faster and more conveniently.

Another big factor in farming efficiency is the immense progress that has been made in bringing electric power into rural regions. Nearly 9 out of 10 farms throughout the country now have power line service—back in 1935 when the REA was started the reverse was true, nearly 9 out of 10 farms did not have power line service.

In the past few years farmers have improved their buildings and fences. Many have invested in higher quality livestock and in improved varieties of seed. With the aid of the soil conservation programs, many farmers have adopted practices and systems which maintain or improve the soil and increase yields.

Another factor of great importance in today's production is the increased use of fertilizer, and more efficient application of fer-

tilizer. Back in 1940 farmers used about 1,800,000 tons of plant nutrients in the form of commercial fertilizers. This year they are using nearly 5,000,000 tons.

Since the end of World War II, several important new insecticides and other chemicals used in farm production have become generally available.

These are statements that apply to the country as a whole. But I am entirely sincere in saying that I don't think any section of the country has made as much agricultural progress in recent years as the South.

You have diversified your production.

You have expanded your livestock industry.

You have increased mechanization.

You have improved your pastures.

You have proved that the old belief that the South had poor soils is just a myth. On the contrary, given proper nutrients and wisely used, your soils compare very well with those of any part of the country. Corn yields in the South have gone up 75 percent in the past 5 years.

These changes are reflected in the general condition of your agriculture.

The proportion of farms operated by tenant-croppers has sharply declined.

Ownership has increased, and many other farmers who are not owners have become independent tenants.

I venture to say that the greatest gains in the country in the level of living of farm-operators are being made in the South.

The South has used to great advantage the programs for price support, conservation, electrification, and agricultural credit. These programs were brought into existence by cooperation and mutual understanding on the part of people in all walks of life and from all parts of the country.

All this has shown up in the production records that are being established this year. In all sincerity I congratulate the farmers of the South on the very good job they are doing.

Now what does all this progress mean? Does it mean that we can slow up—that we can coast along for a while?

Not if we want to play our full role in the defense of freedom.

This year's farm production is setting a new all-time record. But next year we will want to push the record even higher. I'm talking now about over-all production, not about any one crop.

The Department will do its best to provide the information farmers will need as they plan their operations.

Already we have announced guides for wheat and other fall-seeded crops.

The national wheat goal is a little higher than this year's planted acreage. Although wheat is not one of your big crops, I might mention that in Alabama the goal calls for a 36-percent increase over this year's indicated acreage.

The goal for oats in Alabama calls for an increase of 59 percent over this year's indicated acreage.

For winter vegetables, the national acreage suggested is about 6 percent more than the 1951 acreage.

Goals for spring-seeded crops will be announced later this fall.

To assure adequate supplies of feed grains we have just recently announced a higher level of support price on 1952 crop oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums.

So the immediate future is not going to relax the pressure on agriculture. On the contrary, the pressure is increasing—and I would say that the pressure on the mobilization committees particularly is going to increase.

Agricultural productivity depends more than ever before on machinery, fuel, rubber,

chemicals, as well as scientific management and skilled manpower. Not much new land is immediately available for economic production. Farm labor is growing scarcer. Most of the supplies and equipment needed are made in part from scarce or critical materials, which are becoming harder to get.

We need adequate supplies of farm machinery, together with essential repair parts to relieve in part the growing manpower shortage. Without the machinery and parts agriculture needs, production would be badly handicapped. We can't go back to horses to take the place of a shortage of tractors or of fuel. First, we don't have the horses, and, second, even if we did, the result would be less production per man and less production for human consumption.

Fortunately, the rate at which farm machinery was produced during the first 6 months of this year set an all-time record. But for the current quarter of the year, production fell to about the level reached in 1949. And in the fourth quarter of this year, we expect a drop to about 80 percent of the 1949 level. On the demand side, according to a recent survey, farmers need 15 percent more new machinery and 20 percent more parts than they received in 1949.

As matters stand right now, farmers in general still seem to have a fairly adequate supply of machinery on hand. But some farmers don't. And some items of farm machinery are scarcer than others, for example, cotton pickers, crawler tractors, and crawler-tractor repair parts.

What worries us, therefore, is not so much the present supply situation as the downward trend in machinery production.

So far as pesticides are concerned, the supply this crop year has been generally adequate. Industry has increased production of preferred types of pesticides this year to about half again as much as last year's production. There were some distribution problems which prevented some farmers getting supplies when they wanted them, but where these problems were brought to attention, measures were taken to meet such scattered shortages.

One of our biggest headaches, however, is the fertilizer situation.

Increased and more efficient use of fertilizer could be a valuable asset in future abundant farm production. As I mentioned earlier, the fact that farmers are using about 5,000,000 tons of plant nutrients this year in the form of commercial fertilizers, compared with about 1,800,000 tons back in 1940, is partly responsible for this year's record farm output.

But though we have greatly increased the use of fertilizers, we need to speed up the rate of increase in the years ahead. We are not using enough fertilizer this year. The Department estimates that the Nation fell 500,000 tons short of the desirable quantity of nitrogen for use in feed grains and pastures this year. Besides this current deficit, we need to add another 100,000 tons of nitrogen a year to take care of our growing population.

We seem to be in a relatively better position to supply potash needs, but supplies of phosphates are expected to decline next year because the sulfur and sulfuric acid needed for superphosphate production are scarce.

We are working on these problems in two principal ways. First, we are pressing hard for increased industrial production of fertilizer materials in order to bring about a better balance between supplies and needs. Second, we are promoting more efficient use of fertilizer materials within agriculture.

It is in this second part of the over-all job that we look to the agricultural mobilization committees to do a bang-up job in the States and counties. That's where it counts. You can do a tremendous service to the cause of freedom and security by carrying out your part of the mobilization task day by day and week by week.

By urging and example you can help farmers to use their equipment and supplies more effectively.

You guide them on production needs and on shifts in production.

You can help them make better use of their grasslands and pastures through the conservation programs and other programs.

You can help them control the enemies that hold back production—whether insects, rodents, disease, fire, accidents, or whatever.

I want to say that the mobilization committees have been doing a grand job.

We deeply appreciate your efforts. We wish we could tell you that you might take a rest now, because, goodness knows, you've earned it. But instead, I must ask you to work at this vital job of agricultural mobilization even harder, longer, more intensely than ever.

I have complete confidence in you. I know that you will continue to do your part.

Death of Sole Surviving Wisconsin Veteran of Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 29, the sole surviving veteran of the Civil War in my State, Lansing A. Wilcox, of Cadott, formerly of my county, died in the Grand Army Home for Veterans at King, Wis., at the age of 105.

I could not allow the passing of this fine American to go unremembered without reference to him and to the Grand Army of the Republic. As a young man, I remember seeing him march down the street. As I have said, he lived to be 105. Therefore, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record, along with an article from the Milwaukee Journal giving the history of the GAR in our State and in the Nation.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE MEN IN BLUE (Statement by Senator WILEY)

"Under the sod and dew
Waiting the judgment day
Under the one, the Blue
Under the other, the Gray."

There remain today but five surviving veterans of the epic struggle of 1861-65 between the States of the American Union.

Last Saturday the sixth such survivor passed on to his eternal reward. With the death of Lansing A. Wilcox, of Cadott, Wis., there closed for my State the final chapter in the history of the unforgettable Grand Army of the Republic, a splendid, patriotic organization with which we in Wisconsin have been particularly familiar, based upon the tremendous role played by our Badger veterans in it.

Lansing Wilcox had served as national senior vice commander of the GAR, and for several terms as State commander. In 1949, he attended and participated in a one-man meeting of the GAR in my State.

He was born in Kenosha County on March 8, 1846, and enlisted in the Union Army at 18. He was discharged after 3 years of service. He taught school at Cadott, which is very close to my home of Chippewa Falls, in Chippewa County, and served as postmaster there. We of Wisconsin were mighty proud of this stalwart American.

Today there remain, of course, the various affiliated organizations of the GAR in my State including the Women's Relief Corps, which is the official auxiliary of the GAR, the Sons of Union Veterans, and its auxiliary, the Daughters of Union Veterans, and the Ladies of the GAR.

I should like to point out that it is often difficult for succeeding generations to remember the sacrifices made by those who gave their all in order that this country might endure amidst the great crises of its history. It is comparatively easy for us of 1951 to forget the sacrifices of Gettysburg, or Antietam, or for that matter the sacrifices of San Juan Hill and Belleau Wood. The great events of more recent years live in memory far more easily, and even in those instances, oftentimes we forget what our heroes did for us at Iwo Jima and Normandy. And so as we of Wisconsin honor Lansing Wilcox, we summon up these endearing, inspiring memories. We honor all of the men in Blue who with but five exceptions have now gone on to greater glory. We wish for these remaining veterans and for their survivors many more years of continued life. We pledge to them remembrance of the great deeds which they and their comrades performed. We are grateful indeed for these men in Blue who bequeathed for us a Republic intact and unimpaired.

We of the North honor, too, the heroes in Gray who fought so well, so long, and so devotedly for their convictions and principles. Fortunately, we of America are one today. Fortunately, we have never gone the way of Europe with its divided, quarreling states, and for this we should be eternally thankful.

And so, I say for Wisconsin: Hail and farewell, Lansing Wilcox, God bless and rest your eternal soul. May the ideals of you and your comrades be ever our ideals. May Americans ever be united. May the wounds and scars of disunity be closed forever.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 30, 1951]

THE LAST LEAF FALLS, WISCONSIN GAR DEAD—
ONCE VIBRANT FORCE OF CIVIL WAR VETERANS
FADES INTO HISTORY ON DEATH OF WILCOX

"And if I should live to be
The last leaf upon the tree * * *
Let them smile, as I do now
At the old forsaken bough."

—Oliver Wendell Holmes

The last leaf fell Saturday from the gnarled old Grand Army of the Republic in Wisconsin, and with it died the tree.

For the death of 105-year-old Lansing Wilcox, of Cadott—the State's last veteran of the Civil War—knelt the end of Wisconsin's oldest veterans' organization.

Wilcox was the fragile tie to the past, to the days of the boys in blue. His role in the war between the States was minor. It was sufficient that he was in it and out-lived his Wisconsin comrades in arms.

ONLY FIVE LEFT

As long as he lived, the GAR lived. When he died, the colorful, once bolsterous, always patriotic GAR died. The organization lives on in four other States, held together by the existence of five feeble old men whose ages total 629 years.

They are: Douglas T. Story, 106, Los Angeles; William A. Magee, 105, Van Nuys, Calif.; Israel Broadward, 104, Samuels, Idaho; Albert Woolson, 104, Duluth, Minn.; and James A. Hard, 110, Rochester, N. Y.

It was decided at the last Wisconsin GAR encampment in June at Kenosha that the

four allied orders of the GAR would continue in the event of the death of Wilcox.

The groups are the Women's Relief Corps (the official auxiliary of the GAR), the Sons of Union Veterans and its auxiliary, the Daughters of Union Veterans, and the Ladies of the GAR.

REUNION HERE SAVED GAR

When Gen John A Logan, national commander of the GAR, proclaimed the first national Memorial Day in 1868, he wrote:

"Let no vandalism of avarice or neglect, no ravages of time, testify to the present or coming generations that we have forgotten the cost of a free and undivided republic."

Today the ravages of time against which General Logan warned have all but destroyed the great organization of the boys in blue, the army of comrades once more than 400,000 strong.

Wisconsin has long had a special interest in the Grand Army of the Republic. This State was in the vanguard of the organization's founders 85 years ago. A Wisconsin reunion is credited with saving the organization from extinction in 1880, and the city of Milwaukee was the site of great national encampments in 1889 and 1923.

As a national organization the Grand Army of the Republic has now virtually ceased to exist. The last national encampment was held in Indianapolis in 1949, with only six members attending. They ranged in age from 100 to 108. All were deaf; one was blind. Nurses and military police pushed them around the city in wheelchairs. Then they voted to discontinue their national encampments. The man they elected as their final national commander, Theodore A Penland, died September 13, 1950, in Vancouver, Wash. He was 101.

FIRST GAR POST FOUNDED IN 1866

The men of the Union Army formed their first comradeship in battles now famed in American history—Gettysburg, Antietam, Vicksburg—and around "the watch fires of a hundred circling camps" which Julia Ward Howe immortalized in song. The national organization which was to perpetuate this comradeship was founded on April 6, 1866, when a handful of Civil War veterans met at Decatur, Ill., and formed the first post of the Grand Army of the Republic.

The original promoters of the GAR movement were Dr. Benjamin F Stephenson and the Reverend William J Rutledge, surgeon and chaplain of the Fourteenth Illinois Infantry, who had shared a tent during the war.

Wisconsin was quick to join this movement. A soldiers and sailors' league at Madison, headed by Gen James K Proudft, reorganized itself into a GAR post almost immediately after Illinois started the movement rolling. The first Wisconsin GAR encampment was held in Madison June 7, 1866, and Proudft was elected State commander.

STATE LED NATION

The Wisconsin GAR department was actually the first State organization in the Nation. The Illinois department was organized July 12, 1866, more than a month later. However, since the movement originated in Illinois, Wisconsin was content to accept second rank, marching directly behind Illinois in parades.

The Madison GAR post was chartered June 10, 1866. It was named after Cassius Fairchild, a colonel of the Sixteenth Wisconsin Infantry, and later renamed after Lucius Fairchild, a charter member who died in 1896.

The Berlin (Wis.) Post, chartered September 8, 1866, was the only post in the Nation to keep an unbroken record of activity while the other posts were dissolving and reorganizing periodically. For that reason it called itself the oldest post in the Nation.

ONE POST HAD 600 "BOYS"

Other Wisconsin posts organized in 1866, the first year of GAR history, were Ripon, organized June 13; Mazomanie, June 14, Greenbush, June 28; Ahnapec, June 29, and Milwaukee's Phil Sheridan Post, July 31.

Milwaukee posts organized later were named after Gen. John Sedgwick, Robert Mueller, Robert Chivas, E B Wolcott, and George C. Drake. Two other city posts were called the Veteran and Rank and File Posts. The Wolcott Post, organized January 5, was given the coveted No. 1 by the State organization after the older Madison Post had allowed its organization to slump temporarily. The Wolcott Post at its peak had 600 members.

BERLIN POST FORMED CORE OF REVIVAL MOVE

The first 4 years of GAR history were filled with great enthusiasm. In the State of Illinois alone 330 posts were organized before 1870. But this early vigor was followed by a nationwide slump which saw the organization almost disband in its infant years. The period of 1866-77 was marked by an almost complete collapse. In its Illinois birthplace only 25 posts remained on the record books, and only one of these, Rockford, was really active.

Loyal Wisconsin veterans were alarmed by this decline. The slump was dramatized by a State encampment held at Berlin in January 1879 attended by only 3 posts. Collapse of the GAR seemed inevitable.

LETTER SOUNDED RALLY

But the Berlin Post formed the core of a revival movement. The Wisconsin Reunion Association was formed and an all-out effort was begun to revitalize the disbanded army. Letters went out to Union veterans asking them to gather together all their records and reminiscences of the war years and send them to State headquarters. The rallying cry read:

"Comrades, attend to this at once or we shall not know whether you are dead, proud, or gone to Texas."

The association was a smashing success. It organized the great reunion held in Milwaukee June 8, 1880, one of the biggest days in the history of the Civil War veterans' movement.

GENERAL GRANT A GUEST

The 1880 Milwaukee reunion not only revived the GAR and probably saved it from extinction but also earned Milwaukee a great reputation for hospitality. The reunion brought 100,000 people to the 34-year-old city. Neither the hosts nor the guests had seen anything like this tumultuous celebration.

The 40,000 soldiers who attended, many of them not members of the GAR, encamped on North Point, a city of tents situated on what is now Lake Park. The city was elaborately decorated with arches, flags, and miles of bunting.

Gen U S Grant, the ex-President, and Gen Philip H. Sheridan were the honored guests. Old Abe, the famed bald eagle mascot of the Eighth Wisconsin Infantry made one of his last public appearances at the reunion. A huge parade paced by soldiers carrying their tattered battle flags rekindled the old spirit of comradeship. The reunion was called one of the greatest the boys in blue ever had.

IN 1890, ORGANIZATION HAD 409,489 MEMBERS

The Wisconsin revival was repeated all over the Nation. The year 1890 saw the GAR reach its all-time peak, with 409,489 members. (The Union Army had had a total roster of 2,213,365 soldiers. Wisconsin had sent 91,327 men off to fight in the war; 3,801 were killed.)

Milwaukee was also the site for the GAR's national encampment in 1889. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman made his last visit to the city on that occasion. A mock naval

battle staged on Lake Michigan between the revenue cutters *Michigan* and *Andy Johnson* highlighted the celebration.

The Wisconsin Veterans' Home for Civil War veterans, their wives and widows, was authorized at a State encampment held in Milwaukee in February 1887. The home was founded at the Greenwood Park Hotel near Waupaca and was later deeded to the State.

FAIRCHILD ELECTED IN 1886

The fifty-seventh national encampment of the GAR was also held in Milwaukee on September 2-8, 1923.

Wisconsin's Gen Lucius Fairchild, active in the organization almost from the beginning, was elected national GAR commander in 1886. Fairchild was remembered for a determined fight he waged at the 1890 encampment, insisting that Negro posts be admitted to full fellowship in the GAR.

The influence of the veterans' movement in Wisconsin is shown by the fact that in the 35-year period after the Civil War all but two of the State's Governors were Civil War veterans. They were Fairchild, Washburn, Smith, Rusk, Hoard, Peck, Upham, and Schofield.

DEMOCRACY IN RANKS

Originally the GAR leadership was top-heavy with generals and colonels. An early resolution met this threat to a democratic organization by banning military titles and ordering that all members be known as comrade. An attempt to establish a simple three-rank system within the GAR caused much resentment and was abandoned.

The motto of the GAR was "fraternity, charity, and loyalty." Its uniform was dark blue with a black slouch hat. The official badge was a bronze star hung from a strap and a ribbon flag.

MEMORIAL DAY CONTRIBUTED BY GAR

Memorial Day was one of the GAR's greatest contributions to American traditions. It was founded as a result of a suggestion from a GAR soldier who was a native of Germany. He wrote Commander Logan in 1868 and told him of a German custom "to assemble in the springtime and scatter flowers upon the graves of the dead."

The GAR eagerly took up his suggestion and the day quickly took hold throughout the Nation. The observance was later expanded to include homage to the dead of all the Nation's wars, with veterans of the Spanish-American and World Wars joining in.

TIME TOOK ITS TOLL

By its original articles the GAR was intended to stay aloof from the storms of partisan politics. That was a difficult rule to live up to in a period of turbulent political developments. Many GAR historians speak critically of the GAR sallies into the field of politics from time to time, and most of them blame politics for the various slumps in prestige and membership which the army suffered at times in its long career.

The ravages of time that Commander Logan spoke of were the GAR's greatest enemy, however. From its peak of over 400,000 members in 1890, the organization had slipped to 103,258 by 1920. The average age of its members even then was about 80.

By 1921 Wisconsin had only 2,433 members in 158 posts. This was a sharp drop from the 13,987 members and 264 posts of 1889, the peak year.

From 1920 on, the offensive of time rolled faster. By 1930 the national enrollment had plunged to 21,080. In that 1 year, 6,000 members of the Grand Army of the Republic died.

In 1948 the national membership was down to 47. In 1949 it was 10.

The Grand Army of the Republic is nearing the grave.

But when the soldiers are dead the colors will be carried on by affiliated organizations.

Suppression of Information by Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, Members of Congress have viewed with deep concern the announcement by the President of the issuance of an Executive order relating to the classification and release to the public of information by civilian, as well as military, agencies of the Government.

A very significant editorial, citing the dangers in such a restriction of information and possible abuses by bureaucratic agencies, appeared in the Minneapolis Star of last Saturday. It is significant not only because it is the considered editorial opinion of a great newspaper, alert to challenges to a free press and to the American principle that the people are entitled to know what transpires within their Government, but also because it was written by Mr. Nat S. Finney, editorial editor of the Star.

When he was Washington correspondent of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, in 1947, Mr. Finney wrote a series of articles exposing a similar attempt by the administration to impose controls over the free flow of Government information. For his work in this connection Mr. Finney was awarded a Pulitzer prize in journalism, and he also received the Raymond Clapper award.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Minneapolis Star of September 21, 1951, entitled "Security Sickness Attacks Again," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SECURITY SICKNESS ATTACKS AGAIN

Unless the press of the country again stops him, President Harry S. Truman will on October 25 institute throughout the Federal Government a system of suppressing information which was considered necessary only in the military departments until 2 years after World War II.

The system Mr. Truman has announced he will impose is military in origin. It calls for classifying certain information, at the discretion of Government officials, as top secret, secret, confidential, and restricted and imposing the heavy penalties of the Espionage Act upon any Government employee who discloses such information without authorization.

Now, as in October of 1947, the justification offered for using this system throughout all executive departments is that they must occasionally handle classified documents from the State and Defense Departments and the Atomic Energy Commission, and must, therefore, have the same secrecy apparatus employed in these so-called sensitive departments.

Plans to institute the system were discovered in the Veterans' Administration in 1947 when that agency mistook a recommendation of the Security Committee of the State and Defense Departments for a directive and prematurely appointed a security officer and drew up regulations for the classification of information.

SWEEPING DEFINITION

The VA's definition of confidential information is worth repeating now because it recalls the spirit in which these regulations were then approached.

Confidential information was described as information the unauthorized disclosure of which, although not endangering the national security, would be prejudicial to the interests or prestige of the Nation, any governmental activity, or an individual; or would cause administrative embarrassment or difficulty.

The point should be made that the document from which these words were taken in October 1947 was itself classified as restricted, and that getting a copy of it required devious methods. It should be noted that then, as now, the Federal classification system promulgated by the White House describes minimum requirements, and leaves departmental regulations to the discretion of the departments.

Congress, alerted by an aroused American press, subpoenaed executive department officials and documents, and the entire official version of the plan was exposed. It thereafter became dormant, but the executive order under which it was drafted was not rescinded and Mr. Truman, far from acknowledging error, castigated the press for its criticism of the plan.

OPEN DOOR FOR ABUSES

Despite the careful assurances issued by the White House about the nature of the system now proposed, there is no substantial reason to believe it differs in any important respect from the one put forward in 1947. It is inherent in the nature of the system that it must be the same, and that it will contain all the abuses that are tolerated in the military departments because lives can be endangered there by leaks of information.

The essence of the system from the public's point of view is that it empowers officials in the executive departments—often very minor civil servants with no political responsibility—to determine what the public shall be told about what the Government is doing.

There should be no mistake about this, and no wavering confusion. The power to decide what the public shall be told is absolute and unlimited because officials of the executive departments will have complete power to prevent the public from learning what is being kept secret.

It is inherent in this system that no independent review can be had of how the unlimited discretion of officials is used or abused unless the system itself is broken down by Congress or by newspapermen willing to attract secret Government documents and brave the consequences.

The press and the public will be best advised not to place too great reliance in Congress for preventing the abuse of such a system. Congress itself now conducts a major share of its important business in secrecy of one form or another.

IS ALL THIS CALLED FOR?

Is the nature of the world situation such that wholesale subversion of the public's simple right to know what Government is doing is justified? The arguments that it is do not carry conviction.

It has been argued that the Federal Government stands in constant danger of being penetrated, and that this justifies the classification system. The argument is nonsense. If a Dr. Klaus Fuchs penetrates a Government department, the classification system will no more hinder than help him in his work.

Security of information invariably depends upon the reliability of personnel, and the classification system invites spies to place themselves at the defined crossroads of the

traffic in secret information, just as Fuchs placed himself.

Does the system tend to reduce negligence in the handling of secret information? Does it induce security consciousness? These questions have been argued up one side and down the other, and the inevitable conclusion seems to be that a classification system clogs communication to such an extent that the mathematics of probability are against both as much knowledge or as much disclosure. But there is no assurance that leaks of important information will be reduced by impeding the whole flow.

Why, then, adopt the system? Have there been any leaks recently that make it urgent that the executive departments decide what the public shall be told?

In the face of such a lock-up of information, the public might be forgiven for concluding there is some connection between it and the innumerable investigations in the current Democratic Congress. Many of these probes were prompted by unauthorized disclosure of information that led to administrative embarrassment and difficulty; and certainly these disclosures are not increasing our prestige abroad. But no one who understands the spirit behind official determination to adopt the classification system in all departments believes this uncharitable view is by any means the whole picture.

SOURCE OF THE SICKNESS

This stubborn insistence that the public business be conducted in private comes from a coterie of quite able public servants who believe the burden of continuous responsiveness to popular reaction to official acts is intolerable. These men—and any savvy Washington correspondent can name them—conspicuously lack the indispensable capacity of a politician to suffer fools gladly, and they almost visibly wince when required to face the great beast in all its (the people's) whimsicality.

These are men who have formed their executive habits in one of two traditions, each great but neither an adequate preparation in politics. One is the military tradition; the other is big business. Both permit arm-length relations with the public.

These gentlemen—and the word fits them in almost every sense—make vocal and persuasive a more subtle inclination of big government toward secrecy. The incredible growth of government's power has tended to make some government officials the spoiled children of power in much the same way that excessive concentration of economic power spoiled its possessors two generations ago. It is hard to put your finger on it, for the defensive instincts of the political animal are still very strong. But the truth is that big government, like big business, fosters the spirit of the public be damned.

Admission of Spain to the North Atlantic Treaty Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in attempting to enlist the aid of all friendly nations, in the world-wide effort to curb communism, I think it particularly important that we have the great advantages which are available through the cooperation of Spain as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Association. An

editorial on this subject was published in the Baltimore News-Post, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LET SPAIN IN, TOO

The admission of Greece and Turkey to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization makes the whole western world stronger, and thus safer.

It can be made still stronger and safer by similar action in the case of Spain.

All three of these vigorous nations have traditions and a heritage of sovereignty and independence.

They have opposed and resisted communism longer and more successfully than most of the rest of the world.

They are more gravely menaced by communism than most of the other free nations. They are relatively strong in a military sense, and they are genuinely friendly to the Western Powers and they would be loyal and valuable and probably indispensable allies in the event of a general war against the Communist world.

So it has been a mistake to isolate any of these friendly nations, as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has done in the case of Greece and Turkey, and it is a sound decision which now remedies that mistake.

But it is a greater mistake to continue the ostracism of Spain, and the strength and security of the western nations will never be fully assured until that mistake is similarly repaired.

Political Influence in Loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record the Washington Report, by Bascom N. Timmons, the correspondent of the News-Journal Washington bureau, published in the Journal Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., on September 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON, September 28.—That hot water in which both Democratic National Chairman William M. Boyle and Republican National Chairman Guy George Gabrielson find themselves as a result of their alleged efforts on behalf of RFC loan applicants was brought to the boiling point largely through the efforts of one man.

He is Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware.

Senator WILLIAMS surprised a number of persons when he took to the floor of the Senate to make public the fact that the chairman of his own party had been taking \$15,000 a year from a firm that has received an RFC loan and has been trying to get more favorable terms on repaying it.

The action of the Delaware Senator did not surprise those who know him, however, for

he has established an enviable reputation for integrity and for complete fairness. He voiced his own credo when he told the Senate that having initiated the criticism of Mr. Boyle for activities on behalf of an RFC loan applicant, he would insist that the same standard be applied to his own party and to its officials.

It is an interesting story as to how the Delaware Senator got Boyle onto the Washington hot-seat now shared by Gabrielson. Only because of Senator WILLIAMS' insistence that all aspects of the affairs of James P. Finnegan be investigated did Boyle and the American Lithofold Corp. hit the headlines.

Finnegan is the former collector of internal revenue in St. Louis. WILLIAMS, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, has been insisting that improper activities on the part of politically-appointed tax collectors be investigated. Early in the probe, the finger of suspicion pointed at certain activities in which Finnegan had been engaged. Finnegan abruptly resigned his job when the heat began to come on.

Shortly thereafter he was cleared by a Federal grand jury, but Senator WILLIAMS charged that certain derogatory reports on Finnegan's conduct had been withheld from that grand jury. Federal Judge George Moore, of St. Louis, immediately impaneled a new grand jury and when WILLIAMS read in the Senate the file and docket numbers of certain field reports from internal revenue intelligence agents, the grand jury renewed its probe of Finnegan.

One of those reports that had been lost somewhere in Washington detailed Finnegan's connection with American Lithofold, a printing firm from whom he had been getting legal fees. Investigation by the grand jury and by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch then turned up the fact that an attorney named William Boyle had shared in those legal fees and that Mr. Boyle was the one and same who is national chairman of the Democratic Party. The fact that date of the fees to Finnegan and Boyle coincided with granting of an RFC loan to the printing firm has attracted the interest of Senate investigators.

Had not Senator WILLIAMS persisted in demanding a full probe of Mr. Finnegan's business activities, the story might never have been disclosed. As it is, the investigation of American Lithofold is turning up a lot more evidence, including a story of gift cameras to White House Secretary Matthew J. Connolly and others.

Meanwhile, Senator WILLIAMS has demanded to know who was responsible for suppressing the incriminating report about Mr. Finnegan that touched off all the fireworks. He has never had a clear answer. The Federal district attorney for St. Louis, Drake Watson, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, George J. Schoeneman, have both resigned.

The story of intrigue may get deeper, but the man behind the eruption of Washington's newest and most sensational scandal, involving the heads of both political parties, is staying quietly in the background.

Senator WILLIAMS is an unassuming man who does not seek the limelight. A small town feed merchant in private life, he never participated in politics before his election to the Senate in 1946.

Delaware is probably one of the few States where a small-business man can be elected directly from private life to the Senate. WILLIAMS shies away from the spotlight, refuses to appear on radio or television programs, and will not write any books or magazine articles about his investigations.

The Delaware Senator displays a rare quality of modesty, integrity, and impartiality that are like a fresh breath of air on the Washington scene. He may not get much glory for the job he has been doing, but he deserves some credit.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the light of the widespread interest expressed in the recent announcement that Canada might undertake the seaway alone unless we hurry and pass the necessary legislation, I think an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post might well be of general interest. I ask that this editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

President Truman and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada, have put Congress in an embarrassing position with regard to the St. Lawrence project. Only 2 months ago the House Public Works Committee laid aside a measure authorizing United States participation in the construction of the long-awaited seaway connecting the Great Lakes with the Atlantic. In the hearings and discussion that preceded the vote it was frequently forecast that Canada would go ahead with the project alone if the United States was not ready to carry out its agreement of 10 years ago. That warning was generally shrugged off as propaganda. Now Mr. St. Laurent has removed all doubt as to what his administration intends, and Mr. Truman has given his blessing to an all-Canadian seaway in the event that Congress continues to balk. As the channel proposed by Mr. St. Laurent would be built on the Canadian side of the river, it is assumed that no consent on the part of the United States would be required.

If Canada thus decides to go it alone, Americans will probably pay the lion's share of the cost without acquiring the advantages of joint ownership and control. Shipping on the St. Lawrence is predominantly in the hands of United States interests and will doubtless continue to be so. The importance of this shipping is being enhanced by the opening of vast iron ore deposits in Labrador and northern Quebec to supply steel mills in or near the Great Lakes cities. American interests might be left at a serious disadvantage if Canada, having put up the money and done the work, should exercise complete control over the fixing of rates on the waterway. The St. Lawrence might even become a bone of contention between the two countries instead of a bond of common interest between them.

The understanding reached between the President and Prime Minister St. Laurent is to the effect that the two countries would proceed jointly in development of a \$400,000,000 hydroelectric power project near Massena, N. Y., even if the channel for oceangoing vessels should become a Canadian project. New York State is eager to go ahead with the power development regardless of the outcome of the seaway proposal. Congress could not stand in the way of such an arrangement without assuming a dog-in-the-manger attitude.

In our opinion, Congress ought to resurvey the entire project with less of the sectionalism that has so strongly influenced opinions in the past. Apparently a channel for

oceangoing vessels will link Detroit to the Atlantic a few years hence with or without the approval of Congress. Pressure would then be strong for a deep channel linking Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron to the seaway. The most practical course is to plan now for the entire undertaking with the United States and Canada sharing the responsibility, the costs and the benefits.

If Theodore Roosevelt Were Acting in Behalf of William Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, there are many people in this country who feel that its past history can be studied to advantage in light of some of the present day's occurrences. This letter from William Loeb, editor, Manchester Union-Leader, New Hampshire, is an excellent illustration.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the letter in the RECORD:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1951.

Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: Looking over the letter of mine which you so kindly inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the editorial, brought to mind another incident, the inside story of which you might enjoy. It concerns the time the Kaiser sent the German fleet over to the coast of Venezuela to collect some debts owed by Venezuela to various German nationals. The American reaction to this violation of the Monroe Doctrine of that day was as follows:

Back at the turn of the century when my father was a young man, he served as chief private secretary to Theodore Roosevelt at the time he was President of the United States. One day the President sent him to call on German Ambassador "Speck" von Sternberg.

My father said, "President Roosevelt has asked me to call your attention, Mr. Ambassador, to the fact that the German fleet is in Venezuelan territorial waters, contrary to the Monroe Doctrine. The President further asked me to inform you that you request your Government to remove the fleet within 24 hours' time."

Some 16 hours later my father returned to the German Embassy and told the Ambassador the White House had been informed that the German fleet was still in Venezuelan territorial waters and that no message had been received by the State Department or the White House as to the future movement of the fleet.

To which von Sternberg replied, "Surely you were not serious in bringing the message from the President. It would be worth my diplomatic career to convey such a message to the all highest. Yours is a fine country, Mr. Secretary, but, after all, I represent His Imperial Highness and the German Empire. Furthermore, your own father, Mr. Secretary, came from Germany. We are good friends. I gave your son, Billy, a large christening cup when he was born. Surely we can settle this matter."

To this my father replied, "I am sorry, Mr. Ambassador. It is true that my father came from Germany and we have many ties

with the old country. But you must remember that our family left Germany for one reason—we preferred freedom.

"Besides, President Theodore Roosevelt is one who, once his mind is made up, is not swayed from acting in accordance with his firm principles.

"The President has instructed me to tell you further that, since we have had no reply at all in the 16 hours, we have no intention of waiting the remaining 8 hours.

"The Atlantic Fleet, under Admiral Dewey, is at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. President Roosevelt, early in the day, ordered Admiral Dewey to get steam up and strip his ships for action.

"If no word is forthcoming from your Government inside of 4 hours, the President will order Admiral Dewey to set sail for Venezuela immediately to take whatever action is necessary."

With that, my father withdrew from the German Embassy.

In about 2½ hours, the American minister to Venezuela reported that the German fleet had pulled up anchor and was moving out to sea.

I thought this story might be of interest to you, in contrast to what happens nowadays. This story is a bit of unpublished history.

Usual regards and best wishes.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LOEB,
President.

Income Tax on Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL M. LECOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperative Association has made great strides in providing farm families throughout the State with electricity. During World War II and since then our farms have produced more than ever before, and the splendid record is partially accounted for by the fact that more and more of our farms now have electricity. At a meeting of the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperative Association last week a resolution was adopted opposing any change in the tax regulations with respect to cooperatives, and I wish to bring this resolution to the attention of all Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this resolution:

IOWA RURAL ELECTRIC

COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

Des Moines, Iowa, September 24, 1951.

HON. KARL M. LECOMPTE,

House Building Office,

Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. LECOMPTE: At the annual meeting of the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperative Association last week, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas there have been recent proposals affecting the income tax status of cooperatives; and

"Whereas cooperatives now complying with the requirements of the Federal laws and regulations have no taxable income, but rather contribution to capital through price adjustments; and

"Whereas the changing of tax treatment of contribution to capital by patrons will cripple the established financial plans of cooperatives, many to the point of financial ruin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperative Association express its unqualified opposition to any change of the existing Federal laws and regulations with respect to the income-tax status of cooperatives, and be it

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman from Iowa."

Please consider this.

Very truly yours,

WM. H. WISDOM,
Acting Executive Secretary.

Victory for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

VICTORY FOR THE SOUTH

Thanks to the fairness and courage of the people of Indianola and Sunflower County, Miss., a victory of incalculable value to the South has been achieved. It is a victory of decency over brutality—of honesty over the most vicious sort of wrongdoing and fraud. It is a grim warning that the old-fashioned and outrageous theory of law enforcement that "anything for sake of a conviction is all right" has no place in modern, enlightened society, and particularly in the South.

The victory was symbolized by the sentencing of two white men for beating four Negroes so severely that they confessed to a "murder" which hadn't been committed. One was a deputy sheriff and the other a self-styled private detective later revealed to be an Illinois probation violator. He had been hired by a sheriff too busy to do his own investigating. The now-dismissed deputy was in charge of the jail where the four innocent Negroes were imprisoned and beaten until they "confessed."

Both assailants pleaded guilty to four charges of assault and battery. The sentences imposed are the maximum permitted—6 months imprisonment and a \$500 fine. They should be compelled to serve every day and pay every dollar.

The Commercial Appeal is proud of the part it played in bringing their outrage to the attention of Mississippi's people but infinitely more proud of the manner in which, from Governor Wright down, the people reacted to their sense of great indignation. Especially are we gratified by the response which came from the citizens of Indianola and Sunflower County. They and their prosecutive and judicial processes are responsible for the outcome. They even provided for the employment of a special prosecutor to assist District Attorney Sanders. They were determined that there would be atonement to outraged justice and their will has prevailed. Every honest law-enforcement officer in the South will rejoice that it is so.

The two guilty assailants violated not only the constitutional rights of those they so falsely accused but their every action was repugnant to honest citizens in whose service they were sworn. Theirs was a crime

against law enforcement itself as well as against individuals.

The victims were of humble background but far from friendless for as their friends and as their champions, their State and all its good people stood forth. Let the memory of that spectacle be engraved in the minds of those who so readily and blatantly speak ill of Southern justice. Here was true Southern justice.

Federal proceedings against the discredited and imprisoned officers impend but whatever their outcome it is the lesson of local handling of local problems—of local justice prevailing to rectify a terrible wrong that it is so impressive and so expressive of the goodness of the people of Mississippi as this newspaper has known and recorded it for more than 100 years.

Legislation Affecting the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein portions of the testimony of President William M. Thomas, of the National Postal Transport Association, before the Senate subcommittee considering S. 861.

I have introduced in the House a companion bill, H. R. 2331. We who are supporting these measures hope that soon after the convening of Congress in January, a thorough hearing will be held by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House. I have asked for this unanimous consent in order that the Members of the Senate and the House might have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the importance of this legislation. President Thomas, in his very excellent testimony, sets forth the facts and the necessity for the passage of this legislation. I hope that all Members of the Senate and the House will go over the testimony given by Mr. Thomas thoroughly:

STATEMENT OF W. M. THOMAS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, RELATIVE TO S. 861

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is W. M. Thomas, president of the National Postal Transport Association, and represent approximately 27,000 postal transportation clerks. These clerks are engaged in the arduous and exacting duties of distributing and expediting transient mails moving over the rail and airlines of the Nation.

The need for mileage legislation as proposed by S. 861 can best be explained by stating that as early as 1936 the Post Office Department recognized the necessity for a speed differential in order to protect working assignments of postal clerks performing service in railway post office cars on the vast railroad systems that comprise the backbone of the postal transportation system.

Under date of May 25, 1936, the Post Office Department issued Circular Letter No. 4283, which provided that postal clerks assigned to duty in high-speed trains would be allowed a time credit of 8 minutes per mile when the average speed of the train exceeded

45 miles per hour, but not to exceed 60 miles per hour. In 1946 this time credit for speed was further liberalized by allowing credits to begin when the average speed of the train exceeded 42.49 miles per hour.

During the latter part of 1949 the Post Office Department notified the officers of the National Postal Transport Association that it would decline to continue the speed credits beyond July 1, 1950, without legislative authority from the Congress. At this time we seek such legislation.

In substance, S. 861 will give to the Post Office Department legal authority to grant speed credits which heretofore have been granted by administrative action.

A postal transportation clerk assigned to duty in a railway post office car has one of the most unique occupations in the world. He spends long hours of continuous duty, standing on the floor of a swiftly moving mail car, both day and night. Meals and sleep are irregular. The correct dispatch of the mail from the ever-varying standpoints of the trains of the postal transportation service demands expert knowledge and alert minds on the part of postal transportation clerks, which they attain only through long training and constant study. It must be remembered that the train is constantly moving, requiring instant knowledge of different connections covering thousands of post offices. The development of this system of distribution while mails are in transit is the only means by which mail matter can be kept moving constantly until it reaches its destination. Advantage is taken of the best available connections, even to the ultimate in connections where mail is dispatched from one train to another train at a station where neither train stops. It is easy to visualize the delay if all the mail were sent to a central distributing point. The postal transportation service has thus earned by its efficiency the nickname "backbone of the postal service."

The needs of this type of service prevent a normal work day. Train services and schedules dictate completely the working hours of clerks. The clerks are as dependent on the railroad schedule as is any engineer or fireman, and yet he is responsible only to the Post Office Department and the public. Thus, clerks are required to be on duty consecutive hours often much longer than the normal day's work, and they are, therefore, given compensatory time off on another day so that their average day approximates a normal work day.

The service of the individual postal transportation clerk has thus been standardized, to a certain extent, to be a period of time on duty and a period of time off duty. It is easy to understand that if a clerk were to work 20 hours a day for 2 days, he would have the same amount of time on duty as another clerk who worked 8 hours a day for 5 days. So the system of computation as to the number of trips a clerk per year consists merely of dividing the number of work-minutes per trip into the number of work-minutes per year, and the result is the number of trips the clerk shall be required to make per year. The number of these trips can be anywhere from 50 to a few hundred per annum, depending on the number of minutes per trip. It has become the custom to assign the individual clerk his trips in a regular cycle or tour of duty. Thus, a clerk may make one trip in 2 days, and have the next 2 days off duty. Or he can be assigned to make three trips in 6 days and have the next 6 days off duty.

The individual clerk, therefore, has to adjust himself to work a period of from 2 to 6 days away from home and a comparable rest period at home.

A postal transportation clerk assigned to duty on a high-speed train should have special consideration. The Honorable (then Senator) James M. Meade recognized this

fact on July 11, 1935, when he wrote the then Postmaster General, Hon. James A. Farley, as follows:

"MY DEAR JIM: I was glad to have your letter and a copy of your communication addressed to Senator McKellar in reference to H. R. 6990, known as the 40-hour-week bill. Recommendations pertaining to custodial and other employees will be readily agreed to, but I believe we will do a great injury to the employees of the Railway Mail Service if we eliminate the mileage feature from the bill.

"If labor is to receive any benefits resulting from the increased speed of our mail trains it must result from the adoption of a system giving remuneration for a certain number of hours or a certain number of miles, both factors being interchangeable. This principle is based on the sound theory that the faster a train moves the greater the hazard, the exertion, the responsibility, and likewise the greater becomes the amount and volume of production.

"The hour and mileage system has been in operation on our railroads for many years. It was recognized officially during the administration of former President Woodrow Wilson, and it is likewise recognized at the present time under the administration of the Railroad Coordinator. It is to my mind the best system of automatic compensation for technological displacements of manpower that has yet been formulated.

"Unless we adopt an hour and mileage system, with the coming of the Zephyrs and other fast trains many of our railway-mail clerks will be automatically penalized, and only the Department will benefit by this latest development in railroad transportation.

"A readjustment of schedules and the lengthening of advanced time periods will provide ample means for the Department to exercise fair and reasonable control over the employees of this service.

"I trust, therefore, that it will be possible for us to work out a fair hour and mileage provision, and assuring you of my willingness to cooperate at all time, I am, with best wishes,

"Very sincerely,

"JAMES M. MEAD."

The Honorable Senator Mead stated that the faster a train moves, the greater the hazard, the exertion, the responsibility, and likewise the greater becomes the amount and volume of production.

That the hazard is greater is easy to understand. Injuries frequently occur. Files of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, show many instances caused by a violent "lurch of the train."

Injuries caused by loss of balance because the train lurched are not the only hazards that are multiplied by high-speed operation of the trains. Wrecks, even though they are infrequent, are exceptionally dangerous to the postal-transportation clerks, because of the operation of the railway post office car very near the engine. The higher the speed of the train when a wreck occurs, the less are the clerks' chances of survival. Whether there is more likelihood of a wreck occurring in a high-speed train can be debated; but if the wreck occurs it is infinitely more dangerous in a high-speed train.

Exertion, as Senator Mead suggested, is another definite factor that increases in direct proportion to the speed of the train. As mentioned above, there are three distinct motions to the floor of the post-office car, in addition to the forward motion. These motions, side to side, up to down, and front to back, and combinations of these motions, make it very difficult for anyone to maintain a stable footing. Passengers, when walking from one end of a moving passenger coach to the other end, will hold to backs of seats to balance themselves. The postal transportation clerks, on the other hand, cannot hold

to anything, as both hands are occupied with their work. Thus they must not only maintain balance, but must maintain full production simultaneously. Distribution of mail on a speeding train is one of the most strenuous occupations.

The third point mentioned by Senator Mead is responsibility. A postal transportation clerk is responsible not only for the safety of the mail matter in his custody, but for the proper distribution and correct dispatch of the mails. In order to insure the correct dispatch, it is necessary for the clerks to have instantaneous knowledge of the location and train or other connection for each and every post office in several States. This requires intense study and prodigious memory. The post offices in any one State may number from a few hundred to several thousand, and the connections are continually changing. Each time a railroad changes time on any train, a number of connections are affected. The postal transportation clerk must know all this information, as on a high-speed train he has no time to look up an office or a connection. Clerks assigned to high-speed trains realize they have less time to complete their duties and thus put forth every possible effort to complete distribution on time. It is a spirit of honor and service that has grown up through long years, and the pride of workmanship and loyalty to duty.

The inequities arising out of employment on fast trains may be illustrated by the following example. Suppose a clerk lives in Chicago and is assigned to round trips between Chicago and St. Paul, Minn. The distance between these points is 410 miles. The clerk works 1 day running to St. Paul, spends the night there, and works the next day on the return run from St. Paul to Chicago. He is thus away from home 2 full days. Suppose the hours of duty on a slow train were 26. If that train were speeded up to make the run in 5 hours less time each way, his total hours of duty would be reduced to 16, but it would still require him to be away from home 2 days to make the trip. With no speed differential, it is necessary for him to make a much greater number of trips each year to complete his maximum annual hourly requirements at straight time. Clerks must spend substantial periods of time in home work, as is recognized in the present law by the allowance for lay-off periods of 50 minutes per day for class A and 1 hour and 35 minutes per day for class B. But in the nature of the situation, the clerk cannot carry with him his files, data, and written materials necessary for this work; he can complete these home duties only at his home. Thus a clerk assigned to work on a fast train who received no concessions because of any speed differential would have to work much harder to fulfill his annual requirements at straight time than would be the case if he worked on a slow train. In the example given above, a clerk running from Chicago to St. Paul, on the slow set of trains taking 26 hours for the round trip would make 62 round trips per year, 62 nights away from home, 124 days of 13 hours each on duty, but the clerk assigned to the set of fast trains would make 101 trips, 101 nights away from home, 202 days of 8 hours each on duty. And the clerk on the fast set of trains needs more time to recuperate, because of the added physical and mental strains.

The Government recognized and enforced certain rules governing the services of railroad employees during the period of Government operation of the railroads. The conditions affecting the postal transportation clerks are identical to those under which the railroad employees work, though the Government does not provide as favorable hours of service as that in effect in railroad services. Congress has enacted laws for a mileage limitation in the railroad service. The Na-

tional Postal Transport Association is now asking for the recognition of a similar factor for postal transportation clerks. It is fundamental and necessary, and more so now, in these days of faster schedules. The controlling factors in railroad service were set by the Railroad Administration in approving standards in effect at that time. The Railroad Administration said that 150 miles or less (a minimum of 135 miles) should be a day's work and carry a day's pay. Anything in excess of 7 hours 30 minutes should be paid as overtime, or if on a speed basis of 20 miles per hour. Thus the annual mileage requirements in railroad service are 54,750 miles maximum for base pay. Without the protection of such a law, there are many instances of postal transportation clerks traveling well in excess of 100,000 miles per year to fulfill their minimum requirements.

Legislation is needed to give credit to postal transportation clerks for miles or hours on duty. The factors must be interchangeable, because not all the time a clerk is on duty is spent en route. Advance time consists of time spent in the depot before the train departs, at work, both in preparation of the railway post-office car for the trip and in some distribution. Under varying conditions, the advance time may be as little as no time at all, to as much as 5 or 6 hours. The advance time is based, not only on the amount of time the car is available, but also on the amount of time necessary to prepare for the trip and the volume of mail available to be distributed before the train leaves. Advance time is necessary—a much larger crew would be needed if utilization were not made of the advance time available. Also, the clerks are not released from duty, as is the railroad crew, immediately upon arrival at the terminus of the run. They are required to remain in the post-office car until all mail is unloaded, and certain crew members must convey the registered mail to a post office or other designated point.

It is therefore evident that some provision is necessary to protect this branch of the Government service which has been conceded to be the backbone of the postal service, for without proper transportation facilities and proper distribution of mail en route, the entire postal service deteriorates and the delivery of mails is retarded. The worker should not be expected to bear additional burdens on account of these faster train schedules which are being placed in operation. These additional burdens can only be avoided by legislation adopting a speed credit, as provided in S. 861.

Time credits as provided for in the bills under consideration are comparable to those granted administratively for 14 years. In effect such credits would freeze the number of round trips required, once the speed of 42 miles per hour was exceeded. We note that the Department's report states that such legislation would result in personnel problems for the reason that it would grant shorter hours of employment to some clerks. In connection with this statement it should be pointed out that no such morale problems resulted from the operation of the administrative time credits during the entire period of 14 years it was effective.

Time schedules of runs, plus additional requirements for advance distribution and unloading, results in a situation where it is not possible to organize all clerks on a full 8-hour-day basis. Often these clerks are a few minutes a day deficient in time and such deficiencies are cumulative for the period of the fiscal year. It will be seen that during the period from July 1 to December 15 a considerable amount of time deficiency can accumulate against the record of a clerk. The heavy flow of mails during the Christmas season cannot be distributed by regular authorized crews and it becomes necessary

that the crews be informed, resulting in additional trips for the clerks. Often all time credits so earned are entirely absorbed in satisfying deficiencies which have accumulated and the clerks cannot be paid any overtime for the trips made. Thus it will be seen that when employees of private industries are given Christmas bonuses by their employers, and are often granted time off, even in addition to the legal holiday, postal transportation clerks assigned to road duty are required to work additional hours and without additional compensation. Such a condition does not exist in any other branch of the Government service and would surely not be tolerated in private industries. Thus the need for enactment of the last proviso of S. 861 which would provide for payment or overtime for any service in addition to that of the regular schedule. I should point out the fact that the enactment of this proviso would continue the present practice of charging time credits resulting from late operations of trains to accumulated deficiencies and that, while railway trainmen operating on trains, the average speed of which exceed 20 miles per hour, do have deficiencies, such deficiencies are canceled at the end of each trip and they cannot be required to perform additional duties as a result.

It is noted that the report of the Postmaster General states that there is no exact figure of cost computed, but estimates the cost at \$750,000 per annum. It is significant that the Seventh Division is used as an example, the cost in that Division being estimated at \$50,000 per annum. I would like to point out that the Seventh Division, comprising roughly the States of Missouri and Kansas, and being in the West, is served by transcontinental trains and has a greater percentage of speed trains than most divisions. In some divisions the cost resulting from time credits would be negligible. If we should use the First Division as an example it is thought that the cost of this item would not exceed \$5,000 per annum. Of the 15 divisions the cost would not be the same in any two, but it is our estimate that the entire cost of providing time credits to clerks performing service on high-speed trains would not exceed \$250,000 per annum. There would be an additional cost resulting from the last proviso of the bill which grants overtime for additional required service without regard to accumulated deficiencies. Again, it is not possible to accurately compute the cost of this proviso since it would depend, to a great extent, on unpredictable late running of trains during the period from July 1 to December 31 of the year, but any additional cost resulting from this item would surely be justified by the fact that, at long last postal transportation clerks assigned to road duty would be given treatment comparable to that given all other Government employees and to employees of private industries.

Finally, it is noted with a great degree of surprise that the report of the Postmaster General appears to be concerned about the morale of employees, since he states that the enactment of this bill could create a morale problem. While we could enumerate other arbitrary acts on the part of the Department during recent years which have had a strong tendency to completely destroy the morale of postal workers, surely there has been none more apparent than the discontinuation of time credits as was provided administratively over a period of 14 years. When we appealed to the Postmaster General that such time credits be continued, he replied under date of June 28, 1950, as follows: "The fact remains that there is no legislative basis for granting employees assigned to road duty a time credit for performing service in high-speed trains." Such time credits were first provided in 1936 at a time when there was no more legislative basis than in 1950. The credits were granted for the reason that the

Department recognized the merits of such an arrangement and such merits are as great, if not greater at this time than in 1936. The fact that officials discarded these benefits without cause destroyed all confidence many employees had in the Department. It appears very unusual that the Postmaster General should express concern in morale at this time. I have been an officer of this association for 16 years, including the entire period of time time credits were allowed, and knew of no morale problems arising as the result. At this time, I advocate enactment of this bill, but surely would oppose any measure which might result in a morale problem.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I deeply appreciate this opportunity of expressing the views of the National Postal Transportation Association relative to S. 861 and most sincerely urge you to give full consideration to the meritorious provisions contained therein.

Statement of Hon. Guy George Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 1, Chairman Guy George Gabrielson, of the Republican National Committee, made a statement to the executive committee in which he analyzed the operation of the Carthage Hydrocol Corp., of which he is president, and its relationship with the RFC.

The committee was so impressed with Mr. Gabrielson's presentation and the honest, open, and aboveboard manner in which he had handled the company's affairs in connection with the RFC and other departments of the Government which have to do with conserving our natural resources that it unanimously gave him a vote of full confidence.

The statement is of such public interest that I am presenting it for the RECORD, that it may be widely available:

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE FROM 21 STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, OCTOBER 1, 1951

The purpose of this meeting of the executive committee and members of the National Committee from 21 States and the District of Columbia is to discuss plans for the coming campaign and our National Convention which will convene July 7, 1952, in Chicago.

It is customary and proper for such discussions to be held behind closed doors. Before going into executive session, however, I desire to read a statement and invite your comment and questions on a subject in which we have a mutual interest because of recent statements and headlines.

I am proud to be the president and general counsel of Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., a company organized to make high octane gasoline and chemical byproducts from natural gas by a process which does this at a cost competitive to making gasoline from petroleum.

Some of you know part of the story. I have a neighbor in New Jersey, Mr. P. C. Keith, who is an internationally known

chemist and inventor. During the last war, when it became apparent that the possession of high octane gasoline and its by-products might determine who won that war and future wars, Mr. Keith saw a problem.

He recognized that our petroleum reserves are limited. He also knew that we had a vast supply of natural gas. Just as the inventive genius of the United States developed synthetic rubber when the Japanese cut off our supply of natural rubber, Mr. Keith applied himself to the problem of making gasoline from dry gas. He found the answer in an adaptation of Germany's famed Fischer-Tropsch synthesis from coal.

Mr. Keith obtained private financing to construct a pilot plant which proved his process. He then went to Mr. Jesse Jones, who was head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to see whether the Government of the United States would be interested in assisting in the development of a new industry which would contribute not only to the national defense, but to the utilization of a vital natural resource.

I have been asked why Mr. Keith went to the Government. He had two reasons. Instead of selling his process to one of the major oil companies on a royalty basis, and therefore perhaps encouraging a new monopoly, Mr. Keith wanted to share directly in the profits of his research and inventive genius. Second, and most important, he was unable in 1943 to interest sufficient risk capital to finance his venture.

He went to Mr. Jones. He also went to the Army, Navy, and the Department of the Interior. When they endorsed the project Mr. Jones told him that if he would raise half the necessary capital and obtain an option on a trillion feet of gas—enough to operate Carthage Hydrocol for 26 years—the RFC would loan the other half of the necessary funds.

Mr. Keith met these requirements. I was his legal counsel, and I became counsel for the company he organized—Carthage Hydrocol. After the first RFC loan was granted I was asked to become president of Carthage Hydrocol.

These facts were known when you did me the honor of electing me chairman of the Republican National Committee on August 4, 1949. It was also known to you that I would continue as president and general counsel for this company, which at that time owed the RFC \$18,500,000. It owes the same amount today—not a penny more. And I was about to say, not a penny less, except that last Thursday, 5 days before the due date, Carthage Hydrocol made its first repayment of the loan in the amount of \$250,000.

Now the reason I continued to serve this company as president, and my law firm as counsel, is that I felt an obligation not only to the taxpayers who put up \$18,500,000 for this pioneering industry, but to the stockholders who now have put up more than \$28,000,000, to contribute everything I could to making this venture a success. You understand, of course, that until the RFC loan is paid off the Government has a first mortgage on the entire property. Until the Government is paid off the stockholders can't get 1 cent of their money back, regardless of how profitable the company's operations may be. I want to say here it is as safe a loan as the RFC ever made.

I recognize that \$18,500,000 is a lot of money. But I think we almost must recognize that many times that sum is being spent through the Department of the Interior to develop synthetic fuels from coal and oil shale. The Bureau of Mines is presently asking legislation to authorize the spending of \$400,000,000 for this purpose. I believe implicitly in private enterprise, and I am proud that private enterprise has put up the bulk of the funds for Carthage Hydrocol.

Let me quote a portion of what Fortune magazine said of this venture:

"It is a mammoth conception in which three separate companies are interlinked. Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., the key unit, takes in a huge stream of natural gas and oxidizes it into some 7,000 barrels of gasoline and oil products a day. At the same time, it pulls out a mixed stream of water-soluble crude chemicals at the rate of 300,000 pounds a day and pipes it next door to a unit owned by Stanolind Oil & Gas Co. Stanolind separates and refines the mixed stream into some 20 basic chemicals—more to come later—including most organic acids, alcohols, a string of ketones and aldehydes, and pipes them on to a unit of United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc., which ships them elsewhere for further processing and marketing.

"The full engineering feat—collaborated in by all participants and based on process engineering by Hydrocarbon Research, Inc., and Texas Development Co.—cannot yet be explored, but some details will show its Texas scope. To get the amounts of oxygen required, the world's largest oxygen-from-air plant was built, of a new design, equal to all the rest of the oxygen-fixation capacity in the United States combined. To get the huge amounts of cooling water needed from arid Texas, cooling systems were devised to use salt water sucked in from the Brownsville Ship Canal at 144,000 gallons a minute. To handle the high heats and pressures involved, vessels of ponderous new shapes were designed. The big gleaming thermos bottles, for example, are gas-fired furnaces some 60 feet high. To get such a series of plants on stream—started in order, coordinated, and running simultaneously—is the top engineering feat of all."

The Fortune article concludes: "It is a giant pilot plant of a new order, built with great risk and courage."

Fortune did not exaggerate. The process has been proven. The plant has operated successfully over various periods during the last several months, but we also have encountered mechanical failures. We are not yet in continuous, full-time commercial operation.

As many of you know, the RFC doesn't loan money and then forget about it. It keeps a continuing check on its debtors. Since I have been chairman of the Republican National Committee, the RFC has called upon me, as representative of the debtor, for information on various aspects of Carthage Hydrocol finances and operations. Since the loans were made, there have been 30 resolutions and amendments by the RFC pertaining to this project, 10 of them since I have been your chairman.

When the RFC was managed by a board, before the recent reorganization, Mr. Harvey Gunderson was assigned to keep an eye on this loan, and I discussed details of Carthage Hydrocol with him and his staff on at least two occasions. I neither asked favors, nor received any, from him.

After Mr. Stuart Symington became RFC Administrator, I called upon him with two other top officers of Carthage Hydrocol to introduce ourselves. This occurred in the latter part of June or early July. During this visit, I asked Mr. Symington to have the Carthage Hydrocol files investigated, and to state publicly whether he found anything wrong or improper, and to also state publicly if he found nothing wrong nor improper.

During our conversation, he asked about our finances. I told him we had encountered mechanical difficulties, and our executive committee was considering making a request for deferment for 1 year of the first repayment of principal of two of the loans. This was a matter of information—not a plea.

On August 1, 1951, our treasurer, Mr. Allen K. Brehm, signed a formal application to the New York office of the RFC requesting this deferment. In view of recent comments, it is important to stress that this application conformed to the spirit of an agreement twice previously recognized by the RFC—namely, that there would be a lapse of 21 months between the start of operations of the plant and the first repayment of principal.

Owing to delays, the plant was not completed until late 1950. Since that time, we have had numerous difficulties with various pieces of equipment. The plant has operated on 10 different occasions for varying lengths of time turning out a fine product. The longest run was for 24 days, but we still have problems to solve before we can attain continuous operation on a commercial basis. We felt, therefore, that under the spirit of the two former RFC decisions, we were justified in requesting the deferment.

The RFC rejected this application, as was its right. The first repayments, due today, were made last Thursday. As president of Carthage Hydrocol and as chairman of the national committee, I haven't and don't intend to challenge the RFC decision, but I can't refrain from suggesting that it scarcely bears out the inference that I have any influence.

Early last March, I discussed the moral climate of the Truman administration in a speech at Elgin, Ill., and said that the exposure of corruption warranted the Republican Party to revive the old battlecry, "Turn the rascals out." I was warned in advance that if I spoke on this subject, the opposition undoubtedly would attack me because of my position with Carthage Hydrocol. I made the speech and I was attacked. On March 27, I addressed an open letter to all Republican leaders and the press giving full details of the history of this RFC loan, and making it plain that I was proud to be the Carthage Hydrocol president and have a part in the development of this challenging new industry.

Recently, because of information that the opposition intended to attack me again, a Republican Senator asked that all the facts be presented to the Senate subcommittee investigating influence-peddling by others. I promptly asked for an immediate hearing. When that was denied, I prepared a letter to the subcommittee calling attention to my statement of March 27, and bringing it up to date.

The subcommittee has notified me that it will hear me this Thursday. In my testimony under oath, I will answer all questions, and will state that in addition to my two talks to Mr. Symington, I also had two conversations with Mr. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, to ascertain what steps Carthage Hydrocol should take to obtain certain nickel alloys required for resumption of operations of the plant. I have had a preliminary talk with the subcommittee's counsel, and have advised him that he can examine not only my income tax returns for 1949 and 1950, but the detailed work sheets from which they were prepared.

I have met, and will continue to meet, this issue with complete frankness. And in closing, let me say that I propose to continue to denounce, in the most vigorous terms, the scandals and corruption attached to the present national administration, and the refusal of President Truman to move promptly and vigorously against those responsible. I shall discuss mink coats, deep freezes, influence-peddling, pardons to gangsters, vote frauds, Pendergastism, and every other aspect of what has been called by a national magazine the underbelly of the Truman administration. I shall continue to try to convince the public that these scandalous years fully warrant, if for no reason, turning these rascals out in the election of November 4, 1952.

Center of United States Population Moves to Richland County, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the fact that the center of population in the United States, as revealed by the 1950 census, is now in the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois and specifically in Richland County, not far from the city of Olney.

Thus the theoretical center of American population is located in the heart of a typical, progressive American county well typifying the Nation and its people. For Richland County is representative of the backbone of strength in the country. Agriculture and oil contribute to its prosperity. Olney, the county seat, is typical of the best in community life and good citizenship. Thus the graphs and charts of the Bureau of the Census have placed a point of fame on an area and a community reflecting the substantial economy of a prosperous and patriotic people.

This important event will be observed with a Nation-wide ceremony centering on the site in Richland County October 17 and 18 when an official marker will be dedicated, to prevail as the official designation of the center of population during the next decade. The story is best told in the Olney Daily Mail of Saturday, September 29. Under permission granted me by the House, I include it as follows:

The center of population of the United States is in Richland County.

Director Roy V. Peel, of the Bureau of Census, United States Department of Commerce, today announced that the center of population, based on the 1950 census, is 8 miles north-northwest of Olney.

As can best be determined by maps and plat books, the center of the Nation's population falls on the farm of Carl Snider, adjoining the farm of Dewey A. Craig, chairman of the Richland County Board of Supervisors, in east Denver township. Maps on the center of population, as furnished by the Bureau of Census, appear elsewhere in this issue.

Mr. and Mrs. Snider and two small sons are a typical Richland County farm family. They have a 160-acre farm which 33-year-old Carl farms, and although virtually surrounded by oil production, do not have an oil well on their farm. The only oil venture on the 160 acres was a dry hole.

Census Director Peel also announced plans for a 2-day ceremony in mid-October to mark the transfer of the center of population from Indiana to Illinois. On Thursday, October 18, the dedication of a marker at the new population center near Olney will conclude the 2-day program.

Among those who will participate in the program, which will be presented on chain hookups over radio and television, are United States Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer; Census Director Peel; Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois; Gov. Henry Schricker, of Indiana; mayors and other representatives of the 17 places where the center of population has been located between

the first decennial census in 1790 and the seventeenth decennial census in 1950.

The previous day, Wednesday, October 17, a program marking the departure of the center of population from Indiana, after its slow travel across that State during a period of 70 years, will be conducted in Bloomington, Ind.

Although the exact center of population has not been officially designated, it appears to be on the Snider farm, a short distance west of the Snider residence in east Denver township. Official location of the exact spot is expected to be made in the near future and representatives of the United States Department of Commerce are expected to be here prior to the October 18 celebration.

The Richland County center of population is 42 miles west and 7½ miles south of the center of population in 1940, which was located 2 miles southeast by east of Carlisle, Ind.

The total westward movement of the center of population from 1790 to 1950 was 644 miles, from its 1790 location at a point 23 miles east of Baltimore, Md. The point farthest north was the 1790 location and the point farthest south the 1950 location in Richland County, but the north and south difference is only 30 miles. Thus the center of population has remained within a few miles of the thirty-ninth parallel, north latitude, in its long westward movement.

The population crawled westward across the country with the early trappers and backwoodsmen; rolled on with pioneers in their covered wagons, and is shifting nearer and nearer the Mississippi River with the growth of huge cities on the west coast.

The center of population is one of these imaginary but important reckonings, like the North Pole or the Equator. Just a dot on the map, it is a symbol that tells how the country is growing, it is an indication of trends and the movements of people and industry.

Several years ago, with the center definitely moved from Indiana westward into Illinois, it was believed the center of population was in the vicinity of West Liberty, in south Jasper County. The decided shift of 7½ miles to the south during the past 10 years moved the center into Richland County.

In the early days of the United States, the East was literally the whole Nation. The census of 1790 set the first official center of population 23 miles east of Baltimore and by 1800 the center had moved only 19 miles west of Baltimore. But thereafter, as the country's restless pioneers craved the perils of Indians and primitive living conditions to surge westward in wagon and flatboats, the move was in great leaps.

By 1810, the center had passed Washington, D. C. From 1820 to 1840 it shifted through West Virginia. It swept on even during the Civil War. By 1860 the center of population crossed the Alleghenies into Ohio, continuing its move across the State in 1870 and 1880.

In 1890, the center shifted from a point near Cincinnati into Indiana, in the vicinity of Columbus, Ind. Bloomington, Ind., where the October 17 celebration will be held, was the center in 1910. In 1920 it had shifted to near Spencer; westward and southward to Linton in 1930, then in 1940 to near Carlisle, near the border of Illinois.

It appears likely that the trends of the last 10 years will continue, mainly due to the fact that California's population hit 10,586,223 in the 1950 census, a gain of almost 3,500,000 from 1940. The big west coast State forged ahead of Illinois and Ohio to become the third most populous State in the Union, and the populations of Washington and Oregon also mushroomed.

Although a few of the States west of the Mississippi lost in population—North Dakota, Arkansas, and Oklahoma—the gain on the booming west coast was so great that the

center was still pulled westward 42 miles in 10 years.

New York has its Dodgers, Yankees, Giants, and the Statue of Liberty; California has its oranges and movie stars; but when you live in Illinois and Richland County, you're really in the center of things.

The approximate location of the center of population of the United States of each census from 1790 to 1950:

1790: 23 miles east of Baltimore, Md.
1800: 18 miles west of Baltimore, Md.
1810: 40 miles northwest by west of Washington, D. C. (in Virginia).
1820: 16 miles east of Moorefield, W. Va.
1830: 19 miles west-southwest of Moorefield, W. Va.
1840: 16 miles south of Clarksburg, W. Va.
1850: 23 miles southeast of Parkersburg, W. Va.
1860: 20 miles south by east of Chillicothe, Ohio.
1870: 48 miles east by north of Cincinnati, Ohio.
1880: 8 miles west by south of Cincinnati, Ohio (in Kentucky).
1890: 20 miles east of Columbus, Ind.
1900: 6 miles southeast of Columbus, Ind.
1910: In the city of Bloomington, Ind.
1920: 8 miles south-southeast of Spencer, Ind.
1930: 3 miles northeast of Linton, Ind.
1940: 2 miles southeast by east of Carlisle, Ind.
1950: 8 miles north-northwest of Olney, Ill.

Our Army (Forever Victorious)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, by request, I include a new song dedicated to Our Army.

The composer has given me an autographed copy of his original composition. The above-mentioned song follows:

OUR ARMY (FOREVER VICTORIOUS)

(Lyrics by Grant S Ray, music by C. T. Loughner)

Our Army fought with skill
In its fight at Bunker Hill
Til the flag of foe came down
In defeat at old Yorktown
Our Army fought again
With a heart and will to win
So we met and whipped a foe
To avenge the Alamo.

Then we met ole Kaiser Bill
Stopped him cold at Verdun Hill
Then we went to war again
Licked Japan and Hitler's men.

Our Army now you know
Is at war in Korea
Where our men fight commie hordes
Shall be our great victory
Our Air Force is there too
Fight for God's way and you
United Nations will win
And save the world for the free.

Our Army of today
Is the pride of U. S. A.
All its men and WAC's are true
To our flag, red, white, and blue
Our Army stands near by
Where the stars and stripes fly high
To defend our liberty
And the freedom of the free.

Representative Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts, Wins Disabled Veterans' Admiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article in the October issue of the Civil Service Reporter bearing upon the activities of our colleague, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts:

REPRESENTATIVE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS WINS DISABLED VETERANS' ADMIRATION

The youngsters who have come back from Korea, shattered in mind and body, are pretty cynical about Congressmen and Senators in general. You can't expect boys of 18, 19, and 20 who have lost an arm or a leg, or both arms and legs, or who have been blinded or paralyzed in combat to display a calmly philosophical attitude toward the world as it is. They are full of a bewildered resentment toward everything and everybody, and it is not surprising that the legislators who breeze through the wards of Walter Reed Hospital with a jovial "Hi, Joe," and expressions of deepest sympathy are described as those phonies! And it may be childish, but it is very natural that they extend the resentment toward one or two Congressmen to include all Congressmen and Senators.

But there is one Congressman, or rather Congresswoman, who is exempt from their youthful (but sometimes alarming) criticism. To the boys at Walter Reed, and perhaps to all wounded veterans everywhere, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS is a gracious and wonderful woman, who by the greatest of good luck is in Congress and is on their side. Not only on their side, but, "I think she really likes us," one shy youngster said to me.

FIGHTS THEIR BATTLES

She really does like them, and is certainly on their side, fighting their battles to the last ditch. The picture in this issue which shows her cutting a birthday cake, is typical of Mrs. ROGERS. The boy at her left, Bruce Clemens was 21 on the day the picture was taken. Bruce lost both legs in Korea. He is a shy, well-mannered quiet boy who doesn't talk much, but does a lot of thinking, maybe too much thinking sometimes. When he came back to this country he didn't want to talk to anybody, and the secret thoughts of a boy of 20 who has just lost both legs are black and dreadful. It is a long, difficult job to persuade these boys that they are tough enough and strong enough to accept the world as it is and to enjoy life, even though it is a different kind of life than they planned on in high school.

Having a birthday party for a boy who has had tough luck is not part of a Congresswoman's job. She is fighting tooth and nail for legislation which will make life more bearable for seriously disabled veterans. Her life is full from early morning until late at night. She has earned the gratitude of all veterans as a group because of her untiring efforts in their behalf. So a birthday party for one wounded veteran doesn't make sense in terms of legislation or votes. It's just one of the things that Mrs. ROGERS does because she really likes the boys. And do they like her? Well, as one exuberant young man said, "I sure wish she was younger, or I was older. She's wonderful!" She seems to

share a niche in their hearts usually reserved for mothers and/or best girls.

A REMARKABLE WOMAN

Mrs. ROGERS is, to put it mildly, a remarkable woman. The much-abused word "lady" seems to fit her perfectly and she suggests a background of chippendale furniture, rose gardens, and heirloom silver, but she has been in Congress since 1925, when she was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, the late Representative John Jacob Rogers, and she has been there ever since. To get elected to Congress year after year from Mrs. ROGERS' district takes more than graciousness and charm. In addition to charm, she is equipped with amazing energy and determination. In the area of legislation, she has often played alternate roles of immovable object and irresistible force.

Her interest in disabled veterans dates back to World War I years when she devoted her time to their problems. She was one of the first members of the Gray Ladies of Walter Reed General Hospital and went on a special mission to France and England during the hostilities.

THREE COMMITTEES

Upon entering Congress, she was assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Civil Service, and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. She served on these committees until the Eightieth Congress when the Reorganization Act limited to one the number of major committees on which a Member might serve. In the Seventy-ninth Congress she was the ranking minority member on two committees and in the Eightieth Congress became the chairman of the newly formed Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

During the time she served on the House Committee on Civil Service she sponsored and succeeded in getting approval for numbers of bills benefiting Government employees and especially benefiting veterans in civil service. Much of the legislation which protects the jobs of veterans in Government service, and especially the jobs of disabled veterans is due, at least in part, to the devotion of Mrs. ROGERS to the cause of the veterans. She believes that one of the most important steps in the rehabilitation of a badly wounded veteran is when he is appointed to a job and realizes that he is still able to earn a living. The program of the United States Civil Service Commission to aid badly disabled veterans by emphasizing what they can, rather than what they cannot do, is one of its finest achievements. This program has had the wholehearted support of Congresswoman ROGERS since its inception.

Patriotism at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, no one has yet managed to explain why it is necessary for the Air Force and the Army to spend \$688,000 for a radio-recruiting program. The Air Forces have been able to get plenty of young men through normal channels without indulging in these extravagances in the not too distant past. During the war era, in fact, young people were breaking

down the doors to get into the Air Corps. The Army has never had similar appeal, and it is at least doubtful that Frankie Layne's rendition of Mule Train will cause our boys to stampede into recruiting lines.

At last reports singer Layne and sportscaster Bill Stern were to be engaged for this radio appeal, at fees to be agreed upon by our Government spending experts. Mr. Stern was down for the mere pittance of \$1,000 per week and Mr. Layne apparently was earmarked for a bigger production job amount to a total of some \$434,000. These figures, although published generally, seem fantastically high for the purpose, and particularly so when viewed in the light of the statement that they have been reduced because of the patriotic purpose involved.

Patriotism at a price always seems shabby. When it is utterly unnecessary and a complete waste of taxpayers' funds, you can understand why lots of Americans are ready to be led away to the padded cell department screaming, "When does this business stop?"

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following open letter by Charles L. Campbell, published in Connecticut Taxpayers News:

AN OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS AND FRIENDS
OF THE COUNCIL

(By Charles L. Campbell, chairman of the board)

For a great many years I have been battling for economy in government. In recent months a number of people have expressed the opinion to me that the fight for economy seems to be petering out. These friends of economy are very pessimistic over the possibility of getting sensible and sound financing of government and most especially are they gloomy about the Federal Government. For a time I was inclined to feel that there was ample justification for the forebodings which they expressed, but I have been examining the situation and I have come to the conclusion that there is a considerable ray of hope existing.

In my experience as a businessman and in my association with the council, I have discovered that no budget is sacrosanct. In fact, one can say with reason that budgets are made to be cut. A small but determined and gallant group of Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress agree with this belief. In my judgment, they have been given inadequate support for their efforts. Men like Senators FERGUSON, BYRD, DOUGLAS, BRIDGES, DIRKSEN, McCLELLAN and Representatives TABER, JENSEN, PHILLIPS, and HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, have been devoting their energies to a reduction of the vast Federal budget for fiscal 1952. That they have not been more successful is no measure of the time, energy, and diligence with which they have approached this task. One could wish

that the economizers might receive more support than they have had from some members of the Connecticut congressional delegation.

I want to take this opportunity publicly to acknowledge the work that these economy-minded Members of the House and Senate are doing and to give them a word of encouragement so that their endeavors will continue. Unless the citizens and taxpayers everywhere in the country give aid and comfort to their friends in the Congress, the spending will go merrily on and the pessimist will be proved right because congressional economy advocates will lose heart and give up the fight. We have the opportunity to bring some sanity into Federal finances, but we must continue to fight for it and to support those in Congress who are trying to achieve it.

Is Joseph Stalin the Real Author of Point 4?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in recent months many of us have been amused by Russian claims of being first with various modern inventions and discoveries. Most of such claims from Moscow have been obviously humbug.

However, my attention has been called to an item which the Russians—and in particular, Joseph Stalin—can apparently legitimately claim as their origination. I refer to the proposal announced by President Truman under the title "Point 4." Here is the evidence.

On May 8, 1921, Stalin declared:

The fourth factor is that a new element has been introduced into the national question—the element of real (and not merely juridical) equalization of nations (helping and encouraging the backward nations to raise themselves to the cultural and economic level of the more advanced nations), as one of the conditions necessary for securing fraternal cooperation between the toiling masses of the various nationalities (Piauda).

Twenty-eight years later President Harry Truman made a similar declaration in these words:

Fourth. We must embark on a bold, new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. (Inaugural address, January 20, 1949.)

I suppose it is by pure accident that the number "four" was affixed to almost identical proposals 28 years apart. If so, it is a startling coincidence.

But it raises the question whether point 4 is part of a Russian master plan to deplete our resources and destroy us economically. Although so far it is only a relatively small item, it certainly propels us down the road of unending global outlays.

Because of the similarity between point 4 and the fourth factor of Joseph Stalin, I am including the text of his remarks on this subject as recorded in Marxism and the National Question, by

Joseph Stalin, published in 1942, by International Publishers.

While on this subject, I would like to report my own opinion of point 4. I regard it as a type of meddling, professedly well-meaning in nature, that will make us enemies and lose us friends in foreign lands. I have only contempt for the glib propaganda that point 4 is a device that improves upon the efforts made by our foreign missionary societies. I believe that point 4 has been concocted and "sold" to the Fair Deal by so-called liberals whose real allegiance is to the philosophy of collectivism.

The Stalin excerpt is as follows:

The fourth factor is that a new element has been introduced into the national question—the element of real (and not merely juridical) equalization of nations (helping and encouraging the backward nations to raise themselves to the cultural and economic level of the more advanced nations), as one of the conditions necessary for securing fraternal cooperation between the toiling masses of the various nationalities. In the period of the Second International they usually confined themselves to proclaiming "national equality;" at best they did not go beyond demanding the realization of such equality. But national equality, in itself a very important political acquisition, runs the risk of remaining merely an empty phrase. Adequate resources and opportunities for exercising this very important right do not exist. There can be no question that the toiling masses of the backward peoples are not in a position to exercise the right of "national equality" granted them to the degree that it can be exercised by the toiling masses of advanced nationalities. The actual inequality of nations (cultural and economic), which is a heritage of the past and which cannot be abolished in 1 or 2 years, makes its influence felt. This circumstance is particularly perceptible in Russia, where a number of nationalities have never passed through capitalism, and some have not even entered the phase of capitalism, and have no proletariat, or practically no proletariat, of their own; where, in spite of the fact that complete national equality has already been established, the toiling masses of these nationalities are not in a position to make adequate use of the rights they have won in view of their cultural and economic backwardness.

This inequality will make itself felt still more on the morrow of the victory of the proletariat in the west, when numerous backward colonies and semicolonies, marked by the most varied levels of development, will inevitably appear on the scene. That is why it is essential that the triumphant proletariat of the advanced countries should render aid, real and prolonged aid, to the toiling masses of the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development, that it should help them to rise to a higher stage of development and to catch up with the more advanced nationalities. Unless such aid is forthcoming it will be impossible to bring about the peaceful coexistence and fraternal collaboration of the toilers of the various nations and peoples within a single world economic system that are so essential for the final triumph of socialism.

But from this it follows that we cannot content ourselves with national equality and that national equality must be extended by means of measures for securing the real equality of nationalities, and that we must proceed to work out and put into effect practical measures in relation to—

1. The study of the economic conditions, social life, and culture of the backward nations and peoples;

2. The development of their culture;

3. Their political education;
4. Their gradual and painless incorporation into the higher forms of economic life; and
5. The organization of economic cooperation between the toilers of the backward and advanced nationalities.

Such are the principal factors which distinguish the new formulation of the national question as given by the Communists. (Pravda, May 8, 1921.)

Probe Polish Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article which appeared in the Times-Leader, the Evening News, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on September 26, 1951, entitled "Probe Polish Massacre":

PROBE POLISH MASSACRE

Adoption of a resolution by the House of Representatives in Washington, authorizing an investigation of the massacre of Polish Army officers at Katyn, near Smolensk, Soviet Russia, promises a solution to one of the greatest mysteries of the Second World War.

It was just a decade ago that the civilized world was horrified by the disclosure that the bodies of 5,000 Polish officers had been found in a common grave. Altogether, 16,000 officers disappeared, but the others, although presumed dead, were never located.

When the news came to light, the Communists immediately accused the Nazis of the slaughter. But subsequent developments indicated the massacre was decreed by the Kremlin. The purpose obviously was to weaken Poland so it would be ready for the kill when the Communists were free to take over the unfortunate land.

A United States Army officer, who investigated the crime during the war, wrote a detailed report in which he exonerated the Nazis and pinned the crime on the Reds. But this report disappeared from the files of the War Department in Washington. A great many documents were conveniently removed during that period when Red agents had access to secrets of our Government.

It will be recalled that the Katyn massacre did not figure in the Nuremberg trials, although genocide was among the charges against the Nazis. Apparently it would have been very embarrassing for the Red judges to have certain matters, connected with this crime, brought before the bar of international justice.

The Soviet Union has managed to put the quietus on Katyn until now. Thanks to the activity of Representative DANIEL L. FLOOD of Luzerne County, among others, the facts are going to be ascertained and the record filled in. Incidentally, Representative FLOOD has been named vice chairman of the investigating committee, headed by Representative MADDEN, of Indiana.

Not only Americans of Polish extraction but others who believe in justice will welcome this belated attempt to fasten the blame for this massacre where it belongs. There is no time to lose because many of the witnesses and documents that might throw light on the subject will disappear soon, if they already are not gone. But there ought

to be sufficient evidence in Washington and from Polish exiles and others to record a verdict that will arrive at the truth for the benefit of this generation and succeeding ones.

Republican Advice From the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the September 28 issue of the Santa Fe New Mexican, published at Santa Fe, N. Mex., there appears an editorial on the occasion of the meeting of the 18 Republican State chairmen. This editorial from a paper which nearly all, if not all, the 100 years of its publication has been a Republican paper, is I think very timely. That editorial reads as follows:

HEAR OUR STORY, GOP

Today we welcome 18 Republican State chairmen to Santa Fe.

In these times when many burning issues seem too complex for single minds to grasp, the leaders of this great political party may find a lesson in the history of our small but ancient commonwealth, New Mexico. Our first 80 years in the Federal Union—Territory and State—we spent mostly in Republican ranks. Nothing breeds conservatism like the frontier, where wealth comes only to those who tear it barehanded from the fangs of nature.

Life is not always ruthless to the weak and small. But life is implacably ruthless to those who cannot change. In the early thirties, when our State had the highest hunger, disease, and death rates in the country, it was the then dominant Republican Party which did not change. And it was the people of New Mexico who made the change.

For the next 13 years New Mexicans followed what they believed to be the inspired leadership of a great man in another party. When this historic figure passed on our people turned—in spite of profuse advice—to the man who picked up where he left off.

The people of New Mexico were not then moved by tales of ice boxes, fur coats, or Atlantic City week ends. After all, New Mexico had been the home of Albert B. Fall.

They were not stirred by mistakes or failures of untitled men, pressed reluctantly into the job or world leadership. These New Mexicans had seen their crops fail and their herds die, because they themselves had failed to outguess elements they did not understand.

They were not interested in how smart a candidate was—they laid no claim to being smart themselves. Or whether he had been a general—they had been privates, the most unimpressive privates in history. Or who called whom Communist—as long as they could apply their own best loyalty test of all: similarity to themselves.

They did not care who stood for inflation or deflation. All they wanted was a Government dedicated to keeping their earnings in step with their living expenses.

Regardless of what the party now in power may say during the coming campaign, the people will ignore its words and judge its record. That record they will judge less by administrative successes or failures than by whether the Nation's slow movement through history is in the direction their own hearts elect.

But as for the party out of power, the people can judge it only by its words. Are the Republicans the party of shrinking ourselves inward upon half a continent, the party of accepting would leadership which has been thrust upon us; or the party of launching new wars on distant continents without allies? The party out of power now speaks with all these voices.

Before the national convention ends, one or the other of the warring Republican factions will come out on top, or the different factions will get together on a compromise candidate. But during the past five national elections the people of New Mexico, once a Republican State, have demonstrated that they will make no man President until they are convinced that he and his party are wholeheartedly one, and will remain as one, on those few basic principles the people have already chosen for themselves.

Let's Quit Knocking America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Fort Worth Labor News:

LET'S QUIT KNOCKING AMERICA

It has become quite popular in recent months to run down the American Government. We hear it all about us—on the buses, at the cafe counter, and especially at the luncheon clubs. It even goes on, unfortunately, in some churches and Sunday schools.

The ironical thing is that the people involved are those who wrap the mantle of patriotism about themselves, and pose as the defenders of the American system. They are not. The type of lip service which they mouth is a far cry from the fierce patriotism of the mass of Americans who, however inarticulate they may be, stand up with deep, heartfelt pride in theirs, the best government in the word—because they are the government.

Yes, some of the best people today, having ceased to think for themselves, are throwing their hats in the air and handclapping over some of the most dangerous and subverting drivel ever dished out under the guise of Americanism. And you can put this in your pipe and smoke it. If freedom ever topples in this country, it will not be because the Communists could beat us on land, or sea, or in the air—or in the hearts of men. It will be because we listen to the sirens of distrust in our own midst, lose faith in our own wonderful system, and forget that by the grace of God and the heroism of our forefathers, we are the Government in America.

Yes, daily in Fort Worth—and all over the Nation—men of prominence are rising to their feet, often under the shadow of the American flag, and shouting against the Government.

We are not speaking of those who simply disagree with Mr. Truman, or think Mr. MacArthur was right, or don't like Secretary Acheson. Heaven knows, in the America we love, there is plenty of room for such disagreements.

We are talking about those luncheon club speakers and others who launch tirades against "the Government," who by emotional appeal set the people off on one side, and

the Government off on the other—as if the Government today had not been voted lawfully by the people, and may not well be voted out at the next election.

We are talking about those who, thru emotion, stir up one segment of our marvelous land against another, as, for instance, these same people stir up business and professional men against labor and the fine labor unions of this country, and contrive to make patriotic union men and women out as subversives. We are talking about those who wave the flag against "bureaucrats," and denounce as pink conspirators all those who have devoted their lives to one of the finest services a man may render—public service.

We are talking about the stream of hate for our own Government which flows from that slander mill known as Harding College in Searcy, Ark., which ladles out, ready-made, the most dangerous and undermining stream of propaganda now flowing loose in our country.

It is dangerous because it seeks to convince us that our Government—not just our present administration—is to be distrusted. In fact, it really seeks to convince us that all government is an evil thing—that positive community action to meet community problems is nothing but Russian-type communism in disguise.

To sell us this miserable bill of goods, it even distorts history and tries to convince us that Russian-type communism was what made Rome fall, and Athens fall—and is what motivates Britain today. Personally, we have no doubt that Russian-type communism would have been enough to make Rome and Athens fall, or any other nation, for that matter.

But to any careful student of history, such an interpretation is plain dishonesty, calculated to frighten uninformed Americans and turn them against their own democratic government. And it is surprising how many adult, supposedly educated men and women are drinking it in.

America's government remains the greatest in the world, and will remain so as long as the people zealously guard their possession of it, and their faith in it.

We're getting blamed tired of all the self-appointed prophets of doom who want to protect the American people from themselves.

We trust the people one whale of a lot more than the prophets.

Top Secret, Secret, Confidential, Restricted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the blinders are on, boys, and you had better keep your mouth shut, too. This is the significance of the new Truman directive to all agencies throughout the executive branch of our Government. Henceforth, they are to issue no statements or other information which requires safeguarding in order to protect the national interest. The four categories employed by the State and Defense Departments to withhold significant items from publication, top secret, confidential, and restricted, are henceforth to become the watchwords of all executive agencies.

Just what this might mean is not difficult to guess. A congressional investi-

gator seeking to discover how many employees have been added to a special department might be told promptly that this was restricted data, whose revelation might give valuable tips to the potential enemies of the Nation. Nonsense of this kind has always been possible when censorship has been invoked in the name of national emergencies.

At this particular time, when so many of the Federal agencies are under careful scrutiny, the new order takes on particular meaning. Despite the President's assertion that it is not censorship, it will look like censorship, it will act like censorship, and unless the American press is very much mistaken, it will also smell like censorship.

What Do the People Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a very genuine apprehension that the policies of the Truman administration seem to be inevitably leading us down the road toward state socialism, an editorial from the Everett (Mass.) News-Gazette of September 21, 1951, bolsters up our abiding faith that the majority of our people are really opposed to socialism and that they may be depended upon to act wisely at the ballot box. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial as follows:

WHAT DO THE PEOPLE WANT?

Do the people want socialized electricity? A great many politicians claim they do—or, at least, that they will accept it willingly. But the available factual evidence presents quite a different picture.

The Pacific Northwest is a good example. It contains some of the Government's largest power dams. The tax-paid Washington propaganda boys have beaten the drums for so-called public power for years. Everything possible has been done to make the voters believe that only Government can assure them an adequate electric supply at a low cost.

Between 1946 and 1950, inclusive, in Oregon, the citizens of 17 towns and areas voted on proposals for municipal electric plants, or for the creation of public utility districts which would supplant the private utilities. In 15 cases the proposals were voted down, often by heavy majorities. In only two were they approved.

This year two such proposals have been voted on in the State of Washington. Both were decisively defeated.

It's hard to see how anyone could argue that these votes do not represent public opinion. Both sides presented their cases in full, and in every instance public interest was high. The voters simply weighed the proposals on their merits—and marked their ballots accordingly.

In the case of the Federal socialized power systems, the people have no direct voice—it's a case where socialism is forced down our throats whether we like it or not. But when the people can speak out, at the ballot box, socialism almost always gets the ax.

Resolutions Adopted by Sixty-first Annual Congress, Sons of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions which were adopted by the Sixty-first Annual Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution, on July 11, 1951, at San Francisco, Calif.: First, preamble to the report of resolutions committee; second, resolution regarding United Nations; third, resolution on world government and Atlantic Union; fourth, resolution challenging propaganda of Communists and Fabian Socialists; and, fifth, resolution regarding support of public-school system.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that all these resolutions be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. I may say that the Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution is one of the outstanding patriotic organizations of the country and that while I do not agree with all of the details of two of the resolutions which are submitted I have been asked to request their insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, and am doing it for that reason.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SIXTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, JULY 11, 1951, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

PREAMBLE TO THE REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

We note with a feeling of chagrin that even at this hour of peril to this Nation, scores of organizations and groups of agitators are feverishly working to undermine the faith of our people in the form of government bequeathed to us by our forefathers and to destroy the way of life under which this Republic became the most potent factor in world affairs.

We are not deceived by the high-sounding phrases of those fostering these movements. Whenever and wherever the masks have been pushed aside it has invariably developed that back of such movements are men who prefer a different way of life from that we have learned to love. Many well-intentioned people have been misled by their false propaganda and their half-truths.

We recognize such movements for what they are in truth and in fact. We know that most of their leaders, either open or underground, are not friends of, but are enemies of this Republic.

We commend the officials of this great organization for a year of untiring efforts to tell the people of America the whole truth about communism, State socialism, collectivism, one-world government, and all such movements and we also commend our committee and the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities for their valued efforts to unmask the leaders of these movements and develop the fallacies of their teachings. We are happy to note that no longer are men and women afraid of the

pernicious assaults on all those who seek to learn the truth about such movements. We are happy to note that there is a growing sentiment in these United States, that the enemy shall not prevail by dividing us in our thinking and thus make victory for the enemy inevitable.

We renew our faith in our Republic, its Constitution, its Bill of Rights, its program for the basic human freedoms we have enjoyed for so long, and we pledge our efforts to help preserve these basic human freedoms from attack from whatsoever source—to the end that representative government, our free-enterprise system, our freedoms under our Bill of Rights shall be preserved for our children and our children's children. We would be untrue to ourselves and our posterity, untrue to our forefathers and their way of life if we did not wholeheartedly and uncompromisingly resolve that those who would take from us our basic human freedoms and enslave us, under whatever flag or slogan, shall not succeed.

Respectfully submitted.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, SIXTY-FIRST
CONGRESS, SONS OF THE AMERICAN
REVOLUTION

RESOLUTION REGARDING UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the United Nations are a group of nations banded together for the sole purpose of preserving peace in the world, and

Whereas the United Nations has not preserved peace but has become a sinister organization, seeking to control the economic conditions of the world and to promulgate rules controlling civil conduct and government of the world under the guise of creating and perpetuating world-wide peace and that the purposes of peace have not been realized but have resulted in war; and

Whereas the plans of the United Nations are usurping and will eventually usurp the vested rights and privileges of American citizenship; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States by the powers vested in the United Nations can be destroyed and authority exercised over the individual American citizen in every phase of his economic and political life; and

Whereas the entry of our Government into this international organization has forced upon the American citizen heavy confiscatory taxes and that actually people of the United States have paid and are now paying and financing 85 percent of the cost of the operation of this international organization without receiving any financial support from certain members nations; and

Whereas the United Nations, under powers delegated to it by our National Congress, actually changes international law affecting the individual rights of the American people, and

Whereas power has been delegated by our National Congress so that the power of the United Nations is superior to the power of the United States, and such power is actually in the hands of eleven or more men speaking for their government as members of this world-wide international organization; and

Whereas the actions of the United Nations in the past and in the future have been without asking for divine guidance and its sessions are opened without prayer to Almighty God to guide the membership in its deliberations and its acts and its deeds; now, therefore, since the foundation and framework and laws of our Government are grounded firmly upon the individual rights of the citizen and our paramount law is the law as announced by our time-honored Constitution, all based upon our belief in a Supreme Being; and

Whereas 78,000 casualties have resulted in an undeclared war now being waged in Korea; Be it, therefore

Resolved, That the United States withdraw from the United Nations at the earliest reasonable moment; and until such time, be it further

Resolved, That the Sons of the American Revolution in congress assembled at San Francisco on July 11, 1951, invite the attention of the President and the Congress to the dangers that lie in the adoption of committee reports of the United Nations submitted to the United States for adoption and that we recommend that the Executive and the Congress be cautious in taking action under the provision of the United Nations Charter, lest the very rights granted by our Constitution and Bill of Rights be lost and that the United Nations Charter and the proposed changes to strengthen it be not used to the destruction of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly request the United States Senate to promulgate and put in force a resolution whereby all future action of the Senate in the ratification of any treaty, affidavit, agreement or other commitment having to do with the foreign affairs of the United States shall not offend, impair or supersede the Constitution of the United States or of any State thereof or be effective for any purpose unless and until legislation implementing the same shall have been duly enacted by the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION ON WORLD GOVERNMENT AND
ATLANTIC UNION

Whereas the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in Congress assembled in Atlantic City, N. J., on May 17, 1950, adopted a resolution opposed to the United States becoming a part of any world government; and

Whereas there was introduced in the United States Congress on January 15, 1951, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4 and House Concurrent Resolution No. 26, worded identically and known as the Atlantic Union Resolution, and

Whereas the ultimate object of these resolutions is the formation of a federal union composed of the 7 governments that were parties to the Atlantic Treaty, and as stated by the proponents of the resolutions, may be extended to include the 12 governments now in the Atlantic Pact and eventually include more nations; and

Whereas such an Atlantic Union and world federation requires the United States to surrender important basic sovereign rights to the vote and control of these nations, some socialistic, others with strong communistic tendencies, giving them power over matters that affect the independence, prosperity, and life of the United States, power to cancel rights now guaranteed by our Constitution, power to alter the form of our National Government, and power to nullify State laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sons of the American Revolution reaffirm their opposition to the entrance of or participation by the United States in any world-government plan or negotiation pertaining thereto, and, particularly, are opposed to those resolutions now pending in the United States Congress and to the action of the Senators and Representatives who have given their names as supporting these resolutions, and be it further

Resolved, That the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution is unalterably opposed to the adoption of said resolutions and opposed to any form of world government involving the United States of America;

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Governors of all States, and Members of Congress;

Resolved further, That all State societies, and specifically the Sons of the American Revolution State Societies in the States represented by the 27 Senators and 92 Repre-

sentatives be requested to have their constituents register their respective disapproval with their Senators and Representatives who have approved said resolutions.

RESOLUTION CHALLENGING PROPAGANDA OF
COMMUNISTS AND FABIAN SOCIALISTS

Resolved, That we deem it appropriate at this meeting, held on the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, to promulgate the following statements concerning the propaganda attack being made on our Constitution and republican form of government.

First As to the alleged right of revolution asserted by the Communists

A vital part of the propaganda of the Communist Party is the repeated appropriation of a right to bring about revolution by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means; the misuse of quotations from utterances of American patriots such as Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln to create belief in such a right, and the claim that legal control over revolutionary activities is an infringement of civil liberty and a denial of free speech

There is no such thing as a right of revolution to accomplish the objectives of the Communist Party. Under the Declaration of Independence governments derive their "just powers from the consent of the governed." Dictatorship of the proletariat is tyranny. It is un-American and a violation of this Declaration to the same extent as any other dictatorship

These false claims of the Communists are a libel on the reputation and integrity of the great men who established free government in America.

It is time for all patriotic men and women to denounce and expose these false claims and to declare their true purpose, which is to furnish a legal basis for treason

Second In regard to the so-called right of infiltration used by Fabian Socialists and advocates of the social welfare state as a means of seizing and exercising governmental power without the knowledge or consent of the people

The signers of the Declaration of Independence pledged themselves "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence" to support it with their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor

Men accepting public office assume this legal and moral obligation. Public office is a public trust. The Federal Constitution requires Senators, Representatives, members of State legislatures, and executive and judicial officers of the United States and of the several States to take a solemn oath or affirmation to support its provisions. This oath imposes an obligation binding on the conscience of the one taking it, aside from any legal responsibility which may attach. From the moral and ethical standpoint, it is dishonorable and under present conditions equivalent to treason for any man to take such an oath without the intention of performing it. The disregard of the obligation of integrity represented by these oaths represents one of the most serious threats to the maintenance of our republican form of government

There is no right entitling any Fabian Socialist, National Socialist, or other revolutionary to accept public office as part of any infiltration scheme having for its object the substitution of some new or different form of government for our Federal Constitution without the consent of the people.

RESOLUTION REGARDING SUPPORT OF PUBLIC-
SCHOOL SYSTEM

Resolved, That we do hereby declare that we strongly support the public-school system and we recognize the absolute necessity for such a system, as an effective agency to support constitutional government and to make our Government workable in practice. As evidence of our support and fundamental belief in that system, we have, in recent

years sought to expose and eliminate the subversive practices which have in some instances injured that system and have attempted to convert it into a potential danger to the American people. We believe in the fundamental integrity of the average teacher. We are convinced that many of our teachers are misinformed and misrepresented by those who seek to dominate and control the public-school system, and that the teachers themselves will institute reforms once the facts are brought out into the open.

Miss Peggy Cannon's Work in the Battle Against Disease in Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the World Health Organization, affiliated with the United Nations, issues a fine news letter which contains many interesting notes on what is being done by international effort to advance and protect the health of the peoples of the world, especially in the underdeveloped areas.

The August-September issue of this news letter carried a very interesting and well-written report describing one of these projects in Thailand. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article on the battle against disease in Thailand in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN IRISH BROGUE IN THAILAND

(A report by Brian R. O'Brien, information officer for UNICEF Far East Headquarters, Bangkok)

In the remote northeast of Thailand, less than 100 miles from the Burmese border, is a rice bowl ringed by mountains. In this sheltered plain lies Chiangmai, chief town of the province of that name. There is an air about Chiangmai, a feeling that this is a land apart.

Perhaps it is its isolation, or maybe it is the many trees which stand their ground against the encroaching rice fields. Perhaps it is the hill of Doi Su Dhep with its mountain streams and many lacy waterfalls. In this dreamy Shangri-la you will find a people, kindly, smiling, and ingenuous almost beyond belief.

Closer acquaintance, though, would let you know that they have their troubles, from the dread malaria and other insect-borne diseases that plague the area. You would find out, too, that they have their worries about their children, for all too many of them die. So do many mothers bringing the children into the world.

That something can be done to prevent this loss of life, and the ill health of which those high mortality rates are only a reflection, is knowledge that is now being brought to the people of Chiangmai. A nurse from Ireland, straight from the hills of Donegan, is having an important part in that work.

MALARIA CONTROL AIDED BY WHO/UNICEF

She is Miss Peggy Cannon, who for more than a year now, has been in Chiangmai in connection with a malaria-control demon-

stration being carried on by the Thai Government with the help of two United Nations agencies, the International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health Organization (WHO). While teams travel from village to village spraying the habitations with UNICEF-supplied DDT, Nurse Cannon works with the women and children.

Her work means home visiting, conducting mother and child health clinics, supervising village midwives, and caring for the health of school children. Another assignment is to teach pupil nurses public health nursing.

A visit with Miss Cannon to a village clinic in the Chiangmai area is an enlightening experience. In some places the Government has erected buildings, but in most villages, clinics are held in any convenient place that will give shelter from the sun. Sometimes the tall trees of the forest lend their shade, at other times it may be necessary to assemble underneath the headman's house. Buffaloes with high scythe-like horns stand placidly by. Orchids cascade from the palms.

CLINIC FOR MOTHERS AND CHILDREN

The people arrive usually well ahead of time and wait patiently for attention. The children, impressed by the occasion, sit quietly on their heels like so many bronze images. A young mother holds her baby close. Obviously if it does not soon get attention it will die. On a rough bench is a basin of water, a towel, some soap, hypodermic needles and a small bottle of lymph. Water in an iron pot is being boiled for sterilizing purposes over a small Chinese oven. The clinic begins. Medicines are given or prescribed. Some are advised to go to hospitals while others are treated on the spot.

"How many babies for vaccination?" asks Miss Cannon.

The interpreter replies, "Ten."

Miss Cannon busies herself with needles and vaccines.

"I see the teacher's twins are here today," comments the interpreter.

"How is their weight?" asks Miss Cannon.

The interpreter looks at the record. "No gain since last check."

"Is she continuing the whole-milk formula?"

"Yes."

"Ask her about the vitamins. They should be getting C and D."

The interpreter duly inquires. "They're not getting their vitamins," is the reply.

"Tell her the children require them, particularly the one that's just had pneumonia."

Miss Cannon scrubs her hands while the mothers form a queue to have their children vaccinated.

"Everything is ready," announces the assistant.

"All right, Miss Aunchan. I'll prepare the skin. You do the vaccinating."

So the work is done.

MILK PROVIDED BY UNICEF

"When we started work here," relates Miss Cannon, "we discovered that most of the mothers considered it necessary to feed the baby only three times a day. Now we encourage the mor tam-yaes to let the mother breast-feed the baby 6 to 8 hours after delivery, and from then on every 3 or 4 hours, depending on the size of the infant. We encourage all new mothers, expectant mothers, and children over 12 months to take skim milk. Whole milk, which, like the skim, is provided by UNICEF, is distributed at the clinic by the public health nurse to babies under 12 months who require supplementary feeding or who, for one reason or another, cannot be breast-fed. Milk is an unknown food here, however, and its introduction will take time. Some mothers take it regularly; others will not drink it."

The mor tam-yaes are very ready to learn, and attendances at the monthly clinics are excellent. One old lady of 74 has never missed a clinic since they started.

CLASSES FOR VILLAGE MIDWIVES

There they learn not to feed the babies rice or bananas until they are at least 5 months old. They learn not to bathe a newly born baby in cold water, but to use warm water only. They learn cleanliness and simple asepsis. They learn not to interfere with the normal course of delivery, but to call for help if anything goes wrong.

Old practices and customs, if there is no harm in them, are respected. For instance, in some places, after the birth of a child, the placenta in the case of a boy is buried in the garden so that he will grow up to be a good worker and till the soil. In the case of a girl the placenta is buried at the gate of the house so that the girl will grow up to be hospitable and so get herself a husband.

Home visiting is one of the most useful and satisfying parts of Miss Cannon's work. This rural work for nurses is something entirely new to Thailand. First visits find the people shy. The children scuttle away into the forest and peep behind the tree trunks like little gnomes. But before many days have passed they are coming out to meet her and clinging to her skirts with obvious affection, and their parents, too, have a warm welcome for her. There are rapid conversations which need no interpreter.

FIRST NEED IS TRAINED PERSONNEL

A most important part of Nurse Cannon's work, though, is not what she herself does, but the help she is giving so that others can carry on in her place. Such is the purpose of her being here in Thailand, and others like her being in the other countries of South East Asia, for their work is part of a large effort being made in these countries to build up elementary services for women and children. A first need is for trained men and women, like the mor tam-yaes to work among the people, for until such people are trained other plans must remain on paper. The governments of these Asian countries are trying to meet that need, and to that end they are asking for, and receiving, help from WHO and UNICEF. The World Health Organization provides the technical knowledge, UNICEF the "tools"—dried skim or whole milk, mid-wifery kits, medical equipment and supplies, and the like needed to get the work started. It is a down-to-earth type of international assistance, undramatic perhaps, but far-reaching. And it involves many Nurse Cannons and their counterparts in the villages and towns of all of South East Asia.

One County Contributes \$60,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Ham-monton (N. J.) News points out that Atlantic County alone will contribute more than \$60,000,000 toward the current Federal budget. It is useful that the people back home should know about these costs. The editorial follows:

Taxpayers of Atlantic County will contribute \$60,382,000 toward the \$68,400,000,000 which the Federal Government aims to spend by the end of the current fiscal year June 30, 1952, the New Jersey Citizens Committee for the Hoover report estimate.

The county figure is based on a per capita apportionment of \$2,156,884.192 estimated as New Jersey's proportionate share of the pro-

jected Federal spending. The \$68,400,000,000 figure is the estimate of Budget Bureau Director Frederick J. Lawton, made during a recent interview in Washington.

At that taxpayers will be asked to contribute even more than the figure indicated. Appropriation bills, yet to be passed by Congress, may go as high as \$100,000,000,000—far and away a record for peacetime Government spending. Thus, Government bureaus will have to step up their spending to keep pace with appropriations.

New Jersey taxpayers still have a chance to have their say on the astronomical spending program, by writing to their Congressmen urging support of the 20-point Hoover economy program which was introduced in Congress last spring.

To date, Congress has given only token attention to the program, which is based on the detailed recommendations for governmental efficiency, streamlining, and economy made several years ago by the bipartisan Hoover Commission. If the legislation were enacted it would not only save nearly \$10,000,000,000 now wasted annually but would serve notice on the Government that the folks back home still have a watchful eye on the purse strings.

Pack of Lies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have consistently urged the adoption of the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission cannot be blamed for feeling that it is perhaps a futile endeavor in view of the apparent lack of interest on the part of the President. The need for stopping unnecessary Government spending, however, becomes more urgent day by day. Bearing on this vital problem is an excellent editorial from the Melrose (Mass.) Free Press of September 27, 1951, and I append it hereto under leave to extend my remarks:

PACK OF LIES

President Truman has strongly defended his proposed Federal budget, contending that no major cuts can be made in any part of it without endangering the welfare of the Nation. In a recent speech the President took his most aggressive position yet, when he stated that charges of waste and extravagance in the Federal establishment amount to a "pack of lies."

The President has every right to his views. But if he is correct in this instance, the country certainly is full of "packs of lies," and they abound in the Democratic as well as the Republican Party. Senator BYRD, for instance, holds—and substantiates his position with masses of facts and figures—that the budget could be reduced by something like \$8,000,000,000 without harming any essential government activity. Senator Douglas has waged a gallant but losing battle against pork-barrel spending which cannot be defended except on vote-seeking political grounds. The Hoover Commission, which was entirely nonpartisan, showed precisely where billions are being wasted in the administration of the Government. Only a few of the Hoover Commission recommendations have been adopted and those

that have been are of a relatively minor character.

The President's stand is logical only if we assume that centralized government must do everything for everybody. In essence, this assumption says that the people are incapable of taking care of themselves, and that, consequently, they must be wards of the state. That is a philosophy of defeat and despair, and no nation could accept it and retain its strength and freedom.

Unbridled government spending is a cancer that can destroy the richest nation.

More Powerful Than the A-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph J. Bunche, in the Progressive magazine, a publication founded by former Senator Robert M. La Follette.

Mr. Bunche is Director of the Department of Trusteeship of the United Nations and is one of the most celebrated American figures in world affairs. Best known for his successful mediation in Palestine conflict he has performed a host of less widely known services in the cause of peace and international understanding. The article is adapted from a talk Dr. Bunche gave at the World Affairs Institute at the University of Denver recently:

MORE POWERFUL THAN THE A-BOMB

(By Ralph J. Bunche)

It would take great prophetic power to predict how the two great issues of our time—freedom and peace—will be resolved. The only prediction any of us in the United Nations can make with certainty is that the world will be gravely troubled so long as deep fear and suspicion persist among its peoples, and so long as governments succumb to aggressive ambitions.

If the future is unclear, the present is not. The world of today is drifting dangerously. In it both peace and freedom seem clear-cut and decisive to Americans. We regard freedom as something well-defined government of, for, and by the people, the inalienable rights of man, the dignity of the individual; freedom of speech, press, and conscience, the right to boo the umpire and the President alike—we indulge as abundantly in one as the other. To us, the issue of peace or war is also simply defined. War, we contend, is something which can only be forced upon us by direct threat to our national security.

It is imperative that we in America realize that these same issues are by no means so well defined in the thinking of many other peoples in the world. It is important for us to bear in mind that vast millions of people—indeed, most of the world's peoples—have had little or no familiarity with the concepts of freedom to which we in America are dedicated.

This is no mere question of peoples and concepts of the West as against peoples and concepts of the East. The issue of human freedom covers the globe. In varying degrees of intensity, it is to be found in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, the Caribbean, Western Europe, and in some aspects at least, it is as yet unresolved even in our

own country. We ourselves have still much to do in the development of our freedom. We have bigotries to eradicate, undemocratic limitations on suffrage to abolish, poverty, and insecurity for many of our citizens to eliminate.

The issue of human freedom, to be sure, is implicit in the desperate ideological conflict between western democracy and communism, but it is by no means confined to that conflict, nor would the resolution of that conflict find the issue of world freedom resolved. In this sense, the impasse between west and east often leads us to oversimplify grossly the universal problem of human freedom.

We speak glibly these days of the "free peoples" and the "free world," and in doing so we not unnaturally think in terms of our own freedoms. But in actual fact, many among those who are allied with us or whom we hope to have allied with us, against the Communist threat, would not measure up at all as "free" by our standards of freedom. To a considerable extent, what we really mean by the "free world" or the "free peoples" are those who are opposed to communism and aggression, rather than peoples who are actually "free."

Taken in this sense, one of the most serious weaknesses of the "free world" is to be found in the fact that so many of its peoples are not really free and do not enjoy those fundamental rights and freedoms which inspire peoples voluntarily to make heroic sacrifices for their heritage of freedom, or, for that matter, to understand clearly the essential issues between democracy and communism.

In this regard, the Western World today pays dearly for some of its unfortunate policies of the past. The concepts and practices of freedom and democracy have been cultivated primarily as western notions and assets, and have in the past been withheld from or only grudgingly conceded to peoples elsewhere in the world. Freedom and democracy were not in the past generously exported by most of the colonial-minded, imperialistic west, and consequently the millions of Asia and Africa have lagged far behind in the development of human freedom and democratic institutions of government, as they lag far behind in the material standards of life.

In other words, freedom heretofore has been too much confined to an exclusive group of societies, the dominant and favored few of the world. But now, the western concept of freedom is everywhere challenged and threatened by the Communist creed. It can be preserved for those of us who enjoy it only by the widest possible mobilization of those who believe in it. To believe in freedom, people must have some knowledge and understanding of it, and this can come only from experience with it. Recruits for freedom—and they are desperately needed—can be won only by the widest extension of freedom.

It should be obvious that the free peoples of the world, in the protection of their own freedom, must exert every effort to rectify the errors of the past.

They should embark upon a universal crusade for the extension of maximum freedom to all peoples.

They should carry the gospel of freedom to the most remote corners of the earth.

They should seek the rapid dissolution of colonialism.

They should give encouragement and substantial material support to the development of free institutions among every people they can reach.

No such concerted effort is today being made by free nations and peoples. There is much lip service to freedom which is counteracted by a disposition to hold firm to many of the outmoded notions and attitudes of the past regarding peoples long treated as backward.

The west has not sufficiently sensed the revolutionary ferment in process all over the world, and has not fully realized that the old tempo of human progress, the traditional gradualism, is far too slow for peoples who have for so long known only misery and repression, and who have been shocked into a new awareness and aspirations by the two World Wars.

We must never forget that the most vital issue is the peoples of the world—their progressive well-being, the realization of their aspirations, their changing attitudes, and the way of life they may choose or may have forced upon them.

The preponderance of the world's population is found in Asia and Africa. These vast millions, on whom the eyes of an anxious world are now focused, are not really "backward" or inferior or different, they have been and largely still are neglected, suppressed, long-suffering, and miserable.

But they have awakened or are rapidly awakening. Revolutions are in progress among them. They seek freedom and a better life—education, housing, health protection, security. All this has little or nothing to do with communism or any other ideology.

These revolutions cannot be stopped, nor can they be slowed down. The fateful questions are two:

Will the revolutions be violent, or can they be achieved without bloodshed as the United Nations strives for?

Will the revolutions lead into democratic or totalitarian channels?

The western democratic and freedom-loving world can do much to determine the answers to these questions. But the sands are running fast.

To do so, the West must quickly accommodate itself to a new orientation. Peace in the world must be paced by human progress, by equality and dignity for all peoples. The west must learn how to approach the Asiatic and African peoples understandingly and how to win their trust and friendship.

We in the west must realize that despite the undoubted benefits which the west has brought to these formerly far-off lands, there is a long and unsavory history of western imperialism, suppression, and exploitation to be overcome. It will not suffice to offer them only our sophisticated concepts of "western democracy."

Our ideals and professions will have significance in this world-wide struggle only as they find concrete expression in policies and deeds. We must demonstrate our sincerity with regard to the principle of the equality of all peoples by accepting and treating all peoples as equals. We must prove our friendship by extending to them a friendly, not a paternalistic, hand.

In that hand must be many of the things they have so long lacked and now desperately seek, and with no strings attached—technical assistance of many kinds, friendly advice, goods, mechanical equipment, medical supplies, foodstuffs, and assurance that they can have freedom and be secure in it if they will but join with those who stand for peace and freedom.

This will be costly, to be sure, but a tremendous program could be supported for the cost of only a short period of warfare in Korea or anywhere else. Freedom is worth any cost.

I trust that I may be pardoned for noting that my own group, the American Negro, has an especially acute concern for human freedom.

Despite the substantial progress made since the end of slavery the Negro has not yet won his full freedom in this society. Four score and eight years after the great emancipation he is still burdened with undemocratic and un-American restrictions and handicaps, with racial discriminations

and indignities which deny to him that full measure of freedom which is the rightful heritage of every American.

II

I am an American but I am also a Negro; I am proud to be both. Inevitably, as a Negro, I have had no little experience with racial handicaps, rebuffs, discriminations, and indignities, not a few of which were encountered in the capital of the greatest democracy on earth. But I have also had more than one man's share of good fortune. I believe in my country and the American way of life. I have a deep faith in its future and in its ability to correct the undemocratic practices which persist.

It is easy for me to be a good and loyal American. There are great numbers of my race who can lay far better claim than I to unselfish devotion to our country. I think, for example, of the Negro soldier in the hazardous foxholes of Korea, fighting and dying for your future and mine, for security and freedom for you and me that he has never himself enjoyed in full measure at home, solely because his skin is black. This is Americanism at its finest and should put to shame the racial bigots and those small men who, with loud irresponsibility, parade about the country as self-appointed guardians of Americans and Americanism, sowing vicious crops of suspicion, mistrust, confusion, and loss of faith in our democratic institutions.

In this dangerous age it is not enough to have and enjoy freedom. Those who are privileged to enjoy it have the obligation to use it wisely and responsibly. This holds particularly true for Americans because of our heavy responsibilities of leadership, and because the eyes of so many peoples the world over are intently focused upon us. In the end, it is how we use our freedom that will count most heavily.

On this score, we have much to be concerned about at home. There are some within the society, more vociferous than numerous, who, for reasons of hysteria or from more sinister motivations, would take advantage of the deep anxiety induced by the world crisis to stifle independence of thought and the right of criticism, to restrict and circumscribe our traditional rights and freedoms, and generally to invoke a reign of suspicion, terror, and intimidation not unfamiliar to Nazi Germany.

In such soil freedom would quickly wither away. The objectives and tactics of the handful of internal Communists are now well known and are readily identified. We are, perhaps, less well prepared to identify and deal with neofascists in our midst. They, too, threaten our liberties. It took great sacrifice and unrivaled courage to win our American freedom. It will take great sacrifice and unceasing vigilance to preserve it today.

It is because I believe that the American way of life—for all the shortcomings and imperfections of our society—is the best blueprint yet devised for dignified living among free and self-respecting men that I am deeply disturbed at some of the signs of our times. These are signs of American conduct that weaken and divide us as a people and undermine our traditional liberties.

There are demagogues busily at work misleading the people with half-truths and purposeful falsehoods. There are radio commentators and newspaper columnists who concentrate on pouring forth venom and lies with the apparently deliberate purpose of misleading and confusing the public, and breaking down their faith. There are character assassins at work who respect not even those public servants whose lives have been fully dedicated to the Nation.

We see partisanship running hog wild. For some, freedom is only a convenient vehicle in the service of selfish individual political or economic ends. It seems to me that

there are too many people in high as well as low places who are using our traditional freedom to serve their selfish ends without regard for the well-being of the Nation.

III

Some of those who proclaim most loudly and frequently their concern for Americanism and the security of the Nation serve it least. They do us much damage at home and abroad. Our future will be in most serious jeopardy if our principles, high moral values, and our ideals are to be sacrificed on the altar of petty partisanship by petty men.

Moreover, it is impossible to calculate the damage done to our cause throughout the world by evidences of violent racial intolerance like the recent sordid episode in Cicero, Ill. These incidents make more virulent propaganda against us than any enemy could possibly invent. We cannot ever explain such deeds to those nonwhite peoples who constitute the great majority of the world's population and whose confidence and friendship we seek and need.

The world crisis calls us to a firm rededication to the ideals and moral values that have made us free and great. We need men who are national patriots before they are party partisans. We need men of courage who will stand forth as true partisans of freedom, equality, and democracy. We need men who will hold country above party.

I have mentioned the issue of peace or war. We in America have our liberty, our superior standard of living; for us, war is a last resort in the defense of our security and freedom. We would fight again to protect our heritage. But there are other peoples in the world who seek the freedom they do not now enjoy and who, if no alternative is left to them, will fight to achieve it even as we fought for our own 175 years ago.

We have witnessed such determination recently in Southeast Asia and the Near East. There are ominous rumblings of similarly burgeoning nationalism in Africa. Peoples, otherwise peace-loving, will wage war for their freedom. But today, every war, no matter how small and local, poses a threat to the peace of the world. Peace can never be secure in the world until peoples who aspire to freedom may be assured of it without recourse to violence.

The universal struggle for human freedom can be won. But war is no longer the way to win it, either for those who have it or for those who seek it. Peace and freedom in the world are closely allied. Victory in war for the free world, in eliminating one threat to freedom, would inevitably set freedom back everywhere, would leave the basic problem unresolved, and would create conditions which could only beget further war.

There can be peace in the world. But it can be achieved only through the resolute application of collective security. It is folly in this age to speak of any nation saving the peace or protecting its security by unilateral action.

The principle of collective security is neither mystery nor plot. Every man in the street knows well enough that if one faces the prospect of a fight it is both comforting and good sense to be accompanied by friends. That is precisely the purpose of collective security—it draws together in a bond of common purpose, in the interest of their own security, all nations and peoples who are opposed to armed aggression and who are prepared to oppose it with force if necessary. It was necessary in Korea, and collective security is at work there, more promisingly today than at any time since the North Korean forces launched the aggression against the Republic of Korea in June 1950.

The successful U. N. intervention in Korea may well prove to be the decisive event in our times. Those voices which speak of the uselessness of the Korean action speak falsely. They deliberately ignore the highly signifi-

cant fact that the Korean decision was the first instance in history of collective police action to repel aggression. They avoid the vital truth that Korea sounded the harsh alarm for the free world and purchased invaluable time in which free peoples might mobilize their strength. Korea has demonstrated the immense potentiality of collective action by peoples whose sights are true. It has provided a most solemn warning to all would-be aggressors of the future.

If the lessons of Korea are learned well and if nations will but take the preventive actions which these lessons demand, there can be an end to aggression in the world and an era of far greater security for all peoples.

But collective security is a means, not an end. It can be no more effective than the firm determination of nations and peoples will make it. As Secretary of State Acheson has recently written: "Collective security is like a bank account. It is kept alive by the resources which are put into it."

We must realize that peace cannot be cheaply or quickly won. It is only by patient, unrelenting, and undismayed effort that secure peace can be achieved. There are no easy roads to peace, no short cuts or pat solutions.

Nor can there be any question of peace at the price of appeasement, or surrender of fundamental principle. Peace, clearly, cannot be won in this way. But, on the other hand, neither can peace be won by threatening war, by sword-rattling, or intangence. The tried and true and fully honorable instrument in the conduct of international affairs is negotiation. The settlement of international disputes by negotiation and compromise is a difficult and tedious, and, today particularly, a frustrating process. But the dividend is peace.

There can be no doubt that the American people seek peace. They would not, to be sure, take peace at any price, at the fatal cost of appeasement. But given any honorable alternative to war they will welcome it enthusiastically.

Nevertheless, there are voices among us today which speak loosely and lightly of war. They do not reflect the American desire for peace, and, indeed, they seem to imply that it is an evidence of weakness to strive for peace. There are some who talk as though the only relevant question concerning our going to war is whether we can be certain to win it. We hear some who boast of our ability to defeat any enemy and who seem to regret that we are not hastening to do so.

If I understand them correctly, there are some Americans today who would have us conduct our foreign affairs on the juvenile basis of drawing lines, issuing dares, and swaggering about with an atomic chip on the shoulder, crying aloud that we can lick anybody.

We are a great Nation with tremendous responsibilities of leadership to discharge. In this threatening hour we must be strong, but our strength must consist of more than arms and production lines and armies of fighting men, indispensable as these are. Our effective strength must depend also upon great wisdom and understanding and upon an unimpeachable moral position.

IV

To meet the challenge confronting us, we shall find restraint, composure, and cool calculation indispensable. We shall dissipate our strength or we lose sight of the fact that a weapon of even greater effectiveness than the atom bomb is the strong appeal of peace to the peoples of the world.

A fundamental issue in the world today, as it has been for centuries, continues to be the fate of human freedom. It must become increasingly clear to all, if there are any who really ever doubted it, that peace in the world can be fully secure only when there

is universal human freedom, when men as individuals are free to go and come; to speak, think, worship, assemble, and associate freely; to earn their daily bread, and enough of it, by voluntary labor; to feel secure and without fear in their daily lives; when every man, whatever his race or color or creed, whatever his culture or origin, can walk with full dignity and on a plane of equality with all other men.

Soil Conservation Progress—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, Pennsylvania Teachers' Laboratory, State College, Pa., July 15, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRESS

It always gives me great satisfaction to have the opportunity of talking about soil and water conservation with people who are sincerely interested in helping to solve the problem, as you so obviously are.

Being engaged in the educational side of the matter, you are naturally concerned with the solid facts and figures relating to the conservation of our natural resources and the job of making the wisest possible use of them. As a practical soil conservationist, I likewise am concerned with the facts—not with theories, guesswork, halfway jobs, or the representations of those who howl about duplication and forget about cooperation.

One of the things needed at this crucial stage of our national life, it seems to me, is more of what you are doing here in this Teachers' Laboratory: cooperating with one another and preparing people to help with the solution of our national problems.

There are some, perhaps, who feel that only farmers need be interested in the problem of soil conservation—the biggest of all our problems, in my opinion. It's my conviction we should all be very deeply interested in this stupendous job of soil defense, whatever our occupation or wherever we live. Soil defense is an indispensable part of our first line of national defense. Stout soldiers with guns and shells, and ships and planes, are an indispensable part of that first line of defense, too. The two are mutually sustaining, as everyone knows.

And farming according to modern soil conservation methods is not limited in its effects and benefits just to the farms on which such methods are practiced. It is closely related to the profitability of industry, the well-being of municipalities, and the health and welfare of all the people.

I believe I can say that our national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving and making productive use of our interlocking resources of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife. Research, education, land inventories, and the successful use and profitable results of soil conservation have brought us to this new concept of the importance of land and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive. The practical application of this concept is being demonstrated on a progressively wider scale from year to year all over the country by farmers in soil conservation districts. These farmers, in the finest spirit of coopera-

tion, are striking effectively at the root of the evil. Those of us in the Soil Conservation Service are proud to have been asked to help the districts with technical assistance. By enlisting the cooperative efforts of landholders, government and the public, working together, are demonstrating their special adaptability for getting conservation accomplished.

PRODUCTIVE LAND'S IMPORTANCE IN OUR ECONOMY

It would be most convenient for the rest of us if we could pass all the responsibility for soil conservation back to the farmer—the Pennsylvania tobacco grower, the Iowa corn farmer, the Kansas wheat producer, the Texas cattleman, or the Alabama cotton planter—and let the matter rest there. But our economy isn't built that way. The land is still the source of a very large share of our original wealth. Manufacturers, bankers, merchants, doctors, teachers, ministers, writers, and all the rest of us, in Philadelphia, Atlanta, Dallas, San Francisco, are directly affected by what happens to our productive land which is the base of our national vigor and welfare.

We are affected, basically, as consumers of the things that are produced from the land; and we are affected, too, with respect to our income. Some of us are doubtless affected through the effect of poor land on the nutritional value of food.

The importance of productive land in our economy hardly can be overemphasized. A suit of clothes or a pair of shoes is manufactured in Pittsburgh or St. Louis, but the wool or leather which goes into the finished product may have been produced on a western ranch, more than a thousand miles away. And many people, beginning with the rancher himself, are dependent wholly or partly for their income—their living—on the processes involved in getting that suit of clothes or pair of shoes into your clothes closet or mine. There are railroad men and truckers, weavers, leather workers, advertising men, stenographers, bankers, package manufacturers, salesmen, wholesalers, retailers, and many more. I hardly need to go into further detail because the same situation is true of every package of bacon, piece of furniture, or the many other soil-produced items processed or manufactured by the great industrial plants of the Nation. These producers, processors and distributors are, in turn, buyers of goods and services on their own account. They patronize doctors, dentists, lawyers, garden supply shops, and nurseries, barber shops and beauty parlors. They go to the movies and ball games. They buy houses, automobiles, radios, television sets, newspapers, electric irons, and light bulbs. They ride in Pullman cars. They hunt and fish, play golf, and take pictures. Their taxes help build roads and bridges, schools and hospitals, ships and airplanes.

AMOUNT OF PRODUCTIVE LAND IS LIMITED

So it is that every interest in the country has a stake in getting the quickest possible solution to this problem of safeguarding our remaining limited supply of productive land—which is the source of all but a small fraction of our food, as well as of all our wood products.

Although we in this country are not in danger of going hungry any time soon because of our land's running out, the amount of productive land we have left is much more limited than is commonly supposed, and the supply is still shrinking. We have left in the United States as a whole only about 460,000,000 acres of good, first-class land, counting all the good land that is in cultivation now and all that can be brought into profitable cultivation by presently feasible means. In recent years, we have been using for crop production and rotational pasture around three hundred and fifty to four hundred million acres annually. Something like 70,000,000 acres of this

farmed area, however, is unfavorable for use as cropland and should be diverted permanently to grass or trees. All but about 100,000,000 acres of the 460,000,000 acres of good, productive land, in use or available, is, or would be without protection, susceptible to severe damage by erosion, waterlogging, floods, accumulation of alkali.

Our land capability survey indicates that more than 47 percent of Pennsylvania's land falls in classes I, II, and III—land which is suitable for continuous cultivation, with careful conservation treatment of classes II and III lands. Nine percent consists of class IV, a borderline type which can be cultivated safely only occasionally; and about 29 percent consists of land of classes V, VI, and VII, suited only for growing trees or grass. Class VIII land, the only other class, is useful for wildlife and recreation.

Erosion, according to our soil-conservation surveys, has been severe on about 430,000 acres of Pennsylvania's farmland and serious on some 14,275,000 acres. Altogether, 51 percent of all the land in the State has been seriously or severely damaged (and this is more than half of the State's farmland). Pennsylvania is not as bad off in this respect as some of the other States, but the problem, nevertheless is quite serious enough.

DOING SOMETHING ABOUT LAND WASTAGE

Because eroded land is scattered around the country in many thousands of parcels—a gullied field here, a sheet-eroded slope there—many people are inclined to overlook what is happening to our productive land, and to discount its importance because they can't visualize the enormity of the damage. There are too many details for summarization through "picture windows."

But with good land, like some of yours, worth \$125 an acre or more, 14,700,000 acres seriously or severely damaged brings the cost of erosion, if we assume only \$65 per acre damage to the land, to nearly a billion dollars worth of Pennsylvania farmland wastefully depreciated. And, of course, the cost, in the absence of effective soil conservation, goes on in some measure year after year.

What would happen, I wonder, if anything like that kind of preventable damage and depreciation were eating away at your industrial plants and stores, your machinery, buildings, railways, and so on? You would do something about it—that's what would happen most certainly, especially if the damage should get worse and spread more and more, like erosion damage does with every rain, where the land is not protected.

And for precisely the same reason—because it's good business to protect and prolong the productive life of the productive land on which our biggest and most basic business, our agriculture, depends—we are doing something to halt the dissipation of our irreplaceable soil. We are doing it—State-wide, Nation-wide, community by community, farm by farm, acre by acre (of entire farms)—through modern soil conservation farming.

Today you will find this relatively new but already tried and proved kind of farming in constantly wider use as far as United States land extends in any direction. I have reference to the soil and water conservation farming which landholders of the Nation are carrying on themselves through their farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation districts, with the technical help of the Soil Conservation Service and the support and assistance they draw from various other sources, governmental and private. And now some other countries also are adopting this conservation pattern in their agriculture, with soil conservation districts to help—as in the Union of South Africa, Mexico, and some of the countries of Australia.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Before we discuss the subject any further, I think we should stop a moment to examine the meaning of modern soil conservation:

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use.

It means contouring and terracing land that needs such treatment, and strip-cropping and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs. If it is too dry it calls for irrigation; if subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-tripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter. If water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities (alkali), as in parts of the West, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of available adaptable tools.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal and other kinds) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where floodwaters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping. As a part of the modern soil-conservation job, city sewage should be kept out of the streams and treated for use on the land, as some cities are now doing.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil-conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. And, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work, that has a chance for permanency. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season. They are the basis of land permanency and that is necessary if we are to have a permanent agriculture.

ONLY ONE CORRECT CONSERVATION FORMULA

There is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job right—regardless of what anybody may try to tell you. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs as determined by condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife.

If there is any activity of mankind that requires the most scrupulous use of all that land science and hydraulics and agronomy can provide, it is the work of keeping our land permanently productive and making the best possible use of our water supply. There are in the neighborhood of a hundred

soil and water conservation measures now being used in the program of the Soil Conservation Service to halt erosion, conserve rainfall, and improve the land. Each measure is used, as the situation demands, to meet a definite land need or to produce a specifically desired result. Usually, combinations of several measures are essential.

A hundred years of farming experience in this country has proved definitely that no single practice, applied arbitrarily on a whole field or a farm, will control erosion and maintain soil productivity permanently, except perhaps the planting of an entire field or farm to grass or trees. And we can't live by grass and trees alone. Except where the land is used for grass or forest, single-practice soil conservation can't be successful, in the great majority of cases, because it almost always is inadequate to cope with the diverse land conditions and complicated requirements of sound land use and protection, imposed by nature. Some single practices, such as contouring, stubble-mulching, rotation, or manuring will bring some temporary benefits to entire fields or farms; but they cannot get the job done on anything approximating a permanent basis, except on the relatively small areas of the very best quality land (land of capability class I).

NO SHORT CUTS TO LASTING SOIL CONSERVATION

So I want to emphasize as strongly as I can, that there is no substitute for quality and completeness in the protection, development, improvement, and proper use and management of our land and water resources—in Pennsylvania or anywhere else. Each acre of land, as already pointed out, must be used according to its individual capabilities and treated according to its needs, because each acre of land, like each human being, is different from any other acre.

Likewise, each watershed, whether large or small, must be used and treated according to its specific physical peculiarities, if we are properly to conserve, develop, and use the water and land resources of that particular watershed—or any watershed.

If there were some simple remedy for our land and water problems that could be applied everywhere, according to a standardized treatment or formula, the job would be relatively easy. But there is no cure-all, no short cut to the solution of these problems. Nothing less will suffice than a painstaking study of each acre, each field, and each watershed, and the appropriate application of all needed conservation measures that the study indicates as necessary to get the job done right. To ignore these facts is to invite further damage to our diminishing supply of productive land, as well as to waste time, opportunity, and money for the landholder, the community, the Nation—for everybody.

Some will say: "Soil conservation must be profitable." Well, sure, it must be profitable. And it is profitable, practically without exception under normal conditions and where it's done properly and in time. Looking ahead, we cannot keep our sloping land—and the great majority of it is sloping—unless we effectively protect it. And, looking beyond that, land means food and food means strength and life.

That this method is the only possible way to ever provide adequate safeguards for our land is a physical fact devised by nature. It is one of the things we know; there's no guessing about it. It is a fact of precisely the same order as the physical fact that water will not run uphill on its own power.

As a matter of fact, we took our Soil Conservation Service program out of nature's pattern for developing and safeguarding productive land. Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals (with the exception of civilized man) should—and under natural conditions do—exist in harmony and interdependence for

perpetual productiveness of our basic resources.

So, it likewise is a mandate of nature of precisely the same order that the land, and the water which makes land productive, must be treated and used according to need and capability. I am repeating this because it needs all the emphasis we can give it.

Soil Conservation Progress—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, United States Soil Conservation Service, Pennsylvania Teachers' Laboratory, State College, Pa., July 15, 1950:

PROGRESS IN PENNSYLVANIA

In the spring of 1932, I was invited to give a talk at Pennsylvania State College on the subject: Is There an Erosion Problem in Pennsylvania?

Not only was there a very serious erosion problem in Pennsylvania, affecting some 15,000,000 acres of land, but there was the very serious additional problem of few people being aware of the fact and nobody doing anything about it. I don't mind confessing that some of us in Washington, including myself, and a handful of people in the State, had to do the educational work needed to arouse Pennsylvania, both to a realization of the problem and to action. About all that was being done was that an occasional farmer undertook to stop his gully erosion by dumping trash into the washes. In some localities an occasional farmer was field stripping; but at the time strip-cropping was only in process of development on the regional erosion research station. And most cultivation everywhere was up-and-down-hill. You could pretty nearly put down the amount of effort being devoted to soil conservation in Pennsylvania as close to zero.

Now there is a going soil conservation program in the State. This is improving all the time and gaining momentum. True, the district movement has not gone ahead fast enough in Pennsylvania, but in the 27 active districts work is progressing very nicely. From year to year the rate of progress is picking up, as it throughout the Nation. Nationally, in 1942, the Soil Conservation Service finished the job of treating farms according to the need and capability of the land on approximately 5,000,000 acres. In 1949 the amount of work of the same type and quality completed was 22,000,000 acres. This was a gain of 340 percent, and it was accomplished with an increase in facilities amounting to only 43 percent. (I am still talking about what even the bureaucrats can do when they cooperate wholeheartedly with farmers in soil conservation district.)

In 1942 the Service completed only 1 percent of the unfinished part of the Nation-wide soil-conservation job; but last year the annual rate of progress went up to 34 percent of the unfinished job. This year we are hoping it will go up to something above 4 percent. In 1941 only 0.6 of 1 percent of the remaining job was completed, and for the 7-year period from September 19, 1933, to December 31, 1940, we completed altogether only 1.1 percent of the unfinished total.

Some of the accomplishments in Pennsylvania, as of January 1, 1950, were 172,480

acres of contour farming, 156,807 acres of strip cropping, 88,055 acres of tree planting, 347 miles (about 5,000 acres) of terraces and diversions, 6,938 acres of farm drainage, 149,574 acres of crop rotations, and 530 farm ponds.

Now we are moving ahead better and better, partly because the cooperation we are getting in the State is steadily improving. In a period of a little over 4 years our cooperation has extended from working with 12,000 farmers in 6 soil-conservation districts to 80,000, or 46 percent, of the farmers of the State, in the 27 soil-conservation districts. That is good; but I wish we could have the whole State covered by districts by tomorrow night, so we could move still faster with the total job.

One reason why we have been able to move ahead so much faster in this State—and all the other States, too—is because of soil-conservation districts. In my opinion, the soil-conservation district is the most effective instrument for getting conservation on the land that man has yet devised, especially under the plan of local operation of the districts by local farmers who get technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and other types of assistance from other Federal, State, and local agencies.

NATION-WIDE PROGRESS

In soil-conservation districts alone 800,000 complete soil-conservation plans had been prepared Nation-wide by the beginning of 1950. These plans covered some 220,000,000 acres, and the area treated amounted to 112,000,000 acres—that is, for the Nation. Counting work done by the Soil Conservation Service in other programs (not including some of that in small irrigation and flood-control programs), we have completed altogether over a million farm plans. Detailed soil-conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been completed on 322,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance soil-conservation surveys helpful in farm planning had been completed on 180,000,000 acres.

And still the big job stands ahead of us and we are still losing in the neighborhood of half a million acres of farm land annually as the result of unnecessary erosion. This much land is being annually damaged to the extent that it has little or no value for further immediate cultivation.

Certainly the soil-conservation-district movement is the greatest land movement of history. Since the first district was established in my home county of Anson County, N. C., on August 4, 1937, 2,346 other districts are in operation today (as of June 1, 1950) and they include 1,237,141,000 acres, or 81 percent of the farms in the United States.

In these soil conservation districts farmers are working together as they never have done before, and that is an asset which makes me feel confident that we are going to get the job of applying the basic conservation measures to the land, according to kind and need, done before it is too late. I am so sure of this that I can say to you today with much confidence that the job is going to be finished up to the stage of maintenance some time during the 1970's. I wish it could be done before that time, but this would be an accomplishment vastly greater than I ever expected to live long enough to see; as a matter of fact, what has been done already is vastly greater than I ever expected to see as late as 15 years ago.

COOPERATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

I think I should say something more about the fine cooperation we are getting in Pennsylvania with such agencies as the department of agriculture, the department of forests and waters, the Pennsylvania Game Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Highways, the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, and the State soil conservation commission. All of these agencies have a men-

orandum of understanding with the State soil conservation commission.

Vocational agriculture has admirably supported the movement in the formation of soil-conservation districts in Pennsylvania and is now being considered by the State Commission for a Memorandum of Understanding to assist districts with the educational phase of the program.

I think we are over the hump and are winning the battle of soil conservation in the State of Pennsylvania. A little while ago the situation was much less favorable. Cooperation was the touchstone in this instance.

LET'S GET THE JOB COMPLETED

The main thing now is to go even faster. There are many things people like yourselves can do to help. I doubt if there is any instrument aside from soil-conservation districts that can help more to get along with the job than the public schools of this State and the Nation. I think you have a wonderful opportunity to help out with the task, and I am hoping arrangements can be made so that you can do in this connection the highly effective kind of work that you are so capable of doing. I have in mind a matter which I believe we very much need in this country to make the conservation work that is put on the land stay on the land permanently. First, of course, farmers must work together as they are doing more and more in the soil-conservation districts, and, secondly, we must get soil conservation into the bloodstream of our youth so that it will become a national habit. We may have to do some arguing to get soil conservation adequately placed in the schools, but let's go ahead with the argument and keep at it until we get the job done. There will be criticisms surely, but it will all be overcome in time. That interval will be how long it requires to educate the people properly, starting in the lower schools.

Some misinformed people will be pulling back with statements about duplication. I can assure you there is no duplication on our part of anything that went before in the program I am talking about today. If there is duplication, it has been brought about by other agencies undertaking to duplicate the work that the Soil Conservation Service was set up to do in Public Law 76, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved April 27, 1935—the first soil-conservation act for our farmlands passed by Congress—whose preamble reads as follows:

"That it is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare and that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs."

We are absolutely carrying out the mandates of the Congress of the United States in our work, and if you want to read this 1935 law passed by Congress, I can get it for you. If you want to know the details of how the law was passed, who worked on it, etc., I can give you that, too. I know what we are doing and how we have been doing it, because I had a hand in setting the scene and taking part in the act for getting the job done properly and promptly. And I am very proud of the fact.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO AVOID

Some will say "This is the farmers' job, let the farmers do it." Sure it is the farmers' job, and farmers are very busy at it. Soil conservation district supervisors are directing the job, and that means that the farmers themselves are the managers. The farmers in the districts and the supervisors of the districts are grass-root farmers. The supervisors are on nobody's payroll and don't act

at the behest of anyone but themselves and the farmers cooperating with the districts.

But still we must be cautious about calling it just the farmers' job. It is not just the farmers' job, it's everybody's job. Up until now one farm family has been supporting four city families. Suppose a farm family lets its soil erode to a level of productivity where it can support only three city families, then two, then one, and finally none, what happens? Probably the farmer can go ahead and make something for himself, but what happens to the four city families that he used to support?

I won't try to answer that question, except by asking another.

Assuming that conservation is the farmer's job, what happens if the farmer doesn't carry out the job? Suppose he doesn't know how, or doesn't do it quick enough? Who gets hurt? Everybody gets hurt, of course—city people first and probably more so than farm people.

Somebody said recently that you have to pay for soil conservation. What, is it that you don't have to pay for; I mean, of course, what worth-while earthly things? But this matter of saying that you have to pay for soil conservation doesn't tell the whole story. You don't really have to pay for the lasting type of soil conservation, properly applied to the land. This kind pays its way, and more.

In 1945, at the request of the Appropriations Committee of Congress, the Soil Conservation Service made a study throughout the country of the profitability of conservation farming. This was done by examining the books of farmers who had carried out a good job or soil conservation and comparing the results with those obtained on comparable farms where little or no conservation had been done. The farmers of the former group took in, on the average, \$4.90 per acre more than the nonconservation farmers.

With this figure and other farmer results serving as the basis of computation, the indications are that soil conservation is putting back into the Federal Treasury much more than the money that is being taken out of the Treasury to do the job. The Treasury funds are used to pay the salaries of our technicians and other personnel, but the entire amount was returned as increased income taxes during a recent year, plus a dividend of 78 percent. In other words, we spent \$39,000,000 that year on the soil- and water-conservation job, but our study indicated that this \$39,000,000 later on went back into the Federal Treasury in increased income taxes, plus thirty million more as profit.

Soil conservation increases per acre yields (from around 30 to 100 percent, probably); and per acre yield is the basis of farm profitability, whether prices are up or down.

There are certain misconceptions about soil conservation that still seem to confuse the thinking of a few people. We need to be on guard against such misinformation, as the following:

1 That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2 That there are short cuts to conservation, or that farmers can or should do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance.

3 That soil conservation costs more than it is worth, and that dollar-and-cents considerations are all that are at stake.

4 That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

All that one needs to do to clear one's thinking with respect to these notions is to look about the country or to visit some of the other countries of the world. In various parts of the world one can see the refutation of such specious reasoning written on the eroded and unproductive country-

side, and etched on the worried faces of people struggling to produce their food and other bare necessities on erosion-worn land.

I spent some time last fall studying erosion conditions and soil and water conservation methods in southern France, Italy, and North Africa. Over there, I observed the lengths that people go in order to get a living from some of the world's oldest lands still in agricultural use. The work required in establishing some of their steep-slope bench-type of agriculture, supported with stone walls, translated into our American labor costs probably would amount in many instances to \$15,000 or \$20,000 an acre. Such an outlay on farm land clearly is out of the question for us, in the practical sense at any rate, now or at any time we can foresee, even in the most eroded parts of the country. Nevertheless, we are using bench terraces in Puerto Rico—but with grass-supported walls rather than expensive rock-supported walls. As a matter of fact, we are not in need of the stone-wall type of conservation at this stage of our development, except in occasional very special cases. We can now produce with modern soil conservation around twice as much per acre as we were producing prior to the present era of soil conservation, which began 20 years ago.

So, we definitely are getting ahead with the soil-conservation job in this country.

Comment on Address Delivered by Hon. William E. Jenner, of Indiana, on the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a comment on the speech which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] delivered on the Senate floor on September 24. The comment appeared in the Joe Ball Washington Letter of September 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Speech by Senator WILLIAM JENNER, of Indiana, opposing any increase in taxes should be read by every conservative businessman. It is on page 11940 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 24. It is a long speech, full of solid meat, but probably failed to change a single vote on the bill.

JENNER hammered two themes. First was that Congress had lost its control of the purse strings of Government, historically the ultimate method by which parliaments curbed the usurpation of arbitrary power by executives. Only way to regain this essential power, he argued, was for Congress to quit providing funds for the administration.

The Indiana Senator's scathing description of the complete failure of the congressional drive for economy must have made some of his colleagues wince. He made the statement, unchallenged, that the only reason Congress voted \$60,000,000,000 for defense and \$8,000,000,000 for foreign aid was because the administration wanted it, not because Members were convinced it was necessary or that it was for the best interests of the American people.

JENNER's second theme was the failure of the Truman administration to achieve peace,

freedom or stability for the United States in the world despite expenditures which by the end of next year will total \$400 billion. Asking what the people had gotten for their \$400,000,000,000, JENNER contrasted our situation 7 years ago with today. Lands and people controlled by Russia have grown steadily and peace has receded over the horizon. In other words, JENNER contends the people have been bilked and he makes out a good case.

Senator JENNER seldom gets any press coverage, at least here in the eastern seaboard where most newspapers have swallowed State Department propaganda hook, line and sinker. He is a rabid nationalist who has opposed most of the Fair Deal's foreign-policy measures, which makes him a black reactionary isolationist among our intelligentsia.

Nevertheless, JENNER is one of the ablest orators in the Senate and his speeches pack a terrific wallop. Ex-Senator Tydings of Maryland was no slouch on the Senate floor, but JENNER made mincemeat of him during the fracas over the investigation of McCARTHY's charges against the State Department. Unfortunately, JENNER is disgusted with the Senate, intends to run for the GOP nomination for Governor in Indiana next year.

Housing for Families of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. STYLES BRIDGES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "Not Mercenaries," from the Washington Daily News of September 24, 1951, the second entitled "The Rent Gougers," from the Washington Evening Star of September 29, 1951. They comment on the work of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the subcommittee being under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 24, 1951]

NOT MERCENARIES

The obligation of the American people to unite in moral support of our Armed Forces was the underlying theme of a Senate committee report today.

The Lyndon Johnson Subcommittee on Preparedness revealed its findings on the miserable housing for families of servicemen at 15 camps and posts. It was the committee's second such survey this year. In general, it found only slight improvement—widespread gouging and profiteering still going on, and service dependents living in chicken coops, barns, garages, and shacks.

But the committee had some wise and timely observations about American soldiers of today, and the way we treat them. These remarks probably were written by Senator JOHNSON himself, who has a knack of pointing up his committee reports with basic truths and sensible guidance.

The American soldier, it is noted, is not a mercenary. He is not a professional who makes a career out of killing his fellow men. He is first of all a citizen. And unless he feels the moral backing of his fellow citizens, he will lose the will to fight.

Total war involves whole populations—and total obligation. Which is to say, the whole-hearted support of the Nation's industry, its people and their common, unified will.

It is especially indicated, says the report, in the people's willingness to ease the lot of the men who go forth to do battle with the common foe.

Therefore, every case of rent-gouging, every instance of an American soldier forced to house his family in a hovel or chicken coop, represents a crack in the structure of national unity. Enough cracks could topple the whole structure. * * * A nation unable to unite behind its fighting men * * * is doomed.

The problem of housing—as well as the problem of providing needed blood for our Armed Forces—will finally be solved only by the sacrifice and devotion of individual Americans and their unanimous desire to contribute to the morale and peace of mind of our men in uniform.

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 29, 1951]

THE RENT GOUGERS

The latest report from Senator JOHNSON'S Armed Services subcommittee does not make pleasant reading. For it deals with a most reprehensible kind of exploitation—the gouging of servicemen and their dependents by greedy landlords.

This is the second report from the committee on this subject, and it takes note of some improvements. The armed services have been trying to alleviate the housing shortages. And in some areas—notably at Columbia, S. C., and Lake Charles, La.—the local communities have exerted themselves to provide decent housing at reasonable rentals.

The broad picture, however, is disgraceful. It is unreasonable to expect that good housing should always be available to servicemen and their families when a rapid expansion of the Armed Forces is under way. In many areas, where thousands of men suddenly are sent for training, there is little or no available housing. Nor can private sources be expected to provide such housing. Since private builders cannot know when military posts are going to be activated and deactivated—that is, when the need for housing for dependents will arise and when it will cease to exist—they cannot be expected to make a substantial investment in new construction.

This, however, does not in any way excuse the outrageous gouging that has been going on. In many of these suddenly congested areas chicken coops, tool sheds, and shacks of all kinds have been converted into housing for servicemen. Sanitary facilities generally are of the most primitive sort and utilities are grossly inadequate. If this were the best that could be provided, and if men called into the service nevertheless insisted on taking their dependents with them, they would have little basis for complaint if rentals were reasonable. But when landlords, and there are some servicemen among them, take advantage of the distressed situation to push the rent for these hovels to unconscionable heights, an entirely different situation is presented.

Senator JOHNSON'S committee has been well advised to expose these disgraceful conditions, and it should not ease up until everything possible has been done to restrain the chiselers and to provide, so far as possible, decent accommodations for the men who may be spending their last days with their wives and children.

Conservation for War or Peace, Drought Years or Wet—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, first annual KFBF Farm Field Day, Sedgwick County Soil Conservation District, Wichita, Kans., September 12, 1950.

CONSERVATION FOR WAR OR PEACE, DROUGHT YEARS OR WET

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction and encouragement to take part in this stimulating field day on the William Bertholf conservation farm out here in south-central Kansas, the heart of the Nation's Wheat Belt. It is gratifying to find the favorable crop prospects, after the dry weather which caused considerable concern in various localities earlier this year.

In fact, I should like to say a little more about this matter right at this point. I recently received a copy of an editorial from a Kansas newspaper which has been a consistent supporter of soil conservation, taking the Service to task for what the paper called "forecast" of a 1951 dust bowl. Now, I don't know what kind of stories were carried out here that were so disturbing (we have no clipping service); but I do know that neither I nor anybody else in the Soil Conservation Service has ever predicted another "dust bowl." Personally, I always have disliked even the term "dust bowl"; and the few times I use it I do so with quotation marks because it has been a widely used catch phrase, invented by I don't know whom and carried over from the 1930's. To me it is pretty much a matter of wind erosion, which I consider an unnecessary evil, although it may be years before the problem, which is rather more widespread than is commonly understood, extending even to the loose sandy lands of Wisconsin, New Jersey, Charleston, S. C., and many other places, is controlled.

NO DUST BOWL FORECASTS

What we did say, in summarizing late-June field reports last June 30, was this: Although the major threat of wind erosion damage was over for the time being, there were indications of continuing possibilities of trouble ahead for the drought-spotted areas unless rainfall picked up during the rest of the summer and farmers concentrated on their conservation cropping and other measures. That, as you know, was a simple statement of fact, in view of the months-long rainfall shortages and worst dust storms since the thirties in various localities during the spring and early summer. By the same token, possibilities of recurring drought likewise were greater than they had been at anytime since the 1930's.

Nobody rejoiced more, certainly, than we did in the Soil Conservation Service that the ink had hardly dried on the papers publishing this information when soaking rains brought relief to many of the previously drought-stricken sections—precisely in the manner mentioned in our Washington statement. We also felt mighty good, I can assure you, over the fact that southern and central plains farmers planted several million more acres of grain sorghums, sudan, and cover crops this summer than they usually plant,

because they were alert to the situation and set out to cope with it in the sensible conservation way. This, I am sure, was due in part to what was said about the possibilities.

CONSERVATION EFFECTIVENESS PROVED

I have made considerable point of this incident today, because what has happened in the southern and central Great Plains during the past year illustrates rather graphically the importance and the effectiveness of soil and moisture conservation farming, in dry years and wet. The pattern ran true consistently in the 1950 drought areas. Locally, there were soil blowing and poor crops, especially on land lacking any conservation treatment, and at least some kind of a crop or cover on adjacent conservation-farmed fields. And, from all reports, most of the area comprising the heart of the old so-called dust bowl weathered this year's drought in sound condition.

That was because farmers in the soil conservation districts there, where they were hit so hard in the 1930's, long since had come to the conclusion that you can't safely gamble with the weather, either in the Plains or other parts of the country where conditions favor wind erosion. The conservation farmer operates year in and year out so as to keep his land in the best possible condition to take what comes in the way of weather, from long dry spells to torrential rains. He uses stubble-mulch tillage, strip cropping, water-holding terraces, rotations of cover crops. On land unsuited to cultivation, he uses grass, which is a crop of steadily increasing importance throughout the country. Such methods constitute the best insurance he has against the vagaries of the elements and, short of a long period of unusually favorable rainfall such as blessed the Plains during and after World War II, are his best assurance of stable and profitable returns over the long run.

So, I believe you will agree with me that an important part of the legitimate job of the Soil Conservation Service, as the agency set up to meet your requests for technical conservation surveying, planning and treatment assistance, is to direct attention to whatever conditions that require positive conservation action. That is what we have always done, and shall continue to do when it appears such conservation uphugs may be helpful to all concerned.

CONSERVING PRODUCTIVE LAND VITAL TO AMERICAN ECONOMY

Also, in these days when our whole thinking and action must be directed at the preservation and free growth of true democracy in a world split by conflicting concepts of government or "ideologies," there is another important part of our public service job as conservation technicians, supervisors, or farmers. That is to drive home at every opportunity—by both word and action—that keeping our good land productive is vital to the productive strength of the American economy. As the President pointed out in his midyear economic report to Congress on July 26, this productive strength "is basic to our domestic well-being and our international security."

The one thing that is uppermost in everybody's mind today is mobilization of our manpower and economic resources for national security, come what may. Without a lasting agriculture, there can be no assurance of permanent prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere on earth. A prosperous and lasting agriculture depends on an adequate supply of productive land, properly used and so protected from erosion that it will remain permanently productive. As long as people have enough productive land they can continue producing their food and fiber, and many of the raw materials of industry. If the land is neglected or unwisely used, the

certain consequences will be national weakness and decline. That has been the tragic result of many of the world's older agricultural areas.

Lasting soil conservation of the kind you are putting into effect here on the Bertholf farm, throughout the Sedgwick County soil-conservation district, and elsewhere in neighboring Kansas and Oklahoma counties, is mandatory everywhere. It is mandatory here in America, if our Nation—our civilization—is to avoid the undermining of the enemies of democracy, which appear to be girding themselves for new marches against our kind of government.

OUR WORLD LEADERSHIP RESTS ON THE LAND

None of us can say, of course, how long the present international emergency will last. Some people seem to think it will be short lived. Let us fervently hope it will be. Then there are those who take the other extreme view, that we may just as well count on being in a continuing state of emergency—hot and cold war—from the standpoint of defending our own and others' democratic life, for many years to come. We hope just as earnestly that such will not be the case; but, in any event, we must build and plan against any eventuality. It's no time either to experiment or take chances. And we don't need to—not with our productive land. We have learned how to take care of it, and part of that know-how is to keep on guard with eternal vigilance.

The United States definitely is in the position of world leadership, politically and economically, among the democracies, and naturally will be expected to retain that position with all the responsibility it involves. To do so, we must maintain our productive capacity, safeguarding our productive resources of land, water, timber, oil, minerals, and using them wisely.

We must maintain, first of all, the productive capacity of our land—which produces all but a very small part of our food, all of our timber, leather, and wool, all of our vegetable fibers and oils, tobacco, and many other essentials. This we must do regardless of whether peace or war lies ahead—or whether the weather smiles on us or plagues us with drought or flood or soil-drifting winds. Right now, those responsible for our national security are thinking in terms of greatly increasing our stockpiling of metals, drugs, and other raw materials. While doing these vitally important things, let's not forget that we cannot stockpile productive soil, in the sense of shipping it into this country from other countries. But we can and must safeguard our remaining productive land. This is an inseparable and essential part of our first line of national defense, because men with guns and bullets can't fight without food, and there can be little food from poor land. And what's left isn't any too much, although it's enough for a long time, if we take care of all of it—every acre.

CONSERVATION FARMING NOT JUST MATTER OF PASSING CONVENIENCE

Already, in the few short weeks since the Korean trouble started, threatened so-called surpluses of wheat and certain other farm commodities appear to have become comforting stores of essential food and fiber. When we have had repeated experiences of this nature, you wouldn't think anyone would be so foolish as to suggest that we sometimes don't need such things as soil conservation to help keep our agricultural producing plant in condition of top efficiency. Yet I am sure all of us have heard just such loose talk, both when there were a few extra bushels of wheat or other commodities in the granaries or when immediate demands for national defense or economic aid programs have been pressing and properly of first consideration.

We have been told, for example, that we shouldn't spend money on soil conservation in periods of ample crop production, because soil conservation farming increases yields. If that illogical line of reasoning—or nonsense—were carried to its ultimate conclusion, then we likewise wouldn't spend money on crops and livestock improvement, pest and disease control, or on any other agricultural research and improvement at such times. Instead, we would close shop—and mind—to foolishly take chances with whatever may come. The truth is that a maximum per-acre yields always are the basis of good agriculture, whether the market is up or down. Also, they mean the capacity of increased total production as may be needed.

Those who would have you abandon your conservation farming in wartime and other periods of maximum need for agricultural commodities are no less shortsighted. During World War II, conservation farming demonstrated its effectiveness, year after year, in giving maximum production of needed crops, with minimum labor and machinery wear and the most economical use of seed and fertilizer. Those are among the multiple benefits realized when the land is treated and used, acre by acre, according to its need and capability.

THE LONG-TIME NEED FOR SOIL CONSERVATION

Meanwhile—and again keeping in mind the long-time need as opposed to short-sighted land exploitation for the sake of imagined expediency—the kind of practical scientific conservation farming practiced in your own and more than 2,260 other soil-conservation districts over the country builds up a sound reserve of productive capacity. It keeps our powder dry. It is true that during the last war a considerable amount of land damage resulted from cropping to much land that should have been left in grass or in protective grass and legume rotation. But, even including the plowing up of hazardous lands in the drier areas of your own Great Plains for growing wheat, the over-all damage certainly was nowhere near what it might have been had we gone through the war and postwar farm production strain without benefit of any conservation farming knowledge and practice.

Other millions of acres, moreover—here in the Plains as elsewhere—were farmed under sound soil conservation practice for maximum, profitable production. This same land is in sound condition today to give maximum production next year and the next, as need may dictate. Every landowner or operator who has contributed to this favorable side of the record surely is to be commended and shall reap lasting rewards.

The practical flexibility of conservation farming becomes of increasing significance as we look ahead and think about our national well-being and security. Assuming that we shall not forever be faced with international emergencies, we still have to think about better living for our own growing population. That is, enough of the right kind of food—including, in addition to the essential cereal grains, ample amounts of meat, dairy, and poultry products—for everybody, for our children and our children's children. From this stable, peacetime viewpoint, the importance of soil and water conservation again is self-apparent, as the basis for sustained high-level production at relatively low cost.

With the population of the United States already having passed the 150,000,000 mark and the future population trend continually pointing upward, we have no productive land to spare if we look forward to a permanent high standard of living and national security. We have left in this country, as well as can be determined with available information, only about 460,000,000 acres of good,

productive cropland, including approximately 70,000,000 acres that would have to be cleared, irrigated, or drained before it could be cropped.

The main forces operating to reduce both the area of productive cropland and the productivity of cropland are soil erosion and unsound land use. Soil erosion is also the most damaging force affecting the Nation's range and pasture lands. On the other hand, the main forces operating to improve production from our croplands are soil and water conservation, improved plant varieties, insect and plant disease control, proper use of machinery. Of these, soil and water conservation is by far the most important, for the reasons I have explained. At this point, I think it might be well to consider for a moment what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation like that which has brought us together here today.

Conservation for War or Peace, Drought Years or Wet—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, first annual KFBI Farm Field Day, Sedgwick County Soil Conservation District, Wichita, Kans., September 12, 1950:

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use.

It means contouring and terracing land that needs such treatment, and strip-cropping and stubble-cropping the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control; stabilizing water outlets; building farm and ranch ponds; locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable; planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs. If it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter. If water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the "alkali" by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of available adaptable tools.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal, irrigation, etc.) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where flood waters start. Applied at the right time

and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers and ranchers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. And, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work, that has a chance for permanency. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season. They are the basis of land permanency, and that is necessary if we are to have a permanent agriculture.

There is only one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job right—regardless of what anybody may try to tell you about single practices or other tempting short-cuts. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs, as determined by condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS' PROGRESS

That is the kind of conservation farming you have been putting into effect with success and satisfaction here in the Sedgwick County soil conservation district since you began operations with technical assistance 5 years ago this month. It is the kind of conservation farming that is safeguarding and improving our country's farm and ranch lands at a progressively increasing rate each year—throughout Kansas, the Great Plains, and the Nation. In 1943, to illustrate, the Soil Conservation Service assisted the districts in completing 1 percent of the Nation-wide soil conservation job; but in 1949 the annual rate of progress went up to 2.3 percent of the unfinished job. We finished the job on 5,000,000 acres, approximately, in 1912 and on 22,000,000 acres last year. This was an increase of 340 percent, but we had an increase in facilities of only 43 percent.

When we reflect on the comparatively short time that soil conservation districts have been at the job—with the first one established in 1937—I think the progress that has been made is nothing short of remarkable. I mean both from the standpoint of district organization and soil and water conservation work actually done on the land in the districts. Admittedly, we still are not going fast enough, but it is at least encouraging that we are moving ahead at a progressively increasing rate. Do you realize that, as of the beginning of the present fiscal year (July 1, 1950) the districts covered 1,250,000,000 acres in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and that they included 4,750,000 farms and ranches? In fact, 80 percent of all our farms are now within district boundaries, as is three-fourths of the land in farms in the United States.

You in Kansas, in common with your neighbors in States like Oklahoma, Nebraska, Arkansas, and Texas, can be especially proud of your high place in the country's soil conservation districts column. With 103 of your 105 counties in districts as of August 1, I notice that almost 99 percent of all your land and 97½ percent of your farms were within soil conservation district boundaries. Today, you can travel from Wichita to the Gulf of Mexico, or in the opposite direction to the Canadian line, without ever getting outside of soil conservation districts. And I can come to Wichita

through the south Atlantic and Gulf States, and go back by way of Iowa, Illinois, West Virginia, etc., without getting out of districts.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS SPEEDED UP

The districts' accomplishments in getting soil and water conservation on the land likewise are something to be proud of. Figures for the fiscal year to July 1, 1950, show how we have increased again the yearly rate of conservation surveying, planning, and treatment.

	Fiscal year 1950 1	Fiscal year 1949 1	Cumula- tive to July 1, 1950
Detailed conservation surveys made	31, 065, 000	25, 800, 000	134, 770, 000
Complete farm plans number	142, 750	115, 000	8, 000, 000
Acres planned	38, 700, 000	32, 200, 000	210, 000, 000
Acres treated	28, 000, 000	22, 000, 000	121, 000, 000

¹ Approximate total.

"I don't need to review for you your own noteworthy Kansas district accomplishments, with which you already are more familiar than I am anyway. I do want to say, however, that it was most pleasing to have Secretary Lawrence W. Rittenhouse of your Sedgwick County district's board of supervisors write me of the rapid strides he said soil conservation has been making in this part of the State. He said that of approximately 3,000 farms in this county, 888 already had soil conservation farm plans by June 30 this year, with nearly 300 additional applications approved and being carried out as rapidly as possible. Also, that Sedgwick County led all the counties in the State in the amount of conservation work in 1948 and 1949. I would say that you have every right to be proud of such a showing.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND DEMOCRACY

Over and above such satisfying statistics of accomplishment, we cannot lose sight of the importance of your soil-conservation districts as living, working forces of practical democracy in action. The district organization, as it has stood the test of 13 years of peacetime and wartime experience under just about all possible economic, weather, and other conditions, definitely has proved itself to be superior to anything else we know about in coping with our basic land problems in a democratic fashion. Your districts are farmer voted and farmer managed. Between 11,000 and 12,000 soil conservation district supervisors are giving unselfishly of their time and energies in the furtherance of soil and water conservation work throughout the country. They are on nobody's payroll, and are obligated to no Federal or other outside authority.

In order to appreciate what this kind of democratic leadership means in the Nation's basic agricultural economy, really means in terms of what we mobilize and fight for when pressed to it by others, you need only to study the contrasting situation in so many other countries, where what the government says is law, with little or no opportunity for individual freedom of action, assurance of stability, or hope of security. I have observed these things in different parts of the world myself; and, of course, we read about them everyday. We can be eternally grateful that we enjoy an economy that depends on individual freedom and initiative, and the exercise of such individual responsibility as that which has been demonstrated by the scores of thousands of soil-conservation district landowners and operators like those of you in the Sedgwick County district.

Also, I am convinced that the district method would be the best approach that

farmers of the world everywhere could take for getting to the point where they have more voice in the affairs of their government and less discontent with the overlords. Bona fide soil conservation districts are in operation as going programs, I am happy to say, in several other countries—as the philosophy of conservation spreads faster world-wide. The more secure the individual, the more secure the community and the Nation. That is what makes the democracy we fight for.

THE PROFITABLENESS OF SOIL CONSERVATION

And certainly not least among the benefits of soil conservation farming to be considered when we think of national welfare and security is its profitableness. This kind of farming we see demonstrated here today on the Berthoff farm has been shown consistently to raise the individual landholder's income through more economical operations and greater per acre returns. This, in turn, is reflected in better business in town where the conservation farmer trades. And we also know that revenues to local, State, and Federal Governments are increased proportionately from such higher farmer earnings—revenues which pay for, among other things, jet bombers and bazookas. I could make an entire speech on this significant aspect of soil and water conservation, because the individual examples and other reported figures supporting these facts are too numerous ever to have been counted.

DIVERSIFICATION AND LIVESTOCK

Conservation farming, on the basis of following the complete conservation farm plans used by farmers and ranchers in soil-conservation districts, almost invariably calls for diversification of crops, often including more land in grass and trees. In this way, the economic stability of the farm operation is improved, and the farmer is in a better position to operate successfully in any kind of market. As I hardly need to remind this audience, the possibilities are good for increasing livestock production in this part of the country through such conservation farming. The experience of one Kansas livestock operator who stopped in at our Washington office recently is a ready illustration of what I am talking about.

He is Mr. Ben L. Robertson, of Emporia. I am sorry that I was out of town when he called, as I should like to have taken rather full notes from him on his success in fattening his beef cattle on bromegrass and lespedeza, and on the special Emporia Chamber of Commerce committee he heads to promote revegetation and other conservation farming. I understand, though, that Mr. Robertson reported getting 250 to 275 pounds of beef to the acre from his brome and lespedeza in a summer. Our fellows figured that out as a minimum of \$72.50 an acre return from this conservation crop, or anyway twice as much as from corn on the same kind of land, that is, class III and IV land. I feel sure that some of you here today would have similar experiences to report. And I am familiar with some of the things you have been doing out here in Kansas, such as development of improved grass strains like Auchenbach brome, the use of grass and legumes in crop rotations, and pure seed development and seed increase work.

NEED TO PUSH AHEAD WITH SOIL CONSERVATION JOB

The important thing for all of us to keep foremost in mind now, as always, is that we must push ahead as fast as we can, without sacrificing the lasting quality of the work we do, with our tremendous soil and water conservation job. As I said at the beginning, we don't know how long we may be faced with emergency conditions—possibly only a few weeks or months, maybe 25 years, although let us hope nothing like that will come to pass. But we do know that, emergency or no

emergency, we are determined to go forward as a democratic American people, enjoying the highest standards of living we may attain and keeping our national security intact at all times.

Your soil conservation districts have an important responsibility in all this, along with every business and other legitimate interest in this and every community. There is much we need to be thinking about, talking about, and doing something about to reach and hold our objectives. We have been making splendid progress in soil and water conservation; but the major part of the basic job is yet to be done. Especially we need to be on guard against and work to dispel certain misconceptions, or loose assertions, about soil conservation that still seem to confuse the thinking of some otherwise well informed people. Briefly stated, some of these are:

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO DISPEL

1 That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2 That there are short cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that district farm plans are too technical for farmers.

3 That soil conservation costs more than it is worth.

4. That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

These "quibblings" are all so obviously wrong no further time will be devoted to them, merely to list them so you cannot be misled with a lot of nonsense.

SOIL CONSERVATION TAKES CONTINUED TEAMWORK BY ALL

The job we have to do calls for the closest teamwork of all interests in our society: farmers, business and professional people; private and public financial institutions, radio and television stations, newspapers and magazines, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations, sportsmen's, women's, young people's, and other groups; schools and churches; local, State, and Federal agriculture, forestry, and other agencies and farm organizations—everybody I know, as this Farm Field Day event so well demonstrates, that all these interests are working together here in the Sedgwick County soil-conservation district, as they are in districts all over the country.

A PROGRAM OF POSITIVE ACTION

To complete the soil- and water-conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which all such groups have a natural interest. It includes, among other points: (1) Completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit, (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil-conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work—with a scientifically developed soil-conservation-district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm in the country at minimum public cost, (3) active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; and (4) making a real conservationist of every farmer in the country.

I should like to quote briefly from a talk I prepared for the annual meeting of the Kansas Crop Improvement Association in Manhattan on February 2, this year, several months before the fighting broke out in Korea.

"Production of wheat to help feed the allied armies of two world wars has effectively demonstrated the capacity of Kansas land to fill the breach in time of critical national need. This Kansas land must be kept in good condition. It is basic to our welfare;

it cannot be spared. But drought and dust storms have shown us how nature can strike back when man takes the welfare of the land too much for granted and fails to protect it. So do gullies and stiff clay stripped of its topsoil. If we are to have the production we want when we need it, and if we are to avoid dust storms and gullies and dwindling yields on erosion-denuded slopes, we must look closely to the future and the kind of relationship that will have to be maintained between man and the land. Nationally and world-wide, conservation of the land from now on is one of the really urgent, basic problems of our time—probably the most urgent."

To which I wish to add at this time only this further thought: Conservation of our productive land, water, timber, wildlife, and other indispensable natural resources is not a matter which is of interest only to our own generation. It is the foremost factor on which hinges the very survival of all the generations to come after us. The safeguarding and perpetual wise use of these life-supporting resources is the only insurance we can have of continued national security for our free people in free America.

The Japanese Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the New York Times for September 25, 1951, reports that the opposition leaders in the Japanese Diet are showing considerable resistance to the approval of the mutual aid treaty between the United States and Japan. They object because the Japanese Government has not yet published the details of the program so the Diet and the public can be fully informed.

They are protesting also an attempt by the Japanese Government to take over full control of the press and other information media.

I congratulate the members of the Japanese Diet on this adherence to the principles of representative government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain paragraphs from the Times story.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT DUE IN JAPAN ON PACT WITH UNITED STATES—SECURITY TREATY'S RATIFICATION MAY BE HELD UP—MINORITY LEADERS VOICE CRITICISM

TOKYO, September 24—Difficulties here began to arise over ratification of the security agreement between Japan and the United States that followed the signing of the peace treaty at San Francisco.

Some political circles now express the opinion that the agreement to keep a United States armed garrison here, even after the nation becomes officially sovereign and independent will not be approved by next month's session of the Diet.

The expressed opinions of leaders of minority parties now seemed to indicate that

there was considerably harder sledding ahead for the defense agreement than was expected by Premier Shigeru Yoshida at San Francisco.

QUESTIONS OVER TERMS

The Democrats and Socialists, according to intimations, particularly want to know specifically what facilities and what powers will be granted to the United States defense forces, what the costs will be, and whether or not there is a time limit or limitation on the foreign garrisoning of independent Japan before they are willing to endorse a blanket agreement.

The question of ratification of the security pact has come up in connection with the Government's proposal to hold a special session of the Diet next month specifically to endorse the peace treaty but also to act on the internal laws and external arrangements Japan presumably will have to possess when she again becomes a sovereign state.

The sessions are tentatively expected to open October 10. Some Government plans already are encountering considerable opposition and informed quarters consider it probable that much of the program will have to go over until the next regular session scheduled between December 5 and the Christmas holidays.

The principal point raised by the opposition leaders in regard to the security pact is that, though many detailed negotiations would be required to determine just what Japan would grant or withhold, no details had been published by the Yoshida Government concerning what it had in mind.

GOVERNMENT PUTS PACT FIRST

The Government's attitude is that the agreement should first be ratified by the Diet and the conditions later fixed by a bilateral agreement between the Japanese and United States administrations. This is not too popular with nongovernmental parties.

A typical comment came from Inejiro Asanuma, chief secretary of the Socialist Party—generally opposed to the treaty as a whole. Mr. Asanuma said that while the security arrangement was not a special target of the Socialists "I can't understand why the Government wants to conclude the pact even before the treaty itself is ratified."

This is also approximately the feeling of the usually conservative Democratic Party. Takeo Mikki, the party's organizational leader, also expressed the opinion that since the "garrisoning of foreign troops requires true and close collaboration between the troops and the Japanese people," the public here should be better informed on what is expected before their Diet representatives are required to ratify the pact.

A second argument already has arisen over the Yoshida administration's proposed internal state security bill, which in its tentative form would have passed on to the Government many of the powers possessed by the occupation—including press control, a measure that would have permitted bureaucracy, despite all constitutional provisions, completely supervise all information media and even close them down on the vaguest of accusations.

ORIGINAL PROPOSAL SWEEPING

The original proposal was to enact into law the occupation's press code—a military measure put into effect in 1945—which allowed headquarters to punish newspapers and other publications for failure to adhere to what it deemed to be "truth" or for the publication of anything supposed to be troublesome to public peace.

After a bitter complaint by the Japanese Editors and Publishers Association, Attorney General Takeo Ahashi announced yesterday the Government now has decided to abandon this plan, at least temporarily.

Secrecy in Government**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Secrecy Called Peril to Press," which appeared yesterday in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY CALLED PERIL TO PRESS

CHICAGO, October 1.—Newspaper executives from 43 of the country's leading publications warned yesterday "secrecy in Government" imperils United States freedom of the press.

The editors and publishers met in an all-day session with Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz, editor and publisher of the expropriated Argentine newspaper La Prensa.

An honorary degree in journalism will be conferred on Dr. Gainza later today at a special convocation at Northwestern University.

The warning by the newsmen was embodied in a declaration which charged that public information is being steadily undermined by the growing practice of secrecy in government.

SECURITY CODES

The newsmen swung hard at President Truman's order last week setting up "security codes" of censorship of governmental news.

They said there is a feeling among Government officials that they can "extend military security into areas of news which have no bearing on the Nation's security, as shown in an Executive order issued within the week."

The discussion was held at Northwestern and was sponsored by the school's Medical School of Journalism and the Inter-American Press Association.

A WARNING

Dr. Gainza warned that La Prensa's fate could be the fate of any newspaper.

Argentina had a long history of democratic tradition, he said. But in 1941 a "state of siege" was declared in connection with World War II.

Two years later, the leaders of the military coup found it easy to suppress additional information because the press was already controlled.

SIEGE STARTED IT

"I think that what happened in Argentina happened only because of the previous state of siege," Dr. Gainza said. "It would have been impossible without that."

Several American newsmen remarked that the present security measures now being imposed in this country because of the defense effort, with the resulting curtailment of news at the source, are similar to the Argentina state of siege of 1941.

ECONOMIC GROUP ISSUES WARNING AGAINST SECRECY

The Committee for Economic Development, a nonpolitical organization of widely known businessmen and educators, has just dropped a warning into the general discussion of the Government's trend toward secrecy and censorship.

The Government, the committee said, "is following a much more comprehensive pro-

gram of secrecy than in any previous period when we were not at war. Moreover, our people have been cut off from important information through censorship, both formal and informal, by foreign governments. To an unprecedented degree the public is depending for its foreign intelligence upon what our own Government agencies decide to disclose."

The committee findings, by its research and policy committee, were published in December 1949, after a study of 18 months. Apparently the committee feels that the secrecy situation is working out in the dangerous way it forecast because it notes that "this whole problem was anticipated." It is recirculating the brochure it issued nearly 2 years ago.

The Cases of Senator McCarthy and the Late Senator La Follette, Sr.**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "McCarthy Recalls La Follette Incident," written by David Lawrence and published in the Boston Traveler of October 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARTHY RECALLS LA FOLLETTE INCIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON—This is a tale about a Wisconsin Senator—a Republican. He made speeches inside and outside the Senate which angered the people of his own State and the people of the Nation.

The unpopularity of this Senator was such that newspapers from one end of the country to the other denounced him, not only for his tactless way of bludgeoning his adversaries and his vocabulary of anathema, but for treasonable and seditious utterances.

The Republican State Central Committee of Wisconsin by unanimous vote demanded his expulsion from the United States Senate for treasonable and seditious utterances. The League of Wisconsin municipalities took the same action. The State council of defense and 71 county councils called on him to resign and demanded that the United States Senate expel him if he didn't resign. He was hanged in effigy.

Rotary groups, bar associations, public-safety committees in his own State and elsewhere denounced him. The Republican State Convention of Massachusetts adopted a resolution censuring him for marked disloyalty. Former President Theodore Roosevelt called him the most sinister enemy of democracy in the United States and called for his expulsion from the Senate.

The same Wisconsin Senator then made a bitter speech in St. Paul, Minn. There was some doubt afterward as to exactly what the Senator said. The furor caused the United States Senate to appoint a special committee to investigate the demands for expulsion. The chairman of that committee—a Democratic Senator—construed the committee's powers as limited to ascertaining first, the truth or falsity of what the Senator said and second, the truth or falsity of his statement of facts. The issue was debated at length

in the Senate. Senator Kellogg, of Minnesota, Republican, a great lawyer of his day, who later became a Secretary of State, refused to admit that the issue of free speech was at stake. He said "This is a question of erroneous statement of facts rather than of free speech."

The Wisconsin Senator had denounced the motives of the United States Government. He questioned the sincerity of its acts at a time when its troops were fighting on the battlefield. Only from a few places did endorsement of his stand come. The California Federation of Labor, for instance, expressed confidence in him as a true American citizen and upheld his right to voice the views of an intelligent man.

Then after the war, the same Wisconsin Senator was reelected by the people of Wisconsin and remained in the Senate for many years afterward, often fighting in behalf of unpopular causes. So great was his hold on the people of his State that his son—a very able man in his own right—was elected to the Senate as his successor without being in the slightest degree damaged politically by the controversy in which his father had been engaged. Indeed, the father ran for the Presidency of the United States as an independent in 1924 and polled close to 5,000,000 votes. No third-party candidate since then has obtained as many.

The name of the Senator from Wisconsin for whose expulsion there was such widespread demand was Robert M. La Follette.

What did history say 34 years later? A President of the United States—a Democrat—in speaking to a Nation-wide radio audience on July 28, 1951, denounced, by implication, a present-day United States Senator from Wisconsin and spoke of Wisconsin as "The home State of two of America's greatest liberal and progressive Senators, Robert M. La Follette and Robert, junior."

This tribute of greatness was given to a man once widely denounced. It will be argued, of course, that the cases of Senators McCarthy and La Follette are not parallel because the one smeared individuals and the other smeared his own Government or because one allegedly engaged in improper campaigning and the other did not. It makes one wonder how many people in America, inside and outside public life who profess to be liberals, sincerely subscribe to the doctrine laid down by the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the Supreme Court of the United States, who once defined freedom of speech as freedom for the thought we hate.

The Controls Issue**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "By Default," published in the Dallas Morning News of Monday, September 24, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY DEFAULT

The News would be remiss not to acknowledge the readiness with which Indiana's Senator HOMER CAPEHART expressed

personal willingness to appear on a TV debate with President Truman on the nature and effects of the whole control bill, with no coaching. The President had publicized his letter to CAPPHART in which he stated boldly that the Senator did not understand his own amendment to the bill. The News, skeptical that Mr. Truman understands the bill, suggested that the TV debate would be a fair test.

Mr. Truman being silent, presumably the Senator wins by default. Only there is no prize in victory. It would be a great contribution to government if our American Presidents, who customarily speak without anybody being able to challenge, would appear and answer questions. But they will not do so.

The presidency is political capital. The President has a canned speech written for him, delivers it. His party could put up somebody who knows what it is all about to do the talking but the somebody would be just another person.

How many times did you ever listen to Senator Harry Truman? Or put faith in what he said?

Good Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmers responded to an appeal by the Federal Government last year to produce a bumper crop in order to meet defense needs. Acting in good faith, the cotton farmer increased his production and is now threatened by sharp price decline.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer for inclusion a timely discussion of the problem of the cotton farmer which appeared in the Louisiana Farm Bureau News:

COTTON MARKET MUST BE STABILIZED

As a simple matter of good economics and good faith the Government should carry out the cotton price stabilization recommendations made by the Farm Bureau and by others interested in the welfare of agriculture and in fair treatment for agriculture. Such action is necessary if cotton growers are not to suffer severely as their only reward for having answered the Government's appeal for a bumper crop in 1951.

As a result of the efforts of the cotton growers to produce this bumper crop, cotton prices have broken sharply. At the same time labor has become more scarce, and the price of what the farmers must buy to produce their bumper crop has gone up. Cotton growers are being squeezed between low prices and high costs, and little or no profit can be made at the harvest season prices now in prospect.

The proper level at which to stabilize prices for the 1951 crop is the level prevailing at planting time. The Government has the means readily at hand to do so. A cotton stockpiling program would assure cotton farmers a fair price and would protect the country against ever again being caught short of one of the most important of all war materials.

By helping friendly countries meet their cotton needs from the bumper American crop the Government can go a long way toward preventing a burdensome surplus.

By stabilizing the price of cotton at a reasonable level the Government can keep faith with cotton growers and let them know that should any other such emergency arise in the future they can respond without fear of bringing disastrous losses on themselves.

Are We Really Better Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that a recent editorial in the Millville (N. J.) Daily Republican is worthy of the attention of the entire House, I have sought and obtained permission to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

President Truman in defending his unprecedented spending and his administration's policies, says we are better off than ever before.

The answer to that is we should be!

Why shouldn't we be better off? There have been new products, improved products and new processes, improved processes.

The President made comparisons of the present with 1939. It would be just as logical to say that 1939 was better than 1839 or 1869. It should be.

Economically and financially we are better off. But is the country better off with its huge debt that defies liquidation.

Furthermore the real question is, right now wouldn't we be even better off than President Truman says we are, if we had not had inflation.

Mr. Truman also refers to the predictions of financial disaster. He claims such dire prophecies have been made for several years and have failed to come true. What of that?

The answer is not a complex one. It is answered by a question: How much inflation can we stand?

Now we have a 50 cent dollar. When will we have a 25 cent or a 15 cent dollar?

We all know that when the dollar has no value we are sure in a mess. We are certain to have disaster. But at what point between the 50 cent dollar and the valueless dollar is the breaking point?

It is just as sure as Mr. Truman said it that people are better off. But think of how much better off all of us would be if we did not have so much to pay in taxes. President Truman did not mention the fact that the price of government has advanced a great deal more than the price of food.

On the basis of proposed spending one of two things must happen—or some of both. Either we must raise a lot more money in taxes or there must be a lot more borrowing. And that's not butterfly outment, either.

The President says the budget cannot be cut for it is tight and as solid as we can make it.

But Senator BRAD points out that nondefense expenditures in 1948 were \$6,000,000,000. Yet in 1951-52, when we should be retrenching on nondefense spending, the corresponding figure is almost \$10,000,000,000.

If the President feels that some of his critics are using "butterfly statistics," we would suggest that he study the comment of the New York Times on some of his own statistics. It is:

"Paradoxically, however, it is Mr. Truman himself who has produced (quite inadver-

tently) the most devastating indictment of the fiscal policies of his own administration. While nondefense expenditures have gone up 68 percent in the past 10 years, he is reported as saying, they actually declined when one takes into account adjustments for changes in the price level. Precisely. Since Mr. Truman himself took office in April 1945, the cost of living has risen approximately 46 percent and the cost of food nearly 67 percent.

"Are we to believe that this phenomenon has no relation to the Government's policy of steadily blowing up the economy by pumping out purchasing power? And the policy of perpetually easy money advocated by the President's Council of Economic Advisers and maintained throughout Mr. Truman's administration by his own fiscal authorities over the protest of the Federal Reserve—are we to believe that this has not been an essential element in the administration's basic policy of what it likes to refer to as expansionism, but which many would say was simply calculated, deliberate inflation?"

Everybody Shares Soil and Water Conservation Awards—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part I of the address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Denver Post Station KLZ soil conservation recognition banquet, Julesburg, Colo., September 25, 1950:

EVERYBODY SHARES SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION AWARDS

All of us can take personal satisfaction in joining in these recognition ceremonies for your northeastern Colorado winners in the soil-conservation recognition program sponsored by the Denver Post and radio station KLZ. Although the physical awards to be presented necessarily cannot be numerous, the actual rewards of soil and water conservation accomplishment are so many and so substantial that there are enough to go around for everybody.

In other words, presentation of these awards this evening for outstanding accomplishment in soil conservation farming is symbolic of the rewarding nature of soil and water conservation wherever it is practiced. The rewards from conservation and wise use of the land are by no means limited to the farms and ranches on which conservation programs are used. They extend to our whole society, to the profit and satisfaction and well-being of everybody. They mean more sound soil conservation on the land, according to kind and need.

Some of these rewards are:

1. To landowners and operators—increased income, better living, greater security for the future.

2. To the community—better business, improved schools, churches, roads, and other community essentials; and people working more closely together as a result of a thriving agriculture.

3. To the public in general—protection of the land on which we depend for virtually all of our food and much of our clothing; and all of our wood, vegetable oils and fats, tobacco, etc., together with reduction of

floods and siltation of streams and reservoirs.

4. To government (local, State, and Federal)—increased revenues resulting from increased earnings and added wealth from land stabilized and improved through conservation farming.

One of the principal tasks we face as soil conservationists and friends of conservation is getting everybody to know about these generous and continuing returns from conservation farming. That is in addition to, but right along with, the job of putting conservation on every possible acre of land just as fast as we can. It would be hard to overestimate the value of this soil conservation recognition program and the other constructive, day-by-day efforts made by the Post and KLZ for a number of years to further the progress of conservation farming in Colorado and the surrounding territory.

Back in December 1947 when this conservation awards program was just getting under way, I wrote Publisher Palmer Hoyt: "Your enterprise in taking this means to focus attention on the important matter of conserving our soil and water resources represents a real public service. Such a contest unquestionably will be highly effective in stimulating conservation thinking and action throughout Colorado as well as over a wider area." I am happy that events have borne out that statement. When I was out here in Colorado a few weeks ago, various people—including soil conservation district supervisors and some of our own Soil Conservation Service personnel—told me they had learned more about the progress of soil conservation in the State by reason of serving on the awards program teams than they ever had in any other way. I can understand how they feel; because I have visited some of the winning farms and ranches and talked with winning farmers myself. No one can see this work and talk with these conservation farmers without being impressed, and inspired to redouble his own efforts for furtherance of conservation.

Such positive attention to the vital task of safeguarding our basic soil and water resources is especially important at this time. So many sober activities are occupying everybody's attention that the temptation might arise to allow ourselves to be distracted somewhat from such a fundamental element as this is in our whole national well-being and security. You and I know that we can't afford to let that happen, but such understanding among ourselves as practicing soil conservationists—whether as farmers or otherwise—is not enough. Every man, woman, and child who produces, handles, processes, or consumes the products of the soil likewise must have this conservation concept before we can have any lasting assurance that the good land which is the very base of our democracy shall be permanently maintained to meet our utmost needs in time of peace or war.

Without a lasting agriculture—the kind of agriculture which soil conservation districts exist to perpetuate—there can be no assurance of permanent prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere on earth. And a prosperous and lasting agriculture depends on an adequate supply of productive land properly used and so protected from erosion that it will remain permanently productive. What's the use of applying the permanent type of soil-stabilizing measures and then permit them to go to pieces for lack of maintenance.

Lasting soil conservation of the kind you are putting into effect here in the Sedgwick County soil-conservation district and in the other Colorado districts, with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, is mandatory everywhere. It is mandatory here in the United States if we are to avoid national weakening, while the enemies of democracy cry out against us. None of us can say, of course, how long the present

international emergency will last. But the strain on our land which we now again face may be prolonged, and we must build and plan against any eventuality. This is no time either to experiment or take chances. And we don't need to—not with our productive land and other resources of water, timber, oil, and minerals, wisely used.

Productive land is an inseparable and essential part of our first line of national defense; because men with guns and bullets can't fight without food, and there can be little food from poor land. Already since the Korean trouble started, threatened so-called surpluses of certain farm commodities appear to have become comforting stores of essential food and fiber. When we have had repeated experiences of this nature, you wouldn't think anyone would be so foolish as to suggest that we sometimes don't need such things as soil conservation to help keep our agricultural producing plant in condition of top efficiency. Yet I am sure all of us have heard just such loose talk.

During World War II, conservation farming demonstrated its effectiveness, year after year, in giving maximum production of needed crops, with minimum labor and machinery wear, together with the most economical use of seed and fertilizer. Those are among the multiple rewards of treating and using our productive land according to sound conservation practices. It also builds up a sound reserve of productive capacity—keeps our powder dry! We all know that during the last war a considerable amount of land damage resulted from cropping too much land that should have been left in grass or in protective rotations. But the damage was nowhere near what it might have been had we gone through the war and postwar farm production strain without benefit of any conservation farming knowledge and practice.

Other millions of acres, moreover—out here in the Great Plains as elsewhere—were farmed under sound soil conservation practices for maximum, profitable production. This same land is in sound condition today—even in the heart of the old so-called Dust Bowl area—to give maximum production next year and the next, as need may dictate. Such methods constitute the best insurance the farmer has against the vagaries of the elements and, short of a long period of unusually favorable rainfall, are his best assurance of stable and profitable returns over the long run.

Before looking further at some of the remarkable progress we have made in soil and water conservation in the last few years, and at the tremendous job which still lies ahead of us, I think it might be well to consider for a moment what we mean when we talk about modern soil conservation like that which has brought us together here this evening.

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use.

It means contouring and terracing land that needs such treatment, and strip-cropping and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets; building farm and ranch ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable; planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees; development of good pastures and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs. If it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nu-

trients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter. If water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the alkali by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable tools.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal, irrigation, etc.) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where floodwaters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping.

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. And modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work that has a chance for permanency. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season. They are the basis of land permanency, and that is necessary if we are to have a permanent agriculture.

There is one correct formula for doing the soil and water conservation job right. It certainly can't be done right with single practices or with time-consuming, inadequate short-cuts. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs as determined by such conditions as degree of erosion, waterlogging, etc., and using each kind according to its capacity for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife.

You Colorado soil conservation district farmers appreciate what I am talking about in this respect, I am sure. The very fact that some of you are being honored here this evening attests to the fact that you have tried and proved the effectiveness of thoroughgoing soil and water conservation, comprising basic land capability surveys, completely coordinated conservation plans for whole farms, and the careful application of the conservation measures called for, with expert technical assistance. This is the kind of conservation farming that is safeguarding and improving our country's farm lands at a progressively increasing rate each year—throughout Colorado and the Nation.

While we admittedly are not moving fast enough and are still suffering heavy losses of soil, we are, nevertheless, moving ahead at an encouraging rate. In 1943, to illustrate, the Soil Conservation Service assisted the districts in completing 1 percent of the Nation-wide soil conservation job; but in 1949 the annual rate of progress went up to 2.3 percent of the unfinished job. We finished the job on 5,000,000 acres, approximately, in 1942 and on 22,000,000 acres in 1949. This was an increase of 340 percent, but we had an increase in facilities of only 43 percent. And in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the acreage treated with needed conservation measures in the districts jumped to 26,000,000 acres. By these figures, you can see that the conservation job not only is progressing but is doing so at an accelerated rate, considerably out of proportion to the facilities.

Here are some of the figures for the last fiscal year, which show how we have increased

again the yearly rate of conservation surveying, planning, and treatment all down the line:

	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1949	Cumulative to July 1, 1950
Detailed conservation surveys.....	31,465,000	25,800,000	334,770,000
Complete farm plans number.....	142,790	115,000	870,000
Acres planned.....	38,700,000	32,290,000	240,000,000
Acres treated.....	20,000,000	22,000,000	121,000,000

Our books, up to June 30, 1950, show that 18.6 percent of the conservation job had been completed. In addition, there had been a considerable spread of practices to thousands of farms, both inside and outside of soil-conservation districts, for which we have no records. If we can raise the annual rate of application of effective conservation measures a little more, which we can do with adequate facilities, we can begin to see the goal—the possibility of finishing the job on time. This would mean completing the basic conservation surveying, planning, and treatment of the land with the basic conservation measures needed during the next 20 years, or by about 1970. After that, of course, would remain the continuing job of maintenance and improvement of the conservation work as a result of research and other improvements which will continue to develop. Soil conservation, like any other works of man, must be maintained, to avoid disappearing through neglect. And the land is entitled to all the continuing benefits that may be derived from research and experience.

As a step in the continuing effort to reach the goal on time, we are urging the completion of at least an average of 4 percent of the job annually during the coming 3-year period. Nationally, this would mean an average annual rate of around 60,000,000 acres inventoried (surveys), 50,000,000 acres of farm land planned for conservation, and 40,000,000 acres treated each year during the fiscal years of 1952 to 1954, inclusive. I am more confident now than I have ever been before that we can attain this goal if the requisite technical facilities are available.

This confidence in what we can do as a Nation in safeguarding our remaining land resources—and putting to best use the water which makes the land produce—is based in major part on the existence and active operation of your soil-conservation districts. After all, how and when we get this job done is up to those who own and operate the land, and that means, for all practical purposes, that it is up to the farmers and ranchers in soil-conservation districts.

Should anyone doubt the accuracy of this conclusion, let me remind such persons that, as of July 1, this year, 80 percent of all our farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States were within soil conservation district boundaries. Farmers over the country are voting new districts into being every month under their State enabling laws, so that it is not unreasonable to assume that before too long a time the farm land of the Nation will all be in districts. Although the first soil-conservation district anywhere was established no longer ago than 1937, they now number 2,268 and cover 1,230,000,000 acres in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

I notice that, as of August 1, this year, 72 percent of the farms in Colorado and 56 percent of your farm land were within this State's 89 districts, in 53 of your 63 counties. I hope that your fellow Colorado landholders will see fit to drive ahead to place this State in the 100-percent district-covered column, along with neighboring Nebraska and many

other States which are either completely covered by districts or are very largely covered. Do you realize that today you can travel from Julesburg to the Gulf of Mexico, or in the opposite direction to the Canadian line, without ever getting outside of soil-conservation districts? And I can come to Julesburg through the South Atlantic and Gulf States and go back by way of Iowa, Illinois, West Virginia, etc., without getting outside of soil-conservation districts.

These statistics of district organization and accomplishments are satisfying, of course; but your soil-conservation districts possess another quality which in my opinion is most significant to keep in mind in these trying times. I am referring to the districts as living, working forces of practical democracy in action. The district organization, as it has stood the test of 13 years of peacetime and wartime experience under just about all possible economic, weather, and other conditions, definitely has proved itself to be superior to anything else we know about in coping with our basic land problems in a democratic fashion. Your districts are farmer voted and farmer managed. Between 11,000 and 12,000 soil-conservation district supervisors are giving unselfishly of their time and energies in the furtherance of soil- and water-conservation work throughout the country. They are on nobody's payroll, and are obligated to no Federal or other outside authority.

Everybody Shares Soil and Water Conservation Awards—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include part II of the address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Denver Post Station KLZ soil conservation recognition banquet, Julesburg, Colo., September 25, 1950:

The soil-conservation district movement, in my opinion, is the greatest movement relating to the welfare of the land in all history.

It is important to mention, also, I think, the some 20,000 natural neighbor groups in soil conservation districts with which we in the Soil Conservation Service are cooperating in getting this important job done. We can be eternally grateful that we enjoy in this country an economy that depends on individual freedom and initiative, and the exercise of such individual responsibility as that which has been demonstrated by the scores of thousands of soil conservation district landowners and operators like those of you in the Sedgwick County district.

I sometimes wonder if we appreciate just how fortunate we are in having such an effective local, democratically operated organization, through which to carry on vital undertakings like soil and water conservation. There is much we need to be thinking about, talking about, and doing something about; and it is in the soil conservation districts and neighbor groups that the job is going to get done. I am thinking, for example, of the important matter of water conservation.

As you out here in the Great Plains and Intermountain areas know better than anyone else, we can't put land in one pigeon-

hole and water in another and hope to deal with them separately. You also are well acquainted with the problems of having too much water at times, with erosion and flooding as a result, and too little water at other times, with curtailed irrigation and other water supplies, along with drought and wind erosion. Water conservation, in short, is part and parcel of soil conservation, in Colorado and everywhere.

We all are concerned with the conservation and best use of our water supplies. We have just so much water in any given locality; so we must not waste it but must use it prudently and to the best and most economical purpose. Here in Sedgwick County, for example, you are concerned with improvement of your irrigation systems and with drainage, along with developing stock-water ponds and springs and controlling excessive water runoff. You also are concerned with watershed treatment and management which determine whether you are to have a continued, adequate supply of irrigation water in your streams and reservoirs. Meanwhile, municipalities, hydroelectric power developments, and various other water users, in Colorado as elsewhere, likewise are vitally concerned with the conservation treatment and use of the land and water resources.

In the Soil Conservation Service, we look first at the land within the watersheds—examined the condition of the land, how it is being used, from the standpoint not only of soil wastage but of water wastage, too. More and more farmers and urban interests as well are coming to realize that they need special technical help in planning and applying adequate soil and water conservation programs on farm and ranch lands and watersheds. We are continuing to concentrate, also, on irrigation and other water research and on cooperative snow surveys, particularly through the Service's Division of Irrigation cooperating with the State experiment stations and others. The opportunities and promise are great for most effective accomplishment and results in applying these techniques and information to individual parcels of land and whole watersheds alike through the utilization of soil conservation district organization and facilities. This, as we have seen, is in both private and public interest.

Another important matter in this part of the country—as we were reminded again this last spring—is that of drought and wind erosion. What happened in some parts of the southern and central Great Plains during the past years illustrates rather graphically the importance and the effectiveness of soil and moisture conservation farming, in dry years and wet. The pattern ran true consistently in the 1950 drought areas. Locally there were soil blowing and poor crops, especially on land lacking any conservation treatment, and at least some kind of a crop or cover on adjacent conservation-farmed fields. And, from all reports, most of the area comprising the heart of the old "dust bowl" weathered this year's drought without too much damage.

That was because farmers in the soil conservation districts there, where they were hit so hard in the 1930's, long since had come to the conclusion that you can't safely gamble with the weather, either in the Plains or other parts of the country wherever the conditions favor wind erosion. The conservation farmer operates year in and year out so as to keep his land in the best possible condition to take what comes in the way of weather, from long dry spells to torrential rains. He uses stubble-mulch tillage, strip-cropping, water-holding terraces, rotations of cover crops. On land unsuited to cultivation, he uses grass, which is a crop of steadily increasing importance throughout the country. Such methods constitute the

best insurance he has against drought or deluge.

I realize very well that recurring emergency demands for wheat production, for example, such as we appear to be running into again, bring up some problems of reconciling maximum needed wheat acreage with best land use. There has been a great expansion of this acreage in the Plains country, and logically so; but nobody can deny that some of this was on land that shouldn't have been plowed up. When such land is cropped, yields must be expected to drop off in due time, and, if drought comes—as it may—we can't help having wind-erosion trouble.

But we must not overlook the fact that sound information for wind-erosion control is available. We don't need to have any more of it; we know how to prevent it.

Quite likely, however, we are not going to be able to get everybody immediately to see eye to eye with the plans of meeting the erosion problem head-on, whether it be wind erosion or water erosion, and lick the whole thing. In time, however, I am convinced that everybody will be seeing the situation in pretty much the same light, and we'll go about the job of doing whatever is necessary. This conclusion I have come to with greater confidence than I have ever had as the result of the splendid conservation work I saw out here in Colorado only a few weeks ago. On a big ranch near Colorado Springs I saw, on a large scale, some of the finest soil conservation work I have ever seen anywhere. I had seen this land before, when everything was dry and hopeless looking. Not so a few weeks ago, it was just the opposite everywhere, no erosion, and profitable returns from the perfectly stabilized land.

There are some, perhaps, who feel that only farmers and ranchers need be interested in soil conservation, but it is my conviction we all should be very deeply interested, whether we live in Julesburg, Denver, or elsewhere. As I pointed out earlier, modern conservation farming is closely related to the profitability of industry, the well-being of municipalities, and the health and welfare of all the people.

I believe I can say that our national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving our interlocking resources of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife. The Denver Post Station K1Z soil conservation awards program is one good example of this trend in our thinking. Research, education, land inventories, and the successful use and profitable results of soil and water conservation have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and water and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive and using our water to our greatest possible advantage.

The land is still the source of a very large share of our original wealth. Manufacturers, bankers, railroads, storekeepers, doctors, teachers, ministers, writers, and all the rest of us are directly affected by what happens to the base of that land-wealth—our productive land. We are affected, basically, as consumers of the things that are produced from the land; and we are affected, also, with respect to our income.

Agriculture is Colorado's biggest business, yet the State's capital assets of productive land have been reduced substantially through water and wind erosion and other damage in the considerably less than a hundred years since extensive development of dry-land farming in eastern Colorado. On both dry farm and irrigated lands, crop yields decline wherever the erosion process is allowed to continue out of control, water supplies for irrigation and other uses drop off as watersheds deteriorate; and range-carrying capacity shrinks when the forage cover is reduced and the topsoil is washed or blown away. If Colorado's or any other State's agri-

culture is to be permanent and profitable, its lands must be used and conserved according to our best ability and in accordance with the capability of the land. This State—any State, county, farm, or ranch—cannot afford to waste either soil or water.

The conservation job we have to do calls for the closest teamwork of everybody: farmers, business and professional people; private and public financial institutions, beet-sugar companies and other processors of agricultural products, radio and television stations, newspapers and magazines, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations; sportsmen's, women's, young people's, and other groups, schools and churches, local, State, and Federal agriculture, forestry, and other agencies and farm organizations—everybody. The constructive interest being taken in this whole matter in Colorado by agricultural and other leaders, from the Governor on down to the youngest soil conservation district board of supervisors, is most encouraging.

And while I am saying this I think I should say, also, that wherever soundly made soil and water conservation farm plans are carried out and maintained, yields have been increased. There have been no exceptions in our experience.

Also, I think it should be pointed out that good per-acre farm and ranch production determines the profitability of agriculture. So, soil conservation is the most basic work that man has to do.

National attention has been attracted, for instance, to the consideration given by your State tax commission to our land capability classification as a basis for assessing rural lands for taxing. I understand this reappraisal of land on the basis of its long-time producing ability has progressed in several counties where the Soil Conservation Service has made detailed land capability surveys in soil conservation districts. We also have been asked by the State agricultural planning committee for this land inventory information for the use of the State and county committees in their planning work.

But there is little point in my going into further detail on such forward-looking conservation activities with which you already are familiar here in Colorado. I want only to remind you that your soil conservation districts have an important responsibility in all this, along with every business and other legitimate interest in this and every community. And one of the jobs we are all called on to share just now is to help dispel certain misconceptions, or loose assertions, about soil conservation that still seem to confuse the thinking of some otherwise well-informed people. Briefly stated, some of these are:

1 That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2 That there are short-cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that district farm plans are too technical for farmers.

3. That soil conservation costs more than it is worth.

4 That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

Not one of these assertions is true, not even near enough the truth to deserve any consideration, except to keep people from being confused by the nonsense.

To complete the soil and water conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which all groups have a natural interest. It includes, among other points, (1) completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit; (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work—with

a scientifically developed soil conservation district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm in the country at minimum public cost, (3) active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; and (4) making a real conservationist out of every farmer in the country.

Among the rewards of which we are assured for successful completion of such a program is continued national security for our free people in a free America and the very survival of all the generations to come after us.

Pension Plans in Private Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, furthering my study of a uniform system of pensions, the Library of Congress has furnished me with a most interesting analysis of pension plans in private industry.

I am deeply indebted to Mr. Meyer Jacobstein of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress and to Mary R. Heslet of the senior specialist section, Library of Congress, for their aid in compiling the following report.

To those interested in the question of providing a uniform pension system as advocated by many pension groups, it will be well worth the time required in analyzing the following report, covering pension plans in private industry.

PENSION PLANS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

GROWTH OF PENSION PLANS

An accurate account of the number of private pension plans in existence in industry in the United States and the extent of coverage cannot be determined. There is no one particular source of information nor any central agency which gathers complete data relating to pensions which have been provided throughout the country. While there has been some means of accounting for pension plans formally established through collective bargaining or written provisions, there are many informal retirement pension plans, voluntarily established by employers, the number of which is unknown. It can be seen, however, from the data that have been compiled in various places that there has been a trend toward an ever-increasing number of plans in operation, particularly in recent years. The changing sociological picture, governmental activities, and organized labor's interest in the problem of old-age security are responsible for the added momentum. There will be discussed further in this report.

One source of information on pension plans in private industry is the data compiled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This Bureau reviews pension, profit-sharing and stock-bonus plans, established or proposed by employers, for the purpose of determining whether the plans are qualified to permit the deduction of contributions to funds from income subject to tax. Submission of plans is not compulsory, however, and not all companies avail themselves of the Bureau's services to obtain rulings as to qualification under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (employees' trusts—exemption from tax), as amended by section

162 of the Revenue Act of 1942. The records of the Bureau, therefore, by no means give a complete report on the number of existing pension plans. Nevertheless, the figures released by the Income Tax Unit of the Bureau are significant for the light they shed on the growth of pension plans. The following table, prepared by the Income Tax Unit in 1946 (the latest compilation that has been published), shows the changes that took place in the number of pension plans¹ and the number of participating employees over a period of approximately 20 years.

Period in which plan became effective ¹	Number of plans ²	Number of participating employees ³
Prior to 1930.....	105	1,394,184
1930-39.....	517	530,606
Jan. 1, 1940, to Sept. 1, 1942.....	843	450,008
Sept. 2, 1942, to Dec. 31, 1944.....	4,208	714,681
1945 and 1946 ⁴	1,180	201,129
Total.....	6,862	3,290,608

¹ Represents the period in which the "effective date" of the plan fell, which often preceded or sometimes followed date of actual adoption. In cases where plan was very materially amended, may represent period in which effective date of amendment fell.

² Includes 17 plans combining pension and profit-sharing features.

³ Represents employees covered by the plan at the date as of which information was submitted in connection with application for ruling on the plan. Includes all employees nominally covered under the plan even though a large number of such employees may never receive any benefits under it.

⁴ Excludes a substantial portion of plans effective in 1946 and some plans effective in 1945 for which favorable rulings were not issued and processed until after Aug. 31, 1946.

At present the Bureau of Internal Revenue keeps a record of the number of plans presented for rulings in its Income Tax Unit office. As of April 1951, the Bureau reports, 16,502 plans (including profit-sharing plans) have been received. Of this number, 1,100 plans have been disapproved or have become inactive, leaving a balance of 14,402 approved plans in existence. However, it has been found from past experience that income tax returns from employers reporting deductions because of amounts expended for pensions to employees show that there are more pension plans in existence than have been submitted for rulings. The number of plans in operation is estimated to be 20 percent greater than the number reported, and as a consequence there are perhaps between 17,000 and 17,500 formal and informal plans being administered. It is further estimated that approximately 8,000,000 workers are presently covered.

There are other sources of statistics on the number of pension plans in operation and the number of workers involved. These unfortunately are as of different dates and were compiled in incomparable ways.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor reported that as of mid-1950 the number of workers covered by pension plans within the scope of collective-bargaining agreements had increased to about 5,100,000 from 1,650,000 in mid-1948. Although increases in the number of plans and in coverage has continued since mid-1950, it was not at the pace in mid-1948 to mid-1950. It is a reasonable surmise that the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures for mid-1951 will be over 6,000,000 covering those within collective-bargaining agreements only.

Another estimate was made by the New York Legislative Committee on the problems of the aging. In its report, *Youth at Any Age* (Legislative Document No. 12, 1950), it

¹ A portion of the plans submitted for approval for tax deduction to the Bureau are profit-sharing plans, not pension plans. These involve about 10 percent of the number of employees covered by pension plans.

places the number covered by pension plans in industry in the summer of 1950 at 11,500,000, approximately one-fourth of all industrial workers.

As shown above, the number of employees participating in pension plans varies in estimate from 5,100,000 (under collective-bargaining agreements) to 11,500,000 (under formal and informal plans). The figure 8,000,000 as estimated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, is, however, the one generally used in current material on the subject, and the one that in all probability is more nearly accurate. The number of persons actually receiving pension benefits through private plans is 300,000, according to a recent estimate made by Robert M. Ball in connection with a study of private pension plans being conducted by the National Planning Association.

REASONS FOR GROWTH IN PENSION PLANS

Pensions in industry were inaugurated about 75 years ago in the railroad industry. The pension program of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. started in 1913. New plans started here and there in industry but coverage remained comparatively small before World War II. The demand for materials for warfare resulted in a great industrial expansion, which created among other shortages a shortage of manpower. Moreover, the labor market was drastically cut by the absorption of millions of workers into the Armed Forces. Despite the fact that at the beginning of the war in 1941 there were seven or eight million unemployed persons, by the end of 1942 the supply of labor had decreased to such an extent that competition for their services became increasingly sharp. However, the customary avenue for obtaining and retaining workers by payment of higher wages was blocked by action of the Government through the War Labor Board. This Board was given the job of formulating a wage-stabilization program. Under its policy, wage increases, though not prohibited, were restricted to a rise of no more than 15 percent above rates as of January 1, 1941. In lieu of raises in wages (benefit payments not being considered as "wages" at that time), pension plans were established in many industries as an incentive to secure workers and to dispel labor unrest. Coupled with the fact that the current cost of pension programs was nominal in view of the high excess-profits tax, the establishment of pension plans became widespread. Further encouragement to the growth of pension plans has been given by the Social Security Act of 1935 as amended, the 1942 Revision of the Internal Revenue Code, the Lewis-Krug settlement in the United Mine Workers welfare fund issue in 1946, the court decision in 1948 upholding the NLRB's ruling that pensions are a proper subject for bargaining, and the Steel Fact-Finding Board's recommendation in 1949 that a pension plan be established in the steel industry on a noncontributory basis.

Before discussing these activities of the Government in the field of pensions, it may be of interest to note the changing sociological and economic conditions that have influenced the trend toward more liberal use of plans to help provide much-needed security in old age.

The need for a promise of financial security in old age has been stimulated by the changes that have been taking place in the age groups of the population. The number of persons in the older age group has increased and will continue to grow. Not only has the number of people who attain the age of 65 (the normal retirement age) increased, but life expectancy after age 65 has lengthened as well. To the end that this ever-increasing number of persons in the older age group may be given assurance of financial security based on past earning capacity and not on need, the movement for developing pension plans has become of

greater importance to workers. At present there are a great number of older people without adequate means of support who must rely upon old-age assistance funds. It is hoped that in the future that those who are now working may be afforded independent support in later years by presently participating in some form of pension plan so that upon retirement enough benefits will have accumulated to provide an income. The number of recipients of old-age assistance has grown steadily since the inauguration of the Federal social security program in 1935—from 603,710 in June 1936 to approximately 2,700,000 in July 1951.

The extension of the old-age and survivors insurance system under the Social Security Act to the greatest number of workers possible, and the elimination of old-age assistance, except in cases of unusual need, have been recommended by such representative body as the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance.² This recommendation was incorporated in the report of the Senate Committee on Finance on the Social Security Act amendments of 1950.³

In conjunction with this change is the changing economic situation. The number of self-employed persons has been giving way to the increasing number of those who are dependent on incomes from outside employment. Fixed incomes, when subjected to higher taxes and rising prices, cannot be relied upon to provide a surplus to be put aside as savings for future care. It is also true that urbanization has brought about a change in family life, and where formerly older members were taken care of in the homes of younger relatives, now there is no room available for them, and the added cost of providing food and care has become prohibitive. These factors have contributed to the drive for pension plans.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Social Security Act of 1935, as amended, helped promote a further expansion of industrial pensions. The old-age and survivors insurance program inaugurated under the act is intended to provide "a basic measure of protection against the major hazards of old age and death." The publicity given the whole subject of pensions at the time of the enactment of the social-security law brought to the attention of the industrial world the need for greater old-age security for all workers. It became recognized that private pension plans would be necessary not only to provide protection for the workers excluded from the Federal legislation, but also to supplement the old-age and survivors insurance payments under the social-security system to the level of existing living standards. Although the 1950 amendments have extended old-age and survivors insurance coverage to include about four out of every five jobs, and have increased the benefits to about double the former amounts, the pressure for the establishment of private plans continues. In general, labor has maintained that \$100 a month is the minimum amount that could adequately support a pensioner. By combining social-security benefits with those allowed under private plans, this minimum has been met in many industries, it has been exceeded in some companies. The Ford Motor Car Co., for example, pays a minimum monthly retirement benefit of \$125. The increased social-security taxes as scheduled in the act may act as

² U. S. Senate, Recommendations for Social Security Legislation. Report of the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1949; p. 1 (80th Cong., 2d sess., Doc. No. 208).

³ U. S. Senate, Social Security Act amendments of 1950. Report of Committee on Finance to accompany H. R. 6000. p. 2 (81st Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 1669).

a stimulant to the growth of private pension plans, because the cost of the latter to the employer will be lessened where the benefits are tied in with old-age and survivors insurance payments.

Moreover, private pensions have advantage over social security in that benefits can be based on earnings of the various salary groups whereby pensions may be paid that bear an equitable ratio to the income received at time of retirement. Also, provisions for permanent and total disability benefits, not now included in the Federal law, can be embodied in private plans. It does not seem likely that private pension plans will show any signs of diminishing either in number or interest, except in the event of an over-all system providing universal coverage, adequate monthly payments, and inclusion of disability benefits.

1942 REVISION OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

A clarification of the provisions relating to pensions in the Internal Revenue Code served as a stimulus to the promotion of pension plans. Prior to 1942 the law provided that an employer's contributions to an employees' pension trust were a deductible expense for tax purposes, the beneficiaries of the trust fund were not taxed on the contributions made in their behalf until the trust was distributed, and earnings on trust funds were also nontaxable. It was also provided that the trust and any income thereof could not be used for any purpose other than that for which it was intended. These provisions, however, applied to a trust forming part of a plan of an employer "for the exclusive benefit of some or all of his employees." This phrase left the way open for the employer to use his own discretion in the matter of selection of employees who were to participate in the plan. As a result, it was found that a number of trust funds were created which benefited only a few key officers and employers, for the primary purpose of obtaining the income-tax advantages. It was chiefly to eliminate the discriminatory power of employers acquired under this section that the law was amended in 1942.

The 1942 revision continued the provisions noted above, but struck out the words "some or all of his employees." The new law required that employees must be selected by rules that would eliminate discrimination before a trust could qualify for tax exemption. The revision defined methods of taking tax deductions for contributions to a pension trust, and gave authority to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to approve or disapprove trust plans. A clearer understanding of the provisions relating to pension trusts and the tax advantages and the spreading of information resulting from the publicity given to the legislative revision, created a quickening interest in the establishment of pension plans. The growth of pension plans was further extended.

1946-49

After the end of World War II, the wartime controls on wages were lifted. The interest of labor became focused on pay increases and the issue of pensions fell into the background. However, the subject did not remain dormant for long. A phase in the development of pension systems which had not received a great deal of attention became a major problem after 1946. The question of including the subject of pensions in collective-bargaining negotiations developed. The issue was sparked by the Krug-Lewis agreement of May 1946, which provided for the establishment of the United Mine Workers welfare fund to be financed through royalties on tonnage of coal mined and to be administered by three trustees. The success of the UMW in obtaining such an agreement prompted other unions to seek similar benefits through collective bargaining. Their aim was to gain participation in the drafting

and administration of pension programs in which they felt they had a vital interest.

The demand for the inclusion of pension plans as a subject for collective bargaining grew considerably, causing the legality of such activity to be questioned by employers. The question was settled in 1948 by the decision of the United States court of appeals upholding the National Labor Relations Board's ruling in the *Inland Steel Case*.^{*} The Board ruled that pensions are a mandatory subject of collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act. The majority opinion was that benefits paid under a pension plan are within the meaning of the term "wages" and that the age and term of retirement are within the scope of "conditions of employment." The refusal by an employer to bargain on pensions was held to constitute an unfair labor practice.

The decision that pensions are a proper subject for collective bargaining was given greater emphasis in 1949 by the recommendations of the Steel Industry Board appointed by the President to settle a dispute in the steel industry over demands for a wage increase, pensions and group insurance benefits. The Board recommended that no wage increase be granted, but that a group insurance program be incorporated into bargaining agreements, and that pension plans on a noncontributory basis be established in the steel industry—the details of such plans to be determined through collective bargaining. The recommendations were finally accepted. They greatly influenced the spread of the establishment of pensions plans through negotiation to other industries, such as automobiles, glass, chemicals, and rubber.

CHANGES IN CHARACTER OF PENSION PLANS

Prior to 1925 the pension plans that were in existence had been voluntarily established by the employers and were financed and administered by the company. Labor for many years opposed the establishment of company benefit plans and unions were urged to set up their own plans. It was contended that pension plans were established by employers to discourage union organization and also that they were instrumental in curtailing the freedom of employees to seek other and perhaps better employment of their own choosing because of potential benefits that would be forfeited upon leaving the employ of a firm which had an established pension system. The operation of these company financed and administered plans did not prove to be very satisfactory. Payment of pensions under them was subject to fluctuations in business and there was no certainty that pensions would be paid if business conditions were such that a company could not lay aside funds from operating income sufficient to meet pension costs. The companies generally had complete discretionary power as to whether an employee qualified for a pension and could either grant or continue a pension as it so desired.

During the early twenties there developed a method whereby the financing of pension plans became more stable, providing greater assurance of payment of benefits when due to employees. Through the use of insurance companies employers were enabled to transfer their financial and administrative responsibilities with respect to pensions. Insured group annuity plans in lieu of the former pay-as-you-go and uncertain methods of providing pensions were established. By payment of a premium each year, adequate pension funds could be guaranteed and be available to pay retirement benefits. The discretionary power of employers had limitations placed upon it. In setting up a group annuity plan, data had to be supplied

which included a list of employees who would be eligible. The selection of such employees at the outset was discretionary, but once an employee's name was included, refusal to pay a pension practically became an impossibility. The introduction of the contributory feature in group annuity plans, whereby joint contributions were made by employees to the cost of pensions, also helped to eliminate the discretionary control by employers. Employers still retained managerial prerogatives with respect to the right to take the initiative, to prescribe the formula for determining the amount of pension, to select the employees to be covered, and to set the amount of contribution to be paid by employees. If the plan was the contributory type, but the participating employees gained greater security by the guarantee of payment of benefits upon retirement and the continuation of such payment.

Group annuity plans were used by the larger companies, and could be applied only where 50 or more persons would benefit. The use of individual annuities, whereby employers of small numbers of employees could provide policies offered by insurance companies, was developed during the thirties. Individual annuity policies did not constitute a pension plan, but were an insured method of financing a pension plan. The policies were either subject to the direct control of the employer or could be placed in a trust, in which case there was a trust agreement providing for carrying out the terms of the pension plan. The individual annuity policy plan resembled the self-administered plan in that both were formulated by the employer and his advisers. Self-administered plans, however, are not operated through an insurance company. Such plans were growing in use before 1942, generally in the larger corporations, but it was not until 1942 that self-administered plans were definitely defined as those whose funds are placed in trust with an outside agency, other than an insurance company and which provide that benefits are funded actuarially and on a contractual basis. By contractual it is meant that there is an agreement that an employee who qualifies for a pension will actually receive and continue to receive a pension upon retirement.

Although the plans progressively evidenced a sounder financial basis, there still continued to be some discriminations regarding classes of workers covered and eligibility requirements. A corrective for this practice was included in the list of requirements necessary for a pension plan to qualify for tax deduction purposes given in the 1942 revision of the Internal Revenue Code. The 1942 revision stipulated:

- (1) A plan must be for the exclusive benefit of the employees or their beneficiaries.
- (2) It must be in writing.
- (3) It must be permanent.
- (4) It must not discriminate in favor of managerial personnel.

(5) The income from a trust fund must not be used for any purpose other than the benefit of employees and their beneficiaries, and

(6) The contributions to a trust must be for the purpose of distributing accumulated funds to the employees according to an approved plan.

Plans which met these qualifications brought to the development of pension plans increased vitality and dependability. While the risks of a plan's possible failure and cessation of benefit payments have diminished due to careful preliminary studies of the factors involved and the methods of funding a plan, either in the form of insurance or a trust, the establishment of a plan prevents many problems and poses many questions. Such problems occurring under company sponsored and administered plans were worked out by actuaries and advisers

^{*}*Inland Steel Co. v. NLRB* (170 F. 2d 247 (1948)).

in conjunction with employers, who supplied the data necessary to the formulation of a plan. The complexities have been further augmented by the advent of the issue of collective bargaining on the subject of pensions and welfare programs. The Supreme Court's decision upholding the ruling that pensions are a proper subject for collective bargaining, and the recommendations of the Steel Fact-Finding Board for the establishment of a noncontributory pension plan in the steel industry have had a far-reaching effect on the changing pattern of pension plans.

The questions of administration, financing, eligibility, selection, vesting, age of retirement, etc., are no longer settled unilaterally where collective bargaining has encompassed the issue of pensions. However, the difficulties encountered have not been insurmountable and during the past 2 years negotiated plans have been successfully agreed upon in industry after industry. Some of these plans are new, but a number of them had been in existence under management operation and were incorporated in the collective-bargaining agreement after acceptance of such action by management and labor. In some instances previously existing plans were amended and liberalized through negotiation.

The major characteristics of pension plans negotiated in 1949 and 1950 have been summarized by Prof. Harold W. Davey,⁶ as follows:

- 1 The great majority are of the noncontributory type
- 2 The great majority provide for a total pension that recognizes and includes probable benefits from the Federal Social Security program.
- 3 Most of the newer plans call for pensions of \$100 to \$125 a month for workers after 65 with 20 to 30 years' service.
- 4 Most recent plans provide for joint administration.
- 5 A strong preference for a funded, actually sound plan is evidenced.
- 6 Employers are insisting on a compulsory retirement provision in most recent plans.
- 7 Employers are successfully resisting union proposals for vesting.
- 8 Most recent contracts provide for a re-opening of the pension agreements after 5 years.

The National Industrial Conference Board has published periodically analyses of new pension plans. These are comparable to the analysis in Davey's book. The article appearing in the Conference Board Management Record for January 1951 shows that the issue of compulsory retirement has been somewhat modified because of the scarcity of labor at this time. In a number of cases the age for retirement has been raised above 65. There have also been a few plans which outline a retired member's status under the plan in the event it may be necessary to recall him for work. It is also brought out that there is a tendency toward tailoring plans to meet the needs of individual companies, rather than patterning them to a standard plan, as appeared to be the case after the installation of the steel industry plan.

An earlier issue of the Management Record (June 1950), pointed out another development in the pension plan field. This is with reference to area-wide pensions, such as developed in Toledo and Detroit. In these cities a number of employers have agreements with unions for pensions financed by employer contributions. These contributions are pooled in a common fund, and workers of the participating employers

may change jobs within the companies covered without forfeiting pensions.

Experience has shown there is no simple pattern that can fit all types of industries. Each business and industry has its own set of conditions which must be taken into consideration in laying the foundation for a system that will be most effective, financially sound and easily administered. One thing is certain; the trend is definitely in the direction of more widespread application of pension plans in private industry; and at the same time we shall undoubtedly see the development of a still greater variety of pension plans.

Don't Sell the Party Down the River to Satisfy Personal Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a quarter century the Republicans were eclipsed in Albany because of the agility on the part of the little New Deal to outsmart them at every whirl of the political turnstile. They were definitely on the outside looking in with nobody to blame but their own stupidity.

When the people of New York decided on a change in 1942, the whole country looked to the Republicans to rip up the floor in Albany. This they did but they limited their political firing squads to Americans in their own party.

Their golden opportunity appeared last year when the vital subject of reapportionment came up. They got a few contemptible characters together in a smoke-filled room and talked over the situation.

New York State has 45 congressional districts. The little dictators determined to cut the number to 43, without firing a shot or without putting up a single objection.

All well and good, but their real chance came when they were faced with the bright hope of making their own party strong for the next 10 years by drawing the districts in compact form, as they should legally be, into at least 25 and even 30 sure Republican constituencies.

Their smarter brethren, the Fair Dealers, would have looked upon such an opportunity as heaven-sent and would have diminished the Republicans for all time to come.

That great Republican stronghold, up-State New York, which has stood the test of storm after storm, and still votes Republican, could have been made a mighty fortress, giving to the House of Representatives at least three or four more Republican Congressmen.

But no. The Albany pirates preferred to muffle their chance, to scuttle their ship, to saber and liquidate members of their own party whom they hate.

A year ago, a man in the know told me that he had talked with the State chairman about the whole up-State picture.

"There's one man who's got to go," said Pfeiffer, "and that is the Congressman from the Thirty-seventh District."

"But he's a Republican," the man objected, "and his voting record is among the most loyal and regular of all the Republicans in Congress."

"That makes no difference," Pfeiffer retorted, "he's got to go."

After I heard that, I concluded that the Albany gang would stoop to just about anything.

What my personal fate or fortune may be as the result of reapportionment is unimportant. Petty personal hatreds and intolerance have been applied to me ever since I have been in public life, and I have been able to overcome them.

But the fate of our Republican Party in the hands of these dagger throwers is a horse of another color. I am tremendously concerned with the course of action on the part of a leadership which will thrust aside the good of the party to indulge in the sadistic pleasure of liquidating a whole congressional district from the Republican fold simply because they hate me.

Up-State New York should not be deprived of a single Republican Congressman. It is too important an area and the Republican Party must have every last member elected from that area in order to carry the House in 1952.

I repeat, my own political future is of small import but I protest having my district swallowed up and the numerical strength of the Republicans up-State lessened by even one.

The truth is, these outlaws who pose as Republicans in the State capital are afraid of offending the O'Connell gang and the New York City Democratic machine. They prefer to limit their political sanctions against individuals in their own party.

The local newspaper accounts are as insulting to Broome County as they can possibly be. They refer to our great county as being thrown into the Thirtieth District. Actually, the Thirtieth is being attached to Broome.

Naturally, I dislike having to run against a Republican colleague in the House. But the arrangement is not mine, it is theirs, and I have no choice in the matter. However, as long as Broome County remains, I will be in the running regardless where they gerrymander us.

But to get back to the importance of a Republican victory next year. These despots are putting petty hatred above the great prospect of taking the House.

Such a race is bound to be close. Then why not add five Republican districts to New York State, instead of dividing the party, and throwing away the election because they want to settle a score with an Abraham Lincoln Republican like me, just because they do not happen to like me. I do not happen to like them either, but I stomach their existence for love of the party.

God help America if passion such as theirs rules the land and blots out sweet reason. Let us make these pirates walk the plank and save the two-party system for our Nation.

⁶ Davey, Harold W. Contemporary Collective Bargaining. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, p. 219.

Who Owns Your Child's Mind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by John T. Flynn, appearing in the October 1951 issue of Reader's Digest.

This famous and noted writer calls attention to some facts that every citizen should know, facts that are characteristic of the trend to bring socialism to America through our educational institutions. I am bitterly opposed to it, and every other American should be.

The article follows:

WHO OWNS YOUR CHILD'S MIND?

(By John T. Flynn)

Who owns your child's mind? I would assume that the child owns its own mind. And that the parent is the guardian of the child. Our American system is based on the belief that the State does not own anybody's mind—whether of the parents or the child.

When boys and girls enter a public school does the State have the right to teach them any religion it chooses? Does it have the right to indoctrinate the child in a political philosophy? If it has, who in the school has the right to decide what religious or political doctrines will be drilled into the child's mind?

The function of education in our public-school system is to train the child to use his mind, to give him information, train him to think and inculcate in him those principles of moral conduct which are the accepted code of our society.

What of the teachers? Do they possess an authority which transcends the authority of the State? The State has no right to direct teachers to slant their teachings in the direction of communism, socialism or fascism. Do teachers have the right to decide that they will use their positions to indoctrinate children in a religious or political philosophy alien to our society?

This problem is stirring up controversy in many communities.

I do not say that our schools have been taken over by either Communists or Socialists. I do insist that there are schools where the invasion has been started, and that where this exists in a school it is apt to be found chiefly in the social-science departments (where only a few teachers can do immense harm).

Even where it exists, I do not charge it is being promoted with the consent of the authorities; in most cases they are profoundly ignorant of the whole subject.

Finally, I do not charge that even the guilty teachers are teaching communism (though a few may be Communists). I say they teach socialism.

Few, I think, have had so unusual an opportunity to observe this as I have had. The drive to infect our public schools with collectivist propaganda began between 1933 and 1935. I was then, and for 9 years thereafter, a member of the board of higher education in New York City, administering four large public colleges. I participated in the selection of hundreds of teachers. I was chairman of a committee which formulated a new code to protect the academic freedom of our teachers. In this task I visited many colleges and I know that my colleagues will

testify that I was one of the leaders of the liberal attitude.

In the midst of my tenure, charges of left-wing activities on our college campuses in New York City were made which led to an investigation by the State legislature. Specific charges were made against numerous teachers. I knew many of them. I could not believe the charges and I said so publicly. But I had the humiliation of seeing them proved to the hilt. Some 35 leftists—not just Socialists but card-carrying members of the Communist Party—were, after trials by a board made up largely of liberals, held to be guilty and were dismissed.

Let me state precisely what I now allege. A group of educators—not numerous but influential—has set out to introduce into the social-science courses of our high schools a seductive form of propaganda for collectivism—chiefly of that type which we call socialism.

This propaganda takes the form of teaching openly if possible, cautiously if necessary, three things. First, that our American system of private enterprise is a failure. Second, that our Republic of limited powers is a mistake. Third, that our way of life must give way to a collectivist society in which the central state will own and operate, or plan and finance and control, the economic system.

I do not deny that teachers have a right to examine and hold such views personally, just as they have a right to hold whatever religious views appeal to them. I merely maintain they have no right to mold the minds of students in their religious or political philosophies. There are teachers that do this, and their numbers grow in influence. Furthermore, various outside organizations seek to promote this propaganda by slanting textbooks in that direction. This is a grave charge, but I can prove it.

In 1932 George S. Counts wrote a little book called *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* Dr. Counts is professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University. In this book he said we live in an age of revolution, and are witnessing the rise of a civilization built on science and technology which is "rapidly making of the world a single great society." He said we are in an era which has shifted from considerations affecting human liberties to considerations that "have to do with the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth."

He declared that "capitalism no longer works." He said there is no longer a choice between individualism and collectivism. "It is rather between two forms of collectivism; the one essentially democratic, the other feudal in spirit." And then he says that the society of the future is to be "a planned, coordinated, and socialized economy."

How will it happen? "Powerful classes must be persuaded to surrender their privileges." He fears they may refuse to do this, but he has a hope, it may be accomplished through the schools.

There the child must get his ideas from the teachers. And Counts declares boldly: "That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will influence the social ideals and behavior of the coming generation."

Counts and some of his associates did not rest here. A small group of educators got money from the Commonwealth Fund, set up by the wealthy conservative Harkness family, to make a study of social-science teaching. Later the Carnegie Foundation made a grant of \$300,000 to complete this study of the social sciences in use in our schools. The enterprise was sponsored by

the highly respected American Historical Association.

In due course the study emerged in 17 volumes. Dr. Counts was the research director, and some eminent names were associated with it. One of its conclusions was: "The age of individualism is closing and a new age of collectivism is emerging." The report then proposed that the teachers go to work upon the minds of their pupils to prepare them for the new collectivist society.

The late Harold Laski, Socialist and leader of the British Labor Party, wrote of this study "Stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational plan for a socialist America . . . It is a direct criticism of the ideals that have shaped American capitalism."

Here, then, was a plan to sell a socialized America through the teachers by working on the minds of the pupils.

One of Dr. Counts' colleagues in the commission which first promoted this idea was Dr. Harold Rugg. About this time Rugg brought out a book called *The Great Technology*, which argued that the schools must be used to create a new social order. He declared that the first step "must be to develop a new outlook on life and education among teachers." A new public mind, he said, "must be created by creating tens of millions of new individual minds and welding them together in a new social mind."

Dr. Rugg outlined his plan of campaign. The job was not to be done by preaching "socialism"; the way to do it was to condition the child's mind to accept socialism by planting in his mind a few root ideas.

You must fascinate him with the dramatic wonder of change.

The student must be told that there is not much greatness in our history, the American revolution was in reality nothing but a brawl between the British nobility and American landlords, and most of our statesmen in that period were interested chiefly in their property.

Students must be told that our economic system has, after all, been a failure. Behold the poverty, the depressions. This is not a land of opportunity; the Government must provide the good life for the masses. On this point the book gives tricky statistics about income, wealth distribution, etc.

Finally, Dr. Rugg said that to correct our economic system we must have a designed economic system, that is, a planned economy. The Government must take over the big industries; the rest must be operated under State plans.

All this is seductive, and it appeals to the generous instincts of the pupils. But it is socialism, sold under a deceptive label. And they are not instructed about any of the "bugs" in this idea.

Rugg's book was written for professional educators. But he became the pioneer in bringing out textbooks in accordance with the theories in his great technology. He wrote 14 textbooks, 14 student workbooks, and 14 teacher guides. All deal with the social sciences; all are heavily charged with socialist propaganda. I am informed that at least 5,000,000 copies of these have been circulated in the schools of the Nation.

Following the publication of Rugg's textbooks and guides, a steady stream of books on government, economics, and history were published for high-school use and slanted in varying degrees in the direction of different forms of collectivism.

In 1940, Dr. Ralph Robey made an examination of high-school textbooks, to extract passages which indicate the authors' attitude toward the system of private enterprise. The extracts were selected by three experts who examined 600 social-science textbooks—90 percent of those used in United

States high schools. The results were published without comment. Later, after an interview with Dr. Robey, the New York Times said "A substantial proportion of the social-science textbooks used in the high schools tend to criticize our form of government and hold in contempt the system of private enterprise. * * * There is a notable tendency to play down what has been accomplished in this country and to stress the defects of our democracy."

That was in 1940. The situation is worse now.

When objection is made to such books the cry is raised that we are invading the teacher's "academic freedom." That trick term means that a teacher can teach anything he or she wishes in the classroom. This theory is quite indefensible. Teachers have the same fundamental rights as other people. They have the right to write what they wish, and to hire a hall or stand on a soapbox and say what they wish.

The public-school classroom, however, is not a hall in which to exploit a teacher's religious or political theories. There are other rights in the classroom besides the teacher's. The students, the parents, the community all have rights there. The children are compelled to sit in the classroom and listen. They are not a voluntary audience. They have a right to be protected in these rights to the extent of keeping the classroom as an educational instrument and not an agency to turn our children into Socialists.

What can parents do about this? The best procedure in any given community is for a group to get the facts, and make criticism only where it is clearly warranted.

The first thing to do is to examine the textbooks, especially those used in the social sciences. History, government, economics. Then determine whether the books, or certain teachers, advocate leftist policies.

Citizens and parents must not make wild, unsupported charges or brand teachers as Communists where there is no proof. (As a matter of fact, most of the offenders are either Socialists or believers in some vague sort of collectivist scheme.)

On the other hand, citizens who know nothing of this sly and dangerous movement should not be apologists for offenders. Abide by the facts. The future of your country and your children is at stake.

Tass and the Press Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial written by a great American newspaperman, Hon. Dolph Frantz, editor of the Shreveport Journal. This editorial appeared in the Shreveport Journal, issue of September 25, 1951:

DON'T BELONG IN GALLERY

Representatives of newspapers and news-gathering systems recognized as having connection with or sympathy for communism have absolutely no business in the congressional press galleries or in any other American news headquarters. Our Nation runs serious risk when it permits the enemy to have press courtesies in this country.

The absurdity of the practice of allowing unfriendly foreigners and their agents to at-

tend American newspaper conferences and kindred gatherings has been stressed lately in regard to representatives of Tass, the Soviet news agency, which is generally considered to be an adjunct to the Reds' espionage system. Their particular purpose is to gain information for the benefit of the anti-American propagandists and other enemies of American ways. They should be barred from sources of official information at Washington, just as American newsmen are barred from such sources in Communist countries.

There should be no more privileges for Tass or any other Soviet news agency in the United States than are granted the American press representatives in Moscow and other Soviet centers. This evidently was considered by the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors when he suggested that the sources of information at our national capital be denied Tass representatives. The same idea no doubt motivated Senator O'Connor, of Maryland in offering a resolution to bar the Tass reporters from the press galleries of Congress. The prohibition should be enacted and strictly enforced. It would be absurd to continue granting the enemy any such favors.

America has been too lenient too long. It must tighten its defenses. One way to do this is to exclude from information sources news representatives serving the enemy.

Recent Developments in United States Policy Toward the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Sunday, August 26, 1951, I had the great pleasure of attending a banquet at Birmingham, Ala., given by the Southern Federation of the Syrian-Lebanon American Clubs and the National Association of Federations of Syrian-Lebanese Clubs. On that occasion Mr. Samuel K. C. Kopper, Deputy Director, Office of Near Eastern Affairs of the State Department, made a most interesting and able address. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. President, Dr. Malik, Senator Hill, Congressman Battle, and members of the Southern Federation of Syrian-Lebanon-American Clubs and the National Association of Federations, it is a real pleasure and privilege to be here with you this evening and to participate on this program with the Minister of Lebanon, Senator Hill and Congressman Battle. I bring to you the greetings of Assistant Secretary McGhee who looks forward to addressing your national convention in Atlantic City in October.

On behalf of the Department of State, I would like to pay tribute to the fine work which your organization is doing to increase understanding and promote good relations between the peoples of the United States and the Near East. We in the Department and our missions in the field followed with great interest your convention in Beirut and Damascus a year ago. We all believe that your efforts there made a valuable contribution toward the theme of this convention

which is to increase the good relations between the United States and the Near East.

As Mr. Frank Marin stated before the convention in Damascus, you did not go to preach, to seek material gain or to support certain political groups, you were simply returning to the land of your forefathers to dedicate yourselves to the service of your people in all walks of life. By the ties of ancestry and common heritage, you were also in a position better to approach your friends in the Near East and to interpret America's role in the Near East awakening. By your own example you could demonstrate the value of freedom for individuals, a tenet which is basic to the development and maintenance of freedom for nations. This was a solid basis from which only good could result.

To an audience so familiar with the Near East in all its phases of life and society, there is little unknown to you that I can present as general background. However, I should like to give you the picture as we in the Department of State see it today. If I start with what seems to be common knowledge to all, it is because the area we are considering is of such importance to the United States today.

The strategic location of the Near East is self-evident. This is the axis of three continents which credited western civilization, gave birth to the three great monotheistic religions, and sheltered the existence of culture and learning during the Dark Ages of Europe. Its territories are the crossroads of the Eastern Hemisphere. Every major international airline connecting Asia, Europe, and the United States passes through the Near East. The Suez Canal is a vital artery of world shipping.

Moreover, the Near East provides access to south Asia with its tremendous sources of manpower and raw materials, and to the continent of Africa whose resources of uranium, manganese, chrome, and copper we import in large quantities. The Near East itself contains one-half of the proven oil reserves of the world, and it supplies a large proportion of the oil requirements of Europe, Asia and Africa.

As has recently been graphically demonstrated in one of the leading American weeklies, the heartland of Islam, a religion of 300,000,000 people who inhabit the warm belt from the Atlantic shores of Africa to Indonesia and the Philippines in the Southwest Pacific, is found in the Near East.

The peoples of the Near East have today three strong aspirations: (1) They wish fervently to retain and strengthen their recently won independence—although the recorded history of the area is older than any other part of the world, it contains more new nations, and the spirit of nationalism and pride of sovereignty which spread through Europe and the Western Hemisphere during recent centuries is now growing in all of this region; (2) the peoples of the Near East strongly desire to play their part as equals in the family of nations, and (3) these people seek to raise their standard of living and to eliminate disease, poverty, and backwardness which have been prevalent over most of that area for centuries.

One important element which has added to the complexity and disturbing picture throughout the Near East is the neutralist, anti-Western tendency prevalent in certain of these countries. Several of these nations have emerged as sovereign entities only since the close of World War II. The struggle to gain independence is still vivid in the minds of their governments and peoples; relations with the rest of the world are still connected in their minds with external tutelage. Therefore, a belief exists in some circles that the best course for development lies in neutrality and disassociation from the west politically and economically.

Our efforts to assist the Near East are often labeled as attempts at political domination or economic penetration. Russian propa-

ganda has seized upon this suspicion and sought to strengthen it. The suspicion remains despite United States pursuit of a moderate and sympathetic role with regard to self-determination of people, such as in Syria and Lebanon, the lands of your ancestor. To overcome this antipathy and to substitute widespread belief in the mutual interests and common welfare of the West and Near East will require a good measure of understanding, patience and tact on our part. It will also require a good measure of realism and critical self-examination on the part of the near eastern countries. Your organization is well qualified to assist in bringing about a better understanding between the United States and the Near East.

As you are well aware, there have been a number of disturbing developments in the general area of the Near East during the past year. At the present time there exists a problem of negotiation between the United Kingdom and Egypt regarding the future of the British forces in Egypt and the future of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Since the end of World War II the Egyptians have been seeking a revision of the 1936 treaty, not due to expire until 1956, to the end that the British would evacuate both the Canal Zone and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. With respect to the latter the Egyptians claim historical ties and consider that the Sudan should be reunited with Egypt under the Egyptian crown. In early 1950 the Wafd Party came into power as the national government and negotiations which had been going on were resumed, Egypt's case before the Security Council not having succeeded in 1947. We consider that this question is essentially a problem between the United Kingdom and Egypt. Nevertheless, we are deeply interested in the matter because of its relation to general peace and stability in the area. Both the United Kingdom and Egypt have important roles in the security of the region. We, therefore, earnestly desire to see the matter settled through normal negotiations.

With regard to the problems remaining from the Palestine mandate, we continue to support the U. N. in its efforts to achieve a settlement of differences between Israel and the Arab States. There can be no question, however, that the problems arising from Palestine continue to dominate the near eastern scene. As you know, there are several U. N. organizations in the area at the moment which are charged with reconciling the parties and promoting peace and stability. The United States has given considerable support to all three of these organizations in the form of diplomatic backing, financial and material assistance, and manpower.

The organization which comes first in point of time is the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. You may remember that this body was established by the late Count Folke Bernadotte in June-July 1948 to supervise the truce which he negotiated with Israel and the Arab States. It consists of military personnel from France, Belgium, and the United States, and is headed by Lt. Gen. William E. Riley, United States Marine Corps, retired. The Truce Supervision Organization was continued in existence by the Security Council resolution of August 11, 1949, to provide the necessary U. N. supervision for the four armistice agreements which were signed under U. N. auspices, in the first 7 months of 1949 between Israel on the one hand and Egypt, Lebanon and Syria and Jordan on the other. These agreements, which were entered into voluntarily, put a definite end to the hostilities in the Near East, and are considered tantamount to nonaggression pacts. These armistice agreements are the only negotiated settlement which has so far been worked out and agreed to by Israel and the Arab States.

The second U. N. body is the Palestine Conciliation Commission. This organization is made up of United States, French, and Turkish representatives and was established by the General Assembly on December 11, 1948, to assist the Arabs and the Israelis in getting together on an over-all settlement, as well as to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement, and rehabilitation of the Palestine refugees and the payment of compensation to them.

On August 10 the PCC invited the four interested Arab States and Israel to meet with the Commission in Paris on September 10 to discuss problems. The United States, as a member of the PCC, strongly supports this step, in the hope that something positive could be done.

The last U. N. organization in the Near East—and certainly one of the most important—is the U. N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The GA on December 2, 1950, approved a resolution which called for \$20,000,000 to continue direct relief by the Agency from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952. The resolution also instructed the agency to establish a reintegration fund of not less than \$30,000,000 for the same period. The fund would finance projects requested by the near eastern governments for the permanent establishment of the refugees and their removal from relief either through repatriation or resettlement. Both the Arab States and Israel supported the resolution. By their acceptance of the reintegration fund, moreover, all of the parties have taken a public step toward the settlement of the refugee question. We consider this to be a hopeful sign, for the longer the refugees remain in camps, destitute and inactive, the more danger they will constitute as a source of unrest and a field for Communist infiltration and agitation. I might add that the United States has contributed approximately \$45,000,000 to refugee relief and works projects in the Near East.

Like many attempts at impartiality, United States and U. N. policies in Palestine are often interpreted as partial to one or the other of the parties involved. However, our actions and aims in this situation have been consistently designed to favor neither one nor the other, but to remove as much as possible of the bitterness, rancor, and intransigence caused by the hostilities and to promote an atmosphere of cooperation which will benefit all. In December 1948 at the Paris meeting of the General Assembly, it was my privilege to be present during a conversation between Mr. John Foster Dulles, acting chairman of the American delegation, and one of the leading Arab spokesmen. Mr. Dulles recounts this conversation in his recent book *War or Peace*. He assured the Arab statesman that the United States position on Palestine involved no unfriendliness whatever toward the Arab countries, and that the future would demonstrate this. I believe that these assurances have been upheld since then by our record in the United Nations. At the same time it must not be forgotten, as Mr. Dulles pointed out, that the United States supported the establishment of Israel and that Israel is a going concern in the family of nations.

The challenge of Soviet imperialism has made more apparent the weakness in the military, economic, and social structures of a number of states in the Near East. Where people are barely existing on an income of often less than \$100 a year per person, as compared with our average of \$1,400, the grandiose and illusory promises of communism are accepted in desperation and embraced in expectation. Where people have never developed a sense of personal participation or interest in their government, but have

come through the centuries to fear governmental authority as an abstract body of interference and subjugation, the development of responsibility in government takes time to achieve, but achieved it must be to prevent chaos.

These three aspects of weakness must be removed before there can be any effective resistance to communism or any permanent progress in man's state in the Near East. The social shortcomings can be righted only by responsible action from within: the military and economic weaknesses call for assistance from without.

The United States Government is keenly conscious of their need for external help in development and planned utilization of resources, and has proposed programs of financial and technical assistance in that field. Unfortunately, in attempting to render aid of this kind, we encounter charges of internal interference. These charges are made by antiwestern elements and Communist propaganda, charges which are unfairly labeled against our country in view of our traditional and unswerving adherence to national self-determination. . . . The United States Government has no desire whatsoever to encroach upon the sovereignty of these lands in any way, but rather desire to see these peoples become economically, socially and politically stable and immune to subversive influences which seek to undermine them and to deprive them of their legitimate personal and national rights and freedoms.

In January 1949, President Truman proposed in his inaugural address what has since become known as the point 4 program, to make available technical assistance for the underdeveloped countries. This program has already been accepted by most of the countries of the Near East, including Lebanon, and is now well under way. Because of its relative prosperity last year owing to the cotton boom, and for other reasons best known to itself, Syria has not so far seen fit to seek point 4 aid. It is recognized that the Syrians have a perfect right to seek or to reject this aid, and their stand on this question will in no way affect their good relations with the United States. We were encouraged to note the public statement by Syrian Prime Minister Hakim on August 15 that "the Arabs cannot face the dangers of this perplexed world alone, for neutrality is imaginary when we are weak."

The program remains as a means of extending aid to those nations who seek it of their own volition. The response to point 4 throughout the area has been generally favorable. However, even assuming that all the near eastern people should be enthusiastic over the idea, there would still be no assurance of not running into some snags in the ordinary housekeeping aspects of the program which by their very nature might easily run counter to the traditional practices of the area.

In spite of the encouraging progress of the point 4 program, events in Korea since June of 1950 underscored heavily the sobering reality that the economic and technical aid envisaged in that program alone would not be enough to meet the present challenge to the security of the Near East. Because of the urgent need to strengthen a number of non-Soviet-dominated areas, President Truman sent a message to the Congress on May 24, 1951, recommending that further steps be taken to build up these countries under a Mutual Security Program. In his message to the Congress, President Truman pointed out that no part of the world is more directly exposed to Soviet pressure than the countries of the Middle East. He stated further that the incessant pressure on the middle east can be overcome only by a continual build-up of armed defenses and the fostering of

economic development. He then recommended that \$415,000,000 in military aid be granted to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, a portion of this aid to be available for other middle eastern nations if necessary. He recommended that an additional \$125,000,000 in economic aid be allocated for Near Eastern countries, exclusive of Greece and Turkey, for whom economic aid is provided as part of the program for Europe. * * *

The President stressed the problems of economic development in the Near East, putting particular emphasis on the problem of the Arab refugees. He said that the program envisaged for the refugees has the threefold purpose of assisting in their resettlement, of strengthening those states wherein they settle, and removing this threat to the peace of the area. An expansion of needed food production was envisaged through the development of land and water resources. Under the proposed plan up to 10 percent of the \$415,000,000 requested for military and economic aid to Greece, Turkey, and Iran could be utilized in the near eastern states if the President were to determine such aid essential to the security of the United States. This would permit the United States for the first time to assist those countries directly in building up their defensive capabilities. This demonstrates the belief that it is in the interest of the United States to preserve and strengthen the relations of these states with the United States and the West; to increase the will of the near eastern states to cooperate in resisting any expansionist tendencies of the U. S. S. R.; and to develop the strength and stability of the area as a whole by encouraging the countries to increase their capacities for defense, strengthen internal security and reduce rivalries between the states of the area.

Under the Mutual Security Program as recommended by the President, economic aid would be * * * directed in the main toward the following fields: Improvements in public health and sanitation; agricultural extension services designed to increase food production by the use of better tools, seeds, fertilizers and methods of cultivation; increased opportunities and better training in vocational education and improvement of the highway facilities in the area, and finally toward the relief and rehabilitation of the Arab refugees.

As I have already stated, it is proposed that up to 10 percent of the total military aid earmarked for Greece, Turkey, and Iran might be drawn upon for military assistance to other near-eastern countries. The allocation of such assistance would be contingent upon the President's decision that such a course is essential to the security interests of the United States. In this connection I should like to quote from Assistant Secretary McGhee's statement to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on July 20. He said, "In all candor, I should like to say that it is now the Department of State's view that the President may well find it necessary to utilize this authority, if it is granted in the very near future. Events in the Middle East are moving rapidly. The United States cannot afford to allow the forces of neutralism and antiwestern sentiment to gain any further ground, nor to allow these forces to be captured and exploited by international communism."

Near-eastern statesmen would do well to remember that among German Foreign Office documents captured after World War II was a report dated November 26, 1940, from the German Ambassador to Moscow, Count Von Schulenberg. Von Schulenberg disclosed in this report that, subject to certain conditions, Molotov was ready to enlarge the Nazi-Soviet agreement into a four-power pact with all Axis nations. One of these conditions was that "the area south of Batumi and

Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf be recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union." Today all indications are that this area, long sought by czar and commissar alike, remains admittedly a center of immense expansionist pressure by Russia.

In his announcement of the mutual security program, the President emphasized that the Soviet threat to free nations today is world-wide, total, and of indefinite duration. With our assistance the free world as a whole will be able rapidly to strengthen its military defenses. Without our help, the necessary build-up would be protracted, perhaps impossible. Our economic aid and technical assistance will help in the development of the resources of underdeveloped countries, help to raise their living standards and strengthen their resistance to Communist subversion.

The President pointed out that the mutual security program has been examined from the standpoint of the availability of supplies, materials and equipment required to carry it out. The recommended assistance is necessarily limited to what is absolutely necessary to help these countries build essential military and economic strength. We believe that the program is based on a balanced, impartial approach and will be so administered. When the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, was asked by members of the United States Senate earlier this month what he believed should be done about Greece and Turkey, General Eisenhower said that Turkey is only a part of the great Middle East problem and that we should try to bring in the Arab world on our side * * *

As far as the sheer value of territory is concerned, there is no more strategically important area in the world than the Middle East. This area is tremendously important in terms of what it could contribute for our whole effort. We should use our resources, our power, our organizational ability and, above all, our leadership down there to get some kind of an organization that would rally all of them to go in with us.

In his last public statement before his tragic death, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman said: "I regard the strategic importance of the eastern Mediterranean and Middle East as almost equal to that of the North Atlantic Treaty area itself, as related to efforts to resist world-wide Communist encroachment."

Much of the cultural and religious heritage of the American people has its roots in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. This means that, although the pace of industrial and technical progress here seems to have advanced beyond that of the Old World, the two peoples have a common basis to build upon, a philosophy in direct opposition to the dialectical materialism that is the foundation of the Marxian philosophy.

The resources of the free world are indeed adequate to enable it to solve its problems, difficult though they may seem, and to guide the world into a new era of prosperity, security and opportunity for the individual which will not interfere with his essential dignity and freedom. In the face of this tremendous challenge there is no room for apathy on the part of any of us. We should have no illusions that this job can be done merely by the outlay of America's material resources. It cannot be done by the Government alone. We in Washington need the support of the American people in waging the world-wide campaign against poverty, despair and the delusive forces of subversion. You who have family ties with the Old World are in an especially favorable position to help in this effort. We recommend your efforts and will follow your progress with a lively interest.

The Legion Commends Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the letter which I presume all of the Members who voted to override the Presidential veto of H. R. 3193 received from Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion.

The press has been particularly intemperate in its denunciation of the action of Congress in this matter and has apparently purposely omitted pointing out that this legislation applies only to those helpless veterans who require the care of an attendant and who are without income adequate to their minimum economic needs.

I yield to no one in my insistence on governmental economy and while I shall continue to be critical of proposals for cash hand-outs to able-bodied veterans I will not knowingly join in economizing at the expense of those of our fellow citizens who have answered their country's call and are now in physical and financial distress. I commend you to the careful reading of Commander Cocke's fine statement. It follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COMMANDER,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 25, 1951.
Hon. PAUL B. DAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAGUE: This is a letter of congratulations and of thanks.

It is intended to convey to you some sense of the appreciation on the part of 3,000,000 legionnaires of the important role you played in the enactment over the President's veto of H. R. 3193, now Public Law 149.

We believe that you acted not only in the veterans' interest but in the national interest. We are convinced that a very great majority of the American people join us in applauding this action.

For some time now, we have noted in the press a strangely belligerent and resentful reaction to anything having to do with maintenance and improvement of veterans' benefits. The attitude is one of impatience bordering on disdain. It is reflected in editorials and articles which all too often emphasize astronomical cost projections rather than basic facts.

Because passage of H. R. 3193 was greeted in this fashion in many areas, I want to place on your record a brief review of the matter.

The American Legion advocated a reasonable pension for helpless and bedridden war veterans long before the introduction into Congress of the measure which last week became law. Three successive national conventions, in 1948, 1949, and 1950, reiterated the plea. We studied the question, we debated it, and we concluded that it was morally right and economically necessary.

The most severe objective scrutiny will disclose the new law to be just that.

The \$120 monthly benefit is reserved exclusively for those veterans who are in fact unemployable, who are blind, helpless or otherwise so disabled as to require the full-time attendance of another person. In addition, the beneficiary cannot have more than

\$1,000 income if single or \$2,500 if with dependents.

This law will add not a single penny to the tax burden of the American people. I cite this fact merely to refute the outlandish implications of cost that have been used against it. Every veteran who qualifies for the benefit will have already exhausted the last possibility of self-support. The only question, then, is how needed public assistance shall be provided: Whether through county or State taxes or through Federal taxes. It is obviously fair in the case of those who have served all of the people to distribute responsibility for their care among all of the people.

The burden, therefore, rests squarely upon the Federal Government. Public Law 149 recognized this obligation.

Pension based upon identical principles has been awarded by the Congress to veterans of the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. A policy precedent thus has been four times affirmed by different sessions of the Congress in different periods of our history. Fifty-five years elapsed between the end of the War Between the States and provision of this type of benefit for veterans of that conflict. The Eighty-second Congress, by acting now, has assured that the intended beneficiaries of the World Wars and Korea will have full opportunity to claim their right.

The President in his veto message complained that the measure would grant a special award to veterans "whose disabilities are in no way connected with military service." The complaint is as ill-founded as it is misdirected. Advisers to the President are in a position to know better.

The veterans who will receive the new payment are in large part those who have been and are drawing part III pensions for permanent and total disability. The latest Veterans' Administration hospital census conducted by the VA showed that of 19,632 patients in the general, medical, and surgery (non-service-connected) category, 5,532 were receiving part III pensions, and 6,554 had disabilities connected with their war service. Who can say that the service disability did not play a big part in bringing about the conditions that made these men permanently and totally disabled on a non-service-connected rating? To assume the contrary is crass speculation.

According to the same VA census, 1,808 patients among the 19,632 rated as non-service-connected were then awaiting the outcome of claims filed for the purpose of establishing service connection. As you can well realize, the margin of human error in the process of adjudicating such claims is great. How much greater the error to imply a pre-judgment against the claimant.

As of July 31, there were 312,000 veterans drawing pensions for permanent and total disabilities rated as non-service-connected. This included 30,406 World War II veterans. Less than 8 percent—or only 8 out of 100—of the total group are expected to qualify for benefits under the new law.

Were they all bedridden and therefore eligible for this new pension, the obligation upon the Government would be just as binding.

The American Legion is concerned about the high cost of government. But the American Legion is equally concerned about the high responsibility of Government, and we condemn and deplore the double-standard viewpoint of those who would make cost the all-important index of the merit of veterans' legislation while assigning it only moderate importance in other sectors.

Of all the legislative proposals which came before you, those affecting veterans are the only ones which are consistently presented to the reading public on the basis of cost in

the year 2000. Most Americans knew the projected cost of the pension bill by the end of the century before they knew the nature of the bill itself. And the basis of the projection in this instance as in many others remains a highly mysterious question.

The Congress within the week has approved a salary increase for Government workers. We are in sympathy with your action. But so far as we can determine, no voice has been raised to point out that the consequent cost to the taxpayers will be some \$25,000,000,000 by the end of the century.

Certain elements of the population long have regarded veterans' benefits as the soft underbelly of Government spending. Organizations have been formed under varied and attractive aliases for the sole purpose of dulling the public sense of responsibility as regards veterans' rehabilitation. We sometimes wonder if individuals who lead such groups consult either their conscience or the realities of human suffering.

Public Law 149 is a good law. It is a law to be proud of. And it is to the lasting credit of Members of the United States Congress—a mark of your moral and political courage—that you resisted the pressures put upon you to forget these needy veterans.

Sincerely,

ERLE COCKE, JR.,
National Commander.

Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the dedicatory address by Richard D. Searles, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, at the dedication of the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak.

I may say that this was an outstanding event. It was attended by scores and scores of scientists from all over the United States of America. The laboratory which was dedicated is one which will be available to scientists not only from this country but from all over the world, for their use in studying the possibilities of the use of lignite coal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The occasion which brings us here today is a significant step in the industrial development of this State. It also marks an important advance in the scientific program of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines.

The Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory commemorates the vision and foresight of a statesman who maintained throughout his life confidence in the future of North Dakota.

Charles Robertson knew and understood the importance of lignite in the world's energy reserve, and during his career in Congress he persistently and intelligently brought to the attention of those of us in government and to his fellow members of Congress the necessity for increasing research on this fuel.

It is tragic that Congressman Robertson did not live to see this laboratory completed. However, we who stand here today realize that he, more than any other person, was responsible for the construction of this fine edifice. It will stand as a lasting memorial to his faith in this State's important resource.

A brief glance at the position and future of lignite shows the profound importance of the work which this research laboratory will do.

The Geological Survey finds that this State has the stupendous quantity of 300,000,000,000 tons of recoverable lignite. That is approximately 10 percent of the entire world's supply, and it constitutes a natural resource of incalculable importance to North Dakota and to the Nation.

The existence of this rich lignite deposit has been known for many years. In the Journals of Lewis and Clark, written about their explorations in 1804-6, there is reference to the coals which they found in this region. As early as the 1850's lignite was being mined to furnish heat for the forts and fur-trading posts of western North Dakota. The Geological Survey began to report commercial production in 1884, and in the 67 years since then more than 70,000,000 tons of lignite have been produced.

At a conservative estimate, this mining industry had added \$100,000,000 to the wealth of the State. Currently, more than 3,000,000 tons a year are being mined, an output valued at almost \$8,000,000.

Yet this production barely scratches the surface, and this great resource thus far has hardly been touched. Lignite has been a difficult fuel to bring into widespread use, because of certain difficulties in handling it. Compared with the better grades of bituminous coal, it has always been ranked as a low-grade fuel. It has been hard to store and to transport, and when burned as fuel in its raw state, a great deal of expensive energy is used up in steaming out the water.

North Dakota lignite deposits are so enormous, and their potential uses are so immense, that it is of the highest importance to find efficient ways to put it fully to work. True conservation of our natural resources means using them in such a way that they make their best possible contribution to our well-being. We in the Department of the Interior, like many people in this State, believe that lignite can contribute far more to the American economy than it has ever yet done. This laboratory is a concrete expression of that belief.

For once it becomes possible to increase the use of this vast store of lignite as a commercially available low-cost fuel, and as a source of valuable chemicals, this entire region will reap immense benefits.

For one thing, we need lignite to firm up and supplement the hydroelectric power which is to be generated at Garrison Dam and distributed by the Department through the Bureau of Reclamation. It is conceivable that lignite may yet offer a rich new source of low-cost electric power. Unquestionably, if the industrial development which conservative investigators set as a minimum actually takes place, the expansion of power facilities in this region will sharply increase the demand for lignite.

Scientists and engineers of the Bureau of Mines have been concentrating on the problem of synthetic liquid fuels. Since 1948 this country has been using more petroleum than we are producing from our own wells. Despite the great strides which the petroleum industry has made in increasing our domestic supplies of oil, the demand for petroleum and its products has risen so sharply that we must depend on foreign sources for part of our supply.

I do not need to remind you of the hazards which can beset an overseas source of supply. We need very greatly to make certain

that in case of need we can obtain the oil we want, and in our hunt for additional sources we have been turning to solid fuels. By processes developed by the Bureau of Mines, we now know that we can produce liquid fuels synthetically, from lignite, which is a most reactive raw material. It will give a net yield of approximately one barrel of gasoline per ton. In addition a considerable amount of liquefied petroleum gas is also secured.

Nor is that all. The coal hydrogenation process, in addition to motor fuels, can produce substantial quantities of essential chemicals, such as benzene, toluene, naphthalene and others. The demand for these chemicals is increasing rapidly, and the chemical industries are constantly developing new products which need these chemicals as starting materials.

They have been in use for some time in the production of synthetic rubber and plastics, and for enriching high-octane fuels.

Fortunately the processes by which these chemicals can be produced from lignite are now ready for industrial development. The door is open for a new and important industry—an industry which will help ease the burden placed on the petroleum industry and which will contribute to the prosperity and security of our country.

The Department of the Interior, as authorized by the Congress, has conducted extensive research into the production of critically needed chemicals and liquid fuels from coal, lignite, and shale. High-quality liquid fuels are being produced in our demonstration plants and more than 300,000 gallons have met the severe tests of the military. Liquid fuels produced at the Department's Louisiana, Mo., demonstration plant from North Dakota lignite was first used to propel a Diesel locomotive on the Burlington Railroad several years ago. An efficient Diesel fuel has been produced also from coal and shale.

The Secretary believes that it is time for private industry to enter this business. I concur in this view. A privately financed synthetic liquid fuel and chemical industry will have available to it the years of research conducted by the Bureau of Mines. This research proves that the production of liquid fuel from coal, lignite, and shale is not only feasible but can be financially profitable. It is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior to see that research in this field is continued as long as Federal funds are available. It is likewise our responsibility to encourage the development of this new industry by private industry, in commercial size plants. We firmly intend to meet this responsibility. These great resources must be developed for the benefit of all the people and for the enrichment of the national economy.

This new industry can mean much to North Dakota's future.

Approximately 8,000,000,000 tons of lignite—less than 3 percent of the 300,000,000,000 recoverable tons known to exist in this State—have been earmarked for processing; yet this represents a liquid-fuel potential of 11,000,000,000 barrels of products, made up of approximately 8,000,000,000 barrels of gasoline and 3,000,000,000 barrels of liquefied petroleum gas.

The process of gasification, upon which much valuable work has been done by the University of Minnesota, can produce the hydrogen needed for ammonia and fertilizers. This will enable lignite to make a direct and invaluable contribution to the agriculture of this region. This same hydrogen, incidentally, either with or without the accompanying carbon monoxide, can be used in processing the vast quantities of low-grade iron ores in Minnesota. If it should be desirable, the lignite itself, either in the natural state or dried, can also be so used.

Now, it is obvious that a great deal of research has already been done on the way

in which lignite can be put to work. Ever since its organization in 1910—and previously through the Technologic Division of the Geological Survey—the Bureau of Mines has been interested in the problem.

Over the years it has cooperated with the State of North Dakota, with the Minnesota-North Dakota Resources Development Commission, with Texas, and with other States, in the investigation of the properties and possibilities of lignite. Particularly fruitful has been the cooperation with the scientists of the Universities of North Dakota and Minnesota.

In that connection I particularly want to mention E. J. Babcock, who is rightly called the father of lignite research. His vision and enthusiasm made the University of North Dakota the center of such work, and he sent into industry and research work many men who have contributed much.

The late Dean L. C. Harrington served the Bureau for many years as a consultant and gave generously of his time and interest and wisdom. The ability and devotion of these men and their coworkers had their counterpart among the staff members of the Bureau, and the joint accomplishments created the foundation upon which this laboratory was erected.

The present period of cooperation began in 1943. In 1945 the present gasification pilot plant went into operation. In 1947 the work here at Grand Forks was separated from that at Golden, Colo., and placed under its own supervising engineer. It was then that Charles Robertson introduced the bill for the establishment of this laboratory. In preparation for the laboratory the University Memorial Corp. presented the Government with this site of 11 acres.

Provision has been made for you to inspect the laboratory this afternoon. At that time details of lay-out, design, and construction will be evident, and I will not try to describe them to you. I would like to mention one fact, however: that this is preeminently a building for service. Over 92 percent of the 683,000 cubic feet in this building is active, useful space, and 81 percent is devoted directly to research and research services.

We have reached the point now when we know what some of the great possibilities in the lignite resources are—the point at which we can begin to count on widespread commercial and industrial development of the resource. The opening of this great laboratory, of course, marks the beginning of a new program. I think it is worth our while to consider briefly some of the phases of the research which will take place here.

To begin with, the development of the lignite industry has been delayed by three factors—the location of major deposits in regions of relatively sparse population and little industry, the limitations on the use of lignite as a raw fuel, and the high moisture content of lignite.

A research program is under way to minimize the effects of these three handicaps.

Through this program we hope to accomplish a number of extremely valuable results.

We want, for instance, to find economically feasible ways to substitute natural lignite for oil and gas firing in the domestic, commercial, and industrial fields, and to substitute lignite for coking coal in the production of manufactured gas. If we can do that the country can save high-rank fuels through the substitution of lower-rank fuels.

If we can successfully expand the use of lignite in power and industrial plants, if we can introduce dried lignite, and if we can adapt lignite in one form or other to regional metallurgical and other industries, this entire area will save in transportation costs by using a locally produced fuel rather than one which must be imported from great distances. Incidentally, this would materially help to relieve the recurring transportation difficulties, particularly in wartime.

As lower-cost electric power is developed from lignite, more industries will be able to move into this region. This involves new conceptions in power plant design and the development of new methods for the treating and use of lignite, but the result would benefit the Nation as well as this region by promoting industrial decentralization, thereby aiding the country from the standpoints both of economic and national security.

One of the most important goals is using lignite as a source of chemical raw material. This development, which would serve as the base for an extensive economic development, involves perfecting methods for the gasification and carbonization of lignite, acquiring basic knowledge about its chemical and physical properties, and designing the necessary processes and equipment.

In this entire program there will be the cooperation of the Fuels Technology Division of this region with the other division, agencies, and organizations within the area. The goal of this program is the adaptation of lignite in its various forms to many new uses, metallurgical, domestic, and industrial and chemical, through a reduction in the cost of mining, processing, and utilizing lignite.

Here is a situation, therefore, which presents at the same time a great opportunity and a great challenge. These appeal equally to the research man, to the technologist, and to the industrialist.

The cooperative efforts of all three, each in his own sphere, can and undoubtedly will produce results of far-reaching consequence.

Consider what has already been done. When the congressional subcommittee was holding hearings on the legislation to establish this laboratory, the late Dean Harrington presented a list of 38 reports of investigation on lignite from this area. These reports represented studies by members of the university staff, by their students, and by the Bureau of Mines.

They contain a great deal of basic information on lignite and the ways to use it, but to a certain extent they are on isolated, limited problems. There is still a great need for a broad, well-coordinated attack on the basic, fundamental properties of lignite, employing the new and more penetrating scientific skills of today.

The major job to be done in the building being dedicated here today, and by the staff of this Bureau station, is the development of technology—and, I might add, of technologists. These will have to provide the processes, machines, and equipment, working principles, and data that will enable engineers and industrialists to apply them to the vast basic resource of lignite.

Only then can come the broad utilization of this resource, the attainment of the common goal and the fulfillment of the purposes and objectives of this institution which we are dedicating.

Along with technology we need one other quality, which I am sure will not be lacking—vision. Vision, in the sense of imagination—the capacity to make a practical projection of laboratory ideas. In the long run the full success of this undertaking will depend to a large extent upon that quality.

The technical staff here will need vision, not only in a strictly scientific way, but in the analysis and appraisal of projects to be initiated and investigated, and in their application to our regional and national technological and economic needs.

When the basic research and technological advances have been made, I have no hesitation in saying that the industrialist himself will be found ready and willing to put sound developments from this research undertaking into practice. And it will be from that practical application that the great enduring benefits, for this region and for the Nation as a whole, will be obtained.

We can see how that works by looking at events in the recent past. There are many

living examples of contributions to the Nation's welfare made by the Bureau of Mines' studies. I need mention only a few, such as those arising from its combustion research, which has materially aided in the development of more efficient coal-burning equipment; the coking coal surveys and coking studies, which have proven invaluable in times of peace and war alike, and the synthetic liquid fuel researches and plant demonstrations.

The latest addition to this list of practical accomplishments comes in connection with the large development of power and tar from cheap Texas lignite, done in cooperation with the Texas Power & Light Co. The electric power is to be used to produce vitally needed aluminum, while the tar is a material in very short supply for many parts of our great chemical industry. Both products are extremely important to our defense programs during these troubled times.

So, as a result, we now have a huge industrial development taking place in the heart of our major oil and natural gas producing areas. It is a striking tribute to the way in which the industrialist will move in when the possibilities of research and technology have been fully explored. In this case, it is the Bureau of Mines with the cooperation of a power utility which supplied the basic and fundamental data—through its research, the technology through its process, and pilot-plant development and operation.

That is the background against which we dedicate this great new laboratory here in Grand Forks. This institution, with its facilities and staff, both in being and still to be, is a new member of the Bureau of Mines. It has a proud tradition to live up to, and this entire region expects much of it.

This whole area, with its matchless reserves of lignite and its nearby highly mineralized territory, its array of dams to be supplied flaming-up power from thermal plants, its growing diversification of agricultural crops and raw materials and its need for chemical fertilizers—this entire region, therefore, with its desires and ambitions for a stronger, better balanced economy, presents to everyone concerned with this new institution a great challenge and a marvelous opportunity.

It was that challenge and that opportunity which were seen by the late Charles R. Robertson, who applied his intelligence, his enthusiasm, and his vision to the project which is coming into reality today. It is to meet the challenge and the opportunity that this laboratory and its scientists and technicians are being called into service.

On behalf of the Department of the Interior I hereby name this the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory, and dedicate it to the service of the industry, the State, and the Nation.

Tell All?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote an editorial from the Jersey Observer of Monday, October 1, 1951. It concerns observations over demands made by President Truman that Members of Congress be included in the list of top officials who should submit annual statements swearing to their outside sources of income and the amount of such income.

It is regrettable that the President did not include the publication of normal expenses incurred in serving in Congress, as well as the kinship of a Congressman's staff; such information would no doubt lend public support to the pay-increase bill for Members of Congress introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], provided certain ground rules were recognized; that is, no relatives on staff, upkeep of two homes, no lecture fees, and so forth.

The editorial follows:

MUCH CONGRESS DO ABOUT LITTLE

Currently, Members of Congress are in a stew over demands made by President Truman that they, too, should be included in the list of top officials who are to submit annual statements swearing to their outside sources of income and the amount of such income.

If the lawmakers have nothing to hide from the publicity that would result when their sources of income outside of the Government salaries are published, why all the opposition to the plan? Have not Members of Congress, just as others, decried the moral corruption being evidenced in certain Government circles? This would be one effective method in the efforts to put an end to such corruption.

They must remember that their own house is not too clean. Was not a Member of Congress, representing a New Jersey district, convicted of accepting salary kick-backs from employees of his own office? Was not another Member of the same House from a district in Ohio also convicted of the same charge? Do they forget the scandal surrounding Congressman May and the Garsion brothers involving war contracts?

Don't they recall that a Senator and his wife have been mentioned in connection with huge profits made in the sale of commodities to which this Senator, as a member of an important committee, had access to so-called inside information concerning prospective Government purchases of the commodity?

Have they forgotten that another Senator, recent author of a bill affecting pipeline interests, killed by Presidential veto because of the cry that went up that the lawmaker, himself an independently wealthy man, held huge interests in pipeline corporations and would be feathering his own nest when the bill went into effect?

A Miserable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been established by the most thorough examination of our fiscal affairs that a revenue measure such as the one now pending is absolutely unnecessary in the light of the savings that could be made by the executive department.

This attempt to distribute our resources to all parts of the world is indefensible and unworthy of those who are deliberately leading the people down the road to socialism and its ghastly consequences. The fight that has been made by many of us to stop this spending, waste, and corruption in Govern-

ment circles cannot succeed unless the people of the country become aroused, and take a firm stand to remove from public office those who have been dissipating not only the funds of the citizens, but the liberties of the citizens.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of October 2, 1951:

A MISERABLE RECORD

There is a particularly bitter irony in the fact that the amount of new revenue that House and Senate conferees propose to extract from taxpayers and the sum the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report estimates could be saved by better Government are exactly the same—\$5,400,000,000.

For while the administration together with its servants in Congress have busily passed two tax increases since the start of the Korean war and now clamor for a third, they have almost wholly disregarded the committee's bipartisan plan for squeezing the water out of Federal spending.

During this same period of dawdling over efficiency plans, the Eighty-second Congress and Mr. Truman increased Federal expenses 70 and the Federal civilian payroll, 30 percent.

Now Congress proposes to go home, once the new tax bill is passed, and it is too late for President Truman to submit additional reorganization plans to this session of Congress.

This miserable record destroys President Truman's boasts of a water-tight budget and irreducible Federal spending. The fact is that the whole time he was putting these statements into the record, the means to reduce spending were awaiting action by him or Congress.

Since President Truman has done little this year about Federal reorganization, Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the committee, rightly demands Congress remain in session at least long enough to lay the groundwork for respectable progress on Federal reorganization in 1952. He notes that Congress can finish up considerable parts of the program on which it has already completed hearings and other preliminary steps, and lists such examples as these:

1. The Senate bill taking politics out of postmaster appointments could be passed in the next 48 hours. It is now on ice in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

2. A bill separating airline subsidies from payments to airlines for carrying the mails is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There is no reason why the bill cannot be reported out and passed by the House this week.

3. The Hoover Commission's recommendation that the rates on penny postal cards and special services be set at a level to make these parts of the post-office program self-supporting is now in conference between the Senate and the House. It should be enacted into law promptly.

4. There is no reason why the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee cannot report immediately the Federal recruitment bill permitting departments to select certain specialized personnel under civil service standards.

Dr. Johnson also believes the Senate Committee on Expenditures could report the bill to reorganize the sprawling Department of Agriculture and the bill be passed by the Senate before adjournment. This would enable the House to pass the measure next January.

Obviously, much of the reason for congressional dawdling over these measures has been the time spent on publicity-producing investigations. Another reason is understandable reluctance of administration Congressmen to dry up the gravy in Federal employment.

But if Congress fails to make at least a partially creditable record on Federal reorganization during the remainder of this session it may be faced with the horrible possibility of an investigation of Congress by the public next year at the polls. The new taxes will serve to keep the public memory fresh.

**Address by Hon. Wayne Coy, Chairman,
Federal Communications Commission,
at One Hundredth Anniversary Celebration
of Sending of First Train Order
by Telegraph**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr HILL. Mr President, on September 21 last, Hon. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, delivered an address at the one hundredth anniversary celebration of the sending of the first train order by telegraph, at Harriman, N. Y. This address is filled with the story of historic events of 100 years ago. It is most informative and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This celebration of the anniversary of sending of the first train order by telegraph by Charles Minot from this spot 100 years ago gives us a welcome opportunity to pay tribute to a real pioneer and to raise the curtain of time for a review of progress in railroading, in communications and in our Nation.

The year is 1851.

Millard Fillmore is in the White House.

The agitation over slavery is moving toward its climax. The feeble and aging Daniel Webster, now Secretary of State, is at the height of his fame and of the controversy over his historic oration on behalf of Henry Clay's Compromise of 1850 designed to forestall a civil war and preserve the Union.

The echoes of the hundred-gun salutes in leading cities in joyous celebration of the Compromise have barely died away before there is rioting in northern cities over the fugitive slave law.

And more fuel is added to the flames by the installments of a serial story appearing in a Washington-weekly newspaper. It is being dashed off by a little mother sitting at her kitchen table between taking care of six children. Her name is Harriet Beecher Stowe and her serial is Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Despotism is causing trouble abroad.

Louis Napoleon, after serving as President of France for 3 years, makes himself Emperor Napoleon III. For approving this coup d'etat, Queen Victoria dismisses her foreign minister.

The Spanish consulate in New Orleans is wrecked by sympathizers with Cuban independence.

Louis Kossuth leads a revolt for the independence of Hungary from Austria. Russia intervenes. Kossuth escapes, is brought to the United States by a naval vessel and greeted by enthusiastic crowds over the Nation. There are Kossuth hats, Kossuth

overcoats, Kossuth beards, Kossuth streets, and Kossuth clubs.

Secretary of State Webster prepares to send a bristling note to Austria telling her that the people of the United States always sympathize with democratic revolutions, especially with the Hungarian uprising against government imposed from without.

Cyrus McCormick receives a gold medal at the Crystal Palace Exhibition in London for his reaper.

John James Audubon, James Fenimore Cooper, and J. M. W. Turner die. James Russell Lowell is traveling in Europe.

Among the books being published this year are Child's History of England by Charles Dickens, The House of Seven Gables by Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Moby Dick by Herman Melville.

A new newspaper, The New York Times, edited in a windowless, candle-lighted building, makes its first appearance. The first issue carries four columns of foreign news which, the publisher is proud to boast, is, thanks to steamship and railroad, only 2 weeks old.

The Illinois Central & Rock Island Railroad is trying out a new lawyer—by the name of Abraham Lincoln.

The Vigilantes are organized in California and Maine goes dry.

In the field of transportation, canals are connecting the East and the West and the South. The success of the Erie Canal built 26 years ago has led to the recent building of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, the Illinois & Michigan Canal and 800 miles of canals in Ohio and many other projects.

But things are booming on the railroad front. Some people are even saying that railroads may some day supplant the canals.

It is only 25 years since the first railway corporation began to operate a railroad in the United States—a 3-mile road to haul stone from a quarry in Quincy, Mass., for the construction of the Bunker Hill Monument. It used horse power and iron plates on wooden rails. It is only 21 years since the first common-carrier railroad was started in Maryland, first powered by sails and later drawn by horses. On Christmas Day of that same year the first steam railroad began running out of Charleston.

And now in this year 1851 we have 11,000 miles of steam railroads in operation, nearly three times the number of miles of canals.

The locomotives burn wood. The more progressive railroads are substituting whale oil for candles in their lamps and headlights although few of them travel at night. Sleeping cars are coming into use. But there are still no dining cars. In this year of 1851 a train running from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Boston makes history by hauling the first refrigerated car carrying several tons of butter.

The second of the two lines connecting the Ohio River and Lake Erie is being completed this year.

Chicago is to be linked by rail in two more years.

President Fillmore, Secretary of State Webster and other notables come from Washington in May to make the first trip on the New York and Erie Railroad, linking the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes, hailed as the first long-distance railroad trip ever made in the United States.

Secretary Webster in a way invents the observation car on this trip. The famous orator, racked by rheumatism and hay fever, and 69 years old, only a year from his death, insists on being seated in an easy chair tied onto a flat car.

Included in the party of 300 is General Superintendent Charles Minot of whom more later.

It takes 2 days with a night stop-over to make the trip from Piermont, 26 miles north of New York City, to Dunkirk on Lake

Erie, a distance of 446 miles. The first trip linking the Atlantic to the Great Lakes over one unbroken line of railroad is completed. The successful run is celebrated with a barbecue of oxen, sheep, fowl, and loaves of bread 10 feet long.

Agriculture and industry everywhere are calling for the Iron Horse to carry their produce and products to markets. The westward expansion is accelerated day by day.

In the field of communication, great strides are being made although in some parts of the world semaphores are still being used for telegraphing. Russia, for example, is operating a system out of St. Petersburg employing 220 stone towers located 5 miles apart, manned by 6 men each and costing millions of rubles. In America various semaphore systems have been in operation. A proposal to Congress to build a semaphore system from Washington to New Orleans has been abandoned mostly because of the opposition of the portrait painter, Samuel F. B. Morse, who argued for the adoption of his electric telegraph system. It is now 7 years since Morse sent his "What Hath God Wrought" message over the newly completed telegraph line between Washington and Baltimore on the Baltimore & Ohio right-of-way.

Already small telegraph companies are stringing up wires in many parts of the country.

The possibilities of cooperation between the railroads and the telegraph are arousing the interest of men in both fields. But no railroad man grasps these possibilities as comprehensively as Superintendent Charles Minot of the New York & Erie Railroad—now the Erie Railroad.

Minot, the son of a Massachusetts supreme court justice, has abandoned the law for railroading and is an expert telegrapher himself. He has persuaded the directors to build a telegraph line along the Erie right-of-way, training the depot masters and clerks to act as operators.

Now comes the great day in September when Superintendent Minot is to give his conclusive demonstration of the utility of the telegraph in railroading and is to take an action that will make his name go down in history as a most significant contributor to railroad progress.

The telegraph has been used on the Erie heretofore to facilitate freight and passenger handling and incidental business but never in train dispatching.

Minot is riding an express train westward and is scheduled to meet an east-bound express here at Harriman, N. Y., where we are gathered today to celebrate his feat.

He waits here a few minutes. Then, apparently being an impatient man, as I understand many railroad executives are, he telegraphs up to the next stop at Goshen, 14 miles away, to ascertain if the train has arrived there. Discovering that it has not, he wires Goshen to hold up the east-bound express for further orders. This is the first telegraphic train dispatching in history. He then instructs the conductor and the engineer of his train to proceed on to Goshen regardless of the opposing train.

Now, since the advent of railroading, engineers have been running their trains according to the timetable. Whenever an emergency disrupts their schedule, they send a flagman trotting down the track ahead with a red flag. Minot's engineer has visions of a disastrous collision. He can't see committing suicide. His reply is: "Do you take me for a damned fool? I won't run by that thing!"

Whereupon Superintendent Minot takes the throttle himself and speeds ahead to Goshen.

No collision—no catastrophe.

The first train order by telegraph is a success.

So now we are here a century later to celebrate that event and the stimulus it

gave to communications, to railroading and to the general growth of our Nation.

In doing this we are only adding to the well-deserved tribute bestowed when Mrs. E. H. Harriman, the mother of W. Averell Harriman, erected a tablet to Charles Minot's memory here at Harriman in 1912.

Despite Minot's success, there was plenty of distrust of this new medium for dispatching trains. Two years later, for example, when Andrew Carnegie was a telegraph operator on a railroad, he discovered that the officials were so skeptical that they permitted only the superintendent to give a train order by telegraph.

For a long time the telegrams on the Erie began with "Dear Sir" and ended with "Yours respectfully."

More than 10 years were to pass before the telegraph came into general use for dispatching.

From then on the telegraph and the railroads worked so well together that they were referred to as the Siamese Twins of Commerce.

The iron cord and the iron horse teamed up to revolutionize America.

The telegraph came to serve as the nervous system of the railroad. It virtually doubled the capacity of a single track. It flashed time signals, storm and damage warnings over entire systems.

At the peak of telegraphy on the railroads, around 1910, 80,000 telegraphers, including station agents, were employed.

In 1882 railroads began to employ another invention—the telephone—for dispatching and other uses—and today there are 900,000 miles of telephone wire as compared to 550,000 miles of telegraph wire. The number of telegraph operators is about half the figure of the peak year. Today 70 percent of all train orders are transmitted by telephone.

In addition to serving the needs of the railroads themselves, the railroad telegraph systems were indispensable in building up the commercial telegraph industry. Even today the railroads act as agents for Western Union in 10,000 communities and transmit 4,000,000 public telegrams a year.

But perhaps railroads and telegraph have a relationship ahead of them that is far more dazzling, not to say dizzying, than anything that has gone before. Certainly a whole new world of cooperation between the two is opened up by the possibility recently advanced by Norbert Wiener, professor of mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In his book *The Human Use of Human Beings*, Professor Wiener gives us a glimpse of what may be ahead:

"Let us admit that the old idea of the child that in addition to traveling by train or airplane one might conceivably travel by telegraph, is not intrinsically absurd, far as it may be from realization. . . . The difficulties are, of course, enormous. In other words the fact that we cannot telegraph the pattern of a man from one place to another is probably due to technical difficulties, and in particular, to the difficulty of keeping an organism in being during such a radical reconstruction. It is not due to any impossibility of the idea."

Well, suppose Professor Wiener's theory works out. Presumably, you would walk into a railroad station and simply be asked to be telegraphed to Chicago. If this system works, if you can telegraph a person, you can probably telegraph freight likewise. Railroads can tear up their tracks and rely entirely on their telegraph wires. The big gun of the railroads will not be the engineer—it will be the telegrapher.

Personally, I am vastly intrigued by this idea. I am wondering what I would look in Morse code.

Suppose that the telegrapher on some occasion violates rule G and mixes up some of his dots and dashes? You might arrive in Chicago with a misplaced eyebrow, or a few teeth missing or your hair might be

brunet instead of blond. But what would that matter compared to the speed of your journey—the speed of electricity—thousands of miles a second? Certainly you can afford a few changes in your physiognomy in the light of that.

But perhaps this idea isn't any more daring than the idea of sending the human voice and the human image thousands of miles through the ether without any wires would have seemed to Superintendent Charles Minot in 1851. And after all, when you get the voice and the image, what more do you want?

And we must remember, too, in considering Professor Wiener's idea that when the bill to appropriate money for Morse's telegraph line was up in Congress in 1842, 22 Members thought to ridicule it to death by voting to include experiments in mesmerism. The bill passed by a close vote of 89 to 83. Seventy Congressmen didn't vote at all, many of them leaving their seats to "avoid the responsibility of spending money for a machine they could not understand."

In pondering Professor Wiener's idea we must also remember that the Czar of Russia as late as the year of Charles Minot's feat considered the telegraph dangerous. And even some American newspapers helped spread the rumor that the newfangled telegraph lines were responsible for the cholera epidemic of 1849.

After telegraphy and telephony, the next big step for the railroads was radio.

It was in 1915 that railroads began experimenting with the use of radio which had already proved so valuable in dramatic disasters at sea.

Beginning in 1930 the trend was to carrier current or induction radio in which signals are carried on telephone lines along the tracks without physical contact. A dozen roads are using this system today.

But the real advance in radio communication on the railroads dates from 1945 when the Federal Communications Commission established the Railroad Radio Service designed to use space radio or signals traveling through the ether without relation to wires. Very high frequency (VHF) channels were allocated in the 152-162 megacycle band.

Today one-half of all the larger roads use radio. Up to date the Commission has issued authorizations for 400 land stations and 5,200 mobile units. The number of stations authorized has increased by more than 60 percent during the past year.

Radio is rapidly becoming a foremost tool for enhancing the safety and efficiency of railroad operation.

Radio can be used for communication from caboose to engine, from train to train, from train to wayside crews, from train to wayside stations to connect with an entire system over perhaps hundreds of miles. The value of radio is pointed up by the fact that some of today's trains are 2 miles long or more than twice the length of the entire routes of three American railroads.

Radio has proved particularly useful in increasing the efficiency and economy of yard and terminal operations.

Congratulations are due the Erie Railroad for its leadership in the use of radio. It is a curious historical coincidence that the railroad that first used the telegraph for dispatching should also be in the forefront in employing this new art of radio to speed its operations. It is now using radio over its entire main line from Jersey City to Chicago. In its train service it has 62 base stations and 350 mobile units. In its yard-terminal service it has 4 base stations and 86 mobile units.

I appreciate the problems that must be solved before radio's full potentialities can be realized in railroad operation. However, the scarcity of channels in the radio spectrum makes it necessary that the widest possible use be made of them. I am sure that an industry that has solved as many difficult

problems as the railroads have will soon discover the techniques for the fuller application of radio in its operations.

So important has radio become in modern life that the supply of channels isn't nearly big enough to meet the demand. Besides the railroads, other users of radio in our safety and special category now include ships, airplanes, police and fire departments, electric and gas companies, highway and forestry agencies, streetcars, taxicabs, highway trucks and busses, geologists, newspaper reporters, lumberjacks, motion-picture directors, manufacturers, distributors, and individuals.

Railroads cannot afford to let tracks or rolling stock remain idle or to get less than the maximum utilization from them. Neither can the Nation afford to let valuable and scarce electronic highways remain idle. Conservation is imperative.

Radio, like railroading, is a dynamic field and new ideas are constantly arising. I shall discuss a few of these ideas.

For example, there is the possibility of multiplexing on the mobile service frequencies allocated for railroad use—putting several voice circuits on a single radio signal. There is a possibility that such an innovation could do two things: First, provide a larger number of talking channels than the present railroad allocation under present techniques can provide; and, second, permit greater flexibility in the use of those VHF channels. This would be an especially desirable improvement in a particularly congested area. In the world's largest terminal area at Chicago, for instance, there are 200 freight yards with 8,000 miles of track which handle 40,000 cars a day. Experimentation should provide valuable information on this possibility.

Another idea attracting increasing interest is the use of microwave frequencies which are higher in the spectrum—above 1,000 megacycles. Radar operates in these frequencies. The Commission has allocated some of these frequencies for experimentation by the railroads. If such experimentation provides us with adequate information, we can greatly increase our present supply of usable frequencies.

The rapid expansion of the usable spectrum space in the last few years encourages us in these hopes. We are using frequencies now that seemed to be beyond the pale of possibility only a few years ago.

If equipment and techniques can be developed to employ channels in the as yet largely unused microwave region of the spectrum, I can foresee many new applications of radio in railroad operations.

Facsimile, to eliminate all possibility of error in the instantaneous transmission of complicated messages, tabulations or diagrams might come into wide use.

Radio teletype so that train orders or other messages can originate at any point and be received directly on teletypewriters which will type the messages is another possibility.

Microwaves could be used to bring readings to a central point of pressure gauges, speedometers and other indicators.

Whole yards or terminal areas might be made visible to a dispatcher by television. The television cameras located at strategic points throughout the area and perhaps even along the main line would bring the operations to a battery of screens in his control room. The activities of the yard crews, the freight house handlers, the track men, and the signal gangs could all be observed by the appropriate executives.

Then, as the art of radio advances, since we have guided missiles and robot airplanes, why not automatic, unattended or robot freight and passenger trains? A complete push-button operation with the train traveling from coast to coast without engineer, fireman or brakeman, but controlled all along the route by dispatchers using radio signals?

The Casey Jones of the future would not be a flesh-and-blood hero but a robot—a tiny control box of vacuum tubes and wire.

Can you imagine anybody writing a song about a contraption like that?

And how will these robot trains be powered?

Since the middle nineteenth century year of Charles Minot's first telegraphed train order we have progressed from wood burning steam locomotives, to steam coal burners, to Diesels, and to Diesel electrics.

Today with an atomic submarine already under construction and with Chairman FRANK McNAMON of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee proposing an atomic Army, an atomic Navy, and an atomic Air Force, there can be only one answer—the atomic locomotive.

It will, of course, be equipped with radar to detect all obstructions or emergency signals ahead.

I am sure that if Charles Minot were railroading today he would look forward enthusiastically to operating such a radio-controlled, radar-equipped, atom-powered train.

In the 100 years since Charles Minot sent the first train order by telegraph the Nation has grown from 23,000,000 to 154,000,000. The railroads have grown from 11,000 miles of road to 224,000, employ more than 1,000,000 workers, and haul more than 2,000,000 light and passenger cars.

Passengers on some trains who, unlike Daniel Webster on the Erie 100 years ago, aren't interested in the scenery can divert themselves by watching movies, listening to the radio, watching the television, or picking up a telephone and calling their friends anywhere around the globe.

Communication remains the nervous system of our railroads. Freight and passengers will move with increasing speed and safety as the art of railroad communication is developed from year to year.

We honor Superintendent Charles Minot for the impetus he gave to safer and faster railroading when he pioneered telegraphic dispatching back in 1851. He took a great forward step that redounded to the benefit of his road, of his industry and his Nation.

We in communications and in railroading can continue to honor him in the future by emulating his imagination, his vision, and his boldness in the application of new ideas to problems peculiar to our own time.

India's Anxiety Over Japan: Attitude Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD this article on India and some of the probable reasons for her recent action.

THIS WORLD

(By Volney D. Hurd)

INDIA'S ANXIETY OVER JAPAN ATTITUDE
EXAMINED

PARIS.—Does not India see the new Japan as its greatest competitor for the leadership of Asia rather than as a threat to India's physical safety?

It was the Japanese with their "Asia for the Asians" campaign who unleashed the rise of nationalism in the Far East, showing thereby their potential as a modernized nation capable of leading Asia. The only other

Asiatic nation with an equivalent potential of industrialization and the influence and leadership that go with it is India. Its vast natural resources and a British training make this possible.

But India is a case of mere potential against a proved capacity. India is a nation of strongly divided elements, churning around in a vast political turmoil. Further, it has no chance of gaining the astronomical sums needed to compress into a relatively few years the huge program of industrialization which the situation demands.

Japan, on the other hand, is a compact, unified, hard-hitting nation which has successfully challenged even the mighty west with its industrialization, and can do so again. Further, the nations of Asia have the raw materials this great island factory needs. Here is the two-way trade which can tie these nations into the Japanese economy.

When I interviewed Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru here last February he spoke of the fact that the west did not understand Asia and that the Asiatic nations must all be freed to permit their full development. But when I asked, "How about Japan?" Mr. Nehru's face quickly clouded over and he replied, "Japan is something else again. She should not be given the right to be completely free and rearm because she constitutes a threat to the rest of Asia." A further effort to run down the logic of this kind of "freedom for all"—that is, all except one—got me exactly nowhere.

However, having just played the role of attempted mediator between China and the west, and in so doing becoming more and more the self-appointed spokesman for Asia, Mr. Nehru gave the impression that he considered India, with its industrial potential and its middle-ground position, as the logical leader of Asia. The accompanying implication was that the real Japanese threat perhaps was not quite so much military as one might be led to think.

India has been strongly supporting the Chinese Communists in its effort to play this mediator role. It has favored the Communists in Indochina because they are trying to throw off the French controls. India is opposing all French moves there, including the formation of the associated states of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

The question of Asiatic leadership also brings up a third possible nation—China. Peiping frankly has announced its intention of "freeing" Asia. It thereby clearly proclaims its intention to take over the leadership of Asia on a communist basis.

India obviously is playing a dangerous game in stringing along with China considering its own great poverty, which attracts communism. It is apparently acting on a long gamble that it can industrialize quickly enough to eliminate the poverty on which China's communistic imperialism could feed, and in the process overtake China and gain the leadership of Asia.

However, if Japan is freed and becomes dominant in Asia, as now looks likely, thanks to the treaty arranged by the United States, then any Indian hopes for Asiatic leadership would be severely bent, if not broken.

Censorship of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

pertinent to the remarks I made yesterday in regard to the gag order of the President. The article is entitled "Suspicion of News Tinkering Overcasts Edict on Secrecy," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUSPICION OF NEWS TINKERING OVERCASTS
EDICT ON SECRECY: APPROACH OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO PUBLIC INFORMATION
LIKENED TO A PRESS AGENT'S

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons. Among these events were the following:

1 At the recent meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa, Secretary of State Dean Acheson not only opposed publication of limited and officially edited summaries of the general debate on the world situation, as proposed by public relations officers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but also opposed publication of the agenda of the meeting. Incidentally, the official agenda had already been published when he opposed publication of it.

2 The State Department placed a "restricted" stamp on a catalog of the names and hotel addresses of the delegates at the recent Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco. This prevented reporters from getting the list until other delegations, objecting to the ruling, made the list public.

3 The White House recently blocked publication of a report by one of its own top officials because the report was critical of some aspects of the administration's rearmament effort, and presumably because it coincided with the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

4 The Treasury Department recently held back news of irregularities in the Internal Revenue Bureau in St. Louis until compelled to acknowledge the problem by disclosures on Capitol Hill.

5 After many weeks of negotiation with the NATO countries on sharing the cost of certain bases in Europe, an agreement was signed at Ottawa last month. Not even the principles of this agreement or the percentages of the cost have been made public.

6 State and Defense Departments repeatedly denied reports of differences with General MacArthur over the conduct of policy in the Far East, though these eventually led to a dismissal for which the public was entirely unprepared.

7 The Department of Defense sat on the recent disclosures of the death of two officers of the Office of Strategic Services in the famous Holohan case until forced to release the information by an article in True magazine.

These are all run-of-the-mine cases. They do not compare with the administration's secret deal to bring the Ukraine and Byelorussia into the United Nations. Nor do they raise security questions, as did the Kuriles-South Sakhalin-China Railroad deal, which was designed to bring the Soviet Union into the war with Japan.

SUPPRESSIONS OF CONVENIENCE

Most of them were suppressions of convenience, designed to ease the process of negotiation, as in the cost-of-bases deal, or to save the administration embarrassment, as in Nos. 3, 4, 6, and 7, above.

President Truman's new order on handling security information was not intended to protect or encourage suppressions of convenience. On the contrary, it specifically condemned such suppression.

Nevertheless, the order created some apprehension here because the administration's approach to public information is very much like a press agent's approach.

That is to say, the administration's tendency is to turn the flow of information on or off in accordance with the tactic of the moment, flooding the wires with news when it wants to put something over, and closing down on information if disclosure might prove embarrassing.

There were some security angles to the Ottawa conference that had to be handled carefully—although it is doubtful if any NATO military scheme can be put into effect in Europe without the Communists, who are part of almost every continental army, knowing all about it—but in the main that conference dealt with several basic criticisms of United States policy, which our officials did not particularly want publicized.

Therefore at Ottawa a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, came to Washington and the Government wanted publicity. So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place; communiqués, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

MATTER OF NEWS VALUES

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the de Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St. Lawrence seaway herself if necessary—the administration gave him short shrift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him.

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations, is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

At Ottawa, the United States Embassy was protected by the Marines, who went to elaborate security checks before allowing reporters to enter the building, even in the company of high United States officials. At the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco, the State Department placed steel-helmeted soldiers of the Sixth Army on the stage until the Australians pointed out that, after all, this was a peace conference.

Thus the new administration security-information order has received the raised-eyebrows treatment because, regardless of its intent, it must be implemented by many men who have been playing heroes and villains with the news over last few years.

Automobiles for Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the National Service

Headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., October 2, 1951.
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Please find enclosed herewith DAV Resolution 190, adopted at our last national convention held during the month of August 1951, in Milwaukee, Wis.

Resolution 190 clearly expresses the position of the Disabled American Veterans with respect to the bill H. R. 4233.

With kind personal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. FOSTER,
Assistant National Legislative Director.

Rehabilitation Resolution 190

Whereas the House of Representatives, on June 20, 1951, passed and sent to the Senate H. R. 4233, a bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish automobiles to arm amputees, leg amputees, blinded veterans, and those who have suffered the loss of the use of a limb as the result of service in World War II and including the present Korean conflict; and

Whereas it is the intent of the generous American public to assist in the rehabilitation of the severely disabled veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in their thirtieth national convention assembled in Milwaukee, Wis., August 13-17, 1951, go on record as being in favor of the passage of this legislation which would benefit a great many of our most severely disabled comrades and thereby help them on the road to rehabilitation.

What Secrets?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of October 2, 1951, entitled "What Secrets?":

WHAT SECRETS?

We have been trying to find out what secrets were revealed by what Government department to justify Mr. Truman's recent censorship order. He has directed each department to classify its official papers to make sure that important secrets will not be disclosed through the newspapers and the radio to potential enemies.

Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, says that "recent breaches of security by a few executive officials and some Members of Congress seem to have led to the President's latest efforts." That is not very enlightening in the absence of specifications.

Secrecy in the military departments makes some sense, though there is ample reason to suspect that it has done the country more harm than good. But what sense is there in supposing that the Department of Agriculture, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of Engraving, and all the other civilian branches of government have any secrets that ought to be kept from the

American people? What facts do these agencies possess that, if revealed, would weaken us and strengthen a potential enemy?

We passed the question along to an expert, Mr. Walter Trohan, the head of the Chicago Tribune Washington bureau. We quote from his reply:

"Remember that the British made the carrying of gas masks compulsory during the early days of the war and later admitted the things were no good except for morale? Just so, this censorship is calculated to keep up war morale.

"The Commerce Department publishes figures on the production of air frames. From this it can be determined how many planes we are producing. However, since officials boast about production from time to time or report it to Congress, there doesn't seem to be much sense to hiding the figures.

"The Agriculture Department has dope on food shipments abroad, from which one may calculate how much is going to troops, but since we know how many troops there are, suppressing the figures wouldn't make any sense."

There is more to the memorandum, but it all comes to the same point. The Government today does classify all specifically military information and releases only what it chooses to release. There was more censorship before the President's latest order than can be justified. The new censorship is not needed for the national security. It is needed for the protection of the thieves in the administration from exposure of their crimes.

The appropriate remedy is impeachment. As this Congress isn't virile enough to do its duty, the people will have to wait until November 1952 to rid themselves of this tyranny.

Dr. Walter Reed, One of the Greatest Benefactors Mankind Has Ever Known

REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred anniversary of the birth of Dr. Walter Reed, of Virginia, one of the greatest benefactors mankind has ever known.

He deserves a monument almost as high as that of George Washington for the great services he rendered to mankind in saving human lives and reducing human suffering.

It was Walter Reed who discovered, and demonstrated, the cause of yellow fever, one of the most devastating, one of the most horrible diseases of all times. It almost depopulated Philadelphia, at one time, killing 1 out of every 10 persons. Dolly Madison's first husband died from it, as did untold thousands of others, not only in the Philadelphia area, but all down the Atlantic and the Gulf seaboard, and far into the interior. During that horrible disaster, carts drove up and down the streets, picking up the dead and hauling them away by wagonloads.

In the words of the poet:

The sick man started in his bed,
The watcher leaped upon the floor
At the cry, "Bring out your dead,
The cart is at the door."

Approximately 200 years after this malady virtually depopulated Philadelphia, Dr. Walter Reed, of Virginia, a medical officer in the Spanish-American War, discovered the cause of the malady. He found that it was spread by the *Stegomyia* mosquito. He like to never got the authorities to give him the right, and the funds, to put on the demonstration. But when he did, he proved his point, showed them how to eliminate the malady, and forever prevented its spread in the years that were to come. That started the inquiry as to what was causing malaria, and it was found that it was caused by the *Anopheles* mosquito, which has also been eliminated. That inspired the investigators to go a step further in their investigations and they found the cause of typhoid, and how to eliminate it.

In the year 1900, there were 1,000 people died from typhoid fever in the State of Mississippi alone.

In the year 1948 only one person died of typhoid fever in that State.

During the year 1900, almost 2,000 people died of malaria in Mississippi. In 1948, only 12 people died of that malady in the State. This discovery of Walter Reed's also caused an investigation of the spread of pellagra, of which 1,850 people died in Mississippi during the year 1900. In 1948 there were only 30 people died of pellagra in that State. This revelation of Dr. Reed's also inspired a study of the cause and prevention of tuberculosis. In 1900, a total of 3,450 people died of tuberculosis in Mississippi. In 1948 only 668 people died of tuberculosis in that State—less than one-fifth of the number who died in 1900. This investigation led to the discovery, the cause, and the cure of hookworm, which has now been practically eliminated.

What has been accomplished in Mississippi in the eradication of these diseases, as a result of the start made, and the example set by Walter Reed, has also been accomplished in every other Southern State, as well as in many States of the North and in foreign countries throughout the world.

Today, as a result of these developments Mississippi, and in fact the entire South, has become the healthiest section of the world.

The entire world should pause today and pay homage to the memory of Walter Reed, that great Virginian who did so much for mankind. He was one of the greatest individuals our country has ever produced.

Rent Hikes—Rent Clinics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues who represent districts containing congested housing areas, I should like to list below two articles on rent hikes and rent

clinics which appeared in the *Jersey Observer*, Monday, October 1, 1951. They show the extent to which Federal and local authorities are cooperating to ease difficulties caused tenants by the recent lifting of rent controls. I regret that in Congress the will of our democratic administration did not prevail on this issue. Nevertheless, it is to the credit of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Congressman EDWARD J. HART, and of the officials in Jersey City, under the leadership of Mayor John V. Kenny, that the confused and alarming rental situation in Hudson County is being tackled:

JERSEY CITY RENT CLINICS OPEN TONIGHT

Sixteen local rent clinics scheduled to open tonight in the various ward organization headquarters in Jersey City will be manned by a staff of 30 lawyers who have volunteered their services. It was announced this morning by Mayor John V. Kenny's office.

The work of the voluntary staff will be under the supervision of Ralph P. Messano, director of the local Rent Control Bureau, and his assistant, Herman Brandes.

The clinics will remain open on Tuesday and Thursday evenings, starting at 7 o'clock. Decision to open the clinics came as a result of having the facilities of the local Rent Control Bureau swamped when it was announced that office would be open to help local residents get information concerning rent increases.

HART PROTEST BRINGS ACTION ON RENT HIKES

Acting on the protest of Congressman EDWARD J. HART on what he called the confused and alarming rental situation in Hudson County, Tighe E. Woods, Federal Director of Rent Stabilization, has moved into the area rent-control office at Newark through a personal representative, with a staff of five investigators, to correct reported abuses in thousands of rent increases asked by local landlords since the lifting of rent controls.

Congressman HART carried his protest to Director Woods last Wednesday and by Friday the review of affairs at the Newark office in charge of Michael Pecora, local rent-control director, and his staff, was well underway, according to a letter forwarded to Congressman HART by Director Woods.

At the same time that Congressman HART revealed that Director Woods had promptly taken cognizance of his protest, the Fourteenth District Representative also revealed that he had arranged for an immediate review of the cases involving more than three hundred-odd tenants in the old Hoboken estate properties in Hoboken with a view to correcting what appears to be many inequities.

SEES EARLY ACTION

Congressman HART said, "I expect that many of the orders issued by the Newark rent office will be modified by the early part of next week and made retroactive to their effective date, namely, September 10."

He further said, "While the law authorizes automatic rent increases to landlords up to 20 percent, minus certain increases that they may have already received, there is no justification for any increases beyond that amount and where orders have been issued increasing rents based upon false information concerning required service supplied, where in fact they are not modifications and rectifications will be speedily made."

In his written report to Congressman HART, Director Woods says: "Thank you very much for calling the Newark situation to my attention early this week. As a result of your alerting me, I sent a personal representative, together with a number of staff members, to the Newark office so that I

could have a first-hand report on what was developing there.

SEVENTEEN THOUSAND COMPLAINTS

I found the situation substantially as you had reported it to me although there was a considerable exaggeration of the number of tenant protests filed. News stories and other accounts indicated 50,000 to 70,000 tenant complaints but a check of my staff representative disclosed the actual figure was closer to 17,000 tenant complaints.

"We both recognized that this whole problem is basically due to a shortage of manpower. Yet, we must do something about it, and we will. I have worked out some administrative changes in the office to handle this temporary workload, and we have asked Governor Driscoll for nominations to provide a balanced Rent Advisory Board in each of the counties of the northern New Jersey defense-rental area.

"I am satisfied that with these steps and such others as may be necessary we will shortly be able to report to you a satisfactory settlement of the problem. I will follow through personally on this matter.

"My sincere thanks for your constructive and continuing interest in rent control."

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD* an article entitled "New Type of Censorship," written by Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, and published in the *Christian Science Monitor* of September 27, 1951, appearing on the first page of that newspaper, and an editorial entitled "Step Toward Tyranny," published on the last page of the same newspaper.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

NEW TYPE OF CENSORSHIP

WASHINGTON—The White House has applied a meat ax when it needed only a scalpel in order to cut out the weak spots in the Government's efforts to safeguard information affecting national security.

The President has avowed that there is no intention to add any element of censorship through the directive establishing a new, all-agency set of rules for controlling secret information.

This is an honest avowal. This is a good intention. But the experience of Washington newspaper and radio correspondents suggests that the chances of making good that intention would hardly be visible to the Mt. Wilson telescope at close range.

Mr. Truman himself recognized that the new authority to classify data and documents as "top secret," "secret," "confidential" and "restricted" by departments and agencies which normally have nothing to do with operations which affect security, is a dangerous invitation to abuse. In his letter to the Federal bureaucracy the President did his best to warn against the worst in order to avert it. He wrote:

"To put the matter bluntly, these regulations are designed to keep security information away from potential enemies and must not be used to withhold nonsecurity information or to cover up mistakes made by officials or employees of the Government."

The matter needs to be put bluntly and it is not putting it too bluntly to make it clear that the tentlike application of the security rules of the sensitive departments, such as Defense, State, and Atomic Energy, to the entirety of the Federal Government opens uncharted avenues of concealment—more likely by paths, detours and super-highways of concealment.

And everyone will avow that censorship and concealment are not intended—from the President, who sincerely doesn't believe he believes in censorship, to the fifth assistant in the weather bureau who may be frightfully tempted to stamp "confidential" on the file of bad prognostications.

It is the effect, not the theory, of the all-inclusive secrecy rules which caused the President to feel that he must warn against their misuse before they even had gone into effect and which make Washington correspondents view them with a reserve bordering on alarm.

The theory is that it is reasonable to apply to the whole Government—Army, Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Navy, Fish and Wildlife Service, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Smithsonian Institution—uniform authority and uniform regulations for classifying security information.

The theory is that officials will classify only that information which would endanger the security of the United States by becoming known to potential enemies.

That's the theory. But the consequences of the new order are these:

It gives into the hands of literally thousands of Federal officials and employees the power to decide what portion of the information which emanates from their offices shall be deemed secret—secret from potential enemies, secret from the press, secret from the public.

It leaves with these same thousands of Federal officials and employees the authority to determine that information which reflects on the competence of any agency or discloses its mistakes ought not to be allowed to get into the hands of potential enemies—and as an unhappy byproduct of that determination simply couldn't be allowed to get into the hands of the public.

It makes serious penalties applicable to officials and employees who allow any information, which has been classified, from becoming known and, by bringing the entire Federal bureaucracy under this new order, tends to create a mass mood of play-safe censorship.

For a directive which doesn't intend any of these things, it seems to have left little undone calculated to bring them about.

STEP TOWARD TYRANNY

President Truman has just put into the hands of all Federal officials a favorite weapon of tyranny—the power to censor. He undoubtedly believes this is necessary for security reasons, and he declares it is not censorship. But it is the power to censor.

In extending to other departments of Government the authority—hitherto exercised only by the Defense and State Departments—to withhold information on security grounds he is opening the way to serious abuses. He recognizes that there is danger, for he warns officials that the purpose is to keep information out of the hands of potential enemies, not to "withhold nonsecurity information or to cover up mistakes made by any official."

But what adequate means are provided for preventing these very abuses? The chief damage may be done by officials who merely wish to play it safe. But if one should wish to cover up, what chance has the public or

the press of preventing him? Mr. Truman rejected a proposal to permit appeal to the courts against an official's refusal to give information.

Bureaucratic government has been growing apace. The complexities of modern society and political pressures have led to a situation where administrative agencies enjoy very great discretionary and arbitrary power. Their decrees are law for multitudes. These agencies already exercise one form of control over information—they have an army of public relations officers to give out a favorable account of their activities. To hand them power also to clamp the lid on unfavorable facts is indeed dangerous.

The scandals now coming to light in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Internal Revenue Bureau underscore the point. They lift a corner of the curtain on continuing efforts to influence official actions by gifts and political pressure. Surely there are ways to tighten legitimate security requirements without taking this long step—unconscious though it may be—toward tyranny.

The Need for Financial Aid to Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning America's need for additional doctors, written by Dr. Alan Gregg, of the Rockefeller Foundation, and published in the September 1951 issue of the Scientific American as part of a series of articles on America's human resources, and a statement I have prepared regarding the article.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

DOCTORS

(By Alan Gregg)

Anyone who undertakes to assess our medical manpower situation must first consider the question, "medical manpower to do what?" The work of doctors is not, and never will be, a fixed and unchanging task, particularly in a dynamic country like the United States, where not only the national scene but medicine itself is constantly in motion. To understand what is implied by such an idea as the shortage of doctors we need to examine the nature and amount of the services they will be expected to perform. Let us, then, look at some of the broader aspects of medical care—at the trends rather than only the latest figures, the dynamics rather than the statistics of the situation.

Medicine has much more to offer today than it used to have. The Harvard biological chemist, Lawrence J. Henderson, once remarked that somewhere around 1910 the progress of medicine in America reached a point where it became possible to say that a random patient with a random disease consulting a physician at random stood better than a 50-50 chance of benefiting from the encounter. In the 40 years since then the chances have improved a good bit beyond that. The 14,000,000 Americans who served in the military forces in World War II were given a notable demonstration of how far

medicine had progressed, among our military personnel during that war there were only 6 deaths from disease per year for every 160 such deaths in World War I, 250 in the Spanish-American War, and 650 on the northern side in the Civil War. Turn to an example from civilian life: Chicago 20 years ago had 6,012 reported cases of diphtheria with 513 deaths, last year 5 cases with no deaths.

Most people, however, seem to ignore an obvious but nonetheless remarkable consequence of the steady improvement in the quality of medical service, namely, the more doctors can do for people, the larger becomes the demand for medical services. I can remember the heated debates I heard in my childhood as to whether the automobile would ever take the place of the horse. Very few foresaw then that advances in automotive technology and manufacture would make the automobile less expensive, more dependable, more durable, more powerful, more useful, less noisy, and less smelly. Almost no one seemed to realize that with better cars roads would be multiplied and improved. Improvement increases demand, and increased demand in turn creates and rewards still further improvement. This is as true in medicine as in technology. The love of good medical care seems to follow Shakespeare's observation that "love grows by what it feeds on."

As a result, the entire horizon of medical care has changed. An increasing number of people want the better care that is now available. Whereas medical care used to be considered a privilege of the rich or a boon given in the name of charity to the poor, it is now coming to be thought of as a necessity that more and more people insist on having, if necessary by taxation. And at that point a revolutionary change occurs in the horizon of medicine. Instead of calculating increases in the demand for medical care, we face the task of estimating the need for medical care.

No doctor needs to be told that the number of persons who need medical care is at present immeasurably greater than those who are asking for it or getting it. We have no detailed census of the defects and diseases (what the doctor calls "morbidity") among the American people, or even of how much of that need ever turns into explicit demand for the services of doctor, dentist, or nurse. But such samplings as have been taken suggest that the unrecorded need far exceeds the recorded demand. So if the trend of the times is clearly toward meeting the need, we can sensibly dispense with the spurious accuracy of close figuring based on the records of demand. Witness the pressure on the Veterans' Administration to include medical care of non-service-connected disabilities and dependents. If you supply "free" (i.e., tax-supported) medical care to 14,000,000 young persons in the service, who are now civilians and voting, and maintain a growing Veterans' Administration medical service the while, and now plan for a military establishment involving 3,500,000 more young people in the immediate future, you have started changes in the citizens' attitude toward medical care that are worth thinking about in terms that transcend mere arithmetic. By all odds the most important change in the horizon of medicine as a whole is its improved and improving potential value and the increasing realization of that value by an increasing number of people in need who are coming to consider medical care as a civic right.

Here, then, is one factor that has vastly increased the need for doctors. There are others. In the decade from 1940 to 1950, we added 19,000,000 to our population. At the current ratio of 1 doctor to 850 civilians, this population increase alone would call for 23,000 more doctors than we had in 1940, and the need may continue to rise at a comparable rate in the coming decade as our population goes on growing. There is also the fact

that the life span of our people is lengthening, which means that we have more elderly people. As we master the acute infectious diseases, we are seeing more people reach the age when chronic and degenerative diseases are likely to call for medical care; to some extent we have traded mortality for morbidity.

To all this we must add the increased need for doctors imposed by the present military mobilization. If the Armed Forces are to have 35 doctors per 10,000 men under arms, then the planned Military Establishment of 3,600,000 men will call for 12,250 doctors. This is just about three times as many doctors as would be needed to take care of the same number of people as civilians, because the military doctor-to-population ratio is three times that in civilian life. Nor is that all. In the event of war the need for doctors would rise at home as well as in the Military Establishment, for civilian populations in wartime have their own peculiar demands. Civilian defense measures call for doctors. And 1 doctor killed or severely injured in an air raid leaves 850 civilians in search of another doctor, whether or not the bombs have fallen on them. Also, when industry is geared to war production, we must have more industrial physicians and more doctors to rehabilitate some of the 4,000,000 handicapped persons who could be reclaimed for productive work.

Not all of the trends in medicine or our national life are in the direction of piling up demand for more and more doctors. Medicine and health work are becoming more efficient in the use of manpower. By means of surer and earlier diagnosis, more effective drugs and forms of treatment, more preventive medicine, a higher standard of living, more widespread knowledge of hygiene among the laity, better hospital organization, more auxiliary personnel to save the doctor's time—by means of all of these, today's doctor can take effective care of more patients than ever before. There are far more hospitals than there used to be, and the average stay in the hospital is shorter. Automobiles and better roads have enormously reduced the time a doctor spends in mere travel. Group practice, when the standards of the group are high, is an economy of time, effort, and money to all concerned. Yet there are factors that offset these aids. The practice of medicine at its best still requires personal service that is not that of the assembly line. A doctor cannot communicate with his patients over a public-address system, and medicine cannot be very efficient where the population is sparse and scattered and without adequate hospitals. In these areas we have a chronic shortage of doctors, which cannot be corrected by the airy generalization that all we need is a redistribution of the doctors. If the demand for doctors' services were not increasing everywhere, the problems of distribution might stand a better chance of solution without any increase in the total number of doctors. But as long as the interesting opportunities in the profession exceed the number of well-trained men, the well-trained men will prefer to go where those opportunities are—that is, the cities and industrial centers.

The story of the unequal distribution of doctors can be told in a few figures. In 1949 nearly two-thirds of the Nation's 180,000 active physicians in private practice were concentrated in the populous regions of the East, the Midwest, and the Pacific coast. The Middle Atlantic States, for example, had 1 doctor for every 625 people, while the so-called deep South had only 1 for every 1,300; in other words, half as many in proportion to population. But the problem of medical care for the underprivileged areas will not be solved until those regions are provided with more hospital beds, medical facilities, and auxiliary help—and until the Nation as a whole gets more doctors, more dentists,

more nurses, more trained persons in every health service.

Now what are the prospects for increasing our supply of doctors? It can be said at once that the profession of medicine in the United States does not suffer from the handicap of unattractive pay, as some other intellectual occupations do. A survey just completed by the Department of Commerce and the American Medical Association shows that the average net income of physicians in civilian practice in 1949 was \$11,058. There is no dearth of potential candidates for medicine in our colleges. The bottleneck lies in the matter of medical education.

In the first place, the length and cost of medical training are a formidable barrier. No one knows how many able and apt young men and women in the United States renounce careers in medicine for economic reasons, but the number must certainly be large. Even if they can afford the fees in medical school, many cannot afford to spend the long period of their lives in preparation that medicine requires. To speak of a medical education as a matter of 4 years recalls the English philosopher Francis Cornford's definition of propaganda as "the art of lying in such a way as nearly to deceive your friends without ever taking in your enemies." The doctor-of-medicine degree is only the first step; its holder must then spend 1, 2, or more years in internship and further training to become a really competent, fully prepared doctor. The fact is that a good medical education takes not 4 years but 8 or 10, whether it be for practice as a physician, for teaching or for research.

Little can be done to shorten the time of training. Nor can the medical schools, on the present basis of support, reduce the price of a doctor-of-medicine degree. Even in those that receive the highest tuition fees, the fees pay only from one-quarter to one-seventh of the actual cost of instruction. In 1949 the average tuition fee in our medical schools was \$548, but the schools spent, on the average, \$2,577 per student. In a sense, therefore, all medical students are on part scholarships.

In spite of the economic barriers, the medical schools have nearly four times as many applicants as they can accept. Yet here again, paradoxically, difficulties arise. As the Greeks observed, there are only two groups in a peaceful society who may kill human beings with impunity—judges and doctors. The selection of candidates for medicine requires care. Since every student receives an education that costs far more than he pays for it, medical-school admissions committees are loath to accept students who are likely to disappoint their teachers or later disappoint or exploit the public. Candidates who rank below average in their class as premedical students are not the sort they want to admit. Yet scholastic grades alone do not tell everything about a student's qualifications to practice medicine. Among all the M. D.'s who have passed muster scholastically there are still too few real doctors. In weighing candidates the admissions committees must take into account health, motivation, tenacity of purpose, character, and emotional stability. They are always conscious of the necessity for controlling the wastage involved in the fact that about 10 percent of the students who start in medical school drop out before they finish, because of ill health, collapse of economic resources, inadequate scholastic performance or loss of interest, especially among those who never really wanted to become doctors but were pushed into it by parental pressure.

There are 72 4-year medical schools in the United States and 7 others that provide only the first 2 years of medical instruction. At the beginning of the school year last fall the 79 schools had a total enrollment of 7,187 first-year students, 6,720 second-

year students, 6,256 third-year students, and 6,030 fourth-year students. This fall probably 7,500 new students will be admitted to the first year.

The first-year class last year ranged in size from twenty-odd in the smallest of the 2-year schools to more than 160 in one of the State universities. The teaching of medicine calls for individual instruction in small groups, for student participation in laboratory work and for teaching by example and controlled experience under close supervision. This means that enrollments must be kept small; a class of over 100 students begins to put a heavy load on the heads of teaching departments, and a class of 150 is commonly regarded as excessive, especially when the laboratory facilities were built for only one-half or two-thirds that number. The quality of instruction suffers when the student's identity is lost in a class too large for the professor to know his students.

During the 4 years of medical school a student studies some 20 required subjects. The teacher's load is increased by the fact that in almost every subject in the medical curriculum new knowledge steadily adds to or refines the information he must offer the students. The younger teachers have another worry, they must carry on original laboratory or clinical work, because they know that promotion is influenced by the quality and quantity of their published research. Besides all this our medical schools are now feeling the pressures resulting from the rising costs of equipment, supplies and building, from the dislocations and interruptions of teacher training due to the war and from the loss of endowment income during the last depression.

How could the medical schools increase the number of their graduates? If time were not of the essence, the wisest course would be to fill out most of the 2-year schools by adding the two final years and to create new 4-year schools in States possessing none, such as New Jersey and Florida. But this will be slow and extremely expensive, and the new schools could not be expected to produce any graduates before 1957. Furthermore, with at least 250 teaching vacancies already in existence in the present medical schools, it would be no small feat to staff the new ones.

The medical schools have undertaken to increase their output by admitting more students (about 1,000 more this fall than 2 years ago) and reducing the losses of students who fail to finish. But the only way to produce a substantial increase in the number of graduates in the immediate future would be to resort to acceleration, as the medical schools did during World War II. They reduced the 4-year course to 3 by operating continuously, without stopping for the summer quarter. Both in promptness of results and in volume of production over a period of years, the numerical gains of acceleration are certain and obvious. But the experience during the war showed that in nearly every other way acceleration is unsatisfactory. True, it increases the total tuition income per year. But it imposes a tremendous load on the teachers and students, which during the war was reflected in the quality of student performance. Acceleration proved so exhausting to both teachers and students that probably nothing short of a declared war would induce the medical schools to repeat the experience; their attitude toward acceleration ranges from reluctance to bitter opposition. In the main they have voted against the adoption of acceleration in the academic year of 1951-52. Needless to say, acceleration eliminates in large measure the opportunity for research and for the training of future teachers, and therefore it places our long-term medical progress in jeopardy.

We are driven to the unescapable conclusion that the most important thing we can do

to increase the number and quality of doctors is to give more financial support to our medical schools. We allow them to languish and retrench for lack of a pailtry \$10,000,000—which was the medical schools' deficit in 1948. This in a country that spent more than \$4,100,000,000 on tobacco and smokers' supplies during that same year of grace. And 2 years later, with the financial clouds still darkening over medical education, a public fund appeal for \$5,000,000 for the schools that prepare our future doctors for practice finds difficulty in raising \$1,000,000.

The essential fact is that the cost of medical education is a part of the cost of medical care. Perhaps we shall have to find out what a shortage of doctors really means before we realize the importance of supporting enough and good enough schools to prepare young men and women to meet our need for medical care.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS REGARDING
ARTICLE ENTITLED "DOCTORS," BY ALAN
GREGG

There are several points in this excellent article which I should like to highlight.

The first point concerns the question of whether or not there really is a need for more doctors, which, surprisingly enough, has been made a matter of controversy. Dr. Gregg aptly compares the growing need for and demand for medical care with the advent of the automobile. While initially there was some question as to whether the automobile would replace the horse and carriage, as the quality of automobiles went up and their price down, automobiles became available to more and more people, and it was found that there was an almost unlimited demand for them. The same is true of medical care. It is constantly improving and becoming more widely available; and the demand and need for it grows in a way that is difficult to measure, but is real nevertheless.

The second point concerns the question of why we do not have more doctors than we do today. The answer does not lie in a dearth of interest in the medical profession, since there are four applicants for every place in our medical schools.

As Dr. Gregg puts it.

"There is no dearth of potential candidates for medicine in our colleges. The bottleneck lies in the matter of medical education."

Recognizing the medical schools as our bottleneck, Dr. Gregg proceeds to consider ways and means of breaking it, such as added enrollment in existing medical-school facilities and acceleration of program, to do away with the summer vacation period and complete the 4-year course in a shorter time. But these are limited solutions to the problem, and Dr. Gregg concludes:

"We are driven to the inescapable conclusion that the most important thing we can do to increase the number and quality of doctors is to give more financial support to our medical schools."

Mr. President, I hope I do not need to elaborate on my continuing interest in holding Federal expenditures to a minimum during this period of heavy defense spending, and my interest in eliminating waste.

In my opinion, however, our failure to make an appropriate investment in breaking the bottleneck to adequate medical care for future Americans by providing the financial aid to medical schools embodied in S. 337, now before the Senate, is actually a wasteful saving and does not deserve the name of "economy."

Many of our defense procurement items have very long so-called lead times—that is, a lag between the planning and the placement of the contract and the delivery of the items. Airplanes are a notable example, and we are now programing and appropriating funds for planes that will not be delivered

until mid-1953. A cut in our current appropriations for airplanes would have no immediate effect; the dip in production would only be visible some months hence. It takes foresight to plan ahead.

The lead time for doctors is not 18 months; it is four or more years, considering the time required for internships and residencies. Our failure to provide adequate facilities for medical education will not make itself immediately apparent. But it will rike to haunt us within a very few years.

Mr. President, I urge the passage of S. 337.

The Japanese Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the Governors' Conference, Gatlinburg, Tenn., Monday, October 1, Mr. John Foster Dulles, who, it will be recalled, was the representative of the United States in negotiating the Japanese Peace Treaty, made a memorable address on the subject of the peace treaty. It is of such importance, in light of the coming consideration of the ratification of the treaty, that I ask that it be inserted in the Record.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2¼ pages in the Record, at a cost of \$184.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES, AT THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, GATLINBURG, TENN., OCTOBER 1, 1951.

During the last month some good blows were struck in the cause of world freedom.

We signed with Japan a treaty of reconciliation and liberation in a great drama of peace-making unity such as the world has never seen before.

The Soviet delegates, who had come to San Francisco in the blustering mood of wreckers, were made to seem insignificant for the first time in conference history, and in the end they faded almost unnoticed from the scene.

The United States made a series of collective-security treaties which formalized its determination to join with the peoples concerned to hold the island chain which, from the Aleutians to New Zealand, marks the western rim of the Pacific.

What happened is good. But it is not good enough so that we can relax in a mood of contemplative admiration. In Japan and Asia, we have made only a beginning. The future is obscure and there are signs that are ominous. There will be continuing need of the driving power which we have developed. Therefore, it will perhaps be useful to analyze how that came about, so that we can more surely sustain our momentum.

I

A first ingredient was the will to reach a clearly defined goal, namely, peace with Japan. When I speak of "will" I mean more than a lachrymose hope; I mean a resolute determination which had behind it the full power and authority of Government.

That will was born in 1950 out of a growing realization of the danger of perpetuating

the existing situation in Japan. China had gone and, unless we acted positively, it seemed that Japan might go, too. Stalin had boasted with Japan, "we are invincible." We do not have to admit that. But we must admit that Japan was formidable when it fought alone in Asia, and if its manpower and industrial resources could be joined with those of China and exploited by Soviet Russia, the total combination could be extremely unpleasant.

A principal source of danger lay in the continuance of the military occupation of Japan. That occupation, begun in 1945, had by 1950 fully served the purposes specified in the Japanese surrender terms. From then on the occupation would become alien interference in the internal affairs of a proud and sensitive people. It would be increasingly resented and that resentment would be fanned by all the propaganda skills of which communism is master. The free world would be in the position of jailer; while the Communist world would be jangling what it claimed were the keys to freedom.

General MacArthur had seen danger coming. He had warned that the occupation could not safely be continued beyond 5 years. In 1950 the 5 years were up. But we seemed to be caught in a trap. We were committed to occupation until there was peace, and the Soviet Union had thwarted the peace proposals which the United States and the United Kingdom had made in 1947.

Between 1947 and 1950 we were without any strong purpose. Then in June 1950 the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, and I went to Japan to study the problem with General MacArthur. General MacArthur emphasized the danger and he made concrete proposals for surmounting it.

The need of positive action was further driven home by the armed attack on the Republic of Korea which occurred while we were in Tokyo. That attack was probably made because of the strategic importance of Korea in relation to Japan. It showed the lengths to which Soviet communism was prepared to go to dominate Japan. It made it imperative that we should put equal resolution behind a program for peace.

On our return, the President decided that the United States should proceed with all possible vigor to set Japan free, and do so in such a way as to make it likely that Japan would use its freedom to join its destiny with that of the free world. On September 8, 1950, the President formalized his decision and asked me to carry it out.

One year later, to the day, the peace treaty was signed. During that year there have been many moments of difficulty and of concern. We had had to be firm with friends, and we have had to be courageous in facing up to threats from nonfriends. Never, however, has there been any wavering on the President's part. Having made his decision, he put behind it the full power of his office, and at all times he, with Secretary Acheson and Secretary Marshall, gave me 100-percent support. That fact deserves to be recorded. Without that kind of determination there could not have been success.

II

It was, however, necessary to have more than the determination of the administration. National unity was an essential ingredient. What had to be done could not be done as a partisan affair nor could I, as a Republican, have operated on those terms. Fortunately, we found national unity. Governor Dewey, the titular head of our party, Senator Tamm who is chairman of the Republican Policy Committee in the Senate, and Senator MILLIKIN who is chairman of the Republican conference in the Senate, were well aware of the grave issues; they approved of my mission and gave me support and counsel. I worked with complete intimacy

with Republicans and Democrats alike on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

At the time of General MacArthur's relief, our national unity of purpose was severely tested. A lesser man would have wanted to see confusion and failure follow his abrupt elimination from the Japanese scene. But, from his plane leaving Tokyo he spoke to me, on my plane Tokyo bound, and his message was "Carry on with the peace." With the President's knowledge and approval I continued regularly to consult with General MacArthur and I was constantly strengthened by the pledge of his support.

There were four United States signers of the Japanese Peace Treaty and of each of the three related Pacific security treaties. Of the total of 16 signatures, 9 were Republicans, 7 were Democrats.

What happened proves that when responsible Americans see for themselves that their country faces a great danger, when they know that their help is needed to avert that danger, then they will help, if they are permitted to do so in ways that they can justify to their reason and conscience. That unity is often indispensable in these grave times. Friendly nations will not adjust their policies into concert with ours, and unfriendly nations will not give way before our policies, if those policies are merely party policies, which may be reversed in a year.

III

So, we developed here at home a will for positive action, and national unity behind it. Starting with that powerful impetus we sought as a third ingredient, the enlightened qualities of the free world. We tried to avoid the usual sordid aftermath of victory. We proposed a peace of reconciliation, of trust and of opportunity. We invited Japan to return as a free and equal member of the society of nations. That meant a treaty without economic limitations, and without military limitations. Any such limitations would not only be discriminatory, but we felt that in the case of a country situated as was Japan they would, in the long run, be unenforceable and even provocative of violations.

Japan, under the surrender terms, had already been divested of its colonial possessions. This the treaty confirmed. The only abnormal liability to be placed upon Japan was a reparations liability, which she willingly accepted, toward the countries she had invaded. This liability was carefully restricted so as not to undermine Japanese solvency, or to destroy Japanese initiative, or to prevent the Japanese, by their own efforts, from improving their standards of living.

We tried to write treaty terms which would not violate the high ideals which the free world professes, but which often are cut across by lower motives when the time for action comes.

Also, in our dealings with the Japanese we recognized their personal dignity and worth, and sought to break down the wall of division which war had erected between us.

I had witnessed the treatment of the Germans at Versailles. It was so humiliating that the treaty never had a chance to make real peace.

In 1919, the Germans sent a distinguished and liberal delegation to Versailles. They were put into a barbed-wire enclosure. They were forbidden to have any personal meeting with any allied delegate. When the treaty had been finally drafted they were shown a copy and given a few days within which to submit written observations. These, when received, were almost wholly disregarded. Such indignities created bitter resentment and it took the utmost pressure of a starvation blockade to produce any Germans to sign for Germany.

We were not going to repeat that blunder in the case of Japan. In January of this year our Presidential mission went to Japan, where we consulted fully with the Japanese Government and with representatives of the principal political parties, of the labor unions, of business and of cultural institutions. Again in April our mission renewed such consultations in Japan. In addition, I was in frequent communication by cable and mail with Prime Minister Yoshida. He made many suggestions about the treaty which we accepted and, throughout, the Japanese nation knew that its opinions were sought and judged on their merits. We tried to show qualities of courtesy and humanity which the free world uniquely possesses, and which make men want to belong to that society. In the end, the Japanese Prime Minister headed a distinguished parliamentary delegation to the San Francisco Conference and they gladly made Japan's commitment to the free world.

IV

The fourth ingredient of our action was unity with our free allies. We won that unity by making proposals which were simple and inspired by ideals which they shared equally with us. In order, however, to translate that unity into the terms of an agreed treaty text, we had to invent some new procedures.

There were over 50 allies. Normally, all or some of them would have met at one place, at one time, to negotiate the treaty. This was the course which had been proposed in 1947 and which the Soviet Union had blocked. Since then we had had 3 years of Russian sabotage of efforts to conclude treaties with Germany and Austria. It was evident that there would be great difficulty in concluding a Japanese Peace Treaty at a Soviet-attended conference, even assuming that the Soviet Union would renounce the veto power which, in fact, it continued to demand until the end. We did not, however, want to call a conference from which the Soviet Union would be excluded by our act. Many allies were willing to go along with a peace from which the Soviet Union excluded itself, but they shied away from a peace from which the Soviet Union was excluded by others.

The situation was further complicated by allied differences regarding China.

In the end, the President established a special mission which, with the use also of diplomatic channels, would deal directly and independently with each of the allied powers. There was no precedent for using this procedure in an affair of this magnitude, but it worked. It solved the problem of dealing with Russia. We were willing to and did discuss the treaty with Russia, but since Russia was not a party to our talks with others, it lost its best chance to be obstructive. Also, our procedure let us consult with the National Government of China, without this involving the many allied governments which do not recognize the National Government or which, even though they continue to recognize it for certain purposes, would not deal with it in relation to peace treaty terms.

The treaty was negotiated into final form without any general conference whatsoever and the procedure was found generally acceptable. The Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia continued to the last to claim that the procedure was illegal, but the overwhelming majority paid tribute to it.

It was not always easy for our friendly allies to embrace the kind of treaty that we sought. For example, in Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines there were many persons who felt that the peace treaty should limit any future Japanese military establishment. In the Philippines, Indonesia, and elsewhere many persons felt that we were unduly solicitous in protecting Japan from their vast reparation claims. In Allied countries located in and about the Pacific Ocean,

many wanted the treaty to prevent the Japanese from fishing generally on the high seas. In Allied nations which were industrialized, many wanted to restrict Japan's power to compete, particularly in the fields of textiles, shipbuilding, and shipping.

However, the governments of the Allied signatories saw the problem in true perspective and they placed the common good of the free world above local advantages. They showed that the Allies can wage peace together as they waged war together, and that they will make sacrifices for peace as they made sacrifices for victory. That is something that needed showing, and all honor is due those who showed the will and made the sacrifice.

The United Kingdom cosponsored the final text of the treaty. That was not easy for it to do, because the United Kingdom faces a difficult economic future, and Japan can be a dangerous competitor. Great Britain, in a victor's role, might well have sought trade advantages. Yet Britain played the larger role of leadership within a commonwealth whose membership included many Pacific and Asian countries.

Joint action by the United States and Britain may not be wholly popular in either country. When I first discussed this with Foreign Secretary Morrison last June, I remarked to him that probably we would both be acclaimed at home if we took separate courses regarding Japan. But I knew that the place where that would be most acclaimed would be the Kremlin, and we could not afford to give satisfaction there or invite the boldness which would surely follow. The United States and the United Kingdom agreed, and we gave leadership together. That I rate as one of the good byproducts of our endeavor.

We sought the approval not merely of the great nations and those which were directly concerned in the Pacific war, but of all the Allies. Most of the nations of the Americas, Europe, West Asia, and Africa had not been physically damaged by the Pacific war. Their contribution to victory has been more political and moral than military. It had become customary to exclude such countries from any genuine part in the peace making. But why should we seek broad moral support for making war and then exclude that moral influence from making peace? So our proposed peace terms were submitted to all of the Allied Powers in time to permit each to express its views. Many did so and changes were made as a result of their good suggestions.

Our efforts resulted in a striking display of Allied unity. Fifty-four Allied Powers were invited to San Francisco. Three—India, Burma, and Yugoslavia—did not attend, preferring, for different reasons, to make peace separately. The Soviet Union and its two satellites, Poland and Czechoslovakia, attended but did not sign. Forty-eight Allied Powers signed.

Some will perhaps wonder why so much time and effort were expended to get Allied unity. The United States could conceivably have written its own treaty of peace with Japan, imposed it upon Japan through its forces of occupation, and left it to others to take it or leave it as they saw fit. Some few argue that this should have been our course.

There may come times when a nation must act wholly on its own responsibility. But usually the decision to act alone springs from a desire to do what, it is feared, world judgment would condemn. Nations which align their policies with moral principles do not have to act furtively or to stand alone. Therefore the Allied Powers and Japan, 49 nations, stood together and made publicly and in unison their great covenant of peace and liberation; and the drama of that act stirred the hearts of men everywhere who love freedom, peace, and justice.

The fifth ingredient of our action was courage without recklessness. Communist propaganda had been openly threatening that if Japan signed a so-called separate peace, i. e., a peace which was not joined in by the Soviet Union and Communist China, that act would touch off a revival by these two countries of active war against Japan. The Soviet and Chinese Communist Governments had hinted the same thing.

We could not tell certainly whether this was bluff or whether it was serious menace. Those best qualified to judge felt that there was at least some risk that the Soviet Union and Communist China would make Japan's signature of a peace treaty and security treaty the pretext for reviving open war.

That was a risk which the President and his responsible advisers weighed. To have given in to the threats would have been to invite immeasurable disaster. They did not give in, but went ahead.

That was a solemn and necessary decision which required courage; but it equally called for an avoidance of recklessness. There was a duty to proceed in a way that would reduce, not increase, the risk of the awful disaster of general war. We believed that the risk would be reduced if the peace obtained general world approval. Contrariwise, the risk would increase if we alienated world support.

In these matters the Soviet Communists seem to take into account the morale factor which plays a decisive part in the outcome of long wars. They treat propaganda and subversive possibilities as weapons of equal importance to military weapons. So, while free world unity is no insurance against general war, free world disunity probably increases the risk of general war, particularly if the disunity involves the United States being condemned by a large part of free world opinion.

That is the additional reason why we sought a peace which would win general support and why we negotiated patiently and in simplicity in an effort to consolidate that support into a climactic demonstration of world unity.

In that connection the attitude of India was a disappointment. We had scarcely expected that India would sign a peace treaty that was rejected by Soviet Russia and Communist China. That might have involved a departure from a policy which the Indian Government, within its rights, has judged will best serve its national interests. But the reasons given by India for declining our invitation seemed at that time to give encouragement to the Chinese Communists who had revived, for their own imperialist purposes, the old battle cry of "Asia for the Asians," and who were demanding that all United States influence should be eradicated from Japan.

If India's position had in fact been followed generally by the other Asian States, there might have resulted the grave breach in world unity which the Soviets had been seeking.

Fortunately for peace, this did not happen. Over a quarter of the Allied Nations at San Francisco were Asian States, and Zafrulla Khan, of Pakistan; Subardjo, of Indonesia; Jayewardene, of Ceylon, and Charles Malik, of Lebanon, voiced eloquently and authentically the overwhelming determination of Asia to seek peace through world unity rather than to divide continents and races into hostile camps.

However, as Secretary Acheson said in closing the San Francisco Peace Conference, while we regretted that some were unwilling to work with us and criticized our efforts, "for those people we feel no bitterness; but we urge them now to join in the great effort which lies before us all."

All who heard the moving statements made at San Francisco by the delegates of

the 49 signing states will understand why the Soviet delegation did not present there any warlike ultimatum and why September 8 passed without any new outbreak of war.

Some, when they heard that the Russians were coming to San Francisco, thought we had blundered. They said we should never have invited the Russians and should have had no speaking conference, but only a silent signing. They overrated the Russians; they underrated the allied unity that had been achieved, and they developed timidity at the point where boldness was our best insurance.

We knew what we were doing when we invited a Soviet delegation to be at San Francisco. We were confident that we had built soundly and that nothing the Russians could do would enable them to pull down what had been built. We were not afraid. We wanted the Russians to hear what they heard, to see what they saw, and to fail as they failed.

VI

What happened at San Francisco has been called a diplomatic success. That is true—in the best sense of the word "diplomacy." In a larger sense, the results came simply from following in the way of American tradition. I like to think that in some measure we did the kind of thing that our forebears would have expected of us.

When I speak of our tradition I am not thinking merely of our historical interest in the Pacific, although this, too, can usefully be remembered. Nearly 100 years ago Commodore Perry made a treaty with Japan which was the first modern link between Japan and the West. Further, if you will permit a personal reference, I cannot forget that it was my grandfather who, in 1895, negotiated a treaty of peace between Japan and China.

The ground we are today traversing is not new to Americans. But I am thinking primarily in terms of our spiritual heritage.

We achieved national unity; and surely it is nothing new to have national unity in the face of external danger. Today we argue about unity in new-fangled terms: "bipartisanship," "nonpartisanship," "unpartisanship." To me it is old-fashioned Americanism.

We sought for Japan a peace of reconciliation; and that is nothing new to a Nation whose every child has memorized Lincoln's immortal appeal for a peace of malice toward none and charity toward all.

We sought a peace which would liberate Japan from occupation; and that is nothing new to a Nation whose Declaration of Independence, as Lincoln has said, offered "liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time."

We sought a peace which would deserve and receive the approbation of the free world, and that is nothing new for a Nation whose own independence was expressly based on the proposition that all people in great affairs should act with a "decent respect for the opinions of mankind."

We discomfited the despots, and that is nothing new to a Nation which, when it was still young and weak, defied the Holy Alliance formed by the great Czar Alexander and, by the moral courage of its Monroe Doctrine, threw those despots into retreat.

Our troubles today stem from too much reliance upon what is new—our bigness, our material power. We are overly entangled by the complexities of our modern industrial civilization. What we need is more reliance on what is old, and what should be enduring. If the San Francisco Conference succeeded, it was because our Nation operated naturally and simply, in accordance with the faith and the works of our fathers.

Private Cooperative and Public Housing Combine to Clear Slum Area and Erect New 2,600 Family Apartment Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am appending news items and other information describing how the Federal law is being utilized in the best spirit of private and public participation by nine neighboring education and religious institutions for a slum-clearance project to clear a blighted area and to house 2,600 families on two square blocks in the Manhattanville-Morningside area of Manhattan. Having been a sponsor of the Housing Act of 1949 it is deeply gratifying to see this magnificent development in my own district combining private cooperative housing and publicly assisted low-rent housing with slum clearance under title I of the act. The project is being pursued under the distinguished leadership of Father George B. Ford, rector of Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church in my district, who is chairman of the Manhattanville Community Advisory Committee and secretary of the board of directors of Morningside Heights, Inc.:

[Press release from Morningside Heights, Inc., Morningside Committee on Cooperative Housing, New York, N. Y.]

Nine of the leading educational and religious institutions in Morningside Heights and Manhattanville, on the west side of Manhattan, have joined in sponsoring a cooperative housing project in their area, according to an announcement made today by Father George B. Ford, rector of Corpus Christi Church, chairman of the Manhattanville Community Advisory Committee, and secretary of the board of directors of Morningside Heights, Inc. The project is to accommodate about 1,000 families and will cover the two blocks north of One Hundred and Twenty-third Street between Amsterdam Avenue and Broadway which have just been recommended for redevelopment by the mayor's committee on slum-clearance plans. The cooperative project will be bounded on the east and north by a 15-acre public housing project for approximately 1,600 families. "The completion of these two projects," Father Ford said, "will be a tremendous step toward improving our community, and will be notable for combining public and private housing in keeping with the needs of the community."

The institutions which will sponsor the cooperative project include Barnard College, Columbia University, Corpus Christi Church, International House, Jewish Theological Seminary, Juilliard School of Music, the Riverside Church, Teachers College, and Union Theological Seminary. With the aid of data obtained in a previous community survey, representatives of these institutions organized a joint committee early in the year to study the possibilities of such a cooperative. In May the committee requested the mayor's committees on slum clearance plans, through its chairman, Robert Moses, to advance their project in its program. The report of the mayor's committee, recommending the project in conjunction with the adjacent public housing project, has just been released.

The land for the cooperative is to be purchased and cleared with the aid of Federal funds under the provisions of title I of the 1949 Housing Act. The institutions will assist in the initial development of the project, which will eventually be owned and managed by its tenant-cooperators. Both the city and the Federal Government require that the project must be free from discrimination or segregation.

In making his announcement, Father Ford recalled that present site residents have priority, under the law, in obtaining apartments, and stated that applications cannot be taken now, but will be at a later date, which will be announced.

Tentative plans for the cooperative call for 6 20-story buildings containing almost 1,000 dwelling units, ranging in size from 1½ room to 3-bedroom apartments. The average monthly charges per room after the down payment, will be about \$23.

The residential buildings will be so situated as to provide play areas for children, sitting space for adults, off-street parking and plenty of light and air. New stores on Broadway will separate the residential buildings from the IRT subway.

"This project and the public housing units are no surprise to the members of the community, they've been in on the plans for over a year," Father Ford said. To determine the need for new housing, a survey was conducted in the summer of 1950 by 250 teachers college students under the direction of the staff of Morningside Heights, Inc. Representatives of over 50 local community organizations formed the Manhattanville Community Advisory Committee to assist the survey wherever possible. Every third household was interviewed and the other citizens learned of the survey through meetings, pamphlets, and their advisory committee. The findings of the survey appear in a Report to the People which is being distributed throughout the community by the committee in cooperation with Morningside Heights, Inc., and the Manhattanville Neighborhood Center.

The survey revealed that Manhattanville is one of the most densely populated communities in New York City—735 people to every residential acre.

Morningside Heights, Inc., is a nonprofit organization founded 4 years ago to make plans for the improvement of the local community. In addition to the institutions sponsoring the cooperative project, Morningside Heights, Inc., members include Woman's Hospital, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, St. Luke's Hospital, St. Luke's Home for Aged Women, and the Home for Old Men and Aged Couples. Representatives of many of these same institutions are on the board of directors of Manhattanville Neighborhood Center, which provides educational and recreational services in Manhattanville, in addition to working for the community's physical improvement.

REPORT TO MAYOR IMPELLITTERI AND THE BOARD OF ESTIMATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON SLUM CLEARANCE PLANS

This Morningside-Manhattanville slum clearance report under title I of the National Housing Act of 1949 is the last of the eight originally authorized by your board on March 30, 1950. The reports on Washington Square South, South Village, Delancey Street, Corlears Hook, Harlem, North Harlem, Williamsburg, were submitted in January of this year.

Three of the seven plans recommended to you by the committee have been approved and submitted to the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Washington for their approval. These are the North Harlem, Harlem, and Corlears Hook projects. In all three cases, reliable sponsors are anxious to proceed and we expect action in the near future.

This committee was appointed on December 17, 1948, to study and expedite specific slum clearance projects by private capital under anticipated Federal law, later known as title I of the National Housing Act of 1949. We made a preliminary report on July 14, 1949, and were instructed to continue our studies and prepare a definite program for public discussion.

On January 23, 1950, a further interim report was made, outlining the problem and recommending eight specific projects for further investigation. Two resolutions were adopted by the board of estimate on January 26, 1950 (Calendar No. 170), one requesting the reservation of \$16,000,000 in Federal funds—being the city's share of \$200,000,000 available Nation-wide for 1950-51—and the other directing the committee to continue with its work. Subsequently the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency reserved earmarked funds for this purpose and the city of New York set aside its share, \$8,000,000 in capital funds, to meet the proposed Federal grants.

As stated in our previous reports, this field is new, untried and experimental. The initial procedure therefore is necessarily slow and cumbersome. Neither Federal nor municipal funds are available in sufficient volume to do more than blaze the way for a large future program. The size of New York's problem can be measured by the acres of recognized slums, which cannot be eradicated by ordinary private, speculative building. This slum acreage is over 9,000. The present clearance program through public and quasi-public housing completed, under way, and scheduled will be approximately 1,328 acres by 1955—15 percent of the total. Obviously, private capital under a new Federal law must be brought into the picture on a large scale if we hope to escape a tremendously enlarged public housing program with all the implications which go with it. Following is a review of the law and procedure:

Title I of the National Housing Act of 1949 provides that any loss incurred by a city or local agency in acquiring and clearing slum sites and making them available for private redevelopment will be shared two-thirds by the Federal Government and one-third by the local government. To enable the city to proceed with this program, this committee advanced, and the State legislature, at the request of the city administration, adopted chapter 784 of the laws of 1949. Local law No. 104 of 1949, amending section C41-10 of the administrative code, authorized the mayor to execute Federal slum clearance contracts. To remove completely any further doubts of our authority to take advantage of the Federal law, at the request of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, the city administration requested, and the State legislature adopted, chapter 790 of the laws of 1950, which amended section 72K of the general municipal law.

Briefly, the procedure under the Federal, State, and local legislation is to present the data analyzing these slum areas to establish eligibility under the National Housing Act of 1949 for clearance and redevelopment by new private and public facilities mainly devoted to housing, but including also, if and where desirable, business and manufacture. A comprehensive plan for the redevelopment of each area must be prepared and approved by the city planning commission and board of estimate on behalf of the city, and by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the Federal Government. This redevelopment will then be subject to an agreement between the city and Federal Government under which the Federal Government will absorb two-thirds of any loss incurred in acquiring and making a site available, and the city one-third.

Provisions of the Federal law permit guaranteed loans for acquisition and site

clearance, and construction of various site improvements such as utilities and public facilities, as well as the planning advances already provided. To induce private investors to redevelop these sites, losses will be incurred in offering the property for sale or lease. Normally it is anticipated that these losses would represent the value of the existing old buildings, cost of demolition and the expense of relocating tenants.

Tenant relocation, the cost of which will be borne by the developers, will be under control of the board of estimate through this committee and the bureau of real estate. Tenant relocation offices will be established on each site and site tenants will be interviewed as to their needs and preferences. Experienced and reliable real estate firms, such as the firm which made the tenant relocation studies on these projects, are available and will be employed by the director of the bureau of real estate. Low-income site tenants will have first priority in the 55,000 dwelling units of Federal public housing provided for New York City in the National Housing Act of 1949, and will be eligible also for other New York City Housing Authority projects. Moderate-income site tenants will have priority in the 15,000 dwelling units proposed to be constructed in the slum clearance program. Further, they will receive special consideration for admission to tax-exempt developments throughout the city. Financial assistance will be given to tenants where necessary.

This report outlines the plans for the Morningside-Manhattanville redevelopment project. The plan provides for a little less than 100 families per acre. A limited number of shops and offices will be included to replace those demolished and meet the needs of residents of the project and the surrounding neighborhood. In order to avoid the congestion common in this section of the city, the buildings, including shops, will cover only about 16 percent of the land.

From a general point of view, this area requires redevelopment because all existing residential buildings are old, overcrowded, and either deteriorated or badly run-down. Because of small lots and diversity of ownership, redevelopment without condemnation and Government aid under this program would be impossible.

The site is readily accessible by rapid transit and buses. But even more important is its location near some of the country's leading medical, educational, and religious institutions. These institutions employ some 6,000 people, most of whom, in a survey conducted by Morningside Heights, Inc., in 1949, indicated a preference for living near their place of work. These personnel provide a substantial market for any new housing, both middle and low income, in the area. In addition, the industries a few blocks to the north provide excellent employment opportunities for those people who are not directly connected with the institutions.

Adjacent to the redevelopment site, the New York City Housing Authority plans a large-scale public housing project for about 1,600 families. The two projects will be a major step toward the redevelopment needed within the general neighborhood from One Hundred and Twenty-second to One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Streets, Riverside Drive to Morningside Avenue.

This report recommends construction of 981 dwelling units in six 20-story fireproof buildings and the demolition of almost 1,600 substandard tenement dwelling units. The final residential population density per gross acre of the entire site will be about 357 persons as against a present gross population density of 491 persons. The long sides of the buildings will be over 300 feet apart with landscaped sitting and play spaces between them.

Prices used in the estimates of the architects are current, and rental rates for the

various projects are based upon them. In the light of possible national emergency conditions, construction costs may need to be revised before completion of these projects. The project could support somewhat higher rentals if necessary. It has been the aim of this committee to keep rentals down.

Financial analysis indicates that under a standard rental plan a rent of about \$31 per room will be required if the land is sold at \$3 per square foot with the sponsor assuming demolition and relocation costs. On a cooperative basis, the sponsor anticipates rentals could be about \$23 per room with favorable financing. The real estate consultants advise that there is a market at such rents and that the proposed reuse value is proper.

The committee recommends that offers be accepted at \$3 per square foot, subject, of course, to the required public auction, the purchaser to demolish buildings and relocate tenants as outlined in the following report. There will be no discrimination in the selection of tenants because of race, creed, or color in this or in any other project.

An offer has been received from a non-profit cooperative housing group sponsored by the universities and substantial institutions in the area. They propose to develop the property in accordance with the plan recommended by the committee in this report and are prepared to purchase the land at the recommended reuse value. Upon approval of the plan by your board and by the Federal authorities and prior to acquisition of the land, this group will enter into a firm agreement.

We recommend that the board of estimate approve this redevelopment plan, after a report by the city planning commission, and that after approval by the board, the committee be authorized to apply to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for approval of the plan and for a grant.

ROBERT MOSES,

Chairman, Construction Coordinator and Planning Commissioner.

PHILIP J. CRUISE,

Chairman, New York City Housing Authority.

JOHN P. McGRATH,

Corporation Counsel.

JOHN J. BENNETT,

Chairman, New York City Planning Commission.

LAZARUS JOSEPH,

Comptroller.

JOHN C. RIEDEL,

Chief Engineer, Board of Estimate.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 3, 1951]

RECTOR PHRASES MANHATTANVILLE HOME PROJECTS—JUST "PRACTICING WHAT WE PREACH," HE SAYS OF NINE SPONSORING INSTITUTIONS

(By Francis Sugrue)

The Reverend George B. Ford, rector of Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church, 520 West One Hundred and Twenty-first Street, yesterday described the rather novel idea of nine educational and religious institutions sponsoring a housing project in the Morningside-Manhattanville area as just a "matter of practicing what we preach."

On Sunday, Father Ford announced that the nine institutions were joined in a plan to build with Federal help a \$12,567,226 co-operative housing project for 1,000 middle-income families on the 10 acres bounded by Broadway, La Salle Street, Amsterdam Avenue and West One Hundred and Twenty-third Street. But this was not all. A public-housing project sponsored by New York City and financed by the Federal Government is planned in the same neighborhood to go along with the private project. This low-income project will take care of 1,600 families.

THE WAY THINGS SHOULD BE

In Father Ford's conception of housing projects, this is the way things should be. The Catholic priest believes that when a community such as Manhattanville desires both public and private housing, the two needs should be linked both physically and in the spirit. Father Ford is chairman of the Manhattanville Community Advisory Committee, and secretary of the board of directors of Morningside Heights, Inc., and both groups have a keen interest in improving their community, which has "become a bad jumble of businesses and homes."

"When we build one project and say this is for the poor," Father Ford explained, "and then build another and say this is intended for the more well-to-do, we are creating ghettos. This is a form of segregation. It doesn't help our democracy one bit. The projects should be close together so that the people of the community can live together."

Since in his view the Manhattanville-Morningside Heights neighborhood is one of the largest cultural centers in the world, it is Father Ford's opinion that the sponsoring institutions ought to be conscious of their community.

But previously each institution—religious as well as educational—was concerned only with its own problems, its own individual way of life, he said.

OUTLINES HOUSING NEEDS

"They preached the theory that students and citizens should be aware of their community and active in making it a better place to live," Father Ford said. "But they were not aware of their own community. It was a case of not practicing what you preach. I think it is about time the institutions did some practicing with their preaching."

The institutions sponsoring the housing plan are Columbia University, Barnard College, Corpus Christi Church, International House, Jewish Theological Seminary, Juilliard School of Music, Riverside Church, Teachers College, and the Union Theological Seminary.

And on the need of housing in the area Father Ford said that after visiting some tenement flats in his parish, he is ashamed to return to his pleasant rectory and to his own comfortable room. A survey made by 250 students of Teachers College under the direction of Morningside Heights, Inc., showed that Manhattanville is one of the most densely populated communities in New York City—735 people to every residential acre.

"Good housing may not make everyone a saint," Father Ford said, "but it would develop better character, * * * better citizens. It would affect me if I had to live in some of those places—I'd want to shoot someone. As the houses in a neighborhood deteriorate the poor people out of necessity move in and take the consequences. That's where your radical ideas are hatched."

The AFL's Blacklist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF ORLEON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Fred Andrus in the Astorian-Budget, of Astoria, Oreg.:

THE AFL'S BLACKLIST

Organized labor fought for years against blacklisting of workers by employers, considering it to be a highly reprehensible practice.

It is therefore somewhat incongruous to have the American Federation of Labor publish its own blacklist of 19 Senators, whose principal crime seems to have been their support of the Taft-Hartley Act back in 1946 when it became law.

This blacklist indicates the bitterness still pervading labor ranks regarding the Taft-Hartley Act.

Any man who voted for it seems to have thereby automatically classed himself as an enemy of labor.

The Taft-Hartley Act was denounced as enslavement of organized labor and a weapon for destruction of unions.

It is perhaps noteworthy that in the years since its enactment unions have continued to grow, to strike, to win higher pay for their members, and otherwise continue to operate apparently as effectively as in the past.

Furthermore, no specific cases of enslavement have come to our attention. There may have been such, but certainly no great outcry has been made about them.

It is therefore sometimes difficult to understand this continuing bitterness.

Birthday Congratulations to Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Senator GREEN: 84," which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post. It gives much deserved credit to one of our esteemed and distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who yesterday celebrated the eighty-fourth anniversary of his birth.

Let me say that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] joins me in this request and in these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GREEN: 84

On his eighty-fourth birthday, which he celebrated yesterday, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN could lay claim to being, in years, perhaps the oldest and, in spirit, perhaps the youngest Member of the United States Senate. He was born in Rhode Island—which he has served as Senator since 1936—shortly after the Civil War, on October 2, 1867, no senatorial incumbent antedates him in birth with the possible exception of Senator McKILLAR whose biography in the Congressional Directory discloses respecting his age only that he "moved to Tennessee in 1892 after graduating in law at the University of Alabama." Senator GREEN has packed a good deal of living into his 84 years, scholar, university teacher, linguist, lawyer, banker, businessman, governor, and Senator, his career is scarcely to be matched in diversity and achievement.

Years haven't slowed down the senior Senator from Rhode Island appreciably. He never takes a train if he can fly; and he has no hesitation about flying to faraway places to have a first-hand view of developments for himself. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, he has taken four trips

overseas since 1949—pretty grueling trips, including one around the world, one to Australia and India, two to Europe, the last of them this past summer. They contributed, no doubt, to the enlightened and sophisticated approach he has consistently brought to problems of foreign policy.

None of the convenient, conventional labels designating position in the political spectrum fully fits Senator GREEN. A Democrat, he has been a staunch administration supporter—sometimes when there were few in the Senate to support the administration; he was one of the gallant half-dozen who voted against the McCarran Act last year. And he showed the same sort of courage when he served as a member of the Tydings subcommittee which reported that Senator McCarthy's charges concerning the State Department amounted to a fraud and a hoax on the Senate.

If no notable legislation bears the special imprint of Senator GREEN's sponsorship, a great many of the soundest and most humane acts of Congress have been helped along by his wisdom and enthusiasm. His latest legislative effort—in which he teamed on Monday with Senator TAFT—was in support of the International Children's Fund of the United Nations. The country can congratulate itself that Senator GREEN is still going strong—he gave a diving lesson last week end. He has never married; but when this energetic young fellow gets ready to settle down, he would make an admirable catch, we think, for any young woman capable of keeping up with him.

International Monetary Fund To Utilize Idle Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in an address on the floor of this House I pointed out the enormous advantages to be gained by a merger of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund whereby the fund's almost unused resources of about \$3,000,000,000 might be utilized in loans for development abroad, thus easing the great international burden which has been assumed by this country. The appended article, from today's New York Times, tells of plans by the fund to utilize this \$3,000,000,000 in unused liquid available capital. What the fund does in this regard—and how it does it—is of vast importance to us in view of our own foreign-aid efforts and deserves the close interest of all Members.

WORLD FUND PLANS MUCH BIGGER ROLE—EUROPEANS HEAR IT IS GOING INTO BUSINESS OF MAKING SHORT-TERM LOANS TO NATIONS
(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, October 2—For the first time since it was founded in 1945 the International Monetary Fund is about to become an active factor in international economic affairs.

European central bank and Government circles are just now learning of decisions taken at various levels within both the fund's own hierarchy and the principal governments that are members of the fund the cumulative effect of which would completely

change fund policies in important respects. As a result European member countries that have always been skeptical of the fund and its principles are becoming convinced that the fund is really going into business.

In the briefest terms the fund has decided that it should in the future operate as a short-term lending institution in cases in which it can, by doing so, aid member countries to achieve the fund's basic objectives. These remain as they were laid down at Bretton Woods, N. H., in 1944—the establishment of stable international currency relationships unhindered by exchange controls on current transactions and free of discrimination.

TO ABANDON PASSIVE ATTITUDE

In cases in which the fund can use its nearly \$3,000,000,000 worth of resources to aid a country willing to take some risk on removing discriminatory controls it intends in future to do so.

What is perhaps at least as important from a practical viewpoint, the fund has decided to abandon its passive attitude toward member countries. The fund staff in future will be permitted to make proposals to countries about revising their foreign-exchange or central-banking policies. These suggestions can ultimately be backed up with the largest single pool of uncommitted resources available in the world today.

It is in accordance with this recently established policy that the fund has begun discussions with Yugoslavia on a whole series of internal monetary reforms designed to reintegrate that country's economy with world trade and monetary channels. It is widely expected that one result of these discussions will be the establishment of a more realistic rate for the Yugoslav dinar.

But hand in hand with any such change, if it is agreed upon, will come changes in Yugoslavia's exchange-control system and methods for controlling inflation that may or may not, as the facts determine, be assisted by aid from the fund's resources.

CONSULTATIONS SET FOR 1952

This new departure is directly related to the approach of what the fund freely acknowledges to be its great testing period. In the early months of 1952 consultations will be held with all those member countries not abiding by the fund rules such as to non-discrimination and removal of exchange controls. At present this includes nearly all the fund's membership.

Since the beginning of the Marshall plan the United States, which has the controlling voice in the fund's affairs, has opposed the fund's giving dollar aid to countries that were receiving extraordinary United States aid. The United States has now been persuaded that unless the fund has something to offer countries entering into the consultations next year the chances that those consultations will be marked by progress are slim. Therefore, the United States has approved the new policy of careful and selective use of fund resources when furtherance of the fund's objectives can be advanced thereby.

Dedication of New Steam Plant of the Minnkota Power Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an address

by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at the dedication of a new steam generating plant of the Minnkota Power Cooperative at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on September 21, 1941. This is an able and forthright appraisal of the over-all farm question which I earnestly hope will be studied by not only Members of Congress, but also by the public in general.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial entitled "Taft's Visit Shows His Strength," which appeared in the Bismarck Tribune, of Bismarck, N. Dak., under the date of September 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR TAFT

It is always a pleasure to return to North Dakota, particularly at this time of harvest and autumn weather. I cannot come to the Red River Valley without being again impressed with the tremendous fertility of its soil and the advantage which nature has given to you. I have heard plenty about North Dakota from my good friends in the Senate, BILL LANGER and MILT YOUNG. I have to remind them from time to time that Ohio also is a tremendous and fertile agricultural State, the fifth in the Nation. A Senator from Ohio has to study the agricultural problem, and the proper Government action with regard to it, just as earnestly as a Senator from North Dakota or Minnesota. I have always cooperated there with the representative farm organizations and have had the support of their members in my various contests because they believed that I approached the problems of the farmer with understanding and sympathy. In 1950 I received gratifying support in rural counties running to as high as 77 percent of the total vote cast. I carried every rural county except two.

It is encouraging to participate in the completion and dedication of a great cooperative enterprise built by the farmers themselves to give them and their families adequate heat, light and power, and the means of relieving so much household drudgery. You have a right to be proud of this great enterprise which you own, and which in time will come, with good management, to be a debt-free asset.

When the REA program began I was somewhat doubtful whether it could be worked out on a business basis. The first year I was in the Senate, I stated that if necessary I was prepared to have the Government provide rural delivery of electricity just as it had undertaken at a loss the rural free delivery of mail. In the beginning the Washington REA was very secretive as to the financial condition of the various cooperatives, and I thought perhaps the money loaned should be carried as a Government expense rather than a loan to be recovered. When the secrecy was removed, however, it appeared that practically every cooperative in the country was operating at some profit, that the interest and the principal were being paid on the loans and that the Government in the end could count on practically a complete repayment. This was due in part to good management, and in part to the tremendous development of the use of electricity which occurred when it was brought to so many thousands of farms.

Today the REA program is moving rapidly toward completion not only here in North Dakota and Minnesota, but throughout nearly all the rural sections of the United States. I had something to do with running the eightieth "do-nothing" Congress, and I am proud of the fact that among its many constructive and progressive jobs, it appropriated more money for REA than all

previous appropriations put together and that it breathed life into the program from which you are now reaping the benefit. And the Eightieth Congress did that while bringing about a Government surplus of \$8,000,000,000, the first surplus in 18 years, and the largest in the history of the Nation.

There are some who have feared that the REA program might develop into a socialistic enterprise. I think that some have even hoped that the REAs might fall down so that the Government could take them over, and wield them into a great national utility power system. That certainly is directly contrary to the real purpose of the REA. The ideal of the REA is exactly that of other farm cooperatives—to establish facilities owned by the farmers themselves, so that they may get a better price for their crops and pay less for those things which they have to buy.

It is true that in the case of the REA, the money to establish these facilities, which in the power field are very expensive, has been loaned by the Government. But that should not change the cooperative character of REA. So the Government also subsidized the first transcontinental railroads and other enterprises where, for one reason or another, private capital could not undertake the complete support of new and risky development. The REA ideal is to pay off these loans so that the farmers themselves may own the facilities.

A true cooperative is just as much private enterprise as a private utility. It is essential that the rates be fixed high enough to pay off the loans in order that this result may be brought about. And there is no justification for the loaning of Government money which has to be raised from the taxpayer where electric power is already adequately available at a fair price. In Ohio I assisted our cooperative in buying a plant which was for sale. As a general proposition in Ohio private power is available in adequate amount.

The REA is only one phase in the whole cooperative movement, that movement which has accomplished great things in the best interests of the farmers. Like every business project, it has had some faults and some proper criticism has been directed against it, but its justification is clear.

Under a free economic system prices and wages are made in the market place on the basis of supply and demand—negotiations between a willing seller and a willing buyer. We have found, however, that when thousands of people deal each for himself with one or more large dealers or enterprises, or even with a completely free market, he may well find himself at a disadvantage, and the price ultimately fixed may have more relation to his relative economic weakness than to the general processes of supply and demand.

Thus in the field of labor, both under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, we have recognized that the way to fix wages at a fair level is to permit the thousands of workmen to unite in collective bargaining so that the employer may not have too great an advantage in dealing with one individual after another. So, in the farm field, we have recognized that to establish fair prices it is desirable to permit a number of farmers to act together as a unit in disposing of their products in the national market and in their purchasing, particularly of those supplies which they require in the farming business—to some extent in consumers' goods.

In developing this general theory there is some danger that the unit action of labor unions or cooperatives may become too powerful. In the labor field we have gone far toward a monopoly of labor in certain industries. I do not see at the present time that the farm cooperatives have reached any position of danger where they approach a monopoly

position, but we must always remember that the whole purpose of encouraging collective action is to place small units in a fair and equitable position, and not put them in a position where they can dominate the employer or the consumer. Today some feeling has been built up against the largest cooperatives similar to that felt against monopolistic unions and monopolistic business, and the wisest leaders of the cooperative movement are anxious to avoid any justification for such charges.

We are involved at the moment in the highly controversial problem of the taxation of cooperatives. I have supported the Senate bill, which provides for the taxation of so much of accumulated earnings as are not definitely assigned to the members in cash or certificates of interest. If a corporation assumes a personality of its own separate from that of its members, and accumulates property of its own, there seems to be no reason why it should not be taxed like other corporations. But the very principle of cooperatives, which has had the sympathetic interest of most of the people of the Nation, is that a number of farmers shall be permitted to act jointly with at least the same advantages they would have if they were acting separately. If the principle is to remain effective, there should only be one tax, and not two taxes, as in the case of the operation of private business for profit. I quite agree that there is too much duplication of taxes in the case of corporations and their stockholders, but that hardly justifies the same inequality where duplicate taxation is contrary to the very principle of cooperatives. Reserves allocated to farmers, at least in the case of producer cooperatives, are clearly taxable to farmers under the law. They should not be also taxed to the cooperatives. If they are not allocated to farmers, they are taxed to the cooperatives and not to the farmer under the Senate proposal.

I think it is possible that in the future the farmers may find it more convenient to have their taxes withheld and paid by the cooperative instead of by themselves. That is the position of some of the eastern cooperatives, but that can be determined better in the future after the full system is tried out.

It is true that the cooperatives may be able to accumulate reserves and build facilities from those reserves, but, again, if the farmer is to have his fair bargaining power in the market place he requires some physical facilities, and there is no place where he can get the necessary capital except from the operations of the cooperative itself.

The REA is fortunate in having Government money available in the form of loans, but even this is not permanent capital and can only be paid for out of the profits of the enterprise. Cooperatives are entitled to a system of taxation based on the sound principle of cooperatives, but they are not entitled to exemption.

The cooperative movement is important to the American farmer because in the end it enables him to work out his own problems with less and less reliance on the Government. I am convinced that the ultimate success and happiness of the farmer depends on the free economic system which lies at the basis of all American progress. The farmer will be better off the more freedom he has to work out his own ideas and to conduct his own business.

This country has achieved the greatest production, the greatest productivity, the highest standard of living because of its freedom of ideas and of action. Last year I went through many industrial shops in Ohio, and every one of them was proud of some particular machine or method of the product which they had developed. The businessman has been free to try out his own ideas without getting Government approval as would be required in a socialist ownership of industry, now on its way to completion in

England. The competition of free ideas has resulted in the adoption of the best of those ideas.

The more we can produce per person, the more there is to divide up among the people, and therefore the higher is our standard of living. The American workman is paid about two and one-half times as much as the British workman. His standard of living is about two and a half times as high. The American farmer is just as far ahead of the European farmer as the American industrialist is of the European industrialist, and he is there because he has had the right to run his own farm. The future of the American farmer depends on maintaining this freedom of action and a minimum of Government regulation.

While the problem of price support often excites greater political interest and has a more immediate effect on the farmer's income, the best long-term help the Government can give the farmer is in the nature of education and assistance to meet the continuous readjustments which are ahead. American agriculture has none of the static qualities of foreign agriculture. We are constantly developing new plants, improved livestock, better pastures, more grassland farming, a better and greater use of fertilizers, weed killers, and pesticides.

Underlying any permanent program must be the proper conservation of natural resources and land use. The farmer has been aided, I think, to a greater extent than even he realizes by the Agricultural Extension Service. It has been helpful in the past, and it should continue to be a great educational force of benefit to farmers, and in fact to all Americans. In order that it may be better and freer to develop different ideas, I believe very strongly that its control should be on a State basis through our great land-grant colleges. I should not be held down by the deadening effect of central control from a Washington bureau.

In this great effort to improve farming and farm production, American agriculture today faces a great opportunity and a great challenge. Our population is increasing at the rate of about 1,700,000 people per year, and yet essentially there has been no increase in agricultural production since 1945. This is true in part because during World War II agricultural production increased nearly 40 percent, but we ought to be resuming the improvement instead of falling off as we have. The fact that we have such a growing population is likely to bring us soon to the point where agriculture is going to do well to supply food and fiber enough to meet our own needs. That condition in itself is going to help in solving the surplus problem which has been so disastrous many times in the past.

One improvement which seems to be very promising for the farmer is the deliberately organized expansion of livestock agriculture and the increased sale of animal products to the American people. We have heard a lot about the stimulation of our export markets, and certainly the Government can do a better job in that field. But, after all, the big field is the American market. Ninety-five percent of American production of all kinds—industrial and agricultural—is sold right here in the United States. We have the greatest market in the world. With Government assistance, especially in research and education, a determined effort should be made to sell more animal products to the American people.

If we could increase the sale of animal products by 6 percent, there wouldn't be any surplus grain. Animal products are better food. They are more tasty and more necessary to give completely satisfactory nutrition. From the farmers' standpoint, it is the type of business which is safer and not so subject to violent price fluctuations. It is a means by which farmers can make a better living.

It tends to improve and build up our greatest heritage—productive soil. One reason that farm property in Ohio has been somewhat more stable is because over 70 percent of our production is marketed in the form of animal products. You are reaching toward the same goal in the Red River Valley.

Of course, in our legislative field we have been much more concerned with the controversial problem of farm-price supports with relation to parity. I have supported the program written into the Aiken-Anderson Act which is now in effect, although I do not believe it is the ultimate solution. In general, the principle of Government minimum-price support for any commodity is inconsistent with the free-price competitive system, just as maximum price fixing and the minimum wage are opposed to such a system. But I believe that special considerations justify a farm-price-support program at a reasonable level, just as I also believe that they justify a minimum wage.

The farmer after all is a manufacturer and his problems are very much the same as those of industry, except that he must know more about more things, and has certain obvious disadvantages. Besides the gamble of the weather, he has to sell in a market which fluctuates much more violently than does the market on manufactured goods. If a depression comes, its first effect is to reduce the prices of commodities, including farm commodities, in the various free markets. If the bottom drops out of farm prices, as it has in times past, all agricultural purchasing power is destroyed and this soon brings about unemployment in industry and a downward spiral of deflation. Nothing is so likely to start a depression as a disastrous fall in farm prices. I believe that at some point the Government ought to step in to prevent any such dangerous drop in farm prices and to maintain them at some reasonable relation to other prices. Just where the price support should begin is difficult to determine, and no exact formula can be written to apply to all crops. It ought not to be too high, because if it is too high it means acreage limitations and marketing quotas on every principal product. Under a Government guaranty of 100 percent of parity on all products as recently proposed, the farmer will be told not only how many acres he can plant of wheat, corn, cotton, soy beans, but even how many hogs he can raise, how many beef cattle he can feed, how many dairy cattle he can keep. In effect the Department of Agriculture would be telling every farmer in detail how he must run his own farm just exactly as the labor-socialist government runs the farms and the farmers in England.

Furthermore, I do not think any plan ought to involve a subsidy from the taxpayer. The support price ought to give the farmer a fair price, but if it is a fair price to the farmer, it must also be a fair price to the consumer. Of course there may be a Government loss involved in support price operations, but such operation ought to be designed at a price at which the product bought can be ultimately sold to the consumer and which will be a fair price for him to pay. The price should be high enough to encourage adequate production and protect agricultural purchasing power. It should not be so high as to encourage farmers to plant more than can possibly be used, or to raise a crop for which their farms are not well adapted.

I have always thought that this subsidy business was a fraud. It enables an administration to promise a farmer high prices and a consumer low prices at the same time. The idea is that the difference is charged to the taxpayer, but in the long run the consumer and farmer pay most of the taxes and so they really do not get the benefits which are promised them—in fact, they get a bill

for the benefits almost before they receive them, including the cost of a vast Government bureau engaged in working out the subsidy idea. I do not believe that the farmer wants a subsidy. He merely wants a fair price from the consumer for his product.

In emergency situations production control may be necessary. Again the farmer is at a disadvantage. The manufacturer who can't sell his product closes down his plant and his employees get unemployment compensation. The farmer can't shut down his plant and if the unfortunate time comes when there is no market for his goods, he can only escape disaster by some limitation on production which can only be effective through Government regulations.

But any such regulation effort ought to be confined to very serious emergencies. After all each farmer knows best how to make his farm productive. He knows the correct crops to be sown each year, the number of animals he can handle. Production controls are imposed on an arbitrary basis which will always be unfair to many, particularly the small farmer.

In short, we have progressed in this country because the American farmer has been free—free to learn, free to try his own methods, free to experiment with the productive value of his own farm. In this complicated modern life freedom must perhaps be sometimes modified, but if we are to progress at all its essence must be maintained.

Liberty has been the basis of all American life, it has been the cause of the tremendous success of our people. The Department of Agriculture itself has taught the farmer that his improvement lies in better methods and increased production. Let us not turn to a regimented system in which the Government shall direct all agriculture as it also proposes to direct commerce, industry, and the daily lives of 40,000,000 American families. The issue is somewhat obscured at this moment by the war emergency, but the farmer faces the same fundamental issue as the rest of the American people—liberty against socialism. I have no doubt of the result because the American farmer thinks for himself, and proposes to act for himself.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of September 29, 1951]

TAFT'S VISIT SHOWS HIS STRENGTH

ROBERT ALFONSO TAFT made a big impression in North Dakota, particularly among Republicans, during his visit to the State last week for the dedication of the new Minnkota REA cooperative power plant at Grand Forks.

His words in defense of cooperatives indicated an understanding of the cooperative tax problem that will be appealing to many others than farmers. They were the more significant because they came from a Republican conservative who had just helped lead a successful Senate fight to resist taxation of cooperative reserves.

His comments relative to the farm price support program, if not the kind of talk usual on the part of a politician because of their frankness, will appeal to many because they also indicated that the Ohio Senator appreciates the importance of price supports to farmers.

Farmers are among the most ruggedly individualistic people in the country and think for themselves a lot more and a lot straighter than do many businessmen and professional men. There are many among them who have long doubted the wisdom of a support level so high that it makes it appear to consumers, who far outnumber them in their representation in Congress, that price supports are the cause of high food prices. They also have been able to see as well as anybody the fallacy of a program, such as that espoused

by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, which promises high prices to the producer and low prices to the consumer without cost to anybody. Furthermore, they respect a fellow who speaks his mind.

TAFT's very willingness to come into an agricultural State and speak forthrightly on two topics as vital as these is an indication of why he cuts as much ice as he does in Congress and why he is deemed the outstanding Republican Presidential prospect. Much of his strength lies in his candor and courage, and those who think the Republicans should nominate him think that his willingness to speak out boldly on issues will prove popular with the voters at the polls.

The Republicans have gone into three past elections with Presidential candidates who have had little more for a platform than a smile and a promise to be a nice guy. Result: They haven't put one of their boys in the White House since 1928.

TAFT may not be a personality-plus gladiator. But his nomination by the GOP in 1952 might prove that the people of the United States would like to have something besides a fellow with a big smile and a resonant voice in the mansion on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Address by Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, on Democratic Women's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

MR. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, on Democratic Women's Day, September 27, 1951, at Washington, D. C.

I believe that all of us, as we enter politics, particularly those of us who enter rather late in life, are enormously impressed by the great interest and activity of women in both political parties. Mrs. Ross' stirring address helps bring home this fact.

Her address also mentions something which I had not previously realized, although I have been well aware of President Truman's insistence on the appointment of able women to high posts, namely, that he has made more appointments of women to highly important policy-making positions than any other President, and more than have been made by all Republican Presidents combined. I congratulate the President on his determination which resulted in these merited appointments, and on his leadership, and I congratulate Mrs. Ross on her admirable address which deserves a wide reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

If anything were needed to confirm my confidence that the Democratic Party will continue to be the dominant party of this country—of course I am thinking of the oncoming election—just to find myself in a large group of Democratic women like this

would suffice, so great is my respect for the effectiveness of Democratic women's efforts.

I feel sure that no political party ever before had among its women an organized force so strong, so well-informed on issues, so influential in politics and government, as our party has now. I also am inclined to believe that the women of the country on the whole lean pretty strongly toward the Democratic Party. I understand that in all States where a check was made on the relative registration of men and women in the last national campaign, that women in all of them outnumbered the men. We may assume, therefore, that more women voted than men, and the majority democratic, inasmuch as President Truman and a Democratic Congress won the election, though there is no way of proving this.

It is not surprising that the Democratic Party has a strong hold upon women, for it stands for things in which women are vastly interested. Women always are keenly interested in conditions that vitally affect the well-being of their families and of the community-at-large. The community-at-large, to the modern woman, means almost the world-at-large. Before women ever had any political power, able aggressive leaders among them, as groups and individuals, tried to influence conditions under which they lived, by bringing persuasion upon men.

The policies of this Government of ours and the action of those who conduct it bear directly and inescapably, we all know, upon the physical, spiritual, and material welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country, and in this period they involve the well-being of people all over the world. It is plain then that if women are to be influential and helpful in shaping the course of this Government, now when there is needed the best effort that both men and women can give, the place for them to start is in the political party, inasmuch as the party system prevails in this country. There it is that candidates are launched for the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, for Congress. There it is that platforms are drafted which define the party's position on great public questions and on which candidates are to stand before the people. The Democratic Party encourages the political activity of women. It has taken the lead in bringing women into its policy-making councils. It has taken the lead in giving them equal representation on its national committee and gave equal representation on the platform committee 8 years before the opposition party followed suit. Down the line into the precincts, generally speaking, women work shoulder to shoulder with the men. I have seen them in many places supplying most of the leadership.

As for women's participation in the Government itself, there is no doubt that President Truman has made more appointments of women to highly important policy-making posts than any other President before him, and more than all Republican Presidents combined. It is no longer unique to see a woman in a high-level, high-salaried Federal post on involving responsibility which calls for exercise of judgment and independent decisions. That is a development which we Democratic women are entitled to gloat over a little.

One year from now the two great political parties will be pitted against each other in a fiercely fought contest for control of the National Government. The "outs" are desperately wanting to get in. Some of their leaders, especially in the Congress, are already striving to break down public confidence in the administration by fair means or foul. Some use means so foul indeed that the more scrupulous party colleagues refuse either to sanction or condone them. It remained though for the one woman in the Senate to speak out in scathing condemnation of these unfair, unscrupulous tactics.

It now appears that the vicious attack waged of late upon the President's policies has only served to strengthen him with the people. However, the bombardment, we may be sure, will increase in the months ahead and propaganda, designed to discredit the administration, will be released in all directions. We, avowed supporters of the administration, will do well to recognize the power propaganda has to sway public opinion and that public opinion sways elections. It is surprising how gullible really intelligent people can be. I was impressed with this when a few months ago I found myself in a company of friends in a Midwestern State and was asked to tell something about important people and happenings in Washington. Is this true, is that true, I was asked about one high official and another, questions that revealed the most fantastic ideas gleaned from rumors, broadcasts, and probably the Chicago Tribune. I was happy to have the opportunity to set my friends straight on a number of things, which I flatter myself, I did. A bright woman visiting Washington last week mentioned to me an able highly placed official and asked what about him? "The rumor in our State," she said, "is that he is senile." The State being Wisconsin, it was easy to guess the source of that rumor.

We Democratic women can, and should, constitute ourselves a Voice—with a capital "V"—to correct misapprehensions that come to our attention and to refute unwitting or willful misrepresentations about our high officials, their policies, and official acts.

No better-qualified women could be found for such service than you in this company. You are interested in public affairs, as your presence here bears witness. You read, you listen to discussions of issues over radio and television, you follow closely, no doubt, important developments in the Government.

We Democratic women can hold our heads high with pride in the good account of itself our party has given in this crucial period, as it has done in other crucial periods when the country looked to it for leadership.

No President ever before faced conditions and problems so complex, so difficult to cope with, so challenging, as those that confronted President Truman when he took over the Presidency. He has handled them with commonsense, statesmanship, and such courage as is seldom matched in the public life. He has shown the vision for which the times called and boldness in action.

The President has, at all times, been forthright with the people, letting them know his position on controversial and non-controversial matters, in down-to-earth language that cannot be misunderstood. When he takes a stand on an issue, he stays by it. Not all the badgering of critics can force him to recede from it or to compromise. As for the President's major policies, those of greatest importance to us and the world outside, he inspires confidence in them by his own unshakable confidence that they are right and critics, try as they have, have been unable to show that they are not sound.

It is extremely doubtful whether a President of the opposition party would have had the courage, the daring, to commit the might of this Nation, its material and human treasures, to remove the threat of communism to our liberties, and to stop its inroads upon the liberties of other people of the world. Not since Theodore Roosevelt's day has that party put in the White House a strong, courageous leader, and it repudiated him.

It is clear, by now, to the American people that only by powerful, costly measures can the march of communism be stopped. No longer do we think of it as a vague concept far removed from us. The country sees it for what it is, a real, live danger, and is taking Stalin and his cohorts at their word in declaring their intention to bring the whole world into subjection to their doc-

trine; that is to say, to cast us all into one mold, our spirits, our minds, words, and acts, to be subject to domination by the state.

The horrors of that domination have been brought home by word-of-mouth account of the experience of a fine, self-respecting Latvian family, displaced persons, whom my son and I have had for a year on a farm down in Maryland. To hear our tenant tell in broken English, as I did last Sunday, of the physical hardship, the mental anguish, inflicted upon him and his family by the Russian Communists would wring your heart, loss of brothers, sisters, parents, presumably killed or sent to Siberia, loss of home and all of their possessions. He and his family fled from their country in two horse-drawn wagons to the Baltic Sea, there to take a ship to the American zone in Germany. Pointing to dishes on the table and furniture, I interrupted to ask if they took any such things with them. "Only clothes," he said. "I said good-by to my home, good-by to my furniture, good-by to my dishes, my cows, my sheep." Imagine the feeling with which they said good-by to their native land, upon reaching the Baltic Sea. Another Latvian at our farm was a bookkeeper in a small Latvian town. His wife and three children were at the farm of her parents some distance away when the Iron curtain dropped between him and them. Said he, it was as if Mr. Ross were in Washington—referring to my son—and his wife and children were at the farm, expecting him to come down, and the Russians came in between them and he never saw them again. Since this thing happened to that Latvian, he has never seen or heard of his family, except once through a Communist who, taunting him with friendliness to capitalism, told him that his wife had been sent to Siberia to be given over to a Mongol. One wonders that these people could ever smile again. We cannot make them believe that such things will not happen here. They live in constant dread. The man says the Communists will come, asking first for Charles (that is he) and then it will be for Mr. Ross.

It is accounts like these from victims that make us realize the enormity of this evil thing we combat. A matter so grave involving the liberty, the soul's welfare, even the lives of countless human beings, transcends in importance any partisan, political considerations or the political fortunes of individuals. It is shocking that any element among us would try to make political capital out of any phase of it.

In seeking to exalt the merits of Democratic policies and of our leaders, we women, it is safe to say, will adhere strictly to honest, ethical measures. We will not represent that this administration has made no mistakes. We will not contend that every person connected with it is able and worthy. In an organization so enormous as this Government it would be impossible to prevent unworthy persons creeping in here and there; and certainly the President cannot keep his eye on every person down the line.

We can in all good conscience urge the truth that the country has, in President Truman, an able courageous statesman, who is actuated by one single purpose, that is to use the power of his office to serve the best interests of this country, to keep its social and economic structure sound and stable, and to help countries in the outside world gain the strength to join hands in the effort we are making to bring an end to this menace which hangs over them and us. We can also exalt the fact that the President has surrounding him in his Cabinet and in all the high-ranking posts related to Defense persons of outstanding ability whose integrity cannot be questioned.

The progress the country has made under President Truman's leadership is evident. Never before was the country as a whole so

prosperous, so contented, so far as domestic affairs are concerned. The effectiveness of foreign policies is already evident in the Western World and the promise they give of further effectiveness merits, we believe, the sanction of the public.

We have reason for faith that our Nation will emerge in due time from the long seige of strain and sacrifice occasioned by the Communistic threat, to fulfill its destiny as a free country. My own confidence in such an outcome is strengthened by my conviction that God Himself had a hand in founding of this Government, intending that here the souls of men and women might be free and that here they might develop their God-given faculties of mind, body, and soul in ways of their own choosing. Otherwise, how can we account for there having been raised up from so small a population such a large number of brilliant, high-minded, self-effacing statesmen to lay the foundations strong and deep as they did? We have kept faith with them. By our attitude toward the outside world, we have shown that we are the Christian Nation we profess to be; and recognize that we are our brother's keeper. We have defended and preserved our heritage. We know that we are right in the position we are now taking upon this evil thing called Communism. Therefore, we have reason for confidence that if we trust in divine guidance as our forefathers did in launching this Government, that we shall see a victorious end to our struggle to assure no interference from a foreign power with our form of government, or any of our affairs, and to release the hold it has already gained in the outside world.

The Federal Youth Corrections Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article entitled "The Federal Youth Corrections Program," written by James V. Bennett, Director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, which appeared in the January-February 1951 edition of the Prison World.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our preoccupation with the war in Korea and our preparations to meet the serious national emergency with which we are confronted have served to obscure somewhat an important new piece of Federal legislation. Late in September, the President approved the Federal Youth Corrections Act and opened the way to a more intelligent approach toward the treatment of young persons who come into conflict with the laws of the United States. The new legislation rejects the basically punitive approach which has characterized much of the administration of justice for hundreds of years. It recognizes that the traditional methods of handling young men and women have fallen quite short of their objective and do not offer full protection to society.

The act applies to persons under the age of 22 who have committed Federal offenses and places a completely new tool in the hands of the judges. They may, of course,

continue to place more hopeful offenders on probation and they still may sentence under the provisions of adult laws. But there are three important new provisions: (1) The court may commit to the Youth Board a young offender for treatment for an indefinite period up to 6 years or; (2) if the court believes the youth requires treatment or supervision (e. g. a sex offender) for a period of more than 6 years it may commit him for an indefinite period not to exceed the maximum penalty provided for the offense; and (3) if the court is uncertain as to how he should proceed he may place the youth in the custody of the Attorney General for study, diagnosis, and recommendation prior to the imposition of sentence.

When a youth is sentenced under one of the new provisions, he will be placed in a classification center where he will be studied intensively by a group of trained specialists. Their reports will be forwarded to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons who will recommend to the newly created Youth Correction Division of the Board of Parole a program of treatment for the consideration of the Division. The Board, in cooperation with the Director will determine the institutional program. Reports and recommendations of the Bureau of Prisons will be submitted periodically to the Youth Division for their consideration and action. The Board will determine whether further institutional treatment is necessary and under what conditions he may be released. The conditional release of all youth offenders and their unconditional discharge rests exclusively with the Division.

This new procedure recognizes that not a few young men who come before Federal courts are like Bob:

Bob was a completely irresponsible 20-year-old youngster. Enormously egotistical, lacking in respect for authority, maladjusted sexually he began having difficulties in early childhood. Teachers found it virtually impossible to maintain order when he was in their classes. He was 14 when he was first committed to a training school for car theft. Within a few months he was back in the community where he was involved in a continual series of burglaries, robberies, and sex offenses, which were interrupted briefly by periods of juvenile institutions and jails. Because of his behavior his parents refused to permit him to return home although they continued to provide him with money and clothing. When he finally came to Federal court, after stealing a series of cars and driving them across State lines, he received another sentence of a few months. Studies by psychiatrists and psychologists and other professional people held out some hope for reclaiming the young man if there were sufficient time for treatment. However, almost before Bob's problems could be properly understood by the staff, he was on his way back to the street. He resumed his predatory activities and now is back in prison for a long term.

Had Bob been committed as a youth offender there would have been adequate time to study him and plan a program for him which might have held greater promise of his eventual adjustment in the community.

The case of Joe was a bit more spectacular, perhaps, and also presented problems which were almost without solution under the traditional method of sentencing. Joe's name flashed briefly in the headlines when at 22 he staged an armed postal robbery in Chicago. By any standards, he was a pretty good youngster. The oldest of seven children, he had gone to work after finishing high school to assist in supporting the family. His father was in poor health and was chronically unemployed. Financial pressures in the home mounted. Finally Joe, who had never before been in trouble, got a gun

and tried a direct approach to financial security. The law is inflexible in cases of this sort. The result, a mandatory sentence of 25 years. Joe is still in the penitentiary. He must serve eight and one-third years before he may apply for parole. He's doing pretty well in the institution, but whether when he has finally squared his "debt" to society he will still be a decent person with a healthy respect for law and order is a matter for conjecture.

The cases of these young men represent the extremes of the problems which have confronted correctional authorities both in State and Federal systems for years. The practice of sentencing youthful offenders to definite prison terms has hamstrung progressive correctional methods. The result has been a steadily mounting number of youths who once having been committed to an institution returned time after time.

The act also contemplates the establishment of a wide variety of institutional programs for youths—schools, hospitals, forestry and other camps, and also authorizes the treatment of these young and sometimes accidental offenders in specially selected training programs under public or private auspices.

Every youth will be returned to his home or some place selected for him on conditional release at least 2 years before the end of his commitment period. Thus, continuing help will be provided in applying the training and education which he has received. The responsibility for providing the necessary guidance after the youth returns home will not rest with professionally trained workers alone. The act makes provision for enlisting volunteer sponsors—intelligent, stable, well-adjusted private citizens—who can thus share in reclaiming young lives. This is a significant provision because it recognizes that the community must accept some responsibility for the problems of its young people. Also, it recognizes that many private citizens are equipped to make real contributions to the lives of youngsters who have previously been deprived of the counsel and help of parents or capable adults.

A final provision of the act looks beyond the problem of youth and crime and focuses attention on the fact that adequate care of youth offenders is but one segment, though a tremendously important one, of the vexing problem of crime. Recognizing this, the act creates an Advisory Corrections Council comprised of United States judges and administrative officers who will meet to study the prevention of crime and the treatment and correction of all offenders. The committee will also make recommendations to Congress for the improvement of the administration of criminal justice and bring about closer relations between the courts, the prisons, and the law-enforcement agencies.

The new legislation had its origins in the work of two important committees. In April 1938, the American Law Institute, because of its concern about the alarming increase in the number of youthful offenders, appointed a Committee on Criminal Justice for Youth. Two years of work on the part of this committee culminated in the drafting of the Model Youth Authority Act which proposed the creation of a new agency for the treatment of young men and women. Shortly after the publication of the report of that committee, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court appointed a special committee to study the punishment for crime. The studies of this committee enabled them to adopt many features of the model act to Federal usage and led to the drafting of the present statute. When the legislation was before the Congress, it was given the active support of many national groups—the American Bar Association, the American Prison Association, the American

Law Institute, veterans' groups, labor organizations, and many of similar groups. The endorsement of the bill by these organizations served to give evidence of the strong interest of the public in providing more adequate resources for the care of young people in trouble.

Taken all in all, the act has been hailed by judges, lawyers, and workers in the correctional field as one of the most progressive steps in improving the administration of the Federal criminal law. Plans are currently under way to organize the facilities necessary to the administration of the act as promptly as funds permit. It is expected that the Advisory Corrections Council will be organized within the next few weeks and that the President will appoint the members of the new Board of Parole. At the outset, the Bureau of Prisons expects to set aside several existing institutions for youth offenders and to establish its new classification centers at those units. Further experience in the administration of the act will provide the necessary background for the long-range planning of additional facilities.

Small Business Gets Smaller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Small Business Gets Smaller," published in the Boston Traveler of October 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS GETS SMALLER

When the defense production program got into first gear it was announced that every effort would be made to protect the stake of small business. Official statements of Defense Department policy were pledges that there would be no unwarranted concentration of defense contracts.

Defense Mobilizer Wilson has verbally bolstered that policy by repeated assurances that every effort would be made to safeguard the normal peacetime economy.

Unfortunately developments have belied these pronouncements.

It wasn't until last week that President Truman got around to nominate Telford Taylor to head the Small Defense Plant Administration to watch over the interests of small business. Yet such an agency was provided for in the Defense Production Act, which has been in force for many months.

This belated action followed extremely disquieting reports from the Senate Small Business Committee—reports that should be of tremendous concern to New England, where, for all its giant corporations like General Electric, 85 percent of its 20,000 firms employ less than 100 workers.

These reports told a story of unprecedented concentration of defense contracts. Whereas in the last war 30 percent of the contracts were absorbed by 10 huge corporations, since the Korean invasion 40 percent of the defense contracts have gone to 10 companies. Whereas in the last war two-thirds of the defense contracts went to 100 giant firms, the

present allocation is nearly two-thirds to only 50 companies.

It is understandable that the large companies with their systems of multiple subsidiaries would be efficient outlets for a major share of defense work. Unfortunately, however, the Senate committee found that the top 50 concerns have received many contracts for which there were alternative sources of supply equally competent to perform the work satisfactorily.

Moreover, the committee reported that many of the larger firms have refused to contract to smaller concerns, preferring to hoard their contracts, and that as a result their backlog of orders has piled up and the pace of defense production has slowed down.

It appears from such findings that America may have been asleep and that the administration may have welched on its original assurances. It is vital for the Nation, especially so for New England, that the position of competitive small business should not be impaired. It appears, however, that impairment has occurred, both to the detriment of our normal economy and our arms program.

How alert is our New England delegation to the need for reversing this trend?

Farmers Home Administration Has Fine Record in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the fine record of accomplishment of one Government agency.

The Farmers Home Administration has done a fine job in my State of Minnesota and I believe the agency should be commended so as to encourage other governmental departments to do the job they are set up to do in the best possible manner.

I have found the officials of the Farmers Home Administration cooperative at all times when I have called upon them for reports or explanations. The people of my district have received good results in dealing with the agency in the matter of farm loans.

The following report of the activities of the Farmers Home Administration in Minnesota for the fiscal year 1951 indicates the extent of the operations there and I offer it as an example of what a good agency can do in giving real service to the people:

On June 30, 1951, the Farmers Home Administration closed its loaning and supervisory activities for the fiscal year. We feel that you may be interested in our presentation of a brief over-all picture of the main activities of this agency as it operates in the State of Minnesota during the year just passed.

As you know, the Farmers Home Administration operates three distinct types of loan programs wherein supervised credit is offered to that segment of farm population which is not eligible for local credit, namely, the production and subsistence loaning program (chattel loans), the farm ownership

program including insured real-estate loans and the farm housing program.

Production and subsistence loan program— Number of loans made and amount of funds loaned, 1951

Type of loan	Number of loans made	Percent of funds loaned to veterans	Average size of loans	Amount of funds used
Initial adjustment.....	683	0.61	\$2,700	\$1,846,230
Subsequent.....	971	.63	790	764,125
Annual.....	635	.25	580	366,825
Disaster.....	86	-----	760	65,045
Farm.....	3	-----	2,130	6,480
Total.....	2,378	.57	-----	3,048,665

Of the 683 initial P. & S. loans made in 1951 a total of 399 loans in the amount of \$1,085,100 were made to World War veterans. The balance of \$761,130 was advanced to 284 nonveteran families. You will also note that 971 subsequent loans were made to borrowers who were already on our rolls. Of this number 585 were war veterans who received a total of \$466,615. The balance of \$297,510 was advanced to 386 non-veteran-borrower families. Of the 721 annual and disaster loans made in this State for crop production purposes only a very small percentage were made to World War veterans, in the majority of instances their needs were taken care of through regular loan channels.

As in past years the above summary clearly points out that veterans are receiving the major portion of FHA-loan funds in this State, this being in accordance with requirements set forth by the Congress in their annual appropriations to the Farmers Home Administration. During the fiscal year of 1951 over 60 percent of all production and subsistence loan funds made available in this State were granted to veterans. Since the end of World War II 4,835 loans were processed for eligible veterans for a total of \$10,162,048.

Size of operating loans

	1937	1942	1943	1948	1949	1951
Number of loans						
Type of loan:						
Initial.....	1,718	3,118	1,189	596	1,504	675
Subsequent.....	2,171	2,703	1,806	556	1,019	971
Annual.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	134	252	635
Disaster.....	0	0	0	0	41	86
Farm.....	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total.....	3,889	5,821	2,996	1,286	2,816	2,370
Amount (in thousands of dollars)						
Total operating loan funds.....	\$2,340	\$4,333	\$2,563	\$1,605	\$4,334	\$3,038

1 Not available

The foregoing table is set up to illustrate the amount of funds used to establish a borrower family in the business of farming over the past 14-year period. You will recall at the present time the maximum amount of money that can be advanced to a borrower in any one fiscal year is \$3,500. Generally speaking in the south half of the State of Minnesota this amount of money is quite inadequate for establishing an operator in the business of farming under present conditions. A tenant farmer must have reliable and satisfactory equipment if he is to stay in competition for good farms and productive soils. The two bills now in Congress, namely, the Magnuson bill in the Senate and the Jones bill in the House of

Representatives proposes to eliminate some of these difficulties.

TREND OF OPERATING LOAN CASE LOAD

One thousand six hundred and eight active, operating loans were paid in full during the fiscal year of 1951. During the preceding fiscal year final payments were made in 1,157 accounts. Whereas a total of 638 new loans were made during the past fiscal year we actually ended the period with a decrease of 523 operating loans. The 1,608 families who paid their accounts in full in 1951 did so either from farm income or have reduced their indebtedness to a point where they could be readily refinanced through local commercial credit channels. In the year just past the sum of \$4,416,000 was collected and returned to the United States Treasury from chattel borrowers in the State of Minnesota. In looking toward the fiscal year of 1952 our field personnel estimate that they expect to make 1,138 initial-adjustment loans which is approximately 468 more than those made during the past year. The total dollar consideration for these loans would be \$3,333,400. The total number of all types of operating loans estimated that would be made for the 1952 fiscal year is 2,484 for a consideration of approximately \$4,494,450. However, we do know that the appropriations for this fiscal year will in no way permit the aiding of this number of eligible needy farm families.

In November 1946 the Farmers Home Administration was created by the merger of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Security Administration. At that time the agency was charged with the responsibility of collecting approximately 32,000 unsecured accounts which were created during the drought and depression years of the thirties. Under the provisions of Public Law 518 and 731 cancellations, compromises, or adjustments were permitted in dealing with borrowers whose financial conditions did not permit payment in full. Of the 32,000 accounts approximately 23,000 have been processed at the end of this fiscal year. Of the 23,000 settled 8,670 have been paid in full and approximately 14,330 settled through compromise, adjustment, or cancellation.

FARM-OWNERSHIP PROGRAM

During the fiscal year of 1951, 204 farm-ownership loans were made for a total of \$1,843,326. Of this number 102 direct farm-ownership loans were made to eligible veterans in the amount of \$996,160. Seventy-two of these 102 loans were made for the purpose of purchasing family-type farms, 11 loans for the purpose of farm enlargement of non-economic units, and the remaining 19 for the development of farms presently owned by veterans. A total of 93 insured loans in the amount of \$624,501 were also processed. The foregoing sum represents the amount of cash advanced by insurance companies, local banks, and private lenders. To this amount could be added 10 percent or more which represents the down payment or equity the borrowers had in their real property at the time the loan was made.

Of the 93 insured loans made during the past fiscal year 42 were for the purpose of purchasing farms, 17 for the purpose of enlarging present units and 34 for the development of either land or placing of adequate buildings on the tracts. In addition to this amount, nine subsequent loans were processed in the amount of \$22,665.

As of June 30 there were 1,788 active farm ownership loans in the State of Minnesota. Of this number there are 326 insured and 1,432 direct loans. During the fiscal year of 1951 there was collected the sum of \$760,-952 from direct farm ownership loan borrowers and from insured loans the sum of \$128,175. In the fiscal year of 1950 the sum of \$655,166 was collected. This would indi-

cate that during the year just ended we have collected \$234,081 more than that which was collected in the previous fiscal year of 1950.

In the year just past 111 farm ownership borrowers paid their real-estate loans in full. It may be interesting to note that the average size of the farm ownership loan made in Minnesota during 1951 was \$9,337.

FARM HOUSING PROGRAM

During the past year we made the following farm housing loans: Section 502-62 for \$252,939, section 503-14 for \$45,140, section 504-2 for \$1,855, section 504-1 for \$1,000 (\$500 loan and \$500 grant), totaling 79 loans for \$300,934. Veterans received 30 percent of the housing loans made during the past fiscal year; 40 percent of the borrowers were full-time operators, 37 percent part time, and 2 percent landlords. The Government holds a first mortgage on 29 of the total 79 loans made during the year. The average size of the farm housing loan is \$3,809. Of the 79 farm housing loans made 24 were for construction of new dwellings, 13 for the construction of new barns, the balance for enlargement and alteration of dwellings and outbuildings. As of June 30 there was a total of 185 farm housing loans made in Minnesota and of this number there were no delinquent installments.

Disposition of Surplus Populations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested in the problem of the refugees in Western Europe, as well as the general question of excess populations in some of these countries. On October 3 the Washington Post contained an illuminating editorial on the subject. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MIGRATION CONFERENCE

One price of economic stability and prosperity in Europe, says the International Refugee Organization, is the migration of 5,000,000 surplus people to other lands. At least 3,000,000 of these potential emigrants are in Italy and 1,500,000 in Germany. Others are scattered through Greece, Austria, and the Netherlands. The effect of the IRO's report is to emphasize the international character of the problem and to center great interest in the international conference on migration that opened in Naples yesterday.

Surplus population in any country means unemployment, poverty, and unrest, which put an unnatural strain upon any social or economic system. In Italy, for example, an exceedingly high birth rate keeps the population growing faster than economical opportunities. Italians are emigrating at the rate of about 175,000 persons a year, but this falls short of siphoning off the annual increase in the working population. Consequently, Italy is bedeviled by a chronic burden of about 2,000,000 unemployed out of a population of 46,500,000. While the main burden of this economic wastage falls upon Italy herself, the repercussions are felt throughout the free world. The discontent gener-

ated by such conditions is certain to spread, and population that should be an asset remains a liability because it is misplaced.

Many countries in Latin America as well as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have a direct interest in absorbing the population overflow from Europe. They have unclaimed land to be cultivated and growing industries in need of manpower. It is of great interest to the free world that the overpopulated countries be strengthened by reducing their surpluses and that the underpopulated countries be strengthened by increasing their manpower. Certainly these interlocking interests should dictate the acceptance of an international program that will extend and systematize the migratory movements which the IRO has sponsored in a rather limited fashion.

The chief hurdle to clear, of course, is the financing of this great shifting of peoples. The IRO estimates the cost of moving a migrant to a new home at \$276. The International Labor Organization, however, has placed the shipping costs of migrants going to South America or Australia at \$700 to \$800. These expenses cannot be loaded upon the United States. For the most part they should be borne by the countries directly benefiting, or by the migrants themselves when that is possible.

This country can do a great deal, however, by taking the initiative and by supplying some of the tools required to make the migrating families assets instead of liabilities. The mutual security bill authorizes \$10,000,000 that could be used for this purpose. When this bill has been passed, the State Department plans to call a conference of the interested governments in line with the recent appeal from Queen Juliana, of the Netherlands. Joint efforts can go a long way toward curing this maladjustment in the free world without any change in present immigration laws.

Repeal of Tax Exemptions For Certain Government Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "One Improvement," published in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of October 1, 1951, favoring the Senate action in the adoption of the Williams amendment to the tax bill to repeal the special tax privilege extended the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ONE IMPROVEMENT

Generally speaking, the tax bill now pending in the Senate is a great deal worse than the bill previously passed by the House, which was itself inadequate.

Not only is that true, but most of the efforts to improve the bill on the floor of the Senate have failed.

However, one important floor amendment, offered by Senator WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, was adopted and that amendment improves the bill passed by the House, as well

as the one reported by the Senate Finance Committee. The Williams amendment, if approved in conference as it should be, would end the practice adopted a few years ago of paying the President of the United States and all Members of Congress a portion of their salaries in tax-exempt allowances.

There should be no tax exemptions to any taxpayer beyond the small sums (now \$800 for each person) allowed for purchase of the barest necessities of life.

Senator WILLIAMS has started at the right place as exemptions to high officials are the least excusable of all exemptions and should be the first to be eliminated. However, there are other tax exemptions which in the aggregate are far more costly than the indefensible tax-free allowances now granted to the President and Members of Congress. The worst two of these exemptions are those given the owners of tax-exempt securities (issued by States and political subdivisions) and to charitable trusts which are charitable only in name and are actually tax-dodging trusts. There are numerous other exemptions in the tax law.

There should be no tax exemptions of any kind. Senator WILLIAMS with the support of the Senate, has made a good start toward eliminating them. But neither Senator WILLIAMS nor the Congress should stop there. The principle involved in the Williams amendment is important. But the amount of money affected by the amendment is trivial when compared to what escapes through other loopholes in the tax laws. All of the loopholes should be closed.

Owen Lattimore's Position on Far Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Vigorously Denied Often Before," by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star yesterday. It deals with the charge by Harold Stassen regarding the attitude of Owen Lattimore on far eastern policy.

These being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIGOROUSLY DENIED OFTEN BEFORE—STAMP OF "ARCHITECT OF OUR FAR EASTERN POLICY" PLACED ON LATTIMORE BY TESTIMONY OF STASSEN AT HEARING

(By Constantine Brown)

Former Gov. Harold Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, testified under oath on Monday before the McCarran subcommittee that the State Department had tended to implement the program advocated by Prof. Owen Lattimore in regard to the Far East. He also testified under oath that this line was intended to help the Communist domination of China.

Had it not been for the fact that in 1950 Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY denounced Professor Lattimore as the architect of our far eastern policies, a statement strongly denied by the Baltimore professor and the State Department, the testimony of Mr. Stassen would have been interesting but not spectacular.

In the light of the accusations and counter accusations which have been exchanged since Senator MCCARTHY pointed his finger at Professor Lattimore, the Stassen documented testimony has become sensational. The president of the University of Pennsylvania is a highly respected national figure. He has kept completely out of the picture in the political battle around McCarthyism. Moreover, he is considered a liberal Republican.

His background gives weight to the testimony he presented undramatically to the McCarran subcommittee. Mr. Stassen was a member of the conference group invited by the State Department to discuss the policy of this country in the Far East with particular emphasis on China. The witness presented to the committee the stenographic notes of his own statements at the meeting which lasted from October 6 to October 9, 1949. This document was considered secret until Monday. Mr. Stassen put it in the record because he said this classification did not help the security of the country and the minutes of all the proceedings should have been made public at the end of that conference.

The former Governor of Minnesota told the Senators that the conference was dominated by a group headed by Professor Lattimore. It recommended that we consider the formulation of a policy in the Far East as a long-term problem because Russian communism was not nearly as aggressive as Hitler's nazism. And in any event, whatever aggressive intentions Moscow might have they were directed primarily at Europe. This is a point of view which is debatable. But Professor Lattimore also urged strongly that America recognize at an early date the Communist regime in China. Because of the anti-Communist hysteria in the United States the public might not approve of such a step, so Professor Lattimore advised the State Department to have Britain and India move first and we would follow shortly thereafter. He also insisted that we turn over Formosa to the Reds and if they wanted the British crown colony of Hong Kong we should allow them to take it. Mr. Stassen also related that the Lattimore group urged that we suspend all assistance to Nationalist China, that we oppose the blockade of the China coast by Chiang's navy, and that we extend all possible economic help to the Chinese Communists while cutting off all support to the non-Communists. All these points were strongly opposed by Mr. Stassen and the few others who shared his views, but without success. At the end of the 3-day round-table discussions, presided over by Ambassador at Large Philip C. Jessup, Mr. Stassen approached him and urged that Professor Lattimore's policies should not be followed. "There is a lot of logic in what Lattimore proposes," was Dr. Jessup's reply, Mr. Stassen said.

All these discussions would not necessarily have meant that Professor Lattimore was the architect of our policies in the Far East had not the State Department attempted to follow them fully. Evidence shown in the last 12 months indicates that we intended to recognize the Red regime at Peking and would not oppose admission to the United Nations, that we had decided to write off Formosa, that the State Department considered the Pacific of little importance to our security until the outbreak of the Korean war.

Mr. Stassen related a heretofore unknown dramatic episode which occurred at the White House when Secretary Acheson and Mr. Jessup urged President Truman in December 1949 to stop, with a "dramatic" statement, five ships which were on the high seas with arms and ammunition for Chiang's forces. Both diplomats said such a statement would help further the cause of peace in the world. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, who attended that White House

conference, protested violently and carried the day. Mr. Truman refused to recall the Navy transports "dramatically" or otherwise.

Mr. Stassen pointed out the speech made by Mr. Acheson in February 1950, defiling our line of vital interests in the Pacific—with Formosa and Korea excluded from that line; the secret circular sent to our diplomatic officers abroad to prepare foreign governments for the idea that Formosa might fall into Communist hands and that we did not consider that island of importance to our security as full acceptance of Professor Lattimore's "line." Its implementation was hampered by the aggression of the Communists in South Korea on June 25, 1950, when we engaged our Armed Forces.

Mr. Stassen's testimony places on Professor Lattimore the stamp of "architect of our eastern policy," which he has heretofore so vigorously denied.

Bowles Fills the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, the column of last Saturday by Marquis Childs, entitled "Ambassador to Nehru." This is a most interesting column by one of our most distinguished journalists. It deals with one of the great problems of our times, the relations of the American people with the Indian people, and I am glad to see that this most knowledgeable writer and observer advocates for India "a distinguished citizen who can talk to the Prime Minister with some sense of equality." I have only one reservation about inserting this column in the Record. I cannot believe that Mr. Childs knows enough about Ambassador Loy Henderson's career in India to say that he was not "a conspicuous success." There are hazards which surround any able man, on any job which he may undertake. Mr. Childs suggests that Ambassador Henderson operated "under certain grievous handicaps." I do know from my own first-hand observation that Loy Henderson is one of our very ablest foreign service officers. I shall go further. In my close to 3 years in the State Department, and in my service at international conferences, I did not meet another foreign service officer for whom I formed a higher regard. I am sure that ex-Governor Bowles would be the last to ignore Mr. Henderson's experience, and I am sure he will rely heavily on his judgment and guidance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMBASSADOR TO NEHRU

(By Marquis Childs)

BOWLES FILLS THE BILL

In the good old days when sovereigns were sovereign, an ambassador was the personal messenger, intelligence agent, gift or insult bearer of the ruler. There was no nonsense about the advice and consent of anybody else in this highly personal relationship.

In the minor controversy over the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Ambassador to India the curious in-between status of present-day ambassadors is apparent. Today's envoy is certainly not the personal messenger of the President. But at the same time his closest relation is with the Chief Executive and the Secretary of State.

Senator ALFRED SMITH of New Jersey, a Republican who tries conscientiously to take a responsible part in carrying out bipartisan foreign policy, believes the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should have been consulted in advance about the naming of an Ambassador to India. He says he has nothing against Bowles personally.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, equally conscientious in working for bipartisanship, disagrees. In committee session he explained his belief that ambassadors are more or less in the classification of Cabinet officers, with the President having the right to make a personal choice. If the individual selected is of good moral character, then the Senate is obligated to approve the nomination.

No one can dispute SMITH on one point. That is the supreme importance of an able representative of the United States in New Delhi. In the current issue of *Look*, John Cowles points out that India is the last stronghold of democracy in Asia and adds:

"We will be making a blunder almost as calamitous as the one we made in China if we don't support the Nehru government in India, even though we may be irritated over what we think are inconsistencies in Nehru's attitude . . . If the United States is so foolish as to undermine Nehru's already weakened regime in India, the government or the chaos that comes after it in the world's second most populous nation may be far less to our liking."

To be Ambassador to Nehru—and that is what it comes down to—is not easy. He is a brilliant and often temperamental genius who proved a resourceful leader in the long revolution against British rule.

One of the keenest observers in New Delhi told me when I was there a year ago that Nehru has a prejudice against civil servants. It will do no good, so this advice went, sending a career diplomat. You must, said this knowledgeable foreigner, send a distinguished citizen who can talk to the Prime Minister with some sense of equality.

In many respects it seems to me that Bowles meets this prescription. He was a successful businessman, acquiring a competence making it possible for him to go into public life with a sense of independence. That had long been his ambition. As Price Administrator in Washington and later as Governor of Connecticut he showed political ability and finesse.

Loy Henderson, a career diplomat formerly Ambassador to India, was not a conspicuous success in New Delhi. He was under certain grievous handicaps and he never seemed able to enter into any real understanding with the Prime Minister.

In times of ferment such as the present, however, too much cannot be expected from an ambassador. Henderson is in an even tougher spot now as American Ambassador to Iran, where the oil crisis is boiling up so violently as to suggest the possibility of open conflict. The Iranian upheaval is fed by the same kind of violent nationalism that is, in part at least, at the root of Nehru's belief in Asia for the Asians.

While certainly most posts should be filled by career diplomats, no inflexible rule can be laid down. Incidentally, the State Department has figures to show that more career service men are today in top diplomatic jobs than ever before. Occasionally men outside

the Foreign Service have qualifications that especially fit them for a difficult assignment.

The task in India calls not only for an able ambassador but for a larger and more efficient staff than we have had there. It is an opportunity, above all, for the skillful presentation, through the United States Information Service, of the true picture of America in its relations with Asia.

Perfect ambassadors are like perfect marriages. They exist in heaven if they exist at all. It is important to get on as quickly as possible with the kind of bridge building essential between India and the United States.

Acheson-Stassen Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD* a very timely article entitled "Acheson-Stassen Conflict," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

ACHESON-STASSEN CONFLICT—MINNESOTA'S FORMER GOVERNOR PUTS NEW LIGHT ON DISCUSSIONS OF OUR CHINESE POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

Not long ago a slight discrepancy in the testimony of former Communist Louis Budenz—something that will be cleared up in a future hearing soon—brought on an artificially developed furor. Demands were made by administration Senators that the whole thing be subjected to a new investigation and that perjury might be involved.

Now, however, something far more serious has occurred which led Representative TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois, Republican, to demand in the House of Representatives that there be an investigation of "possible perjury" by Secretary of State Acheson in connection with contradictions in testimony that he gave on American policy toward China.

The administration is strangely silent and shows no such interest in conflicting testimony as it did in the Budenz incident.

Mr. SHEEHAN made it clear that the testimony of Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and now president of the University of Pennsylvania, "completely contradicts" Mr. Acheson's statements before the Senate Armed Services Committee when it was investigating the ouster of MacArthur last spring.

Mr. Acheson testified then:

"I said that throughout and up to the present time we have always recognized and supported this government (the Nationalists), and we have not aided, abetted, made plans to recognize or anything in that field, this other (Communist) government."

But former Governor Stassen has just testified before the Senate Internal Security Committee that he learned from the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan that Ambassador Jessup and Secretary Acheson once urged President Truman in 1949 or early 1950 to dramatize a plan to give no more aid

to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek by unloading ships of supplies meant for the Chinese Nationalists.

(*Error's Note.*—The State Department yesterday denied that either Mr. Acheson or Mr. Jessup had made such a proposal.)

Mr. Stassen also uncovered another contradiction far more sensational. He revealed that Owen Lattimore had far more to do with the shaping of State Department policy than Mr. Acheson, by his testimony, has heretofore led the public to believe.

Testifying under oath, Mr. Stassen swore that, until the Korean war broke out, the State Department followed 9 out of 10 of the recommendations made by Mr. Lattimore at an informal round-table conference held under the auspices of the Department of State in October 1949. The tenth recommendation was that the Communist regime be recognized.

Senator MCCARTHY has charged that Mr. Lattimore was the "architect" of American policy in China and that only the exposure of the whole trend of policy prevented recognition of the Communist regime in Peking by the United States.

The State Department has sought up to now to give the impression that the October 1949 conference was just an informal gathering of 31 outside participants—presumably scholars and experts in far-eastern affairs—and that Mr. Lattimore's part was quite insignificant. It seems that a stenographic record of the conference was kept, but the State Department a few days ago declined to furnish a copy of it to the Senate Internal Security Committee when it requested the document. So Mr. Stassen revealed what he knew of the conference. It developed that, when he was told in October 1949 that a stenographic record would be taken, he asked for a copy of the complete transcript but was refused, and he declined to participate unless he was to be given afterward at least a copy of the stenographer's record of what he himself said at the conference.

So Mr. Stassen supplied the Senate committee with his own remarks and then a summary of the notes he took at the conference. It seems strange that the State Department would attempt to suppress what was said by 31 persons outside the Federal service, but such is the behavior of bureaucracy that a secret classification was given to the conference record. When Mr. Stassen was given the copy only of what he himself had said it had on it a label warning him that the document contained "information affecting the national interest of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act."

Neither Mr. Stassen nor the Senators could see any security reasons for suppressing this. Certainly it wasn't in a class with that famous stenographic record of the Wake Island conference which the administration surreptitiously supplied to a newspaper. It was subsequently learned that the record by the stenographer at Wake Island was done on a keyhole basis, without any of the principal participants knowing it was being transcribed.

This is an excellent example of the abuses which the new Executive order by President Truman, requiring suppression of news at the source, makes possible. It helps the administration cover up any inaccurate statements any Government official may make and enables the administration to prevent the disclosure of facts that contradict testimony before congressional committees by administration witnesses. These are strange goings-on for a left wing administration which boasts of its interest in freedom of information.

Address of Hon. Katharine St. George,
of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, at a luncheon of the Eastern and Southern States Republican regional meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Monday, October 1, 1951:

These meetings of Republicans from all parts of the country are necessary and good for the soul; they are also necessary to keep the party alive and if they are properly conducted they might even be instrumental and helpful in winning the next national election.

Of course it is very pleasant to meet old friends, to indulge in plenty of back-slapping and to tell each other that all is right with the world and the party and that we are on the road to victory.

Well, this audience is adult and the facts are that we have lost five consecutive elections and that we had better pause and reflect on how and why this happened.

Our party is divided. It is split in two just as much as the Democratic Party is split in two and no amount of cheering is going to change the fact.

In my humble opinion, the Republican Party has lost the last three elections because it has shied away from the main issues and refused to face them, on account of the cleavage in our own ranks.

The Republican Party will never win an election and may become nothing more than a useless appendix in the body politic if it does not take a strong stand on the important issues facing this Nation and the world.

First it must stand for the ideals of the Republic versus democracy and it must proclaim that difference and teach it. Too few people know it and our young people are completely confused on the subject.

This country of ours was founded as a Republic. With the vision of true greatness, Benjamin Franklin answered the question as to what form of government the new Nation was to have with the reply: "A Republic, if you can keep it." In a republic the representatives of the people stand between them and the encroachments of government, they represent the rights of the individual, they are free to use their best judgment and by the same token, the people can remove them from office when they no longer fulfill the functions for which they were elected. In a democracy, which means direct rule of the people, or Demos, the representative is subject wholly to the will of the organized majority. He or she is nothing but a puppet parroting the ideas of pressure groups and therefore an easy pawn of the all-powerful state who curries favor and remains in power by the old method of giving the people bread and circuses in the days of ancient Rome. The modern version is: Tax, tax, spend, spend, elect, and elect. There is nothing new under the sun.

Democracies have always failed; that is an historical fact. They have always ended in

dictatorship or national socialism, which is the negation of individual freedom. The late Lord Lottian, at the beginning of World War II said, "There will be one certain victor in this war, whichever side wins—national socialism."

But in the last 12 years we have not proclaimed these facts, we have not stood for the basic principles of the Republic, with its well-designed checks and balances. Why? The answer is plain and obvious, because we have been at war. War and liberty cannot exist together. War economy cannot be a free economy and we have been living in a war economy for years. We have a generation, that has now grown up, who have never known anything else.

Why have we been at war almost continuously? Because we have been incapable of making a just and lasting peace. After both wars we lost the fruits of victory and now we are fighting in Korea because of the blunders caused by our lack of a sound foreign policy.

The reason for our losing the peace in both wars—the reason for our high taxes and our planned economy—the reason for our army of bureaucrats and our keeping of one party in power so long that it has become corrupt and arrogant is our foreign policy.

The Republican Party has got to take a firm and definite stand on foreign policy, win, lose, or draw. It must give the people a clear-cut choice on the only issue that holds the key to our present problems. If it does not do this it will not win and it will not deserve to.

It is not our place, nor is this the time to spell out what the foreign policy should be, but one thing is certain: it should be American.

This it has not been for a long time. We have a group of very intelligent people, many of them young, who have been educated in foreign ideologies. They are not patriotic because they consider patriotism a crude kind of nationalism that they despise. They are cosmopolitan, world citizens, they are the nationals of various other countries where they have lived and for whom they hope to be mistaken. They are pathetic because they are men and women without a country, they are laughed at abroad and not a part of their own people at home. Yet these people have been shaping our foreign policy for the past two decades.

The proof and the record are there and undeniable, that we have had traitors in places of high trust. Never, in any other modern state has any great nation had its foreign affairs in the hands of people, who through stupidity or lack of patriotism, or allegiance to other groups or nations, seemed bent on destroying them.

What has the Republican Party done in all this? Very little.

We have been afraid to discuss the subject, although you have to go back to it always as the root of all our troubles.

We are scared off by the silly talk of not changing horses in the middle of the stream. Well, the poor old nag has been in the middle of the stream for nigh on 20 years now, and I think it would be best to leave it to drown and try to swim to shore.

This administration is going to be hard to beat, let no one have any illusions on that.

They have the money, limitless money and they can always get more out of the taxpayers' pockets. They have fomented class hatred, something that had no place here, because if there ever was a classless society we have it. Any man can aspire and can become President and it is equally true that there are only three generations from shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves.

I would like to quote the words of a great American spoken in 1936. "What are these dangers that I see? The first is the arraignment of class against class. It has been freely predicted that if we were ever to have civil strife again in this country, it would come from the appeal to passion and prejudices that comes from the demagogues that would incite one class of our people against the other."

"In my time I have met some good and bad industrialists; I have met some good and bad financiers, but I have also met some good and bad laborers, and this I know, that permanent prosperity is dependent upon both capital and labor alike."

"And I also know that there can be no permanent prosperity in this country until industry is able to employ labor, and there certainly can be no permanent recovery upon any governmental theory of 'soak the rich' or 'soak the poor.'"

"The next thing that I view as being dangerous to our national well-being is government by bureaucracy instead of what we have been taught to look for, government by law."

"Just let me quote something from the President's message to Congress."

"In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power in the hands of the people's government. This power is wholesome and proper, but in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy, such power would provide shackles for the liberties of our people."

"Now I interpret that to mean, if you are going to have an autocrat, take me; but be very careful about the other fellow."

"There is a complete answer to that, and it rises in the minds of the great rank and file, and that answer is just this: We will never in this country tolerate any laws that provide shackles for our people."

"We don't want any outcasts, either in or out of office. We wouldn't even take a good one." Those are the words of Alfred E. Smith, who was a man of courage and a good Democrat.

The issues are big. Will we seize them boldly and honestly? Will we wage a fight for principles or will we lose the battle because we were afraid? Will we fight to keep the Republic and to keep Government in its proper place as the servant of the people, not their master? Will we demand an American foreign policy strong enough to make and keep peace in the world, and for that our watchword must be "let none but Americans be on guard?"

Let us not be afraid to lose, let us give the people a clear-cut issue and we will abide by the result. If we give them no choice on the big issues why should they entrust us with the Government of the Nation? A friend of mine who is well-known to many of you and a life-long Republican, told me after one of the last elections, "Oh, yes I voted, but it was hardly worth taking the trouble to put my hat on and crossing the street to do it."

We must make up our differences, we have enough to fight without fighting each other, before it is too late.

We must fight for great principles, not for little personalities. We must be unafraid though our dangers and perils are very great. We must put our country first at home and abroad. Our loyalty must be to her and no other loyalty can count.

This is a great task, a hard task in which we may well fail again. If we do, the fault will be ours. The cause is just, the principles are high. "We must lift up our eyes to the hills," the hills of integrity, patriotism and justice and from them we will get the strength to win.

How Much Does the Individual Count?—

Sermon by A. Powell Davies, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend A. Powell Davies preached a sermon the other day which should be of great interest to all persons who believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whatever their station in life.

Abraham Lincoln was not posing a rhetorical question when he stated four-score and 8 years ago that the question involved in his time was whether this Nation or any nation so conceived, as ours was, and so dedicated, could long survive. There was, indeed, a deep question in his mind and heart, although his faith was strong.

I believe Reverend Davies' sermon discusses the very heart of whether this Nation, which has grown complex with a population of 160,000,000 human beings, can long survive, bearing in mind the principles through which it has been conceived and to which it is dedicated.

How Much Does the Individual Count?

(A sermon by the Rev. A. Powell Davies, D. D., All Souls' Church, Unitarian, Washington, D. C., September 30, 1951)

I received a letter, not long ago, from a man who thought he knew what should be done about some of the evils with which we are afflicted. "But," he said, "I myself, am powerless to begin these things; I am unknown, I have no reputation; I am just an ordinary individual."

His attitude, I am afraid, is rather typical. People have come to believe that, except in small and insignificant ways, what they think and do is unimportant. They may have opinions but there is no way to give them weight, they may believe in a course of action but they feel helpless to initiate it. Decisions of consequence are all made by leaders—the very few who are vested with authority, and these few are not attentive to the opinions of ordinary people; they are affected only by mass opinion, and mass opinion can be manipulated.

If it happens, therefore, that something is being done that is clearly wrong, it is useless being incensed about it, what can you do? Wrongs can only be set right by legislative committees or crusading newspapers or through the personal tour de force of someone with commanding influence.

Suppose the government of your city is corrupt, its agencies of law enforcement undermined by bribery and graft—well, what can you do, except groan about it, and commiserate with your neighbor when you talk to him over the fence? You certainly can't fight your city government, and least of all its agencies of law enforcement. You would get nowhere—unless it was into trouble. Who are you? Nobody at all, just an ordinary individual.

Suppose you think that the behavior of some of those who have been elected to high places is foolish or hysterical, or even perhaps mean and sordid, well, you can tell your wife about it or the men who ride with you in your car pool, but what can you do about it? Except endure it, hoping that something will

happen somewhere, sometime, that will change it? You are just one of the many, the vast multitude doomed to be helpless and inarticulate.

It may be that your school system is being attacked, that organized perfidy is secretly conspiring to destroy the reputation of your teachers, degrade your educational standards, shatter the confidence of the people in administrators who deserve to be trusted. This has happened in several American cities in the last few years. Well, what do you do? If you take a stand, will there be others to join you? Or will everyone be afraid—as you are—of having their loyalty impugned, of being called a traitor or a fellow traveler on the testimony of someone who saw you glance at a copy of the Daily Worker that had been left on the seat beside you on the train.

You are only an individual, an ordinary person with no influence, an anonymous member of a voiceless, faceless multitude, someone who doesn't count.

This, apparently, is the prevailing feeling. And if it persists, the Marxists will have scored a victory. What else is it but Marxist: the intimidation, the subjection, the complete subordination of the individual. To the extent, therefore, that we have this state of things in America, we are sick with the same disease that has cursed the peoples of the iron curtain countries. The virulence is less but the malady the same. We have come a little closer to being ants in an ant hill.

Democracy as contrasted with Marxism is founded upon the significance of the individual. It is this significance that is fundamental, and not the collective significance of the society. A democratic nation is not a field of grass, or a flock of sheep, or a colony of yeast cells; it is an association of free men and women. That was what was intended by the words, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Not totalitarian life, or collective liberty, or the pursuit of promulgated happiness, but individual life, individual liberty, and individual happiness. This does not mean, of course, that the individual exists apart from society, or that his life and liberty are unconnected with social relationships, or that all alone he can achieve his happiness. What it does mean is that the society shall liberate the individual and not dominate him; that it shall enhance his significance and not belittle him; that it shall invite his free participation and not enslave him; that it shall respect him and not demean him. The government is his servant, not his master, his leaders are his agents, not his rulers, his fellow men are individuals like himself, his neighbors and his fellow citizens, not fellow subjects. For democracy is founded upon the significance of the individual.

If this significance diminishes, if the individual feels weak and helpless, if he is afraid, intimidated, enfeebled by the palsy of futility, his society is to that extent Marxist rather than democratic, and has become infected with the virus of its enemies.

This is something to be thoughtfully considered. It was John Stuart Mill, one of the greatest exponents of individual significance, who warned us in his *Essay on Liberty* that "a state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes—will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

The state that dwarfs its men deliberately, and claims to do so for beneficial purposes, is, of course, the Communist state. But it is possible for people to become dwarfed without deliberate intention, without its being part of a plan. We become dwarfed when we suffer the state of things that is now obtaining in our own country. Listen again to John Stuart Mill: "Whatever

crushes individuality is despotism, by whatever name it may be called." Yes, despotism because despotic in drift and inclination, despotic in spirit and temper, despotic in tendency.

Ah, but, you say, how can you be an individual in a world of parties and factions? You have to go along with what exists, and choose from what there is, accepting its limitations and endorsing the evil with the good. I wonder if you do? Must a man be gagged by a lesser loyalty when his conscience commands him to speak out for a higher one? According to Thomas Jefferson, such a restriction is beneath contempt. He never submitted his opinions, he says, "to the creed of any party of men whatever, in religion, in philosophy, in politics, or in anything else. Such an addiction is the last degradation of a free and moral agent" (letter to Francis Hopkinson, 1789).

According to Jefferson, the individual may have a place in a party and not be subject to the party. He can work with other individuals in an organized movement and not be restrained by the limitations of the group. Is this correct? Or must we modify it? Well, I will say this: It is not certain that Jefferson, writing in his own time, and out of his own exceptional experience, entirely understood how difficult this sort of independence might become. It is not candid, I think, to pretend that an individual can work with a group and not be disciplined by its procedures. Indeed, we should go further and admit that sometimes the individual will be submerged, temporarily, and his chosen purposes distorted if he works with a party or a movement. But I think Jefferson would have replied to this that it is a matter of proportion, that beyond a certain point, the individual should rebel. His controlling loyalty should be to his convictions, and he should not get his loyalties confused. And it is inconceivable to me that Jefferson would not exhort us, if he lived today, to reassert ourselves in character and conscience, as individuals. Only so can any of our associations—parties, movements, citizen groups, churches, or anything else—be carried to a higher level. There is no such thing as a society apart from the individuals who compose it. We speak of churches doing things, or of the Senate doing something, or of some other entity taking action. But this can be misleading. What happens is that the people of the churches do something, or the Members of the Senate, or the individuals that form a group. It is clear, therefore, that you cannot raise the social level unless you raise it through the individual.

After all, this has always been the case. And besides this, there is the pioneer, the enterprising individual. No reform, no correction of an evil, no advance of any kind in all the annals of history was ever begun without an individual to get it started. When the fires of the American Revolution were burning low and men watched the flame of its hope go down towards the ashes of despair, how were those fires rekindled? Who breathed them back into life? Was it the Continental Congress? Did someone appoint a Committee on Unrevolutionary Activities? Was it an ecclesiastical commission? You know the answer. It was an individual therefore obscure, or almost so, Tom Paine, whom George Washington credited with saving the Revolution.

Who in the nineteenth century reformed the prisons and established humane treatment for the insane? Was it an outcry from the clergy? An impassioned plea by the medical profession? A committee of prominent citizens who put an advertisement in the newspapers? No; it was a relatively unknown girl from Hampden, Maine, Dorothea Dix.

Who got the American public school system going? Did someone arise in the House of Representatives and declare with his fist pounding his desk that a great Nation deserved an educated citizenry, whereupon the House of Representatives, instantly persuaded by such impeccable logic, unanimously voted both an authorization and an appropriation, and the Senate declared itself mortified because it had not thought of it first? No; it was a lone enthusiast—a Massachusetts lawyer named Horace Mann—who did, incidentally, arrive after a while in the House of Representatives.

And so we might continue with name after name. Christianity was not established by people of prominence, people who wielded influence and who had evolved a plan to save the world. Jesus of Nazareth was an individual. So was the apostle Paul, and so were the people who formed those early Christian congregations.

When anyone asks, What does the individual count? surely the first of the answers is this: It depends—and always must—upon the individual. If you have the conviction, the courage, the patience, and the persistence, and if you are willing to put everything you have into the venture, win or lose, you can go immense distances, in this time or any other, as an individual.

But still, it may be objected, these that we have mentioned were after all outstanding people. They had unusual talent, conspicuous ability—or at any rate they had a sort of boldness that the majority cannot claim. Say something, Mr. Preacher, that applies to John Doe or even to Caspar Milquetoast. None of us, of course, admit to being John Does, and certainly none of us are Caspar Milquetoasts; but still we know a lot of people who are one or the other. People who are timid—who don't in the least want to save the world, they just want to buy a television set. What do they count for as individuals?

I will answer frankly. At present, not much! Caspar Milquetoast is an appealing little figure and it's natural to be sorry for him. But just the same, he is responsible for a large part of what is the matter with us. He reads the wrong newspapers, believes lies, follows his prejudices, wraps himself up in his fears. And worst of all, he doesn't know when to be angry.

That is one of the truly serious things that has happened to the multitude of so-called ordinary people. They have forgotten how to be indignant. This is not because they are overflowing with human kindness but because they are morally soft and compliant. When they see evil and injustice, they are pained but not revolted. They mutter and mumble, they never cry out. They commit the sin of not being angry.

Yet, their anger is the one thing above all others that would make them count. If they cannot lead crusades, or initiate reforms, they can at least create the conditions in which crusades can be effectual and reforms successful. The wrath of the multitude could bring back decency and integrity into public life; it could frighten the corrupt demagogue into silence and blast the rumormonger into oblivion. It could give honest leaders a chance to win. If the multitude of ordinary people would rise up in righteous indignation and let the sound of their anger be heard, we should no longer have to read in the newspaper of a district attorney, flouted by criminals, who puts his head in his arms and weeps; or of a Senator who groans aloud when his motives are distorted in careless debate and the toll of weeks is heedlessly cast aside. Nor of a hundred other things of which these two are representative.

It is frequently said that there are no longer good leaders: men and women with

the force of character, the mentality, the vision, the integrity to steer us through the dangerous waters all around us and the storms ahead. I am not so sure that this is true. I think it should be put as a question, not stated as a fact. I am doubtful, very doubtful, whether good leadership is as widely welcomed as it used to be, and whether it is recognized when it appears. However, this may be, leadership in a free country is not rulership; nor is there any ruling class. Leadership must emerge from the people. People who believe that the individual counts must produce the outstanding individual—and then help him to count. He is their agent, their representative. Only as such individuals emerge, and are encouraged and supported, can a society based on individual significance maintain its special character, and only so can it endure. It is indispensable that all of us together provide the conditions under which we shall be well and wisely led. And as I said before, this means that at least we must be willing to be angry—at lies and cheating, venality and corruption; at least, we must stand up for common decency. If we will not do that much, what hope can there be for us? What good are we? Why should God or history preserve us? Why should we be saved?

But besides regaining the capacity for righteous indignation, the individual—who ever he is, and no matter how anonymous—can exert continuously, and indeed, must exert continuously, the entire influence of his life and character. There is not one of us who does not every day appreciably affect our total situation. Individuals are every hour making a difference in other individuals and therefore in all of us. By the stand we take—or refuse to take—in ordinary conversation, we encourage either the true or the false, the good or the bad; we make it either easier or harder for other people to have courage, to deepen their convictions, to make right choices. It is out of the vast complex of the relationships of individuals that the impulse comes to raise our standards—or the willingness to let them drop. When we express our own prejudices we deepen prejudice in others. When we counter them, prejudice everywhere receives a setback. If we stand by our convictions, gently but firmly refusing to be intimidated, either to please a friend or placate an enemy, conviction finds a stronger rootage. It is not necessary to be too much bothered by the things that people say at such a time, the irritation or annoyance they express. Something has happened within them that they could not prevent; something that whether they wished it or not, made them believe more deeply that character is a reality; that there are things in life to respect.

How much does the individual count? It is a question that he himself must answer, that all must answer, each by the manner of his life.

"What can I do?" asks Horace Traubel in his Chants Communal. "I can talk out when others are silent. I can say man when others say money. I can stay up when others are asleep. I can keep on working when others have stopped to play. I can give life big meanings when others give life little meanings. I can say love when others say hate. I can say every man when others say one man. I can try events by a hard test when others try it by an easy test."

"What can I do? I can give myself to life when other men refuse themselves to life."

He is entirely right. He, or you, or I, or any of us can do precisely that—and it will determine how much we count as individuals. Let us pray: O God, who has given us powers we seldom use and possibilities we all too easily renounce, lead us to see how much better we might be than we are, and help us to be willing for it. Amen.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House, at a luncheon of the Eastern and Southern States Republican regional meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Monday, October 1, 1951:

Madam Chairman and fellow Republicans, it is a privilege to be here today to join in this discussion of the 1952 campaign. Once more we find ourselves preparing for a victory that has eluded us in five consecutive Presidential elections.

In the disappointment of our defeats we have emerged each time stronger and more determined than ever that America must embrace the essential principles for which the Republican Party stands if our country is to survive as a free nation. Such vigilance, such determination, cannot fail, and it will not fail. Because Americans love their country, because they want to preserve the basic liberties which made it great, they are going to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress in 1952.

Yet, as we approach the campaign, let no one doubt the gravity of the task that is ahead of us. We are dealing with one of the greatest threats to liberty that America has ever known—entrenched government. Nothing less than a complete awakening of the American people and a landslide march to the polls will bring about the victory that is so essential.

In the field of politics, we are often too prone to use old yardsticks for measuring new circumstances.

You hear it said that the Republicans cannot win in 1952 because of the phony prosperity that war-making and bloodshed have created.

You heard it said that the voters have been bought with their own money and that we will go up against a controlled vote.

Finally, you hear it said that the American form of government, as we know it, is gone, that the people have been drugged into an acceptance of socialism.

My colleagues, I cannot subscribe to such despair and defeatism. I, for one, cannot believe that the American people are yet ready to sell out their 175-year-old heritage of freedom for the thoroughly discredited shackles of socialism—a yoke already thrown off by the people of Australia and New Zealand and about to be thrown off by our British friends across the sea.

The truth is that the Republican Party will enter the 1952 campaign with three of the greatest political issues of modern times. I want to talk to you about these issues, which if we face up to them and meet them squarely will bring us a victory of unprecedented proportions.

The first of these great issues—and it is the most fundamental—can be summed up in four words: Lack of national security.

Americans at various periods in their history have experienced fear for their economic security—fear for their pocketbooks

Today, for the first time, they are experiencing fear for their national security—fear for their lives.

Even in the darkest days of the American Revolution the American people never lost faith in the outcome. Today we are a Nation assailed by doubts and insecurity.

Due almost wholly to the blundering of our so-called leaders, to their policies of appeasement and softness, we have witnessed the Soviet Union expand its domination in five peacetime years from 170,000,000 to 800,000,000 people. Simultaneously, we have witnessed American prestige and American leadership deteriorate at an alarming rate.

The effect on the American people has been devastating.

For the first time in our history, Americans go to bed wondering if they will be alive when the dawn comes. They gaze at their homes wondering when they will be reduced to rubble. They gaze upon their children, wondering more about whether they will be alive than whether they will rise to be outstanding citizens.

Under this administration, fear has become a national policy.

The second of the great issues can also be summed up in four words. Lack of Executive leadership.

Never in the annals of our Nation has America had so little leadership when so much was needed, both in the field of international relations and domestic affairs.

On the international scene, we have been out bargained, out smarted, and out maneuvered. We have undergone humiliations unparalleled in our history.

The bankruptcy of the present leadership can best be measured by the President's own confession the other day that he knew no other answer to our problems but the use of force.

The American people are already asking themselves: Is the price of little men in big places to be endless war and endless bloodshed?

The third great issue—an issue which is the bedrock of our civilization—can also be summed up in four words: Lack of public morality.

Let me say now that this issue is far deeper than mink coats, deep freezes and flasks of perfume. This is an issue which reaches to the very vitals of our social system. It strikes at our homes, our communities, and our churches.

We cannot hold up the defalcations of obscure hangers-on and petty bureaucrats when the whole philosophy of government is based on appeal to the pocketbook and the belly instead of to the heart and mind. How can we expect idealism and morality to survive when government itself is dedicated only to the socialist principles of materialism?

The Republican Party would fall in its duty if it did not grasp this issue in its broadest implications. Petty crime is the work of petty people, but the Godless materialism which this administration embraces can lead only to social suicide.

Yes, we have the issues. We must have the courage to meet them. And above all else, we must exercise the wisdom to resolve them.

These three great issues—lack of national security, lack of executive leadership, and lack of public morality—are interlocked and interwoven.

The task of arriving at solutions for the problems they create rests with the Republican Party. Certainly no one can expect the party in power, as the authors of our mistakes, our humiliations, and our failures, to provide the answers.

In the field of international relations, the Republican Party must prepare itself to restore statecraft to its rightful place in government. It must regard force as the weapon of failure. In this age of atomic horrors,

there can be no hope for civilization if war is the only answer.

In our deliberations on principles and in our choice of candidates, we must never lose sight of the fact that America needs most of all statesmen and leaders who not only can evolve wise policies but who have the courage and integrity to carry those policies through to a successful conclusion.

In the field of domestic affairs, the Republican Party must provide leaders and policies that will stabilize our economy, stop inflation dead in its tracks, restore national solvency, and infuse our Government with integrity and moral principle.

In short, what America needs is strength—not the strength of the mailed fist, for we have that, but strength of character and purpose.

All the armor in the world will not save a nation shot through with corruption, political greed, and vacillating leadership.

A Maginot Line could not save a demoralized France, nor will atomic weapons save a demoralized America.

Across the sea in Britain, our English friends are about to hold an election. In many ways, the problems of the British electorate parallel the problems of the American voter. They are beset by socialism from within and the threat of the world Communist conspiracy from without.

My colleague in the House of Representatives from Massachusetts, the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, dropped me a note the other day and enclosed an editorial from a leading British publication, *The Economist*. The editorial forecast defeat for the Labor government and then stated a conclusion which I think we in the Republican Party might well weigh in our deliberations.

I quote:

"The majority of people seem to see the ways to better living in lower government expenditure, hard work, and more competition. They now have little faith in controls and subsidies, still less in nationalization. If on these points the government makes further concessions to the (left-wing) views of Mr. Bevan or of the TUC, it will not be earning popularity, but drifting farther away from the trend of public thinking. . . .

"The swing in opinion demonstrates once again a truth that is not less evident because politicians are generally too timid to believe the evidence. The popularity of a government depends on facing up to its difficulties, even if toes get stepped on in the process. In a crisis, the British people respond, now as in the past, to firm leadership, providing it is honest. They do not expect to be soothed and left alone.

"The Labor Party is too tied to its preconceived notions for anyone to hope that it will take lessons of the past month to heart. The Conservative Party has no excuse for ignoring them."

The truth is that not only America and Britain are crying for leadership but the entire world is demanding it. If, as the *Economist* suggests, wisdom may be born out of watching the blunders of others, then certainly after watching 18 years of government by guess, gouge, and gun, we should be wise indeed.

Finally, let me suggest to you that the 1952 campaign must be conducted on a plane transcending ordinary politics.

Members of the Republican Party have no corner on patriotism.

Millions of Americans who have been voting the Democrat ticket are just as deeply concerned about the future of our country as any one of us.

They are anxious to join with us in restoring America to Americans.

They are just as fed up with the alien philosophies of this administration as any one of us.

As Republicans, it is our duty to extend the hand of fellowship to every American, regardless of party, who wants to join us in our crusade to save America. In no case should we let a narrow partisan view becloud the fact that it is the American form of government to which we are dedicating the 1952 campaign.

We must conduct ourselves in such a fashion that the popular will shall prevail. The best way to do it is to conduct an honest, straightforward, hard-hitting, and fearless campaign so that no one can mistake where we stand.

If we have the courage to meet the duty which is ours, there can be only one result: A landslide victory in 1952 for the Republican Party and America.

Investigation of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., October 3, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,

Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAWSON: On Wednesday, August 1, 1951, at the last meeting of the committee, I offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a subcommittee of five Members, three of the majority and two of the minority party, is hereby created, charged with the duty of conducting a penetrating investigation of the Department of State, including but not limited to its organizational structure, its procedures, its personnel, its performance, and its relationship to other Federal agencies."

At your request, I have prepared a statement of the reasons why I believe this resolution should be adopted by the Expenditures Committee. I urge its immediate adoption by the committee.

It should not require extended argument to establish the fact that the world position of the free nations has deteriorated, and the world position of Russian communism has advanced in the six short years since the close of World War II. We find Russia and her Communist satellites, in fact, in possession of strategic areas and masters over erstwhile democratic peoples, subjugating them against their will. As a result, we find ourselves committed to a back-breaking program of bolstering weak governments and impoverished nations in an attempt to construct a cordon sanitaire against further Communist imperialistic advances. This effort has led us to drain and dislocate our economy, and the end is not in sight.

Without engaging in second guessing, it would seem apparent to any fair-minded observer that we could have done better. It follows that the agency of our Government responsible for the execution of our foreign policy and the conduct of our relationships with other countries, namely, the State Department, has been tried and found lacking the skill, vigor, and effectiveness which the times demand.

Without engaging in recriminations or fault finding for fault finding's sake, it is

incumbent upon this Congress to examine the instrument through which we express and carry out our foreign policies to the end that, in the future, our decisions may be better and our actions more forthright and effective, if we are to avoid the debacle threatening our very existence as a nation or, at least, as an independent nation.

No subject, in my judgment, can merit the concentrated attention of this Congress in as great a degree as the one at hand. It is the obligation of Congress to look into this situation and take such action as may be necessary to improve and strengthen the conduct of our foreign affairs.

So far as I have been able to learn, there has been no penetrating examination of the State Department by a congressional committee in recent years. The Hoover Commission did give attention to administrative problems. Also, a study was conducted by the staff of the Appropriations Committee in the Eightieth Congress. Any investigation conducted at this time should, of course, take advantage of the work done previously. However, it is my belief that something far more penetrating than these previous studies should now be made.

The study should seek to ascertain whether or not the organizational structure and the administrative procedures of the Department of State are such as to enable that agency to make prompt and intelligent decisions and to take effective and forthright action. Failure to act may sometimes be more disastrous than acting mistakenly.

The methods of recruitment of personnel, and the type and caliber of persons in key positions in the State Department, should be thoroughly examined. This examination should go beyond the question of mere loyalty and should be aimed at a recruitment system which would permit us to assemble for this most important aspect of our national affairs the most capable, intelligent, patriotic, courageous individuals that can be found in this country.

A review of the performance of the State Department in important conferences and negotiations in recent years should be undertaken, not so much for the purpose of assessing blame for mistakes as for the purpose of learning in what respects the organizational structure and personnel of the State Department are deficient, so that measures can be taken to strengthen the State Department with the hope that its work may be more successful in the future.

In recent years, the United States has multiplied its activities in foreign areas and has established new agencies for this purpose. Because of the delicacy of relations between nations and the value of marshaling all our potential for the accomplishment of our objectives in foreign affairs, it is extremely important that all our activities be unified and coordinated, and that we avoid inconsistent action and conflict between agencies of our Government operating in foreign areas. There is a problem of administrative relationships here which it would be peculiarly appropriate for this committee to study.

In my judgment, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments not only has the jurisdiction, but has the obligation, to conduct this study of the operation of the State Department with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. If the committee, or a subcommittee created for that purpose, should undertake this task, acquire an adequate staff, and explore this subject diligently but impartially, the resulting good for the future of the United States could be immeasurable.

A few decades ago, the United States was a self-sufficient, well-protected haven. Now we are thrust into the very center of the maelstrom of catastrophic world events.

The agency through which we conduct our relations with the rest of the world has been suddenly required to assume momentous responsibilities which it has never had in like degree in the past. It is imperative that all steps be taken to strengthen and develop this instrument, the State Department, as rapidly as we can. In such strengthening, the Congress bears its responsibility, which it cannot discharge intelligently and effectively without being well-informed. It cannot be well-informed unless it conducts an investigation of the type I have proposed.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Protecting Vital Information the Right Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a bulletin issued by the Office of Civil Defense, Sacramento, Calif., regarding the printing of confidential information by the press. This bulletin, an example of the democratic way of insuring security of vital information, was brought to my attention by Mr. Niver W. Beaman, Assistant Director of Civil Defense in charge of Public Information and Education. Mr. Beaman was formerly editor of Greenwich Time, a newspaper often referred to as the best suburban daily in America, which is published in my home town, Greenwich, Conn. He was also city editor of the Pulitzer prize-winning Waterbury (Conn.) American-Republican.

This bulletin, when contrasted with the President's decree on the same subject, might serve as an object lesson in the true democratic method of protecting vital information as opposed to the dictatorial method chosen by the President.

The bulletin follows:

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE,

Sacramento, Calif., September 26, 1951.

To News Associations, California Newspapers, California Radio and TV Stations:

The California State Office of Civil Defense asks your cooperation in keeping a secret for the good of our State and Nation. California has a State headquarters of civil defense and 10 regional headquarters. These are all control centers to meet atomic attack or other emergency.

We are setting up alternate control centers—usually some distance away from the control centers.

The location of these alternate control centers is restricted information within the Office of Civil Defense.

We hope this information does not become public.

Reason: These alternate control centers contain communications and other equipment vital to the safety and security of California, its people, and the Nation—if we are attacked. We must guard against sabotage. Hence the secrecy of location.

As these alternate control centers move toward completion, you are bound to receive

local news tips on them in the areas where they are located.

For security purposes, we ask you not to print, broadcast, or publicly discuss such locations or activity in connection with them.

There is no law nor code nor directive that forbids you to print or broadcast such information. There is no penalty if you do print or broadcast it. We hope, however, that for purposes of security, you will help us keep this information restricted. This office greatly appreciates the constant cooperation and countless courtesies it receives from California's press and radio.

Sincerely,

W M ROBERTSON,
Major General, United States Army
(Retired), Director of Civil Defense.

They Await the Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29, 1951, entitled "They Await the Verdict." The removal of the crosses from the graves of 13,000 World War II war dead buried in the National Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii has raised a storm of justifiable protest. I want to join in urging that these symbols of faith and sacrifice be restored and made a permanent part of the memorial at the final resting place of those who gave their lives in the defense of America. I urge that prompt consideration and approval be given to House Joint Resolution 338 which directs the Secretary of the Army to replace the crosses which until recently marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii.

The editorial follows:

THEY AWAIT THE VERDICT

The mute white crosses have been taken from the graves of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific—but protests may restore them.

It took only 2 hours for the energetic task force of the Army to remove from the Punchbowl more than 13,000 little wooden crosses. It will require more time to restore them—if they are to be restored.

But there is time for this task of restoration—those who sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater have no need for haste. They will wait, in patience, for the verdict.

All the hurry, all the ordered speed and discipline of their training, all the furious urgency of their attacks on the battle lines, all the sudden anguish of their mortal wounds before they fell, are of the past.

For them the sun will rise and will set over that dedicated "Hill of Sacrifice" in long, unhurried procession. The gentle winds and the stars will keep them company, even if in a burst of organized effort as well timed and precise as the burst from a machine gun the 13,000 white crosses came down in 1 unexpected afternoon.

In Washington, D. C., Delegate FARRINGTON has appropriately said that the wishes of the

families of the men who lie in the Punchbowl graves should be consulted.

That can be done, and should be done. It should have been done, and thoroughly, sympathetically, before the order was given that tore the crosses from the ground.

To do it rightly, the families should have a clear picture of the alternatives—the graves with crosses and also with the flat stone marker, or the graves with only that flat, inconspicuous, and unimpressive headstone.

And the families should know—many of them know already—that in our military cemeteries abroad the white crosses still stand.

And these next of kin should feel that it is not a question of economy—our doing fitting honor to those who are buried in Punchbowl.

It is a question of giving to these heroes of our country the greatest possible evidence of respect and devotion we can give them.

It is a question also of developing this National Memorial Cemetery as one of our Nation's most impressive, most distinctive burial places.

It is a question of maintaining the physical facilities so that each Memorial Day the people of Hawaii can pay their distinctive tribute of leis and garlands, appropriately wreathed above the graves.

Yes; those who lie asleep in Punchbowl can await the verdict.

For them all mortal haste is ended. They lie quietly in the ultimate discipline of death, relying upon a grateful country to do them justice.

Relief Publicity Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, that the Governors' Conference at Gatlinburg, Tenn., should discuss the problem of States being permitted to remove the secrecy from public welfare rolls without risking the loss of Federal welfare funds, I believe, is indicative of the importance of this question to all States and emphasizes the general interest in the matter.

I am quoting below a news item from the Washington Star of October 2 and abstracts from the October 3 Washington Post's and Washington Times-Herald's coverage of the conference pertaining to this discussion. It will be noted that on the question, "Should a State have the power to pass legislation on publication of relief rolls without risking loss of Federal funds," all the Governors present raised their hands in assent.

The news items follow:

[From the Washington Star of October 2, 1951]

FORTY-EIGHT GOVERNORS DEMAND END TO FEDERAL BAN ON RELIEF PUBLICITY—AFTER STORMY SESSION WITH EWING, THEY VOTE STATES SHOULD DECIDE

GATLINBURG, TENN., October 2.—The Nation's Governors voted unanimous approval today of a move to reserve to the States the right to decide whether their relief rolls shall be made public.

The action came on motion of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, New York, Republican, after Gov. James F. Byrnes, South Carolina, Democrat, demanded 11 a stormy session with Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing that the Governors act on the question. Georgia's Gov. Herman E. Talmadge was another critic of the secrecy rule.

Federal law now requires secrecy of relief rolls. The Senate has approved a measure to lift the secrecy ban, but the measure still is pending in the House.

LEE CHARGES EVASION

Governor Byrnes asked the forty-third annual Governors' Conference to go on record in favor of relief-roll publicity. Governor Talmadge said such publicity would reduce relief rolls by at least one-third.

But Mr. Ewing insisted that such publicity would do more harm than good.

The Governors sailed into Mr. Ewing after Utah's Republican Gov. J. Bracken Lee had challenged them to discuss the "real problems" of inflation, taxation, communism, integrity in Government and the Korean war instead of what he called the "side issue" of social security.

Governor Byrnes, a Democratic former Senator, Secretary of State, and Supreme Court justice, told Mr. Ewing bluntly he believes Congress ought to pay more attention to what the governors want than to Mr. Ewing's recommendations.

QUEST FOR ADVICE

"The question is not what you recommend," he said; "but will this conference recommend repeal (of the secrecy provisions) and leave to the States the determination of whether there shall be publicity."

Amid cries of "yes, yes," Governor Lee reminded Mr. Ewing that he has said earlier he came to the conference to get advice from the State executives.

"Yes," Mr. Ewing snapped, "but I reserve for myself the decision whether I will take it or not."

Mr. Ewing told reporters Indiana has lost beyond possible retrieving \$3,000,000 in Federal aid because its legislature failed in time to knock out a relief-roll publicity provision for that State.

SAYS COURTS CAN SEE RECORDS

Governor Talmadge complained that the States cannot find out, even through grand jury action, about relief-roll chiseling.

"You are spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and are doing it without the States even being able to find out about it through grand juries," he asserted.

Mr. Ewing said Federal security records are always available to the courts.

Gov. Johnston Murray, Oklahoma Democrat, said he couldn't fire relief workers who connived to put persons on the rolls. Mr. Ewing replied he didn't have much sympathy with civil-service provisions, but they are in the law.

SAYS ILLEGITIMACY IS ENCOURAGED

Governor Talmadge accused the Government of subsidizing and encouraging illegitimacy by refusing to permit Georgia to limit the number of illegitimate children in one family eligible for relief.

"We took the position that one illegitimate child can be an honest mistake," Governor Talmadge said, "but when there is more than one, then it has got to be a habit."

But he said the United States Welfare Agency refused to permit any such limitation.

Mr. Ewing said the Government believed the illegitimate child should not be punished for the act of its parents.

By a vote of 25 to 10, the governors went on record in favor of States having the right to control their own civil-service standards rather than the Federal Government.

[From the Washington Post of October 3, 1951]

The South Carolinian (Governor Byrnes) talked politics with reporters today after a lively session in which the governors voted unanimously that States should be able to pass laws on publishing names on relief rolls without risking the loss of Federal welfare funds. Byrnes had urged them to demand that Congress repeal a provision in the law which prohibits such publication.

When the governors assembled today to consider problems of social security and public welfare, they had in mind what had happened to Indiana when the State Legislature passed a law permitting the publication of relief lists as a means of eliminating possible chiselers and cutting the costs.

Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, cut off Indiana's share of Federal aid because the State law conflicted with Federal law. Ewing talked to the Governors today and they gave him a rough time of it.

He said the original social-security law did not prohibit publication of names on relief rolls. Congress wrote the ban into the law in 1939, he said, because of flagrant misuse of relief lists in the off-year election of 1938. He said one governor, up for reelection, went to people on the lists and told them they would lose their relief checks unless he was returned to office.

WON'T RECOMMEND REPEAL

Ewing said he would not recommend now that Congress repeal the prohibition against publishing names of those on the relief lists. He said he thought the evils that would flow from publication would outweigh any good.

Gov. Howard Pyle, of Arizona, said the Federal ban had failed to stop political abuses. He said that in his 1950 campaign his opponent had complete lists of those on the relief rolls and used them effectively.

Gov. Herman Talmadge, of Georgia, said if chiselers could be exposed by publishing the names of relief recipients, the cost of relief would be reduced by a third.

Governor Byrnes said he thought governors knew more about what is best for their States than anyone in Washington.

GOVERNORS UNANIMOUS

"We should have a resolution urging Congress to repeal this law and leave the matter to the States," he said. "I think Congress would pay more attention to the governors of the 48 States than to the head of any Federal department or agency."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who presided, pointed out a resolution could be adopted by the conference only by unanimous vote. He got around this by asking for a raising of hands on the question, "Should a State have the power to pass legislation on publication of relief rolls without risking loss of Federal funds?"

All the governors present raised their hands in assent.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 3, 1951]

His (Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina) conference came after the Nation's governors had a stormy session with Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing in which both Republicans and Democrats displayed angry impatience with some of the Federal controls in the public welfare field.

With Byrnes taking a leading role, the governors voted unanimous approval of a move to give States the power and authority to publish lists of relief rolls without having their Federal grants withdrawn.

Federal law now imposes secrecy on these relief lists. The Senate has voted to lift the

ban but the measure still is pending in the House.

The action was taken under the leadership of Governor Dewey of New York, who put the question in the form of a motion because a resolution can be blocked by one objecting vote.

TEMPERS FLAME

The governors also voted 25 to 10 in favor of giving States the exclusive right to control their civil-service standards in the Federally aided public welfare program.

As tempers flared at times, Governor Lee, Utah Republican, challenged his colleagues to talk about the "real problems" of inflation, taxes, and communism rather than "side issues."

He threatened to walk out of the conference on social security problems but he remained in his seat when his outburst brought a round of applause from some governors.

Trend Toward Economic Union With England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record I include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky.

Mr. Speaker, in this article Mr. Sokolsky shows clearly and dispassionately how we have tied our economy to that of England.

It is very possible that we will not save the English economy but that they will drag us down with them. It is increasingly evident that giving England money is like throwing water down a pipe.

Why must we always follow and help the old and worn-out economies of Europe? We would do better to follow the example of our neighbor to the north, Canada, who is forging ahead economically and politically and is not allowing the Old World to throttle her development, even though England is still her mother country.

The article follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The more international conferences that are held, the more clearly an economic pattern presents itself which seems (and I use this verb advisedly) to tend toward a merging of the Western World into an economic union in which the United States will act as the supplier to those nations which are or seem to be in need.

It is an arrangement for the distribution of wealth on an international level. The obvious manifestation of this plan appeared in lend-lease, the Marshall plan (ERP, ECA) and point 4. In a manner, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the RFC have played a part in the development, but even more so, the depression of the American dollar, making it constantly cheaper, is an instrument for leveling values.

The economic union has not in any way been so formalized that it would be neces-

sary to present it to Congress or Parliament for adoption. This would be unsound politically and could create such outraged antagonism as to defeat it altogether. Rather, step by step, acts have been implemented which achieve some movements in the direction desired by those who, in particular, see in the United States a basis for the restoration of British economy even under socialism.

There can be no question but that Great Britain's position is perilous. During this century Great Britain's economy has depended upon banking, shipping, insurance and reexports. The United States, Canada, India, Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, and China played a great part in this business. Britain garnered liquid capital from many quarters in Europe and invested it in Asia, Africa, the United States and wherever in the world liquid capital was required. No other country had developed equal skill in banking, insurance or shipping and the profits were good.

The essential cause for World War I was the German invasion of every field of British economic activity, including heavy machinery and textiles; after World War I, Japan entered these economic areas with startling success, particularly in shipping and textiles. The Japanese were astonishingly competent in China, Malaya, India and North Africa, with the result that a mounting antagonism developed between Great Britain and Japan. This was emphatically notable after the termination of the Anglo-Japanese alliance in 1922.

World War II left Great Britain prostrate and dependent upon the United States. If any country can be said to have lost World War II, from the standpoint of costs, that country is Great Britain. The United States came to the rescue with lend-lease, with various devices worked out at Bretton Woods (1944), with the British loan of \$3,750,000,000, with the Marshall plan which became ECA, with point 4 that aids British-controlled or former British colonial areas, with European military aid which grew into the general term, NATO, with tariff controls favoring British exports to the United States, and with many other economic devices which have assisted the British.

The fact does stand that with all the aid that the United States has given Great Britain, at unbelievably great direct and indirect costs to the American people, the Socialist government of Great Britain is again in trouble and the likelihood is that Great Britain will not be able to meet its obligations to us under the loan agreement. In fact, the situation is becoming so tight that a general election is being held to achieve either a vote of confidence for the Socialists or to produce a government under Winston Churchill, who would then speak to this country in those accents which our people so love. But it will have to do with dollars.

To save Great Britain and what is left of the British Empire, many Americans believe that the solution is an economic union between the two countries. As far back as 1945 there was talk of this. Now that NATO is an actuality, the talk, in private still, is more vehement. One argument is that Europe is accustomed to British leadership, which must be maintained if Western Europe is to be useful in a war or in war prevention against Russia. Europe is, it is said, unaccustomed to American methods and irked by the type of leadership the United States offers.

I do not know whether anyone in American public life will have the courage to propound this program to the American people, but as their economic activities are studied, it is becoming increasingly clear that this is the program and that we are being moved into such a union.

Speech by Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi at the Arlington Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the speech of the Prime Minister of Italy, the Honorable Alcide de Gasperi, delivered at the ceremonies dedicating the four gold-plated statues on Arlington Memorial Bridge, Wednesday, September 26. These statues were the gift of the people of Italy to the people of the United States as a token of their renewed friendship and cooperation toward the preservation of world peace.

The friendly and cordial relations now existing between Italy and our country were further strengthened when President Truman, on behalf of the United States, accepted these statues from Prime Minister de Gasperi.

It is apparent now that Italy will finally receive the greatly needed assistance she has sought to bolster her economy so that she might enter into mutual cooperation with the free nations of the world in the grave struggle against communism and the Russian threat to world peace and stability.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER ALCIIDE DE GASPERI AT THE ARLINGTON BRIDGE

Mr. President, a few months ago at Florence I delivered one of these statues to Ambassador Dunn before it was shipped to the United States.

Now here we have all four of the groups in front of us. And I think that in a certain way they fit into the general picture of our meetings and of my visit to the United States. For here you have portrayed: spiritual elevation, the arts, agriculture, gallantry and sacrifice.

Surely all this can stand for the spiritual and material development of man, his humanity, his traditions and his free determination to defend them if threatened.

That is our common objective and the aim of our Atlantic community.

But they represent something more: I mean the gratitude of us Italians for the generosity of the American people.

These statues, a remarkable expression of modern American art, were cast and finished in four different cities, Naples, Florence, Milan, Rome, by artisans and workers coming from all parts of Italy, some of whom are here with us today. Together, these groups represent, not only the gift of a government, but the action and the skilled contribution of Italian industry and labor which have been so efficiently supported, throughout the land, by Marshall-plan assistance.

This aid is but one of the many proofs of United States friendship. It would be easy for me to recall others. Suffice it to mention the recent evidence we have had in these days that we can count on the sympathetic and effective cooperation of the American people represented by their President and their Government.

We have in fact examined with you, Mr. President, and with your Government many

and complex problems which go from the economic and financial cooperation between our two Governments to the legitimate claims of Italy and the solution to that which, perhaps, is the most important problem, overpopulation. In the framework of our close cooperation and cordial friendship the solution of these problems has accomplished considerable progress during the course of the conversations of these recent days.

You and we, in facing and resolving these problems, aim above all at attaining a better general settlement of advantage to the interests of the community of free nations.

We cannot, however, underestimate the fact that this genuine, loyal, and constructive friendship between our two countries is one of the most promising elements in these troubled times.

It is therefore with pleasure that, on behalf of the President of the Italian Republic and of my Government and—I am certain—of all Italians in Italy and the world over, I offer you, Mr. President, this token of deep gratitude.

At the same time I formulate the sincere wish that your country and mine, under the banner of freedom and justice and in prosperity may always work together for democracy, progress, and peace.

The New Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Raymond Moley appearing in Newsweek of October 8.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Moley in the following article speaks specifically of the Conservative Party in England, but conservatism is a philosophy and an ideal, and even as it has arrived in England it may also well revive in the United States.

The article follows:

THE NEW CONSERVATISM

(By Raymond Moley)

Unless all portents fail, the voters of Britain will presently return to power one of the oldest political parties in the world. The Conservatives have survived the vicissitudes of generations. The Liberals, their former rivals, have melted away, while the Labor Party, a relative newcomer, is already showing signs of disintegration.

Meanwhile, the accumulated wealth and vested interests which were once identified with the Conservative Party have almost vanished. Why, then, does this party live on and command, as it undoubtedly does, the support of a majority of the British electorate? If we seek an intelligent answer to this question, we shall find perhaps a guide to understanding not only the British but our own American people.

A part of the answer is that over the years the Conservative Party has sustained the institutions under which the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth, and the United States have found that liberty and progress are indivisible.

Twice in its history the Conservative Party has broken away from a popular economic philosophy which put mere material well-being above considerations of nonmaterial

when Disraeli repudiated the dismal economics of his day. It is doing it now in providing an alternative to the crass materialism of the Socialists. It has appealed from the court of economics to the supreme tribunal of patriotism.

André Maurois has this to say of the challenge of the young Disraeli to the old Tory leaders:

"For him to be a Conservative was not just to uphold with an apologetic smile a constitution held to be out of date; it was a proud and romantic attitude, the only one that took into account the authentic England . . . The duty of a Conservative was to him the courage to defend the past so far as it was living and likely to live."

Disraeli succeeded in evoking pride in the nation's past in the lower middle-class voters whom he helped to enfranchise. Then, with the proud and ambitious spirit of a nation behind him, he spread its influence, both political and economic, throughout the world. The Socialists and, to a degree, the Liberals have reversed the order but have found that in putting material concerns first a nation loses both its patriotism and its prosperity.

The old Conservative spirit is finding expression among the younger members of the party today. David Eccles, whom I saw in action while he was winning his election in Chippenham in 1950, has given a fine expression of this new conservatism. At that time, I heard him say that he had scant patience for those who were talking about the tight little island and were content with a future in which the British people were to eke out a living by merely dividing up what they have. The proper destiny of Britain, he continued, is in world trade and world influence backed by the proud spirit of the people at home.

Recently in notable speeches Eccles has elaborated this theme. "Our party," he said at Sturminster, "is the party of new creation. We are proud of our inheritance but not content with it. We mean to add to it and to make it still more glorious and more widespread . . . The Labor Party is the party of the carving knife. The Socialists . . . cut up wealth and parcel it out more or less equally whether a man has worked hard or not."

The London Economist, which despite occasional lucid moments is mostly imbued with materialistic, quasi-socialist economics, took exceptions to the Eccles position. It took a dim view of Eccles's faith in rousing the spirit of the people. To this Eccles replied: "The failure is not economic. What is on trial is the British character . . . you underestimate the rapidity and vigor with which a Conservative government could rouse the virtues of enterprise and patriotism."

This issue, which is to be made in the election over there, might well be made by the Republicans over here. Our political leaders have put the cart before the horse too long. Economic progress follows a revival of the spirit. The body is badly fed and the spirit dies when statesmanship merely divides what we have. Creation, not division, is the need.

Sorry Political Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Press of October 1, 1951:

SORRY POLITICAL STAMP

A vein of strong irony runs through President Truman's proposal that all top Government officials, including judges, Members of Congress, and national party officers, be required to declare annually all their income—whether from salary, loans, or gifts.

Mr. Truman told Congress he was offering the plan because "attempts have been made through implication and innuendo and by exaggeration and distortion of the facts in a few cases to create the impression that graft and corruption are running rampant through the whole Government."

It is nice to know, anyway, that the President acknowledges a few cases where everything was not done exactly according to proper moral standard. It is the first real concession to the truth he has made on this score.

But the whole tone of his message suggests that Congress and other critics vastly overplayed the moral missteps of Government officials. And to this extent the President is still persisting in bland denial of the facts.

Read in this light, his proposal for annual income disclosure can only be taken as a cynical diversionary tactic designed to confuse the public and discredit honest investigation of Government immorality.

How unfortunate it is that the President of the United States conceives it his duty in this situation to shrug off charges of corruption merely as efforts to get him politically. How sad that he continues to condone moral wrongdoing in top officials and lesser figures alike.

His plan for coping with the problem is no antidote at all, so long as he fails to act forthrightly in cleaning his administration house when the evidence so plainly warrants it.

Mr. Truman's cavalier attitude toward the mounting testimony of corruption reveals one of his weakest traits as an executive. All he achieves by it is a redoubling of the attacks against him.

He exhibited the same falling in his stand on Communists in Government. Had he not lightly dismissed some of those charges as a red herring, he might not have precipitated the deluge which later descended on him and has done so much harm to innocent men in Government.

The President's message seeks to fasten on Congress the blame for putting in jeopardy the reputation of Government as a whole. The blunt reality is that his behavior is really responsible. Had he acted at all times to enforce a sensible moral code, Government would not today be at its evident low estate in the public mind.

Mr. Truman's new plan merits nothing but a dusty corner on a committee shelf. It is his way of saying that he is more interested in tribal political loyalty to the Democratic Party than in morality in Government.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following state-

president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped:

STATEMENT RECENTLY MADE BY PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, TO BE OBSERVED THIS YEAR FROM OCTOBER 7 TO 13, INCLUSIVE

We hereby rededicate ourselves to faith in the thundering words of our immortal Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self evident: That all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

There is no barrier against the physically handicapped. The founding fathers accepted them to full citizenship and, along with every other citizen, entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And what happiness could be greater to the handicapped than that of earning their own way, holding up their end, being a part of the social and economic life of their neighborhood, their city, their State, and the Nation?

But, they cannot, they should not be denied the right to employment because upon that rock all happiness, security, and hope is based.

Therefore we urge all good Americans to lend full support to National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, knowing that its beneficent operations will bring smiles of gladness to replace tears of sadness, productivity instead of idleness, wealth instead of poverty.

The President's Smoke Screen for Chairman Boyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Times of September 29, 1951:

THE PRESIDENT'S SMOKE SCREEN FOR CHAIRMAN BOYLE

At the present price of newsprint, it is probably almost criminal to waste space on President Truman's latest message to Congress. But a Presidential message is a Presidential message, and here is what we have to say.

Mr. Truman is the leader of his party in the Nation. The party's national chairman is, for all practical purposes, his national chairman. The President is confronted by a situation in which Congress is investigating the sources of income of the national chairman. What has been revealed so far greatly discredits this individual.

How does the President react? By bouncing Bill Boyle out of office? That would be the right thing to do, and actually the smart thing to do politically. But no, Mr. Truman's reply is a demand for a law requiring disclosure of the sources of outside income of all important members of the Federal Government and national party officials.

The President is not subtle in making his real point. "Unfortunately," he says, "there are sometimes cases where members of the executive and legislative branches yield to

temptation." The italics are ours, but no italics are required when further on Mr. Truman says that the statute he proposes would embrace, among others, "all elected officers of the Federal Government, including Members of Congress." Besides the President and Vice President, Members of Congress are the only elected officers of the Federal Government.

In other words, the President's oblique defense of Boyle is a sly and irrelevant challenge to Congress. Many Members of that body have sources of outside income. Some of them, in fact, have to have outside sources of income if they are to meet the expenses which their office imposes upon them. In almost every case of the kind, these sources are legitimate and ethical. Some Members, for example, have farms. What is wrong with that? Some endure the rigors of the lecture circuit for hire. What is wrong with that, if his lectures express the Member's independent, unbought convictions?

The President is compelled to say that between the two groups in the public service—the majority, who have no independent incomes, and the minority, who do—"no distinction can be drawn . . . in terms of the public good." In short, both are faithful to their trusts. Mr. Truman also says: "The overwhelming majority of the people who are working for the Federal Government in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches are decent, honest, and upright citizens who are doing their very best in the public interest."

That is true. Then, why a sweeping enactment whose very terms would question the decency, honesty, and uprightness of such people? Surely few of them feel their lives are such that they have to prove that they are decent, honest, and upright by publishing their personal affairs to the world. Such a thing is repugnant to many natures, not because of the sources of income to be ashamed of, but because of a natural instinct for privacy.

But why continue? The law the President asks for will not be enacted. He doesn't expect, or even hope, that it will be enacted. His purpose is to take a jab at Congress when his jab ought to be at Bill Boyle.

Family Farm Policy Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include recommendations made by the Lee County Farm Bureau to the United States Department of Agriculture in regard to Secretary Brannan's Family Farm Policy Review:

MARIANNA, ARK.,
September 10, 1951.

Mr. H. B. PIPER,

Chairman, Lee County Agricultural Mobilization Committee, Marianna, Ark.

DEAR Mr. PIPER: 1. At a meeting of your committee and a group of farmers in this county held at the courthouse September 4, 1951, the Chairman appointed a committee to study and make such comments and recommendations as it will on the so-called "Family Policy Review" as provisionally reported on and tentatively recommended by the Department of Agriculture to the Secretary of Agriculture in a 120 page memorandum under date of June 11, 1951.

2 It is our understanding that it required about 6 months work for the personnel of the Department of Agriculture to prepare the document which is the basis of this discussion. With three copies of the memorandum made available to the present personnel of this committee, it may be said that it has been quite difficult for many of the committee to any more than glance at the memorandum to say nothing of studying it. It is the unanimous conclusion of the committee that much better results could have been obtained if all extraneous matter had been screened and the subject boiled down to an objective to be reached in simple terms. As we see it a large percentage of the subject matter contained in the memorandum is a dissertation on the modus operandi of the various departments of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out the laws of Congress. Everyone, of course, is interested in the departmental functioning of all Government agencies including the Department of Agriculture and the memorandum referred to would be most interesting for its broadening effect to everyone who could have an opportunity to read it. But that is not possible even with all the farmers in this one county.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture in his seven pages of comments lays stress on the fact that the family farm system leads to agriculture progress and good community life. We, of course, subscribe to this philosophy of thinking for it is the fundamental principle of our democracy and is the very backbone of a system of free and unmolested enterprise. We do not feel, however, that this subject should be broadened and extended into the sphere of thinking along the lines that the United States Government can become the godfather of every farmer and other individual in furnishing the money with which to solve their financial ills. We believe in the self-help, independence, and initiative of every American citizen including every able-bodied family. We believe 100 percent in family farm ownership but we do not believe in the Government showing partiality in selection of a comparatively few farmers and other individuals in using the money in the Treasury to buy farms and farming equipment and setting people up under the theory of rehabilitation. We also feel that the acquisition of land and property is an independent function of the individual who should be frugal enough to acquire his holdings without Government aid. We do not favor the welfare state in any of its ramifications or coloring. We now wish to comment briefly on the various subjects as indicated.

1. Family farm system: We approve this plan which has been in existence in this country since the days of the Pilgrim Fathers and is the cornerstone of our American way of life.

2. Family ownership of farms and homes should be upon their own sponsorship and without the direct influence or direct financial assistance of the Government and absolutely free from Government dictation or control.

3. Pilot farms: The theory sounds good but to be effective there would need be one established in each county or smaller area—which would be very expensive either for the State or the Government to establish and maintain. Each State has experiment stations already—many of them have experiment stations for different products. Our State has one parent experiment farm and four branch stations, namely, cotton station at Marianna, rice at Stuttgart, fruit at Hope, and forestry and grazing at Batesville. The cotton branch experiment farm of our State is located in our county. We have been informed that more farmers from without the county visit the farm than do Lee County farmers. The leading farmers in each cotton-growing county of the State visit the farm and they put into practice on their

farms in every community the favorable results from experiments on the experiment farm. The present personnel of our extension service might be well expanded to further supply the needs of a pilot farm. It has already done very valuable work in this direction.

4 We believe in the parity plan in helping to stabilize farm prices but we do not believe in the so-called Brannan plan of the Government committing itself directly to the purchase of many perishable products upon which enormous losses are taken from year to year with no possible solution to the community or the general economy of the land. We do believe that loans through Government-sponsored agencies are helpful in stabilizing the prices of nonperishables such as cotton, corn, wheat, soybeans and many other commodities. This stabilization should, however, be upon the basis of the general economy of the Nation rather than the idea of help to individuals or groups.

5 We favor as a matter of interest affecting the national economy, public control of certain pests such as insects and plant disease which cannot be controlled by individuals or communities.

6 We think the Bureaus and Agencies of the Department of Agriculture are performing needed and valuable service to the public.

(1) Bureau of Agriculture Economics with its subdivisions.

(a) Production and Marketing Administration. This agency is, of course, essential so long as there is an effort to control planting of agricultural crops and to have a crop-insurance program. While this agency in each county is represented by men elected from among the farmers, the activities as well as the thinking of the agency is on a higher level and the function of the personnel is more or less reduced to physical efforts in carrying out policies and decisions made in Washington. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction over the policies used by PMA in bringing about results in some of the control programs. For example, in 1950 PMA undertook in 1 year to correct the evils of several years in the overproduction of cotton during the war production. Instead of limiting cotton acreage to 50 percent of cultivated land in 1950 with the view of further reductions each year until satisfactory adjustment of reserve of cotton was brought about, high-level thinking insisted that the adjustment be made all in 1 year which has brought about an overproduction in 1951 and too much of a decrease in the price of cotton in 1 year. There has been too much delay in arriving at authorized acreage to be planted to crops. If land measurements are to be done, they should be done accurately. This agency seems to have a lot to do with administrative work of the Soil Conservation Service in each county. It must approve and pay for all soil conservation practices. In view of this fact we can see no reason why the two agencies should not be consolidated with divisional head. There is too much duplication of efforts and spending of money in the two agencies. For example, soil analyses are made by the County Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service and one other agency—duplication of efforts and spending of money.

(b) Soil Conservation Service. We believe this service should be continued. It is doing an excellent job. Soil conservation is more important to the economy of the future of our country than any other agency. We believe, however, from an economy standpoint, this agency, PMA, and county extension service could well be under one administrative head and one committee of farmers from each county.

(c) County extension service. Purpose and policies of the Cooperative Agricultural

Extension Service as outlined in United States Department of Agriculture memorandum, entitled "Family Farm Policy Review," dated June 11, 1951, appear to be correct and in agreement with provisions as set forth in the Smith-Lever Act, section 2, 1914. Likewise, recommendations appear to be in keeping with those of the land-grant college system and the Cooperative Extension Service. Because of distortion to truths by some segments of the Government concerning ways and means by which employees of the Agricultural Extension Service can best render service to farm people, the following recommendations are submitted:

a. That extension agents be left free to work with and through any general farm organization or group in projecting a program that characterizes good extension teaching and fulfills the provisions as set forth in the Cooperative Extension Service.

b. That descriptive terms such as the "family farm" as defined in recent political publications dealing with agriculture, be completely omitted, allowing extension agents the freedom to work with all segments of the farm society. The term "family farm" as such is being used as a means of political maneuver, it is dangerous in purpose and offers hazards of depression to the intuition of the American farmer.

c. The extension service be strengthened, not by Federal regulations that would enforce regulatory features of a service, but through the expansion of the existing three-way team, i. e., the land-grant college system with its Department of Agriculture, the experiment stations and research center, and the Extension Service. This expansion should come as a county-State-National developed program, having been formulated by the people whom it represents, and fitted to their needs.

d. The land-grant college system, with its extension service is the oldest of all agricultural agencies. Through its years of service offered to farm people it has gained respect of those people as well as those in urban centers. Its program has been sound, locally developed and administered.

Therefore, it appears that the Agricultural Extension Service should be left as it is, strengthened in scope, and that personnel of the service be permitted to cooperate without Federal interference with those of other agricultural agencies in developing a program best suited to the needs, offering maximum services to farmers, with the least amount of confusion and duplication.

(d) Farm Credit Administration. While we think the functions of this agency should be continued, we believe that the original policy which motivated Congress to pass the laws setting up the agency have gradually been weakened by policies of key personnel on a department level. In the beginning of this Administration its functions, as far as farm-production loans—feed, seed, and fertilizer and supply loans—were concerned, it may be said that they were to be made only during disasters. The policy required a man to make application to local financial institutions before applying for Government loans. This practice is no longer required apparently. We think the Government should not finance any individual out of the Public Treasury, in the first place, and certainly not if the man can arrange for local credit. Although the disaster of 1930 which prompted the setting up of the feed- and seed-loan agency in this section of the United States was intended to help farmers in the disaster areas to finance their crops in 1931, this committee is informed that there were still some farmers in this county up to last year receiving the so-called feed, seed, and fertilizer loans. Banks, insurance companies, and private lending agencies are now making

approximately 85 percent of all kinds of loans, including real-estate loans, commodity loans, crop-production loans, etc., which again is the true democratic principles of our Government in action. Except in great disasters, private institutions can and should be called upon to render financial assistance and needs to the people of this country. We think the FHA and GI mortgage plan of financing the building and purchasing of homes is a good example of Government indirect aid and of the local supply of money by private lending agencies. The disaster loans as provided under Public Law 38 of the Eighty-first Congress should be continued but used only during disasters.

a. Long-term farm mortgage loans: Long-term mortgage loans have been made through the Federal Land Banks and the National Farm Loan Associations and have been well received and provided a useful and needed service for the members. They have accounted for some 10 percent or 12 percent of the total loans in this field. The stated objective of the agency, that is, to serve family-sized farms, would hardly seem to be adhered to in the making of loans up to \$100,000. At least in our section loans of this size are out of the area of family-sized farms. Recommendations. That no intensive drive be made to obtain all the business in this field. That loan service be continued in much the same manner as past. Also that possibly an intermediate term loan of about 5 years pay-out period be offered for making improvements and installing equipment which will require longer time than short-term loans to produce the means of paying out. Fencing, ditching, sodding pastures, soil conservation projects and breeding stock are some suggested possibilities of this type of service.

b. Production loans. Short-term production credit has been provided through the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks and the local production credit associations. This agency came into being during the late depression when normal credit facilities were very much restricted. It served a much-needed demand in the credit structure at that time. There is considerable difference of opinion at this time as to the continued need of this agency. We are of the opinion that in our county at least the operation is needed for a few large borrowers who use more than the legal limit of local banks. However, these cases are so few that they could be handled locally through excess-loan handlings by correspondent banks. The information made public by the associations indicates that the business is profitable and it is our opinion that they should return the Government capital still invested in their capital structure rather promptly and should also pay income taxes on their earnings, if they continue to operate as lending agencies.

c. Capital for cooperative associations: The Bank for Cooperatives is designed to furnish capital to small farmer associations for production, marketing, and buying purposes, and is recognized as helpful to the member farmers in many situations and is commended for these services. However, the operations in our immediate section have rather been in the area of large business. It seems unfair to competing businesses that cooperatives be furnished capital on very liberal terms and also exempted from income taxes on earnings. We would recommend that income from large-scale operations in this field be subject to taxes same as privately owned businesses. We further believe that if there is any justification by any reasoning for group borrowing (cooperatives) from the Public Treasury, individuals and corporations conducting a business should be accorded the same privileges. We do not favor the Government projecting itself into

these financial business matters, except in disasters and then only to provide, indirectly, the capital temporarily to agencies set up for this purpose.

d. Farm-purchase loans: Loans to tenants and other qualified persons to purchase family-size farms on very liberal terms and on such time as enables them to pay the loans have been made by this agency for several years with funds appropriated by Congress. While all loans of this type have not worked out successfully, there have been some highly successful cases. It has enabled some worthy applicants to become successful owners and operators of their farms.

e. Enlargement and development loans: Loans of a shorter term have been made by this agency for additional land to some farms too small to be efficient and also for the purchase of animals and equipment to make the farm an efficient operating unit. This type of loan requires very close supervision and technical assistance in working out a program practical for the particular farm and the owners' capabilities and available labor. Like the land-purchase program, not all these loans have been successful, but certainly the good results have more than balanced off the poor ones. Some good has resulted from this program.

f. Recommendations: The details of supervision and assistance required in this program makes the overhead cost very high and it is our opinion that the program is not adaptable to mass operation. We agree that a great deal of good has come from the program; however, we are not losing sight of what the main objective of the Government should be, that being that it can't possibly become the "parents" of 150,000,000 people and that as a matter of public policy should not buy farms and other property for one individual or group and not do so for others.

(e) Rural Electrification Administration: Accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration as reflected in reports of the service are commendable. Due to the direct service it has offered and to the increased services provided by independent companies as a result of the stimulation that REA competition has given, the number of farms served by electricity has increased from less than 11 percent in 1935 to 86.3 percent at present. Of the remaining 14 percent of farms without electrical service it is estimated that one-third the number lies within the fringe of commercial power companies and can be thusly serviced, and another one-third is so located that any type of electrical service program would be unfeasible; therefore it is recommended:

a. That REA functions as provided in the original Rural Electrification Administration Act be continued as the present program is outlined for a period of 3 years, or a time necessary to complete existing undertakings and to affect the remaining 5 percent of farms not now receiving electrical service, then to be operated as a maintaining service until such time that all association can be locally owned and operated.

b. That the existing associations be cleared of Government debt and support as rapidly as economically sound to do so, then when free of debt be operated as a corporation, owned and controlled by its stockholders, and subject to governing laws the same as those of other business concerns.

c. That Federal grants of funds be made to organized groups of persons to construct and operate electrical power-producing stations, these stations to be administered in the same manner and with the type program as the present existing REA service lines.

d. That Federal legislation remain in the background of REA administration, i. e.,

executing laws of government and refrain from making such laws, allowing the people to formulate and conduct the kind of program most needed and best suited to the purpose.

(f) Federal crop insurance: This is a very badly needed facility. We endorse the general plan but the policies on a departmental level with respect to arriving at a basis of insurance will have to be changed if it is effective in this cotton country of ours. The program was in effect in this country for about 3 years. Our farmers were none too enthusiastic about the program primarily because of its costs and because of the basis of adjustment of losses. There was some personnel deficiencies in the administration of the program which caused wide dissatisfaction but these should not be charged to the principles of the plan. We do not believe policy of selecting some 200 counties out of a total of over 3,000 in the United States to test out the feasibility of the crop-insurance plan will produce the desired results for the reason that any insurance plan to be successful must be predicated upon the basis of volume and the creation of large reserves for payment of losses. We believe that if a favorable premium rate can be established to begin with, an established basis for the amount of insurance can be worked out. Sufficient farmers throughout the Nation could be induced to take the insurance which would make it big enough to be a success. The amount of insurance per acre was too low and the cost too high to induce our farmers to apply for the insurance.

(g) Commodity Exchange Authority: Your committee is in full accord with the aims and functions of the Commodity Exchange Authority and feel that the Grain Futures Act of 1922, as amended in 1936, has just about abolished the evils of the old-day corners and manipulations to the direct benefits of the legitimate speculator and producer as well as the merchants and processors. It would be difficult indeed to visualize our present commodity economy without the benefit of the exchanges. But it does seem to us far-fetched to ask the small farmer—the family-size farm farmer, if you please—to give opinions and advice on the operations and the legislation needed in the operations of the commodity exchanges. While it is strictly true that he is directly affected by the day-to-day transactions, his operation is such that he just hasn't the time nor the finances to be actively interested. This, we might add, is fact gained through years of association with just such farmers, and not starry-eyed speculation. We personally would like very much to see an educational program instituted upon the workings of the futures markets in all its ramifications and expressed in simple everyday language, but do not feel that this dissemination of knowledge should be another function of Government. Rather, should it come from the brokerage houses themselves of their own free will and not by Government edict, just as some of the larger firms are now conducting investment schools for the relatively smaller investor in stocks and bonds. Certainly they should be better qualified and will gladly do so if the need arises. It can also be part of the educational program of the Extension Service set up in each county without additional cost.

Glen Sharp, Chairman of Committee;
Paul B. Benham, Jr., Secretary of Committee; W. B. Edrington; John Doyel; James F. Brunson; Elgan C. Robertson; H. L. Petty; N. B. Monroe; Thomas H. Glat; George R. Graves; Lehman Fowler; Carl Nash; W. E. Curtis; Max D. Miller, Jr.

Sound Finances in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota established a record in financing which might well be used as an example by the Federal Government. South Dakota paid one of the most liberal of all State bonuses to its veterans. By carefully working out its program and levying a 1 cent sales tax, cigarette and liquor tax, the 1 mill general property tax levy, it has financed the bonus payment and interest in approximately 2 years. The State finances are on a cash basis.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the following editorials from the Valley Irrigator, of Newell, S. Dak., and the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader describing how sound finances in Government pays.

Valley Irrigator:

Example. The National Congress might well look to South Dakota, also, for the current example of how such policy pays off. This next week (October 1) off go the sales taxes in South Dakota on liquor and cigarettes, and the additional 1 cent of a 3-cent sales tax. Those taxes were levied to care for the State's then-current increased expenditures, and the result was that in a few years they could be dropped.

Argus-Leader:

Almost an epochal event in this era of rising taxes is the announcement from Pierre that certain special South Dakota taxes will be dropped.

The taxes to go by the wayside are the 2-mill State property tax, 1 percent of the 3 percent sales tax and the 3 percent sales tax on liquor, beer, and cigarettes. These will be repealed on October 1 of this year.

That's a welcome announcement and behind it is a story of good government—good government in the old-fashioned way.

A few years ago South Dakota faced the same problem confronting many States—the payment of a bonus to the men and women who served in uniform in World War II.

The voters approved the payment of the bonus at the regular election in 1948. Meeting in January and February of 1949, the legislature proceeded to set up the necessary machinery to distribute the payments to the service men and women. It was estimated that the cost would be about \$28,000,000.

The legislature could have gone ahead in what seems to be the modern manner—pay out the cash and let somebody else sometime in the distant future worry about the payment.

But George Mickelson, then governor, and the overwhelming majority of the members of the legislature felt otherwise. If the money was to be spent, they reasoned, it had to be paid. And, as times were relatively good, they concluded that the payment should be made as rapidly as possible.

So they set up a series of extra taxes, including the 2-mill levy on State property, an increase in the sales tax and the special tax on liquor, beer, and cigarettes.

Now this chapter in South Dakota's fiscal history is about closed. A total of \$27,424,797—a large sum for a State such as

South Dakota—has been paid to the veterans and there is no long-time debt to linger on as a headache. The people have paid the bill for the payments they authorized in November 1948

"The Old-Fashioned Generals and Diplomats as Well Stubbornly Ignore the Plain Fact That if Air Power Had Been Used Properly, and Not Merely as Hedgehopping Cannon, the Communist Masses Could Never Have Reached the Korean Battlefield in Effective Strength"—Chicago Herald-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago friend, in writing me a few days ago, appended to his letter an editorial clipped from the Chicago Herald-American entitled, "Air Power's True Mission."

I don't think that any article could, in eight or nine hundred words, sum up the problem of the use, the lack of use, or the proper use of air power in Korea better than does this terse editorial of the Chicago Herald-American.

With penetrating truth, the writer of this article pointed out that—

Air power properly wielded would have dried up Communist strength at its source and rendered the land battles unnecessary.

The crux of the whole matter with respect to the use of air power in Korea is the refusal of those in supreme command to permit the United States Air Force in Korea to bomb the Chinese Communists anywhere beyond the Yalu.

Scores of Russian MIG jet planes can come across the Yalu day after day, and attempt to do what damage they can to the ground forces of the United States and the United Nations—but when engaged in battle by the United States Air Force, the Russian planes streak back beyond the Yalu, while the United States planes—under orders—turn tail and come home. They do not follow the Chinese and Russians in their escape across the river.

How bitter our Air Force men must feel to drive the Russians back over the Yalu River, look down, and see the great troop concentrations, ammunition dumps, marshalling yards, and other strategic points, and go home without dropping a single egg on the many enemy targets in view.

While, for diplomatic reasons, we have not made use of our strategic air power in Korea, nothing can ever detract from the lessons learned by the magnificent work done in tactical use of air power in close battle support.

The plain fact is that no force in the world has ever achieved the seemingly impossible things that the United States Air Forces have, in fighting ground forces from the air. The highest military authorities in and out of Korea frankly

admit that were it not for the United States Air Force, the ground troops of the United Nations would have been thrown out of that country, a long time ago.

While nobody has ever thought of an airplane as a weapon designed to kill individual enemy soldiers and enemy personnel on the ground, authoritative sources report that United States air power has already accounted for more than 47 percent of all enemy casualties in Korea, the destruction of 72 percent of all enemy artillery destroyed, and 81 percent of all enemy trucks destroyed, to say nothing about the destruction of hundreds of bridges, highways, dams, and other enemy delaying actions that have been accomplished by our flying forces.

It used to be thought that the only answer to a new big tank brought out by the enemy was a still bigger, heavier tank, and so, for years, it was a rat race between various nations to see who could bring out and put into action the greatest number of the heaviest, fastest tanks.

Korea has taught the fallacy of that solution. Today, the answer to a bigger tank is a small jet airplane. The records of the Korean war reveal that the American Air Forces have destroyed more than 75 percent of all the tanks that were used against our ground forces with such devastating effect the first few weeks of the war.

The article, Air Power's True Mission, clipped from the Chicago Herald-American, is short, terse, and condensed. Believing as I do that this editorial is something that every American and every Member of this House ought to be acquainted with I am asking the unanimous consent of my colleagues to place the same in the Record.

The article is as follows:

AIR POWER'S TRUE MISSION

When traditional thinking attempts to discredit a novel solution of a difficult problem, the routine technique is to assume that the new method is to be used in a manner entirely unsuited to its nature.

This is exactly what the old-fashioned generals and their political bosses are now doing to the concept of air power.

In hundreds of derogatory statements they persist in the deliberate assumption that airplanes by themselves constitute air power.

They willfully overlook the fact that the airplane is only the instrument of air power, while air power itself means the strategic use of the airplane.

Thus they point to the Korean campaign, in which airplanes have been lavishly used, as one instance where air power was powerless to destroy infantry armies.

They stubbornly ignore the plain fact that if air power had been used properly, and not merely as hedgehopping cannon, the Communist masses could never have reached the battlefield in effective strength.

When pressed to evaluate General MacArthur's urgent pleas that air power be employed to interdict the movement and supply of the Chinese formation, they blandly say:

"He had plenty of airplanes and used them all. Even then, under 'round-the-clock' air attacks, the Chinese kept advancing, fighting and supplying."

What these earth-bound apologists forget is that air power, properly wielded, would have dried up Communist strength at its source and rendered the land battles unnecessary.

Whatever failures occurred in Korea were caused by failure to use air power intelligently. They do not mean failure of air power itself.

As this is true of Korea, how much more true it would be of a general conflict between America and world communism.

For in such a war, there would be actually only two chief targets: the industrial complex of Soviet production, and the industrial complex of American production.

And if either of the antagonists took full advantage of air power, the issue could be decided long before the cumbersome, complicated and enormously costly surface armies got within range of each other.

The Politburo, with its insistence on experiment with new designs, and its much greater numbers and superior organization of military aviation, could then be conceivably the successful contestant.

The United States, with its penurious, short-sighted, hesitant, conventional and surface-minded political view of air power, could very easily suffer disastrous defeat.

It is more than past time that our tradition-bound generals and politicians reorient their thinking or give way to the progressive champions of air power in our national defense.

For nothing is more certain than that the next war, if or when it comes, will be fought almost entirely in the air.

Obviously, whichever combatant is prepared to seize and keep mastery of the air will emerge victorious.

America has the strength, the skill, and providentially still the time, to assure victory for herself.

She must, to survive, immediately establish her claim to undisputed mastery of the air.

Indiana Welfare Funds Mess and Danger to Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate mistake made by the Indiana Legislature in passing, over the Governor's veto, a law in direct conflict with the Federal law concerning welfare funds, has split the Indiana Republican Party wide open. The vast majority of Republicans in Indiana hope the legislature, now in special session, will correct this mistake by amending their recent enactment to be effective if and when the Congress changes the Federal law. The House Ways and Means Committee has already set a date for hearings for the Harrison bill which would make the distribution of welfare funds public. This method is the regular and common-sense procedure for the Congress to take on this matter. The Indiana Republican bosses are making an effort to "come in the back door" and handle this legislation through an amendment to the tax bill. This method is undemocratic and if adopted by the Senate-House conferees will endanger the tax bill. All 47 States are out of step but Indiana. The Ways and Means Committee of the House, in cooperation with the Senate, has spent months in working out a tax bill. Why endanger it by considering an amendment in an effort to lift the misguided Indiana Legislature off its hot seat?

The Gary Post-Tribune, one of the leading Republican newspapers in northern Indiana, has the following comment to make:

USE SOME COMMON SENSE

Some Republicans down-State seem to be placing a great deal of importance on the principle involved in the fight over the welfare law in the legislature. But no principle will be lost if the law opening the welfare lists to inspection is delayed in going into operation.

A great many people are opposed to the concentration of government in Washington, but that is not the only principle involved in that problem. There is another principle of double taxation which is also highly meaningful in this day of very high taxes.

Furthermore, the latter principle can be held without affecting the former. Then there is a third principle which is worth some consideration. That is the business of a representative of the people actually representing their interests rather than taking orders from a few self-constituted bosses.

Who gave the authority to Senator JENNER or whoever is doing the heavy thinking for the Republican bosses to decide who is a rebel and who is not? The idea, of course, is to howl down the opposition. Lacking a sensible issue, the boys are depending on noise to decide the issue.

The Post-Tribune is not interested in party politics, but we are interested in principles and in taxation. We think there is no honest basis for double taxation and no reason to foist this unnecessary expense on Indiana taxpayers. We are also convinced that the principle of opposition to centralized government will not be destroyed by using common sense.

Let us consider all the principles involved. We can still stand against centralized government and not throw away our money. The issue of big government will not be settled by the Republican bosses of the Indiana Legislature. It is a big problem and the excitement of a few little men in Indianapolis will not change the course of history. On the other hand, the use of common sense may help to start a trend in the right direction.

The Senators thought this matter over well, and calmly. They decided not to be hasty. So while the 11-percent boost in income taxes on everybody else is to go into effect November 1 this year, the Senators voted that the end of the tax exemption should not go into effect until January 3, 1953.

In other words, they voted to keep their own tax exemptions but to abolish those of the next Congress and next administration.

What a pretty page of history. The spirit of noble sacrifice exhibited here will touch the hearts of American voters just about as deeply as it touches the pocketbooks of the Senators who voted for it.

Mr. Speaker, much can be said in justification of the tax-free expense allowance now enjoyed by the Members of Congress and it would be as unfair to require a traveling salesman to pay taxes on the moneys he received as reimbursement of legitimate business expense as it is to compel Congressmen to pay tax on the expense incurred incidental to the discharge of their official duties. In fact, the average Member of Congress incurs legitimate expenses far in excess of the annual allowance and if called upon to justify them as provided in pending legislation can undoubtedly do so.

My annoyance, however, stems not so much from the fact that we shall be forced to justify these deductions for bona fide expenses as it does from the implication conveyed by this editorial that Members of Congress do not pay taxes. The statement "So while the 11-percent boost in income taxes on everybody else is to go into effect November 1 this year" conveys the impression that the new tax rise will not apply to Congressmen, which is just not so. Every Member of the House and Senate will have his taxes increased in the same proportion as the rest of the citizenry and any statement to the contrary is simply irresponsible reporting.

derers of history To say this is not to deny that Russia is still dangerous—dangerous as a bear running amuck in a cage would be.

Andrei Gromyko in San Francisco stood more alone than any man in peacetime history. Not even his stooges from Czechoslovakia and Poland could warm the cold that must have run through his marrow.

It is almost unbelievable that Russia could have converted such a glittering opportunity into such disastrous isolation—in six brief years.

When the war ended, Russia was one of the heroic victors. Her prestige was never higher. The western nations were fully prepared to live with her. The Big Five were to spearhead an era of peace and understanding. Trade was open to her in every port of the world. The opportunity, 20 years deferred, was hers then to rebuild her country with the blessing of all men, to give her people the good things of peace so long withheld, to build great dams and to prove that her system had some merit.

Never has any nation before thrown away so much so fast.

Out of a fear refracted back from her own enmities, she remained armed to the teeth. She aggressed constantly for buffers in the Baltics, the Balkans, the Middle East, and Asia. Her stupidity was given impetus by the rigid Marxist concept of historical predestination, a predestination that holds all right and all wrong to be calculable on the bases of classes.

And there was no force to arrest this growth in stupidity, because Russia could not call upon the resources of free men. All decisions were those of Stalin. No man born of earth could meet the test.

So Gromyko stood alone in San Francisco to dramatize for all to see the giant dimensions of Russia's blunders and her tragic losses. He stood before 61 nations. Those nations normally would have represented a dozen clamorous dissents from the Japanese treaty. The Philippines, Indonesia, and all the other smaller Asiatic nations would have registered serious opposition to a reconstructed Japan.

Gromyko drew those nations together. He stilled their dissent. And all that happened this week in San Francisco dramatized what has been happening at an ever swifter pace throughout the world.

Russia has converted trade opportunities into trade restrictions and alliances against her. She has brought into being the organized resources of nations that can outproduce the Red bloc 10 to 1. She has summoned forth the Marshall plan. She has created the North Atlantic Pact, which will shortly extend to Turkey and Greece. She has lost ready access to Japan and West Germany. These two nations, the chief industrial nations potentially apart from America, have gone aggressively into the western bloc. She has started the wheels turning on the most gigantic arsenal of military power ever confronted by any other nation.

In doing all these things, Russia has laid upon herself the burden of continued expenditures for unproductive defense. She must live in fear. She must find her internal strains mounting. She must be confronted constantly by the threat of the rising power against her which may draw away her allies as it did in the case of Tito.

Here in America the tremendous hue and cry arises when anything goes awry in the way we handle things. This outcry helps us correct our mistakes. Such correction helped us pull back from appeasement of Red China and strengthened our whole Asiatic policy. Russia has no such protection. One wonders what the Russian people would do, if they were free to know and act against the Kremlin for the devastation that has occurred in the Russian position.

We stress the monumental blunders of Russia today in order that we may enforce our faith in our own system and in our ultimate victory against all slave systems. Our

Free Press and Editorial Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I am moved to comment on the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer last week:

"SACRIFICE" IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Strictly notorious has been the tax exemption enjoyed by the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress on their expense allowances, which run into quite a tidy sum.

Now the Senate has voted, 77 to 11, to abolish that tax exemption.

The vote came on an amendment to the new tax bill, which boosts the levies on the rest of us by \$5,500,000,000 a year. It was obvious, even to Members of Congress, that when everybody else's taxes were to be hiked, it didn't look too good for them to go on enjoying this special tax privilege.

The Senate, however, is not made up of impulsive young hotbloods. To the contrary,

Enlightened Confidence in World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 8, 1951, the Boston Traveler printed an editorial concerning the situation into which Russia has maneuvered herself in only 6 years and the type of understanding and confidence which we in the United States must have in order to cope with the Russian threat. I think the editorial is excellent, and, under permission to extend, I include it in its entirety:

ENLIGHTENED CONFIDENCE IN WORLD CRISIS

Russia stood before the San Francisco conference this week—almost a suicide.

Such is not the popular version. Too many of us have got into the habit merely of counting noses. Some 600,000,000 persons added to the Communist sphere of influence since the war. How clever are the men in the Kremlin. How invincible this man, Stalin.

It is more than time that we concluded that Russia has outblundered all the blun-

dangers actually rise as Russia's position grows more critical. There is likely to be a period when Russia may well take the gamble of war rather than watch her position deteriorate further. For that reason General Eisenhower is supremely right when he stresses the necessity for aiding our allies with enough and in time.

Unfortunately there seem to be two policies in America today. One is that of General Eisenhower and the other is that of some Congressmen who are retrenching on our effort. What we are asking here is simply for enlightened confidence. Confidence will come through faith in our own system and an understanding of the invincible stupidity at the heart of all dictatorships. Enlightenment lies in our clear recognition that this very stupidity has maneuvered Russia into a position where for the moment she is doubly dangerous.

Security Information: Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News of September 27, 1951:

SECURITY ORDER ONE MORE BLACKOUT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS

President Truman's extension of the Pentagon brand of security information control to all departments of the Federal Government means inevitably a suppression of news which the public is entitled to have.

It's another step in the direction of keeping the people from real knowledge of what's going on inside their Government.

The military services long have used the classification system to cover up matters which they don't want known for one reason or another, but which have no real relation to security.

The Pentagon, for example, has classified as secret the price contracted for ordinary supplies. It has put the lid on the findings of investigations into alleged misconduct.

The system has its ridiculous side, also. Files branded "top secret" have turned out to be filled with clippings of articles which have had Nation-wide publication.

Service officers in charge of classification have found it safest for their own skins to stamp almost everything secret. That will be the natural inclination of security officers in the civilian departments.

The administration has adopted a policy of linking up every conceivable civilian project with defense, including the pet welfare schemes of the Fair Dealers.

It takes no great imagination to foresee how the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, the Commerce Department and others will react to the order that gives a way to prevent prying into affairs which they choose to elect as related to defense. Actually, in these times, almost every activity of the Government can be connected somehow with national security.

The necessity for the Truman directive isn't apparent. The Government got through World War II without a black-out of this extent. We know of no important military secrets that have leaked out through other agencies.

The real reason, we fear, is the instinct of this administration to keep Congress and

the people ignorant of the activities of the mammoth bureaucracy in Washington.

The administration would like to have everything as securely buttoned up as the Atomic Energy Commission. Here is an operation in total secrecy, spending billions of dollars without audit. No one can challenge AEC spending, because no one knows how and why and where it's spending.

Even the Pentagon is envious of the AEC, which has to go through only the barest motions of justifying its budget.

The ideal condition is when "top secret" can be stamped on any project of Government to forbid questioning. The country is getting closer to that through Mr. Truman's so-called security order.

Ye Old Toll Gate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ye Old Toll Gate," published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of September 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YE OLD TOLL GATE

The toll gate is coming back fast and in several places in the East particularly, it has been with us for quite some time.

Despite Federal opposition, which is gradually dying out, and charges that it is "a return to nineteenth century thinking," by the end of this year motorists will be paying to use nearly 1,000 miles of turnpikes, expressways, parkways or freeways, the National Geographic Society reports.

The toll he pays is the only thing today's driver on a super-highway has in common with the nineteenth century teamster on a Conestoga trail. These modern landscaped arteries, free of red lights, intersections, sharp curves, and grades, are a far cry from the wagon trails of 150 years ago.

Construction of the speedways is costly. The United States Bureau of Public Roads estimates an expenditure of \$60,000,000,000 over a 15-year period is necessary to bring United States highways up to minimum adequacy and today's gasoline and license fees cannot touch that figure.

Our own turnpike in this State, 160 miles of it opened in 1940 and to which many more miles have been and are being added, has proved the possibility of financing such express roads by tolls.

After the close of World War II the rush for new toll roads began, with Maine building a 44-mile toll road from Kittery to Portland, bypassing United States 1, as the first section in a proposed 400-mile turnpike to Canada and a 14-mile toll link across the foot of New Hampshire followed in short order.

Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, and Colorado are among the States using or planning to use the toll gate as a means of getting from one place to another in a hurry. And over the Nation 28 States have considered toll road legislation with 18 passing it.

Time moves on, but it moves in a cycle and it seems that ye old toll gate once discarded by public outcry is here to stay and by public outcry.

The Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial entitled "We Must Speak of Peace, Peace, Peace," published in the Minneapolis Star of October 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST SPEAK OF PEACE, PEACE, PEACE

On June 9, 1950, Dr. Niels Bohr, of Copenhagen, wrote an open letter to the United Nations. Though Dr. Bohr is one of the greatest living scientists and philosophers, his letter attracted little attention outside intellectual circles.

The free world at that time was in a fit of fear and desperation over Communist aggressions and, therefore, not in a mood to take long views. The open breach of peace committed by communism in Korea proved that the free world's enemies would not confine their attacks to such propaganda outrages as the Stockholm peace petition, but would shoot people they could not horn-swoggle.

So Dr. Bohr's wise words were lost in the shouts of battle and the clangor of plowshares being beaten into swords. America, while still willing to seek peace, began to prepare to submit its way of life to the test of battle. The country had no choice but to prepare for battle, and still has no choice.

It is not an easy thing for leaders of a democratic country to summon peaceful citizens to prepare for war. People hate to be dragged away from their peaceful pursuits, and to get them to make voluntary sacrifices a nation's leaders must crush peoples' hopes that a show-down can be avoided.

The fact that this is necessary explains many of the recent fearful and uncompromising statements that have been made in Washington. They are justifiable even if they are not based on Russian acts or preparations, because the United States dares not falter in preparing for a test of battle it may have to face.

But leadership has another responsibility in preparing a nation for a test of its way of life. And, because the United States is the leader of the world in which this test may have to be faced, this other responsibility is of profound importance.

It is to say, in inspiring words the whole world can understand, how war could be avoided, and what peace could mean if it were not violated.

America's leaders have not succeeded in doing this—they have not fulfilled their other responsibility to America and to the world. They have not lifted the world's eyes and filled its heart with a vision of the peace we seek as the only goal that could inspire or justify our sacrifices.

John Cowles, president of this newspaper, pointed out in an article in yesterday's Minneapolis Tribune what this failure to describe the peace we seek is costing us. We know the motives of the free world are generous and just. But because we have not sworn our love of peace and declared how we believe it can be attained, we find ourselves in the ludicrous position of being out-paced by the Soviet Union.

We want a disarmed and open world—a world in which men and women will neither have to waste their labor preparing for war nor live in fear that other men and women

are secretly preparing to conquer and enslave them.

This is the summons Dr. Bohr sent the United Nations a year ago—a summons to peace in an open world. "An open world where each nation can assert itself solely by the extent to which it can contribute to the common culture and is able to help others with experience and resources must be the goal to be put above everything else," Dr. Bohr declared.

Dr. Bohr, who speaks with perhaps more authority than any living man, not only believes an open and a peaceful world might be fruitful of almost undreamed material benefits, but that harmonious exchange and blending between the world's varying cultures would deepen the stream of spiritual life.

The time has come, it seems clear to us, to take Dr. Bohr's open letter to the United Nations off the table, and to see if it does not contain the central and galvanic idea this Nation needs to fulfill its other responsibility for leadership to the world.

Projected Executive Order Will Gag Civilian Nondefense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 24, 1951:

PARALYSIS

The paralysis of public ignorance which has been shadowing the American mind through governmental fiat in recent months, on the pretext that defense made it necessary, will receive a further impetus if President Truman issues his projected Executive order to gag civilian nondefense agencies.

This is part of the pattern that the administration has been creating piecemeal to silence criticism and compel the public, by directed information so called, or by absence of facts on public issues to conform to its way of thinking and to support its policies.

The excuse is that the step is necessary to prevent news of mobilization activities, on which military and civilian branches of the Government cooperate, from becoming known.

With sober and plous mien the spokesmen in Washington say that this order will not be employed to withhold information merely because it might be inconvenient to the administration. It will, we are also told, be kept clean of abuse.

Such a system might, in some utopian future, work in this manner. None so far has. But knowing the sensitivity of the present office holders to any suggestion that what they decide to do without public consultation is not divinely inspired, we wish to register a warning that this order will become in application merely another means of preventing the people from learning what goes on, how their money is being spent, and to cloak matters of policy until they are accomplished facts and it is too late, by force of public opinion, to prevent or change the result.

A danger is obvious in the proposed character of the order. What information is confidential, top secret, restricted; what information must be hid in safes or not even mentioned over telephones, will be decided

by the heads of the sixty-odd governmental agencies to which the order will apply.

Obviously, then, what the head of one department may decide is taboo may, to the head of another, be perfectly legitimate public information. The fumbling or worse of one department will be information, surely, of a highly restricted character as far as that department is concerned. And at hand is the powerful order from the President to cover up such mistakes on the excuse that defense might be jeopardized.

When we recall how the administration in the past has put over its pet schemes before the public eye by faits accomplis or by changing the name of some unpopular measure or merely by keeping silent, we fear the consequences of this new gag rule.

We are thinking especially of how the President has declared war without the benefit of established constitutional processes. We recall also the manner in which troops were detailed to Europe. Then there is the history of the program of aid to Greece and Turkey. Only after the step had been taken was Congress consulted. The point is not whether these policies and actions were good or bad—the point is that Truman had his way and public opinion would either come along and conform or be damned.

What, we wonder, will be pulled off under this new cloak of defense security?

Congress, which sits theoretically to protect the rights of the public, should take time out from its various investigations to look closely into this matter. It should raise and debate the issue of Presidential rights by fiat, a dictatorial method that Mr. Truman is making more and more a part of the peacetime operation of the Government.

Regulations Governing Attorney's Contracts With Indian Tribes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, Manuel Lujan, the governor of one of the Indian pueblos in New Mexico, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Interior under date of August 31, 1951. The letter refers to an Indian problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1951.

HON. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAPMAN: Recently I received from Mr. Hagberg, the area director, a copy of the proposed regulations governing attorneys' contracts with Indian tribes. I was informed that I and my council could make comments on this to be in your office by September 11.

I first call to your attention the type of protection that we Pueblos of New Mexico need, and, based upon this need, arises our need for an attorney.

We need protection from the Indian Bureau and not so much more from non-Indians. The Indian Bureau has refused to approve Indian contracts here in New Mexico for over six pueblos because the attorney differed with the Indian Bureau. Commissioner Myer has stated that they will not ap-

prove attorneys' contracts, for any attorney is troublesome.

Today even with non-Indians all matters are referred to the Indian Bureau, since we do not have an attorney. As you know, Mr. Hagberg attempted to change our type of government, and it is impossible for us to work with him.

We object to the proposed regulations, since they give the Indian Bureau too much authority, and no attorney can get their approval unless he does what Mr. Hagberg wants. We further object to the Indian Bureau having anything to do with our internal affairs.

Very truly yours,

MANUEL LUJAN,
Governor.

Security Information: Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 27, 1951:

AN EVIL ORDER

The Presidential order setting up "uniform standards" for "security information," an order giving each head of a Government agency the right to suppress information as injurious to national security, has very dangerous potentialities.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors objected to the order when it was first drafted in July, and certain considerations will make clear to the public why the editors took the stand they did.

In the first place, it can be expected that the heads of Government agencies have judgment enough not to release military secrets that would be of advantage to the enemy—judgment enough to hold such matters back without special order.

Secondly, few agencies are doing work which can honestly be classified under the heading of "Secret for security reasons." The atomic projects and direct military operations are already well protected from the public eye. They need no new orders.

The objection comes, therefore, to giving the heads of all agencies the protection of secrecy. President Truman asserted that the "regulations are designed to keep security information away from potential enemies and must not be used to withhold nonsecurity information or to cover up mistakes made by any official or employee of the Government," but his statement serves more to point up the objections than to remove them.

Who is to decide what constitutes mistakes by agencies or employees of Government?

Under our way of life the public ultimately renders the decisions by its votes at the polls. At the moment the affairs of the RFC are a case in point. Congress is investigating many of its loans and the public is reading about them in the papers. There will naturally be difference of opinion as to the morality and legality of many of the transactions, but eventually Congressmen and Senators elected by the voters will render a verdict.

If, however, the RFC had been armed with authority to keep its transactions secret—and it might have done so on the ground

that it was giving assistance to defense industry—that public would not have learned that the Truman politicians have been playing high, wide, and loose with public money.

And the Presidential order empowers the heads of agencies to say what information is related to national security. Whoever has had experience with Government agencies in time of war knows that the tendency is to err on the side of security that Government job holders deem it in the interest of their personal security not to give out anything they can keep locked up.

Isn't it clear that an agency is most likely to escape the fire of public and congressional criticism if it operates secretly? It is to the selfish interest of every bureaucrat to keep his books under lock and key, to give out only what he might desire to give out.

It is on such considerations that the Society of Editors said that the "net effect of this Executive order" will be to "formalize the suppression of news to which the public is entitled."

One of the distinctive and most important features of American Government has been the absence of secrecy, the right of the public to know what its Government is doing. Secrecy will inevitably create conditions of public oppression of the type from which our ancestors suffered in the Old World.

In our crusade for freedom, let's protect our own.

Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address of Col. Edward A. Sherman, executive director, Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report, over Station WEEI, Boston, Mass., September 15, 1951:

REDUCING THE FEDERAL WASTELINE

Let's invest a few minutes looking two of our country's enemies square in the eye. The names of these two enemies are inflation and waste. First take a good look at inflation. Inflation means money losing its purchasing power. The result of inflation is that your dollar buys less and less. Because of inflation your dollar today brings just a little bit more than half of what it bought in 1939.

Experience has shown that inflation will, unless checked, make money almost worthless—remember the basketfuls of German marks that would only buy a loaf of bread? And run-away inflation can wreck our country just as it has wrecked others in the past.

Inflation is a habit. We've been slaves of this habit now for nearly 20 years. We got into the habit by inflationary measures seized upon as cures for the great depression.

To show you how the cure was worse than the disease, let me give you a few figures pointing out the cost of the inflationary policies used to cure the depression. The officially estimated total loss by depositors in suspended banks between 1921 and 1933 was less than \$2,000,000,000. Compare this figure of two billion with the total loss because of the depreciated dollar on the average value of life insurance policies, time deposits in banks, and E. F. and G. savings bonds for the years 1941 through 1950. That figure is over 116 billion.

You can see how much worse the cure was than the disease itself.

Now there are only two forces that can hold any economy together and keep it working for any length of time. One is an iron-fisted dictatorship which forces people to work and tells them just what they can have in return. The other force is a system of supply and demand pricing based on the free choice of the people as to what they will produce and what they will buy.

In this land of ours, freedom of enterprise is the guiding star for it measures the result of our plans and our work and determines what we may get tomorrow for what we do today.

When inflation takes the bit in its teeth and prices start leaping up, our normal price system loses its power to hold things together and keep us working for the good of all. Then confusion and frustration takes over as healthy incentives disappear and production drops.

Our present inflationary trend in Government, if left unchecked, will eventually destroy what we know as capitalism—the production through incentive system that has made our country great and which functions best when there is a minimum of governmental interference or restraint and when the value of money is established by competition for various goods and services.

The alternative to our American free-enterprise system is the decay of our military and productive power to withstand the Communist pattern which destroys freedom and human dignity wherever it sprawls.

The Communist strategy of world conquest counts heavily on inflation to reduce the strength of its victim.

Knowing this, let's admit that the time to face up to this danger and do something about it is now. For there is a way for a free and intelligent people to avert disaster.

First, we must put emphasis on production. The genius of our Nation for production is our greatest tangible asset. It should not be shackled—it should be used.

Second, we must have economy in Government. The ever-increasing nondefense expenditures of Federal, State, and local government use up an excessive share of our national income.

Let's take time to get our teeth into some definite specifics on this subject. Ten years ago the cost of government, Federal, State, and local took approximately 14 percent of all our income. When the war ended in 1945 taxation was taking 27 percent of our income. This year the best available figures indicate that taxation will take about 29 percent of our income and next year it is expected to be better than 31 percent of all our income.

These steps are so insidiously easy to take—14 percent, 27 percent, 29 percent, 31 percent—then 40 percent as it is in socialist Britain—then 60 percent as it is in Communist Russia. When Government takes more than a third of the citizen income, he, the citizen ceases to be free and independent. Government which should be the servant of the people becomes the master.

From every source we get new evidence of the relentless growth of Government spending that has no connection with our military preparedness program. For example, the Department of Commerce budget for 1950 was over a thousand percent increase over its 1940 budget. The Department of Labor spent over 1,200 percent more in 1950 than it did in 1940.

Soon our army of civil-service employees will be as big as the combined total of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Just how long are we to tolerate this sort of thing? When will the voter, the citizens, the taxpayers, discard their false belief in something for nothing government and flock to the banner of those who do not promise handouts but who advocate reduction of nonessential spending, elimination of waste

and a return to common-sense administration of public affairs.

We have too long rewarded the spend-thrifts who have given us nothing but the highest public debt ever dreamed of and still higher taxes.

A word about the public debt—here are a few figures from the United States Treasury Department.

In 1869 after the Civil War our public debt was \$2,200,000,000. In 1919 after the First World War our debt was \$25,200,000,000. In 1929, a boom year, our public debt was \$16,600,000,000. In 1939 it had grown to \$39,900,000,000. In 1951 we find it at the dizzy figure of \$255,000,000,000. How much is a billion? To give you just a little idea of it—there are not quite a billion minutes in 1,900 years.

You do not have to be a long-haired economist to understand that piling up debts is unsound.

For a while most any individual can spend more than he takes in but—there comes an inevitable day of reckoning. Public spending of more than is taken in merely piles up the problem for future generations. Do you want to saddle your children with the burden of ever-increasing billions of debt? Why not embark on a program of increased production, Government economy, taxes to the point where production incentives are not destroyed, prudent military spending, curtailed credit, increased individual savings, and a real serious dedication of every citizen to the cause of freedom through active participation and interest in responsible Government?

Herbert Hoover recently urged reconsideration of some of our older and time-tested and typically American virtues. I think it will bear repeating. He said, "The practical thing we can do if we really want to make the world over again is to try out the word 'old' for a while." There are some old things that made this country.

There is the old virtue of religious faith. There are the old virtues of integrity and the whole truth.

There is the old virtue of incorruptible service and honor in public office.

There are the old virtues of economy in Government, of self-reliance, thrift, and individual liberty.

There are the old virtues of patriotism, real love of country, and willingness to sacrifice for it.

These old ideas are very inexpensive. They even would help win hot and cold wars.

Our only living former President would have us reexamine the pattern of government given us by our founding fathers, who, with great understanding of human nature created a representative government of checks and balances; a Federal Republic of limited power, dedicated to personal liberty.

Our Nation has undergone many changes since our founding fathers drafted the Constitution. In spite of these changes, Jefferson's axiom that the best governed people are the least governed people still holds true even if it does take a lot more government to meet the pressing issues of today than it did in Jefferson's time.

In our zeal to maintain human rights and protect minorities, we should not lose sight of the fact that majorities have rights, too, and strange as it may seem in these days majority rights are often in need of safeguards. It is often proper and sometimes necessary for agriculture or business, or labor or racial and other groups to act collectively to obtain equality of treatment and to prevent discrimination, but when such groups push beyond such legitimate objectives and use their combined strength to reach for special privileges they undermine the very processes that assure their liberties. In following the will-o'-the-wisp security it should be remembered that nowhere in recorded history has any form of government ever

achieved absolute or lasting security for its people.

Our experience—our common sense tells us that security must be built from within. Every man eventually knows both happiness and trouble, sickness and health, success and failure, and all the many conditions that comprise the wide range of human experience.

Some of the popular catch phrases and slogans need to be more closely examined. For example the phrase "freedom from want and fear," usually associated with the four freedoms, was first uttered by a national socialist named Adolf Hitler when he said, "We shall banish want. We shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. There must be cheap Volkswagen for the workers to ride in and broad autobahns for the Volkswagen."

"Rooted in the fuller life for every German from childhood to old age, national socialism means a new day of abundance at home and a better world abroad." Those were the political promises of security given to the German people in exchange for their personal freedoms.

Why do people fall for such slogans? Here is another well-known promise. Karl Marx said, "To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability." That simply means that government will put its finger on every individual and decide just how much he must contribute to society and just how much he will receive in return.

Then there is the slogan of the Labor Party in England, "Fair shares for all." What fair shares? What all-wise power will evaluate them? Or will it elect to disregard individual requirements, tastes, capacities and rights and feed us all from the same public trough? Even within the last month or so, Clement Attlee said, "Our socialist movement is not merely out to change things—it is out to change people."

Now, government is going to take over the job of shaping individual character. Doesn't that come under the category of—omnipotence? If they succeed there will be no further need for God, for then man will be made in the image of his government. Hadn't we better get back to first principles and try to keep our country the way our founding fathers intended?

We can recognize today's urgent need for active militant participating citizenship. We can enlist in the war against waste and irresponsibility in Government. In the Hoover Report we have a complete battle plan. We can let our people in Congress know that half of the Hoover Report already adopted is a job only half done.

We can demand of our Congressmen that they work toward the enactment of the remainder of the Hoover blueprint for better government at a better price. These things we can do.

Security Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 29, 1951:

BUREAUCRATIC REACTION

When President Truman issued his order establishing uniform methods for the clas-

sification and suppression of alleged security information, he felt impelled to issue a warning to the heads of Government agencies that their censorship authority should not be abused by being invoked "to withhold non-essential information or to cover up mistakes made by any official or employee of the Government."

The very fact that the President thought it necessary to issue such a warning was an admission that the classification order had dangerous potentialities which threatened the free dissemination of news to the people about what their Government was doing.

We did not have to wait very long for a concrete example of this very thing. Within 2 days after the Presidential order was signed, the Office of Price Stabilization issued an order prohibiting the disclosure of internal information "that might cause embarrassment to OPS."

If strictly interpreted, this order might well have prevented the release of any information about OPS activities because we cannot imagine this agency doing anything which will not eventually cause it embarrassment.

Members of the United States Senate had a field day when news of this order reached them. Their denunciations reverberated from Capitol Hill to the White House, with the result that Mr. Truman promptly directed OPS to cancel its order. This was highly commendable on the part of the President. But what would happen, we wonder, on some other occasion, if a similar censorship order were kept secret, or if the President, in one of his stubborn streaks, declined to intervene?

Government suppression of the free press is the first step toward dictatorship. And suppression of news about activities of Government agencies is a step toward suppression of the free press. The President's security classification order is dangerous, and it should be revoked.

Good Advice for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilmington Suburban News of Friday, September 28, 1951.

The Wilmington Suburban News is an excellent weekly publication covering the suburbs adjacent to Wilmington, Del. This editorial is well worth reading and of timely interest.

GOOD ADVICE FOR ALL AMERICANS

Judge Paul Leahy's counsel to a group of 54 foreign-born residents at naturalization ceremonies last week contained injunctions and advice that might well be heeded by all Americans including those in high places. While it was a brief address, delivered to a small group, those who heard it, or read it in the newspapers, can readily recognize that it was not made extemporaneously, or without preparation. The precepts of moral conduct that he laid out might well be made a part of a moral code so needed in these days of hysteria and moral turpitude.

"Respect and obey the laws of the country. Work for peace. Avoid all group prejudice based on class, race, or religion. Try to make the community a better place in which to

live. Practice and teach the principles of good citizenship." Can there be any better advice?

But it was not to the rules of conduct that the judge made his most important contribution. Judge Leahy took occasion, we believe, to issue a word of warning to our leaders in Washington, the Administration, the Department of Justice, the Supreme Court, that they are condoning practices detrimental to the welfare of the country. "This court," he said, "stands ready to guard one of the most precious of our constitutional rights—the right of freedom of speech. It stands ever watchful and ready to protect that right for every one of you, without exception and without qualification."

"There was a time in the history of our country when our American citizens were deprived, out of fear and hysteria, of one of the basic freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. There was an attempt to stop the free speech of Thomas Jefferson by the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1790, which imposed illegal restraints, censorship, and gag rule," he declared. "But that law which attempted to bind men's tongues, could not and did not long exist, for such a thing was truly hated by the American spirit."

"The price of free speech is that you must hear unpopular as well as popular statements even in times of stress and tension. This country was founded on the proposition that our citizens are able, after hearing both sides of every question, to sift out the error and accept the truth. One great judge has suggested that the test of truth is its ability to get itself accepted in the competition of the marketplace of ideas," he said.

During these days when the fear and hysteria to which the judge refers has taken such a hold upon our leaders and administrators of justice that they are denying a minority group the right of bail, jailing them, not for what they have done or what they have said, but for their beliefs—contrary to the Bill of Rights—it is heartening to hear a man like Judge Leahy declare that such un-American practices must stop, and that his court "stands firmly to guard" such a precious right.

Security Control of Public Information From Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Press of September 26, 1951:

THIS SECURITY ORDER COULD BE A THREAT TO FREE INFORMATION

May the new and extended system of security control over public information from Government agencies live up to White House promises.

There can be no quarrel with the stated purpose of the Executive order, which is to stop leaks of vital information to a potential enemy.

But there are grave doubts as to how the procedure will work out; whether it will not, in fact, lead to the suppression of news to which the public is entitled.

President Truman emphasized that the new rules were not to be used to deny non-security information to the public, nor to

cover up any mistake by a Government official.

But the practice of sealing up certain information to hide individual or bureaucratic incompetence is an old one.

In the past, the prerogative of classifying information—that is, keeping it from the public—has been mostly in the hands of the Defense and State Departments. Both are directly concerned with military and diplomatic material that unquestionably should not fall into enemy hands.

Now the practice is to be widened to all civilian agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Each agency head, or delegated authority under him, will be armed with four rubber stamps with which he can mark any data he chooses top secret, secret, confidential, or restricted.

The Executive order does not define the four categories or set up standards which clearly show how national security is breached if the information gets out. Nor is there any provision for appeal or review.

That is the big danger. Too much latitude is given to the Government job holder to determine what information truly involves national security.

The natural inclination will be always to decide on the side of caution, and frequently on the side of protection—for himself or his agency.

In the past war, appeal was possible, and often successfully made, through the Office of Censorship.

But the working of this new security order will have to be watched carefully to prevent classification labels from spreading through Government business as a device for hiding information the people should have.

An alert press can only regard the order as a new challenge to its mission of informing the public.

Help Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr LANE. Mr Speaker, the unemployment situation in New England is serious, while the Nation as a whole is establishing new records for employment. To be jobless, through no fault of one's own, at a time when the cost of life's necessities is becoming fantastic, is a double hardship. No man can feed his family on patriotic slogans. He needs work and income. And he wants to know why he is being deprived of the opportunity to provide for his wife and children.

This is the question that the Federal Government must answer. It is the only agency in a position to find out all the reasons, and then assist in the solution of this grave problem.

I stress the human element because our first concern must be for the welfare of the people—American style.

Big government is sometimes unable to understand the day-by-day struggle to make both ends meet that is being fought in thousands of homes in New England textile communities. It is so accustomed to dealing in billions that it loses sight of the thin margin by which too many people just manage to exist.

All right then, let's get the statistics that will make the Government wake up.

The total work force in the Greater Lawrence, Mass., area is 64,000. Last week, 11,600 of these were drawing unemployment compensation checks. Add to these an estimated 5,000 unemployed who are currently ineligible for benefits, and you get more than 16,000 out of work. This is 25 percent of the labor force.

This means that hated and feared condition—depression—which is weakening the heart of the textile industry.

The Federal Government cannot cure it by pointing to the production-employment health of the nation as a whole.

It must examine, diagnose, and apply remedies as advised by the following editorial from the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., dated September 28, 1951:

The Federal Government has on hand a plentiful supply of that "wonder drug"—orders to buy—which, if applied promptly can conquer the infection of unemployment in a matter of days.

Will Washington go to work on this case at once, or will it tell the patient to come back next year?

The Evening Tribune brings the story of an economic crisis to your attention:

HELP WANTED

The hopes of Lawrence rode to Washington with the delegation of Wood & Ayer mill workers who empowered by Local 227, TWUA, CIO, to see what could be done about improving employment conditions locally.

Textile workers, as orphans of our abundant economy, cannot fail to take envious note of the general prosperity of the rest of the country, or of the fact that the Government envisions a spending program greater than any embarked upon in time of peace, or that liberal subsidies are being transmitted all over the world to better the lot of people who may be appreciative, and who may not be.

The textile worker has no desire to arrest progress, interfere in foreign policy, or deprive anyone of advantages he currently enjoys, but the textile worker does have a pardonable and understandable desire to make a week's pay now and then. The fact that there are presently some 11,000 workers receiving unemployment compensation in this city indicates that an economic crisis exists which should have almost as much claim upon Federal attention as the depressed circumstances of rice farmers in India or as the rehabilitation of West German industry.

The Government will publish a white paper on anything—China, Italy, the Atlantic Pact, the Marshall plan—at the drop of a hat, and the cost of printing it, alone, would mean relative wealth for a textile family. The Government prepares these white papers without any solicitation on the part of the particular area involved. In fact, many times the particular area involved—China, for instance—would undoubtedly prefer that the Government mind its own business. But (and for some reason this seems supremely ironic to us), in order to call attention of the Government to the fact that textile workers in Lawrence, Mass., have a grave problem, it is necessary that they themselves journey to the citadel of government to urge specific consideration of their problem.

Regardless of the fact that at the moment the Government seems to have no particular need of the services of the textile industry, it shouldn't overlook the fact that textiles are basic and are at least sporadically im-

portant to the national economy. The Government can work up a fine case of alarm over the depletion or deterioration or abuse of our inanimate resources—coal, oil, rivers, forests—but it seems reluctant to take any measures looking toward the conservation of human resources.

It may well be that the concern we feel is coloring our view, but it seems to us that only indifference is at the root of the commonly held opinion that nothing can be done to stabilize the textile industry, that it must intermittently wallow in the slough of recession (at a time of general prosperity) until some natural phenomenon occurs to start a new spurt of production. The situation here and throughout the State is not so bad as it was in 1949 when unemployment in Lawrence reached 23,000. And it probably won't get that bad. But, remembering that even then, when confronted with the undeniable fact of a real crisis and real hardship, the Government wanted no stockpile of fabrics cluttering up its warehouses, we most sincerely hope that there has been enough change in attitude to justify the hope that the problems of the textile industry will interest the world planners in Washington as much as the internal affairs of France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and points east.

It must be considered that all the planning abroad may go for naught, the beneficiaries of our help can either be with us or against us. But textiles we'll always have with us, and their present and future stability must be assured.

Payments to Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letters:

AMVETS,

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,

Long Beach, Calif., October 2, 1951.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Congresswoman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDITH: As State vice commander of World War II veterans, department of California, may I take this opportunity to thank you for your wonderful bill H. R. 4233 which truly helps the disabled veterans of World War I, II, and the Korean conflict.

As a veteran I was proud to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of September 17 and 18 your courageous stand on behalf of this measure.

We only hope that you can see this bill successfully through the conference so that it may become law in the immediate future.

With kind personal regards and best wishes for your continued success and happiness, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. DESMOND,

Vice Commander, Department of California

ROBESDALE, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.,

October 2, 1951

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I have written a letter to the joint conference committee with

regards to S. 1864, as amended by the House of Representatives. The following is the letter:

"In a recent statement by Dr. Bertram Feinstein, of the University of California, school of medicine, he states, '95 percent of amputees have experienced sensations that seem to come from their missing members which means "phantom pains." I have mine now for more than 33 years, and if these pains can be entirely eliminated I would consider myself fully rehabilitated and would gladly forego the extra pleasure of riding in an automobile.'

"Also recently there appeared an article in the newspapers about a staggering amount of money appropriated by our Government, for the rehabilitation of foreign countries. Well, to some of us it doesn't seem to add up

"Let's not forget so quickly the men who fought our wars, and who have made rather serious sacrifices. What difference does it make whether they are World War I or World War II, or if they have a leg off or an arm missing? The result of either loss is that they can never be replaced."

I know how you stand on this bill and how you stood for many years on all bills pertaining to disabled veterans. Speaking for many disabled veterans I know it is appreciated

Many thanks and good health.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS NOVIG CD.

Education Is the First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I am including a copy of the address delivered by Deane W. Malott upon his installation as president of Cornell University.

President Malott is a native Kansan. Prior to his becoming president of Cornell he was chancellor of the University of Kansas.

I know the Members of Congress will be interested in reading this splendid address:

Education is America's first line of defense. There is practically no other.

Many transient fears are roaming the world today as to what may be going to happen in the years ahead. Dire prognostications are made about dangerous trends or directions. There is a feeling of hopelessness abroad in the land that we are heading for destruction and that nothing can be done about it.

What a difference it would make in the psychology of the Nation, if we could merely be assured that truth would prevail, that people would be sufficiently enlightened to know what to do and how to do it, and to influence others into a like state of mind.

Simply stated, that is perhaps the task, and the whole task, of all education and specifically of us charged with responsibility in Cornell University. Through the hallways and along the gorge-side paths of this beautiful campus, walk today many of the business, professional, and political leaders of tomorrow. The challenge to us is there, in the unfolding lives about us, to transmit something of the imagination, the courage, the self-discipline, the moral strength, the

spiritual faith, and the sense of individual responsibility of the sturdy founders of this institution. Otherwise we have not justified the trust placed in us.

America has always believed in the fundamental value, the veritable necessity for education. President Washington in his first message to the Congress said: "There is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness."

And in his Farewell Address he again urged the promotion of institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge and the enlightenment of public opinion.

President Madison believed that popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it to be the first step toward farce or tragedy or perhaps both, as people who intend to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. President Jefferson said that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

This belief on the part of Americans, past and present, in education and in its vital relation to the perpetuation of our American concept of life, has built some 1,800 institutions of higher learning in this Nation. It has provided the motive for millions and millions of dollars to flow into private and public colleges and universities.

Education stands as steward for the accumulated values of our civilization. If it does its part, it will everlastingly set forth the positive values of America; it will make crystal clear the dangers of the widening discrepancy between what the theory of democracy requires of its citizens, and what the function of democracy reveals.

Education must stand sponsor for the free world, and lead our thinking people to understand the price we must pay to maintain that freedom.

We fear today the threat of armed aggression. So did ancient Rome as she sat securely and proudly on her seven hills behind the spears of the Roman legions. But as historians have pointed out, that Empire fell, not by force of arms but by the spiritual collapse of her people, succumbing to the debilitating contagion that the government of Rome could do all things for all people.

The long shadow of that fallen Empire looms over America today, a greater threat than all the schemes of furtive and sinister plotters behind the iron curtain.

Too many are asking our officials in Washington to do what our forefathers would have done gladly for themselves. Old ideas of initiative and thrift and integrity are disappearing. Government, like a giant octopus, is wrapping itself around even more and more phases of our lives. It is the direction of ancient Rome, and its implications stand stark before us.

There must come a new thinking into America which insists that government be not an end in itself but a servant of free enterprise, and expediter for the industry and the energy of a free people. Otherwise an unseen paralysis sweeps over the Nation, and we sink slowly from the free republic of decentralized government, to the welfare state, to the hand-out state, to the police state. Over and over again in the history of man this cycle has repeated itself.

Storm signals are flying in our mounting and uncontrolled Federal deficits, in high costs and high taxes, in our failing to think through these trends and their inevitable result on our freedom.

Education must help and help vigorously, lest we ignore our spiritual heritage. We must not put our faith in mere mechanical skills, in mere material wealth, or in Government paternalism, else we shall perish, strutting

to our doom as has many a civilization before us.

In these sweeping changes, in the thrusts and pressures of a world unstable in its very foundations, education has a task to do, else mankind cannot continue to live securely in the environment which it has created.

Never in the long history of Cornell since that distant opening day of October 7, 1868, has the task been so difficult. In those times, the American way of life was regarded as a permanent conquest of the human spirit. We accepted democracy with scarcely a thought, it was not really a major topic of discussion. We were not then concerned at all as to whether capitalism would survive, the fiscal structure of the Nation, difficult always, was not endangering the very economic life of the country, self-respecting people worked hard and expected to take care of themselves.

But in spite of all the dire predictions of the apostles of doom, the outlook is far from dark as the academic year 1951-52 opens today.

Ralph Waldo Emerson perhaps best stated the mood of America, at its youthful best, when he asked, "If there is any period one would desire to be born in, is it not the age of revolution? When the old and new stand side by side and admit of being compared, when the energies of all men are stimulated by fear and hope, when the historic glories of the old can be compensated by the rich possibilities of the new era?"

If our wish is Emerson's, we have it today. The trouble is that for a number of people the future is a bit too rich in alarming possibilities, and when they take the old and the new side by side, they would much prefer the old.

The fearful ones who hate and condemn the liberalism in our colleges never suggest any additions to the store of human knowledge, but always subtractions. They want us to leave out all that is interesting and vital, the great current social issues, the great controversies in forms of government, systems of finance, and policies of ethics on which they wish neither professor nor student to take sides.

Such a course would not mean free minds. We cannot be free and at the same time preserve ourselves only amid "the gentility of the obvious and the tedium of the uncontroversial." Young people, at least, cannot be expected to reserve their greatest enthusiasm for the status quo. Yet our freedom must always be exercised with tolerance for others, with responsibility for the good name of this great institution from which we of the Cornell staff can never completely dissociate ourselves.

This ceremony today is merely a sort of channel buoy in the living stream of the university, as it flows steadily on its way from the ancient past to the distant future. We who participate for a brief time together, to create the Cornell of the moment, lend our hands to an educational project with deep traditions, buffed slowly by the lifelong devotion of many men and women—teachers who have guided the intellectual life of Cornell to a place among the Nation's greatest; administrators who have dreamed and planned and toiled for an ever better institution, generous benefactors who have left the imprint of their lives in the buildings and collections and apparatus of this far-flung educational venture, the taxpayers whose support has been returned times over in the abilities of the graduates and in the applied research from our laboratories; alumni and trustees who have loved this hill and all for which it stands, and who have given of their time and thought and energy and substance; and students who in endless procession have given character and tradition to their Cornell.

We stand humbly today among this galaxy of the builders of the university, living and dead, mindful of our responsibility not only to them but to the generations that lie ahead. For if we fail in our custodianship of this distinguished center of learning, if for one single generation its standards of conduct and performance are allowed to slip, we shall have obliterated something of the immortality of these founders and builders, we shall have shattered their dreams, and destroyed something that can never be recovered.

On some far future day, another channel buoy in the timeless stream of Cornell's existence will mark another installation ceremony. It is my pledge today, in which I know I am joined by the entire Cornell faculty staff and student body, that we shall transmit to those unknown participants in that phantom ceremony an ever stronger university, where unswilled freedom shall still prevail, where the highest intellectual endeavors shall be nurtured, where character and abiding faith shall be evidence of Cornell's contribution to a better world, and to the continued defense of America through the great forces of liberal and professional education which fear neither truth nor heeey.

On the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, man is one of the most wasteful creatures. Given virgin territory, all too often he destroys the opportunities which posterity would otherwise have to enjoy the benefits which he, at the moment, values so cheaply. One thing, at least, we might learn from the people of the Old World, and that is the conservation of natural resources.

All too often, valuable forests have been destroyed, and we permit cities and industry to pollute and ruin our streams. The Kalamazoo River in southwestern Michigan has, through carelessness, been changed from a beautiful stream of pure, swift running water into an open sewer with a series of cesspools where dams collect industrial waste and raw sewage.

The Allegan Gazette—a very, very small weekly published in the city of Allegan, located in the horseshoe bend of the Kalamazoo on a peninsula where the Indians for years camped annually to hunt and fish—which successfully led the fight for a municipal power plant and lighting system against the commonwealth and its subsidiaries, is once more, for the benefit of the public and at its own expense, carrying on a battle for the preservation of this river for future generations.

From the September issue of that paper comes the following editorial:

YOUR STAKE IN THE FIGHT TO END RIVER POLLUTION

In the early 1900's the Kalamazoo River in Allegan county was a reasonably unpol-

luted stream. The people enjoyed the natural benefits derived from living in the vicinity of the river, such as boating, swimming, and fishing.

Indeed oldtimers can recall that a fishing and camping trip down the Kalamazoo from Allegan to Saugatuck in 1900 was equivalent to a \$500 trip into Canada today.

Due to the river, this area had a great resort potential. People had a right to expect that as the country became more settled, property along the river would rise in value, tourist and resort business would increase, and the community generally would benefit from the river.

To protect the property rights of riparian owners and to conserve our natural resources the legislature of this state has passed numerous laws forbidding the depositing of polluted matter into the river.

Disregarding the laws, the municipalities located on the river, the paper mills, and even the State of Michigan, have continuously, in an ever-increasing volume, for the past 50 years dumped sewage, paper-mill sludge and chemicals into the stream.

As a result the river from Kalamazoo down to Plainwell is a stinking open sewer, devoid of all fish life, unfit for swimming, destroying pasture lands, unfit for irrigation and destroying real estate values by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It has been estimated that, as of this date, the de-inking mills alone deposit approximately 180 tons of sludge into the river every day.

The effect of this is to gradually fill the river bed. The sludge has in the past few years reached Lake Allegan situated below the city. If pollution is continued eventually the sludge will reach Douglas and Saugatuck and that area too will be unfit for swimming and resort business.

This sludge destroys all plant and fish life in the stream, gives off an offensive odor, depreciating riparian real estate values, increases flood conditions, destroys pasture land, and in general destroys any practical use of the river for recreational purposes.

Some of the paper mills responsible for this pollution openly state that the river should be made an industrial waste stream. Evidently they desire to use the river for a reservoir for the depositing of industrial waste, regardless of the property rights of riparian owners and the general good of the community. They exhibit little or no interest in the rights of the people of Allegan County to have a healthy, clean and recreational stream and to the benefit derived therefrom.

The various State agencies have miserably failed in their attempts to clean up the Kalamazoo. At the present time the Water Resources Commission is delaying any action it might take against the polluters, for the purpose of receiving and studying a report to be filed by the Kalamazoo City Study Committee. For the most part this committee has dealt with the difficulty of solving the problem confronting the paper mills and it has been rumored that an attempt will be made by some of the mills to have certain sections of the Kalamazoo declared an industrial stream.

The time has come either to enforce the law, clean up the river, or let the polluters have their way.

If you want a normal, healthy river, write your State Senator, Edward Hutchinson, your State Representative, Ben Lohman, the Water Resources Commission, Box 87, Lansing.

If you wish to save the Kalamazoo River, join in our fight against the continuation of pollution by signing one of our petitions, and by joining our Anti-Pollution Association.

WHAT POLLUTION MEANS TO YOU

It endangers your health. Waters polluted with community sewage can carry the germs of many diseases.

Polluted waters peril river property and resorts. Look at the river between Allegan and Kalamazoo. Potentially beautiful, but now it is rotten. What happened to the Camp on Allegan Lake? It had to close. What may happen further downstream? Pollution is moving down there. Even Saugatuck is polluting it's own future.

Polluters have ruined fishing. What was once one of the finest bass and pan-fish areas on the river is now an open sewer.

Can we save what is left?

These are the facts. Forty-five miles of stream is now considered seriously polluted where only a few years ago 32 miles felt the pollution sting.

Some 180 tons of wastes are emptied each day into the stretch of river from Kalamazoo to Otsego. About 90 percent of the solids are from paper mills. About 150 tons a day comes from the Kalamazoo area alone.

These wastes are about the same as the combined wastes from a city of 650,000 people would be if emptied untreated into the river.

There is practically no fish life in about 30 miles of the river below Kalamazoo.

These wastes can be treated and the problem reduced. Studies at Plainwell have proven this fact.

There is no evidence that treatment of the paper mill wastes will break any mill nor even nearly do so.

Many of the mills would probably make treatment pay as the paper mill at Monroe, Mich., is now doing.

The Co-Ops Should Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., for September 9, 1951:

THE CO-OPS SHOULD PAY

The Senate Finance Committee has a feeling that a great many of the so-called co-operatives ought to pay taxes. It has adopted recommendations that would result in taxing about half the multitude of co-ops that are now in business, and the larger ones are those that would be affected.

The co-op idea is about a century old in the United States, but it has been developed into big business within the last 3 decades. In the beginning, the cooperative would be composed of farmers, almost always small operators. They got together in order to take advantage of lower prices on carload lots of feed, fertilizer, and the like. They frequently pooled their production to secure the higher prices that could be obtained for big lots.

These days, however, alleged cooperatives are engaged in almost every sort of business. They trade up to the billions annually. They compete with concerns that do pay taxes, and we do mean pay. It is clearly out of line with common sense and justice to exempt anything and everything that calls itself a co-op from paying taxes. Some of them do pay, as a matter of fact.

The Senate Finance Committee has endeavored to discriminate between the co-ops that help farmers who need help and those that are in business on their own, operating with an unfair advantage over taxpaying competitors. The co-op as such is a good thing for the people involved, but it ought to pay its share of the taxes when it shows large profits and cuts into the revenues of businesses that do pay.

Soil Conservation District's Important Responsibilities—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before a meeting of the northeast area soil conservation district supervisors and directors, Philadelphia, Pa., October 5, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITIES

It is a pleasure to be a guest this evening of you Northeast area soil conservation district supervisors and directors representing a fourth of all the States in the country. It is stimulating to meet this way with those who hold such an important and responsible position, individually and as a group, in the economy of your own communities and States of the Nation.

That is why I have selected the important responsibilities of the soil-conservation districts as the subject of my remarks, although some of you might wonder at first if that might not be more appropriately a topic for somebody like President Waters Davis of your National Association of Soil Conservation Districts or Mr. George Heidrich, your own northeastern area vice president. Actually, however, the degree to which the supervisors of soil conservation districts exercise their responsibilities of leadership and direction of a highly successful and going conservation program is of utmost concern to the Soil Conservation Service as an assisting technical agency. That, of course, is because we have no authority in any district and have no desire to run the affairs of districts, even though our ability to help get the conservation job done depends directly on efficient district management.

UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONSERVATION JOB NECESSARY

Some time ago I wrote the conservation commissioner of a State where lack of progress in getting soil and water conservation practices applied on the land had aroused considerable concern: "The objective of the Soil Conservation Service, through soil conservation district assistance, is not only to help farmers adopt proper land use practices and to apply protective measures to their land but to bring about such a thorough understanding on the part of the farmer: themselves of the need for and desirability of this work that they will continue to farm in accordance with the conservation needs of the land. The farm conservation plan is a necessary step toward this objective, but the job is never completed until all the practices called for in the plan are applied."

I assume that all of you are familiar with the provisions of the memoranda of understanding between your districts and the United States Department of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Service, respectively, setting forth our mutual obligations and responsibilities in carrying out soil conservation district work. As you know, every district under these voluntary agreements has important responsibilities, ranging from determining priorities for work in the district to planning the use of and maintaining field equipment. The effectiveness of the Service's technical or other assistance is contingent on the extent to which the district—through its supervisors—lives up to or goes beyond its part of the agreement.

MUCH WE NEED TO BE THINKING ABOUT AND DOING

Right now, probably as much as at any other time since the first soil conservation districts were established 13 years ago, there is much that we need to be thinking about, talking about—and doing something about—both as district officials and as assisting technicians. The one thing that is uppermost in everybody's mind today is mobilization of our manpower and economic resources for national security, notwithstanding our recent successes on the battlefields of Korea. In this mobilization for defense, the Federal Government seems committed to costly outlays in materials and manpower. No one can say, of course, how long the emergency may last. It might be a continuing situation for quite a long time, no one knows.

Productive land is an inseparable and essential part of our first line of national defense; because men with guns and bullets can't fight without food, and there can be little food from poor land. So, we clearly cannot afford to put soil and water conservation "on the shelf" for this emergency or for any other cause. On the contrary, we should redouble our efforts in safeguarding our productive land, and the water which makes it produce. Among other things, in the light of conditions as they are, this would seem to indicate pretty definitely that government and local interests will need to assume an even larger share of responsibility than ever for carrying on the vital conservation program.

SCS WILL CONTINUE FURNISHING TECHNICAL HELP

The Soil Conservation Service, for its part, will continue to use every dollar of its appropriations to the maximum extent possible in providing technical help to farmers in soil conservation districts, as in the past. In fact, 88 percent of our entire personnel is thus engaged in soil conservation work on the land. This enviable ratio of high work performance and extremely low assignment of Service manpower for administrative duties would not be possible to such a degree without the soil conservation districts through which we work. I mean the day-by-day direction given to the soil and water conservation program by the supervisors of each district, and the contributions in man-hours and materials made by all the district farmers, individually and through cooperative group action.

That is why I cannot stress too strongly the importance of positive and vigorous leadership within your soil conservation districts in bringing conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every acre of land still needing it—from Maine to California, throughout the United States and the world. This, of course, is neither more nor less than fulfillment of the original soil-conservation districts concept.

In 1935—when Congress passed the first National Soil Conservation Act and changed the name of the Soil Erosion Service to the Soil Conservation Service—we reached the decision that two main things were neces-

sary to insure adequate progress: (1) That the technical services of trained conservationists should be made available to all farmers desiring such help; and (2) that some type of local government unit should be established to assist in bringing about necessary cooperative action and to place responsibility for getting the job done and maintained on the local farm people who are intimately associated with the land problem. Anybody who has taken the trouble to observe or to learn anything at all about the operations of the soil conservation districts since 1937 must agree, I am sure, that the soundness of this democratic concept has been amply borne out in their performance—thanks to the intelligent, responsible leadership of progressive landowners and operators like yourselves, the country over.

STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

I want to say, however, that I would be something less than frank in my discussion of this whole matter if I failed to call attention to the fact that there still is room for improvement in many places. That is to say, from the standpoint of the leadership and responsibility that district supervisors and farmers in the districts generally can and should exercise in order to assure maximum, economical results in their district programs. I do not mean to imply that anybody expects the district supervisors and cooperators to do all the thinking and all the work while our technicians just stand around and look wise. But, at the same time, you can't hope to get the service and the production out of these technical men that the district has every right to expect, if they are kept on the jump looking after minor details—making unnecessary repeat trips to individual farms on trivial questions, etc.—while somebody else's farm planning and application of conservation practices wait.

One of the best ways we have found for speeding up the application of the basic measures in a given soil-conservation district is for every farmer to learn as quickly as possible how to carry out as much of his conservation work as he possibly can, and how to keep up his structures and maintain his other conservation developments, with a minimum of technical assistance. In that way—particularly now when the time of our limited number of experienced personnel is so fully occupied in furnishing technical assistance to the still increasing list of soil-conservation districts—each technician can be freed for that much more new planning and assistance in new land treatment. And the immediate outlook in this respect, we might as well admit, just as well could be for the technical manpower situation to become tighter before it gets any better.

Here in the northeastern area, our July 1 reports showed a backlog of 21,693 applications for farm conservation planning assistance in your 12 States. Now, of course, we all want to have a certain reasonable number of applications ahead all the time, for that certainly is a much more healthful situation than to have technicians standing around waiting for customers. Meanwhile, though, you district supervisors and our technical people alike are most anxious to get to every one of those farms with the least possible delay, as well as to the other farms constantly being added to that backlog of requests. It is obvious that the technicians are going to be able to get to more people faster if their time is kept as free as is practicable for new farm planning and application work.

THE FARMER CAN HELP WITH THE CHORES

Also, the best conservation farmer—and the one who gets the highest dollars-and-cents returns from his conservation plan—is the one who goes ahead and takes care

of the day-by-day tasks himself, as a part of the regular farm upkeep. By the same token, there are certain necessary items of daily routine, which we call housekeeping chores, in soil conservation district operations that the farmers—not the technicians—should arrange to do, such as routing, servicing, and other handling of district machinery, materials, labor, etc. In fact, that is why many districts over the country have found it pays them well to hire a manager or secretary to take care of such details as the farmers or the district governing boards haven't the time to handle themselves.

GROUP ACTION

It all boils down to this demonstrated fact: The most efficient way of carrying the soil and water conservation job beyond the planning stage is through the coordinated group action of the landowners and operators—with, of course, the requisite amount of technical, educational, financial, or other assistance from other sources for getting the job done. Your soil conservation districts themselves, of course, are basically group-action devices, with a peculiar adaptability for utilizing the advantages of group action through neighbor groups.

We in the Soil Conservation Service, as all of you know, are putting a great deal of emphasis on the natural group approach to soil conservation, including a group training program under way throughout the country. And I am happy to report that this enormous potentiality for getting effective work done, not only in planning but in applying conservation plans to farms, and maintaining the work, is being taken advantage of more and more. The excellent results we have had through this medium speak strongly for its further use on a rapidly increasing scale; and this presents another important challenge to district supervisors and directors everywhere as the proper leaders.

There is, as we all know, the continuing need for speeding up the application of conservation on the land. There is, also, the necessity of doing the job at minimum cost. I already have spoken of the need for maintaining the conservation practices that are applied to the land. This group approach I have been talking about also provides a means of utilizing existing leadership; it is the natural way to get things done, for which no adequate substitute has been found. And it is a way of getting more done with the same effort on the part of our service technical personnel available for such work.

PROGRAM FOR GREATER SERVICE

National Association President Davis has presented to you a suggested program for greater service—an action program. This program appears to me to offer opportunities to every soil conservation district, and each and every district supervisor or commissioner in the country, to share importantly in the responsibilities and privileges that rightfully rest in such a significant group as your own is in our agricultural economy. There would be no point in my undertaking to review your program for greater service stemming from recommendations originating in all of your districts over the country. But there is one point which is made (in general suggestion No. 3) which I think bears especial emphasis: "Their (soil conservation districts) success depends on the active initiative exerted by the members of their governing bodies with the assistance of all local leaders."

The author of that statement I believe put the keynote of the future success of your whole district's organization into those 22 words. And I think your national association certainly is to be congratulated for the intelligent leadership it has shown in perfecting your program for greater service, and in demonstrating in other ways that it is your association of which each one of you is an

individually important unit striving for this stated common goal: Improving the quality and speed of soil-conservation-district work in the United States while reducing its per acre cost.

That goal can be attained only through your own untiring efforts and making your own decisions. The certain reward will be more efficient production on the farm lands of New England and all America—preservation of our basic soil and water resources, a permanently stable agricultural economy, and multiple individual benefits shared in by every conservation farmer and the entire Nation.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND DEMOCRACY

We can be eternally grateful that we enjoy in this country an economy that depends on individual freedom and initiative, and the exercise of such individual responsibility as that which has been demonstrated by the scores of thousands of soil-conservation-district landholders like those you represent up here in the Northeastern States. In talking to various groups over the country, and in daily individual conversations, I never miss the opportunity to point out that the soil-conservation-district movement, in my opinion, is the greatest movement relating to the welfare of the land in all history. I sometimes wonder if we appreciate just how fortunate we are in having such an effective local, democratically operated organization through which to carry on vital undertakings like soil and water conservation.

With 2,278 districts, containing more than a billion and a quarter acres and more than 80 percent of all the farms and ranches of the Nation, certainly no other agricultural movement in history has approached it in magnitude. And it is my opinion that there never has been anything to equal the soil-conservation districts to induce farmers to work helpfully together.

Your soil-conservation districts possess another quality which in my opinion is most significant to keep in mind in these trying times. I am referring to the districts as living, working forces of practical democracy in action. The district organization, as it has stood the test of 13 years of peacetime and wartime experience under just about all possible economic, weather, and other conditions, definitely has proved itself to be superior to anything else we know about in coping with our basic land problems in a democratic fashion. Your districts are farmer voted and farmer managed. Between 11,000 and 12,000 of you soil-conservation-district supervisors are giving unselfishly of your time and energies in the furtherance of soil- and water-conservation work throughout the country. You are on nobody's payroll and are obligated to no Federal or other outside authority. That is a mighty healthy and enviable position to be in.

In order to appreciate what this kind of democratic leadership means in the Nation's basic agricultural economy—really means in terms of what we mobilize and fight for when pressed to it by others—you need only to study the contrasting situation in so many other countries, where what the Government says is law, with little or no opportunity for individual freedom of action, assurance of stability, or hope of security. I have observed these things in different parts of the world myself, and, of course, we read about them every day.

Just the other day, 15 editors of important newspapers in different parts of the world arrived in Washington on the start of a tour to try—as the reporter of the Washington Star put it—"to unravel for millions of people abroad one of the world's great mysteries—what makes American democracy tick." I wish they might visit some of your soil-conservation districts and talk with district farmers while they are here; for I am con-

vinced that the district method would be the best approach that farmers of the world everywhere could take for getting to the point where they have more voice in the affairs of their government and less discontent about directions and overlords. It is encouraging to note that bona fide soil-conservation districts are in operation as going programs in several other countries now—is the philosophy of conservation spreads faster, worldwide.

These editors also could go back home and tell their readers that soil-conservation districts bring farmers together in moving ahead with sound conservation treatment of the land. That is, the district provides a recognized central point for carrying forward effective conservation work. Also, that when the farmer has a sound plan for conservation operations for a period of years ahead, as he does have as a soil-conservation district co-operator, not only is he likely to do a better job of farming, but he has the satisfaction of knowing that his efforts will increase his security, in the face of whatever international or other unfortunate incidents the Nation may have to pass through. It gives the farmer pride and satisfaction to be able to look forward to the future security of his family.

Soil Conservation District's Important Responsibilities—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before a meeting of the northeast area soil-conservation district supervisors and directors, Philadelphia, Pa., October 5, 1950:

Without a lasting agriculture, there can be no assurance of permanent prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere on earth. And a prosperous and lasting agriculture depends on an adequate supply of productive land properly used and so protected from erosion that it will remain permanently productive. Lasting soil conservation of the kind you are putting into effect in the 12 Northeastern States, with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service and the support of various other interests, public and private, is mandatory everywhere. It is mandatory here in America, if our Nation is to avoid national weakening, while the enemies of democracy cry out against us.

We have made such remarkable progress in a relatively short time in our own Nationwide soil and water conservation program that perhaps our greatest danger is the temptation to look back on our accomplishments—in conservation research developments, in soil conservation district organization, and in conservation work on the land—and be lured into complacency. District organization, of course, is not an end within itself. Neither is a farm plan for soil conservation, where its provisions are not applied to the land. I am happy to say that I know of few, if any, districts like that and a very few such farm plans. You know better than anyone what the situation is in this respect here in your northeastern area.

My point is that whatever may be true in this regard you constantly need to exam-

ine the situation—not alone from the standpoint of past accomplishments but as to current district progress and vigor, and even more important, where your program is headed in the future. Nation-wide this is what we find today through such an examination:

SOIL CONSERVATION MOVES AHEAD

While we admittedly are not moving fast enough and are still suffering heavy losses of soil, we are, nevertheless, moving ahead at an encouraging rate. In 1943, to illustrate, the Soil Conservation Service assisted the districts in completing 1 percent of the Nation-wide soil conservation job; but in 1949 the annual rate of progress went up to 2.3 percent of the unfinished job. And in 1942 we finished the job on 5,000,000 acres approximately and on 22,000,000 acres in 1949. This was an increase of 340 percent, but we had an increase in facilities of only 43 percent. Moreover, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the acreage treated with needed conservation measures in the districts jumped to 26,000,000 acres. By these figures you can see that the conservation job not only is progressing but is doing so at an accelerated rate, considerably out of proportion to the facilities.

Here are some of the figures for the last fiscal year which show how we have increased again the yearly rate of conservation surveying, planning, and treatment all down the line. It is simple enough, of course, for any of you to determine the degree to which your own districts have shared in this performance progression.

[Approximate national totals]

	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1949	Cumulative to July 1, 1950
Detailed conservation surveys, acres.....	31,465,000	25,800,000	334,770,000
Complete farm plans, number.....	132,750	115,000	870,000
Acres planned.....	38,700,000	32,280,000	240,000,000
Acres treated.....	26,000,000	22,000,000	121,000,000

For this northeastern region all together, though, I am most pleased to say that our reports also show noteworthy progress. That is, nearly one-fourth more conservation planning done the last fiscal year than the preceding year (22.8 percent more plans and 23.8 percent more acres planned), and three-fourths more conservation treatment (74 percent). That was with only 10 percent more technical personnel spread over 5 percent more districts than the year before.

Our books, up to June 30, 1950, show that 18.0 percent of the conservation job had been completed, Nation-wide. In addition, there had been a considerable spread of practices to thousands of farms, both inside and outside of soil conservation districts, for which we have no records. Now, if we can raise the annual rate of application of effective conservation measures a little more, which we can do with adequate facilities plus maximum district initiative and leadership, we can begin to see the goal—the possibility of finishing the job on time. This would mean completing the basic conservation surveying, planning, and treatment of the land with the basic conservation measures needed during the next 20 years, or by about 1970.

As a step in the continuing effort to reach the goal on time, we are urging the completion of at least an average of 4 percent of the job annually during the coming 3-year period. Nationally, this would mean an average annual rate of around 80,000,000 acres inventoried (surveyed), 50,000,000 acres of farm land planned for conservation, and 40,000,000 acres treated each year during the fiscal years of 1952 to 1954, inclusive. I am more confident now than I ever have

been before that we can attain this goal if the requisite technical facilities are available.

This confidence in what we can do as a nation in safeguarding our remaining land resources—and putting to best use the water which makes the land produce—is based in major part on the existence and active operation of your soil conservation districts. After all, how and when we get this job done is up to those who own and operate the land; and that means, for all practical purposes, that it is up to the farmers in soil conservation districts.

Farmers over the country are voting new districts into being every month under their State enabling laws, so that it isn't unreasonable to assume that before very long the farmland of the Nation will all be in districts.

LACK OF PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

The public has not understood these things well enough in the past, either as to the fine progress we have been making or the urgent job that still lies ahead. It is time some of these facts were better known. The continuing need, as it will be for some years yet, is, as you know, for more technical and other manpower, machinery, materials, and so forth, directed to the conservation job, in order to pick up the lag and keep pace with farmers' demands which consistently outrun availability of such facilities. There is great hope and encouragement in the fact that many, varied interests—Government and private—are giving increasing attention, financial and other support to soil and water conservation, especially support to your district programs.

I am thinking, for example, of State appropriations and allocations made for the year or biennium ending this year or next by every State but three, I believe it is, for district assistance (including expenses of State committees). These allowances run as high as the five and a quarter million dollars in Texas for the current biennium, and include nine States in the above-\$100,000 column. I hardly need to remind you that such direct State support for the States' own soil conservation district programs not only is logical and reasonable but is of most substantial benefit in furthering soil and water conservation.

There seems to be pretty general agreement now as to the Government's obligation (local, State, or Federal) to help farmers with their erosion and land-use problems. The Government's interest in the continuing productivity of the land is never-ending, because the land is the individual's property for the moment, but it is the Nation's most priceless and indispensable resource for all time. It is pretty clear, I think, that how much help soil and water conservation receives from government, and for how long, depends on the performance of those entrusted with this important work—individual landholders, district boards, technical personnel, and so on. By the same token, it clearly is part of your legitimate responsibility as district supervisors or directors to keep all who are concerned informed on that performance—interested local, State, and Federal officials; banks and other lending institutions; handlers and processors of agricultural products; farm machinery people, and many others.

I realize that you have some peculiar problems in discharging this particular responsibility here in this area of preponderantly urban population. Preliminary 1950 census figures show that nearly one-third (29.2 percent) of the population of the entire United States is found in your dozen States. Also, of course, one-fourth of the United States Senators and nearly a third (30 percent) of the Representatives, all of whom are quite properly concerned with how you and I use

our part of the money they appropriate for soil and water conservation purposes.

The opportunities for most of these interested people in Philadelphia, Boston, or New York, for example, to get out and see what is going on in your districts and on your farms naturally is limited. The situation is different, in other words, than it is in many areas, where the so-called country banker predominates in that business and where more people generally are in almost daily contact with the farm communities. Yet, all the people here in the Northeast have to eat, wear clothes, and otherwise depend on the products of the land and accordingly have a direct personal interest in its conservation.

In fact, because so much of your States' food products, fiber, and even feed for livestock and poultry has to be imported from elsewhere in the country, the people up here have a broader concern in the welfare of the land, country-wide, than do those in most parts of the country. Add to that interest the vital link between the more distant farm States and your textile mills, wool market, great harbors through which vast tonnages of agricultural products are exported—and you can see what important opportunities you have to demonstrate by word and action the gospel of soil and water conservation among your third of the Nation's people.

In many places in this and other parts of the country, business and other urban interests—professional people, schools and churches, newspapers, radio and television stations, women's and sportsmen's groups, etc.—already have caught up with us in their conservation thinking. Right now, for instance, the national farm-equipment manufacturing and retail people are launching an active program of direct cooperation with the soil-conservation districts, through cooperation of your national association, looking to mutual benefits of improved farm-machinery market, on the one hand, and better equipment for doing the conservation job, on the other. It stands to reason that if it is good business for these business and allied interests to devote their efforts and money to soil and water conservation, it behooves those of us who own or live on the land to put our best energies into this vital undertaking.

WATER CONSERVATION

Among the other opportunities for leadership by your soil-conservation districts as responsible local agencies we need to place high on the list those in water conservation and watershed type of development such as that which is now being given consideration in legislation for New England and New York and for other parts of the country. Water conservation is part and parcel of soil conservation here as elsewhere, and I don't need to remind you, after last year's troublesome water shortages in the Northeast, of the vital concern which municipalities, power interests, and various other water users have in the conservation treatment and use of the land and water resources.

More and more farmers and urban interests as well are coming to realize that they need special technical help in planning and applying adequate soil and water conservation programs on farmlands and watersheds. Land treatment, watershed treatment, is basic and must be done first for conserving our life-giving water supplies, reducing flood damage, and reducing costly siltation of our reservoirs, harbors, etc. I want to emphasize here that the opportunities and promise are great for effective accomplishment in applying conservation techniques and information to individual parcels of land and to whole watersheds alike, through the utilization of soil conservation district organization and facilities. This, as we know, is in both private and public interest.

Whether it is on a major watershed or in a comparatively restricted farming community, to complete the soil and water conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which all groups have a natural interest and in which your soil conservation districts group has a most particular interest and responsibility. This program includes, among other points, (1) completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit; (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work—with a scientifically developed soil conservation district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm in the country at minimum public cost, (3) active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; and (4) making real conservationists out of every farmer in the country.

If we had adequate facilities, the basic soil-conservation measures could be applied to the land by 1970. As we are going now, the job could be completed in 35 years. Looking ahead, our computations indicate that if the job were done in the 20-year period, it would save approximately 10 million acres of land from being ruined for any further practical cultivation and around \$400,000,000 in the cost.

Personally, I repeat, I am more than happy over the great progress we have made in soil and water conservation so far. I am encouraged, also, at the initiative being taken by farmers in forming soil conservation districts in areas where previously they had little or no encouragement. And I am gratified over the steadily increasing extent to which district farmers are taking over the many important responsibilities of leadership and direction in the conservation program, which the Government never could do.

We have a long way to go yet, and there is still much for every one of us to do before that job is done. And there are certain misconceptions, or loose assertions, about soil conservation that still seem to confuse the thinking of some otherwise well-informed people. Briefly stated, some of these misconceptions we need to help dispel are—

1. The soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2. That there are short cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that district farm plans are too technical for farmers.

3. That soil conservation costs more than it is worth.

4. That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

The quickest and only way to disprove such false and ridiculous assertions for all time is to drive ahead and finish this conservation job with all the dispatch consistent with doing it right. I know that's what we're going to do.

Restoration of Crosses in the National Cemetery of the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following communications regarding the removal of crosses from graves in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific:

FRESNO, CALIF., October 3, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Please continue your fight to keep the traditional crosses and Star of David on the graves of our American dead. You have the support of almost all those who served and remember their brothers in arms who are buried in national cemetery.

Very Reverend PAUL J. REDMOND,
Captain, USNR (retired), Chaplain,
Department of California American Legion.

BOISE, IDAHO, October 3, 1951.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Congresswoman, House of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Just read your article in the Boise paper about your fight for veterans' graves markers. God bless you. Keep up your good work.

SPANISH AMERICAN VETERANS
SOLDIERS HOME.

ASHLAND, W. VA.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

This community fervently hopes for your success in restoring crosses to the graves of our servicemen.

JOHN CHAPPLE,
Editor, Ashland Daily Press.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
TERRITORIAL COUNCIL ON
VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Many men from your State who made the supreme sacrifice during World War II have found their last resting place in the National Cemetery of the Pacific. Because of this we feel that you are close to us in our efforts to have permanent crosses decorate the graves of those who gave their lives so that others might live.

As you know, until recently the 13,000 graves were decorated with wooden crosses. The wooden crosses were installed by the Army as a temporary measure pending the complete installation of surface marble markers throughout the cemetery. Recently, the installation was completed and the Army carried out its previously announced orders of removing and destroying the crosses.

However, during the tenure of the crosses they bore into the hearts of the people of Hawaii and to the many, many relatives of the men buried there who came from the mainland to visit the resting place of their son, husband, or brother.

The cemetery, now, without the row upon row of white crosses and Stars of David looks bare and forlorn. It was a distinct shock to the people who visited the cemetery after the crosses were destroyed. To them, the crosses have become an integral part of the cemetery.

May we enlist your assistance in securing a permanent-type cross, either of concrete or of some other lasting material, so that the cemetery may be restored to its former beauty and symbolism.

This we know necessitates congressional action. The veterans' organizations and the people of the Territory and we know the relatives of the mainland men buried here, would appreciate anything that you can do.

We are enclosing an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29 that

expresses some of the feeling of the people of the Territory.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. O'BRIEN,
Director.

THEY AWAIT THE VERDICT

The mute white crosses have been taken from the graves of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific—but protests may restore them.

It took only 2 hours for the energetic task force of the Army to remove from Punchbowl more than 13,000 little wooden crosses. It will require more time to restore them—if they are to be restored.

But there is time for this task of restoration—those who sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater have no need for haste. They will wait, in patience, for the verdict.

All the hurry, all the ordered speed and discipline of their training, all the furious urgency of their attacks on the battle lines, all the sudden anguish of their mortal wounds before they fell, are of the past.

For them the suns will rise and will set over that dedicated "Hill of Sacrifice" in long, unhurried procession. The gentle winds and the stars will keep them company, even if in a burst of organized effort as well timed and precise as the burst from a machine gun, the 13,000 white crosses came down in one unexpected afternoon.

In Washington, D. C., Delegate FARRINGTON has appropriately said that the wishes of the families of the men who lie in the Punchbowl graves should be consulted.

That can be done, and should be done. It should have been done, and thoroughly, sympathetically, before the order was given that tore the crosses from the ground.

To do it rightly, the families should have a clear picture of the alternatives—the graves with crosses and also with the flat stone marker, or the graves with only that flat, inconspicuous and unimpressive headstone.

And the families should know—many of them know already—that in our military cemeteries abroad the white crosses still stand.

And these next of kin should feel that it is not a question of economy—our doing fitting honor to those who are buried in Punchbowl.

It is a question of giving to these heroes of our country the greatest possible evidence of respect and devotion we can give them.

It is a question also of developing this National Memorial Cemetery as one of our Nation's most impressive, most distinctive burial places.

It is a question of maintaining the physical facilities so that each Memorial Day the people of Hawaii can pay their distinctive tribute of leis and garlands, appropriately wreathed above the graves.

Yes, those who lie asleep in Punchbowl can await the verdict.

For them, all mortal haste is ended. They lie quietly in the ultimate discipline of death, relying upon a grateful country to do them justice.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., October 1, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: Since you are the ranking Republican member of the House Veterans' Committee, and the Army defended the move as a trend of the times, I want to know who fixed that policy.

Who hates the cross of Christ on the revered graves of our glorious war dead?

Find out what gang was behind this move. They look like Commies to me.

Get those crosses back at once. We Christians are opposed to this dirty piece of business, and I, for one, will be glad to have a United States grand jury look into this—and now. Next thing they will want to omit "In God we trust" from our moneys.

Get after this, Mrs. ROGERS, and God will bless you and yours.

BILL RANDALL.

Comparison of Idaho's Per Capita Debt With Federal Per Capita Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, what a shameful example the administration and the Congress are setting for the States and municipalities.

The per capita debt of the State of Idaho is only \$1.52, but the per capita share of the people of the State of Idaho in the Federal public debt is \$1,696.74, or 1,100 times greater than their share in their own State debt; as you will note from the appended Washington News Bulletin of October 3, 1951

The steadily mounting Federal public debt is a much greater menace to our safety and national security than all our external enemies. No foreign nation can destroy us, but we are making a pretty good job of destroying ourselves. Americans, wake up.

The Washington News Bulletin follows:

**FEDERAL PER CAPITA DEBT MORE THAN 54
TIMES GREATER THAN STATE AVERAGE**
(By Paul O. Peters)

On June 30, 1950, the Federal public debt stood at \$257,357,352,341 or \$1,696.74 per capita. On September 28, 1951, the Treasury reports the debt at \$257,352,895,174 and predictions are that the debt will rise to well over \$260,000,000,000 by the year's end.

By comparison, the total of all State debts at the end of 1950 was \$4,578,500,000, an average of \$31.32 per capita.

Thus it is apparent that the Federal debt on a per capita basis constitutes a tax burden on the American people more than 54 times greater than the State debts, and there apparently is no intention on the part of the present administration to reduce the spending for all kinds of international adventures in various parts of the world.

As a matter of fact, if the administration's announced objectives are to be carried out, practically one-third of the wealth produced by the American people in the next decade will be diverted to the uses of the Federal Government in promoting economic internationalism, and preventing aggression no matter where it occurs.

While the Federal Government has been building up a mountain of debt many of the States have exercised economy and vigilance in their spending without any detriment to their people, and with what economists consider distinct advantages.

Five of the 48 States have practically no State debt. In several States the debt is merely the short-term borrowing to cover a period between tax collections. The States with low per capita debt are:

State	Reported debt	Per capita
Nebraska	\$1,023,000	\$0.40
Georgia	2,790,000	.88
Wisconsin	4,451,000	1.32
Utah	993,000	1.48
Idaho	893,000	1.52
Kentucky	8,280,000	2.89
Kansas	5,500,000	2.90
Indiana	14,946,000	3.81
Nevada	785,000	4.78
Arizona	3,532,000	5.03

The tiny State of Delaware leads the Nation with a State debt of \$36,838,000 or \$122.79 per capita. The complete story of the State debts at the end of 1950 and the per capita amount for each State is shown by the table following:

Per capita debts of the respective States for 1950

State	Reported debt	Per capita
Alabama	\$48,618,000	\$16.75
Arizona	3,538,000	5.03
Arkansas	14,785,000	68.55
California	218,007,000	21.11
Colorado	14,510,000	11.28
Connecticut	70,024,000	35.20
Delaware	36,838,000	122.79
Florida	16,520,000	6.08
Georgia	2,790,000	.88
Idaho	893,000	1.52
Illinois	428,158,000	51.29
Indiana	14,946,000	3.81
Iowa	35,462,000	13.57
Kansas	5,500,000	2.90
Kentucky	8,279,000	2.89
Louisiana	208,657,000	80.54
Maine	8,680,000	9.66
Maryland	57,911,000	27.00
Massachusetts	162,926,000	35.13
Michigan	241,951,000	38.92
Minnesota	140,375,000	4.84
Mississippi	79,851,000	31.77
Missouri	44,708,000	11.48
Montana	21,111,000	41.31
Nebraska	1,023,000	.80
Nevada	785,000	4.78
New Hampshire	8,909,000	17.15
New Jersey	104,861,000	21.90
New Mexico	29,895,000	52.34
New York	824,327,000	57.92
North Carolina	104,824,000	51.29
North Dakota	43,571,000	74.86
Ohio	197,588,000	25.19
Oklahoma	104,173,000	45.40
Oregon	36,710,000	21.78
Pennsylvania	539,620,000	51.50
Rhode Island	51,095,000	68.58
South Carolina	70,251,000	35.41
South Dakota	35,801,000	58.60
Tennessee	101,971,000	32.07
Texas	52,217,000	7.01
Utah	993,000	1.48
Vermont	6,291,000	17.43
Virginia	19,015,000	6.24
Washington	76,194,000	30.93
West Virginia	68,352,000	35.76
Wisconsin	4,451,000	1.32
Wyoming	2,914,000	10.29
Total	4,578,500,000	
Average		31.11

Europe's Will To Resist Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record a timely article that appeared in the Washington Star of October 1 telling of the alertness and outstanding leadership of a great son of Illinois, Lt. Gen Manton S. Eddy, the commanding general of the Seventh Army.

On my recent trip to Europe on a study mission of the NATO countries, I had the pleasure of personally witnessing the accomplishments he is making and has made, to bring about understanding as to why our occupational forces are in Europe. The manner in which he has instilled in the minds of the boys the American way of helping out, is beyond all comprehension.

The article follows:

EUROPE'S WILL TO RESIST GROWS—GENERAL EDDY IS MOLDING THE SEVENTH ARMY INTO AN ALERT FORCE THAT SHOWS THE WEST THAT UNITED STATES MEANS WHAT IT SAYS

(By Doris Fleeson)

STUTTGART, GERMANY, October 1.—General Eisenhower must share the credit for stimulating Western Europe's will to resist imperialist Russia with a growing host of American boys who are battle-training on German ground, faces to the east and ready to give a good account of themselves if trouble comes.

Gen Manton S. Eddy, one of World War II's outstanding division commanders, has the job of putting America's first war-prevention troops into that position of strength which will deter the Kremlin from starting what it cannot finish. The exact size of his Seventh Army is a secret. General Marshall has suggested a figure of around 350,000 as the goal.

This is not large enough for an army of aggression; it is large enough to inflict cruel punishment upon an aggressor.

The significance of the Seventh Army can hardly be overstated. The actual physical presence of American doughboys fanning out over the critical areas which confront the Russians and their satellites affords Western Europe decisive and irrefutable proof that the United States means business. The fleet is striking and impressive but it is at sea. Airpower, the modern weapon, needs no introduction to Europeans. But GI Joe, in battle dress, appearing among them in person, not a talking picture, tells the story of United States determination in a manner that impersonal power cannot match.

No one familiar with American tradition can possibly imagine that this Army will ever be betrayed or abandoned by the people who sent them there. They are a charge on the conscience of every American.

What probably needs to be emphasized at home is America's commitment in this potentially perilous region. Politics as usual seems knocking from the vantage point of the woods of Wildflecken.

General Eddy's task has been a hard one. He began with a small army of occupation, centering in the larger cities, physically and psychologically oriented toward winding up its business and going home. The change had to be sweeping, abrupt, and efficient. Fortunately General Eddy is an experienced commander who won many battles in this same general area.

The general in person tells the Seventh Army story to the arriving battalions. It is a privilege to be present when he does it. Between them, the wise veteran and the alert, fresh-faced young soldiers give a moving demonstration of the American system at its best.

Illinois-born Manton Eddy carries his 6-foot height and 200 pounds lightly and his blue eyes are kind. But there are authority and iron determination in his plain speech. He takes his men into his confidence. They know the truth of their situation, they share with him his estimates of the future. He tells them bluntly what they will be required to do—and it is hard—but he tells them why. Fortunately he doesn't seem to know any long words or platitudes and when he has told his story, he quits. The growing confidence of the men as he talks is almost tangible.

Perhaps the most interesting of General Eddy's problems is that he has to keep an army at fighting pitch that he and his country fervently hope will never have to fight. The most he will say and he says it very quietly is "We shall give a good account of ourselves."

Recently General Eisenhower inspected the Seventh Army. Walking toward the rear he picked out a young soldier at random. "Why are you here, son?" he asked kindly. "I'm here to protect America," replied the soldier firmly.

Steel Cut-Backs Could Bring Rationing, Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch of September 28, 1951:

STEEL CUT-BACKS COULD BRING RATIONING, HUNGER

If the National Production Authority continues its stubborn policy of reducing the amount of steel for manufacture of agricultural implements, the Quad-Cities and other farm implement manufacturing areas not only would face unemployment and its resultant economic ills, but those and the entire country could come face to face with the first real hunger in years and most certainly unprecedented rationing.

As C. D. Wiman, president of Deere & Co., told the Senate Agriculture Committee earlier this week, Congress must meet the situation now, not next year. The food of 1952 must be planted, cultivated, and harvested with machines built this fall and winter. An increased allotment of steel next spring would be of value only to crops in 1953.

And NPA need not shout about food surpluses taking up the slack in the coming year. Records of the Department of Agriculture expose the myth of surpluses.

For example, the department figures show butter stocks down from 185,000,000 to 42,000,000 pounds; dried milk down from 469,000,000 to 130,000,000 pounds; cheese down from 254,000,000 to 195,000,000 pounds; canned vegetables down from 75,000,000 to 64,000,000 cases; canned fruits down from 21,000,000 to 16,500,000 cases. Total stocks are down 50 percent since Korea.

The cotton carry-over is at a 25-year low, according to the department, corn carry-over has dropped from 860,000,000 bushels to 735,000,000, and the 1952 estimate is only 20 percent of the annual requirement, a dangerous situation in such critical times. The wheat estimate for 1952 is only 33 percent of annual requirement.

Senator HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, who has carried a large portion of the fight for more steel for the implement industry, charged this week that there is sentiment in Washington among Pennsylvania Avenue farmers that nature will take care of the food supply.

At a recent hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, Dr. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel for the National Grange, testified

"But there is popular belief that we are certain of all the food we need. There is no such certainty, as will be seen from a few facts. We have 20 percent more people; each will be eating around 20 percent more food than we ate before the war, and we now have around 22 percent less workers on farms to produce this added food which must be produced on the same acres of crop as we used prewar.

"In fact, we shall need 75 percent greater production per farm worker than we had prewar if we are to meet these food requirements.

"During the last decade we had much above the average growing weather. What would occur to our food supplies if we had a series of drought years as in the year 1930? Weather as much below average as we have

had above average could easily reduce total output and food prices surely would soar far above the present levels.

"Such an increased draft on food supplies (including heavy demands of the military) in the face of a 12 to 15 percent depletion on supplies from drought could bring us face to face with the first real national hunger period we have ever known as a Nation. The resultant price rises, barring unprecedented rationing, could make present high-food-price complaints mild indeed."

There is one way to insure ourselves against hunger, rationing, and/or record high food prices. That is for Congress to persuade or force the National Production Authority to provide the steel and other materials necessary to meet the Agriculture Department's estimates of the need for increased production of machinery.

And the time for doing that is now, as Mr. Wiman told the Congress this week.

A Balance Sheet on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by one of our leading economists, Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard University, contains such well reasoned and constructive suggestions as to how our defense and foreign aid programs should be controlled and financed that I hope every Member will study it carefully:

[From the New York Times of September 9, 1951]

A BALANCE SHEET ON FOREIGN AID

(By Sumner H. Slichter)

The hearings on the administration's foreign military and economic aid program were recently interrupted by a surprising outburst from Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and a strong supporter of the administration's foreign policies. Addressing William C. Foster, head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, the Senator declared that the United States "can't support the whole free world and remained solvent" and accused ECA of "trying to cover the earth . . . You fellows who spend all the Government's money never think where the revenues come from."

Both the House of Representatives and the Senate have voted a cut of more than a billion dollars in the foreign aid program. The National City Bank of New York, in its August survey of economic conditions, warns that "we cannot safely undertake to carry the huge defense program, plus global foreign aid, while at the same time continuing to indulge in all sorts of extravagances, public and private . . ." But Aneurin Bevan, who recently resigned from the British Cabinet, is demanding that the United States support a world mutual aid plan "on a far more ambitious scale than anything yet considered."

The administration proposes to spend \$8,500,000,000 on foreign aid during the present fiscal year—about \$6,300,000,000 for military aid and \$2,200,000,000 for economic help. Over the next 3 years the proposed outlay is about \$31,000,000,000—\$25,000,000,000 for military aid and at least \$6,000,000,000 for economic assistance. Are these

proposed expenditures more than we can afford? Would they cripple or seriously weaken the economy? What is the capacity of the country to give foreign aid, and what conditions determine that capacity? Let us take the administration's proposal of \$8,500,000,000 and consider some of its implications.

I

The capacity of the United States to give foreign aid can be measured in two ways. One way is to determine what quantity of goods can be diverted to foreign aid without reducing the level of per capita consumption in this country and without reducing capital per worker. The other way is to determine the amount of foreign aid that we can finance without imposing taxes that weaken the incentives to be efficient, or resorting to inflationary forms of borrowing.

A foreign-aid program that was so large as to reduce consumption per capita or to reduce the amount of capital per worker in the United States would not necessarily be disastrous, but it would seriously weaken our economy and should be avoided. Since the 7 percent of the world's population who live in the United States consume about 40 percent of the world's output, some people (including Mr. Bevan) think that Americans ought to reduce their standard of consumption in order to help the rest of the world.

But any drop from customary levels of consumption would set up strains and conflicts in the country and would foster dangerous disunity. By producing strikes it would cut the output of the economy. Even more serious would be a drop in capital per worker. One of the main determinants of productivity is the amount of tools and equipment that workers have to help them turn out goods. Consequently, a drop in capital per worker would probably bring about a reduction in the output of industry—though a drop in the quantity of capital might be offset to some extent by an improvement in methods of production.

There is no danger that the proposed expenditures of \$8,500,000,000 a year on foreign aid would in themselves bring about a drop in consumption per capita or in capital per worker. Since the population in the United States is increasing at the rate of about 1.7 percent per year, an increase of 1.7 percent, or \$3,400,000,000, in the output of consumer goods would prevent a drop in living standards.

The amount of capital per worker is about \$11,000, and the normal increase in the labor force is about 700,000—though the growth may be above 700,000 for several years. Hence capital needs to increase by at least \$7,700,000,000 a year in order to prevent a drop in capital per worker. Included in capital is public capital, such as roads, bridges, irrigation works, as well as private capital, such as factory buildings and machinery. Housing is included, also because workers must have places to live. The total increase in consumption goods and capital needed to prevent a drop in consumption per capita and in capital per worker is about \$10,300,000,000 a year.

During the next year the output of the economy will grow by about \$16,000,000,000—the result partly of an increase in employment (made possible by a larger labor force, longer hours of work, and a drop in unemployment) and partly of a rise in output per manhour. Furthermore, the United States is now devoting about \$37,000,000,000 a year to increasing private capital. The large output that has been going into the increase in capital would be available to prevent a drop either in consumption per capita or in capital per worker. It is evident that the foreign-aid program would have to be several times larger than the proposed \$8,500,000,000 before it would reduce the established levels of consumption or bring about a decrease in capital per worker.

II

Could a foreign-aid program of \$8,500,000,000 a year be financed without imposing taxes that undermine incentives or without resorting to inflationary borrowing? It is plain that \$8,500,000,000 a year could be raised by noninflationary borrowing if necessary. This amount is only a small fraction (3.8 percent) of all personal incomes after taxes. The Government could stimulate saving by offering securities that individuals found attractive and by building up a sales organization to do house-to-house selling. But what about the possibility of financing \$8,500,000,000 for foreign aid by taxes that do not weaken incentives? Taxes that discouraged efficiency could be very expensive—a 2 percent drop in efficiency would cause a \$6,000,000,000 drop in the national product.

There can be no doubt about the economic possibility of raising \$8,500,000,000 by taxes that would not weaken incentives, but Congress would probably not be willing to impose such taxes, at least in sufficient amounts. The present taxes on corporate incomes and on some personal incomes are dangerously high. The present standard rate of 47 percent upon corporate profits means that a rise of \$1 in expenses costs the company only 53 cents. This large shifting of increases in expenses to the Government has apparently not yet diminished the efforts of managements to hold down costs, but the corporate income tax has reached the point where it can easily weaken the resistance of management to advances in costs. Certainly further increases in this tax would be unwise.

The personal-income tax is too progressive, so that the Government takes too large a share of any additional dollars earned in the higher brackets. For example, a married man with no dependents and an income of \$34,000 a year (after deducting charitable contributions and the like) pays to the Government 50 cents out of any additional dollar he earns. If his income is \$50,000 (after deductions), the Government takes 59 cents out of every additional dollar. There is good evidence that, up to a certain point, taxes on personal income stimulate men to work harder—just as cuts in piece rates usually cause factory workers to speed up in order to preserve their former earnings—but it is obvious that if the Government takes too big a part of the earnings of additional effort, men will not try to increase their incomes.

No one knows at what point high taxes discourage rather than encourage effort, but when the Government takes half or more of additional earnings, the rates must be dangerously close to the point at which they discourage efficiency. And the persons whose efficiency is threatened are those whose superior ability has enabled them to command large incomes—the persons whose efficiency is most important to the community.

Foreign-aid expenditures of \$8,500,000,000 could be financed without injury to incentives (1) by lowering exemptions from \$300 to \$400, thus taxing large amounts of income that now pay no income tax, and (2) by raising taxes on the first \$10,000 of income, on which the rates are still low. As nearly 80 percent of all personal income goes to persons receiving \$7,500 a year or less, these two changes would apply to considerably more than half of all personal incomes—parts of many incomes would not be affected because of deductions.

Tax revenue might also be greatly increased by new excise taxes or a general sales tax, though in a sellers' market such taxes would have some inflationary effect. But Congress has always been reluctant to tax the recipients of small incomes or to impose general sales taxes. Hence, although it is economically possible to finance a \$8,500,-

000,000 foreign aid program without injury to the economy, it is doubtful whether it is politically possible.

III

It is unrealistic to discuss the ability of the country to provide \$8,500,000,000 of foreign aid a year without discussing the capacity of the country to provide the large quantity of goods required for the entire defense program, of which the foreign-aid program is only a small part.

At present, defense expenditures (including foreign aid and atomic energy) are running at the annual rate of about \$35,000,000,000. Twelve months hence, the Government plans to spend at the rate of about \$65,000,000,000 and, during the fiscal year 1952-53, defense expenditures may be above \$65,000,000,000. Far more important than the question of the capacity of the country to provide \$8,500,000,000 of foreign aid a year is the question of its capacity to turn out \$65,000,000,000 or more of defense goods a year without injury to the economy.

The tests of what the economy can stand are the same in the case of the entire defense program as in the case of foreign aid. (1) How will the diversion of output to defense affect consumption per capita and capital per worker, and (2) can the country finance a sixty-five-billion-dollar defense budget without weakening incentives or without engaging in inflationary borrowing?

The output of defense goods can undoubtedly be increased to \$65,000,000,000 a year within the next 12 months without reducing consumption per capita or capital per worker. This rise in the output of defense goods would be about \$30,000,000,000 above present levels. I have pointed out that the national production may be expected to grow by about \$16,000,000,000 during the next year and that the country has been devoting about \$37,000,000,000 a year to increasing its private capital.

This means that there is available about \$53,000,000,000 of present and prospective productive capacity to provide the \$30,000,000,000 increase in defense goods, the \$3,400,000,000 increase in consumer goods needed to prevent a drop in consumption per capita, and the \$7,700,000,000 increase in capital needed to prevent a drop in capital per worker. Evidently the country could increase its defense output considerably faster than is planned without reducing consumption per capita or capital per worker.

Paying for a \$30,000,000,000 increase in defense production is a very different matter. Total outlays in 1952-53 on defense and foreign aid of \$65,000,000,000 a year, even with economies in nondefense expenditures, would mean a cash budget of at least \$85,000,000,000, and perhaps as much as \$90,000,000,000—about \$15,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000 larger than the cash budget of the present fiscal year. The yield of the present rates of taxation in another year will be about \$70,000,000,000. Consequently, the Government would need to raise about \$15,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000 a year by new taxes or by borrowing.

Undoubtedly it would be economically possible to raise even \$15,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 a year by taxes that do not reduce the efficiency of the economy by weakening incentives. This could be done by taxes substantially reducing exemptions allowed under personal income tax, raising rates on the first \$10,000 or possibly \$15,000 of income, and imposing a more or less general tax on sales.

But Congress would be likely to raise a considerable part of the needed \$15,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 by taxes that would be bad for incentives. Hence consideration should be given (1) to the desirability of financing much of the increase in expenditures through noninflationary borrowing and (2) to the desirability of limiting the

peak rate of military spending in 1952-53 to considerably less than \$65,000,000,000—say to about \$55,000,000,000.

Testifying before the Senate Finance Committee on July 3, Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, said that defense expenditures will reach their peak in 1953, that they will drop in 1954 by about \$10,000,000,000 and in 1955 by about \$20,000,000,000. Obviously this temporary bulge in expenditures might better be financed by noninflationary borrowing than by bad taxes. It is true that if a bad tax is definitely known to be temporary, it may do little harm, but when the drop in spending comes, one cannot be sure that it will be the bad taxes that are reduced.

If the Federal deficits of the next 2 years were financed entirely by borrowing, the Federal debt would rise by about \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000—perhaps less. Even the larger increase would leave the debt smaller in relation to the national product than when the Korean war broke out. In June 1950 the Federal debt was about \$258,000,000,000 and the gross national product was running at the annual rate of a little more than \$275,000,000,000. Two years hence, with the rise in defense spending met by the increased yield of present taxes and by borrowing, the debt would be \$280,000,000,000 or less, and the annual gross national product more than \$360,000,000,000.

The possibility of noninflationary borrowing is good. Not only are pension funds a considerable potential source of demand for Government bonds, but so also are individuals. This is indicated by the fact that the holdings of liquid assets of individuals have increased from \$150,700,000,000 at the end of 1947 to only \$155,600,000,000 at the end of 1950, while person incomes have risen substantially. Hence attractive Government securities should meet a good response. But in order to sell savings bonds in large quantities, the Government may have to follow the example of Britain and Canada and liberalize the terms offered to buyers.

IV

Most important of all is the question of whether Government outlays on defense, including foreign aid and atomic energy, should be allowed to rise to a peak of \$65,000,000,000 or more in the fiscal year of 1952-53. This question is important not only because of fiscal reasons but because the magnitude of the defense program determines the rate at which the standard of living of the country will be permitted to rise (or whether it will be permitted to rise at all), and the number and the nature of the various controls that are imposed on the economy.

Two years ago the country went to an extreme in economizing on defense and was rudely shocked and alarmed when the outbreak of the war in Korea revealed the folly of cuts in defense spending. Today the country is reacting from the mistake of 2 years ago and is probably going to the opposite extreme. Everyone (or nearly everyone) is afraid to question the amounts that the armed services assert to be necessary for national security.

Certainly the proposal that \$65,000,000,000 or more be spent on defense and foreign aid in the fiscal year 1952-53 has never been satisfactorily explained. If goods can wait until the middle of 1952 or the beginning of 1953 to be produced, must they then be turned out at such a high rate?

As the total output of the Russian economy was recently estimated at about one-third that of the American, it is safe to say that the Russian output of defense goods is considerably less than is planned for the United States. Indeed, if the Russians were to use half of their output on their armed services (a fantastic assumption) they would

be putting one-fifth less into the armed services than we expect to devote to defense in 1952-53.

The requests of our armed services for goods know virtually no limit. Deputy Secretary of Defense Lovett recently told a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that the original requests of the armed services for the current fiscal year totaled about \$104,000,000,000, but that the amount was trimmed by the Defense Department and the Budget Bureau to about \$48,000,000,000. Later it was raised to \$60,700,000,000, and the efforts of the services to get back what was trimmed from their original requests seem to be continuing.

Several months ago a force of 3 500,000 was suggested as the size needed to deter Russia from military adventures. Now the armed services are suggesting that the figure should be 4 000,000, though there is no gain in Russian strength to justify changing our figure. Among the armed services there appears to be no agreement as to what quantities are required. The Air Force, for example, believes that it should be increased from 95 groups to 150, but the Army and the Navy, which presumably know as much about our enemies and their plans as does the Air Force, are reported to oppose this increase in the Air Force.

It is not easy to get a satisfactory review of the insatiable requests of the armed services for more goods. No one knows how much is required, and it is obviously better to be too well prepared than not well enough. Much of the case in support of the requests for large military expenditures involves military secrets and cannot be publicly disclosed and, therefore, cannot be properly investigated and publicly criticized. Nevertheless, the country should not permit outlays on defense, foreign aid, and atomic energy to rise to \$65,000,000,000 or more in 1952-53 without an adequate demonstration that this peak is really necessary.

A sensible procedure would be to set a limit of \$55,000,000,000 on defense and foreign aid in 1952-53, and to require the armed services to show clear and urgent reason for exceeding this volume of spending. Since expenditures of \$55,000,000,000 on defense would be more than three times as large as the outlay of 1949-50 (including foreign military and economic aid and atomic energy), the chances are that it would be a more than adequate rate.

An increase of \$20,000,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000,000 in defense expenditures during the next year would have several important advantages. It would substantially reduce the need for new taxes or borrowing—though the need would still exist. It would not greatly exceed the probable rise in output during the next year and hence would permit the standard of consumption to be maintained without much drop in the rate at which capital is increased. It would limit the upward pressure on prices and thus help to protect the community from tighter and tighter controls. It would compel the armed services to spend their money more wisely and give them much badly needed time in which to test and improve their equipment. Hence the American taxpayer would be less likely to have to pay for many billions of equipment that would become obsolete within a few months after being put into use.

The conclusion of this examination of the effects of the proposed foreign aid and defense program is that the country can easily afford foreign aid in the amount proposed by the administration—namely, \$8,500,000,000 for the next year. This amount will not reduce established levels of consumption and it could easily be financed by noninflationary borrowing or by taxes that are not bad for incentives. But Congress is likely to increase the wrong kind of taxes. Hence the foreign-aid program will probably cause

taxes to be pushed dangerously close to the point where they impair efficiency.

The real threat to the economy comes from the proposal to raise total expenditures, including foreign aid, by \$30,000,000,000 or more in the next year. Although this could be done without cutting the general level of consumption or capital per worker, the prospect is remote that Congress will be willing to raise the needed revenue by taxes that do not endanger efficiency. To safeguard the economy, a substantial part of the rise in defense outlays should be financed by borrowing and the rise, if possible, should be kept well below \$30,000,000,000.

Acceptance of Endorsement for National Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the Arkansas Legionnaire, which is the acceptance of the endorsement of Mr. Lee Ward of Paragould, Ark., for national commander of the American Legion, by the Department of Arkansas.

Mr. Ward has been active in the Legion since his discharge from the United States Navy in October 1945, and has been highly praised for his work in veterans' affairs. He is an outstanding attorney and a forceful public speaker. As department commander he has contributed much to the welfare of the veterans of his State as well as the Nation. His selection by the State convention is a wise one. Lee Ward is well qualified for the position of National Commander. The article follows:

ACCEPTANCE OF ENDORSEMENT FOR NATIONAL COMMANDER

The faith and confidence of the Legionnaires of Arkansas which prompted them to endorse me as a candidate for the office of national commander fills my heart with pride. This is a tribute which I shall deeply cherish throughout the remainder of my life.

I accept your expression of confidence with sincere humility.

The office of national commander of the American Legion makes a tremendous demand upon the individual who fills that office. No man can face the prospect of assuming the duties and responsibilities that will be thrust upon him by this high office without some feeling of his own insignificance and inadequateness for the task.

However, I have one promise to make to you. Should your efforts to make me National Commander meet with success, you may be certain that I will dedicate every ounce of energy and ability at my command to the job of carrying out the program of the American Legion on behalf of veterans and on behalf of the various communities where they live.

There is no organization, except the church, which offers to suffering and needy humanity as much service, guidance, and inspiration as does the American Legion.

We are greatly indebted to the veterans of World War I for their vision and unselfishness in setting forth the principles

and policies that make up the program of the Legion. We are further indebted to the scores of World War I veterans who have been willing to give of their time and money in establishing this program as a working reality. As a World War II veteran, I count it a vast privilege to be allowed the opportunity of stepping into the Legion as a full-grown and thoroughly established group devoted to the best interests of veterans, their families, and their communities.

One cannot, I believe, read the History of the American Legion by Richard Seelye Jones without getting a deep and abiding conviction that the Legion has reached its present position of prestige and influence because it has, over the long haul, devoted itself exclusively to the acceptance and presentation of certain fundamental policies and principles. It has steadfastly refused to be tied to any individual whether in or out of office.

This fact, in my judgment, indicates that we must follow the same undeviating course in our future activities. We must not permit ourselves to become tied up with any individual personalities who move across our national scene. We are not in the business of promoting or fighting personalities. Our job now, as it has always been, is to fight for the principles we know are tried and true.

Among the major problems of immediate concern to veterans is the continued effort by some groups to tear down and disintegrate the Veterans' Administration.

This agency of the Government was set up to administer veterans' affairs only after a long, hard fight by the Legion. It gave veterans, for the first time, one centralized agency to handle their particular problems. We must not permit it to be torn down with veterans' affairs again being scattered to the four corners of Washington.

The Veterans' Administration was established upon the promise that veterans as a group have certain problems that are peculiar to themselves alone and that they have certain rights and privileges that cannot be granted to other citizens. I believe thoroughly in the correctness and soundness of this principle.

We dare not forget, however, that rights and privileges carry with them attendant responsibilities.

To justify our privileges we must assume our responsibilities.

One of our responsibilities, which we have publicly accepted, is to keep a close watch upon the Veterans' Administration and see that it does, in fact, administer our affairs at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers. This, I suggest, is a serious obligation on the part of the Legion. Much fine work in that regard has been done by our present and past national commanders. I commend them for keeping faith with the people of our Nation.

Nevertheless, we may never rest or go to sleep on our job of policing the Veterans' Administration. This work must be kept up and, if possible, intensified. There is ample evidence that in some instances the Veterans' Administration has not given the taxpayer a fair run for his money. Such a situation becomes the business of the Legion. We have promised the people that we will carefully ferret out such situations and do all in our power to correct them.

We know, for example, that some colleges, operating under the GI educational program, have charged the United States Government more tuition for veterans than was being paid by the same type and class of nonveteran students in the same colleges. If such an act on the part of a college is not larceny, it is at least not justice to the taxpayers who foot the bill for veterans' schooling. We have a responsibility to stop such practices and, if possible, recover for the taxpayers some of the money wrongfully extracted from them through loose practices by the Veterans' Administration.

The American Legion must be as vigilant in protecting the taxpayer as it is in protecting the veteran. These two responsibilities go hand in hand. We dare not evade either of them

LEE WARD.

The Place of the Paper Industry in the United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days when we are talking about taxes and raising money it is important to become acquainted with some of the institutions of our own country which are producing the taxes. The paper and pulp industry employs a great many employees and pays out in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000,000.

I have in my hands an excellent article published in the July 14, 1951, issue of Paper Mill News. It was written by Dr. Louis T. Stevenson, economist for the American Paper and Pulp Association. The article is entitled "The Place of the Paper Industry in the United States Economy."

I am naturally particularly interested in this article because the paper industry plays a tremendous part in our economy in Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

THE PLACE OF THE PAPER INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

(By Dr. Louis T. Stevenson, economist, American Paper and Pulp Association)

It is but repeating a many times twice-told tale to say that the paper and board industry ranks as the sixth largest industry in the United States, when ranked by value of product. Ahead of it, according to the United States Bureau of the Census, come motor vehicles, meat packing, steel works, petroleum refining, and cotton broad-woven fabrics. This ranking was established by the Bureau of the Census in a tabulation which eliminated duplications such as would arise by including with paper and board the pulp industry and the converted paper products industries. Yes, the paper and board industry is officially and accurately ranked sixth, and yet few people outside of the industry realize its size, complexity, and importance to the United States economy because few people stop to think about paper at all. Paper is so much a part of the everyday life of an American that he simply takes it for granted. It is there in abundance when needed, and its cost is so small that it is but an incidental expense for most individuals and for most businesses.

Just where does the paper industry, and in that term I shall include all paper and board, fit into the American economic picture? The answer is, "everywhere." There is not a farm, factory, business, railroad, or other transportation system that can operate without using paper. Its use is essential to the operation of our Governments: local,

State, and National; to our banking system; to our systems of communication; to our systems of distribution; and above all, to our armed services which, during the last war, listed over 700,000 uses for paper. The use of paper had become so essential to the operation of our economy that in 1944, Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, stated that the paper and pulp industry was one of the most essential of all our industries.

THE FUNCTIONS OF PAPER IN THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

The first use of paper by man was as a medium on which to transmit and record ideas or facts. Paper has thus been used by all peoples since its original development by the Chinese about the first century A. D. In the storied libraries of our country and other countries are kept the vast treasures of knowledge on which our entire civilization and educational system are built. All kinds of research depend upon facts recorded on paper, as do all the sciences: chemistry, physics, etc., etc. It is not too much to say that our western civilization was born on paper records and is disseminated through the use of the printed word.

In the United States the vast printing and publishing industry carries out the major part of this function. Local governments also keep the legal records of property transfers on paper, all kinds of other governmental agencies keep records of laws, official orders, transactions, and in most instances, these are published. It is estimated that over 10,000,000 tons of paper were required in the United States during 1950 to record and transmit ideas. This estimate, of course, includes the newsprint imported and used in this country.

In this brief presentation it is impossible to list comprehensively all the uses of paper to satisfy this function. One can hope to mention but a few which may stir the imagination to review the subject and bring to mind many other instances in individual experience.

THE PACKAGING AND PROTECTIVE FUNCTION

One of the fastest-growing fields for the use of paper and board is that of packaging. The modern package must perform satisfactorily under severe conditions of handling, climate, and storage. Paperboard has grown tremendously in volume in recent years because the product has been adapted to meet more and more exacting requirements. The advent of the paper-shipping sack, both single and multiwall, has greatly expanded the use of kraft paper in that field.

Special research into the application of sulfate wrappings, glassine, greaseproof, and vegetable parchment has widened the use of these papers.

Over 13,500,000 tons of paper and board were used during 1950 in packaging United States products.

THE SANITARY FUNCTION

It has been proved conclusively that when paper or board comes off the paper machine it is a perfect sanitary product so far as cleanliness is concerned—there are no coliform bacteria present. Paper is, because of its low cost and disposability, a natural for many sanitary purposes. Paper napkins, facial tissues, milk bottles and bottle caps, ice-cream containers, frozen-food containers and wrappers are but examples of the many applications of paper as a sanitary product. It is not easy to estimate the total tonnage of these papers, but approximately 1,500,000 tons were consumed in 1950. This is one of the most rapidly growing branches of the paper industry.

SOME ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PAPER MAKING

Paper making is a mass-production industry, generally located in small communities, and using large volumes of process water.

Its power requirements are great because the machinery is heavy and the grinding action demands power.

The net result of these characteristics is the economic stimulation of many small communities by the steady stream of payroll and investment money brought to these small towns and cities by the pulp and paper mills located in them.

Wood-pulp mills are dependent for their raw materials upon forest resources. The mills also require huge long-term capital investments. As a consequence of these two factors the careful plant management must assure itself of adequate forest resources and consequently the pulp industry is and has been in the forefront of commercial forestry developments to assure permanent wood supplies. A pulp mill without reasonably priced wood dies on the stem, as it were. The joint use of a forest for the production of saw logs, other wood products, and wood pulp is an almost ideally economical set-up when the forest is handled so as to assure a continuous flow of wood. Waste is reduced and a greater over-all utilization of the wood results.

SOME FACTS AND FIGURES

The primary paper industry in the United States will be able to produce over \$6,000,000,000 worth of goods this year. Employment in the industry is running currently at 209,000 workers, exclusive of woods workers and salaried individuals. The present annual payroll will approximate \$765,000,000. All told, it is estimated that including woods workers, about 500,000 workers of all kinds are employed in our primary pulp and paper-making industry.

Directly dependent upon the product of the paper industry are the printing and publishing industry, and the manufacturers of converted paper products. Between these two industry groups and the pulp and paper industry over 1,000,000 people are employed, drawing about \$3,400,000,000 annual pay. Thus, over 1,000,000 people are directly engaged in the manufacture, printing, and otherwise processing paper. In addition to this, an almost immeasurable army is engaged in the distribution and use of paper.

For example, a manager of a large department store last fall asked me, when he had difficulty in getting an adequate supply of wrapping paper, "What would you do, Dr. Stevenson, if you couldn't get the material without which you could not operate?"

We may think of stores as relatively small users of paper. They think that paper is an absolutely necessary material without which they cannot operate. They can close out a line of merchandise and still do business, but they cannot operate without paper.

But if we are going to include all direct and indirect users of paper in our statement, we cannot avoid mentioning all the 153,000,000 individuals in the United States who come within that category. And the entire gross national product of over \$313,000,000,000 is affected. Certainly without paper it would be sadly deflated.

THE PAPER INDUSTRY AS AN INVESTMENT

During the past 10 years the paper industry has come to be considered by the investing public as an industry in which satisfactory investments can be made. Like all other industries, the paper industry offers investment opportunities that may vary company by company, but taking the industry as a whole, its record will bear analysis for years back as well as during the post-war periods.

The paper industry earnings record, taken as an industry, will stand up with all industry earnings in depression as in prosperity, for, in fact, the paper industry has operated more steadily in depression periods than most industries. In the low year of the great depression (1932), the paper industry

was operating at 58 percent of capacity, while steel was almost flat on its back below 20 percent and banks dependent upon the automobile industry were in distress.

The paper industry is, of course, a service industry, and it therefore is dependent upon general business activity for its own activity. But it must be remembered that whatever business is done demands the use of paper as a necessity. Business cannot be done without paper.

SUMMARY

The paper industry, sixth largest industry in the country, is dependent primarily upon adequate supplies of wood and water. Its products permeate the whole economy which is, as presently constituted, dependent upon a constant flow of products from the paper industry.

Paper production is located largely in small towns and cities in 37 of the 48 States. Consequently, the payrolls and investment money of these mills are widely distributed and stimulate the business activity of these communities.

The Development of the Alabama-Coosa River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record the following address I delivered at Washington, D. C., on Monday, October 1, 1951, at the meeting of the Alabama Club:

Mr. President and members of the Alabama Club, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to my fellow Alabamians.

I am going to talk to you tonight for a few minutes about a subject which is close to my heart and which should be close to the heart of every Alabamian whether they live in Alabama or not. My subject is The Development of the Alabama-Coosa River Basin. Although I know that it has been the dream of political figures for over a hundred years, at the same time I feel that it is more vital to us now than at any time in the past. The Alabama-Coosa Basin is a principal river system of the Southeast. Its importance has been recognized throughout the country and last year it was the subject of a report by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. It is considered one of the 10 great river systems of our country, and I feel that it is important that all of us learn as much as possible about the great potentialities of this undeveloped system. The headwaters of the Coosa are the Etowah and Oostanaula Rivers which unite to form the Coosa at Rome, Ga. These headwaters begin almost 3,000 feet above sea level in the mountains of northwest Georgia and southeast Tennessee and this body of water extends from the Blue Ridge Mountains southwesterly across the Piedmont Plateau to the lowlands of the Gulf Coastal Plain in Alabama, covering an area of 22,800 square miles. As pointed out, the Etowah and Oostanaula unite to form the Coosa; the Coosa and the Tallapoosa Rivers flow through the middle portion of the basin and descend the Fall Line before uniting and forming the Alabama River; the Alabama River flows across the gently sloping coastal plain to

join the Tombigbee River, which drains the adjoining large watershed to the west, to form the Mobile River, and then empties southward to the Gulf of Mexico. A glance at the map will show that the Coosa River touches all counties of the Fourth District except Clay, and flows by the cities of Rome, Ga., Gadsden, near the city of Talladega, by the city of Wetumpka; then the Alabama flows near Montgomery, Selma, and thence to Mobile.

The Alabama River and its main tributary, the Coosa, form the main stem of this system. The Coosa heads west and southwest from Rome, Ga., a distance of 286 miles through a hilly, upland region descending 450 feet in its course. The Tallapoosa River, which is also a part of this system, is 268 miles long, comes from the area to the south and east of the Coosa Basin and joins the Coosa about 15 miles above Montgomery to form the Alabama. The Alabama then flows west and southwesterly 316 miles through the fertile Gulf Coastal Plain to meet the Tombigbee River to form the Mobile River.

This basin is of growing importance to the economic progress of the Southeast and hence to the Nation. The entire basin has a mild, equable climate, there is an abundant and well-distributed rainfall, large areas of fertile soil, and there are rich and varied mineral resources. These are the basic ingredients of a stable and prosperous economy. Agriculture was from the beginning and still is the principal activity. Industry has now become a vital economic factor. Both depend to a large degree on water resources. Agriculture needs protection against floods and erosion of the soil, industrial growth requires power, a dependable water supply and cheap transportation of bulk commodities. The future rate of economic growth will be largely determined by the use made by the basin's water resources. At one time in the history of Alabama, when shallow-draft water transportation was the rule, cotton, grain, and timber products furnished a great deal of freight for cheap water transportation. At one time the city of Wetumpka, Ala., was one of the great cotton markets of the country, due to the fact that it had excellent river port facilities. Plans are under way at the present time to make the river navigable from Mobile to Montgomery through the building of a 9-foot channel and when the river is completely developed it will be navigable from Mobile to Rome, Ga.

Hydropower is another important element of the resources of this great basin. At the present time, there are six dams in operation owned by the Alabama Power Co., which produce more than 500,000 kilowatts of hydropower. Another dam has recently been placed in operation at the Allatoona Reservoir near Cartersville, Ga., which produces around 74,000 kilowatts.

Floods are frequent in this basin, but only moderately severe and do not constitute a great threat to the economic growth of the basin. I would like to call your attention to the fact that last Easter there was considerable flood damage in the counties of Calhoun, Talladega, and Dallas. This damage has been variously estimated at from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000. About one-half million acres are subject to overflow, mostly in the flat coastal plain. Agriculture bears the brunt of this flood damage and most of the urban cities are largely out of reach of floods. Water supply and stream pollution are local problems in this basin. Soil erosion is widespread, therefore, soil conservation is a vital phase of water-resource planning.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers has long been interested in the development

of this basin and there is no greater advocate of the development of this region than Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, the present chief of the Corps of Engineers. I have talked to him on many occasions about this great basin and he has worked unceasingly to promote the building of locks and dams and water reservoirs. It might be interesting for you to know that General Pick married an Auburn girl and hopes to retire and live at Auburn when he leaves his Army service. He has told me on many occasions that he would not be happy in his retirement unless this great region is developed according to the plans that have been made. About 80 years ago the Corps of Engineers developed a plan for the development of this river system. The first improvement was a series of locks and dams in the Coosa River to enable shallow-draft navigation to reach Rome, Ga. As that early type of traffic disappeared from the Coosa, and power dams were built across the lower river, the need for those navigation structures ended, and they have been abandoned. The most outstanding report that has been prepared with reference to the development of this system was the 308 report which appeared in 1934. This provided for locks and dams on the Alabama River and on the Coosa River and locks in the power dams, and it was also planned to provide 9-foot depth for navigation upstream to Rome from Mobile, a distance of 659 miles and for additional power.

The increase in the number of industries in the basin has renewed the enthusiasm for the development of this system. In 1941, the Corps of Engineers submitted another report recommending a program of development of the basin's water resources and this was adopted by the Congress and the President in 1945 and is the present authority for the Corps of Engineers' program. The present program for initial construction, if funds become available, includes a navigation lock and dam and two power dams with locks on the Alabama River below Montgomery and a power dam with provision for a future lock on the Coosa River. These projects are as follows: Howell Mill Shoals Dam, Coosa River, which is now under design and is to provide 174,000 kilowatts of power, Jones Bluff Reservoir on the Alabama River to provide 51,000 kilowatts; Millers Ferry Reservoir on the Alabama River to provide 57,000 kilowatts, Clairborne lock and dam on the Alabama River and channel improvement on the Alabama River. The total cost is estimated at \$116,000,000, however, the Howell Mill Shoals Dam is to be doubled in hydropower capacity and costs on this dam alone are now estimated to reach into the neighborhood of \$90,000,000. It is interesting to note that the building of the Howell Mills Shoals Dam near Pell City would increase the power of the existing dams by almost 60 percent.

One of the most important features of the basin is its forest resources. At one time practically all of the land in this basin was covered with forest. Now, however, most of the valleys are in cultivation, and only in the swamplands and in the southern portion of the basin is there any original timber left. A great movement to reforest this region was started in 1935, and the Talladega National Forest now contains around 250,000 acres of land. This great forest and others will improve the watershed of this great basin and may be the factor that will result in Alabama becoming a great center for the production of newsprint. Most of you know that at Childersburg there is a great newsprint mill known as Coosa Pines, which produces a great portion of the tonnage of newsprint made in America. Recently, as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I accompanied other members of this committee on a trip to Canada to investigate the critical shortage of

newsprint. Before leaving this country we held a conference on September 4 in New York City with the publishers of the leading dailies in the United States. They told us that the United States obtains about four-fifths of its newsprint from the Dominion of Canada. Further, that in the course of the next 4 or 5 years the newsprint industry would require an additional 600,000 to 700,000 tons of newsprint per year. They emphasized that in order to maintain a free press and in order to keep the newspaper as a medium of communication they felt our newsprint situation must be rapidly improved. Throughout the years Canada has supplied this country with newsprint, however, this country has a monopoly on the supply of sulfur, which is absolutely necessary in the making of newsprint. Leaving New York on the night of the 4th, we visited the cities of Montreal and Quebec, and numerous plants throughout eastern Canada. We visited vast forests and power dams and became impressed with the vast storehouse of timber reserves to be found in this great north country. Because of their timber resources and vast power developments Canada has been able to supply the world with newsprint. There are two weaknesses, however, in her situation which are not present in Alabama. First of all, Canada has a slow-growing hardwood which requires from 80 to 90 years for maturity. I refer to the spruce tree, upon which this great industry is based. Luckily we, in Alabama, have a pine tree that grows to maturity in the comparatively short span of from 10 to 15 years. We have another advantage, in that we are near the States of Louisiana and Texas, where the bulk of the supply of sulfur is to be found. This means cheaper transportation costs. With our great rivers in Alabama we have plenty of industrial water, and this very water system can also produce cheap electric power and cheap transportation. The operation at Coosa Pines has been an outstanding success. As a test case it has more than demonstrated that we can make good newsprint as cheaply as it can be made any place in the world. By following proper conservation practices, we can maintain a substantial supply of pulp wood for the newsprint mills which should be built on the banks of the Coosa and Alabama Rivers.

Recently, Mr. Arthur Treanor, Director of the National Production Authority's Printing and Publishing Division, testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and to show you how critical newsprint is at this time, he stated we have been driven to a plan to save newsprint by reducing the number of newspapers for street sale and we are also trying to work out a plan by which used papers can be salvaged through a de-inking process. I asked Mr. Treanor what he thought about the solution of this problem and he unqualifiedly stated that the only solution would be found in the building of new plants. He further stated that he believed the ideal place for these plants was in the South. It was further developed that these plants would be sufficiently impressed with national defense characteristics and so important in the national economy that, if private capital is not available for the building of these plants, Federal assistance should be forthcoming. In order to make Government capital available, I plan to introduce this week a bill which will give the RFC authority to make loans for the construction of these plants. The production of additional newsprint in this country will improve our position as a buyer in the world market and we will not then be dependent on foreign sources of supply.

To show you the growing importance of this area, I should like to point out that the number of industrial plants in this section has doubled since 1939. We now have about 130 textile mills in the area which employ

around 143,000 people. Steel and iron mills found in Gadsden, Anniston, and Rome use coal and iron ore mined nearby and employ about 10,000 men in 33 plants. There are 64 chemical plants and there are 70 concerns in the glass, clay, and stone group and the large industrial cities of Birmingham, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., lie just outside this great basin.

This great basin contains the following mineral resources: Bauxite, Selma chalk (for cement), clays, coal, arsenic ores, flu. ing materials, fuller's earth, gold, lead, graphite, granite, marble, tin, slate, mica, ochre, lime, manganese ore, iron ore (both brown and gray), gravel, sand, silica sand, and asbestos.

As you can readily see from the list a good many of these minerals are in the critical class at the present time. During World War I a great deal of graphite was mined in Clay County and operations are in progress there at the present time. Efforts are being made to expand these operations as we are convinced from surveys made that we can produce a high quality grade of graphite which compares favorably with that being produced in foreign countries. It is important to note that in the event of an all-out war our overseas sources of these critical materials would doubtless be destroyed. One of the most interesting things to me is the fact that Coosa County boasts a considerable tin deposit and the Bureau of Mines has spent quite a bit of money in exploring this valuable deposit. So far it has not been found in large quantities and doubtless Federal aid will be necessary in order to develop the deposit to its maximum benefits. The same situation is true of manganese ore. However, iron ore is being mined at the present time by private sources and is profitable.

The immediate project which should be built in the near future, and in which all of us are greatly interested, is the Howell Mill Shoals Dam which was authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945. This project would be located on the Coosa River about 108 miles about its mouth and about 123 miles from Montgomery, Ala. It will be a multi-water resources development for navigation, hydro-electric power, flood control, and related purposes. The most important immediate purpose is the development of power. The proposed dam will have a maximum height of 130 feet and a length of 11,000 feet. The reservoir which will be expanded by the dam will provide a total storage capacity of well over 2,000,000 acre-feet and will require some 130,000 acres of land. The project provides for the installation of 160,000 kws of power consisting of four units of 40,000 kws each. The project, as now planned, has an estimated cost of almost \$92,000,000. The power is vitally needed at this time due to the rapid expansion of defense plants in this area. Fort McClellan is being expanded, it will be the new home of the Chemical Warfare School, a WAC officers training center, and a National Guard training center. The great Anniston Ordnance Depot at Bynum, Ala., is in the process of a huge expansion program which will call for additional block of electric power. This project should be built immediately and it is estimated, when developed, it will attract industries overnight. The Coosa-Alabama Basin can be the garden spot of the Southeast as it has every element that would insure the health, welfare, and prosperity of a people who deserve the best. Due to low income, a low standard of living, lack of soil conservation practices, and neglect this section has never contributed its full share to the economic wealth of this country. We have an adequate supply of stable labor, we are blessed by the Almighty with a climate that is unexcelled in the world, we have an abundant rainfall throughout the year, and an immense supply of rapid growth timber.

The challenge is here. We must alert our people and excite them to the possibilities to be found in Alabama. We are not doing a good job of selling our section to the country. I would like at this time to show you a pamphlet which came to my desk called "Power for Defense." It shows you what the people in the Columbia River Valley are doing to advertise their section of the world. To you, as native Alabamians, I hope to make an appeal; that appeal is that everyone of you become salesmen for Alabama. The South has shown great strides in the past 10 years and instead of being the Nation's number one economic problem it must become the Nation's number one opportunity.

"Little little, can I give thee,
Alabama, Mother mine;
But that little—hand, brain, spirit
All I have and am are thine,
Take, O take the gift and giver,
Take and serve thyself with me,
Alabama, Alabama,
I will aye be true to thee,
Alabama."

—by Julia S. Tutwiler

Roads on Which Federal Funds Were Spent in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, June 30, 1948, to August 31, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter and statement of Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Commerce, dated October 5, 1950, dealing with expenditures of Federal funds for road building in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, for the period June 30, 1948, to August 31, 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Washington, October 5, 1950.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,

House of Representatives

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: In response to your request of September 28 for information concerning Federal-aid highway funds which have been spent in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, we attach, in duplicate, a list of all projects which have been programmed, placed under contract, or completed from June 30, 1948, to August 31, 1950.

These lists show the county location of the project, project number, route number, terminal, character of work, total estimated cost, Federal funds and length separately for the three stages—programed, under contract or completed, and for the three classes of Federal-aid funds—primary, secondary and urban funds apportioned under the provisions of the Federal-aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1948.

We trust this information will serve your purpose.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Alabama—Seventh Congressional District—Postwar Federal-aid highway projects programed, under contract, or completed since June 30, 1948, as of Aug. 31, 1950

POSTWAR PRIMARY PROJECTS

PROJECTS PROGRAMED BUT NOT UNDER CONTRACT

County	Project number	State or United States route number	Terminal	Character of work	Total estimated cost	Federal funds	Miles
Blount.....	F-42 (3)...	State 38.....	From 0.15 miles south of Blount-Jefferson County line north 7 miles toward Cleveland	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface and 3 bridges.	\$239,500.00	\$143,500.00	7.000
Do.....	F-442 (4)...	State 38.....	North end F-442 (3), north to pavement northwest of Cleveland.	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface and 4 bridges.	517,500.00	288,000.00	9.960
Cullman.....	F1-151 (3)...	State 3 and U S 31.....	From 2.45 miles north of northern city limits of Cullman, north to south end of F1-82 (2).	Grade, drain, and 2-lane hightype pavement.	41,000.00	20,000.00	-----
Total.....					848,000.00	421,500.00	16.960

PROJECTS UNDER CONTRACT BUT NOT COMPLETED

Cullman.....	F1-82 (2)...	State 3 and U S 31.....	North end F1-151 (3), 2.9 miles north of northern city limits of Cullman, north to southern end F1-83 (3) at Morgan County line.	Grade, drain, high-type pavement for 3.5 miles, 2-lane, grade, drain, high-type pavement for 2.16 miles, 2-lane, 1 bridge.	\$1,089,311.31	\$538,453.00	5.780
Walker.....	F-116 (3)...	State 4, 5, and U S 78.....	From Locust Fork to Mulberry Fork of Warrior River	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous pavement	660,295.35	319,544.81	6.545
Do.....	F4-116 (4)...	do.....	St. Louis & San Francisco Ry. crossing on new location of U S 78, 1 mile southwest of Sumiton	Overpass for St. Louis & San Francisco Ry.	69,643.00	69,643.00	.035
Do.....	F-318 (3)...	State 69.....	Approximately 0.5 mile southwest of Cullman County line	Reconstruct section of road where slide has occurred	46,200.00	23,100.00	.361
Do.....	F-330 (1)...	do.....	Tuscaloosa Walker County line, north to State route 18 at Marietta	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface treatment.	166,650.00	80,250.00	9.117
Do.....	F-330 (2)...	do.....	End pavement near northern city limits of Cullman, north to U S 78	do.....	322,400.00	157,900.00	7.559
Do.....	F4-330 (3)...	do.....	St. Louis & San Francisco crossing 0.5 mile south of a point on U S 78, 2 miles west of Jasper.	Steel and concrete overpass.....	30,300.00	30,300.00	.037
Total.....					2,381,799.66	1,219,180.81	29.470

PROJECTS COMPLETED

Blount.....	FAP-F1-84 (2)...	State 3 and U S 31.....	From 5.5 miles north of Jefferson Blount County line north to point 1.3 miles north of Blount Springs	3 reinforced concrete bridges, grade and drain.	\$150,093.00	\$73,973.91	1.720
Do.....	F-412 (2)...	State 38.....	Southern city limits of Arab south to point 0.2 mile within city limits of Blountville	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface treatment and 4 bridges.	459,681.64	222,835.32	13.231
Cullman.....	F-318 (1)...	State 69.....	Northern end of F-318 (2) at Bremen, northeast to point approximately 5 miles south of southern city limits of Cullman	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface treatment and 3 bridges.	512,480.00	253,810.00	9.608
Do.....	F-318 (2)...	do.....	Sussey River bridge northeast to southern end of F-318 (1) at Bremen.	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface treatment and 4 bridges.	486,980.00	242,250.00	9.864
Do.....	F-442 (2)...	State 38.....	do.....	do.....	121,399.33	59,038.69	3.512
Total.....					1,730,633.97	851,907.92	37.973
Total, primary projects.....					4,963,433.63	2,492,588.73	84.406

POSTWAR SECONDARY PROJECTS
PROGRAMED BUT NOT UNDER CONTRACT

Cullman.....	S-201 (2)...		End of pavement 0.5 mile northeast of U S 31 in Hanceville, northeast to Nector.	Grade, drain, and 2-lane bituminous surface treatment	\$150,000.00	\$75,000.00	0.700
Franklin.....	S-461 (1)...		At Little Bear Creek 5.7 miles south of State route 24 at Belgreen	Steel and concrete bridge.....	28,200.00	14,100.00	.040
Lamar.....	S-273 (3)...		From end of pavement near intersection State route 19 in Vernon west-northwest toward Mississippi State line	Grade and drain.....	56,000.00	27,500.00	4.670
Do.....	S-273 (4)...		From F 273 (3) to Mississippi State line.....	do.....	41,800.00	22,100.00	3.750
Pickens.....	S-492 (1)...		From point on U S 82, 1 mile west of Coal Fire to point on Federal-aid State 15, south of Andrew Chapel	Grade, drain, 2-lane bituminous surface treatment and bridges.	175,000.00	74,600.00	8.600
Winston.....	S-473 (1)...		At Creeks 2 miles southwest of Double Springs and 1 mile northeast of Lyun	2 steel and concrete bridges.....	120,000.00	60,000.00	.100
Total.....					674,000.00	273,300.00	23.860

UNDER CONTRACT BUT NOT COMPLETED

Blount.....	S-34 (1)...		Bridges on road from end of S-34 (2) at Hayden, northeast to Nector.	Reinforce concrete bridge and culverts.	\$34,600.00	\$17,150.00	0.032
Cullman.....	S 201 (1)...		At Brinkley and Ducks Creeks on road from U S 31 in Hanceville, northeast via Center Hill to Holly Pond	Steel and concrete bridges.....	103,900.00	51,950.00	.111
Fayette.....	S-390 (1)...		Intersection U S 43 at Bankston northeast to near Cleveland Chapel	2-lane bituminous surface treatment and bridge.	79,700.00	39,650.00	2.262
Franklin.....	S-435 (3)...		Pavement at western city limits of Hodges, northwest 5 miles	Base and 2-lane bituminous surface treatment.	42,600.00	21,400.00	5.051
Lamar.....	S-106 (4)...		Intersection State route 19 in Millport, west to western city limits and west to Mississippi State line	Grade, drain, and 2-lane bituminous surface treatment and 2 bridges.	143,220.00	70,040.00	4.271
Do.....	S-257 (2)...		At Luxapallila Creek, vicinity of northern city limits of Kennedy.	2 steel and concrete bridges.....	44,100.00	20,600.00	.046
Do.....	S-273 (2)...		Bridges on road from State route 19 in Vernon, northwest to Mississippi State line.	2 bridge culverts and 3 treated timber-reinforced bridges.	49,000.00	24,500.00	.068

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6111

Alabama—Seventh Congressional District—Postwar Federal-aid highway projects programmed, under contract, or completed since June 30, 1948, as of Aug. 31, 1951—Continued

POSTWAR SECONDARY PROJECTS—Continued UNDER CONTRACT BUT NOT COMPLETED—continued

County	Project number	State or United States route number	Terminal	Character of work	Total estimated cost	Federal funds	Miles
Marion.....	S-396 (2).....	Intersection Federal-aid State 283 at Brilliant southwest to intersection Federal-aid State 287 at Twin	2-lane bituminous surface treatment and 2 reinforced bridge culverts.	\$20,760 00	\$10,380 00	5.799
Walker.....	S-472 (1).....	Intersection Federal-aid State 187, approximately 1.5 miles south of Cordova, south toward Gorgas	Grade, drain, and 2-lane bituminous surface treatment	81,120 00	41,840 00	3.553
Do.....	S-487 (1).....	From a point on Jasper-Nauvoo Road toward Gordon Hill to point 0.5 mile west of Prospect.	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous surface treatment.	59,570 00	29,095 00	3.510
Total.....	662,070 00	327,605 00	21.740

PROJECTS COMPLETED

Blount.....	S-11 (3).....	State 25.....	L. & N. R. R. crossing at Champion.....	Concrete and steel overpass, bituminous surface approaches	\$120,590 00	\$108,541 00	0.397
Do.....	S-11 (4).....	do.....	Point on U. S. 11 at Whitney northwest to point 0.13 mile northwest of Blount-St. Clair County line	Roadbed topping, base, and bituminous surface	2,666 81	1,333 40	.134
Do.....	S-34 (2).....	0.5 mile southwest of Hayden, southwest to point on U. S. 81	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous surface and 1 bridge	147,454 00	73,718 00	4.870
Do.....	S-399 (3).....	Point Mulberry Fork of Warrior River 3 miles east of Holly Pond	Steel and concrete bridge.....	64,400 00	27,200 00	.054
Fayette.....	S-253 (1).....	0.7 miles southwest of Winfield, northeast to Marion County line, 1.8 miles southwest of Winfield	Base and 2-lane bituminous surface	20,200 00	11,000 00	4.466
Do.....	S-360 (1).....	Point on State route 18 in Berry, south of Tuscaloosa County line	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous surface and bridge	111,001 80	49,780 73	3.64
Franklin.....	S-251 (1).....	Point Bear Creek approximately 3.5 miles north of Vina	Steel and concrete bridge.....	99,405.61	39,178.00	.124
Do.....	S-435 (1).....	S. R. 172.....	Pavement at west city limits of Hodges, northwest 5 miles toward Vina	Grade and drain.....	80,750 00	40,200 00	5.056
Do.....	S-435 (2).....	do.....	1 C. R. R. 3.4 miles northwest of Hodges	Steel and concrete overpass.....	30,000 00	30,000 00	.03
Lamar.....	S-106 (2).....	2.6 miles west of Millport, west to point 3.4 miles east of Mississippi State line	Grade, drain and three bridges.....	112,735.70	52,403.67	4.647
Do.....	S-106 (3).....	2.6 miles west of Millport, west to point 3.4 miles east of Mississippi State line	Base and 2-lane bituminous surface.....	45,302 67	22,423 82	4.627
Do.....	S-257 (1).....	Point 0.5 mile northwest of intersection State route 17 in Kennedy, northwest to point on State route 19, 4.8 miles south of Vernon	Grade, drain, and 2-lane bituminous surface	117,324.29	70,637.38	9.564
Do.....	S-257 (3).....	Intersection State route 18 at Crossville, north toward Mansfield	Grade, drain, and 2-lane bituminous surface	60,909.00	27,680.00	4.120
Marion.....	S-396 (1).....	U. S. 78 at Guin, northeast, 4.5 miles and southeast, 5.1 miles to Winfield	2-lane bituminous surface and 3 bridges	58,300.00	29,150 00	9.448
Do.....	S-420 (1).....	Intersection U. S. 43, 5.1 miles northeast of Hamilton City, north to Franklin County line	2-lane bituminous surface.....	28,417.13	8,608.31	8.570
Pickens.....	S-265 (1).....	Intersection of pavement north of Court House in Carrollton north to 2.6 mile, southeast of Me-Shan	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous surface.....	160,609.32	71,600 00	7.211
Do.....	S-301 (1).....	State 70.....	At Pickensville, east to point on State route 17 in Carrollton	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous surface and bridges	33,180 17	150,346.83	11.090
Walker.....	S-225 (1).....	From city limits of Cordova, west to point on Federal-aid State 189 near America	Base and 2-lane bituminous surface.....	61,334 44	29,540 86	4.186
Do.....	S-359 (1).....	Point on U. S. 78 at Sumiton, northeast to Empire	Grade, drain and 2-lane bituminous surface.....	93,027 80	44,285 65	5.619
Winston.....	S-289 (2).....	State 31.....	Near west fork of Sipsey River east to intersection with Cheatham Road.	do.....	111,840 00	55,570 00	3.181
Total.....	1,888,537.74	958,857 65	91.041
Total, secondary projects.....	3,124,607 74	1,559,662 65	139.647
Grand total.....	8,988,041.37	4,072,251.38	224.053

Discrimination Against Armed Forces Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I have received from a constituent of mine who is at the present time on active duty with the Armed Forces.

I am doing this for the purpose of calling to the attention of the proper committees of the Congress the specific questions he has raised and to urge these committees to see to it that the men and women in our Armed Forces are given a square deal in fact and not in words.

The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 25, 1951.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have always been an advocate of your program and your type of representation, however, it seems to me that as a whole, the administrative program at the present time is discriminating against personnel in the Armed Forces.

We, who are called upon to give the ultimate, at times, are now having most of our privileges and rights taken away from us. At the same time, billions are being spent, both here and abroad, to build up the prestige of the United States and its Government, and at the same time the faith and confidence of the members of the Government's protective forces are being shaken.

As a veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict, I feel personally that it is becoming more of a sucker's role to be a member of the Armed Forces.

In considering the losses of privileges in the Armed Forces, it must be remembered that the personnel are in a certain camp,

post, or station because they are under orders to be there. They have no prerogatives to leave because of unfavorable conditions, rent gouging, high prices, or many of the other circumstances which may be prevalent. We lose most of our rights as citizens when we go into the armed services. We are tried under different laws, we are on duty 24 hours per day, we can't quit, we can't change jobs, we can barely make any squawks. Who then is to protect us other than you and the other honorable Members of Congress and the President.

To bring to mind some of the most recent losses, I have taken the privilege of listing them, although I am well aware that you are probably very familiar with them.

1. Proposed loss of retirement benefits to regular members of the Army, i. e. Age limit 65 and no retirement for enlisted men (average life expectancy is still 63).

2. Mandatory post exchange and commissary prices to show a profit and equal outside (private) prices.

3. Inadequate housing and excessive rents.

4. Cost of living index has risen 175 percent, our pay has not increased, but the

nonfighting members of the Government, in civil service, have just recently been given an increase, and I understand some Members of the Congress wish to raise their pay.

5. Payments of disability allowances to veterans not injured in service, exceeds the disability benefits received by veterans injured in the service.

6. Flight personnel in the Army, Navy, and Air Force receive hazardous duty pay. The infantryman receives not one dime extra and if the casualty reports are examined, it should prove who has the most hazardous duty. Not that I believe these peoples' jobs are not hazardous, but rather that if they are, so then is the infantryman in combat.

7. Quartermaster prices have risen on our uniforms more than 100 percent since the advent of the clothing allowance system, and the Korean conflict. A pair of boots (combat) which were made and purchased in 1943-45 at a cost of \$4 now cost \$12 and we have not been given any commensurate increase in wages or allowances.

In conclusion it should be remembered that the post exchange and commissary and Quartermaster sales were for the Armed Forces with a low fixed income, and not a fluctuating wage scale. Now that prices have not been controlled and are out of all wage proportion with regard to income, I would appreciate it if you could give me some reasonable answer as to why we must suffer this injustice, and also the reasons for the proposed injustices, as retirement and those now in effect, i.e. disability benefits, inadequate housing, and pay.

Save the Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Save the Tidelands," by Harold L. Ickes. I further ask unanimous consent that I may eliminate from the article reference to any Senator by name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the article as corrected, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Frontier magazine for September 1951]

SAVE THE TIDELANDS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

A moral question is involved in the attempt that is once more being made to turn over to the oil interests, via the States, the immensely rich offshore oil lands that the Supreme Court of the United States, on more than one occasion, has found never belonged to them. The States now affected, in the order of the cases that were decided against them, are California, Texas, and Louisiana. These three States, concededly in entirely good faith, for many years assumed that they had title to the so-called tidelands in which enormous oil pools have been found, and they proceeded to grant leases to explore for and capture oil, subject to a royalty to be paid to the lessor. In total, royalties that have been paid have amounted to great sums of money. Part of these profits to the States have been used for educational purposes and

the rest has been expended for other State purposes.

When I became Secretary of the Interior in March of 1933, I found that my predecessors had accepted the theory that title to these off-shore oil lands belonged to the States upon which they abutted. I accepted this policy without question, as every member of the Cabinet necessarily does with policies established by those who have preceded him, unless some reason arises which calls for a reexamination of any question. It would literally take many years for a new Secretary of the Interior to pass upon de novo, every decision made by his predecessors.

Applicants for oil leases in these off-shore areas, on the theory that title to them was in the Federal Government, had been pressing for Federal leases in the belief, as a result of opinions rendered by their lawyers, that title in fact was in the Federal Government. Usually these applicants were turned back by the General Land Office which was the agency in Interior in charge of the leasing of oil lands on the public domain, which no one disputes belongs to the Federal Government. Finally one applicant presented his case to me personally. There was no question as to my duty to consider his case, which I did, with the result that doubt arose in my mind as to whether the decision originally made, and subsequently maintained by my predecessors, was a proper finding under the law. My conclusion was that a legal question was involved which should be decided by the courts. I did not change my mind as so many critics are fond of saying, as if for an executive officer to change his mind was an act of malfeasance. Even if I had done so I would only have been acting with due regard for my oath of office, if I had come to the conclusion that the Federal Government did have title to the property in question.

SECRETARY ICKES AND FDR AGREED ON THE ISSUE

However, on the facts and arguments that were presented to me on both sides of this question, I did not feel justified in coming to a final decision. I simply took the position that, as between the United States and the several States affected, I did not know which held title and that this doubt on my part as the Federal officer having the responsibility for a final determination, should be resolved by the Federal courts. I stated the problem to President Roosevelt and he agreed with me that this was a question for the courts. He, too, was a lawyer by profession, as I am. He, too, as the Chief Executive officer of the Nation, believed that if we had not been following the law we should find out what the law was and amend our course of action accordingly. So far as I knew, he had no interest in any oil property and therefore was without the prejudice that a man interested in gaining profits from such an investment would have. I was in the same situation. It meant absolutely nothing to me whether, so far as oil land offshore the coast of California, for instance, belonged to California or to the Federal Government. But it was my concern to see to it that the United States was not carelessly, and in violation of the law which all of us had taken an oath to uphold and defend, permitting any trespass upon the property or in violation of any of the rights of the United States which was precisely what had been happening, according to the three subsequent decisions by the United States Supreme Court.

It was the Supreme Court that held that paramount rights and interests in these off-shore oil lands belong to the United States, and therefore to all of the people of the United States. I never made any such decision, although I have applauded it. I might have made such a decision, subject to a possible overruling by the courts, but it seemed to me that the orderly procedure

was, first to find out the answer from the courts and then to abide by that answer as it was my duty to do unless I cared so to conduct myself as properly to be subject to impeachment for misfeasance in office. But to listen to the uninformed, as well as misinformed, clamor that is being indulged in in the tideland States, and even from inland States that not even remotely have an interest in tidelands, one might suppose that I was a wrongdoer to be vituperated and excoriated, not for violating my oath of office, but for insisting upon living up to it.

The moral question involved in this issue, stated as simply as possible, is: Is California or Louisiana or Texas justified in holding onto property as to which they have been trespassers, even if in good faith, after the Supreme Court has said that the property is not theirs? Another question is involved which is of the highest political importance. It is: To satisfy the greed of gluttonous and obese oil interests shall we encourage, let alone permit, the Congress of the United States, in effect, to overrule a carefully considered opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, thus doing a grave hurt not only to the Court itself but to our institutions, that it will take more than time to heal? Are we to stand before the world not as a united Nation defending our time-honored institutions, of which we so loudly boast, or are we to present an appearance of disunity and factionalism such as we did on the slavery question which required a civil war to settle? Is the law supreme in this country or, after it has been written by the Supreme Court, are we to tear it up and cast the shreds of paper to any fitful wind which may blow? Is there anything to the American political ideal, as we have vaunted, when the dollar, even though it is depreciated, tempts our greed? Just how patriotic are the oil interests or California, Louisiana, and Texas when it comes to accepting gracefully decisions of the Supreme Court that will put them on a basis of equality with other States instead of at an unfair advantage? Here are questions which we must answer now in the field of politics or with which we must trouble our conscience hereafter.

DISTORTION OF THE FACTS IS CHARGED BY ICKES

There has been going on in the Halls of Congress, in both branches, one of the dirtiest fights on this tidelands issue that I have ever witnessed, and I have been a close observer of government during an entire adult life which has already stretched into many years. I have followed the arguments indulged in by such men as ———, as well as Representatives WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and BOYKIN, of Alabama. If one did not know what the facts actually are, one would be justified in believing, from what these and others have said in and out of Congress, that the real purpose behind the Walter bill (H. R. 4484) is not to get control of the offshore oil lands from the United States "under false pretenses" in order to make them more accessible on more satisfactory terms to the oil interests—no, indeed. The patriotic and unselfish motive is to prevent the rapacious Federal Government from absconding with all of the inland waterways, especially those within the boundaries of those States that are without access to the two oceans and the Gulf of Mexico which, with Mexico and Canada, constitute our outer borders.

The incredible Association of State Attorneys Generals, generously financed, it is believed, by the oil interests, has also thrown itself into this fight for this lofty reason. Moreover, ——— and others are all excited by the thought of Federal ownership of off-shore oil lands because this would tend toward socialism. Texas and Louisiana and California may be given title to off-shore mineral oil lands to lease to private interests, but there apparently would be no danger of socialism in such cases. Socialism rears its ugly head only when the United States takes possession of property which belongs to it.

and grants leases to explore for oil or other minerals. It is interesting that, although the United States for many years has been granting oil and other mineral leases on the public domain, the argument of socialism has never been heard against such a proper exercise of sovereign power, particularly by the oil interests which have obtained many such leases and have grown rich under the generous patronage and protection of the Federal Government.

The argument for raping the tidelands for the advantage of the oil interests is based upon a tissue of lies—no other word is apt enough to describe the situation. The fact is that the Federal Government has frequently and publicly disclaimed any idea of exercising any jurisdiction over the inland waterways, to say nothing of claiming title to any of them. This is a matter of record so clear and explicit that —, a short time ago, on the floor of the Senate felt called upon to try again to set the record straight, so far as inland waterways are concerned. But the light-fingered who are out to pick the pockets of Uncle Sam of these off-shore oil lands do not wish to have the record set straight. They persist in their defamatory and untruthful statements to that degree that one is tempted to suggest the revival of the Ananias Club, made famous by the late President Theodore Roosevelt, so that all of the irresponsible gentry who keep repeating what they must know to be a lie, can become honorary members.

INLAND WATERWAYS ARE NOT IN DANGER OF SEIZURE

There is a conclusive counter to this "Gorbelsmism" to the effect that inland waterways are in danger of seizure by the Federal Government under the doctrine of the tidelands decisions. Representative MANSFIELD offered an amendment to assure this when the Walter bill was before the House of Representatives. This amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by Representatives who at the same time, bitterly complained that the waterways of their States were endangered. Moreover, the administration has caused bills to the same effect to be introduced during the last several Congresses. These have been defeated when they would have been passed overwhelmingly if supported by the Senators and Representatives who are so willing to serve the oil interests. Nor were they supported by the lobbying State attorneys general, who either do not know what the law is or are willing to misrepresent it, for purposes that will not bear the light of day.

The fact is that the oil interests and the unlawyerlike State attorneys general, whose unprofessional conduct would have been investigated long ago by the American Bar Association if it had been doing its duty, do not want any bill to pass that would be declaratory of title in the States to their inland waterways. Despite their professional deviation, they must know that such a law is unnecessary, but the dead horse "danger to the inland waterways" gives them something to fling in order to befuddle the people and distract their attention from the real issue which is a conspiratorial attempt to put over the biggest steal in the history of the world for the enrichment of people already too rich and to the unjust deprivation of the people of those States that do not have any offshore oil lands.

PROFITS SHOULD BE DIVIDED AMONG ALL THE STATES

Those who are opposed to the Walter bill and similar legislation have proposed that the profits from the federally owned oil lands be apportioned among all the States on a fair pro rata basis for the benefit of education the facilities for which, in almost every part of the United States, have been rapidly deteriorating of late years for lack of money to support them. The schools

need money to repair old and buy new equipment, we need to maintain our school buildings and add substantially to what we now have, we need higher pay to hold onto the teachers who are leaving the schools by the thousands as well as to attract new teachers. All of these things we need if we are to provide the rapidly growing army of children of school age with education, lacking which we can hardly expect them to qualify for useful citizenship. And yet a disgracefully large number of the Members of Congress would deny the children of America the educational opportunities to which they are entitled by handing over to the Standard Oil and other interests lands that are estimated to be worth literally hundreds of billions of dollars.

This new national domain constitutes the greatest source of possible new national income since the Louisiana Purchase. If wisely and prudently administered it is capable of supplying substantial financial support to the schools for many years to come. We must either allow our schools to deteriorate further, add to our already vexatious burden of taxation, or use the revenues from this oil that belongs to the Nation if we are even to attempt to educate our children for an intelligent citizenship. Yet it is apparently the intention of such men as Representative WALTER and — to turn this enormous national wealth over to greedy oil interests while adorning the education that used to be the richest heritage of our children "to go hang." When the story of this brazen betrayal by a Congress that is supposed to represent the people against the avaricious comes to be written, those who would pick the pockets of the people in order to gratify the cupidity of the oil aristocracy will richly earn their page of infamy.

Labor's Black List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months it seemed likely that the American Federation of Labor might be modifying its original views on the major issues before the Nation in the light of current world events. Unfortunately, this possibility has been largely dispelled by the convention of the A F of L at San Francisco, where 19 Senators, 6 Democrats and 13 Republicans, were named as targets for 1952.

The sole criterion upon which this decision was based was the stand of these men on the Taft-Hartley Act which many people believed had been removed from public debate by its frequent use by the President himself and by the overwhelming vote received by Senator TAFT in his reelection last year to the Senate. With the world standing on the brink of possible chaos in a third world war, with the national economy pushed to the limit by the demands of military preparedness and our domestic expansion, the test of political expediency adopted by the AFL seems narrow in the extreme.

Many Senators and Representatives are still friendly to labor, even though they have voted for and will continue to support the basic principles of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is time that the AFL recognized this truth.

A Survey of United States Foreign-Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, a democracy depends for its successful functioning upon an informed citizenry. The increasing scope of the activities of our Government makes it difficult for all of us to keep as well-informed as we need to be in order to arrive at sound judgments, and I believe this is particularly true in the field of foreign relations. In order to bring one phase of our foreign relations into clear focus, I requested our Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a survey of our foreign-aid programs. I explained that I wanted the survey to be free from technical terms in order to aid our citizens in quickly grasping the fundamental aspects of the various programs.

The survey prepared by Ellen C. Collier is of such quality that I feel it should be widely disseminated, and I, therefore, include it in our Record at this point:

A SURVEY OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

(By Ellen C. Collier, Foreign Affairs Section,
the Library of Congress)

"Truman doctrine," "Marshall plan," "ECA," "MDAP," "point 4"—these terms appear constantly in the newspapers and magazines. They are keys to understanding the United States foreign-aid programs, which are such a large and important part of American foreign policy.

Various types of foreign aid have been carried on by the United States since the Second World War. In order to help its allies during that war, the United States provided them with defense aid through lend-lease. After the end of the conflict the United States continued its aid to the homeless and hungry victims of war by contributing to UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), through GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas), post-UNRRA relief, an interim-aid program, a loan to Great Britain and the sale of surplus property at a fraction of its cost.

These programs had a triple purpose: (1) To help win the war, (2) to give help where it was needed for humanitarian reasons, and (3) to achieve a peaceful world by preventing the unrest of starvation and misery which leads to dictators and war.

More than \$30,000,000,000 had been appropriated for the wartime program, and more than \$12,000,000,000 for the immediate post-war relief projects.

The following is a summary of the principal foreign-aid programs which are now in operation. It does not include the programs mentioned above because they have been largely terminated. Similarly it excludes some minor foreign-aid programs carried on by international agencies of which the United States is a member. In some of these programs, such as the IRO (International Refugee Organization) and UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund) the United States is the largest contributor. This summary is limited to the principal foreign-aid programs being administered by the United States at the present time.

(a) Aid to Greece and Turkey (the Truman doctrine): A grave foreign-policy crisis

faced the United States in early 1947 when the British Government announced that it was financially unable to keep its troops in Greece. These troops had been there since the end of World War II at the request of the Greek Government. The British also planned to end their economic aid to Turkey. Both Greece and Turkey thought that the withdrawal of British support would have dangerous consequences for their security.

At that time, an armed insurrection was being carried on in Greece by Communist-led guerrillas. Since these guerrillas were being given assistance by neighboring Communist countries, they threatened the independence as well as the stability of the Greek Republic. The Athens government therefore appealed to the United States for assistance.

At the same time the U. S. S. R. was demanding a share in the control of the Turkish-owned Dardanelles, the strategic straits entering into the Black Sea. Moscow launched an intense propaganda campaign against the Turkish Government. Turkey, like Greece, requested United States aid because it did not have the arms necessary for adequate protection against the threat of Soviet aggression.

In view of these facts the President of the United States on March 12, 1947, requested the Congress to extend military and economic aid to these two strategically-located countries. He said that one of the main objectives of the United States foreign policy was to create conditions in which each nation could "work out a way of life free from coercion." But this objective, President Truman continued, could not be realized "unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed upon free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States. * * * I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

Congress voted in favor of the requested aid, and thus was initiated the policy, popularly known as the Truman Doctrine, of helping free nations to maintain their independence when they showed a determination to do so and when the preservation of such independence was deemed vital to the security of the United States. It was an effort to contain communism to the area which it already had rather than to allow it to expand into additional countries.

Six hundred and seventy million dollars was appropriated for this program, administered by the Department of State, in its first years. After 1948 economic aid to the two countries was included in the European Recovery Program and after 1949 military assistance was included in the Mutual Defense Assistance Program.

(b) The European Recovery Program (the Marshall plan). The United States by 1947 had spent \$11,000,000,000 for European relief. This aid had been successful in preventing starvation and unrest. Nevertheless Europe had by no means recovered from the war, in large part because the European states had not yet realized the necessity of cooperative planning for their joint recovery. As a result trade barriers continued to be prohibitive and productive output lagged badly.

Secretary of State George C. Marshall in a speech at Harvard University in June 1947, suggested that the European countries form a cooperative plan for economic recovery and assured them that the United States would support such a plan. But he insisted that any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure

rather than a mere palliative. The purpose of American foreign policy, he declared, should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. The Marshall plan, as the proposal of the then Secretary of State was popularly called, was widely interpreted as being a means of preventing the spread of communism to Western Europe, and thus as a device for strengthening the security of the United States.

Sixteen nations, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom accepted the proposal of Secretary Marshall and agreed to launch a cooperative recovery program. They formed the Organization for European Economic Cooperation to coordinate their recovery efforts. The Communist satellite countries of eastern Europe were forbidden by the Kremlin from participating in this project.

The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 was then passed by Congress in April 1948. This act authorized economic aid to the 16 European states plus their dependent areas and for Western Germany and Trieste (aid to China was also provided by the same legislation) under a 4-year program to be administered by the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA). Eleven billion dollars have since been appropriated to carry out this recovery plan.

(c) The mutual defense assistance program (military assistance). While the European recovery program was getting under way, the fear of Soviet aggression against western Europe mounted. Western Europe remained a military vacuum, an easy target without the force to repel even an initial attack. In order to provide for collective security in the North Atlantic area and to forewarn the Soviet Union that it could not successfully attack any of the signatory countries, the United States signed the North Atlantic Treaty on April 4, 1949. The European signers were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom. The formation of this type of regional security arrangement was permitted by the Charter of the United Nations. Previously, in 1947, the United States had joined the Latin American countries in concluding the so-called Rio Treaty, a regional defense arrangement for the Western Hemisphere.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Act was passed in 1949, primarily to help arm those who had signed the North Atlantic Treaty. However, other strategic areas, including Greece, Turkey, Iran, Korea, and the Philippines, and the general area of China were included in the aid program. This aid was designed both to provide finished military goods and to help the other countries produce their own military equipment. Its objective was to deter possible Soviet aggression by building situations of strength in those areas most exposed to Communist armed pressure.

Under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, \$814,000,000 was appropriated the first year for military aid. That amount was increased in 1950 to \$5,500,000,000 after the Communist attack in Korea had so forcefully demonstrated the necessity of strengthening the free countries. The program has been administered by the Department of State with the active cooperation of the Defense Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

(d) The international development program (the point 4 program). One-half of the world's land surface, containing 46 percent of the population, is occupied by the so-called underdeveloped areas. This means that the people of these areas are still living in poverty largely because they have not had available the knowledge or

means to apply modern methods to their work. In his inaugural address of January 1949, President Truman proposed to give to these underdeveloped areas the benefit of American scientific knowledge and experience. (This proposal was the fourth point in an over-all foreign policy program—hence the popular title is the point 4 program.) If the peoples in underdeveloped areas, the President said, did not share in the achievements of modern technical progress, they might turn to false doctrines which hold that the way of progress lies through tyranny. The role of the point 4 program as a preventive against the spread of communism in Africa, Latin America, and Asia has been constantly emphasized by its supporters.

Some technical assistance to underdeveloped countries was already being carried on when the proposal was made. Since 1948, for example, the Economic Cooperation Administration had assisted in developing the colonial dependencies of the western European countries as a part of the Marshall plan, and for 10 years the Institute of Inter-American Affairs had given technical aid to the Latin American Republics. In 1950 the Act for International Development was passed by Congress. This act allowed the United States to participate in international technical cooperation programs and to establish other programs. Thirty-five million dollars was authorized for this purpose, one-third of this amount to be given to the United Nations for the technical assistance program which it was beginning. One appropriation also included funds for continuing inter-American aid, and brought that program under the Department of State. The ECA continued its separate program.

(e) Far eastern aid. The Far East, which contains half the world's population, is of great strategic importance in the world balance of power. International communism threatens the freedom of every Oriental nation. Already the Republic of Korea has been openly attacked by Communist forces and armed Communist minorities are attempting to overthrow other far eastern governments. Because of the interest of the United States in preventing the spread of communism in this area, aid to the Far East, especially Nationalist China, Korea, and the Philippines, has been included in every general foreign aid act.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, which authorized the European Recovery Program, \$338,000,000 was provided for aid to Nationalist China. Other Marshall Plan funds were authorized for far eastern dependencies of European countries. Later, the China Area Aid Act of 1950 authorized the Economic Cooperation Administration to extend aid to other nations which were in the general area of China. Such aid has been given to Formosa, Indochina, Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia. Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia, India, and Pakistan have already benefited from the Act for International Development (the point 4 program), in which \$3,800,000 was allocated for the Far East. Many Asiatic nations have also received mutual defense assistance funds. Finally under the Philippines Rehabilitation Act special aid has been extended to help this former United States dependency reconstruct its war damage and to furnish a firm economic foundation for the political independence it obtained in 1946.

These programs have been administered mainly by the Department of State and the Economic Cooperation Administration with the cooperation of the Department of Defense.

(f) Loan to Spain: In the fall of 1950 Congress, by a rider on an appropriations bill, authorized a loan of \$62,500,000 to Spain. The money is being used for economic development projects, including the production of hydroelectric power and strategic minerals such as copper, lead, sulfur, pyrites, and

tungsten. These minerals have been described as essential to the West.

(g) Aid to Yugoslavia: Since Yugoslavia's break from the Kremlin in 1948, it has been the policy of the United States Government to help this country maintain its independence. Although Yugoslavia is a Communist state, its independence from Moscow tends to weaken Soviet influence throughout the world. For this reason and because of Yugoslavia's strong armed forces, which could be used to fight the Red army or the other Communist armies of Eastern Europe, the United States considers the maintenance of Yugoslavia's independence important for its own defense, for the defense of Greece and Turkey as well as of the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

In 1950 Yugoslavia suffered a drought which threatened the country with famine conditions which in turn might have offered the Kremlin fertile opportunities for regaining control of Yugoslavia. Fifty million dollars was appropriated by the United States for food and other commodities to prevent the famine from materializing. The funds for this aid were drawn from Marshall-plan appropriations. The program was administered by the State Department.

(h) Emergency food aid to India: Floods, earthquake, drought, and locusts in 1950 left India threatened with a serious famine. The Indian Government, as a result, appealed to

the United States in December 1950, for 2,000,000 tons of grain to prevent the famine from developing. Funds for this grain were provided on easy credit terms under a law approved in June 1951; this grain constitutes two-thirds of all the food which India is buying abroad to meet the emergency. The loan is being administered by the ECA.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 provides for continuing the foreign-aid programs described above.

The program has one stated purpose—preservation of the security of the United States within the security of the free world. For this "Mutual Security Program," which the new integrated foreign-aid program will be called, Congress has appropriated \$7,328,903,976 for the fiscal year 1951-52. These funds will be divided between military aid (\$5,788,502,457) and economic aid (\$1,540,401,519). The mutual defense assistance program will be continued out of the military funds, while the European recovery program and the point 4 program will be financed with the economic-aid funds. Greek-Turkish aid and far eastern aid will be continued with funds from both categories.

In proposing the program to Congress, President Truman said "The dollars spent under the mutual security program will build more strength in support of our security than

we could build at home with the same expenditure of funds . . . the amounts, the geographical areas, and the purposes of the aid have all been chosen in order to bring about the greatest possible increase in the security of the United States and the whole free world." The Soviet threat, he explained, was world-wide, total, and of indefinite duration. The mutual security program was designed to meet such a threat with the ultimate goal being that the Soviet Union would not dare to attack at the present time and eventually that the rulers of the Soviet Union would be forced by international pressures and their own people, rather than by armed conflict, to abandon their policy of aggression.

The funds will be allocated on an area basis. Europe will receive \$5,940,852,457, the Middle East \$556,250,000, Asia \$772,405,866, and the Americas \$59,395,653.

Supervision of the administration of aid programs will be vested in a new Mutual Security Agency, which will take over the functions of the Economic Cooperation Administration. Operation of the military aid program will be through the Defense Department. The point 4 program will continue under the State Department. The Director of the Mutual Security Agency, who will supervise all the programs, will be responsible directly to the President.

Table of principal foreign-aid programs of the United States

Program	Congress	Basic authorizing legislation			Congress	Appropriation act			Administering agency
		Public Law No.	Date approved	Amount authorized		Public Law No.	Date approved	Amount appropriated	
(a) Aid to Greece and Turkey.....	80th.....	75	May 22, 1947	\$400,000,000	80th.....	271	July 30, 1947	\$400,000,000	Department of State.
Do.....	do.....	472	Apr. 3, 1948	275,000,000	do.....	793	June 28, 1948	225,000,000	
After 1948 economic aid was given to Greece and Turkey through the Economic Cooperation Administration. After 1949 military assistance was included in the mutual defense assistance program.	do.....				81st.....	327	Oct. 6, 1949	45,000,000	
(b) European recovery program.....	do.....	472	Apr. 3, 1948	5,300,000,000	80th.....	793	June 28, 1948	4,000,000,000	Economic Cooperation Administration.
Do.....	81st.....	47	Apr. 19, 1949	5,430,000,000	81st.....	327	Oct. 6, 1949	4,702,380,000	
Do.....	do.....	535	June 5, 1950	2,700,000,000	do.....	759	Sept. 6, 1950	2,250,000,000	
(c) Mutual defense assistance program.....	do.....				do.....				Department of State with the active cooperation of the Department of Defense and the Economic Cooperation Administration.
Title I North Atlantic Treaty Countries.....	do.....			1,000,000,000	do.....			500,000,000	
Title II Greece and Turkey.....	do.....	329	Oct. 6, 1949	211,370,000	do.....	430	Oct. 28, 1949	211,370,000	
Title III Iran, Korea, and Philippines.....	do.....			27,640,000	do.....			27,640,000	
General area of China.....	do.....			75,000,000	do.....			75,000,000	
Title I North Atlantic Treaty countries.....	do.....			1,000,000,000	do.....			1,455,523,729	
Title II Greece, Turkey, and Iran.....	do.....	621	July 26, 1950	141,500,000	do.....	759	Sept. 6, 1950	131,500,000	
Title III Korea and Philippines.....	do.....			16,000,000	do.....			16,000,000	
General area of China.....	do.....			75,000,000	do.....			75,000,000	
Title I North Atlantic Treaty countries.....	do.....			3,504,000,000	do.....			3,504,000,000	
Title II Greece, Turkey, and Iran.....	do.....	843	Sept. 27, 1950	193,000,000	do.....	843	Sept. 27, 1950	193,000,000	Department of State.
Title III Korea, Philippines, and general area of China.....	do.....			303,000,000	do.....			303,000,000	
(d) International development program ("Point Four").....	do.....	535	June 5, 1950	35,000,000	do.....	759	Sept. 6, 1950	26,900,000	
(e) Far Eastern aid.....	do.....				do.....				Economic Cooperation Administration.
1 Aid to China.....	80th.....	472	Apr. 3, 1948	463,000,000	80th.....	793	June 28, 1948	400,000,000	
Do.....	81st.....	47	Apr. 19, 1949	(1)	81st.....	327	Oct. 6, 1949	(1)	
Do.....	do.....	417	Feb. 14, 1950	(1)	do.....	911	Jan. 6, 1951	(1)	
Do.....	do.....	535	June 5, 1950	(1)	do.....	343	Oct. 10, 1949	30,000,000	
2 Assistance to Korea (see also Mutual defense assistance program).....	do.....	447	Feb. 14, 1950	60,000,000	do.....	430	Oct. 28, 1949	30,000,000	
Do.....	do.....			100,000,000	do.....	583	June 29, 1950	50,000,000	
Do.....	do.....	535	June 5, 1950	(1)	do.....	759	Sept. 6, 1950	90,000,000	
Do.....	do.....				do.....	911	Jan. 6, 1951	50,000,000	
(f) Loan to Spain.....	do.....	759	Sept. 6, 1950	62,500,000	do.....				
(g) Aid to Yugoslavia.....	do.....	897	Dec. 20, 1950	50,000,000	do.....			(1)	Department of State, Economic Cooperation Administration, Mutual Security Administration, Military aid, Defense Department, technical assistance, State Department.
(h) Emergency food aid to India (loan).....	82d.....	48	June 15, 1951	190,000,000	do.....				
Mutual Security Program.....	82d.....	165	Oct. 10, 1951	7,483,400,000	82d.....			7,328,903,976	

¹ Authorization under Public Law 472 was extended.

² Extended availability of appropriation under Public Law 793.

³ Authorized President to utilize not more than 3 percent of funds appropriated for ERP under Public Law 759.

⁴ Previously authorized.

⁵ From funds previously appropriated.

Soil and Wildlife—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the fourth annual convention Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners Conference, Richmond, Va., October 18, 1950:

SOIL AND WILDLIFE

I am glad to meet with you game and fish commissioners from the Southeastern states. This is a part of the country where various land and water problems challenge the attention and best efforts of all of us who are engaged in the conservation of natural resources.

You are concerned specifically with the conservation of game and fish—natural resources that make life worth living for a great many people and benefit most of us in a number of ways. I am concerned primarily with conservation of soil and water—those basic resources without which there can be no wildlife or any other kind of life anywhere. So, we clearly have a mutual interest and a common purpose in bringing about conservation of these resources in sufficient abundance for our lasting use and enjoyment.

By and large, I am happy to say, wildlife conservationists and sportsmen in general have an unusually good understanding of the farmland conservation work which is progressing so rapidly all over the country, and a real and growing appreciation of its value in enhancing beneficial wildlife. This positive support of soil and water conservation is most encouraging.

I assume all of you are acquainted with the way in which we work—that is, in cooperation with the farmer-voted and farmer-directed soil-conservation districts established under State law in each State. Through these districts the Soil Conservation Service provides technical and certain other assistance to farmers at the district's request. I believe my understanding is correct that the fish and game commissions in all 12 of the Southeastern States likewise are working with many of the soil-conservation districts in various ways, to the mutual benefit of their erosion-control and better land-use programs and your own fish and game conservation programs. The districts, as you know, also draw on different local, State, and Federal agencies for any other help that may be available in carrying on the district programs, in addition to inviting the cooperation of private groups that similarly may be in position to help them.

WILDLIFE STRESSED BY SOIL-CONSERVATION
SERVICE AND DISTRICTS

Of particular interest to you is the fact that the Soil Conservation Service gives specific attention to training in biology for our farm planners and other technicians who work out in the fields, pastures, and wood lots with the district farmers. The farm planner considers the value of treating various types of land, not only for their primary agricultural use but also with an eye to any modification or special practice that will result in more wildlife through complete and adequate land treatment. He is expertly equipped to do this, because his understanding of the wildlife aspects of soil- and water-conservation planning and treatment is

dovetailed with similar basic knowledge and adeptness in soil science, forestry, range management, agronomy, engineering, and other phases of a complete, coordinated soil- and water-conservation program of the kind that the Soil Conservation Service helps farmers apply to their lands. In other words, the soil conservationist is also a wildlife conservationist.

So it is that appropriate wildlife work is a part of the program and work plans of every soil-conservation district and is tied in with other phases of our conservation operations. This is not left to chance; it is done consciously and with direct purpose. In this connection, let me sum up for you our Soil Conservation Service wildlife objectives in soil-conservation districts:

1. To apply to land-use problems biological knowledge useful in the prevention and control of soil erosion—that is, soil and water conservation—thereby preserving natural resources.
2. To achieve productive land use on all lands, including those not adapted to tilled crops, grazing, or wood production.
3. To assist in the solution of land-use problems which involve production of useful wild plants and animals on croplands, grazing lands, and woodlands.
4. To contribute to the prevention and control of biological damage arising out of measures established for soil and water conservation and related land-use practices.

At this point, I think it would be well to explain what we mean when we talk about the kind of conservation we are engaged in—that is, modern soil conservation.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use. It means contouring and terracing land that needs such treatment, and strip cropping and stubble mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage—with full consideration given to wildlife needs. If it is too dry, it calls for irrigation. If subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind-stripping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter. If water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, as in parts of the West, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the alkali by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable tools and crop varieties.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal, irrigation, recreational, etc.) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where flood waters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ESSENTIAL

And, of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing,

vigorous program of soil conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten through college. And modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work that has a chance for permanency. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season. They are the basis of land permanency, and that is necessary if we are to have a permanent agriculture—or a permanent wildlife population.

There is only one correct formula for doing the soil- and water-conservation job. It consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm or ranch according to their individual needs as determined by such conditions as degree of erosion, waterlogging, etc., and using each kind according to its capacity for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife.

This is the only possible way that man can provide anything like a permanent type of soil conservation. This is a physical fact having its origin in the rigid laws of nature. There can be no substitute for it, no shortcuts, no easy way out.

LAND INVENTORY USEFUL IN WILDLIFE
DEVELOPMENT

That is why we put so much emphasis on what we call land-capability surveys, which comprise a scientific inventory of the land that serves as the basis of the land's conservation planning and treatment. Through this inventory, made by our Service technicians in cooperation with the farmers, we arrive at a sound and dependable classification of all the land on a farm according to its capability for best use. Thus, capability classes I, II, and III land together comprise the kind of land which is suitable for continuous cultivation, with careful conservation treatment of class II and III lands. Class IV land is a borderline grade, which can be cultivated safely only occasionally at best. Classes V, VI, and VII represent those lands which are suited only to growing grass or trees; and class VIII land is suitable for wildlife or recreational use or for watershed-protection purposes.

This land inventory, which should be completed nation-wide at the earliest practicable date, has among its uses for other planning purposes particularly important potentialities for those who are concerned with developing wildlife resources—or the best use of land for all purposes in any way related to agriculture. For example, this capability classification shows a particular class of land which is suited better for watershed protection, recreation, and wildlife purposes than for any agricultural purpose; therefore, class VIII land may be of great importance to wildlife and may be used solely for that purpose. This class of land may be found in extensive tracts, such as some of your coastal and inland marshes obviously not suited to growing cultivated crops or even grass or trees, but which can and should be managed for wildlife, like waterfowl and fur bearers that can be produced on it. Such "wildlife land" often is found, also, in small areas on individual farms, where its development and use for wildlife production is equally important.

All together our surveys have already shown that there is a large total area of this kind of land—probably 35,000,000 acres or more. The fact that most of it is scattered through our good agricultural lands is a distinct advantage from the wildlife standpoint; because it encourages increased numbers of birds and mammals valuable to agriculture. These animals destroy insect and rodent pests and help to improve distribution of game locally. All this contributes to the farmers' income and to the Nation's food supply.

ALL LAND IS WILDLIFE LAND

I want to emphasize right here, however, that the benefits of soil and water conserva-

tion from the game and fish standpoint are in no wise limited to specialized treatments of such special kinds of land. On the contrary, all land—with the water which falls on it or flows through it—is wildlife land. Moreover, all soil and water conservation, when properly planned and carried out, is wildlife conservation. In fact, I am convinced that the unprecedented attention being devoted to soil and water conservation today is contributing as much to the welfare of game, fish, and other beneficial wildlife as anything man has ever undertaken in this country or anywhere else. And I say this without in any way discounting the unquestioned importance in this regard of our State and National forests, parks, and wildlife refuges and sanctuaries.

THE NEW SOIL- AND WATER-CONSERVATION ERA

In this present-day conservation era land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife are, for the first time, being tied together and scientifically coordinated on the basis of land capability and need. This is illustrated, for example, by the very fact that I, a soil conservationist, am on your program along with such speakers in companion conservation fields as Lyle Watts, of the Forest Service, and Albert Day, of the Fish and Wildlife Service. This coordination is a basic tenet of modern soil conservation; for without such basic ground work there can be no such thing as lasting conservation of our soil or other resources which depend on the soil for their perpetuation.

Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals all should—and under natural conditions do, with the exception of civilized men—exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productivity of these basic resources. It should be quite clear, then, that every acre of land we allow to be wasted because of soil erosion means, among other undesirable and costly results, less wildlife. That is why we soil conservationists work on the premise that all farmland is wildlife habitat—a simple fact which every farm boy or girl knows, but which their elders sometimes become too preoccupied with doing other things to remember.

Soil and Wildlife—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the fourth annual convention, Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, Richmond, Va., October 16, 1950:

WHEN THE LAND GOES, WILDLIFE GOES WITH IT

I have seen in too many localities how game has been driven from farms, watersheds, and larger areas by soil erosion. Fish, waterfowl, and fur-bearing game have disappeared from too many places because the streams and lakes have been polluted and filled, or partly filled, with erosion sediment. In many places the sources of water have practically dried up. In parts of this country and Latin America, perennial streams have dried up as a result of rapid runoff from eroded land resulting from careless cultivation, overgrazing, burning, and wasteful lumbering. In such localities a few birds and mammals may be seen occasionally, but

the wildlife has predominantly become very scarce with the disappearance of food, cover, and water. In parts of South Africa, large areas such as the Orange Free State and parts of the Transvaal formerly supported a great abundance and variety of wild game, but it has been virtually wiped out as the result of forest removal, the drying up of waterholes and streams. Whole watersheds in some of the mountainous areas have been denuded by fire, overgrazing, and improper land use. I have seen the same sort of thing in the Andes Mountains and in southeastern Brazil. The excessive cutting of forests in Cuba has had a severe effect on bird life in Cuba.

Such situations as some of these may seem remote and of no concern to us. But we have much to account for ourselves in the declamation of the game and fish that abounded in our forests, meadows, and streams back in the days of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. And we can't blame the severe depopulation of our wildlife in many localities entirely to guns and traps, by any means, we must credit a very substantial share of it, also to the ax and plow which inevitably destroyed so much of the natural food and habitat for wildlife in the process of our country's settlement and development. I wonder just how far we would have to go today to find a covey of quail or to catch a mess of bass or trout if it had not been for the persistent efforts of your fish and game commissions over the country in behalf of conserving and restocking our game and fish.

Soil erosion also is an enemy of the fishing and oyster business. Back in 1880, the Chesapeake Bay, for example, produced 13,000,000 bushels of oysters, but the annual harvest today has shrunk to only about 3,000,000 bushels; and, for the Nation as a whole, oyster production has dropped 50 percent in 50 years. Dr. R. V. Truitt, founder of the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, is quoted as having said:

"Poor management of the land around the bay and lack of conservation practices is responsible in no small degree for the declining oyster production. Unless the land is properly managed, erosion will bring about a further decline in oyster yields."

There is no need to go into further detail with respect to the bad effects of soil and water wastage on wildlife. It boils down pretty much to this: Without productive land, and the water that makes it produce, there can be very little in the way of birds, fish, fur bearers, or big game. Most of our life-giving soil is found on our farms. Most of the water that feeds our lakes and streams, and a great deal of it that empties into our coastal waters, drains from or across these same farm lands. Thus the necessity of safeguarding our remaining soil and water resources is clear. We still are losing around 500,000 acres of our productive land each year through soil erosion, with all the attendant damages to game and fish which I have mentioned.

The farm lands of America comprise our principal fish and game habitat, and the farmer is our principal game manager. It must be apparent, then, that we are going to get the most effective wildlife improvement, both in quantity and distribution, by keeping this vast farm-land habitat in its best producing condition. There is no other way to assure our over-all wildlife populations of the future, just as there is no other to assure our future production of food and other crops except by preserving our good land which produces them.

What the soil-conservation districts are doing to this end—the progress the district farmers make in putting the various wildlife-benefiting soil and water conservation meas-

ures on the land—accordingly is of special importance to you. There are now approximately 2,275 of these democratic, local units of State government. They cover 1,250,000,000 acres and include 80 percent of all the farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States.

In the 12 Southeastern States alone, there were 464 districts by July 1, this year, including 87 percent of the land (283,413,902 acres) and 87 percent (1,911,967) of the farms in this Southeastern area. But, of course, it is the conservation work that is being done—the actual conservation surveying, planning, and treatment of the land with needed control and beneficial measures—that really counts. The accelerated progress that has been made in this accomplishment likewise is noteworthy, in these States as a whole and throughout the Nation.

Our July 1 records showed more than 120,000,000 acres of detailed conservation surveys (land inventory) completed in the Southeastern States, principally on the 164,000,000 acres of farm land in these States. Meanwhile, more than a third of a million complete conservation farm plans had been worked out in the Southeastern States by July 1—63,000,000 acres, of which 35,000,000 acres had been treated.

Among the wildlife-benefiting conservation measures going to make up this land treatment in these 12 States I might mention these: 900,000 acres of strip cropping, nearly half a million acres of wildlife area improvement, including field borders, wildlife strips, and wet land improvement for wildlife, 11,000,000 acres of conservation woodland management and about 375,000 acres of tree planting, and 75,576 farm ponds built.

I won't bother you with figures and other details on the different practices, crops, etc. that are involved in this soil and water-saving work, although I do hope that all of you who have not done so already will take the opportunity to familiarize yourselves with these operations in your own States, through your State Soil Conservation Committee or our service's State office. Better still, get out into these soil conservation districts as often as you can and see what's going on in them.

As I said earlier, I understand all of the southeast States are among the 35 throughout the country whose game and fish commissions are working with the districts. Such an example as your group has set in this respect is most gratifying. The opportunities ahead for us all to work together toward the common soil and water and wildlife conservation goal are many. There is plenty of need for all that we can do together, whether it is in such undertakings as furnishing districts with such materials as sericea and bicolor lespedeza seed and plants for wildlife borders, maintaining cooperative projects for quail, or correcting unprofitable fish populations and controlling weeds in farm ponds.

Let me reemphasize this, that wildlife is considered by the Soil Conservation Service to be an important and valuable resource which merits fullest consideration in all of our conservation planning. In planning drainage works, for example, we attempt to point out those wildlife values to those with whom we work, and it is our stated policy to discourage drainage of open-water areas where important migratory waterfowl habitat is affected. Because the decision remains with the farmer, however, it is necessary that the wildlife interests themselves present to the farmers a practical program that will in some way compensate them for utilizing their land as waterfowl habitat. In matters of this nature, it will do no good and probably no little harm for the true friends of wildlife betterment to inform the specialists of the Soil Conservation Service that they are in command of the situation and therefore should be held responsible for all that

¹ As quoted by Joe Boyle, *Mystery of the Disappearing Oyster*, In Short, April 1946.

goes wrong with drainage affairs. This is not helping the interests of wildlife or those who do the charging. The facts are well known that the farmers themselves are in command and those who shout about draining land that they say should not be drained would use their time to greater advantage by consulting with and aiding those who are trying to keep drainage operations in line with sound land use, with the interests of wildlife not overlooked.

Wherever the land capability indicates that the land is best suited for wildlife, no conflict is involved, of course. Where the land capability indicates the land can be used safely and profitably for livestock, trees, or cultivated crops, however, it is only right that some incentive or compensation be made available to the landowner if that land is to be devoted to wildlife production. The from that compensation takes, and the way in which it is made available to the land owner or operator, comprise one of the most important problems facing the wildlife profession today.

In all events it is only through a coordinated land-use plan, based on a careful study of soils, location, engineering requirements, and other factors, that lands unsuitable for farm-crop production may be safeguarded as wildlife habitats. The Soil Conservation Service is committed to continue doing everything it can to obtain effective cooperation with wildlife agencies and organizations, and in encouraging them to work more closely with soil conservation districts. During the past year, in fact, in order that wildlife values be given every reasonable consideration in the assistance we give to the districts, our Service has taken additional steps to enlist the cooperation of such groups.

I have already referred to the way in which wildlife interests for their part, including sportsmen's groups, State fish and game departments, and the rest, are backing up their support of soil and water conservation with physical assistance. That is most important, for the job has only been well begun. In order to finish it, and in time, it is going to take the continued and untiring teamwork of all of us—farmers, soil conservationists, wildlife interests, and everybody else.

The farmers themselves, business, and other community interests, and local, State, and Federal Government all have found by experience that effective soil and water conservation is profitable and satisfying all along the line. It hardly could be otherwise for anything so much in the public interest. With this continued dedication of our joint best efforts to this vital undertaking of safeguarding our soil, water, wildlife, and related resources, I am more confident than I have ever been before that we are going to do the job—do it right, and do it in time.

I am becoming more and more convinced with every trip of inspection I make in the field. I am seeing an encouraging increase in the rate of soil conservation applied to the land and an advancement in wildlife habitat and wildlife numbers. Week before last a big national publication asked for a freshly made picture of a gully in eastern Pennsylvania. It was promised but when our photographers went out to get it, they couldn't get it. It seemed unbelievable, gullies had been so common in the localities. I went out with them, but still no gullies. I asked our local boys why it was we couldn't find any gullies. Their answer was the gullies had been closed up with conservation measures, principally with plantings of adaptable vegetation, including in many instances food and cover for wildlife—and I was told that wildlife was coming back on many farms.

And just last week I had a similar experience in Wisconsin. And not to overlook a

more personal experience, I enjoyed the past summer the call of bobwhites on my 6-acre tract in northern Virginia, where I am getting good results with *lespedeza bicolor*—and bobwhites, too.

Batter's Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members to an article in This Week magazine of September 30, 1951, entitled "Batter's Best Friend." It tells the story of those who work on baseballs in the A. G. Spalding Co. in Chicopee, Mass., which is located in my district.

I have been through the plant and have seen the operation described. I think all Members would enjoy reading the article.

The Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I am pleased to include a statement from the Washington State Federation of Women's Republican Clubs.

This is a partisan insertion in the RECORD. It is however, I feel most worthy of consideration by all who believe in the two-party system. The points raised by the Washington State Federation of Women's Republican Clubs are, of course, controversial. Nevertheless, I feel that they have stated a mighty good case for the Republican Party and I am proud that this statement outlining the achievements and the principles of one of our great American political parties originated in my own State of Washington.

The statement follows:

YOU ASK ME WHAT MY PARTY IS

You ask me, neighbor, what my party is, and this I am telling you true:

My party is the one that in 1947 for the first and only time since 1932 balanced the national budget.

My party is the one in 20 years to reduce taxes.

My party is the one which has warned us of the dangers of annual deficits and a huge national debt.

My party is the one which has fought waste and extravagance in Government.

My party is the one which has stood for the preservation of the Constitution as is.

My party is the one which has upheld the liberty of the individual against the encroachments of government itself.

My party is the only one to champion the cause of free enterprise on every front.

My party is the one which has constantly fought socialism and the welfare state.

My party is the one which has tried to get Communists out of Government, carry out loyalty and security programs, institute investigations into Communist activities.

My party, in brief, is the one which from the beginning has fought communism in this country.

My party is the one which believes there is nothing iniquitous in loving one's country above all others, nor dishonorable in considering this Nation's welfare our first obligation.

My party believes that our foreign policy should be clear, forcible, in the American tradition, truly non-partisan and should be backed by a majority of the American people.

My party believes that any foreign commitments or agreements made in the name of the American people should be known to them and should be subject as required by the Constitution to confirmation or rejection by the Senate of the United States.

My party believes that the Congress of the United States and not the President should declare war.

THESE ARE THINGS MY PARTY IS AND THINGS MY PARTY IS NOT

My party is not the one which reduced the dollar to a 50-cent piece.

My party is not the one which increased the national debt from twenty-one billions in 1932 to two hundred and sixty-seven billions in 1951.

My party is not the one that increased the cost of Government from five billions in 1932 to seventy-four billions in 1952.

My party is not the one that recognized Soviet Russia.

My party is not the one that coddled Alger Hiss, let Gerhardt Eisler escape, and that blocked every effort to smoke Communists out of Government.

My party is not the one which made the disastrous agreements at Yalta.

My party is not the one whose blundering policy lost us China to the Reds.

My party is not the one that ordered the "police action" in Korea.

My party is not the one that fired General MacArthur.

My party is not the one which has brought us a spurious prosperity through war and by mortgaging the future through debt.

My party is not the one whose extravagance and fiscal policy has brought an inflation and then has cried to high heaven for greater authority to bring on more of the same to stop inflation.

My party is the one which has made it so hot for the administration they were forced to order these crime investigations, but my party is not the one whose political connections with the underworld has been revealed by these same investigations.

My party is the Republican Party. It's a first-rate party, neighbor, a Grand Old Party. Won't you join us?

National Jewish Youth Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, from August 31 to September 7, 1951, the annual assembly of the National Jewish

Youth Conference met at Camp Wel-Met, Narrowsburg, N. Y. Two hundred young people coming from all parts of the United States met to consider the problems of Jewish youth at mid-century.

The National Jewish Youth Conference is a permanent Nation-wide body which represents more than 300 local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils and 10 national Jewish youth organizations. It is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include President Truman's greetings to the annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference and an article on the assembly which appeared in the September 1951 issue of the Circle, which is published by the National Jewish Welfare Board:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 15, 1951.

MR. M. DAVID WEISS,
Chairman, National Jewish Youth Conference,
National Jewish Welfare Board,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WEISS: It gives me great pleasure to send hearty felicitations and warmest personal greetings to all who participate in the fourth annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference.

Never before have we had such need of an effective corps of qualified leaders as we do now. Never before have we needed such intensive training in democracy. I trust that your conference will be fruitful of wise counsels and constructive action to inspire American youth with traditional courage and enthusiasm to meet the new and grave responsibilities which these perilous times thrust upon them.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[From the Circle of September 1951]

YOUTH FAIRLEY TRAINS FOR LEADERSHIP
(By Lionel Koppman)

NARROWSBURG, N. Y.—Jewish youth leaders cannot be trained in a vacuum—they must be given opportunities to express themselves, to learn about the community in which they live and the rich cultural heritage which is theirs, to share their experiences and opinions with other Jewish youth, and to acquire certain programing skills which are requisite to leadership.

More than 150 young Jewish men and women from all parts of the country were provided with such opportunities at the week-long fourth annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference, which took place this month at Camp Wel-Met near here. The conference is a Nation-wide youth body which is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board. Represented in the conference are 300 local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils and 10 major national Jewish youth organizations with a combined membership of 300,000.

After spending a full week in discussing common problems and basic issues facing Jewish youth and American Jewry in general, the delegates—many of whom came to the assembly with an inadequate understanding of their Jewishness—passed a resolution calling upon leaders of Jewish community councils and national Jewish organizations to create an American Jewish Conference which would serve as "an instrument for unified action by American Jewry" and another resolution asking for full-fledged, positive programs of Jewish education in communities across the Nation.

The resolution on Jewish education asked for local committees of Jewish education to aid in promoting the effectiveness of Jewish education; called on welfare funds to provide adequate allocations to Jewish educational institutions; recognized that schools which devote maximum time and give intensive Jewish education as being most favorable to the creative development of Jewish life in America; urged the introduction of Hebrew, Yiddish, Jewish history, religion, and culture in the curricula of secondary schools and colleges; and called on all Jewish communities and organizations to seek to improve every aspect of Jewish education.

Seldon M. Kruger of Newark, N. J., 21-year-old student of international relations at Rutgers University, was unanimously elected Conference chairman, succeeding M. Davis Weiss of Munhall, Pa. Mr. Kruger, a former conference vice chairman and program committee chairman, is a member of the Travel and Exchange Commission of the World Assembly of Youth (WAY), a member of WAY Council, and was an American delegate to the WAY assembly. He was also a delegate to its technical assistance seminar last month.

The delegates' attitude toward Israel was reflected in resolutions which called for a deeper understanding of Israel and expansion of the settlement adoption project; a closer relationship between Israeli and American Jewish youth by encouraging the members of the constituent organizations to participate in the various tours and institutes; and the providing of information to those individuals seeking personal participation in and identification with the State of Israel.

The Conference also adopted a resolution thanking the JWB for its sponsorship and urging JWB's "continued sponsorship, interest, and assistance in the future."

Other resolutions urged: The United States Government, through the United Nations, to continue to explore all possible avenues to peace; the observance of U. N. Day, repeal of the McCarran Act; support of the World Assembly of Youth and the Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly; opposition to the encouragement of Nazi revival in Germany and the commutations of sentences and extension of clemency to Nazi war criminals; strong support of the human rights declaration; greater objectivity in textbooks and promotion of intergroup understanding by the entertainment industry, freedom of emigration to Israel from those countries having policies forbidding such emigration; condemnation of any limitations on academic freedom; establishment of a world Jewish youth conference in Israel; the achievement of the goals of the Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth; and the observance, in 1954, of the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States.

The American Jewish Conference was proposed by Mr. Weiss in his annual report. Mr. Weiss called upon local communities to provide funds for scholarships to enable American youth leaders to study in Israel and to enable field workers (shlichim) from Israel to work and study in America; asked the conference to seek, in cooperation with the JWB, a broader sponsorship which would include all adult youth-serving agencies; and called for a wider use of Hebrew and the strengthening of Jewish education.

S. D. Gershovitz, JWB executive director, urged the young Jewish leaders to take advantage of the unusual strengths and unusual opportunities which are theirs and to venture bravely and unhesitatingly into new fields and areas of human need and thought. He said that only during the last few years have adults come to recognize that youth must not only be considered in deter-

mining policies but they must have a share in the actual planning and the carrying out of those policies.

He called attention to the necessity for living by the ethical principles of Judaism and told the delegates that "It is one of the essential tasks of youth movements such as the National Jewish Youth Conference to provide the educational and leadership channels to make it impossible for American youth to be detoured into subversive activities."

The delegates heard Dr. Israel Knox, assistant professor of philosophy at New York University, assert that "Culture is rooted in the lives and experiences of individuals and groups. Therefore, we Jews who live in America must develop a Jewish culture which is indigenous to America."

FROM FATE TO FAITH

Professor Knox told the delegates that Jews cannot nor should they try to escape the fact that they are Jewish. He asked the delegates to take stock of themselves and to make the transition from fate to faith. Dr. Knox urged the delegates to participate more actively in Jewish life and to develop a strong, effective program of Jewish education.

Arnulf M. Pins of Paterson, N. J., board chairman of the UNESCO youth institute and a former conference chairman, told the delegates that "If we want German youth to be democratic, we have to work directly with them and help them solve their own problems." He said that the UNESCO youth institute is one step toward encouraging German youth to participate again in international activities.

In a joint report on WAY, Mr. Kruger and Mr. Pins said, "We as young people have a responsibility for making the Universal Declaration of Human Rights a living realization, for there can be no peace in the world if nations do not learn to recognize the inherent dignity of every individual."

The delegates conducted religious services and acquired leadership skills in music, dance, drama and journalism. Ned Goldberg, JWB youth services director, is the NJYO executive secretary.

The American Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

MR. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the October 1, 1951, issue of the New York Times there appeared a two-page advertisement of the Ford Motor Co. As the advertising men would say, it was a real eye catcher. The left-hand page was a mammoth photograph of a portion of Connecticut's scenic Merritt Parkway, symbolizing "The American Road."

On the right-hand page, above a smaller photograph, was a message from the Ford Motor Co., which deserves the attention of this House.

To the Ford Motor Co., and indeed to every thinking American who realizes the revolutionary part which the automotive industry has played in our national development, "the American road is paved with hope." To measure the achievements of America in 1951 against the dreams of America 161 years ago is to realize, as this message points

out, that "tomorrow's works will dwarf our own."

I commend this advertisement to the reading of every Member of this House, and I salute the Ford Motor Co. for the truly American spirit it expresses.

The article follows:

ONCE IT WAS 2,151 MILES LONG—NOW IT RUNS FOR 2,322,000 MILES

In the good old days, when Henry Ford was still tinkering with his first cars, motor-ing was a risky and a random thing. But your first drive was unforgettable.

You put on your cap, goggles, gauntlets, leather driving coat and leggings; your nervous sweetheart donned her snug ankle-length duster, and wound around her head a fringed silk auto scarf, 90 inches long. The wicker picnic hamper was packed with cold chicken, sharp cheese, and hard-boiled eggs.

You set the throttle and the spark levers. You had to watch out or you would get a jolt that would knock your elbow loose. You cranked furiously and leaped over the door into the driver's seat. The car was jumping as if it would fly apart. Then you pushed the gas lever up and up, and stepped on the low pedal. With a groan and a clank, you were off into adventure, flying along at 25 miles an hour.

Where did you go on your first trip? Everybody went to the end of the road. In those days there was an end of the road. Outside the stone streets of the cities, the road soon died in choking dust or in deep ruts of thick chocolate mud. Great stretches of the Nation were unreachable—and undeveloped.

The automobile changed all that. Today the American road has no end; the road that went nowhere now goes everywhere. One of every seven Americans has a job in the field of highway transportation; a million Americans make cars and parts; a million and a half service and sell cars. Three of every four families own an automobile, Ford alone has built more than 35,000,000 cars.

The funny-looking little contraption on the delicate bicycle wheels became the source of the greatest industry in the world; it has changed all the world's ways of living and thinking.

Persons, things, and places in the Nation depend on auto wheels. The wheels roll on endlessly, always moving, always forward—and always lengthening the American road. On that road, the Nation is steadily travelling beyond the troubles of this century, constantly heading toward finer tomorrows. The American road is paved with hope. The years ahead shine with the achievements that are now only dreams—for tomorrow's works will dwarf our own.

At Ford Motor Co., we have faith in the American road. We believe that America can keep traveling on it toward an even better life for all. We intend to keep contributing to the bright promise of that future.

FORD MOTOR CO.

Public Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the Appendix of the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on pension plans in private industry.

Continuing my interest in the subject and with the assistance of Mr. Meyer Jacobstein, of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, and Miss Helen Livingston, of the Government Section, Library of Congress, the following interesting report has been compiled on public retirement systems.

After analyzing the reports on pension plans in private industry and public retirement systems one can readily understand the immediate need of an over-all study by Congress of the pension question.

The report on public retirement systems follows:

PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

Public retirement systems in the United States range from the informal pension arrangements covering a few public servants in small communities to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system (OASI) of social security which currently covers around 40,000,000 jobs and has been called the largest insurance program in the world. They include plans for special groups of municipal employees, such as teachers, policemen, and firemen, as well as city and county systems. Some State plans are confined to regular State employees, others include teachers, and still others provide for the inclusion of county or municipal employees in the general State plan. At the Federal level, Congress has provided special retirement programs for employees of the railroads and of the Federal Government, in addition to the broad OASI program of social insurance for most of the working population.

As was the case with private retirement plans, the patterns of coverage and benefits are diffuse largely because the first public retirement systems were established by scattered employee units and were usually tailor-made to cover special conditions and requirements. The trend has been toward standardization, consolidation, more comprehensive protection, and broadened coverage. At the present time new plans are being developed rapidly at State and municipal levels especially as retirement programs are being accepted as an important incentive toward good public administration. One result of this rapid development is the fact that up-to-date data on public retirement systems at the State and local levels is not available. Over-all data assembled for 1946 is, for example, now far from being inclusive, and can, therefore, be used only to suggest trends rather than to present a comprehensive picture.

¹ For the purposes of this study, Government retirement plans separately maintained because of special conditions or hazards prevailing in the conditions of employment, have been excluded. For example, retirement programs for military and Foreign Service personnel are not considered at the Federal level, and separate systems for policemen, firemen, etc., have not been included in the discussion of State and local programs. Such programs are usually more generous, retirement age is earlier, and they cannot be considered as typical of Government retirement programs for these reasons as well as because they contain special provisions covering hazardous types of duty.

² The year 1946 is used in tables on State retirement systems assembled under the auspices of the Council of State Governments for the most recent issue of the Book of the States, 1950-51 (Chicago, 1950), pp. 210-221.

I. TOTAL CURRENT COVERAGE AND BENEFICIARIES

Major Federal systems: The Federal old-age and survivors insurance system (OASI) is expected to cover approximately 4 out of 5 (45,000,000 out of 60,000,000) jobs when the 1950 amendments become fully effective.³ But since approximately 3 out of 5 of these jobs are in industrial or commercial establishments many of the workers so covered are also protected by private pension systems. Public employees, on the other hand, have not been eligible for OASI coverage and are subject entirely to the provisions of the various public retirement systems while they are performing government jobs. In January 1951, a total of 6,487,000 persons had government jobs of which 2,204,000 were in Federal civilian employment, and 4,283,000 were under the auspices of State and local units (2,635,000 nonschool, and 1,747,000 school).

The railroad retirement system provides coverage for approximately 2,050,000 employees of the Nation's railroads. The civil-service retirement system provides for most civilian employees of the Federal Government, and coverage is practically complete for the 2,200,000 persons so employed—especially since the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act made the small group of Federal employees hitherto lacking retirement protection eligible for OASI.

State and local systems: Estimates as to the coverage for employees of State and local governments vary widely. For example, a total taken from tables showing total State coverage as of July 1, 1946, is 632,755.⁴ A somewhat more recent compilation, which uses annual reports ranging from 1946 through 1949 for its data, yields a total of 1,304,540.⁵ The most reliable figure for current purposes, perhaps, is the total of approximately 2,600,000 employees of State and local governments who are now under some form of retirement plan. An estimated total of 1,650,000 (38.5 percent) of the employees of State and local governments now lack such established retirement systems and are, therefore, eligible for coverage under OASI through voluntary arrangements.⁶

Number of current beneficiaries in public retirement programs: Although most public systems are of comparatively recent origin and cannot, therefore, be considered as fully-protective even for some long-term employees, the effect of Government retirement programs on the income of the retired population can be measured to some degree, especially by disbursements at the Federal level. Recent figures covering the source of income of persons aged 65 years and over listed by the Social Security Act of 1935 is a third of the persons in this group (3,700,000) are covered by Federal retirement programs—

³ Voluntary coverage was provided by these amendments for employees of State and local governments lacking another retirement system, and for employees of nonprofit organizations. Reliable figures on OASI coverage will not, therefore, be available until these voluntary coverage arrangements are completed.

⁴ Book of the States, pp. 210-215.

⁵ Department of Research, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, Government Insurance in the United States (New York 1950), pp. 86-95. Data were collected from annual reports and handbooks for each fund and, where no published information was available, it was obtained by correspondence with officials of the fund in this compilation.

⁶ These estimates were used by the Congress in estimating the scope of voluntary coverage of State and local employees lacking retirement protection under OASI.

a total exactly equal to the number of employed aged. These figures are as follows:¹

Estimated number of persons aged 65 years and over, receiving income from specified source, December 1950

(In millions)

Source of income	Number of persons		
	Total	Men	Women
Total population aged 65 and over ¹	12.3	5.7	6.6
Employment.....	3.7	2.3	1.4
Earners.....	2.8	2.3	.6
Wives of earners.....	.99
Social insurance and related programs.....	3.7	2.1	1.6
Old-age and survivors insurance.....	2.6	1.5	1.1
Railroad retirement.....	.3	.2	.1
Federal civil-service retirement.....	.1	.1	(²)
Veterans' program.....	.3	.2	.1
Other ³4	.1	.3
Old-age assistance.....	2.6	1.3	1.5

¹ Preliminary estimates for April 1950 based on sample of census returns. Some persons received income from more than 1 of the sources.

² Less than 50,000.

³ Beneficiaries of Federal retirement programs other than civil service, and of State and local government retirement programs, and the wives of male beneficiaries of programs other than old-age and survivors insurance.

No reliable figures are available covering the total number of persons now receiving benefits under State and local retirement plans. One recent compilation showed a total of 68,475 beneficiaries in this group, as compared with the total of 1,388,939 persons covered.⁴ These figures suggest that the number of beneficiaries may be slightly over

4 percent of the total number of persons covered, but it seems likely that this proportion is slightly higher today because of the rapid expansion of coverage for State and local employees during the past 2 years.

II. FEDERAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

The major Federal retirement systems, as indicated in the table just above, are the old-age and survivors system of social security, veterans' pensions, and the retirement systems for railroad workers and Federal civil service employees.⁵ Of these only the last two—the railroad retirement system and the civil service retirement system—can be classified as retirement programs in the generally accepted meaning of the term. The program of veterans' pensions is clearly not a retirement system in this sense either in concept or in method.

The old-age and survivors system established by the Social Security Act of 1935 is a federally administered "social insurance" program which covers approximately four-fifths of the civilian labor force. The retirement features of OASI have borrowed some principles from established retirement practices—such as the methods of relating retirement benefit to the individual's work record, of using joint employer-employee contributions, and of defining insured status. But its "insurance" features are considerably modified by "social" considerations which are designed to furnish floor of security in old age for the whole population of the country. Our system of veterans' pensions, of course, has practically no resemblance to a retirement system in the accepted sense.

The Civil Service Retirement Act of May 1920 was the first legislation in the field of retirement to be adopted by Congress. Numerous amendments to the 1920 act have

greatly extended the coverage of the civil service retirement system, which at present applies to "all officers and employees in or under the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government and to all officers and employees of the municipal Government of the District of Columbia, except elective officers of the executive branch of the Government."⁶ Heads of executive departments were not included until 1946, and in the same year Members of Congress were made eligible to join the system at their option. The Canal Zone Retirement Act of 1931, the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of 1936, and the Panama Canal Construction Annuity Act of 1944 are typical of legislation setting up special retirement systems for small groups of employees engaged in a particular type of Government employment. But here, too, a trend toward consolidation is suggested by the fact that two of these systems, the Canal Zone and Alaska Railroad retirement systems, were merged with the civil-service system in 1949.⁷

The Railroad Retirement Act, originally enacted in 1935 and substantially broadened in 1937 and 1946, created an insurance fund to provide pensions and annuities for aged and disabled railroad employees. The system gives coverage to employees of railroad industry of the United States as a functional economic unit, and thus includes employees of carriers by railroad, express, and sleeping-car operations, affiliated companies and joint associations directly connected with the industry, and employees of national railway labor organizations and employee representatives.

The following comparison of these three major Federal retirement programs suggests the types of protection which are offered:

	Old-age and survivors insurance	Railroad retirement system	Civil-service retirement system
Insured status	40 quarters (10 years) in covered employment, or half as many quarters (but not less than 6) since 1950 or twenty-first birthday if it was later, before the quarter in which worker dies, retires, or reaches age 65. Earnings must total \$50 in a quarter (or \$100 for self-employed).	40 quarters (10 years) in covered employment, or half as many quarters (but not less than 6) since 1936 or twenty-first birthday if it was later, before the quarter in which worker dies, retires, or reaches age 65. Earnings must total \$50 in a quarter.	After 5 years of service workers may, on withdrawing from civil service, either receive refund of contributions with interest or be entitled to annuity at age 62. After over 20 years of service, eligible for annuity at age 62 but no refunds available.
Retirement age.....	Age 65.	Age 65, or age 60 with 30 years service.....	Age 62 with 15 years of service; permissible at age 60 with 30 years of service, compulsory at age 70 with 15 years of service.
Contributions.....	1½ percent each by employer and employee (except 2½ percent for self-employed) on income or wages up to \$3,600 a year, increasing gradually to 3½ percent each in 1970.	6 percent each by employer and employee on income or wages up to \$3,600 a year, to increase to 6½ percent each after 1951.	6 percent of total wages by employees, the Government's contribution made by annual appropriation.
Worker's benefits.....	50 percent of the first \$100 of the average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the next \$200.	Years of service times the sum of 2.4 percent of the first \$50 of the average monthly wage, 1.8 percent of the next \$100, and 1.2 percent of the next \$150.	Years of service times the greater of 1 percent plus \$25 on salaries up to \$4,000 (or 1½ percent of salaries above that figure) but not to exceed 80 percent of the average for those years. "Salary" is computed as the employee's highest 5-year average basic salary.
Wife's benefit.....	At age 65, half of worker's benefit.....	None.	At age 60, half of worker's benefit if worker elects a reduced annuity for this purpose. None.
Dependent children under 18.....	Half of worker's benefit.	None.	At age 60, half of worker's annuity if caring for their child under 18.
Widow or widower.....	At age 65—or if their children under 18 are in the home—¾ of worker's benefit.	Railroad and social security earnings combined to give ¾ of basic amount at age 65, or if their children under 18 are in the home, Half of the basic amount of worker's benefit.	Least of (1) 25 percent of worker's benefit (2) \$300, or (3) amount obtained by dividing \$600 by the number of surviving children.
Surviving children under 18	¾ of worker's benefit for the first child and if 1 child. If more than 1, each child gets ½ of the worker's benefit plus ¼ of that benefit divided by the number of entitled children.		
Total and permanent disability.....	None.....	Payable at age 60 or after 20 years of service if disabled for regular railroad work or at age 60 or after 10 years if totally disabled.	Payable after 5 years of Government service.

III. STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

During the early 1900's some States and municipalities began to establish funds to

¹ Social Security Bulletin, vol. 14 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1951), June 1951: p. 19.

² Totals compiled from Government Insurance in the United States, pp. 86-95. But indicative of the incompleteness of these data is the fact that no totals for persons on retirement appear for the States of Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, although other features of these plans are described.

provide retirement income at a specified age for certain of their employees, especially

³ Other smaller retirement programs for special groups of Federal employees, not discussed here in detail should also be noted. Programs which operate on a contributory basis are those set up for employees in Foreign Service. The Federal Reserve Bank, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Banks, Tennessee Valley Authority, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, civilian teachers at the Naval Academy and the Panama Canal Construction Co. Non-contributory retirement systems are maintained for employees of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Coast Guard,

public school teachers. During the past two decades their growth has been particularly

Army Nurse Corps, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Navy Nurse Corps, Public Health Service, Federal Judiciary, Judiciary of Territories and Possessions, and veterans of wars and peacetime service. See Outline of Federal Retirement Systems, Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Report No. 15 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1948), 144 pages.

⁴ Section 3 (a), Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended to February 28, 1948.

⁵ Act of July 21, 1949, Public Law 180, 81st Cong.

rapid and today every State operates at least one retirement program and most States operate more than one. The latest complete compilation of State retirement systems was made by the United States Bureau of the Census in 1941, and showed 117 State-administered retirement programs covering almost a million employees.¹² It seems safe to assume that a corresponding study anticipated as part of 1950 census statistics will show that the number of persons so covered will have more than doubled.¹³

In recent years the tendency has been toward State-wide plans for all the public employees within the State, including the employees of all its political subdivisions. By the end of 1949, 33 States had provided a State-wide system which provided for general employees of local governments.¹⁴ In some States the same system provides for all eligible classes of employees, while in others two or three systems operate on a State-wide basis. Various plans are used for the inclusion of municipalities, the prevailing pattern being voluntary participation by action of the governing body of the municipality. In Ohio, however, participation for all but specifically excepted municipalities and occupations is mandatory. Nevada and Colorado include local units unless they elect out within a certain period. Illinois places the option with the employees by requiring that a petition be signed by a specified number of the prospective beneficiaries and, if a specified number so elects, the voters of the municipality must also give their approval before coverage is completed. Wisconsin and Pennsylvania provide for participation either by action of the appropriate legislative body or by a referendum among the electorate.

State-wide plans in existence at the end of 1949 can be divided into six general groups. Listed to show the effected States, with the date of each plan's origin shown in parentheses, they are as follows:¹⁵

1. Six States had a single State system for teachers, State employees, and general local government employees as follows: Colorado (1931), Iowa (1945), Maine (1942), Oregon (1945), South Carolina (1945), and Virginia (1942).

2. Eighteen States had a single State system covering State and general local government employees as follows: Alabama (1945), Arizona (1948), California (1931), Georgia (1949), Indiana (1945), Maryland (1941), Montana (1945), Nevada (1947), New Jersey (1922), New Hampshire (1945), New Mexico (1947), New York (1920), North Dakota (1947), Ohio (1945), Tennessee (1947), Utah (1947), Washington (1947), and Wisconsin (1943).

¹² Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Retirement Systems for State and Local Government Employees, 1941. Special study No. 17, Washington, D. C., 1943, pp. 11, 82.

¹³ A similar study is now in the planning stage with the prospect that questionnaires will be sent out to appropriate units in the spring of 1952, and final reports will be available sometime in 1953.

¹⁴ The 15 States without such plans were *Arkansas, Delaware, *Idaho, Kansas, *Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, *Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, *Utah, *West Virginia, and Wyoming. The 6 starred States are among the 12 which have approved plans for covering completed approved plans for coverage of uncovered employees of State and local governments under OASI since September 1950, when such coverage became available.

¹⁵ Based on a memorandum of June 20, 1950, by Weltha Van Eenam, Office of the Actuary, Social Security Administration.

3. Three States had a single system covering State employees and teachers, as follows: Delaware (1945), North Carolina (1941), and Rhode Island (1936).

4. Nine States had a separate system for general local government employees as follows: Connecticut (1945), Florida (1945), Illinois (1939), Michigan (1945), Minnesota (1929), Nebraska (1945), North Carolina (1943), Pennsylvania (1943), and Texas (1947). The Florida plan covers county employees only, and the Nebraska plan covers municipal employees only.

5. Eleven States had separate systems for State employees, as follows: Connecticut (1939), Florida (1945), Illinois (1943), Louisiana (1946), Massachusetts (1911), Michigan (1943), Minnesota (1929), Pennsylvania (1924), Texas (1947), Vermont (1943), and Wyoming (1949).

6. Thirty-nine States had separate systems for teachers. The nine States not having separate systems for teachers are listed in (1) and (3) above.

As has been noted, the employees of State and local governments, including publicly supported educational institutions, became eligible for coverage under OASI under the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, but only if they are in positions not included under existing retirement systems established by States or their political subdivisions.¹⁶ The sentence defining retirement systems in the act reads: "The term 'retirement system' means a pension, annuity, retirement, or similar fund or system established by a State or by a political subdivision thereof," and the amount of coverage which will become available thus depends upon the interpretation of this sentence. Present indications are that a strict construction will be placed upon the intent of this legislation, and OASI coverage will be largely limited to otherwise uncovered public employees.¹⁷

¹⁶ The House bill had provided for voluntary coverage of employees already covered by State and local systems, provided that two-thirds of the employees elected to be covered under OASI as well as under the State systems. In the Senate, however, this version was modified and coverage was limited to employees who lacked any coverage.

¹⁷ An example of the type of problem thus presented appears in the case of employees of higher institutions of learning who are insured for retirement through the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America (TIAA). TIAA issues individual contracts directly to participating faculty members and has no contractual relationship with the employing institutions whose only function is to remit premium payments. State and municipal institutions have used a number of methods for enrolling faculty members in the TIAA system. Sometimes a State university has a considerable degree of autonomy, in other cases enabling legislation has been required before the institution could participate, in still others, the institution makes no contributions of its own but only has required its participating faculty members to contribute a percentage of their salary. The argument has been made that TIAA is in itself a system rather than merely a funding agency for a number of self-contained retirement plans, especially because it has provided for annuity contracts fully vested in each individual participant, so that a faculty member could transfer from one institution to another without losing his accrued benefits. The argument follows that faculty members insured under TIAA should, therefore, be eligible for OASI coverage, and that exclusive factors apply only where a government has an established system for the public administration of retirement benefits. But the prospect is that all TIAA plans in State and local units will be excluded.

Coverage of eligible employees of State and local governments (employees other than those covered by a retirement system) is provided on a voluntary basis by means of Federal-State agreements entered into between the States and the Federal Security Administrator.¹⁸ As of August 1951, 17 States had effected such agreements and 6 other States were negotiating for such coverage. States which had completed agreements were: Oklahoma (December 14, 1950), Idaho (December 28, 1950), Arkansas (February 5, 1951), West Virginia (February 26, 1951), California (March 9, 1951), Utah (April 2, 1951), Kentucky (April 27, 1951), Wisconsin (June 13, 1951), Nebraska (June 20, 1951), Arizona (June 29, 1951), Alabama (July 2, 1951), Missouri (July 11, 1951), North Carolina (July 13, 1951), Kansas (July 24, 1951), South Dakota (July 24, 1951), Washington (July 31, 1951), and Tennessee (August 13, 1951). No figures are as yet available as to the exact number of employees who have obtained coverage by this method.

Most of the State retirement programs are on a joint contributory basis, and in the majority of the programs employer contributions are equal to those of the employee. Two principal methods are used to determine the amount of the employee contributions. (1) employees, regardless of their age on entering the system, contribute a specified percentage of their salary through payroll deduction, and (2) employees contribute an amount actuarially determined to assure them of a specified amount at retirement. In the 32-State plans studied by the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies in 1950, the predominating percentage for contributions was 5 percent of salary for the 26 plans which specified a percentage. The other contribution rates were less than 5 percent. In five plans the rates varied with age, occupation, or length of service, and four had different rates for men and women. Ten named 70 as the age for compulsory retirement, seven called for compulsory retirement at 65, five place it at age 60, and another five made no provision for compulsory retirement at any age.¹⁹

The types of benefits show a degree of similarity, and a majority of the State programs provided disability and death benefits as well as retirement payments. Most disability benefits are geared to the amount of service and the salary earned and usually no limit is placed upon the length of time during which such payments can be made. The amount of the retirement benefits varies more widely, especially as it is influenced by prevailing wages within the different States. Usually the retirement benefit consists of an annuity based on the employee's contribution, plus a pension paid by the State and computed according to the employee's salary. Fifteen of the 32 plans studied by the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies contained provisions for benefits for survivors, but usually they were optional and depended upon reduced benefits for the annuitant during his or her lifetime.²⁰ In general, it may be said that State retirement plans are not as fully protective of survivors and dependents as is the OASI system, but

¹⁸ For a description of the advantages to States in completing such an agreement see "Social Security and a Kentucky Retirement Plan," Information Bulletin No. 6, Legislative Research Commission, Commonwealth of Kentucky (Frankfort, Ky., 1951). For States which already had rather complete retirement systems, however, these advantages are restricted by the provision which exclude coverage under OASI for persons already protected by retirement systems.

¹⁹ Government Insurance in the United States, pp. 86-95.

²⁰ Ibid.

that they are usually more protective than OASI in that they include nonoccupational disability—a protection not included in OASI.

Teachers systems: Retirement systems for teachers are among the oldest of public retirement systems. As early as 1869 small voluntary associations were established in some large cities and appropriation of public funds for this purpose began about 1895. In the beginning they were usually privately financed mutual benefit plans. Then for a time the trend was toward plans fully financed by public funds. Today most plans provide for contributions from both members of the system and public funds. By 1946, all elementary and secondary school teachers were covered, except for the few who chose to be excluded when a system went into effect. Seventeen of the State systems existing today were established between 1921 and 1939. But since 1940 extensive revisions have appeared with the result that 29 of the existing State and territorial retirement systems have been established in their present patterns since that date.¹

Data assembled in a recent comprehensive study of 72 major public school retirement systems gives a comprehensive picture of the status of these systems in 1950.² The study analyzes the 52 retirement laws operating in the States and Territories and in the 20 cities with the largest local retirement plans.³ The trend toward broader coverage provisions is suggested by the fact that only five of the State and three of the local systems analyzed are limited to instructional staffs which were the only beneficiaries of earlier plans. Practically all of the regular public school employees, including the maintenance and custodial staff, are members of 24 State and 11 local systems, and all of the others cover at least some other public school employees.⁴ A total fixed benefit is provided in 20 State and 13 local systems, while in 31 State and 9 local systems the allowance is of the money-purchase type, made up of an annuity (financed from employee contributions) and a pension (from public funds) separately computed, but paid as a single amount.⁵ Most systems require 30 or 35 years of service before the member is eligible to retire, or else the qualifications for retirement are based on an age which, for most members, would represent a comparable term of service. Public contributions are fixed by law in 27 State 11 local systems, while the actuary fixes the amount required from public funds in 22 State and 11 local systems.⁶

¹ Permanent disability retirement allowances are provided by all but one (Iowa) of

the 72 systems. Usually this allowance is computed in proportion to the normal retirement allowance, and the same formula is used. Only three systems (Illinois, Washington, and Milwaukee) provided benefits for temporary disability.⁷ Except for the two noncontributory plans (Delaware and New Mexico), all systems also pay a death benefit to the beneficiary of the estate of a member who dies before retirement, and only 3 States and 2 local systems fail to provide some form of benefit to the survivors of deceased retired members, usually in the form of a return of the member's accumulated contributions.⁸ Again, however, these survivors' benefits are at the member's option, and the allowance paid to the retired member during life is reduced so that the total does not exceed the actuarial value of the reserves due the member.⁹

Most systems place a maximum upon the retirement allowance for the purpose of limiting the obligations for appropriations from public funds. Thirteen State and four local plans set this maximum in terms of an amount of money, ranging from \$720 a year (Puerto Rico) to \$2,800 a year (Illinois). Four State and three local plans set this maximum in accord with the final average salary—ranging from 50 percent (Virginia and Puerto Rico and Boston) to 80 percent (Massachusetts). Other States limit maximums by using salary ceilings in the benefit formula or in the contribution rate.¹⁰ In 18 State and 8 local systems a minimum applies to the total allowance, ranging from a high of \$1,200 (New Mexico and Pennsylvania) to a low of \$1.25 for each year of services (Des Moines, Iowa).¹¹ The present average retirement allowance paid to retired teachers is close to \$1,000 a year.¹²

Retirement boards separately established for that purpose are the administrative agency in all retirement systems except those existing in six States and three local plans.¹³

IV. CONCLUSION

The major shift in public retirement programs has been away from the bounty or gift philosophy which prompted early plans, toward a career concept which sees a sound and attractive retirement plan as a means of holding trained and experienced personnel on the job. This shift has had a marked effect on public systems in all their aspects. One result in the trend toward coverage of all employees, including temporary, provisional and part-time workers, as well as people in elective and appointive jobs. At the same time, benefit provisions have been broadened to include payments for superannuation, disability, and death. Currently there is increasing emphasis upon the inclusion of more adequate provisions for dependents. The practice of relating benefits to compensation during working years by means of formal and compulsory contributions and established benefit formulas has been accepted almost universally.

¹ Ibid., p. 147-48.

² Ibid., p. 153.

³ "Public-School Retirement at the Half Century," Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, v. xviii, December 1950, Washington, D. C., National Education Association of the United States, p. 151-154.

⁴ Ibid., p. 142.

⁵ Ibid., p. 143.

⁶ Ibid., p. 175.

⁷ The exceptions are Alaska and Delaware, where the Territorial State treasurer is designated, Iowa (Employment Security Commission), Nebraska (State board of educational lands and funds), South Carolina (State board of budget and control), Wyoming (State board of education), District of Columbia (District Commissioners), and Chicago and Omaha (local school boards).

The early method of informal gratuities, at the employer's expense, has also given way to funded pension systems, financed on a contributory basis with employees sharing the cost. Employee contributions, it is held, help to assure permanence for the plan, keep the employees alert to safeguard their rights and credits, and make more adequate benefits possible. The trend toward funded pension systems and increased rates of contribution in public systems has persisted in spite of the fact that emphasis upon full-funded or full-reserve methods is less essential than with private plans for the reason that governments have a perpetual life. On the other hand, government plans are usually subject to constitutional limitations which have the effect of limiting the vested rights growing out of contributions. The privilege of an employee to receive a refund of contributions upon separation from service without the right to a retirement annuity is, however, basic to the philosophy of a contributory retirement plan and now constitutes a standard provision.

The most marked development in recent years has been the expansion of State-wide plans which make it possible for small local governments to protect their employees on an equitable and financially sound basis; promote continuity of coverage for employees transferring from one unit to another within a State; make for standardization of rates of benefit, amounts of contribution and qualifying conditions; and relieve small units of the responsibility and expense of creating and maintaining a separate organization.

Perhaps the most serious problem which has arisen with the development of formal plans grows out of inflation. Proposals to increase pensions of retired employees because of increases in the cost of living clearly affect the stability of a plan's financial structure. Some systems have made voluntary increases through special allocations or appropriations for this specified purpose. Although questions have been raised about the propriety of such increases, they have been held justifiable because they do not directly affect the financial structure of the retirement system or the equities of present participants.

In broad review, current developments reflect a well-defined trend toward all-inclusive coverage for public employees, broader protection, an increase in provisions for the vesting of rights in one form or another, and greater emphasis on the concept that pensions are a deferred wage. At the same time, there is abundant evidence of a better understanding of the true meaning of public pensions, their aims, purposes, and objectives, and their long-term cost implications.

Post Mortems Cannot Raise the Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of October 3, 1951:

POST MORTEM CAN NOT RAISE THE DEAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The autopsy on our China policy being conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is an investigation of the state of mind of yesterday in the context of today. There are times when such exercises are

¹ "Teacher Retirement Plans," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Walter S. Monroe, ed.), rev. ed., New York, the Macmillan Co., 1950, pp. 1440-1441.

² The Territories are Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The 20 cities are Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Des Moines, Detroit, Kansas City, District of Columbia, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York City, Omaha, Portland, St. Louis, St. Paul, San Diego, and San Francisco. A number of the local plans are larger than some of the State plans, in terms of number of members and ledger assets.

³ "Public-School Retirement at the Half Century," Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, vol. xviii, December 1950, Washington, D. C., National Education Association of the United States, p. 120.

⁴ "Public-School Retirement at the Half Century," Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, vol. xviii, December 1950, Washington, D. C., National Education Association of the United States, p. 120.

⁵ Ibid., p. 142.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 143-144.

highly useful—on the off chance that nations may learn from experience. But just now exhumations of past mistakes of judgment on the part of present policy-makers seem to be used mainly as a stick for the political "outs" to belabor the "ins." The stick stirs up a lot of mud that spatters nearly everybody who had anything to do with China up to the year before last, but so far it has only failed at a policy that cannot be beaten any dealer than it is.

Certainly the Communist conquest of China is a great historic vicissitude that rocked this country to the depths because most Americans imagined that it was in our power to prevent it. Perhaps it was, looking back from here it is hard to justify the haze of illusion in which we operated in China. The march of advancing Communist armies, the intrigues in Chungking, the quarrels among our official advisers raised a cloud of dust that has not settled yet, that probably will not settle for generations to come. The little partisan post mortem we are holding now will throw no light on the assessment that will take place when our decisions are reviewed in the supreme court of time.

Meantime looking backward is a waste of energy, and crying over spilled milk a waste of tears. If this were a reflective period, when men and nations could ponder in peace the lessons of history, there might be some value in political inquests. In such a period, politicians might safely spend 1 year in 4 in making mud balls out of campaign issues and slinging them about with boyish abandon.

THE VEIN OF UNREALISM

Unfortunately this is a moment when the parties cannot enjoy the luxury of blaming one another for past blunders. Maybe our present troubles are a consequence of inexcusable miscalculations, but whatever the cause, it is conditions as they are that the Government and people of the United States have to face and grapple with. If one were probing our past policy in Asia in a truly objective spirit, trying to find why, or where, or even if, we failed, the first question to ask is: Who was absolutely right on China? Who among our leaders knew enough to deal with the forces at work in the amorphous world beyond the Pacific?

In the chapter on America and the Orient in his too sketchy but thought-provoking book on American Diplomacy, George Kennan remarks that the heart of the problem of the policy makers of Washington in the Far East "lies, and will always lie, in the shaping and conduct of policy for areas about which they cannot be expert or learned." This lack of knowledge, combined as it often is with a feeling that people entirely different from ourselves in mentality, environment, tradition, and circumstances, must somehow, if they are sound, think as we do, adopt our ways and yearn for our form of government, explains why our friendliest allies disappoint us and why our attitude bewilders them. It explains, too, the vein of unrealism which in Kennan's view runs through 50 years of American foreign policy and is now, because of our undisputed leadership, a danger to ourselves and the free world which has to follow us.

THE NATURE OF MISTAKES

In a passage very pertinent to the current inquiry into Asian policy he writes: "The march of events in the Far East in the decades prior to World War II was a vast and turgid process, involving immensely powerful currents of human affairs over which we Americans had little control or influence. It is easy to overrate the part we played, or the part we could have played, in the process. It is also easy to exaggerate the latitude our statesmen enjoyed . . . for none of us is fully able to put himself in

their place, and it is not important to us to pass judgment on them as individuals.

"Least of all," he goes on, "can I point to any single act of American policy and say: Here was the thing that did it—this was the thing that tipped the scales of the future. In the fabric of human events one thing leads to another. Every mistake is in a sense the product of all the mistakes that have gone before it, from which fact it derives a sort of cosmic forgiveness; and at the same time every mistake is in a sense the determinant of all the mistakes of the future, from which it derives a sort of cosmic unforgiveness."

To avoid more mistakes is now our urgent business. Correspondence that comes to this writer suggests that many thoughtful Americans are troubled by the tendency to dwell on what we did and what we left undone in China and to judge what people thought yesterday by the light of the knowledge and experience of today. These correspondents feel that this is a time for action, for going forward instead of harking back, like Lot's wife, to burned bridges that cannot be recrossed. The margin for error grows narrower as the days go by, and all our powers of thought, concentration, alertness are needed to walk the dangerous path ahead.

The Watershed Approach to Soil and Water Conservation—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Watershed development conference, Charleston, W. Va., October 19, 1950:

THE WATERSHED APPROACH TO SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

I am glad to take part in this watershed-development conference. To my way of thinking, the conservation of our national resources is the Nation's most important problem.

It is vitally necessary to defend ourselves from military aggression, but let's never forget that without an adequate supply of various resources, particularly productive land, we will not be able to defend ourselves. Our food comes largely from the soil, and most of our clothing, all of our wood, vegetable oils, tobacco, leather, and many other raw products of industry.

Productive land, then, is an indispensable part of our first line of national defense.

But land cannot be productive without water; so water, also, is a vital part of our first line of national defense and must be conserved and prudently used all over the country. Too much water left uncontrolled, however, is a land-impoverishing agency. So, it is of the utmost importance to control its application to the land in order to prevent excessive erosion and waterlogging.

The problem of soil and water conservation and wise use is not a problem that can wait until farmers solve it by any trial-and-error method, for that might be too late. This is an urgent problem which demands the best efforts of the Nation's scientists and of all who use the land for agricultural purposes. The understanding cooperation and active

participation in its solution by industrial and all other groups in our society will be helpful, even indispensable.

LAND AND WATER PROBLEMS EVERYBODY'S CONCERN

I realize that there doubtless are those who still think—if they think about the matter at all—that the management of farm and pasture lands and our wood lands is wholly the concern of those who own or occupy such lands, and that only these owners and occupiers have to suffer for the mismanagement of land, economically or otherwise. For too long—until very recent years, in fact—our public thinking followed such a pattern very generally. And it is quite understandable how the public has been slow in visualizing this new plan of concerted attack against such matters of public concern as soil erosion, siltation, and floods which are inseparably tied in with the impoverishment of the land and water pollution.

Damaged agricultural land and pollution of our water take heavy toll of municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other urban property. Happily, we now are tackling this problem in our flood-control work at the very beginning—at the upper ends of the small tributary streams where silt and floodwaters start on their destructive journey down to the trunk stream and the ocean. For some time we have been successfully attacking the erosion problem everywhere—from the highest lying fields on down to the lowest fields.

One of the best assurances that we are going to succeed in alleviating the flood and pollution problems is to be found in the initiative taken in that direction by such responsible interests as those represented in the watershed development conference sponsored by the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the various agricultural, forestry, industrial, urban, wildlife, and recreation groups having an interest and concern in the complete resource development of our watersheds. This meeting of minds on so vital a problem as this confirms what I have said many times in talking to similar groups, like the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

We have now entered the soil conservation era, which, for the first time finds conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife intimately tied together and coordinated on the basis of land capability and need. This is a basic tenet of modern soil conservation. Profitable industries and thriving municipalities, and the health and welfare of all the people depend in very large measure on this scientific and practical conservation of our basic life-giving resources of land and water.

PUBLIC THINKING IS BACK OF SOIL CONSERVATION

We now can say that national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving our interlocking natural resources. Research, education, surveys, and the successful application of conservation measures have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive.

Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals all should exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness of these essential resources. To safeguard the land, it must be treated and used according to capability and need. This accords with nature's law, which man too often has overlooked. This concept is of the order of importance with the discovery of the utility of the wheel and fire.

People using land and water and those affected by their use are being confronted daily with new and complex water problems that are related to the land. The flow and

quality of water in surface streams, floods, recharge of ground water, reservoir storage, waterlogging of lands, erosion, sedimentation, and the soil moisture available for plant growth all are influenced materially by the way we use and manage our land resources. But, in most instances, individual land-owners and water users have little or no control over the sources of these problems, and hence are unable to deal with them effectively alone. As a result, local agencies and groups like your own are concerning themselves more and more in the solution of these problems.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE EMPHASIS ON WATER, WATERSHEDS

The Soil Conservation Service which I represent, in fulfilling its authorized responsibilities, is committed on its part to doing everything possible within available resources to providing assistance needed and requested in dealing with this big problem, in natural watersheds or elsewhere. Thus the water conservation activities of the Service are continuously geared to the needs of the land and water users and are coordinated with the activities of other agencies concerned with land and water resources. To this end, we define water conservation—which always has been part and parcel of soil conservation in our Service planning, operations, and research—this way:

Water conservation is the physical control, protection, management, and prudent use of water resources in such a way as to maintain crop, grazing, and forest lands, vegetal cover, and wildlife for their maximum sustained benefits to people, agriculture, industry, commerce, and other segments of the national economy.

From the start of the Nation-wide program of soil and water conservation, in 1933, the Soil Conservation Service has stressed the importance of the watershed approach. The Service began its operation in that year, on a watershed basis, with the idea that soil conservation was intimately tied in with flood control and the filling of streams, lakes, reservoirs, and ditches with the clogging products of erosion. Our first projects were all on watersheds as nearly as possible—and it was found to be possible in most instances.

Some of our principal projects in the beginning were the watershed projects like those on Banister River, Va.; Brown Creek, N. C.; South Tyger River, S. C.; Okatibbee Creek, Miss.; Elm Creek, Tex.; Green Creek, Tex.; Tarkio River, Mo.-Iowa; and Coon Creek, Wis. The work in these and other watersheds had a pronounced effect on reduction of the silt content of the water carried by them, and also on damage resulting from inundation of flood waters.

For the past several years, virtually all of the Soil Conservation Service's technical and certain other assistance, including our work in authorized flood control projects, has been made available through farmer-organized and farmer-manager soil conservation districts, established under State enabling laws. Here in West Virginia, the watershed idea has carried through in the organization and operation of the districts, a number of which have been named after the watersheds in which they lie, such as the West Fork, Little Kanawha, Potomac Valley, Monongahela, and so on.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT WORK BENEFITS ALL FARMS, OTHER WATER USERS

The watershed approach is the most desirable pattern, because conservation work on one farm is planned and carried out with an eye to the needs of the next farm and to farms downstream. This viewpoint is essential, for the process of erosion has no respect for boundary lines. Gullies don't stop at fence lines, farm lines, or even county

or State lines. Neither do dust storms nor floods. And the costly process of sedimentation never concerns itself with the interests of water users dependent on unprotected reservoirs. A main objective of all this conservation work in a soil conservation district or group of districts, then, is to retard the discharge of water from upstream areas—and, moreover, over 75 percent of the Nation's total watershed flood damage occurs in these upstream watersheds.

And while we are thus retarding runoff, we are at the same time, and by the same means, reducing the effect of erosion; and we are storing in the soil for later use the water that may mean a good crop instead of a poor one or a failure. Also, we are, by the same operation, reducing the rate of sedimentation of stream channels, ditches, reservoirs, and productive bottomlands. In our normal conservation work, the objective has been to keep agricultural land permanently productive while in use. In flood-control operations, more emphasis is put on the task of slowing down runoff. So, in the complete watershed program, we give special attention to measures, including engineering, that help to hold back water and slow down its flow.

PUBLIC BENEFIT AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR SHARING COSTS

Let us suppose, for illustration, that 50 to 80 percent of the landowners of a small watershed have treated their land with a coordinate soil conservation program. They have terraced their farmlands and are tilling their fields on the contour. They have adopted soil-protecting and soil-improving rotations, and they are using all the other measures that their land needs for the maintenance of its productivity, permanently. There still, however, would be damaging runoff and sediment loss (water-transported erosion material) from the area. The sediment mostly comes from areas of unprotected land, treatment of some of which lies beyond the means of the individuals or even groups of landowners. To retard this runoff and hold back the sediment may require special measures which may offer little benefit to the farmer on whose land they are built, but which are of great value to other farmers and residents downstream.

Ordinary soil and water conservation measures are for the protection and improvement of the land on which they are applied, and consequently the principal benefit is received by the owner or operator of the farm on which such work is done. Therefore, it is only proper that the farmer should bear the principal cost. On the other hand, the special measures and structures used in aid of flood control are designed to benefit bottomlands along creeks and small streams as well as the major tributaries and to keep sediment out of stream channels and reservoirs. Because these are public benefits, the public—through community groups or county, State, and Federal Governments—should bear their proportionate part of the costs, so long as they are justified by the benefits to be expected.

HISTORY OF UPSTREAM FLOOD CONTROL

The 1935 Soil Conservation Act (Public No. 46, 74th Cong.), establishing the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture, declares it to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the prevention and control of soil erosion and, among other things, "thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors." It also is worth noting when and how the national flood-control bill was first changed to add on the upstream phase of the work to the main-channel program of major engineering operations, which historically have been the responsibility of the Corps of Army Engineers,

That was about the middle of the 1930's, when the Secretary of Agriculture, at my suggestion, asked to make the soil and water conservation efforts of the Department of Agriculture a supplemental part of the flood-control problems. After considerable discussion the suggestion was accepted. This resulted in what seems to me to be a fitting together of the two phases of a comprehensive, coordinated program of flood control and prevention. The Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service have been responsible for the Department's work in this program, cooperating with the Army engineers.

The Watershed Approach to Soil and Water Conservation—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, before the Watershed Development Conference, Charleston, W. Va., October 19, 1950:

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Congress has authorized more than 600 watersheds for preliminary flood-control examination and survey, to determine whether the benefits to be derived would justify the cost. The Department of Agriculture has completed preliminary examinations on approximately 160 watersheds or portions of watersheds, and it has finished 18 survey reports. Congress has authorized programs of watershed improvement on 11 watersheds in different parts of the country under the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944—of which the Potomac River drainage basin is one.

Congress, as you know, recently authorized a review of the Potomac survey report, as requested by local people, to determine the need for possible modification and, in light of changing conditions since the original survey, to see if its recommendations are in line, for example, with the guiding requirement that works of improvement expenditures have to be commensurate with the benefits to be gained in reducing potential flood damages. Meanwhile, of course, we are going ahead in soil conservation district farm planning and treatment in Potomac sub-watersheds with such water retardation and other conservation measures originally recommended as pasture development and improvement, contour furrowing, fencing woodlots, getting better cover on the land, etc. My understanding is that the importance of this work is pretty well understood and that the farmers are going ahead with it, but that this still doesn't take care of such needs, for example, as larger ponds with larger freeboard for floodwater detention than farmers themselves can pay for, other floodwater retarding and sediment-control structures, channel improvement, etc.

As I wrote Director Edwin R. Cotton, of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, just last month, in comment on the United States Public Health Service's Potomac Report preliminary draft: "Over and above the land treatment requirement

(planned, completed, and remaining to be done), certain flood control and water conservation measures are needed to complete the conservation program in this area. Many of these measures are being planned and installed under the flood control operations carried out by the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service under the authority of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Such measures include upstream floodwater and sediment detention structures and debris basins, streambank protection works, and related measures."

INCREASED INTEREST IN STREAM POLLUTION

This matter of stream pollution, as you know, is receiving particularly active attention again at this time, and I am glad to note that silt is being recognized as a serious pollutant, originating in accelerated soil erosion. When we control soil erosion on the watershed, we thereby diminish the silt content of the streams, thus reducing the cost of filtering public water supplies, assuring dependable water supply for industrial uses, reducing the cost of navigation, reducing silting of reservoirs, and producing various other benefits. In fact, the only way in which water pollution from silt can be controlled effectively is by the adoption of soil and water conservation practices applied in accordance with the needs and capabilities of the land.

One good example I should like to mention of effective cooperation between city interests and soil-conservation districts in dealing with this particular watershed problem is that of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission's work with adjacent Maryland counties (through the Montgomery and Howard Soil-Conservation Districts). The commission has bought a tractor and other equipment, which is pooled and used on a rental basis in the districts, and it has established a nursery adjacent to Triadelphia Lake to furnish trees and other plants for conservation use in the districts. The Soil Conservation Service has made a complete survey of the watershed and now is in process of developing a complete plan for conservation treatment. About 35 percent of the planning in that watershed has been done during the last 5 years, and the Sanitary Commission is now allotting \$5,000 a year to assist the soil-conservation districts in speeding up the conservation land treatment.

WEST VIRGINIA EMERGENCY FLOOD-DAMAGE WORK

Another illustration of how soil-conservation districts are in position best to serve the public interest in dealing with watershed problems is the emergency flood-damage alleviation work done here in West Virginia on the south branch of the Potomac River and tributary streams after the \$6,000,000 flood in June 1949. As you remember, eight lives were lost and many others were endangered, and extensive property damage was done in both farm and urban areas in Pendleton, Hardy, Grant, and Hampshire Counties. This included damage to farms, city property, public utilities, roads, bridges, etc. An examination of the damaged area showed that unless emergency measures were taken to restore channels to their original capacity, slight rises in water stage would result in extensive future damages.

The local district supervisors worked closely with the Soil Conservation Service and other United States Department of Agriculture agencies, Army engineers, and other State and Federal agencies in surveying damage, indicating priority jobs, and otherwise facilitating the work, including channel excavation, stream-bank protection, and bank and dike repairs. As a result of the work performed by these agencies and the State road commission, I am told that most of the stream channels in the affected areas now have enough capacity to handle an ordinary flood, and protection from regularly recurring

floods has been given more than 7,200 acres of land, and many of the damaged areas can be reclaimed completely as a result of this work.

So it is that your soil-conservation districts, established under State law as local governmental units, properly have an important part in any permanent watershed program or emergency or other watershed undertaking such as those I have mentioned. Being the principal organizations through which soil- and water-conservation measures are being applied on the land by individual farmers the country over, it is only logical that they should also be called on to serve similarly in the installation and maintenance of conservation work by organized public and private interests, such as municipalities, highway departments, railroads, and other industries, and so on.

LOCAL PEOPLE HAVE BASIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR WATERSHED-DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

This is not discounting the place for an advisory group, committee, or association, the various members of which represent their respective districts and other interests, when a particular watershed undertaking may involve all or part of several soil-conservation districts. The need for the formation of such groups aimed at strengthening cooperation among groups of districts and other interests is, of course, a matter for local determination, when some specific objective in advancing soil- and water-conservation work can thus be achieved.

In any event, for a watershed-development program to operate successfully—in West Virginia or anywhere else—the basic responsibility for that program must be with the people residing in the watershed. That means a local responsible agency, such as the soil-conservation district, which is representative of the interests in the watershed and which can act to coordinate the activities and services of all agencies and interests to formulate the necessary broad, flexible program for watershed development.

The soil-conservation districts, through their elected supervisors, serving voluntarily and without pay from anybody, call on various sources of help in carrying out the district program, whether those sources be local, State, or Federal, governmental or private. One district supervisor summed up the district's advantageous position rather aptly, I thought, when he likened the position of his neighbors and himself to that on a wheel: Before they had a district, he explained, they were in effect running around the rim of a wheel in finding out about and obtaining the help they needed from various Government or other sources. But, through their soil-conservation district organization, they together became the hub of that wheel, and could reach out spoke-wise and draw together the different needed facilities without waste of time or money.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS: ORGANIZATION AND WORK

I am convinced, as I have said many times before, that the soil-conservation districts, which have spread over the country with such astonishing rapidity since the first one was established in 1937, and through which conservation progress is steadily being speeded up, represent the greatest land movement of all history. It is through these democratic units of State government that the big soil and water conservation job on the farmlands and watersheds of America is being done—in West Virginia and throughout the Nation—in an effective and lasting manner never before accomplished anywhere, so far as known.

West Virginia is just short of the 100-percent mark from the standpoint of soil conservation district organization, with 99.6 percent of the State's farms and 99.4 percent of its farmland within the boundaries of its 14 districts. And, particularly in view

of the fact it has been just 10 years since your State's first three districts were organized in 1940, their record progress likewise is noteworthy. In looking over our records, I noticed, for example, that the approximately 18,700 district conservation farm plans prepared by district farmers and Soil Conservation Service technicians to July 1, 1950, covered nearly 2,500,000 acres, with upwards of a million acres having received combined conservation treatment. Also, that nearly 6,000,000 acres in West Virginia districts had been conservation surveyed by that date.

I won't ply you with further detailed figures on the State's district accomplishments, which you may get from your State Soil Conservation Committee, or from our State conservationist, Mr. L. L. Lough. But I do want to remind you of the wide range of conservation measures and practices being put on the land in the districts, such as: Contour farming, cover cropping, stubble-mulch tillage, contour strip cropping, pasture seeding and improvement, woodland management and tree planting, wildlife area improvement, farm ponds, terraces and diversions, and conservation farm drainage. There are others, of course.

ACCELERATED PROGRESS, NATION-WIDE

You will be interested in knowing that, Nation-wide, there are now approximately 2,280 soil-conservation districts, in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. They cover 1,250,000,000 acres and include 80 percent of all the farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States. Our records show that while we admittedly are not moving fast enough and are still suffering heavy losses of soil and water waste, we are, nevertheless, moving ahead at an encouraging rate. It is my belief, based on experience, that we could, with adequate facilities, complete the job of applying the basic conservation measures to the land by about 1970, or around 20 years from now.

This is the sixteenth year in which the Soil Conservation Service will be able to report an accelerated rate of progress. I could cite you an imposing array of figures to illustrate this fact. In fiscal year 1942, for example, basic conservation measures were applied to 5,332,000 acres (in soil-conservation districts). In 1950, the same kind of treatment was applied to 26,071,342 acres. This was an increase of 388 percent—nearly five times as much work done—with operating facilities increased during the 8-year period by only about 50 percent. In addition to the conservation measures applied to the land, much farm planning work was done, and enough soil-conservation surveys were carried out for the preparation of a healthy backlog of necessary conservation farm plans. Nation-wide, detailed surveys had been made on 334,770,000 acres to July 1, 1950, 870,000 complete farm plans on 240,000,000 acres, and 121,000,000 acres treated with needed practices.

HOW NATURAL NEIGHBOR GROUPS HELP

It is of particular interest to this group, I believe, for me to point out that in helping the soil conservation districts to do this work—at their request—we in the Soil Conservation Service are finding the natural or neighbor group approach to be most helpful. There is, as I have already indicated, the need for speeding up the application of conservation on the land, farm by farm and watershed by watershed. There is, also, the necessity of doing the job at minimum cost. We have found that the most efficient way of carrying the soil and water conservation job beyond the planning stage is through coordinated group action of the landowners and operators—with technical, educational, and financial assistance from other sources. This is especially effective, and necessary, in dealing with problems of watershed extent. Soil-conservation districts them-

selves, of course, are basically group-action devices; and their efficiency and success in this direction have been proved over and over. Today, we are working with some 20,000 natural neighbor groups in districts in getting conservation planned and put on the land.

By the same token, in conservation watershed development, technical planning and services logically should be provided first to community groups and then to individual members of those groups, with the individual farm plans made within the framework of the sound technical watershed plan. That is to say, conservation treatment and land use are planned not only in the best interests of the individual landholder but also that of his neighbors up and down the watershed. In other words, a watershed for our purposes of consideration is not just an inanimate geographical area to be dealt with arbitrarily by sticking pins in a map. People are a part of the watershed we are talking about—and an essential part—along with animal and plant life, water, minerals; that is, all its component resources. Those people are the starting point in watershed development—and preferably "self-starters," through individual-group initiative and action.

If you read my article in the Saturday Evening Post some time back,¹ you may recall that I pointed out that: "The remedy (for our water sickness) includes the investment of billions of dollars of public and private money over a period of many years for the development, conservation, storage, purification, and distribution of all the available water resources we can find and utilize. Development of the Nation's water plant, from our watersheds all along the route to the points of use, has lagged behind the rest of our growth. We have a lot of catching up to do. In addition, the remedy involves a considerable change in the attitude of most Americans toward their natural resources, from prodigality and indifference to care and concern."

That includes people in the watersheds, and all of us.

TEAMWORK GETS WATERSHED JOB DONE

I could talk all evening about how soil-conservation district farmers and other people in different watersheds over the country have been working together with satisfaction and profit in this conservation approach to their common problems—in the Washita River watershed in south-central Oklahoma, in the Jones Creek watershed in western Iowa, and elsewhere. And I know all of you are acquainted with the watershed development programs in the Monongahela Valley in West Virginia and Pennsylvania and the Muskingum Valley in Ohio. The Soil Conservation Service is working with the cooperating soil-conservation districts in both of these programs—but I shall leave it to Walter Gumbel and Bryce Browning to tell you about the respective progress of the Monongahela and Muskingum undertakings.

All of these and the many other working examples like them go to show that programs of watershed improvement are good business for everybody—every segment of society involved, including agriculture, industry, and the professions. They likewise show that teamwork by a great many different people is essential to the success of such a program—hard work by rural and urban interests alike. Such a program, moreover, requires scientific knowledge, technical skill, and understanding cooperation. Based on painstaking scientific research and on wide practical use, the principal conservation measures must conform in their application with the principles of hydrology, engineering, agronomy, forestry, biology, and other

related fields. Under varying conditions of climate, topography, and drainage, the wrong thing done, or the right thing left undone, can do serious injury.

WATER CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service will continue to work toward the sound development, conservation, wise use, management, and permanent protection of the Nation's water as well as its land—cooperating with local, State, and Federal agencies and with other organizations and groups like your own which are concerned with water and land. In working toward the permanent solution of our water problems, the Service will continue to give full consideration to all beneficial water uses, including those for recreation and wildlife. Also, the Service will continue to encourage conservation districts and other organizations to use, to the fullest extent practicable, available assistance from all public and private sources, including the natural leadership resources of land and water users.

Such are some of the principles of water conservation by which we are being guided in the Soil Conservation Service. Our men throughout the field are acquainted with all these principles, and I am sure you may count on their living up to them to the fullest possible extent. The confidence we have in the ability of the Nation to safeguard our remaining land and water resources is based, to a large degree, on continuing active cooperation with the soil conservation districts. This, plus the positive support of agencies and groups like those represented here this evening which are in a position to help, will expedite the conservation program throughout the country's watersheds and the length and breadth of the Nation.

We now have the knowledge of how to do the job; the conservation tools have been perfected and tested; and, what is more important, we have the organization and public support for doing the job. Not only is there no excuse for our not doing the job but we dare not shirk it, because our individual and national security, peace, and prosperity depend on it.

Alfred A. Tausk, Mr. Chips of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn has lost a very valuable citizen and a leading educator in the death of Alfred A. Tausk, principal of Boys' High School. Although Boys' High School was closest to his heart and he devoted his greatest efforts to conducting this school in a most efficient manner, he nevertheless found the time to participate actively in community enterprises and organizations.

As a former student and graduate of Boys' High, I feel keenly the loss of Alfred A. Tausk. My first association with him dates back to 1919, when he was my Spanish teacher at Boys' High. I observed then that he took a personal and keen interest in every student, he would go out of his way to be helpful and to enable the student to make the grade.

His success as an educator was due to this personal interest he took in his stu-

dents. Even before he became principal of the school, he would not only help students master the specific subject but encouraged the boys to participate in such extra-curricular activities as debating, math teams, athletics, and so forth.

Himself a student at Boys' High at the beginning of the present century, he became a teacher in the same school in 1909, and was finally promoted to the top post of principal in 1932. Thus, he was associated with the school for nearly half a century. During the past two decades as principal, he always followed the careers of his boys, he was constantly in touch with them during their college years, and he tried to be helpful even after they had left college, which accounts for the fact that many of his boys have been successful in life.

It is not surprising, therefore, that he was often referred to as Mr. Boys High Himself. However, I prefer to call him Mr. Chips, of Brooklyn, because his activities can be compared to those of the well-known literary figure so ably characterized on the screen some years ago.

To me, Mr. Tausk was always an inspiring leader, one who was most helpful in my formative years, and one who was instrumental in guiding me along the path of life toward my cherished goals. He was the ideal type of a man, possessed of a noble character, profound learning, and an inspiring influence for everything that is good and constructive. He was devoted to his family, a great patriot of his country, and loyal to his many friends.

For many years he cherished a great dream which he had hoped would be realized during his lifetime. He talked, hoped, and prayed for a new school building to replace the old structure, but to be located in Brooklyn's Civic Center. He would contact the alumni of Boys High to seek their cooperation in this task, but unfortunately he did not live to see his dream fulfilled.

As a former student and great admirer of his, I should like to suggest that Boys High be renamed in his honor and memory as either the Alfred A. Tausk High School or Alfred A. Tausk Boys High School. Now we should see that his dream comes true.

To his fine family I want to extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of bereavement. His host of friends and his former students numbering in the many thousands will miss his gentle smile and his cheerful greeting, his fatherly guidance, and his numerous good deeds.

Tidelands Versus Marginal Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record, the following letter on the subject entitled "Tidelands Versus Marginal Sea," which appeared

¹ Bennett, Hugh Hammond, Warning: The Water Problem Is National, Saturday Evening Post, May 13, 1950, p. 32.

in the Christian Science Monitor for October 2, 1951:

TIDELANDS VERSUS MARGINAL SEA

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Attorney General Daniels of Texas has presented the so-called Tidelands controversy, The Case for the States. The following is a brief statement, The Case for the Nation, and we believe answers the arguments set forth by Mr. Daniels.

The fundamental arguments Mr. Daniels presented for the States are:

1. The States have always owned the tidelands from the time the Nation was formed until the Supreme Court decisions; therefore, Congress should now return these tidelands to the States.

2. The three Supreme Court decisions have endangered State ownership of navigable inland waters, lakes and rivers, areas which the States have owned since the Union was formed.

3. The Supreme Court introduced a new doctrine in the cases of United States versus California-Texas-Louisiana which would give the National Government the right to take, without just compensation, any State property; and this doctrine is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

4. The Supreme Court has not yet decided that the United States owns the disputed area but only that it has paramount rights to and dominion over this property. Therefore Congress should settle the question and quitclaim the disputed area to the States.

5. The oil operators who went into the disputed area secured State leases and developed for oil, did so in good faith and have now spent millions of dollars to improve these leases, and these leases should not now be taken away from them.

We believe all the answers to Mr. Daniels' arguments are very simple and complete:

1. The most fundamental misrepresentation regarding this problem is the statement that the disputed area is tidelands. There is not one foot of tidelands involved. Never has the National Government claimed any part of State-owned tidelands or State-owned inland waters. The three Supreme Court decisions described the area in dispute as commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. The complaints and decisions in all three cases specifically exclude tidelands from the controversy.

The use of the word "tidelands" has been retained by the oil lobby to becloud and misrepresent the real issues to Congress and the American people. There are 54 Supreme Court decisions which hold that tidelands actually belong to the States. The oil lobby group want to make it appear as if the Supreme Court had overruled all these prior decisions—taken the tidelands from the States and given them to the National Government under this new doctrine of necessity. Never has a Supreme Court decision been so completely misrepresented.

The only area in dispute is the offshore marginal sea, commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. In regard to this area the Supreme Court said: "(a) The case of United States against California was the first time a question of ownership of this offshore belt had ever come before the Supreme Court; (b) neither the Original Thirteen States, nor any new State after being admitted into the Union, have ever owned or controlled this submerged offshore belt.

"California, like the Thirteen Original Colonies, never acquired ownership in the marginal sea. The claim to our 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty (332 U. S. pp. 31-34). The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national defense, relations with other powers,

war and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area" (339 U. S. 704).

If the statements (a) and (b) are true (and a rereading will convince anyone that that is exactly what the Supreme Court decided) then the States have never owned the disputed area—the Supreme Court did not take this disputed area from the States and give it to the National Government—there is no new theory or doctrine of law which the Supreme Court announced that the National Government can take property from the States without just compensation contrary to fundamental constitutional law.

2. The argument that the three Supreme Court decisions have endangered State ownership of navigable inland waters, lakes, and rivers, areas which the States have owned since the Union was formed, has caused many governors, states attorneys general, and state legislatures to support the quitclaim bills before Congress.

The President and all national officials having anything to do with the problem, have repeatedly stated that the National Government makes no claim to these State-owned areas. The disclaimer bills introduced into Congress would, if passed, settle the question forever, but the lobby group won't let any one of these disclaimer bills be passed.

It just seems impossible after reading the Supreme Court decisions that anyone should now question the United States ownership or its exclusive right to take the oil and other minerals from the marginal sea belt.

3. Have oil operators in the marginal sea been fairly dealt with? At the time the oil operators actually began taking any amount of oil from the offshore oil pools they had full notice that the United States was making claim to the offshore area. The States in granting State leases were very careful not to guarantee title to these offshore leases, and the operators took their chances with full knowledge that the States might not own this offshore area and that the State leases might be void.

These operators have made millions and millions of dollars on these State leases after paying their costs of operation, and have now succeeded in convincing Congress that they should not be liable for any oil wrongfully taken by them, and Congress will pass a bill that will relieve these operators of any obligation to repay for any oil wrongfully taken.

Many are of the opinion that a bill introduced in the Senate by Senators DOUGLAS, HILL, and others is the best solution of this controversy. Under their proposal control over the marginal sea areas would remain in the Federal Government but revenues from them would be devoted to grants-in-aid for schools in all States. Thus natural resources, which under three Supreme Court decisions belong to the Nation as a whole, would be dedicated to the welfare of the youth of the land at ocean level.

HAROLD MORGAN.

SALT LAKE CITY.

The Relief Racket Should Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent, I am including herewith an editorial written by Mr. Walter E. Williams, publisher of

the Fairfield (Iowa) Daily Ledger, entitled "The Relief Racket Should Be Stopped." The writer of this editorial has been the publisher of the Fairfield Daily Ledger for many, many years, and his high standing in Iowa journalism is well established and highly deserved. The editorial presented herewith has won widespread recognition and response:

THE RELIEF RACKET SHOULD BE STOPPED

The State of Indiana was recently cut off from the Federal Government's contribution to several of its security funds because that State makes available the names of persons who receive financial aid from such funds.

There is now a bill before Congress to establish the right of all States to enact a similar law without losing their share of Federal funds out of which such payments are made. The bill should be passed.

The original intent of the Federal regulation was to protect the indigent citizen from publicity. There was a time when this was perhaps wise. It was a kindly gesture toward the needy. But 20 years of progress in social welfare has been accompanied by many changes in the moral fiber of a good many persons. There are hundreds of thousands of people who are making a lifetime career of being on relief.

The problem is not so large in Iowa as in the more populous States. It has been shown that thousands of Illinois citizens, for instance, spend their winters in Florida while on the relief rolls of their home State. Once they get on the rolls there seems no way to get them off. The administrators of the funds seem to measure their success by the number of new names they can add to the list. In Illinois it is more profitable to go on the relief rolls than to work. Citizens of Iowa would be surprised, too, if they knew of some of the abuses in this State.

To legalize publicity for such lists is the only cure for a fine program which has grown into a racket in too many cases. Certainly no newspaper would publish the list of deserving recipients of those funds. But the knowledge that they might publish the names of those who are abusing the program would certainly bring about a tighter administration of the laws and save hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' dollars.

This I Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "This I Believe" which appeared on the editorial page of the October issue of the Eagle, the official publication of the great American organization, the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

I know the Congress will be interested in this fine editorial because it once again typifies the outstanding Americanism of this great fraternity.

The article follows:

THIS I BELIEVE

I believe in America.

I believe in its democracy, as it has been developed and is being improved, with the Bill of Rights assuring all of us liberty under law.

I believe in representative government, the expressed will of an informed public being the only safe repository of final power.

I believe in honest public service, limiting the functions of government to those house-keeping services we cannot effectively provide for ourselves.

I believe in our free way of life, under which men can choose an occupation or build a business or belong to a labor union of their choice.

I believe in America.

I believe in its voluntary organizations where ordinary folks can join in serving their community and country.

I believe in its churches, respecting the faiths by which men work and live.

I believe in its schools, public and parochial, knowing education to be the bulwark of democratic living.

I believe in its clubs and lodges, believing such free associations of individuals to be a cement that holds a free society together.

I believe in Americans.

I believe in the folks from many lands, men of all creeds and races, who have built this Nation of nations, this people of peoples.

I believe in my fellow men, something of strength and weakness in each, fellow passengers with me on a troubled planet.

I believe in partnership with all free peoples, in our standing together in defense of the values we share.

I believe in fellowship on a people-to-people basis, including as allies and friends those who are enslaved by the tyrannies of our time.

I believe in national defense, for the world as it is, and international cooperation, for the world as it will some day be.

I believe that Soviet-directed world communism represents a military and economic and moral challenge to our civilization.

I believe that those who love liberty and hate tyranny can muster the military and economic and moral strength to repel that challenge.

I believe that the Soviet empire contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction and that, without war, we can hasten its collapse.

I believe that, war or no war, we must stand firm and united, recognizing that there is nothing to fear that is as bad as fear itself.

I believe in God Almighty, Creator of Heaven and earth, and pray for the strength that, with His blessing and on His side, we shall be adequate for whatever tomorrow may bring, joining in a world-wide Our Father, praying "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

The Lieutenant Governor of California Replies to John B. Elliott on the Sub- ject of the Latter's Defense of the Sec- retary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A5273 contained a statement by Mr. John B. Elliott, an attorney and Democratic Party leader of Los Angeles, addressed to the Honorable Good-

win Knight, the Lieutenant Governor of California, representing in effect a defense of the Secretary of State of the United States.

Under the circumstances it is only right that the original letter of the Lieutenant Governor, dated August 18, to which Mr. Elliott was replying, through the newspapers, together with Mr. Knight's release note to the press, dated August 20, should also be made a part of the same record. Under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on this subject, I now include the release and the letter, as follows:

RELEASE FROM LT. GOV. GOODWIN KNIGHT,
LOS ANGELES, AUGUST 20

NOTE TO THE EDITOR: The attached is an open letter to John B. Elliott, Los Angeles oilman and prominent Democrat, in reply to voluminous correspondence in which he objected to charges I leveled against Dean Acheson in April of this year.

I have learned that Mr. Elliott has made our personal correspondence public in a printed booklet, so I am, therefore, releasing my answer to Mr. Elliott's letter of July 12, 1951.

I am amazed that Mr. Elliott does not seem to realize that Dean Acheson is an extremely unpopular public official. Mr. Acheson is also regarded by vast numbers of Democrats, Republicans and independents alike with tremendous doubts and misgivings. The huge American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and scores of other Nation-wide patriotic organizations who have demanded that the Secretary of State resign are not inspired by partisan politics, but by fear of Mr. Acheson and love of country.

Since Mr. Elliott has elected to be Dean Acheson's apologist, I am happy to let these facts be known.

G. K.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., August 18, 1951.

Mr. JOHN B. ELLIOTT,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of July 12 and my acknowledgment of the enclosure which was a letter from Secretary of State Dean Acheson. In this letter Mr. Acheson sets forth what you and he call explicit answers to set the record straight to my letter to you of April 24, 1951. I am making this letter public as I have been advised that you have already forwarded to the newspapers and radio stations copies of our correspondence.

Mr. Acheson's memorandum is very extensive, being 10 pages of close-typed matter. He admitted that on December 23, 1949, he sent out instructions to the diplomatic and consular personnel in Asia to promote the view that Formosa was doomed and expendable. Mr. Acheson now says this was only a guide in a psychological war against the Communists. It was no guide, it was a surrender, and had Mr. Acheson's policy been followed to the present day, Formosa would have been gone and the dagger of aggression would now be pointed at the heart of the Philippines and Australia. Later on in the first page of his memorandum Mr. Acheson refers to this instruction as a directive. Whether you call it directive, guide, order, or instruction, it was a surrender to the Communists.

Mr. Acheson denies that he testified on June 19, 1947, that there was no danger of the Communists defeating Chiang. He is, within the narrow, hair-splitting lines of pettifoggery, correct. But he testified to exactly that on March 20, 1947, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In answer to a sharp, direct question by Congressman WALTER JUDS on the printed page 16 of the committee transcript he said:

"The Chinese Government is not in the position at the present time that the Greek Government is in. It is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years."

Mr. Acheson positively denies in his letter that he testified before this committee. This testimony refutes him completely. I charged that on July 30, 1949, Mr. Acheson wrote a letter to the President of the United States and that he stated that no amount of aid could have saved Chiang. Mr. Acheson denies that he used those exact words but he admits that he did say, "Nothing this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities, could have changed that result." That is exactly the same thing that I charged Mr. Acheson said except he admits that he said it with the use of more words.

When Mr. Acheson refers to the Polish loan in 1946, he does not deny that he approved the loan and he does not deny that the loan was made against the advice of United States Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane and he does not deny that the lawyer in this transaction was Donald Hiss, brother of Alger Hiss, nor does he deny the amount of the fee. He merely says he did not get any part of the fee. I never charged he got any part of the fee. Every fact that I charged against Mr. Acheson in this matter is true and does not prove anything for Mr. Acheson to say that the law firm functioned completely in a legal capacity. That is the only way law firms honorably can function.

Mr. Acheson claims that at the time the loan was made the Polish Government still included democratic elements. He does not explain why the man best qualified to pass on this question and all other questions, the American Ambassador to Poland, disapproved of the loan. In fact in his letter, John, Mr. Acheson never mentions Ambassador Lane. He mentions a great many other people but never explains why this loan was made against the advice of the United States Ambassador, Arthur Bliss Lane. Of course, as he admits in his letter, the loan was a bad one.

The next thing Mr. Acheson mentions in his letter can be disposed of in one sentence. I charged that he stated there were no Communists in the State Department. His answer to that is that he knew of no Communists in the State Department. He made the statement I charged and it is a play on words for him now to say that what he declared was that he knew of no Communists in the State Department. The rest of his explanation is a series of unimportant words strung together to try to explain the conditions in the State Department.

It is shocking to see the Secretary of State defend his conduct and attitude toward Alger Hiss by simply stating that the decision of the Supreme Court covered the matter. I ask Secretary Acheson now why he has not publicly repudiated the convict Hiss. Why does he still cling so tenaciously to his challenge? "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss." Mr. Acheson's reply to my charge that he sponsored the Hiss brothers to Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle at a time when they had already been denounced as Soviet agents, is contained on page five of his letter to you.

His answer to that is that Adolf Berle lied. He takes a whole page to say so and does it by saying that Mr. Berle's memory is faulty and then again that his memory plays him false. The truth is that Adolf Berle had no motive to testify except to tell the truth. Secretary Acheson is trying to justify his enthusiastic recommendation of the traitor, Alger Hiss, after he had been exposed by Whittaker Chambers. A mere reading of my charge against Secretary Acheson and his reply on pages 4 and 5 of his letter

demonstrate that his only answer to that is that Adolf Berle is and was a liar. That is no answer at all and it is no proof at all.

On August 5, 1949, in a very large book of more than a thousand pages entitled "United States Relations With China" issued by the State Department under the direction of Dean Acheson, the Chinese Communists are presented to the President and the people of the United States as "democratic, liberal elements in China." The whole white paper proves that Dean Acheson and Owen Lattimore, in and out of the State Department, were soft on the Chinese Communists. John Carter Vincent and John P. Davies, top Chinese affairs planning expert, were also soft on the Communists.

The white paper calls these blood-thirsty Chinese Communists "agrarian democrats" and that the best defense against them is agrarian reform (pp. 553-556). Then a final blow is added when the white paper assures the President and the people that in China "the Communists are not practicing or preaching communism" (p. 562).

On the subject of Lauchlin Currie the Secretary misses the point. Mr. Currie has been associated with Communists for years. Why must Mr. Acheson, in private practice in 1948, rush in to defend a man who only recently before the McCarran committee was described by Elizabeth Bentley and Whitaker Chambers as "helping them in their work." In and out of official life, Mr. Acheson seems to be always helping those who help Communists.

Concerning Yalta, Dumbarton Oaks, and Alger Hiss, Mr. Acheson says his only function was to sign a travel order for Hiss to go to these conferences. The implication is strongly made that Mr. Acheson was unaware of the presence of Alger Hiss. He tries to make it appear as though Hiss was just sneaking aboard as a stowaway. He went with Acheson's approval and with his complete support. Does Mr. Acheson contend that he had no power to stop Alger Hiss? Remember he told Adolf Berle he could vouch for him absolutely. And that is what he did as Hiss assumed a position of power and prestige at President Roosevelt's elbow at Yalta.

In August and September of 1945 Mr. Acheson was seeking for confirmation as Under Secretary of State before a Senate committee. He testified that he intended to bring a more liberal government to Japan. He testified that he thought a commission form of government of the big powers should control the future of the defeated country.

On September 30, 1945, John Carter Vincent, Mr. Acheson's new assistant, issued a public rebuke to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, informing him that the Japanese policy would be made by the State Department and not by the commander. The State Department, he said, planned to use Japan to build a bridge of friendship to the Soviet Union, but General MacArthur did not cave in under Acheson pressure, and the commission form of government for Japan never materialized.

The present catastrophe in Korea stems from the blundering that began in August and September of 1945 when Dean Acheson and John Carter Vincent and men like them were trying to prevent Douglas MacArthur and men like him from saving Japan for a democratic form of government. The only bright spot in the whole foreign policy of the United States since World War II was the administration of Japan under Gen. Douglas MacArthur. No living man can or has disputed MacArthur's brilliant civil administration of that unfortunate country. Why doesn't Secretary Acheson say something about that to you and to the American people?

Instead on June 19, 1946, at a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Acheson was busy proposing a program

for a 10-year lend lease for China which included military training and equipment to be given to the Chinese Communist forces. When asked at that same meeting by Representative EDITH N. ROGERS of Massachusetts if there was any danger of the Chinese attacking us, Mr. Acheson replied:

"You mean the Chinese would attack us? I do not think so. I am sure that we do not need to worry."

The many thousands of Korean casualties today do not agree with Mr. Acheson's advice not to worry about the Chinese attacking Americans.

In conclusion, John, I note that you say repeatedly I am a victim of the people who are trying to destroy the public career of Dean Acheson. I feel that you are the victim of the faltering, weasel words and double talk of Dean Acheson, who now finds himself crushed under the weight of the many mistakes you admitted he has made. I have never met Dean Acheson and have no personal quarrel with him. Like yourself, I, too, am deeply devoted to the welfare of our common country. The finest thing Dean Acheson could do would be to resign today. His personal pride and vanity are not controlling factors in a story of diplomacy which is at best studded with mistakes, weakness, appeasement, and failure. I have been extremely surprised that Mr. Acheson would seek to indulge in a controversy with me except that I am persuaded to the belief that because I am 3,000 miles away from Washington that he could safely challenge me, whereas he would never dare launch such a letter against Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a well-informed Senator of the United States, or one of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In any event, the very least Mr. Acheson could have done for this country and all of us was to have resigned the day the bars of the prison clanged on Alger Hiss. Since he stubbornly refuses to do so, he must accept the criticism of those who doubt his sincerity and his capacity. May I remind him that one whom you loved and respected in public life, President Woodrow Wilson, said during World War I:

"We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. Honesty and competence need no shield of secrecy."

I know that you with me, therefore, welcome this opportunity to have every fact known and every truth broadcast to the end that our country may be saved and peace may be restored in the world.

Very sincerely yours,

GOODWIN KNIGHT,
Lieutenant Governor.

Persons Covered by Old Age and Survivors Insurance Program, in Alabama, on March 15, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement prepared by my office dealing with employment covered by the terms of the old-age and survivors insurance program under the Social Security Act, in Alabama, as of March 15, 1948:

On March 15, 1948, Alabama had 498,289 employed workers, covered by the old-age

and survivors insurance program of the Social Security Act.

Thus, the average of Alabama's 67 counties had 7,437 workers covered by old-age and survivors insurance.

However, only 11 counties were above average in this respect. They are:

County:	Number of covered workers
Jefferson-----	159,249
Mobile-----	58,451
Montgomery-----	24,885
Etowah-----	21,859
Calhoun-----	16,338
Tuscaloosa-----	13,353
Talladega-----	10,558
Walker-----	10,451
Chambers-----	9,780
Madison-----	8,726
Morgan-----	7,610
Total-----	341,260

NOTE 1.—These 11 (15.5 percent of all) counties had 66.48 percent of all covered workers.

NOTE 2.—Jefferson (14.1 percent of all counties) had 32 percent of all covered workers.

Thus, roughly speaking, two-thirds of the total covered workers of Alabama were in the 11 counties listed above, and one-third of the total were in Jefferson County.

In considering these figures it should be borne in mind that

1 They are for a date (March 15, 1948) prior to the greatly extended coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance program brought about by the amendments to the Social Security Act in 1950 (81st Cong., 2d sess.).

2. At that time, self employment, family employment, casual employment, agricultural employment, domestic service, Government employment, railroad employment, and employment by certain types of nonprofit organizations were excluded from coverage.

Source: "Part II State Reports, No. 1, Alabama; County Business Patterns, First Quarter, 1948; business establishments, Employment and Taxable Payrolls, by Industry Groups under Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program." (Published by the Office of Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, 1949.)

Excessive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from one of my constituents who under the free enterprise system has developed one of the outstanding industries in Ohio where hundreds of people are gainfully employed. His record is that of many other fine Americans. Under permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert a portion of his letter in the RECORD, as follows:

The creeping socialism and paralysis the Trumanites and New Dealers are imposing upon the economy of America not only leads to inflation but to subsequent desperate conditions and I am anxious for you to show good statesmanship in protecting the people who are primarily responsible for progress which is being made. These people are those who are the so-called higher bracket income men but who are taxed beyond all

reason for their monetary return and accomplishments.

In my case, it is the worst kind of confiscation, far exceeding Great Britain who, in 1950, averaged \$181 for every man, woman, and child in the country as against United States of America average for the same period of \$361. The average is ridiculously low compared to the penalties inflicted upon the higher-income tax men who achieve and specifically my case now is that out of 300 working days of long hours and considerable responsibility I work for the Government 279.4 days and only 20.6 for myself.

With this kind of taxation, it is impossible for me to continue to create jobs for others and you will soon find that the overall picture will give substantially diminishing returns by killing the goose that laid the golden eggs.

This tragedy has already taken effect as I am employing less than half the top number of men because I will not take the chance of being completely wiped out in my effort to continue under the so-called free-enterprise system.

You are going to find a lot more of this before you know it and before it is too late, we had better do something about it.

This Week's Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if you can keep your head while others are losing theirs—maybe you do not understand the situation.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of Congress want to lend their cooperation and full support to National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I hope all employers and everyone in the District will cooperate in every way not only during that week but throughout the entire year. It is not simply the humanitarian desire to assist in every possible way although of course all of us feel that deeply. However, the physically handicapped have established a record that proves beyond any doubt that they can do a wonderful job. In other words, resting their case solely on the proof they have established, they have shown conclusively that they can make a great contribution to America if they are given the opportunity.

Employers would do well to study the record and I am sure that they will see

that even without any regard whatsoever to humanitarian motives, but simply basing it on the desire to have a job well done, there is every reason to employ the physically handicapped.

I know all Members of Congress want to join with me in urging the people of the Nation to cooperate in every possible way.

Annual Address by Hon. Harry McMullan as President of the Association of Attorneys General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS SMITH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, on August 6, 1951, in Seattle, Wash., Hon. Harry McMullan, attorney general of the State of North Carolina, delivered the annual address of the president of the Association of Attorneys General. His address was a thoughtful and scholarly presentation of some of the questions and problems with which the Members of Congress should be and are concerned. Mr. McMullan is an honored and distinguished public servant, and one whose service has been outstanding not only in his native State but also in many matters of national importance. He has upon occasions appeared before congressional committees on matters concerning which he had been particularly well informed.

I feel that his annual address as president of the National Association of Attorneys General is such that it will be worth while to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We are grateful to Gen. Smith Troy for the invitation extended to us to have the forty-fifth annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General in Seattle in this great State of Washington. A meeting held here is of significant interest to us all and particularly to the members of the association from the eastern part of the United States who have not had the previous opportunity to see this wonderful northwest country of which we have had just a preview.

The members of this association who are involved in politics, more or less, in their home States are happy to come to these meetings where for a day it is adjourned and where it has nothing whatever to do with the business of this association or the cordial relations between members attending this gathering. It is most refreshing to us all to get out of the sphere of politics for a while and from a completely nonpartisan standpoint view the interest of the country as a whole as well as from the standpoint of the individual States that go to make up this mighty Nation. Here it makes no difference whether or not a man is a Democrat or a Republican. The only political organization we draw the line on is that one affiliated with

Moscow and the masters of the Kremlin across the seas.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Over the years since the creation of the National Association of Attorneys General in 1907, the attorneys general of the States, as individuals and through our association, have been concerned with the preservation and improvement of our Federal system, with the retention of the basic genius of that system as a proper balance of power between State and Federal Governments during decades of rapid and accelerating change.

We might remind ourselves that the question of relations between the States and the Central Government has been considered by the ablest students of American government—by the authors of the Federalist, by Lord Bryce, by Woodrow Wilson, and others—to be the cardinal question of the American Federal system. As Wilson observed, it is not only the leading question but one which must be continuously restudied and new solutions found for emerging problems as they present themselves for public consideration and governmental action.

These are persisting questions which we as attorneys general face, within our own States and in relations between our States and the Federal Government; and they demand our attention more today than they did 45 years ago when our association was formed. The changes which have occurred during these years—economic, political, social, and international changes—have given new form to the problems we face; they have given rise to demands from the people for new functions and new services by Government and have occasioned the most enormous mushrooming in the activities and expenditures of Government in a short span of years that history has record of. Thoughtful citizens—those who know and understand the basic purposes, methods, and objectives of the American form of Government—and our predecessors in this association have been prominent in that group—have endeavored to accomplish needed changes within the framework of our Federal system, as the best means of preserving freedom of the individual and of maintaining the people's control and direction over Government.

I should like to review briefly some of the major activities of the National Association of Attorneys General since our Miami meeting last year. Most of these developments will be treated in greater detail, of course, in reports of the various standing and special committees which will be submitted and discussed later on.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROHIBITING THE EXERCISE OF ORIGINAL JURISDICTION BY THE SUPREME COURT IN SUITS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND A STATE

In 1892 Chief Justice Fuller, with the concurrence of Mr. Justice Lamar, said, in dissenting opinion in *United States v. Texas* (36 L. Ed. 621), that under the Constitution the Supreme Court clearly did not have original jurisdiction to entertain a suit by the United States against an individual State. Since that time, such jurisdiction, however, has been many times exercised as was most recently done in the suits against Texas, Louisiana, and California as to territorial lands.

To any student of the history of the adoption of the Constitution, it is obvious that the framers of the Constitution did not contemplate that such jurisdiction was granted and they specifically rejected a proposal to grant such authority to the Supreme Court. I am confident the Constitution would never have been adopted with a provision in it authorizing the exercise of such jurisdiction. The alarming situation which has developed

as to State rights and encroachments by the national sovereignty was ably discussed by Gen. Abram P. Staples, now deceased, at our 1946 meeting in Los Angeles.

It is clear to all of us that with federally appointed judges serving for life, umpires are selected and paid by the United States who are permitted by their own decisions and assumptions of authority to pass upon the conflicting rights of the National and State Governments.

In the Texas tideland case less than a majority of these federally selected umpires decided the case in favor of the National Government over the vigorous dissents of three of their fellows. This was the first time in history in which less than the majority of the Supreme Court has decided a great constitutional question.

By the means of constitutional interpretation, the Federal judges, if the present tendency continues, will effectively and completely destroy the sovereignties of the several States thought to have been so carefully retained in the Constitution.

The only possible remedy for this steadily worsening situation is the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, clearly defining and limiting the authority of the Supreme Court as to controversies between the National and State Governments.

Upon the application of legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, Congress is required by article V of the Constitution to call a convention for proposing amendments which would be adopted when ratified by legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the States. This procedure would be free from the danger of Presidential veto and, in my opinion, would be a popular move among the States of the Union who are today so justifiably concerned about the enormous encroachments on the States' rights under the aegis of the Supreme Court interpretations.

It seems to me that it would be wise at this conference to consider this subject and the desirability of appointing a special committee of this association to consider the suggested amendment and others designed to remedy this situation.

The whole problem should be explored by the States unless we are to stand by and allow our dual form of government to be only a name and a memory.

ORGANIZED CRIME

The problem of organized crime has been of increasing concern to the attorneys general since the end of World War II, and as you will recall, led us in October 1949, while we were meeting in St. Paul, to call upon State and Federal agencies to join cooperatively in stamping out the growing menace. The presence and appearance of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER on this program highlights this subject for us. We have discussed the problem at regional and national meetings since the St. Paul meeting, and we shall discuss it in all aspects while we are here. We have cooperated with various groups in developing suggestions for action. Some of these suggestions necessitate legislation at the National, State, or local levels; some involve more determined and effective enforcement and prosecution, some require cooperation among the various units and levels of government. All should be pursued diligently to the end that professional law violators and corrupters may be exposed and their operations controlled in order that the people's confidence in their Government may be sustained and strengthened.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Civil defense and the maintenance of internal security are questions which have

concerned and will continue to concern us. Our present activity in this area is, of course, the domestic or internal reflection of the cold war abroad as well as the shooting war in Korea. The States share a major portion of responsibility, with the Federal Government and with the cities and other localities, for establishing effective plans and programs to minimize loss of life and productive capacity within the Nation in the event that war comes to our borders. As attorneys general we have been called upon—and in all probability will be called upon increasingly in the future—to participate in drafting interstate pacts and agreements to permit the State and local governments to cooperate in civil defense preparations.

INTERNAL SECURITY—SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

As during past wars and emergencies, we bear a general responsibility for the maintenance of security within our States. During the past year we have called upon the secretariat to undertake the preparation and distribution of a periodical, Digest of State and Local Activities Relating to Internal Security, as a means of clearing among ourselves information concerning State and local laws, court decisions, and executive actions relating to the control of subversive activities and the maintenance of internal security. The program has progressed far enough so that we are able to evaluate its contribution to our work—and it has made available a vast amount of material for the first time. This problem of maintaining internal security affects the public interest in many ways. Too lax controls over dissident elements menace the continued existence of the Nation; too restrictive controls threaten the very freedoms for the individual which the great charters of American history proclaim. As responsible officials and as citizens, we face the difficult and inescapable task of preserving the maximum freedom for individuals consistent with the survival of the Nation. It was for our way of life as well as for our lives that we fought in the last war—and for which we must prepare and be strong enough to fight again if that should prove necessary.

FEDERAL TAXATION OF STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

During the year the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States suggested to the House Ways and Means Committee the taxation of income from State and local securities, thus resurrecting the fight which had been defeated in the previous session of Congress.

As this association in its meeting in Jacksonville had gone on record as opposing this form of taxation by the Federal Government, I felt it my duty to appear as a witness before the Ways and Means Committee and state the objections of my State to this form of taxation and to advise them of the action theretofore taken by this association. Copies of my oral and written statement were furnished to members of this association.

In my opinion this is the most dangerous threat to the sovereignty of all of the States and their taxing agencies which has as yet occurred. If successful, it would, I believe, be fatal to the dual form of government under which we now live.

We are fortunate in having on the program at this meeting, representing the Conference on State Defense, the person who has led the fight to defeat this legislation in Congress. I am sure that you will be very much interested in hearing the important and interesting statement which will be made by Mr. Austin J. Tobin, executive director of the Port of New York Authority.

It is my opinion that this meeting has no business of greater importance than the consideration of this problem and the consolidation of our efforts to defeat this legislation.

TIDELANDS

This association has adopted resolutions at its former meetings supporting the efforts of the several States to secure the enactment of legislation in Congress quieting the title to their submerged lands since the startling decision of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against California. A report of the committee having this matter in charge will be presented to the meeting during the session and I am sure it will be of great interest to all. We are greatly indebted to Gen. Hall Hammond, chairman of the tidelands committee of this association, and the members of this committee, for the splendid work done by them in presenting the views of this association on this subject to the present Congress.

FEDERAL SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Problems of social-security coverage and benefits have faced most of the States during 1951. As a result of 1950 amendments to the Federal Social Security Act, the States were enabled to extend old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to employees of their State and local governments.

The attorneys general cooperated with other State officials through the drafting committee of the Council of State Governments in developing suggested enabling legislation to meet requirements of the Federal act in extending such coverage. And in many States the attorneys general have participated in drafting the required contracts between the State and Federal Security Agency. The administration of these laws and contracts will involve continuing relationships between Federal and State agencies, in common with the administration of other Federal-State programs. The attorneys general of the central regional group, during their discussion of this question earlier this year submitted for consideration by the association the recommendation that the Council of State Governments offer its cooperation to the Federal Security Administration in working out the various Federal-State questions which will arise as a result of the extension of OASI coverage to State and local employees, with the objective of achieving (1) uniformity of administration, and (2) definition of areas in which Federal determinations and areas in which State determinations shall be accepted as controlling. This proposal has been discussed with the staff of the Council of State Governments, and in regard to specific ways and means for acting on it if the association so desires, may I suggest that the incoming executive committee be authorized to discuss the question and develop necessary procedures jointly with the council.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Cooperation by the attorneys general can be of assistance in a variety of ways in strengthening the operations of State compacts. During the past year, various members of the association have made proposals for cooperation by the individual attorneys general in two specific situations: (1) With respect to the administration of the interstate compact for supervision of out-of-State parolees and probationers, and (2) with respect to implementing the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act. The parole and probation compact was developed in the first instance, back in the 1930's, very largely through the efforts of the attorneys general and as part of the so-called interstate crime-control program. This year marks the culmination of efforts to obtain enactment of the compact by all of the States, and thus this becomes the first interstate compact in American history to be entered into by all 48 States.

This compact is not self-executing, however; it involves continuing administration

of parolees and probationers by the supervisory officials of the several States, and its administration frequently involves the local courts, prosecutors, and enforcement officials in the localities where these parolees and probationers may seek residence and employment. Misunderstanding of the operation of the compact at the local level may—and in a number of cases has—given rise to jurisdictional disputes and to unwise or unjust treatment of the persons affected. It is largely a matter of explaining to the appropriate authorities at the local level the purposes, objectives, and mechanics of the compact—and to accomplish this, some of our members suggest that we discuss the problem individually with the compact administrators of our several States, and that in cooperation with our several compact administrators we prepare suitable explanatory memoranda with annotations and make this material available to local authorities for their information and guidance. Since the ability of the States to handle this problem will be determined as much by the administration as by the enactment of the compact, this would seem to merit serious consideration as means of strengthening State government. The Council of State Governments has available and can supply us with the pertinent information which we might include in these memoranda.

UNIFORM RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF SUPPORT ACT

Implementing the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act presents a substantially similar situation. Here, in the short space of 2 years, over three-quarters of the States have become linked together in a program for enforcing court awards of financial support. Actual operations under these laws will affect the welfare departments, local courts, and local prosecutors, and I urge your individual cooperation with these agencies in implementing the Support Act—to demonstrate anew the capacity of the States to handle their responsibilities in an effective, affirmative manner.

JUDICIAL INTERFERENCE WITH LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

In *Tenny* against *Brandhove*, decided on May 21, 1951, the Supreme Court decided, by a divided court, a case of great importance to all of the States. It was held that a State legislative committee investigating un-American activities was not liable for damages in a suit brought in the Federal district court under the Federal civil-rights statute. A contrary decision would have imperiled the freedom of action of the committees of the legislatures of all of the States.

Many attorneys general individually joined in the *amicus curiae* brief which was filed in the case in support of the counsel representing the legislative committee.

USE AND MISUSE OF HABEAS CORPUS

At the 1946 conference in Los Angeles, Gen. James A. Emmert, of Indiana, presented an interesting and constructive discussion on the use and misuse of the habeas corpus writ by prisoners.

The resort to habeas corpus proceedings before Federal district judges by defendants who have been convicted of serious crimes and convictions sustained by the highest appellate court in the State and certiorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States has presented a serious obstacle to the enforcement of criminal laws in all of the States. The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that denial of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States is required, in the absence of special circumstances, to constitute exhaustion of State remedies as a prerequisite to a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, has

served only to add additional burdens and involve endless complications in securing final disposition of such cases (*Darr v. Burford* (339 U. S. 198, 94 L. ed. 781)).

In my State, we now have pending three cases in which four defendants have been convicted by courts of competent jurisdiction of capital felonies and convictions sustained by the supreme court of our State and petitions for certiorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States. In one instance, the defendants are supported by an organization which has followed the party line in making its appeal to the public and to the courts in their behalf. The other cases are sponsored by a national organization which takes this course without regard to the enormity of the crime or the fact that the defendants have had every opportunity to present all legitimate defenses.

Under the present status of Federal decisions, the district judge is empowered, in effect, to reverse the decisions of the highest court of the State and disregard the denial of writs of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States. Many States have enacted laws similar to that adopted here providing for hearings upon writs of *coram nobis* as to matters which prisoners assert violate constitutional rights which were not raised at the time of their trials and convictions. This, however, is far from providing any solution to the problem. The prisoners can and do continue to seek endless hearings upon writs of habeas corpus in Federal district courts—in most cases rehearsing matters already adjudicated by trial and appellate courts.

This presents such a serious problem to all of the States, it appears to me that it would be wise at this conference to set up a committee to make a careful study with respect to it and report to our next conference as to recommended State or Federal legislation which may be thought to provide a solution.

It is suggested that the Federal statute should be amended so that if a defendant, who raises constitutional issues in a criminal trial or could have raised such issues, carries his case to the highest appellate court of the State (or could have done so) and certiorari is denied by the Supreme Court of the United States or the defendant fails to apply for such certiorari, then the Federal courts shall not have jurisdiction to entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and to again pass upon the same constitutional issues which have been raised or could have been raised by such defendant in the State trial. Such amendment should specifically prohibit the Federal courts from entertaining such a petition upon the grounds of extraordinary circumstances of an urgent nature, assuming that the State courts have already reviewed the criminal trial as set forth above.

APPRECIATION

I will always be grateful to the association for the great honor bestowed upon me and my State of North Carolina by my election to the office of president of this association. I hold the office of attorney general in any State in great esteem. It is a real honor to each of us to hold this position in our respective States. To head such an outstanding group as this it seems to me is something anyone would greatly value.

During the year all of you have cooperated fully in the work of this association for which I express my sincere thanks. I believe that there is now and will continue to be much important work for this association. We hope to have the attendance at our annual meetings of every State attorney general and in this combination of forces make this organization more and more effective as the years pass.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my views in the past favoring a strong Voice of America program. However, I feel it is my duty to call to the attention of the House some of the ridiculous things being carried on by the Voice of America.

Many experienced promotion and advertising men are assisting in the Crusade for Freedom messages being delivered by the media of helium inflated balloons. Mr. W. Collette, of the Oak Rubber Co., in Ravenna, Ohio, in my district is one of those helping in the cause. So again I repeat, there are constructive ways to get the right type of propaganda behind the iron curtain.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House the column by John Crosby, the well-known radio critic, in Wednesday's New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Crosby had just seen a new documentary film by the State Department titled "In Defense of Peace." This film will be shown to millions of persons overseas in our Government's attempt to win friends.

Here is Mr. Crosby's opinion of the film:

If this is the best we can do in the propaganda line, we ought to save our money—in Defense of Peace is little more than a collection of newsreel shots.

Crosby goes on to say that the narration in the film is "about as inspiring as a Latin textbook." Many of the scenes, he says, are "a demonstration of our native opulence and productive abundance sufficiently impressive to embitter a Balkan peasant against those rich Americans for decades to come."

Finally Crosby asks: "This is propaganda? For whom—the Russians or us?" All in all, this column is one additional bit of confirmation of what many experts in psychological warfare have been saying for a long time—that the Voice of America is being managed by amateurish fumbler. Let us hope that Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett and the entire crew of third-raters will resign before it is too late and make way for some real experts.

I think the Members of this House will agree with me after they have read the Crosby column printed below:

WE'RE MASTERS AT ADVERTISING, CHILDREN AT PROPAGANDA

(By John Crosby)

Last week in the Alsop column Stewart Alsop, writing from Paris, reiterated what we should all now know—but don't. The Russian propaganda line—the Russians want nothing but peace—has bitten into the minds of Europeans far more deeply than we believe possible. It's a great word, an overpowering slogan and a radiant hope the Russians have got hold of—peace. The fact that we Americans don't believe a word of it doesn't do much to countermand it in the minds of people overseas.

What are we doing to counteract it? The other night the NBC television network with a great show of pride unveiled for the first time anywhere in America a State Department official documentary film called *In Defense of Peace*, one of our own propaganda efforts, which has been shown to 40,000,000 people in 71 countries. If this is the best we can do in the propaganda line, we ought to save our money.

In Defense of Peace is little more than a collection of newsreel shots, and I'll bet there isn't a single one you haven't seen at least 15 times. The Russians fighting in the suburbs of Berlin. The great motion picture portraits at Yalta—Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin—smiling, triumphant, and in the light of subsequent events, a little futile. On and on it went—the German surrender in the schoolhouse, the flag being raised at Iwo, MacArthur on the *Missouri* ("Let us pray that peace be now restored to the world and that God will preserve it always."), the birth of the United Nations at San Francisco—great scenes, all of them.

But also familiar ones, and ones that mean different things to different people all over the world. They were knit together by a narration which was as factual as a Latin textbook and about as inspiring. You gathered that these things had occurred—Is there anyone around who doesn't know that?—and that we had had some part in them. That's about all.

But it is in the aftermath of war, that period when the Russians and the free world ceased to be friends and became enemies, wherein our message to the rest of the world—if we have one—should lie. Well, the film showed innumerable shots of great ship-board cranes lifting those boxes into the holds of ships (the Marshall plan), of tractors happily run by French farmers, of piles of grain unloaded in Greece. We showed how our vastly wealthy country blew up its warplanes, beat its cannon into plowshares, and then beat the plowshares back into cannon again. It was a demonstration of our native opulence and productive abundance sufficiently impressive to embitter a Balkan peasant against those rich Americans for decades to come.

This is propaganda? For whom—the Russians or us? When I was in Rome, a man in the Italian Foreign Ministry told my traveling companion, Les Midgley, foreign editor of *Look*, something I've never quite forgotten: "We Italians deeply appreciate everything America has done for us since the war. We know very well that without your tremendous Marshall plan there would have been nothing here but anarchy. But sometimes we wonder why you don't come forth with something like Wilson's Fourteen Points or the Atlantic Charter, something men can have faith in. And they didn't cost one cent."

In other words, we are exporting everything except ideas, which require nothing more elaborate than a pencil and paper. (And a brain. And a conviction.) The Russians have very effectively labeled us as warmongers all over the world. We retaliate by exhibiting films showing 40,000,000 people overseas how many tanks, planes, and guns we are producing. This is reassuring to us and possibly to the heads of foreign states and foreign armies. But hardly to the people who have clutched to their breasts the word that Russia has made its own—peace.

A basket of grain is a very effective bit of propaganda when someone hands it to you—but that's the task of the Marshall plan, not of the Voice of America, which produced this film. A picture of a basket of grain won't do anything for a hungry man except make him hungrier. Propaganda is the dissemination of ideas, preferably the dissemination of a single overpowering idea. The Russians have embraced peace so effectively we'll never get it away from them (at least in the minds of

most Europeans). But we've got a word of our own, "freedom"—"something," as the Italian remarked, "men can have faith in"—and the Russians will never get that one away from us.

If we could become, in the minds of the outside world, the exponents of freedom; if we could show them how free men live; if we could, in short, take over freedom as the Russians have taken over peace, we'd be in the propaganda business. As it is, we're just sending out stale newareels.

FSA Report Reveals Increase in Jobless Persons Over 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks a news release recently appearing in the local press which is of particular interest to all concerned with the welfare of our elderly citizens. This release entitled "FSA Report Reveals Increase in Jobless Persons Over 65," follows:

FSA REPORT REVEALS INCREASE IN JOBLESS PERSONS OVER 65

"Personnel manager wanted; must be under 40.

"Salesmen needed, 20 to 35 years old" The complex sociological problems brought about by an increasing population of old people in an economic world where the emphasis is on youth, caused President Truman last year to call a national conference on aging.

For several days at the Hotel Shoreham, 816 representatives of Government and private agencies all over the country discussed methods of bringing about a "basic social change" so elderly persons might live a happier life during their declining, supposedly nonproductive years.

The Federal Security Agency, sponsor of the conference, has just released a 311-page report on that experiment in planning. Entitled "Man and His Years," the report was published by Health Publications Institute, Inc., Raleigh, N. C.

In a foreword, Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, points out that "having made life longer, we must now work to make longer life worth while."

CONFERENCES IN 17 STATES

Deputy Federal Security Administrator John L. Thurston reports that during World War II, when thousands of elderly persons were called on to make effective contributions in manufacturing and service occupations, "suspicion arose that there were errors in the notion of the unemployability of older people."

The conference was admittedly an exploratory forum, and the FSA report does little beside sum up the problems of the aged, and point the way for an attack on those problems.

However, Clark Tibbetts, conference director, reports that since the conference adjourned there have been local conferences on the same subject in 17 States. Such groups as the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Psychological Association have included discussions of the problems of aging in their annual meetings.

OLDSTERS ON INCREASE

For purposes of the conference, the report says old age was considered to be 65 years old or over, although it points out persons should be judged on their "psychological age and abilities rather than their chronological age."

There are between 11,000,000 and 12,000,000 persons in the United States 65 or older; by 1975, it is estimated, there will be 17,000,000 to 20,000,000.

There are now four times as many old people in the country as there were 50 years ago. In 1890, 68 percent of men over 65 were still working; by 1940, that percentage had dropped to 45 percent.

Certain recommendations are made, however, for increasing the participation in national life of these persons "too old to qualify, too young to die."

The report points out no figures are kept on the productivity and absenteeism of the over-65 labor force during World War II; a recommendation is made that such pertinent data be kept as the mobilization program increases and more elderly workers are called back to work.

The report's condensation of the discussion of the conference section on health maintenance suggests broader programs to prevent premature disability and care of disabled older persons.

Throughout the report, rehabilitation programs on a community level are suggested to return disabled workers to some form of productivity.

"It is urged * * * that society free itself from the traditional prejudices against old age and launch, through various education channels, a campaign to accent the positive characteristics of the aging for continued occupation usefulness, citizenship, and family life, the report says.

Loss of Freedom by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) *Herald-Whig* of Wednesday, October 3, 1951:

LOSS OF FREEDOM BY DEFAULT

This is the freest country on earth. The basic individual freedoms are guaranteed by the Constitution. No one has suggested legal elimination of any guaranty of liberty. Yet there is danger of loss of freedom by default, while the form of legal freedom is being scrupulously maintained.

Here is how it could happen: Government has become a huge and powerful machine which reaches far into the private lives of the American people. Under the pretext of serving the people, it could become their master. This can happen only if Government can exert influence over the minds of the people through control of the sources of information.

Totalitarian countries have propaganda ministries, through which all public information is issued. The people are told only as much of the conduct of their public affairs as the masters deem expedient. This is why bad news never comes from public sources in Moscow. It is the reason for the long regime of Hitler in a literate country. The people are unable to combat the things they don't recognize.

American editors, meeting in Evanston Monday, and a convention of news executives in San Francisco last week pointed to similar dangers in our country. There has been a growing tendency toward censorship at the source of official news. Each Federal bureau has a competent public relations staff which is nothing less than a propaganda machine. Many Government executives withhold some of their records from newsmen and thus from the public.

This practice was developed in the guise of public security in two world wars. Its need then was questionable. Newspapers displayed good judgment in the handling of war news. Censorship in peace, even the censorship at source, is unnecessary and dangerous to the interests of the people.

The three-way classification of departmental news for release is conducted by persons who are in many cases not qualified to judge. It can result in skullduggery. It makes possible concealment as top secrets of the personal derelictions of officials. It enables servants of the people to hide mistakes.

Last week a Washington order was given to the Office of Price Stabilization. It advised the bureau to withhold from the public information that might be embarrassing to the bureau. Perhaps it didn't occur to those responsible for the order that price control is the vital business of the public and that anything embarrassing should be told.

The order was withdrawn after it had brought on vigorous criticism. The point is not this special order or its withdrawal. It is the alarming fact that the power to withhold information from the people exists.

Newspapers are the chief vehicles of information. The facts they print are of vital interest to the people and, in many cases, the press affords the only means for obtaining information. But only the people and their elected lawmakers can assure access to public records.

This privilege some day may mean the difference between freedom and dictatorship. It is high time for Congress to reaffirm the people's right to full information and to see that it is made available.

Six Out of Ten Favor Limiting Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, has made the following findings:

Hard-pressed taxpayers in the upper income brackets, who are faced with a new boost when Congress passes the tax bill, can take comfort in this fact:

A drive to limit Federal taxes to a maximum of 25 percent of income is winning the approval of the American public.

A cross-section survey of adults in all income brackets found that nearly 6 out of every 10 favor the idea of limiting the Federal taxing power at the 25 percent figure, so that no one, whatever his income, would have to pay more than one-fourth to Uncle Sam's tax collectors.

The tax limit drive, started some years ago by a Chicago businessman, has gained considerable momentum lately.

The legislatures of 25 States have gone on record urging a constitutional amendment to set the 25 percent limit. If 32 States adopt

the resolution, Congress will be forced to act.

Persons in the upper income brackets have, for obvious reasons, long been in favor of a tax limit. At present the Government takes up to about 90 percent on very large incomes.

Whether the general public, living on modest incomes, would approve the idea of letting the wealthy off more easily through a 25 percent limit has always been a question.

To find the answer, the American Institute of Public Opinion put this issue before the country:

"It has been suggested that a law be passed so the Federal Government could not take more than 25 percent, or one-fourth of any person's income in taxes except in wartime. Would you favor or oppose this 25 percent top limit?"

Here is the vote:

	Percent
Favor limit.....	59
Oppose.....	31
No opinion.....	10

As might be expected, persons who are in the upper-income brackets voted overwhelmingly in today's survey for the tax change, but those in more modest circumstances are only slightly less in favor.

The difference is illustrated by this vote by educational levels

25 percent income tax limit?

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Favor.....	63	63	53
Oppose.....	34	30	30
No opinion.....	3	7	17

The first State to approve the suggested plan was Wyoming, on February 23, 1939. The latest was Utah, in June 1951.

Others on record, listed in the order that they adopted their resolutions, are Rhode Island, Mississippi, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Arkansas, Indiana, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Delaware, Illinois, Texas, Wisconsin, Alabama, New Jersey, Kentucky, Nebraska, Louisiana, Montana, Kansas, Nevada, and Florida.

Succeeding legislative sessions in five of these States—Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kentucky, and Alabama—have, however, sought to rescind the actions of their predecessors.

Exorbitant Inspection Fees Charged by Federal OPS Meat Inspectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to submit an article from the September 29, 1951, issue of the Daily Signal, published at Crowley, La., the rice capital of America, as follows:

AREA MARKETS PROTEST FEE CHARGED BY FEDERAL OPS MEAT INSPECTORS

Cost of inspection of meat by Federal graders under the regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization is being protested by markets throughout the area, some of whom report the fee to be as high as 2 cents per pound.

The fee is based on the visit by the inspector, Earl Byrd, of Lafayette, they ex-

plained, whose services are billed to them at the rate of \$3.60 per hour, plus 7 cents per mile. Floyd Robichaux, of the Robichaux Market, explained.

One visit to that market when the inspector graded seven quarters of calves was billed at the sum of \$4.50, Robichaux said, and the estimated weight of the seven quarters of meat was 210 pounds. That comes to slightly more than 2 cents per pound, he figured, and with the high price of livestock, it is almost impossible to come out at present retail prices even without such exorbitant charges.

The bill was received from the Livestock Branch, 314 A, United States customs house in New Orleans, Robichaux said.

Robichaux explained that it is very difficult to obtain beef for ground meat for the six school lunchrooms they endeavor to supply at the wholesale price of 65 cents per pound. Beef type cattle are selling at prices so high that you can't possibly buy one, dress it and make ground meat to sell it at 65 cents per pound, without having to pay 2 cents for the inspection.

The butcher stated that the inspector reports that he works from 4 a. m. to 10 p. m., traveling out of Lafayette to cover this area.

Markets all over the area are protesting the charges, packing house salesmen reported to Robichaux, who is wondering if some other arrangement can be made for grading of the meat.

The Story of a Loaf of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here is a story in which every American consumer should be interested. It is the story of a loaf of bread, that basic staple which is a part of every meal we eat, and the cost of which must be an item figured into the budget of every housewife.

In the following article published recently in the National Grange Monthly, all the facts about the production of a loaf of bread and the factors contributing to its final cost to the consumer are clearly and simply stated. I am sure all Members of Congress will be interested in having the important information contained in this excellent report on the production of bread, the "staff of life":

THE STORY OF A LOAF OF BREAD—How THICK A SLICE OF THE DOLLAR THAT IS SPENT FOR BREAD DOES THE FARMER GET? WHO GETS THE REST OF IT? HERE ARE SOME FACTS ON "THE STAFF OF LIFE"

Practically everyone eats bread. As a Nation we consume an estimated 40,000,000 loaves a day. Wheat—its principal ingredient—represents about 70,000,000 of our cultivated acreage and accounts for 6 percent of farm income. Commercial flour milling and breadbaking, the two major manufacturing steps are among the oldest, largest, and most mechanically developed food processing industries in the world. Grain products, of which bread is the most important, provide one-third of the thiamine, one-fourth of the calories, protein, iron, and niacin and one-seventh of the calcium consumed by the American people.

Consumers and farmers are practically certain to be interested in the price of bread. How thick a slice of the bread dollar does

the farmer get? How does this compare with the gross margin of the miller, the baker, the retailer? How much of the price is represented by wages, packaging, other ingredients? How much goes for profits and salaries of executives? How big a slice is taken by taxes? To provide some answers, the Grange, working with Grocery Manufacturers of America, made bread the subject of its fourth study of price spread (earlier studies dealt with milk, oranges, and canned baby food).

COMPLETE PICTURE

As a starting point, they took United States Department of Agriculture figures for 1950, and then filled in the gaps with information gathered from congressional hearings, company financial reports, and material gathered directly from GMA member companies. The result is a virtually complete picture of what happened to the consumer's bread dollar in 1950. The picture was then brought up to date to include important 1951 developments.

Two symbolic loaves of bread highlight survey findings which apply to a standard 1-pound loaf of white bread sold in the retail grocery store, as follows:

Loaf No. 1: How the 1950 bread dollar was shared

	Percent	Cents
Farmer.....	10.6	2.9
Transport.....	21.0	.3
Ingredient.....	3.4	.5
Miller.....	4.7	.7
Baker.....	54.2	8.0
Retailer.....	16.0	2.4
Retail price.....	100.0	14.8

Loaf No. 2: How the 1950 bread dollar was divided among various costs

	Percent	Cents
Farm value (raw ingredient).....	10.6	2.9
Transport and handling.....	3.0	.4
Packaging and supplies.....	0.8	1.0
Wages and salaries.....	37.1	5.5
Executive salaries.....	1.8	2.7
Advertising.....	3.3	.5
Taxes.....	6.8	1.0
All other expenses.....	14.8	2.2
Net profit.....	6.8	1.0
Retail price.....	100.0	14.8

Loaf No. 1 shows the percentage slice going to each stage of proceedings and distribution for performing its special service. The slices don't represent profits but the total margin. Out of this the farmer, the miller, the baker, etc., had to pay their various costs of operation. The farmer's share of the bread dollar in 1950—including both the wheat and other raw ingredients—was 20 percent. The remainder—80 percent—went to pay for the costs and profits of all the intermediate steps—grain storage and transportation, flour milling, the processing of other ingredients, bread baking, and retailing. The largest share of the bread dollar—54 percent—went to the baker for his double function of baking and wrapping the bread and delivering it to retail stores.

The grocer received 16 percent for his labor to handle and sell the bread at retail. The other processing and distributing operations together accounted for the remaining 10 percent of the bread dollar.

COST BREAKDOWN

Loaf No. 2 slices the bread in a different way. Combining the costs at all stages, it breaks the price down in terms of the various types of expense involved. Again, of course, the value of the raw ingredients was 20 percent. The biggest element was wages. They took 37 percent of the bread dollar, or nearly half the 80-percent spread. Taxes took 7 percent. This was as much as packaging and

all other noningredient supplies. Transportation and advertising each took about 3 percent. Executive salaries amounted to 2 percent. All other expenses totaled 18 percent, including fuel, rent, depreciation, repair, and maintenance on buildings, machinery, delivery, and store equipment, heat, power, telephone, interest, and bad-debt losses. Net profits, after taxes, of retailers, bakers, millers, and suppliers of other ingredients claimed the final 7 percent of the dollar.

Table I completes the job by combining the information in the two loaves. It shows how much these various costs were at each processing and distributing level. They are all shown in terms of a 1-pound loaf. To make the necessary "conversions" the study used the factors shown in the box. Let's follow the process through to see what the figures mean in terms of the wheat which the farmer sells.

THE FARMER'S SHARE

To mill 100 pounds of flour, the miller needs 2.35 bushels of wheat. From this, he obtains, in addition to the flour, about 40 pounds of millfeed which he sells as a valuable byproduct. The baker who buys the 100 pounds of flour adds water and about 14 pounds or more of other ingredients such as shortening, sugar, dry milk, yeast, etc. As a result, he gets about 154 one-pound loaves. In terms of wheat, one bushel (66 pounds) produces enough flour to make 66 one-pound loaves of bread.

Now, let's see what table I means in terms of wheat. In 1950, farmers received an average price at the farm of about \$2 per bushel of wheat. This would be about 3 cents per pound of bread. The table shows only 2½ cents for the farmer's share of the 14.8-cent loaf of bread.

This is because of the value of the millfeed credited against the cost of wheat—about \$4 cents per bushel of wheat or one-half cent per loaf of bread. This leaves only about \$1.66 per bushel to be charged against bread.

TRANSPORTATION AND INTERMEDIATE HANDLING

In moving from farm to flour mill, wheat is typically handled by country elevators, commission merchants, and terminal market elevators. It is transported, stored, inspected, and weighed. Additional transportation expense is incurred on flour, from miller to baker. In 1950, these costs averaged about 3 percent (4 cent per pound) of the retail price of bread. The figure does not include the cost of delivering bread from baker to retail store. The latter is reported in the baker's cost of operation.

The costs which enter into the retail price of bread at each marketing stage

	Cents per pound loaf	Percent
Retail price.....	14.8	100.0
Retail grocer's margin.....	2.4	
Wages and salaries.....	.8	
Executive salaries.....	.2	
Packaging and other supplies.....	.2	16.0
Advertising.....	.2	
All other expenses.....	.4	
Federal, State, and local taxes.....	.3	
Net profits.....	.3	
Baker's margin.....	8.0	
Packaging and other supplies.....	.6	
Wages and salaries (except executives).....	4.4	
Executive salaries.....	.04	54.2
Advertising.....	.3	
Federal, State, and local taxes.....	.6	
All other expenses.....	1.6	
Net profits.....	.46	
Flour miller's margin.....	.7	
Out-bound transportation.....	.10	
Packaging and other supplies.....	.13	
Wages and salaries (except executives).....	.23	4.7
Executive salaries.....	.02	
Advertising.....	.02	
Federal, State, and local taxes.....	.06	
All other expenses.....	.08	
Net profits.....	.06	

The costs which enter into the retail price of bread at each marketing stage—Continued

	Cents per pound loaf	Percent
Other ingredient processor's margin.....	0.5	
Out-bound transportation.....	.04	
Packaging and other supplies.....	.08	
Wages and salaries.....	.14	3.4
Executive salaries.....	.01	
Advertising.....	.01	
Federal taxes.....	.06	
All other expenses.....	.12	
Net profits.....	.09	
In-bound transportation and intermediate handling.....	.3	2.1
Wheat and flour.....	.25	
Other ingredients.....	.05	
Farmer.....	2.9	
Net farm value of wheat.....	2.6	
Gross farm value.....	3.0	19.6
Less millfeed credit.....	.4	
Net farm value other ingredients.....	.4	

Conversion factors: 2.35 bushels of wheat produces 100 pounds of flour and 40 pounds of millfeed; 1 bushel of wheat produces 43 pounds of flour and 17 pounds of millfeed; 1 pound of bread requires 0.65 pound of flour (or .912 pound of wheat); 100 pounds of flour produces 154 pounds of bread; 1 bushel of wheat produces 66 pounds of bread.

Army Progress in Troop Education and Information Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 6, 1951, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, I called attention, through remarks and insertion of an article from the America magazine to the increasingly important problem, challenging our high military officials, to provide our troops with fundamental knowledge of the reasons why they are being asked to wear a uniform.

This matter, in my considered judgment, is one vitally affecting the morale of the fighting men we are asking to leave their families and civilian occupations to defend this country against the Communist threat. The magazine editorial referred to certain writings of Mr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times, who had published constructive criticism of the deficiencies in the troop information and education program of the military.

I have today received an excellent letter from Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, Chief of Army Information, in which he explains the Army is well aware of their obligation in this sphere of military training and has made considerable advancement in their education program.

I am personally gratified at the progress achieved in the education program under the very able direction of Major General Parks and his competent staff;

I have every confidence he will continue to inspire even more substantial success in the expansion and efficiency of his information program. I know that all of you will join with me in complimenting General Parks and extending our best wishes in his devotion to duty in this most important work.

I am pleased to include his letter, at this point because I feel each and every Member of Congress will be particularly interested, especially in the statistics he reports.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF INFORMATION,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1951.
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DONOHUE: This is to thank you for your interest in the Army troop information and education programs as evidenced by your presentation to the Congress on June 6, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date entitled "Knowledge Inspires Fighting Morale."

As you so aptly stated, the troop information program is becoming increasingly more important to the military, and the Army realizes full well that a good soldier is a well informed soldier. With this in mind, all possible steps are being taken to bring this about as a direct part of leadership and command.

As you well know, perfection is difficult to achieve. However, in the face of increased mobilization, Korea, and European troop commitments, the troop information and education programs have been considerably broadened in scope in recent months, and further improvements are constantly under study.

In his series of articles in the New York Times, Dr. Benjamin Fine presented data that was essentially factual. However, it will be noted that his conclusions were based on observations at only a few Army establishments. It is felt that had he had the opportunity to visit more establishments, his conclusions may have been a little less critical of the over-all program.

The Army commanders concerned have initiated action to overcome defects in the programs as noted by Dr. Fine and others who have investigated this field of Army training. Many of the recommendations made by Dr. Fine already are a part of Army doctrine, and several others have been authorized and are in the process of being implemented. We well realize that there is yet room for improvement.

During recent months, basic regulations have been revised and brought up to date. Special orientation programs have been prepared for those entering the Army, those going into combat or occupied zones, those returning to the United States from overseas, or those returning to civilian life. Command conferences, Army troop information discussion topics, Armed Forces talks, overseas radio networks, newspapers, films, transcriptions, posters, pocket guides, and many other informational media are used to disseminate information to the troops.

During the past year, a special 40-hour discussion leaders' course has been made available to more than 12,500 officers and enlisted men of the Army as a means of providing the units in the field with the means of presenting the information program to the troops in the best possible manner.

Only recently have the troop information and education programs had adequate funds with which to operate. It is now adjusting its activities to meet the rapid pace necessary to keep up with constantly changing demands from an expanding Army.

The other principal function of the troop information and education division of this

office, the education phase, and one that is often overlooked, is worth mentioning here as a matter of information to you.

Currently, the participation in the Army education program is greater than in any period since the demobilization following World War II, a total of 228,000.

The largest educational system in the world, this program has the objective of increasing the efficiency of the Army by raising the academic educational level of its personnel.

In order that he be fully prepared to carry out his assignments, it is felt that a reasoning man must be educated to the point where he knows and believes in the causes for which he fights. To provide this education is a constantly recurring obligation to all leaders in every stage of training and combat.

During the past year, fifth-grade certificates have been issued to 15,029 Army personnel; eighth-grade certificates have been issued to 5,365; 28,852 have passed high-school graduation requirements; and 6,709 have passed the college-level general educational development test, which is equivalent to 1 year of college.

I hope this letter serves to give you a brief outline of the mission and functions of this highly important phase of training. Realizing your keen interest in the subject, I am enclosing a folder containing material written in support of the troop information and education programs, and a number of publications prepared by this office as an example of the types of information made available to the United States soldier. If you desire, I would be glad to put you on our mailing list for informational materials which I feel would be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD L. PARKS,
Major General, GSC, Chief of
Information.

Progress in Soil Conservation—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper prepared by H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, for the fourth Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, held at Montevideo in December 1950:

PROGRESS IN SOIL CONSERVATION

It is a pleasure and a great honor to attend this important meeting. Many of you are from South and Central America, Mexico, the West Indies, and North America. I have visited a number of these countries for the purpose of studying their agriculture and the condition of their lands. And recently the organization I represent—the Soil Conservation Service—has worked with student-trainees and other representatives from most of the American Republics on matters pertaining to soil conservation. (Incidentally, I have attended all of the Inter-American Conferences on Agriculture.)

Today national policy and public thinking among the countries of the world, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving man's basic natural resources, his productive land in particular. Research,

education, surveys, and the successful application of conservation measures have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and, also, the need for keeping the land permanently productive. No longer do we, in our thinking, planning, and action, put farmland erosion in one independent category by itself and forest depletion in another, or put floods and siltation under one heading and wildlife depletion in still another unrelated classification.

Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals all should—and under natural conditions, do—exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness. So it likewise is a mandate of nature of precisely the same order that the land and the water which makes land productive must be used and managed according to capability and need. This natural law, man too often has overlooked while busy with his daily affairs, or has been unable to understand. The practical application of this principle of capability and need is being demonstrated on a progressively wider scale from year to year in many parts of the world. Our modern, democratic approach, through the cooperative effort of landholder, Government, and the public together, is proving beneficial to both individuals and nations.

The miracle of modern soil conservation is not altogether the accomplishment of so much conservation work in so short a time, as some nations have achieved, but to my thinking, the real miracle is that perennial phenomenon whereby land, properly safeguarded and supplied with water and appropriate nutrients, goes on producing large quantities of wholesome food and other needed things indefinitely. Prudently used and properly cared for, land does not wear out or decline in productive capacity. It may even become more productive.

Hundreds of thousands of farmers in the United States have discovered this miracle of soil conservation during the last 20 years. Those who have made the discovery are now enthusiastic conservation farmers. They have become, or are fast becoming, true soil conservationists, because they have found that they can actually grow better crops, more per acre, by adopting and applying the better farming methods of modern soil conservation. This means that we are now using our knowledge of soil conservation to help nature perform the same general kind of miracle, over and over again, that she used for countless ages before men started interfering with her land plans by clearing off the forests, breaking out the prairie grasses, and tilling the soil.

THE WORLD'S LAND SITUATION

The present growing interest in soil conservation throughout the Americas and the world is doubly gratifying, because the problems of soil loss by erosion and waste of rainfall do not stop at any nation's boundaries. Conservation of the remaining areas of productive land is a world-wide task, as important as anything man has to do.

What's needed—what we must have, if it is humanly possible—is enough productive land somewhere on earth to feed the people of the world. Failure to maintain that minimum would lead the world eventually into the most serious kind of trouble. By comparison, even the potential destructive power of the atomic bomb seems but little more appalling than what could happen to entire countries, even civilizations, if enough agricultural land should be permitted to be ruined for cultivation or so impoverished as to cause a far-reaching shortage of food.

We may not all be conscious of the fact, but already we are in a race between the shrinking productiveness of our land through erosion waste, on the one hand, and the growing food demands of increasing populations, on the other. Nutritionists say that

we need at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres per capita of reasonably productive cultivable land to furnish each person with a minimum nutritional diet. And another half acre is needed per capita for such products as clothing, tobacco, rope, and vegetable oils. Yet some nations have not more than a half acre of productive land per capita. And in the world there is left only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land, as nearly as can be determined with the information available. This is less than 2 acres per person for the present world population of 2,350,000,000. As population increases, the per capita acreage of productive land will decrease. Moreover, much of this limited area of land is only of fair to medium quality. Some of it is poor; and more is being made poor, or ruined, with every year of continuing erosion. The rate of decline has accelerated during recent years in many parts of the world. In some instances, population pressure on the land has caused a more intensive use of the land, and, for that reason, more rapid deterioration. This is especially true where excessively sloping grasslands and woodlands have been plowed or cleared for cultivation. Cultivation of such areas gives some temporarily increased production, but usually at the cost of subsequent erosion that too often leads to severe impoverishment of the land.

There are probably several hundred million acres of unproductive land in the world that might be brought into productive use. The precise extent is not known; surveys needed for the determination have not been made. Here and there are some virgin tropical jungle that could be used to produce more food. And there still are some areas in the temperate zones that can be brought into production by clearing, draining, irrigation, or other means. But even when we consider all these possible sources of new agricultural land, we still do not have any surplus for ready use. A great deal has been ruined irreparably by erosion; most of the remainder is in use.

This means that we must depend largely on the 4,000,000,000 acres of arable cropland now available for use. What we must keep clearly in mind is that the world population is increasing, according to the specialists, at a rate of about 20,000,000 annually—with medical science and sanitation improving and spreading rapidly. Our farmland is continually being asked to produce more food and more raw materials for industry, such as wood, clothing, oils, alcohol, and tobacco. We may even be calling on our food-producing lands sooner than expected to provide relatively more of these products. And, as already pointed out, it must not be overlooked that the estimated world supply of 4,000,000,000 acres of arable land is by no means all good land. Probably in the neighborhood of half of it is of only fair productivity at best. Some of it is poor and most of it is eroding or is subject to erosion.

LAND DAMAGE IN THE AMERICAS

In the United States, for example, we have permitted nearly a fifth of the original area of tillable land to become so damaged by erosion as to make it very largely unavailable for further practical cultivation. That means around a hundred million acres practically ruined.

In addition, about a third of the remainder has been seriously damaged, with all or much of the topsoil gone, and half or more of the rest is subject to erosion.

Canada has much land that is subject to blowing in its western prairie provinces, and water erosion is locally serious in many parts of the more humid southeastern section.

Mexico and parts of Guatemala and Costa Rica have much erosion to deal with. Some areas of considerable size have already been ruined and numerous fields have been stripped of topsoil.

For South America we have chiefly observational information, together with the re-

sults of a few general erosion surveys as a basis for estimates. Our best estimates indicate that about a fourth of the cultivated land (past and present) has either been seriously damaged or ruined for further practical cultivation, although partly still usable for grass and trees. Quite naturally conditions of erosion are worse in particular regions, especially the Andean area.

There is some evidence that around 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres, at least, have been ruined, nearly ruined, or seriously affected in the 10 South American countries. In the northeasterly part of the Andean area erosion conditions have been studied in considerable detail.¹ Much severely eroded land is found on the steeper slopes. Intermittent use of this land for generations without benefit of rotation, manure, or fertilizer, and without protection from erosion, has led to such severe erosion or depletion of the mineral nutrients of the soil, or both, that many of the people living under these trying conditions clearly are suffering from malnutrition. A large total acreage has been so exhausted that most of the people have left the land, some moving into the more productive lowlands and others into cities. With respect to vegetation, there are places where formerly humid areas have been so reduced in water-holding capacity by removal of absorptive topsoil and by gullying that dryland types of vegetation have noticeably invaded the affected areas.²

Progress in Soil Conservation—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper prepared by H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, for the fourth Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, held at Montevideo in December 1950:

There is no need at this time to go further into detail with respect to local conditions. You may all be well enough acquainted with conditions in your own and neighboring areas.

WIDESPREAD MISUNDERSTANDING

Thus, it is easy to underestimate the urgent need for soil conservation. Many people of the past have either underestimated the importance of protecting their productive land or they have not known how. Generally, both factors have contributed to the widespread damage. Then, too, much damage has resulted from military invasion of some areas and destruction of early

¹ Land Conditions in Venezuela and Their Relation to Agriculture and Human Welfare. H. H. Bennett, D. S. Hubbell, W. K. Hull, J. E. Caudle, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture (1942).

² "In the vicinity of El Valle and on the badly eroded slopes between Caracas and La Gaurie a semidesert type of vegetation is found, consisting largely of cugi and cactus. This latter type of vegetation has invaded this originally forested section largely as the result of erosion. According to Dr. H. Pittier, cactus was not found in the hills around El Valle (where he lived) even as recently as 1913. Today it grows extensively." Ibid.

conservation works. Great areas have been terribly impoverished or ruined in this manner, and some civilizations have declined or perished. Today, even here in the Americas, despite the evidence all around us, there are still some who underestimate the importance and urgency of soil conservation. Chief among the false assumptions on the part of these uninformed critics are (1) that soil erosion has been taken care of, is of secondary importance; or (2) that we can afford to postpone the protection of our productive land while we attend to supposedly more urgent matters; that farmers will do all necessary conservation work on their land of their own accord; or (3) that there are short cuts to conservation—quicker, easier, cheaper, and just as effective ways of conserving soil—other than using each acre according to its capabilities and needs under a well-developed plan for each farm and ranch, with the best-trained technicians available helping get the job done; or (4) that soil conservation costs more than it is worth; or (5) that monetary considerations are all that are at stake; or (6) that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme and nothing can be done about it.

Not one of these assumptions is true. Time would be wasted in discussing them here, except to reemphasize the fact that they are made by people who are diametrically unacquainted with the facts or are disappointed and jealous because they overlooked them.

Now we have learned how unrestrained erosion works, at home and away from home. We know of the almost periodic hunger that affects overcrowded areas. True, we have for many years considered hunger as merely an economic byproduct. But today we know it is an unnecessary, costly outgrowth of poor husbandry, ignorance, and lack of decision on the part of nations to take up vigorously the job of correction. Fortunately, many people are beginning to see and understand. Some months ago, for example, news commentators told us that the one subject discussed above all others among those attending the United Nations General Assembly was food.

LOOKING AHEAD

Kingsley Davis¹ is authority for figures indicating that in 1850 the world population stood at about 545,000,000; in 1880 at 806,000,000, in 1900 at 1,608,000,000, and in 1940 at 2,171,000,000. That is a fourfold increase in the world's population in 300 years. At the same rate of increase for another three centuries, the world would have 21,000,000,000 people in it, unless the food supply should give out or people destroy each other in war. (And the latter possibility I am not going to discuss beyond the point of warning that both can come, and with all the horrors our minds are capable of conceiving.)

Looking ahead only a century, we would have, at the present estimated rate of increase, 2,000,000,000 more people to feed. Can the world do this? The indications are that it cannot.

What we do know—and this is one of the more important facts of human knowledge—is that soil conservation increases yields. Fortunately we have learned about this urgent need for better use of land through soil and water conservation. In this way, according to our experience with soil conservation work in the United States, there is promise for largely increasing the production of food in most countries.

And some land—not all—presently producing little or nothing can be rejuvenated in some degree, especially for grass and legumes for livestock forage. And other

¹ Davis, Kingsley. Amer. Social Rev. vol. 10, pp. 242-249. 1945.

areas, of course, can be made to produce trees.

EROSION PROBABLY A PRIMARY CAUSE OF MALNUTRITION

It is possible that erosion may outrank all other causes of malnutrition and famine. It is my opinion that this situation, too, can be vastly remedied by modern soil conservation.

By coincidence or otherwise, it has been only in recent years that we have come to understand something of the relationship between the nutrients in the food we eat and our health and general well-being. This is the distinct relationship, if we stop to think of it, that exists between man and the soil from which he is nourished from birth until the end of his days. Admittedly, much remains to be learned on this vital subject, but it requires no profound research to confirm the fact that poor land makes poor people—people with empty pocketbooks and empty stomachs, living empty lives.

Soil erosion is the surest and quickest way of making both land and people poor and keeping them poor. Topsoil stripped from once fertile land, and fields riddled with gullies, bring on a whole ugly train of economic and social difficulties: monetary losses, declining trade, inadequate diets, lowered taxes, impoverished educational facilities, poorer schools and churches, discontent, and other troubles.

When soil is swept out of fields by erosion, the whole of it is bodily lost, layer by layer, with everything in it, whether put there by nature or man. All available plant nutrients are lost, even the organisms that help convert unprocessed soil-forming material into available nutritive material. What is left behind is usually raw, unprocessed subsoil that contains relatively little available plant nutrients. Although complete chemical analysis may show that the subsoil has about the same chemical composition as the topsoil, except for nitrogen and organic matter the plant nutrients of subsoil, nevertheless, are in a much lower form of availability. This is shown by the markedly lower productive capacity of raw subsoil—yields which sometimes are only 2, 4, 8, 10, or 20 percent of topsoil yields.

If any of the subsoil constituents are unavailable, it is quite probable all of them are unavailable. Therefore, soil erosion appears to be a direct contributor to lower nutrition, and soil conservation the remedy or a partial remedy. Exhaustion of soil by excessive cropping may dispose of a large share of the available nutritive materials in the land, but it doesn't by any means extend to the same extreme as the process of soil erosion, which removes everything bodily. Overcropping, without erosion, hurts some, but it does leave, however, most of the mass of the soil, with a considerable content of potential nutrients in the undecomposed minerals.

Effective soil conservation not only controls erosion but also maintains the productivity and ability of the land to grow healthful crops through the addition of organic matter, fertilizers, and possibly soil amendments containing available nutrients.

Dr. Jonathan Forman, editor of the Ohio State Medical Journal, recently said:

"Depleted soils will not produce healthy plants. Plants suffering from mineral deficiency will not nourish healthy animals. Deficient plants and undernourished animals will not support our people in health.

"The important problem is not how to procure medical care at public expense. First, we should get at the fundamentals of human health, which is the maintenance of soil fertility, so that proteinous materials, full of nutrients, are provided for both man and beast. Our civilization truly rests upon our soil and we must see to it that it is restored to full fertility."¹

¹Manual, Agriculture and Conservation Program, Ohio Chamber of Commerce. 1942.

Sometime ago Surg. Gen. Thomas Parran, United States Public Health Service, said in a discussion of general nutritional deficiency and national health:

"Dietary deficiency is widespread and serious, with more than 40 percent of the population—United States—on inadequate rations. The fertility of the soil influences the food value of crops grown upon it. Animals feeding on depleted soils produce depleted milk. Thus, soil conservation has a direct relationship to nutritional status."²

If we are to have a proper degree of health for our people, it is a growing belief that we must produce more of the protective foods and our crops must be grown on properly husbanded, mineral-rich soil, so that the available nutrients can be absorbed into the products fed to our bodies. But we still have much to learn along this line of study.

So it is with people. Too many of us seem to think that the food we buy in cans and sacks at the grocery store has somehow grown right there in the store. We fail to realize that even though the beans and meat we buy may appear to be exactly alike, one sack of beans and one piece of meat may be much higher in nutritional value than other sacks of beans and packages of meat, because of the soil on which they were grown.

SOIL CONSERVATION, THE MAIN HOPE OF OUR CIVILIZATION

The world—including the Americas—is approaching maturity from the standpoint of new agricultural lands that can be brought into cultivation readily. From now on, we must assume serious responsibility for the care and wise use of what is left. We can no longer afford land exploitation.

In nations where productive land is scarce, there is one best way to produce more for the hungry millions who, under a nonconservation type of agriculture, are steadily growing hungrier. That one way is to take care of the land that is left, build it up, improve it—and store rainfall in the reservoir of the soil through the use of soil- and water-conservation measures and sound land use.

Soil conservation, scientifically applied to the land according to modern standards, is the great need and the main hope of our civilization. To a large degree, people everywhere depend for their well-being on the well-being of their agriculture. Even though there has been phenomenal advancement in invention, manufacturing, mining, transportation, and other industrial activities in recent years, the people of the world are still basically dependent on agriculture.

And a prosperous and lasting agriculture utterly depends on an adequate supply of productive land, properly used and so protected that it will remain permanently productive. Without this solid foundation, there can be no real hope for a continuously successful agriculture anywhere. And, too, without this foundation there can be no assurance of economic stability and social progress, there can be no assurance of adequate nutrition, prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere on earth.

As long as people have enough good land and an adequate supply of water to make the land productive, they have the means to overcome, if they will, such handicaps as poverty, malnutrition, inadequate education, and lack of opportunity. Without such resources, real and lasting progress is impossible.

Soil conservation, then, is mandatory everywhere over the world if our civilization is to avoid a tragic decline, economically and culturally.

PRODUCTIVE LAND A MAJOR FACTOR IN FUTURE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

As the population of the world continues to grow and the supply of productive land

diminishes, land becomes of increasing importance in international affairs. Apparently, food is rapidly becoming the most important article of commerce and international relations in many parts of the world.

HELPING OTHER COUNTRIES TO HELP THEMSELVES

The record of progress and accomplishment in the field of soil conservation during the last 15 to 20 years is quite sufficient to disprove any illusion that sound agricultural planning and application are not possible under our American system of government, as some unfriendly critics have inferred. Apparently, many people around the world agree with this, because during the last few years, 80 countries have sent some 500 agricultural representatives and "trainees" to the United States to study our soil and water conservation program in the field, some of them working with service technicians for as much as a year. These visitors have included agriculturists and scientists from nearly every part of the globe—from South America, Africa, Europe, India, China, Australia, Asia. A number of these countries already have national soil conservation programs under way.

Now, I want to repeat what I said at the plenary session, United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of Resources, August 19, 1949, with respect to keeping our leaders properly and promptly informed about the need for safeguarding our remaining area of productive land:

"The state of world affairs today affords evidence, as I see it, that a great many scientists hereafter must become more than scientists. They must become, also, effective advocates and teachers. I think it must be apparent to everyone here that too much of the knowledge acquired through research—knowledge of great potential benefit to mankind—is not yet being adequately used. Certainly it is not being used widely enough. Nor is the demonstrated ability of science to acquire new knowledge and to help solve current problems being employed as fully as it might be.

"The principal reason is apparent. Our leaders frequently do not understand our scientific language. Too generally we have failed, somehow, to communicate to them facts of the greatest importance. Those we have chosen to direct the affairs of our nations—our leaders—are rarely scientists. More often they are lawyers, soldiers, or leaders in public affairs—politics, labor, business. If they do not understand the facts about natural resources and how best to use them, the responsibility is more likely to lie at our own door, as scientists, than at theirs.

"One of the great jobs, then, ahead of scientists, particularly those working in the fields of natural resources, is to find ways to get their knowledge understood by our leaders and statesmen, and put to wider use."

CONSERVATION EDUCATION

Probably we shall never have maximum results from our soil and water conservation work until the full conception of the cost and destructiveness of imprudent use of the land and failure to safeguard it from the ravages of erosion are fully understood by the people. This is not likely to come about until the subject is taught in our schools, probably beginning in the lower grades and going well into the college courses. If this can be done, it will be possible to get the full and effective conception of the problem into the bloodstream of our youth and thus into the understanding of the people. And when this is done, the matter of taking the best possible care of the land will have been largely assured.

²Bennett, Hugh Hammond. Soil and Water Conservation. United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of Resources. August 19, 1949.

³Technology Rev. June 1940.

Inflation for Beginners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, until the public thoroughly understands the problem of inflation, the Truman spendthrifts can escape their responsibility for the present inflation by shouting "Give us controls." The Truman administration by confusing the public by asking for controls over the economic life of every individual, untruths referring to the real cause of inflation, which is currency expansion, is an attempt to grasp far more and more power under false propaganda.

Henry Hazlitt, a distinguished student of economics, has performed a much-needed service by publishing in *Newsweek* in issues of September 3, 10, 17, 24, and October 1, a series of articles on "Inflation for beginners." Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting the articles to which I have referred as follows:

[From *Newsweek* for September 3, 1951]

INFLATION FOR BEGINNERS—I

(By Henry Hazlitt)

No subject is so much discussed today—or so little understood—as inflation. The politicians in Washington talk of it as if it were some horrible visitation from without, over which they had no control—like a flood, a foreign invasion, or a plague. It is something they are always promising to fight—if Congress or the people will only give them the weapons or a strong law to do the job.

Yet the plain truth is that our political leaders have brought on inflation by their own money and fiscal policies. They are promising to fight with their right hand the conditions they have brought on with their left.

Inflation, always and everywhere, is primarily caused by an increase in the supply of money and credit. In fact, inflation is the increase in the supply of money and credit. If you turn to the recent *American College Dictionary*, for example, you will find the first definition of inflation given as follows: "Undue expansion or increase of the currency of a country, especially by the issuing of paper money not redeemable in specie."

In recent years, however, the term has come to be used in a radically different sense. This is recognized in the second definition given by the *American College Dictionary*: "A substantial rise of prices caused by an undue expansion in paper money or bank credit." Now obviously a rise of prices caused by an expansion of the money supply is not the same thing as the expansion of the money supply itself. A cause or condition is clearly not identical with one of its consequences. The use of the word "inflation" with these two quite different meanings leads to endless confusion.

The word "inflation" originally applied solely to the quantity of money. It meant that the volume of money was inflated, blown up, overextended. It is not mere pedantry to insist that the word should be used only in its original meaning. To use it to mean "a rise in prices" is to deflect attention away from the real cause of inflation and the real cure for it.

Let us see what happens under inflation, and why it happens. When the supply of

money is increased, people have more money to offer for goods. If the supply of goods does not increase—or does not increase as much as the supply of money—then the prices of goods will go up. Each individual dollar becomes less valuable because there are more dollars. Therefore more of them will be offered against, say, a pair of shoes or a hundred bushels of wheat than before. A price is an exchange ratio between a dollar and a unit of goods. When people have more dollars, they value each dollar less. Goods then rise in price, not because goods are scarcer than before, but because dollars are more abundant.

In the old days, governments inflated by clipping and debasing the coinage. Then they found they could inflate cheaper and faster simply by grinding out paper money on a printing press. This is what happened with the French assignats in 1789, and with our own currency during the Revolutionary War. Today the method is a little more indirect. Our Government sells its bonds or other I O U's to the banks. In payment, the banks create deposits on their books against which the Government can draw. A bank in turn may sell its Government I O U's to the Federal Reserve Bank, which pays for them either by creating a deposit credit or having more Federal reserve notes printed and paying them out. This is how money is manufactured.

The greater part of the money supply of this country is represented not by hand-to-hand currency but by bank deposits which are drawn against by checks. Hence when most economists measure our money supply they add demand deposits (and now usually, also, time deposits) to currency outside of banks to get the total. The total of money and credit so measured was \$64,099,000,000 at the end of December 1939, and \$174,200,000,000 at the end of June this year. This increase of 171 percent in the supply of money is overwhelmingly the main reason why wholesale prices rose 135 percent from 1939 to June of this year.

[From *Newsweek* for September 10, 1951]

INFLATION FOR BEGINNERS—II

(By Henry Hazlitt)

It is often argued that to attribute inflation solely to an increase in the volume of money is "oversimplification." This is true. Many qualifications have to be kept in mind.

For example, the "money supply" must be thought of as including not only the supply of hand-to-hand currency, but the supply of bank credit—especially in the United States, where most payments are made by check.

And it is an oversimplification to say that the value of an individual dollar depends simply on the present supply of dollars outstanding. It depends also on the expected future supply of dollars. If most people fear, for example, that the supply of dollars is going to be even greater a year from now than at present, then the present value of the dollar (as measured by its purchasing power) will be lower than the present quantity of dollars would otherwise warrant.

Again, the value of any monetary unit such as the dollar, depends not merely on the quantity of dollars but on their quality. When a country goes off the gold standard, for example, it means in effect that gold, or the right to get gold, has suddenly turned into mere paper. The value of the monetary unit therefore usually falls immediately, even if there has not yet been any increase in the quantity of money. This is because the people have more faith in gold than they have in the promises or judgment of the Government's monetary managers. There is hardly a case on record, in fact, in which departure from the gold standard has not soon been followed by a further increase in bank credit and in printing-press money.

In short, the value of money varies for basically the same reasons as the value of any commodity. Just as the value of a bushel of wheat depends not only on the total present supply of wheat but on the expected future supply and on the quality of the wheat so the value of a dollar depends on a similar variety of considerations. The value of money, like the value of goods, is not determined by merely mechanical or physical relationships, but primarily by psychological factors, which may often be quite complicated.

In dealing with the causes and cure of inflation, it is one thing to keep in mind real complications; it is quite another to be confused or misled by needless or non-existent complications.

For example, it is frequently said that the value of the dollar depends not merely on the quantity of dollars but on their "velocity of circulation." Increased "velocity of circulation," however, is not a cause of a further fall in the value of the dollar; it is itself one of the consequences of the fear that the value of the dollar is going to fall. (Or, to put it the other way round, of the belief that the price of goods is going to rise.) It is this belief that makes people more eager to exchange dollars for goods. The emphasis by some writers on "velocity of circulation" is just another example of the error of substituting dubious mechanical for real psychological reasons.

Another blind alley: in answer to those who point out that inflation is primarily caused by an increase in money and credit, it is contended that the increase in commodity prices often occurs before the increase in the money supply. This is true. This is what happened immediately after the outbreak of war in Korea. Strategic raw materials began to go up in price on the fear that they were going to be scarce. Speculators and manufacturers began to buy them to hold for profit or protective inventories. But to do this they had to borrow more money from the banks. The rise in prices was accompanied by an equally marked rise in bank loans and deposits. From May 31, 1950 to May 30, 1951, the loans of the country's banks increased by \$12,000,000,000. If these increased loans had not been made, and new money (some \$6,000,000,000 by the end of January 1951) had not been issued against the loans, the rise in prices could not have been sustained. The price rise was made possible, in short, only by an increased supply of money.

[From *Newsweek* for September 17, 1951]

(By Henry Hazlitt)

INFLATION FOR BEGINNERS—III

One of the most stubborn fallacies about inflation is the assumption that it is caused, not by an increase in the quantity of money, but by a shortage of goods.

It is true that a rise in prices (which, as we have seen, should not be identified with inflation) can be caused either by an increase in the quantity of money or by a shortage of goods—or partly by both. Wheat, for example, may rise in price either because there is an increase in the supply of money or a failure of the wheat crop. But we seldom find, even in conditions of total war, a general rise of prices caused by a general shortage of goods. Yet, so stubborn is the fallacy that inflation is caused by a shortage of goods, that even in the Germany of 1923, after prices had soared hundreds of billions of times, high officials and millions of Germans were blaming the whole thing on a general shortage of goods—at the very moment when foreigners were coming in and buying German goods with gold or their own currencies at prices lower than those of equivalent goods at home.

The rise of prices in the United States since 1939, or since the outbreak of war in

Korea, is constantly being attributed to a shortage of goods. Yet, official statistics show that our rate of industrial production in June of this year, for example, was two and a quarter times as much as from 1935 to 1939, and 12 percent higher than in June of 1950. Nor is it any better explanation to say that the rise in prices is caused by a shortage in civilian goods. Even to the extent that civilian goods were really short, the shortage would not cause a rise in prices if taxes took away as large a percentage of civilian income as rearmament took of civilian goods.

This brings us to another source of confusion. People frequently talk as if a budget deficit were in itself both a necessary and a sufficient cause of inflation. A budget deficit, however, is fully financed by the sale of Government bonds paid for out of real savings, need not cause inflation. And even a budget surplus, on the other hand, is not an assurance against inflation. This was shown in the fiscal year ended June 30, when there was substantial inflation in spite of a budget surplus of \$3,500,000,000. A budget deficit, in short, is inflationary only to the extent that it causes an increase in the money supply. And inflation can occur even with a budget surplus if there is an increase in the money supply notwithstanding.

The same chain of causation applies to all the so-called inflationary pressures—particularly the so-called wage-price spiral. If it were not preceded, accompanied, or quickly followed by an increase in the supply of money, an increase in wages above the equilibrium level would not cause inflation, it would merely cause unemployment. And an increase in prices without an increase of cash in people's pockets would merely cause a falling off in sales. Wage and price rises, in brief, are usually a consequence of inflation. They can cause it only to the extent that they force an increase in the money supply.

The accompanying chart compares the percentage increase in the money supply (currency plus bank deposits) since 1939 with the rise in wholesale prices and in the cost of living during the same period. The correlation is obvious—though the factors involved are too complex to expect it to be exact. The chief reason why prices have not increased as much as the money supply is that the production rate of goods has also greatly increased since 1939.

A warning must also be given concerning the accuracy of the two price indexes themselves. They show apparent stability from the end of 1942 to the middle of 1946, and a sharp rise then when price control was taken off. But this is chiefly because official price and cost-of-living indexes tend to become fictional under price control. They do not measure the realities of black-market prices, shortages, rationing, queues, favoritism, deterioration of quality and nonexistent goods. When price control is taken off, the Government's increase of the money supply has its full effect on the official price indexes.

[From Newsweek for September 24, 1951]

INFLATION FOR BEGINNERS—IV

(By Henry Hazlitt)

As long as we are plagued by false theories of what causes inflation, we will be plagued by false remedies. Those who ascribe inflation primarily to a "shortage of goods," for example, are fond of saying that "the answer to inflation is production." But this is at best a half-truth. It is impossible to bring prices down by increasing production if the money supply is being increased even faster.

The worst of all false remedies for inflation is price fixing and wage fixing. For if more money is put into circulation, while prices are held down, most people will be left with unused cash balances seeking goods.

The final result, barring a like increase in production, must be higher prices.

There are broadly two kinds of price fixing—"selective" and "over-all." With selective price fixing the Government tries to hold the prices merely of a few strategic war materials or a few necessities of life. But then the profit margin in producing these things becomes lower than the profit margin in producing other things, including luxuries. So selective price fixing quickly brings about a shortage of the very things whose production the Government is most eager to encourage. Then bureaucrats turn to the specious idea of an over-all freeze. They talk of holding or returning to the prices and wages that existed on the day before war broke out in Korea. But the price level and infinitely complex price and wage interrelationships of that day were the result of the state of supply and demand on that day. And supply and demand seldom remain the same, even for the same commodity, for 2 days running, even without major changes in the money supply.

It has been moderately estimated that there are some 9,000,000 different prices in the United States. On this basis we begin with more than 40,000,000,000,000 interrelationships of these prices. And a change in one price always has repercussions on a whole network of other prices. The prices and price relationships of June 24, 1950, were presumably those roughly calculated to encourage a maximum balanced production of peacetime goods. They are obviously the wrong prices and price relationships to encourage the maximum production of war goods. Moreover, the price pattern of a given day always embodies many misjudgments and "inequities." No single mind, and no bureaucracy, has wisdom and knowledge enough to correct these. Every time a bureaucrat tries to correct one price or wage miscalculation or inequity he creates a score of new ones. And there is no precise standard for measuring the economic "inequities" of a particular case that any two people seem able to agree on.

Coercive price fixing would be an insoluble problem, in short, even if those in charge of it were the best-informed economists, statisticians, and businessmen in the country, and even if they acted with the most conscientious impartiality. But they are subjected in fact to tremendous pressure by the organized pressure groups. Those in power soon find that price and wage control is a tremendous weapon with which to curry political favor or to punish opposition. That is why parity formulas are applied to farm prices and escalator clauses to wage rates, while industrial prices and rents are penalized.

Another evil of price control is that, though it is always put into effect in the name of an alleged "emergency," it creates powerful vested interests and habits of mind which prolong it or tend to make it permanent. Outstanding examples of this are rent control and exchange control. Price control is the major step toward a fully regimented or planned economy. It causes people to regard it as a matter of course that the Government should intervene in every economic transaction.

But finally, and worst of all from the standpoint of inflation, price control diverts attention away from the only real cause of inflation—the increase in the quantity of money and credit. Hence it prolongs and intensifies the very inflation it was ostensibly designed to cure.

[From Newsweek for October 1, 1951]

INFLATION FOR BEGINNERS—V

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The cure for inflation, like most cures, consists chiefly in the removal of the cause. The cause of inflation is the increase of money

and credit. The cure is to stop increasing money and credit. The cure for inflation, in brief, is to stop inflating. It is as simple as that.

But while simple in principle, this cure often involves complex and disagreeable decisions on detail. Let us begin with the Federal budget. It is next to impossible to avoid inflation with a continuing heavy deficit. That deficit is almost certain to be financed by inflationary means—that is, by directly or indirectly printing more money. Huge Government expenditures are not in themselves inflationary, provided they are made wholly out of tax receipts or out of borrowing paid for wholly out of real savings. But the difficulties in either of these methods of payment, once expenditures have passed a certain point, are so great that there is almost inevitably a resort to the printing press.

Moreover, though huge expenditures wholly met out of huge taxes are not necessarily inflationary, they inevitably reduce and disrupt production, and undermine any free enterprise system. The remedy for huge governmental expenditures is therefore not equally huge taxes, but a halt to reckless spending.

On the monetary side, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System must stop creating artificially cheap money. That is, they must stop arbitrarily holding down interest rates. And they must stop buying at par the Government's own bonds. When interest rates are held artificially low, they encourage an increase in borrowing. This leads to an increase in the money and credit supply. The process works both ways, for it is necessary to increase the money and credit supply in order to keep interest rates artificially low. That is why the cheap-money policy and the Government-bond-support policy are simply two ways of describing the same thing. As long as Federal Reserve banks buy the Government's 2½-percent bonds, say, at par, they hold down the basic long-term interest rate to 2½ percent. And they pay for these bonds, in effect, by printing more money. This is what is known as monetizing the public debt. Inflation will go on as long as this goes on.

The Federal Reserve System, if it were determined to halt inflation and to live up to its responsibilities, would not only halt this process of holding down interest rates and monetizing the public debt, but it would take the leadership in raising interest rates. It should never have departed, in fact, from the tradition that the discount rate of the central bank should normally (and above all in an inflationary period) be a penalty rate; that is, a rate higher than the member banks themselves get on their loans.

Congress should immediately restore the required legal reserve ratio of the Federal Reserve banks to the previous level of 35 and 40 percent, instead of the present emergency level of 25 percent put into effect as a war-inflation measure in June 1945.

Congress should in addition authorize the Federal Reserve Board to increase this reserve ratio even further. Legal minimum reserve ratios are admittedly an awkward method of limiting the potential supply of money and credit. But they are an added safeguard when other methods are not properly used. As long as the Federal Reserve authorities, moreover, insist on the power to control the reserve ratios of member banks, they should also be obliged to control their own. An increase in reserve bank credit can cause far more inflation than an equal increase in member bank credit.

As a last resort the monetary authorities could actually freeze the credit supply, allowing no net increase in loans at all. But this will never be necessary if other measures have been wisely taken.

It can be said, finally, that the world will never work itself out of the present inflationary era until it returns to the gold

standard. The gold standard provided a practically automatic check on internal credit expansion. That is why the bureaucrats abandoned it. In addition to its being a safeguard against inflation, it is the only system that has ever provided the world with the equivalent of an international currency.

The first question to be asked today is not how we can stop inflation, but do we really want to? For one of the effects of inflation is to bring about a redistribution of wealth and income. In its early stages (until it reaches the point where it grossly distorts and undermines production itself) it benefits some groups at the expense of others. The first groups acquire a vested interest in maintaining inflation. Too many of us continue under the delusion that we can beat the game—that we can increase our own incomes faster than our living costs. So there is a great deal of hypocrisy in the outcry against inflation. Many of us are shouting in effect: "Hold down everybody's price and income except my own."

Governments are the worst offenders in this hypocrisy. At the same time as they profess to be fighting inflation they are following a full employment policy. And as one writer recently admitted, frankly in the *London Economist*: "Inflation is nine-tenths of any full employment policy."

What he forgot to add is that inflation must always end in a crisis and a slump, and that worse than the slump itself may be the public delusion that the slump has been caused, not by the previous inflation, but by the inherent defects of capitalism.

Inflation, to sum up, is the increase in the volume of money and bank credit in relation to the volume of goods. It is harmful because it depreciates the value of the monetary unit, raises everybody's cost of living, imposes what is in effect a tax on the poorest at as high a rate as the tax on the richest, wipes out the value of past savings, discourages future savings, redistributes wealth and income wantonly, encourages and rewards speculation and gambling at the expense of thrift and work, undermines confidence in the justice of a free enterprise system and corrupts public and private morals.

But it is never inevitable. We can always stop it overnight if we have the sincere will to do so.

Mutuals and Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

MR. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while I have received numerous and divergent views relatives to H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951, which will soon be reported to the House by the committee of conferees, I should like to list below extracts of some correspondence on the issue:

HUDSON CITY SAVINGS BANK,
Jersey City, N. J., September 28, 1951.
Congressman ALFRED SIEMINSKI,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AL: You are familiar, no doubt, with the steps that are being taken to bring about taxation of the income of mutual-savings banks and cooperatives, which have heretofore been exempt.

While there has been bitter opposition to this taxation from certain savings banks, it

appears that the Senate Finance Committee is going to insist upon such taxation in spite of the fact that the House of Representatives has voted against such taxation.

To me, there is one important point that should be considered and in which we would like to enlist your cooperation. The mutual-savings banks should be permitted to build up a reserve out of earnings each year on a tax-free basis, and whether that reserve is set at 10 percent or 15 percent of deposit liabilities, there should be a provision in the tax bill which would exempt the income of savings banks so long as the surplus of the savings bank is not up to the required 10 percent or 15 percent.

This is particularly important because the hundreds of thousands of depositors throughout the country are entitled to the protection that an adequate surplus account in the individual banks would give them.

I trust that we can count on your cooperation in seeing to it that this provision is incorporated in the tax bill.

With kind regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. ROE,
President.

NEW JERSEY SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Newark, N. J., September 28, 1951.

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: It is our earnest hope that the House version of the bill will be adopted by the conference rather than the Senate version. We would appreciate it very much if you could recommend to the conferees that they urge the adoption of that version.

The status of the savings and loan associations was carefully considered by the House Ways and Means Committee both in 1950 and in 1951. All of the arguments were presented in detail and the committee on both occasions came to the conclusions that the present treatment of such institutions was proper. It was recognized that the available earnings of savings and loan associations are in the tax stream now, since the participants—the members—are fully taxable upon their dividends received from the associations and that all that is left above the payment of dividends is needed as a prudent reserve against future losses. Therefore no provision was included to tax the associations.

The original Senate version of the bill gave no recognition to the necessity for reserves at all, but after long debate on the floor, it was amended to provide that associations should be taxed upon any accumulations to reserves at any time that their reserves are in excess of 10 percent of the savings of the members in the association.

Even the proponents of the tax in the Senate finally admitted the necessity for reserves. The amendment which was adopted by the Senate while a partial recognition of the fact, is not an adequate recognition. For example, the State of New Jersey requires that associations shall set aside to reserves, a portion of their earnings until those reserves equal 15 percent of their assets.

We would therefore have the situation, if the Senate version of the bill is adopted, that the State of New Jersey would be saying that the reasonable minimum to which an association must build up its reserves is 15 percent while the United States Government would be saying that anything over 10 percent was excessive and should be taxed.

It was argued in the Senate by the proponents of the Senate version that it was their purpose to force into the tax stream, earnings retained in these institutions, but not needed as reserves. There are no such earnings in savings and loan associations. Everything in the way of earnings that can

safely be distributed, is distributed and is in the tax stream. The limited field in which these associations operate, does not permit of large profits. The associations must pay a reasonable dividend in order to attract and hold savings. All that is left is absolutely required as a measure of prudence and safety.

The House bill recognizes this, while the Senate bill sets up a system which will hamper the establishment of necessary reserves and may well result in the weakening of these institutions and make it impossible for them to meet a future economic set-back.

Much of the clamor for taxation of mutual institutions has come from the commercial banking interests. It seems inconceivable that Congress should pass a law which in its effects in New Jersey, would injure the present small earning power of 1,500,000 people who save their money in mutual institutions of one kind or another, or that would weaken the financial soundness of these institutions, simply to improve the competitive position of the commercial banks owned by no more than 30,000 stockholders.

We shall appreciate very much, anything that you may be able to do that will further the adoption of the House version as to this particular matter.

Sincerely yours,

EMIL A. GALLMAN,
Executive Vice President.

D. KALTMAN & Co., INC.,
Jersey City, N. J., August 23, 1951.

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Gifford Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please don't think me presumptuous in sending you the attached editorial.

I do hope you will read it, as busy as you are

Since we, like other wholesalers, work on a fixed mark-up established by the manufacturers, approximately 15 percent gross, we're finding it more and more difficult to compete with cooperatives and mutuals in our field. I know that wholesalers in other industries are in the same position.

May I appeal to you, to use your efforts in righting a wrong, that was created years ago, but was never intended to continue to grow, to the "Frankenstein" it is today, at the expense of a large segment of American business.

Equal taxation for all enterprises—mutuals, cooperatives, or independently owned, will right this gross injustice and in addition, will help our Government raise the additional tax money required.

May I hear from you, for which please accept my thanks in advance.

Very sincerely yours,

DAVID L. KALTMAN,
President.

[From the Jersey Journal of August 11, 1951]

AS IT SEEMS AT JOURNAL SQUARE

There's a movement on to collect income taxes from cooperatives and mutuals doing business in competition with banks, stores, and other concerns which already pay taxes. The amount of subsidy given to tax-exempt businesses like savings banks, credit unions, life insurance companies, consumers or farmers' cooperatives, etc., is said to be more than \$2,000,000,000.

The existence of such a big boom to certain types of business organizations is proof of how easily the country can be led down the path of socialism. If depositors in mutual savings banks, members of credit unions, and of other cooperative or mutual business enterprises thought about it, there is some doubt how anxious they would be to get this tax exemption. Spread over all the co-ops and mutuals today, would it be a serious blow to pay the same taxes that all other business has to pay? The basis of the ex-

emption is not the kind of business done, but the organizational set-up. If the customers own the store, that's a co-op; and it's exempt from income tax. If stockholders own the store, that's not exempt, but is taxed.

One other way to make things fair, and not favor one way of doing business over the other ways of private enterprise, would be to drop the income tax on corporations and collect income tax only from individuals. This way is never going to be adopted, because the Government likes to tax the corporations—the tax is easier to collect.

Still another way to square things off would be to tax all income (gross income) and never mind about net. This would put an end to sitting up all night trying to figure out deductions from your taxable income.

The plan to tax mutuals and co-ops is perfectly sound, but it will take a lot of public support before a Congressman will vote for it. He will figure every member of a co-op or a credit union is a voter, and every mutual savings bank depositor a voter, and he will want to know that they are in favor of taxing their own business the same as other business is taxed.

Truman Nails Down the Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much has already been said, and very properly so, about the iron curtain of news of governmental agencies decreed by President Truman. Truly, much more than an issue between newspapermen and Presidential appointees is involved. We have witnessed all too many efforts by Federal officials to influence and control public opinion. There ought to be less of this, and not more.

I insert herewith, Mr. Speaker, a pertinent editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, the leading newspaper of Wisconsin's capital city:

TRUMAN NAILS DOWN THE CURTAIN

Stubborn as usual, Harry Truman insists on standing by his order which gives Federal bureau chiefs power to pick and choose between news stories the public should or should not have.

"There is nothing wrong with the order" allowing department heads to suppress selected Government news because it is "security information," the President insists.

In addition to proving once again his bad-tempered stubbornness, Mr. Truman's decision displays a state of mind dangerous for America. The President's decision also reveals his own lack of knowledge of the way Government agencies and their bosses operate.

President Truman's order itself concedes that improper application of the classification powers can be dangerous. What the order does not say and what the President apparently does not know is that improper application of the classification power is inevitable.

In the first place, department heads will be inclined to play it safe and stamp almost everything secret.

Second, a few power-hungry and overofficial bureau bosses will use the classification

system at every opportunity merely to satisfy their own ego and prove their own importance.

Third, practically all department heads will use their new powers to cover up their own and the administration's mistakes.

Once a Federal bureau has a good share of its papers and records marked "Secret," the newspapers and the public will have the devil's own time digging out the information that never should have been suppressed in the first place.

The Congress now is sniffing into some odoriferous RFC loans, for example. Many of these loans went to firms connected in one way or another with the national defense effort. Couldn't most of these deals now be classified and the details hidden from the public?

On the same day Mr. Truman stamped his foot and said his secrecy order would stay, Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz, former publisher and editor of La Prensa, warned that the Americas are in danger of losing free access to the news and must fight for freedom of the press. Dr. Paz should know whereof he speaks. His newspaper was suppressed and finally seized by the Peron government of Argentina.

The Germans, Italians, and Spaniards all lost free access to the news at the same time they lost their freedom, he pointed out. And the techniques of totalitarian government have changed from one of suppressing editorial opinion to control of the news itself, he said.

This becomes then more than a fight between a few United States newspapers and a bunch of politicians. The President's secrecy order is an issue between the American people and a government that has shown an insatiable appetite for power, power, and more power.

True Profit Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, we can depend upon our people to cooperate patriotically in any effort made by administration to assume reasonable control over our living in a period when it is essential that our economy be geared to the situation where the national defense becomes a prime consideration of government. Notwithstanding all this, we have to realize the inherent difficulty in attempting to administer controls which drastically affect the lives of all of us by substituting rules and regulations for free and open competition in connection with the basic economic law of supply and demand. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Everett (Mass.) News-Gazette of September 19, 1951:

TRUE PROFIT CONTROL

There has been a lot of talk about how much profit retailers should be allowed to make and just what formulas should be applied by OPS to take care of increases in wholesale prices, overhead expense, and other costs. OPS has, on several occasions, made changes in orders which proved to be unworkable, and which would have squeezed profits so thin that retailers would have had to sharply cut their purchasing of stocks.

Entirely aside from these rather technical matters, the fact is that the best form

of profit control ever devised by man does not lie in rules and orders and laws. It lies, instead, in free, open competition—along with the public's idea of what this item or that is worth. As an example, many commodities are now selling at prices below the legal OPS-established level. The reason for that is that people just wouldn't buy at the higher price—and when that happens, competitive business seeks a price that the customers will pay.

Many people seem to think that retailers customarily keep, as profit, 20 cents and perhaps more out of each dollar that goes through the cash register. This is a highly fallacious assumption. Depending on the kind of goods sold, and the rate of turn-over, typical stores actually earn a profit of 1 to 5 cents out of that dollar. All the rest of the money goes to buy stock; to pay wages, taxes, and rents; and to meet other unavoidable expenses.

Whether prices go up or down in the future, competition will be the big restraining factor on profits. Consumers are abnormally price-conscious today, and retailers, of sheer necessity, are doing everything they can think of to hold prices down.

Executive Order Affecting News Releases by Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the timing of the President's Executive order directing civilian agencies of the Federal Government to withhold information those agencies considered dangerous to security assumes a note of irony when it is realized that the Executive order preceded by only a few days the observance of National Newspaper Week—a week dedicated to a great industry which has served this country well, in good times and bad, for generations.

Many Members of Congress and not a few newspapermen have blasted the order, terming it everything from an "insult to Congress" to a "totalitarian device." Official expressions from newspaper editors' groups have demanded the order withdrawn. Resolutions have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to repeal the order. So far, the President has turned a deaf ear to all criticism.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation has a more patriotic group than is represented by our newsmen. They have a deep devotion to duty in the American tradition—and they have an equally profound sense of obligation to do the best job of which they are capable.

Theirs is a monumental task, particularly in this fast-moving age in which we live, and they measure up to that task.

That the newspaper profession accepts certain limitations is expressed quite aptly in the time-worn slogan of one of the great newspapers of this country. That slogan: "All the news that's fit to print."

For anyone, cognizant of the remarkable job done by America's newspapers during World War II, to believe that the Nation's newsmen would wittingly violate any confidence or deliberately endanger this country's security is simply beyond my comprehension.

It is in recognition of a job well done and of the vital place of the newspaper in the American scene that this special week has been set aside for the observance of National Newspaper Week.

But, as many others have pointed out, the President's executive order transcends even the threat it poses to the Nation's free press. It would, in effect enable any Federal agency to suppress facts, not related to national security, which would throw an unfavorable light upon that agency. It would, in short, absolutely halt any effort to restore and/or retain honesty in Government, because meanderings from that ideal could go unnoticed.

Military agencies of the Government already classify material as "secret" and withhold information which such agencies believe involve national security. But those same agencies, already, withhold other information which probably have no bearing on national security.

As a case in point, I insert here as part of my remarks, the following news item published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 3, 1951:

EUROPEANS GET FACTS BARRED TO AMERICANS

Government censorship at the source is keeping from the American people essential facts about the defense program which already are known by foreigners, it was learned at the Pentagon yesterday.

The rubber-stamp censorship was disclosed when a reporter asked the Munitions Board for a list of military contracts with foreign companies. Similar lists of contracts with American companies are published weekly.

How much are the Army, Navy, and Air Force buying from Britain, France, Italy, and other foreign countries? A Munitions Board spokesman was asked. (The Board is a central clearinghouse for military buying).

WAS STAMPED SECRET

The spokesman, after consulting several Munitions Board offices, replied that such a study had just been compiled of foreign purchases but that it had been stamped secret.

Asked why such information would be considered secret if foreigners knew about it, he said the Board's office of international programs had decided on the secret stamp.

From other Pentagon sources, it was learned the Munitions Board felt that information about defense orders in foreign countries would prove embarrassing—provoking complaints from American competitors and from foreign nations which had not fared as well in the allotment of orders.

Such government information has been withheld not only from newspapermen but from businessmen and business groups.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DENIED DATA

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States was denied access to the list of foreign contracts on grounds they were secret, a Munitions Board official said.

Military buying agents are required by the buy America act to make their purchases in the United States, with certain limited exemptions. Foreign governments, especially those in the Atlantic Pact, have been pressing the Pentagon for American defense orders to bolster their economies. The Defense Department has made special arrangements with Canada for large pur-

chases of munitions from Canadian manufacturers to offset Canadian defense orders in this country.

The Pentagon's secrecy on foreign deals has extended also to the bases being built in Europe on which 26,000 foreigners will be employed, to foreign arms shipments, to the share of Atlantic Pact costs being paid by the United States and to scores of other defense matters involving arrangements with foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is an old adage that we profit by our mistakes. I hope that the President will recognize the wisdom of this adage, realize the mistake of his order and rescind it.

Report of Board of Directors of the Property Owners' Federation of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as an extension of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Property Owners' Federation of Puerto Rico, at its special meeting held in San Juan on September 19, 1951, as a result of its deliberation growing out of the publicity given in the Miami Herald, of Miami, Fla., to the report rendered by Mr. Chester W. Wright to TIES, a private organization of that city. This report contains certain attacks upon the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, as well as upon the Puerto Rican government.

The resolution expresses the points of view of the Property Owners' Federation of Puerto Rico, a nonpolitical organization, with regard to the report rendered by Mr. Wright to the TIES association. I believe the resolution speaks for itself:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PROPERTY OWNER'S FEDERATION OF PUERTO RICO AT ITS SPECIAL MEETING HELD IN SAN JUAN ON SEPTEMBER 19, 1951

Whereas the board of directors of the Property Owner's Federation of Puerto Rico, at its special meeting held in San Juan on September 19, 1951, had before its attention charges made by a private citizen of Miami, Fla., as published in the Miami Herald, against the Hon. Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, and the legally organized government of this island; and

Whereas this federation, which is a nonpolitical organization composed of businessmen, owner of dwellings, urban developments and other real state property, has always been in the alert in order that the good name, credit, and prestige of our country, shall not suffer damage due to adverse publicity originated by reasons not based on the general welfare and progress of this country, or publicity that tends to affect the good relations that prevail between the people of Puerto Rico, and the people and Government of the United States, or foreign countries; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this federation that there exists a legally organized government in Puerto Rico, where all citizens enjoy the right to present their claims and complaints, utilizing democratic and adequate procedures, to make their views prevail on any subject matter, and that Puerto Ricans can only decide whether to elect, keep in power, or change that government, when the electorate thus believes it convenient. Furthermore, it is our opinion that no person from outside Puerto Rico has the right to intervene in our local affairs, as well as we believe that Puerto Ricans should also keep away from the internal affairs of other countries, cities, or people; and

Whereas in Puerto Rico ample opportunities and guaranties are offered both to capital and labor, and the right of all citizens are respected because such rights are specifically included in the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, approved by the United States Congress, and that all business matters are conducted and developed within the democratic policy of the officials in power.

Now, therefore, the board of directors of the Property Owners' Federation of Puerto Rico do hereby resolve—

(a) That this federation deplores the unfortunate and unpleasant publicity that resulted from the statements made by a private citizen, as published in the Miami Herald, and of the report rendered by such citizen to a private institution of that city against the Governor and the legally constituted government of Puerto Rico

(b) This federation respects the right of the electorate of Puerto Rico to elect, reelect, maintain in power, or change the government of its own election, and rejects the intervention of any person or foreign government in the internal affairs of our country.

(c) This federation appeals to businessmen, industrialists, merchants, proprietors, and investors, both within Puerto Rico and in foreign countries, to continue their good business relations with this island, in the assurance that they will enjoy complete guaranties of law.

(d) Copy of this resolution be sent to the honorable Governor of Puerto Rico, to both Houses of Congress, to the Miami Herald, and to the Puerto Rican press.

VICENTE L. GIMENEZ,
President.

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Neckyoke Jones Says column published in the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press on September 26, 1951:

NECKYOKE JONES SAYS

"Did you seen where the Eyettallan wagon-boss had come over here?" I requires of Greeseewood last nite. "Yep," he rewarbles, "An' Presyden Harry greeted him with hugs an' kisses. Like as not he thort to hisself 'Here is another feller we kin give away somethin' to. It's gittin' awtill hard to find somebuddy we kin give somethin' to any more—we about run every one of them Europeans through the chute an' we have plumb emptied the corral. It looks like Clem Attlee an' Morryson over in Brittain is got the skids

greased for 'em—an' while ol' Whinney Churchill ain't above takin' a few nickels from his American cousins he's got a sort of ol' fashioned idea that it's got to be paid back some time. It's sure fine we still have somebody who we kin give a helpin' hand to—so we kin raise taxes some. Of course I kin allus depend on Jo O My Money to help out there—but we got to have somebody to give the money to after we git it. Like as not that's why Harry opened his arms to the Eytalian." Greasewood kin still remember when these heer Eytalians was yellin' "Viva Moosoleeney!" Hopin' you are the same, I am,

Yure Fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

UMW Welfare Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the month just ahead, the Nation's vital coal industry will once more face the hazards of negotiating a contract by the coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America. One of the major factors to be determined will be the welfare and retirement fund covered in the present contract.

I would like my colleagues to know the great good that has resulted from the setting up of this fund, and in this connection I desire to include data covering the cost of the program and the many excellent services that are being rendered through its efficient administration:

UMW WELFARE FUND

The United Mine Workers welfare fund, source of 4 years of bitter strife, has amassed a surplus of nearly \$100,000,000, a financial report revealed yesterday.

Up to last June 30, the report showed, soft coal operators paid into the fund \$360,361,771.02 from royalties on coal mined. Out of this sum, the fund paid \$261,022,128.18 in benefits to miners and their families and administrative costs, leaving a balance of \$99,339,042.84.

Fund Director Josephine Roche said the unexpended balance has continued at about the same rate since June 30. She emphasized that during the full 4 years of the fund's life only \$7,003,862.23, or 2.7 percent of the total collected, was spent for administration. She said the administrative cost during the last fiscal year was 3.1 percent, due to increases in services as well as direct benefit payments.

Since May 26, 1946, when a welfare fund agreement was reached during Government operation of the mines, the fund has been supported by increasing royalties paid by the operators. Originally fixed at 5 cents a ton, these were increased in 1947 to 10 cents and in 1948 to 20 cents, and in 1949 to 30 cents a ton, where they now stand.

Miss Roche said that since payments from the fund were resumed after a long interruption a year ago, they have averaged \$9,000,000 a month. Before the fund ceased operations temporarily in September, 1949, she said, payments were averaging about \$12,000,000 a month. She credited the decrease to tightened operating rules and closer audits of hospital and medical bills.

The report showed the fund began fiscal 1951 with \$51,063,525 remaining from the previous year, collected \$129,873,885 in royalties, and during the year paid out \$79,329,132 in pensions, benefits to widows, and survivors and hospital and medical service. A total of 186,510 persons received benefits; 42,514 miners have received pensions; 23,949 death benefits have been paid to widows or other dependents of deceased miners; 16,188 aged widows are receiving cash assistance and hospital and medical care; 6,805 widows and orphans are receiving cash aid and medical and hospital service; 3,344 miners who have become ill or crippled because of mine work are being restored to physical and vocational usefulness again, and in addition to medical, hospital, and vocational care they are given cash assistance; 14,324 ill and aged miners receive cash aid; 899 miners paralyzed from the waist down or otherwise severely handicapped have been or are being rehabilitated at special treatment centers; 610,803 medical care services have been provided, and these include comprehensive hospital, medical, and surgical care, 4,500 miners or their dependents are being hospitalized each week; 1,296,000 hospital days have already been provided for miners and their dependents, for widows and orphans, and for the old and disabled.

Together with all the dependents, a total of 1,116,742 benefits have been provided.

Our Forgotten Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say a few words about our forgotten boys. In yesterday's paper, an obscure item on an inside sheet announced American battle casualties in the Korean war this week had reached 87,650, an increase of 2,181 since last week.

Baseball, football, and special committee investigations and reports have crowded war news to back pages. Such news has come to be commonplace. What kind of a shock will it take to bring this Nation to a realization of the terrible tragedy of Korea? Only yesterday it was noted that a suggestion had been made that a special committee be appointed to ascertain why more supplies were not being sent to General Eisenhower in Europe. In the name of our Korean dead, if any investigation is to be made, let us forget about Europe for a moment and investigate the supply situation in Korea.

Yes; I am familiar with the situation in Europe, but our boys are not dying by the thousands there. There is no war in Europe—certainly no shooting war.

Every day or so I note in the press where additional air forces are being sent to England and continental Europe. What about Korea? At the same time I read that the Reds are greatly increasing their air power in Korea.

It seems that all we can do is hope, pray, and trust our military leaders, but, if there is to be yet another investiga-

tion—let us investigate why so much is being sent to Europe at the present time, so much more than what is needed to keep our forces there in condition.

Frankly, I do not see how General Eisenhower has time these days to appraise the situation, there being only 24 hours in the day, even in Europe, what with the visits of numerous Members of Congress intent on securing inside information as to his political intentions. The general is certainly doing a fine job, and I imagine he would be better satisfied if his political well-wishers would let him alone, at least for a few more months. That, perhaps, would leave more shipping space for needed supplies and less for unneeded passengers.

I have always thought wars were fought with one purpose in mind—to win them. It is no consolation to anyone for some person to come up with the statement, "We are killing so many more Reds than they are killing of our boys." Place it on that basis and this war would go on for ages.

It is no good answer to merely say, "Congress didn't declare war"—we did not get the country into this thing. There is no use to go into that. We are in war. Hear me, war—the worst kind of war—call it the Korean incident or police action if you will, but do not call it by any such trite name should you happen to meet one of the nearly 100,000 casualties.

I have talked with privates, commissioned officers, and others who have been in the thick of it, some of them in World War II and a few in World War I, they say it is war in its most horrible form.

Let me get this Korean tragedy in proper focus. Let us clear up our perspective. Korea cries out for our attention—for relief for those brave boys fighting such a horribly futile fight thousands of miles from home. If we must have more investigations let us investigate where it will do Americans some good. Investigate this Korean tragedy from end to end. Thousands of hurting American hearts will applaud.

Industrialization Program in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of those present in this Chamber have heard or have read of the good work being done in Puerto Rico by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin and his administration. Since taking office in January 1948, he has instilled in his people a new hope and has inspired them into a vigorously active program to help themselves. This program has been aptly termed "Operation Bootstrap." Governor Muñoz has taught his people that the only way that they can advance their living standards is to help themselves. He has molded of his

people a mighty team for this laudable purpose.

Naturally, as is the case with every great man, Governor Muñoz gathered some enemies along the road toward success.

The insular government, endeavoring to grease the wheels of progress, adopted a tax-exemption law to aid and facilitate the establishment of new businesses in Puerto Rico in an industrialization program designed to relieve unemployment, Puerto Rico's great sickness. In order to qualify for tax-exemption, certain established standards were set up by law to be met by the new industries going to the island. One of these requirements is that the industry must, in fact, be a new industry and not merely a business moving to the island from the mainland.

The industrialization program has not been in operation long enough to have taken care of all the unemployment in Puerto Rico, but it has made significant progress.

Recently, there have been some indications that certain interests, anxious for private gain or nursing private grudges, have attempted to smear Governor Muñoz personally, his administration, and his program. Having visited the island on official business for the Congress, twice within the past 2 years, and having observed the industrious and ambitious efforts of the Puerto Rican people to help themselves, I say that they should be given every bit of help and encouragement. They should not be handicapped by adverse publicity, by smear tactics, or by any other means.

In the September 13 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I noted in the Appendix an insertion of a so-called report on conditions in Puerto Rico rendered to the TIES Association and the TIES Research Foundation, both of Miami, Fla., by one Chester Wright, who, I understand, is the recently elected president of that association. The TIES association is identified as a group of technicians, industrialists, economists, and scientists. This report constituted an attack on the administration of Governor Muñoz-Marín as being that of an absolute dictatorship. In my opinion, nothing could be further from the truth.

It is not necessary to take up the assertions in this report one by one, paragraph by paragraph, but it did strike me that the name of the head of a continental firm doing business in Puerto Rico, occupied a very considerable portion of this report by Chester Wright.

I was pleased to find in the Appendix of the October 1 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another insertion taking the Wright report to task, and suggesting some of the reasons which possibly inspired that report. The Chester Wright report has been refuted by a number of persons and many organizations which have real knowledge of the island of Puerto Rico.

The Puerto Rican Chamber of Commerce at a special meeting held September 17, 1951, unanimously approved the following resolution:

The Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico, always watchful that the good credit of this island be not at any moment or under any circumstances affected by motives impairing our own welfare, declares that at the pres-

ent time Puerto Rico offers full guarantees and opportunities to both capital and labor to develop their activities under the democratic government which rules in this island. Therefore our institution once more invites investors abroad to continue pursuing our island with greater intensity, and, for their benefit as well as ours, their commercial, industrial, banking, and agricultural activities, in conformity with the advantages of a legal order which are offered by the government of Puerto Rico.

In a letter dated September 18, 1951, Mr. B. Hiram Blakey, the president of the Miami Chamber of Commerce, wrote to Fernando Rodríguez, president of the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce, as follows:

The Miami Chamber of Commerce this morning is in receipt of your telegram reemphasizing the guarantees and opportunities to both capital and labor to develop their activities under the democratic government which rules Puerto Rico. You can be assured that the officers and staff of the Miami Chamber of Commerce will continue to work with you, your general manager, Mr. Lugovina, and your chamber of commerce and government officials, in the trade and business programs with which we have been connected during the past 5 years.

I think you will also be happy to read the resolution adopted yesterday afternoon by the board of directors of the Miami Chamber of Commerce. We deplore the unfortunate publicity resulting from a report made by one individual that apparently completely lacks factual basis and are glad to repledge to you and the people of Puerto Rico our continued friendship.

The resolution of the Miami Chamber of Commerce is as follows:

"Whereas it has recently come to the attention of the Miami Chamber of Commerce that a citizen of the Miami area has assumed the responsibility for criticizing the Governor and the Government of the island of Puerto Rico and its government operations; and

"Whereas the Miami Chamber of Commerce recognizes and applauds the close and cordial relationship existing between the people of Puerto Rico and the citizens of Miami, the State of Florida, and, in fact, of the entire United States, and in appreciation of that cordial relationship resolves,

"(a) That the Miami Chamber of Commerce deplores the recent and unfortunate publicity resulting from statements made by a private individual in Miami pertaining to the Governor and the Government of Puerto Rico and further

"(b) This chamber of commerce hereby expresses its full support of the rights of the Puerto Rican voters to elect and maintain in office a government of their own choice and pledges its continued friendship with the people of Puerto Rico."

Adopted September 17, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these resolutions speak for themselves.

Our Greatest Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGLIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to note that there is a widespread awakening to the fact that we

have been gradually drifting into a situation where moral values and a sense of decency, not only in everyday living but also in Government, are being either forgotten or neglected. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the *Melrose* (Mass.) Free Press of September 20, 1951:

OUR GREATEST DANGER

Herbert Hoover's most recent major address dealt with the subject of honor in public life. In the course of it, the ex-President said this: "Dishonor in public life has a double poison. When people are dishonorable in private business, they injure only those with whom they deal or their own chances in the next world. But when there is a lack of honor in Government, the morals of the whole people are poisoned"

"Our strength is not in politics, prices, or production, or price controls. Our strength lies in spiritual concepts. It lies in public sensitiveness to evil"

"The issue is decency in public life against indecency."

"Our greatest danger is not from invasion by foreign armies. Our dangers are that we may commit suicide from within by complacency with evil. Or by public tolerance of scandalous behavior. Or by cynical acceptance of dishonor. These evils have defeated nations many times in human history."

"The redemption of mankind by America will depend upon our ability to cope with these evils right here at home."

Remember that next time you read of 5 percenters, milk coat and deep freeze gifts to Government officials and employees, sordid tie-ups between politicians and gamblers, and morally indefensible activities within the RFC and other Government agencies. These things are terrible symbols of moral decay. As Mr. Hoover has eloquently warned, that decay could destroy us more surely than any foreign enemy.

Withholding Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the *Jonesboro* (Ark.) Evening Sun of September 26, 1951:

WITHHOLDING COTTON

A farm labor organization official Monday accused 100 Congressmen of promoting a scandalous wildcat strike by signing a statement urging farmers to withhold their 1951 cotton from the market until they can get a higher price.

This same H. L. Mitchell charged that the action is an unprecedented plot to wreck our national economy in the hour of our greatest effort to combat communism.

Mr. Mitchell apparently has forgotten all too soon that last fall the Government sounded an urgent plea to the cotton farmers to convert as much land to cotton as possible in order to produce at least 16,500,000 bales. This huge crop was needed to help the free nations of the world in their fight against armed Communist aggression, the Government pointed out. The Government also hinted to the farmer that he would get,

about 40 cents a pound for his cotton if he met the goal.

So the farmers went all out to meet the Government's emergency plea, and have passed the goal by several hundred thousand bales, according to estimates.

But the price on cotton has slipped well below the 40-cent level that the farmers expected. Their only recourse is to withhold enough cotton to force the price upward.

A Jonesboro farmer recently, pointing to a bale he had just gotten ginned, explained that he had paid \$6 a day to cotton choppers, had dusted five times, and still lost much of his crop to boll weevils, and had paid big money to get it picked. He added, "It's 40-cent cotton, all right, but I can't sell it for more than 30 cents a pound today."

That's why the farmer is withholding his cotton. The small farmer and the tenant in the South can't stand a loss of any kind. They operate largely on borrowed money, and a short crop leaves them penniless throughout the winter. That disrupts the entire economy of the South.

It seems to be much sounder economy, in this section at least, for the farmer to hold part of his cotton until he can come out on it than it does for him to sell it at the prevailing prices.

"F-51 Mustangs Are Taking Off Laden With Rockets and Napalm Bombs on Strafing Missions in Korea: Along With Our Jets and Bombers They Succeeded in One 24-Hour Period This Week End in Destroying or Damaging a Record-Breaking 1,121 Communist Trucks Ferrying Supplies and Reinforcements to the Front"—Battle Report, Washington

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, today we come to the fifty-seventh teledocumentary of Battle Report, Washington, projected by Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, and the National Broadcasting Co. over its television network and coaxials.

Dr. Steelman, out of a workweek wherein his associates count his rest and recreation almost by the minute rather than by the hour, has once more brought to the television screen important personages to make direct report to the American people upon the current state of the Union.

Once again on Sunday afternoon, when most men in important positions are enjoying a pleasant interlude with their friends and families, finding several hours of relaxation on the golf course, or else perchance rolling across the highways in the zest, the tang, of autumn breezes, and the beauty of autumn leaves, we find Dr. Steelman under the klieg lights in the sweltering television studio, rapt with interest, always kindly, ever thoughtful. He is simply carrying on in his own inimitable way

the duties to which he has dedicated his every waking moment.

The engineers and the technicians of the National Broadcasting Co. love him because of his great consideration for all in the studio—from the lowest messenger to the highest public dignitary that he brings to the television screen on this weekly broadcast.

How truly appreciative of John Steelman's devotion to duty was a colleague of this House only last week when he said:

Frank, America has no finer citizen, a more capable or harder working public official at any level of Government, or does anyone in public office in these United States merit greater respect from persons in high office throughout the world than Dr. John Steelman.

Mr. Speaker, on this week's teledocumentary Dr. Steelman had as his guests Maj. Pak Byung Soon, of the Army of the Republic of Korea; Hon. W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President; Mr. Homer M. Byington, Jr., Director of Western European Affairs for our State Department; and Hon. Delos W. Rentzel, Under Secretary of Commerce.

Always conscious of the humanities, in his introduction of Maj. Pak Byung Soon Dr. Steelman spoke of the countless numbers of homes in Korea which are in ashes, of the shops and factories that are piles of rubble, and of the millions of innocent men, women, and children who are homeless, and pointed out to his vast television audience that no man could tell the tragic story better than could one of the heroes of the South Korean Army.

Mr. Harriman spoke with great feeling on the tense situation existing with respect to the oil controversy raging between Britain and Iran and which now comes to a head in the councils of the United Nations. He discussed the optimum use of the resources of all countries signatory to the North Atlantic Pact organization and of how these resources could best be utilized under General Eisenhower's command both to deter aggression and to attain national security.

In concluding his splendid analysis of conditions in Europe and Asia, Mr. Harriman declared.

Our task is to make recommendations as to how the available economic resources of the member countries can best be utilized to develop military forces under General Eisenhower's command needed to deter aggression and attain our mutual security.

Just home from Europe, the Director of Western European Affairs for the State Department, Mr. Homer M. Byington, addressed himself as to the benefits that will accrue to Italian agriculture, industry, and finance in creating internal stability as well as to a discussion with respect to the recent visit of Italy's Prime Minister, Alcide De Gasperi, to the United States.

The Under Secretary of Commerce, Delos W. Rentzel, made a most interesting report with respect to the transportation facilities of these United States: railroads, pipelines, ships, trains, busses, automobiles, trucks, and airplanes. Briefly and concisely, he presented a word picture of the accomplishments

made and the objectives yet to be achieved in perfecting all systems of transportation as well as of the merchant marine of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that there is so much contained in this fifty-seventh copy of the Battle Report, Washington, of an estimable value to my colleagues in this House that I am asking unanimous consent to insert same in the Record of this day's proceedings.

The producer-director of this program is Ted Ayers; the assistant producer, Jean Montgomery; technical director, Sherman Hildreth; commentaries, David Brinkley and Bill Wood; the script is written by Lou Hazam; film editor, Bill Brooks, floor manager, John Johnson; art director, Joseph Ferrier; and sound by Jim Martensen.

Mr. BRINKLEY On goes the fight for Heartbreak Ridge in Korea, whose commanding peak still defies our troops. As the Second Division's Twenty-third Regiment and their French allies continue their assault, NBC Television News continues its weekly report on the battle against Soviet communism.

Washington, from which Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, left secretly this week to confer with Gen. Matthew Ridgway on important military decisions that face us in Korea, and the world, which wonders, as the Reds launch a new series of attacks along a 60-mile front, how sincere the Communists are about resuming the truce conferences they broke off 1 month and 5 days ago.

On Battle Report, this last and far-from-peaceful Sunday in September, Maj. Pak Byung Soon, with a Korean's-eye view of the struggle that occupies his homeland; W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to President Truman, reporting on his new mission concerned with our European defense plans; Homer M. Byington, the State Department's Director of Western European Affairs, bringing us up to date on the status of Italy in the family of free nations, and finally, the Nation's transportation czar, Delos W. Rentzel.

But first the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentleman.

In these troubled days it behooves all of us to remember that the first aim of our foreign policy is to prevent war. We not only are trying to prevent a world-wide war, but also any war, anywhere. That does not mean, of course, that we can stand by idly and watch aggressive powers destroy their weaker neighbors. We believe that force should be used only to serve the cause of justice and only when all peaceful efforts have failed.

In the words of the Secretary of State, "Our purpose is peace with freedom and justice. Our method is to build these situations of strength which are essential to the achievement of our purpose. This is based on our conviction that the desire for peace is not enough; the free world must also have the strength to enforce peace."

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is an outstanding example of a great peace movement. All Western Europe was threatened. As long as our friends in Europe remained weak they were logical prey for the aggressors. So the free nations have united in a gigantic effort to build impregnable defenses behind which a peaceful world of plenty can be built.

Our efforts to have the Iranian oil dispute settled by peaceful negotiations is another part of the struggle to prevent wars. Everyone knows the danger there. Not only are the economic needs of both Britain and Iran

imperiled, but also their national pride. There is still hope. Our representatives are working tirelessly to prevent any act which might cause bloodshed. Let us pray a just agreement can be reached around the conference table.

In Korea the well-known Communist tactics to cause delay and confusion are proceeding according to the Moscow pattern. We can only watch and wait until they realize they have nothing to gain by such actions. Meanwhile, the bitter fighting continues. Conspicuous in the news have been the activities of the Communist jet planes which are challenging our superiority in the air. Returning airmen report the enemy is using a new high wing super MIG which has not been seen heretofore. Currently, we do not know whether these air attacks are the prelude to an all-out war or if they are a bargaining point for the long delayed cease-fire negotiations. Men in the field continue to suffer and to die. Countless numbers of homes are in ashes; shops and factories are piles of rubble. Millions of innocent men, women, and children are homeless. No one knows the tragic story better than the heroes of the South Korean Army. One of them is with us today. He is Maj. Pak Byung Soon, who reached here only last Monday.

At 9 a. m. last Monday 263 Republic of Korea officers arrived in San Francisco aboard the United States Army transport *General John Pope*. These Korean officers have come to this country as part of the mutual defense aid program, a world-wide interchange of officers and technicians designed to improve the understanding and cooperation between all of the allied free nations. One of these Korean officers is Maj. Pak Byung Soon, commander of the First Engineer Battalion in the First Division in the Republic of Korea Army. Major Pak has come to Fort Belvoir, Va., home of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, to study and absorb the latest methods employed by our soldiers and technicians. Major Pak, just how large is the Corps of Engineers in the Korean Army?

Maj. PAK. Before the war he had very few engineers; now we have about six times the number we originally had.

Dr. STEELMAN. With all the fighting the Republic of Korea Army has done, I imagine your battalion has suffered heavy casualties.

Major PAK. Yes; it has. Of the original 730 men in my command, only about 150 have survived; that is, about one-fifth of the original troops. However, we have replacements, and the situation is much better now than it has been in the past. We have much better equipment to work with and the men are more carefully trained.

Dr. STEELMAN. Would you say that the primary need of the engineers is for more equipment rather than more men?

Major PAK. Yes; the Korean engineers have enough men to fight effectively, what they now need are the tools to fight with. We are constantly getting more equipment and training more technicians. We are much better now than we were a year ago. We are better than we were 6 months ago and we are improving all the time as new equipment arrives.

Dr. STEELMAN. Can you tell us something about what the Korean engineers are doing now?

Major PAK. We have one large project under way that is rather interesting. An engineer battalion is building four double-lane, all-weather roads. When the project has been completed, we will have constructed many miles of new highway.

Dr. STEELMAN. Major Pak, most of us are very curious to know just what life in Korea has been like in the past few months. Can you give us a sort of general picture of what your people are going through?

Major PAK. Americans have no idea what it is like to live in a country where Communist agents are constantly at work. In

every city, town, and even in small villages, informers spy on an assigned area. They make lists of all anti-Communists in their neighborhood: city officials, such as the chief of police; soldiers of the Republican army; and all those who have aided the forces of the United Nations. These names are taken down and kept so that when the Communists capture a town or village all of the people can be punished. Many important officials may be killed, many people imprisoned, and many may simply disappear. One of the lightest punishments is that given to families of soldiers fighting in the South Korean Army: everything they own—clothes, furniture, valuables—is taken away from them and distributed to Communist sympathizers.

Dr. STEELMAN. Do the Communists offer any reason for doing this?

Major PAK. In North Korea the Communists say they do this to make everyone equal, but their equality is based on the level of the poor class of people so that everyone must take on the appearance of being poor. If you own a bit of jewelry—a ring, a necktie, stickpin, a fine wrist watch—you cannot wear it in public or the Government might take it away from you or add so many taxes to you that you would lose it. Anyone seen wearing a good suit of clothes on the street might be suspected of prosperity and investigated. This Communist equality is something the people do not like for it pulls everyone down instead of building them up.

Dr. STEELMAN. Major Pak, can you tell us something about what the Communists do when one of our bombing squadrons blasts one of their airstrips?

Major PAK. Civilians are forced to repair it. The Communists go through a village or town and take out everyone who can walk—old men, women, children—and make them repair the airfield, and they stay there until the job is finished. Those refusing to go are punished—more often killed.

Dr. STEELMAN. With life so difficult for civilians under the Communists, do many of them try to escape to the South?

Major PAK. Yes; the roads are often crowded with refugees; some of them are young men bitter over the treatment they and their families have suffered. They come south to join the Army fighting the Communists. In my own battalion we have about 150 North Koreans.

Dr. STEELMAN. North Koreans who have joined with you to destroy the Red armies in Korea?

Major PAK. This is correct. Refugees have created other problems too. Because of the destruction war has brought to the buildings in the towns of the country and because there are so many refugees in the South, the housing situation is critical. We no longer think in terms of having a house to live in. If we have one room in a house we consider ourselves lucky. For example, my wife and year-old son, my mother, and sister are all living in a single room located near Pusan.

Dr. STEELMAN. Major can you sum up for us the feeling of the people of Korea today?

Major PAK. Before the war there were many people in Korea with many different political ideas. They often quarreled among themselves. Since the coming of the Communists, two distinct sides have been drawn—the Reds and those loyal to democracy. Sometimes families have been broken up because of conflicting loyalties, brother fighting brother, father against son. In the south the people have united against a common enemy. The Koreans believe it is essential for them and for all the United Nations to combine their efforts to stop the spread of communism. If we do not work together, the Communists will pick us off one by one and Korea, as well as the rest of the world, will not be a good place in which to live.

Mr. BRINKLEY. These are British jets on the Mediterranean island of Cyprus—pointed

toward Iran, only a few flying hours away. The eyes of a worried world are upon them this week end as the oil controversy hits a new climax when Iran locks British technicians out of the huge refinery at Abadan.

One word from London, and these RAF Meteor and Vampire jets can, by entering Iran, give Russia a treaty-based excuse to enter Iran herself. Meanwhile, off the coast of Cyprus, the British battleship *Liverpool* goes through training maneuvers, just in case it should be called upon to steam into Abadan's harbor. Only recently returned from Iran, where he strove vainly to mediate this conflict, comes our next guest. No stranger to tough assignments, he takes on a new mission now as United States representative of the special North Atlantic Council committee designed to make a realistic study of the defense capabilities of all NATO members. Now, Special Assistant to the President W. Averell Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. The oil controversy between Britain and Iran has now come to a head in the councils of the United Nations. During the past months, there has been speculation in the international press as to whether the difficulties would lead to the use of force.

Now that the British Government has taken the case to the Security Council, we can feel this danger is set aside. One of the principal difficulties is that the emotions of the people of Iran have been aroused during the past several years while the controversy has developed, and, in fact, the emotions of the British people as well.

The controversy looks quite different to the people of each country.

On the one hand, the Iranians desire to control their great natural resources and are determined to carry out the nationalization of the industry; whereas to the British it looks more like a breach of contract and confiscation of a very large investment which is important to the economic life of Britain.

Dr. Mossadegh, the Prime Minister of Iran, is himself coming to New York to represent this country.

Let us hope that in the atmosphere of the United Nations—that great organization dedicated to peaceful settlements—a new approach may be found which will lead to a satisfactory conclusion.

From my experience with the controversy when I was in Iran last summer, I do not feel that the differences are irreconcilable, but with good will on all sides an equitable solution can be found.

I am leaving next week for Paris to represent our Government on a special committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Our task is to make recommendations as to how the available economic resources of the member countries can best be utilized to develop military forces under General Eisenhower's command, needed to deter aggression and attain our mutual security.

In considering the principle of mutual assistance to which we are all pledged, we Americans should understand certain factors that exist in Western Europe.

Although Europe is next to ourselves the greatest workshop in the world, the total production, even if Germany is included, is less than half of ours, and, on a per capita basis, is only about one-third. To put it another way, the European countries, with their larger population, have the manpower but not the available industrial capacity to produce rapidly all of the modern equipment which is now so essential for effective military forces.

With only a third of the per capita income that we have, it is far more difficult for the people of Europe to divert the efforts needed to build the required military forces.

Under the mutual-security bill, which will be voted on by Congress in the next few days, we are planning to contribute to Europe an amount equal to about 10 percent of the

money that has been voted for our own Military Establishment.

In other words, with this much smaller expenditure, we can assist in the development of forces as large as ours, in numbers of men.

The primary objective of all of us is that our combined military strength will be a deterrent to aggression and another world war can be prevented. It is my personal conviction that when we are strong enough the Soviet leaders will be forced to change their aggressive policies.

The total production of the Soviet Union and its European satellites is probably only about a quarter of the output of the North Atlantic community.

In my opinion, the Kremlin will not be able to continue to force its people to bear the enormous burden of maintaining its large military forces indefinitely.

No one can foresee the long future, but it is clear that, for the next few years, we must continue vigorously in our mutual plans for building defensive forces.

When this is accomplished, we can look forward with hope to living in peace and security.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Scene now—France, where joint Allied maneuvers, the largest since General Eisenhower took command of the forces of the North Atlantic Pact nations, got under way last week. Over a thousand Allied planes, including 700 jet fighters, swept over Europe from the North Sea to the Alps. Object: to test new concepts of air defense. On the ground, in separate maneuvers taking place at the same time, more than 150,000 United States, British, and French troops armed with 30,000 tanks, armored cars, and other vehicles moved against the French zone of Germany to fight an imaginary enemy presumed to have crossed the Rhine. Part of our new strength in Europe, and an increasingly important part, is our erstwhile enemy, Italy. Only last week her premier visited here in Washington and addressed our Congress. For an informed report on how Italy today is backing the free world, here is the Director of Western European Affairs for our State Department, Homer Byington.

Mr. BYINGTON. Four years ago Italy's Prime Minister, Alcide de Gasperi, visited the United States to ask for American aid to help rebuild his country. The United States responded to his appeal and the prime minister returned to Italy with assurances of our support.

During these past 4 years our aid has helped Italy make good progress in agriculture, in industry, in finance, and in creating internal stability. The heavy damage caused by the war has been repaired with energy and hard work. The Italian people are now devoting that same energy and hard work to the tasks ahead.

Prime Minister de Gasperi in 1947 ousted Italian Communists from his cabinet. Thus, Italy's Government no longer includes ministers who brazenly masquerade communism under the picture of that symbol of liberty, Giuseppe Garibaldi. The Italy which Prime Minister de Gasperi leads today rightly claims its position in the forefront of the democratic nations working for peace.

There still remains, however, the shadow of the peace treaty which is the result of a disastrous war. In that regard, a historic step marked Prime Minister de Gasperi's visit to Washington this past week. The United States, United Kingdom, and France have started action concerning the treaty which will give Italy the full status among the free nations to which it is now entitled. The spirit of the treaty and its stigma of inequality are most unjust to the new democratic Italy. The treaty also cripples Italian efforts for the common defense of the North Atlantic community. It denies Italian workmen the opportunity to use

their energy and skill in defense production for the free world. Our action opens the way to more employment for Italian manpower. It also opens the way to increased activity in Italian shipyards and factories. Italia's production will take a larger part in the joint efforts to create an adequate defense against aggression, and thereby to insure security against the danger of war.

The step taken by the three Governments in their declaration with regard to the treaty of peace marks the beginning of the end of those permanent restrictions and discriminations against Italy which have been overtaken by events and have no justification under present circumstances. Together with all the other signatories who agree with us we shall remove them so far as our relations with Italy are concerned.

When the Italian Prime Minister returns to Italy he takes with him an encouraging report of our Government's recognition of what Italy has accomplished. The President of the United States has declared that if the Soviet Union keeps on vetoing Italian membership in the United Nations other ways must be found to enable Italy to play a full and equal part in upholding the principles of the United Nations. De facto revision of the Italian Peace Treaty is now a matter of weeks and we do not intend to let Soviet obstacles be put in our way. The Prime Minister will also be able to tell his people that the United States will continue economic aid within the limits of funds appropriated by the Congress. This aid will help Italy gain greater economic strength and social stability, and increase its capacity for the defense of its freedom and independence.

In his speech before Congress, Prime Minister de Gasperi stated in no uncertain terms that, if attacked despite all efforts at conciliation, Italy would fight and contribute to the common defense. While in Washington, the Italian Prime Minister also discussed with our Government various other problems of Europe, including Germany and European integration. These discussions revealed that American views were similar to Italy's. His visit has contributed greatly to full understanding between our two countries.

Together with Italy and the other free democracies we shall create the strength and unity essential to confront the threat of aggression which now menaces all corners of the world. Only by this means will we prevent a third world war and establish enduring peace.

Mr. BRINKLEY. F-51 Mustangs, taking off laden with rockets and napalm bombs on strafing missions in Korea. Along with our jets and bombers, they succeeded, in one 24-hour period this week end, in destroying or damaging a record-breaking 1,121 Communist trucks ferrying supplies and reinforcements to the front.

Charged with the responsibility of seeing that essential materials for these and other fighting arms of our services move with dispatch across the country is the man our cameras pick out next. He is the Nation's "transportation czar," Under Secretary of Commerce Delos W. Rentzel.

Mr. RENTZEL. In a country as big as ours we need good transportation and plenty of it. We have it now. And we will have more of it in the not too distant future. Today, our transportation facilities dwarf those of any other nation. We have 226,000 miles of main-line railroads, more than 30 percent of all the railroads in the world. We have 358,000 miles of improved inland waterways and 165,000 miles of pipeline. We have the ships, the trains, busses, automobiles, trucks, and the airplanes to amply use these facilities, every one of which benefits from Federal cooperation and assistance, either past or present. Since early post roads and canal days, the Federal Government never has lost sight of the vital importance of transportation to

the national economic development and well-being. There are 13 Federal agencies directly concerned with transportation problems. Six are in the Department of Commerce. They are the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Maritime Administration, Bureau of Public Roads, Inland Waterways, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Weather Bureau.

At this time of mounting international tension, our country is rapidly mobilizing its vast resources and productive capacity to help maintain world peace. The heavy drain upon our various forms of transportation, to keep abreast of increasing demands, poses a serious challenge to both the private transportation industry and the Federal Government. Through continued cooperation much is being done at present to solve these problems.

Recently Battle Report reviewed merchant marine operations across the Pacific. So today we will look at what makes up all segments of our vast transportation system and how it works.

Mr. WOOD. To a nation confronted with global war, transportation lines become truly lifelines. It is along these lifelines that we move to the defense of our freedoms amid the challenges of 1951.

The truck that lumbers cross country along route 1 is not just a truck; it is a breastplate in the armor that buttresses American liberty.

The steel rails that set our every which way across the continent marking the path for our trains also mark, like the human bloodstream's diagram, the way by which we feed our strength.

And finally the planes that birdlike are borne along unseen routes are just as surely flying a tried and tested road in behalf of the Nation.

Transportation, the arteries of our defense. No part of our Nation is unknown to our railroads as they keep on the move the essential food, fuel, and goods that keep us sound and strong.

In critical today as in World War II, when they carried more than 90 percent of all military freight, they are backing our forces in Korea and wherever else freedom is challenged throughout the world with the stuff of which victory is made, men as well as material. To move just one division of our armed forces from training camp to embarkation point, you, America, demand of your railroads, and receive, 570 pullman cars, 1,422 flatcars, 201 gondola cars, 82 kitchen cars, 40 boxcars, 82 baggage cars.

What is our rail situation now as compared with World War II? Listen. A third of a million new freight cars placed in service, 4,300 new passenger trains, a billion and a half dollars worth of new locomotives. Yes; should Stalin challenge, our railroads are ready.

How about our civil airlines? It has been written, and it is true, that the greatest airlift reserve in the world today is to be found in the fleet of the scheduled airlines of the United States.

Each month, from Key West coast air bases, hundreds such planes have been flying critically needed freight and military personnel to the far-eastern war front.

The trucking industry of America, boasting more than eight million trucks, serving not only the military but business, farms, and homes, is today answering the Nation's needs on a scale that wasn't even dreamed of 20 years ago.

Quickly responding to this present emergency, America's truckers gave the Army expedited service, something the Nation didn't have before—war goods trucked east coast to west coast in a record-breaking 5 days.

Not content with this alone, other special trucking services were devised, such as this automobile transport unit. Today it

carries up to 14 jeep trailers from plants in Chicago to troop centers the country over.

Today everything we eat, wear, or use is carried part of the way to its final destination by this comparatively young arm of the Nation's transport.

In such spinning wheels as these, then, see in your mind's eye America's modern workhorses providing the Nation in these crucial times with a transportation pattern that has no equal.

Mr. RENTZEL You have had but a glimpse of the complex activities of our great transportation system, the finest and most efficient in the world. Yet today we are faced with many problems arising from the expanding mobilization effort. So far our transportation facilities have proved adequate for handling the mounting volumes of traffic, but new problems continue to arise. Their solution depends upon material supply and the manpower available for new equipment construction and operation.

The railroads are faced with growing shortages. To meet their immediate needs during the third quarter of this year, construction plans included 900 Diesel locomotives, 25,000 tank cars, and 30,000 freight cars. To offset to some extent production lags, all segments of the railroad industry must work together for better utilization and improved scheduling.

Highway freight traffic, double that of 10 years ago continues to rise. There is no current truck shortage, but further expansion of trucking operations may be impaired by highway deterioration. The United States Bureau of Public Roads is currently channeling critical material mainly to highways of first importance to mobilization activities. There are 15,056 miles of Federal-aid highways now under construction—and plans have been approved for 5,897 miles.

Great Lakes shipping, particularly of ore, has substantially increased. Despite inadequate capacity, operators have met their schedules. Expanded overseas shipping requires new merchant vessels of high speed and mobility. Present construction includes some 35 dry-cargo type and 26 tankers.

To increase the flow of crude oil and avoid bottlenecks, over 16,500 miles of additional pipelines are planned for construction.

Air traffic also has climbed over 30 percent. Increased civil and military use of the airways and terminals has brought about a common system of air navigation and traffic control that assures more rapid movement of aircraft regardless of weather.

From this round-up of our national transportation system and its potential, it is evident that this system provides the arteries of our economy and security. We want no hardening of these arteries. We do want an increasing flow of the vital blood of commerce at home and abroad.

Mr. BRINKLEY Thanks to Bill Wood for his special narration on this program, and, until we again turn our cameras upon the Nation's Capital next Sunday to report on the battle of democracy against world communism, this is David Brinkley putting a period on your fifty-seventh Battle Report, Washington.

The Late Maj. Gen. Robert McKune Vail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my solemn obligation to memorialize with-

in this RECORD the sad occasion of the death of a neighbor, a great Pennsylvanian, Wednesday, October 3, 1951, Maj. Gen. Robert McKune Vail. I had the honor to know General Vail for my 20 years in the legislature for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pa., and was fortunate enough to have his close friendship during that period and since my entry into this congressional body and until his death. The following can somewhat summarize his career:

ILLNESS IS FATAL TO GEN. R. M. VAIL—HIS MILITARY CAREER COVERED 45 YEARS

Maj. Gen. Robert McKune Vail, 76, a native of Scranton and one of Pennsylvania's most distinguished citizen-soldiers, has been claimed by death.

General Vail succumbed yesterday at his home at Camp Hill, Dauphin County, after a long illness.

A former commander of the One Hundred and Ninth Infantry Regiment and possessor of a distinguished war record, General Vail was also a former State adjutant general, one-time superintendent of the Wilkes-Barre division, Scranton-Spring Brook Water Service Co., and also served for a time as United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

General Vail, who was adjutant general during the administration of Gov. Edward Martin, resided at Indiantown Gap prior to taking up residence at Camp Hill last June. He lived for many years at Kingston.

His military career, which covered a span of 45 years, began March 16, 1894, when he enlisted as a private in Company D of the old Thirtieth Regiment.

General Vail fought in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Mexican Expedition before his World War I service.

Commissioned as a captain and made regimental adjutant of the Thirtieth Regiment on October 4, 1904, he was advanced to the rank of lieutenant colonel in 1918.

During World War I he served with the One Hundred and Eighth Machine Gun Battalion of the Twenty-eighth Division. His courage in combat won high military honors.

On September 5, 1918, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism in action near Villetle, France.

WOUNDED IN ACTION

One month later he was wounded in action during the Meuse Argonne offensive and thus earned the Purple Heart. He also was honored by the French Government which conferred upon him the French d'Honneur and the French Croix de Guerre. After the war he was advanced to the rank of full colonel and placed in command of the One Hundred and Ninth Regiment.

Later he became a brigadier general in command of the Fifty-third Field Artillery Brigade. On his sixty-fourth birthday anniversary, April 24, 1939, General Vail was promoted to major general and was retired on that date.

General Vail was associated with the public utility firm for 40 years and retired as superintendent.

He also served a term as State department commander of the American Legion and was a former president of the Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club.

His term as United States marshal ran from 1929 to 1932. His selection for the Federal post came upon the recommendation of the late United States Senator David A. Reed.

General Vail, who served in the Mexican War with Senator MARTIN, served as adjutant general in Governor MARTIN's cabinet from 1943 to 1947.

Prior to that he served as deputy adjutant general under former Gov. Arthur H.

James, being appointed October 1, 1940, and as acting adjutant general from February 20, 1941, until January 19, 1943, when he assumed full command.

During those years he became known as one of the best-liked officials on Capitol Hill. On at least two occasions his name was mentioned prominently for appointment as commander of the Pennsylvania State Police and, on one occasion, he declined that appointment.

General Vail, who was born in Scranton, received his early education in this city and was graduated from the Binghamton high school. He also was graduated from business college.

He is survived by his wife, the former Helene G. Hull, and a son, John, a member of the Kingston High School faculty, a sister Mrs. Stanley B. Michael, this city; and a brother, Rossman I. Vail, Maplewood, N. J.

Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the following press release from the Brooklyn council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, issued by its county commander, Vincent J. DiMattina. It points up a very serious problem. Unless the mortgage strike by some of our lending institutions is called off they will find that the Government will make the loans directly to veterans as presently provided by law.

The release is as follows:

County Commander Vincent J. DiMattina, of Brooklyn Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars today demanded that the Federal Government begin granting 4-percent mortgage loans to World War II veterans in the metropolitan area unless local banks immediately cease charging veterans higher interest rates on what should be properly classified as 4-percent GI mortgages.

Reporting that a series of complaints on the subject had come to his attention, DiMattina pointed out that the Veterans' Administration already had congressional authority to grant direct 4-percent loans to qualified veterans in areas where it was deemed that a shortage of 4-percent mortgage money exists.

The VFW leader said that he intends to apprise Brooklyn's nine-man congressional delegation of the shortage here.

He termed the apparent need for Federal intervention in this community a disgrace which could only be wiped out by a forthright reversal of policy on the part of our great lending institutions.

DiMattina explained that his organization had been receiving an increasing number of reports that banks have been turning down qualified veterans' applications for 4-percent GI mortgages but have been offering the same veterans home loans at 4½ percent and higher interest rates.

Such action on the part of lending institutions, DiMattina asserted, is a betrayal of the veterans' trust in the financial leaders of this great city.

The turn-down on 4-percent loans, in many instances, have been based on the flimsiest of excuses including a statement that veterans were not eligible for GI loans unless they were already depositors in the particular bank from which a mortgage loan was being sought, DiMattina said.

We Jump Into Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House considered and passed a bill providing for an appropriation to improve the Forest Fire Station at Missoula, Mont. I spoke in favor of the legislation and in the course of my discussion I referred to an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of April 28, 1951, and which was written by my nephew, Starr Jenkins, who was for some time a fire jumper working out of the fire station at Missoula.

In this article he graphically describes one of the fire fighting battles in which he took part. His story must have had some merit else the Saturday Evening Post would not have accepted it. In the remarks that I made I referred to one very tragic incident which he describes. Several Members of the House suggested that I have his story printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am doing so believing that since he was at that time employed by the Government at the Missoula station it will be interesting and pertinent. The incidents that he describes are the every day work of these heroic young men.

The story is as follows:

WE JUMP INTO FIRE

(By Starr Jenkins)

I'm up in the hot sun cutting a tin valley drain for the new loft roof we're putting on when the call comes in "Eight men on Yellowstone Park. One plane load. Cole, Jenkins, Samsel, Hall, Hellman, Bennett, Piper, Thol. Get your gear and let's go. Fire jump."

It is 1.40 on a summer afternoon. The Forest Service parachute loft, at Missoula, Mont., is having a busy week. Fires are popping all over the region, and planes are shuttling men out to jump and back home to rest as long as daylight will let them. We're running out of jump rations and have to order truckloads of C rations from War Surplus, and the riggers are working overtime to get the chutes packed as those big white bundles of loose nylon come in. One fabulous Thursday within the last few weeks 64 men jumped on fires scattered over the wild 25,000,000 acres that is the Forest Service's region 1, and a week later 34 men were dropped in twos and fours and sometimes dozens from the Gallatin Forest, down near Wyoming, to the Kaniksu, up in Washington State.

"All right, you guys, Shank will be spotting you, and you'll land at West Yellowstone to pick up the park man. He'll show you where the fires are. Four small ones they're supposed to be—little lightning strikes. He'll have maps for you and give you your best routes out. Now get that gear into the plane."

We've been loading a pick-up with half a ton of equipment: Back-pack chutes in white canvas covers; chest-pack reserves, compact and olive drab with red rip rings; big bulky sacks that contain our canvas jump suits, helmets, let-down ropes and harnesses. Fire packs with rations, canteens, flashlights, fire tools—a shovel and a pulaski, and a file for sharpening them— all wrapped tightly in new tarps and mounted on click-board carriers for the hike out. Sleeping bags—big

kapok ones this time instead of the tin, efficient goose-down rolls we sometimes have along on fires. Five-gallon water cans—silver square oblongs of steel that we know from experience smash as often as not on landing—tied in pairs to cargo chutes. Then lots of odds and ends, like a spotter's kit, map cases with compasses, climbing irons for retrieving chutes, extra signal streamers, and a crosscut saw bolted between two boards, so that its sharp-set teeth won't be ruined on landing.

Outside, the plane is a sight to frighten the wits out of a modern air passenger. It is an ancient trimotor job, its engines uncowed, external control cables that slap its corrugated aluminum sides in the wind, truck tires on huge solid wheels, large square windows like a streetcar and the over-all streamlining of a model T. The wing is massive and fat, and the fuselage seems cut off square at the bottom to clear the turf of the airport. The wing-mounted engines have three dials each on the inboard side of one strut, so that the pilot, to check the engine's performance, must look through rain, darkness, or fog and find those dials. This museum piece of an aircraft has been known variously as the Heap, the Tin Goose, the Flying Quonset Hut, and Old Ironsides.

Yet we who are about to fly in her feel good inside, knowing that she is light for her size and can get in and out of canyons and postage-stamp airstrips. We know that the pudgy 8-foot-thick wing gives her tremendous lift—she can glide and glide if the engines fail. We know that the high wing and big square windows give us visibility, and visibility is important in this business of jumping on fires. We know also that she, like her sister ships, has been kept up by her owner—Johnson Flying Service, contractor to the Forest Service in Region 1—to the best of man's ability.

Now the pick-up roars out to where the plane is thundering in warm-up, and we transfer the load into her belly and climb in ourselves. Take-off time, 2 o'clock. We are scrambling around in the great jumble of equipment as the airport and the fairgrounds and Missoula drop away below. We swing past the big white M of Montana State University on the side of Sentinel Mountain and then settle on a southeast course bound for Yellowstone country.

Two hundred miles from Missoula to West Yellowstone. A 2-hour flight in the slow-moving plane. We climb to clear the ridges that bristle up before us, and there always seem to be higher ones beyond. Getting cool as we climb. The door of the plane is off and back in Missoula, and a safety bar stretches across the middle of the doorway to keep guys from falling out.

Smitty, the chief rigger, is along for the ride and is telling us not to hit the ground in high country like Yellowstone or we'll break our ankles like he did on his last jump up there in '47.

"Hang up, whatever you do, because that ground at 8,000 to 10,000 feet is just too hard to land on."

We think about it, the fact that air that high is a little thin for safe parachute jumping, and it sounds like good advice.

"Small reproduction, young trees—that's what you want to look for. Small reproduction for a soft landing. But hang up, whatever you do." Then Smitty goes up forward to gab with the pilot and fly the old Goose a while, horsing it sloppily over the next pass till the pilot takes the controls away from him and adds a little throttle for good measure.

"Hey, that must be Georgetown Lake.

"Yeah, there's Anaconda over there. See the big smelters?"

Eleven thousand feet to clear the highest range. It's cold up here in the air-conditioned plane. Seems funny; an hour ago I

was sweating, out on that roof in Missoula's heat. Now I'm shaking with cold and pawing through the big white sacks to find mine and break out my high-collared canvas jump jacket.

Big stone mountains with jagged tops go by. I'd hate to jump into stuff like that. Don't worry, you won't have to. The Forest Service isn't out of its head.

The ranges are getting drier, less timbered, more and more just big humpy ridges of bareness separating the twisting river valleys with their bright-green irrigated fields. We're slanting down over Hebgen Reservoir, and my ears are popping in a gidge. Must be close to West Yellowstone. We start suiting up—too early, but everybody starts, so I do, too. Dumping our sacks out on the crowded floor of the plane, fighting our way into our girdles and jackets and jump pants with the big webbing crotch protection, and our quick-release harnesses.

"You can put on the chutes later, guys, after we pick up the park man."

So we don't fasten our legstraps, but sit comfortably half dressed for a jump, and I'm taking pictures with the 36-millimeter camera that I take on all fires these days.

"Hey, there's West Yellowstone!"

We give the town a good buzz with two steeply banked circles to lose altitude, and West Yellowstone, with its railroad station and lodge and airstrip and stores, and two highways slicing away through the endless plateau of timber, is wheeling below us like a big, slow pinwheel. Then the pilot is down where he wants to be, and we skitter in over the clawing lodgepole to a landing on the dirt strip.

We taxi over for gas and to find the park man, and all pile out for a stretch. Hot again down here. Why did we suit up so soon? Smitty and Hank Shank are out hunting for the park man while we sprawl in the shade of the plane's protective wing. Soon they are back in a black park service car, and they pile out with two National Park rangers. These are dressed in snappy green-and-gray uniforms that we in the forest service think make them look just a little too much like tourist ushers. But forget the rivalry. We're working together this time. Besides, the park service pays for maintaining 101 of our 150 jumpers at Missoula, so that the park people can call on the outfit for fire protection whenever Glacier or Yellowstone needs it.

"One of the fires has a ground crew on it already," Shank is saying. So Hellman and Bennett unsuit to stay here at West Yellowstone. Hellman fits his harness and reserve onto the ranger that's going to guide the remaining six of us to our three remote spot fires. Shank is reshuffling the jump list, and I want to jump last, so I can take pictures of the guys going out of the door. But I don't say anything, and he puts me in the first pair—Kermit Cole, of Missoula, a good boy.

Cole and I didn't find out till Saturday afternoon that the last four men of our eight man load—Hellman, Bennett, Thol and Piper—all made dry runs on Yellowstone and went back to Missoula to jump on Friday and die in Helena National Forest. And I wanted to go last to take pictures!

We suit up again, this time chutes and all, and check one another out. Harnesses secure all around, safety catches of our quick-release on, three little strings under the loop of each static line to secure the apex of the chute to its cover till our weight tears it loose. A dozen little details that have to be right. Our right legs look fat with a 100-foot coil of rope stuffed in the leg pocket. And my left leg is also bulging with a small strapped-on canvas sack of personal gear—soap, toothbrush, clean socks, underwear and dungarees. We'll be almost unrecognizable when we get our football helmets on with the wire-gill face masks buckled down. Six

hundred dollars' worth of equipment. Seventy pounds of fabric and rope and metal per man, not counting the stuff that goes in by cargo chute.

The engines are thundering again, and the park man yells to the pilot, "Got plenty of gas? We've gotta fly 50 miles one direction, then 70 miles another, then 40 miles back." "Yeah, we've got plenty."

All aboard again except Hellman and Bennett—the last I ever see of them alive—and we're roaring down the runway in take-off. The park man has an armful of map scrolls, and he's having a tough time climbing forward over the jumble of men and equipment in the seatless tunnel-like plane. He's brought a feeble little water bag along to drop to one of his ground crews. A 2-gallon job with about half a gallon in it—and that leaking out through the loose cap as the bag lies on its side by the door, giggling with the plane vibration. Hate to be out on a mountain and have to depend on that. Our smashable square water cans don't look half bad alongside this park brand of water supply.

The ranger is a nice guy, and he's done this before. As soon as he knows that Cole and I are on the first stick, he gives me a little piece of a Yellowstone topographic map with some lakes and a couple of rivers on it and an inked-in X and some arrows running east and north from the X. The X is the fire, of course—as close as they can tell from the Mount Sheridan lookout, and incidentally about a half mile off, as we find out later—and the little river nearby is the headwaters of the Snake. The thick green line right below the X is the southern border of the park—less than 3 miles from the fire. So that'll put us 250 miles straight southeast of Missoula. The ranger is explaining that the arrows point the way out.

"Don't go back this way on the trail," he shouts above the roaring engines, "even though it looks closer, because that trail hasn't been maintained. Go north, the way it's marked, to the ranger station on Heart Lake."

"Roger," I say, and put the map away and start taking pictures again. It's great being a second-year jumper and having a little experience to give you confidence. It's more fun knowing the little tricks that take your mind off yourself—enough to keep from sweating like Samsel, or Piper, there. Short Hall seems kinda quiet, too. Oh, well, last year you sweated just as they're doing.

We're over the valley of the Snake, and the C and Teton ranges rear their heads in jagged black majesty 40 miles to the south. Hank Shank, our handsome spotter, is motioning me back to where Cole is sitting by the door, waiting. The ranger is up with Smitty and the pilot, looking for the smoke, and I take a last snapshot of Cole before tucking my camera inside my jacket and under my arm, where it hasn't smashed yet on a landing.

"There it is," I say, poking Hank Shank and pointing to a smoke off the port quarter. The smoke isn't much, and Cole and I figure we really are going on a one-man fire, but two of us along for safety. Word is passed to the pilot, and we get down to business. Cole and I put on our gloves and helmets and snap our collars all the way up and get our static lines over our arms and into our right hands.

There's a wilderness of snags below us—miles and miles of dead-white tree skeletons marching over the hills as far as we can see. Individual trees. The old Heart Lake burn, the ranger said, in 1931, and still looking ugly after all those years.

Snags. One of the four dangerous horse-men facing the smoke jumper; the others being deep water, sheer rocks, and insecure tree hang-ups. Cole and Hank Shank and Smitty and I are all looking for a decent place to land in that tossing ocean of brittle dead bones; and we all simultaneously de-

cide on the only spot available—a stand of thick young reproduction about a mile along the ridge from the smoke. I've got the map out again, getting oriented with the terrain, and 100 percent of my attention is on the problem of getting to the ground safely. Ground altitude almost 8,000 feet here. "Remember, hang up, whatever you do!" A little drift chute gives us the wind—something like 12 miles an hour, blowing east—and then comes the order to hook up.

Cole and I snap our static lines into the cable over the door and give ourselves a last fast check-out. Cole is going out first, so he kneels in the oval door and puts one foot out on the little step hanging there in space. I'm going out second, so I crouch behind him ready to follow him out as soon as the door is clear. Shank checks us over carefully again and briefs us once more on the spot we're to aim for and repeats what the ranger said about hiking out. Then we swing into the final pass. Shank jockeying the plane into position with hand signals to the pilot. The noisy engines die at last and after 1 second of eerie silence, Cole gets the slap to go. He steps out easy and straight, wrapping his arms across the reserve on his chest, and the static line begins reeling the white silk off his back. I'm out with him a half second later, feeling the weird minutes-long moment of falling before the opening shock jolts me in the chest, and then that wonderful nylon flower is open above me with the sunlight streaming through.

No lines over—canopy functioning perfectly. Cole is far enough away. Okay, where is that spot? There it is, the lightest green of that patch of timber. Turn away from it and hold into the wind. I grab a guideline to spin myself west—for this is a steerable, slotted Forest Service chute I'm wearing—and haul down the front risers to gain forward speed.

I'm chinning myself on the risers to give myself 8 or maybe 10 miles an hour into the wind. The plane is circling around watching us closely and is completely out of my consciousness. Damned arms are getting tired, and I'm watching the ground through the V of my feet. I'm not going to make it; the wind's pushing me too far. And yet for some reason I'm not worried at all that I'm sailing beyond the thick safe stand of young trees toward the open, tree-dotted ridge.

Gettin' pretty close. Better stop planing and turn around. The slots start me around so I'll come in frontward, and I'm not quite around, and dumping both slots to kill forward speed, when the grassy ground with all the trees just out of reach rushes up into me with a thump. My feet are together from habit, and I flop into a loose sideways roll and come up tangled, unhurt and happy.

A soft landing, considering the 8,000 feet. No harder than plenty of jumps I've made at 2,000 or 3,000. Well, that just shows what queer ducks parachutes are. The air must be perfect today.

Cole has also hit the ground 100 yards away from me and behind a couple of trees. We are both waving our signal streamers at the plane to show them we're all right, and then we're climbing out of our gear and sacking it up. The plane goes away to drop Samsel and Short on a smoke we can't see, beyond the Snake, and comes back 10 minutes later to drop our cargo. We have piled our sacked-up gear in an orange-streamered cache on the ridge and watch our cargo come out of the plane a mile away through the forest of snags. The water-can chute hangs up in the top of a big snag right near the vague haze of smoke, and the silvery tin twirls and twinkles in the sun, making a perfect landmark for us to hike for.

O K, Jenkins, the fun is over. Now begins the work you're getting paid for. The

noise of the plane tapers away to nothing, and all of a sudden it's quiet on this mountain. Cole and I are two guys alone in the wilderness. Alone, many miles from the nearest road, in a sunny, dead forest.

"Damn Smitty for forgetting to drop the sleeping bags."

"Oh, well," says Cole, full of good sense, as always, "that just means we'll work most of the night. And those kapoks are plenty big to park out."

He's right, and I know it, and I don't mind working most of the night anyway to rake in a little overtime.

The fire is up on a knoll the way most lightning strikes and isn't going anywhere since the wind died down. It's really a tiny fire—at the size the Forest Service likes to catch them—not covering 100 square feet—in five or six little spots, where the lightning split off chunks of a snag and scattered them, burning, out on the grass. The stump of the snag is 20 feet high and burning all the way up and down inside, and dropping it will be our biggest angle job in putting out this fire.

We're a little short on water because when we telled the snag that held our water can way up in the air, the can smashed to tin-foil and the water wetted up the ground good. Besides that, one of the canteens on the fire packs had a leak and is dry, so we have half a gallon from the other canteen to last us till we hike down to the Snake tomorrow sometime. Not that we'll need any more than that half gallon. But knowing that's all we've got is making us thirsty already.

It's been a big job falling a snag 3 feet through at the butt with a Pulaski just to get down the cargo chute—a Pulaski being a heavy-headed ax with an adz blade on the back. Cole and I have taken turns and are really warmed up by the time she sways and cracks and comes crashing down among the jumble of deadfalls around us.

We collect the gear and eat supper, hitting the liquid canned stuff first to save our water, and then settle down for a night of work. The tall butt of the burning snag comes down first and doubles the spread of the fire by taking an unexpected roll. We cool the burning logs by turning them warm side up and scraping the fire out of them with the adz blades of the Pulaskis. We break the big embers up into little ones and spread out the hot spots to cool and burn out. Then we trail each little spot of burn, scraping a shallow shovel-width trench around it down to fireproof mineral earth.

"Separate the fuel from the fire"—the old simplicity-itself fire-fighting method of the Forest Service. It doesn't take water or chemicals or bombs or pumps or hoses, though all those things may help if available. All it takes in essence is men, enough men with tools, and lots of sweat and back-bending and shiny places on the insides of thumbs. And half-decent luck in regard to wind. But like any fire-fighting method, it works best at night, when everything cools down.

It's midnight and cold, and the stars are so bright you can almost see by 'em, and the northern lights are a faint gray glow in the sky that looks like dawn coming up in the wrong place. Cole and I are sitting around patrolling our little line and taking turns going up to a muddy sump of a spring we found to fill two water bags with the stagnant stuff and pour it on what spots are still glowing red in the darkness. There's not much smoke drifting up through the cones of light from our headlamp flashlights any more. The night is still and without wind. And the fire is just about dead.

So we decide to stretch out for a couple of hours, wrapping up in the tarps from the fire packs and the cargo chutes to keep warm. Not as cold as I'd expected it to be, and 2 hours of good shut-eye really pick me

up. Don't forget to put that on the time report, that we slept for 2 hours.

Up again at two for a long cold morning of mop-up. We douse every square foot of the burn with undrinkable water and go over the charred ground with our gloves off, feeling for warm spots. It seems I'm spending half the night slogging back and forth to the shallow sump, filling the water bags tediously with a skillet, and climbing endlessly over the tangled maze of fallen snags back to the fire.

It's dawn and beautiful, and there's Mount Sheridan to the north and the valley of the Snake below us, and we're filthy and tired and unshaven, and the fire is dead. We eat breakfast, gripping again because there's too much chocolate and ham in these jump rations, and the last of our canned fruit and juice goes, and all but a couple of swallows of water. Oh, well, there's a whole river of it right down there. We'll make out all right.

We know we'll have to watch the burn through at least 2 o'clock this afternoon to make sure that somewhere in that black wet mess of charcoal we haven't missed one spark, because the heat of the afternoon will show smoke if there's going to be any. So we figure we'll use this half day to start packing out. Chutes, suits, fire packs, and tools will make a good mule load for each of us. And as we have time to burn, we might as well make two trips.

It's a mile back along the ridge to our jump gear, and then 3 miles down to the river trail—all through the maddening tangle of downed snags that blankets this country. About 80 percent of the deadfalls lie with their tops to the east, telling us mutely that the winds roar through this saddle from the west most of the time. We pack down our jump gear—two big, heavy white sacks apiece lashed to a clackboard—and it's treacherous footing downhill over the never-ending snags. Five or six elk are moving down ahead of us, keeping a good half mile away and wondering what men are doing prowling around their domain. It's marshy grassland in the bottoms, with fresh elk wallows and lots of flies, and a flock of black-headed Canada geese takes off ahonking from the Snake as we trudge into sight.

A soft little rain starts to fall, and we know the fire is out for good, even though we'll check it again to make sure when we go back after the rations and fire tools. We get squared away with our map, discovering the half-mile error in the original fire location from the lay-out of the trail with the river; and it's good to have a full canteen again.

Six o'clock, Thursday evening. The sunlight is bright and warm, and I've just taken a bath in a creek because the mighty Snake here is too shallow to get under water in. Cole is busy eating supper—something I shall later regret not doing—and we've found, from horse tracks and shouting up and down the valley, what the dope is on the packer who is to lug this load the rest of the way out on packsaddles. The packer has been up here looking for us and has gone beyond where we have come out on the trail. So we quit looking for him, pile everything beside the trail, barber-pole a tree with streamers so he can't miss, and start hiking for the ranger station up on Heart Lake.

Our map shows it to be 6 miles away. With all the twists and turns of the trail it turns out to be 12. My boots are stretched and too big, and there's a place on my heel that makes a little squeaking sound with every step as it rubs on the inside of the boot.

Pretty soon it's dark and we wonder if we are on the right trail, and the moon comes up in time to help out Cole's waning flashlight. On a needlessly empty stomach and with one bad foot, I am a poor partner for a strong hiker like Cole, and he is constantly

having to stop and wait for me. Another herd of elk is moving ahead of us in the darkness, crashing away intermittently when the tortured bawling of their scouts warns them of our persistent approach. The black peak of Mount Sheridan seems an eternity in creeping down to our left, and then at midnight we are finally marching along the shore of Heart Lake, feeling triumphantly near to rest. Suddenly we get a jolt, for there, a few hundred yards away, is a tall plume of smoke climbing into the moon-lit sky. Another fire. But the fear quickly evaporates as a stink of sulfur drifts over us. A hot spring. That isn't smoke, that's steam. You're still in Yellowstone, remember?

The ranger station is nothing more than what the Forest Service calls a guard station—just a cabin that may or may not be manned during the summer—the fire season. This one is manned by the packer who is out looking for us, and is well stocked with provisions. It looks beautiful there in the moonlight on the sandy north shore of the lake, and we find the break-in window in the back with no strain. The lake is so clean and remote from people that a bucket dipped out of it is drinking water—a weird contrast to the highway cluttered with people and monoxide fumes just across the mountains.

A quick chow to stifle my gnawing, and the blankets close over us in sleep.

"Hey, Kern, did you shave back there in the cabin?" Cole is hiking ahead of me on the trail out from Heart Lake to the roadhead, and I can't see his face from where I'm walking.

"Hell, no. I wouldn't shave in cold water for all of Yellowstone National Park."

As if smarting under the insult, Yellowstone National Park produces, 100 yards farther up the trail, plenty of hot running water for all our needs. We squat on a steaming line flat among countless bubbling hot springs for our first shave in 3 days. The water is too hot to be used for anything except dipping a washrag, but we make out. And we find the creek nearby has all degrees of mixtures from boiling to cold, as the surface water mixes with that from underground.

I get a scare a little later on when I slip shin-deep into some warm volcanic muck while crossing another open flat. It's not pleasant thinking of the people who have died of accidental scalding in Yellowstone's strange, naturally hot waters. But the mud goes to my boot tops and no farther, and I churn loose like a shying horse. The mud on my boots dries to white crust as we hike on out.

A truck meets us at the road 5 miles farther on, and after we make our fire report at the South Gate, the Park Service sends us on a personally conducted tour of the park, the first leg of our long ground trip home. We're stuck in Mammoth Village, on the north edge of the park, that evening because we can't get a train out of Livingston, Mont., till morning, and we kill time at a dance and a touristy wild-life lecture. Cole and I sit in the back row and grin when the ranger tells how nine forest fires are going in the park right now, and how they've called in extra crews and planes and even smoke jumpers.

At next day we ride the train back to Missoula and grip because it's Saturday and we're traveling on our own time. But then, in the station at Missoula, we pick up a red-headlined paper that tells us 12 of our buddies were burned to death yesterday afternoon down in the Helena. It's hard to believe that Dave Navon, my best friend in this outfit, won't ever be back to get that laughing post card I sent him from Old Faithful. And Cole and I are shocked and hollow and hungry to know why, and we feel powerful lucky to have gone on our Yellowstone jump.

Who Is My Neighbor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days of world crisis, civilization hangs by a thread. If the holocaust breaks out, no man can estimate what will be left. One thing is certain. There will be no victors. There will be only survivors.

There are many who are so discouraged by this prospective future for the world that they can see no hope. I believe, however, that there is hope for the future. It lies in love—love of God and love of our fellow men. Only when man realizes that we are all God's creatures, and therefore, one another's brothers, can we realize the goal of true peace.

The practice of anti-Semitism is inconsistent with the practice of Christianity. To be a Christian one must love his brothers—black, white, yellow, and red; Jew, Christian, Mohammedan, and Buddhist.

This thought was forcefully and beautifully expressed recently in a book called *Head Over Heels*, by Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, head of the department of religious education at the Catholic University of America.

Monsignor Sheehy has not spent his years dwelling in an ivory tower. He is a captain in the Naval Reserve and served on active duty during all of World War II. He was in most of the forward areas of the Pacific, concluding his active duty service as senior chaplain of the Pacific Fleet.

Under unanimous consent, I include under extension of my remarks one chapter titled "Who Is My Neighbor?" from Monsignor Sheehy's book, *Head Over Heels*:

[From the Washington Post of October 2, 1951]

HEAD OVER HEELS

(By Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy)

WHO IS MY NEIGHBOR?

(The following article is an excerpt from the book, *Head Over Heels*, A Guide for the Better Self, by Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, head of the department of religious education at Catholic University. The title, says Monsignor Sheehy, comes from his belief that God intended that the head should be over the heels, looking upward toward Him and outward toward our neighbor. It is reprinted here, as the second of a series, with the permission of the publishers, Farrar, Straus & Young, Inc.)

There is a great deal of nonsense in talk about tolerance.

The fact is that men vary in complexion, height, mind. That is God's business, not mine.

But because I claim to be a Catholic, I am a liar and an impostor the moment I refuse to see anyone as other than a child of our Father.

Our Father. Not mine, not yours—ours. That Christ is our brother makes me by adoption His Father's son.

Of sin, the better self must be tolerant; but in the sinner there still gleams the flashing splendor of the divine.

Twice I spoke on national networks against anti-Semitism when Hitler's sadism appeared in the bloodstream of humanity, indicating an infection which was partly cured by the lifeblood of 10,000,000 men. Hitler is gone, but the virus of hate appears from time to time.

Pope Pius XI in one encyclical spoke as follows: "We spurred all the children of the church, and indeed all men of good will, to a holy rivalry in love and succor."

At the close of World War II, 70 chaplains received their orders directly from me, as district chaplain in Pearl Harbor. Of these only 20 were Catholics. The chaplains were men of practically every faith, united in the purpose to serve, in a religious way, our Navy.

As a consequence of World War II, many of those within my innermost circle of friends are ministers of other faiths. I do not tolerate them. I really and truly like them.

One cannot meet and come to know personally all the 2,000,000,000 people in the world. In the story of the Good Samaritan, Jesus answered the question, "Who is our neighbor?" "That man closest to me, that man in need of a helping hand, that man is my neighbor."

Of certain things I am most intolerant. First, and above all, anti-Semitism.

Once a man wrote me with these words on his letterhead: "A potestate Judaecum, libera nos Domine" ("From the power of the Jews, deliver us, O Lord"). I threw the letter into a wastebasket. Then my conscience compelled me to write:

"DEAR SIR: In response to your letter, I am constrained by the obligation of fraternal correction to inform you that your heart is a crater of hate. Some day you must face as your Judge one who received all His human nature from a Jewish maid."

Thus ended our correspondence.

A few years ago, an old pastor was disturbed at the gossip he heard about members of his parish, particularly the ladies, who, following a popular orator, expressed anti-Jewish feelings. One evening at the ladies' sodality, he gave, instead of his usual 20-minute discourse, the following:

"MY DEAR SODALISTS: In your devotions I have observed that you, while praying, seem to spot a new member of the parish, or to know when Mrs. Smith has a new hat or Mrs. Murphy a new dress.

"From some reports I receive, I fear that if the Mother of Jesus, whom we honor here this evening, were to come attired in modern clothes, some of you would say in surprise, 'Why, she looks Jewish'."

"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

As I grow older I know I am growing more intolerant of people who insult my presence by careless use of the name of Jesus or an off-color story. It may be prudent to keep silent, but such people I no longer want in my company.

One cannot be an inmate (if I may borrow Mencken's term) of Washington for 24 years without being requested to write countless letters of recommendation. I do not tolerate people using my priesthood as a political springboard.

I do not tolerate kind-hearted people who invite me to dinner because a dab of purple gives a bit of color to the scenery.

My stomach, however, is a Catholic stomach, respecting all good foods. It happens that on the occasions I dine out, I dine frequently with non-Catholics, not because they are superior at culinary arts but because they invite me most frequently.

As a priest I have a grave obligation to all my non-Catholic students. The Catholic University of America admits all, regardless of race or creed, to its campus. Over 500 non-Catholics now study at the university.

One student told me at the end of the year that he had been delegated to organize the Communist Party on our campus. He received his degree.

He is still an organizer—but against his former comrades. Why should those who believe in God fear contact with Communists who oppose His purpose?

Some years ago the editor of the Daily Worker wrote an abusive letter to Msgr. Fulton Sheen. The editor was invited to lunch. His name is Louis Budenz. Monsignor Sheen refused to talk to him at lunch about communism. He talked about the Mother of Jesus.

Communists have souls, too. They are our brothers. We must treat them as such. The alternative?

Increased Compensation for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander, the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

1. dianapolis, Ind., September 25, 1951.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: This is a letter of congratulations and of thanks.

It is intended to convey to you some sense of the appreciation on the part of 3,000,000 legionnaires of the important role you played in the enactment over the President's veto of H. R. 3193, now Public Law 149.

We believe that you acted not only in the veterans' interest but in the national interest. We are convinced that a very great majority of the American people join us in applauding this action.

For some time now, we have noted in the press a strangely belligerent and resentful reaction to anything having to do with maintenance and improvement of veterans' benefits. The attitude is one of impatience bordering on disdain. It is reflected in editorials and articles which all too often emphasize astronomical cost projections rather than basic facts.

Because passage of H. R. 3193 was greeted in this fashion in many areas I want to place on your record a brief review of the matter.

The American Legion advocated a reasonable pension for helpless and bedridden war veterans long before the introduction into Congress of the measure which last week became law. Three successive national conventions in 1948, 1949, and 1950 reiterated the plea. We studied the question, we debated it, and we concluded that it was morally right and economically necessary.

The most severe objective scrutiny will disclose the new law to be just that.

The \$120 monthly benefit is reserved exclusively for those veterans who are in fact unemployable—who are blind, helpless, or otherwise so disabled as to require the full-time attendance of another person. In addition, the beneficiary cannot have more than \$1,000 income if single, or \$2,500 if with dependents.

This law will add not a single penny to the tax burden of the American people. I cite this fact merely to refute the outlandish implications of cost that have been used against it. Every veteran who qualifies for

the benefit will have already exhausted the last possibility of self-support. The only question, then, is how needed public assistance shall be provided: Whether through county or State taxes or through Federal taxes. It is obviously fair in the case of those who have served all of the people to distribute responsibility for their care among all of the people.

The burden, therefore, rests squarely upon the Federal Government. Public Law 149 recognizes this obligation.

Pension based upon identical principles has been awarded by the Congress to veterans of the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. A policy precedent thus has been four times affirmed by different sessions of the Congress in different periods of our history. Fifty-five years elapsed between the end of the War Between the States and provision of this type of benefit for veterans of that conflict. The Eighty-second Congress, by acting now, has assured that the intended beneficiaries of the World Wars and of Korea will have full opportunity to claim their right.

The President, in his veto message, complained that the measure would grant a special award to veterans whose disabilities are in no way connected with military service. The complaint is as ill-founded as it is misdirected. Advisers to the President are in a position to know better.

The veterans who will receive the new payment are in large part those who have been and are drawing part III pensions for permanent and total disability. The latest Veterans' Administration hospital census conducted by the VA showed that of 19,632 patients in the general, medical, and surgery (nonservice connected) category, 5,532 were receiving part III pensions, and 6,554 had disabilities connected with their war service. Who can say that the service disability did not play a big part in bringing about the conditions that made these men permanently and totally disabled on a non-service-connected rating? To assume the contrary is crass speculation.

According to the same VA census, 1,808 patients among the 19,632 rated as nonservice-connected were then awaiting the outcome of claims filed for the purpose of establishing service connection. As you can well realize, the margin of human error in the process of adjudicating such claims is great. How much greater the error to imply a prejudgment against the claimant.

As of July 31 there were 312,000 veterans drawing pensions for permanent and total disabilities rated as nonservice-connected. This included 30,408 World War II veterans. Less than 8 percent—or only 8 out of 100—of the total group are expected to qualify for benefits under the new law.

Were they all bedridden and, therefore, eligible for this new pension, the obligation upon the Government would be just as binding.

The American Legion is concerned about the high cost of Government. But the American Legion is equally concerned about the high responsibility of Government, and we condemn and deplore the double-standard viewpoint of those who would make cost the all-important index of the merit of veterans' legislation while assigning it only moderate importance in other sectors.

Of all the legislative proposals which come before you, those affecting veterans are the only ones which are consistently presented to the reading public on the basis of cost in the year 2000. Most Americans knew the projected cost of the pension bill by the end of the century before they knew the nature of the bill itself. And the basis of the projection in this instance as in many others remains a highly mysterious question.

The Congress within the week has approved a salary increase for Government workers. We are in sympathy with your ac-

tion. But so far as we can determine, no voice has been raised to point out that the consequent cost to the taxpayers will be some \$25,000,000,000 by the end of the century.

Certain elements of the population long have regarded veterans' benefits as the soft underbelly of Government spending. Organizations have been formed under varied and attractive aliases for the sole purpose of dulling the public sense of responsibility as regards veterans' rehabilitation. We sometimes wonder if individuals who lead such groups consult either their conscience or the realities of human suffering.

Public Law 149 is a good law. It is a law to be proud of. And it is to the lasting credit of Members of the United States Congress—a mark of your moral and political courage—that you resisted the pressures put upon you to forget these needy veterans.

Sincerely,

ERLE COCKE, Jr.,
National Commander.

The Greatest Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the increasing toll of Korean fighting in the form of Americans killed or wounded should jolt us into final realization that we are at war and not just engaged in what President Truman chooses to call a police action.

Unfortunately, the total losses sometimes fail to convey the full impact of the tragic cost of war. But when individual cases come close to home it is a different story.

Such a case has been brought to my attention in my home community, where the following letter was addressed to the editor of the Paris (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News after receipt of word that a Paris soldier had been killed in the fighting in Korea. Under permission granted me by the House, I am including the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

THE GREATEST WASTE

About a year ago a young man from Paris, Ill., was recalled to active duty and sent to the slaughter grounds in Korea. A great many of us here in Paris realized he was over there but most gave it very little thought until today when in every part of Paris one would hear, "Did you hear about Chuck?" or "Have you heard about Tuffy?" Yes; Chuck, or Tuffy, however you knew him, has given his life for his country—but, was it for his country? Is our way of life being threatened from Korea? Have our shores been approached by the Korean enemy? Did this man die to make our country a better place to live for his wife and daughter? (Just a few of the things a soldier usually fights for.) No; I don't think he died because of any of these, although he would have gladly have done so, for he was that kind of man. Or has this man, like so many others, in the Korean police action given his life to satisfy the aims and desires of a certain handful who are not thinking as much of their country as they are of their own political future or who are not thinking as much of the fine American lives being lost as they are of lining their pockets with American currency?

Yes, Charles (Chuck) Twigg, with many, many others, has given his life in Korea but for what? Ask a Korean veteran, who was lucky enough to be returned to his home, why he fought and I believe he'll tell you he doesn't know. How many of us do know? Is there a goal to be reached, and, if so, is this sacrifice of American lives bringing that goal any nearer? Ask yourself.

When we lose a friend or a buddy or a loved one over there it makes us stop to think just a little more. It is past time we all thought a great deal more and let our thoughts be known to those we have elected to run our country for the people.

We here at home are enjoying many privileges in this, our country, by far the finest in the world, but let's not forget those who have already lost their lives in this conflict and those yet in Korea who are fine Americans and deserve to live and enjoy our freedoms with us. Remember, don't forget.

Government Economy? What Does That Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there are some newspaper editorials which are worthy of being preserved and of having wide distribution.

On September 29, 1951, the Atlanta Journal had such an editorial, entitled "Government Economy? What Does That Mean?"

The editorial deals with an item of spending just recently voted, under which Members of Congress are authorized to purchase \$1,500 worth of electrical office equipment, such as automatic typewriters, and so forth.

It is just common sense that at this particular time when we are having to pass an appropriation bill of approximately \$57,000,000,000 for military purposes, no new spending project should be taken up unless it is absolutely necessary. This electrical-office-equipment project is not absolutely necessary. I think the great majority of congressional offices have no need whatever for this equipment. There are some probably who do need it. For such, the need should be met by buying a few sets of such equipment, setting up a pool, and letting this equipment be used as needed by Members who actually do need it.

I am in accord with the editorial writer in his opposition to this item. For that reason I voted against it. I feel that it is another item added to the tax burden, which could very well have been dispensed with.

Under unanimous consent, previously granted, I insert herewith the editorial above referred to:

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY? WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?

An economy-minded House of Representatives, recuperating from the arduous labors of shaping a bill that will add to the burden of all American taxpayers, has voted itself an appropriation of more than \$1,000,000 for the purchase of new electric typewriters and other office gadgets.

The taxpayers, of course, will foot this bill.

House Members could hear well enough the resonant tones of those urging the need for increased taxes to help pay for the preparedness program and combat the rising tide of inflation.

But when voices all over the land cried out for a reduction of nonessential Government expenses, wax clogged their ears.

Representatives urging passage of the measure authorizing House Members to spend up to \$1,500 each for electrical and mechanical equipment and, if desired, to draw another \$1,000 from the fund for clerical hire, argued they needed more efficient equipment because their work had increased.

Would they also argue that because of the rising cost of living, taxes should be reduced?

Should the people economize now that their cost of living is soaring, their tax burden rising, their dollar cheapened by inflation? By all means.

Economy in Government? Whoever heard of such?

Always Burned, Always Shy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 27, 1951, an editorial appeared in the Canton (Ohio) Repository relative to the recent ruling of the President which, in the opinion of many, strikes at the foundation of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

It seems that perhaps this order violates one of the planks in the platform adopted by the President's party at the Democratic National Convention, July 14, 1948, in Philadelphia, Pa., which reads:

We deplore the repeated attempts of Republicans in the Eightieth Congress to impose thought control upon the American people and to encroach on the freedom of speech and press.

Under leave, Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the editorial referred to.

ALWAYS BURNED, ALWAYS SHY

President Truman says his new Executive order for classifying and protecting security information in all departments will not be used to gag the press.

Spokesmen for the press say it will be used that way. Their reason for saying so is that such orders always have been used that way. Whether they come from the Chief Executive of the United States, or some local functionary trying to button up loose lips, orders to clamp down on certain kinds of information invariably are broadened to cover other kinds of information.

Some of the broadening is done in malice. Most of it is done by underlings made jittery by the hint from on high that newspapermen, peddlers, and dogs are unwelcome. The underlings do not want to jeopardize their security by consorting with these creatures beyond the pale, so they play everything doubly safe.

That is the way it works, Mr. President. There is nothing harder to get along with than a public functionary who has been given an excuse to throw his weight around, especially if there's secret stuff involved. Every newspaperman who ever bird-dogged his daily bread has snubbed his nose for news

on this sort of thing. That is why there is so much excitement over the Presidential order to follow State and Defense Department plans for controlling security information.

From the Presidential point of view, the order no doubt is necessary. From the point of view of people who try to keep the public informed about what their Government is doing, it opens the door to all the incredible nonsense and fat-headedness built into the Federal bureaucracy.

Gold, Communism, and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I submit the following editorial from the California Mining Journal of August 1950 entitled "Gold, Communism, and Money," which was delivered at the Interstate Conference of Western Mining Council, Inc., at Reno, Nev., June 16, 1950, by Harry Sears, president, Calaveras Central Gold Mining Co., Ltd.:

GOLD, COMMUNISM, AND MONEY

(By Harry Sears, president, Calaveras Central Gold Mining Co., Ltd.; director, California Gold Committee Angels Camp, Calif.)

An outstanding business leader, W. C. Mullendore, president of Southern California Edison Co., recently stated in a public address:

"The country is in the most dangerous and unsound boom in its history—a 'phony prosperity' that becomes more dangerous as it continues.

"It is financed by unsound expansion of Government debt, Government guaranty of unsound private loans, by legal counterfeiting and by confiscation of the savings of thrifty people through inflation.

"All businessmen should cease making peaceful concessions and tell the truth about this phony prosperity."

We respond to his suggestion and also note that during the past few months shocking conditions in Government departments and deplorable lack of integrity and sound Americanism on behalf of some public officials has been revealed.

The searchlight is now principally on foreign affairs, tied in with communism and other subversive traitors in our land.

But there is another revelation of subversive influence yet to be made. It concerns both foreign and domestic affairs and its effects govern the daily lives of every man, woman and child in our country. It affects everything that they own and will control their future for years to come.

The lid has been clamped tight on this subject. It is supposed to be something only for experts. The normal reaction has been that money and currency and the value of the dollar are complicated subjects not to be understood by people generally.

But it is a simple fact to know that to be safe, the value of our money must be grounded on truth and honesty.

Because of this aura of mystery, those responsible for the manipulations which have destroyed much of our present and future money values have been able to oper-

ate almost unchallenged, but this condition must be changed.

We are told that it is "un-American" to urge "guilt by association." That because swarms of our public servants mingled freely with traitors and made excuses for them, and chose to follow the Communist line, there is no implied proof that they are equally guilty with them.

Let us therefore be more direct. In this matter of money let us view their "guilty association" and judge the degree of their guilt on the record of their acts.

Now a great many people, particularly here in the West, are very directly interested in gold, but all of our citizens are indirectly interested, although they do not realize it.

THE POWER OF GOLD

Because of its importance and value in world affairs few people here who know and respect gold can understand the motives and objectives of our Government in stifling gold mining and trying to exterminate gold miners. It is natural to believe that if the attention of Government is drawn to their plight, that gold producers will get favorable attention.

But it isn't that simple.

They forget that the control of gold represents power. That is the power that the Government has seized and they will hold it so long as the people permit.

If the control and possession of gold is regained by the people, they will have likewise regained their freedom and the control of their lives.

To the rank and file citizens, bankers are viewed as experts on money. If we trust the bankers with our money, they surely know best and will look after our interests. At least that is the general supposition, but it is no more true than the other general supposition that banks control money. They have very little money. Just a few bags of small change, that's all, and it's very doubtful that if, on the average, all the people of the land now have on hand as much as \$25 each in real money.

What the banks have and deal with are just pieces of printed paper, accepted as currency, and that is about all we ever see or handle. We get this in small or large bundles according to our degree of luck or prosperity and then we promptly hand it back to the banks because we believe they will look after our interest and make sure that the currency is safely kept.

For some years past the Government has been working toward the total demonetization of gold and silver and they have come dangerously close to achieving their purpose.

We are assured by the Government and by many bankers, that our money is protected by the national gold reserve and that bank deposits are guaranteed by the Government.

We have also been educated for many years on the evils of high prices but we seldom hear our money is steadily losing its value. It is not the prices that are high, but the dollars that are low.

We face the simple question—If the gold reserve is really a protection and if the guaranty of the Government is worth anything, why do these things happen? There is no safety to us, if we get dollars that continue to lose their value.

This question was put very directly and courageously by Senator CAIN, of Washington, in an address in Chicago, early this year, and I quote several passages from that address:

"If the Government has operated in the red for 17 of the last 19 years, if it has disregarded the solemn duty to preserve the integrity of our money, the blame for this must be shared by the public."

RESPONSIBILITY OF BANKERS

"In particular it must be shared by those institutions which solicit the confidence of

the citizen and assume obligations toward that citizen payable in the future. I refer particularly to our banks and great insurance companies.

"There are more than 14,000 banks in this country. They have more than 104,000,000 individual deposit accounts. These banks are the debtors and the depositors are the creditors. The depositors give the bank money today which must be paid back at some time in the future.

"If the buying power, or the real value of the dollar is cut in half, the depositor in the end of the period finds himself the loser. This is not fraud in any premeditated sense but the effect is unfortunately precisely the same. Too many of our Nation's banks have had an eye almost solely for the legal discharge of their obligations. They have been completely indifferent to the real substance of their obligations."

ABA SILENT ON CURRENCY ISSUE

"Probably the primary responsibility for urging honest money rests upon the American Bankers Association. This body has consistently remained silent on the great issue of currency. I have never seen the association become indignant or express any articulate opposition to what is happening to our American dollar.

"All banks have a moral duty to insure the value content of the dollars they repay. This they have strikingly failed to recognize and in their failure they reveal a disappointing lack of stature.

"Actually the American Bankers Association at its last annual meeting at San Francisco extended the courtesy of its platform and the great prestige of the occasion to a noted guest who lectured them on the virtues of a managed currency—a planner who would leave the currency to the loose limitations of the printing press and the discretion of so-called competent and responsible men.

"What I have said sincerely and considerately about the bankers goes with equal force and conviction for the great life-insurance companies of America. They carry 191,000,000 insurance policies aggregating more than \$213,000,000,000. They collect money today in the form of premiums at the annual rate of \$6,800,000,000. Again, as in the case of the bankers, there is a narrow concern over the details of dollar obligations and a disquieting complacency regarding the substance of the ultimate payments to their policyholders.

"Rightly or wrongly, the public presumption is that the leadership of our banking and insurance fields understand the subject. Their failure to speak up implies approval of a paper currency completely unhinged from gold. I can understand their reluctance to stand up and be counted, but I can't condone it. They are doing only what their counterparts did in Italy and Germany in the decades of the 1930's.

"As their reluctance—brought gigantic ruin to Germany and Italy, the present day disposition of the banking and insurance fraternities of our Nation to let the administration have its own way in money matters will bring the same sort of tragedy and ruin to all of us in due time."

Those are forceful statements from a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and a man who was a banker for 10 years before he became a Senator.

It is unfortunate that gold, as money, is far from the lives and experience of the present generation. Gold coin and gold certificates have been out of circulation for 17 years, therefore to those under 35 years of age gold is just a substance for jewelry, dental work, and something to bury in the ground at Fort Knox.

The use of gold by our citizens, as a protection from exploitation, by a dictatorial and

spendthrift government is only a dim subject for them to contemplate. Although it affects their lives and future it is something beyond their experience.

PROPER USE OF GOLD IMPORTANT

The proper use of gold and the right and ability of citizens to get it, and hold it, is the most important issue in our economic future.

We were a proud people 5 years ago when we thought we had victoriously concluded a terrible war. Today we find ourselves in another war. They call it cold and our enemy is communism.

MENACE OF COMMUNISM

Communism is not a mere organization, it is an unholy philosophy, founded upon deceit, lies, and greed; administered by brute force, treachery and lust for power, by its leaders, and requiring absolute and abject slavery of the masses of people, to sustain and support it.

Freedom, decency, property rights, kindness, religion, and morals, are signs of weakness to Communists and these are the things which must be ruthlessly stamped out, according to their code.

They have stolen our words and phrases, using them to confuse and cover up their acts. These words in their hands have an entirely different meaning and interpretation from our use of them. Thus they claim that theirs is a real democratic action, that theirs is the peoples government, that their elections, with only one candidate, and mandatory voting, are free. This is all double-talk to confuse.

Communist dogma kills the originality of its followers and robs them of normal human powers of defense. When cornered they slavishly repeat certain pet phrases and rail against pet hates. They follow a routine just as they follow the party line. They have thus recently exposed a dangerous weakness. The Communists' denials of guilt have assumed a recognizable pattern. By their form of denials they prove their guilt.

IS SOCIALISM DIFFERENT?

If we consider socialism as entirely different from communism, we make a mistake, for socialism and government controls are as inseparable as homogenized milk.

They always have been and always must be inseparable, because socialism is contrary to normal human instincts. It must be enforced if it is to prevail. The only way a Socialist government can get the people to behave like robots is to drive them to it with a multitude of regulations and ever-increasing penalties on disobedience. Thus, compulsion is at the very root of the philosophy of socialism, just as it is of communism.

WHAT HAS THIS TO DO WITH GOLD?

You may now ask, what has all this to do with gold? We will show that connection, but first let us quote a few communistic doctrines put forward by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and also widely used in the New Deal and Fair Deal philosophy of the administration as popular slogans.

"The right to work" is a phrase constantly popularized by Roosevelt and Truman and the starting point for countless labor demands, yet this was put forward by Engels in 1893.

NEW AND FAIR DEAL SLOGANS

"We owe it to ourselves" is another phrase use constantly in excusing our vast public debt and to popularize deficit financing. This was advanced as "the modern doctrine that a nation becomes richer the more deeply it is in debt," by Karl Marx, in 1897. At the same time he also said that "over-taxation is not an incident but rather a principle."

"Race, color, or creed" is one of the most widely used slogans to stir up unrest. It comes directly from the manifesto of the First Communist International, dated 1894.

"A quart of milk a day" was one of the great slogans of Roosevelt and Henry Wallace, but it was also the formula proposed by Lenin in 1917.

DEBAUCH THE CURRENCY

Let us remember that Karl Marx also said, "The surest way to overturn the social order is to debauch the currency," and with that in mind can we close our eyes to the fact that the ends sought by the Communists are being deliberately delivered by those who persist in subjecting us to managed paper currency instead of sound and honest dollars?

J Edgar Hoover, the head of our FBI, gave some sensational secret testimony early in April, parts of which have just been revealed. He stated that there are more than 54,000 known Communists in this country and that for every party member there are 10 others who follow the party line, ready, able, and willing to do the party's work.

In plain words, there are 540,000 people dedicated to this work and this slimy philosophy. This fifth column is a feverish arm of a ruthless conspiracy against our freedom. The effects coming from the acts of these Communist sympathizers can be just as deadly as from party members.

To what extent are they meddling with our money?

We hear a lot about ending the cold war, but which one of them; for there are two.

The first is being waged against us by the Communists who hope to pick up power by dividing our people, disrupting our Nation, and ruining us.

The second is being waged against our people by the left wing cliques and the Truman administration because it increases their power and gives them lots of money.

THE SECOND "COLD WAR"

We can end the first cold war when we end the hopes of Communists and their sympathizers that we can be divided and ruined, but we can only avoid being ruined by the second cold war when we end the hopes of the politicians in power who still subscribe to the formula of "spend and spend" and "elect and elect."

As part of this second cold war there has been a constant stream of Government propaganda during the past 17 years telling us that all gold is rightfully in the hands of the Treasury, that it is the backing for paper currency and that it is dangerous to allow it to be in the hands of citizens.

Their efforts have been so successful that economists, businessmen, bankers, teachers, and even many gold miners themselves, accepted this propaganda as fact and talked and thought only of gold in the monetary relation.

GOLD IS A COMMODITY

The facts are that gold is basically a commodity metal, just as copper, lead, zinc, and iron are commodities, or wheat, or corn, or wool.

The industrial use of gold in manufacturing and the arts in this country is constantly expanding and has far outstripped the gold production of the United States.

DICTATORIAL GOLD PRICE SINCE 1934

The Government has only asserted the power to dictate to gold producers since 1934 when the Treasury regulations set up the arbitrary price of \$35 per ounce for gold, but long before this the commercial use of gold in this country was growing and in the 11 years from 1919 to 1930 it was 131 percent of the total United States gold production.

During the years 1941 to 1949 the industrial use of gold here was 139 percent of the total United States production.

SOME LEADING QUESTIONS

Why then in the face of those facts is gold mining a sick and depressed industry

today? Why are about 90 percent of all gold mines in the United States closed down?

Why are hundreds of communities and thousands of property owners throughout 11 Western States deprived of their lawful and constitutional rights to produce and sell their gold?

Why is labor denied the opportunity to seek and secure employment for thousands of men, in hundreds of proven gold mines and in the development of other hundreds of prospective mines?

Why is industry denied the opportunity to furnish machinery, equipment and supplies, and railroads denied profitable freight, and why are agriculture and food processors denied an increased market throughout the West in communities which are today stagnant and depressed?

ANSWER—A DELIBERATE CONSPIRACY

The answer to these questions seems to point to a deliberate conspiracy in the Government to discourage and stifle gold mining in this country, to appropriate and destroy the property rights of gold producers by unlawful regulations, but support and encouragement of gold production elsewhere in the world.

By sustaining a stagnant and inadequate price for gold here and enforcing regulations which do not allow producers to sell their product to industry or in other markets where they may secure a higher price, the Treasury has assumed to be a dictator, blocking gold producers from the free conduct of their business.

The Government thus supports a favored class among the manufacturers who use and fabricate gold, with no limits on their profits, giving them access to the privately owned property of those gold producers who are still operating, at completely unrealistic prices.

OUR DOLLARS LOSE THEIR VALUE

All of this is done by the Treasury under the plea that it must hold gold at the \$35 per ounce price in order that the value of the dollar is maintained.

This brings to mind a story concerning a high school lad who asked for more spending money.

"You don't know the value of a dollar, son," sighed the father.

"Yes I do," replied the lad, "as of last week it was about 58 cents as compared with 1939 standards."

Is this the sound and honest money we expect our Government to provide? Why should the Government wreck the gold-mining industry?

MUST REVIEW GOVERNMENT TREND

To answer, we must consider politics and power. We must review the trend of government and its purposes during the past 17 years.

Previous to that time we proudly felt that we lived and were governed under constitutional checks and balances; that the first loyalty of the Government lay in protecting the rights of our citizens.

Then came the deluge and a horde of soothsayers were gathered into the family fold in Washington. They began to brew a variety of poisons which flowed through the streams of business and social life causing constant turmoil, mounting waste and debt, and piling crisis upon emergency. This mess was known as the New Deal, now it is called the Fair Deal.

CHUMMY WITH COMMUNISTS

During these years some of our leaders in government got very chummy with the Communists. They were invited in and told to help themselves to whatever they wanted. They did. They also sprinkled a liberal layer of spies and agents throughout the Government, putting them on our payrolls. They bundled up the information, experience, information and secrets of our people and

shipped it out to their masters in Moscow just as fast as planes and ships could be lined up and loaded.

And goods, too, anything they wanted, in any quantity. During the last war those gifts went to Russia with higher priorities than we could get for our most vital defense measures.

OUR COMMUNIST MONEY POLICY

Now early in this game our Government began to hint that gold might not have any future and before we became directly involved in the war active steps were taken to reduce postwar gold production. These were later extended to the actual closing of gold mining in this country under pretense of war emergency.

We were told that the real way to have a healthy currency was to manage it. That's what they did in Russia and in Germany.

THEN CAME LORD KEYNES

Then England sent us Lord John Maynard Keynes, Lord help us. He taught our leaders that it was just foolish to bother with gold, all we needed were debts and plenty of them, then we would be prosperous.

The great master minds of the financial side of our Government liked this idea of debt; they just wallowed in it. Roosevelt, Hopkins, Wallace, Morgenthau, White, and Eccles of the Federal Reserve, all bowed to this financial wizard from Britain who arrogantly reported back to Parliament on May 23, 1944, saying:

"I hope your lordships will trust me not to have turned my back on all I fought for. Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshippers of the calf, who wrote that 'gold is a barbarous relic' and 'as a permanent institution, the plan accords to every member government the explicit right to control all capital movements.'"

A PAPER EMPIRE ON A GLOBAL SCALE

Here Lord Keynes was outlining a paper empire on a global scale to be administered by the very debtors and defaulters, on loans from this country, who had created it. Then he came back here to push it through.

Roosevelt called the delegates together at Bretton Woods. They were headed by Henry Morgenthau and Lord Keynes. Here was the meeting to glorify debt. It was all dignified by our Federal Reserve. One of their special advisers, Alvin H. Hanson, said:

"We shall come out of the war debt-free. We shall have no external debt, only an internal one—a public debt (internally held) is an instrument of public policy. It is an instrument of the national income and, in conjunction with the tax structure, to regulate the distribution of income. An internal debt is in fact so different from what we commonly think of as debt—that it should scarcely be called a debt at all. Public expenditures financed by continually rising public debt is essentially a conservative proposal."

A BOLD PLAN TO LIQUIDATE OUR ASSETS

Here was a bold plan to liquidate the assets of every man, woman, and child in this country in a grand slam of national socialism and it was called essentially a conservative proposal.

The 85-page bill in Congress to authorize this was introduced by Senator Wagner, he of the notorious Labor Act that has caused untold losses to labor and business and has divided labor from employers in true Communist confusion.

When this Bretton Woods plan was introduced on February 15, 1945, an immediate loud clamor arose clear across the country for its immediate acceptance. There were appeals, threats, and cajolery from the same groups and organizations who backed Henry Wallace, most of whom have since been listed as Communist fronts.

BRETTON WOODS, COMMUNISTIC

Among the leaders for the Bretton Woods agreements were Alger Hiss, whose Communist ties are now widely known and Harry Dexter White, high policy maker in the Treasury, who sought death rather than face the Communist charges brought against him.

They put it over, and out of Bretton Woods came the International Monetary Fund which is supposed to maintain the price of gold throughout the world at \$35, also to maintain monetary exchange for the various currencies of all members.

MONETARY FUND A FAILURE

The fund has now been in operation for some 5 years and it has signally failed to achieve either of the two objectives. Charging the fund with bad faith and failure to keep its initial promises to members that the \$35 price of gold was only temporary and to be later adjusted upward when it became necessary, South Africa last year sought freedom to sell half of its gold on a world free market.

The fund delayed its decision on this request until the beginning of last month when it refused to agree. Within 3 days N. C. Havenga, finance minister, delivered a blistering indictment of the fund and its dominating power, the United States, in the South African Parliament, charging that the United States "is the most outstanding example of countries that have conformed to fund policies when it suited their convenience," that the fund's gold policy had been "ineffective and largely discredited."

Mr. Havenga cited figures which he charged the fund should have published in 1948 and 1949 showing that half of the world gold production, excluding Russia, "failed to reach central reserves" of governments, that \$367,500,000 went into industry, arts, or private hoards, that of \$300,000,000 that went into private hoards, five-sixths was released from official holdings.

Mr. Havenga made the significant statement that "the United States Treasury conformed outwardly to the International Monetary Fund policy by laying down that no United States subject should deal in such gold at a premium."

SOUTH AFRICA REPUDIATES FUND

Then South Africa refused to be further bound by the fund and reserved the right to sell her gold at the highest price she can get in the world's free markets.

The demand for a free gold market in this country is steadily gaining strength. Business and financial leaders in mounting numbers are seeing this is the only sound means of determining a proper price level for gold, established by public demand and acceptance of its value as a refuge from the shrinking purchasing power of dollars.

This market must be free in all respects. If the Treasury carries out its threats to depress such a market by selling enough of our national gold stocks so as to maintain its present politically pegged price of \$35 gold it can prolong the present unsafe condition of national finances, but in adopting such a course our present financial dictators would reap a whirlwind of public condemnation.

FREE MARKET A PRACTICAL NECESSITY

A truly free gold market is a practical necessity to establish the proper dollar value of gold and a safe level at which it could be made convertible for the present paper currency. The determination of such a price, or value, is far beyond the powers of any person or group of persons to whom such a task could be safely entrusted.

CONDITIONS WARRANT HIGHER PRICE

Never before in history have our citizens been faced with the combination of past and present conditions which would influence such a gold price. It must take into ac-

count the great devaluation of our present dollars, the demand on national gold reserves which our citizens would normally make to provide for themselves reasonable safety and security and it must also reflect the necessity of our Government to retain enough gold as the legal backing for a safe and honest national currency.

There is a striking similarity between the attitude of our Government toward gold and that of the Communist governments toward freedom. Under the pretext that its citizens misuse freedom the Communists confiscate it and make their citizens slaves. Under the pretext that individuals misuse gold our Government confiscates it, to its own advantage, and is making us slaves.

CONFISCATION DOES NOT BRING SECURITY

It is a strange paradox that governments confiscate the best instrument of economic security at the very time when they claim to insure the economic security of citizens, through all sorts of laws and social institutions, pensions, etc. It just doesn't make sense, for good Americans.

It's just part of the game, however, for economic dictators. Remember that Karl Marx said, "The surest way to overturn the social order is to debase the currency."

To this add the words of one of our great statesmen, Daniel Webster, who said, "Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effective than that which deludes them with paper money."

LIFT THE LID ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE

We have spoken of the Federal Reserve and its approval of deficit financing and public debt as a virtue. Perhaps this appears strange to you. It may have been in your thoughts that although privately owned, this institution was the leader of our banking system and the pillar of integrity. Let us lift the lid just trifle and look how it works, then see if you hold the same idea?

On September 30, 1951, Marriner Eccles, then Chairman of the Federal Reserve, was testifying in Washington before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

"Congressman PATMAN. Mr. Eccles, how did you get the money to buy those two billions of Government securities?"

"Mr. ECCLES. We created it.

"Congressman PATMAN. Out of what?"

"Mr. ECCLES. Out of the right to issue credit money."

Now look at the paper currency in your pockets. Do you think it is money, backed by gold? You will find the bulk to be only Federal Reserve notes, backed with debt.

During the hearings on the Banking Act in 1935 the Governor of the Federal Reserve told how it was done. When the bank buys a billion dollars worth of bonds, it debits its Government bond account a billion dollars or it actually creates by a bookkeeping entry a billion dollars.

A BEAUTIFUL EXAMPLE OF FISCAL FRAUD

Isn't this a beautiful example of fiscal fraud? The banks of issue just create the money without cost to themselves, except the paper and the ink required for the printing. The money never even existed before the bank made the loan by bookkeeping entry.

The bank takes a piece of printed paper called a bond. This is a liability, or a minus quantity. It then takes another piece of printed paper called currency, also a minus quantity. It puts these two together and calls the result money, which is a plus. Two minuses therefore make a plus. Two liabilities make an asset.

But even these people face the loss of purchasing power of the dollar. There was a Washington news item last month which said:

"The paper on which currency is printed has gone up in price. Crane and Co. of Dalton, Mass., which supplies the paper, has

raised the price from 48.2 cents to 53 4 cents a pound."

BONDS BOUGHT WITH IMAGINARY MONEY BEAR INTEREST

There is another item, however, in this fiscal hocus-pocus and it is hidden in this paper transaction. Both of the liabilities bear interest and all banks, particularly the Federal Reserve, are vitally concerned with interest. Those bookkeeping entries draw interest. The bonds which were bought with imaginary money are interest bearing.

Who gets the interest? The banks. Who pays the interest? The people.

They pay it through their taxes even though they never saw or possessed one of the bonds.

INTEREST IS THE ONLY REAL MONEY

What they pay in interest is the only real and tangible money, or value, in the whole deal. That's cash on the barrelhead out of their sweat and toil and not a bookkeeping transaction.

But, you may say, we the public also buy bonds. We are told every day over the radio that they are the safest investment in the world, that for every \$3 we pay in now we will receive \$4 in 10 years, when the bonds mature. That's interest isn't it? No, it is just a slice of yours and other peoples' taxes.

As to the payment at maturity. You will receive it provided that at that time someone else buys enough newly printed bonds. But what will you receive at that time? Even the high school lad knew that there has been a loss of 42 percent of what was paid in and then if you lost 42 percent of the 25 percent you were supposed to receive in interest your net loss would be more than 25 percent or what you originally put up and you would have waited 10 years to find it out.

FREEDOM THROUGH GOLD

Now all of these things are possible because your Government has seized control of gold and they refuse to let you get your hands on it.

They will not give you any in exchange for your paper currency, or for your bond, which they claim to be the safest investment in the world.

The reason they give for declining to part with the gold is that you might hoard it. This terrible sounding word only means saving, but somehow they create the impression that you would be a malefactor if you saved gold.

WE FACE LOSS OF FISCAL FREEDOM

The simple truth is that if you got enough gold out of their clutches they would have to tone down their fiscal shenanigans, and another truth is that unless you get the gold out of their clutches you are facing the eventual and early loss of such slight economic freedom as you still have.

At the beginning of this talk we mentioned recent exposures of Communists and their influence in our Government. We find that either from motive, plan, or effect, the monetary and currency policies of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, the International Monetary Fund, and Karl Marx, are all of a pattern and that if they are not checked we will pay the ultimate price through complete loss of our freedom.

Strangely enough, we have been a long time in finding this out, though our Congress had warning when Mr. Morgenthau testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee, when he said:

"The Bretton Woods agreements are good for every American citizen—they involve jobs and profits—they govern the amount of food on the family table, the money for a new radio school books for the children."

These were sweet words, but note the phrase, "they govern." They meant it just that way but we do not have to tolerate it and the same is true of the policies and

practices of the other Government agencies we have named.

DESTRUCTIVE GOVERNMENT

When our Declaration of Independence was written there was a clause which said: "Whenever any form of government becomes destructive—it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Since it is our right to change even our form of government, we surely have an equal right to seek changes in the policies of the privately owned Federal Reserve System. That we need changes should be apparent when we listen to the words of the "planner" mentioned by Senator CAIN.

A MONEY MANAGER SPEAKS

Allen Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, addressed the recent convention of the American Banking Association in San Francisco. He spoke of gold money as something inferior to the present paper currency. He stated that the people were not to be trusted with gold lest they might want to withdraw some and hoard it just when the managers of the paper currency desired their greatest freedom. His statements are typical of those coming from various speakers who join with his views. Sproul says

"We have decided that this policy requires that gold should not be available for private use in this country.

We have decided that the place for gold is in the monetary reserves as a backing for our money supply, not in the pockets or the hoards of the people.

"I perceive no moral problem involved in this question of gold convertibility."

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, a keen financial writer, makes this comment in Newsweek:

A REAL GOLD STANDARD

"Let's help him to perceive one. Prior to the year 1933 our Government pledged itself to pay interest and principal on its bonds in gold. It also pledged the holder of every currency note that it would redeem that note on demand in gold. It violated its most solemn pledge. It deprived the rightful owners of their gold. And it made the possession of gold by anybody but the thief illegal.

"The principal argument for restoring the circulation of gold coin," declares Sproul, "seems to be distrust of the money managers and of the fiscal policies of the Government."

"Mr. Sproul could not have stated the issue more clearly but he seems blind to the fact that this mistrust has been richly earned."

As a matter of practical fact we are just as effectually robbed if we lose our property through Federal Reserve policies or through direct acts of the Communists. We know that the Communists seek our extinction but we had expected some integrity from the Federal Reserve.

DOES OUR GOLD NOW PROTECT US?

We hear of our vast stores of gold and are told it guarantees the integrity of the dollar. Our dollars are issued in ever mounting billions by the very money managers we are supposed to trust. Sproul describes them as "competent and responsible men" but Henry Hazlitt pointedly comments, "Sproul's currency theory may be summed up thus—put your faith in the monetary managers, who have always fooled you in the past."

Since various Government departments issue statistics on the value of the dollar we can adopt their figures and conclude that the present value is only slightly more than 50 cents. Its integrity is at a very low ebb.

SOME FIGURES ON OUR FINANCIAL FIX

On May 4, 1949, William McMartin, Jr., Acting Secretary of the Treasury, wrote a letter to the chairman of the Senate Bank-

ing and Currency Committee for the purpose of showing the impossibility of attempting gold convertibility for our present outstanding currency obligations. He said:

"Even our \$24,000,000,000 of gold holdings would be completely inadequate to meet a serious run on gold from the \$27,000,000,000 of United States currency in circulation, over \$140,000,000,000 of bank deposits and scores of billions of dollars of Government securities.

"Conversion of 5 percent or 6 percent of these Government and bank obligations would be enough to bring the Federal Reserve banks below their legal minimum bank reserve."

In the face of this isn't it childish for so-called economists to talk of converting to gold at the present \$35 gold price?

GOLD PRICE A FICTION AND A FRAUD

The price of gold in dollars is so fatally out of line that it menaces our economic future every day it is maintained by helping to perpetuate a fiction and a fraud on our citizens.

The admission by the Treasury of the dangerously thin margin we have in our present ratio of gold to dollars provides the strongest possible argument for the necessity of a higher gold price.

It is an astonishing experience to hear business and financial men discuss these matters, deplore the dangers inherent in our present money policy, express their distrust of our money managers and then hesitate to press for a higher gold price because "that would mean devaluing the dollar."

THE DOLLAR HAS ALREADY BEEN DEVALUED

Its value is only gaged by what it will buy. It is now worth only 50 cents and headed downward.

AN HONEST ADMISSION NEEDED

An honest admission of this fact by our Government and by bankers and businessmen would be a first step toward returning integrity and dignity to the dollar.

Gold should now be \$70 an ounce merely to be of the equivalent dollar value that it is supposed to hold, but this would not be a safe price at which conversion of currency into gold could be undertaken.

It is obvious that whatever the future price of gold may be, it cannot safely be left to the choice or judgment of the same managers of paper currency who have betrayed us.

FREE MARKET A COMPELLING NEED

It is because of this compelling need for an honest determination of the realistic value of gold that a free market must be established. That there gold may be freely bought and sold by citizens with no fear of prosecution for violation of Treasury Regulations, or of loss through seizure of their gold holdings.

In such a market the Treasury could buy, but it must be prohibited from selling lest we still be the victims of the present political fiction which constitutes our monetary policy.

Such a market could develop the reasonably safe value of gold so that the next step could be a conversion of paper currency to gold without wrecking the economy. The proportion of gold which would be withdrawn by the citizens, and others who possess our currency and dollar obligations, must be carefully estimated so that the remaining gold reserves may legally and adequately support the currency outstanding.

RESERVE INCREASE IMPOSSIBLE

The present world reserves of gold (exclusive of Russia) are tabulated and known. It is physically impossible to rapidly increase these reserves. The mining of new gold is a slow and laborious process, no matter what the price, or the incentive, it is a matter of years to open new mines, or increase the productivity of existing mines.

Taking into account the world consumption of gold as a commodity which is constantly increasing and bearing in mind that much of this gold is destroyed and therefore not returnable for re-use in the future, the actual fresh and new gold production would scarcely keep pace with the expansions of sound credit.

The world gold stocks can therefore only be expanded in the proportions needed through a new dollar price, or value, or relationship.

Such a price now might be \$105 an ounce, but if we continue to be guided by the stubborn stupidity which has chartered our course down the present path to increased inflation and eventually financial disaster, the eventual price of gold may soar to far greater heights.

WE MUST ACT NOW

What can we do to help?

We can make the subject of phony money a daily peeve and talk to our families, neighbors, merchants, bankers. Write to our friends at a distance and suggest their activity along the same lines. Write to our insurance companies and to our Senators and Congressmen and request that they answer our letters. If the answers are evasive or unsatisfactory write again.

These are your rights and privileges as American citizens and this is the most important subject in your future if you wish to retain and enjoy them. A mass movement from citizens now will augment the work of outstanding banking and business leaders who have become increasingly active in publicly proclaiming the necessity and benefits of a free gold market and ultimate convertibility to gold of present paper currency.

HONEST BANKS BACK FREE MARKET

The Empire Trust Co., of New York, in the East and the powerful Bank of America, on the Pacific coast are two leaders of this movement, backed in principle by forceful and independent bankers clear across the continent.

The Washington Mutual Savings Bank, in Seattle, has adopted a very practical plan to help its customers.

When entering the bank to buy a United States savings bond a staff member greets the customer and opens a discussion to show how Government deficit spending is destroying the dollar purchasing power and therefore the security of the bond purchase.

The banker then offers to aid the customer in voicing concern to the State's Congressmen as to the value of the bond in 10 years from now. The bank offers to prepare and send a letter for the customer, which states, in part—

"I have bought this bond because I believe the statements of our Treasury Department and of our Government that this is the soundest type of investment I can make to protect my savings.

"I am nevertheless disturbed by the continuing reduction in the purchasing power of the United States dollar.

"I am of the opinion that Congress must act to balance our budget and should do everything in its power to make certain that the proceeds of my bond when it matures 10 years from now will have purchasing power comparable to those dollars which I have invested in our Government bonds of this date."

These are direct-action methods in the best tradition of every loyal American citizen. They give impetus to a mass movement which will compel the politicians now ruling us to modify their acts and realize that they do not own this country and its people.

IMPORTANCE OF HEALTHY GOLD PRODUCTION

Few people realize the economic importance to the country of a sound and healthy gold-production industry. Gold producers are not seeking any favors, but they are

entitled to justice and the protection of laws and their constitutional rights.

When these suggested actions take place on a mass scale it would seem that the Government should return to financial sanity, and when this happens all the present problems facing gold mining will be wiped away.

World-Wide Influence of American Soil Conservation Program—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part I of the address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, fifth annual meeting, Soil Conservation Society of America, Detroit, Mich., October 27, 1950:

WORLD-WIDE INFLUENCE OF AMERICAN SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Among the benefits our American soil conservation program has given the world are: The rates and behavior of accelerated soil erosion, the extent of erosion in the United States (survey of 1934), and most of the basic principles and measures involved with the control and prevention of erosion.

We have learned through bitter experience here in America that a part-way job is not effective soil conservation in the sense of establishing anything like permanent productivity for the land. For example, the old single-practice type of soil conservation—terracing—used by many cotton farmers of the Southeast for more than a hundred years did much more harm in the long run than good. The failure was due, more than anything else, to the fact that no one knew how or where to build terraces, or how to provide supporting practices needed for their efficient operation. The practice had its beginning (as "hillside ditches") early in the nineteenth century and was never subjected to the scrutiny of research until nearly a third of the twentieth century had passed: a delay of nearly a century and a third in finding out how to build and where to use the principal erosion control practice of the time! Ramser wrote a very important bulletin about terracing as practiced in this country in 1917,¹ but in the absence of research that publication was based on field observation.

Now we know how and where to build terraces. We know what grades and cross-sectional dimensions to provide for terraces to be built on different slopes with different soils and soil conditions. And, what is just as important, we have learned what combinations of conservation practices to use with terraces in order to give them needed support for permanency, as well as what kind of terracing is required to provide needed support for other conservation practices.

These requirements, we have learned through the research and experience of the Soil Conservation Service. That agency has produced most of the fundamental conservation information and has developed the principal conservation measures for the United States and the world. The Service and its immediate forerunner (the soil conservation erosion experiment stations) developed such effective conservation tools as strip cropping,

contour crop rotations, the broad-channel terrace, stubble mulching, the land capability survey, and the principle of treating land according to kind and need for lasting soil conservation.

Our first work in cooperation with practical farmers began in September 1933. Some of the principal projects were those covering the watersheds of South Tyger River, S. C.; Banister River, Va.; Elm Creek, Tex.; South Palouse River, Wash.-Idaho; Salt Creek, Ohio; Big Creek and Tarkio River, Mo.-Iowa; Jones Creek, Iowa; Coon Creek, Wis.; Okatibbee Creek, Miss.; Brown Creek, Ark.; Limestone Valley Creek, Kans.; Arroyo Grande, Calif.; Middle Pecan Creek, Okla.; Green Creek, Tex.; Cadron Creek, Ark.; Dauchite Bayou, La.; Upper Fountain Creek, Colo.; Plum Creek, Nebr.; Shue Creek (Huron project), S. Dak.; Park River, N. Dak.; Presque Isle Creek, Maine; Big Muddy Creek, Mont.; Conchocon River, N. Y.; and Kickapoo Creek, Ill.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

From every conceivable angle of consideration—economic, social, cultural, public health, national defense—conservation of natural resources is an objective on which all should agree. It is also a need which all should recognize and do something about. The public—our society as a whole—has a vital stake and, therefore, an enduring responsibility in the land. Exercise of the public responsibility in the sustenance of agricultural land is of such obvious importance to the general welfare of all people it would seem that an adequate program of soil conservation and prudent use of water would always be the first order of business in all nations.

With the understanding that can be developed through education there should be little or no opposition to sound conservation action persistently carried out. There are, however, likely to be, spottedly, misconceptions, unwise proposals for alleged short cuts and panaceas, and occasional bickering and quibbling arising out of time-wasting argument as to who should do the work, as well as out of ignorance and the common error of taking things for granted. These deterrents represent a type of human behavior that probably can be dealt with most effectively through the educational process.

Public thinking in making the wisest possible use of all of a nation's natural resources is, in a sense, of greater importance than the individual's interest, but both are tied together in such a completely complementary way there is no point in pursuing the subject beyond the point of indicating that no man or group should have the right, legally or otherwise, to recklessly destroy or unnecessarily waste any resource on which public welfare is dependent. Willful destruction of those resources essential to life amounts, in the end, to a form of inflicting privation on one's fellow man.

Productive land occupies a position of such basic importance to everybody that some individuals have come to favor public control in the use and management of land. They contend that because of man's utter dependence on the world's limited supply of land, the question of how land is to be used should not be left entirely to individual discretion.

Our American experience, however, has developed a majority feeling, seemingly, to the effect that our soil-conservation efforts should proceed along lines of cooperative action, without the use of compulsion at any point, at least not until there has been time for adequate education and action. The present national program of soil conservation, under which the Government supplies, on request, technical assistance and certain materials to soil-conservation districts, has become highly effective and very popular. Excellent progress has been made in the districts without public use of anything stronger than persuasion and cooperation.

¹ Ramser, C. E. Prevention of the erosion of farm lands by terracing. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bull. 512. April 5, 1917.

There have been, however, many instances where farmers have not brought themselves immediately into active cooperation in this conservation program. Delays have resulted from such postponement of action on the part of farmers, and in turn these have caused difficulties and hardships for their neighbors; but such situations have usually cleared up with time and education.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

It is my conviction that the democratically farmer-voted and farmer-managed soil-conservation districts, through which the Soil Conservation Service makes available virtually all of its technical assistance to landowners and operators, represent not only the greatest land movement of all time but the most promising vehicle for taking advantage of the powerful force of landowners and operators working together as they do in the districts. It is through these democratic units of State government that the soil and water conservation job on the farm-lands of the Nation is being done in an effective and lasting manner—as never before achieved anywhere.

The districts are in an ideal position for the landowners and operators to work together and take advantage of counsel and assistance of one another, as well as of various local, State, Federal, and private sources.

Back at the time when the districts were getting under way, I never would have believed that in the short space of a dozen years—starting in 1937—every one of the 48 States, as well as our Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, would have enacted these district laws, so promptly taken advantage of by the landholders. More than three-fourths of the Nation's farms are now within the boundaries of the nearly 2,280 soil-conservation districts already established, by what usually has been the overwhelmingly favorable vote of the landowners themselves. The districts now cover approximately a billion and a quarter acres, including more than three-fourths of the Nation's farmland. Nine States and our two insular possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are completely covered by districts. Many of the other States are nearly covered. Up to July 1, 1950 (the beginning of the present fiscal year), farmers and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service, working together out on the agricultural lands of the country, in soil conservation districts alone, had prepared co-operatively some 870,000 complete soil conservation farm plans. These plans covered by that date over 240,000,000 acres, of which more than 120,000,000 acres had been treated with conservation measures in whatever combinations were required to give adequate protection to the land.

GROUP ACTION

Not only are farmers in soil-conservation districts becoming more neighborly and helpful to one another in conservation work, but natural groups of farmers within districts, bound together by the ties of neighborliness and common interests, are contributing encouragingly toward speeding up conservation work by planning together and working together, loaning one another machinery and seed, and cooperating in conservation work in many other ways. The groups usually range from 4 or 5 to 15 or 20 families.

The Soil Conservation Service is now working with some 20,000 of these natural groups. An increasing number of soil-conservation districts are finding that it is comparatively easy to organize and determine the membership of these groups, seek out their leaders, and interest them in conservation. In a great many instances these groups, under their leaders, are coming together in planning and application meetings. They are helping the district supervisors and their

own neighbors in routing equipment, distributing seed, and meeting seasonal farm needs. It has long been known that people like to work together. Many people work in groups far more effectively than as individuals. There is a certain stimulus to morale in the act of working with friends and neighbors for a common beneficial purpose. It leads to better feeling and cooperation here in America and in other countries I have visited.

Recently the leader of a typical neighbor group in Texas said: "We like this group way of doing things. One helps another and is helped in return. One learns what another is doing and wants to do likewise * * *; we save in transporting seed for the whole group * * * and in hauling fertilizer. Naturally it speeds up application * * *; working together, we become more interested * * *; it makes for better group spirit."

UNITED STATES LEADING THE WORLD

And so, in the ways I have indicated, this country is leading the world in soil conservation. And we are not hiding our methods for the conservation of soil and water from any person or nation—when they earnestly request assistance. We are helping as well as we can. Eighty countries have sent representatives to the United States to acquaint themselves with our methods, and we have carefully shown them everything we do and how we do it.

PRODUCTIVE LAND UNLIKE OTHER RESOURCES

Productive land is unlike any other natural resource. It is characterized by the element of life—fruitfulness—placed by nature in the thin mantle of soil occurring over a limited portion of the earth's surface. Productive land is further differentiated from other natural resources in that it must be maintained and used simultaneously. All other natural resources, with very few exceptions, must be taken from the earth—separated from it—in order to be used by man. The principal utility of some of our very important resources calls for their complete transformation, as the consumption of petroleum for heat and the smelting of iron ore to make steel. Productive land, however, can be used over and over indefinitely, if prudently used, in accordance with the principles of sound soil conservation.

LAND SUPPLY

Productive land is much more limited than commonly has been supposed. It occurs only on the surface of the earth, and only on part of this surface. It is not permanent. It cannot be stockpiled—shipped in from other countries—like natural rubber, tin, copper, titanium. Once the fertile topsoil is washed or blown away, it cannot be restored or replaced in any practical way for generations. And what is left—subsoil—usually is far less productive, less stable, and less absorptive of rainfall. There are no undiscovered reserves of productive land of any substantial extent.

We cannot dig deeper into the earth and find new productive soil. We cannot pump it from wells, plant it with seeds, or dig it from mines. We must keep the productive soil we have or do without.

Productive land is the only natural resource without which we cannot live. We are completely dependent on it for the food we eat, except fish. We also depend on it for a very large share of our clothing and all of our wood supplies. With our present knowledge, we cannot get enough to feed ourselves from the ocean—certainly not 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn, a billion bushels of wheat, etc. On any large scale, hydroponics would be utterly impractical. We might conceivably turn sometime to some form of synthetic food, as pills, plus a roughage, but this appears to be a fantastic extreme, still far away, and likely, if it ever comes, it will be decidedly unpopular.

There is no doubt about the need for protecting productive land. Year after year, for generations, man has been steadily engaged in ruining or severely impoverishing millions of acres of this basic resource. Every hard rain falling on unprotected, cultivated, or overgrazed sloping land washes additional tons of soil downslope, downstream, into the rivers, reservoirs, and oceans. There is no practical way of bringing this back. And wind, blowing across bare, dry soil, whether sloping or level, adds to the damage by lifting the fine soil particles into the air and wastefully scattering the substance of the land. What is left behind, frequently, is infertile, shifting sand that smothers out vegetation on neighboring good land.

When the world was younger and our population much smaller, we could, perhaps, stand such waste; but that time is past. It is not defeatism to say that the world is fast maturing and must assume now a mature responsibility for its resources. It is not limiting the horizons of the future to say that land exploitation must stop. It is simply a matter of common sense and self-preservation. Besides saving soil and water—the two go together—soil conservation results in increased yields per acre, and that's the basis of profitable farming, whether prices are up or down. It is also easier and cheaper to farm on the contour than up and down hill, and it's much more sensible to use crop residues as a source of surface mulch and organic matter for the soil than to lose it all by burning.

ONLY ABOUT 4,000,000,000 ACRES LEFT

Today, throughout the world, there are left only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land, the productivity of a great deal of which is only fair to medium. Much of it is poor land. Yet this land must feed a population believed to be in excess of 2,250,000,000, and still increasing.

The United States is somewhat better off, from the standpoint of productive land, than most nations. Even though we have ruined more good land in less time than any other nation in recorded history, we had the advantage of an unprecedented supply to begin with.

It is generally considered that 2½ acres per capita of reasonably productive land are necessary for a minimum adequate nutritional diet. And we need an extra half acre for such crops as tobacco, flax for the production of oil for paints, and other raw products of industry.

With our 480,000,000 acres, approximately, of good land, we have enough for our present needs. Moreover, soil conservation increases yields—probably by more than 50 percent—so that we are not likely to go hungry any time soon.

But some countries have much less than 3 acres per capita. Some have less than half an acre and some have not more than a quarter of an acre.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NECESSARY

Practically all farmers need experienced, scientific assistance on the ground to help them solve their land and water problems. Without such assistance, they are not likely to bring their agriculture to full fruition or adequately safeguard their land.

Effective and lasting soil conservation work demands the utmost in technical excellence. A trained, experienced soil conservationist prescribes for the land much as an experienced physician prescribes for his patients. In a sense, Soil Conservation Service technicians are land doctors. These men have learned that half-way measures are improperly placed practices will not get the job done in a lasting way, and that such measures often do more harm than good over a period of years.

Each conservation measure is specifically designed to fit the land on which it is used.

Furthermore, each measure is designed to support or complement another one, or several other measures, wherever support is needed whether in the same field or an adjoining field, above or below. Also, conservation work on one farm is planned and carried out with an eye to the needs of the next farm and to farms downstream. This viewpoint is essential, for the process of erosion has no respect for boundary lines. Neither do dust storms, nor floods. And the costly process of sedimentation never concerns itself with the interests of water users dependent on unprotected reservoirs.

World-wide Influence of American Soil Conservation Program—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr WICKERSHAM Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of the address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the fifth annual meeting, Soil Conservation Society of America, Detroit, Mich., October 27, 1950:

To hope that anything less than a scientifically planned and properly executed conservation program for each field, each farm, and each watershed will give the needed permanent protection to the land is to hope for the impossible, and, what is very important, any acceptance of the idea that there can be a shorter and easier way of doing the job is dangerous, because there is no short-cut or easier way than doing it right except by lowering standards, which would amount to pure folly.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO AVOID

We need to be on guard against certain misconceptions or loose assertions about soil conservation, that still seem to confuse the thinking of some otherwise well-informed people. Briefly stated, some of these are:

1. That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.
2. That there are short-cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that district farm plans are too technical for farmers.
3. That soil conservation costs more than it's worth.
4. That we have all the good land we need.
5. That soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.
6. That the job will never get done at the rate we are going.

These utterances, for the most part, are either misconceptions or something on the order of quibbling on the part of academic minds run out of factual material. They are so far from correct that it seems unnecessary to discuss them here in any detail. However, some of them could, perhaps, be the cause of wasting time on the part of those who are not adequately acquainted with the facts. Take, for example, the question sometimes asked: "Aren't the alluvial lands along the lower Mississippi good for farming, and aren't they composed of the products of soil erosion?"

Well, of course, they are highly productive lands—among the richest in the world—and certainly they were formed by the deposition of the products of erosion en route to the sea. Anyone who knows anything about the process of erosion understands that all alluvial lands throughout the world are the products of erosion, which have accumulated along stream courses by deposition from overflow.

But this is the answer to only part of the question. It's not a full answer, however, because alluvial land is formed by deposition from two kinds of erosion: (1) slow geological erosion, which does very little harm under normal conditions, and (2) accelerated erosion following man's disturbance of natural conditions by removing the protective cover of grass or trees and then plowing the land for farming purposes. This latter kind of erosion—the accelerated type—does great damage to bare, sloping land through the process of rapid erosion.

Soil-conservation science has shown the world clearly just how and to what degree accelerated erosion damages our productive land more than all other imprudent activities of man. It has been thoroughly explained in almost countless publications that it is the speeded-up action of erosion, which results from man's use and abuse of the land, that soil-conservation science is concerned with, not the tediously slower erosion of normal geological process. We have found that the soil losses from individual rains falling on well-kept woodland or grassland often can't even be measured because of the slowness of erosion within such an environment—geological or natural erosion. The kind of erosion we are concerned with—accelerated erosion—goes on so rapidly it sometimes is exceedingly difficult to get all the mud washed off the clean-tilled fields under study measured up before the next rain.

Before anyone goes too far off the deep end on this subject, they should study the recently published United States Department of Agriculture Technical Papers Nos. 837, 859, 873, 883, 888, 916, 959, and 973, dealing with measurements of rates of accelerated and unaccelerated erosion on different types of land. This would provide them with the facts obtained through research carried on by the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating with the agricultural experiment stations.

The Mississippi Delta illustration provides misinformation rather than helpful information when used without explanation.

Also, we occasionally hear about the good that soil erosion does. In this instance there is some truth but not much. I won't go into detail, but will say merely that by eroding off unfavorable topsoil and its sublayers down to high-lime or high-phosphorous material richer layers are sometimes reached.

What is left out of the illustration is the very important fact that erosion seldom planes off the land evenly down to these richer depths, to leave the surface smooth enough for cultivation. Generally after the removal of the topsoil by sheet and rill erosion, deep grooving of the land by gullying sets in, so that while erosion may get down to limy material, and so forth, the land is likely to be—almost always is—cut into such a rough gullied condition it can't be cultivated at all.

These things really are not very important, however, beyond the point of providing the public with meaningful information.

COST OF NOT CONTROLLING EROSION

It seems to me, we have overlooked a number of important aspects of the land use problem by a process of over-emphasizing certain points of view. One place where the problem is sometimes viewed from the wrong direction, I think, is that in appraising the importance of soil conservation, the cost of

controlling erosion is always stressed, with seldom a word about the cost of not controlling erosion. Accordingly, soil conservation is too often looked on as a good thing provided it doesn't cost too much. And that's a good point, of course, but it just isn't the whole story. In the first place, soil conservation pays its way and more.¹ Then, in a great many instances we can reduce the cost of erosion by stopping gullying before the gullies get too deep. And the same with sheet erosion. Prevention is the word—doing something to prevent or circumvent the damage "before the act."

Here's an example of the cost of not controlling erosion. Out in the Palouse Wheat Belt in 1948, it cost the farmers, where erosion had not been controlled, 25 bushels of good, productive wheat, pea, and grass soil to produce 1 bushel of wheat. The eroded soil largely ran off by way of the floodwaters of the Columbia River into the permanent wastes of the Pacific.

And it's more or less that way with flood control. Reduce flood flows up along the little headwater streams and less water will be getting into the big trunk streams down below—where the cost of control is often very great. By thus holding back the waters of little streams, less water is immediately discharged into the big streams, so that it would be easier and less expensive to control the smaller quantities of water that get down into the big river channels.

Similarly, if a safe place for the discharge of water from a terrace or diversion ditch is prepared before water is turned into the terrace or ditch, much costly gullying will be prevented at the discharge ends.

REPORT TO THE NATION

This is the sixteenth year in which the Soil Conservation Service will be able to report an accelerated rate of progress. While we admittedly are not moving fast enough with the soil-conservation job, and are still suffering heavy losses of soil, we are, nevertheless, moving ahead at a rate which is not at all discouraging. I don't mean that any of us is at all satisfied with present progress, we are not satisfied, and are constantly seeking improvements for continued acceleration of the work. We have greatly increased progress, particularly in recent years, and propose doing everything in our power to maintain this progressive advancement. It is my belief, based on experience, that we could, with adequate facilities, get the job of applying the basic conservation measures to the land completed by about 1970.

This estimate is based on what has been done thus far, together with the encouraging continued upward trend. At the end of the first 7 years of work, in 1941, the Soil Conservation Service had directed the conservation treatment of 26,600,000 acres, an average of 3,800,000 acres each fiscal year for this first period. The first year, 1935, the conservation job was completed on less than 1,000,000 acres.

In 1942, the basic conservation measures were applied to 5,338,000 acres (in soil conservation districts). In 1950 the same kind of treatment was applied to something over 26,071,342 acres. This was an increase of 388 percent—nearly 5 times as much work done—with operating facilities increased during this 8-year period by only 50 percent.

In addition to the conservation measures applied to the land, much farm planning work was done and enough soil conservation surveys were carried out for the preparation of a healthy backlog of necessary conservation farm plans.

But there is still a long way to go, and we are still losing great quantities of soil. How-

¹ Bennett, H. H. New Landmarks in Soil Conservation. Berkshire County Mass. August 16, 1949. p. 9.

ever, we have learned how to control erosion on practically all kinds of land, and we are controlling it at a much faster rate than the public realizes. The job is being done at a rate so much faster than I ever expected to see, even as recently as 15 years ago, that I feel almost jubilant over the progress that's being made. Even so, we are continually finding new ways to accelerate progress.

The figures used in this report are from the records of the Soil Conservation Service. Other agencies, Federal, State, and private, have made contributions, to be sure, but we do not have accurate figures about their accomplishments. The progress I am reporting relates to the use of needed soil conservation measures on farms for which complete conservation plans have been made by our technicians on an acre-by-acre basis. These farm plans have been guided by the physical land facts revealed in our soil conservation surveys (which no other agency makes).

In considering the rate of progress on so prodigious a job as conserving the productive lands of the United States while using them, a major point to be considered is whether or not progress is speeding up from year to year. This has much to do with an appropriate appraisal of the rate at which any long-time job is being accomplished.

As to finishing the job, actually there is no end to it; because when the basic conservation measures have been applied to the land there still remains the continuing task of maintenance. This is true of all the works of man; if not maintained, they eventually disappear through the depredations of neglect.

Our Soil Conservation Service method of conserving soil is markedly different from anything that has ever been done in the recorded history of man insofar as revealed by the literature we have examined. It is based on nature's highly successful method of keeping the productive land she builds permanently productive. Nature accomplishes this through the operation of an almost perfectly balanced program of soil building and soil conservation. The basic principle of her ideal method is perfect coordination between land, water, vegetation, and animals (except civilized man), and climate.

The closer we can follow this pattern, the better will be the job. For example, our measurements show that under a good cover of grass or forest, only a trace of soil is lost by erosion, and most of the rainfall is stored in the reservoir of the soil for plant growth. Under these conditions the negligible loss of soil from the surface of the ground is doubtless compensated for by soil building from the materials beneath and by accumulations of organic matter on the surface.

So, it is a mandate of nature that the land and the water which makes land productive be treated and used according to need and capability if the land is to be preserved. I am repeating this concept because it needs all the emphasis that can be given it. Too many people still do not understand that this is one of the physical facts that man cannot change or amend.

For the cultivated crops, our program of modern soil conservation calls, along with other things, for coverage of the land throughout the year with some form of dense vegetation or mulch for as much time as such coverage can be fitted into practical farm practice. Results obtained from our principal conservation practices, when used in mutual support of one another (if the character of the land and the climate call for such support), show something like 85 to more than 95 percent of complete effectiveness. The degree of effectiveness will be increased as crop rotations and other measures add organic material to the soil and

otherwise improve soil structure and fertility.

In the beginning (September 1933), our work moved ahead slowly, probably more because of newness than anything else. In the beginning I proposed the type of program we are still using, because I felt then, as I know now, it was the only possible way to lasting soil conservation. This I had learned through continuing study of soils, soil erosion, and land use over a period of 30 years. I had mapped soils in the old Bureau of Soils and later had set up and directed the work of the erosion experiment stations in the former Bureau of Chemistry and Soils. Most of the basic data we have relating to rates of soil and water losses from different kinds of land, used for different purposes, as well as the principal erosion control measures, were developed on these stations. These experiment stations, and their successors, cooperating with State stations have also developed the great majority of the control measures being used at the present time.

I was sure in the beginning that my proposal for completely coordinated treatment of the land was scientifically sound—that for enduring soil conservation, treatment of the land on the basis of kind and need was just as much a physical fact as the fact that water will not run uphill on its own power. In other words, our conservation method was based on the closest possible adjustment with reality, as relating to soil, slope, water, and proper land use.

I understood, also, back in 1933 (as the result of 30 years' study of the land), that there was no short-cut—no other way—to get the soil conservation job done with any assurance of permanency. But farmers, generally, and others had to be convinced.

So, in the beginning our program did not move out very fast. It was, quite naturally, necessary to explain every detail of the work to the landowners and operators who were considering taking up conservation farming. Now that great numbers understand the program, not so much time is required, generally, for detailed explanation.

During the first 7 years of the life of the Soil Conservation Service—by the end of the fiscal year 1941—the part of the total conservation job completed on the farm land of the Nation (excluding national forests, parks, public domain, and certain other public-owned areas) amounted to only 3.2 percent. This was an average annual rate of less than one-half of 1 percent. But in the fiscal year 1942, eight-tenths of 1 percent of the job was completed. During the 3-year period of 1943 to 1945, inclusive, the rate of progress averaged 1.1 percent of the total job each fiscal year, while for the 3-year period of 1946 to 1948, inclusive, the average rate had increased to 2.1 percent of the total job—almost doubled. By 1950 the annual rate of treatment had increased to 2.7 percent of the total job.

Our figures up to June 30, 1950, show that 18.6 percent of the conservation job had been completed. In addition, there had been a considerable spread of practices to thousands of farms both inside and outside of soil conservation districts, for which we have no records. We have completed, in other words, around one-fifth of the total job; but in considering the results I must again emphasize the fact that the rate of progress is speeding up and we are striving continuously to move faster.

If we can raise the year-by-year rate of application of effective conservation measures a little more—and it is felt that this can be done with adequate facilities—it will not be long until we can begin to see the goal which for so long has seemed so far off.

Accordingly I am optimistic about progress with our national program of soil conservation, as well as with the possibilities of the work being extended to other countries.

Removal of District Veterans' Administration Hospital From Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Massachusetts district:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., September 27, 1951.
Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: Enclosed you will find a resolution drawn up and proposed by the membership from district 16, Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, stating our position in relation to the removal of the death claims and insurance divisions of the Veterans' Administration from Boston to Philadelphia.

We earnestly solicit your support in this vital matter and your assistance in the prevention of the continuation of the recommendations of the Hoover committee, as they adversely affect veteran problems.

Yours in comradeship,

FRANCIS J. MULDOON,
Commander, District 16.

Whereas war veterans, their dependents, and the public generally in the recent past experienced great pleasure in the victory in their long struggle to have death claims and insurance matters decentralized to various local offices of the Veterans' Administration where personal and sympathetic discussion might be had with regard to their problems incidental to rights granted them under various laws of the United States; and

Whereas prompt, humane, and efficient service in the solution of those problems has been enjoyed since that decentralization in a detrimental comparison to the former delayed and utterly cold-blooded approach to those problems by an entrenched bureaucracy in faraway places; and

Whereas the brief enjoyment of prompt, humane, and efficient service as to death claims and insurance services rendered by district office No. 1 of the Veterans' Administration is about to be lost by the abolition of said district office No. 1 whereby an entrenched bureaucracy is again enfolding unto itself the authority, the power, and the positions to assume complete control of this very important work incidental to death claims and insurance matters incidental to rights granted by laws passed by Congress acting for a grateful nation toward its heroic defenders in times of emergency; and

Whereas we note that the general trend of thinking by the Chief Executive and the Federal agencies generally is emphatically toward decentralization; and

Whereas approximately 600 VA employees of District Office No. 1 after a practical survey have learned that they cannot procure proper living quarters for themselves and their families in the city of Philadelphia; and

Whereas these trained and efficient employees with many years of conscientious service will thus be lost by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas there is an excess of qualified trained workers in Boston, Mass.; and

Whereas there is an established lack of qualified workers in Philadelphia based on Government statistics as to the labor markets; and

Whereas we have been reliably informed that arrangements have been made for the training of about 1,000 prospective employees to replace trained and proven efficient employees who cannot make the proposed move to Philadelphia; and

Whereas the proposed move to Philadelphia of the Death Claims and Insurance Division will leave this area without a duly trained representative as to death claims or insurance matters highly technical in their nature; and

Whereas the 610,000 war veterans entitled to service in the area served by the Boston regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the 1,200,000 war veterans residing within the New England area will be deprived of urgently needed service and information it is our considered opinion that this drastic, unbusinesslike and arbitrary order and its utter disregard toward the rendition of prompt and efficient service to which war veterans and their dependents are rightfully entitled has and will continue to receive the severe condemnation of level-headed and right-thinking citizens as manifested by the roar of public disapproval which met the announcement of this very unpopular and hasty decision; and

Whereas the practice of economy under proper circumstances may have many commendatory aspects, statistics now available make clear that in the over-all aspects this proposed move to Philadelphia is not to the advantage of this Nation and is not economical; and

Whereas we have viewed with equanimity the forwarding of billions of dollars to various foreign countries, which may have served many commendable purposes, even though a great deal of the products flowing from that reservoir have reached and aided the enemies our men are now fighting in Korea and while the millions parcelled out to the farm population for not raising certain farm products may have helped the farmers, a regiment of our population, nevertheless we do deeply resent and protest to the limit of our ability against the practice of economy, again practised in the first instance directly against war veterans, particularly disabled war veterans and the members of the families of deceased war veterans who have been in most instances named as beneficiaries of the policies of insurance upon the lives of those who have made the supreme sacrifice in the defense of this great country and whose money paid the premiums which purchases that insurance, and in our opinion they are not only entitled to a fair deal but also to a square deal. It is therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of District No. 16 Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars comprised of 18 posts in Boston, Mass., protests vehemently and to the limits of our capacity the abolition of District Office No. 1 of the Veterans' Administration and the transfer of the Death Claims and Insurance Division, its current constituent parts from Boston, Mass., the cradle of liberty, to Philadelphia, Pa.; and it is hereby further

Resolved, That the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration be and hereby is requested to rescind that order of abolition and transfer to the end that the best interest of war veterans and their dependents may be served by prompt, humane and efficient service in their own area by personal contact and not by remote control with added erroneous and voluminous correspondence and by persons who only see a number and a folder; and be it further

Resolved, that this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Senators Lodge and Saltonstall; United States

Representatives Edith Nourse Rogers, John F. Kennedy, Harold D. Donohue, Philip J. Philbin, Thomas J. Lane, Foster Furcolo, John W. Heselton, William H. Bates, Angler Goodwin, Donald W. Nicholson, Christian A. Horter, Richard B. Wigglesworth; and Administrator Carl Gray of the Veterans' Administration.

Conservation, Development, Self-Government Through Districts—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the fifth annual meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Oklahoma City, Okla., February 22, 1951:

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, SELF-GOVERNMENT THROUGH DISTRICTS

Your president left a note in my office the other day, inviting me to come out here to Oklahoma City and tell you to do your job better. Those aren't exactly the polite words Waters Davis used, but they seem to represent the general idea, as I understood it.

Now, as most of you already know, I spend a good part of my time telling everybody that we ought to get the soil and water conservation job done faster and more economically. That is, faster insofar as it can be done without sacrificing any fraction of the lasting quality of the conservation work we do. But I am not so sure I am up to the job of undertaking to tell you and the hundreds of thousands of farmers and ranchers you represent that you must do a better job in your soil conservation districts, although I'll risk a few observations in this general direction. And in doing so, I can see no reason why the districts, in turn, should not tell me to do a better job of helping them. That, I am sure, would be all right too; for ours is a service agency, and nothing could be wrong with your telling me to get on with the job.

It is true, however, that all of us—district officers and our service people as well—constantly need to examine the situation, not alone from the standpoint of past accomplishment, but with respect to current district progress. Really much remarkable progress has been made in the 13 years since the districts began to operate. One danger could be the temptation to look back on accomplishment through district organization with a degree of satisfaction that might lure us into the error of complacency. District organization is, of course, not an end within itself. Neither is a farm plan for soil conservation, where its provisions are not applied to the land. I am happy to say that I know of few satisfied districts. I do know, however, that here and there some of the carefully developed farm plans have not been applied to the land. But you know better than anyone what the situation is in this respect in your own States.

Personally, I am more than happy over the great progress that's been made in soil and water conservation. It gives me great satisfaction, for example, to be able to point to the excellent rate of progress that's been made in the districts for 16 consecutive

years. This point was emphasized in my annual report to the Secretary of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. It's been even more encouraging that progress has been accelerated from year to year, with the exception of the 1 year when SCS took a severe cut in funds.

In 1935—before there were any soil conservation districts—we were able to report the farm conservation job completed on less than a million acres. Seven years later, in 1942, 5 years after the first district was established, basic conservation measures were applied in that 1 year to 5,338,000 acres. Then, in the fiscal year of 1950, the same kind of treatment was applied to 26,071,342 acres in that 1 year. This was an increase of 388 percent—nearly five times as much work done—with operating facilities increased during the 8-year period by only 54 percent. In addition to the conservation measures applied to the land, much farm planning work was done, as you know, and enough soil conservation surveys were carried out for use in the preparation of a healthy backlog of necessary conservation farm plans, in most of the districts.

Final figures for the latest 6-month reporting period (July–December 1950) were not all in when I left Washington, but enough had been received and tabulated to show how the good rate of progress has continued right on through to this minute. Work completed between July and January this fiscal year, amounted to about 19,000,000 acres of farm-planning surveys; more than 71,000 farm plans, covering 20,000,000 acres, and approximately 17,000,000 acres treated.

This brings the estimated cumulative figures on accomplishments in soil-conservation districts to around 350,000,000 acres of detailed surveys; 850,000 farm plans comprising 237,800,000 acres; and 138,000,000 acres treated. It also means that 20 percent of the total job has been done. That isn't counting, of course, the considerable spread of practices to thousands of farms, within and outside soil-conservation districts, of which we have no records.

We can all be proud of such figures and tell the world about them. I for one am certainly going to tell the world—if it will listen.

And very encouraging, too, is the steadily increasing extent to which district farmers are taking over the many important responsibilities of leadership and direction in the conservation program. This must continue to be the key to lasting progress. Not all of the districts have done so well, those that have not, we must help in every way we can.

Now, having pointed to the brighter aspects of the job, let's get down to brass tacks and get on with the things I've been asked to say, the things that very acutely need to be said at this time. I have already urged that we avoid all aspects of complacency. Time has come to step up the rate of progress and to do many other important things. In too many places not as much is being done as can be done. We have learned about some of the reasons, and there may be others. The degree to which you district supervisors, directors, or commissioners exercise your responsibilities of leadership and direction of this highly successful and going conservation program is of utmost concern to all the country, especially in this hour of world peril, so threatening with catastrophe we refuse even to let our minds dwell on the subject. And, how you perform your duties is of the utmost concern to the Soil Conservation Service as an assisting technical agency. Our ability to help you get the conservation job done depends directly on efficient district management; but we have no authority in any district, and we have no desire to run the affairs of districts. We couldn't do it if we had the desire—that's out.

The Soil Conservation Service wants to be a junior partner with the district. We have always visioned that kind of copartnership as a most advantageous one. The very facts in the case prevent our occupying any other relationship with districts. You see, we occupy a very peculiar position with respect to districts. It may be more interesting than important, however, but I will explain what I mean. The districts represent, actually, a creation of the Soil Conservation Service. We were there when they were conceived, we nurtured unceasingly the processes involved with their birth, and we helped with their establishment and growth before and after their physical existence.

The point I want to make in connection with this reference is that, by reason of the part we took before and after—at every turn—our efforts were of a nature that forbid the existence of anything but a feeling of copartnership with districts. We did everything we could think of to keep a completely objective attitude toward the districts from the very beginning. Above all, we did what we could to keep them democratic, independent, and in every sense free. If we had entertained any possessive or acquisitive feelings toward them, they couldn't have gone ahead and proved themselves to be, as they have, the best examples of democracy in action that man has yet formulated.

I am not so sure that all of your district supervisors have yet come fully to understand precisely what it is that you are supervising. Let that point rest for a moment, other than to say you are in a position of trust of the highest order, having been chosen by your neighbors to look after your neighbors' affairs along with your own—and this without promise of reward beyond that of truth, faith, and hope. When man bestows such honors and trust in his fellowman, good men cannot betray the confidence or in any way shirk the sacred duties that go therewith. This is the way you are being looked to—and with very scrutinizing eyes—by farmers, industrialists, bankers, professional people, teachers, citizens of other countries, ministers of the gospel. Don't get frightened—just carry out your duties and responsibilities.

All of you are no doubt acquainted with the memoranda of understanding between your districts and the United States Department of Agriculture and also the supplemental memoranda with the Soil Conservation Service, setting forth our mutual obligations and responsibilities in carrying out soil conservation district work. As you know, each district under these voluntary agreements has important responsibilities. They range from determining priorities for work in the district to planning the use and maintenance of field equipment. The effectiveness of the Service's technical assistance is contingent on the extent to which the district, through its supervisors, lives up to or goes beyond its part of the agreement.

Right at this time, probably as much as at any other time since the first soil-conservation district was established, there is much that we need to be thinking about, talking about—and doing something about—both as district officials and as assisting technicians. Again, and for the third time within the brief space of 33 years, we find ourselves in a state of emergency and national mobilization of our manpower and economic resources for defense of our country and of those democracies elsewhere we would have go with us and not against us. Again we find ourselves called on to "defend" soil and water conservation work against questions raised by the short-sighted, the misinformed, the meddlers. It seems to me the rational people would never raise a question as to the perfectly obvious fact that in order to maintain national

strength, we must safeguard and maintain the very source of our individual and national strength—our productive land. Some have argued that now since we seem to be on the way into a long and destructive war, we can postpone soil conservation. Would any man—I mean any understanding, competent man—want to postpone the closing of his jugular vein if it were laid open to the outgushing of the life substance of his body?

Such a foolhardy act would be, to my way of thinking, the precise equivalent to any postponement of the task of safeguarding our productive land from the destructive and impoverishing forces of erosion.

What some people still don't seem to realize, however, is the fact that men with guns and bullets can't fight without food, and that there can be pitifully little food from poor land. No one knows how long the present emergency may last—1 year or 25 years. But the longer it does last, with the continuing need for maximum production of food, fiber, oil crops, timber, the more indispensable becomes our productive land from which all these necessities are derived. The more important becomes the conservation and efficient use of this land, and the water which makes it produce.

Among other things, in the light of conditions as they are, this would seem to indicate pretty definitely that Government and local interests will need to assume an even larger share of responsibility than ever for carrying on the vital conservation program. Your soil conservation districts—every supervisor, every cooperator, and every potential cooperator—must redouble their efforts in safeguarding our productive land. Every dollar of Government money available for soil and water conservation—whether from Federal, State, or other sources—should be budgeted and spent so as to make sure of its utmost contribution to real conservation.

The Soil Conservation Service, for its part, will continue to use every dollar of its appropriations to the maximum extent possible in providing technical help to farmers in soil-conservation districts as in the past. In fact, 88 percent of our entire personnel is thus engaged in soil conservation work on the land now. The Service likewise stands ready to give full cooperation and every encouragement to whatever program or agency is contributing to our common conservation objective, financially, educationally, or otherwise. We are not too greatly concerned, for instance, over "reorganizations," which seem to lead some people off onto tangents of speculation and unwarranted forebodings.

It is you and your neighbors in the soil-conservation districts, farm organizations, agricultural committees, and elsewhere who I am confident will continue to give the necessary direction and push to our overall conservation undertakings. It is an important responsibility which you have in this matter, but one which I urge you not to avoid or slight in any way. Your help is always needed, now it is indispensable.

I cannot stress too strongly the importance of positive and vigorous leadership within the districts in bringing conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every acre of land still needing it. This, of course, is simply the fulfillment of the original district concept. You now have developed the machinery for most effective exercise of this leadership, through your individual district governing bodies, your State associations, and your national association.

Your State and national associations have an important place and a big job to perform. Soil and water conservation has advanced so far in our system of agriculture and has taken such a definitely recognized place in our general economy that the constantly and rapidly growing numbers of bona fide conservation farmers and ranchers no longer

can remain silent and retiring. They have a proper voice in the direction of our resources development, from the back forty to an entire watershed. Your State and national associations are the natural means through which they can express themselves intelligently and effectively.

I have had the pleasure of taking part in some of the State association meetings. I have found them made up of hard-working sessions of hard-hitting men with definite plans and purpose. But the worth of no association or other organization can be measured on the basis of its occasional meetings alone. It must be active and vocal 12 months in the year—get out and get things done. Your associations have a golden opportunity in this respect. They are young and vigorous, with uncounted educational, planning, and other tasks awaiting their attention and action. I hope that very soon every State and Territory will have a strong association leading out in the affairs of all districts in its area.

The initiative being taken by your national association in many worth-while directions is attracting wide attention and respect. People who should know about them are beginning to hear about your more than 2,300 farmer-organized and farmer-directed soil conservation districts, embracing three-fourths of the Nation's farmland and over 80 percent of its farms and ranches. They are becoming aware of the 12,000 district supervisors who are giving unselfishly of their time, energies, and sometimes personal funds in the furtherance of soil and water conservation work throughout the country. It is dawning on some people at least that you are on nobody's payroll, and are obligated to no Federal or other outside authority. That, incidentally, is a mighty healthy and enviable position to be in.

Conservation, Development, Self-Government Through Districts—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the fifth annual meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Oklahoma City, Okla., February 22, 1951:

Please don't misinterpret my appraisal of this matter as indicating any of us are so foolish as to believe your educational and relations job is done. Far from it; there are, as you well know, thousands of people—including farmers as well as businessmen, public officials, and others—who have yet to learn about your sound, thorough-going, permanently effective districts brand of conservation. These are the people—put the figure at 1,000,000 or some other number that suits you—who need, for example, to get hold of and read your Association's brand new booklet on the why, what, and how of soil conservation districts.

It is an excellent presentation of the subject, by the way, and should go far in setting people straight on the purpose and operations of soil conservation districts. From my own point of interest, this publication will

have rendered a most worth-while service if it clears up for some people—from farmers to newspaper editors—the distinction between and relationships of soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service. I get just as annoyed as you do at forever seeing and hearing references to "SCS Districts," and still hope that the day will come when there won't be anybody who doesn't know that soil conservation districts are entirely independent farmer organizations with which the Soil Conservation Service, as a governmental service agency, is proud to be a junior partner, as I have already pointed out.

Along this same line, of your letting people know about the districts and their work, I also hope the time won't be long now until every farm or ranch with a good conservation plan in operation on it will be displaying conspicuously one of those district "Signs of the Times" your association has arranged to make available for purchase through the districts. We in the service began promoting the idea of signs along the road on conservation farms way back in the demonstration project and CCC days. They were successful and effective in many places, too, but this is the first plan I know about for putting inexpensive signs conveniently within the reach of all conservation farmers.

Every genuine conservation farmer I've ever talked with was proud of what he was doing, and there certainly is no good reason why he shouldn't advertise the fact. I want to repeat right here what I have said over and over. That the soil conservation district movement, in my opinion, is the greatest movement relating to the welfare of the land in all history. No other agricultural movement in history has approached it in magnitude. And there never has been anything to equal the soil conservation districts to induce farmers to work helpfully together. I am strongly of the opinion that this matter of farmers working together is going to be the most potent factor we have discovered for the maintenance of soil conservation work.

Also—and I repeat—we can be eternally grateful that we enjoy in this country an economy that depends on individual freedom and initiative, and the exercise of such individual responsibility as that which has been demonstrated by the scores of thousands of soil conservation district landholders you represent. I sometimes wonder if we appreciate just how fortunate we are in having such an effective local, democratically operated organization through which to carry on vital undertakings like soil and water conservation, especially in these days.

The self-government plan of your new slogan is much more than just a well-rounded catch word. It has to do with what in my opinion is a most significant quality possessed by the soil conservation districts—as already pointed out—that they are living, working forces of practical democracy in action. The district organization, as it has stood the test of 13 years of peacetime and wartime experience under just about all possible economic, weather, and other conditions, definitely has proved itself to be superior to anything else we know about in coping with our basic land problems in a democratic fashion. How different this is from the situation I have observed in too many other countries, where what the Government says is law, with little or no opportunity for individual freedom of action, assurance of stability, or hope of security—and where I saw very little in the way of cooperation between farmers and essentially none between Government officials and farmers, beyond regulatory activities.

When the farmer has a sound plan for conservation operations for a period of years

ahead, as he does have as a soil conservation district cooperator, not only is he likely to do a better job of farming, but he has the satisfaction of knowing that his efforts will increase his security, in the face of whatever international or other unfortunate incidents the Nation may have to pass through. It gives the farmer pride and satisfaction to be able to look forward to the future security of his family.

One of the most fortunate decisions ever made in the history of this country's agricultural planning and development, I think, was back in 1935, when we agreed that two main things were necessary to insure adequate progress in farm conservation: (1) that the technical services of trained conservationists should be made available to all farmers desiring help; and (2) that some type of local government unit should be established to assist in bringing about necessary cooperative action and to place responsibility for getting the job done and maintained on the local farm people who are so intimately associated with the land problem.

There still is room for improvement in many places. From the standpoint of the leadership and responsibility in the districts, supervisors have a considerable distance to go by way of exercising maximum effectiveness. I do not mean to imply that the supervisors and cooperators should do all the thinking and all the work, while our technicians stand around and look wise. But you can't hope to get the assistance out of these technical men that the districts have every right to expect if they are kept on the jump looking after minor details and trivial questions while somebody else's farm planning and application of conservation practices wait.

During the last year, an average of about 10 new soil-conservation districts were organized each month, along with substantial additions of new territory made to established districts. I hardly need to remind you what that means in terms of additional demands for technical assistance. Meanwhile, we had fewer technicians available, country-wide, to give service to the districts. What that condition adds up to is obvious: we have had to tighten up all along the line, and increase the efficiency of operations, individual by individual, and district by district. We don't know what the situation will be next fiscal year precisely, but there is every logical reason to expect the manpower situation to get tighter rather than otherwise. That means again, of course, that all of us—district officials and service personnel alike—have to take advantage of every good means of further increasing efficiency in operations.

That is, of course, if we expect not only to maintain our progressive accomplishments but to speed them up, as we hope to do.

Certainly, it seems to me, the national association has moved in the right direction toward speeding up and moving ahead for greater achievement by adoption of your program for greater service. In order to succeed, this has to be an all-out conservation effort, with nobody pulling back. This is an action program, designed, apparently, to give every district officer an important job to do, as well as enlisting the active support of everyone who may contribute in any way to progress of soil and water conservation through districts. The keynote of the future success of your whole districts organization is set out, it seems to me, in general suggestion No. 13:

"Their [soil conservation districts] success depends on the active initiative exerted by the members of their governing bodies with the assistance of all local leaders."

Without that initiative and local assistance, you surely could not hope to achieve your further stated goal: "Improving the quality

and speed of soil conservation district work in the United States while reducing its per-acre cost."

I am expecting much improvement all over the country through your program for greater service. Taken seriously, as everybody is expecting you to take it, there can be no doubt of its success. As I see it, success is dependent on you, but our people will help everywhere they can. I hope when you leave this convention, you will carry home the full realization that you really have found out you have a job to do—one that you should do, must do, will move heaven and earth to do.

One of the best ways, also, we have found for speeding up the conservation job is for every farmer to learn as quickly as possible how to carry out as much of his conservation work himself as he possibly can, and how to keep up his structures and maintain his other conservation developments with a minimum of technical assistance. In that way—particularly now when the time of our limited number of experienced personnel is so fully occupied in furnishing technical assistance to the still increasing number of soil conservation districts—each technician can be freed for that much more new planning and assistance in new land treatment.

Your reports indicate that the backlog of applications for district farm conservation planning assistance continues to be about 200,000. We are all glad, I know, to have a healthy workload ahead, instead of having to go about drumming up business. But you district supervisors and our technical people alike are anxious to get to every one of those farms with the least possible delay, as well as to the other farms and ranches constantly being added to that backlog of requests. That is why we are emphasizing the facilitating device of neighbor group action, maximum farmer application and maintenance work, and relieving the technicians just as much as possible from doing such "housekeeping chores," as routing, servicing, and other handling of machinery, materials, labor, etc.

And still more people—within your districts and the public generally—need to know the job there is still to do and what it takes in manpower and other facilities for getting that job done. They need to know, for one thing, that the continuing need for some years yet is for more technical and other manpower, machinery, materials, and so on, in order to pick up the lag and keep pace with farmers' demands. Fortunately, many interests, Government and private, are giving increased attention, financial and other support to soil and water conservation, especially support to the district programs.

I hardly need to remind you, for instance, that State appropriations and allocations such as are now being made by all but three States, I believe, for assisting district programs are of substantial benefit in furthering soil conservation. There seems to be rather general agreement now as to the Government's obligation to help farmers with their erosion and land-use problems. How much help soil and water conservation receives from Government, and for how long, depends on the performance of those entrusted with this vital work—on individual landholders, district boards, technical personnel, and so on.

By the same token, it clearly is part of your legitimate responsibility as district supervisors or directors to keep all who are concerned informed on that performance—interested local, State, and Federal officials, banks and other lending institutions; handlers and processors of agricultural products; farm machinery people, and many others. In many places, business and other urban interests already have caught up with us in their conservation thinking. You know them—professional people; schools and

churches; newspapers, radio, and television stations, women's and sportsmen's groups, and so on. Right now, for instance, the national farm equipment manufacturing and retailing people are launching an active program of direct cooperation with districts, through cooperation of your national association, looking to mutual benefits of improved farm machinery market on the one hand and better equipment for doing the conservation job on the other.

It stands to reason that if it is good business for these business and allied interests to devote their efforts and money to soil and water conservation, it behooves those of us who own or live on the land to put our best energies into this vital undertaking. Among the other opportunities for leadership by your soil conservation districts as responsible local agencies we need to place high on the list those in water conservation and watershed type of development. Water conservation is part and parcel of soil conservation. Land treatment—watershed treatment—is basic and must be done first for conserving our life-giving water supplies, reducing flood damage, and for reducing costly siltation of our reservoirs and harbors.

Among other points that must not be overlooked as important, unfinished business, we should all do what we can to (1) complete the national land inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit; (2) complete the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil conservation districts and strengthen district responsibility and work with a scientifically developed soil conservation plan for every farm in the country; (3) urge active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; (4) make a real conservationist out of every farmer in the country.

We have a long way to go yet, you see, but with the task in such good hands as yours, we will get the job done on time.

Wisdom in Brief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, discussions of the pros and cons of inflation, and what to do about it, have long since reached voluminous proportions. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the October 4, 1951, Grand Ledge (Mich.) Independent, a weekly newspaper published in my district, which compacts a great deal of wisdom in a single paragraph:

THINGS ONE REMEMBERS

Every day the Washington propaganda machines boom price control as the medicine for inflation control. For some unknown reason the same official agencies never mention tax control or waste control in Government as the one indispensable requisite for inflation control. Nor do they explain how tax confiscation of the earnings of the individuals for Washington bureaus to spend high, wide, and handsome is any less inflationary than if the individual spent his own money. After all, the Government earns nothing, it just spends and it can only spend what it first takes away from the individual who earns it. Only the people can stop the tax spenders who create inflation. They will never stop of their own accord.

The Proposed Aluminum Industry for Montana—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday of this week I had personal conferences with Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Defense Production Administrator; Mr. David Irwin, assistant to the Administrator of Defense Mobilization; and Mr. Charles Wilson, Defense Mobilization Administrator, urging them to make sure that the power developed at Hungry Horse Dam and allocated to Montana be kept in our State and that they make every effort to see to it that a permanent year-round industry is established in the Flathead Valley of Montana.

All three gentlemen were very courteous and considerate and all heard my plea in behalf of Montana with sympathy and understanding. I have done my best to see to it that Montana is not left holding the bag and that the power developed in Montana will be retained there for the development of a permanent year-round industry.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point in my statement a letter I have written to the Honorable Jess Larson, Administrator, General Services Administration; a letter to Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, asking for a hearing on my bill to establish a clearing house in the Department of Justice to pass on companies seeking to do business with the Government; and a reply to my letter to Hon. Manly Fleischmann signed by James F. King, special assistant to the Administrator:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1951.

Hon. JESS LARSON,
Administrator, General Services Administration.

DEAR JESS: A rumor has come to my attention that there may be an attempt to divert practically all the power from Hungry Horse Dam in northwest Montana to the State of Washington, and especially to the Spokane area. May I call to your attention that, in the bill authorizing the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam, it states specifically "that for the purpose of providing additional storage for water which shall be used for (1) the generation of electric energy urgently needed for the war effort, and (2) the irrigation and reclamation of arid lands, and other beneficial uses, primarily in the State of Montana but also in downstream areas."

You will see from this, that Montana has a prior right to the benefits to be derived from the construction of this project. Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, has made specific allocations of something like 300,000 kilowatts of power from Hungry Horse for the use in the State of Montana. Because of Hungry Horse being made a part of the integrated system of the Bonneville Power Administration, it will be able to furnish in addition to the power for Montana, somewhere between 400,000 and 500,000 kilowatts

of firm and interruptible power downstream in the Columbia Basin for Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. I am sending you this information because of my great and paramount interest in the development of my State and to request of you that you give every consideration to my plea that this power allocated to Montana for Montana's development will not be diverted to other States for their development.

Montana has been mined and milked of its great resources for the past 50 years and we have contributed greatly to the welfare and security of people and industries outside of our borders. It is high time that Montana is developed for the benefit of Montana and its people, realizing at the same time, that insofar as Hungry Horse is concerned, this development will contribute greatly to our downstream neighbors in Washington and Oregon.

While this rumor about the possible diverting power from the Hungry Horse may be only just that, I feel that I should call it to your attention and urge upon you with all the sincerity I possess that this vitally needed power from Hungry Horse will not be taken away from our State, and that you will make every effort to see to it that a permanent year-around industry is installed in the Flathead Valley of Montana to use that power. I am depending on your sense of fairness and honesty to see to it that the people of Montana, whom I have the honor and privilege to represent, are not sold down the river, but instead the power from Hungry Horse allocated to Montana will be kept in my State, that a permanent year around industry will be installed in the Flathead Valley, and that we will be given fair and decent consideration.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1951.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My bill, H. R. 5410, has been referred to your committee and I would like to ask that if you have not referred this to a subcommittee, that you do so. I am most anxious to have a hearing on this measure at the earliest date possible.

Thanking you and with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 3, 1951.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter to Mr. Fleischmann, dated September 20, 1951, with which you forwarded copies of your letters addressed to the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Attorney General, concerning a section 302 loan to the Harvey Machine Co.

The Secretary of the Interior, who recommended approval of the loan to the Defense Production Administration, has undertaken to review the matter. We hope to have his findings within a short time since it is imperative that either this expansion or a substitute be undertaken at the earliest possible date if we are to meet the aluminum requirements of the defense program.

We shall be glad to inform you of the results of the investigation at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. KING,
Special Assistant to the Administrator.

Fraud and Waste in Public-Welfare Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been striving for elimination of the improper and fraud-breeding restrictions placed upon the States in the matter of details of their welfare programs have been heartened by recent developments which point up sharply the extent of public demand for an end to this unwarranted Federal restraint.

In acting on the revenue bill, the Senate voted to remove the present secrecy requirement which is a condition precedent to State eligibility for Federal grants-in-aid for welfare programs. This is the third time the Senate has so voted.

Last week, at their annual conference, held in Gatlinburg, Tenn., the Governors of the States, without dissenting vote, adopted a resolution calling for restoration to the States of their rightful discretion in the matter of making public welfare roll data.

In a letter to the conferees on the revenue bill, Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, gave strong support to the mounting demand for an end to secrecy, in the interest of the taxpayers and the deserving needy—who have been robbed of countless millions by chiselers operating under the protection of Federal law.

Mr. Kline said to the conferees:

We strongly favor the enactment of Senate section 617, which is designed to prevent Federal officials from denying Federal aid to States which allow public inspection of public-assistance program rolls.

I also wish to include an excerpt from a letter directed to the conferees by Mr. M. A. Hubbard, executive secretary of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, as follows:

It is also our understanding that you will also be considering the Senate amendment providing public access to welfare program rolls.

This matter is one that our rural people have been much concerned about for a number of years and with good reason.

A strong resolution on this subject has been a part of our Farm Bureau platform for a number of years and it is readopted at each of our annual sessions with much enthusiasm.

There is certainly no good reason why the States and their political subdivisions should be prohibited by Federal law from making their welfare rolls public if they choose to do so. In our opinion this should be entirely a matter of local option. Even though this option might not be exercised in all cases, the very fact that it readily could be done on short notice, would discourage many chiselers from seeking and receiving unnecessary and undeserved public assistance.

Unless something is done toward correcting this situation some of these days the backs of those who carry the load will be

broken by those who are willing to pile on for a free ride.

Mr. Speaker, when the conferees finish their labor, we in this Congress will proceed to impose the heaviest tax burden in the history of the Nation upon the backs of the people. How can we defend ourselves if we do not plug a drain through which many hundreds of millions are being wasted and stolen?

Let Church Bells Ring at Noon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Afro-American, Baltimore, Md., of September 1, 1951. This is a splendid editorial, and I urge everyone to read it:

LET CHURCH BELLS RING AT NOON

Prayer changes things.

In this earnest belief, the Afro suggests that the church bells in the city should be rung at 12 noon daily as a signal to stop a moment and pray for peace.

Because of the present world crisis, such unified prayer services are spreading throughout the country. They meet the need for renewed hope and courage.

Let us pray that the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet shall have the help and direction of Almighty God in the Government of this country and in their relations with other nations.

Let us pray that Almighty God will direct the minds and the hearts of our governors, our mayors, of our county and State officials so that they will understand that every human being must be treated with respect and dignity.

Let us pray that Americans everywhere shall believe that it is God's will that segregation, hatred, and discrimination are evils which should disappear from our broad land.

Let us pray that with the help of Almighty God peace and serenity shall come to each of us in our personal lives.

Let us pray for the safety of our boys in foreign service.

Let us pray for a real commonwealth of nations, a real United Nations and lasting peace in our time.

Each of us should be greatly concerned about the possibility of lasting peace. We also should be disturbed about the fate of mankind if peace cannot come to us.

HAVE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTION

No matter how hopeless the present world tension may seem, each of us has a personal contribution to make peace real.

World peace in our time is not so wild a dream as some might think. Within each man and woman there is the power to reach this ideal. Within all of us, there is the power of prayer.

Peace can be reached through a simple plan of action.

Peace can be achieved through personal prayer.

If we take time each noon hour to stop for a minute and pray to Almighty God asking that He grant understanding among nations, between all races of men, a chain reaction

can be set off greater than any exploding atom pile.

NO FORCE MORE POWERFUL

If the spark of our daily prayers extended beyond our home, our city, our Nation, around the world, peace can be realized.

No force is more powerful than the will of God—than mankind's belief in God. Since all else has failed, let us appeal to Him.

We suggest therefore that all churches leave their doors open during the noon hour, so that the passer-by can step in for a moment of silent meditation.

Those of us not near a church can be equally as sincere in our silent prayers at home, at work, or at lunch.

No prayers are so necessary, no prayers are so vital, no prayers are so challenging to the world as our prayers for peace.

Our Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago a member of the United States Foreign Service was seated in front of his radio in the foreign city where he is serving and heard some speaker criticize the United States. It seemed that the speaker on the radio, or wireless, as they call it there, was endeavoring to make the point that the United States had some ulterior motive in its program of aid to other countries. Our Foreign Service officer became so indignant at the misrepresentation of the truth being made that he went to his typewriter and wrote his thoughts on the subject. Being a modest man, this gentleman does not wish to have his name appear in the RECORD, but his patriotic words are worth our reading and our consideration:

Let us say now, categorically and with all the force at our command, that which the world knows to be true. The United States is the most altruistic nation the world has ever known. No other nation in the world's history which had power even approaching that of our country has been able to forbear, under some pretext or other, the urge for conquest by war or threat, with all the accumulation of riches and power it brought. In two World Wars when, at tremendous cost of life and treasure, victory was forged, we can search in vain for any benefit to our country that came to us other than peace, or the semblance of it.

All Europe knows how, in the hands of the imperialistic conqueror, those wars would have ended—and Asia, too, must know. Were it not for the fact that our country was founded and has grown in the spirit of a Republic with malice toward none, a great part of the civilized world could have been absorbed as satellites without a shot being fired.

Instead, we have poured out treasure, America's treasure, in an effort to secure peace in the world by building up those weak and powerless countries.

The United States has thus gained nothing from the wars in which she has been compelled to engage—she has nothing to gain from any war. War can only threaten

the American way of life, more than favorably comparable with any other in the world, which, because of its industry and devotion to the liberty of the individual, is the envy of many and the scourge of totalitarian dictatorships.

For this way of life, and its respect for the individual in the true concept of the first of the real republics, many sacrifices have been made. Its majestic achievements in the short period of some one hundred and seventy-four years can be seen from east coast to west and from north to south, over thousands of miles. It will be protected by all the strength and with every powerful aid at our command.

Farm Support for St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the texts of two resolutions. One is a resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association of region IV at its annual meeting, September 24-25, at Dayton, Ohio; and the second was adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at its annual meeting September 27-28, at Chicago. Both resolutions endorse the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and indicate the widespread support for this project by farmers from the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, West Virginia, Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION REGION IV ANNUAL MEETING, SEPTEMBER 24 AND 25, 1951, DAYTON, OHIO

Whereas the necessity for full farm and industrial production is essential to national defense; and

Whereas, 2,000,000 horsepower of electric energy is available to the United States and Canada by development of the St. Lawrence seaway. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress approve the program for the St. Lawrence seaway.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION REGION V ANNUAL MEETING, SEPTEMBER 27 AND 28, 1951, CHICAGO, ILL.

Whereas in World War II it was only because of the power capacity of public power, particularly TVA and the Bonneville Power Administration, that there was the margin of power available so that our country was able to produce aluminum in sufficient quantities for total defense; and

Whereas, in our now critical defense situation, production of aluminum and other defense materials is being greatly curtailed because of a serious shortage of power; and

Whereas, had it not been for the selfish and short-sighted influence of the commercial power interests through their propaganda campaigns and lobbying against all public power, our defense program today, as related to power, would not be in as precarious a situation as exists; and

Whereas this shortage of power will materially and adversely affect the growing needs of rural electric cooperatives in their

service to farms with their labor shortages in their production of food and fiber, essential also to the defense effort; and

Whereas in spite of the dire need for the development of all sources of power, the same interests are ignoring the common good and are still working against the proper development of the water resources of the Nation for power purposes; and

Whereas it is our conviction that the natural resources of the Nation, as contained in its hydro power potential, belong inherently to the people first, for the general welfare in peace and for defense. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this convention representing 111 cooperatives in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois, That we support the report of the President's Water Power Commission, and strongly urge its further implementation by legislation where necessary, and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the efforts of the commercial power interests to discredit said report, their apparent object being that they may destroy the established Federal policy of priority rights of municipalities and cooperatives to said power, and be it further

Resolved, That we reaffirm our support of all public power projects which are economically feasible, including TVA and the Bonneville Power Administration, the St. Lawrence waterway, and those proposed by the Reclamation Bureau and the Army, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the modification or elimination of the Keating amendment that preferential customers may again have their rightful access to Federal power by the most practical and economical means possible.

The Late Hon. Frank Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by our former colleague, Hon. Harry L. Towe, referring to the late beloved Representative Frank Fellows.

I am certain that this beautiful expression will meet with the unanimous approval of the House:

FRANK FELLOWS

The House of Representatives learned of my resignation from Congress on September 12, the same day that his sorrowing colleagues learned of the death of Representative Frank Fellows, of Bangor, Maine.

And so it was that I took leave of Congress with a heavy heart, regretting the necessity of leaving those with whom I had worked and served for 9 years, and mourning the loss of a friend whom I would never see again.

Frank Fellows, who had represented his State's third district since 1941, was an admired and respected colleague; but far more important than that, he was a beloved and understanding friend.

He loved life, and lived it bravely. I don't think Frank Fellows was ever afraid of anything. Certainly he was never afraid to stand up and be counted against the pettiness and selfishness in Government which he loathed. And certainly he was never afraid to pour all of his boundless energy into causes in which he believed. Whatever the outcome of any issue, Frank Fellows always

voted and talked as he felt. No colleague ever wondered what Frank Fellows' position was, on any issue.

I shall remember him for his wisdom, for his great gift of oratory, and for the lavish manner in which he gave all of his talents to his constituency and to his people.

I shall remember him too, for his love of song, and for the delightful wit which made so many of us love him.

No man or woman ever came to know Frank Fellows without becoming a better person as a result of the experience.

No person who ever knew him can think of his passing without experiencing the sense of loss which has come to all of us.

Maine has lost a great Congressman. America has lost a patriot. I have lost a good friend.

The United States Merchant Marine: Heroes Generally Unsung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent, I am including herewith an editorial written by Mr. Clarence Moody, editor, Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye Gazette, which has won outstanding recognition because of its high quality and because of the deserved recognition extended by Mr. Moody to the merchant marine.

The Burlington Hawk-Eye Gazette enjoys a large circulation over all of southeastern Iowa and a large area of western Illinois and Mr. Moody's outstanding service as editor has been recognized by the patrons of that paper throughout the entire period of his editorship.

HEROES GENERALLY UNSUNG

While its exploits which would fill pages of history have never been touted as have the records of other branches of our Government forces, nevertheless every war discloses anew how highly essential it is for Uncle Sam to have a strong merchant marine organization.

It is generally the tendency to let this urgent factor go to pot during periods of peace and then strive frantically, when war breaks, to build it up again. This was more true after the First World War than the second. In 1939 we only had 1,300 merchant craft while we now sail about 3,500. Gross tonnage, too, has trebled.

Little known to the general public, especially here in the Middle West, the merchant marine is sometimes confused with the United States Marine Corps, but it is something entirely different. The merchant marine is that vast fleet of cargo vessels necessary to maintain our trade relations with the world and, in event of war, to supplement naval and military craft in transporting munitions and supplies of all kinds. It operates on the inland waterways such as the Mississippi and also on the Great Lakes, as well as the high seas.

Uncle Sam owns outright a lot of cargo-carrying vessels that are not a part of the Regular Navy. Many of them are leased to private operators of shipping lines. Furthermore, Uncle Sam maintains an academy at Kings Point, on Long Island, near the city of New York, where young men may be

trained for officerships in the merchant marine. Candidates are received between the ages of 16 and 21. Upon graduation at the end of 4 years, a candidate then has a bachelor of science degree to his credit and is eligible for a commission either in the United States Naval Reserve or the United States Maritime Service.

There are several men around Burlington who have seen service in the merchant marine or are so engaged now. They don't have the opportunity to enjoy the fanfare of publicity that rival branches of service come in for as a matter of course, nor do they frequently parade behind timbrels and clanging brass.

Instead, they're the seasoned salts who brave the seas on fairly slow-going merchantmen—tankers, freighters, and the like. There is a job as hazardous as if they were in the active military. We know a young merchant marine officer whose craft broke in two during a storm in the Indian Ocean but they brought him off it safely into port.

In time of war merchant vessels are always ready targets for enemy submarines. Hundreds of brave men have gone to their deaths in such encounters, but their memories have been allowed to dim. They haven't been given the hero worship attending death on a battlefield or in an air fight or aboard a destroyer.

It's about time the general public was understanding more about the merchant marine. If we are to maintain our position as mistress of the seas, we must always have a strong fleet of such vessels ready for anything and everything to be found on the world's oceans and in ports from Cape Horn to Cape Hope, Singapore to Frisco, or New Orleans to Rio.

Incidentally, if you're a youngster with a yen for the sea where you've got to be a man's man, you could do well by investigating the merchant marine as a career.

The Lafayette Steel Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record a statement issued this day by the Honorable BLAIR MOODY, Senator from Michigan, supplementing one made by him on the floor of the Senate on October 4, 1951. The statement follows:

I am reluctant to identify pending tax cases, but it might be well to have the Commissioner of Internal Revenue take a personal interest in the long-pending prosecution of the Lafayette Steel Co., of Detroit. This case now is believed to be in the hands of the Bureau's penal division in Chicago.

Agent Weyn was in charge of the investigation of this case, and he recommended to his superiors that officers of Lafayette Steel be prosecuted. Investigators for the Senate subcommittee found no irregularities in Weyn's handling of this case.

Albert C. Grunewald, agent in charge of the Detroit Intelligence unit until his retirement last July 1, assured committee investigators that the case would stand on its merits and that any charges against Agent Weyn would not materially affect its prosecution.

This alleged tax-fraud case was under investigation for nearly a year, starting late in 1949. It has been in the hands of the penal division in Chicago for nearly a year.

The St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an article entitled "Last Call on Seaway" by Peter Edson, which appeared in the October 2 edition of the Washington Daily News. This article relates to the issue of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which has been brought to a head by the September 28 announcement that Canada is prepared to construct this project by herself.

LAST CALL ON SEAWAY

(By Peter Edson)

Canadian Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent's proposal that his Government alone build the St. Lawrence River seaway has done more to stimulate American interest in this project than anything yet. The feeling is that if this is a good thing for Canada, the United States should be in on it.

Congress is too anxious to go home for anything to happen in a hurry. But the bill introduced by Representative JOHN BLATNIK (Democrat, Minnesota) will be high priority unfinished business when the lawmakers return in January. The Blatnik bill would authorize joint Canadian-American construction of the \$818,000,000 project. About \$300,000,000 would be for locks and ship channel around the St. Lawrence rapids, the rest for power.

There is no question about Canada's ability to finance this undertaking alone. The Canadian Government has a \$500,000,000 surplus which could be utilized on the ship channel. Ontario's Hydro-Electric Commission could easily finance the power development.

Congress thus has one more chance to bring the American Government in on the act. The St. Lawrence project has been kicking around since 1921. The Canadian-American treaty on the project, negotiated in President Herbert Hoover's term, was signed in 1932. It has been awaiting ratification ever since.

In tracing the record of defeats, opposition to the St. Lawrence project is seen to come from three principal sources. First and most powerful of the opponents are the three big eastern railroads—New York Central, Pennsylvania, and Baltimore & Ohio. Through their connecting lines, this influence has been traced to opposition which comes from southern and western railroads.

The Association of American Railroads has taken a lead in opposing the seaway. And an organization known as the National St. Lawrence Project Conference has been the "front" for railroad opposition to the seaway.

Railroad opposition has not been applied so much through lobbying here as through indirect pressure on local chambers of commerce, conferences of shippers, and industries which depend on railroad support. In tracing various congressional committee votes on St. Lawrence legislation, it has been found that most of the votes against the seaway come from districts where there are major railroad interests.

Chicago Association of Commerce stood on the sidelines of the dispute for many years, though many Chicago banking, industrial, and shipping leaders have been for it. But a committee on transportation made up of railroad men has consistently been able to

impose the railroad point of view in the association's policy statements.

Similarly, in Toledo's chamber of commerce, an industrial committee has gone on record in support of the seaway while a transportation committee opposed it. Both reports were tabled until a railroad man became head of the organization, when the transportation committee's recommendation was brought out and approved.

Railroad opposition has also been reflected in policy statements of the railway labor brotherhoods and John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers. Finally, Boston, New York, and other eastern seaboard port authorities, dependent on railroads for most of their freight traffic, have taken a stand against possible competition from the seaway.

Until all this potent opposition can be overcome, the St. Lawrence project doesn't stand much chance of getting anywhere, as far as Congress is concerned.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a resolution of William N. Oatis, which was adopted by Pleasant Aerie, No. 2293, of Georgetown, Ohio, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles on September 4, 1951:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred of our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much "off-the-record" information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pleasant Aerie, No. 2293, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the

release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 2293 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 4th day of September 1951. Aerie No. 2293, city of Georgetown, State of Ohio

Attest

WILBUR L. MARTIN,
Worthy President
C. R. ROBINSON,
Secretary.

A Letter of Timely Interest to Every Member of Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter written by Mr. Edgar P. Paulsen, service officer, Post No. 256, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Lehighton, Pa., is of timely interest to every serviceman because it contains advice that, if heeded, will prove of untold value. The letter appeared in the December 1950 issue of *Foreign Service*, a monthly magazine issued by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

DEAR JOHNNY. You are in the Army now—and God keep you safe and bring you back home in good shape. Barring wounds that may come to you in the conflict, or accident or illness, the Army life can make you or break you. You can come out a bum or you can come out as a man. If you watch your step, keep your nose clean, your ears open, and your mouth shut, you will be O. K. I know. I have been through it.

I want you to read the rest of this letter carefully. Then read it over a few times more. After that, pass it along to your buddies. It may mean a lot to you later and may keep you from learning the hard way.

First off, in the Army you will have all sorts of chances to make decisions. You can decide to drink or you can decide to stay sober, and I mean to let it alone altogether. The Army today has no room for a drunk or a bum. It is too highly specialized to have room for the man whose wits and judgment are clouded with liquor. Promotion today goes to the man whose mind is clear in an emergency and whose judgment is not fouled up with alcohol. In a combat area, you never know what instant you may be called on for a quick decision and your life, and the lives of your buddies, may depend on you. If you are not sober, you may regret it all your life. If one buddy's life is lost, or his body maimed, because you bent your elbow too long, you will never forget it.

It is not sissy to say "No." No one in the Army will ever force you to drink and no one will laugh at you if you say "No, thanks" and stick to it. Those days have gone by. The smart soldier today is the soldier who is always sober.

Discipline will not bother you. It is taken for granted that order are given to be obeyed. You will have 90-day wonders who will burn you up—but there is only one

thing to do. If a dumb order is given, carry it out and gripe afterward. No officer can make you do a thing if you do not want to, but he can make you wish you had.

DON'T BE A HANDSHAKER

Leave the handshaking and brown-nosing to the other fellow. You will have one in your squad, your platoon, and probably one in your file. Let him do it. He will get the promotion and the soft detail, but sooner or later it will catch up with him and he will be transferred. It may get you places with your sergeant or your officer, but not with your buddies. Some officers like it. You will notice that the guy with the long nose always gets it rubbed off sooner or later. You never did it at home, so don't start now. If asked about anything, just don't know how it happened.

WOMEN

As far as women are concerned, use your head. Just remember you are coming back to America where there is a nice girl waiting for you. One misstep can cause you a lot of grief and remorse for the rest of your life.

GET A HOBBY

You will have a lot of spare time. Use it so that it will be of use when you get back. Get a hobby for this spare time—an orchestra, stamps, books, travel, and visiting the points of interest in the country you are in. Make a study of the history of the country you are in, then use the museums and libraries to increase this knowledge. There will be a teacher or an official in every town you are stationed in, and they are always glad to see a foreigner take an interest in their better things. You will then have some happy memories to bring home, or send home with your letters. You know every country has a great many things that we do not know about.

ATTEND CHURCH

Go to church. No matter where you are, or what religion the church may represent, attend it. There is nothing that will take the place of prayer if you get into a tight place. You will find, if you get into action, that there is no religious difference in the fox hole, and there are no atheists in the front lines. It's just "God" to every man.

Get acquainted with your chaplain. He will help you get into school, or with the hobby you may be interested in. If you get into a jam see him. He knows the score and is there to see that you get a fair shake. Of course he will see that the officers get their parties and cigars, but he will see that you get yours too.

Your chaplain is your contact between you and God, between you and your officers, and between you and yourself.

WRITE HOME

Write home. Remember that your dad and mother are always worrying and watching every mail. I know that if and when our Phil goes, that we will be haunting the post office. It will be seldom that you cannot write home every week at least. Send cards from every where you are. They will be interesting as long as you live. A letter may seem like a small thing to you, but it is all that your parents have to look forward to while you are away. To them, war is always combat, even if you are far behind the lines.

Save your money. If you save \$20 per month, one bond, in three years you will have nearly \$800 with the paymaster, and that's not hay. When you get that discharge, if you have \$800 in cash money, plus your last month's pay and mustering-out pay, you will have nearly \$1,000 in your pocket. An honorable discharge, \$1,000 in cash, together with some trade that you will learn in the service, you will be on easy street when you get home. There are few boys at home who will have a thousand

iron men in their hands after 3 years. The best way is to have your commanding officer take it out of your pay every month and put it to your account or have a bond paid for every month.

KEEP RECORDS

And now, get this. If you are injured, no matter how slightly, if you are ill, or operated on, or for any reason sent to sick call or to the hospital, even for a report, or for a day, or for a CC pill, or a swab of iodine, make a note of it. Write down the day, the date, the place, and the reason. Get the names and addresses of your buddies who know of the injury or the disability, and write them down.

A sprain, bruise, illness, wound, operation, a cold, or anything that you are treated for in the service may show up as serious after 20 years, and if it is not on your record, you will have a hard time proving the service connection when claiming for compensation or pension. You see, there is a statute of limitations, which states that after certain periods of time, some as short as 3 months, unless you can prove continuous treatment after discharge, the disability has to be proved to have happened in the service. If it is on your record, it is already service-connected for the rest of your life. In every case, if any disability is not in your records, you will be the one who has to prove it happened in the service. That is rough after a few years. I know.

You know of my work as service officer for the VFW. Last March there were 653 veterans or their dependents in my home for various claims, and the majority were here because their disabilities were not on their records. One lad is not able to walk. He is totally disabled, had fallen off a tank while on maneuvers, hurt his leg, and after his discharge it affected his spine. It took 117 letters and 2 years of work before we could service-connect it by finding men from his outfit who knew of the original injury and made affidavits to that effect. He is now drawing \$228 a month compensation, and just received a car from the VA. A veteran from Palmerton fell in a hole while on reconnaissance patrol on one of the islands in the Pacific. He hurt his back, went to the dispensary, and had it taped up. It was, for some reason, not put on his medical record. Get this. He came to me in October 1945 to get out-patient treatment from the VA, and filed a claim for compensation, as he was unable to do his old job.

We worked on that claim until November 1950 before we could get the necessary proof by affidavits from his buddies, etc., that it was service-connected. In those 5 years he had paid his own doctor bills, lost his rights under Public Law 16 for education, lost money by having to take a lower-paying job, and lost compensation. Had the injury been on his record there would have been no delay at all. Another is drawing total disability, \$150 a month, but it took over 2 years to get it. Not on his record. I can show you hundreds of similar cases.

Another veteran, R. S., living here in Lehighton, was on a bulldozer in Honolulu when a tank hit it and turned it over and pinned him underneath, hurting his leg. It was only a minor injury at the time, and after reporting to the medics he went back to duty, and in time was discharged. He came home, and after a long time his leg began to bother him. For 5 months he had to lie on a floor, and was unable to walk except on his haunches. He was totally disabled, as it had injured him in such a way that his spine became affected. Not on his record, so no service connection. But I had written him as I am writing this to you, and he had the name of the driver of the tank that hit him, and his address, the name of the driver of the bulldozer behind him that saw it happen, the name of the doctor that strapped his leg, and the name of the

first sergeant that had confined him to quarters. He had the place, day, and date. With this information it took only a few weeks to get him \$800 back compensation and \$150 a month. If he had not had those names and addresses, he would have been out of luck.

A service connection for a total disability means the difference between \$150 a month, plus an allowance for the family or parents, instead of \$60 a month for a non-service-connected disability. A service-connected disability means that any time during your lifetime that you need hospitalization you can get immediate hospitalization or outpatient treatment at the VA expense. You can get crutches, braces, etc., as you need them, and there is no delay or question. Also, if it is service-connected, in most cases you will get \$150 a month after the first 21 days that you are hospitalized.

If your disability is not service-connected, you get nothing, and you may have to wait a long time before you can even get into a VA hospital. If there is a repetition of the Economy Act of 1932, you will not even get into a VA hospital for a non-service-connected disability.

In the event that you die from a service-connected disability, your widow will get from \$75 a month up, and \$25 up for the child or children. Your wife will have priority for a civil-service job. She will also have certain rights that you would have under the GI bill, as the GI loan privilege, etc. Your children will also be eligible for certain State benefits. Your dependent parents will also be eligible for certain benefits.

If your death comes from a non-service-connected cause, your widow may get \$42 a month, and \$10 a month for each child. I have not been able to get one of these through yet though, except for widows of World War I veterans. You will be under Public Law 346 if you select education, and you will wait your turn for hospitalization, and you will pay for your own crutches, braces, etc., and that goes for a service-connected disability that cannot be proved because there is no record of it as having happened in the service; and even if the disability is service-connected, but is not on your record, and cannot be proved to have happened in the service, you will pay your own doctor bills.

It is almost impossible to prove service connection without the necessary dates, places, names of witnesses, etc., which are naturally required for proof.

MORE BENEFITS

Hospitalization, compensation, pensions for your dependents or survivors, is worth taking care of. You are the only one that can do it. A good many medical corpsmen and officers will neglect to put your injuries, treatments, or disabilities on your record, and you will not realize it until you are laid up months or years after discharge with a bad back, a mental condition, nerves, varicose, a bad knee, arthritis, etc., and you claim compensation or hospitalization.

A year, or 5 years after discharge may be too late to service connect the disability that is not on your record unless you can get proof by affidavits from buddies that know of the conditions under which the disability originally occurred. I can show you hundreds of veterans, unable to work, and paying their own doctor bills for conditions that happened in the service, but for which there is no record, and for which we cannot get proof.

Write everything down, with the names and addresses, and send two copies home so that if one copy does not reach them, the other will. It is easy to lose these records if they are in your pocket or bag.

The same goes for dental work. If the service dentist fixes your teeth and later the filling comes loose or falls out, the VA will

fix them for life. The same goes for the plate that will not fit after several years. Also, if a tooth is extracted, except the wisdom teeth, it will be replaced by the VA. A dental disability is service connected in the same way as a physical disability, but it must be on your record.

The Veterans' Administration will not come to you or write you to ask if you are O. K., but if your disability is service-connected they will keep in touch with you and give you the best of care and treatment and compensation as you may deserve. Remember, it is in every case up to you to prove that the disability happened in the service.

CHECK YOUR RECORD

You have a right to ask to see your record before you are discharged. Do so, and if there is anything missing in your medical or dental record that is missing, see that it is put in the record before you sign the discharge. It is your right and the service wants you to have it. That goes for any illness or disability no matter how trivial it may have appeared at the time. Day, date, name, place, number, and location of the hospital or dispensary, name of the doctors or nurses or buddies, and the nature of the disability. Get them, and keep them.

GO TO SCHOOL

Go to a service school if you can. The man without a trade is in a tough spot today as a civilian. The service wants you to learn, and your captain or chaplain will help you get into the trade you think you are fitted for. We are out of the day of the bow and arrow.

AT THE SEPARATION CENTER

One thing more, and this is important. When you come back and are at the separation center waiting for the discharge you will receive a thorough examination. It is your last chance to tell the service of any accident, illness, or injury you may have suffered while in uniform. This includes surgical, medical, dental, mental, or anything else that may affect you in later years, and to get it on your record. Check with the records you have sent home.

At the separation center, the officers will suggest that you get your teeth fixed up, or that you get that disability looked after before you are discharged. It may delay you for a few days or weeks, but stay there until you are fixed up. You will be anxious to get home, and you will perhaps be as dumb as thousands of us were and say to the officer, "Give me my discharge and let me get home, I'll get myself fixed up." But if you do that, you are just fouling yourself up.

Stay at the separation center, or go where they tell you to go, and get fixed up. In this way, you will have that disability service-connected and you will avoid the long delay with the VA and the possible refusal of service connection.

That's about all this time. I am telling you what thousands of us have learned through bitter experience. For 6 years I have had veterans come to my home every day, and many nights; all in trouble, and three-fourths of them in trouble because they kept no records of injuries or illnesses that happened while they were in uniform.

Wherever there is a United States Army, there is a VFW post. Wherever there is a VFW post, there is a VFW service officer to help you. Go to him if you have a problem on your hands that needs the help of a trained man.

I will be glad to hear from you at any time, Johnny, and will answer your letter—but write home first, and often.

Again—may God keep you safe and well, and bring you back to us straight and strong in mind and body, with nothing on your record except "Service honest and faithful." Such a hitch in the service will bring you

out as a man, and if you decide to stay in for retirement, you will not be making a mistake. It's a good career if you like it. That's all this time.

So long

Sincerely,

EDGAR P. PAULSEN,
Service Officer, VFW Post, No. 256,
Lehigh, Pa.

Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Faribault County Register, Blue Earth, Minn., on September 18, 1951:

Jim Markham, at the helm of the Hopkins Review, expounds on some of the fundamentals of public service for new members of the Hopkins City Council. He explains:

"The first of these is that every man and woman who chooses to serve his fellow countrymen, on any level of American government, at once becomes the fair target of his peers who elected him to office. Gratitude is not an outstanding characteristic of the average American voter. Witness the abuse always heaped upon the Chief Executive of the land, whether he be of Democratic or Republican persuasion.

"As people are ungrateful, so newspapers can be embarrassing some time, especially when they call attention to those acts of elected officials which do not meet the approval of a majority. But newspapers are a part of the American scene. They do have a habit of reporting the news, and their editors do reserve the right to differ, now and again, with the voting judgments of public servants.

"Most men in public office adjust their emotional apparatus to these facts early in their careers. They do not consider it as a personal insult every time another citizen, or a newspaper editor, disagrees with their official judgments. We feel certain that in good time they will learn these first lessons too, and certainly when they do they will find it less difficult to pursue their duties as elected officials."

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution on William N. Oatis, which was adopted by River City Aerie, No. 567, of Portsmouth, Ohio, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles on September 13, 1951:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was per-

forming his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional, and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being, and

Whereas, by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world, and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That River City Aerie, No. 567, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be uncensuring in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 567 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 13th day of September 1951 Aerie No. 567, city of Portsmouth, State of Ohio

Attest:

KENNETH G. WELLS,
Worthy President
PAUL M. BEILMAN,
Secretary

Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is proud of many things and institutions. One of those of which it is proudest is the Jewish Hospital. Despite its name and although organized and supported in the main by persons of the Jewish faith, it has never been a sectarian institution, nor has it ever practiced segregation. It has always been operated on the principle that all people suffer the same ills and injuries and that the cures and the remedies are the same for all people and

can be administered by persons learned and trained to do so, no matter where they may come from, no matter what the color of their skin, and regardless of their religious beliefs.

I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following commendation sent to Max Abelman at the hospital, immediately following a visit by the Honorable Ralph J. Bunche, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS,

New York, September 25, 1951

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Director of Public Relations, Jewish
Hospital of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: My recent visit to the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn was an inspiring experience. I thank you for arranging it.

This institution is something a good deal more than patients, doctors, nurses, and hospital facilities. I realized almost immediately that what makes it a great hospital is the sense of dedicated service to humanity which characterizes its personnel and the spirit of true democracy which prevails throughout. In its rooms and corridors, people are people and are cared for and treasured as such, irrespective of race, religion, color, or origin.

The Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn is at once a monument to the fine public spirit of Brooklyn and a noble example of democratic medical service for the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH J. BUNCHE,

Director, Department of Trusteeship

The Attempted Tidelands Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, due to recent expressions contained on the subject of tidelands, and particularly in connection with late statements by a former official of the Government, I am constrained to call to the attention of the Congress and the country, a statement made by the same Government official on the same subject on December 22, 1933.

In order to include the statement to which I refer, I wish to quote part of the statement which I recently made on the floor of the House in regard to the bill under consideration on the subject in the House on July 27, 1951, when the House voted almost unanimously to approve the bill H. R. 4484, which rebukes the Government, and provides for the vacating of the Government's claim to these tidelands which rightfully belong to the sovereign States.

Following is an excerpt from my statement above referred to, to wit:

What a far cry is that decree of the highest Court of our land of the free, from that of the highest Court of the same land of regimented nationalization, which now solemnly holds that where that sovereign right of ownership in the people of a State, which it now refers to as the "bare legal title" to the lands under the marginal sea is questioned

by this Federal Government, the right of power and dominion of the United States transcends those of a mere property owner.

Thus for the first time the United States Supreme Court has adopted and put into effect the totalitarian doctrine of the supremacy of the state over the people, or that the people have no property or right whenever the Federal Government wishes to appropriate, because of its power and dominion.

The Supreme Court ignored all its prior jurisprudence on the subject of tidal ownership by the individual State for its sovereign people, and its repeated decisions since 1842 that the Original Thirteen States absolutely owned all their navigable waters and the soils under them for the common use of the sovereign people of each State, subject only to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the Federal Government—navigation, interstate and foreign commerce, the national defense—and that all States since admitted into the Union succeeded to the same ownership and rights of sovereignty.

However, the Supreme Court did, with seeming compunction, admit the right and power of Congress to legislate on the matter of recognizing the century-old fact of tidal ownership in the States for their sovereign people, or ratify and confirm their totalitarian decree, either by positive action or inaction.

Further, to cap the climax, Mr. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, who agitated this Federal land grab, declared officially that he recognized the settled law that title to the soil within the 3-mile limit is in the State and cannot be appropriated except by the authority of the State. In his letter dated December 22, 1933, to Mr. Proctor, of Long Beach, Calif., rejecting his application for a lease under the Federal Leasing Act of 1920, Mr. Ickes stated:

"It has been distinctly settled that . . . the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated. . . . Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incident to the sovereignty of the State . . ."

"The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no right can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State."

The RECORD shows that on Wednesday, October 5, 1949, the Solicitor General appeared and testified for and on behalf of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of the Interior appeared and testified in person on this subject.

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior based his entire testimony and claim for Government control of the tidelands and resources of all the coastal States of the Union on the ground that it was necessary for national defense, he did not elaborate to show in what manner Federal control could produce the petroleum necessary for national defense in times of emergency any better than has been done in the past under State ownership and development through private enterprise.

On the other hand, the same Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, testified on the same subject on March 3, 1948, at the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary—see page 741 of the report—that the States and the oil industries "had done a miraculous job" and he thought "they would continue to do a miraculous job." Therefore, the Secretary of the Interior has no substance to his claim for national control of the oil resources in the submerged coastal lands adjoining the coastal States of the Union.

There Is an Imperative Need for Sound Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, thousands of retired railroad employees and surviving widows and children were keenly disappointed last week when the House leadership failed to schedule final action last Friday on pending legislation designed to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

Every day that we delay we are adding to the misery of beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement Act who find it impossible to meet the high cost of living on the present scale of retirement benefits.

During the debate last week the following remarks were made by me on the subject of amending the Railroad Retirement Act:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like all of you, I have been the recipient of personal calls and printed material setting forth the arguments for and against pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

I can truthfully say that those who contacted me did so in a cooperative manner, thus convincing me of their sincerity of purpose. Without doubt, the information furnished me has been very helpful in my study of this subject.

As many of you know, I am a railroad man on furlough while a Member of Congress. I come from a railroad family and represent a congressional district that has, without doubt, on a percentage basis, the greatest number of active and retired railroad employees in the United States. I mention this to assure you that my interest in the Railroad Retirement Act is not seasonal, because the subject is one that has been with me since the law was enacted in 1935.

I have introduced over a score of bills during my congressional career designed to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. These bills were introduced because of the need for increased benefits to those retired and to surviving widows and children. They also provided for structural changes in the act regarding the age of retirement, the years of service required, and would have amended other provisions of the law.

To get action on these bills I was constantly in touch with the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to such an extent that I know at times my tenacity must have exhausted the patience of the chairman and the professional staff. This resoluteness on my part was not confined to the House of Representatives, because I was equally active in Senate circles.

Ever since the Eightieth Congress increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by 20 percent to annuitants and pensioners, the only replies I received to my repeated requests for action on my bills were that no consideration could be given any railroad retirement amendments until actuarial studies could be completed, revealing the financial condition of the railroad retirement fund and the impact such amendments would have on it.

Speaking frankly, the repeated statements that nothing could be done until the ac-

tuarial reports were available, were accepted by me as an exhibition of sound judgment, because the future of the Railroad Retirement Act depends upon maintaining the solvency of the railroad retirement fund. In short, those who have retired and those who will retire must be able to look forward to receiving their monthly retirement checks with absolute certainty and without any interruption.

Therefore, any vote I cast on railroad retirement amendments will depend upon their relationship in maintaining the solvency of the retirement fund. In other words, can the fund stand the additional cost of proposed amendments, or will such amendments so impair the fund that their approval will threaten the future of the Railroad Retirement Act by making it financially impossible to fulfill its obligations to its beneficiaries?

Another basic factor that I intend to keep in mind during our consideration of this legislation is that it is generally agreed that retired employees and survivors of deceased employees must have immediate relief. I know it will not surprise many of you to learn that I have retired railroad employees and survivors of deceased employees in my congressional district who are actually hungry and living under conditions that you and I would find repugnant to the American way of life. These people are the victims of a frozen income over which they have no control and Congress, as custodian of the railroad retirement fund, is obligated to provide relief to these people through sound amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board the average age of the disabled and retired annuitant is 70.3 years and the pensioner 83.2 years; while the average age of the widow is 73.1 years. The average monthly benefit received by the annuitant is \$82.75 monthly, the pensioner \$79.79 monthly; and the widow \$29.62 monthly.

Keeping in mind the present scale of benefits, it may be well to look at the cost of living figures as furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. As of July 15, 1951, or about 3 months ago, the cost of living had increased 82.7 percent over the cost of living in 1937, the year the Railroad Retirement Act became effective.

For an illustration, food had increased 114.8 percent; wearing apparel, 98.3 percent; rent, 34.9 percent; fuel, electricity, etc., 45.3 percent; house furnishings, 108.6 percent; and miscellaneous, 83.5 percent. As I stated, prices of everyday commodities have increased during that period.

While these increases in the cost of living were mounting during the period from 1937 to 1951 the recipients of railroad retirement benefits received but one increase—the 20 percent granted by the Eightieth Congress. The widows, however, received no increase.

It may be well for me to remind you at this point that the 1937 or 1939 dollar is not the same dollar in value that these retired railroaders or their survivors receive today. It can truthfully be said that they are the victims of not only the high cost of living, but of the inflated dollar. For that reason, they need assistance and they need it immediately.

It is to the credit of the advocates and opponents of the proposed legislation that they are in agreement on the fact that those already retired and the survivors of deceased employees must have immediate relief.

Another factor that I cannot ignore is one which concerns the railroad man of today who will be the retired man of tomorrow. He definitely is in favor of structural changes in the Railroad Retirement Act, that involve the reduction of the retirement age from 65 to age 60 and he desires the option

of retiring on a full annuity after 30 years of service, regardless of age. In addition, he also wants an increase in present benefits without any increase in payroll taxes. Above all, he wants nothing to do in any way, shape, or form with the Railroad Retirement Act becoming related to the Social Security Act.

It is unfortunate that we have so much difference of opinion with respect to the proposed amendments. For example, members of the Railroad Retirement Board are divided, actuarial experts cannot agree in their opinions, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is divided and railway labor groups have opposite views. Among the thousands of railroad employees, you find the same state of confusion exists regarding the provisions of these proposed amendments. Frankly, from my conversations with railroad employees, there is no doubt that there is favorable sentiment for liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act, but, as many employees have warned, all amendments should be sound and should not impair the financial stability of the railroad retirement fund.

In my great desire to protect the interest of active and retired railroad employees and the survivors of deceased employees, I have spent hours in diligently studying not only the many bills introduced in Congress but also the printed hearings in the Senate and House of Representatives, together with the viewpoints of various railway labor organizations.

In addition, I have studied the majority and minority reports issued by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

At this point I should like to discuss House bill 3669 as originally introduced and which is commonly referred to as the minority or Crosser bill.

The original House bill 3669 provides that retirement annuities shall be increased on an average of 13.8 percent, pensions to be increased by 15 percent, survivor benefits to be increased from 80 to 100 percent, and in addition to provide for a spouse's annuity. The report on the bill states that—

"These substantial increases provided in the original bill, H R 3669, are made possible only because said bill makes certain of the adequate financing by assuring certain savings to the railroad retirement fund and by providing additional income for the fund. The Railroad Retirement Board estimated that the combined yield of such savings and additional revenue would amount to about \$230,000,000 annually."

It might be well at this time to discuss the source of these savings and additional revenue from which the proposed increases and new benefits are to be financed. Let us first discuss the \$50-work-restriction clause.

The Crosser bill provides that annuitants and pensioners are prohibited from earning in excess of \$50 a month unless they forfeit their monthly benefit for such month. This same provision is in the present Social Security Act and has been the basis of bitter and widespread criticism.

Under the present Railroad Retirement Act, the only work restriction imposed upon retired employees provides that while receiving an annuity, they must not be employed by a common carrier railroad recognized under the Railroad Retirement Act or by their last regular employer prior to going on pension.

Benefits under social security are not restricted in any way if annuitants are employed on the railroads or in any other employment except that covered under the Social Security Act. The retired Government employee is not restricted as to earnings because of employment in any other field except employment in the Federal Gov-

enment. It is only reasonable and fair that railroad employees who will pay a higher tax rate than either of the above-mentioned groups, beginning January 1, 1952, be given the same privilege to supplement their fixed retirement incomes in other fields.

One of the provisions of the present Railroad Retirement Act provides that an employee who has attained age 60 and has 30 years of service may retire on a reduced annuity. Each year a number of employees, who have been disqualified for work by the railroads and who do not meet the Railroad Retirement Board's disability test, as well as many others who meet the requirements for a reduced annuity before age 65, retire on such a reduced railroad retirement annuity and they obtain work outside the railroad industry to supplement their retirement benefits. This \$50-work-restriction clause will create a great hardship upon the disqualified employee who did not qualify for a disability annuity, and, of course, it would discourage others from retiring on a reduced annuity. It would practically nullify the reduced annuity provision in the present act.

The only argument that has been made in favor of the \$50-work restriction contained in the Crosser bill and which has been borrowed from the Social Security Act, is that such a provision will provide additional funds with which to finance the increases and new provisions sponsored by the Crosser bill.

Although the present Railroad Retirement Act provides for retirement at age 65, the average retirement age is about 68 years, which means that there has been a saving in the railroad retirement fund in two respects. First, no annuities have been paid for the 3 years from 65 to 68; second, taxes have been received during the same 3 years from these employees who could have been receiving annuities.

Of course the \$50-work restriction is intended to create further savings by discouraging retirement even at age 68. The Railroad Retirement Board has estimated that the \$50-a-month work restriction will save the railroad retirement fund \$50,000,000 in a year. When you consider that the average annuity paid each year is about \$1,000, then such a \$50,000,000-a-year saving would mean approximately 50,000 employees who are ready for retirement will not retire because of the \$50 limitation on earnings.

The Railroad Retirement Act as enacted by Congress was intended to make it possible for men to retire, rather than to retire by restrictive legislation. That is, it proposed to provide benefits and encourage retirement of railroad employees at age 65, instead of imposing restrictions upon the aged employee to discourage his retirement at age 65.

Another feature overlooked in the \$50-work-restriction clause is the administrative problem, which will mean the policing of some 200,000 retirement claims each month by a corps of new employees.

The Railroad Retirement Board's experience with respect to the policing once every 6 months of the present work-restriction clause as applied to the disabled employee, should certainly provide sufficient evidence as to the amount of extra work that can be expected if a monthly check is necessary.

Also included in the \$230,000,000 savings and additional revenue mentioned in the minority report is the \$100,000,000 savings estimated to be provided for in the financial adjustment between the railroad retirement and social security systems.

The Railroad Retirement Board's actuaries have estimated that approximately \$40,000,000 of this saving would be realized through the transfer to social security of railroad employees with less than 10 years of service, and the remaining \$60,000,000 savings would be the result of future contemplated

legislation, which is to be recommended jointly by the Railroad Retirement Board and the Federal Security Administrator by June 1, 1956.

Under this proposal, railroad service after 1936 is to be considered employment under the Social Security Act—see section 23 of original bill, H. R. 3369. It might be well to point out at this time that the Railroad Retirement Board actuaries have estimated that the cost of the Crosser bill would be 14 1/2 percent of a \$5,200,000,000 annual payroll. However, this cost estimate is based upon the financial adjustments between the railroad retirement and social security systems, which include the so-called \$50,000,000 contemplated savings for which no legislation has been introduced or recommended.

The Railroad Retirement Board's actuaries have also estimated the cost of the Crosser bill without the \$60,000,000 contemplated savings would be 15 3/4 percent of a \$5,200,000,000 annual payroll.

With respect to the adequate financial claim of the Crosser bill, Mr. Musher, chief actuary for the Railroad Retirement Board, in his testimony before the Senate committee, introduced a table—see page 238 of Senate hearings—which showed that, under the Crosser bill, the railroad retirement fund would be entirely exhausted by the year 2000. Mr. Musher in his appearance before the Senate committee also testified that to continue the railroad retirement system after the reserve was exhausted would require a payroll tax rate of approximately 20 percent. Also, according to exhibit on page 429 of the House hearings, which was prepared by the Railroad Retirement Board's actuarial staff, there would be an outstanding liability of \$16,200,000,000 when the railroad retirement fund became exhausted in the year 2000 under H. R. 3369, as originally introduced and commonly known as the Crosser bill.

Mr. Robert D. Holman, a member of the Railroad Retirement Board's actuarial advisory committee, also appeared before the Senate committee and testified that in his opinion Mr. Musher's cost estimates were on the low side. Mr. Donald M. Overholser, an associate of Mr. George D. Buck, labor's member, on the Board's actuarial advisory committee, in his testimony before the Senate committee, said that the plan embodied in S. 1347, which is identical to the Crosser bill, "would go on the rocks. That is definite." He further stated that if he were a member of the railroad unions he would "be scared about this plan."

Mr. Murray W. Latimer in his prepared statement on S. 1347—which is identical to the Crosser bill—stated that under that bill that—

"Either the railroad retirement system will collapse or there will be a Government subsidy. He further characterized the bill, from the standpoint of financial soundness as the extreme of recklessness."

Mr. Meyer, chief actuary for the social-security system, was in complete disagreement with Mr. Musher as to the amount of possible savings that could be realized by adjustments with the social-security trust fund under the Crosser bill. According to Mr. Meyer's statements the savings would be only about \$50,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000.

Under the Crosser bill there is a new eligibility requirement which provides that a railroad employee must have completed at least 120 months of compensated service in order to receive any benefits himself under the Railroad Retirement Act. The so-called residual lump-sum benefit is a death benefit that may be payable to survivors.

The bill provides that upon retirement or death of an employee who has completed less than 10 years of service, benefits to him or his spouse, or his survivors, will be pay-

able under the Social Security Act. However on the other hand there is also a minimum service requirement provided in the Social Security Act before benefits can be paid under that act. According to the amended Social Security Act of 1950, generally speaking, any individual who attains age 65 after 1970 must have completed 40 quarters of coverage—calendar quarters—in order to receive any benefits for himself, his spouse, or survivors under the Social Security Act.

Briefly this would mean that a railroad employee after performing less than 10 years of compensated service on which compensation he paid a tax three to four times higher than paid under social security, would not be entitled to any benefits at all under the Railroad Retirement Act, and if he attained age 65 after 1970, then he also would not qualify under the Social Security Act for any old-age and survivor insurance benefits.

Under the present Railroad Retirement Act an employee who has a current connection with the railroad industry, and who has less than 10 years of service and has attained age 60, is entitled to a monthly disability annuity provided he has been disqualified for work in his regular occupation. An employee who is totally disabled and who has less than 10 years of service is entitled to a disability annuity provided he has attained age 60.

Under the 10-year provision of the Crosser bill, such disabled employees would not be entitled to any benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. However, if such employee had completed sufficient service to meet the requirements of the Social Security Act, he would qualify for benefits under the Social Security Act. According to the Board's statistics there were 453 disability claims awarded in 1949 to disabled employees at age 60 who had less than 10 years of service.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board's annual report for the year 1949 there were 4,811,700 former railroad employees with less than 10 years of service, of which some 4,000,000 had less than 1 year of railroad service. The Crosser bill proposes to forfeit the annuity rights of such former employees and transfer them to the social security rolls. To begin with, none of these 4,000,000 former employees with less than 1 year of service would qualify for benefits under the Social Security Act unless they had performed additional employment covered under social security. It is reasonable to assume that practically 90 percent of these 4,000,000 employees with less than 1 year of railroad service did engage in and are still engaged in social security employment. This being the case, and because of the new effective date of January 1, 1951, of the Social Security Act, the crediting of service and compensation earned before that date will not increase the old-age insurance benefits payable to such former railroad employees.

The statement has been made by the supporters of the Crosser bill that the transfer of employees with less than 10 years of service to social security will provide higher benefits than under the present Railroad Retirement Act. There is no doubt that if a study is made of these 4,811,700 cases of former employees with less than 10 years of service, it would reveal that in at least 90 percent of the cases the employee would receive higher benefits under the present dual system of paying both railroad retirement and social security benefits.

The Bureau of the Budget in response to a request from the House committee has the following to say with respect to the section of the Crosser bill providing for the transfer of the less than 10-year men to social security:

"1. The workers with less than 10 years' service in the railroad industry—and these

make up a very large percentage of the total—would get virtually all of their benefits from the old-age and survivors insurance system and nothing from the railroad retirement system; yet under the bill they would pay for the same OASI benefits four times as much taxes as nonrailroad workers pay currently. In a sense, the short-term employees would be forced to subsidize the longer-term employees, a situation that might result in considerable discontent."

The Crosser bill provides that the retirement annuity or pension of an individual shall be reduced beginning with the month in which such individual is receiving or is entitled to receive an old-age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act.

To give an example: Take the case of a former railroad employee who retired in 1941 on 30 years of service at age 65 on an annuity amounting to \$90 a month. Assume further that during the war he had social-security-covered employment from 1942 through 1946, and applied for and received a social-security benefit of \$20 a month, which was later increased to \$40 under the social-security amendments of 1950.

By the operation of the Crosser bill the railroad retirement annuity of \$90 would be increased to \$102 a month. However, under the above provision, where the retired employee in this case was receiving \$40 a month under social security, his railroad retirement annuity would be reduced from \$102 a month to \$62 a month, which would mean that, instead of this retired worker receiving higher total benefits, he would suffer a reduction of \$28 a month in his total railroad-retirement and social-security benefits, from \$130 to \$102 a month.

The impression has been given that the Crosser bill is to provide increases in all retirement annuities and pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act. That is one of its purposes. It has another purpose, and that is to reduce many thousand annuities which are now being paid to individuals who have acquired rights for benefits under both the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts.

Mr. Lester Schoene, counsel for the Railway Labor Executives' Association before the House committee in support of the original H. R. 3669, which is now the Crosser bill, when asked by Congressman BENNETT if, under the present act, an individual could draw benefits under both the railroad retirement and social security, he stated, "That is true under the present law; yes." Then, in answer to Congressman BENNETT's question, "Is that happening in a good many cases?" Mr. Schoene answered, "I do not know in how many cases it happens, but I would say in a substantial number, yes"—see page 542 of House hearings.

Mr. Murray W. Latimer, in his testimony before the House committee—page 278—in reference to the number of cases in which retirement annuities now being paid would be reduced under this provision of the Crosser bill, stated:

"I do not know, and neither does anybody else know, how many annuities that would be reduced, but I would guess it is in the neighborhood of 20,000 or 25,000."

Of course, this is another of the proposed savings provisions to provide additional income to finance the increased and new benefits of the Crosser bill. It sounds more like robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The additional income listed as part of the \$230,000,000 made possible under the Crosser bill to finance the increases and new benefits of the bill is provided by increasing the taxable compensation from \$300 to \$400 a month. The House report on the Crosser bill states that "by increasing the limit from \$300 to \$400, additional revenues of \$80,000,000 per year would be provided."

However, of the \$80,000,000 additional taxes obtained by raising the maximum taxable and creditable compensation from \$300 to \$400, only a fraction would be available to finance the new increases and benefits proposed in the Crosser bill. The greater part of this additional revenue would be used to meet the increase in benefits that would result from the use of creditable compensation up to \$400 a month in calculating employee and survivor benefits.

The proponents of the Crosser bill and other proposals, as well as the House committee, were unanimous on one point and that was in view of the rising cost of living, which substantially reduces the standard of living of retired workers and the survivors, who are on a fixed income, the first problem to be met was the urgent necessity for increasing the amount of the monthly benefits payable to retired workers and survivors who are now on the current retirement rolls.

In order to meet this need, it will be necessary to enact legislation that will not require any administrative difficulties. There are some 400,000 retirement and survivor claims in current status; therefore, there should not be any legislation enacted at this time that will require a reexamination of such claims before any increased benefits can be paid. Such a delay is an absolute certainty under the Crosser bill.

As an illustration, under the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, 200,000 claims had to be reexamined in order to determine if and how much increased benefits would be payable on each claim. It required over 1 year to complete the reexamination of those 200,000 cases, and, of course, that meant considerable delay in paying increased benefits as provided under the 1946 amendments.

The Crosser bill proposes many changes which will require considerable correspondence and handling before a claim can be certified for additional benefits.

For example, the spouse's annuity. This is a new benefit which is payable to the spouse and will require the filing of an application and evidence to establish the date of marriage and age of the spouse.

The Railroad Retirement Board does not even have a record of employees who have a spouse, let alone the necessary evidence to establish the date of birth and marital status of such spouse. In addition, the Board will have to hire and train additional employees to process these cases. The present employees of the Railroad Retirement Board that are trained to handle cases under the Crosser bill will be busy handling the current new claims.

On the other hand, we have before us for consideration the Hall bill which provides for a 15-percent increase to all annuitants and pensioners, and a 33 1/3-percent increase to widows and surviving children. This bill has been referred to as stopgap legislation because it does not contain any of the controversial features of the Crosser bill, but does provide an immediate increase to retired employees and to widows and surviving children.

My study of the so-called Hall bill reveals there is a difference of opinion as to its cost. Some say it will completely wreck the railroad retirement fund in some 20 years; while others are of the opinion that it is the only sound approach to amending the Railroad Retirement Act without increasing the payroll tax or adding to the cost of administering the existing law.

Advocates of the Hall bill support their position by stating that the increases are reasonable and will not impair the railroad retirement fund. They also point to the fact that the 1948 amendments granting a 20-percent increase did not cost as much as originally estimated, due to increased wages,

with the result that the railroad retirement fund is in a healthy condition today.

I recognize the honest differences of opinion that exist between advocates of the Crosser and Hall bills.

After detailed study and serious reflection, I am convinced that there is only one position I can take to guarantee the solvency of the railroad retirement fund and to grant immediate relief to retired employees and to widows and surviving children and that is to support the bill reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and referred to as the Hall bill.

In my support of the Hall bill, I realize it is stopgap legislation, yet it provides immediate relief to those in need of assistance, and that is the crying need of the hour.

On the other hand, I am in favor of many of the provisions of the Crosser bill, if it can be shown after further study on the part of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that these new benefits will not endanger the financial condition of the railroad retirement fund and that the relationship between the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Administration, proposed in the Crosser bill, is not one that will eventually result in having the railroad retirement system absorbed by social security.

In supporting the Hall bill I am doing so with the understanding that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be charged, as the result of a House resolution, with the responsibility of conducting a complete review of all the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act for the purpose of liberalizing them if it is deemed possible to do so.

To guarantee action by Congress on the recommendations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the committee is instructed to report to the House of Representatives in the form of a bill not later than February 1952. In my opinion such procedure is a sane and practical manner of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act.

In conclusion, by approval of the Hall bill we will furnish immediate relief to retired employees and to the surviving widows and children. Next February we can complete the task of liberalizing provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act in general.

Clarion Call of the Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the October 7 issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

This editorial, in my opinion, is an excellent statement of the fundamental reason why many of us in the House are urging action at this time to reverse an unwarranted and obnoxious invasion of State rights which has operated to the detriment of the taxpayer and the honest indigent.

The editorial follows:

CLARION CALL OF THE GOVERNORS AT
CATLINBURG

The 48 governors of the 48 States, representing all schools of political thought, from

conservative Republican to liberal Democrat, took a unanimous, and historic, step at their recent Gatlinburg conference.

They demanded the right to a much larger degree of control over the Federal-State-local social-security system, and specifically the right to control publicity given the names of persons on relief rolls.

The issue here is far more important than the particular question whether receivers of public assistance should or should not be permitted to remain anonymous. As is set forth in the article on this page by Roscoe Drummond, the question goes to the root of Federal State-local relationships.

The unanimous action of the 48 governors signals a rapidly reviving insistence on the part of leaders of all schools of political thought on the importance of reversing the trend toward centralization in Washington—under way for nearly two decades—and returning to the States many powers that have gradually drifted away from them.

Time was when some of the governors would have been unwilling to go on record as favoring these changes in the social security system. Yet, today we see the chief executives of such States as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio uniting with those of Virginia, South Dakota, and Mississippi in demanding that the Federal Government stop dictating to them with respect to public assistance, and leave details of administration to State and local authorities, after certain minimum standards have been met.

The issue was precipitated by several developments. One was the action of the Indiana Legislature in voting to give publicity to relief rolls in that State, where chiseling is said to have been rampant. As a result of this action, Indiana was deprived of some \$20,000,000 annually in Federal welfare funds.

Another factor was the introduction in the House of Representatives by Virginia Congressman Burr P. Harrison of a bill to repeal those provisions of the Federal Social Security Act which deny Federal relief funds to States making their relief rolls public. Hearings on this bill have been scheduled to open tomorrow before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Here in Virginia, where the situation is relatively good, we have legislation which helps to hold down abuses. Names of all persons getting public assistance are made available monthly to members of city councils and county boards of supervisors, and this is believed to serve as a check against the kind of scandalous graft and chiseling that have become notorious in some other areas.

There is no reason, however, why the General Assembly of Virginia, or of any other State, should be forbidden by Federal law to make the names of all recipients public, if it should develop that such action is desirable.

Arguments have been made against such drastic action in Virginia at the present time, but the basic thesis is sound that the State ought to have the right to solve its own problems in its own way, as far as possible, free of dictation from Washington.

In sounding a call to the Nation on behalf of decentralization, economy, and simplification, as opposed to federalization, waste, and bureaucracy, the governors at Gatlinburg have taken a momentous step. It should do much to arouse the people of America to the dangers which confront them, and help markedly to revitalize our fast deteriorating system of local self-government.

Worth Thinking Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include two articles. The first is an editorial from the Sunday edition of the Washington Post. The second is an article by Henry Hazlitt in the current issue of Newsweek:

[From the Washington Post]

DOLLARS AS DIPLOMATS

What the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., had to say in Chicago about the demoralizing effects of long-continued American aid abroad makes a lot of sense to this newspaper. Dollars, Mr. Cocke maintains, do not win friends for America—they only silence enemies. Such gifts, ladled out over a long period of time contribute not to the strength of a friend but to his appetite.

It is a truism in public welfare that the hand-out is demeaning. Wealth, to be sure, carries with it social responsibilities, but wealth expended unwisely brings not independence, or even gratitude, but envy and expectancy. Moreover, a criterion of economic aid is its cost-reducing potential. Self-help was the principle of the Marshall plan, especially in the latter days of technical assistance. It is also the principle of the kind of point 4 aid which this newspaper supports—the modest, village type of assistance which helps people to use better what they already have. This is the kind of aid, in other words, which brings steel plows, not elaborate tractors and combines, to areas where the tractor would be as impractical as a television set.

In the jumps from expediency to expediency that accompany the pleas for dollars, we are in danger of forgetting that the only form of economic betterment that is permanent lies in an increase in productivity. It is quite possible, as foreign aid becomes more and more institutionalized, for free access to the American dollar to constitute a new form of subversion.

[From Newsweek of October 8, 1951]

THE REAL PROBLEMS OF FRANCE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

PARIS—To a visitor who, like myself, has not been in France since 1947, the improvement in the physical appearance of the country, and in the better neighborhoods of the cities, is in some respects striking. Much of this physical improvement must no doubt be attributed directly or indirectly to American economic aid. Yet the ECA program, as at present conceived and administered, seems largely irrelevant to the real problems that confront France today. These problems might be grouped under three main headings: (1) Lack of confidence in the Government, (2) lack of confidence in the currency, and (3) lack of incentives for new enterprises and for expanding production.

1 When a Frenchman talks about necessary fiscal or economic reforms, he is apt to add resignedly that they would only be possible under a government with a majority dependable enough to give it reasonable security of tenure and courage. But the French vote for a multiplicity of warring political parties and become collectively disgusted with the over-all situation they have collectively created.

Much has been written about the great effect of Marshall aid in turning the tide against communism in Europe. In France, the statistical proof is not impressive. In November 1946, the Communist vote came from 28.6 percent of the French electorate. In the elections this June the percentage was still 28.5. How much credit Marshall aid can claim even for this reduction of only 2 percentage points is doubtful. For in the light of all that has happened in the intervening 4 years, no French voter has any excuse for still believing the old myth that Soviet Russia is a great peace-loving nation or that the French Communist Party has the interests of France primarily at heart.

2. The Frenchman's lack of confidence in his currency is hardly surprising. He has seen the franc decline to one-twentieth of its purchasing power in 1938. He has seen it decline since 1914 to one-seventieth of its former value in terms of the dollar and to less than one-hundredth of its former value in terms of gold. No one should be astonished to learn that the former French habits of saving have largely disappeared and that the kind of saving that does take place is more likely to go into gold hoarding than into Government bonds.

Today the franc is under new pressure of several different kinds. One is the rise in world raw material prices, owing to American rearmament. Another is the increased strain on the budget for increased French armament. A third is the continuing deficit in French socialized industries (of more than 90,000,000,000 francs, for one example, in the nationalized railways in the 1951 fiscal year). A fourth is the political pressure for adopting "l'échelle mobile"—"the moving ladder," or sliding scale, whereby the legal minimum wage will automatically follow prices upward. A fifth is the persistence of a low-interest-rate policy under which the volume of money and bank credit have continued to expand by 554,000,000,000 francs, for example, from June 1950 to May of this year.

3 Finally, as a result of the whole network of exchange controls, import quotas, tariffs, price controls, allocations, social-security deductions and payments on a huge scale, and the cartelization of business, there has been a great distortion of productive incentives, a growing lack of correspondence between effort and reward, and heavy obstacles to the appearance or success of new enterprises.

I have space to cite only one example. Price-fixing in wheat is unfortunately one of the chief reasons why France's wheat production since the war has been persistently lower than the average production in 1934-38.

The major problems of France today, in short, barring the menace of Russia, are problems of internal policy. They can be lightened, of course, by continuance of American military and economic aid. But they can be solved only by a courageous recognition on the part of the French that a halt to the present inflation, and the restoration of economic freedom and production, will come primarily only through their own efforts.

MacArthur's GOP Stock Soars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the high esteem that the American people have for Gen. Douglas MacArthur is revealed further by a recent Gallup poll described in the following article that appeared last week in metropolitan newspapers:

MACARTHUR'S GOP STOCK SOARS—REPUBLICANS BACK HIM 6 TO 5 BUT DON'T THINK HE WILL RUN

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

A majority of Republican voters with opinions on the subject, and a substantial proportion of all voters, would like to see Gen. Douglas MacArthur run for President in 1952.

Despite the fact that he will be 72 at the time of the election and has disavowed any intention of running for office, the general could command considerable popular support if he chose to run, judging from interviews with a cross section of voters throughout the country.

Each person in the survey was asked:

"Would you like to see MacArthur run for President on the Republican ticket in 1952?"

Here is the national vote:

	Percent
Yes.....	38
No.....	52
No opinion.....	10

As might be expected, Democratic voters don't relish the idea of the general as a Republican candidate.

Among Republicans, on the other hand, the vote is 6 to 5 in his favor.

Here is the party vote:

	(Percent)	Rep- licans	Dem- ocrats	Inde- pendents
Yes.....	50	41	31	
No.....	42	56	69	
No opinion.....	8	13	9	

As the above results indicate, one possible handicap to a MacArthur-for-President drive would be the comparatively cool attitude of those voters who classify themselves as independent politically.

Their opinions regarding MacArthur for President contrast sharply with their views toward Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Recent institute surveys have found that General Eisenhower is the top choice of independent voters, on either the Republican or Democratic ticket.

There has been constant speculation over whether General MacArthur might throw his hat into the political ring. At the present time, most voters are guessing that he will not be a candidate in 1952. Only about one-fourth (26 percent) think he will try for the Republican nomination.

Each person in the survey was asked a second question:

"Do you think General MacArthur will try for the nomination for President on the Republican ticket in 1952?"

	Percent
Yes.....	26
No.....	59
No opinion.....	15

Another Truman Hemorrhage of Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, after reading the editorial in the Wall Street Journal under date of October 8, 1951, I am sure that the people will be amazed at the man whom they call President of the United States. This outburst by President Truman is one of the worst, and it does raise a question of vital concern to all whose lives and security rest upon this type of leadership.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD:

The autumn of 1940 was such a one as this. The clouds, if anything, hung heavier, for the stalemate war of that time had already erupted. In the United States, the people were being asked to pay higher taxes, to prepare for sacrifices, because we were rearming again. The talk in Washington was of emergencies, tanks, guns, planes—and talk of the dangers of informing the public what was going on lest the enemy be informed, too.

In just such an October, 11 years ago, we assigned a reporter in our Washington bureau to write a series of articles on the rearmament program. A key subject was armor plate. We did not desire to reveal any technical secrets, but we did think people had a right to know something of the problems involved in the then time-consuming process of making it.

Inquiry at the War and Navy Departments brought consternation; our reporter was asking for military secrets. So our reporter repaired to the Encyclopaedia Britannica and found what he needed in an essay on armor plate. At once the consternation was compounded. It was only with difficulty that we extricated ourselves from the position of having shaken the security of the country, at one point we were told that it was dangerous even to call attention to what was in the encyclopedia.

The other day President Truman took the press severely to task for "revealing" vital war secrets. At one point he made the startling observation that 95 percent of the security information of this country has already been published. It was for this reason, he said, that he had signed a security order directing Government offices to stamp as "confidential"—and hence barred from publication—whatever the Government office thought it unwise for the public to know.

To illustrate abuses by the press, Mr. Truman cited an article in Fortune magazine on atomic energy development. This, he said, was an outstanding example of dangerous and irresponsible publication, for among other things the article revealed the location of our atomic energy plants.

Fortune quickly explained (without contradiction) that the article was passed by the Atomic Energy Commission and indeed the AEC bought 500 reprints of it for distribution. As to the plant locations, it turned out there was nothing in Fortune not available in any good library or in AEC publications on public sale.

Apart from this, a little reflection suggests that it would be a bit difficult, to say the least, to hide the location of Oak Ridge, Hanford, and the other atomic plants.

A second example cited was the irresponsibility of printing pictures of the Matador, a new jet-propelled bomber. These pictures had been given to the press by the Defense Department. To the President another terrible example was the air maps of big cities which some papers had published as part of their air-raid warning publicity. But these maps were developed and sponsored by the civil-defense agencies.

Mr. Truman's expressed view was that despite these circumstances publishers have no business printing this sort of thing if they have the welfare of their country at heart. The White House later "clarified" this, explaining publishers should only refrain from publishing what came from "irresponsible" sources.

It is against the background of these incidents, a decade apart, that the President's remarks about the irresponsibility of the press and the need for censorship must be judged.

Mr. Truman says that on the one hand no one will "seriously contend that military secrets should be published in the newspapers" and that on the other no one will argue that secrecy should cloak from the people "information about their Government which should be made known to them." He interprets his orders for secrecy as a way of steering between these two shoals.

We will agree on the objectives and we will certainly agree on the difficulties. And nowhere are the difficulties greater than in the basic decision of what constitutes a military secret and what is information the people have a right to know.

Here we have instances of an encyclopedia article on armor plate, a map of a city, a picture of an airplane, and some scientific and industrial information—all of which appeared to some eyes as proper public information and to others as dangerous military secrets. These are not isolated instances. They cover 10 years that any newspaper editor could find rich in examples.

And the peculiar difficulty is that those who make the most absurd classifications can have good reason. It would indeed have been better had the Germans not known how to make armor plate. It would indeed be better if the Russians knew not of Oak Ridge or the street plan of San Francisco.

The difficulty is, Where does it end and who is the omnipotent to say where it ends? The most valuable information imaginable to an invading army would be the highway maps of gasoline companies or the history of tides and weather along the vulnerable coasts. It could be argued well that to safeguard this information would be worth ignorance of the coming rain or inconvenience for motorists floundering in a charless countryside.

Nor does the difficulty end with the little absurdities of bureaucrats which one may ridicule. It is not got out of by the most careful limitation of what subjects are military secrets.

Indeed, the difficulty is deepest when it touches such vital things as atomic energy. Here the price of that safeguarding secrecy is complete ignorance of what our servants are doing; a free people have no way to measure, check, condemn or exhort their officials. It is not likely to happen—but it is by no means past possibility—that the people should awake one day to find that the trusted safeguard of secrecy had covered up such failure that there would be no safeguard at all.

How is that difficulty to be resolved? We do not think it can be. But if it cannot be resolved, if it will remain always with us, it can be met by following a course which will bring the greatest strength and the lesser of the dangers.

That course, we firmly believe, is not more secrecy by compulsion. It is one thing to

leave to the conscience of each official what he shall talk about; it is quite another thing to give an official the power to stamp a document in red ink and hence bar everyone else from talking about it. For beneath this red ink may hide all manner of things—not simply administrative mistakes, which is not the least part of the matter, but information which all unknown to the most conscientious censor is vital to the country if it is to make collective judgments on political matters or even technical problems.

At first this rubber stamping will lead to a multiplicity of absurdities, afterwards to a snarl of confusion that will not be funny at all. Soon it will lead us to a place where little dictators of the mind will sit back deciding what we shall know and what we shall not know. The people will sit not knowing, and what is worse, not knowing what it is they do not know.

We cannot operate a democracy unless the people have full information on which to make political decisions. Equally true, we cannot utilize our full scientific and technical strength without wide knowledge for all inquirers. Knowledge is for our own benefit. It should be withheld only in the most extreme cases and even then only with the greatest caution.

We will concede there are risks in this policy, in rejecting the Truman approach. It is risky to leave our enemies free to know about us, to know our accomplishment that they may imitate them, our weaknesses on which they may capitalize, and our confusions which they may enjoy. But knowledge for the people is, we firmly believe, the source of so great a strength that it will outweigh these risks. This is as true of free scientific knowledge as of political ideas. Real strength grows here, too, where ideas can feed upon one another.

Fortunately our enemies live where ideas stagnate, mired in this very sort of official secrecy which is now thrust at us. So if they steal from us, they will still be forever imitators and so forever lagging. They may profit a little from our seed, but it is better by far to risk giving them a little that we may acquire so much.

We believe that we strengthen ourselves as we make knowledge a wider domain. When we narrow it we weaken ourselves far more than we would help our enemies by enlarging it. In this jungle of a world it is safer to walk in the light than in the shadows.

National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters of the Twelfth District Oppose Senate Joint Resolution 76

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave accorded me by the House, I am including in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the members of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters at their twelfth district meeting in Wichita on September 28, 1951. I believe this resolution is of sufficient importance that the Members of Congress ought to have a chance to read it.

Whereas proposed Senate bill 1579 and the companion resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 76—the so-called Benton bills, authored

and initiated by Senator WILLIAM BENTON of Connecticut—would establish a presidentially appointed board of review charged with reviewing the program performance of radio and television stations and reporting conclusions to Congress and the Federal Communications Commission annually; and

Whereas such procedure, in the view of the broadcasters of the twelfth district of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, would be contrary to guarantees expressed in the Bill of Rights, insofar as the proposed board would have the implicit power of censorship; and

Whereas the legislation, if adopted, would impose even further regulation upon a medium that stands as one of the important national guardians of free speech; and

Whereas such proposals are in contradiction of the rights of the people to a broadcast medium free of government program surveillance. Be it

Resolved, That the members of the twelfth district of NARTB, in convention assembled, unanimously and vigorously oppose this legislation, and be it further

Resolved, That the NARTB president and staff continue their efforts to keep all broadcasters, members and nonmembers of the association, fully informed on this subject, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, to the chairmen of such subcommittees as may be designated to hear testimony on these legislative proposals, and to the Senators and Congressmen of Kansas and Oklahoma.

Mounted Cavalry Should Be Reactivated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following remarks in behalf of my bill, House bill 5156, to reactivate the Mounted Cavalry as a basic branch of the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my bill, I ask: Did the experience of General Wainwright receive any consideration at the hands of the infantry generals catapulted into high command because of their good fortune on the battlefields of Western Europe with its unique network of roads and with no cavalry on either side, a purely vehicular road war? None whatever. Neither did they pay any attention to the counsel of Patton, Truscott, and other Cavalry generals of much riper experience than they. Now Korea, with its lack of roads finds them off base with an army on wheels.

In this connection, I would like to insert the following portion of a memorandum submitted to Maj. Gen. John Herr, United States Army, retired, the last Chief of Cavalry of the Army, by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, United States Army, retired, on September 24, 1951:

Long have I advocated the retention of at least one Mounted Cavalry Division at full strength with horse artillery, armed with the pack howitzer which may be moved in pack

(five loads to each piece) or may be drawn by horses. Such a division would be immediately available in an emergency or would serve as a nucleus for cavalry expansion if necessary.

It would appear appropriate to bring home the famed First Cavalry Division, reorganize it, reequip it, mount it, and officer it with experienced cavalry officers while there are some still left. They would all be in higher grades but could readily train the junior officers and soldiers.

In the campaign in north Luzon, December 1941 and January 1942, I withdrew my corps of four Philippine Army infantry divisions and the Twenty-sixth United States Cavalry, under orders of the high command, from Lingayan Gulf to Bataan, 140 miles.

These Philippine Army divisions, while they later became good defensive troops, were initially only partly mobilized, partially trained, and poorly equipped. The Twenty-sixth Cavalry was the only Regular Army unit available to me, so I used it very extensively to cover my withdrawal. This it did in a masterful and heroic manner. Without it I doubt if the withdrawal of my corps would have been successfully accomplished.

As the last senior commander to employ cavalry against an armed enemy, perhaps my opinion of the value of mounted cavalry is entitled to some consideration.

JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT,

General, United States Army, Retired

The Item Salutes Its News Boys and Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a splendid editorial from the celebrated Clinton Daily Item entitled "The Item Salutes Its News Boys and Girls."

This editorial, which was written by the Honorable Orra L. Stone, distinguished editor of the Item, admirably points up the important place of news boys and girls in our American life, the contributions they make, and the benefits they receive from their valuable work.

I congratulate Mr. Stone for his excellent editorial on the subject, which I know will be greatly appreciated by all the news boys and girls in his locality.

THE ITEM SALUTES ITS NEWS BOYS AND GIRLS

This is National Newspaper Boy Day in the United States and the Item halls the opportunity to eulogize the boys and girls who daily, in rain, snow, hail, sleet, and frigid cold faithfully cover their respective routes uncomplainingly in order that the thousands of subscribers of this newspaper may enjoy, at their firesides, the news of each recurring day.

While we have week-to-week and month-to-month days set aside in honor of many national movements it is doubtful if any is of greater importance than National Newspaper Boy and Girl Day.

Can any reader of the Item realize what their plight would be if they were forced to don outer garments and walk to a distributing center in order to obtain a copy of their favorite newspaper? If such were

the daily program it is self-evident that many copies would remain on the counters unsold and unread.

Stories of many heroic deeds performed by newspaper boys and girls appear almost daily in the press of the Nation, while many of their accomplishments, which are nonetheless worth while, are never brought to the attention of the public.

Even though we cannot single them out individually their constant faithfulness affords this newspaper an opportunity to give them a pat on the back.

Their work is just as important as that of the employees of the Item at its place of publication who hurriedly place in type all the news of a 24-hour period in as few columns as possible as without the source that enables the newspaper boy and girl to deliver the product to the homes of subscribers the Item would fall of its purpose.

The 500,000 newspaper boys and girls throughout the Nation are engaged in a service that sets a fine example for the youths of their respective communities.

It requires a steady, ambitious, and faithful boy and girl to deliver newspapers 6 days a week and it should be recalled by the readers that this group is not composed of drones, idlers, and malicious mischief makers, but rather youths who are building for the future and who are acquiring knowledge of the value of money which will stand them in good stead in the days ahead.

To all the Item news boys and girls, we salute you this day and wish you every success in the future.

The Rewards of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following summary of remarks by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the annual award presentation, twenty-ninth national convention, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., at Cincinnati, Ohio, April 6, 1951:

THE REWARDS OF SOIL CONSERVATION

I am proud and honored to receive the Izaak Walton League's annual founders' award—for myself personally and in the name of those other conservationists with whom I have been closely associated. Your election of me as a soil conservationist for this year's award demonstrates what I have stated many times in speaking before sportsmen and other groups concerned with the conservation of our wildlife and allied natural resources; namely, soil and water conservation is invariably helpful to wildlife.

CONSERVATION ERA

The unprecedented attention to and progress in soil and water conservation which we are experiencing in today's conservation era is contributing as much, if not more, to the welfare of game, fish, and other beneficial wildlife as anything man has ever undertaken in this country or anywhere else.

If you, as national leaders in wildlife conservation, did not agree essentially with this proposition, I would not today be the recipient of this beautiful bronze plaque awarded for contributions to conservation of America's soil, forests, grasslands, water, and wildlife.

In this new era, conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife are, for the first time in history, being tied together and scientifically appraised on the basis of land capability and need. This is the basis of modern soil conservation. Without this basic groundwork there can be no such thing as lasting conservation of our soil or other resources which depend on the soil for their perpetuation. This is one of the physical laws that were set up by nature but pretty generally overlooked until recently.

INTERDEPENDENCE OF LAND, WATER, PLANTS, AND ANIMALS

Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals all should—and under natural conditions do, with the exception of civilized man—exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productivity. So, it likewise is a mandate of nature of precisely the same order that land and water must be treated and used according to capability and need.

The practical application of this principle is being demonstrated on a progressively wider scale from year to year all over the Nation by farmers in soil conservation districts receiving technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. This modern, democratic approach, by enlisting the cooperative effort of landholder, Government and the public together, is proving beneficial to an unprecedented degree to individuals and the public alike.

The Soil Conservation Service in fulfilling its authorized responsibilities is committed to doing everything possible within its resources to provide technical assistance in dealing with the erosion problem, siltation, floods, and water wastage. Thus, both its soil and water conservation activities are continuously geared to the needs of land and water users. We define soil conservation as the treatment of land with all those applicable measures needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use.

Similarly, we define water conservation, which we have always considered an inseparable part of soil conservation, in the following manner: Water conservation is the control, protection, management, and prudent use of water in such a way as to maintain crop, grazing, and forest lands, vegetative cover, and wildlife for maximum sustained benefits to agriculture, industry, commerce, and other elements of our national economy.

SOIL-CONSERVATION PROGRAM EMPHASIZES BIOLOGY

At this point, I should like to mention some of the biological aspects of our technical program. We give particular attention to training in biology for our farm planners and other technicians who work with farmers out in the their fields and pastures (not in an office). In planning farmers for conservation farming the technician considers the value of safeguarding various types of land, not only for crop production but also with an eye to any helpful modification or special practice that will result in more wildlife. He is expertly equipped to do this, because his understanding of the biological aspects of soil and water conservation is dovetailed with related techniques of land, hydrology, agronomy, and engineering.

I personally have seen how game has been driven from farms, watersheds, and larger areas by soil erosion. Fish, waterfowl, and furbearing game have disappeared from too many places because the streams and lakes have been polluted and filled with erosion debris. In many places the sources of water have dried up. I have seen these things in our own country, in Latin America, and in parts of Africa.

We have much to account for here in America in the decimation of the game and fish that abounded in our forests, meadows, and

streams in the days of Washington and Jefferson. And we can't blame the severe wildlife depopulation of many localities entirely to guns and dogs. We must credit a very substantial share of it to the axe and plow.

By and large, I am happy to say, wildlife conservationists and sportsmen in general have an unusually good understanding of the farmland conservation work which is progressing so rapidly all over the country, and a real and growing appreciation of its beneficial effect on wildlife. This positive support of soil and water conservation by such important groups as the Izaak Walton League is most encouraging, and is of real help in speeding the job along.

Less than 2 weeks ago, for example, I took part in the fourth semiannual seminar of the Marine Laboratory of the Texas Game, Fish, and Oyster Commission at Rockport, Tex. This seminar was participated in by marine biologists and other scientists, representatives of private industry and Government, college students, and soil and water conservationists. I found all of them genuinely interested in the bearing uncontrolled soil erosion has on the siltation of streams, reservoirs, and bays, and on marine and fresh-water life. I took particular pains to emphasize the fact that the only way by which water pollution from silt (eroded soil) can be controlled is by the widespread adoption of soil and water conservation practices on the land. Contour farming, strip cropping, terracing, good pasture and range development and management, proper woodland management, land-use changes, and various other specific land-management measures which have proved to be successful in the control of soil erosion and runoff must be applied to the land by those who use the land.

It is not enough to treat just part of a farm, or part of a watershed, or part of any other area of land. Every acre of cropland, pasture land, farm woodland, and idle land must be treated according to its needs and each acre used according to its capabilities. This is true, whether it is in major watersheds for flood control and silt-pollution abatement purposes, on individual farms and fields for erosion control, or through such group undertakings as conservation done by farmers in their soil conservation districts with which we cooperate at their request.

According to recent publicity, too many of our citizens seem to have lost something in the way of integrity, substituting gambling and favors for honest work, mendacity for truth, etc. But we can't cheat nature.

So, let's not lose the resources that nature gave us by refusing to work diligently with nature. Let's follow one of nature's laws that conservationists discovered some years ago—the law of treating land according to capability and need. Let's recognize the fact that without obedience to this law, there can be no lasting conservation of vegetation, soil, water, forests, wildlife, and people.

Recently the Soil Conservation Service's basic concept of safeguarding agricultural land was recognized for the first time at a significantly broader national level. I wonder how many noticed it?

I refer to that part of the reorganization announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, on February 15, 1951, relating to conservation activities. This was the announcement that the basic soil conservation objective of the department would be guided by the principle of treating land according to kind and need.

This, I think, is the first time any nation ever announced the acceptance of this utterly basic principle to the conservation of our most indispensable resource—productive land.

I think I should add that our farmers are getting along with the conservation job faster than people seem to know about. For example, we completed the conservation job on 5,000,000 acres of land in 1942 and on 26,-

000,000 acres in 1950. This was an increase of 388 percent—nearly five times as much work done—with operating facilities increased during the 8-year period by only 54 percent. This is what we have been striving for—progressive advancement in soil conservation work. We still are not going fast enough, to be sure, and will never be going fast enough until the job is finished, because until it is finished we will continue to lose soil to uncontrolled soil erosion.

Now, I think I should announce one other thing while feeling so good over the award you have given me: Soil conservation is definitely a national investment and, what is very important, it does not put the Government deeper in debt. Rather, it yields dividends.

Beef Price Controls: A Colossal Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a summary of a study made by Economic Trend Lines which is highly illuminating and which the public should understand:

The consequences of the effort to control beef prices have now become glaringly evident. Chiefly they are as follows:

1. The marketing of beef animals and the production of beef have been drastically reduced. The American Meat Institute has announced that the movement of beef into consumption through usual distribution channels since the imposition of price controls was more than a quarter of a billion pounds below the like period a year ago. Purchases of cattle during this period by the 95 leading beef-producing plants (doing 75 percent of the business) were 62.5 percent below the purchases in the same period of 1950.

2. Farmers are shipping fewer cattle to terminal markets. Since the imposition of price rollback and price controls, farmers have sent 17 percent fewer cattle to these markets. For the week ended August 26, 32 terminal markets received 165,593 head of cattle compared with 203,455 head in the same week a year ago. The Department of Agriculture has this pertinent comment to make, "Consumption of beef in the second half of 1951 is now expected to be less than previously estimated because considerably more cattle are being added to herds." This is the Government propagandist's way of saying that farmers are refusing to market their stock.

3. Meanwhile marketing of beef cattle and beef through other than regular channels has been mushrooming. In the September 1950 issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation, the Department of Agriculture pointed out that "If consumers use somewhat more than half of their deep-freezer and locker space for meat, they will have room for 1,000,000,000 pounds, or about 50 percent more than the meat and meat products in commercial cold-storage houses on July 1, 1950." As practically anyone can determine by simple observation, there is a vastly increased volume of meat that is bypassing meat packers and going directly into frozen-food storage.

In this connection a strange phenomenon has appeared. Although the prices farmers have to pay for feeder stock they buy for

fattening are so high in relation to price ceilings for the finished animals that the feeding profit approaches the vanishing point, the shipment of feeders is running far ahead of a year ago. How many of these feeders are going directly into consumer food lockers and frozen-food storage without fattening?

4. Consumer resistance to beef prices, even at roll-back levels, indicates that if the Government had permitted an unrestricted volume of beef to move into consumption channels, the prices of beef would have dropped substantially without any recourse to roll-back tactics. The Department of Agriculture, in fact, is predicting such a drop in beef prices with any marked increase in marketings this fall. Roll-back prices and controls simply acted to reduce the available beef supply and sustain prices. Even though beef production is running 13 percent under a year ago, the inventories of beef in commercial cold-storage plants on July 1, 1951, were 25 percent above inventories a year ago.

How has the free market adjusted to this situation? With beef prices out of line in relation to comparable foods, consumers have turned to poultry and eggs and other meat substitutes. Egg prices are sustained at unusually high levels even though production has been running at a rate that required immense Government support purchases a couple of years ago. In the poultry business, the commercial production of broilers is running almost double that of 2 years ago. The turkey crop this year is expected to be the largest on record. Pork production and consumption is close to record levels. Pork prices, however, did not follow beef prices to atmospheric heights but are currently close to pre-Korean levels.

In a free market it is more than likely that beef prices would long since have adjusted competitively to the prices of alternative foods. So a chief consequence of the roll-back price controls promulgated by Price Controller DiSalle and his cohorts has been to reduce ruinously the market for beef by encouraging the use of substitutes.

The withering hand of the Government bureaucracy has been laid on one more food industry. Those who doubt or who are not familiar with bureaucracy's blighting touch need only to study the fate of butter, which was a casualty of Government price controls in World War II. Under Government assistance in the form of price supports and promotion of the margarine substitute, the consumption of butter has sunk to new low levels, the lowest in the history of the industry.

Government support of potato prices was discontinued a year ago, at the urgent behest of important potato-producing sections, but not before potato consumption had dropped by 20 percent under price support. Can the glaringly unwarranted measures of an inept administration sabotage another food industry without evoking an outraged protest? How much is homo Americanus 1951 willing to take?

Mine Incentives Payment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new mine incentives payment bill which is a revised ver-

sion of H. R. 2862. Because I believe that the small and strategic miners have not been dealt with properly by the agencies, and the Defense Materials Procurement Agency will not take care of their needs, I have introduced this new legislation. The new bill puts the Mine Incentive Payments Division within DMPA, where it now belongs. Nonproducing prospects of merit are made eligible for the automatic monthly exploration grants. The bill also provides that material may be diverted to industry instead of going into the national security stockpile if the Administrator of DMPA rules there is a critical industrial shortage. It is my belief that the bill will make up for the deficiencies and the shortcomings which have characterized the defense minerals program.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution on William N. Oatis which was adopted by Wausau Aerie, No. 251, of Wausau, Wis., of the Fraternal Order of Eagles on September 11, 1951:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of Government, at which often much "off-the-record" information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Wausau Aerie, No. 251, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also

offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 251, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet new agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 11th day of September 1951. Aerie No. 251, city of Wausau, State of Wisconsin.

CLIFFORD WAGNER,
Worthy President.

Attest:

FRANK J. DEICHSSEL,
Secretary.

Examine the System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr KEATING Mr Speaker, perhaps the present system of selecting candidates for admission to the Military and Naval Academies is the best that can feasibly be devised. Certainly, however, no possible harm and probably much good would come from a careful review of present procedures.

Members of Congress should be the first to insist that any special privileges or powers they have enjoyed should be relinquished if the national interest so dictates. All I ask is that the Committee on Armed Services thoroughly and dispassionately canvass the situation.

Judging from the volume of favorable mail from all over the country which has greeted the introduction of my bill directing a congressional investigation, I am convinced that the American people would welcome and applaud such an inquiry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe Times. The editorial follows:

EXAMINE THE SYSTEM

Much has been said and written about violation of the West Point honor system that led to the wholesale dismissal of cadets. Little has been said how these men got to the Academy in the first place. Along this latter line Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING has come up with a resolution in the House. It would authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an inquiry and make recommendations with regard to any changes which should be made in the manner of selecting and nominating candidates to the Naval and Military Academies. In discussing his proposal, Congressman KEATING said that the greatest contribution Congress can make to the situation created by the West Point scandal is to seek out the causes of dishonesty which has been revealed and try to prevent a repetition.

"No doubt a general lowering in moral standards has been a contributing factor," the Congressman said, continuing: "Without question the young men involved can point to more serious examples of betrayal of trust and disloyalty to country which have either

gone unpunished or with a slap on the wrist. Yet it seems to me a more basic cause may be the reason why widespread cheating exists at the military academy. Perhaps the fault lies, at least in part, with Congress.

"It has long appeared to me highly questionable whether the candidates for nomination to the service academies should be named primarily by Members of Congress. What peculiar qualification does a Senator or Representative have which enables him to select young men who are likely to make the best Army, Navy, or Air Force officers?

"I am not at all sure, however, that a higher caliber of youth in both character and ability would not result from selection through competitive examination or screening by an independent board or otherwise."

As to the present method, Congressman KEATING is not alone in doubting the efficacy of the present system. Many is the citizen—whether in Bethlehem or any part of the Nation—who often asked himself how "so and so ever got into the Academy." The answer is obvious—so and so's people knew somebody who knew the Congressman. Generally Academy nominations go to the lad whose folks have influence with the voters who sent men to Congress. Congressman KEATING may not have a solution, but he has offered some food for real thinking.

Dependency Allotments for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following resolution adopted by the Mississippi Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Whereas many parents of men now on the battle front in Korea are in dire circumstances through no fault of their own, and are in many instances barred from Government aid by the rigid requirements of the Dependency Assistance Act of 1950, which set up the dependency allowances, or the so-called Q allotments, and

Whereas the morale of these men is not helped when they learn that their aged or invalid parents are hard-pressed to pay grocery bills, while other citizens are enjoying the greatest affluence they have ever known; and

Whereas there is no true equality of sacrifice when the parents of a boy now trying to push the Reds from "Heartbreak Ridge" in Korea are denied help from their Government just because the soldier was taken direct from the classroom and sent to the thirty-eightieth parallel, and has no way of proving he contributed at least 50 percent to his parents' support before being loaded on a transport. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the council of administration of the Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars, meeting at Jackson, Miss., on September 30, 1951, That the Congress be called upon to reexamine the requirements of the Dependency Assistance Act of 1950, and if it be found from the experience of the Congressmen and Senators that too many hardships are worked on widowed mothers of servicemen now at the front in Korea, or on the invalid fathers and mothers of other such fighting men, that steps be taken to so amend the law that these worthy people may be taken care of by a Government which is spending untold billions for defense; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Mississippi Senators and Congressmen, and that copies be given the press and radio.

Approved:

DELOS H. BURKS,
Department Adjutant.

Soil Conservation in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Soil Conservation Service, under its capable State conservationist, Marvin F. Schweers, has been doing an effective job in Wisconsin. Mr. Schweers and his district conservationists have never stopped searching for better administrative and functional methods. Then, too, there has been a family feeling among members of the service of Wisconsin, both in their fraternal effort to do a good job and in their attitude toward the farmers and local agencies with which they work.

I have asked this permission to place these remarks herein, Mr. Speaker, in order that I might say a well-deserved word of compliment and insert a letter from my friend Charles Skaife, district conversationist of my home county, in which he enclosed a letter from State Conservationist Schweers.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Waukesha, Wis., October 4, 1951.

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS,
Member, United States Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GLENN: You have on several occasions asked me to keep you posted concerning Soil Conservation Service developments in Wisconsin. Thus far I have never fulfilled your request in this connection. However, I believe you will be interested in the enclosed letter that our mutual friend and my associate, State Conservationist Marvin Schweers, sent to members of soil conservation district governing bodies in the State informing them of the assistance the Service will be making available to their districts during the 1952 fiscal year.

I believe this enclosure pretty well expresses the philosophy of the Service in its sincere desire to serve the farm people of Wisconsin. Furthermore, it points out how we are trying to correlate our responsibilities with PMA through the medium of locally organized and directed soil conservation districts, which we assist.

Looking forward to another pleasant field trip with you following the close of the current session of the Congress, I am,

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES W. SKAIFE,
District Conservationist.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., September 28, 1951.
To: Soil Conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: SCS assistance for 1952 fiscal year.

According to the supplemental memorandum of understanding entered into between

your district and the SCS "the Service will make available the assistance provided for in accordance with schedules to be furnished by the Service to the district . . . on or before July 31." The Agriculture Department appropriation bill was but recently enacted into law and we did not learn of our State allocation until a few weeks ago. Hence, this delay in writing you.

Before listing the types and quantities of assistance to be made available, we want to discuss briefly a few matters we believe will be of interest to you. Some of the information and thoughts will be new to you, some old. Our sincere desire to be of service to you supervisors has resulted in our repeating some references which we believe to be both timely and important.

OUTLOOK FOR STAFFING DISTRICTS

Our State allocation for the 1952 fiscal year is about equal to the amount available last year. Because of an expanded program and increased expenses we will have to spread our manpower somewhat thinner. We are planning to assign farm planners to two soil-conservation districts not previously staffed. Operating expenses, such as rentals, repairs, etc., are advancing. We understand that at least a couple more counties will be created as soil-conservation districts this fall. If so, their governing bodies will be requesting assistance of the Service.

All in all, our present plans call for permanent staffs about as they are today. We will be forced to make a reduction in the employment of part-time help to take care of the added costs and expenses referred to above.

CONSOLIDATION OF OFFICES

We are doing our best to fulfill Secretary of Agriculture's directive No. 1278 to provide one-stop service to farmers. We sincerely hope that it won't be too long until all agricultural agencies are housed together. At least, the consolidation of SCS, PMA, and FMA is a step in the right direction. Furthermore, this alignment should contribute to providing greater assistance to farmers, resulting in the establishment of more practices on the land and increased numbers of soil-conservation district cooperation.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANCE

Through the encouragement of the State PMA Committee, county committees throughout Wisconsin have set aside sufficient 1951 ACP program funds to provide for the employment of about 2,500 man-days of aid assistance. These men will be hired by PMA county committees and will work under the supervision of service personnel primarily on 1951 ACP approved practices.

PMA county committees, with the approval of the State committee, may also assign 5 percent of their program funds to the SCS for technical services. The several types of activities involved under this cooperative program were discussed in detail in our letter acknowledging your 1950 annual report.

Soil-conservation measures, such as strip cropping, may be marked out this fall with the assistance of PMA aids. These, with similar measures, will qualify for 1952 ACP payments.

WORK PLANS FOR 1952

Before long you supervisors, in consultation with representatives of the Extension Service, PMA, Conservation Department, SCS, and others, will be getting together for your annual work-plan development meeting.

At this point we should like to mention that according to memorandum No. 1278 the service has been assigned the technical responsibility for ACP permanent-type practices. Our assignment in this regard consists of—

"(1) a finding by SCS that the permanent-type soil-conservation work contemplated is

needed and practical on the farm; (2) necessary site selection, other preliminary work, and lay-out work of the practices; (3) the necessary supervision of the installation; and (4) certification of performance (or application of the practice to the land)."

To fulfill the above Service obligation, much of which will be carried out on farms of district cooperators, and continue normal soil-conservation district operations, we are taking the liberty of suggesting that you consider having your annual work plan dovetail with the agricultural resources conservation program for your county, which you will have a part in preparing. For your convenience we are quoting a portion of 1.278 having to do with this over-all program:

"Within the State-wide programs formulated by officers of the Department of Agriculture and others . . . the PMA county committee and the local technicians of the Soil Conservation Service shall, working with the governing body of the soil conservation district, jointly formulate and determine the soil-conservation policies and programs by conferences or other means to be initiated by the chairman of the county PMA committee. The county agent for the county and the county supervisor of Farmers Home Administration shall be invited to participate in these deliberations."

The basic objective of the Department is the focal point around which ARC programs are to be developed. You will likely recall this goal being as follows.

"The basic physical objective of soil-conservation activities by Department agencies shall be the use of each acre of agricultural land within its capabilities and the treatment of each acre of agricultural land in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement."

In reviewing the above you will note that its scope and intent is in complete harmony with the objectives of your district.

SCS ASSISTANCE FOR 1952

Unless unforeseen changes are made in our fund situation during this fiscal year, the Service will make available to you the part-time services of the district conservationist and other personnel to the extent indicated:

(The number of personnel per soil conservation district varies directly in proportion to workloads. As an example, the following insert appears in the letter sent to supervisors of the Waukesha County Soil Conservation District:

"One work-unit conservationist (farm planner), full time. The soil scientist assigned to work group office will prepare conservation surveys as needed, part time. Clerical assistance will be provided from work, part time group office."

We have made little, if any, mention of the key to the success of the soil- and water-conservation program, or any agricultural program for that matter. It's the family out there on the land. Everything we plan and do should be aimed at improving its status and result in sound and complete conservation.

In the event you have any questions concerning information contained in this communication please consult your district conservationist.

Extending personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

P. S.—We believe you will be interested in knowing that Wisconsin's accomplishments during the first half of 1951 as compared to the first 6 months of 1950 is second to none in the region. We sincerely thank you, the fine farm families of your district, and all others who collaborated with us in making this record possible.

M. F. S.

Proposed U. N. Code Criticized as Bar to Anti-Red Undergrounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following article taken from the New York Times of September 26, 1951, entitled "Proposed U. N. Code Criticized as Bar to Anti-Red Undergrounds," which was written by Mr. A. M. Rosenthal:

PROPOSED U. N. CODE CRITICIZED AS BAR TO ANTI-RED UNDERGROUNDINGS

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., September 22—Organizations representing Americans of Polish and Lithuanian descent have issued strong warnings that in international legal code to come before the United Nations General Assembly in the fall could "outlaw" western support for anti-Communist underground movements in the Soviet world.

It was revealed today that the Lithuanian-American Council and the Polish-American Congress had filed separate protests against a code drawn up by the International Law Commission setting down offenses against the "peace and security of mankind."

The charges were centered on provisions in the code making it an international offense for authorities of a state to organize, encourage or even tolerate "activities calculated to carry out terrorist acts" or stir up civil war in another country.

Both complaints attacked Vespasian V. Pella, Rumanian Minister to the United States in 1948, and said that he had provided the inspiration for the code. "This in our opinion speaks for itself," said the Lithuanian-American Council.

But Mr. Pella, now living in New York, bitterly denied that the code was meant as a blow at liberation movements. He said it was a reflection of General Assembly resolutions denouncing attempts to stir up civil war, as in the case of Greece.

Mr. Pella said that he was a refugee from Communist Rumania, that he was under sentence of death there and that all his property had been confiscated. Mr. Pella added that he was a member of the Rumanian National Council in Washington that works with the National Committee for a Free Europe.

One legal expert gave it as his opinion that at it stood now the code could outlaw the work of the National Committee for a Free Europe and its Radio Free Europe, which beams anti-Communist programs toward the Soviet world. At the offices of the National Committee, 350 Fifth Avenue, officials had no comment but said they would study the case.

The session of the International Law Commission at which the code was drawn up took place in Geneva this summer. The members of the commission sat as experts in their own right, and as official delegates from their countries, and there were no Iron Curtain experts at the session.

UNITED STATES EXPERT VOTED FOR CODE

Mr. Pella said that the expert from the United States, Prof. Manley Hudson, voted for the code which also denounces aggression as an international crime. The code is on the agenda of the General Assembly session opening in Paris on November 6. Professor Hudson himself declined to comment.

The former Rumanian Minister also said that the code was not based on his opinion but was largely the work of a Greek expert, Prof J Spiropoulos, who served as rapporteur of the International Law Commission.

The protest of the Lithuanian-American Council was sent to Gen. Omar L. Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It asked that the governments and groups concerned be allowed to express their opinion on the case "from the point of view of military security in general and in particular in connection with the peculiar situation in the strategic Baltic area."

The Polish-American Congress sent its complaint to members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The letter said: "Any liberation movement or activities within the nations captured by the Soviet Union will fall within the definition of civil strife or creating a state of terror."

The protests were similar in some respects, and both included an attack against the code as weakening the International Convention on Genocide. The charge was that the inclusion of the crime of genocide in the "controversial and highly political" code was a deliberate Soviet effort to create confusion regarding the convention itself.

Judges as Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the El Paso (Tex.) Times. The editorial follows:

JUDGES AS WITNESSES

Justices of the United States Supreme Court would be barred from testifying as character witnesses or on matters of opinion under a bill soon to be considered by the House Judiciary Committee and endorsed on July 9 by a subcommittee.

Representative KEATING, Republican, New York, who introduced the bill, has declared that he was motivated by the appearances of Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses for Alger Hiss (in his first trial).

Justice Reed has been subpoenaed by the Hiss defense. Justice Frankfurter was a volunteer witness. Chief Judge Magruder, of the United States Court of Appeals in the First District, was also a character witness for Hiss.

An alternative bill, introduced by Representative SMITH, Republican, Wisconsin, would provide simply that no Federal judge could be compelled to testify as to character or to appear as a witness if similar testimony could be obtained from other witnesses.

Representative KEATING points to the possibility of some smart lawyer subpoenaing most or all members of the Supreme Court as witnesses in a lower court trial. Then the Court would be unable to pass on an appeal in the case. Reed and Frankfurter both disqualified themselves in the Hiss appeal.

An earlier case, of 1905, has been unearthed in which two Supreme Court justices appeared on the list of witnesses. There is no indication that they were actually called to the witness stand.

Prior to making its favorable report on the Keating bill, the House subcommittee had received a letter from Chief Justice Vinson, declining comment on the measure. Vin-

son said he and other justices felt that they should not go on record. Deputy Attorney General Ford had advised the subcommittee that the Justice Department also preferred to make no recommendation.

The Keating bill ought to be made into law.

Justices of the United States Supreme Court never should be called upon to testify as character witnesses. Their task is to interpret the law, to uphold the Constitution, and endeavor to see that justice is done in cases that come before them. They should never be called upon to play any other role.

Bibliography on World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion's National

Americanism Commission has done an excellent job in compiling a list of books and periodicals which provide detailed background material on all phases of world communism. Every American should read at least a few of these books to firmly convince himself of the true horrors of communism and in order to better understand the Communist methods of seizing power.

I include herewith this list which has been compiled by the American Legion. Anyone who desires copies of this list can obtain them by writing to American Legion National Headquarters, National Americanism Commission, Indianapolis, Indiana.

RECOMMENDED BOOK LIST, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, THE AMERICAN LEGION, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SEPTEMBER 7, 1951

The following 10 titles are recommended by the research staff as elementary or basic reading for those who know little or nothing about the whole complex problem of world communism in all its aspects and the threat it presents to America today. These titles should be in every library:

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
11 Years in Soviet Prison Camps.....	Elnor Lippert	Henry Regnery Co.....	\$3.50
I Chose Freedom.....	Victor Kravchenko	Scribners.....	1.49
1984.....	George Orwell	Signet Book Co.....	.35
Out of the Night.....	Jan Valtin	Alliance.....	3.50
Red Masquerade.....	Angela Calomiris	Lippincott.....	3.00
Seeds of Treason.....	Lasky and Toledano	Funk & Wagnalls.....	3.50
Soviet Spies.....	Colonel Hirsch	Duell, Sloan, Pearce.....	1.00
The Front Is Everywhere.....	Colonel Kintner	University of Oklahoma Press.....	3.00
Total Empire.....	Rev. E. A. Walsh	Bruce Publishing Co.....	3.50
Whole of Their Lives.....	Gillow	Scribners.....	3.50

The following books are recommended for those seeking more advanced knowledge or specialized information, i. e., Life Behind the Iron Curtain, Soviet Foreign Policy, International Communism, Soviet Espionage, Infiltration, and Propaganda Techniques, Front Organizations, etc.

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
Blueprint for World Conquest.....	William H. Chamberlin	Henry Regnery.....	\$3.50
Case of Comrade Tulayev.....	Victor Serge	Doubleday.....	3.00
Comes the Comrade.....	Orme	Morrow, N. Y.....	4.00
Communism, Its Plans and Tactics.....	U. S. Library of Congress	Infantry Journal.....	2.00
Communist Party in Action.....	Rossi	Yale University Press.....	4.00
Communist Trail in America.....	Spolunsky	MacMillan.....	3.50
Forced Labor in the Soviet Union.....	Dallin and Nicholayevsky	Yale University Press.....	3.75
Handbook for Spies.....	Foot	Doubleday.....	3.00
I Believed.....	Douglas Hyde	Putnam.....	3.50
I Chose Justice.....	Victor Kravchenko	Scribners.....	3.75
Invitation to Moscow.....	Stypulowski	Thames & Hudson, New York, N. Y.....	3.50
I Spied for Stalin.....	Nora Murray	Wilfred Funk.....	2.00
Lenin.....	Boris Shub	Doubleday.....	5.00
Lost Illusion.....	Freda Utley	Fireside Press.....	3.00
My Retreat From Russia.....	Vladimir Petrov	Yale University Press.....	1.00
Men Without Faces.....	Louis Budenz	Harper Bros.....	3.00
Neither Three Nor Five.....	Helen MacInnes	Harcourt Brace.....	3.00
New Soviet Empire.....	David Dallin	Yale University Press.....	3.75
Pattern for World Revolution.....	Yostlin	Ziff Davis.....	3.50
Power in the People.....	Felix Morley	Van Nostrand.....	3.50
Red Prussian.....	Schwartzchild	Scribners.....	4.00
Russian Purge and Extraction of Confession.....	Beck and Godin	Viking Press.....	3.50
Slave Labor in Russia.....	American Federation of Labor		3.00
Soviet Gold.....	Vladimir Petrov	Farrar and Strauss.....	4.00
Theory and Practice of Communism.....	C. Jew Hunt	MacMillan.....	3.00
Truth Will Out.....	Charlotte Haldane	Vanguard.....	3.50
Under Two Dictators.....	Margaret Buber Neuman	Dodd, Mead.....	4.00
Verdict of Three Decades.....	Steinberg	Duell, Sloan, Pearce.....	5.00
Voyage No. 39.....	Christensen	Vantage Press.....	3.00

All the above titles can be secured directly from the American Legion Book Service, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following titles represent the "cream" of the more worth-while and important books published in recent years. Libraries, whether

in colleges or the larger cities, making any claims of having fairly complete collections of books on Soviet Russia, international communism, and related fields should have at least 50 percent of these titles on their shelves to justify such claims. A few of the following titles are out of print and are so indicated:

International communism and related subjects

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
China Story.....	Freda Uteley.....	Henry Regnery.....	\$3.50
The Choice.....	Boris Shub.....	Duell, Sloan, Pearce.....	2.75
Coming Defeat of Communism.....	James Burnham.....	John Day.....	3.50
Czechoslovakia Betrayed.....	Ripka.....	MacMillan.....	3.50
Defeat in Victory.....	Jan Ciechanowski.....	Doubleday.....	3.50
Foundations of Leninism.....	Stalin.....	International Publishers.....	2.75
Great Globe Itself.....	William C. Bullitt.....	Scribners.....	3.00
Half Slave, Half Free.....	Abend.....	Bobbs-Merrill.....	3.00
History of Bolshevism (out of print).....	Rosenberg.....	Oxford University Press.....	1.00
History of Communist Party, Soviet Union.....	International Publishers.....	10.00
History of the Russian Revolution.....	William H. Chamberlin.....	MacMillan.....	5.00
International Relations.....	Strauss Hupe and Fossony.....	Duell, Sloan, Pearce.....	3.50
I Saw Poland Betrayed.....	Arthur Bliss Lane.....	Bobbs-Merrill.....	5.00
Last Chance in China.....	Freda Uteley.....	do.....	3.50
Lenin.....	Boris Shub.....	Doubleday.....	3.50
My Three Years in Moscow.....	General Smith.....	Lippincotts.....	3.50
The Real Soviet Russia.....	David Dallin.....	Yale University Press.....	5.00
Rise of Russia in Asia.....	do.....	do.....	5.00
The Russian Enigma.....	William H. Chamberlin.....	Scribners.....	5.00
Soviet Russia and the Far East.....	David Dallin.....	Yale University Press.....	10.00
Soviets in World Affairs.....	Fischer.....	Princeton University Press.....	3.75
Soviet Slave Empire.....	Heinrich.....	Wilfred Funk.....	Longmans Green.....
Stalin (out of print).....	Souvarine.....	Longmans Green.....	Harvard University Press.....
Stalin and German Communism.....	Ruth Fischer.....	Harvard University Press.....	Howell Soskin.....
Stalin's Kampf.....	Werner.....	Howell Soskin.....	International Publishers.....
State and Revolution.....	Lenin.....	International Publishers.....	John Day.....
Struggle for the World.....	James Burnham.....	John Day.....	Dial Press.....
Three Who Made a Revolution.....	Wolfe.....	Dial Press.....	Doubleday.....
Total Power.....	Rev. E. A. Walsh.....	Doubleday.....	Duttons.....
The Vatican and the Kremlin.....	Clanfarra.....	Duttons.....	W. W. Norton.....
World Communism (out of print).....	Borkenau.....	W. W. Norton.....	McGraw Hill.....
World Communism Today.....	Ebon.....	McGraw Hill.....	4.50

Soviet espionage

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
Stalin's Secret Service (out of print).....	Krivitsky.....	Harper Bros.....	\$3.50
Report of Canadian Royal Commission.....	King's Printer.....	Ottawa, Ontario.....	1.00
Smeersh.....	Sinevsky.....	Henry Holt.....	2.75
Out of Bondage.....	Bentley.....	Devin-Adair.....	3.50

Life in Soviet Russia and slave labor camps

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
Backstairs Mission to Moscow.....	Gilbert.....	Bookfab.....
Country of the Blind.....	Counts and Lodge.....	Houghton Mifflin.....	\$3.50
Dark Side of the Moon.....	Anonymous.....	Scribners.....	2.75
The Great Retreat.....	Timasheff.....	Dutton.....	5.00
If You Were Born in Russia.....	Goodfriend.....	Farrar-Stans.....	5.00
I'll Never Go Back.....	Kornakov.....	Dutton.....	3.00
I Speak for the Silent (out of print).....	Tchernavin.....	Hale-Cushman-Filnt.....
(reading this book caused Whitaker Chambers' break with communism).....
The Iron Curtain.....	Gouzenko.....	Dutton.....	3.75
I Was a Soviet Worker.....	Andrew Smith.....	do.....	2.00
Land of Milk and Honey.....	W. L. White.....	Harcourt Brace.....	3.00
Life in the Soviet Union.....	Paul Ward.....	Baltimore Sun.....
My Life in the Red Army.....	Vorski.....	MacMillan.....	3.50
One Who Survived.....	Alexander Batimline.....	Putnam.....	3.75
Red Army Today.....	Ely.....	Military Service Publishing Co.....	3.50
Report on the Russians.....	W. L. White.....	Harcourt Brace.....
Russia Twenty Years After.....	Serge.....	Hillman Curl.....
Tell the West.....	Glikman.....	Gresham.....	3.75
This is Russia Uncensored (out of print).....	Stevens.....	Didler.....	2.75
Why They Behave Like Russians.....	Fischer.....	Harper Bros.....	2.75
The Workers Before and After Lenin.....	Manya Gordon.....	Dutton.....

Communism in America—Communist Party Fronts, etc.

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
American Communism.....	Oneal and Werner.....	Dutton.....	\$5.00
I Confess (out of print).....	Gilow.....	do.....	3.75
Proletarian Journey (out of print).....	Beal.....	Hillman Curl.....	2.75
Red Decade (out of print).....	Eugene Lyons.....	Bobbs-Merrill.....
Red Fascism.....	Senator Tenney.....	Federal Printing Co.....	8.75
This Is My Story.....	Louis Budenz.....	McGraw Hill.....	3.00
Trojan Horse in America (out of print).....	Marlin Dies.....	Dodd Mead.....

Fiction, satire, autobiography, and miscellaneous

Title	Author	Publisher	Price
Animal Farm.....	George Orwell.....	Harcourt Brace.....
Darkness at Noon.....	Koestler.....	MacMillan.....	\$2.00
The God That Failed.....	Crossman.....	Harper.....
Leap to Freedom.....	Kasenkina.....	Lippincotts.....	3.00
Murder in Mexico (assassination of Trotsky).....	General Salazar.....	Secker & Warburg.....	(?)
My Life as a Rebel (out of print).....	Angelica Balabanoff.....	Harper.....
Yogi and the Commissar.....	Koestler.....	MacMillan.....

1 10 shillings.

NEWS LETTERS AND PERIODICALS

Alert (weekly), 127 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif., \$10 a year.

The Challenge (bulletin of the Association of Former Political Prisoners of Soviet Slave Labor Camps), 112 West Seventy-second Street, New York 23, N. Y., \$3 a year.

Counteraction (monthly), P. O. Box 101, Indianapolis, Ind., \$2 a year.

Counterattack (weekly), 55 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., \$24 a year.

East Europe and Soviet Russia (weekly), 16 Chester Row, London, S. W. I., \$8 a year.

For God and Freedom, The Christianform, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., free.

The Freeman (Fortnightly), 240 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., \$5 a year.

Human Events (weekly), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., \$10 a year.

Intelligence Digest, 7023 Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., \$10 a year.

National Republic (monthly), 511 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., \$2 a year.

National Republic Lettergram (weekly) includes magazine, \$10 a year.

New Leader (weekly), 7 East Fifteenth Street, New York, N. Y., \$3 a year.

Newsletter From Behind the Iron Curtain (weekly), Lithuanian Information Service, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y., \$10 a year.

Summary of Trends and Developments, Americanism Division, the American Legion, National Headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind. (Monthly subscription limited to Legionnaires and law-enforcement officers), \$3 a year.

The hearings and reports of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Washington, D. C., are available free of charge from the committee or through your Congressman upon request. Ask to be placed on their free mailing list for all publications.

PAMPHLETS AND BOOKLETS

Communism in Action, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 30 cents a copy.

Communist Party as the Agent of a Foreign Power, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 15 cents a copy.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 25 cents a copy.

Program for Community Anti-Communist Action, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., 50 cents a copy. This pamphlet contains bibliographies of other anti-Communist books, pamphlets, and periodicals.

Communist Trade Union Trickery Exposed, Argus, P. O. Box 174, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C., \$1 a copy.

Communist Invasion of Agriculture (Senator BRIDGES speech), Argus, post office box 174, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C., 25 cents a copy.

Secrets of the Communist Party Exposed (Peters' C. P. Manual of Organization), Argus, post office box 174, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C., \$1 a copy.

Soviet Russia and the Jews, American Jewish League Against Communism, 220 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., 50 cents a copy.

Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, Americanism Division, The American Legion, National Headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind., 20 cents a copy, 25 or more, 15 cents each.

Argus Advisory Associates, post office box 174, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C., specializes in searching for and supplying out-of-print and hard-to-find books, pamphlets, and Government reports and hearings on communism.

Ireland's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a recent news item appearing in the columns of the esteemed Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item on Tuesday, October 2

The material follows:

IRELAND'S FRIEND—BOSTON AMERICAN EDITORIALY LAUDS CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN

Monday night's edition of the Boston American carried the following leading editorial, under the caption, "Ireland's friend":

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, an outstanding member of the New England congressional delegation, did not receive the right kind of support last week when he called for a square deal for Ireland.

The vote against the gesture of good will to the Irish people was 206 to 186, with many Congressmen making remarks which would be more proper in the British Parliament than in the Capitol at Washington.

Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK, the majority leader, brought out this fact when he backed Congressman PHILBIN and said:

"I am disgusted when I hear some of the arguments made against Irish unity. Some Members of Congress ignore the history of our country. They have forgotten that since the infant days of our Constitution one of the basic policies of our country has been the right of all nations, large and small—particularly the small ones because they need an expression of this policy—to determine their own future. The House has passed similar resolutions many times before. Yet Members take the floor and deny it in the case of Ireland. Why? That is an interesting question. Why?"

Despite the opposition which Congressman McCORMACK condemned, Congressman PHILBIN made a plea for justice for Ireland which will long remain among the noblest records of Congress.

He said:

"I can see no valid reason why our Government which has shown so much tender solicitude for other nations seeking to unite and liberate their people should not promptly and vigorously move in behalf of the Irish Nation.

"In fact, there are most abundant and eloquent reasons why it should do so.

"Our own great country is much indebted to Ireland and the Irish people. Men of Irish blood have been in the vanguard of every American war. History is replete with their deeds of valor, their sacrifices for America, their distinguished service.

"Our civil and religious life, our educational and political systems, our marts of trade and commerce, our sanctuaries of art, literature, and law, all our great cultural institutions have drawn liberally upon the blood and upon the brains of our Irish citizens whose loyalty to God, to America, and to the cause of freedom has been and will be an ever-shining light and an invincible shield of inspiration for those who would know the ways of good citizenship and how best to preserve the blessed heritage of America.

"Our Government should have no hesitancy in calling upon the British government at an early date to take action long overdue in behalf of and for the relief of the oppressed Irish nation and to repeal the Ireland

Act of 1949 and the infamous Partition Act of 1920.

"Such a move by the British Government at this time would do more to bring unity, enthusiasm and the spirit of militancy into the defense of the free world and democratic institutions than all the Marshall plans that could be devised."

Congressman PHILBIN might have gone even further and reminded the House of Representatives that it is inconsistent for it to favor a war in Asia to unite North and South Korea while it refuses even to vote for the unification of Ireland.

The Reds Could Entrap Us at Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following editorial taken from the national Catholic Weekly Review America, volume 86, No. 1, of October 6, 1951, entitled "The Reds Could Entrap Us at Paris".

THE REDS COULD ENTRAP US AT PARIS

Just a year ago we expressed our concern over a draft code of "Offenses against the peace and security of mankind" prepared but kept "restricted" by the U. N. International Law Commission. How large, we asked, was the part played by Communists and Communist sympathizers in its drafting? We inquired because, 2 years previously, the Soviets had tried to have the crime of genocide in just such a code, instead of in a separate convention. If they had succeeded, they would not have been liable under the code for their own patented form of genocide, which they perpetrate in times of "peace." But they failed (America, November 4, 1950, p. 126), and on December 9, 1948, the U. N. Assembly adopted a separate Genocide Convention at Paris. It has since been ratified by 32 nations, but not by the United States.

Meanwhile, 12 members of the International Law Commission completed the final draft of their code of offenses. Remarkably enough, though no iron-curtain experts participated, the crime of genocide is included in the code. It deals, besides, with such touchy matters as incitement to war, preparations for war, arms, military training, location of armed forces, and fortifications. The document has already been placed on the agenda of the U. N. Assembly, which begins November 6 at Paris.

Normally, such legal drafts are submitted to member governments for 1 year of study. This has not been done in the case of the completed code. Why this reluctance to let the governments study the code before submission to the Assembly?

The Lithuanian-American Council and the Polish-American Congress think they have one answer. They charge that section 5 of article 1 was deliberately designed to outlaw their efforts to assist the Lithuanian and Polish undergrounds. They likewise charge that Vespasian V. Pella, mysterious envoy of Rumania's notorious Anna Pauker, inspired this section.

A. M. Rosenthal, for the New York Times, and Peter Kihss, for the Herald Tribune, interviewed Mr. Pella September 21 about his part in drafting the questionable code. Mr. Pella bitterly denied that the code was meant as a blow at liberation movements.

He also declared that the code was not based on his opinions but was largely the work of a Greek expert, Prof. J. Spiropoulos.

Let us see. Section 5 of the completed code outlaws:

"The undertaking or encouragement, by the authorities of a state, of terrorist activities in another state, or the toleration by the authorities of a state, of organized activities calculated to carry out terrorist acts in another state."

The Lithuanian-Americans and the Polish-Americans proudly admit their guilt under this section, and claim that if the code were adopted, the United States could be found guilty of tolerating their activities.

What of Mr. Pella's assertion that the code was "not based on his opinions"? On November 24, 1950 the U. N. published a 216-page basic memorandum on this code by Vespasian V. Pella, No. 122, page 157, reads:

"Acts of terrorism affecting international relations. Under the code it should be a punishable act to incite, encourage, or tolerate activities designed to spread terror among the population in the territory of another state."

The give-way is the presence in both drafts of the key word "tolerate." Why such modesty, Mr. Pella?

The Lithuanian-Americans and the Polish-Americans demand that the draft code be taken off the agenda of the Paris Assembly in order to give the United States and its allies time to study its provisions, which, they claim, touch upon many phases of Western security. That study may even reveal that, except for the section on genocide, the code remarkably resembles a legal formulation of Vishinsky's famous speech against war mongering delivered at the U. N. Assembly on September 18, 1947.

President Ingersoll's Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Greenville (Miss.) Democrat-Times:

PRESIDENT INGERSOLL'S RESIGNATION

Exactly what does the Government want? When buyers try to buy the Federal Barge Lines, the sale always falls through. When the Congress is asked for money to properly equip the line, it is refused.

Some months ago President A. C. Ingersoll, Jr., and his staff on the Inland Waterways Corporation offered to buy the line at a price to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Here are the men best able to conduct the business of the line. They have been working with the river for years and their administration of the Federal Barge Lines has brought the line from deep in the red to a small profit. If there was anyone the Government would agree to sell the line to, here was certainly the group.

But the Department of Commerce turned down this offer.

Now, Captain Ingersoll has resigned from the presidency of the Inland Waterways. The Federal Barge Line which it administers is not to be permitted to give service, either through Government ownership or through private service. The river traffic seems doomed to inadequate handling though the Government and people have put the waterways into good condition.

Is there no way free enterprise can be permitted to use the facilities the Congress has provided? Who's putting the hitch in the way? And why?

Those are questions the river people have a right to have answered. And President Ingersoll's resignation may crystallize some action that will mean increased use of the waterways. But in the meantime, let's hope that Captain Ingersoll has not resigned his interest in the subject along with the presidency. We need able leadership.

Cattlemen's Views on Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, Glenn Martz, United Press radio farm editor in Washington, comes from the Middle West. He knows the problems cattlemen have faced and conquered through the years. His daily program, *On the Farm Front*, is prepared for some 29,000,000 listeners. The program for Wednesday, October 10, presents a clear, concise picture of the cattlemen's views on controls. I include it as part of my remarks:

Mike DiSalle has denied rumors he might give up his fight to control meat prices.

His statement was made to reporters after a group of western cattlemen stormed into his office to reiterate they have never asked for Government help in times of economic stress and they are not going to submit passively to Government controls now.

Little did Government price fixers realize that when they locked horns with beef producers over high prices they were going into a knock-down, drag-out battle with one of the most independent—and courageous—segments of American agriculture.

The cattlemen—ever since the buffaloes were driven from the range to make room for beef—have alone and unaided fought everything from Indians to disastrous drought to supply the Nation with meat.

They've driven lean, hungry herds to market when prices were way below cost of production. They've argued with bankers to stave off foreclosures when times were rough. And with the indomitable spirit of the pioneer they've rebuilt foundation herds after each successive setback, clinging to the hope that some day they'd bask in economic sunlight.

Now that they've attained a favored place in the national economy, they resent being called price gougers.

Everybody—including the cattlemen—will admit beef prices are now too high in relation to the prices of other food commodities. And cattlemen don't deny they're making more money today than they ever have before.

But they point out that high prices aren't the result of any conniving on their part. It's just a combination of economic circumstances over which they have no control. A situation whereby consumers, with more money in their pockets than they ever had before, are bidding for short beef supplies and thus are forcing prices up.

In their battle to keep free of Government control, the beef producers remind the price fixers that Government didn't offer to bolster prices back in the early thirties when they were selling meat for American dinner tables at below cost of production prices. By pulling in their belts they weathered

that economic storm without Government assistance. Why, then, they ask, should the Government be so concerned when the "price shoe" pinches the consumer's foot?

Back in those days, you'll recall, literally thousands of head of cattle were seized by the Government for \$10 or \$15 a head, driven to slaughter pits, shot under Government supervision, and buried because there wasn't enough feed available to keep them alive.

These Federal boneyards are still dotted with bleached skulls—a grim reminder of a financial catastrophe which took cattlemen years to overcome.

The history of the cattle industry is replete with economic disasters. Some of the Nation's brainiest men—men with plenty of money—went broke trying to buck repeated droughts and low prices.

The late Theodore Roosevelt—before he became President—tried to build a fortune for himself in the cattle business on the North Dakota West River range. Thousands of head of cattle, bearing the famous Maltese cross brand, once grazed on the Roosevelt spread in the Little Badlands. But the financial returns were lean, and Roosevelt gave it up as a bad venture.

The dashing Marquis de Mores—that intrepid little Frenchman who went West in the early eighties heeled with \$1,000,000 in cold cash to start a cattle empire—4 years later found his fortune melted away. A 20-room chateau on the bluffs overlooking the Little Missouri River near Medora, N. Dak.—and the crumbling walls of a huge slaughterhouse in the valley below—are all that's left of his dreams.

Yes, the cattlemen haven't always had it rosy. They've trailed their herds over seared ranges in search of grass and water all the way from the Texas Panhandle to the Canadian line. They've battled rustlers and drought, blizzards and bankers, heartaches and hard times to get where they are now.

No wonder Mike DiSalle's finding they're a tough bunch to deal with.

Regardless of whether they're right or wrong in their contention that the Government has no business meddling in their affairs, that's their conviction. It's a spirit of independence born in the days of the Old West and nurtured through the years by men who have always believed in the principle of free enterprise and a sky's-the-limit philosophy.

They compare their fight to a game of stud poker—the best hand should win. Now that they hold a royal flush they believe they ought to have the right to rake in the winnings.

Right or wrong—that's their belief. And it's doubtful whether Mike DiSalle's Price Stabilization Agency can ever make them see it any other way.

With both sides bowing their necks, it looks as if the big battle over beef has barely begun.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the *New York Times* of Sunday, October 7, 1951, concerning Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who gave his life magnificently aiding our fight for independence nearly two centuries ago.

The views expressed in this editorial are most appropriate today in honoring this great Polish fighter for freedom because his native land is now under the control and domination of the Red Soviet tyrants. It is to be hoped that a free Poland will once again join with the other free nations of the world in the not distant future.

The Times editorial follows:

PULASKI DAY

Pulaski Day has its sadness for Poles and Americans of Polish descent who turn out today to commemorate it. Poland was not free when Count Pulaski fell at Savannah in defense of American liberties and it is not free now. The Polish leader who defended Warsaw in 1944, General Bor-Komorowski, is today a welcome visitor in New York City but he could not return to Warsaw without risk of imprisonment and death.

Liberated from the Germans, Poland has fallen into the hands of the Communists. Whether or not it is formally incorporated into the new Russian empire makes little difference. Its people cannot raise their voices for Polish interests, nor act as Polish patriots, nor openly cherish what is good and noble in Polish traditions.

But the Poles have survived partitions, conquests, and suppressions over the course of many centuries. Today we do not worship political nationalism as uncritically as we used to. A liberated Poland may some day be, not fiercely independent, but part of a voluntary federation in a free Europe. But the Polish character, personality and culture will survive. Today we do them honor.

In Ironing Out All Inequities, a Completely New Air Force Is at This Very Moment Being Developed for Congressional Action and Approval in February.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess taken by the House, the fifth annual national convention and reunion of the Air Force Association was held in Los Angeles, Calif. It was not my privilege and pleasure to have been in attendance at that gathering inasmuch as my presence was precluded by the pressure of official business.

I have, however, received a copy of a speech made by the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, currently charged with the formulation and establishment of a long-range program which will provide for the organization, operation, administration, maintenance, and training of the Reserve components and Air National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, the future of this Nation will be made more secure by the establishment of this long-range program for Air Force Reserves. The country itself is fortunate in having Secretary Finletter designate the Honorable Eugene Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air

Force, as the man to iron out the many disappointments—the contradictions—and, I might add, the difficulties—that seemingly have developed in handling the National Guard as well as the Active and Inactive Reserves in the armed services of the Nation since the beginning of the Korean conflict.

In discussing this and other similar difficult and tedious matters handled by Eugene M. Zuckert, the Honorable Leo E. Allen, ranking Republican member of the powerful Rules Committee of the House, in extending his remarks in the *RECORD* as of March 12, declared:

There might be other men in public life who elected to undergo such training and follow such a career, but there is none who has made a greater sacrifice of his personal time and fortune in order to translate his learning into action programs that looked to the eventual introduction into Government of the same high standards of business administration that characterize our multibillion-dollar corporations.

Mr. Speaker, with a background of a great many years in the Reserves, I think the plan brought forth by the Smith committee for our Air Force—and as disclosed by Mr. Zuckert—meets requirements that the Special Subcommittee on Civilian Components might expect. It is a constructive measure, and though submitted to this Congress late rather than early, the Air Force program laid out by the committee—headed by Brig. Gen. Robert J. Smith—gives evidence that great study, ascertainment, deliberation, and ability have been directed to the equitable solution of this vexatious question.

Mr. Speaker, no expression of mine with regard to Mr. Zuckert's speech and the over-all question of the treatment which has been accorded civilian components of our armed services would be complete were I not to say that the country found itself militarily in a "tight" insofar as personnel was concerned at the outbreak of the Korean war.

We entered the war in Korea to stop aggression. Who knows but that if we had not entered at the time we did that half of the civilized world would not have been wiped out by atomic bombs dropped by the democratic forces in world-wide global conflict against the forces of communistic aggression.

I note the frankness with which Mr. Zuckert points out that 78 percent of all officers on active duty during these difficult days are reservists, and suggests that "the backbone of the Air Force aptly describes the men who stood so firmly behind the Air Force in the post-War II years."

I can imagine no document that could be more expressive of the great accomplishments made in Korea by the Reserves than was the talk made by Eugene Zuckert before the recent national convention and reunion of the Air Force Association. But more important still is the response by those in the Air Force that were mandated by the Armed Services Committee to bring up a Reserve program that is equitable to all types and classes of civilian components not alone with respect to compensation, tenure of service, grades, and promotions, but with

respect to their contributions to the peace and security of the Nation as contrasted with the contributions made by those of the regular Air Force insofar as compensations, promotions, and other material benefits are concerned.

The splendid work which the Smith committee has rendered in this matter is to be commended. At least we on the Special Subcommittee on Civilian Components of the House Armed Services Committee now have the format of a program highly suited to the objectives indicated, and deemed requisite by the findings disclosed in the first interim report.

As I have heretofore stated here on the floor, I believe basically, fundamentally, sincerely, and honestly that the type of defense most needed for the United States of America is a strong, efficient, consolidated, well-equipped, and well-trained standing army of a small or reasonable size dependent on the international conditions, and, backing that up, as it were, should be a well-trained, well-equipped, and well-organized economic and efficiently handled Reserve program. Until we have such a program, we face the possibility that the country will go too far in the military line. The way to obviate that difficulty and keep this Republic safe and sound, civilianwise, is to have that type of a highly integrated defense congressionally established as a long-time program.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has taken care of most of the needs of all Reserve Components. We have taken care of their pay situation; we have taken care of their retirement provisions and of their equipment needs. We have taken care of their armories. Insofar as the Civilian Components of the Air Force is concerned, every other desired feature is taken care of in the program submitted by the Air Force.

In pointing out this fact, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, in his talk to the Reserve Association, declares.

The organization, administration, training, and supply of Air Force reservists * * * shall be completely integrated with the organization, administration, training, and supply of the Regular Establishment under the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff and * * * that the Secretary of the Air Force * * * and the Chief of Staff shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Reserve forces as they do to the active establishment. This is an order, and it is, indeed, a big one.

Mr. Zuckert reports that the plan is designed to mesh into the existent 1952 program "without noticeable jar," and will definitely provide a far greater unity between Regulars and Reserves. This altogether desirable feature will do much to insure better handling of both the services and the facilities for all Reserve activities.

Furthermore, it provides for the expansion and contraction of Reserve programs in response to world tensions, including a long-range Air Force plan for the Reserve forces with a special provision that reservists will receive exactly the same treatment and support as regulars in time of peace and in time of war.

Above all, the Air Force has evolved and presented a plan and program which they themselves are satisfied they can make work—a plan which gives the entire Air Force a good, sound incentive to support.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that is good about many things which have to do with the future relations of the Air Force toward its civilian components in all branches of that service—as disclosed in Mr. Zuckert's statement—that I am asking the unanimous consent of my colleagues to incorporate into the *RECORD* of this day's proceedings his speech before the fifth annual national convention and reunion of the Air Force Association.

That speech is as follows:

Mr. President, members of the Air Force Association, and guests, I am naturally more than pleased to be able to address a group so vitally interested in the United States Air Force and the whole vast realm of air power.

I am especially happy because most of you are reservists and I have come here today to tell you about the Air Force's new plan for its Reserve Forces.

During the past few years the reservist program has had its up and downs. It was up, for which we can all be thankful, when the Korean crisis came, and 120,000 reservists returned to active duty to bolster our strength in the air. But it had been down in 1949 when our good friend Harold Stuart took over as Assistant Secretary with special responsibility for the Reserve Forces. He built it up with the tools at hand—and then had to stand by and watch it torn down as the cream of its strength was drawn off to fight a war.

Hal Stuart, himself a reservist, brought with him a real understanding of the reservists' problems—and made those problems felt throughout the Air Force. He was a vigorous proponent of the Reserve program, and he made his office an effective mechanism for hearing, and acting on, reservists' grievances—the reservist, believe me, never had a better friend in Washington.

I personally think that Hal Stuart did one of the outstanding jobs in Air Force history by whipping together a going Reserve organization.

When Hal Stuart resigned, Secretary of the Air Force Finletter gave my office the responsibility for the welfare, organization, and training of the Reserve Forces. The job looked staggering, but when we took a good look at the situation we realized that we had a splendid opportunity to revise the entire Reserve structure and program. The needs of the war in Korea had moved so many reservists into active service that we were able to start with virtually a clean slate.

We went to work with one big idea fixed firmly in our minds. This was to keep the welfare, the advancement, and the status of the reservist constantly before us—not just for the sake of the country and the reservist himself, but to gain the support of his family and his employer.

Today I want to give you a report on the past 4 months' work that we have done on the Air Reserve forces. I'm bringing you today the details of a long-range plan for the Air Reserve forces, approved by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff.

It is a long-range plan that extends through 1958 and, we believe, puts teeth in the entire Reserve program. It establishes realistic missions, it places responsibility for making the program work directly on the shoulders of the Air Staff and the major command; it will tell the reservist and his family and employer exactly what his status is; and it will blanket the entire country.

But don't expect miracles—as I said, it is a long-range plan, and we don't intend to go off half-cocked and try to put everything into effect overnight. We now have a plan, and we're going to follow it in planned sequence.

Its success is going to be dependent on two factors:

First, the effectiveness of the integration of the organization, administration, training, and supply of the Reserve forces with those of the Regular Air Force Establishment.

Second, the effectiveness of the parallel Air Force public-relations program which can bring about public understanding of the need for participation in Reserve activities.

Obviously, the first thing we had to do when we were given responsibility for the Reserve forces was to take a good look at these forces in the light of the present difficult world situation and the tremendous commitments this Nation has accepted, commitments which extend far into the hazardous future. We knew that any Reserve force to be effective, must be regarded from the standpoint of its role as a military necessity.

This Nation has assumed world leadership in the cause of peace—and assumed all the penalties that go along with such leadership. Among the greatest of these penalties is that we must provide a major part of the police force necessary to discourage war. We are bound, not only for our sake but for the sake of friends the world over, to do everything to defend the position we have assumed.

To do this we need abundant military strength—and to keep this military strength at the peak of its power we vitally need that extra stock of strength maintained in the Air Reserve forces. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, expressed this need graphically when she told the Brooks Subcommittee on Reserve Forces:

"The Armed Forces Reserve bill and the Universal Military Training and Service Act are twin foundation stones in a sound structure of national security for our country. . . . The Armed Forces Reserve Act is intended to assure that the flow of trained men will be organized in a way that will give this country an insuperable fighting force when it is needed."

The accomplishments of reservists and Reserve units during the past year's conflict—and when I say "reservists" I mean members of both the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard—have shown vividly that such reliance on our Reserve forces is amply justified. When you consider that the latest figures show that 78 percent of all officers on active duty during these difficult days are reservists, I think you will agree that the phrase "backbone of the Air Force" is an apt one to describe the men who stood so firmly behind the Air Force in the post-World War II years.

And when you look at the record of the feats accomplished by reservists and Reserve units in Korea, you can only say, "Thank God for the Air Reserve." Flying fighters and bombers, huge transports and little Mosquito planes, reservists have taken every sort of active part in the Korean air war, and have given a remarkable account of themselves.

The leading Mig-15 killer of the Far East Air Forces next to jet ace Capt. James Jabara is a reservist. Capt. Milton E. Nelson, of Tarrant, Ala., has shot down 4 of the Communist's best fighting planes while flying his F-86 on 79 sweeps through "Mig Alley," and has won the DSC and the Air Medal with oak leaf cluster for his brave work.

One of the most spectacular rescues in the history of aviation was performed far behind enemy lines by a reservist. Lt. John J. Najarian, of Fresno, Calif., landed his big SA-16 Albatross amphibian in pitch darkness on a small river to pick up a downed fighter

pilot, and took off from the debris-strewn stream under heavy enemy fire without any visual reference points except the flashes of enemy guns to bring the rescued pilot safely home.

An all-important lesson, learned in World War II, and driven home forcibly by the Korean conflict, is the great need for airlift of every description. In Korea today the entire combat cargo operation—the evacuation of wounded, the dropping of paratroopers, the parachuting of supplies to cut-off units, the backbreaking job of ferrying men and supplies to and from the front—is run by a Reservist, Brig. Gen. John P. Henebry, the youngest general officer in the United States Air Force.

The Three Hundred and Fifteenth Air Division (combat cargo) which General Henebry commands, not only contains hundreds of reservists and Reserve corollary units serving in its many wings, but has as an important element an entire Reserve unit, the Four Hundred and Thirty-seventh Troop Carrier Wing, General Henebry's old outfit. This wing, which once trained at O'Hare Field, Chicago, flew 7,000 miles to Japan last fall after a brief accelerated training program. Only 15 hours after its arrival, it was flying its first combat mission—led, of course, by General Henebry.

Since that time, the Four Hundred and Thirty-seventh has flown nearly 12,000 missions, carried 85,000 passengers, and set up a record of 8,000,000 ton miles. It has participated in every sort of operation from dropping paratroopers at Munsan-ni to carrying Christmas mail, and brought drastically needed airlift support.

Another complete Reserve unit, the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Light Bomber Wing, has been fighting still another sort of war in Korea. This California outfit has flown 5,000 dangerous low-level sorties in every kind of weather, and Reserve crews in their B-26's have dropped 8,000 tons of bombs, fired 12,000 rockets, and expended several billion rounds of ammunition in their task of destroying enemy troops, airfields, and supply lines. Using proximity-fused bombs, they have given the closest kind of support to our ground troops, and they fought an aerial rear-guard action for the men retreating from the now-famous Chosen Reservoir last winter.

Men of the Four Hundred Fifty-second have performed many acts of heroism, freeing fused bombs from bomb bays at the risk of their lives, and bringing home badly crippled planes under all but impossible conditions. They are credited with destroying tens of thousands of enemy troops, buildings, and vehicles in their hazardous battle of interdiction, and their night intruder operations have kept dozens of enemy airfields constantly out of action. All this was accomplished by Reservists who found themselves flying over enemy targets only 77 days after their recall to active duty.

The Korean war has proved to everybody what the Air Reserve forces can do when called upon to bolster our national strength during an emergency. And it is a matter of pride that this splendid record has been made despite the difficulties which beset our Reserve program.

General Vandenberg, in a recent letter urging greater care and discretion in the recall of inactive reservists, said, "I recognize that there was a great urgency due to hostilities in Korea to recall great numbers of Reserve personnel and due to this urgency a great number of mistakes, as outlined by the Brooks subcommittee, were made. I know also that we have made a great deal of progress in handling this Reserve problem during the past year, and that many of the deficiencies outlined by the committee have been corrected. Nevertheless, the problem . . . is still acute."

The first thing we did when we began working on this new long-range plan was to hold a series of conferences with key officers in Air Force Headquarters, recommended by the deputies as their best men, who had been dealing with plans and policies for civilian components—as you gentlemen are sometimes officially called. Then we met with officers on the staff of Continental Air Command who had had actual, down-to-earth experience in working directly with all aspects of the Reserve problem. About the same time, I made a trip to Colorado Springs to meet with the Reserve Section V Committee, a statutory group which advises the Secretary on Reserve matters. We talked to many reservists, in and out of the Regular Establishment, to get every possible side of the Reserve picture.

What we heard and what we learned gave us a good, fast briefing, and we knew more than ever that the situation called for immediate action. On the 4th of June, following a meeting with the Council of Deputy Chiefs of Staff, a committee was formed, made up of members of the air staff representing all major phases of Air Force planning, plus two reservists recalled temporarily for service on the committee. Brig. Gen. Robert J. Smith, United States Air Force Reserve, was appointed chairman and the committee has been known around the Pentagon as the Smith committee. Bob Smith, who I'm sure is known to many of you, is a Dallas, Tex., resident, a very active reservist, worked with ATC in World War II, runs an airline, was Vice Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and is an outstanding executive, organizer, and sound thinker. His committee was charged with the development of a realistic long-range plan for the Air Forces Reserve, related and responsive to the defined requirements of the United States Air Force, and capable of meeting those requirements in numbers of personnel and standards of training.

The committee had access to stacks and stacks of reports on Reserve matters from Air Force Headquarters, Continental Air Command and other major commands, and to a thorough study of Reserve matters made by the Reserve Policy Board—and I want to remind you again that several of its nine members were taken directly from major air staff agencies.

This is what the Smith committee accomplished.

1. The report set forth plans for a truly long-range program which not only extends to fiscal year 1958, but is strongly established as a major mission of the Air Force. In the words of the report itself, ". . . the organization, administration, training, and supply of the Air Forces Reserve . . . shall be completely integrated with the organization, administration, training, and supply of the Regular Establishment under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff, and the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Reserve forces as they do to the active establishment." This is now an order—and a big one.

2. The Smith committee report evolved a plan which, while new in concept, was so designed as to mesh into the existing fiscal 1952 program without any noticeable jar. It retains those features of existing programs which have proved workable, and at the same time provides for the eventual input of reservists from the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for a unity between regulars and reserves which will insure better handling of, and facilities for, Reserve activities.

3. The report provided for a flexible format which will allow the Reserve program to expand and contract smoothly in response to

changes in world tensions. Any realistic plan must foresee drastic fluctuations if it is to be effective.

There are a lot of things about this long-range Air Force plan for Reserve forces that give me definite grounds for substantial encouragement. For the first time, we have a plan that is tied directly to the very real, crucial needs of the Air Force in the years to come—and that has been worked out, what's more, in terms of the actual ability of the Air Force to support the sort of program envisioned in the plan. This plan contemplates the best ways in which a Reserve organization can be utilized, and works out its future, I believe, accordingly. Reservists will especially like those provisions of the plan which insist that they receive exactly the same treatment and support as regulars in times of peace as well as in times of war.

There's another thing about this plan that encourages me. Because it is so closely geared to the future needs of air staff and the major commands—especially in its emphasis on the necessity for adequate supporting organizations—air staff and the major commands have every reason, in their own interests, to give the fullest possible assistance and encouragement to every last part of the plan.

For instance, when the commanding general of the Tactical Air Command reviews his operations program for his combat units, he will be charged with automatic responsibility for providing training for that same program to the Reserve units earmarked for his command after D-day. This responsibility is exercised through, and under the supervision of Continental Air Command but the accountability rests squarely on the shoulders of the Tactical Air commander.

In other words, we have a plan that we are sure we can make work—and one that the whole Air Force has a good, sound incentive to support.

But is it more than this—it is a plan which shows every promise of eliminating many of the troubles which have plagued the Reservist and the Reserve program in the past.

First of all, because it is a stable, long-range plan, it gives the Reservist a clearly mapped-out future on which he can rely, on which he can base his own plans, and through which he can show his family and especially his employer exactly where he will stand Reserve-wise for years to come in the event of varying degrees of national emergency. The plan is based directly on the Department of Defense concept of the Ready, Stand-by, and Retired Reserves, of which you doubtless have already heard, and because it is correlated both in terms of predetermined personnel needs and of the probable input from U M T. & S sources, the plan provides for a much surer knowledge on the part of the Reservist as to where he fits into the Reserve organization and what need the Air Force has for his services.

The plan also gives real meaning to Reserve training activity. At the request of Continental Air Command, Training Command will be charged with providing up-to-date, intensive correspondence courses, conducting two-week blitz training tours in accordance with all regular training practices, and arranging for the use by Reservists of civilian contract training facilities, just as is done in the regular Training Command program.

Older reservists, who have little to gain by taking training courses, will act as instructors in their various specialties.

What is even more important, this plan calls for the resumption of scheduled Reserve flying training by fiscal year 1953. Through special procurement and levies on major commands, sufficient aircraft—in as many instances as possible they will be first-line planes—will be acquired to provide for practicable, useful, concentrated flying training. Through the increased use of Air Force

and Air National Guard facilities, plus the sharing of bases with other services, a geographical distribution has been developed to bring flying training within easy reach of as many rated reservists as possible. These will be in 95 metropolitan areas.

I want to stress the point that under the provisions of this plan, all training will be conducted on a realistic individual proficiency basis, and geared to the best possible extent to the reservist's civilian occupation. We are going to do away with this business of killing time during training periods by having instructors read long, dreary stretches from out-of-date, irrelevant field manuals—instruction will be planned and conducted in terms of specific skills needed by the Air Force and the specific capabilities of the reservist.

I have an illustration of the realism and earnestness of this wedding of the Air Force and its Reserves. The Air Force will start immediately to seek approval for a program for building special ground-training centers in areas of potential Reserve population. These special buildings will have classrooms, projection booths, and workshops for training in all those skills the Air Force needs. We plan to build more than 100 of such centers. These centers will not, obviously, spring up overnight, but they will be built once we get the approval of Congress—and with all possible speed.

No plan, however excellent in form and intent, is going to work without the proper personnel to carry it out and without a good framework of organization in which these competent people can work. This new plan recognizes as an urgent necessity the selection of the highest caliber of officers and other personnel for duty on the Reserve forces program, and provides for direct supervision and control from the Secretary's office through the Chief of Staff to Continental Air Command, which is directly charged with all field responsibility. The plan tentatively calls for the creation of an adequate number of district headquarters to carry the supervision and control to the local level.

To tighten up the administration and even further, the plan envisages that master files on every reservist will eventually be kept up at ConAC headquarters, instead of being scattered all over the country the way they are now, while field files on every reservist will be maintained at district headquarters, enabling the reservist to keep in close and constant touch with his records. Many of you read several weeks ago the news released by the Department of Defense that we are seeking authorization for the construction of a new multi-million-dollar headquarters for ConAC centrally located at Grandview, Mo., near Kansas City. One of the primary functions of this new installation will be the proper handling and storing of Reserve records. It is scheduled for completion in late 1953.

There's something else about this plan that is refreshingly new and different. Even though we believe in it, even though it has been approved, even though we know that it has been worked out with care and intelligence, we are not going to rush into it with our heads down until we're sure that it will work. This time, before committing ourselves all out to a piece of paper, we're going to run some tests to make certain that all our thinking has been in the right direction.

We're going to set up four test districts in four widely varying types of communities, to try to get the bugs out of the plan before it becomes a fully operational program. We'll try one, say, in the Southwest, where reservists run about one to a county, another in the Northeast, where you've got a crowd of small, separate towns, one in a Midwestern one-industry region like Detroit, and still another in a mixed agriculture-small business complex like southern California.

Once we have seen the new program actually in operation at these pilot installations and have ironed out whatever difficulties show up under these stringent tests, we can go ahead and start the whole program rolling with the assurance that we have not uselessly gone out on a limb for the sake of a plan that looked very good on paper.

Now I know very well that reservists have other gripes besides those stemming from actual deficiencies in the Reserve program—and the one that I hear the most often deals with the touchy matter of promotions. I want to say first of all that while the Air Force is the first to admit that there have been instances of injustice in individual cases—which no plan or program known to man can completely avoid in times of feverish expansion—I intend to do something about the problem in order to help make the Smith plan work.

To iron out these injustices, a completely new Air Force-wide promotion policy, integrating Reserve and Regular promotions into one integrated advancement system, is this very minute being developed for congressional action in February, bringing all Air Force promotion policy in line with Department of Defense service-wide directives.

I'm sure that even after this plan is in effect there will always be one great-grandfather reservist writing in to the magazine *Air Force* claiming to be the world's oldest living first lieutenant, but we will do our best to see that he either gets his captaincy or is lent to the Smithsonian Institution as a permanent exhibit.

Cases like these prehistoric first lieutenants remind me to remind you that no plan, however well-studied, well-tested, and well-carried out, is going to cover every contingency. The Smith plan I have discussed with you today is in my opinion the best plan of its kind I have seen, both in concept and in its practical potential, but there are some things which, by the very nature of military organizations, and because of the uncertainty of our times, it does not even pretend to accomplish.

It is not, for one thing, any immediate cure-all for all Reserve Force ills. As I told you, this plan must first be tested, and then must be put into effect with sufficient care, and attention to changing circumstances, to ensure that a plan so fine in concept is not irretrievably damaged by trying to start it off with a blind rush. It is going to take time to make this plan work the way we want it to work, and because it is, for the first time, a truly long-range plan, I think the time taken will be well worth while.

The new Reserve plan will not, and cannot, keep reservists at the same peak of efficiency, skill, and training as the men on active duty. Since it is still a plan for part-time activity, taking up only a small fraction of a reservist's time, nobody expects it to. We do believe, though, that it will keep all reservists at a far higher peak of efficiency, skill, and training, and make them far better prepared for possible return to active duty, than any previous or existing plans.

No plan for Reserves forces, I'm afraid, can guarantee complete freedom from the hardships entailed in recall. National emergencies do not run on nice, tidy, timetables, and there is no indication that they will in the future. The new plan does, however, give the reservist a realistic opportunity to gauge the possibility of his particular recall chances in the event of varying degrees of emergency, and to show his employer just what these chances are; no plan, believe me, can give you more.

And the plan, though it does provide for a broad program of flying training, simply cannot bring flying within the reach of every last reservist. We all know that this is a vast country geographically; its resources, though great, are not limitless, and the ex-

pense and effort entailed in bringing flying to every remote settlement would just not produce results worth the expenditure. We are sorry to have to say this, but we must, for the sake of national security, look cold-bloodedly at the facts.

I have taken some time to tell you what the program cannot do; but I don't want you to forget the many things we think it will accomplish. I would like to go into many of the interesting details that make the plan a good one, but time is short, many of these details are still classified, and they cover too much ground to be spelled out minutely to the satisfaction of every one of you. While a thorough briefing on the plan will be given you by Colonel Toole immediately after this talk of mine, I do want to reiterate that:

1. The plan is carefully related to the master mobilization plan, and all personnel and training requirements are spelled out in terms of the military needs imposed by this plan.

2. Adequate and numerous facilities are provided for both the Reserve and the Guard.

3. Provision is made for a full supply of the best first-line equipment.

4. The joint use of facilities, and the employment of equipment by satellite units and individuals will promote both economy and thoroughness of training.

5. The reservist's civilian occupation is to be taken into consideration much more than it has been in the past; training in the new study workshops will be in line with the reservist's civilian specialty when that specialty has a useful application in the Air Force. This insures that the Air Force obtains the most efficient use of reservist skills, and that the reservist gets the sort of training which ensures advancement in both the Air Force and civilian life.

6. The plan will show employers where their employees stand in the Reserve picture, and provides for a vigorous campaign to show employers the need for encouraging employee participation in Reserve activities.

7. The plan is long-range but flexible; it is projected through 1958 to give it stability, but at the same time is so worked out that it can expand or contract in response to changes in world tension.

8. It makes the Reserve forces an integral part of the United States Air Force, and ensures the backing of every part of the active establishment.

I can only add that I am deeply aware how much of the success of this plan depends on the cooperation of the civilian side of the Air Force, the Air Staff, and the major commands, and that we are going to do everything in our power to see to it that this cooperation is forthcoming.

And I am equally certain that if we do our part, the reservists will more than do theirs; their splendid performance in the Berlin airlift and in the Korean crisis is guarantee enough of this. From this point on, reservists and regulars will work as close partners in our common enterprise of insuring the security of this great Nation.

Alarming Facts Concerning Our Boys in Korea

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of some of the most alarming facts that have come to my notice since I have been a Member of this Congress.

Several days ago I had a bill for the admission of a foreign individual held up temporarily until I could investigate it. Although I withdrew my objections to the measure, I have been attacked from one end of the country to the other—ostensibly because this individual was a minor.

I was not particularly interested in the individual involved in the bill which I had held up, but I am interested in the welfare of my country.

I have just received a letter from an American woman, who is now in the Medical Service Corps in Japan, in which she gives the most alarming information concerning the treatment of our American boys now in the service in Korea.

She encloses an article relative to that incident, and in her letter she says:

After reading the enclosed article, I had to write my first letter to a Member of our Congress. I don't altogether disagree with you in your stand, but I wish to state a few facts about a much worse infiltration of "un-American elements," as you called them.

As a laboratory officer in the United States Army, stationed in Japan, I am in possession of some alarming facts about the marriages of our American boys, to the Japanese girls over here. Do you realize that there have been thousands of our "American element" boys marrying the lowest type women in Japan, those who yesterday were walking the streets and selling themselves to the highest bidder?

The venereal disease rate of these applicants is appalling. Twenty to forty percent with positive serologies; 30 to 50 percent with positive chancroid; 20 to 30 percent with positive gonorrhea (who are treated at Government expense before the marriage is sanctioned).

Young boys who have been fighting in Korea are given the opportunity of returning to Japan, if they are going to get married. They flood in by the hundreds, anything to get out of Korea. Boys who haven't been home since they were 18 or 19 and haven't seen our young, clean, American girls, are marrying these women over here every day.

Perhaps I've been over here too long and have become prejudiced, but when I left the United States, I was under the impression that our standards were quite high, and to see them lowered by these uncalled-for marriages is quite sickening.

Can any Member of this House imagine any procedure that could be more alarming, or more dangerous, than that outlined in this letter? I hope every newspaper that carried the attack on me will publish these alarming quotations from this letter, written by this patriotic American woman who is on the ground and knows what is being done to corrupt our boys and to try to drag them down to the lowest possible level.

God save America.

Censorship of Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article

under the headline "Capitol Stuff," written by John O'Donnell, which appeared in the October 5, 1951, issue of the New York News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF (By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 4.—Even President Truman's best political friends had to exchange ill-bred snickers when our distinguished Chief Executive sat down at his press conference piano, tossed aside the carefully prepared musical score of his "consorship concerto" and started to play by ear the most bewildering discords on the control of American news writers that White House reporters have heard in over a half century. Perhaps longer.

This issue of White House censorship of our own newspapers, radio, and television was so startled up by Truman that the only newspaperman who could make sense of his observation was Mike Federov, the Moscow engineer, now chief of Tass, the Kremlin's news agency, in Washington.

STARTS WITH WRITTEN EXPLANATION

All in all, it was a mighty sorry performance. Truman started out with a carefully written and reasonably intelligent explanation of his recent Executive order by which the White House, on its sole authority and without congressional action, advised all Government departments and agencies that they were keeping under the same security censorship blanket which has covered the vital military secrecy of the atomic-energy set-up and the Defense and State Departments.

Truman got away with his reading of the prepared statement, which was a well-done job of writing. But it was also obvious that Truman did not have the slightest idea what it said. And, more importantly, Truman disclosed that he had no idea what it did not say.

Hence, while Press Secretary Joseph Short and the boys of the palace guard tried to pluck at Truman's coat tails and hoarsely whisper that "everything should be put off the record" after the reading of the prepared statement, Truman charged ahead in a most shocking revelation of ignorance. Old-time White House correspondents could hardly believe their ears when Truman blamed them and their publishers for printing news and pictures which had been officially handed out for publication by the Department of Defense or the administration's own civilian defense organization.

HICKENLOOPER WARNS OF DANGERS

It is interesting to note that at the same time Truman was damning the newspapers for printing news and pictures, "even if they had been given out by the Defense Department or the Atomic Energy Commission," Republican Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, was speaking on the same subject in Chicago before a newspaper audience. He said:

"Censorship is now becoming the order of the day with the administration. It is not new by any means. Congressional committees over the past several years have been unable to function properly because the President has refused them access to information files concerning people strongly suspected as security risks to our country. Under the so-called loyalty order of the President, hearings against those charged with being dangerous risks are held in secrecy and the public never knows the nature of the evidence. People have been cleared by such boards when later investigations, blocked at every turn by the administration, have shown them to be traitorously guilty. But the censorship goes on and increases, and has now come to the point where great

newspaper associations of our country have formally called attention to its dangers.

"There is the new technique of vilification and intemperate outbursts from the White House, unique in Presidential conduct. Let me give you some of the terms which have been flung at critics by the President, who has not seen fit to cooperate in developing the facts, but resorts to smoke screens of violent words.

"Some of these terms are: liars, slanderers, mud slingers, reactionaries, isolationists, undercover saboteurs, Republican gluttons for privilege, Wall Street dictators, double-talkers, resounding misrepresentations, scandal-mongers, hatemongers, warmongers, scare-mongers, demagogues, special interests, villifiers, selfish interests, professional antis, economic fossils, anti-defense, anti-control, anti-everything, pullbacks, false economizers, blind, sordid, sowers of distrust, besmirchers, character assassins, scurrilous workers, defeatists, enemies of progress and S. O. B's

"Some of these terms have been applied on occasions to Republicans, Members of Congress, newspaper people, music critics and the Marine Corps."

And this is the same Truman who, when asked today why it wasn't proper to print information handed out by Harry's own Department of Defense, rapped back that newspaper publishers had no business using such material even if it was given to their reporters by the Defense Department or the Atomic Energy Commission.

At this point, the newspaper men clutched their skulls and called the session off with a "Thank you, Mr. President." Everybody had the dizzy sensation of standing tiptoe on a mountain top shaken by an earthquake and surrounded by a hurricane of Missouri horsefeathers.

Dr. E. Paul Knotts, Maryland's Family Doctor for 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the family doctor, for years the counselor and friend of families throughout the Nation, particularly in the rural areas, has at last come into his own.

The Maryland Academy of General Practice, at its third annual assembly last week, paid deserved tribute to the work of one of Maryland's outstanding general practitioners, Dr. E. Paul Knotts, of Denton, Caroline County, by naming him Maryland's family doctor for 1951.

Dr. Knotts, who has practiced medicine successfully in his county for 30 years, is 1 of 10 general practitioners now actively serving the people of their county. An article in the Baltimore Sun of Friday, October 5, recounting the reasoning behind the award, will be of interest to families everywhere who have benefited from the services of the family physician in their own area.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE PHYSICIANS HONOR DR. KNOTTS—SHORE PRACTITIONER NAMED FAMILY DOCTOR OF 1951

A 56-year-old Eastern Shore doctor, a practicing physician for 30 years, was honored yesterday as Maryland's family doctor for 1951.

Dr. E. Paul Knotts, of Denton, won the award, the first of its kind in the State. It was presented at the third annual assembly of the Maryland Academy of General Practice. Yesterday had been designated by Governor McKeldin as General Practitioners' Day.

Dr. Knotts, the award recipient, a vice president of the academy, is one of the 10 general practitioners, the old-time family doctors, now practicing in Caroline County.

TO DIGNIFY EFFORTS

The award and the assembly both had one thing in common, "the effort at focusing attention on the general practitioner and dignifying his efforts at promoting and maintaining high standards of general practice," in the words of one of the members.

The nearly 500 doctors yesterday, aside from witnessing the presentation to Dr. Knotts, also heard a group of specialists from the eastern seaboard discuss various phases of medicine that might be of value to a general practitioner.

MUST CONTINUE JOB

In receiving the award, Dr. Knotts stated that he could accept it, not as a personal tribute, but only as a "humble member of that grand group of men designated as the old family physicians."

Dr. Knotts recalled that the Maryland Academy of General Practice, a branch of a national organization, was formed 3 years ago, so as to "raise the standards of practice of medicine." He added that "we must so elevate that practice and continue to do the job that all general practitioners do, so that our people will not hearken to the voices of the social planners or ever give you up."

The presentation was made by Dr. Walter D. Wise, president of the Medical and Chiropractical Faculty of Maryland.

Dr. Knotts, who early in his career had two opportunities to train for the role of specialist, turned them down for a schedule which now begins at 8 a. m. and ends at 11 p. m. on a routine day, in which he sees at least 35 patients.

FORCED TO LET UP

Twice during his career Dr. Knotts was forced to let up temporarily owing to illness, and to turn his practice over to a substitute doctor. An admirer of Dr. Knotts recalled yesterday that on one of those occasions the visiting doctor could only keep up "with one-third of the work Dr. Knotts did as a matter of daily routine. The substitute left to go to Baltimore as a specialist."

But does Dr. Knotts sometimes regret that he once made the choice between a 7-day week and a 16- to 18-hour workday and that of the life as a specialist?

"Not at all," he answers.

"I made the choice freely and completely. I charted my life and am completely happy doing the job I want to do, taking care of the people I love," he says.

FABRIC OF THE PRACTICE

To Dr. Knotts, the general practitioner is "the foundation and the fabric of the practice of medicine in all its ramifications."

Last year, Dr. Knotts was nominated by the Maryland medical and chiropractical faculty for a similar award of the American Medical Association.

A graduate of Washington College, from which he received his bachelor of science degree cum laude in 1916, Dr. Knotts graduated from the University of Maryland School of Medicine in 1920.

WAS AT HOPKINS

He later did postgraduate work at Harvard University, Rush Medical College, McGill University, and the Johns Hopkins University.

He is a fellow of the American Medical Association, a member of the Caroline County Medical Society, the medical and surgical faculty of Maryland, the American Academy of General Practice and the American Association of Railway Surgeons.

Aside from having held the chairmanships of many committees of these organizations, Dr. Knotts is a staff member of Memorial Hospital at Easton and chairman of the Maryland State Medical Board.

WROTE FOR PERIODICALS

A contributor to many medical periodicals, Dr. Knotts also has found time to serve in the Interracial Committee for the State of Maryland.

He was a member of the Governor's commission that inaugurated the plan for abolishing almshouses and establishing hospitals for the chronically ill. For 4 years he was a member of the Selective Service System.

A former chairman of the medical examiners of Caroline County, Dr. Knotts was a member of the veterans advisory committee in 1945 and a member of the Army advisory committee, Second Army, in 1949.

He is also a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland.

During the sessions of the academy, Dr. Eugene I. Baumgartner, of Oakland, Garrett County, was elected president for 1952.

Dr. Harold Plummer, of Preston, was named president-elect.

Stassen on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stassen on Asia," which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch on October 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STASSEN ON ASIA

Harold E. Stassen's appearance before Senator McCARRAN's security committee with a transcript of his part in a State Department Far East policy conference in 1949 is another proof that over a long period of years he has been right in his judgment of major national and world problems.

The conference was held at a time when the Chinese civil war was at a critical stage and the purpose was to discuss American policy. Harold Stassen was one of a number of experts and leaders of opinion who were invited to attend.

In the more than 2 years that have passed, China has been lost to the Communists, the delusion that these Reds would be independent of Soviet Russia has blown up, and loss of South Korea has been prevented only by war.

Former Governor Stassen did not share the illusions and delusions which were current then, but stood for a staunch anti-Communist line throughout Asia. Had his views instead of those of the Jessup-Lattimore group prevailed with the State Department, even at that belated hour much might have been done to retrieve earlier failures and mistakes, and almost certainly South Korea could have been held without the war.

The State Department should now release the transcript of the 1949 conference in its entirety. With the committee's acquiescence, Mr. Stassen used only the portion of the transcript in which he figured and followed his own judgment as to whether security was involved.

Whatever may have been the justification for keeping the conference confidential at the time, security is better served now, as Mr. Stassen said, by making it public than by continuing to suppress it. Any security data can be censored out, as was done in the MacArthur hearings, but all material throwing light on the issues of our Far Eastern policy, and the part played by various individuals in its formation, should be brought out.

Embarrassment of individual policy makers there may be, but here is another illustration of the ease with which officials can cover up mistakes by withholding public information on the grounds of national security.

Let's Make the Draft Make Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Admiral Ben Moreell from the Saturday Evening Post of September 15, 1951:

LET'S MAKE THE DRAFT MAKE SENSE

(By Admiral Ben Moreell, Civil Engineer Corps, U. S. Navy, retired)

We live in a grim world, with no security on any frontier. Innumerable books have been written about the last war, and if they make any one point completely clear it is this: We came close to defeat and utter disaster in the early months of 1942.

It would be presumptuous in anybody to state with assurance precisely how the United Nations might emerge victorious from another conflict, if that dreadful possibility strikes us. But it is easy enough to say how the war could be lost. We can lose it, and we shall, by continuing to waste, or improperly use, our manpower.

By that I mean squandering our engineers, scientists, and other technicians through using them—as we are now doing all too frequently—in combat or as supply officers or in public relations. The situation is further aggravated by the acute shortage of technically trained young men and women, which will get worse before it gets better, and by the short-sighted and unrealistic attitudes of some of the selective-service authorities. Their policies do not make sense. They often want to draft every physically able young American, whatever his skill or potentiality. And we mustn't forget that the selective-service people are in the saddle. They have the last word.

That is why, in December of last year, the National Security Resources Board created a

panel called the Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee. It was made up of 12 men—industrialists, scientists, engineers, educators, and a retired Army officer—with Dr. Charles A. Thomas, of the Monsanto Chemical Co., as chairman. I had the honor to be a member of that committee. We had an excellent staff. I know that we worked hard and I think that we worked effectively. We issued our report in January 1951.

The Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee recommended the enactment of universal military training whereby all boys would receive 4 months of basic training. After that, the ones who were qualified would go to accredited technical schools of their own choice. I must say, in all candor, that I have never been a great drum beater for UMT. The cost will be very large. I have been afraid that the tendency would be to use funds which might otherwise be available for the development of new weapons and that UMT would take into the Armed Forces young men vitally needed for scientific training. But I went along with my colleagues on the issue. I learned long ago that practically all reports of boards, committees, and panels are the result of compromises. Without them, in most cases, there would be no report.

In a sense, UMT was incidental. The core of our committee's proposal is the creation of a National Scientific Personnel Board which will delegate its very great authority over scientific personnel to regional boards. With this machinery, which would doubtless have to be created by Congress, we could supply the scientific skills we now so sorely lack.

Will anything result from our report? Certainly there exist influences which will do their best to shelve it. Technically speaking, the committee is still in existence. But it is dormant, and it is safe to say that little will be done about our recommendations unless the public gets behind us.

The issue is deep, basic, and terribly important. Selective service wants to maintain the control it now has over the procedures by which all young men are either taken into the military or are deferred. We believe that the ultimate decisions with respect to scientific personnel should be in the hands of men eminent in the fields of science, engineering, and education. Both our national and regional boards would be made up of such men. We have no possible doubt that they will agree to serve. They are fully aware of the crisis.

It will be the job of these specialists to make sure that an unbroken supply of trained technicians would be provided, on the fairest possible basis, to all branches of the services, as well as to industry and to our educational institutions. The regional scientific personnel boards would be the local operating agencies. They would have power to make decisions, subject only to appeal to the National Scientific Personnel Board. Thus they would function in the same way the local selective-service boards do for other military eligibles.

The picture has become confused by regulations in Washington which lead us to believe that everything is under control and give us a false sense of security. About 3 years ago Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, of the selective service, created an Advisory Committee on Scientific Personnel. But that committee has no power. What is needed—and I don't know how to make this too strong—is a top-level scientific body composed of men renowned in their fields. Nobody, except the President, could dispute their rulings.

The system would insure a uniformity in policy quite impossible with the local selective-service boards. Such uniformity requires knowledge which those boards cannot have. So we find a wide disparity in what is done. Bill Jones of Seattle is told to go

on with his college courses. Jim Smith of Philadelphia, equally qualified for a technical career, is called into the Army. I do not know how the aptitude tests over which so many of our boys sweated last spring and summer turned out. They were given the impression that they would be deferred if they passed with certain grades. Again it's up to the selective-service panels. The amendments to the draft law did not, by the way, diminish their powers.

The time has come to look at some facts. The United States, even combined with her allies in the United Nations, cannot hope to win any ponderable war by matching man for man. The United Nations are clearly outnumbered. This was proved in Korea, where, so far as the numerical strength of our troops was concerned, we would most certainly have been pushed into the sea. I am no defeatist. I know we can win with superior weapons, aircraft and naval vessels. If we are to have this power, though, we must have available the scientists and engineers who can devise, design and build the instruments of modern war. Today the number of students receiving technical training is dwindling to an alarming extent.

Take engineering alone. A survey made last June by the Engineers Joint Council brought replies from almost 400 companies and Government agencies. It showed that some 80,000 new engineers were needed, apart from the armed services. This year's graduating classes produced only 42,000 engineers. The military, it now appears, will take about 19,000 graduates, with a resulting shortage of 60,000. Nor does the future seem any brighter. Only 26,000 engineers will get their degrees in June, 1952, possibly 17,000 in 1953, and a mere 12,000 in 1954. Other scientists are in just as urgent demand.

What has caused these shortages? Some of the blame must be admitted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the Department of Labor. Over a year ago that Federal agency issued a most discouraging report on job opportunities in engineering and related fields which doubtless kept many young men from entering them. From other sources came statements that engineering and science would be overmanned. The youngsters undoubtedly had these pessimistic predictions in mind when choosing their careers. The Russians are getting well ahead of us. The most authentic reports we can get are that they have graduated 150,000 engineers in the past 5 years. This is roughly the same as our own record. But our graduates will be cut by a third in the next 5 years unless something is done.

You can't entirely blame the American college boys. Many of them must feel that it makes little sense to embark on a long, arduous and expensive engineering course and then get drafted in the middle of it. It isn't a very intelligent policy to enlist a lad trained in electronics and make a platoon leader out of him. And yet I think the students must share the responsibility. Engineering and science are generally regarded as tough, with long periods of uphill digging. Some of the boys would rather go into business and become, as they hope, highly paid executives in short order.

Certainly, because of the great demand, part of the current crop of technical men has a pretty swollen idea of its importance. Employment managers from most of the big corporations begin to interview senior students early in the academic year. I have been told about one graduate student at Columbia University who took a post at \$6,000 a year before he received his degree, and that this was raised to \$7,200 before he began work. More than 200 employers sent representatives to Cornell this past year.

Radical changes are needed in our method of conserving scientific manpower. The General Electric Corp. decided last spring

that it needed 1,600 science and engineering graduates in its many plants. Its recruiters were instructed to offer places to 2,200 on the theory that 600 might fall by the wayside. But only 700 could be hired.

The picture is the same everywhere. The entire faculty in the engineering school of the University of California, I'm informed, has been employed at good pay for this summer. A steel company which needed men for its research laboratories was unable to get a single graduate. The payoff, though, was at a New Jersey corporation which offered a post to a girl engineer in its design department. She said she couldn't take it, because she had a young baby.

"Don't worry," the head of the department said, "bring him along with you. We'll build you a play pen."

So she took the job.

Inquiries made by the engineering manpower commission of the Engineers Joint Council brought similar reports. F. J. Thomas, of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., said that he was much worried about the future supply of trained men. The Sperry Gyroscope Co. answered that it was seriously handicapped in current classified research development and design contracts. The Westinghouse Electric Co. regarded conservation of present manpower and a continuing supply in the years ahead a major problem. And I am daily aware that my own company is having plenty of trouble getting the type and number of boys we must have.

It takes time to train a technician, however bright and competent he may be, to become really effective in a particular plant or laboratory. We spend considerable energy and money on such postgraduate training and then, in a lot of cases, our employee is snatched away by his draft board. Most of the time he refuses to ask for deferment. He is afraid that he may be branded a slacker if he does so. Our committee's program would end that danger, a very real one to any patriotic boy. Rules would be established which would eliminate any possible slur.

Another complication in this very involved situation is the number of scientists and engineers who are in the Reserves or the National Guard and are, for those reasons, being called up for active duty. As many as 18,000 scientists and 50,000 engineers may be subject to service. A study by our committee in 15 key plants indicated that the number of engineers with Reserve status varied from 32 to 75 percent of the total on the staffs.

Other countries, as far as I can gather, handle their manpower problems more intelligently. I have it on good authority that the United States was the only important belligerent on either side in World War II that had not taken special measures to assure an unbroken flow of young people who had been trained in science and technology. We were willing to trust to luck. Let me contrast our hit-or-miss method with the one now operating in England. Our committee looked into that too. All young Britishers are liable for military service when they turn 18. But if they have been admitted to a university they can postpone active service until after they have received their degrees.

Recently, I read a report by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON's subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Service. His group has also been studying the proper utilization of manpower and it found, in part:

"Today the great weakness of America is lack of manpower. Of resources and technology and industry and arms, we have much, of men, we have few. We are thus weakest where our enemy is strongest, for the enemy's great strength is manpower.

"The enemy's superiority in manpower strength is assured, virtually for so long as the struggle between the East and the West continues. . . . The enemy's inferiority in technology and firepower is by no means certain."

A lot of Americans—like some members of Congress—are reluctant to face these frightening facts. We think they run counter to the long span of our history. We have been so utterly confident, to reverse the song in *Porgy*, that we had plenty of everything. Plenty of the necessary skills and materials for either peace or war, and plenty of men. But those happy days are with us no longer—I indeed, they ever existed at all.

We like in this country, I sometimes think, to enunciate policies and then let time and inertia and petty jealousies among Federal agencies scuttle them. Actually, President Truman's statement of January 17, 1951, set forth about all that was necessary for a national manpower-mobilization policy. It was vital, he said, "to expend our supply of persons with highly developed skills essential to civilian and military activities." Regarding operation of the selective-service system, the President added, "the occupational deterrent of persons possessing critical skills, if they are currently using such skills in essential activities," was to be a basic Government policy. So was the "determent of a sufficient number of individuals in educational and training institutions to provide an adequate supply of professional and highly skilled manpower."

"This policy," said Mr. Truman, "shall be adhered to by all departments and agencies under their control."

Few people, unless they are rank partisans, will question the purpose of the sincerity of the President in promulgating this policy. But the Government has become so big that it is quite impossible for any Chief Executive to be familiar with more than its broadest operations. A President may issue an order or state a policy, but how is he to make it stick?

Yet the problem of the way to use most effectively our scientific personnel is quite definitely a question of defeat or victory if still another war should desolate the world. My convictions on this are based on my own experiences in the last war, when I saw, on every side, evidence that our greatest weapon was our technological superiority. When I retired from the Navy and entered industry, I found a serious gap in the supply of technically and scientifically trained people who might improve our means of waging war.

Sailors on our fighting ships win wars, just as do the brave, weary footsoldiers who suffer such terrible hardships. Wars are also won by skilled commanders on land and sea and in the air. We have a common and utterly obligatory duty toward all fighting personnel, of whatever rank. That obligation is to provide the weapons which will make them most effective on the front line, and which will reduce casualties. We cannot do either without competent men assigned to basic research or without technical men in the laboratories and plants.

We did not do the job we might have done in World War II. May I cite torpedoes? They are extremely intricate weapons. They were a serious handicap during the first years of the war in the Pacific because many of them were inefficient. Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood, Jr., who was commander of submarines, Pacific Fleet, from February 1943 until December 1945, has made the flat charge that our torpedoes were inferior. Fletcher Pratt, the naval historian, offered specific examples in a magazine article about a year ago. He told of the submarine *Sargo* sinking at a Japanese invasion fleet steaming toward the Philippines a week after Pearl

Harbor, in December 1941. The torpedo missed. A fortnight later the *Sargo* aimed five torpedoes at another convoy. All of them went wild. Some of our early torpedoes exploded prematurely. Many ran under the target.

The complicated devices which make torpedoes operate effectively are developed in laboratories of course. The armor plate of tanks is perfected by metallurgists. By the time bad weapons reach the fighting lines it is too late to do much about them. So engagements are lost and men die. That is not war. It is suicide.

I would not hesitate for a moment in saying that our war effort would have been more effective and that the struggle would have been shortened, with consequent saving of lives, had our industrial plants and the armed services been supplied with enough scientifically trained men. We suffer from the same lack in the United Nations defense program today.

We Americans like to pride ourselves on being practical men. We talk glibly about know-how, whatever the phrase really means. I've never been quite certain. I admit that I have a definite gift for utilizing what has been called practical research. We can make gadgets work. I'm pretty confident that we can turn out the best automobiles, at least on a mass-production basis, and I'm sure that our refrigerators, our vacuum cleaners, and our nylon stockings are second to none in the world. Yet I have little faith that we can overcome a future enemy by attacking him with vacuum cleaners or by waving stockings at him.

We are still lacking in what has been called fundamental or pure research. Maybe that is due to a kind of national impatience. Our desire is to get on with things to put new products on the line so they will earn dividends, and this has its virtues. But it also has grave defects. I'm quite sure that fundamental research in Europe was, at least up to the start of World War II, well ahead of American research. I don't mean that there are not individuals in this country who compare favorably with the best abroad. But I think we have only to look at the number of Nobel prizes awarded to Europeans for scientific achievements, in proportion to the population of their countries, to realize that we have quite a way to go.

We let the Europeans bring to the point of usefulness a fundamental scientific principle. Then we make something out of it. One need go no farther than the atomic bomb. Scientists of many nationalities worked out the basic data—Einstein, Fermi, and other Europeans. We used the data and we beat the enemy in making the bomb.

So, again, we need scientists with top-flight brains. It might be well to look again at the causes for this crisis in which we find ourselves, for these shortages of trained manpower which so gravely endanger the Nation. It is too pat to say that everything would be solved if the draft boards in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and the small towns which dot the land would only adopt more enlightened deterrent policies.

Those of us in the technical professions have, I'm afraid, talked too much about how hard we work and too little about the satisfactions we derive. We have offered average figures on possible earnings, sometimes averages do not look very attractive. We have failed to make it clear that the technologist can get a decent share of the world's goods if he is competent and industrious.

But that is not all. We have been backward in portraying the nonfinancial rewards of our callings. We talk about opening frontiers of science, about designing bridges and building dams. Yet we have not really shown the inner gratification which comes from

spending a life in such work. What is much more important right now is to impress on our students that a vastly greater reward lies in working toward another goal; making our country safe after 175 years of independence so that it and the rest of the world may do more than merely hope for peace. The dollar seems unimportant in the face of that consummation.

Yet these ends, so greatly to be desired, need further examination. Who is to pay for the scientific training? Possibly I am a bit of a shellback, due to my long years in the Navy. But I can't persuade myself to accept the plans for Federal aid to education. I'm aware that many fine educators have endorsed the idea that superior students should be awarded Federal scholarships. But I'm worried about Government interference with our schools and universities, and I shrink from the idea.

Obviously those of us who feel that way should come up with a substitute. For myself, I believe there is a growing realization on the part of American industry that it has a definite responsibility to see that the people it needs—scientists, engineers, and other technical men—must be cultivated. By that I mean that industry must take an interest in young people early in their college careers if it hopes to have adequate personnel. In our company, the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., we have taken some action along this line, although not enough. We have given financial help to technical schools and have encouraged students to take jobs with us during their summer-vacation periods.

Other companies are doing the same thing. Many are offering scholarships without any commitment that the students will work for the particular company when they graduate. The idea that industry has an obligation to interest boys and girls in higher education is spreading rapidly. Another possibility is financing the education of exceptionally able sons and daughters of corporation employees. To do so would be a morale builder in the sense that it would make our people take a greater interest in the continued success and stability of the company. I have no doubt that the labor unions would cooperate with enthusiasm with any such project.

On the other hand, I will stick my neck out and say that it is easier to work one's way through college than it was 30 or 35 years ago. I posed this question to the educators who worked with our committee. Most of them thought that it was less difficult. They pointed to very much higher hourly wages and to the large number of job opportunities. Naturally I admit that attending college is a lot more expensive than it was in my day.

People often ask me whether those of us who must have technicians do enough to encourage girls to enter the field. I am sure I have no closed mind on that. I think women have special qualities, such as manual dexterity and patience, which are extremely valuable. I know very well that our company would have no hesitation at all in taking on some brilliant young women. Yet we cannot ignore the probability that the girl who has been trained at considerable expense will resign in order to get married and raise a family. Her objective is most worthy and I am all for it. It is a hazard, just the same. A man will usually stay with his profession.

We will take the girls on, too, if they are able to hold the jobs. But the principal interest of our committee was, quite rightly, in the boys. About 1,000,000 of them reach the age of 18 each year, and the number will increase substantially during the next decade. Technology wants its share of these young men. We want them—and I am really not exaggerating—to insure the safety of the world. Their parents must be con-

vinced of this. So must all parents. They must realize why their own son is drafted while the boy across the street, who is studying to be a physicist, is deferred. Quite a few mothers and fathers already understand.

I heard about one father whose son was in law school, while a neighbor's boy was taking engineering.

"My son should go into the Army," he said, but Bill should finish his college course. Without such Bills, working on weapons, my son would be a sitting duck if he has to fight. His one chance of survival depends on whether American science moves ahead faster than that of any possible enemy."

United States Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by Gov. Harold E. Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, which he made this morning before the Sparkman subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 3½ pages of the Record, at a cost of \$273.34.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May I, at the opening of my appearance this morning, thank the committee for their courtesy in hearing me this morning instead of last Friday morning.

I received your telegram of invitation to appear last Friday in Philadelphia at 7 p. m. on Thursday night, and it was not possible to assemble my staff and my documents and be in Washington on such short notice on a matter of this importance.

May I also briefly state the background of my appearance here.

Two weeks ago the McCarran committee, in the course of an investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations, had before them as a witness a former member of the Institute's editorial committee, Dr. Kenneth Colegrove, of Northwestern University. During the examination of Dr. Colegrove, he testified about a conference held in the State Department on October 6, 7, 8, 1949, which was presided over by Dr. Philip Jessup, and at which Mr. Owen Lattimore was an active participant. Dr. Colegrove further testified that I was present and that he recalled that I had opposed Mr. Lattimore in the discussion and that I had insisted upon a copy of the stenographic transcript of my own remarks from the stenotypist who was present throughout the conference.

I had no advance knowledge whatsoever that Dr. Colegrove was to testify nor of what he intended to say.

After his testimony the McCarran committee subpoenaed me to produce my transcript. This I did, and I answered their questions in relation thereto.

I said to that committee and I say now that I do not intend to make accusations nor to give exonerations. I will testify of the facts which I know. The conclusions to be

drawn from these facts, and from other facts assembled by this or other committees, are for you to draw. As a witness, I do not give conclusions. As a witness, I do not associate myself with any other person; I do not attack any other person; I testify of what I know, and I will be personally responsible for what I say.

Let me also add that I am not interested in post mortems—especially not for the sake of post mortems. I am interested in the future, in the future of the American people and the future of mankind. I am very interested in history as an aid in decisions for the future.

Now, as you know, the testimony which I gave when subpoenaed before the McCarran committee was reflected in a number of ways into your hearings and in recent press releases by the State Department and statements of the President.

I therefore now present the facts which I do know, which are pertinent to your immediate task and which are also important on a much broader base than your immediate task.

May I also state that I address myself especially to the Democratic Senators in my presentation. I know that they are just as patriotic and just as interested in the future of our country as I am. I will endeavor to be objective and to avoid partisanship, and I believe they will do likewise.

The two major central points of my testimony today, upon which I will present extensive evidence, are these:

1. There has been for a number of years a world-wide pattern of action which has had as its consequence the undermining of the Chinese Nationalist Party and of Chiang Kai-shek and the turning of China to almost complete domination by the Chinese Communist Party and by Mao Tse-tung.

2. There is now in its early stages a similar world-wide pattern of action which would have as its consequence the undermining of the Congress Party of India and of Premier Nehru and the turning of India to the domination of the Communist Party of India.

I take it there is no need to dwell upon the tragic results of the first pattern of action to America, to the people of China, and to the world. Korea, with all of its heavy loss of lives, is only one of the sad derivatives.

I take it there is also no need to dwell at length upon the catastrophic results which would flow from the second pattern of action to America, to the people of India, and to the world. In numbers the 350,000,000 of India, added to the 800,000,000 now under Communist domination would bring a total of 1,150,000,000, or slightly more than one-half of the peoples of the world under Communist control. In strategic position, India in Communist hands, added to China in Communist hands, would place the rich southeast of Asia, Indochina, Malaya, Burma, and Thailand in the position of a lush plum in a nutcracker. In political position, India in Communist hands would provide a ready-made antagonist against the Moslem nations including sturdy and courageous Pakistan.

I am aware that the State Department has denied that it in any way participated in the pattern of action in China which I describe.

I am aware that the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the Ambassador at Large, Dr. Philip Jessup, have both testified and have repeatedly stated (1) that the State Department rendered every reasonable assistance to Chiang-Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists against the Chinese Communists; (2) that they have never proposed cutting off all military aid from the China Nationalists, (3) that they never have been

willing to permit Formosa to go to the Chinese Communists, (4) and that they never have considered or contemplated the recognition of the Chinese Communist Government.

The record will directly contradict this testimony of theirs on all four points. It is a further fact that I would have greater confidence in the future actions of the State Department officials if past mistakes were admitted, if they said these were errors of judgment, if they said they were now alert to the facts, and would not repeat the mistakes. As it is, the denials by the State Department of things I know are true, the claims by the State Department of things I know are not true, leaves me very uneasy and disturbed with regard to our country's future policy.

Turning now to present the evidence of the two patterns of action with reference to China and to India, I will not endeavor to assess motives or intentions of the participants. There can be no question but that many of the participants had the best of intentions and had good motives. There can be no question but that many of the participants were such due to ignorance or misunderstanding of vital facts. There can be no question but that many of the participants were patriotic citizens of their countries who made errors of judgment. There can be no question but that many of the participants were knowing associates of the Communist design in connection with the pattern.

I will not attempt to classify any of the individuals that I will name today. In fact, so far as the consequences to our country are concerned the classification is not the most important feature. The results are equally tragic whether they follow from honest mistakes or subversive treason.

But what is very important from a standpoint of individuals is the fact that all over the world men who were participants in the China pattern of action are now transferring to India.

I will now proceed to develop some of the major evidence with regard to the China pattern of action.

During World War II I spent more than 2 years on the staff of Admiral William F. Halsey in the Pacific. For more than half of that time and up to the time of the surrender of Japan and its occupation I served as assistant chief of staff and as officer in charge of the admiral's flag plot, which is the center in the superstructure of the flagship in which information and communication with the fleet and with other commands is assembled and integrated.

In these capacities it was my duty to know the contents of plans and intelligence reports of the admiral's command and of related commands.

Thus I know that it was the recommended plan of the armed services when the war ended, which I assume is no longer classified material, and which national security no longer requires to be secret, that the Japanese armies in Manchuria should be directed to march to the sea with their arms, be there disarmed by the United States Marines and United States Navy, and be repatriated to Japan.

This recommended procedure was disapproved by the State Department on the ground that the morale of the Chinese and Russian people and our relations to both required that the Japanese Armies be disarmed in the interior by the Russian and Chinese forces.

As a result the Japanese arms in Manchuria were turned over to the Chinese Communists by the Russian forces, and the Japanese soldiers were taken to Siberia, where a substantial number still remain as an armed force under Communist command.

In my service in the Navy I was also aware of the extended and careful consideration in the Navy of postwar China policy and of the combined consideration of this matter with the Army. I know of this both from my service with Admiral Halsey in Japan at the end of the war and from my brief service in the office of the Secretary of the Navy after the occupation command in Japan was turned over to Admiral Spruance by Admiral Halsey.

I find that my recollection in this respect are confirmed in detail by the diary of Mr. James Forrestal, who was the Secretary of the Navy at that time.

I now present to you the appropriate references in the Forrestal diary as published in the book, the Forrestal Diaries, by Walter Mills and E. S. Duffield, issued by the Viking Press.

From these entries it is apparent that the combined Navy-Army study and recommendation contained in the Patterson-Forrestal memorandum for aid to Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese Communists was rejected by the State Department, with Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary, taking an active part in its rejection.

Instead, direct consultations regarding China were conducted with the U. S. S. R. by the State Department, and the Marshall mission was dispatched to China with its instructions to force the Chinese Nationalists to accept the Chinese Communists into their Government and into their armies on a compromise basis, and to stop the aid to the Chinese Nationalists unless this was accomplished.

The Marshall mission, the unfortunate directive from the President under which it functioned, and its results are familiar to all of you.

Following this period the next significant period is the latter half of 1948. During this period Congress had voted an appropriation for military aid to the Chinese Nationalists in their struggle against the Chinese Communists. But the record shows that very little of this military aid was actually shipped, that there were unduly long delays in the issuance of export licenses and permits, and that as Admiral Oscar Badger testified, many of the rifles and machine guns lacked essential parts when they arrived in China.

During this period, Mr. William Remington had direct administrative supervision over these shipping licenses in the Commerce Department.

In the late months of this year (1948) the Chinese Nationalists suffered their first serious reverses. The appropriate officials in the State Department then recommended a course of action which Secretary of State Marshall characterized as "administering a final coup de grace to Chiang's government," and which he rejected.

I present a copy of the appropriate pages of the "Forrestal diaries" to prove this point.

Early in 1949, General Marshall resigned as Secretary of State and Mr. Acheson took his place on January 21, 1949. At the same time Mr. Lovett resigned as Undersecretary of State and Mr. Webb took his place.

On January 28, 1949, Mr. Forrestal was notified by the President that his resignation would be accepted. (It became effective on March 28, 1949.)

Then on February 5, 1949 the White House conference with Senator Arthur Vandenberg took place.

I testified regarding this conference before the McCarran committee on my first appearance on October 1, 1951, as follows:

"Mr. MORRIS. Will you relate what you know about that particular subject, (stopping arms aid to Chinese Nationalists) Governor Stassen?

"Mr. STASSEN. I know what Senator Arthur Vandenberg told me.

"Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us what he told you about it?

"Mr. STASSEN. When I saw Senator Vandenberg, for whom, as you know, I have the very highest regard, for the last time in his home in Grand Rapids, Mich., in November of 1950, just prior to my last trip through Asia and around the world, he told me of a White House conference on this question of stopping supplies for Chiang Kai Shek.

"Mr. MORRIS. Will you develop that for us, if there is any more to develop?

Mr. STASSEN. Senator Vandenberg told me in this conference he was called in to, which he said was the only conference that he had been called in to on Asiatic policy, it was there proposed by Secretary Acheson and Dr. Jessup to the President that the supplies which were then being loaded in ships in Hawaii and San Francisco for the Chiang Kai-shek government be dramatically stopped as a move toward world peace.

"That is that all armaments should be immediately cut off from the Chinese Nationalists and that the ships that were then on the way and then being loaded, as I recall—he said there were five such ships that would be carrying supplies to the Chinese Nationalists—they should all be stopped in a dramatic and direct announcement to stop the supplies that were continuing the internal war in China; that he then vigorously opposed it and analyzed it, and that after discussion with members of the Cabinet who were present, the President decided not to go ahead with the recommendation of Secretary Acheson and Dr. Jessup in view of Senator Vandenberg's statement he would publicly oppose it, and he was certain he would get the majority of the United States Senate to join with him in the opposition to that policy.

"Mr. MORRIS. Were these supplies purchased by the moneys appropriated by Congress during the 1946-48 period?

"Mr. STASSEN. Yes.

"Mr. MORRIS. Were they the supplies referred to by Senator Vandenberg?

"Mr. STASSEN. They would be purchased by various sources, by the Chinese Nationalists. It was to be all arms en route to the Chinese Nationalists, just a complete stoppage of all supplies of a military nature for the Chinese Nationalists, whatever their source of purchase had been.

"Mr. MORRIS. What was the date of the White House conference that Senator Vandenberg told you about?

"Mr. STASSEN. I do not know the date. It can be traced down at the point when these ships were going to sail from Hawaii and San Francisco with these supplies."

On the next day (Oct. 2, 1951), the Department of State issued a release which included these statements:

"Secretary Acheson has no recollection of such a meeting. Ambassador Jessup has no recollection of such a meeting. We have checked the records at the White House thoroughly. We have checked the Secretary's records and find nothing."

I challenged this release in this specific direct question:

"Does Secretary Acheson deny that at a meeting in the White House in 1949 he recommended stopping military aid to the Chinese Nationalist Government and that Senator Vandenberg opposed it?"

The Department of State on the following day issued a further release partially reversing their earlier release. They admitted the conference, placed responsibility for the recommendation to stop military aid on General Barr, declined to state what the position of Mr. Acheson was in the conference, and stated that Mr. Jessup was not present at the conference. Mr. Jessup also testified before you that he was not present.

Senator Vandenberg's personal diary substantiates the essential facts of my recollection of his statement to me. It does not say who was present. But it is a fact that a recommendation of this nature would not be prepared for action and presented at a conference between the President and Senator Vandenberg unless the Secretary of State had approved it and recommended it.

The military situation in China at the time of this conference was approximately as indicated on this map. In other words, two-thirds of the people of China were then under Chinese Nationalist administration and only one-third under Chinese Communist control.

The developments immediately preceding this conference included the following:

On January 21, 1949, Chiang Kai-shek retired as President of China and Gen. Li Tsung-jin was named as acting president.

On January 22, 1949, the Peiping garrison surrendered to the Chinese Communists.

On January 31, 1949, Gen. Hsueh Yueh, Governor of Kwantung Province, declared in Canton that Kwantung, Kwangsi, Hunan, and Fukien Provinces would make a last-ditch stand against communism.

The developments following are outlined here:

On March 15, 1949, Secretary Acheson wrote a letter to Senator CONNALLY rejecting the McCarran-China aid bill which had been supported by letter by 25 Democratic and 25 Republican Senators.

On April 3, 1949, the Peiping Communist radio broadcast a statement that the Chinese Communists would fight on the side of the U. S. S. R. in the event of a world war.

On May 3, 1949, Gen. Claire Chennault told the Senate Armed Services Committee that South China could be held with United States aid.

On May 26, 1949, Acting President Li Tsung-jen, of the Chinese Nationalists, asked for moral encouragement from the United States and for some statement that the United States realizes the import of things that are happening in Asia.

On June 20, 1949, the Chinese Nationalist Government declared all Chinese Communist ports would be closed to traffic on June 26 to prevent war supplies from reaching the Communists.

On June 29, 1949, the last 1,500 troops of the United States Army left Korea.

On July 27, 1949, Secretary of State Acheson announced that a thorough review of United States policy toward the Far East would be made under the guidance of Ambassador at Large Jessup, with a view to making recommendations to the Secretary of State for the formulation and implementation of policy concerning those areas.

On August 5, 1949, the State Department issued the White Paper on China, edited by Dr. Jessup, marking off the Chinese Nationalists, and declaring that they had lost through their own decay and not through any inadequacy of American aid.

On August 6, 1949, Senator Vandenberg states publicly that the review of policy by Dr. Jessup should not overlook the possibility of finding a way to aid the non-Communists in China.

On September 12, 1949, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed 20-3, the one and three-tenths billion military assistance program, including \$75,000,000 for the "general area of China."

On October 1, 1949, the Chinese Communist Peoples Republic was proclaimed.

On October 2, 1949, the U. S. S. R. recognized the Chinese Communist Peoples Republic; Bulgaria and Rumania followed on October 3, and Poland and Czechoslovakia on October 4.

On October 5, 1949, the line of the internal war extended across China at a point

about 125 miles north of Canton, with the four southern provinces and approximately 40 percent of the people not under Communist control.

On October 6, 7, and 8 a conference of approximately 25 citizens and State Department officials was held at the State Department under a call arranged by Dr. Jessup. The major portion of the session was presided over by Dr. Jessup and other portions by Dr. Fosdick.

At this conference the prevailing group was led in the discussions by Mr. Owen Lattimore and Mr. Lawrence Rosinger. This prevailing group recommended 10 points for American policy in China and in Asia, as follows:

1 That Asia should be approached as a long-term problem to be studied and deferred, that the Russian Communist attention was concentrated first on Western Europe with its industrial strength, that the United States should likewise give priority to Europe.

2 That an aid to Asia program should not be started by the United States until after long and careful study because of the complexity of Asia and the dangers of a Communist charge of United States imperialism.

3 That the Russian Communists were not as aggressive as Hitler and would not be apt to take direct military action to expand their empire.

4 That the United States should recognize the Communist Peoples Republic Government of China under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung at an early date.

5 That the United States should encourage the recognition of the Communist Peoples Republic Government by Britain and India and follow with its own recognition soon thereafter.

6 That it should be United States policy to turn Formosa over to the Chinese Communist Government.

7 That it should be United States policy to permit the Chinese Communists to take Hong Kong if they insisted.

8 That Premier Nehru had shown reactionary and arbitrary tendencies and should not be leaned on or assisted as a leader of non-Communist forces in Asia.

9 That the United States should not approve of the blockade of the Communist Chinese coast by the Chinese Nationalists under Chiang Kai-shek, should assist in breaking it, and should send economic aid to the area of China under Communist control.

10 That no aid should be sent to the non-Communist Chinese guerrillas in the south of China, nor to the Chiang Kai-shek forces, and the military supplies en route to them should be cut off.

During the conference I opposed all of these 10 points, and as the stenographic transcript will show I urged the following:

A. That American Asiatic policy should be given immediate attention as I considered Asia to be the number one priority of the Russian Communists and that they would move into the vacuum in Asia at an early date. That this was true because Asia was the vast underbelly of the Soviet Union, and the Communists would not move aggressively toward either Europe or Alaska so long as they were uncertain about Asia.

B. That an American Aid to Asia program should be promptly established under able men with a headquarters in Bangkok, to assist the non-Communist peoples and that study and action should move forward together as in the Marshall plan.

C. That the Russian Communists were potentially just as aggressive as Hitler and that America should consider aggressive action by the Soviet Union as one of the definite alternative possibilities.

D. That the United States should not recognize the Communist government in

China, and that to do so would be one of the most tragic moves the United States could make in long-term world strategy.

E. That the United States should announce that it considers Formosa a vital part of our perimeter and that we would not permit an armed assault from the mainland on Formosa.

F. That the United States should back up the British at Hong Kong, and that if the British, who must be our close partner in the world, decided to stand and fight at Hong Kong we should back them up with planes and ships.

G. That Nehru was an important leader of the non-Communist areas of Asia, that India should receive economic aid, that he should not be opposed in his effort to develop his third position in the world struggle.

H. That for the sake of world peace and our own security high American policy should be to prevent Russian Communist Imperialistic consolidation of Asia, that every move of opposition to the Communist advance in Asia should be made, and that all forces resisting communism in Asia should be aided militarily as well as economically.

There was considerable support in the discussion for my position, but the Lattimore-Rosinger group prevailed.

Near the conclusion of the sessions I said, directly across the conference table (see "d," pp. 6 and 7 of original transcript; p. 15 of transcript of Stassen remarks) that the steps advocated by the opposing group could best be characterized as steps that would hasten the victory of the Communists and that these steps would be a very sad mistake in American world policy.

At recess at about noon on the third day, disturbed by the prevailing trend of the discussion I spoke to Dr. Jessup. I said I certainly hoped that they would not make the tragic mistake of following this recommended program that had been advocated by Mr. Lattimore and his group.

Mr. Jessup responded that he felt that the greater logic was on that side.

Then I pleaded with him that he should not follow that view and urged that before he moved in that direction, he should go to Tokyo and see General MacArthur and discuss the whole situation with him. I told him that I had not seen General MacArthur or had any communication with him since the end of the war, but that I know from the whole wartime experience that he was extremely brilliant and well informed about those very problems we were dealing within this conference, and that it was, in my judgment, tremendously important that he go promptly to see General MacArthur and discuss with him the recommended Lattimore program. Dr. Jessup said he might do that, and that was the end of the conversation.

At this point one of the important questions of correctness of memory and of testimony is involved.

Dr. Jessup has testified to this committee that he does not recall such a conversation and further that recognition of Communist China never was considered or contemplated by him or by the State Department.

Senator ALEXANDER SMITH has reported a recollection similar to mine in connection with a November 1949 talk he had with Dr. Jessup.

Dr. Jessup states that Senator SMITH must be under a misapprehension.

General Fortier testified before the McCarran committee that in the first week of January 1950 Dr. Jessup told him that the United States would recognize Communist China within 2 weeks after Britain, who had just issued their recognition at that time, on January 5, 1950.

Dr. Jessup says that General Fortier is mistaken.

Thus, on this central point he disagrees with the recollection of Senator SMITH, General Fortier, and myself.

After a careful search, Mr Robert Matteson, of my staff, has discovered remarkable corroboration of the position of Senator SMITH, General Fortier, and myself from an unexpected source.

You will recall that on July 1, 1949, Secretary Acheson wrote to Senator CONNALLY that the United States would not recognize Communist China until he had first consulted with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and reaffirmed this publicly August 5, 1949, and August 24, 1949.

Then, on November 16, 1949, Secretary Acheson said that the recognition of Communist China was out of the question so long as they held Angus Ward.

On the same day Foreign Minister Bevin, of Britain, said, in the House of Commons, that Britain was waiting for the United States to join with Britain before Britain recognized Communist China.

On December 12, 1949, Angus Ward was released.

On December 30, 1949, India recognized Communist China.

On January 5, 1950, Britain recognized Communist China.

And here is the confirmation of the recollection of Senator SMITH, General Fortier, and myself.

In the January 11, 1950, edition of the New York Times there is a report of a long closed conference on January 10, 1950, of Secretary Acheson with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is written by William S. White. It contains a lengthy reference to disclosures by Senator CONNALLY as to the nature and content of the conference.

It includes these words:

"Senator CONNALLY strongly indicated also that while United States recognition of Communist China would not be accomplished 'in a hurry', it was on the way. Asked whether Secretary Acheson in today's discussion has fulfilled his pledge to consult with the committee before acting on the recognition question, Senator CONNALLY observed:

"I think he has fulfilled it now. But very likely he will consult us again before final action."

I present a complete copy of the New York Times story.

This same report is confirmed in a report by Phillip Porter in the Baltimore Sun, who wrote:

"CONNALLY said Acheson had taken up with the committee the question of extending recognition to Communist China and added that, in his view, the administration had thus 'fulfilled' its promise to consult with the appropriate congressional committees before taking action."

My staff has found no indication in the days following January 11, 1950, of Senator CONNALLY or any one else disputing the accuracy of these stories.

The public reaction in America to this report, however, and to the January 5, 1949, statement of the President abandoning Formosa was very adverse. Soon thereafter the Chinese Communists committed new adverse acts against American property and personnel in China.

The warnings which some of us issued years ago with reference to China were ignored with tragic consequences. This is now recognized by nearly everyone and the efforts to conceal or twist the evidence are of no avail.

I now issue a new warning with regard to India.

The evidence thus far is not extensive but to me the pattern is clear.

I reiterate that I do not prescribe motives. I do not attempt to differentiate between the intended and the unintended.

On August 15, 1947, India won its independent sovereignty. It came into sovereignty partitioned from Pakistan, with acute problems of food, refugees, water, land, and poverty. It has a population of approximately 350,000,000.

In September 1947 the Communist Cominform met in Eastern Europe. Soon thereafter evidence appeared in India of a new line of the Communist Party of India.

On October 18, 1947, an article appeared in The Nation, written in India by Andrew Roth, who will be remembered as one of the men mentioned in the Amerasia matter.

The title of the article is "Rice and Riots in India."

It contains a reported quotation from an unnamed young North Malabar lawyer as follows:

"I don't know much about China, but it seems to me that here in south India the conflict between landlords and tenants is so sharp that it may grow into a civil war of Chinese proportions."

The article further reports that the head man of one Indian village said, "Ninety-five percent of the people here are Communists."

In the December 25, 1947, issue of Bolshevik, Nehru was attacked, and the third-force idea of neutrality was attacked.

From February 28 to March 6, 1948, a Communist conference was held in Calcutta. In attendance were 800 delegates from India and some representatives from other countries. Also present was a Soviet delegate whose identity was not disclosed but who sat on the rostrum and was referred to as the Russian comrade.

This conference attacked Nehru and established an anti-Nehru violent line.

Following the congress, Communist-led strikes and violence flared in many cities in India.

In October 1949 Premier Nehru visited the United States. While he was here he indicated to the United States Government that what he most needed was 1,000,000 tons of wheat as this would ease up the profiteering in wheat in India, would improve his bargaining position with Pakistan and other countries for wheat imports, would strengthen his currency, and would allow him to improve the meager ration of his people. He indicated further that India would to a considerable extent repay in future years with raw materials produced in India.

This request was not presented to the United States Congress until 15 months later in December 1950 after the situation in India had become very acute.

At the time of Premier Nehru's visit to America in October 1949, Mr. Lawrence Rosinger wrote an article in Far Eastern Survey of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, which stated that the position of the Indian Communists, as stated in March 1948 by its central committee, was as follows:

"At a time when the anti-imperialist democratic camp is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the imperialist camp led by American imperialism, Nehru refuses to take the side of the former camp and poses neutrality. This so-called neutrality . . . is only a mask to cover collaboration with the Anglo-American imperialists."

Rosinger further reported that "Sarat Chandra Bose of the Socialist Republican Party . . . has expressed sharp criticism of New Delhi on the ground that it is not independent in its foreign policy."

"Bose declared of Nehru: 'His surprise of yesterday will probably mean abject surrender to President Truman and Clement Attlee tomorrow.'"

In March of 1950, a public affairs information conference was held in the State De-

partment. I attended as a representative of the Council of Religious Education.

The reports which were made included no reference to wheat for India, and knowing that this was India's great need, I raised the question from the floor. The question was parried and when I followed it up in the sub-conference on Asiatic affairs, I was first told that the United States did not have any surplus wheat to ship and I replied that I knew that this was not true, as our carry-over of wheat was at the highest level for many years. Then I was told that a satisfactory trade agreement for raw materials had not been consummated. I urged then that the matter be presented promptly to Congress. This was not done until 8 months later and in the meantime the situation in India became much more adverse both in economic conditions and in the attitude toward the United States.

On December 16, 1950, another article by Andrew Roth appeared in The Nation entitled the "Scars of Imperialism" which reflects adversely on Nehru's government.

Throughout 1951 the crucial issues with India have been handled in a manner such that our relations have further deteriorated.

In closing it is also well to keep ever in mind that Lenin said, "The outcome of the world struggle will be determined by Russia, India, and China, inasmuch as they constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe."

Encirclement of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Russians Don't Like Being Encircled, Either," which appeared in the Hartford Courant on February 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUSSIANS DON'T LIKE BEING ENCIRCLED, EITHER

Suppose you're a Russian. You pick up a newspaper, not Pravda or Izvestia, but a typical American newspaper. And you read the following news item:

"PARIS, February 9.—The United States and her Atlantic allies are blueprinting a network of fighter-bomber bases all around the Mediterranean authoritative sources said today.

"Equipped to handle everything from jet fighters to B-50 bombers, the bases will stretch from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf.

"Some of them are to be built from sand or jungle, others are to be expanded and improved out of existing airbases.

"The main purpose of the network . . . is to advance the forward positions available to high-speed aircraft for use 'against any possible enemy.' Some of the new bases will be within 500 miles of Russia."

How are you—in Russia—going to react to that news? Can you be blamed for wondering who is encircling whom? We all know how Americans would feel if the Russians were openly building a ring of air bases around this country, at distances ranging

from 500 to 1,500 miles. Couple the news item above with the belligerent, irresponsible talk some among us are indulging in, and it is not surprising that much of the rest of the world distrusts our peaceful intentions.

Senator McMAHON and Representative RUSKOFF are sponsoring in Congress a joint resolution of friendship for the Russian people. That is a sound and sensible step, a beginning on convincing the world that we really want peace not war. But how much weight will such a resolution carry if we continue flaunting our growing circle of air bases in Russia's face?

The vast majority of Americans have no aggressive intentions. That ring of fighter-bomber bases is intended actually as another deterrent to prevent Russian aggression. But could not we make that a little clearer to those who are quite naturally concerned? We fumble from what looks like appeasement to belligerence. Is there no middle ground?

Can the Voice of America carry any more vital message than the reiteration that we do not want war, preventive or otherwise? Any sensible step to dissuade Russia from war is justified. But let us make sure that we know, and that others know, what we are doing, and why. Let us not make the stupendous error of goading Russia into doing just what we are trying to prevent.

Ignorance in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Polish-American Journal of September 27, 1951, entitled "Ignorance in the State Department," and I wish to commend it to the attention of the Members of this body. I am doing this because on several occasions in the past I have encountered incidents similar to the one described in this editorial and because I strongly feel that the use of the term "satellite nations" should be discontinued with respect to Poland and other similar nations which are today dominated by the Soviets against the will of their peoples.

I am also deeply concerned about the attitude of certain officials who, while applying the term "satellite nation" to such countries as Poland, either openly express their conviction or imply that the Communist-dominated regimes of these nations have the support of their peoples. It should be clear to all that such is not the case. In Poland, for example, only approximately 5 percent of the population consists of Communists. The remainder of the population, while opposed to the Communist government imposed upon them, is simply unable to free itself from that regime which is backed by the armed might of the Soviets, and which ruthlessly suppresses all instances of open resistance.

I think that these facts should be borne in mind, particularly by our Government officials. The opposite attitude is not compatible with the long-standing

friendship of the American people for the people of Poland and for the people of similar nations who are today, not of their own choice, ruled by Communist regimes.

It is my hope that incidents such as the one described in the following editorial will cease, just as it is my sincere hope that the people of Poland will once again have a government of their own choice and be able to join the free nations of the world as a sovereign, democratic, independent power, helping us in our fight against Communist totalitarianism:

IGNORANCE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Last week an amazing example of high-level ignorance in the State Department regarding Poland was discovered by us during a conversation with Durward V. Sandifer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for United Nations affairs:

Here is the evidence:

We have told Mr. Sandifer that it is an injustice to Poland and to other iron curtain countries to brand them as "satellites of Russia" and that it would be much better to refer to them as "captive countries."

Mr. Sandifer disagreed, contending that the term "satellite" is fitting on the basis of their pro-Soviet record of performance in the United Nations and elsewhere.

A discussion ensued during which we have tried to explain to Mr. Sandifer that 99 percent or at least an overwhelming majority of the Polish people are against the Communist government of Poland, and that they cannot be held responsible for the doings of that government, etc.

Mr. Sandifer again disagreed, arguing that if the majority of the Polish people would not be behind the government—it could not exist, and moreover the Polish people do not manifest their disapproval of the governments etc.

Of course, we did our best to explain that the Polish people did not elect their government but that it was imposed upon them and that to resist that government openly, under the present circumstances, would be foolish and disastrous. However, not having experience in dealing with the diplomats, we wonder if we were able to dispel the clouds of doubt and confusion in the matter.

Be that as it may, we believe that some action should be taken to remove such ignorance from the State Department, as it is harmful to our international interests.

P. S.—We were informed by several exile leaders from behind the Iron Curtain that they have encountered similar ignorance in the State Department regarding their countries. All of them also object to the term "satellite" and favor the term "captive." One of them, Carlos Davila, former Rumanian Ambassador in Washington, recently stressed this point in a letter to the New York Times.

Another Seed of Growing Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks made on the 3d day of April 1951, in connection with our Growing Prussian Staff, I quoted from the remarks and

book of Donald Nelson, former head of the War Production Board. He told us of the devices and means by which the Military Establishment attempted to create public opinion so as to gain more powers in the management of American industry.

I am disturbed by recent news releases which are apparently advising the American people that American industry cannot produce or deliver the goods to Europe or Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a subject that needs immediate investigation. I think the same wheels are being turned against Charles E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, and his office that were so well operated against Donald Nelson, as evidenced by his own statements.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that many Members of this House will be very much concerned by news releases published by our Military Establishment before the Second Session of the Eighty-second Congress convenes next January. I refer you again to my remarks where I published surveys made for our general staff at their request and in which surveys they were advised that they could not expect efficiency while operating through the red tape created by overcentralization. It is my belief that a complete investigation will show that our industry is producing but that delivery is handicapped through overcentralization of our Military Establishment.

I also want to point out that there has recently come to light a distressing case evidencing the destruction of professional integrity by the military service. The case indicates that there is a necessity for the Military Establishment to politically support the administration. The example in point is contained in the July 1951 issue of Combat Forces Journal, pages 10-11, published by the Association of the United States Army. This is the journal of Regular Army officers of our country. The president of the association at the time the article was published was General Haislip, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, and the board of directors of the association are all Regular Army officers on active duty. The Journal passes itself off as being devoted to the professional as distinguished from the political advancement of its members.

The issue mentioned devotes considerable space to an attack on the integrity and professional honor of General MacArthur. It discusses the recent hearings by the two committees of the other body of the Congress. It makes disparaging and sarcastic comparisons of General MacArthur's conduct during the hearings relative to the conduct of General Bradley and General Marshall. It flatly accuses General MacArthur of dishonesty when it charges him with "distortions, evasions, and unfairness."

If the Journal is justified as a publication for professional soldiers, it goes to unprecedented lengths when it trumps up a case of incompetence against General MacArthur for not joining up the Eighth Army and the Tenth Corps in Northern Korea. We all must wonder

if the men back of this article are not those who were seeking to exercise illegal powers in the report of General MacArthur to the Congress in 1931 and 1932. As a lay person, it seems to me that the fabricators of the article also display a lack of professional objectivity. At least, that point is arguable, even though they do not admit it. The article points out the success in joining the Eighth Army and the Tenth Corps across the waistline of Korea after the time that it criticizes General MacArthur for not making such juncture. Presumably, the writers of the article knew that the juncture was possible after a retreat of many miles had resulted in a much shorter defense line across the more developed and narrow part of Korea. Presumably, they also knew that the longer defense line across the widest part of Korea was also across inaccessible mountainous wilderness.

I do not think any Member of this body can read the article and still believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are truthful in their contention that they stand upright as professional men and are doing only their duty in expressing debatable opinions opposed to those of General MacArthur. Their article demonstrates that they have, in fact, an animus against MacArthur. They, too, have become puppets of a totalitarian political machine issuing propaganda with the hope that the prestige of office may lend it weight. When the article says, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff have proved its case against General MacArthur," what happens to its previous statements that it was not opposed to General MacArthur?

The only case that it has sought to support is the political case of its Commander in Chief against the fathers and mothers of those in the fight. If they desire to write such publications, I think it would be more pertinent if they would tell us politically what we must do to get back the prisoners of war of these United States when we do not know where they are, why they were fighting, who we talked peace terms with, or what the subject of peace discussions will be, and when our Joint Chiefs of Staff have told us that we cannot send military expeditions into the land mass of Asia.

The Communist Attempt To Take Over Hollywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate an article entitled "The Strange Story of the Hollywood Ten," which was written by Victor Lasky, coauthor of *Seeds of Treason*, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRANGE STORY OF THE HOLLYWOOD TEN (By Victor Lasky)

The biggest headache in Hollywood's history centers around seven writers, two directors, and one producer who, after refusing to tell a congressional committee whether they were Communists, became known as the Hollywood 10. Their reticence resulted in their going to jail on contempt charges.

The story of the Communist attempt to take over Hollywood can now be told in its startling entirety. The Communists took the industry for a ride it will never forget, and they managed to do it despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of people connected with the movies detest the Communist Party.

Who are these 10 men who, in the public mind, came to symbolize Hollywood communism? How did they, out of the many pro-Communists and intense left-wingers in the movie business, suddenly find themselves in the limelight?

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities decided, in 1947, to investigate Communist activities in the motion-picture industry, its researchers prepared a list of almost a hundred Communists and fellow travelers who held positions of importance. Since there was not time to call that many witnesses the committee finally decided on 19 men—actors, writers, and directors. Exactly how the men were selected is not known; perhaps some of the names were picked arbitrarily. All of the men, as it happened, were married, and none of them was a veteran.

The committee thereupon issued subpoenas to the 19. But when the hearings took place in Washington, in October 1947, there proved to be time to call only 11 of them: writers John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Dalton Trumbo, Lester Cole, Ring Lardner, Jr., Alvah Bessie, and Berthold Brecht; producer Adrian Scott; and directors Edward Dmytryk and Herbert Biberman. As a result of their appearance as witnesses, 10 of these men were convicted of contempt of Congress. (The exception was Berthold Brecht. Brecht, a German-born playwright whose pro-Stalinist record was clear enough, later returned voluntarily to live in the Soviet zone of Germany. He readily admitted to the committee that he had been affiliated with a long list of party-line organizations, but denied that he had ever been an actual member of the party.)

The testimony of the 10 ran in a fixed pattern. They answered a few perfunctory questions, demanded the right to read prepared statements (in some cases they were allowed to do so), delivered several abusive observations about the committee and the proceedings, and refused to answer directly the question, "Are you now, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" The appearances were short and violent. Albert Maltz addressed the committee counsel, Robert Stripling, as "Mr. Quisling." John Howard Lawson, the obvious leader of the group and the first to be called, announced pontifically, "I am not on trial here, Mr. Chairman. This committee is on trial before the American people. Let us get that straight." Samuel Ornitz intimated that the committee was motivated by anti-Semitism. Dalton Trumbo yelled, "This is the beginning of an American concentration camp." During the proceedings, most newspapermen referred to the witnesses as the "Unfriendly 10." To the dismay of the motion-picture industry, the Communists were able to change that phrase to the "Hollywood 10."

The 10 behaved alike before the committee because, as we now know, they had met in advance and coordinated their strategy.

In fact, 18 of the witnesses—again excluding Brecht—had held a strategy meeting at the home of director Lewis Milestone. Milestone was one of the eight witnesses the committee didn't find time to call. The other seven were writers Dick Collins, Gordon Kahn, Howard Koch, and Waldo Salt; directors Irving Pichel and Robert Rossen; and actor Larry Parks. Collins, who has since broken violently with the Communists (as has Parks), told the story of that meeting in Milestone's luxurious home.

At the meeting, Larry Parks made an impassioned appeal for unity. "Let's stick together," he pleaded, "and go to Washington together." But the real leader of the meeting—in fact, the real Communist boss of the Hollywood talents sections—was John Howard Lawson. It was Lawson who decided on the strategy of not giving direct answers to the \$64-question about party membership. Actually, this was the only strategy he could advocate. A decision to admit that they were party members would have meant perjury citations for Biberman, Ornitz, and Lawson, who had previously told the California Un-American Activities Committee that they were not Communists. On the other hand, most of the 18 men could not deny under oath that they were Communists, because, as they were painfully aware, the committee's research staff had photostats of their party cards; a denial would have meant perjury citations for them, too. The only course left was the swashbuckling speechmaking and wordy attack on the committee's legality that they finally adopted. They knew that course would probably lead to contempt-of-Congress indictments, as it finally did, but the penalty for contempt is much less severe than that for perjury.

"They didn't explain all this to us," Collins later said bitterly. "What they sold us was a bill of goods about the highest devotion to basic American principles."

Before the committee's hearings in Washington got under way a gigantic Communist front had been organized to defend the unfriendly witnesses. This was the Committee for the First Amendment, an organization that pulled in more names than almost any front organization in the previous 10 years. (Four Senators joined.) The committee's first act was to send a delegation, headed by Humphrey Bogart, to protest the hearings in Washington. Bogart, who later admitted he had been "taken in" and that the whole affair had been incredibly stupid, is the only one of many Hollywood luminaries who would rather forget that trip. John Garfield, Canada Lee, Lauren Bacall, June Havoc, Marsha Hunt, Danny Kaye, and most of the others who flew to Washington to applaud for the "persecuted liberals," were thrown into confusion when committee investigator Louis Russell began pulling out the party cards of the witnesses.

However, the Communists knew when they had a good thing. Before the 10 finally went to jail, most of them were sent on a Nationwide tour, during which they denounced Hollywood, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and America's foreign policy. A 15-minute film short, *The Hollywood 10*, was produced by Paul Jarrico. A heavy-handed, propaganda-packed job, it was never very popular in this country, but it became a big success in the iron-curtain countries. Gordon Kahn wrote a book called *Hollywood on Trial*. By the time the comrades were through, the 10 men were known all over the world; in fact, they were more famous abroad than in this country. Let us take a closer look at these men.

The real leader of Hollywood's Communists was John Howard Lawson. Jack Lawson, whose first play was produced in 1914 when he was only twenty, was a founder and an early president of the Screen Writers' Guild. A stocky man, with uncombed brown hair, jughandle ears, piercing brown eyes,

and a domineering manner, Lawson had little difficulty riding herd on the Hollywood comrades. "To me, as to other writers and, I imagine, to some actors," Dick Collins later reported, "Lawson was father. His book—on screen-writing—was the bible. He had enormous intellectual baggage. He gave a tremendous amount of energy to the party. After meetings, which usually ended at 2 a. m., Lawson would sit down and write his reports to the central committee. He was a dynamo, and set the pattern for the Hollywood comrades." Lawson was a tremendous admirer of Earl Browder up to 1945, and the only time his leadership in Hollywood was menaced was when Browder went on the skids that year. Lawson put up a tremendous fight to retain his position, and finally succeeded. "He was an intensely ambitious writer at one time," Collins recalls, "but he never quite made the grade in Hollywood, a pretty tough place for the best of them. But as a party leader, Lawson was an honored name behind the iron curtain. I think the greatest thrill Lawson ever had was when the Soviet writers at the Waldorf-Astoria peace conference in 1949 jumped to their feet when he was introduced to them."

Lawson was the party's top fund-raiser in Hollywood; he was the final authority on cultural matters among the town's Communists; and he was the leader of the Red faction in the Screen Writers' Guild. It would hardly have been a secret to anyone, even before the House committee dug into it, that Lawson was a Communist, he wrote for the Daily Worker as far back as 1933. And while he was up to his ears in Communist work, he was also making a good living writing scripts for such movies as *Action in the North Atlantic*, *Blockade*, *Aiglers*, *Sahara*, and many others.

Beside Lawson, most of the other members of the 10 seem to lack forcefulness, though some of them are brilliant writers. But Sam Ornitz, for example, has virtually no solid accomplishments in his career outside of a fairly good novel written in the twenties, *Haunch*, *Paunch*, and *Jowl*. He worked regularly as a movie writer from 1930 to 1938, after which he got very few screen credits. Herbert Biberman has a similarly undistinguished record. He wrote such pictures as *Action in Arabia* and *The Master Race* and directed several inconsequential items; but he and his wife, actress Gale Sondergaard, were always more proficient at rank-and-file Communist work than at turning out anything worth while in motion pictures.

Lester Cole, who is now fighting a legal battle to get back his job at M-G-M, is cut to pretty much the same pattern. A balding little man, now 47 years old, he has spent 20 years in Hollywood without writing a single first-rate picture; the best known of his accomplishments are *Objective Burma* and *High Wall*.

Adrian Scott will doubtless go down in film history as the man who converted Dick Powell from a smooth, singing hero into a professional tough boy. He produced *Murder, My Sweet* and *Cornered*, and also worked on several other pictures, notably *Crossfire*. He is only 39 years old, and did not begin his Hollywood career until 1940; before then, he was an associate editor of *Stage* magazine.

Ring Lardner, Jr., the son of the famous humorist, is a tall, bespectacled man, now 36, who looks like the standard caricature of a writer. During the midthirties, he left Princeton and went as a tourist to Russia; he returned to this country with great admiration for socialism. Lardner's whole career has been something of an accident. He was originally brought to Hollywood as an actor, but his screen test was a complete fiasco. He became a press agent and later graduated to

a post as junior writer. He made his mark in 1941, when he collaborated with Michael Kanin on the script of *Woman of the Year*, which, starring Katharine Hepburn, made a small fortune and ended up with an academy award. At the time of the 1947 hearings, he was making \$2,500 a week. Lardner became one of the Hollywood Ten by an accident. Although he had been one of the 19 originally subpoenaed by the committee, he received a wire at the last minute announcing that his appearance had been indefinitely postponed. However, he felt an obligation to go along to Washington with the others, and when the committee saw him there it changed its mind and called him to the stand. Lardner is described by people who worked with him as a real gentleman, extremely bright and witty, but rather shy (he speaks with a nervous stutter). He has always been a close friend of Dalton Trumbo's.

Trumbo is one of the most talented and also one of the most erratic, of the 10. As a child he lived in humble surroundings in Grand Junction, Colo., but moved to southern California during his youth and grew up in the movie colony. A complete individualist, he lived about 50 miles outside of Hollywood and rarely came to party meetings, or even to meetings of the 10. By avoiding the town's social whirl, he was able to turn out a fantastic amount of work, his associates recall that Trumbo was addicted to 20-hour uninterrupted stretches of writing and that he once turned out a finished hundred-page screen story in 2 days and 2 nights. He got screen credits for *A Guy Named Joe*, *Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo*, and *Kitty Foyle*, among others.

Alvah Bessie, who came to Hollywood after fighting with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain, was a Communist who liked to refer to himself as a professional soldier. In between writing more than 85 articles for the Communist *New Masses* and acting as a kind of adjutant general to Lawson, Bessie found time to work on such films as *Northern Pursuit*, *The Very Thought of You*, and *Hotel Berlin*. A bitter, sensitive man who played at being tough, he was regarded as one of the most fanatical Communists in Hollywood.

Another of the 10 is Albert Maltz, who was born in Brooklyn 42 years ago, became deeply involved in party activities during his youth, and went to Hollywood during the thirties. "What I have written," he told the Un-American Activities Committee, "has come from the total fabric of my life—my birth in this land, our schools and games, our atmosphere of freedom, our tradition of inquiry, criticism, discussion, tolerance. Whatever I am, America has made me." This rhetorical flourish failed to impress the committee; it knew Maltz's record too well. He had been an open, belligerent Communist who, during the war, had cabled Moscow: "Please use my literary royalties for the defense of the Soviet Union." Maltz is an unusually gifted writer who wrote the screen plays for such motion pictures as *This Gun for Hire*, *Destination Tokyo*, *Pride of the Marines*, and the House I Live In, and is also the author of the serious novel, *The Cross and the Arrow*.

The committee was not impressed by Maltz's talk about criticism, discussion, tolerance, because it knew the story of his battle with the Communist Party. This battle had begun with an article Maltz had written for the party's magazine, *New Masses*, on February 12, 1946. It was a remarkable article to have appeared in a Communist publication, and why it was published is still uncertain. In general, the article called for a greater degree of freedom for Communist writers. "An artist can be a great artist," said Maltz, "without being an integrated or

a logical or a progressive thinker on all matters." He ridiculed the party for attacking an anti-Nazi play during the Nazi-Soviet pact and then praising it after Hitler attacked Russia. He complained that it was almost impossible for a "socially conscious writer" to create real characters because the party was always demanding black-and-white stereotypes.

As soon as the article appeared, the house fell in on Maltz. The Daily Worker came out with an immediate blast expressing sorrow that "Albert Maltz seems to have let the luxury and phony atmosphere of Hollywood at last poison him." He was accused of sympathizing with the Trotskyites. For weeks, every Communist intellectual in New York and Hollywood denounced Maltz in the terms of abuse only the comrades know how to handle so well. A special meeting of left-wing Hollywood writers was called. Samuel Sillen, a Communist "cultural expert" from New York took charge. Lawson launched into a violent diatribe against Maltz, and the others pitched in.

It was too much for Maltz to take; on April 7, 1946, he finally capitulated completely. For the Worker, he wrote a long, scathing criticism of his earlier *New Masses* piece. He attacked the few comrades who had liked it; he even attacked those who had protested against the violence of the language used against him. And he ended up by reaffirming the necessity of having the Communist Party dictate to "progressive" writers. Maltz was taken back into the fold.

The last of the 10 is Director Edward Dmytryk, who was a Communist briefly during the last war. He was still friendly to the party at the time of the 1947 hearings and went along with the unfriendly witnesses. After being cited for contempt, however, he developed a number of serious reservations about the party's course. To have pulled out them would have given the Communists a chance to accuse him of being "yellow," so he went ahead and served his jail sentence. But when the Korean war broke out, he decided to break for good, and when the Chinese Communists came into the war last winter, Dmytryk, still in jail, prepared an affidavit expressing hostility to the party. This brought the expected blasts from the Daily Worker, but he had long since ceased to care. When his prison term expired, he told his story to the House committee, and was eventually hired by King Bros. Productions to do a film called *Mutiny*, a story of the War of 1912. Producer Maury King explained: "We're proving we here will give jobs to these fellows if they'll go ahead and tell us who these rats are. It'll help us to clean out these rats. We don't want the fellows who can talk to be scared to talk."

Actors also fell for the Communist line. Most of the actors who went into the party left it after a relatively short time. They had gone in for a variety of reasons. For instance, a feeling of guilt affected many Hollywood figures during the depression. When 9 to 12 million American workers were unemployed, when real destitution could be seen almost everywhere, when Fascist rabble-rousers were attracting big audiences, a reasonably sensitive man who had several luxury cars, a swimming pool, and a salary of \$2,000 a week often developed a sense of guilt because of his good fortune. In the beginning, he would try to ease this feeling by making substantial contributions to "liberal" causes. Then the comrades would go to work on him, appealing to him as an "advanced" thinker and great artist, and finally asking him the direct question that brought actor Sterling Hayden into the fold: "Why don't you stop talking and join the Communist Party?" (Hayden got out after 6 months in the party, and later observed,

"It was the stupidest, most ignorant thing I have ever done")

Besides the feeling of guilt, there was a desire to escape the intellectual sterility many actors and writers believed to be characteristic of Hollywood, there was the need to feel that, despite all the boy-meets-girl pictures, they were doing something really "worth while." For some, there was a muddled notion that the party was just a good liberal organization

Actor Larry Parks, who went into the party in a state of intellectual confusion and came out of it still bewildered, said that "being a Communist Party member fulfilled certain needs of a young man who was liberal in thought, idealistic, who was for the underprivileged, the underdog."

How can you explain Karen Morley's involvement with the Communists? She was named as a comrade by several witnesses before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Her former friends have different opinions on why the glamorous, hazel-eyed blonde became involved. Some say she is "one of those chronic idealists who are always bleeding for mankind." Miss Morley herself supplied the answer in an interview she granted several years ago, when she accepted a job as a labor organizer for a party-line union. She told the interviewer that she had traded her screen career for politics because "I washed out as an actress." She appeared in such films as *Black Fury*, *Arsene Lupin*, and *Dinner at Eight*. She said Hollywood seemed very artificial and unreal to her.

"I remember," she explained, "when I was working in *Pride and Prejudice* it seemed as if every time we shot a scene, Hitler took another country." (That Stalin is doing the same these days does not seem to cause her any concern, however.)

The House Un-American Activities Committee had considerable trouble trying to locate Miss Morley. During the recent hearings she was reported in Paris, avoiding a congressional subpoena. Miss Morley attempted a comeback in several Broadway shows that failed. Then she obtained a job with the Office of War Information. "That didn't satisfy me either," she said. "When a friend asked me if I'd like to pass out pamphlets for the CIO, I jumped at the chance." In 1947, Robert Taylor charged that she was a disruptive influence in the Screen Actors' Guild.

Another reason for young writers and actors' going over to the comrades was just plain opportunism. In some cases, a "correct political line," as the Communists would call it, was almost indispensable to advancement within the studios. Most of the big producers were unaware of it at the time, but in some studios a few key positions had been infiltrated by the ever-active "progressives." They controlled hiring, firing, and the awarding of choice opportunities.

The Hollywood Communists never had much success in influencing the actual content of the movies. For one thing, none of the major producers—the men with the final word—was ever pro-Communist, and very few of the directors were. The writers and actors were not in a very good position to be able to influence the finished content of a movie as it would finally come from the cutting room.

Today the movie industry is working energetically to rid itself of the Commie label and to keep the Communists out of the studios. As a result, the Communists and pro-Communists are openly repentant, on the scrap heap, or on the run. Hollywood, it seems, has learned a painful lesson from the revelations at the trial of the Hollywood Ten—and the lesson will be remembered for a long time to come.

Beef Price Controls: A Colossal Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement:

BEEF PRICE CONTROLS: A COLOSSAL HOAX

Cattlemen and meat packers from Montana to Texas would love to see Price Controller DiSalle and his cohorts sitting on the top rails of the cattle pens of the stockyards throughout the western country carrying out their threat to put an individual ceiling on every beef animal sold.

Such a ridiculous threat reveals with shocking vividness the fog of ignorance concerning the processes of beef production and distribution that seems to shroud the price controller's office. Indeed there are many who wonder whether the price controllers know that the prices of beef cattle are made in the pens of the stockyards where cattle buyers can inspect and appraise the quality of the cattle.

Moreover, the cattle buyers for the meat packers must appraise pretty accurately the quality and grade of the animals they buy or their employers would soon be candidates for the bankruptcy courts. The reason is that meat is not graded as to quality until after the cattle are killed and dressed. The carcasses are then graded by Government inspectors and these grades largely determine the wholesale and retail values of the meat which is to be sold. Thus it is evident that a ceiling price cannot be put on a live beef animal until the quality and grade of the meat it produces is known, and this is finally determined only after it is dead.

Of all the commodities that might have been selected to spearhead the price reduction and control program, beef is probably the thorniest and most difficult. The obstacles to fair and equitable enforcement of price control measures are indeed so great as to defy practical administration.

Why did the administration attack this porcupine of the food industries? Could it have been prompted by the stinging defeat the cattle industry delivered to the President in 1946 when he admitted consideration of a proposal to send soldiers into the country to force rebellious farmers to market their stock?

At any rate, as a problem in price controls, consider these facts concerning beef. Beef, as sold at retail, varies so much in quality and types of cuts as to constitute not one product but many, not to mention the by-products, hides, tallow, and so forth, which have markets of their own. This is indicated by the fact that on August 31, for example, the prices paid for beef cattle ranged from a low of \$18.50 per 100 pounds to a high of \$39.60. To complicate matters further, the various qualities and cuts of beef go to widely separated markets more or less related to the varying standards of living of different segments of the population. The largest share of the top grades of beef, for example, goes east to New England and Atlantic seaboard States. The poorer cuts go to the Southern States and to the poor industrial areas of the large cities.

This, however, is only part of the picture. On the production side, beef is the end product of a slow and leisurely 3-year process of cattle raising. This process begins on the ranges of the Western country and on farms everywhere and continues through lush

pastures and feed lots until the beef animals reach the stage of maturity that commands the best prices in a given set of circumstances. The cattle, or at least a major part of them, change hands several times before the conclusion of the process.

For a panorama of the industry think of a vast stretch of grassy ranges and meadows and farms, 3,000 miles broad and 1,600 miles deep. As the animals mature year by year their feed is improved until finally a large proportion of the best go into the feed lots of the richly fertile Mississippi and Missouri valleys. Here they are fattened on corn to produce the prime beef whence come the tender steaks and the rich, red roast meat that city eaters prize so highly.

In this rashly oversimplified panorama there are, of course, infinite variations of the cattle-raising process. For instance, it is a little-known fact that the dairy farms of the country, chiefly the Middle West, produce or feed to maturity half of all the beef and three-fourths of all the veal produced in the United States.

It can thus be readily seen that the production of beef is a cumulative process which must carry forward the costs of feeding and tending through all the successive steps by which the animal is eventually prepared for market. Hence a reduction in beef prices by arbitrary Government edict is immensely unfair to producers of a product which represents an irretrievable 3-year investment in capital, labor, and feed. The cattle raiser readily accepts the risks of the free market because the free market possesses none of the rigidities of the bureaucratic mandate but, in its ever-continuing adjustments, gives constant warning of impending overproduction and its consequences, and presents alternatives and opportunities that compensate for its rigorously impartial operation.

This, in large, is the situation and the circumstances of the industry which the price controllers invaded. Unable and probably unwilling for political reasons to reduce and control beef prices through ceiling prices imposed on the farmers' live animals, the price controllers imposed their will through the meat-packing industry, which customarily processes more than 80 percent of all the beef produced. The balance is butchered by the farmers themselves. Instead of putting a ceiling on the animals, the price controllers put a ceiling on the average price paid by the meat packers for the beef animals they buy. Elsewhere the farmers can sell their cattle freely for what they can get.

Historically it has always been taken for granted by governments whenever they have imposed price controls that the controls would not reduce the available supplies of the commodities affected. They base this assumption on the belief that the economic processes of production are more or less automatic and must go on no matter what happens. They ignore completely the element of free choice in the processes of producing and marketing any commodity.

By now, however, Price Controller DiSalle and his cohorts know that cattle and beef production are still in the hands of men who are able to exercise free choice as to whether or not and where they market their cattle. As a result, beef price controls have become a colossal hoax. They have succeeded mainly in sustaining high prices, reducing the available supply of beef, and in diverting cattle from the regularly established channels of processing and distribution, the commercial meat packing establishments, into the new and free marketing channels that exist outside the packing industry.

The consequences of the effort to control beef prices have now become glaringly evident. Chiefly they are as follows:

1. The marketing of beef animals and the production of beef have been drastically re-

duced. The American Meat Institute has announced that the movement of beef into consumption through usual distribution channels since the imposition of price controls was more than a quarter of a billion pounds below the like period a year ago. Purchases of cattle during this period by the 95 leading beef-producing plants (doing 75 percent of the business) were 62.5 percent below the purchases in the same period of 1950.

2. Farmers are shipping fewer cattle to terminal markets. Since the imposition of price rollback and price controls, farmers have sent 17 percent fewer cattle to these markets. For the week ended August 25, 32 terminal markets received 165,593 head of cattle compared with 203,455 head in the same week a year ago. The Department of Agriculture has this pertinent comment to make, "Consumption of beef in the second half of 1951 is now expected to be less than previously estimated because considerably more cattle are being added to herds." This is the Government propagandist's way of saying that farmers are refusing to market their stock.

3. Meanwhile marketing of beef cattle and beef through other than regular channels has been mushrooming. In the September 1950 issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation, the Department of Agriculture pointed out that "if consumers use somewhat more than half of their deep-freezer and locker space for meat, they will have room for 1,000,000,000 pounds, or about 50 percent more than the meat and meat products in commercial cold storage houses on July 1, 1950."

As practically as anyone can determine by simple observation, there is a vastly increased volume of meat that is bypassing meat packers and going directly into frozen-food storage.

In this connection a strange phenomenon has appeared. Although the prices farmers have to pay for feeder stock they buy for fattening are so high in relation to price ceilings for the finished animals that the feeding profit approaches the vanishing point, the shipment of feeders is running far ahead of a year ago. How many of these feeders are going directly into consumer food lockers and frozen-food storage without fattening?

4. Consumer resistance to beef prices, even at roll-back levels, indicates that if the Government had permitted an unrestricted volume of beef to move into consumption channels, the prices of beef would have dropped substantially without any recourse to roll-back tactics. The Department of Agriculture, in fact, is predicting such a drop in beef prices with any marked increase in marketings this fall. Roll-back prices and controls simply acted to reduce the available beef supply and sustain prices. Even though beef production is running 13 percent under a year ago, the inventories of beef in commercial cold-storage plants on July 1, 1951, were 25 percent above inventories a year ago.

How has the free market adjusted to this situation? With beef prices out of line in relation to comparable foods, consumers have turned to poultry and eggs and other meat substitutes. Egg prices are sustained at unusually high levels, even though production has been running at a rate that required immense Government support purchases a couple of years ago. In the poultry business the commercial production of broilers is running almost double that of 2 years ago. The turkey crop this year is expected to be the largest on record. Pork production and consumption is close to record levels. Pork prices, however, did not follow beef prices to atmospheric heights, but are currently close to pre-Korean levels.

In a free market it is more than likely that beef prices would long since have adjusted

competitively to the prices of alternative foods. So a chief consequence of the roll-back price controls promulgated by Price Controller DiSalle and his cohorts has been to reduce ruinously the market for beef by encouraging the use of substitutes.

The withering hand of the Government bureaucracy has been laid on one more food industry. Those who doubt or who are not familiar with bureaucracy's blighting touch need only to study the fate of butter, which was a casualty of Government price controls in World War II. Under Government assistance in the form of price supports and promotion of the margarine substitute, the consumption of butter has sunk to new low levels—the lowest in the history of the industry.

Government support of potato prices was discontinued a year ago at the urgent behest of important potato-producing sections, but not before potato consumption had dropped by 20 percent under price support. Can the glaringly unwarranted measures of an inept administration sabotage another food industry without evoking an outraged protest? How much is homo Americanus 1951 willing to take?

ECONOMIC TREND LINE STUDIES.

Wisconsin's Stake in the Andresen Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the entire State of Wisconsin, because our State relies so heavily on the dairy industry, has a great stake in maintaining import controls on dairy products, fats and oils, as inserted in the Defense Production Act of 1951 through an amendment offered by our colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

The urgency of this matter, and specifically the defeat of S. 2104, the administration's attempt to repeal this provision, is outlined in a letter I received today from William O. Perdue, general manager of the Wisconsin Pure Milk Products Co-operative. I hope my colleagues will ponder the contents of this letter—which follows—before acceding to the administration's request to repeal this provision previously approved by the House:

PURE MILK PRODUCTS CO-OPERATIVE,
Fond Du Lac, Wis., October 6, 1951.

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Senate will quite likely take action next week on S. 2104, a repealing of import controls on butter, cheese, and other dairy products. I hope you will talk to members of our Wisconsin delegation urging them to contact their friends in the Senate to the end of defeating such action. We will need tough aggressive action to protect our great dairy industry against a well organized foreign group of importers and jobbers. As you well know, the repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act will have a paralyzing effect on the entire dairy industry of this Nation. This is especially true when proper weight

is given to the high quality standards for American dairy products—both in the field of production and manufacturing. Our own State of Wisconsin is now enforcing a new and effective brucellosis-control law—we have for many years had a tough standard well enforced TB program—by 1955 every farmer in the State who offers milk for sale must meet new and stringent health and sanitary requirements, even to the point of requiring a milk house separate and apart from the barn. These all add tremendously to the cost of production of milk. It doesn't make sense to provide support prices for dairy products now burdened with high surplus and then offer foreign markets ways and means to cut our prices and create further surpluses. Wisconsin farmers have a big stake in this national picture. We produce nearly 15,000,000 pounds of milk per year. This is far in excess of any other State production and represents nearly 13 percent of the entire national production. A major portion of our production goes to manufacturing products such as cheese, butter, and evaporated milk—a larger portion of the foreign-type cheese of our Nation is produced here in Wisconsin. These farms will be hurt beyond measure if proper safeguards are not adopted. So we look to our Members in Congress to help us, and help enlist the aid of other Congressmen.

In view of the fact that foreign markets cannot adequately supply the American public with good wholesome fresh milk and dairy products and because the American people are dependent upon our farmers for this supply, why then, handicap the only available supply? If the American consumers are to be supplied in part or whole by foreign markets with the cheese, butter, and other manufacturing products, then ultimately the cost of fresh milk for bottling purposes will be so high that the average consumer will be priced out of the market because of the fact that our farmers must have an outlet for the spring surplus which is necessary to guarantee fall and winter needs. This outlet is the market some would give to other countries with poorer quality and cheaper cost of production. (Won't you please see some friend of yours in the Senate and help us tell our story.)

We are transmitting a similar communication to other Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM O. PERDUE,
General Manager.

Vivid Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 29, 1951:

VIVID TESTIMONY

Exhibit A is what happens when bureaucrats are permitted to suppress information that should be available to the American people, was supplied by the Office of Price Stabilization within a few hours after President Truman issued his dangerous directive to department heads of civilian agencies granting them the right to use their own discretion in making public news with which they are directly concerned. It was a perfect example

of what can happen when the pattern of a news blackout is laid down by the administration.

An assistant in the OPS, in the absence of Director DiSalle, arose in the majesty of his bestowed authority and issued instructions to all employees of that department not to make public any information that "might cause embarrassment to the OPS." Here was a specific order to suppress any information which, in the estimate of any employee with even a modicum of authority, might cause the people to question the wisdom of department rulings or even request the reason why.

In short, each little bureaucrat from DiSalle on down was instructed to rely on his own judgment—and it could be very bad—as to what the American people should know about the regulations that affect them more intimately than any at issue at the present time—the cost of living. Here was an order that would prohibit the press from obtaining any of the answers to questions the people are asking if those answers embarrassed the department. Of such things are dictatorships born.

The President, smarting under the Nation-wide criticism of his news clamp-down directive of last Wednesday, acted quickly in view of certain political repercussions. He demanded that the instructions be withdrawn forthwith, and they were. Director DiSalle in Chicago professed dismayed surprise that the order was issued. Assistant Director Cook said he didn't issue the instructions personally, but they were signed "under a delegation of authority from him," an ambiguous explanation but probably meaning that amid department confusion some bright lad had an idea and swung his weight around. Such are the possibilities when little Caesars operate even on the fringes of important authority.

Commenting on the President's directive, this week, we said it was simply a manifestation, and a vicious one, of the trend toward news suppression at Federal, State, and city levels. The people's right to information is being distorted into a censorship that could be projected into a complete black-out unless it is stopped now.

At the national level principally it masquerades as a necessary step to guard our defense secrets. No sensible American wants our military or production secrets made available to a potential enemy if they are important to him. But under the guise of a safeguard, authority has been delegated to or assumed by Government employees far beyond their wisdom to discriminate or even their desire to keep the people reliably informed. The President's directive confirmed their right to censor without supervision.

And to repeat, the OPS adventure in this domain of news suppression offers a perfect illustration of what can happen

editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal on September 17, and entitled: "Short-Sighted Seaway Foes." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Record as follows:

SHORT-SIGHTED SEAWAY FOES

The St. Lawrence seaway project will be permanently postponed, if the AFL railway employees' department has its way. Michael Fox, president of the union group, has announced his organization's opposition to any effort to revive congressional consideration for the seaway.

Fear of the loss of thousands of jobs in the railroad industry motivates this obstructionist feeling, we conclude from the union president's statement.

This perpetuate-the-job philosophy of labor is out-dated, short-sighted, and unprogressive. More enlightened unions are coming to see that intelligent self-interest forbids labor from opposing real progress in any form.

Labor's interests cannot be divorced from those of the whole population, and any technical improvement in manufacturing, any great transportation development which strengthens the country as a whole, will, in the long run, improve the lot of labor.

What sort of living standards would the workingman have today if labor had successfully blocked modern methods of mass production because the introduction of machines would result in "the loss of thousands of jobs?"

Temporary dislocations may follow a change in the way of doing things, it is true. It is possible that railroads will lose somewhat immediately after the seaway is opened—if it is ever built.

But if the seaway brings a great expansion and prosperity to industry in the Midwest and other affected regions—as there is every reason to believe it will—then there will be more traffic than ever for the railroads. Many products are better suited to transportation by train than by the slower waterborne carriers. Many markets are out of reach of water transportation entirely, and must be served by rail or highway.

The big question for the railroad employees as for other citizens, should be: Does America need the St. Lawrence seaway? The overwhelming weight of evidence says that we do.

elling evidence that we are headed straight for the tomb.

The local dailies have outraged us the past week with the shame of the heavy, the slicker, and 'he moll. The press, which thinks itself free and responsible, exploits the filth of press agents while the moguls prepare fatter contracts. Respectable papers flaunt this stuff for the delectation of the moronic fringe, and all the while the decent folk dismiss the insult with amused contempt in an apathy from which rises neither dismay nor apprehensions of doom. There has been before this heralding of harlotry in the public press, but more than ever the newspapers delight in their vomit. When shall this license come full cycle when the conscience of the people will reel in punishing disgust of this cynical acceptance of immorality? This way lies the tomb.

Into our homes too the past week by television has come a parade of Hollywood hoodlums masking disloyalty behind the convenient facade of the fifth amendment. Just fears have given way to proved facts of even wider infiltration by subversives of a great industry than was at first suspected, but there is not yet the adamant resolve by the Hollywood people for the kind of housecleaning that the nature of the crisis demands. There is an admitted ex-Communist in the very front offices of a major studio which screamed to high heaven when a conscientious critic detected the familiar sign and symbol in a major production, and others of questionable patriotism are harbored there and elsewhere. To cry "red hering" and "witch hunt" is no longer diverting, it is self-revelatory. Clothing drives for Korea may be a beginning in atonement for former questionable front and dubious alliance, but vigilance is the price of liberty. Any other way, lies the tomb.

There is this cynical acceptance of dishonor too in the affairs of government. President Truman in his Legion talk might breezily dismiss the charge of communism and corruption in his administration, but with the almost daily recital of irregularities in Washington, people will continue to whisper and wonder. It is not only a question of mink coats, of 5-percenters, of RFC scandals, the pathetic "take" of minor officials—"I only got a 9-pound ham"—it is the blind dismissal of guilt and the bland refusal to punish by the Chief Executive himself which shocks and disturbs.

There is a new cynicism in politics which has learned how to perpetuate itself by the doling of liberal largesse. Is there a conservative district represented in Washington by a caustic critic? Perhaps some war contracts with an influx of new voters in the wake may turn up a new face at the next election. Is there a club leader disturbed with certain trends in Government affairs? Perhaps an appointment to one of the far-flung bureaus or an official errand of good will might console and flatter. Is there a group restive with restraint? Even a sop will stop a bolt. This is the way of politics, no doubt, but never before has it had wider vista or freer scope. And this way too, lies the tomb.

Finally, there are enough old-fashioned, Jeffersonian Democrats hereabouts and elsewhere in the country, leaders of the stamp of Al Smith and Governors Ely and Ritchie and Mr. Farley, who resent in mounting intensity the inspiration in foreign affairs and on domestic issues which flows not from the hard core of common sense in the rank and file of the people of America but from a handful of benighted intellectuals on Manhattan's lower East Side. Their liberalism devoid of supernatural springs has reaped diplomatic failure abroad and secular conceit at home, and bankruptcy not alone of the purse but of the spirit impends. And this way lies the tomb.

This Way Lies the Tomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record this editorial by Msgr. W. E. North in the September 28, 1951, issue of the Los Angeles Tidings, the official Catholic paper in the Los Angeles area. It should be read by everyone.

THIS WAY LIES THE TOMB

No election looms, so we may safely quote, without fear of political hacks upbraiding us for toying with politics, the elder statesman who is our only living ex-President. Mr. Hoover writes: "Our greatest danger is not from invasion by foreign armies. Our dangers are that we may commit suicide from within cynical acceptance of dishonor." We do not have to go far afield to find com-

Short-Sighted Seaway Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, now that Canada has refired the country's interest in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I think it important that we appeal to those who have traditionally opposed the project to reexamine their position. This was very ably done by an

Water Power and the Power Trust**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Not by a Dam Site," by Alfred M. Green, published in the *Machinists Monthly Journal* for October 1951.

This article points out the tremendously important public issues involved in litigation now pending in the United States circuit of appeals in Richmond, Va., with regard to the comprehensive development of the Roanoke River Basin and its effect on other similar programs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT BY A DAM SITE

(By Alfred M. Green)

Should all of America's water power resources be turned over to the private power companies? Put bluntly, that is the issue in a tremendously important legal case which the United States circuit court of appeals in Richmond, Va., has been called upon to decide this fall.

For months, the propagandists for the power trust have been spreading extravagant charges about the law suit, on which hearings were scheduled to open on September 4. They charge the suit is part of a plot to "socialize," not only all electrical power, but even every other industry.

An amazing feature of the case is that two agencies of the Federal Government are on opposite sides of the dispute. The Interior Department is asking the court to set aside a decision of the Federal Power Commission granting to the Virginia Electric & Power Co the right to build a power dam on the Roanoke River at Roanoke Rapids, in North Carolina.

Appearing as attorney for the Interior Department is Gregory Hankin, who in the last 20 years has handled on behalf of the Government some of its most historic power disputes. He is credited with winning the famous "New River Case," which gave to Uncle Sam authority over all navigable streams—not only the parts that are navigable, but the entire streams right up to their sources.

But Hankin regards the Roanoke Rapids case as possibly more important, at least on a dollars and cents basis.

MIGHT BAR ALL BASIN PROJECTS

The point is that Congress has approved a plan for comprehensive development of the Roanoke River "basin," and already has appropriated \$78,000,000 for a start on the project. If a private power company is to be allowed to step in and grab the choicest power site in this, or any other "basin" project, that would probably mean the end of all such projects, Hankin warns.

"It is high time that the readers of newspapers and magazines realized the difference between socialization of industry, as it is called, and the program of the Government," Hankin declared, referring to the power trust attacks on the suit.

"To socialize an industry means for the Government not only to embark upon it, but also to exclude all private enterprise from that industry. It is entirely different to say

that the Government may enter an activity without excluding private enterprise.

"It is still another thing to say that private enterprise should operate to the exclusion of the Government, especially in such a monopoly field as producing power from our navigable rivers.

"The so-called public utilities really perform a Government function, which is why they are called public. To say that the Government should be excluded from the production of power means that private business should engage in the performance of a government function, to the exclusion of Government itself."

COMPETITION BENEFITS COMPANIES

"Another peculiar thing about the power trust propaganda is that it overlooks one important fact. That is that, wherever the Government has offered some competition to the private power companies, the result has been to benefit not only the public, but also the private companies as well.

"They have been forced to give better service at lower rates, which has increased the use of power, and that, in turn, has increased the companies' profits."

For the Roanoke Basin, Congress has approved 11 dam projects, with the aim of providing flood control, navigation, power development and recreational resources. Two of the dams are already under way, one at Buggs Island, near the Virginia-North Carolina border, and the other at Philpott, far upstream on a tributary, the Smith River, in the western part of Virginia.

ALL PART OF SAME PROJECT

But the two sites which offer the most in the way of power, for the least outlay, are at Gaston and Roanoke Rapids, both somewhat downstream from Buggs Island. In fact, Hankin contends, Buggs Island, Gaston and Roanoke Rapids really should be considered part of the same project, with Gaston and Roanoke Rapids, the power stations for the Buggs Island Dam, which is designed to hold back a large volume of water to form a lake of considerable size.

If the Virginia power company, usually called Vepco, gets a permit to go ahead with its power plant at Roanoke Rapids, it plans to apply for another at Gaston. That would give the private company most of the benefit for the \$78,000,000 which Uncle Sam already is spending upstream.

Since Congress already has approved the entire basin project, including dams at both Gaston and Roanoke Rapids, the Interior Department declares, the FPC has no right to grant a license for a private company to use the sites.

According to law, Congress may approve only projects that will be "self-supporting," that is, that will pay for themselves through the various benefits they offer, such as power, reclamation, navigation, flood control, and recreation.

Treated as a whole, the Roanoke basin program meets this test. But it no longer would if the best power sites are to be handed over to Vepco. That means that, if Vepco gets its Roanoke Rapids license, Congress probably will appropriate no funds for the other parts of the development.

WOULD PREVENT FLOOD CONTROL

Vepco's plan is to use the Roanoke Rapids Dam for a "peaking plant," which means that it would produce power only when it is needed to supplement other plants in the Vepco system. At such times, there would be a heavy flow of water, but, when the power is not needed, the water would be held back.

That would interfere with what might be the most important function of the whole development—the control of floods.

And, if Vepco is to be permitted to block the entire Roanoke Basin development, there is no reason why other power companies can-

not do the same thing elsewhere. That is what Hankin means when he says this case may decide whether Uncle Sam is ever again going to be able to carry out such a project as the Tennessee Valley Authority anywhere in the country.

If the FPC and Vepco win, the power company will be almost the only one to benefit from the \$78,000,000 of Federal funds appropriated.

The value of the Buggs Island Dam, built by Uncle Sam, to a power plant at Roanoke Rapids has been estimated by Government engineers at \$1,500,000 a year, or a total of \$75,000,000 for the 50-year term of the license the FPC proposed to issue to Vepco.

In other words, Uncle Sam's \$78,000,000 appropriation would be returned almost in full, but it would be returned to a private power company instead of to the people of the Nation, who put up the money, or to the people of the Roanoke Valley.

Should the U. S. A. Ratify the Genocide Treaty?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article presenting the affirmative in a debate on the question, Should the U. S. A. ratify the Genocide Treaty? The article was written by John D. Hickerson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE U. S. A. RATIFY THE GENOCIDE TREATY

(By John D. Hickerson)

YES—FOR MORAL LEADERSHIP

History is full of examples of man's inhumanity to man on a wholesale scale. The persecution of the early Christians by the Roman Empire, the massacre of the Armenians by the Turkish Empire, and the slaughter of some 6,000,000 Jews and Poles by the Nazis are only a few instances of the kind of deliberate mass murder that is now called the crime of genocide.

The conscience of mankind was so shocked by the bestial actions of the Nazis that the General Assembly of the United Nations at its first session affirmed that "genocide is a crime under international law which the civilized world condemns," and recommended that a convention be prepared to facilitate the speedy prevention and punishment of that crime. In 1948 the General Assembly, after 2 years of careful preparatory work by other bodies, adopted the "Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." This defines genocide as—

"Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such:

"(a) Killing members of the group.

"(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

"(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part.

"(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.

"(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."

The convention states that persons committing genocide shall be punished, "whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, or private individuals." The contracting parties undertake to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide. Any contracting party may call upon competent organs of the United Nations to take such action as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide.

The convention came into force on January 12, 1951. The President of the United States has strongly urged that the Senate consent to the ratification of the convention, and the convention is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is a tragic commentary on the state of our civilization at this midpoint of the twentieth century that one has to admit that genocide may again occur. But what assurance have we that another dictator may not someday go berserk and slaughter millions of people belonging to a particular national, ethnical, racial, or religious group? The Republic of Korea recently charged that genocide had been committed by the North Koreans, Chinese Communists, and the Soviet leaders. These charges, which will have to be examined with care, show that the danger of genocide is not a thing of the past.

Genocide was immediately recognized by the General Assembly as a matter which could not be handled by national action alone. Genocide, the Assembly decided, is a crime against international law, the prevention and punishment of which requires international cooperation.

The convention does four important and useful things: It brands genocide as a crime under international law; it brings the full moral weight of world opinion to bear against this crime, it binds the contracting parties to prevent and punish acts of genocide; and it gives formal and legal recognition to the fact that genocide is a matter of grave international concern and therefore a matter of grave concern to the United States.

No one contends that the Genocide Convention is a perfect treaty. Like any treaty, it represents a compromise between differing points of view.

The convention has been criticized, for example, because it does not refer to political groups. This term was debated by the General Assembly, but many delegations including some Latin-American ones, argued that it could not be defined precisely enough for use in the convention. For the same reason, no reference was made to economic groups. These omissions may be considered as a flaw by some people, but they certainly do not warrant the rejection of the convention and the consequent denial of protection to four very important groups—national, ethnical, racial, and religious.

The convention defines genocide narrowly: any one of five acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such. Thus neither a murder nor a lynching constitutes an act of genocide; they are crimes against an individual, not a whole group. Ordinary acts of war are not genocide, they are acts designed to defeat a national group but not to destroy it as such. The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima was merely another instrument of war and not an instrument of genocide.

Genocide, as defined in the convention, does not embrace economic or social discrimination against a group, or mistreatment of a group, or suppression of a group's civil or political rights. Genocide embraces acts committed with the intent to destroy a group—by outright killing or by other acts which, in the course of time, will eliminate the entire group. Some critics have questioned one of these acts—"causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the

group." They might ask whether producers of comic books, grade-B movies, and certain radio and television programs are guilty of genocide by causing mental harm to our children. No, this unusual phrase "mental harm" refers to the kind of act the Japanese war lords committed when they deliberately stimulated the distribution of opium in order to injure and weaken the Chinese people.

The five acts which are punishable under the genocide convention are carefully defined: a person must have actually committed genocide or have attempted to commit it, or he must have been directly involved in such acts, as in a conspiracy.

Only one of these acts has given rise to any question—direct and public incitement to commit genocide. This prohibition, it is alleged, might violate the freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. The clause does not mean, of course, that a person who reviles all Methodists or ridicules an Irishman is guilty of genocide; however deplorable his conduct may be. If, however, he directly incited a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden, and millions of others over the radio and television, to massacre all Methodists or Irishmen in the United States of America, he would most certainly be guilty of genocide.

Some lawyers, including a committee of the American Bar Association, have opposed ratification of the covenant on the ground that it runs contrary to the United States Constitution. Other lawyers, including a section of the association and several local bar associations, have supported the convention. As I am not a lawyer, I am willing to accept the view of the Solicitor General of the United States and the legal adviser of the Department of State that the convention is constitutional.

That the convention accords with our Constitution is the view not only of the executive branch, but also of a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Four of the five members of that subcommittee, which recommended ratification of the convention, were lawyers. In order to leave no doubt on this point, the subcommittee proposed the adoption of four understandings (not reservations) to make clear the Senate's interpretation of the constitutionality of this treaty.

The heart of the matter is whether it is proper for the Federal Government to undertake, by means of a treaty, the obligation to prevent and punish genocide. Article I of the Constitution leaves no doubt on this point. It expressly authorizes the Congress to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations. The General Assembly of the United Nations, which one of our great statesmen, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, called the town meeting of the world, has twice declared, in 1946 and 1948, that genocide is a crime against the law of nations. It has twice done so without a single dissenting vote.

Genocide has thus been recognized as a proper subject for international action, like piracy, slavery and slave trade, the international traffic in narcotic drugs, and counterfeiting. The fact that the representatives of 43 nations signed the convention and that 23, including several outside the United Nations, have already deposited their ratifications or accessions means that the world community has reaffirmed the view of the General Assembly that genocide is a crime under international law.¹ Under the Constitution of the United States, this means that genocide is a proper subject for action by the Congress.

¹ Five other nations have transmitted ratification or accessions with reservations, and the question as to the legal effect of these reservations has been referred by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion.

Some lawyers seem to fear that the convention somehow infringes on States' rights under our Constitution. As a Texan, I know what the phrase States' rights means—legally and emotionally. Nevertheless, I do not see why States' rights is an issue here. Genocide means the mass destruction of a group of human beings, which should be punishable under international law; it does not mean individual acts of homicide which, in this country, are punishable under State law. Genocide has never occurred in the United States and, pray God, it will never occur here. But in the purely hypothetical event that some conspirators undertook to massacre all the Episcopalians or all the Jews in this country, would not such a crime be of national concern?

Another point of controversy is the fear of some that ratification of this convention would mean that the Federal Government is trying to legislate through the treaty power. Treaties, under our Constitution, become the supreme law of the land. Is it right, some critics ask, for the Federal Government, acting through the President and two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting to place a new crime on the statute book?

The convention itself is quite clear that this is not the case: Article V states expressly that this treaty is not self-executing and that it must be given effect by subsequent legislation. Once the United States Government had ratified the treaty, it would be necessary for the Congress to enact legislation declaring that genocide is a crime under Federal law and providing penalties for its punishment.

Some concern has been expressed over article VI of the convention, which provides that persons charged with genocide shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

This means, they allege, that an American citizen could be deprived, against his will, of a trial before an American court and brought before some international court; or it might even mean that a decision of our Supreme Court in such a case might be reversed by some international court. This is not true, for the article makes clear that a party to the covenant would have to accept the jurisdiction of some international penal tribunal before one of its nationals could be tried before such a tribunal. If any such proposal is made after our Government ratified the convention, it would have to be considered on its merits by the Congress; and no such tribunal could be given jurisdiction over an American citizen without the consent of the Congress.

Our Nation has come into a position of great influence in world affairs. Everything we do or fail to do affects the destinies of all mankind. Ratification of the Genocide Convention would show the whole world that we are determined to play our part in preventing and punishing an odious crime.

Questions of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Cost of living index? How high is high, Mr. Di-Salle?

Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, says that this is the last tax increase bill he will support, short of an all-out war or war crisis. Do not worry, Senator. Have we ever been short on war crises since your party took over?

Religious Liberty Committee Report of the Illinois State Council, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD the report made by the religious liberty committee of the Illinois State Council of the Knights of Columbus. This committee was headed by a loyal, patriotic, and conscientious American, Mr. Vincent Knaus, of Chicago.

It seems to me that the recommendations made by this group are especially meritorious, and I would like, especially, to call attention to points IV, V, VI, VII and VIII. I am confident that any organization which is interested in getting into the fight against communism could well utilize the outline which has been presented.

We all recognize the valiant efforts which the Knights of Columbus have made against the insidious encroachments of communism in this country. The Illinois State council has been in the vanguard in this fight and all Americans will applaud the program which these patriotic, Christian men have designed to promote loyalty to our country.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY COMMITTEE REPORT

I

These are extremely dark days for the church and mankind. Materialistic communism seems an irresistible force that will engulf and destroy civilization. To conquer this atheistic foe we must appeal to Our Lady to give us extraordinary confidence and inspiration to overcome this obstacle to world peace. To protect our interests we must fear nothing—not life itself—for conquer we must. Our Blessed Lady made a promise attached to the devout wearing of her scapular: "Whoever shall die clothed in this shall not suffer eternal fire." Mary concluded her message at Fatima by holding out to all the world the same sign she had given to her beloved Simon Stock. The Scapular is her special mark of love and eternal peace.

We recommend that the members of our order join in this appeal of the mother of Christ and sponsor the devout wearing of her badge of honor.

II

We wish to again call your attention to point V of last year's report and include another martyr:

That annually in the State, as an observance of the Illinois State Council and by local councils—at a suitable date—we offer

our prayers and hold an annual Communion Sunday in memory of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, and Archbishop Joseph Boran (and all other martyrs to the same cause), of the torture and struggle they underwent and now remain the symbols of freedom against depravity in government.

That our beloved State chaplain and bishop be consulted on this program—to make it a fitting tribute to these three men and others of our faith who stood up against tyrants and confessed that faith before men.

III

We again convey to you point IV of last year's program with special emphasis:

That the revelations at Fatima and the occurrences at Lipa demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that in waging a war against this Satanic ideology we must be spiritually armed and protected—that prayer and sacrifice are concomitant barrages to storm heaven to avert our threatened catastrophe and destruction.

We recommend the family rosary, recited daily in the homes of our members. That the Knights of Columbus inaugurate in our beloved State, a 15-minute radio program, State-wide, under the direction of our beloved State chaplain and bishop, to reach Catholic and non-Catholic alike, to a method of prayer that has never failed and will not fail us now.

That at our council meetings, at the closing prayer a decade of the rosary be recited, dedicated to the coronation of our Blessed Mother as Queen of Heaven.

IV

Our Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States with the cross symbolizes the soul of America. A child, by his belief in Almighty God and obedience to his commandments, which is the citizenship creed of America binding on Congress, as on the home and school, on the Nation and the President, as well as on men and women, boys and girls, should recite a pledge of allegiance that conforms to a belief in these ideals.

Communism seeks to preserve children and adolescents from all contamination of love of God and country and the child, especially must be freed from the debilitating influence of family, paternal and maternal authority and preserve his ears from all such infection to the end to dechristianize him and make him Godless.

We believe that the present pledge of allegiance to the flag—in this day and age—is incomplete and insufficient, and suggest the adoption of the following:

"PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

"I, ———, citizen of the United States, hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, my Government, represented by this flag, was instituted among men, and to this Government, and to this flag of the United States, I pledge my undying allegiance."

V

Free speech is not an absolute right. It becomes license if there are no bounds. Free speech is restricted by the criminal laws, libel, and slander, as well as ordinances of the city or village on disorderly conduct.

Free speech has been employed by the enemies of a free representative government as an instrument of its own destruction. Communists under the guise of liberty have held elections to end all elections.

As a Catholic lay organization, it is our solemn duty and obligation as free men and women to pronounce on controversial legislation seeking to control communism and its adherents. This is not a matter of opinion but a struggle involving life and death.

VI

The Fourth Commandment places upon all the obligation of obedience to all civil rules who command lawfully. We select our rulers by the use of the ballot—this must be done intelligently. There is an obligation on the voter to understand the political issues, know the character and ability of each candidate he selects or elects. There should be no blind fanaticism in voting for a party or a particular candidate. Failure to vote has been held to be a mortal sin of omission. It has been aptly said that unchecked power is no less tyranny because someone has voted for it. We must get off the gold standard and on the moral standard. We are paying dearly for our lazy thinking in the past.

We recommend that you think before you make the sign—that may seal your doom.

VII

In point III of last year's report, we recommended that the Illinois State Council and the Supreme Council affiliate with the "All-American Conference to Combat Communism" at once.

Whereas it appears that this conference is now being organized on a grass-root principle or basis to reach the mass of people not only on a State-wide basis but people in the city and village as well.

We therefore recommend that the Illinois State Council, the local chapters in the State and individual councils and officers cooperate in this endeavor to unite all our people of all races and creeds to destroy the ugly scourge of communism in the formation of such local units.

VIII

Clarence Manion, dean of Notre Dame law school, has written an inspiring statement of the basic principles which make our American way of life and are the source of our past progress and present strength and he has called this small volume *The Key to Peace*.

It is attractively titled and timed. The book is American rather than Catholic in a sectarian sense. It clearly sets forth the rich roots of religion that guided the thinking of our founding fathers. This book should be in the hands of every council in the State to be read, discussed, and analyzed. It is an excellent antidote for the Communist Red terror.

We recommend that a copy of *The Key to Peace* be given to every Grand Knight as a gift from the Illinois State council for a refresher course in the greatest traditions of America.

IX

In order to properly combat foreign isms, particularly communism, we must be able to separate the wheat from the chaff. Double talk, upside-down words have been employed by the enemies of our free institutions seeking to ensnare even the elect—so that we must dispel the clouds of confusion and muddleheaded thinking. In order to be prepared in an educational way, we recommend the holding of a countersubversive seminar to be held at least once a year (one in the city of Chicago and another at Springfield for down-State) in order to fully and completely understand the position of the church on communism and other totalitarian isms and give the required answers.

X

We recommended in our last report that our State deputy appoint a committee on religious liberty representative of the whole State and that meetings be held at least four times a year. In addition, we recommend that a State chairman be appointed together with diocesan chairmen with an executive committee to pass on all activities of the committee. That the administrative assistant be placed on this committee. That all matters pertaining to legislation affecting our church, State and home be referred

to this committee and that the scope of this committee be broadened to take in all subversive activities affecting these subjects.

VINCENT L. KNAUS,
Chairman.

HENRY H. FONKE,
Vice Chairman.

HARRY T. STOUT,
ELMER ZWELLING,

BERNARD WIRTH.

California's Dewey Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief article from Frontier magazine, published in California, concerning interest in the possible candidacy of Dewey Anderson for the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate.

I have known Dewey Anderson for a good many years during his service with committees of this Congress interested in the national economy and in small business. He rendered outstanding service with the TNEC and later with the Senate Small Business Committee, working tirelessly not only to help develop facts and wise national economic policy, but to see that small-business institutions were protected in the war and postwar periods.

Since leaving Government service, Mr. Anderson has founded and securely established the Public Affairs Institute here in Washington, a research agency similar in structure to Brookings, which puts emphasis on the study of those problems which are immediate and current. I am sure that many members of this body know Mr. Anderson as favorably as I know him. He has appeared many times as a witness on problems before our committees, and he has made a real contribution to those hearings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S DEWEY ANDERSON—IN THE 1952 GOLDEN STATE SENATORIAL SWEEPSTAKES, HE IS EYING HIS CHANCES

(By Benton J. Stong)

Dewey Anderson is a husky Californian with a smile well proportioned to his broad shoulders. As he moves through the House and Senate Office Buildings, the Capitol and elsewhere around Washington, you may see him stop and visit with a Senator, a Congressman, a high administrator, a guard at one of the doors.

Anderson, author, economist, legislator, executive, and a man with a Ph. D. degree that doesn't protrude, knows the people of the Nation's Capital from top to bottom. The statesman puzzling with the problems of world affairs and the page boy following the Washington ball team are both friends of his. Anderson has a genuine interest in people and their affairs, and it is this interest which kindles warmth and friendship wherever he moves.

It is no surprise in Washington that a section of Democrats in his home State of California are discussing him as a potential can-

didate next year to oppose reactionary Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND. Few men who could be named to carry the Democratic banner in California would, as a personality in contrast to KNOWLAND, give the voters of the State a clearer, sharper choice between liberalism and reaction than Anderson, say his friends. The big question is, of course, whether he has the qualities, experience, demonstrated ability and electability. The Democratic cause in California, despite a majority of registrations, faces a steep uphill battle to unseat KNOWLAND.

Perhaps first it should be conceded that California Democrats must build up any candidate. There appears to be no ready-made leader, but it would take a long search to find a more personable and competent candidate than Anderson, who is obtaining increasing recognition for his work as director of the Public Affairs Institute of Washington.

Many Californians have gone on record with their opinions of Anderson. John B. Elliott, a Democratic Party leader, wrote: "He is an experienced public servant whose record is without flaw."

James Roosevelt and Attorney General Pat Brown are both among the founding sponsors of the Public Affairs Institute. J. Frank Burke, a leader of the good-government cause in California, says that Anderson would be outstanding in the United States Senate.

The Democratic delegation in the Congress endorsed Anderson for appointment as the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors recently in this way: "Dewey Anderson is well known in California as an expert economist and liberal thinker. He has become nationally prominent as the director of the Public Affairs Institute . . ."

Nor is this recognition confined to Californians. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, dean of Senate liberal leaders, says of him: "Dewey Anderson is a leader whose integrity and ability are recognized by a wide circle in the Congress." Representative ADAM POWELL speaks of Anderson's professional competency and liberal views.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS considers him and his work in Washington of vital concern to the entire public, of real importance in a functioning democracy.

A CALIFORNIA PRODUCT

Anderson is a stockily built, energetic man in his early fifties. He grew up in California, graduated from the public schools in San Jose, and took three degrees at Stanford University, ending up with a Phi Beta Kappa key. His wife is Erma Sams, who prior to marriage 31 years ago, was the metropolitan girls work executive for Los Angeles. They have two children, Harry, a law student at Denver University, and Mrs. June Jensen, who lives in Menlo Park, Calif.

Dewey Anderson makes friends easily and holds them even when he may have to part company over important issues. Witness the time he resigned from Gov. Culbert Olson's administration over a difference in policy in handling the State's big relief problem. Later the breach between the two was healed, and Olson is now one of the sponsors of the Public Affairs Institute.

Anderson was born into a pioneer family whose Norwegian-immigrant father proved up on a homestead in Dakota Territory. His father in later years, after retirement from ownership of a manufacturing enterprise in California, became the unanimous choice of the several political factions as the reform mayor of a Los Angeles suburb. This is the atmosphere in which Dewey was raised, and effective political action in good causes was his daily fare. He has engaged in a variety of successful business ventures and recently was chosen founding president of the Inter-Continental Development Co., a Washington, D. C., corporation formed by American business leaders and engineers to

conduct economic and business surveys and operate development projects in the undeveloped areas of the world under our point 4 program.

Anderson's life has been amazingly varied. He joined a circus as a member of an acrobatic troupe when not yet in his teens, but was knocked out of a career under the big top by a fall that sent him to a hospital for most of a year. He has driven a dog team 1,100 miles from the frozen wastes of Nome to the lower Kuskokwim in Alaska, collecting economic and social information about the natives as the director of a study for Stanford University commissioned by the United States Government. And many a summer has seen him exploring the back country of the High Sierras.

Why is Dewey Anderson potential material for the United States Senate? He was nurtured on fundamental American liberalism in his boyhood by a father who was a member of the Democratic National Convention that first nominated William Jennings Bryan. He followed the reform progressive leadership of Hiram Johnson, the elder Bob La Follette, and Senator George Norris. Then, as Franklin Roosevelt came on the scene with the compelling features of the New Deal, Dewey Anderson became an early supporter of F. D. R., who appointed Anderson California's representative along with Judge Ben Lindsey to the White House Conference on the Care of Children. Later in World War II, he again called on Anderson, making him a member of the War Food Advisory Board, as well as director of the monopoly investigation of the concentration of economic power in the United States.

WATER PUT HIM IN POLITICS

What started Dewey Anderson in active politics was the urgent need of his own Santa Clara Valley for water to irrigate the parched areas of its valuable orchards. This caused him to study the water needs of the State, and made him one of the team of speakers in what finally became a successful effort to launch the Central Valley project. He has maintained a continued interest in the water, power, and land problems of California ever since, being called upon by such men as Samuel B. Morris, head of the Los Angeles Water and Power Department, for assistance in Washington.

In the depression mid-thirties, the educational people of Santa Clara County were concerned over the drive to cut back support of public schools. Their representative in the legislature was considered a leader in this effort, and they sought a candidate to unseat him. They drafted Anderson, who was elected in two successive campaigns. He became a recognized leader of the liberal forces in Sacramento. When the next election to select a governor came around, he was one of the small group that prevailed upon Olson to run, and campaigned vigorously for him.

When Olson was elected, he chose Anderson to help prepare the biennial State budget, which became a model of budget construction. Then, Anderson took over the politically ridden Republican-managed State Relief Administration. He put the SRA in some degree of order and refused to permit the exploitation of the unemployed by the corporation farms.

Anderson fights for the right things. That is why, when public education was confronted with the beginnings of what later turned into the Goetz affair in Pasadena (which stirred the National Educational Association to positive action against present-day bigots in their recent San Francisco convention), the rank and file of classroom teachers drafted him to run for State Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1946. With only 6 weeks in which to actively campaign, but with the nearly unanimous endorsements of State-wide labor and liberal

groups, he rolled up 546,000 votes, getting a higher percentage of the votes for that office than the Democratic candidate for governor obtained in his race.

The Democratic National Committee is aware of Anderson's usefulness in campaigns. Presidential Adviser Clark Clifford once wrote him, "I think you might have noticed in the President's State of the Union message references to the philosophy contained in the material you sent me. I want to extend my congratulations for the fine work you are doing."

Dewey Anderson's practical political experience has been almost continuous for the past 15 years. For 5 years he had the privileges of the Senate Chamber itself, first as the head of the monopoly investigation (TNEC), and later as the director of the active Senate Small Business Committee.

How really effective Dewey Anderson has been is indicated by the remarks in open hearings of Representative CHARLES HALLECK, Republican leader, who acknowledged: "You have been working on just about everything that is 'hot' around here, as we say," to which Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Ohio Republican leader, added, "I suggest that we designate Mr. Anderson 'moulder of public opinion'; * * * I am sure your organization would have done better than the Hoover Commission (of which he was a member). I want to give you public credit for that."

Church and welfare groups of California recognized Anderson's leadership by choosing him the president of the California conference of social work. More recently, a federation of 30 national organizations, embracing farm organizations, labor, a cross-section of church leaders and other groups, which are banded together to make point 4 a reality in national policy, chose Anderson as the chairman of the group's drive to establish a Nation-wide grass roots citizens' organization similar to the effective Stimson committee for the Marshall plan.

WHAT HE STANDS FOR

A man is known by what he fights for, how he stands up under fire and how effectively he works in the muddled field of politics. The list of Anderson's battles is long. Outstanding are the following:

Pioneer participation in the campaign to establish the Central Valley project, and continuing efforts to help provide California with more water and power.

More equitable taxation. He was chairman of the Legislative Interim Committee on real property taxation, seeking to make taxes fairer on homes, small farms and small business properties.

He has long been involved in the fight to protect and strengthen independent and small business. His efforts in this direction are many sided, the most recent being the successful use of his proposal to establish a Smaller War Plants Corporation to take prime contracts and assist independent businesses to obtain capital to expand to do defense business.

Organized labor frequently looks to Anderson for advice and support. He supplied the minority membership of the Joe Ball Watchdog Committee on Taft-Hartley with the facts used in their report which offset Ball's whitewash of the bill's first-year operation. He published a treatise on Taft-Hartley After 3 Years—and the Next Steps in which Anderson challenges Taft to give objective proof that the act should be continued.

He has long championed adequate old age pensions, and wrote a critical evaluation, "The American Pension System." He sought to have the revisions of social security include a cost-of-living factor in all old-age pensions.

He has long been identified with the conservation movement.

He is a close student of Government efficiency and economy; was early made a mem-

ber of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report.

His concern for a peace without appeasement is shown in numerous public addresses and writings. One of these was *The Ruhr: A Better American Policy*, which more than a year before the Schuman plan outlined almost an identical solution of this danger zone in central Europe. His latest study, *Defense of America*, is an argument for a foreign policy which will enable us to defend ourselves against any totalitarian aggression of either the Left or Right varieties. At the same time he proposes to strengthen America at home through welfare, education, resources development, and other programs, and abroad through a bold new program to remove the triple threat to international friendship—poverty, disease, and ignorance in the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world.

The Full Employment Act introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY and championed in the House by then-Congressman George Outland, of California, declared it to be the policy of this Government to never again allow large-scale unemployment. This measure was strongly influenced from its inception by Anderson.

Here, then, is a broad sample of the range of his activities and interests. It marks him as a man of singular qualifications and practical liberalism.

But can he be elected?

His friends, some of whom are among the leading political figures of California, say he can. At any rate, Anderson is a man to watch.

Europe Trapped Between Stalin and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. David G. Dallin, which appears in the current issue of the *New Leader*. Mr. Dallin has been in Europe and writes most interestingly about the real situation as it exists in Western Europe. The American people ought to fully understand and appreciate the significance of the Eisenhower mission in Europe.

The article follows:

The pace of history has slowed down; that was my dominant impression on my second postwar visit to Europe, after 3 years' absence, and it necessarily formed the background for all the political conclusions I drew. Fewer great events occur today; there are fewer major upheavals, and the man in the street has entered the scene once more as a sort of everyday life is resumed.

Postwar recovery is complete in some countries and virtually so in others. Food and clothing, for the great majority of Europeans, are at approximately the prewar level, although there is still a lag in housing, the chief exceptions are England, with her austerity program, and devastated Germany, where it will be decades before the last traces of the war are finally erased. It is surprising how few mutilated ex-soldiers one sees in the streets and how great a display of wealth and luxury one finds again in the upper social strata, though, in the latter respect, England is again an exception.

Not so long ago, wartime and postwar motifs still set the tone of European life: mothers and wives in mourning, trials of collaborationists and Nazi war criminals, tales of heroic partisans, homeless children, inflation, milk and meat shortages. In 3 years, all this receded into the background. Sports and dancing are important once again. The newspapers have become monotonous and even dull, with little noteworthy front-page news, and bank robberies and rape cases are back in the headlines. The average man is satisfied, life having resumed its easy, comfortable course.

Not only has the pace of history slowed down, but it sometimes seems as if political institutions were frozen. Europe's political curiosities—like West Berlin, the non-Communist island in a Communist sea, and turbulent Trieste—are still there, fascinating and absurd as ever. Austria is still the same—a nation at once divided and united. And France and Italy remain the chief bastions of Western European communism.

The Communists' numerical strength has undergone little change, freezing in France at about 25 percent of the electorate and in Italy at thirty-some-odd. And yet, in spite of the fact that the Bolsheviks commanded far less support than that at the time of their successful revolution in 1917, no one in Europe today thinks in terms of possible Communist uprisings. The Communist movement is like a chained beast; it emits fearsome roars, but it cannot burst the bonds created by unfavorable political conditions. Even in weak nations like Italy and Germany, the authority of the state has been restored; law and order largely prevail, the courts and the police function in a more or less normal fashion, and law violations—both criminal and political—have fallen off sharply.

And yet, the picture I have drawn of a return to normal conditions in Europe is one-sided and therefore deceptive. The real state of affairs is one of the utmost precariousness and every intelligent European realizes the paradox of this abnormal normalcy.

For the basis of this general improvement is not international amity and sound progress in world affairs, but rather a state of equilibrium between two giants poised for a possible death grapple. Whether we like it or not, most Europeans think of themselves as standing helplessly between the two mighty contestants. The giants are afraid of each other and are therefore avoiding a clash for the moment, permitting Europeans to enjoy peace, prosperity, and happiness. However, everyone is aware that this is a purely temporary state of affairs.

Here in America, we generally talk of the struggle between west and east, identifying Western Europe with the United States. The average European, however, is not in complete agreement with American political policies and methods, even though he views them more sympathetically than he does Moscow's. In his eyes, Western Europe today is much like no-man's land: Between the two lines of trenches, the farmer tills his land, tends his cows, and celebrates holidays. But he knows that, at any time, his little hut may be blown to bits and his family wiped out.

That is why the whole of Western Europe, in spite of the apparent return to normal conditions, never ceases to talk of war. Europeans are more fearful and less ready for war than we in this country and, though they sometimes affect a confidence they don't actually feel that it will never come, war remains their chief preoccupation and a contingency that is taken into account even in making private plans.

"If the Russians start a new drive on the Korean model," says the American, "we will strike back in force."

But the European says: "If Moscow launches a new aggression, they will strike back."

"If Soviet armies invade Europe, our bombers will destroy Soviet cities," say people in New York, Washington, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

But the people in Brussels, Paris, Rome, and Frankfurt say, "Their bombers will obliterate Moscow and Leningrad."

In other words, Europeans by no means tend to identify themselves completely with the United States; the "west" as a perfect alliance, as a community of homogeneous and united nations does not exist. The sooner we rid ourselves of this dangerous delusion, the better.

The nations of Europe vary, of course, in their attitudes toward Moscow and Washington. Generally speaking, however, the Western European outlook on the cold war differs from ours in the following respects:

1 All of Western Europe lies within the range of Soviet bombers, and is likely to feel their devastating power long before the Western Hemisphere suffers any major damage.

2. Europe is too small to be economically self-supporting, and must of necessity trade with the Soviet Union. To do so, it is forced to supply the Kremlin with goods that the latter needs.

3 Europe is politically and militarily too weak to defy the Soviet Government and react to its provocation in an appropriate manner.

4 A trend which may be called Bevanism, or Nehruism, i. e., a tendency toward appeasement of Moscow, still constitutes a political force in a number of European countries. This tendency inevitably assumes the form of anti-Americanism.

As a result of all these factors, Western Europe cannot be viewed simply as one element in the western alliance; not only in a geographical sense, but in a political sense as well, it lies between America and Soviet Russia. Moscow has skillfully played upon Europe's differences of opinion with the United States and will certainly continue to do so. Moreover, at the critical moment, Stalin will doubtless attempt to win some European countries over to a position of neutrality, exploiting their fear of his military might as well as anti-American sentiments.

But, one may well ask, doesn't the Atlantic Pact constitute complete, effective consolidation of western power against the eastern bloc? The fact is that it does not; the 14-nation alliance based on the pact is far less powerful than is generally supposed in this country.

Large Manufacturer Achieves Excellent Results When Utilizing Neglected Productive Capacity of Workers Over 45

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, our unemployment pool is down practically to a minimum, and the postwar establishment of so many new families cuts down the number of women who can go into defense production. This is a golden opportunity to integrate our older workers into our economy and to keep them employed. The older worker and the

handicapped, therefore, become a most important part of the manpower available for our defense mobilization—it is significant that estimates of the manpower category which includes older workers is about half of the total estimated available manpower supply to meet the emergency. Appended is a letter from Leonard Ashbach, president of the Majestic Research Fund, detailing the very favorable experience the Majestic Radio & Television Corp. has had in utilizing the skills of older workers:

MAJESTIC RESEARCH FUND, INC.,
New York, N. Y., October 3, 1951.

HON. JACOB J. JAVITS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: As president of the Majestic Radio & Television Corp. I wish to congratulate you on your legislation, H. R. 4731, the National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment. We wish you great success in this important undertaking and I want you to know that my company is in complete agreement with your program.

The Majestic Radio & Television Corp. employs an average of 2,000 workers in its several plants. Management in this company takes a particular interest in the older and disabled worker.

You may be interested to know that our records reveal some exciting statistics regarding the older worker:

1. Older workers are generally as efficient as younger workers.

2. Older workers, in a great many cases, are more efficient than younger workers. This applies to the assembly line as well as nonproduction departments.

3. The productivity of the older worker, in many cases, surpasses that of the youthful worker.

4. The older worker demonstrates an intense desire to progress to higher and better-paying positions within the plant.

5. The older worker has a greater feeling of responsibility and loyalty toward the plant operation.

6. The older worker demonstrates a higher degree of dependability which is reflected in a lower rate of unaccountable absenteeism.

Incidentally, Mr. Roland Baxt, executive director of Federated Employment Service, a nonprofit employment consultation service specializing in problems of the older worker has recently informed me that he is now completing a study conducted in general industry, which substantiates the findings outlined above. Mr. Baxt is regarded as an authority in the problems of the older worker.

As a result of our findings regarding the older worker, Mr. Congressman, we initiated a project 6 months ago, which has created wide interest and which we believe you will find most unusual. During the month of April 1951 Majestic Radio & Television Corp. established a scholarship fund known as the Majestic Research Fund to provide for complete degree granting courses in the field of television engineering for 48 worthy participants a year. Thus far, we have made provision for the fund to function for a period of 5 years. Since we are keenly interested in the problem of the older worker and also because we believe that the older worker group holds a huge store of untapped talent, we are offering the scholarships only to people over 35 years of age. Our scholarships are known as the "second chance scholarships."

The entire project is organized and handled by our public relations counsel, Calvin L. Fox & Associates. Soon after the information regarding this project was released, we were besieged with applications and letters

of inquiry from people over 35 from coast to coast. Thus far, we have had more than 12,000 applications. Some applications coming from people as old as 70. You may be interested to know that one of our applications from a retired professor of botany, who was most anxious to apply his intellectual skills to the field of electronics engineering. Wouldn't it be shameful to permit such intellectual talents to go unleashed and non-productive.

The training program for these older people is being developed under the direction of Mr. U. A. Sanabria and Dr. Lee De Forest—two eminent electronic scientists. All of our scholarships are being awarded to the American Television Institute in Chicago, a school picked for its high educational standards, and performance record during and after the last war. Before the project was undertaken, Mr. Sanabria attested to the fact that the older students at the American Television Institute have better performance records than the younger ones.

The Majestic Radio & Television Corp. believes that this second-chance fund will set a new precedent in providing for specialized training for the older worker. We believe further than this training will open a new reservoir of much needed talent and skills in our vital electronic industry.

Giving employment and training to the older workers is not an act of charity. The older worker group can and should provide industry with a reservoir of much needed talent. Industry should accept the older worker with open arms. We are in complete support of your legislation because we feel that it is a step in the right direction.

American industry has a huge job to perform in the years ahead; it must utilize every last bit of talent and ability. Age consideration is a taboo which must be discarded by industry.

Cordially yours,
LEONARD ASHBACH,
President, Majestic Research Fund, Inc.

What To Do if a Bomb Is Dropped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent article by William Lindsay Gresham, entitled "How To Save Your Life," which tells the story of what might happen if a bomb explodes nearby, and of what we can do to prepare ourselves.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix as follows:

How To Save Your Life

(By William Lindsay Gresham)

The sun of an Indian summer morning strikes golden through elm branches on the cream-colored stone of the courthouse. A block away in the square, girls are still wearing gay summer dresses as they set about the day's shopping. A county-seat town of 5,000 people, friendly, hospitable. Carlinville, Ill.

Sixty miles south, in a wide bend of the mud-brown Mississippi, lies the gateway to the West—St. Louis, Mo., site of the largest small-arms factory in the country, center of chemical manufacturing, heavily loaded with aircraft construction, the second greatest railroad center in the world. Stretching

for miles along the west bank of the mighty river, it raises its factory chimneys and church spires into the blue autumn air.

A mile to the south of St. Louis' mammoth Union Station, in the yard of a brick house on Park Avenue, two children are playing in a sandpile.

Yesterday it was chilly, and mommy made them put on sweaters, but today it got hot again and mommy said they could play in the sandpile in just sun suits. Only Ellen, a dignified 6-year-old, wore a sunbonnet because it matched her suit. She filled her pail with sand and upended it, pulling the pail off carefully to make a cake. Carlie, who was only 4, reached out his shovel and said, "I cut it for you, Ellen," and she had to grab his hand to keep him from spoiling it. "I wanna cut it."

Their shadows struggled beside them on the white river sand. Then the shadows paled and Ellen's shadow shot out in a different direction, straight over Carlie, as the sky flashed white. Then it was as if somebody, playing rough and nasty, had pushed her down, bumping into her brother. The sun dimmed. And the sand was tearing away under her fingers in a roaring torrent of air. Ellen felt the ground shudder. When she could get her breath she screamed, "mommy!" and got to her feet, stumbling toward the back door. The wind spent itself, then suddenly it drove the other way, knocking her down. It ripped off her sunbonnet and whipped dust in her eyes. But she had seen enough—the house wasn't there any more.

Carlie was on his back, as if he had fallen asleep. Ellen cried again, "mommy! mommy! Something . . . hit me . . . and I hit Carlie, but not on purpose." And then Carlie started to howl, and Ellen crawled over to him and started to hug him, telling him not to be such a baby because really he wasn't hurt much. Finally she shook him. "Listen, Carlie— you hush up now and listen. Ellen's got to find mommy. You stay right here and don't you dare move."

"I don't wanna stay here. I want my Mommy!"

"Well, we'll find her. Don't be such a baby."

Their house was nothing but a heap of bricks. . . . Mommy had been in the house, she was downstairs, working the washing machine.

Ellen began to scream, "mommy! mommy! mommy!" and then she ran over to where the cellar door was, only there was nothing but bricks and pieces of wood sticking out, and there was smoke coming up from under the bricks.

Suddenly she felt tired, and so she sat down, and then she lay forward on the grass that was all yellow now and smelled funny. She was so tired she knew she was going to sleep. . . .

When Ellen opened her eyes again, Carlie's yell had died down to a snuffle. She sat up. "Carlie! What's the matter with your feet?"

They were red, where they had been sticking out before him—when the bright light came over them her shadow had covered him except for his feet. Now they were all red and bumpy.

Carlie was patting her and sayin, "Ellen, get up."

She must have fallen asleep again. There was a long piece of something like tissue paper in Carlie's hand, and she saw that it was wet and horrid-looking and said, "Carlie, drop that, it's dirty. Where did you get that?"

Carlie said, "I got it off your back. Your back's all funny."

Ellen began to howl then herself, not because it hurt but because she was so scared and it was all dark and dusty with things breaking. And Mommy didn't come.

But somebody in boots and a raincoat with a hood was climbing over the pile of bricks

where the house next door ought to be. It was Mrs. Carroll from across the street, only Ellen called her "Joan" because she used to take care of them when Mommy and Daddy went to the movies.

When Joan reached them, big drops of rain had started to fall. She said, "Come on, kids—we've got to get out of here."

"Where's Mommy?"

Joan knelt down. "She can't come now. She wants me to take care of you. Now come on, kids—beat feet."

Something went whoom in the house next door, and fire began roaring through all the broken stuff. Joan had them by the hands, hurrying them toward the street.

Ellen looked back to see if Mommy was coming, but it was so dark and dusty that she couldn't see. She started to whimper. Joan said, "I'll get a bandage on you in a second, honey. Does it hurt bad?"

Ellen didn't know what she meant.

The smoke was getting thicker. Finally Joan stopped and set Carlie down on part of a brick wall to keep his feet out of the dirt. Then she took off her raincoat and took off her house dress and stood there just in her slip right out on the street. She was tearing the dress up, too, and that wasn't right.

She folded a piece of dress and put it on Ellen's back, pressing it down hard and tying it in place with strips of cloth. "That'll have to do, honey. We've got to make tracks." Ellen's back began to throb at the edges like when you have bumped your head and it starts to ache. Then she had to laugh, because Joan had tied strips from her dress on Carlie's feet and they looked like little boots.

Ellen knew where they were going now—over to Lafayette Park. Only she didn't want to go to the park at all, she wanted Mommy, and it was too dark and smoky.

Joan sounded sort of cross, and Ellen thought that maybe it was because all the trees in the park had lost their leaves and looked bare and funny. A truck was rolling toward them right over the grass, and when it stopped a man got out.

Joan called to him and he shouted back, "Pile in!"

But Joan didn't get in the truck. She sat down and took a roll of adhesive tape from the pocket of her raincoat. She tore off a strip and wrote something on it with a pencil. Then she pressed the tape right on Ellen's chest and made another one for Carlie. Then she kissed both children. "Ellen—don't let Carlie pull off his tape. It has his name and address on it. Don't let him. Promise Joanie."

Ellen promised, and the man lifted them into the back of his truck. He turned and watched Joan hurrying back the way they had come, and then he said, "Boy, that babe's got what it takes, huh?"

The smoke was getting worse, and more children were coming. One was a big boy, and he was being carried on a door by two men. Ellen saw that there were bones sticking out of his leg. He was asleep.

The truck bounced and jolted out of the park and around a bulldozer that was pushing bricks away in the street. . . . Ellen was going to be sick.

Out through the back of the truck she could see the street going away from them, and sometimes people came out and ran behind the truck shouting and then fell down when they couldn't run any more, but the truck was too full and lots of people were being sick. The boy with the bones sticking out of his leg moaned and began to roll over, but somebody caught him and held him still.

When they stopped bouncing at last, the man came around and let down the back of

the truck. They were in front of a school-house with a Red Cross flag out in front.

Inside the school the classrooms were full of people waiting, and in the gymnasium they were lying on mattresses on the floor. A doctor looked at Ellen's back and then said, "Are you thirsty? Drink this, anyhow." It was a big glass of water which tasted salty, but she drank it.

Suddenly she missed Carlie and began to call him, but a doctor whose shirt was sticking to him with sweat said, "Your brother's O. K. young lady. You've got to go to sleep now." Something bit her arm and she howled, but soon she felt herself falling asleep fast.

When she woke up, she was crying and being sick. It was a different place, and it was night. She was in a bed and something was tied to her arm. A lady with a flashlight came in and said, "Hush, darling—let me clean you off."

Ellen's back was hurting now, and in the light of the flashlight she saw that a bottle was hanging up by the bed and a rubber tube was coming down to her arm. She was hot and stuffy and was tied up tight all around her chest. "I want a drink of water. I want Carlie. I want Mommy."

The water wasn't salty this time. The lady was very nice, but she said Carlie was with the younger kids and Ellen must go back to sleep and not worry about Mommy, either. "You're Ellen and Carlie's your little brother. You see, I know all about you."

"Where is this?" Ellen asked.

"This is a place called Carlinville. This is where you are going to wait for Mommy and get better. You've got a bad burn, but if you stay quiet and do just what we tell you, you'll be fine."

The next time she woke up there were other kids crying and some were being sick. Her back felt better, but she still had something tied to her arm that made it ache. Two men came in and took a girl in the next bed and put her on a little bed with handles and carried her out, and Ellen tried to tell them that the girl couldn't breathe with her head all covered with a sheet, but then they were gone.

Sometimes children fell out of bed and screamed, and sometimes they screamed before they fell out. But the next day a very nice little girl was put in the bed next to Ellen's. They could talk to each other and make believe. And there was lots of ice cream.

It didn't seem like a whole week until the day when one of the ladies said, "Ellen—surprise, surprise." And Mommy was there right by the bed.

When Ellen hugged her she said, "Oh, please be careful, baby. Mommy's ribs are sore."

"Mommy, why didn't you come?"

"I couldn't, darling. Mommy was down cellar and couldn't get out. Guess what—they had to dig Mommy out with picks and shovels."

Carlie was upstairs, and when they all got ready to go to their new home Carlie was crawling because his feet were bandaged, but he was fine.

They went to live with some people who were old like Grandpa and Grandma, named Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson.

And finally Daddy came back to them. They all lived upstairs, with the Fergusons downstairs, and Ellen started to go to school—but that was after Christmas. There was a Christmas tree in their own room, and Carlie was learning to walk all over again and his toes were all together in one piece, but he learned to walk fine.

One night Ellen heard Mommy say to Daddy, "It's horrible—she'll never be able to wear an evening dress."

Daddy said, "Listen—when her generation gets to the evening-dress stage, those

scars won't be any novelty. They'll be a decoration. They're Ellen's Purple Heart."

That is the story of two American children of the future. But the story is based on a number of ifs.

If Joan, the block warden, had not known enough first aid of the atomic age to put a dry compress on Ellen's back where it was burned in the heat flash, the child might have died while being evacuated.

If the first-aid station had not had morphine, tetanus antitoxin and plasma, the child might have died of shock or infection.

If Ellen, with a third-degree burn and radiation sickness combined, had not received whole blood and careful attention at the emergency hospital, she might have died.

If there had been no supporting community, like Carlinville, equipped to house seriously injured children in nursing homes and able to give them constant care through trained nurses' aides, the story might have ended differently.

If evacuation plans in St. Louis had not been carefully worked out ahead of time and administered by a trained corps of auxiliary police, the children might not have gotten out at all.

If trained rescue squads had not been able to plunge into the inferno of the badly shattered area a mile in every direction from "ground zero"—about which the enemy's atom bomb exploded—the children's mother would never have been saved from the ruins of her house.

If records had not been kept of the children's names and destinations and these checked with the mother when she had recovered from injuries, the family might not have been reunited for weeks or months. If Carlile were too young to know his last name and his address, some grief-stricken mother might have claimed him as her own and he might never have been returned to his own family.

The list of ifs could fill pages. But there is one last one which overshadows all the others: If Civil Defense had not been tightly and efficiently organized with trained personnel and supplies, the country's productive forces which feed the machinery of war might have bogged down. The war might have been lost. And the children might not have had a Christmas tree at all—it might have been forbidden by the "people's" Government as a "bourgeois superstition" which wasted timber.

For our typical example of how well-organized civil defense would work, we chose St. Louis and Carlinville for a number of reasons: St. Louis because it has a double tactical value to the enemy as a target: (1) Its tremendous production volume and (2) the effect on the rest of the country if a city as far inland as St. Louis were knocked out. Yet St. Louis is as vulnerable as Chicago or Detroit. Experts claim that if the Army's radar screen, antiaircraft batteries and fighter squadrons can down 30 percent of the enemy planes, this will be an all-time high.

Carlinville is the home town of Gen. John Homer, deputy director of Illinois Civil Defense. The model plan for a small town's organization in support of a major city was worked out for Carlinville. When I visited County Clerk Denby Boring, heading the local civil defense outfit, he was all set to go as soon as the State legislature passes the proper bill giving civil defense legal status and powers.

In St. Louis, director of civil defense Raymond R. Tucker and his assistant, Gen. Francis P. Hardaway, have been steaming ahead with a public-educational program with special emphasis on school children. But at the time I talked to them, there was still no civil defense legislation in Missouri.

In both of these communities everything has been done by civil defense and Red

Cross leaders that can be done, and the citizens are defense-minded far above those of most other places. Yet public apathy is present even there, to some extent.

Question: Does your State have a law giving the civil defense organization full legal authority to act? If you don't know, telephone your local newspaper and find out. And if there is no law as yet, the paper can tell you who your representative is at the State capital. Few of us know who these men are, and fewer still make their opinions known by letter or telegram.

The atom-bomb raids which will open world war III will strike at from 20 to 30 target cities. This is no military secret—it is just what we know is going to happen. Furthermore, as good as our radar screen is, it cannot, as of now, be depended upon to warn us accurately of planes flying close to the ground or shielded by mountains. The rural areas of Montana are as important to the country's survival as are any other areas. A network of aircraft spotters is being organized in rural areas, but this network must literally cover the country.

The oceans that wash our coasts are no barrier to enemies now. The sky is their road. Go to your window, look up at the sky. Take a good look. That's where they will be.

Many air-raid wardens during the last war were either people who liked to boss others around or devoted citizens who felt a bit self-conscious in white steel helmets because they knew that the threat of large-scale bombing just wasn't real. But it is real today.

We won't have to run around enforcing black-out regulations—the radar-scopes of enemy planes give them an accurate map of any city on the darkest night. The problem will be lighting a city, if they manage to flatten the power stations. Which is one reason why you should carry a pocket flashlight, starting now.

A power shut-off in an emergency is a great breeder of panic, while a few flashlights in the hands of calm people can restore order and save lives.

There is only one way to prevent panic: adequate training beforehand. Every able-bodied teen-ager and adult must have training and a definite job to do when the crisis arrives. Roy Wingate, chairman of the St. Louis chapter of the Red Cross, is a veteran with 28 years of Red Cross service in every sort of disaster, earthquake, flood, fire, hurricane, and tornado. He told me: "The way I look at it, an atom bomb on this city would be no worse than a bad tornado—except for the people directly under it in the ground zero area. The big danger is not lingering radiation, but fire and panic. And the only way to prevent lives being lost from panic is a thoroughgoing campaign of education beforehand. Unless the people know what to expect, what to do if it comes, and what to do afterward, you will have panic—with fatal results."

The Red Cross is training classes in first aid as quickly as they can be organized, but in most places the housewives of the country just aren't signing up.

Answer quickly: If your child were badly cut on the cheek by flying glass, how would you stop the bleeding?

When the A-bomb falls you won't be able to call a doctor or an ambulance. The telephone lines will be down or jammed with official messages. Doctors won't be in their offices, they'll be hurrying to their emergency stations. Many of them will be dead. Very well—how would you stop that bleeding? A first-aid course will teach you.

Answer quickly: If your child is suffering from loss of blood or severe burns, what substitute can you use in an emergency for whole blood or plasma? It's a solution

made from supplies you already have in your own kitchen, and you make the child drink it. But what are the ingredients? Take your Red Cross course and learn.

Question: Who is going to pay for stockpiles of medical supplies? A box of sterile gauze pads measuring 3 by 5 inches can be bought in any drugstore. You will pay 75 cents for a box of 25 pads. And if you get badly burned you are going to need 2.7 miles of gauze.

In Poughkeepsie, N. Y., a city of 40,975, Civil Defense has enlisted the local pharmacists' association: When an alarm sounds, each druggist will prepare a package of drugs and first-aid supplies and take it to a depot designated by the head of the civil defense medical committee. As of today, that is almost the only source of first-aid equipment except what the Red Cross has on hand for disaster work.

The supplies will have to come from the small towns. When the bombs land, mobile relief units, drawing on the resources of small towns and moving with the precision of well-drilled troops, will have to converge on the stricken areas. There is no other way to save our industrial resources—men and equipment—and win the war.

This is going to be a civilians' battle. When the frontier was pushing into Kentucky, the frontier woman was the family medico. Also, she took the precaution of carrying a rifle with her when she went to the spring for water. She could never afford to say, "I don't think the Shawnees will raid our settlement."

If you have young children, do they have identification tags? Do your children know what to do if they are playing outdoors and see a blinding flash in the sky? Do you?

Let us return to our little A-bomb victims in the fictional introduction to this article. Ellen and Carlile survived in that fable only because their city was completely organized for civil defense, and a town in the support area was ready down to the last detail. But St. Louis and Carlinville are not really ready—not completely and not yet. Most communities have very little else than plans on paper and lists of things they will do—when enough citizens can be aroused to sign up, study and learn how to do them.

Now go back and consider the story of Ellen and Carlile again. If the bomb falls tomorrow, they are not fictional characters—they are your kids. And if it falls tomorrow, your community is not prepared.

Then the story is different, is short, and is this:

Those children are dead.

High Cost of Electricity in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

BOSTON EDISON CO.,

Boston, Mass., October 4, 1951.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For your information I enclose a copy of a telegram sent to the United States Tariff Commission in connection with the pending renegotiation of a

reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Venezuela.

I am sure the users of electric power in Massachusetts will appreciate any effort you may make to obtain a reduction or prevent an increase in the cost of fuel oil delivered at Boston harbor.

Very truly yours,

J. V. TONER.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Boston Edison Co., as one of the largest users of heavy fuel oil in the New England States, respectfully presents the following information in connection with pending renegotiation of reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Venezuela:

Boston Edison Co. is an operating electric utility supplying electricity to the industries, public buildings, commercial establishments, hospitals, and other institutions, schools and homes of 40 cities and towns in metropolitan Boston. To produce this electricity, Boston Edison in 1951 will use approximately 4,500,000 barrels of fuel oil, most of which will come from Venezuela and other Caribbean areas. Any renegotiation which adds to the price of Venezuela oil delivered at Boston harbor will act unfavorably on our customers, as our rates for electric service are based upon the cost of fuel delivered at our generating stations. Recent publications of Federal Power Commission and other Federal agencies have stated that the cost of electricity in New England is higher than the national average due entirely to higher costs of fuel delivered at New England power plants and higher local taxation. Even though cost of electric power represents only 1 or 2 percent of operating costs of most industries in this area, any increase will tend to be a disadvantage to New England manufacturers in competition with manufacturers in other parts of the country.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
By JAMES V. TONER, President.

A Wasteful Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest has already manifested itself in the effort of the Department of Agriculture to sell the farmers on the program of farm benefits that the farmers themselves are not asking for. An example of the reaction of some farm communities in Iowa is set forth in and editorial of the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier of October 2, and under permission to extend my remarks, I include the views expressed by the editor of this splendid paper:

A WASTEFUL PROGRAM

A great many people cannot consider themselves represented in Congress until an elected Representative stands there to demand an end to the wasteful farm program.

In recent days, the Department of Agriculture's hirelings have been holding public meetings for open evaluation of what is called the family-farm program.

In the next election campaign this move frequently will be referred to as taking the farm program from the grass roots. That will be so much talk. Careful scanning of

reports from these meetings shows, first, they were attended by fewer than 1 percent of the farmers of each county—even counting those paid by the Government for part-time jobs. It also shows many details of the various Government indirect subsidies were discussed, but practically no attempt was made for a grass-roots evaluation of the entire program.

Most of these programs the Department of Agriculture undertakes date back to the days of Rexford Tugwell and cronies in the Department. The present secretary, Charles Brannan, broached one stupendous flop as a new program, and now after its shelving is fishing for some popular way to hand out more millions.

A farmer at the Wapello County meeting asked: "Why should the Government pay landowners for doing something that is profitable to them?" He referred to payments for spreading limestone.

The production and marketing administration—one of the dozen agencies of the Department of Agriculture which may send a representative to a Wapello County farm—pays about half the cost of spreading lime under the guise of "soil conservation." It also pays for fertilizers, tilling, plowing under green manure crops, and other practices which the successful farmer was doing when some of the FMA boys were kids.

The Department pays for such practices, then lends money or the crop which results, lends money to the farmer to build storage facilities or builds them itself, and then pays the farmer for storing his own crop.

Why is any of this necessary? In times of high commodity prices, the farmers who produce high yields make money. The farmer who conserves the soil assures productivity for next year and future years.

It must be acknowledged that in production of agricultural surpluses—when there were such—orderly marketing was helped by the Government. It is not acknowledged that private enterprise could have been less helpful. It is true that the moratorium kept many farms and farm families intact, but it was not an essential function of the Government to do more than guarantee loans and deposits.

It cannot be justified to spend millions and millions of dollars in administering unnecessary farm programs, when tax money is so desperately needed for warfare and defense. The Government's farm program today has deteriorated so far from its past elements of worthwhileness that its complete abandonment would benefit rather than cripple the farming communities of the Nation.

A Government program dating back to the thirties to extend soil conservation practices to the country's farms is progressing so slowly that it will take almost a century by present progress to accomplish its goals. Progress like that would rob any organization, just as Government expenditures today are bankrupting people with exorbitant taxes.

Aiding Escapees From Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to mobilize the world against communism we have unfortunately done very little to utilize

those people who are in many instances the strongest foes of communism, namely, the escapees from behind the iron curtain.

Now, however, with the adoption of the new mutual security bill, these escapees who can be of great assistance to us in the fight against communism will no longer be neglected. The conferees on the mutual security bill have agreed to the adoption of an amendment to the mutual security bill which I had offered on the floor of the House. This amendment provides that \$100,000,000 of the foreign-aid funds may be used to aid these escapees.

Too often in the past our propaganda telling how much better things are in the Western World has backfired when we have refused to accept and help those who heeded our propaganda and sought a new life in the Western World.

If we make a sincere effort to help those escaping from tyranny the report of our actions will thunder back behind the iron curtain even without the aid of powerfully beamed radio broadcasts. Our actions will truly speak louder than any torrent of words.

I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of October 8, 1951:

ESCAPEES

At the very time that the United States is doing its utmost by radio and other means to encourage defections from the Communist regimes behind the iron curtain, the lack of a coordinated policy for dealing with escapees is frustrating the objective we seek. Recent stories have told how escapees reaching Germany or Austria have a 2-to-1 chance of landing in jail as "illegal" entries. Unless the escapee is fortunate enough to contact the International Refugee Organization or one of the private refugee groups, he is likely to spend long months in a camp where he is grilled incessantly by intelligence agents and then seemingly forgotten. Word of this inhospitality for a time virtually shut off the flow of escapees from Russia.

Perhaps the most pitiful conditions are in Germany, where some 80 percent of the escapees are branded as "illegal immigrants" and many are treated as common criminals. For example, a number of young people attending the Communist Youth Festival in Berlin asked for asylum in western Germany. Instead, many reportedly were thrown in jail or confined in reformatories with delinquents or mental defectives. Reports of these conditions quickly get back through the grapevine, and the Communists make the most of them in their propaganda. Meanwhile, of course, the real Communist agents who come through the border have their papers in perfect order.

Resettlement of these people, such as is carried out on a small scale by IRO and pleaded for by Queen Juliana in her appeal, is not enough, important as it is. Immigration does not provide an answer for persons who are looking not for permanent new homes, but for a chance to live elsewhere until their homelands are free. An entirely new concept is needed—one which would give such persons jobs in the western European rearmament effort so that they could support themselves, one which would coordinate the efforts of refugee groups and the refugee press, which would mobilize this resistance on a broad basis and not merely in military terms.

This is a field for governmental action, for the valiant efforts of private organizations are necessarily limited in scope. There

is the basis for such action in the provision of the mutual security bill which allows up to \$100,000,000 for the formation of escapees into elements of the North Atlantic Treaty army or for other purposes. The real need, of course, is for a fundamental, unified NATO refugee policy as a part of a program of strategic resistance which makes use of all the psychological weapons at our command. The refugees who come across the border now are for the most part accidental allies. A common western European policy to provide new hope for escapees could furnish an appeal to enslaved peoples that would really make use of the chinks in the iron curtain.

A Few Kind Words for Harry Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the August 28 issue of *Look* magazine by Henry Steele Commager entitled "A Few Kind Words for Harry Truman."

Mr. Speaker, there are men in Congress and on the outside who make it their business day by day and week by week to criticize every action and every pronouncement of our great President, Harry S. Truman. Nothing he seems to say or do meets with their approval. Their carping criticism is basically unfounded; it is never in conformity with fact, nor, in many instances, is it in the best interests of our Nation during these critical times. They merely spout in the belief it is politically advantageous to do so, or in the hope their ill-advised words will benefit them personally. In many instances these critical expressions come from the headline seekers—those who believe the day is not complete when their names do not appear in bold type in the daily press attacking the President on some pretext or another.

To those acquainted with the history of our great Presidents of the past this is not new or strange. Its pages are replete with the mouthings of those who were bent on endeavoring to pull themselves up to the stature of these great leaders of ours through innuendo, deceit, trickery, and falsehoods, but in virtually every instance they found themselves grounded with a thud, the broken rope of their aspirations wound about their humiliated forms, while history went on to record the imperishable greatness of those they so foully attacked.

Mr. Speaker, when history brings in its verdict on the present incumbent of the Presidency, it will be clearly recorded that Harry S. Truman has done an outstanding job as President. He will be found ranked with our outstanding leaders of the past who were abused by their contemporaries.

The article by Mr. Commager, appearing in a magazine which, in the past, has been so highly critical of many of the actions and deeds of our President,

is so revealing and factually true, I felt it would be of vital interest to each and every Member of this Congress. I commend it as "must" reading to those who are sincerely interested in dealing with real facts on the President's record and achievements. The verdict to date is by far in Mr. Truman's favor.

The article follows:

A FEW KIND WORDS FOR HARRY TRUMAN

(By Henry Steele Commager)

Some months ago, President Truman, smarting perhaps under criticism which had reached new heights, or depths, of billingsgate, observed that the final verdict on a President cannot be made in less than a generation, and that when it comes it will emphasize not the day-by-day squabbles of party politics but the great positive achievements. He believed, he added, that there were a number of these to the credit of his own administration.

He was right on both counts. He was right in saying that the verdicts of contemporary critics and of the historian rarely agree. Every one of those Presidents whom we now call great was denounced by his contemporaries as a weakling or a tyrant, a tool of the privileged interests or a demagogue, a marplot or a traitor.

Washington himself was not immune from this kind of abuse. The last years of his Presidency were embittered by a campaign of vilification. Jefferson was denounced as an atheist, a tool of the Jacobins (the Communists of that day), a demagogue, a tyrant, a coward, a liar, and almost everything else that those past masters of invective, the New England Federalists, could think of.

Jackson was portrayed as ignorant, illiterate and uncouth, denounced as King Andrew, charged with immorality and even with murder. Lincoln was reviled for his lowly birth, compared in appearance to an ape or a baboon, accused of telling ribald stories on battlefields and funny stories at Cabinet meetings, charged with subverting the laws and the Constitution, with reckless interference with the military conduct of the war, with blundering in the domestic and incompetence in the foreign field.

The vilification heaped on Wilson passed the bounds of decency: He was a dictator and a tyrant, he had abandoned the Monroe Doctrine, he had pusillanimously surrendered to Mexico; he had lowered the Stars and Stripes over the Panama Canal; he was immoral in private life as in public.

The attacks on Franklin D. Roosevelt are so fresh in our minds that we can still blush for them; nothing, apparently, was too indecent or too profane for his opponents to say. He was a traitor to his class and eventually to his country, he had sold out to the British and then to the Communists; he fomented class war, he undermined private enterprise, he tried to destroy the American system; he joined hands with the spoliemen and bosses to corrupt the Government. And, as Roosevelt said in his teamsters' union speech, not content with attacking him, his critics attacked his little dog, Fala.

So in a sense Truman shouldn't complain. He is in good company. And he doubtless knows enough about American politics to know that this is what a President has to expect. It was Horace Greeley, Presidential candidate in 1872, who said he didn't know whether he was running for the Presidency or for the penitentiary. Yet, in another sense, Truman has a right to feel aggrieved. He might well ask what it is that he has done.

By all normal standards, his administration has been one of almost uninterrupted and unparalleled success.

At no previous time have Americans enjoyed such widespread prosperity. Unemployment has all but disappeared; farm in-

come and labor income are higher than ever before in peacetime, and even corporation income and dividends are at an all-time high. There have been no great crises in domestic affairs, unless inflation is such a crisis, and Truman has fought inflation consistently.

In world affairs, American power and prestige remain high. So President Truman is probably right in asserting that the verdict of history will not be the same as the verdict of contemporary critics.

It is a pretty safe prophecy, too, that Truman is right on his second point, that history will credit his administration with important achievements. For 6 years now, while critics have belabored Truman for venial sins, for tolerating a General Vaughan, for permitting the taint of corruption to reach high places, for replacing faithful New Dealers with cronies who have no real interest in progressivism, for loyalty to friends instead of to principles, Truman has gone ahead and chalked up one achievement after another in both foreign and domestic affairs.

The most important accomplishments are clearly in the foreign field. If we are to generalize here, we can say that no other President except Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt has appreciated as fully the extent to which American power involves American responsibility.

In foreign relations, President Truman has revealed a firm grasp on the necessity of combining vigor with moderation, generosity with tolerance, a zeal for peace along with readiness for war. Here he has displayed an understanding of the nature of the problems confronting the democratic world.

Perhaps the first indication of this came with the President's advocacy of a substantial loan to Britain, a proposal which had the isolationists fighting George III all over again. The loan bill was passed and that money primed the pump of British economy, enabling it to start on the road to recovery. Soon there was a more serious challenge to American resourcefulness and readiness. When, early in 1947, the British announced that they were no longer able to carry the burdens of the defense of Greece, Truman moved quickly to take over the responsibilities they had theretofore fulfilled. He seized the opportunity not only to save Greece from Communist domination but to promulgate what is known as the Truman doctrine.

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States (he said in a message to Congress) is the "creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

ACHESON SPEAKS OUT

After the Truman policy declaration, and after military aid to Greece, came the Marshall Plan. It was in May 1947, that Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced that Europe must be made self-supporting and that the United States was prepared to help out to that end. The next month, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, in an address at Harvard, elaborated on this theme. Britain, France and other Western European nations responded with enthusiasm, and out of all this came the European Recovery Program—a program that pledged the United States to finance European economic recovery over a period of four or five years.

In boldness, in hardheaded realism, in imagination and vision, it was a program comparable to Lend-Lease. Republicans fought the proposal as they had fought Lend-Lease, as for that matter they had fought every major item in the program of internationalism. But after a full-dress debate, and after the Russians moved into Czechoslovakia, ERP went through and an initial appropriation of four billion dollars guaran-

teed a fair trial. That it has been successful beyond even the hopes of its sponsors is a matter of record.

Economic aid was crucial and, with that aid, Western Europe started on the long road to recovery. But ERP was designed for Europe only. Already, President Truman was contemplating American aid on an even larger scale. Even American resources would not stretch to Marshall Plans for every continent, but American resources in skills, techniques, organization and brains might be still more valuable than American money.

That was the principle behind the famous point 4 proposed in Truman's inaugural address. Point 4 caught the imagination of the world. But a reluctant Congress made only grudging appropriations and, for 2 years, the program has limped along without accomplishing what was expected of it.

Economic recovery of Europe was a long-range affair. Before it was even partially complete, Russia might strike or might persuade Communist elements in western European countries to revolt. To strengthen immediate barriers against communism, Truman next proposed a military pact. "The determination of the free countries to protect themselves," he said, "will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them to do so."

The idea of a powerful Anglo-American alliance had been broached by Winston Churchill in his Fulton, Mo., address, and Churchill, too, had worked for the creation of western European union. Now Truman proposed that the United States move in with large-scale military aid to supplement the large-scale economic aid already transforming European economies.

Out of this came the Atlantic Pact—the first peacetime military alliance in our history. It provided that "an armed attack against one or more of the members should be considered an attack against them all." And when Truman persuaded Gen Dwight D. Eisenhower to take the post of supreme commander and weld together the disparate defense systems of Western Europe, the military balance of power in Europe began to right itself.

THE REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE

The Atlantic Pact was passed with bipartisan support, but when, in 1951, there came the problem of implementing it with American troops, the Republicans went into the opposition. That opposition took the form not only of challenging the possibility and the value of saving Western Europe but of challenging the Presidential power over the Nation's Armed Forces. This was the kind of challenge that Truman could not avoid and would not have avoided if he could have done so. Clearly, he had the Constitution on his side, and history and common sense as well. President Truman won a practical victory, though not a complete one, in that historic debate.

In other fields too, Truman's foreign policy will appeal hopefully for a favorable verdict from history. When, in 1948, the Soviet took advantage of a failure in the Potsdam agreement to provide for American access to Berlin and instituted a blockade, Truman met the challenge with the spectacularly successful air lift. Later, his administration formulated a German policy that went far to bring Germany back into the family of western nations and to heal some of the deep wounds of war. When there appeared some danger of Italy's going Communist, the Truman administration moved to meet the crisis—and met it.

Thus, even before the Korean crisis, President Truman had displayed in the field of foreign relations firmness, vigor, courage, and vision. The invasion of South Korea presented a challenge to the United States and

the United Nations that could not be ignored, and again Truman acted with boldness.

HE DID NOT DRIFT

We have only to contrast this action with the shilly-shallying of American policy toward the Manchuria invasion of 20 years ago, or toward Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia, to appreciate the extent to which Truman had learned the lessons of history.

The invasion of Korea had another consequence of far-reaching importance. Ever since his accession to office, Truman had been calling for the rebuilding of our Armed Forces and the development of our military productive capacity.

To most of this program, Congress was deaf. The Korean war speedily changed the situation. Under the compelling pressure of military realities, Congress accepted the Truman program, voted immense sums for the military, stepped-up taxes, organized production and created an Army big enough to meet aggression wherever aggression should strike.

That Truman's record is less impressive in the domestic than in the foreign field will not be denied. He has not been able to carry Congress with him. Nevertheless, the Truman administration will be credited with the following body of domestic legislation: the reorganization of Congress, a National Security Act unifying the armed services; an Atomic Energy Act that guarantees civilian control of the whole atomic energy program and greatly enlarges that program; an act increasing the number of displaced persons who might come to the United States; increasing Federal aid to education; the extension and liberalizing of social security, steady advances in the field of civil rights; progress in slum clearance and housing, and the maintenance of rent control.

Two negative acts may be counted in the long run, as important as any positive acts. These are the veto of a bill that would have handed over the immeasurably valuable tidelands oil, property of the whole American Nation, to a few States and the veto of another bill that would have exempted natural gas from Federal regulation.

The list of proposals that President Truman has urged upon Congress and that Congress has rejected makes, it is fairly safe to say, a record that will not redound to his discredit. Congress has refused him an effective civil-rights bill. It has refused effective measures against inflation. It has ignored suggestions for further Federal aid to schools and public health; it has rejected a farsighted conservation program. It has failed to act on findings of investigations of monopolies.

All in all, here is a record that is not only respectable but impressive. We cannot know what verdict history will pronounce upon it, but we can make a pretty good guess.

THE TRUMAN PARADOX

It will perhaps record the curious paradox that a man charged with being soft on communism has done more than any other leader in the Western world, with the exception of Churchill, to contain communism; that a man charged with mediocrity has launched a whole series of farsighted plans for world reconstruction, that a man accused of being an enemy to private enterprise has been head of the Government during the period of greatest prosperity for private enterprise; that a man accused of betraying the New Deal has fought one Congress after another for progressive legislation.

A good part of the hostility to President Truman is like the hostility to Secretary Acheson; it means merely that the opposition wants an issue and a victim. That there are many things amiss with the Truman administration no one in his senses will

deny. But it seems clear that the verdict is so far favorable, and that much of the criticism that fills the air is directed not to Truman's failings but to his successes.

A Formula for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth herein a very excellent analysis of basic issues of our times as written by Thomas M. Blake, of Chicago, Ill., in his *Formula for Peace*, the text of which follows:

FORMULA FOR PEACE

(By Thomas M. Blake)

We Americans are troubled by the absence of a firm, wise and resolute American policy in the world problem which we face. It is imperative, for the morale of our youth, that we do not drift into world conflict without our objectives having been clearly defined. People the world over long for peace. The destruction wrought by two world wars has been so wanton and so ruthless that we must find a way to maintain peace in the world if civilization is to survive. Peace must be achieved not only from a military sense, but peace of mind, peace of soul, must be attainable to all.

Like other people throughout the world, I have asked myself why we have not secured peace. Our country has been engaged in two destructive world wars, the objects of which were to end aggression for all time. Great sacrifices were made to win these wars. In the prosecution of these wars thousands of noncombatants were killed or injured. The lives of our youth and the resources of our country were thrown into these conflicts, in the hope that victory would bring peace and freedom to all the world. But there is no peace and dangers more grave than ever now beset us.

We participated in World War I to "make the world safe for democracy." Our armies contributed to the victory, but Democracy was not "made safe." During World War II we campaigned for the "four freedoms"—freedom of speech and expression, freedom to worship God in our own way; freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Unfortunately, we failed to make secure the freedoms for which we fought, and what we thought we had won on the battlefield we had lost at the conference table, even before the victory in war had been achieved.

In our hour of victory the Communists, with whom we had made common cause, scuttled the plan for the four freedoms and proceeded to impose their will upon eastern Europe. Under the guise of encouraging the establishment of governments in the satellite countries that were "friendly" to Soviet Russia, the Communists actually installed governments that were subservient to their will. Too late, we recognized the true intention of our Soviet allies. Then it was that we began to rally the rest of the free world to the defense of freedom.

Not satisfied with subjugating the people of Eastern Europe, the Communists now seek to overrun the world. Communist indoctrinated disciples have seized power in China and are looking with lustful eyes at the rest of Asia. Soviet might truly has rung down "a curtain of steel" around the countries dominated by the Kremlin, and has engaged

in a war of "nerves," or a cold war, with the rest of the world.

The real objective of the cold war is the conquest of human minds. Communism is a godless philosophy, the disciples of which seek to enslave the mind of man not by military might but by a campaign of falsehood. An entirely new concept of warfare is being waged against us in which armed conflict is only a part and may indeed be only a small part. In our preparation to meet the onslaught we must prepare our defenses to overwhelm the military challenge to peace, but even more urgent is the need to expose the false philosophy of communism. Contemplation of the catastrophic destruction that can be inflicted by new and more deadly weapons, such as the atom bomb, causes grave concern among our people, but the insidious campaign of communism to conquer the minds of people is far more serious. The danger is that communism deludes people into thinking that its objectives are to further the brotherhood of man, when in reality the means used to achieve their objective are destructive of all the moral and spiritual rights which the brotherhood of man would imply. The basic clash between communism and Christianity is that communism interferes with the exercise of free will by destroying the individuality of man.

How, then, can we combat the false philosophy of communism? Should we continue to counter each communistic move with an opposing force on our part? Why should we permit the godless philosophy of communism to force us into a negative position in defense of our ideals? Why should we permit a campaign of lies to overwhelm the truth?

The time is now at hand for us to proclaim to the world our faith in God, ourselves, and our ideals. We are a peace-loving nation. Our way of life thrives only during peace. The greatest freedom, the greatest dignity of man, and the highest standard of living ever known in history, are achieved under our way of life. We believe that our way of life is superior. How, then, can the disciples of communism convert people from our way of life? Why? Because we have not proclaimed to the world that we believe in the basic principles upon which our country was founded, that man is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that no power on earth can intervene between man and his God-given rights.

Our people desire peaceful solutions to the world's ills. American ingenuity can surely devise a way to secure peace. We, who have amazed the world with our industrial progress, can surely bring forth the answer to establishing peace. We must mobilize, in waging peace, as effectively as we have marshaled our forces for war. We engage in war to secure peace. What, therefore, is more logical than that we should plan for the peace for which we are prepared to fight? Can we, by constructing the provisions of the peace we desire, bring it about without plunging the world into a third world war? Certainly it is worth a trial.

To guide the world to peace and freedom we need at once to establish a plan that leads to its achievement. We must find a way to provide qualified leadership for ourselves and the people of the free world, so that we can give them the inspiration and the will to support our plan. We must prosecute our campaign for peace and freedom throughout the world, on both sides of the iron curtain. Our plan must be a campaign of truth; a campaign to bring hope to all people; a campaign to again establish the dignity of man, and his relationship with his Creator.

There are three basic fundamental steps that should be taken in order to overwhelm

the forces of communism. They are as follows:

I. Provide qualified leadership for the world.

II Formulate an affirmative, ideological answer to communism.

III Work out a constructive plan for an enduring and just peace.

I To provide qualified leadership we should—

1. Select men of high ethical and moral standards as candidates for public office. Qualified men should be urged to assume governmental responsibilities. Political parties who do not seek out proper candidates should not get the support of the American people. Men who serve their Government should receive adequate compensation.

2 Our Government, in formulating policies, should adhere to the intent as well as the letter of the Constitution.

3 We should establish a standing committee of outstanding Members of the Senate to act as an administrative committee, to advise the President on vital issues (as, for example, the opposing aggression in Korea in the first place, and as to the wisdom of removing General MacArthur from all of his command). While the President has various committees which advise him on national policy with respect to foreign relations, the budget, the Armed Forces, and other important functions, the decisions as to administering those policies rests solely with the President. The need for wisdom in directing policy and administering the office of President is so great that sole discretion should not repose in the mind of one man. Members of the President's Cabinet are looked upon as advisers by the President, but they are appointed by the President and can be removed by him. The Senate represents the people.

(a) The President should consult with this committee before taking any action of a major nature that may affect the well-being of our citizens on the safety of our country, and then act in accordance with that advice.

(b) This committee should see to it that the citizens of the country are fully advised, insofar as it is possible to do so, regarding the situation we face in the Far East, and in Europe, and any other serious foreign-policy problems. Foreign policy should not be the subject of partisan political intrigue.

4. Appointment to the State Department an outstanding and capable American who has a zeal for our way of life and a sincerity of purpose beyond question, whom all the world can respect.

(a) Follow up the appointment of a new Secretary of State with a thorough reorganization of the personnel in the State Department to get the best results. Only men and women we can all respect should serve our country at such a critical time.

(b) Representatives abroad should be Americans of high integrity and truly representative of our people.

5 Continue to build up our defense as needed, to meet the world emergency.

(a) Cooperate with other nations who are willing to contribute their just share to the common defense effort.

(b) Draft outstanding American industrialists to manage the national defense effort and advise on world defense problems, and then have the courage to give them the support needed to carry out their program.

(c) Clearly define our position in opposing aggression so that our friends, as well as our possible enemies, may know that further acts of aggression will not be tolerated; that should such acts of aggression occur we may attack the source of aggression rather than the area where such aggression occurs; and if necessary attack with all the force at our command.

II An affirmative ideological answer to communism must be formulated. Express-

sion must be given to the tenets of the way of life to which we aspire; our answer to be based on the precept that "God, to be sure, framed man for an immortal destiny, the created image of His own endless being" (Book of Wisdom, ch II).

1. Our answer must be built around the basic truth that man was intended by his Creator to have the exercise of his free will and that no governmental dictum can interfere with the right of man to the dignity to which he was raised by his Creator.

2. The lines of conflict are drawn. There can be no compromise with communism. We must overwhelm it or we shall be defeated. There can be no lasting peace until communism is destroyed. We cannot destroy it by military might. The only way to victory is through a campaign to restore to mankind the dignity intended for him by his Creator.

3 We can have no Communist allies. Titism may seek to placate us to gain temporary help from us, but the ultimate aim of communism is to destroy us, and that purpose is being pursued by all segments of communism without deviation.

4 We must insure our own economic stability by pursuing a wise fiscal policy, to avoid inflation. The following steps should be taken:

(a) Adopt a fair and equitable tax without political complexion that will assure our operation on a balanced budget, on a pay-as-we-go basis.

(b) Reduce nonessential governmental expense to the minimum consistent with the performance of the necessary functions of government.

(c) Refrain from any further devaluation of the dollar.

(d) Facilitate production necessary to provide as high a standard of living as possible consistent with the needs for national defense.

(e) Provide an adequate national defense.

5. We must enlist the aid of eminent men and women from religion, education, science, industry, philosophy, sales, advertising, and other fields of thought, to work in groups to find the most effective means of expressing the answer to the lie of communism. Assistance of men and women who have escaped from behind the iron curtain should be used, to learn more thoroughly the intimate problems of the people within the sphere of Soviet might, including Russia. Time is an all-important factor in formulating our program, so continued diligent application to the task is urgently required. When we have found the way to give positive expression to the meaning of freedom and the dignity of man, we can launch a crusade to proclaim to the world the purpose of our way of life. We can seize the initiative from the Communist aggressors and maintain so effective and forceful a program that communism will fail utterly in its attempt to enslave the mind of many. To carry out this campaign we will need the best minds in sales and advertising to sell to all people, all over the world, the virtues of freedom.

(a) Secure cooperation of the governments of all free Nations in providing facilities to give voice to the campaign of truth.

(b) Relentlessly direct our intelligent effort toward converting people from the Communist philosophy of government wherever it may exist, for Communism knows no boundaries.

(c) Encourage peoples all over the world to start crusades for a just peace. Urge them to demand of their government that it cooperate.

(d) Proclaim our friendship for the people behind the iron curtain, including the Russian people, as distinguished from their communistic governments.

III. We must work out a constructive plan for an enduring and just peace. Peace is not insured by pious platitudes and high-

sounding phrases. To secure peace we must build from the people up. We must truly learn the causes that lead to war and eliminate them. No organization can promote peace unless every government of such a world organization truly represents the interests of the people that it governs. No firm peace can be established unless we recognize the relationship between man and his Creator.

1. We, in America, should take the initiative by appointing a peace planning board to work out a proposed formula for a just peace.

(What is more logical than establishing the objectives of the peace for which we are willing to wage war?)

2. Representatives, from all governments who are willing to participate should be invited to a council of peace. Representatives to this council of peace should include religious leaders and outstanding industrialists, economists, scientists and engineers, equipped to give the economic answers to constructing peace.

3. In establishing a formula for peace, we must give people the hope of getting the maximum out of their daily living, in the environment and standard of life that it is possible for them to achieve. No purpose is served in holding up the American standard of living as a basis for comparison when it is not possible for it to be attained. It is of no interest to the man in Warsaw, for instance, to know that the majority of workingmen in America drive their own automobiles, if it is not possible for him to do the same. We Americans must learn to wear our blessings modestly.

(a) No attempt should be made to export our political system. In our attempts to aid other people in establishing a political system we must be realistic, taking into consideration other peoples necessities and limitations. We must recognize that the cultural and political philosophy of a country is the outgrowth of the customs and nature of its people.

4. Grant all assistance we can afford to other nations in eliminating the economic distress which leads to war. But we must recognize that peace cannot be purchased by handouts. The greatest help we can give the world is in technical assistance in developing the natural resources of the world.

(a) By placing at their disposal the best techniques in developing the fertility of their land.

(b) By assisting them in improving the production methods required to make use of their natural resources, to give their people a better standard of living.

5. Demonstrate that a just peace will free scientific research from the need of finding new and unique methods of destruction, so that such efforts may be devoted to the betterment of standards of living and of health. With the help of God we may yet demonstrate that man can be made worthy of the power with which he has been blessed. Scientific research and the eminent scientists who have done so much good are deserving of the dignity of devoting their efforts to the noble purpose for which their Creator endowed their genius.

6. Bring a new and practical interpretation to the principles of Christianity. Our industrial progress; our scientific research; our highly developed mechanical ability; our ingenuity, can assist in solving the economic ills of the world; or the output of our industrial plants can be used to inflict catastrophic destruction on the people of the world, including our own. If, by patience, intelligence, and effort, we can lead the world to peace without war, great good will be done to humanity. Between these two alternatives we must ultimately choose, with the other nations of the world, the use to which we will put the scientific knowledge with which we have been blessed—for the betterment of the lot of man, or for his destruction.

We can use our God-given knowledge to uplift mankind, or we can continue man as man's worst enemy.

It is true that life as a man knows it is a period of trial or preparation for eternity and that there have been "wars and rumors of wars" throughout all history, and man's lot is to "earn his bread by the sweat of his brow." But it is also true that "To whom God has given much, much will be expected in return" and that man and nations will be judged by what they do with the blessings which they receive from their Creator. To accept war as inevitable, makes it inevitable.

We Americans have been blessed by our Creator with many gifts, and we have developed our talents in an atmosphere that has been conducive to our growth and development. The time has come when we must prove ourselves worthy of that which has been given to us. The banner of world leadership has been cast to us—the eyes of the world are upon us. We have the right way of life before us. The truth is on our side. Nothing more is needed from us but the will and the wisdom, and with the help of God we may lead mankind to freedom, peace, and a better way of life.

Forging Ahead in Soil and Water Conservation—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at premier showing of motion picture, *Neighbors of the Land*, the Oliver Corp., Vandalia, Ill., March 12, 1951:

FORGING AHEAD IN SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

I consider myself fortunate to be here this evening for the premier showing of this outstanding soil conservation motion picture, *Neighbors of the Land*. That private industry is doing this to help along our great soil and water conservation program is highly significant, I think. It means to me that people—business people and others—are coming to understand that here is a common problem that must be looked after before it is too late. I mean the problem of taking care of our productive land.

Twenty years ago, the few of us who for decades had been trying to bring attention to the alarming problem of soil erosion counted ourselves well rewarded for our efforts if we managed to get a few paragraphs on the subject included in a general bulletin once in a while. That would be without even a photograph to illustrate the text. We certainly could not foresee then that people would become so aroused over conservation within the next two decades that proverbially hard-headed businessmen would become soil conservation movie producers.

I congratulate you on *Neighbors of the Land*. It now has become a valuable addition to the growing body of pictures, books, and other educational vehicles by means of which the compelling conservation message is being carried to the farthest corners of our own land and to people of other countries around the world. It is at once an inspiration to the soil conservationists, a well deserved compliment to conservation farmers,

and a timely reminder to city and farm people alike that we all must work together as neighbors of the land in order to complete this big conservation job we have set out to do.

EVERYBODY HAS A STAKE IN SOIL CONSERVATION

It would be most convenient for the rest of us if we could pass all the responsibility for soil and water conservation back to the farmer and let the matter rest there; but our economy isn't built that way. The land is still the source of a very large share of our original wealth. Manufacturers, bunkers, merchants, railroad and other transportation interests, men and women in the professions, and all the rest of us are directly affected by what happens to the base of our land-wealth—our productive land. That is true whether we live in Chicago, Vandalia, St. Louis, or Atlanta. So it is that every interest in the country has a stake in getting the quickest possible solution to this problem of safeguarding our remaining productive land—which is the source of all but a small fraction of our food, as well as of all our wood products, leather, wool, vegetable fibers and oils, and many other things.

In spite of the remarkable progress we have made in soil conservation the past 17 years, there still are many people who do not know about or understand these facts. There are thousands of people—including farmers as well as businessmen, public officials, and others—who have yet to learn, for example, about the thoroughgoing, permanently effective soil- and water-conservation work being done and remaining to be done in farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil-conservation districts. These are the people—put the figure at 1,000,000 or some other figure—who need to see *Neighbors of the Land*.

That is about the next best thing they can do, short of actually visiting Director Rolle Eakin's farm and seeing at first-hand how acre-by-acre soil-conservation treatment is planned and put on the land of his farm and that of his Fayette County soil conservation district neighbors like Cyril Daniel, Carrol Bone, Walter Groves, and John Daniel. Here in this farm neighbor group—as throughout your district, the State of Illinois, and the Nation—is a living demonstration of the practical application and profitable results of research, education, land inventories, and land treatment and use according to need and capability.

DEMOCRACY IN SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS—NEIGHBOR GROUPS

It is also a working example of our democracy in action. I think we all must agree that this is something that is fundamentally important at any time, and especially so in these days of international tension and domestic mobilization of our human and economic resources. This phenomenon of group action in soil-conservation districts is something I like to talk about, and I am happy that it has been emphasized the way it has in *Neighbors of the Land*. In fact, I don't know of another picture which has played up this important point this way.

Natural groups of farmers within districts all over the country, bound together by the ties of neighborliness and common interests, are contributing encouragingly toward speeding up conservation work. This they do, as we have seen, by planning together and working together, lending one another machinery and seed, and cooperating in conservation work in many other ways. The Soil Conservation Service is now working with some 20,000 of these natural groups.

In a great many instances these groups, which are not formalized, are coming together in planning and application meetings. As groups of people who have come together quietly through a natural process, they are helping the district directors and their own neighbors in many ways. It long has been known that people like to work together,

whether they are in rural areas or in cities. Many people work in groups far more effectively than as individuals. There is a certain stimulus to morale in the act of working with friends and neighbors for a common beneficial purpose. It leads to better feeling and cooperation here in America, and in other countries I have visited.

UNITED STATES SETS WORLD PATTERN IN CONSERVATION

In order to appreciate what this kind of democratic leadership and working together means in the Nation's basic agricultural economy—really means in terms of what we mobilize and fight for when pressed to it by others—you need only to study the contrasting situation in so many other countries. There, what the government says is law, with little or no opportunity for individual freedom of action, assurance of stability, or hope of security. I have observed these things in different parts of the world myself, and, of course, we read about them every day. I am convinced that the district method would be the best approach that farmers of the world everywhere could take for getting to the point where they have more voice in the affairs of their government and less discontent about directions and overlordships. It is encouraging to note that bona fide soil-conservation districts are in operation as going programs in several other countries now—as the philosophy of conservation spreads faster, world-wide.

The district organization, as it has stood the test of 13 years of peacetime and wartime experience under just about all possible economic, weather, and other conditions, definitely has proved itself to be superior to anything else we know about in coping with our basic land problems in a democratic fashion. The confidence we have in the ability of the Nation to safeguard our remaining land resource is based, to a large degree, on continuing active cooperation with the soil-conservation districts. This, plus the positive support of those agencies and groups—governmental and private, local, State, and national—which are in a position to help, will expedite the conservation program.

We now have the knowledge of how to do the job, the conservation tools have been perfected and tested, and, what is more important, we have the organization and public support for doing the job. We have no valid excuse for failing to go ahead and get the job done.

DISTRICT ORGANIZATION IS WIDESPREAD

As of January 1, this year, more than four-fifths of all our farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States were included within soil-conservation district boundaries. Every month farmers over the country are voting new districts into being under their State enabling laws. It seems not unreasonable to predict it will not be long until all the farmland of the Nation will be in districts. These districts, which are still being formed at an average rate of 8 to 10 a month, now number nearly 2,350 and cover 1,250,000,000 acres in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Illinois landholders can be proud of this State's high standing in the soil-conservation districts column, with approximately 95 percent of your farms and land in farms in districts. Curiously enough, the number of Illinois districts also totaled 95, as of February 1, this year, in 98 of the State's 102 counties.

District organization, of course, is not enough by itself. It is the soil and water conservation work that actually gets done on the land that counts, which I shall talk more about in a moment. But I want to emphasize the districts, through which the Soil Conservation Service has made available to farmers virtually all of its technical and

certain other assistance; because they unmistakably point the way in which we are forging ahead with soil and water conservation in the United States. When we pause to consider that the great majority of owners of 82 percent of all our farm lands already have, of their own initiative, gone to the polls and voted to establish their soil conservation districts under State enabling laws, then I think it is pretty obvious the responsible landholders of the Nation are never going to let us go back to a wasteful system of land neglect.

I believe I can say that our national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving our interlocking resources of land, water, forest, grass, and wildlife. The occasion of our being here this evening is one good example of this trend in our thinking. We have a new concept of the importance of land and water and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive and using our water to the greatest possible advantage. In short, we have entered on a new era in the United States—the soil conservation era.

ACCELERATED PROGRESS MADE IN SOIL CONSERVATION

Figures on the progress we have made in terms of actual accomplishments in conservation surveying, planning, and treatment of the land bear me out in that conclusion: Approximately 36,000,000 acres on which detailed conservation surveys had been made in districts; 941,000 conservation farm plans worked out by district farmers and Soil Conservation Service technicians out on the land together, covering 26,000,000 acres, and 131,000,000 acres treated with conservation measures called for in the plans.

All my figures are from the records of the Soil Conservation Service. They do not include PMA figures, or those from other Federal, State, or private agencies which have made contributions.

In considering the rate of progress on so prodigious a job as conserving the productive lands of the United States while using them, a major point to be considered is whether progress is speeding up from year to year. This has much to do with an appropriate appraisal of the rate at which any long-time job can be completed—what is ahead in soil conservation. Personally, I am more than happy over the great progress that has been made. It gave me great satisfaction, for instance, to be able to report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the sixteenth year of accelerated progress—the last 12 of them in work in the districts—with the exception of the one year when the Service took a severe cut in funds.

In 1935, before there were any soil conservation districts, we were able to report the farm conservation job completed on less than a million acres. Seven years later, in 1942, 5 years after the first district was established, basic conservation measures were applied in that 1 year to 5,338,000 acres. Then, in the fiscal year of 1950, the same kind of treatment was applied to 26,071,342 acres in that 1 year. This was an increase of 388 percent, nearly five times as much work done, with operating facilities increased during the 8-year period by only 54 percent.

THE CONSERVATION JOB AHEAD

In addition to the conservation measures applied to the land, much farm planning work was done, and enough soil conservation surveys were carried out for use in the preparation of a healthy backlog of necessary conservation farm plans, in most of the districts. Farmers' applications to their districts for conservation technical assistance continue to outrun available facilities, with a backlog of 185,000 applications on hand for the country as a whole as of last January 1, and they no doubt will continue to do so for some time to come. Meanwhile, how-

ever, we estimate that, based on experience, we could, with adequate facilities, complete the job of applying the basic conservation measures to the land by about 1970, or around 20 years from now.

As to finishing the job, actually there is no end to it; because, when the basic conservation measures have been applied to the land, there still remains the continuing task of maintenance, along with the adoption and putting to use of constantly improved methods developed through continuing research. This is true of all the works of man, if not maintained, they eventually disappear through the depredations of neglect. Our figures up to January 1, 1951, show that we have completed approximately one-fifth of the total job. In addition, there has been a considerable spread of practices to thousands of farms both inside and outside of soil conservation districts for which we have no records.

If we can raise the year-by-year rate of application of effective conservation measures a little more, and I believe this can be done with adequate facilities, it will not be long until we can begin to see the goal which for so long has seemed so far off. But the job ahead is still a big one, and one which is going to test our mettle. One thing we need to guard against is any temptation to look back on our accomplishments with a degree of satisfaction that might lure us into the error of complacency.

We are still losing some 500,000 acres of productive land each year in the United States through continuing erosion; whereas, we have left all together only about 460,000,000 acres of good, first-class land, counting all the good land that is in cultivation now and all that can be brought into cultivation by presently feasible means. Even right here in Illinois, which is uncommonly well off from the standpoint of its area of arable land, erosion has been severe on a million acres of farmland, and serious erosion has occurred on around 35 percent of the State's farmland. That is, more than 14,000,000 acres of Illinois land, worth anywhere from \$125 an acre up, has been either seriously or severely damaged. This would be a total land damage of around \$2,000,000,000, not counting the cost of stream and reservoir silting, damage to roads and railways, increased floods along small streams particularly and all streams in general. I am sure you businessmen here tonight would not tolerate a drain like that for any time at all on your plants, stores, machinery, buildings, railways, and so forth.

IMPORTANCE OF SOIL CONSERVATION IN DEFENSE

Another fact we have to face is that, for the third time within the brief space of 33 years, we find ourselves in a state of emergency and national mobilization for defense of our country and of democracies elsewhere. In order to maintain our national strength, we must safeguard and maintain the very source of our individual and national strength—our productive land. What some people still don't seem to realize is the fact that men with guns and bullets can't fight without food, and that there can be pitifully little food from poor land.

No one knows how long the present emergency may last—1 year or 25 years. But the longer it does last, with the continuing need for maximum production of food, fiber, oil crops, timber, the more indispensable becomes our productive land from which all these necessities are derived. And the more important becomes the conservation and efficient use of this land and of the water which makes it produce. The corollary is rather apparent, I think:

SPEEDING AND INTENSIFYING CONSERVATION WORK

Last year, already, we had fewer technicians available, county-wide, to give service to the steadily increasing number of soil

conservation farmers. As a result, we have had to tighten up all along the line, and increase the efficiency of operations, individual by individual and district by district. We don't know what the situation will be the next year precisely, but there is every logical reason to expect the manpower situation to get tighter rather than otherwise.

Forging Ahead in Soil Conservation— Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at premier showing of motion picture, *Neighbors of the Land*, the Oliver Corp., Vandalia, Ill., March 12, 1951:

The Soil Conservation Service has every possible man out working directly with the farmers, close to the job (approximately 88 percent of its employees out in work units and other field offices). Only about 1½ percent work in the Washington office; and of the other roughly 11 percent in State and regional offices, a substantial number are technical, cartographic, and other personnel directly engaged in or concerned with field activity along lines of quality work, maintenance, and improvement.

We will continue to use every dollar of our appropriations to the maximum extent possible in providing technical help to farmers as in the past. The Service likewise stands ready to give full cooperation and every encouragement to whatever program or agency is contributing to our common conservation objective, financially, educationally, or otherwise. In fact, I have been spending considerable time the last 2 weeks working with the agricultural conservation program people on ways for making our facilities together bring about more conservation on the land as speedily as is possible consistent with getting sound, permanently effective conservation.

PUBLIC TEAMWORK IS ESSENTIAL

But getting the total soil and water conservation job done in the time in which it needs to be done requires considerably more than even the best efforts of one or a group of public agencies working with the people out on the land. It takes the teamwork of anybody and everybody who has anything to contribute to advancement of this major national undertaking—teamwork of the kind which went into the production of *Neighbors of the Land*, for example. That means just about everybody—from bankers to school-teachers, from railroads to newspapers, from manufacturers to retailers. The farm-machinery industry, a member of which is our host this evening, provides a ready illustration of what I am talking about, although I could draw examples from numerous other fields of business and professional endeavor.

The national farm equipment manufacturing and retailing people have launched an active program of direct cooperation with soil-conservation districts, looking to mutual benefits of improved farm machinery markets on the one hand and better equipment for doing the conservation job on the other. Good land and good machinery go together. Eroded, gullied land can't produce the in-

come to pay for efficient, up-to-date implements; neither can worn-out machinery, held together with baling wire, permit of efficient and profitable farm production.

FARM-MACHINERY INDUSTRY HELPING SOIL CONSERVATION

Farm-machinery makers and local dealers alike have to have customers in order to stay in business—good customers who come back year after year with money in their pockets. That means that the future of their business depends on the permanent productiveness of every farm and every possible acre of land in the sales territory. So naturally it would be extremely short-sighted and poor business for the machinery people to encourage their customers to squeeze the last ounce of fertility out of their farms and soon not have anything left to buy needed implements with.

This interest in fitting good machinery to good land is by no means one-sided, however. The farmers, in turn, have to have equipment adapted to their own needs in order to operate most efficiently and economically. This includes machinery suitable for conservation tillage, contouring, and other individual operations, as well as heavy and other special equipment for earth-moving jobs like building farm ponds and district group-drainage projects, and so on. They naturally look to the farm-implement people to come up with the machines or equipment modifications needed. There are also machinery credit facilities and other needs, including those of the growing number of private contractors doing soil- and water-conservation work.

When we stop and think about these and other sound factors which dictate a natural cooperative relationship between conservation farmers and the machinery people, this premier showing of *Neighbors of the Land* becomes a most natural and understandable event. That is, in case there should be anybody here who had any question about the matter. And what the farm-machinery people thus can do—and are doing—through such educational means, dealer consultation and cooperation with the farmers, physical improvements in equipment, and otherwise is one more substantial means to getting the farm-conservation job done.

CONSERVATION OVERREACHES FARM BOUNDARIES— WATERSHED APPROACH

The man on the land is, after all, the one who has to do the actual conservation job. Nobody else can do the whole job for him, even if he wanted them to do it, which I know from long observation and experience he certainly does not want. It not only is an obligation, but I sincerely feel, a privilege for any of us who can in any way do so to contribute our respective talents to this common conservation goal. This objective does not stop at farm boundaries. More and more farmers, and urban interests as well, are coming to realize that they need special technical help and other support in planning and applying adequate soil- and water-conservation programs on farmlands and watersheds.

Land treatment—watershed treatment—is basic and must be done first for conserving our productive land and for conserving our life-giving water supplies, reducing flood damage, and reducing costly siltation of our reservoirs, harbors, etc. The opportunities and promise are great for effective accomplishment in applying conservation techniques and information to individual parcels of land and to whole watersheds alike. This, as we know, is in both private and public interest.

A PROGRAM OF POSITIVE ACTION

Whether it is on a major watershed or in a comparatively restricted farming community, to complete the soil and water conservation job in time calls for a program of positive action, in which all groups have a

natural interest. This program includes, among other points:

(1) Completion of the national land capability inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit; (2) completion of the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil-conservation districts, and strengthening district responsibility and work—with a scientifically developed soil-conservation district plan applied by a conservation farmer to every farm in the country at minimum public cost, (3) active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation; and (4) making a real conservationist out of every farmer in the country.

SOME REWARDS OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

The rewards for such conservation effort are most substantial. We can't afford to let them slip through our fingers. Some of these rewards are:

1 To landowners and operators—increased income, better living, greater security for the future.

2 To the community—better business, improved schools, churches, roads, and other community essentials; and people working more closely together as a result of a thriving agriculture.

3 To the public in general—protection of the land on which we depend for our food and other essentials, with reduction in floods and siltation.

4 To Government (local, State, and Federal)—increased revenues resulting from increased earnings and added wealth from land stabilized and improved through conservation farming.

5 To the Nation—assurance of continued national welfare and security.

It clearly behooves all of us to be neighbors of the land.

COMPLETING THE JOB OF SOIL CONSERVATION

In 1942, soil conservation was applied to 5,000,000 acres of land. In 1949, the same kind of job was completed on 24,000,000 acres, and in 1950, on 26,000,000 acres. And it looks very much as if, even with somewhat reduced funds, we may get the job done this fiscal year on 28,000,000 acres of land. During the 8-year period between 1942 and 1950, the increase in work completed was 388 percent but the corresponding increase in facilities was only 54 percent.

Speculating on what could be done, the indications are that with an increase in technical services to soil conservation districts from around 320,000 man-years to 380,000 man-years, the job could be completed in 20 years. At the present rate of progress it would take 35 years to finish. If the job could be completed in the shorter period, there would be a saving of 10,000,000 acres of land, which at \$100 an acre would amount to a billion dollars. There would be a further saving of 50,000 man-years, which would amount to a saving of \$120,000,000 more, and a still further saving of \$4 per acre, at least, in increased yields resulting from soil conservation on 10,000,000 acres over a period of 15 years. This would amount to \$600,000,000 more, or a total saving of \$1,720,000,000, without counting the silt kept out of streams, reservoirs, ditches, and harbors and without including damage costs to roads and railroads or any reduction in flood flows, as a result of the conservation work carried out.

INCREASED PRODUCTION IMMEDIATELY

If the emergency continues, we are going to have to do our best to increase our yields this year over last year by, as I am informed, 3½ percent. This would be a terrific undertaking, but apparently we are going to have to exert our every possible effort to do it.

I pointed out at a meeting of soil conservationists at New York on March 7, this year,

that the work of the Soil Conservation Service would yield a very largely increased production by reason of the increased per-acre yields that invariably result from doing a good job of soil and water conservation on farms. I pointed out that in a single instance the drainage work resulting from the research carried out by the Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the Imperial Valley Drainage District in California, had resulted in returning to good production land that was practically producing nothing—because of poor drainage and resultant salty condition of the soil—to the extent of 70,000 acres. An area of between 7,000 and 8,000 acres of land is being thus returned to production every year.

Last year the Soil Conservation Service improved the drainage on wet farm lands to the extent of 1,161,000 acres and prepared for irrigation by leveling 315,000 acres. Moreover, 617,000 acres were prepared for improved water application, making a total of 2,093,000 acres of what could be called essentially new land, put into production through improvement for irrigation.

This present fiscal year the Nation needs a great deal more cotton than was produced last year—some 50 percent more. I have been informed. Our technicians are going to advise farmers to put in more cotton, but they are going to advise them to put it on land that can be protected from ruinous erosion.

SCS PERSONNEL LARGELY IN THE FIELD

And last but not least, I think it may be of interest to you to point out that our force is not sequestered in comfortable offices scattered about the country, but are out in the field, very largely carrying on soil and water conservation work right along the firing line.

In 1942, 21 5 percent of our personnel were in Washington, State, and regional offices. At present, only 11 8 percent of our personnel are in these offices, 88 2 percent of our force is in the field force.

SUPERVISORS' ANNUAL MEETING

In February I attended the meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in Oklahoma City. There were approximately 1,500 supervisors present from all parts of the country, together with something like 500 wives, and a good many children. In addition, there were visiting farmers, soil conservation technicians, bankers, and businessmen.

In talking to these supervisors, I found that to a man they were ready and determined to do everything they possibly could to help the Nation out of the emergency it has been forced into by the Communists.

With that sort of spirit and determination behind our farmers, and with the spirit and determination I see here in the exhibiting of this wonderful picture, I can tell you I am not losing confidence in the strength and general welfare of this, the greatest nation on earth.

Life in 1951 Is Best Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

* IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a special report published in the June 15, 1951 issue of the United States News and World Report.

The United States News contends that the article gives the results of an ex-

tensive research on the economic situation in the United States.

It refutes many of the claims made by reactionary columnists, editors, and administration opponents in and out of Congress who constantly charge that the Nation is in dire economic peril.

If danger threatens it is the result of such irresponsible and unethical attacks devised to confuse and fool the American people.

This article, published in one of the Nation's most conservative and anti-administration magazines, gives answer to the critics who are desperately seeking to gain political advantage by deceit and confusion.

LIFE IN 1951 IS BEST EVER—STANDARDS GO ON RISING DESPITE REARMAMENT

(Living standards, for most Americans, are getting better all the time. It's a good life, despite war, taxes, inflation. People generally are abundantly fed, clothed, housed. They have all the comforts, and ample time to enjoy them. And there's still room for improvement. There's a market for almost everything. High living standards are going higher.)

In spite of high prices, high taxes, rearmament, war in Korea, most of the people of this country are living better than ever before. They are better fed, better housed, better clothed, enjoy more leisure, enjoy more comforts than at any other time in history. Only the men called to the armed services and those on fixed incomes are out of the stream of prosperity.

People a year from now are going to be better off in most ways than they are at this time. This will be true in spite of cuts in the output of automobiles, appliances, other things made of scarce materials. It will be true despite credit controls and a reduced level of home building. Even with cutbacks there will be 5,000,000 new passenger cars produced in 1951, at least 850,000 new homes built, and millions of television sets and appliances made.

Down through the years people in this country have enjoyed a steadily rising standard of living. Brief slow-downs and rare reversals in that rise have occurred during wars or depressions. But across the sweep of the country's life its people have gone steadily toward better standards of living.

Better living in the United States shows up in the phenomenal growth of actual goods and services bought by individuals. Amount of these things bought for each person in the United States has risen five and a half times since 1870—measured in physical amounts, not inflated dollars.

In 1870, the average individual had only the equivalent of 196 of today's dollars to spend on clothing, food, luxuries. From that year on, the rise in living standards was sharp and steady. Even the depression of the 1930's reversed the trend for only 4 years.

By 1940, consumers were spending the equivalent of \$963 apiece on the things they wanted, five times as much as they enjoyed in the way of new goods in the years just after the Civil War.

Even World War II and the record inflation that followed interrupted the over-all trend to better living in only 2 years, 1942 and 1948. When products made of metal disappeared from store shelves, people spent more on food, clothing, and other things. Altogether, the amount of goods and services bought went on up.

Now, 11 years later, people have been buying a third more per person than they bought back in 1940.

Inflation, higher prices on nearly everything, higher taxes, have reduced standards

of living for millions of individuals whose incomes have not kept up. And millions of families—hard-pushed to meet all the installments on the things they were buying—have complained how much worse off they were than in the good old days. Yet, through it all, living standards of the average family have gone up and up.

At the same time, a shift in buying from necessities to luxuries shows what is happening to the way people live.

The job of keeping alive, warm, fed, and clothed took just about all a man could earn back in 1870, before the industrial revolution hit its full stride in the United States. Specifically, the average consumer used \$64 out of every \$100 of his spending money for food, clothing, other so-called nondurable goods. Now these necessities take only \$53 of each \$100 spent on consumer goods and services. That leaves 47 more to spend on gadgets and equipment.

Result is that the average consumer today buys ten times as much in the way of household equipment and other durables as he did in 1870.

Since 1946 alone—in the biggest inflation in history—more than 18,500,000 new automobiles have been bought. In the same period, 15,000,000 families have purchased new vacuum cleaners, 20,000,000 have gotten new refrigerators, more than 4,000,000 have moved into new homes, and 17,000,000 have acquired new washing machines.

At the same time, people have enjoyed more and more services of all kinds—from permanent waves to medical attention. Altogether, the amount of these services used by each person has increased by a third since 1940.

Result of buying on this rising scale is best shown in terms of examples. The chart on page 36 gives some of the changes that have occurred in the last decade.

Electric refrigerators, for one example, were not regarded as standard pieces of household equipment back in 1940—fewer than half of all homes had them. Now 78 in every 100 homes have electric refrigerators and some of the remaining 22 homes have the gas-operated type.

Home ownership itself has become the standard since 1940. In that year, 44 of each 100 families lived in homes that they owned. Now more than half of all families—55 in 100—are homeowners.

Dwellings, at the same time, have become less crowded. The census of 1940 revealed that 9 out of 100 homes were overcrowded—with more than 3 persons to every 2 rooms. The 1950 census showed 6 homes in 100 overcrowded.

Eating, too, is better than it ever was before. With more food, and more nutritious food, at prices that are lower in relation to incomes, the typical United States family never had it so good at the dinner table.

To show what has happened over the years, an hour of labor in a factory today will buy the worker and his family nearly 7 quarts of milk delivered to the door. That hour would buy only 5 quarts in 1939 and 4 in 1929. The same hour's labor will buy more—in most cases far more—bread, bacon, eggs, oranges, potatoes, canned tomatoes, margarine and many other foods today.

What many individuals are finding, in fact, is that they already are too well fed, as a current rash of special diets is indicating. Heart troubles, artery disorders are catching up with more people, in many cases apparently because of diets too rich in fats. Millions of individuals are overweight.

Markets for the products of factories still are immense despite the loading up on all kinds of goods in recent years. Just keeping the country's 43,000,000 families on the

standard of living to which they have become accustomed—keeping their equipment repaired and replaced—is a big job.

In addition, there still are nearly 7,000,000 homes without inside running water.

Altogether, more than 11,000,000 homes still have no flush toilet. Only one farm home in four has one. And three out of five farms have no telephone yet.

The biggest home-building spree in history still leaves more than 2,500,000 homes overcrowded. For nonwhite families, a sixth of the city homes are overcrowded, and nearly a third of the farm homes are.

Even eating isn't what it could be for all families. In Charlotte, N. C., for example, a community committee has just counted 761 school children who are going hungry through the lunch hour every day.

What it all adds up to is a standard of living that has risen with astonishing persistence for generations—and one that still has room to rise.

Better living—10-year gain

In 100 homes, the number 10 years ago	Now
Electricity	79 96
Radios	81 95
Running water	69 84
Passenger cars	72 82
Refrigerators, electric	46 78
Flush toilets	65 77
Baths or showers	61 74
Telephones	41 70
Washers, electric	44 65
Television sets	0 24

The Place of the Paper Industry in the United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following paper by Dr. Louis T. Stevenson, economist for the American Paper and Pulp Association, presented before the thirty-second annual convention of the American Pulp and Paper Mill Superintendents Association held in Portland, Oreg., June 24-28, 1951:

THE PLACE OF THE PAPER INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

It is but repeating a many times twice-told tale to say that the paper and board industry ranks as the sixth largest industry in the United States, when ranked by value of product. Ahead of it, according to the United States Bureau of the Census, comes motor vehicles, meat packing, steel works, petroleum refining, and cotton broad woven fabrics. This ranking was established by the Bureau of the Census in a tabulation which eliminated duplications such as would arise by including with paper and board the pulp industry and the converted paper products industries. Yes, the paper and board industry is officially and accurately ranked sixth, and yet few people outside of the industry realize its size, complexity, and importance to the United States economy because few people stop to think about paper at all. Paper is so much a part of the everyday life of an American that he simply takes it for granted. It is there in abundance when needed, and its cost is so small that it is but

an incidental expense for most individuals and for most businesses.

Just where does the paper industry, and in that term I shall include all paper and board, fit into the American economic picture? The answer is—everywhere. There is not a farm, factory, business, railroad, or other transportation system that can operate without using paper. Its use is essential to the operation of our governments, local, State, and national; to our banking system; to our systems of communication, to our systems of distribution; and above all, to our armed services which, during the last war, listed over 700,000 uses for paper. The use of paper had become so essential to the operation of our economy that in 1944 Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, stated that the paper and pulp industry was one of the most essential of all our industries.

THE FUNCTIONS OF PAPER IN THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

The first use of paper by man was as a medium on which to transmit and record ideas or facts. Paper has thus been used by all peoples since its original development by the Chinese about the first century A. D. In the storied libraries of our country and other countries are kept the vast treasures of knowledge on which our entire civilization and educational system are built. All kinds of research depend upon facts recorded on paper, as do all the sciences: chemistry, physics, etc. It is not too much to say that our western civilization was born on paper records and is disseminated through the use of the printed word.

In the United States the vast printing and publishing industry carries out the major part of this function. Local governments also keep the legal records of property transfers on paper, all kinds of other governmental agencies keep records of laws, official orders, transactions, and in most instances these are published. It is estimated that over 10,000,000 tons of paper were required in the United States during 1950 to record and transmit ideas. This estimate, of course, includes the newspaper imported and used in this country.

In this brief presentation it is impossible to list comprehensively all the uses of paper to satisfy this function. One can hope to mention but a few which may stir the imagination to review the subject and bring to mind many other instances in individual experience.

THE PACKAGING AND PROTECTIVE FUNCTION

One of the fastest growing fields for the use of paper and board is that of packaging. The modern package must perform satisfactorily under severe conditions of handling, climate, and storage. Paperboard has grown tremendously in volume in recent years because the product has been adapted to meet more and more exacting requirements. The advent of the paper shipping sack, both single and multiwall, has greatly expanded the use of kraft paper in that field.

Special research into the application of sulfite wrappings, glassine, greaseproof, and vegetable parchment, has widened the use of these papers.

Over 13,500,000 tons of paper and board were used during 1950 in packaging United States products.

THE SANITARY FUNCTION

It has been proved conclusively that when paper or board comes off the paper machine it is a perfect sanitary product so far as cleanliness is concerned—there are no coliform bacteria present. Paper is, because of its low cost and disposability, "a natural" for many sanitary purposes. Paper napkins, facial tissues, milk bottles and bottle caps, ice cream containers, frozen food containers and wrappers are but examples of the many applications of paper as a sanitary product.

It is not easy to estimate the total tonnage of these papers, but approximately 1,500,000 tons were consumed in 1950. This is one of the most rapidly growing branches of the paper industry.

SOME ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PAPERMAKING

Papermaking is a mass production industry, generally located in small communities, and using large volumes of process water. Its power requirements are great because the machinery is heavy and the grinding action demands power.

The net result of these characteristics is the economic stimulation of many small communities by the steady stream of payroll and investment money brought to these small towns and cities by the pulp and paper mills located in them.

Wood pulp mills are dependent for their raw materials upon forest resources. The mills also require huge long-term capital investments. As a consequence of these two factors the careful plant management must assure itself of adequate forest resources and consequently the pulp industry is and has been in the forefront of commercial forestry developments to assure permanent wood supplies. A pulp mill without reasonably priced wood "dies on the stem," as it were. The joint use of a forest for the production of saw logs, other wood products, and wood pulp is an almost ideally economical set up when the forest is handled so as to assure a continuous flow of wood. Waste is reduced and a greater over-all utilization of the wood results.

SOME FACTS AND FIGURES

The primary paper industry in the United States will be able to produce over \$6,000,000,000 worth of goods this year. Employment in the industry is running currently at 209,000 workers, exclusive of woods workers and salaried individuals. The present annual payroll will approximate \$765,000,000. All told, it is estimated that, including woods workers, about 500,000 workers of all kinds are employed in our primary pulp and paper-making industry.

Directly dependent upon the product of the paper industry are the printing and publishing industry, and the manufacturers of converted paper products. Between these two industry groups and the pulp and paper industry over a million people are employed, drawing about \$3,400,000,000 annual pay. Thus over 1,000,000 people are directly engaged in the manufacture, printing, and otherwise processing paper. In addition to this, an almost immeasurable army is engaged in the distribution and use of paper.

For example, a manager of a large department store last fall asked me when he had difficulty in getting an adequate supply of wrapping paper, "What would you do, Dr. Stevenson, if you couldn't get the material without which you could not operate?"

We may think of stores as relatively small users of paper. They think that paper is an absolutely necessary material without which they cannot operate. They can close out a line of merchandise and still do business, but they cannot operate without paper.

But if we are going to include all direct and indirect users of paper in our statement, we cannot avoid mentioning all the 153,000,000 individuals in the United States who come within that category. And the entire gross national product of over \$313,000,000,000 is affected. Certainly, without paper it would be sadly deflated.

THE PAPER INDUSTRY AS AN INVESTMENT

During the past 10 years the paper industry has come to be considered by the investing public as an industry in which satisfactory investments can be made. Like all other industries, the paper industry offers investment opportunities that may vary company by company, but taking the industry as a whole, its record will bear analysis for years back as well as during the post-war periods.

The paper industry earnings record, taken as an industry, will stand up with all industry earnings in depression as in prosperity, for in fact, the paper industry has operated more steadily in depression periods than most industries. In the low year of the great depression (1932), the paper industry was operating at 58 percent of capacity, while steel was almost flat on its back below 20 percent and banks dependent upon the automobile industry were in distress.

The paper industry is, of course, a service industry, and it therefore is dependent upon general business activity for its own activity. But it must be remembered that whatever business is done demands the use of paper as a necessity. Business cannot be done without paper.

SUMMARY

The paper industry, sixth largest industry in the country, is dependent primarily upon adequate supplies of wood and water. Its products permeate the whole economy which is, as presently constituted, dependent upon a constant flow of products from the paper industry.

Paper production is located largely in small towns and cities in 37 of the 48 States. Consequently the payrolls and investment money of these mills are widely distributed and stimulate the business activity of these communities.

A United America Will Never Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include, in the RECORD, the address I delivered Saturday, October 6, 1951, at the installation of officers meeting of the John E. Harkins American Legion Post No. 42, in the Town Hall, at Holden, Mass.

The address follows:

One of the penalties of being a Congressman these hectic days is that it deprives one of the opportunity of meeting with his friends and neighbors at home as often as one would like.

I am therefore particularly happy to be able to come here tonight and take part in this meeting, not only as your Representative, but more especially as a fellow legionnaire.

I am glad to join in the expression of thanks to the post and auxiliary officers who have performed such fine work this past year, and also in your congratulations to the newly chosen officers who I know will earnestly devote themselves to the individual discharge of their responsibilities and the general progress of your post's objectives.

I deeply feel each and every one of us have justifiable reason to be proud of our membership in the American Legion. Our organization was conceived in a spirit of vibrant love of country which is our heritage, and a pledge to serve it faithfully and tirelessly in peace as in war.

I can personally testify as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for years, that the Legion has fought the good fight for the disabled, the widows, and orphans of deceased servicemen. It has led the way in national defense, rehabilitation, child welfare, and Americanism;

It has furnished vigorous and intelligent leadership in every phase of community service. It has won the confidence of the

American people who recognize our organization as purely American in purpose, ever ready to work for whatever is best for community, State, and Nation.

Ours is a mighty record of organizational achievement, giving full promise that it will be equal to the challenge that faces us today in stopping the expanding Communist scourge threatening to overrun us and the rest of the free world.

This Nation is embarked today on a program designed to preserve the principles of individual freedom and personal justice for ourselves and the civilized world. Opposed to this objective are the leaders of the Soviet Union, whose expressed purpose is to reduce us and all freedom-loving people to the inhuman status of state slaves.

To accomplish their un-Christian purposes, the Soviet Government is using methods of military might, of demoralizing propaganda, and of secret undermining of other governmental systems from within. They have been most successful in their pressures where governments were weak, where peoples were divided, and citizens bowed down with poverty, which is evidenced by the fact that since 1945 the Soviet Union has taken over 7,500,000 square miles of new territory and the control of more than 500,000,000 people. It is now trying to extend its empire across Asia.

Soviet expansion has wiped out three nations—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It has reduced to servitude six nations which were independent before 1939—Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and, in many respects, Yugoslavia. It is now obvious that the Soviet leaders have marked China for the same fate.

Is it not evident to you and every sound-thinking American that as each day passes this threat is getting nearer and nearer to our homes?

I am not naturally a pessimist, but I have spent many anxious hours wondering if the American people realize what is at stake in this world revolution in which we are not merely spectators, but leading participants. Do we fully realize that the world we have known, the world of liberty, of our kind of private enterprise, of economic security, is finally, after two world wars, almost marooned on our half of the Western Hemisphere? Communism has crowded in on us from every side.

Millions of Americans are trying to evade the realities by turning all their attention to the secondary question of how world communism ever reached this peak of power. They seem to entertain the idea that if they can only pin the whole blame on some person in government they can then sit back and relax. These unhappy manifestations of apparent American disunity have prompted the Soviet leaders to question the capacity to sacrifice among the American people, they do not question our physical resources.

There are too many evidences today, unfortunately, that self-seeking individuals, high pressure groups, and ambitious organizations are stubbornly pursuing their personal profit objectives in opposition to the national welfare. Jealousies, passions, prejudices, partisanship, and unrestrained emotions have been in undermining operation against our orderly advance of concentrated determination to keep ourselves and the free world from being ground to pieces under the Soviet steamroller.

Too much valuable time is being taken up in defiance of, and challenge to, the duly constituted authority of this Government. In the industrial and farm theaters we have too many unmindful leaders of management, labor and agriculture questioning and opposing legal regulations to accelerate desperately needed war production and mobilization.

In our private lives we have too many unwitting individuals nullifying any real program to control inflation.

Any continuing demonstrations of such supercharged emotional controversies surely must give great aid and comfort to the Kremlin leaders and enable them to harden the purpose and perseverance of their unwilling slave followers.

It is my hope and, indeed my personal belief, that the great majority of true Americans will daily become increasingly aware of this insidious Russian challenge to our American spirit; when the Russian authorities forget our history, it becomes our obligation to recall to them some of its pages.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence closed their monumental appeal to the judgment of mankind with this passage:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." That was in 1776.

Here again, in 1951, we stand in the tradition of our forefathers. Now again we must pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor—not for national independence only, but for the independence of all the free world, ourselves included. While once again American soldiers are dying on foreign fields in resistance of the diabolical enemy, you and I can do no less.

The basic problem of your Federal Government is then to convince the Russian leaders that they should accept peace and, if they should choose war, they will be defeated.

In support of that basic objective your Federal Government must reasonably help friendly nations, maintain a strong American military organization, and preserve our national financial stability. If each of us will accept the personal individual sacrifice that these objectives require, there is every reason to believe that the Russian leaders will agree to peace on earth because any other course will involve their own destruction. Let us then unite in resounding answer to the Russian challenge to our American spirit.

I know the members of the John E. Harkins Post, together with the American Legion posts in every community in the country will prove, once again to be the spearhead of the patriotic national spirit we need today more vitally than we ever needed it before in all our history. With such a spirit there is no power on earth that can or ever will defeat a united America.

Censorship: Synonym for Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if the power over the purse is the power over liberty, the power over the press is the path to dictatorship. Censorship of news released from Washington in the executive departments exclusive of the Defense and State Departments has seldom been practiced in American history. Even in Defense and State, we have developed a marked antipathy to any efforts to cut off our supply of information, and the extension of these restrictions into executive organizations such as Mr. Truman has now authorized is wholly uncalled for. Certainly, data

getting into the hands of espionage agents of foreign governments may be dangerous to our security, but this information is not released to the public. It is stolen from precisely those departments which are always protected by the most rigid standards of secrecy.

What most of us find most objectionable in the President's order is the ease with which it can be used to cover up blunders and incompetence, and the absence of any provisions for removing secrecy provisions after the emergency has passed. We may now find our friends in other countries revealing information which we are not permitted to publish or broadcast.

When a man gets the use of a blue pencil, he is strongly tempted to use it. America has grown great through the dissemination of news and information. No government has ever succeeded in fooling the American people too long because we have an alert press. If we stifle this source, we may well stifle America with it.

Tribute to W. K. Kellogg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr SHAFER. Mr Speaker, with deep regret I announce the death of a distinguished American, my fellow townsman, W. K. Kellogg.

Pioneer of the ready-to-eat cereal industry, founder of the Kellogg Co., and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Mr. Kellogg died Saturday afternoon in Battle Creek, Mich., the city in which he was born 91 years ago last April 7 and the city to which he contributed so much in the course of his remarkable career as an industrialist and as an exponent and practitioner of the philosophy of helping others to help themselves.

Despite his great age and the fact that he had been totally blind during the latter years of his life, Mr. Kellogg had maintained a keen and active interest in the affairs of the Kellogg Co., and the Kellogg Foundation until his final illness.

Mr. Kellogg was perhaps the last survivor of a generation of great individualists of American industry.

In the middle 1890's, while associated with his brother, the late Dr. John Harvey Kellogg at the Battle Creek Sanitarium, Mr. Kellogg developed a wheat flake, the first ready-to-eat flaked cereal. Before the turn of the century he had also produced the first corn flakes, and in 1906 entered business for himself, founding the Battle Creek Toasted Corn Flake Co., which subsequently became the Kellogg Co.

Besides the parent company in Battle Creek, the Kellogg Co. now has plants in Omaha, Nebr., and in Canada, Australia, England, South Africa, and Mexico. The ready-to-eat cereal industry which Mr.

Kellogg pioneered has, in the past 50 years revolutionized eating habits and developed a vast new market for agriculture on an international scale.

Mr. Kellogg credited his business success to the stimulus of free competition and remained, throughout his life, an exponent of the philosophy of free and fair competition. He was one of the pioneers of modern advertising. Only recently I had occasion to mention to my friend, the Member from Ohio [Mr. Bow] that a part of Mr. Kellogg's original, limited capital was spent in 1906 for a then very sizable magazine and newspaper advertising budget, and that his first expenditure for newspaper advertising was with the Canton (Ohio) Repository, a daily newspaper still published in Mr. Bow's home city.

In 1930, at the depth of the depression, Mr. Kellogg introduced the 6-hour working day at the Kellogg Co. plant in Battle Creek, paying the same wage scale for a 6-hour day as had previously been paid for 8 hours. This schedule is still retained in certain phases of the plant's operations. His program for spreading employment won national recognition when President Herbert Hoover called Mr. Kellogg to Washington for a conference on this approach to the unemployment problem.

Always a man with a profound sense of social responsibility and stewardship with respect to the fortune which his industrial success had yielded, Mr. Kellogg made his home community the beneficiary of numerous gifts, including a civic auditorium, a youth recreational center, a regional airport, a bird sanctuary, and several school buildings including the Ann J. Kellogg school, named in honor of his mother and especially designed and equipped for handicapped as well as normal children. He also made numerous other gifts to schools and colleges throughout Michigan.

A little more than 20 years ago, Mr. Kellogg established the foundation which bears his name, to which he turned over the bulk of his fortune to be used to advance the health, happiness and well-being of mankind, especially children.

It is noteworthy that the inspiration for both the Ann J. Kellogg school and the Kellogg Foundation was largely drawn, by Mr. Kellogg, from the Children's Charter, drafted by the original White House Conference on Child Welfare, called by President Hoover.

Today the Kellogg Foundation continues to contribute, nationally and internationally, to the advancement of training and physical facilities in the fields of education, medicine, dentistry, hospital administration, public health and nursing. In the international field its activities have extended principally to Canada, Central and South America and the Philippines.

Upon American entry into World War II, Mr. Kellogg directed the foundation to gear its activities to full cooperation in the war effort with the result that it contributed particularly to accelerated training of urgently needed medical, dental and nursing personnel.

The W. K. Kellogg Arabian Horse Ranch at Pomona, Calif., which Mr. Kellogg established many years ago and later turned over to the University of California was sold, at his request, to the Army for the sum of \$1 to be used during the war as an Army remount station. Mr. Kellogg's estate at Gull Lake, near Battle Creek, was turned over to the Army on the same terms and became an annex to Percy Jones General Hospital used for convalescent purposes. Three Kellogg Foundation camps near Battle Creek were converted into boot-training camps for the United States Coast Guard, on the same basis.

Personally, Mr. Kellogg was an individual of retiring disposition who shunned the limelight and abhorred the term "philanthropist" as applied to himself.

I pay tribute to him as a splendid gentleman, a loyal friend and an esteemed fellow townsman. I pay tribute to him for his achievements in industry and for the high sense of responsibility and foresightedness which prompted his creation of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Most of all, however, I pay tribute to W. K. Kellogg as a symbol of the individual courage, initiative, integrity and social conscience for which government and governmental activity can offer no substitute, qualities which are in the highest American tradition, and which must ever remain a vital force in American life if this Nation is to remain true to its great heritage.

Relation of Soil Erosion to Coastal Waters—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, fourth semi-annual seminar, Texas Game, Fish, and Oyster Commission's Marine laboratory, Rockport, Tex., March 22, 1951:

RELATION OF SOIL EROSION TO COASTAL WATERS

I am glad to have this opportunity to take part in your seminar. You who are concerned with the marine sciences and we with the science of soil conservation have certain common interests. These interests are joined across the deltas of silt that are constantly creeping out into our coastal waters. As soil conservationists, we welcome the constructive exploration of the relationship between these sciences.

SOIL CONSERVATIONISTS INTERESTED IN SEDIMENTATION

At the outset, I should like to make clear my position in your deliberations: We in the Soil Conservation Service have no thought of undertaking any extended investigations in either the biological or hydrological aspects of the marine sciences.

We operate on the land, with the primary objective of safeguarding that resource against the impoverishing effects of accelerated soil erosion. We have no intention of posing as authorities in the marine sciences. I can say, however, that soil conservationists are getting acquainted with some of the interesting aspects of the relation of sedimentation to marine bays, estuaries, reservoirs, and aquatic life. But thus far our explorations have not extended much beyond very general observations. We are desirous of getting better acquainted with our investigations.

As I wrote Dr. J. L. Baughman, your chief marine biologist, about a year ago, we believe the influence of siltation on (marine) organisms may be of considerable importance, inasmuch as environmental conditions usually affect all living things in some degree. My special purpose today is to direct your attention specifically to conditions, problems, and remedial actions being taken through soil and water conservation in the watersheds out of which flows the water—along with the silt—that feeds your bays and estuaries.

The silting of estuaries is, of course, a natural condition that was in progress for undeterminable time before there was any cultivation of the land. But there's much evidence, both historical and geological, indicating that the preagricultural rate of sedimentation of bays and estuaries was very slow in comparison with rates following extensive clearing, burning, plowing, and grazing activities. Too many historians and engineers, I am afraid, have attributed the rapid sedimentation of harbors to uncontrollable forces of nature. They too often have failed to notice the rapid changes brought about through man's deforestation and agricultural operations. Certainly in many instances the rapid sedimentation of bays and estuaries is an abnormal condition that developed after, or along with, the clearing, overgrazing, and cultivation of land in the contributing watersheds.

SEDIMENTATION OF HARBORS

This is nothing new. Sedimentation of harbors is as old as history. Sites of a number of Biblical cities, which we are told were originally seaports, are far inland today. Continuous deposition of sediment from eroding uplands gradually extended the land area and pushed the tidewater from their wharves. Ur, of the Chaldees, is said to have been a thriving seaport at the head of the Persian Gulf about 3000 B. C. Today its ruins lie in a desert 150 miles from the present shores of the gulf. For centuries, the sediment brought down by the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers from the overgrazed highlands of Turkey, Syria, Iran, and Iraq has pushed the head of tidewater out into the Persian Gulf, and the shore line today is reported to be advancing at the rate of 1 mile in 30 years.¹

A number of ancient harbors that were frequented by the ships of Phoenicia, Carthage, Greece, and Rome are now many miles inland from navigable waters. Adria, Italy, was a busy seaport in the time of Caesar Augustus, but today it is 20 Italian miles inland. Sedimentation forced the Romans from the harbor at Antium and caused abandonment of the once magnificent harbor of Ostia, built in 43 A. D. at the mouth of the Tiber River.²

¹ Banks, Edgar J. *The Reclamation of Ancient Babylon by Irrigation*. Engineering News, vol. 69, No. 10, pp. 468-469. March 1913.

² Gottschalk, L. C. *Sedimentation in a Great Harbor*. Soil Conservation, July 1944.

³ Saville, Sir Leopold. *Presidential Address to the Institution of Civil Engineers*. The Engineer (London), vol. 170, No. 4427, pp. 316-317, November 1940.

In early postglacial time the Tigris and the Euphrates flowed into the Persian Gulf near Hitt and Samarra, now some 600 miles north of the present shore line.

The Karun River, flowing westward from the Persian highlands also contributed its silt to the Persian Gulf and built up a bar which extended eastward from Basra and protected lower Mesopotamia from the inroads of the sea.

As irrigation agriculture spread to the land farther up the rivers, the problems of flooding and sedimentation became more serious. The powerful communities resorted to the only means that they knew for protecting themselves against floods and at the same time preventing accumulation of sediment in their canals. This consisted of completely shutting off the water from certain branches of the rivers by earthen dams. While protecting the area farther upstream, the lower delta lands were subjected to increased sedimentation and higher floods.⁴

Along the Euphrates, the irrigated fields lay to the east of the river. Irrigation waters were carried to the east and flood waters allowed to escape to the west. Babylon was protected from floods by two large natural depressions, the Habbania and the Abu Dibis. The Hindiya Canal provided additional protection by diverting the water to the west of Babylon. During the dry season it was barricaded by a temporary dam, which was constructed and destroyed yearly, a task requiring the labor of 10,000 slaves.

Near Beled, north of Bagdad, the flood waters of the Tigris were turned into a large basin with a hard bed of conglomerate underlying a thin alluvial deposit. The three heads of the famous Nahrwan Canal, whose construction is commonly attributed to Nimrod, led from the upstream side of the dam. The dam was maintained for 3,000 years and was not destroyed until about 600 or 700 years ago, during the later caliphate days. Since its destruction, the channel of the Tigris has shifted to the east, and the lands near the head canal, formerly among the most fertile of the Tigris Valley, have been so badly cut by ravines and gullies that, according to Sir William Willcocks,⁵ their restoration today is not financially practicable.

BUILDING LAND WITH RIVER SEDIMENT

In 1949, I saw extensive land-building operations in the lower alluvial plain of the Po River in Italy, near the Adriatic Sea. Dikes were being built on low-lying, unusable portions of marshland within the alluvial plain. Silt-laden waters from the Po were directed into these diiked areas, where deposits of water-borne sediment were laid down to build up new land. The surface of the finished fields was about 3 to 4 feet above the marsh level and the land was producing excellent yields of a great variety of vegetables, corn, alfalfa, fruits, and other crops.

SILTING OF HARBORS IN AMERICA

Here in our own country, almost an infant by comparison in the genealogy of nations, we have a number of similar examples of the abandonment of early colonial ports on Chesapeake Bay, because their harbors filled with sediment—silt washed down from the neighboring highlands—after the clearing and plowing of the land. When Captain John Smith sailed up the Chesapeake in 1608, he found many deep-water estuaries which afforded excellent harbors.⁶

⁴ Bennett, H. H. *Soil Conservation*. fig. 8, p. 18. McGraw-Hill, 1939.

⁵ Willcocks, Sir William. *Irrigation in Mesopotamia*. London and New York, 1917.

⁶ Gottschalk, L. C. *Effects of Soil Erosion on Navigation in Upper Chesapeake Bay*. The Geographical Review, April 1945.

This is what happened: Most of the land, in Maryland, was planted to tobacco, generally on newly cleared land having fertile woodland topsoil. When such fields were worn out or severely impoverished—usually after a half dozen years or so planted to tobacco, mainly—they were often abandoned and a new field cleared. Soil erosion inevitably set in, streams became muddy, and the estuaries and bays began to silt up. With this accelerated (man-induced) soil erosion, early open-water ports were converted into mud flats, in some instances within 50 years. Towns that otherwise might have become thriving cities and seaports thus were destined to die in their infancy—choked, indirectly, by the very industry that had promoted their founding.

Today's port of Baltimore is the head of navigation on the Patapsco River, but before the first street was laid out in Baltimore (founded in 1708) shops from Europe unloaded their cargoes at Elk Ridge Landing, 7 miles farther upstream than the present docks. A hundred years ago, the Patapsco was recorded as being 17 feet deep along the left bank just under the Hanover Street Bridge in Baltimore.⁷ By 1898, it was only 3½ feet deep in the same place; and, by 1924, it was a mere 6 inches in depth.

Sedimentation in the Baltimore Harbor prompted enactment of a law as early as 1753 providing a fine for throwing earth, sand, or dirt on the shore or in any navigable part of the harbor below high-water mark, and the first dredging of record in the harbor was in 1783. During the past 100 years the Federal Government, which began dredging in Baltimore Harbor in 1836, alone has removed more than 111,000,000 cubic yards of silt from the harbor at a cost of nearly \$17,000,000. And in the entire Chesapeake Bay area, the Government has spent in the past century more than \$56,000,000 for dredging, yet much still remains to be done.⁸

It is estimated that a million dollars' worth of topsoil from farms in the Brandywine watershed in Chester County, Pa., and New Castle County, Del., is carried into the channel of the marine terminal at Wilmington, Del., annually, filling it at the rate of 12 inches a month. Each year the Government pumps out 500,000 cubic yards of silt at a cost of \$300,000.⁹

If I have seemed to belabor these examples, somewhat, it is because I believe it is most important for us first to visualize the tremendous extent of this silt-producing erosion and the comparative rapidity with which it can proceed. I could list long columns of siltation figures, including the measured silt loads carried by your own major Texas rivers, like the Trinity, the Colorado, the Nueces, the Rio Grande, the Brazos, and others. But you probably are quite familiar with these facts, and with the sediment accumulations building up in your bays and estuaries as a result.

We have looked at some of the outright monetary costs and broader economic penalties imposed on the public by the physical problem of siltation. I think it is self-evident that there are various other mal-effects, too, including the harm done to marine life and inland fish and game, to navigable waterways, to municipal and other water supplies, to recreational areas, and, most important, to heavy costs of producing silt through the land-impoverishing effects of soil erosion.

⁷ Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart, 1945.

⁸ Gottschalk, L. C. *Effects of Soil Erosion on Navigation in Upper Chesapeake Bay*. The Geographical Review, April 1945.

⁹ Richards, Annette H. *A New Battle of the Brandywine*. Nature magazine, February 1950.

EFFECT OF SILTING ON AQUATIC LIFE

In addition to filling up navigation channels in estuaries, sedimentation takes a heavy toll of aquatic life. Suspended matter in water diminishes the sunlight needed by certain organisms to grow, I am told, and thus eliminates the food on which aquatic life feeds. Sand, silt, and clay may completely smother out spawning beds.

Few fishermen will venture forth a-fishing when streams are muddy. A study of the fishing habits on the Meramec River in Missouri made several years ago by the Missouri State Planning Board showed that when the waters of this stream are muddy, recreational attendance drops (or did at the time) by one-third.¹⁰ It was found that stream flow was above normal and the Meramec muddy, on the average, about 25 times each recreational season. As a result, loss of attendance and income to the people of the area was estimated at \$49,000 a year.

The damaging effects of sedimentation on the oyster industry of the Chesapeake Bay area is one of the best illustrations showing the toll taken by the indirect effects of soil erosion on marine life in bay waters. Maryland's oyster production, once considered second only to agriculture among the State's industries, was 15,000,000 bushels a year during the period of 1883 to 1885. By 1950, it had dropped to only 2,500,000 bushels. The observations of biologists and other authorities confirm the fact that the decline of the oyster industry in Chesapeake Bay waters parallels strikingly the silting up of bay ports, described earlier. Curtis L. Newcombe, well-known biologist, with whose studies many of you no doubt are acquainted, has brought out this fact quite strongly.¹¹

"Studies have shown that over-fishing and siltation operate together to cause depletion," he points out. "Throughout the Chesapeake tributaries silt is the oyster's greatest natural enemy."

Newcombe supports that conclusion with statements from documents of colonial days and figures on present-day silt measurements and oyster populations. He reports, for example, that whereas several hundred boats plied the oyster trade in the York River in Virginia as late as 1900, fewer than 50 boats can be counted now; and the estimated 12,000 or more tongs who worked in Virginia alone in the 1880's has dropped to only about 2,500.

Heaps of oyster shells found on the shores of the upper tributaries of Chesapeake Bay show that the Indians took them from extreme upper bay waters, but the bottoms of these tributaries now are soft mud in which oysters cannot exist. The head of oyster propagation today is many miles down-bay from those former good producing sites.

Dr. R. V. Truitt, director of the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory of the Maryland State Department of Research and Education, at Solomons Island, is of the opinion that, at least in the last few years, upper-bay beds have been destroyed by freshets. He thinks there is reason to believe that the increased fresh water inflow is the result of erosion in the uplands.

Dr. Truitt had this to say, when interviewed recently: "Although there is no specific evidence, it is my firm belief . . . that poor management of the land around the bay and lack of conservation practices is responsible in no small degree for the declining oyster production. Unless the land is properly managed, erosion will bring about a further decline in oyster yields."

The Chesapeake Bay Institute's hydrographic program includes, in cooperation with Johns Hopkins University, a sampling

¹⁰ Brown, Carl B. *Floods and Fishing*. The Land, vol. 4, No. 1, 1945.

¹¹ Newcombe, Curtis L. *Treasures in Troubled Waters*. The Scientific Monthly, vol. LXX, No. 2, February 1950.

of the bottom of the bay by borings. It is expected that the silt figure will be helpful in showing the effects of such depositions on marine habitat and life in the bay area.

The decline in oyster production has in no wise been confined to the Chesapeake Bay, but applies to the whole east coast reporting area, including the Gulf of Mexico. Thus, in 1880,¹² the first year of record, the figures show, that production for this area totaled 153,405,000 pounds of shucked oyster meat. By 1945,¹³ the production had dropped to 65,392,000. That represents a decline of approximately 57½ percent. West coast production is not taken into account; because as you probably know, importation of Asiatic seed oysters spawned in Japan, particularly since the 1930's, has greatly expanded oyster production in that part of the country (from 1,050,000 pounds in 1888 to 10,074,000 in 1945).¹⁴

SOURCES OF SILT

Wherever silt is found, in reservoirs, streams, or bays, the bulk of it comes from the land as the result of soil erosion. The Soil Conservation Service estimates that in this country at least 4,000,000,000 tons of soil are annually moved out of place some distance downhill by water erosion. Of this amount, roughly 3,000,000,000 tons are deposited on lower slopes, over alluvial plains, and in reservoirs, ditches, canals, and fresh-water harbors. About 1,000,000,000 tons a year are carried on down to tidewater. Part of this silt is deposited as sediment in our harbors and navigable channels, where it must be removed by dredging in order to maintain proper water depth. Most of it goes on out to sea or is deposited on the lowest parts of deltas and over Continental Shelf positions.

Silt load measurements made on Texas streams¹⁵ indicate that the major rivers—the Sabine, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, and Nueces, Rio Grande, San Antonio—discharge an average of about 80,000,000 tons of sediment into the Gulf of Mexico each year.

That figure, however, represents only a small part of the soil moved downslope by erosion. For example, the 80,000,000 tons amounts to only about 1 ton per acre derived from the approximately 80,000,000 acres above the measuring stations. The Soil Conservation Service has measured annual surface losses of more than 25 tons of soil per acre by erosion from corn plots of Houston clay at the Temple, Tex., experiment station.

The silt load at tidewater would be even greater were it not for the sediment removed by deposition in reservoirs and stream channels within the watersheds upstream. Reservoir-sedimentation surveys made by the Soil Conservation Service show the annual rates of deposition to be about 5,500,000 tons in Buchanan Reservoir, 400,000 tons in Medina Reservoir, 860,000 tons in Lake Corpus Christi, 9,750,000 tons in Possum Kingdom, and 1,900,000 tons in Lake Nasworthy. This sediment is derived mainly from erosion of crop and range lands in Texas.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND SILT CONTROL

It should be clear enough, then, that the task of reducing floods and controlling erosion and thereby reducing the intake of silt

¹² The Fisheries and Fishery Industries of the United States, sec. 2, S. Doc. No. 124, 47th Cong., 1887.

¹³ Fisheries Statistics of the United States, 1945. Statistical Digest No. 18, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

¹⁴ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Records. (Statistics in pounds of oyster meat, because of varying bushel sizes and poundage records used in different States.)

¹⁵ Silt Load of Texas Streams, 1948-49. Texas Board of Water Supply (Soil Conservation Service cooperating), Progress Report No. 11, 1950.

by our reservoirs, bays, and estuaries, is one which should begin where the rains fall and runoff starts, and end only when the runoff reaches the sea. A main objective of all the conservation work which the Soil Conservation Service does is to retard the discharge of water from upstream areas. In other words, the purpose is to put as much of the runoff as possible into the reservoir of the soil. Probably more than 75 percent of the Nation's total watershed flood damage occurs in the upstream tributary watersheds, along the little headwaters streams.

Relation of Soil Erosion to Coastal Waters—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at fourth semiannual seminar, Texas Game, Fish, and Oyster Commission's marine laboratory, Rockport, Tex., March 2, 1951:

And while thus retarding runoff, the rate of silt production by erosion is reduced. In our normal conservation work, the objective is always to keep agricultural land permanently productive while in use. In flood-control operations, more emphasis is put on the task of slowing down runoff. So, in the complete watershed program the principal effort is devoted to measures that help to store water in the soil and slow down runoff. The two types of control are complementary in effect, at least in some degree: generally speaking, slowing down of runoff reduces the rate of erosion, while the measures applied to the land for erosion control result in increased infiltration of rainfall, thereby reducing the runoff. Both actions are beneficial to the land, reduce production of silt, and lessen flood hazards.

The flow and quality of water in surface streams are influenced materially by the way we use and manage out land resources; but in a great many instances individual landowners and water users have little or no control over the activities involved with stream flow and hence are unable to deal with them alone. As a result, local agencies and groups like your own and the soil conservation districts are concerning themselves more and more with water-control problems.

The Soil Conservation Service in fulfilling its authorized responsibilities is committed to doing everything possible within its resources to provide technical assistance needed in dealing with the erosion problem, siltation, floods, and water wastage. Thus the water-conservation activities of the service are continuously geared to the needs of the land and water users and are coordinated with the activities of other agencies concerned with land and water. To this end, we define water conservation—which always has been part and parcel of soil conservation in our service planning, operations, and research—this way:

WATER CONSERVATION

Water conservation is the physical control, protection, management, and prudent use of water in such a way as to maintain crop, grazing, and forest lands, vegetal cover, and wildlife for maximum sustained benefits to

the people, agriculture, industry, commerce, and other segments of the national economy.

WHAT HAPPENED TO LAKE WACO

If erosion in a watershed can be reduced, sedimentation in reservoirs, harbors, and estuaries can be reduced. Recent studies made by the Soil Conservation Service at Lake Waco here in Texas illustrates this fact. This reservoir, built on the Bosque River by the City of Waco for municipal water in 1930, had an original capacity of 40,000 acre-feet and a drainage area of 1,666 square miles. From 1930 to 1936 the average annual capacity loss from silting was 3.35 percent, but from 1936 to 1947 the rate dropped to 2.06 percent. Actually, the rainfall and runoff were more favorable to erosion and silting during the second period; but silting actually decreased 36 percent as a result of changes in land use and the application of conservation practices in the watershed.

Since 1934, approximately 200,000 acres, or nearly 19 percent of the watershed, has been converted from clean-tilled crops—mainly cotton—to pasture. Conservation measures have been carried out through the soil conservation districts program on about 10 percent of the land in this watershed, and additional conservation measures not under district plans have been installed on additional acreages. Further reductions in the rate of silting of Lake Waco can be expected from the conservation land treatment being extended steadily over the watershed.

Similar examples are to be found all over the country. For example, conservation treatment in the 14-square mile watershed above Lake Issaqueena near Clemson, S. C., between 1941 and 1949 reduced the rates of silting of that reservoir by 53 percent. Here again rainfall and runoff were above normal during this period as compared with the years before 1941. Rotation strip cropping applied on some 1,400 acres was the major practice used. These results demonstrate, wherever they occur, that if you slow down erosion, you will reduce sedimentation. And the control of erosion on the watershed has many off-site benefits, such as reduction in flood damage and in rates of silting of reservoirs, harbors, and estuaries, in addition to creating more favorable conditions for the propagation of aquatic life.

SOIL CONSERVATION ONLY WAY TO CONTROL SILT

The only way, moreover, in which water pollution from silt, with the attendant problems of sedimentation, can be controlled or reduced effectively is by the adoption of soil- and water-conservation practices applied in accordance with the needs and capabilities of the land. Contour farming, strip cropping, terracing, good pasture and range development and management, proper woodland management, land-use changes, and various other specific land-management measures which have proved to be successful in the control of soil erosion and water runoff must be applied to the land by those who use the land.

It is not enough to treat just part of a farm, or part of a watershed, or part of any other area of land. Every acre of cropland, pasture land, farm woodland, and idle land must be treated according to its needs and each acre used according to its capabilities. That is true, whether it is in major watersheds for flood-control and silt-pollution abatement purposes, on individual farms and fields for erosion control, or through such group undertakings as conservation

drainage or irrigation projects. That is exactly what is being done by farmers in their soil-conservation districts, with which we cooperate.

I am convinced, also, that this unprecedented attention to and progress in soil and water conservation which we are experiencing in today's conservation farming era is contributing as much, if not more, to the welfare of game, fish, and other beneficial wildlife as anything man has ever undertaken in this country or anywhere else. In this new conservation era, conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife are, for the first time in the history of man, being tied together and scientifically coordinated on the basis of land capability and need. This is a basic tenet of modern soil conservation.

PUBLIC BENEFITS

Ordinary soil- and water-conservation measures are for the protection and improvement of the land on which they are applied, and consequently the principal benefit is received by the owner or operator of the farm on which such work is done. Therefore, it is only proper that the farmer should bear the principal cost. On the other hand, the special measures and structures used in flood control are designed to benefit downstream bottomlands and to keep sediment out of stream channels, reservoirs, bays, etc. Because these are public benefits, the public—through community groups, or county, State, and Federal Government—should bear its proportionate part of the costs, so long as they are justified by the benefits to be expected.

FLOOD CONTROL ON THE TRINITY

Among the streams which dump sediment into your Gulf waters is the Trinity River. You probably are familiar with the flood-control program under way on this stream under the Army Corps of Engineers. Also this is 1 of the 11 major watersheds in the country—the largest 1 of the 11—in which the Soil Conservation Service is carrying on waterflow retardation works of improvement. Our Service and the Forest Service are the two United States Department of Agriculture agencies authorized under the 1936 and subsequent flood-control acts to engage in this work. We do it through the soil-conservation districts. We have been working on the Trinity since 1947, although the flood-control surveys were made earlier.

Watershed treatment work in the 3,860-acre Howard Creek subwatershed of the Trinity River watershed, near Jacksboro, is typical of much of the work done in the 11 authorized watersheds. This subwatershed was chosen for early flood-control operations because of local interest. The subwatershed improvement plan developed cooperatively by the Soil Conservation Service and the local people, included installation of terraces with protected outlets on many cultivated fields, contour farming, cover cropping, improved grazing practices, seeding abandoned cropland to pasture grasses, eradication of brush for the establishment of grass, building of diversion ditches and farm ponds, construction of a small upstream reservoir for retarding floodwater and reducing deposition of sediment in reservoirs and over bottom lands.

On June 24, 1949, 6 months after the reservoir was completed, 2 inches of rain fell in 1 hour on the lands above the reservoir. The runoff from this rain, which before the conservation treatment would have flooded cropland and pasture along this branch of Howard Creek, was retarded in the reservoir so that the peak flow in the creek was only 25 percent of channel capacity.

The May 1949 flood in the vicinity of Fort Worth, which did nearly \$9,000,000 of erosion, crop, and pasture damage and estimated

miscellaneous damage from \$15,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000 to city and other property, was from a storm in only part of the Trinity River watershed. It originated in the type of watershed in which we are working. The Trinity watershed area is completely covered by soil-conservation districts; so we may look forward to widespread beneficial results in the reduction of such damages in the future as more of the conservation treatment is completed.

COOPERATION OF LOCAL INTERESTS

A most important factor in this watershed planning and treatment is the active cooperation of local interests. In the case of the Trinity, the Trinity Improvement Association should be mentioned, among others. At San Antonio, through the San Antonio River Canal and Conservancy District, the local people have been so determined to speed up this kind of work that the conservancy district has arranged to set up trust funds to pay the cost of a flood-control survey on that watershed. That was after appropriations were not forthcoming for the Service to proceed otherwise with the survey as planned.

Flood control surveys are under way, meanwhile, on the Sabine-Neches watershed by the Soil Conservation Service and we have completed a survey on the Little River branch of the Brazos. Surveys have been made on the Bosque and are under way on the remaining part of the Brazos. Other flood-control surveys in progress involving Texas watersheds include those on the Pecos, in the lower part of the State; on Red River, a large part of which is in Texas; and the San Jacinto. Works of improvement are under way on the Middle Colorado, and the work already undertaken on the Washita River watershed in Oklahoma, which likewise affects Texas areas somewhat, have attracted national attention among the 11 authorized watersheds.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

It should be understood, however, that the soil and water conservation work which concerns you and every other segment of society in Texas and in the Nation is not confined to this flood-control type of operations. It is progressing at a constantly accelerated rate throughout the State and the whole country in the farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil-conservation districts.

As of January 1, this year, more than four-fifths of all the farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States were included within soil conservation district boundaries. The districts, which are still being formed at an average rate of 8 to 10 a month, now number nearly 2,350 and cover 1,250,000,000 acres in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Texas is high up in the district column, with 93 percent of the State's farms and ranches and 89 percent of the total land in 160 soil conservation districts as of February 1, this year.

District organization, of course, is not enough by itself. It is the soil and water conservation work that actually gets done on the land that counts. To January 1, detailed conservation surveys had been made on 361,000,000 acres in the districts, 941,000 conservation farm plans had been worked out by district farmers and Soil Conservation Service technicians out on the land together, covering 260,000,000 acres; and 131,000,000 acres had been treated with conservation measures called for in the plans. All my figures are from the records of the Soil Conservation Service. They do not include PMA figures, or those from other Federal, State, or private agencies except as the activities of

¹ Noll, John J., Roehl, John W., and Bennett, Jackson. Effects of Soil Conservation on Sedimentation in Lake Issaqueena, Pickens County, S. C. United States Soil Conservation Service, SCS-TP-95, Spartanburg, S. C., June 1950.

these other agencies have contributed to the work done on the SOS planned farms.

I could, of course, give you the comparable accomplishment figures for the State of Texas; but, if you are not already acquainted with them, you may obtain them in detail from our local offices.

BIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOS PROGRAM

I have already mentioned some of the various conservation measures which are used in this acre-by-acre land treatment. I should like to mention further, however, some of the biological aspects of our technical program. We give particular attention to training in biology for our farm planners and other technicians who work with farmers out in their fields (not in an office). The farm planner considers the value of treating various types of land, not only for their primary use but also with an eye to any modification or special practice that will result in more wildlife through complete and adequate land treatment. He is expertly equipped to do this, because his understanding of the biology aspects of soil and water conservation planning and treatment is dovetailed with similar basic knowledge and adeptness in soil science, geology, forestry, range management, hydrology, agronomy, engineering, and other phases of a complete, coordinated soil and water conservation program.

The Service's stated biology objectives may be of particular interest to you.

1. The apply to land-use problems biological knowledge useful in the prevention and control of soil erosion—that is, soil and water conservation — thereby preserving natural resources.

2. To achieve productive land use on all lands, including those not adapted to tilled crops, grazing, or wood production.

3. To assist in the solution of land-use problems which involve production of useful wild plants and animals on croplands, grazing lands, and woodlands.

4. To contribute to the prevention and control of biological damage arising out of measures established for soil and water conservation and related land-use practices.

We now can say that national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving our interlocking natural resources. Research, education, surveys, and the successful application of conservation measures have brought us to a new concept of the importance of land and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive. Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals all should exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness of these essential resources.

The problem of soil and water conservation and wise use is not a problem that can wait until farmers solve it by any trial-and-error method, for that might be too late. This is an urgent problem, which demands the best efforts of the Nation's scientists and of all who use the land for agricultural purposes. And the understanding, cooperation, and active participation in its solution by industrial and all other groups in our society are indispensable to getting done in time this vital job which so importantly affects all of us.

We now have the knowledge of how to do the job; the conservation tools have been perfected and tested; and, what is more important, we have the organization and public support for doing the job. Not only is there no excuse for our not doing the job, but we dare not shirk it; because our individual and national security, peace, and prosperity depend on it.

The Thirty-eighth Parallel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., of Sunday, October 7, 1951:

U. N. DIDN'T SET LINE AT THIRTY-EIGHTH—RUSSIANS ARBITRARILY DECIDED ON PARALLEL, VIOLATING AGREEMENTS AT CAIRO AND POTSDAM

(By Lawrence R. Goldberg)

Here's a simple, unbiased guide—based upon United Nations intelligence reports gathered and examined carefully during the past year—to the present situation in Korea, now entering its fifteenth month.

At 3 o'clock the morning of June 25, 1950, the telephone rang in the New York suburban home of United Nations Secretary General Trygve Lie. Calling Mr. Lie was the United States deputy representative to the U. N. He had an urgent message from the American Ambassador to the Republic of Korea: The United States Department of State had received information that North Korean forces had invaded the territory of the Korean Republic.

The report from Korea upon which the telephone message was based was sharp, factual. "According to Korean Army reports, North Korean forces invaded Republic of Korea territory at several points this morning. Ongjin was blasted. North Korean Infantry commenced crossing the thirty-eighth parallel. Amphibious landing was reportedly made south of Kangnung on the east coast. Kaesong was reportedly captured. North Korean forces, spearheaded by tanks, are reportedly closing in on Chunchon. Details of the fighting in the Kangnung area are unclear."

"It would appear from the nature of the attack and the manner in which the attack was launched that it constitutes an all-out offensive against the Republic of Korea," concluded the report.

U. N. ACTS PROMPTLY

As a result the United States requested, in a formal note which followed the telephone call, that this message be brought to the immediate attention of the President of the U. N. Security Council. The United States considered the assault upon the Republic of Korea as a breach of peace and an act of aggression, and thus the prime business of a world organization dedicated to world peace.

The U. N. acted promptly. At 2 p. m. of the same day the Security Council was called to order. Meantime the U. N. had before it a report on Korea from one of its own commissions—the U. N. Commission on Korea. This report—direct from Seoul—gave much the same information which had been received in Washington some hours previous, then added:

PLANE ATTACKS

"At 17.15 hours four Yak-type aircraft strafed civilian and military air fields outside Seoul destroying planes, firing gas tanks, and attacking jeeps. Yongdungpo railroad station on outskirts also strafed."

"Commission wishes to draw attention of Secretary General to serious situation developing which is assuming character of full-scale war and may endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

Now the U. N. had before it two reports: One from a member nation, the other from a U. N. commission itself, which told that on a large peninsula jutting out from the northeast coast of Asia, on which lived about 30,000,000 people, the peace had been shattered by organized forces.

"What is the thirty-eighth parallel all about?" asked many youths and students and others destined to service in Korea.

The thirty-eighth parallel is simply a demarcation line which came into being as a simple military expedient.

NOT DIVIDED

At the end of World War II it was decided that Japanese troops north of the thirty-eighth parallel would surrender to Soviet forces and those south of that line would surrender to United States forces. That was all.

There was nothing in any records anywhere to indicate that Korea was to be divided into two parts.

In 1943, at the Cairo Conference, and again in the summer of 1945, at the Potsdam meeting, it was quite definitely agreed that, in due course, Korea would be a free and independent country. Those who so agreed were China, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States.

Yet almost immediately after Japanese troops surrendered in Korea the Soviet military command arbitrarily decided that the thirty-eighth parallel was a permanent line separating two military zones.

The United States military command in southern Korea tried repeatedly to negotiate arrangements, all aimed at establishing the unity of the country, but could get nothing but a deaf ear from the Soviet military.

PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

This is the way matters stood until December 1945. Then at a foreign ministers' meeting in Moscow the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States agreed that a provisional Korean democratic government should be set up for all of Korea. To this end it was decided that the Soviet and United States military commands in Korea were to form a joint commission which, with Korean democratic parties and social organizations, was to make recommendations to the big four powers for an all-Korean Government.

The United States command's attempt to get the Soviet Union to agree to some method to consolidate North and South Korea was marked by frustration. Time and time again the Soviet members of the joint commission blocked the planning for practical action. After nearly 2 years of effort all the United States command and the members of the commission could get the Soviet Union to agree to was a spotty exchange of mail between North and South Korea.

DENIED ENTRY

That was on September 17, 1947.

Subsequent events show how the United Nations took on the problems of Korea; how its representatives were denied entry north of the thirty-eighth parallel; the supervision of free elections in the southern zone; the establishment of the Republic of Korea with seats reserved for 100 representatives from the north as soon as elections could be held under the observation of a U. N. commission; the approval of the new republic by the U. N. and its recognition by more than 30 countries—have been related before.

Thus the Republic of Korea was not only the legal government of the Korean people, it was created under the auspices of the U. N.

But Korea remained divided. The United Nations, continuing its efforts, kept a commission in Korea working toward erasing that artificial line and uniting the country.

But this U. N. commission could make little headway. Its representatives were not even allowed to cross the thirty-eighth parallel, north of which there had been established a regime called the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea—a government formed by a mere transfer of power from Soviet occupation authorities. Elections—if any occurred—were never allowed to be observed by U. N. representatives.

Thus—briefed—stood matters on June 25, 1950, when the Security Council met at 2 o'clock in the afternoon with those fateful messages before it.

EVENTS MOVE SWIFTLY

Events moved swiftly afterward. The United States authorized Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo to furnish the already hard-pressed South Korean troops with military supplies. This was followed by orders to give the Korean Government forces air and sea cover and support, and prompt response in the form of pledges of aid from 53 of the 56 nations of the U. N. The three who opposed aid to Korea were Russia and her satellites, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

At the moment, the U. N. itself, as an organization, had no forces to combat the North Korean aggressor. The establishment of such forces had long been blocked by Soviet intransigence. Now the need for swift action was imperative to prevent the Republic of Korea from being overrun by the aggressive troops from the north.

REDS OBJECT

The Soviet Union, however, bluntly called the U. N. action on Korea illegal on two counts. One, the Soviet Union's absence when the vote was taken constituted a veto. Two, China's delegate had no legal right to vote, since he did not represent the Communist government which, the U. S. S. R. delegate claimed, was the legal government of China.

The Soviet position was utterly false and was for propaganda purposes only.

CAMPAIGN SUCCEEDING

From then on U. N. forces continued successfully to destroy the fighting power of the North Korean forces, and during the closing day of October 1950 there was every indication that soon peace would return to the 30,000,000 people of Korea, and, with this peace, a danger to world security would have been wiped out.

This hope diminished in November, however, when Communist China—a fresh enemy force—entered the war. The U. N. then named Communist China an aggressor.

What has been accomplished after more than a year of bloody warfare? Has collective action by the U. N. been worth the sacrifices? What has been gained by meeting the aggressor firmly, while at the same time trying to localize the conflict?

Here are the answers:

GENERAL WAR PREVENTED

By fighting a limited war in Korea, aggression has failed thus far, and a general war has been prevented to date.

The ability of the free world to resist Communist aggression has been greatly improved.

The conflict has unmasked the Soviet's phony world-wide "peace" offensive; has exposed the Soviet designs for conquest on the installment plan; has upset the Soviet timetable for new conquests on the Korean pattern; has rallied the first collective force and action behind U. N. principles, has stimulated the U. N. to develop new machinery and better methods for meeting future threats; has brought a free world to a new peak of unity in the U. N.

But most important of all: Has alerted people all over the world to the imminent danger of Soviet aggression, has strengthened the will of nations to stand together

and resist aggression; has aroused the free peoples to the necessity of mobilizing their strength for defense and may thus have saved civilization.

Mao Tse-tung's Bloody Regime in Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the first of a series of articles which appeared in June in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times. This series of seven articles presents a vivid picture of one of history's cruelest regimes—that of Mao Tse-tung's Communist China.

Even if no more blood is shed in the remaining 40 years of the twentieth century, this century will undoubtedly be recorded as the bloodiest in the history of man. The murders and purges of Communist Russia are being repeated in saddening similarity in Communist China.

I include herewith the first of the series of articles by Everett S. Allen which appeared in the Standard-Times of June 26, 1951.

I will include the rest of these articles in subsequent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MAO REGIME CALLED ONE OF HISTORY'S BLOODIEST

(By Everett S. Allen)

Death impending electrifies a mob

Seventy thousand persons watched brightly and tense as the firing squad raised its guns.

More than 300,000 unable to attend the public trial stood transfixed before microphones rigged up throughout the city.

The shots exploded rudely on the silence. And the woman, born Hauch Chihyou, died with the crowd chanting, "Kill her! Kill her!"

She was executed by a Chinese Communist squad for being a "special agent who had consistently sabotaged patriotic movements among the students."

The cheers of the multitude, directed by a party leader, rang through the streets.

CONDEMN'S OWN MOTHER

Hauch Chihyou died in Chungking April 11 because her daughter, Chen Kuo-taeng, a student, pleaded at the trial that her mother be put to death for being a counterrevolutionary—in other words, anti-Communist.

"Secret agents are not human," she declared to the crowd. "I don't recognize her as my mother, I ask the Government to execute her so she will no longer be a menace to the people."

Peasants who understood they must attend, walked 10 miles to witness the execution. Fanatics and opportunists, seeking to preserve their own skins, crowded to the platform to shout complaints against the accused. The Communist news agency reported with pride this triumph of loyalty to State over the decadent and imperialistic family ties.

More than 15,000,000 Chinese have perished during the past 2½ years as a result of Com-

munist misrule, man-made famine and the campaign in Korea, according to the Free China Anti-Atrocity League.

Twelve million have died of hunger, 600,000 have been killed in Korea fighting and 2,260,000 Nationalists have been put to death.

The Chinese Communists have reverted to purge and terror as weapons to keep themselves in power. Even according to official Peiping (Communist) reports, the agrarian reformers have massacred thousands in a nationwide purge, the real number of victims undoubtedly runs into hundreds of thousands.

FOLLOWS BOLSHEVIST COURSE

The Chinese revolution—which was more apathy than revolt—is following the course of many internal social revolutions, particularly that of the Bolsheviks in Russia. It produces such monstrous symbols as the public trial, in which a mob, under compulsion, fear and fanaticism, chants the death demand in proper response to the grim litany of the party official.

Natural revulsion of the people forces the Communist regime to perform much of its slaughter secretly, public trials keep wavering opinion in line. More naive elements in the west view this growing wave of terrorism as an indication of the opposition which the Communists are facing, and derive great hopes therefrom.

It would be a grave error to view this purge as a sign of Communist weakness. In Russia, the OGPU and their successors still employ terror to wipe out even suspected opposition and to cow the population into abject subservience. The China purge first was directed against spies, saboteurs, bandits and counterrevolutionaries. Now, it has spread to include landlords, merchants, students and the clergy.

Like all purges, it will ultimately lose all boundaries, like all terror, it will be hard to stop.

Death is a way of life to the Chinese Communists. In 1939 they pushed women and children ahead of their Manchurian troops, hoping the Nationalists, in the name of humanitarianism, would not fire until too late. Today, in Korea, they are pushing "human sea waves" of Chinese farm boys ahead of their own trained army units, buffers to absorb the initial shock of combat.

Months ago, the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic was accused by anti-Communists of agreeing to liquidate one out of every four persons of its 450,000,000 population in accordance with a Mao Tse-tung-Stalin pact signed in Moscow February 12, 1950. Reason for this allegedly was that, due to lack of existing resources, China's economy could not support its present population.

MEANS OF REDUCING POPULATION

Whatever the truth of this, Communist China now is reducing her population systematically by five means:

1. Use of untrained, unsupported troops in Korea.
2. Annihilation of anti-Communist guerrilla groups.
3. Artificial famine, caused by Government seizure of crops.
4. Deportation of labor to Siberia.
5. Execution or imprisonment of political dissidents.

Certain of the purge deaths are announced by the Communists for their iron hand propaganda value. From December 1949 to April of this year, the Mao sources acknowledged the killing of more than 172,775 persons, the seizure of 49,462, some of whom were slain, and the arrest of 264,900, many of whom are now presumed dead. These persons were described as enemies of the people and bandits, stock party-line tags with the Moscow trade-mark.

During the first 5 months of this year, Nationalist reports have mentioned the deaths of 74,215 persons and the imprisonment of 415,616. Numerous other massacres of undetermined size were announced.

On February 6, the Communists reported units of the People's Liberation Army had wiped out 90,000 remnant bandits in east China during the past year. Militia, they added, was helping to carry out land reforms in combination with bandit-suppression work.

In March, Mao's Kwantung subdistrict announced that after more than half a year, about 15,000 counterrevolutionaries faced the firing squad. Nationalists said February 8 that more than 1,000 persons at Pinghsiang, including Government officials and teachers, were massacred by Communists.

MASSACRES SPREAD

Central News Agency (Nationalist) claimed on May 18 that Chinese Communist newspapers admitted 180,000 persons were executed in Fukien Province from January 1 through April. The China News, Formosa's English-language daily, reported 30,000 persons were arrested at Shanghai in a 4-day round-up through April 30, of whom it was believed all but 6,000 had so far been put to death.

On January 2, a Communist report from Wuhan said the central and south China military area of the People's Liberation Army announced that from January through November 1950, a total of 378,700 bandits had been accounted for, of whom 38,000 were either killed or wounded.

In April the Free China Anti-Atrocity League gave the following breakdown of figures by Provinces of persons put to death by the Communists up to the end of January. These do not include any Korean casualties.

Hunan, 350,000; Kwangtung, 200,000; Chekiang, 150,000; Kiangsi, 80,000; Hupeh, 80,000; Shantung, 50,000; Kwangsi, 200,000; Szechwan, 300,000; Shanghai City, 50,000; Yunnan, 30,000; Kansu, 20,000; Anhwei, 50,000; the nine Provinces of the northeast, 140,000; Hunan, 50,000; Hopei, 50,000; Shansi, 50,000; Sikang, 30,000; Kweichow, 30,000; Shensi, 30,000; Tsinghai, 10,000; Jehol, 20,000; Chahar, 20,000; Suiyuan, 20,000; Sikiang, 20,000, and Fukien, 80,000.

TEN THOUSAND EXECUTED

Taipei (Nationalists) in April said public notices announcing death sentences were so numerous in Changsha City there was no longer enough space on the bulletin boards for posting them. Since January, 3,000 persons were reported killed and 7,000 more were believed secretly executed and 10,000 held in custody.

The China Union Press announced the death of 700 at Kunming, capital of Yunnan, in the week ending March 20. Fifty thousand were arrested in Shanghai in the 3 days ending April 17, Taiwan's newspaper, Hsin Sheng Pao, reported. The Communists in Wuhan announced 10,000 bandits had been wiped out in northwest Kwangsi.

May Day is the Communist holiday of the year. In Peiping, on May 1, more than 600,000 citizens, 70 abreast, marched or danced cheering down the great square in front of the Gate of Heavenly Peace for 6 hours. It was a "demonstration of unity, of happiness," said the Communist leaders, "of strength, of a people joined in the defense of peace with all who seek peace and are willing to defend it."

On the same day, Hangchow Communists reported mass trials and the public execution of 162 "top counterrevolutionary criminals." And Sian's Communists reported on May 4 that 3,500 "bandits" were killed, captured, or wounded in the northwest army area. Mao's officials in Shanghai said on May 10 that 15 people's governments in

South Anhwei had sentenced to death and executed 58 counterrevolutionaries.

MASS MURDER DRAWS CROWDS

Like baseball in America, mass murder—and official compulsion, is drawing crowds. In Sian, 80,000 attended the trial and execution of "several" counterrevolutionaries; the Communists also said another 10,000 listened to the broadest of the event. Communists in Mukden reported on May 12 that 30,000 attended an accusation meeting, which was recorded and broadcast to an additional 822,000 persons. During the meeting, the head of the Mukden Public Security Bureau reported to the people on the crimes of counterrevolutionaries and exhorted the people to expose them.

Twelve "bandit agents" were paraded before the audience and accused and a "batch of counterrevolutionary elements" was executed.

Other citizens deemed undesirable are sentenced to hard labor. On June 12, Taipei reported 300,000 men concentrated at points along the Peiping-Hankow and Tientsin-Pukow railways for dispatch to the labor camps in Siberia. The men were mostly family members, relatives, and friends of persons killed by the Communists in their purge of "dissidents," "counterrevolutionaries," and "landlord tyrants."

This was the second such group to be condemned by the Communists to hard labor in Siberia in recent months. An earlier group numbered 1,500,000 persons, Taipei said.

Accentuated by propagandists and party agents, heightened by betrayals and fanaticism, the terrible paralysis of fear spreads.

The Real Crime: Bad Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free-Press of October 8, 1951:

THE REAL CRIME BAD JUDGMENT

The Senate should not consent to President Truman's appointment of Dr. Philip C. Jessup to the United States delegation to the United Nations.

The ground for rejection has nothing to do with Senator McCarthy's charge that Dr. Jessup has an affinity for Communist causes.

Adequate cause exists in Jessup's record of poor judgment in an area in which we have already suffered grievous damage, as in Korea, and in which irreparable damage may be inflicted upon us in future by further bad guessing in foreign policy.

We can well believe that Ambassador Jessup is a loyal citizen and that he sincerely believes that he has the right answers to the problems which confront this Nation.

Yet in these perilous and treacherous times something more than loyalty and sincerity are required to stave off disaster. The men entrusted with this country's fate must also have sound judgment in formulating policies and courage in carrying them out.

Jessup's record shows neither.

At last Thursday's session of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee holding hearings on his nomination, for example, Jessup disclosed a heretofore top secret directive addressed to him by Secretary Acheson

on July 18, 1949, the key paragraph of which follows:

"You will please take as your assumption that it is a fundamental decision of American policy that the United States does not intend to permit further extension of Communist domination on the continent of Asia or in the southeast Asia area."

With that assumption Jessup faithfully and industrially identified himself.

What steps did he and Acheson then take to check Communist expansion in Asia?

At the very time Acheson issued this directive, Jessup was putting together the white paper on China, a masterpiece of deception, which wrote off the Chinese Nationalists and invited the Chinese Communists to come and get it.

Consider this sequence of events:

December 10, 1949: Chiang Kai-shek quit the mainland, arrived in Formosa and established his regime there.

December 22, 1949: The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that Formosa be kept from the Communists.

December 23, 1949: The State Department sent a secret instruction to our diplomatic missions abroad to minimize the possible fall of Formosa and to emphasize that this island "has no special military significance."

December 29, 1949: At a meeting of the National Security Council, General Bradley, for the JCS, argued for a military mission to Formosa. Acheson vetoed the idea and Truman sided with Acheson.

January 5, 1950: At his press conference President Truman declared that the United States "will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China . . . will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

January 12, 1950: Acheson made his famous speech before the National Press Club excluding both Formosa and Korea from our defensive perimeter and thus gave notice that the Communists could have them.

June 24, 1950: The Communists attacked in Korea.

The dust which Secretary Acheson said he was "waiting to settle in China" was the screen behind which Moscow was preparing a war that has already cost us more than 13,000 dead and 60,000 wounded and the end of which is not in sight.

Yet President Truman now proposes to make Dr. Jessup, whose judgment in far-eastern policy has proved so tragically wrong, a spokesman for the United States in the bear pit of the United Nations.

We pass over Jessup's appearance as a character witness for Alger Hiss at both trials of that convicted traitor.

The question of his fitness to decide policy for the United States in a field of which he has only textbook knowledge has unfortunately been confused by Senator McCarthy's unproved charge of Communist sympathies.

A vote on confirm Jessup's nomination can now be represented as a vote against "McCarthyism."

Just as easily a vote to reject Jessup could be interpreted as a lack-of-confidence vote in Acheson, who sponsors him. As Acheson and McCarthy are about equally disliked in Congress, the issue is complicated.

The Senate and its Foreign Relations Committee should try to put out of mind all of these muddying irrelevancies.

The times are too perilous to pick men to uphold our interests abroad because they are for Acheson or McCarthy or against them.

The sole test should be fitness.

When his record to date is examined Ambassador Jessup falls in our opinion to meet that test.

The Senate should give President Truman an opportunity to select another representative of the United States in the United Nations whose judgment has not proved so consistently damaging to our national security.

Tribute to the Late Representative Karl Stefan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article with reference to the death of Representative Karl Stefan, which appeared in the Human Events for October 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

OBIT FOR A CONGRESSMAN

When Members of Congress pass on, stiff obituaries in the papers give slight inkling of the real circumstances. We believe that in many cases the end is hastened by overwork and discouragement. This long and turbulent session has aggravated these causes. (Seven House Members have died since January.) The death yesterday of Karl Stefan, according to friends, was in no small measure the result of excessive labors and a feeling he was waging a hopeless fight.

Stefan represented the Third District of Nebraska. That is an area reminiscent of the early prairie communities so beautifully described by Willa Cather in her novels about Nebraska. The Congressman typified the friendliness, the sturdy individualism, and hatred of war and dictatorship which characterizes the folk out there. Like many of Miss Cather's characters, Stefan came to the prairies from his native Bohemia.

Although of Czech race, Stefan felt no bitterness toward the German people under Hitler and in 1948 did his bit for healing the scars of war. In that year he journeyed to the Rhineland where he presented a gift of relief money from a town in mid-Nebraska to a German town. A stout fighter against centralized government, Stefan was tireless in his efforts to curtail the veritable flood of dangerous requests for funds from Congress to expand collectivist power. Although discouraged by failure to stem this all-powerful tide, he never flinched. *Ave atque vale*

No Central Valley-Bonneville Intertie Means Less Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress are aware that the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest has become a national problem which appears already to have affected production of aluminum in the defense effort. In connection with this regrettable situation, which could have been avoided, I wish to include two editorials for the RECORD, the first from the Sacramento Bee of September 25 entitled "Chickens Come Home To Roost in Power Crisis" and, second, from the Redding Record-Searchlight of September

25 entitled "No Bonneville Line, No Aluminum."

As the Sacramento Bee editorial says:

The possibility of a serious west coast power shortage has been evident for some time.

Notwithstanding the precarious outlook, Congress has been untowardly niggardly in providing for the development of power supplies, either because of a mistaken idea of economy, or because of the opposition of the private power interests.

As the Redding Record-Searchlight points up, one of the more sensible suggestions is an interconnection between the Bonneville power system in the Northwest, and the power systems of California and Utah. The proposed Bonneville intertie has been recommended by the engineers of Federal agencies, and we should, I believe, make every effort to overcome the political difficulty so that this sensible suggestion can be made a reality.

Only recently we have received word that the private utility in northern California would build a steam power plant of 600,000 kilowatts capacity. This move to build up almost non-existent power reserves is commendable. However, it seems extremely short-sighted and stupid to deny funds for public hydroelectric power plants in connection with irrigation and reclamation projects and at the same time proceed with the construction of these steam power plants which day after day will burn up irreplaceable oil supplies, while at the same time we allow the waters of our western rivers to cause flood damage and not put them to beneficial use.

If these streams were controlled by storage reservoirs, then the drain on our precious oil supplies would be reduced and we would not be guilty of wasting forever the power potential of these streams as they are allowed to flow uncontrolled into the sea.

It is also rather difficult to understand how this Congress is appropriating funds and urging reclamation development in a number of foreign lands and at the same time we are adopting budget policies which prevent development of our natural resources and obviously weaken our national defense. It is high time that we proceed again with a logical, far-sighted program for construction of storage reservoirs and hydroelectric power plants in our Western States. The editorials follow:

[From the Sacramento Bee of September 25, 1951]

CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST IN POWER CRISIS

Charles E. Wilson, the Nation's defense mobilizer, has called upon the west coast aluminum manufacturers to prepare plans for moving their plants from the Pacific Northwest because of a power deficiency.

The shortage, of course, is temporary. But it points up the undependability of our power sources, a weakness which could prove embarrassing if the Nation was at war.

What is tragic about this whole thing is that the contemplated move to be made at a great sacrifice of time and money would have been unnecessary had it not been for the shortsighted national power policy of the last few years.

The possibility of a serious west coast power shortage has been evident for some time.

Notwithstanding the precarious outlook, Congress has been untowardly niggardly in providing for the development of power supplies, either because of a mistaken idea of economy or because of the opposition of the private-power interests.

And while the acute shortage is in the Northwest, the matter is linked directly with California in at least two respects—one is the failure of Congress to provide for a great Pacific power grid as long has been recommended by engineers, and the other is the slowness of Congress in authorizing feasible projects in California which now could be sending a flow of precious energy into the power grid.

A 119-mile transmission line would tie together the power resources of the three Pacific States. As recently as September 19 the Defense Power Administration, in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior, stated:

"The advantages of this interconnection would result from the transmission of otherwise unusable excess hydro energy from the Pacific Northwest to California during seasonal high-water and off-peak periods on the Columbia River system, and transmission of steam power from California to the Pacific Northwest in low-water periods on the Columbia.

"Steam power would be transmitted at a time when the California steam plants are not operating on peak loads. There are water power reservoirs in both areas where energy can be stored. Advantage also can be taken of the diversity of run-off between different basins. Mutual advantages would result to the Pacific Northwest and the California power systems without disadvantage to either area."

It is a little late to think about meeting the current shortage. The chickens have come home to roost.

But the situation should cause Congress to reexamine the matter more closely to prevent future and perhaps more serious deficiencies—and to pay less heed to the voices of the private power interests which intone the false prophecies that there never will be a power shortage.

[From the Redding (Calif.) Record-Searchlight of September 25, 1951]

NO BONNEVILLE LINE, NO ALUMINUM

The production of war-vital aluminum has had to be cut 10 percent in the Pacific Northwest because there is a shortage of power. The situation is so desperate that all sorts of solutions have been proposed, ranging from steam generators (which would require several years to design and build) to artificial rain making (which might or might not work.)

One of the more sensible suggestions is an interconnection between the Bonneville power administration system and power systems in California and Utah. Such an interconnection would make more firm power available both in the Northwest and in California, because each system would make up for the lacks of the other.

Bonneville, operated by the low-head, big-volume flow of the Columbia River, turns out an almost steady flow of power, day and night, summer and winter. When the use of electricity falls off (late at night and early in the morning, for instance) Bonneville can't store the unused electricity in storage batteries, and it can't hold back the water to be used for power generation later. Shasta Dam, however, can store water for long periods, releasing it for power production when the power is needed. If the Shasta powerhouse had a connection with Bonneville, surplus power from Bonneville could be brought here during those wee, small hours when it otherwise would be wasted. The Shasta generators would be shut down, with only a small flow of water

going through the turbines. The water thus saved in Shasta Lake could then be run through the turbines later in the day, returning some power to the Bonneville system.

Representative CLAIR ENGLE, the Congressman from our district, has espoused the idea of a Shasta-Bonneville intertie, but private greed and partisan politics have blocked the proposal. The result is that today both California and the Northwest face power shortages, and aluminum output has had to be cut.

The interconnection, if accompanied by definite plans to develop the Trinity River power resources, could pave the way for an aluminum or magnesium plant near Shasta Dam. That would mean a lot to the economic development of Shasta and Trinity Counties. It would add to our national security. So far, however, those who are willing to endanger national security in order to prevent any development of public power facilities have had their way.

Bingham Formula for Solving Transit Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARK

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, Col. S. H. Bingham, chairman of the Board of Transportation of the City of New York, recently has made public a formula for solving some of the vexing transit problems which confront cities throughout the country. I commend the Bingham formula to your attention.

In recent years public transportation in many cities has found itself caught between rising costs, on one hand, and, on the other, a concentration of traffic in brief peak hours, increasing competition from private automobiles and a change in the pattern of metropolitan areas requiring steadily lengthening routes on congested streets. The result has been increasing financial strain, increasing fares, and in some cities, impaired service.

Colonel Bingham has spent more than a quarter of a century in mass public transit, not only as administrator of one of the largest systems in the world, but also as adviser to municipalities all over this country, in Europe and South America and as an expert in the United States Army in two wars.

Rapid, frequent public transportation in large urban areas at reasonable fares and in safe, modern vehicles is as vital as any other utility. Because, as Colonel Bingham says, "It may well come to pass that the individual private company may not be able to furnish the type of service desired at a fare considered reasonable," he has worked out a broad plan applicable to any city. It is a far-sighted, thoroughly feasible formula which might well be considered by authorities wherever streets have become costly, cluttered roadblocks rather than arteries for the free flow of commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the Bingham formula as presented by Col. S. H. Bingham on July 16 in an address to a joint meeting of the metropolitan traffic and transit committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the Los Angeles Transportation Club, Inc., be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We must look for a new type of organization of transit that will provide this public service. The community must then take a much more active role in the provision of this essential service—even to the point of becoming a partner in the enterprise and controlling its operations.

I have given this long and detailed study. As a result, I have evolved a formula which I am confident is applicable in broad outline to most cities which may have to enter the bus transit business. Local conditions will, of course, require modifications in details of this formula. This is the first time I have discussed my formula in public. It calls first for a new type of government business entity.

This is a new kind of public transit corporation which, for want of a title, could be termed "City Transit Corp." It would combine the best features of private and municipal enterprise. It would retain the efficiency of operation known in the best competitive industry and the financial and other advantages of community operation.

This corporation would acquire the facilities and equipment of the existing private transit company or companies in its city through an exchange of revenue bonds for the physical assets and property. I shall go into this in greater detail later, but I should like to point out here that in this way the private transit line is acquired with no outlay of municipal funds and with no strain on municipal borrowing power. It is paid for out of earnings.

One of the principal benefits under my formula would be freedom of the public corporation from burdensome State and Federal taxes which have been a large factor in the financial problem of the private companies. Without additional fare increases or use of funds from other sources, I believe that essential service can be made readily available under public ownership in most cities and attractive enough to aid in the reduction of traffic problems. In cities where more than one local transit company operates, acquisition by the public transit corporation would permit elimination of wasteful competitive routes, and coordination of all mass transit facilities, to give the public the best possible service.

Now let us look to the method of acquisition.

I believe a city should acquire privately owned transit properties in return for revenue bonds issued for a term of, say 20 years. Naturally there will be negotiation on the purchase price which will depend upon conditions in each city and the book values of the physical assets involved. Purchase prices for some transit properties in the past have ranged between once and twice the gross annual income.

The bonds would be issued by this public transit corporation which would not be a part of the regular city government. Payment of interest and amortization of these bonds would be assured by a requirement that the fare should be sufficient to pay operating expenses and debt service. Since the transit property run by this public transit corporation would be tax exempt, the likelihood of the necessity for an increased fare to meet obligations would be small.

I believe it would be necessary to adopt this procedure because few cities these days have free borrowing power sufficient for the acquisition of a transit system. With tax exemption on the transit property and a 20-year amortization period for the bonds, I believe that transit operation could produce sufficient revenue at a reasonable fare. One of the critical problems, of course, is management.

It is essential that management be business-like. Therefore, my formula proposes a corporate form rather than merely establishing another city department.

The day-to-day operations and management control under my formula would remain in the hands of present management of the private companies—provided, of course, that the balance sheet and operating statement of existing management show it to be successful and alert to its responsibilities.

The management would be given authority to run the property in the most efficient manner possible, but complete regulatory control would be vested in the city. This would divorce transit operation from the red tape of government and civil service. It would be run as are the most progressive private enterprises.

To sum up, I think that in this type of public transit corporation we get the best features of both private and public ownership. We reduce the fare burden on the rider so that transit patronage is encouraged, and traffic congestion relieved.

Following this pattern we can have a well run, efficiently managed transit system. The rider has a stake in the enterprise. Management has the economic responsibilities of meeting operating expenses from the revenue derived from a low fare, and is given the authority and freedom from red tape to make such a result possible.

What I have tried to do today is point out to you that an essential public utility, mass transit, is in a period of severe economic stress. The powerful social and economic pressures on this industry are forcing it into a position where it may not be able to do its job under the usual pattern of private enterprise in this country. We must therefore devise a new pattern, using the best elements of both private and community enterprise to assure the continuity of this essential service.

I have suggested such a pattern, a public transportation corporation, in broad outline. Each community will, of course, have to work out the details to meet its own needs and circumstances.

Inherent in this formula, no matter how it is worked out in any city, are seven benefits which I have indicated and which I should like now merely to recapitulate. They are:

1. The municipality would ultimately become owner of the transit system which serves it.

2. It would acquire this system at no cost to the farepayer or taxpayer.

3. It would acquire this system with no outlay of its own general funds.

4. It would acquire this system without affect on its debt limit and without diminishing its borrowing power for other capital improvements.

5. It would have a coordinated transit system operating solely for the community's benefit.

6. The municipally-owned public transit corporation could operate without pressure or restriction from outside sources.

7. The city would have assurance of continuity of this essential service.

This is, of course, no complete cure for all the ills of public transportation and traffic in our cities. But it is a fair statement of the problem and a sound approach to solving it.

The Physically Handicapped**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. FRANK CARLSON**

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the Record an address delivered by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, at their kick-off luncheon today, Monday, October 8. The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, under the able direction of their president, Paul Strachan, has been carrying on an active and effective campaign in behalf of the Nation's physically handicapped. This address is most timely as we give national recognition to Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

At a time when our Nation is entering into a program of expanded production for national defense, it is necessary that we make a greater effort to fit our physically handicapped into positions where they can be of real service, not only to themselves but to the Nation.

During my 4 years as Governor of the State of Kansas, I had an opportunity to work closely with the national organization, and our State, through the cooperation of civic and veterans' organizations, in conjunction with our State employment service, rendered outstanding service to these citizens. We had fine cooperation from the employers in our State, and made some very definite gains in the number employed and the results obtained.

I am confident that this year, during the Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, additional thousands of our physically handicapped citizens will be given an opportunity to make a livelihood for themselves and render a service to their Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, BEFORE KICK OFF LUNCHEON, "NEPHW," STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 8

Mr. Toastmaster, Rabbi Gerstenfeld, Monsignor McGowan, distinguished guests, friends. Ten years ago we began a militant campaign to inculcate in the minds of the American people the fact that their physically handicapped brothers and sisters are not worthless human wreckage, with the status of second- and third-class citizens, but are a valuable national resource.

We have not yet achieved our goal, although definite progress has been made. On employment of handicapped, alone, since 1940 we have come from 27,675 placements in that year to 276,822 in 1951, with a cumulative total of 2,355,000 handicapped so placed, over the 10-year span. These handicapped, so rescued from the human scrap pile, have proven their worth as workers and as citizens. They have shown willingness, loyalty, diligence, and their production performance is as good as nonhandicapped and, in many instances, better.

This is proving that the proper approach to solution of the handicapped problem is

not charity; not the crocodile tears of the I'll Cry for You pseudo philanthropists and humanitarians who are, really, more concerned about having their pictures in the paper, than actually giving needed service to the handicapped.

We shall never succeed with this problem, affecting in greater or lesser degree the lives of some 30,000,000 American citizens, until we cease attempting to futilely palliate the evil, instead of seeking and applying a real remedy.

After more than 36 years of study I am convinced that the only proper method is to regard this as a cold-blooded economic proposition. We have these millions of handicapped people. We must either form a Euthanasia League and thus kill them off, or we must find a way to integrate them into our social and economic life. We cannot longer ignore them and we cannot dismiss them by, once a year, mailing a check to our favorite charity and then rubbing our hands with smug self-satisfaction, while saying, "Well, we're all through with that for another 12 months."

No; you, and you, and you—all of us—must realize that in this matter we are our brothers' keepers, and we cannot escape or evade that responsibility by any shallow or false sophistries whatsoever.

While we know that employment of handicapped is, basically, the most important part of the program yet, we also know that there are other phases, medical treatment, education, and training, etc., which likewise are essential and to meet which needs, today, there is grave lack of trained specialists, facilities, and funds to do this highly important job.

It is my absolute conviction that the great pillars of this program are, on the one hand, industry and business and, on the other, labor. There you have the employers, so vital and necessary to the success of this program, and in the other extreme you have the people who make up the working population. Unless there is understanding of this problem and agreement between these two groups as to supporting the program it cannot win.

Today in many cities across country we have established labor-management committees. In my judgment there are the places to plant the seeds of the program for handicapped. There plans can be studied and in the light of experience, other plans adopted or amended, that will provide for the utmost use of our handicapped in the 25,000 different kinds of jobs existing today, and I may say, parenthetically, that we have already found—thanks to the fine but still incomplete research job done by the United States Civil Service Commission, the United States Bureau of Employment Security, and the Public Health Service—that handicapped can fill satisfactorily more than 10,000 of those jobs if they are fitted into work where their own particular disability is not a factor.

In these labor-management committees we have the means to do the greater part of this job because management, as representing the employers, will thus learn from actual experience the great value of handicapped people as workers, and labor will learn thus that its own people are not necessarily to be laid on the shelf, a drain upon their families, communities, States, and the Nation, when injury or disease incapacitates them for one job but there are many other jobs for which such persons may be trained.

In these labor-management committees, I firmly believe, we have the crucible which will melt down the metal and burn off the dross and slag until we develop to the fullest extent the great public service program to utilize our physically handicapped so that within their capacities to perform they will have the same opportunities as nonhandicapped, and no longer will they be told "not wanted" when seeking employment so that they may earn their way as taxpayers—not tax eaters.

The Problems of Youth**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. ALEXANDER WILEY**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we hear a great deal of talk these days about the problems of American youth. There is much worrying about our young people—a good deal of it competently unjustified, incidentally. But comparatively few folks ever bother to do anything constructive for and with the young people.

One exception to that, however, is a new series of excellent television broadcasts, the American Youth Forum, conducted by Mr. Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the famed American Forum of the Air. To my way of thinking, the American Youth Forum is one of the most constructive uses of television by any network.

Under the theme "Youth Wants to Know," some 50 bright young people, aged 16 to 20, from high schools and junior colleges, submit their questions to some prominent personality in public life. An audition program was presented on September 8 with my able associate, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as guest. The questions and answers proved so dynamic and spirited as to enhearten every one who saw and was connected with that initial program. Other guests have been my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and last Saturday night Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

I have in my hands the transcript of General Hershey's talk. I must say that the youngsters really offered some splendid questions, evidencing mature, well-reasoned thinking.

Having long been interested in the use of television for educational purposes, I am delighted, indeed, to pay my respects therefore to Ted Granik, to the National Broadcast Co., and to all of the folks associated with American Youth Forum.

The program is presented with the cooperation of the American Legion each Saturday night over the NBC television network. It originates from the NBC-TV studios in the Wardman Park Hotel from 7 p. m. to 7:30 p. m.

The American Legion, as we all know, has long been interested in helping American youth fulfill our highest ideals. Its famous Boys' State and Girls' State, involving youthful government in action are, I believe, two of the most marvelous ideas which any organization has ever initiated in connection with young people. Next week the Legion convention is meeting in Miami. There will certainly be a great deal for the assembled Legionnaires and auxiliary members to be proud of indeed.

Yes, Mr. President, we hear a great deal of talk about the problems of youth, but American Youth Forum is the type of program that is going to help take care of those problems. It challenges the mettle of youth. It uses youth's

vital energy along wholly constructive lines. It shows young people that we value them. We want their best judgment. We want to treat them in as mature a fashion as they themselves can achieve. We want them to help solve their own problems and those of adult America.

Let me add, Mr. President, that we hear a lot of talk about the wrong type of program or television. Well, in American Youth Forum we have a very fine example of a right type of program, a program meriting the backing of parent-teacher organizations, youth groups, civic clubs, and, yes, everyone else in America who is interested in our young people. It is the type of program which merits commercial sponsorship and backing from the American free enterprise system. I feel sure it will get such backing. America always rewards fine projects like this.

I had hoped to place the full text of last Saturday's transcript in the Appendix of the RECORD, but since that would exceed the normal two-page RECORD limit, I have had to make certain necessary cuts in the transcript. I am reluctant to do so, but I think that General Hershey and the young people involved will forgive me.

I have concentrated on retaining those sections containing General Hershey's replies on the subject of the draft, with which he is most thoroughly familiar. As a matter of fact, General Hershey was very careful to point out that many folks have opinions about a lot of things in which they, comparatively speaking, are not expert. So he very carefully drew the line when questions arose on which he did not feel himself to be particularly well versed to give an authoritative answer.

I commend General Hershey for that careful, conscientious, and humble attitude. Many men in public life could benefit by using that type of careful approach, in which the individual does not presume that he knows everything about everything. I hope that the young people who heard General Hershey on Saturday learn that splendid lesson from him—Never to be "sure" of things when they simply do not have sufficient facts and background to really give a definite opinion.

I recall that Will Rogers once stated in his inimitable humble way, in effect: "It ain't the things that people don't know in this world which cause so much trouble; it's the things that people think they do know but which just ain't so."

Fortunately, we have in Lewis B. Hershey a man who is careful not to exceed the limits of his own background and authority.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from the broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN YOUTH FORUM

FRED W. LLEWELLYN III. How would the universal military training affect high-school students?

Miss MARIAN MANDELL. I want to know, is it democratic for the Government to defer college students with high I. Q.'s?

Mr. CLIVE R. DYSON I want to know, is President Truman justified in accusing newspaper officials for releasing information already released by the Pentagon?

ANNOUNCER These are a few of the questions young America is asking today. What are the answers? Youth wants to know.

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Youth Forum, a program dedicated to the principle that the future of America rests with the young people of our Nation. And to help resolve some of the questions in their minds, here is the founder and director of the American Youth Forum, Theodore Granik.

Mr. GRANIK. Good evening. Our guest tonight has one of the toughest jobs in the Nation, that of bossing our Selective Service System. I have a high personal regard for Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the draft director. I had the great privilege of serving as one of his civilian aides during the last war. I recall he was a major then, secretary of the joint Army and Navy selective service committee when we first began our association and friendship. I shall always remember his affectionately dubbing me his corporal and the thrill I had in sending him his first stars when he was appointed a brigadier general.

The youngsters in our studio tonight, who were brought here under the auspices of the American Legion, want to question the general about his recent trip to Europe and the prospects for the draft.

But first here is a little background information about our guest. General Hershey was born in Indiana. He is a soldier but not a "brass hat," for he came up through the ranks. He has served as a rural school superintendent, a job he quit to join a National Guard unit at the Mexican border. In France, after World War I, he helped arrange for the return home of American troops. He is the father of selective service, as well as the father of four children. His hobby is psychology. He has a huge library and says he likes to know what makes people tick.

And now, General, our youngsters want to know what makes you tick.

General HERSCHEY. Well, if it wouldn't be presumptuous, I would like to say, Corporal, I think the problem tonight is not what makes people tick, but, after I look over this group of youngsters, I am wondering whether I am going to tick or not, and when we find that one out, then, they can go into what makes me do it.

Mr. GRANIK. Shall we take the first question, General?

General HERSCHEY. Let's go.

Mr. LLEWELLYN. General Hershey, my name is Fred Llewellyn, and I would like to know how universal military training would affect our high-school students.

General HERSCHEY. I think that is a pretty easy one to answer because every time the Congress has legislated in this field, they have always planned to let the individual finish high school before he took military training, that is, providing he could get through by the time he is 20 years old—and he would have to be a pretty good football player if they wanted to keep him much longer than that. So, my answer would be that, as far as high school goes, universal military training I don't think creates much of a problem for them. The problem is further on in the educational system.

Mr. LLEWELLYN. Then you don't believe that there would be any of this marks business, that is, that the highest half would get to stay in high school and the other half would go into military training?

General HERSCHEY. Well, I suppose, being a little facetious, we ought to let them go to school a while even if they aren't too bright.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead, ma'am. Do you have a question?

Question. General Hershey, I want to know, are you in favor of universal military training?

General HERSCHEY. Yes. I have been since 1908.

Question. Do you think we can avoid doing the same thing that happened to Germany before World War I?

General HERSCHEY. Well, I think we are jumping a little fast there. Just because people live in a white house, and the white house burns up, is no sign that everybody else who lives in a white house is going to be burned out. I think the people determine whether they are going to get into militarism, if that is what you are worrying about. It is a question of mind and a question of the way people approach things. The Swiss have been over there for a great many centuries, and one of the things that impressed me on this last trip was that the one place that you are conscious people are going to survive is in Switzerland; and certainly they haven't damaged democracy much in Switzerland because there they don't let the central government do anything.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead, young lady.

Miss MANDELL. I am Marian Mandell, and I want to know, is it desirable and democratic for the Government to defer college students with high I. Q.'s?

General HERSCHEY. Well, you kind of put me on the spot a little on two or three things, because, in the first place, I am not so sure what a thing is that is democratic, and I am not so sure that I know what you mean when you say "Is it democratic?" Now, is it democratic to send a boy 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 to fight and leave a 60-year old not to fight? I don't know the answer to it, but the reason you send the youngster is because he can do something while the 60-year old can't. Now, if we are going to send any one to college, we had probably better send some one who can get along in college. That is one of the basic reasons why you pick out the high I. Q.'er to go to college, the assumption being that he can do something.

Miss MANDELL. Don't you think there will be antagonism on the part of the people who are not so bright and who have to go into the military toward those who are brighter and who get to go to college?

General HERSCHEY. I think you are saying that we should lose the psychology that you should never have a competition because somebody has to lose. But if we lose that philosophy, there will be no football games and there will be nothing because somebody might be frustrated because they didn't win.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you have a question back there?

Mr. SHAW. My name is Russell Shaw. I want to know whether you think A. B. college students should be deferred as well as technical students?

General HERSCHEY. Well, yes. You have rather hit me in a weak place.

Mr. GRANIK. He knows one of your weak spots.

General HERSCHEY. When I was in college, I was an A. B. rather than a so-called technician. I do have one Bachelor of Science degree. But we have to have people in this world besides scientists. One of the things we are very low on is people who know something about human relations. Most of our troubles are because of human relationships, not because of the relationships of matter. I don't know whether this bill A. B.'er is going to do something about it sooner than the fellow with a degree in engineering.

Mr. DYSON. My name is Clive Dyson. I want to know whether the President is justified in accusing newspaper officials for printing and releasing information that has already been given to the press by the Pentagon.

General HERSCHEY. Well, I can say that if I had been back from Germany longer I wouldn't be able to answer that; but, fortunately, I just got back yesterday, and I haven't gotten myself into it. There are

three or four other excuses I could offer, but I won't give you those.

Miss JOHNSON. My name is Joan Johnson. I want to know if the rearmament of Western Germany will reawaken the militaristic spirit of the Germans and cause them to attack France again.

General HERSHEY. Well, I guess that is a good question, and I am one of these experts that has been over there 2 nights or so in Germany, and I suppose I ought to know the answer. I think that it is a debatable question, that is, how much militarism you are going to awaken by having people get into the posture where they can defend themselves. I think Aristotle or Socrates, one of those two philosophers, said: "Not too much of one thing," so I suppose one of the things we are going to try to get is a belligerent spirit in the West to defend themselves.

Miss JOHNSON. Don't you think we have learned that lesson from World War I and World War II?

General HERSHEY. I was over there a very short time. I have been in the United States, I won't say for how many years, but much longer, and I am not sure that America has learned the lesson of either war, so I would hate to say that the Germans have done so.

Mr. GRANIK. General, a teenager named Sam Rose telephoned me and asked whether, considering the number of American troops that the administration has made available for General Eisenhower's international army, after your first-hand survey of conditions in Europe, you think additional GI's should be sent over there?

General HERSHEY. If they need more troops then we are going to furnish them, there is no question that we should. I am inclined to think that the numbers we have over there are probably the minimum. That is quite a little country over there, small as it is, and as I looked at the line between us and the East, it is an awfully long line and I can tell you that it is not heavily populated with soldiers at the moment.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you think it is the very minimum?

General HERSHEY. I think it is less than the minimum, and having had a son-in-law about 50 miles from the Czech border for the last few years, I shall be happy to have that line better protected.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead, please.

Mr. ZIERNICKI. My name is Robert Ziernicki. I would like to know what age group produces the best soldiers.

General HERSHEY. Well, you flatter me. In the first place, I am in the procurement business. I am not in the using business. I think soldiers can be too young, but, on the other hand, they usually get too old.

One of the strange things was that when we went to the mechanized army we found we had difficulty in teaching the older people. We haven't been able to teach people of my age even to drive. I think the early twenties or the very late teens are probably the most dynamic, the most easy to learn. I don't want to say the most tractable because they sometimes don't act like it. But I would say the very late teens and the early twenties.

Mr. GRANIK. Young man, go ahead.

Mr. FENSTER. My name is Harvey Fenster. I want to know what chance a college student taking a more extended course has of finishing it?

General HERSHEY. By extended, you mean graduate?

Mr. FENSTER. Postgraduate.

General HERSHEY. I think that after you have finished your 4 years of college you get into a little different philosophy. For the first 4 years of college, you may have some rules on deferment. You allow a man to be deferred because you think he has the capacity to become useful. But after you finish your undergraduate work then I think the work that you are going to do has to be

useful or we probably had better have your 2 years in and then you can go to your graduate work after you get back.

Mr. GRANIK. All right, young lady.

Miss ANDREE. My name is Kathleen Andree. I want to know what your opinion is on the draft of women in the event of an all-out war.

General HERSHEY. I have a daughter named Kathryn, and I am quite able to be embarrassed by people of that name asking me questions, but I am not quite as much embarrassed as I would be otherwise. I try to stay out of that for several reasons. One is that I don't believe the demand for the women in the Armed Forces at the present time is great enough that we are going to do very much about it. But I do believe that if we get all-out mobilization and get to needing people, the women would go if necessary. If we can get all of the women in the Armed Forces without drafting them we would rather have it that way. But any time we need more women in the Armed Forces than we can get otherwise, I believe that when that time comes we will have no trouble passing an act making women liable.

Mr. GRANIK. All right, young man.

Mr. HILLIG. My name is Bernard Hillig. I want to know whether you think we should extend more military and economic aid to Franco Spain since she occupies such a strategic position on the European Continent.

General HERSHEY. Well, that thing I don't know anything about. I wasn't in that area of the world, and I don't even know how much we have sent. My remembrance is that we haven't sent very much, so if we send anything we will be sending more than we are sending now.

Miss VAN SCIVER. My name is Gloria Van Sciver. Mr. Granik mentioned that you are interested in psychology. As a student of this, I want to know if it is really possible for a people who have a warlike history such as the Japanese have to change their ways and actually work democratically when their culture doesn't have the traits that this needs.

General HERSHEY. Well, you sort of have worked me over on quite a little bit of evidence here. In other words, you have rendered some judgments, and I think your answer is "no." I don't know that I agree with you. I heard that question debated, coming back on the ship, about Germany. Both of them are allegedly warlike people. I don't know what makes people warlike, whether it is because of the climate or the food they eat, or some cussedness or something that came in them. I am not so sure but that one of the things that makes them warlike is their neighbors. I know people who live in neighborhoods around here and they kind of make a lot of noise but when they move into a quiet neighborhood they do quite well. I am not so sure but that the Japanese didn't find part of their need of becoming warlike due to what they thought of their neighbors. One of the strangest things is that when you meet the individual Japanese, and the individual German, he is about the most gentlemanly person you can imagine. I don't think they are necessarily condemned to being warlike. After all, if survival requires warlike, we had better be careful about not being too pacifistic.

Mr. KANE. My name is Matthew Kane. I would like to know whether, since you are in charge of procuring men, you advocate dropping an atomic bomb and saving all of this bloodshed that is going on in Korea without drafting and drafting and drafting ad infinitum.

General HERSHEY. It seems to me that if I was in charge of that job I certainly wouldn't be in favor of dropping the atomic bomb, because it might put me out of a job.

Mr. KANE. Aside from your job, are you in favor of it?

General HERSHEY. In the first place, I haven't the problem of whether we should drop an atomic bomb or not, and I certainly wouldn't want to drop an atomic bomb, knowing as little about the tactical and strategic situation as I do. And I am a little disturbed about the fact that sometimes people who know little more than I do about that are so positive.

Mr. KANE. Then you have no idea whether you want to drop an atomic bomb or not?

General HERSHEY. If you will give me the situation under which we would drop one, I will tell you; but I am not running around dropping even shotgun shells in the situations that I know nothing about. And you don't drop the bomb just on Thursday, or something. You drop it on some part of Korea or Manchuria, or some other base. I want to know a little more about why we want to drop it and what we expect to see left after it is dropped and what that will accomplish. Then after I know some of those things then I can give you an answer.

Mr. KANE. Take the bases in Manchuria, the supply bases in Manchuria which are keeping the Chinese Army alive.

General HERSHEY. Don't you think that if those bases were destroyed, the Chinese Army would still stay alive?

Mr. KANE. We have blockaded the water ports, and the supplies must be coming through them.

General HERSHEY. But there is a whole continent behind them.

Mr. KANE. The facts show that the railroads are running right through Manchuria.

General HERSHEY. Well, maybe the trucks will run through if you blast out the railroads. You are jumping at the conclusion that dropping one bomb is going to put Asia up on its ear. Asia is a very large country. Even around here, I believe that Montgomery County could stand one atomic bomb if they dropped it in the right place. Of course, there would be some differences of opinion where the right place would be.

Mr. VERDI. My name is Anthony Verdi. I want to know whether you advocate the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in Korea.

General HERSHEY. I never have. I don't want to say that I never would or wouldn't.

Mr. GRANIK. Young lady.

Miss STRACK. My name is Doris Strack. I want to know whether if Japan trades with Red China, which is now its most important source of raw materials, you think that will tend to break down the steps that Japan has taken toward democracy.

General HERSHEY. Well, I don't know a thing about that, hardly. China is a very large question and there are hundreds of things that enter into it. I think one of the things that perhaps I have lost as I have grown older—and I am not sure that it was wisdom to lose it—was the ability to settle all questions on the basis of getting them reduced down to a single area and then say "Yes" or "No." There are so many factors that enter here, that you swamp me a little bit and I don't know.

Mr. GRANIK. Young man.

Mr. GEARY. My name is Nathaniel L. Geary. I would like to know if, in your travels through the different parts of the world, you find that the people there have good attitudes and beliefs about the American people or whether they think we are a bunch of capitalists who are trying to take everything that we can.

General HERSHEY. Well, I don't think everyone—I don't know what the Germans think. I have a little ancestry way back that was German, but it is probably so far away as to be of little importance. I think they would like to have us out of there. I would, if I were a German. On the other hand, my observations at the moment are that there are some other things that might happen if we got out. As little as they like to have us there, they believe that what would happen to them if we went away would leave

them in a rather bad situation. They have two choices, neither one of them good. I don't think they think we are all capitalists. They might because we do have a reasonable amount of money. I think they think the average private in the Army is a fairly wealthy fellow. He happens to be on paydpy. But I still don't think they think we are all capitalists, nor do I think they think we are all angels. They probably think we are somewhere in between.

Mr. GRANIK. One more question.

Miss LOVING. My name is Rita Loving. I want to know just what is the status or the potency of the Communist Party in Europe.

General HERSHEY. I haven't the slightest idea. I think they are working as hard as they can. Sometimes they are gaining and a great deal of the time they are losing. I would say that in the latter part of the last 5 years, I don't think they have done as well as they did in the first part, but this again is something I don't know much about.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you very much.

General. I know this give and take questioning could go on for hours, but now our time is up. Next week, our representative group of teen-agers will ask their questions of Senator BLAIR MOODY, a Democrat, of Michigan, who has been active in the congressional battles over taxes and economic controls. This is Theodore Granik inviting you to be with us again next week at our unrehearsed American Youth Forum.

Statement by the President Regarding Order for the Handling of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of the President's prepared statement on his order governing the security of Government information and the transcript of the discussion which followed that statement at his press conference on October 4. The statement and transcript are taken from the New York Times of October 5.

The President prefaced his statement with an observation that reporters were interested in censorship and that he did not believe in it. He then read his prepared statement, and a discussion with the reporters followed. Subsequent to the press conference the President's press secretary, Joseph Short, issued a clarifying statement which is attached to his statement and the transcript of the discussion.

There being no objection, the statements and the discussion were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEXT OF TRUMAN SECURITY STATEMENT AND TRANSCRIPT OF DISCUSSION

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT

There has been considerable misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the Executive order issued on September 24, 1951, relating to the handling of information which has been classified in order to protect the national security. This executive order represented an honest effort to find the best approach to a problem that is important to the survival of the United States.

[At this point he looked up from the text and said that right here he wished to stop and say that the Central Intelligence Agency had reported to him that Yale University had made a survey and that survey found—it had no connection with the Government—that 95 percent of all our information was public property.]

I issued this order with great reluctance, and only when I was convinced after lengthy consideration that it was necessary to protect the United States against its potential enemies. I think my record in defending civil liberties in this country demonstrates that I have no desire to suppress freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

I would like for the public to understand what this order undertakes to do and why it was necessary to issue it.

In its simplest terms, the problem is what we should do to keep military and related secrets from falling into the hands of enemies of the United States.

I do not believe that anyone could seriously contend that military secrets should be published in the newspapers or that anyone has a right or duty to see that military secrets are made public. I believe that everyone, including Members of Congress and newspaper editors, should think twice before advocating a theory that would lead to that result.

Whether it be treason or not, it does the United States just as much harm for military secrets to be made known to potential enemies through open publication, as it does for military secrets to be given to an enemy through the clandestine operations of spies.

[Here he said that there wasn't any difference at all.]

On the other hand, I do not believe that protection of military secrets should be made a cloak or cover for withholding from the people information about their Government which should be made known to them. I believe that everyone, including Government officials, should try to prevent this from happening.

It is easy to agree on these two objectives, but it was difficult to establish the means for accomplishing both of them.

In those agencies of the Government primarily concerned with national-security matters, such as the Department of State and the Department of Defense, we have had for a number of years a system of classifying information to prevent its disclosure to unauthorized persons when it would be dangerous to national security.

This system has worked reasonably well, although it has not in all instances prevented the publication of information which aided our enemies against the United States, and in other cases it has been used to classify information which actually had no particular relationship to national security.

[Here he paused and said that those were the two things that we were faced with—how to prevent our military secrets from becoming the possessions of our enemies and how to be sure that in doing that we don't cover up information that ought to be made public.]

In the present defense mobilization period, it has become necessary in an increasing number of cases to make military secrets available to executive agencies other than the military departments in order that these other agencies might effectively perform their functions that are necessary in supporting the defense effort.

It is also necessary for some of the civilian agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for example, to originate and protect some information vital to our defense.

It should be readily apparent that military secrets in the hands of these agencies should be protected just as much as when they are in the hands of the military departments. It would also seem to be sensible to provide that different agencies take the

same kind of precautions to protect this information.

It would not make any sense to have a paper containing military secrets carefully locked up in a safe in the Pentagon, with a copy of the same paper left lying around on the desk of a lawyer in the State Department.

Now, the purpose of this Executive order is to provide a common-sense answer to these problems. It is to provide that information affecting the national security shall continue to be protected when it gets out of the hands of the military departments and into the hands of other agencies.

The purpose is to provide that these other agencies shall provide the same kind of protection that is provided in the military departments.

An important purpose

Another purpose of the order—and it is a most important purpose—is to provide that information shall not be classified and withheld from the public on the ground that it affects the national security, unless it is in fact actually necessary to protect such information in the interests of national security.

In other words, one of the purposes of this executive order is to correct abuses which may have grown up by use of overclassification of information in the name of national security.

I think this Executive order represents a reasonable approach to a very difficult problem. I think it will work in the public interest and I expect to watch it closely to see that it is not used as an excuse for withholding information to which the public is legitimately entitled.

It may well be that experience under the order will indicate that it should be changed. In that case, I will be glad to change it—and I will be glad to give consideration to reasonable suggestions for changes that are advanced in good faith.

I would like to suggest to those who are seriously and honestly concerned about this matter that they consider it objectively and with the interest of the United States uppermost in their minds. I would like to suggest that they consider how we can best accomplish objectives which all of us should be able to agree upon.

I do not believe that the best solution can be reached by adopting an approach based on the theory that everyone has a right to know our military secrets and related information affecting the national security.

[After ending the reading of his statement, Mr. Truman said that now he was going to hand reporters this in mimeographed form and he hoped every one would take a good look at it, that they would give it to their editors and publishers and remember that 95 percent of our secret information had been revealed by newspapers and slick magazines, and that is what he was trying to stop.]

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTERS

Question. Mr. President, can you give us examples of what caused this order?

Answer. The President said yes, the most outstanding example was the publication in Fortune magazine of all the locations and maps of our atomic energy plants, and then in this very town, in every town in the country, were published air maps of Washington, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, and other of our great cities, and with arrows pointing to the key points in those towns.

Question. I think that information was given out by the military department.

Answer. Mr. Truman said he did not care who had given it out, and that the publishers had no business to use it if they had the welfare of the United States at heart.

Question. I don't know whether it was the military or the atomic energy department.

Answer. The President replied he did not care who had given it out, that publishers ought to be as patriotic as he was and he wouldn't give it out.

Question. If stories came over the wire—

Answer Mr. Truman said he did not care.

Question (Continuing). Would you attribute it to a military agency?

Answer. If the military agency gives it out and an atomic bomb falls on you on account of it, who's to blame? Mr. Truman demanded.

Question. As I understand it, the editors did not make up these maps.

Answer Mr. Truman said he meant civil defense maps. They were the air pictures of all those cities, and it was terrible. He wished he had them of Russia and their manufacturing plants. He could use them.

Question. When was that Yale survey made?

Answer. Just a short time ago, Mr. Truman said.

INSTANCE OF OVER-ZEAL

Question. Along the lines of your effort to safeguard military and security information, what safeguard is there that the military officer will not be over-zealous? As I recall it the first act taken under your executive order was a statement that security information is anything that embarrasses the OPS.

Answer. He got the carpet pulled out from under him, said the President.

Question. You are the one man to watch those things and it is not possible for one man to watch everything.

Answer. That is correct, that is correct, said Mr. Truman, adding that he hated censorship just as badly as they did and would protect them against that as far as he could but the safety and welfare of the United States of American came first with him.

Question. There was a suggestion on Capitol Hill by Senator BAXTON that if each department had a security officer, it should also have a man who fights for release of information.

Answer. Mr. Truman said he did not know about that.

Question. Mr. President, have you weighed the importance of a free press in relation to military security as both important to this country?

Answer. The President replied yes; a free press was just as important—a free press was just as important as the Bill of Rights and that is what was contained in the Bill of Rights.

A DANGEROUS POWER

Question. But do you not think you are giving dangerous power to agencies to decide what should be given to the people?

Answer. He said he was not so sure, that we would have to wait and find out. If that was the case, he continued, we would change that, as he said.

Question. Do you not think that censorship is always abused?

Answer. Mr. Truman replied he did not know. He had not had any experience with it.

Question. I have, sir, and I think it is always abused, even by the military.

Question. Is there any program for giving the agencies uniform standards?

Answer. Mr. Truman said he hoped there would be.

(At this point Joseph Short, presidential press secretary, spoke in a low voice to the President.)

Question. What did Joe say?

Answer. The President answered that Mr. Short had said there was a provision in the order for a training program for these men and for uniform standards and that the training would be carefully supervised.

Question. Did I understand you to say that 95 percent of our secret information had been revealed?

Answer. The President replied yes; 95 percent of all our information had been revealed in the press one way or another.

Question. I think what was in Macon's (Macon Reed, Jr., Trans Radio Press) mind was your statement that 95 percent of our secret information has been revealed in newspapers and slick magazines and that is what I am trying to check. Is that it?

Answer Mr. Truman said that was right; that was correct, that was the answer.

Question. Mr. President, on this question of the maps, I wonder if we could recapitulate that just a little. Do we understand you correctly that in the event a newspaper or magazine gets some information from, say, the Defense Department, do you think, sir, that the primary responsibility for publishing it rests on the publishers or the originating agency?

Answer. The President said there was no question about that because they were very careful not to publish a lot of things that he said.

WASHINGTON AIR MAPS

Question. This is just a technical question, what maps have we been referring to?

Answer. Mr. Truman said air maps of the cities of the United States.

Question. Are you referring to any one in particular, or just to some that have been published?

Answer. The President said that if they would look back through the magazines they would find, in the daily press, in the newspapers in Washington, that they published air maps of Washington and pointed out the key places, and that was what he was worried about. He was not trying to censor information. He was trying to prevent us from being wiped out.

Question. To get the record clear, those maps, indicating vital points in those cities, were those issued by the Civil Defense Agency?

Answer. He said he did not know where they came from. All he knew was that he saw them in the papers.

Question. I would like to clear up that 95 percent secret information that has been disclosed. You would not have that 95 percent disclosed that has been disclosed?

Answer Mr. Truman replied. No; there was a lot of it he would not disclose, but 95 percent of it had been made public.

Question. I know that Central Intelligence says that 95 percent of their information comes from magazines and newspapers.

Answer. That was absolutely correct, said the President.

THAT 95 PERCENT

Question. As I understood your statement, you said that 95 percent of our secret information has been disclosed. We are talking about two different things.

Answer. Maybe, said the President, adding that the Post-Dispatch and he were usually on different things, Pete (Brandt of the Post-Dispatch).

Question. Not on military matters. But this 95 percent of our secret information which you wanted to keep secret has been disclosed?

Answer. That was the information he had from Central Intelligence, Mr. Truman said.

Question. Who classified that 95 percent as secret?

Answer. The military and State, the President replied.

Question. What is the unit of information? What percentage is maps, stories, and so forth, out of the 95-percent figure?

Answer Mr. Truman said it took into consideration all of the things mentioned.

Question. I am a little confused. Was that the Yale survey you were talking about that said that 95 percent of the secret information has been revealed?

Answer. Yes, yes, said Mr. Truman.

A CASE IN POINT

Question. I would like to raise a case in point. Yesterday Mr. Short announced on your behalf that another atomic bomb had been exploded by Russia and said that fur-

ther details would not be given because they might adversely affect the national security. Right afterward the Associated Press came through with a story quoting an unidentified but authoritative source that there had been two explosions, one of them had fizzled, and quoting a Congressman, also unidentified, as saying that the explosions had taken place in the last 3 or 4 days. Could you give us some reaction to that as a specific example of information over and above what was released by the White House?

Answer. Mr. Truman thought that was an example.

Question. Of what?

Answer. An example of disclosed information that should not be disclosed, Mr. Truman said.

Question. Don't you think the Russians know it? I mean—

Answer (breaking in) Mr. Truman said they had exploded it, of course, they did.

Question. Then why would that hurt our national defense?

Answer. Because we have got to find out what they are doing, the President said.

Question. You mean disclosure of our means of detection?

Answer Mr. Truman said that was exactly right.

Question. How far does this Yale survey figure in your decision to put out these new rules?

Answer. Mr. Truman said he had not signed the order until he got the survey.

Question. When this information comes out of Congress, when it is released by Congressmen, then that Executive order doesn't apply to information released by Congressmen?

Answer. Mr. Truman said he could not answer that.

Q. I may be simple-minded about this—

Answer. The President said you are not, Smitty (Merriman Smith, of the United Press).

HOW DID YALE KNOW?

Question. But how did Yale know? How did they know all this secret information?

Answer. They made the survey, said the President. They got it out of all the newspapers and magazines and came to the conclusion that they knew 95 percent of what was going on.

Question. Does Central Intelligence Agency agree with Yale on that 95 percent?

Answer. Mr. Truman replied "Yes," they had made a report to him on it.

Question. That story about the Matadors and those guided missiles, and so on, that was published practically by every newspaper in the land. Was that the publishers' responsibility not to publish that?

Answer. The President said he thought so, asking wouldn't it be better to defend the country? He said that was what we were doing and that was what they were fussing about.

Question. If they wanted to protect the country, you think they should not have published them?

Answer. The President answered that they ought to think about the welfare of the country the same as he did, and that he thought most of them would if they stopped to think about it.

Question. I don't want to defend editors, but those maps were used as part of a civil defense program to make people alert as to the danger of atomic attacks.

Answer. Yes, Mr. Truman agreed, but he didn't think they should be made available to the Russians.

Question. Do I understand that you were confirming the reports that there was a third A-bomb experiment in Russia that fizzled?

Answer. The President was making no inferences at all. He made the announcement yesterday—the only one he could make.

THE ROLE OF EDITORS

Question. I would like to ask a question that I am afraid my editors will ask me if I

don't ask it. Are you suggesting that perhaps the editors and publishers that we supply news stories to should ask some agency in the Government whether they should be published?

Answer. No. Mr. Truman was not. He was asking editors and publishers to take the same viewpoint of the safety of the United States as he took and he was not asking them to ask anybody to help them do it. They ought to know.

Question. I know many times we receive statement from Members of Congress, for instance. We go ahead and write stories about those statements. Perhaps many times a reporter feels that that information might be of a security nature, but if it is on the record up on the Hill there is nothing we can really do but go ahead and put it out.

Answer. The President commented, Well, that was up to them. The safety of the country was in their hands the same as it was in his.

Question. Do you think everyone in this town talks so much?

Answer. The President wouldn't say that.

Question. In your reading of the written statement you said that 95 percent of the information had been made public.

Answer. Of our secret information, the President corrected.

Question. Mr. President, what will happen to a reporter that prints something the Government doesn't want printed?

Answer. Nothing, came the answer. They printed things that caused our men to be shot in the back and nothing was done to them right during the war.

Question. Do the security rules apply to what is telecast just the same as published?

Answer. The President said this was certainly so. He had heard a lot of broadcasters talk about visits they had had to Korea and reveal what our strategy was going to be, and you can't fight battles on that basis.

(Mr. Short stepped to the President's side and spoke to him.)

Answer. The President explained that Mr. Short wanted him to make it perfectly clear that his Executive order referred to Government workers. But his comments applied to everybody who gave away State secrets.

Question. As I remember, the release about the Matadors was given out by the Pentagon and the question was asked at the White House later: Was that one of the secret weapons that you referred to in San Francisco?

Answer. Mr. Truman did not know what the questioner was talking about.

Question. When the Department of Defense hands us photographs and a story, are we supposed to censor that ourselves?

Answer. The President asked whether the questioner believed in saving the United State from attack.

Question. I do not think it should have been given out at the Pentagon.

Answer. That is your opinion and you are entitled to it; the President observed.

Question. Are you asking publishers to impose voluntary censorship?

Answer. No, Mr. Truman was asking them to use good judgment for the safety of the United States. He was not asking them to use censorship at all.

Question. Would not that require a security officer in every newsroom?

Answer. The President did not know how they could, but he was just telling them what he thought, that patriotism and the welfare of the United States was the first thing to think about.

Question. You told us that those planes were some of the weapons that you talked about at San Francisco.

Answer. He did not remember it.

Question. To get back once more to that 95 percent, may we quote you when you said: Remember that 95 percent of our secret information has been revealed in newspapers

and slick magazines and that's what I am trying to stop?

Answer. Permission was granted.

(After the news conference, Mr. Short issued the following statement:)

The President has directed me to clarify his views on security information as follows:

1. Every citizen—including officials and publishers—has a duty to protect our country.

2. Citizens who receive military information for publication from responsible officials qualified to judge the relationship of such information to the national security may rightfully assume that it is safe to publish the information.

3. Citizens who receive military information from sources not having the necessary responsibilities and qualifications to evaluate such information should, as loyal Americans, exercise the most careful judgment in determining the safety of publishing such information.

4. The recent Executive order on classified information does not in any way alter the right of citizens to publish anything.

Broome County Must Be the Sphere of Influence in Any New Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the avowed determination of State Republican Chairman Pfeiffer to throw the weight of his position behind political axmen who want to abolish the congressional district I represent is the greatest set-back the Republican Party could possibly receive in the face of its long-awaited chance to regain national supremacy.

Up-State New York can be made into several more safe Republican districts instead of subtracting from the present number, thus strengthening the party in Congress. Personally, I would like to see the Republicans carry the House in 1952.

They cannot do so if the first consideration is to be eliminating Abraham Lincoln Republicans with whom I have always been identified. The race will be too close, and dissensions in the ranks just will not win an election.

The proposal to eliminate my district, while aimed strictly at me, would also seem to indicate a lack of respect for the Broome County Republican leadership, unless, of course, its ace courier of shady missions, Charley Kress, is now so powerful an influence, that his advice is being taken by the high command in Albany.

Be that as it may, the writer of a friendly letter to me from home states flatly, and I quote:

Billy Hill could put his foot down and stop the proposal, if he wanted to.

Knowing the prestige that our county Republican leader has with the powers, I agree with that observation.

In view of Mr. Hill's past campaigns against your Congressman, I realize an appeal to him on my part to prevail upon

Pfeiffer would be futile. However, I will try to have enough faith in his sense of decency and fair play to believe that he would protest the wanton elimination of Broome County as the sphere of influence of a new congressional district.

It takes a heap of political offal to quiver the stout nostrils or to violate the sensibilities of the Binghamton Press. But even they have not been able to tolerate such obvious and lewd display of tyranny on the part of those bent upon squeezing me out of Congress without due election by the people.

While they are rough on your Congressman, I would probably have died a thousand political deaths without their coverage of subjects they want to touch on regarding my career. Although they want to beat me, they are jealous of the mission they consider to be theirs and they do not want outside gaudiers invading our section to take credit.

In spite of the underground professionals who will stoop to any depth to accomplish the demise of the people's representative, I believe the consensus in Broome is best summed up in a recent editorial from the Binghamton Press as follows:

BEATING HALL BY SPLITTING OUR DISTRICT IS MUCH TOO DRASTIC REMEDY FOR US

Fantastic though they seem, these stories that the Thirty-seventh Congressional District is to be cut up like a paper doll in the approaching reapportionment of New York State continue to pop up with frequency.

The latest version of what Representative EDWIN A. HALL calls the great gerrymander of 1951 is the most ridiculous of all—the report that Broome County will be divided between the Twenty-ninth and Thirty-ninth Congressional Districts when New York's congressional map is redrawn.

As we said in December, when the proposal was first reported, the idea is so unfair to the populous Triple Cities area that it is hard to take seriously. Repetition of the reports in one form or another, however, is sufficient cause to voice the strong opposition to any plan which would bury the interests of the Triple Cities in another remote congressional district.

It would just not be possible for a representative whose home is in Bath or a representative who likes at Tuxedo Park in the Hudson River Valley to do justice to the industrial and agricultural interests of Broome County.

In Republican circles last week it was reported that the proposition to divide Broome County between the two congressional districts was based on a strong desire on the part of Congressmen from New York to retire Representative EDWIN A. HALL, of Binghamton. If this is the objective, we say the cure is much worse than the disease.

To dispose of him by reducing Broome County to an impotent attachment to one or more congressional districts is much too drastic a remedy for Mr. HALL.

The reapportionment job is to be done by a joint legislative committee headed by Senator Phiny W. Williamson, of Westchester County. Committee spokesmen scoff at the reports that Broome County will be cut in two or attached as the tail of some elongated district which has little in common with our interests.

We hope that the committee spokesmen are right, but we also are aware that responsible portions of the Broome County Republican organization give sufficient credence to the reports to be greatly disturbed by them.

As we said at the outset, the reports are so fantastic that it is hard to believe they are substantially true. Whatever may be the fact, it is the responsibility of all Triple

Cities groups to make plain to the Williamson committee the great damage any such carving job would do to this community.

Broome County has a population of close to 200,000. It should not be sandwiched in with a number of other counties in such a way that its influence could not be exercised effectively in the congressional district.

Civil Air Patrol Operation Bloodlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens are rendering outstanding volunteer service to the Nation's national defense effort. One of the most important of these has been inaugurated in the city of Washington by an organization already widely known for courageous service and close cooperation with the military. I refer to the Civil Air Patrol, and particularly in this instance to the National Capital Wing of the Civil Air Patrol, commanded by Col. Donald T. Webster. This organization composed of both men and women volunteers has inaugurated regularly scheduled blood delivery service by air to cities and military bases northeast and northwest of the Nation's Capitol.

In this unusual service, members of the organization furnish their own planes, with all others in the unit cooperating to coordinate the work of handling the blood on the ground and in the air. Quick deliveries by air greatly reduce the handling problem, and in addition, the service established creates an emergency service instantly available at any hour of the day or night. This unusual program already has won the commendation of the American Red Cross.

Under permission granted me by the House, I am including in the Record the official announcement of the newly established service, a letter of commendation from the American Red Cross, and a comprehensive news report of the first flights written by Peg Sonenfield, reporter for the Washington Post, and published in that newspaper Sunday, October 7.

I am sure all Members will be interested in this further evidence of the great value of the Civil Air Patrol and the indication of willingness and readiness to cooperate with every agency in meeting our present crisis.

The above-mentioned follows:

CIVIL AIR PATROL INAUGURATES FIRST SCHEDULED BLOOD DELIVERY SERVICE BY AIR IN THE UNITED STATES

The National Capital Wing of the Civil Air Patrol today inaugurated the first regularly scheduled blood delivery service by air in the United States with weekly flights from Washington, D. C., to cities and military bases northeast and northwest of the Nation's Capitol.

Col. Donald D. Webster, commanding officer, National Capital Wing, Civil Air Patrol, announced that scheduled flights would leave every Saturday morning for cities in the northeastern region from Washington, D. C., and would include blood deliveries to

the United States Army base at Fort Meade, Md.; Phillips Army Base, and Edgewood Arsenal, Aberdeen, Md., and the United States Navy Training Base at Bainbridge, Md. Colonel Webster added that weekly scheduled blood delivery flights into the northwestern area, also leaving from Washington every Saturday morning, will include Hagerstown, Md., and Martinsburg and Charlestown, W. Va.

The weekly blood delivery flights will be conducted under the direction of Lt. Col. Donald T. Speirs, operations officer of the National Capital Wing, Civil Air Patrol. Colonel Speirs stated that the blood-delivery flights will be flown by various types of light civil aircraft owned by Civil Air Patrol pilots. The Washington Regional Red Cross Blood Center will provide the blood supplies for the weekly scheduled flights.

Colonel Webster also disclosed that the National Capital Wing, CAP, expects to inaugurate similar blood deliveries by air in the near future from Washington, D. C., to cities in the southwestern area such as Front Royal, Harrisonburg, Culpeper, and Fredericksburg, Va., and to the United States Marine Air Station, Quantico, Va., and the United States Naval Air Test Center at Patuxent, Md.

Col. DONALD T. WEBSTER,
Capital Wing, CAP.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL WEBSTER. I am writing this letter after the first few weeks of cooperation between the Civil Air Patrol and the Washington Regional Blood Center of the American Red Cross. Your organization has already proved of inestimable value in helping us to get blood, in emergencies, to patients who have been in great need of it.

The missions your pilots have flown so far are as follows:

July 16: Four pints to Cambridge, Md.

July 20: Four pints to Roanoke, Va. for Abington, Va. Hospital. The Virginia State Police took the blood from Roanoke to Abington, as your pilot could not get there before dark.

July 25: 12 pints to Baltimore, Md., four for United States Marine Hospital and eight for Mt. Sinai Hospital.

July 28: 12 pints to Norfolk, Va., for the Tidewater Regional Blood Center.

As you probably know, I am discussing with Colonel Speirs the possibility of combining training flights on Saturdays and Sundays with our regular deliveries of blood to Hagerstown, Leesburg, Winchester, Charlestown, Aberdeen and Fort Meade. I believe a practicable plan will come out of these discussions.

Very truly yours,

WASHINGTON REGIONAL BLOOD CENTER,
KENNETH R. NELSON, M. D.,

Medical Director-Administrator.

By M. M. BAKER, Assistant Administrator.

[From the Washington Post of October 7, 1951]

CIVIL AIR PATROL OPERATION BLOODLIFT BEGINS DELIVERING PLASMA TO THREE CITIES BY AIRPLANE

(By Peg Sonenfield)

A dozen single-engine airplanes lined up single file at Hybla Valley Airfield yesterday, October 6, loaded 120 precious pints of blood aboard and took off over the white rail fences of Virginia on Operation Bloodlift.

The planes were manned by a dozen Civil Air Patrol pilots and inaugurated a regular blood delivery service to be flown weekly to replenish hospital blood supplies in Hagerstown, Md., and Martinsburg and Charlestown, W. Va.

It's a brand new idea—a sort of airborne pony express operated jointly by the Red Cross which supplies the blood and the Fairfax-Falls Church-Herndon Squadron of the

CAP, which undertakes its safe and quick delivery.

PREVIOUSLY USED CARS

Prior to yesterday's special delivery flight, the blood had been driven to hospitals in the three cities—a slow and cumbersome, nineteenth century delivery service.

The flight yesterday, led by Col. Donald Webster, commanding officer of the National Capital Wing of the CAP, split up shortly off the ground with three planes bound for Hagerstown and the other nine, clumped in a rainbow of colors against a misty blue sky, bound for Martinsburg.

In Hagerstown, a 25-minute flight over countryside barely touched by autumn, the planes were met by Miss Lucille Miller, Volunteer Red Cross Motor Corps driver, and Mrs. Nathan Raskin, chairman of the Red Cross blood program.

Forty-five pints of whole blood were transferred from planes to station wagon and the first batch of life-giving fluid began the last lap to Hagerstown hospitals.

In Martinsburg, 15 air minutes away, the operation was duplicated. Under the direction of Maj. Hunter T. Butts, group commander of group 4 of the West Virginia Wing, the insulated boxes of blood were transferred to waiting cars and another small batch was air expressed to Charles Town, 15 miles distant.

Yesterday's inaugural flight was a celebration and Malcolm Baker, assistant administrator of the Washington Regional Blood Center, and Mrs. Baker went along to watch from the cockpit of one of the dozen "freight" planes. Henceforth, however, the weekly delivery will be flown by CAP Sgt. E. E. Lyons, of Vienna, Va.

FIRST CALLED IN JULY

According to Col. Donald Speirs, who when not flying is an aeronautical engineer, the new delivery service idea has been simmering since early summer. In July the CAP was called on for emergency blood deliveries to outlying districts. The missions were completed successfully.

Shortly afterwards, Speirs says, a simulated air lift to fly blood plasma from Frederick, Md., to Washington was set up to test the efficiency and organization of the squadron. "We called in Mr. Barker to watch," Speirs says, "and in three hours time we flew 3,300 pints of simulated blood plasma in 34 planes."

Baker says he was impressed. Shortly afterwards Speirs was asked if the CAP could make blood transportation a regular operation.

For the past few weeks trial runs have been made and the Bethesda Squadron of the CAP has been flying blood from Fort Meade to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. Success of the venture is being watched by Red Cross and CAP officials, interested in the possibility of expanding the service to a nation-wide operation.

As Speirs says, "We're the pioneers."

Pioneers on the first flights included: Lyons, C. G. Cox, H. F. Jones, Rober Lyons, Garland Farris, J. C. Mayhew, R. M. Smith, Claude Davis, C. B. Boyd, Wallace Lewis, A. Eleanor Davis, Colonel Speirs, Ada Mitchell, and Colonel Webster.

An American Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Members of the Sen-

ate a statement entitled "An American Creed," which was prepared by a group of Sierra Madre, Calif., business and professional men who believe that a restatement of the moral principles of the men who founded the United States of America may well be of value to the people of this country in these times. I ask that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN CREED

I believe in the unlimited power of God and I believe that we, as members of the human race, have full access to that power.

I believe in the destiny of America as the hope of freedom for all mankind.

I believe in the sanctity of the individual.

I believe that my own courage is no less than that of the founding fathers of this Republic who, in signing the Declaration of Independence, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

I believe that it is my duty, as an American, to work, to fight, and to pray for the preservation of American ideals of freedom to the end that those privileges I enjoy because of the efforts of those who have gone before me, may be passed on, unblemished, to those who come after me.

I believe that it is my duty, as an American, to see to it that American Youth be well informed on American history in all its phases dating back to the settling of America by the early colonists, and I believe that it is my duty to see to it that American youth be given—in home and school—an abiding appreciation of those moral and spiritual values which have made America great.

I believe it to be my duty, as an American, to see to it that those who are elected or appointed to positions of public trust and responsibility, conduct themselves in all their dealings in a moral, spiritual, and ethical manner. Should I be asked to serve in such a capacity, I pledge myself in advance to conduct myself likewise.

I pledge myself, as an American, to raise my voice in support of these beliefs in all my individual and group associations, and to work with and cooperate with other Americans of like belief regardless of race, color, or religious affiliation.

When Is Congress Going To Act on the Bill To Remove Racial Discrimination From Our Immigration Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, do we really think the Japanese are going to fight valiantly on our side when our laws still officially insult them as inferior beings? All our millions of aid will be in vain until we correct this act of injustice.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a press release reporting the action on this question of the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan:

THE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE IN JAPAN,
Tokyo, September 12, 1951.

At the annual meeting held yesterday in Tokyo, the American Chamber of Commerce

in Japan unanimously approved a recommendation urging early congressional action toward authorizing Japanese immigration into the United States.

This action was taken upon a recommendation of Mr. Frank Ale, chairman of the chamber's liaison committee. The annual meeting closed the third year of this organization's activities and was attended by over 100 Americans engaged in business in Japan.

The American Chamber of Commerce is the first chamber of commerce to take steps urging Congress for early action upon such a bill. Three bills whereby Japanese immigrants would be permitted into the United States are understood to be currently pending in Congress. These bills were submitted by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, Nevada; Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota, and Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania.

One of the revised bills before Congress enables all far eastern peoples to become eligible for United States citizenship and their admission to the United States to be placed on a quota basis.

The American chamber's resolution to this effect has been sent to appropriate Senate and House committees. Japanese immigration into the United States was banned by Congress in 1924.

Youth Is Smarter Than Some Elders: Anti-Hall Propaganda Fails To Work on Bright Young Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed satisfying to discover that the savage opposition now stepping up their barbaric attacks upon your Congressman as the campaign approaches has not been able to propagandize the clear-thinking youth of the Triple Cities.

The writer of the letter below is a young lady of discernment, who is interested in her Government, interested in Americanism, and desirous of seeing your Congressman survive in the jungle of local communistic outrages upon his good name.

Some sophisticates, such as those who sneer at duly elected officials, say that our youth of today are not as responsible and not as keen as they were when they were young. After reading this letter, I am sure you will agree that our young people are far ahead of the usual run-of-the-mill-haters of your Congressman in Broome County.

I am proud to be the recipient of such a wonderful letter and I would make public the young lady's name but for the fact that she might immediately be made the target of the same ridicule and derogatory defaming that Triple Cities' parlor pinks and ravenous Reds hurl daily at me.

Her support is treasured by me and I feel certain the thousands of other young Americans in our section, who love our

great country, are likewise impervious to the gigantic propaganda campaign now being promoted against your Congressman preparatory to the 100-percent Communist assault upon EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in the 1952 Republican primary.

The letter reads as follows:

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I was so very glad to receive your letter today, asking my help in the coming election. I thought, by now, you would have forgotten me, the girl that wanted the information on the SPARS last year. Well, I am very glad that you didn't forget me and I am very anxious to help you.

Since I am only a high school student and 17 years of age, I can not vote for you but I can help in many other ways. I don't know if you are informed on this or not, but your answers to my previous letters caused a lot of talk in our high school. Remember, I told you that I was writing to you because of an English assignment which we were supposed to write to a famous person. Well, I had to hand my teacher a copy of the letter I wrote you and your answer.

My teacher was so thrilled and happy about your letters that she read them to all her students and all the other teachers. Soon it was all over school that I had political influence and some kids even said that I was planning to run for Congresswoman in the future.

There was an article in our school paper and my English class published a story and there was an article about our correspondence in there also.

Before I knew it, all the fellows and girls were coming to me with their troubles. They asked me to write you and ask to have some teachers resign and ask for a teen canteen for teen-agers in the Triple Cities. I almost died laughing when a fellow in my social studies class told me that his mother told him to ask me to write you about the margarine question and some other bills that she wanted passed.

This year I plan to do all I can to help you in your campaign. I'm sending my parents, relatives, friends' parents, neighbors and teachers to the polls.

I am taking public speaking now, in school, and plan to make one of my speeches a campaign speech in your behalf. Mr. HALL, you'd be surprised what I can accomplish by this. People can think whatever they want about high school students and teen-agers, in general, but they certainly have a great influence on their parents and their relatives, who are the voters.

The teen-agers of today will soon be the voters of tomorrow and I think they should be exposed to politics. They should have ideas of their own and have as much, or even more, interest in the Government as their parents.

The reason I am a supporter of yours, Mr. HALL, is because you try to do all you can for the common person. I've heard so many instances where you did something thoughtful and kind for a common, factory worker. Why, take my situation. I was just an average high school student, doing her English assignment, and you were so willing to help me. I never considered myself as anyone so important that such a busy man, such as yourself, should take the time to help.

All I can say, Mr. HALL, is please don't change and keep up your wonderful fight against communism. I could write another page and a half about the terrible thing communism is, but I'd probably bore you. I'd like you to know that I read all I can get hold of about you and your work in the newspapers, though.

I will say goodby and good luck in your coming election and close now.

Your teen-age supporter,

JERPY.

**Investigation of William M. Boyle, Jr.,
and Guy G. Gabrielson**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared concerning the investigation by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments into the activity of Mr. William M. Boyle, Jr., and Mr. Guy G. Gabrielson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There has been an understandable amount of confusion, contradiction, charges, and counter-charges growing out of the investigation into the activities of Mr. Boyle and Gabrielson. The committee report will attempt to resolve some of these conflicts and to appraise the entire record. However, on the basis of their own testimony, both Mr. Boyle and Mr. Gabrielson should resign their positions as chairmen of the Democratic and Republican National Committees.

The basic issue is whether a high official of the national committee of either major political party should be in a position where he can profit financially from the influence which he may be able to exert with Government agencies. And as President Truman has indicated, in judging the propriety of such conduct it makes no difference whether the official is paid or unpaid by the party for his work.

In the case of Mr. Boyle, there has been a tendency to emphasize unduly the controversy which has developed over whether he received \$8,000 or \$1,250 from the American Lithofold Corp. The following facts in the record are uncontroverted:

While Mr. Boyle did not become a paid party official until April 1949 he served as acting chairman of the party from approximately February 15 until the time he went on salary in April. During this period, he admits that he received a total of \$1,250 in fees from the American Lithofold Corp. The only work he did for his client during that period was to make an appointment on February 28, 1949, for company officials to see Chairman Hise of the RFC. Three days after this appointment was arranged, a loan was granted to the company, a loan which up to that time Mr. Boyle intervened had been turned down by every examiner in the RFC to whom the case had been referred, by the agency review board, and by the board of directors.

Mr. Boyle says that in making the appointment he was only doing what he would do for any person who came to Washington and asked the national committee for assistance in obtaining a hearing of its case. He says that he sees no difference in the fact that the appointment in this instance was made for a client. The answer is that when the national chairman of the party in power intervenes in behalf of a client, such action—having in mind the fact that he has the power of recommending appointments and promotions in the Government service—is influence in itself regardless of whether he goes further and advocates the merits of the case.

In any event the record is that Mr. Boyle did arrange an appointment at the RFC for

his client, that his client got its loan, and that Mr. Boyle got \$1,250 in fees—all while he was acting chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Since becoming paid chairman of the party, Mr. Boyle makes much of the claim that he has severed his connection with his law firm but the facts are undisputed that he has profited to the extent of approximately \$100,000 from what he says was a sale of his law practice since he became paid chairman, that a great proportion of this amount was directly attributable to \$158,000 of legal business which came into his office while he was acting chairman without pay between February 15 and April 30 and that the law business which he says he sold to Mr. Slakind involved almost without exception clients who were engaged in actions with Government agencies. While Mr. Boyle and Mr. Slakind both have denied that Mr. Boyle has attempted to influence the outcome of any of these cases since Mr. Boyle became paid chairman, it is now well known that he has a financial interest in these cases and no one can be so naive as to believe that that fact could potentially have no effect in influencing the action of the Government agencies involved.

Finally in Mr. Boyle's case it is necessary to consider the facts just brought to light this week that during the past 4 years he has paid over \$11,000 in fees and expenses to a \$10,000 a year RFC employee and that during the year 1949 he continued this relationship while he was serving as paid National chairman for the Democratic Party. Again taking at face value Mr. Boyle's and Mr. Gratz' explanation that Mr. Gratz was rendering bookkeeping services and advising Mr. Boyle on financial matters and that none of the work was done on Government time, the fact that Mr. Gratz was known at the RFC to be on Boyle's payroll indicates the possibility of influence and regardless of the nature of the employment it would seem highly improper for the chairman of either national committee to have on his payroll for any purpose a full-time employee of a Government agency.

The Gabrielson case differs in many respects from the Boyle case but the same conclusion must eventually be reached. Mr. Gabrielson was unpaid at all times in his position as chairman of the Republican National Committee. The only client he represented before the RFC was the Carthage Hydrocol Co. of which he was president and general counsel. The loan for the company was granted long before he became chairman of the national committee. The only major action he sought in behalf of the company after he became chairman was rejected by the RFC. As far as the record is concerned there is no evidence of improper influence in behalf of his client by Mr. Gabrielson during the time that he has been chairman of the Republican National Committee.

On the other hand, Mr. Gabrielson's statement to the effect that he has no influence cannot be accepted. While it is true that the Republican national chairman has less influence than the Democratic national chairman, it must be remembered that he has the power of criticism and the potential power of recommending appointments and promotions. In other words, the opportunity for influence exists and where the opportunity for influence exists charges of impropriety are bound to follow.

Mr. Gabrielson owes a duty to his company if he continues to represent them to advocate their position as vigorously as he can. If he fails to attempt to influence the RFC to make decisions favorable to his clients, he will not be doing his duty by his clients. If he does attempt to influence the RFC in behalf of his client, he will subject himself to criticism because of his position in his party. To put it bluntly, Mr. Gabrielson is not in a position to do an adequate job

both for the company he represents and his party.

The fault does not lie with Mr. Gabrielson—the predicament he finds himself in is due to the action of the national committee which elected him with knowledge that he would have to deal with the Government in his capacity as president of his company.

The chairman of the minority party has a duty to expose and to criticize improper conduct on the part of the administration in power. Regardless of the merits of Mr. Gabrielson's position and regardless of how many times he reiterates his innocence of any wrongdoing, his effectiveness as chairman of the minority party has been irreparably damaged because the charges against him will constantly be used to camouflage and confuse the issue and to protect those who are really guilty of corruption in high places in the Government.

I see no evidence of illegality or moral turpitude in the actions of either Mr. Boyle or Mr. Gabrielson insofar as the facts developed to date in the investigation are concerned. But the Nation has been shocked by the evidence of widespread corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau, the RFC, and other agencies of the Government. The paramount need in the country today is to restore public confidence in the integrity of our national leaders and Government officials. The resignations of Mr. Boyle and Mr. Gabrielson will serve to aid in attaining this objective. The top officials of both major parties should set an example of propriety and ethics which goes beyond the strict legal minimum required by the law.

In replacing Mr. Gabrielson and Mr. Boyle both parties should select as their chairmen men who are in a position to profit neither directly nor indirectly from any dealings with the Federal Government.

Is There Need for a Southern Democrat-Northern Republican Political Alliance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, so many Members of Congress have made inquiries about the recent developments leading to the creation of a Committee To Explore Political Realignment and the basis upon which this committee is studying the causes and cures for present trends toward socialism in America that I am asking consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a short summary of some of the background data which lead to the decision to devote continued effort and study to the proposal. The information in the summary outlines the reasons for this approach to an analysis of our political and economic problems, and it indicates how interested citizens can get in touch with the committee of distinguished and informed Americans who have undertaken to explore areas of political activity and cooperation which are beyond the immediate concern of either of America's two major political parties.

Many Americans are beginning to realize that our traditional two-party system, which means so much to the continuance of our free way of life, is in

danger. We are approaching a situation—if we have not already reached it—in which we are operating with a two-party system in name and a four-party system in function.

This grows out of the fact that differences between segments within each of our two major political parties are actually often greater than the differences between the two major parties themselves. It also reflects itself in a similarity of stated platform purposes in the planks of national party platforms—"me-toolism"—and subsequent repudiation of these planks and purposes by many, perhaps a majority, of the Members of Congress to whom most of them are directed. As a consequence of the lack of realism which is thus manifesting itself in present political groupings, which appear to be based much more upon geographical, traditional, or historical factors than upon a grouping around basic economic, social, and political concepts—Mr. and Mrs. John America, the voters to whom the country belongs and who are supposed to direct its destiny, find themselves confused, frustrated, and disillusioned when they have their opportunity one Tuesday in 4 years to vote for or against a candidate for President and a set of policies to be followed for the next 4 years.

In 1948, over 40,000,000 Americans stayed away from the polls and refused to vote in a national referendum in which they were given no clear-cut choice between platform promises and between the pronouncements of the Presidential candidates. Either way, the voters figured, they would get about the same foreign policy, about the same trends toward more boards, bureaus, and coercive commissions in Washington, about the same shirking away from a bold return to the concepts of home rule, private enterprise, individual initiative, and the reward-of-merit opportunity system which has made America American.

In a great speech which has been widely quoted and frequently reread, Donald R. Richberg, of Charlottesville, Va., once executive director of the NRA and now a member of the law faculty at the University of Virginia, highlighted the foregoing and many other facets of the political phenomena which today in America keep like-minded Americans from voting for the same candidate for President, and in support of the common ideals and objectives which they share and hold. Speaking on September 11 before a New Haven, Conn., audience comprised in large part of the members of the industrial and business fraternity of Connecticut, Donald Richberg took as his theme *The Murder of a Candidate*—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, 1951, page A5605—and warned America how our entire way of life was in dire danger because of the political unrealities and shackles involved in the present picture. Richberg is a prominent member of the executive committee of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment and his address at Yale merits careful study by all citizens desiring to do something more effective toward stopping our drift toward

socialism than merely to curse their misfortune or to cry out in futile consternation at the future they confront.

On September 14, 15, and 16, a 3-day conference was held in the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington to determine whether like-minded voters whose party registrations differed but whose affinity to principle was identical could work, plan, and vote together. The question considered at this conference, which was attended by about 100 important Americans about equally divided between southern Democrats and northern Republicans, was this direct and simple one: Is it desirable and can a way be found for Americans who think alike to have a method for voting alike effectively regardless of how they are registered politically and of where they live geographically?

The 3-day conference answered the first part of that question decisively and affirmatively. Unanimously it was agreed that it is desirable. The creation of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment was the result of the determination of the conference to find an equally decisive answer to the question, "Can a way be found?"

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a digest of an address which I delivered at the closing banquet of the conference which organized and set in motion the Committee to Explore Political Realignment. I hope serious students of what is being undertaken by this committee will read Donald Richberg's speech entitled "The Murder of a Candidate," but the background data and information set out in my digest may be helpful in suggesting some of the causes and some of the cures for the present dangers as they are developing in America with steadily increasing speed and potency. This digest also helps to clear up any misunderstanding about what the new committee proposes to do or not to do.

Most emphatically, it is not the plan of the committee to organize or promote or propose a third party in America; rather, it represents a determination to strengthen our two-party system by giving new strength and significance to each of two major party groupings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD NEED FOR A SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC-NORTHERN REPUBLICAN ALLIANCE IN 1952 BE EXPLORED?

Several times in our earlier American history, we have had a realignment of our political parties and a regrouping of American voters around the most urgent and significant issues of the era. Each time this has occurred, it has provided a good tonic for our country, our people have forged ahead to new levels of economic opportunity and individual freedom.

There are many in America who think that political and economic trends over the past 15 years and the current basic issues confronting our voters today indicate that need for another regrouping of political adherence. It has been suggested that for the election of 1952, at least, steps be taken in that direction by exploring the possibilities, the potentialities, and the practical procedures involved in developing a workable political formula which would enable Americans who think alike to vote alike for

President and Vice President in the next election.

Prior to 1936, the so-called two-thirds rule operating in the convention of the National Democratic Party gave the 11 traditionally Democratic States of the South a near veto in the nomination of party candidates and, as a consequence, in the formation of dominant party policies. At the 1936 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, however, that two-thirds rule was abrogated. The results of the elimination of the two-thirds rule have been significant and prophetic in both the Democratic and the Republican Party positions on the new issues that have arisen in our country. In the Democratic Party, elimination of the two-thirds rule has shifted the balance of power away from the States of the traditionally Democratic South to the States of the North which, whether or not they vote Democratic in November, have power enough and votes enough in the convention to enable the large city delegations which predominate in those States to write the platform and nominate the Democratic candidates.

In each successive Democratic convention since 1936, the southern delegates have consequently played a smaller and smaller role in determining convention decisions. As a result, the traditional allegiance of the Democratic Party to States' rights has been abandoned. Platforms have been written containing planks repugnant to the people of the South. Candidates are chosen who ignore or openly defy the opinions of southern voters. No effort is made to meet the wishes of southern citizens. Convention speakers actually castigate and criticize southern voters and viewpoints as "reactionary"—or even worse.

After the convention, the major candidates do not campaign in the South, relying upon the conviction that "the South is in the bag"—"it will vote Democratic regardless"—there is no other place for the South to go. In recent campaigns, except for four States in 1948, that attitude has paid off in votes for the fair deal high command. The Democratic machine has won—even though the objectives and principles of a large majority of southern citizens have lost.

As a consequence, each succeeding Democratic convention courts the North and evidences contempt for the South more and more openly and flagrantly. The result has been a steady shifting to the left—toward the concept of completely centralized Government in Washington—toward an American brand of socialism—toward the death of all the rights of all the States. Put in its bluntest terms, many northern Democratic voters are vehemently and vigorously anti-southern.

How did the abrogation of the two-thirds rule in the Democratic convention of 1936 affect the Republican Party and its attitude? Viewing the statistics of their humiliating defeat in 1936, as Republicans met in convention in 1940, party leaders realized that the new political alliance of the big city Democratic machines of the North who play politics for profit and the left-wing pressure groups who play politics for power with the unhappy but traditionally and habitually Democratic voters of Dixie had evolved a vote-getting if not a public-serving formula which could control the country. Recognizing the great obstacles involved and the inevitable delays in building a Republican-winning party in the South, the Republican convention in 1940 started turning its eyes to what appeared to be the only available votes with which to win a national campaign. Consequently, "me-toolism" in Republican circles was actually born at the Democratic National Convention of 1936 and the successful Democratic campaign which followed. In 1940, the Republican platform and the Republican Presidential candidate moved in the direction of what the New

Dealers (Democrats) were offering to present voters True, the Republican strategy of "me-tooism" failed—but it gained votes over the disastrous results of 1936. In 1944, and again in 1948, Republicans felt compelled to move even further in the direction of offering a platform and a campaign designed to appeal to northern voters of our metropolitan cities and the organized pressure groups to whom it had been demonstrated the new strategy of the New Dealers (since 1936) was so successfully appealing in each succeeding campaign. Believing itself to be unable to garner sufficient votes to win in the South, the Republican Party began offering almost identical appeals to the same group of voters that the Democrats had wooed and won in the North—especially in our industrial States with the largest metropolitan cities. In 1948, more than half of our American voters stayed home from the polls because they felt themselves deprived of a clear-cut choice of issues and objectives in that political campaign.

Thus, American political history has witnessed some striking and basic changes since 1936. Tragically, organized political and pressure groups in some 11 vast metropolitan cities of the North have thus come to have the balance of power in political campaigns and are largely calling the tune to which Presidential candidates of both parties are compelled to dance. The results are today clearly apparent in the trends of our national policies which are veering away from basic American concepts of limited government, individual freedoms, and States' rights toward various shades and degrees of some type of European socialism and centralized power.

Only an informal, unorganized, intermittent alliance comprised in the main of southern Democrats and northern Republicans in Congress has prevented these trends from becoming even more destructive and disastrous. In each Congress since 1936, this congressional alliance between North and South has operated with increasing effectiveness and frequency but it—alone—has been unable to stop the continuing extravagances in both fiscal and political policies. Trying to direct the destiny and direction of Government from the congressional level against the resistance and over the objections of a determined President is like trying to operate a railroad train from the caboose.

If more is to be done than to apply the brakes, slow down the trends, and bring about minor economies in Government, it is necessary to elect an engineer to man the White House locomotive who agrees in principle with the trainmen in the caboose. Election of such an engineer is what is made exceedingly difficult by our prevailing unrealistic, unrepresentative political party groupings in which geography, tradition, and comparatively meaningless political labels combine to defeat that objective.

The importance of allying like-minded voters in America by some political formula enabling them to give effective expression to what is the major viewpoint of our citizens is highlighted by the tragic experience of Great Britain from which intelligent Americans should draw a realistic lesson.

Great Britain is now in the throes of socialism precisely because in that country the opposition to socialism is divided into two political groupings by unrealistic devices just as today is the case in the United States. Both the Conservative and the Liberal Parties of Great Britain oppose socialism. This is evidenced by the fact that all Members of the House of Commons from both of these parties voted against the nationalization of steel which is a step that breaks the back of private enterprise and individual ownership wherever it occurs. The Socialists had a bare majority in the House of Commons which enabled them to

put through that nationalization of steel by a narrow but effective margin. However (and this is the important point) had there been no Liberal Party candidates for the House of Commons in the last election and had the voters thus had to decide definitely between Conservative or Socialist (Labor) candidates, it is a reasonable assumption that the vast majority voting Liberal Party (against socialism) would have voted Conservative Party (also against socialism). Had this occurred in the large number of British constituencies in which all three parties had candidates in the field and in which Socialist candidates consequently won, there would now be a majority of 29 Conservative Party members in the House of Commons. In that event, steel would never have been nationalized in Britain and the Socialist scourge would have been ended in that country in the last election.

The British experience is almost an exact parallel of what is happening in America. It is a stern warning to us all as to what may happen and as to what seems likely to happen unless we find a way so that those who think alike can vote alike for President here in the United States.

If nothing is done to change the political thinking and performance of leaders in the ranks of our two major political parties, it is now entirely probable that again in 1952 we will find neither political platform providing American voters with a consistent pattern of opposition to totally centralized government, current trends toward socialism, bureaucratic extravagance, and that neither political party will raise the standard of States' rights which of and in itself has done so much to prevent the total centralization of power in Washington which is an essential prelude for any form of totalitarianism.

How then is it possible to regroup political strength in the United States to give those who oppose the welfare state here the maximum opportunity for success and to preserve our 2-party system as an effective device for registering realistic political convictions?

At the start it should be noted that there are various approaches, methods, and degrees of change and modifications in established procedure which might be employed in the next election. The merits and demerits as well as the practical application of these various methods should be carefully surveyed. At this time, no single source has available sufficient factual data to suggest the adoption of any one specific form of procedure. There is, however, the maximum method and the minimum method (and several methods in between) for approaching an effective combination of like-minded voters in determining the decision this country confronts in 1952.

The maximum method would be to have the southern Democrats and northern Republicans, who have been cooperating in Congress, evolve from their informal alliance a formal, continuing, and cohesive organization. This would mean a courageous reorganization of both Houses of Congress before next year's political conventions. It would mean that these like-minded legislators (representing in large part Democrats of 11 Southern States and Republicans of Northern States) would elect leaders of both Houses, select committee chairmen, and form themselves under some such name as the southern Democrat-Republican alliance to designate the group. If this were done, some southern Democrats and some northern Republicans might prefer to move out of such a regional regrouping of congressional legislators as here suggested and find their place among the Members of the loyal opposition. Once such adjustments were made, however, this southern Democrat-Republican alliance could then call upon the country to elect a President and Vice President whose

position on political and economic issues would be in harmony with it, and those preferring to support the doctrines of the Fair Dealers and left wingers would be forced to hold a convention to nominate an opposition ticket whose standard bearers would share platform convictions with those who would then be in a cohesive minority in both Houses of Congress.

Such action in Congress might well require more political courage and risk than it is realistic to suppose will be demonstrated, but it is one direct and clear-cut method for making the election of 1952 a definite choice between two clearly conflicting philosophies of government. From such action could come a permanent, political realignment in America which would give every voter in his own precinct a clear-cut choice between philosophies of government and which would give the members of each party a cohesive quality which now is sadly lacking. Such a regrouping of American sentiment into homogeneous, realistic, operating party units would provide America with an effective and responsible two-party system with sufficient room between the positions of the opposing parties to attract a substantial group of independent voters whose allegiance would intelligently be sought in each election by each major party as then constituted.

It is extremely unlikely, however, that this maximum method will be employed by Congress under prevailing circumstances. Before Congress would break with tradition and with existing majority and minority alignments, it would probably require one or more of the following eventualities: (1) The emergency of a vital, urgent issue virtually requiring a permanent rather than a temporary alliance of cross-party members to resolve the issue; or (2) a great ground swell of grass-roots sentiment reflecting itself clearly in Washington as an indication that the home folks behind both parties to such an alliance were insisting upon it; or (3) the impetus of many resolutions and expressions by groups of citizens, associations, organizations, and possibly even official urging by conferences of governors or other elected public officials. Hence, it seems probable that if the North-South political alliance is to operate effectively for the 1952 election one or more of the minimum methods will be employed.

The minimum method, which would at this time seem to be more realistic and probable than the maximum method, would involve only comparatively safe steps to be taken by delegates at both of the major political conventions.

For example, Republicans at their convention would: (1) Adopt a platform consistently and clearly opposing further centralization of power in Washington and dedicating the party to a rational and realistic implementation of the great American doctrine of States' rights and limited government; (2) faithfully pledge themselves to meet the so-called civil-rights issue within the purview of the doctrine of States' rights by encouraging an improved economic status and equality of opportunity for minority groups through utilizing State governments and State-appointed boards and commissions to implement and enforce constructive State laws and regulations; (3) nominate a President and a Vice President willing to fight a hard-hitting, honest campaign on basic American doctrines and who are personally popular and acceptable to the voters of the South.

Southern Democrats at their national convention should: (1) Seek the restoration of the two-thirds rule; (2) endeavor to have the convention pledge itself to the rational and realistic application of the doctrine of States' rights; (3) induce the convention to avoid committing itself to a compulsory national FEPC and other coercive and authoritarian

steps in the field of civil rights and economic endeavor; (4) nominate candidates who will faithfully pledge themselves to stand on such a platform and to conform with it when elected.

Should both conventions write such platforms and nominate such candidates, the trend toward national socialism would be stopped regardless of which party won the election because collectivism cannot engulf this country if States and individuals are permitted to exercise their independent judgment on political, economic, and social issues.

Should the Republican Convention write such a platform and nominate such candidates and the Democratic National Convention, because of domination by big city, northern Fair Dealers, write a Fair Deal pro-Socialist platform and nominate Harry Truman or somebody to the left of him, southern delegates and other States' rights minded delegates might walk out of that convention and thus set the stage for other steps and activities leading to the formation of an effective southern Democrat-northern Republican pattern of cooperation in 1952 either in the November election at the electoral college level, or in the determination of the presidential contest in the House of Representatives should that be necessary.

What are some of the steps and tactics that might be employed in such an eventuality to bring the effective voting strength of like-minded Americans together (regardless of geographic location or political preference) at either the electoral college level or at the level of the House of Representatives should the election be decided there?

Some steps and methods for evolving such a pattern of effective cooperation on a working alliance for 1952, include the following:

1 Preconvention conferences between leading southern Democrats and northern Republicans might determine in advance of the conventions that the Fair Deal crowd and Trumanism will again (for the fifth time) control the Democratic National Convention. By that time, it might be clearly indicated that the Democratic National Convention moved by the compulsion of pressure groups and big city machines is certain to offer America a platform and a slate of candidates dedicated to the superstate, an American version of Fabian socialism, and the complete destruction of the rights of States and perhaps of private enterprise and our established financial structure. In that event, Republicans might well consider nominating as a vice presidential candidate a Jeffersonian Democrat, selected through consultations with southern leaders to run with a Republican candidate for President who is personally acceptable to Dixie and who will run on a platform adopted by the Republican convention which is consistent with the viewpoint of sturdy Americans in both South and North who believe in the rights of States, the rights of individuals, and the American concept of limited government; or

2 Following nomination by the Republican convention of Republican candidates for President and Vice President who on their records and by their personalities and convictions are acceptable to the South, these candidates might early in the campaign pledge themselves to select three or four prominent, capable, and popular southern Democrats for some of the more important Cabinet positions. In that way, the electorate, both North and South, would be offered an all-American team selected from both sectional majorities as a choice against the Fair Deal team now in control or seeking election on the so-called Democratic ticket. In that way, too, the identity of the membership of both teams would be in large part known to the electors so their choice in November could be based on complete information and a clear-cut idea of what to expect from each team; or

3. Either separate State Democratic conventions or an all-South Democratic convention could be held in Dixie after the frustrations and disappointments at the National Democratic Convention. Out of such activities could come southern Democratic candidates to run on the ballots of Southern States under the Democratic banner, or, as an alternative, a series of favorite-son candidates each of whom would appear as the Democratic candidate for President on the ballots of his particular State. Either technique would subtract from the Truman ticket substantially more electoral votes that the States' rights movement received in its surprisingly successful effort in 1948 which demonstrated to America that there is a limit to the insolence, derision, and abuse that the voters of the South will countenance and accept from the leadership of the National Democratic Party. This method could easily give the southern electors an effective balance of power at the electoral college level or in the House of Representatives—wherever the election is decided, if the northern Republicans won a minimum of 138 votes of the 403 outside the South, an achievement they have not made alone since 1928. It could very probably result in either a Republican or a southern Democrat ending up as President—possibly with a President from one party and a Vice President from the other. It seems clear that electors who are pledged to oppose Trumanism but who are unattached to either major candidate would determine the final choice for President unless without the votes of the South to help bolster the forces of Truman, the Republican candidate should win in the November voting. Some people have referred to southern electors selected by either of the foregoing methods as free electors. Certainly they could contribute historically to a free America; or

4 Southern Democratic convention action—by individual State parties or an all-Dixie convention—could select Democratic electors running in the Democratic column with the regularly nominated Democratic candidates for State and local office, but pledged openly to support the Republican nominees for President and Vice President. This would add southern voters to the ticket opposing Trumanism rather than simply subtracting southern votes from the Truman ticket. Either course or some modification of suggestion 3 or 4 would give individual voters in the South a clear-cut choice in November between candidates favoring States' rights or candidates favoring the police-state concept included in the welfare state.

Other suggested courses of action are open to southern Democrats and northern Republicans sincerely eager to mark 1952 as the end of our trends toward total centralized political power and economic socialism. All of them recognize that to make such an effort of "allied political forces" successful in 1952 both parties to the alliance (North and South) must be treated as equal partners. Seniority status in Congress, patronage considerations, et cetera, for participating southern Senators and Congressmen must be respected and protected. The goal of such a regrouping and realignment of voting forces in 1952 is to make neither the southern Democratic Party nor the Republican Party the sole beneficiary of ensuing victory. The real beneficiary must be America, and those Americans who want to reinstate and reinforce our American success formula of individual initiative, private ownership, free enterprise, and the safeguarding of the rights of States and the rights of individuals. This is the essence of personal liberty, the operation of which has made our country great and kept it strong; this is also the essence of the great American concept of limited government in contrast with the European concept of limited freedom for the individual as per-

mitted by an all-powerful central government.

To this end, a Committee To Explore Political Realignment might well be created from among representative and respected southerners and northerners, equally included, so that the full possibilities and potentialities of various courses of action might be studied and appraised and so that a single course of action could be recommended if the committee's research develops a formula which promises success.

It might be possible for a Jeffersonian Democrat or a Republican advocate of the limited Government concept to win a Presidential election under existing unrealistic political groupings even though they virtually confine Republican vote-getting opportunities to 36 of the 48 States, and at the same time virtually deny Constitution-minded Democrats of the South any effective voice in either the National Democratic Convention or the November election. However, to maintain in power a national administration dedicated to American concepts of limited Federal Government, private ownership, individual liberties, and solvent fiscal policies, it is highly desirable, perhaps necessary, to find a method for offsetting and defeating the existing alliance by which pressure groups and northern Democratic city machines utilize the voting strength of Southern States in the electoral college to support policies antagonistic to the American pattern of economic and political behavior. Exploration of all practical procedures by which southern voters who support our constitutional concepts can use their votes to reinforce those precepts rather than to reject them would, therefore, seem to be in the public interest.

Few should disagree with the objective of evolving political procedures whereby the same political and economic concepts can be represented both in the Congress and in the White House and its associated departments of government. It has been many years since this situation has prevailed in Washington. Only as this situation is recreated and implemented can an effective two-party system bring to this country the great advantages and dividends which are inherent in our cherished two-party political system.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, neither the Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] nor I myself is a member of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment, although both of us attended the Mayflower conference in mid-September and although both of us for many months have been conferring with people from throughout America who are earnestly searching for an effective formula by which to provide every American voter with a clear-cut choice and an effective ballot in 1952. We declined membership on the committee roster in the conviction that nobody presently active in the political life of our country as an officeholder of important public trust should attempt to influence the decisions and deliberations of the committee. The committee's exploratory activities must not and will not be in support of any specific candidate, either Republican or Democrat. The committee is equally divided between Democrats and Republicans—it is truly a bipartisan, objective, determined public-serving effort to study, analyze, and report on the political practices of our times and to recommend to the country in due course the steps it believes Americans can take between now and that important Tuesday in 1952 when the whole destiny of human liberty may well be determined by

what happens at the polling places of America.

For the information of all interested Americans, however, who may want to correspond with the committee members or its staff, or who may want to have a part in the great task of constructive service it has undertaken, I submit a statement of facts which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Officers of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment:

Co-chairmen: Albert W. Hawkes, Montclair, N. J. (Republican), and Edward A. O'Neal, Florence, Ala. (Democrat). (Mr. Hawkes is a former Senator from New Jersey, a former national president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Mr. O'Neal was for 16 years the national head of the American Farm Bureau.)

Executive secretary: Joe T. Lovett, Columbus, Ohio, past State commander of the Kentucky Department of the American Legion.

National treasurer: John W. Finger, 960 Park Avenue, New York City, recent past president-general of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Members of the executive committee: Albert W. Hawkes, chairman, Montclair, N. J.; Edward A. O'Neal, Florence, Ala.; Edward R. Burke, former Senator from Nebraska; Donald J. Cowling, former president, Carleton College; Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey; Horace A. Hildreth, President, Bucknell College, ex-governor of Maine; Felix Morley, author and educator; Donald R. Richberg, University of Virginia Law College.

Headquarters of the committee is in Washington, D. C. Address: Suite 302, The Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Telephone: RE 7068.

A long time ago Mr. Justice Chase put it well when he defined the United States as "An indestructible Union of indestructible States." It is the hope of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment that it may make a constructive contribution to the indestructibility of a free America and of the home rule authorities and rights of each of its States and all of its citizens. The committee seeks support and counsel as it forges forward toward that goal.

The Charter of the United Nations the Supreme Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is detained from the Senate by the illness of his wife, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Wake Up, America," by Fred Brenckman.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

(By Fred Brenckman)

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, one of the most level-headed men in the House, asks the question, Is the Char-

ter of the United Nations the supreme law of the land?

Specifically, what Mr. BURDICK has in mind is a decision of the Appellate Court of California, handed down a year ago, in which the court held that California's alien land law was null and void because it came in conflict with certain provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Reference was made to this case in an editorial contained in Pennsylvania Grange News several months ago.

It has been held that the fourteen most ominous words of legal meaning uttered in our time were contained in the decision of the court in this case when it unanimously declared: "The Charter of the United Nations has become the supreme law of the land."

HOW THE CASE ORIGINATED

A Japanese person, insisting on his right as an Asiatic to own land in California, had appealed from the State law to international treaty law and was upheld by the court. In justification of its action, the court cited article VI of the Constitution, which reads:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges of every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Commenting on this provision, Congressman BURDICK makes a strong case when he declares:

"This provision of the Constitution never contemplated that in approving a treaty and recognizing it as the supreme law of the land, that any such treaty would go beyond the affairs between nations. It was never contemplated that any such treaty could reach down and control the affairs of States within the United States. That was never the intention of the framers of the Constitution, as the debates in the constitutional convention clearly indicate."

Continuing, Mr. BURDICK rightly asserts:

"All the State's rights we have ever known, North, East, South, and West, can be set aside and annulled by merely having the United Nations pass what they call a convention, and, when approved by the Senate, such law becomes the supreme law of the land."

Under the Bill of Rights, which is contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the people are guaranteed, among other rights and immunities, freedom of speech, the right of public assembly, and freedom of worship. Congress is forbidden to pass any laws about them at all. But how these cherished freedoms might be diluted and frittered away is indicated by the International Covenant of Human Rights, which President Truman has asked the Senate to approve. The Covenant says:

THE LANGUAGE OF DICTATORS

"Freedom to manifest one's religious belief shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary."

The Covenant says:

"Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression . . . subject to certain penalties and liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be only such as are provided by law and are necessary."

The proposed Covenant further says:

"The right to peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with law and which are necessary."

That was probably about as far as it was possible to get countries like Russia and her satellites to go in framing a bill of rights, which, of course, amounts to nothing at all.

If the Senate should ratify the International Covenant on Human Rights, would the

language above quoted supersede the provisions of our own Bill of Rights, which is a part of the Constitution? If so, would not some of the most sacred rights of the American people become a mere sham and a mockery?

These are questions which the American people have a right to ask before the Senate ratifies any more treaties which the courts may construe as having changed or modified the Constitution. In our laudable eagerness to share the blessings of liberty with the peoples of other lands, we must make sure that we do not lose our own freedom.

WRITING A NEW CONSTITUTION

A former president of the American Bar Association declares that lawmaking by treaty amounts to a blank check for writing a new Constitution. His views on this question were set forth in an article appearing in the official publication of the association for September 1950.

The American Bar Association has appointed a commission to consider an amendment to the Constitution to forbid the invasion of domestic laws by treaty unless specifically authorized by Congress, and to forbid Congress to ratify treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution.

While such an amendment might do good, the fact remains that it would not be necessary if the State Department would use a little common sense and refrain from entering into any treaties that plainly violate the provisions of the Constitution, and if the Senate would refuse to ratify any such treaties into which the State Department might blunder.

Congressman BURDICK is on the right track in the stand he has taken on this subject. He deserves the united support of the American people in his effort to preserve the integrity of our fundamental law.

Loyalty Investigations by Civil Service Commission in Lieu of Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of turning over the function of routine loyalty clearances from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the United States Civil Service Commission, so that the FBI can carry on its more vital roles. I ask unanimous consent that its text and appended letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON BEHALF OF
BILL S. 2077

Every patriotic American is interested in the continued success and effectiveness of the great Federal Bureau of Investigation. Why? Clearly because upon this Bureau's success depends in considerable part the national security of our country in this time of grave international peril.

It is for this reason that many of us in the Senate and House have sought to relieve the FBI of routine loyalty clearances which we felt to be an important but secondary function as compared with the basic anti-espionage, antisabotage, antisubversive re-

sponsibilities of this famed agency. There is, fortunately, legislation pending right now before the Senate and House Civil Service Committees which would enable the FBI to continue to do its main jobs and to continue to do that job superlatively as it has always done in the past.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE ACTION SOON

The sands are running out in this first session of the Eighty-second Congress. It is my earnest hope that before we wind up our affairs, this legislation to relieve the FBI of these routine clearances, can be passed by both Chambers and sent to the President.

Let me say by way of background that I, for one, had hoped that in connection with the mutual aid program (on which conference committee I served), we might have retained the Senate provision turning over that clearance function to the Civil Service Commission. That would have covered the agencies in that bill like the point 4 set-up. However, the final version of the bill, H. R. 5113, unfortunately knocked out that Senate provision.

Now, over-all legislation like S. 2077 provides for an orderly and systematic turn-over of the over-all FBI clearance duties to the Civil Service Commission. S. 2077 lists a long series of agencies whose employees would thereafter be cleared by the Commission.

As an elaboration of this view, following this statement there is the text of a letter which I wrote last week to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. In this letter, I reiterate the unanimous views within the executive branch and the strong views of many members in the legislative branch necessary for this delegation of authority.

The great chief of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has respectfully asked for this legislation, the executive agencies have asked for it; many of us in Congress ask for it. We hope that it can be accomplished.

FBI'S GREAT SUCCESS MAKES IT NO. 1 IN CONGRESS' ESTEEM

It is a fact that so high is the Bureau's prestige that Congress is reluctant to turn over its duties to any other agency. Here is an instance therefore where the sheer success of an agency—the FBI—has elevated it so high in the Congress' esteem that this very success is almost a handicap to its concentration on its main functions. I trust, however, that Congress will recognize this situation and see the need for relieving the FBI of this immense clearance task.

FBI HELPED MAKE THE ANTICOMMUNIST CASES

One need only glance at each day's newspaper to note the tremendous job which faces the FBI. Barely a day goes by without some new facet of Soviet espionage being opened up or, fortunately for us, being closed. Just yesterday, for example, the United States Supreme Court rightly rejected the pleas of the 11 top Communist leaders for a second review of their conviction on charges of advocating the overthrow of the United States Government. Thus, the final curtain was rung down on the stormy 9 months' trial which had been presided over by the great Judge Harold Medina in New York.

No one who followed the presentation of that case by the United States attorney's office in New York could fail to appreciate the tremendous amount of FBI spadework which must have gone into assisting the United States attorney and his staff in the preparation of the indictment and the ultimate prosecution of the trial. Nor for that matter could one possibly overestimate the tremendous job performed by the FBI in other significant antiespionage cases which have been prosecuted so successfully in that very diligent United States attorney's office, let alone the anti-Communist prosecutions now

under way in other districts throughout the country.

I am thinking particularly of the prosecution of the atom spies there, as presided over by another great judge in the southern district, the Honorable Irving Kaufman. I am thinking of the FBI spadework for the Hiss trials, the Remington trial, and so on down the line. Evidence in cases like these does not grow on trees. It must be dug up, tediously, laboriously, painstakingly, in months and years of patient undercover work against the slippiest group of rogues that ever threatened a nation's security. The atom-spy case in particular represented a masterpiece of investigation and prosecution work. One cannot praise too highly those public servants who brought it to a successful conclusion.

J. EDGAR HOOVER SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO CONCENTRATE ON TOP PRIORITY

And so let this vital work continue unhampered. Let us not tie down the FBI's staff in relatively routine work. Let us allow J. Edgar Hoover and his aides to continue to do the basic top-priority job they have done for us so well and for so long.

The letter to Chairman JOHNSTON follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
October 1, 1951.

Hon. OLIN JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service
Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you to convey my endorsement and respectful suggestion for action on S. 2077, which you had introduced by request on August 30. As you know, this bill was designed to turn over to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility for routine security clearances in specified Government agencies in order that the Federal Bureau of Investigation might be freer to handle the investigations of espionage, sabotage, and subversive acts.

I realize what a tremendous job has been done by your committee in various other legislative fields, and no doubt your heavy workload has served to delay action on this particular bill.

I hesitate to present a suggestion to expedite a particular bill's consideration to an industrious committee which has been doing so energetic and faithful a job; but I know that you will appreciate that it is with the interest in mind of the security of the American people that I submit these respectful thoughts to you.

The specific reason that I, for one, am writing to urge all possible speed in your committee's consideration of this bill is as follows:

As you undoubtedly know, in connection with the Mutual Security Act of 1951, H. R. 5113, the Senate had decided to turn over the security-clearance function to the Civil Service Commission so as to relieve the FBI of that task. However, the House conferees had insisted on retaining the House's opposite version in this particular field; and, unfortunately, to my way of thinking, the conference committee went along with the House's judgment. Thus, the FBI still has the responsibility for action in this area.

You and I both recognize that the FBI is ready, willing, and eager to handle any job which Congress and the President see fit to assign to it. However, we both realize that the crucial nature of antiespionage, anti-sabotage, and anti-subversive work is such that the Bureau is in a far stronger position to meet that more urgent responsibility if it is relieved of the routine clearance function.

The FBI, unlike practically every other Government bureau with which I have had any experience, has constantly sought to concentrate on its principal responsibilities, rather than have its jurisdiction constantly expanded and its limited staff overextended. Its great chief, J. Edgar Hoover, is virtually

unique in Federal Government personnel in his amazing fidelity to the principal responsibilities of his agency and his unswerving resistance to all attempts—well-meaning or otherwise—to place in his Bureau jurisdiction either larger than it can reasonably handle or jurisdiction which should not be allocated to the Bureau at all.

I understand that the executive branch thoroughly approves of S. 2077 and I am indeed hoping that it may be possible for you to report it out in a few days to the calendar without hearings so that at the very minimum it might clear the Senate before adjournment.

I write this letter at my own instance and with all due respect to yourself and to your able associates who have been laboring so long and so well.

I am taking the liberty of sending a carbon of this message to various other members of the committee.

Thanking you and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Truman Administration Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith my speech at Fairfield, Iowa, Wednesday evening, September 12, 1951, at a public meeting sponsored by the Jefferson County Women's Republican Club:

The House of Representatives has taken a brief recess until September 12 while the Senate is catching up with the House on legislation. It is indeed a pleasure to return home and to discuss with you some of the most important issues confronting our Nation today. In my opinion, the bulwark of our American Government is the interest and active participation of the people of America in shaping the laws of our Nation. I commend and congratulate you on your manifest interest and your study and your discussion of the great issues before Congress and our Nation today.

THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION ROAD TO RUIN

With the unsettled international situation now confronting our Nation we must study preparedness fairly and thoroughly, and we should analyze America's position in the family of nations as well as analyze the factors important in our defense of America. It is most important that we build America for the purpose and to the end that our strength may enable us to prevent our involvement in world war III.

It is highly necessary that we know our adversary and that we be alert to every danger.

There have been growing up in this world over the past 150 years two great rival nations—Russia and America. Notwithstanding development in the middle 50 years of this period that obscured their basic rivalry we need to be especially alert today to its existence. This rivalry was recognized by world diplomats, historians, and military leaders soon after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. It is worth our while briefly to look back to the writings of

the period immediately following the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine because it may help us to understand some of the cross currents in world affairs of today.

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, in 1831 visited the United States to inquire into what was then hailed as the great experiment in constitutional liberty. Coming to North America shortly after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, de Tocqueville was acquainted with the major currents of national developments in Europe, which, in view of subsequent events, he described with remarkable precision.

Writing about 1835 in his *Democracy in America*, he summarized his views with unusual clarity.

"There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place among the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power, but these are still in the act of growth, all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him, the adversaries of the Russians are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life, the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts, the conquests of the one are, therefore, gained by the plowshare; those of the other by the sword.

"The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russians center all the authority of society in a single arm, the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853 between France and England on the one hand and Russia on the other, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Minister for many years and Prime Minister for nearly 10 years, spoke of the czardom and its methods as follows.

"The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance. In furtherance of this policy, the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow, moderate language and disinterested professions at Petersburg and London, active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations."

Abraham Lincoln in a letter to his friend, Joshua F. Speed, of Springfield, Ill., dated August 24, 1855, stated:

"As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer immigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

In the light of events in our time, the significant thing in this letter is, that when

Lincoln thought of the quintessence of enslavement, despotism, and hypocrisy, he immediately thought of Russia.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned.

Commodore Perry presented a paper before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, from which I quote as follows:

"It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement—Russia—stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

It is my sincere hope that we can avoid this fierce and final encounter between Russia and America that was predicted so definitely by Commodore Perry in 1856. To do so we must know and understand our adversary and we must know our own strength and our own weaknesses. Then we must build a sound economy and develop to the utmost the strengths of our country. In doing this we must rely on the understanding and sound judgment of the American people themselves.

There are six great factors that must be developed and steadfastly maintained if we are to protect America's position of leadership in the family of nations.

The first of these factors is the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and the development of our production of as many of those materials as possible within our own land and within the Western Hemisphere.

In natural resources Russia and America are the two great "have" nations on this earth. No small part of our strength lies in our natural supply of strategic and critical materials. Both Russia and America are today vigorously locating, producing, and developing these materials.

Another great factor is industrial production and inventive genius. In that field America has developed overwhelming superiority, due most of all to the capable and loyal service of industry and labor.

A third great factor is the general development of our economic strength and trained manpower to maintain our agricultural and industrial production.

Another great factor is military preparedness. Developments over the past 6 years in Russia give us ample warning of Russia's determination to build her military might to the utmost in preparation for any possible future war. This warning should cause us sufficient concern to build our defenses strong enough to discourage Russia from attacking us and to maintain our position in

the family of nations. In doing this we must zealously guard against plunging headlong into militarism and against destroying our own fiscal stability.

Our fiscal strength is the fifth great factor, but here our Federal budget does not give us much ground for optimism unless we quickly reduce wasteful and extravagant Federal spending.

The sixth and greatest factor in building our Nation is our spiritual strength. It is in this field that America shines out in the family of nations in contrast to the godless despotism of Russia.

Russia and America have provided very different roles of government within their lands. The Russian Government promotes despotism and degrades the individual to serfdom. America, on the other hand, places supreme power in the individual.

The strength of our Nation in the family of nations in comparison with Russia will depend on our ability to maintain the six great factors I have briefly discussed. Weakness in any one of these factors can quickly undermine our strength to the point that Russia may decide she can successfully challenge us in that fierce and final encounter predicted by Commodore Perry.

Proceeding in order from strongest to weakest of these factors in America's position compared with Russia's, we might summarize our comparative strength as follows:

In two of these factors, namely, industrial production and inventive genius and in our spiritual strength, America has no fear of successful challenge by Russia.

America is definitely a "have" nation in strategic and critical materials, but America's strength as a "have" nation can quickly be dissipated through our failure to strengthen our natural resources through adequate exploration, prospecting, and development of them.

As to military preparedness, the Korean war has brought us to timely realization of the importance of rebuilding our forces of defense and America need no longer fear Russian supremacy on that score.

There is not a clear-cut rating for America's economic strength due primarily to America's extremely limited manpower. Without strong allies America may be considered a "have not" nation in manpower compared with the more populous areas of the world.

America's chief weakness is the threatened instability of our fiscal position. I will hereinafter discuss the trend in America's fiscal position more fully because America's fiscal position is in greater jeopardy than her position in regard to any of the other factors.

One of the greatest threats to our strength is decay and collapse from within through the loss of interest by the people in maintaining the six great factors on which our strength depends. The infiltration within our own land of Communists and fellow travelers recruited from our own people and directed from Moscow within the past 20 years is a dire warning to us.

During some of my travels I had occasion to visit Egypt, Babylon, Greece, and Rome and to view the remnants or physical manifestation of the mighty developments of earlier days indicative of the powers of past generations. As I viewed these silent historic sites the thought came to me with startling clarity that not one of these great powers was crushed from without. Rather they each crumbled and disintegrated from within.

In order to appraise more accurately the threat to America's fiscal strength today, it is fitting that we study present-day developments in the light of the history of the great nations of the past.

For 13 years I have studied budgets and taxes but more especially has my time been given to spending and tax problems during the past 5 years because of my membership

on the Committee on Ways and Means, starting in January 1947. Annual Federal spending today exceeds the total spending of any 10 successive years up to 1943. And Federal taxation for this year likewise exceeds the Federal revenue of any 10 successive years prior to 1943. We have, indeed, reached dizzy heights of spending and taxation far beyond the experience of any other nation. The best available estimates are that President Truman's Federal spending record from the end of World War II to the end of his present term will exceed \$400,000,000,000, and his total tax exaction in 8 years has already exceeded the total Federal tax collections from the Revolutionary War to the beginning of his service as President. Still higher taxes are demanded even though taxation has already approached confiscation. If all personal incomes over \$4,000 were confiscated today and all annual incomes up to \$4,000 were taxed at present rates, the total additional revenue would be only \$9,720,000,000. With the American dollar today worth only 53 percent of its 1939 value, the taxpayers are really having a most difficult time to meet the increased cost of living and pay their taxes. Notwithstanding this dire situation, Federal spending goes on far beyond Federal revenues and our Federal debt on August 31, 1951, stood at \$256,700,000,000 which is also an all-time record for any nation known to history.

During the past few years I have been impressed by the marked resemblance between the present-day political developments in Britain and America with those of ancient Rome. Some of the policies that are creeping into our modern life proved fatal to that great world power nearly 2,000 years ago.

The Roman Republic started its development about 509 B. C. and grew strong over a period of several centuries. During the early years of the Republic there was a fierce struggle between the Plebeians and the Patricians. This struggle gradually resulted in greater power for the Plebeians, eventually culminating in the Hortensian law passed in 287 B. C. In the Hortensian law the sovereignty of the people in elections of Roman officials and in legislation was made secure. The Hortensian law was the Magna Carta of the Roman Republic and at the enactment of the Hortensian law the Roman Republic seemed destined to develop its strength beyond the strength of any nation known to history up to that time. But the people, having once acquired their rights, became apathetic. By the time Julius Caesar became Consul in 59 B. C. the decline of the Roman Empire had become quite evident. The people had permitted political parties and individuals to assume the authority of government. The people also gradually had become susceptible to the promises of the politicians to use their power, if elected, in support of government-financed projects. Politicians had proceeded to use extensively the funds in the Roman government treasury for the furtherance of their political ambitions. They competed so vigorously with one another in their promises to the people through the sale of food at a loss to the government and through the extension of the dole that the Roman treasury could no longer stand the strain. By 50 B. C. Rome had become a Socialist state. Its finances were so depleted that the overburdened taxpayers could no longer meet the burden of government-financed projects made necessary to fulfill the promises of office-seeking politicians.

Julius Caesar realized that the Roman Republic was at an end at the time he first became Consul. Something had to be done, but Caesar knew he could not rely upon the votes of the people against the military power that had been built up in the machinery of civil government. In fact, military control threatened the very existence of Rome. In order to develop his own position, Caesar demanded appointment as Governor

of Elyria and Gaul and was so appointed in 58 B. C. His military successes added greatly to the glory of Rome and to his own reputation.

In order to win the political support of the people at home, Caesar wrote his Commentaries on the Gallic War. His commentaries comprise one of the greatest works of Latin prose and they constitute the greatest political propaganda effort known to history up to modern times. Caesar's fame and great popularity and recognized honesty in his conduct of government affairs made him the idol of the people. By senatorial action he was made dictator.

Caesar realized that the politicians had gotten out of hand, especially in the use of government funds to carry out their campaign promises. He soon discontinued the right of the people to vote for elected officials and he removed nearly 100,000 persons from Rome who were then living on the dole. He gradually put the government back in fairly solid financial condition.

Following the Battle of the Actium in 31 B. C., the Roman Senate conferred the title of "Augustus" on Augustus Octavius, nephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar. That date is generally conceded to be the end of the Republic and the establishment of the Roman Empire. The Roman Senate invested Augustus with imperial powers in 27 B. C., and the name of his office was "Princeps," meaning "the first of citizens." Another title was "Imperator" from which we get emperor.

Rome's decline began and a great panic occurred in Rome in A. D. 33, having grown out of Augustus' unwitting easy-money policy. The Roman Empire gradually became impotent and subject to enemy attacks. The Roman Government had taken its greatness, its security, and its stability for granted while actually traveling the road to bankruptcy and destruction. Paternalistic projects and officials irresponsible to the people speeded Rome's decline. Internal disorders brought unguarded frontiers that led almost to the abyss of anarchy in the century following the end of the reign of Commodus in 193 A. D. Barbarians from the north, who grew stronger as Rome grew weaker, became a serious menace. From 212 to 284 A. D., heavy spending continued on the army, on bureaucracy, and on the extension of the dole. Military anarchy combined with ruinous taxes and inflation demoralized business and brought about a breakdown of the middle class. When Diocletian became head of the Roman state in 284 A. D., he believed the time had come for society to be remodeled by the fiat of despotic authority. The will of the Emperor in whatever form expressed was considered to be the sole fountainhead of law. Diocletian soon undertook a planned economy. Lactantius wrote that Diocletian was an inveterate organizer of governmental bodies and that he established many administrations and appointed a multitude of inferior officers in each territory and in almost every city. He established a public-works program as a part of his planned economy and demonstrated such a passion for building that endless tax exactions inevitably resulted. The collection of taxes and the increased roles of public officials required larger military forces to collect the larger revenues needed to support his economy.

Diocletian debased the Roman currency but his currency manipulation failed to produce the result desired. He then resorted to limiting the prices for commodities. Diocletian's edicts might almost have been written today. One of them, unearthed at Stratonicea by Colonel Leake, describes with great vehemence the greed and inhumanity of merchants and money changers and then proceeds to fix prices throughout the Empire for all necessities and commodities and to regulate the wages of laborers, artisans, and school teachers.

Diocletian's master code resulted in disaster. His restrictions upon commercial freedom brought about a serious disturbance of the food supply and ruined many traders. Diocletian followed precedent and restricted the overproduction of grapes by decreeing the plowing up of one-third of the vineyards of Italy.

The apathy of the people, the lack of courage and statesmanship by the members of the Senate, and the usurpation of power by Diocletian brought about the loss of the Senate's power. Diocletian then completely stripped it of its power and the Roman Senate disappeared from the pages of history. The people were again subjected to totalitarian rule.

Diocletian appointed such a large number of local officials that the burden of government became enormous. Taxation grew steadily higher and nothing possessed by the citizen was free from ruinous overtaxation. The citizen had little access to Diocletian. Various scholars of domestic officials, as they were called, made difficult all approaches to Diocletian and his administrators. The impact of controls and the planned economy, together with the burden of overtaxation deprived the Roman citizen of his independence and incentive to produce. The middle class disappeared and were permanently lost to the Roman Empire. The citizens could only toil for the state and they were barely able to survive on what was left after taxes. The loss of power of the Roman Senate, excessive taxation, and governmental controls of daily living literally crushed Rome's great civilization. The mighty Roman Empire had stumbled and bungled its way into impotency and oblivion. Diocletian abdicated in A. D. 305 and civil war followed. Rome never again rose to power.

There are many interesting treatises that describe the history of the rise and fall of Rome, but I am indebted primarily to H. Ralph Burton, former investigator for the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States House of Representatives for much of the foregoing material concerning the Republic of Rome and the Roman Empire.

The foregoing description of the experience of the Roman Empire is enough to apprise us of the disaster that lurks in the type of political doctoring of economic and fiscal problems practiced by the New Deal and the Fair Deal over the past 20 years. The experience of the Roman Empire should cause us to condemn and denounce President Truman's attempt to continue and to expand the paternalism of our Federal Government and his continued efforts to embrace socialized medicine and the Brannan plan along with Federal aid to education and the development of many regional authorities similar to TVA. In President Truman's midyear economic report issued in July of this year he, perhaps unwittingly, again attempted to subvert the defense emergency to the advancement of paternalism of government.

Because President Truman has shown no inclination to curtail nondefense Federal spending and because of his determination to increase Federal taxation, even in wartime, to raise additional revenue for his use in the expansion of socialism and paternalistic measures, America can suffer the fate of ancient Rome and plunge headlong into fiscal chaos and collapse.

This threat of impending chaos and collapse reminds me of a recent experience of mine in Washington. I have examined many documents in the Library of Congress, but occasionally I find it necessary to go to the Archives Building to examine original documents. Recently, on one such occasion, I struck up a conversation with my cab driver and as his taxi pulled up in front of the Archives Building I asked him to wait for me as my mission to the Archives Building was brief and I desired to take the same taxi back to my office on Capitol Hill. As I stepped out of the taxi I glanced up above

the pillars and read over the door the inscription, "What is past is prologue." Turning to the taxi driver, I said, "What do you suppose that means?" The taxi driver was completely puzzled. "I just don't know," was his only reply. A few minutes later, on my return to the taxi, the driver was highly elated and eagerly awaited my return. "I've got it, boss," he called to me. "That motto up there means 'We ain't seen nothin' yet.'"

America must rise to the challenge and defeat the Truman administration and their horde of bureaucratic spenders in 1952.

Our Constitutional Rights May Be Nullified by Foreign Treaties—Adoption of House Joint Resolution 325 Will Protect Us From Losing These Rights

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights, is the only guaranty of individual freedom and liberty that protects the rights of our citizens against any usurpation of these rights. As long as the Constitution stands as the undisputed supreme law of the land, unchallenged from any foreign or domestic authority, the rights of Americans to enjoy the full blessings of liberty and to hand these liberties to posterity will be unabridged.

But in our time, in fact since the formation of the Union, a question has been raised in the courts of our land as to whether another law, outside of the Constitution, may not in fact be considered as the supreme law of the United States, namely, the provisions set forth in any treaty negotiated by the President and duly ratified by the Senate.

This is a matter not to be lightly brushed aside. There are those, of course, who are experts on international law who would declare without reservation that no treaty entered into by the United States could be valid if it conflicts with any provision within the Constitution and its amendments. But court decisions have challenged this interpretation of international law from 1796.

The United States of America emerged as a Nation dedicated to the freedom and independence of the individual only after the bloody and terrible struggle of the Revolutionary War. Upon winning independence the American colonists zealously labored to insure that the blessings of liberty would be preserved in our land for endless generations of the future; and before the necessary number of States would ratify the new Constitution, a solemn promise was made that the first Congress would amend the Constitution to include a bill of rights which would specifically guarantee to every citizen certain inalienable rights which would forever secure the individual liberty of Americans and

would serve as a shield to protect them against any threat of tyranny and oppression.

Later when each of our 48 States drafted individual constitutions, the civil rights of United States citizens were considered so important that the bulk of the provisions guaranteeing these rights within the Federal Constitution were incorporated in some form into the constitutions of the new States.

Only the United States of America, among all the nations of the world, gave such freedom to each and every one of its citizens, and under these freedoms men from all walks of life, born in poverty and wealth but with equal opportunity, have chosen their own destiny and watched their dreams become reality as they built our mighty Nation.

Each generation of American manhood has recognized that liberty is indeed the jewel beyond price which other powers in a jealous world would envy, and that the wealth of the United States would be coveted by others. But whenever our land has been endangered and our liberty placed in jeopardy, our young men have rallied round freedom's banner, and thousands have bled and died that you and I and all other Americans, native born and naturalized citizens alike, can today enjoy life in this land as free men.

There can never be too much protection of our freedom. No measure that will strengthen the guaranty of fundamental civil rights to our citizens should be neglected. Wherever a weak spot is found in the bulwark of our liberty, steps should and must be taken to shore it up without delay.

And today the danger signals have been raised by men of national reputation and standing in the legal profession of the United States, members of the bar, who foresee in view of United States court decisions and the present trend in international relations, that our civil rights are conceivably threatened by possible ratification of any treaty which though apparently right in intent and desirable upon a surface examination of its contents, may after ratification be found to lend itself to legal interpretation which will shackle our freedom and limit even our most cherished rights, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.

In article VI, paragraph 2, of the United States Constitution, we have the provision relating to the making of treaties which reads as follows:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The language of this provision in the Constitution has been subject to controversy among experts on international law and in the courts, and it is apparent today that this provision should be clarified by adequate constitutional amendment to reaffirm those principles of the

rights of the individual upon which our Government is established. I have, therefore, introduced the following proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution which would end all controversy as to the effect of any treaty upon the civil rights of Americans as guaranteed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and will clearly state that no treaty shall ever abrogate those rights:

House Joint Resolution 325

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"Article —

"SECTION 1. Treaties made under the authority of the United States and international agreements entered into by the Department of State or by the President shall be void to the extent that they abrogate or interfere with any of the rights guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the Constitution.

"SEC 2 This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Far too many of us have come to accept our constitutional rights as individual American citizens for granted. We do not realize that many peoples in other parts of the world do not enjoy such privileges of liberty. And it has been largely to enjoy these rights that so many hundreds of thousands have immigrated to our land to share our heritage and raise their families as Americans under the protection of the United States Constitution.

Here in our land, in addition to freedom of religion, speech, and the press, we are guaranteed the right of free assembly, the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, protection from illegal search and seizure, the right to public trial by jury, protection against unlawful imprisonment without a legal hearing, and the protection of private property which cannot be taken away from us even by the Federal Government without due process of law.

These rights must never be nullified. It is not enough to assume we are adequately protected as stated in the Constitution. It is imperative that any question as to interpretation of any act which might abridge these rights be removed by adequate constitutional amendment, as I have proposed.

A study of the history of court decisions relating to treaties in the United States clearly establishes the fact that the provision in the Constitution relative to treaties has been subject to continuous examination and controversy.

As early as 1796 Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Samuel Chase stated:

It is the declared will of the people of the United States that any treaty made by the

authority of the United States shall be superior to the constitution and laws of any individual State.

At a later date Secretary of State Edward Livingston, serving in the Cabinet of President Andrew Jackson, stated:

The Government of the United States presumes that whenever a treaty has been duly concluded and ratified by the acknowledged authorities competent for that purpose, an obligation is thereby imposed upon each and every department of the Government, to carry it into complete effect, according to its terms, and that on the performance of this obligation consists the due observance of good faith among nations.

In another early decision by our Supreme Court regarding the effect of treaties, Associate Justice James Iredell said:

The present Constitution of the United States affords the first instance of any government which, by saying treaties should be the supreme law of the land, made it indispensable that they should be published for the information of all. At the same time I admit that a treaty, when executed pursuant to full power, is valid and obligatory, in point of moral obligation, on all, as well on the legislative, executive, and judicial departments (so far as the authority of either extends, which in regard to the last, must, in this respect, be very limited) as on every individual of the Nation . . . because it is a promise in effect by the whole Nation to another nation.

In 1920, when the famous *Migratory Bird* case was finally decided by the Supreme Court, Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes handed down a decision which in substance proclaimed that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate, which may legally ratify a treaty by two-thirds of the Members present at the time, not two-thirds of the whole Senate. Since 1920, when the *Migratory Bird* case was decided, the United States Supreme Court has consistently followed this doctrine, both in the matter of the superiority of the provisions of a treaty over all State law and as to the scope of the treaty-making power being broad enough to make matters otherwise unconstitutional constitutional.

These are but a few of the examples that could be cited of court decisions and judicial opinions since the adoption of the Constitution establishing treaties as the supreme law of our land. And the question of whether or not a treaty under the present provision in our Constitution can supersede the Constitution itself is an open question.

It is important to recognize the fact that in every nation in the world with the exception of the United States—and to some extent France—a treaty, though an international agreement between the signatory nations, requires implementation before it becomes law, that is, subsequent legislation adopted and approved by the governing body.

In 1944 a prominent English lawyer, Professor Lauterpacht, pointed out to America the danger inherent in the treaty-making provision of our Constitution when he warned that there was in America a third body of law, the rati-

fied treaty, of at least equal dignity with our Constitution, and which superseded all State constitutions, decisions, and laws covering the same subject, and was superior to all prior enacted laws of Congress on the same subject, and which dangerously approached the status of an amendment to our Federal Constitution.

If there is a trend toward using the treaty-making power to enact new local laws or nullify existing local laws and to change the relationship between the States and the Federal Government and to change even our Constitution and our form of Government, this constitutes a most serious threat to our American rights and liberties.

It is our duty as representatives of the people to guard against any threat to the basic individual rights and freedoms of Americans, and to be ever alert to the need for legislative action to strengthen the laws which guarantee these basic individual rights and freedoms.

As Alfred E. Smith once said:

I say . . . that the Bill of Rights is the soul of the Constitution, and I hope that it will forever be related to the people, to the end that if it is ever threatened, the American people will rise—as a united body—and defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights against whoever threatens them . . . with the last drop of their blood.

My proposed amendment to the Constitution, House Joint Resolution 325, would not in any way limit or deter the powers or authority of the President or the Secretary of State to negotiate treaties with foreign nations, but it would protect and guarantee citizens of the United States against the abrogation or nullification of any constitutional rights guaranteed to them in the Constitution of the United States.

Adoption of the constitutional amendment which I have proposed will clearly establish forever the rights of United States citizens under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and there could be no further question as to any expressed or implied power of a treaty entered into by the United States to have any effect under any circumstances upon these basic rights.

For this reason I have introduced House Joint Resolution 325 which should have the early attention of the Congress.

Broadcast by Hon. Edward Martin to the
People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record program No. 51 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington," broadcast by me to the people of Pennsylvania on October 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO. 51
(By United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
of Pennsylvania)

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capitol and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Since I last talked with you Congress has reached the crowded days of the final rush toward a recess.

In these closing sessions, when the tax bill and the big appropriation bills were enacted, the outlines of the Government's financial picture began to take on definite form. And I regret to tell you that from all present indications there are dark days ahead.

At the present rate of spending demanded by the Truman administration we will have a Federal deficit estimated at between twenty and thirty billion dollars in the next fiscal year.

That means that even though every one of us pays higher taxes, the Government will spend twenty or thirty billion dollars beyond its income.

It means that the Government will pile up new billions of debt upon the present staggering national debt of nearly \$260,000,000,000.

It means another decline in the value of the dollar, which already has been cut in purchasing power to 40 or 50 cents.

It means that we will pay higher prices for everything we buy.

And furthermore it will mean more inflation and more severe hardship on the many thousands of people who depend upon small fixed incomes for their livelihood.

Every savings account, every life insurance policy, every annuity, pension, and retirement fund will depreciate in value.

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is what we must expect because there is no will or spirit in the present administration to cut the size or the cost of Government so that the budget can be balanced.

Of course there is another way to balance the Federal budget—the method advocated, yes, demanded, by the Truman administration.

And that way is to tax and tax and tax—to take more and more from the pockets of the taxpayers—without regard for the limit beyond which taxation cannot go without destroying the stability and the solvency of our Nation.

When the new tax bill was before the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, Republicans and Democrats gave up all thought of party politics.

We worked together as a team, trying to arrive at the proper answer to each of the problems and issues that confronted us. We particularly wanted to be fair to those in the low-income brackets. We wanted to be fair to business and industry so as not to destroy the economy of our country. We did not want to destroy initiative. We did not want to destroy the productive power of American industry.

We were not unmindful of the great burden that had been placed upon the American taxpayer since the beginning of the war in Korea in June 1950. We remembered that this was not the first tax increase that we were called upon to make since that date.

We knew that it was the third call for increased taxes on the part of the administration. The Revenue Act of 1950, which became law on September 23, a few months following the outbreak of the Korean conflict, increased taxes \$6,100,000,000.

Then on January 8, 1951, we passed another tax measure, the excess-profits tax law, and this bill imposed additional taxes of \$3,900,000,000.

The Senate has now passed a bill which will add another \$5,500,000,000 dollars to the tax burden of the American people.

When you add up the new and increased taxes levied by these three bills, you will find they will produce \$15,500,000,000 more revenue than the tax laws that existed at the time the Korean war began.

Never before has so much additional revenue been raised in so short a period of time. Moreover, these three revenue measures have brought the income-tax burden of most individuals and corporate taxpayers near the World War II peak. For many such taxpayers the rates imposed under this bill are above the maximum rates imposed during World War II.

In view of these facts, the committee, generally speaking, was of the opinion that we had reached the saturation point.

We felt we had reached a tax level which could go no higher without destroying initiative, productivity, and the entire economy of this great Republic.

We felt that we had reached the point of diminishing returns—that higher taxes, instead of producing more revenue, would destroy all incentive to create new income, and would, in fact, cut down the return to the Government.

As many of you know, I have consistently advocated a balanced budget. I believe that a balanced budget is the first essential of a sound fiscal policy. But I do not agree that the only way to balance the budget is by increasing taxes. That is the administration's philosophy. It is not the philosophy I believe in.

When we consider our huge national debt, and the burdensome taxes we are called upon to pay, the sane, sensible, practical way to balance the budget is to reduce expenditures.

Mr. Truman has said many times that he, too, advocates a balanced budget. But not once during the days when appropriation bills were being considered did he ever send a message asking Congress to reduce any proposed appropriation or to curtail any item of Government spending.

On the contrary, the administration leaders in the House and the Senate insisted upon higher and higher appropriations. Every fiscal message from the White House demanded bigger spending and higher taxes.

When the 1951 tax bill was debated on the Senate floor, the administration argued that income tax rates on individuals and corporations had not been raised high enough. They sought to abolish the split income provision which is of benefit to married couples. They offered a long list of amendments which would push increased taxes far beyond the figures proposed by the Finance Committee.

Their demands for higher taxes were based principally on two contentions.

First, that the Government must take away a larger portion of the taxpayer's earnings in order to check inflation.

Second, that our Nation is now at the peak of its prosperity, that the rate of investment and savings are at an all-time high and therefore we can afford to pay more taxes.

Let me point out that it was a distinguished Democrat, the able chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, who replied to the first argument.

Senator GEORGE said, and I quote:

"Go back home and ask the poor man who is earning \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year under present prevailing high prices how much he's adding to inflation.

"How much do we want to take out of his pocketbook to stop inflation. He is not adding to inflation.

"Go and ask the teachers, the policemen; go and ask the merchants in the small towns; ask anyone who is working for a very moderate salary.

"How much have you got that you are using to push up the inflationary spiral?" and see what sort of an answer is made.

"Such a worker will say frankly that he does not need any government nor any agency of government to tell him that he must be taxed more in order to keep him from destroying himself through inflation."

Senator GEORGE continued, and again I quote:

"What is causing inflation is the disposition of the administration to spend more than the American people ought to be called upon to bear as taxes. Unless we face that issue we shall never come out of this thing."

At another point in the debate, the ranking Republican member of the Finance Committee, Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, demolished the contention that all of us are just rolling in money. Replying to remarks made by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Senator MILLIKIN said, and I quote:

"We have been listening to a speech, the theme of which is that everything is O. K. We have a debt of \$260,000,000,000, which means a debt on every family in the country of between \$5,000 and \$6,000. We are adding new burdens this year of about \$1,800 on every family.

"Everything is fine. Everything is wonderful.

"We have a 40-cent dollar. Everything is fine. Everything is just wonderful.

"We have a war in Korea. Everything is fine. Everything is wonderful."

Then, Senator MILLIKIN continued:

"Nothing would please me more than to see a balanced budget. I would say that during the Eightieth Congress we had a balanced budget. We produced a sizable surplus and we reduced taxes. That is the way to run the country."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, please bear in mind that the statements I have quoted had no political purpose whatsoever. They represented the thinking of men on both sides of the aisle, as we say in Congress.

They were based on the firm conviction that if we continue to follow the spending policies of the Truman administration we are working toward the end of freedom of the individual in the United States. We are rushing into national bankruptcy and the inevitable result will be destruction, not by Communist Russia, but destruction from within, because we followed unsound fiscal policies.

As a Member of the Senate, I have consistently voted in favor of reducing appropriations. I want to tell you about one instance in which I voted to increase Government spending.

That vote was to override the President's veto of a bill to increase the pensions of permanently and totally disabled veterans from \$60 a month to \$120 a month. The increase applies only to those veterans who, because of age, physical, or mental disability, helplessness or blindness, require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

The bill was specifically designed to help those veterans to obtain the constant attention they need in their daily lives.

The President's veto was overridden by tremendous majorities in the House and in the Senate. I'm proud of that vote. I have said over and over again that there are only two items in the budget that are sacred. One is to pay the interest on the national debt. The other is to care for our disabled veterans and the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice.

If we can pour billions of dollars into the building of a giant, spendthrift bureaucracy, and if we can pour more billions into foreign give-away programs, I think we can take care of our disabled veterans who are so helpless that they cannot take care of themselves.

To me it is shocking that the only economy in Government spending suggested by

President Truman was at the expense of veterans who must face life with the terrible handicap of total and permanent disability.

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capitol. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address on inflation delivered by Walter P. Casey before the Brawley, Calif., Kiwanis Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Kiwanians, when I was asked to make a 5 minute talk before you today, I was told I could take any topic I wanted except my own business. I chose the topic of inflation, and since then have decided that it is something that is very much my own business.

There is only one way to stop inflation, and that is to stop doing the things that cause it. Sounds simple, and it is.

Nothing you may do like restricting sales, or limiting production, or fixing prices will do any good. They only complicate and confuse the issue.

I have listened to round table discussions by college professors, and radio quizzes of Congressmen and Senators and other Government employees; and I have read and listened to direct appeals by Government employees urging Americans to curb and control everything from goods and babies to clothing and steel and crops and rent, but not one of these has said anything about ceasing to do the things that cause inflation.

And so you say what is the cause of inflation?

Well you know just as well or better than I do, but you have been afraid to face the issue, afraid to express your honest knowledge and opinion. Just why I don't know unless it may be the fear of reprisal if you go against our present constituted authority. Or, maybe you find it easier to let someone else think for you. If that is the case will you listen to me while I tell you what is causing inflation.

One of the principal things is taxation—high taxes. You know, taxes are an expense. And there is no place you can put expense except on the cost of production. Doing that inevitably increases the cost of the article. That makes the purchaser pay more, and the higher cost of things calls for higher wages, and thus the vicious circle continues to grow.

Now I know some of you will say that President Truman has asked for higher taxes to curb inflation. But you know and I know that such a request is wrong, and there has been nothing in our constantly increasing taxation that has in any way tended to evidence that it is right, or to control inflation. Higher taxes are more expense, which reduces profits, which calls for higher prices to pay higher wages and results in cheaper money until today you are trying to live on a 50-cent dollar.

Do you realize that your total taxes, Federal, State, and county and municipal amount to about 42½ percent of your income? And that your social security, and

unemployment, and U. C. D. and workmen's compensation bring the total up to over 50 percent, so all you have left to spend out of every dollar you earn is 50 cents. Or let's put it this way, your direct taxation for income taxes, old-age security, unemployment, compensation and the like, takes more than 30 percent of your actual earnings, so the remainder (70 percent) is being used to buy your living and other necessities on things that are twice or more as high as normal. Thus your actual earning is worth about 85 percent of what it used to be worth, before inflation. And yet Mr. Truman says he wants higher taxes to control inflation.

And so you stumble along and hope against hope that something will happen to change the situation, instead of facing the condition and realizing you are being governed by a false philosophy. You know Mr. Truman is telling you an untruth when he says higher taxes will curb inflation. You know if you were not paying the taxes you now pay that the things you buy would of necessity cost that much less, and yet you say nothing and do nothing to refute such false, even malicious perversion of the truth.

You know and I know that inflation is actually caused by the thing Mr. Truman says will cure it.

To be sure inflation is also caused by deficit spending, and because we are off the gold standard and because the Federal Reserve Bank can issue currency without control. And too, you won't begin to curb inflation until you balance the budget. And I'm telling you, you will never begin to stop inflation until you elect men to office whose philosophy is sane and honest, and whose thinking is straight, and who place the welfare of their country above the temporary monetary advantage of their party members.

Lenin said before he died, "We will make the United States spend itself into destruction." And these men who continue to advocate higher and higher taxes are doing just that. These are the same men who told you that industry could increase wages without increasing the cost of production. These are the men who are spending money all over the world without regard for where it is coming from or how it is to be repaid.

Unless you elect men to Congress who will return the powers and controls to Congress that are granted them in the Constitution. Unless you elect men to office who believe a man should stay home, mind his own business and keep his mouth shut, you will continue to increase inflation.

Perhaps you don't believe me. Perhaps you say I am prejudiced.

Well, gentlemen, the law of cause and effect is inviolable. We only have what we have because we have produced it. Other peoples could have the same things if they had produced them. No one has given us what we have, and from a psychological standpoint we cannot give something to someone who is not worthy of receiving it, who does not appreciate it.

And now, if we cease to do those things that have made us what we are, if we cease to conserve, and cease to create and produce—and instead, if we spend and destroy, we will inevitably have the things those actions create. I tell you the law of cause and effect is inviolable. If you put dirt in clear water you make muddy water. You no longer have clear water. If you want to continue to have the things you love and enjoy, then you must do the things that have produced them—otherwise if you continue the way you have been going the last few years you will not have the things you are wasting and spending.

I have told you in brief how to stop inflation.

Balance your budget.

Take away the power of Government to print currency unless backed by gold or something tangible.

Reduce taxes and stop increasing cost of production.

But you say, "How can we do these things?" We are fighting a war and we must make our defense impregnable.

Well, gentlemen, first you must have the desire, then the intent, then the will, and then you must make the effort to accomplish what you want.

Until you elect men to office who have such objectives, you can kiss your former way of life good-by.

If you cease to do the things that produced what you have you will cease to have those things.

As long as you temporize with untruths you will have untruth. As long as you spend more than you make, you will continue to cheapen money. As long as you increase taxes you will increase the cost of production, and further inflation.

Have you the fortitude to stop this new way of life? I hope so.

Adoption of James A. Farley Into the Iroquois Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is detained from the Senate by the illness of his wife, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Visit," which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal of September 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY'S VISIT

Former Postmaster General James A. (Big Jim) Farley is now "Chief Straightforward" of the Iroquois Nation. He was adopted into the tribe and given his Indian name at the State fairground yesterday.

The Iroquois, famous for their prowess, valor, and brains, now have a very able American to sit with them around the campfire.

But if they happen to have a stalwart brave with a resonant voice they ought to hang on to him very tightly, otherwise Chief Straightforward might pick him up and make him President.

Of course, it is always a pleasure to welcome Jim Farley to Syracuse, whether he comes for the purpose of joining an Indian tribe, running a political convention, or just delivering a speech.

Here is a patriotic American of great ability—a man whose sound integrity, broad experience, shrewd judgment, and vigorous ideas make him a very exceptional guest.

Whether there is anything to the reports that influential Democrats in certain States want to put his name before the Democratic National Convention next year, we do not know.

All we do know is that they could do much worse.

Maybe the delegates to that convention could learn from the Iroquois.

Korean Goal Still Undefined Despite Bitter Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Korean Goal Still Undefined Despite Bitter Cost," published in the Chicago Daily News of October 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN GOAL STILL UNDEFINED DESPITE BITTER COST

While Gen. Matthew Ridgway and the Red commanders continue to bicker over possible truce sites in Korea, the casualty lists have grown to more than 2,000 a week.

Press reports say that U. N. forces are conducting a limited offensive. Correspondent Fred Sparks writes that these limited offensives have been bloody, ghastly affairs.

Day after day, the Air Force tells us how many Russian-made MIG's were shot down, but the story always ends with the statement that all of our jets returned safely.

Gen. James Van Fleet, the U. N. field commander, says that we can clobber the Reds whenever he gets the signal to go.

According to Keyes Beech, of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, the recent visit of Gen. Omar Bradley to Tokyo and Korea gave rise to cautious optimism regarding Korean armistice prospects.

General Ridgway has given the Reds what the Associated Press describes as the surprising privilege of selecting the site of future peace talks, with the proviso that the U. N. will not meet again at Kaesong.

Washington officialdom talks about incredible weapons far more terrible than the A-bomb.

Yet, U. N. commanders are not expected to undertake any major offensive, but will continue limited attacks to keep the enemy off balance and our troops in fighting trim.

This last paragraph, taken from a war dispatch, sounds like pointing for a championship football game, until one realizes that the price of keeping our men in fighting trim ran to 2,200 casualties in a recent week.

RIDGWAY IMPATIENT AT RESTRICTED WAR

It is reported that General Bradley's trip to the Korean front apparently presaged no major developments but served to solidify thinking and planning between Tokyo and Washington.

What planning, may we ask?

General Ridgway is said to be impatient over orders from Washington which prevent him from "MacArthurizing" the Communist forces that are killing our young men at a frightful rate.

What kind of a war is this?

The United States News and World Report calls it a Russian pet, a war that the United States doesn't want and has told the world it does not intend to win.

The magazine suggests that the price for a deal remains high, a clean-cut appearance of victory for the Communists, or no deal.

Ostensibly, our diplomats are now considering if the United States should pay the price.

Still some people scoff at the timid British for leaving Iran without firing a shot.

Jack Kofoed, writing in the Miami Herald, says "they are talking now about a winter

offensive in Korea War is always bitter, but worse in savage cold. . . . What happens, even after the winter campaign has become a success? Will Russia take a physical part in the war? What do we plan to do if there is no truce when spring comes over the horizon again?

"Men fight better when they know the score, and our men in Korea know no more than we do at home."

CASUALTIES OUTRAN THOSE OF WORLD WAR II

In 15 months of Korean fighting, United States casualties are higher than in the first 15 months of World War II, with 14,280 killed, 10,600 missing and another 60,000 wounded.

Under present rules, we are prevented from hitting the Red sources of supply. General Ridgway is under orders not to bomb north of the Yalu River. From the Reds' standpoint, this arrangement must be eminently satisfactory.

But what about our boys in Korea? How do they like the ground rules under which this diplomatic game is being played?

To be sure, we have halted Red aggression, but where lies the ultimate victory?

Washington claims we have a big stockpile of atomic bombs. Why are we saving them?

Atom bombs are no more barbaric than flame throwers or fire bombs and some of our four-star generals believe that a few of them dropped on the right targets would keep a lot of American boys from being buried on Korean soil.

But then you see, we have no firm, realistic, clearly defined policy in Korea.

Poor Ridgway is told he can't be beastly to the Reds and the grave marker business is thriving.

All this while the little man in the White House is devising new ways to protect his political pal, Bill Boyle, and getting ready to tell the people how the peace was preserved in our time.

Could anything be more revolting?

GABRIELSON'S OUSTER WOULD IMPROVE PARTY

Random notes: All honor to the 12 Republican congressmen, including Representative WILLIAM AYRES, of Akron, who told RFC's Republican National Chairman Guy Gabrielson that he should resign. Men of this type should replace some of the stone-age thinkers on the national committee.

Word comes from a trusted correspondent in Paris that "General Eisenhower will not lift a finger to get the Republican nomination but will most certainly accept it if it is offered to him. If the Republicans really want him as President, it is consequently imperative that they should find means of nominating him without forcing him to declare himself too openly in advance."

If this is a true reflection of Ike's attitude, the odds against his being nominated will rise sharply. Eisenhower backers are cheered, however, by the prediction of Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, that with Ike as the candidate, the Republicans would carry at least five Southern States.

Ambassador John Foster Dulles did a stand-out job on the Japanese Peace Treaty but his statement that President Truman and his advisers "risked war with Russia and Red China" in pressing for its adoption at San Francisco sounds a bit too dramatic for an old hand like Dulles. What are we doing with Red China now, playing ping-pong?

The Decatur (Ill.) Herald applauds Senator BILL BENTON's courage in trying to expel JOE MCCARTHY from the United States Senate. Why not let the people of Wisconsin decide that question in 1952? Could be that BILL might get licked in Connecticut.

Harold Stassen is back in the news with charges that Secretary of State Acheson and Ambassador-at-Large Philip C. Jessup proposed cutting off aid to Nationalist China

back in 1949. Stassen's presidential lightning rod is still up.

TRUMAN CONTRIBUTES TO FANTASTIC HUMOR

From the report of a recent Presidential press conference:

Question: Mr. President, could you tell us the purpose of Mr. Potofsky's visit today?

Answer: He comes to see me whenever he feels like it. I think he is one of the ablest of the labor leaders. He came to see me about the unemployment that exists among Government workers.

The latest Gallup poll shows the British Conservatives holding a 5-to-4 lead over the Labor Party. Dr. Gallup claims that his British Institute of Public Opinion has called the last two British elections within 1 percentage point.

President Truman is said to favor the re-election of Attlee's Socialists because a Churchill victory might "start a trend." A good many people over here think that kind of a trend would be in the right direction.

Dr. Alberto Galinza Paz, late of La Prensa, says there is no truth to the rumor that his difficulties in Argentina might have been averted if his wife had invited Evita Peron to tea. "We don't even know her," exclaimed the publisher.

Arthur Vandenberg, Jr., son of the late Senator, will probably make a bid for his father's Senate seat now held by BLAIR MOORE. Contrary to rumor, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg is not thinking of entering politics when he retires as Air Force Chief of Staff next year.

Another big newspaper merger is jelling in the Pacific Northwest. The Hearst heirs are no longer worried over the possibility of a suit by Marion Davies claiming control of the Hearst properties.

Six-color newspaper printing presses are now in the development stage. Sir Eric Bowater, who owns large newsprint interests in Newfoundland, is preparing to build a \$50,000,000 mill in eastern Tennessee if he can get a certificate of necessity from Washington.

Since the Government is now requisitioning newsprint from American mills for use abroad, it will be interesting to see how promptly the Government acts upon Sir Eric's application, if at all.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Sorry Political Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, why does the President continue to confuse the issue of the lack of morality in his administration? Does he really believe the American people can be so easily duped and misled when he intimates that all elected representatives have sinister motives?

The following editorial in the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter of October 1, 1951, expresses very well the fact that he cannot shrug off the charges of corruption in his present national administration. Mr. and Mrs. Citizen will not accept this sugar-coated pill to alleviate the maladministration in the RFC, the tax scandals in the Internal Revenue Department, the job selling in Mississippi, as well as the fur coats and deep freezers.

SORRY POLITICAL PLAN

A vein of strong irony runs through President Truman's proposal that all top Government officials, including judges, Members of Congress, and national party officers, be required to declare annually all their income—whether from salary, loans, or gifts.

Mr. Truman told Congress he was offering the plan because "attempts have been made through implication and innuendo and by exaggeration and distortion of the facts in a few cases to create the impression that graft and corruption are running rampant through the whole Government."

It is nice to know, anyway, that the President acknowledges a few cases where everything was not done exactly according to proper moral standard. It is the first real concession to the truth he has made on this score.

But the whole tone of his message suggests that Congress and other critics have vastly overplayed the moral missteps of Government officials. And to this extent the President is still persisting in bland denial of the facts.

Read in this light, his proposal for annual income disclosure can only be taken as a cynical diversionary tactic designed to confuse the public and discredit honest investigation of Government immorality.

How unfortunate it is that the President of the United States conceives it his duty in this situation to shrug off charges of corruption merely as efforts to get him politically. How sad that he continues to condone moral wrongdoing in top officials and lesser figures alike.

His plan for coping with the problem is no antidote at all, so long as he fails to act forthrightly in cleaning his administration house when the evidence so plainly warrants it.

Mr. Truman's cavalier attitude toward the mounting testimony of corruption reveals one of his weakest traits as an executive. All he achieves by it is a redoubling of the attacks against him.

He exhibited the same failing in his stand on Communists in Government. Had he not lightly dismissed some of those charges as a red herring, he might not have precipitated the deluge which later descended on him and has done so much harm to innocent men in Government.

The President's message seeks to fasten on Congress the blame for putting in jeopardy the reputation of Government as a whole. The blunt reality is that his behavior is really responsible. Had he acted at all times to enforce a sensible moral code, Government would not today be at its evident low estate in the public mind.

Mr. Truman's new plan merits nothing but a dusty corner on a committee shelf. It is his way of saying that he is more interested in tribal political loyalty to the Democratic Party than in morality in Government.

Tom Whelan, North Dakotan and New Ambassador to Nicaragua, Will Be Good Will Messenger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Tom Whelan, the newly appointed Ambassador to Nicaragua, received a great re-

ception in Washington. Through dinners given by the North Dakota Society in Washington, and by Senators Langer and Young, Whelan came in contact with much of official Washington.

The naming of Whelan to this position created a lot of favorable comment, especially from North Dakotans, for it is the first time that any of our North Dakotans has been recognized in an official way to represent us in any foreign nation.

Whelan is not only a well-educated man, but has had long experience in legislation. In business he came up the hard way to well-earned success. He is a fair example of what a young man can do in a Government like ours. He never asked for or received any special privilege—he took things that were common to all. He is imbued with the value and need of free institutions and grounded deep in the conviction that the strength of our democracy is anchored by our Constitution and its amendments. Here we have no revolutions—we have substituted elections for that activity. We have so framed our Government that the most powerful body in the Government—the House of Representatives—can be changed every 2 years if the voters so will. It is so easy to control this Government that a revolution is needless.

Nicaragua will meet an upstanding American in Tom Whelan and in contact with him they will come to understand that this democracy does not seek any nation's territory; that we believe in peace; that the great hope of all Americans is that wars may be outlawed and differences among nations settled by intelligent deliberations.

War the Last Resort of Any Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Hal Boyle's statement on war as the last resort of any nation deserved to be circulated. Here is an item from the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune:

New York.—War is for people who don't know any better—or who can't help themselves.

It interrupts or destroys the chief pleasure of this world—which is to live happily.

War is the last resort of a nation that tells another nation it must have its way, by force if necessary.

The fact it also says its goal is peace is confusing. By peace it means, "I want my own way and my own system."

Wars, birthed by ambition or principle, have tended to end in the same way: They renew chaos instead of achieving order.

All leaders, dictatorial or democratic, throughout history have sent millions of men to bloody death on strange battlefields to win a victory by force of arms that can only be temporary.

How can war achieve permanency when it is most often merely hate against the foreigner?

Rome finally killed Carthage, and then Rome sickened and died. Why? She couldn't police her own great system.

The Romans spread a colossal net of awe for order that still afflicts us, their conquerors, after the barbarian outbreaks of these many centuries. The passion for a pattern that the Romans set still endures.

And one who has a hopeful eye about the march of history cannot feel that the passage of 20 centuries has been less than a step toward a unified world. Hope is better than a timetable.

Napoleon and Hitler tried to achieve world unity by the direct assault of power. So had Alexander the Great. The British, a small people with a great mind, worked by the twin channels of prestige and strategic strength toward the same goal.

The muscle of America rules the world today except for the untested might of Russia. Not only the muscle of America but its dreams. Dreams can win, too.

What happens to the world in our time depends on whether America and Russia bump hearts and heads in battle.

Will they?

They sometime and somehow may probably have to do so, but I am optimist enough to believe it won't be tomorrow.

As the world has shrunk great nations have tended to fight each other just as small nations in Europe once could afford the luxury of enmity expressed in combat. But this irresponsibility is dying.

Sometime some nation in the long story of mankind must pledge its money and men and minerals underground to something finer than either future profit or boyish restlessness—the goal of eternal peace.

Men and nations often reach for power because they are neurotic. To control something else becomes their obsession because they cannot control themselves.

The third world war—if it does come, and it will be an unnecessary war if it does happen—probably will express the internal frustration of some ruling clique that will start a war rather than lose the grab it has.

But scientifically war today is about as needful to the happiness of mankind as yellow fever.

What Price Air Power—Are We Getting Our Money's Worth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "What Price Air Power—Are We Getting Our Money's Worth?" by Robert E. Gross, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., before the American Bankers Association, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, October 2, 1951:

In considering what I would say to you gentlemen this morning, I decided to divide my remarks into two principal subjects—both closely related but nevertheless quite different.

In the first part of my talk I want to make some observations on the current aircraft production program. It seemed to me that you would expect me to say something on this subject, and because I am quite close to it and because I doubt that there is real public understanding of the topic, it does seem appropriate to dwell on it.

In the second part of my remarks I want to say something of what I think the future in the air holds for us—if we want it. You might call it the philosophy of the air age, since I think of the future in the air as very much more than just airplanes and engines. But more important than either I want to put my finger on the bridge we have to build to get from this current stage over into the new age.

I honestly believe that, considering the amount of money we are spending on it, there is little understanding of what the air program really is. I believe the man on the street thinks the program is bigger than it really is. I believe he thinks we are going to get it quicker than we are, and I don't think he knows why it has to cost so much.

On that historic morning in June of last year when the Asian hordes swarmed over the thirty-eighth parallel, the American air industry was plodding along at a fairly steady rate of production—indifferent though the totals were. The monthly production of the entire industry for both Air Force and Navy was only 200 or 300 airplanes per month. Suddenly the President called for an immediate increase in the number of planes to be delivered and also asked that the air industry be given make-ready contracts which could ultimately produce 50,000 planes per year. It was strongly reminiscent of that same clarion call that went out from President Roosevelt in the spring of 1940 when he, too, called for 50,000 planes and the industry then responded, "We can do it."

This time industry was older and wiser and it knew the pitfalls. Notwithstanding these, it took the Government at its word and with the same determination it showed before, we started in all over again. Soon industry leaders were traveling to Washington for direction. Internally we started to change our tempo and overhaul our whole plan of building. We engaged in a constant series of studies as to how production could be increased, having in mind all the new and different types of planes. A few orders were placed by the Government, but, after some weeks, one thing became patently clear. It was this: Industry could move faster and more positively than Government.

Immediately after the call of Korea, industry responded with pent up enthusiasm and desire to do something. But as the weeks drifted by without the fast action the public expected, gradually the realization came over us that the program was not, and probably could not be, what people had originally thought when the first flush of North Korea was over. I know from my own experience that soon after the call, I was confronted on all sides by members of the public and businessmen with questions as to how hard we were working. The assumption on their part always was that we were going wide-out. When I told them that no, we were working only a 40-hour week—no third shift—and that our planned acceleration would, by agreement with the Government, not yield any substantial additional production for between a year and a year and a half, they were horrified. One thing finally shone through like a light: The call of 1940 was one thing, issued under clear straightforward circumstances; the call of Korea—the call of 1950—was something very different.

Both of these great periods have had a different program. How do these programs differ? This is really asking: How do world conditions differ now, in 1951, from then, in 1940?

Well, in the first place, in 1940 the lines were clearly cut; we knew who our enemy was; there was no doubt about it. Germany was on the march in Europe, and Japan soon attacked us from the east. The lines were formed quickly; everybody was friend or foe.

There was no question of arguing whether beef and gasoline had to be rationed. We were at war.

Today all this is different. We are neither at war, full-out, nor at peace, full-out. We have some stout and declared allies who are ready to stand and be counted. But the real enemy does not show. And, ironically enough this time, the very people who were lined up against us then are now, at least sympathetically, on our side and the nation that was on our side last time is pushing trouble for us all over the world.

It was against this insane background that our Government had to plan. How could we buy enough of the right weapons to protect us without bankrupting the country and destroying the very forms we are fighting to preserve? How could we get enough arms to protect us soon enough without invoking controls? And if we had controls, how could we avoid a life of scarcity? And if we had a life of scarcity, where would it all end? Finally and most important of all, should we work out a national defense plan along the lines of Fortress America or Troops for Europe or Asia First.

For if we were to go the route of Fortress America and accept the thesis that we must be prepared to defend ourselves from our own shores without the help of foreign nations or their bases, then we would need a certain kind of Air Force. It would consist almost entirely of long-range bombers to strike abroad and interceptors to protect our shores. If, on the other hand, we were to take the plan of sending our forces to Europe and, with the help of our continental allies, try to contain it there and fight from Europe, then we should have a very different Air Force. This one would contain many medium bombers, many ground support and attack planes and assault transports. If we were to take the third route and say that Asia is the center of gravity, then a combination of the two types of Air Force would be needed. Each of these would be different, each would have a different cost, and we couldn't afford to have all three at the same time. These were the real reasons our program couldn't be touched off overnight. Before it could be jelled for keeps, the elements that went to determine that program had themselves first to be determined.

(1) Not willing to act too quickly and not able to wait indefinitely, from our planners, there emerged back in the autumn of 1950 the pattern of our air program today. A middle ground prevailed. The architects of the plan proposed the authorization of the 70-group Air Force patterned largely after the troops-for-Europe plan, but with certain diversifying elements. The acceleration was to be modest but unmistakably potent. It was generally to treble the rate of output in a little over 2 years. It was to be done on a 40-hour week. And, above all, it was to be laid on top of the output of civilian goods rather than taking precedence and cutting into it. The decisions were taken, the die was cast.

With the make-ready phase not quite over, we are already steepening the acceleration to equip a 95-group Air Force with mostly new planes in 1952. Our Air Force has already activated 87 groups, but this has been done only by using many old planes. This is a long way from the 243 groups we had in World War II or the 96,000 planes the aircraft industry built in the 1 year 1944.

Now I think we're going to have a very good Air Force. I think it's going to be respectable in size. But I doubt if our Air Force is as big as the average man thinks it is, and I have reservations as to whether we'll get this Air Force as soon as he thinks we will. The one great compensation is that our Air Force will be one of high quality and the 95 groups will do very much more than 95 groups of World War II planes could have done.

The next questions are obvious: What is this new Air Force costing and why does it cost so much? Why all these billions for an Air Force less than half as big as that which we had in the last war? Well, as for cost, the currently proposed national budget calls for defense expenditures of around \$56,000,000,000. About \$20,000,000,000 of that will go to the Air Force. The Air Force, in turn, will spend more than \$11,000,000,000 of its money on air equipment. The Navy will spend over four billion on aviation. Altogether, a total of \$15,250,000,000 on military procurement for air. Out of every defense dollar earmarked for military procurement, 48 cents—almost half—is going to the aircraft industry. You gentlemen, therefore, and all Americans, certain have an interest in the airplane and in the industry that produces it.

Now the reasons airplanes cost so much more today than ever before are three: First, all of our normal elements of cost are up; second, today's airplane is different and is two to three times the airplane that World War II's airplane was; third, because we practically stopped building any airplanes in 1945, 1946 and 1947.

I'm not going to spend any time talking about the way our labor, materials, manpower and equipment are problems to us—because you know that anybody in America who is making anything big is having to face them. In short, we are competing with civilian industries for manpower, materials, parts and equipment.

This shouldn't mystify anyone. It's our national policy. Now I'm not attempting to refute the national policy, which is to keep civilian production going and to keep defense production going, too. I happen to be one of those who believe that, all things considered, it would be wrong to completely subjugate our civilian industry to the demands of our defense program. I am saying, however, that in my opinion it is not possible to superimpose our defense program on the civilian production—and still get both at the same time. I do not say that we should change the policy. I simply say that, the policy being what it is, we cannot expect our civilian products and our defense products at one and the same time. And we must expect to be late as long as we try to do both.

I do, however, want to talk to you about the other two elements which account for the high cost of airplanes, but which are not so obvious. One of these is the very nature of today's airplane. By comparison with today's version, yesterday's military airplane was little more than a power-driven kite, a flimsy of metal, and often operated by a swashbuckling pilot. Today's combat aircraft are virtual labyrinths of the most sophisticated automatic devices requiring pilots and crews who are practically scientists.

Ten or fifteen years ago the accent in design of a military airplane was placed on the airframe, the engine, and the propeller. They were the big three items and they represented close to 85-90 percent of the airplane. They also represented 85-90 percent of the cost of the finished fighting weapon. Less than 10-15 percent of the money and effort was spent on the rest of the plane.

Today it's all different. Again looking at the whole weapon as the end product, those percentages have shifted considerably. It's probably fair to say that nearer 50 percent of the design and the cost is expended on airframe and engine. They're still important. But the real point is that today's planes have devices and installations that the old airplanes just didn't have: Automatic fire-control systems, tracking systems, radar systems, air refueling systems. And these new and different elements now amount to at least half of the cost and the work in a modern airplane. In the old days the plane itself was the thing; today, the plane is merely a carrier.

A patrol bomber built early in World War II was loaded with 103 pounds of instrumentation. But today's counterpart has 582 pounds. I remember a particular plane produced in 1944 which carried almost 1,000 pounds of electronic items. The comparable plane of today has well over 5,000 pounds. The nerve center for the flight deck of a new Navy plane contains 12 miles of wiring.

But I should point out that the performance of these new planes is worth it. Take a typical fighter of World War II and a typical fighter of today. The old plane had a fighting altitude of 25,000 feet. The new one is right at home at 50,000. The old one did 400 miles per hour; the new one 650-plus. Normally this World War II fighter could fly war missions only during clear daylight weather. But the new fighter, with radar and other special equipment, is available round-the-clock, day or night, any kind of weather.

Performance is wonderful stuff—but performance costs money. You may be able to get a bargain out of buying a second-rate airplane or a second-rate air force, but just try to get a bargain out of using one.

Furthermore, to attain these performances, the modern airplane has to be heavily built of tougher materials. Its construction is different—completely different—than that of the old ones. World War II planes, generally speaking, were made of very thin outer skins. They had a great deal of internal bracing which carried most of the primary structural loads. The outside skin was just that—a skin, a covering. Today the situation is just reversed. The outside skin is much tougher and thicker and actually does a lot of the load bearing. The internal bracing is much simpler. In other words, the World War II airplane carried its load from the inside out—while the modern plane, to a much larger degree, carries its load from the outside in.

But this means a whole new manufacturing procedure. Many people wonder why the great aircraft industry with all its wartime plants suddenly needs new plants, new machine tools, and new equipment. On the surface they have a point. At the peak of the last war, America's aviation industry had a covered floor space of 175,000,000 square feet. So it must seem appalling that that same plant and equipment which turned out 96,000 airplanes in 1 year is now hard put to get up to ten or fifteen thousand a year.

Well, part of it goes back to the fact that we're building completely different airplanes. Quantity has nothing to do with it. Processing is the problem—and these new ones take very heavy equipment, such as skin mills, spar mills, and stretch presses that we didn't even have in World War II. And all that equipment takes money. The largest hydropress in our aircraft industry, unless the Russians have one—an 8,000-ton machine to form tougher metals—is being bedded down in our plant now. It cost \$750,000 and it's just one of hundreds upon hundreds of items we've had to buy to build these new airplanes.

To emphasize that today's airplane is more complicated and therefore more costly to build, I'll say it this way: In 1943, we figured that for a very specialized radar and electronic job, we could get along with one such technician for every thousand employees. Today, we need 1 out of 24 to be such a technician. In 1943, 1 out of 22 was an engineering employee. Today, 1 out of 8. That's how complicated and technical aircraft manufacture has become—and a major reason why it's more costly.

Aside from the present-day elements such as labor and materials, no small part of the high cost of air power is traceable to the sins of the past. Our cost of aviation today is not high just because of the high cost of the things we are doing today, but, instead, because of the things we didn't do in 1945, 1946, and 1947. That's the trouble with our air

program today—and it's the only absolutely basic thing that is the matter with it.

When you see a beautiful new airplane standing on the runway gleaming in its glory and just off a production line, you see an article that, I think, epitomizes the longest, the most complicated, and the most far-flung production effort of all time. I'm speaking now about articles that we make in some respectable quantity production. A battleship is complicated and takes a long time—but we only make one or two. And the airplane is no longer just a frame, an engine, and a propeller. The end product that we call the airplane is really an assemblage of thousands of individual products, each of which has to be invented, developed, manufactured, and then housed in the mother structure that itself has to be invented, developed, adapted, tooled, and manufactured. This long and costly process represents a time cycle of 5 to 7 years for the mother structure itself, to say nothing of the years of development of the various systems, accessories, and installations that make the whole an integrated thing. All these thousands of manufactured products have to be seasonably fed into the master plane production process. Everything has to be there at the right time. The parts and pieces come from every State in America and some from foreign countries.

This is no small-time, single-process show that can be stopped and started by the snap of a finger. This is the longest manufacturing river in the world. It's the Mississippi of manufacturing, and you can't get the big water out of the mouth of the Mississippi if you once shut it off at the source. And once you shut it off at the source, you can't suddenly turn it on and get the water out of the mouth of the river. It's got to flow just so fast and just so far and pick up its feeders along the line, and in the end you've got the big water flowing out at the mouth of the river.

But with the military victory in Europe, we shut off our airplane river, right at the source. In the month of March 1944, we produced over 9,100 military planes. Within a period of 1 month, from August to September 1945, we dropped from 2,800 to less than 800. By the following summer (1946), America's powerful aviation industry was producing less than 100 military airplanes a month. To be exact: 66.

Several dry years went by. Then suddenly someone discovered that Russia had an air force. "Where did they get it?" everyone asked. This is how they got it—they just didn't ever stop building the one they had, as we did. We let our stream run so dry, however, that back in 1946 and 1947 it looked as though America wouldn't even have a small Air Force. But a group of far-sighted men took note of the worsening world conditions in 1947 and began to urge immediate rebuilding of our Air Force. The President's Temporary Air Policy Commission, headed by Thomas Finletter—and the Hinshaw-Brewster congressional board came up with virtually the same recommendation: namely, rebuild aircraft production on a gradually intensified scale.

So, in 1948, we began to turn the water back into the stream. But that shut-off in 1945 is now costing us the time and the big money. We, as manufacturers, have been trying to stress this fact for years. Yet, there's still a general and widespread lack of appreciation for the time lag in aircraft production. Stopping and starting this complicated process of aircraft manufacturing is not as simple as merely telling the plane maker to stop and start. It means letting these hundreds of contributing organizations go out of the air business and making them find other lines to keep busy with—only to find that years later when we do try to get them back feeding us again, they aren't so keen to come back, or able to. Why should they be? By that time they can't

just drop whatever they're doing and serve us all over again.

Here is the hard core of it: In 20 years between World War I and World War II we spent an average of less than \$28,000,000 a year for air—only to find that, to dig us out of World War II, we had to spend \$28,000,000 a day, and for more than 4 years. We spent an average of about one and one-half billion a year in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. Now we're having to spend fifteen and one-fourth billions in just 1 year. And if conditions get worse—and they can—and if Senator Lodge's proposal for a 150-group air force were to be adopted—and it may have to be—it would call for thirty-two billion in fiscal 1952, twenty-seven billion in fiscal 1953, and thirty-seven billion in fiscal 1954. That's what the feast-or-famine, turkey one day and feathers the next, costs us.

When will the American people learn that steadiness in moderation—rather than enormity in a crisis—is better and cheaper?

Air power is expensive enough in itself, but when we add to it this insane cost of stopping and starting, we do two things: First, we run the cost up into the stratosphere; second, when we stop building we lay ourselves open to world attack—and the money we think we save in so-called fair weather, we have to quadruple to dig us out of foul. Steadiness rather than size in the pinches is the thing. It will cost less and keep us out of trouble, while the all-out and all-in route will cost us more and get us into trouble. These \$30,000,000,000-a-year crises would never come up if we kept our guard up all the time, and it need cost only a fraction of the way we've been doing it for the last 30 years.

In addition, a modest but steady long-range air program would have given us a running start in emergencies such as this one today. It would have permitted the industry to hold together some of its highly skilled work team in the lean years. It would keep both the industry which builds the planes and the Air Force which uses them stripped down, clean, up to date, and ready to go. It's a lot easier to get to 60 miles an hour if you're already going 15 or 20 than if you're standing still.

Finally, a long-range air program would support the constant research and development necessary to produce airplanes of the future. For by its very nature the development of aviation requires continual improvement and betterment—and that means continual experimentation, continual searching for newer and better ideas to produce newer and better airplanes.

Enact and support this long-range air program, and I can bring you great promise of wondrous things that can and will be done. Even right today I can allude to three or four definite projects all within our grasp in the foreseeable future and all stimulating to the imagination. I will just mention them in the order in which I think they can be developed.

The first and most obvious is the ultra-modern airliner that must come. Volumes have been written as to what the next completely new great airliner will be. Several types are promising, but one that I feel sure must be built would be something like this: It would carry around 60 passengers in luxurious comfort and have a cruising speed of around 600 miles per hour. It must have range and operating characteristics that will make it a magnificent airplane for the runs from Chicago to Los Angeles and New York. It must also have enough range to make it able to maintain dependable regularity of service in all weather, both ways across the Atlantic with only one stop, and be able to make it nonstop except under certain conditions. Above all, it must demonstrate an improvement over present operating costs and maintain, if not improve, the excellent safety factors built into present-day airliners.

Much has been said about the fact that Great Britain bids fair to seize the supremacy of airline air from our United States industry because she is first in the field with a pure jet airliner.

Having in mind what I have said about steadiness in air research and production, it would be well for all thinking Americans to see what the British Government was doing in the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 when we in America were doing little or nothing. In those significant years the British Government encouraged the starting of several—not one—several forward designs, and the 5 to 7 years time span for the development having about matured, at least 2 of those brand new types will be carrying passengers this year or early next. How will you Americans like the prospect of seeing these planes digging into the business of your own airlines and air companies with the fruits of engineering manhours and money that could just as well have gone in here at home?

Actually this does not have to happen. With all credit to our British friends, whose courage and enterprise I am the first to salute, I say it is still not too late to keep the supremacy of the airline air as we always have. Again with all due credit to them, I do not honestly believe that the British liners have the range to make them practical for operation over ocean routes and I do not think they have low enough operating costs to make them profitable over land routes. So the race is not yet over—or won.

An American design could easily be done that would accomplish the following times for typical runs, and do it all at equal if not better profit margins than are now in style:

Los Angeles to New York: 4 hours, 2 minutes

Los Angeles to Chicago: 2 hours, 56 minutes

Chicago to New York: 1 hour, 17 minutes.

And just to show you the capability and reliability of such an airplane, how's this: Flying 8 hours out of every 24 (this is less utilization, mind you, than present airplanes will do), one lone jet airliner could carry in 1 year across the Atlantic 26,600 first-class passengers. The *Queen Mary* is estimated to carry 39,000. Now if the jet could operate 10 hours a day (Eddie Rickenbacker does this with the *Constellation*) it could haul 33,300 in 1 year against 39,000 for the *Queen*.

Everywhere I go, people say to me, "What about the guided missile? When do we get that?" This is such a vast subject that I will only pick off one little corner of it as one of these wonderful things we can do within a very few years.

There are literally hundreds of different missile designs and types and they can be broken down many ways—by one measuring stick or another. To date, the effectiveness of all kinds of missiles as far as we know all over the world is limited because they are of relatively short range. And the reason they are short range is because the guidance systems are limited in their effectiveness. It is not hard to build just a missile of any range, long or short, it is not too hard to build short-range guided missiles, but up to now it has been awfully hard, if not impossible, to build a long-range guided missile. The long-range guidance system, not the missile—that's the key. And that's the prize—what the race all over the world is for—and we must and we can win it.

In plain language, we must have a guidance system that can guide beyond the horizon. How do you bend a beam around the curve of the earth's surface? The German flying bombs—the V-1's and V-2's—were guided by clock-type steering apparatus which was pre-set so many seconds this way, so many that. But that apparatus could not be used for long range and could not be accurate.

I cannot speak of it here, but we have a fine start on this problem. And when we get it, it will be possible to put this guidance

system on something that resembles a fighter plane, power it with the same kind of engines we now use in fighters, and shoot it off for its target.

Think what that will save us all. Not only will it be accurate, it will cost only a fraction of a big bomber. And, most sacred saving of all, it will not carry the precious irreplaceable complement of 10 to 20 young American men. This can well prove to be the intercontinental guided missile.

People often ask me why we don't have more individual flying—you know, with every man owning and flying his own plane. Well, the real reason is because we don't have the plane. The ordinary type airplane takes too much space to land in and can't hover or stand still in the air. And the helicopter that can stand still pays too big a price for being able to. The thing that keeps an airplane or a helicopter up in the air is to force the wing or the rotor blades through the air.

I'll just make you another of my expensive predictions. Given the development encouragement of a permanent program and a little leisure, we can come up with an entirely new concept of flight. Instead of dragging the wing or rotors through the air, by creating a pressure differential between the inside and the outside of the wing, we could drag the air through the wing—not the wing through the air. Wouldn't that be something? Then the wing could stand still, rise vertically, fly at high or slow speed in any direction. Just the ticket for the everyman's airplane. It probably would have to embody the principles of boundary layer control and have a ducted fan engine which in itself would take 10 to 15 million to work up. If any of you men have your checkbooks on you, the line for that one forms on the right. When we get this plane, we'll call it the little dipper.

Finally, those of you who have regarded the predictions of the space ship as the aberrations of the mildly insane, I must ask you in all seriousness to be a little more charitable toward those who are working on this problem.

Of all the things I have mentioned, the practical space ship is certainly the farthest away. But I will tell you this, here and now—within the present state of the art, and with developments we know positively will be here shortly, we already know that a space ship can be constructed and could achieve the miracle of space flight.

It would embrace the principle of probably three stages of propulsion which would arrive it in the space regime. At this area in the universe its minimum speed for an indefinite period would be 24,000 miles per hour.

The next step, as yet beyond our knowledge, is the problem of how to get it back safely to a landing on this earth, or, if to the moon, how to carry enough energy to climb back out. To those who may say that not having solved the second, third, and fourth phases of space flight, the solving of the first is meaningless, I will respond that 20 years ago those same people would have said we never could have knowledge of the first stage. But we do have that knowledge, and the rest will come.

So I say all these things can come, and I believe that they will. These are all things that we know we can do now, or rather soon. But they are only the beginning, not the end. As each one of these and other imminent questions are solved, science, her tempting finger constantly beckoning us forward, will show us new fields in which to work. The solution of one will but lead to the challenge and solution of another, until at last will come the answer, to mysteries that have kept mankind in ignorance and restriction for centuries.

In my heart I know there is a whole new world waiting for us in the mysteries of the air. Within and beyond this immensity of air and space there lies a new way of life, and we can be rewarded with her fruits and powers—if we will. New airplanes and

power systems are but on the threshold of this long corridor of searching, which at the other end may well hold the very secret of eternal life.

The land on this earth is limited, we know its dimension and we have worked well this land. So also we know the sea; we know its size, and for generations it has transported us, and given us food and other products. But each of these in itself is limited, limited until we augment it with the secrets of the age of air—the third and perhaps the greatest element in this philosophical trinity of land, sea, of air.

This is the great medium—the most vast of all. And yet about it the least is known. From its trackless expanse can come more energy from other planets than mathematicians can compute. And through its limitless space we can someday move—earth-bound no longer.

It can even make us realize how small our own world is and make the peoples of this weary world stop beleaguering one another and spend their strength and resources on constructive measures for mankind rather than on war among themselves.

We must be practical. We must arm. We must at frightful cost have these things—many of them actually in being. We must be ready to fight, if we must, to protect our homes and families—and we will.

But down the long corridor of time there must be another way. Surely there is power that is stronger than anything on this earth. When our men of science solved the mystery of the atom, we may have thought—and it may well be—that the atom heralds a new way of life. But I propound that there is still a greater source of power and energy, and we must reverently and patiently devote ourselves to finding it.

If it does exist—and I believe it does—then, mortals though we are, our help must come in the future as it has in the past by lifting up our eyes, because, truly, our help will come from the skies, for this—this is the age of air.

Pulaski Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, October 11 has been designated as Pulaski Memorial day in honor of the great Polish soldier and hero of our revolution, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record some remarks I have prepared in observance of this memorial day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, IN OBSERVANCE OF PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

It is fitting that Americans of Polish descent and all Americans, for that matter, should reverse the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, that great Polish symbol of liberty. It is well on this occasion to recall how much this hero contributed to our freedom when he rushed to these shores in answer to the thrilling call sounded by the American Revolution.

What were the circumstances which led him across the seas to participate in our struggle for liberty?

From 1768 to 1772, General Pulaski had engaged in the heroic but vain efforts of the

Polish nation to maintain its freedom against the Russian and Prussian tyrants. The Polish nation was unable to hold back the cruel tide of aggression of that day and General Pulaski was forced to flee the country. In France, he met that great American philosopher of freedom, Benjamin Franklin, who had said, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." General Pulaski was an example of one who knew that freedom was, in fact, total and indivisible, and that safety was a poor exchange for loss of liberty.

In 1777, inspired by a profound belief in the cause of freedom, General Pulaski, a renowned military figure in Europe, offered his services to General Washington. This gallant Polish-American soldier invested his efforts, his treasure and blood in building that nation to whom millions of people in Europe and Asia now look for help and deliverance. We have not forgotten, and we must not forget, the fact that 150 years ago Europeans like General Pulaski helped deliver us from tyranny.

It was a dark hour in the history of the American Nation when General Pulaski offered his services to our country. Pulaski and those other gallant heroes from Europe—Kosciusko, Lafayette, Von Steuben, and many others—did not come here because it was apparent that victory was sure. In the winter of 1777-78, following Pulaski's arrival here, the forces of General Washington endured the terrible ordeal of Valley Forge. The prospects of our Revolution were dim, indeed. We can take inspiration from this fact of history, in evaluating our prospects, and the prospects of freedom all over the world.

This is an especially dark day for the cause of freedom in Poland. The Polish people are once again crushed beneath the heel of Russian tyrants. But the inherent love for freedom still flourishes in that land. Though the fire of freedom no longer burns openly in the land of the Vistula, the remaining embers will, I am sure, successfully nourish liberty's sacred fire.

Never in history has human liberty been more seriously threatened. Never has man's readiness to sacrifice in defense of liberty been more urgently needed than today. Today the same forces of tyranny and aggression, which in Pulaski's time crushed Poland as a free nation, are controlling one-third of the globe.

Today, when the free nations of the world are uniting their resources and their efforts in a common defense against the spread of the insidious force of communism, Pulaski Day should be an occasion for a rededication of all freedom-loving peoples, to the principle that liberty under God is a birthright which cannot be denied any people anywhere.

I hope the day will soon come when Poland, a country that has sacrificed so much because it has loved freedom so dearly, can share in the victory of the cause of freedom. The determination of the Polish people to regain their liberty will not be diminished and must ultimately prevail.

Toward Higher Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the unanimous consent granted me by the Members of the House to do so, I

present for your attention, and for the attention of every Member of Congress, an editorial printed in the *Christian Science Monitor* on Friday, September 28, 1951, which follows:

TOWARD HIGHER STANDARDS

The American conscience is being dusted off. There is good hope that current disclosures of moral laxity and worse will produce definite reforms. A first step is the admission that something is wrong. At last President Truman has recognized this with his proposal that Federal officials should file reports showing their total income.

Publicity can be a wonderful aid to conscience. Several witnesses have recently testified that they had seen nothing wrong in taking gifts of money from firms with which their Government jobs brought them in contact. But since these practices have been exposed some have had the grace to concede that they don't look just right now. The new light of publicity which today enables them to perceive the unethical aspects of these practices might have been supplied earlier. Many would have refused gifts and fees if required to report them.

Mr. Truman's proposal could be very useful. We hope Congress will give it earnest consideration. But it would be a mistake to think that any regulation is going to meet the whole danger of public servants being also the servants of private greed. There must also be higher standards of ethics. Possibly something can be done with the proposal for a code defining proper conduct. Probably some practical advances in drawing the line between right and wrong will be achieved in the present investigations.

For instance, clearer concepts of improper influence should come out of the Hoyer committee hearings. William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, declares that it was not only right but his duty to make appointments with officials when requested by businessmen visiting Washington. He insists that this was all he did when American Lithofold Corp was renewing a thrice-rejected application for a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that he did not discuss the loan with any RFC official.

Aside from any questions as to the ethics of Mr. Boyle's other activities, this episode raises the question of what is improper influence. Just the making of an appointment could carry a good deal of weight under certain circumstances. Yet this is something that every Congressman is continually plagued to do by his constituents. Indeed, he is often requested to build a fire under this bureau or that to obtain action favorable to people back home. There is a law against Congressmen taking fees for appearing before a Government agency. But there is no law against taking campaign contributions or political help.

It is going to be difficult to state in a law or a code where proper aid to friends and political supporters ends and improper influence begins. Possibly congressional dissatisfaction with the operations both of Mr. Boyle and of Guy G. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, will set higher standards for political workers. And the exposure of abuses in the Internal Revenue Bureau is pointing clearly to the dangers of double employment. But in all these matters Congress and the public should make sure that they demand no less of themselves than they do of others.

Senator Horry has said that the only way to obtain dedicated service by Government employees is to see that they avoid outside employment. Will Congress apply this rule to itself? If the plan Mr. Truman proposes is adopted it will show many Congressmen with outside income and employment—many entirely proper. But why has the RFC inquiry shied off every time it has ap-

proached the subject of influence exerted by Congressmen to obtain loans?

We need higher standards. We trust every measure for obtaining them will be pressed. These measures will be most successful if they are themselves ethical enough to play no favorites.

Fooing the Taxpayers?—Not All of Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the October 4 issue of the *South Bend Tribune* carries an editorial which calls the attention of the "little fellows" to the fact that Congress is not quite as friendly as it might be.

That editorial reads:

FRIENDLY TAXATION

Congress intends to levy the heaviest corporation earnings taxes on the "big fellows." This does not mean, however, that the incorporated "little fellows" will not be carrying a heavier tax load. House and Senate conferees have agreed that the first \$25,000 of each corporation's earnings shall be taxed at 30 percent and that the new tax shall be retroactive to last April 1. This justifies emphasis on the fact that many politicians in the Federal area proclaim affection for and determination to protect "little business."

Yet in the impending tax law the Federal Government is to be empowered to take almost one-third of the earnings of the smaller corporations. And that tax is to be retroactive to last April 1, a contingency that probably did not enter into the calculations of any of the "little fellows" exposed to this new impost. If this is "friendliness" and "protection" what would avowed enemies of "little business" undertake in the form of taxation? Incidentally, a similar dose is coming for "little fellows" subject to personal income taxation.

Mr. Speaker, we should not fall into the error of thinking we can pretend to be friendly to and considerate of the interests of the average American. After the "big fellows"—the rich—have paid their taxes the "little fellows" are called upon to carry the real burden.

Time was when I thought the Federal Government would go broke when it spent more than its yearly income.

In my ignorance I overlooked the fact that the Federal Government, unlike the businessman, had the power to tax. The man with something to sell can only charge a price which the purchaser is willing to pay. The Government can tax not only to the extent that the citizen is willing to pay, but can take the last cent he is able to pay.

In my humble judgment, it is now taking from the average taxpayer dollars and pennies which impair his working capital, his ability to increase production, and, shortly, when the taxpayer is unable to dig up tax dollars and is broke, the Federal Government will not only be broke but busted—and wide open. Previous depressions may prove to have been just little valleys into which the Nation's prosperity slumped, while the next one may seem like the Grand Canyon.

Our New Deal wasteful spending and taxing, friends, are responsible for what is on the way. My hope is that it comes while they are still in power. It will be a little—yes, just a little—satisfaction and extremely interesting to hear them explain a situation which I hope they will not be able to characterize as a Hoover depression.

Trade Treaties Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the *Record*, I include a recent article from the *Boston Daily Globe* entitled "A Breach of Faith."

This article refers to recent legislation which allegedly violates the spirit, as well as the letter, of the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act. It is feared that retaliatory action may be taken by other nations.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. MAYBANK, recently introduced a bill, S. 2104, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This would presumably eliminate the reasons for present dissatisfaction voiced by several nations regarding our alleged violation of reciprocal-trade treaties. I understand that the measure has been reported favorably to the Senate and that it is expected to come up for action on the Senate floor in the near future.

It is apparent to me that the present situation definitely invites retaliation against our policy by other nations having trade treaties with us and I hope that the Congress will act speedily and effectively to relieve the concern of those who view our previous action as violation of the trade treaties.

There are some Members of Congress who fear that the passage of the Maybank bill will result in a sizable increase in imports and lead to increases in purchases of milk under Department of Agriculture price-support programs.

It should be pointed out in this regard that exports of United States dairy products greatly exceed the import of dairy products by the United States by two and one-half times. I have never believed that the trade treaties present a completely satisfactory way of regulating our trade with other nations of the world. This legislation does not contain proper safeguards against the influx of cheaply produced goods and commodities from foreign lands. It does not afford that degree of flexibility necessary to protect our own economy against dumping and low-paid labor. But on the other hand, once we have entered into these agreements, under current laws, we should abide by them and not change the rules

after the game has begun as we have sought to do by recent legislation. We should extend to other nations the same kind of faith and credit and respect for contractual obligations that we expect them to display toward us.

The article above referred to follows:

A BREACH OF FAITH

"The United States," declared President Truman last June, as he signed into law an act of Congress extending our system of reciprocal trade agreements, "will continue its efforts, with other countries, to expand trade by reduction or elimination of barriers, and thus build up strength for the free world."

This week at Geneva, Switzerland, bitter and blistering attacks upon the United States for violation of a whole series of its own pledges and professed policies in the realm of trade were delivered by official spokesmen for a number of governments long numbered among our friends. The criticism came from Switzerland and Belgium, from the Netherlands and Denmark, from Norway and from our own next door neighbor in this hemisphere, Canada.

What is the matter? Perhaps the best answer is given in a dispatch by an American correspondent covering the National Trade Conference now in progress at the Swiss city "Stone by stone," he writes, "the edifice erected by the western powers, largely under United States inspiration, to house the community of nations devoted to the establishment of a stable, nondiscriminatory international trade, is being dismantled."

Ever since the close of the recent great war, it has been the avowed policy of the United States to press for agreements designed to restore economic strength to the free nations. Two goals have been sought under this policy. The first has been to get our friends back upon their feet, economically, so that the financial burden of supporting them might be taken off this country's shoulders, and they could pay their own way. That was, and is, the essence of the Marshall plan.

The second objective behind this American policy has been to fortify the international community by building up international trade. To that end we have championed reciprocal trade agreements. To that end we have, as a nation, entered into a number of solemn engagements drawn up for the purpose of removing from the world's commerce the shackles of tariff quotas, restrictions, licensing limitations, import hurdles, and other impediments. At Torguay, at Geneva, at Washington, in a succession of agencies and pacts ranging from the International Monetary Fund down to our recent extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, the United States has preached greater freedom of trade, war on commerce-strangling cartels, greater production, and freer movement of commerce which would enable other nations to earn dollars through their own efforts instead of receiving them as gifts.

This policy, obviously, is not one of altruism, but one of common sense. It derives from sober appraisal of problems in a world still wracked by recent disaster. More important it embodies the lesson taught by insane trade wars of the twenties and thirties, which led directly to catastrophe.

The explosion at Geneva this week results from a direct about-face on the part of the United States—thanks to the power of the farm lobby in Congress. These insatiable interests, faced with prospect of having about 5 percent of the American market supplied by largely noncompetitive dairy products from half a dozen countries abroad (about the prewar level of such

trade), forced into the Defense Production Act a rider placing quantitative restrictive quotas on all such imports.

As a result, our Government is now knocking the props from under 4 years of effort by Belgium to stand on her own feet, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland find their trade status wobbling, as this trade barrier begins to undo the benefits of the Marshall plan. In addition, this violation of pledges and stultification of our professed policy has landed us in a nasty row with our Canadian neighbor. All the injured states are preparing today to retaliate with restrictions on our exports.

Here, then, are the makings of trade war at a time when survival of the west depends upon cooperation and scrupulous observance of pledges. Unless Congress undoes this blunder and puts our policy back on the rails, here may well be the beginning of a repetition of what happened following World War I. We face today a tide of evils spawned by the dishonoring of pledges by powerful states. Can America afford to jeopardize her honor, interest, and integrity by damaging what the world has left of international good faith?

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the record, I include the following article entitled "Representation," by George S. Reuter, Jr., executive board member, Johnson County (Mo.) Baptist Association:

REPRESENTATION

(By George S. Reuter, Jr., executive board member, Johnson County (Mo.) Baptist Association)

Central Missouri has a noble history. Such outstanding leaders as David Albaugh De Armond, Clement Cabell Dickinson, Reuben Terrell Wood, and George H. Christopher have gone to Congress to represent this section. John Lamar, Jr., was an elector for President Woodrow Wilson, and Wallace Crossley was Lieutenant Governor of Missouri. Prior to these great men, central Missouri had the outstanding service of Cockrell, Crittenden, and Vest. Educators point with pride to W. B. Starke.

Of the great men who are now history, the memory of Wallace Crossley remains most vivid. Perhaps the reason is the short time since he died, or maybe he just appealed to the people more generally.

He was born October 8, 1874, in Bell Air, Cooper County, Mo. He was educated at William Jewell College and the University of Missouri. Eventually he became professor of literature at Central Missouri State College, but he left professional education in 1903 to be editor of the Star-Journal at Warrensburg, Mo. He was for years the pride and joy of central Missouri, giving out wonderful advice and outstanding leadership.

He found time to serve 8 years in the State house of representatives and 4 years as State senator. The year he left the State senate, he was elected lieutenant governor of Missouri. President Wilson named him Fuel Ad-

ministrator during the First World War. Governor Park appointed him to head the State relief committee, and he went from that to direct the Federal Civil Works Administration. His final service was on the State social security commission. He was also past president of the Missouri Press Association. He died December 13, 1943.

While Senator J. F. Patterson is busy in Jefferson City doing a fine job planning new districts, central Missouri can look forward remembering a noble past. Many of her wonderful citizens will never sit in Congress, but will serve the people regardless.

There is the Reverend George Calvin Monroe, who celebrated 50 years as a Baptist minister on July 22. This grand old man of religion has trained two sons for the ministry since he graduated from William Jewell College. One of them died in action in World War II as an Army chaplain.

Dr. Earl Harding is another noted preacher. He is moderator of the Johnson Baptist Association, State recording and statistical secretary of the Missouri Baptist Association, board member of Central Baptist Theological Seminary (where he received his Th. M. and Th. D.), and pastor of the First Baptist Church of Warrensburg.

Probably the present favorite is Rolla F. Wood, professor of history of Central Missouri State College. After completing his graduate work, he returned home to the college and is a great benefactor of humanity. He has found time to be a member of the city government of his home town, as well as represent his district at the recent State constitutional convention. Yes, he has the governmental ability of Crossley, the understanding of Prof. C. F. Martin, the spiritual wisdom of Monroe and Harding, and the love of people of Miss Edith Howard and Mrs. Fred Miller.

With all this fine representation, past and present, how can central Missouri lose its place in the sun?

Nonstoppage Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of September 25, 1951, titled "Nonstoppage Strikes." This represents some new thinking along these lines by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. VELDE, and an old law school professor and constituent of mine, Prof. George W. Goble, of the University of Illinois.

The editorial follows:

NONSTOPPAGE STRIKES

Representative HAROLD VELDE's plan for what he calls "nonstoppage strikes," introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday, certainly is worth careful consideration by the Members of Congress.

The plan, which is the brainchild of George W. Goble, a law professor at the University of Illinois, would keep production continuing during the settlement of labor disputes, such as the costly one now going on at the Caterpillar Tractor Co. Its sponsors assert that it would do this without weakening the

bargaining power of either side to the dispute.

Under the present method of conducting strikes, both company and workers suffer the consequences of the cessation of production. The bargaining power of the company is enhanced by the cutting off of income of the idle workers. The bargaining power of the employees is strengthened by the cutting off of company profits through cessation of work. Both gain and both lose by this stoppage of production.

The Goble plan calls for work to go on as usual when a strike is called because of disagreement between company and bargaining agent. The company, however, would be required to deposit in a designated bank one-fifth of its previous year's net earnings each week of the strike, and halt payment of dividends and accumulation of surplus. All wages and salaries of all employees, from the president on down, would be reduced 10 percent or more and also deposited in a bank.

If an agreement was reached in 90 days all the impounded funds would be returned, but if no agreement was reached the funds would be forfeited to the Government, both sides thus being penalized.

We can imagine there will be many objections to the plan, both from labor and management. Companies may object to sacrificing any part of their profit and workers may balk at giving up 10 percent of the wages earned. The plan also appears to have numerous advantages, especially from the viewpoint of the public. If it would reduce losses to production and at the same time give proper guarantees to workers and employers that their rights would not be violated, it would be highly advantageous to the country. It should be given careful study by all parties concerned with industrial relations.

Education Defined by James A. Moss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, here is a definition of education written by James A. Moss:

I bear the torch that enlightens the world, fires the ambition of man, feeds the flame of genius. I give wings to dreams and might to hand and brain.

From out the deep shadows of the past I come, wearing the scars of struggle and the stripes of toil, but bearing in triumph the wisdom of all ages. Man, because of me, too, holds dominion of earth, air, and sea; it is for him to leash the lightning, plumb the deep, and shackle the ether.

I am the parent of progress, creator of culture, molder of destiny. Philosophy, science, and art are the works of my hand. I banish ignorance, discourage vice, disarm anarchy.

Thus, have I become freedom's citadel, the arm of democracy, the hope of youth, the pride of adolescence, the joy of age. Fortunate the nations and happy the homes that welcome me.

The school is my work shop; here I stir ambition, stimulate ideals, forge the keys that open the door to opportunity. I am the source of inspiration; the aid of aspiration. I am irresistible power.

The Cotton Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the cotton situation as it presently exists requires the attention of every Member, since it is a matter of national concern. The present price the farmer is receiving for his cotton, as compared with the cost of production and the cost of living, makes it imperative that we see that his income is increased. The following letter is a practical approach to the problem and offers a solution to the entire matter. I sincerely hope other Members will join me in this appeal to the Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., October 5, 1951.

The Honorable CHARLES F. BRANNAN,

Secretary of Agriculture,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Before the 1951 cotton crop was planted the cotton farmers were requested by our Government to increase acreage and yields in order to provide the fiber necessary to meet the demands during this present period of national emergency. The patriotic cotton farmers of this country responded to this request and have produced—or will have produced when crop gathering is completed—17,290,000 bales this crop year, according to the last report from the Department of Agriculture.

Since the picking of the crop commenced, we have seen a sharp decrease in the price of cotton. Due to the high cost of production, inclement weather, and the use of insecticide, the producers are receiving for their cotton a price that does not represent a fair return on their investments. This is particularly true with the nonmechanized farmer and the small family operator who has enthusiastically gone into the production of cotton at the beckoning of our Government.

Pursuant to section 402 of Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, you are given authority to establish a price on any agricultural commodity in excess of the minimum level of price support, after public hearings; and to establish an increased level, if found necessary, to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of an agricultural commodity essential to national welfare, or in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security. It is apparent at this moment that we must continue to have an excess of cotton on hand at all times to meet the national exigencies that the international situation has brought about. If the parity price of cotton were to be established at 105 percent of parity, it would insure to this year's producer a reasonable return for his cotton, and would also insure to the producer next year a warranty that would justify him to continue to produce cotton. An announcement at this moment that you will hold hearings for this purpose will have the added advantage of increasing the value of the present crop to the farmers, as well as assuring the required acreage for the next year.

The consensus of opinion seems to be that we will have a carry-over this year of approximately three or three and one-half

million bales. If this estimate is correct, the margin of surplus will be entirely too low for security purposes. The best minds on the subject feel that we must have at least 4,000,000 bales of surplus on hand at all times for national-defense requirements. Therefore, from these figures we must conclude that it will be necessary for us to produce 16,000,000 bales in the 1952 crop year. This accentuates the need for immediate action. For, unless the present price and the future price hold forth some opportunity for our farmers to have a reasonable return for their labors, investments, and efforts, they will not plant the acreage in 1952 that will be needed to attain a 16,000,000-bale crop.

Unquestionably the cotton producers of this country comprise the lowest-income group of our entire economy, and it is my honest and firm conviction that if the procedure I have suggested is followed, it will meet with universal satisfaction to our farmers and will not in anywise destroy or injure the economic stability of our Nation. This would afford our farmers no greater consideration than is presently being afforded industry and other segments of our national economy.

It will be greatly appreciated if you would give sympathetic consideration to this request and initiate whatever action is necessary for a determination of this problem along the lines that I have suggested.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

One Feature of the Crosser Bill on Railroad Retirement Is Unconstitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would naturally be inclined to favor a measure advocated by Chairman CROSSER, as I regard him one of the best friends of labor in the House of Representatives. There is one feature of his bill, however, that I am sure has not had sufficient consideration. I can find no law, or provision of any law, or any place in the Constitution, that gives the power to anyone to penalize a man—for making over \$50 per month—by taking away from him a part of his retirement fund that belongs to him. To take away a part of this fund is taking property from him without due process of law. It is further an annulment of a contract which has existed for years contrary to law.

Under the Railway Retirement Act, each retired worker has an interest in a fund which he himself has helped to create during his years of service. From this fund, under the law, he is entitled to draw monthly payments.

Who created this fund, and what was the contract on which his retirement assessments were made?

The workers created this fund themselves through the years of contributions which they have made to that fund.

Upon what conditions was this fund created?

The conditions were that at a certain age, if the contributions are kept up, the worker could retire and then draw out his own money.

Now, in the Crosser bill it provides that if a retired worker draws more than \$50 a month on outside work he loses his benefit payments. We will say that these benefits are \$70 per month. He loses that because of this law passed 30 years after he entered into this contract of retirement. The money which he loses is his own money, created by himself and others acting similarly.

Does anyone here, with only a limited knowledge of the Constitution of the United States, contend that we here in this Congress can take away a man's property without due process of law?—fifth amendment to the Constitution. Does anyone here contend that we can violate a contract that has existed for 30 years by merely passing an act of Congress?—see Dartmouth College case on contracts.

That is precisely what this bill does. It takes away private property without due process of law and it violates a long-existing contract, upon which the workers have relied for 30 years.

This cannot be done, as it is clearly unconstitutional.

It is none of our business at this time what the retired worker draws for outside work. It is his own money, and if he has enterprise and energy to go out and earn more, this Congress cannot impose a penalty which was not in his original contract.

To put a limit on a man's earnings, when his payments from retirement were created by himself, is saying to a retired worker, "You retired and you are supposed to be dead. And if you show any life, any energy and activity—no matter how beneficial to humanity—you cannot have the savings you have laid up during your 30 years of employment."

Such a doctrine is not only unconstitutional but it violates all the cardinal principles of common sense. The Constitution of the United States prevents such action, as the framers must have had in mind that some Congress, sometime, would attempt to show more wisdom than the framers, and destroy the protection to a citizen's right to property.

I will not vote for a provision which I know to be unconstitutional, nor would I vote for a provision which to my mind carries grave doubts of its constitutionality.

Truman's Latest Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman told us that newspapers and magazines were publishing information which aids our potential enemies; might enable them the better to destroy us. He issued an order which

directed executive departments and agencies to classify and stamp as secret or confidential, and to refuse to release to the press or to anyone, any and all information which, in the judgment of the agency head, might, said the President, assist our enemies.

Perhaps the recent and repeated disclosure by the press and congressional investigations of corruption, not only in the President's political family, but of officials prominent in executive agencies, was the real reason for this order. The President is not only irked, but greatly exasperated, because light has been thrown on the appalling lack of honesty and public morality of so many of those whose conduct he deprecates, but for whom he is responsible. That publicity the President would like to suppress.

But Mr. Truman is responsible for the press leakage of information to the enemy. Through Acheson, he stood by Hiss, high in the State Department, who was convicted of perjury when he denied he was a Communist. He personally characterized the efforts of congressional committees and Republicans to expose Communists as a "red herring." Members of his administration tried to discredit the efforts of Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley and others who tried to expose Hiss, Judy Coplon, Dr. Fuchs, Gubitchev. He backed Dawson and Vaughan, and he still insists that Chairman Boyle of the Democratic National Committee is a truthful man, of unimpeachable integrity.

Perhaps the President is sincere in standing behind some of his political cronies and appointees, for experience has demonstrated that his standard of what constitutes good conduct in a public official is a little peculiar.

But the President reaches the height of absurdity when he charges that the press has been supplying our enemies, that is, the Communists and Stalin's agents, with information which should, for our own protection, be suppressed. That information comes from him or his agencies. It was the President who gave out the story on the "guided missiles." It was the President who has been talking publicly about the atomic bombs of the Russians and those we possess.

Top officials in the armed services, without any expression of disapproval from the President, have been releasing information to the press about our production and the efficiency of this, that, or the other weapon of offense and defense. Stalin's representatives sit in the press galleries of the House and Senate and have access to propaganda releases put out by the armed services. The Kremlin has long had friends in Mr. Truman's administration.

Only last Thursday, October 4, Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, appearing before a Senate committee, seeking confirmation of his nomination as a delegate to the United Nations, after an hour's prodding, admitted "that he continued to endorse the activities of Frederick V. Field for many years after he discovered Field's communistic party leanings."

Jessup admitted that, as late as August 1, 1944, he had written a letter endorsing Field, Alger Hiss, Lauchlin Cur-

rie, Owen Lattimore, Harry Dexter White, and John Carter Vincent as delegates to the Institute of Pacific Relations of which he was chairman, trustee, and executive committee member from 1939 to 1945, of which he is a member, and which has been known as a Communist-front organization.

The President is still backing Jessup, who was unable last Thursday to find an answer to the question put to him "Why were you recommending Field years after you discovered his Communist Party leanings?"

All too long—yes, far too long—the President has given his support to men high in administrative positions who, like those named above, have conceived and implemented policies which worked out to the benefit of the Communists and those who are now fighting and killing our men in Korea.

The security of the Republic has been threatened, not by press releases, but by the administration's support of individuals like those named and others of like views, whose policies, however sincere and patriotic they may have been, have resulted in the establishment of Russia as a world power.

Mr. Truman reaches the height of absurdity when he charges that a free press is a dangerous instrumentality in a Republic.

Landlords and Merchants Liquidated by Chinese Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Communists aim to dominate every phase of everyone's life in China. The landlords and merchants are being systematically liquidated in their efforts to secure complete domination.

I include herewith the third of a series of articles by Everett S. Allen, which appeared in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, of June 28, 1951:

DEATH TO CHINESE LANDLORDS, MERCHANTS
DECEED BY COMMUNISTS IN PURGE

(By Everett S. Allen)

This is the story of how two Chinese landlords were introduced to death by the Communists. At this moment, with the Nationalist forces under wraps on Formosa, one of the deadliest weapons of the Mao-Chiang war is propaganda. These two landlords, Hu Pa and Uncle Chen, were selected—one by communism, the other by nationalism—as symbols of agrarian reform in action.

Relatively insignificant in themselves they assume historic importance because, like villains and heroes in storybooks, their lives and deaths have been recorded for the edification of the Chinese people.

The Communists did not come into power on a wave of public enthusiasm. Ninety percent of the Chinese people, hamstrung by illiteracy and insularity, are not interested in government and wish only to be left alone in peace. But to many of the remaining 10

percent, the major hope in the Communist regime was the promise of agrarian reform. Mao's basic plank in the party platform was that he would take the land from the landlords and distribute it among the peasants.

The landlords, called "tigers" by the Communists, were described by Mao's propaganda spokesmen as persons who owned the bulk of the forest land and tea and bamboo plantations. They had estates the size of counties. Behind the landlords stood the Chiang Kai-shek government. They were all-powerful. Their word was law. Local administration was in their hands, and they could do as they wished with—and even kill—an peasant.

LIKE SLAVE HOLDERS

In defense of the landlord system, a well-informed Chinese liberal in this country describes them as "the many being persecuted for the few, in the same manner as were the slave holders of American Southern States." Some were evil, most were indifferent toward their peasants. A few were barbarous, but most were tolerable, even though unprogressive. They represented an archaic system, but nevertheless a system which would, at least, have prevented chaos in a transitory period which already was under way before World War II.

Immediately after the Communist "liberation," it was necessary to determine immediately the party's friends and enemies. People's committees were set up, including land-reform work teams. Peasant meetings were held, at which the workers were acquainted with the party's policy. Finally, came the general meeting at which all villagers whose social status was questionable were evaluated.

In Laohu village, Hunan, about 1,000 persons gathered in the open square before the gray brick building of a former ancestral shrine that now is the office of the Peasants' Association. Audience participation is recognized as highly valuable by the Communist Party.

The party chairman said, "We must be careful not to let any wolves slip in among the sheep. We must not take friend for enemy or the other way."

An elderly man in rags said he was a poor peasant. "Liar!" shouted an irate worker, and went on to detail the land he owned in other villages. One who claimed to be a middle peasant was formerly a Kuomintang official and many peasants accused him of extortion and various other crimes.

TWENTY-SIX CALLED LANDLORDS

At last, 26 families were declared to be landlords. "If you do not agree with this classification," they were told, "you can appeal to the people's tribunal. Meanwhile, you must obey the law. You can work on the land but no sabotage, killing of livestock, or other tricks will be tolerated." Rich peasants were told that so long as they did not side with the landlords and try to sabotage the land reform, they would be protected by the other peasants.

Hu Pa was declared to be a landlord. A flood of accusations came against him each day at the office of the New Peasants Association. On a sunny morning, the peasants hurried to Laohu to discuss his crimes and accuse him at a public meeting. A makeshift stage had been erected on a piece of fallow land, with a portrait of Chairman Mao in the center and the five-star flags of the Republic floating overhead.

Some hundreds of children gathered in the front row, singing the favorite popular song, "Who feeds whom? Let us consider. Will rice grow without labor? Without toil, landlords, there are no mountains of grain * * *." Young men and women militia with red armbands and carrying spears patrolled the meeting place; Hu Pa was marched to the platform and the peasants

began to shout, "Down with the tyrant Hu Pa."

Lao Mao, head of the land reform work team, spoke for the government. "Do not be afraid of your feudal oppressors," he said, "for the people's government will back you to the hilt."

A laborer said Hu Pa killed his brother in 1927 and denied him a coffin. An old woman, weeping with rage and sorrow, said Hu Pa killed her son and beat her. A man in the uniform of the people's liberation army bared his back and said Hu Pa had him beaten and left those scars, and moreover buried his grandfather alive for failure to pay full rent.

SIXTY ACCUSERS

More than 60 accusers appeared and there were more who could not be heard because darkness was near. The Peasants' Association decided to send Hu Pa to the people's tribunal. This brought stormy applause and the chanting of people's government slogans. Said Peiping, "The peasants knew that their heaviest burden was gone and they could soon begin the great land distribution."

On the following day, the official Communist news bureau announced, "The trial and execution of Hu Pa, tyrant and murderer, gave a great impetus to the land reform movement in Laohu. The membership of the Peasants' Association shot up. Obviously, the government meant what it said."

The Communists thought highly enough of Hu Pa's case to broadcast it on their official radio network in English Morse code for North American consumption.

The second landlord was Uncle Chen, father of Chen Chih-lung, who attended Kwangsi State University. The youth, Chih, was very happy at that time because he was a member of the Communist underground unit. He led a group called the First Underground Team of Nanning and he spent hours telling the lao paisheng (common people) to welcome the liberation army when it entered Nanning. He spent more hours writing numerous propaganda leaflets for welcoming the liberation army.

Chih came from an ordinary farming family. His father's wealth, amassed by years of toiling and saving, consisted of two draft cows and a small amount of land. And yet, the father was accused by the Communist cadres of being a local despot and an exploiter of the poor.

Comrade Chih-lung, who had worked hard and long for the liberation army, was infuriated and shocked with surprise when he heard the news that his father was arrested.

EXPELLED FOR DEFENDING FATHER

In a symposium of Nanning youth, Brother Chih-lung stood up and defended his father. He said the wealth his family had was less than that of a poor peasant and it was wrong to arrest his father. At the meeting, the political director jumped up and assailed Chih-lung as having "incompatible thoughts" and "obstinate mind." Furthermore, he was expelled as a member of the youth corps.

After this blow, Brother Chih-lung became mentally confused. When he received the report that his father was sentenced to death, he lost his mind. He cried, sighed, and mumbled repeatedly to himself, saying, "Chairman Mao is not a man, but a beast. Is this the reward of 'liberation'? Is this the emancipation of the poor?" And by and by, he disappeared.

Uncle Chen's case was selected by the Nationalists at Taipei as symbolic of the Communists' ever-broadening purge. Both his and Hu Pa's case were used as propaganda. Undoubtedly, there were many Hu Pa's and Uncle Chen's, some evil, some persecuted grievously, but none ever got a trial by jury, none ever had the right of appeal and none ever was convicted on other than the most unobjective word-of-mouth evidence.

The Communist purge, including the slaughter of the landlords, followed a definite pattern. At first, those landlords selected for trial and death were those whose wrongdoings already were widely known and deeply resented. Immediately, the people felt, "Here then, is real justice, come to us at last."

Those persons next marked for death by the party were those whose crimes were unknown or minor or perhaps even nonexistent. Opportunists, shills, and stooges, or disgruntled employees of the victim were induced by coercion or bribery to testify in public against the accused. Usually the defendants in this second group were persons who were not popular, and of whom, therefore, the public was willing to believe evil.

But there came the day when a defendant stood on the banner-draped platform and there were those in the crowd who knew he was neither unpopular nor evil. There were those who were there by compulsion, who knew the witnesses were lying.

NO LIMITS TO PURGE

Then came the chill of realization. From being grateful at being relieved of tyrants, they became terror-stricken when they saw the purge had no limits. As a man in danger turns his back to the wall, the Chinese turned only to his family, daring to trust no one else.

And even the unity of family, heart of China's philosophy for centuries, was denied him as the Communist Party deftly aimed at undermining all loyalties to units other than the State.

The Hangchow working committee of the youth league commended Kuo Cheng-fang, a 14-year-old youth cub, for reporting a relative, Ho Shu-Wen, as a "despot and special agent" to the public security organization. The act reflected, the committee said, "the quality of gallant intelligence."

Kwantung regional news service in Dairen commented on May 4, "The people's eyes are bright as snow." The people's strength is great. If everyone increases his vigilance, assists the public security authorities in collecting data and boldly exposes the criminals, the counterrevolutionaries will be completely isolated and will have no place to hide before the millions of eyes of the people.

"Everyone yells and tries to kill the rat which crosses a street. If the people demonstrate their strength, it is easy to wipe out all counterrevolutionaries."

Soil Conservation Progress—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the Pennsylvania Teachers' Laboratory, State College, Pa., July 15, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRESS

It always gives me great satisfaction to have the opportunity of talking about soil and water conservation with people who are sincerely interested in helping to solve the problem, as you so obviously are.

Being engaged in the educational side of the matter, you are naturally concerned with the solid facts and figures relating to the conservation of our natural resources and the job of making the wisest possible use of

them. As a practical soil conservationist, I likewise am concerned with the facts—not with theories, guesswork, halfway jobs, or the representations of those who howl about duplication and forget about cooperation.

One of the things needed at this crucial stage of our national life, it seems to me, is more of what you are doing here in this Teachers' Laboratory—cooperating with one another and preparing people to help with the solution of our national problems.

There are some, perhaps, who feel that only farmers need be interested in the problem of soil conservation—the biggest of all our problems, in my opinion. It's my conviction we should all be very deeply interested in this stupendous job of soil defense, whatever our occupation or wherever we live. Soil defense is an indispensable part of our first line of national defense. Stout soldiers with guns and shells, and ships and planes, are an indispensable part of that first line of defense, too. The two are mutually sustaining, as everyone knows.

And farming according to modern soil conservation methods is not limited in its effects and benefits just to the farms on which such methods are practiced. It is closely related to the profitability of industry, the well-being of municipalities, and the health and welfare of all the people.

I believe I can say that our national policy and public thinking, with few exceptions, are agreed on the utter necessity of conserving and making productive use of our interlocking resources of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife. Research, education, land inventories, and the successful use and profitable results of soil conservation have brought us to this new concept of the importance of land and, also, of the need for keeping the land permanently productive. The practical application of this concept is being demonstrated on a progressively wider scale from year to year all over the country by farmers in soil conservation districts. These farmers, in the finest spirit of cooperation, are striking effectively at the root of the evil. Those of us in the Soil Conservation Service are proud to have been asked to help the districts with technical assistance. By enlisting the cooperative efforts of landholders, Government and the public, working together, are demonstrating their special adaptability for getting conservation accomplished.

PRODUCTIVE LAND'S IMPORTANCE IN OUR ECONOMY

It would be most convenient for the rest of us if we could pass all the responsibility for soil conservation back to the farmer—the Pennsylvania tobacco grower, the Iowa corn farmer, the Kansas wheat producer, the Texas cattlemen, or the Alabama cotton planter—and let the matter rest there. But our economy isn't built that way. The land is still the source of a very large share of our original wealth. Manufacturers, bankers, merchants, doctors, teachers, ministers, writers, and all the rest of us, in Philadelphia, Atlanta, Dallas, San Francisco, are directly affected by what happens to our productive land, which is the base of our national vigor and welfare.

We are affected, basically, as consumers of the things that are produced from the land; and we are affected, too, with respect to our income. Some of us are doubtless affected through the effect of poor land on the nutritional value of food.

The importance of productive land in our economy hardly can be overemphasized. A suit of clothes or a pair of shoes is manufactured in Pittsburgh or St. Louis, but the wool or leather which goes into the finished product may have been produced on a western ranch, more than a thousand miles away. And many people, beginning with the rancher himself, are dependent wholly or partly for their income—their living—on the

processes involved in getting that suit of clothes or pair of shoes into your clothes closet or mine. There are railroad men and truckers, weavers, leather workers, advertising men, stenographers, bankers, package manufacturers, salesmen, wholesalers, retailers, and many more. I hardly need to go into further detail because the same situation is true of every package of bacon, piece of furniture, or the many other soil-produced items processed or manufactured by the great industrial plants of the Nation. These producers, processors, and distributors are, in turn, buyers of goods and services on their own account. They patronize doctors, dentists, lawyers, garden-supply shops, and nurseries, barber shops and beauty parlors. They go to the movies and ball games. They buy houses, automobiles, radios, television sets, newspapers, electric irons, and light bulbs. They ride in Pullman cars. They hunt and fish, play golf, and take pictures. Their taxes help build roads and bridges, schools and hospitals, ships and airplanes.

AMOUNT OF PRODUCTIVE LAND IS LIMITED

So it is that every interest in the country has a stake in getting the quickest possible solution to this problem of safeguarding our remaining limited supply of productive land, which is the source of all but a small fraction of our food, as well as of all our wood products.

Although we in this country are not in danger of going hungry any time soon because of our land's running out, the amount of productive land we have left is much more limited than is commonly supposed, and the supply is still shrinking. We have left in the United States as a whole only about 460,000,000 acres of good, first-class land, counting all the good land that is in cultivation now and all that can be brought into profitable cultivation by presently feasible means. In recent years, we have been using for crop production and rotational pasture around 350,000,000 to 400,000,000 acres annually. Something like 70,000,000 acres of this farmed area, however, is unfavorable for use as cropland and should be diverted permanently to grass or trees. All but about 100,000,000 acres of the 460,000,000 acres of good, productive land, in use or available, is or would be without protection, susceptible to severe damage by erosion, waterlogging, floods, accumulation of alkali.

Our land capability survey indicates that more than 47 percent of Pennsylvania's land falls in classes I, II, and III—land which is suitable for continuous cultivation, with careful conservation treatment of classes II and III lands. Nine percent consists of class IV, a borderline type which can be cultivated safely only occasionally, and about 29 percent consists of land of classes V, VI, and VII, suited only for growing trees or grass. Class VIII land, the only other class, is useful for wildlife and recreation.

Erosion, according to our soil conservation surveys, has been severe on about 430,000 acres of Pennsylvania's farmland and serious on some 14,275,000 acres. Altogether, 51 percent of all the land in the State has been seriously or severely damaged (and this is more than half of the State's farmland). Pennsylvania is not as bad off in this respect as some of the other States, but the problem, nevertheless, is quite serious enough.

DOING SOMETHING ABOUT LAND WASTAGE

Because eroded land is scattered around the country in many thousands of parcels—a gullied field here, a sheet-eroded slope there—many people are inclined to overlook what is happening to our productive land, and to discount its importance because they can't visualize the enormity of the damage. There are too many details for summarization through "picture windows."

But with good land, like some of yours, worth \$125 an acre or more, 14,700,000 acres seriously or severely damaged brings the cost

of erosion, if we assume only \$65 per acre damage to the land, to nearly a billion dollars worth of Pennsylvania farmland wastefully depreciated. And, of course, the cost, in the absence of effective soil conservation, goes on in some measure year after year.

What would happen, I wonder, if anything like that kind of preventable damage and depreciation were eating away at your industrial plants and stores, your machinery, buildings, railways, and so on? You would do something about it—that's what would happen most certainly, especially if the damage should get worse and spread more and more, like erosion damage does with every rain, where the land is not protected.

And for precisely the same reason—because it's good business to protect and prolong the productive life of the productive land on which our biggest and most basic business, our agriculture, depends—we are doing something to halt the dissipation of our irreplaceable soil. We are doing it—State-wide, Nation-wide, community by community, farm by farm, acre by acre (of entire farms)—through modern soil conservation farming.

Today you will find this relatively new but already tried and proved kind of farming in constantly wider use as far as United States land extends in any direction. I have reference to the soil and water conservation farming which landholders of the Nation are carrying on themselves through their farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation districts, with the technical help of the Soil Conservation Service and the support and assistance they draw from various other sources, governmental and private. And now some other countries also are adopting this conservation pattern in their agriculture, with soil conservation districts to help—as in the Union of South Africa, Mexico, and some of the countries of Australia.

WHAT MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION IS

Before we discuss the subject any further, I think we should stop a moment to examine the meaning of modern soil conservation.

Modern soil conservation consists of the kind of sound land use and protection needed to keep the land permanently productive while in use.

It means contouring and terracing land that needs such treatment, and strip cropping and stubble mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, green-manuring crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, erodible land to grass or trees, development of good pastures and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Where land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls, moreover, for drainage, with full consideration given to wildlife needs. If it is too dry it calls for irrigation; if subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind strip-ping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter. If water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities (alkali), as in parts of the West, it calls for both drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of available adaptable tools.

Modern soil conservation likewise calls for flood control and reservoir protection (municipal and other kinds) by treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller, upper watersheds where floodwaters start. Applied at the

right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, stores water in the soil for plant use, and, where conditions are favorable, in the underground strata for pumping. As a part of the modern soil-conservation job, city sewage should be kept out of the streams and treated for use on the land, as some cities are now doing.

And of course, an indispensable part of modern soil conservation is a supporting program of research, such as will provide for the welfare of the land at all times, and give farmers all the advantages that progressive science can contribute. Also, a continuing, vigorous program of soil conservation education should be made a part of our teaching from kindergarten on through college. And, modern soil conservation calls for the maintenance of all effective work, that has a chance for permanency. Such measures are not intended to be used for just a single year or cropping season. They are the basis of land permanency and that is necessary if we are to have a permanent agriculture.

ONLY ONE CORRECT CONSERVATION FORMULA

There is only one correct formula for doing the soil- and water-conservation job right—regardless of what anybody may try to tell you. That formula consists of treating the different kinds of land on a farm according to their individual needs as determined by condition, and using each kind according to its capability for continued safe and economical production—whether that be for field crops, pasture, timber, or wildlife.

If there is any activity of mankind that requires the most scrupulous use of all that land science and hydraulics and agronomy can provide, it is the work of keeping our land permanently productive and making the best possible use of our water supply. There are in the neighborhood of a hundred soil- and water-conservation measures now being used in the program of the Soil Conservation Service to halt erosion, conserve rainfall, and improve the land. Each measure is used, as the situation demands, to meet a definite land need or to produce a specifically desired result. Usually, combinations of several measures are essential.

A hundred years of farming experience in this country has proved definitely that no single practice, applied arbitrarily on a whole field or a farm, will control erosion and maintain soil productivity permanently, except perhaps the planting of an entire field or farm to grass or trees. And we can't live by grass and trees alone. Except where the land is used for grass or forest, single-practice soil conservation can't be successful, in the great majority of cases because it almost always is inadequate to cope with the diverse land conditions and complicated requirements of sound land use and protection, imposed by nature. Some single practices, such as contouring, stubble-mulching, rotation, or manuring will bring some temporary benefits to entire fields or farms, but they cannot get the job done on anything approximating a permanent basis, except on the relatively small areas of the very best quality land (land of capability class I).

NO SHORT-CUTS TO LASTING SOIL CONSERVATION

So I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that there is no substitute for quality and completeness in the protection, development, improvement, and proper use and management of our land and water resources—in Pennsylvania or anywhere else. Each acre of land, as already pointed out, must be used according to its individual capabilities and treated according to its needs, because each acre of land, like each human being, is different from any other acre.

Likewise, each watershed, whether large or small, must be used and treated according to its specific physical peculiarities, if

we are properly to conserve, develop, and use the water and land resources of that particular watershed—or any watershed.

If there were some simple remedy for our land and water problems that could be applied everywhere, according to a standardized treatment or formula, the job would be relatively easy. But there is no cure-all, no short-cut to the solution of these problems. Nothing less will suffice than a painstaking study of each acre, each field, and each watershed, and the appropriate application of all needed conservation measures that the study indicates as necessary to get the job done right. To ignore these facts is to invite further damage to our diminishing supply of productive land, as well as to waste time, opportunity, and money for the landholder, the community, the Nation—for everybody.

Some will say, "Soil conservation must be profitable." Well, sure, it must be profitable. And it is profitable, practically without exception under normal conditions and where it is done properly and in time. Looking ahead, we cannot keep our sloping land—and the great majority of it is sloping—unless we effectively protect it. And, looking beyond that, land means food and food means strength and life.

That this method is the only possible way to ever provide adequate safeguards for our land is a physical fact devised by nature. It is one of the things we know, there is no guessing about it. It is a fact of precisely the same order as the physical fact that water will not run uphill on its own power.

Soil Conservation Progress—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the Pennsylvania Teachers' Laboratory, State College, Pa., July 15, 1950:

As a matter of fact, we took our Soil Conservation Service program out of nature's pattern for developing and safeguarding productive land. Nature's laws were so contrived that land, water, plants, and animals (with the exception of civilized man) should—and under natural conditions do—exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness of our basic resources.

So, it likewise is a mandate of nature of precisely the same order that the land, and the water which makes land productive, must be treated and used according to need and capability. I am repeating this because it needs all the emphasis we can give it.

PROGRESS IN PENNSYLVANIA

In the spring of 1932, I was invited to give a talk at Pennsylvania State College on the subject: Is There an Erosion Problem in Pennsylvania?

Not only was there a very serious erosion problem in Pennsylvania, affecting some 15,000,000 acres of land, but there was the very serious additional problem of few people being aware of the fact and nobody doing anything about it. I don't mind confessing that some of us in Washington, including myself, and a handful of people in the State, had to do the educational work needed

to arouse Pennsylvania both to a realization of the problem and to action. About all that was being done was that an occasional farmer undertook to stop his gully erosion by dumping trash into the washes. In some localities an occasional farmer was field strip-cropping; but at the time strip-cropping was only in process of development on the regional erosion research station. And most cultivation everywhere was up-and-down-hill. You could pretty nearly put down the amount of effort being devoted to soil conservation in Pennsylvania as close to zero.

Now there is a going soil-conservation program in the State. This is improving all the time and gaining momentum. True, the district movement has not gone ahead fast enough in Pennsylvania, but in the 27 active districts work is progressing very nicely. From year to year the rate of progress is picking up, as it is throughout the Nation. Nationally, in 1942, the Soil Conservation Service finished the job of treating farms according to the need and capability of the land on approximately 5,000,000 acres. In 1949 the amount of work of the same type and quality completed was 22,000,000 acres. This was a gain of 340 percent, and it was accomplished with an increase in facilities amounting to only 43 percent. (I am still talking about what even the bureaucrats can do when they cooperate wholeheartedly with farmers in soil-conservation districts.)

In 1942 the Service completed only 1 percent of the unfinished part of the Nation-wide soil conservation job; but last year the annual rate of progress went up to 34 percent of the unfinished job. This year we are hoping it will go up to something above 4 percent. In 1941 only six-tenths of 1 percent of the remaining job was completed and for the 7-year period from September 19, 1933, to December 31, 1940, we completed altogether only 1.1 percent of the unfinished total.

Some of the accomplishments in Pennsylvania, as of January 1, 1950, were 172,480 acres of contour farming, 156,607 acres of strip cropping, 88,055 acres of tree planting, 347 miles (about 5,000 acres) of terraces and diversions, 6,938 acres of farm drainage, 149,574 acres of crop rotations, and 530 farm ponds.

Now, we are moving ahead better and better, partly because the cooperation we are getting in the State is steadily improving. In a period of a little over 4 years, our cooperation has extended from working with 12,000 farmers in 6 soil conservation districts, to 80,000, or 46 percent of the farmers of the State, in the 27 soil conservation districts. That is good; but I wish we could have the whole State covered by districts by tomorrow night, so we could move still faster with the total job.

One reason why we have been able to move ahead so much faster in this State—and all the other States, too—is because of soil conservation districts. In my opinion, the soil conservation district is the most effective instrument for getting conservation on the land that man has yet devised, especially under the plan of local operation of the districts by local farmers who get technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and other types of assistance from other Federal, State, and local agencies.

NATION-WIDE PROGRESS

In soil conservation districts alone 800,000 complete soil conservation plans had been prepared Nation-wide by the beginning of 1950. These plans covered some 220,000,000 acres and the area treated amounted to 112,000,000 acres—that is, for the Nation.

Counting work done by the Soil Conservation Service in other programs (not including some of that in small irrigation and flood control programs), we have completed altogether over a million farm plans. Detailed soil conservation surveys adequate for

farm planning had been completed on 322,000,000 acres, and reconnaissance soil conservation surveys helpful in farm planning had been completed on 180,000,000 acres.

And still the big job stands ahead of us and we are still losing in the neighborhood of 500,000 acres of farmland annually as the result of unnecessary erosion. This much land is being annually damaged to the extent that it has little or no value for further immediate cultivation.

Certainly the soil conservation district movement is the greatest land movement of history. Since the first district was established in my home county of Anson County, N. C., on August 4, 1937, 2,246 other districts are in operation today (as of June 1, 1950) and they include 1,237,141,000 acres, or 81 percent of the farms in the United States.

In these soil conservation districts farmers are working together as they never have done before, and that is an asset which makes me feel confident that we are going to get the job of applying the basic conservation measures to the land, according to kind and need, done before it is too late. I am so sure of this that I can say to you today with much confidence that the job is going to be finished up to the stage of maintenance some time during the 1970's. I wish it could be done before that time, but this would be an accomplishment vastly greater than I ever expected to live long enough to see. As a matter of fact, what has been done already is vastly greater than I ever expected to see as late as 15 years ago.

COOPERATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

I think I should say something more about the fine cooperation we are getting in Pennsylvania with such agencies as the department of agriculture, the department of forests and waters, the Pennsylvania Game Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Highways, the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, and the State soil conservation commission. All of these agencies have a memorandum of understanding with the State soil conservation commission.

Vocational agriculture has admirably supported the movement in the formation of soil conservation districts in Pennsylvania, and is now being considered by the State commission for a memorandum of understanding to assist districts with the educational phase of the program.

I think we are over the hump and are winning the battle of soil conservation in the State of Pennsylvania. A little while ago the situation was much less favorable. Cooperation was the touchstone in this instance.

LET'S GET THE JOB COMPLETED

The main thing now is to go even faster. There are many things people like yourselves can do to help. I doubt if there is any instrument aside from soil conservation districts that can help more to get along with the job than the public schools of this State and the Nation. I think you have a wonderful opportunity to help out with the task, and I am hoping arrangements can be made so that you can do in this connection the highly effective kind of work that you are so capable of doing. I have in mind a matter which I believe we very much need in this country to make the conservation work that is put on the land stay on the land permanently. First, of course, farmers must work together as they are doing more and more in the soil conservation districts, and, secondly, we must get soil conservation into the bloodstream of our youth so that it will become a national habit. We may have to do some arguing to get soil conservation adequately placed in the schools; but let's go ahead with the argument and keep at it until we get the job done. There

will be criticisms surely, but it will all be overcome in time. That interval will be how long it requires to educate the people properly, starting in the lower schools.

Some misinformed people will be pulling back with statements about duplication. I can assure you there is no duplication on our part of anything that went before in the program I am talking about today. If there is duplication, it has been brought about by other agencies undertaking to duplicate the work that the Soil Conservation Service was set up to do in Public No. 46, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved April 27, 1935—the first Soil Conservation Act for our farmlands passed by Congress—whose preamble reads as follows:

"That it is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare and that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs."

We are absolutely carrying out the mandates of the Congress of the United States in our work, and if you want to read this 1935 law passed by Congress, I can get it for you. If you want to know the details of how the law was passed, who worked on it, etc., I can give you that, too. I know what we are doing and how we have been doing it, because I had a hand in setting the scene and taking part in the act for getting the job done properly and promptly. And I am very proud of the fact.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO AVOID

Some will say, "This is the farmers' job; let the farmers do it." Sure it is the farmers' job, and the farmers are very busy at it. Soil-conservation district supervisors are directing the job, and that means that the farmers themselves are the managers. The farmers in the districts and the supervisors of the districts are grass-root farmers. The supervisors are on nobody's payroll and don't act at the behest of anyone but themselves and the farmers cooperating with the districts.

But still we must be cautious about calling it just the farmers' job. It is not just the farmers' job; it's everybody's job. Up until now one farm family has been supporting four city families. Suppose a farm family lets its soil erode to a level of productivity where it can support only three city families, then two, then one, and finally none, what happens? Probably the farmer can go ahead and make something for himself, but what happens to the four city families that he used to support?

I won't try to answer that question, except by asking another.

Assuming that conservation is the farmer's job, what happens if the farmer doesn't carry out the job? Suppose he doesn't know how or doesn't do it quick enough? Who gets hurt? Everybody gets hurt, of course—city people first, and probably more so than farm people.

Somebody said recently that you have to pay for soil conservation. What is it that you don't have to pay for; I mean, of course, what worth-while earthly things? But this matter of saying that you have to pay for soil conservation doesn't tell the whole story. You don't really have to pay for the lasting type of soil conservation properly applied to the land. This kind pays its way, and more.

In 1945, at the request of the Appropriations Committee of Congress, the Soil Conservation Service made a study throughout the country of the profitability of conservation farming. This was done by ex-

amining the books of farmers who had carried out a good job of soil conservation and comparing the results with those obtained on comparable farms where little or no conservation had been done. The farmers of the former group took in, on the average, \$4.90 per acre more than the nonconservation farmers.

With this figure and other farmer results serving as the basis of computation, the indications are that soil conservation is putting back into the Federal Treasury much more than the money that is being taken out of the Treasury to do the job. The Treasury funds are used to pay the salaries of our technicians and other personnel, but the entire amount was returned as increased income taxes, during a recent year, plus a dividend of 78 percent. In other words, we spent \$39,000,000 that year on the soil and water conservation job, but our study indicated that this \$39,000,000 later on went back into the Federal Treasury in increased income taxes, plus thirty million more as profit.

Soil conservation increases per-acre yields (from around 30 to 100 percent, probably); and per-acre yield is the basis of farm profitability, whether prices are up or down.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS TO AVOID

There are certain misconceptions about soil conservation that still seem to confuse the thinking of a few people. We need to be on guard against such misinformation, as the following.

1. That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.

2. That there are short-cuts to conservation, or that farmers can or should do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance.

3. That soil conservation costs more than it is worth, and that dollars-and-cents considerations are all that are at stake.

4. That we have all the good land we need, and that soil erosion is an inevitable part of nature's scheme.

All that one needs to do to clear one's thinking with respect to these notions is to look about the country or to visit some of the other countries of the world. In various parts of the world one can see the refutation of such specious reasoning written on the eroded and unproductive countryside, and etched in the worried faces of people struggling to produce their food and other bare necessities on erosion-worn land.

I spent some time last fall studying erosion conditions and soil and water conservation methods in southern France, Italy, and North Africa. Over there, I observed the lengths that people go in order to get a living from some of the world's oldest lands still in agricultural use. The work required in establishing some of their steep-slope bench-type of agriculture, supported with stone walls, translated into our American labor costs probably would amount in many instances to \$15,000 or \$20,000 an acre. Such an outlay on farmland clearly is out of the question for us, in the practical sense at any rate, now or at any time we can foresee, even in the most eroded parts of the country. Nevertheless, we are using bench terraces in Puerto Rico—but with grass-supported walls rather than expensive rock-supported walls. As a matter of fact, we are not in need of the stone-wall type of conservation at this stage of our development, except in occasional very special cases. We can now produce with modern soil conservation around twice as much per acre as we were producing prior to the present era of soil conservation, which began 20 years ago.

So, we definitely are getting ahead with the soil-conservation job in this country.

Treaties With Colombia, Israel, and Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1951, the United States signed a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with Israel. This is the third of a series of such treaties signed by the United States in 1951. One was signed with Greece in Athens on August 3, 1951, and one with Colombia on April 26, 1951.

Each of these treaties contains the most-favored-nation clause as well as national-treatment provisions. The Colombian treaty has been submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Article VI of the Constitution provides that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land.

The House of Representatives has no hand in the ratification of treaties. This is a right limited to the Senate.

Nevertheless, the overriding character of treaties may set aside statutes in the enactment of which the House did participate under its constitutional powers. The provisions or contents of proposed treaties are therefore of the utmost concern to Members of the House no less than to the public.

The treaties with Colombia and Israel each contain the following provision, in each case a part of article IX:

Nationals and companies of the Republic of Colombia (or Israel) shall be accorded, within the territory of the United States of America—

(a) National treatment with respect to leasing land, buildings, and other immovable property appropriate to the conduct of commercial, manufacturing, processing, * * * and professional activities, and for residential and mortuary purposes with respect to occupancy and using such property.

National treatment means the same treatment as is accorded citizens of the United States.

The treaty with Greece differs slightly but significantly from the foregoing. It provides in article IX that—

1. Nationals and companies of either party shall be accorded, within the territory of the other party, national treatment with respect to acquiring by purchase or otherwise and with respect to owning, leasing, occupying, and using land, buildings, and other immovable property appropriate to the conduct of commercial, manufacturing, processing * * * and professional activities, and for residential and mortuary purposes, subject to the following limitations:

(a) In the case of nationals and companies of Greece the acquisition by purchase, or otherwise, of ownership rights in land, buildings, and other immovable property, within the Territory of the United States, shall be dependent upon the applicable laws of the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States of America within which such property is located.

In other words, the treaty with Greece provides limitations that recognize the force of the applicable laws of the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States within which the property in question is located; the Colombian and Israeli treaties do not. They would override the applicable laws of the States, Territories, and possessions that might conflict with them. In this manner the local self-government of our States could be superseded by central authority wielded principally by the Executive as represented by the Department of State.

Moreover, acts of Congress could be set aside and the legislative authority as vested in two Chambers could effectively be circumvented. The House of Representatives would be bypassed and rendered impotent in such fields as the State Department elected to encompass in treaty provisions.

The treaties with Colombia and Israel would set aside restrictive covenants regulating ownership of residential real estate, for example, as well as other practices of alleged racial discrimination. To undertake to settle these controversial issues by international treaties would be to violate the slower but more effective democratic processes. The United States is engaged actively in finding solutions to problems of this character within its own borders. Progress is being made. It would be most unwise to seek by indirection to impose, through the processes of our foreign relations, final decisions in such issues when the debate is still unsettled in this country.

All three of the treaties contain the most-favored-nation clause. The rights and privileges granted to Colombia or Israel would extend automatically to the nationals of any other country which has a most-favored-nation treaty with this country. This would happen without further debate, further hearings, or further voting. To assume that this would be desirable would be to assume that the State Department in drafting these treaties took into account all the consequences of extending their provisions to virtually all other countries of the world and had found no objection to such a universal extension of privileges and rights. Are we willing to make such an assumption? If so, are we willing to assume further that if the State Department did take full account of the consequences of most-favored-nation extension of the provisions of these treaties, her judgment would be infallible with respect to the effects that might fall upon our domestic laws, practices, and policies from the outside?

Are we willing to repose in the State Department legislative powers superior to those of the House of Representatives in social and economic fields—in fields where it is customary because of the controversial and disputed character of many issues, to hold extensive public hearings before committees of Congress and subject bills to searching debate? Treaties are often abstruse in language; they do not come to public attention as readily as bills before Congress; they

may cover a wide variety of subjects. Is it not more sound to confine treaties to provisions that do not conflict with existing laws? Would it not be more wise procedure when treaties that do conflict with existing laws are contemplated by the State Department that this executive agency should make this fact known and seek prior modification of our statutes? This would be more open, more frank, and more honest. Should Congress refuse to make the necessary modification of existing statutes the State Department should then confine itself to treaty provisions that would conform to laws or constitutional provisions already in effect. Should it not be willing to be thus bound, Congress and the public would at least be altered and there would be little danger that we would wake up one day to find that a provision in some obscure treaty had bound us hand and foot in some vital matter.

Truman Income-Tax Plan Abhorrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the *Stockton Record*, with which I am in full accord:

INCOME REPORT PLAN IS ABHORRENT

A distorted sense of political opportunity is shown by Harry S. Truman in his proposal for a public report of income by Government employees on salaries of \$10,000 or more. It is a desperate counterattack along the issue which is likely to play a large part in the 1952 campaign—lack of integrity in government.

Mr. Truman naturally believes that the outcries of his opposition will be muffled if that opposition kills off the income-reporting plan. For the purpose of gaining this end, the President submits an idea which is purely expedient and political, and which carries not an ounce of real statesmanship.

In asking that all incomes, loans, and gifts in excess of \$10,000 Government salaries be reported and publicized, President Truman is taking over the same line of thought which he has criticized in others. A law to require the reporting of income would presume that all Americans holding Federal jobs—Congressmen, judges, admirals, and generals as well as administrative employees—are capable of dishonesty and unethical conduct. This same presumption has been followed all too far in contriving security devices to protect the country against communism. The signing of a non-Communist affidavit as a requirement for employment now is a general practice.

What kind of government shall we have when no man is presumed to be honest and ethical, and when no man is presumed to be non-Communist?

One of the surprising aspects of the Truman plan is that it is being taken up by some of the same Members of Congress who have been most outspoken in their opposition to non-Communist tests.

It would be a grave error for the Republican leadership to fall in with the President's

idea. It would place the GOP on the defensive, where now it has the offensive. It would run Republican chances of attracting progressive support.

Mr. Truman's income-report bill is an act of deep-dyed reaction. It is an illiberal violation of traditional American concepts of justice and fair play which out-McCarthy McCarthy. And so it should be branded unmistakably.

The crooked administrator, the unethical Congressman, the indiscreet politician should and can be sought out and exposed man by man. To fasten the presumption of such conduct on all persons in Government is something very different and completely abhorrent.

Effects of Erosion Silt on Bays—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the spring meeting of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association with Southern States Coastal Erosion Control Association, Mobile, Ala., April 28, 1951:

EFFECTS OF EROSION SILT ON BAYS

I am especially glad as a soil conservationist to take part in the discussions of your coastal conservation groups, because the silt at the bottom of your streams, harbors, and bays comes from eroding lands on which we work up in the rolling country of the interior watersheds.

This silt makes trouble all along the way, from the place of origin to the coastal waters. Stream channels are choked and polluted, valuable bottom lands are covered with sand, ditches, reservoirs, and harbors are silted at great cost to individuals and the public. This sedimentation makes it necessary to carry on expensive dredging operations in streams and harbors. It necessitates replanting oyster beds, and develops other difficulties.

Therefore, everybody has a direct stake in what farmers, hundreds of miles upstream, do to keep their topsoil at home and out of the streams, reservoirs, and bays.

Although only a fraction of the total amount of soil washed off the sloping lands of our watersheds actually reaches coastal waters, you are doubtless familiar with the tremendous economic and other burdens imposed by that part which does come down to the coast. Everyone will benefit from a thorough understanding of the problem, and from common support of practical programs and measures for dealing with the difficulties involved.

Soil conservationists are beginning to get acquainted with some aspects of the relationship of sedimentation to marine bays, estuaries, reservoirs, and aquatic life. You, in turn—as my presence here today bears out—are directing more attention to conditions, problems, and remedial actions being taken through soil and water conservation in the watersheds, out of which flow the floodwaters that too often dump harmful silt into coastal waters.

MAN HAS SPEEDED UP SEDIMENTATION PROCESS

The silting of bays is, of course, a natural condition that was in progress for unreckoned time before there was any cul-

tivation of the land. There is much evidence, however, both historical and geological, indicating that the preagricultural rate of sedimentation of bays and estuaries was very slow in comparison with rates following extensive clearing, burning, plowing, and grazing of our uplands. Too many historians and engineers, I am afraid, have attributed the rapid sedimentation of harbors to uncontrollable forces of nature. They too often have failed to notice the rapid changes brought about through man's deforestation and agricultural operations. Certainly, in many instances, the rapid sedimentation of bays and estuaries is an abnormal condition that developed after or along with, the clearing, overgrazing, and cultivation of land in the contributing watersheds.

Sedimentation of harbors, for example, is as old as history. Sites of a number of Biblical cities, which we are told were originally seaports, are far inland today. Continuous deposition of sediment from eroding uplands gradually extended the land areas and pushed the tidewater from their wharves. Ur of the Chaldees is said to have been a thriving seaport at the head of the Persian Gulf about 3000 B. C. Today its ruins lie in a desert 150 miles from the present shores of the gulf. For centuries, the sediment brought down by the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers from the overgrazed highlands of Turkey, Syria, Iran, and Iraq has pushed the head of the tidewater out into the Persian Gulf, and the shore line today is reported to be advancing at the rate of one mile in 30 years.¹

HARBOR SEDIMENTATION FROM EARLY HISTORICAL TIMES

A number of ancient harbors that were frequented by the ships of Phoenicia, Carthage, Greece, and Rome are now many miles inland from navigable waters. Adria, Italy, was a busy seaport in the time of Caesar Augustus, but today it is 20 Italian miles inland.² Sedimentation forced the Romans from the harbor at Antium and caused abandonment of the once magnificent harbor at Ostia, built in 43 A. D. at the mouth of the Tiber River.³

In early postglacial time, the Tigris and the Euphrates flowed into the Persian Gulf near Hitt and Samarra, now some 600 miles north of the present shore line. The Karun River, flowing westward from the Persian highlands, also contributed its silt to the Persian Gulf and built up a bar which extended eastward from Basra and protected lower Mesopotamia from the inroads of the sea.

As irrigation agriculture spread to the land farther up the rivers, the problems of flooding and sedimentation became more serious. The powerful communities resorted to the only means that they knew for protecting themselves against floods and at the same time preventing accumulation of sediment in their canals. This consisted of completely shutting off the water from certain branches of the rivers by earthen dams. While protecting the areas farther upstream, the lower delta lands were subjected to increased sedimentation and higher floods.⁴

SEDIMENTATION ALSO HAS CHANGED LAND AREAS

Near Beled, north of Bagdad, the flood waters of the Tigris were turned into a large

¹ Banks, Edgar J. The Reclamation of Ancient Babylonia by Irrigation. Engr. News, vol. 69, No. 10, pp. 468-469. March 1913.

² Gottschalk, L. C. Sedimentation in a Great Harbor. Soil Conservation, July 1944.

³ Saville, Sir Leopold. Presidential Address to the Institution of Civil Engineers. The Engineer (London), vol. 170, No. 4427, pp. 316-317. November 1940.

⁴ Bennett, H. H. Soil Conservation. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1939. Fig. 8, p. 18.

basin with a hard bed of conglomerate underlying a thin alluvial deposit. The three heads of the famous Nahrwan Canal, whose construction is commonly attributed to Nimrod, led from the upstream side of the dam. The dam was maintained for 3,000 years and was not destroyed until about 600 or 700 years ago, during the later caliphate days. Since its destruction, the channel of the Tigris has shifted to the east; and the lands near the head canal, formerly among the most fertile of the Tigris Valley, have been so badly cut by ravines and gullies that, according to Sir William Willcocks,⁵ their restoration today is not financially practicable.

In 1949 I saw extensive land-building operations by siltation in the lower alluvial plain of the Po River in Italy, near the Adriatic Sea. Dikes were being built on low-lying, unusable portions of marshland within the alluvial plain. Silt-laden waters from the Po were directed into these diked areas, where deposits of water-borne sediment were laid down to build up new land. The surface of the finished fields was about 3 to 4 feet above the former marsh level, and the land was producing excellent yields of a great variety of vegetables, corn, alfalfa, fruits, and other crops.

SILTING RUINED SOME AMERICAN COLONIAL HARBORS

Here in our own country—young as it is by comparison—we have a number of examples of similar abandonment of early colonial ports on the Chesapeake Bay and Potomac River, because their harbors filled with sediment—soil washed down from the neighboring highlands—after the clearing and plowing of the land. When Capt. John Smith sailed up the Chesapeake in 1608, he found many deep-water estuaries which afforded excellent harbors.⁶ Most of this Maryland land was planted to tobacco, generally on newly cleared land having fertile woodland topsoil. When such fields were worn out (severely impoverished), usually after some 6 or 7 years planted to tobacco, mainly, they were often abandoned and new fields cleared. Soil erosion inevitably set in, streams became muddy, and the estuaries and bays began to silt up.

With this accelerated, or man-induced, soil erosion, early open-water ports were changed into mud flats, in some cases within 50 years. Towns that otherwise might have become thriving cities and seaports thus were destined to die in their infancy. They were choked, indirectly, by the very industry that had promoted their founding.

Recently I visited Joppa Town, in the upper Chesapeake Bay, and stood on the stone wall of a former busy port for trans-ocean shipping. The town had been abandoned many years because of silting. An ocean-going ship could come across the mud flats no nearer than 5 miles of the docks.

TODAY'S COSTLY HARBOR SILTATION

During the past 100 years, the Federal Government, which began dredging in Baltimore Harbor in 1836, alone has removed more than 111,000,000 cubic yards of silt from the harbor, at a cost of nearly \$17,000,000. And in the entire Chesapeake Bay area, the Government has spent in the past century more than \$68,000,000 for dredging; yet much still remains to be done.⁷ It is estimated that a million dollars' worth of topsoil from farms in the Brandywine watershed in Chester County, Pa., and New Castle County, Del., is carried into the channel of the Marine Terminal at Wilmington, Del.,

⁵ Willcocks, Sir William. Irrigation in Mesopotamia. London and New York, 1917.

⁶ Gottschalk, L. C. Effects of Soil Erosion on Navigation in Upper Chesapeake Bay. The Geographical Review, April 1945.

⁷ Gottschalk, L. C. Effects of Soil Erosion on Navigation in Upper Chesapeake Bay. The Geographical Review, April 1945.

annually, filling it at the rate of 12 inches a month. Each year, the Government pumps out 500,000 cubic yards of silt at a cost of \$300,000.⁸

Right here in Mobile Harbor, silting, I have been informed, has been a costly harbor problem for many years. From 1826, when Federal Government first undertook to improve the navigation channels into Mobile, through June 30, 1948, Federal expenditures alone for maintenance have cost more than \$8,500,000.⁹ This is in addition to large sums spent by the State and by private interests.

Recently the cost of harbor maintenance has risen rapidly. At present the authorized annual maintenance cost is reported by the Army Corps of Engineers to be \$452,000.¹⁰ In the 11-year period 1936 through 1946, an average of 4,000,000 cubic yards of silt were dredged annually from navigation channels in Mobile Harbor.¹¹ During the same period, dredging of navigable channels in the Warrior and Lower Tombigbee Rivers averaged 2,300,000 cubic yards. I understand that the yearly maintenance dredging in Mobile Harbor is now running between five and eight million cubic yards, and on the rivers above the harbor between two and four million cubic yards.¹²

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946, more than 10,000,000 cubic yards of sediment were removed from Savannah Harbor and waterway, at a cost of approximately \$985,976. The bulk of the dredged material was silt material washed from eroding uplands.¹³

EXTENT AND RAPIDITY OF SILT-PRODUCING EROSION

I have given these figures in some detail, because I believe it is important to visualize the tremendous extent of silt-producing erosion and the comparative rapidity with which it can proceed. Soil erosion, to illustrate what I mean, is a serious problem throughout the vast drainage area that funnels into Mobile Bay. The Tombigbee-Alabama River system drains 44,700 square miles, an area almost as big as the State of Alabama.

Within this area, where steep land (20-percent slope) is used for cotton, erosion losses of more than 150 tons per acre have been measured in a single year.¹⁴ On the other hand, under close-growing crops such as vetch and rye, the corresponding soil loss was only 5 to 10 tons. Under a good cover of grass or trees, which in this region should be grown on slopes as steep as 20 percent, erosion losses normally are only a few hundred pounds a year.

The Soil Conservation Service estimates that at least 4,000,000,000 tons of soil are annually moved some distance downhill by man-accelerated water erosion. Of this amount, roughly 3,000,000,000 tons are deposited on lower slopes, over alluvial plains, and in reservoirs, ditches, canals, and harbors. About 1,000,000,000 tons a year are carried on down to the oceans, some being de-

posited on the lowest part of deltas and over Continental Shelf positions.

DAMAGING RESERVOIR SILTING ALSO COSTLY

We have made studies of silting in many reservoirs over the country, including about a dozen here in Alabama. The Alabama reservoirs measured have watersheds ranging in area from only a few square miles up to more than 9,000 square miles. We have found that they are losing their water-holding capacity at rates from as low as one-tenth of 1 percent annually, where the watersheds are mainly in grass and trees, to more than 3 percent annually where the watersheds are principally in cultivation and the reservoir's capacity is limited in relation to the size of the watershed.¹⁵

One study of reservoir sedimentation showed that (as of 1940) one or more water-supply reservoirs had been built by each of the 189 towns, cities, and institutional establishments in the nine southeastern States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, at a cost of approximately \$23,500,000.¹⁶ Sedimentation surveys of 45 of these reservoirs showed that half of them were losing more than 1 percent of their capacity annually. Based on the assumption that they will cease to give effective service before they have lost, on an average 60 percent of their capacity, it was estimated that a third of them would have a life of less than 50 years, and more than half of them a life of less than 75 years. A number of smaller reservoirs were found to have been completely silted and abandoned.

Carl Brown, of the Soil Conservation Service Sedimentation Section,¹⁷ has pointed out that "Southern communities will have to pay higher taxes or higher water rates to cover the reservoir replacement costs resulting from lack of erosion control on their watersheds."

EFFECTS OF SILTATION ON AQUATIC LIFE, ETC

We have examined some of the monetary costs and broader economic penalties imposed on the public by the physical problem of siltation. There are various other self-evident bad effects, too, including harm done to marine life and inland fish and game, navigable waterways, water-supply installations, recreational areas, and, most important, to the lands that produce the silt through land-improverishing soil erosion.

In addition to filling up navigation channels, sedimentation takes a heavy toll of aquatic life. Suspended matter in water diminishes the sunlight needed by certain organisms to grow, I am told, and thus impoverishes or eliminates the food supply on which aquatic life feeds. Silt (mixtures of clay, silt, and sand) may completely smother spawning beds.

The damaging effects of sedimentation on the oyster industry of the Chesapeake Bay area is one of the best illustrations showing the toll taken by the indirect effects of soil erosion on marine life in bay waters. Maryland's oyster production, once considered second only to agriculture among the State's industries, was 15 million bushels a year during the period of 1883 to 1885. By 1950, it had dropped to only 2,500,000 bushels. The observations of biologists and other authorities confirm the fact that the decline of the oyster industry in Chesapeake Bay waters parallels strikingly the silting up of Bay ports. Curtis L. Newcombe, well-known biologist, has brought out this fact pointedly.¹⁸

¹⁵ Unpublished data, Soil Conservation Service Water Conservation and Disposal Practices Division, Sedimentation Section.

¹⁶ Brown, Carl B. Protecting Municipal Watersheds in Southeastern States, Public Works, May 1948.

¹⁷ Newcombe, Curtis L. Treasures in Troubled Waters. The Scientific Monthly, vol. LXX, No. 2. February 1950.

"Studies have shown," he points out, "that over-fishing and siltation operate together to cause depletion. . . . Throughout the Chesapeake tributaries silt is the oyster's greatest natural enemy. . . ."

Newcombe supports that conclusion with statements from documents of Colonial days and figures on present-day silt measurements and oyster populations. For example, he reports that several hundred boats plied the oyster trade in the York River in Virginia as late as 1900, but that fewer than 50 boats can be counted there now. Meanwhile, the estimated 12,000 or more tongers who worked in Virginia alone in the 1880's has dropped to only about 2,500.

Heaps of oyster shells found on the shores of the upper tributaries of Chesapeake Bay show that the Indians took them from extreme upper bay waters, but the bottoms of these tributaries now are soft mud in which oysters cannot exist. The head of oyster propagation today is many miles down bay from those formerly good producing sites. E. V. Truitt, Director of the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory of the Maryland State Department of Research and Education, at Solomons Island, is of the opinion that, at least in the last few years, upper-bay beds have been destroyed by freshets. He thinks there is reason to believe that the increased fresh water inflow is a result of accelerated erosion and runoff in the uplands.

Effects of Erosion Silt on Bays—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the spring meeting of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association with Southern States Coastal Erosion Control Association, Mobile, Ala., April 28, 1951.

EROSION AND DECLINING OYSTER PRODUCTION

"Although there is no specific evidence," Dr. Truitt said recently, "it is my firm belief . . . that poor management of the land around the bay and lack of conservation practices is responsible in no small degree for the declining oyster production. Unless the land is properly managed, erosion will bring about a further decline in oyster yields."

The hydrographic program of the Chesapeake Bay Institute, in cooperation with Johns Hopkins University, includes a sampling of the bottom of the bay by borings. It is expected that the silt figures may be helpful in showing the effects of such depositions on marine habitat and life in the bay area. I have come across a number of significant references bearing on this particular point. One which I have in mind was a report by Allan F. Archer, of the Alabama Museum of Natural History, based on a survey made in cooperation with J. B. Engle, of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, of oyster reefs and the effects of the 1947 hurricane on the coasts of Mobile and Baldwin Counties.¹ I was interested in their general finding of higher oyster mortality in bays with muddy bottoms as contrasted to that on oyster reefs on hard bottoms likewise subjected to storm-water disturbance.

¹ Archer, Allan F. Alabama's Oyster Reefs, Alabama Conservationist, May, 1948.

⁸ Richards, Annette H. A New Battle of the Brandywine. Nature magazine, February 1950.

⁹ Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, Annual Report, part 1, vol. 1, p. 972. 1948.

¹⁰ Data from Office of Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, Washington, D. C.

¹¹ Hathaway, Gail A. Sedimentation Problems Related to Floodways, Navigation Channels and Harbors. Proceedings, Federal Inter-Agency Sedimentation Conference, Denver, Colo. May 6-8, 1947.

¹² Noll, John J. Erosion Damage to River and Harbor Works. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. April 1949.

¹³ Disker, E. G., and Yoder, R. E. Sheet Erosion Studies on Cecil Clay. Alabama Experiment Station Bulletin 245. November 1936.

If I may do so without being considered as expressing an opinion on the merits of the proposed legislation, I also would like to refer to one or two statements on the effects of silt on oysters, made during hearings in May 1947 before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Salt-Water Fish and Shellfish Problems.¹ Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, told the subcommittee concerning the release of the fresh water at the mouth of the Mississippi: "The result was that all of this silt brought down from the Northern States and the Southern States through which that river meanders, was deposited out there on these oyster beds. This fresh water and the silting completely wiped out those oysters. * * * Other testimony and statements submitted were accompanied by similar references."

A. E. Hopkins, aquatic biologist of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, had this to say of a survey he made of the oyster damage in the Mississippi Sound area: "I did not notice, in any of the places I went to, any severe quantity of silt, but sand certainly is very violent as far as oysters are concerned, because it is heavy. The oysters can withstand a very considerable amount of silt, because it is light, and they can still open their shells. But sand is heavy. When that washes over them the shells will not open. They cannot get the shells open, and they just lie there and starve to death or asphyxiate."

To which I might add the comment that the heavier sand material to which he refers definitely is likewise a product of soil erosion, and most certainly has to be taken into account in considering the effects of erosion silt on bays.

Although we have no way of establishing the exact percentage chargeable to sedimentation of coastal oyster waters, the fact remains that the decline in oyster production has applied to the whole east-coast reporting area, including the Gulf of Mexico. In 1880,² the first year of record, the figures show that production for this area totaled 153,405,000 pounds of shucked oyster meat. By 1945³ the production had dropped to 65,392,000 pounds. That represents a decline of approximately 57½ percent. West-coast production is not taken into account, because importation of Asiatic seed oysters spawned in Japan, particularly since the 1930's, has greatly expanded oyster production in that part of the country (from 1,050,000 pounds in 1888 to 10,074,000 in 1945).⁴

MUCH YET TO BE LEARNED

Undoubtedly there is still much to be learned about the entire matter of the effects of silting of our waters on marine and other aquatic life. That, of course, is the job of the biologists, but we soil conservationists feel that we can contribute something of practical value from the erosion control and waterflow retardation standpoints. I believe that all of us will benefit as more information is developed along some of the lines we have been discussing here today. For instance, I am told that the Fish and Wildlife Service people feel that siltation of bays and estuaries has its effect on young

shrimp, by interfering with their feeding and proper growth there before they migrate out to deeper water. But it seems that neither Federal nor State studies of this question so far have been feasible.

BAY SILT REDUCTION BEGINS WHERE RUNOFF STARTS

In all events, however, on the basis of sound and extensive research and experience, this we know: That the task of reducing floods and controlling erosion, and thereby reducing the intake of silt by our reservoirs, bays, and estuaries, is one which should begin where the rains fall and runoff starts, and end only when the runoff reaches the sea. A main objective of all the conservation work which the Soil Conservation Service does is to retard the discharge of water from upstream areas. And, while we are thus retarding runoff, the rate of silt production by erosion is reduced.

The flow and quality of water in surface streams are influenced materially by the way we use and manage our land resources; but in a great many instances individual landowners and water users have little or no control over the activities involved with stream flow and hence are unable to deal with them alone. As a result, local agencies and groups like your own, and the farmer-organized and farmer-directed soil conservation districts through which we make technical assistance directly available, are concerning themselves more and more with water-control problems. The Soil Conservation Service, in fulfilling its authorized responsibilities, is committed to doing everything possible within its resources to provide technical assistance needed in dealing with the erosion problem, siltation, floods, and water wastage.

SERVICE'S COORDINATED WATER-CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

Thus the water-conservation activities of the Service are continuously geared to the needs of the land and water users, and are coordinated with the activities of other agencies concerned with land and water. To this end we define water conservation—which always has been part and parcel of soil conservation in our Service planning, operations, and research—this way. Water conservation is the physical control, protection, management, and prudent use of water in such a way as to maintain crop, grazing, and forest lands, vegetal cover, and wildlife for maximum sustained benefits to people, agriculture, industry, commerce, and other segments of the national economy.

If erosion in a watershed can be reduced, sedimentation in reservoirs, harbors, and estuaries can be reduced. For example, conservation treatment in the 14-square-mile watershed above Lake Issaquena, near Clemmon, S. C., between 1941 and 1949 reduced the rate of silting of that reservoir by 53 percent.⁵ Rotation strip cropping applied on some 1,400 acres was the major practice used.

ACRE-BY-ACRE CONSERVATION TREATMENT OF LAND ESSENTIAL

The only way, moreover, in which water pollution from silt, with the attendant problems of sedimentation, can be controlled or reduced effectively is by the adoption of soil and water-conservation practices applied in accordance with the needs and capabilities of the land. Contour farming, strip cropping, terracing, good pasture and range development and management, proper woodland management, land-use changes, and various other specific land-management measures

which have proved to be successful in the control of soil erosion and water runoff must be applied to the land by those who use the land.

It is not enough to treat just part of a farm, or part of a watershed, or part of any other area of land. Every acre of cropland, pasture land, farm woodland, and idle land must be treated according to its needs and each acre used according to its capabilities. That is true, whether it is in major watersheds for flood-control and silt-pollution abatement purposes, on individual farms and fields for erosion control, or through such group undertakings as conservation drainage or irrigation projects.

That is exactly what is being done by farmers in their soil-conservation districts, with which the Soil Conservation Service cooperates. In today's conservation era, conservation of land, water, forest, grass, cultivated crops, and wildlife are, for the first time in the history of man, being tied together and scientifically coordinated on the basis of land capability and need, using various mutually supporting practices in sufficient number and appropriately coordinated to get the job done effectively.

This is a basic tenet of modern soil conservation.

PUBLIC BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITY

Ordinary soil and water conservation measures are for the protection and improvement of the land on which they are applied, and consequently the principal benefit is received by the owner or operator of the farm on which such work is done. Therefore, it is only proper that the farmer should bear the principal cost. On the other hand, the special measures and structures used in flood control are designed to benefit downstream bottom lands and to keep sediment out of stream channels, reservoirs, bays, etc. Because these are public benefits, the public—through community groups, or county, State, and Federal Government—should bear its proportionate part of the costs so long as they are justified by the benefits to be expected.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND FLOOD CONTROL

The Soil Conservation Service is carrying on water flow retardation works of improvement on 11 major watersheds in the country at the present time. Our Service and the Forest Service are the two United States Department of Agriculture agencies authorized under the 1936 and subsequent flood-control acts to engage in this work, in cooperation with the Army Corps of Engineers. We do it through the soil-conservation districts. The 11 watersheds in which such operations are under way include the Trinity and Middle Colorado in Texas, the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie in Mississippi, the Coosa above Rome, Ga., and the Potomac in Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Surveys which are in progress, meanwhile, in this same general area include those on the Roanoke in Virginia and North Carolina; the Savannah in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; the Altamaha-Ogeechee in Georgia; the Apalachicola in Alabama, Georgia, and Florida; and the Sabine-Neches, part of the Brazos, the Pecos, Red River, and the San Jacinto wholly or partly in Texas. The survey report has been prepared on the Pee Dee River watershed in North and South Carolina and Virginia, and the survey has been completed on the Little River and Bosques branches of the Brazos in Texas.

SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICT ORGANIZATION AND ACCOMPLISHMENT

It should be emphasized, however, that the soil-and-water-conservation work which concerns you and every other segment of society in the Nation is not confined to this flood-control type of operations. It is progressing at a constantly accelerated rate throughout

¹ Hearings, "Rehabilitation of oyster beds destroyed by the opening of the Bonnet Carré Spillway." Subcommittee on Salt-Water Fish and Shellfish Problems, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 80th Cong., 1st sess., May 6, 1947.

² The Fisheries and Fishery Industries of the United States, Sec. 2, S. Doc. 124, 47th Cong., 1887.

³ Fisheries Statistics of the United States, 1945. Statistical Digest, No. 18, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

⁴ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service records. (Statistics in pounds of oyster meat, because of varying bushel sizes and poundage records used in different States.)

⁵ Noll, John J., Roehl, John W., and Bennett, Jackson. Effects of Soil Conservation on Sedimentation in Lake Issaquena, Pickens County, S. C. U. S. Soil Conservation Service, SCS-TP-95, Spartanburg, S. C. June 1950.

the State and the whole country in the soil-conservation districts. More than four-fifths of all the farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States are now within soil-conservation districts, which number nearly 2,350 in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. You now can travel from northern Maine through all the States bordering the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, and on across Texas into New Mexico, and be outside of soil-conservation district boundaries only one time—for a very short distance in New York.

Alabama, incidentally, is one of nine States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands which are all completely covered by districts, as are South Carolina, Delaware, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Nebraska. Many others are largely covered.

District organization, of course, is not enough by itself. It is the soil and water conservation work that actually gets done on the land that counts. To January 1, this year, detailed conservation surveys had been made on 361,000,000 acres in the districts; 941,000 conservation farm plans had been worked out by district farmers and Soil Conservation Service technicians out on the land together, covering 260,000,000 acres; and 131,000,000 acres had been treated with conservation measures called for in the plans. All my figures are from the records of the Soil Conservation Service. They do not include PMA figures, or those from other Federal, State, or private agencies except as the activities of these agencies have contributed to the work done on the Service-planned farms.

SERVICE'S EMPHASIS ON BIOLOGICAL ASPECTS

I should like to mention that we give particular attention to training in biology for our farm planners and other technicians who work with farmers, out in their fields—not in offices. The farm planner considers the value of treating various types of land, not only for their primary use but also with an eye to any modification or special practice that will result in more wildlife through complete and adequate land treatment. He is expertly equipped to do this, because his understanding of the biology aspects of soil and water conservation planning and treatment is dovetailed with similar basic knowledge and adeptness in soil science, geology, forestry, range management, hydrology, agronomy, engineering, and other phases of a complete, coordinated soil and water conservation program.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION IS URGENT, TAKES TEAMWORK

The problem of soil and water conservation and wise use is not a problem that can wait until farmers solve it by any trial-and-error method, for that might be too late. This is an urgent problem, which demands the best efforts of the Nation's scientists and of all who use the land for agricultural purposes. And the understanding cooperation and active participation in its solution by industrial and all other groups in our society are indispensable to getting done in time this vital job which so importantly affects all of us.

Princes of Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

an editorial from the October 6, 1951, Saturday Evening Post entitled "The New Princes of Privilege Are the Bureaucrats":

One thing that makes President Truman particularly hard to take is his belief that he got elected in 1948 by making silly speeches. Because he believes that, and because he appears to be set on a third term, Mr. Truman continues to make silly speeches. His San Francisco address to the local Democrats was a whistle-stop number which topped even the 1948 record.

Actually, Truman was not elected in 1948 by defying economics and ordinary common sense from the rear platforms of trains. That would be an insult to the intelligence of the people who live in the rural areas of America. He was elected partly by indifference to the Republican candidate, but more by votes of Federal jobholders, who have grown so numerous that they, with their wives and in-laws, now hold the balance of power in any close election. For example, in 1948 Ohio went for Truman by about 7,000 votes. At that time there were 80,000 Federal jobholders in Ohio. They have been increased by almost 15,000 since then, according to the figures of Rogers C. Dunn, the election analyst, who keeps a close track on the relation of the number of jobholders to election results.

In his San Francisco address the President went to town on some imaginary characters whom he described as "the special-privilege boys." They are supposed to be rolling in luxury because the "national income" has leaped from \$40,000,000,000 in 1933 (the bottom of the depression, incidentally) to \$278,000,000,000 last year. Deduct the Government's cut through taxes, and slice down the remainder to allow for administration-sponsored inflation and high prices, and the national income looks less impressive. Perhaps people may soon begin to suspect that the evil genius who wants to cut their take-home pay down to the standards of the McKinley era isn't the boss, but Mr. Truman's tax eaters.

If there are any "special-privilege boys" extant, they are Federal officeholders, beginning with Mr. Truman himself, whose compensation includes a \$50,000 extra "expense allowance" which he can clap right into the bank without paying any tax at all. How much money would one of Mr. Truman's phantom special-privilege boys have to get to be able to do that? The scandal of privilege extends all the way down the line. The roster is sprinkled with mink coats, deep freezes, and substantial inducements for "public servants" with an eye to business. Year after year the payroll is augmented until it has become a serious question whether the party in power, supported by an ever-increasing Praetorian Guard of pliant officeholders, can ever be defeated at the polls.

These are the forces upon which Mr. Truman relies for reelection, and it must be admitted at the outset that it is a formidable array. In a recent edition of Human Events Donald Richberg thus defined the new privileged class: "The ruling class, which is always the reality behind the abstraction of government, is not a privileged class in the old sense. It is only privileged in the new sense: privileged to decide how everyone should live and work for the good of society; privileged to have all the facilities for exercising power, which incidentally always include a great deal of what would have been called luxury and pomp in previous societies."

The remnants of the privileged class which Mr. Truman uses as a prop in his class war have to look over their shoulders for the sheriff. The new privileged class of self-perpetuating job holders and functionaries is the sheriff. It makes a difference, as people are gradually coming to see. Not too gradually, we hope.

The Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a very disturbing, yes, tragic situation in the constantly increasing cost of living and the outrageous skyrocketing of prices on everything. Not only is the average workingman and his family being pinched more than ever before, but the cost of our entire defense program has increased to such an alarming extent that we may soon be faced with all-out inflation.

This dangerous situation has troubled me no end for many months. Some 15 months ago, at the time of the Korean outbreak, I urged and advocated complete controls across the board. During my long service in the Congress I have seen the effects of uncontrolled and unbridled price stampedes. I have seen the corporations and major industries run hog-wild in their lust for profit and more profit, accumulating unconscionable wealth and power out of the misery of war and great emergencies. The thought uppermost in my mind has been this: "Will this greed and avaricious quest for power, for control, for wealth ever cease?" We are now witnessing a recurrence of their ill-advised and unpatriotic actions, and I, for one, want to see it controlled; yes, eliminated completely. Until this is accomplished, the hope and struggle for peace remains but an illusion. I have always firmly believed that, once the profit motive is completely eliminated, the scourge of war will disappear.

In order to determine the true facts in the present situation, I addressed a letter to Director Michael V. DiSalle, of the Office of Price Stabilization. His very forthright and detailed explanation of the laws he is required to administer, and the program he has outlined in connection therewith, is contained in his reply which reached me recently. It is deserving of the careful attention of every Member of this House, and I urge each of you to read it carefully. My letter to Mr. DiSalle and his reply follow:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1951.

Hon. MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Director, Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DISALLE: When I urged and advocated, 15 months ago, that controls be instituted across the board, and made every possible effort to bring about the enactment of fair legislation to preclude the skyrocketing of prices on foods, rents—in fact, on everything—I was in hopes that when your agency went into action, prices would be held down. Instead of that, I notice that price increases are being authorized almost daily, instead of having them lowered. This tends to inflation and makes it impossible for the white-collar worker, the rank and file of labor, and the vast number of our aged on retirement or fixed income to withstand the pressures they are subjected to. Their standard of living is continually being lowered.

Should not some effort be made to hold prices down or even lowered? Conditions are commencing to be intolerable.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1951.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH. I sincerely appreciate your letter of September 26, 1951, regarding the efforts of this Office to stabilize prices. I had known of your endeavors to provide for strong and effective price and wage controls before I came to Washington in December 1950 as Director of Price Stabilization, and since that time I have had personal knowledge of your continued efforts to support the economic stabilization program and the legislation which would make it even more workable.

I am sure that I am as disturbed as you are by the necessity from time to time to authorize increases in ceiling prices. Some of these increases, of course, are required under the terms of the Defense Production Act. Our recent increases in pork prices, for example, or our recent regulation permitting increases in milk prices, were required in order to allow reflection of upward movements of farm products which are below parity. We have not yet completed our procedures for granting price increases under the terms of the so-called Capehart amendment, but unless this section of the act is changed, many price increases will flow from this requirement. As you know, our attempts to roll back prices that had advanced exorbitantly have likewise been severely limited by recent congressional action.

Nevertheless, one should not conclude from the frequency of the announcement of price increases that such increases have been permitted on a general or across-the-board basis. Our economy embraces millions of sellers and a vast array of products. Although we have been forced to increase prices here and there, ceilings for the bulk of the goods and services produced in the economy have not been increased and, in significant cases, decreases have been required. Actually our record as measured by the various price indexes has not been a bad one. Since price controls became effective, the BLS index of consumer prices has advanced by approximately 1 percent. An appreciable part of this increase occurred in items which are not within the control of our agency, including rents, public utilities, etc. Wholesale prices have actually declined since price controls became effective. Some of this decline has been due to reductions in ceilings which OPS has required and some has been merely the automatic correction of speculative excesses which occurred during the panic buying which followed the Korean outbreak. I am frank to concede, however, that many market prices are below ceilings and that a renewal of inflationary pressures would permit some increases in price levels before our controls would take hold. It is our intention and constant effort to reduce inflated ceilings wherever that is possible within the limits of the Defense Production Act and the limitations of our relatively small and newly assembled staff.

In all frankness, I should also explain that, even with unlimited authority to hold or reduce price ceilings, and unlimited staff to exercise it, a return to pre-Korean price levels or anything approaching them would be out of the question. Since Korea there has been a sharp and irreversible advance in basic cost levels, including both wages and prices for raw materials, many of them produced outside our shores. It would be a futile and hopeless effort to set as our goal

any substantial reduction of prices from present levels. With the limitations on our legal authority which now exists and in the face of the inescapable facts as to levels of cost, our reasonable goal should be and is to maintain, to the maximum possible extent, the general level of prices which presently exists.

Even with the aid of generous subsidies and with a substantially stronger basis of public support and enabling legislation, OPA was unable to achieve complete stability of the price level. In fact during the first year of general price controls and before institution of subsidies—from May 1942, to May 1943—the consumer price index rose by 8 percent. It is our firm intention to do substantially better than this if we can.

Thank you again for your letter, and if I can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE.

Red China Aims To Wipe Out Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Communists are carrying out a bloody, unrelenting persecution in China aimed at wiping out all evidences of Christianity.

I include herewith the second of a series of articles by Everett S. Allen, which appeared in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of June 27, 1951:

CHRISTIANITY FACES ANNIHILATION IN GREAT CHINA COMMUNIST PURGE

(By Everett S. Allen)

When the Chinese Communists arrested Father Paul Shih Kuang-chiu, a native Maryknoll priest at Chihfeng, Jehol, they tied his arms to his body and knotted a rope about his ankles. Then they dragged him over stony roads and sorghum stubble for 2 hours and finally shot him dead.

Seven Christians in Shanwantse were arrested and ordered to apostatize. When they refused, a pole was placed behind their knees and their arms were tied to the pole so the chin came between the knees. They were tied to two mules and dragged until dead.

Five armed Communists arrested Father Maurus Pai, a native priest attached to the Maryknoll Fushun mission in Manchuria. In frigid winter weather, he was stripped of his clothes and thrown into an unheated prison. He was brought to trial on charges that he spread an American religion, hid arms and plotted against the Communists. He denied all charges, was whipped and taken back to prison.

On Christmas Day, 1947, he was led to his church, where the Communists tribunal had assembled. He was beaten with whips and sticks until he was unconscious. Then he was dragged back to prison.

On January 17, 1948, he was brought again before the tribunal. Regional Prefect Chao and another Communist named Li reread the charges, during which time he was accused of being a slave of the Americans.

He was sentenced to death. Clad in bur-lap bags, he was dragged through the streets and finally shot through the head. He was 70.

THIRTY MONKS DIE

Thirty Trappist monks in Yangkiaping died on a death march to prison after Communists burned the monastery.

The Reverend Joseph Liang, 48, died of hunger and exposure in a Chihfeng jail after 10 months of torture and imprisonment; his body had been beaten to a pulp and his bones were broken and exposed.

In Yenki, Manchuria, 32 German Benedictine Fathers and Brothers and 13 Swiss Sisters were arrested and sent to a concentration camp.

Two Polish Franciscan priests, Fathers Francis Arciszewski and Gothard Krysteczko, were arrested in December 1947 at Shunteh, Hopi. Charged with political activity in behalf of their own government, they were released after 198 days in jail when this accusation became embarrassing to their accusers.

Father Maurus Bougon, a French Trappist who survived the Yangkiaping death march, was suspended from a tree with his arms tied behind his back for 24 hours. On the verge of death, he was thrown into a prison cell where his toes became frozen. He is still in jail.

More than 100 priests, brothers, and nuns died in the late forties as the Communist Chinese overran northern China. At present, of the Maryknoll group in China, there now are under arrest awaiting trial two bishops, seven priests, four Chinese priests, one American Sister and two Chinese Sisters. Under house arrest are 11 priests, 10 Sisters; evicted or mission confiscated, 16 priests and 2 Brothers; seized by the Communists and since disappeared, 1 bishop, 1 priest.

PARTY-LINE VIEW

Peiping's headquarters gave the party-line view on Christianity on April 28, although firm, it still professed much more tolerance than the Communists have any intention of showing. This pseudo-benign pose was taken, however, because they feel the time has not yet come to wipe Christianity out completely in China and because the policy statement was in a propaganda broadcast directed at North America.

It said, in part, "Our aim is to wipe out thoroughly the influence of American cultural aggression which pervaded China for more than 100 years. To carry out this struggle, there must be the unity and common effort of patriotic Christians and the government, led by the Communist Party of China."

"According to the common program, we have a common responsibility to unite and join our efforts on many things, quite apart from the question of world outlook and religious belief, with which governments cannot interfere by administrative orders."

Nevertheless, Communists deported nine European nuns and priests from China in April, took over the Baptist University of Shanghai in February and confiscated Peiping's world-famed Yenching University, a Protestant-supported institution that was the symbol of western faith, learning, and respect for China.

Peiping, sensing some advantage in the social organization previously set up by the church, is first content to cut off the China units from their mother churches abroad. Annihilation will come later, after enforced withering has set in. Nationalism is now the major argument placed before Chinese Christians.

"Leading Catholics in Tientsin and Nanchang," the Communists announced in January, "are among the latest to make statements supporting the move for an independent Catholic Church. The Methodist Church, Anglican Church, and other Christian churches and organizations, also view independent organization as the best way to

escape from the control and manipulations by the imperialists."

INSIDIOUS METHODS

Insidiously, as if to indicate that intolerance is not involved, the Communists never bring charges of a religious nature against Christian leaders. Rather it is charges that will appeal to Chinese nationalism, that will stir hatred. Nuns are accused of killing infants, priests with espionage, cheating the poor, and distributing pornographic literature. The Communists even allow the carrying of Catholic flags in anti-American demonstrations and thereby lure nationalistic Christians another step along the road toward the atheism of the iron curtain.

But the iron fist slowly is being revealed beneath the glove. At Ngwa, neophytes of the Catholic Church were told they would have no share in the agrarian reformers' distribution of land unless they repented of their Christianity. Christians in Paklau were threatened with being machine-gunned if seen talking to the pastor.

In Kansu, a compulsory meeting of Catholics and Protestants ruled the Catholic Church was anticommunistic, all foreign missionaries would be expelled, and no further conversions to Catholicism would be allowed under penalty of death. In addition to cracking down on Catholicism, by not accusing Protestantism as well, it served the dual purpose of splitting the two groups and jeopardizing a united Christian front.

In Kongmoon, middle-school students, instigated by two Communist teachers, wrote obscenities on the church wall and stoned the pastor before the church. He stood like a soldier before the firing squad, in silence, as the stones cut him on the face and legs. Grieved and humiliated, the townspeople who had been his parishioners, later expressed their apologies in secret.

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY CHURCHES CUT TO 47

A year ago, the Church of Christ in China, reporting in the publication Protestant Missions in China, recalled that its organization had been the major church in Manchuria. Prior to the purge of Christianity by the Communists, this denomination had 290 churches throughout the Province. Last year, these had been whittled down to 47; the others were destroyed and confiscated. Those remaining were mainly in cities, the rural churches not functioning. Presumably the situation now has deteriorated further.

People's China, the bimonthly English-language magazine published by the Communists in Peiping, declared shortly before General MacArthur's removal from Tokyo, "Let no one be confused by the anti-Communist rantings of the United States. The ulterior and unmistakable aim is the economic and political subjugation of all Asian peoples to Wall Street."

"MacArthur is subsidizing reactionary churches in various eastern countries and turning them into spy centers. The American espionage ring in Hong Kong, which maintains close contact with Kuomintang agents and Catholic missionaries in China, is known to be under the direct control of MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo."

An American priest, long experienced in the Catholic mission work in China, said sadly, "They do not understand the spiritual motive. If they cannot find an obvious materialistic motive, they are certain that there is one, and they create one."

"In actuality, religious persons in China—and I speak from experience—bend over backward to maintain neutrality in times of difficulty. Members of the American clergy even are embarrassed occasionally by military espionage agents of their country, who, eager to do the best job possible, ask questions which a priest—as with a doctor—

would consider a violation of sacred confidence.

"But the Communists do not understand that."

Lasting Conservation Through Conservation—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at summer session of State Teachers' College, Fredonia, N. Y., July 19, 1951:

LASTING CONSERVATION THROUGH EDUCATION

It is most gratifying to attend a meeting of this kind—where the entire student body of a great teachers' college has gathered to discuss better ways of educating American youth with respect to the conservation of our natural resources. Less than 20 years ago, very little thought was devoted to this vital phase of education. Even as late as 1933, with a few scattered exceptions, probably very few teachers even thought of devoting valuable class time to discussing the conservation of our vital soil resource. No teachers' college, so far as I know, and very few of our agricultural colleges, offered such a course as soil conservation. Certainly, no college thought of giving a course on how to teach conservation to the elementary and secondary pupils in our public schools.

The first strictly erosion-research station of the world was set up in 1929, near Guthrie, Okla. This was followed in rapid succession by the establishment of nine other such stations in widely separated areas where erosion was known to be a serious problem. Most of the basic erosion data was acquired at three research establishments.

But times have changed. Erosion control—soil conservation—has gained the approval of the Nation. Fredonia State Teachers' College, I am informed, requires that all undergraduates take a course on the conservation of natural resources. According to my understanding, a class in conservation education is one of the important courses given in the present summer session. I know of other teachers' colleges and some universities, in various parts of the Nation, which are doing much the same thing. That is as it should be—it is a natural outgrowth of the great conservation movement that began in America about 20 years ago.

In a democracy such as ours, most great reforms or changes in public policy are brought about, either directly or indirectly, through education. But they are seldom started in the public schools. The school system nearly always follows, rather than leads, our public in such reforms as they gain momentum and the need for them becomes obvious. It is then that our public school system takes on the burden of helping make the reforms permanent by educating the coming generations.

SO LONG TO LEARN

Our present conservation program, especially our soil conservation program, is definitely a reform, as well as a national technical program based, where done right,

on a new science (the science of soil conservation). Our present perspective in relation to the importance of our natural resources is the equivalent of a great national reformation (which, however, is still not great enough). With respect to land use and protection, it amounts to an agricultural revolution never previously approached.

During the years when the American Continent was being settled, some of our wasteful methods might have been excused in some degree. But not even then was all the waste excusable. About the only justification—if it can be justified at all—we can think of for much of the profligate waste is that it was often the easiest thing to do. It was easier in those days to cut and burn timber that interfered with cultivation than it was to save the trees that were cut. It was often easier to settle on a new farm, when the old one was worn out, than it was to take care of the soil. But scarcely an excuse in any sense, looking back from the advanced viewpoint of today.

Of course, the matter of ignorance entered into our early wasteful use of the land and other resources. During the years of settlement, we gradually built up a false sense of security by assuming that our land and other resources were inexhaustible. The vast extent of good virgin land, forests, wildlife, and clean water quite naturally affected the average viewpoint with respect to the seeming American abundance of natural resources. But it is hard to understand how most people of a great enlightened nation should continue, generation after generation, to delude themselves into thinking that our natural resources were inexhaustible and that any kind of conservation was unnecessary in the first place and too costly in the second place. It is difficult, also, to understand how a farmer could see his land literally wash out from under him without recognizing the threat to the welfare of his family.

But, with few exceptions, that is exactly the way most of the people of the Nation thought and acted for generation after generation. And a few foolish ones—not usually farmers, however seem (or pretend) to think about the land as did our forefathers a hundred and fifty years ago. Fortunately, they have no important following.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY SOIL-CONSERVATION SURVEY

In 1910 I helped make a soil survey of Fairfield County, S. C. We found that soil erosion was severe over most of the land in the county. Much too much of the land, we found, had been ruined for further cultivation. Twenty-eight percent of the land, all of it formerly cultivated, had been so damaged by erosion and by the deposition of the products of erosion over stream bottoms, it was valueless for any use except forestry and pasture. I thought, at the time, that the report on the findings of this survey, when published, would create a sensation, at least locally and nationally, too, I was hoping.

Did it?

Not in the slightest degree. Those who read the report—if any read it—apparently laid it aside saying, with some such meaningless observation as, "So what?"

Subsequently other reports of severe erosion damage from many parts of the country were made, still without arousing any interest on the part of a generally complacent public, either locally or nationally. Too many people seemed still to hold to the idea that land is permanent and indestructible, or that erosion is a natural process over which man has no control; that soil conservation would cost too much; that those who talk about it make their appraisals of the damage in exaggerated terms, and other such nonsense.

In 1928 I was coauthor of a Government pamphlet entitled "Soil Erosion, a National

Menace." I was determined that my part of the pamphlet would not be ignored. The facts were marshaled in a way which I thought would convince any fair-minded person that soil erosion is a real menace to the continued welfare of the Nation. This publication attracted more attention, it seemed to me, than any other ever written about the need for a vigorous program of soil conservation. It engendered some thoughtful editorials around the country and a number of articles in the press. It helped induce the Congress to make a small appropriation for the establishment of 10 soil-erosion experiment stations—the first erosion research stations of history, as previously mentioned. These stations—provided for by funds obtained through the Buchanan amendment—supplied much valuable data supporting the conviction that I and a few others had acquired by years of study of land conditions throughout the country. But even with this, it was not easy to arouse public interest. A few agricultural scientists still insisted, in spite of proof to the contrary, that we were overstressing the harmful effects of soil erosion. But there were a few clear-thinking men and women who put their shoulders to the task and helped with getting a national program of soil conservation underway. Finally, the Soil Erosion Service was set up with an allotment of NIRA (relief) funds. This Service devoted its efforts mainly to demonstration projects—most of them on a watershed basis—showing what conservation could accomplish. But even then the matter of soil conservation had not been declared a national policy and an essential function of government. That came in 1935, when Congress passed our first Soil Conservation Act—the act that created the Soil Conservation Service in its present form. That was the real beginning of our national reformation in the use of land.

I cite these items relating to the early history of the soil conservation movement in this country, mainly to emphasize a point: It is not easy to change people's ways of thinking, and it usually is even more difficult to change their ways of acting, their habits. Great numbers of people had acquired the attitude of thinking in terms of inexhaustible resources because, as pointed out above, of our original abundance of rich land. In settling the country, we allowed millions of acres to be seriously damaged by erosion, a great deal of it so seriously as to have little or no further value for plowing.

Even now, there are some uninformed critics who still scoff at the idea that we may some day run short of good land. They look at some of the so-called farm surpluses and assume that we will always have such surpluses. Furthermore, even some of those who see the necessity of conservation think it is not a job that concerns them. They say that soil conservation is the farmer's job, not theirs. They don't stop to consider what will happen if the farmers don't do the necessary work, or don't know how to do it. They fail to realize that city people will be the first to go hungry if our land should become so depleted that it will no longer support all of us. Farmers for a time would be able to produce a little for themselves, but not enough for their cousins in town, perhaps.

SOIL EROSION IN WORLD HISTORY

At this point, I should like to mention some of the mistakes of nations and civilizations of the past in their use of the land that supported them. Nearly all historians recognize that there has been something of a pattern to the rise, decline, and fall of various civilizations of the past. People advanced and prospered for some centuries, then decline set in and eventually their civilizations disintegrated. Historians have used various explanations for this recurring

pattern in the rise and fall of past empires and civilizations. Seldom, however, until the last few years did anyone think of attributing any part of the decline and fall to the decline in the food-producing value of the land. The evidence was there, but no one thought of looking for it. Almost without exception, the civilizations that have come and gone left behind them great areas of wasted land. They progressed and prospered as long as their land was new and fertile. They declined and fell as the land became unproductive and was no longer able to support a progressive and prosperous civilization. I am not contending that soil erosion was entirely responsible for the decline and fall of all the ancient civilizations that came to grief. I am saying, however, that the two in many instances have been closely associated. I contend that misuse of the land played a vital role in the decline and fall of some of these civilizations—taking a much more important role than most historians seem to realize.

We have found much convincing evidence of this. All across the continent of Asia, in North Africa, and in southern Europe are found here and there the homes of former leaders of world civilization in areas where there now is much barren and desolate land. Most of these seats of former great empires now support only a half, a third, or less of their former population; and they support that reduced population at a very low standard of living. You have but to examine the land, as it is today, to see why these regions are no longer capable of supporting a well-fed and prosperous people and a progressive civilization. Take a look at the area where the ancient Assyrians lived when they ruled most of the civilized world of their time. Look at Iran, the home of the ancient Medes and Persians. Look at Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine—empires that once supported prosperous and proud civilizations. Or take Crete, Greece, and Italy; these were the areas where our own western civilization actually originated. Or you can take northwestern China and the Indus valley of Pakistan as examples of severe land impoverishment.

There is not time to describe in detail what the land looks like now, in these regions. A detailed description is hardly necessary, the poverty and backwardness of the people are indicative of the poverty of the land. In general, you will find, if the countries are explored in detail, that most of the topsoil has been stripped from the uplands, although the valleys often are still covered with productive alluvium. Take the once famous city of Antioch as an example. Around 600,000 people lived there during Roman times and the city was one of the greatest export centers of the Roman Empire. A few years ago archeologists excavated some of the ruins of this old city from covering erosion-deposited silt, 28 feet deep in places.

In the highlands of interior Syria some of the stone door sills of ancient houses are now 3 to 6 feet above the bare skeleton rock around them. The land has lost that much soil during the centuries since the houses were built; it has lost practically all the soil, because only the bare rock remains in most places. It is erosion of this kind that is responsible for much of the poverty of these once-fertile lands.

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

There would be little point in reciting the history of these ancient lands, unless the examples might serve as a guide for the future. Much the same thing could happen to our land if we should continue to ignore the danger signs. It is true that we now have a vigorous national conservation program under way, especially with regard to our land, water, and forest resources. But we are not yet practicing true conservation on all our land, by any means. Only about a fifth of

our American farmers are practicing full and complete conservation farming on their land. We are still losing hundreds of thousands of acres of land every year—probably about 500,000 acres—through the process of unnecessary erosion. Millions of people in town and country are still blissfully unaware of the dangers of continued exploitation of the land. We cannot afford to be too complacent about our recent progress toward true conservation; for the main job still lies ahead. We must not slacken our efforts or cease our educational work. Some of the ancient peoples I mentioned started conservation work as they saw their land slipping away from them. They were not entirely ignorant of the fact that soil wastage was ruining them.

Returning briefly to ancient history, let me cite a few examples of people who recognized what was happening to the land and a few who tried to do something about it. As early as the fourth century, B. C., Plato recognized what was happening or had already happened, to the soils of his homeland. He said: "The surviving hills of Attica are but skeletons from which the flesh has been washed away." Plato's observations came very late, even if the people of Athens had heeded him and tried to stop the destructive erosion. The brilliant civilization, not only of Athens but of much of Greece, slowly died or was dispersed because the land of Greece would no longer support a progressive and prosperous civilization. During the first century, B. C., the Roman philosopher and poet, Lucretius, observed: "Our earth itself is dying * * * The land is becoming exhausted, rains and rivers erode it, and carry even the mountains into the sea." Yet, with this and similar observations by other farsighted citizens, the Romans did little to check the ruinous erosion process. Their empire and their civilization gradually declined and died as more and more of the farm land was abandoned and the rural areas became depopulated. The ancient Phoenicians even went so far as to construct rock-walled bench terraces, that would cost \$15,000 or more per acre, measured in terms of present labor costs in this country, on some of their steeply sloping hillsides. But they did this only after much of their better land had been severely damaged or ruined. And even after they had constructed such terraces they continued to strip the forests from other hillsides without providing protection for the land. In other words, their conservation efforts were mainly too little and too late. And that pretty well describes the efforts of most other ancient peoples. In this country we, too, started rather late with our conservation efforts; but not too late, fortunately, provided we make sure that our efforts are not too little.

Lasting Conservation Through Education—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my re-

¹ "Critias," by Plato. Quoted by Will Durant in the *Life of Greece*, p. 562, Simon and Schuster, 1939.

² *De Rerum Natura* by Titus Lucretius Carus. Quoted by Will Durant in *Caesar and Christ*, p. 153. Simon and Schuster, 1944.

marks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at summer session of State Teachers' College, Fredonia, N. Y., July 19, 1951:

THE SCIENCE OF SOIL CONSERVATION

We have two distinct advantages over the ancients with regard to this matter of conserving our soil and other vital resources. First, we have the lessons of history before us. We know, or at least we should know, that the conservation of our natural resources is absolutely essential for our survival as a progressive, prosperous, and vigorous nation. Second, we have the knowledge necessary to conserve these resources while still using them. We know how to conserve the land so that it will not only continue to produce as much as it has in the past but will produce more than ever without impairing future productivity.

Within recent years, mainly within the last 20 years, we have developed a new science of soil conservation in this country. I call it a new science in spite of the fact that soil conservation has been practiced by various people, according to the extent of their knowledge, for thousands of years. Men have been struggling with this problem ever since they learned to farm, some 8,000 years ago. But, in all the historical records, I have never been able to find where any people ever attempted to practice full and completely coordinated soil conservation, as we now know it and do it in America. At no place did they ever develop the practice of conservation to the point where it was a science in itself. Always the matter of soil conservation was considered just a phase of agronomy or a branch of agricultural engineering, or something else. Proper use of the land, according to its capabilities, was seldom given as a means of conserving the soil. Erosion control was given little consideration until the land had already been practically ruined. Irrigation and drainage were usually considered entirely apart from the matter of soil and water conservation. In other words, until about 20 years ago, the various elements that go into making up a complete and scientifically coordinated program for soil and water conservation were treated as separate sciences or practices. The agronomist concerned himself with developing better seed, better fertilizers, better cropping systems, and better tillage methods. The engineer was mainly concerned with building dams, terraces, irrigation canals, drainage ditches, and other water-control structures. The soil surveyor was mainly interested in classifying soils. No one attempted to coordinate these and other pertinent sciences into one broad science for proper use and protection of the land.

The new science of soil conservation, about which I am speaking, was developed largely through research, aided by the world's first Nation-wide soil-conservation program—the program of the Soil Conservation Service. Assembling a large corps of scientists and technicians from many fields and having them work together coordinately and cooperatively, to plan and carry out a program that would permit full use of the land while giving it complete protection, agronomists, engineers, soil scientists, foresters, range-management specialists, biologists, geologists, climatologists, hydrologists, economists, and others all made their contributions. The resulting program is what we call modern soil and water conservation. It is based on research, as stated, and has been tested now by a million farmers. It has proved so remarkably successful that some of the sciences are imitating some fundamental parts of its basic principles.

The basic principles on which this science is founded are relatively simple: They may be briefly summed up under two headings: (1) Use each acre of land according to its

capabilities; and (2) treat each acre according to its needs.

ACRE BY ACRE LAND INVENTORIES AND PLANS

The principle of using each acre of land according to its capabilities is fundamental. True and lasting conservation can be achieved in no other way. This is one of the basic principles that most of the ancients, and modern scientists as well, generally overlooked. No two acres of land are exactly alike; different kinds of land differ in what it is best suited to produce. Yet, all land has some economic value, if it is used properly. Some land is suited for cultivation; other land is suited only for growing grass or trees, while some is suited only for recreational purposes, as a home for wildlife, or other minor uses. Each acre should be used for the best purpose. Of course, if the land is underused, like using good cropland for pasture, the land may not be harmed but it may not be producing maximum income. If it is overused, however, it eventually will be ruined—thus ending its chances for producing anything profitable or otherwise. Thus, our aim is to determine exactly what the land is best suited for and then use it that way, insofar as economic and market conditions permit.

The second basic principle involved with soil conservation is that of treating each acre with all conservation practices needed to keep it permanently productive. This applies to pasture, range, and forest land as well as to cultivated land. There are many different kinds of conservation practices that may be used on the various types of land. Soil-conservation farming calls for using all of them that are needed in each field, one supporting another. Terracing, strip cropping, contour tillage, crop rotation, cover cropping, stubble mulching, and many other practices are commonly used on cultivated lands. In addition, liming, fertilizing, manuring, and other practices to help build up fertility are used. Gully control, establishing grass waterways, building farm ponds, planting trees and grass, adjusting the use of these measures to the needs of the land. Even fences, roads, and field boundaries should be adjusted, as nearly as practicable, on the contour. If the land is too wet, drainage becomes a conservation practice; if it is too dry, then irrigation should be used. All these, and many more, conservation practices are coming into common use among American farmers. They are fitted into a coordinated program, each being used to supplement the others, where needed. That is what we call treating the land according to its needs, using a coordinated tool of combined skills.

The Soil Conservation Service has a large corps of trained surveyors who make detailed soil-conservation surveys of farms and ranches to determine the best use for each acre of land. We also have a large corps of soil conservationists, that we call farm planners, who take these land surveys and help farmers work out detailed plans for better land use and soil conservation. We have found, from experience, that these detailed surveys and plans are essential to getting a complete and coordinated conservation program applied to the land. I might add that these surveyors and farm planners of the Service work in the closest possible cooperation with the local soil-conservation districts.

SOIL CONSERVATION DOES MORE THAN PROTECT THE LAND

Modern soil conservation, as we now practice it, is not directed merely toward maintaining land as it is. It is dynamic and progressive; it leads to increased and lasting productivity of the land and thereby promotes the common welfare wherever it is practiced. All regions of the world can be improved, we think, and some currently poverty-stricken areas may be advanced to a state of relative prosperity by safeguarding

and increasing their agricultural-producing capacity through sound soil and water conservation and proper land use.

Soil conservation does much more than safeguard the land. It directly or indirectly results in a wide variety of fundamental benefits. It both increases the yields per acre and lowers the cost of production on most farm land, which, in turn, start a whole chain of benefits, such as increased farmer income, increased taxes for support of government and schools, increased trade for both rural and urban communities, and increased employment for professional, skilled, and unskilled workers.

It results in large savings, such as reduced siltation of streams, ditches, harbors, and reservoirs; lessened damage to fills, cuts, and culverts of highways and railroads; decreased damage to oyster beds and breeding and feeding grounds of fish, crabs, and other valuable aquatic life; and reduced flood crests on both major and minor streams that result in lessened damage to farms, homes, manufacturing plants, livestock, highways, railroads, and other property.

It helps to alleviate drought damage to crops, pastures, and meadows. It encourages a more flexible and diversified type of agriculture. It helps create a greater pride and satisfaction in farming along with the greater material returns. It encourages the sons and daughters of farmers to stay on the farm. And, apparently, it helps to improve the nutritional quality of food.

MODERN SOIL CONSERVATION

Our experience in the Soil Conservation Service has led me to redefine soil conservation under the heading of "Modern soil conservation."

A sound and lasting agriculture depends primarily on an adequate supply of productive land, properly used and so protected from erosion that it will remain permanently productive. Without such an agriculture, there can be no assurance of continuing prosperity, happiness, or peace anywhere.

As long as people have enough good land they can continue producing their food and fiber, and many of the raw materials of industry. If sloping land is neglected or unwisely used, it will be wasted or severely damaged by erosion, and the certain consequence, where the damage is extensive, will be lowered standards of living, poverty, and national decline. Much the same is true with respect to the effects of wind erosion, although this process affects level land as well as sloping land, when conditions are right (protracted drought and land bare of protective cover).

This erosion-caused economic decline has been the tragic result in many of the world's older agricultural areas.

For these and other reasons, lasting soil conservation is mandatory everywhere. It is mandatory here in America, if we are to avoid national decline—economically, socially, and nutritionally.

Modern soil conservation practices must be scientifically fitted to the land, according to the kinds and needs of the land, and flood control must be done all the way from the crests of enclosing divides of watersheds on down to the channels of the main drainage systems.

This kind of soil conservation is based on (a) sound land use and (b) treatment of the land with all the proven appropriate measures that are needed to keep it permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; and contouring, strip cropping, and stubble-mulching the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, highly erodible land and shallow soil to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and

devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Modern soil conservation, moreover, consists of doing these and still other necessary things. Where the land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for careful water control, with full consideration given to wildlife needs, if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if it is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind strip cropping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If the plant nutrients, lime, and the humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter; if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, as in parts of the West, it calls for drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of adaptable tools available to farmers. In other words, it means using land within its capabilities—as imposed by nature—and treating it according to its needs—resulting from man's use of the land, or, perhaps, abuse of the land.

It likewise includes, for flood control and reservoir protection, treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller watersheds where flood waters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watershed treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, puts water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in ground-water reservoirs, and otherwise benefits general farm, industrial, and municipal water users.

A DEMOCRATIC APPROACH TO SOIL CONSERVATION

I have been telling you something about our modern science of soil conservation, what it includes and what it means. I should now like to briefly discuss the methods whereby we put this program into operation. Of course, if we had a totalitarian form of government, we might undertake to force soil conservation on farmers by decree. If such an error had been made, everybody probably would be professing to practice conservation with few actually doing anything worthwhile. Most fortunately, we live in a democracy and so our approach has followed democratic procedures. Probably the present method of furnishing technical assistance to soil conservation districts, where farmers and ranchers set up and manage the affairs of the districts is the best example of democracy in action that we can find anywhere on earth.

The first step in our program, as I explained, was research to determine what were the best methods for achieving conservation. Then, over a period of 7 or 8 years, we demonstrated these methods to farmers and ranchers in some 500 demonstration areas, scattered all over the Nation. Along with this, we started an intensive educational program to inform farmers and landowners about the need for conservation and tell them how to go about it. Progress was rapid in this demonstration and education program. In 1937 the third and most distinctive step was taken in our national soil-conservation program. That year, many of the States passed laws that permitted farmers to organize their own soil-conservation districts. All the other States and territories soon did the same. These State laws do not compel farmers or landowners to do anything. They simply permit them to organize soil-conservation districts, if they wish to do so. So far, there have been around 2,300 such districts organized in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These districts include about four-fifths of all the Nation's farms and ranches.

The organization of soil-conservation districts represents a distinctive step, not only in our conservation program but also in

democratic government. These districts are democratic institutions. They were organized and their governing bodies were elected by the farmers and landowners who live in them. They have programs of work that were drawn up by their governing bodies, assisted by technicians and scientists from the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies. They are doing an excellent job of getting the farmers within their boundaries to practice conservation. In short, these districts are the local government agencies on which we must depend to get this job done.

WE ARE GETTING THE JOB DONE

Even though we are not yet going fast enough with the job, or as fast as it ought to be done—and could be done with adequate facilities—this is true: The farmers in soil conservation districts, in New York and throughout the country, are working together, planning together, helping one another with tools, labor, seed, planning, etc., as they never did before. It is this kind of voluntary cooperation, initiated and carried on by the landowners and operators themselves, without any outside interference or dictation of any kind, that is getting the job done. And this kind of cooperation is probably the most effective way—if not the only way—to bring about permanency of the conservation we put on the land.

At this time, approximately a million farmers have farm plans already made of their farms, or have taken steps to have their farms planned. Thousands of others—an estimated 500,000—have delayed the filing of formal requests for planning services at the suggestion of the district supervisors. And now, with group action mounting rapidly in the districts, it appears that not less than 2,000,000 farmers and ranchers have taken some action toward carrying out completely coordinated soil conservation work on their farms. In other words, these farmers and ranchers are either active or are ready for action in the field of modern soil conservation.

And easily another million in soil conservation districts are interested in the work.

THE MAIN JOB STILL LIES AHEAD

All of this is still not yet enough. We still have the biggest part of the soil-conservation job to do. Instead of getting some 25,000,000 acres of land treated with conservation measures each year, as we are doing now, we should be completing the treatment of considerably more than that each year, in order to finish the application of the basic soil-conservation measures in time. The job can be speeded up if facilities for doing it are made available.

We can, and we should, move ahead faster toward this urgent goal of soil and water conservation treatment of every important area of land that needs such treatment. Essential to our future progress is continued teamwork of all elements of our society: People working together through the active participation and efforts of all interested segments of the public, rural and urban alike.

We know what the problem is. We have perfected the tools of practical scientific soil conservation, and we have the soil-conservation districts through which to put these tools to work most effectively. We have nobody to blame but ourselves—the citizens of the United States—if we permit our land and water resources to go on wasting away any longer. This is still the most urgent, basic, and important job confronting the people of this Nation and the rest of the world.

HOW SCHOOL TEACHERS CAN HELP

Education is still probably the most powerful force at man's disposal. I think that this is certainly true in a democracy. Conservation is done by people. Like most other things, it will not be done unless the people

understand how to do it and why they should do it.

We have many educational forces working today. We have the newspapers and periodicals, the radio, the churches, public forums, and numerous other agencies that either intentionally or unintentionally do a great deal toward forming public opinion. Many of these agencies could rightfully be called educational institutions to some extent. But we have only one institution that purports to reach practically all the people and give them systematic instruction on the fundamental arts and sciences essential for their becoming well-informed citizens. That institution is our public-school system, supplemented in some places by parochial and private schools. These so-called elementary schools, in which almost every boy and girl of the Nation spends a major part of their early formative life are the backbone of our educational system. The knowledge, thoughts, and habits of American youth are molded largely by the classroom teachers of these schools. I think it absolutely essential that these teachers not only be well informed about conservation but that they also be well trained in methods of imparting their knowledge on this subject to the pupils who attend their classes. The future welfare of our Nation—in fact, the future of our civilization—may well depend on how well these classroom teachers perform their job of instilling conservation attitudes and developing conservation habits among these boys and girls.

TRUE CONSERVATION CAN BE ACHIEVED ONLY BY AN INFORMED CITIZENRY

We who are living today, and the next few generations that immediately follow us, must learn the science of soil conservation and get the habit of practicing it as a refined technique. It will not be enough if we merely safeguard the land for the next 10 years or the next 100 years; we must safeguard it—conserve it, while still using it—for as long as we and future generations expect to use it.

We cannot achieve our goal of full and permanent conservation by merely making conservationists out of those who farm the land or manage our other resources today. We must teach conservation methods and develop conservation habits among all of those who will ever have anything to do with the management or operation of our farm, pasture, range, and forest land, or with the conservation and scientific utilization of our water, wildlife, and mineral resources. Those who farm the land today may not be here tomorrow. People move from place to place; they change occupations; and people die. But the coming generations will still depend on these resources—what we leave of them—for their food, clothing, and other necessities of life. The farmers who farm this land, the woodsmen who cut the trees, and the miners who dig ore from the ground 20 or 200 or 2,000 years from now must also be conservationists. We will but postpone the issue if we merely make conservationists of our present generation and fail to instill conservation habits into those who take over after we are gone.

We will never achieve our goal of permanent soil conservation until every citizen thoroughly understands the utter necessity for soil conservation that is scientifically applied to the land, and is well informed about current progress in the field. Not only must all people who handle or manage our basic resources be conservation-minded and know how to use such resources without wasting or destroying them; all of the people who depend on those resources must recognize the stakes involved and know what is being done about conserving them. In other words, I think that every man, woman, and child must be kept fully informed about

this matter, insofar as they are capable of absorbing such knowledge. We can achieve such true conservation only through an informed citizenry.

As I see it, one of the greatest challenges to our public-school system and the teachers in that system is to see to it that all future citizens are properly informed about this vital matter.

More of the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, no one is deceived, or even amused, by the recent whistling-past-the-cemetery assertion of President Truman that the Republicans have no issues for 1952.

The great majority of the American people, I am convinced, are well aware that they themselves face one transcendent issue—the issue of whether they want more of the same after 1952.

More of the same reckless extravagance, deficit financing, and still mounting national debt despite the fact that Federal revenues collected during the Truman administration have exceeded all Federal receipts for the 156 years of national history before Truman.

More of the same shameless spoils system which has seen the dollars-and-cents payroll for executive department civilian employees top the previous record-breaking peak of World War II.

More of the same Federal tax increases which have evoked expressions of dismay and alarm even from Democratic congressional leaders and which, on the testimony of those same leaders, foreshadow a Federal sales tax in 1952.

More of the same reckless fiscal policies which have fed the raging fires of inflation, diluted the value of the dollar, spiraled the cost of essentials for citizens and Government alike, forced persons with fixed incomes into the merciless squeeze of higher prices and taxes and lowered purchasing power, and created the phoniest and most precarious prosperity in the Nation's economic history.

More of the same malodorous administrative scandals of the RFC, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the Post Office Department, of mink coats and deep-freezes, of free hams and free hotel accommodations.

More of the same socialistic schemes to impose the heavy hand of government upon business, agriculture, medicine, and education.

More of the same blanketing censorship in and by the executive department; more of the same reprisals against responsible officials who dare to speak the truth as they see it, whether a MacArthur, a Denfeld, or a Wedemeyer; more of the same refusals of vital information to the Congress; more of the same impounding of loyalty files and suppression of State Department docu-

ments and records; more of the same insistence upon "yes men" in Government.

More of the same secret State Department instructions to broadcast official falsehoods to the world—and to the American people—of the Formosan policy variety.

More of the same administration resistance to exposure of the infiltration of Communist personnel and policies in the executive branch.

More of the same Truman grasping for what the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg once termed "total, world-wide, war-lord powers in the White House," including Executive usurpation of treaty-making and war-making authority bestowed upon Congress by the Constitution.

More of the same give-away to foreign countries of American resources of manpower and wealth.

More of the same no-decision, accordion-type limited wars "at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy" bringing more of the same tragic casualties to American fighting men and more of the same let-down of the United States by professed allies.

More of the same no-decision peace talks which serve only to give the enemy time to build up its forces for stiffened resistance or renewed offensives.

Yes, the Republicans have an issue for 1952—and an unparalleled opportunity.

It is the opportunity to be the agents of the American people in their own deliverance; the opportunity to be the instrument of their sovereign will and determination that there must not be more of the same.

Release of William Oatis and John Hvasta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which I received from the Monessen Slovak Home. The letter concerns Press Correspondent Oatis and John Hvasta, who is also in jail in Slovakia.

MONESSEN SLOVAK HOME,
Monessen, Pa., September 23, 1951.

Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN. The members of the Monessen Slovak Home, assembled in their regular meeting this 23d day of September 1951, unanimously resolved to commend our Government on a stand taken to free the press correspondent, Oatis, from jail in Czechoslovakia.

We also ask your office to take the same drastic action on behalf of John Hvasta, our United States citizen from New Jersey and former member of the United States

Navy, who is at present jailed in Bratislava, Slovakia, since 1948.

We doubt whether the United States Ambassador Steinhart did anything for him, for he was prejudiced against the Slovaks. Mr. Steinhart did not raise his voice when the Communist-controlled government of Czechoslovakia condemned and hung Msnr. Joseph Tiso, the first president of Slovakia.

The secretary was directed to mail one copy to our President, Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and our Congressmen and Senators and the same to be spread on record of our minutes.

Awaiting your favorable action.

Very respectfully yours,
JOHN KOTCH, Jr.,

President.

ANDREW B. BENYAH,

Secretary.

GEORGE A. ANDRISKOVICH,

Treasurer.

There Must Be No Iron Curtain To Hide the Government From the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, last week newspapers across the land united in observing National Newspaper Week. Appropriately, theme of the observance was "Your newspaper lights the way of freedom."

A singular coincidence brought a serious threat to the freedom of the press in this country in the very week devoted to directing public attention toward the importance of preserving that freedom.

Under permission granted me by the House, I propose to review the issues presented by the administration's newest attempt to hide the Government from the people. President Truman has issued an executive order affecting the purely civilian agencies of Government and designed to restrict the flow of information from Government agencies to the public. David Lawrence, noted reporter of the Washington scene, terms it an iron curtain, and calls the Presidential order as sweeping as any ever used in a dictatorship.

First of all, there should be general understanding that the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press is not a guarantee of the right of the press to print the news so much as it is a guarantee of the right of the people to know. It is a protection for free people who would remain free.

For this reason, the latest executive order is a dangerous one. It constitutes, as the President admits, "for the first time, uniform standards for classifying and protecting security information throughout the executive branch of Government."

Every thinking person recognizes the importance of protecting security information in relation to national defense. That is a military problem. But in the executive departments, who is to say what is or is not "security information?"

Why, the Government officials themselves—the political appointees of a political administration.

Perhaps it is fortunate, rather than unfortunate, that this thinly-veiled attempt at censorship came during National Newspaper Week, for it resulted in immediate and wide-spread protest not alone from the Nation's newspapers, but from the radio, television and periodical fields as well. All of them are important sources of public information. All of them enjoy the constitutional guarantee of freedom. All of them must remain free if the Nation is to remain free.

Commenting on the President's directive, Editor & Publisher, trade publication of the newspaper industry, said that—

It amounts to the most drastic peacetime censorship ever attempted in this country and will make possible almost a complete black-out of important news from the Nation's Capital. Even in wartime our civilian agencies were not given such a blanket authority to suppress information.

By this order we will have sixty-odd individual censors in Washington, each pursuing his own interpretation of information vital to the national security. No Executive order could be more subject to abuse and misapplication. The public and the newspaper editors, acting in its behalf, have a fight on their hands to keep Washington from becoming the black-out capital of the country under this order.

More than 40 news executives from as many cities, meeting at Evanston, Ill., for a forum on freedom of the press adopted a declaration saying:

That the American people are in danger of losing their rights to freedom of information by default unless they demand of their public officials the right of free access to the facts about their Government.

That the integrity of freedom of information goes to the very roots of popular government in the United States. That this fundamental right of the people is being steadily undermined by the growing practice of secrecy in Government . . . the growing tendency of public officials to feel that they are not accountable to the public; that they conduct the business of their offices in secret; that they may divulge only such information that they think is good for the people to know; that they may extend military security into the areas of news which have no bearing on the Nation's security, as shown by the dangers in an Executive order issued within the week.

This is the pattern by which the Fascists in Italy, the Nazis in Germany, the Bolsheviks in Russia and the Peronistas in Argentina, began to limit the rights of their people to know, forced their newspapers into complete subjection, and were able to take from them all their other democratic rights as well.

The Associated Press Managing Editors Association, meeting in San Francisco, has called upon the President to rescind his censorship orders. The editors called the President's directive a dangerous instrument of news suppression and said that under the President's order security will be endangered, rather than safeguarded.

Here in America we have boasted properly enough to other nations that there

is a free flow of information in the United States and that the Constitution declares Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press. But the President apparently feels he can make such a law by means of an executive order bottling up at the source whatever news he wishes.

In analyzing the situation confronting the people, Mr. Lawrence has these revealing observations to make:

Everybody is anxious that really secret information of a military nature be suppressed. The American press through two world wars cooperated by voluntarily withholding from print all such information, whenever requested. But the new iron-curtain order applies to every department or agency of the entire executive branch of the Government, and to every single person among the more than 2,500,000 employees, no matter in what bureau or city he or she is stationed.

Granting that certain regulations are necessary to protect really secret information of a military nature, there is no reason why the Post Office Department or the Agriculture Department or the employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service or the clerks in any other department should be restricted in their telephone conversations, their letters or their communications with persons outside the Government.

What is conspicuously lacking in the new regulations is a system of checking against abuse. Each department head and the subordinate he delegates to perform the task of classifying information is a law unto himself. An interdepartment committee on internal security is provided, but it has no real power of its own and it cannot exercise any effective check against abuses.

The "potential enemies" which the President fears might get information are not named, but it is suspected that perhaps the Republicans in Congress and the opposition press generally are now in that category, too.

For some strange reason, instructions are included in the iron-curtain order specifying how classified documents shall be destroyed. It must be by burning and not necessarily in the presence of more than one official. Just why it is necessary to give orders at this time in the new regulations as to how to destroy secret public documents is hard to explain. Since there has been no uniform system of classification in effect anyhow, the problem of destruction of documents ought to be academic, at least for some years to come. It may be that the Truman administration is getting ready to purge records of anything that an incoming administration in 1953 may find politically damaging if there is a change to a Republican President.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot gloss over the seriousness of the situation by attributing partisan motives to those who protest against this invasion of the rights of the people to know what their public servants are doing. To resort to such an answer does not alter the truth. The truth is that secrecy in government imperils freedom of the press. A threat to the freedom of the press is a threat to freedom of the people.

Mr. Speaker, it is the solemn responsibility of the Congress to preserve this freedom and to defend this principle fundamental to the survival of self-government.

Enactment of Flood-Relief Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a copy of resolutions adopted by the forty-third annual city convention of the Kansas League of Municipalities, held at Topeka, Kans., on September 17, 18, and 19, 1951.

Hon. Clark E. Tucker, mayor of Kansas City, Kans., is president of this organization.

John G. Stutz, executive director of the organization, has had many years of experience in problems affecting municipal governments and other governmental units. Under his guidance and direction, many worth-while studies have been suggested by this organization and have been carried into effect through legislative enactment.

At the convention one of the major topics for discussion was the recent flood disaster.

The resolutions committee for the convention was composed of the following members: Chairman H. E. McMillen, city manager, El Dorado; M. W. Maxwell, mayor, Westwood; G. A. Erickson, mayor, Coffeyville; C. L. Clinton, mayor, Dodge City; and Ray E. Lundy, city clerk, Goodland.

In many of our cities the citizens suffered serious losses, and the governing bodies of these cities were confronted with additional expenditures as a result of the damage done to power plants, sewerage systems, water works, and streets and alleys.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the delegates of the League of Kansas Municipalities assembled in its forty-third annual convention:

Your committee on resolutions submits the following report:

"Be it resolved by the member cities of the League of Kansas Municipalities in convention assembled in Topeka, That the State league take this means to express its appreciation to the city of Topeka, Mayor Wilke, the city commission, and other city officials and employees, for their hospitality during the convention and for their work in making this convention a success; be it further

"Resolved, That the appreciation of the State league be extended to the Topeka Daily Capital and the Topeka State Journal for the excellent press coverage and publicity given to the convention; be it further

"Resolved, That the appreciation of the State league be extended to the hotels of the city of Topeka for the excellent service given to the delegates; be it further

"Resolved, That the State league take this means of expressing to the officers and staff of the League of Kansas Municipalities, the member cities' recognition of their able and faithful performance of their duties, not only during the convention but during the past year; be it further

"Resolved, That our sincere thanks be extended to the Honorable Edward F. Arn, Governor of Kansas; to Ross C. Keeling, State highway engineer; to Carl H. Chatters, executive director of the American Municipal Association, Chicago, Ill., for their addresses, and to all the other speakers and participants on the program for their contributions to the success of the convention; be it further

"Resolved, That this convention endorse resolution No. 1 of the legislative council adopted at its meeting in September 1951, memorializing the Congress of the United States to promptly enact flood-relief legislation, and that the executive director of the State league inform the Kansas congressional delegation of this action."

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROMPTLY ENACT FLOOD-RELIEF LEGISLATION"

"Whereas during the month of July 1951 the State of Kansas experienced the most devastating and worst flood in its entire history; and

"Whereas approximately 70 counties and 126 cities in this State have been materially affected and have received flood damage and loss; and

"Whereas it is estimated that total damage to community facilities of some 80 Kansas cities worst hit by the ravaging floodwaters exceeds \$33,000,000, and the loss and damage suffered by the counties to highways and bridges alone amounts to approximately \$14,500,000; and

"Whereas by reason of washed-out and broken dikes and levees various drainage districts and associations organized throughout the State for the protection of both public and private property have sustained losses totaling several million dollars; and

"Whereas the State of Kansas as a separate entity of government has also suffered substantial loss to buildings and other property and also damage to State highways, the damage to the State highway system being estimated in the sum of \$6,252,000; and

"Whereas it is impossible to make an accurate estimate as to the physical damage to private property, but the damage to such property has been estimated at \$1,000,000,000, but this figure does not take into consideration the loss sustained by railroads and other transportation facilities, community facilities, and industrial plants; and

"Whereas, according to the American Red Cross, approximately 19,000 families in the State of Kansas were made homeless by the floods, and

"Whereas 20,248 farms, comprising 2,886,275 acres, were damaged by the flood; and

"Whereas other farm losses, including buildings, machinery, crops, livestock, and grain, have been estimated to total \$76,338,477; and

"Whereas the flood which caused these unprecedented and devastating losses was, as stated by the Topeka Daily Capital, 'not a Kansas flood, it was a regional flood caused by water which fell over an area extending far beyond Kansas' borders. It affected rivers which have been the recognized responsibility of the Federal Government, and whose control cannot possibly be made the responsibility of the individual States. It was the greatest flood in the history of this country, in terms of dollar damage. The State of Kansas and its subdivisions could tax every piece of property to the limit and would still be unable to raise enough money to pay the bill;' and

"Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States several bills which would provide relief to the flood-stricken States and their citizens, and particularly H. R. 5259, commonly known as the Bolling bill; and

"Whereas Col. A. E. Howse, personal representative of the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C., on August 30, 1951, requested Hon. Edward F. Arn, Governor of the State of Kansas, to furnish him with an outline of how such a Federal flood-relief program should be administered, and on September 6, 1951, Governor Arn, with the advice of the Kansas Federal-State Advisory Committee on Flood Matters replied to Colonel Howse's request; and

"Whereas it is imperative that the Congress take immediate and prompt action on flood-relief legislation in order that the various States, their political subdivisions, and citizens may know just what the Federal relief is to be so that they may proceed with the rehabilitation work that should be gotten under full way at the earliest possible moment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Council of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to promptly enact flood-relief legislation along the lines of the bill now in the Congress; namely, H. R. 5259, commonly known as the Bolling bill, and that it provide that the same be administered and contain provisions in general accord with the recommendations made by the Governor of Kansas to Col. A. E. Howse in the Governor's letter of September 6, 1951."

Fulton Lewis Discusses North-South Political Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is the existing political alliance, by which big city Democratic machines who play politics for profit, aided by left-wing pressure groups who play politics for personal power to compel reluctant, disillusioned southern Democrats to support their candidates for President, and their continued drive to break down all that is left of States' rights, to operate again in 1952?

Is the present alliance between those who demand an FEPC and those who deplore an FEPC going to continue to rule America and to ruin all that remains of our doctrine of home rule, individual freedom, and private enterprise? Is this "marriage of convenience"—a shot-gun political marriage if there ever was one—going to continue to worship at the shrine of patronage and plunder on the theory that victory for those who are in is more important than the preservation of the constitutional principles upon which our American way of life depends? Are city Democrats, Fair Dealers, of the North going to continue to push around Jefferson Democrats of the South to the point that the great States of Dixie completely lose their authority and their autonomy?

Mr. President, those are serious questions, and in the article by Fulton Lewis, which I am asking to have printed in the RECORD, they are discussed most seriously. Dixie can save freedom in Amer-

ica. Dixie can compel our Federal Government to turn from the paths of national socialism and the totalitarian state. Dixie can call the turn in 1952 if it will agree upon a course of action which will put an end to the bizarre pattern of the past few presidential elections by which northern Democrats write the ticket and call the tune while southern Democrats yield up the votes which give power-hungry politicians the position to push the South around.

Fulton Lewis discusses some of these possibilities in his most recent Washington Report. For additional data on the subject see the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page A6240, and page A5605. Or read a little book by a great man, namely, The South's Political Plight, by Peter Molyneaux, editor of the Southern Weekly, and available at \$1.50 per copy from the Calhoun Clubs of the South, 904 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Fulton Lewis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

If successful, a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans will establish a new political party in the Nation. There are political precedents.

Senator KARL MUNDT, the South Dakota Republican, has promoted a national coalition committee to encourage southern Democrats interested in bolting the Democratic Party under its present leadership of President Truman and William Boyle. MUNDT's present goal is short of creating a new political party, but in case of such an eventuality, neither the South nor the GOP has anything to fear. Neither has the Nation.

The first great political parties in the United States were the Federalists and the Republicans. The Federalists were led by Alexander Hamilton, the Republicans by Thomas Jefferson. By the year 1824 the differences between factions within both parties were greater than the differences between the two parties. The result was political realignment, or coalitions.

Much the same situation exists today. The majority of American voters are unable to find a clear-cut difference between the two labels—Democrat and Republican.

Conservatives in the South vote with Republicans, radical Republicans vote with Fair Deal Democrats. Voters retain the right of selection but are unable to focus political wisdom on clear-cut objectives in either party.

When the liberal wing in Jefferson's Republican Party got sore enough, it broke away to form the Democratic Party. What was left became known as the National Republican Party. It soon formed a coalition with the Whigs under the leadership of Daniel Webster. The next outbreak of coalition occurred in 1854.

At that time issues between various factions within political parties were once again greater than issues between the parties. A faction of the Whigs stuck by the National Republican Party and in 1856 adopted Abraham Lincoln as a candidate, electing him in 1860. Disgruntled Whigs joined the Democrats and the political alignments continue in existence today, at least insofar as political labels are concerned.

Conservative southern Democrats refuse to be forced into accepting President Truman's

Fair Deal program. The Fair Deal minority in the Republican Party has done so. What Senator MUNDT and his southern associates want to do is create a vehicle whereby Fair Deal Republicans can admit their political acceptance of the President's program, and conservative southern politicians can candidly admit their acceptance of the GOP program adopted by conservative Republicans.

Thomas P. Wall, Jr., president of the Young Republican Club of Nashville, Tenn., has accepted the possibility of a southern-GOP coalition, and wants to call it the American party. He thinks it is an honorable way out for opposing factions within both political parties as they exist today, to say nothing of the break it would be for voters, both north and south.

This is what Senator MUNDT is proposing. MUNDT has not suggested that Democrats of the South join the Republican Party. He simply thinks that conservatives of both parties have enough sense to get together and select candidates mutually acceptable. Just how such candidates could be placed before American voters if rejected at both political conventions, is the subject of considerable political soul searching at the moment.

A year is a long time in politics. Congressional investigative committees might solve the issue. A few dozen more scandals and the grip President Truman and Democratic National Chairman William Boyle have on the party might be loosened considerably. In that event, with nominal party control restored to their hands, southern Democrats might be content to stay where they are, provided they can name the candidate for 1952.

Ahead: Biggest Boom in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith another article from the conservative United States News and World Report which again indicates that the Nation is in a great period of prosperity.

Last June the United States News published a report of a special research which found that the year of 1951 is the best ever in our history.

This article now predicts the biggest boom in all our history ahead.

AHEAD: BIGGEST BOOM IN HISTORY—RECORD OUTPUT, JOBS, PAY, SPENDING IN 1952

Prosperity is moving in for an extended stay. Signs point to a boom the whole family can enjoy for a long time ahead.

There will be plenty of everything. That includes jobs, spending money, and things to buy. Prices will not change drastically.

What's ahead, barring big war, rising living standards even as United States piles a big arms program atop growing civilian business.

A boom now being refueled is to develop into the biggest in the country's history. It will be a boom in business activity and in incomes, not one in terms of sharply rising prices.

More goods will be turned out by industry than ever before. There will be more people with jobs than ever held jobs in the past. Incomes will be larger than ever. People will eat more, wear better clothes, enjoy more and better living quarters, own more

automobiles, take better and longer vacations than in any past period. This assumes big armament spending but no major war.

Retail trade that has been lagging will revive and push ahead. Prices that had eased will firm. Pockets of unemployment that have developed will disappear as the months pass by.

Prosperity is building up for an extended stay. The boom will be fed by spending for arms. It will get well under way in the final 3 months of this year, will go on growing in the first 6 months of 1952, and probably will reach its peak in the final 6 months of that year.

What happens after that will be related to what the Nation decides that it wants permanently in the form of armament, and what it intends to do in supplying its allies. But, as of now, the boom seems certain to continue well into 1953.

Armament making is to have widespread effect. Industry, to fill orders for arms and to meet civilian demand, will need to work harder than ever. The rate of output in this year's April-June quarter was 223 percent of the prewar 1935-39 average. But in 1952 production promises to approach two and a half times the prewar rate.

Production will go down sharply in some lines, up sharply in other lines. Gains in output will more than offset losses. Defense business will move in, but will not take over the economy as it did in World War II.

Fewer automobiles will be produced than in the record year 1950. But production of aircraft will more than double between now and late 1952. Industry will turn out many more tanks, many more artillery pieces.

Auto makers, shifting to war orders, will produce more, not less, in 1952 than in 1951.

Television production will be held down, but TV makers will have their hands full turning out electronic apparatus for the military.

There will be less aluminum and copper for the building industry, but much more for the armament industry. As 1952 wears on, new steel capacity will begin to come into use, providing more steel to be processed into more things by more workers earning higher wages. The same goes for aluminum.

As the output of basic materials rises, there will be a gradual increase in the volume of goods made of metal that civilians can buy. By late 1952 or early 1953, Government will start taking off some of the restraints on production of major consumer items—autos, refrigerators, radios, TV sets.

Living, even while output is under curbs, will not be badly cramped. Production of metal goods for civilian use will be reduced, but not cut off. People will not starve for goods.

The auto industry will turn out about 5,400,000 passenger cars in 1951, which will be more than in any previous year except 1950. About 4,500,000 will be produced in 1952. That still will beat any year prior to 1949.

Appliances, plentiful now, will be in short supply in a few months. But production will pick up again before the shortages become very painful.

Home building is declining. About a million homes will be started this year. In 1952, starts may drop below 850,000. At that, about as many homes will be built next year as in postwar 1947. New houses will be limited mainly by material shortages. Credit terms are being eased on cheaper houses, the kind that represents the bulk of the market.

Goods needed for day-to-day living will be in adequate supply. There is to be no shortage of food, clothing, or other essentials. Civilian services are not to be crippled.

Families, even though they spend more than ever before, will be able to save toward the time when metal goods and houses become plentiful again. Personal incomes, in total, were at an annual rate of \$217,000,000 just before Korea. They are up to \$250,-

000,000,000 now, and will rise to an estimated two hundred and sixty-six billion in 1952.

Wages, despite controls, will keep going up. Jobs will be plentiful at pay rates that will induce a lot of housewives and oldsters to go to work.

By 1952, well over 65,000,000 will be working. Not so long ago, many doubted whether this country ever could provide as many as 60,000,000 jobs in a period other than all-out war. Employment already has passed that by more than 3,000,000, and more jobs keep opening up.

Prices, here and there, will rise, but no new spiral is in sight. People are likely to find that their dollar in 1952 will go about as far as it does now. Government controls will keep most raw-material prices in check. After armament spending levels off, prices will be regulated by the marketplace. Huge capacity then will be available to take up the slack in civilian output.

Personal taxes will rise, but not enough to drain off the public's increase in buying power. Real income will grow.

Total spending—what the economists call gross national product—has increased from an annual rate of \$275,000,000,000 before Korea to \$326,000,000,000 last quarter, and will go up to an estimated \$342,000,000,000 in 1952.

What's ahead, then, is a period of relative plenty, with high business activity, big incomes, record spending.

Christmas trade in 1951 will break all records. The summer slump in consumer spending will not last long.

Buying gradually will shift to the things that remain plentiful.

Some businessmen will lose as others gain. Dealers in automobiles will have fewer cars to sell. But the supply of cars, new and used, will be enough to keep them going. Appliance dealers will be hit hard.

Billions that will be diverted away from hard goods will go into food stores, dry-goods stores, haberdasheries, drug stores, filling stations, hotels.

Restaurants will prosper as families, with more ready cash to spend, start eating out oftener. New fabrics that are coming on the market will find plenty of customers.

More money will be spent on travel, vacations, entertainment, football games. Vacation resorts, night clubs, and gambling houses will do well.

Farmers, in general, will be well off, with high incomes. There will be no farm-price collapse.

There will be annoyances. Maids, yardmen, and clerks will be hard to find. Shoppers often will have to wait to be served. Minor hardware for the household, in many instances, will be scarce.

Still, living for most people will be good. This will be a boom that the average family can enjoy. The country will build a vast military machine, but defense output will simply be piled on top of high civilian output. Living standards, in the process, will rise, not decline.

Arizona Has Enough Underground Water for Century of Supply to Farms, Geological Survey Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, Arizona has enough water in underground stor-

age basins at the present time to supply the farms within the proposed central Arizona project for a full century.

The United States Geological Survey recently issued a report which stated that more than 60,000,000 acre-feet of water are now stored in the underground basins of central Arizona.

The supply of underground water now available to central Arizona is at least twice the capacity of Lake Meade, the reservoir behind Hoover Dam.

This enormous amount of underground water in Arizona is close enough to the surface to be pumped economically by growers. In making its estimate, the Geological Survey used the 1950 Arizona water table as the upper limit in estimating the capacity of the storage basins, and set the lower limit at 100 feet below the water table of 1950.

It is within these highly conservative boundaries that the Geological Survey estimated more than 60,000,000 acre-feet of water are stored.

The question immediately arises as to why the central Arizona project should recommend a gigantic pump lift of 985 feet to take water out of the Colorado River when water can be pumped only 100 feet out of underground reservoirs, which a Government agency reports contain more than 60,000,000 acre-feet of available water, or twice the capacity of Lake Mead.

The 100-foot depth arbitrarily assumed by the Geological Survey is not asserted by it to be the limit of economic pump lift. The economic lift is certainly greater. Hundreds of wells now operating in central Arizona are pumping water from much greater depths, and are doing it at costs considered fully economic by growers.

The Geological Survey report was sent to me in response to a series of questions I addressed to William E. Wrather, United States Geological Survey Director. In general, the answers corroborate the testimony of California witnesses, who appeared before this committee at hearings on the central Arizona project.

The testimony of these California witnesses was to the effect that the water problems of central Arizona could be largely, if not wholly, resolved by proper measures to further conserve and utilize local water resources, and by judicious operation of the available ground-water storage in conjunction with the usage of surface storage.

The Geological Survey's estimate of 60,000,000 acre-feet of underground water actually available at present, in spite of years of drought and excessive withdrawals, confirms the statement made before this committee by Clay C. Elder, hydrographic engineer of the metropolitan water district of southern California, on Friday, June 3, 1949—page 972, hearings on H. R. 934, part 2.

Mr. Elder testified that at least 45,000,000 acre-feet of underground storage water were available to central Arizona within an economic pump lift.

This estimate is far below the present estimate of the Geological Survey.

The Geological Survey report states that possibly 500,000 acre-feet of water might be salvaged in central Arizona by

the use of recommended salvage methods. This, too, substantiates the testimony of California witnesses.

The Geological Survey report estimates that about 3,000,000 acre-feet of water is recoverable in central Arizona each year from annual precipitation. By recoverable, the report means the diversions of surface water, the recharge to underground reservoirs, and the savings achieved by salvage methods not now practiced.

The estimated 3,000,000 acre-feet a year of recoverable water is sufficient to supply the requirements of more than 800,000 acres, including necessary drainage to maintain salt balance in the land.

The Geological Survey report emphasizes the validity of testimony made before this committee by Raymond Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California—page 802, hearings on H. R. 934, May 13, 1949—that the gigantic supplemental water supply proposed for the central Arizona project would cause water-logging of lands and require costly works for artificial disposal.

In making its estimate that more than 60,000,000 acre-feet of water are now available in underground central Arizona storage basins, the Geological Survey considered nine different storage basins in the area. The estimates were made in terms of "available water."

The Geological Survey report is dated in August 1951. I requested the information on May 4, 1951.

Georgia: An Engineer's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. WOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following article by W. E. Taylor, tide and wave research engineer:

GEORGIA: AN ENGINEER'S DREAM

(By W. E. Taylor)

Sidney Lanier, the beloved Georgia poet, wrote two very beautiful poems about Georgia: *The Song of the Chattahoochee* and *The Marshes of Glynn*. During his short life of 39 years, he may not have seen anything more indicative of power and growth than the railroads of his day and the overshot wheels which turned the grinding rocks to make meal and flour of his corn and wheat for the table.

In the subsequent years, much improvement has been made in the transportation and communication system of Georgia. Even the educational facilities and living conditions made such marked progress that Georgia now ranks with the most modern States of the Union. Modern machinery has vitally changed the modes and methods of farming to such an extent that she now leads in many phases of the farming industry.

The commissioner of agriculture for the State recently reported that the State produced \$200,000,000 of marketed livestock in 1 year. This—added to the \$200,000,000

worth of tobacco and turpentine products and \$400,000,000 worth of cotton, peanuts, hay, and various other agricultural products taken from the bosom of mother earth within her boundaries—puts Georgia into the billion-dollar bracket of production.

Georgia pioneered in. The minting of gold, the first college for both men and for women, the introduction of anesthesia, the first farmer's markets, and other achievements in other fields too numerous to mention.

What more does Georgia need?

Paraphrasing a Biblical expression:

Behold! A greater than this is here. And has always existed in Georgia abundantly.

If Georgia dammed all the valleys of Hall in the hills of Habersham, she would catch only a small portion of the power of which Georgia is capable. Even the marshes of Glynn has unimaginable millions of horsepower locked up in them. The 1,000 miles of indented seacoast is an incalculable storehouse of untouched power.

The Georgia coast has an average daily high tide of 7½ feet, year in and year out. This has occurred regularly during the thousands of years before Columbus discovered America and the hundreds of years since, seemingly without notice. All through this long interval of time, the great Atlantic Ocean has been surging powerfully into the marshes of Glynn and into the inlets from the sea—gently bathing and then angrily slapping the face of the beaches of Georgia literally with millions of horsepower annually.

Georgia has enough water power along her coastal fringes and her tidal plain, if entrapped, to turn the wheels of industry for the whole southeastern part of the United States without a phenomenal feat of engineering. There is enough power stored in the marshes of Glynn alone to light every city, town, and hamlet south of Macon without harming a single farmer who raises cotton, tobacco, peanuts, watermelons, hay, or the one who wiregrasses his cattle for market.

The ultimate goal is to get power from the coastal and tidal plain equaling Boulder Dam's 45 cents per 1,000 kilowatt-hours. Notable research engineers would not raise the water higher than the present tidal level. If and when power companies do raise the present tidal level and cover and submerge new lands for power purposes the farmer would reap royalties similar to the oil-land payments. This would create another source of income for the State of Georgia.

Corraling this unleashed coastal power would bring many manufacturing industries to south Georgia which would make Georgia blossom as a rose in the industrial and financial world. On account of the labor opportunities, the population of south Georgia would double itself in a very short time, and the industrial output would triple itself in the meanwhile.

With this end in view, Georgia would be the first to install tidal or coastal power on her shores. At the present there is not a salt water or shore line power plant in the great United States. Here is an opportunity for Georgia to pioneer again and in a field that is most new to her.

The beauties reflected in Lanier's—

"I hurry amain to reach the plain,
Run the rapid and leap the fall,
With the lover's pain to attain the plain
Far from the hills of Habersham,
Far from the valleys of Hall!"—

Have made Georgia a poet's paradise and delight.

Capturing and putting into effective use the potential power of the Georgia tideland and coastal plain would be a research engineer's dream. Therefore, a résumé of all of Georgia's esthetic beauties and the possible power potentialities shows Georgia: A poet's delight and an engineer's dream.

New Farm Planner Starts Work at Reynolds County Soil Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 5, 1951:

NEW FARM PLANNER STARTS WORK AT REYNOLDS COUNTY SOIL OFFICE—ERIC PALMER ASSIGNED TO ELLINGTON DISTRICT BY SCS—NEW OUTLOOK ON LAND MANAGEMENT

ELLINGTON, Mo.—Eric Palmer has been assigned by the United States Soil Conservation Service as farm planner for the Reynolds County Soil Conservation District. He assumed his new duties here Monday.

Palmer was reared on a Current River farm in Shannon County, attended high school at Eminence and acquired the degrees bachelor of science and master of arts in education and bachelor of science in agriculture in Missouri colleges.

He taught in the State public schools for 16 years prior to going with SCS. He went directly from the superintendency of the Bloomfield (Mo.) High School to the position with the SCS in 1937.

ARCADIA FARM FORESTER TO AID

Robert Ralsch, who has been stationed at Arcadia, Mo., as farm forester for the Missouri Conservation Commission, will act as part-time farm forester for the local soil district. Ralsch's territory covers Reynolds, Iron, and Madison Counties, and he has already set up timber-management plans for a number of Reynolds County farmers.

Merritt G. Wilson, SCS scientist, has been working with Reynolds County farmers for several weeks, making soil maps of the farms. About 20 of the farm soil maps have been completed, with 10 more farm applications to be processed. Wilson has headquarters at Cape Girardeau and works with the conservation districts in the Cape Girardeau area.

Harry Anderson, chairman, and Melvin Smith, vice chairman of the Reynolds County Soil Conservation District Board of Supervisors, spent 3 days at the supervisors' training meeting in Fulton, Mo., last month and with the assignment of technical assistance, the soil district expects to begin working at top efficiency.

Planting time next spring will take on new significance in this first Missouri Ozark County to organize and put into motion a soil-conservation district. Farm land that has been depleted during several generations of cropping by old-time methods will be tilled according to soil-building procedure and some will be returned to forest. The protection of timber, which covers about 86 percent of the county's land area and which has been burned over each spring according to tradition, will be given added emphasis. Benefit will accrue to water and wildlife resources.

CLASSIFICATION OF LAND

Preparatory to next spring's work the soil scientist has been making capability maps of the soil in the district, classifying it in three categories, that best suited for rotational crops, pasture, and timber. The maps will be used as guides in putting the land to its fullest use, building up productivity while battling erosion for the present and future generations. A 5-year rotation of crops is recommended by the soil supervisors.

The applications of farmers for aid are regarded as an indication of a new Ozarkian attitude toward farm and timber management, because Reynolds County, deep in the hill country, lagged for years in acceptance of soil-conserving methods. Under the new plan, local bankers, businessmen, teachers, youth groups, and women's clubs will cooperate to put over a program for a better long-range economy. Under the soil district plan there is teamwork between the various Federal, State, and local soil agencies to offer technical advice.

A year ago, under leadership of T. R. Smith, agriculture instructor at Ellington High School, people of the county began taking stock of the county's needs. Some farmers and timber owners were barely eking out a livelihood on eroded slopes and the timber had been burned out, over-grazed, and promiscuously cut. Smith called a meeting at Ellington, petitions for the establishment of the soil district were signed, and an official hearing was held. Later a referendum vote was passed with only six dissenters, though there are 969 farms listed in the four participating townships. The board of supervisors was elected and got busy on its plans to solve soil and water problems.

TYPICAL OZARK PROBLEMS

"Reynolds County being a typical Ozark county and the first to establish a soil-conservation district, is confronted with woodland, soil, and water conservation problems typical of a great many other Ozark counties," says a spokesman for the district.

"The first settlers came to the county about 1830. Most of these came with the idea of establishing residence along the creek valleys. A later influx occurred in the early 1900's, and reached its peak about 1930. A high percentage were timber workers, who stripped the land of short-leaf pine, oak, and hickory.

"As virgin timber stands disappeared, the erosion problem became acute not only in the upland (timbered) sections, but in the valleys where creek and river channels filled with gravel and silt and floods devastated. The old custom of burning the woods at least annually further added to the erosion problem.

"A large part of the county today offers excellent possibilities for reforestation because the production of timber is the most practical land use for upland areas. The latest figures available show 242,465 acres in forest not in farms (Clark national forest and Deer Run State park), 83,548 acres of forest on farms, 13,660 acres of pasture, 38,617 acres in cropland. It is plainly seen that timber production is the biggest single crop in Reynolds County as has been the case since the county was settled. Livestock and livestock products, such as beef cattle, hogs, and dairy products, are second in economic importance."

TIMBER MANAGEMENT NEEDED

"Proper methods in timber establishment, management and selective cutting will go further toward solving the county's soil, moisture, and flood-control problems than any single group of practices that may be employed. It so happens that Reynolds County has one of the large flood-control projects of the Midwest, Clearwater Reservoir, within its boundary. But in order to prevent silting of this reservoir, constructed and operated by the United States Corps of Engineers, soil and water conservation measures should begin in the upper end of the reservoir."

Protection of the forest through a broad educational program and reforestation of slopes too rocky and steep for any crop but trees is on the Reynolds County agenda. Between the flat, narrow valleys and the steep timberland there are slopes that can be farmed effectively with the use of terraces

and diversion terraces, contour planting and fertilization. Rotational crops are recommended for the alluvial soils in the flood plains of the small streams.

According to a 1949 census, the average corn yield was 33 bushels per acre; wheat, 13; oats (for grain) 21; soybeans (for beans) 10; hay (clover, timothy, alfalfa, and other) 1 ton per acre. But an indication as to the potential yield, using soil-building methods, is found on the farm of Oren Sutterfield at Corridon. Sutterfield began his soil-conserving program 20 years ago on land cleared by his grandfather in 1854. Even in pioneer days 50 to 60 bushels of corn to the acre was considered a bumper crop, but at the time Oren took over in 1931, the soil was worn out and the harvest was scarcely enough to justify cost of seed. He limed and fertilized, planted legumes, building up from lespedeza to sweet clover, and plowed the legumes under as he rotated crops. On a 20-acre field along Logan's creek last year he harvested 100 to 121 bushels of hybrid corn per acre.

Sutterfield, now PMA chairman for the county, was elected vice chairman of the board of supervisors when the new soil conservation district was set up, and neighbors look to his cropping success as a goal to meet. They will follow a pattern of farming that is new to many when planting begins next spring and woods burning, it is hoped, will be a thing of the past.

Representative Velde's Nonstoppage Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of September 25, 1951. Here is a new and novel way by which labor and management can contribute to the defense effort. They are given an opportunity to include the provisions of this law in contracts between labor and management. It is possible such a law would be a new landmark in labor-management relations.

The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE VELDE'S NONSTOPPAGE STRIKE

We expect plenty of controversy over the nonstoppage strike plan of Prof. George W. Goble (University of Illinois) which is embodied in an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, introduced by Representative HAROLD H. VELDE, of Pekin. But it is the first legislation, as far as we know, that has proposed a practical method of compensating the public, in part, for the losses it suffers on account of strikes. The people of this community should be in a mood, at this particular time, to give serious consideration to any plan for settling management-labor disputes without bringing economic loss and suffering to the community.

Professor Goble's plan, adopted by Representative VELDE, is to offer management and labor a form of contract which they may accept or reject, but which, once accepted by both parties, places a penalty on work-stoppage. When a labor dispute reaches the point of a strike, either side could apply to the National Labor Relations Board for a non-stoppage-strike order which would require work and negotiations at the

same time. It would also require that both the company and employees pay certain sums weekly to the NLRB, to be returned if the dispute was adjusted satisfactorily within 90 days; but to be confiscated by the Government if the disputing parties failed to adjust their differences.

There are bound to be loud objections to this plan but it seems to us that it is about time that legal recognition be given to the rights of the public, although it is not a party to management-labor disputes.

The Treason of Selfishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Sunday Star written by Frederick Brown Harris, pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, and Chaplain of the United States Senate, entitled "The Treason of Selfishness."

The sentiments expressed herein are such to appeal to our citizens in these times.

The article follows:

THE TREASON OF SELFISHNESS

The scene is the always solemn opening of a session of the United States Senate. The Vice President, in calling the body to order, announces first of all that the Chaplain will offer prayer. The Senators present stand with heads bowed in reverence, as do the visitors from all parts of the world who crowd the galleries. Since the beginning of the Republic that wayside shrine with its altar of supplication has stood at the portal of each day's deliberations.

At the first October session of that which is often called the greatest deliberative body in the world, the opening prayer contained the confession that "we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who seek their own will and whims in spite of the noble and polished professions with which we come to Thee." Then was lifted this petition: "Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. Fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and from the treason of inner selfishness."

Later on, that same day, one outstanding Senator was heard to say to another, equally distinguished: "I have found myself repeating a phrase of the Chaplain's noontide prayer, 'the treason of selfishness—the treason of selfishness.'" Said the other: "I've been thinking of it, too. That is the treason most to be feared and from which our America needs to pray for deliverance."

Standing now beneath the spires of the Spirit, shall we join those nationally known legislators in thinking frankly about the enormous significance of that phrase, whose terrible possibilities need to challenge not only the Congress, but to be laid on the conscience of every American worthy of that proud name?

Now, treason is an ugly word. To betray one's cause, to shatter trust, to crucify integrity brings down upon the head of the offender the disdain and disgust of those who can forgive anything but the unpardonable sin of selling out to the enemy. Brown-

ing catches the withering scorn with which outraged virtue turns on a traitor in his Lost Leader:

"Just for a handful of silver he left us,
Just for a ribbon to stick in his coat."

That is the hateful label in scarlet letters which a loyal citizenry brands upon those who in these days of the supreme test betray the free world and espouse the contemptible cause of the slave state. Such traitors join the debased company of the Benedict Arnolds whose patron saint is Judas Iscariot. But one is also guilty of high treason who barbers the most precious thing in the world—integrity—selling it to the devil of selfishness. The supreme treason is to put one's own cupidity at the center of one's universe.

In an eastern city a recent trial sent a municipal official to State's prison for accepting graft. The testimony revealed the very day when this elected public servant, a churchman, a civic leader, a backer of all good causes, yielded to the temptation to increase his weekly income by accepting the shady propositions of the underworld. He actually reversed the unblemished record of a lifetime. He decided that honesty did not pay—in bank deposits—and that from then on he was going to join those who "get theirs." He continued to pose as a patriot. He joined in salutes to the flag on public occasions. He hurled anathemas at Communists. But all the time he himself was a traitor. He had surrendered to inner selfishness.

But one does not have to commit a prison offense to do that. As soon as one makes it the drive of his life to see how much he can get from his country, rather than how much he can give to it, he commits treason. The goal of a true patriot is to put a little more in the common pool than he takes out. That self-realization comes through self-surrender is a universal law. The penalty for disregarding that and attempting some shortcut to heart's desire is to reduce one's stature from a potential moral giant to a puny pigmy. Caring for one's self may mean coddling a mean little creature of narrow, clamorous, egoistic desires. To put that self in the saddle is to lose life utterly.

When an individual life is stretched to take in the interests of others the personality is not depleted; it is completed; it is enormously enlarged. The highest treason is to deny that in practice. One is held back from that crime against himself, not by fear of penal penalties but by the pull of inward sanctions, that holy trinity of honor, honesty, and fidelity. The most heinous offense against oneself is to commit sacrilege in that inner shrine, to blow out the candles of faith and hope and love on that altar. It is in the profanation of that holy place that self-respect is lost.

Well has it been said that a quick sense of possessing within ourselves something fine that must not be desecrated is essential to great character. In all literature there is no more searching and significant phrase than Tennyson's about being "loyal to the royal in thyself." Inner treason is the desecration of that.

And shall we add this to the Senate prayer: O God, when hot egotistical voices are resounding in my soul, telling me that unselfishness does not pay; that love is not the law; that altruism is foolishness, and that the thing to do in life's swift race is to look after No. 1, to get and grab while the getting and grabbing is good: O Thou searcher of hearts, when such voices are whispering in my own heart, tempting to the inner treason of selfishness, may I hear again the tinkle of water being poured into a basin, and as in a vision see the Son of the Most High washing His disciples' feet and going forth to change a cross into a throne, as losing His life He finds it, to the joy of the ages?

Thick, Golden Molasses Bubbles Under Shade of Sycamore Tree—Horse Still Turns Roller Mill That Squeezes Out Juice at Allen Boyer Place, Near Hunter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 8, 1951:

THICK, GOLDEN MOLASSES BUBBLES UNDER SHADE OF SYCAMORE TREE—HORSE STILL TURNS ROLLER MILL THAT SQUEEZES OUT JUICE AT ALLEN BOYER PLACE, NEAR HUNTER

(By Lucile Masnor)

HUNTER, Mo.—Molasses is being made down here in the hills of Carter County. The sweet, thick golden sirup bubbles and boils in the evaporator in the shade of the sycamore tree. And out on the level spot old Barney, the horse, patiently walks round and round moving the sweep that turns the roller mill that presses the thick, green juice from the sorghum cane.

Mr. and Mrs. Allen Boyer, who live 2 miles west of Hunter, have been making molasses for the last 25 years. With all this experience, Boyer knows just the right kind of loamy soil in which to plant his sweet sorghum seed. He avoids rich, black soil, for it makes the molasses dark and strong. The sorghums belong to the grass family, but they do not grow too well in wet seasons, for they need to be cultivated frequently.

The sorghums are tall, earless plants bearing terminal heads of seeds. The sirup-yielding plants are known as saccharin or sweet sorghums. The others are nonsaccharin or seed sorghums, such as kafircorn and broomcorn.

ONE HUNDRED GALLONS FROM ONE ACRE

Mrs. Boyer says that their crop of sweet sorghum is very poor this year because of the rainy season. They will make only about 300 gallons of molasses from their 3 acres of cane. But at \$2 a gallon, those 3 acres are still the most valuable plot of ground on any farm along Current River.

In making the molasses, labor is not too big an item since the Boyers are a family group. Burton, Floyd, and Ivory Boyer live on adjoining farms to Allen, and the four families exchange work. Whoever has crops to harvest, wood to cut, or molasses to make, gets help from his brothers, their wives, and children. No money is exchanged—just you help me and I'll help you.

Mrs. Nettie Parcell was brought in this fall to skim the green foam from the sorghum juice when it begins to boil in the lower end of the evaporator. Allen Boyer attends to the molasses end of the evaporator, for it takes an experienced hand to know when the bubbles in the heavy sirup say that the juice has turned into molasses. Mrs. Boyer says it is ready when the big round bubbles come up and burst open in a certain sort of way. That is the dangerous point in molasses making, for if it scorches, the molasses is ruined—it becomes bitter. The finished molasses runs out of the evaporator through two strainers into a lard can, which Boyer covers quickly to head off attempts of molasses-loving jackets which are ready to dive into the scalding sirup.

BELLS WELL AT MILL

These cans of molasses are set aside to cool until next morning when Mrs. Boyer gets up before the lazy yellow jackets get on the job. She skims the cold molasses, pours it into gallon buckets, and sets it on the table where customers throughout the day come and buy it. She says they sell their molasses about as fast as they can make it right there at the mill.

Ivory Boyer—with the help of the Carl and Elva Peek families—cut, strip, and top the sorghum cane in the field. Burton Boyer brings the cane stalks from the field to the mill site in a truck. Floyd Boyer and Old Barney run the roller mill. The juice runs into a barrel and through a pipe down the slope to the evaporator. Mrs. Parcell just opens a faucet to refill the pans in the evaporator. They make about 50 to 75 gallons of Ozark sorghum molasses a day.

Mrs. Boyer says that the furnace under the evaporator is built of sandstone and clay. Other stones or cement will not hold up and will not keep an even heat which is one of the secrets in the success of molasses making.

Here is a favorite Ozark recipe for molasses custard pie. One cup sorghum, one-half cup buttermilk, three eggs, one cup sugar, one-half teaspoonful of soda, two tablespoons of flour, flavor with cinnamon.

Mix the ingredients together, adding the beaten eggs last. Boil until it begins to thicken, pour into a crust, and bake slowly for about 30 minutes.

Honest American Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, although I have never laid claim to being a connoisseur of art, I am among that great class of Americans who stoutly maintain that they know what they like and what they do not like in such matters.

This attitude, of course, exposes one to the accusation that the evaluation of art by such criteria is inexcusable, stamping one as an individual lacking in the finer sensibilities which allegedly accrue from a well-rounded education.

To the ivory-tower school of thought my tastes in art would probably be characterized as provincial. I am quick to admit, in this respect, that my home county—Jasper County, Ind.—for all its worth-while contributions in many fields of human endeavor, does not boast of eminent crusaders in the cause of such salon movements as cubism, abstractionism, or impressionism. Our tastes are more down to earth.

My defense of the I-know-what-I-like attitude rests on the fact that at times I find myself admiring the works of an artist who has already gained wide recognition as a master in his field. At such times I am comfortably assured that my taste in art is not hopeless, since what I appreciate has also earned the approbation of the experts.

Such an artist is Ray Strang, illustrative painter from Tuscon, Ariz. My interest in this son of Illinois, who has adopted Arizona as his home, stems in part from a similar admiration for his work on the part of my friend and fellow Hoosier, Mr. A. K. Mayer, of Indianapolis, who, like Strang, has "discovered" Arizona.

Thanks to the thoughtful generosity of Mr. Strang, the wall of my office in the Capitol is now graced with an excellent example of the artist's talent. The gift, gratefully acknowledged, is an oil painting entitled "Arizona Cutting Horse."

Certainly in the development of a native American culture Ray Strang is making a splendid contribution, portraying for posterity these honest and sturdy scenes of the West—painting with the sincere strokes of a man who possesses undeniably great talent coupled with an obvious love for his native land.

The Economic Aspects of Death
and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, two eminent gentlemen in the field of economics have proposed revisions of the Federal taxing system which merits attention outside of financial circles.

Mitchell G. Meyers, distinguished attorney and jurist of Waterbury, Conn., and Ray B. Westerfield, Yale University professor of economics, wrote at length on this proposal in the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*. A recent issue of the *New York Times* discusses the proposal in more general terms. I include the article in my remarks for the attention of Members interested in equitable tax measures:

PLAN TO SURVIVE DEATH AND TAXES IS HELD
NEEDED BY SMALL BUSINESS

(By Paul Heffernan)

The impact of death and death taxes is an ever-present threat to any family-owned business. But the many administrative and financial problems which these inevitable forces have stirred up during the last couple of decades have received but little attention outside professional banking, legal, and trust circles. And the techniques developed for dealing with such problems, little known as they are, can hardly be said to be more than tentative.

As a result, when faced suddenly with the dread visitation of the death-and-taxes specter many flourishing businesses of limited scope go into liquidation for no other reason. Or the surviving owners consent to disadvantageous dilutions of equity through ineptly arranged sales of securities or hasty mergers. These involuntary and often avoidable shifts in the ownership and control of closely owned business are related, moreover, to the over-all social problem bound up in the chances of small business surviving and growing in an economy in-

fluenced increasingly by the sway of big business.

The general problem posed by death taxes to small business may be said to be threefold. For the owner, it is a problem of tax anticipation. For his estate it is a problem of fiduciary responsibility. And for the private financial world it is largely a problem of relating investment banking techniques to the needs of limited enterprises.

Where the need for anticipating death taxes has been foreseen adequately the other problems are less acute or may be obviated altogether. It is rare, however, that a family business built up in one generation is as well prepared for death taxes and continuance of the enterprise as is family owned big business, where generation of association with the world of finance, accountancy, and law have developed satisfactory ways of bridging the ownership-management gap and financing the adjustment.

In small businesses, forged in the prime years of a single enterpriser, life insurance is a simple means for coping with the problem. But often insurance protection is not thought of as a tax hedge until late in life, when the coverage becomes too costly. It often happens in family-owned enterprises that there is no other means at hand for paying death taxes than for the survivors to sell out.

SPECIAL PLAN PROPOSED

A proposal advanced recently for preparing family-owned enterprise for the inevitable coming of the undertaker is that the Federal Government should make available to such enterprises a special investment in the form of an estate tax anticipation certificate.

This recommendation was made by Mitchell G. Meyers, Waterbury, Conn., lawyer, and Ray B. Westerfield, Yale University professor of economics, in a recent issue of the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*. Their proposed tax anticipation note would bear income-tax-free interest related to the cost incurred by the Treasury in borrowing on 91-day discount bills, and would be surrenderable at face value at any time with interest penalty before the death of the registered holder.

When enterprises have to raise money for taxes on the death of the owner, problems of financial and business administration are often visited upon trustees of the estate and the traditional conservative approach of the fiduciary relationship may turn out to be more of a handicap than a help. This aspect of the death-and-taxes problem is stressed in the current issue of the fiduciary journal *Trust and Estates*, by Alexander E. Elsemann, president of the Elsemann Industrial Corp.

TRUSTEE IS RESPONSIBLE

The difficulty lies in the fact that while the trustee is responsible for the conservation of what is in his custody, and the trustee is answerable to the court for his stewardship, it is in the highly competitive investment banking activity of the Nation's financial centers that the most effective solutions to the problem are most likely to be worked out.

The answer in one case might be a public sale of equity securities and in another case a private sale. Or it might be the negotiation of a term loan with an insurance company. Or the furnishing of new management and the investment of new capital. Or the effectuation of a merger with an enterprise of related scope.

In any case, the job is one which calls for the conservative force—the trustee—joining hands with the dynamic force—the investment banker—if the business is to be bridged over to new life and not be liquidated or left to languish.

ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the *European Review*, September edition, from London:

THE RECORD OF ECA—SURVEY BY THE
NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK

While the ECA has been given ancillary responsibilities in other parts of the world, its main sphere of operation has been Europe, working with and through the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). The recovery of production in participating countries has been rapid. For this achievement the ECA and the OEEC share credit with the individual participating countries, especially for activities which have added to productive facilities, aided in the restoration of confidence in money, and lowered barriers to intra-European trade. The following table shows production gains over prewar for Western Europe:

Western Europe: Recovery of production

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

(1938=100)

Calendar years:	
1946-----	77
1947-----	87
1948-----	101
1949-----	115
1950-----	127
1951, first quarter-----	139

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

(Prewar=100)

Crop years:	
1947-48-----	85
1948-49-----	93
1949-50-----	103
1950-51-----	109

The increase in production has directly enlarged supplies of goods for home consumption and also for export. The enlarged earnings from exports, in turn, have permitted a freer access to imported goods and relieved the necessity for outside financial and economic assistance. United States Government grants over and past 2 years have been more than enough to cover the reduced deficits in European balances of payments and thus have served to increase gold and dollar reserves. For the United Kingdom and France, among other countries, these reserves were at a very low ebb during the first years of the program. In fact, near exhaustion of reserves—dollar shortage—was the proximate cause for undertaking it.

The chart portrays the postwar changes in gold and dollar reserves, in comparison with the prewar December 1938 levels, by geographical areas of the world. Separate curves are given for countries which hold the largest reserves—the United Kingdom (partly on behalf of the sterling area), Switzerland, and Canada. When all areas are combined, the increase in gold and dollar holdings outside America since September 1949 exceeds \$5,000,000,000. United States gold reserves in this period have declined by \$2,800,000,000, and foreign short-term dollar assets have increased by more than \$1,000,000,000. Since 1949 newly produced gold has been absorbed into foreign official reserves or sold in free markets, in either case helping to restore confidence in money.

The ECA program clearly has had a substantial measure of success. Results desired have been achieved, and with less financial aid than was commonly expected at the outset.

At the same time, the ECA experience, not to mention preceding programs of aid, has also emphasized dangers. Even within the reduced appropriations allowed by Congress there has been unnecessary waste. Any political loan or grant has an uncommon amount of waste as an almost inevitable ingredient. Moreover, the United States has, by aiding foreign governments in power, taken upon itself a responsibility for their policies and for the postponement of needful changes.

One vital lesson out of the experience is how open-handed grants can distract the attention of recipients from the fundamentals of economic progress, create competition to see who can get the most, and make a virtue of improvidence as a qualification for aid. Fortunately for us, European governments have all avoided this temptation. Those who have held to the straight and narrow path of sound finance naturally have had the least need for aid.

The \$25 billion of foreign military aid proposed by Mr. Acheson may have its greatest merit as a warning to the aggressor of the extent to which at least one administration official would go in providing military equipment to friendly powers overseas. At the same time we must not reckon without the effect upon these countries. Responsible people abroad express concern over the excessive demands being made on world supplies of raw materials, the dangers of loading big military outlays onto swollen peacetime budgets, the problems of collecting more taxes, and difficulties of reeducating people to consider Government bonds a better investment than gold or other material goods. While grateful for our help, they get the uneasy feeling that we may promise too much, deprecate the dollar by giving out too many, open the floodgates of world-wide inflation, and do more harm than good by mistaken generosity.

The American people are solidly behind the policy of building the military and economic strength of this country and its allies. We should not underrate the potential of these allies—as some of the public hearings on foreign-aid legislation have seemed to do. In the past, England, France, Germany, and Italy, among others, have shown themselves capable of producing instruments of war second to none. The defensive strength that we mutually seek cannot be bought with dollar appropriations which promote attitudes of dependency or threaten to destroy the usefulness of the dollar as an anchor of monetary stability. The strength must be one built out of cooperation among self-reliant partners, and around a core of sound economic and financial policy. After all, the best thing we have to contribute to anybody is the example of what free enterprise and free individuals can accomplish.

Press Must Remain Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit, for the en-

lightenment of my colleagues, a very well written editorial by C. W. Brown, of the *Oconomowoc (Wis.) Enterprise*:

PRESS MUST REMAIN FREE

Two events have occurred the last few days which have given more emphasis to National Newspaper Week than perhaps anything else could have done. The week is being observed October 1 to 8.

The first event is the visit to America of Alberto Gainza Paz, editor and publisher of the suppressed Argentine newspaper *La Prensa*. This great newspaper was simply taken over as a climax of incidents created to give a front to the action of the Argentine President Peron, the dictator who has silenced his political opposition. This is the way of all dictators. Freedom of men and a free press must go together. Without a free press, freedom dies. This is history. There is no free press in Russia or in the iron curtain countries. There was no free press under Hitler or Mussolini. The controlled press has now jumped the Atlantic to the Argentine.

The second event was the action of President Truman who issued an order permitting civilian Government agencies to suppress such news as the agencies consider a factor to security. Such an order has been in effect in the Defense and State Departments and the Atomic Energy Commission. These previous restrictions have not been opposed—recognizing that national security was involved. When similar restrictions were in effect during the war, the information withheld was screened by a body set up to do the job. Under the new order extending the news restriction to civilian governmental agencies, the agencies themselves become the judge of their own actions and can suppress anything and everything they so elect including their mistakes. The action could well work out the same as a city suppressing its corruption leaving the grafters and crooks in office with a free hand. It would lead to such things as city councils, police departments, and school boards to act behind doors closed to the citizens who pay the bill.

A storm of protest of the order broke loose when the President's order was announced. On the day that President Truman made the order public, the Office of Price Stabilization issued an edict forbidding its employees to make public any information that might cause embarrassment to the OPS. The order was quickly withdrawn. The vital thing is that we, in the United States, have had creep upon us progressive regulations and Government in business with its terrific cost reflected in taxes so that today the extent of controls is not realized. If the average citizen could suddenly be set back 25 years, the contrast between then and now, so far as Government regulation of the individual is concerned, would be shocking.

Two dangers are revealed in the President's order: (1) That the President can presume to ride so roughshod over a basic American right so essential to freedom itself, and (2) the public's apathy toward this and many other matters that are a part of our creeping socialism and approach to moral and financial bankruptcy as a nation, while waste is rampant in Government.

The President chose a very inopportune time to issue his order, just before National Newspaper Week. His action aided greatly to center attention on the importance of freedom of the press and its importance to the citizen. National Newspaper Week is not for newspapers, rather it is to inform the public of its great right in having a free press. Open debate on any subject is unfettered here which means that human rights will stand so long as a newspaper will argue points editorially and print all the news. This right must be preserved whether you agree with the individual newspaper or not.

Secrecy in Public Welfare Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I insert two editorials from the Shreveport (La.) Times. The first appeared in the issue of October 7 and the second in the issue of October 9:

THE GOVERNORS ACT

The national governors conference which met at Gatlinburg, Tenn., last week, voted unanimously for removal of the Federal ban against publication of State relief and welfare rolls. Forty-six of the Nation's 48 governors were at the conference. Whether all were present when the vote was taken is not known here, but no dissenting voice was raised despite the ardent pleas of Washington socializers sent to the scene to try to block action. Governor Long, of Louisiana, was one of the two absentees from the conference—he was the only Southern governor not attending.

Representative BURR HARRISON, Virginia Democrat, recently filled nearly 10 pages of small-type print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (equivalent to about 15 columns in the Times) with discussion of graft, corruption, waste, cheating, chiseling, et cetera, of public tax money used for various relief rolls in various States which he cited. He cited cases ranging from a championship squirrel shooter in Tennessee collecting \$214 a month from "aid to the blind" to a woman operating a big numbers racket who had her welfare checks brought to her gambling establishment although she had a liveried chauffeur and an expensive car.

All welfare and relief money is tax money—half of it paid in State taxes and half in Federal taxes, but all from the same pocket-books. The secrecy law not only helps chiselers and crooks graft this tax money, but it thus lessens the amounts that could be available for worthy cases not given enough aid to meet actual need.

At the governors' conference the chief executives of more than a dozen States revealed legislative steps taken or under way to try to end the secrecy provision which the Federal Security Administration uses as a political blackjack over State governments. Indiana has gone all the way, the legislature passing a law compelling publication. FSA Director Oscar Ewing promptly cut off its Federal aid for welfare. The United States Senate recently passed an amendment to an appropriation bill to end the Federal provision for secrecy. In Senate-House conference on the bill the House succeeded in eliminating the amendment.

It's time for the public to call to account its Senators and its Representatives, not only in Washington but in State legislatures. It's time for an overwhelming demand that these people wake up and get busy in service of the public which elected them. There never has been any logical reason for secrecy on welfare rolls.

THE CAUSE OF THE EVIL

In every State in the United States where real investigation of welfare rolls has been made, cheating, chiseling, stealing, thieving, fraud, corruption—all contributing to wholesale waste of the public's tax money—have been revealed. Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Washington, Oklahoma are a few States

where wholesale welfare crookedness has been revealed publicly.

These malpractices do not necessarily in every case run back to individual administrators of welfare—State, county, parish or city. The fault lies in the system itself as established by the Federal Congress in Washington. That fault is the Federal provision that names of recipients of welfare payments must be kept secret from the public.

The only way to end the welfare stealing is to end the secrecy provision. So long as there is secrecy there is not only opportunity but blanket invitation to stealing.

The House Ways and Means Committee now is holding hearings on a bill by Representative BURR HARRISON, Virginia Democrat, to end the Federal provision for secrecy and leave the matter of publication of relief rolls to the individual States. It would be better in actual practice if the Federal law made publication mandatory, but in the ultimate philosophy of free government the preservation of the right of States to decide the issue figures strongly.

The principle of the Harrison bill—the principle of removal of the Federal ban against publication—should have the full support of citizens, civil groups, and organizations, and of all legislators who have welfare itself truly at heart. States violating the secrecy provisions are deprived of the Federal share in relief funds. In all probability, most States could get along without the Federal aid and handle their welfare problems alone if welfare was trimmed of the chiselers, cheaters, political hangers-on, and also of those who seek to gain politically through it.

Representative HARRISON, in a recent speech in the House concerning his bill, emphasized that the present welfare secrecy violates the spirit and possibly the letter of the Federal Constitution. Framers of the Constitution delegated, through it, certain powers to Congress. But at the same time they specifically listed 10 things which Congress cannot do constitutionally, 1 of them reading as follows (sec. 9, art. 1):

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The present secrecy on welfare spending disregards or violates that provision—that accounts of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time. Only the political administrators doling out the money now know where or to whom it goes. The Constitution clearly means for the people who put up the money—the taxpayers—to know.

The Washington Star—almost paraphrasing past editorials in the Times, though not, of course, by intent—says:

"There is another principle at stake which is more important than any of these suppositions. That is the right of the people to know how relief money is being spent and to whom it is being paid. For it is the people who put up this money. It is their own money. It should be contrary to sound public policy to clothe in secrecy the expenditure of huge sums in public funds, paid out to support citizens."

Representative HARRISON put the same thoughts this way:

"Secret and concealed expenditure of public money desecrates a basic principle of democratic government. The principle of government by the people is in fundamental conflict with a policy that permits officeholders to levy huge taxes and spend the money in secrecy and concealment."

The Chicago Daily News, commenting on the thin argument that people receiving charity would be made ashamed by publication, points out that only those "receiving charity without need" would be ashamed,

and that "a return to the days when every man valued his independence and was reluctant to accept help except in dire need, is not to be feared, but welcomed."

Since when is it any disgrace unavoidably to be poor?

Since when need an aged person feel shame that age has conquered past ability to earn a living?

Decent citizens are proud to help those who cannot help themselves. Decent recipients need lose no pride in having to accept help from others willing to give it—under honest conditions.

The State senate of the Deep South State of Georgia recently passed a resolution demanding an end to the secrecy provision in the Federal welfare. The resolution declared that secrecy "proves a hindrance to just administration of the social-security laws," is "conducive to fraud," and "costs the State of Georgia thousands of dollars every year."

A recent Fulton County, Ga., grand jury, finding itself tangled into cases involving relief, took time out from its crime inquiries to adopt a resolution denouncing welfare secrecy and to send copies to each Georgia Member of Congress. The grand jury of another Georgia county, De Kalb, adopted a similar resolution. The Atlanta Constitution had this to say:

"As matters stand now, not even a grand jury or a legislative committee can examine relief rolls on the penalty of losing matching funds, which amount to about 70 percent of the total benefits distributed by the State."

The glaring weakness of the whole welfare set-up in the 48 States is the Federal provision imposing secrecy except to politicians and political groups taking part in administration of the funds.

More than a dozen States have taken legislative steps of some kind toward an end to welfare secrecy. Governors of 46 States—2 Governors, including Louisiana's, being absent—voted unanimously last week for an end to secrecy.

The blame and the remedy both rest with Congress itself. It made the foolish law and it alone can unmake it. If the Harrison bill is bypassed or sidetracked, the voters should note carefully which legislators helped in the bypassing and sidetracking. It's time for Congress to awaken, that is true; but it is time for the people to awaken and start setting off a few alarm clocks under dozing or indifferent Senators and Representatives. If the alarm clocks do not have effect, a wholesale tossing of ballot bombs on election day certainly would work.

Ewing Raises a Righteous (?) Anger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith a very pertinent editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis., which speaks—and very well indeed—for itself:

EWING RAISES A RIGHTEOUS (?) ANGER

This time, Oscar Ewing may have stubbed his toe.

At their Gatlinburg, Tenn., conference, the governors of the 48 States voted unanimous approval of a move to reserve to the States the right to decide whether relief rolls should be open to public inspection.

Mr. Ewing, the Federal Relief Administrator, attended the meeting. But he made it plain the governors' views did not change

his own opinion that relief rolls should be kept secret. Reminded that he had said he had come to the conference for advice Mr. Ewing—a public employee—snapped:

"Yes, but I reserve for myself the decision whether I will take it."

That put the governors back in their seats, seething with anger.

That anger is good. It is healthful. And in it lies hope.

For until the American people do become angry, angry enough to take action, they will continue to be shoved around by the Fair Deal administration and its bureau chiefs who have the idea they are our masters, rather than our servants.

The relief-roll issue that blew off the lid at Gatlinburg was itself brought about by Mr. Ewing's arrogance.

Early last summer two women circulating the Stockholm peace petition (then being pushed by pro-Communist groups) were discovered to be Indiana State Welfare Department workers. There was an investigation and a few pinks were fired from the department. But a byproduct of that probe was the discovery that Indiana relief rolls included a substantial number of chiselers.

Some relief recipients had enough money to buy new automobiles. Others lived in \$160 a month apartments. Some headed for Florida vacations—with relief checks in their pockets. Relief checks were going to race-track touts and to people holding down well-paying jobs.

The legislature, with Republican majorities in both houses, decided the best way to knock off the chiselers was to allow quarterly inspection of the relief rolls. The Democratic Governor vetoed the bill.

Ewing stepped in and threatened to cut off Indiana's Federal relief money unless the rolls were kept secret.

That threat made the legislature so angry it passed the publicity bill over the Governor's veto. Explained one legislator:

"That threat crystallized opinion for the bill. Up to that time we were principally interested in eliminating relief chiseling. After his threat, we saw the main issue hinged on whether a Federal administrator could tell a State legislature what to do. Hoosiers don't like ultimatums."

Neither do taxpayers in other States.

Although Mr. Ewing may not be inclined to "take advice" and "allow" open inspection of relief rolls, he cannot very well avoid a law passed by the Congress of the United States. The United States Senate already has passed a bill giving the States discretion in this matter. The House should approve it soon.

Mr. Ewing's insulting and arrogant speech to the Nation's governors should do much to convince Members of the House that action is necessary.

John Otto's Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the hurly-burly rush of our modern day, when faith seems more a condition sought after than a status giving rest within, it seems appropriate to call attention to a story about a complete and absorbing faith of yesterday.

This story about John Otto and his dedication to the task of preserving for

posterity a beautiful area of the handiwork of nature appeared recently in the Empire magazine of the Denver Post. It gives graphic portrayal to a man's life, a man who asked but little from his fellows but a chance to open up and make available to them a restful spot of beauty and inspiration. Thousands now come each year from all parts of the Nation, over fine highways and trails, to see the unspoiled monuments which John Otto loved enough to protect in the interest and for the benefit of those who would follow.

Not only western Colorado and the people living near the Colorado National Monument but many citizens of many areas throughout the entire Nation have benefited from the preservation of this awe-inspiring uplift of rock, shaped and weathered by wind and water. Many are those who owe John Otto a great vote of thanks, and may this insertion be a part of that process by which we say "thank you, John Otto, and well done."

The article follows:

JOHN OTTO'S WILDERNESS
(By Nell Murbarger)

About 50 years ago, John Otto wandered into western Colorado, apparently from nowhere. He recognized the work which he seemed to have been put on earth to accomplish; and once his self-appointed chore was completed, he moved along westward and into obscurity.

That's about all men know of him or his affairs; excepting, of course, those years he devoted to fulfillment of his mission.

Practically everyone around Grand Junction, Colo., is familiar with John Otto's work in gaining national recognition for Monument Canyon, 5 miles southwest of town.

A towering wilderness of sheer precipices and tumbling red sandstone monoliths, of deep gorges and cross-fissures, colossal amphitheaters and massive pilasters fantastically fluted by wind and water, this was a wonderful place, said men of the locality . . . a wonderful place to stay out of.

There seemed no question about this being good advice, but in Otto's case it was only so much wasted breath. Something about that wild land of the monoliths seemed to fascinate the man, seemed to draw him to it.

THIS WAS HEAVEN

After buying a few pounds of flour, bacon, and beans, the stranger loaded his old bedroll and other worldly possessions on the backs of his burros, Foxie and Cookie, and alone headed toward the forbidding red cliffs beyond the town.

The more he saw of the canyon in the weeks which followed, the more he fell under the spell of its majesty and massiveness, the quiet grandeur of its great, silent aisles; the delicate loveliness of its forested retreats where early summer spread a carpet of wild flowers and ferns. For John Otto this was heaven on earth; yet it wasn't enough that he alone should see and enjoy this place. All men must be given an opportunity to see and enjoy it with him.

To that end John Otto began a single-handed project of road and trail building and publicizing; a work which he pursued for more than 10 years without a breather and with no thought of profit.

Grand Junction didn't see much of him except on his infrequent trips to town for flour and beans and blasting powder, whenever funds permitted. Now and then some adventurer would hire him as a guide on a hunting trip into the canyon. The few dollars he made this way apparently constituted his only income.

Through these visiting sportsmen, this strange frontiersman's labor of love at last began to attract the outside interest he had sought so long. National magazines started publishing articles about the Old Hermit of Monument Park, and the trails he had built through the gorges, over the mesas, and along the cliffs.

TO DO SOMETHING BIG

Eastern folk, visiting at Grand Junction, began asking to see the place. Eventually this remarkable area in Mesa County was brought to Uncle Sam's attention.

That day in 1911 when President William Howard Taft ordered this 18,000-acre wilderness placed under Federal protection and supervision as Colorado National Monument was probably the greatest in John Otto's life. He felt that this was a marvelous thing Uncle Sam had done, and to show his appreciation he vowed to do something big, something outstanding.

He could think of no grander expression of his gratitude than to unfurl the Stars and Stripes from the top of Independence Monument. The highest monolith in the canyon, this solid rock spire towered 500 feet above the valley floor, and its entire height contained scarcely a large enough ledge to make a footstool for a buzzard.

That the hazardous perpendicular had never been scaled (even professional alpinists considered it unscalable) didn't faze Otto. He had made up his mind to climb it with the flag.

COLORS OVER THE WILDERNESS

Working with single jack and chisel he would laboriously drill a hole in the solid rock and drive a strong iron bar into it. Climbing a single step higher, he would chisel out another hole and insert another bar. Day after day, week after week, this operation went on, until the hermit at last pulled himself up on the pinnacle of Independence Monument. Exhilarating, frightening moment. No man before him had been there to have this eagle's view.

So, with neither fanfare nor witnesses to salute his accomplishment, John Otto raised his flagpole and triumphantly ran up the colors to fly over the wilderness. After a time he climbed back down from that dizzy height.

The flag became somewhat faded and tattered after a year or so, and Otto decided that a new one was in order and another trip up the rock was scheduled. On this occasion, however, he had plenty of witnesses, who gathered from miles around to celebrate in his honor and to watch him make the climb.

Viewing the perilous ascent was blood-chilling enough; but when the man had planted the new flag and started back down the sheer rock, lowering himself from one fragile-looking bar to the next, it is said that women fainted and scores of men—unable to watch his downward course—found themselves compelled to close their eyes or turn away.

FAME AND FACILITY

The monument has gained in fame and facility considerably since John Otto first forced a trail into it with pick and shovel and pack burros. Today an excellent highway skirts the canyon rim for most of its 22 miles. Parking areas have been provided at all the main points of scenic interest, and an excellent camping and picnicking ground has been established for convenience of visitors.

Some of the more spectacular scenic stops include Cold Shivers Point—a narrow rock ledge overhanging Columbus Canyon 800 feet straight down; Red and Ute Canyons; the Coke Ovens—a group of natural rock formations resembling old-time charcoal furnaces—and Independence Monument, where the flag was placed by Otto. Grotesque formations of less prominence bear such interpretive names as Cleopatra's

Couch, the Praying Hands, Devil's Kitchen, Liberty Cap, Monolith Parade, Window Rock, Keyhole Rock, and so on.

From many sections of the monument, particularly from the campground and from Trail-of-the-Serpent Drive, it is possible to look across the Colorado River and the wide sweep of orchard-planted Grand Valley, far below, to Book Cliffs, on the northern horizon, and Grand Mesa, the world's largest flat-topped mountain, which looms to the east.

Fossils and petrified wood are found within the monument area. The rocky slopes between its boundaries and the Colorado River have yielded five different species of dinosaurs, including the diplodocus, largest land-living animal known, and the brontosaurus.

Considering John Otto's long and unpaid service during which he built roads and trails and opened the forbidding places to visitors, it would have seemed right had the hermit been appointed as the monument's first official custodian, but this was not done. Still, for several years after creation of the park, John Otto continued to serve its best interests—without remuneration. And then—no one appears to remember exactly when—he simply dropped out of sight.

HOW BIG ARE THE ROCKIES?

Just a few weeks ago he wrote a letter to *Empire* magazine from Klamath River, Calif., where the editors had managed, after considerable research, to locate him.

They had inquired diplomatically after his health, to which John Otto answered: "I am today—as far as I know—the healthiest man in the world and going it as strong as ever." (His age remains his secret.)

As an afterthought, just before mailing his reply, he printed a rather homesick note on the back of the envelope. "How big are the Rocky Mountains? They are as big as my heart. Nobody loves them more."

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following enlightening article that appeared in the September edition of the *Bar Bulletin* published by the Boston Bar Association and written by Julia T. Sullivan, a member of that organization who is well versed on the social-security law and presently employed with that agency in the Boston office, Boston, Mass.:

THE SELF-EMPLOYED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY (By Julia T. Sullivan)

The Social Security Act embodies a number of provisions, such as old-age and survivors insurance, grants to States for old-age assistance, for the needy blind, for the needy totally and permanently disabled, for dependent children, and for public health.

Title II of the act, effective January 1, 1937, covering old-age and survivors insurance, as amended to August 28, 1950, established a system of Federal insurance providing for monthly retirement benefits to insured workers and their families when the worker retires at age 65 or later, and for his family when he dies. The cost of paying the insurance benefits is met by taxes which are levied at equal rates on both employers and employees under subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, referred to as the Federal Insurance Con-

tributions Act. Prior to the Social Security Act amendments of 1950, approved August 28, 1950 (Public Law 734, 81st Cong.) this system of Federal insurance applied primarily to workers in commerce and industry. Under the 1950 amendments the system was expanded to be effective on and after January 1, 1951, with respect to services performed by many new groups, in the same manner that the original groups were covered.

One of the largest of the newly covered groups to come under this law are the self-employed individuals who have income from trades or businesses which they operate either as sole owners or as partners. Some of the different kinds of trades and business in which earnings will count toward old-age and survivors insurance payments are:

Operating a tailor shop, tourist court, printing shop, store, beauty parlor, filling station, shoeshine stand, barber shop, etc.

Working for oneself as a writer, photographer, adjuster, private teacher, independent contractor, etc.

The amended social security law, however, specifically excludes those whose income is derived from operation of a farm and whose services are performed as sole operators or partners in certain specified professions.

Excluded are physicians; dentists, lawyers; osteopaths, chiropractors, optometrists, naturopaths; veterinarians; architects, professional engineers, funeral directors, Christian Science practitioners; certified, licensed, registered, or full time practicing accountants.

The revised law also excludes the net earnings from self-employment derived by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry, or services by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order.

Although income from self-employment in these specified professions is excluded, persons so engaged as employees will have their wages credited toward insurance benefits. Moreover, an individual who is self-employed in an excluded occupation may become eligible for old-age and survivors insurance if, apart from his noncovered profession or business, he engages in other work, either as an employee or as a self-employed person, which comes under the social security law.

For old-age and survivors insurance benefit purposes, self-employment income, subject to certain exceptions, means net earnings derived from a covered trade or business during any taxable year beginning after 1950. The minimum net yearly earnings reportable are \$400; the maximum net yearly earnings, together with wages, which can be credited to a social security account, are \$3,600. These net earnings may be from full or part-time self-employment.

Net earnings are gross income derived from a covered trade or business, less the allowable deductions attributable to such trade or business as computed under the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. In case of a partnership, each partner will include in his net earnings his distributive share of the ordinary net income or loss from the partnership enterprise. Whether or not a distribution is made, each partner must consider his distributive share in arriving at the amount of his net earnings reportable for social security.

Excluded from net earnings are rentals from real estate (including personal property leased with the real estate) unless the person is self-employed as a dealer in real estate. Income from real estate investments, such as from ownership of apartments or houses, may not be included in net earnings. Moreover, the proprietor of a store or shop is not permitted to count as a part of his self-employment income any money received from rentals of parts of the premises not used for his trade or business. By the

same token, dividends or interest from personally owned stock or bonds, or notes, or certificates, must not be included as net earnings from self-employment, unless the person is self-employed as a dealer in stocks or securities.

An individual may have both self-employment income and wages from employment during the same year. In such cases, wages from a job covered by social security would be credited toward old-age and survivors insurance first. Then the difference between \$3,600, which is the maximum yearly earnings which can be reported, and the total amount of wages would be determined. Net earnings from self-employment amounting to \$400 or more would be taxed to the extent that they did not exceed that difference. The excess would not be taxable.

The report on a self-employed person's income will be coordinated with his income tax return. All that he will need to do is to transfer certain information from the trade or business schedule of the return to a social security schedule on the same return. The amount of the social security contribution for self-employed persons from 1951-53 will be 2¼ percent. Self-employment income must be reported for every taxable year beginning after 1950. Thus, the first report will be made after the close of 1951. The taxable year is the calendar year unless the self-employed person uses a different taxable year for income-tax reporting.

Under the "new start" provisions of the amended act, the self-employed person needs as quarters of coverage—a quarter of coverage is a calendar quarter in which self-employment income is at least \$100 or wages are \$50—only half the number of elapsed quarters between 1950 and his attaining age 65 to be fully insured. The minimum of quarters of coverage is six. The maximum number of quarters of coverage ever to be needed for a fully insured status is 40. They may have been gained at any time, and either as an employee or as a self-employed after 1950 in work covered by social security. For each full year in which his self-employment is \$400 or more, the self-employed person will receive credit for four quarters of coverage.

Before the time of filing the 1951 income tax return—in 1952—every one of the 4,600,000 covered self-employed will need a social security account number. Many of these people have, at one time or another, been employees in covered work, and already have social security cards. If a self-employed person has never had a card, or has had one but has lost it, he should contact the social security office which serves his area. The card showing his account number, will represent his Federal insurance policy. It will identify him when he applies for monthly insurance payments to himself and his family when he retires, or if he dies, when his surviving dependents apply for benefit payments.

Every social security office has informational literature. A post card or telephone call is sufficient when requesting the material. The Intown Boston office is located at 161 Devonshire Street.

Testing Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Journal:

TESTING TIME

The next 3 months with their critical power problems will be a testing time for the people of the Pacific Northwest.

They will test the ingenuity and skill of regulatory and public utility officials. They will test the understanding of industrial and commercial users to which power is an essential of continuous operation. They will test public patience.

The extent to which this ingenuity and understanding and patience and cooperation is extended by all elements will determine just how much or how little real damage will be done to the region's economy, to national defense and to employment.

The stakes are tremendous. Among them are production of aluminum and other critical items for rearmament business profits, jobs, and personal comfort.

Some of the things necessary to be done are either being done or are programmed.

For right or wrong, the decision not to extend daylight saving time has been made by the governors of Oregon and Washington. It was made for legal reasons and because estimated savings for October—250,000 kilowatts on peaks and 100,000 kilowatts throughout the month—were at best educated guesses with no actual experience to sustain them.

On other fronts, however, the actual curtailment and power saving program is proceeding.

Interruptible power contracts with aluminum companies have been canceled. They involve 215,000 kilowatts.

Bonneville Power Administration is raising the level of the Bonneville Dam pool with stoplogs to realize another 40,000 kilowatts.

BPA also is signing a rainmaking contract designed to seed clouds in the Pend Oreille, Clark Fork, and Flathead Basins in an effort to increase the flow in the upper reaches of the Columbia Basin. (Rain in the lower basin is meaningless insofar as additional power is concerned.)

An emergency steam-plant program to supplement the region's overstrained hydro output is being pressed in the Congress.

Efforts are being made to unstick projects like Pelton, to obtain the go-ahead on PGE's 225,000-kilowatt Round Butte job, to speed up installations at Rock Island, to revive the Oregon-California Intertie (100,000 kilowatts involved), and to remove various roadblocks that have stymied Tacoma's Cowlitz projects and other proposed developments in the region.

And the Columbia Basin interagency committee is urging earliest possible completion of Hungry Horse, McNary, Chief Joseph, Albion Falls, Detroit, Big Cliff, Lookout Point, Dexter, and Fallsdam Dams. It makes no recommendation of the controversial Hells Canyon and Ice Harbor projects.

Meanwhile defense electric power administration orders, affecting curtailment of industrial and commercial uses of power in the Pacific Northwest, are ready and will be put into effect in steps (16 blocks in all) starting October 1. No one can estimate the exact power savings involved, but they are substantial.

For practical purposes, that leaves the power savings that may be attained on a strictly voluntary basis by domestic consumers. And this program, to be spelled out soon by public and private utilities, may prove to be very important. Indeed, providing the final push that may avert disastrous consequences.

In simple terms, household users of power will simply be asked not to waste power—on indoor and outdoor lighting, heating, cooking, and hot-water heating.

The possible saving by domestic consumers is variously estimated at from 50,000 kilowatts (operating group of the Northwest

power pool) to 150,000 kilowatts (Henry Kaiser) over the next 3 months' water-storage period. But even the minimum saving implies complete—not hit or miss—cooperation.

The thing to be remembered—by industries, commercial, State, city, and county users and domestic consumers—is that every step they take, inconvenient as it may be, every block of power they save, small though it be, adds up to hundreds of thousands of kilowatts.

These are the kilowatts we must have if we skin through the next 3 months without serious curtailment of vital defense industries and serious damage to business and employment.

Peter Mihaly Berend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a special bill in behalf of Peter Mihaly Berend, a young man who came to the United States in 1949 from Hungary as a student, but due to the unwillingness of the Hungarian Government to extend his passport could not be admitted to this country. He was paroled and is now an engineering student with a splendid record. He is strongly anticommunistic and desires to remain in this country permanently. The Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service has informed me that since he never technically entered the United States as a student but was only paroled, he does not qualify for permanent residence under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. This bill will, if enacted, overcome this technical obstacle and permit this young man to qualify as a displaced person and to contribute his intelligence and skills for the benefit of this country.

An Overdue Switch in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press:

OUR NEW FOREIGN POLICY—A SWITCH

At a recent press conference President Truman reiterated that the foreign policy of the United States aims at peace through strength.

The free world must be put in position, said Mr. Truman, where it can force the Soviet Union and its satellites not only to keep the peace but also to honor their treaty agreements.

Accepting this as the objective now guiding administration policy, when and why did it replace the policy of appeasement

pursued by the administration until it led to a war in which more than 80,000 young Americans have already been killed or wounded?

Certainly it was not peace through strength that directed the pell-mell demobilization of our Armed Forces under the Truman administration.

Certainly it was not peace through strength that caused the administration to fritter away \$50,000,000,000 voted for defense between V-J day and the Korean outbreak.

Certainly the Soviet Union and its satellites were not encouraged to keep the peace and honor their international agreements by Secretary Acheson's writing off Korea and Formosa as of no importance to us and waiting for the dust to settle.

Certainly Stalin was not deterred from his knavish tricks by Mr. Truman's declaring during the 1948 campaign that Joe's a decent fellow.

The fact is that the peace-through-strength policy for which Mr. Truman now takes exclusive credit was forced on him by public opinion, aroused and alarmed by the consequences of his playing footsie with the Commies at home and abroad.

As much as any one man, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, was responsible for forcing this shift of policy.

The American people took the reins out of the hands of men who should have led but were misleading them. That is democracy in operation.

While Mr. Truman may claim credit for executing a policy thus imposed upon him, the credit for originating that policy belongs to the Nation as a whole.

All of the military power we may forge will not save this Nation from disaster. Courage to use that power will not save us. A third element is necessary to our survival: the intelligence to use our strength and courage wisely, and not for mean and petty political purposes.

Time To Atone for Yalta and Potsdam Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the disgraceful bargains made at Yalta and Potsdam with the lives of innocent people will always be dark pages in the history of our country. The crimes committed there against humanity call for atonement if we are a Christian nation. A day of repentance should be set aside in public acknowledgement that the Yalta and Potsdam agreements were wrong and must be repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of humanity, what manner of official was he who agreed to the expulsion of 7,000,000 German citizens from Silesia and other parts of eastern Germany. Further, who was responsible for the expulsion of 3,000,000 "ethnic" Germans from Czechoslovakia and Rumania? Men, women and children were uprooted from their homes without notice, driven like cattle along the highways where thousands died and were left homeless. Their blood, Mr. Speaker, is upon the doorsteps of the United States Government and the British and the Russians. We pay lip service

to the principles of liberty and freedom, we profess great faith in the moral law and say, "In God we trust." We have flouted the moral law and cried out, for revenge. "Unconditional surrender," was the slogan. There was unconditional surrender and in its wake another war confronts us. "As ye sow, so shall ye reap," and today we reap the whirlwind. It is time to atone for our national sins, and we must be big enough to rise to such heights.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I shall include an article by Iain Wilson which appeared in the *Christian Century* for October 3, 1951:

GERMAN REFUGEES' OWN STORY

(By Iain Wilson)

Enough has been said and written about the German refugee problem to make thoughtful people aware of its existence and dimensions. The articles of the Potsdam Agreement which authorized the expulsion of 7,000,000 German citizens from Silesia and other areas of Eastern Germany involve the American, British, and Soviet Governments in direct responsibility for the fate of these people. Scarcely less direct is their responsibility for the expulsion of about 3,000,000 ethnic Germans from Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and other countries which took their cue from Potsdam.

It is true that some steps have been taken to ease the difficulties created by the inrush into Western Germany of this vast human tide. Some 3,000,000 refugees are industrially or agriculturally employed in the Bonn Republic's precarious economy. Full political rights have been granted the expellees. Legislation for equalization of burdens has been passed. The Expellee's Bank, with guaranteed funds of \$5,000,000, has helped organize over 50,000 small businesses and industries. Over \$130,000,000 has been furnished by state governments and Marshall plan funds to establish refugee enterprises. The undertakings in behalf of these people of such voluntary agencies as the Hilfswerk, largely financed from ecumenical sources, are of real if restricted importance.

WHY ARE REFUGEES GOING EAST?

In spite of such developments, refugees are flowing back to the Russian zone in large numbers, disillusioned by the west. With all that has been done, the economic and political menace they present has been only superficially dealt with. For the most part, these millions remain propertyless, impoverished, and unhoused. They can be transformed into a healthy and constructive element in western society only by a planned international action of unprecedented imagination and generosity. However, our leaders are at present otherwise occupied.

The church should see and proclaim that in, through, and beyond the economic and political aspects of this situation there looms a tremendous spiritual problem. Far more relevant than argument about the justification of the Potsdam decrees is the question, What ideas and attitudes are developing among the refugees? What do we expect of people who have been forcibly driven from their homeland, deprived of their possessions, and subjected to inconceivable hardships and indignities, and are now wholly dependent upon such help as can be given them by others who are themselves harassed to the limits of human endurance? We in this country cannot even begin to enter imaginatively into such a situation unless we try to realize that almost every factor we take for granted as contributing toward our physical and mental health is totally lacking to these people.

We prize a free nation, a home of one's own, regular employment with reasonable remuneration, adequate food and clothing, the possibility of privacy, an unquestioned recognition of one's significance as citizen and individual. Replace these by their opposites—worst of all, by the sense that one is of no interest or value as an individual and is regarded, if at all, as a problem by the rest of mankind—and you begin to suspect faintly the continuing wretchedness of their existence. We might reasonably expect either such bleak nihilism as would play into the hands of the Communists, or such savage nationalism as could sweep the neo-Nazi demagogues into power. At least it is obvious that in face of the present actualities and potentialities, it is of secondary importance to argue about the apportioning of guilt.

DOCUMENTS OF COMPASSION

It is therefore encouraging to find so many signs that the refugees have in many cases come through with a vigorous Christian faith, more realistic than ever before, and a perception of ethical values more vivid than is commonly found among ourselves, whose sensitivity is blunted by reliance upon material power. One portent of the moral leadership that may yet emerge from this deepest abyss of Europe's degradation is a small book published by the Holzner-Verlag of Kitzingen-Main, Germany, called *Dokumente der Menschlichkeit—Documents of Compassion*. The book was got together by a group of refugee scholars located in Göttingen, who are convinced that an overwhelming majority of the refugees have been brought to realize, through their sufferings, that it is human nature itself, their own included, which is radically sinful, and that to talk of nations or groups as good or bad is a senseless, although demonically powerful, folly. Repudiating every assimilation of the individual into collective categories, they now place a new value upon man as an end in himself, and it is on behalf of man's dignity that the book has been conceived. Thus the Göttingen group echoes Bishop Dibelius' cry, "Let man be man."

THE TESTIMONY OF SIMPLE PEOPLE

The *Documents of Compassion* consists of one-hundred-and-thirty-odd stories of humane actions experienced by German refugees, during their trek to the west, at the hands of foreigners—Poles, Americans, Czechs, Russians, British, French, and so on. The stories were received by the Göttingen group following press and radio requests, and the printed collection is a selection from the replies. The result is unpretentious and almost crude, devoid of literary graces—as concrete and free from speculation as the Old Testament narratives. Many of the stories are evidently the work of illiterate men and women writing under the compulsion to testify. The very insignificance of most of their laboriously told recollections gives the book its pathos and power.

We see the 70-year-old Frau Guenther sitting alone and exhausted in a Czechoslovakian ditch and thinking her end has come, when a Negro American soldier approaches. He says, "Can't you make it, Mother?" and takes her as far as the frontier, giving her coffee and buttered rolls and telling her about his family in the States. We meet two Belgian DP's who left east Prussia with a wagonload of German peasants. One of the Germans, Fritz Meller, tells how gently the Belgians assisted his aged mother in and out of the wagon when it halted. There is the Czech doctor—unnamed for fear of reprisals—who, after examining a middle-aged German who has just been released from 9 months of internment, springs agitatedly to his feet exclaiming, "This is intolerable" and who then tends and protects the man and his family.

A RUSSIAN SAMARITAN

A Russian soldier drives away a gang of hooligans who are molesting an old German woman, and comforts her while she weeps, and gives her a cow he has stolen. A young Polish officer lays his hand on the shoulder of a German mother as she stands by her son's grave and says, "Don't be so sad, matka, those who sleep here are well off." Anton Knobloch, once a substantial farmer in east Prussia, tells of his "dear, faithful Frenchman" who had worked as a DP on his farm and stayed with him when he had lost everything, including his family, and was sick and in flight. There is the little story of the hundreds of bewildered Pomeranians waiting to board the steamer that is to take them to Travemünde, staring wide-eyed as the English guards carry a couple of weeping children aboard and stuff their little mouths with chocolate, so that "their tears quickly dry in the laughing morning sunlight."

To some, these may appear to be pitiful enough notes of compassion in the uproar of human cruelty. But they mean a good deal to the humble people who recorded them. And there can be no understanding of the spiritual situation of the German refugees without serious appreciation of what this book is saying—that the smallest loving deed has power that is simply unbreakable, and that this is known best by the people who have suffered most from human hatred. This is a heartening assurance with which Christians may continue to seek the good life for the world's dispossessed millions, so that "their tears may quickly dry in the laughing morning sunlight."

Employ the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that this week is devoted to employ the physically handicapped.

To me, every week should be Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

From an enormous testimony amassed in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses by the Committee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped, of which I had the honor to be chairman, there was conclusive proof that the handicapped person can fill a position, in many instances, as well as a normal person. During the Second World War it was necessary to tap this pool of the handicapped. Many highly reputable industries kept records of the performance of the handicapped and discovered, to their amazement, that the performance of the handicapped on jobs to which they were suited equaled those of the normal person. Some truly astonishing records were revealed. Thus, with this evidence, there is no excuse for not placing handicapped people in positions where their capabilities can be used. The drive to place the handicapped on jobs has resulted in some success, but the percentage of handicapped employed is small compared to the total handicapped persons living in the United States.

Only Religion Can Counter Communism in Germany or Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson:

UNITED STATES FAILS TO RECOGNIZE GERMAN SPIRITUAL HUNGER

(By Dorothy Thompson)

If communism is a secular religion—whose youth festivals and other ceremonies are liturgical rites—then it should be obvious that it can never successfully be countered by democracy. Democracy is not a creed, nor has it power to evoke the devotional instinct.

Communism and nazism have appealed to an irreligious generation. The roots of nazism were pre-Hitler. Its mass mania followed an epoch of agnosticism, breakdown of personal and public standards and inhibitions, characteristic of all western countries between the two wars.

Like communism it was a religious substitute, elevating the swastika as a new cross and preaching a mystical union of the Germanic peoples in blood and soil. Like communism it appealed to empty-souled youth who had been taught that there are no transcendental values, that all things are relative, that religion is superstition, and who nevertheless craved an answer to the eternal question, "Child, why were you born?"

The Nazis had an answer: To redeem the world through Germanic blood.

The Communists have an answer: To redeem the world through Lenin-Stalinism.

Both could evoke a higher loyalty because no other higher loyalty competed.

The only resistance to nazism which encompassed voluntary martyrdom came from German Protestants and Catholics, for whom nazism was patent blasphemy.

It is possible to convert a Democrat, a capitalist, an intellectual, or an agnostic Jew or Christian to communism, and even such pastors as conceive Christianity to be a code of ethics without divine origin. It is not possible to convert a follower of Judaism or anyone for whom Christianity is a God-inspired faith. For these have no unsatisfied devotional instincts.

The greatest failure of the western occupation of Germany has been failure to recognize the German spiritual dilemma—the stirrings, self-probings, and inarticulate longings, especially of German youth, not for a new form of state, but for a new content of life. This longing is not assuaged by formal declarations of the rightness of secular democracy. When one has descended into hell, one seeks more than an external order; one seeks salvation and redemption, the process by which one makes one's peace with God, oneself, and mankind.

The occupation authorities, indeed, not only have failed to recognize the longing; many officials actively have opposed it, being themselves state worshippers or actively anti-Christian, holding Christianity to be somehow reactionary. (So, of course, did Hitler.)

Nor was the Christian Democratic Party any help. Its aims are realistic and political.

Thus an opportunity for the birth of a social order founded in spiritual revulsion

from the war and the Hitler epoch was submerged in great power greeds, petty party politics, paper purges, and horrendous bureaucracy, all without inner substance or comprehensible purpose.

Only the Communists in the east zone, recognizing the longing, are again perverting it into the channels of another secular religion, which has its ecstasies, though they be of tom-tom inspiration.

In all the western democracies, including our own, the grounds are being laid for totalitarianism through the gradual emptying of society of its spiritual content. Christian criticism of government is frowned on as violating the separation of church and state, and in the separation the church is relegated to the fringes of life.

Every cure for juvenile delinquency—playgrounds, boys clubs, and what not—is energetically promoted, except one; that children should be taught to fear God and keep His Commandments, and even without sectarianism be taught so in the public schools. The welfare state emerges as the substitute for Christian charity, to the point where few will lift a finger for their neighbors.

But when the state becomes God, you get the essence of communism, no matter by what name it calls itself.

It might even call itself anticommunism.

Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we all have an unfortunate tendency to get carried away by our own virtues and importance and the need for us to shed light in someone's "darkness." I have commented in the past that very often the small independent newspaper editor seems to have a firmer grip on reality and a closer touch with the ordinary individual who makes up America than one who, of necessity, is faced with great issues and great problems.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short and pungent editorial from the October 4, 1951, issue of the Gunnison Courier, an independent newspaper in my district. I offer this editorial for whatever value it may have to anyone or any organ carrying some great, but self-imposed, burden of trying to be all things to all people.

NEWSPAPER WEEK

This is Newspaper Week.

On this occasion the editors have the privilege of letting their hair down and claiming a certain extra-extra concern for all our freedoms.

We do feel a certain concern about this world we live in, but we find that most of our fellow citizens and newspaper readers are about as aware as many of our editors.

The Courier occasionally indulges in comment on the wider world we live in, but much of the time just tries to give Gunnison County readers a fairly accurate, fairly complete picture of what's going on right here at home.

Sometimes what goes on here at home has far-reaching implications and we often feel that we should go further in pointing out

our interdependence with others of our State, Nation, and the world we live in.

One small example—local folks are attempting to get the mining industry in Gunnison County out of the doldrums. Some folks we know are working with a project to take tungsten from local mines. But the fate of such a project can be determined by international policies. If we prefer to buy our tungsten from Red China (from groups who may not want to see the United States producing its own tungsten) we may not have such a local mining enterprise. But in case of war, the Nation might have to engage in desperation tactics to get that very mineral from that very same place. So even the question of stockpiling vital minerals can come right here to affect our local economy. It has caused ups and downs for Whitepine in the past.

This is only one of a dozen ways the world steps right in to affect our future in Gunnison County.

We hope this newspaper—and every newspaper—can get better and better in bringing to your doorstep the relationship of seemingly unrelated political arguments to your daily life.

Should Wages Be Tied to Living Costs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a reliable weekly news letter from France. When some Americans are advocating tying all wages to cost-of-living index, we might well take a look at what a level-headed Frenchman thinks about it:

DEAR SIR: This week's letter will be concerned entirely with an analysis of the National Assembly's recent decision to tie all wages to the rise and fall of a cost-of-living index. The idea is to work out a standard subsistence budget, to fix a guaranteed minimum wage to cover it, then when this budget (following a rise in the cost of living) goes up by as much as 5 percent, to adjust the guaranteed minimum wage accordingly. This increase will be followed, within 15 days, by a corresponding rise in all wages. In this way the promoters argue that the workers will no longer suffer from fluctuations in prices.

SLIDING SCALE ADOPTED

By 410 to 203 votes the French National Assembly passed, at first reading, the bill to introduce the sliding scale. By this bill a standard worker's budget will be worked out by the Committee for Collective Agreements. This standard budget will be used as a basis for calculating the guaranteed minimum wage.

The bill proposes that as soon as the standard budget goes up by more than 5 percent, the guaranteed minimum wage will be adjusted correspondingly. In its turn the rise in the guaranteed minimum wage will automatically be translated, at the end of a fortnight, into a rise in all wages.

A once-yearly revision of the standard budget by the committee in question is provided for (it should be remembered that the standard budget includes only the barest essentials) "so as to adapt it to the growth of production and the extension of consumption."

All sane and competent people in economic, financial, industrial, and political circles, both public and private, are against this law in its present form.

The National Assembly has quite simply dispossessed the executive of its power to exercise control over the movement of prices, and therefore over the whole economic life of the country—and this in favor of a committee whose powers are ill-defined.

There is nothing to stop the Committee for Collective Agreements from applying blindly, with mathematical rigor, a system which takes no account of the numerous political, economic, social, and even seasonal factors, besides which the National Assembly has allowed itself to be led astray by the labor unions as to the real nature of the guaranteed minimum wage.

As we have made clear in previous letters, it was intended to protect unqualified workers from starvation wages. It concerns only a small proportion of workers in France, where nearly all are qualified. By its recent vote the National Assembly sanctioned the guaranteed minimum wage as a basic wage on which to adjust all wages with the rise (and, theoretically, fall) in the cost of living.

It must be said, however, that the Government itself was the first culprit. For example, in August 1950 and again in March 1951 officials of the French social security scheme demanded and obtained a rise in salaries corresponding to an increase in the cost of living and proportionate to the guaranteed minimum wage.

As regards the power given the committee to add one or two items of expenditure each year to the standard budget following the growth in productivity, it tends to falsify completely the whole productive effort by swallowing up immediately as goods for consumption what ought largely to be left for investments, reserves, and the capitalization of French industry, badly hit by the war.

A VICIOUS CIRCLE

The adoption of the sliding scale for wages will of course lead in a very short time to its application to pensions, military and civil, family allowances, and such like * * * and of course the Government will have to foot the extra bill when already it can't afford to pay what it pays now—or rather, the overburdened taxpayer can't. For in this eventuality the Government would have no alternative but to levy further taxes to meet the increased bill for pensions and allowances.

The producers, still further burdened with taxes, would then have to up sale prices, which in turn, by affecting the standard budget, would lead automatically to a general rise in wages. This would have to be followed by an increase in those same pensions and allowances to pay for which sale prices went up in the first place.

Furthermore, producers and traders have been hesitating up to now to raise prices for fear of discouraging their buyers and customers, whose purchasing power has remained roughly stationary. With the introduction of the sliding scale this fear disappears, as wages follow prices automatically—a process which leads, of course, to inflation, a debasement of the currency, and economic instability.

The real solution advocated by clear-headed economists is not the sliding scale or anything of the sort, but an increase in the flow of goods and especially consumers' goods, and higher productivity, which will effectively raise the purchasing power of all sections of the community.

In fact, happily for the economic future of the country, the harm may not be so great as one might first imagine. The Government itself is determined to resist the adoption of such a senseless measure. And the Council of the Republic (the French Senate), before which this measure has been sent and

which has the constitutional power to hold it up for 2 months in order to study it, will not fail to amend the whole project radically. And lastly the Committee for Collective Agreements has got to draw up a worker's standard budget that will be acceptable to all parties. Up to now it has been unable to do this.

THE RETURN TO REASON

Between the first passing of this bill by the National Assembly and the final approval giving it the force of law there are the local elections in France (October 7 and 14).

That is to say, the political parties—and in particular the SFIO (Socialists)—who have stood up for the sliding scale in the National Assembly (so as to curry popular favor) will be able to boast of their success during the coming electoral campaign.

Once the elections are over, however (i. e., after October 14), they may prove themselves more amenable. Many deputies in fact who voted in favor of the sliding scale are hoping desperately that the Senators will not endorse their vote. What they want to do in a country where the electorate is often ill-informed about the real state of affairs is to make a gesture that will bring them easy popularity. After the elections are over it might well be that they will return to safer notions about the economic future of the country. It is worth recording that in January 1947 Mr. Ramadier (Socialist) declared, at a time when he had just been made Prime Minister, "a rise in wages leads to a rise in prices, the sliding scale then renews the rise in wages."

Foreign Policy Is the National Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of shadow boxing as to what the issues are before the people as the 1952 presidential campaign gets under way. We are blind unless we see and appreciate that the only issue in that campaign is foreign policy as it operates all over the world under the Democrats. I have said repeatedly on the floor of this House that our foreign policy has been and is an absolute failure. It has failed so badly that now it must be implemented by armed force. Korea is a pitiful example of foreign policy gone wrong under a President who thumbs his nose at the Congress and declares war without getting its approval as provided under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is futile to protest against high taxes, undeclared wars, the draft, OPS and NPA, and many other complaints. The basic cause of all our gripes is foreign policy—nothing else. And only an aroused people can correct the mess we are in.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of October 6, 1951:

THE FORGOTTEN ISSUE

Republican Party leaders from Eastern and Southern States met in Washington a few days ago to talk things over. They were told by a number of speakers that crime, communism, and corruption are to be the big issues in 1952 and apparently believed it.

Now, there is no doubt that crime, corruption, and communism should be stressed in next year's campaign. The Republican orators will have no difficulty in showing that the criminal syndicates, the Bolshevik spies and fellow travelers, and the grafters have enjoyed the protection of the New Dealers and have had easy access to the White House during the New Deal era. The facts ought to be told and retold until every voter is aware of them and their implications.

But there is another issue—foreign policy—that touches the people more closely and the failure to stress it is ominous.

The people want tax relief. It is idle to pretend that they can have it except through a revision of the foreign policy that makes high taxation today and higher taxation tomorrow inevitable.

The people don't want the draft, but as long as the present foreign policy is pursued the draft will continue.

The people want the threat of inflation ended, but the foreign policy of inviting war everywhere and extending military and economic aid to an ever-growing list of nations overseas makes inflation inescapable.

The people want the war in Korea ended and of the press preserved, but there isn't much hope of preserving liberty in a garrison state, and it is a garrison state that the New Deal foreign policy is fastening upon us.

The people want the war in Korea ended, but the Truman-Acheson foreign policy won't let us win or even get out.

Foreign policy, despite its overwhelming importance, was the forgotten issue at the conference and it is easy to see why. Some of the conferees were real Republicans and the rest were Truman Republicans. All could agree on the evils of crime, communism, and corruption, to hear them denounced gave a feeling of unity that may have seemed genuine to the participants but is not likely to deceive anyone else.

The New Deal Republicans have had their way in the last three national conventions and have led the party to successive defeats. If once again the central political issue of our times—the foreign policy of the United States—is regarded as too hot to handle in a presidential campaign, the Republicans will lose. They will lose because they will have offered to the country no relief from present ills and because their cowardly evasion will be apparent to every voter.

Disarm the Pirates by Making Gerry-mander Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., October 10, 1951.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on Reapportionment, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MANNY: Thank you very much for your kind invitation to give me the opportunity to testify before your Committee on Reapportionment. This is far more consideration than I have had from the Albany boys.

I deeply regret that official business holds me here in Washington for I would like noth-

ing better than to testify in favor of your bill, designed to save what little is left of fair and decent alignment of congressional districts.

The next best action I can take, therefore, is to ask you to incorporate this letter in your hearings.

As you may know, the most heinous example of gerrymandering has been proposed for our State. I doubt that the old masters of crooked and dissolute politics of the last century could have approached the finesse with which this Albany gang have proceeded. Two years ago last summer, I called their shots and accused the Committee on Reapportionment with double dealing. According to the Gannett newspapers, one of their members shouted then that I was all wet.

They were simon pure, he averred, and I was way out of line to suggest they would stoop to anything but strict compliance with the loftiest principles of reapportionment.

Time and again, the newspaper records will show, that I charged the committee with a plot to gerrymander, and time and again, they have retorted likewise.

Every charge I made has come true, at least if we are to believe the unerringly accurate accounts of the Gannett news service on this subject.

The secret, clandestine workings of this committee behind heavy doors and in smoke-filled rooms have proved I was right in every statement and every prediction I have made.

They have produced the most disgraceful, bare-faced, lewd, and rotten plan for gerrymandering the country ever saw. Their whole pattern follows the horizontal likeness of a nest of crocodiles.

Before anything else is touched upon, it should be pointed out that the reapportionment plan of 10 years ago was carried out aboveboard and on time. The opportunity was given to every candidate for Congress to know what counties he should run in nearly 2 years ahead of his campaign.

Some smart but shady politicians down in my neck of the woods remembered how advantageous such an arrangement was for candidates such as me to have time to meet the people. They recalled how completely I campaigned in a new county fully a year and a half ahead of primary day, getting my fences pretty well built, and they vowed such would never happen again.

So procrastination was the weapon these enemies of the people have employed, thus blocking honest men from presenting themselves to their proper constituencies time enough ahead to get acquainted and friendly.

Such a deliberate delay, if it did nothing else, acts as a drug upon the natural enthusiasm the rank and file Americans have for direct representation.

The only chance the public has to give proper study to their elected officials is to know them thoroughly and completely before a campaign. In the case of our State and in some others the people will be denied that choice.

Such denial only serves to increase the power of ruthless political overlords and bosses, who are the characters most detested in the popular mind today in this country.

However, the New York crowd has taken this into cunning thought and is now using it for all it's worth.

So much for the delay in this terrible scheme of things. That alone may suffice to deprive the people of our State of what free-thinking candidates they have left and help plunge Congress into an even greater mental vacuum than they complain of now.

The greatest sin they are committing is to seriously consider charting districts of elongated or irregular shape.

There can be but one reason for any such move and that is for the sake of dirty, crooked, dishonest, designing politics. Such a shape is atrocious, undesirable, and entirely unnatural. It is not conducive to decent

government and thus would have great appeal to these moral lepers.

They are bent upon debauching, raping, and degenerating all chances of preserving our American form of government and a fair, equitable election system.

There is nothing a group of vultures such as these won't stoop to. They have been told to sabotage up-State Republican congressional districts in New York State and they are doing a thorough job of scuttling their own ship. They are out and out pirates.

As I see it, and I have given this vital matter the most thorough study, there is but one way to stop this present-day gerrymandering. The Congress should pass the Celler bill or some such measure and pass it before these desperados can commit the political murder they plan.

Your bill will outlaw for all time the nefarious work of picaresque politicians by making it mandatory for those who claim to be responsible men, not monkeys, to draw congressional districts compactly, contiguously, fairly, and intelligently.

The only way to deal with zealots who will go so low as to gerrymander, which is the most atrocious of all human crimes, is to hogle them. Give them the only kind of treatment they know, the total kind. Shear them of power, for they are not fit to use it with even a spark of decency or judgment.

Your bill will outlaw the gerrymander. It will erase that ugly carbuncle from the American political scene and will eventually wipe out dictatorship and bossism over the honest public official.

Your bill will eliminate the danger of having distant and unrelated sections of a State represented by a Congressman who finds himself helpless to adequately meet the needs of so many different segments and occupations, with widely divergent interests.

The only sensible and sane way to create a congressional district is embodied within your proposal to concentrate in as compact and square an area as possible the confines of such a district. Such a pattern is better for the district itself, better for the country, and better for efficiency in representation.

I do hope that you can prevail upon the high-minded, the right thinking, and the truly American Membership of our Congress to get busy before the present session adjourns and enact into law your much-needed bill.

If this is possible, you will be saving America and especially our own State from the most ravenous, hateful, and vicious wolves ever to threaten our civilization, those who would gerrymander out of office the duly elected representatives of the American people.

I sincerely hope you will not rest until you have accomplished your noble task.

With best wishes for success, I remain,

Your colleague,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Member of Congress.

Russian Communists Direct Red China's Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Communist seizure of power in China, far from being a spontaneous action of the Chinese people them-

selves, has been directed and promoted continuously by the Russian Communists for years.

Mr. Everett S. Allen's fourth article of a series which appeared in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times last June shows how the Russian Communists colonized Red China.

I include herewith Mr. Allen's article which appeared on June 29, 1951:

RUSSIANS COLONIZE CHINA BY INFUX OF COMMUNISTS WHO TAKE KEY POSTS

(By Everett S. Allen)

Heavy infiltration of Communist China by Russian nationalists, many of them hand-picked, rapidly is bringing certain sections of the country under the iron-handed jurisdiction of the U. S. S. R. The Sovietization program in China is expected by Russia to be completed in 2 years.

Superimposition of technical advisers, civic administrators, party organizers, propaganda experts and secret police by the Soviet—all of whom work in background advisory capacity, is molding China forcibly into the party-line schedule. Planned immigration by Russians, plus improved transport systems between Russia and North China are major tools in this operation.

Heavy-handed experts have started the job of grafting the U. S. S. R.'s political philosophy upon the society and economy of China.

The relationship between Communist China and Russia is at the crux of the problem which the Western nations must solve. A Chinese liberal, an author, commented, "I had hoped Mao would prove to be another Tito. I felt he was Chinese first, and Communist afterward. But my faith is wavering."

A former high-ranking officer in Chiang's Army, a university graduate, declared, "The Western Powers still delude themselves with the dangerous dream that Mao will one day break away from Moscow."

RUSSIAN AIM PREVAILING

Evidence would point to the fact that, although Mao may have had different concepts at the beginning of his relationship with Stalin, their alliance now is tending toward the Russian aim of making China a completely docile satellite. It may not be successful, if the Communist regime is overthrown, and it may take a considerable time, but that is the trend.

And where Mao's government, so-called, inept and inexperienced in iron rule and administration, might conceivably break down with a little anti-Communist pressure, Moscow is determined it shall not. The U. S. S. R. is injecting U. S. S. R. methods and men into China to stiffen Mao's bamboo screen into a genuine iron curtain by 1953.

Up to now Stalin's hand has worked behind the scenes, but to observers inside China he has gone so far toward sovietizing by immigration and influence that it is difficult to conceal the program longer.

The much-discussed secret treaty of February 12, 1950, signed in Moscow, is a major key to the unholy alliance which exists between Mao and Stalin. It was signed by Chou En-lai and Andrei Vishinsky, delegates plenipotentiary of their respective nations. Both nations agreed its terms were not to be publicly announced.

TREATY OUSTED

There was good reason for this if the English translations of the reported treaty which have seeped out of China since have even a vestige of truth. These quote the treaty as stating:

1. That the population of the Chinese People's Republic must, owing to the existing lack of resources, be diminished by 100,000,000, since otherwise they cannot be sustained. Detailed procedures to accomplish this end are left up to the discretion of the Chinese People's Government,

2. That the Chinese People's Republic will be responsible for the mobilization of 10,000,000 Chinese workmen to assist Soviet Russia in collectively constructing Sino-Soviet military establishments in order to "cope with imperialistic activities and aggression."

3. That the contracting parties agree to reorganize the Chinese people's liberation army into an international Communist army to be under the direct command of the highest officer of the Red army.

4. That the contracting parties for the purpose of "preventing together imperialistic invasions and for coping with the third world war," agree that the Chinese People's Republic will permit the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to station troops within the Chinese boundary with a view toward "protecting together world peace."

FOUR MILLION MORE SOLDIERS

5. That the Chinese People's Republic will, before the end of this year (1950), increase the number of soldiers by 4,000,000, so as to be ready for meeting the "imperialistic act of aggression."

6. That within the boundary of the Chinese People's Republic, the cities of Peiping, Tientsin, Shanghai, Kwangchow, Changsha, Hangchow, Kuli-kan, Chungking, Fuhu, Amoy, Swatow, and Foochow are to be earmarked as the central district to serve as residential districts for the "immigrants" from the U S S R.

Exact nature of these immigrants has aroused considerable speculation, since some of them apparently are "opposite numbers" for both district and provincial Chinese officials. Others are technical advisers and secret police experts.

Taipei reported on March 5, for example, that 5,000 Soviet Russians had arrived in the Central China Province of Hunan to give the Chinese Communists practical lessons in NKVD (Russian secret police) purge methods.

The informant, whose identity was concealed, said, "Soviet Russia wants all internal resistance in China to be ruthlessly crushed. Moscow feels the Chinese Communists need lessons in purge techniques. The idea is to make effective opposition to the regime as hard in China as it is in Russia. The Russians believe China can be Sovietized in this respect in 2 years' time."

"The initial proving ground is in six hsien (counties) in Hunan Province, native Province of Mao Tse-tung. Altogether, there are 77 hsien in Hunan. The Province, often called China's 'rice bowl,' has an area of approximately 84,000 square miles, which makes it about the size of Idaho. The idea is that the Soviet Russians, after having crushed all opposition in the six counties, will extend the Soviet-style purge to 12 counties and then to others in the Province. The Hunan pattern will then be extended throughout the country."

RUSSIAN INFLUENCE SHOWN

It is the opinion of most experienced observers that Chinese entry into the Korean war is one of the best examples of Russian influence over Mao. The Chinese always have felt a sense of paternalism toward Korea since the thirteenth century. At that time, Chinese armies defeated Japanese invaders on Korean soil in a bloody 18-month war which cost 20,000,000 lives and left Korea barren. Up to June 1950, when the present conflict started, Korea still was trying to rehabilitate a red-ink economy wrecked by the ancient war.

Of all the areas of possible conquest in the Far East, Korea was the least rewarding, the most sterile. Those Chinese Communists who favored a military campaign beyond their own borders would rather have gone into Indochina or Burma, both economically important.

But by Russian direction, either by persuasion or exertion of influence, Mao went into Korea. Admittedly, it was a bright psy-

chological bauble. If he had pushed U. N. forces into the sea, and there were many—even in the west—who said he would, he would have gained tremendous prestige. But now, Korea is a millstone about his neck.

There are many other signs of the alliance. Last December, an undisclosed number of Russian ships arrived at Canton to help the Communists in transportation there.

In April, a foreign national who had lived with the Russians in Shanghai reported the Russians now colonizing China are a "generation of faceless men." He said the new Russians will not even talk to the old Russians although the latter are Soviet citizens. The informant described the Soviets as "tough, ruthless, emotional country boys," completely lacking everything but brute intelligence.

A-BOMB PLANT REPORTED

On April 11, guerrilla troops opened fire on Russian workers at Whampoa shipyards. In April and May Nationalist sources quoted rumors inside China to the effect the U S S R. had started to build an atom-bomb plant in Sinkiang Province. The missing Italian atomic scientist, Pontecorvo, was said to have arrived at Tihua, capital of Sinkiang, in March, in connection with the plant.

In this country a well-informed Chinese authority said last week that the Soviet Embassy in Peiping is the superauthority of Chinese communism. The number of Russians in China, he added, is steadily on the increase. Already they are so numerous that it is no longer possible for them to remain inconspicuous, a practice to which they resorted at first, by living in widely scattered areas.

This corps of "carpetbaggers and locusts," he said, is treated as a group of distinguished guests. They ride first-class on all public transportation and are provided with ample first-quality food, liquor, and clothing.

They are technicians and advisers to administrative officials in many cases. "In the wings of the stage, therefore," said the Chinese observer, "the Russians have excellent and increasing control of the political and economic operations of China."

The Province of Manchuria is the first area to be completely sovietized and there, thousands of Russians and Chinese live and work, shoulder to shoulder, although there is no question of the Russian superiority in the economic marriage.

Most of the skilled Chinese in Manchuria were lured there by attractive newspaper advertisements which offered high pay and good living quarters. They found neither existed when they got there, but it is not known that any ever returned; Nationalists presume they are not permitted to leave.

MAO NOT TO BE TRUSTED

There is no evidence, Chinese observers say, that Mao can be trusted, even if he were free to make his own decisions—which appears increasingly doubtful.

Most radical theory with regard to the Russian domination of China is that the Soviet wants the Chinese Army eliminated. It is noteworthy that Chinese Communist prisoners of war have expressed discouragement because they had to attack without support, since Russian-promised tanks and planes failed to materialize in Korea.

The factor of greatest importance to the West in all this lies in the grim prediction of an American businessman, who has lived and traveled extensively in China and who has had more than 30 years' affiliation with that nation and its people.

"Russian and Chinese Communist leaders intend that the United States shall be destroyed ultimately," he said, "and they are confident of their ability to accomplish it."

"Mao Tse-tung rates Chiang Kai-shek as his No. 1 enemy and the United States as No. 2. Mao has said neutrality is a camouflage; his philosophy is, 'You are either for us or against us.'"

Overthrow of Chinese Communists Still Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when communism seized power in China, the Chinese people knew little about its terrifying practices. As a result many of them did not strongly resist communism. Now, however, the bloody regime of Mao Tse-tung has shown them the true horrors and barbarism of communism. And they are, therefore, much more strongly impelled now to try to throw off the Communist yoke.

Mr. Everett S. Allen points this out in his fifth article of a series which appeared in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times in June.

I include herewith his article of June 30, 1951:

DOCILE IN ACCEPTING COMMUNISM, CHINESE STILL MIGHT BE REDEEMED
(By Everett S. Allen)

Communism in China may endure through inertia, but with little organized resistance could be overthrown. This is easier to understand if it is realized that communism, in coming to power, has not used so much actual force, as a display of force where needed. Redemption of China by the Nationalists presumably need only follow the same tactics, since the caliber of both armies is substantially the same.

Wherever a display of force has been made by either side, there has been ready submission or retreat with insignificant casualties, so that active resistance, following a succession of such stands, could just as quickly see the redemption of China.

Traditionally in China, wherever civil war is concerned, the armies have readily shuttled back and forth to whichever side for the moment offered the better security; there is little question of allegiance or principle involved.

NO FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Complete suppression of the freedom of expression, joined with propagandizing raised to a high art, accounts for the real strength of communism in China. A high rate of illiteracy forces the average Chinese citizen to obtain all his news of nation, province and county by word of mouth. Mao's agents make capital of this and show increasing skill in disseminating party-line doctrine in the guise of news.

By comparison, the Nationalist Party has little facility for propaganda-making, more often, it resorts to dignified silence, which is totally ineffective when dealing with an uninstructed people.

The church is the sole articulate organ in China to counteract this, but though rooted in the sound farming class, it is numerically insignificant and unprepared for the quick distribution of efficient propaganda.

Here in the words of the man much of whose mature life has been spent within China, is the story of the Allied betrayal, the fumbings of circumstance which brought the Communists to power.

Communists adapt their methods to the locality. If they are weak in a given area, they placate local opposition by proclaiming freedom of religion. This is followed soon by suppression of neutral or opposing newspapers and the appearance of atheistic articles in "liberated" publications, insinuating that

the church is capitalistic and dominated by imperialistic governments.

Private schools are urged to continue, but teachers are under pressure to attend indoctrination courses; new textbooks in many branches are issued, emphasizing Soviet-inspired reform. The entire course in civics is abolished and a new course is substituted on a universal stateless, Sovietized regime. Patriotic songs are suppressed in favor of Communist martial music.

INFORMATION CONTROLLED

First efforts then are to control information. Radios are confiscated, and later registered and returned, to permit listening to public trials and other propaganda their uncontrolled use is not permitted, however, and there are eavesdropping teams to report violators. Private telegrams are suppressed, rebellious editors are removed and replaced and printing plants are confiscated and immediately set to work printing party pamphlets.

Propagandists spread out through the country speaking wherever a group can be formed, oratory is new to China, it draws a crowd readily. National and provincial schools are absorbed by the party for "indoctrination" classes; students are housed and fed gratis and guaranteed jobs upon being graduated. This is a major attraction in a country which, in the best of times, has at least 30,000,000 unemployed.

Fifth columnists meet the "liberators" on their arrival, they already have drawn up a list of the wealth of each family, and a contribution based on this estimate is levied immediately. The lists also furnish a working basis for deciding who is a despot and who is a peasant. Stores are obliged to remain open; often prices are fixed and new currency is issued. Hoarding is penalized, and sales taxes are heavy.

Deliberate attention is paid to the efficiency of the party's first phase of "reform"; it is designed to look good. Gouging by local officials is halted; exorbitant transportation fares charged by private companies are dropped; one-man courts, capable of rendering absolute decision, cut through the red tape of their predecessors and settle local disputes. Wages are equalized, even though scaled into five categories depending on party loyalty—workers who merely stay at their jobs are paid the lowest; those who cooperate fully or even become party members get highest compensation.

It must be understood that the Chinese people were not won over by communism. They were docile in accepting it, because they never have taken any part in government; no one ever asked or permitted them to vote. Always, officials have been changed without public notice, there never has been any expenditure of taxes on public works, and about the only return the people ever got for assessments was some protection from full-scale banditry.

PEOPLE ALWAYS PASSIVE

For centuries these people have been accustomed to the coming and going of armies, living on local confiscation, they submit to officialdom without much thought of resisting graft or redressing wrongs. They never have had a voice in government, so when communism came they remained passive as always.

Moreover, the unemployed, unmarried young man found an opportunity to get into the Communist Army; it appeared a better future than the utterly bleak one which he faced at home. Those few persons who were literate did not in any sense understand the Communist Party doctrine but no doubt found its references to equality fascinating.

"Communism in China," said the observer who saw it come, "has taken advantage of the disorganization of a very loosely knit country toddling toward the first steps of responsible government. The trend toward a democratic government was showing real

promise when the Japanese invasion interrupted it.

"Ten years of aggression from without could have been slowly repaired, but the rash allied betrayal of the recognized government at Yalta, which resulted in recruiting and arming a hitherto insignificant horde of Communists, suddenly presented China with a formidable enemy within the country, sponsored by China's allies. Thus was communism in China, formerly discredited as a band of mountain outlaws, baptized into respectability. The moral effect on a friendly nation was disastrous."

Communism is not strong in China, not in the western sense of strong governments. For no government in China ever has been really integrated with the people nor has it ever reached efficiently into the great sprawling vastnesses of the country.

Moreover, the Communists found themselves abruptly in power, and with a crippling shortage of trained personnel. They were in no position to operate railroads, commerce, industry, communications, or utilities. Thus, they were forced to leave some persons of questionable sympathies on the job, at least temporarily. Their only real experience was in fighting, propaganda, and sabotage, and although these would have done them little good in any other country, all three are of value in retaining control of a naturally disorganized area.

ARMS CONFISCATED

All civilian arms, of course, have been confiscated; public expression has been suppressed and the death penalty and confiscation are exercised daily. Since it is dangerous to confide in others, the Chinese citizen is thwarted at the outset in any effort to unite in rebellion. Thus, the only manner in which an overthrow might come—without external aid—is through the ponderous passive resistance of the defenseless peasantry. Naturally, if military assistance came from without, the united action, or even the continued noncooperation of the peasantry could be a strong force.

Nothing is more illustrative of the value in war of citizen opinion than the European campaigns of World War II. For the most part, the Germans fought in countries where the citizenry was hostile, they were accordingly sabotaged, harassed, confused, and kept on the constant alert. The means by which the same civil populations assisted the Allies were manifold and of inestimable military value.

Like a snowball, anti-Communist resistance in China needs an initial impetus, once started, it will increase in size and strength of its own volition after being assured that the overthrow has a reasonable chance for success.

Behind the Chinese Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some of those Americans who have urged the recognition of Red China or who refuse to be shocked by the recognition of the Communists there by Great Britain and other countries theoretically friendly to the west should read the current reports emanating from behind the Mao Tse-tung iron curtain. In at least 30 well-authenticated cases, Americans and other nationals have been ruthlessly

seized by the Chinese Red authorities and no word whatever of their fate has leaked through to their families or friends.

Prominent on this list are Protestant and Catholic missionaries, whose principal crime against the Chinese Reds appears to have been their determination to bring religious doctrine and ethical teachings to the people of their communities. Businessmen, too, have disappeared.

In the Communist-dominated countries of central Europe, the leaders make a great pretense of observing the forms of prosecution, trial, and sentence, despite their obvious denial of all the elementary principles affecting the rights of the accused. The Chinese make no bones whatever of their wholesale disregard of personal liberties, and do not so much as bother to offer even a vestige of the western concept of fair trial. To consider the recognition of so barbarous a regime is unthinkable in this era of world crisis, and those who advocate it are wise to silence their views.

A Diplomat Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial which appeared in the New York Times, October 1, 1951, entitled "A Diplomat Retires":

A DIPLOMAT RETIRES

The United States Foreign Service loses one of its outstanding diplomats today, when Norman Armour retires after 36 years in Government posts. This is an opportunity not only to pay due tribute to one of the most distinguished American civil servants of our time, but also to point a moral. In these days when the State Department and all that belongs to it are being so unjustly—and sometimes dishonestly—criticized, it is well for all of us to be reminded that our Foreign Service has men of the caliber of Norman Armour. The gibe of "cookie-pusher" becomes silly when one studies careers like his, with devoted service stretching from imperial Petrograd to the strategic oil capital of Caracas, Venezuela. Such careers rarely bring public notice, because they are held, by voluntary choice, within strictly official, diplomatic limits. Our spectacular envoys are more likely to be the businessmen-contributors to the party chest rather than the career man for whom diplomacy is a profession.

Like all professionals, the true reward and the judgment that one really values come from colleagues. There is no diplomat in the American service more highly regarded than Norman Armour. For years he has been a model of the American envoy at his best. This is a matter of training, knowledge, judgment, the preparation of reports, the administration of embassies, and (however badly this may make the critics feel) of tact and social gifts. To be first class in

reality, as well as in grade, requires qualities and talents of exceptional order.

Norman Armour has been one of the best. He came back from retirement twice at the call of duty. Such men are too valuable to let go, but this time, although he is eminently capable of carrying on, one must wish him the rest that he has merited.

The "Threat" to Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian:

THE "THREAT" TO ALUMINUM

Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson's "threat" to aluminum production in the Pacific Northwest sounds like the half-baked result of inadequate information, special interest pressures, or both. This newspaper, however, declines to get excited until it can be determined what is behind the proposal that the aluminum companies inform Wilson of the cost of moving some of their units elsewhere.

It would be sheer nonsense to relocate existing pot lines or build new ones in areas where power sources would have to be developed which would reflect costs to the companies greater than the combined costs of Columbia River hydro and new steam plants. It would also be a poor investment for the Government, which now needs and will always need assistance to its run-of-the-river hydro plants in the form of standby steam generation.

Senator Guy Cordon's suspicion that Mobilizer Wilson's mystifying proposal may have originated with the aluminum companies themselves, or one or two of them, needs to be explored. The aluminum manufacturers are as well aware as are the people of the Northwest that it is not a healthy situation for the region to have more than half the production of electricity from the Government's Columbia River system going into aluminum. There has been criticism of the sale of such a huge block of power to aluminum, while new and diversified industries have been discouraged from entering the area because of the power shortage.

Nevertheless, the Columbia Basin offers the natural and most advantageous long-time home for aluminum, which requires vast amounts of electricity but few workmen in its primary manufacture. No other river basin or area supplied with other fuels can compete in rates of power production or power volume yet to be developed.

The aluminum companies may desire to create a more favorable public reception to their power-consuming operations in the face of a regional brown-out; they may even be willing to go anywhere, in this emergency, if assured prime contracts to supplant the interruptible contracts which the Bonneville Power Administration was forced to cut back because of this summer's drought. But Alcoa and the others did not come to the Northwest by accident, and the future power benefits of the region are evident.

Examination of the situation probably will show that the Government can build or subsidize construction of steam plants in this area to firm up the hydro supply with greater rate advantage to the aluminum companies

and more benefit to the Federal investment than would be the case if the units were moved. The annual congressional reluctance to maintain the schedules for Columbia Dam construction necessary to meet the needs of heavy industry and the expanded Northwest population is, of course, the basic trouble. Low water and mobilization have made the problem acute.

This situation arising from Wilson's proposal—which is, after all, only a request for more information—certainly requires that the Northwest review its power program and lay all the facts, including the overbalance of aluminum power demand, on the table. It is no time for factional bickering.

A Survey of New Construction in Westchester County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article from the Westchester Realtor, August 1, 1951, entitled "A Survey of New Construction in Westchester County":

A SURVEY OF NEW CONSTRUCTION IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY

(By John W. Lane, president, Westchester County Realty Board)

A survey of new construction in Westchester County by the Westchester County Realty Board, covering the period from January 1, 1950, to July 1, 1951, shows an unusual amount of building activity.

The total number of one-family dwellings built during the 18-month period was 6,038. In the first 6 months of 1950, 2,003 one-family houses were built. The last 6 months produced 2,233 units, our record for the post-war period. The first 6 months of 1951 showed 1,802 one-family houses constructed.

In comparison, the first half of 1951 is only 10 percent below the same period of 1950. Full effects of regulation X are not indicated because of commitments issued prior to October 12, 1950, which continued through the last two 6-month periods. The figures also indicate good volume despite regulation X, especially in higher-priced homes.

VACANCIES UNDER 7 PERCENT

Our survey further shows that the purchase of these 6,038 new houses has been heavy percentage-wise. The number of vacant new houses throughout the country as of July 1 is under 400, or less than 7 percent of the total. Acceptance by the public, therefore, continues very high.

It is important to remember that the survey shows only new construction; not the remarkable record of used-home sales in the county. Demand for new and used houses continues to be very good, and the market shows a healthy condition.

During the 18-month period, 4,412 apartment units were built. While our survey does not indicate the percentage of privately financed buildings to Government-guaranteed financing, we know the latter is higher.

ANSWER TO RENT CONTROL

With 10,579 family accommodations in apartments and one-family houses provided

in 18 months, certainly the argument for rent control becomes very thin indeed.

Dollar amounts in the charts indicate only the permit value rather than actual-sales value. The board estimates that permit value represents only 60 percent of true value.

Bearing this in mind, \$31,699,000 of commercial and industrial construction, including alteration work, displays a remarkable activity in this phase of building.

Demand for modern one-floor factory space is very high. Existing buildings have enjoyed pronounced activity. Plant expansion and commercial activity as a result of decentralization is becoming a greater factor in our county. Large corporations are moving offices to Westchester County in increasing number.

Our growth is solid, steady, and ably financed, and we look forward to a continuation of this normal expansion which is ours.

The Land and the People—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the missionary conference of Methodist ministers of the Southeast at Lake Junaluska, N. C., July 21, 1951:

THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE

It is an inspiration to meet with you ministers of the gospel concerned with the welfare of people whose very life depends on the fruitfulness of the soil.

There are many texts for sermons in the Bible, which tell of man's dependence on productive land. One could select from man's experience on earth many texts, also, which reveal specifically how generations of men have suffered penalties of deprivation, want, and exile when they wasted their God-given heritage of fruitful land—when, actually, they sinned against the land by misusing and abusing it.

Poor land makes poor people and poor people make poor congregations in any church. Man lives not by bread alone, but bread he must have to live. Moses had sound reason when he assured the children of Israel that in the Promised Land they should "eat bread without scarceness." "Give us this day our daily bread" has been a primary supplication of Christians down through the centuries.

BREAD COMES FROM THE LAND

Bread comes from the soil and from nowhere else, as does the great bulk of our food, all of our wood products, cotton, wool, leather, and vegetable oils and fats. If we fail in our stewardship of the land which the Creator provided as the source of our food and raiment, we inevitably must go hungry and barefoot. Although historians seem largely to have overlooked this relationship between land and people, the civilized world is strewn with monuments to man's improvident use of the land.

Almost without exception, the civilizations that have come and gone left behind them great areas of wasted land. They progressed and prospered and were usually able to resist invasion as long as their land

was productive. They declined and fell as the land became unproductive through overuse and was no longer able to support a progressive and prosperous civilization. I am not contending that soil erosion was entirely responsible for the decline and fall of all the ancient civilizations that came to grief. Some of them, as we know, declined because of wars and morals and economic decay. But I do say that misuse and abuse of the land played a vital role in the decline and fall of some of these civilizations, and that this mistreatment of the land played a much more important role than most historians seem to realize.

EROSION SPEEDED FALL OF SOME CIVILIZATIONS

There has been much convincing evidence of this. Archeologists, for example, had to dig 18 to 28 feet in places to reach the tops of the magnificent buildings of the once great city of Antioch in Syria, where the Apostle Paul struggled so hard in getting the Christian religion established.¹ They were covered by the debris of erosion, washed down from neighboring mountains.

On his return some years ago from the excavation of the theater at ancient Corinth, Dr. T. L. Shear, of Princeton University, told me that in order to uncover the structure, they had to dig 40 feet through soil washed down from the adjacent hillsides where most of the vegetation had been removed by goats.

In Asia, Africa, and southern Europe are found areas where there now is much barren and desolate land. Some of these areas, seats of former great empires, now support only a half, a third, or less of their former population, and they support that reduced population at a very low and precarious standard of living. You have but to examine the land as it is today to see why these regions are no longer capable of supporting a well-fed and prosperous people and a progressive civilization. The poverty and backwardness of the people in many areas are indicative of the poverty of the land. In general, you will find, if the countries are explored in detail, that most of the topsoil has been stripped from the uplands, although the valleys in many places still contain considerable productive alluvial soil.

When the world was younger, its smaller population was better able to stand such waste, with people making adjustments through migrations to rich, undeveloped lands that lay beyond the next range of mountains or across the sea. But the time is long since past when man, anywhere in the civilized world, can afford such extravagance in the use of his most priceless heritage—productive land. The world of today is fast maturing and must assume mature responsibility for its remaining supply of productive land and other resources if millions are not to perish.

SOIL EROSION IN THE UNITED STATES

The history of land exploitation and soil waste right here in our own country is by now a familiar story to most of you. When our forefathers settled along the Atlantic seaboard and later pushed westward toward the Pacific Ocean, there was a seemingly inexhaustible supply of good land, virgin timber, clear streams, fish, and game. It is understandable that warnings against land-wasting farming methods by even such eminent men as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson should have gone unheeded in the tempting pursuit of territorial development and free land across the continent.

The fact remains, however, that before we woke up to what was going on—an awakening that has come almost entirely in our

own generation—we allowed something like half of our productive land to be damaged by erosion, millions of acres of it so severely as to be rendered unfit for further immediate practical cultivation. As a result, we have left today in the United States only about 460,000,000 to 500,000,000 acres of high-grade cropland, as well as we in the Soil Conservation Service have been able to determine. This includes considerable land not now in cultivation which is suitable for cultivation. All but about 100,000,000 acres of this limited supply of good land is subject to erosion or other forms of depreciation when used without adequate safeguards. Also, millions of acres of rangeland have suffered erosion damage and loss of productive capacity.

TURNING THE TIDE AGAINST EROSION

We have made remarkable strides in soil and water conservation in recent years, but still haven't closed the gap between the rate of soil loss and the rate at which we are safeguarding our land through soil conservation. We are still losing hundreds of thousands of acres of land every year—probably not less than 500,000,000 acres—through the process of unnecessary erosion which damages many areas beyond further practical immediate cultivation. That is because we are not yet practicing true conservation on all our land. In fact, only about one-fifth of the farmers of the United States are practicing full and complete conservation farming on their land—and until this is done, erosion is likely to continue in some degree.

I mention these facts now, not to discount in any way the fine progress that is being made in getting on with the soil and water conservation job, but by way of emphasizing the fact that we cannot at any time afford to be too complacent about the problem, since the main job still lies ahead. Certainly we must not slacken our efforts or cease our conservation educational work, through the schools, the churches, and by all other available means. Some of the ancient peoples I have mentioned started conservation work as they saw their land slipping away from them, but apparently they not only started too late—after much of their best land had been wasted or damaged almost beyond repair—they also failed to recognize the need for doing a complete conservation job and for halting such ruinous practices as overgrazing and stripping the timber from their remaining sloping lands.

Today, we cannot plead ignorance of either the problem of erosion and water waste or effective methods of dealing with the problem. We have measured the size of the problem, located and mapped the various problem areas, and perfected the conservation tools for coping with it. I am referring to the comparatively new science of soil conservation, built on the basic principle of treating each acre of land according to its needs and using each acre according to its capabilities.

Modern soil conservation is based on (a) sound land use and (b) treatment of the land with all the proven appropriate measures needed to keep it permanently productive while in use. It means terracing land that needs terracing; and contouring, strip cropping, and stubble-mulching the land in need of this kind of protection, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, stabilizing outlets for excess water, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences as nearly on the contour as practicable, planting steep, highly erodible land and shallow soil to grass or trees, development of good pastures, and devoting good management to them after they have been developed.

Modern soil conservation, moreover, consists of doing these and still other necessary things. Where the land is too wet, it calls

for careful water control, with full consideration given to fish and wildlife needs. Where the climate is too dry, modern soil conservation calls for irrigation; if the land is subject to wind erosion, it calls for wind strip-cropping, tree planting, growing cover crops, and stubble-mulch farming. If the plant nutrients, lime, and humus supply of the soil have been depleted, it calls for fertilization and addition of lime and organic matter; if water-soluble salts have accumulated in toxic quantities, as in parts of the West, it calls for drainage and leaching out of the salts by flooding. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the most adaptable varieties of crops as well as the most efficient of adaptable tools available to farmers. In other words, it means using land within its capabilities (as imposed by nature) and treating it according to its needs (resulting from man's use of the land, or, perhaps, abuse of the land).

Modern soil conservation likewise includes, for flood control and reservoir protection, treatment of whole watersheds with the right combinations of practices, land use, and small structures in the smaller watersheds where flood waters start. Applied at the right time and place, such watersheds treatment saves soil and reduces flood and sedimentation damage, puts water in the soil for plant use and, where conditions are favorable, in ground-water reservoirs, and otherwise benefits general farm, industrial, and municipal water users.

This sound, acre-by-acre soil conservation is based on painstaking research dating back to 1929, and on some 18 years of application and use of soil and water conservation practices and methods by farmers from one end of the country to the other. Since 1937, when the first farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation district anywhere was established right here in Anson County, N. C., these conservation measures have been applied to the land by landholders in such districts, with the technical assistance they request of the Soil Conservation Service. Each farm, and each field on the farm, is treated and subsequently maintained according to a complete conservation plan worked out by the farmer and the technician out on the land—not in an office. This plan, in turn, is based on a detailed land capability survey, or land inventory, which shows the best and safest use of every acre, as determined by such factors as the soil, slope, climate, amount of erosion, and susceptibility to erosion, and so on.

FARM PLANS FOR SOIL CONSERVATION COMPLETE ON 250,000,000 ACRES

At this time, approximately a million farmers in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have such farm plans already made of their farms, or have taken steps to have their farms planned, and an estimated half a million others have delayed the filing of formal requests for planning services at the suggestion of the district supervisors. Final accomplishment figures for the first half of the 1951 calendar year—to July 1—are not yet available, but we estimate that the conservation farm plans to July 1 will cover approximately 252,000,000 acres, of which about 143,000,000 acres have been treated with conservation practices as needed. And detailed conservation surveys have been made to date on an estimated nearly 375,000,000 acres.

And now, with farmers in soil conservation districts further speeding up their conservation planning through group action—neighbors getting together and doing their initial planning as a group so the assisting soil conservationist can work with several farmers at once—it appears that not fewer than 2,000,000,000 farmers and ranchers have taken some action toward carrying out completely coordinated soil conservation work.

¹ Bennett, H. H., *Soil Conservation*, pp. 25-27. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1939.

on their farms. In other words, these thousands of farmers and ranchers are either active or are ready for action in the field of modern soil conservation; and it is estimated that easily another million in soil conservation districts are interested in the work.

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS BEST EXAMPLE OF DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Farmers of the Nation so far have organized approximately 2,350 soil conservation districts. They include more than four-fifths of all our farms and three-fourths of all the land in farms in the United States, amounting to a total of about 1,225,000,000 acres. North Carolina is high on the list of States in district organization with 95 percent of its farm land and 93 percent of its farms within district boundaries as of June 1, this year. Virtually all of the other southeastern States are three-fourths or more covered by soil conservation districts, Alabama and South Carolina being 100 percent within districts.

Probably the present method of furnishing technical assistance to soil conservation districts, where farmers and ranchers set up and manage the affairs of the districts, is the best example of democracy in action that we can find anywhere on earth. The organization of soil conservation districts represents a distinctive step, not only in our conservation program but also in democratic government. These districts are democratic institutions, whose affairs are managed by locally elected neighbors pursuant to provisions of State enabling laws but beholden to no Federal or other outside authority.

They have programs of work that are drawn up by their governing bodies, assisted by technicians and scientists from the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies. They are doing an excellent job of getting the farmers within their boundaries to practice conservation. In short, these districts are local governmental agencies—State agencies—on which we must depend to get this conservation job done, and get it done on time. Our present soil and water conservation program is definitely a reform, as well as a nation-wide technical program based on a new science (the science of soil conservation). In relation to the importance of our natural resources, it is the equivalent of a great national reformation (which, however, is still not great enough). With respect to land use and protection, it amounts to an agricultural revolution never previously approached.

So we see that this system of modern soil conservation, operating through local, democratic districts, does not end with the physical measures put on the land. It doesn't stop with the terraces or diversions that are built, the kudzu, sericea lespedeza, or Suiter's grass which are grown, or the farm ponds or wildlife borders which become part of the rural landscape. It goes far beyond those physical aspects, as basically important as they are, to both the physical and spiritual well-being of people—those who actually till the soil, as well as all the rest of us who depend on its products.

Men and women who normally would have little or no concern about such a matter as soil erosion are spending considerable time and energy these days in support of soil and water conservation. They are beginning to see that their own future is founded on productive land. They have discovered that good land, duly safeguarded against erosion and against overcropping, overgrazing, or wasteful timber slashing, is something a man and his family can see, and feel, and count on, to a very great extent, through periods of trouble as well as in times of prosperity. The idea extends beyond the farmer. Throughout our society there is developing a deeper respect and appreciation for productive land as a source of strength and well-being.

The Land and the People—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the missionary conference of Methodist ministers of the Southeast, at Lake Junaluska, N. C., July 21, 1951:

AND FLOODS CONTINUE TO HARASS US

Today, for example, when people over the country read about such a disastrous flood as that which has just swept down across Kansas and Missouri, they are more aware than they used to be of the tremendous loss in our productive resources which goes far beyond the itemized dollar-damage to urban property, railroad bridges, highways, manufacturing and processing plants, etc. More people now understand that, over and above the currently growing crops that are ruined by floodwaters, there is formidable damage to uncounted acres of good, productive farm land from floodwater erosion and burying of good land under sand and gravel and other flood debris.

Conservationists do not claim, of course, that all floods can be prevented, but it is known through experience that such conservation practices as contour cultivation, growing soil-holding grass crops on steeply sloping land, and other safeguarding measures used throughout a given watershed or group of watersheds do reduce floods. Although actual figures had not been compiled when I left Washington, Soil Conservation Service men in the Kansas-Missouri flood area had sent in reports on their observations that farm land having the benefit of sound conservation measures suffered much less damage than did land lacking such protection.

The same kind of reports came from the Great Plains wheat country, last spring and the years before, when winter drought and high spring winds brought recurring threats of local "dust bowls" all too reminiscent of the 1930's. We were able to show definitely how soil and water conservation farming practices like stubble-mulch tillage, using water-holding terraces, and so on, cut down on the wind erosion damage to a very great extent. And—confirming further our growing awareness of the importance of such phenomena as floods and dust storms to all of us—I want to mention the fact that the dust storms in particular immediately bring us many expressions of concern and requests for information from a wide range of business, radio, and press, and other interests here in the East and elsewhere.

MOUNTING INTEREST IN LAND

All this interest in our land—including the very circumstance of your inviting me to be on your program today—plainly indicates, I think, that the country has about reached the point where we need to give positive consideration to a long-time land policy that will conserve our resources and permanently assure our growing population necessary amounts of food and fiber from the land. I know that you are directly interested in this important matter, because your modern missionary activities embrace the satisfaction of the physical as well as the spiritual hunger of the people. As a result, you inevitably must recognize the proper responsibility of the church for sharing importantly in all

feasible efforts for conservation of the land. As Rev. James W. Sells, your extension secretary, wrote me, "The church needs a basic land policy as much as America does."

You will be interested in knowing that the Department of Agriculture is engaged in a cooperative study with the land-grant colleges to determine our capabilities for future production, with 1955 as the target goal. Future agricultural production no longer can be measured just on the basis of acres of farmland; it involves an evaluation of all such factors as land, water, fertilizers, and pesticides, labor, and machinery. The department has directed attention to the fact that we are going to have to depend on the land we already have instead of looking to bringing new areas into crop production. There are some new acreages potentially available, but no very great area. However, good use and good care of the land is the equivalent of more land in that it results in increased per-acre yields.

A NATIONAL LAND POLICY

The land-use goal in our national land policy must be a complete soil and water program on every farm, ranch, forest, and watershed in the country. To build toward that objective it is necessary that as a sound guide we make an inventory of all physical land resources with respect to area, capability, and condition. Such a land policy is requisite to sustained and improved agricultural production, erosion control, and reduction in flood damages and siltation of reservoirs, harbors, etc.; protection of irrigation, power, municipal, industrial, and recreational water supplies and maintenance of underground water resources; irrigation and drainage development on additional suitable lands; and fish and wildlife protection.

I submit that such a sound national land policy also is requisite to maintaining a strong and God-fearing democracy over a long period of time for our common well-being and security, and for world peace and security. There is no place in our economy any more for exploiters of our land and water resources. Neither can we afford to put up with slipshod, low-producing methods in our agricultural production any more than we can afford them in industry or elsewhere. We have to have high-efficiency use of our remaining productive land in order to keep up our desirable standard of living and to meet our continuing and expanding domestic and international obligations as the world's leading democracy.

Latest figures from the Bureau of the Census (on June 29, 1951) showed that the population of the United States has already passed the 154,000,000 mark, having increased at an average rate of around 200,000 a month the past year. Not only do we require additional farm production because of increasing population, but we have shouldered responsibilities in the free parts of the world, ranging from assistance in maintaining armed forces abroad to sending wheat to famine-pressed India. All of these activities bring additional pressures on our own resources. No one knows how long present world uncertainties and conditions may last, during which we must be prepared to defend our country and democracies elsewhere. But the longer it does last, with the continuing need for maximum agricultural production, the more indispensable becomes our productive land. And the more important becomes the conservation and efficient use of land, as well as the water that makes land produce.

Meanwhile, coming back closer to home, the experience of the past 15 to 20 years dispels any doubt that comprehensive soil conservation, scientifically applied to the land, is the great need and the great hope of the South, as I pointed out in that part of the

1948 report of the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture dealing with Soil Conservation and Land Use in the South. (I believe we still have some copies of this document, which is well worth reading, if some of you should write me for it.)

GREAT OPPORTUNITY IN SOUTHEAST

With soil conservation safeguarding and increasing the agricultural productive capacity of the lands of this region, the South can become an area of vast opportunity, not only for material well-being but for the spiritual well-being so essential to a great people. It is rapidly becoming a more productive area than it ever has been, wherever the land has not been ruined by excessive erosion. As a native of the South myself, from North Carolina, I have heard all my life the call for diversification and more livestock and grass and legumes. With the modern soil conservation now going forward under the program I have been discussing, the South is fast getting these highly beneficial agricultural and other advantages.

I am sure, also, that if you have studied the situation even casually, you have been impressed by the broader community benefits stemming from this advancement—benefits which radiate from beyond the farm and the farm family proper to the schools and churches, and to industry, business, and the professions in town. Although there are many similar instances of rural communities lifting themselves by their soil conservation bootstraps, so to speak, the experience of the Sylvania community in Lonoke County, Ark., is an outstanding example.

SOIL CONSERVATION HOLDS YOUTH ON FARMS

When the farmers in the Sylvania community started practicing soil conservation, in 1936, the main crop was cotton. But today dairying is the major enterprise centering about the old community church. It has developed into a profitable farm business—more than a million-dollar business in this part of the Lonoke-Pulaski Soil Conservation District. A study of an average group of 10 families in the community revealed that the farms were paying from 6 to 10 times more taxes of all kinds than they paid 10 years earlier, with the Sylvania community dairymen marketing \$3,500 worth of milk a day at the time the study was made.

But here is another most significant point about this Sylvania development. 9 out of the 26 children of these 10 families had become partners with their parents in dairy farming; 11 had married and gone into dairying themselves locally; and 3 were still at home and going to school. Only three had left the community. A similar study of 10 families in a nearby community—having the same kind of land but with everybody still depending largely on cotton for their income, and few having started conservation farming—showed that only 8 of their 33 children had married and settled in the community, and 2 were still at home going to school. There were no father-and-son partnerships. But 23 of the 33 children had left the community to make a living elsewhere.

It hardly is necessary to pose the question of which of these communities affords the better opportunities for most effective work of the church or any other essential community activities. The answer is obvious. Dr. T. S. Buile, of Spartanburg, S. C., who is regional director of the Soil Conservation Service in your southeastern region, has called my attention to what I understand is a still unpublished church survey based on land capability, made last year by the Reverend E. H. Coale, Methodist missionary from Nigeria, who was in the States on sabbatical leave. The Soil Conservation Service cooperated in assembling the information.

THE LAND AND THE CHURCH

I shall not recite the various details of this significant survey report, covering 155 rural Methodist churches in the Piedmont section of the South Carolina conference; but I do want to emphasize that it shows the direct relationship between the vigor and the prosperity of the church and the productivity of the land within the 2-mile radius of each church covered in the survey. Seventy-three of the churches were in the good-land group (i. e., with 50 percent or more of the land in capability classes I, II, and III, representing land suitable for row-crop production); and 82 were in the poor-land group (having less than 50 percent of these better classes of land).

Results of study may be summarized as showing that the good-land group of churches had more frequent services and larger attendance, larger contributions, more adequate church buildings, and better paid pastors despite the fact that the poor-land congregations devoted a larger percentage of their contributions to the minister's salary. Also most significant, I think, was the fact that the poor-land communities were making but a fraction of the progress in soil conservation that the good-land communities had made, although the entire area involved is covered by soil-conservation districts.

It seems to me that this study, made in a representative southeastern area, definitely points to the interest and responsibility the church itself has in good farming and conservation of the land, which invariably means increased per acre production, higher income, and better living for the farm families practicing soil conservation. I should like to repeat some thing I have said before in appearing before church groups:

I am glad to see the church as a body taking up the fight for conservation of soil and water. I have said that there is no one answer to these problems that we face. It is a field in which science and religion can work side by side for the betterment of man. I can't think of a more glorious common objective, or any other activity so promising of rich rewards. People working together to safeguard and improve the land and to make wise use of the water that falls on the land are all engaged in work that results in common benefit to all. This kind of work develops better understanding among people, increased security through increased yields, increased friendliness, and increased cooperation.

The church has the primary responsibility to help and serve human beings, for the greater glory of God. I believe that man was given this marvelous resource—the land—not as an outright possession to do with as he chooses, but in trust to use and improve and pass on to succeeding generations. I also believe that man has a moral obligation to care for the land so that it may continue to produce abundantly for those who will come after us. Unquestionably, they will judge us, their forebears, according to whether we treat well or badly the vital land inheritance we bequeath them.

The prime sponsors of soil conservation are men who live on the land and unselfishly devote time and energy to saving soil. They must have, and do have, a love of the land. The leadership in conservation is composed not only of farmers, but of business and professional people who have acted wisely in thus shouldering some personal responsibility to the public interest and to the future of America. Man holds stewardship of the land; and it is our duty to conserve and protect our land for our present use and for use by future generations.

Every pastor, more especially every one in a rural community, has a rich opportunity to give practical, inspirational leadership in conservation stewardship of the land; for truly "The earth is the Lord's and the full-

ness thereof" (Twenty-fourth Psalm). The church holds a place of first importance in such community life and would be indeed remiss in performance of its proper functions if it ignored community soil conservation activities. If there were time, I could cite you various examples of how this has worked out in practice, in your own southeastern region and elsewhere. Of course, you are familiar with such outstanding cooperative undertakings as Soil Stewardship Sunday, sponsored annually by Farm and Ranch-Southern Agriculturist in cooperation with local pastors and soil conservation district supervisors, and with the annual selection, by the Progressive Farmer in cooperation with Emory University's school for town and country ministers, of the rural minister of the year. Did you know that 2 of the 14 Southern States' pastors selected in 1951 were soil conservation district supervisors?

In the 9 States of the southeastern region, there are more than 2,000 of these soil conservation district supervisors. These men generally are leaders in rural church activities as well as in soil and water conservation. They are good men for the pastor to get acquainted with in familiarizing himself with the facilities available in his community for promoting the common welfare, and I am sure that each pastor, in turn, can be of real inspiration and service to these and other agricultural leaders in his community. I understand that during Soil Conservation Week, sponsored last September by the Georgia Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, 274 sermons on soil conservation were delivered to congregations totaling more than 32,000 people.

That fine performance illustrates one way of forging strong links between the land and the people. We will never achieve our goal of permanent soil conservation until every citizen thoroughly understands the utter necessity for soil conservation that is scientifically applied to the land, and is well informed about current progress in the field. Not only must all people who handle or manage our basic resources be conservation-minded and know how to use such resources without wasting or destroying them, all of the people who depend on those resources must recognize the stakes involved and know what is being done about conserving them. We can achieve such true conservation only through an informed citizenry; and the church has one of the largest roles in bringing people to see that the earth is holy and that man's relationship to it is essentially moral.

"THE LAND SHALL NOT BE SOLD FOREVER"

The rural church of the South, as well as of the Nation, can be of still greater service to the South, and to all parts of the Nation, than heretofore. Through such sound soil conservation as you are now getting from the highly cooperative program of the soil conservation districts and cooperating soil conservation technicians, you have a new and greater opportunity—and I think obligation—to serve the people. You have made a good start. My advice is—and I have crossed the line of three score and ten—go ahead with this work, even on an expanded basis. There is missionary work to be done here at home, as well as abroad.

I certainly hope you will find ways and means for expanding your efforts in this challenging field. Get better acquainted with this work I have been talking about for a long, long time. Do what you can to improve and safeguard the going program of soil and water conservation. Our lives on earth depend on the salvation of our land. I believe the parable of the talents supports this conclusion.

"The land shall not be sold forever, for 'the land is Mine,' saith Jehovah, 'and ye are strangers and sojourners with Me'" (Leviticus 25: 23).

Can We Stop the Waste of Our Hard-Earned Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the article *How High Can Taxes Go?* by Roswell Magill, president of the Tax Foundation and former Under Secretary of the Treasury, which I have asked to have printed in the Appendix of the Record:

How High Can Taxes Go?

(By Roswell Magill)

Is there any outside limit to the taxes you and I can be required to pay? Must we look forward to paying a quarter or a half of our incomes to the Federal Treasury all through the indefinite future? Is there any limit to the Federal expenditures that compel the high taxes except the collective judgment—or imaginations—of Congressmen?

We have always thought of America's resources and financial capacity as unlimited. We have everything here—automobiles and the Grand Canyon and frozen orange juice, and once we had roast beef in every oven. Recently we have acted on the basis that we can have all the good things of civil life—the highest standard of living in the world—and pay for a few wars besides, at least small-scale wars.

But now there seems to be a catch. The Senate is wrestling with a tax bill designed to yield \$7,200,000,000 on top of Federal taxes that take about \$60,000,000,000 out of our pockets. The Treasury says the tax bill isn't big enough. It ought to produce \$10,000,000,000. In any event, the Secretary of the Treasury implies that he will be back next year to ask for more.

Some Senators are saying, however, that the tax bill can't be made greater without grave damage to each of us and to the economy. We are told that we have just about reached the limit of Federal taxpaying capacity, and it looks very much as if we have. The bill increases the Federal tax on cigarettes to 8 cents a pack. That is a sales tax of about 80 percent, for the cigarettes themselves cost only about 10 cents. (The average State tax adds another 3 to 5 cents.) The tax on liquor will go up to \$2.60 a quart. Gasoline is to be taxed 2 cents per gallon. (All the States tax gasoline, from 2 to 9 cents per gallon.) Sales of automobiles are to be taxed 10 percent, and parts are to be taxed 8 percent, aside from State and city sales taxes. Not all of these are taxes on luxuries. The average man is being hit just about as hard as the Federal Government can hit him.

For instance, let us take an average suburbanite who lives outside one of our larger cities and commutes to work. We will call him Henry Suburban, and he might be any one of us. He knows that he pays an income tax, and a heavy one, as well as a social-security tax. They come off his pay check every week. But that is only the beginning of his tax troubles.

Henry is aroused in the morning by his alarm clock (price \$6 plus \$1.32 tax). Partially awake, he walks across the floor of his \$8,000 house (annual property tax, \$240) and switches on the electricity (3½ cents tax on each dollar of his monthly bill), which lights the bulb (price 20 cents plus 2 cents tax). On his way to the bath-

room Henry turns on the radio (price \$30 plus \$2.54 tax).

As he shaves—forgetting the taxes that went into the price of his razor and shaving cream—he listens to a radio newscaster reporting that the Federal Government is preparing to increase income taxes and special taxes on many of the things he buys. After shaving, Henry finishes up with some bay rum (price \$1 plus 22 cents tax).

He dresses quickly, fastens his tie clasp (price \$1.60 plus 33 cents tax) and, as he leaves the bedroom, puts on his wrist watch (price \$70, tax \$15.40—not counting customs duty) and fastens his cuff links (price \$3.50 plus 77 cents tax). He hurries downstairs and kisses his wife (marriage license, \$2), who gives him his toast from the electric toaster (price \$20.50 plus \$1.74 tax). She pours his coffee from the pot on the gas stove (price \$190, tax \$16.18) and gives him his fruit juice from the refrigerator (price \$300, tax \$25.52).

A TAXING DAY FOR HENRY

Henry's wife tells him to buy some talcum powder for the baby (50 cents plus 11 cents tax), a roll of camera film (price 34 cents plus 4 cents tax), and since some friends are coming for dinner, a bottle of liquor (price \$4.69 including \$2.72 in taxes). A glance out of the window shows it is raining, so he asks his wife to telephone (monthly bill, \$12, tax, \$2.05) for a taxi. Too many other people want taxis on a wet morning, so Henry gets out his own car (price \$1,800, plus \$102 Federal tax, plus \$38 sales tax, plus State license fee, plus tax of 5 cents a pound on the spare tire, plus 5 percent on each new part or accessory, plus average State and Federal gasoline tax of 5½ cents per gallon). On the way to the station, Henry lights a cigarette (price per pack, 10 cents, plus Federal tax, 7 cents; plus State tax, 4 cents) with a match (tax 5½ cents per 1,000). He boards his train and gives the conductor his ticket (price 85 cents, tax 13 cents) and sighs (no tax). And Henry has been up only an hour.

Yet, the biggest part of Henry's tax story is still to be told. Take Henry's toast. That started from a loaf of bread and it started on the farm. Just as anyone else who owns property, the farmer had to pay taxes on his land and buildings and machinery, and he also paid most of the taxes Henry pays. These taxes are just as much a part of the farmer's cost of raising wheat as seed, lime, or fertilizer.

The miller, too, had taxes to pay—taxes on his personal property, on his real estate, as well as all the taxes that went into the making of his milling machinery and his flour sacks. Transporting the flour included taxes—railroad taxes, taxes on gasoline and oil, licenses, and so on.

The baker, too, paid taxes—the hidden taxes in the yeast and other ingredients that go into his bread, the hidden taxes in his oven, wrapping machinery and other equipment. Furthermore, he paid taxes on his property, unemployment-compensation and social-security taxes on the wages he paid his employees, as well as his income taxes and other business taxes.

When the bread reached the shelf of the grocery store, the retailer's markup included still more taxes—those that the retailer had to pay. So that there are literally hundreds of taxes which find their way into the price of the loaf of bread which Henry's wife used for his toast, and ultimately the price Henry pays for the bread includes a large share of all these taxes.

So that Henry, along with every one of us, is paying far more than he realizes for Government. Just how much is Henry's total tax burden—the part that he sees and the part that's hidden in the prices he pays? Economists have studied this question for years and have yet to come up with a satis-

factory answer. The necessary facts and statistics are difficult to gather and a good many assumptions, including some dubious ones, must be made as to how people in different income brackets spend their money, how successful sellers are in passing on tax costs in their selling prices, the supply-and-demand situation, and so forth. However, recently several economists who have studied Government figures on the 1948 expenditures of individuals and families with different incomes have attempted to allocate the total tax burdens upon these spending units.

If Henry's family was in the \$3,000-to-\$4,000 income bracket in 1948, and his income was the average for his bracket, \$3,500, we come up with this picture of his tax burdens:

	Fed- eral	State and local	Total
Personal income taxes.....	\$230	\$3.16	\$233
Corporation income taxes (paid by or passed on to Henry).....	156	8.49	164
Excise or sales taxes (paid by or passed on to Henry).....	168	125.00	293
Property taxes (paid by or passed on to Henry).....	-----	111.00	111
Payroll taxes (paid by or passed on to Henry).....	106	-----	106
Total.....	660	248.00	908

Thus a little over one fourth of Henry's income ultimately found its way to government in the form of taxes. Economists differ in their estimates of the incidence of different types of taxes, but there is some agreement that this calculation of the total burden on Henry is about correct.

The plain fact is that the tax money the Federal Government must have can't any longer be collected just from the big corporation or from the rich man who lives in the big house on the other side of the street. For 20 years now, Congress has tried to balance the Federal budget that way—and most of the time has failed to balance it. Congress still wants to raise the money that way. Congress proposes now to take for the Government more than half of corporation earnings, and up to 70 percent of corporate earnings in some cases. Congress proposes to take 94½ percent of the top earnings of individuals. The rates of tax, State and Federal, applicable to many individuals, will be a little over 100 percent. Only the fact that the Federal Government allows a deduction for State taxes prevents the taxpayer from having to pay a little more than he earns for the privilege of earning additional money.

Probably that's the limit so far as the well-to-do are concerned. Still the Federal Government wants more tax money to pay for defense, for more atomic bombs, for more veterans' hospitals, for more old-age pensions, for more farm parity to keep food prices up, for more public works, for more Federal employees. Where can Congress get more tax money?

It begins to look as if the new taxes will have to be collected from Henry, and that means from you and me.

If new tax money is so hard to find, why bother? Why should we break our backs to balance the budget if expenditures are climbing and taxes are already so heavy? Why not let the Government run a deficit?

For years the Government has been going into debt, issuing bonds to pay its bills, instead of collecting enough taxes to balance expenditures. The result is inflation and a dollar that's now worth only about 50 cents. We've got to stop it or the dollar won't be worth anything. That means we've got to balance the very high Federal budget expenditures with very high taxes, if we are to keep the dollar from going the way of the franc and the mark.

One way to keep from going into debt is not to spend so much. The Federal Government could try that plan, but it's very hard to do, for we have become used to thinking the other way. Everything ought to grow bigger and bigger—we've got plenty of money. Bigger Government departments, with more divisions and bureaus and sections, so that half a dozen or fifty or a hundred people are working on everything anyone can think of. That makes jobs for lots of people. Lots of reclamation and rivers and harbors projects, so that the battleship *Missouri* can sail into any harbor and up to the fork of every creek. Better have two or three Federal agencies working on each of these things. They can compete with one another to see which can spend the most. It all improves the country and we can certainly afford to pay for it.

But can we? President Truman presented us with a \$71,600,000,000 bill for Government expenses from July 1951, through June 1952—about 10 times what the Government spent in the 1930's. Later this estimate was reduced to \$68,400,000,000. Congress has trimmed it a few million dollars here and a few hundred thousand dollars there, and there has been a lot of talk about economy. There are plenty of soft spots in the budget, but most of the budget items are based on past congressional authorizations. For the most part, the Budget Bureau has simply put down in a column and added up the cost of all these new veterans' hospitals and farmers' parity and reclamation projects and new steam plants for TVA that Congress has voted in the past.

The only way to get the budget down is to wipe the slate clean—to wipe off the old lush peacetime authorizations and start over again with a shorter list of items and a smaller total that we can afford in times like these. Almost any of us could cut our family budgets if we had to do it. Congress and the Budget Bureau can do it, too, if they will. Students of the problem have shown that seven to ten billions of dollars can be cut out of the budget without any real damage to anything that absolutely needs to be done by the Government.

If the Federal budget is cut that much, we won't have to have any new taxes. But you'll have to do without some governmental frills. You'll have to get along without that new yacht basin in Bureau Creek and maybe there won't be a Federal job for Johnny or Mary.

Certainly we can do without Government loans for snake farms and fur ranches, and special calendars for Congressmen at a cost of \$6,000 per year—equal to all the income taxes paid in a year by 27 families earning \$4,000 a year. Why should we be paying for ski lifts in Austria? Why should it cost a Government agency \$13.39 on the average to process purchase orders, even one for a popular 50-cent men's magazine? Do we need 15 agencies to deal with public housing or 65 to do statistical work? Unquestionably there is ample room for substantial cuts in the budget, if we start with a clean slate.

But suppose Federal expenditures aren't cut very much. It really doesn't look as if they will be, in spite of all the talk about economy. How much money will the Federal Treasury have to have to balance the budget?

Business is going great guns. There aren't any unemployed to speak of. The total national income is about the highest it ever has been, and that means the base for taxes is very large. Even so, the Treasury will probably need at least \$5,000,000,000 more taxes to balance the budget, and it might need \$7,000,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000 next year, for defense expenditures have finally got into high gear and we are spending a lot of money every month. Where is the tax money to come from? Have we really reached the end of the road?

The well-to-do and the moderately prosperous have already been squeezed pretty dry. A lot of our people pay the Government more in taxes than they can keep for themselves. Consequently, if we put a 100-percent tax on all taxable income over \$10,000 the Treasury would get less than \$3,500,000,000 more money, and that isn't enough. To get \$10,000,000,000 more from the individual income tax, the Treasury would have to take all taxable income over \$4,000. Yes, a 100-percent income tax on taxable incomes over \$4,000.

Taxing the man with the smaller income is equally difficult. The Department of Labor has studied family budgets for a family of four in representative cities across the country. Their figures show that there is very little fat in a worker's income out of which more taxes can be squeezed. Whether you make \$4,000 or \$10,000 or \$25,000, if you are taxed 50 percent or 100 percent, how much better off are you than a Russian?

In this connection, perhaps we can learn a lesson from England—a lesson that should help dispel the notion that taxation hits the wealthy while government expenditures benefit the poor. In April 1950 the London Economist published a table showing that the current social-welfare expenditures of the British Government amounted to 57 shillings per week per family. That was the measure of the welfare-state program which the Socialist British Government had established as a criterion of what a paternalistic government should do for its people. The startling fact brought out by the Economist was that the approximate taxes paid by the average low-income family in 1948 was 67.8 shillings per week, or 10 shillings per week more than the welfare benefits it presumably received. These figures applied to families with incomes under \$1,400 a year, and they made up about 80 percent of the British population. Thus the Government program, initiated largely for the benefit of the low-income groups, had reached a point where the taxes resting on the beneficiaries of the program were greater than the benefits. Of course, most of these taxes were hidden in the price of the beer and tobacco and other items which these families consumed.

Can't we hang the additional taxes on corporations? That won't hurt us—or will it? After the corporation pays the tax, what happens to it? The only money that the corporation has is what it gets from selling goods to its customers. It must try to add the tax to the price of its goods—and then you and I will have to pay the tax, or the tax will come out of the earnings that would go to stockholders or out of the money needed to expand the business and keep production high. If stockholders can't get a decent return on their investment in common stock, they sell the stock and buy bonds or put their money in the savings bank.

A few years ago a prominent business magazine made a careful survey among business executives to discover what effects seriously heavy taxes have on them. One of the questions asked was, "Have you passed up an opportunity to invest in a new business in the last 5 years because the return after taxes would not justify the risk?" Forty percent of these executives answered "Yes."

Will you and I take our chances on setting up a business to make a new gadget when we must bear our own losses, but the Government will take half or three-quarters of anything we make? Won't we do better to work just for what we need to pay for our living, and then sit under a tree and fish the rest of the time?

When a wealthy individual decides not to risk his money in an investment in a new business because over the years the Government will take out in business taxes and in personal income taxes 10 times the amount

he can hope to keep, we need not shed any tears over him. It's true that he would take all the responsibility and risk and the Government would get most of the profit, and if he died it might be necessary to sell his business to pay the inheritance taxes. However, he needs no sympathy from us since he is already in the 90 percent income bracket.

But we need him. We need the new industry which his willingness to gamble could give us. He can decide not to gamble and he still has his money. But we are out a new industry, with all that that means in new jobs, more production and a higher standard of living for all our people.

Undoubtedly most of us have other incentives to work besides the money we make. Fortunately most of us like our work and we want to do a good job at it. But the incentive to take on more work, or to start a new industry, is fostered by the prospect of a decent financial return for the additional effort. If the prospect is slight or nonexistent, then people won't work harder and won't produce more; and the country loses much more than the prospective taxes.

Aren't there some other kinds of taxes than taxes on corporations or individuals? Yes, there are sales taxes and estate taxes and gift taxes and property taxes. They are levied on different things and transactions, but they all come out of people's incomes. The Federal Government already levies many sales taxes, and many States levy sales taxes, too. The States actually do a much better job than the Federal Government, for the State sales taxes apply equally to all sales—generally excepting food and clothing—while the Federal taxes are selective and discriminatory, as well as much steeper in rate. Unless the Federal budget can be pruned, Congress is going to have to levy a general sales tax, retail or manufacturers', for there is just no other way to raise more billions on top of present taxes.

The Federal Treasury is already getting all the money that it can in estate and gift taxes from the well-to-do. To get more would mean taxing the small gift and small estate, and even then not much revenue would be produced. In general, the Federal Government can't constitutionally levy property taxes; they are reserved for the States and localities.

Well, is there a tax ceiling? Can taxes go much higher?

Colin Clark, the Australian economist, who is Under Secretary of State for Labor and Industry, and Financial Adviser to the Treasury in Queensland, recently examined this question. Looking at the experience of France after the First World War, and again in the 1930's he came to the conclusion that "the critical level of taxation beyond which inflationary forces come into play is around 25 percent of the national income." In other words, when the Government begins to take more than 25 percent of the national income inflation sets in. As the money begins to be worth less—and the total national income rises in terms of a currency of lesser value—a stabilization point is usually reached when taxes are once more taking only about one-quarter of the national income. Mr. Clark's conclusions are supported by the experience of Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Finland, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, and to some extent the United States during the 1940's.

Where do we stand now? Congressional tax experts recently pointed out that in the calendar year 1950 the receipts of all levels of government in the United States were about 29 percent of the national income. They were 38 percent in Great Britain. If we assume that there will be a higher level of national income this year and next in the United States, we find that the tax increases proposed in the House bill will raise the percentage in the United States to 32 percent. We are certainly treading hard on

the heels of Great Britain in driving incentives to produce out of the economy, and in inviting catastrophic inflation.

So we're back where we started. There is no good way or satisfactory way or tolerable way to raise \$70,000,000,000 for the Federal Government to spend. It can't be obtained from the well-to-do. They don't have it left to pay. It can't be obtained from corporations, without killing their activity and their growth or without shifting the ultimate burden to the consumer through higher prices. Seventy billion dollars can be obtained only by taxing you and me much more heavily than we've ever been willing to stand for. We haven't been willing to stand for it, because the money we would pay in taxes is what otherwise we would spend for the things that make life worth living—our standard of living—toys and education for the children, an automobile, a television set. We don't absolutely have to have them. We can get along on less. But we've never been willing to cut our standards of living in order that Washington and the Government can spend more than was ever spent before in time of peace.

Still, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains at least one report of a Congressman to his constituents in which he states that in the fiscal year 1951 he secured \$80,000,000 of direct appropriations for his district; authorizations of rivers and harbors and flood-control projects totaling \$681,000,000; electric-power projects totaling \$47,200,000; and Rural Electrification Administration loans of \$3,851,000. He is working for other rivers and harbors and flood-control projects totaling \$480,000,000. During his 8 years in Congress he says that he has secured for his district direct appropriations of at least \$265,000,000.

As long as the Congressman's constituents want and approve such activities, how can Federal expenditures be reduced? If Federal expenditures can't be reduced, you and I are certainly going to have to stand for higher and still higher Federal taxes—on ourselves. The bill must be paid in one way or another; either through taxes, through inflation—which is worse—or through both.

The Working Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting story published in the periodical entitled "The Working Boy," of Newton Highlands, Mass., by Mr. William W. Buechel:

JESUIT'S BARK (By William W. Buechel)

Malaria is one of the great scourges which yearly visit the southern part of the United States. Most people will be surprised to know that malaria is native here in America; most seem to regard it as solely a jungle fever. While it truly is a tropical disease, it can be found in almost any consistently hot land. Two hundred fifty thousand cases are treated here every year.

Any one who has seen a malarial attack will know what a terrible scourge it is. At first the victim is cold and chilly even though the weather is hot. His teeth chatter. Then the exact reverse takes place: The poor victim is burning up with a fever that can reach 105 degrees. Along with this, the victim may

become delirious and even fall into coma. His skin takes on a clayish color; his breathing becomes hard and forced. Sometimes he may even become a dangerous maniac.

Those are probably the symptoms a certain Indian had, better than 800 years ago in Peru, when he was carried by the townsmen out of their village to the side of a small stream and left there to die.

Burning up from thirst, the sick Indian while waiting for death drank copiously from the stream. Death did not come. Instead, in a few days robust and healthy once more the Indian was able to return to his village. Naturally the villagers were sure that they were seeing a ghost. It took a great deal of persuading to change their minds.

However, they did want to know what was the story behind this sudden recovery. The Indian could tell them nothing except that to quench his thirst he had taken numerous draughts of water from the stream. Hearing this, the villagers took all their feverish sick and carried them to the side of the stream. All who drank from the "holy stream" were cured. However, such a rush was made on the waters that the supply was not equal to the demand and the water apparently lost its curative powers.

The sages of the tribe realized that the water itself was not the benefactor in this case but that something somehow saturated the water with its curative qualities. Without the aid of modern scientific equipment and know-how, they found that a certain species of tree, the cinchona tree, lined the banks of the stream and that it was from the bark of this tree that the water obtained a certain bitter taste.

So they stripped the bark from the trees and pounded it into powder which they used as medicine. So great were the healing powers attributed to this new febrifuge that it was not long before the Jesuit missionaries found out about it and tested it for themselves. The results were so amazing that they took back to Europe great quantities of the bark. They distributed it freely. That is how modern-day quinine acquired the name "Jesuit's bark."

A story is told of a French merchant who stored a vast quantity of the bark in an unoccupied apartment that he owned. Because the bark gave off such a disagreeable odor, it seemed unlikely that the room would ever be occupied as long as the bark was stored there.

However, some travelers carrying a dangerously sick companion happened to pass through this town and begged to be allowed to rest their feverish companion in the apartment. He was placed in one of the rooms containing the bark. After the first day he felt much better. In a few days, without any medical attention whatever, he was completely cured. Subsequently many feverish sick were placed in these rooms and all were cured.

The discovery of "Jesuit's bark" was as important to medicine in its fight on fever as gunpowder was to war. As many as 80 alkaloids have already been extracted from the bark, but the most important from every point of view is quinine, discovered in 1820 by two French pharmacists. It has been said that quinine is more precious than all the gold and silver in the world today. It is so important a preventive treatment that the American Government spent huge sums of money during World War II to get enormous amounts of "Jesuit's bark" from the wild jungles and mountain sides of South America, for it was no longer possible to get any from Dutch Java which had been captured by the Japs.

Previously the Dutch Government had supplied most of the world's supply of quinine although no small amount was always forthcoming from India. "Jesuit's bark" in South America, strangely enough, is not as consist-

ent in its quality as the Java product. Fortunately, research chemists in the United States were able to produce a substitute.

Since quinine is the medical specific used against malaria attacks, it goes without saying that it was an invaluable ally to our boys fighting in the hot lands of the Pacific. Today in Korea, quinine is like a hovering guardian angel, for without it our boys would die like flies.

Little did that lone Peruvian Indian, centuries ago, dream his feverish attempts to slake his feverish thirst would start such a string of events down the succeeding centuries. Little did he realize that he was but the first of a long line of hundreds of thousands who, like himself, would hasten joyfully back from the dead to the bosom of the living because of the inherent medicinal qualities of the tree bark from which, centuries later, pharmacists extracted the king of febrifuge—quinine.

Stalin Trying To Exterminate Catholicism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Stalin is well aware of the strong opposition of the Catholic Church to the doctrine and practices of communism. He knows that in order to effectively consolidate his gains in Eastern Europe he must wipe out all the influence of the religious principles and philosophy of the Catholic Church in the hearts of the people. He is now relentlessly and rapidly pursuing this objective.

I include the following article by Ernest O. Hauser, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 22, 1951, which vividly portrays the persecution now going on behind the iron curtain:

WHAT STALIN HAS IN MIND FOR CATHOLICS (By Ernest O. Hauser)

The death struggle between the Catholic Church and the governments of Eastern Europe's slave states has moved into a critical phase. No longer can this struggle be appraised merely in terms of show trials, prison terms, ravaged convents, and closed churches. What is causing alarm on Vatican Hill today is the fact that the clergy behind the iron curtain is beginning to show symptoms of combat fatigue. Already, thousands of Catholic priests have pledged allegiance to the "people's democracies." Hundreds have joined Communist-run ecclesiastical fronts hostile to the Vatican and the west. One priest serves as Minister of Public Health in Czechoslovakia's Red government, while another, in open defiance of Rome, has usurped the administration of a Czech bishopric. In two predominantly Catholic countries, Poland and Hungary, the Catholic hierarchies have signed accords with their governments. The accords were received here with astonishment and sorrow.

Such attempts to come to terms with plainly atheist regimes are, unfortunately, just what Moscow needed to carry out its deadly operations against the Church of Rome. The Soviet master plan envisages the destruction of the Catholic Church in two major steps. One is the isolation of the clergy from Rome and creation of a

schismatic national church controlled by the Red regime. The second step is liquidation. While the integration of Protestant churches, always organized along national lines, called for no deep-laid plans, Catholics posed a special problem. Catholicism, by its very nature, is supranational. A Catholic, wherever he may be, looks to Rome for spiritual guidance. A Catholic bishop, in exercising his sweeping spiritual and jurisdictional powers, represents the Pope, to whom he must report in person at fixed intervals. Here, then, was a link with the free world which had to be broken before the Catholic community could take its place in the monolithic state.

Today we are witnessing the breaking of that link. In Czechoslovakia, where 75 percent of the population are Catholic, the Communist regime first reduced the church to poverty by stripping it of almost all its possessions and revenues, then offered to put the clergy on the Government payroll. All it asked in return was an oath of loyalty to the people's democracy. In October 1949, the bishops—still refusing to take the oath themselves—advised the lower clergy to accept the offer. All but a dozen did.

"I had to live and my parish needed me," said a Czech priest, now safely in Rome. "When my bishop said it was all right, I saw no reason for holding out. I went to the office of the district Soviet and took the oath: 'I promise upon my honor that I will be faithful to the Republic of Czechoslovakia and to its people's democratic regime, and not to attempt anything which could be contrary to its interests, its security, and integrity. As a citizen of a people's democratic republic, I will conscientiously fulfill the duties resulting from my job and will try to assist the reconstructive effort which is promoting the well-being of the Czech and Slovak peoples'."

"But I added, ' . . . if it isn't contrary to the law of God, the church, or the natural rights of man'."

(This reservation was insisted upon by the bishops in their advice to the lower clergy.)

"That part is invalid," the top official said.

"Perhaps I put it in, just in case."

"In case we'd tell you to go against the laws of God? We'd never do that."

"So much the better," said I.

Once the Government had the priests impoverished it went after their souls. Another Czech clergyman now in Rome recalls the trying visits of the local church commissar, an elderly ex-cabinetmaker who had been reeducated in party schools. "He'd come to the parish at all hours, sometimes twice a day," the clergyman related. "He'd sit there and try to convert me, repeating what he'd read in the papers about communism not being against religion or just trying to trick me into taking one more little step toward Moscow. He always had some appeal or other he wanted me to sign, and when I said no, he called me the most stubborn man in town, and warned me of the consequences."

Out of renegade fragments of the lower clergy the state, in June 1949, formed a religious front tauntingly named Catholic Action, after the leading lay organization sponsored by the church. Its creator was Joseph Plojhar, a priest, and Minister of Health in the Prague government. Growing slowly but steadily, the violently anti-Vatican organization now includes several hundred priests—proving, as the Communists would have it, that "the lower clergy is on the side of the people" and no longer speaks to Rome.

Just how the Government goes about increasing its supply of "people's priests" is illustrated by the account of a monk who fled Czechoslovakia only a few weeks ago. Ever since a night raid on his monastery in April 1950, a night in which most of the country's 2,500 monks were arrested, he had

shared the misery of 200 of his colleagues in a deserted abbey turned into a "concentration monastery." Here the prisoners were subjected to an intensive reeducation program, listening to lectures and writing papers on such topics as Communist culture and the place of the priest in the people's state. Now and then special agents would take one of them aside, inquiring whether he was ready to be freed as a party-line school teacher or a secular "people's priest." Surely, the special agents' talk went, there could be no doubt that Christianity, like communism, provides for a better world in which the rich share their wealth with the poor. As the months dragged by, more and more of the trapped monks agreed, outwardly, at least.

Not this one, though.

"One night 10 of us were loaded on a truck and whisked off to jail," he said. "They tossed me into a tiny, brilliantly lit cell and left me there for a month. Then they questioned me, day and night, day and night. Why didn't I like the people's democracy? What were my contacts with foreigners, with the Vatican? Sometimes I had to kneel before my interrogator for five hours, answering questions. I was beaten and kicked by a squad of four. Between sessions they kept me standing for hours in a dark disciplinary cell. After a fortnight of that, they suddenly returned me to the re-education routine. Apparently I wasn't ripe, but they assured me the cycle would be repeated every couple of months. 'The last of you will crack in two, three years,' they told me."

All that remained to be done was to tie up the loose ends. In June 1949, Czechoslovakia's primate, Archbishop Joseph Beran, was made a prisoner in his Prague residence. He has recently been deported and his present whereabouts is not known. A year later all of the remaining bishops, except three who were jailed and have since been sentenced to long prison terms, were under house arrest. Guarded by armed police, they could not communicate with the parishes of their bishoprics, could not receive visitors and were closely watched by a people's commissar. In at least one case, the commissar actually slept in the same room with the bishop he was assigned to watch.

Moscow moved in where Rome was elbowed out. In January 1950, Bishop Skrabec, of Banska Bystrica, died. Before the Vatican could name a successor, the Czech Government grabbed the bishopric. A communist priest, John Decht, appointed "administrator," assumed episcopal jurisdiction, and let it be known he would yield to no one. Since then, several other bishoprics have been taken over by Communist "vicars general" blithely exercising the administrative powers of the muted bishop, who has no way of disowning them.

Few were surprised when, on March 12, 1951, a triumphant Czech Government announced that three residential bishops and one titular bishop—Ficha, Trochta, Carski, and Laznik—had yielded at last and taken the people's democratic loyalty oath. Given a choice between seeing their jurisdictional functions usurped by Communist stooges, and of comforting their flock once again as "free" men, they had chosen the latter. With that, the power of the hierarchy was broken. The parish priest, hopelessly confused, and more and more frequently hitched up to a chain of command that ended in Moscow, could resist no more. Nine million Czech Catholics were adrift. From the Kremlin, Stalin could flash his Czech confederates a "well done."

There are roughly 50,000,000 Catholics living in Eastern Europe, and though it is generally agreed that fiercely Communist Czechoslovakia spearheads the drive against the Catholic Church, it is hard to say where things are better, and where they are worse.

Communist strategy everywhere adapts itself to local conditions. In one iron-curtain country Catholic schools still limp along; in a nearby country they've long since disappeared; in one, religious processions still use the streets, in another they are confined to the interior of the church or to the graveyard.

THE CHURCH IS SPARED—FOR PROPAGANDA

The least tormented area now under Red control is probably Eastern Germany. With the majority of German Catholics concentrated in the western zones, the Soviets still go slowly for propaganda reasons. By contrast, from sketchy reports available here, one might conclude that persecution has gone furthest in Lithuania, a heavily Catholic nation of 2,900,000 inhabitants where only 400 out of a prewar total of 1,600 priests are still around. The rest, including all of the country's 11 bishops, have disappeared from sight. In little Albania, where Catholics form a small minority, the clergy was disposed of by a method best described in one word, "massacre." By a recently passed law, Albania has cut off all relations between its Catholic citizens and Rome, and has announced it will subsidize and administer the church in Albania.

Tito's Yugoslavia, which first evolved some of the techniques now applied against the church throughout the communist countries, has called off the bloodhounds. The marshal recently offered to release Archbishop Stepinac, who, in October 1946, was sentenced to 16 years at hard labor. He did this with the stipulation that the Archbishop be recalled by the Holy See. The compromise was vetoed by Rome, which felt that acceptance might look like an admission of the primate's guilt.

The one country about which even the refugees are reluctant to talk is Poland. "Really, we've had little trouble so far," they say. "Let sleeping dogs lie." Perhaps because postwar Poland is 95 percent Catholic, the regime has been slow to apply the more drastic methods used elsewhere against the church. Although some 600 Polish priests and 1 bishop, Monsignor Kaczmarek, are in jail, many of them on unproved charges of wartime collaboration with the Germans, Catholic schools and newspapers still function, and people who saw this year's Corpus Christi procession in Warsaw have nothing but praise for the traffic police, who kept the main streets open with a smile.

Yet it is toward Poland that the Vatican now looks with the most profound concern. For Poland's hierarchy was the first to capitulate. On April 14, 1950, the secretary of the Polish episcopate and two bishops, acting on behalf of the entire clergy, put their signatures to a pact by which the Church solemnly condemned any anti-Government attitude, and promised to exhort the faithful to respect the authority of the state and to punish priests taking part in any secret or anti-Government movement. In return, the Government acknowledged the Pope's jurisdiction over the church in religious and spiritual matters. It further guaranteed the supervised freedom of Catholic teaching, the Catholic press, processions, and religious orders.

Rome, which could only guess at the pressure under which the bishops had signed, received the agreement with wide-eyed incredulity. However, now that the shock has been absorbed, the feeling here is that the Catholic Church, during its present ordeal, can afford to take a long-term view. In times of persecution, sources close to the Vatican explain, the church can back up a step or two to find a *modus vivendi*. It can yield what it considers legitimate rights in the fields of education, charity, and the press. As long as the concessions do not touch on dogma itself, or surrender a moral principle, they can be upheld.

When, last April, Poland's primate, Archbishop Stephen Wysynski, unexpectedly arrived in Rome for the official ad-limina visit which bishops are obliged to undertake periodically, Vatican observers were relieved to find him as warmly devoted to the Holy See as ever. They were struck, at the same time, by the unusual deportment of his traveling companion, Bishop Klepacz, of Lodz—one of the three signers of the 1950 pact. "He just wasn't his old forceful and outspoken self," one Vatican official said. "He walked as if in a dream and never opened his mouth." Together with the archbishop's secretary, the two visitors stopped at a Polish convent here and refused to see any of the important people who had rushed to Rome from several countries in the hope of obtaining a fresh view of iron-curtain developments. It has since become known that, in return for permission to go to Rome, the primate had agreed to do the Warsaw government a favor. While here he urged the Vatican to recognize as Polish bishoprics the former German dioceses taken over by Poland after the war. He was turned down; no peace treaty has as yet granted these regions to Poland.

New propaganda blasts against the clergy after the primate's arrival back home suggest that the shaky truce may have run its course. No longer useful to his Government the hapless archbishop may well be next in line for a "full confession" before the people's court. The guessing here is that his time is up.

It is in Red Hungary that the formula of striking the shepherd and dispersing the sheep—first evolved by Marshal Tito—has been developed to perfection. In this iron curtain country, where Catholics number 68 percent of the people, Church resistance centered around the person of the primate, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. On December 26, 1948, after an organized press campaign had denounced him as the chief enemy of the people's state, the cardinal became the first Prince of the Church to be arrested since the time of Napoleon. The rest is history, painfully remembered.

With the primate out of the way, the government confronted the lower clergy with the usual choice of "collaborate or suffer." Scores of priests were arrested and tortured. Monks and nuns were carted off to labor camps and concentration monasteries. A group known as the National Committee of Hungarian Catholic Priests began to demonstrate how church and state could live happily under the same roof. It was headed by Magr. Miklas Beresztoczy, a prominent clergyman who was sentenced together with Cardinal Mindszenty and who emerged from prison in the spring of 1950 with his fingernails torn off and his personality changed beyond recognition. No exact information is available here as to the number of his followers, but 150 peace priests seems to be a fair estimate. The organization publishes an anti-Vatican weekly called the Cross, which is graced with a rendition of Picasso's peace dove. Five of its leaders, among them the renovated Beresztoczy, were recently decorated with the Order of Merit of the people's republic.

Meanwhile, Archbishop Joseph Grösz, next in line of seniority to the imprisoned primate, had taken over Mindszenty's duties as head of the hierarchy. A quiet, unassuming man—"the son of a peasant, and proud of it," in the words of a friend—he was at first considered more tractable by the authorities than the impulsive cardinal. This appraisal seemed confirmed when, after a stiff series of church-state conferences, during which the pressure on the lower clergy steadily increased, Archbishop Grösz apparently felt the time had come to follow the example of the Polish bishops. On August 30, 1950, he signed, on behalf of the Hun-

garian hierarchy, a humiliating accord with the Government in which the bishops made four crucial concessions. They agreed to support the people's republic and punish all priests opposing it; they condemned the "exploitation of religious feelings and of the Catholic Church for political aims opposed to the state"; they threw their support behind the 5-year plan and land collectivization; they endorsed the peace movement and condemned warmongering and atomic weapons.

In return, the Government guaranteed complete religious freedom and, perhaps to take some of the hollow ring out of the phrase, reopened eight Catholic high schools. The state also undertook to finance the church, which had already been stripped of its properties, on a gradually diminishing scale for all of 18 years. (At the end of this period the Catholic Church in Hungary, presumably, would be either self-supporting or dead.) Unlike the Polish accord, the pact said nothing about papal jurisdiction.

Once he had signed the accord, Archbishop Grösz could be discarded. Last June he stood before the same expert judge who had sentenced Cardinal Mindszenty, as well as Robert Vogeler. He "confessed" to having led a movement to overthrow the Government and was sent to jail for 15 years.

When, last July, the nine not yet imprisoned bishops swore loyalty to the people's democratic state, Hungary's Red bosses could relax at last. What isolated pockets of resistance remained they'd have no trouble mopping up. The church in Hungary was beaten.

With this slow, crumbling process holding our attention, it is easy to forget that one entire segment of Rome's spiritual empire has all but disappeared. There are, or were, in eastern Europe some 5,500,000 Christians worshipping according to the eastern, or Oriental, rite of the Catholic church. Because their ancestors at one time belonged to the orthodox church—which split with Rome in the eleventh century—these Catholics still retain the old ritual and allow their priests to marry. But they are devoted sons of Rome, with which they have been reunited for several centuries.

For them, Stalin had a special recipe. It was first tried out in the Soviet Union, which, at the end of the war, found itself with 3,500,000 of these eastern-rite Catholics on its hands, most of them in the amputated part of Poland. Informed that their church no longer existed, these new citizens were told they now belonged to the orthodox church of Russia—the bell-ringing arm of the Soviet Government. To drive home the point, their priests and bishops were shipped off to Siberia.

Things were less simple when it came to the 1,570,000 eastern-rite Catholics in Rumania, the 320,000 in Czechoslovakia, and the 195,000 in Hungary. The invitation was always the same: Return to the orthodox mother church. At this writing, Hungary's lone eastern-rite bishopric is still relatively free; there is no orthodox church there to do the absorbing. But Czechoslovakia's eastern-rite Catholics have fared badly. Their organization was swallowed by the tiny local branch of the orthodox church, their bishop sentenced to life imprisonment, and their churches declared orthodox.

In Rumania, where 75 percent of the population are orthodox, the greater part of the Catholic community belonged to the eastern rite. Known for its intensive work in the field of primary education, this eastern-rite clergy was considered particularly dangerous. When all appeals for it to break with Rome were ignored, the Government got 36 priests to announce, early in October 1948, that their church had returned to the Orthodox Church. With that, the Catholic Church of the eastern rite officially ceased

to exist. Priests refusing to knuckle under were given the full treatment, the methods ranging from crude blackmail to indescribable tortures and slow death. By now, one-quarter of the former eastern-rite clergy have taken their places in the ranks of the Rumanian Orthodox Church, whose patriarch, a former horse dealer, boasts he was a Communist when Rumania was still under a king.

Painfully scrawled letters, arriving at the Vatican by circuitous routes, ask: "Shall we bury our dead like dogs? There is no Catholic priest here." "How can I baptize my baby?" "Can we marry a young couple at home?" Radio Vatican—and people do listen, under the bed covers—tries to give the answers: "Only in extreme emergencies call an Orthodox priest. Stay faithful. Do as follows . . ."

As for Rumania's 1,235,000 Catholics of the western, or Latin rite, the national-church formula sufficed. A Catholic action committee, founded in April 1950, and headed by a turncoat priest, Andrea Agatha, now speaks for the democratic clergy. Since the expulsion, in July 1950, of the papal representative, Archbishop G. P. O'Hara, of Savannah, Ga., little news has been available here from Rumania. We know, however, that many churches are closed—two of the finest serve as ballet schools—and that between 300 and 400 priests are in jail. All of the country's 11 Catholic bishops—5 of the Latin rite, 6 of the eastern rite—have been arrested. Two have died in jail and a third, 81-year-old Bishop Pacha, is reported to be doing forced labor on the Danube-Black Sea Canal.

As Eastern Europe's battered clergy looks to the Holy See for comfort and protection, there is little Rome can offer. It has at its command spiritual weapons only, and their effect on the disciples of Marx is problematic at best. Ever since the Vatican decree of 1949, denying the sacraments to professing Communists, the church has made judicious use of its harshest penalty, excommunication, against the enemies of God. Among iron curtain priests thus expelled from the community of the faithful are the leaders of Czechoslovakia's schismatic Catholic Action; Andrea Agatha, the Rumanian priest heading the Catholic Action Committee; and John Dechet, the Czech priest wielding episcopal jurisdiction as administrator of a bishopric.

The next move, clearly, is up to Stalin. With Red administrators and vicars already usurping the jurisdictional functions of the bishops, what is there to prevent the Communists from enthroning puppet bishops? All they'd have to do is force one of the many legitimate bishops now in jail to consecrate, as bishop, a renegade priest. Endowed with the spiritual powers of a Roman Catholic bishop, the renegade could then proceed to ordain new priests and consecrate new bishops. The chain reaction obviously would break the church in two.

Confronted with this prospect, the Vatican is helpless. The prison-cell consecration would be valid in the eyes of the church, despite the presence of duress, provided the consecrator, for some reason, did not withhold his intention. Merely to discourage aspirants a Vatican decree of April 9, 1951, ruled that any bishop, archbishop, or cardinal who consecrates a new bishop without the approval of Rome incurs the severest form of excommunication, even though he may have been coerced by grave fear. The bishop thus consecrated faces the same punishment.

Should Stalin decide to go ahead and beget a line of new Red bishops, the future of the people's democratic church would be assured. Then what? Once again the Church of Rome is preparing to go underground. Already, behind drawn shades, laymen well

grounded in the faith and society ordained as priests, say mass in private homes. Men in overalls or business suits, secretly consecrated as bishops, have taken over in some dioceses where the bishop is no longer free. "We are going back to the catacombs," said one priest from far behind the curtain. "Hard times are ahead, harder than the church has known for centuries."

The Complete Watershed Program in Flood Control—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the newspaper editors flood control meeting, Lincoln, Nebr., August 11, 1951:

THE COMPLETE WATERSHED PROGRAM IN FLOOD CONTROL

It is a real inspiration to me as a soil conservationist to meet with you newspaper editors assembled here in Lincoln to consider the critical problem of flood control. It is a significant milestone, I think, in the Nation's march toward preserving its basic soil and water resources, when several hundred busy editors come together this way, on their own initiative and at their own expense, to discuss ways of achieving sound and effective flood control in this breadbasket of the Nation.

The recent flood catastrophe in Kansas and neighboring States has, once more, focused attention on the urgent need for doing the very best we know how to prevent the recurrence of disastrous floods which every year somewhere in this area, as well as in other parts of the country, tear down across productive farmland and through prosperous towns and cities. The effects of floods are very real to you people right here in Lincoln and throughout southeastern Nebraska after your experience of May and June last year, and again this year.

FLOOD CONTROL IS URGENT

What can be done—what must be done—to prevent the staggering losses in crops, property, and even human life, depends in large degree on the determination and efforts of you people who are in this audience today.

Some among you may feel that we cannot afford the cost of flood control in these times of national emergency. As a civil servant, I did not come here to tell you what the Nation's policy should be in this regard. That is for you, the people to say. But there are some things I can tell you.

First, the rivers out here did not wait until we had settled our score with the Communists before they decided to go on a rampage. We hope that neither we nor our children will live to see another flood catastrophe like this last one. But, unfortunately, we can be certain that, emergency or no emergency, costly floods, in all probability, will strike again next year, and the next, somewhere in Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, or other parts of the Nation.

Secondly, I can tell you that it is possible to control these floods. It is possible to eliminate almost completely the smaller and

more localized floods, and it is practicable to greatly reduce the damages from tremendous storms that cause super floods like this last one.

COORDINATED FLOOD CONTROL PLANS ARE ESSENTIAL

No single method of flood control, however, will do the whole job. We have seen in this great flood, for example, how levees high enough to have withstood the largest previous floods of record were overtopped. On the other hand, we have also seen how the soils of some of our best pasture lands became so saturated with water after 2 months of heavy rains that they could absorb very little more from the final big rain. No, to meet all kinds of flood conditions, and to prevent or minimize flood damages wherever they occur, we must use every available method of control.

We must develop a sound, coordinated plan for every watershed to assure a properly balanced and truly effective attack directed toward prevention of flood damage. The day of piecemeal flood control—where only a part of the damages in a watershed are considered—is rapidly drawing to a close.

Our efforts to control floods must begin where the rain strikes the ground. We must get what water we can into the soil and hold or retard the runoff of the excess on farm fields by soil conservation practices applied on the land as needed. What does run off the fields into the drainage ways and creeks we must slow down with small retarding structures and with grass, crop rotations, contouring, and so on. What flows out of the creeks we will have to handle in the main river valleys by more imposing measures, such as reservoirs and levees. Our job of flood control begins then where the raindrop falls and it does not end until the water reaches the ocean.

The important problem now confronting all of us is to determine, in cooperation with each other, what kinds and combinations of measures are needed, watershed by watershed, to accomplish the most effective flood control we can afford. In doing so we must, of course, bear in mind our continuing need for irrigation storage, for power production, for municipal water supply, for pollution abatement, for preserving fish and wildlife resources, and especially the need for maintaining maximum agricultural production on fertile valley lands. Our watershed plans must provide not only for the control of floodwaters, but also for their conservation for beneficial use. In this connection, let us bear in mind that the limited number of available sites for larger reservoirs should, wherever possible, be considered with respect to multiple land and water needs before they are dedicated solely to flood control.

There are several reasons why sound and enduring flood control, aimed to benefit all the people, can be achieved only through a coordinated attack. The first of these reasons is apparent from a glance at the distribution of flood damages. Although some engineers may dispute what I say—and might even quote Webster against me—I submit that flood damages begin where the rain falls on the land, regardless of what Webster may have thought about it when he was living. The crops on upland farms that are swept down by storms that cause great floods are just as truly lost as the crops on overflowed land in the valley below. The soil washed off upland fields reduces the productivity of the land just as much as does deposition of soil by the water flooding over agricultural bottom-lands along the rivers. Floodwater damages to agricultural lands in thousands of miles of small creek bottoms throughout our watersheds represent just as much loss per acre as flooding of the wide Missouri River Valley between Kansas City and St. Louis.

1951 FLOOD DAMAGES ON UPSTREAM WATERSHEDS

The Soil Conservation Service has just completed a preliminary survey of the storm and flood damages in Kansas and Nebraska during July. This is what we found. Losses of crops on upland farms amounted to approximately \$110,000,000. Losses or irreplaceable topsoil, the thin and fertile layer that sustains agriculture in this granary of the Nation, has been estimated at \$200,000,000. This figure is based on the differences we have found in crop yields with different depths of topsoil. Losses from floodwater and sediment in the creek bottoms and small stream valleys, above the points where anyone has yet proposed specific flood protection measures, were estimated at \$102,000,000. The total of these three figures is \$412,000,000. Additional losses in Missouri, Oklahoma, Iowa, Illinois, and other neighboring States would bring the total to well over a half billion dollars in the one month of July.

Without in any way minimizing the staggering losses at Kansas City and along the major river valleys, we believe that these astounding damages along the tributaries are convincing evidence that a flood-control program aimed only at downstream cities and river bottoms is only a partial flood-control program and not one designed to benefit all the people who have suffered losses.

Let me give you another reason why this country needs a coordinated and complete flood-control program extending to every acre all the way down to the sea. To be sure, superfoods like this last one are comparatively rare events. I am told that the flood discharge at Kansas City far exceed the highest ever previously experienced, which was back in 1844. When an event exceeds all previous expectations and wrecks such havoc, it not only makes banner headlines, but it becomes an historic classic. It gets into our memories and textbooks. People come to look on it as characteristic rather than something rare—or unique. Actually, if one spreads the enormous damage caused by this flood over all the years between such rare events, the average annual loss is considerably less than the damages from all the smaller local floods than occur year after year in the smaller watersheds throughout Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Oklahoma, Iowa, and Illinois. A typical example of the smaller, more frequent floods has occurred here on Salt Creek these last 2 years. You local people are only too familiar with this kind of flood.

UPPER WATERSHEDS ARE SOURCE OF MOST FLOOD LOSSES

Our surveys show that 75 percent of our average annual flood loss has occurred above the main river valleys and large cities. This, of course, is due in no small measure to the fact that a substantial part of our major river flood plains and cities are already protected by levees and major reservoirs, for which credit is due primarily to the effective work of the Army's Corps of Engineers.

I can give you still other reasons why a coordinated approach to flood control is essential. Soil erosion on watershed lands must be brought under control to protect downstream flood-control works. We must control erosion to protect our flood-control reservoirs from rapid silting and loss of effectiveness. We must control erosion to prevent the silting of stream channels, which further reduces their flood-containing capacity. We must control erosion, moreover, to prevent overwash of infertile sand and subsoil material on our productive bottomlands. But even more important than all of these, we must control soil erosion if we are to maintain the base of our agriculture, our national strength and defense, and indeed prevent our civilization going the way of many great nations of the past which failed to take care of their agricultural land.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE'S FLOOD-CONTROL POLICY

So that there may be no mistake about where we stand in the Soil Conservation Service, let me reaffirm:

1 That we believe, and our widely multiplied experience confirms, that flood control is a job which begins where the rains fall and the runoff starts; that is, in the fields and pastures, and forests, and ends only when the runoff has safely reached the ocean.

2 That we believe wholeheartedly in coordinated planning and treatment of entire watersheds and drainage basins in cooperation with the Army Corps of Engineers, with soil-conservation districts, with watershed associations, and with all other Federal, State, and local agencies that have a responsibility in land and water management.

3. That the work of the Soil Conservation Service is in the fields and pastures and wood lots on the upstream tributaries of the major rivers. Our job is first to assist landowners and operators to use their land within its capability, and to treat it with sound conservation practices in accordance with its needs. Beyond this, our job is to assist organizations of local people to install upstream flood-prevention measures, such as small retarding structures, gully plugs, and channel improvements. If through such a program we can cause the water which falls on the lands in the upper watersheds, or even a considerable part of it, to delay its race to the sea, we have by that action won part of our objective—completed part of the job.

But this kind of program alone will not prevent flooding of the main river valleys and the cities in them.

I understand that some of your local papers have editorially attributed to soil conservationists claims to the effect that the amount of money spent on large flood-control reservoirs would, if spent in the watersheds, dry up the rivers. I don't believe any employee of the Soil Conservation Service ever thoughtfully made such a statement. If he did, I repudiate it here and now. In my opinion, additional controls such as reservoirs, levees, and other main channel protective works will be needed to safeguard the flood plains of our major rivers against such disasters as we have just experienced. This trunk-channel job is the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers, which has ably fulfilled its part of the job for more than a century.

4 We believe that coordination of the river control and watershed programs was the intent of Congress when it passed the Flood Control Act of 1936. We believe it is still the intent of Congress. We do not believe that Congress intended one program to be in any sense a substitute for the other, but rather that they should be complementary parts of a single job.

The Complete Watershed Program in Flood Control—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at the newspaper editors' flood-control meeting, Lincoln, Nebr., August 11, 1951:

The Flood Control Act of 1936 and subsequent acts provide all the authority needed

by the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers to work together in planning and carrying out a complete program for alleviating flood damages and conserving soil and water resources. Such watershed and river basin plans for flood control, as we see it, involve three principal types of operations, namely:

PRINCIPLES OF WATERSHED-RIVER BASIN TREATMENT

1. Land treatment: Our conservation farm and ranch planning is based on the principle of treating every acre of land according to its need, and using each acre according to its capabilities (that is, for cultivated crops, grass, timber, or wildlife). It also includes safe and orderly disposal of runoff water originating on the farm or ranch. Land-treatment measures prevent erosion, maintain soil fertility, conserve water by storing it in the soil, prevent damage on the farm from the erosive action of rainfall and runoff, and reduce the sediment loads of creeks and rivers. Land-treatment measures are now being rapidly installed by landowners throughout this area—as well as in other areas—under the programs of the locally organized soil conservation districts, aided by technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and by other forms of assistance such as educational and financial. We have ample authority for this part of the program, but funds available for technical assistance fall far short of the need. If we expect to achieve substantial flood protection in the next 10 to 15 years

2. Upstream engineering for waterflow retardation and channel stabilization. This phase of the watershed plan involves work on the tributaries and waterways to control or retard runoff from neighboring farms. These measures alleviate damage to the agriculture of the smaller watersheds above the downstream engineering works. It slows runoff and stabilizes sources of sediment in upstream channels.

We are doing these things now just as rapidly as our facilities permit.

3. Downstream engineering for flood control. This comprises the work done on the major waterways to control runoff after it has reached the main stream. It alleviates urban damages and damage to agriculture in the flood plains of the major rivers. This major engineering work is the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers.

There you have, as we understand it, a coordinated approach to flood prevention and control—a program that protects the farmer or rancher of the uplands as well as of the lowlands, while protecting the cities, too.

Congress has so far authorized watershed programs, including land treatment and upstream engineering, on 11 watersheds in different parts of the country. Many of you no doubt are acquainted with the work under way on the Little Sioux watershed of northwestern Iowa, and the Washita River of Oklahoma. We are carrying out the works of improvement in these two flood-control projects—as in the other nine—primarily through the farmers' soil conservation districts. In all instances our work is coordinated with the authorized work of the Army engineers farther downstream.

NEBRASKA'S SALT-WAHOO WATERSHED IS GOOD ILLUSTRATION

We need go no farther than the city limits of Lincoln—into the Salt-Wahoo watershed—to find what is to my mind a splendid example of the coordinated watershed approach to flood control. Here is a striking illustration of effective community cooperation, including the Salt-Wahoo Watershed Association, which is made up of city people and farmers in soil-conservation districts, the Soil Conservation Service, the Army engineers, and other local, State, and Federal agencies.

Joint studies of this watershed are being made now by our Service and the Army engineers under authority of the Flood Control Act of 1936. We hope that this study will lead to authorization of a coordinated program for flood control in this area similar to that already authorized in 11 other watersheds. I think the soundness of this cooperative approach was well stated in the progress report on the joint watershed survey made by these two agencies (Army engineers and Soil Conservation Service). The report pointed out that the two agencies had one objective in this study—that is, to prepare an over-all plan for the entire watershed "which will represent, from the standpoint of both agencies, the best plan for the basin as a whole which is practicable within the limits of economic feasibility, and one which both agencies can recommend and support without reservation."

"Both agencies feel," the report added, "that this objective can best be realized by a joint study which will produce a single plan mutually developed by both agencies rather than a compromise between two individual plans developed by the two agencies acting independently."

The Salt-Wahoo undertaking also graphically illustrates the importance and effectiveness of local group action in watershed planning and development. Here, as elsewhere, the local soil-conservation districts are taking an important part in the permanent watershed program. As the principal organization through which soil and water conservation measures are being applied to the land by individual farmers the country over, it is only logical that these districts also should be called on to serve directly in such flood-control activities in the public interest.

IMPORTANCE OF GROUP ACTION—SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

By the same token, the Salt-Wahoo situation shows why there is a place for an advisory group, committee, or association like the Salt-Wahoo Association, which brings together the interests of farmers and city people. In other words, for a watershed-development program to operate successfully—in Nebraska, Kansas, or anywhere else—the basic responsibility for that program must involve the people residing in the watershed. That means there must be a local responsible organization such as a soil-conservation district, watershed association, or flood-control district, which is representative of all the interests in the watershed and which can act to coordinate the activities and services of all agencies and interests to formulate the necessary broad, flexible program for watershed development and protection.

We have found that the most efficient way of carrying the soil- and water-conservation job beyond the planning stage anywhere is through coordinated group action of the landowners and operators—with technical and other assistance from other sources. Group action is especially effective, and necessary, in dealing with problems of watershed extent. Soil-conservation districts themselves, of course, are basically group-action devices; and their efficiency and success in this direction have been proved by their rapid organization and growth. In only 14 years, approximately 2,350 such districts have been formed in the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. They now include more than four-fifths of the farms and ranches in the United States and three-fourths of the country's farm land. Fortunately, the area you editors represent is largely within soil-conservation districts. Nebraska, for example, is one of 10 States completely covered by soil conservation districts. Kansas is not far behind with more than 99 percent of its area in districts; while Iowa is 98½ percent covered. If your county doesn't yet have a district, I recommend that you urge the local people to organize one.

SPECIAL TECHNICAL SKILLS ESSENTIAL IN WATERSHED TREATMENT

Let me emphasize, however, that planning and application of the watershed program requires special technical skills. Downstream, as you know, the highest order of engineering skill is necessary for building big dams, main channel stabilization works, and so on. Also, in the uplands technical know-how is required to plan and apply sound land treatment and upstream-engineering measures. Such plans must be based on painstaking research and on wide practical experience. They must take into account the principles of hydrology, engineering, agronomy, land science, forestry, biology, and other related fields. Under varying conditions of climate, topography, and drainage, the wrong thing done, or the right thing left undone, or any part of a farm can do serious injury.

In no event can this watershed planning and treatment be accomplished overnight by some magic formula, although it takes heavy rains and excessive run-off only a few days, or even hours, to do irreparable damage to watershed land and property. Our conservation land-treatment and upstream-engineering activities are based, in the first place, on detailed land-capability surveys. They show, acre by acre, the needs and capabilities of the land in relation to combinations of such factors as soil, slope, rainfall, erosion, and so on. Our watershed plans involve the location of sites for small floodwater-retarding structures, water-disposal systems, gully-control structures, streambank stabilization, and other upstream-engineering measures.

Our Soil Conservation Service technicians work out on the land cooperatively with farmers, covering entire farms, acre by acre, and field by field. We cannot depend on windshield surveys and office planning in doing a job of the complexity and magnitude of safeguarding the farm lands of the Nation. Nor can we have a ready-made plan including a fixed set of practices to slap on any farm or watershed. Land, and the behavior of the water that falls on it, differs from watershed to watershed, from farm to farm, and from acre to acre. So every watershed and each parcel of land must be dealt with individually.

That, briefly, is how we go about the treatment of agricultural land for effective soil conservation and flood control. We have developed a unique combination of soil conservation, engineering, and vegetative practices designed to dispose of surplus water safely while making the best practical use of the water that otherwise would be wasted. For the first time in history, we are going into the small watersheds to do everything possible to provide relief from recurring flood damages.

FLOOD CONTROL BENEFITS DEMONSTRATED

Splendid examples of the effectiveness of tributary stream flood control can be cited from the experience of the Soil Conservation Service.

On May 16, this year, Sandstone Creek with a watershed of 65,000 acres, southeast of Cheyenne, Okla., had 4½ inches of rainfall. The watershed had been treated for soil conservation and flood control. The runoff water did not even come up to the drawdown pipes in the dams. None of the permanent pools were filled. Sandstone Creek, which had been noted for its flooding, contributed practically no flow to the Washita River, while other similar creeks of the locality were flooding and doing great damage.

Farther west, near Clinton, during the same wet period, the Barnitz Creek watershed received about 13 inches of rain within 24 hours. Within its watershed of 4,000 acres four detention structures had been built and the usual surface treatment of terracing, regrassing, contouring, and the like had been completed. The creek stayed within its banks while neighboring creeks did great damage with this same precipitation.

WATERSHED TREATMENT ALSO PROTECTS RESERVOIRS

Rates of silting have been measured two or three times in some reservoirs—first, before any conservation work was done on their watersheds and again after a substantial part of the needed conservation measures had been applied. Treatment of about 40 percent of the watershed resulted in a 33 percent reduction in the silting rate of the municipal reservoir at High Point, N. C. In contrast, it was found that more intensive use of land for row crops and lack of conservation measures caused an increase of 20 percent in the silting rate of the water supply reservoir at Decatur, Ill.

In conclusion, let me say that with whatever resources we are provided the Soil Conservation Service will continue to work toward sound soil conservation, wise land use, and protection of the Nation's water resources as well as its land. We will do this in cooperation with local, State, and Federal agencies, or with any other organizations and groups which have like objectives. In working toward the permanent solution of our water problems, the service will continue to give full consideration to all beneficial water uses, including those for recreation and wildlife. Also, the service will continue to encourage conservation districts and other conservation organizations to use, to the fullest extent practicable, all available assistance from public and private sources.

Our men throughout the field are acquainted with the principles I have mentioned and I am sure you may count on their living up to them to the fullest possible extent. We will actively cooperate with soil conservation districts and other similar groups. This, together with the positive support of agencies and community leaders like those represented here, who are in a position to help, will expedite the conservation program throughout the country.

We have the knowledge of how to do the job, the conservation tools have been perfected and tested, we have an organization equipped not only with the necessary technical skills, but with the knowledge and understanding to work with local people, individual farmers, community groups, organized districts and associations, city people, and industries as well. As a Nation we have no excuse for not doing the job of conserving our basic soil and water resources; indeed we dare not shirk it, because our individual and national security, peace, and prosperity depend on it.

Antidiscrimination Legislation Has Worked and Is Working in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am, as Members know, an enthusiastic supporter of a Fair Employment Practice Act because I know that the law can help form folkways. Certainly when the Supreme Court struck down the civil-rights statutes over 50 years ago a powerful shove was given to latent racism; the momentum of that shove is only now being overcome.

In the May issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* there appeared a scholarly article by Mr. Will Maslow showing that

New York's State fair-employment-practices law has worked in New York and is continuing to work, and that there is no longer any question of its value in an industrially strong democracy.

To save space, I have omitted all footnotes and references and a portion of the text which does not affect the main thesis.

PREJUDICE, DISCRIMINATION, AND THE LAW

(By Will Maslow)

In December 1944 a New York legislative investigating committee recommended the enactment of a State fair employment practice law. The bill introduced to carry out the committee's recommendations proposed the creation of a State commission against discrimination with power to investigate complaints, hold public hearings, and issue cease-and-desist orders enforceable in the courts. At that juncture, six distinguished New York citizens, including Oswald Garrison Villard, all of whom strongly opposed racial or religious discrimination, wrote to the *New York Times* on February 13, 1945, opposing the fair-employment-practice bill as a remedy worse than the disease. They urged that it was far wiser to rely on the force of slow but steadily growing public opinion than on any coercive legislation. Their view was not shared, however, by the Republican-dominated legislature, which quickly adopted the first State FEP law.

The lugubrious prophecies of the six liberals have not been fulfilled. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination has not been overwhelmed with claims. It has been demonstrated that it is possible to lessen discriminatory practices by law and serious harm has not been done to the entire antidiscrimination movement. On the contrary, since 1945 seven other States (New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Washington, Oregon, and New Mexico) have enacted FEP measures modeled on New York's Ives-Quinn law. Two States (New York and Massachusetts) have adopted fair educational practices laws. Two others (New Jersey and Connecticut) have created new administrative machinery to enforce prohibitions against discrimination in hotels, restaurants, theaters, and other places of public accommodation. Finally, six States (Indiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin) have forbidden discrimination in housing built with the assistance of the State, the so-called urban redevelopment projects.

DISCRIMINATION DISTINGUISHED FROM PREJUDICE

But even were we to accept this popular notion, discrimination as distinguished from prejudice could still be attacked successfully. Many victims of discrimination cannot wait upon the long difficult, and uncertain process of eradicating prejudiced attitudes. They are concerned here and now with hostile acts. They are willing to risk working, studying, living with bigots, if only they may be granted opportunities still denied them. Whether or not rigid subjective attitudes can be softened, this group seeks to attack outward behavior so that it may reap the fruit of such work. Even if legislation had no effect on prejudicial attitudes or worsened them, this group would nevertheless press for curbs on discrimination.

Fortunately, we know a great deal more about prejudice and discrimination than was known a generation ago. We know that they are different phenomena, differently motivated and responding to different treatment. We can no longer accept as a simple axiom that prejudice causes all discrimination and that removing the latter is impossible unless the former likewise is extirpated. We know, for example, that many a person conforms to the discriminatory patterns of his group, not because he is prejudiced but because it is easier to discriminate than to

resist the group's demand for conformity. We know, too, that attitudes do not automatically flower into behavior, and that whether or not a prejudiced person acts in accordance with his beliefs depends on many factors, not the least of which is the community's notion of what is right and proper. We also know that while some prejudice is based on misinformation, a more significant root cause is the status gain achieved by looking down on an inferior group. Finally, recent studies of the authoritarian and prejudiced personality indicate that hatred and hostility toward large groups in our society are essentially a displacement into other channels of aggression bred by frustration.

THE CONFORMITY FACTOR

Much discrimination does not stem from prejudiced attitudes but from the need to conform to prevailing social standards. When Dr. Cheln refers to as the "conformity dimension of prejudice" plays a large role in sustaining discriminatory behavior. As he points out, "educational measures applied to this dimension only succeed in engendering guilt feelings" and perhaps hostility toward the victim of the discrimination. The importance of this conformity is likewise stressed by Professor Merton, who describes the "fair-weather liberal or the unprejudiced discriminator who follows community patterns without believing in them.

In no community, no matter how prejudiced, is there a uniformity of attitude. Northerners are prone to regard the South as one undifferentiated mass of bigotry. Such a conclusion is of course preposterous. The best demonstration of its falsity is the elaborate legal measures designed by the southern lawmaker to create and reinforce prejudice. If everyone in the South looked at the Negro with contempt and revulsion, it would not be necessary to enact laws (and occasionally to punish violators) forbidding racial intermarriage and rigorously commanding the separation of Negro and white. Southern Jim Crow laws are designed to whip the rebel, the nonconformist, and the laggard in line. It is this minority lacking prejudice but conforming to the mores that would readily accept and obey a statute which forbids antisocial or discriminatory behavior.

How large this minority is, even in the South, is indicated by recent opinion polls. A survey of factory workers' opinions by the McGraw-Hill research department showed that 48 percent of southern workers approved a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. A Gallup (American Institute of Public Opinion) poll of January 17, 1949, revealed that one-third of southern whites favored a Federal antilynching law, and one-sixth did not believe that Negroes should be segregated on interstate railways or busses.

Recent findings by psychologists indicate that conventionality and submissiveness to authority play a significant role in the prejudiced personality, that "he would be impressed by legal restraints against discrimination," and that his "self-restraint would increase as minority groups became stronger through being protected." Such an insight leads the way to the profound conclusion that, if prejudice causes discrimination, discrimination causes prejudice, and that an attack on either will lessen the other.

EXPERIENCE IN HOUSING PROJECTS

New York City in the last decade has been engaged in a tremendous public housing program. Today 50,000 families, about 200,000 persons, live in such housing projects in that city. All of that housing is completely biracial and unsegregated. The administrators of this vast housing program were concerned with providing shelter for those desperately in need of decent homes. Psychologists, however, wondered what effect this

living together had in an atmosphere where Negro and white were considered as equal and where there were no all-Negro or all-white projects or buildings or even wings. They compared the attitudes of housewives in two New York City housing projects with two comparable Newark, N. J., projects where Negroes and whites lived in the same development but were assigned to different buildings or portions of buildings. Having satisfied themselves that both groups of tenants were people of similar education and circumstances, who possessed similar attitudes toward Negroes before moving into these housing developments, they learned that after living in such projects:

1. The attitudes of the housewives in the two integrated projects were considerably less prejudiced than those in the two segregated ones. From 10 to 13 percent spontaneously revealed prejudice in the former, as against 31 to 38 percent in the latter.

2. Two-thirds of the housewives in the integrated projects reported a desire to be friendly with their Negro neighbors, as against one-tenth in the segregated projects.

3. In the segregated projects from 72 to 82 percent stated that they would rather not live in the same buildings with Negroes; in the integrated projects the corresponding percentages were 22 to 25 percent.

4. Finally, and most significantly, the percentage of those who themselves reported a changed attitude in favor of Negroes was 59 and 62 percent in the integrated projects, and only 13 and 17 percent in the segregated ones.

So we find that an effort to eliminate discrimination has resulted in significant changes of attitudes, in a lessening of prejudice more substantial than could have been achieved by frontal assaults on mental states.

IN THE ARMY AND IN DETROIT

The same change of attitudes took place under dramatic circumstances during the fighting in France. Faced with a shortage of combat troops, the theater command of the Army invited Negro service troops in the area, then serving in segregated units, to volunteer for combat service in white divisions. Negro soldiers organized into platoons were then placed in white regiments in 11 white combat divisions, where they fought side by side with white troops for months.

Thereafter, white officers and men in seven of the divisions were interviewed, including two divisions composed of men predominantly southern in background. Although two out of every three white men admitted that at first they had been unfavorable to the idea of serving alongside of colored platoons, three out of every four stated that the feeling had changed after this combat service. The response of the southerners varied only slightly from that of nonsoutherners.

That living or working together on a plane of equality results in a lessening of prejudice was demonstrated by the experiences in the Detroit race riot of June 21, 1943. Although this bloody riot raged through the entire city, competent observers reported no untoward incidents in mixed neighborhoods where whites had lived alongside of Negroes, in the Detroit war factories where integrated employment was the rule, or in Wayne University, in the heart of Detroit, where Negro and white students continued their classes without any friction.

These experiments have great potentialities in race relations. They show not only that discrimination may be lessened without first removing prejudice but also that removing discrimination results as a by-product in a lessening of prejudice. Thus, as Roscoe Pound has observed, law makes habits instead of waiting for them to grow.

PROOF OF DISCRIMINATION

There is a widespread skepticism about the effectiveness of antidiscrimination laws which arises from the notion that it is difficult, if not impossible, to prove a case of

discrimination. Professor Saenger, in another of his studies, asked a sample of residents of New York City whether they believed the Ives-Quinn law could be effective. Sixty-nine percent of the Jews questioned did not have confidence in such legislation. The reason for this lack of confidence was the belief that an employer could always conceal the basis for his biased rejection of an applicant and that the law was too clumsy an instrument to reveal the truth.

That there are difficulties in proving an individual case of discrimination goes without saying, but Government agencies have been able to establish not only racial or religious bias but motivations far more complex. The simple fact is that discrimination involving any considerable group of persons over any considerable period of time cannot be concealed. The National Labor Relations Board has experienced no difficulty in establishing an employer's discrimination against union men in every incident of the employment relationship: hiring, promotion, transfer, and discharge. There are now over 86 volumes of NLRB decisions which record countless unsuccessful efforts of employers to conceal antiunion actions. When the Wagner Act became law in 1935, there were about 3,000,000 organized trade-unionists in the country. Ten years later, before the Taft-Hartley Act weakened the powers of the NLRB, the number of trade-unionists had risen to 15,000,000—an increase which most observers attribute in large part to the zealous enforcement of the Wagner Act. Racial or religious discrimination is in principle easier to detect, because it is directed against entire groups instead of specific individuals.

Most discrimination is crude and avowed. The factory which gives Negroes menial jobs only, the restricted development which bars Jews, the copper mine which pays Latin Americans less than "Anglos" for the same quality and quantity of work, the medical school which puts a quota on the number of Jews it admits—all of these are vulnerable to any governmental investigation.

Six years' enforcement of the New York and New Jersey FEP laws indicates that even cautious and slow-moving administrators are able to prove discrimination when in fact it exists. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination, in investigating a complaint, examines the over-all policies, practices, and patterns of an employer, as well as the merits of the individual complainant. It is significant that in almost 6 years of operation it found an over-all discriminatory policy in 403 cases even though there was no merit to the complaint of the individual who first brought the problem to SCAD's attention.

DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

Proving discrimination in education likewise presents no insuperable difficulties. In 1948 David S. Berkowitz made a study of educational discrimination for the New York State Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University, in which he established the statistical principles upon which discrimination, that is, unequal treatment, could be proved. Any investigator who follows his analysis, examining both the rejected and the successful applications to a school and sorting them as to the factors, avowed and suspected, upon which selection is made, will be able to establish discrimination against a group, even though not against a particular individual.

Of course, the enterprises or institutions which will be regulated by a proposed statute will always find arguments against legislation. The Association of American Colleges meeting in 1948, while conceding the prevalence of discriminatory practices against racial and religious groups, urged education and voluntary action instead of coercive legislation. The association feared that such legislation would threaten the freedom of colleges now independent of political control.

It suggested therefore the appointment of a national commission under the auspices of the association which would launch an active program to broaden educational opportunity. Such a commission on minority groups was appointed, but, according to its 1949 and 1950 annual reports, it planned nothing, did nothing, and merely endorsed the voluntary action of other educators.

A more disinterested group of educators, the President's Commission on Higher Education, while urging educational institutions to act as pioneering agents in fighting discrimination, pointed out that the urgency of the issues did not promise to let a satisfactory democratic outcome await tardy voluntary action. In recommending State fair educational practice laws, it observed: "Where assurances of good conduct in the fields of public concern have not been forthcoming from citizens' groups, the passage of laws to enforce good conduct has been the corrective method of a democratic society.

LEGISLATION IS EDUCATIVE

An unfortunate dichotomy is sometimes made between legislation and education, as if they were conflicting techniques. The fact is that legislation thrives best when it receives the alert and informed support of the entire community. That support can be quickened and nourished by an educational campaign which attempts to encourage voluntary compliance with its provisions, to inform its direct beneficiaries how they can utilize it, to correct misinformation, and in general to transform the commands of the statute into the behavior patterns of the community. Even the campaign for the enactment of a bill is itself an educational device which stimulates the flow of information, stirs advocates and opponents to debate, and transforms the sociological problem into a popular issue. Thereafter, every step in the enforcement of such a law provides opportunities for the deepening of popular understanding and the awakening of support: the issuance of regulations, the public hearing, the announcement of cases settled, and the annual report. Civic agencies share with government the obligation to participate in this effort to educate.

Of course, the converse is also true. Carey McWilliams in a seminal essay has shown that antioriental prejudice [on the west coast] becomes a part of the mores in large part as a result of incessant propaganda and agitation for the enactment of various [antioriental] legislative proposals.

Law itself is an educational device. As Dicey has pointed out: "No facts play a more important part in the creation of public opinion than laws themselves." The enactment of a law is often the signal for a reappraisal of past thinking and past behavior, and the replacement of attitudes and conduct based on unthinking conformance to outmoded patterns. Cantril reports that after statutes were enacted repealing the arms embargo, instituting conscription, and repealing prior neutrality laws there was a 10-percent rise in opinion favorable to these actions, compared with opinion before the statutes were adopted.

USEFULNESS OF LEGISLATION

Granting the effectiveness of well-drafted laws which can be enforced, there will always be those who insist that particular legislation is not timely, that it does not have popular support, and that consequently it will boomerang. One short answer is that our legislative bodies are so slow to move, so resistant to new ideas, so packed with representatives of rural areas, that legislation really in advance of popular understanding and support will not be enacted. The civic agency which seeks a legislative reform need not be deterred, therefore, by the fear that it is acting precipitately. It will not succeed until the legislators who possess

more sensitive instruments for listening to the public pulse believe the times are ripe. Meanwhile, even the premature and, therefore, unsuccessful legislative campaign prepares the way for the future.

Of course, legislation, in the sense of statutory commands or prohibitions, will not solve every problem in race relations. When gang fights occur in a city like Boston between Jewish and Irish Catholic boys or between those of Irish and Italian descent, we are in an area where the heavy hand of law can do little more than preserve the peace. The underlying tensions created by a virulent prejudice can yield only to other remedies—not within the scope of this essay.

But when we contemplate the vast areas in which the irrelevant factors of birth or ancestry still stand as barriers to the achievement of full and equal opportunity, we must realize that no other technique of social control promises as quick, durable, and meaningful results as well-conceived and vigorously enforced civil-rights legislation.

Grass for Soil Conservation and Better Yields—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at grass conference, Atlanta, Ga., August 19, 1951:

I well remember how farmers of the South—and many other parts of the country, too—were being exhorted, a few decades ago, to adopt a more diversified type of agriculture. One-crop cotton farming was not getting the South ahead, we were told, and there was much truth in that point of view. The clean tillage methods used to produce cotton, along with the corn that was grown—and more cotton and little else—were conducive to erosion, 1-year tenancy, and poverty. Millions of acres had been ruined for further immediate practical cultivation and a vast area was damaged in varying degree by the erosion resulting from continuous planting of cotton and other clean-tilled crops. Furthermore, many of the people did not have an adequate diet because farmers were not producing the milk, butter, and beef needed for a good diet and a good agriculture. Most of the milk and cheese and much of the butter and beef consumed came from outside sources. That took income out and brought in nothing for the betterment of the land—not even manure.

I am sure many of you present can remember the agricultural situation in Georgia during and before the First World War. I was traveling extensively over the country during those years, and spent a great deal of my time in Georgia and other States throughout the Nation. I recall vividly the extensive cotton and cornfields of Georgia. Also, I recall the very distressing lack of good pastures and meadows. According to the statistics, United States Department of Agriculture yearbooks, Georgia farmers used around 5,500,000 acres for cotton each year from 1910 to 1920, and about 5,000,000 acres for corn—some of it half-hearted corn. At the same time, less than a half million acres of hay were harvested in the State each year. Georgia farmers were beginning to grow pea-

nuts for market. Statistics also fail to give the acreage of improved pasture at the time, but I know from personal observation it was not large. I doubt if it was as much as 50,000 acres of really good, improved, and properly managed pasture in the whole of Georgia. Moreover, the fact might be mentioned also that very few farmers were even thinking of planting winter cover crops to protect the land against erosion. And you seldom saw a farmer who was using a good practical rotation including either grass or legume.

I don't think I need to describe to this audience the erosion conditions that resulted from this type of agriculture. Soil erosion in Georgia has been rather freely advertised, both locally and nationally. Gullied and abandoned fields can still be seen in too many places, especially in the Piedmont section. And similar conditions were showing up in parts of southern Georgia.

During the decade following World War I, the agriculture of Georgia began to undergo a change. Some farmers began to heed the warnings that they must adopt a more diversified agriculture. The boll weevil discouraged many farmers from overplanting to cotton, but some went on planting little but cotton—and corn. I have heard it suggested that the boll weevil may have been something of a blessing in disguise to many Southern farmers. The greatest shift in crop production, however, at that time was from cotton to peanuts in Georgia, and somewhat later to tobacco. These shifts were more or less of a local nature. It seems that many farmers thought that if they rotated peanuts (a legume) with cotton and corn and used more fertilizer, they could maintain the fertility of their land. To check erosion in their cotton, corn, and peanut fields, they relied largely on terracing.

Some of you may remember the first two decades of the century when terraces were constructed on thousands of acres in Georgia. Farmers generally seemed to think that a few terraces across clean-tilled fields would halt the erosion that was steadily impoverishing their land. Often they built the terraces on land that was too steep and these without proper outlets. Tillage operations were frequently carried on across the terrace ridges—a practice that quickly causes breaks in the system. At the best, the terraces only slowed down erosion, at the worst, they did more harm than good. American farmers and agriculturists, in general, had not then conceived the idea of coordinated soil conservation treatment of the land—where each tract is used within its capabilities and treated according to its needs as determined by its condition. Most of them had not realized the highly important part vegetation must play in any practical and effective erosion control-soil improvement program. In other words, most farmers were struggling along with halfway soil conservation measures, applied in piecemeal fashion.

GRASS WAS TAKEN FOR GRANTED

Grass was more or less taken for granted by Georgia farmers, and too many other American farmers, also, up to the beginning of our national soil-conservation program in the early thirties. A few farmers occasionally planted some type of grass—frequently not the most adaptable or best variety. In the main, if a farmer wanted grass for hay or pasture, he just waited for it to grow somehow. Sometimes nature would plant and grow a fairly dense stand of fairly good grass, more often she would grow a scant stand of poor grass, along with plenty of weeds. Even those who seeded grass seldom thought of fertilizing it or giving it any special care. They assumed that grass would take care of itself.

Legumes were given a little more consideration, but not nearly enough. Too often, when seeded, they were planted on the poorer

land and given no special care. They were used in regular crop rotations by very few farmers, and seldom as a protective cover crop or catch crop for soil conservation.

In other words, American farmers were essentially row-crop and grain farmers—in the South principally the former. Improved grasslands had little place in the scheme of American agriculture.

It is vastly different now. Grass and legumes have become important crops to hundreds of thousands of farmers all over the country, and especially in Georgia and other Southeastern States. Now more and more grass is being planted, fertilized, and taken care of just as diligently as cotton, corn, tobacco, or wheat. The farmers have become grass-legume conscious—and from that "grassland farmers."

WHAT IS GRASSLAND FARMING

The term "grassland farming" has become so popular in recent years, it probably should be defined at this point. What does it mean? It simply means giving grasses, legumes, and other sod crops a much more important place in the farming system. It means more and better pastures and ranges. It means more grasses and legumes in the crop rotations and more and better hay crops and grass silage. It means more and better cover crops, grass waterways, strip crops, including the grass and legumes, and the use of sod crops in any other way that helps conserve soil and water and, at the same time, constitutes an important source of income. It also means better balanced and more profitable farming; more diversified farming with less risk, by having a too restricted income source.

Practically all grasses and legumes conserve both soil and water and improve the structure of the soil. They are the farmer's principal agents for controlling erosion on sloping land in many parts of the country. Nearly always they improve both soil tilth and fertility and increase the water-absorbing and water-holding capacity of the soil, whole growing, and also after being turned under as green manure or left on the ground surface as a protective mulch.

The advantages of grassland farming, moreover, are not limited to beneficial effects on the land. Grassland farming takes less labor than cultivated crops. The labor is usually distributed more evenly over the year, and in these times of farm labor shortage this is important. It has increased the income of nearly all the farmers who have really tried it out. Furthermore, it is usually a more interesting and enjoyable way of farming. Many farmers enjoy working with livestock more than the usually harder labor of planting, cultivating, and harvesting row crops. And good grass is the main base for profitable livestock farming.

GRASS FARMING FOR EROSION CONTROL

With all of its advantages, one might suppose grassland farming would have become more popular long ago. More pay with less work and more enjoyable work should appeal to any farmer, it would seem. But as long as good land was plentiful, few farmers awoke to the fact that more grass and legumes meant better pay and less work. Most of them started grassland farming within the last 10 or 15 years, mainly to control soil erosion. They became increasingly interested when they saw how their farms and ranches were being safeguarded from impoverishing erosion and useless runoff of water—and otherwise benefited. They learned also that the crops and the milk and beef they produced are profitable crops.

When the old Soil Erosion Service (later the Soil Conservation Service) started its conservation program back in 1933, the need for more grassland farming became strikingly obvious. There was no other practical way to plan a thorough-going, balanced soil and water conservation program for a great number of farms and ranches of the country.

Grasses and legumes were needed and were used increasingly as the national program of soil conservation advanced.

For example, the soil conservation experiment station at Guthrie, Okla., has found that more than 10 times as much rain water runs off an 8-percent slope planted to cotton as from the same type of land covered with Bermuda grass, while the corresponding loss of soil amounted to nearly 500 times as much. At Bethany, Mo., the soil conservation experiment station found that more than 4 times as much water runs off a sloping cornfield from the same kind of land planted to alfalfa, with the corresponding soil loss amounting to about 400 times as much. The soil conservation experiment station at Zanesville, Ohio, compared the runoff and soil loss from an unimproved native pasture with that from a pasture which had been limed, fertilized, and planted to a good pasture mixture. It found that the runoff was more than three times as much from the native pasture and the soil loss about twice as much. At Statesville, N. C., in the Piedmont, the average annual loss of soil from cotton was 31.28 tons per acre, as against only 0.3 ton lost from the same kind of land on the same farm where there was a good grass cover. Thus, grass was 104 times more effective in holding soil against erosion than cotton.

It was research findings such as these that made grass enthusiasts out of our soil-conservation technicians, as well as many farmers. The conservationists began to recommend more and better grasses and legumes. Conservation-conscious farmers soon saw the light and the movement began to get under way.

GRASSLANDS BRING UP NEW PROBLEMS

It was not all smooth sailing; more was involved than just planting grass on formerly cultivated land and watching the grass grow. It wasn't always easy to change from straight row-crop farming to grass farming. More land in grass usually meant more livestock—and more manure on the land, or part of the land. Many farmers had to buy the livestock to start with, and often on credit. Some row-crop farmers found that they had to learn new methods of farming in order to grow and to harvest the advantages of these hay and pasture crops. In some instances new machinery was needed. Usually more fencing was necessary. In fact, it almost added up to a new way of farming for many operators; often it meant a complete overhauling of the farm. In spite of these obstacles, however, the grassland movement gained adherents rapidly. At the moment, probably at least a fourth of the million farmers cooperating with soil-conservation districts of the country are, to some extent, either grassland farmers or are becoming grassland farmers.

CONSERVATION NURSERIES SUPPLY MORE AND BETTER SEED

Both the soil-conservation technicians and the farmers soon ran into difficulties of another kind. They couldn't find enough seed to plant all the pastures, range areas, eroded fields, critical slopes, and waterways that needed to be covered with a good, protective sod. They had to sponsor a big seed-growing campaign. The Soil Conservation Service nurseries in many parts of the country undertook, in the thirties, to help supply more and better seed for the conservation grass program. Eventually, some 50 such nurseries were established (the Service still operates 24 of them).

Specialists attached to these nurseries looked over our grass acquisitions from many parts of the world, and over our wild natives, too, for new and better species and strains of grasses and legumes. Up to the present, thousands of different kinds of promising grasses and legumes have been ferreted out and their values observed in the nurseries.

Some of the foreign species came through the Plant Exploration and Introduction Division of the Bureau of Plant Industry. Some were picked up by service technicians traveling abroad, and others were sent by friends and scientists from foreign countries. The highways and byways of this country were searched, too, for both native and naturalized species and varieties. Several dozen native grasses have already proved worth while, and have gone into use in our American agriculture as domesticated natives—as the result of the carefully planned and prosecuted search for new conservation tools for the program.

Promising strains or species were planted in small plots at one or more nurseries. They were observed and their growth habits studied, sometimes for several years. If they looked exceptionally promising, seed were harvested and larger plots planted. Then the seed from these plots were planted on several farms of the region to see whether the plants still grew favorably under average farm or ranch conditions. If a plant met the tests satisfactorily, the conservation nursery then planted larger areas for seed multiplication. These seeds were shipped in small lots to soil-conservation districts in those areas considered adaptable to the plants. Enough seed to plant seed-increase plots were sent to soil-conservation districts having adaptable growing conditions for the particular grass or legume at hand. The districts, in turn, turned their seed over to interested farmers for use and further multiplication. Farmers often multiply the seed and sell them to their neighbors.

THE SPREAD OF BETTER GRASSES AND LEGUMES

It was through this conservation nursery program of discovery, observation, multiplication, and distribution that many of the important grasses and legumes of today were spread to conservation farmers. For example, some years ago nurserymen of the Service discovered two promising strains of Bahia grass, one at Pensacola, Fla., and the other at Wilmington, N. C. The original seed of these grasses probably had come to the country as stowaways on ships from South America. Some seed were collected and observational plantings made at two Service nurseries. Both grasses came through all tests most promisingly and were then multiplied at the nurseries and distributed to soil conservation districts throughout the Southeast. More than 100,000 acres had been planted to these grasses by 1950. Last year enough of these seeds were harvested by farmers and nurseries to plant another 150,000 acres. Thus a valuable new pasture plant was added to the Nation's agriculture. And so it has been with many other grasses and various now highly important legumes.

Something over a decade ago it was learned that a strain of tall fescue had been growing on the Sulter Farm in eastern Kentucky since about 1890. In 1941, the Soil Conservation Service bought about 100 pounds of seed from this farm. The purchased seed was planted at the Chapel Hill Nursery in North Carolina for increasing the supply. Since 1942, enough seed has been produced from the original purchase to plant one or more 5-acre seed-increase plots in soil conservation districts in 687 counties in the Southeast. This grass (variously called Sulter's grass, tall fescue, Kentucky fescue, Kentucky 31) has proved so sensational that it has spread widely through the Southeast and as far west as Texas and Oklahoma. It also has spread to the Middle West and parts of the Northeast. By 1950, more than a million and a half acres had been planted throughout the country. Enough seed was harvested last year to plant another million and a quarter acres. In Georgia alone, enough seed was harvested by soil conservation districts and cooperating farmers to plant nearly 100,000 acres. And these new grass seed are actually being planted, not just harvested for chicken feed.

Grass for Soil Conservation and Better Yields—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States Soil Conservation Service, at grass conference, Atlanta, Ga., August 19, 1951:

The story of crested wheatgrass in the northern Great Plains is somewhat similar to that of Suiter's grass. Crested wheatgrass, I have been told, was introduced into this country from Russia in 1898. The North Dakota agricultural experiment station at Mandan showed that it was a valuable grass for the region, as early as 1915; but by 1934 only a few thousand acres had been planted by scattered farmers and ranchers (as well as could be determined). Soil conservationists decided it was one of the best grasses to plant on "blown-out" croplands and denuded ranges over much of the northern and central Great Plains. Nurserymen and field technicians began multiplying the seed and distributing them through soil-conservation districts. Several million acres have now been planted to this valuable pasture plant.

Blue lupine was doing fine at the experiment station at Quincy, Fla., in 1937; but not much of it was being grown by farmers. Soil conservationists observed it and thought it might make a fine winter cover crop, especially for the peanut fields of the South. Nurserymen and soil-conservation field technicians started multiplying and distributing the seed. Soil-conservation districts of the South gave excellent cooperation. During World War II, peanut acreage was greatly expanded. Erosion had been unusually severe on the sandy peanut lands after the crop was harvested. In this situation, blue lupine proved itself a valuable soil-saver, as well as soil-improver. Today, practically all conservation-minded peanut farmers of the southerly peanut area seed their peanut land to blue lupine during the summer. It serves as a protective winter cover and is often plowed under as green manure in the spring. In 1950 enough blue lupine seed was harvested to plant more than two million acres.

I might cite one example of what blue lupine is doing for peanut farmers of the South. Mr. W. C. Aultman, a soil-conservation district supervisor at Bainbridge, Ga., says that he decided in 1942 he had failed as a peanut farmer. This crop, along with the cotton that had formerly grown on the farm, had so depleted his land that he was raising only 400 to 500 pounds of peanuts to the acre, and his yield of corn was about 10 bushels. He became interested in blue lupine, purchasing enough seed to plant about 50 acres. He produced 800 pounds of seed per acre from that crop. He decided that this was better than the meager peanut and corn crops he had been raising, so he quit planting row crops altogether for 5 years. He planted 200 to 300 acres of lupine each year and harvested about half of it for seed. He produced 800 to 1,400 pounds of seed per acre. Since there was a ready market for the seed, he found it a valuable cash crop. In 1948, Mr. Aultman began planting limited amounts of row crops on the land that had been in blue lupine. His peanuts averaged better than a ton per acre

and the corn made about 45 bushels the first year.

Ladino clover was well known to most agronomists and a few farmers of the Eastern States, but it was not being planted extensively. Conservationists began recommending it as a soil-conserving and forage plant. Its use spread rapidly. Enough seed were harvested last year to plant nearly a half million acres. Crimson clover was well known through the East and South, too, but it was not used extensively until soil conservationists started using a hard-seeded strain that would reseed itself annually. Now it is planted on several hundred thousand acres. The seed harvest for last year alone was enough to plant nearly a half million acres.

The lespedezas, vetches, and others have similar histories. And we should not forget kudzu and Bermuda grass (usually multiplied by crown or sprig plantings). These gully-stoppers and fine pasture and hay plants came into widespread use mainly because conservation farmers and technicians wanted plants that would stop soil erosion while also producing good forage. Then there are blue panicum, weeping lovegrass, and King Ranch bluestem in the Southwest. One of them came from Australia, one from Africa, and the other originally from Asia. All three are valuable strains, now spreading rapidly among southwestern ranches and farmers. Pangola grass from Africa is spreading rapidly as a pasture plant in Florida, especially on sandy lands. Smooth brome grass in the Middle West and many native grasses, such as the bluestems, grammas, sand lovegrass, and Indiangrass in the Great Plains, have spread phenomenally. Dozens of others have had less phenomenal seeding histories but are filling important needs for certain situations.

And this process of exploration, observation, multiplication, and distribution is still going on.

CONSERVATION FARMERS GROW MORE SEED

We must not overlook the farmers, however, while giving credit to the conservationists, the experiment stations, other Government agencies, and the 2,300 soil-conservation districts of the Nation for what they have done. In the final analysis, it was the conservation-minded farmers and ranchers of the Nation who planted the grasses and legumes and who are now growing them.

Once the grass farming program began to gain momentum it was not hard to get farmers interested in harvesting seed. Grass and legume seed became one of the best cash crops with many. Thousands of farmers and ranchers all over the Nation soon found that they could sell their seed crop for much more than they could sell a corn, cotton, or wheat crop from the same land. In addition, they usually got a lot of good pasture or hay from their grasses and legumes. Many conservation farmers use their best cropland to grow grass and legumes for seed. Some irrigation farmers in the West have planted native grasses in rows and cultivated and irrigated them to grow seed for market.

SEED CLEANING AND PROCESSING

Many grass seeds need cleaning, decortication, or other processing before they can be advantageously planted. Also the seed often need to be dried to prevent heating before storing or shipping. At first soil conservationists and farmers did most of the cleaning on the farms with home-made cleaners or with hammer mills and fanning machines. Fresh seed were dried by spreading in thin layers on barn floors. But when seed began to be produced by the hundreds of thousands of bushels these improved methods proved impractical. Commercial cleaning and drying plants were needed, especially for seed that were being offered for sale through commercial channels. Then cleaning and proc-

essing plants began to spring up all over the country. A new industry was created.

In 1940 W. A. Womack, of Ashford, Ala., planted 35 acres of blue lupine for seed. The seed crop proved so profitable that he increased his plantings to about 500 acres by 1946. He harvested around 750,000 pounds of seed that year. As his seed production increased, he found it impractical to clean the seed with a small fanning mill. He started a commercial seed cleaning and drying plant and began custom cleaning for his neighbors. Then he increased his storage facilities and soon was in the seed processing business on a commercial scale. He began to grow large quantities of sericea lespedeza, crimson clover, and Bahia grass for seed. Now he is fully in the seed business. Not only does he market his home-grown seed all over the Southeast, he also cleans and stores seed for most of the other farmers of his community.

Womack's experience is an example of how the seed business has grown by leaps and bounds during the last few years. There are now more than a thousand such plants throughout the Nation. Practically all farmers in soil conservation districts of the South and Southwest now have access to a commercial seed cleaning plant, and the industry of seed cleaning is rapidly spreading to other parts of the country.

Some seed-processing plants are operated by soil-conservation districts. Many others were created at the instigation of and with the support of district supervisors or the soil conservationists working with districts. For example, in 1949, the supervisors of the Santa Fe soil-conservation district in Florida recognized the acute need for a seed cleaning and drying plant. They bought the necessary equipment and constructed a small plant at a cost of about \$4,000. During the first 2 years of operation, the plant processed about 650,000 pounds of grass and legume seed valued at more than \$150,000. The original cost of the plant was paid for from the processing charges. Furthermore, two privately owned seed-processing plants have since been constructed in this district, mainly because of the showing made by the district-owned plant.

GRASSLAND RESEARCH EXPANDED

There were many other problems confronting the modern grassland pioneers. Which grass or legume or mixture to use; where to use it, what kind and how much fertilizer to use under varying conditions; seedbed preparation, the use of nurse crops; renovation of depleted pastures, weed and pest control, and numerous other problems needed more adequate research. Prior to 1929, research on grassland farming was rather meager. Most agricultural experiment stations had devoted the major part of their work toward improving the more commonly cultivated crops. The grasses and legumes were largely neglected, aside from a few of the more common hay crops.

When the first soil erosion experiment stations were established, beginning in 1929, they began, as already noted, devoting a major part of their research toward using more grass and other sod crops in erosion control. Within a few years, this work began to direct attention to other grass and legume problems. As the grassland movement gained momentum, the State experiment stations carried on more and more research on the use and management of these soil-holding, soil-improving, and animal-producing crops. During the past 15 years, a great fund of scientific knowledge about grasses, hitherto unknown, has been developed. Today most grassland farmers can get much more accurate information about their various problems than they were ever able to get before.

The present-day grassland farmer knows that it pays to fertilize most pasture and hay

crops. He knows, also, that it pays to fertilize and reseed old pastures where stands of grass are thin or where poor forage types of grass predominate. He mows weeds and clears brush from his pastures and meadows and often uses a chemical spray to control weeds in grass-seed plots. He knows which grasses are best for his waterways and which will do best on his eroded or worn-out lands. Soil Conservation Service research has shown the resistance various grasses offer to water flowing along waterways in various parts of the country, and this aids greatly in making the right selection of grasses to stabilize these outlets for excess runoff. This knowledge and these services are helping greatly as guides to the advancing grass program. Besides, farmers have a variety of choices in selecting grasses and legumes that fit into their long-term crop rotations. But probably, above all, farmers are now able to get the right seed for the different kinds of land.

An indication of how the grasses have become increasingly important in the soil conservation program during the last few years is found in a comparison of the amounts of terracing and pasture improvement work done by conservation farmers in five southeastern States. Up until the last few years, terracing was generally the most widely used soil conservation practice among farmers of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Terracing is still important in this region but it is no longer the most widely used conservation practice; improved grasslands are now considered much more important by most farmers. For example, in 1945 the acreage of pasture improved by reseeding, fertilizing, or other means was only about three-fourths as much as the acreage terraced by farmers cooperating with soil conservation districts in these States. In 1950, the acreage of pasture improvement was about three times as much as the acreage terraced.

Georgia has been one of the leading States in this phenomenal grass boom of recent years. As of July 1, this year, nearly 66,000 farmers of the State were cooperating with their soil conservation districts on complete conservation farming programs, and another 30,000 had made application to the districts for technical aid in conservation. Almost without exception, these conservation farmers have expanded and improved their grasslands. Recent reports show that nearly a million and a half acres of pastures had been improved by seeding, fertilizing, brush clearing, or other means on these 66,000 farms. Around 700,000 acres of new or old pasture land had been planted to Suiter's grass, Bermuda, Bahla grass, sericea, kudzu, clover, or some of the other better grasses and legumes that greatly increase the forage yields. In addition, around 2,000,000 acres of cover crops are being planted on cultivated lands, and grass waterways and improved meadows are found on practically every conservation farm.

The farmers of Georgia are now planting much less cotton than formerly. They have also reduced the acreage of corn. At last, I think we can truly say that Georgia farmers are really beginning to practice a diversified agriculture—they are now planting the grass and legume crops and raising the livestock that was recommended 30 or 40 years ago. Largely as a result of this agricultural change, farmers are more prosperous and both farm and city people are eating a more healthful diet, with more milk, butter, beef, eggs, and fresh vegetables on the table.

This change to a grass-livestock agriculture is not confined to Georgia and other Southeastern States by any means; although the change is probably greater and more noticeable here. All across the country there are hundreds of thousands of farmers who have changed or are changing from row-crop farming to grassland farming. Many of them are putting their entire farms to

grass, aside from that used for woods. Obviously, all farmers can't put their entire farms to grass or woods. Grain, oil crops, fibers, tobacco, vegetables, potatoes, and other crops are also needed. But most grassland farmers do not put all their land to grass. They simply use grass as it should be used in a practical conservation farming program, with the land properly adjusted to its capability. They plant their steep, highly erodible lands and other areas less suitable for cultivation to pasture or meadow. They grow sod crops in rotation with row crops to maintain good soil tilth and organic matter. They use cover crops in their clean-tilled fields when and where needed as a common-sense matter of land upkeep. They use strip cropping, grass waterways, and grass-stabilized diversions where needed. And, above all, they take better care of their grasslands—they give them the same consideration that they give their cultivated fields.

A PERMANENT AGRICULTURE FOR THE NATION

It is not just the individual farmers who will profit from a grassland agriculture. The Nation has a vital stake in this matter. It means better conservation of our basic soil and water resources. It can provide one of the best means for adjusting agricultural production each year to the actual needs of the country, with eroding and deteriorating crop lands being planted to sod crops when a surplus of grain and fiber crops seems probable. The grassland, in some instances, can be safely plowed up when an emergency demands an increase in cultivated crops. In fact, grassland farming does not necessarily mean less corn, less cotton, less wheat, less potatoes, or less tobacco. The acreage of these crops is usually decreased to some extent on grassland farms, but the yields per acre usually go up within a few years, so fast that the total production may be increased—has been increased on numerous farms. Furthermore, the amount of gain consumed by livestock is much less where plenty of good pasture and hay and grass silage are available.

In the final analysis, grassland farming is an adjustable type of agriculture that can be made to meet our needs as conditions bring about the need for changes in production. In addition, the productivity of the land can be maintained almost indefinitely, and per-acre yields are increased. This is a natural way of farming, and a practical way of farming. It is conservation farming—the only kind of farming that can be done year after year without depleting the land. It is farming in strict accordance with nature's example—that is to say, nature employs grass and trees to keep the land perpetually productive. Grassland farming follows this example, with grass as the basis of stability and permanence.

A Plea for a Modified Form of Senate Bill 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at its session today had under consideration the act S. 75 as it came over to us from the other body. I had proposed amendments which greatly reduced the substance of the measure by holding in abeyance authorization for

expenditures at this time of national emergency. In fact, the watered-down measure which I had proposed was intended, without costing the Government a dime, to make the controversy between Arizona and California over the waters of the lower Colorado River a justiciable issue in the United States Supreme Court so the high Court could take jurisdiction and render a definitive judgment. The following was my plea this morning for this reasonable and logical form of the bill:

This may be the last time I shall appeal to you in behalf of this phase of the future of my young State of Arizona. Her future for many a long year hangs upon what this committee in its wisdom may do for her now. I am not talking for my own political future, for that is of small moment; nor is the political fortune of any man comparatively important. The future of Arizona, that old-new land, for centuries to come is important. The welfare of unborn generations is the chief consideration here. The first step in the assuring of that future can be taken here and now without injury to any State or section, and can be taken in full keeping with the laws of man, of nature, and of God. This bill, even this watered-down bill, is far from perfect, but this modified bill does provide without a penny of Federal expense for the first essential step—a judicial determination as to what is the law of the river as it affects Arizona.

Time works in favor of the opposition in southern California. Arizona has tried several times to get a judicial determination, and in those earlier cases the Supreme Court has refused to take jurisdiction on grounds which this bill will remedy. If Arizona is prevented from having her day in court, she will suffer inestimable injury in a way which cannot be remedied and also in a way in which she cannot submit an effective claim for damages. If Californians can prevent Arizona from getting Colorado River water which Arizona knows to be rightfully hers to use, not Arizona alone but the entire Nation will be the loser and very few individuals will be apparent gainers. Do not for one moment believe that Los Angeles will be a gainer.

In voting for this bill you are not voting to authorize the spending of money in the near future, nor for anything but a sound development later. You will be voting only to offer a plan to deliver water into Arizona so that because of this general plan the high Court may decide whether such diversion is according to law. No Federal money can be authorized to divert such water until after the Supreme Court has "declared the law" and only after this committee finds such a proposal feasible in the light of future conditions. If neither of these two things happens, it will be up to Arizona to do something else or do without that water. I plead with you to give the future of Arizona a chance by giving her a day in court.

Yom Kippur and the Good World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day, it was my pleasure to have at lunch in the House restaurant two distinguished citizens of the Jewish faith

from my district. Conversation turned to the manner in which speakers sometimes refer to the Christian world, when in truth they mean the good world, including all people with faith in God.

A new nation is born—Israel. It appears to me that greater appreciation of its people can be gained by understanding one of its rites, Yom Kippur. Accordingly, I should like to list below an article from the Jersey Journal of recent date which describes the significance of this Day of Atonement:

YOM KIPPUR RITES CLOSE HIGH HOLY DAYS PERIOD

Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement and the last day of the penitential period, which began with Rosh Hashonah, the most sacred of days in the Jewish calendar, will be ushered in at sundown today with the special Kol Nidre service in synagogue and temple in Bayonne, as the members of the respective congregations join their coreligionists throughout the world in the observance.

Services will be held at Temple Emanu-el, Talmud Torah Synagogue Beth Abraham, Synagogue Agudas Achim, Ohab Sholem Anshe Sfard, and Synagogue Ohab Sholem Uptown, and the synagogue at the Gluckman Home for the Aged. The entire day is spent in the synagogue tomorrow, Yom Kippur, in fasting and praying for forgiveness of all sins.

Late this afternoon the family gathers around the table for a solemn meal, called the seudah hamaphseketh, the stopping meal, after which the fast begins, shortly before sunset. It is a silent meal, tense with the feeling that one's destiny for the coming year is to be sealed the next day. Those present ask for forgiveness from each other, blessings are bestowed upon the children by the parents, and charity is given to the poor.

The bread that is served and the candles that are lit are shaped in tapering form to symbolize that the prayers will ascend to God. Prior to the meal at the Minnah service in the synagogue one relinquishes all grievances that he may have nursed during the year against his fellow men, and in turn asks forgiveness and attempts to right any wrongs that he may have done to others during the year.

The synagogue services start on the eve of Yom Kippur with the chanting of Kol Nidre before sunset, and end at sunset the next day with the blowing of the shofar (ram's horn) at the end of the Ne'illah, the closing prayer.

BACK TO MOSES

According to the sages, originally Yom Kippur too was a historical festival. It marked the day on which Moses brought down the second Luhoth Ha-B'rith (Tablets of the Covenant) on which were engraved the Ten Commandments. After the Revelation, Moses retired to the top of Mount Horeb for 40 days, and when he returned he brought with him the Tablets on which had been engraved the Ten Commandments.

During his absence the Israelites in the desert felt lost without their leader. Confused and discouraged, they followed the example of the Egyptians and made a golden calf and worshiped it. This happened just a day before Moses returned. When Moses saw what they had done, he felt bitterly disappointed and in his anger he dashed the tablets to pieces. After reestablishing order in the community, he again ascended the mountain, and after another 40 days he brought down a duplicate set of the original Luhoth Ha-B'rith.

Tradition has it that this second event took place on the tenth day of Tishri, which is the day of atonement. As the second tablets marked the fact that God had forgiven the people for their sins in worshipping the golden calf, the day on which they were

brought down came to be observed as a day of prayer and atonement.

A distinctive feature of the Yom Kippur service is the prayer for the dead. God is asked to forgive not only one's own sins, but also those of the departed ones. Theirs are the most important sins to be forgiven, since they no longer can make good their errors. Prayers for the repose of their souls (Hazkarath Neshamoth) are offered in the synagogue and temple. At home a special memorial lamp is lit to commemorate the soul of a departed relative. This light burns throughout Yom Kippur and is symbolic of immortality.

SERVICE SCHEDULE

The Kol Nidre service at Temple Emanu-el will commence at 5.15 p. m. today with Rev. Abraham M. Felnerman having as his sermon topic *How Shall We Face God?* At the Yizkor memorial service tomorrow his topic will be *Fear Not the Sentence of Death.*

At Talmud Torah Synagogue this evening the Kol Nidre will be chanted by Cantor Samuel Glatt at 5 o'clock. Rabbi Jacob Danishefsky will speak on *The Day of Forgiveness Tomorrow* the service will begin at 8 a. m., with the Yizkor service at 10 30 a. m. Rabbi Danishefsky's sermon topic will be *Our Obligations to Past and Future Generations.*

American Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article entitled "High Lights in the American Labor Movement" from a recent edition of the *Laborer*:

HIGH LIGHTS IN THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

1786: Philadelphia printers gain minimum wage of \$6 a week by earliest authenticated strike of workers in United States

1791: Philadelphia carpenters stage first recorded strike in building trades as unsuccessful attempt for 10-hour day and additional pay for overtime.

1806: Philadelphia Journeymen Cordwainers bankrupt by conviction of members, tried for criminal conspiracy on charges of combining to raise wages and injure others

1827: First city central type of labor organization formed in Philadelphia as Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations.

1828: Workingmen's Party, including wage earners, craftsmen, and farmers, organized in Philadelphia.

1834: First national labor federation, National Trades Union, formed in New York City.

1836: First national labor union of specific craft, National Cooperative Association of Cordwainers, formed in New York City. Printers, comb-makers, carpenters, and hand-loom weavers formed similar organizations soon afterwards.

TEN-HOUR DAY RULE

1840: President Van Buren established a 10-hour day for Federal employees on public works.

1842: A Massachusetts court held that trade unions, as such, were legal organizations. The decision also denied that the attempt to establish the closed shop was unlawful. Massachusetts and Connecticut

passed laws prohibiting children from working more than 10 hours a day.

1852: Typographical Union, first national organization of workers to endure to this day, formed. First law limiting women to 10-hour day passed in Ohio.

1859: Iron Moulders' Union formed, forerunner of Molders and Foundry Workers.

1862: "Molly Maguires" come to public attention; 10 later executed

1863: Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers founded

1866: National Labor Union, a national association of unions, formed.

1868: First Federal 8-hour day law passed by Congress.

1869: Knights of Labor organized, declined with emergence of AFL

1874: Union label first used by Cigar Makers' International Union

1881: Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, later named American Federation of Labor, formed in Pittsburgh. Gompers, 8 national union leaders, 107 delegates present.

LABOR DAY SUGGESTED

1882: Peter J. McGuire, New York carpenter, suggests first Labor Day

1884: United States Bureau of Labor established as part of Department of Interior.

1886: Under FOTLU 340,000 participate in move for 8-hour day. Public prejudiced by Chicago Haymarket riot. American Federation of Labor organized in Columbus

1894: Injunctions and Federal troops defeat strike of American Railway Union. Eugene V. Debs jailed.

1908: Outlawing of yellow-dog contract by Erdman Act, declared unconstitutional.

1911: New York factory fire kills 146 workers, leads to improved factory conditions.

1912: Massachusetts adopts first minimum-wage act for women and minors

1913: Department of Labor established by law. William B. Wilson first Secretary of Labor.

1914: Clayton Act limits use of injunction; legalizes picketing

1916: Adamson Act provides basic 8-hour day on railroads.

1917: Yellow-dog contract upheld.

1918: Federal Government seizes wartime control of railroads.

1919: Gompers leads fight for organization of International Labor Organization; first session in Washington, D. C., on October 29.

1921: Supreme Court denies Clayton Act legalized secondary boycott or protected unions from injunctions for conspiracy in restraint of trade.

1922: Labor unions held suable for their acts.

1924: Samuel Gompers, president of AFL, dies on December 13.

1926: Collective bargaining imposed on employers by Railway Labor Act; provides for mediation, voluntary arbitration, and fact-finding boards.

1931: Davis-Bacon Act provides for payment of prevailing wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors in public construction.

ANTI-INJUNCTION LAW

1932: Anti-injunction (Norris-La Guardia) Act prohibited Federal injunctions in labor disputes and outlawed yellow-dog contracts. Wisconsin adopts first unemployment insurance act in United States.

1933: United States Employment Service created in Department of Labor.

1934: United States joins International Labor Organization.

1935: National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act passed.

1936: Labor standards on Government contracts established, including minimum wage, overtime compensation for hours in excess of 8 a day or 40 a week, child and convict labor provisions, and health and safety requirements.

1937 National Labor Relations Act held constitutional

1938 Fair Labor Standards Act provides minimum wages and time and a half for hours over 40 a week

1942 President establishes National War Labor Board NWLB lays down "Little Steel" formula for wartime wage adjustments. Stabilization Act authorizes President to stabilize wages and salaries.

1943 President creates Committee on Fair Employment Practices War Labor Disputes Act, passed over President's veto, authorizes plant seizure if needed to avoid interference with the war effort.

1947 The Norris-LaGuardia Act prohibition against issuance of injunctions in labor disputes held inapplicable to the Government The Labor-Management Relations (Taft-Hartley) Act passed over the President's veto.

1948: The Federal Government's first national conference on industrial safety meets in Washington, D. C.

1949. International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, with AFL, CIO, and United Mine Workers participating, formed in London

1950. AFL, launches year-long observance of the centennial of the birth of Samuel Gompers. National emergency occasions formation of the United Labor Policy Committee, composed of representatives of AFL, CIO, and railroad unions.

The Missouri: We Need Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article on the proposed Missouri Valley Administration, written by me some time ago, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article was written prior to the Kansas floods, and hence does not refer to the fact that recent developments prove still more strongly the desirability of a Missouri Valley Administration, and the shortcomings of the Pick-Sloan plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSOURI: WE NEED UNIFICATION
(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator)

When there is no teamwork among the armed services, it shows up in lost battles, in "Pearl Harbors." When there is no teamwork among our civilian services, it shows up in our tax bill, and in the waste of our great natural resources. It is in the Missouri Valley that we have today the most outstanding illustration of what rival civilian bureaucracies can do to disappoint the people's hopes and to saddle them with debt.

There are few more important projects or problems facing the American people than the proposal made by Senator MURRAY, myself, and others, to harness the mighty Missouri Valley, stop the periodical ravages occurring in that territory, and put the river to work for the benefit of all the people. The control and development of the Missouri River is not a local problem; it is a national problem. The waters of the Missouri River wind their ways through my own State of Minnesota, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado,

Montana, and Iowa. Within this vast region is found our largest undeveloped stores of rich farmland, forests, hydroelectric power, fertilizers, minerals, wildlife, and recreational wonderland areas of unsurpassed beauty.

This great Missouri River Basin is an important untapped reservoir of raw resources needed for our Nation's defense. It is important, however, also for its potentialities for the development of vast amounts of essential civilian production. These potentialities are so great as to offer to America a new economic frontier for the use of our capital, our unused manpower, and the utilization of our great enterprising and democratic genius.

The Missouri River drainage system encompasses an area of 500,000 square miles, almost one-fifth of the land of the United States, but in 1950 its population was less than 16,000,000, or one-tenth of our population. Every year whole families and vigorous single workers leave this area. This is a serious problem which must be met.

Farms are being abandoned in this area, too. In 1930 the United States census was taken in the 430 counties of the Missouri Basin and another census was taken in the prosperous year of 1945. During the intervening 15 years, the number of farms operated declined by more than 12 percent. Some 90,000 families gave up their lifelong stake in farming. Those who still owned farms in 1945 suffered a money loss of more than \$2,330,000,000 in the value of their farm properties. Here are problems which warrant the attention of the American people and their Congress.

Only a balance between agriculture and industry will ever reverse the loss of population trend and raise the standard of living to which the people of the area are entitled. In all this vast area, covering 10 States, there were only 20,000 manufacturing establishments in the prosperous year of 1929, employing less than 600,000 wage earners. Yet by 1939, despite a very substantial national economic recovery, the number of factories still operating in the Missouri area fell to 17,000, and the number of wage earners declined one-fifth.

The Missouri Valley is known for its national wonders, its parks and monuments, its wild game, birds and fish, its great forests, and an infinite variety of wild flowers. But these resources are being wasted. Ponds and waterways are drying up; streams are being polluted, destroying birds and fish; and timberland is being ruined; overgrazing of grasslands is endangering the open range. The rich heritage of our Nation is being jeopardized. America has a stake in this serious problem.

The evidence is clear that the Missouri Valley can develop its potentialities only under a unified and balanced development of all its resources. With such a unified approach it can develop with an assured future, and can create new wealth, attract new populations and raise the standard of living for the people in the area. It can go far to stabilize our economy at full employment.

In spite of this promising future, the present is a dismal one for the Missouri Valley. The mad rampages of the Missouri River have already cost more in lives of animals and humans, suffering diseases and destruction of valuable property than our imaginations can state. Today, in spite of years of effort, and hundreds of millions of dollars spent in dyking the river, strait-jacketing it in levees, the big Missouri is less tame than ever before, and sweeps away millions of dollars in one season's floods. In spite of man's ingenuity, we cannot order the weather to suit our purposes. Storms, floods, droughts, hot suns will continue to take their heavy toll until engineering projects for flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, reforestation, and hydroelectric power de-

velopments are combined into a single system under which the rain will be held where it falls, surplus water will be stored and then its flow directed for the benefit of the valley. Only a unified attack on the manifold problems of resource development and control will accomplish what is essential to the future of the area.

Why then is the present development of the Missouri Valley failing to fulfill the potentialities of the area? A brief word of history is in order. Following the floods of 1943, the Army engineers, under the direction of Gen. Lewis A. Pick, rushed together a plan for the lower Missouri River and presented it to Congress. The Bureau of Reclamation, of the Department of the Interior, however, attacked the plan vigorously. Its spokesman, W. Glenn Sloan, claimed the Army's plan to be extravagant, unnecessary, and misdirected. The conflict between the two agencies was primarily a conflict over whether the emphasis should be on navigation, which was the Army's primary interest, or on irrigation, the Bureau's chief concern. The Sloan plan was in turn attacked by the Army as extravagant, fantastic, and unnecessary. At about this time the concept of an integrated Missouri Valley Authority, similar in approach and based on the valuable experience of our Federal Government in developing the Tennessee Valley Authority was presented to Congress.

The effect on the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was electric. After accusing one another in the public press and before congressional committees of inefficiency and lack of planning, they joined together in mutual opposition to this concept of a unified MVA. To head off the growing movement in Congress to create an MVA, they frantically entered into an agreement after 2 days of conference, to share all the construction work of the Missouri Valley. They split the dams, the power plants, and other construction work between them on a basis which has never been explained satisfactorily. Whereas they had previously criticized one another's plans for the development of this crucial area, they now apparently laid maps of their two conflicting plans side by side and engaged in a barter deal. They sealed their agreements with a bond of silence, and all the loud and bitter engineering criticism of one another's plans were suddenly hushed up. They divided up projects totaling \$6,300,000,000 without ever settling down and developing a full river plan.

The result to date has been a total failure, a great disappointment to the population, to the region, and to the Nation's taxpayers who carry a heavy and unnecessary burden. Further evidence of this failure is a statement from a task force report to the Hoover Commission whom, describing the Pick-Sloan plan which said:

"After sharp clashes over plans for the development of the Missouri Basin, the Corps, and Bureau announced complete agreement on the Pick-Sloan plan. Analysis of that plan reveals the fact that it contains many projects which previously had been subjected to devastating criticism by one or the other agency. The compromise consisted for the most part of a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego the privilege of criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other."

The Hoover Commission, in its final report, stated:

"There is simply no escaping the fact that so long as the present overlapping of functions exists with respect to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Federal Power Commission, costly duplication, confusion, and competition are bound to result. It has been demonstrated time and again that neither by voluntary cooperation nor by executive coordination can the major conflicts be ironed out. * * * Consolidation of these agencies is the only

remedy. The Commission feels there is a possibility that the disastrous Portland floods last year reflect the failure of the present divided program."

Compare this to the Tennessee Valley Authority, a tremendous success, a plan which has improved the economy and the life of the people of that valley. We have invested about \$800,000,000 in the Tennessee Valley development, but the TVA has already paid for itself more than once. Today the Tennessee is one of the most flood-proof rivers in the world. The use of electric power in the homes, farms, and industries of the Valley has boomed. Residential users, who consumed only 600 kilowatt-hours average in 1939, 11 years later consumed more than 2,500 kilowatt-hours in 1949. On some systems residential use was averaging 4,000 kilowatt-hours a year in the Valley.

When the Congress established the Tennessee Valley Authority the seven affected States were paying 34 percent of the total income taxes collected by the United States Treasury. In 1947 the same area was paying 6.3 percent of the total income-tax payments made in the United States. Today, after 15 years of TVA, with improved agriculture, 2,100 new factories, and cheap electric power, the Valley is paying almost twice as much income tax percentage-wise as it did before TVA.

There are now 1,000,000 acres of terraced land in the Valley, and pasture acreage has increased 800,000 acres, reflecting a tremendous gain and a solution to the problem of soil erosion. Livestock has increased 9 percent, dairy cattle numbers are around the same, while milk production is up 22 percent. The Tennessee Valley, as a result of an integrated resources development program, is no longer a problem area. It is an area that contributed great strength to our Nation in wartime, and continues to contribute strength in peacetime.

Why then can we not learn from the experience of the TVA, and produce a valley administration idea comparable in scope and results, although on a larger scale? Our people in the Midwest have been looking at the miracle of the TVA. They have seen cheap electric power from the river's flow. They have seen industries grow up near the cheap power, and they have watched the great atom plant working in the Tennessee Valley for the progress and people of the world. They have seen soil conservation, flood control, and navigation improve constantly in the Tennessee Basin. They have wondered, and they have every right to ask why cannot the same be done for their valley, for the Missouri Valley?

The Missouri Valley can prosper. As the Tennessee Valley grew under TVA, the Missouri Valley can grow under MVA. The Missouri Valley Authority bill is based on the principle that where there is one river system with conflicting claims upon its water, with different problems as to its course, there must be one center of responsibility, one authority acting on the principle of equity. This authority must consider the interest and welfare of the country as a whole, after obtaining the best advice available from all groups and all sections in the area directly affected. This is the democratic way to solve a complex problem and to judge conflicting interests and demands. Under this plan, the people will always have a check on the program, because MVA can continue, and its principle can be put into operation only as a result of annual appropriations by the Congress of the United States.

Our bill would create a Government agency described as the Missouri Valley Authority. It would preserve much of what is now being done by existing local, State, and national agencies. The bill proposes that the agencies now engaged in reclamation, irrigation, flood control, soil erosion, forestation,

wildlife, power development, and so forth, are to be coordinated and integrated so as to eliminate waste and duplication, achieve economies, and preserve the needs of the area as a whole.

Headquarters of the MVA are to be in the region itself, with regional offices throughout the area. This decentralization of Federal Government activities is sound in that it allows day by day scrutiny, participation and evaluation of the problem in the area, at the same time as the great benefits of Federal financing, planning, engineering, and administration are achieved.

The MVA will be administered by a Board of directors of five American citizens, three of whom must have had a residence of at least 5 years in the Missouri Basin. The board of directors are required to consult with an advisory board, and no plan for the area can be presented to Congress and to the President until the advisory board has carefully examined and commented on the plan. The advisory board is to represent agriculture, industry, labor, and wildlife and recreation in the Missouri Valley. The fact that the 10 governors from the 10 States in the Missouri Basin will constitute a special committee to advise and cooperate with the MVA is a guaranty that the interest of the region will be preserved. Furthermore, the Congress and the people will be kept thoroughly informed of proposed plans, work, accomplishments and progress through the requirement that the MVA is to make quarterly reports to the Congress. Here then is a decentralized, carefully planned and efficient administrative policy designed to obtain a unified program of river development.

A Missouri Valley Authority is not a luxury. It is a necessity which the people of the Nation cannot afford to neglect. Unless we act, irreparable damage to our Nation can follow. The need for the development of the Missouri Basin is not disputable. All agree. The only question that remains is how to meet that need. Opponents of the MVA assert that the Pick-Sloan plan can do the job. They do so, however, in the face of the facts. What are the facts? The facts show constant failure to meet the needs.

Let us look at the shortcomings of the Pick-Sloan plan. The Pick-Sloan plan is but a fraction of a total basin plan. It deals with a river, it does not deal with the problems of the land, of soil conservation, of the development of land and mineral resources, and the human resources of the Valley. It has no plan to stop the loss of 300,000,000 tons of topsoil annually. It does not provide for the development of the plant-food resources on the western rim of the Missouri watershed to make conservation practices economical for farmers, who would then help to stop erosion and floods. It does not contain any forestry plans to help stop floods and protect and restore our forests and our soil. In fact, a land and forest program proposed separately by the Department of Agriculture is being opposed by the Department of the Interior for fear it will jeopardize main-stream projects by holding water on the land.

The Pick-Sloan plan does not provide for the development of recreational facilities, for the maintenance of wildlife, for power and navigation coordination, so that new industries can be established for industrial research. The Pick-Sloan plan is limited and, as we have seen, has not been successful even within its limited scope.

Let us more carefully look into the question of the power potential of the area. The Federal Power Commission has pointed out that there is a potential of ten to fifteen billion kilowatt-hours of electricity per year in the lower reaches of the Missouri. Yet all that the Pick-Sloan plan is doing is attempting to provide an open, flowing navigation channel in that section of the river

which will not generate electricity for the unlighted sections of the valley. The electric power potential of the area is being overlooked, but electric power is vital in an industrial age. Low cost electric power is vital if farms are to keep pace with modern agricultural techniques. Low-cost electric power is important to farmers who have to pump water for irrigation, and it is also important to every farmer who wants relief from drudgery, better living and attractive surroundings for his children, who now move away from the family home. More than 60 percent of the electric potential of the Yellowstone River, a tributary of the Missouri, is being ignored. One of the most needed and most prevalent of the Missouri resources, electricity, is not being tapped to any adequate degree, and where it is planned, the evidence is conclusive that it is being planned so poorly as to discredit the whole project.

Let us look at flood control. You will recall the words of the Hoover Commission: "The Commission feels there is a possibility that the disastrous Portland floods last year reflect the failure of the present divided program." Here is a severe condemnation of the Pick-Sloan plan which cannot lightly be dismissed. It can be proved further that the Missouri River floods of 1943, 1945, and 1947 were not at all alleviated by the work of the Army engineers, but rather on the contrary, the floods were apparently worsened by the fact that the navigation planning of the engineers overlooked the necessity of planning for flood control.

One of the most essential concerns of any river valley plan must be soil conservation, yet the Pick-Sloan plan failed to integrate soil conservation into its planning, since Pick-Sloan only has jurisdiction over one percent of the surface area of the Missouri valley. Soil conservation must begin where the rain hits the ground, not where it flows into the river, carrying rich top soil with it. Proof of this is the fact that the Department of Agriculture last year reminded Congress of the omission of soil conservation from the Pick-Sloan plan, by printing a 2-pound, 200-page report which said, in effect, that if the shortcomings of the Pick-Sloan plan are to be met, an additional appropriation of \$8,500,000,000 would be necessary for soil conservation. This is not only a severe condemnation of neglectfulness on the part of the agency now developing the valley, but also an example of the high cost to the American taxpayer of bad management, shortsightedness and uncoordinated plans.

The irrigation possibilities of the Missouri are also being damaged by the present plan. It is very clear that the navigation channel projects under the present plan will take millions of acre-feet of water away from much needed irrigation. A 9-foot channel which the Army is digging in the lower Missouri, which will result in damage to the irrigation possibilities of the area, is scheduled to cost \$222,000,000. The Bureau of Reclamation is planning a recreation project which would spend considerable money and use enough water annually to irrigate 55,000 acres. Yet Mr. W. G. Sloan, of the Bureau, told a St. Louis Post-Dispatch reporter that he did not think this project was the best use of the water, but that he was doing it nevertheless to get those people over there to stop talking.

There is one further consideration which must be revealed. It concerns the relationship between the irrigation needs of the valley and the navigation needs of the valley. The navigation flood-control projects of the Army engineers depend on impounding and holding a large amount of water for downstream use while the Bureau of Reclamation requires an ever-increasing amount of water for upstream area irrigation and power generation. Expert engineers reveal that there simply is not enough water over

wet and dry cycles to meet both needs. Neither agency has ever squarely faced this fundamental problem.

Most of the expensive dams now being planned and built on the river are not for flood control. The flood-control needs of the Missouri River could be taken care of with 10,000,000 feet of storage, yet the dams now being built provide almost 80,000,000 feet. The extra 70,000,000 feet therefore are for navigation and irrigation. Yet, as we have seen, the problem is not being effectively met. We now find that even the navigation part of the development has been incompletely thought out and is being seriously challenged. The Army engineers, under the present system, have planned for a 9-foot channel, yet most of the neighboring Mississippi-Ohio navigation system is based on a 12-foot channel. Big barges, therefore, will not be able to move up the Missouri, which means that barge cargo loads will have to be shifted from one size barge to another when loads are transferred from the Missouri to the Mississippi or back. The expected advantages from making the Missouri part of an inland waterway system are therefore not going to be achieved.

We could go on with more criticism of the Pick-Sloan plan. Garrison Dam, for example, is being built in North Dakota to back up 17,000,000 acre-feet of water at a cost of about \$180,000,000. We find in the record that the Bureau of Reclamation, through its Chief Engineer, W. G. Sloan, told Congress:

"Garrison Dam is unnecessary in any plan of developing navigation, or any other purpose." He also said, "We recommend the elimination of the Garrison Dam because we think it is unnecessary and not worth the expenditure." This criticism was made, however, before the bond of silence between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers was entered into in 1944.

Lower down in the river, a dam is being built at Gavins Point, S. Dak. It is basically a power dam, and will cost over \$30,000,000. Mr. Sloan, again before he took the vows of silence, told Congress "It is a very expensive dam for the benefits to be derived from it. As a power proposition, the cost per kilowatt-hour for the development there is 30 to 40 times the cost of power at any of the other dams."

America is paying a big price, and an unnecessary price, for the waste of our resources in the Missouri Valley. The Missouri Basin is an essential part of America. In the Missouri Basin is raised nearly half of our foodstuffs. Here are limitless deposits of coal and phosphates, timberlands, and mineral deposits. But here, too, is a river rushing away to the sea in floods, thousands of acres of rich land and irreplaceable natural resources.

The issue of an MVA is not a sectional issue at all. It is a national issue. MVA will mean more and cheaper production from more and cheaper electricity. It means more diversified agriculture, providing crops in demand rather than crops in surplus. It means cheaper finished products because it will bring cheaper transportation of raw materials out of the valley. MVA can make a great contribution to food security for the world, because its soil-conservation provisions will improve and extend the conservation practices of the basin. MVA can strike a blow for free enterprise against monopoly in such fields as light metals and fertilizer, where big business controls supply and controls price. New business growing from MVA's cheaper electric power can break the monopoly control.

MVA is a symbol of liberalism in that it is an acknowledgment that the meaning of democracy in 1949 is that responsible government should be the agency through which the people can act together to do for themselves what each individually cannot do. It is a symbol of conservation in

that it champions efficient and economical government and practical business administration. It is plain good sense. And it is urgent.

MVA should come out of the Eighty-second Congress. Sound economy and the requirements of efficient and constructive use of our natural resources, present compelling evidence for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Administration.

Resolutions of the Annual Assembly, National Jewish Youth Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, from August 31 to September 7, 1951, the annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference met at Camp Wel-Met, Narrowsburg, N. Y. Two hundred young people coming from all parts of the United States met to consider the problems of Jewish youth at midcentury.

The National Jewish Youth Conference is a permanent Nation-wide body which represents more than 300 local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils and 10 national Jewish youth organizations and has a membership of 300,000 young people. It is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include some of the resolutions adopted at the annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference which clearly reflects the thinking of many of our young people. They follow:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, NATIONAL JEWISH YOUTH CONFERENCE

I

Whereas the charter of the United Nations states "In order to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples," the United Nations was created; and

Whereas the lives of our generation have been disrupted by past wars and preparations for possible future wars; and

Whereas we feel that the interests of the world in general and youth in particular can be best served through negotiation of differences within the framework of the United Nations; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 1951 National Jewish Youth Conference commend the United Nations for the efforts it has already made and urges it to continue to explore every avenue which may lead to a peaceful solution to these differences and so avoid world conflict; Be it further

Resolved, That the United States Government, through the United Nations also continue to explore all possible avenues of peace.

II

Whereas the United Nations is the only international organization that can establish a strong and durable peace; and

Whereas the United Nations is our best hope to build the economic, social, and political foundations necessary to achieve world peace and security based upon the rights and dignity of peoples and nations; and

Whereas the United Nations is designed to serve people and since survival in this critical period will depend upon the kind of support we give it; and

Whereas people have a decisive role to play in assuring the continued effective operation of the United Nations; Therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to create community awareness of our stake in the United Nations that the 1951 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference call upon all local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations to observe United Nations Day on October 24, 1951.

III

Whereas the delegates to the 1950 annual assembly of the NJYC unconditionally oppose the adoption of the McCarran bill; and

Whereas we still believe that the McCarran Act "jeopardizes the rights of individuals and organizations which are not subversive but which are dedicated in principle and program to fight antidemocratic forces"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 1951 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference calls upon the Congress of the United States to repeal the McCarran Law.

IV

Whereas the annual assemblies of the National Jewish Youth Conference for the past 3 years have stated their opposition to the resurgence of nazism in Germany, and

Whereas we note with pain and anger the rapidity with which the murder of 6,000,000 Jews and millions of peoples of all nations is being forgotten; and

Whereas events since the last annual assembly indicate that far from abating, the danger of nazism has increased;

Therefore the 1951 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference—

A. Opposes the encouragement of Nazi revival in both East and West Germany.

B. Specifically opposes the commutations of sentences and extension of clemency to Nazi war criminals

C. Recommends to local councils and national Jewish youth organizations that they consider this matter and take action on it.

V

Whereas the annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference considers it essential that human rights be achieved for all people of every country in the world; and

Whereas the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human rights enumerated those human rights which are the ultimate goal of all democratic people;

Therefore all people should pledge their support of this declaration, and all Americans should work to eliminate violations of human rights. Jewish youth in America should play a vital role in this effort;

Therefore the 1951 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference should—

A. Urge its constituent councils and national organizations to undertake, by the most effective means, practical programs to educate its members and to work for the elimination of violations of these rights.

B. Focus attention on such issues at its annual assemblies and take action on those issues where there is general agreement.

C. Supply factual information to its constituents on issues agreed upon by the assembly to enable them to take intelligent and informed social action.

VI

Whereas many studies by responsible groups have revealed many instances of bias toward minority groups in textbooks and the entertainment industries; and

Whereas such bias has led to a lack of understanding and its consequent instances of discrimination: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference take the best effective action to encourage objectivity in textbooks; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the entertainment industries to lend their facilities to promote a better understanding among all groups.

Whereas the National Jewish Youth Conference through the Young Adult Council is related to the World Assembly of Youth; and

Whereas the World Assembly of Youth has developed an international program for the coming years to bring about international understanding; and

Therefore the National Jewish Youth Conference should support the program of the World Assembly of Youth by making the purposes and activities of the World Assembly of Youth known to its constituents.

VIII

Th 1951 annual assembly of the NJYC notes with gratification the inclusion of grant-in-aid to Israel in the Mutual Security Act which was recently passed by both Houses of the United States Congress. The 1951 annual assembly of the NJYC urges the Joint Appropriations Committee of the United States Congress to make funds available to implement speedily the act.

IX

The 1951 annual assembly of NJYC expresses appreciation for the efforts of the United States delegation to the United Nations in spearheading the Security Council resolution calling upon Egypt to end its blockade of Israeli-bound ships passing through the Suez Canal as another step toward promoting peace and stability in the Middle East.

X

Whereas the National Jewish Youth Conference having participated in the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth through resolution by its Annual Assembly in 1949 and 1950, and

Whereas through the participation of the National Jewish Youth Conference and the National Jewish Welfare Board, delegates in the meetings of the White House conference in Washington, D. C. and through the participation of local and regional councils and national Jewish youth organizations and the leaders of the National Jewish Youth Conference in the activities of local and State committees and in the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth both before and after the December meetings in Washington,

Be it

Resolved, That the 1951 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference call upon Jewish youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations to continue to lend interest and support to the achievement of the goals of the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth as expressed in the recommendations of the conference and pledge to children, and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the President of the United States on his establishment of a national committee to implement White House conference recommendations and pledge it the cooperation and support of the National Jewish Youth Conference, and be it further

Resolved, That we record our appreciation for the full opportunity for youth participation both in the planning and conduct of the White House conference, and be it further

Resolved, That we approve and endorse the recommendations made by the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth and that during the period ahead the National Jewish Youth Conference continue to give high priority to the recommendations calling for the separation of church and State, the adoption of President Truman's civil rights program, Federal aids to tax-supported educational institutions, adequate housing, slum clearance, youth participation in community affairs, and employment opportunities and guidance.

More Potent Than Beefsteak, and Dirt Cheap, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

MR. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article of Harriet L. and Harry C. Andrews which appeared in the Iowa Farm and Home Journal Register of September 2, 1951:

MORE POTENT THAN BEEFSTEAK, AND DIRT CHEAP, TOO

There's a new food available which you can put in a canister on your pantry shelf—along with your sugar and flour—and have a supply of concentrated protein and mineral on hand at all times.

It is nonfat dry milk.

You've already heard of it, and it's been on the dinner menus of pigs and chickens for years. Bakers and ice-cream manufacturers have been using it, and now the housewife has access to this valuable food for her daily cooking.

Nonfat dry milk solids are made from fresh whole milk from which the fat has been removed. The milk is dried by a low-heat process during which the milk is shot in a very fine spray and under extremely high pressure through heated air. It instantly turns to a very fine powder, almost white, odorless, but with a pleasing taste.

This nonfat dry milk solid or dried milk powder contains 35 percent protein, 50 percent milk sugar, 8 percent mineral, numerous vitamins and about 4 percent moisture. (There's a tiny bit of the butterfat still in it, but not enough to count.)

Dry milk can be bought economically and used conveniently by adding it to many familiar recipes.

This is especially important when you consider that the most expensive part of a well-balanced diet involves the protein foods which the housewife customarily purchases. Addition of dried milk makes an inexpensive way of upgrading the diet and providing the protein lacking in so many meals.

This low cost is an important factor in these days of high prices for many of the proteins. The housewife who knows good nutrition now can supplement meat, fish, poultry, eggs, cheese, and milk with dried milk powder and thus afford better nutrition for her family without spending much more.

Nutritionists say the average workingman weighing 150 pounds should have 2½ ounces or 70 grams of protein daily. Requirements may range from 1½ ounces or about 40 grams for the 2-year-old child and 2 ounces or 60 grams for the 8-year-old to as much as 3½ ounces or 100 grams for the active teen-ager or a pregnant woman.

About half of these daily requirements can be met by adding one cup of dry milk per person per day to the diet, or a total of 2 pounds weekly (one cup weighs a little more than a quarter of a pound). One cup contains about 1½ ounces of the highest quality complete protein, which can be purchased at from 6 to 13 cents—the price depends on whether it is purchased in a small package or in bulk.

This nonfat dry milk is a highly concentrated food, not only in protein but in carbohydrates and food energy as well, with a bonus of minerals and vitamins.

One cup of dry milk at a cost of 6 to 13 cents is the approximate equivalent in complete protein content to a half-pound of beefsteak at 50 cents or two-thirds of a pound of pork loin at 33 cents or seven eggs at 30 cents or a third to a half-pound of Cheddar cheese at 20 to 30 cents.

Each cup of dry milk contains 434 calories. One pound contains 1,643. It is especially valuable for those who require a low-calorie, high-protein diet as well as for older people and children.

From the standpoint of the Iowa dairy farmer, the wider use of dry milk may prove an important economic factor. For every pound of fat a cow produces, she also produces about a pound of high-quality protein.

It may be possible for the dairy farmer to realize as much from the sale of protein in the form of dry milk as he gets for the butterfat now being marketed. This might bring either considerable increase in return from sale of dairy products or a lessened cost of butter.

Butter has had to carry most of the cost load of dairy production because the returns from protein have been relatively small when the milk has been separated and the cream or butterfat sold for churning into butter.

With wider use of the protein content of milk, it should be possible to provide better food, cheaper, to consumers and at the same time increase returns to milk producers. Present sale of the protein content of milk in dry form for human consumption now is yielding returns in dollars and cents approximately half what a dairyman gets for fresh, whole milk.

The dairy farmer is now in a position to help alleviate the world-wide protein shortage. On the basis that a cow produces a pound of protein for each pound of butterfat, each Iowa cow produces about 225 pounds of protein per year. It would take the equivalent of four 940-pound steers to yield this same amount.

Dried milk has been available for some time, but much of it has not been suitable for human consumption. Now that grade A dried milk is here, homemakers should know more of its value and how to use it.

Most of the emphasis on household use of dried milk has been on reliequifying or reconstituting it by adding water. Little has been done to use the dry milk powder itself in cooking, and there has been little imagination in preparing dishes that add both fortification and glamour to daily meals through use of the powdered milk.

Dried milk may be used as liquid (by reliequifying, of course) or may be made into pastes of various consistencies with any desired amount of liquid such as water, whole milk, or the liquid in which vegetables have been cooked.

For example, one may enrich the liquid in making scalloped potatoes, corn, or macaroni and cheese by adding one cup of dry milk to two cups of liquid. Dry milk also mixes well with semiliquids such as shortenings, corn sirup, and peanut butter.

One of the best ways to use it is to mix the dry milk powder with other dry ingredients. This saves time and helps with the subsequent dissolving.

Many familiar recipes may be used with the addition of dried milk to provide better eating. This can be done without materially increased cost or sometimes at even less cost in these days of high meat prices.

Children who don't drink enough milk—either because it's not available or because they don't have enough appetite for this and other proteins—may get much of their protein requirements by the addition of dried milk to their diets.

Better consult your doctor about adding it to baby's prepared cereal or other foods as a supplementary protein.

Youngsters will benefit from a few teaspoonful added to their eggnogs, chocolate drinks, and other milk dishes. The same will be true of an extra amount of dry milk added to cream soups, puddings, and desserts.

One cup of dry milk, when reliquified, makes about a quart of milk. So when a cup of powder is added to any food the family is getting all the health benefits of an extra quart of milk without having to consume the extra fat and water.

When reliquified for drinking, dried milk is not only palatable but quite tasty. Some persons even say that when it has been properly mixed and chilled, they prefer it to fresh whole milk. There is no question about its palatability now that proper methods of making it have been developed. Its high protein content makes certain types of dried milk valuable for formulas for infants, too.

One of the advantages of using protein in dry milk form is that it is an animal protein and as such incorporates into the diet valuable amino acids. Amino acids are the building blocks with which muscle, blood cells, and tissues are made and repaired.

Many vegetable proteins actually are incomplete and a diet requires the addition of animal proteins to get these necessary amino acids. No balanced diet is possible without them, and so the use of more dried milk is a way to better nutrition.¹

Still another property which makes dry milk so worth while as a food is that it can be stored almost indefinitely without refrigeration. This storage does not require any further processing or preservation, and with proper storage, the powder will retain all of its valuable properties.

This very fact means a great saving to the wholesaler, the retailer, and to the housewife. You can store the product almost indefinitely merely by putting it in a moisture-proof canister or fruit jar on the kitchen shelf.

It is more economical to buy it in larger quantities than the small packages now on the market, but once a package is opened, it should be placed immediately in a moisture-proof container.

Dry milk can serve as an effective means of storing food against emergencies such as floods or atomic attacks. Persons cut off from supplies of fresh milk and meat could subsist for some time on dried milk powder and water. The powder is 50 percent carbohydrate and 35 percent protein.

It is a concentrated food and can be transported easily because of its character and bulk.

It is hoped that repetition of this old, old story will help the public to appreciate the true value of nonfat dry milk, a fine product derived from the once lowly skim milk.

Again scientists and engineers have found a byproduct that has been looked down

upon and thought worthless for human consumption for many years, and through the development of a proper recovery process, it becomes available and is recognized as extremely valuable.

The value of this dry milk can scarcely be overestimated when you realize that it is one of the richest sources of protein which in turn is the primary structural material from which the human body is built.

Furthermore, these developments will make it possible for the first time for every person in America and many people in foreign countries to receive the high protein diet necessary for best health.

The securing of these great benefits now waits primarily for the Nation's housewives to acquire sufficient knowledge of dry milk's value and varied uses.

Penalties for Influence Peddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Columbia Tribune, published at Columbia, Mo., a staunch Democratic newspaper. This editorial appeared in the issue of that newspaper of September 25, 1951. It is timely and, coming from where it does, I submit that it should be observed that even the Democrats of Missouri are becoming disgusted with the practices of the present national administration. The editorial follows:

PENALTIES FOR INFLUENCE PEDDLING

From some of the remarks he has made about William Boyle and some other members of the White House family who have gotten lucrative fees, mink coats, trips to Florida, and other things of value in exchange for help in getting Government loans, one gets the impression that President Truman thinks it's all right to sell influence. Apparently the President, being an old-line politician himself, holds to the Jacksonian idea that "to the victor goes the spoils."

Maybe influence peddling and other forms of capitalizing on political power weren't too bad in the days when Andrew Jackson put the spoils system on a national basis. In those days the Federal Government and the spoils that could be gained from it were peanuts compared to the gold mines that can be worked in Washington today. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation alone dishes out more money than was spent by the entire Government under Jackson. So influence peddling is a practical matter as well as a matter of principle. It is costing the taxpayers a lot of money. If the American people aren't shocked by widespread lack of moral standards among high-placed public officials, maybe they will get stirred up when they realize that these unprincipled officials actually are taking money out of the people's pockets.

It is said that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will soon issue a scathing report containing some practical suggestions on ways to improve moral standards in official conduct. This report will be the result of Senator FULBRIGHT's resolution calling for an investigation of public morals. It has the active backing of such Senate stalwarts as DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and other crusaders for more responsibility in government. It is also said that the commit-

tee's report will recommend changes in present laws to more clearly define the limits to which public officials can go in selling influence without reaping criminal punishment as well as public condemnation. For instance, the acceptance of gifts, such as mink coats and free hotel rooms, would carry penalties.

This seems like a sound approach to a problem that is growing more serious as Government grows bigger. Legislation alone won't make all public officials conduct themselves in an ethical manner. You can't legislate morality. But the threat of a fine or jail sentence would give pause to the more flagrant violators and might change the current attitude that it's all right to peddle influence, especially if you are smart enough to stay within legal bounds.

Where the Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, United States Government spending will reach a peak during fiscal 1952 far beyond any previous yearly expenditures by the Nation except in periods of all-out war. Many people realize a vast amount of money is being spent for military purposes, but few know exactly what the entire amount of money is buying.

Repeatedly in letters and personal conversations with citizens of the Seventeenth District, I have been asked the question, "Where is the money going?" It is hoped that the facts and figures presented here will help to bring these expenditures into the open.

Government spending this year starting July 1, 1951, will total \$69,000,000,000, according to the present plans. With our economy geared to a partial mobilization program, many of the funds will go for defense purposes.

American industry, through defense contracts, will get the largest share of this year's outlay. About \$15,800,000,000 will go to producers of guns, tanks, and other similar weapons of war. Aircraft manufacturers will receive \$7,300,000,000 in contracts this year and, with prospects of the Air Force being increased to nearly 150 groups, their share of the national budget will be increased.

THE ARMED FORCES

Pay and allowances for men and women in the Armed Forces will account for \$12,500,000 in this fiscal year. Uniforms and food to clothe and feed these troops is estimated at \$5,000,000,000 and includes other miscellaneous items of equipment.

The total for pay and allowances that servicemen will draw is more than it cost to run the entire Government prior to World War II. Should the war in Korea become more explosive, these figures also will rise sharply with any increase in the size of our Defense Establishment.

Other items of the budget more or less related to defense are: \$2,000,000,000 for firms with foreign-aid orders, \$1,900,-

¹Livestock feeding specialists, having known for a long time that animal protein adds something valuable to the diet that vegetable protein does not supply, called this unknown quality or substance "the animal protein factor." Research, of course, has now determined that at least a part of this difference between animal and vegetable protein is due to a recently-discovered vitamin in animal protein, vitamin B-12.

000,000 to building contractors for construction of critical installations, \$1,500,000,000 will go to the important atomic energy program, and \$1,200,000,000 will be used to purchase raw materials for stockpiling purposes.

Persons holding United States Government bonds and other securities will receive \$6,000,000,000 in interest during the coming year. Although major expenditures for the education of veterans under the GI bill have been completed, the sum of \$4,900,000,000 is allotted to veterans during the year and includes pensions, medical payments, and so forth.

Through the farm subsidy program, the Nation's agriculturalists will garner a \$1,600,000,000 chunk of the budget pie. State and Federal public works programs, including such items as bridges, roads, flood control, and so forth, will take \$1,600,000,000 of the outlay, too.

RETIREMENT PAYMENTS

Persons on relief and others, including retired postal employees, users of the postal service and the shipping industry will receive \$7,600,000,000 in direct or indirect subsidies.

Pay for the Nation's 2,500,000 Government workers is included in the figures previously given and will total \$9,700,000,000.

This breakdown is for the fiscal year of 1952. Our top economic planners believe the total Government spending will reach \$84,000,000,000 in 1954, when, barring a global conflict, the spending will level off.

Now more than ever before there is a need for economy in our Government. The public debt will rise along with the national budget since economists say the United States Government's income will not equal its outlay and we will be using red ink on our country's account books for many years to come.

Now is the time to cut unessential expenses before this enormous spending program gets out of control. We must all recognize the need for the United States to be strong, but we must also recognize that waste and unnecessary expenditures in the Government must be stopped before it is too late to halt this inflationary trend.

Guilt by Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star newspaper of October 8, 1951, entitled "Guilt by Association."

The editorial is very well written. I was extremely pleased to note that there has been somewhat of a change of policy at the University of Chicago. I want to commend the board of trustees and fac-

ulty members of the University of Chicago for taking the initial step to rid the campus of the subversive element, and hope they will continue their efforts in this direction.

GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

Last week the University of Chicago ousted from his position the student-editor of the school's weekly newspaper, the Chicago Maroon. Reason for the action was that the student had been a sponsor of and participant in the Communist World Youth Festival in East Berlin, Germany, last August.

The dean of students said that "sponsoring and attending the East Berlin Youth Festival demonstrates your lack of qualification to edit a free and independent newspaper."

But this is evoking the guilt-by-association doctrine which Robert M. Hutchins so bitterly denounced when he was chancellor of the university. Apparently no one at the University of Chicago has any idea what the student-editor has been doing in East Berlin. All they know is that he met there with young Communists and apparently had a part in organizing the meeting. To penalize him for associating with Communists is quite plainly to declare him guilty under the doctrine of guilt by association.

Of course, we have always thought that guilt by association had considerable validity. If a bank officer regularly plays golf with a convicted embezzler, or if an elected official spends his evenings with known racketeers, he expects to be thought guilty by association. But we have had some brilliant intellectuals in recent years who believed that they could belong to Communist-front organizations and associate freely with members of the Communist Party and talk like Communists without any suspicion of Communist sympathies being attached to them.

Mr. Hutchins was one of these. After some University of Chicago students, along with students from Roosevelt College, staged a riot in Springfield, demonstrating against Senator Paul Broyles' anti-subversive bill, Mr. Hutchins was subpoenaed before the legislature's seditious activities investigation commission.

Here are some of the statements from Hutchins' testimony:

"I cannot testify concerning subversive activities at the University of Chicago because there are none."

"The university has many thousands of students. None of them, so far as I know, is engaged in subversive activities."

"It would not be in the public interest to exclude students of communistic leanings. If we did, how would they ever learn better?"

"The university does not subscribe to the doctrine of guilt by association. The university does not believe that an individual should be penalized for actions other than his own. The university believes if a man is to be punished that he is to be punished for what he does, and not for what he belongs to."

"It has sometimes been said that some members of the faculty belong to some so-called Communist-front organizations. The University of Chicago does not believe in the un-American doctrine of guilt by association. The fact that some Communists belong to, believe in, or even dominate some of the organizations to which some of our professors belong does not show that those professors are engaged in subversive activities."

But 2½ years later a student editor is found improperly qualified for his position because he met with Communists in Berlin.

Mr. Hutchins stated several things in which the university did or did not believe. Apparently it was Mr. Hutchins who did or did not believe in those things. Now that he has left the university, that institution appears to have adopted the doctrine of guilt by association.

Like all people with good common sense, the university now concedes that if a bird is seen with ducks, walks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it is probably a duck.

Cuckoo Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial that appeared in the October 5 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News. It follows:

CUCKOO STATISTICS

President Truman slings a mean statistic. A casual reader of his budget-defense address Tuesday gets the impression that, considering the defense effort, Government expenditures are quite modest, kept that way by a penny-pinching Chief Executive.

Yet here are record taxes, with at least another \$6,000,000,000 coming up. What's wrong?

It's the way the President uses the statistics. These may not be the kind he calls butterfly statistics, taken out of the air with a net. They are cuckoo statistics, come to lay eggs in the wrong nest.

The President extracts defense expenditures from the budget because we must pay what it costs to be free. He extracts the national debt because "we can't repudiate the signed obligations of the United States." He extracts veteran costs because he doesn't believe in "economizing at the expense of men who have bled their breasts to save their country." He also extracts grants for the blind, aged, and needy with the statement that money couldn't be spent for a better purpose. And finally he extracts a little half-billion item for highway grants, which somehow also carries an appearance of inevitability.

So with \$60,000,000,000 written off as sacrosanct, the \$8,000,000,000 that is left just covers the bare cost of essential Government operations, like the Coast Guard, the FBI and the Public Health Service. Or so the President says.

It's an old trick, this marking off untouchable budget items. Too old to be convincing. For the chances for economy are everywhere. Even in the interest on the national debt.

Included in the debt item are a bunch of interest payments to Government trust funds and Federal corporations and agencies, and these payments form a concealed subsidy. The National Service Life Insurance Fund invests in Government securities and gets 3 percent interest, compared with the 2.2 percent paid to public purchasers of Government bonds. A couple of retirement funds and an Indian trust fund gets 4 percent out of the Government. Taxpayers getting refunds from the Government enjoy 6 percent interest.

The Tax Foundation, Inc., computed that \$145,000,000 a year could be saved here, without incurring any of the dishonor Mr. Truman suggests.

If there are not savings also to be made in defense, veterans and grants to the State, then the millennium is here.

The President also has a prize cuckoo statistic in the statement that over the last 5 years "we" have operated the Government with a surplus of nearly \$8,000,000,000. "We" indeed. The despised Republican Eightieth

Congress, over Mr. Truman's own vehement objections, effected reductions or rescissions in budget requests amounting to almost \$10,-000,000,000. By far the greatest part of "my" 5-year surplus was achieved by the Republicans.

Even the present Democratic Congress has already cut \$2,000,000,000 off what the President calls his tight budget, and it's not finished yet.

But what is going to be said for the average citizen to take is the President's calm assumption that all the complaint about taxes is really just blowing off steam—half the fun of being a citizen in this country comes from complaining. And he cites the man who goes into a night club and pays \$10 or \$50 but screams about a \$30 tax bill. Believe us, Mr. President, any man who spends like that has a \$7,000, not a \$30, tax bill.

As against cuckoo statistics, let us have butterfly statistics.

Farm Electrification in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, after reading the estimate of the REA report made relative to the State of Connecticut, I questioned the accuracy of the report.

In order to clarify a situation of conflicting reports, I requested an explanation from the State of Connecticut Public Utilities Commission, a copy of which I include under the extension of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission report is based on facts whereas the REA report is based on estimates. Apparently the Government report should be corrected as previously recommended by that most able chairman of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission, Mr. Eugene Loughlin.

Mr. Speaker, also included in my extension of remarks is an article appearing in the Hartford Courant on October 8, 1951, written by Bob Byrnes, who is well informed on the affairs of the State of Connecticut, especially where those affairs originate in our Nation's Capital.

Therefore it is my suggestion that the REA correct their report in order that the taxpayers of Connecticut may have a factual report instead of an estimated report.

The above-mentioned follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
Hartford, August 14, 1951.

Mr. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,

Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKARD: The commission acknowledges receipt of your letter of July 13, 1951, requesting information concerning the number of farms in Connecticut that were receiving central station electric service as of June 30, 1951.

During the past 5 years, the commission has used the 1945 Farm Census which listed 22,241 farms in Connecticut. Based upon this figure and as reported to you in our letter of August 3, 1950, there were 22,216 farms receiving electric service, or 99.9 percent, as of June 30, 1950.

We note from the Administration's release of July 30, 1951, with regard to farm electrification that, according to the preliminary 1950 census statistics, there were 15,615 farms in Connecticut, of which 14,408 were receiving central station electric service as of April 1, 1950, or 92.3 percent. This represents a substantial reduction both in the number and percentage of farms electrified when compared to our report of 1950.

According to a copy of the preliminary report for 1950 Census of Agriculture, Bureau of the Census, for Fairfield County, Conn., there were 1,427 farms reporting as being electrified compared with 2,475 in 1945. We note on this report that among other items, telephone and electric service are listed under specified facilities and equipment, after which there is a star (*). At the top of this column is a notation in explanation of this star which reads as follows:

"Generally, the data for both 1950 and 1945 are based upon the tabulation of reports for all farms in the county. However, the 1950 data for items followed by a star (*) represent estimates for all farms made on the basis of reports from a sample of approximately 20 percent of the farms."

It is the commission's opinion that, based upon the results of a 20-percent sampling of the farms reporting in the State as a whole, the figures are not representative or accurate enough to draw conclusions therefrom, and, for this reason, the commission must take exception to the REA release of July 30, 1951.

The State of Connecticut for the past 25 years has been vitally interested in farm electrification as evidenced by the active interest taken in this work by the public utilities commission, county farm bureaus, agricultural agencies, and privately owned utilities operating within the State. Accurate annual figures have been kept by this Commission of the farms to be furnished with electric service, with a resurvey being made three years ago. Therefore, we are confident that the figures on farm electrification kept in this office are accurate and reliable.

For your information, we are enclosing a tabulation on farm electrification as of June 30, 1951. This report indicates that only 10 farms in this State remain to be served, of which 6 have been offered service but declined and 3 where extensions are not justified because of inaccessibility. This leaves a balance of 1 farm still to be served. Therefore, it is the commission's opinion that the line building phase of the farm-electrification program in Connecticut is practically 100-percent complete.

Yours very truly,

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
LOUIS B. WARREN

Farm electrification data, June 30, 1951, State of Connecticut

	Total number of farms (U. S. Census)	Number requiring line extensions	Offered but declined	Not necessary	Balance to serve	Number with electrical service
Are served by—						
Connecticut Light & Power Co.	3	2	1	0	0	—
Hartford Electric Light Co.	0	0	0	0	0	—
Connecticut Power Co.	2	2	0	0	0	—
United Illuminating Co.	0	0	0	0	0	—
Derby Gas & Electric Co.	0	0	0	0	0	—
Danbury & Bethel Gas & Electric Light Co.	0	0	0	0	0	—
Clinton Electric Light & Power Co.	0	0	0	0	0	—
Mystic Power Co.	1	1	0	0	0	—
Bristol Electric Co.	2	1	2	0	0	—
Municipal plants	2	1	0	0	1	—
Total, State of Connecticut	10	6	3	1	—	—
1950 census	15,608					15,598

[From the Hartford Courant of October 8, 1951]

WASHINGTON REPORT—CAPITAL DEVELOPMENTS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO CONNECTICUT CITIZENS

(By Robert D. Byrnes)

REA SAYS 1,015 FARMS NOT ELECTRIFIED

WATERBURY, CONN., October 9, 1951.—The Rural Electrification Administration, in its latest estimate of the rural electrification situation, says there are 1,015 farms in Connecticut, or 6.5 percent of the total number of farms in the State, which do not have central station electric service. The announcement of the statistics does not reveal the manner in which the estimate was made, other than an indication that the 1950 census enters into the computations. The announcement cited preliminary figures of the 1950 census of agriculture which showed 14,408 of the 15,615 farms in Connecticut had central station electric service. The REA estimate, for June 30 of this year, as opposed to the April 1, 1950, date of the census, was that 14,600 farms in the State now have central station service.

With an estimated 93.5 percent of the farms electrified, Connecticut is well below the top-ranking States in the REA estimate table. States with higher percentages of electrified farms than Connecticut, and their

percentages, are California, 95; Idaho, 94.8; Indiana, 96; Iowa, 95.8; Michigan, 97.8; New Hampshire, 94.7; New Jersey, 94.7; New York, 95; Ohio, 94, and Washington, 93.7.

REA is required to make an annual estimate of the number of electrified farms in each State. This estimate is used as a basis for apportioning REA funds to States for loans. On the basis of history, this aspect is academic for Connecticut, as it is one of two States which has never had an REA loan.

Capitalist!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith a parable which appeared recently as part of an advertise-

ment in one of our national magazines, but which illustrates graphically the apparent philosophy of our present-day social planners and many of our administration leaders:

CAPITALIST!

Johnny used to be a laborer. Brother Tim still is.

Both cut lawns. Both used to use customers' hand mowers. Each could do one big lawn a day, and got \$2 for it.

Tim spent his \$2 on movies and candy. Johnny saved some money, borrowed some more, and bought a power mower. Now he can cut 5 lawns a day, and so makes \$10.

He puts aside \$2 a day to pay back his loan, and \$1 toward another mower when this one wears out.

He still has \$7 where he used to have \$2, and is helping more people get their lawns cut when they want them. Yet some enemies of business would say that that shows Johnny is too big; he should be limited in the number of people he can serve.

These same strange enemies would prevent Johnny from setting aside \$1 a day out of his own earnings, to buy a new mower when this one wears out. (Of course, that means Johnny would go back to hand labor at \$2 a day, and fewer people would be served—but these strange people don't care about that.)

And some people say Johnny should be forced to share his \$7 with Tim so Tim can keep on spending his \$2 for movies and candy.

Sounds ridiculous? Not at all. Every one of these charges and demands is leveled at American business today.

Truly a Day of Atonement

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I insert in the RECORD an article by Prof. Max Lerner, from the New York Post of October 10.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the published installments of the Forrestal diary should, on Jewry's Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, be concerned with the late and great Mr. Forrestal's curious inverted attitude toward world Judaism.

Washington was full of whispers of Mr. Forrestal's antagonism against the Jews during his Government career. I have no way of assaying the truth of those rumors, except as they are partially borne out by the diaries; but it seems to me that the course of history in the Middle East has proven that, on policy levels, he was as mistaken as are all other people who fall into the grave error of mass prejudice.

President Truman's "state ship" has, obviously, been of finer craft, for he has piloted the world's most powerful Nation through 7 years of international uncertainties; and one of his greatest acts has been his consistent support of Israel.

Perhaps it is not amiss to say that the coincidence gives an opportunity for the people of other faiths who have, even temporarily, fallen into such grievous error, to observe a day of atonement also.

Professor Lerner's column is so inclusive that I permit him to speak for me:

FORRESTAL ON THE JEWS

(By Max Lerner)

By a curious timing, the installment of the Forrestal Diaries dealing with the Jews and Palestine appear in various newspapers today exactly on the Jewish Day of Atonement. Individual Jews, like individuals of every other faith, may have many things to be penitent about, but I cannot believe that the Jews as a group played the monstrous role in the Palestine crisis that Forrestal's pages try to assign to them.

It is ungracious and futile to argue with a dead man, who led an agonized life and met a tragic end. But when the dead man's papers, now published, give so distorted a view of a living people, who will have to bear the hatreds of millions of bigots which his pages are bound to strengthen, the picture must be set back in focus.

Forrestal's big theme was that American military security depended on winning the Arabs—which is to say, appeasing them by the sacrifice of the Jews, that the American Jews were pressing for action in line with their sympathies but not with our national security; and that Truman, Haunegan, and McGrath were too weak to resist the pressures and, by playing politics, presumably sold out the national security to the Jewish voters and the big Jewish campaign contributors.

I put some of these things more baldly than Forrestal. I am trying to get at the essence of his argument, stripped of indirection and adornment.

Almost every element of the argument has been proved wrong by the history of the 4 years since he made these diary notes.

American security has not turned on the attitude of the Arab States. We have strengthened our basic military position, which depends on Europe and Asia, on our air strength and atomic strength, on our industries, on the attitude that decent men of all faiths have toward American decency. We have done this even with the Arabs half-hostile to us.

On the question of oil, we have stronger positions in the Middle East than the British, whose whole policy under Ernest Bevin was to surrender the Palestine Jews to the Arabs.

As for the military strength of the Arabs and Jews, Forrestal overrated the one and underrated the other. The later collapse of the Arab Armies, and the victory of the small band of despised Jews, was a measure of Forrestal's whopping error.

Forrestal was even wrong on the domestic side of the question. It was not the Jews alone who urged the administration to back up the U. N. partition plan. The whole of Christian liberal opinion, not only in America but throughout the world—as shown by the reports of the many commissions of inquiry—was for partition as a policy of sheer justice. It was the military, under Forrestal's spearheading, who tried to sell out a just position for the fancied advantage of appeasing the Grand Mufti's cohorts. What the combined pressures of Jewish and Christian liberal opinion did was to put American policy back on the track again, where it belonged.

Possessing a good mind, Forrestal covered his militarist and anti-Jewish position with high-flown language. He was trying, he said, to lift the Palestine issue from politics, and put it on the high level of national security alone. Which meant that those who differed from him were low-minded politicians, while he was a patriot.

The trouble is there were many who thought true patriotism demanded that America act as a great people, and not in the image of the Nazis. American greatness could not be expressed in brutally abandon-

ing to the Arab mercies those who had escaped the fate of the millions who had been burned in Hitler's furnaces.

We shall be hearing many times in the future the cry about lifting certain issues of decency and honor and American greatness out of politics. Let us remember that sometimes those who say it will be suffering from a disease—the disease of fearing the American people, and therefore fearing the political democracy through which the people operate.

Forrestal tried to live in a high place, away from the sweat and hearts of the people. In the end he fell from it tragically, toward them.

Bucking the Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recent action by the Government of Canada has focused renewed interest in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I think it appropriate, therefore, that the Congress, as well as the American people, be presented with a brief explanation as to how and why American participation in the development of this project has long been stymied.

I doubt, if any great project has ever enjoyed the unanimity of authoritative and expert support that has been acquired by the St. Lawrence proposal. The project's development has been urged by every President, Republican and Democrat, since Woodrow Wilson. Year by year the St. Lawrence project has attracted under its banner an ever-increasing number of State and municipal governments and national farm, labor, business, and veterans' organizations. Today, every major national farm organization in the country supports the project. Many of the leading labor organizations have rallied to its cause; and a substantial segment of American industry has urged its completion. To top it all, the chiefs of every Federal agency concerned with the proposal informed the Congress early this year that the St. Lawrence project is needed not only as a valuable adjunct to our expanding national economy, but especially as a vital part of our national defense mobilization program. Among those attesting to the defense importance of the St. Lawrence project were Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense Marshall, Secretary of the Army Pace, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Resources Board, the Munitions Board, and the Permanent Canadian-American Joint Board of Defense.

Why is it, then, that the pleadings of such eminent and responsible authorities have gone unheeded? The answer lies in the persistent machinations of a small but powerfully entrenched group of special interests whose chronic antipathy toward the St. Lawrence project has led them into destructive activity detrimental, in the long run, to their

own as well as the Nation's best interest. The nucleus of this opposition is the railroad industry. However, this general identification can be misleading and requires some careful delineation.

There are 19 registered lobbyists whose interests are in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project. Fourteen of these represent the following railroad interests: The Association of American Railroads, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, the Mississippi Railroad Association, the Texas railroads, the railway conductors, and the Santa Fe Railroad.

It is no surprise that the most virulent opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project comes from States where the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio, and the New York Central operate. This includes New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, as well as down-State New York. We occasionally find traces of their activity even in Michigan, but they do not dare come out openly in our State because they know the crushing effect of public opinion would descend upon them.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, along with the Baltimore & Ohio, has managed to create seemingly unanimous opposition among business groups through their representation in chambers of commerce in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. Its influence extends into Virginia through its subsidiary, the Norfolk & Western, as well as the Richmond & Fredericksburg Railroad. It is interesting also that the Pennsylvania Railroad's influence extends into Kansas and the southwestern territory through Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad, all of the directors of which are from Philadelphia and some holding interlocking directorates with the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The New York Central Railroad, though not registered under the Lobby Act, is one of the most aggressive opponents of the seaway project. Through its subsidiary, the Boston & Albany, it extends its influence into Massachusetts. From St. Louis and Chicago to New York and Boston, wherever there is a New York Central, Pennsylvania, or Baltimore & Ohio depot, you can expect to find a cell of violent and virulent opposition to the seaway project which extends this influence through their trade connections into the business life of the community.

The Association of American Railroads is fronting for these eastern railroads. It is known that the voting power in the Association of Railroads is on the basis of gross revenues of the member roads. This gives the major roads, which are controlled from New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, a preponderant voice in the management of the Association of Railroads.

Each member of the association enters into a compact with the association to follow the policies of its board of directors and, in case of disagreement, resort to arbitration within the association. Members of the association are therefore contractually bound not to take public exception to its policies. The result is that, even where any member

railroad is in disagreement with the policy of the eastern railroads, they are not free to express themselves publicly. Thus, directly through their own lobbyists, as well as through the Association of Railroads, the eastern railroads are able to mobilize country-wide opposition to the seaway.

The so-called National St. Lawrence Project Conference, which is supposed to represent many chambers of commerce, is actually financed largely by the Association of Railroads and acts as a front for eastern railroads.

Thus, a pattern of influence and intimidation has been created throughout the country, centered in the Association of Railroads and the eastern railroads and banking interests which they represent. The activity is usually pinpointed at those areas where they wish to influence congressional opinion. For instance, when the Governors' Conference of Inland America held its first session in Omaha in June, the Association of Railroads sent a representative from Washington to undermine the conference and they also had the assistance of a director of the Burlington Railroad and Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., Chris Abbott, in attempting to discredit the conference.

Again, the lobby reports indicate that the Texas railroads are registered as opposing the St. Lawrence project. By no stretch of the imagination can one conceive of the interest the Texas railroads can have in this project, except perhaps the fact that Congressmen and Senators from Texas hold responsible and honorable positions in the organization of Congress.

It is possible to take up most of the major railroads in the United States, such as the Union Pacific, the Illinois Central, Great Northern, Northern Pacific, the Southern Railroad, Atlantic Coast Line, Baltimore & Ohio, and trace their financial and directorate control to the eastern financial centers; and, when the western roads act in opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project contrary to the regional self-interest of the people of their areas, they are acting at the behest of opponents of the seaway in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

It is well known that Fred Gurley, president of the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railroad, has been in Washington lobbying against the St. Lawrence seaway. The fact that the Santa Fe Railroad is fighting the seaway is also verified by the registration of one J. P. Reinhold, as representing the Santa Fe Railroad in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 13, 1951, page 11342.

It is difficult to explain why the Santa Fe Railroad, serving west of Chicago a rich agricultural territory through Missouri and Kansas all the way to California, should fight the St. Lawrence seaway, which is supported by all of the agricultural organizations in the country as being of great benefit to agriculture. In fighting the seaway, the Santa Fe Railroad is going against the regional interests of the territory it serves and against the interests of the farmers.

There is no basis in logic or in fact for the attitude of the Santa Fe officials.

We must find the reason for this attitude of the Santa Fe in other factors than economic logic or regional self-interest. I think you will find the reason in the control of the Santa Fe by interests located in New York City. If you examine the 30 largest stockholders of the Santa Fe Railroad as reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission, you will find that nearly all of them represent New York and Boston interests, and some Philadelphia and Pittsburgh interests. Although many of these large stockholders are brokerage houses, among them you will find the Equitable Life Assurance Society, Massachusetts Investors Trust, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Prudential Life Insurance Co., New York Life Insurance Co., John Hancock Mutual Life, the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York.

Again, examining the board of directors of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, you will find that interests affiliated with New York banking groups have influential representation. Thomas S. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Co., is there, as is J. Luther Cleveland, chairman of the board, Guaranty Trust Co., of New York. In addition, there are five directors representing Pacific Telephone & Telegraph, Illinois Bell Telephone Co., and Western Electric—all of which are controlled by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., of New York; two of them also are directors of the New York Life Insurance Co., and three are directors in common with International Harvester.

Under these conditions, is it any wonder that the Santa Fe Railroad opposes the St. Lawrence project? It is well known that the opposition to the project emanates from those financial circles in New York which are interested in the eastern railroads and power companies. In opposing the seaway project, the Santa Fe management is acting against the interests of the farmers and the businessmen in its territory. When Congressmen from Missouri or Kansas or New Mexico receive letters against the St. Lawrence project, they can be sure that they are stimulated by the railroads, such as the Santa Fe, acting at the behest of the New York and Boston financial groups. Not 1 out of 10 men in the street in the Western States knows much about the St. Lawrence project, but a great flood of letter writing is stimulated by railroads such as the Santa Fe, whose voice may sound like that of the prairie farmer but the words are put there by eastern interests.

The question that confronts the Congress of the United States is whether we shall be intimidated and cowed by the powerful and concentrated attack of this handful of people in the eastern United States who, through economic controls, are able to extend their dominant influence into other parts of the country. Unfortunately, this intimidation extends to many businessmen and bankers who sell goods and services to the railroads. Time and time again, businessmen will say that they favor the seaway but they do not wish to be quoted on the subject because they do

business with the railroads. Has the power of the railroads reached so high that it actually curtails freedom of action and speech in the United States?

In the recent action of the House Public Works Committee on July 26, 10 out of 12 Republican members voted against this project. We know that the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio, the New York Central, and other railroads, operate in their districts, as they do in the districts of most of us. Heretofore, this project had been bipartisan in its support. Are we to conclude from this one-sided result in the committee that the Republican Party has succumbed to the pressures of the railroad lobby, and the other groups that it can activate?

I am bringing these facts to the attention of the House because I do not believe that a majority of the Members on the other side of the aisle would knowingly want to side with one special interest, centered in the eastern financial circles, to the detriment of the public welfare.

And now, we have the recent proposal by the Prime Minister of Canada, a proposal which signifies a shameful paradox. Here is a brave nation, our neighbor to the north, of less than one-tenth the population of its great and powerful neighbor, and endowed with an even smaller percentage of national wealth than we possess, offering by itself to sustain the entire outlay needed in the development of a common waterway—a great artery of traffic whose clearance will be far more lucrative economically and far more important militarily to this great Nation, and to which we Americans like to refer as the bastion of the free world and the democratic mode of life. Can it be that our foresight, courage and our reputation for taking the initiative in matters of this kind have sunk to such a level that we must impose our burden upon the finest and most generous and trustworthy neighbor in the world? Are we dependent upon Canada to provide for an American life line?

I, for one, will not concede this—not until the entire story of the St. Lawrence project has been told to the American people and to their elected representatives. I firmly believe that once all the facts are known and the total story is told, the American Congress will rise in righteous indignation and repudiate those who would have us shirk our responsibilities for the maintenance of our own security and well-being.

Controls Did It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a very alert, active, and practical businessman of Okla-

homa City. Without identifying him, I am pleased to quote as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I just saw in one of the weekly letters coming across my desk, an item that reads as follows:

"A still tighter pinch on structural steel for civilians is ahead early next year. Reason is that the figures show bigger Government demand for structural steel for foreign military bases, and for atomic plants. So new and deeper cut-back orders will be issued for January, February, and March. Roads and bridges will be hit the hardest by the new regulations. Offices, stores: most will be banned, except in defense areas. Schools: many will be postponed. Churches will get little steel."

It surely doesn't look encouraging for our business. Controls did it. Without controls there would have been a more equitable distribution of steel production and everybody would have been much happier. Government controls cause unnecessary stockpiling by all governmental agencies. Just watch the United States engineers, the Army, Navy, Atomic Energy Commission, Maritime, Munitions Board, and other governmental agencies move into the reinforcing-bar market and start stockpiling reinforcing bars all over the world in quantities far in excess of the wildest imagination of the requirements. Then, we wonder why there are shortages. How can we avoid shortages with such slipshod governmental controls and with such greedy claimant agencies?

The Action of the Department of Defense in Liberalizing Its Policy on the Release of Reserves Vindicates Those of Us in Congress Who Criticized the Department of Defense for Its Shameful Treatment of Reserve Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that the Department of Defense has revised its program for the releasing of reservists without doubt stems from the concerted efforts of some of us in Congress to correct the rank injustices inflicted on Reserve personnel.

I take pardonable pride in the part I played in trying to correct this situation, as evidenced by the following statements I made on the floor of the House during the present session of this Congress.

On January 12, 1951, I had the following to say:

ADDITIONAL SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the past week a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, has been taking testimony from representatives of the Reserve Officers Association, the Air Force Association, the AMVETS, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other organizations on the question of the Reserve components of our Defense Establishment.

While I do not want to create the impression that I am reporting for the subcom-

mittee or reflecting its views, yet I do want the membership of the House to know that because of the mishandling of the Reserve program, much hardship has resulted. The uncertainty that each reserve is faced with today has thrown both officers and men alike of the Army, Navy, Air Reserve, National Guard, Marines, and Coast Guard into a complete tail spin.

Two years ago I called to the attention of Congress these unfavorable conditions among the Reserves and at that time recommended that action be taken immediately by creating additional Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force whose sole responsibility would be to look after the affairs of the Reserve components. My recommendation, which was incorporated in H. R. 1439, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, was the first step necessary to bring about a complete overhauling of all Reserve activities with the hope of eventually building a strong Reserve force. Unfortunately, the legislation was ignored by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with the Reserve problem acute today and thousands of reservists being called to active duty, it is incumbent upon this Congress to take immediate action in remedying conditions. With this thought in mind, I have reintroduced my bill to create additional Secretaries for the Reserve components of our Military Establishment. I hope that it will receive favorable consideration.

On June 7, 1951, I made the following statement on the floor of the House:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I favor the conference report with the exception of the provisions that affect those Volunteer and Inactive Reserves who have been called to active duty against their own wishes. Most of them are veterans of World War II.

When this bill was considered by the House Armed Services Committee we members of that committee spent many hours discussing the treatment accorded the Reserves. After a lengthy discussion the committee unanimously agreed as did Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of National Defense that the Reserve program had been poorly administered by the Defense Department and that the reserve himself had been mistreated. My personal opinion is that the word "mistreated" was mild and that the word that should be used was "tortured," for it more aptly describes the treatment accorded reserves by not only the Defense Department but also by the component branches of our Armed Forces.

After the House Armed Services Committee had spent hours discussing the Reserve problem in general we wrote a proviso into the bill that any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserves who served for a period of 12 months or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, shall upon application be released to inactive duty after he has completed 12 months of active duty. When I speak of an inactive or volunteer reserve I speak of one who did not attend drills, one who did not take his summer training and one who did not receive pay for being a member of the Reserves. This type of a reserve is one who was solicited by the various branches of the armed services and asked to join a Reserve unit with the understanding that he would only be called to active duty should his country become involved in a national emergency. At the time the reserve was solicited for membership there was nothing contained in any law that permitted the armed services to call him to active duty. Last year without warning the Congress of the United States amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 authorizing the call to active duty of any type of reserve. By so doing, Congress violated the contract that existed between the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves and the Government of the United States.

With this authority the armed services launches a program of ruthlessly calling up the inactive and the Volunteer Reserves without considering the fact that the average reservist served anywhere from 2 to 5 years in World War II. The fact he had decorations, including the Purple Heart, was not given any consideration. There was no concern shown for the reservist or his family nor for his job or his efforts to complete his education. He was abruptly taken from civilian life and the hardships that resulted cannot be adequately described in words.

As the result of this inhuman treatment the reservist's mind is poisoned and his attitude so bitter that there is not a Member of this Congress who has not received scores of letters containing violent protests over the shabby treatment accorded these veterans of World War II who made a stellar contribution in winning that conflict.

These reservists cannot understand why they have been conscripted and thrown into combat while thousands of Organized Reserves are still on inactive duty and Selective Service is monthly lowering the draft requirements. During the month of July draft quotas have been lowered to 15,000 and frankly there is no answer to the criticism voiced by Inactive and Volunteer Reserves. They are the victims of maladministration and the resulting injustice that follows in its wake.

As I have said before the House version of the UMT bill provided for release of these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves after 12 months of active duty. Now we find that this conference committee report extends the 12 months of active duty to 17 months. In the vernacular of the armed services the reservists have been given another shellacking when this bill becomes a law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It does not make any difference how sweetly proponents of this report mouth the words "unless sooner released," the fact still remains that they have added five more months to the active service of Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Last fall the Department of the Army announced a point system, and distributed information throughout the services telling the men that after they had acquired a certain number of points they would be sent home. Then, within a matter of a week, the Department of the Army completely ignored the point system and the Reserves started asking the question, "Where is the point system?" The truth of the matter is that the Army had no intention of putting the point system in effect. It was nothing more than a sugar-coated promise designed to quiet the Reserves on the eve of last fall's general election.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not agree that someone in the Department of Defense has been dragging his feet concerning giving relief to the reservist?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Absolutely. Mrs. Rosenberg in her statement before the House Armed Services Committee stated the entire Reserve program has been maladministered and the reservists poorly treated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman think in view of the fact that the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], which is now writing a Reserve program, that if there is

any injustice done in this bill it can be dealt with and corrected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is on that subcommittee?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly, but that is another sugar-coated promise because it will take months before any Reserve program can be written into law.

Mr. VINSON. With the gentleman's aid I hope we shall have it in less than 30 days.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Already we have been waiting and waiting for 18 months. We started consideration of it last year and nothing has been done about it yet, even despite Mrs. Rosenberg's report to us that the Reserve program was maladministered.

Mr. VINSON. I hope the gentleman is not trying to convey to the House that the viewpoint he is now expressing cannot be solved; we all recognize the force of the well-meaning criticism the gentleman is directing to this problem, and we are trying to correct it and will when we bring out a Reserve program bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. While it is our hope that a new Reserve program will be a reality in the near future we are losing a golden opportunity in this bill to regain the confidence of the reservists and to restore their faith in Congress.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Under the conference report can the enlistment of Volunteer Reserves, Inactive Reserves, be extended 1 year beyond the termination date of their contract?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It can be extended to July 1 of 1953.

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman give any logical explanation of the right to extend the 4-year term or 3-year term enlistment contract of a volunteer or inactive reservist?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I cannot. Being brutally frank, the contract that the reservist has with his Government has been ruthlessly ignored so many times in recent months that it appears to be but a scrap of paper. Let me say in conclusion that in my opinion the great majority of all Reserves now on active duty are so sour and bitter over the treatment accorded them that upon discharge they will never have anything to do with the Reserve components of our Military Establishments. They have had enough, and I agree with them.

During House consideration of the military appropriation bill on August 9, 1951, I offered the following amendment, which was approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 122 for and 102 against:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: 'Page 52, line 9, insert '(a)' after 'Sec. 604'."

"On page 52, insert after line 11 the following new matter:

"(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act for 'Pay and allowances' of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserves who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

"(c) No part of any appropriation contained in this act or any other act shall be expended for the pay or allowances, or for benefits under part I or part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as the

case may be, of any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty if such member was receiving benefits under part I or part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, at the time he was ordered to active duty."

In support of the above amendment I had the following to say:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, on the 7th day of June, when we considered the conference report on the Senate bill No. 1, now Public Law 51, we found that the conferees had agreed to a period of 17 months of active duty on the part of Inactive and Volunteer Reserves who had been called to active duty involuntarily against their own wishes.

As a matter of information, when the House approved Senate bill No. 1, commonly called the UMT bill, it provided that the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves called to active duty against their own wishes would be required to serve 12 months. The Senate bill, when it passed the Senate, did not contain any provision whatsoever. So the conferees recommended the 17 months' period of service. During the debate the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] stated that in a few weeks the Department of Defense would send to the House Committee on Armed Services a bill providing a new Reserve policy and that it would be certain to correct any injustice that was being done to the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves. The House Committee on Armed Services has received that bill, and there is nothing in it that will correct any injustice which has been done to the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of the committee that is now conducting hearings on that bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Is there anything that will prohibit him from carrying out the statement I made, that we could correct it in the Reserve bill, which the gentleman is holding hearings on now?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can reply to your question by saying that the bill you have in mind may not reach the floor of the House for possibly a month and it may not pass the Senate for another month. In the meantime these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves are being retained on active duty.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to do is provide relief to a group of Americans who served during World War II for more than 12 months, and who joined the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves of our Armed Forces with the understanding they would not be called except in case of war. Unknown to these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves, the Congress of the United States amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 and provided that not only would their enlistment be extended for a period of 12 months, but they could be called up to active duty. Mind you these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves attended no drills, received no summer training, or pay. They were literally reservists on paper. When Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of National Defense, appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services she confessed that the law had been administered poorly. She confessed that the Department of Defense had treated the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves of this country in a shameful manner. Yet, they are still on active duty, and there is no Member of this House who has not received a letter, or numerous letters, telling him about the discrimination that the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves have been subjected to in being separated from his family, his civilian occupation, or his business while Organized Reserves who attended summer training and weekly drills

and receive pay for them remain at home with thousands of young men of draft age walking the streets.

Mr. Chairman, what does my amendment do? It provides that on the 30th day of November, 24 days before Christmas, because of the fact that no portion of this appropriation can be used to pay a volunteer or inactive reserve who has had more than 12 months of active duty he must be separated and returned to inactive duty. I say to the members of this committee, if you want to recognize a group of Americans who have already made their contribution in World War II, and who are being forced to make another contribution in world war III—and I consider the Korean war world war III—and if you want to help the Reserves in the future, I urge that you pass this amendment and return these boys to their homes for Christmas Day 1951.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How does this help the Reserves, by cutting off their pay?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It means that the armed services will have to return them to inactive duty by November 30, because they cannot be retained on active duty without pay.

Mr. COOLEY. That does not necessarily have to follow. I think the gentleman's purpose is right, but to cut off a man's pay seems to be a very awkward way of accomplishing what he desires.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is the only way it can be done. As I mentioned previously we tried to correct the intolerable conditions when the UMT conference report was on the floor but because of the parliamentary situation amendments were barred.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to repeal a provision in the Draft Act.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Not necessarily.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly the effect of it, because the result is that it will force the Department to do either one of two things: Turn them out in 12 months or hold them without pay.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They will not hold them because, under existing law, military personnel ordered to active duty must be in a pay status.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If it has the effect of repealing that provision in the Draft Act it ought to be done anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely so.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am entirely in sympathy with the objective that the gentleman has in mind, but I wonder if he can tell the committee what effect this would have on the armed services as of today—whether it would release so many men that it would make many of the units of the armed services impotent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When I considered introducing my amendment I took that into consideration, and that is the reason for establishing the date of November 30. At the present time there is a rotation program under way. There is, in addition, a program providing for the release of reserves under this program. They are releasing so many thousands every month. Among those released are inactive and volunteer reserves. Therefore, on November 30 a great majority

of inactive and volunteer reserves who were called during July and August of last year will be released under the 17-month provision which is a maximum, and not a minimum, period of service.

It is now August 9 and we are giving the armed services nearly 4 months' notice to call up paid reservists and draftees to replace the inactive and the volunteer reservists. Therefore, the results of my amendment in returning to inactive duty the inactive and volunteer reserve will in no manner disrupt the Armed Forces of our country. It will, however, in a small measure let the inactive and the Volunteer Reserves know that Congress recognizes the shameful treatment accorded them and is making a ninth-inning attempt to correct a situation that should have never developed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved a point of order against the amendment, but it seems to be clearly a limitation on the pay of certain military personnel and I think it is not subject to a point of order. I therefore withdraw the point of order.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the point of order is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down this amendment.

The question propounded by the distinguished hero from Wake Island was very pertinent. This amendment would have the effect absolutely of practically destroying a great many elements, particularly in the Navy.

I offered this amendment in the committee when we were considering the draft bill because I was very anxious to do what was right and proper for the inactive and voluntary reservists, and I fixed the period of service at 12 months.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman's amendment was not the one that was approved by the House, the one that was approved by the House was the one offered by the gentleman from New Jersey now interrogating the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman's amendment provided that they be turned out if it was convenient to do so.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I withdraw that statement and give the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] full credit, but the issue was brought up in the committee at my suggestion.

Admiral Sherman pointed out that to do what is proposed by that amendment would completely destroy a great many units in the Navy, it would be utterly impossible to administer without great military damage. So when we went to conference we reached the decision to limit their length of service to 17 months, and the services are trying to get out the Inactive Reserves now. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the effect would be to force out immediately every one of the inactive and voluntary reservists who are now in service because the Army could not pay them, the Navy could not pay them, the Air Force could not pay them; and certainly, therefore, you could not hold them involuntarily in the armed services.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will certainly agree that there are literally thousands of Organized Reserves who have not yet been called, and who are receiving drill pay and expect to be called.

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Why were they not called instead of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman understands my position on that. I think the services made a mistake in not calling first the Organized Reserves instead of the Voluntary Reserves. But what this here would do is force the departments to turn Reserves out immediately, within 12 months, and the effect of it would be that half of your Army would come out of Korea, half of it would come out of Germany, and a large number of Reserves would have to come out of the Navy. So I trust this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The interim report submitted to the Congress by the Brooks subcommittee shows that as of April 1, 1951, there was a total of 360,000 Reserves on active duty and the majority of them are represented by the National Guard divisions, and the Organized Reserve units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps leaving literally only a handful of individuals called to active duty from the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

When the conference report on the military appropriation bill was before the House on October 5, 1951, I made the following statement:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 46, which is contained in the conference report, represents a compromise on the part of the conferees of both Houses. I appreciate the difficulties that confronted the conferees, but I am not satisfied with the 16-month provision. It represents nothing more than window dressing.

To refresh the memories of the Members of the House, my original amendment provided that where a veteran of World War II was a member of the Volunteer or Inactive Reserves and was called up against his own wishes, if he had more than 12 months' service in World War II and had served 12 months in the Korean war, then beginning November 30, 1951, he would be separated from service because no money would be available to pay his monthly wages.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Here is the thing that was pointed out, and it had quite a bit of merit to it, namely, that many of these men about whom the gentleman and I are concerned have already been in 12 months or more. Some of them went in late in July, some early in August, and some in September. The language of the bill as written is that if they have served over 12 months that would prohibit the use of any of this money for paying them. If this is adopted right away, it will take 2 weeks or 3 weeks or a month to process many of these men for immediate discharge. Therefore, taking all of those things into consideration, the gentleman and I would not want them to be deprived of their pay just because they have been in 12 months; would we?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They would not be deprived of their pay because under my amendment they are not eligible for separation until after November 30, which is approximately 8 weeks from this date.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, they would, because none of this money could be used for the payment for their services after the expiration of 12 months. Seeing that picture, and

while things went on in conference that may not be made public. I am not going to make any bones about the fact that I did not like the 12-month provision. I went up to a figure a trifle higher. This was the best we could do. It will take a few days to get this through. Let us say it becomes effective the 1st of November. Then, by the 30th of November, by the time most of them will be processed out, it will be close to 15 months.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I repeat that under my amendment an inactive or volunteer reservist to be eligible for discharge after November 30, he must have 12 months' service in World War II and 12 months in the Korean war.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thought all the way through that really was the best we could do.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I appreciate what the gentleman says he tried to do in conference, but, frankly, here is the situation. Under existing law the volunteer and inactive reservists can be discharged after 17 months of service unless the need for his rank or rate is considered critical by the Secretary. The compromise offered us eliminates the officers entirely and provides that the 17 months under existing law is reduced 30 days and made applicable only to enlisted personnel. In short, the so-called compromise is a delusion and a snare.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is what is happening in so many cases. When they try to get their release, their category is always needed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This provision is necessary if the majority of these veterans of World War II are going to be out any time soon.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

I want to remind you that your mail as well as mine has been full of criticism from members of the armed services who are volunteer and inactive reservists. You know the story of their treatment. I want to remind you that Mrs. Rosenberg admitted before the House Committee on Armed Services that inactive and volunteer reservists have been shamefully treated. Therefore, as a Member of this Congress, I shall not support any so-called compromise because to do so it is simply condoning the shabby treatment accorded Reserve personnel. It is interesting to note that the armed services cried that my amendment would destroy the services and hamper their combat efficiency. As a result of this outburst from the Pentagon I did a little research myself. What did I find? I found that in the Senate, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's manpower committee had studied the manpower utilization as far as the military is concerned. What do you suppose that committee said about the surplus of military manpower? Let me read from the report of this Senate committee:

"The officers and enlisted men assigned to 'permanent post' status at the 16 installations and performing some type of overhead function total 95,784. This is well over five divisions of men, most of whom are presumably physically and mentally fit for full military duty."

There alone you have enough surplus personnel to replace many of the inactive and volunteer reservists that would be affected by my amendment.

Let us see what a newspaperman has to say about the treatment accorded Reserves. The Boston Globe and Traveler of Wednesday, August 8, 1951, in an article by Hal Clancy, said:

"One reason frankly admitted was because the United States was caught short, and the mobilizers just grabbed the cards of men who were not assigned to organized units."

Then he went on to say, and he is quoting an Army officer:

"Give them the business—give them the business." That is an accurate quote."

Hal Clancy said:

"Those words were said to me by one Army official in an off-the-record discussion."

That is the attitude of some of the Regular Establishment toward our inactive volunteer Reserve.

Then, let me read to you from a letter received by an officer from Korea. Here is what he has to say:

"There are 7 major airfields in Japan which have a complement averaging 3,500 men each. These airfields merely contain an average of 150 personnel engaged in actual flying. Nonflying personnel on the basis of World War II standards for these type airfields should never exceed 2,000 men."

"The staff officers to command such airfields during World War II usually consisted of a colonel and about 20 field grade officers. Currently, the same organization has a brigadier general, 4 colonels, and about 30 field grade officers."

"These airfields contained an average of about 30 fighter-bomber-type aircraft. During World War II airfields of this type were handling three times this quantity of aircraft with smaller personnel. This obviously means that in Japan the Air Force has twice the amount of airfields they actually need."

"In addition to these facts, the internal administration of Air Force bases are broken down into materiel, personnel, inspection, comptroller, special service, legal, intelligence, communications, and public information. I have personally seen the operations of these administrative functions and I would conservatively estimate that each section was overstaffed five times the amount of military personnel required to do the job. This waste of manpower nevertheless is the standard organization set-up for every air base in both the United States and abroad, as put out by Air Force General Vandenberg."

"Each of these airfields in Japan are saturated with social clubs for this overstaffed personnel, including officers' clubs, non-commissioned officers' clubs, airmen's clubs, and a service club. The personnel on these airfields are occupying their time in Government-operated golf courses. One of these golf courses is maintained by 90 Japanese at Government expense. In short, the military personnel in Japan are living like playboys and are furnished a Government home rent free, and are having their families and American cars sent over at Government expense. Each home is given a Japanese house boy and a maid."

Now, let me read what a soldier said at Fort Eustis, Va., who is an instructor in a military school:

"Since the middle of July there have been no students to instruct. We have merely been reporting to work every day, and since that time we have been just sitting around waiting for 5 o'clock so we can go home."

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of surplus manpower in our Armed Forces and with some efficient handling of personnel, replacement of all inactive and Volunteer Reserves can be accomplished without any ill effect on the armed services.

As I said in the beginning, this so-called compromise is nothing but a delusion and a snare and I cannot conscientiously stand here and support it. Furthermore, I would be nothing less than a hypocrite to urge support of any recommendation of any conference committee of this Congress which would in effect place the stamp of approval on the shameful manner by which the inactive volunteer reservists of this country have been treated.

Mr. Speaker, the job of correcting the shameful treatment accorded Reserves has revealed the necessity for guarding against a repetition of the abuses that were permitted under the present Reserve program. To that end, Congress should immediately pass H. R. 5426, a bill commonly known as the Reserve bill of rights.

Preparation Against Danger From Russia From Without and Inflation From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Nation Marches Forward," prepared by me and published in the October 1951 issue of the American Vocational Journal, the official organ of the American Vocational Association, Inc.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION MARCHES FORWARD

(By United States Senator LISTER HILL)

The United States is today threatened by two equally deadly forces—Russia from without, inflation from within. Our most effective weapon against both is production—production of weapons for military superiority, production of essential civilian goods to prevent bidding for scarce commodities in the market place.

National security is the business of every citizen. Each must contribute his maximum usefulness to the common effort. We must make the wisest use of our reserves of basic critical and strategic materials, conserving them and finding new sources. We must step up our scientific and engineering research. We must increase our production of food and fiber. We must gear our training of industrial and other skilled workers to the long-range demands of perhaps 5, 10, or 20 years of armaments and military budgets.

The most serious bottleneck to increased production is skilled manpower. It takes far less time to make a bazooka than to train the man who makes it.

When we put engineering genius and skilled worker together what is the result? Industrial marvels such as our one-man-operated giant excavator with the work capacity of 2,200 mules, but which unlike a mule does not stand around most of the day eating its head off.

In such a mechanical Hercules and the trained hand at the controls lies much of the secret of our country's greatness, of our industrial and military superiority, of our atomic supremacy, of our capacity to out-produce both our enemies and our allies during the last war, of why the United States with but one-fifteenth of the earth's population produces and consumes one-third of the goods and services of all the world—achieving a standard of living four or five times that of the average for all the rest of the globe.

Under the threat of all-out war, quite naturally our thoughts turn to weapons in overwhelming numbers—tanks, planes, ships, and guns. But what of the manpower to produce them? Already we have exceeded the peak of employment in World War II and our defense program is still largely in the tooling-up stage. Already the shortage of skilled workers is felt in aircraft construction. Soon it is expected to spread to the manufacture of auxiliary aircraft equipment, then to the production of machine tools, and from there to the metal trades.

We see important elements of the aircraft industry, facing the heavy manpower demands of defense contracts, compelled to

start up their own courses for hasty, incomplete training at abnormally high instructional costs, to be added in the price of the planes to the taxpayers. We see a vast expansion of industrial training by the armed services at a cost running high into the millions and far exceeding the per student cost under established vocational education programs.

Why have these things occurred? The answer is simple. Under our heavy debt load the drive for economy has sometimes cast discretion to the winds and struck in the wrong places—struck at our long range plans for vocational education along with all educational needs. Too many Americans in civilian life remain unskilled. Our pool of skilled manpower is not sufficient to meet both military and civilian needs. The pinch will become more severe as the defense pace increases.

The last war proved once again the essentiality of the instrument maker, the metal worker, the machinist, the draftsman, the scientific farmer, the efficient housewife, the clerk, and the cannery. Following the war, Senator WALTER GEORGE and I and other cosponsors introduced and pressed to passage the Vocational Education Act, providing for a great expansion of our vocational education program. Unfortunately, the funds voted each year have fallen short of the amount authorized by about one-third, roughly \$10,000,000—a drop in the bucket as compared with the cost of less than adequate training today under emergency programs being launched by the Armed Forces and defense plants. How much wiser and less costly it would have been to step up training under our regular vocational education program that contributed 11,500,000 essential workers to the last war effort.

Our intelligence sources tell us that Russia and her satellites are feverishly working to train large numbers of skilled workers, instructed by highly trained vocational teachers taken out of East Germany since the last war. The masters of the Kremlin know all too well that their chance of success in their cold war, a major hot war or the long range struggle for world markets, depends upon maximum efficiency in mass production.

The Senate has made determined efforts to increase the funds for vocational education but each time the House has remained adamant, saying we couldn't afford to spend the money.

And yet, right under our noses lay the greatest source of financial help for American education ever dreamed of—a fabulous treasure of undersea oil off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana. Despite the fact that the United States Supreme Court has held in two famous decisions that the oil belongs to the people of all 48 States, these three States with the help of big oil companies has pushed through the House of Representatives a bill to take all the oil for themselves. The bill would have Congress make them an outright gift of the oil, estimated as being worth at least \$40,000,000,000 at present prices.

I, with several of my colleagues, have proposed an amendment to this bill to require that the royalties from this public oil resource shall be paid into the United States Treasury and used for education. This is the policy that Congress followed in the Morrill Act, providing grants of public land for the establishment of our magnificent system of land-grant colleges. Applying the same policy to this great new "land resource" at the bottom of the sea would be like placing an oil well in the back yard of every vocational school, grammar school, high school, and college in America.

I have been joined in the introduction of the "Oil for Education" amendment by Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, MORSE, of Oregon, NEELY, of West Vir-

ginia, TOBEY, of New Hampshire, HENNINGSSON, of Missouri, BENTON, of Connecticut, HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, LEHMAN, of New York, MURRAY, of Montana, my colleague, Senator SPARKMAN, and Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Every teacher, every parent knows the desperate financial condition of education—of vocational schools, grammar schools, high schools, and colleges.

This oil offers education's big chance—the means given by Providence without taxes for meeting a large part of education's pressing needs. It is America's big chance to pull away from illiteracy and educational deficiency that has caused the rejection of over 300,000 young men by the armed services since Korea—the equivalent of 17 Infantry divisions.

As one educator recently put it, "The Nation marches forward on the feet of little children." The royalties from this oil must be used for their education—in every State in the Union.

The "Oil for Education" amendment should have the active support of every parent, every teacher, and vocational instructor, every educator.

EDITOR'S NOTE—Senator HILL is coauthor of the Vocational Education Act, TVA Act, Hill-Burton Hospital Act, and the Rural Telephone Act.

MacArthur the Stalwart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared an editorial in the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., entitled "MacArthur the Stalwart," which I think worthy of our serious consideration. I am pleased to quote this editorial, as follows:

MACARTHUR THE STALWART

Straight, hard-hitting Americanism had a field day when Gen. Douglas MacArthur spoke at Cleveland. He made a direct attack upon the State Department and the general conduct of affairs and sent out a solemn warning that the United States is slipping into totalitarianism. He was direct and almost explicit in his allusions to the national administration and the leaders of our time, they had wasted the fruits of victory in World War II and lost for this country much of its prestige and opportunity.

The general, since his summary return to this country from Japan, has expressed his distrust of current leadership. Now, he becomes specific. The time at which he spoke was significant. The Japanese Treaty was up in San Francisco, the war was raging anew in Korea; Russia was showing its claws and teeth all around. The general was a powerful part of the Japanese renaissance; as commander in chief in the occupied country and the chieftain on guard in the Orient, he exercised power and influence in impelling the Japanese toward peace with the United States and progress toward western conceptions and ways. His removal, under the circumstances of today, now appears more reprehensible and dangerous than it did at the time. The practical adoption from grim necessity, of the MacArthur plan for ending the war is now in sight. His recall at a most critical time still stands out as one of the major blunders of all history.

General MacArthur put into strong words his feeling that the United States Government has become too paternalistic. The domineering conduct of the State Department, its interference in domestic affairs under the pretext of international urgency, its disposition toward appeasement, its faltering on China, all came in for attention. The general put the matter in striking light by saying that the Department now seems to regard itself as a prime ministry, superior in all affairs and meddling in detail.

One big item of misguidance in national affairs was the quick disbanding of the army after World War II. That, with the diplomatic blunders now in painful evidence, made a good basis for the general's charge that the administration and its various leaders can no longer be trusted.

The situation called for stern rebuke, and General MacArthur, with influence and prestige undimmed by most deplorable treatment, is a natural and convincing spokesman. With each succeeding appearance, General MacArthur reaches closer into the core of American thought. The pro and anti MacArthur sentiment cannot long remain unexposed. What he is saying should have been the basis of our national thought and actions all of the time. It is just too bad that it has to be called to public attention at this late period, but better said than left unsaid with the hope that it will reach into the conscience of the people.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, today is Pulaski Day, a day of great significance not only to persons of Polish descent and Polish affiliation, but also to the American people as a whole. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks which I made on the radio recently in connection with the observance of Pulaski Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASIMIR PULASKI: SOLDIER OF LIBERTY

History knows few men of the caliber of Casimir Pulaski. Hero, patriot and soldier of liberty, he crossed oceans and continents to give vivid expression to the spirit and philosophy of freedom.

Before he was 20 years old Pulaski played a gallant and leading part in the heroic effort of his country to save the Courland Province from the onslaught of the Russians. From 1768 to 1772 when organized resistance had been crushed by the invaders, Casimir Pulaski organized and led a band of Polish patriots in what would be known in modern warfare as an underground guerrilla operation.

Eventually, when he realized that Russian oppression had become too organized to defeat by guerrilla methods, he escaped from his native land to seek assistance from the outside. He journeyed from Germany to France to Turkey and further seeking to interest others in the cause of freedom for his Polish countrymen.

Unfortunately, no aid was forthcoming from a Europe which was not yet ready for democracy, and when the turn of events in

another part of the world opened to him the possibility of consecrating his great talents to the cause of liberty. Pulaski joined the American revolutionary forces.

Pulaski's baptism of fire took place in the battle of Brandywine, and shortly thereafter in recognition of his heroic exploits he was formally commissioned Brigadier General and Commander of the Horse. Trenton and Flemington were scenes of even greater valor by General Pulaski; and by the time he fell mortally wounded at the siege of Savannah he had succeeded in writing into the history of the United States a saga of patriotism almost unbelievable in scope.

Casimir Pulaski, early missionary of freedom and democracy, has bequeathed to all of us a stirring example, ageless and priceless. In our twentieth century efforts to establish a free and democratic world we would do well to take notice of that example and thereby gain inspiration for the momentous task of international missionary work in which our Nation is now engaged.

In paying our respects to the memory of Casimir Pulaski, we are acknowledging our national debt to the father of the United States Cavalry, to one of George Washington's most trusted associates, to the intrepid commander of "Pulaski's Legion," to a foremost soldier of liberty. His was the cause of freedom. It is our present cause and eternal cause of decent human beings. In its steadfast pursuit lies the best hope of redeeming those who, like the Polish people today, suffer under the heel of alien oppression.

The President's Executive Order on Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared opposing the President's Executive order for the censoring of news, together with a letter to me from John A. Creviere, of De Pere, Wis., dated October 8, 1951, and an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, both on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OR CENSORSHIP?

I received yesterday from Mr. John A. Creviere, editor of the De Pere Journal-Democrat, of De Pere, Wis., the text of an open letter which is being printed in this week's issue of his newspaper, rightly protesting against the President's action in his recent Executive order on censorship. A great many Americans feel that this Executive Order No. 10290 can result in the lowering of an iron curtain over information about our Federal Government.

I have already signified that I for one feel as our people do, that the President erred in his action. I think that this order constitutes a violation of freedom of information, and that it lays the basis for a tremendous cover-up of official blunders, errors of commission and omission by defense and non-defense agencies.

I believe that the open letter published in the De Pere Journal-Democrat represents

views which are shared by most of the newspapers throughout the Nation.

The American newspaper profession has never, in my judgment, betrayed the confidence of the American people. It would be the last source in the world which would want to impair America's internal security. Its correspondents have died on the same battlefields as have our American fighting men. It has fought notable battles for liberty from the days of Paul Peter Zenger onward.

During World War II, it abided by the directives of Office of Censorship in a model manner.

But, Mr. President, we are not in a state of total war today, thank God. And, while our men are dying in Korea in what has been mistakenly called a "police action", no case has been made for a closing down of America's basic freedoms because of that conflict.

For that reason I joined with most of the other Republican Members of the Senate in the statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 30 denouncing the administration's attempts to silence any opposition.

I hope that the bill offered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], S. 2190, for repeal of the censorship order, will receive prompt consideration, and thus will wipe Executive Order No. 10290 off the statute books.

Mr. Creviere's open letter states clearly the case for information. It points out the dangers intrinsic in this order, principally the likelihood that every bureaucratic blunderer will wrap a cloak of "top-confidential" over his actions, and thus prevent the people from knowing the truth.

It is "the truth (which) sets men free." Let us not lose our right to read the truth, the complete truth, in America's press, while observing sensible voluntary safeguards to protect our real military secrets.

The forthright editorial from the Tuesday, October 9, issue of the Chicago Daily News further describes the inconsistencies of the President's approach, as revealed by the latter's press conference remarks.

JOURNAL PUBLISHING Co.,
De Pere, Wis., October 8, 1951.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Throughout the Nation last week, publications devoted several thousand columns to informing Americans of the heritage they enjoy, in publicizing the celebration of National Newspaper Week.

National Newspaper Week came just after President Truman released his unparalleled executive order setting up censorship in approximately 60 Government bureaus not concerned with the military security of our country. We are in agreement with editors and publishers all over America that the President's order is a definite threat to the constitutional right of freedom of the press.

We have seen the ridiculous extreme to which this order can be carried. This in the Office of Price Stabilization directive to suppress information that might prove to be "embarrassing." We hold this to be but a disgusting sample of the liberties which will eventually be taken, even though this particular order was cancelled by the President.

Without a complete definition of terms, and a sharp rein on irresponsible officeholders, the President's order can easily make mockery of our precious freedom.

We feel it essential that action be immediately taken by our Representatives in Congress to see that the President's order be revoked or cancelled by act of your honorable body. This is not a plea for special privilege,

but a demand to continue to bring the truth to the people.

It is our sincere hope that you will strive to see that this directive is not allowed to remain as official policy in the capital of our country.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. CREVIERE.

[From the Chicago Daily News]

TANGLED TRUMAN

In his press conference last week, President Truman revealed an extremely muddled mind.

The major part of the conference was devoted to a discussion of his recent order to classify security information in all Government departments. It began with the passing out of a written statement intended to clarify the order and promising to amend it if it doesn't work.

The original order that was the basis of discussion extended to all Government departments the duty of classifying security information as confidential, secret, or top-secret.

This process has been well established for years in the military branches and the State Department. The Atomic Energy Commission, of course, has operated under the strictest of military rules concerning information, though the Commission is not an integral part of the military establishment. The Justice Department naturally has confidential files relating to the investigation of crimes.

The controversy that has arisen over the President's order centers around the question of whether the same system should be extended to other departments—to all Government departments, in fact.

The explanation has been that defense activities cover so large a scope that any department may have incidental functions in relation to projects that ought to be kept secret from the enemy.

Truman's formal statement dealt with this subject without, however, making it clear why secret information is likely to reach the variety of departments covered in the order.

Answering reporters' questions, the President launched out wildly in several new directions.

Asked what had prompted the debatable order, he said it was the publication of several specific articles. In every instance the material had been provided by a department already empowered to classify its information.

He also objected to the publication of some air maps that had been provided the Washington press by the Civilian Defense Department. The articles, however, had come from the military or the Atomic Energy Commission.

When this was pointed out, the President declared that the press ought not to print such material no matter who provided it. This was a new departure fantastically irrelevant to the order he had been defending.

If a responsible Government agency provided a piece of news for publication, how could all the editors in the country be expected independently, but simultaneously, to agree that it was dangerous and decide to suppress it? Reporters thought this could not be reasonably expected.

Nevertheless, Mr. Truman stuck to the proposition that if editors were sufficiently patriotic—as patriotic as himself, for instance—they would all agree not to print dangerous information even if the Joint Chiefs of Staff had issued it.

The President maundered around in contradiction and irrelevancy to such an extent that after the interview had ended Joseph Short, the press secretary, had to issue a statement getting him off the hook.

This statement said publishers might rightfully assume it is safe to publish infor-

mation from responsible sources. Citizens receiving military information from unqualified and irresponsible sources should be careful about using it.

With which everybody must agree.

Meanwhile, Mr. Truman had made an exhibition of confusion in his mental processes that is truly alarming.

A Banker Looks at His Supervisor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the fiftieth anniversary convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, held recently in St. Louis, Mr. C. Francis Cocke, of Roanoke, Va., delivered an address which I consider to be a classic in its field. Its title is "A Banker Looks at His Supervisor."

A few days later Mr. Cocke was elected president of the American Bankers Association, the highest honor that can be bestowed by those who manage and serve our unique but highly successful system of independent, dual banking in this Nation.

Mr. Cocke, as a native of Roanoke, as a distinguished member of the bar, as president of the First National Exchange Bank of Roanoke, and past president of his State bankers association, and as one of Virginia's most active leaders in civic affairs, has long held my admiration for his accomplishments, as well as my deep personal affection.

The St. Louis address of the new ABA president summarizes in dispassionate and constructive commentary the occasional differences of opinion which arise between banker and supervisor, and suggests means by which improved relations between them could contribute to sounder banking in this Nation. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of Mr. Cocke's address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A BANKER LOOKS AT HIS SUPERVISOR

(Address by C. Francis Cocke)

When your gracious invitation to meet with you was extended me by your able president, the first thought that popped into mind was: What on earth can I offer a group of supervisors of State banks? His invitation was so persuasive, however, that I could not resist the temptation, and I accepted. My understanding of the technical aspects of your work is too limited for me to venture on such a subject. You deal with the administration of banking laws daily, and although I am a lawyer by training, I could scarcely hope to prepare for and intelligently discuss the banking laws of even a few States in the time at my disposal. It occurs to me, however, that you might be interested, and perhaps find something of value, in a brief résumé of a banker's view of supervision and supervisors. I think it does us all good on occasion to learn how

the other fellow regards us and our work. On such a subject I feel qualified to speak, for, through the years, I have had many intimate contacts with supervisors and sat across the desk from examiners on many and many an occasion. But more than that, I have heard the complaints, justified and unjustified, that have been leveled at examiners, as I have mingled at State and national gatherings of bankers.

As I thought about what I might say to you, I was struck by the parallel in our objectives and the mutuality of our interests. Our common objective is safe, sound, serviceable banking—strong banks and a strong banking system, dedicated to an enlarged and adequate banking service. Immediately came the thought that the contribution supervision can make toward that objective is largely measured by the caliber of the supervisors and their staffs. At once, the divergence in methods of selecting supervisors came to mind: In 10 States, the governor makes the appointment, in 31 other States, he does so with the approval of one house of the legislature, in 5 States, appointment is by a State board; and in 2 remaining instances, selection is by popular election. Whatever the appointive method, one fact stands out: the average tenure of office is too short, the position is all too insecure.

Permit me at this point to make one parenthetical observation. In 34 States the banking department is a separate unit of government; in 14 States it is not a separate unit but is merged with some other department of the State organization. It seems to me that if any one department should be separate and apart from every other department of the State organization, it would be banking. Its independence should be pre-eminent. I am sorry to say that in my own State—Virginia—the banking department is set up as a part of the State corporation commission, and the commissioner of the division of banking reports to the commission. His authority is limited. Someday I hope to see a change made. I realize that it is not within your power to change these constitutional functions of State government, but it is a reform we should be contemplating.

Inevitably, then, my thinking turned to the compensation aspect. In spite of the fact that the cost will generally be borne by them, I think you will find that bankers everywhere will agree that supervisors and their examiners are usually ill paid. These bankers recognize that to obtain what they want from bank supervisors and from examinations, these positions must be filled by men of real capacity—men with keen, incisive, analytical minds—men with perception and perspective. To obtain such men with present pay scales is well-nigh impossible in today's market. In fact, you must be hard-put to even maintain your staffs numerically.

I might elaborate considerably on these twin problems. It is in the interest of the bankers as well as the supervisors that improvement be sought in the matter of appointments and salaries. It is not a condition to be changed overnight, however, for the remedy, if there is to be one, lies in the legislative halls of your respective States. Enlightened bankers will lend their influence and support to the alleviation of these weaknesses in our supervisory system. You can and should exert all possible pressure to secure more adequate compensation for your examiners, and, indirectly, you will be improving your own situations. These problems are not susceptible of direct action on your part, nor by me; hence, I should like to devote the remainder of my time to certain aspects of supervision which you can do something about right now, and in so doing heighten the respect for supervision and thus

create a more favorable atmosphere for pressing our legislative requests.

With you I rejoice that the examiner is no longer regarded as a "detective," to be dealt with at arm's length. We have made great strides in achieving mutual understanding and developing greater cooperation. With increasing infrequency do we find examiners whose approach to each examination is one of, What can I find to criticize in this bank? There is still room, however, for further improvement. Many examiners and some supervisors might well take a leaf from the salesman's book with profit to themselves and to banking.

No American can be driven into cooperation. On this score, bankers are true Americans. They resent the idea of supervision even when acknowledging its need—and surely the horrible record of bank closings in the twenties and thirties clearly emphasized this need, in a banking system comprised of thousands of individual banks. Nevertheless, the idea of regimentation is abhorrent to the banker. Consequently, the "big stick" approach only makes matters worse and is to be avoided. We just naturally resent coercion. Supervisors and examiners, then, should adopt the salesman's approach and "sell" their product on its merits.

Such an approach involves an appreciation of the other fellow's viewpoint and scrupulous avoidance of unnecessary provocation. Perhaps nothing upsets the bank executive more than to receive a copy of a report, which he must present to his directors, that lists criticisms and adverse loan classifications that the examiner never discussed with him. If the criticisms are sound, he resents not having had the opportunity to take prompt corrective action, if they are ill-founded—a fact that could have been developed by discussion in the bank—respect for the examiner and for supervision reaches a new law. The cardinal rule for an examiner should be to get his facts first, and such facts can scarcely be developed without discussion of the matter with the bank executive. Moreover, the simple element of courtesy dictates that the officer be advised of the examiner's views and be given an opportunity to offer an explanation or additional facts in extenuation. The report should take cognizance of such discussion by citing the explanation or at least the fact of the officer's disagreement with the finding, when such is the case.

Another source of irritation is the tendency of too many examiners to pull out the book and cite violations. So often, when the banker undertakes to sit down and discuss the logic and reason behind the rule or regulation, he finds the examiner no better posted than he is, except for the knowledge that such a limitation exists. Most of our laws, regulations, and administrative rules were developed out of sad experience and are founded on sound concepts. It should be part of the bank examiner's training to be well grounded in the "raison d'être" of the laws, regulations, and orders that it is his responsibility to enforce. Most of us yield to reason, even when we don't feel that our particular situation warrants the prohibition.

Examiners naturally employ ratios as rules-of-thumb for expressing various relationships, and that is wholly proper. Some examiners, however, come to regard ratios as important per se—almost sacrosanct. In these recent postwar years, loan volume has been a frequent subject of comment in examination reports and in letters from bank supervisors. Likewise considerable reference has been made to the inadequacy of capital. When is loan volume too high? What constitutes adequate capital? These questions are reminiscent of the words of a popular song, "How deep is the ocean, how high is the sky?" Whether loans are too high or capital too low is not simply a matter of

ratios. It is dependent upon a variety of factors, such as the character and composition and quality of the portfolio, the deposit structure, the capacity of management, and local and general economic conditions at the time and in prospect. These are matters for determination in the case of each individual bank—certainly no average is an adequate guide. An average includes extremes—like the man with his feet in the fire and his head on a block of ice—a statistician might say that on the average he was comfortable. So I say beware of making a fetish of ratios. On the contrary, use them for their true purpose—as danger flags—and support your criticisms with competent analysis of the particular situation.

Still another irritant—and a wholly unnecessary one—is the tendency among so many examiners to overemphasize technical exceptions and matters of minor importance. If supervision is to enjoy the wholesome respect of bankers, then it is essential that examiners distinguish between the truly significant and the relatively inconsequential. That is one reason why I urge that examiners be men of perspective; men with a proper sense of values, who will not detract from the value of their reports by cluttering it up with matters of slight consequence. Usually the mere mention of such features during the course of the examination will be sufficient. Only when continued disregard and the cumulative effect reflects upon management is it worthy of being brought to the attention of directors. Bankers simply cannot avoid placing less value upon the examination and having less respect for the examiners when trivia are so dignified.

As part of his job, the examiner must inquire into the express opinions on all phases of a bank's operations. Generally he is as well qualified to do this, as are most bankers. The attitude with which he approaches the job, however, is all-important, for nothing is more irritating than the occasional examiner who poses as an expert in all fields. If he is dogmatic in his Monday morning quarterbacking, he will arouse resentment even when he is right. In other words, it is not the act itself—the opinion expressed—but the manner in which it is done that draws the banker's criticism.

Finally, though it is so obvious as to require no elaboration, none of us likes to be told how to run our own business. I am sure that supervisors generally recognize that no phase of their work requires greater care than recognition and observance of the tenuous line of demarcation between the banker's responsibility for operating the bank and the examiner's responsibility for pointing out weak spots and unsound policies. In his discussions and in his report, the examiner should exercise extreme care not to invade the province of management. Failure to hew to the line in this respect will invariably impair the close working relationship that holds maximum benefits for both banker and supervisor.

Have I sounded unduly critical, gentlemen? Have I overstated the case? I am sure, as I have tallied off these complaints of bankers, you have recognized men on your staffs who fill the bill.

You know the men who delight in "cracking down" on "that so-and-so"; men whose sole approach to any situation is to bludgeon their way through. Bankers are human, and they react in human fashion. They can be persuaded; they will yield to reason and fact; but they have just enough mule in them to balk at any attempt to drive them.

You know the men who rush away from an examination the very first moment they can, who have no time to discuss their findings with the executive officers and possibly directors. Yet, some of these same men will write scathing criticisms in their reports, make wholly unwarranted inferences and

cite matters that could have been explained in a moment if they had been but mentioned.

You recognize the examiners who are prone to cite chapter, page, and verse of even the slightest prohibition, yet who, when the banker seeks a fuller understanding of the principles involved, can do no more than fall back on the cliché: "That's the law. I didn't write it; it's merely my job to cite it."

Familiar to all of you is the examiner who is "hipped" on ratios and regards any deviation from the average as the sign of an impending disaster rather than a point of departure for further investigation.

You know well, I am sure, the examiners who regard the failure to obtain a title certificate on a real-estate loan as a cardinal sin and a sure sign of incompetent management, yet who fail to recognize an overconcentration of loans to the same line of industry and upon the stock of same.

Finally, there's the boy who knows all the answers. He can come up, instantly, with a pat solution to every problem—so clever, you can't help wondering how he can be content with his job.

Yes, I am sure you recognize all of these characters. They impair the effectiveness of examinations, and they lower respect for supervision. It is for this reason, and not because I relish the role of critic, that I have spoken so frankly this morning. Let me say this, too, lest my remarks be misinterpreted: I am well aware of the many fine men who serve as bank examiners. It would be most remiss of me not to pay tribute to the remarkable job that they are performing, particularly under handicaps. The majority of examiners, faithfully, ably, and tactfully, are making substantial contributions to banking.

Perhaps I might have "pulled my punches" somewhat had I not felt that the conditions of which I have been speaking were susceptible of prompt corrective action—action wholly within your control. I am confident that these sources of irritation can be promptly alleviated. In spite of the fact that you are grossly overburdened in many instances; in spite of the high rate of turnover and the lure of more remunerative fields; in spite of the fact that capable men just are not to be had; in spite of these and other difficulties in your way, I feel that, working with only the material in hand, you can effect tremendous improvement.

My suggestion, first of all, is a bit of in-service training that would stress the mutuality of interest of banker and examiner and would point out the weaknesses in the approaches and attitudes that I have discussed this morning. In such a program, I would urge that the "why" of certain laws and regulations be emphasized, that ratios and rules-of-thumb be relegated to their proper sphere, and that the importance of assembling the facts produced by thorough analysis as the basis for criticisms be taught and practiced. The effectiveness of such training will be enhanced by subsequent scrutiny of reports of examination and close observance of the men themselves for evidences of the sort of things I have mentioned.

Secondly, I would supplement this in-service training with all possible outside educational facilities, including university extension courses; state association conference schools; classes offered by the American Institute of Banking; and, for those who could qualify, the work of The Graduate School of Banking at Rutgers and similar schools. I wish to congratulate you on the progress you have already made in training your examiners. It is gratifying to see so many of them attending these conferences and schools. I want to endorse these efforts most heartily.

Fundamentally, examinations and supervision should be constructive. Better trained and better informed examiners will undoubtedly contribute to this end. Maximum re-

sults can be achieved only through cooperation and mutual respect and understanding. Supervisors and examiners work toward that goal when, in salesmanlike fashion, they take pains to explain, to analyze, and to marshal facts so that bankers will feel constrained to accept the obvious conclusions. Logic and moral suasion will win more real victories than any other approach; if not, then most likely the facts, logic, or salesmanship fell short in some respect. I say most likely, for there are extreme exceptions. There are bankers, too, with dangerously swollen loan portfolios and woefully inadequate capital structures—bankers sorely in need of guidance; and that is what they should receive—guidance rather than arbitrary demands and dogmatic requirements. It is with these banks that a time-consuming selling job is most important; it is with these banks that supervisors can make their largest contribution.

Banker and supervisor, each in his own sphere working toward the goals of a stronger banking system offering improved banking services, have much to offer each other. Greater understanding and mutual respect between them will bring these goals much closer to realization.

In bringing this talk to a conclusion, I wish to close with a statement made to your association by our good friend H. Earl Cook while he was superintendent of banks of Ohio. Mr. Cook said:

"It is then our responsibility as supervisors to cooperate with, rather than to dominate, management; to guide rather than direct; to interpret the laws governing operations as liberally as those laws and statutes permit; not to take the place of management, but rather to be constructive help to the end that depositors may have better protection, stockholders' interests be preserved, and the needs of the community be best served."

If my remarks this morning are interpreted as an effort to encourage a mutual understanding among the supervisor, his examiners, and the banker, and my presence here as a mark of my respect and high regard for you and your fine organizations and staffs, then my visit will have been helpful as well as most pleasant. I thank you for the privilege.

Racial Segregation Under the Exchange of Students Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Defeating Our Purposes," which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 5.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEFEATING OUR PURPOSE

A group of 53 foreign-exchange students who had been brought to the United States to study during the coming year were about to climax an "orientation course" at Indiana University with a trip to the TVA. Fifty-one of the students were white and two were dark-skinned Panamanians. When it developed that the two could not stay at the same hotel in Knoxville as the 51 be-

cause of racial segregation in the capital of the TVA, the 51 refused to make the trip. Net result: 53 foreign students will fail to see one of this Nation's most impressive achievements; the rigidity of racial segregation in the United States will have been sharply demonstrated to 53 inquiring minds; and 53 youngsters who might even yet be enthusiastic friends of America in the 17 countries to which they will return have been given a bad taste which it will be difficult if not impossible to eradicate.

The student-exchange program can be one of the most effective means of building up permanent good will between the United States and other countries. We think that Congress would make a great mistake if it drastically cut the appropriation for this purpose. Yet it cannot be denied that many dark-skinned students from Asia and Africa have had unpleasant and embittering experiences directly due to the segregation practiced in various parts of the United States. They cannot be expected to know that segregation is fighting a losing battle in this country, or to realize that that battle is necessarily a slow and tough one. While, unfortunately, we cannot wipe out segregation overnight, the responsible agencies could by careful planning and skillful guidance pretty well prevent the opportunity for embarrassing incidents from arising. It is essential that great pains be taken to do so; for every colored student who is humiliated while a guest of our country is all too likely to go home an enemy rather than a friend of the United States.

Presentation to Kentucky of the First Post Office at Danville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* the text of a speech delivered by Dr. William Jennings Price, of Danville, Ky., and Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the presentation to the Commonwealth of Kentucky of the first post office at Danville. The small building stood for many years on West Walnut Street, where Ephraim McDowell Memorial Hospital recently purchased for its new addition the land on which the old post office was located, necessitating its removal and appropriate restoration on Constitution Square. This shrine is a symbol of the aim of service to the people to which the post office was dedicated from its origin.

Dr. Price is a former Minister to Panama, and is one of the most distinguished Kentuckians of the day. I ask to have printed in the *Record* the editor's note of the Danville Advocate and the text of the inspiring address by Dr. Price.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, together with the introductory note by the editor of the Danville Advocate, as follows:

(Editor's Note.—The address of presentation on Monday, August 20, of the first post office west of the Allegheny Mountains, by

Dr. William Jennings Price, of Danville, and Washington, D. C., at Constitution Square, on behalf of the Danville and Boyle County Historical Society, to the Commonwealth of Kentucky, is reproduced herewith in full. Dr. Price, for over 8 years envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Panama, practiced law here before entering the diplomatic service and for 16 years lectured in law at the Centre College Law School and Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. A graduate of Centre College, he has had conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws, and the doctor of laws and political science by the University of Panama. He negotiated the important Lefevre-Price Treaty, among other things exchanging important lands and privileges with Panama. Dr. Price also conducted the negotiations resulting in Panama's becoming the first nation in the world to join the United States in declaring war on Germany. After an unsurpassed record in the diplomatic service, Dr. Price for a number of years accomplished important legal work for the United States Government. He was a visitor in Danville during the past week. Mrs. Henry Jackson, corresponding secretary of the Danville and Boyle County Historical Society, which sponsored the post office presentation project, served as chairman of the program committee.)

"The soul hath its merchandise;
I barter curl for curl upon that mart."

And its merchandise in founding an empire west of the Alleghenies has been:

"The sense of gallant chivalry;
The silken strength of will."

The Encyclopaedia Britannica in its eleventh edition said:

"The settlement and development of that part of the United States west of the Allegheny Mountains has probably been the notable feature of American history since the close of the Seven Years' War (1763). Kentucky was the first settlement in this movement."

The Wilderness Road was marked by Daniel Boone in 1775 and was passable only for men and horses until 1795, when the State made it a wagon road.

"During this period," says Kerr's history of Kentucky, "1775-92, Danville was the most important road center in Kentucky. The Wilderness Trail leading directly to this place poured out its stream of settlers to be scattered over the country."

Some of the early important sequences of this stream of settlers poured out from Danville in Kentucky said the late Senator Chapman on the floor of the United States Senate was "the conquest of the Northwest Territory under the leadership of George Rogers Clark, and the extension of American influence southwestwardly paving the way for the Louisiana Purchase."

The inspiration and dogged determination to add this vast empire to the then narrower confines of what was America may be said to have surged through the English, Scotch, and Scotch-Irish settlers of the real America and to have originated in the historic town of Danville in Kentucky.

The recognition of what was the genuine America of that day was recorded in the old Kentucky Gazette, the first newspaper west of the Alleghenies, when the advertisement of letters awaiting call in the Danville post office included one addressed to Thomas Knight, America.

Through whatever port this letter from Europe came, the post office authorities in charge knew that if it was to reach the addressee, then Danville, in Kentucky, in all that vast area comprising America, was the one point to be utilized.

"Europe stretches to the Alleghenies," said Emerson, "America lies beyond."

The prestige and usefulness of mail service have been recognized through the centuries. The name of postmaster was used to designate the scholars of Merton College, Oxford. The Postmaster General in Britain is a member of the Privy Council and of the Cabinet. He is a member of the President's Cabinet in the United States.

"From the earliest times," says the encyclopedia, "the speedy dispatch of messages, letters, etc., was attained by relays of men and horses stationed at regular intervals." From the use of these stations have come to us the words, post, post office, postal, postage, postchaise, post-haste.

The carriers became known as Royal Messengers. The beginning of the post office system in America originated in 1692 among the colonies when a royal patent was given Thomas Neale. Single individual posts among the seaboard colonies preceded, but only a few. The Wilderness Road was typical. There were the men and horses with the pack saddle, precursors of the pony express of the West, followed by the Conestoga or covered wagon, by the stagecoach, by the steamboat, mail train, and the airplane.

What an eager gathering of the pioneers there must have been each midday in the old first post office at the end of the trail, which was Danville in Kentucky. What counseling together, what romance, what interchange of joy and sorrow.

From the confines of these old logs come memories as appealing and tender and fragrant as the eloquence which distinguished the pulpit and courtroom and the convention hall of these other log structures on this (Weisiger) Court and Constitution Square where we stand today; come memories as vibrant

"As the winds come when forests are rended;
As the waves come when navies are stranded."

A Kentuckian, it was, who described the beneficences of this postal instrumentality so eloquently that it has been carved above the architrave of the handsome and costly building in the capital, from which its far-flung activities radiate.

It is here quoted:

"The Post Office Department in its ceaseless labors, pervades every channel of commerce and theater of human enterprise and while visiting as it does kindly every fire-side, mingles with the throbbings of almost every human heart in the land. In the amplitude of its beneficence, it ministers to all climes and creeds and pursuits with the same eager readiness and with equal fullness of fidelity. It is the delicate ear trumpet through which alike nations and families and isolated individuals whisper their joys and their sorrows, their convictions, and their sympathies to all who listen for their coming."

Danville, the recognized capital of the district of Kentucky, was the western capital of Virginia, while Kentucky remained a part of the Old Dominion. Here the first educational institution was inaugurated. It was here that statehood was wrested from Virginia. Here the conventions were held, which resulted finally in the achievement of "the first great act of self-government," the adoption of the State constitution of 1792. Here the first court of higher jurisdiction was established. "The Wilderness Trail, leading directly to this place, poured out its stream of settlers to be scattered over the country" (Kerr's Kentucky, p. 298). Its claim to have been "the cradle of the Commonwealth" is meritorious, and it continues to be, as in the early days of Kentucky history, a center of culture, of wealth, and of activity in those things upon which only can be built the true greatness of a proud people's government.

From official letters from the Post Office Department in 1940 these excerpts emphasize

the complete official record authority for the contention that the first post office in Kentucky was established at Danville in Kentucky:

"An act of the United States, approved February 20, 1792, directed that from and after the first day of June 1792 a post road be established from Richmond, Va., . . . to Danville in Kentucky . . . That act is the earliest available record of contemplated postal service to Kentucky."

"The records show that under date of August 20, 1792, the Postmaster General forwarded to Thomas Barbee a commission as postmaster at Danville, Ky. . . . There is no indication in Post Office Department records of an earlier establishment of a post office in Kentucky."

Danville takes pride in the fact that Benjamin Franklin was intimately associated with the development of the United States Postal Service and may be said to have been the first Postmaster General; that his unanctional and administrative wisdom contributed to the establishment and growth of an agency that now numbers its activities by the billion and counts its budget in billions of dollars—greater in scope than that of all Europe combined, takes pride in that Gen. Thomas Barbee was its first postmaster and that among the occupants of the office was the great surgeon, Ephraim McDowell.

On behalf of the Danville and Boyle County Historical Society, I present to the Commonwealth of Kentucky through you, Hon. Henry Ward, commissioner of conservation, as the head of the department of the State, which has done and is doing such splendid work in preserving historic landmarks, this structure of logs, as genuine as the Kentucky forest from which they came and a signpost of all that is most worthwhile in the simplicity of virtue in man and State and Nation.

While claiming all the noble "firsts," to which Danville and Boyle County are so generously entitled, they stand at attention as "America first" passes by today in the procession of nations on a new trail in the wilderness of international relationships:

"Not treading again in the old worn, bloody pathway, which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster, but blazing a new trail, along which, please God, other nations will follow into the new Jerusalem where war will be no more. Someday, some nation must take that path unless we are to lapse into barbarism and that honor I covet," said Ashton Oldham, "for my beloved America. And so in that spirit and with these hopes I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first.'"

The Value of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, with the dollar looming larger and larger as a problem in our minds, and smaller and smaller in actual value, a study of this medium of exchange, in an article I hold in my hand, should be of more than passing interest to all of us.

The Topeka Daily Capital, on September 16, pointed up this matter in a forceful article which, during these days on

tax discussion, we could all read with profit to ourselves and the people of our country, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEFENSE OF THE DOLLAR

1. Defense of the dollar is the paramount problem. The critical front is on the Foto-mac, not the Yalu or the Elbe. Stalin is as keenly aware of this fact as is the President, and the latter goes the limit when he says "If inflation got away from us and wrecked our savings and ruined our economy, that would be the easiest victory the Kremlin could ask for. Communist Russia could win the whole world to totalitarianism without firing a shot."

2. What does he mean? Not merely that the vested capital of the country will be wiped out, including the worth of pensions, of life-insurance policies and of mortgages. He means the destruction of the American system (in terms of politics as well as economics). He means just what he says, namely, that the alternative to a sound dollar is the acceptance of Stalinism.

3. History cannot be mocked. The traditional recourse of the dictator in his quest of power is seizure of the public purse. All other authority follows that. On this account the founding fathers gave the control of money to the Congress and kept it from the Executive. Solvency for years past, prior to 1933, had been anchored to a natural standard—gold—a rock against which the waves of extravagance could make no headway.

4. That control has been lost. It is no longer a barrier to the whims of the Executive and Congress. Nothing other than a temporary agreement among a few officials restrains the Government from printing money in whatever amount it wishes. It need not go to the public for funds, for it can pour its promises to pay into the banking system whenever these officials, or others to follow them, decide again to have the Federal Reserve System support the bond market.

5. Such dollars have a backing so long as they are receivable for taxes, but they are fiat money just the same. They produce the inflationary gap. They are the lifeblood of extravagance.

6. They are fiat for this reason. Just as they are created by decree of the Government, just so their value can be utterly destroyed by another decree. It is only common sense to realize that a single election can, directly or indirectly, repudiate the public debt in its entirety. It can do so by electing a Congress pledged to appropriate no funds for interest payments. It can do so by boosting expenditures higher and higher to the point where paper money will be of value only to museums. After that, the concentration camps.

7. The States are in imminent danger. They cannot print money. They must use whatever currency the Federal Government foists upon them. Already their tax sources have been invaded. Malignant inflation can deprive them entirely of usable funds. More and more they look now to Washington for what is called, with the illusion of language, Federal aid. They get but a part of what has been taken from them. They cannot, even now, sustain their normal and historic functions without begging from the Federal Capital the means to keep alive. Inflation hastens attenuation of the idea of federation. Tomorrow there may be provinces instead of States, ruled by satraps dispatched from

Washington. Constitutions cannot prevail against the power of the purse.

8. All of the foregoing the present Government, directly and by implication, admits. So, it cries: "Inflation must be stopped." But who creates inflation and at what paps does it nurse? They who cry "wolf" are the wolves. The theory seems to be that it takes a thief to catch a thief. And what cure is offered? Give us more money. The taxes, already confiscatory, are not enough. The ideal position, says the Government, in effect, is when virtually all profits flow into its coffers; when the people cannot pay high prices because they have not the means to buy more than a modicum even of essentials.

9. Nationalization of profits is the worst form of socialism. When a Government nationalizes industries it must at least manage them and be concerned with profits or losses. When it seizes the profits of private industry it absolves itself of risk. Call it cowardice or identify it as a subtle method of accomplishing by indirection what Stalin at least has the nerve to do openly and violently.

10. "How long," asks a Senator, "can American business go on paying from 60 to 70 percent of its income in taxes, and survive?" The answer of an official is that, barring a general war, reductions may be permissible after 1955. But taxes then will inevitably be higher, not lower, if inflation has not been stopped in its tracks. And how much longer can the middle classes, the salaried people, and the annuitants, survive under present and proposed taxation? The kulaks need not be liquidated, as was the Russian method, by cutting off their heads. "You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

11. Confiscatory taxation is inflation. To put \$17,000,000,000 of additional taxes on the economy is to add even more billions to the cost of doing business. Taxes, like wages, are a cost figure. Somewhere, somehow, the high rates that are prescribed to stop inflation actually bring it about. Listen to the President on that point. He says (not with entire correctness) that the entire \$4,000,000,000 of new taxes levied last fall paid for not a single gun because the inflation meantime had raised the cost of defense purchases by \$7,000,000,000. Consider that—\$4,000,000,000 added to the tax load at a net loss of \$3,000,000,000 to the Treasury! Stalin laughs; we cry.

12. In the shadows of that picture, it is maintained that there is only one answer, namely, to give the Government more power. It wants to put ceilings on prices and to license business. To fortify its demand, officials with one accord, from the President down, keep telling the country that an even more devastating inflation is just ahead. It is an invitation to everybody to rush into the marts and buy, at any price. It is a repetition of the warning from the White House itself, last summer, to use dollars quickly because they were certain to depreciate.

13. "We propose," say officials in effect, "so to expand the facilities of the country that, within a year or two, production will be in such huge volume as to assure competition in the marketplace; we can and will have butter and guns." There is considerable merit in that argument. The American economy, in all truth, is an economy of surpluses. That was true before Korea, and the potentially grows with the days.

14. But political error can be the snake even in such a promised Paradise. Will the private economy expand under the burden of confiscatory taxation, combined with price and allocation controls? Already, there are signs that management is becoming cau-

tious Who is going to buy a production so vast that it would swamp domestic markets? It may not be practicable to subsidize exports interminably. It may be that point 4, whatever its merits, will not be a powerful force in the world economy until decades hence.

15. An expanding economy is a desirable economy, but not if the expansion is at an explosive rate. Not if the assets of the generations to come are sequestered in advance, not moderately but extravagantly. Ours is a mansion already filled with good things. We have, as Charles Kettering has noted, with 6 percent of the world's land area and 7 percent of its population, 58 percent of the telephones, 76 percent of its automobiles and 34 percent of its radio and television sets. That is an establishment worth looting—and the doors are left unlocked for any demagogue to enter when Federal expenditure is unlimited.

16. This enormous accomplishment has been achieved under our American system of free enterprise, which is quite a different thing from the feudal capitalism which in other places is under attack and we are called on to protect. The Nation can live a long time on its fat unless that fat be squandered.

17. The authorities, with support from both political parties, offer only one solution—higher taxes and more controls. Every proposal from the White House is for heavier expenditure. There must be, its propaganda insists, no slowdown of its welfare projects. It wants to increase them and it uses the necessity of defense as a justification for projects that would be of debatable propriety even in normal times. But the more revenue Washington gets the more it is certain to spend. It refuses to recognize that the barrel has a bottom.

18. There has been built up an opinion that it is treasonable to question the practicability of a White House program. Experts in public relations are summoned to Washington to advise the Office of Defense Mobilization how to coordinate the activities of all the multiple public relations officers of the Government to carry a single message to the public, and sell the idea that not only is the policy of the Government perfect and unassailable, but also that its methods of mobilization are beyond criticism.

19. How close are we even now to the one-party system in our Government? It is wise to have partisanship end at the border and to present a united front abroad. But that is quite a different thing from outlawing debate in the formulation of the policy, whatever it may be. Therein lies the fallacy of a bipartisan foreign policy. It is sheer madness to foreclose on discussion. A country under parliamentary forms is in a sorry status if it lacks a loyal opposition. Diplomacy ought not to be deceptive of our own people.

20. The peril is far too great to permit major decisions to be made in secret chambers, even though members of both political parties participate. It is known now that the present danger is largely the consequence of fatal errors made at Yalta and at Potsdam. In the first case, a Chief Executive, sick unto death, with his principal consultant in a similar condition, made concessions that poured strength into Stalin's veins. He did this as Commander in Chief, without consultation with Congress and without reference to the people. That was embezzlement of power. Who can assure that it would not happen again, or that another victory in another war might not be bartered away by a well-meaning but incompetent authority? It is the abuse of our own institutions that makes necessary a defense of the dollar.

21. The people are confused because the danger to the country has not been explained to them with vivid clearness. They have been bombarded with a series of generalities, some of which would tax the credulity of infants. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," said Roosevelt, but the Washington bureaucracy, including the generals, has again and again, in public testimony, indicated a dread lest a gesture here or an action there annoy the Politburo.

22. It might be supposed that Russia was the giant and this country the pigmy. It may be doubted if the Politburo is more cunning than America in its programing. It is altogether unlikely that its production equals America's in volume or parallels it in quality, over-all.

23. Extravagance in Government can be moderated, and without impairment of defense. The so-called Marshall shield calls for mobilization of our collective production facilities and an arrangement whereby they may move into maximum output by pressing a button. Most of this capacity already exists. After the last war the Government retained 440 of its War II plants as a reserve of industrial capacity. More than half of these 278 are now producing defense items, and another 66 are being reactivated. Defense has already arranged for \$6,000,000,000 additional in plant expansion and tooling, mostly for the production of aircraft. Private capacities have enormously expanded since War II. Atomic warheads for artillery shells and guided missiles are well advanced, as is the use of atomic power for submarines. Together there exists already, with rapidly increasing potentiality, a Marshall shield.

24. Defense is the one great area in which economy can be practiced. Let it confine its actual production to usable hardware. Let there be no such overproduction, say, of tanks, as to overwhelm our storage facilities. This would serve a double purpose, since it would also tend to minimize obsolescence.

25. Let it be observed, too, that possibly the very hugeness of the appropriations is intended to frighten Stalin, with no present idea of actual use of the amounts in full. Yet defense will always be tempted to spend whatever is authorized. The "watchdog committee" of the Senate can be of incalculable service to the Nation by keeping its tender fingers in touch with this situation.

26. Inflation has already gone so far that possibly some form of price control is essential, but to be used only if necessary and with great caution. Let there be denial of appropriations for projects that safely can be postponed. Let the Congress wait, at least until fall, before imposing any new taxes whatever. Let aided foreign nations also show restraint in spending their and our money on welfare or postponable projects. Let a spirit of devotion to the public weal be substituted for the extravagant atmosphere that prevails in Washington. In a word, let the bureaucracy become patriotic.

27. The thing that is inflated is the Government. Big Government costs big money. Inflation is conceived and born in Washington. Only the Federal Government can spend in unlimited amounts. It alone determines the value of money and the extent of credit because it alone is legally empowered so to do. The administration already has controls adequate to stop the inflation dead in its tracks. It can stabilize the whole economy by utilizing its present powers. It can do so by putting ceilings on expenditures. It can barricade the American system against disaster by itself practicing that economy which it so belligerently calls on the mass public to endure. Congress should insist that it do so.

(Reprinted by Capper Publications, Inc., as a public service.)

Some Californians Would Grab the Entire Colorado River—Have Grabbed for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is known that of the 12,000,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water on an average now flowing annually into Lake Mead that certain water agencies in southern California are planning to use permanently more than 10,000,000 acre-feet, to the exclusion of any and all other American users? I wonder if it is known that of approximately 10,000,000 acre-feet which these California water agencies count on using, they have a legal right under existing law to the use of less than half that amount? I wonder if it is known that of the 12,000,000 acre-feet flowing into Lake Mead the use of more than 7,000,000 acre-feet of that water belongs to someone outside of California?

I wonder if it is generally known that southern California is now getting about nine-tenths of the total of all benefits of the lower Colorado River, both in water and in hydroelectric power, and at the same time is reaching out for more of them? Believe it or not, such is the case, although the Colorado River does not flow through California and there are no tributaries of the Colorado River within the State of California contributing to the natural flow of that river. Only the smallest fraction of California—and that an arid one—is in the natural basin of the Colorado River. The following facts speak for themselves.

BRIEF BACKGROUND SKETCH

Let me give a brief running sketch of the historical development on the Colorado River. That river was, up until nearly the opening of this century, more of a foe to man than a friend. It certainly was an obstruction to the westward movement of the Anglo-Americans, and it was no aid to the northern movement of the early would-be Spanish conquerors. Indeed it remained more or less a river of mystery until toward the beginning of this century, but around the beginning of the present century, American settlers began in earnest to think of using waters of the lower main stream, having already developed the waters of most tributaries. Especially the Arizona main tributary, the whole Gila River Basin, had long before been put to use and largely developed. Thus, for a couple of decades after 1900 an editorial war occurred as to whose river the main Colorado River was and who should get most of it. There were men in all the seven States touching the Colorado Basin who made extravagant claims on it.

So great was the task of taming the main Colorado River that it was apparent the Federal Government would

have to take a hand. This led to the seven-State treaty or compact, which Congress authorized and which President Harding approved by appointing his Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, to preside over and direct its drafting. This compact is the basic law of the river. It is officially known as the Colorado River compact and frequently called the Santa Fe compact, as it was signed by all seven States at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922. This compact among the seven basin States made a beginning of dividing the waters in the only way that was possible at the time to divide them. Taking 15,000,000 acre-feet annually as the safest dependable figure of the river's average flow at the strategic point known as Lee's Ferry in northern Arizona for use in the United States, the upper basin was apportioned in perpetuity by article III, subparagraph (a), 7,500,000 acre-feet, and the lower basin was apportioned a like amount, or 7,500,000 acre-feet, which latter amount was increased by 1,000,000 acre-feet by subparagraph (b) of article III, making 8,500,000 acre-feet in all for the States of the lower basin, which include Arizona and California. However, it must not be forgotten that three other States have some, though minor, claims on the water apportioned to the lower basin, while Arizona and California are the chief claimants. From this it is logical to assume that the water which California has the right to use under existing law, the compact, is practically all contained in this apportionment to the lower basin.

FIRST IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION

The next step in formulating the law of the river is that act of Congress known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, which authorized the building of Boulder—now called Hoover—Dam on the Colorado River, to furnish, besides power, a large amount of storage in a man-made reservoir called Lake Mead. This act also authorized a canal lying wholly within the United States to convey water from the Colorado River into Imperial Valley. This measure was greatly sought by California and met with considerable opposition during the 8 years that the legislation was pending in Congress.

Its enactment was urged by California as a flood-control measure for Imperial Valley in California and also as an aid to reclamation, but it was well known that Los Angeles especially wanted hydroelectric power produced and transmitted to her area and, almost as a second thought, wanted water for municipal purposes. Last but not least, some men in Los Angeles wanted the river regulated in order to furnish more irrigation water to the delta lands in old Mexico. Harry Chandler, of the Los Angeles Times, testified before a Senate committee in 1924 that he and his associates owned 830,000 acres of land in the rich Colorado delta region in old Mexico. Thus we see a variety of motives prompting the Californians to seek this legislation which was introduced by Congressman Phil Swing, of California, and Senator Hiram Johnson, of California.

FEAR OF CALIFORNIA BY HER NEIGHBORS

The Swing-Johnson bill was resisted or questioned to a certain extent by Members of Congress from the six other Colorado Basin States lying in the Rocky Mountain area. Their principal reason for concern was that they feared the rich and powerful State of California would obtain control first and garner all the benefits of the river. The chief wish of these Members from the Rocky Mountain States during consideration of the bill was to shape the final legislation so as to give California what she actually needed and should have, but at the same time limit her in such a way that what the other States would later need, after a quarter century or half century of growth, should be carefully safeguarded and held in trust by the Federal Government for them.

Accordingly, the Swing-Johnson bill of 1928 became law, and it is known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act. So far as the division of the waters in the lower basin are concerned, this act divides the seven and a half million acre-feet apportioned by the Santa Fe Compact to the lower basin in subparagraph (a) of article III as follows: To Arizona, 2,800,000 acre-feet; to California, 4,400,000 acre-feet; to Nevada, 300,000 acre-feet; these three making a total of 7,500,000 acre-feet thus apportioned by the compact in article III (a). The Boulder Canyon Project Act also assigned to Arizona the full and exclusive use of all the waters of the Gila River within her boundaries, which Arizona had been using for 50 years. A further provision was made by this act that any surplus or undivided water was to be divided between Arizona and California on a 50-50 basis. However, it was not assumed that there should be a great deal of surplus water to be thus divided and such was not to be divided or apportioned prior to 1963. Prudent men could not safely plan or count on the surplus being much, and indeed it has later been shown conservatively to be relatively a small amount.

CALIFORNIA'S SELF LIMITATIONS

From the foregoing, it would appear that existing law contemplates that California's "take" out of the Colorado River shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet, plus a small and indefinite surplus to be later divided, if any. Let it also be remembered that as a condition precedent to the going into effect of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, by the express term of that act, California was required to limit herself to the amount of 4,400,000 acre-feet, plus one-half the surplus, by an act of her legislature in an unconditional and irrevocable covenant. All this was done by California in 1929 when her State legislature enacted the necessary Self-Limitation Act, as required by the congressional act. In the light of the foregoing, it may well be asked: How then does California now claim or plan to use, in one way or another or for one purpose or another, as much Colorado water as at first indicated in the beginning of this statement, or more than 10,000,000 acre-feet?

California advocates point to the "plus" quantity added to their 4,400,000 acre-feet of their Self-Limitation Act. Well, even if it develops that the river can possibly have more than the compact's 15,000,000 acre-feet measured at Lee's Ferry, the upper basin guaranteed to let down only 7,500,000 acre-feet annually. Four States besides California have varying claims on the 7,500,000 acre-feet let down and any surplus coming down, and if there is—as there will be—a surplus, Mexican treaty water must come out of it and then California cannot legally claim more than one-half of it available in the lower basin. But before picturing the successive California efforts to grab more and more of the river's benefit through the years, let us cite "chapter and verse" and where possible and needful quote applicable law.

THE CONDITION AND ACCEPTANCE

That it may be made perfectly clear that Congress did require California to enter into this unconditional and irrevocable covenant with Uncle Sam for the protection of her six younger sisters, the pertinent part of section 4 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act is quoted as follows:

This act shall not take effect and no authority shall be exercised hereunder and no work shall be begun and no moneys expended on or in connection with the works or structures provided for in this act, and no water rights shall be claimed or initiated hereunder, and no steps shall be taken by the United States or by others to initiate or perfect any claims to the use of water pertinent to such works or structures unless and until . . . the State of California, by act of its legislature, shall agree irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, as an express covenant and in consideration of the passage of this act, that the aggregate annual consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California, including all uses under contracts made under the provisions of this act and all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist, shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact.

That it may be made perfectly clear that the sovereign State of California did meet the condition required by Congress just quoted, the pertinent part of the California enactment known as the Self-Limitation Act—act of March 4, 1929, chapter 16, forty-eighth session—is quoted as follows:

The State of California as of the date of such proclamation agrees irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming as an express covenant and in consideration of the passage of the said Boulder Canyon Project Act that the aggregate annual consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California, including all uses under contracts made under the provisions of said Boulder Canyon Project Act, and all water necessary

for the supply of any rights which may now exist, shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower-basin States by paragraph "a" of article 3 of the said Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact.

SEC. 2. By this act the State of California intends to comply with the conditions respecting limitation on the use of water as specified in subdivision 2 of section 4 (a) of the said Boulder Canyon Project Act, and this act shall be so construed.

DID CALIFORNIANS FORGET

Hardly had the ink dried upon the California statute of March 4, 1929, which was that "irrevocable covenant" by which California pledged herself to Uncle Sam not to take more than 4,400,000 acre-feet of apportioned water from the river, before certain water agencies in southern California did some ambitious planning. In 1931 about a half dozen California water agencies negotiated with the Secretary of the Interior, himself a Californian, Ray Lyman Wilbur, serving as a cabinet officer under a California President, and contracts were made for a total of 5,362,000 acre-feet out of Lake Mead. How can you get 5,362,000 out of 4,400,000? Of course, these were not firm contracts, but were all written with the saving clause, "subject to the availability of the water" under the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the Santa Fe Compact.

Apparently nobody in California pays much attention to that saving clause, and perhaps few know that it is in the contracts. For that matter, very few Californians know that their legislature did on March 4, 1929, enter into a solemn covenant which was to be irrevocable with Uncle Sam whereby California limited herself to a definite amount of apportioned Colorado River water. Therefore, the plan begins to unfold. These water agencies conveniently forgot about the 4,400,000 limitation and contracted for 5,362,000, and now they speak of such contract "rights" as sacred things which must be sacredly upheld. Astonishing. But that is not all—only the first semi-legal grab. Please read on.

WATER PLANNED FOR THREE PURPOSES

A careful reading of the seven-party water agreement of 1931, as found on pages 557-560 of the Hoover Dam Contracts, by Wilbur and Ely, 1933 edition, will indicate the Californians' plan for Colorado River water for three purposes, as follows: for irrigation within the State of California 4,150,000 acre-feet annually; for municipal use 1,212,000 acre-feet annually; and for power production near the border and for disposal to Mexico, as designed in the construction of the first section of the all-American Canal, 2,190,000. These three amounts added are found to total 7,552,000 acre-feet which have been thus expressly planned for by the Californians, and thus the limit of 4,400,000 is upped even beyond 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned by subparagraph (a) of article III of the Santa Fe Compact which were to be let down for the entire lower basin. This second grab is beginning to get interesting to the upper basin.

Shortly after these interagency agreements, the city of Los Angeles developed a great thirst and decided to draw on the Colorado River for municipal water. This move has many similarities to the city's move in Owens Valley two decades earlier, but on a larger scale the second time. This was to be a big undertaking and called for the establishment of a metropolitan water district in southern California. At a cost of \$220,000,000—or that was the amount of the bond issue—an aqueduct large enough to carry 1,212,000 acre-feet of water, though a rated capacity of 1,100,000 acre-feet, was built from the Colorado River to the Los Angeles area. Thus Californians planned on taking 1,212,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water for municipal purposes, including San Diego.

Such municipal use meets with general approval—certainly my approval—if given first priority—though it was not—and kept within California's self-imposed limits. Of course, they were building for many years ahead, and it should be noted that during the 10 years of its functioning, the metropolitan aqueduct has not carried more than 7 percent of its total capacity taken over the entire decade of its life.

Of course, this was a less reprehensible grab in the name of dire thirst—of which I am not complaining, if according to the law of the river and if the amount of water is included within the California limitation and not added on top of it. But this human use was rated lowest in the list of priorities, which lowest priority rating certainly does not have my approval.

ANOTHER GRAB IN OVER-BUILT CANAL

The build-up of water for southern California still continues. In the thirties Uncle Sam built the All-American Canal and the Imperial Diversion Dam to furnish water for the Imperial Valley and for other purposes. This canal, built according to California specifications, as well as on California's agreement to repay its cost, has a capacity of 15,000 second-feet at its intake at the west end of the Imperial Dam. Fifteen thousand second-feet capacity converted into acre-feet annually means that through its gates 11,000,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water could be turned into California each year. Oh, but they would never think of doing it, when they so solemnly promised to observe the 4,400,000 acre-feet limit. Do not be too sure they would not. At least they have an oversized first section of this canal. Now, how do they propose to use it?

California water authorities, in a letter to Secretary of State George C. Marshall dated January 9, 1948, indicated an intention or desire of using nearly 6,000,000 acre-feet of water through that canal to create power at Pilot Knob on the Mexican border after which that water could be disposed of in Mexico.

A paragraph from that letter reads as follows:

The plant will have an installed capacity of 33,000 kilowatts, using a maximum flow of 8,000 cubic feet per second. The general layout of the wasteway and power plant, as well as the capacity of the plant, was planned at the time the All-American Canal was de-

signed and constructed. (See Hoover Dam Documents, latest edition, p. A918.)

If to the legitimate quota of 4,400,000 acre-feet to California is added a grab of 6,000,000 acre-feet for certain Californians to use to produce power, that would be most all of the river. Other documentary proof in the form of official documents, especially Senate hearing on water treaty with Mexico, 1945, indicates that some of that water would be carried to land in Mexico at a charge which would produce a profit for somebody in California.

I think we may in all fairness in summing the amounts which somebody in California wants, say that in addition to the 3,850,000 acre-feet, which California plans in her priority agreements to use for irrigation of land within California, plus the 1,212,000 acre-feet which California plans to use for municipal purposes, we must add the 5,840,000 acre-feet which California plans—at least hopes—to put through a power plant at Pilot Knob on the Mexican border to produce power and later to carry that water to land in Mexico at a profit. Adding 5,840,000 and 1,212,000 and 3,850,000, we arrive at a grand total of 10,902,000 acre-feet, which for one or another of three different purposes Californians have indicated their plan or hope to use Colorado River water.

Mind you, this is not hearsay or guesswork on my part or anybody's part. These figures are taken from authoritative sources in black and white. One would never suppose that those who are reaching for nearly 11,000,000 acre-feet of water from that limited and vital river had solemnly promised Uncle Sam that they would limit their take to not to exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of compact-apportioned water. Let it be noted that the Colorado is not California's last water hole, but it is Arizona's last water hole.

MR. CONGRESSMAN, HAVE YOU REPLIED IT?

Every Member of Congress must have received from all directions of the compass communications undoubtedly inspired by southern California urging that the central Arizona bill now pending be killed. Could there possibly be any connection between the California desire to kill the central Arizona bill and their plan for an enlarged portion of the Colorado River benefits for themselves? Of course there is a very definite connection. However, the central Arizona bill calling for 1,200,000 acre-feet out of the Colorado River is not the only present-day proposal upstream that must be blocked if men in southern California are to have their way. To have their way as indicated, they must ignore the act of their legislature in March 1929—the California Self-Limitation Act—flout the act of Congress of 1928—Boulder Canyon Project Act requiring the irrevocable covenant—and nullify the clear and express provision of the Santa Fe Compact providing an equitable division if they are to succeed in getting as much as they are deliberately counting on and planning to get from that river.

My colleague, can this thing be put over on us? It can by the indifference

or inaction of a majority of us. I beg you not to let propaganda coming out of southern California detract your attention from the main question.

I request that you close your ears to the din of the California propaganda and examine carefully the merit of the central Arizona project, as well as projects in the other States in the Colorado River Basin. I am confident you will not deny development in these States to utilize water which is clearly theirs, in order to aid in the unconscionable attempt of a few Californians to grab all the benefits of the Colorado River.

Tuttle Creek Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* an editorial from the *Kansas Farm Bureau News* for August 1951, entitled "Ultior Motives."

We are being asked to make an appropriation for Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas on the ground that it would have helped to stop the recent Kansas River flood by holding back the waters of the Blue River. The editor points out in this editorial that the Kansas River backed the water up the Blue, and that Tuttle Creek Dam would have been of little value.

The editor directs attention to a project at New Cambria where a group of farmers organized to pool their agricultural conservation program payments and build terraces, retention dams, and other run-off controls. Their experiment in one small watershed came through the severe test of July rains in Kansas with flying colors, and is indicative that we might save the soil of America and greatly reduce our flood problems if we would put more emphasis on that type of work.

I believe Senators will find this editorial particularly significant, not only for the lesson it proposes to teach in regard to flood control, but also as an illustration of the value of the agricultural conservation program payments. Suggestion was made to this Congress that this program should be drastically reduced. I am happy to say that this was not done. It is my hope that the Congress will continue to maintain it, and that it will be used much more in small watersheds, as it has been used at New Cambria.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

ULTIOR MOTIVES

We were mildly surprised recently to learn that Gen. Lewis Pick of the Army engineers is not always a conservative man. We had supposed that an engineer has an approach to his business comparable to that of a banker to his business. Bankers are

always cited as examples of conservatism when they consider the handling of their bank's money, although we have known a few who sometimes were just a little loose with a few nickels in a rummy game. We had supposed that engineers were just as conservative when they sat down to a drafting board or handled complex blueprints involving billions of taxpayer money.

But General Pick disturbed that conception somewhat when he appeared before the Senate flood-control appropriations committee July 19. He declared first of all that a paltry \$300,000,000 would have saved a billion dollars of damage in the Kaw watershed. It may be a minor point, but General Pick apparently ignored the fact that his figure of \$300,000,000 was based on Army engineers' estimates, some of them several years old, and that Army engineers seldom have built a dam and reservoir at a figure which would begin to fit into the original estimate.

More alarming was General Pick's conclusion that Tuttle Creek Dam would have averted most of the disaster to Kansas City. There are not many engineers in central Kansas, but almost all of the residents of that area have completed sixth grade arithmetic, and they do have eyes to watch running water. At Manhattan they saw the Kaw backing the Blue upward toward where General Pick says Tuttle Creek Dam should have been. And these central Kansas folks know that water was spilling over the banks of the Kaw at Kansas City within a few hours after flooding began from Tescott, Wakefield, and Blue Rapids, all the way to Topeka.

General Pick also told the Senate committee soil conservation is not an aid to flood control. We don't know what General Pick includes under the heading of flood control. Out here in Kansas, folks think of soil conservation as including contour planting, terraces, permanent grass, detention dams, and other practices. Now if General Pick will concede that such practices are a part of the conservation program (certainly, they are not Army engineer programs), there are some folks at New Cambria, just east of Salina, who would like to show him how their project controlled run-off of the heavy rains which fell July 9, 10, and 11. Reputable farmers in Saline County will testify that the New Cambria project, featured some months ago in the *Kansas Farmer*, came through this most severe test with flying colors.

At New Cambria, a group of farmers organized to pool their ACP payments in the construction of terraces, detention dams, and other run-off controls. They treated one small watershed as a unit problem, instead of each farmer trying to handle the problem on his own farm without cooperation with neighbors on whose land his water might run or other neighbors from whose land water might run to his farm.

It has been noteworthy that newspapers featuring General Pick's testimony have not bothered to dig deeply for accurate facts. Whenever extravagant statements are made, whenever there is a noticeable lack of effort to investigate thoroughly and to secure accurate facts, it often can be assumed there are ulterior motives.

In this case what motives would there be other than the single purpose of controlling floods. The Army engineers have two rather obvious ulterior motives. First, they must get money to build another big dam. Unless there is some big project to keep them busy, Congress might get the idea of curtailing their activities. And, second, this flood offers an opportunity to stampede Congress into forgetting the 1950 report of the President's Water Policy Commission. That report called for a comprehensive water-resources program. The Army engineers would have been subject in the future to supervision by an over-all water-resources control. They would not have been allowed to go their own way, ignoring other agencies

interested in land and water conservation. And the engineers simply don't want to be curbed.

Finally, at least one large city down the river has another reason for wanting Tuttle Creek Dam, other than the flood-control motive. This large city needs a flush bowl to flush out its sewage when the river runs low in the summer and early fall months. Tuttle Creek would provide such a flush bowl.

Control of Beef Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, in these days, when we hear much loose talk about the virtues of certain controls, and especially with all the grandiose promises that have been made to the American people by the control authorities with reference to livestock and beef production, I thought it might be refreshing to place in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* from down West Texas way an article appearing in the *West Texas Livestock Weekly* on Thursday, September 27, 1951, entitled "Unregistered Bull in a Hotel Lobby." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the *Record*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

UNREGISTERED BULL IN A HOTEL LOBBY

(By a Contented Cowman)

"From where I am," said John, "it looks like the OPS is having more trouble than a near-sighted man judging a beauty contest. Every time they make a move, somebody slaps 'em."

"Personally, I'm glad of it. Us cowmen tried to tell the bureaucrats they'd wind up with beef ceilings and no meat, and they thought we were just a bunch of profiteers, trying to fill our pockets at the public expense. They were right, of course. Anytime I fool with a string of cattle, I'm doing my dead level best to make as much money as possible without doing something that will get me whipped or jailed. Punching cattle is fairly healthful, maybe, but there's lots of other outdoor exercise you can take without risking losing a fortune or being obliterated by a bull."

"But I'm no optimist where the OPS or any other bureau is concerned. The OPS is in trouble, but that doesn't mean the OPS is going out of the picture. I think it means present OPS officials will get promotions so they can take on the responsibility of bossing some extra help that'll have to be hired; when a bureau gets in a jam, it always seems to get bigger and get an extra bureau or two to help it."

"I don't claim to be any economist either, or I'd have a position in Washington. I'd have charge of a bureau office, with a string of good-looking secretaries to drink coffee with on week days and scotch and soda with on weekends."

"But I don't think it takes so much of an economist to know that if people have a lot of money and are hungry for meat, they're gonna buy it. If they can't get it from legal sources, controlled by the OPS, they'll get it wherever they can, and pay an extra high

price because bootleggers charge more than legal operators, whether it's beef or bourbon you're buying.

"But the main thing is that you simply can't control beef prices in this country, as long as it's making any pretense of being a democracy, without holding down production. We're close to having a record number of cattle now. Cattle speculators and meat packers would be in a good shape to find themselves with a low market right away if it wasn't for the fact that production and distribution are already messed up to the point where there's a meat scarcity in butcher shops, and unions keep striking for higher wages every day.

"The OPS has proved it can't even enforce ceilings on fat cattle, let alone on stockers and feeders or pot roasts.

"If the OPS really wanted to control inflation, instead of screaming for more power it would suggest that (1) all OPS personnel and about a million or so other Government employees be fired immediately so there wouldn't be such a shortage of help around ranches, feedlots, and packing houses; (2) unions be prevented from jacking up wages and manufacturing costs, so laborers wouldn't be so anxious to give a black market man \$2 a pound for steak; (3) lobbyists of all kinds, including those of the cattle and packing industries, be told to shut up whenever they start putting the pressure on Washington for special handouts of Government funds or privileges.

"But I don't look for anything like this to happen as long as the average citizen prefers to have lots of dollars instead of lots of meat, and is willing to vote for politicians that promise to hand him a new home on Easy Street."

Background on Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Byrnes, able Washington correspondent for the Hartford Courant, exposes in a special column for that paper the weakness of the recent Executive order by the President concerning the suppression of news by executive agencies.

Exposing by factual observation the fallacies of the order, Bob Byrnes demonstrates very clearly that the order was ill-conceived and totally lacking in substance. The impugned slur on American newspapers should not go unnoticed.

The fault, if there is fault, for the dissemination of news detrimental to our security, lies with the agencies involved, not with the faithful reporters of such happenings. Through this order the President of the United States has lowered a paper curtain of involuntary censorship in this Nation.

The article follows:

BACKGROUND ON SECRECY

(By Robert D. Byrnes)

WASHINGTON.—Here is a case history, in part factual observation from a third-row seat at the President's press conference Thursday morning, and in part speculation based on background and experience.

The President, in discussion on his order on safeguarding information of military

value, issued September 24 to Government departments, made it clear to 50 or more newspaper men and women, including several foreign correspondents, that the prime responsibility rests on publishers for circulating information of military value, regardless of what source, including the Pentagon and Members of Congress, gave out the information.

During the conference the President, in response to a question, branded as an example of disclosing military information the statement of an unnamed Congressman Wednesday that the latest explosion of an atomic bomb by the Russians had been within 4 or 5 days.

Later in the conference the President was asked if there is any relation between the information security order and the explosion of the Russian bomb. There was no relationship, the President said, and the information order was signed before the report on the Russian bomb was received.

The order was signed September 24, which is 11 days ago. All that is factual and a matter of record.

Now suppose a publisher, exercising the prime responsibility the President said (before his statement was clarified) he should use on all information pertaining to national security, regardless of where it came from, considers the revelation by the President that news of the Russian bomb explosion was received within the past 11 days. A publisher is not expected to be an expert in nuclear physics, meteorology, and espionage, and possibly other fields which might enter into the evaluation of the significance of the time-lag between the actual explosion of the bomb in Russia and the announcement of that event by the President of the United States. The publisher might recall that the White House announcement of the bomb gave no date for the explosion, but did say that details, presumably including the date, cannot be given without affecting our normal security interests.

It is quite possible that publishers, and directors of other news media, would be divided on whether they had a prime responsibility to suppress the revelation from the President that news of the Russian bomb explosion had been received within 11 days. This condition of divided opinion would mean some segments of the population would get the news and some would not. This would be sort of a geographical division of the truth, or, in an uncommon use of the term, a half-truth.

Half-truths, including those only half heard or half understood, as everyone knows who has been on the answering end of a newspaper telephone, are the finest spawning ground for rumors. But if all the publishers and all the directors of other news media agreed to suppress the news about the 11-day aspect of the bomb report, and in the improbable event their action did not spread by word of mouth, there is still the probability of several people having the same question in their minds as the reporter who asked the President Thursday morning if there is any connection between the Russian bomb and the information order.

Such questions, when banded about unanswered, have a way of becoming transformed into statements. What such a statement, traveling by the "have you heard the inside" route, can effectuate strains the imagination.

The likelihood of publishers being required to exercise what the President referred to as their prime responsibility to second-guess official sources of information, now seems to be remote. During the press-conference exchange there was a question, which was almost a reminder, about the role of the free press in America, and an acknowledgment by the President that the free press is just as important as the Bill of Rights.

Then, some time after the press conference was over, the President's position was "clarified" by his press secretary in a statement which included the pronouncement that the recent order on information "does not in any way alter the right of citizens to publish anything."

Forty-eight Governors Demand End to Federal Ban on Relief Publicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE Mr. Speaker, the following news item appeared in the October 2, 1951, edition of the Washington Evening Star. It certainly shows the attitude of the people back home as reflected through the expressed sentiments of their governors in their recent conclave, and I trust that the Congress will take notice of the demand of the people for publicity of the names of those who are on our relief rolls.

FORTY-EIGHT GOVERNORS DEMAND END TO FEDERAL BAN ON RELIEF PUBLICITY—AFTER STORMY SESSION WITH EWING, THEY VOTE STATES SHOULD DECIDE

GATLINBURG, TENN., October 2.—The Nation's governors voted unanimous approval today of a move to reserve to the States the right to decide whether their relief rolls shall be made public.

The action came on motion of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, New York, Republican, after Gov. James F. Byrnes, South Carolina, Democrat, demanded in a stormy session with Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing that the governors act on the question. Georgia's Gov. Herman E. Talmadge was another critic of the secrecy rule.

Federal law now requires secrecy of relief rolls. The Senate has approved a measure to lift the secrecy ban, but the measure still is pending in the House.

LEE CHARGES EVASION

Governor Byrnes asked the forty-third annual Governors' Conference to go on record in favor of relief-roll publicity. Governor Talmadge said such publicity would reduce relief rolls by at least one-third.

But Mr. Ewing insisted that such publicity would do more harm than good.

The governors sailed into Mr. Ewing after Utah's Republican Gov. J. Bracken Lee had challenged them to discuss the real problems of inflation, taxation, communism, integrity in government, and the Korean war, instead of what he called the side issue of social security.

Governor Byrnes, a Democratic former Senator, Secretary of State, and Supreme Court Justice, told Mr. Ewing bluntly he believes Congress sought to pay more attention to what the governors want than to Mr. Ewing's recommendations.

QUEST FOR ADVICE

"The question is not what you recommend," he said; "but will this conference recommend repeal (of the secrecy provisions) and leave to the States the determination of whether there shall be publicity."

Amid cries of "yes, yes," Governor Lee reminded Mr. Ewing that he has said earlier he came to the conference to get advice from the State executives.

"Yes," Mr. Ewing snapped, "but I reserve for myself the decision whether I will take it or not."

Mr. Ewing told reporters "Indiana has lost beyond possible retrieving \$3,000,000 in Federal aid because its legislature failed in time to knock out a relief roll publicity provision for that State."

SAYS COURTS CAN SEE RECORDS

Governor Talmadge complained that the States can't find out, even through grand-jury action, about relief-roll chiselling.

"You are spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and are doing it without the States even being able to find out about it through grand juries," he asserted.

Mr. Ewing said "Federal security records are always available to the courts."

Gov. Johnston Murray, Oklahoma Democrat, said he couldn't fire relief workers who connived to put persons on the rolls. Mr. Ewing replied he didn't have "much sympathy with civil-service provisions, but they are in the law."

SAYS ILLEGITIMACY IS ENCOURAGED

Governor Talmadge accused the Government of subsidizing and encouraging illegitimacy by refusing to permit Georgia to limit the number of illegitimate children in one family eligible for relief.

"We took the position that one illegitimate child can be an honest mistake," Governor Talmadge said, "but when there is more than one, then it has got to be a habit."

But he said the United States welfare agency refused to permit any such limitation.

Mr. Ewing said "The Government believed the illegitimate child should not be punished for the act of its parents."

By a vote of 25 to 10, the governors went on record in favor of States having the right to control their own civil-service standards rather than the Federal Government.

Our Emergency Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Our Emergency Economy," published in the Erie (Pa.) Times of August 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR EMERGENCY ECONOMY

Suppose, asks Senator GEORGE W. MALONE of Nevada, all threats of war came to an end? Truman administration officials would shudder at the thought.

They have thrived on one "emergency" after another, and would not know what to do with peace and normal, healthy American economy.

The prospect of bringing the shooting in Korea to an end left the Fair Dealers badly frightened men. They have busied themselves justifying spending as usual.

The Truman administration must have a war economy or an emergency economy in order to function.

On Saturday General Ridgway sent probably the toughest note ever written in modern times to Red negotiators in Korea and it

was general opinion in Washington that it is almost impossible to answer it.

Which means the peace talks may be further encumbered, on orders from Washington, while the war emergency continues.

The American economic system, as known for many years, was abandoned first by President Roosevelt and then by President Truman who ordered the current war under the guise of a police action.

It created the emergency he wanted. He has since bragged about the great boom, refused controls when they were needed and given him by Congress, and talks about present top employment—defense or emergency employment, whichever you prefer to call it.

The New Deal and Fair Deal have traded solely on the something-for-nothing philosophy but it has not panned out. It was politically successful but economically suicidal.

Says Senator MALONE:

"The Socialists have wanted from the start to discredit the American economic system. At the same time they have tried almost every trick in Adolph Hitler's bag in trying to regiment the American people."

"Some of this regimentation has slipped through, with the result that the hot breath of the bureaucrats is felt on the necks of Congress, demanding more and more power to tax and spend. These people who would regiment our lives and change our economic system are not willing for free enterprise to function."

Is it any wonder he asks what would happen if all threats of war came to an end?

Harold Stassen's Book, Man Was Meant To Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a new book was released for distribution today. It is entitled "Man Was Meant To Be Free," and it contains a series of addresses and public statements by Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and now president of the University of Pennsylvania. This collection of addresses is remarkable for the breadth of understanding of our problems which is revealed in it. I believe that it is a major contribution at this time. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appears in the Washington Daily News today, written by Charles Lucey of the Scripps-Howard staff, be printed in the Appendix of the Record:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW BOOK PUTS STASSEN IN SPOTLIGHT FOR 1952

(By Charles Lucey)

It is hardly a coincidence that a new Harold Stassen book, *Man Was Meant To Be Free*, appears just as the political talk is beginning to heat up on the 1952 Presidential election.

Save for some speeches and the recent congressional hearings, Mr. Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, has been all but forgotten politically since 1948. In that year he was the Man Who Might Have

Been President. He trimmed Tom Dewey and "Bob" Taft in the bellwether Wisconsin and Nebraska Presidential primaries and seemed to be on his way.

But something happened. Many say the turn came when Governor Stassen straddled and trimmed on the issues in trying to take delegates away from Senator Taft in Ohio. Then, in Oregon, Mr. Dewey edged him in a debate on communism and out-campaigned him generally. At the Philadelphia convention Harold Stassen was an also-ran.

Yet Mr. Stassen is resourceful far beyond most men in public life, he certainly never sees any personal defeat as more than temporary, and over the years he has enunciated a modern American philosophy that is always thoughtful and often bold and challenging.

INCISIVE STAND

The title of this book, edited by Mr. Stassen's close friend, Amos J. Peaslee, springs from the dominant theme expressed in an impressive series of Stassen articles and speeches since he keynoted the 1940 Republican convention. And although that speech was largely a lofty catalog of ideals with which none could disagree, most of the succeeding utterances take a clear incisive stand on the controversial issues of the day. The book was published by Doubleday & Co.

Harold Stassen reads the centralization of power that occurs when a government moves toward overcontrol of the political and economic life of its citizens. He meets this issue, to cite an example, in discussing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948 by the United Nations.

This declaration says everyone has a right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family—food, clothing, housing, medical care, social services, the right to security in event of unemployment, sickness, old age, etc.

Mr. Stassen points out that the United States Constitution has no such provisions, but that the Soviet constitution does have a very similar one. He argues:

FORCED LABOR

"The endeavor to label detailed economic dividends as rights of man is completely lacking in logic and unfortunately is tragic in consequence. Both experience and reason tell us that when tangible material returns are labeled as rights of man—in other words, when economic guarantees from the Government are mingled with basic law—the result is a corollary power of coercion over men by government that wipes out the true rights of man."

"The two articles from the Russian Constitution are not a coincidence. Forced labor and the loss of true human liberty is the opposite side of the coin of economic guaranty."

Newswise, the sharpest chapter in this book is entitled "The Coming Collapse of Communism." Mr. Stassen describes his personal experiences in countries bordering on Russia, in talking with men who daily risk death to flee Soviet oppression at home.

"It is my judgment, founded on a careful fitting together of reports and bits of information from public and private sources in a dozen countries . . . that there is serious trouble inside the Soviet Union, that it affects the Red army itself; that, if aided from the outside, it would burst forth in counterrevolution if . . . the Kremlin should begin a third world war."

SWINGS HARD

Mr. Stassen's political-economic thinking is a good half century removed from the 1890 isolationist-conservatism of some Republican leaders, but nobody could ever charge him with a New Dealism which sees the public treasury as the cure for all ills. He swings hard on both extremes throughout this book.

Mr. Stassen warns that the ultimate end of the "excess give-away approach" is increasing regulation and control. He tells his Republican Party that foreign policy should be based on "vigorous bipartisan participation in world affairs." And, urging the regular GOP organization to stop elbowing people aside and to broaden its base wherever it can, he says:

PROVOCATIVE READING

"It is understandable why many Republican organization leaders have that attitude, but we had better recognize that it completely prevents building the kind of broad-based political movement essential if there ever is to be victory over an entrenched administration with the tremendous power the Federal Government and Federal administration has at this time."

There is nothing stodgy about Harold Stassen and this book makes provocative reading all the way.

We Call Them Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Call Them Allies," published in the Portland (Maine) Express of September 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CALL THEM ALLIES

On the subject of billions for defense—for Europe—Nevada's Republican Senator GEORGE W. MALONE reminds his colleagues, and the country, of certain interesting matters. We quote from a speech on the Senate floor by the Nevadan on Monday of this week.

"Both Britain and France have had with Russia separate and independent economic and military pacts which read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact. . . .

"The one which was signed between Britain and Russia was signed by V. Molotov. . . . In this treaty. . . . article VI says:

"The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war."

"That was after World War II. Now, to all intents and purposes, in defiance of America's efforts to stop them from trading with Russia, they are carrying out this treaty."

"Article VII reads:

"Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance, and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party."

"I should say that, if our interpretation of the North Atlantic Pact is correct, they violated that particular provision of the treaty, but it was laughed off by both Britain and France. . . . However, . . . Russia was calling them to account—for which I cannot blame Russia. . . .

"I want to refer to two paragraphs of the economic and military pact signed by France and Russia. . . . Articles V and VI read as follows:

"ART. V. The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and

not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties."

"ART. VI. The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view to facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity."

"The treaties are in force today. There has been no indication of cancellation. . . .

"No one seems to take seriously, even now, the fact that both England and France have military pacts with Russia. We must take that fact into consideration."

"In 1945, when the United Nations was being organized, I stated that the world would be divided into spheres of influence. There were not five major nations. There were two major nations, and I predicted that the two major nations would divide up the world. That is what they are doing. Now we are taxing our people to arm the other nation within its sphere of influence."

Price Control Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

PRICE CONTROL STUPIDITY

The stupidity of those in charge of price controls is demonstrated by the manner in which, through Office of Price Stabilization uncertainty, dilly-dallying and double talk, the cotton-textile industry has been brought to a virtual standstill.

Since January of this year the OPS has issued raw cotton and textile orders, reorders, countermands and counter-countermands. It has hinted at roll-backs, denied that there would be roll-backs, then announced that it is studying roll-backs.

The result has been that retailers have been ordering from hand to mouth, fearful that they will be caught with merchandise, the selling price of which may be less than they paid for it. The same is true of wholesalers, converters, and the mills themselves.

Where on January 1 of this year the mills were booking orders as much as 6 months ahead, were buying cottons to fill those orders and were operating at a high rate, today they are booking a bare 2 months ahead, have curtailed production and are hesitant about booking additional orders. Mill hands, lacking full employment, are leaving the textile areas, with the result that mills will be compelled to train new hands if and when the demand for textiles is revived.

More than that, the stagnation of the industry has dried up the demand for cotton just at the time that the producers are bringing their crop to market. Ordinarily mills buy at this time for their future needs. Now they are buying only as far ahead as they have orders. This lack of buying interest has compelled the producers to turn to the Government-loan program as an outlet for their cotton in order to stabilize the market and prevent losses because of the high cost of production.

Had the OPS had a determined pricing policy, one that was final, understandable, and based on facts and not political whims, these conditions would not exist.

Actually, with raw cotton production high, there is no need for price ceilings on either raw cotton or textiles.

Ceilings or no ceilings, however, the industry should be freed from the present pricing uncertainties and allowed to work and act in a normal, orderly manner.

Beef Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Beef Control," published in the St. Paul Pioneer-Press of October 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEEF CONTROL

What emerges out of the complaints being made by the Middle West meat-packing industry and the countercomplaints of the Federal enforcement authorities is simply what was foreseen when the beef-price control was established. The controls are a failure and there is nothing in sight that will make them a success.

The packers cannot buy the beef they need for normal production operations at OPS prices. The beef is being bought, however, at over-the-ceiling prices and diverted to slaughterers on the east and west coasts, particularly the former. This is possible because of technical loopholes which the enforcers do not have the power to close.

The result is that beef disappears from the market in one part of the country and is being bought at inflated prices in other parts of the country. Prices are not being controlled. Inflation is not being checked. Ordinary channels of meat marketing and slaughtering are being disrupted at enormous costs to legitimate packers and their employees.

To continue this futile experiment under these conditions is fanaticism.

The enforcement officers believe that the administration of beef-price control could be saved by the restoration of beef-slaughtering quotas.

It is true that if the Federal Government were going to undertake a resolute effort to enforce beef-price controls, with a tremendous police organization to back it up, a system of slaughtering quotas would be a necessary integral part of this apparatus. In fact no price control of beef can be successful without them.

But it is also a fact that the Federal Government did not have enough power or means of enforcement even during the war to make meat-price controls work, and there is no prospect of any such effort now. Adding quotas to the present controls would merely drive the slaughtering of cattle deeper into the mire of black-marketeering on the local level, and the final result would be more and worse of what is now going on—high beef prices for those who can get it and no beef for the majority.

So far as keeping the price of beef down within reason is concerned, a moderate relaxation of tariff regulations would do the trick quickly and easily and cheaply, and

soon there would be ample supplies of beef for everyone at reasonable prices. This would not be palatable to some sections of the beef industry, but it would be wholesome and healthy for the industry as a whole and for everyone else into the bargain. Certainly as compared with the present disgraceful state of affairs in beef this would be a vast improvement.

Conditions in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a beautiful and thought-provoking letter which I have just received from a mother and grandmother who lives high up in the mountains of western North Carolina. I feel sure that the sentiment which this letter breathes would be most helpful to our whole country, and will enable us to think more clearly about all the problems which confront the Nation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GNEISS, N C, October 7, 1951.

Senator CLYDE HOEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEY: You know far better than I the condition of the Nation and the world and what steps had best be taken to eliminate at least part of the troubles.

But it looks to me like we are being "bled white" while Russia calmly looks on.

Surely there is some honorable way to peace and hush this confusion.

Imagine my home far up in the cove on Leadford Branch in Macon County, not a house in sight, for almost endless hours not a sound of a human voice or humanity, unless a plane passes overhead—I've much time for meditation.

Sixty summers have passed over my head. My parents instilled into me the love of country and respect of law.

What must the rising generation think as they listen to news and comments over the radio of wickedness (spiritual and otherwise) in high places?

Are our young men having to bleed and die in Korea because of the sins of our Nation?

I have two nephews over in that area now.

On December 24, my son Samuel was aboard the carrier *Leyte*, CV-32. He now has shore duty.

In July my son Gilbert joined the Navy. Has finished boot at San Diego, Calif.

My son James has served nearly 3 years in the Army. Has married a Raleigh girl since entering service.

My oldest child, Edward, age 29, is a radio operator for the United Fruit Co.

The youngest son Richard, who will be 18 November 3, plans to enter Mount Berry College soon.

Yes, I have two daughters. One served as a link trainer in the past war—married a pilot. They are both in their senior year at Duke University. They have a baby girl over 2 years old.

The other daughter worked at Seymour-Johnson Air Base then for the Bell Bomber Air Plane at Marietta, Ga. After the war she went to work at Naval Air Base,

Norfolk. She married an ex-sailor who then and now works there. She continued her work there until July 1 year ago. They have now a fine young son.

The sum and substance of this long epistle is as a mother and grandmother I wish that the present and rising generation could have a chance to look clearly into the future, unhampered by war and fear of war, that abiding peace could come.

Is the book of Daniel being vividly fulfilled in our day by us?

"Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord"

"Woe unto the Nation that forgets God"

My troubled heart I've poured out to you. Don't take time to answer if you wish—but please do all in your power to save our Nation.

Hoping for abiding peace, I am.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. FAY MASHBURN.

Secrecy Order Is Threat to All Our Basic Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Secrecy Order Is Threat to All Our Basic Rights," written by Carroll Binder, and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of October 7, 1951. I believe it is a very timely article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRECY ORDER IS THREAT TO ALL OUR BASIC RIGHTS

(By Carroll Binder)

The anxious citizen has additional grounds for anxiety these days. He is told by his President that 95 percent of the Nation's secrets have been published by the newspapers and slick magazines. That is why, according to the President, all branches of the Government must have the right to withhold information which the Defense and State Departments already exercise.

Some newspapers and Members of Congress warn the citizen, however, that if the President's secrecy order remains in force governmental corruption and incompetency far worse than anything thus far exposed will flourish unexposed.

Reactions to these charges and counter-charges tend to be conditioned by the citizen's attitude toward newspapers and Mr. Truman.

Those who dislike the press tend to believe such charges as the President made Thursday and to accept the sort of secrecy he has ordered to take effect October 25. Those who dislike the President tend to believe he is trying to cover up administration shortcomings for partisan political benefit with these extended controls.

No patriotic citizen wants our enemies to have our military secrets but every alert citizen wants the fullest possible information about what goes on at home and abroad so that he may have a basis for sound decisions about public policy.

It is hard to weigh a statement such as the President made about national secrets. If he means 95 percent of all the things

some official has classified at some time as "restricted," "confidential," "secret," or "top secret" information ultimately has been published, that is not necessarily a cause for alarm.

Clippings from foreign newspapers sent to Washington by our Embassies abroad have been stamped with a secrecy label by officials who thought it would be damaging to let possible enemies know what sort of things people in Washington like to see. Much other material which could not possibly give substantial aid to the enemy bears a secrecy stamp.

If the President means that all but 5 percent of everything we know about how to make atomic weapons and guided missiles or wage bacterial warfare has been published, if he means that 95 percent of our military and diplomatic secrets are known, the national defense is indeed in a bad way. But how does he arrive at such a calculation? Who can compile and grade all the secrets of the world's greater air, sea, atomic, industrial, and financial power? Who can correctly figure that 95 percent of what is really vital to national defense no longer is secret?

It would take more than the Yale experts cited by the President to make such an evaluation sufficiently meaningful to justify the President's encroachments on the citizen's right to know.

The trouble with the President's order is that it gives dangerously wide powers of secrecy to a dangerously large number of officials with no clear guide by which they may govern their official acts. The President says his order should not be a cloak for withholding nonsecurity information. There is no authority, however, to which the question of what shall be classified must be submitted in advance of classification.

As the Committee for Economic Development points out, "a Government official is rarely commended for disclosure. He may, however, be reprimanded or otherwise disciplined for underclassification, that is, for failure to make material confidential or secret." The effect of such a procedure as the President has ordered is to make officials play it safe and put secrecy stamps on anything which anyone is likely to consider desirable to withhold from public knowledge.

The National Security Council is given broad review powers but, in the words of the Associated Press Managing Editor's Association, "the machinery and method by which this review is to be accomplished is not prescribed and no means is set forth by which an immediate review of classification decisions can be obtained."

Nor do citizens have means of discovering, for themselves or through proper representative agencies, "what information is being withheld or if decisions to withhold information have been wisely made. At no stage in the operation of the classification system is there provision by which a hearing may be given to those who desire to have the interests of information weighed against the interests of security."

That is setting up a straw man and knocking it down. The objection to the President's order is the extension of secrecy to nonmilitary information by authorizing a secrecy classification of anything officials consider "affecting the national security."

A secrecy-minded official can construe just about any type of information as "affecting the national security." That is why United States delegations in United Nations bodies dealing with pacts on newsgathering, censorship, and related matters objected to drafts which proposed to authorize censorship on outgoing news relating to "national security." Our representatives pointed out that "national security" includes not merely matters directly relating to national defense but also any economic or political information which a government having

wide powers in this field might regard as prejudicial to the security of the state. In practice that sometimes is interchangeable with "security of the administration."

Thus United States representatives fought hard to have such limitations upon the flow of news confined to news directly related to "national military security." When that proved too ambiguous, they succeeded in having the censorship limited to news relating "directly to national defense."

That is the term employed in article 7 of the draft convention on gathering and international transmission of news—a convention the United States unsuccessfully has sought to have adopted by the U N in the hope of thus lowering barriers to the free flow of news between peoples.

Now the United States is about to institute at home the inclusive sort of controls on news which it sought to deter other nations from adopting.

While newspapers and other media of information have a vital interest in the fullest possible freedom of information, every citizen has an equally vital interest in that basic human freedom. Free utterance, free listening, free printing and free reading are sacred rights of every man which must be defended by the whole citizenry and not regarded as the vested interest of any particular element or enterprise.

Freedoms unexercised may be freedoms forfeited, the businessmen and educators comprising the Committee for Economic Development point out in a study on national security and our individual freedom.

"Public apathy and the pressure for security can lead us along a dangerous road that ends in a garrison-police state. In such a state, the soldier and political policeman rise to power while the institutions of civilian society and of freedom shrink. In the name of security, channels of public information dry up, the press becomes a mere purveyor of official hand-outs. Cut off from significant information, editors, commentators and group leaders become less accurate in their judgments. The process of public discussion atrophies. Political parties decline. The power of Congress dwindles. Administration by civilian shrinks, relative to administration in uniform. The courts weaken. Cut off from information, the power of the citizen fades. Local plans are subordinated to central purposes. The free market is constricted. Labor is hedged in by special regulations. Consumers find their range of choice reduced. Decisions come to be made by an all-powerful government. All freedoms suffer."

There is nothing so insidious as encroachment, on freedom in a time of insecurity. There is nothing so hard to reestablish as the practice of freedom once it has been abandoned. Freedom itself, and the self-discipline necessary to freedom, are the best safeguards of security.

Tribute to Jess Larson, General Services Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to see recognition accorded to an individual who richly merits it—particularly when that individual is in high place in Government, where adverse, rather than favorable, comment is all too frequent.

In the Washington Evening Star of October 4, 1951, there appeared a strictly factual, but quite complimentary, article regarding Mr. Jess Larson, General Services Administrator, who recently was named Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

Mr. Larson has held a number of important posts in Government—and always with distinction. He is really, as the title of the article puts it, a "Big Man Who Does Things in a Big Way."

Maryland business leaders were impressed with his grasp of Government problems and methods when he headed a group of Federal officials who came to Baltimore last year to consult with and to advise them as to the procedures to be followed by industries seeking war contracts.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Evening Star be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BIG MAN WHO DOES THINGS IN A BIG WAY

(By Francis P. Douglas)

Jess Larson, one time "boy mayor" of Chickasha, Okla., has taken over one of the Nation's biggest jobs, that of Defense Materials Procurement Administrator. At the same time he still holds down the job of General Services Administrator, charged with looking after Government supplies, office buildings and other housekeeping duties for the Government.

His job of acquiring defense materials stretches to many points of the world. His decision on buying minerals may affect native employment in the steaming interior of the Belgian Congo. Recently he made a deal for the entire output of a Peruvian zinc mine. What he says about buying rubber—he has been the Nation's sole buyer of natural rubber since last December—is big news in Malaya.

The man who rides herd on the Nation's business got his start riding herd on his family's dairy animals. He had completed his first year at the University of Oklahoma Law School when his father became ill. Young Jess had to go back home to run the family dairy ranch and creamery enterprises at Chickasha.

When his father was able to resume management of the business, Mr. Larson was 24 and wanted to get married. The pay of the mayor of Chickasha had just been increased from \$3,000 a year to \$4,000, so Mr. Larson became a candidate.

Some supporters of those he defeated referred to him as the boy mayor—he was just 25 when he took the job. But officials of other Oklahoma cities thought enough of him to elect him president of the Oklahoma Municipal League.

He made another political race later which he will recall if you ask him about the reasons for his notably friendly relations with Congressmen. "Maybe I understand their problems," he answers. "You see, I ran for Congress once . . . and was beaten."

While he was mayor and later, he continued studying law and was admitted to the bar. Then he was given the job of managing the \$200,000,000 business of the Oklahoma Land Office as secretary to the commissioners.

When he got back to private practice it was for only a short time. In September 1940, the Oklahoma National Guard and Lieutenant Colonel Larson were inducted into Federal service.

He went overseas as commander of an artillery battalion in the Twenty-fourth Division. The outfit saw plenty of action. At

the bloody crossing of the Volturno River in Italy Mr. Larson was wounded so seriously he was evacuated to the United States.

Restored to duty, there came various Army assignments—good ones—but to Mr. Larson, now a colonel, the law still beckoned. In July 1946, he became assistant general counsel of the War Assets Administration. By the close of the next year he was WAA Administrator.

Remembering the scandals in surplus property disposal after World War I, newsmen kept a careful and expectant eye on WAA. Mr. Larson knew the dangers. "Unscrupulous operators," he said, "declared an open season on the Public Treasury and resorted to every known trick to obtain unfair advantage of their Government."

While administrator, Mr. Larson disposed of \$4,800,000,000 worth of World War II surplus. Law violations were kept to a minimum.

When the WAA job was winding up, Mr. Larson was made Federal Works Administrator to succeed Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming. A month later when FWA became the General Services Administration under a Hoover Commission reorganization plan, Mr. Larson became its first head.

GSA is a big business in itself, but additional jobs have been assigned Administrator Larson in this defense mobilization period: Buying for the stockpile, expanding aluminum production, buying rubber, breaking the machine-tool bottleneck, and other tasks. When the defense minerals and metals program began to lag, President Truman turned to Mr. Larson to fill the new job, Administrator of Defense Materials Procurement.

Mr. Larson occupies a cathedral-like office in the GSA Building. Its first occupant was Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane in the Wilson era. It is a reproduction of a big chamber in Haddon Hall in England. The huge office makes Mr. Larson uncomfortable, for as GSA head he is responsible for housing Government agencies, and he is acutely conscious that employees are being crowded into less and less space.

Mr. Larson is more than 6 feet, black-haired, and moves fast. He was in Europe on business last August when his new job was decided on. He got back and began to organize for it. He told a staff meeting:

"We must build an organization able enough and big enough to do a good job. But let's not confuse this with empire-building."

He was sworn in on September 14. He started that day with a speech to a group of trade publication editors at breakfast. Questions kept him until about 9:30 o'clock. He reached his office at 9:45. Staff members eyed the clock nervously because Mr. Larson had to take a plane for New York at 10:30.

He was sworn in. He immediately appointed Howard I. Young as his deputy administrator. He issued DMPA regulation No. 1, which started operations. He had various directions to give his assistants. Then he left for the airport and made the plane. His staff sighed with relief. It didn't last long. Less than 2 hours later Mr. Larson was telephoning from New York. He had thought of other things to be done.

Airline Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me, I include an editorial by the Washington

Daily News of September 28, 1951, concerning separation of hidden airline subsidies from so-called mail pay.

It is my hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may report out the same excellent bill that they reported out last year, now reintroduced as H. R. 508, and that this bill may eventually be enacted. In that connection I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the following recommendation in the report of our Committee on Appropriations, House Report 685, made July 10, 1951:

It is recommended that legislation be enacted to separate airline subsidies from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail. The subsidy portion if any, should be paid through a separate appropriation for the Post Office Department.

The bill reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last year, now reintroduced as H. R. 508 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and as H. R. 190 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON], would adequately carry out this recommendation, and I hope that the House may take effective action.

The editorial reads as follows:

KNOW WHAT WE PAY

Senate approved of a bill to separate airline subsidies from the cost of transporting air mail was long overdue, altho the bill doesn't go far enough.

If the Government is to continue the policy of paying part of the bill for air transportation, the public is entitled to know what that policy is costing.

As long as airline subsidies are hidden in payments for air mail, taxpayers will never be rid of them.

This policy was established to help get air travel started. Isn't air travel started yet?

It is because this subsidy has been hidden behind bad governmental bookkeeping and the flying industry's double talk that the taxpayer has been milked to support mushrooming airlines whose services too often merely duplicated flights already being made by other lines. Such expansion is primarily for the purpose of getting on the profitable Federal subsidy gravy train. This usually has been accomplished by the ambitious new carrier yelling "monopoly" unless there were two or more airlines competing. This also has been true in international flying, even though the American carrier had a half dozen or more competing foreign lines running against it. It was still accused of being a "monopoly" simply because it got all the taxpayers' dough. When an enterprise is run by subsidy, on schedules and at fares set by government, the cry of monopoly is "bunk."

Taxpayers can't be expected to kick in forever. One of these days, if the time hasn't already arrived, the industry ought to be healthy enough to stand on its own feet.

But if, as the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce said, "the national defense of the country makes it advisable to augment civil aviation facilities and services beyond their natural economic level, this objective should be recognized as a proper security cost." In other words, if the taxpayer has to pick up the check, let him see the itemized bill.

The airlines subsidy has been a part of the annual and huge deficit of the Post Office Department. That deficit is big enough without throwing in something that by any standard of bookkeeping doesn't belong there.

Let's call things by their right names.

That's what the Senate bill attempts to do.

The House, which last year passed an even better bill, has no reason for not repeating itself promptly, now that the Senate has concurred in the principle.

United Mine Workers of America Brand Canada's Threat To Build the St. Lawrence Seaway as a Bluff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, appeared before the House Committee on Public Works, October 9, he pulled no punches in unmasking the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway, whom he stated are running a bluff when they warn that Canada will build the project itself if Congress does not approve House Joint Resolution 337, which seeks to revive the proposal after its defeat by the committee last July.

In the course of his remarks Vice President Kennedy had this to say about the proponents of the seaway measure:

In the latter part of September the Prime Minister of Canada met with the President of the United States. There oozed out of that meeting a statement that Canada would build the seaway itself, although the President indicated that he preferred that the seaway be built jointly. It appears to us that this meeting between the Prime Minister and the President was a very crude and clumsy stage-setting for the presentation of House Resolution 337. This resolution was presented several days after that White House conference. It seems to me that the intelligence of the American people was taken very lightly by those who staged this act. It is so transparent that even a child could see through it.

Out of these extracurricular activities, since your committee refused to report out the first resolution, a pattern has been laid out by the proponents of the seaway legislation which certainly does not mesh with our conception of representative government. After exhaustive hearings, this committee saw fit to vote adversely on the seaway resolution. The proponents had their day in court.

The proponents of this seaway resolution refused to invoke the rules and the parliamentary procedures necessary for reconsideration of this measure which was previously defeated in the committee. On the contrary, they elected to flaunt these rules and beat the devil about the bush by introducing a so-called new measure, slightly changed in details but not in principle. It is my humble judgment that upon this point the whole subject matter is out of order. Subterfuge and evasion should have no part in our deliberative bodies. This resolution is an assault on the legislative branch of government.

Every American should read Mr. Kennedy's statement before the House Committee on Public Works so that he will be familiar with the unethical parliamentary tactics that are being employed in an effort to foist the St. Lawrence seaway project on the American people.

Mr. Kennedy's remarks follow:

On behalf of the United Mine Workers of America, I appear before your honorable committee to reiterate our opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

On April 18, 1951, I appeared before your committee and presented a statement in opposition to the seaway resolution then pend-

ing. I was interrogated at some length with respect to our position. I see nothing in the present resolution that changes the situation. The present Resolution No. 337 has to do with tolls and public power. It in no way affects the principles of our opposition to the suggested project. I, therefore, submit that if the committee deems it necessary, my statement of April 18, all of which is contained in part 2 of the hearings, be presented for use of the Committee on Public Works.

However, I think it important, at this time, to supplement my previous statement by analyzing some of the happenings that occurred subsequent to the action of your committee which did not report out the previous bill. Shortly after your committee acted adversely on this matter, certain Members of the House endeavored to have the House Foreign Relations Committee accept the St. Lawrence seaway as part of its foreign relations bill. It was properly ruled out and it was not accepted.

The Representatives who are back of this action evidently knew very little about parliamentary practices or procedures because it was clearly irregular and characteristic of the sharp practices indulged in by proponents of this measure. Later in the Senate some of the Senators tried to have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee accept it as part of the Senate foreign relations bill. It was ruled out by the chairman and subsequently the Committee on Foreign Relations by vote refused to accept it. It was then brought to the floor of the Senate and withdrawn by its proponents.

In the latter part of September the Prime Minister of Canada met with the President of the United States. There oozed out of that meeting a statement that Canada would build the seaway itself, although the President indicated that he preferred that the seaway be built jointly. It appears to us that this meeting between the Prime Minister and the President was a very crude and clumsy stage setting for the presentation of House Resolution 337. This resolution was presented several days after that White House conference. It seems to me that the intelligence of the American people was taken very lightly by those who staged this act. It is so transparent that even a child could see through it.

Out of these extra curricular activities, since your committee refused to report out the first resolution, a pattern has been laid out by the proponents of the seaway legislation which certainly does not mesh with our conception of representative government. After exhaustive hearings, this committee saw fit to vote adversely on the seaway resolution. The proponents had their day in court.

The proponents of this seaway resolution refused to invoke the rules and the parliamentary procedures necessary for reconsideration of this measure which was previously defeated in the committee. On the contrary, they elected to flaunt these rules and beat the devil about the bush by introducing a so-called new measure, slightly changed in details but not in principle. It is my humble judgment that upon this point the whole subject matter is out of order. Subterfuge and evasion should have no part in our deliberative bodies. This resolution is an assault on the legislative branch of government.

The proponents of this measure who engaged in these unethical activities displayed very poor sportsmanship and they not only trespassed upon legislative fundamentals, but conducted themselves in a manner which is at variance with our traditional form of representative government. Procedures of this type have no place in our democracy and I think that such tactics are menacing to our form of government and lean to being subversive of the regular procedures and decisions of our representative government.

The statement that Canada will build the seaway itself is doubtful and contains something of a veiled threat. If we received such a threat from any other government, the average Congressman would be inclined to resent it and tell them that this Nation would not be influenced by such tactics. In our judgment, Canada will not build the seaway by itself for the following reasons:

1 The tremendous outlay of money would be prohibitive for that nation.

2 Ontario and Quebec are the only two sections of Canada that would benefit substantially from the seaway and the other Provinces, including the Maritime Province, I understand, are not in favor of it.

3 The fact that at a point on the St. Lawrence River, midway between Gananoque and Alexandria Bay, the main channel of this river runs for many miles on the American side.

I am not an expert on international relations, territorial boundaries, or otherwise, but it is my impression that the main channel running on the American side could not be taken over by Canada without some arrangement between the Governments. After reading the testimony of previous hearings, I am under the impression that the United States intended to and would be required to do this work along the channels and locks located on the American side of the river.

Moreover, several power projects on other rivers in Ontario have been held up by the Ontario Power Authority and the statement has been made that they will be held in abeyance until they find out whether the American Government will put money into the seaway. If Canada cannot now undertake reasonable expenditures for these projects, how is it possible for Canada to expend the vast amounts necessary for the seaway? Canada will have to also find about \$1,000,000,000 for its new old-age-pension law that becomes effective January 1, 1952, and for other federal enterprises above and beyond present outlays.

Canada hopes for industrial expansion in Ontario and Quebec through the instrumentality of the seaway. Businessmen and bankers in Canada have given voice to these sentiments at meetings in Canada during the past several weeks. In common with other nations they hope we will pay the bill for their industrial growth and for the expenses of this expanded economy. For this reason I doubt that Canada will ever build the seaway.

However, if by chance, in the distant future Canada should start to build the seaway herself—so what? She will profit most, and we will be able to save for the taxpayers a great deal of money which, no doubt, would receive the acclaim of the citizens of our country. And I might add that should the seaway be built by Canada, we, the United States of America, a great sovereign nation—the greatest of all—could no doubt protect our interests as a nation and as a people.

In the new resolution public power is given some prominence. Our answer to this is, that if they want public power, they can very easily get it by building a number of coal-steam generating plants that can be erected more economically than this hydro-electric scheme. These plants could be decentralized and would not be fixed targets for bombs such as the seaway project would be.

I do not propose to go into the matter in any further detail. I have made these observations with the thought of restating my previous testimony. To the proponents of this measure I say that their activities and plans, with respect to the proposed regulations, do not measure up to my conception of the requirements of our representative form of government, nor to our democracy, and are destructive of the fundamental principles related to the presentation, the con-

sideration, and the consummation of legislation.

I express the hope that the committee will decide against this resolution and tell the proponents of the seaway project that they had their day in court and should now conduct themselves in conformity with the true principles of good sportsmanship, of good government, and that they should gracefully retire, and go way back and sit down.

Proposed Dam on the Verdigris River, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Kansas Herald, of Eureka, Kans., on August 23. This article raises the question of the wisdom of building a large and expensive flood-control dam on the Verdigris River in Kansas and suggests that a complete, basin-wide water conservation and flood-control plan, which would have much greater benefit, could be executed for a fraction of the cost of the dam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO SPEND \$75,000 PER SQUARE MILE TO CATCH SMALL PART OF RAINFALL—NEWLY DEVELOPED SYSTEM OF UPLAND RETARDING RESERVOIRS GIVES MORE PROTECTION AT LESS COST—LITTLE FLOOD PROTECTION IN TORONTO DAM

The Toronto Reservoir is one of two projects in Kansas scheduled for immediate construction. Following the July flood, the Corps of Engineers rushed in a request for \$3,000,000 as a starting appropriation. The project now is being considered by a conference committee of the Senate and House.

Kansas needs a solid plan of flood protection for its farms, roads, and industries. This first project merits a close examination of its costs and effectiveness, before the State begins a widespread program involving many millions of dollars.

This article will point out some of the main features of the Toronto project.

The Toronto Dam is located on the Verdigris River in southeastern Kansas, in the west side of Woodson County. The water that will drain into the reservoir originates in parts of Lyon, Chase, Greenwood, and Woodson Counties. The watershed area is about two-thirds hilly, Flint Hill pasture land; covered with native, tall prairie grasses. The balance of the land is cultivated and devoted to general livestock farming, principally cattle production.

Congress has authorized four dams in the Verdigris River and tributaries in Kansas. They are the Fall River (already built), the Toronto, the Neodesha, and the Elk City. The four were authorized in 1941, based on a 1939 survey.

SMALL CAPACITY

The flood-storage capacity of the Toronto Reservoir was authorized at 140,000 acre-feet, with an addition of 20,000 acre-feet for conservation storage. The drainage area above the dam is 750 square miles, so the reservoir has space for 187 acre-feet of flood-

water from each square mile in its watershed. (An acre-foot of water is an acre covered 1 foot deep.)

A 1-inch rain on a square mile of land, comprising 640 acres, produces 53 acre-feet of water. Hence the storage space in the Toronto Reservoir amounts to 3½ inches of runoff.

The major floods come after periods of heavy rains, when the ground is saturated, and nearly all of the rainfall runs off.

In case of an 8- or 10-inch rain, with the ground saturated, the runoff water would fill the Toronto Reservoir in about half a day, and all the rest of the water would go over the spillway of the dam.

In the recent July flood on the Verdigris, a heavy rain fell west of Madison at about 3 o'clock in the morning. The crest of the floodwater reached the Toronto Dam site by about 9 p. m. the same day; in less than 20 hours.

The facts show that the Toronto Dam offers very little flood protection.

NOT COMPARABLE TO FALL RIVER

The Fall River Reservoir has more than double the flood-storage capacity of the Toronto site, based on its watershed area. The Fall River Reservoir can store about an 8-inch runoff from its watershed of 673 square miles. In the recent July flood, when the Fall River Dam reduced the flood damage downstream, there was heavy rain on only part of its watershed.

TREMENDOUS COST OF CATCHING RUNOFF WATER

Calculations of the cost of catching floodwater in the Toronto Reservoir show that the total will be at least \$50,000 to \$75,000 for each square mile of the watershed above the dam, for only 3½ inches of runoff.

The original cost estimate of \$15,000,000 for a watershed of 750 square miles amounts to \$20,000 for each square mile upstream from the dam.

Costs have gone up two or three times since the first estimate was made, so \$20,000 to \$40,000 more must be added for each square mile.

In addition, it now is agreed by engineers and agricultural authorities, that some money must be spent on the land above the dam to keep silt out of reservoirs, and to prevent flood losses on the watershed. Experiences on a few projects show that this item will add \$10,000 or more per square mile.

The total then of catching the 3½ inches of run-off in the Toronto Reservoir will be at least \$50,000 to \$75,000 for each square mile in the area above the dam.

An indication of the great increase in prices is shown by the engineers under-estimate in the price of land in the Fall River project. The 1939 survey on which the four dams were authorized (p. 33 H. Doc. 440, of the 76th Cong.), shows that the total cost of land for the four reservoirs combined, Fall River, Neodesha, Toronto, and Elk City, is estimated at \$2,956,700. But the cost of the land (and some minor damages) in only one reservoir, the Fall River, actually cost \$2,243,000. So one dam has practically used the funds planned for the four dams, on one main item of cost.

NINETY-NINE PERCENT OF VALLEY UNPROTECTED BY SINGLE DAM

The Toronto Reservoir will inundate about 7,000 acres at flood stage, and is planned to give full flood protection to 15,000 acres downstream, to the head of the Neodesha Reservoir. After the inundated land is deducted, only 8,000 acres (12 square miles) net are benefited fully.

There are 1,160 square miles in the upper Verdigris Valley, of which 750 are above the Toronto Dam, and 410 square miles are downstream from the Toronto Dam and above the site of the Neodesha Dam. Out of the total

area in the upper valley that needs flood protection, the Toronto Dam provides a net benefit to only 12 square miles out of a total of 1,160 square miles. This is only 1 percent of the upper valley.

During the July floods, severe damage occurred upstream from the Fall River and Toronto Reservoirs. Farm crops were washed out, farmhouses and barns were washed completely away, and land was badly eroded in both the Fall River and Verdigris River and the creeks that emptied into them. This agricultural loss was near a million dollars. Damage to roads and bridges in Greenwood County alone was over \$300,000,000. Homes and business establishments in four towns were flooded.

In addition all main highways were blocked, and four truck wash-outs occurred on the three railroads in the county. Five people lost their lives in floodwaters. Business was at a standstill several days. This all took place above the sites of the two big reservoirs.

The Toronto Dam can give some protection for many miles downstream, and reduce the crest of floodwater. However it is just as true, that a system of smaller dams on the tributaries can give as much protection.

BEST FLOOD PROTECTION COMES FROM MANY RESERVOIRS

The great July flood in the Kaw River Basin proved that a few large dams on the main rivers were nearly useless in preventing a major flood. The rain that caused the damage fell downstream from the Kanopolis Dam, and downstream from the other proposed big dams that were supposed to prevent floods. The floodwater came from the small ravines and creeks along the side of the Kaw Valley. To have prevented the Kaw Valley flood, it would have been necessary to control the small streams along the valley.

Since about 1940, a new system of flood control has been developing. Its goal is to give flood protection to entire valleys, including both the upland and main valleys.

The first step is to store as much water on the land as possible, by means of good farm practices, in order to reduce runoff and prevent soil erosion.

The second step is to control the runoff water on the farm or in nearby ravines and creeks. Small retarding dams are used for this purpose. They are made with sufficient size to control floodwater on each small stream. These dams have open draw-down pipes that empty the water as fast as the ravines can carry the water without flooding. A complete system of these ponds regulates the stream's flow, and maintains a more uniform water supply on the rivers.

Congress appropriated money for a few demonstrations of this complete plan of flood control. One is located on the Washita River Valley in Oklahoma. After the project was in operation, a 15-inch rain fell May 9 and 10, 1950, in 36 hours. The retarding dams and other soil conservation practices handled the flood without damage to the land, and kept the streams down within their banks. Costs were less than \$10,000 per square mile on the Washita project.

A similar project in Saline County, Kans., prevented flood damage to the land during the recent July floods, and prevented overflow on the creek below the demonstration area.

The Toronto reservoir is located in the Flint Hill area where there are sites for retarding dams on nearly every square mile. At the present time State engineers are working on a pilot project to locate retarding dams on one creek valley of 56 square miles. They have found an average of two sites per square mile. These sites can store as much or more flood and conservation water as the Toronto site.

Plans are under way to survey all of the watershed above the Toronto and Fall River Reservoirs, in order to develop a complete

conservation and flood-control plan for the entire upper valleys. A few of the retarding dams will be constructed this summer. The Flint Hill area of Kansas, including about 15 counties, is very similar to the land in the Washita, Oklahoma project.

FEW DAMS OR MANY?

Kansas needs flood protection and a water conservation plan to help in times of drought, and to provide water for industrial uses and some irrigation.

Will Kansas choose a few big dams to benefit perhaps only 5 percent of its area, at a cost of \$50,000 to \$75,000 per square mile for catching runoff water (and on its best valley land)?

Or will Kansas choose a complete, basin-wide water and flood conservation plan, to help 95 percent of the State at a cost of about \$10,000 per square mile. This plan distributes the benefit of small dams over a wide area, and pays triple dividends by giving—

- 1 Upland flood protection
- 2 Upland soil conservation.
- 3 Bottom land flood protection.

There is no single cure-all for floods. Soil conservation, to store water in the ground, and widespread distribution of retarding dams, is the keystone in a sound control system. On the main streams, levees, bank stabilization, floodways, and channel improvements are needed. Every community should develop a program, not only to fit its own needs, but also to help plan an over-all program that will help its neighbors both upstream and downstream.

NOTE—After this article was written, the House Appropriations Committee in Washington, on August 20, announced that the Army engineers had underestimated flood-control projects 124 percent. The projects were costing over twice as much as the original estimates and the projects were not completed.

On this basis the Toronto project would cost over \$45,000 per square mile, to catch a small part of the runoff rainfall.

Harry's Horrors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was once said by Thomas Deke that—

This age thinks better of a gilded fool than of a threadbare saint in wisdom's school.

I hope this will not hold true in this age in which we are now living and enduring the type of corrupt administration of our national affairs that is coming to light each day. I am directing these remarks to the editorial which appeared in the Washington Times Herald of October 11, 1951, which, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD:

HARRY'S HORRORS

Four reverent Democrats have just been discovered beating the tax-deductible bushes for, of all things, a Harry S. Truman Memorial Library.

Every dollar put up for such a cheap dodge is, of course, a dollar that otherwise would go for taxes. Thus, the taxpayers once more are hooked by indirection to build at their

expense—for they must make up the loss—another politician's vanity case, now for Truman as for Roosevelt at Hyde Park.

The citizens' indignation is natural. But just the same we see merit in the idea of a Harry S. Truman Memorial Library and Museum. It has already been built by Truman, himself, after a manner of speaking, and it stands as a lesson and a warning to future generations. It is a lesson and a warning against the election of cheap and shoddy men to public office.

This Harry S. Truman Memorial Library of which we speak is, of course, the living record of Truman's ghastly career in office. Mme. Tussaud's waxworks contains no chamber of horrors to compare with it.

It has no rival except Roosevelt's own, and the principal problem is merely one of deciding which of Harry's horrors has been his worst so far.

Which blunder has exposed him most plainly for the small, scared, confused, and shiftily imposter in office that he is?

For instance, he has demonstrated that he does not understand communism in the Government of the United States, or else is willfully determined to conceal the truth.

Thus, his red-herring effort against the facts on the traitor, Alger Hiss, is surely a principal among what might be called the exhibits of Harry's horrors.

Then, as a rich and aromatic sample of his ignorance or worse toward international communism as a world force, there is that celebrated declaration that he likes old Joe Stalin. He might as well have said he considered Adolph Hitler a good-natured old German, Hitler not being even a German.

In the matter of fundamental dollar honesty, we have the whole series of party hacks caught up to their pudgy elbows in the public jam pots, with Truman asking what of it.

The candidates for "Harry's worst" could be listed by the yard. Yet one blunder does seem, more than any other, to give most plainly the measure of this man's wisdom and fitness for the job he holds.

This supreme blunder was the firing of General MacArthur.

Here was the ablest military commander of our time. MacArthur, more than any other, staved off tragedy in the Pacific from Pearl Harbor to Inchon, and at the moment of his dark-of-the-moon dismissal, was still holding out against the enemy despite the slack support of the cravens in Washington.

Why did Harry really fire MacArthur? Why did he deprive the United States of America of the professional services of such a man?

It was an act of pure fear and jealousy. It was the one move an intelligent man would have resisted above all others, if merely for reasons of good politics. But they just never taught Harry how to deal with men like MacArthur. You don't come up against that caliber in the Kansas City back rooms of Tom Pendergast.

Actually, the blunder was multiple. It not only deprived this country of the courage and intelligence of an authentic great citizen, at a time of urgent need, but brought also him back to the United States where the general has become a living reminder of Harry's stupidity.

Here MacArthur sits in civilian clothes when he might be serving his country at the work in which he is a proved and effective genius.

But note that the stream of decent Americans to his parlors in New York grows constantly, while the fires burn hotter around the little man in the White House. Harry's worst blunder, there can be no doubt, was in counseling with his bourbon-flavored fears to bring MacArthur home.

In Japan, MacArthur was a disembodied idea to most Americans. Here, in person, he is a living example of everything good that Truman is not.

Pentagon "Blue Room" Shameful Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a newspaper article which appeared in the September 28, Washington Evening Star, under the caption, "Pentagon's 'blue room' suite adds new color motif."

Ostensibly this article is a description of the office recently remodeled and redecorated for its occupancy by Assistant Army Secretary Earle D. Johnson, at a cost of some unrevealed thousands of dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

To me, however, this article is a description—one more description—of the reckless and criminal extravagance and profligacy of the administration and the "top brass" military tax-spenders.

It is one more evidence of their loss of all sense of proportion, of their fading comprehension of the toil, sweat, and sacrifice represented by the tax dollars, and of their lack of even an elemental sense of decency with respect to American men killed, wounded, frozen, and captured on the battlefields of Korea.

The newspaper article reads as follows:

A new color motif has come to the Pentagon in the form of a "blue room" for Assistant Secretary of the Army Earle D. Johnson.

Workmen have just about completed some 5 weeks of toil in carving out the spacious office suite.

The blue room actually consists of three large offices, plus an entrance lobby from which the Johnson entourage will be able to view an outer office through a beautiful archway, which is a rarity even in the Pentagon.

The main office is painted in what one painter called infantry blue, explaining that it is similar to the scarves worn by the famed ceremonial Third Infantry Regiment at Fort Myer. The outer rooms are done in a lighter tone of blue.

To bring about this miracle, workmen tore out several partitions and built new ones.

They have provided Mr. Johnson with a commodious dressing room, replete with built-in clothes chest and full-length hanging closet. Off this lies the bathroom with a full tile shower compartment.

Officials could not give an estimate of the cost of this operation, but the square footage is about the equivalent of that in a moderate two- or three-bedroom house. The main office dimensions are 80 by 22 feet.

It is located right off the Mall entrance, commanding a view of Memorial Bridge.

Said the Army, in answer to a reporter's query:

"The move is being made to bring Mr. Johnson physically closer to G-1 (personnel division) people with whom he does considerable work as Assistant Secretary in charge of Army manpower and personnel. Also it will make him more convenient to the office of Secretary of Defense personnel people."

Mr. Johnson now is located some 175 paces down the hall on the same floor.

It also was explained that Mr. Johnson's new location would be directly below that of his superior, Army Secretary Pace, thus cutting in one-fifth, the distance between those two offices.

The spokesman also maintained that the Assistant Secretary was not getting in his new offices a more elaborate lay-out than he was entitled to and added that others in similar positions had like suites.

Officials also disclosed that new offices soon will be provided for former Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, who, as a five-star general, is entitled to office space along with several aides, and for Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower when he makes trips here for conferences.

There are some 30,000 workers in the Pentagon. An official said an average of 83 square feet per person is provided the workers, but in some cases it has been necessary to reduce this to 50 square feet.

The new Johnson office reminded observers of the thousands of dollars spent on the security-tight Pentagon offices once built for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They were abandoned before they were even occupied when the then Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, decided it would be a better arrangement for the top military planners to be located directly below his office.

The original Joint Chiefs' offices were planned before Mr. Johnson himself moved his offices from the Mall entrance to the river entrance, previously occupied by the Army Secretary and containing a private elevator from the basement.

While the Earle D. Johnson suite is a pretty elaborate affair, it does not contain the private kitchen and dining room provided for the Secretary of Defense.

I could not help but think, as I read that definition of "infantry blue," and of the built-in clothes closet in the Assistant Secretary's new offices, of infantrymen blue with cold in the rigorous fall and winter climate of Korea. And I was reminded of recently published newspaper reports of a GI writing home from Korea asking that warm winter clothing be sent him, because, he said, the Army has failed to issue sufficiently warm Army apparel.

I could not help but think, as I read of the expensive transfer of the Assistant Secretary's office to save 175 paces of interoffice travel, of dog-tired infantrymen in Korea marching endless miles under battle pack, and often under enemy gunfire.

Quite apart from the waste of taxpayers' money, of which this ornate new office is only a single example, I am sickened and revolted—as I know the great majority of Americans must be—by the shameless ostentation, the indecent and obsequious tribute to the pomp and circumstance of rank, implicit in this elaborate, plush extravagance, whilst men wallow and die in mud and filth in Korea.

I have personally visited the vaunted office of Hermann Goering in Berlin and other offices of the "top brass" of one-time Nazi Germany. The "top brass" of the Nazi regime enjoyed the splendor and the tinsel of rank and fame for a moment. It is a tragically disturbing thing to see evidences of a growing attachment in this administration and among the top military hierarchy of this country to the vulgar symbols and perquisites of rank.

This, I must remind the House, is the same administration and the same military organization to which this Congress has voted billions of dollars of appropriations this session—many billions more than the administration or the military can possibly spend this year.

The Congress has imposed all too few restrictions and controls upon the spending of these billions.

How many hundreds of times are we to be confronted with the accomplished fact of wasteful expenditures, small and large, like the expenditures involved in the new color motif of the Pentagon's "blue room" furnished, note well, for all Assistant Secretaries—with appropriately more elaborate facilities for those of higher rank.

Do you wonder that the American people are restive, resentful, deeply disturbed, and sick at heart?

They have reason to be—not alone over the extravagance, the shameless lack of good taste; not alone even over the tragic plight of American fighting men trapped in an "accordion war"; but, most of all, deeply disturbed and sick at heart over the multiplying evidences of moral decay and palsied leadership in high places.

God save the United States of America.

One Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL J. WELCH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following eulogy of one of my constituents in the Appendix of the Record:

ONE BLOOD

(By George S. Reuter, Jr., an ordained Southern Baptist deacon)

The late Wendell L. Willkie made a great contribution to the world by writing *One World*. In the long run, it is the only way out. *One Blood*, which includes President Truman's civil-rights program, is an essential part of the over-all program. We should not forget the work of the late Dr. Edward Byron Reuter in studying the race problems. As Christians, we look toward a single Heaven composed of all races—all one blood, hence we should practice the policy of one world—all one blood, while yet alive.

Dr. Reuter, who died May 28, 1946, was born near Holden, Mo., July 19, 1879 (according to the 1880 census). He was the son of Peter and Julia Ann (Sullivan) Reuter. The other children were: Charles Joseph, Pratt, Kans., building contractor, who died in Carlsbad, N. Mex. in 1936; Judge George S., stockman, farmer, banker, and political leader, who died October 30, 1948; Mary, who married Nelson Chapman and who died September 8, 1950; Ann, who married A. J. Merklin, St. Louis insurance broker, and who died January 3, 1939; and Katie, who married Paul Chittin, and who died in 1940.

After being graduated from Central Missouri State College in 1904, Dr. Reuter received A. B. and B. S. degrees from the University of Missouri in 1910, an A. M. degree from the same institution in 1911, and a Ph. D. degree from the University of Chicago in 1919. He taught in a number of colleges and universities. He was professor of sociology at the University of Iowa from 1921 to 1944, and he held a similar position at Fisk University from 1944 to 1946. He was president of the American Sociological Society in 1933, and president of the Sociological Research Association in

1939. He was the author of a number of books.

He married Miss Mildred Goodspeed on June 30, 1914. Both the widow and their son reside at Stanford University. The son, Donald G., who is continuing his father's work, and the writer are the only two Reuters of this generation.

As a final token, Dr. Reuter was buried on the campus of Fisk University at Nashville, Tenn. A tree, in front of the Social Science Building, where he had his office, marks the spot. He lived, taught, and died believing in one blood. Five years have passed. Are we doing our part to make this dream a reality?

Fifty-four Scholars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, believing as I do that one of the most permanent of our investments in world-wide good will is the Fulbright scholarship plan, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Toledo Blade of October 8, 1951, entitled "Fifty-four Scholars":

FIFTY-FOUR SCHOLARS

When the front pages are devoted so largely to reporting of military and diplomatic moves on the world chess board, it is sometimes comforting to reflect that in quiet, unheralded ways a great deal is being done to build up friendly, intelligent relations between different nations. Just the other day, for example, the Consul General of Austria in New York gave a reception for 54 young Americans who were en route to spend a year in Austrian universities.

These youngsters were Fulbright scholars. That is to say, their education in Austria is to be financed under the Fulbright Act of 1946 which allows Austria to pay for United States surplus property by granting scholarships to selected Americans in its universities. And Austria, as a matter of information, became in June 1950, the twenty-first nation to arrange similar agreements with the United States.

Naturally an exchange of young people, to be most effective in producing a mature view of world affairs, shouldn't be a one-way proposition. Nor is it. As Donald J. Shank of the Institute of International Education pointed out, nearly 300 Austrians have already been students in American universities since the end of the war, on United States Government grants and scholarships given by colleges, universities, and private organizations.

In the course of the past few weeks, four groups of Austrian students—including 112 university and 64 secondary-school students—arrived in New York to continue their studies in this country. They had been brought here by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Field Service, the Brethren Service Committee, and the National Grange. Many of them were to spend a preliminary 6 weeks with American families to get used to our way of living.

The exchange of students between little Austria and ourselves is only one part of a larger program to promote international tolerance and sympathy through exposing young, fresh minds to different environments. It is a healing, catalytic force in a world that, in so many ways, seems unable to bridge the differences between peoples and ideas.

Cotton Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 10, a group of Cotton Belt farm leaders, representing the Belt-Wide Cotton Producers Association, conferred with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan in regard to the current cotton situation, and prospects for the 1952 crop.

Secretary Brannan was presented with the following summary of the current cotton outlook, as a background to this conference, which I include under unanimous consent:

Producers statements presented before the special subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, Chairman JOHN STENNIS presiding, are presented as background for a review of the cotton situation before the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Memphis hearing highlighted the fact that the United States cotton industry represents one of the Nation's greatest military and economic assets in that it can expand in great volume in a very short time to meet the fiber needs of the country and its allies. All cotton producing countries of the world, including Russia and her satellites, are incapable of such expansion as was seen this year when American production rose by 70 percent in one season. The synthetic fiber producers cannot begin to approach such expansion either.

In discussing the supply and demand situation in cotton, it was brought out that the demand for United States cotton, in keeping with the mobilization tempo of the national economy and the rest of the free world can be expected not only to remain strong but may prove far stronger than the best official estimates would now indicate. The present projected demand of 16,000,000 bales leaving an estimated carryover next year of 3,200,000 bales does not allow for the inherent dangers faced by the Nation.

In the event that the international situation should seriously worsen, mill consumption might rise to 12,000,000 bales annually. The export market would rise too. Requirements for United States cotton might go to 18,000,000 bales or more which would reduce the projected carry-over to 1,000,000 bales. This would be a tragedy for the Nation. On the supply side, it was testified that because of the prospect of a banner crop this year of nearly 17,000,000 bales, it is assumed in many quarters that such production can be taken for granted. Actually, declining prices and rising costs, ever-present threats of weather damage, and increased difficulty of obtaining necessary labor and materials make such an assumption totally unwarranted.

In reviewing experience with cotton during World War II, it was brought out that although there were sufficient supplies of cotton, the grades and staples needed were not always on hand for prospective military and civilian requirements to produce both old and new fabrics. The country was faced with decreasing supplies of high-grade cotton and increasing amounts of low grades due to mill requirements of higher grades and producers having increasing amounts of low grades with the shortage of labor on the farm. The fact that the military is constantly drawing up more exacting clothing requirements must be recognized in the current situation. At the same time, the quartermaster and other buyers for the military forces should place their orders promptly

for cotton requirements and thus put the mills to work. Moreover, it should be recognized that the military will spend many dollars abroad this year in addition to normal trade. Facilities must be extended to provide the necessary credits to export the needed cotton.

It was testified that with respect to the 1951 crop the major problem encountered has been cost. The fact that the farmer overextended himself to produce the much-needed large crop made 1951 production the most expensive on record. An on-the-spot study of comparative direct costs in the Mississippi Delta indicates that the cost of producing a pound of cotton was 7 cents higher this year than last. This 45 percent direct cost increase came about largely by almost 70 percent higher labor costs for hoeing and picking—\$25 per acre for pre-harvest unskilled labor in 1951 (mostly chopping) as compared with \$14 in 1950, and \$50.22 per acre for picking in 1951 compared with \$35.69 in 1950. These costs, it was shown, do not include such substantial items as taxes, supervision, debt service, management, etc. High production costs, scarcity of labor coupled with shortages of materials and necessary utilization of marginal land, all combined to create more hazards in bringing in the 1951 crop than those normally assumed in a business risk, it was pointed out.

Regarding the stockpiling of cotton, testimony revealed that the high quality of the 1951 crop would strongly recommend stockpiling for military needs from this year's crop. Whereas the 1950 crop was regarded as deficient in quality, reports indicate this year's crop as the best quality in several decades. It was stated that for breaking strength, the right sparsity, fullness, and uniformity the present crop would prove excellent for stockpiling purposes.

With respect to price hardship encountered by the cotton farmer, it was stated that in marketing the 1950 crop the farmer had sold the bulk of his cotton at a price much lower than the ceiling. The latter part of his production could have been sold higher if price ceilings and export subsidies had not been imposed. Last year, it was testified, the American cotton farmer contributed to the national economy and the fight against inflation in that he sold his cotton for \$10 a bale less than the world price. Despite the fact that he was asked officially last year to produce a crop in 1951 of at least 16,000,000 bales, and responded to that appeal, the cotton farmer again faces penalty in that he is again going to take less than the world price and even less than the cost of production.

By an organized program and hard work, the farmers went all-out in producing this year's crop. No price promise was made. * * * It was recognized that producing the required cotton was a patriotic duty. At the same time, the farmer expected that his remuneration would be in line with hardships encountered in the production and greatly increased production cost. Farmers, fully realizing they faced an expensive year, nevertheless invested personal funds, borrowed and mortgaged to finance the 29,000,000-acre crop.

In reporting on the cotton-producer program for orderly marketing of the 1951 crop, it was testified that this program helps to maintain the quality pattern so that the kinds of cottons needed will be on hand. The orderly marketing program also helps to maintain supplies of strategically needed cotton by stabilizing market prices and thus reassuring the grower. Whereas uncertainty, confusion, and pessimism prevailed in the Cotton Belt when the first banner crop forecast was made, orderly marketing held out the prospect of helping growers out of financial difficulties and providing capital for 1952 production. If cotton were to be sold at loan levels, it was stated, resistance

to cotton would grow. Many farmers would be forced to turn to profitable alternative enterprises requiring less labor and less capital. Without orderly marketing, it was stated, prices this year could well be at loan levels when the grower is selling and then rise sharply later when inherent demand exerts itself. Nothing could hurt prospects more for continuing high production in the future than such a development.

With conditions remaining as they are—cotton prices, costs, labor, and policies—cotton growers estimate a reduction of 20 percent in cotton plantings in 1952 compared with 1951. This would mean production approximating eleven to fourteen million bales in 1952. Largest reductions would be in the Southeast, smaller but substantial downward shifts in Midsouth and smallest in Southwest and far West. If prices fall below present levels and costs continue to increase the production decrease would be even greater. Unfortunately, experiences in 1951 with the request for more than a 60 percent increase in production, the high prices at planting time and an 11-cents-per-pound drop in prices at the beginning of picking has caused much dissatisfaction and confusion among growers in the major cotton-producing counties.

If national security, domestic consumption, exports to friendly nations and reserves for future contingencies require more than eleven to fourteen million bales in 1952 then several specific steps should be taken to insure the obtaining of those supplies.

Cotton growers propose following actions:

1. That a stockpile of cotton be accumulated beginning now under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This proposal reflects the fact that having a stockpile of cotton would protect against future shortages of fibers. Having the stockpile at hand would make it unnecessary to set future acreage goals at such high levels as to result in untenable market-price risks to growers. The availability of large supplies of high-quality cotton in the 1951 crop prompts the suggestion that stockpiling be started immediately.

2. That Department of Agriculture intensify its most commendable efforts to obtain minimum requirements of machinery, fertilizers, insecticides, bale ties, tractor fuels and other supplies.

3. That failure of the 1951 program to obtain labor satisfactorily from outside sources (particularly Mexican Nationals) be recognized. That a lower-cost, and less-involved, program be developed in keeping with the tentative plans outlined to users of Mexican labor on October 8, 1951, by Labor Department and other administration officials.

4. That full recognition be given by the Department to the fact that requests for extremely large increases cause disproportionate increases in production costs. There appears to be no relief from upward-cost trends. Therefore, the Department must recognize that accompanying added risks to farmers and to those who finance farmers will act as a further deterrent to future production increase.

5. Unless the potential threat of lowering ceilings on textiles and the inevitable roll-back in cotton prices which accompany lower textile ceilings is eliminated then growers will have little incentive to help production at high levels. The Department should continue to keep a clear-view perspective of this problem and the hazards involved before the Office of Price Stabilization.

6. The Department should continue its excellent efforts to service growers in the orderly marketing of the 1951 crop. It must be recognized, however, that the voluntary grower marketing effort results in higher risks and financing costs than when the habitual marketing pattern was followed.

Growers must market in an orderly fashion because they have no alternative. They need the Department's full support in the undertaking.

7. The basis for cotton price supports should be shifted to low-middling $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch staple to reduce grower risks on large crops.

Cotton growers have demonstrated their willingness to meet fiber needs in an unprecedented fashion by their action in 1951. They did so at financial risks greatly in excess of those assumed by other segments of the economy in the preparedness program. Fiber needs can be met best and with less drain upon national resources from cotton fields. Yet, they cannot be met without specific assurances as to conditions which will be confronted at harvest as well as at planting time.

Permanent Crosses to Mark Graves of Veterans on the Pacific Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I have received from James A. O'Brien, director of the Territorial Council on Veterans' Affairs, Territory of Hawaii, and an editorial from the Honolulu Star Bulletin of September 29, 1951.

During the last war, at which time I served on the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, our committee received budget estimates for the construction of national cemeteries on Guam and other islands in the Pacific, as last resting places for our men whose next of kin did not request the return of the bodies to the continental United States. Objections were raised by Francis Case, then Congressman Francis Case, member of the House subcommittee, and by me, in the House committee, to the location of permanent national cemeteries in numerous areas of the Pacific. The chairman thereupon designated us, as a special committee, to see if an agreement might be worked out with the Memorial Division of the Quartermaster Corps. As the result of several conferences it was agreed that only one permanent national cemetery would be located in the Pacific area, in the Territory of Hawaii, which would be adequate in size to accommodate the bodies of all American dead remaining in the area, and as beautiful as could be made.

We wrote into our bill the location of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific and provided ample funds to the Memorial Division for improvements to the grounds. Hawaii was chosen due to its natural beauty, climatic conditions, and relative accessibility and physical comfort facilities for the families of the dead who might have opportunity to visit the graves of their loved ones. Some 2 years ago I had the opportunity to attend the dedication of that cemetery, which seemed to me one of the most beautiful of its kind possible to be pro-

vided. More than a thousand wooden crosses then stood on that ground as evidence of the devotion in which we hold those who have given that last full measure.

Naturally since I had something to do with creating such a cemetery in Hawaii, I feel a keen interest in the cemetery. These crosses should be restored immediately, and if those in charge fail to take the necessary action to restore the crosses immediately, then Congress should pass a law requiring it.

The above-mentioned letter and editorial follow:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
TERRITORIAL COUNCIL ON
VETERANS' AFFAIRS.

Iolani Palace Grounds, Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NORRELL. Many men from your State who made the supreme sacrifice during World War II have found their last resting place in the National Cemetery of the Pacific. Because of this we feel that you are close to us in our efforts to have permanent crosses decorate the graves of those who gave their lives so that others might live.

As you know, until recently the 13,000 graves were decorated with wooden crosses. The wooden crosses were installed by the Army as a temporary measure pending the complete installation of surface marble markers throughout the cemetery. Recently, the installation was completed and the Army carried out its previously announced orders of removing and destroying the crosses.

However, during the tenure of the crosses they bored into the hearts of the people of Hawaii and to the many, many relatives of the men buried there who came from the mainland to visit the resting place of their son, husband, or brother.

The cemetery, now, without the row upon row of white crosses and Stars of David looks bare and forlorn. It was a distinct shock to the people who visited the cemetery after the crosses were destroyed. To them, the crosses have become an integral part of the cemetery.

May we enlist your assistance in securing a permanent type cross, either of concrete or of some other lasting material, so that the cemetery may be restored to its former beauty and symbolism.

This we know necessitates congressional action. The veterans organizations and the people of the Territory and we know the relatives of the mainland men buried here, would appreciate anything that you can do.

We are enclosing an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29 that expresses some of the feeling of the people of the Territory.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. O'BRIEN,
Director.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of
September 29, 1951]

THEY AWAIT THE VERDICT

The mute white crosses have been taken from the graves of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific—but protests may restore them.

It took only 2 hours for the energetic task force of the Army to remove from Punchbowl more than 13,000 little wooden crosses. It will require more time to restore them—if they are to be restored.

But there is time for this task of restoration—those who sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater have no need for haste. They will wait, in patience, for the verdict.

All the hurry, all the ordered speed and discipline of their training, all the furious urgency of their attacks on the battlelines,

all the sudden anguish of their mortal wounds before they fell, are of the past.

For them the suns will rise and will set over that dedicated hill of sacrifice in long, unhurried procession. The gentle winds and the stars will keep them company, even if in a burst of organized effort as well timed and precise as the burst from a machine gun, the 13,000 white crosses came down in one unexpected afternoon.

In Washington, D. C., Delegate FARRINGTON has appropriately said that the wishes of the families of the men who lie in the Punchbowl graves should be consulted.

That can be done, and should be done. It should have been done, and thoroughly, sympathetically, before the order was given that tore the crosses from the ground.

To do it rightly, the families should have a clear picture of the alternatives—the graves with crosses and also with the flat stone marker, or the graves with only that flat, inconspicuous and unimpressive headstone.

And the families should know—many of them know already—that in our military cemeteries abroad the white crosses still stand

And these next of kin should feel that it is not a question of economy—our doing fitting honor to those who are buried in Punchbowl.

It is a question of giving to these heroes of our country the greatest possible evidence of respect and devotion we can give them.

It is a question also of developing this National Memorial Cemetery as one of our Nation's most impressive, most distinctive burial places.

It is a question of maintaining the physical facilities so that each Memorial Day the people of Hawaii can pay their distinctive tribute of leis and garlands, appropriately wreathed above the graves.

Yes, those who lie asleep in Punchbowl can await the verdict.

For them all mortal haste is ended. They lie quietly in the ultimate discipline of death, relying upon a grateful country to do them justice.

Tribute to Mr. Rozmarek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, the Evening News on September 27, 1951, entitled "Tribute to Mr. Rozmarek":

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROZMAREK

It was not at all surprising to his native Wilkes-Barre to learn that Charles Rozmarek had been retained as president of the Polish National Alliance at the convention in Buffalo by an impressive majority. The combined votes of his two opponents were far below 50 percent of his total. Actually, he polled four times as many votes as his nearest rival. So it was scarcely a contest so far as he was concerned.

Mr. Rozmarek's popularity with the rank and file of the Polish National Alliance is understandable. Since he took office more than a decade ago, it has enjoyed its greatest growth despite the fact many fraternal bodies have been satisfied merely to hold their own. Assets have gone from \$25,000,000 to more than \$60,000,000, a gain of 140 percent, and membership at 330,000 is the high-

est in its history. The alliance is the fifth ranking American fraternal organization in certificate holders and total insurance. It operates 1,720 subordinate lodges in 32 States and is known for its cultural program and humanitarian activities as well as for its financial achievements.

Just as the alliance which was launched in Philadelphia in 1880 with fewer than a dozen members has gone a long way, so has Mr. Rozmarek since he first affiliated in 1917 and became its president in 1939 with headquarters in Chicago. By virtue of this office, he has become a world figure through his election to the presidency of the Polish National Congress, which speaks for 6,000,000 Americans of Polish extraction and has been occupied with the crusade for the liberation of Poland, among other things.

As he embarks on his fourth term of 4 years, Mr. Rozmarek is able to look back on a remarkable career although he still is in his prime and the years beckon alluringly ahead. The satisfaction that must be his can only be matched by the pride his home town takes in the eminence he has achieved.

Pulaski, in Death, Still Serves Freedom's Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article taken from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader-The Evening News, of October 10, 1951, entitled "Pulaski, in Death, Still Serves Freedom's Cause":

PULASKI, IN DEATH, STILL SERVES FREEDOM'S CAUSE

Little did the world realize when Gen. Casimir Pulaski died on October 11, 1779, of wounds received in the Battle of Savannah that he would still be serving his beloved Poland and the cause of freedom 172 years later.

The spirit of the Polish nobleman who loved liberty more than life lives on with gratifying results for his countrymen, enslaved now as then by a Russian oppressor. When Pulaski shed his blood for America in the Revolution, he unwittingly performed his greatest service for Poland, for he bound the two countries with unbreakable ties.

Down through the corridors of time, Pulaski has marched at the head of millions of others with Polish blood in their veins and today they remind us of our obligations as well as the bonds of friendship that have withstood the ravages of two centuries.

When we speak of the relationship between the United States and Poland, we, of course, are not thinking of the puppet Communist regime that has usurped power in Warsaw with Soviet armed might. Rather, we refer to the real Poland and its brave sons and daughters who carry on in the finest tradition of their forebears.

Thanks to the warnings of such organizations as the Polish-American Congress, the United States today is fully aware of the Communist menace which overwhelmed Poland a decade ago and poses for a death thrust at America if and when possible. It is generally realized now that Poland's fate awaits us unless we are alert and strong to repulse this enemy of God and man. While Poland remains in subjugation, there can

be no guaranty of freedom anywhere on earth.

So the crusade in which Pulaski played a leading role on both sides of the Atlantic goes on as this community and the Nation as a whole prepare to pay tribute to his memory tomorrow on the anniversary of his unselfish sacrifice. God rest his noble soul and protect the country of his birth and the country of his adoption, both of which he served so magnificently in life and in death.

Articles From Rolla (Mo.) Weekly New Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles taken from the Rolla Weekly New Era, Rolla, Mo. One is entitled "Farmers Recommend No Drastic Changes in Agriculture Program." The other is an editorial from the same paper entitled "Unjust Criticism of Fine Programs."

FARMERS RECOMMEND NO DRASTIC CHANGES IN AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

(By Barney Miller)

Phelps County farmers recommended no drastic changes in the Department of Agriculture programs being conducted in Phelps County, according to a report of the Family Farm Policy Review which has been completed here.

But several recommendations were made to improve the work of the various United States Department of Agriculture groups in the county.

The various agencies, all of which are part of the Department of Agriculture, were called upon to go into various farm communities of the county and to explain their work in detail. Then, special committees were appointed, and these farmer-committees were asked to write down their criticisms and recommendations. These committee meetings were all held behind closed doors with only the farmers present. No Government official was around when the individual criticisms or recommendations were written. This entire report, from each of the various communities of the county, has been compiled into a county-wide report.

Agencies which come under the Department of Agriculture include the Extension Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, the Production Credit Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Forestry Service, the Vocational Agriculture Department, the Rural Electrification Administration, and others.

Each of these agency heads was asked to explain his program in detail. Committee-men who wrote the final report were John Staggs, Frank Gabel, Dorsey Black, G. E. Allison, Blevie M. Lorts, and Lawrence Branstetter.

The reports for each of the agencies included:

Extension Service (county agent): No major changes recommended and the program approved, but one farmer said he thought the program was poorly-managed at the State level. "I think having a county agent is a wonderful thing, but it is not handled properly in Missouri. I do not feel that the majority of the farmers are benefited by

them. In Iowa, the Extension Service is run entirely different and is more successful. Not just one or two farmers get the benefit. Missouri has poor direction at the State level," were his comments.

"There is good in Extension Service and it can do much good in the educational line," were other farmers' comments.

Production and Marketing Administration: No major changes recommended and program given general approval. One farmer commented, "FMA has helped us in selling our grains. We are not forced to sell when the market price is low. We are no longer at the mercy of speculators." Another declared, "Farmers should go ahead on their own as much as possible but soil conservation is now at a crucial stage and the agricultural conservation program should not be discontinued."

Forest Service: No major changes recommended and program given complete approval. One farmer said, "there would be no timber left if it were not for the Forest Service."

Farm Credit system: Program approved and expansion recommended. Farmers particularly want a short-loan agency, which is what the FPCA is.

Farm Home Administration: Recommended more funds for agency. "It has given veterans a chance to own their own farms," one man said. It is a supervised credit group, designed for lower-income farmers and those just starting.

Rural electrification: Program generally approved but considerable criticism. "The trouble with REA in Phelps County is at the local level," one farmer commented. Another said, "all of us who have REA are happy with it, but we really have to put up a fight to get it. There is too much red tape connected with getting hooked up with REA." "Local directors always give excuses for not giving better service," was another farmer's comment. Recommended changes include: (1) That members of the REA should be kept informed as to its operations and financial conditions; and (2) that the REA telephone system be extended.

The Family Farm Policy Review was called for by the Department of Agriculture throughout the United States to see if there were overlapping agencies and duplication. The entire county report, together with similar reports from other counties all over the country, will be sent to Washington, D. C., where the entire group of reports will be used to determine farm policy for the next 12 months.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF FINE PROGRAMS

There has been much in the public prints of late concerning the Department of Agriculture plan for a review among the farmers of the various department programs being conducted. The Department calls this a Family Farm Review and has been conducting it for the past several weeks in Phelps County and elsewhere across the country.

Much of that which has been written has been criticism—and most of it is unjust criticism, we feel. The whole plan, in a nutshell, is this: The Department of Agriculture, through its various county organizations and agencies, is going out into the field and asking the farmers their honest opinions regarding these programs, such as FMA, the Extension Service, the FHA, the Forestry Service, and others. The paid county officials go to Edgar Springs, let us say, and explain to the farmers in that community just how, for instance, the FMA works, just how the production credit plan works, how the farmers' home group works, and so on. Much of this the farmer, as the user of these agencies, already understands, but it is reviewed for him. Then he is asked to appoint a committee composed of farmers, and these committeemen are asked to

meet by themselves and actually evaluate the various programs. This evaluation is put in writing and turned in to the county officers, themselves. Any suggestions, criticisms, or warnings are written right into the farmers' report. That's the plan in a nutshell.

Now, what is wrong with that? What, we ask, is wrong with the county PMA chairman, for instance, going out into the various communities, explaining his program in brief, and then asking the farmers—meeting behind closed doors—to write down just what they think of it? What is wrong with it? What is wrong with the Government agencies "feeling the pulse"? What is wrong with the farmer having his day in court, so to speak?

Let's take it for granted that what happened in Phelps County happened in most other counties across the country. Here the farmers who were asked to express their sincere opinions and to put those opinions in writing were such substantial citizens as Frank Gabel, Dorsey Black, G. E. Allison, Blevie Lorts, and Lawrence Branstetter. What, we ask, is wrong with men of that caliber telling the various Government agencies how they can best serve the farmer?

We feel that the criticism of this administration program is merely another phase of the constant carping and criticism that some of those outside the Government are leveling at the efforts of the present Democratic administration to aid the farmer. The farmer has learned to depend on many of these Government agencies. He has learned that most of them are managed by farmers right in his own community, and that they are there to serve him. These agencies are the very lifeblood of the program which the Democratic administration over the past 20 years has used to bring the farmer out of the poor house and make him a self-respecting citizen once again.

Those who are criticizing it now were criticizing it 20 years ago. And they'll probably be doing the same 20 years from now, too. And they'll still be on the outside looking in.

A Tribute to Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments to pay tribute to the memory of Christopher Columbus, an undaunted dreamer and brave voyager to whom the world owes a vast debt.

During the immediate centuries preceding the birth of Christ, Greek mathematicians and astronomers came to the conclusion that the earth was a sphere. They came to this conclusion through the means of mathematical computations. But it took almost 2,000 years before a man was found who would prove this theory.

The man who proved it was a Genoese voyager named Christopher Columbus. He was a man obsessed with an idea; the challenging, gnawing notion that he could reach the Orient by sailing west, through an unknown and unmeasured ocean.

For years he walked and lived with that dream, trying in vain to obtain the aid necessary for its realization. He journeyed from one court in Europe to

another, seeking a sponsor who would furnish him with ships, and with the funds necessary to underwrite the venture.

After 10 years he succeeded, and set out with a handful of men in search for a short route to the Orient. Although he never reached his original destination, he proved that the world was round, discovered the New World, and opened a new era of exploration and discovery in the history of the western civilization.

Christopher Columbus Day, which we are commemorating, is not a mere tribute to the past. It is a dynamic challenge to the present and to the future.

During the recent years, our Nation has entered into new fields, and reached for new goals. We have maintained that it is possible for the people of our country, led by a liberal government, to increase the prosperity and welfare of our population, to do away with much of the poverty, sickness and discrimination which blemish our national scene, and to prevent the recurrence of depression and of widespread unemployment. Further, we propose the idea, in the point 4 program, that it is possible for us, without in any way harming our own interests, to aid the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world to improve their lot. And, finally, we have been trying to establish the fact that the nations of the world can work together through the medium of an international organization for mutual benefit, mutual defense against aggressors, and for the establishment and maintenance of world peace.

There are people today who feel that these objectives are but fruitless dreams, just as there were people who felt, four and one-half centuries ago, that Christopher Columbus' proposal was unrealistic and impractical. Faced with such skepticism, I think that we should take an example from Christopher Columbus' unyielding perseverance and determination, which enabled him to realize his ambition, and which benefited the whole humanity. I am convinced that, if we consecrate ourselves to the attainment of our goals, we will succeed, and our victory will result in the betterment of our society, our Nation, and our civilization.

Five Hundredth Birthday Year of Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article taken from the Wilkes-Barre Record of September 28, 1951, entitled "Five Hundredth Birthday Year of Christopher Columbus":

FIVE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY YEAR OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Many nations in this hemisphere will mark Columbus Day, October 12, this year more

ceremoniously than usual. According to the leading biographers, Christopher Columbus was born between August 26 and October 31, 1451. So the celebration this year will take on the significance that goes with the rounding out of 5 centuries since Columbus was born, according to the best available information. There are no birth records.

The Dominican Republic is making this year an occasion to press an appeal for United States support of a Columbus memorial project. The memorial, a lighthouse, in the shape of a recumbent cross a half-mile long, is being erected in Ciudad Trujillo at an estimated cost of \$10,000,000 by the 21 Republics of the Americas. Funds for this are being contributed by the republics, but to date, the United States has not taken steps to meet its contribution quota, according to the Columbus Lighthouse Committee.

The Columbus Memorial Lighthouse, when completed, possibly in 1954, will contain a museum of historical Columbus treasures, a library and a section for each of the 21 nations in addition to the tomb. It is being built on the site of the first permanent white community—now known as Ciudad Trujillo—from where the migration of men to many parts of the New World was undertaken. From this "Cradle of the Americas" fanned out Cortez, Ponce de Leon, Pizarro, Balboa and a host of other adventurers.

On October 12 the Library of Congress will observe the five hundredth birthday (it might be the five hundred and fifth) of the man who started it all—this business of being Americans and not Europeans. Since the exact date of Columbus' birth is unknown (it is generally believed to be some time in 1451, though some scholars insist on 1446), the Library has picked October 12, the date of the "great discovery," as a fitting time-honored on which to hang their observance of his birthday.

The Library's observance will take the form of a special exhibit of rare maps, atlases and charts. The exhibit will include an atlas published in 1480. Columbus may have used this very copy in 1492. Also copies of Juan de la Cosa's map of America, drawn in 1506, and a copy of Martin Waldseemüller's map of 1507, which shows, first time on any map, America as a separate continent. The map's use of the name "America" was also the first time the great new land mass was so designated.

Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the Members are aware of the many inequities occurring in the various agencies of Government which are attempting to control our economy. Many small businesses are losing their skilled personnel because the red tape cannot be cut fast enough to act on their various cases.

Mr. C. Blake McDowell is one of the foremost authorities on newspaper operations in this country. The letter from him printed below is self-explanatory:

BROUSE, McDOWELL,
MAY, BIERCKE & WORTMAN,
Akron, Ohio, October 9, 1951.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Representative in Congress, House
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: I have noticed recently that there is a movement in

Congress to attempt to change the price stabilization so that all communities where products are manufactured will be upon the same Nation-wide ceiling price.

For example, if a manufacturing establishment is manufacturing newsprint in the United States, irrespective of the location in which it is manufactured, it shall be sold at the same ceiling price.

This kind of a fixed-ceiling price cannot possibly be equitable, as newsprint in Texas and in the extreme South can be manufactured at a lower cost than newsprint manufactured in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. These small northern mills are far removed from the source of supply; to wit, wood. Therefore, the cost of production of newsprint is much greater than it is in the southern mills.

If a ceiling price is fixed at, say \$116 per ton, including freight, for newsprint manufactured in the United States, there will be at least 200,000 tons less newsprint manufactured in the United States, as every one of the small mills in the above States would immediately cease to operate and convert their mills to some other paper products, such as tissue, toweling, or kraft paper.

Newsprint is a critical material and if the production in the United States is cut 200,000 tons the newspapers now being supplied will be forced to buy the same in the open market at prices two or three times the Canadian price per ton, or will be forced to cut the size of the newspaper and their circulation or quit entirely.

Another item that is critical in the country is sulfite. Sulfite is required to make newsprint. At the present time a fixed price has been set for the sale of sulfite manufactured in the United States at \$132.50 per ton, including freight.

The Norfolk Newsprint Mill, purchased by Knight Newspapers, Inc., produces sulfite for its own use and approximately 260 tons per month additional which must be sold, and during the months of July, August, and September of this year has been sold at the ceiling price of \$132.50 per ton, including freight.

Unbleached sulfite to be manufactured in the United States in the northern mills costs from \$150 to \$180 per ton, and to sell the same at \$132.50 per ton, with freight included, means a loss to all of these small mills of at least \$50 per ton.

You can see, therefore, that the small northern mill on the St. Lawrence River, in New York, owned by Knight Newspapers, Inc., sustains a loss under the present ceiling price of from \$12,000 to \$13,000 per month on sulfite alone.

We have applied for an increased price to at least cover cost, plus freight, so that we will at least be able to recover the cost—not asking for a profit. Unbleached sulfite is sold on the spot market in Canada and other foreign countries at anywhere from \$185 to \$200 per ton. Why, therefore, penalize the American manufacturer on a critical material, and force the American purchasers of sulfite to buy from the foreign mills and pay an excessive price?

You can see from the foregoing that if industry price is set and it is not an amount sufficient to permit these small concerns to live, they will quit manufacturing. For example, the two critical materials about which I am addressing you; to wit, newsprint and sulfite (there may be other manufactured products in the same class).

Therefore, my suggestion is that if the Capehart amendment is modified or changed, or even though it is not modified or changed, legislation should be passed authorizing the Price Stabilization Board to fix a ceiling price, but add an exception: substantially as follows:

"The Price Stabilization Board, however, shall, upon application of any manufacturer, authorize an increase in the ceiling price at

least to cost of manufacture, plus freight, for any article manufactured by any person or company where the ceiling price as fixed is under the cost to the applicant."

You may ask, Why do you manufacture more sulfite than is required for your own use?

1. It takes about 50 persons to make the sulfite.

2. Sulfite can be made by working 3 days per week, but no concern can hold its employees by working them 3 days per week.

3. If they do not work, therefore, there will be no sulfite and, as a result, no newsprint.

4. If we work them 5 or 6 days per week, there is an additional 260 tons of unbleached sulfite produced, which must be sold almost immediately, as it quickly deteriorates.

5. Furthermore, when there is such a tremendous demand for sulfite, it is the duty of the company to make the additional sulfite to help supply the demand.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senators TAFT, BRICKER, and CAPEHART, and Representatives SPENCE, WOLCOTT, and RAYBURN, but I think you should interest the Senators and Representatives from all of the States where these small mills are located, and there are a number of them in the northern part of the United States, and I know that the cost of making newsprint in these small mills is anywhere from \$150 to \$180 per ton; and I further know that all of them will quit making newsprint and quit making sulfite immediately upon a fixed ceiling price being established with no right to ever have relief.

Respectfully yours,

C BLAKE McDOWELL.

(Knight Newspapers, Inc., The Detroit Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, the Miami Herald, the Akron Beacon Journal.)

The Fogarty Resolution: Statement Supporting Its Passage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the world is engaged in a struggle between two ways of life. We in America who believe in freedom must be consistent in that belief and consistent in its application. There is no other way to win the friendship and trust of those vast numbers of people who are now undecided as to what course to take. Great numbers of peoples in the world are emerging from bondage. They need a fresh and inspiring leadership. They want facts, not words.

We have an opportunity in the Fogarty resolution of presenting powerful proof that we stand actively behind the belief that democracy can become a living reality. This resolution simply and emphatically expresses the sense of the Congress that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determined and declared to the contrary. By adopting this resolution we will strengthen the cause of freedom the world over.

Ireland must take its proper place in the world. Elimination of the partition would mean that Ireland would immediately become a member of the Atlantic Pact and by joining the Atlantic Pact a united Ireland would provide the northern pivot for the defense of Western Europe. Ireland as a geographical unit is important; it is a major strategic approach to Europe.

Not only geographically, but racially, economically and historically unification is a more natural condition for Ireland. Partition cannot be justified—it is a man-drawn, unnatural line created some 30 years ago to satisfy the whims of British politicians. The English now favor unification but their Government, in matters outside England proper, lags behind the times. Here lies a dynamic opportunity for two great nations to solve a problem with justice and honor.

If the people of Ireland were given a chance to vote on having a unified nation, they would vote overwhelmingly against partition, for on this issue the Irish are united. Is it right that a people so united should be denied the principle of self determination? Is it right that one people should be cut into subdivisions so that the economy of the country is split? Neither Ireland, nor any other nation, can maintain its national unity when it is divided into unnatural physical components. Division in any country tends to weaken that nation. To use induced division as a technique for conquest was Hitler's philosophy—now it is Stalin's philosophy. This forced and unnatural division of Ireland now plays into the hands of the Kremlin.

The issue of partition has become an international question. It has become a test as to how well and how soon the Western World can resolve those old problems which stand in the way of real progress. As long as the British hold on to the six northern counties of Ulster, a wrong persists. As long as we fail to exert every ounce of pressure—in support of freedom and a united Ireland, we acquiesce in that wrong. Our complacency on the issue of a divided Ireland can hardly be calculated to help win the confidence and support of the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia. It will instead link us with a decadent imperialism—an imperialism of which they want no part. Inaction of this sort is disastrous for the cause of freedom. A stand-pat attitude will not suffice.

The relationship of the people of Ireland, not only historically but today, is very close to America. They have a deep and abiding faith in our Government and particularly in the Congress of the United States. This faith is based upon the knowledge that our Government has always associated itself with the principle of national freedom. We did so in Israel; we did so in India; we did so in Burma. Shall we, the free people of the United States, who have a reputation for protecting the rights of small nations—shall we permit this injustice to Ireland to continue by our silence, by our failure to make known our stand?

Lewis Cass, the Last Jeffersonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the seat I hold in the Senate today once was held by Lewis Cass, a New England pioneer who grew up with the Northwest Territory. Few American statesmen have rivaled Cass in the multiplicity of his public duties as soldier, territorial governor, Secretary of War, Minister to France, senatorial leader, presidential nominee, and Secretary of State. He was a firm believer in American democracy and in local sovereignty. He tried to save this Nation from Civil War.

Frank B. Woodford, an editorial writer of the Detroit Free Press, has written a scholarly and vivid biography of Lewis Cass, which critics and historians universally praise. Mr. Woodford had access to the unique resources of the Clements Library of the University of Michigan, and his work contains much that increases our understanding of an important man in an important era.

In the belief that Mr. Woodford's biography of "Lewis Cass, the Last Jeffersonian," will interest many of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a typical newspaper review, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. It is but one of many tributes the book has received.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CASS OF THE OLD NORTHWEST

(Lewis Cass, the Last Jeffersonian, by Frank B. Woodford, 380 pp. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. \$5)

REVIEWED BY AVERY CRAVEN

The career of Lewis Cass was so intimately connected with the development of the early Old Northwest that a biography of the man is almost a history of the region. Though born in New Hampshire and educated at Exeter Academy, he early migrated to Ohio which was still in the territorial stage. Three years after his shingle was out he was a member of the Ohio legislature, and a few months later United States Marshal for the State.

From that point forward Cass grew and prospered with the region. As a brigadier general in the Ohio militia he took part in the War of 1812 and came out a hero in spite of having been with Hull at the surrender of Detroit. He was still in uniform when President Madison named him Governor of Michigan Territory. For the next 18 years he held that office, handling Indian problems, exploring the wilderness and revealing its matchless mineral resources, and encouraging the development of social-economic institutions of every sort. As Woodford asserts, Cass, almost single-handed, builded an empire.

Such achievements in the growing West brought national recognition. Jackson made him Secretary of War and then Minister to France. Here he attracted wide attention by opposing England's right of search in checking the slave trade and returned home to find himself being talked of as a possible presidential candidate. Michigan sent him

to the Senate, and Texas and the Mexican War gave him the chance to develop the doctrine of popular sovereignty as the best solution of the troublesome problem of slavery in the territories. That gave him the Democratic nomination in 1848.

With defeat, Cass became one of the elder statesmen alongside of Benton, Clay, and Webster—men who took middle-ground in the sectional controversy and urged compromise. Like them he felt that the preservation of the national parties was the best way to keep the Nation united. He hated slavery, but he loved the Union enough to grant it constitutional rights. He remained a staunch Democrat and soon found himself called a dough-face and deserted even in his beloved Michigan.

There is little that is new in Woodford's book but it is far better written than its predecessors. Some of his background is a bit out of date, but his estimates are sound and his general appraisal of Cass entirely satisfactory. He has done a much-needed job in calling attention to one who has been largely neglected for the simple reason that he took conservative ground in a day when radicals were taking control.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] on Monday, October 8, 1951, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., at a luncheon under the joint sponsorship of the Washington Variety Club and the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.

This luncheon was the seventh annual national kick-off luncheon commemorating the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

I also include in my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of October 7, 1951, and an article appearing in the New York Times of October 7, 1951, written by Howard A. Rusk, M. D.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN MCCORMACK

Of all the social programs designed to promote the most effective utilization of American manpower, I know of no project more worth while than our efforts to stimulate employment of the physically handicapped.

In the not too far distant past that small but important segment of our society consisting of physically handicapped persons was looked upon as a social problem, and the persons who constituted this class were neglected or forgotten in the formulation of plans for social and industrial improvement.

During the past 10 years, however, and especially since our social conscience was stirred by the return of handicapped veterans from World War II, the American people have become acutely aware of the existence of the physically handicapped among us and the necessity of incorporating them into our daily life as useful and productive members of society.

In the beginning the program designed to aid the physically handicapped was to some

extent colored by the impression that help and assistance to these persons was solely a charitable and humanitarian requirement. With the inception of an annual Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, however, American business and industry have come to learn that the skills and aptitudes of our handicapped citizens have a definite and important place in our entire scheme of manpower utilization.

It has been discovered after examination and trial that properly trained physically handicapped persons, regardless of the nature of their impediment, are susceptible to training and adaptation in a whole host of job skills for the performance of which they are peculiarly qualified.

In addition, from an economic viewpoint, it has been discovered, somewhat belatedly, that training and utilization of these persons in skills for which they are adapted is a sound and lasting investment in human integration. By employment of the physically handicapped in jobs within the area of their competence, we have not only created a new and productive segment of industrial workers, but in addition, we have salvaged a substantial number of citizens from the social scrap heap, speaking descriptively, and, at the same time, converted a liability subsidized by public financial assistance into a group of persons independently enabled to contribute to the economic welfare of themselves and their community.

It has been further discovered that the physically handicapped worker, by reason of his exaggerated consciousness of competitive disadvantages can be converted into the best and most reliable type of American workman. Our American employers who have had the foresight to employ physically handicapped workers report almost without exception that such employment represents the soundest business investment and opportunity. Their reports are substantiated by official Government statistics which reflect that, among the physically handicapped labor force as a group, there is greater stability and less turn-over, a lower industrial accident rate, less absenteeism, and a corresponding equality or advantage in production in comparison with nondisabled workers as a whole.

As a Member of the Congress, I am happy that the legislative branch of the Federal Government has given a decided impetus to our social efforts in behalf of the physically handicapped citizenry of America. Convinced of the desirability of any program designed to benefit this group, laws have been enacted providing for the utmost assistance in the vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped veterans. Complementary programs have been authorized through the channels of the Labor Department and the Federal Security Administration. Much more is to be done.

In full cooperation with State and local agencies the Federal Government has materially aided in instilling in the minds of American businessmen a sense of responsibility to physically handicapped workers whose eagerness to work is matched with their competence to perform the jobs to which they are adapted.

I consider it a privilege and honor to add my personal endorsement to the Seventh National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I wish to take this occasion to pay high tribute to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, because it is through the consistent efforts of that organization that America is well on the way toward the discharge of one of its most pressing human and social responsibilities.

Not in the sense of extending the hand of charity, therefore, but rather in the sense of providing well-deserved opportunity, let us hope that American business, American industry, and American Government will

continue to create, uncover, and make available American jobs at American scales of wages for Americans who are physically handicapped.

In closing my remarks, I desire to pay my respects to one of the finest men I have ever met, Paul A. Strachan, cochairman of this splendid luncheon, the 1951 national kickoff luncheon of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

All handicapped persons throughout America are indebted to Paul Strachan for his determination throughout the years in fighting their battle and in the progress that has been made, particularly during the past 15 years.

I pay Paul Strachan a tribute he richly deserves.

[From the Washington Star of October 7, 1951]

EMPLOYING THE HANDICAPPED

Congress has designated the week beginning today as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and Federal and local committees are mobilizing rehabilitated workers for the defense campaign especially but for ordinary industrial and commercial routines also. The Nation cannot afford to be wasteful of any of its human resources. Handicapped persons should be trained in useful skills and, when they have been so trained, they should be placed in jobs where those skills can be exercised effectively. This is a duty recognized by the Federal Government and by many State governments and municipalities. It is supported by two considerations worthy of mention here and now.

One, of course, is that of the instinct of sympathy which the fortunate naturally feel toward their handicapped neighbors. A blind person, for example, is entitled to the help of the community in which he belongs. But few Americans so afflicted want to be favored simply because they are handicapped. They wish to be employed on equal terms with their fellows. The various rehabilitation programs aid them in qualifying and the results frequently are remarkable.

Perhaps the principle of natural compensation is involved in such cases. The blindness of Homer and the blindness of Milton yielded *The Odyssey* and *"Paradise Lost"* under the influence of their acceptance of the challenge of their handicap. Deaf Beethoven wrote beautiful music. Melancholy Dante brought forth *The Divine Comedy*. Lame Scott and Byron, maimed Cervantes and Nelson, hunchbacked Aesop and Steinmetz, paralyzed Heine and Pascal, consumptive Keats and Stevenson, migraine-tortured De Quincey, Coleridge and Darwin, lonely Hans Christian Andersen and Lewis Carroll—each of these immortals sublimated his suffering, and the common welfare was the guinea. The annals of humanity are replete with personalities made richer by adversity to the profit of millions.

And the end is not yet. The handicapped men and women of our own time are motivated by the same dream of triumphing over circumstance, and they deserve full opportunity to show what they can do. Particularly now, when manpower is needed in the struggle to preserve our free civilization against totalitarianism in its latest threatening form, employing the handicapped is a privilege as well as a duty. History confirms this view, and the prevailing emergency illumines it.

[From the New York Times of October 7, 1951]

NEEDED MANPOWER IS SEEN IN PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—MEANS OF INCREASING REHABILITATION SOUGHT AS NATION FACES WORKER SHORTAGE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

When the 1949 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was observed, 60

columns of "help wanted" advertising appeared in that Sunday's issue of the New York Times. Two weeks ago there were 135 columns.

Two years ago 3,500,000 persons were unemployed and the handicapped among them had particular difficulty in finding jobs. Repeated objective studies had shown they make good, safe, reliable and productive employees, but industry as a whole shied away from hiring the handicapped, because of prejudice and a lack of understanding. Today, however, the situation is different. We have fewer than 1,600,000 unemployed persons and the handicapped are in great demand.

In his third quarterly report to the President, last Sunday, Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, said, "Few, almost no, lags in defense production have yet occurred because of manpower shortages." He warned, however, "In the planning of manpower programs, Government and industry must prepare for the more widespread shortages that are in prospect as we enter into the period of mass production of military goods."

Both the Nation's several million disabled citizens and our thousands of industries should be proud of Mr. Wilson's statement that our defense mobilization program has not lagged because of manpower shortages. The several hundred thousand handicapped persons who have found employment since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea have played an important role in filling the Nation's manpower needs. Industry is to be commended for its broadened concepts and the realization that the handicapped have far more ability than disability.

VALUE OF CAMPAIGN SHOWN

It is true that a large degree of industry's willingness to employ an increased number of handicapped persons has resulted from the fact that nonhandicapped workers have not been readily available. Much, however, has resulted from the increased understanding by industry of the handicapped's ability to produce that has been created by the annual campaigns of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, headed by Admiral Ross T. McIntire.

In the fiscal year that ended in June, 277,000 handicapped workers were placed in jobs through the joint efforts of the Federal-State public employment services. This was an increase of 100,000 over the 177,000 placements made the previous year. Several hundred other thousands of handicapped workers found jobs by themselves or with the aid of voluntary agencies.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults in Chicago on Thursday, Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, president of Winthrop-Stearns, Inc., reported that 7,200,000 persons must be added to the Armed Forces and defense industries by the end of 1952 if we are to meet our mobilization objectives. Of this number, he said, 3,000,000 could be obtained by shifting workers from nondefense to defense industries and 1,800,000 others could be gained by normal additions to the labor force. This leaves a deficit of 2,400,000 additional workers.

Dr. Klumpp estimated that of this 2,400,000 deficit, 900,000 could be recruited from the ranks of women and by returning older and retired workers to industry. This still leaves a deficit of 1,500,000 workers, a group equal to the population of Detroit.

WIDER REHABILITATION STUDIED

The only potential source of workers to fill this gap, Dr. Klumpp asserted, is from the estimated 2,000,000 persons with severe, static physical disabilities who could become employable if they had proper rehabilitation services and were selectively placed in

the proper type of work. Dr. Klumpp heads a special task force on the handicapped under the Office of Defense Mobilization to study methods of rehabilitating more handicapped persons and placing them in jobs in support of the mobilization program. The report and recommendations of the task force, he said, will be made within the next few weeks.

Owing to the increased demand for workers resulting from the intensification of our defense mobilization program, the problem today is not so much finding jobs for handicapped persons, but finding handicapped persons to fill vital defense jobs. With modern rehabilitation services, there are hundreds of thousands of successfully employed handicapped persons who would have been classified as unemployable a few years ago. They are the persons who have been responsible in no small measure for Mr. Wilson's optimistic report of last Sunday.

The retooling phase of our mobilization program is largely completed and within the next few months our efforts will be centered on the mass production of defense materiel. As Mr. Wilson warned, this will require increased numbers of workers. The only sources of such workers are the handicapped and aged who are not now at work but who could become employable if given rehabilitation services. This year's National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week slogan sums up the situation clearly and crisply—"America Needs Us All."

The Christian in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared a new book, the author of which is a former colleague of many of the Members of this body. He represented the Twelfth California District in the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses. I refer to the Honorable Jerry Voorhis. The title of his book is "The Christian in Politics." The book and the subject commend themselves to all legislators and to all interested in good government.

In the October 1951 issue of Social Order there appears a review of this book by one of our present colleagues, the Honorable CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL, of the Eleventh Missouri District. The gentleman from Missouri sits on a different side of the aisle than did the gentleman from California. That has not, however, prevented him from giving sympathetic treatment to the book. The review from Social Order follows:

THE CHRISTIAN IN POLITICS

(By Jerry Voorhis, Associated Press, New York, 1951, 136 pages)

The Christian in Politics is a challenge to Christians to enter into politics aggressively and wholeheartedly. It is also an indictment of the political smugness and complacency of the people who take for granted that America is a Christian nation and that it will always continue to be such.

The book is a particular call to young Christians to enter politics. The author, an experienced and seasoned politician, gives a practical study on how to enter politics and how to win an election. After reading the book one can use "politician" as a name of honor and not in its usual depreciatory sense. The author points out that the first essential for one who has political ambitions is "to like people and know how to get along with them." While liking and getting along with people might sound like a pleasant vocation, nevertheless this path in politics is not strewn with roses. Mr. Voorhis speaks from the heart and from experience when he warns of the abuse and malignment inevitably cast at the holder of public office who must live in the veritable goldfish bowl.

The author is not satisfied that the Christian voter merely goes to the polls. He insists that it is a duty for Christians to make their influence felt in the political life of America. If one is not actively engaged in politics nor sufficiently interested to seek public office, the author points out how effective one can be politically by taking part in his labor union, farm organization, or any other civic enterprise. While the author urges all Christians to participate actively in politics, nevertheless his wrath is directed at those pseudo-Christian politicians who politicalize their religion or assume that their position on each issue is correct merely because they are Christians, though perhaps merely ostensibly Christians.

The book places politics on a high level, in fact, almost on an idealistic level. "Serving the cause of democracy is serving the cause of Christ."

One might question the extent to which the writer would have the churches take positive stands on political issues. The author correctly contends that the churches take a positive stand on political issues in fulfillment of their responsibility to the welfare of human beings. This is undoubtedly academically true, but as a practical matter the question will always arise as to what issues summon the responsibility of the churches and particularly how far they should go. The author properly points out that unemployment, soil conservation, housing, and old-age pensions are Christian political issues in which the churches should concern themselves. Is he willing to go further and include Federal aid to education, medicine, and the other basic needs of the individual? It appears that the churches themselves are divided on these issues, and there is considerable dissension within the hierarchy and the laity on many of these issues. In the opinion of many, the churches are treading on dangerous ground by espousing too many of the so-called Christian political issues. The author of the book, however, doesn't seem to think that the churches have gone far enough in speaking out on political issues. He wants more political activity from within the churches.

On specific issues the author deprecates extremes and states that the perfect Christian order would be much different from either capitalism or communism.

In conclusion, the book is a wholesome and practical education in politics. It is a clarion call from the political parties for Christians, particularly young Christians, to participate actively in politics. It stresses the need for good, honest, Christian candidates for public office and properly places the blame for the mediocrity of candidates where it belongs—on an indifferent electorate.

CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Enforcement of 160-Acre Limitation of the Reclamation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. C. (Sam) Hermann, quartermaster adjutant of the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has prepared a very illuminating statement on the 160-acre limitation issue as now embodied in reclamation law. As you know, a determined effort is now being made by the corporation interests to circumvent the principle of the 160-acre limitation. Sam Hermann has for years been a leader in the fight which the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and particularly the Department of California under his leadership, have been waging to preserve the principle. The corporate farm interests in California have continually intrigued to subvert the law and to deprive family farmers of the benefits of reclamation water. The issue is now being fought again in connection with the Kings River and Tulare Lake project in the State. Sam Hermann is again fighting to protect the rights of veterans and other small landholders. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY M. C. HERMANN, QUARTERMASTER-ADJUTANT, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

The 160-acre water limitation of the 50-year-old National Reclamation Law is in danger again. I appeal to the many friends of this great law to alert themselves once more, and to insist again publicly and to the proper officials that it be enforced strictly in accord with its original purpose to settle families on land, and that it be preserved from impending attacks.

During the very 10 days when the people of Central Valley were rejoicing over completion of the first great unit of their project, and the Governor of the State of California was dedicating it "to the happiness of our people," two Members of Congress, speaking within an area of huge landholdings in the valley itself, denounced the historic 160-acre limitation that is part of the law that made the project possible and threatened to undertake its emasculatation, if not outright repeal.

According to press reports, one of them called this great bulwark of equity and the family farm erected first by President Theodore Roosevelt, an impractical law, a demagogic law. Another Congressman speaking at the same occasion offered, if necessary, to introduce a bill to throw a cloak of legality over the phony doctrine of supplemental water that enemies of reclamation law have always used as a rallying cry. He seemed to think, by some quirk of the mind, that if you bring water to land that has a little water, but not enough, it isn't reclamation. The founders of reclamation weren't confused by this kind of argument at all, and they applied the limitation to all water that the Federal Government supplied to thirsty land, deliberately and purposefully. The purposes of the Congressman who is now considering trying to amend the

law are equally clear. If he has his way, then thousands of families of veterans and other qualified persons will be denied farm homes, that reclamation law intends they should have, so that a few excess landowners can get the lion's share of the water that the public supplies.

I regret that the Water Resources Policy Commission unintentionally provided the cover behind which the attack on the 160-acre water limitation labeled "supplemental water" is going to be made. The intentions of the Commission in making recommendation 44 about supplemental water are plainly of the best. The Commission is devoted wholeheartedly to the principle of acreage limitation and simply hoped it might have found a more flexible device to secure enforcement. But the technique it suggests is loose and ill-advised and already is being laid hold of, not by the friends of acreage limitation who share its belief in the principle, but by its avowed enemies.

According to the press, one of the Congressmen said cynically that the 160-acre law can be circumvented. The press report did not say whether or not he explained just how the 160-acre water limitation is to be circumvented. But maybe another recent news report from the valley tells that.

A valley newspaper carried the flat headline assertion that "Paying lump sum on piece flat to void 160-acre rule." It was talking about the Kings River and Tulare Lake projects in Central Valley, and it said: "If the single-payment principle is approved by both parties (the United States and the water-users' districts), it would mean no acreage limitations in the Kings River service area, a goal long sought by the KRWA (Kings River Water Association)."

If the Bureau of Reclamation, representing the people of the United States, does what the excess landowners want and permits them to buy their way out of the major purpose of reclamation law—to help people make homes on the land—then the law will be emasculated as surely as if Congress had repealed it, instead—as is the fact—of refusing to repeal it every time it has been tried since 1944.

I cannot believe that the Bureau of Reclamation will scuttle its own law the way the excess landowners evidently hope they will. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are adamant against any yielding to pressures or to wiles. Our national encampment at Cleveland declared in 1947 when the 160-acre limitation was under open attack: "That we protest any administrative relaxation of the 160-acre water limitation under pressure, whether it be a weakening of the law by acquiescing in mere 'technical compliance,' or by interpreting it to permit publicly financed water for '320 acres to man and wife,' which is an obvious distortion of the original intention of Congress, and an injustice to those veterans and others for whom acreage limitation was intended to create opportunities to farm." We stand on the same ground today, and our opposition covers any and all devices, new or old, that excess landowners may think up to try to take the 160-acre water limitation position from the flank or the rear, when they find that they cannot take it in the open and from the front. I take this means of warning the officials of the Department of the Interior and all friends of reclamation everywhere, what it is that the excess landowners are trying to do now, by the trick of offering to pay water charges in a single sum.

It is not hard to see why excess landowners on the Kings River and Tulare Lake project want to get out from under the 160-acre water limitation. In Tulare Lake alone about 25 corporations own nearly 55 percent of a 300-square-mile district, and 102 indi-

viduals own about another 35 percent. So about 127 corporations and individuals own about 90 percent of the entire 300 square miles in excess holdings under the reclamation law. Public documents report some holdings on Tulare Lake bed of 12,000, 16,000, and 19,000 acres each. Naturally these landowners would like to buy up all the water the public will supply them with, even if it means that other people who want it will not get it. If they are allowed to have their way, they will gain in increased land values all that the water will cost them.

So far as I have been able to find out, there isn't a real farm home in that entire Tulare Lake district. If the Bureau of Reclamation falls for that trick of the big landowners in the Kings River Water Association called lump-sum payment, there never will be any homes there. We want more homes on Kings River and the law says there should be. We want the purposes of the law carried out, not, as the Congressman said and the large landowners hope for, "circumvented."

I think it is time that the holders of excess lands and their public representatives face the fact that the people of the United States approve of acreage limitation. Congress rejected their attempts to repeal the 160-acre limitation in 1944 and again in 1947. In California and all around the Kings River and Tulare Lake project itself, the water users have been approving contracts containing acreage limitation during the past 3 or 4 years, by secret ballot and by vote of around 9 to 1. The public record tells the excess landholders that the great organizations of veterans, of labor, of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews concerned with healthy rural life and a good society have all set their faces against tampering with acreage limitations. Isn't it time to accept this great reclamation law as the will of the people and quit trying to circumvent it? I could go even further. The free world is in crisis. Wherever people abroad have not solved their land problems, there is unrest. Our own Nation is trying to draw the fires of this unrest by helping these nations to solve their land problem. In this way we try to bring them to our side, to join them solidly with the free world. How can we help our friends abroad if, instead of enforcing the national law that was intended to solve them, we create more land problems of our own by ignoring and undermining it.

I invite all organizations and individuals who are devoted to the aims of the 160-acre water limitation to join with me and with organized veterans to reaffirm their faith publicly, and to advise public officers of the Department of the Interior that they have support in resisting all efforts to break down and circumvent the law.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, now that the Russians have exploded their second atom bomb, it might be a good time to ask, "Whatever became of our civil defense?"

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was 459 years ago that an event took place which changed the entire history of the world. A Genoese navigator pierced the curtain of mystery which up until that time had confined fifteenth-century civilization to about one-half of the expanse of the globe. In these days of uncertainty—when the curtain to be pierced is one fabricated of iron—it is fitting that we should pause for a brief time to reflect upon the truly wonderful accomplishments of Christopher Columbus.

The year 1492 was not a cheerful one in western Europe. Christian civilization seemed to be shrinking in area and dividing up into hostile factions—even as today. The Ottoman Turks had snuffed out the last remnants of the Byzantine Empire, had overrun many of the Balkan countries, and soon would be threatening Austria. Emperor Frederick III had been driven into retirement by the Hungarians. In England, the War of the Roses was at an end but the House of Tudor was on shaky foundations. Such was the state of world affairs at the time Columbus was preparing for his great expedition which was to lift the horizons of the world and give new hope and life to a weary and jaded Europe. Within a few years of the announcement of the discovery of the New World an astounding change came over Europe. Columbus by his faith in divine guidance did much to conquer the skepticism and lassitude of his world.

Since that time other vast contributions have been made by Italian immigrants to the physical and social development of the United States; many of them have profoundly affected the destiny of our country. It is a commonplace that the Italians in this country have built the railways, roads, and bridges. Every industry in the United States today feels their impact.

Through the years, Italian immigrants in the United States have taken an active and patriotic part in the civil and military activities of the country. They have, in great numbers, entered every form of business and professional life. There have been judges, legislators, and teachers of Italian origin. During the last half-century literally thousands of Americans of Italian origin have held public office in the United States and served with distinction. Others have been teachers, musicians, and artists. Many had distinguished records in both World Wars. An estimated 845,000 men and women of Italian descent were in the United States Armed Forces in World War II. Twenty out of the 500 Congressional Medals of Honor in the last war went to American boys of Italian lineage.

Everybody knows that Cristoforo Colombo—the first American—discovered America; that Giovanni Cabota first explored its mainland; that Amerigo Vespucci provided its name. But how many Americans know that it was an Italian, Filippo Mazzei, who was among the first men in the American Colonies to urge publicly that the enslaving yoke of England should be thrown off. Mazzei was intimately acquainted with Jefferson, Washington, Franklin, Patrick Henry, and other famous revolutionary patriots. He came to Virginia in 1773 at the invitation of Jefferson and Franklin. There, under the pen name of Furlioso, he wrote articles in Italian exposing the tyranny of the English rule. Jefferson translated them into English and circulated them among the Colonies.

In one of these articles, published in Pickney's Virginia Gazette in 1774, Mazzei penned the phrase:

All men are by nature created free and independent . . . it is necessary that all men be equal to each other in natural rights.

Jefferson later incorporated this phrase into the Declaration of Independence in the form of the immortal "all men are created equal."

Today we find this creed challenged by the threat of totalitarian aggression and the free peoples of the world uniting to meet the danger. On September of this year another traveler came from the Old World to the New to explore unknown horizons. Premier Alcide de Gasperi, head of the Italian Government since 1945 and prime mover of the Italian Communists' defeat in the 1948 elections, arrived on these shores to ask Congress for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. He urged modification of its military and economic restrictions, to enable Italy to participate fully as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He also asked that increased industrial orders be placed in Italy and that assistance be given to facilitate the emigration of the country's surplus population. The United States, Britain, and France responded by calling on the Soviet Union to revise the harsh peace treaty and bring Italy, the birthplace of Christopher Columbus, into the United Nations.

No one can predict what lies over the horizon. But if we face the future with the same faith and determination that Columbus displayed in exploring the unknown nearly 500 years ago, surely the free world can set sail with confidence despite the perils confronting it.

A Black Market in Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Halting a Black Market," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 1, 1951, relating to the threat of a black market in meat.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HALTING A BLACK MARKET

Perhaps the most significant result of the Office of Price Stabilization's check of the Nation's slaughterhouses is the discovery that a black market in meat may be in the making.

OPS enforcement employees learned that several car and trailer loads of ungraded and unmarked beef had been shipped from Wichita, Kans., to several eastern cities. The investigation is continuing in an effort to determine just how widespread the activities of the Wichita firm have been.

President Truman predicted just such an occurrence when he reluctantly signed the new economic-controls legislation in August. One of the worst provisions of the law, he said, was the Butler-Hope amendment wiping out slaughter quotas on beef and thus encouraging the return of the black markets.

Nearly every available OPS employee was used in the recent slaughterhouse inspection. Obviously the agency can't continue to operate on that basis. When enforcement relaxes because of lack of personnel, chances are favorable for black-market operations. The real solution is to improve the law so as to make enforcement easier. Congress should eliminate the Butler-Hope amendment.

Forty-fifth Division Association Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith four resolutions adopted by the Forty-fifth Infantry Division Association, more popularly known as the Thunderbird Division, which held its sixth annual convention in Washington on October 5 and 6, 1951.

In peacetime this division is known as the Oklahoma National Guard. It was recalled to active duty September 1, 1950, and is now on duty in Japan. While primarily an Oklahoma division, it has drawn its personnel from every State in the Union and numbers citizens of every State among its heroes of World War II.

Oklahomans are proud of this gallant fighting division and of the tens of thousands of Americans who have made their contribution to its unexcelled record of valor in defense of this Nation.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION FOR THE CONGRESS

We are mindful that we have accumulated, in the civilization which we enjoy today, great benefits derived from specific human values gained and achieved by the suffering and endurance of our forefathers, and that they did not fall to us without great sacrifice. These human values are expressed very distinctly in the Declaration of Independ-

ence and in our Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

We submit that it is more righteous to preserve and protect these great human values than it is to compromise them or lose them by complacency.

We are mindful that millions of people in the world today pray for peace, not only in Korea but also in the future course of the conflict between the free countries of the west and the Soviet Union and her satellites. We fully subscribe to the justification for the sacrifices now being made in Korea because it demonstrates the integrity of the United States and our allies and it serves as a warning to future aggressors.

We submit that our desire for peace must be founded on our determination to preserve intact the human values for which our forefathers fought and died.

We, therefore, urge the Congress of the United States to support adequate preparedness in order that the United States may achieve a military position which will permit it to take the diplomatic offensive with the backing of sufficient forces in being to give validity to its foreign policy rather than as we have done in the past—to speak hopefully but often futilely because of an improvident military policy.

RESOLUTION FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Congress has recently passed Public Law 51, known as the universal military training and service bill. Under this law a commission was set up to draw plans for a universal training system effective as universal service is phased out and the reduction of over-all military strength is permissible.

We commend Congress on the passage of this act so long advocated by veterans' organizations and others who have been concerned in adequate provisions for national security.

Approximately 511 days of actual combat in a period of 2 years in the recent war has made clear to the members of this association that in spite of the great contributions of other services and other means, decision in war depends on men on the ground.

We have seen the great and unequal burden which men on the ground carry in war and the unequal casualties which he must suffer and the unequal hardships he must endure.

We, therefore, urge the Secretary of Defense to so apportion the troop strength to be trained by the various services so that those trained for the Army will be in sufficient numbers so that the Army can undertake its missions in any future war without being exposed to the almost disastrous shortages of infantrymen that occurred in World War II.

RESOLUTION FOR THE CONGRESS

We have noted that appropriate bills have been introduced in the Congress providing that the infantry soldier serving in front-line units will receive additional pay for hazardous duty. We commend those Members of Congress sponsoring such legislation but we deplore the lack of concern displayed by those Members responsible for preventing these measures from being submitted to a vote.

Our 511 days of actual combat in 2 years during World War II and our more than 28,000 battle casualties will not let us forget the heavy burden carried by the infantryman. In World War II, 30 percent of the Army, including the Army Air Forces, were infantrymen. This 30 percent suffered over 70 percent of the battle casualties, including the Army Air Forces. In the face of these facts is it in any sense logical to give extra pay to flyers while denying it to the infantryman whose burden is so much heavier? Does the flyer remain exposed to enemy action 24 hours a day for periods as long

as 3 and 4 months? Is the flyer exposed to rain, snow, jungle, desert, muck, and mud? Does the flyer in Korea risk his life and endure hardships in any way comparable to the infantryman?

We, therefore, urge the Congress to take immediate action to authorize hazardous-duty pay, as sealed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, for all infantrymen assigned to infantry battalions in combat and to selected infantrymen at regimental level.

**RESOLUTION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
AND THE CHIEF OF STAFF**

During World War II, the Forty-fifth Infantry Division took part in four major amphibious operations. It stood in the path of the enemy break-through at Salerno and turned back the Germans who were determined to liquidate that beachhead. It drove into the mountains of central Italy in the Cassino-Venafro districts in actions of high gallantry. In a 4-day battle it stopped the main attack of Kesselring on the Anzio Beachhead in an action which Kesselring himself labeled "The epic of heroism of American arms." It absorbed this major blow by five German divisions and destroyed the German forces which for 4 days beat against it. It later fought gallant actions in France and Germany. In total the division was in combat for 511 days—more days of fighting than any other division in the European area.

This division, in comparison with all other divisions which have received Presidential citations, is entitled to such an award. Recommendations have been submitted.

We ask and urge you to personally review these recommendations and do justice to the Forty-fifth Infantry Division by recommending this belated reward, which it has earned on more than one field of battle.

**Independence of Grand Juries Should Be
Preserved**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and I have introduced legislation to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers. It will also prevent the discharge of Federal grand juries by the court once notice is given that an inquiry has been undertaken.

It is essential that Federal grand juries should be autonomous in that they should be empowered to make and conduct such investigations as they in their judgment may deem necessary. Recent developments in the case of a Federal grand jury in San Francisco indicate that there is some doubt as to the investigatory powers of Federal grand juries. There is evidence that efforts may have been made to make Federal grand juries subservient to the wishes of the Attorney General's office.

In order to preserve the independence of the judiciary and its component parts, it is essential that the executive branch of the Government exercise no control over the rights of grand juries to con-

duct investigations. This legislation will strengthen the powers and independence of the Federal grand-jury system. It is particularly important that the independence of the Federal grand juries be maintained in view of the numerous disclosures of corruption in various levels of government which will require thorough and honest investigation by Federal grand juries throughout the Nation.

Such legislation has been requested by the Association of Grand Jurors of the City and County of San Francisco and other similar organizations.

We shall urge the House Committee on the Judiciary to consider this legislation at the earliest opportunity. The questionable circumstances of Federal grand-jury operation in San Francisco stresses the need for immediate action in this regard.

The following is the text of the bill that we have introduced:

A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 215 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after item 3328, the following new item:

"3329 Powers of grand jury, special counsel and investigators, limitations on discharge, signing of certain indictments, charge"

SEC 2 Title 18, United States Code, is further amended by inserting immediately following section 3328 a new section as follows

"§ 3329 Powers of grand jury, special counsel and investigators, limitations on discharge, signing of certain indictments, charge

"(a) Any grand jury impaneled before a district court may inquire at the instance of the court or an attorney for the Government, or at its own instance, whether a crime cognizable by the court has been committed

"(b) Any grand jury undertaking an inquiry upon its own initiative shall be entitled to the services of a special counsel and special investigators, not exceeding in number, who shall be appointed by the court before which any such grand jury was impaneled with the approval and upon the request of 12 or more jurors. Any such special counsel shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of \$, and any such special investigators shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of \$ per day for each day engaged in investigating or presenting evidence in connection with such inquiry. Such compensation shall be paid by the United States marshal on the voucher of the foreman of the jury out of any funds available for the payment of fees to grand and petit jurors.

"(c) Whenever a grand jury shall give notice to the court that it wishes to undertake an inquiry, such grand jury shall not be discharged by the court prior to such time as the court shall receive notice that such inquiry has been completed. The notice provided for in this subsection shall be given in writing signed by 12 or more members of the grand jury.

"(d) Upon the completion of any inquiry undertaken by a grand jury upon its own initiative, the grand jury may prepare one or more indictments upon the concurrence of 12 or more jurors and return such indictment or indictments to the judge in open court. Any such indictment shall be signed by the foreman and by the special counsel, if one shall have been appointed pursuant to subsection (b).

"(e) The district judge, on empanelment of a grand jury, shall charge the grand jury of its rights under this section."

An article recently appeared in *Fortnight* magazine on October 1, 1951, reciting some of the facts surrounding the questionable situation in San Francisco. The article follows:

ROUND-UP

A number of profound and thoughtful Americans have expressed alarm and deep concern recently over symptoms of what they variously term "the flight from honor," "a growing insensitiveness to evil," "the issue of decency in public life against indecency." These words cannot be dismissed as politics for they are voiced from both sides of the political fence—ominous warnings of a malignant sickness upon the American spirit.

Herbert Hoover, a distinguished American who has lived honorably in the public service long enough to have acquired much stature, in his most recent public comment, put it this way. "Our dangers are that we may commit suicide from within by complacency with evil . . . here at home"

What was "the old reactionary" talking about at an Iowa picnic? To cope with evil there are corps of cops, courts, and commissions by the dozen. There are officeholders, appointive and elective, and an army of able civil-service careerists.

AUTHORITY

These legions, to the ordinary citizen, are almost overwhelming in their robes, uniforms, and with their gleaming badges of authority.

But it was rediscovered in San Francisco quite recently that there is yet another body—separate and apart from all this established authority—concerned with evil doing, but detached from the temptations of those accustomed to being sustained in position and power.

This agency, the institution of the grand jury, thoughtfully provided for by pioneers in the democratic process, was beginning to emerge last fortnight in San Francisco and elsewhere as a mighty force for public decency, though it has been right here all along.

More than a year ago, July 10, 1950, by law and old legal tradition, a new Federal grand jury was sworn in in San Francisco, a routine every 4 months. Twenty-three citizens of good reputation were chosen for this public duty and, but for reasons of ill health or grim personal circumstances, no one was excused.

ROUTINE

There was nothing out of the ordinary in the swearing in of this new grand jury in July 1950. Its membership was a cross section of a democratic citizenry, decently ordinary, just as juries ought to be.

There was oath-taking, instruction from a black-robed judge, and once a week, at first, the jury met to hear certain evidence and, upon advice and direction from the United States attorney assigned to it, indictments were returned.

For the most part, this process was proscribed and commonplace. Indictment for theft of Government pension and veterans' benefit checks were most frequent, though a jury of private citizens seemed hardly necessary to assess wrongdoing in such a plain and simple act.

Richard E. Seward was chosen foreman of this grand jury, a conservative business and professional man. Seward, an investment counsel, a member of the Montgomery Street brief-case set, has offices in San Francisco's towering Russ Building, a home in Piedmont across the bay, and by long custom he has confined his politics to voting regularly and for the best man in his judgment, Republican or Democrat.

ZAMLOCK CASE

During the course of its routine duty doing, some aspects of a previously tried Federal case came to the jury's attention, the so-called Archer Zamlock case, a most sordid affair involving a prominent San Francisco attorney, subsequently convicted, and a notorious trafficker in narcotics, Paul J. Steffen, who pleaded guilty.

In pronouncing sentence in this case, Federal Judge Waties Waring, a visiting jurist from the East, elaborating unusually, had this to say: "This case has many collateral facets to it, which could not be investigated or fully looked into in the trial of this case. * * * I feel, however, that some of the matters that were aired in this trial are quite worthy of being investigated further. They cry aloud for scrutiny and investigation by the proper investigational departments of the United States Government, grand jury or United States attorney or FBI or whatever department is determined should take it over."

From the jury's initial interest in collateral facets of the Zamlock case, the honeymoon between the Seward grand jury and the United States attorney's office chilled. The then United States attorney, Frank Hennessy, since retired, displayed a strange reluctance to pursue the collateral facets of the Zamlock case and referred to Judge Waring disparagingly as a talking judge, implying there was nothing to these grave suspicions.

FACTS

Despite lack of enthusiasm and support from Mr. Hennessy, the Seward grand jury found itself knee deep in the slough of collateral facets. Assistant United States Attorneys Joseph Karesch and Charles O'Gara, however, were carefully diligent and most helpful.

The jury's trial took a curious course, involving the local office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The need for investigative help from the FBI was manifest and was sought, but was not forthcoming. United States Attorney Hennessy was less than helpful.

It is incidentally noteworthy that two of Zamlock's former law partners, James Martin MacInnis and Vincent Hallinan, somehow were involved. These two had previously defended Harry Bridges, Soviet Russia's west coast water-front advocate, and had been cited for contempt for their conduct in this case before the court. Both attorneys have frequently charged that the Government was out to get them for their selfless efforts in behalf of civil liberties.

PLOT

If such a plot ever existed, United States Attorney Hennessy seemed not to have been in on it, for press clippings indicate his extreme distaste for further pursuit of the curious collateral facets of the Zamlock case.

The jury's transcript of testimony, now deeply involved in affairs of the Revenue Bureau, measured 1,000 pages or more. Help from the FBI in checking out the statements of various witnesses had been sought months before, but still was not forthcoming. In a resolution of the jury seeking an extension of its tenure, the need of help from the FBI was emphasized and their term was extended by Federal Judge Michael J. Roche. But that was not enough for Mr. Hennessy or the Department of Justice in Washington.

The jury's foreman was a most patient, abiding man. The conservative, methodical procedure of finance was his habit, but grand jury service can try men's souls. Apparently, his was tried.

THE RUNAROUND

The original reference to collateral facets of the case in the Judge Waring sentencing of Zamlock and Steffen had mentioned the FBI. Subsequently, repeated requests for this at-

tention had been made by the jury. Letters and finally a Government teletype message under the signature of Mr. Hennessy had been dispatched to Washington, without result, and then a telegram from Jury Foreman Seward was ignored.

His telegram unanswered. Foreman Seward decided upon more direct action. On March 27, he telephoned Washington and reached Assistant Attorney General James McInerney, in charge of the Criminal Division, insisted upon the FBI investigation and outlined the jury's difficulties in pursuit of their sworn duty. McInerney promised attention and referred Seward to two of his agents in San Francisco at the time on the Tokyo Rose case.

These two men reviewed the jury's study and agreed to recommend FBI attention. This investigation, first sought in November 1953, began April 3, 1951.

WILD WEDNESDAY

Meanwhile, the income-tax matters and the Revenue Bureau aspect of the case had been turned over to another Federal grand jury, the Taylor jury. This body heard the case from young O'Gara, but had barely picked up the ball when a most surprising thing happened. The press referred to this day, May 16, as wild Wednesday.

Federal Judge Louis E. Goodman summoned the Taylor jury before him and summarily halted their investigation into income-tax matters, terming its action a most serious affront to the laws of the United States.

Judge Goodman went even further in his lecture to the Taylor jury, ruling that a Federal grand jury was not an investigative body and was restricted in its interest to those matters brought before it by the court or the United States attorney's office. Too, the judge scolded young Attorney O'Gara for even presenting the income-tax matter to the new jury without instruction to do so from his boss, the new United States attorney and San Francisco politico, Chauncey Tramutolo.

THE TECHNICAL GAME

Judge Goodman's findings failed to square with many a higher court ruling defining the broad and historic function of the grand jury. On this point, as recently as 1942, Justice Frankfurter decided a case in which the power of a hold-over grand jury to indict for an income-tax violation was challenged. The Justice ruled the court cannot restrict a grand jury's broad investigative powers and added, "So to hold is to make the grand jury a pawn in a technical game instead of respecting it as a great historical instrument of lay inquiry into criminal wrongdoings."

Meanwhile, the Seward holdover jury was in recess awaiting the report from the FBI on the complicated matters still before it. On June 5 a preliminary report was forthcoming from the investigation bureau. It was heard, and the body adjourned to meet again by court order on July 3 to hear the full report.

When the jury met that day they didn't know a loaded gun was pointed at their head, that Federal Judge Edward P. Murphy was taking aim. And, as events proved, his aim was good. The blitz on the grand-jury system seemed complete when Judge Murphy pulled the trigger that day and announced that he intended to dismiss the Seward grand jury, following the Independence Day holiday, as it had been around too long and had failed to complete work and even impugned its honest intent.

THE AX

Judge Murphy made good his threat, on schedule, despite the protest of 23 puzzled jurors, whose work couldn't have been completed earlier because of the disinclination of the United States attorney in San Francisco and the Department of Justice in Washington to provide them with the tools to look

into collateral facets of the now-famous Zamlock case.

Judge Murphy then proceeded to direct the new grand jury, just being sworn in, to keep in line, pointing out that the court called the jury and the court could fire the whole body if it conducted itself in the manner of the late Seward grand jury.

To the San Francisco News this looked like intimidation, while the Chronicle editorialized that Judge Murphy's action was right and proper. The Hearst papers, the Examiner and the Call-Bulletin, kept out of the Murphy decision editorially, but distinguished themselves in covering the affairs of the grand juries trying to do a job on the ugly implications of conduct in the Bureau of Internal Revenue dug up by the Seward grand jury.

But this seemingly high-handed action of the Federal district court in San Francisco did not go unnoticed.

Reporter Dick Hyer, covering the story in its beginning for the Chronicle and in its final, feverish stage for the Call-Bulletin, tripped to Washington to cover the appearance under summons of Assistant United States Attorney Charles O'Gara before the Senate Finance Committee. The committee, debating billions in a new Federal income tax bill, wanted to hear from O'Gara, who had sparkplugged the tax investigations before the Seward and Taylor grand juries.

THE FILL-IN

The committee listened to O'Gara for 2 hours and 20 minutes instead of the scheduled half hour. Earlier, Hyer reported, the Department of Justice sought to thwart the O'Gara appearance before the committee, seeking instead to have them hear the Chief Assistant from the United States Attorney's San Francisco office, Robert McMillan.

O'Gara, back in San Francisco, apparently was very much in Mr. Tramutolo's dog house. He was immediately taken off criminal cases and placed in the civil action department. "Just routine," said his boss.

Meanwhile, Senator RICHARD NIXON, Republican, California, heard from home, as did Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Congressmen HAVENNER and SHELLEY. The Association of Grand Jurors of the City and County of San Francisco passed unanimously a resolution asking the legislators to write into law a full definition of grand jury powers, as implied in many historic decisions, but frequently distorted and denied under local judicial ruling.

THE BILL

Senator Nixon has gone to work on this measure.

And it was noted last fortnight that judicial opinion and attitude in San Francisco, like the weather, changes quickly.

Judge Murphy, seeming to sense the shift in popular sentiment toward the institution of the good old grand jury, issued a strong statement. The grand jury, in his most recent opinion, was a mighty fine thing, with power to investigate unlimited and worthy of help from any agency of the Government, the United States attorney, the court, the FBI, where and when it needed it.

Can Kiwanians Get Mad and Stay Mad?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ben Dean, past president, Kiwanis International, has written a vigorous editorial

which recently appeared in the October 1951 issue of Kiwanis magazine. Mr. Dean points out the fact that one of the great objectives of Kiwanis is to promote economy, efficiency, and integrity in Government at all levels. His vigorous editorial suggests a course of action for the furthering of this objective.

As a member of the Arcadia, Calif., Kiwanis Club, I was deeply impressed by this fine editorial, and I recommend it to all my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

CAN KIWANIS GET MAD AND STAY MAD?

These are times that cry out for Nation-wide public indignation at the low state of morals in public office.

What is needed is a new organization called Public Indignation, Inc., and every Kiwanian should be a charter member.

Holders of high public office and their political appointees have interpreted the 1948 election, when only half the people voted, as a national indifference to venality among elected officials.

Thus we are subjected to the nauseating spectacle of deep freezers and mink coats and influence peddlers and political judgments.

Thus we see administration officials ridiculing and obstructing congressional committees who bring the Hissés and other Communists to trial, who expose the slimy trail of RFC loans, who unearth the underworld connections of Costellos and other racketeers and dope merchants with law-enforcement agencies.

There are signs here and there that the people are disturbed. A senatorial committee, over bitter opposition, seeks to set up a code of conduct for public officials. Herbert Hoover, a wise and incorruptible elder statesman, catches the ear of the Nation with a timely speech on honor in public office.

Time magazine gives wide currency to a Cleveland Press editorial entitled "Can't We Tell Right From Wrong?" and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat stirs the conscience of its readers with an editorial, "Low Estate of Public Morals."

Yet unremoved and unrebuked are those who have debased the moral fabric of our Nation.

Where lies the blame? With us, the people. We make the Government. With our votes, or our failure to vote, we elect the public officials. A repetition in 1952 of the 1948 election when only 50 percent voted may well seal the fate of the American Republic.

Can Kiwanians get mad—and stay mad?

Or have we, who claim to be community leaders, lost, as so large a segment of the people seems to have lost, the capacity for a sustained sense of outrage at the base and shoddy in public service?

The fourth objective of Kiwanis International for the current year is: Promote economy, efficiency, and integrity in government at all levels.

Did you get that? Integrity.

This is the official policy of Kiwanis International.

Newspapers and others have a right to ask, as did the Chicago Tribune recently, Do we mean what we say; are we willing to back up high-sounding principles with action?

Few organizations in America have the seasoned leadership, the established facilities, the public prestige to implement a program of public indignation as does Kiwanis International.

To date the editorials and speeches and sermons condemning the low state of public morals have been simply unorganized protest against a condition that cries out for remedy.

The time is ripe for some organization of decency to crystallize the protest, and who better than Kiwanis?

Let every Kiwanis Club pass a resolution with teeth in it, and send a copy to the White House, to its congressional representatives, to the governor of its State, and the mayor of its city, and see that it is publicized.

Let every club schedule soon a program in which a competent speaker explores the low state of morals in public office and the causes and remedies.

Let every club develop among its own membership able speakers who will appear before other community groups to arouse the indignation of the community.

Let every club make it a major objective for the next 12 months to keep alive this public indignation.

Kiwanis has the power and the influence to mold a public opinion that could sweep the country and develop an indignation that would force the removal of the base and unfit.

There never was a clearer mandate for Kiwanis International to use its great influence to enforce its historic ideals of good citizenship.

Can Kiwanians get mad—and stay mad?

Nation's Safety Inspiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week's National First Aid and Mine Rescue Contest, held in Columbus, Ohio, was such an outstanding event, and so important to all of us, that it merits official recognition by the Congress. I am, therefore, inserting a brief summary in the RECORD at this time.

Sponsored by the United States Bureau of Mines, producing companies, and organizations of mine workers, this meet brought together 70 teams from 10 coal-producing States. Known as the "greatest safety show on earth," it served as an accident-prevention inspiration not only to coal-industry management and labor, but also to everyone else interested in making our Nation a safer place to work, and to live.

The Honorable Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio, attended the contest and remarked that such an impressive exhibition should make all industrial workers more conscious of safety practices. The Honorable Millard Caldwell, Federal Defense Administrator, had this to say of the contest:

It is a timely demonstration of skilled teamwork which must be developed by civil defense rescue teams throughout the Nation. Such trained teams will save many thousands of lives in the event of an atomic attack on our cities.

Winners of the first aid event were: Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., Maple Hill Colliery, Pottsville, Pa., first; Republic Steel Corp., Indianola Mine, Indianola, Pa., second; and Consolidation Coal Co. of Kentucky, mine No. 214, Jenkins, Ky., third.

The mine rescue championship was won by the United Mine Workers of America, District 16, Kitzmiller, Md., with the U. S. Steel Co. Robeno Mine,

Uniontown, Pa., second, and Consolidation Coal Co. of Kentucky, Clover Splint Mine, Clossplint, Ky., third.

The Hanna Coal Co. Dun Glen No. 11 Mine, Dun Glen, Ohio, was winner of the combination first aid and mine rescue event, in which that team had no competition.

Members of these teams and their sponsors deserve the Nation's congratulations, as do all the other men who took part in the safety meet. Today they are all back on the job with a renewed determination to carry out the principal objective of the contest—the promotion of safety in mining.

Mr. J. J. Forbes, Chief of the Health and Safety Division of the Bureau of Mines, was chairman of this highly successful affair. He was assisted by other Bureau experts, by members of State mining departments, and by representatives of the mine operators and unions. To them we owe a vote of thanks for their efforts in calling America's attention to the value of safety practices and of first aid and rescue training.

Problems Confronting Banks and Bank Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks in St. Louis, Mo., the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John W. Snyder, delivered an address which high-lighted the problems presently confronting not only bank supervisors, but also the banks themselves.

Mr. Snyder points out that the banking industry holds a front-line position in the fight to preserve a stable economy. He advises that they exercise care in their lending and investment policies and urges that they work steadily to increase their ratios of capital to risk assets.

The Secretary's talk is so timely and his suggestions so germane to the welfare of our national economy that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY

I was very pleased to be asked by your president to speak on this program, for it gives me a chance to visit with you again and to talk over matters of mutual interest. I recall with great pleasure the many happy associations I have had with your group in past years, and especially the last meeting I attended in Reno, Nev., 2 years ago. I always find a friendly informality about your meetings, which strikes me as perhaps one of the reasons why you are able to get so many things done.

This fiftieth annual meeting of your association marks a full half century in which your group has devoted itself to promoting the ideals of better banking. Over this long

period you have played a substantial role in the development of more efficient, more uniform, and sounder banking practices, to which our banking structure owes much of its present strength.

I appreciate especially the part you have played in welding our dual banking system into a smooth-working unit, through the coordination of your thinking and policies with those of the Federal authorities, especially with the Comptroller's office, which is part of the Treasury. Today, when the international emergency has placed an increased strain on the Nation's economy, this sharing of common aims and common policies in the banking field will contribute much to the over-all success of our defense effort.

As a nation we are facing today the most crucial threat that has yet confronted us. Upon the way we unite to meet this threat depends the very existence of our Nation and the freedoms we cherish. The stakes are high, and we can afford no delusions as to the aims of the aggressors who seek to engulf the world, and principally us, with a flood tide of communism—a tide designed to wipe out the ideas and ideals which have inspired the life of our Nation and which stand as a beacon of hope to other freedom-loving nations.

To insure a successful outcome of our great defense effort we must all share in the responsibilities which are ours, as groups and as individuals, in preserving our democracy. Not only the selected few who are asked to risk their lives on the battlefield, but all of us on the home front, must be willing to assume an increased responsibility in developing our national strength.

Closely paralleling the importance of the task of building a powerful military establishment to forestall threats to our national security, is that of building a sound economy to combat threats to our economic security.

Those who are able to contribute to the actual strengthening of our economy may well feel that they are fighting shoulder to shoulder with their sons at the front in the war against Communist aggression.

In this effort it is not enough that we strive to keep our economy strong and stable during the years of the defense program alone. It is highly important that we build the foundation now for a continued healthy economy after the security of our Nation is assured.

In the fight to preserve a stable economy, the banking industry holds a front line position. As the principal suppliers of credit, the banking industry has a grave responsibility to shape its loan and investment policies toward assuring the financial soundness of our national economy.

A primary requisite now is to hold unnecessary borrowing to a minimum. As the defense effort broadens—and it is expanding rapidly now—the volume of bank loans needed for defense uses may be expected to rise. It is essential that our defense industries be provided with the necessary capital. But as defense loans increase, loans for less essential civilian purposes must be reduced if we are to avoid the inflationary consequences of an overexpansion of bank credit.

You are no doubt aware that total bank loans in the 12 months ended June 30 showed the largest increase ever recorded for a comparable period—an increase of \$12,000,000,000 in a single year. Some of this borrowing was basically of a speculative nature.

As experience has demonstrated, when prices are rising and business profits are high there is often a tendency to assume that those trends will continue. Both borrowers and lenders are inclined to evaluate the high profits as if they are more or less permanent. Under such conditions, nearly everyone wants to borrow money in order to buy something, build something, or expand his business. This human tendency has undoubtedly been responsible for a substantial part of

the great loan expansion of the past year. When everyone has the urge to borrow, there is probably more than usual danger that bad loans will get into bank portfolios, since lenders are likewise affected to some extent by the same overoptimism.

The buying boom of the past year has brought new problems in appraising the soundness of loan collateral. This responsibility of the banking system is made much more difficult this year by the many uncertainties in the present business outlook. The conflict between deflationary factors in some parts of the civilian economy, and inflationary forces arising from the defense program, creates an unusual variety of risks. Inventory losses may be suffered by some businesses, where demand has suddenly fallen off or prices have dropped sharply, while other businesses may reap unusual profits. Under such circumstances, an unusually careful selection of loans and a diversification of risks is clearly called for.

The responsibility of bank supervisors is increased by the fact that bank capital in relation to risk assets is lower than at any previous time in the past two decades. The proportion of capital accounts to risk assets last December 30, for all insured commercial banks, averaged less than 18 percent. This compares with a prewar figure of over 27 percent in 1939.

I have spoken of some of the increasing responsibilities which are falling on the banking system in assuring the effective functioning of our great defense effort. You, as bank supervisors, can do much to bring to the many bankers with whom you come in contact the vital importance of their participation in this effort. Moreover, you can point out to them how they, by accepting their responsibilities, not only have an opportunity to serve their Nation but at the same time have unusual opportunities for strengthening the future security of their own banking institutions.

The present financial situation offers an opportunity seldom equaled for improving a bank's loan position.

Secondly, conditions have become more favorable for building up bank capital, both through retention of earnings and through sale of capital stock. Bank operations recently have profited from the high demand for loans, and banks generally are now in a very favorable position for building up capital funds. Gross earnings of all insured commercial banks have been climbing since 1938. They amounted to over 8 percent of capital accounts last year, a figure exceeded only during the war years.

Capital accounts have, in fact, been expanding steadily since before the war, but the increase has not kept pace with the rise in risk assets. Last year, capital accounts of insured commercial banks increased by \$632,000,000, the major part coming from additions to surplus. But risk assets in the same period rose by more than \$11,000,000,000.

Deposit insurance should not be regarded as a substitute for adequate capital. The fact that the present low capital ratio is close to those at the top of two major speculative credit booms should warn the banking system of the need for rebuilding capital accounts.

A third opportunity for banks today lies in the better prospect of encouraging savings during this period of full employment and high incomes. Department of Commerce estimates indicate that personal savings in the second quarter of this year increased by a greater amount than in any quarter since 1945. While this may have reflected an unusual situation, there is little doubt that savings are easier to accumulate today than they are likely to be in more normal times.

Our defense bond campaign this fall, with its Nation-wide advertising program, is doing a great deal to make people

savings conscious. Our objective, as you know, has been not merely to sell savings bonds, but to promote the habit of thrift. The tremendous increase in all forms of personal savings during the past 10 years, I believe, has reflected in part the effectiveness of this program.

In our present campaign, we are stressing the fact that a period of high economic activity like this, when incomes are high and nearly everyone has a job, presents a golden opportunity to every individual to accumulate a financial reserve.

The development of a habit of systematic saving contributes to economic stability in both booms and recessions.

There is one other matter in which banks might well take better advantage of their present opportunities. That is in developing a better trained personnel. To raise the level of understanding of banking and financial matters among bank employees, I believe, would not only be worth money to the individual bank, but would benefit the entire banking industry.

Bank supervisors can have considerable influence toward such improvement. Excellent work is being done today in providing advanced training by such institutions as the American Institute of Banking, the Rutgers Graduate School of Banking, the University of Wisconsin School of Banking, the Pacific School of Banking, as well as by various others. An increase in demand for such facilities would undoubtedly give rise to many more schools throughout the country designed to meet the special needs of bank employees.

Modern day banking calls for a working knowledge of many aspects of economics as well as finance and business. Probably no one problem is giving our bankers more concern today than the related problems of inflation and deflation, particularly in view of their importance in bankers' decisions on investment and loan programs.

For instance, today, on the one hand, we read in the papers that commodity prices have fallen; that warehouses are bulging with inventories; that retail buying has fallen off; that stores are having difficulty moving their stocks; that lack of demand has caused cutbacks in consumer goods production; and that these and other indications point to a deflationary situation.

On the other hand, we are warned that the situation is actually inflationary, and that the important thing is to look ahead to shortages of consumer goods when the defense program gets fully under way.

The surprising thing is that both of these statements are largely true. When consumers and distributors over-bought last fall and early this year, in fear of imminent shortages, they overlooked two important things, the length of the tooling-up period required for defense production, and the immense productive power of American factories. The prices that were forced too high are now being adjusted, and the goods that were bought in excess of needs are being digested, while consumer buying lags.

But the underlying inflationary forces are already making themselves felt. Despite all the talk about current deflationary pressures, the broad wholesale price index of the United States Department of Labor—made up of nearly 900 commodities—has declined no more than 4 percent from its extreme peak, and has shown practically no further decline since July. Very definite and positive inflationary forces account for this firmness in the price index.

Personal income is steadily rising, while the production of civilian goods, to be bought with this income, is affected by increasing restrictions on the use of critical materials needed for defense. Rapidly expanding defense expenditures have shifted the Federal budget heavily to the deficit side, even on a cash basis. Bank credit, after leveling out for several months, has again

started to expand. Business loans, real estate loans, and other loans of weekly reporting member banks, in recent weeks, have all reached new record high levels.

The effect of these pressures on prices and living costs may be held back for a time, however, while present excess supplies of various consumer goods are being liquidated. But the most intensive phase of our rearmament effort lies ahead of us. In the coming months we will inevitably see an increasing impact of military production on the civilian economy—a situation in which inflation thrives. Under the existing revenue tax law, not including the tax bill being considered by the Congress, a budget deficit of about \$10,000,000,000 is indicated for the current fiscal year. In the following year, with current tax rates, the deficit may be twice this figure, or more, under the present schedule for defense expenditures.

A Government deficit, of course, means that excess funds are being added to the spending stream. If the individual funds are spent, prices will be bid up, and another round of inflation will get under way. If the money is saved, price advances may be forestalled, and the funds will be available for spending later over a more extended period.

During this defense emergency, we can do much toward maintaining sound and stable conditions by avoiding the many potential sources of inflation in the civilian economy. In the efforts of your organization to maintain a sound banking system, I know you will keep in mind the importance of the various operations of State banks in the economic welfare of this country.

I know that you will take advantage of the many opportunities you have for bringing about a better understanding of the role that banking and bankers can play in our great defense effort. When people throughout the Nation share in a united effort toward a common goal, past experience tells us that the goal will be reached. In this light, we have every reason to look forward with confidence to success in maintaining a stable and prosperous economy.

Our Future Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Threat and Promise," published in the Christian Century, under date of October 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

THREAT AND PROMISE

On September 18 Senator BRIEN McMAHON delivered a speech which was by all odds the most important so far made during this session of Congress. It was important not only because of what it contained but equally because of what lay behind it. For Senator McMAHON is chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. As such, he undoubtedly knows more about

the actual state of the present atomic-arms race than any other Member of Congress. His speech was a carefully prepared address which, it can be assumed, had been checked by the Atomic Energy Commission. In it he made a series of challenging proposals regarding future military policy. Yet his speech has received surprisingly little attention from Congress, from the press, or from the American people.

Senator McMAHON's speech followed several weeks of flamboyant announcements regarding America's possession of new and revolutionary weapons. Beginning with President Truman's reference at San Francisco, one Senator and Representative after another had taken up the refrain that the United States now has fantastic means of dealing death and destruction to any enemy. Whether the purpose was to scare the Russians or to reassure our European allies or just help pass a \$60,000,000,000 defense appropriation bill, we don't know. Evidently, however, the AEC and the Armed Forces had become embarrassed by this loose talk. Assertions that this country has fantastic weapons which, in the words of Senator O'MAHONEY, can "conquer the atmosphere," sounded too much like the sort of thing Hitler used to indulge in. The men who might be called on to make good on the tall talk wanted a more responsible report to the Nation.

I

So Senator McMAHON stepped into the picture. He told the Senate—and the world—some of the real facts, not in terms of a Buck Rogers fantasy but in a sober summarization of the stage now reached in atomic weapons production. With that as a base from which to draw conclusions, he went ahead to propose, as within the scope of immediate possibility, a drastic, indeed a fundamental, revision in the military policy of the United States and its allies.

According to Senator McMAHON, the AEC is now reaching mass production of atomic weapons. Russia is employing more persons in this field than we are, and has atomic power capable of bombing from 20 to 30 American cities. But we can now produce atomic bombs "numbered in thousands or tens of thousands." We can make an atomic weapon "at a cost of \$20 or \$30" with the same explosive force "which costs literally thousands of dollars to produce by ordinary means." We can blast an enemy in a single day with as much destruction as fell on Germany during the entire 6 years of World War II. We can make inconceivably destructive bombs "at less than the cost of a single tank." By shifting our military policy to mass production of these now available atomic weapons and, instead of drafting mass armies, training the specialized forces required to use such weapons, we can save from \$30,000,000,000 to \$40,000,000,000 a year on our defense budget and at the same time provide greater military strength.

What this undoubtedly means is that the problem of manufacturing breeding piles of fissionable material has been solved. Readers of the Christian Century will remember how the atomic scientists, Squires and Daniel, who contributed a series of articles published in May and June 1949, told how, if the theoretical possibility of such breeding was ever realized, our atomic plants could go on indefinitely using uranium-plutonium energy without diminishing the available supply. The McMAHON speech can only mean that the AEC has now reached this goal.

Such attention as Congress and the press have given to Senator McMAHON's speech has centered largely on his proposals for a new military spending policy—appropriate \$6,000,000,000 instead of the present \$1,000,000,000 a year for atomic weapon production

in order to save \$30,000,000,000 or \$40,000,000,000 on the over-all defense budget. That is natural, for this year's defense appropriations have warned every thoughtful citizen how rapidly military demands are carrying the Nation toward financial ruin. Last year the regular defense budget was for \$35,000,000,000, and that seemed a staggering amount. This year it is for \$60,000,000,000, and that does not include supplemental items which will bring the total to at least \$75,000,000,000. Next year, it is generally predicted in Washington, the defense appropriation will go above \$100,000,000,000. "At the rate we are moving," Senator McMAHON told the Senate, "I can see ahead only two ultimate destinations: military safety at the price of economic disaster or economic safety at the price of military disaster."

II

The Senate's reaction to the McMAHON speech has been about what might be expected. Knowing the truth of the financial warning, yet feeling unable to do anything about it under present world conditions, Senators have asked the Pentagon, Can the McMAHON promise of increased military security at half the present cost be relied on? No answer has come as yet. When an answer does come we expect that it will either deny the effectiveness of the proposed atomic defense or will take refuge in an alleged need for secrecy which will keep the facts from the public. For if the McMAHON description of the state of atomic weapon production should be admitted to be correct, the Pentagon would thereby (1) cut itself off from half its present funds; (2) leave hundreds of high-ranking officers without jobs; and (3) admit that it must change the entire conception of a defense program on which it is now raising and training defense forces.

However, the proposal to swing into mass production of atomic weapons was only half the McMAHON speech. And the shocking fact is that nobody seems to be paying much attention to the other half. The first half contained a threat of atomic destruction awaiting any attacker—at a bargain price. This at least won a play in the press. The second half held out a promise—general disarmament and an assuring security at the price of careful diplomacy and a rise to a higher level of international cooperation. The threat has registered; the promise is in danger of being lost to view.

Senator McMAHON's promise, we take it, is in large measure a reaction to our recent diplomacy. It is based on his belief that piling up force is not enough; that the extension of military alliances gives no assurance for the future. It does not challenge the assumptions of "military security." Senator McMAHON is no pacifist; he is working within the limitations imposed by a public opinion which demands military security. But he does not see that security in terms of the last war. He sees it within an entirely new framework—the framework of the atomic age—and he believes that with it there should go hand in hand an alternative of international accommodation and peace. He believes that it is time to strip the Communists, with their phony Stockholm appeal, of the immense propaganda advantage they enjoy in appearing as the devotees of peace.

So in the second half of his speech Senator McMAHON renewed the proposals he made in the Senate resolution he introduced in the previous session of Congress. Push the production of atomic weapons? Yes; at six times the present pace. But at the same time send the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations, which opens at Paris in November, under instructions to stop the mad arms race "by speeding agreement upon effective and en-

¹ A condensation of Senator McMAHON's speech will be published next week in the Christian Century.

forceable disarmament and control, covering conventional armaments, biological and chemical agents, and atomic and hydrogen bombs." Back this with a promise that, if and when this disarmament is attained, we will "make available to the United Nations . . . a substantial portion of all money saved for a period of 5 years . . . [for] peaceful development of atomic energy, technical assistance to underdeveloped areas, and general economic aid and assistance to all war-ravaged countries."

There is nothing here about the United States going to Paris to insist on sticking to the outdated Baruch plan for atomic control. What the McMahon proposal calls for is a new start from the ground up. It would combine conventional and atomic weapons in one disarmament plan. It would take recent Russian offers of international inspection and control as a sign that the Kremlin is really ready to negotiate. It would count on rallying the support of all our allies, who now view the diplomacy and armament policies of this country with much misgiving.

A year ago, the original McMahon proposal was derided as fantastic. There is nothing fantastic about this. Its steps are clearer than anything coming out of the Pentagon, the State Department or the White House these days. Here they are in summary:

1 Develop the atomic arms of the United States to the maximum of their power

2. Save the Nation from financial catastrophe by junking or reducing to a minimum the conventional forces of past wars and training specialized forces for atomic war.

3 Free the American way of life from the prospect of being throttled by the tyranny of a garrison state

4 Offer the world genuine, inclusive disarmament

5 Hold out the promise to all the world, if this genuine, internationally inspected and certified disarmament becomes a reality, of constructive help to end human want on a scale never before known.

III

Senator McMAHON has made his speech. He has introduced in the Senate his resolution to give it substance. Representative CARL T. DUNHAM, of North Carolina, vice chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, has introduced the same resolution in the House. The question now up to the American people is this: Shall this be allowed to sink into obscurity and be forgotten? Only desultory interest was shown in the McMahon proposal of a year ago. Now, however, the Nation is much farther along the road to a financial crash or world war III. Is there not enough moral energy within the Nation to see that this year the McMahon proposal is not stabbed to death in the Pentagon or smothered in the committees of Congress?

Here, it seems to us, is a moment at which the Christian churchmen of America should go into action. Let them begin by writing to Senator McMAHON (Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.) for the full text of his speech. Study and discuss it in local groups. Find out where the other Senators and Representatives stand on it. Keep after the local press, radio commentators, forums, service clubs and the like until they give it serious consideration on its merits. Press for instructions for the United States delegation soon to leave for Paris which will make acceptance by the U. N. Assembly a top item on the American participation. If met with a brush-off now, start pushing for action by the platform committees at next year's national party conventions.

Senator McMAHON has given the churchmen of America a new chance and method by which to do something positive for peace. Let's not miss it.

Activities of the El Kahir Chanters, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, over the country various organizations are rendering unselfish, patriotic service. One such group in my home town is an organization called the El Kahir Chanters, an organization of businessmen, insurance men, farmers, mechanics, and others who belong to El Kahir Shrine, and who sing because they enjoy it. They spend most of their time going to hospitals and other institutions to entertain those who cannot get out.

A little story was written about their activities. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an editorial about what they are doing, published recently in the Cedar Rapids Gazette, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EL KAHIR CHANTERS, OF CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

The Shrine Chanters of El Kahir Temple, AAOONS, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, were organized during the summer of 1948. They were formed to sing for the various functions of El Kahir Temple. The group is made up of businessmen, professional men, bankers, insurance men, farmers, mechanics, and other vocations. Some of the 30 member chorus come from as far as 35 miles away for concerts and weekly practice sessions.

As the object of the National Shrine organization is to help others less fortunate than themselves through the medium of their crippled children's hospitals, so the El Kahir Chanters believe that they can help others by their singing. They started by singing at a Christmas program at the Iowa School for the Blind at Vinton, Iowa, during the Christmas season of 1949. This has become an annual affair. These children, hampered as they are by the lack of eyesight, must get their entertainment from their hearing. That the chanters were successful may be attested by excerpts from two letters received by Noble Orville Rennie, the chanters' director, from Mr. D. W. Overbeay, superintendent of the school. He writes, "The children are still talking about the excellent music program which you and your chanters presented," and "We want you to know how very much we appreciated the excellent concert which your fine chanters presented. This, as you know, is one of the real high lights of our school and is an event every one of our boys and girls looks forward to."

The same season the chanters also sang for the Christmas program at the State Tuberculosis Sanatorium at Oakdale, Iowa. This has also become an annual concert for the group. Another letter, this time from Dr. W. M. Spear, superintendent, "The patients at Oakdale feel very indebted to your group for the fine program . . . We realize that to make such a trip in your full dress, and especially in such inclement weather, was not easy. We know that you are all busy men and it was a sacrifice of time to fill this engagement."

The chanters have also visited the Children's Hospital at Iowa City, Iowa, and during the National Shrine convention in Chicago in 1949 they sang at the Shriners' Hospital at Oak Park, Ill.

This year, April 3, 1951, the group journeyed to Toledo, Iowa, to the State juvenile home. These children are from broken homes and appreciative of everything done for them. With a letter from the superintendent came some 20 letters from the children of the school. These were explained by the superintendent as follows: "Out of a clear sky, and with no suggestions from anyone, I received a large number of letters written to me or to the chanters from the girls and boys in the various cottages. I am sending them to you 'in the rough'; they are just as they came to me from the children, they have not been corrected or rewritten on pre-entable stationery. These letters in simple language will convey to you and the Chanters a better idea of how much the youngsters appreciated your coming to the juvenile home and singing for us." One of these letters from a little girl on common notebook paper is representative. It reads in part—"I am writing you telling how much I enjoyed your program. It was very nice. I hope that all of you can come back. I thought the Lord's Prayer was very nicely sung. What I liked was when you joked with us. I hope you can come back. You are always welcome."

In addition to singing for misfortunates, the chanters and the Shrine band present an annual concert on Palm Sunday afternoon in Cedar Rapids for the public. There is no charge or collection at this concert which averages an attendance of 2,500 people.

The chanters also participate in the union Holy Week services held by the Cedar Rapids and Marion Council of Churches. They have sung during the last 4 years at the Good Friday services. Edwin B. Zeller, general secretary of the YMCA in Cedar Rapids, writes, "I want to thank you sincerely for the contribution the chanters made to the Good Friday program of the union Holy Week services. We shall point to the Friday music as one of the high spots of the week's services."

The group has also sung for Masonic and church organizations in and around Cedar Rapids. The Mount Vernon, Iowa, newspaper, the Hawkeye-Record, June 7, 1951, stated before a concert, "When the El Kahir Shrine Chanters present a concert at Mount Vernon Methodist Church next Wednesday, the local people will hear a group of men from all walks of life who sing because they enjoy it. Singing is their hobby." After the concert the same people printed: "Many commented favorably not only upon the fine quality of singing and directorship but also upon arrangements and on the enthusiasm of the personnel. It was evident that these men enjoyed doing the combined choral numbers and were appreciative of their individual members who appeared."

The work of the chanters may be summed up by part of an editorial which appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette, May 5, 1951, written by a staff member, "A good example of the many civic-minded groups and organizations doing an excellent work for others in this vicinity is the El Kahir Chanters. It is obvious they go to some sacrifice to bring good singing to others . . . Yes, it may take a little sacrifice sometimes to bring happiness to others, but doesn't a thing like that make any sacrifice worth while? The chanters and groups like them think so."

The chanters also appeared on the official program banquet at the Central States Shrine Association held in Denver September 29, 1951, and were highly praised by all representatives attending for their fine work.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of May 5, 1951]

THE EL KAHR CHANTERS

A good example of the many civic-minded groups and organizations doing an excellent work for others in this vicinity is the El Kahr Chanters.

This 30-member chorus pays an annual visit to the State sanatorium at Oakdale, the hospital for crippled children at Iowa City, the State home for juveniles at Toledo, and the State school for the blind at Vinton, in addition to fulfilling many engagements in and about Cedar Rapids.

Since the members, some from as far as 35 miles away, practice faithfully every Monday night under the direction of Orville Rennie, it is obvious they go to some sacrifice to bring good singing to others. But members will attest that letters like those from some 20 children at Toledo following a recent program there make it all worth while.

A visit from a group like the Chanters means much to these children and their feeling is summed up in the letter of one little girl which reads in part: "I am writing you telling how much I enjoyed your program. It was very nice. I hope that all of you can come back. I thought the Lord's Prayer was very nicely rendered. What I liked was when you joked with us. I hope you can come back. You are always welcome."

Yes, it may take a little sacrifice sometimes to bring happiness to others. But doesn't a letter like that make any sacrifice worth while? The Chanters and groups like them think so.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week—Statement by Secretary of State and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, October 7 to 13 is National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. It has been so declared. There have been various statements made regarding it, and I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a joint statement issued by the Federal Associate Members of the President's Committee regarding this subject, and also to have likewise printed in connection with National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week an extract from the current issue of the Alabama Legionnaire, which is the official publication of the American Legion in Alabama.

A short time ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extract from the Birmingham News telling of the winning by two blind veterans in Alabama of a very substantial prize which was given by the American Legion or some other organization, which I believe was sponsored by the American Legion. In letters they told of the manner in which they had overcome their physical handicaps; and in this issue of the Alabama Legionnaire those letters are printed.

One of the veterans, Charles Boswell, was at one time an outstanding football star on the University of Alabama football team. He lost the sight of both his

eyes during the war. He tells his story of rehabilitation. He has been, since he lost his sight, the blind golf champion of the United States. He plays an excellent golf game, even though he has no sight whatsoever.

I think the story of these two boys, Charles A. Boswell and Lewis A. Moore, constitutes one of the most inspiring things I have ever read.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that along with the joint statement to which I referred with reference to National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, these letters be printed.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT, 1951

The seventh annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, October 7-13, should be a period of thoughtful reflection for all those concerned with manpower. Government, industry, and business have made great progress these past 7 years in placing handicapped workers on jobs suited to their abilities. Our past successes should point the way for even greater use of handicapped workers in the difficult months and years that lie ahead.

The Federal and State governments, through the employment service and the rehabilitation programs for veterans and civilians, have in the past provided the framework within which employers could seek and find qualified handicapped workers. As an employer the Government itself has made real and effective efforts to fill available jobs with people with disabilities, including a great many disabled veterans.

This is not an academic matter—not in an economy geared to the present defense mobilization requirements. The President and the Congress have called for the greatest possible use of handicapped workers and for the rehabilitation and training of those who are not now in the labor force. The governors of our States and Territories and the mayors of our cities have enlisted the interest of civilian leaders in this year-round program.

As Federal associate members of the President's Committee we promise additional efforts on our own part to increase the use of qualified handicapped workers in the Government. We ask all our countrymen, particularly business and professional men, to inform themselves better on this subject so that they too may benefit from employing the handicapped. Truly, America needs all of us.

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense; Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture; Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce; Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor; Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator; Robert Ramspeck, Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission; Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans Affairs; Jack O. Gorrie, Chairman, National Security Resources Board.

[From the Alabama Legionnaire]

HOW I OVERCAME MY PHYSICAL HANDICAP

Charles A. Boswell, Birmingham, and Lewis A. Moore, Gadsden, have been declared two of the four winners in the Nation-wide contest sponsored by the American Legion in its Operation Comeback, a contest of letters for handicapped veterans. Both Boswell and Moore were blinded in World War II. Both will receive awards of \$1,000 and expense-paid trips to the Legion's Miami con-

vention. Another Alabamian, Charles J. DeLong, Montgomery, was a \$50-award winner. There were 586 entries. Boswell's and Moore's winning contributions follow:

(By Lewis A. Moore)

"I entered the United States Army in 1939 at the age of 16 while still a high-school student. When World War II broke out I was stationed in the Philippines. I fought in the Battles of Corregidor and Bataan. I was taken prisoner at the fall of Bataan in April 1942. The next 10 days were spent on the Bataan death march. Six of these were without food.

"The following 2½ years were spent in a series of Japanese prison camps. Here the food consisted of rice and sweet potato vines. I was forced to work exceedingly hard building bridges, planting rice, and burying the dead. The lack of food was surpassed only by the lack of medicine and sanitation. My bed was Mother Earth and my bathroom was a slit trench which I helped dig. After 6 months the terrible prison conditions took their toll on my health. First came the dreaded malnutritional disease, dry beriberi, in my feet and my legs. The terrific shock of this killed most of the nerves in my eyes, causing an extremely limited vision. In September 1944, I escaped during a massacre of American prisoners and made my way back to a hospital in New Guinea.

"Upon returning to the United States I was sent to Valley Forge General Hospital where tests showed my vision to be 20/200. From here I was sent to the rehabilitation center for war blinded soldiers at Avon, Conn. I was given extensive training in insurance here before being discharged in March 1946. I started to work in the general insurance business and a grateful Government gave me every assistance. It furnished me with reader service for 2 years, a sound scribe, magnifying glasses and any aid which I could use to overcome my handicap. The Veterans' Administration gave me 2 years on-the-job training and 1 year self-proprietor training.

"I could not possibly have attained the success which I have had had it not been for the assistance of the Veterans' Administration and my wife whom I met while in service and who is also a disabled veteran. After 5 years my vision has dropped to 20/400; however, I have advanced as far in 5 years as most insurance men do in 20. I have built a medium-sized general insurance agency which represents 15 large fire and casualty companies and which give me an annual net income of ten to twelve thousand dollars.

I am vice president of a group insurance company, a director of a life insurance company, a director of the Alabama Association of Insurance Agents and I helped organize and am a director in a fire insurance company. I also hold membership in the following social organizations: Blinded Veterans' Association, the Moose Lodge, church (which I attend every Sunday), the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, Post 213, which another veteran and I organized and in which I have served as an officer three times."

(By Charles A. Boswell)

"Shortly before the Battle of the Bulge, the tank in which I was carrying supplies to my company, was struck by shell. As I climbed out, another shell exploded, filling my chest and face with fragments, and blinding me. On reaching the States 4 months later, I learned I would never see again.

"Thus ended all my dreams for the future, for I had entered the Army so soon after college that I had been unable to begin a career. I had played football and baseball at college, and had planned a career in professional baseball. Now I had no means

with which to provide for my wife, small daughter, and the baby we were expecting. "The next few weeks were the darkest of my life. I had always been active, independent, and self-reliant. How could I adjust myself to a world of inactivity, pity, and despondency? Just as my spirits reached their lowest ebb, I began the rehabilitation program at Valley Forge Hospital. Trained men taught me to type, to read and write Braille, to walk through traffic unaided, and helped me regain my self-confidence and self-reliance.

"At this time, I was introduced to golf, a game that was to play an important part in my rehabilitation. Golf was one sport I had never tried, and I had no illusions about the ability of a blind man to play it. But from my first swing of a driver, I realized I had found the answer for my love of competitive sports.

"After Valley Forge, at Avon, Conn., I underwent a more intensive program. Because of my love for, and knowledge of, sports, I decided to enter the sporting-goods field, and took training courses in that line.

"Getting home at last to my family, I began the arduous task of convincing the world that a blind man can hold a job. Finally I was given a chance to sell sporting goods for a department store. There my knowledge of athletics and the training I had received, earned me a promotion to manager of the expanding department. Now I handle all invoices, correspondence, go to market to buy merchandise, keep a close check on inventory, wait on customers, and know the prices of all items in stock.

"After 7 years of blindness, I feel that my rehabilitation is complete. Neither my wife nor I have let my blindness keep us from living a normal life. We dance, attend movies, play cards, and golf together. I have won five national and one international golf tournaments in the past 5 years and my golf has taken me from Maine and Canada to California. I am also active in Lions Club, sight conservation, church and Cub Scout work, and frequently make speeches at schools and clubs. In 1949 I was selected Hero of the Year by the National Disabled Veterans Association.

"I have found that blindness is not a handicap, it's just an inconvenience."

Activities of Allapattah Lions Club in Improving Relationship Between the United States and the People of Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article which appeared in the September 23, 1951, issue of the Miami Herald.

This article tells the story of how a group of men in the Allapattah Lions Club have scored a 10 strike in improving the relationship between the United States and the people of Yugoslavia. It shows how easily, and yet how effectively, all Americans, regardless of their station in life, can help improve the understanding between ourselves and the other nations of the world. In this article we see what was done by the

thoughtfulness of a group of men who were willing to take the time and trouble to send to a group of Yugoslavians some basketballs and equipment, along with the rules of how to play the game of basketball.

I know that all Senators will enjoy reading what can be done, and I recommend this act of the Allapattah Lions Club to the civic organizations within all the States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ALLAPATTAH LIONS KICK FIELD GOAL FOR UNCLE SAM

(By Jack Anderson)

The State Department can give a nod to the Allapattah Lions Club for lending a hand to this country's effort to win friends and influence allies—particularly in the Yugoslav department.

With a load of sweaters, shoes, and basketballs, the Lions have gained Uncle Sam solid support among a group of young athletes in the city of Pancevo, near Yugoslavia's capital of Belgrade.

It all came about this way:

Back in April, one of the Lions, James Rice, director of public school attendance, got a letter from one Mikovich Milan, of Pancevo.

In labored but understandable English, Milan explained he got Rice's name out of an American directory of basketball referees. The book had in some way gotten into a package sent from America to a friend of Milan's.

"As you are the basketball workman in your country," the letter said, "or you were it in the time when became this book, I thought it best to write to you."

"We play basketball in Yugoslavia only after the Second World War and it is, as in America, the play of students and pupils. But, we have a misfortune."

"Our industry doesn't produce all the necessities for the basketball or we haven't enough. Therefore, I please you, if you have possibilities, send me any books about the ways of training the basketball, especially the basketball shoes or ball."

The letter went on to ask about life in America in general and basketball in particular.

Mr. Rice took the matter up with fellow Lions and they got busy corraling eight pairs of new basketball shoes, two new basketballs, several rule books, a lot of used pairs of shoes, and 10 used basketball uniforms—the uniforms donated by several high schools.

He sent a letter to Milan telling him the equipment was on its way and tossing in information about the schools here and the American way of life.

Recently Rice got a letter from Milan. In halting English the young Yugoslav managed to convey that he and his basketball playing friends received the equipment with a joy that must have been felt in Belgrade.

"When I wrote to you, an unknown man in the world," Milan said, "I wrote with a great wish, but not also with great hope. In my happiness there was no place for doubt. The dreams became a reality."

"Your letter, especially the style of it—friendly and humane, assured me that there are still true men in the world who can understand others in all parts of the world."

"I cannot tell you what cheered us most. Such basketballs we have never seen in our lives. Every match we ever had before we received your packages, we had to play with irregular balls because we had no others. Only the Red Star team—the best in Yugoslavia—have shoes similar to the ones you sent."

Milan went on to report that the same day they received the equipment they "gave a

surprise" in a match with one of the best teams from Belgrade.

His team had left on the uniforms the names of the Miami schools which had donated them as "our sign of gratitude to the men who sent us these gifts."

He added that he was sending a photograph of the team in full regalia. And he thanked Rice for sending him a Croatian-English dictionary to help the team read those basketball rules.

The Strength of Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Hon. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., the chief of our mission to Switzerland, recently delivered an important and stirring address to the students and faculty of Union College, Barbourville, Ky., at the fall matriculation convocation.

Union College, under the leadership of President Conway Boatman, is rendering a distinguished service and is contributing abundantly to stalwart leadership in business and public life. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent remarks of Minister Patterson be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STRENGTH OF FREEMEN

(Convocation address of Richard C. Patterson, Jr., United States Minister to Switzerland, Union College September 24, 1951)

President Boatman, members of the faculty, Governor Sampson, students of Union College, after a flight of 22 hours in this small world of ours, I find myself in these beautiful mountains of Kentucky. I feel at home among mountains in Switzerland, mountains form our landscape. We live among them, on them, with them. The Swiss mountains, like your mountains, are the homeland of free and united men.

When Daniel Boone and David Crockett walked these hills, they relied on their own strength and their neighbors' cooperation to shape an environment for their free lives in the bounty of nature. They worked in harmony with nature and the only limits to their daily living were set by their own efforts and imaginations. Among mountains, a man has to stand on his own feet and produce his living by his own effort and ingenuity.

In your careers you will find the truth of this pioneering experience. The boundaries of your lives will be established by your own selves—by the energy which you put forth, by the purposes which you set for yourselves to achieve, by the persistent pursuit of your goals.

FREEDOM AND EDUCATION

I am also excited to be here at the opening of a new academic year. I feel at home in an academic community. Since I am a university trustee, I know some of the problems of operating an educational institution for the benefit of its students. But I am primarily concerned with the spirit of leadership and loyalty which a college creates for the entire community—its respect for the past, its participation in the present, its obligation to the future. September 1951

is an autumn of gravest importance in the history of our world: the issue of human freedom is at stake, the outcome of the issue will affect the kind of world in which you students will live, and it will shape your careers.

In 1919 I served at the Paris Peace Conference on the staff of Woodrow Wilson. He used to say that he believed that a universality was the compass of the human spirit pointing steadily to the lodestar of truth. I share with my former chief the drive toward the good and the useful which the college cherishes.

You stand today on the threshold of high expectations. In a few weeks some of you will suffer from the occupational hazards of college life—the need for money to pay your bills, the need for grades to keep you off probation; and that greatest of all needs of college students—time to sleep. But even amid these distractions, stand steadfast in your search for truth. Issues in history beyond your personal fate are at stake.

You are freemen, despite the fact that you live for these 4 years in a community of discipline. Like your Kentucky forefathers, by your own efforts, you can achieve high purposes under the wise and sympathetic comradeship of these scholars who compose your distinguished and well-known faculty. You are free now—this autumn—to choose to be something, and to commit yourselves to the pursuit of the values of the free world.

STAMINA

The strenuous world into which you will be graduated demands physical stamina, high professional competence, and deep spiritual consecration.

Union College stands for this trinity of fundamental virtues.

May I say this to you: Have a good time in college—certainly—but direct your major energies to the major objectives. Don't let the sideshows crowd out the main tent. Put your life behind values and purposes that count in a free world.

At this time, neither you nor your country can afford the waste of a single human life. Certainly none of you can afford it. And our country demands the best each one of us can contribute in the toughest struggle of men and ideas that this scarred world of ours has ever witnessed. I urge you, therefore, to prepare yourselves in these days for the supreme task of great American citizenship in a common world of freemen.

SECOND WIND

In support of this needed stamina in the modern world, don't forget you possess within yourselves a second wind. If you want to get more work done in 1 day than you have been doing in 2, have sublime faith in your second wind. It has been demonstrated that you have within you layers of energy which you rarely tap. We work a while, putting forth physical or mental effort, and become tired. Our impulse, then, is to give way to fatigue. But if we have the courage to keep on, we are free in our wills to break through into a new layer of endurance. We go on again with renewed vitality, with lessened fatigue, with a fresh sense of well-being. This is the second wind in practice. Have faith in it and use it. Few of us ever reach the limit of our capacity for effort. William James used to say that we have barely scraped the surface of our physical and mental resources.

Many of us are afraid to put forth added effort, these new and difficult efforts, because of the fear of breakdown. One of the great specialists in America says that in his practice he has never known a case of nervous breakdown brought on by intellectual overwork. Breakdown comes from the wrong attitude toward work. It comes from hating and dreading what we have to do, instead of doing it. General Marshall calls it fight-

ing the problem. We are worn out not by what we do, but by what we fail to do and what we worry about. Have sublime faith in your second wind—and keep going.

WILLIAM TELL PLAY

One Sunday this summer, I motored through the Swiss Alps to the beautiful town of Interlaken, which snuggles at the foot of the Jungfrau. I went to see a presentation of Friedrich Schiller's drama, *William Tell*. Every year the people of Interlaken present this great play in a natural out-of-doors theater on the mountainside. The actors are the people, the citizens of the community—the local dentist, the local mason, the housewife. These citizens were reenacting the history of their own past. They were participants in the drama of their own freedom.

You will remember from your reading of Schiller's play that Walter Furst said:

"So must we trust in God and ourselves in meeting the problems of freedom."

Looking from the tower which the townsmen were building under the whip of their overlords, William Tell exclaimed:

"What hands build up, hands may well pull down." Then, pointing from the uncompleted tower being built by man, to the mountains, he said:

"But there! There stands a house not built of mortal hands, the house of freedom and the house of God." Mountains make free men.

And the Baron of Attinghausen adds:

"Hold fast together—firm and true. Be not one world of freedom stranger to another! Set instant watches on your heights that league may answer league and rise in mutual aid. A nation to be free must be united! Be united—united—united."

SETTING

Walking down the mountain from the *William Tell* play, I suddenly paused. There, framed by gigantic sister mountains stood the Jungfrau—head held high out of the clouds. To understand and fully appreciate the Jungfrau it must, like any other thing of beauty—like any real value—be seen in its own setting. It is like a great diamond shining by virtue of its cutting and its setting, like a picture showing best when it is best hung, like a magnificent tree in a meadow not hidden in a forest, like a refreshing shower in a parched land. So it is with freedom; its beauty is in its setting, and the setting of freedom is strength and cooperation. So it is with what you say; its value is determined largely by who you are, and when, where, and how you say it, quite as much as by the contents of the sentence itself. In a heated discussion, the man who will keep still until everybody gets through and then expresses his opinion quietly, puts tremendous force behind what he says. A word set in its perspective shines like a jewel. You must study a people in its setting, its culture, its history, its resources. You must counsel a student in terms of his background, his goals, his interests, his abilities.

The *William Tell* play gave me these three ideas:

First. That people must participate in history—their own history—past—as well as the history of freedom—present.

Second. That man working with Nature produces a culture, by the quality of his ideas, character, and craftsmanship.

Third. That everything to be really understood must be studied in its setting—in its real and functional relationships, in terms of the purposes it means to achieve.

As the Swiss actors in the *William Tell* drama held up their swords in collective strength, I knew—as I have known since I was a GI—that every man is a defender of his country, that every man is a craftsman in the workshop of his country, and that every man, as Jefferson said, "Should be a builder in the workshop of liberty." Public order

supported by the strength of citizens is a condition of freedom.

UNION AND FREEDOM

As I motored back to Bern from seeing Schiller's play, I thought about the citizens of the Swiss community of Interlaken. They were reliving history, the universal story of freedom. They were modern participants in the great epic of freedom. And I thought: Here is a universal story—past becomes prologue in the forward movement of the world of freemen united in hand and spirit. We are reliving the struggle for freedom today. You and I are participants in the drama—student, professor, diplomat, businessman, and others.

The United States and Switzerland understand the language of union and freedom. We are free peoples. We have shown how free peoples under God can use their own material and spiritual resources for the benefit of mankind. And the keystone of both forms of government is the liberty of the individual. Our President tells us that some things have not changed since we signed the Declaration of Independence. One thing is the cost of freedom. Freedom is still expensive. He also says there is another way that our situation today is like that of 1776. Once more we are engaged in launching a new idea. In 1776 we launched a new kind of national government to insure freedom. Today we are creating a new kind of international organization—the United Nations.

The ideas of freedom and equality and self-government were opposed by the vested interests and reactionaries in 1776. And today the United Nations is being opposed by the same interests. We succeeded in 1776, and we will succeed today with the U. N., but it won't be without a struggle of the first magnitude. Bear in mind that in dealing with Communists one must lay aside the finesse and indirection of diplomatic language.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

On Monday morning following my trip to Interlaken, I was back in my office. My staff of over 200 people was busy at work. The staff is an intricate organization. It includes economists, lawyers, political analysts, and the experts who compose the permanent Foreign Service. It includes file clerks who keep the records, translators, press readers, stenographers who take dictation, accountants who keep the books, messengers, gardeners who tend the flowers in true Swiss style. Each person has his role to play. He performs a specialized task requiring particular competence. He plays on a team.

Each specialist has his part in dealing with problems. Let me refer to just one. If you look at the watch on your wrist, you will see one of our problems and one of your problems. What questions arise in this problem? How can you buy the best watch at the best price? To what extent shall the tariffs protect the American watch industry? How are the details of the watch industry handled in international trade—the payments of dollars by American business to Swiss industry, the purchase of steel for mainsprings from Sweden? This individuality means freedom. This protection to American industry means freedom of citizens to develop their own strengths in their own way. The protections which are provided by the Government are the protections for free and strong men.

Switzerland is not rich in natural resources. For that reason it has been compelled to develop the skill and efficiency of its people. The quality of its people outweighs the scarcity of its resources. The free spirit, imaginative competence, and expert craftsmanship of a people have made Switzerland a happy, prosperous, strong, free, and united people.

I draw a final universal lesson from these Swiss characteristics. The real wealth of a people lies in its craftsmanship, its competence, the loyalties in its heart, the wisdom

in its mind, the skill demonstrated by its hands

The Government service requires the same qualities—high professional competence expressed within a functionally organized operation. These are the same qualities required in any community of citizens. The Government needs experts; competent personnel to carry out sound policies. It also needs alert and capable citizens at work on the main streets of our cities and villages. Our specialized work in Government can only be successful to the extent that it is supported and nourished by constructive public opinion.

Good government requires good people—citizens in the service of the free world.

COMPLICATED WORLD

But this is easy, you say. All we need are good people and a free world and everything will be all right. That is the assumption, but how can we have assurance that we can achieve this goal? A little while ago, Stuart Chase sat down with a group of distinguished social scientists to see if they could state a fundamental law regarding social integration and peace. They wanted to formulate a law like Boyle's law in physics, or Newton's law of gravitation. What did they do? At the end of the day they came up with this statement: "Everything is more complicated than it seems."

As you grow older you will appreciate that seasoned observation. You will learn its real meaning here on this campus. Achievement is neither simple nor easy.

But because everything is more complicated than it seems, is just the reason all of us should devote ourselves to the cultivation of the professional and spiritual qualities which this world requires in its new setting—one world sustained by the strength of freemen and conducted so as to bless them with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As the Baron of Attinghausen said: "Hold fast together—firm and true. Be not one world of freedom stranger to another. * * * A nation to be free must be united. Be united, united, united." So I say to you students, this is our proclamation to the world in the autumn of 1951.

CONCLUSION

President Boatman, members of the faculty, and students for whom this institution exists, may fellowship on these mountains and in this community of citizens and scholars enable you to press forward with strength the frontiers of one stable, prosperous, and peaceful world of freemen.

Is the Medal of Honor Being Cheapened?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Is the Medal of Honor Being Cheapened?" written by Mr. Harold G. Stagg, and published in the current issue of the American Legion magazine.

While I cannot pretend to be an expert on this subject, Mr. Stagg, who is now the editor of Army Times, here in Washington, is generally regarded as a leading expert on veterans' and military affairs. He is a constituent of mine with a long record of journalistic accomplishment in Connecticut.

Because of the high regard in which Americans hold the Congressional Medal of Honor the article should be of interest to the public as well as to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE MEDAL OF HONOR BEING CHEAPENED?

(By Harold G. Stagg)

CONGRESS ONCE RECALLED 911 MEDALS OF HONOR IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN ITS POSITION AS THE NATION'S GREATEST AWARD—BUT DOES THE ARMY'S WAY OF HANDLING IT MATCH THE UNDERLYING SPIRIT OF THIS MOST CHERISHED MEDAL?

Is the Medal of Honor losing its meaning as the true symbol of America's most glorious military traditions?

It is a sad commentary on the state of today's world that war heroes—living and dead—have become so numerous that a Nation's highest decoration for valor sometimes is valued by the public at a dime a dozen.

Is heroism fast becoming a glut on the market?

This tragic and questionable evaluation is apparent from the "who cares?" attitude evidenced in Washington and elsewhere recently when three veterans of the war in Korea were decorated with the coveted medal by President Truman in ceremonies at the White House. A busy Washington and a busy Nation passed them by with hardly a fleeting glance.

Radio- and television-network officials brquely refused to consider even arranging an appearance before the microphone or TV cameras for the youngest of the trio. Life magazine snapped a few pictures which it subsequently featured. The Saturday Evening Post shrugged its editorial shoulders. Time magazine couldn't be bothered. The daily newspapers—here and there—printed a few paragraphs and published pictures taken in the White House and let it go at that.

Once, in 1917 the Congress so feared that the Medal of Honor was being cheapened that it turned Indian giver and had the names of 911 men who had been awarded the medal in bygone days stricken from the Army's Medal of Honor list. A board of five retired general officers had decided that the awards had not been properly made for distinguished service as defined in a 1916 act of Congress.

Do we want that to happen again?

Already there is a suspicion in many quarters that the Army too frequently uses the Medal of Honor—not simply as a deserved reward for unusual acts of heroism—but as a general morale builder. There is equal suspicion that it is not proving too successful in that field.

Since the Korean war began, the Medal of Honor has been awarded 23 times (as of June 21 last). At first, President Truman conferred the awards—either upon the heroes themselves, or posthumously upon their next of kin.

Last June Gen Omar N Bradley, top-ranking Army general and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, passed out 11 medals after the Army had carefully rationed out to newspapers—one at a time—details of the heroic exploits which led to the awards. One award went posthumously to the first Negro to win the Medal of Honor since the Spanish-American War.

When the United States entered upon World War II 10 years ago, the Medal of Honor was the true symbol—as it is today—of the fighter who distinguishes himself conspicuously by gallantry or intrepidity, at the risk of life, above and beyond the call of duty. Only 95 Army Medals of Honor had been awarded for heroic deeds performed in World War I as compared with 1,200 in the Civil War.

Thereafter, with 10,000,000 men under arms in World War II—with heroic deeds of great intrepidity taking place in all four corners of the world—the Medal of Honor again began to be bestowed on a mass production basis—not because its meaning had been cheapened, but because valorous deeds meriting the medal were occurring with greater frequency.

On one occasion—April 23, 1945—President Truman bestowed the Medal of Honor upon 28 soldiers, the largest group award in history. On another occasion, May 21, 1945, a joint session of Congress was held to commemorate the award of the medal to the one hundredth World War II infantryman—Tech Sgt Jake W. Lindsey.

Since that time, the Nation has scarcely paused in its routine to take notice of subsequent awards—no matter how heroic the deeds involved—no matter whether the award was posthumous or otherwise.

Has mass heroism put the Medal of Honor on an assembly-line basis?

The Medal of Honor carries with it little except glory—and the munificent sum of \$2 a month extra pay for enlisted men. Honorably discharged medal winners—if they are alive at 65 and make application—receive a special pension of \$10 a month for life. Nothing more.

"He who possesses the Medal of Honor is the holder of the highest military award for bravery that can be given to any individual in the United States of America," says the Army.

"This symbol of bronze, wreathed in green enamel and held by a white starred ribbon of blue silk, bestows upon the man who has won it a great privilege—that of sharing in the company of the few heroes who have been honored by the award of the same medal he wears."

Unhappily and seldom remembered, a large percentage of Medal of Honor winners have no opportunity for "sharing in the company" of other heroes—the award too often is made posthumously.

The Medal of Honor—in peace or war—is indeed the highest decoration which can be given by any of the armed services—Army, Navy, or Air Force. Since it first came into being in 1861 it has been awarded to 3,054 Army men—less the 911 forgotten heroes whose names were stricken from the list—723 Navy men, 194 marines, and 1 Coast Guard man.

Great heroes—such as those deserving of a nation's highest award—are a product of war. And, as wars come upon us with greater and greater frequency, and as millions of men are committed to gallant combat, heroic deeds become more and more commonplace. Thus, a steady flow of heroism from the battlefields begins to dilute the great honor.

But Medals of Honor are neither so diluted, nor so commonplace, nor so cheaply come by, that America should ignore them or pay their wearers only brief and passing attention. Yet the curtain is beginning to rise on such a stage of affairs.

Today, there is distressing evidence that after 5 years of unrelenting war in one decade, the Medal of Honor—still the only official symbol of the ultimate in military glory in America—is losing much of its meaning insofar as many members of the armed services are concerned.

It is a tragedy of our times that great deeds of heroism, coming one upon the heels of another, are having a tendency to devalue the medal in the public mind.

This was sadly illustrated by the case of Sgt John A. Pittman, late of Company C, Twenty-third Infantry Regiment, Second Division, one of the trio of medal winners recently decorated by President Truman.

Sergeant Pittman was the first GI awarded the medal for smothering a hand grenade with his body to come out of the Korean war alive. Only one World War II soldier awarded the medal for a similar act lived to

tell it. (A more recent medal was given posthumously to a Negro GI who gave his life smothering a grenade in Korea.)

With scarcely a pat on the back from his superiors, 22-year-old Sergeant Pittman—in a beat-up old uniform and badly stained blouse—was released from the station hospital at Fort Campbell, Ky., for his trip to Washington and the White House ceremonies. A shocked but friendly newspaperman took him in hand and saw that he was outfitted properly.

A shy and unassuming hero if there ever was one, Sergeant Pittman twice shielded his men from enemy grenades—once with his poncho, once with his body. The Army says his intrepid and selfless act saved several of his men from death.

Yet, radio and television officials, and most of the important magazines, could find no glamour worth the telling in Sergeant Pittman's exploits.

On the eve of his momentous visit to the White House to receive the medal from President Truman, Sergeant Pittman and his Mississippi farm parents were quartered in a downtown Washington hotel of somewhat ancient vintage.

It had been a long day. The sergeant's parents—Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Wiley Pittman, of Tallula, Miss.—had arrived that morning and enjoyed an hour's nap before the Army caught up with them. Then the Pittmans were put on display by the Army for the benefit of newsmen.

Capt. Robert A. Lehman, a suave Army engineer, was assigned to watch over the sergeant and escort the family to dinner. One or two newsmen moved in and out of the rather plain Willard Hotel room the Army had reserved. The beer that went on the Army's check was drunk by a couple of well-wishers. Mr. Pittman gave it up 7 or 8 years ago. Mrs. Pittman didn't bother looking at it.

Sergeant Pittman sat nervously in a straight chair answering questions—killing time until Captain Lehman arrived to take them to dinner. Already the captain was an hour and a half late.

The telephone rang. It was the captain calling from the lobby.

Everyone went downstairs. The captain was nowhere to be seen so the Pittmans sat in the long lobby corridor, more lonely than they ever could have been on their Mississippi farm. No one paid them the slightest attention.

One of the newspapermen finally flushed Captain Lehman out of a telephone booth.

As the dinner setting, the captain chose the swank Carlton Hotel—plush and forbiddingly formal hostelry where all State functions are held while the White House is being renovated. The dinner orchestra whined a soft melody as the Pittmans—escorted by Captain Lehman and another sergeant—entered the dining room.

Snowy white linen reflected light from the gleaming chandeliers. Bustling waiters poured bubbling champagne into long-stemmed glasses ringing the Pittman's table. The United States Army was doing it up brown.

The newsmen sat at an adjoining table.

"I'd better make the most of that medal ceremony tomorrow," one of them remarked. "The President—much less the country—won't remember it or him a year from now. Name me one World War II Medal of Honor winner? You can't, can you? Well, few people can."

Captain Lehman dominated the desultory conversation. His highest award—the good conduct medal—stood out in bas-relief upon his tunic but was dwarfed by Sergeant Pittman's combat infantryman's badge.

The other sergeant—the captain's driver—tossed his fellow soldier. The parents sipped the bubbling champagne slowly and

warily. They were as ill at ease as fish out of water.

The tinsel was obvious. There was an artificial air about everything around the Pittmans. The fuss and bother seemed too much for Mississippi farmers; yet too little for a Medal of Honor winner. One could almost hear the vaillant sergeant later describing it to friends as phony.

But, of course, he didn't. He felt strange and unsure of himself. And he must have compared a GI's muttered thanks for a beer bought, a cigarette given, or a life saved, with the handshaking, the pats on the back, the "good going, sergeant" flung at him in Washington.

Everyone seemed to be glad when dinner was over. The captain, in cultured accents befitting the splendor of Washington's No. 1 hotel, ordered *creme de menthe frappée*. Their opalescent greenness drew the attention of Mr. and Mrs. Pittman. Their sergeant son looked expectantly toward the door. He wanted to get his parents back to their hotel room and wanted to hit the sack himself. He was still carrying around pieces of grenade fragments and he was tired.

The conversation at the table became more animated. Sergeant Pittman's parents wanted a souvenir to take back to Mississippi. The efficient captain held a brief conversation with the captain of the waiters. An agreement was reached and the Pittmans—father, mother, and heroic son—left the Carlton Hotel proudly carrying an oversized dinner menu and the personal autograph of the captain of waiters.

The day was done.

The White House ceremonies next day were impressive and friendly—but all too brief, all too quickly forgotten.

Today, Sergeant Pittman is back in the Fort Campbell Hospital—his physical wounds a grim reminder of his heroism; his mental wounds an ironic reminder of his glory, his name not even a hazy memory in the public mind; his deed buried in the Army's file of Medal of Honor statistics.

The Medal of Honor was created first in 1861 to distinguish enlisted men of the Army and voluntary forces who "shall most distinguish themselves by their gallantry in action, and other soldierlike qualities."

In later years, officers were made eligible and the Army began taking steps to limit the award to men performing conspicuous acts of gallantry during actual conflict.

After 1862, Medals of Honor were awarded quite freely. Then, in 1897, Army regulations were revised to require "incontestable evidence" of a heroic deed and to require that the deed itself must be one clearly distinguishing the individual for intrepidity judged by a standard of "extraordinary merit."

Burial of Marine Sgt. Paul Moose in Isle, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a transcript of a radio broadcast by Mr. George Grim, of Station WCCO, on September 2, printed in the Appendix of the Record. It is a tribute to the people of the town of Isle, on Mille Lacs Lake, Minn., who deserve commendation and tribute for their dedication to democratic prin-

ciples. This represents the real America.

Mr. President, I make the request to have this article printed in the Record because some time ago we heard of a rather unfortunate incident which took place in our country when certain persons refused burial in a cemetery of a young man of Indian blood. This community in Minnesota reversed the pattern set in the other case, and gave great tribute to a Marine Corps veteran who lost his life in Korea. The entire community paid tribute to his memory and his valiant service to his country.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RADIO BROADCAST BY GEORGE GRIM OVER WCCO

The following is a transcript of George Grim's radio broadcast over WCCO given on Sunday, September 2 at 10:15 p. m.:

"Good evening.

"This is a story to make each of us proud.

"This is the real American story of what happened when the body of an American Indian—killed in action in Korea—came home to a little town on the shores of Mille Lacs Lake in Minnesota. It is the story of a community of understanding and of brotherhood.

"Paul Moose grew up in that community. He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alex Moose. The Chippewas were his ancestors and he was proud of that heritage.

"Paul went to school in Isle. He would have been class of 1951. But he was strong, had a longing to see far-away places. He also wanted to prove, by himself, that he knew his duty as an American.

"Paul Moose enlisted in the Marines, trained, went overseas to Korea. The class of 1951—last June's class at Isle High School—dedicated their yearbook to Paul. They were proud of him. He became a sergeant of Marines.

"Then, last September, in the hottest part of a battlefield, Sgt. Paul Moose was killed in action. He had not yet reached his twenty-first birthday, but had given his life for what he believed to be the fight for freedom.

"The news of his death, received by his parents, soon was a community sorrow in Isle. And, last Tuesday, his body came home for burial. With it, came a military escort, Corp. Joe R. Noel. He brought Paul Moose home to Isle and to his people.

"On last Friday afternoon, not a store was open in Isle, a town of 700 people. Nobody wanted to do anything but pay respects to Paul. Not a church in the community was large enough to hold these understanding people. The funeral services were held in the local movie theater.

"Four hundred people gathered, a hundred of them Indians, to pay their respects to the first boy from the Isle area killed in Korea. The men of the American Legion acted as pallbearers, the superintendent of schools, the postmaster, a real-estate man, a carpenter, a county commissioner. Mayor Fladebo was surprised that outsiders were interested.

"Why should we be doing anything less," he said.

"A few words were spoken by the wife of Pastor Auerbach, for he is in the Pacific, a chaplain. The Auerbach son is in service.

"This is a challenge to all of us," she said. "A challenge to prove our own worth, our own determination to fight for our freedom."

"Outside, on the stilled main streets of Isle, 63 automobiles were lined behind a hearse. Ready to lead the procession to the cemetery, a Minnesota highway patrol car. The simple ceremony ended, the body of Sgt. Paul Moose was carried to the motorcade.

"It's only a mile to the cemetery. I asked the superintendent of schools what was the name of that cemetery. He hesitated.

"Don't think it has one," he said. 'It's just where we bury our dead and come to remember them.'

"In the procession was Herbert Nyquist, who runs a food store. For 32 years he has been the closest friend in town of the Indians, buying furs and rice from them, selling them groceries, carrying them on credit during the ends of a lean winter. Grocer Nyquist speaks Chippewa.

"The services at the grave were short. After the townspeople left, Nyquist and the Indians conducted a short ceremony of tribal tradition.

"Nobody in Isle has thought of much else this week end. Just of Paul Moose, the Indian, the boy they liked when he went to their school, the boy who gave his life in Korea for them.

"But how did all this look to a soldier who doesn't live in Isle? I asked the young corporal who accompanied the body to write down how he felt. Just as he wrote the words, I read them:

"I arrived at Isle, Minn., at 2 p. m. from Oakland, Calif., Army Base, escorting Sgt. Paul Moose. As I got to Isle, the American Legion was waiting to show the respect of the people. They had their colors on hand, color guards, and an honor guard.

"The people were not concerned with Paul's race. In fact, not once did I ever hear anybody mention it.

"Paul was given a complete military funeral. Everyone, from the funeral home to the people at the cemetery, were good to Paul.

"I myself talked to some of the people in business about Paul. All spoke well of him. They all seemed to know him. Paul was an Indian boy who gave his life for his country. He was placed to rest in the Isle cemetery.

"All business was closed to show respect.

"I would like to thank the American Legion of Isle and the people of Isle for their kindness, their courtesy, to Paul, and what they did for him.

"I met Paul's father and mother at the train station. I was treated well—as good as anyone—by them.

"The people of Isle and the men of the American Legion all showed respect for their boy."

"The pencilled report was signed: 'Cpl Joe R Noel escort.'

"In wonderful simplicity, the community of Isle, Minn., has written a story of understanding. Their very wonder at our interest in what they did for Paul Moose is the measure of that understanding.

"He was one of us," they say simply.

"You cannot add more.

"You can only hope that this understanding exists in a thousand—10,000 Isles all over America. This is what we must have—not the shame of that bigotry in the cemetery in Sioux City—a story already used by the Russians to prove that our brotherhood is only a word and not a fact.

"This is the story the world should hear.

"I have only one voice, one radio station.

"But I wanted you to know what happened in Isle, Minn., when Sgt. Paul Moose, marine, killed in action in Korea, came home to his people.

"Who were they?

"Everyone in town.

"Can you hear this without feeling indebted to boys like Paul, to people like the folks in Isle, Minn.?

"I can only say, in humility,

"For a few moments, we saw a light of such beauty that no man could face it without a prayer of thanks in his heart."

"Good night."

A Cesspool of Corruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is news when Doris Fleeson, the New Deal apologist, devotes a column in the Star to point out that the lid is off cesspool of corruption.

Mr. Speaker, to Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, an accolade for his persistent efforts to expose corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau. He has established himself as a Senate leader whose voice must be heard in the councils of the Republican Party.

I include at this point the article by Miss Fleeson:

LID OFF CESSPOOL OF CORRUPTION—DELAWARE'S SENATOR WILLIAMS SPENT 4 YEARS INVESTIGATING JUGGLING OF TAX ACCOUNTS BY INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

(By Doris Fleeson)

Four years ago an unimportant little crook in the Internal Revenue district of Delaware tampered with the tax account of a moderately successful grain merchant. When the Bureau began then to press the merchant for taxes he knew he had paid, he became annoyed. When his own investigation disclosed monkey business in the Bureau he decided he would discuss it with the Bureau's boss.

He had no trouble reaching the then Internal Revenue Commissioner George J. Schoeneman, because the merchant had just been elected to the Senate. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS recalls very clearly, however, that Mr. Schoeneman was not impressed.

For that boredom, the Truman administration is now paying a heavy price. The lid is off a widening cesspool of corruption in the most sensitive agency in Government, vital centers of Democratic political power are involved, the name of a Truman secretary, Matthew Connelly, has bobbed up in testimony and the end is nowhere near in sight.

Senator WILLIAMS persisted until he had cleaned up the Delaware situation which involved the juggling of 400 tax accounts. The country didn't notice it but a Delaware Democrat employed in the rich New York tax district did. He decided to risk some disclosures to the steadily persistent honest Senator from his own State who did not appear afflicted with headinitis but got results. As the results began to get attention, the Bureau's many other honest employees began to offer the Senator their cooperation.

Not all the red faces resulting from Senator WILLIAMS' remorseless pressure for a clean-up are in the executive branch.

The naming of collectors of internal revenue, like Federal judgeships, is a senatorial prerogative. Startled by current disclosures, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, a discreet man, permitted himself to exclaim that if the Georgia collector proved false, he would himself feel culpable.

In particular, the Senate Finance Committee which has jurisdiction over revenue matters, including collector nominations, remained noticeably quiescent as the "Delaware David"—a member of Finance—repeatedly took his disclosures to the floor. This committee prides itself on its austere conservatism and its dominant figures—Chairman GEORGE, Senators BYRD, JOHNSON

of Colorado, Democrats; Senators MILLIKIN, TAFT, BUTLER, Republicans—virtuously scorn the Fair Deal.

But like Mr. Schoeneman, they were slow to take seriously the unimpressive Senator with the squeaky voice from the small State of Delaware.

They have agreed on their mea culpa. They have now adopted a rule that before any collector of internal revenue can be confirmed he must be called before the committee and a full understanding reached with him that it's a full-time job whose duties do not—in spite of Mr. Finnegan, of St. Louis—include keeping people happy.

Senator WILLIAMS approves of that but he's not quite finished with the current crop, in large part because he'd like to see the honest ones completely cleared. He has called for full biographies and reports on the whole lot. He thinks perhaps some kind of public pat on the back for the innocent might help restore public confidence in the Bureau. Believe it or not, he hasn't introduced a resolution for a Williams subcommittee to do it, either.

Conditions in Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Hugh Grant, who formerly was secretary to Senator Hugo Black, when Justice Black was a Member of this body, and still later Minister of the United States to Albania until it was overrun by Italy, and yet later Minister to Siam, made an address recently before the Baptist Brotherhood in Augusta, Ga., in which he told something about Albania and its hopes of coming out from behind the iron curtain. An account of his address is published in an Augusta, Ga., newspaper, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAPTIST BROTHERHOOD IS TOLD OF ALBANIA'S KING BY GRANT

The First Baptist Brotherhood last night heard Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania and Thailand, tell of his recent meeting with His Majesty, King Zog, of Albania, in Washington and of the terrible plight of the Albanian people under Russian iron curtain rule.

Mr. Grant made an earnest plea for a study and appraisal of the present situation of Albania by the American public. He said Albania was a trusted friend of America, but had been largely bypassed in the tug of war that the United States is carrying on with the encroaching Soviet Communists in Europe.

HEADED LEGATION

Mr. Grant was in charge of the American Legation in Albania for 4 years immediately prior to World War II and was there when Mussolini's Fascist legions attacked the little country and took it over in April 1939. He remained there until after war broke out in Europe, when he closed the American Legation since Italy had taken over everything.

Cason Bruker, president of the First Baptist Brotherhood, presided at the meeting

which had an attendance of more than 100. Jack Calloway was master of ceremonies as program chairman. Dr. Warren A. Huyck, pastor of the church, pronounced the invocation, and Warlon Symms introduced the speaker.

DESCRIBES GEOGRAPHY

Mr. Grant described the geography, history, and religion of Albania, and told of the cordial and friendly attitude toward America of His Majesty, King Zog, Albanian political leaders, and the people throughout the country.

Everywhere he traveled in Albania, he said, he found deep gratitude for the friendly interest in Albania shown by the late President Woodrow Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Some 50,000 Albanians residing in the United States have cemented these ties of friendship.

The speaker paid high tribute to King Zog, who is making his first visit to this country. The King is in exile in Egypt. Mr. Grant said the King was a natural leader, astute, courageous, friendly, and intensely loyal to the cause of Albanian independence.

The King told Mr. Grant in Washington that his aim is to see Albania completely free from foreign domination in order that she may take her place among the freedom-loving nations of the world, and that he would leave it to a vote of the Albanian people to decide what form of government they want once they are free of the present Russian yoke which has brought starvation and misery for a large part of the population.

RUSSIANS VULNERABLE

King Zog also told Mr. Grant that he believes the Russians are very vulnerable in Albania, especially since only a small number of Albanians are supporting the Soviet regime and most of these through fear and compulsion.

The Russians are in Albania with several thousand soldiers and technicians because Albania is a place of great strategic importance from a military standpoint. It is the western gateway to the whole Balkan area with its fine harbors and it is also an important factor in the control of the Mediterranean because of its location near the point where the Adriatic Sea flows into the Mediterranean.

The Russians are reported to be building a great submarine base on the island of Valona just off the coast of Albania.

Following the address, moving pictures of Albania which were made by members of the American Legation stay were shown.

Taxpayers Shocked by Internal Revenue Bureau Disclosures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Gould Lincoln that appeared in the Star last night:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

TAXPAYERS ARE SHOCKED BY BUREAU DISCLOSURES—FRAUD AND BRIBERY IN COLLECTIONS TO BE MAJOR ELECTION ISSUE

The American taxpayers who are called on today to turn over to the Internal Revenue Bureau some \$50,000,000,000 a year, are blinking their eyes in amazement over what

is being turned up in the offices of half a dozen collectors. To be more exact, in the offices in Boston, where a recently deposed collector, Denis W. Delaney, is under indictment on charges of bribery and false certification of tax payments; in New York, San Francisco, St. Louis, Newark, and Detroit. Not only are they amazed, they are angry.

These revelations, many of them growing out of investigations by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, headed by Representative King of California, Democrat, threaten to be even more devastating as a campaign issue next year than the disclosures of the use of political influence used in recent years to obtain loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The end of the inquiries by the House committee is not yet in sight, either.

The recent testimony given before the committee by James P. Finnegan, internal revenue collector in St. Louis until he resigned last spring, particularly is enlightening. A grand jury is looking into the operation of the St. Louis office under Mr. Finnegan.

Replies come as shock

His replies to some of the questions by the committeemen come as something more than a shock. For example, he testified that he averaged "2, 3, or 4 hours a day" in the collector's office—handling a job that was paying him \$10,000 a year; that he was informed when he took the job that he could spend as much or as little time as was necessary in the office; that he could continue his private practice of law while he was collector; and that of the 64 collectors scattered over the country he did not believe more than 15 were tax experts. Mr. Finnegan freely admitted he was no tax expert—that he was just an "administrator." He also admitted that his private law practice brought him \$30,000 to \$35,000 a year.

This particular collector was a crony of the late "Bob" Hannegan, also of St. Louis, who was successively Commissioner of Internal Revenue, chairman of the Democratic National Committee—he ran the 1944 campaign for the late Franklin D. Roosevelt—and Postmaster General. Mr. Finnegan played football as a young man on the same team with Mr. Hannegan. He contended that it was quite natural that Mr. Hannegan, when the latter was Commissioner of Internal Revenue, should want him as collector in St. Louis, and he took the job on Hannegan's invitation. From Mr. Finnegan's description, it was a political job. He was a kind of public-relations man and job dispenser. He liked, he said, to give jobs to people.

Had sought to resign

Mr. Finnegan also testified that in 1949 and in 1950 he had sought to resign as collector in St. Louis and had taken it up with Matthew J. Connelly, secretary to the President, and with President Truman himself, and had been told not to resign. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, however, told the House committee that he had advised Mr. Finnegan in October 1950 to resign "because of general rumors around St. Louis." Mr. Finnegan did not, however, resign until some 7 months later. Mr. Snyder, who, like President Truman and Mr. Finnegan, is from Missouri, said he knew nothing of Mr. Finnegan's reported talks with the President and Mr. Connelly.

Mr. Finnegan's sources of revenue—from his law clients, which netted him about \$105,000 in 3 years—have not yet been fully disclosed. The House committee is still working on that end of its investigation. He did not appear as an attorney of record, but acted as counsel, he said, in an advisory capacity.

The administration is now busying itself, according to Mr. Snyder, in an attempt to clean up the mess that has been uncovered

in the tax collectors' offices. One thing appears certain however, and that is, the members of the House Ways and Means Committee are intent on seeing that the collectors give full time to their jobs—and do not practice law on the side; also, they will insist that all collectors know something about the tax laws.

Demobilization of Armed Forces After World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, within recent months the question of demobilization of our Armed Forces of World War II has taken on ever-increasing importance. It has been the subject of sharp controversy. On September 8, 1951, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune carried an excellent editorial on this controversial issue. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Let's Look at Record on Demobilization," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT RECORD ON DEMOBILIZATION

The version of what happened to the military might of the United States at the end of World War II offered by Gen. Douglas MacArthur at Cleveland Thursday night may be good demagoguery but it is bad history.

MacArthur accused our political and military leaders of dissipating the armed strength of the United States with reckless haste after World War II. They deliberately disarmed in the face of threatening communism, MacArthur charged.

MacArthur would have done a greater service to the cause of national defense and to the American people if he had told plainly what really happened after the Japanese surrender and warned against a repetition.

It was the American people and their representatives in Congress who dissipated the Nation's armed strength at a time when it should have been kept intact for the safeguarding of the free world. Leaders of both parties in Congress bowed to the overwhelming demand of parents, wives, and friends to get members of the Armed Forces home from overseas without delay. The President and the heads of the Defense Establishment were unable to resist pressures which shocked those who grasped the significance of this national debacle.

The Tribune feels warranted in setting the record straight because it was one of the few newspapers which, in the months following the Japanese surrender, pointed out the grave dangers of the precipitate demobilization then going on.

Perhaps General MacArthur was trying at the same time to prevent this reckless dissipation of our means of winning the peace, but we have not come across any evidence of his doing so.

The pressure on Congress and the Defense Establishment to get the men home without regard to consequences was strongest then from the men under MacArthur's command. The slogan, "no boats, no votes," which terrorized Members of Congress into demanding that the soldiers be brought home re-

gardless of consequences, appeared most frequently on letters bearing the postmarks of Army post offices in MacArthur's command.

The mimeographed and chain letters demanding that the troops be brought home which poured into newspaper offices in those days came principally from the Pacific.

More than 18,000 soldiers in MacArthur's command signed a pledge "not to vote for any Senator or Representative now in office who does not in the next 25 days take some tangible action to get us home." The soldiers' newspapers in MacArthur's command gave great impetus to this pressure.

MacArthur had a lot of other grave problems on his hands those days. Had he attempted to buck the tide he probably could not have persuaded the men under his command, their friends, and relatives, or Members of Congress that our Armed Forces should be kept strong until the peace had been won.

But that is no warrant for fostering in American minds the delusion that their costly military weakness was the fault of a few men in Washington rather than their own. The only way to make sure that the American people do not make such a dangerous mistake again, if unhappily they should ever again be engaged in global war, is to make clear the responsibility for the past mistake.

Cordova, Walker County, Ala., Is a Good Location for a Pulp and Paper Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the need for the immediate expansion of the wood-pulp and paper-making industries of the United States is apparent.

Recently published reports point up the present shortage of newsprint, and that shortage daily threatens to become more acute.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the privilege to represent in the Congress, has great natural resources. Among the nine congressional districts of Alabama, it ranks third in the number of acres of timberlands. Its 2,400,000 acres of forests cover approximately 63 percent of its total land surface.

The William B. Bankhead National Forest, partially located in the Seventh District counties of Winston and Franklin, provide a readily apparent and wonderful example, as do thousands of privately owned tracts, of the timber and pulpwood production possibilities of the entire district.

The Seventh Congressional District possesses many appealing advantages for the location of a pulp and paper mill. Included among them are:

First. Vast existing pulpwood resources.

Second. A mild climate, and a high average annual rainfall, which together, insure rapid growth of pulp timber through a long growing season each year.

Third. Hundreds of millions of tons of high-grade coal to meet any sustained fuel requirements, now, or in the future.

Fourth. An ample supply of skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled labor that believes in doing a day's work for a day's pay.

In addition to these natural locational advantages, Cordova, Walker County, Ala., possesses the following special advantages for a pulp paper mill:

First. Cordova, Ala., is located on the navigable Mulberry Fork of the Warrior River, which provides an ample supply of industrial water, a fundamental necessity in the pulp paper-making process.

Second. This river is navigable the year around, with a 9-foot channel, maintained by the Corps of United States Engineers. Cordova is located some 10 miles downstream—west—of the head of navigation on the river. The quantity of available water is indicated by the fact that the Alabama Power Co. at its steam generating plants, a few miles down river from Cordova, extracts many millions of gallons of water daily to run through its condensers.

Third. In addition, natural gas, if needed, is available at Cordova from the lines of the Southern Natural Gas Co.

Fourth. Electric power needs, primary or supplementary, is readily available through the electric system of the Alabama Power Co., whose steam generators at Corgas, Ala., have a capacity of 325,000 kilowatts.

My remarks have been induced by a brochure recently prepared by the industrial development department of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., setting forth the locational advantages of a site at Cordova, Ala., on its rail lines, for a pulp and paper mill. The written information contained in the brochure follows.

SUGGESTED LOCATION FOR A PULP AND PAPER MILL IN WALKER COUNTY, ALA., NEAR CORDOVA

The proposed site is near Cordova, Ala., which is located in Walker County about 30 miles northwest of Birmingham. It is situated on the west bank of the Mulberry fork of the Warrior River, 428 miles by river from Mobile and about 10 miles downstream from the head of navigation on the river. Jasper, the county seat of Walker County, is about 9 miles from Cordova.

The elevation of Cordova varies from 400 to 500 feet above sea level. The health conditions in the area are excellent.

The average rainfall approximates 63 inches and the mean annual temperature is 63° F. The average growing season is about 215 days per annum.

Population 1950 census

1950 Census	City of Cordova	Walker County
Total population.....	3,147	61,005
Males.....	1,536	32,081
Females.....	1,591	31,820
Whites.....	2,912	57,209
Negroes.....	188	6,802

The site suggested herein is located on the east side of the Warrior River near the town of Cordova and adjacent to the tracks of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. (Frisco).

It consists of approximately 650 acres, under the control of Mr. C. S. Blasey, 2229½ First Avenue North, Birmingham, Ala., who is liquidating agent of the Old Black Diamond Coal Co. All or any part of this property is available.

This property has not been used for mining purposes. Most of it is now under cultivation. The improvements thereon consist of four 5-room houses, one 3-room house and a barn and two 4-room houses. All improvements and acreage are assessed on the tax records at Jasper at \$5,410.

It is particularly fitting that the site is located in a bend of the river which will allow the water intake from the north side of the site and effluent disposal on the south side of the site, with a minimum of pipeline pumping.

The topography of the area is such that a minimum of preparation will be necessary, and the soil is such that grading and filling can be accomplished at nominal expense.

The building site is well above any known flood water on the river. The county officials have indicated they will be glad to cooperate if necessary in rerouting and hard-surfacing the county road that extends through the site. The river at this site is bridged to the Cordova side of the river furnishing highway access from that direction as well as from the east.

PULPWOOD RESOURCES

Since the availability of pulpwood is one of the most important requisites for a successful pulp and paper mill, this report will treat with the subject in what we consider a conservative manner, and the data contained herein is only that applicable to all or part of nine counties, contiguous to the proposed site. This arbitrary area was chosen because it appears there will be no conflict in wood procurement with existing mills nor with proposed mills. The nearest mill to this site is at Tuscaloosa, Ala., which is about 50 air miles, and the theoretical breaking point for satisfactory wood procurement should, we believe, not be nearer than 25 miles to the existing mill.

In view of the fact that rail lines serving this site traverse portions of northwest Alabama and northeast Mississippi, which are heavily wooded in pine, the areas, even though they are not included in the summary herewith, would be able to supply quite large amounts of pulpwood on an economical basis. It appears that a mill of capacity sufficiently large to be economical could easily secure all of its pulpwood requirements within the area treated in this report. If a very large mill were proposed for this site, it would be in the interest of conservatism to secure the advice of a reputable forest surveyor to determine positively the existence and the availability of pulpwood in all the area from which pulpwood would likely be procured currently and in the future.

The data which follows is considered to be reliable and conservative, as its source is the Federal and State forestry services.

County	Available to proposed site		Thousands of acres allocated to proposed site	
	Total acres	Percent	Total	Wooded
Blount.....	410,000	100	410	213.1
Cullman.....	476,000	100	476	219.0
Marion.....	475,000	100	475	291.5
Walker.....	518,000	100	518	362.6
Winston.....	405,000	100	405	300.0
Franklin.....	412,000	50	206	125.9
Jefferson.....	714,000	50	357	261.0
Lawrence.....	438,000	60	263	120.0
Morgan.....	368,000	50	184	64.0
Total.....			3,291	1,961.0

Based on the Forest Service's survey of this area and allowing for the recent excess drain over reproduction because of the war,

the following estimate of available acreage and stand of timber is considered conservative:

Forest condition	Pine	Pine hard-wood	Upland hardwoods	Bottomland hardwoods	All types
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Old growth					
Uncut	43,800	14,800	24,800	3,200	86,600
Partly cut	88,000	27,700	43,400	3,600	133,300
Total, old growth	131,800	42,500	68,200	6,800	219,600
Second growth sawlog					
Uncut	433,500	136,500	51,700	13,700	635,400
Partly cut	154,700	60,400	24,800	9,100	249,000
Under sawlog size	258,600	283,800	219,500	18,400	780,300
Reproduction	24,000	16,300	25,700	2,000	68,000
Total, second growth	871,000	497,000	321,700	43,200	1,733,500
Clear cut	6,000	450	425	425	7,000
Total, all conditions	960,000	539,950	390,025	50,425	1,901,000

Thousands of cords (1945) stand

Species group	Sound trees, sawlog size		Sound trees under sawlog size	Cull trees	All classes of material
	Sawlog material	Upper stems			
Pines	6,000	952	2,755	455	10,162
Hardwoods					
Soft textured	614	341	674	645	2,274
Firm textured	1,195	674	2,808	2,304	7,017
Total hardwoods	1,809	1,015	3,482	2,949	9,291
Total all species	7,809	1,967	6,237	3,440	19,453

The forester in charge of the Bankhead National Forest (178,000 acres) north of Jasper, has estimated that the natural reproduction rate of pines in the area is at the rate of one-half cord per acre per annum. Based on his experience with managed timberlands, he estimated a pine reproduction rate of three-fourths to one cord per acre per annum, depending on the length of time in which good practice has been effective.

WATER

The proposed site is located on the Mulberry Fork of the Warrior River.

The water in this stream is of a quality seldom found in volume sufficient for large industrial needs. It is soft, very low in mineral content, and carries no organic or inorganic stain.

The drainage area of this site covers 1,900 square miles of mountainous country and the water is from a sandstone formation that is above the limestone formation of central Alabama and above the iron deposits.

A 9-foot channel is maintained and this river is navigable from the proposed site to Empire, 9 miles upstream. This channel depth is largely controlled by locks and dams 16 miles downstream at Gorgas. The Alabama Power steam plants, at that point, extract 250,000,000 gallons of water per day on the upstream side of the locks, which is run through their condensers. Since a 9-foot channel is maintained and the river is navigable to the suggested site, we estimate there is sufficient quantity of water at all times to supply a plant as proposed.

CLIMATE

This area does not experience extremes of either heat or cold and the weather will in no wise contribute to absenteeism or work stoppages. Out-of-doors work can be accomplished the year around without interruption, except for occasional rains.

Since the maximum and minimum seasonal temperatures are reached without drastic day-to-day variations, the operatives will not be affected adversely in the efficient performance of their daily tasks. This is especially important in a 24-hour operation.

FUELS

The important requisite of a reliable and economical source of fuel is amply fulfilled at this site. The plant site suggested for consideration in this report is located within the great Warrior Coal Field of Alabama and some of the largest mines in the State are located within 1 to 25 miles of the actual plant site and, of course, will afford an opportunity for considerable economy to a paper mill located at this site.

The actual coal analysis of the Walker County coals are recorded in the Bureau of Mines—and all of it is adequately set forth as ample steam-coal minerals, with the analyses ranging from 11,500 to 18,000 British thermal units.

Natural gas. In addition to the immediate availability of coal, natural gas from the lines of the Southern Natural Gas Co. is also available at Cordova. This alternative source of fuel places the user in the enviable position of being able to install facilities for the use of both powdered coal and natural gas, and thus be able to change from one to the other according to the dictates of economy and current availability.

Electric power: It is assumed that electricity will be produced at the plant, but it is probable that some kind of interchange agreement with the system of the Alabama Power Co. would be advantageous to insure continuity of supply. The power company's generating facilities at Gorgas are rated at 325,000 kilowatts.

TAXES

Alabama's tax laws are fixed by legislative enactment and are not subject to revision at the discretion of local tax officials.

The maximum limit of assessed value, as fixed by law in Alabama, is 60 percent of the reasonable cash value. The accepted practice is to assess property at from 40 percent to 45 percent of its reasonable cash value. Everyone in Alabama follows the accepted practice procedure, and that explains the use of the term "accepted."

There is some latitude in the term "reasonable cash value." For instance, a piece of property costing \$8,000 in 1927 was pur-

chased for \$5,500 in 1932. It is presently assessed for \$2,400. The assessed value is thus seen to be 43½ percent of the last purchase price (when a depression was in full swing) excluding improvements and betterments, and 30 percent of the original cost. Since our tax officials make every effort to equalize taxes, and since they are elected to office, there is very noticeable attitude of fairness and cooperation on their part, toward the taxpayer. The assessed-rate difference and the base latitude apply to both corporations and individuals alike.

For the purpose of this analysis we have assumed an assessed value of 40 percent of the reasonable cash value. It is our opinion that this represents the maximum tax cost to be expected and that the actual cost of local taxes will be less than those shown in the resulting estimates.

Alabama laws offer certain exemptions from property taxes to new manufacturing plants. Land is not exempted, and 70 percent of the rate, which is earmarked for schools, is not exempt. The exemption runs for a period up to 10 years under the law. We have, therefore, based our calculation on the first year, with exemptions, and the eleventh year without exemptions.

The larger manufacturing plants in Alabama are usually located outside the corporate limits of the communities from which the labor supply is drawn. The suggested site is so located.

Corporation permit tax: The rate is graduated from \$5 for a capital investment up to and including \$1,000 to \$100 for a capital investment of \$50,000 or more. It is an annual tax and, in the case of this analysis would amount to \$100.

Corporation franchise tax: This tax is an annual tax. The law as written specifies a rate of \$2 per \$1,000 of capital employed in Alabama by a foreign (out of State) corporation. We are advised by the State commissioner of revenue that a court order is now the basis of determining this tax, and that the order directs him to calculate the true value of the tangible property, as reflected by the assessment returns from the county officials and then apply the \$2 rate. This reduces the tax but complicates the explanation. The following is the actual procedure:

The tangible property assessments include land, buildings, improvements, appurtenances, machinery, equipment, and inventory over 12 months old (parts, supplies, etc.). This assessed at 40 percent of the reasonable cash value and reported to the commissioner of revenue at Montgomery. The commissioner's office assumes that the assessment represents 60 percent of the reasonable cash value and calculates such reasonable cash value by the simple process of multiplying by one hundred-sixtieths. Thus one hundred-sixtieths of 40 percent produces a figure which is only 66⅔ percent of the actual reasonable cash value. This method eliminates cash, accounts receivable and raw materials, goods in process and finished goods (if held less than 12 months) from the calculation, as well as 33⅓ percent of the tangible property in use. The \$2 per \$1,000 rate is then applied.

Property tax: The tax on tangible property is an annual one. The elements considered in arriving at the base are: land, buildings, improvements, appurtenances, machinery, equipment, and inventory over 12 months old (parts, supplies, etc.). Cash and accounts receivable are excluded as well as raw materials, goods-in-process, and finished goods, if held in the inventory for less than 12 months. The base amount is assessed at say 40 percent of its reasonable cash value and the tax rate is then applied. At the site under consideration the rate is \$2.10 per \$100 of assessed value. This is the tax to which exemptions apply.

Unemployment tax: This is an annual tax based on payroll payments. Alabama is one

of the States which uses the experience-rating method of arriving at a base rate. The system involves a straight 3 percent payment for the first 3 years (until experience has been had) and can fall as low as 0.8 percent if justified by experience. Both the 3 percent rate and the lower rates include 0.3 percent for Federal unemployment tax.

State income tax: Alabama's State income tax is based on net income after all other taxes. It is an annual tax and the rate is 3 percent.

Incorporation expense: The original (one time only) annual costs of a corporation, under the laws of Alabama, are illustrated in the following table. We have arbitrarily assumed three different amounts of capital investment, for comparative purposes.

Item of incorporation expense (paid only once)	Original capital of—		
	\$5,000	\$250,000	\$25,000,000
Charter fee (\$1 per \$1,000)	\$5.00	\$250.00	\$25,000.00
Examination of certificate fee	2.50	2.50	2.50
Admission of certificate fee	2.50	2.50	2.50
Recording of certificate (approximately)	5.00	5.00	5.00
	15.00	260.00	25,010.00
ITEM OF ANNUAL CORPORATION			
Permit fee (graduated \$10-\$100)	10.00	100.00	100.00
Franchise tax (\$2 per \$1,000)	10.00	500.00	50,000.00
	20.00	600.00	50,100.00

TRANSPORTATION

Rail: The suggested site is served by the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. (Frisco

line) and the Illinois Central Railroad, the latter line being granted operating rights over the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. (Frisco line) from Jasper to Birmingham, Ala.

The Frisco operates in 9 States and extends from Pensacola and Mobile north to Birmingham, Memphis, St. Louis, Kansas City, Oklahoma City, Dallas, and Fort Worth, connecting with all lines at these gateways. Thus, the proposed site has direct mainline connections to all principal markets.

Freight rates: The scale of rates applicable to movement of pulpwood for single line haul to the proposed site will be as per the attached mileage scale. Joint line rates will be a combination of each participating line local factor rates based on distances shown in the statement over the junction point.

At the present time there are no published rates on woodpulp from the proposed site. By using the existing formula for rates from this site as was used from other Alabama producing points a resultant rate to Philadelphia, Pa. as example, would be 67 cents per hundredweight, minimum weight 50,000 pounds, for all rail movement.

The rate on woodpulp from this site to Mobile would be 40 cents per hundredweight, minimum weight 50,000 pounds. Steamship rate from Mobile to Philadelphia is 52 cents per hundredweight, minimum weight 36,000 pounds or 48 cents per hundredweight, minimum weight 70,000 pounds. There must also be added to the above steamship rate wharfage and handling charges at Mobile in the amount of 94 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds.

Highway: United States Highway No. 78 and five paved State roads serve the area.

Air: The site is less than an hour's drive from Birmingham where air service is provided by Eastern, Capital, and Delta Air Lines.

Pulpwood (Roanoke Rapids scale)

[Rates in cents per cord of 128 cubic feet, minimum 12 cords]

	Basic	X-162 table 5	X-166 table 9	X-168 table 5	X-175 table 1
10 miles and under	77	92	115	127	130
15 miles and over 10	86	103	129	142	146
30 miles and over 15	93	112	140	154	157
110 miles and over 90	171	205	256	282	288
200 miles and over 190	248	298	373	410	418
250 miles and over 230	279	335	419	461	470
350 miles and over 330	359	431	539	593	605
450 miles and over 430	430	527	659	725	740

Communists Objectives Have Always Been Consistent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many of those who are attempting to justify our kind of treatment of the Soviet Union during World War II and in the years immediately following now propagate the idea that it was only an honest and natural error. The idea is given out that there was no way of knowing that Stalin would not live up to any of his agreements or that the Communists were not honestly intending to cooperate with the rest of the world in insuring world peace.

Those who are supposed to be well versed in world affairs have no right to make this excuse. A study of the Com-

munist movement would show to them that the Communists have consistently and relentlessly pursued their objectives—only their tactics have changed. And these objectives have been openly stated on numerous occasions since the fall of the validly elected Russian Government in November 1917.

As long ago as 1922, Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., noted authority on communism and regent of the Georgetown School of Foreign Service, demonstrated the proper technique in dealing with the Communists. At that time he was a part of the American Relief Administration which went to Russia to help relieve the starving people of Russia. When all their supplies and equipment were in Russia and ready to be distributed to the people the local Communist leaders told Father Walsh that they would select the people to help him in distributing the food.

Father Walsh immediately contacted high authorities in Moscow and flatly stated that unless their relief administration was allowed to distribute relief in their own way and to select their own

help they would not distribute any but would remove all their supplies from Russia immediately.

Thereupon the authorities stated that the order of the local Communists was in error and would be rescinded. Father Walsh, however, insisted that an order to the local Communists be issued to desist from interference and then after this was done the food kitchens would be reopened, but not before. The officials thereupon complied with Father Walsh's demands.

If Father Walsh had not been insistent on his demand to distribute the food relief as he saw fit, obviously the entire relief program would have deteriorated into a political weapon in the hands of the Communists. So it was highly important that Father Walsh insisted on maintaining his position rather than compromising with the Communists.

Father Walsh, a student of communism these many years, in his recent book *Total Empire* clearly states that Soviet objectives have never changed. He states:

The plain truth of the matter is that Soviet policy is the most logical and consistent political phenomenon that emerged from World War I or prevailed after World War II. That is why the Russian revolution has advanced to the points of longitude and latitude where it now stands on the map of Europe and Asia. The vacillations, the empiricism, the half measures, the weakness, and compromises were all on the other side of the table—at least, until recently.

* * * No government in history has been so frank and circumstantial in spelling out and publicizing its basic policy and its ultimate intentions. Candor leaves but one conclusion: the tragedy of unpreparedness lay not in our stars but in ourselves (p. 177).

In another portion of the book Father Walsh gives his views of those who believe that cooperation with communism is possible. He states:

In view of this declared intent and in the face of facts developing over the years in consonance with such established principles culminating in the Korean war, he who still clings to the hope of converting world communism to harmonious cooperation with the United Nations is a hopeless idealist, and, if a statesman, he is a reckless and dangerous leader. He will end in the frustration which engulfed Mr. Benes and Mr. Masaryk and made Czechoslovakia a house of bondage (p. 239).

Those who believe that cooperation with the Soviet Union in the United Nations would be possible after World War II should have read what Lenin stated in *Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*:

You must work inside them—bourgeois-democratic institutions—otherwise you run the risk of becoming mere babblers * * * The conclusion which follows from this is absolutely incontrovertible; it has been proved that participation in a bourgeois-democratic parliament even a few weeks before the victory, not only does no harm to the revolutionary proletariat, but actually makes it easier for it to prove to the backward masses why such parliaments deserve to be dispersed; it facilitates success in dispersing them and facilitates the process whereby bourgeois parliamentarism becomes politically obsolete. To refuse to take this experience into account and at the same time

to claim affiliation to the Communist International, which must work out its tactics internationally, is to commit the greatest blunder and actually to retreat from internationalism in deeds while accepting it in words

Why our diplomatic officials could not have adopted the common-sense methods of Father Walsh in their dealings with the Soviet Union after World War II must remain a mystery for all of us.

I include herewith an article by William Henry Chamberlin from the Wall Street Journal of August 28, 1950:

UNLOADED GUN—THE EXPLANATION THAT THEY DIDN'T KNOW IT WAS LOADED DOESN'T EXCUSE THOSE WHO PLAYED WITH THE KRIEMLIN

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

"Didn't know it was loaded" is the familiar stock excuse when someone accidentally shoots a friend with a lethal weapon. It is never a very good excuse, and it is no better in public affairs than in private.

For there is a distinct "didn't know it was loaded" flavor about the explanations and attempted justifications of the Yalta agreement which are now being offered by high public officials and commentators. Implicit in these explanations is the assumption that the Soviet dictatorship, up to February 1945 had behaved in such a manner as to warrant high expectations that it would be a willing, cooperative partner in building a brave new world of peace, justice, and freedom.

Now it is understandable and pardonable if the average American and British citizen believed this. The man in the street cannot be expected to be an expert on history and international affairs. It was deliberate governmental policy, in the interest of wartime unity, to suppress, so far as possible, knowledge of the less agreeable sides of Soviet life. This policy greatly affected the character of books which were published, of newspaper reports, of radio broadcasts.

HOPE FOR WORLD PEACE WISHLIFUL THINKING

It was, of course, pleasant to believe that a world of peace and harmony and relaxation would be the reward for the sufferings and sacrifices of the war. One can scarcely blame the ordinary citizen for cherishing this hope; especially when he was assured over and over again, on the highest authority, that this fair prospect would certainly be realized.

What is not pardonable, what, in retrospect, seems scarcely comprehensible, is the blind wishful thinking of the men in higher policy-making posts. Surely the Soviet record in international affairs before the war and during the war was available to these men.

And it was not a reassuring record. There was the repeated identification in the most authoritative of writings of Lenin and Stalin, of the Soviet regime in Russia with the success of the movement for world revolution. There was the starving to death of millions of Soviet peasants in order to force on the remainder an undesired system of collective farming. There was the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, the deliberate planned social and economic extermination of perhaps a million peasant families, singled out for persecution because they were a little better off than their neighbors, there was the growth of a gigantic slave-labor system.

It was scarcely probable that a Government which used such ruthless methods in dealing with its own people would be gentler in respecting the rights and liberties of people outside its own frontiers, once its armies started to march across those frontiers. Nor was the record of the Soviet Government in the war years any better.

SOVIET WAR RECORD

The outbreak of the war was precipitated by the signing of the Hitler-Stalin pact of

August 23, 1939, a pact which made Stalin a full accomplice in all Hitler's aggressive schemes in Eastern Europe and gave him a share of the human and territorial spoils in Poland and the Baltic States.

It was, or should have been, well known to responsible Government officials that the Soviet annexation of eastern Poland and the Baltic States was accompanied by mass deportations on a scale unknown in modern European history, and under circumstances of extreme barbarity. Subsequent Polish investigations led to the conclusion that about 300,000 of the 1,250,000 Poles deported from the eastern provinces of that country perished as a result of overwork, malnutrition, shocking sanitary conditions in the deportation trains, and the forced-labor camps.

The overwhelming circumstantial evidence that the Soviet Government was responsible for the slaughter of thousands of Polish officer prisoners whose graves were found in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, in the spring of 1943, was no secret to men in the higher diplomatic posts—unless they deliberately wanted to be deceived. The State Department archives of this period have not been opened. But it is known that some fairly sharp communications were dispatched to Moscow (invariably without success) on such subjects as the treatment of Polish deportees in Russia and the failure of the Red Army to support, or assist American and British air aid to the gallant Polish uprising in Warsaw against the Germans.

THE MISUNDERSTOOD DEMOCRACY

Yet, with all this mountain of evidence pointing to the probability of a highly charged and explosive situation developing with the Soviet Union after the war, the men responsible for directing American foreign policy persisted in giving the American people soothing syrup about the Soviet regime as a great misunderstood democracy. At Yalta and elsewhere they made concessions to the Soviet regime which were immoral in themselves and most disastrous for American interests in the Far East and in Eastern Europe. We are still stumbling over the remains of these past blunders. It is not without significance that it is always Communists and Communist sympathizers who want to "get back to Yalta and Potsdam."

The plea, "We didn't know it was loaded," will not get the men of Yalta, in the actual and figurative sense of that term, an acquittal at the bar of history. The course of events since the end of the war would have been much more favorable if the western statesmen had returned, with interest, the attitude of profound mistrust which Stalin consistently maintained toward them.

It's Not Safe for a Congressman to Write the Bureau of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the duties of a Congressman are many and arduous these days, and he should not have to bear the additional burden of worrying constantly about the political machinations of hired hands in Government departments upon which he must depend for information and guidance.

On August 16 of this year, my colleague on the House Interior Committee, Representative WILLIAM H. HARRISON of

Wyoming, wrote a letter to the Bureau of Reclamation requesting information about a sewerage system in the town of Mills, Wyo. This system was formerly owned by the Bureau, and was transferred to the municipality of Mills under Public Law 832 of the Eighty-first Congress.

The nature of the information requested and the entire contents of Representative HARRISON's letter are not important here. The letter is available to any one who wishes to read it. What is important is the fact that the letter was not answered, although it was promptly received by the Bureau, as evidence will show.

Nearly 2 months later, in October, Representative HARRISON did receive a reply. What occurred during the 2-month interval is a disgraceful example of how the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation take every opportunity to enhance their own political fortunes, with a total disregard for their sworn duty.

This is what happened after the Bureau received Representative HARRISON's letter:

It was turned over to Robert R. Rose, Jr., recently appointed Assistant Secretary of the Interior Department, who supposedly is to direct the departmental activities in mines and mining. The question: Representative HARRISON asked, and the information he desired, had nothing whatever to do with mines and mining.

But they had to do with a town in Wyoming. And Mr. Rose is from Casper, Wyo.

On September 18 of this year, another colleague of mine on the Interior Committee, Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, said on page A5659 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Here I think is a good place to mention Robert R. Rose, of Casper, Wyo. He recently was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Interior, supposedly to direct the mining activities of the Department. Rose is a good Democrat. He has political ambitions. Wyoming's lone Congressman, WILLIAM H. HARRISON, is a Republican. Oscar Chapman doesn't like Republicans, he doesn't like Republican Congressmen especially, and he knew that Rose could get a lot of good publicity as an Assistant Secretary, dealing with mining and metals in this time of emergency.

The point is obvious. Rose is being built up to oppose HARRISON in the election next year. Oscar Chapman is watching for every opportunity to help him. So is Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus, who operates the largest political propaganda machine in the Government.

When Representative HARRISON's letter regarding Mills, Wyo., was received by the Bureau it provided an opportunity, even if it was a small one, to help the Rose publicity campaign.

Mr. Rose was making a western trip, and when he got to Casper he looked into the Mills sewerage system. Meanwhile, Representative HARRISON was waiting for the information he needed in order to conduct the duties of his office.

While in Casper, Mr. Rose conferred with J. F. Mahoney, a friend and attorney, and when he returned to Washing-

ton he wrote Mr. Mahoney a letter. It is dated October 2, 1951, and it reveals the entire scheme to give Mr. Rose every opportunity to cash in on Wyoming affairs at the expense of Representative HARRISON.

Let me quote from Mr. Rose's letter to Mr. Mahoney:

I have had discussions with Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation, with regard to this matter and he assures me that, in the event there remains any further negotiation, the Government and the city of Mills will have such time as is necessary to consummate an agreement and that therefore the deadline previously set out for final determination of this matter will be extended for a reasonable length of time so that the matter will finally be determined according to the best interests of the Government and the people of Mills, Wyo.

Please call upon me if I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with this matter.

Mr. Rose is an Assistant Secretary for Mines and Mining. He has nothing to do with sewerage systems except as they apply to the direct operations of the entire Interior Department.

The arrogance of the Bureau of Reclamation is almost unbelievable. Under date of October 10, Representative HARRISON received a short and impertinent letter from the Bureau of Reclamation. It was signed by G. W. Lineweaver, Acting Commissioner.

All Mr. Lineweaver did was enclose a copy of Mr. Rose's letter to Mr. Mahoney.

It is a sad commentary on the integrity of the Interior Department when a Congressman cannot write a letter seeking legitimate information without risking his own standards of service to his constituents.

Many of us have long known how unscrupulous the Bureau of Reclamation is, and we have learned to be cautious in dealing with it. The case of Representative HARRISON's letter is, I believe, an excellent example of how the Bureau and the Interior Department have achieved a new low record in failing to serve the Government, the Congress, and the people.

It is not safe for a Congressman to write them, even in the line of duty.

Chiang Kai-shek's Return Awaited in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mao Tse-tung is by no means firmly in the saddle in China. There still exists an excellent possibility for overthrowing him and ridding communism from control in China. Chiang Kai-shek still has his army around which the people can rally in the overthrow of the Communist regime. I include herewith the sixth in a series of articles by Everett S. Allen, which appeared in

the New Bedford Standard-Times, on July 1, 1951:

NINETY PERCENT OF CHINESE INDIFFERENT TO POLITICS; MOST OF OTHERS WOULD WELCOME RETURN OF CHIANG

(By Everett S. Allen)

Fewer than 4,500,000 of China's 400,000,000 population are Communists. Ninety percent of the nation's people are indifferent to politics; of the remaining 10 percent, a majority would welcome Chiang Kai-shek back on the mainland as a rallying point for an overthrow of communism.

Supporters of Chiang, who maintain this point of view, feel the generalissimo has been much maligned and betrayed by the Western World. Always, the first major question which their critics pose is, Why did Chiang's American-equipped Nationalist Army go down in defeat before the Communists and withdraw to Formosa?

Withdrawal of American and British support—at a time when Chiang felt he most had a right to expect it—was a principal reason his forces withdrew from the mainland. That support, worth 100 divisions in the field, was eased from beneath the Nationalists as the West watched eagerly what it visualized as the new era of agrarian reform in China—the coming of a great renaissance for the people. When the West left Chiang, he lost face in the eyes of his country and found himself in a very awkward position.

THREE DRASTIC STEPS

The Nationalist Government had been assured, during World War II, of economic, political, and military aid, not only from the west, but from Russia. Therefore, counting on this assistance, Chiang had taken certain drastic steps, including

1. Acceptance of the Chinese Communists' offer to fight side by side against the Japanese. The Communists, then numbering no more than 100,000, had been completely routed by the Nationalists and confined to northwest China. Only World War II delayed the final mop-up.

2. Voluntary overextension of China's economy, at the certain risk of inflation at the war's end. This was done to permit an all-out national war effort.

3. Adoption by the Nationalist Army of American systems and equipment, at the suggestion of the United States.

The war's end found the Nationalists staggering down to the wire at V-J day, depleted and exhausted—a tired, drained government. Moreover, although a strong national unity had developed during the war, it decreased into apathy as victory came in sight.

Chinese Communists found themselves armed, trained, and equipped and their propaganda of promises for a better life fell on the eager ears of a confused and war-weary peasantry. While Nationalist strength depleted, the Communists grew stronger. And Russia turned over to them the arms of the Japanese Kwantung Imperial Army, excellent equipment, obtained from the surrender of Manchuria.

INFLATION MUSHROOMS

Inflation mushroomed, some of Chiang's best aides bungled their jobs at a time when even miracles would not have been sufficient. Russia not only refused to aid the Nationalists but poured assistance over the border into Manchuria to Chinese Communists.

The Nationalists requested Russians leave Chinese soil. Ultimately, they did, but when one of Chiang's best armies was sent to recapture Manchuria, it was annihilated by well-trained, well-equipped Communists in previously occupied and prepared positions.

When American and British support was withdrawn from the Nationalists, it also meant the United States no longer sent critical items, without which the Nationalist-adopted American military equipment was

hamstrung. Chiang was starved for tools with which to carry on a war.

General Marshall in 1946 attempted an impossible coalition of Nationalist and Communist governments. While Chiang, influenced by American economic restrictions, froze his army and maintained a cease-fire, the Communists to the north infiltrated strategic areas unopposed. When negotiations collapsed, as both Chiang and Mao knew they would, the Communists rolled forward in a massive assault.

The Nationalists still gave a good account of themselves, according to the best figures available, they accounted for 1,500,000 Communist casualties. The Government's retirement to Formosa was neither a rout nor a disintegration, as it often has been described for the pacification of Western diplomats who have wondered since if they might have been wrong.

SEES WRITING ON WALL

When the Communists crossed the Yangtze River, the last natural barrier at which the Nationalists might conceivably have made a major stand, three-fourths of Chiang's troops had been liquidated. It was obvious to Chiang that it might take months or years for the West to discover the true nature of the Communist regime; by that time, if he persisted in active fighting, there might be no Nationalist army left.

He felt it was better to withdraw the troops he had to a safe retreat and use them as the training corps for rebuilding a new army when the time came. His selection of Formosa, 100 miles off the coast was a sound choice. It not only would require a major military operation to take it, but economically, it is far better off than any other area in the Far East, having rice, sugar, camphor, and quinine for export, and being self-sufficient. Chiang decided it was wise to save what he had in men and equipment than to deplete them entirely, and this was inevitable if he kept fighting, since the Western supply had stopped.

It is doubtful if the Communists ever had more than one-fourth of the intelligentsia's support. Even in 1946, when the Nationalists were vilified by both east and west, three-fourths of the literate, thinking Chinese recognized the Nationalist principles of government as superior to those proposed by the Communists.

Since 1946, the Communists have been losing that 25-percent figure rapidly through disillusionment. It now is doubtful whether 5 percent of those persons capable of expressing an intelligent opinion (an estimated 5,000,000) would back communism.

SMALL MEMBERSHIP

There is, of course, a sharp differentiation between party members and those who favor communism. Actual membership figures indicate nothing because it is party policy to keep the membership small, closely knit and easily manageable. There have been two or three purges within the party, aimed at liquidating particularly those persons who joined from 1946 to 1948 and who, therefore, were suspected of being opportunists. Although indoctrination and brain reform are basic parts of the party program, its authorities do not encourage expansion of the membership.

Chiang's supporters say, "If Mao rates him as the Chinese Communists' No. 1 enemy, why should the West rate him any less?" Even with the purge and bandit suppression, it is estimated that at least 1,000,000 guerrilla and local militia troops on the mainland would join him to fight the Communists.

Chiang's photo appeared in the suggestion box of a Communist North China factory. An instruction film distributed by the Mao government offered a view of Chiang, at which the audience was supposed to hiss. Instead, they cheered, at the risk of their lives, and the scene was soon deleted from the film.

Although Communist terrorist activities certainly are cutting inroads into these groups which might conceivably rally around Chiang, the widespread purging and iron-glove tactics are having the opposite result as well. Three thousand labor conscripts, who had been working under Chinese Communist compulsion to complete the Ningming-Channankwan section of the Hunan-Kwangsi railway revolted June 2 and after killing approximately 50 Communist guards, joined the guerrillas active in the Enning area in southwestern Kwangsi, according to a Nanning report.

TIME FAVORS CHIANG, TOO

Time, particularly as long as the Korean war lasts, favors Chiang as well as Mao. The war means increasing demands for men and food upon the already overburdened citizenry. Time means more purging and persistent accent on the fact the Korean war is not popular with the Chinese, whether they be Communist or anti-Communist.

Chiang also feels the time has not yet come for offensive action by his Nationalists. Although his army is under wraps at the request of President Truman, the generalissimo has never surrendered any power of decision. He is free to alter the policy of inactivity whenever he chooses, but thus far has been content to abide by wishes of the United States and of the United Nations.

General opinion is that he is not ready for an attack on the mainland, because of insufficient supplies and transport, which are being built up. It is likely first phase of the effort, expanding from a major bridgehead, would aim at retaking South China, which is not nearly as well organized under the Communist regime as are the north and northwest areas.

Pro-Chiang circles think his mainland support would mushroom once his landing was established, and that, since he is conscious of vacillations in his own prestige, the scope of such support might surprise even the generalissimo.

The Fact That We Have Been Able To Go Forward With Our Military-Preparedness Program, With Aid to Our Allies, Fight a Devastating War, Produce the Necessary Supply of Civilian Goods, All at the Same Time, Is Ample Evidence, if Indeed, We Need It, That Our Free-Enterprise System and the Spirit of the American People Is Strong Enough To Withstand Any Crisis That Might Confront Us, Now or in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech which I made to the Automobile Dealers Association of Alabama, at Biloxi, Miss., on Monday, October 1, 1951. The speech follows.

Mr. President, Mr. Broadway, and friends of the Automobile Dealers Association of Alabama, I first want to acknowledge the compliment which you paid me when you asked me to address this convention meeting of your fine association.

It is always good to get away from Washington, and I particularly appreciate the opportunity to do so at this time, when I can again mingle with my fellow Alabamians and discuss with them some of the problems of the difficult period we are going through. Perhaps, as we discuss these problems we can develop ideas that will be helpful toward their solution.

You are good business men and women and good citizens, or you otherwise would not occupy the position you hold today, as the connecting links between the great aggregations of industrial know-how, engineering skill, and abilities that characterize present-day manufacturers of automobiles, and the public which depends upon you for advice, consultation, and direction about the proper selection and use of its automotive products.

As such good citizens, occupying a key position in the economic life of our free-enterprise system, you are entitled to know what the policies of your Government are, insofar as those policies have been formulated. As a matter of fact, if the policies of our Government are to be successfully carried out and finally accomplished, it will be because you, as integral pillars of our democratic way of life, understand those policies, express yourselves intelligently in their formulation, and then see that they are carried out.

None of us will ever forget the elation and thanksgiving that swept the width and breadth of this country in 1945, when we came to the close of the greatest war mankind had ever fought. American ingenuity, American manufacturing capacity and skill, American labor, the American farmer, the finest Armed Force that any nation has ever organized, all working as a team, brought that great war to a successful military conclusion, and America stood in a position of world leadership, towering above the crumbled edifices of falling empires and political systems, facing the future with few forebodings, but with an over-all feeling of confidence in her ability to discharge those new obligations which had been thrust upon her broad shoulders.

Now it is true enough that at that time the picture was not altogether one of sweetness and light. There were the distant thunders of a gathering cloud, but we confidently expected that it would move away as had similar clouds of the past.

The American people have in the main been an idealistic people. They have not encroached upon their neighbor's holdings in the family of nations. So, at the end of World War II, we went about trying to build a stable peace, thinking that we could at least depend upon our allies of World War II, the Russians, not to throw too much sand into the machinery of the United Nations. In this assumption we were grossly mistaken. The realization of this mistake dawned on us about 1948.

We adopted the fragmentary beginnings of a "get-tough policy" with Russia in early 1949 and from that date we saw her block or attempt to block every move that we considered worth while in building a peaceful world.

Finally, the specter of Godless communism provided the motivating force for the North Koreans to roll across the thirty-eighth parallel and begin what historians may yet describe as the opening military action of world war III. The people of this Nation reacted immediately to the threat and on June 27, 1950, our Government moved troops across the 90 miles of water that separates Korea from our Japanese base. At that time we all felt a thrill that our people were intent enough on preserving the peace of the world that they were willing to make the sacrifices which war entails in order to say to Russian communism, "Thou shalt not pass."

The South Koreans, aided by our armies, and by such units as were furnished by our partners of the United Nations, whipped the North Koreans and then the Communists

nudged the yellow hordes of Mao's puppets across the Yalu River and the war was greatly intensified.

By that time, we realized more than ever the dangers inherent in the world situation, and it became apparent that Russian strategy for the time being, at least, was to play the game of war in the Kremlin, as a game of chess, shifting her satellites into the fray and tying down American productive capacity, American energy, and American military manpower, without using the Russian armed forces themselves. Russia was saving her own, against the day when our strength would be primarily involved in a war with her stooges, at which time she could envelop Western Europe to pick up, almost without a struggle, the steel capacity, the coal, the billions of barrels of oil of Western Europe and the Near East, and finally the industrial know-how of 20,000,000 or so skilled workers, without a fight.

The American people did some calculating on their own about that time and decided that we would not become engaged in an all-out war with Russian satellites, but instead we would prepare and prepare against the day when it might become necessary to face the Russians themselves head-on.

There were characters, strong characters, men of noble impulse, in the unfolding acts of this drama, who urged that we immediately spread the war to China and take whatever consequences might follow. Other strong characters, no doubt of no less noble purpose, insisted that we should withdraw from the flame of the conflict on our flanks and concentrate upon the defenses of our own shores.

Out of the welter of this debate was born the policy which said to the world that the American people would protect their interests wherever located. America would discharge her responsibilities of world leadership. The sleeping giant was awake.

General Eisenhower was dispatched to Western Europe to build an army among her disheartened and discordant peoples. We began to furnish military equipment and aid of all kinds. New hope was kindled. Today Western Europe is flexing her muscles. Tomorrow her strength will be a part and parcel of the defensive power of Democratic peoples everywhere. Then the question arose of whether or not we would furnish aid in exchange for bases in the nations whose forms of government were not to our liking. The result was the policy evolved of furnishing aid to Yugoslavia, and to Spain, in exchange for commitments that will aid us in the defense of Western Europe, if we have to defend it, which God forbid.

Why do we regard Western Europe as being the great prize in this battle between communism and democracy? Simply because Western Europe's 70,000,000 tons of steel-making capacity added to the 40,000,000 tons of Soviet Russia would give communism the ability to produce as much steel as we in this Nation can now produce.

It hurts me a great deal to hear people say that our efforts in Korea have been a failure. They have not failed. There, at the remotest outpost of our system of defenses we have bought the time to prepare this country, industrially and militarily, for the greater responsibilities that may lie ahead. At the same time, our effort is making America strong so that we may speak to Russia in the only language that Russia understands, the growl of strength.

The impact of these and related things which come to our minds is tremendous on our civilian economy, but the fact that we have been able to go forward with our military preparedness program, with aid to our allies, and with our civilian supply of goods at the same time is an evidence, if indeed we need any, that our free-enterprise system and the spirit of our American people is strong enough to withstand any crisis, that might confront us now or in the future.

In the early days of the Korean war, many of our American people, remembering the shortages of World War II, became jittery and overbought their immediate needs, forcing prices up, out of all proportion to the situation of supply that prevailed and in the period from the beginning of the Korean war to February 1951, we had an across-the-board inflation of a staggering 10 percent. The ingenuity of the American people came into play. The industrial and agricultural plant of the Nation was expanded to produce not only the hardware, clothing, and food needed by our military machine, but to meet civilian requirements as well. The result was that inventories of goods on hand reached a peak greater than anyone thought possible, and the inflationary spiral was slowed almost to a stop.

But now, my friends, our industrial expansion for defense purposes has begun to eat into the supplies of many of our raw materials, and shortages are beginning to appear, particularly in steel, the result of which is a warning sign to us that for at least the next 2 or 3 years we are going to have to get along with less and less steel for civilian purposes. A large part of the steel that we would like to put into the new and beautiful models of the American automobile must be diverted to building guns and tanks, airplanes, atom bombs, new steel mills, new aluminum factories, new atomic energy plants, and for other related purposes.

And, my friends, the danger of inflation is not over. We cannot have, we must not have, runaway inflation. Inflation has already crippled the purchasing power of our dollar too much. The preservation of our free enterprise system and the liberties which it permits every individual must be preserved. In my judgment, future months will make it mandatory that our price, wage, and salary structure be more tightly controlled than at present.

In the year 1950, only 8 percent of our total national production went into our security program. In 1951 the program is taking about 15 percent of our production. Next year it will take about 20 percent.

A year ago military supplies were being furnished the Government at the rate \$500,000,000 per month. Today, those supplies are rolling in at the rate of \$1,500,000,000 each month, but we should keep in mind that orders for military supplies and equipment of all kinds are going out at the rate of \$4,000,000,000 per month, and as the gap between the \$1,500,000,000 of deliveries and the \$4,000,000,000 of orders, per month, is closed, inflationary pressures of every kind will grow more intense.

Some of the shortages that are giving us trouble right now, in addition to steel, are copper, nickel, sulfur and other miscellaneous minerals. Canada furnishes this country 80 percent of its newsprint, but sulfur is required to make newsprint. Now, Canada says, "Sell us more sulfur or get less newsprint." The situation is becoming such that some of the larger newspapers in the country are clearly beginning to talk about their plans for private rationing of advertising in their papers.

If we are to hold the dike against inflation, it seems to me that we must do these things:

1. We must practice the most rigid economies possible in the operation of governments at all levels—local, State, and Federal. This must be an economy in which our highest powers of discrimination and good judgment are used. We must insist that the military purchase as much of its requirements as it is able to do through competitive bidding, so as to hold costs down. Governmental reorganization at all levels, so as to effect the greatest possible economies should be a constant concern of those of us engaged in Government policy making. With a present national debt of \$260,000,000,000 there is no place for waste or extravagance.

2. As a people, sorely burdened with many pressing problems, and facing the uncertainties that day to day beset us, and realizing that one of our greatest sources of strength is the confidence which the common man has in his Government and his institutions, we must condemn graft, corruption and crime, whether organized or unorganized, wherever it may appear. In this temple of our mighty effort there is no place for the money changers, the influence peddlers, the black marketer, the "deep freeze" boys or the "mink coat" girls.

3. We must be mindful of the problems of smaller businesses, so as to keep them functioning, and contributing their part in our great effort, seeing at all times, insofar as it is possible to do so, that there is substantial justice done them in the matters of loans, priorities, allocations of scarce raw materials and procurement contracts and subcontracts. The recently enacted small-defense-plants legislation, of which I was privileged to be one of the sponsors in the House of Representatives is, I believe, a step in the right direction.

4. I would be less than fair to you if I did not say that in my opinion it is of the utmost importance that we balance our budget. When we failed in World War II to adopt a policy of pay-as-you-go we saddled ourselves with a \$250,000,000,000 debt. As far as I am concerned that is enough debt to pass on to our children and their children. It will require unremitting sacrifice on the part of all of us to pay as we go this time. Certainly, short of an all-out war, we should be willing to make that sacrifice. We are not doing it today.

5. Last, but not least, we must realize that a solidly informed public opinion is in itself, the equivalent of several divisions of trained troops. I have supreme confidence that given all the facts, the American people, in their combined wisdom, will reach a substantially correct conclusion. Unbiased, straight-from-the-shoulder information on the price-control program, for instance, will do more to beget cooperation and compliance, than will an army of enforcement agents, when the public is not informed. Lack of good information prepares the ground for the growth of seeds of dishonesty and doubt. I think that it is in this field that our Government shows a considerable weakness, whereas in this field, in any democracy, the government should be strongest. A democracy depends on an enlightened public opinion, undergirded by public schools and colleges of all types, which admit, without fear, favor, social standing, or the lack of it, this world's goods, or the lack of them, the free development of the individual as far as his abilities will carry him. When we weaken or destroy the sources of pure undistilled facts, we open the back door to communism, and the anarchy that follows.

And now, for the foreseeable future, barring the outbreak of an all-out war, I will call a few shots as I see them.

The present great need for iron ores will increase, with the result that we will call more and more heavily on available supplies from Labrador and South America. The most efficient utilization of these ores suggests that we build the St. Lawrence seaway at the earliest possible date, and that we lose no time in improving the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, so as to weld a closer connection between the steel center of Birmingham and the great port of Mobile.

The growing realization on the part of all our people of the possibility of the destruction of large segments of our industrial capacity makes it necessary, whether we like it or not, that industry disperse itself into areas where the danger of destruction is lessened. Alabama stands to benefit from this necessity, provided it is willing to spend the necessary time, energy, and money required to advertise to industry everywhere

the inherent locational advantages we possess.

We can expect business to continue to grow and expand for at least another year. Deflation is not now in sight.

During this period the pace of business will be dominated by defense spending. Hence, businessmen at all levels should carefully acquaint themselves with the projected defense spending timetable, and with the rules and regulations that pertain thereto.

Commercial building is daily being drastically cut and will gradually sink to a level of only about 25 percent of what it was last year, before it starts rising again.

The rubber-supply picture is much better, tires may even become cheaper. However, octane ratings in auto gasoline will probably suffer some cuts.

The newsprint industry in this country will grow.

Neither the wage scales or the productive capacity of America will ever revert to the pre-Korean war levels, but as for now, better put your order in early if you plan to buy a new car next year.

Thank you.

Function of the Freight Forwarder in the Transportation Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the function of the freight forwarder in the transportation pattern is one not understood too generally today. On October 4, an address on the subject which would be of interest to businessmen of the country was made before the Brooklyn Traffic Club, by Mr. Charles R. Seal, Director of the Bureau of Water Carriers and Freight Forwarders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Seal is recognized as an authority in the field of transportation, and I ask unanimous consent that his address before the Brooklyn Traffic Club be inserted in the Appendix of the Record so that it may be given the national prominence that it deserves.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The duties of the Bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission with which I happen to be associated relate not only to freight forwarders but to all of the classes of carriers in varying respects. In addition to the administrative activities at Washington, they include field compliance work to detect and prevent violations of the act, which I am happy to say in most instances are inadvertent.

This being the club's freight forwarder night, however, it seems appropriate that what I have to say should pertain to freight forwarding. But I am a little bothered by a comment that Will Rogers once made, to the effect that everybody is ignorant but about different things. I am sure the freight forwarder representatives here know much more about the business of freight forwarding than I know, and that the shippers know as well as or better than I why they use the services of freight forwarders. So it seems that my chief difficulty is to try to avoid if I can the impression that my

particular ignorance pertains to freight forwarding. But perhaps I can discuss briefly some general aspects of freight forwarding and of our administrative problems back in Washington that if not too interesting at least I hope will not be too boring.

Why do shippers use freight forwarder service when it means no saving to them as a rule in shipping costs?

The answer I believe is that the freight forwarder provides expeditious, safe, and supervised through service. That is, the shipper gets expedited and safe carload or truckload service at no cost over the less-carload or less-truckload services which do not have these virtues in the same degree. Freight forwarding is competitive with trucking but less so with the railroads, and so far as the railroads are concerned it converts nonprofit or low-profit LCL traffic into profitable carload traffic by increasing the per-car volume and reducing handling costs and claims for loss and damage.

The House and Senate conferees who reported the freight forwarder bill as it was passed in 1942 and became part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act stated that "forwarding operations should be encouraged as the most practicable available means toward securing an integration and coordination of the transportation facilities of the Nation insofar as the handling of less-carload or less-truckload freight is concerned." That freight forwarders have served a shipper need is indicated by the growth of their industry, to which I shall briefly refer later.

This need for a type of service adapted to small-lot shipments pressed itself upon shippers long before the advent of the freight forwarder. Service bearing similarities to that of the present-day forwarder had its beginning in this country even before the Civil War, through the organization by merchants of what were known as fast freight lines for the transportation of package freight in consolidated consignments.

The organization of these freight lines was the result of a lack of adequate arrangements by the railroads for the carriage of through interchange freight, and even some of the railroads regarded the freight lines as a necessary complement to the railroad service. Later the railroads organized their own fast-freight lines for the handling of merchandise freight, and somewhere toward the beginning of the present century the independent freight forwarder came into existence. Freight forwarders later were able tremendously to expand their operations by the development of motor transportation.

Today freight forwarders are one of the four major classes of transportation agencies which have been subjected to Federal regulation by the ICC. In 1937 there were about 20 recognized freight forwarders. In operation and their gross revenues amounted to less than 50 percent of the revenues of the railroads from their less-carload traffic. Now there are 98 regulated forwarders and their revenues in the calendar year 1950 were approximately 81 percent of the less-carload revenues of the railroads.

This indicates the public-interest aspect of freight forwarding, and it was the increasing effect of freight forwarding upon the public interest that led to enactment of the Federal regulatory statute in 1942. I am satisfied that this statute, though possibly imperfect in some of its provisions, has been of benefit not only to the shipping public but to the freight-forwarding industry itself.

And this leads me to some brief references to the provisions and requirements of the statute and the status of freight forwarders under it.

The statute contains a definition of freight-forwarder service, and no one may lawfully

engage in service that falls within that definition without first obtaining a permit from the Commission authorizing it to do so. The test for obtaining a permit is that the proposed service shall be consistent with the public interest and that the applicant is ready, able, and willing to perform it. This test is much less severe than that required to obtain a motor or water common-carrier certificate of public convenience and necessity, or even a contract carrier permit. And Congress seems to have intentionally made it so. It provided in the law for instance that—

"(d) The Commission shall not deny authority to engage in the whole or any part of the proposed service covered by any application made under this section solely on the ground that such service will be in competition with the service subject to this part performed by any other freight forwarder or freight forwarders."

The reason for this provision was explained on the floor of the House by one of the managers of the forwarder bill, who stated that it "is predicated upon the essential nature of forwarder service as a shipper service, so far as the actual carriers are concerned. Without such a provision, there might be a tendency to deny legitimate operations on the ground that the existing forwarder service was adequate. The committee was of the opinion that if the advantages of freight-forwarder service are as great as are claimed for it, then the greatest opportunity should be given to persons to go into the business and to make it available to the public to the greatest extent possible."

This provision relating to the granting of forwarder operating permits has brought some difficult questions to the Commission for decision, and some pretty positive disagreements by competing forwarders with the issuance of permits in some instances. Forwarders, like other carriers, are severely conscious of competition and just as vigorous to protect their business.

It has seemed to me sometimes that those advocating their views to the Commission were firmly of the belief that there could not possibly be but one side to the matter—their own. But we at the Commission, occupying a neutral and middle position, must try to see and weigh both sides or every side of a controversial question. And in our situation there must be two sides to every such question.

Sometimes there may be more than two sides to a question and an advocate may inadvertently establish and prove a point that he hadn't thought of or wanted to prove.

But the controversial nature of our work makes it intensely interesting, and we try to exercise the best judgment that we can on the merits of each matter as we see them, although we make mistakes as does everyone.

And now briefly as to the status of forwarders as carriers. As you know the forwarder, although it is a common carrier, functions as an intermediary between the owner of the goods and the underlying common carriers by rail, motor, or water whose facilities it must utilize. Because of this intermediary relationship a forwarder may not do everything that other carriers may do. For example, it may not act as a connecting carrier and interchange freight with other types of carriers or with other freight forwarders.

As I read and understand the law and the decisions of the Commission, once a freight forwarder receives a shipment in its service it must be the transportation agency thence to ultimate destination, and it must issue a bill of lading and be responsible for

the shipment to that destination. This means that a forwarder may not lawfully accept and transport a shipment unless its permit authorizes operations by it from the point of receipt to the destination of the shipment.

As I have said, the development of motor transportation contributed greatly to the expansion of freight-forwarder service. Forwarder traffic is handled in consolidated carloads or truckloads between terminal points known as on-line or concentration break-bulk points. Motor transportation enabled the forwarders to extend their service to distant so-called off-line points, which in general are the smaller cities and towns. Shipments to and from such points are handled by motor carriers in what is known as assembly service to the concentration points and distribution service from the break-bulk points. Thus, merchants in the smaller communities are provided with forwarder service that they otherwise would not have and without which they would be at a competitive disadvantage as compared with the larger centers.

The forwarders are able to utilize the services of motor carriers for this purpose by reason of a provision of the statute which permits forwarders and motor carriers to enter into contracts for compensation to the motor carrier at less than its published LTL rates, except for distances of 450 miles and greater. If the forwarders had to pay the published LTL rates for service from and to off-line points, it seems likely and to have been the view of Congress—that their ability to serve such points would be greatly restricted. The number of such contracts in force probably runs into the tens of thousands.

And finally a word about shippers' cooperatives. As I said earlier, these were the forerunner of the independent freight forwarder. In recent years there has been a revival and tremendous expansion of these associations, which are exempt from regulation when operated on a nonprofit basis. Many of them clearly are bona fide and nonprofit. Others have appeared not to be truly nonprofit, but where the Commission has attempted to apply regulation to such operations, it has been overturned by the courts. I wish to emphasize, however, that the Commission has no desire whatever to interfere with those cooperative operations which clearly fall within the intent of Congress that they shall be exempt.

Gold Trading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, only a few moments ago I discussed the question of gold and the price of gold, stating that it should be fixed at a higher figure. I placed in the *Record* an article from the pen of one of the most able reporters in America, if not the most able, Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr. I ask unanimous consent at this time to place in the *Record* another article written by Mr. Fulton Lewis on the same subject, which appeared in the *Washington Times-Herald* of Sunday, September 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

On one or two occasions I've touched the subject of gold trading, and for my pains Government experts cuffed me around in print.

I said there was a black market in gold in Europe and England, involving United States Government people. Denials got pretty shrill until Treasury Department and military intelligence agents blundered into a couple of gold black-market rings and were forced to lock up several smugglers and traders. I haven't heard a word from my critics since.

Actually, the real grab bag in gold profits is strictly legal, according to the way the Truman administration and British Socialists play it. In fact, the British use the Fort Knox, Ky., gold hoard like an accordion, and as you might guess they don't lose in the process. It's a simple poker game with gold chips and what looks like a stacked deck.

British colonial possessions gouge out a log of gold from the ground that is promptly turned over to the Socialist government. During, and for a short period after the end of World War II, the British sold us \$6,020,000 worth of this gold at \$35 an ounce, the pegged United States price. This gave the British a good profit plus a lot of American dollars for trading in European monetary circles. The dollar has done better than the pound sterling—and still does.

The minute the administration started pouring billions into Britain in the form of European recovery program money the British quit selling gold to the United States. They didn't need to any more: they were getting hand-out dollars instead. Besides, the price of gold in Europe and Russia went up from \$35 an ounce to \$57 and even \$75.

In fact, the gold-selling business got so good for the British that the Socialist government started buying back gold from the United States, naturally at \$35 an ounce. During ERP days it purchased a total of \$1,120,181,000 worth of gold from us.

Not satisfied with this killing in the gold trade, British buyers speeded up their purchases, hauling back to the island from Fort Knox an additional \$1,857,452,000 worth since the end of ERP this year.

At present the British are buying gold at the highest rate in history. It's running at about \$600,000,000 a quarter. And the British aren't buying it to stick back into the ground. They're selling it, not to us but wherever the Socialists can get a good price for \$35 an ounce United States gold. One of those places is the Soviet Union.

In addition to buying from the United States, the British have increased their own gold mining production in all colonial possessions. So their production of the last 5 years—at least equal to the \$6,000,000,000 worth sold to us during the war and immediately thereafter—has been sold somewhere else—not to the United States of America. Even with United States gold purchases British gold reserves are now less than \$3,000,000,000, which means that the Socialist government has dumped almost \$8,000,000,000 worth of gold into European and Soviet exchange markets in the last 2 or 3 years.

All of this might seem like a painless way to keep the British Government afloat, since few of us ever have to dig down in our pockets and hand over a gold sovereign to our British cousins in person. But this gold chip poker game has a rigged hand.

With the profit from gold bought at \$35 an ounce and sold at a minimum of \$57 an ounce the British can buy more United

States gold or reach into European trade markets for raw materials and manufactured goods. It wouldn't be so bad if she did all of her buying in countries that are riding on our backs economically. But instead, the British carry on a brisk trade with iron-curtain countries with bargain-basement gold from Fort Knox. All this helps explain why the British announced they could get along a spell without any more ERP cash from the United States of America. They had found a new till to tap.

Action of Republic of Panama in Denying Charters to Certain Merchant Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post of yesterday discusses the recent action of the Republic of Panama in denying charters to merchant vessels under its registry which have been carrying strategic merchandise to the Communists, particularly in Korea and China.

This is a matter in which the disclosures of the Senate Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies found unusually favorable response and I am happy to pay tribute to the Panama authorities who have thus set an example to many other of the nations opposed to communism in taking steps toward denying to the Communist countries the supplies without which their aggression cannot be pressed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANAMA'S BLOW TO THE REDS

Panama's action in cracking down on merchant vessels which have been carrying the Panamanian flag into Communist harbors was long overdue. The use of Panama's colors by non-Panamanian concerns seeking to get around trade restrictions elsewhere was a subterfuge that reflected on Panama itself. The trick had threatened hemispheric solidarity at a time when unanimity of western action against the Chinese and North Korean aggressors was essential.

The O'Connor subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee found that two-thirds of the ships which called at Communist ports in the Far East since the first of this year were under Panamanian registry. Yet it was regarded as virtually certain that none of these ships actually was owned by Panamanians. Inquiry showed that while these vessels were registered under names indicating Panamanian control, ownership in many cases actually could be traced to European or Asiatic countries. Senator O'Connor said that while no direct link with United States firms had been found, it was rumored that some of the anonymous organizers of cover-up firms were American citizens or were aliens residing in the United States.

It was obvious, of course, that Panama did not have the merchant marine or the resources to engage in the Far East trade to the extent indicated by the number of vessels under its flag. Panama has had an abnormally large merchant fleet for years, because of inducements offered to world shipping. There are few governmental controls in normal times and taxes are far cheaper than in most countries. As a result, the little Central American country has risen to tenth place among maritime nations in size of merchant fleet registered in its name. The set-up was a handy one for firms desiring to do business with the Reds under assumed identities.

When Panama's action was called to the Senate committee's findings, officials there promised to act. They have carried out their pledge faithfully. The government has issued an order prohibiting ships of Panamanian registry not only from entering waters controlled by the Communists but from anchoring in nearby waters, either. Shipment of war material to any port or area where they are likely to find their way to the Chinese Reds or North Koreans also is forbidden. That this is not just a paper crackdown is evident from the fact that punitive action already has been taken against more than a score of ships and more actions are pending in several cases under investigation. All of this is reassuring to the United States and to the United Nations, for it means the plugging of a serious loophole in the barrier against aid from western sources to our enemies in Korea. Panama has dealt the Red aggressors a blow that really hurts.

Stop Water Where It Falls—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Elmer T. Peterson:

STOP WATER WHERE IT FALLS

(By Elmer T. Peterson)

There may be some folks who think that it isn't necessary to worry about floods if you don't live on the banks of a large river.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that from 80 to 85 percent of all agricultural flood damage is done on the tributary watersheds, away from large rivers—above the places on those rivers where it may be planned to have big reservoirs.

This is the finding of engineers of the United States Department of Agriculture, which nobody disputes.

First let's consider a few simple matters. Floods consist of water in motion. Flood prevention (or control) means preventing water from getting into motion.

Water in motion is more spectacular when it comes at the rate of 100,000 cubic feet a second, makes a lot of sound and fury, and washes away houses and barns and pigs and cattle. But much more damage is done, by small rivulets and gullies where the damage attracts no attention on the part of the public. It is done up on the watershed, around Hennessy, McAlester, Konawa, Shattuck, Stilwell, Duncan, at the forks of the creek, and in the draws, and on the slopes.

It is done, not only by destroying crops and livestock, but by washing away our most valuable property—the soil. And that can't be replaced. Every time you see a muddy stream, big or small, you know that this soil is getting away.

It is natural to try to do something spectacular, so it will make a big impression on the minds of people who are too busy to stop and think this problem through. So some would have the people believe that the 15 percent damage is worse than the 85 percent damage.

Floods are unnecessary. They are not an uncontrollable "act of God," like earthquakes or tornadoes. Floods are caused mainly by man's folly. Nature had her own flood controls before mankind messed things up.

Recent experiments by the United States Soil Conservation Service show that where there is a good growth of natural grass, 3.3 inches of water soaked into the soil in 1 hour. Where the grass was removed, leaving only the sod, as in the case of burning, only 0.65 inches soaked into the ground in 1 hour. In other words, the difference between grass and no grass is 2.65 inches in 1 hour. As you know, that much rain in 1 hour is a cloudburst, and it produces a bad flood.

When land is cultivated, here is what took place. A cultivated field with 2½ tons of straw per acre soaked in 3.5 inches of rain in 1 hour. The same kind of field without cover, soaked in only 0.49 inches of rain in 1 hour. The difference was 3 inches, which, again, is enough to produce a bad flood.

Sometimes you hear men question the soil conservation method of preventing floods, saying that there always have been destructive floods, washing away the soil, and always will be. However a little reflection shows that they are mostly wrong, except for localities like Arizona and southern Utah, where there are extremes of wet and dry, but mostly dry. Here the vegetation is sparse and the occasional flash floods have caused the greatest example of erosion on earth—the Grand Canyon.

In the regions of reasonably good rainfall, nature, when left to itself, automatically prevents this by building up a vast sponge of vegetation on the earth's surface, so experts tell us that nature normally builds soil at the rate of one inch in 500 years or such a matter, by producing an accumulation of organic matter. If there had been a constant process of flood and erosion in humid regions for the past 50,000,000 years, as some folks say, there would now be no fertile soil, for everything would have been washed down to bedrock. Taking the world as a whole, then, floods and erosion are abnormal, not normal. You can figure that out for yourself.

Now, as a matter of fact, man has not only caused destruction by laying the topsoil open to erosion and floods; on the other hand he has proved that by being intelligent and far-sighted, he can actually improve on nature's way.

In my opinion the most important job of flood-control work in the United States and probably in the whole world, is under way on the Washita Valley, in Oklahoma. After nearly 3 years of work, handicapped by small appropriations, enough actual results have been produced to prove beyond question that the Washita Valley method of flood control, through conservation treatment, is far more efficient, and better in every way, than the other methods.

Facts and statistics may sound dry and uninteresting, but when they carry such important implications, we can't afford to ignore them.

In July 1948, the Cloud Creek sector of the Washita Valley program, involving 5,000 acres of creek watershed, was finished and dedi-

cated in the presence of about 10,000 people, including the Governor, Senators, and Congressmen. The following May it received its baptism, consisting of a 4.6-inch cloudburst falling within a few hours. Other creeks in that area got the same kind of a deluge and they overflowed, sending destructive floods into the Washita, where the flood was very bad, doing great damage in the Anadarko area.

The surface treatment on the Cloud Creek watershed had done its work so well, however, that it absorbed the cloudburst like a sponge. The small detention reservoirs—glorified farm ponds—had very little to do, containing only a small amount of water after the downpour. Not one bucket of water flowed out of the treated part of the creek.

The most amazing exhibit of the superiority of the agricultural flood-control method, however, was furnished last May by the treated part of the West Owl Creek watershed, south of Purcell. It was hit by one of the heaviest cloudbursts ever seen in the Middle West.

The United States Weather Bureau has no station in that immediate area, but the official reading at Purcell was 15.5 inches. I was told by responsible Government authority, immediately after the storm, that this was likewise the estimate for West Owl Creek, some distance south. However, other Government men estimated 13 to 13.5 inches for the 36-hour period, so let's accept the smallest estimate, 13 inches. I was given official figures as to absorption and impoundment of water immediately after the storm. Then I was given revised figures, which show impoundment capacity, by reservoirs, of 5.22 inches of run-off. Louis P. Merrill, regional director of the United States Soil Conservation Service at Fort Worth, says in a letter to me, that "if the rainfall on the watershed of structure 4 amounted to 13.5 inches, the soil absorbed 3.03 inches." He also said that during the peak of the storm there was 3.47 inches discharge from the drop inlet and 1.78 inches of run-off through the spillway. However, the most significant fact, as reported by State Conservator Harry Chambers, when I traveled with him over the area immediately after the storm, was that West Owl Creek did not overflow its banks until it had flowed 1 mile below the last structure, and by that time it had received an increasingly large volume of run-off from its watershed. By the time the stream reached Paoli, in that terrific downpour, it had increased to a bad flood stage. This has caused some confusion among those who overlook the main part of this operation, which is that even in a 100-year cloudburst—one that happens only once in a century by the law of averages—the conservation methods kept the water within the creek banks. It is obvious that if this were done all over the Washita watershed, there would be no floods on the river, even if the extremely heavy downpour should occur over the entire watershed—something that has never been known to occur. (Such cloudbursts are always local in character, seldom spreading over a radius of more than 25 or 30 miles.)

Now, here's the pay-off. There are other official calculations showing that if the entire watershed above Denison Dam had permitted only 1.31 inches of run-off into Lake Texoma, the flood pool would have filled up and water would have started to run over the dam, so its flood-control function would have failed for any run-off in excess of 1.31 inches. The little dams alone took care of 4 to 5 inches of run-off, which they call a 25-year flood. Denison Dam couldn't begin to handle it, if extended over the entire watershed.

When the cloudburst hit the West Owl Creek area there was another spot of heavy downpour—on the watershed above Grand Lake and Fort Gibson, in eastern Oklahoma. The difference in that the rainfall in the same 36-hour period on the Fort Gibson watershed was 9.79 inches or about three-fourths of what fell on Owl Creek.

The Fort Gibson Dam lies about 50 miles downstream from the huge Grand River Dam.

The Army engineers were quoted on May 12 as saying that the river overflowed the Grand River Dam and also the Fort Gibson Dam at the rate of 140,000 cubic feet a second, and this current went on into the Arkansas River and contributed materially to a very destructive flood in the bottoms, as shown in pictures. This is nothing new. The same thing happened in 1943 when Grand River contributed half of the Arkansas River flood water which drowned 19 persons and did \$127,000,000 worth of damage. The water just flowed over the dam and did the same damage as though it were not there.

Now let us look at Denison.

Its cost, including power installation, purchase of inundated land, relocation, auxiliary structures, was \$61,595,000. It contains 18,290,000 cubic yards, including concrete and steel, making the total cost \$3.30 per cubic yard. The flood pool is 2,690,000 acre-feet. The total watershed area is 38,291 square miles. Using these factors we find that a net runoff of 1.31 inches would fill up the flood pool from lowest level and start running over the dam with the same volume as though the dam were not there. So the people along the Red River banks, in Arkansas and Louisiana, for whose benefit the flood control function of this dam was set up, would be in the same shape as were the people along the Arkansas River in 1943.

Taking the Mill Creek watershed of the Washita Valley agricultural flood-control project as typical, we find the average cost of building the small dam is 27 cents per cubic yard—less than one-tenth the proportionate cost of the Denison Dam. Whether it would take more or less total yardage for the entire job has not yet been calculated, but probably about the same, for Dr. N. E. Winters, eminent soil conservationist, when he was in Oklahoma, repeatedly said that he would take half of the cost of the Denison Dam and do such a complete job of conservation and small-dam building that he would stop all floods on the Red and Washita Rivers. Remember that this includes surface treatment as well as dam building.

Summing up at this point, we see that the small detention dams of the agricultural flood-control project can be built proportionately for less than one-tenth the cost of the big dam, volume for volume, and that they will impound three or four times as much runoff water, in proportion to area.

I am not trying to tell you what to think, but there are the figures, and you can draw your own conclusions.

The only contrary argument on this point runs something like this: "Oh, well, that may be all right for a creek watershed, but thus far you have no engineering proof that it will work on a big river watershed."

The answer is this. According to arithmetic we know that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts. If flood conditions are prevented on all the tributaries of a river, where would the water come from to produce a flood in the river? And now, don't we have the engineering data to prove that the little dams are far more efficient than the big ones? That is saying nothing of all the other features of the agricultural flood-control method.

There are at least seven additional features, each one very important, which make

the agricultural flood-control method superior.

1. Watershed insoak. The agricultural program uses terraces, regrassing, strip cropping, reforestation, chisel plows, and other types of land use that produce a vast sponge, to stop and soak in water where it falls, exactly as Mother Nature did before the plow came—sometimes better. This sponge action worked so beautifully in the West Owl Creek watershed last May that this part of the treatment took up about as much as was impounded from runoff by the little dams. And, as I have said before, these little dams took care of three or four times as much runoff proportionately as could be impounded by Denison Dam. The soil along West Owl Creek looks like the average—some sandy and some tight, so I see no reason why other watersheds shouldn't do as well. Just to show what a remarkable change can be made by use of conservation practices, the Red Plains Demonstration Farm near Guthrie had several sloping plots, all of the same type of soil. Once when about 2 inches of rain fell in 1 hour, a bare plot shed 98 percent of its water, while the same kind of plot with sweet clover shed only 2 percent. This explains why plowed or bare ground promotes floods, while good farming stops floods.

A. D. Bull of Woodward, a soil conservation official, has recently invented a device called an infiltrometer which accurately measures the amount of water that soaks into the ground under various conditions. He finds that the "plow pan" or "plow sole" that exists about 4 inches under the surface when a moldboard plow is used, keeps moisture from soaking into the ground, so he has investigated various ways of overcoming this state of affairs. With ordinary tillage, in one field, he found that the soil absorbed water at the rate of only three-tenths inch per hour. When a chisel plow was used, breaking the plow sole to a depth of 8 inches, it soaked up 250 percent more, or seventy-five hundredths inch per hour. When sweet clover was planted, it not only broke up the plow sole but penetrated several feet in the ground, so that the insoak was 8.2 inches in 1 hour, or 1,066 percent more. As I mentioned in the beginning of this talk, such a rapid rate of insoak would take care of a cloudburst, or 3 inches per hour—enough to produce a bad flood when the runoff takes place on ordinary plowed land. In another experiment he found that breaking the plow sole produced the tremendous insoak of 9 inches per hour.

So you can see from these random examples that the science of causing water to soak directly into the soil is in its infancy, and we are learning some amazing facts. I could cite many more if I had time.

Stop Water Where It Falls—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Elmer T. Peterson:

This insoak, for one thing, brings great increase in crops, for water is stored away in wet periods and is drawn upon in dry periods.

A. W. Erickson, who has spent his life studying the growing habits of wheat, bases his crop predictions on borings. It is the subsoil water—4, 6, or even 7 feet down that makes a good crop.

2. Restoration of high water table. Lester Velle, in Collier's and Reader's Digest 2 years ago, gave a frightening picture of how the national water table is falling so that in the average area it is 100 feet lower than when nature had her own way. This is extremely serious, not only to farmers but to big and little cities. Wells and springs have played out. Restoration of the ground water is the next big step in the general conservation movement. There must be a widespread insoak all over the watershed, which is the only thing that produces a high-water table. Nature's own primitive way was to retard water, first using it to nourish vegetable and tree life, then causing it to seep down through porous material until it found seams and veins which produced underground water and springs that gushed out of the slopes. These springs fed creeks and rivers, which had been kept clean of sediment by nature's own vast filter beds. Any old-timer will tell you that 50 years ago the two Canadian rivers and other prairie streams were clear, comparatively narrow and deep, and carried water all year, so the fishing was good. Now these same rivers are shallow and clogged with silt. They are either dry sand flats or torrents of muddy water.

3. Irrigation by clear water. The insoak and raising of the water table, produced by proper watershed treatment, makes irrigation feasible. Three years ago I attended the National Reclamation Association conference at Phoenix, and, with Senator Bob KERR I visited the biggest irrigated farm in the area—3,000 acres, owned by John Jacobs. The foreman, a highly intelligent and well-informed man, told us they were digging big wells, costing \$20,000 apiece, to a depth of 700 feet, to get clear water, and were glad to stand the extra expense of pumping it that high, because this furnished silt-free water, whereas the ordinary ditch water from the big reservoirs was muddy, and filled up the ditches with silt. The first empire in recorded history, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, was made possible by irrigation. That was Babylonia, in the region of the Garden of Eden, along the Tigris and Euphrates, which flow roughly parallel, somewhat like the two forks of the Canadian. This same encyclopedia says that the empire perished because the irrigation canals and ditches filled up with silt. Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk, of the United States Soil Conservation Service, found at least 90 of these silt-filled canals. In this connection I would like to say, in regard to the Washita project, that farmers who have the detention ponds are free to use the water for irrigation, and where proper conservation methods are used, the soil doesn't wash down into them, so the pond water is clear.

4. Prevention of Siltation. When water stops flowing, it drops its silt. The Washita Valley program stops siltation while the downstream reservoir produces siltation, not only in the reservoir but far above, in the tributary river channels. During the first few years the fishing may be good, as in Lake Texoma. But the siltation from the Washita River is proceeding so fast that the Federal fish hatchery expert at Tishomingo says that fishing is doomed. The first place the fish desert is where a stream flows into the reservoir. The citizens of Tishomingo and Madill thought they would have great prosperity as resort towns, but now, after just a few years of siltation, the people are so alarmed that they held mass meetings last summer to see what could be done. And

they found nothing could be done. Bob Armstrong, civic leader at Tishomingo, told me that the river channel there, in 4 years, had filled up 20 feet, and the delta had spread out into the lake over several hundred acres. Places that were 12 feet deep out there are only 4 feet deep now. Fishing is no good at Tishomingo because silt chokes out the vegetable life upon which all aquatic life ultimately depends, and it ruins the spawning beds, found mostly in the mouths of inflowing streams. J. N. Darling, former chief of the United States Biological Survey, emphatically opposes all big dams in the prairie States, for this and other reasons. Incidentally, I was talking with a man from Washington State on the train the other day and he said that the big dams on the Columbia River are ruining the vast salmon industry because of siltation and the interruption of their spawning habits.

Lake siltation is bad, and will fill up most of these reservoirs in a generation or two, but river siltation in the long run is far worse. According to the Army engineers' own blueprints, the backwater effects of the big dams extend 100 river miles up the Washita, and on the South Canadian to the town of Calvin. That means sedimentation of channel, spreading of floodwaters over wider and wider zones of the valley and ruination of thousands of acres of our best and most fertile bottomlands which now produce as many as five crops of alfalfa per year. I talked with leading citizens of Pauls Valley last May. They are 140 river miles upstream from Denison Dam, but they already see great increase in siltation of bottomlands, and in May that city had its worst flood in history, doing more than \$5,000,000 worth of damage, with loss of 2 lives. Right near there I saw fields that used to produce big alfalfa crops which had been choked out by sand, and now have nothing but Johnson grass, other weeds, and general mess.

Dr. Harold Munger, of Kansas State Agricultural College, has made a special study of stream siltation covering many years, and he says that in the average prairie river silt is dropped and deposited even if the slope is as much as 1 foot in 100. On the Washita, between Denison Dam and Pauls Valley, the slope is only half an inch in a hundred feet. As you know, the slower a stream, the faster it deposits its silt content, and when the stream is stopped altogether by a dam, it drops all of its load. There are many variables in siltation, such as character of the soil, width and depth of stream, location of storm center, amount of debris in the channel, etc. The slope itself becomes a variable because it constantly decreases upstream as the sediment is deposited at or near the mouth.

Dr. Munger goes further and makes this extremely significant statement: "When a dam is built, the new channel bottom tends to be parallel to the old one, and higher than the old one to the extent of the height of the dam."

If this is true, there will be no upstream limit to the backwater effect of siltation, assuming that the present gradient is fairly uniform from the dam to the uppermost tributary.

I realize that this sounds a bit technical, so I will state the case in another way: It took millions of years for the prairie streams to establish and stabilize their bottoms, by a process of scour and fill. The gradient or slope is based on average conditions as to the type of land. So when a new channel bottom is established by the filling up of the old one, due to the dam, the new bottom follows the same hydraulic laws as the old; therefore, it reproduces the old gradient

above the old one, to the extent of the height of the dam.

What does this mean in realistic, practical terms? It means that if Dr. Munger's findings are correct, every major stream valley in Oklahoma, whose gradient is less than 1 foot per hundred, that has a downstream dam, will be ruined, and the effects will be felt away up on the small tributaries. By this I mean that the flood plains will be increasingly clogged with silt, and the water will be spread out more and more, depositing silt in a wider and wider zone, and indefinitely upstream, up the watershed. So the big dams actually increase floods instead of controlling them.

You don't have to take my word for siltation of lakes. In a public speech at Stigler, more than a year ago, Col. Edward G. Daly, head of the Army engineers in Oklahoma, said that the proposed Eufaula Dam, which is expected to cost \$130,000,000, is "definitely intended as a silt trap," and its effective life will be over in 50 years.

5 Saving of rich bottomlands According to A & M economists, we now have only three acres per person of fertile land in the United States. If we had only two acres we would have to quit using meat and live on cereals, as most Asiatics do, because it takes seven pounds of high protein grain to make one pound of meat, poultry, eggs, milk, etc. We are losing our best land at the rate of 500,000 acres a year because of erosion. We can't afford to lose any more. Yet the permanent flooding by means of downstream reservoirs is rapidly taking our best land out of cultivation by millions of acres.

One of the proposed dams is Keystone, near Tulsa. Research revealed that 40 percent of all the livestock coming into the Tulsa stockyards is produced in the area that is to be permanently flooded. Other farm and industrial items are in proportion. Since each three acres of good land has the potential of supporting one person it means that the building of the proposed Eufaula Dam, to cover about 100,000 acres, will notify 30,000 people that they are no longer wanted in Oklahoma. This may not be directly evident, but in the long run that is exactly what it means.

6 Flood control is mainly needed upstream. I have already mentioned the fact that according to the engineers of the United States Department of Agriculture, 80 to 85 percent of all agricultural flood damage occurs above the big dam sites. Let's be practical and realistic about this. One instance out of hundreds or even thousands will illustrate. The Colvert Bros. ranch in the Mill Creek valley, southeast of Sulphur, lost 1,000 bales of alfalfa by flood in 1949. In 1950 the valley was hit by the May downpour and the Colvert ranch reported 6 inches of rain, but no damage to that alfalfa field. Then, of course we must remember the shed when it is not properly treated. Remember also that the damage at the Colvert ranch occurred on the watershed of Lake Texoma, and that \$61,000,000 dam didn't save a single bale of alfalfa.

7. Saving the soil. This phase alone is worth far more than any possible protection given below the big dams. The soil is saved when we protect the watershed by investing in regrassing, strip cropping, contour furrowing, terracing, and the building of small, inexpensive ponds.

In conclusion, I wish to say that every material statement I have made is supported by competent engineering authority and by Government statistical records.

The greatest job of all is to save our soil. When we save the soil we also save water, for saving the soil means slowing water down to a walk. It means soaking the water into the ground instead letting it flow over

the surface. Already one-third of our topsoil has been washed into the ocean. We can't afford to lose any more. To save the soil we have to stop the water where it falls.

There is some tendency to say, "Well, why can't we have both watershed control and big dams?" As I see it, there are two main answers: 1. The facts and figures show that the watershed program beats the big dams at their own game by impounding and absorbing far more runoff than the big dams can possibly accommodate. 2. Defense of the big dams means accepting their bad features—inundation of hundreds of thousands of acres of our best lands, siltation of tributary rivers with consequently worse and worse floods; vast expense to the taxpayer; failure to do the extremely vital tasks that I have mentioned as essential to a sound water and soil conservation policy. Perhaps you think I am over-enthusiastic in taking this point of view, but I am only calling the plays as I see them—you be the judge of appeals.

Floods are unnecessary. They can be stopped. They have been stopped wherever the right methods have been used on the watersheds.

The place to stop floods is right here in your own back yards in the fields next to this town, on the uplands. When you stop such floods, you help people down on the lower parts of the big river, but you help yourselves far more.

Shortage of Nurses in Tuberculosis Hospitals and Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, made a statement last week concerning the acute shortage of nurses in the tuberculosis hospitals and services of the country. The situation as described by Dr. Scheele is a very critical one. This statement, in my opinion, dramatizes the vital need for more health personnel in all the health fields and demonstrates why S. 337, the bill the Senate recommittees recently to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee should have been passed and must be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release from the Federal Security Agency containing the statement by Dr. Scheele be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many tuberculosis patients are receiving inadequate hospital care because of a serious shortage of nurses in the Nation's tuberculosis hospitals and services, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, said today.

"The situation is extremely acute," he said. "There are approximately 320,000 civilian nurses employed in all types of services today, but there is room for 65,000 more."

The problem in tuberculosis hospitals is due in part to the Nation-wide shortage of nurses, which has resulted in stiff competition for their services, but it is due also to unfavorable working conditions in many tuberculosis hospitals, Dr. Scheele said.

In many cases, he said, inadequate patient care can be traced to inferior hospital facilities, unsatisfactory personnel policies, and insufficient personnel and patient education.

Dr. Scheele pointed out that there is only one professional nurse for each 10.6 tuberculosis patients, whereas in general hospitals there is 1 professional nurse for each 2.5 patients.

"Now that treatment for the disease includes not only rest, but extensive chemotherapy and surgery, almost as many nurses are needed in tuberculosis as in general hospitals," he said.

Dr. Scheele called attention today to the appearance of new information relating to patient care and nursing deficits in a number of the Nation's tuberculosis hospitals. The causes underlying the current situation are discussed in an article in the October 5 issue of Public Health Reports, which is being distributed this week.

The article, Nursing in Tuberculosis Hospitals, is based on a survey of more than 45 tuberculosis hospitals in 12 States and the District of Columbia. The survey was made at the request of the State health department or hospitals concerned. It was conducted by Martha B. Naylor, nurse officer in the Division of Chronic Disease and Tuberculosis, Public Health Service.

In one hospital studied, there was a 65-percent deficit in nursing care for each 24-hour day. In 1 region surveyed, only 2 of 10 hospitals provided as many or more hours of nursing care as the recommended minimum.

Mrs. Naylor observes that patient care and nursing staffs in the hospitals surveyed suffer from many of the following conditions:

1. The inconvenient, rambling manner in which so many sanatoria are constructed;
2. Nonexistent and frequently antiquated hand-washing facilities;
3. Inconsistent isolation techniques for safeguarding against the spread of the tubercle bacilli, which are among the most difficult of organisms to destroy;
4. Lack of personnel- and patient-education programs on communicable-disease precautions;
5. Lack of individual patient care;
5. Low pay, long hours, short or broken vacations;
7. Absence of pre-employment physical examinations and tuberculin tests for nurses;
8. Inferior living quarters;
9. Lack of educational opportunities in tuberculosis nursing.

The need for nurses today is greater than in any previous year, Mrs. Naylor reports, primarily because of such developments as scientific progress in health fields; recognition of the need for better patient care; expansion of public-health services; greater use of nurses in industry, spread of medical prepayment plans; population growths and increasing numbers of older people, and an all-time high standard of living.

Mrs. Naylor concludes her report with six recommendations to help tuberculosis hospital administrators plan to meet nursing needs. They are:

1. Increase nursing services to provide patients with proper care;
2. Improve the safety, efficiency, and attractiveness of physical facilities for the care of tuberculous patients;
3. Provide nurses with a safe working environment by teaching them communicable disease precautions;

4. Improve personnel policies until they compare more favorably with those in general hospitals;

5. Provide sound educational opportunities in tuberculosis nursing, and

6. Devote more attention to the over-all care of the patient through cooperative planning on a community-wide basis.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a constituent dealing with the Korean war.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANDPOINT, IDAHO, October 10, 1951.

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: I and many of the people to whom I talk are perturbed by announcement about a week ago that American casualties were more than a thousand in a week—bringing near the 100,000 mark our losses in more than a year of Korean fighting. This morning's news was that the Reds suffered losses of about 80,000 for the August 25–October 5 period, which seems to be perfectly satisfactory with Generals Ridgway and Van Fleet. However, the same dispatch said that although our losses were unannounced, they would probably be 10,000 to 15,000 because Red losses in the past "usually worked out about five to eight times as many as the Allies."

This was a particular shock, because the Pentagon at various times led us to believe we were doing quite well by maintaining a 20-to-1 casualty ratio. I personally never talked to anyone who thought even a 20-to-1 ratio was verging on victory in fighting orientals; the 8-to-1 ratio is sickening because these same people can't figure out why our Government is so uncertain as to why it is in Korea now or what its goal is.

For whatever it may be worth, I'd like to tell you, sir, that the undeclared war and more especially its conduct are a No. 1 topic of conversation. My work now takes me to three other cities and puts me in contact with businessmen, laborers, and people in all walks of life. It is amazing to find that on this war issue their thinking is in the same channels—and unless the people of western Montana, northern Idaho, and eastern Washington are a breed apart from the rest of the Nation—then the horde of commentators and columnists who live in Washington's rarefied air better take to the road and find out what is going on in the country.

With but one single exception—a woman who feels the administration is responsible for her husband having a good job at the moment—I have not talked to a single soul who has real confidence in the way the Korean war is now being conducted. They—and I—don't understand the devious ways of our so-called diplomacy. They are entirely in favor of peace talks looking to a possible armistice, but not at the expense of a Commie build-up to sacrifice more Ameri-

can lives. They are unable to understand why, as soon as General MacArthur was fired, the trend has been to do the very things he advocated—but at so gradual a rate that the connection wouldn't be too noticeable.

Nearly everyone I talk to expresses the view that the administration is deliberately prolonging the war for political advantage. Horrible as this thought is, it ought to occur to some of the Washington brass that the people generally are the ones who are making the sacrifices of sons and brothers—and they are not concerned whether either of our political parties profits from the general conduct of the war.

We may have differences of opinion on deep freezes, mink coats, telephone calls to the RFC, and some of the other facets of current political life, but I sincerely believe that the average citizen now regards this Korean war as something that needs settlement, regardless of how either Democrats or Republicans might be affected. And that settlement, unless it should be the unlikely one of an armistice that means something, should call for the all-out effort of the United States with but one thing—victory—in view.

If Mr. Gordon Dean knew what he was talking about the other day when he said that this Nation has weapons with which it could win a war, then why aren't we using them? The newspapers and the radio no longer maintain any administration or State Department fictions about who we are fighting. It's a war and it's against the "Chinese Reds." North Koreans haven't been mentioned in so long that only the long-memory would know who they are.

I would like to repeat that, with one exception, every single person I have talked with in recent months thinks the United States should get into that war to win it, using every available means at our command, including atomic weapons. It must be sorry solace to parents who have just received word that a son was wounded or killed or missing in combat to pick up a paper and read that we've got the weapons to win the war but that we're not using them.

This letter, Senator, undoubtedly has an undertone of bitterness. I served in the Pacific in World War II. I now have a son who is in combat in Korea and another will become 19 and eligible for service this month. So that there can be no question of a "sour grapes" attitude, let me say that I voluntarily enlisted in the last war at an age when I could easily have stayed at home. My boy in Korea enlisted voluntarily. We think the United States is wonderful and I hope that we all have had ingrained a feeling that in our democracy we have something worth fighting for. But I don't feel—and neither does anyone else I have talked to—that we should fight communism as we are now in Korea. We ought to fight that war to win, or else get out. And to the military planners who say that we can't afford to risk this because we're not ready, may I point out that we weren't ready at Pearl Harbor. Maybe one of the veterans of the First Marine Division who went ashore at Guadalcanal when we were at the height of our unreadiness could give the Pentagon brass a good answer as to how to work that out.

I think the simple way of saying the one thing which is most on my mind, Senator, is this: If you never lifted a finger in Washington during your term to do anything else than to help mobilize official opinion that a decision should be made between either withdrawing from Korea or else fighting an honest-to-goodness war against communism, then you would be successful and have the heartfelt gratitude of your constituents.

Respectfully,

JIM PARSONS.

Release of Members of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OH.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed H. R. 5426 which will correct many inequities in the reserve program in the future. However, as has been pointed out, this bill in no way relieves the present situation.

Since becoming a Member of this body I do not think it unpatriotic for me to say that the one thing I am proudest of is that through my office we have been instrumental in getting some 400 inactive reservists returned to their families. My only regret is that all of the men who have been used merely as cheap labor have not been released.

I have received absolutely no consideration for H. R. 5337, introduced on September 13, 1951. This bill met with overwhelming approval of thousands of reservists who wrote me expressing their views. In my humble opinion, if the Defense Department, and particularly Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, understood the hardship the inactive reservists have been subjected to, this bill would be given immediate consideration. I am confident that if it were brought to the floor of the House for a vote it would pass by an overwhelming majority.

In the event there are those of you who are not familiar with the bill, I have included it with my remarks, and it is printed below:

H. R. 5337

A bill to provide for the release of certain members of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserve serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective November 30, 1951, each member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who has been or shall be involuntarily ordered to active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States shall, unless sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, be released from active duty when he has been credited with 50 points as provided in subsection (b) if he makes application for release to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving. Any member released pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by Congress.

(b) Each such member shall be credited with 1 point for each month he shall have actively served with the Armed Forces of the United States after September 30, 1940, and shall be credited with 10 points for (1) his spouse, if any, (2) each of his children, if any, and (3) each of his other dependents, if any.

(c) For the purposes of this act (1) the term "children" means legitimate and illegitimate children, legally adopted children, stepchildren, foster children, and any other persons who are supported in good faith by such member in a relationship similar to that

of parent and child, but shall not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped, and (2) the term "dependent", when used with respect to any such member, means any person who is a United States citizen or who lives in the United States or its Territories or possessions, and whose support such member has assumed in good faith, but such term shall not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped. In the consideration of a dependency claim, any payments or allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments or allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for the dependency claim.

Americans of Italian Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, many good things come from Italy, but the most valuable export is people, some of the best of whom have come to our own land of opportunity and progress. It is fitting that we should recall some of them on this five hundredth anniversary of the birth of the best known of them all, the Genoese navigator Cristoforo Colombo, whom we commonly call in this country, Christopher Columbus.

"On, on, into the West," he cried:
 "I know and will not be denied
 The world is round; by the western gate
 The riches of the Indies wait.
 Lift sail, my men, the hour has come
 For shipwreck or millennium
 Lift sail, my men, the hours is here
 To probe the secret of the sphere."

The story of this great admiral—his simple faith, heroic persistence and final success, greater far than he knew—has been often told and may well be repeated. But if Columbus could know, he would want to hear the achievements of his fellow Italians in the years since he showed the way to the New World. Many Italian-born patriots and heroes have come to these western shores, men who have contributed much to the development of freedom and of prosperity—fit fellows of the bold admiral of the ocean sea.

It is general knowledge that in our country today it is not unusual for Americans of Italian birth or descent to hold high positions in the world of music, art, commerce, science, education, and government. We are accustomed to governors, mayors, judges, and legislators with Italian names. But there is sometimes an idea that these are late arrivals. It is not too well known that Italians also did their part in the early exploration and development of America.

There was Enrico Tonti, who accompanied LaSalle in his explorations. Tonti was the son of a distinguished Neapolitan banker who invented the tontine system of insurance. Through the Great Lakes and up and down the Mississippi Tonti traveled, building forts and treating with the Indians. Other well-known early Italian explorers include Amerigo Vespucci, from whom America gets its name, John Cabot, and Giovanni Verrazano.

Filippo Mazzei, born at Poggio-a-Calano, Italy, a physician by profession, settled in Virginia in 1773 and became a friend of Thomas Jefferson, who translated some of Mazzei's patriotic anti-British writings into English. The Declaration of Independence itself reflects expressions from these writings. Under Jefferson's friendly interest Mazzei started important agricultural experiments, which were interrupted by the Revolution, at which time he was sent to Europe as the agent of Virginia to raise money for the war.

Francesco Vigo, born in Mondovì, Piedmont, Italy, came to America in 1775 and became a fur trader and "merchant prince" of the Mississippi Valley. When the expedition of George Rogers Clark, in the Revolutionary War, seemed ready to fail for lack of supplies, Vigo put his fortune at the disposal of the Revolutionary cause and made possible the success of Clark's campaign against the English in the west.

William Paca, Governor of Maryland and signer of the Declaration of Independence, was of Italian descent and related to Pope Leo XIII, according to the traditions of the family.

Of course, we can name only a few of the many. They did not all come to America; most of them stayed in Italy. We are accustomed to credit Italy with great artists and musicians, but to think of science as an American specialty; but Volta, Galvani, and Marconi were all Italians, as, going further back, was Galileo, who introduced the "scientific method," called by Prof. A. N. Whitehead, "the most intimate change in outlook which the human race had yet encountered."

America has been quick to appreciate these things, as someone has well remarked:

The Italian arriving in America by way of New York, its main gateway, is greeted at Battery Park by Verrazano in bronze, at Washington Square by Garibaldi, at Columbus Circle by Columbus, at Broadway and Sixty-third Street by Dante, and at Seventy-third Street by Verdi. Thus he is reminded that he comes not without spiritual credentials to the land discovered by a fellow countryman over 400 years ago.

If Columbus could have come to life last month and made the trip with Premier de Gasperi, flying through the air, making the Atlantic crossing in hours instead of weeks, and viewing the great cities of the New World, how astonished he would have been. And if he could have added a few words of his own to the message which the Premier brought in his address to Congress, what would

Columbus have said, and what would be our response? I am sure he would have added his word for a revision of the Italian peace treaty. He would urge as the Premier did that we be realistic and treat Italy in the light of her present attitude and the free world's needs and not on the basis of the repudiated past. The forward-looking Columbus discovered a New World over here; if we too are forward-looking, we may discover a new world of freedom developing in his native land. We may be able to aid such development. We may in part repay our debt to Columbus.

The Real Meaning of Floods—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Elmer T. Peterson to Friends of the Land and St. Louis Farm Club, St. Louis, October 11, 1951:

THE REAL MEANING OF FLOODS

Though it may have a Druidical flavor, I think it might be a fine thing if the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce would hold one meeting each year on Eads Bridge and spend an hour in meditation and prayer while watching the wealth of its tributary territory flow down the Mississippi—the lifeblood in the form of mud which amounts to one cubic mile annually. Likewise if the Kansas City chambers would do the same on a bridge across the Missouri, the Topeka chamber on the Kaw, the Oklahoma City Chamber on the Canadian, and so on throughout the Mississippi Valley, there might come a new and highly fruitful vision of the facts of life—one that is tragically needed.

What is the real meaning—the life meaning—of the recent floods?

Most urban dwellers have amazingly dim appreciation of the significance of rich topsoil sliding down our big and little streams, hour after hour, week after week, year after year, but Louis Bromfield, standing on the banks of the Raccoon River in Des Moines, once said "I did not see just muddy water—I saw factories, homes, schools, churches, railroads, office buildings—all going down the river."

In flood time the river dumps an extra tonnage of that rich topsoil on our front porches and in our factory warehouses, making a sickening mess. Most of us think of it only as a filthy nuisance, not realizing that when kept on its right place it is the most precious material thing we have—even more important than gold or blue-chip stocks or machine tools—the source of roses and honey and bread and delicious steaks. King Midas learned, the hard way, that he couldn't eat gold. That topsoil, in its right place, is the very elixir of life. It ultimately produces food, with vitamins, hormones, enzymes, molds, spores, chlorophyll, precious trace elements, antibiotics like penicillin and aureomycin—a bewildering concourse of treasure. Mother Nature's topsoil is her industrial laboratory. In a process whose significance is barely dawning on the people she brews all

the elusive but basic substances that enable us to live. The science of hydroponics—the artificial propagation of vegetables without soil—is a pale, enemic, and deficient imitation. Nothing ultimately can take the place of outdoors topsoil. Modern research in isotopes and an infinite number of hydrocarbons, carbohydrates, and other organic compounds, with almost daily discoveries of substances like cortisone and the products of endocrine and sex gland secretions, only emphasize the fact that nature's outdoor workshop has been producing these substances for millions of years, by means of an interlocking network with millions of combinations in the topsoil and vegetable and animal organisms that grow out of the soil in a magnificent and orderly life cycle. Mother Nature's creative process, as neatly stated by Dr. William A. Albrecht of your State university, chiefly necessitates water, air, and sunshine. Photosynthesis is a basic necessity. When other elements are needed, they come from her own infinite warehouse. No artificial process can support great populations. Mother Nature is one woman who always has the last word.

What is the dollar meaning of the recent floods?

In a recent television feature the National Association of Manufacturers declared that 16,000,000 tons of mud were deposited in the Kansas City bottoms during the July flood. This mud, in the right place, is commercially worth a minimum of \$2 a ton, according to a contractor friend. But only a small fraction of the topsoil coming down the rivers stopped in those bottoms. Most of it went on past St. Louis, down into the Gulf of Mexico—a treasure lost forever. It is safe to say that even if you count the static value of the mud, at least \$32,000,000 worth was left, all its value nullified, on those bottoms, and several hundred million dollars' worth went on down the Mississippi.

The static value, however, is not the real value, for topsoil, in its right place, is industrial capital, in that it continues to produce, year after year, decade after decade, indefinitely, our most vital and essential wealth, far more important than money or steel-and-concrete structures. The topsoil in that single flood was worth \$1,000,000,000 or more likely several billion dollars in terms of future production.

The visible damage done to packing houses, railroad yards, warehouses and industrial installations was tragic and deplorable, but really trivial compared with the loss of topsoil. As a matter of obvious and realistic fact, such establishments cannot even exist with the maintenance of that topsoil for the oncoming generations.

If present trends continue, historians of 100 years hence will say that one of the most conspicuous policies of many American politicians as of the year 1951, was sheer stupidity. That policy is that of trying to control floods in the plowland areas by imprisoning huge bodies of muddy water—a thieving fluid loaded with the most precious riches of the upland slopes—behind high midstream dams. It is a plain parallel of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

That is the spectacular way—one that can be easily sold to people who never see or conceive of floods except as huge, spectacular torrents,—but in the farm belt it is as obsolete and unscientific as the horse-and-buggy. Its formula of ancient folklore persists, like the concept that lightning is something that travels zigzag around acute angles, or the profound mathematical axiom that 13 is an unlucky number.

Medical science demonstrates that cancer and all other diseases are most effectively

defeated in their incipient stages. Every other science follows analogous patterns. All but one. Flood engineering, with one exception which I shall mention, still clings to the primitive and unscientific concept that you must let a flood reach its most dangerous theater of operation before trying to stop it. The psychology is that of the movie hero whose entrance is postponed to the very last few seconds in his effort to rescue the heroine. It is good showmanship, and how unthinking people love it. In fact many politicians positively demand it, even to the extent of refusing to let the Government take the scientific method.

I am not against all big dams. I have visited many of them, including the Arrow Rock Reservoir near Boise, Idaho. This is a most admirable project, but it resembles the proposed Eufaula Reservoir in Oklahoma about like an elephant resembles a goldfish. It is located on a sharp gradient, in a mountain area protected almost entirely by rock, forest, and vegetation. It receives clear water from mountain streams. Its level fluctuates enormously, depending upon rainy seasons or irrigation demands. Only the most naive engineer would infer that if a big dam is practical at Arrow Rock, it would also work at Eufaula, Okla. There is no rational resemblance between the two projects. Even the Army engineers have publicly admitted that the Eufaula Reservoir is "definitely intended as a silt trap" and that its usefulness will be over in 50 years. An eminent Oklahoma geologist says that the average big reservoir in the prairie plowlands will fill up with silt in 50 years. Before it fills up, it will have done infinitely more damage in another way, but I am getting ahead of my story.

By the time the average flood in the Mississippi valley has reached a site chosen for a huge reservoir, it has already done four times as much damage as it could below that site. Engineers of the United States Department of Agriculture (hereafter called USDA) have conducted research showing that from 80 to 85 percent of all agricultural flood damage is done on the tributary watersheds, leaving 15 or 20 percent possible damage on main streams. Bear in mind always that agricultural damage ultimately is what chiefly counts. Since these figures are officially documented, I could rest here and my case would be proved to any impartial jury. But I want to clinch the argument with additional facts that may astonish some of you.

Please remember this vital point:

The big-dam promoters rely on just one theory to demonstrate alleged superiority of the last-minute-rescue form of flood control; that is the theory that huge dams impound more runoff water than any other method. Impoundment. Keep that word in mind. The theory is completely false, for actual engineering figures prove that the small detention dams of the Washita Valley agricultural flood control program in Oklahoma impound far more water than the big dams in the same area. And the Washita pattern can be applied anywhere in the farm belt.

In other words, the little dams beat the big dams at their own game—the only game the big-damers know—containment of water in surface reservoirs. Please remember this if you forget everything else I say tonight.

Here are the figures that demonstrate what I mean. Before the Oklahoma City hearing of the inter-agency basin committees for the White, Red, and Arkansas Rivers, the engineers of the USDA and the Army corps submitted estimates on flood control for the Little Washita, a creek tributary of the

Big Washita. Here are the comparative figures:

	Army	USDA
Number of reservoirs.....	1	34
Drainage area, square miles.....	195	190
Flood storage, acre-feet.....	52,000	50,100
Recreation, permanent pool, acres.....	1,950	2,100
Flood, pool, acres.....	3,650	5,100
Bottoms inundated, acres.....	14,850	11,000
Bottoms protected, acres.....	3,371	8,080
Cost, proposed plans, complete.....	\$6,000,000	\$1,983,000

¹ Only waste land would be used for USDA program. The richest bottom lands would be inundated in the Army program.

In every respect, therefore, the small-dam system is better than the big-dam system.

Incidentally, the fact that the Army engineers are now aggressively moving into the creek watershed sphere finally disposes of an argument they have previously made.

Up to the present they have said, "Oh, well, the USDA system might work on a creek watershed, but not on a big one." Of course, this always was a meaningless argument, since we know by simple arithmetic that the whole is nothing more nor less than the sum of all its parts. If you stop floods on all the creeks, where would you get water for a flood on the river? It is significant that the Army engineers have gradually moved upstream until now they are trying to compete with the USDA system. It would also take longer to complete, since the USDA program works with simpler implements. If you want flood control in a hurry (and don't forget that impoundment) take the USDA route.

The recent disastrous experience in Kansas, where I lived for 24 years, showed that the worst floods came from an aggregation of creek floods. More on this point later.

Going on from the Little Washita demonstration, we see that, according to the general trend, the bigger the dam, the less it is able to impound runoff water.

A typical small detention dam in the Mill Creek watershed under the USDA program in Oklahoma is engineered to impound 5.22 inches, while the huge Denison Reservoir, fed by Mill Creek, could not impound more than 1.31 inches of its proportionate runoff, so the little dam is four times as efficient as the big one. Yet the big-damers stubbornly continue to insist, against plain facts, that the big dams are necessary for impoundment of runoff.

Actual performance make a sorry showing for the big dams. During the Kansas flood the army engineers blurted out this significant remark: "When 12 inches of rainfall within 48 hours none of our dams can contain it." That is true of their own program. That excessive runoff cannot be contained by the big dams is proved by many examples, such as Bonneville, promoted as a multiple-purpose dam, including alleged flood control. Below that dam, at Vanport, occurred one of the worst floods in history, drowning 40 persons and doing \$200,000,000 worth of damage. In 1943 the Pensacola or Grand Lake Reservoir overflowed and contributed half of the torrent which devastated the Arkansas Valley, drowning 19 persons and doing \$127,000,000 worth of damage. It was this top half of the flood, of course, which did the damage, for if the dam had actually contained the Grand River flood according to advance promotion there would have been only high water on the Arkansas. Again in 1950, the same dam permitted a huge torrent to flow over it because of lack of impoundment capacity, and it contributed materially to another bad Arkansas River flood. Before reaching the Arkansas River it encountered the newly completed Fort Gibson Dam, and didn't even

hesitate. Here are pictures that show what happened.

The vast and expensive TVA structures are urged as models for this part of the country. But as soon as the last TVA structure was finished, Chattanooga set up a terrific clamor for a multi-million-dollar local flood-control program. I could go on and on, indefinitely showing the failure of the huge structures, which simply can't contain the bigger floods.

In contrast with this dismal record of failure we have the actual performance of the little dams, augmented by surface treatment in the Washita Valley program. I mentioned this in an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post for August 4. Incidentally, one of the most aggressive big-dam promoters in Kansas rushed into print with an attempted refutation of the statistical data used in this editorial, but I had all the official documents, weather maps and other data to substantiate my points. I have been on the firing line for at least 10 years, using extensive statistical data, and have not yet met successful refutation.

The facts are that in May 1950, not less than 13 inches of rain fell on the conservation-and-detention-dam treated area of West Owl Creek, Okla., in a 36-hour period, and the technicians did their work so well that the creek stayed within its banks until it had flowed a mile past the last structure. By that time it had received runoff from the nontreated slopes.

There are three principle factors in this flood control. First is the capacity of the small detention reservoirs, which is this area run from 4 to 5 inches of runoff. Second is the absorptive power or insoak produced by surface treatment—terracing, regrassing, contour furrowing, reforestation, and the like. This varies with the soil type, but in some cases is even higher than the reservoir capacity. Third is the draw-down valve, which permits the water to run at a safe rate down the stream as soon as it tops the permanent pool, or lower reservoir capacity. It was the combination of the three which produced the remarkable record of West Owl Creek. The system performed even better on a 4,000-acre subwatershed of Barnitz Creek in May 1951, when 13 inches fell within a few hours—well within 1 day—and a similar result was recorded.

The largest watershed thus far treated is that of Sandstone Creek near the western edge of Oklahoma, which contains more than 65,000 acres. It has 24 detention dams, about the same number of gully plugs, and surface treatment. On May 16, 1951, a storm that in other years would have produced a disastrous flooding of the lower valley, hit this area. The nearest official gage showed 4.57 inches, and unofficial gages showed from 3 to 6 inches. According to a local soil-conservation official, similar downpours in previous years caused the creek to create a flood half a mile wide, but in this case the water did not even come up to the draw-down valves.

The Real Meaning of Floods—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

Record, I include the following address by Elmer T. Peterson to Friends of the Land and St. Louis Farm Club, St. Louis, October 11, 1951:

In 1949 the Cloud Creek watershed received 4.6 inches in 4 hours. The water did not even reach the draw-down valves, because the insoak produced by surface treatment had taken care of almost all the precipitation, so not a bucket of water escaped from this area, though neighboring creeks, in the same cloudburst area, went on wild rampages, causing a bad flood on the Washita.

In 1949 the Colvert Herford ranch in the Mill Creek area lost 1,000 bales of alfalfa in one flood. By May 10, 1950, the USDA program had been completed, then came the big flood which centered on West Owl Creek in that general area. I called the ranch and they said there had been 6 inches of rain, but no damage.

Here we have five subwatershed projects, all of which had severe tests, and every one performed perfectly. The USDA program on the Washita Valley has performed 100 percent efficiently. It went through the May 1950 cloudburst with flying colors, while at the same time the newly completed Army engineer dam at Fort Gibson, Okla., with far less rainfall, was pouring water into the lower Grand River and Arkansas, producing a bad flood at the rate of 400,000 cubic feet a second, according to an Army engineer quote in our newspapers.

The only trouble, of course, is that the Washita program thus far has reached only a fraction of the total valley, because the skimpy appropriations are cut down. This year the appropriation was cut from \$1,070,000 to \$625,000 at the very time the big dam promoters were clamoring for hundreds of millions. If one-half the appropriations demanded for the big dams were spent on the USDA program, we would have perfect flood control and I have plenty of figures to prove it.

The draw-down valve function of the United States Department of Agriculture small detention reservoirs is analogous to the dry-dam system used in the Miami Conservancy District in Ohio, where dams bear this inscription: "The dams of the Miami Conservancy District are for flood-prevention purposes. Their use for power development or for storage would be a menace to the cities below." The Miami dams are virtually emptied after every flood to receive the next inundation. In the typical huge multiple-purpose dam a relatively small percentage of capacity is allocated to flood impoundment. Theoretically the flood-pool capacity should be lowered at least 30 to 40 percent. Actually, however, the reservoir is kept practically full because sportsmen and power generation and irrigation or water-supply interests demand it. Sportsmen don't want to see their boathouses and docks up on a hill, or the margins of the lake messed up with mosquito-breeding mud flats. Here is another point of superiority for the small dam. The typical United States Department of Agriculture flood pool holds about 65 percent of total capacity and the permanent pool, up to draw-down valve, about 35 percent. There is no one to prevent the lowering of the water level to the draw-down valve, whereas the people demand a high level on the big artificial lakes.

Up to this time I have contended that the huge dams are highly inefficient for flood control, compared with the small ones, which have taken care of a 100-year flood, so someone may say:

"Well, even if they are inefficient, maybe we should have them anyhow, as added precaution, say in case of a 1,000-year flood."

I propose to show that the huge dams are worse than that. They are positively harmful. They actually cause floods. This fact causes me to be amazed when a few soil conservationists, apparently not fully informed, defend or condone big dams in the prairie plowland areas.

There is an inexorable scientific law, described and applied in geology textbooks, which should be heeded by everyone who deals with soil and water conservation and flood control. Failure to heed this law can only lead to disaster.

The geologists have condensed and applied it in this axiom: "The history of a lake is the history of its death."

That is because of siltation, a natural process which has changed the whole course of world empires.

If you read the Encyclopedia Britannica you will see that Babylonia, the first great empire or recorded history, depended for its basic prosperity upon irrigation canals, using the water of the Tigris and Euphrates, and that its economic death was caused by siltation of its irrigation canals about 90 of which have been discovered by Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk.

Utica, in a later century, was once the greatest city on earth, located at the mouth of the Mejerda River—the pride of the vast Carthaginian empire. The plow era caused the erosion of a once enormously productive watershed and the silt produced a delta. Now the only thing left of Utica is a pitiful little array of stones, mostly buried in a desert 12 miles from the mouth of the river.

These are examples that could be multiplied many times.

Our existing natural lakes are well protected by watershed cover, but even they will eventually fill up. In the plowlands any artificial lake created in the midst of a major stream is doomed to an early death, as described in brochure No. 521 of the USDA on Sedimentation of Reservoirs. The classic example is a water-supply reservoir at Osborne, Kans., which filled up in 1 year. Old Lake Altus in Oklahoma filled up in 14 years. After 10 years, Lake Texoma, also in Oklahoma, shows tremendous siltation, and the communities of Madill and Tishomingo have held mass meetings to try to find out what to do. Unfortunately they can do nothing but furnish an example to communities everywhere in the plowlands. Already they say the mouth of the Washita is clogged with 20 feet of additional silt since the dam was built and the sedimentation extends far out into the lake.

Each year, using the formula of the best hydraulic engineers, Washita Valley erosion amounts to a pile 1,000 feet long, 1,000 feet wide, and 700 feet high. This is based on the standard rule of 2 acre-feet for every square mile of watershed per year. The United States Geological Survey shows that Rush Creek, a tributary, carried siltation of 11 acre-feet per square mile per year.

This silt is first deposited at the mouth, in the classic delta pattern, but immediately it constitutes a secondary dam which starts a chain reaction upstream called backwater sedimentation. I have in my hand the blueprints of the Army engineers forecasting backwater sedimentation in the Washita to a point 100 river-miles upstream. That confession is bad enough, but they have greatly underestimated this effect. According to Dr. Harold Munger, of Kansas State Agricultural College, a highly reputed hydraulic engineer and authority on siltation of prairie streams, such siltation builds a new river bed upstream which tends to be parallel to the old bed, at a height equal to the height of the dam. In other words, the backwater sedimentation in anything less than a 1 percent gradient (which he uses as

a maximum) will extend indefinitely upstream. Since the Washita River has an average gradient of only half an inch in a hundred feet, you can imagine what this means.

The actual results uphold Dr. Munger's formula, for already the backwater sedimentation, since the building of the dam about 10 years ago, has completely changed the character of the Washita channel and flood plain as far upstream as Chickasha, more than 200 miles upstream from the mouth. R. C. Longmire, president of the Washita Valley Association, says that this ghastly damage is due to the presence of the big dam. He has ample substantiation, but I must hurry on. A typical section of the river now is five times as wide as the channel was 10 years ago, and the water now wanders crazily over the flood plain to such an extent that last year I saw at Pauls Valley where the river had cut back of the town and emptied into its own tributary—Rush Creek. That was at least 10 river-miles upstream from the normal confluence. This great zone of bottoms was once the prize alfalfa-growing area of the State, producing as many as six crops a year. Now it is being cut to pieces. A former State senator is bringing suit against the Federal Government, alleging that his fine bottom-land farm about a dozen miles upstream from the lake, has been ruined by reason of the dam. I walked over this farm and took many photographs which I have with me.

In Missouri you have already seen a revolt of farmers above the Alton Dam, alleging that their farms are being flooded by reason of the dam below their farms. I am informed that the supreme court of Missouri, about 2 years ago, in the Bagnell Dam case, held that the dam was responsible for similar upstream damage, caused by backwater sedimentation. The suit in Oklahoma will be followed by many more. There is almost no limit to the damages incurred by the Government in building these silt-trapping dams. If the whole Mississippi Valley is to become a series of chains of artificial lakes, as forecast by General Pick, the damage and complications defy the imagination.

You may have read about the flood on the Neosho River at Miami, Okla., near the confluence of the Neosho and Spring Rivers, which feed Grand Lake. One man was drowned and the property damage was \$5,000,000. Since the Army engineers said that the flood stage at Miami was 28 feet higher than the corresponding level at the dam, you can easily see that there was a bottleneck at the head of the lake. I visited that critical point shortly after the flood, slogging around in the mud which was everywhere.

At one point 2 inches were deposited on an old blacktop road during that one flood. I have pictures. Assuming that the backwater sedimentation process and detritation occurred on this very muddy river, as it does everywhere else, I am satisfied that the flood at Miami was caused by the presence of the artificial lake.

The town of Waurika, Okla., had six floods during the past summer, so I also made a personal inspection of this area. I found enormous acceleration in backwater sedimentation on the Red River since the building of the dam. Waurika is about 12 miles up Beaver Creek, which empties into Red River. Beaver Creek's mouth is about 100 feet wide, but the present water channel of the Red River there is only about 50 feet wide. The river bed is almost half a mile wide, and piled high with silt. Obviously the flood coming down Beaver Creek was unable to get away fast enough through this bottleneck, so it backed up six times into Waurika—a phenomenon that had never occurred before the building of the dam.

The State engineer of New Mexico, in an official report, says that millions of tons of silt, about 20,000 acre-feet, are transported annually by the Rio Grande into the Elephant Butte Reservoir. Now there is a silt bed 60 miles long and 35 feet maximum depth, formed because of the dam. This gives an idea of what is taking place wherever muddy water is trapped by artificial obstructions. Wherever land is plowed, erosion and siltation are hastened.

It is therefore plain that instead of controlling floods, the big dams are causing worse and worse floods, as river beds are filled with silt and backwater sedimentation increases.

Now I come to a more pleasant phase of this discussion—the constructive side which shows the tremendously beneficial results of the USDA program on the Washita watershed under the Soil Conservation Service.

In addition to the impoundment capacity of the small detention dams, mentioned a few minutes ago, there are at least six other points of superiority.

1. Insoak by sponge action of vegetation, contour plowing, and other conservation practices. By means of an infiltrometer, an instrument he invented, A. D. Bull, of Oklahoma, has measured this insoak under varying conditions, and found that by proper handling he could secure as much as 9 inches absorption in 1 hour.

If this sounds incredible, remember that Mother Nature, in the jungle areas of Cherapunji, India, takes care of an average of 429 inches of rainfall a year, whereas the Grand Canyon, which is the biggest gully—the biggest job of erosion—in the world, is located in an area of low rainfall.

On Malabar Farm, Louis Bromfield greatly increased insoak by use of a chisel plow so that he had plenty of water in the 1946 drought year when neighbors hauled water. I am convinced from my own research and actual experience on my Kansas wheat farm that this item alone will work wonders. Mr. Bull utilizes this as one of his techniques.

2. Restoration of high water table, which depends absolutely upon watershed insoak. All conservationists know that the water table is now alarmingly low. Insoak revives old springs, creates an even flow of streams, replenishes wells, brings back good fishing, and brings other blessings. Storage of ground water is the next big step in conservation.

3. Irrigation by clear water. Canal and ditch irrigation from surface reservoirs or muddy streams is bound to fail, as it did in Babylonia. Mother nature again has the last word. Her own filter beds do the work.

4. Prevention of siltation. This can be achieved only by conservation methods. Obviously the big dams can't stop siltation, but increase it. Building silt traps above the big reservoirs is only a temporary stop-gap for these, too, will quickly become useless unless the surface is treated over the whole watershed.

5. Saving of rich bottomlands. The big reservoirs inundate millions of acres of our best land. They drive people off the land. The Washita program increases production and keeps people on the soil. Only waste land is used for the small reservoirs. I have time to give only one of hundreds of instances I could name to prove my point. The site of the proposed Tuttle Creek Reservoir north of Manhattan, Kans., would destroy 55,000 acres of the best land in the State—an area which annually produces more than \$6,000,000 worth of crops, to say nothing of the fine homes, churches, schools, and other institutions. To inundate this area and scatter these fine citizens would be a crime comparable to the destruction of Lidice. Yet you people of Missouri are told that Tuttle Creek Dam is essential to the protection of your

cities. That is a ridiculous falsehood completely disproved by the facts presented.

6. Saving the soil. Soil, after all, is the most precious asset of all. The big dam promoters do not even pretend to do this job.

So we come back to the first episode in this story—the dumping of rich topsoil on the bottoms of Kansas City.

There is nothing in the big dam program which promises to halt this rape of the soil. Piling it up behind huge dams is obviously a stupid performance. The only rational method is to stop water where it falls and keep the soil in its proper place. That will solve the flood problem, and it will save the soil for posterity.

The Case for the Bonneville-Central Valley Intertie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD two recent articles concerning the Bonneville-California transmission line intertie. One article, written by State Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, appeared in the October issue of the magazine *Frontier*. The other is an editorial from the *Portland Oregonian*, of September 28. The *Oregonian*, as you know, is one of the outstanding Pacific coast newspapers. Without concurring in any of the characterizations of the public officials in the Northwest, I think Mr. Neuberger's article explains the basic issues and therefore should be of interest to everyone concerned in finding a way to remedy the power shortage in the Northwest. The editorial entitled "California Power Tie Needed" accurately states: "The agreement proposed for the interconnection would have prevented the delivery of any power to California except that capacity not needed in good water periods."

I believe when the facts are fully known to the people of the Pacific coast States, they will be in favor of the construction of the intertie. It has been approved and recommended by the engineers of four Federal agencies—the Federal Power Commission, the Defense Electric Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration. The article and the editorial follow:

[From *Frontier* of October 1951]

THE CASE FOR INTERTIE—HOW PROVINCIAL POLITICS BLOCK CALIFORNIA'S USE OF BONNEVILLE POWER NOW GOING TO WASTE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PORTLAND, OREG.—California and the Pacific Northwest are as much sisters under their skins as the Colonel's Lady and Judy O'Grady. Yet a galaxy of politicians in the Northwest are finding it to their personal interest to keep the two great regions hostile and apart.

The specific occasion for this stirring up of rivalry has been a proposal by the Bonneville Power Administration that its system

be connected with Shasta Dam by 119 miles of transmission line extending southward from Klamath Falls, Oreg.

Yells of outrage are rising from Gov. Douglas McKay, of Oregon, and Congressman Russell V. Mack, of Washington, to cite only two in politics who consider provincialism a good vote-getting technique. "They're trying to give our power away!" cry these and assorted other leaders of the people. One might think that the wires would extend not to a sister State of the Union but to Leningrad, Russia.

Only three daily papers in the Northwest have been affirmatively friendly to Intertie. They are the Oregonian of Portland, the Union-Bulletin of Walla Walla, and the Tribune of Lewiston, Idaho. A handful of others are undecided. The rest are bitterly hostile. In the case of Republican papers, this betrays a markedly split personality. While these papers rooted and tooted for Earl Warren to be Vice President of the United States in 1948, they now are determined that not a single horsepower of northwestern hydroelectricity shall light a bulb or turn a factory wheel in Earl Warren's State.

At the risk of his political fortunes, Dr. Paul Raver, the Bonneville Administrator, has been defending Intertie. This is a long, slow process but most observers believe he ultimately will come out on top. Logic and facts can be obscured by invective only over a limited period of time.

Nor is California quite as unpopular in the Northwest as some politicians seem to believe. A strong plea for a Coastwise alliance might prove more potent than efforts to split California off economically from its Pacific neighbors.

What are the reasons for "Intertie," as the project is formally known?

Bonneville is a run-of-the-river dam. This means that it has no storage facilities. The Columbia's massive volume foams constantly through its spillways. But between midnight and dawn the Northwest has no need for all the power which Bonneville can produce. Why not transmit this surplus energy to California, where pumping for irrigation requires power 24 hours around the clock?

There is a further reason for this. California and the Northwest work in unison climatically. California rivers are at their peak in spring. By summer stream beds often are gaunt and dry. But this is when the Columbia rises to its maximum flow. Its origins lurk in the British Columbia sub-Arctic, where snowfields and glaciers melt at least two or three months later than in the Sierra Nevada Range.

WASTE OF PRECIOUS POWER

Thus Bonneville spins out its fullest capacity at a time when California is most in need of energy. Bonneville engineers estimate that 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours might be transmitted to California during a normal year without in any way depriving farms, homes or industries of power in the Northwest.

This would result in the saving in California of 850,000 barrels of oil now used to generate power with steam turbines. In addition, surplus power from Bonneville would enable Shasta Dam, a storage structure, to impound water that otherwise might have to be used immediately in California. This storage released through Shasta generators would be able to produce many thousands of kilowatts of prime power at a later time in the year.

During off-peak hours at Bonneville, the penstocks are closed and the Columbia's icy surge pours uselessly over the lip of the spillways. It is a pretty sight. Spray rises in the mountain air. The roar sounds like

massed artillery. But no power is produced. The glacial runoff is pouring untapped to the sea. Yet there stands the huge dam, built with money contributed by taxpayers in Oregon and California and New Hampshire. Why should the dam be comparatively idle in the long hours of the night watch, when it could be manufacturing energy to irrigate land in the far-off Central Valley?

Intertie meets all the demands of logic, but Intertie has had a stormy history.

The Defense Power Administration has urged Intertie because it would increase agricultural and industrial production in California and at the same time save oil. But \$2,000,000 in funds to start the 119-mile set of transmission poles was cut off by a House budget committee. A bill by Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of California, specifically authorizing Intertie, has languished without action.

Democrats as well as Republicans in the Northwest have been lambasting Intertie. In spite of the fact that it is the region with as much potential hydroelectricity as all the rest of the Nation, the Northwest suffers from a power shortage. Two factors account for this. (1) Aluminum plants alone absorb 50 percent of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee production; and (2) dams have not been built fast enough to keep pace with the region's burgeoning economy.

Intertie would not aggravate the shortage of power, but it frequently is difficult to convince people of this. The difficulty is heightened when politicians discover they can make hay by claiming California wants to steal our greatest God-given resource, the Columbia River.

A curious inferiority complex exists in the Northwest where California is concerned. Let some national magazine mistakenly place Mount Hood or Crater Lake in California, and the protests will drown out the thunder of Bonneville's spillway. In vain do a few lost voices try to point out the importance of California to the prosperity of the Northwest. California, in fact, is far and away the Northwest's best customer.

NORTHWEST WOULD BENEFIT ALSO

Not long ago the Interstate Commerce Commission took a careful sampling of railroad waybills originating in the Northwest. The facts disclosed that this is the percentage of important Northwest products shipped in freight cars to California:

	Percent
Railroad ties.....	61
Cattle and calves.....	56
Sheep and goats.....	50
Potatoes.....	46
Onions.....	31
Fresh apples.....	33
Furniture.....	47
Newsprint.....	66
Wrapping paper.....	59
Flour.....	40

These extremely significant figures demonstrate that the Northwest will benefit substantially from anything which increases the prosperity and efficiency of California.

Not so long ago nearly all the Northwest's raw materials had to be shipped eastward, bucking the discriminatory freight-rate differential. Once resources were processed, they took a far higher rate. This made the Northwest a colonial empire, a kind of India to the factories of New England.

But gradually California began to fill up with people. This meant that the Northwest had a large potential market, not 2,000 miles and more away but a mere 700 miles away, on the Southern Pacific's Shasta route. A little-known interior freight line to California, operated jointly by the Great

Northern and the Western Pacific, suddenly boomed with cargo. Rail had to be strengthened and roundhouse forces increased. The Shasta route couldn't handle all the freight traveling between the two vast regions.

So why not intertie the Northwest and California with copper wires carrying kilowatts? Wooden poles could be used and the cost of the connection would be only \$6,000,000. This might be amortized during one season of power conservation. Nor would the power benefits flow only in one direction. From October until April, California's power projects probably could transport energy northward to the Bonneville system, thus reciprocating in part for off-peak summer energy sent to Shasta Dam.

But will the project materialize? Its future remains uncertain so long as California-baiting continues politically profitable in the Northwest. Henry Carstensen, master of the Washington State Grange and a proponent of public power, is as vehement against the idea as is any conservative or Tory. He claims the project would milk the Northwest of its power resources. This is embarrassing to the Interior Department, which has a loose working alliance with public ownership advocates. William E. Warne, Assistant Interior Secretary, has endorsed Intertie. He contends it would provide usable hydroelectric energy which at present is not even generated.

The recent 1951 session of the Oregon Legislature produced a torrent of invective against California. Bills were hastily whipped to passage denying any Oregon water to northern California, even though many lawyers warned that some provisions were probably unconstitutional. One would not have thought that boys from California were dying at the front in Korea alongside boys from Oregon. Had a spectator from Mars sat in the legislative gallery, he might have been justified in supposing that California was an enemy land rather than a sovereign State of the United States of America.

Some Northwest politicians realize the logic back of Intertie. But they confess that they fear to get out in front for Intertie so long as their adversaries can collect votes by shouting that it is all a scheme to sell out the Northwest to wicked California. In domestic matters as well as foreign affairs, political demagoguery is fatal to the national interest.

[From the Oregonian of September 28, 1951]

CALIFORNIA POWER TIE NEEDED

Henry J. Kaiser, operator of aluminum plants at Spokane, is one of the few who have joined this newspaper in approving the Interior Department's proposal to interconnect the Columbia River and California Central Valley power systems. If the Intertie were in effect now, the Northwest would be getting approximately 100,000 kilowatts of energy from California—in exchange for excess power delivered to California in periods of surplus.

The vigorous opposition to the California Intertie, especially in the State of Washington, appears to be more of a regional political nature than the result of calm appraisal. The cry has been that the Northwest does not have enough power for its own purposes, hence should not permit any exports (though excess power has been delivered to British Columbia for years). Apprehensions that an interconnection would be another step toward a Columbia Valley Authority also have been expressed, on what reasoning we cannot determine.

Actually, the agreement proposed for the interconnection would have prevented the delivery of any power to California except

that capacity not needed in good water periods. More power would be delivered to California than California would return to the Northwest, but the difference would be made up in additional revenues to the Federal power system of the Columbia basin.

The Northwest could pick up an additional 100,000 kilowatts of energy in low-water periods such as this by the construction of a transmission line from the Oregon border to Shasta Dam, and without any arguments over fish. The present shortage is reason enough to press this program in Congress.

Creeping Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Paul O. Peters, which is most enlightening:

FEDERAL CONTROLS OFFSET BY FEDERAL SPENDING MERELY SLOW INFLATION

The creeping inflation which started in December 1949, accelerated in 1950 has only been slowed up by the controls established under the authority of the Defense Production Act of 1951.

The President's Council of Economic Advisors reports the gross national product for the first 9 months of 1951 at the annual rate of \$324,000,000,000. In the calendar year 1949 it was reported at \$257,300,000,000 and in 1950 at \$282,600,000,000. Measured in terms of inflated dollars (dollars with less purchasing power), there is nothing encouraging in the bare figures because they do not reflect a material increase in the production of goods and commodities, but on the contrary, reflect a situation, which, unless brought under control soon may get out of hand and confidence in our monetary and financial policies be seriously impaired.

The new taxes which the Congress has seen fit to approve were thought to be the most useful tool with which to syphon off excess purchasing power and thus control the spending. This idea failed mainly because the Federal Reserve banks and the Treasury allowed the money in circulation to be increased to a new high of \$28,300,000,000 as of October 3, 1951. With money plentiful and bidding for goods against the Government, the inflation is bound to last for many months and that situation will not be corrected by new taxes or warnings that the Government will take more and more of this or that material for the defense program.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the comparative index for 28 commodities at wholesale on the basis of August 1939 equals 100 as follows:

	Dec 30, 1949	Oct. 20, 1950	Oct. 5, 1951
General index.....	247.7	330.0	334.1
Imports.....	286.2	356.1	346.0
Domestic.....	242.4	314.2	326.6
Domestic agricul- ture.....	207.0	248.2	258.8
Foodstuffs.....	305.3	352.9	372.3
Raw industrials.....	222.9	317.6	319.6

Net receipts of the Federal Treasury in the first 9 months of 1951 are up approximately

46.4 percent above the comparative period in 1950

The totals are:

Net budget receipts 9 months 1951.....	\$42,052,725,404
Net budget receipts 9 months 1950.....	28,715,073,866

Gain over 1950..... 13,337,651,538

In the first 9 months of 1951 the budgetary spending has been \$1,494,149,904 less than the receipts. However, on October 8, there was \$66,768,259,183 to the credit of disbursing officers to be paid out.

PAUL O. PETERS.

The Web of Bureaucratic Functions and Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON] who cannot be here at this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the appendix of the RECORD two thought-provoking communications. One, from the regional director of the Wage and Hour Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor; the other, a reply to the first over the signature of Herman Lazarus, Jr., publisher of the Bayonne Times of Bayonne, N. J.

These letters speak for themselves, but I should like to say they furnish a good illustration of the manner in which American business and industry is being enmeshed in a web of bureaucratic functions and procedures which may soon completely stifle and destroy the free-enterprise system which has been one of our richest heritages.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR
AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS,
Newark, N. J., September 19, 1951.

Mr. DAVID J. WINKWORTH,
Labor Relations Adviser, Times Print-
ing & Publishing Co., Bayonne, N. J.

GENTLEMEN: This will acknowledge your petition for approval of wage increases dated September 13, 1951. Before we transmit your request to the Wage Stabilization Board, it is requested that you amend your petition in accordance with the following:

It is noted that you have submitted original and three copies. Current procedure requires that petitions be submitted in original and four copies. It is suggested that you submit another copy as soon as possible.

Your petition will be held in this office 15 days pending the receipt of the information requested above. Unless you ask for an extension of time to submit the required information, the petition will be forwarded to the Wage Stabilization Board at the expiration of the 15-day period. Upon your request, all copies of the petition will be returned to you for the purpose of amending the original request.

The Board may request additional information before acting upon your petition, and in such case, will contact you directly.

Very truly yours,

FRANK J. MUENCH,
Regional Director.

By HUGO C. SICA,
Wage Stabilization Supervisor.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1951.

Mr. HUGO C. SICA,
Wage Stabilization Supervisor,
Wage and Hour and Public Con-
tracts Divisions,
Newark, N. J.

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed is additional copy of form No. 94-R-239 with attached letter as requested in your letter of September 19. Your third paragraph refers to this as a request for information, and I would like to emphasize that it is only a request for an additional copy. Your letter also states that you acknowledge our petition dated September 13, when actually our original petition was filed with your office on July 10 in the form of a letter, as we were instructed to do by your office at that time.

The copy enclosed with this letter is the thirteenth copy we have sent to your office. If this were not so tragically serious, it would be ridiculously funny. This application is made by a small business. It affects two employees out of a total of 72 persons employed here. But 60,000,000 persons are employed in the United States. When the fantastic paper work required for this petty, all but trivial case is multiplied by the paper work for the 60,000,000 in the Nation, what do we have? Tragedy or comedy?

And some cases in the United States may be complicated, may require special study and special attention. The case here is simple. It is readily understood by anyone. Since wage stabilization became effective, certain customers of one of our departments asked that it get delivery in the early morning instead of the late afternoon. This made it necessary for us to transfer men who had been working days to a schedule calling for night work. Since this was the first time that department had been on night work, we had no established practice which we could follow in favor of employees who work the night shifts. It is and always has been the desire of this company's management to abide by this practice, but the wage-stabilization rules made it necessary for us to apply for special permission.

Such application is not easy. The wage-stabilization program is so complicated that small employers are all but forced to engage expert counsel to interpret the rules. Meanwhile, it is sure that most employees will never understand the rules; most of them will never even want to. They believe that when they are entitled to more pay it is up to their employer to provide it. But the employer is caught in the red tape of wage stabilization. This situation brings about distrust of the employer by his employees, and the distrust grows deeper as the employer struggles to find his way through this costly, inefficient, thoroughly unnecessary tangle of governmental controls.

Big labor and big business get their rulings, they even get rulings that break through the rules others must obey. Their cases are fought out in the open, with much publicity; but rulings come more slowly, if at all, to small businesses. In our cases, the bureaucrats can indulge their love for multiplied copies, for long letters phrased in the dialect of Government functionaries, for endless delays that defer rulings and preserve the jobs of the time-wasters in Government. Our request inflationary? How does it compare in that respect with the payment of continuing salaries to hordes of

Government workers hired to do nothing but process these endless forms that busy men must supply in order to be able to hope to run the rest of their businesses normally?

One of the primary rules for good relations in industry and business is frankness and honesty between employers and employees. Honesty and frankness become progressively more difficult when the employer has to deal with clumsiness of this order in the wage-stabilization program. Employees, their expectations put off again and again, begin to think they're getting the run-around. Employers, caught in the web of governmental stupidity, find themselves helpless in spite of their specially hired expert advisers.

We first applied to your office for permission to grant these two increases on July 10. This is September 24. I would appreciate a letter from you offering me your best guess as to when we can expect a final ruling in this matter. I am thoroughly sick of putting these men off again and again while your office tries to make up its mind how many copies it needs, how many letters it needs, how much information it needs, with long delays between each tiny forward move you allow.

I propose to give this letter what publicity I can.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN LAZARUS, Jr.

P S—Please don't ask for 13 copies of this letter. It's too long.

The Social-Security Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of the most frequent charges against social security is that the social-security fund is insecure because its assets have been converted into Government bonds. The charge has often been made in the press and, indeed, on the floor of the Senate, that the investment of the social-security fund in Government bonds is somehow dishonest and unfair to those who have made payments into the social-security fund. On October 6, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried a very instructive editorial, completely dispelling, in my opinion, these misleading inferences and charges. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT SOCIAL-SECURITY KITTY

A Post-Dispatch reader wants to know whether the Government still uses its social-security receipts to meet current operating expenses, and deposits its I O U's in the kitty for ultimate payment of social-security retirement benefits.

This is one of those loaded questions which implies that beneficiaries of the social-security system may be swindled, when it comes time to collect their benefits, by finding only I O U's in the till.

On the same principle, one would have to assume that every holder of a Government bond may be swindled when the time comes

to cash it in. The social-security fund, as a holder of Government bonds, is no worse off and no better off than all the banks, insurance companies and individuals who also hold Government bonds.

Currently the social-security fund collects in contributions more than it pays out in benefits. What should be done with the surplus? If it were held in cash, like bank notes squirreled away in the mattress, it would earn no interest for the fund, and in the end the beneficiaries would receive smaller retirement payments than if the surplus were invested. Moreover, the stored-up bank notes would be no sounder, basically, than the Government bonds. Both are promises to pay. The soundness of both depends ultimately on the solvency of the Government and the productive power of the people.

Instead of holding the surplus in cash, the social-security fund invests it in Government bonds. And why not? So long as a public debt exists, what is the objection to having part of it held by the social-security fund for the ultimate benefit of retired people? Surely this is no less sound than the investment of private retirement funds in various forms of public or private debt.

Free Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I found it most refreshing to read in Sunday's New York Times a news item about a New Jersey country doctor who, through his own initiative and sense of responsibility, has set up a free clinic for anyone unable to pay his regular fees. During the past 9 months he has treated 400 to 500 patients without charge, by means of a free clinic held every Monday. I think this is a fine example of the type of thing that our doctors can do themselves to make medical care available, especially in rural areas, to the needy and the indigent. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the New York Times to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTOR POINTS WAY ON FREE CARE ISSUE—HAS CLINIC FOR NEEDY PATIENTS IN REGULAR OFFICE HOURS AND FINDS HARDLY ONE FRAUD

CLAYTON, N. J., October 6—County, State, and national medical associations may still be bickering about socialized medicine but Dr. Benjamin Broselow, 40-year-old physician in this farming community of 3,000, has worked out his own solution.

Last January Dr. Broselow put up a sign in his office that said he would hold a free clinic every Monday for anyone unable to pay his fees. In the 9 months since then, Dr. Broselow disclosed today, he has examined and treated 400 to 500 patients without charge.

And, he said, he has come to the conclusion that the average American is proud and thoroughly honest.

"In these 9 months I have had only two persons come into my office whom I would class as chiselers," said Dr. Broselow.

"The rest have been people who honestly could not afford medical care and in a small town like this you know whether they are indigent or not.

"For the most part the men and women who have taken advantage of the clinic have been either on old age or social-security pensions who could not afford to seek medical aid at a price and were too poor but too proud to seek help elsewhere.

"I've been able to detect many cases of incipient cancer, tuberculosis, and hypertension and arrest or relieve the condition."

Dr. Broselow, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Hahnemann Medical College, said he opened the free clinic with doubts as to how his experiment would be received by the Medical Society of New Jersey and whether he was opening his door to a flood of neurotics.

On both scores his anxiety was groundless, he said. His medical colleagues of the county have congratulated him, and as for the "neurotics" he had expected:

"I have more trouble with paying patients than I do with the fifteen or so a week who come into the free clinic. When they are told to come back in a month they wait 30 days, they don't rush back the next day or the next week to pour out a new set of symptoms."

Relations With Scandinavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter concerning relations with Scandinavia, written by Maj. Benjamin H. Namm to the editor of the New York Times, and published in the Times on October 13. I would point out that this letter is most interesting and enlightening.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELATIONS WITH SCANDINAVIA—GOOD-WILL VISIT OF MERCHANTS BELIEVED TO PREBAGE CLOSER COOPERATION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

Your issue of August 31 carried the announcement of a good-will visit that approximately 50 Scandinavian retail merchants will make to this country in January 1953.

Since I just returned from a 6 weeks' stay in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland, some of your readers may be interested in receiving a few first-hand impressions regarding conditions in these countries.

Of the four countries that I visited, Finland proved to be the most surprising. I had been led to believe that Finland was virtually behind the iron curtain. Nothing could be further from the truth. I saw more Americans in Helsinki than I saw Russians. I found a free press, which was willing to print anything I cared to say, and a free radio system over which I made a nation-wide uncensored broadcast.

Of the four countries, Sweden is in the best shape, from an economic standpoint. The index of its volume of industrial production (1938=100) has increased from 140 in 1947 to 162 in 1950. There has also been an annual increase in productivity of about 5 percent in the postwar period. Sweden has also made great progress toward closing the gap between imports from and exports to the United States. In the month of September 1947, the gap was 160,000,000 kronor, while for the whole year of 1950 it amounted to 182,000,000 kronor. Sweden has received no grants from our ECA. All the assistance she now receives is in the form of an interest-bearing loan of approximately \$120,000,000.

AID RECEIVED

As to the other Scandinavian countries, Denmark has received approximately \$250,000,000 in grants and about \$30,000,000 in loans. Norway has received about \$225,000,000 in grants and about \$35,000,000 in loans. Finland has received no ECA aid whatsoever. All four countries are tackling their economic problems realistically and with full confidence in the future. Communism is at a very low ebb. Its existence is primarily underground.

During recent years, when improved methods of transportation and communication have made the entire world seem small, the Scandinavian countries have acquired a new and vital importance for the United States. Norway, Denmark, and Sweden are now the keys to the control of the North Atlantic Ocean. They are also Europe's gateway to the north polar cap, and it is quite possible that, in these days of atomic fission, that area may serve as the scene of the future struggle for survival between the east and the west.

Norway and Denmark are members, along with the United States, of the Atlantic Defense Pact. Norway, like Finland, has a common frontier with Soviet Russia. It is generally believed that Stalin plans, as Hitler did, to use the deep fjords of Norway as submarine bases, if and when war should come.

NEED FOR UNDERSTANDING

There are, however, additional and urgent reasons why close cooperation and improved understanding between our country and the Scandinavian countries has become very necessary. First, there are many millions of American citizens who are of Scandinavian origin. They are among our best citizens. Second, there is a growing need for all the free countries of the world to find markets for their products and products for their markets.

American retailers, generally speaking, are quite happy about the economic cooperation that has been extended to the countries of Europe at the Government level, under the Marshall plan. We believe, however, that Government action was only the beginning. We further believe in economic cooperation at the business level—between trade groups, labor unions, farm groups, and individuals. In that way, perhaps, the free peoples of the world may succeed, where the diplomats and the warriors have failed, in ultimately achieving world peace and economic stability.

The good-will group will be the guests of honor at the Forty-second Annual Convention of the National Retail Dry Goods Association. Following this the delegation will visit several leading American cities.

It is our hope and belief that this visit, along with those that are being scheduled from other countries, will make a substantial contribution to the development of that friendship, understanding, and improved trade relations upon which the future of the world so largely depends.

BENJAMIN H. NAMM.

BROOKLYN, September 4, 1951.

City of Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members to a very fine column written recently by the well-known Washington correspondent, Mr. Walter Shead, of the Western Newspaper Union. The union, as I am sure we all know, is a well-respected agency in Kansas City, Mo., which furnishes much of the news for the smaller papers throughout the Middle West.

Mr. Shead has expressed clearly and cogently, I believe, the fact that many Americans have fallen victim to a campaign of smear words designed to stop progress in our Nation.

The article follows:

CITY OF WORDS

(By Walter Shead)

Washington, with all its beauty and cleanliness, its stately buildings and broad, tree-lined avenues, its smart shops, wide streets, tradition and historical significance, seat of government of the world's greatest Nation and cynosure of the eyes of the world, is not a pleasant place in which to live just now.

The man or woman who can penetrate the fog of confusion, who treads the paths with his feet firmly set on ground hallowed by former great Americans is, indeed, rare here in Washington. We live here in a whirling mist of eddying words—words which mean nothing or everything—according to the point of view. Even the word democracy, if mentioned in some circles, gets an indignant outburst and is given a leftist connotation.

"This is not a democracy, it is a republic," is the disdainful reply. Everybody has a gimmick to sell, an angle to peddle, whether it is influence or a Government building. The gush of words goes on, day after day. Congress does one thing today, tomorrow it reverses itself.

Lobbies are spending millions on words to sell an idea. According to Fortune magazine, the National Association of Manufacturers and others are spending this year something like \$100,000,000 buying high-priced advertising and high-priced words on the free enterprise campaign to sell America to Americans to sell our American way of life to our own American people. The fallacy to that campaign and to these meaningless words is that the American people know more about their way of life than anybody can tell them. They are living it.

SOCIALISM CHARGE

We recently wrote a column taking issue with a railroad president because he wanted to abolish the entire Social Security program on the grounds it was socialistic. Just because he said so does not make it socialistic. From the earliest days of this country every progressive idea has been branded by its enemies as socialistic, which, of course, did not make it socialistic.

Even some ideas sponsored by Socialists have not proven to be socialistic. Some of these ideas first sponsored by Socialist leaders such as the late Eugene V. Debs were the Federal graduated income tax, direct vote for United States Senators, Federal in-

spection of meat, building inspectors, public regulation of public utilities and safety inspectors in factories. Does anyone consider these ideas, all embodied in the laws, socialistic today?

SOCIALISM IN HISTORY

Going further back in our history, the Tories of revolutionary days called Thomas Jefferson a rank Socialist for his progressive ideas. His free, tax-supported public-school system was fought through the Congress as socialistic. Benjamin Franklin was called a Socialist as an early sponsor of the Federal Post Office and a great system of Federal post roads. Federal subsidies and free lands for railroads were called socialistic in their day; the great system of land-grant colleges was also socialistic.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Federal Housing Administration Act, the Wages and Hours Act, old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, the Federal Reserve Banking System, the Securities Exchange Commission, the entire system of social security, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, farmers cooperatives, all these and many more have been branded as socialistic by their enemies, not because they were fostered by Socialists, but to smear these ideas in an attempt to defeat them. Just more words to add to the general confusion of words.

FREE ENTERPRISE

Here is a word to the backers of the free-enterprise campaign. The American people believe in free enterprise and the free-enterprise system, but for all the people, not just a few self-appointed custodians at the top of the heap. The American people pride themselves on their possession of good common sense. They believe when ideas are thrashed out in open debate they are able to decide for themselves whether the idea squares with common sense, not with a doctrine of socialism or with the fears the word "socialism" is supposed to arouse.

DELUGE OF WORDS

We might point out to our friend the railroad president, who says the Social Security Act is socialism, that he is in the company, of real Socialists who oppose the act and are its severest critics, for they regard the act as one which treats only symptoms of unemployment and old age, rather than causes of such human ills. This deluge of words will fall eventually of its own weight. A charge of socialism does not make it so.

Vocational Education in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution of the Iowa Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association:

Be it resolved by the Executive Committee of the Iowa Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, assembled in regular meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, Saturday, September 8, 1951:

1. That we strongly oppose the transfer of Vocational Education in Agriculture from the Vocational Division of the United States

Office of Education to the United States Department of Agriculture as proposed in S. 1149, section 7.

2. That vocational education in agriculture is an organized systematic training program conducted by and through public schools to train present and prospective farmers for proficiency in farming.

3. That vocational education in agriculture is developing as a regular part of the program of public schools in this country in meeting the needs of present and prospective farmers, for training in farming and in maintaining high farm production and a strong democratic rural citizenry.

4. That the agricultural education program in this country should be administered by local public schools and recognized State and National public-school agencies.

5. That strong and definite effort be made to secure funds and personnel, as provided in the national vocational education acts, in the Vocational Education Division, United States Office of Education, to work with the States in the further development of the program.

6. That the vocational agriculture program in this country must be free from partisan politics and free from domination by other governmental agencies and by other groups or organizations.

7. That the Hoover Commission be commended for recommending that the administration of vocational education in agriculture remain in the United States Office of Education and not be transferred to the United States Department of Agriculture.

8. That the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report be requested to make a further study of the vocational agriculture program and the implications of the proposed transfer.

9. That copies of these resolutions be sent to: (1) The sponsors of S. 1149, (2) the Iowa Senators and Congressmen, (3) the members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, (4) the officers of the American Vocational Association, (5) the officers of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, (6) the officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation, (7) the officers of the National Grange, (8) the officers of the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, (9) the members of the Iowa Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, (10) the Governor of the State of Iowa, (11) the members of the State board for vocational education, (12) the members of the House subcommittee and the Senate subcommittee on appropriations of the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency, (13) the superintendents in schools with vocational agriculture departments in Iowa, (14) to other interested groups, organizations, and individuals, (15) the offices of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union.

Adopted unanimously by the executive committee of the Iowa Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association.

The Best Things in Life Are Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARMAR D. DENNY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter published in the Washington Post of October 11, 1951:

THE BEST THINGS IN LIFE ARE FREE

The thought hit me at 10 minutes to 5 on Monday afternoon. I picked up the phone

and called the Red Cross, "I can spare a pint and can deliver it at 5:15—will you be there?" Answer was "Yes."

I phoned my wife and said, "Honey, the boys are really low and hurting and I'm going to chip in a little blood, so I'll be maybe an hour late getting home." My wife said she'd save dinner for us. She's great.

"How short are they over there?" I asked the nurse. "They need it," she said. She told me about a dream job with a cork company she had given up in April in order to help out. Told me how good the job had been—but how glad she now was that she had made the change. The Red Cross needed her.

I gave the nurse a 2-minute speech on my favorite subject: politics. Well, maybe three. When I got wound up, oh boy.

Before I could get finished the blood was in the bottle. The nurse had to tell me because I hadn't noticed the blood was going out while we were talking. Oh, I knew the connection had been made all right. But didn't have time to watch the bottle.

So then I had grapefruit juice and doughnuts and coffee with a couple of the boys. Reminded me of a Red Cross setup in Metz I had run into in the last one.

"I hear they're getting to the bottom of the barrel," the big fellow said. Wouldn't it be rough if they ran out? We agreed. I got my hat and coat and went home. I thought how my taking a little time like that and being late for dinner might save a Joe. Probably would.

That was the fifth human being I figure I've saved by dropping off a little blood to the Red Cross. The Red Cross fixes it so I can reach out my arm 8,000 miles to Korea and touch life back into a hurt, dying buddy—whether I have a million dollars or am in my usual financial condition makes no difference. The fellow who said the best things in life are free was right. They are.

WILLIAM S. POWER.

PITTSBURGH.

The Third Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Congress will soon pass another tax bill, the third since the start of the Korean war. The new bill will bring the total annual Federal tax burden up to about \$68,000,000,000, which exceeds by \$22,000,000,000 the highest Federal tax levy of World War II.

All three measures enacted during the Korean war will produce approximately \$18,000,000,000 in additional taxes. This increase alone is more than three times the total Federal taxes collected in 1940.

What is needed at once is an earnest effort by the administration and Congress, working together, to cut to a minimum all Federal spending not truly essential in this period of national emergency.

Despite efforts of economy-minded Members of Congress, the new tax bill represents the price the American people are being asked to pay for the failure or refusal of their Government to tighten its own belt as it has repeatedly urged the people themselves to do in this war emergency.

The Federal civilian-employment picture is one of the best examples of bureaucratic growth. In 1939, the Government had a total of 960,939 civilian employees on its payrolls. The total civilian-employment figure as of July 1951 was 2,500,889.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

If we exclude from these employment statistics all war-related agencies, we find that the Government had 666,616 civilians on its payrolls, exclusive of the armed services and the Veterans' Administration. Comparable figures for July 1951 show 1,036,963 people excluding not only those employed by the Armed Forces and the VA, but also those of defense mobilization agencies, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the ECA.

This is a 55-percent increase in comparable civilian employment in all non-war-related agencies. Civilian employment means large expenditures to meet the payroll. Large expenditures mean high taxes and high taxes mean increased living costs for all of us.

Civilian employment in the Government can be reduced by weeding out spending programs that the Nation can get along without in this period of emergency. This is no time for luxury, waste, or extravagance anywhere, not even in the armed services of the United States.

The Story of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Hon. JOHN T. WOOD, Member of Congress from Idaho, delivered an address before the United States Flag Committee at Hotel New Yorker, October 10, 1951. His speech should be of great interest to the people of this country as it sounds a warning to the people of just what attempt is now being made to build in this world a super-government of which the United States is to become simply one state in this great world organization. Here is the speech:

THE STORY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Hon. JOHN T. WOOD)

The story of the United Nations is one of the strangest, most weird, and most tragic which has perhaps ever been unfolded upon this earth. Mothered by a universal desire for peace, almost at any price, which still thrills the soul of America, it is a strange compound of love and hate, a burning desire among the millions of Americans to banish war from the earth; while on the other hand it has well served the purpose of still more millions of an alien horde of Communists, still other millions of Socialist or near Communist nations, with a still greater admixture of savage or barbarous peoples who have not yet learned the first lessons of living decently with their fellows more or less under a reign of law and order.

Gendered by the American people in an honest and fervent desire for universal peace, proclaimed from most pulpits as more or less of a going concern, and almost a panacea for the reign of godliness and Christian liv-

ing, there can be no reasonable doubt at this time that it was a made-to-order trap for the Communists to bring into being a one-world government, a Communist world state, and a pliable instrument for Soviet aggression. It is all so incredible that the good people of America, not being used to Oriental duplicity and intrigue, simply cannot believe that men could be so utterly false to all the laws of decent living, regard for the rights of minorities, and the great moral principles upon which this Government was founded, and which its people have followed for the past 175 years.

DUPLICITY OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Lying, duplicity, treason, suicide, bloodshed, genocide on a scale never before witnessed upon this earth have been practiced in the rape of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, China, Tibet, East Germany, and many other smaller states, whose peoples were either brutally murdered when they refused to bow the knee to the invader, were sent to a fate worse than death in the slave labor camps of Russia and Siberia, or who are living in peril of their lives in the police states set up in these overridden countries.

And yet the Communist hordes of Russia and her satellites piously profess their adherence to the alleged principles of the Genocide Convention. What a strange thing it is that the people of America, blinded by their desire for universal peace, have either overlooked this discrepancy, or refused to believe it. One of the five original signers of the United Nations Charter still poses as a liberty-loving democracy. In spite of all these hideous crimes against the minorities in the states it has engulfed. No wonder I shudder every time I hear the word "democracy." It is now Stalin's word, and has an entirely different connotation than when Webster wrote his dictionary. Certainly no American should ever now use the term. I am sure I do not need to remind you that we are not now, and never were a democracy, we are a constitutional republic, and have nothing in common with that hated term, which has now become opprobrious to a most extreme degree.

THE WORLD'S MOST GULLIBLE NATION

The American Nation is undoubtedly the smartest on the face of the earth in its scientific know-how, and in its capacity for getting great things done quickly, as witness the speed with which, starting from scratch, we armed ourselves, the rest of our allies, and even Communist Russia. At the demand of the President, 60,000,000 workmen sprang to work, and with the expenditure of almost unlimited savings of American citizens, we truly became the arsenal of the world. And we are doing it again, though our savings are almost gone, and we are reaching a most dangerous stage of inflation, where our dollar is only worth about 40 cents.

But it is a tragic fact that, with all of this capacity to produce, we have been the world's most gullible Nation, blinded by our inherent love for peace, to the Communist menace which has been set up within our own borders by this spider web thing we call the United Nations, an instrument designed by the Communist hordes to compass our enslavement and destruction as a freedom-loving people. It is my purpose tonight to categorically give the facts which support this thesis.

AN INTERNATIONAL FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER

Possibly no one could have envisaged the ultimate purpose behind this Communist plot at any single given time. It is only as the dark schemes unfold that we may begin to realize the ulterior motives present from the beginning in the ignoble birth of this international Frankenstein monster. It is no wonder that President Roosevelt, the bewildered partner of the compact, said that

he did not see how it could work, but that it must work. If he could see it now, he would realize that it has worked all too well in the Russian design to enslave America for communism.

Frequently the accumulated wisdom of the ages may be compressed into a few simple and homely sayings. Among these might be mentioned: "A stream cannot rise higher than its source"; "Like begets like"; "Men do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles"; and "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." And with all our boasted modern wisdom, much of which is spurious, we still do well not to run counter to the truth expressed in these timely maxims.

Contrary to its stated aims, the United Nations Charter was never an instrument dedicated to the cause of universal peace as its Charter proclaims. It has always been an instrument of force from its inception. And while its founders cloaked the application of power with the universal desire for peace, even a cursory reading of the Charter will demonstrate that a solid backbone of military power occupies almost one-third of the body of the Charter, with speculations as to its effective use on occasion by the dominant Big Five of the contracting powers.

Power in itself is entirely an unmoral thing. It knows neither right nor wrong. The same force which might loose cataclysmic destruction in the explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb, might conceivably run farm machinery, or help in the production of crops, or increase the number and complexity of labor-saving devices. In fact, this is the purpose of the atomic plant set up in my own State of Idaho. Power may be a good thing or a bad thing, depending upon the moral nature and aims of its users.

UNIVERSAL PEACE ACHIEVED ONLY THROUGH SLOW EVOLUTION

I believe firmly in the innate nobility of the soul of man. But it has seemed to be God's will that largely such a growth of the soul from the savage to the highest characters in a Christian community has followed a process of slow evolution, and while there are abundant exceptions to this general law, certainly the larger growth of nations has seemed to follow such a general evolutionary plan. Any scheme for universal peace shall probably fail unless predicated upon this fact, and also upon the additional fact that, even in more advanced peoples, selfishness still remains the dominant factor which determines their collective actions and reactions. Freedom from the bonds of the flesh comes slowly and painfully rather than by some arbitrary convention such as the United Nations, and a study of its results so far will demonstrate even it is not far removed from the reign of tooth and claw.

Ever since there were mothers, there has been more or less of a universal desire for peace. For no mother, unless fired by profound family, religious, or patriotic urges really wants her sons to go to war, and even then does so shudderingly and shrinkingly.

There have always been efforts to preserve peace by means of union with stronger nations, leagues, balances of power, and what not. Such may have prevented some wars, but sooner or later, selfishness in persons in authority, nationalistic or religious urges, or the desire for national aggrandizement has triumphed over the desire for peace. For there are many things worse than death; and the stultifying Munichs and Tehrans of the past have frequently been the basis for future wars. It seems inevitable that large power concentrations shall sooner or later override the rights and national aims of minority nations, until the emotional strains of the less powerful nations at least become vocal and explosive enough to result in war. And even if the

minority may lose the war, there is always the chance the victor may be outsmarted at the peace table, as happened with the last war.

CECIL RHODES OBSESSION OF PAX BRITANNICA

Possibly the first of the modern urges toward universal peace originated in the fertile brain of Cecil Rhodes, who envisaged the role of Great Britain as the one power able to enforce world peace. Originally Great Britain was supposed to act alone in this capacity, but later he began to comprehend the rising power of the United States was necessary to be joined with Britain to accomplish his aim. And thus originated his idea of Rhodes scholarships, through which American young men, possessing the necessary elements of leadership, which was prime in his scheme, should be taken back to English universities and there indoctrinated with his compelling idea of a Pax Britannica, with the aid and assistance of the United States. Hundreds of these young men have returned to America to foster the idea that the great English-speaking peoples should eventually rule the world.

And in spite of the fact that the sun of the British Empire seemingly set at Dunkerque, this idea is still far from dead. Rhodes scholars in the United States are plentifully present in every department of public life, and are still attempting to warp the policy of this country toward a strong union of the English-speaking peoples, both in and out of the United Nations. Much of the near treasonable policies of our State Department are perhaps as much pro-British as pro-Communist. Many of them are present in Congress, and one may almost always determine beforehand what their votes shall be, particularly in foreign policy.

One must never forget that the lifeblood of the British Isles is foreign trade. They cannot exist without it. The greatest opportunity for foreign trade at present exists between them and Communist China, and Socialist Britain finds it politically easy to forget her many obligations to us, even to the extent of shipping potential war materials to our common enemy, even if United Nations rules did not prohibit such a restriction, and those rules do just that.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER DESIGNED AS INSTRUMENT OF FORCE

The Charter of the United Nations was written by Alker Hiss, the treasonable felon, assisted by Harry Dexter White, later cited before a Congressional Un-American Activities Committee as a possible Communist, and who died shortly afterward from causes which were never cleared up. Molotov of Russia, and Edward Stettinius, who was then Secretary of State. It was patterned to some extent upon the Constitution of the Soviet Republics, frequently paraphrasing the wording of that document.

A perusal of articles 43 to 51, inclusive, will reveal the fact that it was designed as an instrument of force, and the flinching of Russia in obtaining the preponderance of votes over ours, proves that she intended to use it as an instrument of aggression against us. This fact was dimly realized by the other signers of the pact, to the extent that a General Assembly had to be formed, in addition to the original Executive Council of the big five, wherein Russia and her satellites could be outvoted, and where her veto would not be permitted. And in point of fact, most of the deliberations of the United Nations at present are carried on in this General Assembly.

UNITED NATIONS SELF-GRANTED POWERS FORMING ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

All of this was bad enough, and hopeless enough, as far as the best interests of the United States were concerned, but worse was still to come. Entirely through self-constituted authority, without a single particle of

any grant of power from the American Constitution, there was formed within the body of the United Nations, self-granted powers to form a one-world government, with hundreds of subsidiary organizations, such as UNRRA, UNESCO, the International Labor Organization, the International Court, the International Economic Organization, the Atlantic Pact, the Atlantic Community, International Education Organization, International Child Welfare, the Human Rights Convention, the Genocide pact, and many others of a similar ilk. While the Charter of the United Nations was brought into being by a treaty signed by the President and the United States Senate, certainly it was never intended that these later powers should be spawned from the womb of the United Nations Charter, each of which by the terms of the treaty becomes the highest law in the land for this country, and superseding the laws of the individual States.

The United Nations, I repeat, was bad enough, and illusory enough but the later inclusion of the idea of a one-world government, dominant over the Constitution, and the laws of every State in the Union, and which is even now actively functioning, to our great detriment, is intolerable.

AMERICA IS ON THE MARCH TO REGAIN NATIONAL HERITAGE

We shall never surrender the freedoms set up for us by the founding fathers to this alien monstrosity, this malignant being we are now sorry we ever gave the right to live and function in this free America. It is our modern Frankenstein which must be destroyed ere it destroys us. Free America is on the march to regain our glorious national heritage, and we shall be satisfied with nothing less than the destruction of this mongrel and alien entity, with its total expulsion from our shores, along with the Communist traitors who have gained refuge in its welcoming arms.

Reexamination of the basic recognition of the United Nations by the United States Senate is being conducted at this time by a Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, based upon testimony brought to the floor of the House in a debate, through a speech by Congressman Usher L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1951, page 12293, and which was spearheaded by a report of the American Bar Association as to the possible loss of our national sovereignty through the later inclusion of the idea of a one-world government in the United Nations, which is superseding our body of Federal and State laws as in the California Fujii case. Congress is becoming exercised about the increasing perils for continuing American institutions in the handling of our internal affairs, free from the encroachments of this cancer implanted within the body of the United Nations. My own House bill 5080, introduced into the House August 8, 1951, seeks to strike at the root of the matter by a complete severance of our national fortunes from the United Nations, with all its monstrous accretions.

Since the filing of my bill, which seemed to focus the attention of the House, as well as patriotic people in every State in the Union, there have been four bills introduced into the House, either seeking to withdraw from the United Nations, or to pull its teeth by limiting its power to destroy the United States through the host of conventions introduced by one-world devotees in that body, which are plainly designed to merge the people of the United States, with their glorious national institutions, into a fantastic and unworkable world government which, in the opinion of most thinking and truly patriotic Americans, promises nothing for us but enslavement to European and Asiatic hordes, hungry for our wealth, but without the slightest comprehension of the freedoms we

have toiled so long and with such difficulty to obtain.

FALLACIOUS REASONING OF ONE WORLDERS

Proponents of this one-world government are apt to point a similarity between the position of the Thirteen Original Colonies under the articles of confederation and the condition of the United Nations at present. But what a foolish simile this is, and how designed to point up the differences. In the Thirteen Colonies, we had groups of brave and adventurous peoples, who certainly had this great compelling thought in common: a burning desire for freedom from a domestic oppressor, and the will to fight and die for the attainment of those freedoms. And history records how well they succeeded in the quest of their holy grail of freedom. The less adventurous, and those who were willing to submit to oppression, stayed at home.

As over against this intrepid band of modern Jasons, united in the search for the golden fleece of freedom and self-expression, let us compare for a moment, the motley lot, other than the United States, providing the present complexion of the alien countries within the United Nations:

Great Britain: A Socialist state, shorn of most of her former glory.

Russia and her satellites: Completely Communist and pledged to destroy everything we hold dear.

France: Thirty-percent Communist, the balance strongly Socialist

Australia, New Zealand, and Canada: Representative democracies and worthy allies.

Argentina: A Fascist, totalitarian state.

Brazil: A representative democracy, with socialistic or Communist leanings.

China: Nonexistent through our base betrayal.

Czechoslovakia: Betrayed by the United States; and now Communist.

Denmark: A constitutional kingdom inclined toward socialism.

Ethiopia: A barbarian monarchy.

Greece: A kingdom, leanings toward communism.

India: Problematic, leanings toward communism.

Indonesia: Strong Communist leanings.

Iran: Mulcted by the British. Tendency toward socialism or communism.

Mexico: A republic; some leanings toward communism.

Netherlands: A monarchy.

Norway: A constitutional kingdom.

Sweden: A constitutional kingdom.

Turkey: A republic with totalitarian leanings.

Yugoslavia: Communistic.

Besides those mentioned, there are other smaller states, most of which have little conception of what membership in the United Nations is all about, merely looking to it for protection against their stronger neighbors; or with strong desires to participate in American give-away programs, which have been plentiful enough to almost bankrupt us, with little avail in increasing the national standard of ethics in the countries receiving the gratuities. Not only so, but they have become quite insolent in varying degrees in their demands for bigger and more expensive aid.

WE MUST NEVER SURRENDER OUR NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

I submit that it might be perfectly proper to join with some of these nations who really desired it, and who have even a slight conception of freedom and free institutions, in some form of an international league, in which international problems could be discussed and helpful solutions sought; but to merge our national fortunes in a firm union with such, giving them the right to tax us out of 300 years of our earnings, and to surrender land and property rights to them, our freedom of speech and press, our rights

to be secure in person and property against the encroachments of any state, whether domestic or foreign, I repeat this: We cannot, should not, and will not tolerate. I am sure no patriotic and thinking American would tamely submit to such atrocious doctrine. I feel sure every American citizen will cry out with Patrick Henry: "I care not what others may think; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

USURPATIONS OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Now, lest you should think some of my conclusions are far-fetched, let me quote some of the comparatively recent usurpations of our constitutional rights promulgated by the United Nations; and the result of these orders to a free people, whose tax-gathering principles are well defined, and the subject of many statutory safeguards, which alien orders shall be inevitably reflected in the taxes you will pay next year.

1. While standing by the ticker tape in the cloak room of the House about midsummer of this year, I saw spelled out the news item that the International ECA Committee of the United Nations had met that afternoon, and had decreed an annual tax levy of \$19,000,000,000 upon the peoples of the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and of all peoples, Western Europe, who are at present the recipients of our national ECA.

Within a few days, the President sent to the House Appropriations Committee a request for \$7,500,000,000 for our international ECA fund, as our share of the \$19,000,000,000, allotted to us for this purpose, by order of the international ECA committee of the United Nations. And this was done, in the face of an amendment placed in the measure appropriating funds for the continued existence of the United Nations, and passed by the House, placing a ceiling upon our contributions to this body to not over one-third of the amount paid by the other member nations. And it is well to further remember that many of the member nations have not paid a single cent into the United Nations since they were admitted, while our payments have run between 90 percent and 51 percent of the total. And our percentage has been paid. Not only so, but we loaned, or perhaps one should say, gave them \$65,000,000 for the building of their new home. So we now occupy the unique position of not only being destroyed by the United Nations, but paying them for the privilege of destroying us. In other words, we are having a royal set of horns placed upon our devoted heads, by this group.

ACCEPTS PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE

The House cut the seven and one-half billion to something over five and one-half billions, on which I voted "nay." A few days later, the President wrote a stern letter to Congress, suggesting that if any of its Members felt that way about the foreign-aid bill, they should immediately submit a bill to get out of the United Nations, which I did, 8 hours afterwards, as soon as the bill could be drawn.

In doing so, I remembered that the founders of this country had fought the Revolutionary War on the principle that they could not, and would not submit to taxation without representation; and it seemed to me this was just that same old principle wherein we had merely exchanged masters.

UNITED NATIONS CAN SEND YOUR SON TO WAR

2. The constitutional right of Congress to declare war has been completely transferred to the Military Committee of the United Nations, both in foreign countries, as well as those comprised in the Atlantic Pact. Articles 43 to 51, inclusive, leave little doubt of the fact that the United Nations now has the power to order us into war at any time, without the consent of Congress. What we have done in the acceptance of

the United Nations is to take away from Congress the power to say when, where, and with whom, we may engage in war. In the name of the United Nations, we may bring freedom to a foreign nation; but we shall have lost our own. Moreover, our soldiers are to be denied the privilege of serving under their own glorious flag, the beautiful Stars and Stripes. They must serve under the hated spider web banner when going into battle, and its alien folds are to enshroud their coffin should they have the misfortune to be killed while serving under it. They must wear its emblem on their sleeves, and serve under its generals.

Present examples of these facts are the police action in Korea, which has already cost us 100,000 casualties; and the continuing sending of our troops to Europe, to countries with which we are at peace; and which it is now decreed to continue until we have a total of 4,000,000 men serving upon foreign soil, in a war which has never been declared, and with which Congress has had nothing to do except appropriate money and charge the account to the taxpayers of this country.

And this sending of our troops abroad is plainly illegal, for the terms of the Atlantic Pact provide that only in case of actual war may troops be called upon to serve under that treaty; and there has been no aggression demanding it. In an article published in the *Evening Star* of Washington, D. C., recently, bearing the heading "United Nations group urges call on force such as Eisenhower commands" it went on to say: "A special United Nations group recommended today that in case of future aggression, the United Nations should call on regional defense, such as the army of General Dwight Eisenhower, to act in the name of the United Nations."

This was one of the main points in a report by the military subcommittee of the General Assembly's Collective Measures Committee which is preparing a master plan to meet future emergencies. The subcommittee also proposed that the military-command structure be revised generally to give both the United Nations and the participating countries a bigger voice in the combat operations.

DICTATES OF UNITED NATIONS SUPERSEDE STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS

3 The superseding of the dictates of the United Nations International Court over our Federal and State laws, as in the Fujii case in California.

4 The International Labor Organization dictates much of our internal labor legislation. For instance, the Wagner Labor Relations Act was written by this body, and submitted to Congress without any alterations. The composition of this body at that time comprised about the same number of Communists or Leftists as does the general complexion of the United Nations.

5 The International Child Labor and Child Welfare Committee, the International Health Organization, and socialized medicine are sponsored, and frequently dictated, by these committees of the United Nations, and are usually introduced into Congress later by leftists.

SUBVERSION IN OUR SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES

6 The educational policies of the National Education Association follows the general line of those laid down by the International Education Committee of the United Nations. For instance, when Congressman A. L. MILLER of Nebraska recently made a survey of the textbooks used in the District of Columbia schools, he found quite a proportion had been printed in Russia, containing clear Communist teachings, and even including pictures of Marshal Stalin. A number of the teachers belong to subversive organizations, and a certain number of them were discharged. Undoubtedly large numbers of

these same subversives are employed in the structure of our high schools, colleges, and universities throughout the United States. The recent Pasadena case will point the fact that the situation is becoming serious.

7 Religion even is not exempted, though communism is known to be atheistical and opposed to all religion except the worship of totalitarian force. One of the high officers of a national religious organization has publicly stated that "The living of the Christian religion is not possible except in a Communist state." I may say parenthetically, that I consider this the greatest example of fuzzy thinking I have ever observed. Many of the high officials of this church organization belonged, or had belonged, to from 3 to 41 subversive organizations.

8 The Human Rights Convention of the United Nations takes away the vested right of every American citizen to acquire property by lawful means and to remain secure in its ownership under American law. The recent Fujii case in California has proved that this right is now no longer secure, that the rights of citizens, States, and even the rights of the Federal Government may be contravened at the will of the International Court of the United Nations.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION CONTRAVENES AMERICAN LAWS

9 The Genocide Convention dictates that not only must nations abstain from the wholesale destruction of other peoples, as occurred in some of the countries of Europe during the last war, and since the last war by Russia in the Baltic Provinces and the eastern states of Europe, but that also one cannot inflict mental harm to any other person, or any other national of other countries, or even hurt his feelings, without being liable to be called to account before the International Court of the United Nations, wherein he would be denied the rights which have always been accorded to him under American law, such as the right of trial by a jury of his peers, and the right to be tried in the court nearest to him. Under this convention, if he happened to call Stalin a murderer, even though Stalin might secretly feel complimented, he might even be taken to Russia and tried under Russian law. Thus the Genocide Convention contravenes the entire framework of American jurisprudence.

10 They have their own postal system, a most decided advantage to the free exchange of information between the Communists within our borders, and those in other countries bent upon our destruction.

11 They have diplomatic immunity from arrest, and full diplomatic release from import or export duties. No American legal process can attack them.

12 Salaries of all employees are exempt from taxation by the United States. This immunity from taxation is not enjoyed by any other person in the United States, not excepting the President.

13 The seizure of nine cities in southern California by Military Reserve units, trained by the United States Army, and acting under the authority of the United Nations, with the immediate institution of martial law, accompanied with the declaration that all civil functions were hereby taken over by the military forces of the United Nations until further notice.

The statement was made that this action was taken for practice; and that it was planned to seize cities on the Atlantic States in the near future.

Mayors were displaced, newspapers taken over, civil and criminal courts closed, all schools closed, and all the populations of these cities were warned to look to the commanding officer of the occupying force for further orders. Apparently the enemy is moving faster than we thought to our attempted complete subjugation.

"Upon what meat doth this, our Caesar feed?"

MY FIRST SIGHT OF OLD GLORY

I well remember the first time I ever saw Old Glory. Upon leaving England with my parents, when I was 10 years of age, we had sailed down the river Mersey from Liverpool, and were in the Irish Sea. There sailed into view a big ship with the Stars and Stripes at its masthead. Its colors were gloriously beautiful against the glow of the setting sun. I asked my parents "What flag is that?" They said: "That is the flag of America, where we are going." I said, "How beautiful it is." Little did I think I should be here much later in life seeking to defend Old Glory against its own citizens.

The imperial eagles of Rome, the lily banner of France, the composite Saint George's cross of Britain, the rattlesnake banner of the Thirteen Colonies, all have a connotation which has fired the imagination, and provoked the patriotic fervor of all who have looked upon these symbols as the outward manifestation of an inward and spiritual faith.

Fellow countrymen, this should not be my joy at all. I am an Englishman, but many of you present tonight were born in this country. You, like Paul of Tarsus, in Biblical days, could stand before Lysias, the Roman captain, who had just told Paul that he had purchased Roman citizenship with a great price, and could answer with Paul: "But I am American born."

TO BE AN AMERICAN IS GREATER THAN TO BE A KING

You were born to the purple; born into a glorious heritage where every man is a king by divine right. All the enginery of our free institutions were yours for the asking. You were privileged to enjoy by birth the priceless boon of hard won freedoms, secured for you through the blood and strivings of your liberty loving forefathers. The freedoms you enjoy so thoughtlessly were won for you on hundreds of battlefields.

The sighs of dying soldiers, the wounded on the pain-racked beds of countless hospitals, the fortitude and wisdom of a Washington and Lincoln, the forensic abilities of a John Marshall and a Daniel Webster, and the mighty works of numerous other wise and patriotic giants wrought the privileges which have been yours to enjoy, and I might here add, to defend.

THE STARS AND STRIPES FOREVER

This flag of ours, and I refer only to the Star-Spangled Banner, is something more than merely a piece of colored bunting. It stands for the bravery of the colonial soldiers fighting the French and Indian wars; for the drums and fife of the Revolutionary War; for the hungry and frozen soldiers at Valley Forge, for the peace at Yorktown, for the Articles of Confederation, the nursing ring for that most glorious of all state documents, the Constitution of the United States.

It is the glorious fight of the good ship *Constitution*; the sturdy defense of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans; the matchless seamanship and naval skill of Decatur at Tripoli, Jefferson, and the acquirement of a western empire in the Louisiana Purchase; the glorious epic of the western trappers and voyageurs; the spiritual gallantry of the Jesuit "black robes" winning the western Indians for Christ; the Mormon trek; the Alamo, with its glorious defense; the building of the transcontinental railroads; the Civil War, with its almost healed wounds; the death of the great and good Lincoln; our great industrial progress; the First and Second World Wars; and the present Korean episode; all are in that beautiful flag.

Our national fortunes are not ensouled in the United Nations flag. We cannot hitch our wagon to that star. Its motive power is too erratic, and its orbit is ill-determined by treacherous and ignorant captains. Straight ahead under the glorious banner which has won our hearts, and is

capable of exciting our love and devotion, is our only safe course. There is no other millennium for America. We cannot become traitors to our forefathers, and cast their hard-won freedoms, and our glorious heritage into their teeth. If we do, then they have wrought, won, and died in vain. God grant that we may survive as a United States, worthy of such beginnings, determined to carry the torch of freedom they have handed to us, to the conclusion of the glorious race. We are on the march to the completion of our marvelous destiny; and in that march, we must continue to have our eyes fixed upon the Stars and Stripes before us to hearten us with the memory of what it represents in the building of America. We cannot march under a hybrid flag else our hearts shall have no song.

If You Can't Kill It, You Can't Eat It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. L. W. Schaller explains in his letter to me in a few words how OPS rules and regulations have kept him from buying beef, hence he cannot furnish beef.

Everybody, even Mike DiSalle and Harry Truman, should know that you first must butcher a beef before you can eat it. Yet OPS wants the Congress to reimpose slaughtering quotas. Even a dumbhead should know slaughtering quotas mean three things: Less beef-steak at the counter, black marketing, and higher steak prices.

This kind of silly OPS business proves but one thing, which is that Mr. Truman is determined to bring about a condition which will reduce production, force prices up, and hence perpetuate the emergency of keeping a horde of big and little Federal czars on the necks of honest businessmen.

Congress should not only refuse to reimpose slaughtering quotas, it should throw OPS out the window, lock, stock and barrel. There is but one way to keep prices down. Let the great productive capacity of America operate full speed ahead.

*Cedar Falls Refrigerated Lockers,
Cedar Falls, Iowa, September 17, 1951.*

Mr. BEN F. JENSEN,
United States Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. JENSEN: I just read today in the Des Moines Register an article written by Clark Mollenhoff under date of September 14, 1951, quoting you as saying, "Beef slaughtering quotas have resulted in a discrimination against midwestern packers."

I want to commend you on this statement. For 15 years I have operated a locker plant in Cedar Falls, Iowa. During those years I have never slaughtered a single beef for resale. Always purchased my beef from the packers. Today I cannot buy one single quarter of beef from a single packer in this territory. One thousand and forty of my locker customers have depended upon me for their beef. I cannot furnish beef because I cannot buy it, and OPS rules do not

allow me to slaughter because I have never slaughtered for resale.

Just returned from an eastern trip through New York State and Pennsylvania, and I found locker plants there had plenty of beef; no shortage whatever. Your statement in the Register seems to prove itself in my experience.

The Office of Price Stabilization uses the slogan, "Fair Distribution of Livestock and Meat." What is fair about this kind of a situation. Never during all of World War II did we want for beef like we do right now.

Mr. JENSEN, I appreciate your statement and your stand against this very inequitable situation.

Very truly,

L. W. SCHALLER,
Owner-Operator.

As to Scrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald. The editorial follows:

AS TO SCRAP

In recent weeks, this newspaper has commented on the fact that the defense-production program is using up such vast quantities of steel that the Nation's ready-at-hand stocks of scrap are just about reaching the vanishing point.

Various activities now are being outlined with a view to remedying the situation; but it would seem that an inordinate amount of time is being wasted conferring over the situation.

In the meantime, what a western New York Congressman has had to say on the matter is worthy of attention, both official and public.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, had no hesitation in taking the floor of the House last week and accusing Government agencies of being the chief laggards in the campaign to collect scrap steel for use in defense industries.

Mines, railroads, junk yards, and even farm yards, Mr. KEATING pointed out, now are being combed for scrap.

But until the Government "takes its own dire warnings and directives to heart," he said, "and exerts some earnest effort itself, one cannot help feeling that the wrong people are being alerted."

The Rochester salon specifically castigated the Department of Defense for laxity in the matter.

The urgent warnings and pleas of Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson to "get the scrap out," he said, will be received with greater enthusiasm when all Government departments "including especially the Defense Department and not just the Office of Defense Mobilization" take the scrap steel shortage seriously and "review their own potential sources of scrap."

Then the Congressman became even more specific.

"We have all seen abandoned Government material in various supply dumps throughout the country," he said.

"Reports of tons of such scrap in Navy yards, Army depots, and Government agencies not only are rife in the industry, but are the constant source of legitimate gripes in congressional mail from taxpayers far and wide."

There is a colossus in this country which, when it operates smoothly, efficiently and speedily, is the most powerful human force in this world.

It is the Government of the United States. But when that colossus becomes lazy, dilatory, unwieldy and generally slow-moving and inefficient, it becomes a menace to the people it is pledged to serve.

Recent revelations as to some of the "goings-on" within the "higher circles" have not been calculated to enhance the respect and confidence of the American people in their Government.

Representative KEATING is to be commended for his forthrightness. If he is in error, he will be the first to admit it.

And if he is right, his declamation should have the effect of improving a situation that badly needs improving.

Attack on the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune:

THE RED UNDERGROUND—PARTY BANKING ON SUCCESS OF LAW GUILD DRIVE ON FBI

(By Ogden R. Reid)

Communist Party functionaries have "lots of hope" that the 3-day annual convention—ending today—of the National Lawyers Guild in Chicago's Congress Hotel will be a complete success.

These functionaries have expressed satisfaction over the convention's agenda, which lists as a must the launching of a national campaign against the FBI. A guild resolution, drafted on Thursday, said: "The FBI activities continue to invade elemental rights of privacy, to infringe on constitutionality * * * and to intimidate and repress free speech and association * * *. The liberties of the American people are not safe as long as the FBI continues on its present path."

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, of the Yale University Law School, who has been associated with the guild since its inception in 1937 and who is currently its president, is expected by the Communist Party to run for reelection if his duties defending 16 of the 21 Communists indicted on June 30 (in pretrial motions) do not interfere.

The party may be disappointed, however, as Professor Emerson, in an interview in the Congress Hotel on Thursday, said: "I indicated I would only hold the job (the presidency) for 1 year. I feel it should change hands at that time. I am planning to write a book in the field of political and civil rights—a legal textbook."

A House Committee on Un-American Activities report of September 21, 1950, said:

"The National Lawyers Guild is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions. Since its inception it has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents. It has consistently fought against National, State, and local legislation aimed at curbing the Communist conspiracy. It has been most articulate in its attacks upon all agencies of the Government seeking to expose or prosecute the subversive activities of the

Communist network, including National, State, and local investigative committees, the Department of Justice, the FBI, and law-enforcement agencies generally. * * * The National Lawyers Guild has constituted itself an agent of a foreign principal hostile to the interests of the United States. It has gone far afield to oppose the foreign policies of the United States, in line with the current line of the Soviet Union."

Why in God's Name?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on Sunday, October 7, 1951:

WHY IN GOD'S NAME?

Three minutes of your time, please—3 minutes away from the world series, football scores, the comics

A man in Korea who loves his baseball, football, and L'il Abner paid a high price for these 3 minutes.

He lost a leg in a see-saw game of death on a Korean hill. He questions not the loss of a leg, the shattering of the other. He is a soldier

The question on his boyish lips is bigger than personal tragedy.

Lieutenant X, United States Marine Corps, Dallas, United States of America, wrote a couple of letters home in the last 2 weeks to his Mom went the first. To an uncle, the second.

They are recommended reading. The words of this 26-year-old leatherneck will burn into your soul:

"DEAREST MOM: My platoon was called on today to clear an assembly area and a trail of enemy mines. We did this without mishap and then went back down the hill and led the infantry boys up.

"We watched the battalion as it laboriously moved up the long, steep climb. They carry all their possessions on their backs—rations, ammunition, and weapons. It is a terrible load, but there is no other way.

"Soon they jumped off in attack. The colonel hit a mine up the hill. He was badly injured and had to be flown out by helicopter.

"It is a mighty rough go for the infantrymen. The casualties are high. The North Koreans dig into the mountains and stay until someone kills them. But they take a terrible toll before they die.

"The boys who go in after them have all the courage in the world. Their superhuman efforts can never be fully appreciated. Climbing the hill is hard enough without having to pack 80 to 100 pounds and then fight for their lives.

"The nights are cold and damp, and the days are hot. They are never warm enough at night or cool enough during the day. The world owes each and every one of them a debt that cannot be repaid.

"I'm telling you this, Mom, in hopes that more people can learn just what hardships these boys are going through. Maybe more people will demand that this war be given all-out support.

"Why in God's name do we let them say this is a police action that should be fought on a limited basis?

"Every available means should be brought to bear to bring this conflict to the speediest conclusion possible—including the atom bomb, the Chinese Nationalists, the Japs, and whatever else we could use that we are not now employing

"I know that there are many problems confronting our Government with respect to utilizing our various potentialities. But I feel that if more people could become conscious of the suffering and the hardships that infantrymen are enduring, pressure could be brought to bear and at least an objective conclusion could be our goal.

"We have many things to be thankful for, mainly that I am in the engineers and not in the infantry. Some good is bound to come from this experience."

Three days and a hellish experience later, another letter arrived in Dallas. It was addressed to an uncle:

"I have decided to write you concerning my misfortune. Then, will you go over and talk to mom?

"Two days ago I stepped on a Russian shoe mine. It was 3.45 p. m. I had taken my platoon out to clear a mine trail. We had removed some 50 mines. I was off the trail, examining ground for a road. It is impossible to find all the mines in the high grass.

"I stepped on a crude wooden box mine that contained one-fourth to one-half pound of Russian TNT. It immediately blew my left foot off just above the ankle. It broke my right leg.

"One of my boys came up to get me. He stepped on one in the grass and received approximately the same injuries. I directed my men to carefully clear a path to us and to call for a helicopter. We were taken by jeep to a landing field and flown several miles by copter.

"I was given the proper treatment and sedatives and was operated on about 8 p. m. When I awoke I felt no pain and looked down to see a cast on my right leg. My left one was bandaged and cut off below the calf.

I am now in a big Army hospital. It is fine, with all the comforts of a stateside hospital. I was put in a ward with U. N. forces—French, Dutch, South Koreans, and colored boys. We receive excellent attention and it is a real eye-opener to observe the close feeling between these wounded of various countries.

I have no qualms about my disability. It could have been so much worse. Since I still have the majority of my leg below the knee it will be quite simple to wear an artificial foot.

"Soon they will fly me back home. I will miss the cold winter, I will be home 7 or 8 months sooner and I am no longer exposed to worse fates. Infantrymen here with me with shrapnel and bullet wounds, suffer a great deal more. * * * Please don't spend your time worrying about me. Direct your prayers for those who still face the hardships and danger of Korea.

"And it looks as if I'll get to see some football games after all."

Almost forgotten the war in Korea! Men still die and are maimed—every day on every hill.

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks, I would like to submit the following "Neckyoke Jones Says" column from the Sheridan Press, Sheridan, Wyo., under date of October 6:

"I seen by the paper," I whortes to Grease-wood, "that Harry Truman is mad at the newspapers an' magazenees, because, he sez they are tellin' all of our seckrits to the enemy." "Yep," he refrigerates, "it's down-right terribul. The newspapers has been tellin' all of the folks about what's goin' on with the New Deal, Fair Deal, bad deal an' sundry—which is sure bad campaign amnytion. It has allus been said that a boll kin be a pain in the neck—an' withouten tryin' to be funny it looks like iffen you spell it differunt—me bein' an expert on spellin'—a Boyle kin also be a pain in the neck. Not to be prejdiced—probably folks would jest as soon see this here Boyle an' ol' Gabrilson both go back to wherever they come from an' try to make a livin' by bein' lawyers—the same as other lawyers. It ain't fair not to let some others set in an' make a lil' easy money. Of course, when you git right down to cases, what these fellers has been doin' ain't very important as they kin git the bartender's boost iffen the people wants to give it to 'em—but what is important is the publick don't seem to give a whoop or a holler how rotten things are. I'm still thinkin' about that ol' boy Esau, in the Good Book (with which I ain't too familiar) who sold his birthright for a bowl of dog soup." Grease-wood gits Scripturuel at times. Hopin' you are the same, I am

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

Thought Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Ill.) Daily Journal of October 10 1951:

THOUGHT CONTROL

Freedom-loving Americans should support the protests of editors of leading newspapers, as well as of many Congressmen, against the growing tendency in Washington to withhold the news or revise it to suit bureaucratic ends. In a republic there must be accurate reporting of events so that the electorate will be informed.

The more nearly 'his ideal is approached, the better the Government. There is much to be disturbed about. The history of the past decade has been doctored by the withholding of relevant facts and official revision of vital information. The executive department has blocked attempts by Congress to obtain documents and facts from bureaus of the Government.

Emboldened by these successes, the executive department now is sponsoring the mischievous policy that no information shall be given out that is derogatory to any of the departments.

Unless challengers of this trend are supported by the public, this can go on until America becomes the victim of complete thought control regarding governmental affairs.

How To Walk in Government Buildings**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the complexities of administering our thousands of Government buildings and millions of Government employees are great, and deserve the sympathy of the Congress, but some of our administrators sometimes let the problem go to their heads. As an example, I submit the following, under unanimous consent.

[From General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, Buildings Management Division, region III]

MAY 22, 1951.

To: Chief clerks, administrative officers, all agencies.

From: Chief, buildings management division.

Subject: Study of unsafe practices in corridors having waxed floors.

Our safety and fire prevention section has received several reports of accidental falls within buildings under our jurisdiction. Many of these accidents are reported to have been caused by waxed floors. An investigation of each of these incidents indicates that the cause, in the large majority of cases, was not the slipperiness factor, but carelessness on the part of the injured person.

It is virtually impossible to properly maintain some types of floors within our buildings without waxing. This must be done not only as a matter of proper maintenance, but also for cleanliness and appearance. Our Engineering and Research Office is constantly testing waxed floors with a Sigler pendulum impact type slipperiness tester, developed at the National Bureau of Standards, to insure their safety. This testing program determines the coefficient of friction which is an index of relative slipperiness. Our tests on recently waxed floors with this equipment show satisfactory antiskid properties and do not indicate a high slipping hazard to exist.

We believe that many of the accidents blamed on waxed floors are avoidable and that much of the difficulty can be eliminated by employees exercising greater caution while going about their daily duties. Accident statistics indicate that about 85 percent of our accidents are the result of unsafe acts. We would appreciate your assistance by the issuance of a brief instructive memorandum to your employees to help them in the prevention of this type of accident. Listed for your convenience are a number of suggested causes and remedies for this type of accident:

1. Walk, don't run.
2. Face in the direction you are walking
3. Be extra cautious on waxed floors.
4. Don't read while walking.
5. Keep to the right of the center in corridors.
6. Keep far to the right in turning corners, especially blind corners.
7. Enter corridors from offices, stairways, and elevators with caution.
8. Don't crowd or push.
9. Avoid horseplay.
10. Wear a practical-type work shoe.

We feel sure that a brief educational program of this nature will do much to eliminate many of the accidental falls now being reported. The basic objective to be gained is a mental awareness on the part of our occu-

pants that they have some responsibility in the entire program of accident prevention. Your cooperation will be very much appreciated.

W. H. SAALFIELD.

Chicago International Trade Fair**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include my remarks in the RECORD on House Joint Resolution 331, that authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952, which passed this body on October 11, 1951.

As a Chicagoan, it gives me much pride in the initiative Chicago is taking again in continuing the exhibitions of manufactured goods of America and many other countries of the world.

I believe that every worthy effort and every possible encouragement should be applied for such a program so as to bring about better understanding in the development of marketing the manufactured goods that will aid directly in the promotion of world peace.

A little more than a year ago I was happy to lend my support to the resolution introduced by the Dean of the House, Mr. SABATH, which authorized the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair at Chicago. An identical bill, House Joint Resolution 331, passed this body enthusiastically on October 11, 1951, authorizing a Second International Trade Fair at Chicago, from March 22 to April 6, 1952.

The splendid accomplishments of that first fair in quickening the economic life of Chicago, the Midwest and the United States have led the same civic-minded leaders of Chicago to plan this second fair next year.

Fairs of the proportions of those that Chicago holds are not casual or spontaneous. They represent endless weeks and months of careful planning and wise management. They demand a type of civic support that is so uniquely characteristic of American communities. If I were to read the roster of those citizens of Chicago who were responsible for the success of the first fair, it would be a Who's Who of Chicago. The same is true of the fair planned for next year. We citizens of the Midwest owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude for what they are doing to spur the economic life of our area. My hat is off to them.

We are a nation of traders—among ourselves and with other people. Our whole history is one of expansion of trade and of the opportunities to develop trade. Anything that contributes to the

enlargement of trade is a step for the advancement of our national welfare. Much of our postwar effort has been devoted to the restoration of world trade. The Marshall plan was dedicated to that purpose. And the degree to which Europe has recovered can be measured in a large degree by the trade recovery she has made.

Paul G. Hoffman, former ECA Administrator and a Chicago boy, made this apt observation not so long ago:

We believe such an exhibition, in which products of both continents would be on display, would prove of great value to Western Europe and to the United States. It would give manufacturers on both sides of the Atlantic an opportunity to exhibit their products, make sales contacts and develop new methods of marketing and distribution.

The first Chicago Fair resulted in the introduction of hundreds of new products to the United States. Within the confines of the fair agricultural, consumer and industrial products from many corners of the world were brought to the attention of the American public. Foreign exhibitors gained a first-hand knowledge of the American market, its demands and its tastes, and the method of American distribution. This will be a valuable asset for foreigners who seek to enlarge their American outlets.

Finally, there is one valuable contribution that fairs such as that in Chicago have made—they create a bond of good will and understanding that cannot be measured in material terms. I think that next year's fair is one of the most constructive steps being taken in these days of world tension. Its motto speaks its purpose—"World trade promotes world peace."

I hope that all of you will come to Chicago during fair time and see what one American city is doing to promote world peace and world betterment.

Slogan for Bob Taft: A Clean Deal in Washington**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, public opinion to the contrary, not all public officials are crooks, and by the same token, not all crooks are public officials. A cursory reading of the day's news sometimes creates this highly erroneous notion, and it is about time that we began to do something to correct it. As matters now stand, many people who should be attracted to political life because they think soundly, reason accurately, and have a storehouse of ideals which they desire to put into practice, are deterred from entering the political arena because they are afraid of being tarred with the stigma of infamy.

The serious weakening of morality and ethical standards in public life must cause concern to all Americans. Integrity and leadership on high principles are the foundation on which all public responsibility must rest. Nothing that is morally wrong can ever be politically right.

What has been happening in Washington is made to order for Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio. The New Deal, the Fair Deal, have begun to look more and more like a "Dirty Deal" as the internal machinations of bigwigs inside the Democratic Party have been exposed to public scrutiny. Washington today needs a "Clean Deal." No man in the national spotlight is better qualified to lead this effort than BOB TAFT.

How a Congressman Should Represent His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to address the radio audience of radio station WGN in Chicago on the subject of how a Congressman should represent his constituents. The address is as follows:

In discussing politics with some of my friends in the Eleventh Congressional District, the question frequently arises as to how a Congressman should represent his constituents. I felt my political philosophy on this subject would be of interest to every Chicagoan and I would like to present my views to you.

In the Federalist papers, written with a view toward explaining the meaning of the Constitution to the American people, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison brought out the idea that the sense or will of the community will prevail in our republican constitutional type of government. They said:

"As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of the rulers, so there are particular moments in public affairs when the people stimulated by some irregular passion or some illicit advantage or misled by the artful misrepresentation of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterward be the most ready to lament and condemn."

With the above viewpoint of our founding fathers in mind, I am of the political philosophy that a Congressman should vote to express the will of the majority of his constituents, unless, in his own conscience, he is convinced that such majority opinion would be contrary to the general welfare of the country. In that event, the Congressman voting against the will of the majority of his people would have an obligation to let the people know why he felt their majority opinion was contrary to the general welfare of the whole country.

Now the question will probably be running through your mind, "Well, how does Congressman TIM SHEEHAN go about finding the majority opinion of the people in his district?"

In my particular case, I feel that the will or opinion of the majority of the people on

the northwest side of Chicago can be readily ascertained on practically all major issues before Congress. I, personally, have used the following methods of ascertaining my constituents' views:

1. By carefully reading all letters sent to me in Washington. I might add, I answer every one of these letters.

2. By frequent trips home, where I talk to people and arrange to meet personally constituents interested in stating their views.

3. By attending a town hall meeting, where I reported to the people and also asked them their opinions on important questions before Congress.

4. By conducting a postcard survey, asking 2,600 people their opinions on certain major issues. Every single receipt in the Eleventh Congressional District was covered in this survey, which included most civic and community leaders.

By talking to precinct captains of my own Republican Party, asking them how the people in their precincts felt about these major issues.

5. By writing letters to certain individuals whom I feel have their fingers on the thinking of the people, asking these individuals to tell me their neighbors' thinking.

There are several other minor methods of ascertaining the majority opinion, but I feel the six methods outlined above constitute the major manner of finding out the majority will of my constituents.

It is also a part of my political philosophy that a Congressman should report to his constituents and inform them of his work in Congress, of his votes on vital issues, important speeches he makes, and to report any facts or information crossing a Congressman's desk which is not readily known or available to his constituents.

I accomplish this last objective by issuing a newsletter every 10 days, which is mailed to 3,000 people in the Eleventh Congressional District. Also, through the kindness and public spiritedness of many of the local community papers in my district, who publish my news releases, I keep the great majority of my people informed as to the conduct of their Congressman. I have informed the people of my special work in Congress as chairman of the Policy Committee of the Republican Freshmen Congressmen, of my having introduced the first resolution in this Eighty-second Congress to bring MacArthur home to report to Congress, of my being the first Congressman to introduce a resolution for the investigation of the mass murders of 5,000 Polish Army officers at Katyn Forest in Russia, and this week you probably read that Congress passed a like resolution Tuesday and I was appointed a member of this investigating committee.

By following such a political philosophy of representing the will of the majority of my constituents, and by reporting my actions to them, I best feel that I am carrying out the ideals of our Constitution by having, as Hamilton and Madison stated, "the cool and deliberate sense of the community . . . prevail over the views of the rulers."

Mr. Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial from the Daily Times published in Ma-

maroneck, N. Y., September 25, 1951, entitled "Mr. Baseball":

MR. BASEBALL

Ford Frick, of Bronxville, is naturally to be congratulated upon his selection as the new commissioner of baseball. The 7-year term at \$65,000 a year, with the attendant responsibilities and authority, is an important job.

At the same time, we feel that the two major leagues are themselves to be congratulated upon their perspicacity and upon the fact that so experienced a man as Mr. Frick was available. We may, ourselves, be pardoned, we trust, for expressing a bit of professional pride in the knowledge that the new commissioner of baseball came up through newspaper work.

For a quarter century now Mr. Frick has made Westchester his home, a point which of itself indicates sound judgment and keen discernment of values. Formerly he lived at 129 Dellwood Road in Yonkers and for the past decade at 16 Edgewood Lane in Bronxville. He is a former president of St. Andrew's Golf Club, a member of the Bronxville Field Club, a member of the Bronxville Episcopal Church, and a member of the American Yacht Club in Rye. Thus it will be seen he had injected himself and family into community life along various lines.

To this third commissioner of baseball, former English professor, former newspaperman, former radio commentator, former National League president, we extend every good wish for a long tenure in office. It is pleasing that one of our neighbors rises to a post of tremendous potential public service. And we are certain that as in the past he will make good.

Dr. Homer C. Brown, Leader in Dentistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and privilege today to attend a luncheon honoring Homer C. Brown, D. D. S., of Columbus, Ohio, in recognition of his services to the dental profession, given by the American Dental Association, as part of their convention, at Hotel Statler. Eleven past presidents attended the luncheon.

The program was as follows:

Presiding, Dr. Clyde E. Minges. Invocation, Dr. Carlos H. Schott. Dr. Brown, the Friend, Dr. Frank M. Casto, presented by Dr. Earl Jones, Columbus, Ohio. Dr. Brown's Contribution to the Army Corps, Gen. Oscar P. Snyder, Director of Dental Activities, Army Medical Center. Dr. Brown, the Builder, Dr. J. Ben Robinson. The Marks of a Professional Man, Dr. Arthur H. Merritt. Presentation of Token, Dr. Harold W. Oppice, president, ADA. Response, Dr. Homer C. Brown.

Here is a brief summary of the life and accomplishments of this leader in dentistry:

Dr. Homer C. Brown was born in Mason County, W. Va., September 4, 1868. Parents moved to Ohio in 1870. Served short preceptorship in the office of Dr. C. E. Miles, Gallipolis, Ohio. He matriculated as junior, Ohio College of Dental Surgery, Cincinnati, September

28, 1888. He graduated March 12, 1890, with first honorable mention. He was married to Miss Mary Louise Shaefer, of Gallipolis, Ohio, December 21, 1893. Mrs. Brown was the first president of the Women's Auxiliary of the ADA, serving two terms, 1924 and 1925. Dr. Brown became a member of the American Dental Association in 1897. He moved to Columbus, Ohio, and started practice there in 1902; appointed on Dental Board of Ohio June 6, 1902, and was named secretary the same year. Served three terms. President of Columbus Dental Society, 1905. President of the Ohio State Dental Society, 1906. Was elected corresponding secretary and member of legislative committee of NDA at 1908 meeting. Was leading force in negotiating merger between the ADA and the NDA and was elected the first president of the combined organizations in 1913. Advocated and outlined a program for improving the status of the dental profession in the Armed Forces in his presidential address of that year. Named chairman of the legislative committee of the ADA in 1914 and served in this capacity until 1934. Appointed member of Ohio State Board of Health June 2, 1913. Was the first dentist in the United States to receive such an appointment. Served on research commission of ADA from 1912 until 1937. Cooperated in establishing research program of United States Bureau of Standards. Dr. Brown led the fight opposing increased tariff duties on dental instruments, thereby saving the dental profession thousands of dollars. Dr. Brown organized the Past Presidents' Club of the ADA in 1923 and served as secretary for 25 years. Is now the only living charter member. Dr. Brown is a Fellow of the American College of Dentists, a member of the Pierre Fauchard Academy, an honorary member of the Military Dental Surgeons Association, and many State and local societies. Was the recipient of the Callahan Award in 1933, and was the first recipient of the Harvey J. Burkhart Award in 1949.

Dr. Brown is a long-time personal friend of mine, a civic leader in my home town, and I am proud of the deserved recognition he has received in his profession.

The World Menace and How To Meet It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered by Karlis Ieyasmeyer at the House Breakfast Group Thursday, October 11:

Honorable Members of the United States Congress, it is with deep humility and profound appreciation that I appear before you to fulfill the commission of Providence, to which I owe my life, to be a voice for those

millions who have been silenced and are being silenced and a faithful witness regarding the menace of world communism. My every heartthrob and thought belongs to America, the stronghold of liberty and the refuge for pilgrims yearning to be free of whom I dare to be one. I testify of facts which I have learned in personal experience, observation and first-hand studies during the 34 years since communism started its march for world domination.

Communism has not been victorious because of inevitable fatality as some think, but because of exploitation of the following factors:

1. Masterly use of mass psychology methods and the powerful lower drives and instincts.

2. Successful exploitation of the shortcomings of the Western World:

(a) Political oppression by promising political and all other freedoms;

(b) Economic exploitation by promising prosperity;

(c) Social injustice by promising the rule of the working people;

(d) Religious vacuum, indifference or confusion by igniting a religious-like fervor for the Communist ideology.

3. By system and action of deceit:

(a) The whole Soviet system is a duplicate system with absolute power vested in the Communist Party alone, concealing this fact by fake government institutions and agencies as attractive democratic window dressing;

(b) Communism, struggling to overthrow the existing governments, conceals its real aims and reality but presents itself in stages, promising and as if striving to fulfill the old revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity. But as soon as they have succeeded in establishing full grip over the victim nation the grim reality falls description.

The true reality of communism is—

1. In the political field: Having established an all-powerful secret police with an inner security army behind it and a thorough spy net covering the whole nation, they bring down the existence of the people on the level of life or death, i. e., life must be earned by unlimited obedience to the Communist Party requirements. Even freedom of thought is lost as everybody is forced to study, apply, and praise the Communist ideology and deeds, and so life becomes a nightmare of absolute slavery under an absolute political dictatorship.

2. In the economic field: After the expropriation of all property without any indemnity there is basically only one form of ownership and that is, officially, national or state property, but in effect, because of the absolute political power of the Communist Party, the whole state, public and private property becomes the property of the Communist Party, thus combining in its hands absolute political and economic power.

3. In the moral field: Having pronounced all moral principles as prejudices, religion as opium of the nation, and the evil forces as their spiritual source of power and leadership, they have only one formal principle guiding their actions—expediency. Everything that might help the Communist cause must be done irrespective of moral principles, sentiments, or beliefs.

In order to safeguard the Communist system and maintain its success, real or potential enemies or opposers, including faithful Christians, are being made harmless in three death-mills:

(a) Secret police prisons. There are executed the supposed leaders of the opposition with the most atrocious methods. Though innocent I went through it, had to face their execution squad and, only through divine intervention, miraculously escaped. During 34 years of Communist rule in Russia in them have been liquidated thousands of men and women.

(b) Organized starvation. By confiscation of all food from the opposing peasants, or by deprivation of food rations from certain disliked groups of people in the cities, several times artificial famines have been caused in which children, young people and adults have perished, including my two sisters and other relatives. The rest of us survived only by eating decaying straw. In this way extensive groups of the opposing population have been destroyed.

(c) Forced labor. Large segments of the nation and lately whole nationality groups, the Baltic people, who are distrusted, have been brought into the forced labor camps. Under hard labor and small food rations there have succumbed millions of the best men of Russia and many European nations. With the subjugation of other nations under the Communist domination other thousands of victims are on the road to extermination.

COMMUNISM IS A DANGER TO THE WORLD AND AMERICA

1. Marx, Lenin, and Stalin have repeatedly stated and the Communist ideology is built on the basic assumption that the permanent security and stability of the Communist system can be insured only by the conquest of the whole world.

2. Communists consider the awakening hungry millions of Asia and Africa as their potential allies and they work hard to capture these masses. In their drive for the world the Communists already have succeeded so far that about 800 million people are directly under their command with many other millions around the globe in their following.

3. To reach their goal the Communists have deprived the conquered nations of any comfort, but have used the rich resources of their lands for rearmament purposes and thus already have become a formidable military force.

4. The present situation of the world is such that there is not a power in Asia, neither in Africa, nor even at the moment in Europe that could stem alone a military onslaught of the Red tide, but the United States with its wealth, technical and military might is the bulwark to match the armies of enslavement. The Communists realize that with the defeat of America the world is conquered and vice versa.

5. Communist forces have always exploited for the downfall of a nation its internal weaknesses to the extreme. Therefore, in addition to the external there are internal threats to the existence of America:

(a) According to the FBI there are in the United States approximately 50,000 card-holding Communists with about 500,000 fellow-travelers.

(b) The Kefauver Crime Committee uncovered in the United States a Nation-wide crime syndicate, political and criminal corruption of such extent that it has brought, according to the judgment of Senator Kefauver, this country close to the ruination point.

(c) Dope addiction and juvenile delinquency are alarmingly widespread. They are ruining the moral backbone of the Nation.

All these facts show conclusively that in this crucial hour the stronghold of the free world—the United States of America—is in real and imminent danger.

HOW TO AVERT THE COMMUNIST THREAT?

1. All diplomatic efforts have failed to reach a satisfactory agreement with the Communist-dominated world.

2. Military preparations, through most important, yet do not offer full security from outward attack, nor solve the problems of internal danger.

3. With the titanic responsibility for the destiny of the world on its shoulders, the American Nation needs gigantic moral and

spiritual power, must be healed internally to sustain even mortal blows and at this late hour a grand ally that can balance the scales. Stakes are higher than ever in human history and command unflinching action. It is noteworthy that those men who are directly responsible for the fate, future, and rearmament of this great Nation, as well as the leaders of the free world, have pointed to the supreme source of moral and spiritual power and the mightiest ally in the universe—God. What is His significance in the swinging scales of destiny?

Two facts give convincing answer with striking clarity:

(a) Amidst all the countries overrun by the Communist armies there is only one small nation of 4,000,000 people whose moral integrity and spiritual strength could not be broken. Although militarily defeated twice, its borders near the gates of Leningrad, it is the only free country under the Soviet control. How is this miracle in modern history possible? Finland is one of the most Christian countries in the world and God is for most of the Finnish people a living reality. After nation-wide religious awakenings this rough and sturdy race of Asiatic descent became a symbol for high morals, admired sportsmanship, and unsurpassed heroism, and an irrefutable proof to the great truth: It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.

(b) When the combined forces of Hitler and Stalin trampled most of Europe and had smashed the small British army at that time in Belgium, threatening to invade England, the British King called on his people, who were left alone, to seek God and His alliance. They did. Up to that moment the German blitzes had been amazingly successful, but after that Hitler began to make blunders of a blinded Old Testament conqueror. God intervened and the ruthless tyrant was doomed.

If a moral and spiritual rebirth sweeps over the American Nation, its infirmities and deficiencies will be cured and the Communists, after their experience with Finland, will never court a disastrous plan of attacking an internally indomitable and mighty America. The assured alliance of the Almighty will frustrate the vilest devices of a satanic and formidable enemy against the shores of freedom.

Such an America will become a magnet of global effectiveness, will have the willingness and power to lift the hungry world out of its mire of despair with her material, technical, and spiritual resources, will win them for a better way of life and the banner of freedom before they line up with the armies of destruction.

WHAT ARE THE CONCRETE STEPS TO SUCH ACHIEVEMENTS?

Nominal religion is ineffective, has failed, and is traitorous in this crucially momentous hour. Only real, experimental, applied Christianity and a living faith in God can change men, nations, and the march of doom. We are in a race against time. Therefore, it seems to me, the imperative orders for every American patriot are—

(a) become a changed man and woman by the grace of God;

(b) transformed men, start a spiritual avalanche by everybody leading another one to the inner rebirth and the application of Christianity and awareness of God in all phases of life;

(c) all whose hearts belong to America support spiritually and morally American leaders in their tremendous responsibility;

(d) participate actively in selecting men of sound integrity for positions of leadership;

(e) let the solid foundation of America, the fountain of power, and the secret of victory become in the flame of experience America's strength and shield: "In God we trust."

The Honest Do Not Hide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that people can lose their liberties, and not miss them for 100 years. Step by step that is precisely what is happening under the Truman administration.

The suppression of information, whether it relates to those on the welfare list or relates to the activities of the administration, is gradually increasing. It is so gradual that the people do not realize the extent to which the noose is tightening, but their homes will soon be visited by administration appointees to ferret out all that should be secret within a family.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appears in the November issue of Farm Journal:

THE HONEST DO NOT HIDE

An ever-present fear constantly terrorizes every person who lives under the Communist tyrannies behind the iron curtain. The same fear pervaded Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy.

At any hour of night or day uniformed officers may appear at any door. The member of the family who is summoned—father, brother, mother, or daughter—has to go instantly with the officers. Where? Usually no one ever learns. Why? That is secret, too. Whether any word will ever be heard, or whether the victim will ever return, no one can learn.

That sort of thing is today common in all Communist countries. The overwhelming power of secret government leaves the individual completely helpless.

Beyond what is essential to military security, the least tinge of secrecy in government is dangerous to the people.

If no other reasons argued against secret actions by public servants, it would be enough that government by the people depends upon free and complete access to information. How can the people decide unless they have all the facts?

Other highly important reasons make secrecy abhorrent. Secrecy offers a convenient cover for corruption. It hides mistakes. And it permits Government officers to exert power to which they have no right.

In this issue Farm Journal reports the extraordinary facts of the potato marketing agreement referendum which was conducted last year. The Iowa farming firm of McKinley & Sons has challenged the procedure, and "unreasonably annoys, embarrasses, and oppresses" the United States Government, according to the Federal attorney who is trying to prevent all the facts from coming to light.

The key point in this matter is secrecy. Department of Agriculture officials, making their own rules, kept the counting of ballots secret, and refused to allow growers as observers.

This is a far cry from the trembling Russian who is seized from his home by night. But both situations arise from the same evil—the evil of secrecy in government.

President Truman last week signed an order which directs all agencies of Government to classify as secret certain kinds of information. So far as this protects military secrets, it is customary, and necessary.

But this order went far beyond military matters. If permitted to stand it will help to cloak mistakes, hide corruption, and to hold out information vital to fair judgment by the people. Only recently the New York Times published an impressive list of secrecy acts, by the State, Treasury, and Defense Departments, for which obviously no justification could be found, and which concealed facts to which the public was entitled.

The secret "diplomacy" of the State Department, from Yalta on, has misled Americans, and has built up toward the tragedy of Korea and the costly tensions of today's world.

Secrecy is indispensable to dictatorship and destructive to freedom. Let's not tolerate it in the United States of America.

Overriding of Veto of H. R. 3193

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when Congress overrode President Truman's veto of H. R. 3193, the bill that provided \$120 a month for veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person, most of us knew that we were doing a kindly and humane act for these bedridden and helpless veterans.

I was cognizant of a number of instances where such an authorization would mean that the infirm veteran would be able to leave the Veterans' Administration hospital and go home where his loved ones could give him the personal care and attention that he craved.

Aside from the humanitarian aspect of the law, when one considers that it costs the United States Government about \$10 a day to maintain a patient in a Veterans' Administration hospital, it is readily seen that great savings will be made by paying the veteran the additional sum so that he can provide his own attendant.

One of the nicest letters I have received lately came to me this week from the wife of a blind veteran who has been for 7 years a patient at the Wood, Wis., Domiciliary Home of the Veterans' Administration. I hope that the Members of this House who voted to override President Truman's veto will read this letter. I know they will feel as I did when I read it. There is much more to be considered in these veterans' bills than the mere cost of the proposals.

The letter follows:

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: My husband and I received your lovely letter of October 2, in which you told us of the passing of Public Law No. 149.

Not only my husband and I thank you with all of our hearts but all of the men at Wood, Wis., are doing the same. I wish you could have seen the happy faces of the men at Wood when the news came. They feel independent now, not afraid if they ever should leave the VA that they would be a burden to someone.

After living at the VA for 7 years my husband will leave on Christmas eve for our home at Williams Bay, Wis. Now that the pension has gone through he feels that he, too, can contribute his share toward the maintenance of the home. I believe I told you he and I were just married last New Year's eve. I had been a widow 19 years. Raised five lovely children, all of whom are now married, and have five lovely grandchildren. My husband never had any children of his own but now has a large family. The children are so happy that I found such a wonderful man and as our eldest daughter lives in our house now, they will continue to live with us for awhile. I have a room right outside the VA gate and see my husband every morning. Week ends we go home.

There were improvements we wanted, so I have worked to get them, but on Christmas eve both he and I will leave for Williams Bay to live.

God has been good to me, Mrs. ROGERS, and somehow I feel this, too, has been in His hands. I met my husband just a year ago on the bus going home. You see after my last two daughters married I came to Milwaukee to work. I knew my job was done and didn't want to interfere with their lives, and was here only 2 months when I met my husband. We are very happy; he is a wonderful man, so kind and true. We both feel so grateful to you and your colleagues for the wonderful thing you have accomplished and should you ever come to Wisconsin we would deem it a great honor to have you visit us. We have a large house and can make you comfortable, I know.

Please again accept our heartfelt thanks and also the thanks from the veterans at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Wood, Wis.

Sincerely yours.

Migration of Surplus Workers From Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following on the consideration of this matter in connection with the appropriation for the Mutual Security Act last week, the appended editorial from the Washington Post of October 9 makes a direct and practical suggestion by which this program vital to the well-being and future security of Europe can be implemented:

MIGRATION

No one who has read the conference report on the Mutual Security bill will be surprised at the news from Naples that the United States has rejected the International Labor Organization's 5-year plan for the resettlement of surplus population. The conference bill authorizes the appropriation of \$10,000,000 to aid migration of peoples from overpopulated lands, but the conferees agreed that none of the fund may be allocated to any international organization in which Communist-controlled countries are represented. That excludes the I.L.O. which has among its members five satellites of Soviet Russia. In these circumstances, the Naples conference considering the I.L.O. plan is left hanging in midair.

Other large questions had been raised about the I.L.O. plan. It call for \$10,000,000 to be used by the I.L.O. for the improvement

of technical services connected with migration. And it contemplated the raising of \$130,000,000 to finance the movement of surplus people who cannot pay their own way over the next 5 years. No one had indicated how a fund of that size could be raised, and, with the United States bowing out of the picture, there seems to be no possibility of implementing the plan.

Other practical steps can be taken, however. As soon as Congress appropriates funds under the mutual security bill, they could be drawn upon to take over and operate the 12 ships that the International Refugee Organization has been using for the transfer of migrants and refugees. With these ships, it is estimated that 115,000 migrants could be moved in the first year. If an interim program of this sort could be worked out, a conference of the interested countries could then arrange to carry on from that beginning. The important thing at the moment is to keep in operation the ships already conditioned for this service.

Memorial Foundation of Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a radio address by the Honorable Frank Murray on the Memorial Foundation of the Fraternal Order of Eagles:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. At this time I wish to express to the management of the Z-Bar Net my deep appreciation for their courtesy in making this radio time available to me in order that I might speak to you about the Memorial Foundation of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

In making this report, we must go back to those dreary war days when the Fraternal Order of Eagles, like many other groups and individuals, made a promise. "We will look out for your children until you return."

Soon the realization came that some means had to be established so the Eagles could keep that promise to their members of the armed services. This realization was driven home as the casualty lists mounted daily.

The administrative director of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, M. L. Brown, presented to the Eagles in 1944 the idea of what he called a living memorial, the Eagles' own "Memorial Foundation". During that year 1944 the grand aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles had founded and established the Eagles' Memorial Foundation.

This foundation was established for the commemoration of all Eagle World War II veterans. It is a living memorial dedicated to improve the lot and welfare of children forever.

In planning the Eagles' Memorial Foundation program, the important question was, "How may Eagles best serve children?" The answer: "Help build children into strong, healthy, educated citizens, so that they might become useful and active citizens in their communities."

The Eagles swung into full action in 1947, basing its program upon the present purposes of the foundation. This is to provide financial assistance in the educational, physical, medical, surgical, clinical, dental, and optical welfare of the children of those members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles killed

in action or dying as a direct result of wounds or illnesses contracted while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or Canada. That is providing that such members were members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles during their service in the Armed Forces in World War II—also the present Korean situation.

Thus, the program of health assistance was established and placed in action. It was realized that the widows of our deceased brothers would need this form of assistance to preserve the integrity of their homes and for the best interests of their children.

The foundation was very loyally supported by many understanding aeries, auxiliaries, and their members. Soon many Friends of Eagles, believing in and having faith in the principles of the living memorial program of the Eagles Memorial Foundation, contributed to this fund.

Immediately a search was started to locate all the children who were eligible for participation in the foundation program. This was a very difficult task due to the upheaval and turmoil of war. The search is still going on as the foundation tries to locate all eligible children. In the Philippines, where all the records were destroyed by the Japanese, the task is extra hard.

There are many hundreds of memorial foundation children today throughout the United States and Canada and the Philippines. These hundreds of children, from toddlers to college age, are the large family of the Eagles' Memorial Foundation.

Today, each foundation child is provided with an annual medical and dental examination by his or her family doctor and family dentist. The widow chooses her family doctor and dentist because they know her children and her problems and they can best help and advise her.

The annual medical and dental examinations are very closely scrutinized. Many times, the foundation through the assistance and advice of the family doctor and dentist, has been able to correct deficiencies, thus improving the health, physical welfare, and emotional adjustment of the child.

Each succeeding annual examination has shown a steady health status improvement in almost every case. The foundation's goal is to develop the best possible health for every foundation youth.

When disease, illness, or accident strikes a foundation child, the foundation provides the best possible medical, hospital and clinical care obtainable. It is during these dark times, when a mother, financially helpless, struggles to hold her family together, that the foundation best typifies the fraternal spirit of Eageldom.

There have been many very outstanding individual programs for Eagle foundation children. They include speech lessons for children with oral defects; the correction of physical deformities; the furnishing of eyeglasses; dental services; surgical operations and special clinical treatments. There are hundreds of these cases where foundation children have received special services and care in order that they might take their rightful places along side their friends and classmates.

The foundation's educational program provides each foundation youth with an opportunity to prepare himself for useful and productive citizenship by aiding him to attend the vocational school, university, or college of his choice. An all-out expense account is not granted, as each student is expected to help himself. Today, on many campuses, these youth are preparing for teaching, ministry, engineering, radio, TV, business administration, nursing, law, welding and many other careers.

As the memorial foundation swung into full action, it was soon discovered that the earned income of the original memorial foundation fund would never sustain the

planned memorial foundation program. None of this fund has ever been spent for administrative purposes. The administrative expenses have been paid by the Grand Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Therefore, as the foundation studied its future, it was foreseen that planned action must be taken, because in the 1960's, two-thirds of the foundation children will graduate from high school, and they will need foundation educational assistance.

The planned action developed by the Eagles foundation was the creating of the Eagles' Memorial Foundation Annual Seal Campaign. The Memorial Foundation Seal is a beautiful seal. It tells an outstanding Eagle story and affords all Eagles and Eagle friends an opportunity to endorse the memorial foundation program in a dignified manner.

As the needs of the foundation keep mounting, it is essential that the March 1952 annual seal campaign be an outstanding success.

A beautiful new Eagles' memorial foundation patron bond and patron certificate has been added to the seal campaign. These patron bonds and patron certificates afford all Eagles and friends of Eagles an opportunity to demonstrate their belief in the Eagles memorial foundation and the foundation program by becoming Eagles' memorial foundation patrons. Every Eagles memorial foundation patron receives a beautiful patron bond and/or patron certificate bearing his name. For further details regarding this foundation fund, please write to FOE, 23 South Center Street, Springfield, Ohio.

The Eagles' memorial foundation is a living memorial dedicated to be of perpetual service as long as there is an America, because as long as there is an America, there will be a Fraternal Order of Eagles. All Eagles and friends of Eagles may be justly proud of their loyal support to this project for child welfare; the Eagles' memorial foundation.

When the first phases of the Eagles' memorial foundation have been completed, the foundation will move into its second phase—this will include giving financial assistance to accredited hospitals and associations engaged in health welfare work, baby clinics, and other like undertakings calculated to improve the lot and enhance the physical, mental, and spiritual welfare of underprivileged and physically handicapped children in various communities.

Much of today's success of the Eagles' memorial foundation fund is due to the kind consideration and understanding that the loyal members of the Eagles and Eagle friends have given this program.

We hope that all aeries, auxiliaries, Eagles and Eagle friends will plan to again participate in the foundation's month of March seal campaign next year.

Remember—"He who builds well in the lives of children builds a monument to the heavens."

In closing, I take this opportunity to congratulate and applaud all members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles and Eagle friends for contributing over \$3,000,000 as a living memorial to Eagle members killed in World War II also the present Korean situation. As previously stated, the income from the fund goes to pay all medical and educational expenses of more than 1,300 Eagle children left fatherless by the war. During April and May of this year, over 1,000,000 Eagles and their friends throughout the 1,700 aeries in this country attended dances, dinners, picnics, or card parties to aid and increase the fund for the Eagle memorial foundation.

Since the founding of our order in 1898 we have always championed such humanitarian work. We have led the fight in many

States for workmen's compensation and we urged the passage of the present United States social-security law. Today, through our memorial foundation fund, we fill the more immediate needs of a new generation.

We are definitely in an era of building, the best kind of building—the building of great humanitarian work for the benefit of our Nation and with the definite objective of building human happiness.

Keep up the good work.

Good night, and thanks for listening.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

FRANK MURRAY,
Grand Aerie, Regional Vice President,
Fraternal Order of Eagles

President Truman's Attempt To Muzzle the Press and Prevent Criticism of Public Officials One of Most Dangerous Steps Ever Taken by a President of the United States—Confederate Stars and Bars Not Worn for Provocation Purposes

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the criticism of me for wearing a necktie with the Stars and Bars of the Confederate flag on it, I desire to assure you that it is not worn for purposes of provocation, but as a memorial to the Confederacy, one of the greatest governments the world has ever known.

No administration that ever existed for the same length of time had more statesmanship and less corruption than did the Confederacy. Her flag floated over more victorious battlefields, for the time it lasted, than has any other flag that ever existed in all the history of mankind.

I have never seen as many Confederate flags in all my life as I have observed floating here in Washington during the last few months. But, as I said, they are not used as emblems of provocation; they are merely memorials. And if this administration keeps going on down the dangerous road of communistic internationalism it is now following the chances are that in a few years you will all be wearing ties with the emblem of the United States flag on it, as a memorial to the dead Republic. In that event we Members from the South may be compelled to join you.

I saw in a recent issue of the New York Post a picture of the Confederate flag with Stalin's likeness on it. That was about the craziest distortion I have ever seen; for if there ever was a government far removed from communism, it was the Confederate States of America.

My country comes first. I put the welfare of our own Nation, and our own people, above all other considerations. And I can say without fear of contradiction, that the same feeling exists among those Members on both sides of

the aisle whose fathers, grandfathers, and collateral relatives fought on opposing sides during the War Between the States.

Whenever a question arises that concerns the very safety of the Nation, the relatives of those old veterans who faced each other on the battlefields of that war, are always the first to rally to her standard.

President Truman's attempt to muzzle the press and to prevent criticism of individuals on the Federal payroll is one of the most dangerous steps ever taken by a President of the United States.

This administration is making war on white Americans, and especially on the white people of the Southern States.

One of the first real victories of communism in this country was the beastly treatment meted out to the white children in the District of Columbia when the administration wiped out segregation and drove them from their playgrounds and swimming pools. That was an accomplishment the Communists had been planning for more than 30 years.

The attempts to wipe out segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and other similar movements, are driving the white people over into Virginia by the tens of thousands. Something has happened to the members of the Civil Service Commission to cause them to stack the various departments and bureaus of this Government with racial minorities that are subjecting the white women on the Federal payroll to indignities such as they never dreamed of a few years ago.

You can hardly find a white gentile on the payroll in many of these bureaus; and the service has degenerated to an alarming degree.

One of the most vicious communistic movements ever instituted by any administration was that wiping out segregation in the Armed Forces. It has done more to demoralize our Armed Forces than anything else that has ever been accomplished. It is subjecting our white boys, and especially the ones from the South, to the most beastly treatment ever imposed on white Americans anywhere; and these attempts to wipe out segregation in the public schools in the Southern States is a communistic maneuver that is likely to drive our people in the South, and probably in other sections, to private school systems. In that case the Negroes would have practically no schools at all.

But this gang of Reds that have swarmed into this country, and got into many key positions of this Government, do not give a tinker's damn about the Negroes. They are merely using them as a smoke screen to drag America down, bankrupt her, and subject her to the domination of alien racial minorities, under whom no civilized white people have ever been able to live in peace.

Stirring friction between the whites and Negroes in the South, as is now being done by this administration, is not only doing the white people infinite harm, but it will result in more harm to the peace, safety, security, and welfare of the American Negroes than anything

else that has ever been attempted since the War Between the States.

This communistic drive here in the District of Columbia to wipe out segregation in the Fire Department is an illustration. The ones who are pushing it remind me of a drunk man sitting on a keg of dynamite and striking matches with both hands. It would not only result in infinite harm to the Fire Department, but it would probably result in the loss of millions of dollars worth of property, to say nothing of the human lives that might be lost, as a result of demoralizing the Fire Department in this way. What Stalin wants is race riots all over the country, and all this agitation, all these crazy movements to reverse the laws of nature by Executive edicts, orders, and regulations is likely to result in race riots, not only here in the District of Columbia, but throughout the entire country.

The people of this country are not in favor of this crazy FEPC. It was the chief plank in the Communist platform, and has been pushed by the stooges of Stalin from the very beginning.

Everywhere they have taken a vote on it, the people have turned it down. They voted on it in California and defeated it by more than a million votes. I do not believe it would carry in a single State in this Union, if the people were permitted to vote on it and understood just what it means. It did not carry a single precinct in California, where white Americans were in the majority. Yet this administration is trying to impose it on the people of the District of Columbia and on the people of the Southern States, when everyone familiar with the situation knows that the gang behind it belongs to a racial minority that constitutes the brains and strength of communism throughout the world.

They are the followers of Karl Marx and are insidiously attempting to ram the philosophy of Marx down the throats of the American people; and, as I said, are using the poor Negroes as a smoke screen.

The people of the South are not going to stand for this kind of mistreatment. They now have it in their power to control the next election. If they will nominate a strong man for President, and one for Vice President, on what has been called the Dixiecrat ticket, it will sweep the South and throw the election into the House of Representatives; for the simple reason that no candidate can possibly get a majority of the votes, if the South sticks together.

If no one got a majority of the electoral votes, that would throw the election into the House of Representatives. Then it would be an entirely new election, with each State having one vote. New York would have one, Nevada would have one, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and all the other States would have one vote apiece. If no candidate carried a majority of the States in the House on the first ballot, the South's man would be elected; for the simple reason that all Republicans would rather have him than Truman, or any Trumanocrat, and all the Democrats would rather have him than Taft, Dewey,

Eisenhower, or Stassen, or anyone else who is likely to be nominated on the Republican ticket.

That seems to be the only way to get us out of the horrible mess we are in today, and save America for Americans.

Between the Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 11, 1951:

BETWEEN THE LINES

(By Harry B. Wilson)

KANSAS CITY, Mo., October 10—One of the favorite American themes is that of the poor boy who rises to wealth and influence. It used to be that he rose by hard work or by marrying the boss' daughter. Today, there is a new way. Take, for example, the career of Turney Gratz, a resident, successively of Kentucky, Kansas City, and Washington, D. C.

Today, Gratz has very reason to look around his world and find it sweet. He is a vice president of one of the country's biggest trucking concerns, Riss & Co. Not long ago, he was an executive of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. And he is an old friend of none other than Bill Boyle, the man who runs the political affairs of the Democratic party which, in turn, runs the Government.

Boyle, another poor boy from Kansas City, also rose fast. Gratz regards their respective good fortunes as mostly a coincidence. "Boyle might have been in the cheese business and I driving a taxicab," he once said.

This remark was made when some Senators had Gratz over for questioning. They were curious about Gratz being Boyle's personal bookkeeper and investment counsel at the same time that he was with the RFC. In 4 years, Boyle paid Gratz \$11,000 for his part-time services.

The business of the RFC is to lend money to people the banks are afraid of. Boyle has been accused of throwing his political weight around in behalf of applicants for RFC loans. Why, the Senators wondered, did he have an RFC man on his private payroll?

Just a matter of old friendship, said Gratz. He added that he had never tried to influence an RFC-loan decision to please his old friend. The Senators, perhaps because they had other witnesses waiting, didn't question Gratz very much about his past. They missed some interesting stories.

He was born in Kentucky 49 years ago and christened Hugh Turney Gratz, although he has long since dropped the Hugh. When he was still a young man he came to Kansas City. Before long he was a Pendergast-machine precinct worker. In the Kansas City of those days that was a good spot for an ambitious young man.

Gratz had a variety of jobs, none very impressive. He was, for example, secretary-manager of something called the North Side Business and Improvement Association. The association seemed to be more interested in the improvement of Pendergast than the North Side. And the police once seized some gambling casino books that indicated Gratz was on the payroll there as well.

At about the same time the city park department was paying Gratz 50 cents an hour as a "skilled laborer." And the city water department paid him \$1,584 a year as a "chemical attendant."

That must have been an important job, despite the low salary. Someone was unkind enough once to imply that Gratz wasn't worth the \$1,584. "I work my hours," Gratz replied indignantly. "When a mother gives a child a glass of water she can thank me because I've been on the job and the water is purified."

In addition to improving the North Side, laboring in the parks, and purifying the water, Gratz found time to defend Kansas City's old produce market. His friend Boyle, then a police lieutenant and expert wire tapper, helped.

Some residents of Kansas City, Kans., decided to build a new produce market. It was designed to take a lot of business away from the market in Kansas City, Mo. Loyal Missourians, Gratz and Boyle set out to block the deal.

The two men appeared in Washington one day in 1938. Gratz said they were carrying wire-tapped recordings which proved that the Kansas City, Kans., people were trying to pull a fast one on the Government. Today, Boyle certainly could have taken such a matter straight to the President.

Gratz tried, but was sidetracked to the office of Harold Ickes, who was running the PWA then. Ickes listened to Gratz denounce the political morality of his Kansas City, Kans., neighbors. At the end Ickes had only one comment.

"Dear, dear," he said, "that from a Kansas City Democrat."

Times, of course, were different. Kansas City Democrats had yet to be elevated to the same semisacred position in Washington that cows, monkeys and such like occupy in India.

Gratz next tried to help Kansas City by rushing to Detroit to talk Henry Ford out of closing his Kansas City automobile assembly plant. Gratz announced he was Pendergast's spokesman, a fact Pendergast disputed. In any event, Gratz must have charmed the Ford people, because they gave him a job.

Then Mr. Truman, an old Kansas City Democrat himself, became President. Boyle moved to Washington. So did Gratz, to a \$10,300-a-year post with the RFC. He left a year and a half ago to become Boyle's No. 1 assistant at Democratic headquarters. From there he went to the Riss & Co. vice presidency.

And nobody mentioned his old city water department job when he came back to Kansas City to help prepare for a huge dinner in Boyle's honor. Gratz was a friend of Boyle's. That made him a big man, by proxy if not in person.

It made him a big man even though he has never shown any signs that he thinks there is much of a difference between National Government in Washington and local government in Kansas City. Except, of course, that the RFC paid him more than the city water and park departments.

People Want MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues all know, I have

been a consistent advocate of the election of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Presidency and have continuously urged my party to nominate him as a candidate for that high office. I am encouraged to believe that the people of my party are coming around to my way of thinking on this matter. Evidence of this is shown in the recent Gallup poll which revealed that 54.89 percent of Republicans with opinions on the subject said they would like to see MacArthur run for President on their ticket in 1952. The significant thing about all this is that support for the general has not been stimulated by an organized effort in his behalf but is a spontaneous upsurge of feeling that he would lead us out of the morass into which we are sinking as a result of the fumbling foreign policy and disastrous fiscal policy of this administration. They are sick and ashamed of the tie-up of government and crime and the sale of political favors that are being revealed day by day. The whole dirty mess is becoming a stench in their nostrils. They long for leadership that will clean it up. To my mind no better words can be found to express the growing feeling about General MacArthur than those of the late Senator Vandenberg in his Collier's magazine article of February 12, 1944, entitled "Why I am for MacArthur for President". He said in part:

I know that he [MacArthur] would come to the White House with no thought or purpose except to serve America at home and abroad in the climax of a devoted career. I know he has never shirked a tough job in his life or compromised with it. He is granite in the face of duty. I know that his training and experience produced an integrity of character which will persist in any assignment he accepts. I would like to vote for integrity of character. It means more to me than a thousand campaign promises. Isn't that what America needs? He has the know-how because he has dealt with Government all his life. More than any other Presidential possibility he would be elected as a great unifying American, who would win his country's unified support by deserving it.

Further quoting Senator Vandenberg:

I repeat that spiritual values rule his mind. This blossoms in every speech he has ever made. I have lasting consolation and assurance in this simple Christian's reliance upon divine grace. That is the kind of President I want, Mr. Editor. I believe General MacArthur has what it takes in full measure. He has maturity and vast experience. If nominated, he will be elected. If elected, he will bring a great mind, a great heart, a great capacity, and a great devotion to the proud leadership of a great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, those words were spoken in 1944. They are more than ever true today. I would like to have General MacArthur invited to address the national convention when it meets in Chicago next June. I am convinced he would set such a high plane for the coming campaign that it would be more like a crusade. Our country is badly in need of such a crusade to clean out the accumulated rottenness and restore it to the high purpose set for it in the Constitution.

A Man With a Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I read a most instructive and inspiring message yesterday. It was an address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily Tribune, over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Saturday night, October 13.

Colonel McCormick's address dealt entirely with the prevailing dangers relative to governmental encroachment upon the freedom to write and the freedom of the press. Colonel McCormick presented what I consider unimpeachable facts tending to show the tyrannical and consistent movement that is afoot with the obvious intention of encroaching upon one of the facets of the Bill of Rights. This must never come to pass here in the United States. Members of Congress cannot turn their backs on any overt act intended to rob the people of the benefits of the free press. Colonel McCormick has been a tower of strength in fighting the subversive forces who apparently are trying to bring this about, but the task of preserving freedom of the press is not that of one or more individuals. The primary responsibilities to prevent this rest with the Congress of the United States. In his radio address, Colonel McCormick stressed the assaults by Government upon a free press and cited some glaring examples and instances of how the enemies of this freedom propose to accomplish their objective.

In his address, he also gave us a splendid analysis of the story that lies behind the history of suppressing freedom of the press in England. Very succinctly the message points out that the only enemy of a free press is government.

Undoubtedly many thousands heard the address over the air, but I believe it is well worth while to preserve this message in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address entitled "Freedom of the Press" delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick and printed in the Chicago Daily Tribune on October 14, 1951. The address follows:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

Within the last few weeks, freedom of the press of the United States has suffered one of the most vicious attacks in the history of the Republic. This attack is part of the continuing pattern of Government assaults upon free newspapers which has characterized all of history for the last 500 years since printing began.

These assaults by Government upon the rights of the people to print and to inform each other have been particularly violent during the last 18 years of the New Deal. With scandals, thievery, corruption, and treason in Government reaching an all-time high in this Nation; with a national election approaching which may settle the fate

of the New Deal and rob the Socialists and Communists of their right to rule us, the attacks upon freedom of the press are becoming unusually vicious.

It is vitally necessary, therefore, to alert every citizen to the real meaning of freedom of the press and to examine, once again, its history. Since I have written most of that history, and even have made a part of the history of the freedom of the press which occurred in my lifetime, I feel qualified for the task.

All of you who read newspapers or listen to the radio know what has occurred in recent weeks. President Truman has called upon Congress to pass a law which will move the New Deal's latest plan to control both newspapers and radio nearer to completion. This law would give the President vast dictatorial powers over the press by granting him control of revenue from all newspaper and radio advertising. It also would strangle business and industry. The President could dictate how much money any business could spend for advertising in offering its goods or services to the public.

At the same time, the President issued an order to all the civilian bureaus and agencies of Government to censor their news at the source, on grounds that it would protect military security. The Defense Department and the State Department already classify much of the business they do as a military secret and refuse to disclose it to Congress or to the newspapers.

This order would give the same right to the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury, the RFC, and every other alphabetical agency in the land. The first result of the President's order was that the Office of Price Stabilization warned its employees not to disclose any news to the public which might cause embarrassment to that bureaucracy.

The storm of protest which arose in Congress over this edict caused the President to rebuke the OPS and rescind its action. But his general order classifying news of the operation of all Government bureaus under the cloak of military security—keeping that news from the public—remains in effect.

Congress and groups of newspaper editors and newsmen all over the Nation have condemned this act of censorship. Alert Americans everywhere have asked: What secrets can these civilian agencies of Government know which the public should not have?

The answer is obvious. Only the secrets of graft, corruption, and treason which are being exposed with increasing momentum in every day's headlines. If Russia is our enemy, let us take what security we can in the fact that our most important military secrets already have been betrayed to the Soviet by the Communist spies and traitors on the Federal payroll in our Government.

Alger Hiss was one of them and he is now in prison. He was the architect of the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy, the trusted manager of the State Department, upon whom Dean Acheson will not turn his back. He was the brains behind all that Roosevelt did at Yalta. He was the creator of the United Nations at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco.

Several other traitors in our Federal Government are in prison, two of them in the death house at Sing Sing. Their crime was that they stole and delivered to Stalin the secrets of the atom bomb—our greatest weapon—even before it had been dropped on Hiroshima in 1945. These people were exposed by the Congress—not by the President and the administration. In every single case of treason, the administration sought to cover up and to whitewash investigation until the weight of facts in the hands of newspapers and the people made that course impossible.

At this late hour, the President calls upon his deputies in the executive department to withhold news of their operations because it will protect our military security. Reasonable men, who know the facts, cannot believe any such story. Patriotism is not involved here. Beyond Members of the Congress, there are few patriots in our Government today.

Two measures are ready for possible ratification as treaties of the United States which were drafted by United Nations. One of them is the so-called Genocide Convention. Both of these documents have been drawn up through the connivance of our State Department, and with the assistance of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who was our United Nations delegate to the U. N. Council on Human Rights.

Since treaties are the "supreme law of the land," and have been held powerful enough to override the Constitution itself by Supreme Court decision, either of these documents could kill the first amendment to the Constitution and kill a free press in America as thoroughly as Stalin has done in Communist Russia.

Who is attacking freedom of the press in the United States today? Government. It is the government of the Socialist-Communist welfare state. It is the government of the United Nations, devoted to the same Socialist-Communist principles, conceived and put into operation by men like Alger Hiss.

Freedom of the press is liberty from the tyranny of government. That is all it means today. That is all it ever has meant since printing first began. Government—powerful government—is the enemy of free newspapers and of the people's right to know. There is no other enemy. This has been true throughout the last 500 years just as it is true today.

You may have heard a lot of strange new definitions of freedom of the press from Red university professors, Communist pamphleteers, top bureaucrats in government, and others in the pinko fringe. All of them are on the side of oppressive government, and against the people's right to know. When that is understood, their arguments carry no weight.

Every modern critic of a newspaper's right to print the facts suggests some method by which government shall be given power to censor newspapers or to impose a responsibility over them. None of these critics believes in liberty. None of them wants to give the people more freedom to print and exchange the news. They say that government has become so big and so important to the people that government's own side of the story—the whitewash that government wants to apply to its own operations—must be told to the people by every newspaper, and government has the right to impose that responsibility in the interests of the people.

This is hogwash—Socialist, Communist, big government hogwash. The people are entitled to the facts. Free newspapers give them the facts. Any government which has a side to the story which is unfriendly and inimical to the people is a tyrannous government. In our Republic the power of Government is derived from the people, and the people have the inalienable right to know, at every step, what their Government is doing.

The United States is the only nation in history which has had a free press. We have this great freedom because of the unique and precious principles of republican government which our forefathers drafted into two great documents. In the Declaration of Independence the architects of this Government set forth the self-evident truth that each individual citizen possesses "certain unalien-

able rights" from the Creator—rights that no government can take away from him because no government is powerful enough to give them to him.

Based on this great and original "declaration of rights" is our Constitution and its Bill of Rights. The first amendment says "Congress shall pass no law regarding the establishment of a religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging freedom of speech or of the press * * *." We have the right to forbid government to infringe on freedom of the press because, as individuals, we have accepted the self-evident truth that the Creator has granted us that right. Here, again, in the basic documents of our Republic, is the acknowledgment that the only enemy of a free press is government.

It is significant that the first amendment defines the three great freedoms in one single sentence. Thomas Jefferson explained it thus: Freedom of the press, he said, is the most important freedom because it defends the other two. If either freedom to worship or freedom to speak are threatened, freedom of the press will defend their right. If freedom of the press is lost the other two freedoms cannot defend themselves against the tyranny of government.

How right Jefferson was is proved not only by what is going on in Washington and in the New York headquarters of United Nations today, but by all of history. The history of freedom of the press is only 500 years old, but throughout it has been a history of newspapers fighting the tyranny of government.

Gutenberg invented movable type about 1450. Before then there had been no printing and no press. Caxton brought the printing press to England in 1476. It was a hated machine, hated by government, and government immediately took steps to control it.

In the reign of James I newspapers first were established in England under strict licensing and tyrannical abuse. Unlicensed printers and violators of censorship were punished by having their ears cropped, their tongues slit, or by hanging. They were the men who tried to tell the truth about the King's Government and for their devotion to truth they were maligned.

Under Charles I the tyranny grew even more terrible and the star chamber was established. This was a kangaroo court of the King's nobles and their bureaucrats, very similar to the kind of behavior clinic certain leading professors in our greatest universities would like to see established to regulate the freedom of the American newspaper press today and make it responsible.

Among the professors who have suggested such a device are ex-Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago; Zechariah Chafee, William E. Hocking, Arthur M. Schlesinger, of Harvard; John Dickson, of Columbia; Robert Redfield and Charles E. Merriam, of Chicago; Harold Lasswell, of Yale; and George Shuster, of Hunter College.

When King Charles was beheaded and Cromwell took over as the defender of the people's liberties the star chamber was abolished. But the Long Parliament immediately enacted a licensing law to prevent the press from criticizing government or exerting influence to control it.

It was against this licensing law of the Long Parliament that Milton wrote, and printed surreptitiously, his famous essay *Areopagitica*. "Give me liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties."

Milton's words fell on deaf English ears, for in his lifetime nothing was done by his countrymen to make them live. But they became the clarion cry of all free men, everywhere.

When a king was restored to the English throne, this time Charles II, parliament re-

newed licensing of the press. The law died in 1679, but Chief Justice Scroggs, an evil name in legal history, rushed to the breach to support the power of government against the threat of a free press. Scroggs invented the theory that the king has common law right to license newspapers, parliament notwithstanding, and held no one could print without royal consent.

James II, in turn, persuaded Parliament to renew the licensing acts, and they did not expire in England until 1694, during the reign of William and Mary. Thus, for the first 144 years of the history of printing, government held the whip hand over the press. The story of government's attempts to do the same thing continues right down to the present.

Under the reign of Queen Anne in England and under George I, newspaper publishers were persecuted, but the persecutions were not frequent. At this same time, however, a new method by which government could suppress newspapers and prevent people from learning the truth was thought up. It was conceived in, and passed by, Parliament—government. This was the "taxes upon knowledge."

It was a threefold plan: Taxes upon advertising, taxes upon paper, and stamp taxes upon newspapers themselves. This idea lived long enough to plague the American colonists and contribute to the cause of the American Revolution. It still is not dead. Huey Long attempted to revive it in Louisiana some 20 years ago. Several other States attempted to use it.

It is, even now, a favorite device suggested by the evil college professors who are looking for ways to control and dominate the American press.

Stamp taxes were one of the causes of grievance against King George III outlined by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence. At this same time other tyrannous laws concerning libel, and the pernicious doctrine of "libel upon government," held English newspapermen in check.

One famous British publisher, John Wilkes, editor of the *North Briton*, would not be suppressed. He described George III's address before Parliament as "the most abandoned instance of political effrontery."

For this simple statement—a crime against government—Wilkes was held to trial for libel and found guilty. The King was outraged and wanted to have his ears. But the people of England were with Wilkes. He was elected twice to Parliament. Each time Parliament expelled him. Finally, the excitement died down and he was elected again and allowed to take his seat.

From that time on the story of the crusade for freedom of the press and real liberty to print the truth moved westward, to the American Continent, where freedom of the press first was truly defined. England made progress along that road, slowly, steadily, but not completely. America led the way to real freedom. Today we lead the world. Our story is the greatest ever told.

Reaching Hearts and Minds of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article entitled "Reaching Hearts and Minds of

Men" which appeared in the Lewiston (Maine) Journal shortly after an address by Jim Farley at Ithaca College:

REACHING HEARTS AND MINDS OF MEN
(By Daniel S. Dexter)

James A. Farley—he doesn't mind being called "Jim"—is a master of the art of politics. It's an art and close to being a science. Many miss that.

To be successful in politics—and the word is used here in its best meaning—one must have a good memory for faces and names.

The former Postmaster General Farley has this faculty.

While he needs no memory aids, he takes the precaution to make a note now and then to stiffen his memory and refresh his recollection.

The Plumed Knight, of James G. Blaine whose heirs gave his house for Maine Governor's residence, saw a face or heard a name once—and he never forgot.

Maine's Senator OWEN BREWSTER has a top-flight memory.

Farley, who broke with Franklin D. Roosevelt on the third-term issue has a little talk on Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men.

He's had many years' experience with reaching hearts and minds, which was his major objective.

To be successful in politics, he says, a man must gain the confidence of enough voters to persuade them to vote as he suggests.

It's the same with the businessman.

The man in business is forever at the polls. He wins if he succeeds in instilling confidence in himself and his goods. That is also the idea behind advertising. To build up and keep before the public the name of a company or product.

It's the same with an executive whether he has a squad in uniform or employs men and women in civil life. He must reach the hearts and minds of his subordinates.

Success in command or civil administration doesn't depend so much on authority as on the ability to win confidence.

Farley puts good manners at the top of the list in the art of reaching other people.

This is something more than knowing how to hold your soup spoon or how to dress when you go to a church wedding.

"Good manners are much more than a capacity to say the pleasant but insincere thing. It is much more than mere tact. It is to feel and, above all, to show that you have a genuine concern in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, treating them as equals and sharing their fears and earthly concerns and their ideals.

"Closely associated with good manners is what we call 'good humor,' he continues.

"And I am not now talking about ice cream, with which my own product is a close competitor. What I mean is the manifestation in all outward dealings with the public of a calm and friendly disposition. This is especially true in politics.

"We have learned in that very complex art that the most certain way that a man can defeat himself is to get angry. People are not interested in other people's angers. Anger does not attract, it repels.

"It causes the victim to say and do things that he would not otherwise say and do. He loses his balance of judgment. He makes mistakes. He reveals defects in his own personality and in his own ideas. He lays himself wide open to debate. Sometimes it is not easy to maintain a calm attitude, but success in life, in any profession, and success in attaining our own peace of mind is only gained by meeting situations with a smile, by turning aside criticism and the ill-natured attacks of others with calmness and courtesy."

And memory. "It is true that I have a pretty good memory for names and faces, and I have met a great many people in my

life, all over this country and all over the world. I do not always trust to memory alone—that is too risky. I have, throughout my life, made it a habit, not only in politics but in business and socially, to help that memory by keeping a brief memorandum of anything which seems important, and at the same time incomplete and unfinished. I keep that memo until the matter is closed * * *

"I would like to add something at this point. It is not a manifestation of good manners for a person to go up to another and challenge him by saying, 'Do you remember me?' That puts you at a great disadvantage if you happen to have forgotten. I have found that the best way to meet that situation, when the challenge comes and when I am unable to remember, is to answer frankly that I do not. Such an answer is not always pleasant for me but it is a good reminder to the other person that he should be tolerant and not expect too much of other people's memories. Of course, in my experience that has not happened too often and I am glad that it hasn't, but when I meet it, I meet it frankly."

The Proposed Aluminum Industry for Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to the Honorable Jess Larson, Administrator of the General Services Administration, two telegrams sent to me by Robert E. Harris and Robert C. Weller, and a newspaper story carried in the Great Falls Tribune of October 12, 1951.

I am turning this material over to the Hardy subcommittee investigating charges made against the Harvey Co. It is my sincere hope that this committee will make its findings known shortly so that this matter can be settled and the aluminum project allowed to go forward in the Flathead Valley of Montana.

The above-mentioned follows:

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD. The following is a copy of a day letter dispatched to Mr. Jess Larson today:

OCTOBER 11, 1951

MR. JESS LARSON,
Administrator, Defense Metals,
Procurement Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARSON: It has come to our attention that you have asked the Harvey Machine Co.'s loan be held up until the application of a Montana concern headed by A. J. Smith, of the Smith Engineering Co., of Kalispell, be investigated.

We do not know about Mr. Smith's ability to perform, while he states he has \$15,000,000 equity capital to put up. While we do not want to oppose Mr. Smith's application, we do not in any way feel that it should stand in the way of the Harvey matter.

Many things in connection with the Harvey Machine Co.'s application to come into Montana have been handled on a personal, rather than a business, basis. We think there have been instances of discrimination and unfairness. We think the recent headlining of the Harvey Machine Co.'s applica-

tion in connection with the power shortage in the Northwest and the accompanying smear campaign of Drew Faelson and certain Congressmen and Senators, was used in this area completely to divert the power from Hungry Horse Dam out of Montana. The congressional group involved in putting out the propaganda individually admit receiving their information from an Idaho paper, which to our knowledge, in almost all instances, has been a spokesman for the Idaho Power Co. over a long period of years. The Idaho Power Co. is in turn a sister company of the Washington Water Power Co. The diversion of this power into the State of Washington and out of Montana would be a welcome diversion to all of the parties. It would be a power grab. It would mean that the fruits of our labors would be diverted to another State for use by industry there. It would be the denial of industrial development in Montana.

We feel there has been far too much obstruction and delay, much of it inspired, with respect to the establishment of the aluminum industry in Montana. By using power from Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, we are not taking anything away from anybody. This has been answered by the Bonnevile Power Administration before at least two congressional committees in past 2 weeks.

Certainly the downstream benefits which are added by Hungry Horse Dam to existing plants in the Northwest is contribution enough for Montana water to make. We urge that you immediately instruct those responsible to bring about the entrance of an independent producer in the aluminum business at the earliest possible moment. There will be plenty of power available in Montana next year for an additional aluminum quota to be allocated the Smith Co. or any other company if they are able to perform and meet Federal requirements, but it seems ridiculous now to hold up the Harvey matter pending negotiations with any other company. Inasmuch as the Harvey Co.'s war production record has withstood the light of investigation and several agencies have stated there is no reason to hold up the loan, we can only interpret any further delay in the approval of the Harvey loan as an aid to the interests which are now attempting to stifle progress in western Montana.

We ask your cooperation in bringing the matter to a final and speedy conclusion.

Very sincerely yours,

FLATHEAD VALLEY CITIZENS COMMITTEE,
By DONALD C. IRLE, R.
KALISPELL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By JAMES E. MURPHY, President

KALISPELL, MONT., October 13, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives

Carpenters union and other organized building crafts now building Hungry Horse Dam are greatly alarmed over the apparent effort to divert this power out of Montana. Request that Smith Engineering Co. proposal for aluminum allocation not be allowed to interfere or delay the Harvey Machine Co. loan or construction plant for this area. Please make our wishes known to the appropriate Government agencies.

ROBERT E. HARRIS,
Business Representative, Northwestern Montana District Council Carpenters Union.

KALISPELL, MONT., October 13, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Flathead Valley loggers and lumber and sawmill workers local unions disgusted over apparent efforts of some Government agencies to find ways and means to take Hungry

Horse power out of Flathead Valley where it is badly needed to alleviate historically heavy seasonal unemployment. This entire district council supports its members in Flathead area and urges an end to all maneuvering now going on to defeat proposal for Harvey machine aluminum plant. Believe application by Smith Engineering Co., not in best interests of Flathead and Montana until after favorable conclusion of Harvey loan. Please represent our wishes to various agencies involved.

ROBERT C. WELER,
Business Representative, Montana
District Council Lumber and Saw-
mill Workers Unions.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of
October 12, 1951]

KALISPELL ASKS FAST ACTION ON HARVEY LOAN

KALISPELL, October 11—The Kalispell Chamber of Commerce and the Flathead Valley citizens committee has sent a letter to Jess Larson, Administrator of the Defense Metals Procurement Administration, urgently requesting fast action on the Harvey Machine Co.'s loan application for an aluminum plant here. It was announced today.

The action came as a result of information received here that Larson has ordered the Defense Production Administration to hold up action on the loan until a study has been made for another proposal for an aluminum plant made by the Smith Engineering Co. of Kalispell.

The letter said: "We do not know about Mr. Smith's ability to perform . . . while we do not want to oppose Mr. Smith's application, we do not in any way feel that it should stand in the way of the Harvey matter."

The letter was drafted by Donald C. Treloar, president of the citizens committee, and James Murphy, president of the chamber of commerce. Copies were forwarded to 18 Government officials and Congressmen who have been involved in the processing of the loan.

Tax Pinnacles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 11, 1951:

TAX PINNACLES

Within a week Congress probably will pass the new \$5,500,000,000 tax bill, estimated to boost the annual Federal levy to \$67,000,000,000.

Most individuals will have to pay about 12 percent more, corporation earnings will take another \$2,000,000,000 slash and higher excises will add upward of \$1,200,000,000 to the costs of living. The public will utter a concerted groan and start paying through the nose.

We might as well face the fact we have to pay through the nose. Even with perfect tax policies and an economical Government in Washington, we would be forced to accept a punitive tax burden. That is the price of national rearmament and military aid to our allies around the globe. This is the price we must pay because of Soviet aggression and the Kremlin's imperial fanaticism.

So it is old hat to gripe arbitrarily about painful taxes. It is especially tiresome and futile if we do nothing to alleviate the problem. But it certainly is time the Nation calmly took stock of the runaway trend in taxation.

The United States can tax itself into an economic stall. We can tax ourselves into inflation. We can tax ourselves into a "bust" that would make the debacle of the early thirties look no worse than a scratched fender on our economic wagon. All this is precisely what Joseph Stalin expects and has publicly prophesied. His Communist policy of aggression, power threat, and subversion is directed at a crack-up of American economy.

Have we reached the tax peril point? How close are we?

Let's survey a few facts:

The new Federal tax rise means, according to a research study of the U. S. News and World Report, that \$84,000,000,000 a year will go to tax collectors, Federal, State, and local. It will be higher in 1952.

It means that approximately \$1 out of every \$3 of American income goes to taxes.

In 1940 the aggregate national taxation was \$15,500,000,000, the Federal share \$6,700,000,000. At World War II peak (1945) the aggregate levy upon the Nation was \$47,600,000,000, with Federal revenues \$37,300,000,000. Now the total taxes paid by the country will bulk \$83,900,000,000.

The new bill will be the third tax measure passed by Congress since the Korean war began. The combined result of these three laws is to add an estimated \$17,000,000,000 to Federal taxes.

It costs to rearm, and we must rearm. But billions of tax funds could be saved by Federal Government if it would come to grips with the problem of lavish Washington bureaucracy.

In the face of new, back-crushing imposts, the President has stood adamant against budget cutting by Congress. Government departments and other special-interest lobbies have exerted savage pressure to balk appropriation paring.

Estimates by Senators BYRD and DOUGLAS, Representative TASON, and others have set possible savings in nondefense spending at figures up to \$10,000,000,000. But the administration has ignored demands of the Hoover Commission or the few doughty economy spokesmen. It refuses to tighten its belt in a war emergency.

There is a point obviously at which taxes can smother the economy. They grow so steep as to destroy or erode initiative; they can cause lavish expenditures for unneeded purposes to avoid taxes. Some experts have placed the peril point at 25 percent of national income. America's tax bill now will be approximately 30 percent of income.

The Nation, its leaders and private citizens need to take a long, careful look at the stampeding tax trend. Not because of individual stress, or perhaps hardship, but because the structure threatens national economy. We have reached taxation pinnacles, beyond which may lie sheer destruction.

Truman Can't Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the September issue of the American Magazine written by an eminent son of a former great statesman

and Cabinet officer, Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh, N. C., News and Observer, entitled "Truman Can't Lose," struck me as a very timely and authoritative analysis of the national political picture, particularly as it concerns the future of our great President, Harry S. Truman. A great deal of to-do has been and is being made in the press daily over the possibilities and the probabilities of potential Presidential candidates in 1952, but I am convinced, as is Mr. Daniels, that Truman cannot lose.

For the edification of the many seers and prophets, as well as Members of the Congress and the public generally, I include the article by Mr. Daniels as part of my remarks:

TRUMAN CAN'T LOSE

(By Jonathan Daniels)

Harry S. Truman will be the Presidential nominee of the Democratic Party in 1952 and will be reelected President of the United States.

We seem all set now for a repetition of the old pattern: "He won't run; he can't win; ouch."

The people who were surprised in 1948 are now carefully rebuilding, hope by hope, the same toppy structure which fell on them in 1948. It will fall again. The emblem of Truman's opposition is not so much the elephant as it is a resilient Humpty-Dumpty who does his act every four years.

I do not expect to be surprised in 1952, but I was surprised one day during the summer when I talked with reporters after a visit to the White House. I had just seen Harry Truman, whom I know and admire, and I had sensed his attitude toward his candidacy and his problems. I told the reporters outside his office that in my opinion he would run again. The surprise was that this seemed big news to them. The news hit the radios before I left the White House grounds. It got front-page space all over the country.

I had thought everybody must realize that Truman will run again. Like the girl in the song he hasn't said yes and he hasn't said no. For him to say either now would be to court the administration troubles of a lame-duck President or to overemphasize pure politics in the Presidency. But he will say yes in good time.

Of course, those who are reluctant to have him run are putting redoubled stress on his own human reluctance. Some in their own eagerness for Truman's retirement are stressing Mrs. Truman's retiring personality, forgetting that she has never held Harry Truman back from any fight he felt he ought to make. Increasingly, however, the politicians of Truman's party, who know that they have to make the fight on his record, recognize that he is the man to make that fight. Inescapably he realizes that, too.

Truman has to run. Under the Constitution this is the only method by which a President deeply concerned for his program can put the democracy of the people behind it. Truman is deeply concerned. Barring profound and unexpected developments, he will win by a greater electoral majority than surprised the experts on the flabbergasting night in November 1948.

During the campaign there will be the often-repeated stories about his playing the piano. The ghost of Pendergast will be made to walk its millenth mile. But in the end the campaign will have been won on the high level of foreign affairs and American security.

There seems nothing strange or confusing to him about his foreign policy and he will have made the issues clear to the American people. They will understand that his purpose is effective peace in the face of an im-

placable enemy. He believes the people understand now the policies behind that purpose: economic and military assistance to our allies and the building of American strength as the central phalanx of a truly United Nations determined to bring sense and safety to the world. The Truman platform will be not merely the promise of peace but the clear demonstration of a way toward it.

The essence of his fight in 1952, as now, will be defense of his policies against those who by isolationism or going-it-alone, or a strange combination of both, would have America cut loose from its leadership in international cooperation.

His foreign policy is, however, by no means entirely foreign. To him the New Deal-Fair Deal is not merely domestic in its significance. The welfare of American farmers and workers, old people, children, the minorities, and the underprivileged is not only important at home; by example it is essential also in the contest for the minds and the hopes of the world.

Harry Truman will not find it strange if in the fight of 1952 he faces a continuing alliance of the isolationists and go-it-aloners with those who would make communism abroad an excuse for economic and social reaction in the United States. American aid and arms to other freedom-loving people and America's example to the rest of the world seem to him equal parts of a policy essential to the safety of the people of the United States. It is a policy, he believes, which appeals to their intelligence.

He will win on those issues. Already he has a tremendous head start, which his opponents, as usual, prefer to disregard. Every 4 years they energetically create the impression that the American people may do a political somersault. That undoubtedly makes both newspapers and polls exciting and salable. The records and the realities are less exciting but more informative.

National political somersaults are rare. The facts are that for many years this was a Republican country and for a long time now it has been a Democratic country. In five straight presidential elections 23 States have given their electoral votes to the Democrats. Even the census seems to have gone Democratic, since next year population increases will give those 23 States more electoral votes—251 of the 268 votes necessary to elect.

On the other hand, the States which have been most consistently Republican will add up to only 43 votes.

Let us look at some of the things which opponents of Truman are counting on in their predictions of a national political somersault in 1952:

The South is still mad about civil rights. Labor walked right out of the defense mobilization set-up. Taxpayers don't like high taxes. Farmers have been furious about beef roll-backs. There has been at least one milk coat, and Tom Pendergast is only 6 years dead. According to Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, even Gen. George C. Marshall is a stooge of anti-American conspirators. Some people don't like Margaret Truman's voice and others are shocked by the Truman letters. The Republicans gained in the 1950 congressional elections. And Harry Truman is 67 years old. Here are some others:

1. The country is tired of Truman.

This can be regularly filed under "Time for a change." I think this feeling is recurrently true as it was under Roosevelt. Up to now, however, Truman has been lucky enough, as was Roosevelt, to reach the low points of recurring unpopularity many months before presidential elections. Truman, for instance, could not possibly be any lower in popularity than he was a year before the 1948 election.

2. The country showed it was tired of Truman when the Republicans made gains in the 1950 congressional elections.

This undoubtedly encouraged his Republican opponents, notably "Mr. Republican" himself, Senator TAFT, who was overwhelmingly reelected when the Democrats and labor tried to beat him.

One important item has been overlooked: While the Republicans made gains in the 1950 congressional elections, they made a smaller gain in the House than they made in any midterm congressional elections since 1934, just before the Roosevelt sweep in 1936.

3 The Congress which keeps its ear to the ground has been turning him down on practically everything he has asked, from civil rights to price controls.

Truman certainly has had his troubles with Congress, but there is nothing new about that. Roosevelt had so much trouble that he tried to purge some of his opponents in his own party. Also, using all his persuasiveness and powers of pressure, Roosevelt, 3 months before Pearl Harbor, was able to get selective service extended by a bare margin of one vote in the House. Actually, the Congress may now be giving Truman ammunition for an appeal to the people, though he may not be able to hit quite as hard at the present democratically controlled Congress as he did in 1948 at the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress.

4 The farmers are furious.

Certainly they, or some of their leaders, have made some angry sounds about beef roll-backs and commodity price controls. This undoubtedly could be serious to Truman, who showed great and unexpected farm strength in 1948. It is worth remembering, however, that the beef roll-back fight is practically a playback of the fight in 1946, when the same combination of the Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Cornbelt Livestock Feeders Association insisted that price controls of beef would cut beef production. They made it a campaign issue in 1946 "Ladies, if you want more beef, vote Republican." Many of them did. Two years later, however, even Iowa, where the Republican president of the Farm Bureau Federation lives, voted for Truman. Farmers who do not want their prices controlled at the top are still concerned about the system of supports from the bottom which the Democrats gave them.

5 Labor is unhappy and might go Republican or just sit at home and on its hands.

There was, indeed, the united labor walk-out from the Wage Control Board set up by Defense Production Director Charles E. Wilson and his big-business boys. Truman backed up Wilson. Incidents like that could make labor less friendly to Truman. But labor was also pretty angry before the 1948 election. After Truman's crack-down in the railroad strike of 1946, the head of the trainmen promised to spend his whole union treasury to beat Truman, who, he said, had signed his own political death warrant at a CIO meeting in New York. Truman was described as the No. 1 strikebreaker of the American bankers and railroads. John L. Lewis opposed him with bitter Lewis rhetoric in the 1948 campaign.

When the chips are down, however, labor has found, and will find again, little reason for voting for the party in which the title "Mr. Republican" has been given to one of the authors of the bitterly resented Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

6. "The people are sick of Pendergastism in Washington."

Certainly the changes have been rung on this one, and wrung pretty dry. On the basis of one fool and a milk coat, an effort has been made to prove that the Democrats in Washington have reached a proficiency in corruption equaling that of the Republicans in the Teapot Dome case. There is always too much grabbing and seeking around Government. There must be a constant vigilance to weed out the 5-percenters and the

bigger percenters in the influence racket. That is being done. The remarkable thing, in a Government spending billions under the scrutiny of eager political investigators, is that no major scandal has been uncovered in Government in 20 years.

Pendergastism is a dead issue. Though small and busy slanderers are still trying to smear Truman with it, the biggest and most powerful Republican paper in his home State, the Kansas City Star, has given him a clean bill of health on his connections with Tom Pendergast. Also, in 1948, the people of Missouri, who ought to know most about their own political machines, gave Truman a bigger majority than they gave Roosevelt in 1940 or 1944.

7 "The angry South just got started in revolt in 1948. In 1952, it will really pull out of any Truman party."

Actually, there seems less and less chance of a recurrence in 1952 of the Dixiecrat revolt. This does not mean that Truman has won the affection of the South. More southerners next year may vote the Republican ticket, though not enough of them to threaten any State. But the Dixiecrats are done. This judgment is based upon the increasing probability that the contest in 1952 will shift in emphasis from the civil rights of some Americans to the national security of us all. And in foreign policy the South since the time of Woodrow Wilson has been devoted to the kind of program Truman defends now.

Furthermore, the Dixiecrat revolt in 1948 accomplished nothing for the South except to reduce its voting strength in the 1952 Democratic convention. Because 4 Southern States failed to vote the Democratic ticket in 1948, the 11 Southeastern States, under the regular apportionment rules, will lose 16 votes in the 1952 convention. The southern revolt created no southern heroes and did not pay off for Strom Thurmond, who ran for President for the Dixiecrats. He was beaten 2 years later in his own South Carolina when he ran for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator.

A recent southern revolt meeting staged by Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, with Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, as the speaker, lit no bonfires in Dixie. When Byrd lambasted the administration it was apparent that his speech was the same as he had been making since Roosevelt's second term. Also, in each Presidential year since 1940 Byrd himself has put up a small lightning rod as candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, and it has attracted very little southern lightning. His alliance with Talmadge will not add respectability to his reaction. The South does not like civil rights, but it is not ready for a combination of economic reaction and Bilboism to which Talmadge is the natural heir.

Undoubtedly the situation is complicated by the bad blood between Harry Truman and Gov. James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State, since they separated in 1947. Byrnes has great prestige in South Carolina and in the South as a whole. However, he has declined to align himself with the Dixiecrats. It is very doubtful that at the age of 73 he would consider running for President on any third-party ticket. Yet if he does not run almost anyone else would seem definitely second class and unable to hope for a significant following. Suggestions that Byrnes might be nominated as Vice President by the Republicans to cement a new southern-Republican coalition have been heard less frequently since Republican optimism bounced again as a result of the 1950 congressional elections.

Byrnes has sometimes been sharply critical of some aspects of the administration's foreign policy since he ceased to direct it, but in other important particulars he has given it clear and strong support. Even most conservative southern Senators have been supporting the administration's foreign

policy and often doing so with vigor and effectiveness.

Undoubtedly a Supreme Court decision ending segregation in the public schools in the South might swiftly alter the attitude of the South on everything. The present chances, however, are that with a grimace the South which does not love Truman will put all its votes in the Democratic column next year.

8 "The left wingers who always voted for Roosevelt are dispersed or dissatisfied."

Certainly there is nothing new about that. Dewey beat Truman by only 60,989 votes in Dewey's own State because to Wallace went 509,579 votes which were largely drawn from the Democrats. Similar things occurred in Michigan and Maryland. Next year the Communists, who used Wallace to lead off the innocents, will prefer anybody to Stalin's chief antagonist, Harry Truman, but many thousands whom they duped may be expected to come home to the more liberal Democratic side of the contest.

9 "Truman just isn't a big enough guy to be President again, particularly at a time like this."

The effort still persists, of course, to make Truman seem still just the piano player and the busted haberdasher. That effort will continue. One thing already clear, however, is that he is not going to run against Superman but against a Republican politician nominated by Republican politicians.

The truth is that Truman has always seemed an unlikely candidate. He never in his life entered a contest for a major office in which he seemed to have the proverbial Chinaman's chance. Although he has nearly always looked like the man who could not win, Truman's career has been that of a man who could not miss. Whether he will have tough going in 1952 depends, of course, not only on how he runs, but against whom he runs.

Truman's favorite opponent would be Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio. He would enjoy a campaign against Taft personally and would be delighted politically if the Republicans in Chicago in 1952 would nominate the Senator they have turned down twice before. Nobody could better serve to dramatize the differences which the Democrats want dramatized in the 1952 elections. No accident gave Senator TAFT the sobriquet, "Mr. Republican." To his admirers he embodies all the virtues of their conservative hopes. Also, Democrats think he personifies all those characteristics which conjure up the images of big business, old- and new-style isolationism, and upper-crust conservatism which the masses of the people have learned to distrust. Nobody so well as TAFT, they think, could hold the mass of Democrats enthusiastically behind Truman or any other Democrat.

Second in Truman preference probably would be Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose fluorescent fading away after his dismissal as American military chief in the Far East undoubtedly did more than any other thing to make it certain that Truman would be a candidate again. Republicans, however, have been shying away from MacArthur since their initial enthusiasm for him on his triumphant return. He not only would make a colorful candidate, but one who would make the issue of foreign policy exactly as the administration wishes it to be made.

The big mystery candidate, of course, is the other soldier. So far the polls, if not the politicians, have indicated that more people this year have been for General Eisenhower for President than for anybody else, including Truman. Presidents are nominated by political parties, however, and nobody yet knows to which party, if either, Eisenhower belongs.

Some effective Republican politicians have declared themselves for Eisenhower, and it has been suggested that Truman himself has had Eisenhower under wraps as his own successor as Democratic nominee next year. Truman has made no statement suggesting that. Indeed, when Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois, himself often suggested as Democratic candidate for President or Vice President proposed that both parties nominate Eisenhower for President and presumably forego any election, he got a sharp crack from Truman. When asked about the Douglas suggestion, the President seemed sarcastic. With DOUGLAS for Vice President, he suggested.

Apparently the proposal irritated the President. Truman has not missed the fact that some of those urging Eisenhower as the Democratic nominee are anti-Truman Democrats who believe they might end the New Deal-Fair Deal domination of the party with the admirable soldier whose views on most public questions nobody knows.

Eisenhower's position is complicated too: Not a Democrat so far as anybody knows, he is the personal symbol of Truman's European arms program which has been criticized and limited by the Republicans. Also, he is still a soldier at a time when the Truman administration has sternly met MacArthur with the issue of civilian control.

Eisenhower has Truman's admiration and respect, but I am confident he will not get his mantle. Truman himself is going to need that at the whistle stops.

I doubt that either party will nominate Eisenhower. The last time the Republicans turned to an outsider and an amateur they got Wendell Willkie, and the Old Guard did not like that or him. If the Republicans believe they can win they want to win with a man about whose Republican ideas there can be no question.

If Eisenhower were nominated he would be a much better candidate in July than in November. In the guerrilla fighting of American politics he would have difficulty maintaining the dignified and spotless role of knight in shining armor. Also, while the MacArthur parade demonstrated considerable market for a savior in uniform, it also stirred deep and ancient prejudices against military direction of American affairs.

There is no shortage of willing Republican opponents to Truman. Governor Dewey may seem to be in exactly the same position William Jennings Bryan was in 1904. His travels in the Far East, which Senator TAFT caustically referred to as a holiday, suggest that he means to be going somewhere. Harold Stassen could be persuaded to give up an academic career. JOE MARRIN and JOE MCCARTHY would both be willing.

Truman in a fight is not the kind of campaigner who needs to be afraid of anybody, but in my opinion probably the most dangerous man he could meet would be Gov. Earl Warren, of California. If Warren has no national record to commend him in national affairs, neither does he wear any of the scars of national contention. He is a Republican who does not seem the stereotype of the Republicanism which has now been five times rejected.

Indeed, no Republican in the United States has shown such facility in picking up Democratic votes. Last year in his campaign for reelection as Governor he beat the Roosevelt Crown Prince Jimmy by more than 1,000,000 votes. As second man on the Republican ticket in 1948 he could not quite pull California to Dewey, but as top man he might easily win his own State, which will have seven more electoral votes in 1952 than it had in 1948, more than any State except Pennsylvania and New York.

Warren is not so well known in the East as some other Republican candidates, but he

is not so well worn, either. He did his duty as Vice Presidential candidate with Dewey in 1948, but somehow seemed untouched by the Dewey deflation. I do not believe Warren could beat Truman, though the similarity of the appeal of the two men might make a real race.

While Warren appears to be the toughest opponent in sight, the toughest issues on which Truman will make his fight include high taxes, high prices, criticism of the State Department, the war in Korea, General MacArthur, bureaucracy, and Government spending.

The Democratic ticket will need strengthening. Undoubtedly ALLEN BARKLEY added much to its appeal in 1948. He has been a very popular Vice President. Apparently his age and health may not permit his renomination in 1952. That would create a real hole to be filled. There will be no shortage of men to fill it. Justice William O. Douglas, who has often been "a bridesmaid but never a bride" will be prominent again. He turned down the Vice Presidency in 1948. The rejection of Truman's offer then may not make Truman so ready to offer it to him next year.

Truman can name his running mate; and some of those most prominent in the public eye may seem less acceptable in his. Some of Truman's close associates felt that Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, as chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee before the 1950 election, showed a positive addiction for investigating Democratic neighborhoods and avoiding Republican ones.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, apparently did not particularly please Truman when he proposed that both major parties nominate Eisenhower.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, however well or badly he may have handled the RFC hearings from the point of view of the White House, irritated Truman when he suggested that Truman resign after the Republicans won the congressional elections of 1946.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, who has done a fine job as chairman of the MacArthur investigation, would as Vice Presidential nominee end any fears of a repetition of southern revolt, but RUSSELL was the angry South's candidate for President against Truman in the 1948 convention and might be unwilling to take second place on a Truman ticket.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, would be available and effective on the stump. Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, has made a good impression as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and has kept himself relatively free of the sectional contentions within the party.

A recent but very popular newcomer to party politics, Senator BLAIR MOODY, of Michigan, will be worth watching when the process of selection narrows down. So will a number of others: Gov. Sidney S. McMath, of Arkansas; Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois (whose grandfather was Vice President under Cleveland); Gov. W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado; former Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray (now president of the University of North Carolina); Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and a body of dark horses, one of whom may now be only a gleam in Harry Truman's eye.

Truman will be the man making the race. And his victory will be a surprise again. Talk to the fellow you meet at the club. Talk to your neighbor. Talk to the experts. Most will tell you again that Truman has not a chance: "One accident, not two. One surprise, but surprise can't be a habit." (I'm not so sure of that.)

What they say repeats what was said in every race in which Truman ever ran. He

always seems like the tortoise looking through spectacles at the hind end of the hare. But he does not lose.

Certainly nothing less than an explosion will beat Truman. There is no present indication that the States which have rolled up regularly in the Democratic column five times straight will not be there again. Here they are: Arizona, Arkansas, California (Warren might change that), Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia. As I said, they will cast 252 votes in the electoral college. Necessary to elect: 266.

Furthermore, in 1948, but for the votes which went to the Dixiecrats and the Wallaceites, the Democrats would have carried Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, New York, Michigan, and Maryland. In 1952 these States will cast 111 votes. Also in 1948 Truman carried Iowa, Ohio, Colorado, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. In 1952 these will cast 56 votes. Total for these last two groups of States, 167 electoral votes. Add this to the total of the States which have been consistently Democratic in five elections and the total is 419. Necessary to elect: 266.

No sensible prognosticator would claim any such exact total for Truman now. Also, I am not conceding the other 112 votes to the Republicans; only one in five elections have they received that many. All I say is that my assumptions are a molehill beside the mountain which must be claimed by those who say that Truman can be beat.

No region or group could claim Truman's 1948 victory. It was, indeed, preceded by the loudest complaints against him by the organizations of farmers, labor, and professional politicians. In the election no minorities came to him with the balance of power from Harlem or the Bronx, Philadelphia or Detroit. He did not require the solid South or the city bosses. He carried California, though he received 74,000 fewer votes than Roosevelt got in the strange and wonderful county of Los Angeles. He got along without the extreme right or the extreme left.

Those who admitted their surprise at his victory have never yet really got around to admitting even to themselves the terrific vote-getting quality of the man, particularly among the town and country people, the unorganized people, the people the politicians and the pollsters apparently did not know existed.

These people are still there. Truman knows they will elect him again. He will not be cocky about it. Indeed, he will still look a little unimpressive on the back platform of his train, speaking as the leader of the free world before the upturned faces at tank towns. He will be confident. He has gone to some pains to tell the newspapermen who have watched his exuberance that he is never cocky—just confident.

"I think," he told them, "that the programs and the policies that the Executive has been endeavoring to put into effect are right, and I think the people of the United States and of the world believe they are right."

For the benefit of the people of the world he means to give all the people of the United States a chance to confirm that next year. They will. The politicians, the pollsters, the pundits might as well get ready for that if they want to avoid another rude shock in 1952.

They can't beat Truman. In this tough world "here will be no change in the policy or the President of the United States.

Statement of the Red Bay Industrial Committee on the Locational Advantages of Red Bay, Ala., for Plants to Manufacture Office Furniture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, there has recently come into my hands an attractive statement of the locational advantages of Red Bay, Ala., in Franklin County, for plants to manufacture office furniture.

This statement was prepared by the Red Bay Industrial Committee, in cooperation with the Alabama State Planning Board in July 1949. It emphasizes the large supply of native labor, available raw materials, including 39 species of timber, cheap power and fuel, transportation by rail, truck, and bus, the good climate, community attitude, government, schools and churches of Red Bay, and the surrounding area.

Red Bay is situated in the midst of an excellent farming area. Its manufacturing assets are small, but substantial, consisting primarily of lumber, garment and feed manufactures. Its people are enterprising and industrious, and they are to be commended on their foresight in urging the advantages which the town possesses upon prospective industries seeking a good location for expansion purposes.

A new spirit pervades the entire Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. A great effort is being put forth to improve the economic opportunities available to all the people.

In this effort the Seventh District is doing what for it is pioneer work. The results of this work will be in proportion to the effort put forth by all groups.

It has been my privilege, as a Member of Congress, to work closely with the groups dedicated to the industrial development and promotion of the assets and resources of the Seventh Congressional District, including the people of Red Bay.

I include the statement of the Red Bay Industrial Committee, and the Alabama State Planning Board in the RECORD.

To the Manufacturer of Office Furniture:

Red Bay, Ala., has locational advantages for your manufacturing operations. In a framework of facts and truth, we are presenting data setting forth the locational advantages of Red Bay, Ala. This information is presented to you in the hope that you will find it pertinent and that you may establish a plant in Red Bay which will be productive and profitable.

The tremendous advantages of Red Bay are in terms of labor availability, large and growing markets, and raw material availability in this area.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

Red Bay is located in the northwestern section of Alabama. It is on the Alabama-Mississippi State line in western Franklin

County. Red Bay is 50 miles southwest of Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River and the Tri-City region (Tusculum, Sheffield, and Florence, Ala.). It is 78 miles west of Decatur, Ala.; 141 miles northwest of Birmingham, Ala.; and 142 miles southeast of Memphis, Tenn. The city is 50 miles northwest of Tupelo, Miss., and 50 miles southwest of Corinth, Miss.

The surrounding land is best suited to timber growing and range pasture with some excellent land planted in row crops. The land is generally rolling to hilly.

POPULATION

The 1940 census showed a population of 1,560 persons for Red Bay. A present estimate places the population at 2,200 persons. Franklin County had a population of 27,532 persons in 1940 of which some 5 percent were nonwhite.

LABOR FORCE

Active labor supply: Files in the Alabama State Employment Office in Russellville, the county seat, show 87 active applications from the Red Bay area. Of these, 10 are classified as skilled, 35 as semiskilled, 27 as unskilled, 11 as clerical, and 4 as professional. This does not show the complete situation as this office is located 26 miles from Red Bay and many people seeking work do not go to Russellville to register.

Potential labor supply: There is at present a definite surplus of workers in the Red Bay area. The present estimate made the 1st of July 1949 shows that within a 15-mile radius from Red Bay there are some 300 females, semiskilled and unskilled, available for work, and 450 males, semiskilled and unskilled, desiring labor. Most of the women are interested in local employment and are for the most part housewives, with a few textile and clerical workers. The available male labor supply is composed mostly of farm and sawmill workers, with a few industrial workers. At present a noticeable number of industrial workers commute to the tri-city area and a majority of these would be interested in local industrial employment.

State labor supply: In the State of Alabama it is estimated that at present there is a fluid group of unemployed workers numbering between 65,000 and 75,000 persons. These are 80 percent unskilled and 20 percent skilled and any reasonable labor demand could be supplied at any locality within the State.

MATERIALS

Alabama is the third largest lumber-producing State among the 48. Franklin County, Ala., and the two adjoining counties in Mississippi are large lumber producers. Figures on standing timber and lumber production are as follows:

1946 Estimate, Franklin County, Ala., standing timber

Sawlog net volume:	Board feet
Softwood.....	106,900,000
Hardwood.....	134,100,000
Total.....	241,000,000
Total net volume:	Cords
Softwood.....	511,400,000
Hardwood.....	1,282,800,000
Total.....	1,854,200,000

1947 Lumber production, Franklin County, Ala.

	Board feet
Softwood.....	4,926,000
Hardwood.....	4,834,000

The species of timber growing in the county are basswood, beech, birch, red cedar, chestnut, cottonwood, cucumber tree, dogwood, American elm, slippery elm, winged elm, black gum, sweet gum, tupelo gum, mockernut hickory, pignut hickory, holly,

hop hornbeam, red maple, sugar maple, mulberry, black oak, blackjack oak, chestnut oak, red oak, post oak, white oak, willow oak, persimmon, loblolly pine, shortleaf pine, Virginia pine, sassafras, sourwood, sugarberry, sycamore, tulip, poplar, black walnut, and black willow

ELECTRIC POWER

Lights and power are furnished by the Tennessee Valley Authority to the city of Red Bay which has its own distribution system. The commercial rate for large blocks of power is as follows:

Demand charge

First 1,000 kilowatts of demand per month at \$1 per kilowatt

Excess over 1,000 kilowatts of demand per month at \$1 per kilowatt.

Energy charge

A Applicable to annual customers (defined as all customers under this schedule other than seasonal customers).

First 15,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 8 mills per kilowatt-hour

Next 25,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Next 60,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour

Next 400,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour

Excess over 500,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour

B Applicable to seasonal customers (defined as customers such as cotton gins, cotton oil mills, and others, who, owing to the seasonal character of their requirements, take power for no more than 8 months in the year)

First 10,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 10 mills per kilowatt-hour

Next 25,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour

Next 65,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour

Next 400,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour

Excess over 500,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour

Charge for energy in excess of 360 times the demand shall be subject to a reduction of 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour from the otherwise applicable rate

For the purpose of illustrating the cost in mills per kilowatt-hour of electrical energy for industry under operating conditions the following actual case is offered:

Garment factory 20,040 kilowatt-hours used over 3-month period. Total cost, \$129.88 6.4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

TRANSPORTATION

Railroads: A main line of the Illinois Central Railroad from Chicago, Ill., to Birmingham, Ala., serves Red Bay. There are 14 scheduled trains with three mail deliveries daily over this line.

Highways: State Highway 24, a first-class road running east and west, connects Red Bay with Russellville and Decatur, Ala. At Russellville there are direct United States highways to Nashville and Memphis, Tenn., and Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala. Good roads connect 24 with U S 78 (between Birmingham, Ala., and Memphis, Tenn.). There are also connections to Mississippi Road 25 which leads to St. Louis, Mo., and northward by way of U S 72.

Buses: The Red Bay Bus Lines operate between the city, Russellville and Decatur, Ala., with four daily schedules each way. At either of these towns bus connections with Greyhound and National Trailways Bus Lines lead to all major points in the Nation.

Trucks: B. and M. Express picks up freight at Red Bay frequently for delivery to major points over the Nation. Local lines provide short-haul service.

MARKET AND TRADE AREA

The purchasing power of consumers increased since 1940 at a faster rate in the Southeast than in the rest of the United States.¹ From 1940 to 1947, incomes of individuals rose by 184 percent for the 11 Southeastern States,² whereas the gain for the country as a whole was 150 percent. The gain for Alabama was 211 percent. Improvements in land use and intensive industrial development give some evidence that the favorable trend in the South is likely to continue.

The number of consumers in the South has also been increasing at a faster rate than that for the United States, even after allowing for migration. The rise in incomes has modified the market estimates based on the number of potential consumers for most products. The first map following shows the population within radii up to 1,000 miles of Red Bay. The second map shows population within radii up to 200 miles.

The gain in business and industry has been just as outstanding as the purchasing

power above and was one of the main causes of the income gain. Therefore, the market for office furniture is keeping pace with the general increase in market potential in the South.

WATER SUPPLY

There is a municipally owned water plant which supplies Red Bay. The water is filtered and chlorine treated as it comes from springs and shallow wells. The daily capacity of the plant is 220,000 gallons, and the average daily usage is 160,000 gallons. A recent analysis of this water by the Alabama Department of Public Health shows total alkalinity, 16 parts per million, total hardness, 15 parts per million, pH (acid factor), 6.6.

The cost of water is as follows: First 3,000 gallons, \$2, next 7,000 gallons, 50 cents per 1,000, next 15,000 gallons, 40 cents per 1,000; next 25,000 gallons, 30 cents per 1,000, next 25,000 gallons, 25 cents per 1,000; next 125,000 gallons, 18 cents per 1,000; all over 200,000 gallons, 12 cents.

Alabama taxes on manufacturing corporations

Tax	Payer	Basis	Rate
1. Entrance fee (paid only once)	Foreign corporations	Capital employed in Alabama during the first year of operation	25 percent on first \$100, 5 percent on next \$900, 1/10 percent on all over \$1,000, \$5 minimum, \$100 maximum
2. Corporation permit (annual)	Domestic corporations	Paid capital stock	
3. Corporation franchise (annual)	Domestic corporations	Capital employed in Alabama	\$2 per \$1,000.
4. Corporate income tax (annual)	Domestic corporations	Full stock	
	Foreign corporations	Capital employed in Alabama	
	Domestic corporations	Net income	3 percent.
	Foreign corporation	Net income earned in Alabama (expenses, interest on indebtedness, taxes paid or accrued, etc., are deductible from gross income)	
5. Property taxes (annual)	Corporations, individuals	60 percent of value of all real and personal property.	

State	Mills
Franklin County	6.5
City of Red Bay	11.5
City of Red Bay	5
School district	3
Total (per dollar or \$2.60 per \$100)	26

Strong consideration will be given to exempting county and city taxes for a period of 5 or 10 years. The city has no special taxes on gasoline, cigarettes, tobacco, etc., other than a 1-cent tax on cigarettes.

Climate¹

Month	Normal precipitation	Normal mean temperature
	Inches	" F.
January	5.00	43.0
February	4.80	44.0
March	6.00	54.0
April	4.60	61.0
May	4.10	69.5
June	4.00	77.0
July	4.70	79.5
August	4.10	79.2
September	2.80	71.0
October	2.90	62.5
November	3.60	51.5
December	5.30	41.0
Year	51.00	61.6

¹ Interpolated from normals of stations in area.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN AREA

Industrial activity in Red Bay is small but thriving. The lumber industry is the largest industry operating in the area at present.

¹ Source: Survey of Current Business, August 1948.

² Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

It is reasonable to believe the lumber industry will continue on a substantial basis in this area because the stands of timber are being cut on a sustained yield program. A garment factory specializing in children's clothes has grown from a very small beginning into a stable industry employing some 80 people.

There are several local consumption industries in Red Bay, such as a feed mill producing prepared animal feed and some corn meal products. This mill employs about 20 people.

Several cotton gins process and bale the locally grown cotton crops.

Desirable industrial sites are available at reasonable cost within the city limits.

LIVING CONDITIONS

Health: Red Bay is the itinerant point for a full-time health unit that operates from Russellville, Ala. A free 4-hour clinic is held in the city hall every week. Once a month a State sanitary officer makes a scheduled survey of the business establishments in the city. At present there are three practicing physicians and one resident dentist in Red Bay.

The nearest hospital is in Russellville, Ala., 26 miles east of the city.

Alabama was the third State in the Nation to provide a full-time health department in every county. Alabama was the first State to pass and enforce legislation for the detection and treatment of syphilis and for the detection of tuberculosis in the 14-50 age group. The county health offices hold free periodical clinics, supervise public water

supplies, and work to combat malaria, typhoid, and other contagious diseases.

Housing: At present there are no available housing facilities in Red Bay, but building space and supplies are readily available. Houses in the city with adequate yard and garden space generally rent from \$80 to \$45 a month.

Recreation: There has recently been constructed a canteen for young people in the city. The American Legion Hut is also available to the citizenry for use the year round. There is a large, lighted baseball-football field and a new \$40,000 gym is being completed at the high school which will greatly add to the city's recreational facilities. There are also a motion-picture theater and a roller-skating rink. Wilson and Wheeler Dam reservoirs on the Tennessee River are within 50 miles and Bantock National Forest is 70 miles distant. These are nationally known recreation areas.

CIVIC ASSETS

Schools: The Red Bay school system consists of a senior high school, junior high school, and elementary school for white children, along with a junior high school and elementary school for Negro children. The school system is staffed by a principal and 22 teachers. During the 1948-49 school session there were 104 senior high school students, 135 junior high school students (including Negroes), and 400 elementary school students (including Negroes).

Churches: There are seven churches in Red Bay of the following denominations: Methodist, Baptist, Church of God, and Christian. Five of the churches are for white people and two are for Negroes.

Organizations: The Civitan Club, a businessmen's luncheon club, meets regularly and sponsors civic improvement programs. There is also a lodge of Masons, the American Legion, and a VFW post. For women there are garden clubs, bridge clubs, sewing circles, and the Eastern Star. For children there are Boy Scouts, 4-H, and F. F. A. organizations.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND SERVICES PROVIDED

Red Bay is governed by a mayor and council. Municipal services provided are fire and police protection 24 hours per day. Adequate sanitary sewers are maintained and garbage is collected regularly.

A community canning plant is maintained. Individuals with surplus garden produce may avail themselves of this facility to can the produce for winter use.

ATTITUDE OF COMMUNITY TOWARD INDUSTRY

The municipal authority and civic organizations of Red Bay are ready and willing to offer any reasonable cooperative assistance to industry in the community. Every effort is being made to make Red Bay a pleasant place to live.

Telecasting of Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Friday, October 12, 1951:

LET TV COMPETE

The Justice Department is performing a service to both television and the general

public by challenging the National Football League's rule limiting the telecasting of games by member clubs.

TV has undoubtedly posed a major problem for the sports promoters. When a big sporting event is televised, thousands of potential box-office customers stay home and enjoy it free. The big stadiums and sports palaces are in danger of becoming empty shells. And even minor sports are hurt by the tendency of the public to concentrate its interest on the big contests which television now makes so widely available.

But in the inevitable adjustment which the new medium is occasioning there must be some rules. The old vested interests must not be allowed to stifle TV altogether. And in the sports field this is now a real danger.

The Government is charging the National Football League with engaging in a conspiracy in restraint of trade and violating the Sherman Act, because it has bound its members in several States to boycott certain stations and "black out" telecasts of their games to certain areas. Whether the league's actions in fact violate the law will have to be decided by the courts. And the results will be of extreme interest to other organizations, notably the National Collegiate Athletic Association, who have adopted similar restrictions against TV.

But we are convinced, in any case, that the principle which the Federal men are seeking to establish is sound. Whether or not the Sherman Act proves applicable, it is certainly important from a public point of view that all restrictions be removed on the right of each football club to determine for itself whether and on what terms it will sell its broadcast and telecast rights. This is the essence of a competitive system.

Television must sell itself both to the public and to the legitimate promoters of sport. It should get no special favors. But neither should its opponents be permitted to gang up on it and exclude it from an important field of entertainment and communication without a chance.

If the Justice Department has a case under the Sherman Act, an early decision will clear the air enormously. If it does not, the need for eliminating combinations to restrict TV will remain and other means must be found to bring the boycotters around.

We cannot afford permanently to hold back anything as big and vital as TV.

OPS, Like the Old OPA, Is Doing an Effective Job of Taking Beef Off Your Dinner Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the Omaha (Nebr.) Daily Journal-Stockman:

SAME METHODS, SAME RESULTS

During the reign of OPA in the livestock and meat industry a few years ago market history was full of evidence of how Federal control strangles production; disrupts normal distribution of supplies; and promotes illegal trading through violations of the price laws. In the short time that OPS has thrown its authority around in this business

its actions have upset the well-regulated meat and livestock industry more quickly than even OPA did during and after World War II. It took OPA some time to turn production down. But not so with OPS. Here is a record taken from Government files of what has happened since OPS froze meat prices late last January, its first plunge into control of the meat industry:

In January packers under Federal inspection butchered 1,159,942 cattle, the biggest January total in 3 years, and 5 percent more than January of last year. The December 1950 volume ran 4 percent ahead of a year earlier. November was up 3 percent and October 1 percent over the same period of 1949. Beef production was on its way up. But then the blow fell. Mr. DiSalle and his misinformed "wrecking crew" went to work on January 26, 1951, with their "monkey wrenches." It was not long before they had beef production and distributing machinery slowed down and heading toward chaos.

Department of Agriculture data shows that February butchering of cattle dropped to 887,448 head, the smallest of any month since May 1948, and down 5 percent from February 1950. It was the smallest February total in 8 years. Every month since has seen less cattle handled than in the same month of 1950, decreases replacing the increases shown before OPS's first action. March volume dropped 10 percent behind last year, April was off 8 percent and May off 8 percent.

On June 4, OPS tightened its strangle hold on beef packers by ordering all plants to observe ceiling price regulations for live cattle. DiSalle and his men should have known that the only packers who would abide by the new rule would be the same packers who were losing business steadily to the illegal trade, the same meat interests that were put almost out of business of OPA in 1946. Inspected butchering of cattle immediately tumbled further below 1950. The June slaughter of 786,861, down 26 percent from last year, was smallest for any month since September 1946, the month before President Truman was forced, by the worst meat famine the country ever knew, to end all controls over the industry.

It is not surprising that we must go back to OPA days to find beef production as low as in 1951, because those in control now are following the same harmful methods of destroying tonnage. Price administrators lost a little of their power at the end of June when slaughter quotas ended. This was immediately reflected in some slight improvement in inspected production and some improvement in distribution. July slaughter was down only 14 percent from last year and the August total down 10 percent. However, in the first 9 months of 1951 inspected packers butchered about 1,000,000 fewer cattle than a year ago, and only 1,000,000 more than in 1946 when many retail butcher shops in the country were closed because black markets had taken over the meat industry.

Justice Delayed Is Justice Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, October 14, 1951. The editorial is entitled "Illinois Needs Judges."

Mr. Speaker, I worked in the interest of and supported legislation that made provision for more Federal judges to be appointed to the United States district court in the northern Illinois district. I charge that it is a crying shame and a disgrace that Illinois is being deprived of the benefit of more judges, due in no small measure to that of politics and political jockeying.

The editorial quotes from a report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and his description of the crowded condition of the court calendar in the northern Illinois district should supply all of the argument that is required to support the reasons for a clogged and crowded court calendar which has resulted from the dereliction of those in authority and charged with filling the judicial positions created in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. Speaker, how long must the people of Illinois tolerate a condition that is depriving them of even-handed justice? We are denying justice to these people due to a long and shameful course or procrastination superinduced by the juxtaposition of politics.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therein an editorial entitled "Illinois Needs Judges," which follows:

ILLINOIS NEEDS JUDGES

President Truman's comment that he assumes that some day he will make new appointments to the two vacant judgeships in Illinois is far from being reassuring. Illinois needs additional judges now. Of course the President is irritated by the Senate's rejection of his two previous nominees because the method of their selection was obnoxious to Senator DOUGLAS. But he has only himself to blame. If his previous nominations were not made entirely for political reasons, they were casually made, and when Senator DOUGLAS protested against such methods of selection the President refused to correct his error. In the circumstances the Senate was justified in wiping the slate clean and, in effect, asking the President to start over again.

The action of the Senate has not, however, made it any less urgent to fill these judgeships. In his recent annual report as Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Henry P. Chandler, has this to say in respect of the northern Illinois district where these vacancies exist:

"A constant increase in the pending civil caseload in this district has continued, due largely to the fact that there have been three vacancies for the last year, only one of which has now been filled. Civil cases filed were 1,993, the number terminated 1,774, and the pending cases on June 30, 1951, were 2,231. For cases tried and terminated in 1951, the median interval from filing to disposition was 16.7 months and from issue to trial was 10.8 months. With the addition of two more judges to fill the judgeships created by Congress last year, the situation should begin to improve immediately."

Illinois is not the only State in which the law's delays often mean the denial of justice. Some other States are in even more critical need of additional Federal judge power. But the situation in Illinois is sufficiently acute to demand prompt attention. With the old controversy settled, will President Truman be big enough to swallow his defeat and give Illinois the kind of judges that it obviously wants? If so, he will have to consult with Senator DOUGLAS and the leaders of

the Illinois bar. For a change the doctrine of senatorial courtesy has been used to require higher standards of judicial selection than the President was originally disposed to follow.

Pulaski Day Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered in connection with the Pulaski Day program of the Polish United Societies of Chelsea, Mass., on Sunday, October 14, 1951, at Pulaski Monument, Chelsea Square, Mass.:

When Count Casimir Pulaski came to the New World, he stepped ashore at Marblehead in Massachusetts. On his way to Boston, he must have passed close to this place where we stand, near the monument that has since been set up in this square to perpetuate his memory.

The deeds that made him famous occurred almost 200 years ago. They belong to the past but the courageous spirit of the man and his devotion to liberty are desperately needed today.

We gather before his monument to pay tribute and to take heart.

For the struggle to win peace and freedom is not something that is embalmed in history. It goes on in every generation, as we who live in the year 1951 well know.

A child depends upon his parents. The time comes, however, when the child must mature and in turn assume parental responsibilities. The same may be said of nations. You and I grew up thinking that all the tremendous efforts to win and strengthen our independence had been made by men and women in the past, that the worst was over, and that life for us would be clear sailing.

World War II dispelled that dream.

The mounting American casualties in Korea tell us that we can never afford to relax.

The clouded future will test our worth, even as it did to Pulaski, in his time.

Will we prove ourselves, as he did, for the benefit of those who come after us? If we don't, our lives will have little meaning except that we have taken up a little space and time. And we will have lost for our children that which our forefathers won for us.

We are sometimes confused and discouraged in these tense days by the evidence of shallow and uncertain leadership in too many quarters.

Remember that this is nothing new.

This Nation as a whole has the vitality and the endurance to surmount any crisis. Sometimes our criticism springs from our own lack of confidence—seeing the occasional defects but missing the over-all strength of this, a people's government. It is we who choose or chance our leaders. They represent us. In the larger sense, however, the worth and purpose of the United States is determined by the millions of American citizens, by their faith and their industry and their sense of justice.

There were times when Pulaski was discouraged, but he never quit.

He not only had to fight the enemy in front of him, but the timid and short-sighted

civilian leaders behind him. He was shocked by those who put narrow personal interest before the claims of a nation that was struggling for birth.

But he had the physical and the moral courage that was supreme against the dangers of the battlefield and the cowardly corruption behind his own lines.

There is the bravery of a soldier, and there is the bravery of an honest citizen.

The two have much in common.

Joined, they are unbeatable.

The example of Pulaski's leadership drew many citizens to his standard. They became soldiers all, defeating the best professional and mercenary warriors of Europe before they returned to their plows and their looms and their shops. Pulaski, the Polish count, and the rough frontiersmen of the New World were united in their respect for one another as freemen and in their opposition to oppression.

It was almost 200 years ago in his homeland of Poland that he fought to throw out the Russian despot who occupied his country. The young man and his small band of patriots could not do the job alone. Then, as now, many people refused to face the facts. They would not give the young leader the support he needed and deserved. They played it safe, as they thought, and tried to do business with the invader who only scorned their weakness.

Casimir Pulaski clearly saw the danger long before we did. Russian imperialism, hungry for conquest, was on the march then, just as it is reaching out today under the deceptive slogans of international communism, to make Russia the ruler of the world.

The odds were too much against him; so Pulaski came to the New World to continue the fight for freedom. He saw far into the future, sensing what so few in his age understood, that the struggle to win liberty and protect it goes on in all countries and at all times.

The brand new land of America matched his own youth. Here was the great chance to begin all over again, avoiding the mistakes which had betrayed the peoples of the Old World into the hands of false leaders who kept them in ignorance and poverty.

Perhaps he believed that we could build a new society here, where every man would have a chance to prove his ability, and that it would become so strong by the liberation of these talents, that it would encourage the downtrodden everywhere.

We have grown up to that position of responsibility.

In a little more than 175 years we have demonstrated that there is nothing like emancipation to promote the happiness and prosperity of all the people in a community.

What we have done, others can do.

The tragedy of Europe and Asia is that they no sooner throw off one oppressive rule than they are tricked into accepting another.

In Italy, China, Iran, and even in the once powerful country called England, the average person is striving for what he calls economic freedom, or the chance to earn a decent living for himself and his family.

This is an aspiration which no one should deny.

But unscrupulous men who seek power at any cost, promise to give what they cannot deliver, and in turn become oppressors.

Political freedom, economic freedom, or any other similar cry or label means nothing if it is not founded on God's law of respect for one's fellow man. It is not enough to think of honesty and justice or to speak of these virtues unless we try to practice them in our everyday actions.

We are thankful that we live in a country where "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As Americans who believe in tolerance, knowing that the variety in our Nation has sparked its progress. We don't care what the next man's spiritual beliefs are as long as he practices them. All faiths have this in common—that they help men to live the good life, without which human society would degenerate into animalism.

As men drift away from God's laws, the troubles of this world increase. The menace of Russian communism is that in rejecting the moral code it has become a plague to itself and the world. Even in the United States we see the corruption which easy virtue breeds.

Why do I speak in this vein?

Because we are apt to forget that Casimir Pulaski was not only a brave man but one who devoutly believed that in the conduct of his life he must answer to his Divine Creator.

No man can move in two directions at the same time.

In living for freedom under God, he finds the one that leads to all truth.

Brigadier General Pulaski, hero of the American Revolution, knew this for sure. He came all the way from Poland to help us when the difficulties of travel in those days made the journey seem as far as from one planet to another.

His was the faith that was stronger than pain, hardship, or death itself. He lived his life for others, that they might gather courage to make their way through darkness into light.

He came to help the colonists in their hour of need. He placed implicit faith in their cause and paid the supreme sacrifice for its realization. He died believing that we of succeeding generations would not falter in our duties.

Holding a prominent place in the history of his native land, he is assured of even greater glory in these United States that he helped to create. He was the intrepid warrior who twice saved George Washington's army from disruption. And among the patriots of all nations he shall ever be remembered as the hero of two hemispheres.

Around the campfire at night, during the period when it seemed that the cold and hungry and poorly armed colonists could never hope to win their independence from the world's strongest nation, he must have thought of his own homeland and the spirit of the Polish people that would never be conquered.

How alike the two peoples are in their passionate love of independence.

Perhaps some day America will help Poland in turn to win the freedom that belongs to mankind.

Before this monument to his memory in the year of 1951 we make that promise because we know that the people of Poland look to us for hope and assistance.

In ways as yet unseen we shall repay the debt that we owe to Casimir Pulaski because, in the words that he might have said, "We have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Flood Controllers Should Study How Oklahoma Does It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my re-

marks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of August 4, 1951:

FLOOD CONTROLLERS SHOULD STUDY HOW OKLAHOMA DOES IT

(By Elmer T. Peterson)

With almost monotonous regularity come reports, usually in spring or early summer, of floods in the great agricultural valleys. With corresponding monotony the tendency seems either to regard these visitations as unpreventable acts of God or to build huge downstream dams in an effort to contain the torrents after they have got well under way.

Oklahoma, forced by climate and the character of its soil to work faster than usual in the conservation movement, comes up with a prescription that rejects both alternatives. And it works.

One of the wildest actors in the State is the Washita River, whose guilt is frequently evident in the red mud it carries down into the Red River. In its valley are the beginnings of a project to prevent floods by the same kind of foresight that stops cancer. The method is to halt the evil right where it begins—in the gullies, in the furrows, and right up to the stalk-and-root system of grass. Defeating each individual floodlet before it gets started means defeating the big flood, for the river has no way of getting water (except from its tributaries).

In May of 1950, 13 inches of rain fell within 36 hours on a section of West Owl Creek, south of Purcell. This is the lowest official report. Other reports ranged upward as high as 15.5 inches for that area. This part of West Owl Creek had been given a thorough soil-conservation treatment, including the use of grass, contour farming, terracing, and the building of smallish detention reservoirs, a degree larger than the average farm pond.

In previous years downpours of less intensity and volume had produced destructive floods, destroying crops and contributing to the main rush of water down the valley. This year the creek stayed within its banks until it had flowed 1 mile past the last conservation-treated section of its valley. By that time the creek had received runoff from untreated slopes, and it began to go out of its banks. The detention reservoirs took care of a substantial proportion of the runoff. The surface treatment held back another substantial share. A regulated flow from a draw-down valve in each reservoir kept the creek within banks. The threefold system worked even better than had been figured in advance by the conservation engineers.

On May 16, 1951, the Sandstone Creek watershed of 65,000 acres, southeast of Cheyenne, received a downpour ranging up to 4.57 inches. A similar system of detention dams and conservation practices had been not quite completed. The runoff water did not even come up to the draw-down pipes. In other words, none of the permanent pools was filled. Sandstone Creek, which in previous similar storms had been a bad actor, was perfectly tame and did nothing to augment the flow of Washita River, though other creeks in that part of the State were doing great damage.

Barnitz Creek watershed, near Clinton, during the same wet period, received 18 inches of rain within 24 hours, according to several unofficial gage tests. It has an area of 4,000 acres and is equipped with two detention reservoirs with two smaller dams upstream from them, besides the usual surface treatment of terracing, regrassing, and the like. It stayed within its banks while neighboring creeks did great damage with equal precipitation.

"We planned it that way," said one of the conservation technicians. All these agricultural-flood-control-project reservoirs are engineered in advance to hold considerably more runoff water, in proportion to drainage area, than the big Army-engineer projects

in the same region. The huge dams built by the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau have come under heavy fire in recent years. Since one of the chief functions of the big dams, according to the promoters, is flood control, it is up to the opponents of the big projects to propose a practical substitute. They will do well to make a close study of the Washita program.

The Community Chest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a portion of my address at the conclusion of a parade to promote interest in the Community Chest campaign for Greater Lawrence, Lawrence, Mass., on October 14, 1951:

We have just seen a colorful parade, in which thousands from all walks of life took part.

This enthusiastic turn-out proves that our people have a real civic pride and a civic spirit.

Just as a soldier is ever ready to help and support his comrades, so do we, as citizens, owe a responsibility to the children, the youth, the old folks, and those in unfortunate circumstances. They, too, are members of our community and belong to the larger family that we call Greater Lawrence.

This parade was not merely a show.

Its purpose was to call our attention to those organizations in our city which work day in and day out lending a helping hand to those in need. These charitable and social agencies, with their experienced and devoted employees, are the good Samaritans who bring the light of human kindness into dark places, assisting the weak and the discouraged.

In fact, they are doing this merciful and constructive service in human relations for us.

In other days we were called upon to do it personally in a hit-and-miss fashion.

The 13 Red Feather agencies through the Community Chest have taken over this responsibility from us and have put it upon a 365-days-a-year basis that reaches every worthy case among the 125,000 people in this area.

By group effort, more is accomplished than any number of individuals, motivated by good will toward their fellow humans, could ever hope to do. It is a system whereby a whole city mobilizes its strength against poverty and juvenile delinquency and helplessness. When all of us chip in, we make sure of raising the \$200,000 which, spread fairly among the 13 services, assures us that it will be put to the best use and that it will benefit the largest possible number of deserving people.

The more of us who share in the giving will guarantee that more will share in the help that they need.

It is the complete, efficient and economical way to take care of all our own.

Even to the heart-warming assistance that is provided to the men and women in our Armed Forces the world over as well as to their lonely families at home.

All of us are partners in the great defense program that is designed to protect our Nation from attack. That calls for a united effort from us to meet a common danger

and to meet it as members of the larger family that we call the United States.

There is also the problem of protecting ourselves from within. In every city and town of this country, we must try to build up the health and strength and courage of every individual. By giving just a little of our own productiveness, we rescue those who might go under without it.

No one of us would ever think of letting a brother or sister, a mother or father, suffer because of our indifference. Without love and consideration and sacrifice for those near to us, we would lose our own self-respect.

We owe a smaller obligation, but an obligation nevertheless, to assist our more distant relatives. And these include the fellow human beings in the locality where we share the common experience of life.

The parade just concluded was the energy which turned over the motor. But it will mean nothing unless we shift into high gear and accelerate the forward movement with our donations.

Money is the only fuel that will make this Community Chest drive go and keep going until it arrives at its \$200,000 destination.

I have been told by the authorities that there will be no speed tickets handed out on this drive.

This is one time when the faster we go the better for all concerned. We have only 2 weeks to travel 200,000 "dollar-miles."

A fast start is urgent. And we must keep feeding in contributions without let-up.

Let's get together the neighborly way, the organized way, by giving our individual quotas to the Lawrence Community Chest campaign today.

Columbus Cleans Up and Saves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, with America's industrial capacity continuing at full speed, the problem of air pollution is quite likely to become intensified—especially in our larger cities—unless local government, industry, and the general public join together to prevent it. For your information and for the benefit of interested communities throughout the Nation, I should like to review the problem very briefly and to tell you something about how my home city has dealt with it. Cleaner Air Week is to be observed October 21–27, so this subject is particularly appropriate at this time.

Air pollution consists of dusts, pollens, smoke, fumes, and gases—some of which we can see and some of which we cannot. The character and intensity of pollution is largely dependent upon the geography and topography of a community, the locations and the nature of its industrial and commercial activity, and local weather conditions.

We should take advantage of the research and development progress that has already been made in combating one of the visible and more obvious components of air pollution—smoke. Power engineers have found that most smoke is unnecessary and that it can largely be

eliminated. They have also proved to us that smoke is wasteful. Fuel saving is a factor that no one can afford to overlook during the period of tight economy which we are now entering.

Now is the time that these proved engineering theories should be put to work cleaning up our atmosphere and cutting down our fuel bills. My home city of Columbus, capital of Ohio, has been putting these theories into practice with increasing success. Columbus has received widespread recognition for accomplishing a large reduction of smoke in a short period of time.

Columbus has met the air pollution problem of smoke with sound engineering principles and not with fuel prohibitions. The smoke law is based on the premise that any fuel that is available for practical use in a city—gas, coal, oil, or wood—will smoke if it is not properly burned.

Engineering and education have been the key words of the program since it was inaugurated by Mayor James A. Rhodes after the conclusion of World War II. Harry C. Ballman, smoke abatement engineer for the city of Columbus, has established that human failure is a chief contributor to smoke. He has found that carelessness and indifference plus old and improperly maintained equipment are responsible for 60 to 70 percent of all smoke.

One of the first undertakings on the agenda at Columbus was a survey of more than 300 plants, schools, hospitals, Government buildings, and large commercial buildings for the purpose of determining the principal sources of smoke. Then came the educational campaign to show how engineering methods reduce smoke and save on fuel bills. Night school classes were set up for operators of power-heating equipment, building owners and employees, and for railroad men. Our local newspapers—which have given immeasurable assistance throughout the entire project—carried series of articles explaining how to eliminate unnecessary smoke, as well as many promotional articles on the advantages of smoke control and why a city like Columbus should have it.

The plant surveys showed that most of our public buildings and a great number of our factories and commercial buildings were using equipment that was either obsolete or badly in need of repairs. Making the repairs and adjustments presented no insurmountable problems, but replacing an entire heating plant can be an expensive operation that is far more than an overnight job. Through excellent cooperation on the part of city and State officials, as well as industry executives, a tremendous amount of new heating equipment has been installed in Columbus since the survey was made, and the results have been highly satisfactory. Besides eliminating or reducing smoke, the new boilers and furnaces are saving so much fuel that some of them will actually pay for themselves within a few years.

Railroads were also a constant smoke menace until company officials, firemen, and maintenance men got together behind the smoke-abatement program. Fireboxes in the engines have been equip-

ped with special jets for burning all volatile matter before smoke can be formed. In the final analysis, of course, whether there is going to be smoke depends largely upon the engine crews of the five railroads serving Columbus, just as the men in charge of furnaces and boilers in large buildings and factories have such important roles in keeping the city's atmosphere clean.

The Columbus program against unnecessary smoke does not stop here. The smoke engineer has gone into the small business houses—the garages, dry cleaners, grocery stores, and the like—to see what can be done about their participation in the program for clean air. Many of these marginal shops are using obsolete and broken-down equipment, and they are not always in a financial position to make the necessary repairs or replacements. In like manner, all home owners cannot afford to invest in new heating systems on short notice. In these cases the only practical course to follow is to insist that extraordinary care be utilized in the burning of the fuel until such a time as the proper adjustments can be made.

The smoke engineer is empowered by the smoke ordinance to license installation of all new power and heating equipment. Our atmospheric conditions may thus be expected to improve from year to year because, as old equipment is discarded, plans for new boilers and furnaces must be wholly acceptable to the smoke-control authorities before installations are permitted. In this matter of equipment replacement, the division takes the same basic attitude as it does with fuel. There is no restriction on any make of equipment, but each piece of equipment must be installed in such a manner in relation to the rest of the plant that smoke and air pollution will be held to a minimum at the source.

There are instances of where the smoke-abatement office has been forced to take legal action against violators of the smoke law, but for the most part there has been excellent cooperation simply because the public in general is behind our officials on this project. The annual report of the division of smoke regulation and inspection points out that the successful job in air-pollution work depends upon the wholehearted cooperation of every operator, manager, owner, and citizen in the city of Columbus. By the same token, our entire citizenry can be proud of the national and international recognition that has come with our air-purification accomplishments.

Now, as you may know, I have refrained from going into detail on the program which Mayor Rhodes and Mr. Ballman have conducted so successfully. But their offices have handled inquiries from every State of the United States and from Canada as well, and they will be glad to provide basic information for communities in your districts. I hope that all communities will take an interest in smoke-abatement work, especially at a time when conservation of our fuel resources is so important.

As for the other components of air pollution—particularly the irritating elements contained in that mixture of contaminants known as smog—I feel confi-

dent that scientific and engineering research will one day bring us relief. The problem is under study in numerous laboratories, including those at Ohio State University and Battelle Memorial Institute, both in Columbus. These laboratories are cooperating with the city, and we are hoping that Columbus will pioneer developments in smog reduction just as it has been one of the pioneers in smoke abatement.

Six Cry Out From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, in its issue dated October 13, 1951, the Chicago Daily Tribune printed what it termed "a heartbreak story from Korea." After reading the article, I came to the conclusion that characterizing the story as heart-breaking is placing a very mild interpretation upon its contents.

If the facts charged in the article can be substantiated, then the situation is nothing short of criminal negligence. The story is ascribed to that of six wounded soldiers of the Twenty-third Regiment, Second Infantry Division, who agreed to issue a statement about conditions in the Armed Forces in Korea. The story lays special emphasis on the treatment of the wounded and details instances that are so appalling that they cannot help but shock the conscience of every thinking and interested American whose attention has been called to what these boys have to say.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that a fortnight ago we appropriated more than \$60,000,000,000 for national defense and for military and Armed Forces including those in Korea. The facts depicted in this story, as told by the six wounded boys, should be thoroughly investigated and if found to be factually correct, then it is high time that Congress take more of a hand in the police action wars than that of furnishing funds for the military services. The story is replete with details about the hardships and suffering to which soldiers are being subjected.

I request that here in the House we do something about the deplorable conditions which the six soldiers described—that is do something constructive and something more than indulge in general debate and render lip service to a situation which seems to have gotten out of hand at least in some sectors where the fighting forces are now stationed in Korea.

When a boy in the combat services of our country finds himself subjected to a nightmare of starvation, thirst, cold, fear, agony, and death and cries out that we as Members of Congress are permitting this state of affairs to go on and the poor fellow openly acknowledges his lack of confidence in us and points out that only God can save us, it is high time that we take a careful inventory of our stewardship and ascertain where

the blame should be fixed. If we, as Members of Congress, fail in this task and permit the guilty to go unwhipped of justice, then we might well take cover behind the utterances of Mark Anthony from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar:

Age, thou art shamed;
Rome, thou hast lost the breed of noble bloods.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therein an article published in the Chicago Daily Tribune under date of October 13, 1951, entitled "Only God Can Save Us." The article is as follows:

"ONLY GOD CAN SAVE US," SIX CRY OUT FROM KOREA—THEIR LETTER SAYS SOME PRAY, SOME GO CRAZY

The Tribune herewith prints a heartbreak story from Korea.

It is told in a letter, written to the editors on September 22, from a Korean hospital. Six wounded soldiers from the Twenty-third Regiment, Second Infantry Division, got together there to tell—more eloquently than they knew—of the soldier's war—a nightmare of starvation, thirst, cold, fear, agony, and death, and the hopelessness of youth sacrificed knowingly. It reads:

"DEAR SIR: If the American people could only see what is happening in Korea to their boys, they would never again think of war. I'm only a Pfc (private first class) over here, and let me tell you, in only 3 months I've seen more than I can hardly stand."

"I'VE SEEN BOYS DYING"

"I've seen boys dying on a mountain top because they couldn't get them down, blood soaked from head to foot, losing every second a little more of that precious stuff we call blood.

"But, you ask, what about those wonderful helicopters which are floating around in Korea? Those wonderful helicopters can't fly at night, and, when the fighting gets tough, you won't see those slow flying planes very close to much of the real thing.

"From where I am now it takes 8 hours to reach an aid station. So a badly wounded American (your boy) is carried down steep mountain trails by South Korean boys (who are sometimes too lazy to carry the stretchers and rest 5 minutes out of every 10).

"The stretchers are dragged over rocks, tree stumps, and all sorts of obstacles on the way down (no fault of the stretcher bearers). Yes, and if they are lucky to reach an aid station alive, they may still die, as some of the aid stations up near front are nothing but a tent. For light they use flashlights, a chaplain is usually there to pray for those who are badly wounded."

"IF WE ONLY COULD—"

"Only God can help these boys," he (the chaplain) said. "We can't get them to the hospital. If we only could, if we only could—" Maybe that boy was one of your boys who died in Korea. Of course, they won't tell you any of the facts of how he died. Lucky are the boys who don't know what hits them.

"Those who are slightly wounded and can walk are lucky. They only have to walk 8 or 10 miles to an aid station. And, if you get your foot shot off, they wrap a blanket around the stump and you can walk down that way. Mind you, the country is so rough over here, that this is the only way wounded can get to an aid station. But then there is a chance you will get ambushed by the enemy on the way down. In other words, you might get killed trying to get to an aid station."

A TEASPOON AN HOUR

"Water in Korea? Yes, there are rivers here by the hundreds. But, when you are on top of a mountain, it's a little different

story. They might as well not be any rivers in Korea, as they aren't doing a person any good when you are on a mountain.

"For 4 days, a half a canteen full of water is what you get if you are lucky. One teaspoon of water every hour is the way some of the boys over here drink their water while on a big mountain.

"What about food? Yes, the United States Army tries to get food to all the front line boys, but the food is delayed by ambush or mortar shells. Therefore, we are sometimes lucky to get two cans of food a day, sometimes none for 2 or 3 days."

THEY PRAY FOR WOUNDS

"Here is another thing hard to believe, but true. About 8 of 10 boys over here I have heard talking, pray they will get shot (not a bad wound) so they may go to a hospital. Isn't that something, when your boys want to get shot? Some fellows (there are tents full of them in Korea) say they are going nuts. Some of them are, some say they are. I don't blame them, this thing over here can drive anyone nuts."

"Seeing things like I am telling you here is what every GI sees every day."

"Yes, what have we to look forward to? If you get wounded they keep sending you back to the front till you can't walk any longer. Most fellows who have to climb a mountain say that just the climbing is a big enough fight, let alone when you get near to the top to have to fight an enemy who is poking a machine gun down your throat. An enemy who rolls grenades down the mountain like a little boy in the United States would roll a marble down a hill."

CAN'T SOMEONE HELP?

"Yes; this is Korea all right. Only God can watch over us here. He is the only one who can help us.

"But I say this, thank God that our friends and family can't see how bad it is; they would never believe it, you won't believe it, I don't believe it, but it happened to us, as we are in the hospital now.

"We pray for peace, but that is all we can do over here. Can't someone help us?"

Although written in first person singular, the letter was signed by 6 men. They are from Fisk and Gary, Ind., a small town in Wisconsin; Highland Park, Ill.; Kansas City, Mo., and a Minnesota farm.

The People of the Missouri and Kansas Valleys Need Governmental Assistance Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, in August of this year, Senator HENNING, of Missouri, introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to establish a Missouri Basin Survey Commission whose duty it would be to make a full and complete investigation of the land and water resources and their utilization for the Missouri Valley region, consisting of the entire Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, as located within the following States: Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Minnesota, and Iowa. Fourteen other Senators joined as co-sponsors.

In September a similar resolution was introduced by me in the House. So far no action has been taken before the Public Works Committee of either body on these resolutions.

I believe it was Odell Shepard who once said, "A man's memory is what he forgets with." And so it is that, in less than 3 months after the most devastating flood that ever happened in our country, we have conveniently forgotten.

As Congress puts on its final burst of speed to adjourn this week end and start for home, we have apparently forgotten that in the Kansas and Missouri Valleys there are thousands who have no home.

As we hasten to return and build our political fences, we have forgotten that many farmers living in these heretofore fertile valleys can build no fences. They cannot do so because their farms are covered with from 4 to 8 feet of muck and mire and sand and gravel. As one commentator put it: "Farm lands, rich, good earth, converted into sand dunes. The waters had brought the Sahara to the farmer."

Within a few days we shall hasten to return and tell the voters what we are doing for freemen everywhere. We shall speak in tones of self-sacrifice as we stress the benefits of the point 4 program and aid to starving India. In glowing terms shall we detail the economic aid to Europe and parts of Asia—how we have sent farm experts to rehabilitate the agriculture of those countries and rebuild the industrial plants of the free nations.

We shall tell the voters how weary and tired we are after 10 months of unceasing vigilance and attention to duty in their behalf. How nice it is to return home again and breathe the clean, pure air. We shall do all this while other men in Kansas City Mo.; Kansas City, Kans.; Manhattan, Topeka, Parsons, and many other cities and towns are still shoveling the stenchy mud from what was once called a home; and while other men, women, and children stand sad-faced to view only the stone steps and foundation of where a home once rested, a home that long since floated in pieces along the Missouri and Mississippi, and perhaps to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the flood damage may have amounted to some \$2,500,000,000. Big business, small business, large farmer, small farmer, big homeowner, small homeowner, and tenant inhabitants—they all suffered in many sections. What have we done to partially alleviate these great losses? We voted \$25,000,000 for rehabilitation and direct relief. That is a mere pittance. We thereafter made available to existing agencies around \$113,000,000, mostly for loans; that is, the House did, but the Senate has not acted.

There may be those who can avail themselves of this beneficence; but what of those whose homes have vanished or those who formerly paid \$25 per month rent and now can live in a Government trailer at \$35 to \$45 per month if they had the money—which they have not, because their jobs went with the floodwaters? What of the young married couple just getting started in life, with a home purchased on the payment plan;

a couple with a large debt hanging over them and nothing but the ground left?

Mr. Speaker, this particular flood did not touch my district. However, it is my thought that every district in the country has been indirectly affected. This area is not just a spot to itself. It is the heart of America. It is the crossroads of the greatest Nation on earth. Within its confines is the second largest railroad center in America. The whole basin area comprises one-sixth of the United States and a most important segment of our economic life. In sections of these fertile valleys is a loess soil of astonishing depth and richness which many authorities have stated is as fertile as the delta of the Ganges or the valley of the Nile.

Much of this great farm land has been badly eroded, the soil loss ranging from 2 inches up to 10, with some fields badly cut up by gullies and new ponds. This topsoil is irreplaceable.

On some of the tributaries flood control is needed for rainy years such as this and conservation pools are needed for the drouth years. A steady flow of water at all times is needed at power and industrial plants.

I have voted consistently for economic aid to Europe. In our fight against communism it has been my thought that we must render aid to democratic ideals everywhere. Victory can never come on the battlefields alone. The fight against false prophets must be finally won in the fields and factories where men labor and struggle for a full life. However, we should not forget our own people when disaster hits and sorrow falls.

As we spend billions for defense in this and other countries, let us not forget that we have here a problem of defense, a problem of prosperity and security not only for the people of the Missouri Valley, but of the Nation as well. We can ill afford to lose the industry of this great region.

In my opinion, we should not adjourn until reasonable legislation is passed for direct grants-in-aid. We should not adjourn until a commission is authorized to study the over-all problem of flood control and make recommendation to the Congress on proper measures to prevent a recurrence of this catastrophe.

Deployment of American Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to submit an editorial from the Pointer, a weekly paper published in Dolton, Ill., by Mr. A. L. Rausher. This editorial concerns the deployment of American troops on foreign soil.

I should like to preface this editorial in the Dolton Pointer with some reactions of my own to this particular topic. It

was in the autumn of 1940 that the Congress passed the first peacetime conscription. That plan for conscription contained the provision that the men to be drafted were not to be sent out of the Western Hemisphere except to our own territories and possessions.

Certainly, if there ever were a time when we were justified in placing a limitation on the manner in which our troops shall be deployed, it is now. We do not even know how long an American commander will be leading these troops, but we do know that they will be part of an international army, and that a dozen other governments will be exercising control over them. After the shameful way in which other nations have failed us in the Korean crisis, where the blood of our American youth by the thousands is being spilled, we shall betray our trust and be remiss in our duty to our country if we fail to retain the authority for the disposition of our troops in the Congress, where by constitutional mandate the power to declare war rests. Yes, I know there have been cited 134 examples of the use of such power on the part of the Chief Executive since the founding of this Nation. What are some of these citations? They include the following.

First. The dispatch of five marines to Cuba to bury one of their comrades who died of fever.

Second. Six sailors from the battleship *Tennessee* who were sent to Paris to guard our exhibit in the Paris exhibition.

Third. Admiral Perry had an honor guard of 300 bluejackets when he went to China.

There were many others in that list of 134 citations which were of no greater significance. There is a vast difference between such examples of the exercise of authority on the part of an Executive, and the war in Korea where casualties have exceeded 80,000, and where we now have approximately 300,000 troops committed to battle.

The issue before us today is not confined only to the deployment of troops; it involves the issue of peace and war. If we agree to permit the present incumbent of the White House to exercise his will in the use of our troops, we shall have abdicated the authority to declare war as vested in this body by the Constitution of the United States. If you do not believe this, look at what has happened in Korea. Are we at war there? Did the Congress declare that war?

We stand today on the threshold of new action. Where will that action lead us? Speaking for myself, I want the authority to make war to remain in the control of the Congress. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to embrace any other course, for I still have the haunting memories of what happened in June 1950, when our troops were ordered to Korea without the approval of the Congress. That step has led us into a situation fraught with the gravest danger. No one dares predict what the outcome will be. I do not want a repetition of episodes of that nature.

In this situation I speak only for myself and with the future welfare of my country at heart. My convictions, nevertheless, are strong. The Congress has

already abdicated too much of its authority, in my opinion. Let us hold the line at this point and prove that this body still possesses the virility which our founding fathers expected of us when they entrusted us with the defense of our country and the power to make war should necessity impose that burden upon us.

The Dolton Pointer has discussed this subject from an unbiased viewpoint in an editorial in a recent issue, and I should like to insert that editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of some of the impartial thinking on this subject which exists in our country today. The editorial follows:

AS WE UNDERSTAND IT

The great debate continues over whether the President has the legal or moral right to send troops to help garrison Europe without the consent of Congress, and, regardless of current actions, will continue for a long time to come. In more placid times, this extremely important dispute undoubtedly would have been given much more press coverage and comment than has actually been the case—it might, for instance, have been comparable to the late President Roosevelt's Supreme-Court-packing proposal in its impact on the public mind. Today, however, there are so many vital issues, and so much is going on in the world, that it is clearly impossible for each problem and controversy to be given the space and attention it may deserve.

The principal differences between the President and those who oppose him over the troops-to-Europe issue are sharp and clear-cut.

The President points to the fact that the Constitution specifically states that he is Commander in Chief of all the military forces. He holds that decision as to where troops shall be sent, and in what number, is a military and diplomatic decision, and that it can only be made by the Executive. And he cites many cases, going far back into our history, where the Presidents have sent troops on foreign duty without the consent or advice of Congress.

Those who think otherwise—and Senator Tamm has been a leader of this group—have strong arguments on their side. They say that the writers of the Constitution made the President Commander in Chief so that he could immediately rally the Nation's defenses in event of attack—in the stagecoach days, it took weeks to convene Congress, where now it could be convened overnight. They argue that it is a very different matter to send divisions of troops to Europe, in the face of the Russian menace, than it was to dispatch a few soldiers or sailors to deal with the Barbary pirates or Mexican bandits. Probably their most powerful argument is that, if the President can send troops wherever he likes and in any number, he actually has the power to make war without the consent of Congress, which would be a direct violation of the Constitution. It is an interesting fact that some Senators who are battling the President over this far-reaching issue are for, not against, sending substantial number of American troops abroad to serve under General Eisenhower's Atlantic Pact command. But they do not believe that one man should have authority to make that decision.

There is still another side to this which Walter Lippmann touched on in a recent column. "If the President were wiser than he is," Mr. Lippmann wrote, "he never would have dreamed of questioning the right of Congress to participate in the unprecedented project of placing an American standing army in Europe and of merging it in an international army. He would not only have sought the advice of Congress but he would

have insisted from the outset that Congress share his responsibility." Mr. Lippmann differed sharply with Governor Dewey's unequivocal support of the President on this issue, and said, "Can Governor Dewey argue that the project of an American standing army in Europe, involving perhaps 750,000 men, can be called a mere 'deployment' like sending troops to Hawaii, Alaska, or even by putting ground crews at some air strips in Great Britain."

So the various arguments run. One thing is sure—whatever the ultimate decision, this is one of the most important constitutional questions that has ever arisen in this country.

Our Policy in Western Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the solution of the German problem remains the fulcrum of the capability of Europe to defend itself against Communist aggression, to repel Communist subversion, and to be unified economically and politically. The appended analysis—taken from the October 9 New York Times—of the issue now under negotiation which will determine Europe's and Germany's future should be of interest to every Member:

THE ISSUES AT BONN

Overshadowed at the moment by seemingly more dramatic events, negotiations of great importance are now under way in the provisional German capital of Bonn. These negotiations are based on the decision of the recent Washington conference to conclude a peace contract with Western Germany in return for a German contribution to Western defense. The negotiations deal, therefore, at one and the same time with the three basic problems that confront the Western World and affect all its policy decisions in dealing with Soviet imperialism—first, the solution of the German problem, which has been at the bottom of most recent wars and which could spark a new one, next, the reorganization of Europe, which has outlived the division into rival national states and is striving for new forms of unity as an essential condition for survival; and finally, the creation of an effective Western defense, able to balance Soviet power.

Thus far the negotiations have not been going well. After three prolonged sessions between Western High Commissioners and Chancellor Adenauer, and despite some announced progress, the basic problems remain unresolved, and there is even talk of a German walkout and an Allied postponement of the whole program. Such a development would play into Soviet hands, and it must be hoped that the new session scheduled for tomorrow will bring a break in the deadlock.

It would, of course, be easy for the Western Allies to impose any solution they like, at least on Western Germany, which is still under their unconditional occupation rule and has no other place to go. Nor are voices lacking which propose to do just this. But any solution that does not command wholehearted acceptance by both Germany and the Western Powers could soon backfire. It would leave a sullen and resentful Germany which would be a prey to the demagoguery of its neo-Nazis and the blandishments of Soviet propaganda, making any German con-

tribution to Western defense either futile or actually dangerous.

In these circumstances the most hopeful procedure is to emphasize, above all national rivalries, the idea of European unification, which is as inspiring as it is necessary, and which, under French leadership, has already developed a powerful grip on the European youth of all nations. That idea is the basis of both the Schuman plan for European economic integration, and of the European Army aiming at similar military integration. Both plans have been accepted by the German Government. But the value and even the full realization of these plans will depend on the success of the Bonn negotiations, which must lay the political foundation for them.

For the Western Powers the issue is not only German integration but also security against new German aggression and even German domination of a united Europe. For that reason they propose to continue what they consider essential political, economic, and military controls, either under the peace contract or outside of it. The Germans, mindful of their past history, cannot well object to measures necessary for this purpose. But for the Germans the issues are equality, security and a chance for ultimate national unification under viable conditions. It is on these issues that Soviet propaganda, under Stalin's personal leadership, now concentrates, dangling before German eyes the fantasy of a unified, independent and neutralized Germany. And however blatant its promises or threats, the issues themselves carry so much weight that they put the German Government under pressure.

For that reason the Western Powers, within the framework of their own security, must take account of this pressure. The Germans must be made to realize that European unification offers the best chance for their own unification and that equality must be earned. But any suggestion that the Western Powers are seeking German manpower merely for their own defense, indifferent to the fate of their new prospective partner and trying to retain controls for their own ends beyond the requirements of security—above all, any hint that they are still open to a bargain with the Soviets at German expense—can only wreck their own design. The situation calls for a solution along the lines laid down in the treaty recently negotiated with Japan.

This Is the Remarkable Story of What Happened to Lum Cummings and His Farm Family, of Franklin County, Ala., When It Decided to Use Pasture Crops, Fertilizers, and Beef Cattle to Work With Nature Instead of Digging It Out in Cotton and Row Crops With a Mule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the story of Lum Cummings and his fine farm family, of Franklin County, Ala., and its switch from row crop-mule farming to pasture crops and beef cattle, and the rewards that came in 14 short years as a result is a story that should be told millions of times in the southeast, because it points the way to increased prosperity in

an area that has for too long been tied to cotton as the one cash crop.

I had the pleasure of visiting the farm of Lum Cummings, and his son Lawrence, and their families on May 30 this year, and observing at first hand the wonderful transformation that their efforts had wrought.

The Cummings have as a sideline made a wonderful contribution to better farming in the area, by being willing, day in and day out to demonstrate to those who come, the results of their fine work. More than 5,000 people visited their farm last year.

I like the spirit in which Lum Cummings realizes the future of pasture and cattle farming in Alabama. When I talked to him on May 30, he pointed to a little boy and said:

That little fellow deserves a good opportunity in life. Pastures and beef cattle will provide it for him where cotton wouldn't.

As a part of the Lum Cummings story, I include an article styled Lum Cummings tired of following "a little mule," by J C Lowery, extension agronomist of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, from the October 1951 issue of the Progressive Farmer.

LUM CUMMINGS TIRED OF FOLLOWING "A LITTLE MULE"

(By J C Lowery)

"I went around rows with a little mule so long I just tried to find another way of making a living," said Lum Cummings, of Franklin County, Ala.

This decision made more changes in the life of Lum Cummings and his family than any other he ever made. In 1937, he had an 80-acre farm with 26 acres in cotton, 16 acres in corn, and 17 acres in soybeans. Cotton was practically his only source of cash. As a matter of fact, Lum was in very hard circumstances financially. He just wasn't getting anywhere with the land use program he was following.

Then one day in 1937 his county agent, J D Wood, asked him if he would cooperate in testing some TVA fertilizer on pastures and other cover crops. He was willing to try, because he thought any change might be for the better. Mr Wood helped Lum work out a program for sound use of fertilizer in growing clover-grass pastures, perennials, and other cover crops. He started by clearing some swampland and improving 17 acres of pasture. The pasture was used by a small dairy herd. He also got his first purebred beef cattle. To provide some added summer grazing, he set some kudzu in 1938. Since then he has changed to sericea.

In the spring of 1938, Lum got his first hard jolt about his pasture. The pasture was so good that he put 35 head of cattle on 18 acres. In a few days along came the county agent, R M Reeves, assistant district agent, and the winter. Lum says he thought these fellows came to bug on his pasture. But all he heard on this trip was fussing about too many cows on the pasture. He says they just refused to pay much attention to his good pasture and kidded him about so many cows on the pasture. Lum never forgot that experience. Just as soon as he could he sold off part of his cows, and from that day on he has been very careful not to overstock his pasture.

It's a long story to trace Mr Cummings' development. Only a few of the high points can be covered in this article.

Here is a year-by-year brief of the changes on this farm as reported by Mr Reeves, who helped in developing this demonstration pasture.

1937: Started with 80 acres of land with normal yield of 200 pounds lint cotton and 8 bushels corn per acre. Cleared swampland and converted to pasture. Terraced remainder of farm. Improved 17 acres of pasture. Applied 50 tons lime. Bought first purebred beef cattle.

1938: Bought 60 acres of additional land. Increased improved pasture. Planted first perennial legumes. Applied 100 tons lime.

1939: Increased perennial cover by setting 10 acres kudzu. Reduced dairy cattle and increased purebred beef cattle. Increased hogs. Saved first sericea seed. Applied 40 tons lime.

1940: Bought more land. Increased sericea acreage. Reduced soybean acreage. Increased improved pasture acreage. Harvested 800 pounds sericea seed. Added broilers to livestock program. Applied 10 tons lime.

1941: Increased farm acreage to 275. Increased pasture acreage. Expanded small grain winter legume acreage. Increased beef cattle. Saved white Dutch clover seed for sale. Bought tractor and tractor equipment.

1942: Reduced farm acreage to 156. Reduced beef cattle to purebred animals. Added crimson clover and vetch seed to sources of income. Increased hogs and broilers. Increased bought feed.

1943: Improved home and tenant house. Expanded purebred beef cattle. Reduced hogs and increased broilers. Increased bought feed.

1944: Increased size of farm to 314 acres. Increased pasture. Increased sericea. Reduced cotton. Reduced broilers. Bought larger tractor. Did custom terracing up to \$3,000 under triple A program. Increased legume seed saved to 4,000 pounds.

1945: Increased size of farm to 354 acres. Bought combine. Increased sericea acreage. Increased legume seed produced to 31,000 pounds. Increased purebred beef cattle.

1946: Improved farm home. Installed running water in pasture. Increased improved pasture to 126 acres. Increased sericea acreage.

1947: Increased size of farm to 594 acres. Increased improved pasture to 188 acres. Increased sericea to 80 acres. Grew 365 acres of perennial and winter cover. Added cotton for tenants. Purchased new combine, hay baler, and lime spreader. Bought washing machine and furniture.

1948: Increased size of farm to 839 acres. Increased improved pasture to 211 acres. Added alfalfa. Built two barns. Bought water system for home. Increased legume seed sales. Increased cotton for tenants.

1949: Increased farm to 979 acres. Increased improved pasture to 345 acres. Discontinued all row crops except garden. Increased legume seed sales. Expanded registered beef herd. Increased annual application of phosphate and potash. Bought deep freeze, electric heater, and other household appliances.

1950: Increased improved permanent pasture and use of potash and lime. Enlarged registered beef herd. Bought truck, tractor, car, and water pump. Increased sale of legume seed.

He had in May 1951, 385 acres of improved pasture, 120 acres sericea. In 1951 he had more than 200 registered Hereford cattle on his farm.

The Cummingses fertilized all their pastures and perennials each year at least up to the rate recommended by the experiment station and, in many cases, at a higher rate.

For several years the Cummingses have been selling seed saved from their pasture when they have a good seed crop. The "Lum Cummings' pasture mixture" has become popular. It contains bluegrass, orchardgrass, and white clover seed. Mr Lum gets these seed in combining and does not separate them.

Mr Lum wants to see his customers succeed. So he insists on their preparing the soil well and using plenty of fertilizer. He

insists that those planting the mixture apply 2 tons or more lime per acre, 400 pounds superphosphate, and 100 to 150 pounds muriate of potash per acre. When the customers do what he says, they usually succeed.

In 1951, he sold \$100 worth of seed per acre from about 12 acres.

Here is a bit of evidence of how good Lum's pasture is. From August 1950 to August 1951, 32 head of cattle got their feed from 26 acres of pasture.

This development has been a family affair. Mrs Cummings and their son, Lawrence, and his family have been a vital part of the partnership.

Now for some of Lum's observations about his pasture job. He said:

"We came up the hard way. We never bought any seed except at the beginning. We have saved our own. For the first few years we rubbed out the seed by hand, because we did not have a combine or the money to buy one. We pulled weeds by hand and carried them out of the pasture in a pick sack. The main reason we have good pastures is the use of plenty of lime and fertilizers. Failure to use lots of lime and fertilizer causes most of the pasture failures."

"When we learn more about grazing, we will be better able to make a living without the plow. The hoe and the pitchfork are the two worst things ever invented. Take hay. We do not plant hay crops on this farm. We save the surplus growth of our pastures for hay."

"There is no loss of soil from our farm. The water comes off our farm clear. This is because we keep our soil in sod."

Here is a partial story of one of the most amazing pasture developments in Alabama. A man who started at the bottom, and now has one of the finest pastures in Alabama on upland not usually considered good pasture land. People from many States and foreign nations have traveled to visit this humble man and his family and see the miracle they have performed in pastures. Government officials, agricultural workers, professional and business men go to see him and learn his story. More than 5,000 people visited this farm last year. Day after day county delegations visit Mr. Lum.

Scarcely a day passes that travelers do not stop to see the Cummings pasture and the beautiful herd of more than 200 registered Herefords.

It has taken him 14 years to get to where he is—over the hard road.

On May 30, Cummings Pasture Day was held on his farm to honor him and his family and to see the great pasture story. Leaders from neighboring counties, professional men, executives of great corporations, the press, and farmers waded through orchardgrass, bluegrass, Dallis grass, white clover pastures and lespedeza sericea. They saw this pasture being prepared for market by his fine Hereford cattle.

All day long Mr. Lum kept preaching "Fertilize! Fertilize! Fertilize! We are trying to make a living growing grass."

The Cummings farm is now out of debt, from red ink to green grass.

Secretaries Wanted Desperately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Saturday Evening Post of October 6,

1951, titled "Secretaries Wanted Desperately," which describes the shortage of secretaries and stenographers in Washington, D. C., which the Federal Government is experiencing today.

For one thing, parents read exposés of the Capital, like *Washington Confidential*, which reports shocking moral and living conditions—

The article points out—

and then mamma puts her foot down and refuses to let her baby lamb go to the wicked city. Recruiters recently reported tremendous public reaction to an article published by a national magazine under the title: "Don't Send Your Girl to Washington." In some places it slowed recruiting to a standstill. Mothers ganged up on one recruiter in Boston and threatened to have her run out of town. Ministers rose up in their pulpits in one town, declaiming against the evils of the big city.

The *Saturday Evening Post* article sets forth facts that must be answered by the Federal Government. Not to do so, or to attempt to evade the issue, can only result in greater troubles.

I have recently introduced a bill in the Congress, H. R. 5373, the text of which appears below, which would give the Federal Government authority to deal with a large part of the problem by establishing recreation programs for the leisure hours of Federal employees, the young men and women recruited from all over the country, similar to those which private industry has carried on so successfully for over 50 years at such leading concerns as Eastman Kodak, Hershey Chocolate Co., Ford, Firestone, and Goodyear.

My bill is similar to legislation which passed the Senate during the Eighty-first session of Congress as S. 2859 and upon the recommendation of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, acting for the President, was introduced in the present Congress by Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

It is important that wise manpower policies be adopted by the Federal Government before it is too late. Too little and too late hardly describes the Federal Government's lagging 50 years behind private industry in this vital aspect of its employee relations. Wholesome recreational outlets must be provided Federal employees now.

Even during the war, when the need was even greater than it is now, Eleanor Roosevelt pointed out in her column *My Day* recently the Federal Government did not employ trained recreational leaders, nor did it take any interest in the recreation problems of its employees.

The article is as follows:

SECRETARIES WANTED DESPERATELY

(By Carolyn and Phil Gustafson)

In Washington they tell a story about the way Government agencies test new candidates for stenographic jobs. The timorous applicant is blindfolded and gently ushered into a large room. Then the blindfold is removed and she sees five tables lined up in front of her. Each table holds a single object. There is a juke box, a calculating machine, a cash register, a typewriter and a slot machine. If she can identify the typewriter, she's hired.

This story illustrates the desperate fix in which the Government agencies are finding themselves these days with the Capital burst-

ing its seams in defense expansion. Short supplies in other strategic materials may have caused more clamor, but as far as Washington bureaucracy is concerned, the three most critical items in the cold war are typists, stenographers, and secretaries. And so scarce are all three that employment chiefs in some of the new agencies say they are having a hard time getting their organizations under way.

At one point last summer, Arnold Sukrow, employment officer of the National Production Authority, was beating the bushes for 500 girls to fill out a complement of 1,200 while phases of the production program marked time. In the Office of Price Stabilization, his opposite number, John Ahern, was combing the country for 400. In one period critical aircraft-manufacturing contracts were held up at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, where 650 stenographers were needed. So frustrated did impetuous flying generals finally become that they started training their own stenographers—and paying them \$42 a week to learn. Screams of private employers speedily reached the ears of Senator HARRY F. BYRD's "watchdog committee" on Federal spending and the noble experiment was slapped down.

In Washington, executives lured into the production agencies from \$40,000 jobs in private industry wander from office to office like lost sheep, timidly begging for someone to type a letter. Sometimes the wheels of justice threaten to stop because lawyers in that department can't find anyone to type their briefs. Executives deny reports that they are walking the streets in search of secretaries, but one good-looking young NPA official helped a bundle-laden damsel across a busy street and hired her when they reached the opposite curb. New agencies raid old agencies for stenographers and typists, offering them higher grades, and both have robbed private industry until businessmen are resorting to desperate measures.

After losing three girls in a year, Kneessi and Adler, a Washington haberdashery, put an ad in the papers promising their next secretary a cocktail party every afternoon and a husband within 6 months. This news tidbit was picked up by the press services and spread over the country until it had brought in 300 applications. Attractive Elenore Nelson, 23, of Minneapolis, was the girl selected for the job.

True to their promise, Kneessi and Adler threw a cocktail party every afternoon at 5, with latecoming customers as guests, and in 3 months Elenore had had eight proposals, all of which she turned down. At the end of 4 months she went home to attend the wedding of her sister and neglected to come back, perhaps having discovered that the chances were better at home. Another flurry of publicity attending her departure brought Kneessi and Adler another secretary, who has the same guaranty.

"It's a pretty expensive way of getting a secretary," Mr. Kneessi chuckled, "but it's better than typing your bills yourself."

Distress is greatest in Washington, but the crisis in the Capital only reflects the bitter shortage of stenographers and typists which is gripping the country as a whole. And a civil-service survey shows the shortage is world-wide. The demand for these two frail items in the labor budget has gone up 10 times since Korea, according to the Labor Department, while demands for all other types of workers have risen only fourfold. Business colleges are having a tough time getting girls to come to school, and some are running only partly full. Placement officers say they get nine calls for every girl graduate—if she ever gets that far, for girls are being widely snatched out of school with their courses only half finished.

In Dallas, Tex., the employment manager of one large company called a secretarial school and asked for two graduates. There were none to be had, he was told. Then he

asked for a couple who were near graduation. There were none of these either, he learned.

"Then whom do you have in the school?" he demanded.

"No girl who has been here more than 2 weeks."

"Well, send over a couple of those," begged the desperate employment manager. "They have 2 weeks' more training than anyone else I've been able to find."

A Chicago business-college director was scandalized to learn that two local girls who used the hunt-and-peck system were recently hired as secretaries. Executives in Washington admitted that things weren't quite that bad in the Government, they only seemed that way. Civil-service requirements, which used to be much higher, now allow the hiring of stenographers who can type 40 words a minute and take dictation at 80. But the agency executives who get some of these young things say somebody's stopwatch is slow.

Between the bureaucrats and the businessmen, the District of Columbia has long since been picked clean, and 14 of the larger agencies are covering the country with hot-shot teams of recruiters, shaking the trees from Maine to California for any little peach that might fall. Other agencies are reaching for these hard-to-get girls through field offices, regional offices of the Civil Service Commission, and the 1,800 local offices of the United States Employment Service.

"We're doing everything but get down on our knees to get the girls to come on," reported Albert Sonntag, Civil Service deputy in St. Louis. Recruiters have already picked off the few remaining girls in that city and fanned out into small towns, where salaries are lower and girls are more susceptible to tales of Washington glamor. In other large cities the situation was the same.

As many as eight recruiting teams have been known to crisscross one another's paths in a single State and the competition is terrific. So is sales resistance. Recruiters come back from their tours with empty hands and hanging heads and tell heart-breaking stories to their bosses.

For one thing, parents read exposés of the Capital, like *Washington Confidential*, which reports shocking moral and living conditions. Then mamma puts her foot down and refuses to let her baby lamb go to the wicked city. Recruiters recently reported tremendous public reaction to an article published by a national magazine under the title "Don't Send Your Girl to Washington." In some places it slowed recruiting to a standstill. Mothers ganged up on one recruiter in Boston and threatened to have her run out of town. Ministers rose up in their pulpits in one town, declaiming against the evils of the big city.

Navy Department recruiters were aghast to find that one of their own officers, Capt. Walter Karig, USNR, special deputy in the Navy's Office of Information, had also made mothers militant by writing a best-selling novel, *Caroline Hicks*. The book is about a 21-year-old girl from a small Pennsylvania town, innocent of many of the basic facts of life, who does her bit to uphold Washington's reputation as the drinkingest town in America and loses her innocence in the process. When Mrs. Dorothy Jacobsen, Navy recruiting chief, good-naturedly charged Karig with sabotaging the defense program, Karig declared that the book has only whetted the girls' curiosity. It brought in a lot of fan mail, he says, along the lines of a note from a girl in Bryn Mawr, Pa.:

"I'm a candidate to become a Caroline Hicks myself—in a nice way, you understand. Will you please tell me how to go about getting a job in Washington?"

The indignation of parents and preachers, however, is nothing to the wrath of local businessmen threatened with having their secretaries spirited away by the Government. Angry merchants wait on publishers

beguiled by pretty recruiters into publicizing their visits, and threaten to withdraw their advertising. One ruffled Ohio man whose secretary had gone to see Mrs. Billie Moore, a recruiter for the Economic Cooperation Administration, called up to warn, "I'm telling you right now, if you steal my secretary, I'm going to report you to my Congressman!"

Especially infuriating to the local businessmen are the crack teams of the Navy Department, who, unlike the girl hunters of other agencies, nearly always get their woman. The Navy's staff of 30 women has been bringing in 200 to 250 civilian recruits a month.

"They pull out all the stops, those Navy girls," growled a middle western personnel manager. "They always seem to manage to have a couple of cute sailors around somewhere or else they let a picture of some good-looking young gob 'accidentally' fall out of their papers and land at the prospect's feet."

But the recruiters from Washington are only part of the Federal competition which the businessman has to buck if he wants to keep his girl. For of 2,316,045 Federal employees, only 256,060 of them work in Washington, the rest are spread over the country. Since Korea, the lives of businessmen in such cities as Detroit, Chicago, Columbus, Dayton, St. Louis, and San Francisco have been made particularly unhappy by booming Federal establishments, while in Baltimore and Philadelphia they are plagued by the nearness of "Truman's Teapot," as one Republican likes to refer to the Nation's Capital.

The lures of the Federal hiring agents were hard for most private employers to beat, for the Government brings in typist-stenographers at grade 3, \$50.96 a week—and grade 4, \$55.29 a week, where the average starting salary in private business is about \$10 lower. Cities like New York, Chicago, San Francisco and Detroit are exceptions, there private salaries are competitive. Apart from salary, the Government dangles such enticing extras as 26 days' paid vacation each year and 15 days' sick leave with pay.

Businessmen in critical areas have had to upgrade salaries 15 to 20 percent to meet the competition, and the scale is still going up. In Columbus and Dayton such foolishness as the customary half day of work on Saturday has been quietly dropped in favor of a 5-day week. Married women, long taboo in some firms, are now welcome as the flowers in spring.

A businessman phoned a New York employment agency and offered to find an apartment for any stenographer who would come to work for him and promised to have it redecorated to boot. The agency's placement officer gasped and would let no one apply until she'd checked to see whether the employer's intentions were honorable. Apparently they were, and the job was filled.

"The girls are choosing their bosses with care these days," said one business-college official, "but the funny part of it is that these fellows still seem to pretend it's the other way around. They're going to have to learn to sell themselves."

The stenos, on their part, have come to realize that they are the queens of the day, and they like the feeling. One girl in St. Paul passed up a good job because the boss didn't have an electric typewriter. One turned up her nose because she wouldn't be allowed to smoke at her desk. And another because the boss smoked El Ropos.

A faint idea of where this attitude may lead can be had from an incident reported by Frank Kimball, personnel chief for the National Production Authority. Four sweet young things from the Middle West, signed up after a good deal of heavy rushing on the part of the recruiters, finally arrived at Union Station in Washington and were met by

an NPA limousine. The car took the girls to the personnel office, where they filled out some routine papers, and then delivered them to the boardinghouse where the agency had found temporary accommodations. The girls had been told to report for work at 9 o'clock the next morning. Nine o'clock came and went, and no girls. Ten o'clock and no girls. At last an NPA telephone rang. One of the recruits was calling. "When are you going to send the limousine around to take us to work?" the girl inquired sweetly.

The main reason for the shortage, of course, is rapid defense expansion. And at such a time many a sharp young lady finds it pays better to put on overalls and go into a defense plant. Moreover, attractive jobs have been opening up in advertising, fashion, radio, and television. The girls say they're tired of working under conditions that shouldn't happen to a dog. We talked to a number of them who had moved on to other jobs, and they had plenty to say about their former employers.

"I got good and tired of being treated as a social inferior," snapped a peppery little redhead from the Bronx. "When visitors came into our office, was I ever introduced? I was not. Then all day long it was 'Katy this' and 'Katy that,' but I had to call him 'mister'."

"When a couple of his friends would come in," complained a dignified young lady in Philadelphia, "he'd fish down in his pants pocket with a wink, throw me 50 cents, and say, 'How about some coffee, Jonesy, old girl?' One day when he popped this question, I settled back in my chair and cooed, 'Why, I'd love some, Archie, old boy.' It was not long after that that I left."

One girl voiced a common complaint, "He'd sit around in conference all afternoon and hold hands with a lot of other so-called executives who couldn't make up their minds either. Then he'd dash in at 4, dictate until 5, toss me a cheery good night, and hurry off to a hot supper. There I'd be, battling out a batch of 'must' letters, that could have waited until next week anyway, and stuck with the seven-oh-one for the third or fourth time that week."

But the prize complaint of them all came from the crack ex-secretary of the brilliant young president of one of the Nation's leading advertising companies.

"He'd start dictating at 160 words a minute as soon as I got in the door," she recalled, "and sometimes finish the letter before I had even had time to sit down. Things went on and on at that same mad pace all day. The man was utterly disorganized. I was there to put order in his life. And for this I got sixty a week."

"He'd come in wearing the coat to one suit and the trousers of another, with a tie that went with neither. I was always running out to buy ties, and brother, were those things hypnotic. Not only did I have to take the spots off his suit but I had to put a note in the pocket to tell him when it needed cleaning. When he went to Europe last summer I had to take care of his office and run his house in the bargain. On request, I canned the prize peaches from his orchard, kept an eye on the kids' nurse, and helped mind the Alredales. When one of these had puppies, I was to give the little darlings away to members of his office staff. People had always seemed thrilled when he'd given out other litters. But would they take them from me? In the end, I called the SPCA. And did I ever catch it for that?"

Among the big reasons for the woman-power shortage in Government are the stories that float back from Washington about the maze of restrictions that keep women from getting the pay they deserve or block them off from jobs for which they are qualified.

Practically hoodwinked into taking a grade 4 job at \$55.29 in the early stages of

the defense effort, many a bright girl has had a rude awakening when she ran into a tangle of red tape that forced her to mark time for a year or more before she could take a grade 5 job at \$59.62 even if she had the offer. Any number of such cases were quick to join the half-million Government workers who shift jobs or leave the service each year.

Bright-eyed young things are being made into bitter, complaining women by the unwritten law that a girl's grade is dependent on that of her boss.

"I can tell you why there's a shortage of stenos," one of them told us. "I've been a grade 4 stenographer for 9 years, and because I work for a grade 13 boss I'm told I can't get a higher grade. My only chance to go up is to find me a grade 15 boss."

So much of a howl has gone up from the typists and stenographers that civil-service grading experts came out last summer with modifications in the hidebound rules on promotions. Among other things, the rule requiring 6 months "in-grade" was reduced, in all grades through 5, to 3 months.

But whatever rules are changed, the situation is expected to get worse before it gets any better. And one of the things that are making it worse is the bad press that the Capital keeps getting all over the country.

As the various Washington expositors have it, the Government girls have to sleep in flea-bitten barracks under conditions that would revolt a DP from Soviet Poland. Food and housing, are out of sight. The Capital is full of sin. The few men in town are wolves. You take your choice and become a fallen woman or a dudge.

"The average Government girl goes home to her tiny room to eat her dinner out of cans and ponder whether to wash her panties or write letters home or get drunk," say the authors of Washington Confidential.

All these reports are nothing but a pack of lies, say officials of Government agencies, who have joined with Washington social organizations in a campaign to expose the expositors.

"The theme of Washington Confidential, that the District of Columbia is a moral cesspool, is so far overdrawn as to be silly," says Ray Everett, director of the Social Hygiene Association's Washington branch. "Why, the city is so prudish that it even closed down the Gayety burlesque a while back."

Mr. Everett admits that the problem cases involving promiscuity have grown with the population, but claims they're still far from reaching any dangerous proportions. Police say the city is still running along on the same low curve of delinquency that set in after the last war.

Upset at reports of high costs and housing shortages, the Civil Service Commission issued a fact sheet which says that plenty of good, pretested rooms are available at \$35 to \$50 a month, and that Government girls can eat in restaurants for as little as \$2 a day. They can even have apartments if they will double up on the costs. ("What apartments?" say the girls.)

To dispel the notion that Washington is a lonesome and manless place to live in, social agencies flood Government offices with booklets that list every kind of diversion from bird watching to water skiing. They promise so many opportunities to meet young men that matrimony would seem almost incapable. The District Recreation Department lists 500 to 1,000 girls who stand ready at the drop of a telephone receiver to dash off to surrounding camps and dance with soldiers and sailors.

School and university officials claim Washington offers more cultural and educational opportunities than any other city in the world. They point with pride to an estimated 10,000 part-time students—most of them Federal workers. American University even runs a special work-study plan by which, for \$850 a year, a working girl can live

on the campus and get a bachelor's degree in 6 years.

As a shining example of what an ambitious girl can do in Washington, the university points proudly to Miss Margaret Matus, 26, who came to Washington 6 years ago from the little town of Nescopeck, Pa., and went to work for \$1,440 a year. By last June she had worked herself up to grade 7 at nearly \$4,000 and graduated with honors as a bachelor of arts. Her next steps will be a master's degree and a job as administrative assistant. Far from being an overworked drudge, Miss Matus is a sensibly dressed, attractive brunette who views her double life calmly. She shares an apartment with another girl, finds time for concerts, the theater, golf, and horseback riding, and says she likes Washington fine.

Training, personnel, and employment experts in the Capital have plenty of ideas on what should be done about the shortage, and one of the most outspoken is Dr. J. S. Noffsinger, executive secretary of the National Council of Business Schools.

"Congress is still living back in the horse-and-buggy days," he fumed. "Government officials could save millions of dollars if they'd follow the lead of private industry and recruit through the Nation's twelve hundred business schools."

Another critic of present methods is Mr. Kimball at NPA. "I proposed the idea of having the schools do the recruiting, but I got slapped down by the Civil Service Commission," he said. "So I say it's up to the commission to take the lead and recruit office workers for all the agencies."

We took the question directly to Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

"It isn't practical for the Commission to recruit for all the agencies," he told us. "We did it in World War II, but now we've become too decentralized. And anyway, we'd just be stealing from private industry if we turned on any more heat. I think the next step is some training. We might pay the trainees' tuition, assuming Congress is willing."

To improve the situation in private business, a number of things seem to be needed. Most of them come under the heading: More pay. Especially for gals who run the office while the boss takes a fishing trip. But that isn't all of the story.

"Why be a good secretary when it leads to nothing else but more secretarial work?" asks Dr. Irene Place, an official of the National Association of Secretaries, which lists 10,000 members. "Today's young woman would rather be Lady Friday on an air liner. The job of being a secretary has lost its glamour. Businessmen have to invest it with more prestige, better human relations, more interesting duties, and a better goal to shoot at."

Other employment specialists are quick to point out that the employer has only himself to blame for his predicament.

"He hires for sex appeal, not ability, and that's where his troubles begin," says Mrs. Badie Brown, director of the Collegiate Secretarial Institute, a New York business college. "He keeps this cute featherbrain around to show what a picker he is. He can't stand a capable girl around because he doesn't want women pushing up in the business. He's psychologically unable to accept women as business equals. This is one of the reasons we train and recommend men as secretaries. They have an unprejudiced opportunity to go on up in the business."

Vernon Armstrong, employment specialist in the Labor Department, says employers do themselves out of a lot of good workers because of race prejudice.

"When you insist on keeping to the white market these days," he told us, "you're scraping the bottom of the barrel, and what you're

getting is splinters. Move over to the other barrel and you can have the cream of the crop. Big-league baseball found this out."

They are also passing up a lot of good secretaries among the older women, according to the employment service of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in New York, who have been running into all sorts of resistance in their efforts to train and place high-caliber older workers.

"When I tell them my age, they're ready to drop dead," said one capable 51-year-old woman who has been trying in vain to get a typing job.

The Civil Service Commission, at the urging of Mr. Ramspeck, has been campaigning among Government agencies for improving on the use of existing talent.

"Please don't use trained stenographers just to type reports and answer telephones," is one of their requests. Mr. Ramspeck has also been carrying on a campaign for wider use of dictating machines.

Many large companies are doing the same thing and some are carrying the idea even further by using a machine which allows as many as 20 executives to lift individual desk instruments and dictate to a central station. Their voices are picked up on records, which may be transcribed by a single typist.

The next step may be a machine which will take the spoken word and put it right down on paper without benefit of the feminine hand.

"Scientifically speaking, it's perfectly possible to create an electronic secretary," says Dr. Waldo Kliever, research director for Minneapolis-Honeywell, which develops automatic machinery. "But I don't think American businessmen would ever go for a robot secretary. Who'd correct our spelling and grammatical mistakes? Where would we get our inspiration? Beautiful or not, the secretary can't be spared by American business. She's here to stay—we hope."

Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I shall make tonight at the Virginia Highway Conference at Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This has been the most trying session of the Congress during my 18 years of service in that body. On the House side Members are limited to one major committee and, while the Ways and Means Committee on which I served, which as Champ Clark said, handles the lifeblood of Government, namely, taxes, was a hard-working committee, it normally handled only one major bill in a session of Congress. When I transferred to the Senate in 1946 I was happy to be privileged to serve on the two committees on which my predecessor, Carter Glass, had rendered such distinguished service to Virginia and the Nation, namely, Banking and Currency and Appropriations. I knew, of course, that they were both important committees but I did not know that we were moving into a period when they would be the two hardest-working committees of the Senate, the former handling a flood of bank-

ing and currency and economic-control bills and the latter appropriations of an unprecedented size.

Before the end of the week I anticipate that the Congress will complete action on an amendment to the price-control bill which it was my privilege to draft as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the public hearings. The Appropriations Committee has completed its hearings, totaling thousands of pages, on budget requests of staggering amounts and we hope Senate action can be completed on that program before the end of the current week.

Needless to say, it was not easy for me to leave my duties in Washington during the closing days of a tough session but throughout my period of public service I have been so deeply interested in the development of good roads and, in recent years, so deeply concerned over how these instrumentalities of improved travel have been turned into national death traps, that I felt that I could at the moment render no better service than to come here tonight and publicly endorse the efforts of Virginia and her sister States in working out ways and means for greater safety on our highways.

This three-day conference was preceded by a brilliant series of articles in the Richmond Times-Dispatch by our young Lexington friend, Charles McDowell, and during the proceedings here those far better qualified than I to discuss the subject have given to you all of the material facts involved. While I am, therefore, in the position of bringing coals to Newcastle tonight, the situation confronting us is so very serious that some of the fundamental facts involved may be given emphasis by mere repetition.

On Memorial Day of each year we gather to commemorate the sacrifices of those who have died on the field of honor. Their total since 1776 is now 800,000. It is fitting and proper that we should commemorate their memory because, as Pericles said of the young men of Athens, "They gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by."

No day has been set aside by our State or by our Nation to commemorate those who have died on our highways in motor vehicle accidents although the pen of the press is poised to record the death of that man who will make the total 1,000,000. The press has already recorded the fact that each year in recent years the casualties on our highways amount to over a million, many of whom while not killed are crippled and maimed for life. No Memorial Day orator can arise and say to a solemn assembly that those millions of killed and wounded have been sacrificed for the perpetuity of political and economic freedom. The harsh fact is that most of them died uselessly and unnecessarily, that many were guilty of self-destruction while others were guilty of violating the oldest and most fundamental law of all history. "Thou shalt not kill."

Every father and mother with a son on the fighting front in Korea is happy when a day passes without the receipt of a telegram: "Your son has been killed in action." While fewer men have been engaged in Korea than were engaged in either of our two World Wars, more men have been killed in 1 year in Korea than were killed in the first year in World War II. The casualty rate has been so high that one newspaper correspondent has described it as a race between rotation and death. And yet those killed on our highways during the period of the Korean war numbered nearly three times as many as those killed in battle, while those seriously injured in traffic accidents were far more than three times the number injured in Korea.

The annual property loss from highway accidents is approximately \$3,000,000,000, while no figures are available on the amount of loss of earning power of those who have been incapacitated. This situation has caused the English historian, Arnold Toynbee to say that western civilization has progressed from the premechanical road, where the problem was "getting the journey accomplished at all" to the road of today on which "the old challenge of physical distance has been transmuted into a new challenge of human relations between drivers who, having learned how to annihilate space, have thereby put themselves into constant danger of annihilating one another."

Man's mastery of the physical sciences has outstripped his mastery over the social sciences. Our discovery of how to split the atom and to explode a bomb that would destroy great cities at one blow is no longer regarded as a means of preserving an uneasy peace. The definite knowledge that Soviet Russia has a stockpile of atomic bombs, coupled with the admission of our Air Force that a considerable percentage of jet-propelled bombers bearing those bombs could penetrate any defensive screen we might throw around our major metropolitan areas, has caused many to believe that H. G. Wells was right when he predicted that a third world war would leave civilization cowering behind a windbreak or in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum.

With the hope that a demonstrated ability to retaliate will stay the hand of a potential aggressor, the duly elected representatives of the American people have at this session of the Congress voted to appropriate approximately \$90,000,000,000 for our national security. At the same time and for the purpose of preventing ruinous inflation which inevitably would result from financing such a public outlay with borrowed money, the Congress has imposed the heaviest tax burden in the history of our Nation. That burden is so heavy that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. GEORGE, has publicly declared that the current tax bill is the last one that he intends to support. But even on the basis of collecting in tax revenue the unprecedented sum of approximately \$65,000,000,000 per year, most economists are agreed that if our defense production plant can be expanded as now planned, outgo by the end of the current fiscal year may exceed income by as much as \$8,000,000,000 and by the end of the following year by as much as \$20,000,000,000. It, therefore, behooves the American people to take stock of our resources in manpower and in physical wealth to ascertain in what manner this apparently unavoidable strain upon our domestic economy of military preparedness can be to some extent offset by prudent economy in other fields.

It is needless for me to remind you that the entire Virginia delegation has at this session of the Congress presented a united front against unnecessary domestic spending. I feel justified in saying that the current program in Virginia, as evidenced by your wonderful conference at VMI, dedicated to the conservation of life and property on our highways has the united support of the Virginia congressional delegation. We share the concern of our distinguished Governor and of the best highway commissioner that any State has ever had over the fact that only 10 States have a higher death rate than the Old Dominion. The national traffic accident death rate has since the safety movement commenced 5 years ago been reduced from 11.3 deaths in traffic accidents for every 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel to 7.5 in 1950. But in that year Virginia's traffic rate rose to 9.2. Fear has been expressed that the national ratio will be exceeded in 1951, to say nothing of the fact that we now have around 50,000,000 vehicles on the road as compared with 30,000,000 in 1946 and travel mileage has increased proportionately.

In 1942 Virginia adopted the uniform motor-vehicle operators' and chauffeurs' license law advocated by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. We also adopted the basic provisions of the uniform code covering registration of motor vehicles and some of the recommended provisions concerning financial responsibility. Virginia's traffic laws covering serious offenses, rules of the road, and equipment provisions have been described by the Federal Bureau of Roads as modern, comprehensive, and substantially the same as the uniform code recommendations. Yet casualties on Virginia highways continue at an alarming rate and last week the seven hundred and sixty-first death for this year was reported.

Everyone in this audience who has operated an automobile for 30 years or more well knows the kind of cars we had in those days and the kind of roads over which we drove then. Your lights would suddenly go out. The two-wheel mechanical brakes, which were never adequate for complete control, sometimes completely failed, or the steering mechanism would fail. The headlights of an approaching car would blind you and there was no law to require dimming. Today the mechanical defects of automobiles have practically been eliminated. And do I need to remind you of the old dirt roads where for drainage purposes side scrapers crowned them to the shape of a pone of Virginia cornbread and where the motorist was almost forced to take his half of the road right out of the middle. I hope our friends from other States will not deem me to be guilty of vain boasting when I say that to me the construction of highways in Virginia, first under Mr. Shirley, and then under General Anderson has been an epic. In areas of congested travel three- and four-lane highways have been provided, while all main travel roads have been hard-surfaced. Dangerous curves have been eliminated and what remained adequately banked. Hilltops have been cut off and the dips of the valley elevated.

Evidently, therefore, the hard core of our present problem is the personal equation referred to by Arnold Toynbee.

We must educate those drivers who are willing to learn safer procedures and we must eliminate from the roads those unable or unwilling to learn. We do not have enough traffic officers in Virginia now and I hope the next general assembly will appropriate for an enlarged force. There can be no question about the restraining effect on speeders and other traffic violators of visible evidence of the law and a demonstrated ability to enforce it.

I would recommend also that all trial justices and judges of courts of record be furnished with a scientific analysis of the meaning of driving under the influence of intoxicants. Virginia has a strong law on this subject. Section 18-75 of the code provides that: "No person shall drive or operate any automobile or other motor vehicle, car, truck, engine, or train while under the influence of alcohol, brandy, rum, whisky, gin, wine, beer, lager beer, ale, porter, stout, or any other liquid beverage or article containing alcohol." It also has been determined by a test case (*Owens v. Commonwealth*, 147 Va. 624) that the test is not the ability to drive and operate a vehicle with safety to self and others, but whether the driver is to any degree under the influence of alcohol.

That law gives all the authority needed to stop drunken driving in Virginia, if it is properly enforced. But I fear some would like to construe the statute like the three men who staggered up to the bar and ordered a whisky highball, while the fourth companion sprawled on the floor. When the bartender said: "What about your buddy on the floor?" One of them promptly replied, "Don't give him any more, he's got to drive." Scientific tests have clearly dem-

onstrated that a 1-ounce drink of whisky will influence the perceptions and reactions of a driver, that 2 ounces will very perceptibly influence him and that after taking 3 ounces, which is smaller than three normal drinks, an interval of 4 hours should elapse before a man undertakes to drive.

I also would suggest the advisability of increasing the minimum penalty for excessive speed and we should give serious consideration to the program advocated by the Department of State Police which calls for mandatory suspension of drivers' licenses for speeding, and reckless driving, and revocation for subsequent offenses as well as for driving while drunk. Twisting judgment or respecting important persons has no place in the administration of any criminal statute.

Before Moses took leave of the children of Israel on the Plains of Moab, he delivered a series of addresses, recorded in Deuteronomy, in which he summarized the fundamental laws and the rules of conduct for an organized society which during the previous 40 years he had given them, as recorded in Leviticus and Numbers. Among other things, he instructed the judges: "Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift, for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous."

The great English statesman, Edmund Burke, once said, "Nations do not learn by experience." It has been a source of great embarrassment to Virginians and all other good citizens who believe that public office is a public trust that there have been officials in the Democratic Party who have ignored that fundamental injunction from Moses to the judges who were serving under him; and if a nation can learn by experience, it may help us to recall the parting injunction of Moses to the people he loved and whom he had led out of bondage when he said that if they disobeyed God, "Ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it, and the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other . . . and among these nations thou shalt find no ease, neither shalt the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee, there, a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind, and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee."

In view of the fact that a passenger bus involves the safety of a large number of lives, I would recommend stricter enforcement of speeding laws on such busses, since it is well known that many of them now make an average of 60 miles per hour when traffic conditions will permit and apparently that practice on the part of the drivers is tacitly ignored.

We know that young drivers generally have quicker responses than their elders and potentially should make safer drivers, but we also know that young drivers are the ones who have the most accidents. It is evident, therefore, that our task is to train their mental attitudes rather than their muscles.

In the 1950-51 school year driver-training courses were being given in 229 of the 510 high schools in Virginia covered by a national survey on this subject and enrollment in these courses was estimated at 13,068. That is a fine start but should be only the beginning of a program which eventually will make the training of young people to handle an automobile safely as much a matter of course as teaching them to read and write and count.

This training must not stop with merely giving them experience in the mechanics of handling a car. They must accept the fundamental philosophy of the familiar maxim of English common law, "Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas—so use your own as not to injure another."

That principle has been recognized since the day when Cain offended and asked

guiltily "Am I my brother's keeper?" It was accepted in the days of the Roman Empire when roads were built which still stand today because the Roman law provided that if a road failed the contractor lost his life. The voluntary rather than compulsory aspect was emphasized by Jesus in his parable of the Good Samaritan and the principle is implicit in the statement of our Declaration of Independence that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable rights. It is fortified also in the Bill of Rights amendments to our Federal Constitution which define the limits beyond which one man or a government of men may not go in using their own when the use might injure another.

In brief, we must teach that safety on the highways is—like democracy—a matter of co-operation and coordination and that liberty to operate a high-powered modern automobile over a modern highway designed and built for such use must be protected in the same way that all other liberties must be protected, namely, with a view to similar enjoyment on the part of the other fellow.

We have more miles of improved highway than any nation in the world and more motor vehicles. That is but another way of expressing a fact that has made up the envy of the world, namely, we are the richest nation in the world, with the highest standard of living. But it is just as true today as it was during the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 when Benjamin Franklin said: "I have lived a long time . . . and the longer I live the more convincing proof I see of the fact that God governs in the affairs of men."

Our Virginia forefathers made an enduring contribution to the birth of a Nation destined to hold aloft for the oppressed people of the world the torch of freedom. The sterling qualities of character, of moral fiber, of courage, and of self-control which characterized the Virginia pioneers are the same qualities we need today to pass on to generations yet unborn those priceless principles of political and economic freedom which were born of the brain and purchased by the blood of the founding fathers.

**Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio,
at Founders' Day Republican Banquet
at Detroit**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last evening, at Detroit, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] delivered an address at the Founders' Day Republican banquet. I had the privilege and the honor of introducing the Senator from Ohio on that occasion. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address delivered by him and my introductory remarks.

There being no objection, the address and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON

In the 21 years of complete Democrat Party control in this country evidences of moral degeneration emerge as a pattern that disturbs every honorable, loyal American—the graft and corruption—the scandals; the

staggering appropriations—resulting in excessive taxation; the resources of our Nation dissipated, our people bewildered and disturbed, the trend toward socialism and away from our basic freedoms. We join forces as Americans and unite as Republicans to stem the tide of disaster and fight to recover the moral strength which was the basis of our greatness as a nation.

Our speaker tonight has fought with courage and integrity, with knowledge and understanding, to help correct the errors of the past and to reestablish a sound political and economic national and international policy.

His background as the son of a President gives him an understanding of the importance of first things first and the necessity for clear thinking and integrity of purpose. His experience as aid to President Hoover with the tremendous job of rehabilitating Europe following World War I gave him insight to humanitarian problems. For this work he was decorated by the Belgium Government.

In any Who's Who you can read of our distinguished speaker's brilliant academic background, and the numerous honorary degrees that have been conferred upon him, but this recital cannot convey his ability, his courage and honesty of purpose.

He is a realist and as such he appreciates the serious problems that face us today, squarely and honestly.

I have come to cherish his friendship as one of the richer awards of being a United States Senator.

My personal affection for him has grown because he embodies the high principles in whose name we as Republicans are met together tonight.

In him is the courage which has fought through adversity to defend those high principles, and in him there is as well the vigor to defend them successfully.

In him there is the genius of enlightened and constructive thought which will not stoop to narrow interest or mere expediency.

Upon him there is the stamp of integrity, which is the hallmark of Republicanism.

I have the great pleasure of presenting my friend and colleague, ROBERT A. TAFT, Ohio's able senior Senator.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

It is a real pleasure to come here to the city of Detroit, one of the greatest bulwarks of production in the United States, at the invitation of Arthur E. Summerfield, Republican national committeeman for the State of Michigan. He is responsible for this great enthusiastic Republican meeting. I like to come to Detroit among other reasons because it is the home of Homer and Myrtle Ferguson whom I count among my close friends in Washington. I don't know any better Senator than HOMER FERGUSON. He is the hardest worker in the Senate. He will not deviate from principle, and he has effectively represented the views and interests of the people of Michigan.

Michigan has always been a great Republican State. At this banquet you are starting the campaign to assure its remaining a Republican State in 1952. Such a campaign was never so necessary. Never in our times will we see as crucial an election as that of next year. You must decide then whether we continue our present policies to their logical conclusion of totalitarian government and war, or whether we turn again to American principles and resume our progress in freedom and in peace.

A whole generation of Americans has grown up under New Deal and Fair Deal administrations. Forty-five million voters have never known a Republican president in their adult life. They have come to accept as a normal part of American Government, war and alarms of war. They hear of spending in such astronomical figures that they are unable to judge the necessity or the proper

scope of government action. They accept as a matter of course the appointment of left-wingers of all degrees, including Communists, to positions of power, and the exclusion from public office, with few exceptions, of those who refuse to sacrifice their philosophy of freedom. They are convinced that government is normally corrupt, and that government action and contracts and favors are dispensed in accordance with the desire of influence peddlers who dispense deep freeze, fur coats, and 12-pound hams to achieve their purpose. They accept as a matter of course the constant expansion of Federal power in every field. They have lived through a succession of emergencies and look for continuous emergencies in the future. They accept, while they resent, bureaucratic efforts to control their business, their farms, and their daily lives. They have lived under a regime of government by slogan, flooding the press and radio of the country from the greatest propaganda machine which the world has ever seen.

Many do not realize that these conditions are in fact abnormal, that they do not really represent the philosophy of the American Republic, or of the majority of Americans even today. It is your job and the job of all Republicans to inculcate again the principles of liberty and honesty and justice and common sense. The American people have not in fact changed. In the last 2 years I have talked with hundreds of boys and girls in the high schools and colleges of Ohio and other States. They still believe in those American principles which were the basis of the greatest experiment in self-government in the history of the world. They still believe in liberty and honesty and equal justice under law. They can be shown that the actual number of left-wing intellectuals is infinitesimal in proportion to the real Americans in the United States, that they are one hundred times as powerful in government positions as they have any right to be on the basis of proportion of population. They can be shown that government can be honest, as are so many of our State governments and city governments under Republican control.

The Republican Party appeals to these young people today, because it offers hope of an honest American government. We offer hope of peace and prosperity; of progress within American principles of liberty. We offer leadership toward those goals, and we ask the help of every true American, and particularly the help of the younger people to whom this country belongs, to achieve our goals and their goals. The Republican Party can assume the leadership of the country, but it can only do so if the people have confidence enough to make it their vehicle to achieve an able and honest government. We ask the help of all Americans in this crusade.

For years now the Republicans have had to carry on a rearguard action, and they have seldom had the power to put their program into effect. They had one chance in the Eightieth Congress, and there was more constructive action taken in that Congress than in any Congress in which I have ever served. The Government in one of our years had a surplus of \$8,000,000,000. We scrutinized every appropriation bill and carried through a long series of carefully planned measures, including—

1. The repeal of war controls and the return to a free economy.
2. The unification of the armed services, and a 70-group air force, later cut down by President Truman.
3. The Taft-Hartley law, to assure equality in collective bargaining.
4. The Aiken agricultural policy and price support law.
5. The Marshall plan to combat communism abroad.
6. The only tax reduction bill we have seen in many a New Deal year.

7. A constructive reclamation and REA program.

8. The first revelations of communism in government.

9. And many other substantive laws. The Eightieth Congress also initiated the studies which resulted in bipartisan social-security amendments. It passed the Vandenberg resolution which led to the Atlantic Pact. These laws, even those passed over the President's political vetoes, have been the basis of all Government policy since that day.

It is a pleasure to point out here in Michigan the great affirmative accomplishments of Arthur Vandenberg to the extent he was permitted to participate in the administration's foreign policy. He was the one who wrote some semblance of justice into the United Nations Charter at San Francisco after the State Department had written that charter at Dumbarton Oaks on the basis of an arbitrary and impractical five-power control of the world. He understood and analyzed the real nature of Communist Russia. He was the most powerful influence through his friendship with Secretary Byrnes in reversing in Europe the tragic policies of Yalta and Potsdam. The dismissal of Wallace by President Truman on his protest and that of Secretary Byrnes marked the final abandonment of appeasement in Europe. It is unfortunate that Senator Vandenberg was never consulted about the Far East, and he expressed often and forcibly his disagreement with the disastrous policy which lost Manchuria and China to communism. Thus on March 18, 1947, he said:

"It also is necessary now to get the record straight. This bipartisan foreign policy has been confined within relatively narrow limits. It has applied to the United Nations. It has applied to peace treaties in Europe. It has applied to nothing else. I have had nothing to do, for example, with China policies or Pan-American policies except within the United Nations and at times I have been satisfied with neither. The first I ever heard of the Greco-Turkish policy was when the President disclosed his thoughts 10 days ago at the White House."

Again on April 15, 1947, he said:

"I have stated publicly that I have been highly critical of the State Department's policy heretofore in China, because it has looked toward the creation of a coalition with Communists, and in my opinion no Communist ever entered a coalition except to destroy it."

In his earnest desire to prevent an open conflict with the administration, he made concessions in the amount of foreign aid and arms aid beyond the point which he considered wise. He insisted on independent administration of ECA and fought bitterly the State Department domination over the giving away of American money abroad, which is now to be fully consummated in the appointment of Harriman as administrator of foreign aid. With the reelection of President Truman, all pretense of serious bipartisan consultation was abandoned, except in the case of Dulles and the Japanese peace treaty, and President Truman has proceeded cockily to snap decisions and prolific spending.

Foreign policy is a matter of developing a well-thought-out program based on sound underlying principle, and making wise decisions in accordance with that principle from day to day. Wavering and uncertainty can only bring disaster, and unnecessary war.

Some say the Republican campaign in 1952 should be conducted on the issue of corruption, some say on domestic liberty, some on foreign policy, some on communism. It ought to be conducted on all these issues, for the very existence of the American Republic depends on restoring to Washington to operate in every field a government of

thrift, and honesty, and integrity, of common sense and sound judgment. The present administration has lost all these qualities, and its poor judgment is further distorted because it will never admit its own mistakes.

In the foreign field I cannot review fully here the disastrous policy of Yalta and Potsdam which established Soviet Russia as the dominating power in Europe and the Far East. The result of that policy was to establish Soviet Russia at Berlin and Prague and Vienna dominating Central Europe and threatening the freedom of Western Europe and therefore the United States itself. American troops could have captured both Berlin and Prague.

In the Far East by turning Manchuria over to Soviet Russia the administration abandoned every principle of American foreign policy since the days of John Hay and the open door in China. Although we had gone to war with Japan because of their aggression in China, the administration bargained away Chiang Kai-shek's most important industrial province without even telling him of the bargain for 4 months and established Russia in the very position which Japan had occupied. From that position the Soviet was able to aid and equip the Chinese Communists, while we abandoned the Nationalist Government which had fought by our side for 5 years. Then the President sent General Marshall to China with instructions to compel Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into his cabinet, and for eight vital months the administration cut off all assistance to Chiang because he refused to comply. What happens to a cabinet when Communists are taken in was tragically revealed in Czechoslovakia. The net result of our policy was the loss of China and its 350,000,000 people to communism and to the Soviet.

We could have no more tragic example of the results of wavering and weakness than the Korean war. It was an unnecessary war which could have been prevented by common sense and a planned program against communism. Today we find ourselves in Korea exactly where we were 3 years ago and face exactly the same problem except that there have been more than 85,000 deaths and woundings of American boys, the loss of a million South Koreans, the utter destruction of the very country we undertook to defend, and the waste of billions of dollars.

The Korean war was begun by President Truman without the slightest authority from Congress or the people in a hasty decision the night of June 26, 1950. He plunged this country into a major war, when under the Constitution only Congress can declare war. He did not even notify Congress for 2 weeks that the war was on. Under the United Nations legislation he had no right to send troops without action by Congress, as I pointed out in the Senate on June 26, 1950. This administration has no respect for the Constitution, or for law, if it can evade our laws. It does not accept the principles in which most Americans believe.

It is said that we had to go into Korea under the United Nations Charter to punish international military aggression. That was for Congress to decide. But if that was the purpose, it has utterly failed today, for the United Nations has refused to punish Communist China, although the Chinese aggression was far more serious and directed at the United Nations itself. The only principle we have established is that if the aggressor is big enough, he will not be punished.

The Korean war could have been avoided. It never would have occurred if we had kept our Armed Forces in Korea as we did in Germany. I doubt if it would have occurred

had we armed the South Koreans as fully as the Russians armed the North Koreans, and on this subject the administration had before it the express advice of General Wedemeyer. In his report on Korea made in September 1947, and long suppressed by the State Department, he said:

"The creation of an American controlled and officered Korean scout force, sufficient in strength to cope with the threat from the north, is required to prevent the forcible establishment of a Communist government after the United States and the Soviet Union withdraw their occupation forces."

But the fact is that we did not arm the South Koreans and deliberately adopted the policy of giving them only small arms to prevent border raids and internal disturbance.

I doubt very much if there would have been any attack if we had given a definite notice that we would do exactly what we finally did—move American troops in to South Korea to resist aggression.

But Secretary Acheson practically invited an attack on Korea. He was determined that absolutely no aid should be given to the Nationalist Government in the defense of Formosa to prevent its being taken over by the Chinese Communists. In December 1949 he had issued a memorandum to all State Department officials directing them to prepare public opinion for the capture of Formosa by the Communists, although it was an island 100 miles off the coast of China where our Navy at practically no cost could prevent the further spread of communism. Now he testifies that this directive deliberately misrepresented the facts about the strategic importance of Formosa in order to save our face when Formosa fell. Either the State Department was lying then, or it is lying now.

I believe that history shows without question that the State Department really desired the liquidation of the Nationalist Government. Secretary Acheson was so determined in his prejudice that in January 1950 while he said that Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines would be defended if attacked, he repeatedly announced to the world that beyond this line the United States could not assure the rest of the Far East against attack, including, of course, by clear inference Formosa and Korea.

We had permitted the Chinese Communists to take over China. It was certainly a reasonable assumption on the part of the Communists that we would be even less concerned about their taking over the little land of South Korea. In May 1950, Senator Connally, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, was asked whether we were going to abandon South Korea, and he stated clearly that we would have to do so and that the Communists could overrun Korea whenever they got ready. As far as Russia was concerned we thus gave them to understand that here was a soft spot into which communism could move without cost. That is what the Russians have been doing for 200 years. They have seldom started an aggressive war against serious opposition.

Whether Congress should have authorized war in June 1950 can be argued at great length, but it was never given the opportunity to make that decision.

But no argument now can change the fatal results of administration policy. No argument can change the fact that we lost the peace after we won the war. No argument can change the fact that Soviet Russia presents a threat to our security greater than we have ever faced forcing a vast policy of mobilization dangerous to our liberty at home. In no way can this administration, directing our foreign policy for the last 18 years, escape responsibility for its tragic

results. They must be judged by those results.

As the Lord said in the Sermon on the Mount:

"A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

"Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

"Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Today obviously we cannot withdraw without admitting a military defeat by China. I believe that by the methods suggested by General MacArthur we might have achieved the United Nations objective of setting up a united and free Korea. At this time, however, a stalemate peace at the thirty-eighth parallel is better than a stalemate war at the thirty-eighth parallel, a war in which the American Army is suffering 2,000 casualties a week. These are American boys who are being killed and maimed because of the mistakes and lack of judgment of this administration.

As far as the basic strategy of foreign policy at this moment is concerned there is no fundamental disagreement. We are all determined to prevent the spread of communism by military aggression and by propaganda, to the extent of our ability. In carrying out that policy I believe a firm and well-planned program can avoid war. When the threat of communism has been met, we should return to our policy of friendly assistance, and not court war by trying to dominate the world with our money or our military forces.

The purpose of any foreign policy must be to protect the liberty of American people, and so long as that liberty is threatened so is the peace of the American people. Modern war is pure tragedy. There is no longer the false glamor of earlier years. It means pain and suffering and destruction not only of soldiers, but of millions of men and women in civilian life.

In the meantime our battle must be carefully planned by intelligent and unprejudiced men. Today we are asked for the expenditure of such huge sums that the very economic stability of the Nation will be threatened in 1953 and 1954. There has been no intelligent appraisal of the limits of our economic capacity in time of peace. There is no intelligent program, and the plans change from day to day. While each department of the Government and of the Armed Forces may be making intelligent plans in its own field, there is no over-all brain operating with horse sense to assure that the whole program is efficient in its purpose, that is not as destructive as war to the liberty of the people.

The administration has turned with enthusiasm from spending at home to more spending abroad and to huge spending for the Armed Forces; for the philosophy of the New Deal has always been that Government spending of other people's money is a good thing in itself, spending for spending's sake. The whole policy is intended to corrupt the people—it is not strange that it has corrupted the politicians who believe in it.

The Republican Party believes that real progress toward the happiness, the security, and the increased material welfare of the people must be made within the principles of liberty, equality, and justice on which this Nation was founded, and whose application for 154 years has made the United States of America the greatest Nation in the world. Why change now?

What the Republicans offer is a government controlled by people like yourself. Because you and people like you make up a great majority of the American people I am convinced that you will cause the Republican Party to take over this Government in

1953. The American people believe in liberty. They don't believe in the constant extension of Government power and Government spending. They believe in the freedom of men to live their own lives and to run their own farms and their own business. They don't believe in OPA's and OPS's, and the Brannan plan. They believe in the freedom of local communities to decide how their children shall be educated and their local services performed. They don't believe in socialized and nationalized medicine. They believe in thrift, and in efficiency in Government equal to our efficiency in business. They believe in honesty and integrity. The Republican Party can be depended upon to build a better America for all our people. If you will help from now until election day in arousing the interest and concern of those who have slept in past elections, if you will bring home to them the fact that Government can be just as honest and healthy and American as baseball, that the Republican Party alone offers hope and leadership to achieve this result, there is no doubt about the overwhelming election of a Republican President and a Republican Congress in 1952.

No More Political Sham Battles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Republican, like the Democratic, Party is split right down the middle.

Ever since early in 1933, the contest in the Congress has not been between Republicans and Democrats as such, but between those who call themselves liberals and progressives—by some opponents called taxers, spenders, wasters, and internationalists, and those who have been named as conservatives, and, at times, nationalists, isolationists, reactionaries.

Congressional battles have been waged between those who believed that the activities and spending of the Federal Government should continuously be expanded; that our people were obligated, because of their power and wealth, to assume the burden of raising the standard of living of all people throughout the world; that the welfare of our own people and the security of our Republic depended upon our active participation in the affairs and wars of other nations; that we can surrender a little of our sovereignty without impairing the effectiveness of our Constitution; and

On the other side were those—like-wise in both parties—who believed that, though charitably assisting other nations, we could best advance civilization throughout the world by following the advice of Washington and Jefferson who told us—the one in his Farewell Address, the other in his first inaugural address—to, as a nation, avoid entanglement in the affairs of foreign nations; that 150,000,000 people cannot, with safety, assume the burden of materially raising the living standard of 2,400,000,000 people, and that, in any event,

other peoples, who do not want our way of life, cannot be forced to accept it, nor can they be forced to accept our religious views; that we cannot, without destroying the welfare of our people and the security of our Republic, engage in every war in which other nations might become involved; that a surrender of a part of our sovereignty, however small, was but the opening wedge to the surrender of our independence.

As neither the Democratic nor the Republican Party presented a united school of thought to the people on either domestic or foreign policy, the last three Presidential campaigns have been in the nature of sham battles, just shadow-boxing.

Democratic candidates have advocated more spending, more control, by the Federal Government, a greater degree of participation in the affairs of other nations and their wars.

Republican Presidential candidates, that is, Willkie and Dewey, advocated a little less spending, a little less control by the Federal Government over the States' and people's activities, made the assertion that Republicans could spend to better advantage, make Federal controls a little more effective and economical.

But both Republican candidates for the Presidency heartily endorsed the administration's foreign policy.

So it has come about that, in the last three Presidential elections, the people have never been given an opportunity for a square vote on two questions: (a) Should the power and the spending of the Federal Government over the activities of its citizens and of the States be expanded; and (b) should we, as a people, continue to impoverish ourselves by economic and military aid to other countries which, without consulting us, become involved in war, and should we, as a nation, continue to conscript our men to fight on foreign soil, sometimes without a declaration of war by the Congress?

Three times Republicans have gone down to defeat at the polls. Is it too much to ask that those of us who are thoroughly convinced that, while we should extend Christianity's hand of charity and fellowship to all people and to all nations, we can best serve not only our own people, our own Republic, but world civilization, by conserving our resources, building a strong national defense, and, by our might and example, promote world peace?

Should not midwesterners, at least once in 16 years, be permitted to name the standard bearer?

The liberals and the progressives, so-called, internationalists, have three times sent their pinch hitter to bat. He has fanned each time. Now, let the conservatives, the nationalists—if you prefer, the isolationists—that is, those who believe and have confidence in our country and its form of government, name a candidate—Bricker, MacArthur, Taft, Dirksen, Byrd—anyone, frank, honest, sincere—who has faith in the wisdom of the forefathers, confidence in a Republic which adheres to the principles of the Constitution.

H. R. 5714

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, prompted by many people back home, who are alarmed at the possible lack in proper school facilities, I am introducing H. R. 5714.

When one sees so many superfluous projects going up outside home and school construction it is hard to believe that responsible Government authority would deprive school buildings of necessary materials.

I call for priorities for structural steel and other metals and material to be given to school construction.

What heritage is more priceless to us than our youth? Their welfare should be our first consideration, and I hope our Government will keep in mind the necessity of building schools for them.

The text of the bill follows:

H. R. 5714

A bill directing the Administrator of National Production Authority to allocate enough steel for school construction

Whereas there is a shortage in many parts of the United States of schools to provide for educating our children properly; and

Whereas the national preparedness program has caused disappearance from civilian channels of necessary building materials such as steel and other metals; and

Whereas many school buildings have already been planned and even construction started thereon only to be held up by serious and long delays because of denials by various Government officials thereby making it impossible to obtain these vital materials; and

Whereas we must not neglect the education of our most priceless heritage, our American youth: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the National Production Authority is hereby directed to order enough steel and other necessary materials allocated for the completion of schools now being built and also for the construction of schools already planned for, which are considered essential to the needs of educational authorities.

The St. Lawrence Seaway—"If You Live in a Glass House, Don't Throw Stones"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, those Members of Congress, myself among them, who have for so many years been urging upon this body the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway, have noted with dismay two recent events which indicate, first, the sincere determination of the Canadian Government to proceed with completion of the seaway without the United States; and, second, that the United States will not take action on

this matter at least until January 1952, the date set by the House Public Works Committee for further consideration of the seaway resolution.

I am including as part of my remarks a letter which I have received from the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, which points out that the interests of the United States will not be as adequately protected nor as well served by the Canadian-construction program.

I also bring to the attention of my colleagues a compilation of data which shows that the outspoken railroad opposition to the seaway has not been as solicitous of the national budget in seeking rapid tax write-off privileges as they have been in criticizing the seaway on its cost of construction. The information in this table makes me think of the old and familiar saying, "It all depends on whose ox is being gored."

The table and Governor Williams' letter follow:

These figures represent totals to June 1, 1951. No precise over-all figures on railroads alone were obtainable from any governmental source. Moreover, the Defense Production Authority's information, as well as that of the Defense Transportation Administration, does not include a compilation of these data as to types of equipment. Practically all certificates and amounts listed, carry the designation "Transportation—Rail." One of the Defense Production releases for certificates of necessity does not include the percentage of the amount authorized for quick tax write-off. However, an examination of the remaining listings shows the percentage to be ranging generally from 65 to 80 percent.

GRAND TOTALS

Total number of certificates	157
Total amount authorized (railroads)	\$638,840,349
Estimated mean figure for amortization factor (percent)	72
Estimated amortization allowed the railroads themselves, using the mean factor of 72 percent	\$459,985,051
Total amount applied for (includes rail equipment for other industries as well as the railroads)	\$777,000,024
Amortization actually allowed for rail equipment (all industry)	\$562,208,000

¹ These are separate figures obtained from the over-all compilations of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, October 10, 1951.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: After Prime Minister St. Laurent's recent visit with President Truman, I checked the problem of the St. Lawrence seaway in Canada and found the situation to be urgent. The Prime Minister's announcement seems to me a sincere declaration of Canada's determination to complete the seaway without further delay. I believe the Canadian Parliament will take aggressive and definitive action at an early date. Undoubtedly, preliminary plans at least will be formulated within a very few weeks.

It is my understanding that the Canadian program requires extensive changes in the engineering plans. These changed plans

place all critical locks and navigation facilities on Canadian soil. They further provide for the establishment of a 27-foot controlled depth up to and including Detroit, Mich., but not including channels to Lakes Huron, Superior, and Michigan.

All States and municipalities, but particularly those located north or west of Detroit, should view this revision with deep concern.

The interests of America are by no means so well served by this substitute. Practical business management, national security and the economy of America's heart land in addition to our national pride should require our immediate and affirmative action on this project. The United States should be Canada's partner in developing the tremendous economic potential of the Midwest.

House Joint Resolution No. 337 is now before the Committee on Public Works of the House. This new resolution takes account of the suggestions and criticisms that have been made before Congress during the course of extensive hearings this past spring. It incorporates positive requirements that will make this project totally self-liquidating. It establishes a new framework for the just and equitable determination of all tolls and charges.

The St. Lawrence seaway is essential to national defense, and the future prosperity of the whole country. The American program would open half a continent to world trade and its power facilities would provide electricity for power-starved New York and New England. In view of its importance to the national welfare, I am again taking the liberty to bring the matter to your attention. The hour is late. Canada has offered us one more chance to join her in this great project. It is imperative that we immediately take all necessary steps to bring Resolution No. 337 to an early committee vote. Even if action were taken on October 12, really definitive action would not be had until the return of Congress in January 1952. If no action is taken this month, then Congress will not be able to act until too late. I feel that we must demonstrate to our Canadian friends our sincere intention to cooperate with them on the construction of this great project. House Resolution No. 337 offers us the opportunity to make such a declaration. Let us make every effort on its behalf.

Without congressional action, we must reluctantly endorse the Canadian effort and offer them our help and encouragement for this partial substitute.

Sincerely,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

American Casualties and Not One Russian Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, American battle casualties in Korea have reached 87,650. It will soon be a hundred thousand unless there is a truce. While American men are dying in that undeclared war not one Russian has given his life in the cause of world communism; only Americans pay and pay and pay.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Washington

News and which is pertinent to the remarks that I have made:

TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-ONE MORE AMERICAN CASUALTIES—AND NOT ONE RUSSIAN DEAD

American battle casualties in Korea reached 87,650 on Wednesday, an increase of 2,181 since last week.

This was during a period of comparative lull while we were still waiting to see whether the Reds really meant to talk peace.

Twenty-two hundred men—the finest commodity America has—poured into a bottomless pit, with no prospect that anything will be accomplished by it.

Twenty-two hundred American men killed, maimed or missing in still another week of the war of futility. Futility because we have no plan other than to continue a war of maneuver and attrition along the general line of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Not a single Russian has died, not a one has been under fire, while 87,650 American casualties were tolled off.

We're fighting Russian communism, yet Moscow is throwing her cheapest ammunition at us—the vast manpower of Red China. No Russian blood is being shed, only Chinese and Korean, and, on the Allied side, mostly American.

We can be bled to death that way. Because we are limiting our operations, trying to localize the war. General MacArthur was severely restricted by the Truman administration for fear of bringing the Chinese Reds into the war. Then when Stalin sent his Chinese puppets in anyway, General MacArthur's hands were still tied. He couldn't bomb their bases and supply lines in Manchuria for fear of bringing in the Russians.

If it was to be our policy to avoid offending Russia at all costs, we should have stayed out of Korea when the war started. The cost is now 87,000 Americans killed and wounded and missing. A frightful price—and the danger of Soviet intervention no less than when the war started.

While we are being weakened, our manpower used up at the rate of 2,000 a week, Soviet strength remains unimpaired.

Russia can afford any number of wars like this—but we can't.

Particularly, we cannot afford these losses in a war which we are not fighting to win. We're fighting only for a draw which would settle nothing. Because we're still committed to a policy of staying below the Manchurian border, leaving the enemy inviolate in his Soviet-protected sanctuary.

Mr. Truman and his strategists of the State and Defense Departments vetoed General MacArthur's proposal to go all-out for a quick and decisive victory.

If there is a substitute for victory, it is up to the Truman administration to find it, and soon. For the American public cannot longer close its eyes to the tragedy of the monstrous futility of what is happening in Korea.

No Short Cut to Air Power

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as long as the very real menace of Soviet war hangs over us and the whole world, we will be inviting national suicide unless we keep

militarily strong enough to meet attack and decisively defeat the enemy.

Since military leaders freely admit that the first blows in any war would be struck from the air, and that no armed force of modern times may win without an superiority, it is obvious that we must build our air power to a point of safety, and maintain a capacity of production to meet any threat.

Recognizing this, it becomes doubly important for us to realize that the building of air power cannot be achieved quickly. First, we must recognize and understand the inescapable time factor in aircraft development and production. Second, it is tremendously important that we project that factor into a stable long-range procurement program.

FLUCTUATIONS COSTLY

In design, tooling, research, supply, and manpower the aircraft industry could save untold millions of the taxpayer's dollars if it could avoid the erratic fluctuations which have marked its course since we first called for military planes in World War I. In Congress, where authorizations and appropriations establish the scope within which this industry can operate, we need to learn more about the vast complexity of manufacturing modern aircraft.

Production of aircraft cannot be turned on and off overnight. A minimum of 24 months is required to put bombers in production, 18 months for a new fighter. This is in addition to the design cycle, which requires from 2 to 3 years. It adds up to 3½ to 5 years before new design concepts can be translated into combat aircraft.

Just recently the Air Force awarded what it calls phase I, or design study, contracts to three firms for a new high-altitude interceptor. Eventually, one or more of these studies may be accepted and a prototype plane or two may be ordered. If it meets the performance and other requirements of that future date, it will be put into production. But that prototype would not fly before 1954. And remember that special tooling will then be required for its production. Right now, with semimobilization, aircraft factories sometimes cannot hope to get delivery on a relatively simple machine tool for at least 36 months.

That interceptor we may need against the Russians in 1954, 1955, or 1956 has to be planned now.

The expansion we can get in the aircraft industry is determined by the base size of the industry at the time expansion begins. World War II experience gave us a rule of thumb that under the impetus of all-out mobilization production rates can be accelerated three times within 12 months from the date the go ahead is given, and can again be tripled by the end of 2 years. It is impossible to increase this curve of acceleration in production activities.

INESCAPABLE TIME LAG

Here is another current example of the inescapable time lag: Two of our finest aircraft companies have been working for months to put into operation stand-by plant held over from World War II at Marietta, Ga., and

Tulsa, Okla. Yet neither company will deliver a plane from those factories until the spring of 1953.

Any substantial expansion in the Air Force is determined by aircraft production. The Air Force and the Navy arm cannot be increased in size and equipped with modern planes for from 3 to 5 years following the decision to expand.

Ironically air power is the first and most effective element to be thrown into combat, yet requires the longest time to build. This is all the more reason for a long-range program.

The importance of the time factor in expansion and the necessity for an adequate base from which to start are only part of the compelling reasons for a stable long-range procurement program. Unit costs under a long-range program can be substantially reduced. Here is a graphic example. For one of the top all-around World War II fighters, actual unit cost of the first 620 airframes was \$26,700 each; for the first 4,000 the unit cost was reduced to \$14,100 each. The same company's outstanding jet fighter airframe today costs \$121,132 each for the first 620, but on the basis of 4,000 production the company computes the cost at \$47,954 each.

SHORTAGE OF ENGINEERS

Another important aspect of the instability of the present year-to-year method of military aircraft procurement is reflected in the requirements for engineers and the inadequate number available. At the wartime peak, the aircraft industry employed 2,930,000 people, by 1947 it was down to 167,000. Consequently, the industry did not encourage college students to enter engineering courses since the number of engineers required for the small peacetime industry was not high. Now there is an acute shortage of engineers which is becoming increasingly serious and the numbers of engineering graduates from United States universities are on a constantly declining curve.

The complexities of the jet-electronic-supersonic age call for scientists and engineers of the highest quality. Their training for this specialized field takes time—a lot of it—but an erratically fluctuating industry can not attract them nor justify their expensive training. Thus, when the Nation's need for them is greatest, there are few to be had.

It is time we recognized that our national survival in the foreseeable future may depend primarily upon the aircraft industry. It is time we make provision for its enormous complexities by giving it a chance to do its job on a sound, stable, long-range basis.

It will be expensive to build up and maintain the necessary air preparedness. But we must keep improving our aircraft lest the enemy hurl better ones against us, and keep our aircraft manufacturing industry in all its wide ramifications on a base broad enough to meet emergency needs and sustained production if the shooting starts. The cost of airplanes is high, but as someone has aptly said, in a very real sense they represent the cost of living.

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the *Columbia*:

COLUMBUS: MAN OF THE CHURCH

(By Thomas E. Kissling)

Some 800 objects of artistic and scientific interest, bearing on the life and voyages of Christopher Columbus, are on exhibit at the International Columbus Exhibition in Genoa. Twenty-four countries are represented in the exhibits, marking the fifth centenary of the birth of the great navigator, patron of the Knights of Columbus.

This event focuses attention on the fact that the relics and records of Columbus are scattered in many lands—Spain, Italy, France, San Domingo, Portugal, Vatican City, and in Washington, where the Library of Congress preserves a goodly number of Columbian treasures. It seems that every few years some new discovery about Columbus turns up, starting a documentary battle which attracts attention for a time and then is forgotten.

It is interesting to note that when preparations were being made for the great World's Fair, held in Chicago in 1893, marking the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, the United States Government sought the loan of precious Columbian relics, maps, and records from the Vatican archives. The exposition was held a year late because of construction delays, but on September 18, 1892, Secretary of State John W. Foster, in a letter to the papal secretary of state, Cardinal Rampolla, said:

"The intimate association of the Holy See with the Columbian enterprise and its results has so linked the memory of Rome and her pontiffs with the vast achievement of Columbus and his competitors in the work of discovery and colonization, that an exhibit, such as by the President's direction I have the honor to suggest, could not fail to be among the most noteworthy contributions to this international celebration."

POPE SENDS REPRESENTATIVE

Cardinal Rampolla replied stating that His Holiness Pope Leo XIII was pleased to grant the request, feeling "certain that the United States Government would spare no pains to preserve the various objects that are to be entrusted to it from any mishap, and he returns his thanks for the kind offer that has been made for their transportation" and cue. The Pope also announced that he would send Archbishop Francesco Satolli as custodian of the Columbus relics and to represent him at the public demonstrations at the fair. Satolli, a few months later, was named the first apostolic delegate to the United States. At the close of the Columbian Exposition, the relics were returned to the Vatican on the U. S. cruiser *Detroit*.

Not only did Pope Leo XIII loan the Columbus relics of the Vatican archives for the American celebration of the fourth centenary of the discovery of America, but as early as July 16, 1892, he wrote an encyclical letter on Columbus, addressed to the archbishops and bishops of Spain, Italy, and the two Americas.

Much has been written about the deep religious faith of Christopher Columbus. That he was a devout Catholic is evident in a number of his deeds. Letters and documents signed by him with his anagram read: "Suppliant servant of the Almighty Sav-

iour—Jesus, Mary, Joseph—the bearer of Christ (I. e. Christopher)."

The records show that one of the great admiral's first acts after putting out to sea, was to summon the crews to his flagship, the *Santa Maria*, to hear the chaplain's invocation to Almighty God for His blessing on the perilous adventure. The records of the voyages further show that Columbus turned to God for help when storms, tempests, shoals, and reefs threatened disaster. Thanksgiving to God was his first thought on sight of land, and in the ceremony of landing on shore he raised and planted the standard of the cross.

From his letter to Rafael Sanchez, treasurer of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, written March 14, 1493, on board the caravel while returning from his first voyage, we learn that the first land he discovered he named San Salvador (Holy Saviour) "under whose protection I made the discovery." And the second, Santa Maria de la Concepcion. He gave gifts to the natives, cautioning his men to make friends, in order that they may receive the faith of Jesus Christ, and be well disposed toward us. * * *

In this same letter (published in Barcelona, May 1493) the first publication concerning America, Columbus gives further evidence of his great humility and piety, chronicling that "the great success of this enterprise is not to be ascribed to my own merits, but to the holy Catholic faith and the piety of our sovereigns. The Lord often granting to men what they never imagine themselves capable of effecting, as He is accustomed to hear the prayers of His servants and those who love His commandments, even in that which appears impossible. * * *

A great faith in God, and a great desire to spread that faith. In a letter addressed to Pope Alexander VI, Columbus, seeking missionaries to accompany him, wrote: "I trust that, by God's help, I may spread the holy name and gospel of Jesus Christ as widely as may be."

Columbus' fidelity to Jesus was dramatically epitomized in his last hours on earth. His last words were, "Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit." He was buried in the robes of the Third Order of St. Francis, on Ascension Day, May 20, 1506.

GLORY OF HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Though, during his lifetime, there were those who attempted to defame or detract from the glory of his life and his accomplishments, Rome did not forget the apostolic zeal of Christopher Columbus. Successively, three Popes had honored him with their confidence. They and the Roman cardinals continued to honor his immortal labors.

Perhaps, because it obtained little progress, but few realize that there ever was a movement for the beatification of Christopher Columbus. However, the matter gained considerable momentum in the middle of the last century. In 1856, Count Roselly de Lorgues published a two-volume biography of Christopher Columbus—*The History of His Life and His Voyages*, compiled from authentic Spanish and Italian documents. It was an exhaustive work which attempted to vindicate the life and works of the great discoverer, and openly proclaimed his sanctity. The author received a letter of praise from Pope Pius IX, stating that it "results as much to the honor of religion as to the honor of Italy." The work received both the encouragement and support of some of the highest personages of the time. Count Tullio Dandolo translated the book into Italian. It was not long before an English edition, condensed to one volume, appeared in Boston (1870), the work of Dr. John J. Barry, who also expressed the hope that Columbus would be enrolled on the glorious catalogue of the canonized saints.

Pope Pius IX, as a young priest, served as auditor of the Apostolic delegation in Chile,

from 1823 to 1825. He thus was the first Pope who, before ascending to the papal throne, had set foot on the American Continent. Naturally, he was interested in things concerning the Americas. When, in 1865, Count Roselly came to Rome, he received him, together with Count Dandolo, with utmost benevolence. In response to their wish that the formal introduction of the Cause for Beatification of Columbus should take place, Pius IX explained the difficulties which it would meet through the impossibility of proceeding according to the rules established by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. But he concluded that one can always try.

The movement for the introduction of the cause soon made great strides. That is, it gained the support of the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Cardinal Donnet, who made a formal demand to the Holy Father. Associated with him were the Archbishop of Genoa, the French bishops assembled in provincial Council of Poitiers, in 1868, and the Archbishop of Burgos in Spain. They were soon joined by requests from other bishops in both Europe and America. Meanwhile, when the Vatican Oecumenical Council met in Rome, the Archbishop of Bordeaux initiated a postulation or formal request for the council to submit to the Holy Father. Many of the members of the council were in agreement, but the suspension of the council prevented its further progress at this time.

About the time of the fourth centenary celebrations of the discovery of America other attempts were made. Count Roselly de Lorgues, visiting Pope Leo XIII in 1893, presented copies of two books he had written, both designed to prove the sanctity of Christopher Columbus. But the great Pontiff had apparently expressed all his thought on Columbus in his encyclical, "Quarto abeunte saeculo," published to the Catholic world on July 16, 1892.

The movement for the beatification of Christopher Columbus stayed dormant for two decades. In October 1922 a news dispatch from Rome mentioned a Franciscan friar, Rev. Antonio Santarelli as in charge of the cause. In June 1941 with the approach of the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the great navigator's discovery, and the investigation being conducted at his tomb in San Domingo, rumors of progress in the cause appeared in the press.

Although Count Roselly de Lorgues in both his works makes an exhaustive and impressive case the real obstacle in the path of obtaining the honors of the altar for Columbus seems to be in the lack of convincing records to prove that his second son, Ferdinand, was born of a marriage recognized by the church.

With what consideration Christopher Columbus should be held in the eyes of the church we are wisely told by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical issued to commemorate the fourth centenary of the discovery of America. The Holy Father did not hesitate to call him "the man of the church," and assert that "Columbus is ours." "It is fitting that the church should not be altogether silent," at the time of this great anniversary. "It is true," he continued, the church "reserves her special and greatest honors for virtues that most signally proclaim a high morality, for these are directly associated with the salvation of souls; but she does not, therefore, despise or lightly estimate virtues of other kinds."

On the contrary, she has ever highly favored and held in honor those who have deserved well of men in civil society, and have thus attained a lasting name among posterity. For God, indeed, is especially wonderful in His saints; but the impress of His divine virtue also appears in those who shine with excellent power of mind and spirit, since high intellect and greatness of spirit can be the property of men only through their parent and creator, God

* * * It is indubitable that the Catholic faith was the strongest motive for the inception and prosecution of his design * * *

"We say not that he (Columbus) was unmoved by perfectly honorable aspirations after knowledge, and deserving well of human society; nor did he despise glory, which is a most engrossing ideal to great souls; nor did he altogether scorn hope of advantages to himself; but to him far before all these human considerations was the consideration of his ancient faith, which unquestionably dowered him with strength of mind and will, and often strengthened and consoled him in the midst of the greatest difficulties. This view and aim is known to have possessed his mind above all, namely, to open the way for the gospel over new lands and seas."

A Foreign Policy Tied to Colonialism Has Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette which points out that American foreign policy needs a restatement with stress upon the fact that it should not be tied to colonialism. This editorial correctly points out that under our present policies we are losing one friendly nation after another because of our adherence to a policy which is ineffective:

HOW THE U S A CAN WIN FRIENDS

To peoples of every color and creed all over the world the United States of America has stood as a symbol of democracy, of the dignity of the individual, of the champion of the little fellow. They have seen proof of this in our treatment of the Filipino, in our aid to needy nations, in our sympathy for the colonials of empires.

Our lack of policy has turned many against us, for sheer misunderstanding of our motives. Our State Department fails to express the friendship of the American people for the peoples of nations in trouble. We fail to affirm our support for the everlasting struggle for freedom now stirring the peoples of many nations.

Iran and Egypt are the latest evidences of failure of the colonial policy. But what has the United States done to prove to those peoples that America is concerned with their problems, both social and economic? American dollars alone will never buy friendship.

In Saudi Arabia Americans are developing petroleum resources, but on a fair basis for the Arabians. Our development there is not sheer exploitation for our own benefit. We are teaching Saudi Arabians our know-how—how to make a living for themselves; how to solve their own social problems and raise their own living standards.

Iranians know this. The United States has been friendly with Iran. Yet instead of proving to Iran that we are concerned with the poverty, the social and economic problems of her people, we have been more concerned with our support of the British viewpoint, regardless of justice.

Could not the traditional United States policy of sympathetic understanding and concern for weaker peoples prove more suc-

cessful than outright support of the British there?

Is it not time for this Nation to assume its destiny, to stand forth against tyranny as the champions of the weak, and once more to raise the flag of freedom high that all may see? Is it not time to act and talk like Americans and prove the truth of our democracy?

This American policy was successful. We made friends of the Chinese, the Filipinos, Europeans and Arabs. Indonesia has sought our help. India's new independence was inspired by the American example. Japan is now being developed, not for American exploitation but for strengthening of a new Japanese democracy.

Our Economic Recovery Act was designed to help European nations rebuild their war-torn economies. Our aid to Greece was aimed at throwing off the Communist threat. Our activities in Italy bolstered her independence and recovery.

American know-how is the most that some countries required and they got it. We have tried to understand the social and economic problems of Saudi Arabia as our private oil companies help her to develop her oil resources.

The word "exploitation," does not refer to the American concept of our relationship to such areas as the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and postwar Japan. We have sought to develop in these areas and among these peoples social and economic strength for independence.

It is a fair question, therefore, to ask why American foreign policy does not go forward, firmly in the right to continue this kind of benevolent interest in foreign peoples.

Why do we not reaffirm our stand—the natural American stand—to help others to throw off the yoke of colonization as the United States threw off the yoke of foreign rule?

What have we to lose in retelling to the world that this is American policy?

Under present policy, we are losing one friendly world neighbor after another to the false promises of a false enemy—world communism. We have lost China. India questions our motives. Indonesia is not sure of American friendship and support in her struggle for independence.

Dedication of Civic Memorial Airport, Alton, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by me at the dedication ceremonies of the Civic Memorial Airport, Alton, Ill., Sunday, September 30. It follows:

I am particularly happy to be here today. It is a pleasure to view the dedication of this beautiful airport to the service of aviation in this favored section of Illinois. I can clearly foresee what the operation of this airport will mean to the citizens of Alton and of Madison County, and I congratulate you. I would like to commend all those who have had a part in the planning and development of this very worthwhile project. Its development and expansion in the future would add new lustre to Alton's well-established reputation as a center of travel, of culture, and of human understanding.

In the relatively short span of time of slightly less than 50 years since the first flight of a heavier-than-air aircraft was made by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk, N. C., man has made tremendous strides in the conquest of this new world. Up to 1903, man was not only unable to fly, but the very idea that such a thing would be possible was almost universally met with ridicule.

In the past 48 years man has not only ceased to be earth-bound, but he has explored and charted the air lanes overhead. He has unlocked the secrets of weather, and of other conditions that prevail in the atmosphere. He has conquered heights and distances beyond the early airman's wildest fantasy. The little bicycle shop of the Wright brothers, where the first aircraft was built, has become the prototype of great factories and large laboratories throughout the United States and the world. Aviation has become one of the greatest industries of the country.

Let us pause and consider the significant potentialities of aviation today: the factors which escape many who travel by air, but which affect all of us who depend upon air power to defend us against enemy attack.

Aviation can usher in a bright new day of peaceful development, or it can provide the vehicle and the weapon for the most devastating attack man has yet made on his fellow man.

Airplanes make travel and communication quick and easy.

Airplanes, equipped with special devices, have been used to spray extensive areas to eliminate insects, and thus to contribute to the health of populations, or the protection of crops. Airplanes aid in forest-fire control. They fly mercy missions to flood-stricken areas and other areas experiencing sudden emergencies. They do rescue jobs on land and sea. They speed emergency mail and freight to their destination. They make it possible for world leaders to meet in person, easily, quickly, and often in the interest of world peace. And, as today in Korea, they serve as flying ambulances, hurrying our wounded men from the dressing stations of the front line to the permanent hospitals on the rear bases, or even back in the United States.

But even as Orville Wright feared, the airplane has become an instrument of destruction. Only a few weeks ago the United States Air Force released information on new, pilotless aircraft, called Matador B-61 Pilotless Bomber, which can carry atomic weapons to targets in enemy territory, or against enemy troops.

Other aircraft have already flown across the Atlantic Ocean and landed safely without the pilots' hands touching the controls. The day of robot pilots and push-button warfare has not arrived, but flight controlled by radar and other devices of modern science is perfectly possible, and has been amply demonstrated. The time may soon come, if it is permitted to come, when even this new airport with its modern facilities may seem old-fashioned and out of date. Aviation is still in its infancy. Many significant developments will come within the next few years.

Even with such airborne weapons as we have already developed, there is no likelihood that the United States will ever use them against another nation, except in defense. These United States of ours have never gone to war except in self-defense. As long as our free, democratic institutions prevail, it is unlikely they ever will. We must realize, however, that if we can develop terrible air weapons to use in our defense, other nations may be expected to develop similar weapons to use against us. As a nation we have no monopoly on inventiveness; we do not control the resources of the world; and time may be against us. We have no desire to engage in an arms race with any nation, but we would be unworthy of our rights as American

citizens, and unworthy of the heritage our forefathers have bequeathed us, if we did not build our defenses quickly and strongly.

Whether or not you have ever seen combat aircraft, antiaircraft artillery, or other evidences of aerial warfare on this memorial airport—and I trust that you never do—this municipal, civilian-type airport is part of the defenses we are building. The late Gen. H. H. Arnold, who commanded our victorious Air Forces of World War II, used to say that "Air power will always be the business of every American citizen."

Every plane that flies, private, commercial or military, every airport that is developed in this country, every service that air transport performs, contributes to the air mindedness of our citizens. This is the air age supplanting the age of sea power and the age of land power, just as the railroad locomotive supplanted the river steamboat, and the automobile, trucks, and busses have to a great extent already supplanted the locomotive.

Enlightened citizens, who understand this aspect of air power, will use the airplane, and all the services it can give, for the development of our natural resources, our national welfare, and our individual and collective aspirations. Building fine municipal airports like this, they will make them symbols of progress and national enlightenment. But they will also support military air power, as the chief armor of our defense. They will demand the build-up of air power, not to make war, but to preserve peace. They will demand a strong United States Air Force, to defend us against an enemy that would make war on us. And they will make of this airport, dedicated though it is to peaceful, civilian use, a symbol of the strength of the United States.

If we are strong, we shall remain free; and if we appreciate our freedom, we will not delay in building up our strength.

In the past, the courage and the valor and the sacrifices of our ancestors won and preserved the freedom which we now enjoy.

Today courage and valor are not enough.

Science must be added to sacrifice. All our resources must be mobilized in the defense of our Nation. But nowhere has science made greater and more startling progress than in aviation, and that during the lifetime and the memory of most of us here. So we look to aviation as a new guaranty of our security, our freedom, our welfare, and our happiness.

Because, in that sense, this airport means so much not only to the people of Alton and Madison County, but of Illinois and all the other 47 States, I again congratulate you citizens, and you leaders, who have brought this airport into existence. You have made a contribution to the welfare of your community and your Nation and beyond that, you have set an example for others to follow.

Our Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address delivered by the Honorable William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, delivered before the seventy-seventh annual convention of the American

Bankers' Association, held in Chicago on October 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to participate in this convention of the American Bankers Association. This is particularly so, because, as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, I feel that we have a special dependence on, and a real responsibility to one another.

We are all painfully aware today of the manifold and overpowering complexities of our modern life. As bankers, dealing in media of exchange, we understand more clearly than ever before the ramifications inherent in our daily operations, which, like the proverbial pebbles tossed into the pool, set in motion forces with far-reaching repercussions. It was this realization that led originally to the creation of the Federal Reserve System.

Out of the increasingly unwieldy gyrations, the Frankenstein mechanics of an uncontrolled supply of money, the need for a strong central bank has been found to be essential to our economic stability. The banks, the people, and the Government realized that panics and crises, caused by periodic irregularities in the flow of our money supply, must no longer be permitted to rock our country back and forth every few years. The central bank was designed to minimize these convulsions, create more stable values, and thus make possible the smooth functioning of monetary machinery so necessary to promote the growth of the country and to improve standards of living. This was the purpose and this is the ideal.

Our present central bank is now nearly 39 years old and the time has come, it seems to me, when we must reevaluate, reassess, and redetermine its worth and effectiveness.

Central banking in the United States has been adapted to the requirements of a free people with a minimum of Government interference. The genius of the framers of the Federal Reserve Act lies in the creation of regional banks, knit together by a national governing body in Washington rather than in the establishment of a central institution with authoritarian powers. Each Federal Reserve bank and each branch office is a regional and local institution as well as part of a Nation-wide system. Through their boards of directors, the banks are in a position to represent the views and interests of the particular region to which they belong and, at the same time, they are the administrators of Nation-wide banking and credit policies.

Instead of functioning from the center outward, we function through an interdependence of all our parts. The lifeblood of the Federal Reserve System is in its members. The health of each member affects the whole and it is only through the work, and the conviction, and the determination of the members that the whole has life. No dictatorial powers were accorded it when it was set up. No dictatorial powers should it usurp. Within the framework carefully outlined by law, the Federal Reserve Board is charged with the responsibility for formulating national credit policies and supervising their execution.

The Federal Reserve System is certainly not perfect but it is unquestionably the main bulwark of our private banking system. Without a strong and independent central bank, private banking must inevitably lose the initiative it now possesses. Too few bankers seem to appreciate this fact. It was never more important than now for the central bank to understand and cooperate with commercial banks and for commercial banks to understand and support the central bank.

These are challenging times. These are times when strange voices would lead us down roads alien to the concepts of our founders. If our institutions do not serve us well, let us revamp them. On the other hand, if, given the imperfections of all things human, they are the best servants of the common good which we can fashion, and if they can adapt themselves to the changing needs of the people they serve, let us see to it that they are preserved. I call upon you as bankers, and as leaders in your community, to ever be conscious of the measure of freedom we have enjoyed in every sphere of our life, to be concerned with any attempt to deprive us of this freedom and to be vociferous in preserving those rights which we have obtained. Whatever changes we make, let us not betray the foresight of those who have struggled so valiantly to maintain our self-government and the security of our democracy.

In the next few years the bankers of America will be called upon to meet severe tests. They are already meeting successfully, in the voluntary credit restraint program in which they are so actively participating, one of the demands placed upon them. In this program, they have organized the managerial resources of the banking community in an educational program of benefit to borrower and lender alike. This has confounded the cynics and those who sneer at self-regulation. It will require real courage, vision, toughness, and stamina to continue this laudatory fight against inflation. I am confident that the bankers can meet the test, provided they are ever alert to the famous admonition, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The Business of Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a timely editorial entitled "The Business of Schools," published in Business Week for October 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE BUSINESS OF SCHOOLS

In Germany it was "guns or butter." Guns won, and Germany lost. In America, as the cold war takes more of our cash and time, it may become "guns or schools." If we choose either we lose. Somehow we've got to have both.

Guns have been getting both money and attention, but education has been going short. The schools are bursting at their seams. Thirty-three million Americans picked up their books last month. Over 24,000,000 of them trooped off to elementary schools, 6,500,000 to high schools, 2,500,000 to colleges, universities, and professional schools.

But some of them lack seats to sit on. Some of them haven't enough teachers. Some haven't as good teachers as they need. In the last 50 years the school population has doubled. We have built up a wonderful investment in buildings and equipment, in teaching staffs, in the ideal that every child shall have a chance at all the learning he or she can profit by. We have come to take all this for granted.

There lies the danger. Businessmen know that taking anything for granted means neglect. In these last years our fine free education system has been suffering from undermaintenance.

What can the businessman do about it? First, take a new look at the matter. Frank Abrams, chairman of the board of Standard Oil (New Jersey), says our country depends for its very life on people that are educated, productive, tolerant. And only that kind of people can make our business system dynamic and flexible.

So the board of directors of Standard Oil encourages its people to take an active interest in the public schools where they live. It wants more of them to serve on school boards, participate in the Parent Teachers' Association, take part in citizens' committees to bring schools up to date, and improve the quality and pay of teachers. It will even grant company time for this.

The Standard Oil pattern is worth thinking about. It costs time, energy, interest, and money. So does everything else that is worth doing. Unless businessmen back up our schools, we can have neither a strong Nation nor a strong economy.

Psychological Weapon Urged To Tame Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a letter entitled "Psychological Weapon Urged To Tame Kremlin," written by J. Anthony Marcus, who is president of the Institute of Foreign Trade. This letter appears in the October 13 issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and is very interesting and enlightening.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPON URGED TO TAME KREMLIN

(By J. Anthony Marcus)

Your October 4 editorial, Our Only Recourse, states that "We have no other recourse than to continue our own atomic build-up as the one remaining hope that our strength will be the ultimate deterrent to the atomic war that only Russia will start."

It would be sad indeed if that were true, if we had to depend upon armaments alone. The backbreaking expense soon would make itself felt in ever-falling standards of living, in further inflation, in a mounting public debt, and, if continued long enough, it might even result in national bankruptcy. This cannot happen in Russia. Stalin has tens of millions of slaves. He has recently acquired hundreds of millions of slaves in China and the satellite nations, with inexhaustible cannon fodder.

Fortunately for us there still is another recourse—the ideological-psychological propaganda front. We have not yet scratched the surface, while the Kremlin has been at it since December 24, 1917. Until 5 years ago we did nothing on that front. We watched Stalin proceed from one triumph to another. Belatedly we woke up 5 years ago and began to counteract his campaign of lies and slander and intimidation with the so-called campaign of truth. Our efforts have

proven feeble and foolish, even though hundreds of millions of taxpayers' money has been spent. We have failed lamentably and completely. The work of our United States Information Service and the Voice of America under the aegis of the State Department has proved to be a tragic joke.

We are publishing, for example, a Russian-language magazine, Amerika. Our officials bowed to the Soviet demand that every word going into the magazine be submitted for censorship; they again bowed to the Kremlin when they accepted the demand that circulation be restricted to 50,000 copies per month, and this has since been reduced to about 25,000 copies; they failed to protest when the Kremlin decreed who shall distribute the magazine in Russia.

At the same time we did not dare to impose similar conditions upon the Soviet Embassy in Washington, which has been publishing a fortnightly, the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin, filled with propaganda and falsehoods designed to misinform and mislead our people. The constitutional provisions of freedom of the press, be it remembered, were not designed to help a foreign government come to our shores and under the protection of the Constitution carry on work inimical to our safety.

Under the conditions existing in Russia, I can state without fear of contradiction, that no Russian would dare be seen buying or reading our magazine Amerika. It would be the surest way of obtaining a one-way ticket to a slave labor camp. But assuming that I am wrong—that every man, woman and child in Stalin's "paradise" is able to read our magazine—what earthly benefit could they or we derive from this when its issues are filled with such articles as Dolls, the Attic—the Family Archive, Blankets from Colored Rags, Ladies' Pocket Books, Mosaic Windows, and similar drivel? Would such inflammatory messages bring hope to the oppressed Russian masses, would that kindle their hopes that we would help them in their struggle for liberation from the Communist bondage?

Unless we inaugurate a hard-hitting propaganda campaign (1) to stir the masses of the world outside the iron curtain by exposing to them the true conditions of Russia's enslaved, and (2) use all means at our disposal to bring about revolutions in Russia and the satellite nations, our armament program will not save us from a catastrophic world war.

MANHATTAN.

Rearmament Not the Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a newspaper article which appeared in Between the Lines, whose editor is Mr. Charles A. Wells, and who has been calling the turn on the crazy rearmament program now under way in the western nations. If we really want peace, we can find it through economic, social, moral, and spiritual means and not in the manufacture of weapons of war. The pattern we are following today is that of Hitler and Mussolini, and unless it is stopped, we will end in the same place, our Nation will go the same way that Ger-

many went under Hitler. It is time to stop and consider the course we are now on before it is too late. The article follows.

If we would devote the same amount of time, energy, and resources to the containment of communism by economic, social, moral, and spiritual means as we are now devoting to the weapons of war, we would find the solution. This is much more real and practical than it appears, for the free evangelical peoples of Finland, Sweden, Denmark, pressed closely on every hand by the threat of communism, have succeeded miraculously in curbing communism—not by military might but by their inner individual resources. Why must we in the cool vastness of our abundant west go stark crazy?

It is because two salient historical facts are being ignored or suppressed by the political and military spokesmen:

(1) That communism comes into a nation through internal upheaval, mob violence, civil war, not by the invading Russian Army. Nations are not being made Communist because of the invading Russian Army but by the breakdown from within of their economic, political, and moral life. (2) That, if the Russian Army should overrun Europe (no one pretends that they would dare try to overrun Asia), no historian living would say that Russia would then conquer Africa, then South America, then North America. For the truly well-informed authority on the subject is aware of the gross and traditional inefficiency of the Russian Government, the enormous amount of rebellion within the iron-curtain countries—and the magnitude of such a project. Only the irresponsible—and some of them in uniform and in politics—are saying that.

The same propaganda drum was beaten about the Kaiser—then about Hitler. Yet it is now freely admitted in all diplomatic, military and educational circles that Hitler could never have achieved such a program unless he could first conquer Russia, unless he could thoroughly subdue Europe, unless he could make the British, Dutch, Belgians and French work for him. Hitler failed to accomplish any of these things. His subjection of Europe we now know was a roaring, boiling, explosive farce. He hung on, millions suffered, but from the Goebbels' Diary and from many other authentic sources it has been recorded that Hitler himself knew he not only was failing to subdue Europe but that even Germany was full of growing revolt. If the Germans, who are an extremely well organized skillful people, couldn't do it—how can we presume that the Russians, a notoriously poorly organized, inefficient people, for all their other great creative capacities, could succeed?

In view of indisputable historical data—if communism spreads through Europe, Africa, South America, North America, it will not be through the power of Russian arms but through the power of communism as an ideology pouring in where nations, through selfishness, poverty and corruption, have opened the way. And that is a process we can't shoot at.

Do men really want peace? Top military men, top politicians, leading industrialists, financiers, when they stop to think, must know these things—for these are historical facts. Then what is at the heart of this mass hysteria of fear and devotion to physical violence?

We believe it is that, in the very action, the very onrush of this great parade, we are able to escape facing closer problems. Remember 1938? Business was flat; we had found no solution for the big depression that was still on. Then war in Europe came nearer and American business picked up as European war orders hit our markets. Following this, our own war orders helped boost business. But we never solved that depression—under the surface it still exists—the

12,000,000 men are still out of work. Oh, they are making machine guns, bombs, and planes, but they are really still unemployed as far as a healthy, stable economy is concerned. Business is booming, profits are booming, the stock market is booming, dollars are flowing, but they are cheap, shrinking, dying dollars.

A reasonable defense pattern for our hemisphere, a strong program for the economic, moral and spiritual rehabilitation of the threatened areas of the world has simply been crowded out by this big parade. The only way we'll change it is for those who see and understand—each of us, wherever we are—to turn around and march the other way. Only thus can the big parade be stopped this side of the precipice.

Socialized Medicine in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "London Dentist Says 9 Out of 10 School Children Are Denied Dental Care Under British Nationalized Health Services," published in the Washington Post this morning, bearing upon the results of socialized medicine in Great Britain, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON DENTIST SAYS 9 OUT OF 10 SCHOOL CHILDREN ARE DENIED DENTAL CARE UNDER BRITISH NATIONALIZED HEALTH SERVICES—AUSTRALIAN WARNS ADA TO PREPARE FOR SOME GOVERNMENT PLAN HERE

(By Nate Haseltine)

Nine out of every 10 British school children are being denied dental care under their country's operation of nationalized health services, a London dentist said here yesterday.

The visitor, Dr. Cyril deVere Green, of London, official representative of the British Dental Association, gave the report to dentists assembled here in the ninety-second annual meeting of the American Dental Association.

One of the few British dentists who have declined to join their country's health services plan, Dr. Green warned American dentists to "take your lessons from our experiences."

Great Britain's dental profession, he said, was not prepared for the deluge of work thrust upon the dentists when the country's national health services act went into operation 4 years ago. As a result, he said, the dentists are working longer and harder than ever before, "and earning four times as much as they did in private practice."

But, under the British program, he added, the children suffer most because the dentists "naturally prefer" to work on adults. This, he explained, is because dentistry for children is more exacting and more time-consuming, as compared to measuring adults for false teeth.

"As a result," he declared, "the school dental services have been denuded by the scheme (National Health Services), initiated at the wrong end of the scale. The initial intent was to provide dental services first for children and expectant and nursing mothers, but it didn't work out that way."

Dr. Green said there are plans under way to provide dentistry for the school children

by "diluting" the dental profession. The proposals, he explained, would authorize special 18-month training programs, in contrast to the standard 5-year schedule in dentistry, to qualify for dental practice limited to children.

Japanese Peace Treaty Echoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in *Between the Lines* on October 8 on the subject of the Japanese Peace Treaty, by Mr. Charles A. Wells, editor and publisher. Mr. Wells speaks with authority on this subject as he has traveled throughout the world and written extensively on matters of international relationships:

JAPANESE TREATY ECHOES

In recent issues we reported that many of the nations that signed the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco did so with strong resentments against the American military policies behind this treaty.

When we ran these reports we assumed that there would eventually be adequate coverage of this situation in the usual news channels. That coverage has not been forthcoming, but you can substantiate and document our own reporting on this issue by referring to the full analysis presented in the *New York Times*, September 1, by America's top diplomatic writer, James Reston; and also to the long report from Rome in the *New York Times*, August 29, which stated the reasons for the Vatican's opposition to the Japanese peace treaty—reasons tied to the fact that many countries affected by the treaty, such as the Philippines, India, China, etc., as well as Japan—have strong Catholic constituencies. Also the *Nation*, September 15, discussed the inevitable misfortunes that will come of efforts to enforce this treaty and the resentment of the many delegates who, though they were compelled to sign up, freely expressed their fears and lack of faith in the military character of the pact. In short, *Between the Lines* does not stand alone as perhaps it may sometimes seem.

Perhaps the worst aspect, however, has been the misleading reports in most places about how the Japanese people themselves feel about the treaty. It has been known all along that there is widespread resistance in Japan toward the complete reversal of American policy, which only five brief years ago urged on Tokyo a constitution that denounced forever the use of arms as an instrument of international policy, then, within that short period, forced on Japan a policy of rearmament. The true picture was revealed when the Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida returned to Tokyo after signing the treaty, broke the ban of silence that had been imposed on him and announced that, while he had been willing to cooperate in shaping the treaty, as the Japanese leader who seemed destined for that task, he would not have anything to do with the program of rearming Japan.

The Japanese fear communism, but they fear war more. The Japanese people want protection against communism, and if such security requires rearmament they will do their part. But it is made clear by the statements of their leaders and their press that they do not want to destroy their antiwar

constitutional provisions, and if they are to participate in rearming, it must be under actual and realistic United Nations controls and direction and not just as a partner with America in militarism.

On the surface the American peace treaty with Japan presents itself as just a document of cooperative security, except that it sidesteps the UN and clearly indicates the intention of American armed power to be paramount and to commandeer a rearmed Japan. The Japanese people and many other Asians fear that the military extremism which has characterized our action in Asia will lead to war rather than to peace.

And can you blame the Japanese—and others—for having these fears when they have witnessed how the American military saved Korea from communism? All Korea is totally destroyed—industrially, economically—in terms of property and homes; out of their small population between two and three million civilians have been killed, to say nothing of the millions who have suffered torturing injuries, hunger, illness from exposure, etc.—all that aside from the military casualties. The Koreans feared and hated communism, but about the only ones who will bear a favorable testimony as to the way we have "saved" Korea are the Koreans whose professional careers in religion and education have been fostered by American mission funds and whose loyalties to American support and good will are to be expected. But when you read and hear statements by such Koreans, worthy and fine as they may be as Christian leaders, their opinions must be recognized as a far cry from the sentiments being expressed by the other 99 percent of the Koreans who have never had the good fortune to benefit by missionary expenditure and investments.

What has happened in Korea should at least teach the world that some other way must be found to stop communism. Modern military realism is like trying to prevent cancer by blowing a man's brains out.

Mr. Boyle and Mr. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Out; One To Go," appearing in the October 15 issue of the *Journal-Every Evening*, of Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OUT; ONE TO GO

Since we have no way of knowing how he feels we shall have to believe William M. Boyle, Jr., when he tells President Truman that "ill health" is the cause of his resignation as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. But it may well be the fact that the operation which Mr. Boyle had last year—and upon which he lays stress—is not the only reason for the present state of his physical being. The suspicions raised by his public conduct and the accusations which have been laid against him may well have made him just a bit tired. They would do that to most men.

Anyway, Mr. Boyle will soon be out and it's a good thing. The chairman of a political party in power has no business using his influence to obtain Government loans for private concerns or serving as counsel for

firms which want something from the Government. There may have been nothing illegal in the proceeding but it was reprehensible conduct nevertheless and should never have been tolerated by the President.

The case of Guy G. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, is not on all fours with that of Mr. Boyle, but it is still a question whether he, too, has not outlived his usefulness to the party. He has admitted that he sought the extension of a loan to a company he heads. That's using politics to further personal interests and as such cannot be defended in the case of a man in high position. As long, moreover, as he keeps his present place, as he says he intends to do, Republicans will have a difficult time convincing the average voter that their standards of ethics are any higher than those of the Democrats.

With Admiral Fechteler in Command, Navy Is in Good Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the October 14, 1951, issue of *Parade* entitled "Fechteler Is Tops":

WASHINGTON.—Why will 55-year-old Bill Fechteler do a bang-up job as our new Chief of Naval Operations?

News men have been asking that question since Admiral Fechteler (pronounced "FEK-tel-er") took over the late Admiral Forrest Sherman's office on the Pentagon's fourth floor here.

Lately, they've got answers from old Navy hands who've known Fechteler since his plebe year at Annapolis. Here's what they say:

1. He's smart. For example:

Twenty years ago the then Lieutenant Commander Fechteler was No. 2 gunnery officer on the battleship *West Virginia*. One disastrous day during firing practice a shot from a 5-inch gun hit a 12-inch gun turret a few yards away.

NO GLOOM FOR HIM

That's enough to end any blossoming naval career, and gloom was a fathom deep in the wardroom. But Fechteler had an idea. "Look," he told his brother officers, "it's not our fault. The ship is built wrong. Instead of blaming us, they ought to change the design of all our battleships."

It was a great and novel idea. It worked, too, because young Fechteler's suggestions got top-level Navy Department approval. The ship and her officers won an orchid instead of a raspberry.

2. He has a sense of humor.

They tell this one in the Pacific Fleet: Fechteler, in 1942 captain of the spick-and-span new battleship *Indiana*, was steaming toward Japan with a support force comprising some old battlewagons.

Skipper of one of them signaled: "You're making too much smoke."

Fechteler signaled right back: "Can't help it. Have to burn garbage to hold speed down to yours."

3. He's no worrier.

Late in the last war Fechteler was responsible for seeing that new ships had all their officers.

But word came that three commanders, assigned to a new cruiser had been wrongly

directed and had left for a hunting trip just 24 hours before the ship was to be commissioned.

Fechteler's staff was frantic, but Fechteler (as he usually is in tight moments) was placid as a tropic bay. "They'll get there," was all he would say.

THE NAVY USED A MULE

They did—and weeks afterward his junior officers learned that Fechteler had telephoned the smartest guide in the mountain region, and sent him out by muleback to bring in the absentees. "You can win a lot of war with a mule," he said.

That's Fechteler: smart, sometimes witty, sure thinking in an emergency. The fleet's in good hands.

The Democratic Party Is the Prosperity Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an able, courageous, and forthright address delivered by Michael J. Galvin, Under Secretary of Labor, before a luncheon meeting of the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington on October 11, 1951:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS THE PROSPERITY PARTY

What are the real reasons behind the ever-growing strength of the Democratic Party? In searching for the answer to the question I have raised, I tried to avoid comparing the current situation with the last year of the Republican administration, that is, with 1932. In order that no one accuse me of making an unfair comparison of a prosperous year with a depression year, I shall make most of my comparisons with 1929—the peak year of prosperity under Republican administration.

In reviewing the record for the past 20 years, I am impressed with the continued growth and present strength of our national economy. The national output in the United States increased from \$104,000,000,000 in 1929 to two hundred and eighty-three billions in 1950. Even after adjustment is made for the higher price level in 1950, the output in terms of actual physical quantities, the goods you and I consume, increased by 80 percent from 1929 to 1950. Each Democratic administration from 1933 on has contributed substantially to the increase in the economic well-being of the Nation. The increase has not been sudden. Except for minor ups and downs, you can notice a gradual and continuous increase in our national output beginning with the first year of the Roosevelt administration right down to the present moment. And as you and I well know, we shall not rest on our laurels—our country can look forward to a continued increase in our well-being.

The Democratic administration is concerned not only with an over-all increase in output but with making certain that a large majority of our citizens share in this increased well-being of the Nation.

The largest segment of our population are those who work for salaries and wages. If we look at the record and see what happened to this important segment of our citizenry, we shall see that they have fared extremely well in this increased output of the Nation. In 1929, the employees of this Nation re-

ceived about \$51,000,000,000 in the form of wages, salaries, and other compensation. In 1950, this figure tripled to \$153,000,000,000. Another way of interpreting the same phenomenon is to observe that a full-time employee earned slightly over \$3,000 per year in 1950 as compared with only \$1,400 in 1929. Even after allowing for higher prices, the purchasing power of the full-time employee was 52 percent larger in 1950 than in 1929. This means that on the average each employee could purchase 50 percent more goods and services than he could have in the peak prosperity year of the Republican administration. Is there any question in our minds that the persons who receive their income in the forms of salaries and wages have benefited tremendously by the past 20 years of Democratic administration?

Most of you may not be surprised by this fact since the Democratic Party has always been considered the friend of the wage earner. Let us now turn to the farmers and see how they have fared during the past two decades of Democratic leadership. One of the easiest ways to determine the farmer's status is by the value of his output. The total value of farm output in 1929 amounted to about \$14,000,000,000. In 1950, this value totaled more than \$33,000,000,000. Again after one makes allowances for the changes in price levels, the value of farm output increased by almost 50 percent. The actual output per farmer is even greater than that indicated by this figure in view of the fact that a smaller number of persons were engaged in farm pursuits in 1950 than in 1929.

I am sure that this fact alone should answer the question as to why farmers who previously have been considered the backbone of the Republican Party are turning in ever increasing numbers to the Democratic Party.

We have now covered the two largest segments of our population, the farm and labor groups, and they have undoubtedly benefited by the policies of the Democratic administration. Let us now turn to another very important segment of our population, namely, the business groups. I use the term "important" not in the sense of numerical strength but rather "important" from an economic sense.

President Truman as well as the rest of us in the Democratic administration is dedicated to the preservation of free enterprise. Our free-enterprise system can flourish only if the business groups prosper. Many far-sighted businessmen have looked at the record, as we are doing today, and they are satisfied that the Democratic administration has been good for them. But some businessmen have continued to oppose the policies of the Democratic administration. To them I say, let us examine the record.

Corporate profits amounted to slightly less than \$10,000,000,000 in 1929. In 1950 such profits quadrupled—over \$41,000,000,000. Ah, but some say that this increase is more apparent than real. All of the increased profits are going into taxes. This is far from the truth. In 1929, corporate profits after taxes amounted to slightly over \$8,000,000,000; in 1950 this figure amounted to twenty-three billion. Thus, corporate profits in 1950, after payment of taxes, were three times as large as in 1929. I am sure that our keen and far-sighted businessmen are not being fooled by the cry of higher taxes. Although I promised not to make any comparisons with 1932, I am compelled to remind some of our business friends that corporate profits, even with the low tax rate, were nonexistent in 1932. Our corporations actually showed a loss of \$3,000,000,000 in that year.

The story for small business is also spectacular. This can best be illustrated by the profit story for unincorporated businesses and enterprises. If we examine the data for unincorporated enterprises, we find that their income increased from eight billions in 1929

to twenty-four billions in 1950. I am sure that any businessman who is confronted with these facts would come to the same conclusions that I have. The Democratic Party not only is preserving our free enterprise system but also is strengthening it greatly.

Throughout the history of the United States, there have been repeated statements made by our political leaders that the strength of our country and our economic system depends to a very large degree upon the strength of our small business concerns. I am happy to report that there has been a substantial increase in the number of business firms in operation in the past 20 years. In 1929 there were about 3,000,000 business firms in operation. In 1950, there were about 4,000,000. Most of this increase of a million firms was among the smaller companies.

Thus, by any sensible criteria we can come to only one conclusion—our business community has prospered, and prospered well during the past 20 years. Looking at the record, we come to the inescapable conclusion that Democratic administration is good for the labor groups, the farm groups, big business and small business.

I do not have to elaborate on what the Democratic Party has done for the aged and retired people. It was the Democratic Party which spearheaded the legislation providing old-age insurance for the retired worker and survivors' insurance for his family. Again, I need not remind you about the program of unemployment insurance for our workers. It was the Democratic leadership which sponsored this legislation and has put it into effect.

I have been giving you numerous facts which indicate the well-being of the various segments of our population. One over-all single factor which is a real reflection of the well-being of our country is the number of families living in their own homes. In 1930, the number of such families amounted to about 14,000,000. Today there are about 24,000,000. Today, 55 out of every 100 families are living in their own homes.

I should like to come back to the question which I originally raised. What are the reasons behind the inherent upward trend in the strength of the Democratic Party? After examining the record, you will agree with me that the Democratic Party stands for the greatest good to the largest number of people. As a matter of fact, it appears that the Democratic Party has been good for everyone except the Republican Party.

Let us now turn to outstanding problems of the day. The most important problem of the day is the one of international security. The Democratic Party has taken the lead in combating communism. It was the Truman doctrine that stopped communistic aggression in Greece and possible aggression in Turkey. It was the Marshall plan that stopped the rise of communism in Italy and France as well as in other Western European countries. It was the Berlin airlift which stopped further aggression in Germany. It was the decisive action of the Truman administration backing up the United Nations that stopped the Communist conquest of Korea. Through these various acts, the administration has been successful in keeping the Communists from achieving success in their aggressive moves. This is not talk—this is action.

The second most important problem of the day is that of inflation. In combating inflation, it is the present administration that has brought forth concrete plans for stabilizing prices and therefore protecting all of the consumers of this country.

In conclusion, I ask every one of you and all other persons with whom you come in contact, to examine the record. Let each one draw his own conclusion as to whether Republican or Democratic administration is

best for his or her welfare and the welfare of the country. You and I know the answers. I am sure the others will come to the same conclusion.

Malone Bill To Abolish Bureau of Indian Affairs and Repeal the Wheeler-Howard Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a statement which I have prepared relating to Senate bill 2167, introduced on September 22, 1951, by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] providing for the abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the repeal of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA, REGARDING SENATE BILL 2167, INTRODUCED ON SEPTEMBER 22, 1951, BY THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM NEVADA [MR. MALONE], PROVIDING FOR THE ABOLISHMENT OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND THE REPEAL OF THE SO-CALLED WHEELER-HOWARD ACT

Senator MALONE's statement in connection with the introduction of said bill is an able and forthright appraisal of the over-all question of the present policy in the administration of Indian affairs, which I hope will be studied by, not only Members of Congress, but also by the public in general. I support Senator MALONE fully in his efforts to help the Indians to help themselves.

When Congress enacted the so-called Allotment Act of 1887, and subsequent acts to implement this program, it anticipated the gradual and complete liquidation of all the Indian reservations in the United States. However, the period from 1934 to the present, during the John Collier, New Deal, and Fair Deal policies, has seen the complete reversal of the expressed will of Congress and the American people through the retention of lands held in trust status and the adding to tribally owned lands, by acquisition of Indian allotted lands and privately owned lands.

For the past several years I have advocated the emancipation of the Indians by giving them the same rights and privileges as other citizens, and I have sponsored legislation which would at least accomplish such purpose by piecemeal, such as—

1. Conferring State criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indians.
2. Transfer all Indian education and health to the States.
3. Medical services available to non-Indians in Indian hospitals.
4. Transfer of supervision of Indian irrigation projects to the Bureau of Reclamation.
5. Eliminate Indian Bureau agricultural extension, since Indian citizens have the same rights and access to such State and Federal services as other citizens.
6. Require the Secretary of the Interior and his Indian Bureau to dispose of the fractionated Indian heirship lands.

7. Distribute the approximate \$100,000,000 Indian moneys in the Treasury of the United States drawing 3 percent, 4 percent, and 5 percent per annum, costing the taxpayers approximately \$4,000,000 annually. This money should be distributed to the individual Indians in same manner as funds owned in common by other citizens.

8. Providing for a decree of competency of Indians in certain cases.

9. Repeal the Wheeler-Howard Act which includes the repeal of the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to create new Indian reservations, add to existing Indian reservations, and to set up Indian tribal councils which have power or authority only with the sanction of the Indian Bureau.

10. To cancel and rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing, under the authority of the Wheeler-Howard Act, Indian reservations in Alaska.

If such proposed legislation were to be enacted it would leave little or nothing for the Indian Bureau to administer in regard to the affairs of the Indians. If only one of such bills would be enacted it would at least diminish the power and authority of the Indian Bureau over the Indians.

The enactment of one or all of such bills would be an approach to the release of the Indians from governmental supervision on a piecemeal basis. The present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Dillon Myer, apparently is opposed to such a policy of emancipating the Indians. He is constantly appearing before committees of Congress urging the enactment of the so-called rehabilitation long-range programs, which long-range programs, in my judgment, amount to the continuance of the Indian Bureau for all time to come.

Such long-range programs are in reality to enslave a minority group to a bureau of the Federal Government, which is the Indian Bureau. Such programs are also being advocated by the John Colliers, the James E. Currys, the Ruth Bronsens, the Congress of American Indians, Civil Liberties Union, and the like, which organizations and persons are advocating and approving of the withdrawal of public domain for Indian use under Indian Bureau control and the acquisition of lands, Indian and private, for the creation of additional Indian reservations or additions to Indian reservations, to alter boundaries of existing Indian reservations, and the elimination of individual Indian allotments and put all lands in communal or tribal ownership.

With reference to the withdrawal of public domain for the alleged purpose of Indian use, in a discussion on the floor of the Senate, on July 30, 1948, concerning a bill (S. 2394, 79th Cong.) providing for the amending the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (36 Stat. 847), so as to terminate such outstanding withdrawals from settlement, entry, location, or sale of public lands, unless such withdrawals be authorized by the Congress, and in a colloquy between the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the then junior Senator from Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, the following took place:

"Mr. McCARRAN. . . . To all intents and purposes, these withdrawals constitute Indian reservations or additions to reservations, and they all still stand in full force and effect. None has ever been revoked. They remain as festering sores of controversy to plague the communities and the States in which they are located.

"Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

"Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not a fact that after a withdrawal has been made, especially in connection with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the withdrawal is used as a club over the heads of Senators and Representatives in order to force legislation through Con-

gress which otherwise, in my opinion, might not be considered at all? That has been my experience in both the Senate and in the House. The very withdrawal to which the Senator from Nevada has referred was made when I first became a Member of the House in either 1932 or 1934. It is still in full effect. Under that withdrawal the Bureau of Indian Affairs took over jurisdiction of, as I recall, approximately a million acres of land, and since then has constantly used that circumstance in an attempt to force through the Congress legislation which should never be enacted and will not be enacted.

"Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, no statement could be more accurate than that which the able Senator from Utah has made."

The Indian Bureau and the so-called Indian welfare organizations advocate rights without obligation for the Indians, and are advocating discrimination, not rights.

STATE LAWS SHOULD BE APPLICABLE TO INDIANS

I sponsored legislation conferring jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within the State of New York, which legislation was enacted and approved by the President on July 2, 1948. This law confers complete jurisdiction on the State of New York over crimes committed on Indian reservations in the State of New York, which law has now been in operation for more than 3 years. I am advised that this law is being administered by the State of New York to the complete satisfaction of the Indians, the State of New York and all concerned, yet the Indian Bureau advocates legislation which would retain in the United States jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians within Indian reservations or Indian country. I submit that such a law would be discriminatory against the Indians and does not make them amenable to the same laws as other citizens. Why does not the Indian Bureau advocate and recommend the New York law as a pattern for other States?

INDIAN FUNDS

During this session of the Eighty-second Congress, I sponsored a Senate resolution (S. Res. 147) directing the General Accounting Office to make a study and investigation to ascertain the amounts of the funds and securities of the several Indian tribes, including those of tribal organizations, whether held in the Treasury of the United States, in private banks, or elsewhere, and the rates of interest which are being paid on such funds, and such other information with respect to such funds. This resolution was on July 23, 1951, adopted by the Senate, and I am advised that the Comptroller General has already started such study and investigation in pursuance to said resolution. I have complete confidence in Mr. Warren, the present Comptroller General, and I am sure that the results of such a study and investigation will be of much assistance to the Congress in the consideration of matters pertaining to the affairs of the Indians.

WHAT IS AN INDIAN?

The junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, on July 11, 1951, on the floor of the Senate stated:

"Some years ago I had this rather embarrassing experience: I sent a letter to the Indian Bureau. I simply said to John Collier, who was at that time at the head of that activity: 'What is an Indian?' I got back four pages of single-spaced typewriting and when I got through I could not find out what an Indian was."

"I addressed a letter to the Bureau of the Census. I got back 5 pages. To this good hour, I do not quite know what an Indian is, although by one standard probably one-sixty-fourth blood entitles one to be on the tribal rolls. By that standard the second

Mrs. Woodrow Wilson would have been enrolled upon the rolls of the Indian Bureau: And if numbers mean anything for the purpose of getting anything out of Congress, that is a very felicitous way to do it."

The junior Senator from Illinois is mistaken when he presumes that an Indian of at least one-sixty-fourth blood entitles him to be on the tribal rolls. I am advised that there are Indians on the rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes, of Oklahoma, who are one-two-hundred and fifty-sixth part Indian and less.

Indeed numbers of Indians mean a great deal to the Indian Bureau in getting money from the Congress.

In justification for appropriations the Indian Commissioner, this year, paraded 427,000 Indians before the Appropriations Committees of Congress, whose activities he claimed to supervise and for which he asked the Congress for an appropriation of \$71,425,000 for the alleged support of the Indians. Perhaps it would be more correct to say, "to feed his hungry board of bureau tax-eaters" in excess of 12,000 of them.

Under any rational definition of an Indian, there is nowhere near the population of 427,000 who need the care and supervision of the Indian Bureau, only a small proportion of this number is in any way dependent upon the Bureau. Among the 427,000 whom the Commissioner of Indian Affairs says he has to supervise are Congressmen, State supreme court judges, lawyers, doctors, State legislators, State and county officials, and hundreds and thousands of the one-fourth, one-eighth, one-sixteenth, one-thirty-second, one-sixty-fourth degree of Indian blood and less.

An Indian who is as much as one-fourth degree of Indian blood is three-quarters of some other race.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish an Indian from the other citizens of the Nation, in fact Congress made all Indians citizens in 1924, yet, due to powers embodied in the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution, the Federal Government continues to control by special legislation and regulation the lives and property of these citizens who are arbitrarily classed as "Indians." The power delegated in the Federal Constitution over trade and affairs is no longer needed nor just.

As long ago as 1899 in the case of *Keith v. United States et al.* (58 Pac. 507), the child of a white father and an Indian mother was held to be a non-Indian. Yet today there are many persons of infinitesimal proportions of Indian blood, even one-two-hundred-fifty-sixths and less who are on the rolls of certain tribes.

All enrolled, recognized, and allotted Indians or their heirs, regardless of tribe, degree of blood, or place of residence, should be given immediate control of their lands and the revenue therefrom now in the hands of the Federal Government. The allocation of their respective shares in their tribal funds or per capita payments should be made and they should now be given their share of all tribal money on deposit with the Federal Government, which is now being handled and used by the Indian Bureau and its puppet tribal councils, which councils can only do what the Indian Bureau allows them to do. This money belongs to the Indians and should be paid to them. Advancement and self-sufficiency of a people comes through the free use of their initiative—not paternalism or bureaucratic direction. Indians are not an exception to this well-established rule.

INDIAN BUREAU MUST GO

The Indians should be released from Federal supervision as quickly as possible. The Indian Bureau will not go voluntarily. It has been nourished and warmed too long. It will have to be kicked out by the Congress.

Disaster on the Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, no thoughtful American can deny the fact that there is possibility of disaster on our national horizon. I have just read a statement from a great American who has confidence in the judgment of the American people and their ability to take the proper action when they realize what a crisis we are in. In this, he makes suggestions which are so practical that none of us should fail to heed them. Under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the Record the following statement by Mr. Nathaniel Leverone, one of the thoughtful citizens of Chicago and of the United States:

DISASTER ON THE HORIZON

(By Nathaniel Leverone, chairman of the board, Automatic Canteen Co. of America)

I have great confidence in America's future, but that does not prevent me from being deeply concerned over the present socialistic trend.

Right now the Nation is in the midst of a great crisis—in fact, it is facing an internal danger much more destructive than any A-bomb attack or invasion by a hostile power. The danger is more acute because the average man does not seem to be aware of it and hence he is doing nothing to prevent it.

We are feverishly working to prepare ourselves to meet any attempted attacks from without, but we are overlooking almost entirely the danger of complete internal collapse, which will be bound to take place unless we prepare to meet and defeat this new enemy—inflation.

Inflation is growing by leaps and bounds and is affecting every American family. It is destroying the value of their insurance policies, of their savings accounts, of everything else they have strived for to protect them and their families as they grow older.

Few incomes have kept pace with the increase in the cost of living, and as inflation continues to grow, it is only a question of a short time before it begins to reach the same proportions it did in Germany in the disastrous years following World War I. At that time the mark lost its value so rapidly that workers were paid daily at noontime in order that they might attempt to buy needed food and clothing before prices became prohibitive that same day. In spite of the fact that wages were increased almost daily, the income never kept up with the increased prices. Finally, as many of you will recall, laborers collected millions of marks for pay for a single day's work and actually used wheelbarrows to carry the necessary marks—in paper money—to have enough to pay for ordinary purchases. There were not enough printing presses in Germany to print new marks fast enough to keep pace with the drop in purchasing power. The result was that the entire economic structure of Germany was destroyed, and she entered the most disastrous period in her history.

Keen students who have no interest in either political party are agreed that we are going down the same road that Germany did, and unless something is done promptly, we may find ourselves in that same tragic situation that Germany did following the other world war. So let America beware.

However, I have confidence in the judgment of the American people and in their ability to take the proper action when they realize what a crisis we are in. So the important question now is how can inflation be stopped. You, as an individual, can do your share in this fight. Here are some suggestions.

Watch your purchases carefully, weighing the merits of each, buying only what you need, and, above all, avoid "scare buying." Don't be stampeded into buying something you do not need, at too high a price, because there is going to be a shortage of it. Isn't it much better to do without something unnecessary now than to have to do without necessities later?

You should write to your Congressmen. Tell them of your fears about inflation—let them know that they are accountable to you for their actions in Congress—that you do not intend to be represented by anyone who votes against the Nation's welfare by voting for extravagance. Elected officials pay attention to the people whose vote put them in office, and if you and enough other good citizens will cry out against governmental extravagance, it will be corrected.

Buy Defense Bonds. Every dollar invested wisely in savings is a dollar enlisted against inflation. Inflation, in its most simplified form, is a case of too many dollars in circulation. If you help keep more and more money circulating, you speed the pace of inflation. Every time you withdraw some cash for savings, you lessen the flow and help fight disaster.

I urge everyone who reads this to join the fight against inflation. Remember, no matter how difficult or painful the cure, the final stages of the disease itself mean the end of everything worth while for which America has always stood.

Time Running Out for Restoring Freedom in China as Mao Tse-tung Crushes All Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, time is working for Mao Tse-tung because he uses this time to kill off his opposition. As he gradually consolidates his position, the chances of freeing China become ever slimmer.

I present herewith the seventh and last in a series of articles by Everett S. Allen, which appeared in the New Bedford Standard-Times on July 2, 1951.

TIME RUNNING OUT AS CHIANG IS AWAITED TO OVERTHROW MAO

(By Everett S. Allen)

If Mao Tse-tung's Chinese Communist Government ever sits at a conference table with the Western Powers, it will constitute only a temporary diversion, designed to give him more time to build up his military strength. Mao views the United States as his principal foreign enemy. America, by virtue of contributing the major portion of UN military forces in Korea, has caused his alleged government acute embarrassment and possible serious trouble.

The ramifications are numerous within China. The Communists' civil program has been slowed down and their demands in men, money, and food stepped up heavily. Their

army, once heavily volunteer, now is largely conscript. All this has come at a time when Communist control over loosely joined China still is far from crystallized.

Result has been an obvious building up of silent resentment, and there have been noticeable, widespread signs of non-cooperation—passive, yet formidable in the light of China's enormous population. The purge certainly was scheduled anyway, for the Communist Party in China planned to cut its estimated 5,000,000 membership down to a total of 3,000,000 or fewer. And certainly political dissidents would have been removed according to plan. But the burden of Korea has forced acceleration of this purge, to keep the grumbling public aware of the iron hand's strength.

Probably the greatest advantage in time lies with the Communists. It has even been estimated that if Chiang does not make a major mainland strike within a year the corps of organizers on whom he should be able to count will have been killed off, one by one, without ever having had a chance to fight.

Neutralization of the Nationalist forces on Formosa by the United States Seventh Fleet, in accordance with President Truman's policy, prevents any move against the mainland Communists. This plays into the hands of Mao's government, for he is thus given time to stabilize an uneasy regime by eliminating opposition piece by piece.

Although it is true the Nationalists still reserve right of decision and could attack if they chose, such a move would be suicidal. The United States is their only hope for supplies, if they displease us, they won't get any. This happened to them once, and the memory is still fresh and painful.

Manchuria is a good example of the advantage that time gives the Communists, that Province now is Sovietized and would be a much harder nut to crack, for example, than the relatively unorganized areas of southern China. Given time and pressured by the methods the Communists know so well, the most rebellious populace can be brought to heel.

Communist control now is strongest in the west and northwest of China, it is not nearly so rigid in the south. It is tightest in the cities; the rural areas, with their tremendous distances and poor transportation, are much more difficult to systematize.

BITTER TOWARD BRITAIN

Thinking Chinese, perhaps 10 percent of the population, are bitter against Britain for recognizing Mao's government; they feel she was motivated by pounds and not principles. If the United States or the United Nations sits down at a conference table with Mao to discuss peace terms, they will say, "The west has betrayed us again. They are still deluded by Mao's barbarians, whom they consider as agrarian reformers instead of seeing them as they are, neophytes of the Russian NKVD, country cousins of the Red army."

They feel Mao cannot possibly carry on a long-range war in Korea on the present scale; lack of resources will force him to the wall. Further, they say Mao lost some of his Communist support, because he bowed to Russian will in the matter of engaging in the Korean war.

As for Chiang Kai-shek, he is no national idol. Many of China's thinking people declare he certainly is not the man to lead the country to a new future, possibly under some form of modified socialism. They look for a new political party and a new leader; as yet neither has appeared on China's horizon.

Critics of Chiang say he is an advocate of the spoils system and has an unfortunate knack for surrounding himself with incompetent officials whose primary interest is to squeeze out of a job all possible cumshaw and kick-backs, for their own enrichment.

But Chiang is accepted as the logical figure to lead the Communist overthrow by all shades of opinion. Even his adversaries say, "We would rally around a figure with horns and a tail, if he would bring a sizable, competent force—with a reasonable chance of victory, against the Mao government."

They are waiting for him to come now, confident that if he is reasonably prepared, he will win by sheer weight of numbers in a drive borne up by the people's desire for freedom from terror.

TIME RUNNING OUT

They feel time is running out, and fast. They foresee the time when the Communists will have killed every adult who is of no use to them, when all-out war against the Christian church—temporarily held in abeyance—will have wiped out this last link with the peoples of the west.

In Europe, the Communists found how easy it was to control an entire nation with a few key persons in the right places. It is even simpler in China, because of the illiteracy and lack of national organization.

Even though communism attacks their most intimate beliefs—the sanctity of the family and the dignity of the individual—China only sits in ponderous lethargy. Some day, in some century, the very weight of this passivity would wear out communism, like rain beating on a stone. But there are better ways and faster.

Nationalists, landing to establish a bridgehead in south China, might be expected to find, among persons of military age, a ratio of 19 anti-Communists to every Communist. Almost any of these young men, if they must fight, would rather fight in China than go to Korea which currently appears to them inevitable and illogical.

Chinese intelligentsia realize the Korean war—terrible though it is—is holding the attention of the western allies on the Far East. Otherwise, they know very well Mao probably would have been permitted to run roughshod over China, and perhaps would even have been given assistance by the West. Even now, they half expect America will join in an appeasement of the Chinese Communist regime.

And if fighting stops in Korea, they conjecture, will not the eyes of the West turn toward Europe, with which a closer kinship is felt? If so, the Mao government, uncomfortably spotlighted for the past year, may withdraw into comparative obscurity to continue its Sovietizing of China. And the West's natural apathy toward China will settle in once more.

But the Chinese still have a warm feeling for America and for reasons which our Government would least suspect. Not because of UNRRA, which spent lavishly and took tractors to areas where there is no gasoline so that now they are used for hen roosts. Not because of Federal propaganda agencies which told Chinese how they could do their farming in half the time and then did not tell them what to do with the half they had saved. And not because of the American displays of books and captioned photographs, created at great expense, which toured areas characterized principally by illiteracy. Nor even because of the "Voice of America," which can not begin to compete with the grass-roots, town-to-town broadcasts and oratory of the Sovietized propaganda.

The Communists are clever that way. They have gone to many places which Westerners never touched and are, therefore, the first new influence to make itself felt in those areas in generations.

But in sections where the Americans have been—usually along the coast or in the larger communities, the Chinese have a warm feeling for them. They do not understand democracy as such, but they have come to associate it with a virile, young country called the United States, where the living is good and everyone has a wonderful opportunity.

Russians scoff at Americans because they give away candy bars and are sentimental about their families. China will never forget the uninhibited GI who passed out chocolate and cigarettes, bounced slant-eyed babies on his knee and grinned because he could not speak any of the language. The Chinese will long remember the American mission schools, hospitals and churches and the patient work of Catholics and Protestants who sought to bring light and help.

FILMS HAVE BIG INFLUENCE

And the influence of American films is greater than most persons in this country realize. Communists recognized the worth of this medium immediately. They banned United States movies and distributed their own. But the Chinese still remember Clark Gable, Hedy Lamarr, My Blue Heaven, and the skyscrapers. Where America has made any inroads of feeling at all, the relationship is basically friendly.

What we do next, since obviously we are in a position to chart the new course if we choose, will determine what happens to that relationship.

Meanwhile, Mao's "agrarian reform" goes on. Every Chinese peasant will be given some land—even if it is only 6 feet of land, under which he can lie through eternity, attempting to dream away the bitterness of tragic disillusion.

Visual Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American people are fast learning that this is a visual age as well as an atomic age.

Never before in man's history has he had more occasion to use his eyesight in viewing flickering images from which he learns, is informed, is entertained, is aroused.

The Members of Congress themselves are finding that motion pictures and television are increasingly affecting them in the legislative and political affairs of this Nation.

At this time I have prepared a statement reviewing some of the current developments in these fields as they affect Congress and America as a whole.

The particular occasion for this statement is the publication this month in the magazine "Educational Screen" of an article which I personally contributed on the subject of Congressmen's use of the visual medium in contacting the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, my statement, the article, and various materials along this line.

There being no objection, the statement, article, and other matters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

MOTION PICTURES AND TELEVISION IN THE AMERICA OF TOMORROW

In perhaps no single other area of activity today is there more dynamic development than in the field of motion pictures and tele-

vision. Wherever one looks in these fields, one notes significant occurrences which may powerfully affect American life, sometimes in obvious, sometimes in subtle ways that we of today can barely guess.

One can quickly run down a whole series of such developments.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TV

(a) Here in Congress a considerable number of bills have been introduced dealing with television and particularly its educational aspects.

(b) The Ford Foundation has set up a million-dollar television workshop which will provide a wide range of educational features to commercial stations—programs which the workshop hopes to have eventually sponsored so that the workshop and the stations will thereby cover the costs.

(c) The FCC has tentatively decided to reserve some 200 channels for schools and universities.

(d) Over in Berlin, Germany for 14 days there has been a tremendous demonstration of American TV sponsored by the Radio Corp of America, the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Economic Cooperation Administration for 100,000 Berliners. It is estimated that one-sixth of the city's western population have "gotten the TV bug"—have seen and been enthralled by American TV, have gotten a graphic demonstration of what the American way of life can produce.

(e) Back in this country, while the RCA-CBS color television pot boils, Nation-wide black and white network television now includes all but 11 of the country's 65 cities served by television. In these network communities are 94 of the 107 operating television stations.

The 11 TV cities having a total of 13 stations which are not part of the network are in the far South, the Southwest, and the Pacific Northwest.

(f) Meanwhile, whole new vistas are possible in the development of subscription television if that medium is ever given the green light.

(g) Consider, too, the advances being made in theater television.

(h) Ponder the significance of the proposed merger between the American Broadcasting Co. and United Paramount Theaters.

Mix these developments together—consider their domestic and foreign implications, consider their complicated legal aspects, their effects on sports, etc., and you get quite a brew.

I mention these matters together because I feel that it is important that we in the Congress take the time to look at this total pattern.

Now, let us continue.

MOVIE TIME, U S A.

At this point, let us not forget that equally momentous developments are taking place in motion pictures. That great industry which already has contributed so abundantly to the pool of performers, producers, directors, writers, and other technicians of television, is observing Movietime, U S A., the golden jubilee of construction of its first theater. By means of Movietime, U S A., this mighty industry which has carried American culture to the far corners of the world is focusing the attention of our citizens and all others on the monumental achievements of United States cinema art.

By this campaign, the movie industry is using its traditional competitive salesmanship to meet head-on its current problems, particularly those posed by that lusty infant of visual media—television.

Those of us who are familiar with Hollywood's generous services to a great many patriotic causes—war bonds, blood donations, USO, community chests, infantile paralysis drives, etc., note that for once the movie industry is taking the time to bespeak its own cause. It is certainly eminently justified in that respect.

Now, let me point out that no man in public life can ignore all of these basic motion picture and TV developments, because obviously they affect all of the American people, particularly the Nation's young folks. Whole culture patterns of America are being changed, just as once the American automobile so dynamically revolutionized American life.

1952 ELECTION CAN HINGE ON FILMS AND TV

The man in public affairs finds that he too is being impacted by television and films. Almost everyone clearly recognizes that the 1952 Presidential campaign may well hinge on the opposing candidates' use of television and motion pictures.

The Republican and Democratic National Committees will be exceptionally active therefore in television. The 1952 party nominating conventions in Chicago will probably see the greatest single use of television that has ever occurred for a similar political gathering.

CRIME COMMITTEE HEARINGS SET MANY PRECEDENTS

Speaking personally, as one of the five members of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I saw how unprecedented television could dramatically impact the American people as never before.

In New York today there is currently being waged an important political campaign. There, one of the chief candidates for the presidency of the New York City Council is Mr. Rudolph Halley, the brilliant young chief counsel of our committee, who first came to Nation-wide public attention during the hearings in New York. He is accenting television in his live-wire campaign for that important post.

Here in Washington, the House Radio Recording Facility, under Mr. Robert Carr, has produced some 30 to 35 TV films showing legislators describing current events. These films, mostly 4½ minutes, but some 2 minutes or 9 minutes, are then shipped back to TV stations in the home districts or States.

TV COULD BECOME CRUCIAL IN NATIONAL CRISIS

I, for one, have long pointed out that some day television may become the very means by which the Nation itself may survive.

I visualize a day (although we pray it will never come) when possibly the city of Washington might be under enemy attack, and the Congress would have to disperse to widely scattered areas. From these centers, by means of a TV hookup, legislators could communicate with one another and could debate and vote on important issues. In these scattered areas, the legislator would be relatively immune from enemy attack. Think, too, of the potentialities of television in the event of such an attack insofar as the continued functioning of the armed services of the Nation would be concerned, and insofar as instructions are concerned to citizens on what to do and how to do it so as to keep the economy rolling.

WISCONSIN INTERESTED IN VIDEO FOR EDUCATION

I have before me still other evidence of the awareness of television's dramatic possibilities. The week before last, the Wisconsin State Radio Council filed a statement with the Federal Communications Commission relating to the proposed allocation of TV frequencies for educational use. The council, which now operates a network of State-supported AM and FM broadcasting stations, asked the FCC to amend its original proposal which was to reserve six frequency assignments for Wisconsin educational television use. The council seeks to reserve instead 12 frequencies for my State.

The council has estimated that such a network would cost around \$3,000,000.

The manager of the State radio council, Mr. H. B. McCarty, pointed out that the filing of the statement with the FCC by the council didn't constitute an application for

the frequencies, but was intended to convince Federal authorities that the TV envisioned for Wisconsin should be planned on what was felt to be a practical basis, which would cover the educational needs of the whole State.

Mr. McCarty also pointed out that no formal proposal has been made by the State radio council to the people of my State nor to the legislature at Madison for any TV broadcasting service.

"The State Radio Council's proposal to the FCC pointed out that the capital outlay involved in setting up a TV station, was considerably "less than the estimated cost of a single high-school building now under construction in a town of 25,000 inhabitants."

The Wisconsin State Radio Council consists of 10 leading State officials headed by Gov. Walter Kohler, Jr.

Incidentally, the chief executive of our State has indicated his firm support of the application for more TV frequency reservations.

I mention these facts as symptomatic not only of the potential revolution in the class room, which can be wrought by television, but also as examples of the thinking of educational and cultural sources throughout the Nation.

CRITICISMS OF STATE AM, FM, AND TV

I do want to point out that the matter of appropriating public funds for construction of radio stations has become an issue of considerable controversy in my State. There are many people who believe that the State might better devote its energies toward securing time on regular commercial broadcasting stations, rather than investing funds in constructing its own stations. Many feel that there are whole questions of public policy which arise from a State government competing for listener time with private broadcasting stations. Many feel, too, that a State radio or TV system would be misused by the politically ambitious.

Just last week the Milwaukee Common Council went on record against public ownership of an educational video station in Milwaukee. By a 20-to-3 vote, the aldermen adopted a resolution opposing public TV ownership at this time, and urging the Federal Communications Commission to remove from channel 10, there, the noncommercial education designation that has been placed on it. The council resolution stated, however, that commercial TV stations should agree to devote 15 percent of their broadcasting time to educational programs.

I do not propose to enter into, much less, to settle this controversy at the present time, because I think it is a matter for the people to solve at a State and local level. I do, however, want to mention the problem as significant of the ferment in the broadcasting and telecasting medium on the part of educational and related groups.

LIBRARIES GETTING INTO FILM WORK

While the commercial aspects of both films and TV are necessarily to the fore, the educational and cultural aspects are indeed exciting interest everywhere. For example, libraries are increasingly recognizing the challenge which is theirs.

Thus, the Wisconsin Library Association which has found that TV programs are competing with the reading of books, has just set up a circuit-film service for some of its member libraries. This series, the third of its kind in our country, was, in the words of a newspaper write-up, "deemed a countermove to compete with radio, television, commercial films, and picture magazines for public attention."

According to the WLA program, as presently set up, 6 participating public libraries will receive from 5 to 10 educational films a month.

The program was designed by the Wisconsin Free Library Commission at Madison and by the State bureau of visual education.

The library in Chippewa Falls, my home town, will be one of the participating regional libraries. It, like other libraries will draw from a pool of 45 films intended to stimulate public interest in library service. I might note, incidentally, that the first two States to set up such a service were Missouri and Washington. Next year, Wisconsin is expected to bring in additional libraries under the plan.

Dr. W. A. Wittig, director of the bureau of visual education at Madison, has said that the sponsors hope to inspire people to return to the library as a great storehouse of information.

"The public has been weaned from the reading habit," he said, "by the great clamor for attention by radio, TV, picture shows, and picture magazines. Unless we examine that competition critically and seek to meet it, there is great danger that the voice of the library will be drowned out."

REVOLUTION IN THE CLASSROOM

Every thinking American realizes that in no segment of America does the visual medium offer more dramatic possibilities than among America's children. Movies and television open up whole new worlds for the growing, developing, flexible minds of our children.

In the September 1951 issue of the famous magazine *Think*, published monthly by the International Business Machines Corp., there is a splendid article entitled "Revolution in the Classroom." This article points out the miraculous way in which, by the use of films, our Nation's young folks can be better educated, faster educated.

Recognizing, as I do, that the Nation's future depends, of course, on these young folks, I feel it my duty as a Senator to encourage to the greatest extent this use of the film medium by American education.

SENATOR WILEY'S 16-MILLIMETER SOUND FILM

It is a pleasure to have actually contributed, in turn, in some small way to this process. Ever since September 1950 there have been circulating in the schools of my State prints of an educational film entitled "America in Crisis," prepared by my staff and myself. The film is subtitled "Senator WILEY Reports to Bill Jones, an Average Wisconsinite."

The amazing reception which this little film has received has surpassed my fondest expectations. Although a year has gone by, and although the prints have been in continuous circulation all that time, there have been whole periods recently when the flood of incoming requests for prints has exhausted the quantity of 25 prints available. I do not flatter myself into believing that this is because of the intrinsic merit of the film. I think the film does make a small contribution, but I think the response to it reflects in considerable part the deep hunger of schools and other groups for constructive film material. It reflects the pleasure of folks in seeing on the screen in a graphic, dramatic way, the problems of our country in this challenging period.

That is why the prints, too, have received such tremendous circulation among adult groups throughout Wisconsin.

I might note at this point that thus far the requests for the film from inside Wisconsin have been so frequent that with but few exceptions it has not been possible to show it outside the State to the many groups which have asked for a print. It was shown, however, to a political club in Louisiana and to a National Guard unit on maneuvers in Tennessee and to some few other out-of-State groups.

It is an amazing fact that in all this time—one solid year of showing—never once has any charge of partisanship been leveled

against the film, and I have not received a single adverse communication, although it has been shown before every type of group—of every political faith and during the stormiest political times.

ENTHUSIASTIC LETTERS ENDORSE FILM

What do our people really think of this film? Let them speak for themselves. Excerpts from their letters follow this statement. I have selected these quotations as representative of a great many more messages which I have received. While these excerpts have very graciously commended the film, I realize that folks would indeed tend to be gracious in their response for a courtesy of making the film available to them. Nevertheless, I see in these messages genuine sincerity and enthusiasm, and I am deeply appreciative of their fine spirit. I submit them in order to help prove to my colleagues that a venture in an educational film proves very rewarding and more than compensates for the time, effort, and yes, the money expended in it.

A Member of Congress cannot assume that he is a D. W. Griffith, or a Cecil B. DeMille. The art of making motion pictures requires a great many complex skills which neither we nor our staffs can hope to possess, but we can offer in a simply, unaffected, straightforward way our views on film and the people will accept them in that light.

By means of an extended 22-minute film like my own, or even by a 2-minute film (clip used in a local video station showing a Congressman discussing current issues, the thinking of our people is stimulated. Films help weld the contacts between Washington and the grass roots of our country. Incidentally, films also help a legislator to first clarify his own thinking so as to be able to convey that thinking to his people.

I conclude by presenting the various materials previously mentioned:

1. Excerpts of quotations to me regarding my film.

2. The text of my article in *Educational Screen*, September 1951 issue.

3. The text of the article in *Think* entitled "Revolution in the Classroom."

QUOTATIONS FROM LETTERS TO SENATOR WILEY PRAISING HIS FILM

A businessman in Appleton: "I have seen your film, *America in Crisis*, and I want to compliment you for giving the citizens of Wisconsin this enlightening film. You can't get out a film of this kind without a tremendous lot of time and thought. We need more films like this and a program whereby we are assured they will be shown."

A co-op sales association manager in Milwaukee: "I want to take this opportunity to thank you for sending it to us and will say that we very much enjoyed it. It's a wonderful picture."

The wife of a farmer in Beaver Dam: "The Elks Ladies of Beaver Dam were delighted to have had your film *America in Crisis* last night at their monthly meeting. The film arrived and is in perfect condition. It had been shown at a Beaver Dam defense meeting and at the high school earlier in the month."

"The Elks Ladies commented that they found this film informative, stimulating, purposeful and a true and grave picture of our country's crisis. Personally, I wish large industries would show this picture to their employees."

A county official in Green Lake: "I showed the film last night at a sportsmen's meeting held in Berlin last night and it was enjoyed by all. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for forwarding the film and believe same to be very educational."

A club officer in Merrill: "We received the film you sent us and after showing it to our Rotary Club and several classes at the vocational school we forwarded it as per your instructions. We had many very favorable

comments on the film and I would estimate that 125 people saw the showing."

A leader of the Thirty-second Division Veteran Association in Milwaukee: "I believe the Red Arrow men in Milwaukee enjoyed your films and the subject surely was very timely. It also gave us a close-up view of our institutions in Washington and sort of created a tie between Washington and Milwaukee that should be beneficial to all concerned."

A parent in Merrill: "Your film *America in Crisis* came to us well before our scheduled screening time. We previewed the film and were very pleased with it. We had a Washington program at school to which the parents were invited and the film was shown then. Heard many fine comments on the film. It was taken to the high school for their Washington program to which the public was invited. On February 23 it was shown at the St. John's Parochial School—so all the junior and senior high students saw the film, including the parents that were present. The principals of the respective schools commented very highly on the film."

An American Legion Auxiliary leader in Wisconsin Rapids: "Thank you very much for the use of your film *America in Crisis*. Despite the fact that this program was scheduled on Ash Wednesday in 28 below zero weather we had about 40 auxiliary members in attendance."

"I had many favorable comments on your film and I certainly felt a great deal more was presented to the unit, than I would have been able to do in a prepared talk."

A Masonic officer in Waupaca: "The film has received a great deal of favorable comment and interest from the students at the high school, Lions Club, and our chapter. The approximate number seeing the film was 225. In view of the fact that we borrowed the sound projector from the school, they asked if they could screen the film before their classes in civics and social science. The Lions Club also heard about the film and asked if they might screen it for their Monday meeting. The general comment was favorable and that it was an instructive film."

A village officer in Weyerhaeuser: "We showed this film to an overflowing crowd at our village hall last night. Everybody present liked it very well. It's the kind of picture every American should see. We want to thank you for the loan of this remarkable picture."

A theater manager in Eau Claire (on the 35-millimeter version): "We played your short subject at this theater over the week end and I am sure that you will be happy to know that the comments from the patrons were very good. I personally thought it contained a very fine message on the subject of preparedness."

A trade-association manager in Milwaukee: "We are pleased to convey to you that the entire membership who attended our annual meeting appreciated very much the excellent film, *America in Crisis*. It is our candid opinion that this method of portraying historical events and Washington scenes is very educational. It also apprises the people of the State that we do have men in Congress who are deeply interested in protecting our American way of life. We are very grateful to have had the opportunity to show your film to our members."

A parochial-school principal in Eau Claire: "Thanks so much for your kindness in sending it to us. The students enjoyed it and it gave them food for thought."

A school sister in Kenosha: "We have shown the film *America in Crisis* to our seventh and eighth grade boys and girls, which include about a hundred pupils, and their reaction to it was very favorable."

"It fitted in nicely with the civics that is being taught in our school at the present time."

A librarian in Fort Atkinson: "The film was shown seven times here, to a total audience of 180. It was enjoyed and made people think about our current problems."

From a businessman in La Crosse: "I wish to express my appreciation for the use of your film. We showed it at our Toastmaster's Club of which I am an officer and also to the Shrine Club's quarterly meeting of which I am a member. One of our Shrine brothers, a teacher at one of our schools, asked to show this film tonight. So we made good use of it while it was here and we had some fine comments on same."

[From the Educational Screen]

"CONGRESS, THE PEOPLE, AND EDUCATIONAL FILMS"

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

Can a legislator stimulate the thinking of his constituents through the use of motion pictures? The answer is of course, yes. But it is not an answer which need be based on guesswork; rather, it can be proven in an actual illustration of a 16-millimeter sound motion picture entitled "*America in Crisis*" which I produced and distributed throughout my State.

In January 1950 I developed the idea that I should prepare such a picture so that through the magic of the audio-visual medium I might acquaint the people of my State with the basic problem of world peace in our times.

A small number of other 16-millimeter motion pictures had previously been prepared from time to time by other Members of Congress. Most of these films consisted, however, merely of collections of standard travelogue shots, i. e., scenes of the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Capitol, and so forth.

I felt that while it was essential that our people become familiar with these great landmarks of American freedom, it was infinitely more important to focus the attention of our people on some of the crucial present-day legislative and executive dilemmas.

I had my staff contact various Government agencies to see what footage might be available in their film collections on current-day problems. The staff contacted the National Archives, the United States Department of Agriculture, the Signal Corps of the United States Army, and other Federal agencies, in addition to private film collections. (The latter were used ultimately only for ideas contained in their films rather than for actual "borrowing" of footage.)

My staff quickly confirmed that there are, of course, available literally millions upon millions of pertinent film shots made by Government photographic departments and that probably 99.99 percent of this footage has been used exclusively by the executive branch rather than by any member of the legislative branch.

Unfortunately, we could devote time to this motion picture project only infrequently as at irregular intervals amidst the heavy schedule of the Senate. The project could not have a high priority in the office since I had to attend to an average of 300 letters arriving each day from constituents, in addition to participating in meetings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and later the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

Moreover, commencing actively in August 1950, I was engaged in a political campaign for renomination in the Republican primary and then for reelection.

I recognized, of course, that to some extent, any film that would be released during a campaign season would almost inevitably be labeled as "campaign propaganda" even though it might be sincerely intended for educational purposes. Mean-

while, in June 1950 had come the North Korean invasion which brought to a head the very problems I had been intending to present on the motion picture screen. Therefore, I felt it worth while to carry through with the project even though its educational effectiveness might to some extent be reduced by the partisan campaign.

The month of September saw the actual substantive work start on the picture. Members of my staff went to various Government projection rooms and there and in "Movieola" machines scanned through some thousands of feet of tentatively chosen film in order to make the final selection. From one Signal Corps film, they selected scenes showing American infantry in battle, scenes of the first atomic explosion in history in the New Mexican desert. From another film, they collected scenes of a 1930 dust bowl, an industrial dispute, a bread-line. Gradually, the clipped footage was assembled into a coherent pattern. Some 20 musical pieces (carefully selected to be free of copyright so as to avoid the expense of royalty) were secured for the sound track.

One morning, we put the finishing touches on the film at the Engineer's research development laboratory at Fort Belvoir, Va., which had been loaned to us. There, I recorded my portion of the narrative on the sound track. This portion of the film lasts for but a very few moments. Thereafter, the narration is taken over by a professional announcer and by voices of members of my staff. Thus, my own role in the film both on the sound track and on the screen is very limited. The film revolves around issues and principles rather than around any single personality.

We chose as the basic theme of "*America in Crisis*"—Senator Wiley Reports to Bill Jones, an Average Wisconsinite. The opening scene shows a veteran (one of whose arms had actually been amputated because of battle wounds) ascending the steps of the Capitol. On the sound track, the veteran's voice is heard as he describes why he had wanted to come to Washington—to see what the Government for which he had fought was really like. As he looks at the Capitol he states that he can see in his mind's eye why his buddies are fighting in Korea. Then, we see superimposed on the Capitol actual scenes of United States ground troops in combat.

Thereafter the film switches to my office, where I am seen briefly speaking to Bill Jones and introducing the report on America's problems. From there on, we view the documentary footage collected from the Government agencies. Initially, we show scenes of Washington itself, of the three branches of our Government, legislative, executive, and judicial, in operation. Then the professional narrator's voice takes over and he describes our basic domestic and foreign problems—prosperity and depression, freedom and slavery, war and peace. We see scenes of America's great freedoms, freedom to worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the air waves, etc. We see scenes of the bitter mid-thirties, when hunger and strife stalked the land.

Our camera moves to the world scene. We see the price which America paid in World War II, scenes of dead Americans lying in the surf of an embattled Pacific island. We see and hear a bugle sounding taps in a final tribute to the honored dead at Arlington National Cemetery and in particular, to the Unknown Soldier. The prelude to a possible World War III is then shown as Marshal Josef Stalin come into view, together with scenes of Russia's armed forces, scenes of the United Nations in action, and a map of Korea.

The film concludes with my voice urging the American people to seek further facts on the issues shown, to choose their leaders wisely, to vote soundly in order that they

might maintain the peace, keep their freedom, and secure a lasting prosperity. The film suggests no panacea, it attempts no profound analysis, it does, however, focus on the problems and urges earnest evaluation of them.

On the night of September 25, 1950, we screened the 22-minute film at the Academia Theater at the Washington headquarters of the Motion Picture Association of America. The MPA had kindly made available its facilities that night, and we had invited a very fine audience consisting of representatives of the movie trade press, of newspapers, radio, Capitol Hill, and Government agencies.

The response to the film that night was tremendously gratifying. While it was expected that the usual type of gracious, formal comment would be received, I sincerely felt that the warm response was most spontaneous and exceptionally kind.

I arranged for five 16-millimeter prints of the film to be prepared, and immediately sent out notices to Wisconsin organizations advising them of the film's availability. Within a short time, I had received a deluge of requests for the prints. Wisconsin newspapers added more references to the film and it was not long before the incoming requests had snowballed. We found ourselves so far behind in trying to schedule screenings that additional prints were ordered. Ultimately, a total of twenty-five 16-millimeter prints were secured and sent out. By a system of tight scheduling, the same print was shown in an, let us say, American Legion post in Racine and within 72 hours thereafter in a woman's club in Kenosha. Each print's schedule was prepared so that it remained in approximately the same geographic area, thus saving time in transit. Thus, within 6 weeks the film had been seen by a vast variety of farms, school, church, business, labor, civic, and other groups in 49 of Wisconsin's 71 counties.

In addition, several film libraries, both public and private, requested prints and they were gladly given permanent custody of them.

Virtually all of the expenses of the film had been borne out of my own pocket (including cost of repair of the prints, a cost that proved somewhat substantial since the handling of a film by amateurs is often not very skillful). The only cost to the Federal Government was the reproduction of the master print of its own documentary footage and the loaning on a few occasions of Federal lab facilities (which were costing Uncle Sam money, whether we used them or not).

An order to reach the widest possible audience, it was felt that some prints might be made for motion-picture theaters if a demand developed. What had been anticipated happened, and soon it became advisable to reproduce five 35-millimeter prints. These too, were snapped up as fast as they were sent out and a system of tight scheduling saw audiences multiply many fold. The Independent Theater Owner's Association of Wisconsin has been particularly helpful in arranging screenings.

Soon, too, a request was received from Station KSTP-TV in St. Paul and the film was shown over that outlet.

The entire experience of this project has been tremendously rewarding. The comparatively small total of man-hours put into this project (aside from the long intervals in between work, dating the film's conception in January)—that total seemed a well-justified use of my own and my employees' time, from the public standpoint.

On the political phase, it is a fact that the large number of people who saw the film prior to the election may have been somewhat more kindly disposed to vote for me. However, even in the heat of the election debate, no single message—verbal or written—was received in protest against any partisan angling in the film. The narration

and selection of footage are obviously conservative in approach, but no objection has been received from any source.

As I have indicated, there was a minimum of live scenes in the film. Only a few score feet were actually shot in my office and elsewhere. These scenes were taken by cameramen graciously made available by the Republican National Committee, and they in turn, assisted in the assemblage of the footage, in the recording of the sound track and other technical operations. The national committee took a very broad and public-spirited view of the film. It absorbed the cost for this technical manpower and secured reimbursement from me only for the actual charges for the raw film.

The precedent we set has apparently encouraged my colleagues. At the present time, the Joint Senate-House Radio Recording Facility is beginning to work on the preparation of television films for use of Members of the Congress. Thus, a Member desiring to produce a short film can go over to the studio, be photographed, can, in addition, record his voice on a tape (to be played as "stock" shots are shown on the screen) and then have the reel sent to his local station. Many of these stations are even willing to pay the cost of the film itself since there is such a shortage of usable subjects on TV stations. Of course, this service is necessarily limited to films used prior to political campaigns.

The whole TV approach is, of course, destined for a tremendous boom as the November 1952 election approaches. It is quite clear that both in the Presidential and congressional races, television as well as 16- and 35-millimeter motion pictures will play the greatest part that audio-visual media have ever played in American political history. The political party and the candidates who best recognize the nature of this medium, its problems, its advantages, its limitations, will have a tremendous advantage over their foes. The pioneering television achievement of Thomas E. Dewey in ably answering vast numbers of questions on the TV screen during the closing days of the New York gubernatorial race in November 1950, that precedent set a standard that other candidates will try to match.

I do hope that other seekers of public office will blaze new paths in this field because it is in the public interest that the most modern media be used by legislators to keep in touch with the American public. The miracle medium of television in particular offers a golden opportunity for reaching vast audiences that hitherto could be contacted only by radio or, very inadequately, by meetings face to face.

If an office seeker adheres faithfully to the concept of encouraging thinking by his audience (rather than trying to give them canned, predigested ideas), if he utilizes the medium in an honest objective way then I believe that he can make tremendous contribution to public enlightenment. The candidate can in the process stimulate his own thinking, because no man can satisfactorily put a subject on film unless he has personally thought that subject out.

Never before in the history of America has it been more important that our people think and think clearly, and never before have we been better able to utilize visual media to encourage straight and clear thinking.

[From Think of September 1951]

REVOLUTION IN THE CLASSROOM

(By William A. Buck)

A flurry of snow was blowing up from the bay, but the children in the schoolroom paid no attention to the weather. By means of questions and discussion the teacher pointed out several things she wanted the children to observe in the story, and she wrote these down on the blackboard. Two boys closed

the window shades on the rolling snow and the movie projector threw its cheerful oblong on the screen.

The film was a simple documentary on the home life of a middle-class family in Montevideo, Uruguay. It showed the family at meals and on a picnic; it showed the children at school, doing their home work, practicing their music lessons, in all their daily pursuits. It pictured the life of the family with a fullness and intimacy that could not have been achieved if the class had been transported to Montevideo by magic carpet. The students followed the story in wide-eyed silence.

When it was over everybody raised their hands at once. The children and the teacher had gone through a moving emotional experience together, and in the students' minds the barriers between them were down. Small boys who seldom spoke up in class now clamored for attention. They had not missed a single point among the items the teacher had written on the board. The thin girl in the third row finally gained the floor to point out that the Montevideo family owned no electric refrigerator, no vacuum, no washing machine, yet they could afford a servant. The picture of the girls and boys of South America going on picnics, wrestling with home work and music lessons, filled the class with astonishment and delight. No one had ever told them that home work and music lessons were curses inflicted universally on civilized mankind. The students emptied the school library of books on South America and scores of clippings about Uruguay and its capital city appeared on the classroom bulletin board.

"I can't imagine a better method of teaching tolerance, social responsibility, the United Nations in fact, than a movie like this," the teacher observed. "I have seen the attitude of an entire class toward spelling change completely after seeing a single movie. The spelling didn't improve while I had them, but the attitude certainly did."

Edison, who invented the cinematograph—if any one man did—would have appreciated the fact that such adventures in teaching were daily events in American schools in 1951. During his early experience with pictures, some 60 years ago, he predicted that movies would entirely supplant textbooks within 10 years. He believed then that his pictures that moved would be used entirely for education, and never dreamed that some day people would go to the movie for fun. He was wrong about the textbook, also, for the movies show no signs of supplanting either the text or the teacher, and the discussion before and after the screening is as necessary as the film.

Before World War II American educators had carried on large experiments with teaching films, more than those of any other land, but the educational film industry was able to produce only about 30 films a year. Since the war the industry has grown like Paul Bunyan's blue ox. In 1950 the United States industry turned out between 1,600 and 2,000 titles. In the thirties there were about 1,000 sound projectors in the schools of the United States. Now there are more than 50,000 and the manufacturers were making another 50,000 last year. There are 10,000 or more titles on the shelves of educational film libraries today.

Educators knew long ago that the movies had amazing powers of teaching, but not until World War II did they have a full opportunity to give their theories a try-out. At once Uncle Sam had to teach the American people a thousand new arts. Sound movies and film strips provided a large part of the means for doing this; without them the war would undoubtedly have been longer and more costly. The entire film industry organized for the task. Famous directors combined their experience with that of fa-

mous educators. New techniques, dramatic methods of presenting educational material were developed.

The result is becoming a revolution in the classroom, nothing less. "Audio-visual Aids in the Armed Services," a report on the Army and Navy war-time experience with educational films, says this: "Films can produce a most any desired responses, predispose men to almost any course of action, alter basic attitudes in a short period of time, and motivate men to hitherto unacceptable modes of behavior. Drama, suspense, propaganda, adventure, sympathy, intense emotional feeling and desire for action are all inherent within motion pictures. In civilian education multisensory aids can open new vistas of experience, broaden the horizons of childhood and youth, and motivate serious study of personal and social problems."

Films have a more intimate and convincing command over reality than any other teaching medium. They can communicate subtle sequences of ideas that make sense only in relation to each other. They can do useful tricks with time and space, can make fancy more real than reality, can be simple or complex, subtle or broad, bombastic or literal without losing touch with reality. They can eliminate all the unessentials, can look around the instructor's elbows, so to speak, so that every student gets an immediate view of what is going on. They can bring the whole world and all past history alive into the classroom.

Where movies are shown, there is no discipline or attention problem. Before the title appears on the screen, the film takes the student right out of the school room and puts him in the pleasant and easy atmosphere of the movie house. Consider these titles in contrast to the old birch rod and the textbook. *Cotton Planting*, reveals in an 11-minute reel a growth cycle that takes almost a year. *The Internal Combustion Engine*, by means of cartoons and other methods, breaks down the lightning stroke in a gas engine to a slow pace so that the auto student may study it. *Circus Animals*, for the kindergarten and first grade, gives meaning and background to the words and events the pupils find in their readers. *This Charming Couple*, made on a college campus, with student actors, tells in dramatic story form the tale of a marriage and analyzes why it failed. *The Baby Sitter* takes a shrewd look at some of the problems of both sitter and parents. There are dozens of films that show in a few minutes scientific experiments that could not be performed in an hour in a school laboratory, some that cannot be performed at all with a school's resources.

Under experimental conditions the sound film method of teaching was compared with the old-fashioned method to show that classes in natural science gained 22 to 30 percent more knowledge when given a boost with movies, and music units gained 18 to 34 percent. The pupils not only absorbed more knowledge but retained it longer and more fully. This experience has been generally confirmed.

A New Castle, Pa., school system reported that ordinarily they expected 20 to 25 percent of first graders to turn up with reading troubles after the first 4 months. By using motion pictures they slashed this percentage to less than six. Many quarters agree that films do not turn children away from reading. In fact, some who would never wholly learn to read, who have no talent for handling words, can actually make this art their own through the help of audio-visual aids.

Suppose you were a Parent-Teachers' Association member and you wanted to introduce an audio-visual aids program in your school. Probably half the projectors used today in the schools were donated by PTA's. Will your program be expensive? No; surprisingly cheap. A magazine of audio-visual education estimates the cost of starting and

maintaining for 10 years a full audio-visual program, including the purchase of sound projectors, a 300-film library, film strips, opaque projectors, and so on, for a school system of 100 teachers and 3,600 pupils, at some \$10,000 a year if the equipment is used moderately, at \$19,000 a year if used abundantly, or \$2.69 to \$5.38 per pupil.

School systems find the longest economy in buying prints of most of the films they use, not only from a short, bookkeeping point of view, but also because experience has proved that teachers make more use of films if they are obtainable without much bother. Most black and white sound prints cost from \$40 to \$50 a reel; color costs double. Local merchants, civic clubs, and graduating classes often donate films to schools. Some, sponsored by governments, social research trusts, or private industry may be secured for nothing or almost nothing. Many of these are excellent.

The Educational Film Guide and the Film-strip Guide list nearly all the films there are, give a brief description of each film and its story, where it may be purchased and the price. Each producer and each library, of course, also has its catalog. Renting a title you want may or may not be easy. There is no proper national network of movie libraries, but there are commercial libraries in many cities. Many public libraries lend films. There are large college and university free libraries and others connected with public schools, religious and industrial organizations and Government agencies. The Superintendent of Documents in Washington offers a pamphlet called *A Directory of 897 16 Millimeter Film Libraries*.

For those who have their doubts about teaching movies, if such there be, Harold D. Lasswell, of Yale, stated, "It is not too much to say that audio-visual media of instruction make it possible for the first time to educate for citizenship in the world community. By themselves, words are poor substitutes for direct observation of the social process. Audio-visual media open the doors of experience on the globe as a whole and upon all human history."

Support Is Where You Find It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am picking up support everywhere I can get it in the rat race the bigshots are throwing me into.

Since that man of great stature, Chairman Pfeiffer, decreed that my new district would stretch clear to Timbuctoo, I have received a number of valued assurances of support all along the Erie line.

I include such a letter as follows:

ELMIRA, N. Y., October 14, 1951

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: I have been following with interest the recent moves by some of the New York State Republican cloak-and-dagger detail.

If you can get down this way and carry on the same campaign you have in the past you can get elected just as well as not.

My inclination has been to write a letter to the editor of the local *Star-Gazette* telling of my acquaintance with you. It is a Gannett paper of course but George Crandall, the executive editor is pretty fair.

If you would like me to do this or anything else in your behalf please let me know. I am not a local bigwig, wheel, or anything else but I do have some friends who might be influenced.

Any time you are in Elmira look me up. I would like to introduce you around here and there.

Cordially yours,

A. WHITNEY.

Growing Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I read an editorial or comment that says so much as this editorial by Lewis Haney. It certainly carries a great deal of fundamental thinking.

Mr. Haney is a professor of economics at New York University, and this fact alone should make it more worth while. We do not very often get such down-to-earth fundamental beliefs from eastern universities.

Here follows his comments from the *New York Journal-American* of October 10, 1951:

GROWING SOCIALISM

(By Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University)

Are our businessmen waking up to the danger of their position? Last week a number of leading bankers made strong speeches against the waste, inflation, and restraints on individual freedom that threaten us today.

Now comes the head of the American Petroleum Institute with one of the most penetrating discussions I have seen. Let us hope this is the shot that will be heard around the American business world.

W. Alton Jones, president of Cities Service Co., in addressing the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, said: Groups in both political parties are paying lip service to individual freedom, but are tightening the Government's grip on our personal liberties.

Said he: "During the past two decades the United States has moved in the direction of communism through Government control over saving, production, wages, hours, and prices. We must act promptly, or before we know it our savings will be gone and we shall be reduced to the level of the Government-dominated countries of the Old World."

In view of these strong and multiplied attacks on the creeping socialism that has infected us, I want to list below some of the evidences that too many American businessmen have been asleep. Here is my indictment of them:

1. They have fallen for and subsidized the publication of advertisements that attack the very vitals of free private enterprise. A notable case is the *Miracle of America* pamphlet which sees little but labor and power machines in our economic greatness—no enterprise. It centers on Uncle Sam as the giver of all good things.

2. They have fallen for the payment of wages that are not based upon the productivity of labor, but on so-called costs of living, profits, etc.

3. They have employed known Socialists to do research work and have used employee training material that might have been prepared by Karl Marx.

4 They have fallen for the practice of pushing Government so-called savings bonds on their employees, rather than encouraging productive investment in corporation securities. This is doubly bad. It transfers employee interest to the Government and it encourages public debt in a period of inflation.

5 They have advertised in pink publications and sponsored leftist broadcasts. This is not necessary. They have no power of censorship. They are not wise to feed the dog that bites them.

6 They have financed and sent their sons to colleges that are known to disseminate socialism. Many endowed institutions of learning are busy teaching that private property and private enterprise are bad, and that more and more central government control is desirable. For example, the Keynesian economics as spread by the Samuelson, Tarshis, and Morgan texts, leaves little or no room for private enterprise or private saving and leads to a managed currency and a managed economy—which is socialism.

7 They accept the easy-money policy which is the root of managed currency and inflation.

8 They stand by, and, like politicians, take no sides while our schools are infested with those who try to condition the whole child for the good society.

9 They often go along with world government and the UN.

10 They accept lip service to freedom and private enterprise, that are mocked by the actions and main ideas of the Socialists or social planners.

11. They run to Washington for subsidies and controls.

12 They stick to party lines, when the party offers little but "me too."

13. They set up foundations that use their millions of dollars to spread socialistic ideas.

Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter which I wrote to my constituents under this date:

DEAR FRIEND: There's something unchanging about the land, and something heroic about the efforts of farmers.

The Korean land is a battlefield. Yet, I learned the other day that crop harvests this year have been 70 percent of normal—which has definitely averted the danger of famine in the months ahead. Certainly it is a victory for the farmers there, as great you might almost say, as any that we have won in our military actions.

This situation is the result of careful planning, bold action, and above all, the tireless effort of the Korean farmers. Many of them are persons who have been swept back and forth with the tides of battle. Many are aged and many are just past toddling. But they have gone ahead with their incredible patience and devotion to the soil, have worked to save their country and their countrymen.

I think they deserve our salute.

Also, in regard to the war, it looks now as though many of your sons who have been serving over there for sometime, will be coming home soon. Even while our offensive is grinding forward, the Army has announced

that it has speeded up its plans on rotating men. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, has said that "all personnel who endured the bitter combat conditions in Korea last winter" will be brought home this winter.

There's welcome news from the Agriculture Department on my desk this week. Farm income, I notice by their report, has gone up 17 percent during the first 7 months of this year, for a total of \$15,400,000,000. But this was not entirely a net gain for farmers because farm cost rates rose an average of 12 percent for the same period. Income from livestock and products was reported at \$10,700,000,000. Income from crops amounted to about \$4,700,000,000. I don't know how these figures apply to each of your farms—but I certainly hope that all of you had a good season.

I have heard from many of you since I began these letters, and I want to thank you for the correspondence. It has been most helpful in my work here in Congress.

Young Republican Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the high lights of certain recommendations of Republican policy adopted by the Glendale Young Republicans at their regular meeting held on September 20, 1951:

GLENDAL, CALIF., YOUNG REPUBLICAN POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOREIGN POLICY

1. We denounce the Yalta agreement.
2. We support the four steps advocated by Gen. Douglas MacArthur to conclude the war in Korea.

3. We support the North Atlantic Pact, but urge greater military participation by the nations of Western Europe in the common effort.

4. We favor the creation of a sovereign West German republic.

5. We favor the inclusion of Greece and Turkey in the North Atlantic Pact.

6. We favor the utilization of Spain's strategic position.

7. We oppose admission of Communist China to UN membership.

8. We oppose the Genocide Convention and the World Bill of Rights recommended by the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations Organization.

ECONOMIC POLICY

1. We urge a return to balanced Government budgets and an end to deficit financing.

2. We oppose nonessential public-works programs.

3. We oppose welfare programs which are in reality costly schemes for socializing the Nation.

4. We support the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as they apply to waste and inefficiency in Government and the armed services.

5. To prevent inflation in time of crisis, we favor control of private credit rather than price and wage controls.

6. We favor the enactment of a constitutional amendment to prohibit the Government from engaging in any business, profes-

sion, or enterprise in competition with its citizens except as specified in the Constitution.

GENERAL WELFARE POLICY

1. We support the continuation of private medical insurance.

2. We favor returning to State control all Government services which can be effectively operated on a less than national scale.

3. We oppose a continuation of the principle of Federal social security.

MISCELLANEOUS POLICY

1. We oppose corruption and incompetence in high office.

2. We oppose coddling of Communists and Communist sympathizers.

3. We oppose the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act.

4. We favor continuation and strengthening of the Taft-Hartley Act.

5. We favor a flexible parity on price supports of agricultural commodities.

6. We favor local self-rule for the District of Columbia.

Regulation No. 1 of the Petroleum Administration for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1951, I wrote to the Secretary of the Interior requesting an explanation of regulation No. 1 issued by the Petroleum Administration for Defense. I have received a reply to my letter. I am pleased to report to the Congress that the Secretary has written a forthright letter in reply to mine, and in my opinion he has rendered a real service by clarification of some of the issues in the order referred to.

I am pleased to include my letter and the Secretary's reply. I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the prompt and complete reply from Mr. Chapman.

The letters follow:

OCTOBER 6, 1951.

HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior, Department
of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAPMAN: I have just examined PAD Regulation No. 1. You have by this regulation defined what you consider to be your authority to control deliveries of oil and gas.

Although you state in section 1 of the regulation "The directives will relate only to matters under the jurisdiction of the Petroleum Administration for Defense," I feel that by reason of section 3 a detailed explanation of what you consider that jurisdiction to be should be made immediately.

I particularly refer to that part of section 3 which reads as follows:

"Where a directive, or an amendment or supplement thereto, is issued, it shall take precedence over the provisions of any general order, regulation, direction, or other action of the Petroleum Administration for Defense, over the provisions of any contract to which any person, to whom the directive, amendment, or supplement is issued, may be a party, and over the provisions of any rate schedule, tariff, regulation, or order of any regulatory body, including regulatory bodies of the several States and Territories."

I am sure you are familiar with the so-called Bow amendment to the National Production Act, which reads as follows:

"No rule, regulation, or order issued under this act which restricts the use of natural gas (either directly, or by restricting the use of facilities for the consumption of natural gas, or in any other manner) shall apply in any State in which a public regulatory agency has authority to restrict the use of natural gas and certifies to the President that it is exercising that authority to the extent necessary to accomplish the objectives of that act."

Do you not consider the language of section 3 above referred to as in conflict with the language of the amendment adopted by the Congress?

I should like also to have you state with certainty whether or not you feel a directive can be issued taking precedence over an order of a State regulatory body relative to a rate schedule or tariffs. Do you feel that this Federal authority nullifies the functions of the States?

I believe, Mr. Secretary, that by virtue of the severity of section 5 of the regulation and the threat to a great industry contained therein that this matter should be fully explained in plain and simple language without equivocation.

I shall appreciate an immediate reply to this letter so that I may determine what steps may be necessary to preserve the integrity of the States and the proper regulation of an industry that so vitally affects not only a large segment of labor but also millions of our citizens.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress

UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., October 15, 1951
Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: This is in reply to your letter of October 6, 1951, in which you ask for my views in respect of the relation of PAD Regulation No. 1 to the amendment to section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which bore your name.

I think that there is no conflict between the regulation in question and the Bow amendment. The regulation establishes a framework under which the Petroleum Administration for Defense proposes to exercise the authority to allocate oil and gas which was vested in the President under section 101 of the Defense Production Act and subsequently delegated to me and redelegated to the Petroleum Administration for Defense. Inasmuch as the authority for the issuance of the regulation itself is section 704 of the act, which is the section containing the Bow amendment, the issuance of directives under the regulation necessarily must be limited by the terms of the Bow amendment. It was because PAD understood that directives to be issued by it must be confined to the subject matter legally entrusted to its administration that there was included in the regulation the statement, quoted by you, that "The directive will relate only to matters within the jurisdiction of the Petroleum Administration for Defense."

You ask specifically whether I consider the language of section 3 of the regulation to be in conflict with the language of the Bow amendment. I do not. The Bow amendment relates only to restrictions on the use of natural gas. It does not apply to oil or manufactured gas and is applicable to natural gas only in States in which a public regulatory body has authority to restrict the use of natural gas and certifies to the President that it is exercising that authority to the extent necessary to accomplish the ob-

jectives of the Defense Production Act. It is not applicable elsewhere. Of course, no directive has been issued which conflicts with this prohibition, nor will any be issued.

You ask that I state with certainty whether or not I feel that a directive can be issued taking precedence over an order of a State regulatory body relative to a rate schedule or tariff and whether I feel that such authority nullifies the functions of the States. Section 101 of the act empowers the President to allocate materials and facilities in such manner, under such conditions, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense. Assuming this section constitutes a valid exercise of the Federal power, the authority thereby granted must necessarily supersede any conflicting exercise of authority by a State, in the absence of a specific reservation in the act, such as appears in the Bow amendment, that the Federal authority shall not do so.

Please do not misunderstand the use of the phrase "rate schedule" or the word "tariff." As you are aware, rate schedules and tariffs, both as to oil and gas, contain terms and conditions of service delimiting obligations to deliver oil and gas as well as establishing prices. It is only with respect to the former aspect of rate schedules and tariffs that we are concerned. PAD has no authority over prices and cannot and does not intend to attempt to exercise any such authority. That power, to the extent that it was granted to the President by the Defense Production Act of 1950, has been delegated to the Office of Price Stabilization, and forms no part of the authority pursuant to which Regulation No. 1 was issued.

Further, with reference to section 3 of the regulation, that section was included only for the purpose of informing persons to whom directives might be addressed of the legal effects of such directives. It is entirely possible, for example, that a directive might require an oil operator to take some action which was forbidden by another PAD order. Section 3 tells the operator to obey the directive rather than the prior PAD order.

Similarly, directives may cut across private contract obligations. This occurred recently in the cases of 4 producers of Navy special fuel oil and 14 other oil companies. The Navy needed 2,100,000 barrels of Navy special fuel during October, November and December. Directives were issued to 4 refiners to supply this fuel and to 14 other companies to supply, on a pro rata basis, grade C fuel oil to the primary suppliers to make up deficits caused by the diversion of this grade C fuel oil to blending into Navy special fuel. The refiners to whom these directives were addressed were not unwilling to meet the emergency created by the Navy's need but needed directives from PAD to protect them, under section 707 of the act, from liabilities arising from prior contractual obligations.

Another example of a situation in which directives might be issued involved the American Steel Foundries plant in East Chicago, Ill., which was being reactivated for the manufacture of military tank armor. The Armed Forces made strong representation to PAD that it was necessary that a reliable supply of gas be provided for this plant. By vigorous action and through industry cooperation, PAD was able to arrange for a combined supply of natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas for this essential defense plant. Fortunately, it was not necessary to issue a directive, but this was in part because no contract, rate schedule, tariff, regulation, or order of any regulatory body stood in the way of the service provided. It is easy to imagine that in another otherwise similar case it might be necessary to issue a directive to achieve the same result.

PAD policy is to issue directives only as a last resort and after all other avenues of meeting essential military and defense needs have been exhausted. Also, when at all possible, PAD intends to seek the cooperation of States and other governmental authorities in discharging its responsibilities under the Defense Production Act.

I am advised that actions of the type described are within the authority of PAD, even in States which have certified to the President under the Bow amendment, inasmuch as a directive of that character would not "restrict the use of natural gas," as that phrase is used in the Bow amendment. It is my view that the Bow amendment was not intended to nullify the clear obligation imposed upon the President under the Defense Production Act to assure the adequate operation of military activities including such defense production operations as are essential to the national defense.

I hope that this explains my views fully in plain and simple language and without equivocation. If you have any further questions concerning our position relating to this subject, I shall be very glad to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Good Advice From Mr. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House know and admire Jim Farley. His comments always command respect. Recently he addressed the graduates of Ithaca College and gave the young people some fine advice. In commenting on his address the Salem (Mo.) News endorsed his reference to good manners, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I include the News editorial as follows:

GOOD MANNERS, A VALUABLE ASSET

When James A. Farley addressed the graduates of Ithaca College he told them, among other things, that good manners are essential to the man or woman who expects to amount to something.

Mr. Farley said: "A person who is concerned in persuading other people to do something or buy something or just to be friendly and helpful, must have what I call good manners. Now good manners means something more than knowing how to hold your soup spoon or how to dress when you go to a church wedding. It is much more than a capacity to say the pleasant but insincere thing. It is much more than tact. It is to feel, and above all to show, that you have a genuine interest in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, sharing their fears and earthly concerns and their ideals. When these are felt and shown there need be no fear about winning confidence and winning friends, for this attitude will make itself known in a hundred ways."

Jim Farley's advice is good. There are characteristics that are invaluable in whatever business or profession one may engage.

But they must be genuine, and not assumed for the moment. Even a very dull person can see and know when someone is putting on an act to accomplish a purpose or attain an end. It is something that every young man and woman can acquire and use. Good manners are a valuable asset.

A Word for Harry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette.

A. WORD FOR HARRY

We doubt that the old boy needs it, but we think it's about time somebody said something nice about President Truman.

As things stand now, we'd vote for him.

We doubt that any other man, faced with the same problems, would have handled them any better.

He's had it rough. He deserved a kind word.

He's been blamed for corruption in Government, for bad jokes, for drinking whisky, for insulting religious faith, for insulting free thinkers, for writing angry letters, for sending your boy to be killed in Korea, for giving Stalin half the world, for promoting his own daughter's career, for spending fabulous sums on his own living quarters, for being too common, for being too uncommon, for cussing, for encouraging Communists, for turning the Nation over to the labor unions, for stabbing labor in the back, for high prices, for low wages, for taxing us to death, for giving the country to the huge corporations, for socializing industry, for poor taste in clothing.

Now don't jump up and howl. Sit there and think a minute.

Did Truman send all our soldiers home after the last war and leave us defenseless? Or did you?

Didn't you weep and moan about your poor, homesick boy over there? Didn't you write your Congressman about it? Didn't you and thousands like you plead and beg and threaten and bluster until Congress, against the President's wishes, and against the military's wishes, brought your boy home? And left the world unguarded so the Russians could thumb their noses at us? Was it Truman or was it you?

Did Truman bring on this terrible inflation? Or did you?

Didn't your union get you that big raise, and didn't you go out and buy a new car and a new stove and a fur coat for the little woman? Didn't you gently ease up the prices in your store when you saw your customers going on a spending spree? Was it Truman or was it you?

Did Truman shackle business with those burdensome controls? Or did you?

Didn't you scream in anguish when prices went far beyond the reach of your pocket-book? Didn't you demand that somebody do something about it? Didn't you swear that unless you got help from the Government the black marketeers would ruin your business? Was it Truman or was it you?

Did Truman get us into war in Korea?

Didn't you agree that a United Nations would be useless unless it had some teeth to show? When, after a few years of blessed peace, the Communists jumped on the South Koreans with guns and tanks and chased our handful of troops almost out of the country, didn't you feel, like the President, that it was time somebody put a stop to war for all time by punishing aggressors with all the force of the United Nations? Do you think we should quit? Do you think we should say to the Communists, "Okay, you win. You're too tough for us. We surrender?"

And if you had all these things to worry about, wouldn't you get a little sore if somebody said your daughter couldn't sing?

Indiscriminate Smearing of Federal Employees Costing Taxpayers Millions,
Warns Chairman of United States Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday October 16, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Robert Ramspeck, Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, before the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada on Thursday, October 11, 1951.

I am indeed happy to be here and to talk to you today.

Believe me, this is more than the platitudinous opening statement we expect from practically all speakers. I really feel that way about the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada. I feel that way because your organization truly is different from too many groups and individuals who have succumbed to a deadly malady afflicting our country in the trying times through which we are living. It is because you have retained your sense of constructive reasoning and because you have not fallen victim to the disease which seems to impel its victims to indulge in intemperate, and sometimes hateful, criticism, that I find such a high degree of satisfaction in discussing common problems with you.

It's about invidious, indiscriminate criticism, about this disease which I regard as one of the gravest dangers of democracy today, that I want to talk to you. And I'm sure you will concede that, with nearly 2,500,000 Federal employees comprising a primary target for precisely the snide sharpshooting to which I refer, the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission is eminently qualified to discuss the subject.

I should like to make it clear at the outset that I do not hold that Government or its employees should be immune to criticism. From the democratic processes which permit differences of opinion and free and open discussions flow the decisions that make our form of government the best that man has yet been able to devise. But criticism must be constructive—like the criticisms and suggestions your own organization has consistently made—not destructive. Criticism should be specific, not general, on an individual basis, not of Government employees as a class, or by association. The sins of the spectacularly guilty few must not be visited upon the many who are innocent if we are to retain the very form of government we are now so deeply engaged in selling the world over. We are spending billions of dollars and shedding immeasurable quantities of blood in the doing of that Herculean job in humanity's name.

The most disturbing factor in the practice of indictment by generalization and conviction by accusation is that it just isn't democracy. Democracy's stake infinitely transcends the question of the well-being of individual Government employees. While I am not a medical man, and I may seem presumptuous in so branding it, I call this practice a disease. I call it that because of its noxious and pernicious characteristics. Like a disease, its effects pervade our whole way of life and, in time, could be a most potent factor in destroying that way of life.

Since this disease carries with it the element of self-destruction, it would appear,

then, to be a disease of the mind, so to speak. Accentuating its viciousness is the fact that the malady seizes and ravages us at a time when we are engaged in an all-out endeavor to influence men's minds all over the world. And what is it we're trying to convince them of? Why, the fact that our way of life is the best way.

It is paradoxical, isn't it? Here we are, on the one hand, upholding with all our might, with our resources, and, in many instances, with our very lives, the efficacies of our form of government, yet, simultaneously, we are indulging in a form of self-destruction that could consume us and permit barbarism's all-enveloping darkness to return unhindered to a world presently lighted only by democracy's torch.

In our democracy, Government depends upon the consent of the governed. If the confidence of the governed in the competent, conscientious, and loyal men and women who staff the Government is destroyed, consent will be withdrawn and Government will fall.

It is obvious to me that we must devote more attention to informing men's minds at home, to telling them fully and frankly all there is to be told about their own Government, even while we conduct similar efforts in other parts of the world. For it will avail us nothing to halt communism's military might abroad, or to condition foreign minds to accepting democracy, if, when they are ready for it, we have no true democracy to offer them.

The field in which you and I operate offers an unexcelled opportunity to perform a much-needed task right here at home, to demonstrate democracy's strength and capabilities, to sharpen the focus of the picture portraying the merit system as an exemplar of democracy at its finest, and to enlist public support for the advancement of the aims of all true believers in a sound civil service.

By so doing—by setting an example—we can do much to clarify issues, which become confused in times as uncertain as those in which we are living, to establish a pattern of straight thinking as a replacement for the fuzziness which seems to creep into ideas put forward in such times, and, most important of all, to reimburse with good, old-fashioned faith those among us who have grown so puzzled and bewildered by events as to entertain doubts as to our own strength and national character.

It is unfortunate, but nonetheless true, that in times of stress there are those who seek to take advantage of the confusion to further their own aims, to secure political advancement, or to obtain personal power. Many times they are unscrupulous in the way they go about it. Increasingly, the tenor and tempo of attacks upon men in public office, leaders in public affairs, and Government personnel generally, have been stepped up. No person seems to be immune to these vague but disturbing charges. A lifetime devoted to patriotic public service can be destroyed by this sort of attack if the people do not voice their disapproval of such underhanded tactics.

I am confident we want no part of the methods of a Hitler or a Stalin. We do not believe in the philosophy of guilt by association, of indictment by implication, or in sentencing without trial. We believe in fair play, and it is certainly not playing fair when our public officials and employees are vilified and their loyalty and devotion to their country questioned on mere hearsay, vague charges, and testimony of disreputable and discredited persons who have time and again proved to be unreliable. We need to return, as a people, to the principle that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty, that a man who comes into court must come with clean hands and, above all else, must not bear false witness against his neighbor.

The relative handful in the Federal service who have been proved disloyal, or whose

loyalty was open to a reasonable doubt, have been eliminated. But we didn't do it by summary dismissal, or by vague, unsubstantiated charges. They had fair and impartial hearings, were given the right to present their side of the case, with witnesses and counsel if they wished, and their rights as citizens have been protected. The approximately 330 found ineligible for Federal employment constitute an infinitesimal proportion, indeed, of the total number of Federal employees, all of whom have been investigated or are under current investigation. The few have been dismissed. The many have not been punished.

That's the fair way, the just way, and we need a return to a more fair and just appraisal of our public servants—not a witch hunt, nor a condemnation proceeding in the press, on the radio, on television, and in denunciatory speeches, including some in the halls of Congress.

When I assumed the office of Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission some 7 months ago, I placed this problem high on the list of those requiring immediate and intense attention. I said then, and I feel even more strongly about it now:

"It is my purpose to undertake a campaign to bring about better public understanding of Government employees and what they do. That is a public relations problem. It seems to me to be worth trying. The public is essentially fair when they have the facts and I expect to make every effort to acquaint them fully with those facts."

As we all know so well, the ultimate test of our form of government is public approval. Disapproval means an end to our form of government and, in today's global circumstances, an end to democracy.

Therefore, what the public thinks of its form of government takes on a significance that ranges beyond our own shores and directly affects the steadfastness we may expect from our allies.

But before it can intelligently approve or disapprove, the public must be informed. Its opinion should be an informed opinion. It should have all the facts, not merely those cunningly selected and disseminated by some power-hungry and politically ambitious individual or organization motivated by a self-serving purpose which conflicts with the public interest.

So deep-rooted are some of the maladjustments of our times and so contagious is the mania of self-destruction that presentation of only one side of the story is by no means confined to the recognizable realm of politics. What grieves me most is that so many well-meaning and excellently intentioned individuals and organizations today indulge in the practice of hammering away at only the destructive side of the story about Federal employees. Precisely why they participate in this form of self-destruction is impossible to understand. One clue, however, runs through virtually all such presentations. That is the tone depicting the high-mindedness which these detractors of government insist prompts them to compound and magnify the myths about Federal employment.

You know the sort of things: All Federal employees are lumped into one category; they're "bureaucrats"—never workers. All, according to these disciples of destruction, are loafers; all, to hear them tell it, are overpaid; not any, according to these lopsided versions, can be or are fired, and so on and on, ad infinitum, ad nauseum, and entirely without regard for the facts of the matter.

And, as I have said, the tone that runs through all such denunciations is one of pious proclamation. It is inferred broadly, if indeed it isn't claimed outright, that the bright light of civic virtue shines exclusively from the eyes of the individual or organization making these misrepresentations. To hear them tell it, each considers himself or

his organization to be the only brave arrow in flight.

For example: When streamlining of Government and administrative reforms are mentioned, they are almost invariably mentioned in terms of what has not yet been accomplished. Rarely, if ever, is there presented the other side of the story, the side covering the many progressive steps already taken in this direction. When economies are suggested, always this is done with regard to what still remains to be achieved. Never is it brought out that the very carping tone of the recommendations and the accompanying derision of Government employees in themselves result in increased costs that are many, many times as great as the cost of the real or fancied evils these critics so zealously pursue. It probably does not even occur to many people that unjust and personally derogatory criticism drives good men and women out of Government and skyrockets the costs of recruiting and training personnel of lower quality than that which the hasty critics mercilessly drum out of camp.

There is no question in my mind that, in seeking to effect savings, these critics, by persisting in the use of destructive, headline-hunting tactics, rather than the constructive attitude which built up our great country, are costing the taxpayers they so vociferously represent, untold millions in the long run.

Undoubtedly, some of the fault lies in the fact that no effective effort has been made to get the facts over to the public. True, the facts have been available to any sufficiently interested in seeking them out. But, in the court of public opinion, we are not guaranteed our day, as we are in our other courts. We must make our own day in this particular court. We must militantly sell public service to the public.

And when I say "we" I mean all of us interested in good government. That, of course, places the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada right in the thick of this matter. For that is where you have always been. Your most praiseworthy record of support of the merit system points clearly to the fact that you can, and should, undertake the job now of quickening the public conscience regarding the woeful lack of fair play inherent in too many of the destructive criticisms which are undermining our very form of government.

It has been because of you and your continuing and undiminished interest in good government that the civil service has made many of the forward strides which have characterized its growth over the 68 years of its existence. You know the facts. You know that the history of civil service is the story of a bitter battle to overpower the spoils system which plagued our country for more than the first century of its sovereignty. You know that while there still are many improvements that can and should be made, the important thing is that our progress away from the spoils system has been a steady one. You know these things because you have been instrumental in bringing them about. Most important of all, you have restrained your approach to the constructive characteristics which breed freedom and enhance the stature of freemen.

That's what places you in such an excellent position to accept the increased responsibility which I think present conditions impose on all those interested in good government. I think it is the duty of the Civil Service Commission to assume a place of leadership in this undertaking to sell the public on public service. I think the employees under civil service have an obligation in this endeavor, and I envision the job as a vast area of agreement between management and labor in which both can be effective in a joint and mutually beneficial effort. Further, I think your organization, and many others like it, in the same and

similar fields—and even those in areas not primarily nor avowedly dedicated to improved government—must assume the leadership which your experience and objectives impose upon you.

In my opinion, there's a mighty interesting story to be told on the constructive side of how our Government functions under the democracy we are all striving to preserve. The facts about government, without distortions or embellishments can be presented in an animated manner designed to capture the attention and fire the imagination of the public so vitally affected by it. The tools and techniques of public relations are available to us. All we need do is apply them and reject, once and for all, the concept of public reporting which has made of Government presentations the drab, colorless, statistical documents they too frequently are.

Here are but a few examples of what I have in mind:

When Government employment is portrayed—for any reason, political or otherwise—as Utopian, we can and must come back with the following facts, which are all on our side:

So far removed from Utopia did Federal employees consider their employment that 321,291 of them quit their jobs in the year ending last June 30.

When that old wheeze is trotted out, about how it is impossible to fire a Federal employee, our factual, but effective, answer can truthfully be:

In the same last fiscal year, 17,250 were discharged.

When the destructive story is circulated—as it regularly is—that nobody ever is allowed to run out of work in a Federal agency or department, our facts can speak for themselves once again:

Seventeen thousand and thirty-nine did run out of work and were removed from the payroll through reduction in force because projects on which they were working were completed.

There are many other solid facts that can be similarly used. The point is we must not, and do not intend to, use them only defensively, as illustrated in the foregoing examples. We must diligently and energetically make opportunities for presentation of these facts in less statistical style. It is essential that the people of the United States—and of the world, if you please—be alerted to the fact that while we are engaged in a recruitment program of considerable magnitude, to man the thousands of essential defense positions created by the current threat to our way of life, the rate at which Federal employees have been quitting their jobs has jumped from .9 in June 1950 to 2.1 in June of this year, that the monthly turnover rate for Federal employees in the same period increased from 2.3 to 3.2.

More emphatically stated, the turnover rate of Federal employees is approaching 36 percent right now. For this audience, I need not spell out the fact that it is a costly thing to recruit and train workers only to have them leave Government employ for positions in private industry where salaries, especially the upper management levels, are clearly higher and where opportunity for advancement, money-wise at least, is infinitely better.

That is a point which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, stresses with great vigor in an extremely forthright article in the October issue of the *American* magazine. He goes so far as to intimate the Federal Government would be more than adequately compensated in better management if it decided to pay the additional \$28,000,000 it would take to double the salaries of the some 2,500 employees on civil-service rolls receiving \$10,000 and up per year. Incidentally, Senator DOUGLAS' article, which offers

ample proof there are able and broad-visioned persons in the country ready and willing to take up the cudgels in behalf of fair play, listed as the number one item in a six-point analysis of why it is difficult to attract good men to Government, the following reason: "There has been too much indiscriminate smearing and hounding of men who were just trying to do a good job." Similarly, his very first recommendation to cure this situation is that steps be taken to end indiscriminate smearing. In the article, he likens the problem to one he encounters at his summer place in trying to rid the premises of poison ivy without damaging the wild roses among which it grows. Says Senator DOUGLAS:

"The same kind of patient thoroughness is required in uprooting our cunning home-grown Communists without injuring public servants who happened at one time to have innocently crossed their paths. You can't approach the problem of poison ivy by running over the dunes swinging a meat cleaver. And you can't cope with Communists by that methods, either, without injuring innocent bystanders."

While the Senator mentions only those Federal employees indiscriminately and irresponsibly smeared in connection with communism, his warning against a meat cleaver approach is sound with respect to all types of smears and all loose accusations which are made in terms of glittering generalities. The effects of these tactics, as the Senator points out, are being felt keenly, not only by the employees but by the Government as well. Not only do sensitive individuals suffer undeserved indignities and, as the Senator states, develop "hangdog expressions in some cases and consider themselves as second-class citizen," but the Government loses the services of many of them because, as the Senator says, they "have been hounded, harassed, heckled, and scorned."

As I see it, our job is twin-hinged. In addition to giving the public the facts, we must inculcate a revitalized pride in their work in Government employees. Unless we do, the trend will continue in the wrong direction and present figures, disturbing as they are, will become even more appalling.

Our work is cut out for us in our efforts to produce better government through better management. We must exert increasingly greater efforts to instill in men and women with leadership qualities the crusading spirit to undertake to improve government by giving it their personal attention, by helping to operate it. In the Civil Service Commission, we are everlastingly stressing our concept that management is a philosophy, and must not be sacrificed by mistaking mechanics for management. We continuously endeavor to sharpen the tool that we hold management to be, so it can work more effectively toward our ultimate goal, which is, of course, better government.

You and I and all people interested in better government have the same objectives. We should join hands in utilizing the same weapon, one which has made our country great—truth. We can, and should, undertake jointly the work of bringing home to the public—forcefully, forthrightly, and in the interests of a better country—that good management is a good investment; that it is shortsighted to regard it as an expense, and that we can have good management and, through it, good government, only by attracting and holding as Government employees the highest type of people. If we do not check this disease of indiscriminate smearing which, as I have stated, really is a form of self-destruction, we cannot hope to retain good employees in the Federal Government, much less attract new ones of high caliber.

In the words of President Truman, who uttered them recently in addressing a group of Federal employees:

"It is time we made it perfectly plain that we feel it is an honor to work for our fellow citizens through public service."

That's the spirit in which good people must accept service in Government. To restore that spirit is our job—the job of all of us interested in good government. There's a tremendous job to be done. Let's get together and do it.

Time To Watch Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

MR. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the interest in the 1952 election mounting daily, the following timely editorial in the October 10, 1951, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune contains much food for thought:

TIME TO WATCH OUT

As Presidential election nears, we might as well brace ourselves for a heavy dose of come-on ideas designed solely for the purpose of bringing in the votes.

Most of these plans in the past have been aimed at the vote. Any benefits that might of recent years would be purely coincidental, accrue to the Nation through most of them.

The Brannan farm plan of 1949, for example, didn't make much progress, although the Department of Agriculture pushed it with all the propaganda machinery of the Government.

But, now Secretary Brannan has another idea. It's closely related to the first one, but is a little more shrewdly presented.

Perhaps Mr. Brannan's mistake in the first one was that he made it too easily understood.

This one he sticks in with a report of the "family farm policy review committee."

It provides two rather seductive thoughts. One, guarantees prosperity for the farmer by providing for direct Government payments to him. The other plan includes the purchase by the Government of certain farm lands, and the resale of it to small farmers who want more land.

A Government spokesman qualifies this by saying that where some farmers do not have enough land to make a living, the Government may buy this land and resell it to others, who, their property thus enlarged, presumably would be able to make a living.

What happens if nobody wants to sell might become a problem. Then, again, since it's the Government, there might be no problem at all, so far as the Government's concerned.

There's a good possibility of the national health insurance or socialized medicine plan popping up in a new guise, too.

We might find the President harking back to his message to the Eighty-first Congress, in which he said: "Our Government must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of abundance * * * our Government has undertaken to meet these responsibilities."

It's worth remembering, too, that in undertaking to meet those responsibilities, Congress was asked to fix the pay for labor, fix prices, decide what credit terms the citizen should have, what merchandise he could get on certain credit terms, decide what materials should be used by industry, and for

what purpose, and what goods the citizen ought to have.

Besides, there was the matter of rent controls, socialized medicine, or health insurance, pensions, and a large catalog of others.

It's pretty tough for the average Mr. American to have to earn his living, pay his taxes, bear his usual worries, then have somebody come around and hand him out a "load of stuff" every election time, giving him the choice of voting for the "right party" and getting "all this free * * *" whatever "this" may be depending upon the wants of the citizen at the time.

It might be safer for Mr. American to put all this hand-out theory in one package, and to handle each such dazzling proposition the same way.

Just ask yourself, how is the Government to pay for these things? What methods will be used by the Government?

If we do that, it must become perfectly plain that the Government alone can't do a thing. It can't give us a dime's worth that it doesn't take from us and someone else.

And so, unless, of course, we like to be fooled, we come inevitably to the conclusion that what the Government really means is that it will divide up the wealth of the country and hand it out to those it deems worthy on the basis of mass segregation.

Of course, the redistribution of wealth is not a new idea. But, it's amazing the different forms in which it can be presented.

Two methods characterized the redistribution of wealth, as practiced by numerous governments in the past, and present; One method is the totalitarian method, force.

The other, red tape, regulations, and penalties for failure to conform to the red tape, or the regulations.

We are now in the outer circle of the red-tape phase of socialistic experimentation.

Let's not get any deeper into it. As election time approaches, as free Americans, we should make our desire for our continued freedom clear to both major parties.

And vote for the party and the candidate which offers the best platform for reducing the red tape, the regulations, the socialism, and the strings of bureaucracy which are throttling our America.

The United States Can Now Take the Offensive in the Cold War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

MR. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act, recently passed by Congress and signed by the President, sounds for the first time a new note in our foreign policy. Under the provisions of an amendment which I offered and which was accepted the United States will be able to render assistance to escapees from behind the iron curtain and also to underground units working for the liberation of their people in the Communist-dominated countries.

Specifically this amendment provides \$100,000,000 "for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania,

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States."

To date all of our actions in the cold war have been at best merely reactions to an initial action by the Communists. The Berlin airlift was only a response to the Berlin blockade. The aid to Greece was only in response to a Communist offensive there, and our present long drawn-out conflict in Korea is merely a reaction to the Communist invasion.

Now, however, under the provisions of the amendment set forth above, we will be able to take positive action against the Communists. We will be able to harass them instead of merely responding to their harassment of us. We can begin to infiltrate their regimes instead of letting them infiltrate our governments. We will be able to instill fear in the Communist leaders of Eastern Europe instead of having our Western European friends tremble in fear of the Communists. Freedom can come in the world only when peace and justice are restored and we must take positive action to restore this peace and justice.

I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the October 1951 issue of the Sign magazine:

TIME FOR AN OFFENSIVE

From the founding of the U. N. at San Francisco in 1945 to the recent peace conference in the same city, we have been playing a purely defensive role toward Soviet Russia. We have initiated practically no major action in the international sphere which was not a retreat, a surrender, an appeasement, or a defensive reaction to Russian aggression.

We don't advocate dropping bombs on Russian cities tomorrow, but we certainly do advocate a strongly aggressive policy in the fields of propaganda and subversion.

When the U. N. was founded, the Russians made sure that it could never be a restraint on their aggressive intentions but at the same time would serve them well as an international propaganda forum. Right up to the present they have used it for no other purpose.

The best way to stop them is to take over the U. N. for our own propaganda. Instead of answering Russian accusations, we should be the accusers. The Reds have so many skeletons in the closet that we could drag out one a day for months to come.

We don't even have to accuse; we can simply ask questions. Here are a few general ones that come to mind which we would like to see put insistently and repeatedly to the Soviet delegates: What about the treatment of minorities in the Soviet Union? What about freedom of religion, the press, and assembly? Where are the hundreds of thousands of unaccounted for war prisoners who surrendered to the Reds? What of the rearmament of East European satellite states in spite of the peace treaties? Why the vast military program of the U. S. S. R. if only peace is sought? Why cannot a treaty be concluded with Austria and Germany?

What about slave labor and inhuman conditions in the labor camps of Siberia and the Arctic? What about the mass deportations of whole populations from Eastern Europe, specifically from Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Hungary?

We wouldn't get an answer to these questions, but that isn't the point. We would be furthering our own cause and countering Red propaganda, which is highly effective in some parts of the world. It is just possible too that the bright light of publicity might prevent or mitigate some of the horrors which the Reds are perpetrating while posing as the great protagonists of peace and of the people.

At the same time, we should direct a barrage of propaganda to our friends behind the iron curtain. It is little short of a miracle that these people have kept faith in us in view of our spineless attitude toward the Russians and especially in view of the little hope we have given them of ever throwing off the yoke of their Red masters.

We can be sure that most of the people of the satellite states are on our side, that they hate the Reds and would actively cooperate with us if given the opportunity. Even in Russia there are millions who hate the Soviet regime and would welcome an opportunity to destroy it. In these people we have a fifth column behind the iron curtain 10 times as numerous and devoted as the Communist fifth columns in the west.

It would be senseless to advocate open rebellion in the presence of the Red Army. At the present stage, that would lead only to a bloody repression of the entire population. On the other hand, we shouldn't sit back and leave these people without direction, help, and encouragement. They can do a work similar to that of the underground movements in Nazi-occupied territories in World War II—initiate slow-downs in agriculture and industry, sabotage military production, ammunition depots, transportation, and communications, organize groups that would create disruption behind Red lines in case of war.

The more the Reds are occupied in defending themselves, the less time they will have to plan aggressions. Furthermore, it would be very encouraging to see our leaders do something more than wait apprehensively for the next Russian blow. No war—hot or cold, on the battlefield or of the air waves—is ever won by defense alone. A little showing of the offensive spirit would be a warning to our foes and an assurance to our friends that we can do more than run for cover when attacked.

Father RALPH GORMAN, C. P.

With So Many People Saying So Many Things on the Subject of Atomic Energy, It Is Hard to Determine Where We Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks the American people have been listening to persons in high places voice their opinions regarding the development of atomic power for military purposes.

The following article by John Gerrity appeared in the October 14, 1951, issue

of the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star and reveals the divergent views on the availability of atomic-tactical weapons and long-range guided missiles.

The article follows:

ATOMIC BOMBAST—WITH SO MANY PEOPLE SAYING SO MANY THINGS IT'S HARD TO DETERMINE WHERE WE STAND

(By John Gerrity)

Vast clouds of rumor and cross-rumor billowed over Washington last week, confusing public understanding of American strength in the field of atomic warfare.

Nearly every official whose name has ever been linked with the atom, and who could find a convenient sounding board, had something to say about atomic weapons. Each statement seemed to conflict with the others.

No Johnny-come-lately, the bewilderment, indeed, had its beginning a little more than a month ago in a presidential speech at San Francisco. Then, speaking to a get-together of Democratic Party faithful, Mr. Truman had talked bravely of the national suicide in store for any enemies who tampered further with the peace of the world.

"It is fantastic what can happen with the use of the new weapons that are now under construction in this country," the President said, "not only the one which we all fear the most, but there are some weapons which are fantastic in their operation."

Apparently taking his cue from the President's statement—" * * * now under construction * * *"—Democratic Senator BRIEN McMAHON, who heads the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, pressed for an immediate step-up in atomic warfare development. His demands, expressed on the Senate floor, were interpreted by many to mean a drastic revision in defense plans, with heavy emphasis on atomic weapons which McMAHON had stated were "relatively" cheaper to produce than conventional weapons.

ENTER MR. LOVETT

Hardly had Messrs. Truman and McMAHON planted the motion of a new kind of warfare than Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett uprooted it. A few days after Senator McMAHON's speech, Mr. Lovett scoffed at the flurry of reports of sensational weapons and said that no magic way of winning wars was yet at hand. Bluntly, Mr. Lovett said, in effect, "We can't win today's wars with tomorrow's weapons."

Then this week, the idea that the day of 'Buck Rogers warfare has already dawned received new impetus. Despite Mr. Lovett's attempt to deflate false hopes, Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Gordon Dean said that the United States now possessed tactical atomic weapons that "could cancel out on the battlefield any numerical advantage of an enemy," and that it need not hesitate or fear to use them.

Thus within the narrow confines of the administration—and aided by the announcement on October 4 that Russia had had its second atomic explosion—a national perplexity had been developed. The divergent opinions of those officials who should be in complete harmony on the progress of atomic warfare, had raised, but not answered, several vital questions.

QUESTIONS IN PUBLIC MIND

Does the United States actually have now sufficient atomic weapons of a tactical nature to use in Korea or elsewhere? Does Russia's explosion of its second bomb mean that the United States is in danger of losing its superiority in atomic weapons? What is the relative strength of the two nations, as far as future atomic weapons are concerned?

In contrast to the roseate views expressed by the President, Mr. McMAHON, and Mr.

Dean, Secretary Lovett appears to be the one who is striking closest to the real truth. While he admits there has been enough progress to encourage a very optimistic outlook for improved American armament, the idea of quick, easy and inexpensive security is exaggerated. Although we have literally dozens of tactical atomic weapons under study, it will be at least 3 years before existing and planned atomic plants can produce those weapons in sufficient quantities for troops to use them in the field, tactically.

Mr. Lovett is strongly supported by General Bradley, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A few days before he left for the Middle East, General Bradley told the Senate Armed Services Committee that such weapons were about 4 or 5 years away, at least in terms of practical use by troops in the field.

And perhaps the most convincing fact to support Mr. Lovett is that United States troops would not know how to use atomic weapons, even if they were available. In the forthcoming atomic tests at Frenchman's Flats, Nev., tactical atomic weapons (or models of the same) will be tested for the first time. And for the first time some 5,000 troops will engage in training exercises under actual atomic warfare conditions—using the experimental weapons and deployed defensively and offensively in whatever new ways such weapons will demand.

As for the superiority of the United States over Russia in so-called strategic atomic bombs, these are the facts. It is no secret that when the United States dropped its third bomb on Nagasaki on August 11, 1945, its then existing supply was exhausted. It was planned at the time to use three atom bombs for each of three amphibious landings on the Japanese mainland the following November. That would put our rate of production, at that time, at three bombs a month. If that same rate had remained constant, we would have today about 210 bombs, allowing for the 12 to 16 we have exploded since for experimental purposes. However, the rate of production has more than trebled since 1945 and it is a fair estimate that the United States has stockpiled today between 750 and 1,000 bombs, each about five times more powerful than the first.

If the same rate of production were applied to Russia—a far-fetched theory in light of its vastly inferior industrial capacity—she could have produced since her first burst in the summer of 1949 somewhere between 60 and 75 bombs. However, American atomic scientists insist that Russia would have been foolhardy to have devoted her limited producing capacity and very limited supply of uranium to the manufacture of a Nagasaki-type bomb, which is known to be far less powerful than the bomb the United States is making today. For that reason, they maintain, Russia probably stopped production after making about 30 of such bombs and began experimenting on new ones. That the experiments have been completed and she is ready to produce greater bombs is evidenced by the explosion of October 4.

ONE HUNDRED IN RED ARSENAL

For military purposes, however, Defense Department planners are figuring that Russia has stockpiled 100 bombs. It is admittedly an extravagant estimate, but even so it establishes a comfortable ratio in favor of the United States of nearly 10 to 1.

Although Russia's second burst was disquieting proof that she is stepping up her atomic-bomb production, several physical factors guarantee that the United States' favorable ratio of 10 to 1 will hold, or perhaps even improve.

An atom bomb is made of either of two fissionable elements, uranium 235, a rare

element found in tiny amounts in nature, and plutonium, an artificial element produced in huge plants called nuclear reactors. Plutonium is produced from nonfissionable uranium 238, which is abundant in nature. To produce uranium 235 bombs requires a gaseous diffusion plant (to separate fissionable uranium from nonfissionable) such as the one at Oak Ridge, Tenn., which cost the Government \$500,000,000. To make plutonium bombs requires a plant costing about one-fifth as much to build and using about one-half the electrical energy to operate. For this reason, it is known that Russia's bombs are of the plutonium type, since she is at least 20 years behind in the technical know-how necessary to build an Oak Ridge type of plant.

POWER SHORTAGE

Moreover there is a marked limit on the number of cheaper, nuclear reactor plants which Russia can build. To operate just one such plant, a 250,000-kilowatt power station is needed. Russia has only one big power station, the Dnieper hydroelectric plant, with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts. If she were to build two nuclear reactors, it would take the entire output of Dnieper, leaving no power for the operation of supporting and collateral industries, to say nothing of civilian goods industries.

Apart from lacking vital electrical power plants Russia is known to be short of uranium. Captive mines in Czechoslovakia are almost exhausted. For some time she has been trying to get uranium from old worked-out mines in Saxony. On the other hand, the United States is the sole recipient of the output of the world's three largest fields, one in the Belgian Congo, one in the western United States, and one in the Great Bear Lake region of northern Canada. All these produce an ore about 15 times as rich as the ore available to Russia.

Therefore, on these two counts alone—electrical energy and uranium supply—the United States is assured of long continuing superiority. Added to these, the fact that the United States is building or contemplating building three new reactor plants gives a margin of safety upon which Russia could not infringe for at least a quarter of a century.

Pro America Speaker Says Women Must Save America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following news item appeared in the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern newspaper October 11, 1951. It outlines in detail just what is motivating not only the members of Pro America but also many other women's groups to organize and fight against the schemes which have been promoted by the socialistic planners within our present national administration.

Just last week we celebrated National Newspaper Week and I want to compliment the reporter who covered this meeting so thoroughly, as well as the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern, so that all citizens will become alerted to the issues which confront our Republic. Many of us have accepted the freedom that we enjoy un-

der the Constitution of this Republic as a heritage free from any obligation on our part, except to coast along and enjoy all the benefits. It has taken the low moral standards of our present administration to awaken us to the fact that we can have freedom only so long as we fight and speak out for the cardinal principles embodied in our Constitution. Whatever our walk in life may be, we must constantly be reminded of the devotion we owe to God and to our country if we are to maintain this freedom. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe this Pro America women's organization is supporting these cardinal principles and I congratulate it on the great job it is doing.

The above-mentioned news item follows:

PRO AMERICA SPEAKER SAYS "WOMEN MUST SAVE AMERICA"

"It is up to the women of this country to save America from socialism and bankruptcy," declared Mrs. R. S. Knappen, Tulsa, Okla., national president of Pro America, speaking before members of that organization Wednesday afternoon at the Oshkosh Country Club.

Members of Pro America are dedicated to Americanism and are disquieted and disturbed about the Government of this country, and its foreign policies, Mrs. Knappen said. They are not averse to lending and giving aid to other countries, she said, but they object to the way the job has been handled.

Women of America are influential and powerful, and they have time to ferret out facts which the hurried business and working man does not have time for, the speaker stated. The task of saving this country is big enough and important enough for women to sacrifice lesser interests and devote their energy to a crusade to save America and the constitutional form of government. Freedom can no longer be taken for granted, but must be fought for, Mrs. Knappen believes.

Corruption in Washington must be voted out at the next election as part of the crusade, the speaker said, and, in order to do this, women will have to crusade through their social groups, their church groups, their schools, the grocery store, the taxi, and over the back fence. There can be no personal glory or reward, she warned, only a consecration to the job of alerting all women to the importance of their vote in restoring this country to morally conscious leadership.

This country thrives on adversity, Mrs. Knappen said. Early American history proves it. The Constitution came into being under adversity. With competent moral leadership, this country's finest hour is probably just ahead, the speaker stated, in spite of the threat of socialism and communism.

Mrs. Knappen gave a brief history of Pro America which originated 18 years ago among five women dedicated to a cause inspired by a truck strike at Christmas time in Seattle, Wash. An aroused citizenry made attempts to deliver Christmas gifts to orphanages, but the men were injured so the women took over with success. An appeal for help to the authorities went unheeded because of a corrupt city government, she said. Volunteer workers broke the strike after 18 months, but the women had already determined to improve conditions, and, beginning in the precincts, they eventually elected an honest city government. Women in other parts of the country became interested in the accomplishment of these Seattle women and so little by little, Pro America, the name suggested by Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, has grown.

Pro America has no headquarters staff, not wanting strong centralization where control would stem from the top and secretaries determine its policies such as might emanate from bureaucratic Washington. It is a small organization, but its effectiveness in helping elect moral leadership is outstanding, Mrs Knappen said.

Mrs Dietler, also of Tulsa, national vice president, concluded the program with a brief talk on the functions of this bipartisan organization. She explained that Pro America believes that as long as the Government of this Republic is carried on through the two-party system, it is necessary that it function through one of the two major parties. Consequently, since its inception it has worked through the Republican Party, as the vehicle, which has best expressed the principles of Pro America as embodied in the Constitution of the United States.

A 1 o'clock luncheon preceded the program and the president, Mrs. A. P. Nonweiler, turned the meeting over to the program chairman, Mrs. Byron D. Ising, who introduced the guest speakers.

The Case of the Tactical Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following article written by Rev. Edward A. Conway, appearing in the October 20 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "The Case of the Tactical Atom":

THE CASE OF THE TACTICAL ATOM

(By Edward A. Conway)

(Senator BRIEN McMAHON, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, seems to have coined the term "tactical atom" in a September 25 address in Washington. It means atomic weapons for use in the field, as contrasted with city-destroying atom bombs. Father Conway here pictures some of the confusion that surrounded the beginning of the age of the tactical atom.)

This is an analysis, somewhat critical, I must confess, of some news stories which circulated widely during the first 5 days following President Truman's laconic announcement on October 3 that another atomic bomb has recently been exploded within the Soviet Union.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1951

Joseph C. Harsch, star Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reported:

"Best guessing here is that after the 1949 explosion the Russians concentrated on a stockpile of the Hiroshima-type big bombs and have accumulated between 40 and 200 by this time. * * * It is being hinted around Washington that the new Russian explosion was of the smaller tactical type of bomb. * * * Having balanced off our stockpile of big bombs with a retaliatory stockpile of their own, they are starting now to try to catch up in tactical atomic weapons."

After making the obvious observation that our military would like to have a monopoly of tactical atomic weapons now that the United States has lost its monopoly of strategic atomic weapons, Mr. Harsch continued:

"However, both Army and Navy are conducting autumn maneuvers based on the assumption that their enemy would possess tactical atomic weapons. These maneuvers were announced in early September, which probably dates the second Russian explosion."

An AP dispatch dated October 3 detailed secret testimony given last week to a House appropriations subcommittee by Gordon Dean, chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission:

"Mr. Dean did say that the United States now has tactical atomic weapons, and made a cautious disclosure that new atomic weapons are being produced. * * * Atomic weapons now can be used for tactical warfare purposes and bombed areas can be occupied by troops 'in a reasonably short time,' he said."

President Truman fell or was pushed into admitting that he had learned of the Soviet explosion within 10 days before he announced it. Asked at his press conference if his September 24 ban on security information was connected with the explosion, he claimed he had signed the security order before he had heard anything about it. Does that explode Mr. Harsch's theory that the Russians tested their second atom bomb in early September?

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1951

Hanson W. Baldwin, New York Times military expert, disagreed with Mr. Harsch about the type of bombs the Soviets are stockpiling. "These very probably are roughly comparable to the United States Nagasaki bombs," Mr. Baldwin seemed to accept "some estimates in Washington—subject now to revision in the light of the second blast—which indicate that Russia may now have a stockpile of somewhere between 30 and 80 atomic bombs." His next two paragraphs I set down as the Times printed them, though I am convinced someone excised some of his argumentation:

"Moreover, the rate of stockpiling undoubtedly is increasing. All this means that within 4 months to a year from now Russia probably will have a 'strategically significant' stockpile, probably numbered in three figures or a large two—enough, in other words, to cause very material damage here."

"Thus there is no doubt that Russia's atomic power is increasing."

Mr. Baldwin added this unqualified assertion:

"The United States has a whole 'family' of atomic bombs, ranging in destructive power from bombs five or six times more powerful than those used against Japan to so-called tactical bombs of 5 kilo-tons power (equivalent to 5,000 tons of TNT) useful against armies in the field."

Mary Hornaday, the Christian Science Monitor's New York correspondent, revealed that Bernard Baruch, whom she identified as "father of the United Nations majority plan for atomic control," had been invited to Washington "to give his views on United States-Soviet relations to 75 leading intelligence officers in an off-the-record session in the next few days." According to Mrs. Hornaday, "the adviser to Presidents said his plan was not outmoded, since it would make no difference whether 'one country or twenty' has the bomb when it is invoked."

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1951

Joseph Stalin, in a Pravda interview, confirmed President Truman's October 3 announcement by saying: "Indeed a test was recently made by us on a type of atomic bomb. Tests on atomic bombs of various calibers will be made in the future."

Associated Press and United Press reported from Los Angeles that Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Gordon Dean disclosed on October 5 that AEC had begun the mass production of tactical atomic bombs. Never, to

my knowledge, have those trusted news services so massacred a major story. Associated Press carried eight full paragraphs or condensations of paragraphs, United Press 13. Only three paragraphs or condensations of paragraphs were common to both dispatches. The United Press dispatch, far and away superior to the Associated Press, though still quite inadequate, reported that Mr. Dean had explained that the new tactical weapons would make it possible "to smash an enemy's armies on the field of battle instead of being faced with the morally repugnant necessity of raining atomic bombs on noncombatants in enemy cities." United Press quoted six paragraphs in which Mr. Dean replied to his own question: "Where does this leave us in terms of our moral position?" Associated Press completely ignored what seems to have been a most important part of the Dean address.

The paragraphs United Press cited give evidence that Mr. Dean sees the moral significance of the possibility of using small tactical bombs against the aggressor himself, at the place of his aggression. Both dispatches, on the other hand, testify to the fact that Mr. Dean went far beyond what might be supposed to be the province of the director of a Government operating agency like AEC. He urged, for example, that we should give serious consideration to the use of an atomic weapon in any battlefield situation where it can be used effectively from the military standpoint. To those who would object that our use of the tactical atomic bomb against enemy troops in the field might provoke Russian retaliation with strategic bombs against American cities, he replied that there is no more chance of that than there is now. The Russians, he argued, would still be restrained by fear of our counter-punch.

After studying the two dispatches, my net impression was that Mr. Dean had delivered himself of a speech that was nothing short of sensational, an impression that grew as I recalled that his record for reticence in press conferences had been equaled only by the Sphinx. Someone had removed the gag. Had Mr. Dean's address been prepared after the Government had learned about the Soviet explosion? An inkling of the answer came the next day.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1951

Under the caption: "Dean idea to wage atomic war in field is held significant," the New York Times front-paged a special article by its Washington correspondent, Anthony Leviero. It looked like a clumsy attempt, obviously inspired, to pump fresh air into Mr. Dean's trial balloon, which the wire services had grounded in Los Angeles. Mr. Leviero, it may be recalled, was the correspondent chosen to break the circumstantial story of President Truman's conference with General MacArthur on Wake Island. Mr. Leviero solemnly declared:

"Since all major pronouncements of United States policy are cleared at the highest levels, it was assumed that Mr. Dean, who verged into questions of military policy, had spoken with the highest sanction. He went so far as to say that use of the tactical atomic weapons involved no greater risk of widening the war than existed at the present."

Mr. Leviero quoted in full Mr. Dean's remarks on moral considerations, which Associated Press had not considered worth quoting in the dispatch carried in the Times the day before, and then added:

"In other words, Mr. Dean suggested there was no reason beyond simple military expediency why we should not use the tactical atomic weapons in Korea or anywhere else where aggression against the free world breaks out. Thus, he apparently put the issue squarely up to President Truman, who alone has the authority to direct their use."

If Mr. Dean spoke with the highest sanction, we have the picture of the President approving his text and saying, "Very well, Gordon, now go out to the Founder's Day of your alma mater, the University of Southern California at Los Angeles, and put the issue squarely up to me. We'll watch for public reactions."

Also on this Sunday, Marcus Duffield, in his weekly news review in the New York Herald Tribune, revealed that

"Information had previously been received by our Central Intelligence Agency that the Russians had developed more powerful bombs than the Nagasaki type, which was about the force of their first explosion. The number of bombs they had on hand was said [by CIA?] to be higher than current American estimates, which put the Russian stockpile at 'less than 100'."

Thus Duffield supports Baldwin against Harsch, while improving on the former regarding the type of bomb the Russians are stockpiling. But where does he leave the Times atomic expert, William L. Lawrence, who on the same day devoted a lengthy and closely reasoned feature article to proving that while "some estimates in Washington place the [Soviet] atomic stockpile as somewhere between 30 and 80 bombs of the Nagasaki type . . . we would arrive at a figure of about 12 to 16 bombs per year, or about a total of 25 to 32 since September 1949?"

The Sunday New York Herald Tribune published an article by its Washington correspondent, James E. Warner, on testimony by Mr. Gordon Dean before the Senate Appropriations Committee on September 21, released by coincidence today on the heels of Premier Stalin's Moscow announcement. Mr. Warner called this passage "the most significant authoritative statement on tactical atomic weapons yet made public":

"We have today a tactical capability which is very impressive, and when I say 'tactical' I am not talking about the type of weapons; I am talking about the use of the weapon. It can be used against men in the field and against military targets. Now you must know that we have this capability today, and we do, and we could use it any place in the world, assuming you can deliver it. We can use it against military troops in the field."

Begging Mr. Warner's pardon, that paragraph strikes me as almost unintelligible. What kind of bomb is he talking about? It must be a big bomb which can be used tactically. Mr. Dean, as of September 21, seemed not to have yet discovered that we have tactical atomic bombs in mass production.

The AP dispatch based on the same Senate committee release remarked: "The hearing transcript brought out many of the points Mr. Dean made in a speech October 5 at Los Angeles." When I read that, the suspicion stirred within me that the new Psychological Warfare Coordinating Board might be behind the Dean releases. It might be attempting, with, to be sure, the awkwardness of a major-league recruit, to pull off a triple play. It might be trying: (1) to distract the American public from thinking about the truly grave implications of the latest Soviet achievement; (2) to pressure the Communists in Korea into an early armistice; and (3) to reassure our anxious allies in Europe. If the Board is involved, by the way, it should be rebuked for allowing this Dean quotation to appear in the AP dispatch:

"Everything in the way of fissionable (explosive) material which is produced in our whole program today goes into bombs."

That is just what Stalin contends, but never before have I heard of a United States official admitting it. Now Mr. Stalin can quote Mr. Dean.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1951

AP, UP, and the New York Times carried stories on AEC Chairman Gordon Dean's September 27 testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the same testimony that was treated in the AP dispatch of October 3. All three sources said that the testimony was made public by the subcommittee on October 7. The earlier AP dispatch, as carried in the October 4 Washington Post, had said: "The testimony was made available yesterday."

Why this apparent repetition, coupled with deception? By comparing the October 3 and October 7 dispatches, I found that the first had omitted two Dean statements which might be considered as important propaganda in the present altered atomic situation. All three October 7 stories included Mr. Dean's assertion that the United States is working toward the possession of a complete variety of atomic weapons, "which would include artillery shells, guided missiles, rockets, and bombs for ground-support aircraft among others, and it would include big ones for big situations and little ones—and this is important—for little situations." All the later stories also quoted this passage.

"Given the right situation, and a target of opportunity, we could use an atomic bomb today in a tactical way against enemy troops in the field, military concentrations near combat areas, and other vital military targets without risk to our own troops."

COMMENTARY

Where to begin one's comments? One could point a dozen morals, ask a dozen questions, voice a dozen warnings, challenge a dozen authorities. But that might only compound the confusion. Let me limit myself, therefore, to these suggestions.

1. That whoever is handling the psychological side of our atomic policy think up less obvious ways of softening bad news—which is bound to break often as the atomic race progresses—than the old trick of trying to distract the public by shouting: "Look what we're doing ourselves."

2. That Government atomic policy-makers drop the ancient and discredited device of inspiring news reports as a means of testing public reaction to their tentative courses of action. "Henceforth," says Hanson Baldwin, "we live with danger." All of us together. Let's together search out a quicker, surer, simpler way of deciding how to meet it.

3. That the wire services and the newspapers treat every atomic item with the most cautious care, exercise voluntary censorship when Government officials let slip information that might aid the enemy, and base their atomic speculations, if they must indulge in them, on the best available authority.

4. That everyone stop calling Bernard Baruch the father of the majority plan for atomic control and stop calling the original American proposals for control the Baruch plan. As Mr. Baruch himself would testify, he had resigned as United States representative long before the majority plan was finally elaborated. He would also admit that he had nothing to do with the original American proposal except to add the no-veto clauses over the opposition of many American experts. The Soviets have been taking advantage of our using Baruch plan for brevity's sake, in order to prove that the plan is a Wall Street trap.

5. That, despite Mr. Baruch's optimism, the U. N. majority plan for international atomic control be thoroughly restudied. Most of the experts I have talked to of late agree that recent developments may well make radical revision necessary.

6. That Mr. Truman most carefully consider the argument that the United States could use the tactical atom against the nibbling aggression of Soviet satellites without risking Russia's atomic retaliation. Who can

be sure that, once she has her military significant stockpile, she may not seize the first plausible excuse for using it against us? Who would hear our protests that we were using only a small tactical atomic bomb, or a big bomb in a tactical way, above the Russian roar that we had used the A-bomb first?

7. That, in view of the current confusion in our atomic policy, President Truman finally fall in line with a recommendation made editorially by America some 2 years ago (America, July 30, 1949, p. 476) that he appoint a Citizens Commission on Atomic Policy. It is painfully apparent that the President is getting precious little help at present in his heart-straining struggle with atomic problems. He should welcome the assistance of a commission somewhat like the one we have suggested.

Community Chest Fund Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under my right and privilege to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I enclose a splendid appeal made by the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, the Attorney General of the United States, to his associates and employees of the Department of Justice on Tuesday, October 16, at a mass meeting held in the great hall of the Department of Justice, in connection with the Community Chest fund campaign of this year. The remarks of Attorney General McGrath can well be heeded by each and every person throughout the United States. It is a stirring appeal in the cause of Godlike charity.

His remarks follow:

I am greatly encouraged by the evidence of your feeling of obligation to the community where you live, as shown by your attendance here this morning.

I am equally pleased to have the opportunity to see so many members of the Department of Justice family face to face. Unfortunately, I have not been able to see you as often as I would like, but I shall hope to avail myself of every opportunity to see more of you.

The Community Chest campaign for the Greater Capital area extends an opportunity for each of us, who work in Government and live in the Greater Capital area, to respond to the obligation to provide, through our own voluntary contributions, the funds necessary to care for the needs of those in our community who are less fortunate than ourselves. If any of you have taken the opportunity to visit any of the 100 social welfare and health agencies who participate in the Community Chest, then you will know, as I do, what an indispensable instrument it is for the stability of our community. The Community Chest fund meets the needs of approximately 250,000 persons of all ages, classes, and races. This great number, amounting to a quarter of a million, is a forceful reminder to us of the warning of the Divine Master, "The poor and the needy you will always have with you." If we should let these essential agencies languish for lack of interest in our support, the community in which we live would suffer irreparably.

We, in the Department, do not propose to tell you how much you should contribute

or how you should contribute—that is a very personal matter and will evoke, according to circumstances, a different answer from each individual. I only ask you to remember that charity and the acceptance of the obligation to help our fellowman is the highest act of Christian manhood and womanhood.

Each Division and Bureau of the Department of Justice has responded magnificently to my request that the Community Chest message be personally brought to each and every one of you. The keymen and women in every branch of the Department of Justice are unselfishly assuming the additional burden of the solicitation while carrying on their heavy responsibilities, and I know that you will not shun their solicitation but will be eager to talk with them and to make a pledge or a contribution in accordance with your abilities. At this point, let me emphasize that we do not expect all the members of the Department of Justice family to make their contributions in one sum, rather we encourage the use of the pledge card so that you may, by installments over a 12-month period, make a contribution that you can carry without too much burden. Your pledge will be welcome just as much as an immediate and single contribution.

In closing, I want to tell you of my affection and high regard for each and every one of you, and my feeling that we are a family of people joined together by a bond of public service. I am confident that the Department of Justice's quota of \$51,000 will be subscribed within the 1-week period of our drive.

Mr. Morison tells me that Mr. Gilks of the Community Chest Federation is here to answer any questions that you may have about the Community Chest. I do not think that the question and answer period should be over 15 minutes, but if you have questions after that you are free to remain and Mr. Gilks will answer them for you. I now invite questions from any of you, and I urge you to ask them.

Our Little Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of October 15, 1951:

OUR LITTLE DICTATOR

On June 27 an amendment to the Defense Production Act intending to confer on the President power to disperse industry was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 56 to 25. On July 11, a similar amendment failed in the House by 134 to 79.

Thus in a matter of 2 weeks' time both Houses of Congress had emphatically refused to give President Truman power to scatter war industry all over the Nation, wherever the whim of the moment dictated. Yet only a few weeks later the President assumed to do by roundabout methods the very thing that Congress had rejected.

He issued a directive ordering the office of Defense Mobilization to undertake a general policy of dispersal of industry to be enforced by granting or withholding certificates of necessity, by allocating or refusing critical materials for construction purposes and by making or declining emergency loans growing out of defense production.

In other words, a manufacturer who is ordered to make rifle cartridges in Truman's home town in Missouri where no cartridges have ever been made before and where nobody knows anything about making them, must either do so or risk having his certificate of necessity denied, his allocation of raw materials cut down, and any necessary loans refused.

The sum and substance of this is that the present occupant of the White House is setting up a miniature dictatorship. That is, it is miniature at the moment, but tends to grow larger because hardly a day goes by without some further evidence of the same tendency.

The President, by using these roundabout methods, has plainly defied the vote of Congress. But for that matter, Congress itself does not come out very well in the matter. Having voted as it did, it lacked the gumption to make the President adhere to the policy thus laid down and meekly submitted to his evasion. It is hard for anyone to have much respect for that kind of Congress.

Private Enterprise Cannot Be Held Wholly Responsible for the Housing Shortage Which Faces America Today, Nor Does the Only Solution Rest in Federal Housing Projects—The Solution Must Be Found by Intelligent Action on the Part of an Enlightened and Responsible Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of an address I delivered on housing last week to the National Association of Housing Officials, conferring here in Washington. I believe no greater problem faces us at this time than the very real need for providing decent environment in which to rear the coming generation of this Nation:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON BEFORE THE LUNCHEON CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING OFFICIALS, WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 10, 1951

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Association of Housing Officials, and distinguished guests. It is a pleasure to be with you today and to divide the honor of being here with my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Mr. RAINS, as well as to share with you for a few short minutes some of my thoughts on what, for lack of a better word, we all call housing.

I am no housing expert with facts and figures at my finger ends; that you know. For 12 years I have had the great privilege of representing in the House one of the greatest districts of the country—a district made up of every conceivable point of view, consisting of people from all parts of the world and of many religious and political faiths. It has been a most challenging experience and a most illuminating one.

During the years previous to my election to the Congress, I was the wife of an eminent member of the Ohio Legislature and of the United States House of Representatives, and the mother of three sons, the

oldest of whom, through a swimming accident at a camp where he was a counselor, has been my key to an understanding of men's hearts and minds which only such an experience could give.

But it was many years before that that housing made a direct attack upon me.

As one of a small group of girls—we had been the Brownie Club since we were 5 or 6—I found myself at 18 head of the supply committee of the newly established Visiting Nurse Association of Cleveland. Being of curious minds, we asked to be allowed to go with the nurses into the districts to carry the extra supplies and assist them in every way. My childhood has been a sheltered one. This leap into what the stark realities of life are for the unsheltered was dramatic in the extreme. It is one I have never regretted; indeed, it deeply affected my adult development.

The crowded conditions, the unbelievable filth, the lack of even the most primitive decencies in certain areas, imbedded themselves in my heart and mind. The degradation, the sickness, and the crime bred in our slums has laid heavily upon me down the years.

No; I am no housing expert such as are most of you at these tables. I have brought you no scientific facts in regard to the results of overcrowding. You have enough of these. Whatever I bring you today is the result of all that grew out of that winter when I went to the University of Stark Reality. Through the years following, when most of my time and energy went into my small family, until now, I have tried in many different ways to become increasingly aware of and useful to the battle that must constantly be waged in this great Republic of ours ultimately to eradicate the lack of decent shelter that continues to be the lot of all too many of our people. Whatever I bring you today is from the deep conviction that has become mine that we who have decent homes in decent areas have an inescapable responsibility to find ways to make adequate shelter and wholesome environment possible to others.

You who are members of the National Association of Housing Officials have a vital part to play. Of that there can be no doubt. I hope you are all as eager to play if from the depth of your human understanding as is your Chairman Ernie Bohn, to whom Clevelanders look with the constant assurance that he strives for justice seeking always to do his full duty to humanity in the light of his understanding. Whether one agrees with him or not, no one who has had continuing contact with him down the years as I have had, could fail to credit him with loyalty to his dream of seeing greater Cleveland and the whole United States, a better place to live in.

For myself, I have never been able to set aside my sense of personal obligation as a free citizen of this great Republic, as a representative of a large and varied constituency and as a woman deeply concerned with the future. I have never been able to believe that our concentration upon machines has made us so material-minded that we fail to see our responsibility in the matter of assuring our people adequate homes in which children can grow into honorable and healthy citizens. The future is deeply my concern—and where is our future unless it be in our children? Am I wrong, friends, in believing that they have the right to expect us, as intelligent Americans, to see to it that they be born into homes where love will be their portion, set in decent surroundings where they may grow straight and strong in body, mind, and soul?

We have a wonderful heritage of freedom, we Americans, one which we must guard well if these same children are to bless our generation.

It is both important and necessary that adequate shelter be possible for all. But,

unless the sun of liberty and freedom rise with every new day, darkness will be our portion and shelter, will imprison our people.

Am I wrong, Mr. Chairman, in believing that no thoughtful American today can fail to recognize a growing need to protect this liberty, this freedom from the intrusions of centralized power, that no one may shirk the responsibility of assuring the future such justice as will protect the individual against the encroachment of Government upon his inherent right to choose his particular path. Surely that is the fundamental tenet of the American way of life.

Yes, I am opposed to Federal authority as against State responsibility. I am aggressively for local and individual action rather than the inaction which will inevitably force the acceptance of Federal domination. At the same time—and I see no conflict between these points of view—I believe that because the States united for common protection and mutual well-being, there rests upon the resultant Federal Government a definite responsibility toward these States and through them to those individuals unable to carry their part of the load. This responsibility is of several parts, not the least of which is that whatever is done by the Federal Government to help the individual must not encroach upon his responsibility to himself and to his fellow man.

Although my sons are grown and their sons and daughters are beginning to reach towards the realities of today's living, I have not forgotten lessons I learned from my need as a mother to see that they should grow strong in character—that they should learn to do their part and to do for themselves. All mothers know how much easier it is to pick up the toy themselves, to hang the coat away, than to insist on the child doing this for himself. So much faster to do the buttoning and the shoelace tying than to wait while the little fellow learns laboriously to do it alone.

So much easier, friends, for a local government to let the State give it funds for schools and such and so easy for the State to give over to the central government. But just as a child is retarded and often made tragically helpless by too much parent help, so is a State and a community weakened by overmuch leaning on the greater power.

Does the child realize that when the disciplines of self-help are not imposed, insecurity and fear is built up? Have we appreciated that we have been building insecurity and fear amongst us in much the same fashion?

Am I wrong in believing that our children have the right to expect us, as wise parents and responsible citizens of a nation born to give a pattern of freedom under law to mankind, to keep their homes free from the autocratic controls of centralized power and so continuing the basic concept of this great Republic?

I am strongly of the opinion that those of us who are gathered here today have but one object—to do our best for America, to learn from her past and the past of other less fortunate countries, and to build the framework for a future which will give to men everywhere a new sense of what life can mean to all.

I believe that if we cannot find ways to make our concept of freedom function within the American pattern, we are but poor exponents of the formula upon which we as a Nation set ourselves up.

There have always been those who believe that the people as such cannot govern themselves. But here in our Republic the power was given to the people and they were charged to watch vigilantly lest it slip from them.

We are poor stewards if we fail to find ways to protect the basic tenets of our faith and so permit those who want to divert us from the straight road of responsibility for our own freedoms by using the needs of cer-

tain groups, dramatic as they may be, for their own ends because of our default.

As I pointed out in relation to the housing bill (H. R. 1883) which I originally introduced on January 27, 1949, with nine of my Republican colleagues, the needs of our people for adequate shelter are very real. No one act of omission or commission has created the present situation. No one method will solve the problem. The fact that industry has not demonstrated a capacity to cope with it does not mean that private enterprise can be held responsible for the tragic needs of our low-income group. Nor does this mean that the only solution rests in Federal housing projects. The answer is as complex as the causes are manifold, and the solution rests upon the intelligent action of an enlightened and responsible public.

To cry aloud that the cost of Federal housing is beyond all reason, makes little sense to those who, like myself, believe that (as I said on the House floor in June of 1949) "public housing may be a losing venture from the money angle, but it cannot help being an abundant dividend-paying venture insofar as health, good citizenship, and a stable society is concerned."

Add up the cost of crime, hospitals, mental institutions, etc., subtract as large a percentage as is reasonable for other basic causes, and you will still have left a tidy sum to apply against the savings we could make in physical, mental, and moral value through decent homes and wholesome environment for our children.

For those who do not look only through a financial eyeglass, it would seem to be indicated that we dare not neglect these human returns, that in order to build strength within our own frontiers, our own body politic, we dare not refuse to use every possible means which will insure to oncoming generations health, honorable living, and opportunity to forward the ideals of unity and freedom which is their rightful heritage.

But we must use these elements intelligently, always alert to and aware of the implications of what we are doing.

To this end, those who, like yourselves, are working on one phase of the picture, and those who, like my distinguished colleague, Mr. RAINS, and I are charged with the responsibility of recognizing all sides of the larger picture, must do our utmost to see to it that the people of this great and wonderful country of ours are thoroughly informed, that they know something at least of the various problems involved in what we oversimplify when we just say "housing."

The partially informed layman is apt to blame the municipality entirely for slum conditions—saying broadly "the area should be condemned." Unfortunately, you know and I know it is not as simple as that. The limit to condemnation proceedings is soon apparent although they do often serve to bring a desirable pressure to bear upon the owners of properties where human beings live under conditions unfit for any animal—paying high rents—and exposed to every deteriorating influence.

The battle against this deterioration must be waged relentlessly. We shall need to use all our weapons, not the least of which is the fundamental American belief of the individual in doing for himself—asking help only when he has exhausted all his own resources.

In all too many instances men have lost confidence in their own capacities. In our slum areas life itself has become devoid of all hope of betterment. What must be achieved is an aroused public opinion which will bring into action all individual and local elements, with an intelligent use of the available Federal assistance to fill in the gaps. Part of the battle is to increase the sense of personal responsibility in every individual. We must find ways to make positive personal action a mark of patriotism and an object of popular admiration. We must bring to all our people a new sense of

self-dependence, a "let's do it ourselves" attitude such as the rural health program which the American Medical Association has begun to build so very successfully. But, at the same time, we must remember that when the States joined together to form the Union, there was created a Federal Government with capacities which no single State could develop alone. To use these capacities wisely is one of our great responsibilities as citizens of a country whose people accepted the responsibilities for their own freedom placed upon them by those who gave us our Constitution and our Bill of Rights.

I am one of those who believes that we can circumscribe Federal authority sufficiently to preserve our freedoms if we are alert to all possible dangers and if those in authority determine and intend that they shall be preserved. I believe that we can set up a percentage of Federal housing units where individual and local elements are unable to meet an evident need without endangering our free way of life. And I believe the end result of intelligent use of the necessary Federal funds to fill in the gaps in local programs for adequate shelter for all people will be a stronger Nation.

In closing, I would urge upon you who carry a real responsibility to protect oncoming generations from the heavy hand of Government control in this vital area of our national life, to be alert to danger, aware of the subtly covered pitfall on every path your feet must tread, serving the best interests of the America of today and tomorrow.

When all is said and done, America, with her belief in the capacity of the people to protect their freedoms and to govern themselves with her trust in Almighty God, has a duty to Him in the preservation of the right of the individual to choose what he will do with his life.

Each of us has a vital part to play in carrying forward these freedoms that have been our heritage. Together we can build an ever stronger, ever greater America.

How Tough Is the Red Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we often think here in America that the Soviet Army is a rough, tough fighting force of immense power. But is this really the case, or is this idea another example of how Communist propaganda has been subtly filtered into the minds of us Americans? Remember the millions of people of the Soviet Union who surrendered to the Germans in World War II rather than fight for Stalin. Father Leopold Braun was the only American Catholic priest in the U. S. S. R. during the war and he had an inside view of the might of the Red army. I include herewith his views on the Red army which appeared in the October 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine:

THE MYTH OF THE MIGHTY RED ARMY

(By Leopold Braun, A. A.)

World War II finished in the minds of distant observers outside Russia in a fanfare of universal praise for the Red army. Invincibility, discipline, toughness, and superiority are but few of the attributes dimmed

into the ears of the public concerning the Red forces. The Soviet Union was proposed to world admiration as the savior of civilization. Even Stalin was adulated as the redeemer of democratic liberties. People now look upon the Red army with awe and bewilderment.

What are the facts? What did really happen in Russia during World War II? Why did the Soviet regime not finish crumbling to pieces as it had unmistakably started to do within 4 months of the German attack? This article will attempt to throw some light on these questions.

This first-hand information is based on 12 years of uninterrupted experience in the U S S R as chaplain to American Catholics from 1934 to 1945. A fluent knowledge of the language enabled me to deal directly with Russians of every possible walk of life from Vladivostok to Moscow and from Leningrad to Baku. I was one of the few foreigners who lived through the Moscow panic of 1941 when commissars were frantically paying as much as 20,000 rubles to be driven away from the besieged capital.

Six years after VJ-day the American public is only beginning to recover from the dose of political anesthesia administered by Soviet propaganda. The biggest injection of mental morphine lulling the world to unawareness was the announced suppression of the Comintern. The time has come to reveal a few startling facts.

On Sunday morning of June 22, 1941, there were signs of extraordinary excitement in Moscow. Narkomindel (foreign office) cars, along with those of the NKVD (secret police) were darting in and out of streets at more than the customary speed. Something of unusual importance was going on, but the proletarian masses, supposedly ruling the country, were being kept in utter ignorance. Exactly at 4.30 a. m. of that day the Wehrmacht launched its drang nach Osten (drive toward the east) on a front 280 miles long. The impact was so terrific that Soviet frontier garrisons were immediately swept inland. Such was the case with the Red army troops in the cities of Minsk, Bobruisk, Zhitomir and other points along that line. The western border had been secretly replenished with additional divisions from the Mongolian and Manchurian borders at least one month before the attack. Pravda had denied these troop movements as reported abroad. Fleeing Red officers and soldiers were instantly accused of treason. Back in Moscow the families of these officers lost overnight the privileges attached to their military rank. The prestige of the Red army had been shattered. Treason was the only convenient excuse that could be resorted to by the narkomoboron (defense commissariat) to hide its shame.

Hush-hush details were reaching Moscow or mass desertions at the front. One had to live with the people to learn these facts. The Sovinformburo, of course, concealed this from its communiques. Throughout the war one single brain imagined the cock-and-bull stories of Red army feats appearing in the Allied press. This was Comrade S. A. Lozovsky alias Commissar Dridzo, boss of the Prointern and Tito's friend, who prepared the daily volennaya svodka (war communique) handed to the press.

As early as July 1941, Red army resistance was so ineffective that narkoms (departmental chiefs) had hastily flown out. Bigwigs who later tried to leave by car were mauled to death by infuriated Russians. The retreat was certainly anything but a planned affair.

The Luftwaffe established an air base in Smolensk within a few weeks. Press reports from Kouibyshev, the temporary capital, boasted that anti-aircraft fire over Moscow was so effective that German planes couldn't fly over the city. This is utterly false. I was under the bombs myself all through the war. Heinkels, Messerschmitts and Stukas flew

over Moscow at will taking the precaution of scare-bombing only. The city was deliberately not destroyed because von Bock, the German commanding officer, wanted to use it to garrison his troops for the winter. The thermometer that year dropped to 46 degrees below zero centigrade in Moscow, let alone the surrounding countryside, where it was still colder. Those who lived in the city at the time cannot explain why the Germans, only nine miles away, did not enter the capital. Perhaps it was because the troops were exhausted, far away from their bases and most of all, totally unprepared to withstand the bitter cold weather. All that was left of the Red army in the capital were the demolition squads waiting for the signal to blow up the bridges and main buildings. Explosive charges had been prepared all over the city.

By October of 1941 the Red army had retreated so deeply inland that Moscow commissars became very restless. The Government decided to "evacuate." Secretly it had done so 2 months previously. Diplomats and foreign correspondents were ordered to leave. On October 14, I too, was summoned by the American Embassy to follow them with all I could carry in two suitcases. I flatly refused to leave while I was still in charge of that last-remaining Catholic church in all of the U. S. S. R. It was being attended also by hundreds of Russians. That evacuation train in five sections was not bombed only because it was snowing that night. Otherwise all such trains were regularly hit by the Luftwaffe and reduced to tchelovitcheskaya kasha (human porridge) as the Russians called it.

On the day of the German attack the Politburo deliberated for all of 8 hours before revealing the news. Finally about noon, Molotov in a radioed proclamation spoke of an unprovoked and unexpected attack. Documents later seized in Germany by the American Army prove beyond doubt that Molotov had actually provoked the Germans by demanding more Rumanian territory. Molotov did not tell the Russian people that away deep inside Poland occupied by the Red army since September 17, 1939, the Soviets had built fortifications extending back 40 kilometers from the border, in expectation of the German thrust. This information was obtained without my asking for it, from the evacuated Polish population brought into Russia against their will at the time. The Wehrmacht swept through these pillboxes, blockhouses, and tank traps with ease and speed. Shortly after Molotov's proclamation the Kremlin confiscated all radio receivers belonging to Russian nationals for the duration of the war.

General confusion was so great along the western border, that 2 weeks after the invasion, supply trains in accordance with the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of August 23, 1939, were still leaving the U. S. S. R. headed for Germany. In the initial stages of the war, a general sentiment of apathy and lack of enthusiasm prevailed in the population, barring some elements of Soviet youth. Marshals Tukhachevsky and Blucher, idols of the troops, had been shot just prior to the war, accused of having plotted the overthrow of the régime. Added to this the shooting of several hundred other officers of the Red army for similar reasons had depressed the entire nation. Three chiefs were left to lead the hesitant Red army: Voroshilov, Edenny, and Timoshenko. Klim Voroshilov, Commissar of Defense, had boasted that the Red army would not allow Soviet soil to be trodden to the extent of 1 foot by an invading army. The Wehrmacht later occupied 4,000,000 square miles of the U. S. S. R. and made this statement look silly.

When the fighting began in Russia, there was hardly a family which did not have one member or relative in a concentration camp or under political arrest. The Kremlin, suddenly seized with terror because of the Red,

army instability and the surging sentiments of its demoralized population, reintroduced the word "patriotism" deleted from the Comintern vocabulary. It also placed each Red army officer under the immediate control of the hated political supervisors—all NKVD spies. Most of the Red army is conscripted from the peasantry violently dispossessed during collectivization. In the late thirties several million Russians, intellectuals, engineers, and technicians had been shot in the purges of two successive NKVD chiefs: Iagoda and Iezhov. The population remembered these massacres. Thousands upon thousands of males of military age from the Asiatic republics fled into the mountains from the start of the war to escape conscription. In the much-better policed RSFSR, mobilization was less difficult.

The U S S R has 2,000,000 conscripts per annum but these men are not all willing fighters. Red army men in several instances had to be pushed into battle by the bayonets of the NKVD troops. When there was no danger of being shot in the back by NKVD troops they surrendered in droves to the Germans. Soviet press bulletins never made mention of the 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 Red prisoners who handed themselves over to the Germans without firing a shot. As prisoners of war working on German farms and in armament plants, their life was heaven compared to their peacetime existence in sovkhoses and kolkhozes. After Normandy the liberating Bolsheviks fell upon half a million Ukrainians fighting communism in the south of Russia under General Vlasov, later hanged as a war criminal. Hundreds of thousands of civilians followed the retreating German and Rumanian Armies. This mass exodus was so important that at Potsdam the Soviets demanded and obtained American, English, and French assistance in repatriating these political refugees against their will.

It was common practice during the early stages of the war for Red soldiers to wound or maim themselves in a desperate effort to stay away from the front. The demand for cannon fodder was so great that 16-year-olds were sent to battle following a bare 2 weeks' training. Even this couldn't satisfy the ruthless demand for more and more men. Bandits were released from jails provided they went to the front lines. Such desperadoes dressed in Red army uniforms are responsible for some of the outrages attributed to the Red army. Indignant parents with relatives under political arrest showed me certificates notifying them that their sons had died a glorious death in defense of the socialistic fatherland. To raise its prestige, the party enlisted unwilling Red army men into its ranks, sending them membership cards at the front as a reward for their valor. After the war, purges brought the party back to normal, i. e., one-twentieth of the population.

In the heat and haste of the Soviet retreat the Reds finished off captured Germans, plus their own wounded and those Russians who, from sheer exhaustion, could not keep up the pace. Stragglers from the front testified to me about these horrible practices. The debacle of the hot-footed Red army racing for the Caucasus is only one of the unwritten chapters of the last war. Press correspondents a thousand kilometers away could not and never did report this military marathon won hands down by the Red army.

I constantly ran across Red army men who fled from the front with absolutely no desire to fight the Germans or any other invader. What they did want to do was fight the NKVD troops, fully equipped and fed with American lend-lease. It was this secret-police army that prevented global insurrections from taking place in unoccupied Russia. How often Russians asked me what kind of men our American leaders were to

be sending so much materiel to the torturers of their people.

With the Wehrmacht fighting on two fronts, the Red army triumphantly reoccupied its territory, proudly riding on Dodge, Ford, and 10-wheeler Studebaker trucks. Close to half a million vehicles from the United States of America alone reached the U S S R. In the endless columns I watched there was scarcely any Soviet-made equipment after 1942.

As the liberating Red forces approached cities and villages only recently evacuated by the Germans, the people got after the officers of the Red army, pleading with them to seize power. "We want to live like normal people," they said. "Get rid of that man in the Kremlin and abolish this organized slavery of collective farming." That was the general chorus throughout Russia in 1944-45.

Gen. N. F. Vatulín, of the Red army, was suspected of being favorable to this move. While ill in a Kiev hospital, he was surgically assassinated in the quiet manner known to the Kremlin potentates. On the day of his death, April 15, 1944, he was promptly proclaimed a true son of the Bolshevik Party, one of the best military leaders of the Red army.

Readers will object that the Red army fought well. This is absolutely undeniable. Red army men fought like blazes and were models of bravery, endurance, and self-sacrifice in circumstances of hardship that defy description. How is this explained? The good muzhik (peasant) who carried the brunt of this war began to give his all and fought like mad, from the moment he saw the possibility of a change of regime. This is of extreme importance for a true understanding of this about-face. Every Russian from then on really thought he was fighting for himself and his family. This also explains the widespread type of partisan guerrilla warfare that then became so popular. Moreover, they had expected the Allies to bring them liberation. This was especially so when the now-forgotten Atlantic Charter was proclaimed. While millions of Russians have learned the hard way to distrust Stalin's signature, they believed the western leaders heralding the four freedoms. Also when the Kremlin for a time was forced to withdraw its Politruki (political administrators) from the ranks of the Red army because of the resulting disorders, mutinies, killings, denunciations and desertions, then the Red army did fight. But no sooner had the military begun to feel their power than the Politruki reappeared reinforced by the karáélni riadi (punitive squads) of the NKVD troops. They did such a fine job of keeping the Red army in check that these NKVD chiefs were decorated at the war's end. The indignation of the Russian people then knew no bounds.

Similarly when victory salutes were fired on the Red Square just as the NKVD troops were resuming their stranglehold of the "liberated" population, repressed anger was apparent on all the faces. All this happened during the critical period of flux when Russians were led to think they were heading for a much-dreamed-of democracy. People then said: "Why did these British and Americans come over here to pour oil on our fire?" Disenchantment is a mild word to translate the feelings of Red army men who went abroad and compared standards of life undreamed of. Moreover, prisoners of war forcibly repatriated were never allowed to go back to their families. Branded in a body as predateľi naróda (traitors to the country) they were herded into boxcars or put on barges and sent deep inland for their perevospítání (reeducation). They had seen too much. To this day they are at forced labor under MVD-MGB armed guards.

The NKVD during the war dealt both with the military and civilian population. There is no arguing with these perfected Tchékists.

This explains to a great extent the perfect "discipline" of a Red soldier. Quivering submission is a far better expression. The Russian nevertheless is tough and can endure a great deal more than any ordinary western soldier, because he is born in poverty inconceivable to the west, and accustomed to extraordinary privations from early childhood. Outsiders are prone to confuse "discipline" with the results of mental fear and physical intimidation. Upon the slightest act of insubordination a Red soldier may be shot dead on the spot by a superior officer. Is it any wonder that casual observers should marvel at Soviet "discipline"? General pass-partoutization in the U. S. S. R. makes escape virtually impossible. Should a Red soldier get away, he knows that his next of kin will immediately be arrested. This is a simple application of the Penal Code (art. 58 in 12 subdivisions) protecting the Bolshevik régime.

In the light of these details, the might of the Red army becomes a myth, its strength a weakness—because all is based on systematized fear and bullying. Stalin and the Politburo know this better than anyone else. Never will they risk sending the Red army into world conflict, because of its inherent instability. Besides this, the Russians have been severely weakened in manpower—a fact so far carefully concealed. Stalin admitted 7,000,000 killed in World War II. But Red army men never hesitated to tell me that 10 of theirs at least died for every German killed. To say that 20,000,000 Russians died in this last war is an understatement. And what about the invalids, the maimed and the helpless veterans? Their number is far greater than the killed. In the U. S. S. R. it is an act of counterrevolution even to mention this.

While Voroshilov, Budénny, and Timoshenko in the initial campaign lost entire armies of 400,000 men apiece, it is also true that they had as many more men to throw into battle. Our own GI's bravely fighting in Korea with organized handicaps know what this means with the Red Chinese "volunteers" descending upon them in wave after wave.

It is also true that such generals as Zhukov, Rokossovsky, and Manilovsky, to name but a few, acquired glory. Leningrad never fell to the Germans and von Bock was stopped at the outskirts of Moscow. Stalin-grad did change the course of the war and Simferopolis in the Crimea held out nobly. No one denies these accomplishments. Americans, on the other hand, omit throwing into this balance other important considerations: In the face of an invasion Russia, not the Red army, has three natural advantages: (1) Fourteen and one-half million square miles of territory to run on; (2) almost inexhaustible manpower; (3) insurmountable winter conditions. Added to this, two other important factors in World War II pumped and puffed the Red army to a degree of glory far in excess of its real worth. Who knows, for example, that two entire Soviet fronts were exclusively supplied, fed, and equipped with United States of America lend-lease? Red army officers admitted to me that but for this they could not have held out. The Allies in general and the Americans in particular are held responsible by the Russian people for abetting NKVD ruthlessness at a time when it should have been wiped out. The true factor in the Soviet "victory" is not the overstated Red army so much as the NKVD-MVD-MGB type of perfected Gestapo the Russian people hoped to get rid of. Since when are we to look upon this as a symbol and proof of Red army might?

The real story of Red military weakness remains to this day little known. No allied military, naval, or air attaché accredited to the U. S. S. R. was ever permitted to observe the Red army or any other Red military unit in combat throughout the entire war. Their weaknesses had at all costs to be concealed. I know that occasionally allied

officers were conducted to the front. Similar excursions were organized for foreign newspapermen, including the impudent farce of the Katyn massacre investigation elaborately staged by the Soviets. Participants used to call these trips vodka circuits.

When our GI's stretched a hand of friendship to greet the Red army on the Elbe, they were offering perfect sincerity but the Americans quickly noticed the "disciplinary" restraint of the Red army men cowed by the NKVD. Every single American officer and GI who ever dealt with the Soviets experienced the same embarrassment.

Toward the end of the war an American correspondent in Moscow showed me a cablegram just received from his home office which approximately read: "We sent you to Russia to get the news. Since you can't do that, come back home." Much less starry-eyed admiration of the nonexistent Red army superman would have resulted in the American public mind had other agencies acted likewise. The survival of our God-given liberties and the safeguard of our constitutional heritage are too precious to be disturbed by unfounded belief in Soviet superexcellence.

Veterans' Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my office has been flooded with inquiries from Members of Congress and veterans protesting the action in preventing veterans from applying for Government insurance. Some of the cases are most distressing. Certainly it could not have been intended to deprive millions of veterans of their rights to apply for Government insurance without any previous notice. Many veterans through circumstances beyond their control failed to renew or convert their existing insurance which they had kept in force for a period of 8 years since their discharge from World War II. There is no remedy for these individuals unless the provisions of my bill, H. R. 4412, become law.

I was very much pleased to note a press release made on September 28 by the national commanders of six major veterans' organizations from which the following is quoted:

The national commanders of six major veterans' organizations agreed today to call on American consumers to buy only goods and services produced by the free nations and to refrain from purchasing products of Russia and Communist countries under Russian domination.

The veteran leaders who met in Washington today were Erle Cocke, Jr., Dawson, Ga., national commander of the American Legion; Frank C. Hilton, Reading, Pa., commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars; John L. Smith, Barberton, Ohio, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS); Donald J. McQuade, Toledo, Ohio, national commander, Catholic War Veterans; Paul Ginsberg, Atlanta, Ga., national commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; and Charles W. Bernhardt, Atlanta, Ga., national commander of the United Spanish War Veterans. The Disabled American War

Veterans was represented by Cicero F. Hogan, Washington, D. C., national director of claims.

The group in reaching agreement on the need for an educational campaign aimed at the American buying public, pointed out that the imminence of the Christmas shopping season underscores the urgency of self-discipline on the part of consumers here to insure against a flow of American dollars to Russia and Russian-controlled manufacturers and sellers. At the same time, the veteran leaders agreed to press this campaign against Communist products on a year-round basis when the Christmas holidays have ended.

The veterans' commanders also agreed to seek closer coordination of their organizations' efforts to work for adoption of universal military training and service legislation; to join in urging enactment of a measure to extend GI bill of rights benefits to veterans of the Korean fighting, and to seek extension of the present grace period for reinstatement of veterans' insurance. The group advocated that veterans whose premium payments have lapsed be given an opportunity to reinstate insurance policies by the payment of back premiums.

Mr. Speaker, it is unusual and unique to find all major service organizations seeking to open the rights to these millions of deserving veterans.

Although my bill was introduced many weeks ago it has not as yet received a hearing before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. A significant factor is the statement of Deputy Administrator Clark, of the Veterans' Administration, to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs under date of September 6, 1951, that "the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4412) would result in some cost to the Government, but it is estimated that such cost would not be large." That being the case I hope the Veterans' Committee will schedule this bill for immediate action to do justice to these millions of veterans.

Withholding of Information by Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it often is necessary for me, as a Member of Congress representing the people of Wyoming, to request information from the several departments of our Federal Government. It often is necessary for me to obtain information on a variety of problems, in connection with my duties in serving the people of Wyoming as their representative here in Washington.

All of you, no doubt, have occasion to make similar requests, and probably many of you have experienced difficulties identical to those which I am about to relate.

I wish to protest, Mr. Speaker, against the withholding of information requested by Members of Congress, requests made in an honest effort to serve

the people we represent. I have had two experiences recently which I want to bring to the attention of Congress, as shining examples of what I believe to be deliberate attempts to withhold information from Members of Congress. Perhaps such laxity in answering departmental mail is dictated by political reasons, perhaps not. I will not attempt to make such distinctions here and at this time.

It so happens that both instances I am about to detail involved the Department of the Interior, but I do not intend to infer that this department is the only one guilty of similar maneuvering.

On September 28, I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, asking for a definite statement on the Department's plan for development of synthetic fuels and for construction of such a plant in Wyoming. It has been rumored in Wyoming, particularly in northern Wyoming, for many months that a synthetic fuels plant is planned by the Department in that area. I asked Secretary Chapman specifically what the Department's plans are in this regard.

I wrote this letter to Secretary Chapman for the express purpose of obtaining a definite statement from him, because I believe the people of Wyoming have a right to know where they stand in this matter.

This letter was written on September 28, and despite another letter to Secretary Chapman, written on October 8, I have yet to receive a reply from him. I have had, only a few days ago, telephonic acknowledgment of my letters. This telephonic acknowledgment came not from Secretary Chapman, but from one of his assistant secretaries.

Meanwhile, an Assistant Secretary was in Wyoming and spoke at a public meeting in the northern part of the State, where the interest in development of synthetic fuels is most intense. News reports of this address shed little light on definite plans of the department for the area, and I have yet to receive a reply from Secretary Chapman.

The second incident got under way last August 16, when I wrote to Mr. T. W. Mermel, Assistant Commissioner, Engineering, of the Bureau of Reclamation. This letter was in response to an appeal from the community of Mills, Wyo., relative to the transfer of a sewerage system constructed by the United States to the town of Mills. I asked Mr. Mermel for information concerning the transfer, effected by a law passed by the Eighty-first Congress. So far, I have not heard from Mr. Mermel.

Instead, I have received a brief letter of transmittal signed by another assistant commissioner, Mr. G. W. Lineweaver, enclosing a copy of a letter written to a Casper, Wyo., attorney by an assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior.

This assistant secretary is assigned to mineral resources—not reclamation. I received the copy of his letter on October 11; his letter to the Casper attorney was dated October 2—9 days earlier.

Mr. Speaker, this appears to be a deliberate attempt on the part of the Department of the Interior to obstruct me

in my duties of serving some of the people I am here to represent. I never have received any information from the party to whom I addressed my request on August 16.

Nearly 2 months later, I received a copy of a letter written by an assistant secretary whose duties are supposed to deal with mineral resources—not the transfer of a sewerage system constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I was denied the information I requested, while an assistant secretary of the department went far afield of his official duties, on the same problem.

I protest such activities by the Department of the Interior or by any other Federal department, bureau, or agency. I believe that Members of Congress should be shown the courtesy of at least being advised whether the requested information is available. If they cannot supply the necessary information, let them say so frankly.

In both of the instances I have described, I believe that the information I sought could have been provided me directly and without delay. Such should have been the case, but was not, in either instance.

In the latter case, particularly, I would like to know if it is the usual procedure in the Department of the Interior for an assistant secretary to step outside his own specific assignment and to supplant a Member of Congress in his duties.

On the Roman Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a discussion by H. Ralph Burton, of Washington, D. C. Mr. Burton served as special investigator for the Committee on Military Affairs for many years during my service on that committee. During that time I found his knowledge of history most interesting and informative.

The quotation below consists of some extracts from *On the Roman Road to Ruin*, a presentation of the startling analogies between Rome of ancient times, first as a republic and then as a totalitarian state under emperors, and the United States and England of today.

This is a historically factual account of disaster befalling Rome, resulting from the effects of corruption, confiscatory taxation, and government spending, startlingly comparable to the trend of the times today in the United States of America.

It is based throughout upon facts of history drawn from authentic sources and supported by authors of standing in the field of historical research.

Mr. Burton's discussion is copyrighted, but he has extended me permission to

insert the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ON THE ROMAN ROAD TO RUIN
DEMOCRACIES AND REPUBLICS

For years there have been statements in public and private spheres regarding the exact meaning of democracy and republic in which frequently the use of the two terms indicated belief that one was inconsistent with the other. This is definitely not true for Republic connotes a particular procedure in the exercise of democratic rights of free people in the form of government known from the earliest times as a democracy.

Government then existed as city states and legislation could be readily enacted in the public square by the people's direct vote and the cities of that day such as Athens, Sparta, Thebes, Corinth, and others were so governed. As time passed, however, cities extended to enlarged territories thus making impossible the personal attendance of the citizens which, therefore, necessitated employing the system of government by representatives of the people within an existing democracy, and the United States is as Rome was, a democracy using the system of representatives elected by the people of a democracy exercising their rights as its citizens.

Democracy is a word of Greek origin meaning "the rule of the people," and the Greeks were the first people of the ancient world to gain it.

There were, of course, political parties in such ancient democracies such as the oligarchs and democrats, conservatives and radicals, a peace party and a war party, according to the burning questions of the day, but party systems were never developed and whatever may have been the evils incident to the ancient form of democracy the boss, the caucus, and the spoils system were not among them. These came with modernization of politics.

CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT—(FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES B. C.)

National festivities gradually increased, selfishly promoted, at Government expense, by politicians seeking favor through pleasing the less discriminating voters, later supplemented by the vying of candidates in giving gladiatorial contests and other spectacles at their own expenses. The splendor of the games eventually became the standard by which the voters estimated the fitness of the candidates for consulship, which was then the highest office in Rome.

To check the growth of such methods of getting votes, Cicero, in his consulship, brought in a corrupt practices act which forbade citizens to give gladiatorial exhibitions within 2 years of any election in which they were candidates.

It proved no more effective, probably, than modern corrupt practices acts because the Romans were as clever as some politicians of the United States in obeying the letter but not the spirit of the law.

Apropos of campaign tactics it is of interest to note some of the early political philosophy expressed by Quintus Tullius Cicero in the effort to persuade his brother, the great Roman Senator, to become more practical in seeking election to the office of consul.

He urged promising favors to voters.

"Human nature being what it is," said Quintus in his Handbook of Politics, "all men prefer a false promise to a flat refusal. At the worst the man to whom you have lied may be angry. That risk, if you make a promise, is uncertain and deferred, and it affects only a few. But if you refuse you are sure to offend many, and that at once."

Quintus could have then little realized that he fathered a political philosophy in the first century B. C. which would steadily develop until the zenith of perfection in the art of political promising would be reached by the middle of the twentieth century, 2,000 years later.

ROMAN REPUBLIC ENDS

Mommsen says of this period: "But in order to such elections and such decrees there was needed some special stimulus, in general the mass having no will of its own followed the first impulse, and folly or accident dictated the decision. . . . But the weakening of the government and the weakening of the community itself were among the lesser dangers that sprang from this demagogism. . . . That which formally issued forth as the will of the supreme authority in the state was in reality very often the mere personal pleasure of the mover, and what was to be the fate of a commonwealth in which war and peace, the nomination and depolition of the general and his officers, the public chest and the public property, were dependent on the caprices of the multitude and its accidental leaders. The thunderstorm had not yet burst; but the clouds were gathering in denser masses, and occasional peals of thunder were already rolling through the sultry air. . . . It was in reality the calm before the storm and the epoch of political mediocrities, an age like of the government of Walpole in England; and no Chatham was found in Rome to infuse energy into the stagnant life of the nation."

Irresponsibility in voting by those seeking to profit by gratuities, always at the expense of the taxpayer, to which class few of the ones who so voted belonged, portended the end of the Republic. Receivers of benefits now outvoted taxpayers.

It was the "grave train" of that day.

TAXES REACH DESTRUCTIVE STAGE—(ROMAN EMPIRE, THIRD CENTURY A. D.)

Administration of government business was conducted by a large number of local officials in many successive ranks and classes, from high to low, and the financial burden of government under Diocletian was enormous. Taxes grew steadily greater and eventually nothing possessed by the citizen was free from taxation. The penalty for wealth seemed to be ruin and there was no longer an incentive for progress in business when the holding of property meant ruinous over-taxation.

The Roman Empire lost the enterprising and successful businessmen of the middle class, never to be regained. Liberty for which its people had so long striven was lost and the once free Roman citizen had no independent life of his own, decrees by the head of government taking the place of laws. Citizens' earnings and prices paid for food fell under the Emperor's edicts fixing the amounts.

Staggering under what became a burden of confiscatory taxation, practically without hope in a bankrupt state, its citizens could toll only for the state, barely able to survive on what was left. Creative ability in all cultural arts and commercial affairs could not survive the hopeless situation. That remarkable civilization, so comparable in innumerable ways with ours of today, ended, not to be equaled for centuries to come.

Bolshevism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an amazing statement regarding Russia by H. Ralph Burton, of Washington, D. C., that appeared in the Manufacturers Record dated June 12, 1919.

For many years Mr. Burton served as special investigator for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The article follows:

BOLSHEVISM

(By H. Ralph Burton)

The Bolsheviks are members of a political machine. They are not a political party; they are merely a plot. The two outstanding leaders are Nicholas Lenin and Leon Trotsky, both of which names are aliases. It is interesting to note that these men, by their agitation of the masses and their extravagant demands, during the revolution following the Japanese War lost to the people of Russia a constitutional form of government which was just within their reach. A close associate of Lenin, a personal friend, made such radical speeches in the Duma as to cause the real democratic, real patriotic men of standing to cease their support of the liberals, knowing that such a program as some of these fanatics were trying to force through would mean anarchy and ruin of the nation. It was found later that this intimate of Lenin's was a paid agent of the reactionaries, who wrote his speeches for him, knowing that such speeches would result in the withdrawal of the support of all of the sane elements in the liberal movement.

To these violent extremists the world is but a laboratory in which to try out their theories. They are class internationalists, bent upon a world-wide revolution, which would merely turn things upside down and place the power of government in the hands of the most ignorant of the working classes after using them to get into power. There is nothing socialistic about their program. They would merely exchange one privileged class for a much larger, more avaricious, more brutal, more merciless body than the one overthrown. They have from the first been the avowed enemies not only of the propertied classes, but of everyone who has prospered, or who, because of education, is in any way allied with this class, as, for instance, being dependent upon them, for a salaried position. Judges, lawyers, clergy, doctors, professional men of every description, clerks, foremen, experts of all sorts, are of the bourgeoisie, the enemies of the people. Under this regime law is administered by the revolutionary tribunals, the members of which know nothing of law; schools and hospitals were turned over to committees of janitors, kitchen servants and scrubwomen, physicians, and professors being forced to take their orders from them. They destroyed the morale of the Russian Army, retaining only a uniformed mob of criminals, who supported them because they could now be privileged to break all Ten Commandments with impunity.

They sold to Germany tons of American ammunition, which was used against our soldiers.

They demolished the Russian munition factories before they began negotiations for peace, deliberately rendering the Russian people helpless so that they would be compelled to make a shameful separate peace, and would be unable to defend themselves when Germany should choose to break the peace agreements. They murdered in cold blood thousands of patriotic officers, some of them while they were in hospitals recovering from their wounds. In many Soviets they have even gone so far as to make all women between certain ages the property of the state, to be used by any man, however notorious his character, provided he will contribute money to the Bolshevik revolutionary cause. They have done unspeakable things against God and man. Of what use to go further or to discuss the point as to whether they have accepted German money for personal gain? They accepted enough of it to finance their propaganda, and are now spending millions of the Russian money in the United States, as well as every other country,

the burden of which will again fall upon the poor peasant. They have bolstered up their power by creating a new privileged class of criminals, Red guards, and government officials, a group bureaucracy infinitely worse and more numerous than the old. With the threat of bombardment, bayonets, and machine guns they broke up the Constituent Assembly, the only real democratic institution ever convened in Russia, which was legally to adopt a constitutional form of government. This outrage was perpetrated because, in spite of every means known to a criminal political machine, they had been able to muster but 30 percent of the votes. They then put all power into the hands of the Soviets and disenfranchised everyone opposed to their program. Anyone now elected to a Soviet who is opposed to the Bolsheviks is either murdered or imprisoned as a "counter-revolutionary." Lenin himself says of his aggregation that of 100 of them, 60 are fools, 39 are criminals, and 1 is a true believer in bolshevism. He is more frank than one of his admirers, an English newspaperman, who says: "These men who have made the Soviet Government of Russia, if they must fail, will fall with clean shields and clean hearts."

Lenin and Trotsky always found time to issue orders and to talk about raising an army to fight against Japan in the East and the English, Americans, French, and Serbians in the West, but could not raise an army to fight against the Germans in their midst. Why? Because Germany put them in power and was keeping them there. Now it is seen that bolshevism, nurtured and fostered in Russia by Germans, has turned upon Germany and threatens to envelop that country.

The German policy toward Russia has always been and is still far-reaching, ever looking well into the future. With the access to such a wealth of raw materials, and with a people subjugated again working for slavery wages, the materials could, as before, be brought to Germany and manufactured into finished products. With such cheap source of labor and materials, Germany could overcome all competition in the world's markets, forcing hard times, low wages and labor unrest in the democratic nations of the world. Possessed of an unequaled storehouse of everything needed in warfare, with the exception of rubber, she could quickly recuperate her finances and prepare for another war of aggression, surpassing all possible rivals in armament and wealth. The advantages to Germany in the exploitation of Russia were recognized when the recent Brest-Litovsk treaty gave Germany full preference of trade in Russia for a term of 20 years. Immediate steps should be taken to stop the advancement by the Germans of their own economic interests in Russia, and the border states, Poland, Lithuania and Rumania should be so strengthened as to prevent further encroachment by Germany.

Russia is the keystone of the whole question of whether or not we are to have peace and prosperity, or a season of continued intrigue and treachery and expenditure of enormous sums in the race for supremacy in the production of engines of death and destruction. That is why, fearing American capital and the granting of opportunities for American aid in developing Russia, the German propaganda has been directed so bitterly against America and the American Government and other institutions. Our financial institutions especially have come in for German-Bolshevik criticism of the most perfidious sort.

Many millions of the uneducated masses of Russian people believe that Wall Street forced the American people into an unpopular war to safeguard the loans made by private American bankers to the Allied governments. They believe that our President is a tool of the capitalistic classes. They are taught that his words of encouragement are insincere and hypocritical.

They have as yet had no word or evidence to the contrary.

Russian patriots, men of education and discernment, are fully alive to the destruction which has been going on in their country under the direction of the Hun plunderers. They have always looked across the seas to America for our aid in developing their rich resources. From the point of view of temperament, we are best fitted to deal with the Russian people. Because of geographical separation we need never be feared by the Russian nation. Because we have the capital and the experience gained by developing similar resources, our cooperation is eagerly sought. They look to us, also, to build railways and highways, and to improve their inland waterway transportation. We can save Russia much in time and money by introducing more modern and perfected methods.

The former Empire of Russia was nearly three times as large as the 48 States of the Union, or just a trifle larger than all of the continent of South America and all of Mexico in addition. Its arable lands, if fully cultivated, are capable of supplying food for the entire population of the world. Its pastures and grazing ranges are sufficient in extent to support livestock enough to supply the world with beef and beasts of burden; its standing timber and mineral wealth are of similar proportion. Oil, coal, lead, copper, manganese, asbestos, gold, silver, and platinum are especially abundant.

Reconstruction of Europe absolutely demands the exploitation of Russia's resources—her agricultural, mineral, and timber wealth. The Russian people cannot possibly develop these resources to a sufficient degree perhaps even to supply their own demands, without foreign assistance. They have not sufficient capital, a sufficient number of engineers and executives, sufficient machinery and facilities for producing the machinery and tools necessary for so great a development.

Foreign assistance must come, either from the Central Powers or from the Allies. Germany has been proceeding with economic penetration in every possible way. Banks, industries, mines, and forests have been bought with German money at from 10 to 20 percent of their value. They take what gold they can get and buy up Russian properties at a small fraction of their values, demanding concessions for the balance when the gold is exhausted. They can well afford to support the Bolshevik political machine which controls the Central Soviet with paper money, which the poor peasants must eventually make good.

Students of the Russian question from an unprejudiced standpoint, who have not fallen under the spell of the political charlatans now in power in Russia, have been emphatic in their advice that the basis of the solution of the Russian problem rests upon the foundation of personal contact with the Russian people. An effort along this line would undoubtedly have momentous results for good. By a propaganda of truth and kindly deeds the Russian people would have a better understanding of our real attitude. Such an effort properly directed would drive the Soviet Government into either cooperating or showing itself to be the despicable organization that it is.

There is great need for definite knowledge on the part of a majority of the American people because of confusion in the public mind as to the real issues at stake, and with regard to what attitude they should take with respect to revolutionary Russia at the present time. The importance of the Russian problem is apparent from any one of several viewpoints among which are humanitarian, political and economic. The humanitarian side of the issue, involving the lives of millions who are destined to starve, freeze, or die of preventable epidemic diseases, is too obvious to require plea or argument. Relief has already been so long withheld that mil-

lions will surely be lost, and if it is not promptly applied to such a measure as can be given, millions more will be lost. As the result of unsanitary conditions and lack of nourishment, terrible scourges of cholera and typhus have been sweeping the country. Thousands of babies have died in the cities and throughout the land through lack of milk. This is the sort of condition existing after the Bolsheviks have come into power, the only thing they think of being their own control of Government affairs.

The United States Government was the first to recognize the Provisional Revolutionary Government and to welcome it to the family of democratic nations. Soon afterward we added to our moral responsibility the very definite obligation of a partnership in arms. As confusion increased in Russia and enemy-promoted misrule came into power, we lost contact entirely with the real democratic elements in Russia.

This contact should be reestablished in such a way as to confirm the several expressions of our President regarding the friendship of the American people for Russia.

The whole purpose of the Bolsheviks is to trade upon the sorrow and miseries of others in order to place themselves in power. Those whom they have used for their base purposes are afterward mocked and are compelled by violence to do the bidding of the Bolsheviks. Their political policy may be said to strive to create ferment, dissension, and animosities throughout Europe, and later, when Europe has been swept by the flame of radicalism, to use the most cunning rascals in Europe to sow the seeds of discontent in other continents. They figure that there is a double usefulness in this. First, that they will gain the respect and awe of all countries by this method, bringing such countries to the realization that they have the power to create disorder or restore order at will; secondly they will by intrigue reach their hands into the management of government functions by the simple use of politics, mob psychology and top-heavy government indebtedness through government ownership of railroads and other public utilities. The governments of Europe will be shackled by an all-embracing terrorism. As their tools they are using the doctrines and the followers of all opinions, such as reactionaries, monarchists, demagogues, Socialists, Communists, and other utopians. The Bolsheviks have put all of these at work for them. It is the boast of Lenin that the world will not have peace until Lenin's supergovernment is recognized openly and with submission.

Bolshevism is an insidious, subtle, and destructive force which feeds upon the bestial passions of mankind. It is a thing which is very little understood by the average person. As a matter of fact, there seems to be a tendency on the part of most people to treat it very lightly, as if there were not the slightest danger of their ever having to come into contact with it. To the unthinking, ignorant person, it appears as a panacea for every social ill. It promises a remedy for all of their sufferings. There is not a want in all the category of their desires that it does not offer to fulfill. When stripped of all its superficial covering so carefully constructed it is shown to be an anarchistic policy backed by cunning schemers whose sole purpose is to obtain control of all the world by creating between the classes a hatred which must result in disastrous controversies, leaving the plotters an opportunity to take advantage of those whom they have succeeded in embroiling in a meaningless, useless, terrible war. They are not content to stop where they are at present. It is merely the beginning of what they conceive to be an international revolution. They follow the principle of first destroying, by the germ of bolshevism, the social fabric of a nation in order that they may have the opportunity to go among the masses and preach their doctrines. There is a policy of absolute destruction, without an iota of constructive

ambition. It is a return to the days of the cave dwellers, retrogression in the extreme, and an absolute destruction of competition, which science recognizes as the main force of progress. The stability of the world would, by the elimination of all border lines, become completely unbalanced.

There is a tremendous influence for bolshevism, not only in Europe, where the condition hourly grows more menacing, but in the United States, where the Bolsheviks are preaching their devilish theories with amazing freedom.

Until the people of the United States not only realize that their safety, both for the immediate and for the future, lies in controlling Bolshevik forces wherever they exist, but also voice that feeling publicly so that the officials of our own Government may know that they desire immediate, forceful, and determined action to accomplish this purpose, we may expect chaos to reign supreme in the affected nations, with the ever-constant danger of its spreading in every direction.

Everybody Wants Government "Freebies"; What Has Become of the Self-Reliant Citizens of Yesteryear?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, most people seem to be totally unaware of the fact that our Government cannot give anything to our own people or to foreign nations that it does not first take away from the American people, either in taxes or in unsound monetary and fiscal policies of government.

The New Deal-Fair Deal has won elections chiefly by appealing to the larceny of the people who hope to get something "for free" at the expense of the other fellow. But it simply cannot be done for long. Everybody must pay for waste and extravagance in government, either directly or indirectly, as anyone who has been to the grocery store lately knows. "Each ounce of dross costs its ounce of gold."

I am indebted to my good friend Paul O. Peters, editor of the Washington News Bulletin, for the following observation:

EVERYBODY SEEMS TO WANT MORE FREE SERVICES FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The huge tax burden which bears heavily on the competitive free-enterprise system under which the United States grew and prospered for more than 150 years appears to be caused principally by the desire on the part of many citizens (and some foreigners as well) to get something for free out of the Government of the United States, no matter whether they need it or not, and seldom without regard to the sources from which the gratuities or services originate.

Basically everything the Government does and every dollar that is spent by Government stems from the productive effort of the American people. Those who work and produce carry the burden of supporting the drones and the nitwits who think up new schemes to saddle on the backs of the producers.

Last year we warned that taking money and power from the Government has

become fashionable. To review the situation we said:

Businessmen denounce waste and extravagance in Government, but when the line is formed and contracts are being let, they seek either subsidies for their own industries or loans from the public till on terms no commercial institution could afford to consider.

The union man deplores the rise in living costs, but he wants his wages increased, and his leaders favor Government subsidized housing, rent control, subsidized medical care and hospitalization, and complete insurance coverage for himself and family from the cradle to the grave.

The farmer, being right in the middle of the inflation, wants subsidized tools, subsidized fertilizer, subsidized electricity, and a subsidized telephone, guaranteed prices for his crops, and Federal insurance against crop failures no matter what the cost with the Federal Treasury advancing the premiums.

The old people want either the Townsend plan or some equally acceptable substitute which will provide the aged with the comforts and necessities of life with spending money thrown in.

The bureaucrats claim an unalienable right to their jobs and shudder at the thought the time may come when the Federal payrollers provide the straw that breaks the camel's back.

The internationalists and free traders go all out for one-world ideas, a federation of bankrupt nations joined to the United States, with Uncle Sam footing most of the bills. They want our sovereignty and independence mingled with that of some fifty-odd nations, the Constitution and Declaration of Independence to the contrary notwithstanding.

That's the picture as we see it.

A Vote for Our Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week we passed the foreign aid appropriation bill in the House. My colleague, the gentlemen from Virginia, Representative J. VAUGHAN GARY, as chairman of the subcommittee, presented the bill and guided it through to passage. His handling of the bill on the floor was a brilliant performance and incited the approbation of his colleagues in the House. In that connection, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on October 14, 1951:

A VOTE FOR OUR SECURITY

The House has acted with admirable dispatch and good judgment in approving an appropriation of \$7,500,000,000 for the mutual-security program.

A Republican attempt to make a further deep cut in the already shorn funds for economic aid was beaten down, and that is something that should be welcomed by all who believe that our own security is linked to the security of Western Europe and that General Eisenhower is doing an honest, competent and intelligent job of directing the rearming of Europe.

Most of the argument in favor of a cut was aimed at the so-called economic funds. But, as Representative GARY, of Virginia, properly pointed out, the economic aid contemplated in the bill has been completely integrated with the military program. And when Republicans raised the question as to how, in view of our own fiscal problems, such a large appropriation can be justified, Mr. GARY replied, "Only in one way, and that is by the consequences we may face if we do not embark upon this program. I believe from the bottom of my heart that we are dealing today with the security of America, the very existence of America. If I did not think so I would not be here arguing for this bill."

That is a view that is supported by the reports which have reached this country of the recent maneuvers by the forces under General Eisenhower's command. Participating in these maneuvers were troops from the major North Atlantic nations—some 450,000 ground troops plus perhaps an additional 100,000 men in the several air forces. Divisional and corps maneuvers were not attempted—the troops are not yet ready for that. But in the judgment of professional observers, including our own military men, the force that was on display was at least twice as strong as any force that could have been put in the field a year ago. Even more encouraging was the attitude of participating troops—an attitude of enthusiasm and determination to fight if aggression should come.

This report from the maneuvers can be discounted as one sees fit. Certainly it is true that there does not yet exist in Western Europe a military force that would be capable of effectively opposing a determined Russian attack.

That, however, misses the real point. The important thing is that progress—real progress—is being made. And that progress, in the judgment of every competent military adviser, is a highly significant element in maintaining the security of the United States. This is why it is gratifying that the House resisted attempts to cut the appropriation to a level that would have gravely threatened the whole Eisenhower program. And this is why it is so important that the Senate should follow the example which has been set in the House.

The Brannan Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, final reports from the field were supposed to have been received Monday, October 15, by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, relative to a Nation-wide series of meetings conducted by farm groups.

Officially, the meetings were described as "sampling sentiment" on the Brannan farm plan and allied subjects. Actually, I suspect, they were designed to drum up support for those projects by sending in federally remunerated individuals to extol the virtues of Brannan's socialistically inclined schemes.

As evidence that these manipulations are not fooling all of the agriculturalists, I include herewith a portion of a news story published in the Lusk (Wyo.) Free

Lance, following one of those meetings late in September:

Niobrara County farmers and ranchers Monday evening may have started something that could sweep the entire Nation, when, at a meeting attended by representatives of several Government agencies and 56 farmers and ranchers, the Brannan farm plan and the cash payout by the Production and Marketing Administration to farmers and ranchers, both received telling blow:

The attenders for the most part referred to the Brannan plan as a long step toward socialism, and pointed out that too much was being spent for administrative costs in comparison to that returned to the producing agricultural groups.

The meeting, it appears, was a "feel-out" on the Government programs which have been in force for a number of years, and which are now somewhat in the process of being extended as to scope and benefits to the farmers and ranchers.

Briefed down, the majority consensus of the meeting attenders means something like this:

That the United States Congress be asked to furnish more research in the various departments of agriculture, more help for the Extension Service, and that the Bureau report be disregarded.

That opposition is unanimous against the Brannan plan or any variation thereof.

That immediate discontinuance of any cash payments to farmers and ranchers through PMA is unanimously agreed upon.

That all congressional appropriations for soil-conservation work be discontinued.

That the setting up of any more Federal bureaus or departments is unanimously opposed.

That it be recommended to Wyoming's representatives in Congress that hereafter the FHA committeemen be specifically instructed to proceed in a most conservative and cautious manner, scrutinizing most carefully their prospective clients.

From the minutes of the gathering, much may be learned by the general public, which foreshadows the bill for all these programs. The expressions of the speakers, backed by vote in most cases unanimously, tend to give the average taxpayer at least a peep into the reasons for the present national debt. More can be said on this matter, and more will be said as time proceeds. Should the attitude in evidence here start rolling, the present farm program will certainly experience reverberating results. It is something worth watching.

The Extension Service, operation of which in this country has resulted in outstanding achievements, was given an all-out boost at the meeting. This service, under the supervision of County Agent "Si" West and Home Demonstration Agent Ruth Harris, was declared to have too much to do, especially tasks not relating to its specific objectives. After explanation of the work being done by the local agents, the motion to include more assistance to the extension program received unanimous support of the meeting in one of its motions.

The remainder of the news story dealt with the identities of those present, including representatives of the county PMA committee, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, and the Extension Service, and named the speakers who addressed the meeting.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this news story points up very clearly a contention I have made here in Congress on previous occasions: That the American people, generally, still are a self-reliant Nation, and that, for the most part, they would much rather live their own lives

as free citizens than be regimented by a bureaucratic Federal Government making every effort to live their lives for them.

I am proud that it was this particular segment of the American public, the agricultural people of Niobrara County, Wyo., who have expressed themselves so forcefully on this issue. I compliment them highly, and commend this news story for study by every Member of Congress.

Proposed Formula for Use in Establishing Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me during the course of my remarks in the Senate today, I submit for publication in the Record the address delivered by Commissioner Paul A. Walker, Vice Chairman, of the Federal Communications Commission, before the 1951 annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at Charleston, S. C., on October 17, 1951.

The address is as follows:

All of us who are charged by statute with the duty of regulating utility rates and services recognize the importance and value of gatherings, such as these, wherein we may exchange information and ideas regarding our problems in an effort to solve them in a spirit of cooperation. I believe that among the most valuable aids to effective regulation of telephone toll rates, in particular, are collaboration among regulatory authorities in the treatment of the many problems which are of common concern and the availability of adequate information. In view of the complexities of the telephone industry from both the technical and economic standpoints, we cannot overemphasize the importance of being fully informed on all matters pertaining to the operations of the industry. A long step forward toward bringing to light such essential data in this regard was, of course, the special telephone investigation of the FCC back in 1935-38. It is to be regretted that it was not possible to continue the process begun by this investigation so that all of us could keep more closely in step with the rapid and overhanging growth and complexities of the telephone industry. It was, therefore, with a great deal of gratification and appreciation that I recently received a copy of the report of the Joint NARUC-FCC Subcommittee on Toll Rate Disparities. This report in my opinion represents a comprehensive, constructive and useful work on the matter of toll rates and should be of substantial value to more enlightened toll-rate regulation. It is a testimony to the fruitful results that can be produced by co-operative action among State and Federal regulatory authorities. The staff members of the various commissions who participated in this project are to be complimented for their work. The report speaks for itself. It obviously required a great deal of work and thought in its compilation.

This association, at its convention held in November of last year at Phoenix, Ariz.,

adopted a resolution endorsing a suggested change in the telephone separations procedures which would have effected a transfer from State to interstate telephone operations of substantial amounts of toll plant investment and related expenses. It was indicated in the resolution that such a transfer would reduce the disparity between State and interstate toll costs and would thereby constitute a means of alleviating existing disparities between State and interstate toll rates. The resolution called upon the FCC to agree to the separations change in a spirit of cooperation. However, as you know, the Commission, upon consideration of the plan, was unable to find a basis upon which it could approve the plan as a reasonable method of telephone separations.

Now, when I was asked by this association just a few weeks ago whether I would be willing to discuss at this convention the matter of toll rates, I frankly hesitated to accept the invitation. I wondered whether there was anything I could say which would help in the solution of the toll rate problems before us. I, nevertheless, accepted with the hope that by the time the convention took place, something would come to my mind. Fortunately, events have been kind. I think we have found an effective solution to these problems. Let me give you a brief summary of the events leading up to this development.

As you know, in view of the high level of interstate earnings which obtained during 1950, and the questions posed thereby as to the reasonableness of interstate rates, the Commission in January 1951 instituted proceedings in Docket No. 9889, looking in the direction of reductions in earnings from interstate telephone service, through appropriate rate adjustments. Subsequently, the Commission in February 1951 postponed the hearings which were scheduled to commence in April, and invited representatives of the States to participate with us in further informal efforts to resolve the questions which had been raised concerning the reasonableness and fairness of the existing separations procedures. This action was taken by the FCC with the hope that further exploration of the procedures might produce acceptable modifications therein. It was recognized that changes in separations might assist in alleviating the toll rate disparity problem, or, at least, in relieving intrastate operations of the additional revenue requirement burdens presented by pending requests of the Bell System companies for intrastate rate increases.

Technical experts of the staffs of both the State commissions and the FCC met in March 1951 to consider possible changes in separations as well as other suggestions, apart from separations, which would make possible the establishment and maintenance of substantial uniformity in State and interstate toll rates. As a result of these meetings, the Joint NARUC-FCC Separations Subcommittee was instructed to give special attention to the development of possible separation changes affecting the allocation of costs associated with the exchange component. There was also established, as a result of a meeting of the Commissioners' Committee held last May, the Toll Settlement Plan Subcommittee, which was assigned the task of formulating a comprehensive plan for making possible uniform State and interstate toll rates, including consideration of necessary legislation. Although the work of these two committees has not yet been completed, the members of the Separations Subcommittee have reached tentative agreement on certain simplification changes in the separations manual which, though not of a substantial or fundamental nature, will have the effect of shifting some amounts of plant investment and expenses from State to interstate telephone operations.

More recently, in connection with the interstate rate investigation in Docket No. 9889 the Commission has been reviewing, with representatives of the Bell System, the existing separations procedures, particularly those affecting the allocation of exchange plant investment and expenses, in order to determine whether changes in the procedures are necessary or desirable before proceeding further in that docket. As a result, we have developed certain modifications of the separations procedures applicable to the exchange component, which we are willing to propose and accept on an interim basis. I say "interim basis" because, as you know, the Federal Communications Commission has not, as yet, formally prescribed separations procedures. The Federal Communications Commission believes that these proposed modifications represent reasonable separations procedures, and that they will produce results which are fair and equitable to both State and Federal jurisdictions. These revised procedures did not mature until just about a week ago. As soon as the Federal Communications Commission concluded that the plan merited approval, I contacted my good friend Matt McWhorter, chairman of your Committee on Telephone Regulatory Problems, and advised him of the plan. Last Thursday, State representatives of the Separations Subcommittee met with our staff to discuss the plan. Since our arrival at Charleston, there have been further discussions of the plan. We have been advised by representatives of the Bell System that they consider the plan reasonable and are prepared to put it into effect if the NARUC and the Federal Communications Commission agree on it. We feel confident that the NARUC will also look with favor on this plan and that it will be promptly incorporated in the existing procedures.

An explanation of the details of this proposed change, together with the rationale in support thereof, is available for distribution to those of you who do not already have copies.

Now, what would be the effects of this plan? It will have the effect of shifting from State to interstate operations approximately \$82,000,000 of exchange plant gross investment and \$17,000,000 of related annual expenses. This is in addition to the transfer to interstate of over \$1,000,000 gross plant investment and almost \$4,000,000 of annual expenses, which will result from the previously mentioned simplification changes worked out by the Separations Subcommittee last May. The States will also be relieved of additional amounts of book costs and expenses if, as is anticipated by the Federal Communications Commission, the 5-cent rate applicable to certain interstate toll routes is eliminated in connection with possible adjustments in the interstate schedule which I will discuss more fully in a moment. Under separations methods used in most State rate cases, interstate operations not included in the interstate division of revenue arrangements, such as the 5-cent traffic, are lumped in the intrastate operating results. Thus, elimination of the 5-cent exception rate will bring into the interstate division of revenue arrangements the larger part of about \$6,500,000 book costs and \$2,000,000 excess of annual expenses over related revenues, with corresponding relief to the States. To summarize, the changes which I have discussed would have the effect of shifting from State to interstate operations about \$90,000,000 in gross plant and about \$22,000,000 in annual expenses.

In view of the large number of State commissions which are currently engaged in considering requests for third or fourth rounds of intrastate rate increases, I should like to point out that from a revenue requirement standpoint, these changes will increase the total interstate requirement and reduce the

total requirement applicable to State operations by substantial amounts. At this point, I should also like to remind you of a revision made in the early part of the year by the Bell System companies with respect to the development of toll coefficients related to the allocation of operator work time between State and interstate services. On the basis of current estimates, it appears that this change has had the effect of shifting to interstate operations about \$20,000,000 of gross plant investment and \$15,000,000 of annual expenses. Thus, in effect, since our last meeting in Phoenix, changes in the separations procedures, or in the methods of applying them, have resulted or will result in a transfer of about \$110,000,000 of gross plant and about \$37,000,000 of annual expenses from intrastate to interstate operations.

I realize that each State commission representative is speculating as to the extent to which his individual State will benefit from these proposed revisions in separations procedures. Although, at this time, we do not have data by States, it is obvious that every State will benefit. I am confident that every State will look after its interests in this regard, and that the Bell System companies and State commissions will see to it that the benefits to the States resulting from these changes in separations, if placed in effect, will be appropriately reflected in each jurisdiction.

Another question which, no doubt, has aroused more than just idle curiosity in your minds relates to the effects of these various changes upon interstate operating results and, particularly, the Commission's rate proceedings in docket No. 9889. Obviously, transfers to interstate operations of plant and expenses of the magnitude which I have outlined will have a substantial impact upon the level of earnings and revenue requirements in the interstate field. Accordingly, the Commission is reviewing the entire picture in this light, and is exploring the nature and extent of interstate rate adjustments that may be necessary. It appears that these explorations may afford the opportunity for effecting substantial adjustments in the interstate toll rate schedule by way of increases at the short hauls, together with possible reductions in other parts of the schedule. In approaching this matter, and having in mind the cost data reflected in the report of the subcommittee on toll rates, the Commission considers increases in short-haul toll rates to be desirable in the interest of bringing such rates into closer alignment with the costs of rendering interstate service at those hauls. This will also serve materially to mitigate the disparities between State and interstate toll rates. These are matters which will receive the attention of the Commission upon our return to Washington at the close of the convention.

In closing this brief discussion, I think it not inappropriate to add a personal word. In point of years of attendance, if not in years of age, I am perhaps one of the oldest members of this association. Interstate Commerce Commissioner Clyde Aitchison will tell you about his long years of connection with this association. Let me say, in all modesty, that while I do not antedate him, I can almost equal his years in attendance and in interest in this association. My first connection with his career, if I may so put it, occurred in the year 1917. At that time a movement was under way among the State commissioners for the establishment of a national office for the association of State commissioners and the hiring of a general counsel or general solicitor. This antedated the national career of the late beloved General Solicitor John E. Benton. I was then attorney for the State Corporation Commission of Oklahoma. The Honorable George A. Henshaw, a former assistant attorney general for the State of Okla-

homa, had been elected a member of that commission and he was quite ambitious to assist in carrying on the work of the State commissioners as a national officer. Knowing that a movement was under way to select a general solicitor, he asked me to go to Washington and to suggest to those in power his availability for the office. This I did to the best of my ability, but was politely advised that older and more experienced heads were available and among them was a brilliant and wise commissioner from the State of Oregon named Clyde B. Aitchison. No argument on my part availed for Mr. Henshaw, and Mr. Clyde B. Aitchison was chosen. I can say truthfully that his is one of the most brilliant minds which have graced the office of general solicitor.

In coming into the family of Federal commissions, I have perhaps carried more of the "brand" of States rights than most of those who have been appointed to Federal commissions. In fact, I believe it was the frustration which I encountered in connection with my activities in State regulation of the telephone industry which brought me to Washington. Otherwise, I state to you frankly, that I very much doubt if I would ever have been a Federal Commissioner. Suffice it to say that from the year 1917 to the year 1934, I was keenly active in the work of this association. At the Phoenix convention of 1924, I presented one of the first reports on cooperation between State and Federal authorities, on behalf of a State commission. I was keenly, perhaps aggressively, active, on behalf of the States in cooperation with the Federal commissions, while I was with the State commission, and have been interested in and have participated in cooperative efforts since my incumbency as a Federal Communications Commissioner.

So I say to you, my brother Federal and State commissioners, that I hope this effort in telephone-rate making which I have outlined today may be concluded as an example of a constructive effort at cooperation between the States and the Federal Communications Commission.

The Tragedy of the Ukrainian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on October 13 I had the privilege of attending the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee convention at Philadelphia, Pa., where it was my pleasure to hear a most informative and interesting speech by Hon. Edward M. O'Connor, Commissioner, Displaced Persons Commission.

The information contained in the Commissioner's speech about the Ukrainian people came as a pleasant surprise to me, for I had no idea there was such a large group of people within the borders of the Soviet Union who loved democracy and personal freedom with the same passion and fervency that we here in the United States do.

Mr. O'Connor pictured in eloquent terms the unfortunate plight of these brave, Christian people who have been caught up in the mad ambitions of the Nazis on one side and the equally sinister evil of communism on the other.

The speech was not mere flattery of a brave and honorable people, but it pointed out factually that a majority of all persons imprisoned behind the iron curtain are non-Russians and unsympathetic with the Soviet Union's ambitions. Mr. O'Connor made it clear that there is great hope for the future in those many millions of people who will not for long submit to the domination and oppression of the foreign Soviet tyranny. He pointed out that we people here in the United States, and people elsewhere in the world who believe in personal freedom and democracy, must be ready to assist the Ukrainians and all those like them in their efforts to throw off the chains of slavery.

Many of these people have found their way to our friendly shores. They are encouraged by what they find. They are imbued with the determination to see their homeland, where the spirit of individual independence has existed for over 1,000 years, freed from the yoke of dictatorship and once again enjoying the blessings of freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Commissioner O'Connor's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TRAGEDY OF THE UKRAINIAN NATION

(Address by Hon. Edward M. O'Connor)

As we gather in this great hall to pay tribute to the Ukrainian patriots who down through the centuries made the good fight for national independence, we are more than ever conscious of the fuller meaning of the great American birthright of independence. A little more than a stone's throw from where we now meet, the courageous American patriots signed into action a declaration of independence which gave birth to our great Nation. This declaration set forth the basic rights and freedoms to which all men are entitled, and made clear that to deny men these rights was just cause for revolt. Thus, the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence became the battle cry of the American patriots and has served ever since as an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today, our Nation is faced with the gravest threat to its survival since the glorious days of its inception. The United States is the citadel of human freedom and individual opportunity—a bright beacon of liberty shining out upon a world endangered by the engulfing black smoke of a new imperial tyranny, and the masters behind this conspiracy make it clear their appetite will not be satisfied until they have devoured the world. They are absorbing nations and people at an alarming rate, but their record of digestion is not at all satisfactory. It is not an easy task to stamp out the natural cravings of man for freedom, the spontaneous rise of the patriot under conditions of oppression, nor the moral codes of human conduct which have guided mankind through the centuries.

In the conspiracy to enslave all mankind, we find the Soviet Union the announced and admitted leader. The Soviet Union is the result and embodiment of the false teachings of Karl Marx, Lenin, and now Stalin. Even a cursory reading of the writings of these men will dispel any doubts as to the actual and final aims of that regime. But we shall commit a fatal error if we believe the majority of the people within the Soviet Union are sympathetic to the notions of Marx, Lenin, or Stalin, or that they are in support of the conspiracy of the Kremlin.

The Soviet Union has been posed by some experts as a mysterious power, strange and unfathomable to the western mind, and presenting a problem which only the expert is equipped to understand. It is unfortunate that this peculiar notion has gained some recognition and, worse still, it will present a real danger to our future security if it is not exploded. There are many things about the Soviet Union which are as simple as the A B C's and these are the very things which can lead to the defeat of its past and present objectives.

The most common understanding about the Soviet Union is that it is a nation of Russian people. This is, of course, completely untrue. According to the 1939 Soviet census, and reasonable projections on those figures to bring them up to date, we find that of the total population of approximately 202,000,000, 91,500,000 are Russian and 110,500,000 are non-Russian. Thus the majority peoples of the Soviet Union are not Russians, on the contrary, over 54 percent are non-Russians.

To carry this point even further, only two of the Soviet Republics, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and the Karelo-Finnish Soviet Republic are predominantly Russian. The other 14 Soviet Republics are overwhelmingly non-Russian in complexion. Now let us look at the complexion of the other Soviet Republics:

Ukrainian Soviet Republic, population 42,272,000, approximately 91 percent non-Russian.

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 10,525,000, approximately 93 percent non-Russian.

Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 1,120,000, approximately 92 percent non-Russian.

Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 1,950,000, approximately 88 percent non-Russian.

Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 3,134,000, approximately 98 percent non-Russian.

Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 2,321,000, approximately 100 percent non-Russian.

Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 3,721,000, approximately 100 percent non-Russian.

Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, population 1,316,000, approximately 100 percent non-Russian.

Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic, population 3,372,000, approximately 90 percent non-Russian.

Lazak Soviet Socialist Republic, population 645,000, approximately 60 percent non-Russian.

Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, population 6,601,000, approximately 94 percent non-Russian.

Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic, population 1,317,000, approximately 93 percent non-Russian.

Tadzhik Soviet Socialist Republic, population 1,563,000, approximately 100 percent non-Russian.

Khazak Soviet Socialist Republic, population 1,533,000, approximately 88 percent non-Russian.

I need not remind you that the Government of the United States does not recognize the absorption of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Now you may ask, "What is the special significance of this well-documented point on the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union?" There is a great deal of special significance to this point, and to demonstrate the most significant point I wish to review with you briefly the tragedy of the Ukrainian nation—the most numerous non-Russian people in the Soviet Union.

The land of the Ukrainian people runs from the Carpathian Mountains in the west to the Don River in the east along the north

shore of the Black Sea and includes the valleys of the great rivers which come down from the north and empty into the Black Sea. In the north there are no distinct natural boundaries, but the ethnological history of the people has well provided for this oversight by nature.

In the heart of this great land is the ancient city of Kiev, capital city of Ukrainian affairs throughout all of recorded history. The equally ancient trade routes linking west with east and north with south meet and cross in this capital city. Over 1,000 years ago the State of Kiev was founded and prospered in an era when powerful and warlike tribes of nomads were pushing westward and armies of western states were pushing eastward in search of new lands.

The Kingdom of Kiev came into being in the second half of the eighth century and with Volodimir at its head. Thus an empire was created which soon adopted Christianity, and then began efforts at consolidation of a peaceful state which exploited the culture of the west among the people. Strong ties were made with the rulers of other Christian states, trade and commerce flourished with the city of Kiev as its hub. This kingdom fell in the early part of the thirteenth century under the unrelenting attacks of the Tartars at a time when there was dissension among the ruling princes. This era is best remembered through the Song of the Legion of Ihors.

Then followed an era of domination of the Ukraine by the rulers of other kingdoms and states. It was in these circumstances that the Kozak movement was born. It was a resistance movement, and one which aimed at restoring a free State of Ukraine. The exploits of the Kozaks, their reckless daring, their unquestioned bravery, has become legend throughout all of Europe and central Asia. They became highly organized for military purposes, but then social and political system was simple—expressing the natural cravings of man to be free of any and all oppressors.

In 1648 the Kozak movement rose in revolt against the Polish domination of the Ukraine—led by Hetman Khmelintsky. It was impossible for him to win a decisive victory and complete independence, so he turned to the Muscovite rulers for an alliance which he hoped would aid his cause. This alliance turned out disastrously for the cause of Ukrainian liberation, because the prince of Moscow eventually turned it into an instrument to dominate the Ukraine. Thus opened another era of Ukrainian life, under the domination of Moscow, which has continued uninterrupted except for a brief period following World War I.

Before the outbreak of World War I, the Ukrainian nationalist movement was much stronger in the cultural than in the political field. The Kozak movement of liberation had, in the passing centuries, been completely broken and disseminated by the Tsars. The liberation movement of necessity was forced to the cultural field to keep the national spirit alive. With the breakdown of the Russian Empire in March 1917, and the later fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the stage was set for another supreme effort at Ukrainian national independence.

The Central Rada, organized along nationalist rather than class lines, set up a provisional government. On November 20, 1917, the provisional government proclaimed a "peoples republic" and all state authority was vested in the Rada pending the meeting of a Ukrainian Constituent Assembly. This same proclamation announced freedom of speech, press, faith, assembly, unions, and strikes, together with freedom of national and cultural development for the Russian, Polish, and Jewish minorities. The Bolshevik authority then getting established in Moscow denounced the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, accusing the new

state of carrying out a two-faced bourgeois policy, concealing itself behind nationalist phrases. This young Government had a short and stormy life, appealing to the Paris Peace Conference for recognition and assistance in driving the Bolshevik out of Ukraine. These pleas fell upon unsympathetic and to some extent uninformed ears, and thus closed another chapter in the tragedy of a great people.

The fate of the Ukraine under domination of the Bolshevik, now known as the Politburo, is one of the saddest in all of history. The program to communize the Ukraine ran counter to the distinct national culture, the Christian faith, the spirit of individual independence which has kept this nation alive for over 1,000 years. The Soviets used the most brutal tactics in an effort to break this spirit. Mass killings and deportations were the first techniques used. When these methods failed, the Politburo established the system of collective farming to liquidate the Kulaks as a class and to bring about the famine of 1932-33, which resulted in the planned extermination of close to 3,000,000 innocent people.

But nothing was to stand in the way of Bolshevik complete control of Ukraine. There could be no strong Soviet Union until the Ukraine was conquered. When we understand that this nation before World War II supplied the Soviets with 25 percent of their grain, two thirds of their sugar requirements, three fifths of their pig iron, half the coal, half the salt, and one fifth of its chemicals, we can see its true economic importance. When we understand that the possibilities for development of hydroelectric power, in addition to what is already established there, are greater in Ukraine than anywhere else in the Soviet Union, we can better realize the importance of this region to the Red plans for world conquest.

With the outbreak of World War II, the masters of the Kremlin and the forces of Hitler were as one—joined together in a common conspiracy to absorb all of the smaller and weaker nations. This union was, of course, aimed at defeating the defenders of Western culture and traditions. It was inevitable that this alliance would fall apart and that the two international gangsters would fight it out among themselves to see who would take all the spoils. Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union and history records the unusual and unprecedented rapidity with which the German armies penetrated to the gates of Moscow and Leningrad, swept across the Ukraine to the Black Sea and beyond. The uninformed masses of the West had the feeling that the Nazi war machine could not be stopped, and that it was most likely the Soviet Union would be conquered within an unbelievably short time. It was only during the closing days of the war that we learned the real reason for this rapid, almost unresisted advance across the reaches of the Soviet Union. We learned that the people of the Soviet Union, particularly the Ukrainians, first looked upon the German invaders as their liberators—as another historical opportunity for them to regain national independence. They had expected that the opportunity would be theirs to take up arms and drive the Bolsheviks completely out of the Ukraine, and that after the war was over, somehow they could reconstruct the Ukrainian nation. But here they were deceived; their hopes were dashed upon the rocks of despair when the Nazi invaders treated them as inferiors and little better than animals. When the Ukrainian people realized that their hopes for independence were in vain and that the Nazi invaders were as evil as the Communist oppressors, they then turned upon the new invader. The resistance movement then had to fight two oppressors, the Communists and the Nazis. These same circumstances apply to many

other Soviet Republics which were overrun by the Nazi armies.

One important fact has been clearly established since the end of World War II—that the masters of the Kremlin did not have the support of the masses of the people in the early stages of the war. On the contrary there was no real resistance until the German forces reached the gates of Moscow and Stalingrad. By that time, the masses of people were outraged by the treatment accorded them by the Nazis and fought back, not for the survival of communism but for their own personal survival. It was then possible for Stalin to declare the "Fatherland Front," which led the people to hope for better days after the war was over.

With the end of World War II, the Ukrainian nation found itself in an even heavier hand of the Communist oppression. They were further separated from the Western World by the addition of new captive states—the states which Stalin used to form his cordon sanitaire. One would be led to think that these drastic events would lead to the complete crushing of the national spirit of the Ukraine. We know, however, that this has not occurred, because even today the resistance movement in the Ukraine is of such a character and magnitude as to cause the masters of the Kremlin grave concern—has caused them to engage in new extermination programs in their efforts to break the national spirit of independence.

The tragic story of the Ukraine, together with its many heroic epics, is a story that applies to all the captive nations held within the iron grip of the Kremlin. We can rightfully look upon this story of the Ukraine as a symbol and a guidepost for understanding the other peoples who make up the various republics of the Soviet Union. There is one great lesson we can learn from these historical facts. That lesson is that the non-Russian peoples, who are the majority peoples of the Soviet Union, are the weakest link in the Soviet plan for world conquest. They are the weakest link because for centuries they have despised and have suffered under Russian imperialism; they have nothing in common with either the old princes of Moscow or the new princes of the Kremlin, and can be counted upon—once given an opportunity—to make a heroic effort to throw off the yoke of their oppressors. This is the greatest weakness in the plan of the enemies of all mankind which must be recognized and fully exploited. We must be outspoken and firm in our commitment to the universal principle of self-determination, and we must make our stand in this matter known to the peoples of all these captive nations. If we get our story across and stand firmly by it, we will then

have created great possibilities for averting a war and establishing a peace with justice and freedom for all.

I have noted with interest and great pleasure that there has been formed in the United States an organization known as the Free Russia Fund, Inc. It is encouraging to know that some good Americans have recognized the plight of the Russian people and are planning to do something to bring about their well-deserved freedom from the tyranny of communism. On the other hand, I find myself seriously disturbed that no one appears to have done anything about the cause of the non-Russian people of the Soviet Union who make up the majority, and who clearly comprise a group of nations who want their freedom and liberties just as much as any other people. To the best of my knowledge, no American organization has been formed to advocate the cause of these captive nations nor to encourage them to keep alive the spirit of national culture and independence nor to provide a practical means whereby their hopes for a better life will some day be realized. I therefore strongly commend to your consideration—and to the consideration of all freedom-loving Americans—the need for the immediate formation of an organization to be known as the American Committee for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Peoples in the Soviet Union. I am confident that when the American people are given the facts that have been presented to you this evening, they will gladly support such a worthy and necessary undertaking. When it is made clear that such an organization can make a major contribution to the removal of the menace which endangers free men everywhere, its success will be assured.

The spirit of the patriot which brought forth in this city of Philadelphia the historic Declaration of Independence is very much alive in the hearts and minds of those patriots of today who reside in the captive nations. The hopes and ambitions, the yearnings and struggles of the Ukrainian patriots parallel those of our founding fathers. If we are to continue to enjoy the God-given liberties which have come to us through the application of this Declaration, we must see to it that all those who struggle for these same principles attain them at the earliest possible moment. This clearly is our historic mission. The ranks of free men must be multiplied many times before we can expect to attain that great objective of a universal peace toward which we now devote our wholehearted efforts.

May God speed the happy day when all men will be free and all nations, founded on the natural principle of self-determination, are formed into a world community of nations dedicated to permanent peace.

Estimates

Republic, region, or district	Total	Russian	Non-Russian	Percent of non-Russians of total in republic, region, or district
Estimated population	202,067,877	91,520,472	110,547,405	54.7
Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR)	114,237,428	83,923,672	30,313,756	26.6
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	42,272,943	3,889,111	38,383,832	90.8
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	10,825,611	757,837	9,767,674	92.8
Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic	1,120,000	91,840	1,028,160	91.8
Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic	1,950,502	239,912	1,710,590	87.7
Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic	3,134,070	78,352	3,055,718	97.5
Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic	2,321,225	2,321,225	100.0
Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic	3,722,282	3,722,282	100.0
Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic	1,340,709	1,340,709	100.0
Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic	3,372,794	327,161	3,045,633	90.3
Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic	6,458,175	1,272,260	5,185,915	80.3
Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic	6,601,619	369,691	6,231,928	94.4
Tadzhik Soviet Socialist Republic	1,317,693	98,327	1,218,866	92.5
Karghuz Soviet Socialist Republic	1,560,640	1,560,640	100.0
Kyrgyz Soviet Socialist Republic	1,533,439	179,412	1,354,027	88.3
Karelo-Finnish Soviet Socialist Republic	512,977	292,397	220,580	43.0

Even Infants Are Legal Prisoners in U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, even though you are an infant 1 month old in the Soviet Union, you may be subject to the same punishment as that received by the political prisoners. The fate that befalls these innocent babes is described in stark language in an article which appeared in the June 1951 issue of the Challenge. The Challenge is a bulletin published by the Association of Former Political Prisoners of Soviet Labor Camps, 112 West Seventy-second Street, New York, N. Y.

I include herewith the article from the Challenge:

ANGEL FACTORY

(By E. Z.-n.)

In the Rostov province, near Olginsk, there is a somewhat unusual camp. In appearance it does not differ from all the other camps scattered through the Soviet Union. Fenced in by a triple row of barbed wire, with wooden guard towers in the corners, the camp is thickly clustered with wooden barnlike barracks. Each barrack is occupied by up to 200 women with infants. The Soviet Government has long been sending thousands of women to concentration camps. Many of these women fall into the hands of the MVD with small babies. Often they are pregnant, and give birth in prison or camp. Since the separation of mothers and children would lead to the additional expense of setting up nurseries, the whole problem in such cases is solved much more simply; the nursing babies are entered into the record as prisoners and go to special camps together with their mothers.

The camp at Olginsk has been nicknamed "Angel factory." This nickname, originated by the prisoners themselves and later taken over by the people outside, derives from the popular belief that when innocent babies die their souls become angels.

The entire furnishings of each barrack consist of two rows of double-tiered wooden bunks, with a passage between them. At the end of the barrack there is an unheated common toilet and washroom. On the bunks are scattered some sacks filled with straw. These serve as mattresses. But there are never enough mattresses for all the prisoners. Two dim electric bulbs are suspended from the ceiling.

The prisoners call these barracks "musical," since even outside one always hear the ceaseless wailing of hundreds of sickly and wretched babies.

The camp regime is strict. There is no pampering of the nursing mothers. Every one is wakened at 5 o'clock in the morning, lined up in the yard and let out to heavy road-construction work. The working day lasts till 6 in the evening. After work, the women must spend another hour cleaning the camp and the barracks.

The sole privilege accorded to the prisoner-mothers is the right to leave work three times a day to feed their babies. The nursing mothers are led to the barracks in formation. They may spend not more than a half-hour with the babies.

All the women are driven to work. Illness is recognized only when the temperature is

over 38° C. (over 100° F.). With a temperature of 37.9° a woman is considered fully well and capable of work.

The daily food ration consists of 500 grams of gray bread and balanda—a watery soup made of potatoes or some cereal. Those who overfulfill the daily output norm receive an additional 100 grams of bread and a lump of sugar (6-8 grams).

The medical facilities consist of one nurse for every four barracks (800 nursing babies and 800 mothers), and one doctor for the entire camp. The "medpunkt" (medical center) is a tiny office-reception room. The entire pharmacy is in the doctor's bag. Bandages and cotton are chronically absent.

The children are bathed in two or three common wooden troughs provided for the purpose in the cold washroom. The stove is heated only once a week.

The mothers take turns in "home" duty. Every day 10 of them remain in the barrack to take care of the 200 infants—1 for every 20. The prisoners regard their day of barrack duty as the most difficult of all. There are frequent cases of fainting. Road construction is considered easier work.

After a period of mass deaths from colds, the camp administration issued a half of an old army blanket for each baby. Everything for the infants—from diapers to clothing—is made by the mothers from their own skirts or from clothes of those who have died, which the authorities are generous enough to leave at the disposal of the prisoners.

Within a few months, the nursing mother reaches a state of total exhaustion, physically and nervously. The constant running from work to the barrack to feed the sickly babies, the ceaseless suffering around of young and old, the crying of the feeble and dying infants and their wretched mothers often lead to complete breakdowns. To the overwrought mind the screaming, sucking, demanding, never-satisfied baby becomes a symbol of all these misfortunes, the cause of all this grief, and crimes are committed in insane desperation.

When the nursing mother has no more milk, the infant is assigned to another nursing mother by order of the administration. Neither woman is consulted about it.

Babies who reach the age of 10 months are taken from their mothers and sent away to an unknown destination determined by administrative order. The mother, who is never told the whereabouts of her child, is transferred to some other camp. (From Golos Naroda—The Voice of the People.)

Short Summary of Differences Between the House and Senate Bills With Respect to Railroad Retirement Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the action taken by the House yesterday in approving amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act increasing the monthly allotments to pensioners, annuitants, and survivors will be greatly appreciated by those who are now so greatly in need.

I am including as part of my remarks a short summary showing the differences

between the House and Senate bills with respect to the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act adopted in the respective bodies, as follows:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS—DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

1 The Senate bill provides that an individual to be qualified for benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act must have at least 10 years of service, and those with less than 10 years of service will be transferred to the social-security agency for the payment of benefits.

The House bill retains the employee under the Railroad Retirement Act as provided in the present law.

2 The Senate bill provides to increase the taxable monthly compensation from \$300 to \$350 a month.

The House bill retains the \$300 limitation on taxable compensation.

3 The Senate bill in section 9 guarantees that the retirement annuity and survivor annuity paid to an individual with 10 or more years of service under the Railroad Retirement Act will at least be equal to those which would have been payable by the social-security agency, provided the railroad service was creditable under the Social Security Act.

The House bill retains the same provision except it provides that the employee must have had a current connection with the railroad industry in addition to having the 10 years of railroad service.

4 The Senate bill provides for an adjustment between the railroad retirement and social-security funds because of a proposed transferring of less-than-10-year employees to social security and other proposed correlation of the two agencies.

The House bill contains no such provision, except as provided in the present law.

5 The Senate bill provides that a railroad-retirement annuity will be reduced any month in which an individual is entitled to receive an old-age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act, in an amount which would be equal to that portion of his annuity which was based on his years of service and compensation before 1937, or by the amount of the old-age insurance benefit whichever is less.

The House bill does not provide any such provision.

The House bill and the Senate bill are identical with the exception of the above. In brief the House bill provides:

1 Increase of pensions and annuities 15 percent.

2 Increase in survivor annuities 33 1/3 percent.

3 Increase in lump-sum benefits 25 percent.

4 A spouse's annuity with a maximum of \$40.

5 Credit for service after 65.

6 Increase in annuity benefits for the individual who elected a joint-and-survivor annuity and whose spouse has died.

7 Increase in time limit for filing application for annuities from 60 days to 6 months.

The above seven items are also included in the Senate (Douglas) bill, and the language used in the two bills is the same.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Senate will accept the amendments proposed by the House to the end that the benefits provided for can be payable at the earliest possible day.

It is also gratifying that both the Senate and the House have adopted a resolution for a study of the entire act, and it is hoped that the result of this study will mean additional benefits without an increase of the tax now being paid by employees and employers.

United States Navy Should Have a Cruiser "Brooklyn"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is a movement afoot that the United States Navy should name one of its cruisers *Brooklyn*, in honor of the Borough of Brooklyn. Officials of Brooklyn, the press of our borough, and its citizens support this idea. As one of the Representatives of Brooklyn in Congress, I urge our Department of the Navy to give serious consideration to this request and to name one of its cruisers *Brooklyn* in honor of the second largest community in this country.

At a recent meeting of the Society of Old Brooklynites a resolution was unanimously adopted regarding this matter. I am pleased to insert this resolution in the Record in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues the historical facts pertaining to other ships named after our borough in the past and the role they have played in American history. The resolution is as follows:

"Whereas there is under way a movement to have a United States Navy cruiser, under consideration christened the *Brooklyn*; and

"Whereas it is the Navy's custom to name its cruisers after large communities, the borough of Brooklyn is the country's second largest community in the United States, and that it has been the custom of the United States Navy to have a capital ship named *Brooklyn*; and

"Whereas there have been three Navy ships named *Brooklyn* in the last 100 years, the latest of them a light cruiser launched from the Brooklyn Navy Yard in 1936. She saw 15 months of combat in European waters in World War II, including four landings and four major engagements. She returned unscathed to the United States in December 1944 and a little more than a year later she donned a plastic coat and joined the moth-ball fleet; and

"Whereas the first U S S *Brooklyn* was launched in 1858 and took part in Commodore Farragut's capture of New Orleans, Galveston, and Mobile and participated in the bombardment of Vicksburg, the capture of which brought Gen U S Grant into spotlight during the Civil War and led to his advancement to commanding general of the Union Armies and later President of the United States; and

"Whereas the second *Brooklyn*, launched in 1895, was the flagship of Commodore Winfield Scott Schley in the battle of Santiago during the Spanish-America War, 1898, and in that engagement the Spanish Fleet was completely wiped out, all ships being captured or sunk; and

"Whereas the last ship bearing the name *Brooklyn* was sold to Chile a few months ago; and

"Whereas both Borough President Cashmore and the Brooklyn Eagle and other organizations here in the borough have pressed for another U S S *Brooklyn* to carry on; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Society of Old Brooklynites heartily endorse such movement and urge the borough president, Hon. John Cashmore and each and every one of the nine

Representatives in Congress and the two United States Senators from the State of New York, Hon. HERBERT H. LEXMAN and Hon. JAMES M. IVES, to continue to press the propriety and desirability of giving the next United States cruiser to be constructed the name of *Brooklyn*; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the borough of Brooklyn; the immediate nine Representatives in the Congress of the United States; the two United States Senators from New York; Hon. Dan A. Kimball, Secretary of the Navy; and the editor of the Brooklyn Eagle; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Society of Old Brooklynites pledges its aid and assistance in attaining the objective hereinabove indorsed"

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM A. DAWKINS,
Past President

Attest: I hereby certify that the above resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Society of Old Brooklynites on Wednesday, October 3, 1951.

ARTHUR HOFFMAN,
Secretary

In These Days of Ruinous Taxation There Seems To Be No Slacking of Interest in the Erection of Monuments to Adminis- trations That Seem To Have Forgotten That Taxes Fall Most Heavily Upon Those Who Labor for Their Daily Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following thought-provoking editorial from the October 13, 1951, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror is a timely discussion of the subject of economy in Government which is necessary if we are to receive any relief from the ruinous tax policies now in effect:

CASTLES ON THE RHINE

There are many Americans alive today who were fortunate enough to be born in this country because their ancestors fled from the types of government that made "castles on the Rhine" a possibility. We are thinking of "castles on the Rhine" as a symbol rather than as specific castles in this instance.

The theories of government that made the Sphinx in Egypt, the Coliseum in Rome, the grand Athenian temples of early Greece, and numerous other historic relics possible are as archaic as the ruins that now offer mute testimony to the slavery of common men and as modern as power-drunk men can make them. We are afraid that some of our American men of power have forgotten the lessons they teach.

In these days of ruinous taxation there seems to be no slacking of interest in the erection of monuments to administrations that seem to have forgotten that taxes fall most heavily upon those who labor for their daily bread. Fine buildings are highly desirable, and all of us get a thrill of pride when we see a splendid public building that offers service to all mankind.

There are, however, times when the erection of fine buildings at public expense must stop. We believe that we are now in one of

those periods of time. Taxes have reached an all-time high in this country. Men and women who work day after day have the right to enjoy the fruits of their labor. It is wrong to take away the great portion of those fruits that are now being consumed by government at all levels. If the tendency persists men will become the slaves and not the masters of government.

There seems to be a scarcity of building materials for the homes of men and for the industrial establishments where men work and earn the money with which to pay their taxes. Judging from the number and character of public buildings erected and under course of construction at the present time a shortage of materials or money for public buildings does not exist. It seems to us this is a distortion of priorities. Under the American system of government the people should have the first priority. It is time for a tax reduction not a tax increase and if we must stop for a few years this building of "castles on the Rhine" we believe that most of us will be better satisfied.

There are now more than 150,000,000 Americans. We doubt if one-third that number will ever see the Pentagon. Certainly there are few of us who will ever use it and if recent military prowess has been engendered by it there seems to be little evidence of it in the daily accounts from the battle-fronts.

Big and elaborate public buildings are a continual drain on the tax resources of the Nation. It costs a great deal of money to staff and maintain them. It has been jokingly remarked that it takes a man holding the rank of colonel to serve as custodian at the Pentagon. Perhaps he also is entitled to some medals for being able to keep track of what goes on there as most folks seem to have trouble just finding their way around.

"Castles on the Rhine" always seem to link themselves up with cottages and huts in the villages and reasoning folks can easily discover that the men and women in ordinary walks of life who must pay the bills for them have little left to build and maintain a comfortable home.

To our way of thinking it is about time that you and I have some straight-from-the-shoulder talks with those who legislate taxes against us.

We have heard enough of this talk about the necessity for higher and higher taxes. Isn't it about time some of those who legislate taxes explain in detail how those taxes are to be used? Isn't it time for those of us who elect them to demand that they reduce taxes or make way in public life for men who will?

Today there are many gloomy castles in England, and the people shiver as they approach another austere winter without enough coal to keep even one room of their home comfortable at all times. In many other European nations where the system of government that makes men the slaves rather than the masters of the state similar conditions exist. It could come to that here.

At Harrisburg the other day the Governor of this Commonwealth told newspaper editors and publishers that they were not fulfilling their duty to the citizens of this State until they educated them to the need for more State taxes. Unfortunately for the Governor, newspapermen have good memories, and they also maintain adequate files to supplement their memories. Can this be the same man who last year told us that he did not believe that new taxes were necessary?

We think that we would be remiss in our duty if we did not tell our people that it is to their best interest to resist every increase in taxation and to insist that economy be instituted in all levels of government.

The time has come for us to insist that every branch in every level of government

ask itself. "Is this expenditure of public funds really necessary?" The time has come to tell every taxing authority in the entire system of government to economize or to make room for men who will. The time has come to select and elect men who will cut down on governmental costs so that the cottages and the homes of America can be repainted and repaired, and the industries of America retain enough of their earnings to replace worn-out capital tools and buy new ones so that the economy which makes us the strongest Nation on earth shall not be impaired.

The time has come to halt for a time at least the building of "castles on the Rhine."

Businessman Writes From Triple Cities Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: As I am a businessman who has to make a living in the Triple Cities "jungle" as you call it, I am asking you to keep this letter in confidence.

Even though the local political overlords seem to have it in for you, I want you to know that some of us here are in your corner and admire the fight you've put up against the Hill-Kress snipers for so many years.

The press is saying that your fellow Republicans from New York State are ganging up on you. I should think each one of them would have all he could do to take care of his own district, that is, if he's honestly representing his people. I can't imagine what business it is of theirs who gets elected from our part of the country, especially an outstanding gentleman like yourself.

Did Charley Kress have anything to do with this? If the other Congressmen were aware of his background and past history I don't believe they'd be so anxious to listen to him talk against you. Who finances his trips down to Washington? Who sends him around on such dirty errands?

I've always been one to read between the lines. There isn't anything this crowd in Binghamton wouldn't do to get rid of you, Ed. That's why I've always pulled for you. Here's wishing you luck.

Count on me for a lot of quiet campaigning in your behalf. Enclosed you will find a little of the right kind of support.

Cordially yours,

BUSINESSMAN.

Taft Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I should

like to insert in the RECORD the three statements issued yesterday by Senator ROBERT A. TART, of Ohio, in formally announcing his candidacy for the nomination on the Republican ticket for President. The complete text of the three statements follows:

I have decided to accept the invitation of Thomas E. Coleman and other leading Republicans of Wisconsin to enter the Wisconsin primary as a Republican candidate for President of the United States. I have also agreed to the use of my name as first choice by the delegates of Ohio. I have taken this action because I am convinced that a majority of the Republicans in those States, and also throughout the Nation really desire me to be the candidate for the party. That majority is especially pronounced among those most interested in the Republican Party and most determined to restore Republican principles of liberty integrity, and sound judgment to the councils of the Nation.

I have been deeply concerned that in this campaign the Republicans present an affirmative program based on the principles of government which that party has always supported—a program of progress within the principles of liberty of the individual, of State, and local self-government, and of economic freedom and not based on the New Deal philosophy of constant increase in Federal Government power and Federal Government spending. A vigorous presentation of such principles to the people of this country will assure the election of a Republican President and will restore integrity and honesty and sound judgment in the administration of domestic and foreign affairs. It will insure a determined foreign policy against the spread of communism by military aggression or propaganda, including the establishment of Korea as a free country and the completion of the arming of Western Europe to enable it to defend itself against Russian aggression.

I am going to run because I believe I can conduct the only kind of campaign which will elect a Republican to office. I believe we can extend to the entire Nation the methods which we used in Ohio—a forthright presentation of our case to the people of this country, to the farmers and the workmen, to the businessmen and to all of those who accept American principles. A determined organization of every enthusiastic supporter to interest the voters who have stayed at home in such large numbers, but who can be interested and persuaded to vote if there is enough enthusiasm on the part of Republican supporters. I do not underestimate the difficulties of electing a Republican President against the automatic propaganda of a great administration machine supported by taxpayers' money, but I am convinced that a great majority of the American people today believe fundamentally in those principles which the Republican Party can present to them.

I feel confident, therefore, that I will be nominated and elected.

DECISION BASED ON TALKS WITH REPUBLICAN LEADERS

(Second statement)

My conclusion has been reached after conversations with hundreds of Republican leaders throughout the United States from the Pacific to the Atlantic. It has been reached after studying the report submitted by my friends, David S. Ingalls and E. Tate, who talked with hundreds of other leaders as well as representatives of union workmen and of farmers. I have had more than 2,000 letters, telegrams, telephone calls, urging me to run from numerous State chairmen, national committeemen, Senators, Congressmen, publishers, and other party lead-

ers. Furthermore, I have had many indications that the rank and file of Republicans desire me to be the candidate, particularly those who vote on election day. In a number of States the promises of support are so general that delegates from those States are assured. In a sufficient number of other States to constitute a majority at the convention the prospect appears to me to be strongly in my favor.

I have asked a committee consisting of David S. Ingalls, of Cleveland, chairman; John D. M. Hamilton, of Philadelphia, and Thomas E. Coleman, of Wisconsin, to recommend to me an organization set-up to keep in touch with the developments in various States. I anticipate that there will be associated in the management of the campaign many who have loyally supported me in the past, as well as many new adherents.

TECHNICAL SMEAR TACTICS OF CALIFORNIA PARTISANS

(Third statement)

I do not intend to comment on other possible candidates for the Republican nomination. My campaign will be conducted solely on a presentation of the reasons why we need a Republican President to replace the present administration. My attention has been called to smearing tactics of certain irresponsible organizations calling themselves Republican. As a matter of fact, they have no right to such a designation. I was particularly disgusted with a pamphlet issued by people calling themselves the partisan Republicans of California, making wholly unjustified attacks on Governor Warren and General Eisenhower. That kind of slander can only hurt the Republican Party and only serves to prove, therefore, that these people are not interested in the Republican Party.

EXPLAINS LETTER IN FORRESTAL DIARIES

My attention has been called to a statement in the Forrestal diaries that I wrote a congratulatory letter to President Truman after the 1948 election and said at the end of the letter that neither I nor my wife were particularly disappointed in the result of the election.

Mr. Forrestal was mistaken. I wrote a congratulatory letter to President Truman and offered to cooperate with him in the coming session of Congress. The letter contained nothing which remotely resembled the statement quoted above. As a matter of fact, I do not remember an election in which I was so very much disappointed after the strenuous speaking campaign which I had conducted in behalf of Governor Dewey. I can only assume that when President Truman told Mr. Forrestal of the letter someone present made a humorous comment of his own which Mr. Forrestal understood incorrectly to have been part of the letter.

Throw Out the Time Clocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that any business firm in the United States could take a major step forward in bringing about greater employer-employee cooperation by taking a tip from the Parker Pen Co., of Janesville, Wis.

Earlier this year Parker Pen threw out all their time clocks and substituted an honor system. The success of this change is well described in the October 18, 1951, issue of the *Machinist*, which I include herewith

HONOR SYSTEM REPLACES TIME CLOCKS AT PARKER PEN

Six months ago, the Parker Pen Co., removed the time clocks from its Janesville, Wis., plant. In half a year, Parker employees have almost forgotten what it was like to punch out. Since April 2, they have just walked out of work when the 4 o'clock bell sounds, instead of waiting in line to have the mechanical watchdog record their time. Everyone at Parker is on his honor as his own timekeeper.

Last week, the *Machinist* asked Oliver W. Fleming, business representative for IAM, district 48, to find out what life was like in a shop without time clocks. We asked him to talk to both the members of IAM Lodge 1266 who work at Parker and with management. Here is Fleming's report.

The company and the unions, IAM Lodge 1266 and A. F. of L. Pen and Pencil Workers Federal Local agree that the unprecedented decision to abandon the archaic time clocks was a forward step in employee relations.

Their opinion is substantiated by records of decreased tardiness and the whole-hearted approval of the employees. In a recent vote, 92 percent of the 1,050 production workers said they were glad to see the time clocks go. Here are the reasons they gave:

Time isn't wasted waiting in lines.
Enmities aren't created now by line buckers.

They feel happy that management has confidence in them.

The emotional irritant of this form of regimentation is removed.

The company, similarly, reports that it has reaped benefits in improved morale, increased loyalty, and a fuller day's work.

To some, however, the removal of the time clocks was a trifle sad. For instance, Brother William O'Connell, tool and die maker, had built up a personal relationship with the clock after punching it for 27 years. He took pride in his ability to punch in on the last tick before the bell rang. O'Connell says, "It's no contest any more."

What method has replaced the clock for keeping time according to the requirements of the wage-and-hour law? That's what several other firms have asked Parker management. The answer is, an honor system under which each individual is responsible for keeping a handwritten record of his time.

First of all, the honor system was thoroughly tested. Supervisors have not been punching the clock at Parker since September 1950. When that worked out so well, two production departments ignored the time clocks and kept their own time for a test period. The previous experience of the supervisors helped a great deal.

Trouing out difficulties that arose during these test runs, the honor system was set up throughout the entire factory. Time cards are placed in racks at convenient spots within the various departments. Each person fills in his card during the day, merely writing down the number of hours worked.

At the end of the week the cards are signed by the employee and his supervisor and sent to the payroll department where the hours are totaled. If the employee is more than 6 minutes late he puts down the time of arrival and fills out a tardiness slip. The company reports that tardiness has virtually disappeared in the 6 months since the new system's introduction.

IAM members at Parker spend their 8 hours a day making and repairing tools, dies, and machines used in the precision manufacture of pens, pencils, ink, and Flaminale butane lighters. Lodge 1266 was first organized in May 1934 and its first agreement drawn up by Al Hayes, now international president of the IAM. Good relations have existed between labor and management ever since, Paul L. Delly, recording secretary of lodge 1266, reports.

American Legion, Department of California, Urges More Study of Veterans' Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the American Legion, Department of California, a copy of an article from the Long Beach Press-Telegram, together with copies of two resolutions adopted by the Echo Park Post, No. 414, and the American Legion, Department of California. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article and the two resolutions:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of September 23, 1951]

Proposals to set up local committees of American Legionnaires to investigate the effect of public housing on veterans' interests and to continue efforts to eliminate unnecessarily costly building requirements from local, State, and Federal codes have been approved by the Legion's Department of California.

"Insufficient study has been given to the effect of such public housing (urged as a solution to veterans' housing problems) upon veterans' rights and interests in affected areas," the Legion declared in its public-housing resolution.

The document was adopted following acrimonious debate on the convention floor between Rollins MacFadyen, seventeenth district housing chairman and department housing technical adviser on housing, and Al Weinberg, an official of the Los Angeles Housing Authority.

MacFadyen emphasized that socialized housing gave preference for occupancy only to the small segment of veterans having low incomes. The majority of veterans, he continued, are taxed to subsidize public housing, regardless of occupancy. Weinberg reportedly was booed from the platform after resorting to personal attack on MacFadyen.

The second resolution, aimed at making lower rentals available through reduced costs, was based on Legion-sponsored experiments in constructing apartment houses acceptable to local building authorities but not eligible for FHA insurance. Claiming that many of the FHA requirements were unnecessarily expensive, the California Legion obtained approval of the national organization for a countrywide study of the situation.

The San Diego resolution noted that successful results (of the campaign) are increasingly apparent especially in the average cost rental field and urged continuation of

the effort as in the best interests of the veterans.

The California department will urge the national convention at Miami, Fla., to take similar action.

Whereas, the American Legion is concerned with the proper housing of all veterans; and Whereas, the proponents of public housing have often urged such housing as a solution to the housing problems faced by veterans; and

Whereas, insufficient study has been given to the effect of such public housing upon veterans' rights and interests in affected areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a fact-finding committee be established by the American Legion in each area affected by public housing to determine the effect of such housing on veterans' interest, and be it further

Resolved, That no endorsement of public housing be given until such fact-finding committee has submitted its report; and be it further

Resolved, That such fact-finding committees be set up in affected districts of the American Legion and that this resolution be referred to the seventeenth district and the Department of California for action.

Passed by Echo Park Post, No. 414, at their regular meeting August 16, 1951.

Whereas housing problem studies initiated by the seventeenth district have resulted in action directives by the two preceding department and national conventions, and

Whereas these directives mandated study and action by the respective department and national commanders through appropriate committees, the objectives being the elimination of excessive and unnecessary costs, by technical and administrative changes in Federal, State, and local building codes; and

Whereas successful results are increasingly apparent especially in the average cost rental field, in that building projects inspired by these studies are the object of intensive interest on local and national levels by legislative bodies, building officials, and private builder-investors; and

Whereas it is in the best interest of the veteran that these excessive and unnecessary costs be eliminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of California, through proper channels, continue the efforts to achieve the objectives as set out, namely, the elimination of excessive and unnecessary costs in local, State, and Federal building codes, be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the national convention at Miami, Fla., for action.

Still Flourishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial appearing in the October 16, 1951, issue of the *Washington Post*:

STILL FLOURISHING

The fact that 1,935 persons were victims of aggravated assault in Washington in the

first 6 months of this year is shocking whether it stands alone or is compared with similar crimes in other cities. Uniform Crime Reports, published by the FBI, indicates that only five cities, New York excluded, have records in any way comparable, and Washington tops them all, even Chicago. The FBI points out that many different factors influence the crime rates for different cities. When allowance has been made for all those factors, however, the District has ample reason for concern over its lawlessness.

In some other crime categories Washington's standing is relatively good, as in the number of automobile thefts. In robberies and larcenies it is also far behind Los Angeles, Chicago, and Detroit, although that is to be expected because they are much larger cities. Still it is a disgraceful fact that 352 robberies and 1,854 burglaries should be committed in the Nation's Capital in 6 months. And the reflection is not alone upon the police department, but also upon the community and upon Congress, which tolerate conditions that lead to so much crime.

One foremost reason for this prevalence of lawlessness here and elsewhere is clearly evident from the FBI report. For every 100 crimes reported to the police in 1950 only 28 were cleared by the arrest of 22 offenders, some of whom were accused of more than one crime. Of the murder cases 93.8 percent were cleared, but clearance is recorded in only 29 percent of the burglaries, 25.6 percent of the auto thefts, and 22.1 percent of the larcenies. Even after arrests have been made a considerable number of the accused persons are found to be not guilty. In other words, the criminal still has a good chance of escaping punishment for his crime. So long as this is true crime is likely to flourish, and small crimes will lead to greater crimes. That is why it is so important to strike at all lawlessness and not merely at the major crimes that arouse public indignation.

God and the Koch Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "God and the Koch Treatment," delivered by Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, D. D., before the 1951 annual convention of the Christian Medical Research League, at Detroit, Mich., on September 25, 1951, together with a brief summary description of the speaker.

There being no objection, the summary and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

REV. GERALD B. WINROD, D. D.

Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, D. D., is well-known as a minister, editor, author, radio speaker, and president of Defenders of the Christian Faith. His humanitarian service in contributing to the relief of pain through the dissemination of information regarding the Koch therapy is well-known. The commanding position which he enjoys before the public today, results in part from his ability to stand firm in the face of stern persecution.

As a fluent and forceful speaker, he will have something important to say to this convention.

GOD AND THE KOCH TREATMENT

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have brought my Bible with me to the rostrum this evening. With your permission, I shall preface my remarks by reading one sentence, James 1: 17.

"Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights."

The Koch treatment belongs to this category. It is a gift from God to man for the relief of pain and suffering.

When I was in South America something over a year ago Dr. Koch told me one day of an early spiritual experience which he had here in Detroit.

It seems that he had attended a Sunday afternoon evangelistic service in the local YMCA. I believe he said the meeting had been addressed by Dr. Stidger. He was deeply moved. Returning to his room he dropped to his knees and made a covenant with God.

New knowledge was then breaking upon his consciousness. He was thinking thoughts that had never before registered in a human brain on this planet.

He prayed. He told the Heavenly Father that if these thoughts which he was thinking had substance in them, that if a beneficent providence was entrusting new knowledge to him for the relief of human suffering, he would be careful to give God the glory. He would dedicate the undertaking to Him.

The new knowledge was imparted. His mind was impregnated with thoughts from a source above ordinary human levels. It seemed as though his path was illuminated. He could always see and understand the next step to take. He told me about several mystical experiences that crossed his life—experiences which baffled human understanding and vindicated the hand of a guiding providence.

I believe the Koch therapy to be a gift of God to our day and generation.

I received a letter a while back from a lady in Oklahoma. She told me that her son had developed a growth on his right cheek. Surgery had been recommended but she and the local doctor feared the outcome. The family had been praying. A copy of the Defender magazine fell into their hands containing an article about Dr. Koch's discoveries.

I gave them the name of a well-known doctor in their State. The treatment was administered. I received another letter a short time later saying that the boy's right cheek was as clean as his left cheek with all signs of the growth gone. It was a Christian family and they thanked God.

"Every good gift and perfect gift is from above."

Mrs. R. C. Long and her daughter called at my office a few weeks ago. They are longtime residents of Wichita. On the religious side they are of Dunkard denominational persuasion.

The daughter's name is Rita. She is a fine young lady 19 years old, a graduate of East High in Wichita and now a student in Kansas University. I wish you could hear their story as I heard it during the afternoon of the visit to our office.

When Rita was 2 years old, in May 1934, she was examined by Dr. J. O. Chaney of our city, an eye specialist, and Dr. Harold W. Palmer, a pathologist.

The diagnosis made at the Wichita hospital showed that the child had cancer of the left eye in a most virulent and treacher-

ous form. The eye was removed. Rita is today blind in her left eye.

Mr. and Mrs. Long took Rita back to the same doctors a little more than a year later. They found that the cancer had spread to the right eye and they advocated its removal. It showed exactly the same symptoms as had been previously observed in the left.

In the meantime the parents had heard about the Koch treatment. They brought the child to Detroit.

Dr. Koch's examination confirmed that of the Wichita specialists. Glyoxylide was administered on November 25, 1935. The reaction cycles were perfect. Progress was noted from the beginning.

A second dose was given almost a year later on August 18, 1936. Rita enjoys perfect sight today through the right eye. Had Mr. and Mrs. Long learned about the Koch treatment in time, there is every reason to suppose that the left eye could have been saved. And the Federal Trade Commission can find no therapeutic value in the Koch treatment.

"Every good gift and perfect gift is from above."

Mr. and Mrs. Long testified for Dr. Koch in both of his trials, held in this city. If I understood Mrs. Long correctly, no effort was made by the prosecution to refute their testimony.

But here is the sequel to the story. The pathologist who worked on the case, now an aged man, was later called into the Federal building in Wichita to testify that he must have made an erroneous diagnosis back in 1934 before they took the child's eye out.

Ralph Hinman is the head of the Better Business Bureau in Wichita. A week ago last Sunday night he delivered a tirade over the radio denouncing Dr. Koch and the treatment as quackery. Mr. Long, Rita's father, was so outraged that he called Hinman on the telephone and received a polite brush-off.

We may be seeing in Wichita a pattern for future attacks in other parts of the country. Fortunately, truth is on the side of those who espouse the cause of the Christian Medical Research League and the American Association of Physicians. And truth has a way of triumphing in the end.

Some people think the Better Business Bureau is a public service organization like the chamber of commerce or other businessmen's organizations. This is not the case. Morris Bealle has exposed its true character in some of his writings. Granted that it often succeeds in camouflaging its true nature and real purposes, the fact remains that the name "Better Business Bureau" is a misnomer.

I rang my friend, Rev. D. E. Young, of Winfield, Kans., on the telephone last Sunday afternoon. Mr. Young has been pastor of the United Brethren Church of that city for the last 17 years. It is no exaggeration to say that he is one of the outstanding religious leaders of the State of Kansas.

I told him on long distance that I was coming to the Detroit convention and asked him for some message to deliver to the assembled delegates. This is what he said: "Tell them I was opened up in July 1949 and found to have cancer. Tell them that the doctors sewed me up and gave me only a short time to live. Tell them that I knew about the Koch treatment through reading the Defender magazine. I was given the injection a few days after the operation."

"Today I have no pain. I preach every Sunday and carry on heavy pastoral duties, feeling as good as I have ever felt in my life. I am a living, walking, talking testimony to the efficacy of the Koch therapy. And if anybody wants my testimony under oath they can have it. Send my greetings to the convention."

"Every good gift and perfect gift is from above."

I could go on at great length. We have voluminous files containing such testimonials, supported by hospital records, clinical findings, and other documentation.

I was preaching in Georgia last summer, at Dr. Watson's North Georgia Camp Meeting and Bible Conference. A lady came to me. She said, "I am from Florida. We know Dr. Baldor of Tampa and think he is a wonderful man."

This is what she told me:

"My nephew Tommy Bates, was found last year to have leukemia. He is my sister's boy and they live in Belleview, Fla. They were told that there was no hope. Through reading the Defender they learned about the Koch treatment. Discovering that Dr. Baldor was a user, they took Tommy to Tampa. From every indication he is today sound and well, the picture of health. He has been back to the hospital for several check-ups and his condition pronounced satisfactory in every respect."

"Every good gift and perfect gift is from above."

What shall I say about little Marie DuVall, of Newport, Ark? She was stricken with polio in July 1949 at the age of 7. She was taken to the University Hospital of Little Rock and her case so diagnosed, polio. She was taken to the Children's Hospital, of Jacksonville, Ark., where the diagnosis was confirmed.

Three months later her parents heard a Defender Hour broadcast and took their little crippled girl to the Corning Hospital, of Corning, Ark. On November 18, 1949, Dr. J. S. Schirmer administered glyoxylide. A perfect recovery followed. Today Marie runs and jumps and plays and rides her bicycle like other children.

"Every good gift and perfect gift is from above."

As your convention assembles this year, there are indications of a storm gathering on the horizon. Persecution appears to be in the offing. One of the major tragedies of the twentieth century is the fact that forces have been set in motion which would deny mankind the blessing of Dr. Koch's discoveries.

This fact—the fact of organized opposition—should impress the assembled delegates and all other friends of the treatment, with the necessity of standing together. Hang together, ladies and gentlemen, or you may hang separately.

The old adage never applied with greater pertinency than here: "In union there is strength."

Dr. H. H. Jones, a Negro medical missionary from Liberia, is present this evening. He is connected with the Defenders' organization. We support him on the field. This good man was our guest in Wichita week before last. He told me a story which I wish to pass on to you at this time:

One day Dr. Jones was in conversation with the native chief of a large tribe who gave the following illustration of strength through cooperation:

Hold one small stick in your hand, explained the chief, and it can be easily broken. Put two sticks together and they are stronger. Place a third with the other two and you cannot break either one of them. In union there is strength.

Millions of people know nebulously that there is a cure for the so-called incurable diseases which today curse mankind. There are others, and their number is legion, who have the facts concretely fixed in mind regarding the Koch therapy. Multitudes want more information. They are reaching for the truth.

Their cry will not be silenced. They will receive the light because they are demand-

ing it. Those who think to keep this knowledge from mankind underestimate the power, the potency, the irresistible force of the popular will.

May I refresh your memory regarding an event that took place in the life of Christ in the days of His flesh?

He entered Jerusalem in great triumph, riding on the back of a colt. Crowds thronged about Him. Shouts of glad Hosanna pierced the air.

"Hosanna, Hosanna; blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest."

There was a great tumult. Artists have visualized the incident as the triumphal entry. Throngs greeted the Christ. People threw down their garments for the beast that carried the Master to walk upon. Palm branches were strewn along the way.

But the negative crowd was also present. This is always the case when something constructive is being done. The negative element must always be taken into account. Its representatives are always on hand. The Pharisees demanded a stop to all this noise.

What did Jesus say? How did He answer those who demanded that the celebration be brought to an end? This is what He said: "I tell you, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."

A similar situation exists here. If enemies of humanity should succeed in silencing the cry for knowledge on the part of those who are seeking relief from pain through the discoveries of Dr. William Frederick Koch, they would find other ways.

The demand is so great that the very stones would cry out.

Security Risks in Government Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release from the office of the junior Senator from Nevada, dated October 17, 1951, on the subject of security risks in Government personnel.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Press release from office of United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, October 17, 1951]

WASHINGTON, D. C.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, today issued a statement in which he said that "the rank and file of the American people are deeply grateful to Senator McCARTHY and others for their service to the Nation in exposing the 'security risks' in Government personnel." The Nevada Senator said that McCARRAN's subcommittee is doing a great service in following through on leads and ferretting out the facts.

Referring to the charges against Philip Jessup, whose appointment to the U. N. General Assembly is being considered by a Senate subcommittee, Senator MALONE said that he would oppose the appointment, "on the ground that Jessup had contributed to the loss of China as a free nation, thus adding to our troubles in Asia," and that Jessup's

usefulness as an American diplomat had been destroyed "because of his poor judgment concerning international affairs, entirely apart from his association with questionable organizations and individuals."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "There was a time when a breath of suspicion about a man's loyalty to his country would cause him to be ostracized in his community, now it seems such a man is rewarded with a highly confidential Government job."

"Just when did we cross the line? I do not believe that the American people have crossed it, they want no part of compromise with loyalty, particularly when their sons are dying in isolated parts of the world and their hard-earned tax money is being squandered."

"The rank and file of the American people are wondering why, out of the millions of veterans whose loyalty has never been questioned, there cannot be found a sufficient number qualified to fill the responsible and confidential posts of our Government. Why must we choose incompetent camp followers for such positions, they ask."

"It is any wonder that we are continually in trouble internationally? This can be laid to the tolerance of weakness in our State Department."

"When one surveys our losses internationally and the loss of lives on a distant battlefield, where our boys are fighting a war they are not allowed to win and do not dare lose, one is inclined to ask: What part did 'poor security risks,' frustrated individuals, homosexuals (91 of whom have been dismissed from the State Department), and other weak administration camp followers play in the formulation and conduct of our Government's policies which led to our present sad state?"

Address by Paul G. Hoffman on Receiving Freedom Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the brief but classic address given by Paul Hoffman, the director of the Ford Foundation, on the evening of October 7 when Mr. Hoffman received the tenth annual "Freedom Award" of Freedom House at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. My wife and I were among the 1,400 people who came to pay tribute to Mr. Hoffman, and to watch General Marshall make the presentation: General Marshall, himself, along with the late Senator Vandenberg, Bernard Baruch, Secretary Acheson, and General Eisenhower, has been among the previous recipients of this distinguished award.

Those of us in the audience were rewarded with a statement of the character and goals of the American people, as contrasted with the nature of totalitarian governments, which in my opinion, is unmatched in recent times for its simplicity and profundity. I suggest it might well be taken as a charter for our times here at home, and as the

philosophical basis for our Voice of America abroad

Mr. Hoffman saw fit to place his greatest emphasis on fear as the enemy of freedom. I want the Senate to hear just four of his paragraphs:

The thought control of dictatorships is imposed by force, but discussion, criticism and debate can be stifled by fear as well as by force. Persecution by public opinion can be as powerful as purges and pogroms. School teachers, Government clerks, Government officials and even businessmen can be frightened out of their rights under the first amendment as effectively as if that amendment were repealed, and frightened men are at best irresponsible in their actions and at worst dangerous. Of all the forms of tyranny over the mind of men, none is more terrible than fear.

Of late, some of our people—often good people—have been blindly spreading just this kind of fear. In their zeal to combat communism they have been betrayed into using methods and measures which impair the sources of our strength and thus play directly into the hands of the Kremlin. They are making criticism socially dangerous. They are forcing conformity through fear. They are ready to pillory anyone who holds an unpopular view or supports an unpopular cause. As a result, too many of our fellow citizens have been afraid to speak out. In far too many cases, decisions, often decisions in high places, have been influenced by fear. In short, the danger of Communist penetration and disruption has been compounded by the spread of panic. All of this in a Nation which has grown to greatness and glory because it has recognized the rights of nonconformists and dissenters.

If we want to assert the free nature of man and strengthen our free society, we must insist that within the law of libel and slander, the unlimited right to criticize must be maintained. This right is meaningless unless it extends to the thoughts with which we disagree—in the words of a great chief justice of the United States, freedom for the thought we hate. I, for example, disagree most intensely with the Daily Worker's tagging of every opponent as a Fascist. I also disagree intensely with those who make reckless charges of Communist sympathies. But I would not for a moment suppress these irresponsible critics. They must not be suppressed. They must be answered.

We must remember, too, that a free society is a just society. Everybody concerned about freedom in America must be concerned about justice, too. One reason why we must encourage criticism is that we must encourage people to point out such injustices as remain in America and to fight for their elimination. An unjust society cannot long endure. An injustice against one puts all justice in danger. Only by safeguarding the rights of minorities do we safeguard the rights of majorities. Racial and religious discrimination, special privilege, and inequality of opportunity for growth are on the wane in this country, but, where they still exist, these and other injustices must be discovered and rooted out.

I submit that Mr. Hoffman has summarized one of the great dangers of our time, and our greatest internal danger, in what he calls the process of "forcing conformity through fear."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Freedom House is concerned with maintenance of freedom and with the maintenance and perfection of a free society. There

never has been a time in our history when there was more need for such concern than now. The liberties which our forefathers called the inalienable rights of men are under attack everywhere.

I shall not take up your time by emphasizing the most obvious danger to our freedoms—the determination of the Kremlin to force its tyrannical way of life on the rest of the world. Rather, I propose to speak of a more subtle danger—the danger which stems from our failure to understand as well as we should the true nature of our free society, and the deep sources of its strength. As a result of that failure, we have outside of America too much neutralism and inside America activities, often carried on in the name of freedom, which are putting our freedoms in jeopardy.

The contention of the neutralists is that this free society of ours and the totalitarian society of the Soviets have one basic weakness in common: both are materialistic; neither meets the inner needs of man. They see the present world conflict as one between these two great powers, each intent on forcing upon the rest of the world its way of life. Undoubtedly we in the United States have contributed to this misunderstanding by our constant droning of statistics about the number of automobiles, telephones, radios, washing machines, and television sets that are owned by our 150,000,000 people. We have every right to take pride in the extraordinary capacity of our economy to create wealth and a right to even more pride because that wealth is distributed equitably. But it is a mistake to overstress these accomplishments. Their real significance lies in their relationship to the sources from which they derive. For they reflect the creative strength of a free society. In and of themselves, they are a bright spot, but they themselves are not the glory of America.

The glory of our American free society, the underlying fact which totally justifies it, is that here men have had a constantly expanding opportunity to realize on their capacities intellectually and spiritually as well as materially—that here conditions have encouraged the growth and development of the individual. Our goal must be not only equality but certainty of opportunity for full growth for every citizen. We are some distance from that goal. America is still unfinished business but we are on the way.

Particularly during the past 50 years there has been a spectacular growth of intellectual opportunities for the individual. At the end of the last century only 7 percent of all children in the United States of high-school age were still in school. By 1950 this figure had increased to 80 percent. In 1900 we had 7,200 college and university professors. Today we have more than 10 times that number—more than 72,000. Since the turn of the century the number of our college graduates has increased six times as fast as the population.

In terms of spiritual progress it seems clear to me that on balance we have during the past 50 years gone forward. We need not confuse the reality of spiritual growth with certain external indicators, but we may point to these indicators as the only practical means to suggest a measure of something which by its nature cannot be measured. We have seen a notable abatement in hypocrisy and a lessening of prejudice and intolerance in American life. It seems to me that the widening spiritual outlook of our country is nowhere better exemplified than in our constant concern for social justice. This is the Christian quest that has led to new and better relationships between large groups of our citizens, to the development of new codes of behavior and freshened insights into the interdependence of all Americans.

This growth and development in opportunity for intellectual and spiritual progress has been made possible because our free society squares with the nature of man. Man is by nature free; man is by nature social. This fact of a dual nature of man was much in the minds of our forefathers as they laid down the principles of our free Government. They spoke again and again of "the laws of nature; and of nature's God."

That man is by nature free can be supported by scientifically established evidence and philosophically disciplined reasoning. I have with great profit heard that evidence and listened to that reasoning. However, I do not believe it is necessary to present the proofs to this audience. Most of you are familiar with them. Furthermore, we Americans know instinctively that men who are enslaved cannot fulfill their nature. We Americans also accept as self-evident the fact that man is by nature social. "No man is an island—an island entire of itself." He cannot forsake society for the sake of liberty any more than he can satisfy his natural need for social life by forswearing his natural right to freedom.

Posing our major argument for a free society on the fact that it accords with the nature of man makes all the difference in the world to the character of our cause. Any support of our system that is based upon our ability to outgadget, to outproduce, and to outfight any other nation is fundamentally weak. It overlooks the vicissitudes of history. It means that if some other nation at some time should for a period outgadget, outproduce or outfight us that their system will have proven itself better for men. It could also be taken to mean that our system acquired its validity only in the last 25 or 50 years, which witnessed our rise to material supremacy. It unconsciously mocks the America of the founding fathers when, in the material sense, we were relatively small and weak alongside the France of Napoleon and the Russia of Alexander I.

In contrast, when we rest our case for a free society on its capacity to fulfill the deepest needs of man, we are saying that a free society is right and good for all men everywhere because their nature as men demand freedom, and we are proclaiming to the whole world that we want it not just for ourselves but for all mankind.

In stressing the moral basis of a free society, I do not wish to ignore or minimize its practical basis. From this standpoint, it is the strongest of societies, for it is the only form of social organization which makes it possible fully to draw upon the chief resource of any society—the character and talent of its people. The authoritarian society in suppressing the free thought and action of its people and forcing them all into a mold prescribed by a handful of men, automatically squanders and nullifies that most precious resource. Such a result is certain, even under wise leaders, but wise leaders are a rare phenomenon in a totalitarian society which is by nature sick with two corrosive forms of corruption—the corruption of unlimited power, and the corruption of unlimited submission.

But it is not enough to know that a free society is best for all men. Certainly, if freedom is to be defended and extended, it must be understood. We must be able clearly to identify those elements in a free society that are principally responsible for its capacity to meet the needs of the free and social nature of man.

Since each man in the exercise of his free nature directs himself to the attainment of his own ends, he cannot be rightly treated as a means to the end of another man or of the state. The essential point of the dignity of man can best be expressed in terms of the

basic natural right of every man to be respected as an end. Upon this turns the distinction between the free man and the slave. A free society must therefore grant rights and privileges which leave men as far as possible free to decide for themselves all matters affecting their own development—rights and privileges which provide security from arbitrary actions by other men or capricious intervention on the part of the state.

If a society is to meet man's social needs, it must provide conditions under which he can live and work together with his fellow-men in mutual respect and confidence.

These goals of a free society can be quickly and easily stated but can be reached only through complex arrangements. Our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our Federal and State laws, our customs, our mores, and our voluntary organizations are all a part of these arrangements. That is why a free society has been called the most signal achievement of mankind.

A totalitarian society differs sharply from a free society in almost every particular. I shall mention only two.

First, a totalitarian society cannot by its very nature accord to its citizens as individuals the right to determine for themselves what they should think, what they should discuss, or what they should do. To accord such freedoms is contrary to the basic totalitarian concept that man is a means only, not an end—a means for serving the end of the state.

The extent to which thought, discussion, and action are controlled in the totalitarian state was brought home to me on the occasion of a recent visit to East Berlin. The city was crowded with young people who had been brought together from Eastern Europe to a Communist youth rally. They were marching in unison, singing in unison, and thinking in unison. A few thousand dissenters slipped across the line of West Berlin, but let no one be deceived by that circumstance. For everyone who slipped away there were 10,000 who remained, and the content in the minds of those 10,000 was identical. They sang with enthusiasm the chants of praise for Stalin and of hate for the United States of America. Boys and girls alike were wearing bright blue shirts. It is terrible what modern dictators have done to children. Mussolini put them in black shirts, Hitler put them in brown shirts, and now Stalin is putting more and more millions of them into blue shirts, as part of a studied program to dwarf and warp their minds.

The second element of difference between a totalitarian and a free society has to do with its impact upon the social nature of man. If man is to live and work with his fellowmen happily, he must live and work in an atmosphere of confidence. Such a condition cannot exist under a totalitarian society because the thoughts and words and actions of men can be controlled only by complete police surveillance. No man in Russia today can be sure that a fellow worker—or even a member of his family—is not an agent of the secret police. As a consequence, instead of living and working happily, life goes on under a cloud of pervasive and corroding fear.

My purpose in calling attention to these particular differences between the elements of a totalitarian and a free society is twofold. These differences which dramatize the failure of a totalitarian society to meet the inner needs of man, provide a complete answer to the neutralist. In addition, they point up both the need to sharpen our determination to keep our society free from any taint of totalitarianism and the manner in which this must be done. We must be on guard against any and every activity which puts in jeopardy our rights as individuals to determine for ourselves what we

should think, what we should discuss, and with proper regard to the rights of others, what we should do. Freedom of thought is a basic human right, from which flow freedom of religion, freedom of press, and freedom of assembly and association. But freedom of thought is a sterile and meaningless right, unless we are free to discuss, to criticize, and to debate. Criticism, discussion, and debate are the only means to peaceful progress. All history shows that without them, a society must stagnate and die.

The thought-control of dictatorship is imposed by force, but discussion, criticism and debate can be stifled by fear as well as by force. Persecution by public opinion can be powerful as purges and pogroms. School teachers, Government clerks, Government officials, and even businessmen can be frightened out of their rights under the first amendment as effectively as if that amendment were repealed, and frightened men are at best irresponsible in their actions and at worst dangerous. Of all the forms of tyranny over the mind of man, none is more terrible than fear.

Of late, some of our people—often good people—have been blindly spreading just this kind of fear. In their zeal to combat communism they have been betrayed into using methods and measures which impair the sources of our strength and thus play directly into the hands of the Kremlin. They are making criticism socially dangerous. They are forcing conformity through fear. They are ready to pillory anyone who holds an unpopular view or supports an unpopular cause. As a result, too many of our fellow citizens have been afraid to speak out. In far too many cases, decisions, often decisions in high places, have been influenced by fear. In short, the danger of Communist penetration and disruption has been compounded by the spread of panic. All of this in a nation which has grown to greatness and glory because it has recognized the rights of nonconformists and dissenters.

If we want to assert the free nature of man and strengthen our free society, we must insist that within the law of libel and slander, the unlimited right to criticize must be maintained. This right is meaningless unless it extends to the thoughts with which we disagree—in the words of a great Chief Justice of the United States, freedom for the thought we hate. I, for example, disagree most intensely with the Daily Worker's tagging of every opponent as a Fascist. I also disagree intensely with those who make reckless charges of Communist sympathies. But I would not for a moment suppress these irresponsible critics. They must not be suppressed. They must be answered. We must remember too that a free society is a just society. Everybody concerned about freedom in America must be concerned about justice, too. One reason why we must encourage criticism is that we must encourage people to point out such injustices as remain in America and to fight for their elimination. An unjust society cannot long endure. An injustice against one puts all justice in danger. Only by safeguarding the rights of minorities do we safeguard the rights of majorities. Racial and religious discrimination, special privilege, and inequality of opportunity for growth are on the wane in this country; but, where they still exist, these and other injustices must be discovered and rooted out.

These convictions of mine are at best merely guidelines to a program of action. The forming of that program must be a task for our best minds—for men of great stature. But we must get on with the job, and Freedom House should play a leading role. The aggressive expansionism of the Kremlin has made the rebuilding of the military strength of America and the free world vital

to the maintenance of the peace. But something more is needed effectively to counter totalitarian plans for world domination. We must dedicate ourselves anew to making in America a demonstration of a free, just, and unafraid society at work. No police system could keep the news of this demonstration from reaching the peoples of the world, even those behind the iron curtain. Our forefathers projected this demonstration by framing a Constitution which firmly grounded on the nature of man combined freedom and justice. We must not let their aspirations escape us; we must push steadily forward toward the realization of the American dream.

Comments by George Dixon on Address Delivered by Hon. George W. Malone, of Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

MR. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Dixon, published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 15, 1951, commenting on the address of the junior Senator from Nevada before the 11 Western States Republican conference at Seattle, Wash., on Monday of this week.

There being no objection, the RECORD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

There are times when I wish Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, the old sourdough from Nevada, would quit making blurt statements and bow to the old Washington tradition of talking all around the point. I can understand the old Malone ranger and he scares me.

Circumlocution is so much more comforting. As an accomplished head-in-the-sand-sticker I resent being whacked with anything as blunt as this:

"In 38 of the 48 States, the total assessed valuation of all the property is now less than the State's per capita share of the national debt."

"A goodly number of our hothouse economists and political one-worders want to modify the United States Constitution so as to join an Atlantic federation of nations. In this federation the other nations could tax us for their support by the simple expedient of basing taxation on ability to pay."

See what I mean? When the world planners discuss the same thing it doesn't sound nearly so alarming. They cover up the ultimate result in millions of misleading words.

Senator MALONE does another of his blunt-instrument jobs on the international dollar shortage. I guess I have heard 50 long tons of words on the shortage of dollars abroad, including beautiful explanations of why we should remedy this situation, but never anything as devastatingly straight to the point as this from the outspoken mining man from Nevada:

"The dollar shortage theory as an excuse for gift loans to foreign nations is the

greatest hoax by which a trusting public was ever deceived.

"Any nation fixing a fictitious dollar value on its own currency—demanding more dollars for its own currency than it is worth in the markets of the world—will certainly be short of dollars."

The Malone ranger has taken to the trail again. Hi, ho, Silver.

Anchors for the American Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 3, 1951, a distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. Edward C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank of Portland, Oreg., delivered what I consider to be a great commencement address at Lewis and Clark College, in Portland, Oreg. The title of the address is "Anchors for the American Goal." I wish to read just one paragraph of the address before I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. Mr. Sammons said:

Anchor yourself to the Constitution of the United States of America, the greatest document ever given from the brain or hand of man. A sound political situation is the bulwark of America. Sound homes, sound churches, inspiring colleges, and free political structures comprise the American goal. Thus equipped, no ideology on earth can ever grind us into the dirt, be it communism, socialism, or any other type of ism.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire address published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANCHORS FOR THE AMERICAN GOAL

(Address by Edward C. Sammons)

Thank you, Dr. Odell, for your overgenerous words of introduction.

With your permission, Mr. President, members of the faculty, and members of the board of trustees, I am going to direct my remarks exclusively to the members of this graduating class. If the rest of you hear what I have to say, that will be coincidental.

Your graduation here today reminds me of a similar situation in which I participated. The scene was at the Presidio, San Francisco, in August, 1917, when I was graduating from the first officers' training camp in the First World War. General Barrows, former president of the University of California, was scheduled to make the commencement address, and the young graduate sitting at my left whispered in my ear, "I wonder what the 'old geezer' is going to talk about?" * * * I know you are wondering at this moment what I am going to say.

That reminds me of another experience when some years ago I was the commencement speaker at Oregon State College. My good friend the late Bishop Bruce Baxter, Methodist bishop of Oregon, was to preach the baccalaureate sermon, and he said to me, "Ed, remember that 'he who thinks by the inch but talks by the yard should be kicked by the foot'."

I am willing to risk your judgment as to whether I have talked by the inch, but I am unwilling to talk by the yard, for I do not want to be kicked by the foot of one of those

champion football players like Clarke Anderson, Stan Blair, or Rube Baisch. Consequently, my remarks are going to be brief and I hope very much to the point.

Since time immemorial it has been customary at graduation exercises for an older person to bring alleged words of wisdom to the members of the graduating class. Today is no exception. Thus, I am going to address my remarks to the 285 members of the graduating class, and, frankly, young men and women, I am going to talk in a very old-fashioned way about a very old-fashioned subject—no technical stuff about international relations or atomic energy; no soaring flights of fanciful oratory. I wish to talk about you, as individuals, and about our beloved country and the part you and I can play in it. This thought was prompted by an article I read recently wherein a Cleveland woman asked her employer this question:

"Why doesn't somebody talk about the United States?" She and her husband, both born in Europe, had gone back just before the war to share in what they had been promised was "the people's government—everything for the people!" When they got back there, they were painfully disillusioned—they did not like what they found. Her husband, having become accustomed to free speech in America, said whatever he wanted to say, so they shot him. Eventually this woman returned to her adopted home in Cleveland, and this is what she said: "If people here only knew what they have here, they would fight to save it—not tear it down by quarreling. It makes me ill to see groups talking for this greedy little group or that greedy little group. America will be ruined by it. Based on my experience, I wonder why somebody does not talk about the United States." And that is what I wish now to talk about to you members of this graduating class. I give you a great challenge.

Remember that it is to the United States that freemen look for light and hope in this vast and troubled world. America is the hope of hundreds of millions of hungry people who fear their neighbors more than they trust them and whose thoughts are warped with suspicion and disease. We have here in America a challenge from the rest of the world and an appeal from all mankind to save it from destruction. We Americans should dedicate ourselves completely to this struggle to have our own people realize what we have in America. We must be tireless in our efforts to destroy the falsehoods that are being told about everything American. These falsehoods are designed to create doubt and confusion regarding the value of our American free-opportunity system. And it really is the free-opportunity system—that is what we should call it—not a "capitalistic" system. We in America are truly free men and women. Our freedoms are based upon the oldest Constitution in the world with its hard-earned Bill of Rights, and it is time for us to stop rapping and start clapping for the American way of life.

Do you realize that in the United States 63.99 percent of the income is paid to the worker, while only 4.9 percent goes to the owners as dividends. The other 31.11 percent goes for materials and taxes. The free opportunity system might well be called the profit-and-loss system. As a matter of fact, 50 percent of all businesses, over a 10-year period, fail; yet the hope for profit keeps the others going—keeps them forming. Out of the few, success came to such as the General Electric, the General Motors, the Chrysler Motors, the United States Steels, and other great employers of labor.

Not so many years ago, some of the ill-informed were saying it was terrible for big corporations to make so much money. But let's look at the automobile business as an

example. Six hundred forty-seven different makes of automobiles have tried the job of pleasing the public. In the terrific battle of competition, less than 40 makes remain. Most of the men who ventured their capital lost it. A very few like Henry Ford, for instance, made millions and built up huge corporations out of profits, but the successful companies provide 8,000,000 jobs in America today for the highest-paid workers in the world. Those 8,000,000 jobs would not exist had it not been possible to make and keep profits. Please remember that.

It will be well to remember, also, that our American economy is like a milking stool. It has three legs—capital, labor, management. Without capital invested in tools and equipment, labor could make only the barest living. Without labor, which is the human energy and skill to use the tools and equipment that capital provides, capital would be useless. Management brings the two together and makes the best use of both. When any of these three legs—capital, labor, management—fails to function properly, our entire economy is upset and everyone suffers.

A jet fighter, for instance, like the one on display this afternoon in front of Hotel Portland, is a collection of profits. The fighters, bombers, guns—without which this country would be helpless—would never have existed if the enemies of business had had their way. Since the last war, American business has put \$70,000,000,000 into new machines and factories that are now building the planes, tanks, guns and everything else that makes this Nation strong.

If there had been no profits, these new machines and factories—and their defense production—could not have been built. Money for these machines and their output didn't come from taxes, which have stayed high. It didn't come out of wages, which have stayed high. It came from stockholders whose dividends have not gone up like taxes and wages—stockholders who could have had those dollars in dividends but invested them, instead, in America.

Government, labor, the public—everyone—is today drawing dividends of safety from that patriotic machine investment by American business.

Lewis and Clark, under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Morgan Odell, has just concluded another fine year, teaching students to think and to see what makes America tick. In Lewis and Clark's brochure entitled "Education for Competence," I find these challenging words:

"Whatever you do in this world, you've got to be good. Your satisfaction, your earnings, your advancement, your place in a community depend upon your ability to do your chosen job well. Society expects you to be competent, to stand on your own feet, to know where you are going and how to get there. Whether you want to be a doctor or a musician, a teacher or a journalist, a homemaker or a businessman, whether you plan to enter military or some other type of national service, competence and maturity will be required of you. In most occupational fields, competent performance can best be developed upon the basis of a good, general college education. Such education should prepare you mentally for the intelligent use of knowledge, physically for healthful living, socially for constructive human relations, and spiritually for devotion to the highest American and Christian ideals. Lewis and Clark seek to provide you for that kind of education."

Lewis and Clark College has brought that kind of education to you young men and women who are graduating here today, and I feel you are competent to meet the future. Probably one of the thoughts uppermost in your mind is "What are the opportunities for the future?"

In that regard I feel as does Dr. Arthur J. Brown, secretary emeritus of the Presbyterian board of foreign missions, who at age 94 (don't get the idea that I'm 94, though I have been around for a long time) said, "Old men are said to be cynical and pessimistic. I am not. I am an incorrigible optimist." Like Dr. Brown, I, too, am tremendously optimistic about the future of our Nation.

You may run up against people who think that opportunities are limited—well, don't you believe it. There are opportunities everywhere, and as proof I offer these facts.

Not long ago an analysis was made of management personnel in the 50 largest business enterprises in our country. The 143 men in absolute top management of these companies were asked to list their beginning jobs and to spell out their steps as they progressed. Of this group, 1 started to work at \$1.50 per week, 11 others for less than \$5 a week, 45 began their way up the ladder at jobs paying less than \$10 per week, 81 began with jobs paying \$10 to \$25 per week; only 7 of the group started at higher than \$25 per week. The average starting wage of those 143 leaders of the 50 largest enterprises in the country was \$13.40. America has always been the place where the plain man had a chance—and it still is.

Talk about opportunities. Five of our Presidents were born in log cabins; five were sons of farmers, including President Harry Truman; three were sons of mechanics or artisans, three were sons of country ministers. Here on American soil, rail splitters have turned into Presidents, privates into generals, gobs into admirals, shoemakers into Senators, newsboys into governors. Our own Governor McKay is one of the latter. He was a newsboy on the streets of Portland. He also acted as a delivery boy for a butcher shop, so he came up the hard way.

Last Monday the speaker at the Portland Chamber of Commerce forum was T. S. Peterson, president, Standard Oil Co. of California. He was a cigar-store clerk in Portland, then went to work for Standard Oil pumping gas and wiping windshields at a station at Fourth and Madison Streets. From there he went up the ladder to the presidency of one of the largest corporations in America. I will give you two other examples. F. B. MacNaughton, former president of that great institution, the First National Bank of Portland, now president of the Oregonian Publishing Co. and of Reed College, came to Portland with \$3 in his pocket. He spent part of that for a garret room in the Portland Hotel, went out early the next morning and got himself a job as a draftsman in an architect's office, and from that position he went on to become one of Portland's most successful and useful citizens. I could give you many examples, but I will give but one more. This afternoon at this very hour, John A. Zehnbauer, president of Jantzen Knitting Mills, is receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from the University of Portland in recognition of his fine contribution to the business life of this State. He and his associates started in business with a very modest sum of money in a tiny room on Third Street between Morrison and Alder, and now his firm is internationally known.

America, you should always remember, is a worker's republic, but it has never been a lazy man's Republic. There are no titles of nobility, no inherited rank, no caste to buck against. Here we have free schools, free libraries, lots of scholarships and help for the poor boy on the make.

Where and when have workers ever had a better republic than this great republic of ours? Where on God's good earth have so many people for so many generations had a better chance? The Good Book says, "As ye sow, so also shall ye reap." If I leave with you no other thought than that, it will stand you in good stead.

Dr. Kirkland West, in his baccalaureate sermon this morning at the First Presbyterian Church, challenged you to align yourselves with the Christian movement, citing as he did the antigodliness of the Communist movement in China. That was sound advice.

I challenge each and every one of you to tie yourselves into a part of a good public cause. Good causes are the anchors of the American goal. The American goal is to dignify and glorify the individual. Abraham Lincoln summarized that goal as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." In other words, freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of opportunity to change jobs, freedom to change ideas, freedom to do whatever one wishes to do so long as it does not harm his neighbor.

There are many good causes, local and national, into which I hope you will tie your intelligence and energies. It is not so important which cause is the first you align yourself with—whether Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, Community Chest, alumni activities of Lewis and Clark College, the church of your choice, or whatever else—but it is important that you put your talents to work in behalf of one or more of these worthwhile causes. You will gain great satisfaction in serving any of these organizations efficiently. And, more important than any of these, is politics. Take an active interest in politics.

Again quoting that great Presbyterian, Dr. Arthur J. Brown—"It all comes down to this: whatever the number of years, to make life worth while one should have a useful purpose, seek it diligently; form alliance with others of like purpose; have unshaken faith that beneath the surface tumult of the world there runs deep and strong the mighty current of God's eternal purpose. In the glory of this conviction, though my clock of time at 94 points to an evening hour, morning is in my heart."

Stated another way, listen to what Jesus, the Master Teacher, said. "He that heareth my words and doeth them is likened unto a man who built his house upon a rock. The rains came and the floods descended and the winds beat upon the house, but it did not fall, because it was founded upon the rock; but he that heareth my words and doeth them not is likened unto the man who built his house upon the sand and when the rains came and the floods descended and the winds beat upon the house it fell and great was the fall thereof."

No nation on earth, regardless of its form of government, ever gave to human beings so much liberty and material prosperity as we have enjoyed under our own constitutional form of freedom. We started out as thirteen little States, ridden by poverty and threatened by savages. Fortunately we were blessed by God, and we represent the utmost in individual freedom and individual prosperity. Compare our United States with any other land on earth. The workingman here is a king compared to the workingman in any other country. Nearly all of us have modern homes—electric lights and power, gas cooking, telephones, automobiles, automatic refrigeration, electric washers and irons, radios, insurance policies. Most of us own bonds and have money in the bank, plus a thousand and one other conveniences and luxuries. Are we ready to exchange all this for the crazy promises of some foreign crackpot? Isn't it time for us to thank God for America and our many blessings? Isn't it time that we wake up and do a real job selling America as it is?

If capitalism is wrong, why don't people who hate it leave America? If socialism is desirable, why don't they go to England? If communism is what the so-called common man wants, why doesn't he move in droves to Russia or China?

Nobody wants to leave America—but tens of millions of men and women all over the world, in every country, plead for the chance to come to America. "Parlor pinks" here lip about the beauties of statism, where the government guarantees security. People in those countries know all about this business of government taking care of you from cradle to grave, particularly the grave. Do what you're told or you get hurried into it.

They vastly prefer America, with its chance for progress, its high living standard, its liberty, its dignity of the individual. They'd swap security for your liberty any time. Look out that you aren't talked into the trade. Back in the dark days of 1932, I heard William Randolph Hearst, the well-known newspaper publisher, deliver an address on Americanism. It was reprinted in the Hearst papers, and I wish to share his words with you at this point.

"I know of no finer title, and I want no higher position, than to be a citizen of the United States of America."

"In ancient days to be a Roman citizen meant to be the equal of princes and kings."

"Today the most envied honor in the world is to be an American citizen."

"And this is so, not merely because America is the greatest Nation in the world, but because it is the freest nation in the world, and the happiest Nation on account of its freedom."

"We cannot understand how much freedom means in this country until we come back from countries where freedom means nothing."

"Here we have freedom of thought, freedom of the press, freedom of speech."

"Here we can think and say and do what we please as long as we do not interfere with the rights and liberties of our fellow citizens."

"But the great honor and advantage of being an American citizen carries with it an obligation just as great, and that obligation is to preserve inviolate the rights and liberties and privileges which our forefathers won for us in blood and toil and travail, that we may hand this precious heritage of freedom and independence, of liberty and dignity, down to our children and our children's children, undiminished and unimpaired."

To you who are graduating today, I say hail to the commencement of your careers! You have been fortunate to have had the opportunity of association with fine men and women in your classes and to know and take knowledge and leadership from members of an outstandingly fine faculty. These are memories which will grow in luster as you view them from a distance. The beauties of this outstanding campus will be treasured, to be sure, but what is even more to be valued, I feel, is the connotation of those two names, "Lewis and Clark," which are so enshrined in the memory of this country as symbols of pioneering courage and patience, daring and usefulness.

May God give each and every one of you enough of the faith and the vision and the courage of such men, as may be needed to surmount the difficulties of the days immediately ahead and to bring America through whatever confronts us.

If I had one single gift for you, I'd give you courage—that quality of mind which enables one to encounter danger and difficulties with firmness, and without fear or faint heart. Shakespeare, in four words, wrote of "The King becoming graces—the needs of a king—devotion, fortitude, patience, courage." I bespeak in your behalf to a kind Providence for all of these.

During World War II we built or repaired hundreds of ships of various sizes and categories here in this harbor. Many of you in this audience worked on some of those ships. Every one of them, for safety purposes, was equipped with four anchors when it was sent to sea. I wish to suggest four anchors for

your ship of experience which you will launch at the conclusion of this commencement.

First. Anchor yourself to your home. The home is the greatest cooperative institution in the world, and if you do your share, your kinfolk will never let you down. Strong homes are the foundation of this or any other country.

Second. Anchor yourself to the church of your choice. It will constantly be a place of refuge and there again, as in the home, if you do your bit, your church will never let you down.

Third. Anchor yourself to this great college. Participate in its affairs through the alumni association. Return frequently to experience the wisdom and the friendships of the members of this fine faculty. A college is always an inspiration and a source of new ideas. Your college will never let you down.

Fourth (but by no means least). Anchor yourself to the Constitution of the United States of America—the greatest document ever given from the brain or hand of man. A sound political situation is the bulwark of America. Sound homes, sound churches, inspiring colleges, and free political structures comprise the American goal. Thus equipped, no ideology on earth can ever grind us into the dirt, be it communism, socialism, or any other type of ism.

May good luck attend you and may God bless you all is my sincere wish on this notable day.

The "Vested Interests"—Past Mistakes of the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a formal report from the board of directors of the American-Hungarian Federation of 1624 I Street NW, in Washington, detailing the reasons for their visit to President Truman at the White House last Friday.

I had the honor to receive this same distinguished group in my office immediately after their meeting with the President. I was impressed with the intense interest they are showing, as citizens of Hungarian descent, in our Government's efforts to pin point Communist brutalities behind the Iron curtain. They are acutely aware of the various economic and propaganda techniques we are utilizing in the cold war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "VESTED INTERESTS"

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, in a speech to Republicans of the 11 Western States, says, "We need a new administration with no vested rights in past mistakes."

His speech could hardly have been better timed. William M. Boyle, Democratic National Chairman, has just resigned under fire and so becomes a really top-drawer administration mistake in the very sense Senator MALONE intended.

President Truman has a clear vested right in Boyle. He, Boyle, has grown up in the same Fendergast soil. The President backed him for the Democratic National Chairmanship. When Boyle was accused of wrongdoing, the President investigated and promptly cleared him. If Boyle was wrong, then so was the President.

Fortunately, Truman's clearance made very little impression on Congress which proceeded to investigate on its own, and with considerably more vigor, Mr. Boyle's health just could not take it.

Mr. Truman's reaction was regret that Boyle had resigned.

The point, however, is that President Truman thought it necessary to clear his party chairman when any sort of sincere investigation would have disclosed the same facts Congress disclosed. But the President has done the same thing before, and for the very reason Senator MALONE points out—vested rights, vested interests in past mistakes.

It is hardly necessary to list these mistakes in any detail. They have occurred with sickening regularity ever since 1933.

Our foreign policy has led us to war after war. Our domestic policy has created a national debt in excess of \$256,000,000,000, unremitting tax increases, a radical and dangerous price-control system, an inflation which has stolen half our savings, insurance and wages, and severe losses in personal liberties.

Yet the administration has a vested right, a vested interest in all of this. There will be no true apology, no honest promises of reform, no retractions, in the appeal for reelection.

For if a single false card is removed the whole structure collapses. But that is Truman's problem. The problem of the American people is to abolish these vested interests in crime, folly, and betrayal.

The year of action is just ahead.

Prompt Action on Suez Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following able and timely editorial written by Mr. C. A. McKnight, editor of the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N. C., which appeared in the News on Friday, October 12, 1951:

PROMPT ACTION ON SUEZ PROBLEM

The State Department has responded to the crisis in Egypt with swiftness and decisiveness.

Egyptian nationalists want to control the Suez Canal. Control of Suez by persons not in accord with the Atlantic community—such as the Egyptians—would endanger western security. Therefore we and other western powers are proposing that Suez be placed under the control of NATO, and that the canal be guarded by an international contingent.

With the Ottawa decision to extend Atlantic Pact membership to Turkey and Greece, NATO is now responsible for the defense of the Middle East, and Suez therefore properly becomes a NATO responsibility.

When Britain was forced to withdraw from her Greek and Turkish spheres of influence, the United States promptly—and fortunately—moved in. The United States alone, of course, could have chosen unilaterally to back up Britain in the Suez crisis. However, since the pronouncement of the Truman doctrine regarding Greece and Turkey there have been significant changes in the relationship between Atlantic powers. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, despite its many faults, has become the organization responsible for western defense. If the Suez problem is resolved through NATO, rather than by the United States alone, the true intent of the principle of collective security will be furthered and this

country will not be open to charges of imperialism which would be levied against unilateral action.

Furthermore, the Egyptians, like the Iranians, have a very proper desire to throw off the last vestiges of foreign control, and a solution which will be in tune with their legitimate aspirations is more likely of fulfillment if negotiations are conducted by NATO, which includes some of their neighbors, rather than solely by Britain and the United States.

The State Department deserves accolades for promptly backing a proposal which may well be workable.

Report of Board of Directors of the American-Hungarian Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a formal report from the board of directors of the American-Hungarian Federation of 1624 I Street NW, in Washington, detailing the reasons for their visit to President Truman at the White House last Friday.

I had the honor to receive this same distinguished group in my office immediately after their meeting with the President. I was impressed with the intense interest they are showing, as citizens of Hungarian descent, in our Government's efforts to pin point Communist brutalities behind the Iron curtain. They are acutely aware of the various economic and propaganda techniques we are utilizing in the cold war.

Two members of their directorate, Mr. Stephen L. Segedy and Mr. Peter Suta, of Bridgeport, Conn., are from my State. Both are leading citizens in their community. I chatted with them of the valuable contributions our citizens of foreign descent can make and are making bringing freedom's truths to oppressed peoples. After leaving my office, for example, the board of directors of the American-Hungarian Federation made a broadcast for the Voice of America beamed directly at Hungary giving, among other things, the facts regarding mass deportation of Hungarians to Russian slave-labor camps.

Mr. President, I believe the following interesting statement warrants a wide reading.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the United States received last Friday members of the board of directors of the American Hungarian Federation, an American citizens' organization in existence since 1907. The national headquarters of the federation is Washington, D. C.

The federation consists of half a million loyal American citizens of Hungarian descent. Three hundred and fifty member churches of the three major faiths and about 2,000 fraternal civic and patriotic member groups are located in 288 major centers throughout 39 States.

The delegation requested this special audience for three reasons.

First Convey the gratitude of the Hungarians of America to President Truman for his statement of July 27, 1951.

The President's statement dealt with the current mass deportations, internments, and dislocations of the Hungarian citizens and charged the present Hungarian Communist Government with flagrant violation of the human-rights provisions of the treaty of peace. Following this statement, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, on August 1, 1951, branded the Hungarian Communist Government's inhuman practice of mass evictions and deportations the grossest brutality. Reliable information reaching the American citizens of Hungarian descent state that the sympathetic and firm stand of the President and our Government temporarily slowed down the forced expulsions of the Hungarian citizens.

In reflecting the true sentiment of the Hungarians of America, the group of directors paid tribute to President Truman for his personal concern in condemning the brutal acts against the liberty and justice of the people of Hungary.

(In Hungary, deportations began in 1950. Over 70,000 persons have been taken to Russian slave-labor camps until April 1951. The vast and general deportations began in the middle of May 1951. They rounded up the so-called undesirable and unreliable element; people who are not in sympathy with the Communist program. Substantiated facts indicate that about 165,000 are scheduled to be interned. The undesirable people include children separated from parents, pregnant mothers, pensioned, sick, and aged of both sex and of every religion or political affiliation.)

Second Express the appreciation of the Hungarians of America for the Mutual Security Act, recently passed by Congress, which provides assistance to friendly nations in the interest of mutual security and offers aid to those who escape to western Europe from countries behind the iron curtain.

(There are approximately 1,570,000 Hungarian-speaking citizens in the United States—1 percent of our total population. The first large group of Hungarian pioneers came to America in 1851 with Louis Kossuth, leader of the Hungarian War of Independence of 1848-49. Kossuth's countrymen settled along the Mississippi Valley (southern Illinois, Missouri, Iowa). There are a number of places in the United States (Pennsylvania, Georgia, Florida, etc.) which still preserve the name of Kossuth, i. e., the largest Iowa county is Kossuth County (Algona is the county seat). The largest group of Hungarian immigrants settled in the United States during the last decade of the nineteenth century and in the years preceding World War I. A considerable element of the American Hungarians are still first- and second-generation immigrants. Their ties and contacts are alive with their kinfolk and relatives subjected to Communist oppression in Hungary. Among the escapees from the Soviet satellite countries envisaged in the recently enacted Mutual Security Act, many Hungarians are anticipated who are to be integrated into the Western European armies. The Hungarians of America are deeply concerned with the liberation of Hungary—the country of their origin—from the bondage of Soviet yoke.)

Third, Request the President that the United States Government, as the most influential member nation of the United Nations Assembly, scheduled to convene in November 1951, should accuse the Hungarian Communist government before the world as violators of the Universal Declaration of the Human Rights which was signed and adopted by them, too.

(The executive secretary of the American Hungarian Federation submitted series of

carefully checked evidences to the Office of Eastern European Affairs of the State Department about the tragedies of deported people of Hungary. Simultaneously, the members of this Federation expressed their just indignation toward the Soviet rulers of the present Hungarian Communist Government by staging orderly picketings against the Soviet delegation of the United States at New York, against the Soviet government officials and against the Soviet Embassy at Washington, D. C. Under the auspices of this Federation, mass-meetings and public demonstrations were organized throughout the United States in protest of the infamous conduct of the Communists of Hungary.)

Alphabetical list of directors, attending Friday's presidential audience:

Stephen E. Balogh, executive secretary, Washington, D. C.

John Benzene, president of the board of directors, Pittsburgh, Pa.

George E. K. Borshy, editor in chief of the American-Hungarian People's Voice, daily, Washington, D. C.

Rev. Mathias Daroczy, president of the American-Hungarian Protestant Ministerial Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Aloysius Falussy, chairman, Hungarian division of the Democratic National Committee, New York, N. Y.

Rev. John Gaspar, cochairman Hungarian Roman and Greek Catholic Pastoral Union, Passaic, N. J.

Zoltan Gombos, publisher and editor of Liberty, daily, Cleveland, Ohio.

Emery Kiraly, treasurer of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, Washington, D. C.

Rev. Julius Kish, Roman Catholic priest, Trenton, N. J.

Dr. Albert B. Mark, representative of the American-Hungarian Jews, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Kalman Molnar, president of the Federation's New York Branch, New York, N. Y.

Stephen L. Segedy, executive secretary of the American Life Association, Bridgeport, Conn.

Peter Suta, president of the American Life Association, Bridgeport, Conn.

Louis Szanto, life-long director of the Federation, Richmond, Va.

Dr. Francis Ujlaky, president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, Washington, D. C.

Edmund Vasvay, national treasurer of the American-Hungarian Federation, Washington, D. C.

George Weiler, director, American-Hungarian radio programs, Milwaukee, Wis. (attorney Aloysius Falussy acted as spokesman of the group).

Large Philip Jessup to be this country's delegate to the United Nations Assembly—if not upset by Mr. Jessup's speaking engagements—was salutary in every sense. Senator McCARRAN, the Nevada Democrat, and Senator HICKENLOOPER, the Iowa Republican, who demanded definite action at this session one way or another when it appeared that administration strategy might be to evade it so that Mr. Jessup would be eligible for a recess appointment, are not partisans of the State Department or the Ambassador; quite the contrary. But their demand served the interests of both, and also the influence of the United States in international conferences.

The Senate and its committees can do business very swiftly when they want to. The maximum length of time which might be consumed in debate on a motion to confirm or reject Mr. Jessup's nomination by the President can be spent by the Senate without greatly postponing adjournment. This is well known to the Foreign Relations Committee, which must vote before any recommendation by its subcommittee can reach the floor. Hence, if the full committee fails to act or deliberately delays action on the technical ground that a record bulging with essentials is "incomplete," it will be a reasonable conclusion that the administration strategy is what Senators McCARRAN and HICKENLOOPER suspected it to be: after the majority leader, Senator MCFARLAND dwelt on other items as having greater priority in the brief time remaining of this session.

THE CURRENT TACTICS

If the Senate is given no chance to vote on Mr. Jessup, and the President gives him a recess appointment, he can perform and complete the duties of the office before the Senate meets again. Of course, he would have to agree to serve in such unsatisfactory circumstances. For the deplorable suspicion that this is the administration's plan and that Mr. Jessup would cooperate, the tactics of the State Department are largely responsible.

These tactics have been to go underground in the presence of an attack on its far eastern policy, and attempt by silence, concealment or ex parte revelations to weather each political storm. When it has been put to the question on past words and performances which have become unpopular, the State Department has not stood to its guns. Its frequent course, as with the testimony of Harold E. Stassen about a 1949 conference on China, has been to gloss over or to lock up the facts instead of coming out with them boldly. Because sections of the past record have become unpopular, or seem to be, does not mean they could not be well defended when placed in their context. By often failing to do this the State Department has invited much of the public distrust it has to contend with, when prompt, clear and complete statements would have the opposite effect.

TWO PERFECT EXHIBITS

The two replies to Mr. Stassen's account of the 1949 White House conference on military aid to Chiang Kai-shek are perfect exhibits of this tactic. By placing the conference "early in 1950 or more probably late in 1949," Mr. Stassen misled the departmental searchers of the files. But this did not justify the hasty announcement that the search had been "exhaustive" and disclosed no such meeting; that it was not "exhaustive" was proved next day when the conference was disclosed in the amended reply to have taken place in February 1949.

Also, Secretary of State Acheson was revealed as easily accessible to the searchers in the first statement. He had, it said, "no recollection" of such a meeting. But when the record was found the Secretary became suddenly inaccessible. He was away resting

More on Mr. Jessup and State Department Evasiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of October 16, 1951:

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

A GOOD SERVICE TO ALL CONCERNED

WASHINGTON, October 15.—The decision of the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations to give the Senate tomorrow an opportunity to vote on the nomination of Ambassador at

and could not be disturbed for days, according to a State Department spokesman who had reached him so readily the previous day. Because of this, the perfectly defensible fact that Mr. Acheson, at the conference, supported the proposal of the military authorities that no more military aid be given to Chiang appeared as an item which had to be dragged out of the State Department and it preferred to conceal

THE RECOGNITION DISPUTE

The same flaw is to be found in the dispute over whether "serious consideration" was ever given by Mr. Jessup, Mr. Acheson and the State Department to the question of recognizing the Communist Government in China. This only became important as a test of the Ambassador's fitness and the State Department's candor because of hot denials that the question had been "seriously considered." For if it had not, in the period before the aggression in Korea, all policymakers who failed to do so would have written themselves down as irresponsible and incompetent, or both. But instead of saying, "Certainly we did," the effort has been to obscure or slant a wholly sensible record.

These maneuvers, plus a review of Mr. Jessup's past judgments that raises fair and grave doubt that he should continue to be Mr. Acheson's foremost adviser on foreign policy, have stimulated the fight against his latest nomination. If it is evaded, and Mr. Jessup is given and accepts a recess appointment, he will serve without the influence abroad he should have and only a successful Senate show-down can give. And once again a United States envoy will be sent to an international gathering without the constitutional mandate his errand requires.

Record of Chester Bowles as Governor of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I like the following editorial from the Hartford Courant. And thinking it may also interest my colleagues, I wish to waive my right to any technical advantage I may have—which this great newspaper, the oldest in the United States, has been generous enough to concede—and, in fact correct the record by asking unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BENTON HAS A CHANCE TO CORRECT THE RECORD

Because of his vigorous campaign against Senator McCarthy and the latter's alleged misrepresentations of the truth, Senator BENTON should be especially careful about his own assertions. During the Senate debate last week on the appointment of Chester Bowles as Ambassador to India, Senator BENTON made the statement that Mr. Bowles was one of only three Governors who had balanced the State budget. Here are his words taken verbatim from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "Does the Senator from Alabama know that in addition to having balanced the budget of the State of Connecticut during his 2-year term of office, as

Governor, Governor Bowles was one of only three Governors in the United States who achieved that distinction without raising taxes?"

The implications of that statement are clear enough. But the facts are slightly different. Mr. Bowles took office in January 1949. On July 1, 1949, about 6 months later, the sales tax went from 1 to 2 percent. Thus, for almost the entire period of his incumbency and during two fiscal years, Mr. Bowles had the benefit of an increased sales tax to help him balance the budget. Without that increase in taxes balancing the budget might not have been possible.

To be sure, the increase became effective under the provisions of Public Act 1, Special Session of February 1948. If Mr. BENTON wished to, he could claim technical correctness so far as the actual passage of the law is concerned. But a man as sensitive to the truth as is Mr. BENTON surely is more interested in the substance of tax increase, and not in the technicalities.

We mention this because of Mr. BENTON's zeal in keeping the record straight. He now has the opportunity to correct the false impression he has created about balanced budgets and no increases in taxes.

Ladies May Have To Turn Rough in Political Scrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Walter Ferguson, of Tulsa, Okla., is one of our great lady writers or woman columnists. She writes exceptionally realistic and factual views. One of them recently appearing in the Tulsa Tribune of Tulsa, Okla., appealed to me. By unanimous consent, I am quoting the entire article. It is entitled "Ladies May Have To Turn Rough in Political Scrap."

LADIES MAY HAVE TO TURN ROUGH IN POLITICAL SCRAP

October sees the start of a new campaign urging women to political action. Under the heading, "Political Pilgrims Progress," the editors of the Ladies Home Journal issued the following challenge:

"The problem of each citizen is to see that politics in his locality draws the best brains and the efforts of the most responsible men and women of the community. There is no way that national politics can be more intelligent, ethical or courageous than the local groups in which it has its roots."

Certainly the time is ripe for such a crusade. And there seems to be a surge of feminine concern over the corrupt conditions which prevail. But we shall have to forget about being ladies while we go at our political housecleaning. Some of the old suffragette spirit that got us the franchise must take hold of our souls. Perhaps we may be forced to make ourselves obnoxious to the professional politicians. There have been many instances in our history when women did that and great things were done.

Work on the local level must be a major part of any cleanup program and it's a hard task. We hate to get mixed up in bickerings with fellow townsmen. And how much safer it seems to argue about the point 4 program, or the human rights charter, or any other big subject to which distance lends enchantment. And we know that the man

who is a demagogue, trickster, and grafter in the city hall, will be the same kind of a public servant in Washington.

One dreadful fact confronts the American people now. We have often chosen those we believed to be our best, our most ethical and courageous, to serve at national levels only to find that they became polluted after they had held high positions for a while.

Housecleaning on national levels is now in order. The truth is that we have installed Fendergast graduates in the National Capital and their political methods have contaminated the entire country. It isn't always the individuals who are to blame for our shameful records. It's the evil system which so many of our leaders now proclaim to be good.

It Is Imperative That the Railroad Retirement Act Be Amended Immediately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the Harris bill yesterday it took a step in the right direction by liberalizing the existing provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

In supporting the Harris bill, which was offered as a substitute for the Hall bill, I made the following remarks on the floor of the House during the debate:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was under consideration on October 4, I stated very frankly why I could not support the Crosser bill at this time, but would support the Hall bill, which is stop-gap legislation. I also said in my remarks at that time that I would favor the House resolution which provides that a study of the Railroad Retirement Act be made immediately and that by next February 15 a bill be introduced incorporating the recommended changes resulting from the study.

Since October 4, I have talked to many railroaders back in my congressional district and have heard from many others by mail. I am not being critical of any of the railway labor organizations when I say that those railroad men to whom I talked—both active and retired—confessed that to them the debate on the Crosser and Hall bills is too technical and they are bewildered and confused.

When I talked to officials of the various railway unions I found that they knew the good points of both bills but they were reluctant to discuss the controversial features. Regardless of what bill these union officials supported they joined active and retired railroaders in agreeing that the solvency of the railroad-retirement fund is the paramount issue. They were also in complete agreement on the fact that immediate relief must be given to present recipients of railroad retirement benefits.

It was unanimously agreed that the Railroad Retirement Act should be examined with the thought in mind of reducing the retirement age, the years of mandatory service, and liberalizing other provisions of the existing law.

In addition to talking to active and retired railroaders several retired men canvassed members of the railroad fraternity in my congressional district and here is the report I received regarding their interviews:

"We can see nothing wrong by having both Houses of Congress accept the Hall bill as an emergency plank for the bridge, thus

permitting the Railroad Retirement Act to receive a general overhauling next February. Meanwhile, we old-timers will receive a much-needed increase as well as the widows and children of deceased employees."

As I said during the debate on this legislation on October 4, I am in favor of many of the provisions of the Crosser bill, if it can be shown after further study that these new benefits will not endanger the financial condition of the railroad-retirement fund.

It is freely said that these new benefits are sugar-coated pills and include the increase of benefits to annuitants and pensioners and the widows and surviving children together with the new monthly benefit to the spouse. These benefits are said to be sugar-coated because they require the acceptance of bitter pills in order to obtain them.

Taking the bitter with the sweet means that in order to obtain these new benefits certain savings to the railroad-retirement fund must be effected and in addition new sources of income must be found in order to provide \$230,000,000 estimated to be the annual cost of these new benefits under the Crosser bill.

To raise the \$230,000,000 it is proposed that the following changes be made in the existing law:

Recipients of railroad retirement benefits would be prohibited from earning in excess of \$50 monthly except if retired on disability. This prohibition means that a retired railroader cannot earn more than \$50 monthly in outside employment without forfeiting his monthly railroad-retirement check.

This provision in the Crosser bill is designed to force railroad employees to work beyond their retirement age of 65. It is said that such a provision will effect a saving of \$50,000,000 annually.

Railroaders in my district resent Congress or anyone else restricting their earnings after they retire under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. They feel that with their employer they have paid for their retirement and that it is rank discrimination if not unconstitutional to apply such a restriction. In my opinion such a restriction is punitive legislation and would force retired railroaders and their families to exist on a fixed income.

The idea of forcing railroaders to work beyond the age of 65 is equally repugnant because the majority of us know that a determined effort is being made in railroad circles to reduce the age of retirement from 65 to 60 years with the option of retiring at age 60 or upon completion of 30 years' service regardless of age.

I have petitions from more than 3,400 railroaders in my district urging that the age of retirement be reduced to age 60 and that the Railroad Retirement Act be amended to permit retirement upon completion of 30 years of service regardless of age.

Then, too, we must not forget that in times of depression in the railroad industry it is the young man at the bottom of the roster who is furloughed and who urges the retirement of older employees. These young employees will suffer greatly if older employees are forced to work beyond the age of retirement.

Another objection to the Crosser bill is the increase in payroll taxes brought about by taxing earnings up to \$400. Under existing law earnings up to \$300 are taxable.

This increase which will amount to \$625 monthly on the additional \$100 is estimated to produce \$80,000,000 annually after January 1, 1952. While I recognize that the increase of payroll tax will provide additional benefits to the individual upon retirement, yet the average railroad man in my district is opposed to any increase in taxes on his earnings. He knows that to increase payroll taxes will shrink further his take-home pay and he states he fails

to see the necessity for an increase since he now pays four times the tax imposed under social security, yet, upon retirement receives less benefits.

It has been said that there is only a small percentage of railroad labor to be affected by this payroll increase under the Crosser bill. According to information furnished the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as a result of a check of the 10 largest railroads in the United States 46 percent of their 1,490,000 employees receive wages less than \$300 monthly. That means that 54 percent of the employees earn in excess of \$300 a month and on their shoulders will fall the burden of paying for these sugar-coated pills.

Objection is also voiced to the Crosser bill over the proposal to transfer over 5,030,000 persons with less than 10 years of service to the social security rolls, on the assumption that such action will effect a saving to the railroad retirement fund of \$40,000,000.

For the Congress of the United States to arbitrarily transfer these people without any idea of their feelings on the subject and to reduce their benefits at the same time is in my opinion a violation of their rights. I have hundreds of people in my district who would be adversely affected by this provision and those who are aware of it are vigorously opposed to it. Over a period of years railroad brotherhoods have indoctrinated the railroad man and his family with the idea that the social security system is intent on taking over the railroad retirement system. With all the sincerity at my command I can tell you that the people in my district feel that the Crosser bill is the first step in that direction and they want nothing to do with it.

According to the testimony in the Senate of Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, I look with suspicion upon the provision in the Crosser bill whereby the Railroad Retirement Board and the Federal Security Administrator will, by June 1, 1956, recommend legislation that they hope will make a further estimated annual saving of \$60,000,000 in the railroad retirement fund.

Mr. Chairman, as I said on October 4, and I repeat it again today, there is general agreement among all who are interested in amending the Railroad Retirement Act that present recipients of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act must be granted immediate relief through an increase in benefits. This cannot be accomplished under the Crosser bill, because the Railroad Retirement Board will have to hire and train hundreds of new employees to administer its provisions.

For example, the spouse's provision alone will require the filing of an application with supporting evidence in the form of a marriage certificate together with a birth certificate. In addition the files of more than 5,000,000 employees will have to be examined preparatory to the transfer to social security of those with less than 10 years of service.

Let us not forget the policing job that will have to be done to ferret out retired people earning in excess of \$50 monthly so that their retirement check could be stopped as provided by the Crosser bill.

May I remind you that under the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act 200,000 claims had to be reexamined in order to determine if and how much increased benefits would be payable on each claim. It required over 1 year to complete the job and that meant considerable delay in paying the increased benefits.

All of us should give particular attention to the division of opinion on the Crosser bill. It starts in the Federal Security Agency, it exists with Railroad Retirement Board, is found among actuarial experts, prevails in the ranks of railway labor and among the

members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, while active and retired railroad employees are equally bewildered and confused.

Nor can we ignore the opinion of experts who are opposed to the Crosser bill, including Mr. Murray W. Latimer, formerly Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, and who should know whereof he speaks, for he is a recognized authority on the Railroad Retirement Act. When testifying on Senate bill 1347, which is identical to the Crosser bill, Mr. Latimer said:

"Either the railroad retirement system will collapse or there will be a Government subsidy."

He continued by saying that the bill, from the standpoint of financial soundness, represents extreme recklessness."

In conclusion, after detailed study and serious reflection I am convinced that there is only one position that I can take to guarantee the solvency of the railroad retirement fund and to grant immediate relief to retired employees, and that is to support the Harris bill which will be offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] as a substitute for the Hall bill. If the Harris bill is approved by both branches of Congress before adjournment it will mean that the check that all retired employees and survivors receive immediately after December 1, will include an across-the-board increase of 15 percent to all annuitants and pensioners and 33 1/3-percent increase to widows and surviving children, with a 25-percent increase in lump-sum death benefits.

In addition, the Harris bill includes the provision passed yesterday by the Senate to pay \$40 monthly to the spouse. It also provides that those with less than 10 years service will remain on the railroad retirement rolls with the guaranty of a minimum annuity equal to what they would have received if they had been transferred to the social-security rolls.

It is my intention to support the House resolution which will be considered in conjunction with this legislation and which provides for a thorough study of the Railroad Retirement Act by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order to determine the extent to which it may be liberalized without jeopardizing the railroad retirement fund.

The House resolution provides that the recommendations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be submitted to Congress in the form of a legislative proposal following the completion of the study and that such legislation be introduced not later than February 15, 1952. Therefore, Congress will be given the opportunity of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act after careful study of the recommendations made, and will not be proceeding in a blind manner.

Housing at Camp Polk

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio National Guard is to be ordered out immediately after the first of the year. It is understood that the training area is to be Camp Polk. We hear from every hand that the situation there from the housing standpoint is exceedingly bad and we are deeply troubled. I, for one,

have been doing everything possible to call the attention of the Department to the situation. It appears that Camp Polk and the nearby towns have not even now been declared a defense area, although my correspondence with the Assistant Secretary of the Army indicates that after certain investigations have been made such designation will be made.

It was a satisfaction to me to find that the Army was thoroughly aware that a difficult problem exists and has moved in to do all possible. I shall follow this as assiduously as possible, whether the Congress is in recess or not.

Ignorance in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Polish-American Journal in their issue of September 29, and of which Mr. Leopold Dende is national news editor, contains an editorial entitled "Ignorance in the State Department."

It seems to me that our State Department's Mr. Sandifer's contention that the term "satellite" is fitting to the Polish Nation because of their pro-Soviet record of performance in the United Nations and elsewhere, is a sad commentary on the State Department's way of thinking. After all, it was Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party who went along with Stalin in giving over the Polish Nation to Russia; now by some strange quirk of illogical reasoning we blame the Polish Nation for going along with Russia when our own Government without protest acceded to Stalin's demands.

President Truman and our Democratic leaders, such as Harriman, former Secretary of State Byrnes, and others, knew immediately after Yalta that Stalin had no intention of honoring his agreements at Yalta. And yet, months later, President Truman and his followers at Potsdam O. K.'d the Russian grab of Poland.

If our national administration had protested the Yalta and Potsdam agreements before they were ever signed, then the State Department certainly would have some basis for criticizing Poland's present course of going along with the Russians but as James Farley, a former member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, said on June 8, that it is his "solemn conviction that many of the problems besetting the world would not be with us if we had a vigorous, alert, and forceful leader at Tehran and Yalta." The editorial is as follows:

IGNORANCE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Last week an amazing example of high-level ignorance in the State Department regarding Poland was discovered by us during a conversation with Durward V. Sandifer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs.

Here is the evidence:

We have told Mr. Sandifer that it is an injustice to Poland and to other iron curtain countries to brand them as satellites of Rus-

sia and that it would be much better to refer to them as captive countries.

Mr. Sandifer disagreed, contending that the term "satellite" is fitting on the basis of their pro-Soviet record of performance in the United Nations and elsewhere.

A discussion ensued during which we have tried to explain to Mr. Sandifer that 99 percent or at least an overwhelming majority of the Polish people are against the Communist Government of Poland, and that they cannot be held responsible for the doings of that Government, etc.

Mr. Sandifer again disagreed, arguing that if the majority of the Polish people would not be behind the Government—it could not exist, and moreover the Polish people do not manifest their disapproval of the Government, etc.

Of course, we did our best to explain that the Polish people did not elect their Government but that it was imposed upon them and that to resist that Government openly, under the present circumstances, would be foolish and disastrous. However, not having experience in dealing with the diplomats, we wonder if we were able to dispel the clouds of doubt and confusion in the matter.

Be that as it may, we believe that some action should be taken to remove such ignorance from the State Department, as it is harmful to our international interests.

P. S. We were informed by several exile leaders from behind the iron curtain that they have encountered similar ignorance in the State Department regarding their countries. All of them also object to the term "satellite" and favor the term "captive." One of them, Carlos Davila, former Rumanian Ambassador in Washington, recently stressed this point in a letter to the New York Times.

Broomcorn Pullers Treated Unfairly, Oklahoma Farm Bureau Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from the President of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, in which he attaches a letter from the Cimarron County Farm Bureau of Boise City, Okla. The Cimarron County Farm Bureau letter contains statements criticizing very severely the method that has been employed with reference to the shifting of farm labor in Oklahoma. Among other things, it is stated that broomcorn pullers who came to this area of their own free will, stated that they had contacted certain employment offices in the eastern part of the State—Oklahoma—and these offices told them that work was not available in this area. This happened at the time when our need was greatest. It appears that an effort was being made to hold laborers in that area for the cotton harvest that was to start at some future date.

Hence, the broomcorn pullers were treated unfairly, according to the assertion of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau.

It will be noted in the letter of the president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau to me, dated October 9, that he states:

Mr. FOGARTY and his staff have been very cooperative but the program seems to lack coordination and cooperation.

I am a member of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security Agencies, of which Congressman FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, is the chairman. Our committee has attempted in every possible way to cooperate with these organizations to the end that the farmers may have available labor at the time they need to harvest their respective crops, and I know of no good reason why the situation complained of should exist. I hope we may be able to look into this further and correct the situation by the time our committee meets next year.

The letter of October 9 to me and the enclosure from the Cimarron County Farm Bureau are as follows:

THE OKLAHOMA FARM BUREAU,
Oklahoma City, October 9, 1951.
The Honorable GEORGE SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN. Your attention is respectfully called to a situation in our State which we believe needs readjustment. It refers to the State employment office. Recently we have been hard pressed for farm labor and doubtless this condition will continue for from 30 to 60 days.

Mr. FOGARTY and his staff have been very cooperative but the program seems to lack coordination and cooperation. I enclose herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. William L. Dlake, secretary-treasurer of the Cimarron County Farm Bureau which will emphasize that point. Further, we find that in many counties the recruiting officer appears once a week with no established office and co-operating with no one in the county.

We believe this condition will be materially improved if the recruiting officer would establish a local connection in each of the counties which has surplus labor, such as county agent's office, or some other.

There is another item in the law which certainly should be eliminated. That is the provision, with a severe penalty against employers, of hiring children when school is in session. Historically, whole families work in the cotton patch and many families working together can supplement their incomes materially by such labor. Certainly we believe children should be in school and in most cases, school is dismissed for this purpose. However, in some towns it is not and therefore a child cannot work where that happens. This phase of the law should be repealed.

These matters are called to your attention for what they are worth and we hope that this program can be more effective and in case it cannot, possibly then we can offer further suggestions for a change in the program.

Very truly yours,

JOHN I. TAYLOR,
President, Oklahoma Farm Bureau.

CIMARRON COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Boise City, Okla., September 28, 1951.
Mr. DAN ARNOLD,
Oklahoma Farm Bureau,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

DEAR SIR: This is to verify our telephone conversation of Monday, September 24, relative to our broomcorn labor problems of this fall.

Our county farm bureau sent two representatives to your office and together with your representatives they contacted the State employment office. They outlined our labor needs as to the number of men needed, the date on which we needed the men and the wages to be paid.

The State employment office at Oklahoma City told our representatives that they had a man with a bus to haul the needed laborers to our county. They asked for an advance

notice of 48 to 72 hours prior to the date the men would be needed. This notice was supplied by telephone by the labor office here.

Mr. Elswick, a representative of the State employment department, contacted the local broomcorn growers to determine their needs and passed this information along to the State employment office. At this time he received assurance that the men would be delivered.

However, at about 5 p. m. on Friday, September 14, word was received that transportation was not available for the men that were to be here on Sunday morning, September 16. This failure to deliver men left the local growers holding the bag as they were depending on the employment department to deliver the men as they had promised.

It appears to us that the State employment department made promises that they knew they could not fulfill. Further observation indicated that they did not want to deliver the men.

Broomcorn pullers who came to this area of their own free will stated that they had contacted certain employment offices in the eastern part of the State and these offices told them that work was not available in this area. This happened at the time when our need was the greatest. It appears that an effort was being made to hold the laborers in that area for the cotton harvest that was to start at some future date.

We feel that Mr. Elswick did his job the best he could with the facilities he had to work with.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to do something about this matter as it has left a very unfavorable impression of both the farm bureau and the State employment service in the minds of the Cimarron County farmers.

If this employment service could be properly handled it would be of great service to us from year to year.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM L. DRAKE,

Secretary-Treasurer, Cimarron County
Farm Bureau

Destruction of Food Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Christian Century Magazine is well worth reading. I recommend that there is some excellent advice which the Congress might do well to follow:

Paging through the September 10 issue of Life, we came on an arresting full-page picture in reds, yellows, purples and blues. It showed a bulldozer pushing 3,200 carloads of apples—the purples were the wrappers—into a 7-acre hole at the city dump in Yakima, Wash. Well, you say, haven't we all seen similar pictures—oranges rotting in great heaps in Florida and California, wheat piled in the streets of Kansas and Nebraska towns, potatoes being dyed and fed to pigs or doused with kerosene and burned? Yes, we have. And, that's the point. This sort of thing goes on every year, and it is wrong. It is a despoiling of the goodness of God and a mockery of the needs of our fellow men. Yes, we know about the law of supply and demand, about labor costs

and transportation costs and dollar shortages and currency blockades. With all these factors operating, we don't criticize the growers who destroy their gluts. But if there were enough true statesmanship at Washington and the headquarters of the United Nations, they wouldn't have to do so. If this Nation can spend \$60,000,000 a year to cope with world unrest by methods that come straight out of our cave-man past, we can spend a hundredth part of that sum to cope with the same unrest by methods which come out of the New Testament. And we can find in the United Nations an agency to see that the food we have and don't need gets to those who need it so desperately. Church peace commissions and interchurch committees on international affairs have been having a hard time finding where to take hold of the problem of world concord in such a way as to make their efforts count. May not these gluts of unwanted and unwanted food offer one place to take hold? It might surprise some Government leaders to learn that there is a Christian conscience about destroying food while millions are hungry. But if the church representatives pushed hard enough, their servants in Government would do something about it.

More Butterfly Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the September 12, 1951, issue of the Tulsa Daily Tribune, entitled "More Butterfly Statistics":

MORE BUTTERFLY STATISTICS

In what sounded remarkably like another campaign speech President Truman yesterday lashed out at persons who with "malice aforethought" use "butterfly statistics" to convince voters that the Truman administration is spending the Government into bankruptcy.

Do not be afraid, said the President. Everything is fine. The country is healthier than ever before.

The President specifically denied that non-defense expenditures had doubled since the war. He said they had only gone up 67 percent. He did not delineate what he considered defense and non-defense spending. There are a number of items, the expenditures of the Army engineers, for example, that could be thrown into either classification. But, using the President's own figure, he claims that the value of the dollar has dropped enough so that in real nondefense spending the Government is putting out no more than it did 10 years ago.

This is an interesting view of the Truman psychology. To help halt inflation he demands that citizens tighten their belts. That means that citizens should spend less money for their own uses. But Government is to be commended for only spending 67 percent more.

Maybe the following are butterfly statistics but they come from the United States Treasury:

From 1789 to July 1, 1941, 31 American Presidents, including Franklin D. Roosevelt, managed to spend a little less than \$180,000,000,000. In 4 years from July 1, 1945, to

July 1, 1949, President Truman succeeded in spending a little more than \$180,000,000,000.

Including the period of War War II Franklin Roosevelt, who until his death proved to be the gaudiest spender in American history, succeeded in spending an average of \$31,000,000,000 for each of his 12 years in office. Mr. Truman has spent 45 billions a year—one and one-half times as much.

The gross national product is now running at about \$280,000,000,000 a year. National product is the value in current prices of all the crops, minerals, farm produce, building material, manufactured goods, and handicraft produced by all Americans in a single year. The value is so high because prices are so high and prices are high because of the inflation that the President deplores. Yet the national debt is now so great that even at these inflated prices it would take the full labors of all Americans an entire year to equal it.

Federal expenditures now absorb more than a quarter of the national income. For every \$4 you make Mr. Truman and his employees spend \$1. This, of course, doesn't count the expenditures of State, county, and municipal governments.

Last year every man, woman and child in America paid an average of \$258 in Federal taxes alone. Mr. Truman's new tax bills would raise this total to \$432, which is 38 percent more than the highest per capita tax collected during World War II.

In terms of dollars (not in purchasing power) national income has increased threefold since 1940. But Federal taxes have increased tenfold.

It's comforting to have Mr. Truman tell us that we have nothing to fear from a new record wave of public spending that, by coincidence, will be launched in an election year. But we hope he is talking through some better experience than that which caused him to go broke in the haberdashery business and to dare his creditors to garnish his nongarnishable public paycheck from the Pendergast machine.

If a nation cannot collapse through lavish public spending then historians are going to have to rewrite history. Something else must have happened to those wrecked kingdoms that cheered for the bread and circuses without regard to cost and that now litter the road behind us.

Vincennes Flood Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Vincennes, Ind., I wish to extend to the Congress our heartfelt thanks and gratitude for the inclusion in the civil functions appropriations bill of an appropriation for the Vincennes flood wall.

The fight to obtain this wall has been long and hard. Never has a community worked more loyally as a team for this most necessary protection.

The fight to save the city from flood destruction in 1950 was an epic of the tenacity and fortitude of the great Midwest. It reflected the courage of the pioneer ancestors of these people.

We fervently trust that this project, of which this appropriation provides the beginning, can be completed in time to save Vincennes with all its homes, industries, culture, and illustrious history from destruction.

Again we humbly thank you.

China's Oatis Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of October 2, 1951:

CHINA'S OATIS CASES

(By Marguerite Higgins)

AMERICANS JUST VANISHED

HONG KONG, October 1.—Anguished Americans, waiting here for news of friends and relatives in China's jails, wonder whether the United States has not adopted an international double standard regarding the Chinese Communists. There are at least 30 "Vogeler" or "Oatis" cases in China today. They are cases which would undoubtedly cause the greatest indignation if they had been perpetrated in Eastern Europe. But the sufferings of the Americans in China seem to cause comparatively hardly a stir.

In one sense, the Chinese treatment is far more cruel than the mock trials of Eastern Europe. Oatis and Vogeler, at least in theory, knew the charges against them. Their families had an approximate idea of their fate. But since January, when the number of arrests began to mount in Communist China, most Americans have just vanished. Their families have no means of knowing where they are or whether they are dead or alive.

A tragic example is the case in Shanghai of Robert T. Bryan, lawyer, former municipal advocate, and certainly one of the best known and beloved Americans in the Far East. He was literally yanked out of his bath in his Shanghai home on the morning of February 12. The Chinese secret police gave him enough time to get dressed and put together a bundle, then marched him off, ignoring the pleas of his wife to tell her where he was being taken.

Mrs. Bryan has remained in Shanghai, a lonely figure in her rapidly shrinking foreign colony. A foreign diplomat, who came out of the city last month, said she has borne up well. The only crack in her morale came one day several months ago. On that occasion she left home for a few hours and returned to find a Chinese policeman at the door, bearing the message that during her unusually long absence of her husband had tried to reach her. Mrs. Bryan was never able to confirm whether the policeman's message was the truth or mere psychological warfare.

EUROPEANS SHARE FATE

The arrested Americans are divided just about equally between missionaries, Catholics and Protestants, and businessmen. The total of 30 represents those positively known to be in prison or under house arrest. There may be more.

Although the Americans seem to be the most numerous victims, their fate is shared to a degree by all nationalities as a result

of the violent antiforeign campaign being whipped up by the government which clearly would prefer to operate its own public trials and liquidation campaigns without having to worry about observation of foreigners. It is generally conceded that the Chinese Communists aim at nothing less than the elimination of all foreign-sponsored educational, church, and medical activities. They are also moving slowly to bring about the gradual shut-down of consulates and the forcing out of foreign businesses.

The antimissionary campaign is carried out mainly by inciting Chinese to indulge in public denunciations of foreign churchmen who are then imprisoned or expelled.

The Resist United States Aid Korea Journal, published in Peiping on September 12, states that "according to incomplete figures for this area in May, June, July, and August the number of imperialist elements denounced in the accusation campaign reached 113, most of whom belong to the Catholic Church and are mainly American, French, Spanish, Italian, Belgian, Dutch, and German. The number of persons expelled from China, as requested by the patriotic Chinese religious followers and the people of all circles reached 33. Some others have been put under control, arrested, ordered to apologize and repent, or sentenced to prison terms."

The Communist Journal added: "The foreign imperialist missionaries with a saintly mask asserted that they singly devoted themselves conscientiously to the work on the propagation of religion and relief and that they were above politics. But irrefutable evidence exposed in various places has proven that these imperialists under the cloak of religion are out-and-out counterrevolutionaries. According to figures checked by the Peiping Government the number of children murdered by the foreign missionaries throughout the nation reached more than 100,000."

By resorting to such flamboyant and absurd charges, it is no wonder that a certain amount of mass feeling has been whipped up against foreigners.

The greatest scandal in China is the death in Woochow jail of Dr. William Wallace, Southern Baptist. American authorities here have been sufficiently satisfied by the evidence to report to Washington that his death was most likely the result of Communist mis-handling.

Justice Department Impedes Probe of Tax Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the front page of the Washington Post for today, Wednesday, October 17, 1951, there appears a copyrighted story by George T. Draper, reporter for that paper, entitled "Justice Department Impeded Probe of Tax Cases, Says United States Judge; McGrath Denies It." This story ties in very closely with my remarks made on the floor recently and the extension of remarks of the Honorable PATRICK HILLINGS, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11, 1951, on page A6354, wherein there is

reported a similar attempt to impede the investigations of a grand jury sitting in San Francisco. Today the Honorable CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL and I issued press releases commenting upon the laxity of law enforcement as the result of the failure of Attorney General McGrath to act, and suggesting his resignation or ouster.

The article from this morning's Post states that Federal District Judge George H. Moore, of St. Louis, stated that he had suggested to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath that Justice Department channels for obtaining aid in a grand jury were "dammed up and blocked up." Mr. McGrath is reported as having stated that George Moore's statements "if he actually said them" are "damnable and contemptible lies."

It is almost inconceivable to me that the head of the Department of Justice who must work so closely with the Federal courts of this country would issue such a statement or would refer to the statements of a Federal judge as "damnable and contemptible lies." Judge Moore enjoys the highest reputation. His statements and assertions cannot be lightly cast aside. This further emphasizes the absolute necessity for a thorough and complete investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary. Such an investigation must be undertaken promptly.

I am also including an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "Cover-Up Pattern," which clearly states the serious problem which confronts this Nation on this subject.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post of October 17, 1951]

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IMPEDED PROBE OF TAX CASES, SAYS UNITED STATES JUDGE, McGRATH DENIES IT

(By George T. Draper)

Federal District Judge George H. Moore, of St. Louis, told the Washington Post by telephone yesterday that he had suggested to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath that Justice Department channels for obtaining aid in a grand jury investigation were dammed up and blocked up.

McGrath retorted last night that Judge Moore's statements—if he actually said them—are damnable and contemptible lies.

The Attorney General said categorically in a statement to the Washington Post that he does not know the St. Louis judge, that he never met with him and that to the best of his recollection he never talked with me over the telephone.

McGrath called for any inquiry, by congressional committees or otherwise, to determine the motives of the slanderers that are behind the present campaign to discredit the Department of Justice.

It was the grand jury convened by Judge Moore which last week indicted James P. Finnegan, collector of internal revenue at St. Louis.

Judge Moore said he called McGrath last March after United States District Attorney Drake Watson complained he could not get authority from the Department for the grand jury investigation.

Watson, the judge said, claimed the Department wanted the names of cases about to be presented to the grand jury before authorizing an investigation.

"I refused to give the names and said they would be made available to the grand jury," the judge continued.

When he telephoned McGrath, the Attorney General said he preferred having such matters go through channels, the judge told the Post.

"I understand that," Judge Moore said he replied, "but what do you do when the channels are dammed up and blocked up?"

Judge Moore said he explained to the Attorney General that the statute of limitations was about to run on some of the cases involved and that he would like a definite answer from McGrath within 2 days.

McGrath did not call him back, the judge said, so he told District Attorney Watson to get in touch with the Attorney General. Watson came back in an hour or two, the judge said, and announced he had the go signal.

In his statement last night, McGrath asserted that the "Department of Justice has never acted with more conscientious concern toward its obligations than it has done in the St. Louis inquiry."

Secretary of Treasury John W. Snyder yesterday issued a statement explaining a telephone call he made to Judge Moore on March 23.

"The purpose of the call," Snyder said, "was, among other things, to request that Judge Moore talk with investigators from the Bureau of Internal Revenue who were engaged in an investigation of the office of the St. Louis collector of internal revenue."

Snyder added that "reference to the resignation of James P. Finnegan, then collector, was incidental." Snyder also reported that the then Commissioner, George J. Schoeneman, had called the judge "subsequently" to give him the names of the investigators.

Judge Moore said, when informed of Snyder's statement, that both Snyder and Schoeneman had informed him Finnegan had resigned and that the resignation would be announced very soon.

Judge Moore, 73, himself served as collector of internal revenue in St. Louis from 1914 to 1922. He is a Democrat and was appointed to the bench in 1935.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

COVER-UP PATTERN

Mounting evidence sharply indicates that Federal officials, reaching up to Cabinet rank, used their influence to clamp a hush on the investigation of the St. Louis internal revenue collector's office.

Federal Judge Moore blocked the efforts and militantly pursued the inquiry, which has now resulted in the indictment of James P. Finnegan on charges of bribery and other statute violations.

The administration's high officials apparently consider scandal or the threat of scandal should be made top-secret. The backstage maneuvers of these influential figures reveal a shocking cover-up routine, a political cynicism that had no compunction over attempts to sway the United States court.

(Ironically, while this and other administration scandals were being front-paged yesterday, President Truman made an address at ground-breaking ceremonies for Wake Forest College at Winston-Salem, N. C., and his theme, of all things, was—"Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Perhaps it was in a moment of contrition that he told his audience: "God forbid that I should claim for our country the mantle of perfect righteousness. We have committed sins of omission and sins of commission, for which we stand in need of the mercy of the Lord." This was doubtless in reference to foreign affairs, but it is peculiarly applicable to recent developments on the home front.)

Former Collector Finnegan seems to have had many friends in Washington, including the President and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. When Finnegan's activities as col-

lector and counsel for delinquent taxpayers got beyond the gossip stage, and Judge Moore demanded a hard-boiled investigation, some of these friends began to pull wires.

They were not successful, but that is not the point. They tried to smother a legitimate probe of a Federal official's activities, because it would embarrass their party and administration.

After Judge Moore had instructed a grand jury to investigate Finnegan's office, George J. Schoeneman, then Internal Revenue Commissioner, telephoned the judge that Finnegan had submitted his resignation and he (Schoeneman) would see that the collector's office was cleaned up. Schoeneman himself resigned June 28.

On March 1 Judge Moore had instructed the jury to look into tax case fixing. About the middle of March, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder telephoned Judge Moore, informing him that it was understood Finnegan would resign. Finnegan did not resign until April 4.

On March 21, after the grand jury had made its original report, frequently called a whitewash of the collector's office, Judge Moore bluntly told the jurors he was not satisfied and they had not thoroughly examined the case.

It has now been learned the report was prepared apparently at the direction of a Department of Justice assistant, Ellis N. Slack. After the report was drafted, it is said District Attorney Watson read the document over the telephone to Slack. This Slack denies, the district attorney refuses to deny or confirm.

It is further reported Attorney General McGrath was loath to cooperate with the grand jury in the Finnegan investigation, though he later gave full assistance.

No wonder then that Judge Moore told the jury it had not received "the support and guidance you should have received from some quarters." No wonder the judge bitterly scored tax evaders and fixers in Government and legal circles. No wonder he denounced to the jury on April 30 the "damnable, gnawing viper of special privilege."

The unfolding mosaic of the Finnegan case, and top-level pressures involved, adds up to a disgusting design for a hush-up of a grand jury and the Federal bench. That it failed is no fault of political influence artisans.

Kansas-Missouri Flood Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, included herewith is the letter sent by the distinguished American artist, Thomas H. Benton, to each Member of the House and Senate. Enclosed with the letter was an equally forceful lithograph vividly depicting the suffering of the tens of thousands of victims of the Kansas-Missouri floods. Mr. Benton lives in my district in Kansas City, Mo., and not only is he an artist of world renown but also a conscientious and public-spirited citizen.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

October 13, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: "The Foxes," you will remember from your Sunday School days, "have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head."

It is now more than 90 days since the floodwaters hit the valleys out here. Ninety days of wrack, ruin, muck, and stink.

The attached lithograph shows what things are like, as of this day, for thousands of poor, hopeless "Sons of Man" in the Kaw River Basin. It was made for you and your fellow Members of the Eighty-second Congress. It is not for sale.

It is given you in the hope that you'll forget the academics of precedent and get out a new bill which will relieve the human side of this rotting catastrophe.

Truly yours,

THOMAS H. BENTON.

Collapse of Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, these closing days are busy days. I am putting in the Record, and I hope everyone will read it, the answer I received from the Attorney General in answer to my letter calling his attention to what appears to be a serious violation by the Solicitor General of the criminal statute against lobbying with appropriated moneys.

I am also making an extensive statement calling attention to the collapse of law enforcement against violations by persons in the executive branch of Government on the part of the Justice Department. Not only has law enforcement collapsed but the Justice Department affirmatively acts to prevent others from trying to clean up the messes.

The House Judiciary Committee should immediately investigate the Justice Department from stem to stern. The Attorney General should resign. The final remedy available is a terrible thing, but I suggest if something is not done by the time Congress reconvenes for its second session in January, the first order on the agenda should be the impeachment of the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. McGrath.

On October 1 I called to the attention of the House, through a speech on the floor under special order, what appeared to be a criminal violation of 18 U. S. C., 1913, by the the Solicitor General of the United States. I read a letter which I had written to the Attorney General asking for an explanation of this action. I will read the answer I received from the Attorney General:

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of October 1, 1951, in reference to the letter sent by the Solicitor General to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, copies of which were sent to the Members of both branches of Congress. The letter related to statements appearing in a pamphlet distributed to Members of Congress by the National Association of Attorneys General, and was intended to correct misstatements which, if not disputed, would give Congress wrong impressions as to the position of the Government on a subject of interest to every taxpayer.

You will be interested in knowing that the idea for such a letter grew out of a conversation with Senator O'MAHONEY, and

that there were several requests for it before it was completed. As soon as it was delivered other Senators made requests for additional copies, and also requested, on the floor of the Senate, that it be printed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*. You will be interested in knowing that the letter, together with the attorney's general's pamphlet, was issued and distributed as a committee print by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that it was actually printed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* on Monday, October 1, 1951 (p. 12433) at Senator O'MAHONEY'S instance, on the very day that your remarks were made in the House, including the copy of the letter to me. The request that the letter be placed in the *RECORD* was made on September 10, 1951 (p. 11069). The committee print, issued some time before your letter to me, contains a foreword written by Senator O'MAHONEY. The letter sent by the Solicitor General gives the same information in a somewhat more readable form than the small print.

We think, upon reflection, you will agree that there has been no violation of any provision of law in attempting to do everything possible to give important information to Members of Congress.

I will now read the answer which I have today delivered to him.

MY DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 4, 1951, in answer to mine of October 1, 1951.

I am very disturbed by your answer, which openly admits the violation by your Department of 18 United States Code, section 1913, entitled "Lobbying With Appropriated Moneys." The excuse you offer for the violation is that the information contained in the 49-page document your office sent to all Members of Congress without authority and without request had appeared in a Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs print and was going to appear (and later did appear at the time I wrote my letter to you) in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

These excuses, far from being valid, make the voluntary distribution of this material seeking to influence the thinking of the Members of Congress on a piece of pending legislation even more amazing.

I do not know whether you are being facetious when you say: "The letter (of 49 pages) . . . was intended to correct misstatements which, if not disputed, would give Congress wrong impressions as to the position of the Government on a subject of interest to every taxpayer." Surely you realize that this is solely a matter for the Congress to initiate and decide. If the Congress wishes the views of the executive department concerned, it has many means at hand to obtain these views. Any lobbyist could make the same case you attempt to make. Congress will take care of whether it has wrong impressions or not.

Any sensible interpretation of the criminal statute against lobbying with appropriated money reveals that it was written to prevent just such actions as your Department has taken. I know that your Department is fully aware of the lengthy hearings held in 1950 by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, which hearings are printed, where in many alleged violations of this criminal statute by persons in the executive branch of Government were inquired into. It is quite clear now why your Department made no investigation by itself of these matters nor instituted actions against the violators. The pattern of inaction of your Department on other fields of law infractions by members of the executive branch of Government has become a public scandal.

I shall place your letter and my present answer to it in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* and again call my colleagues' further attention to the developments of the situation which having been called to your personal attention

meets not with correction but arrogant disregard.

The legislative branch does have constitutional recourse in such matters. Such recourse is most serious and not to be undertaken lightly. At this time, having called this matter to the attention of the House and its leaders, I shall await whatever action they may deem is necessary. If the leadership sees fit to disregard what appears to me to be a serious attack upon the dignity and integrity of this House, I shall then feel called upon to initiate action myself.

Mr. Speaker, to the people of this country this may seem to be a technical violation. To many of my colleagues in Congress who may not be as jealous as I of the independence of the legislative branch of Government, it may seem to be of no consequence.

I might state that I am sorry the matter has come to a head on such a controversial issue as that of title to the tideland oils. The question before us has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of that issue. It means nothing in particular to the people of my district in land-locked Missouri; it is only of general interest. No one has ever solicited my vote, pro or con, on this matter and frankly I am not greatly concerned about the fate of the tideland oil bill one way or the other.

The issue, of course, is whether a statute of this country devised to protect the free deliberations of Congress is to be willfully and brazenly violated. Most of you are aware of the extensive hearings held by the House Select Committee of Lobbying Activities of the Eighty-first Congress. Many of you know that lobbying with appropriated moneys by various branches of the executive department was one of the main subjects under consideration. The committee called the officials of the Government Accounting Office to see what they could do through their organization to stop lobbying activities of the various executive bureaus. It is interesting to note that Mr. Weitzel, of the GAO, though recognizing that the GAO could be of considerable assistance, stated:

The criminal provision, of course, is within the province of the Department of Justice to enforce.

The issue then becomes one of what does the Congress do when the Justice Department itself violates a law and refuses to do anything about it? But then, is this any different than the question which has been before the country for the past 2 years: "What do we do when the department responsible for enforcing the laws fails to enforce the laws?"

In my opinion there is one basic reason why graft and corruption stink up the Federal Government today. It is not that men are any more dishonest as some suggest. It is no breakdown of morals. It is simply that when grafters and corrupters are caught, or could easily be caught and the department responsible for catching and prosecuting these people refuses to or fails to prosecute them, corruption runs rife. Those who are corrupt remain in a position to continue their nefarious schemes. Those who are not corrupt, simply from fear of being punished, find that punishment is not forthcoming, and so follow suit

and become corrupt. The longer a collapse of law enforcement continues, the more persons with weak convictions follow the route to easy money.

It is not just the failure to prosecute the RFC scandals, and the Attorney General may recall my letter to him of February 14, 1951, pointing out some 21 violations of criminal statutes revealed in the Senate investigations. It is the failure to prosecute the Kansas City thugs who stole the ballot box evidence some 5 years ago in Kansas City. It is the failure to prosecute those unfaithful servants revealed in the Maritime Commission investigations, the failure to follow through on the Federal Prison Industries investigation, the investigation of certain rural electrification agencies, of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, of the national service life program, of the war housing disposal program—what are these? Merely investigations conducted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House in the Eighty-first Congress. What about the attempt of the Justice Department to call off the prosecution in the San Francisco tax collector scandal—or the same in my own home town of St. Louis. Who is bringing these things to light—the Justice Department or the Congress? Did the Justice Department either conduct or do anything about the Kefauver hearings? What interest does the Department have in the labor racketeering ex-convicts in the St. Louis area? Why is the FBI prevented from going ahead with these investigations, even though, in this matter, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Air Force were being hampered in their program for the defense of this country by these conditions?

I do not need to list the series of stinks and odors that have been seeping into the air for the past 2 and 3 years which remain stinks and cesspools in spite of congressional investigation—all for one reason. The Justice Department has fallen down on its job. How many cases lie buried, uninvestigated and unprosecuted, in the Department today? I know of many. Why are they not prosecuted?

Gentlemen, aside from the issue of the brazen disregard for the independence of Congress bound up in this seemingly technical issue is the corruption or criminal negligence which seems to be in the very heart of the Justice Department itself.

Let us see the problem for what it is. It is time that Congress quit compensating for the collapse of the Justice Department through its countless investigations. Surely it is apparent why this Congress has been the investigating Congress. We have been trying to do what the Justice Department should be doing, but will not. Congress cannot do the job; it is not designed to do the job. The Justice Department is so designed.

In my own heart I know the remedy. It is a terrible thing for the Congress to undertake, but I suggest that, if something is not done by the time Congress reconvenes for its second session in January, the first order on the agenda should be the impeachment of the Attorney General of the United States.

A Typical Letter From a Constituent**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE Mr. Speaker, the following is a typical letter of the many I have received from constituents and of those which I understand other Members of Congress are receiving almost daily. Our people are alarmed and concerned. They are distressed beyond words. Read what this anxious and intelligent lady has to say.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., October 8, 1951
Representative GEORGE SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE My friends and I are so alarmed and concerned over the fate of our country that it has driven me to writing not only my Congressman, but everyone who should know the viewpoint of most of us.

We are not satisfied with the progress of the war in Korea, which is really putting it mildly. To sacrifice thousands of men in a limited war is about as heartless a thing as I ever hoped to see in my lifetime. We demand that it be pursued to a rapid and successful conclusion with every weapon available to us.

We know from what we read and hear that the Government is indulging in wasteful and extravagant expenditures. We are anxious that every American Congressman get behind Mr. Hoover and Senator Byrd's recommendations and cut these expenditures to the bone. We are willing to make the sacrifices that are necessary under the circumstances, but the Government must set the example and be sincere in its effort toward economy.

There are books of Communist exposures by the hundreds, and newspaper items daily; the American people are well aware of the fact that the Government is not as militant in rooting out Communists and fellow travelers from important Government posts as it must be to save our country. We demand that a sincere and honest effort be made and that the job be done before it is too late.

No code of ethics will help these corrupt ones in our Government, but we demand that they all be exposed and punished.

We are against universal military training. We feel that selective service is adequate and the UMT would give subversives still an additional opportunity to reach our boys easily. As long as selective service does the job there is no reason to add another means of withdrawing some of our liberties.

I hope you will continue your fight for the American way. I hope you will not find it amiss when I say that I will remember you in my prayers so that you will continue to have the strength and courage which is demanded of you.

Address Before the Kern County Republican Central Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. WERDEL Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following address by me before the Kern County Republican central committee on Saturday, October 13, 1951:

Fellow Republicans, I was in Washington when your resolution was passed on Wednesday, September 26, 1951, condemning "me-too-ism" and parts of creeping socialism in the Republican platform. Your resolution attracted considerable Nation-wide interest. In some of the eastern papers my name, as Congressman from this district, was associated with your action.

There has been considerable comment by the press and other people to the effect that the resolution was directed against the Governor of this State, Earl Warren. There has been other comment that it is designed as a pro-Taft move for the Republican nomination in the next presidential election. Due to the fact that I will only be privileged to remain at home during the illness of a member of my family and the House may not adjourn for several weeks, your chairman, Keith McCormac, asked me to say something in connection with the resolution to the central committee before I may be required to return to Washington.

Let me say at the outset that I believe the resolution is well drafted and timely. I agree with the principles that it recites in connection with the next national election. In thinking about the subject, I believe a distinction must be drawn in connection with State-wide elections in certain States and a national election. When that is done, I believe everyone will agree that the resolution sets forth what must be done by the Republican Party at its next convention for the continued welfare of our country and what must be done by the Republican Party if it is to ever again be a strong party contending for the election of a President and control of the Congress. In connection with my remarks, I will ask you to keep in mind that until recently, the word "liberty" in connection with politics has described a condition where the individual has more rights as against government than individuals have under a different type of government. In the United States, those rights have been withheld from government by the Constitution for the individual. It is also true that our National Constitution withheld rights to the respective States as against the National Government. For 20 years, the Congress has delegated its powers and responsibilities to the Executive, which in turn has assumed more powers than those delegated. It has usurped the rights of individuals and the respective States to the point where our President now claims the right in peacetime to grant a license or deny a license for our citizens to do business in any part of our country.

I have divided my remarks into two subjects. First, "The Condition of the Republican Party," and, second, "The Condition of Our Country."

**IN REGARD TO THE CONDITION OF THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY**

The number of men in political life who have felt that they were ahead of the voters probably is measured by thousands. They each had to individually discover that in our system of government, the people are always ahead of the men in executive and legislative office who purport to represent them. The voters demonstrate that on election day when politicians they dislike are thrown out of office. The voters have also demonstrated on several occasions that they will throw out of existence organized political parties. Theoretically, and from a practical standpoint, there would have been no Republican Party at the time of its creation had the minority party, organized and obligated to oppose those then in office, drawn the issues as the voters and citizens wanted them drawn.

It is perhaps unfortunate today that the issues of 1850 were drawn by the people on a sectional basis (North versus the South). It is unfortunate today because the new political party (Republican), required at that time, became a sectional party with great power north of Mason and Dixon's line and an absence of power south of that line. It is unfortunate today because in reality there appears to be a new alignment of those citizens living outside of metropolitan areas who believe in and demand individual liberty with individual responsibility. Such people are today opposing metropolitan areas where a large majority of the people believe in socialistic trends. The Republican Party has thus become a sectional party above Mason and Dixon's line and outside of metropolitan areas. To those in America who understand and realize that the party out of power must be the opposition and draw the issues, it is significant that many local Republican leaders are willing to give ground to creeping socialism in order to increase their minority strength in metropolitan areas.

For three-fourths of a century, Republican strength was overwhelming north of Mason and Dixon's line. Its strength was so great in that section that at all times it appeared to be a national majority party. In all of its political power, it only had one President who served two full terms. It never sought to continue its party control by reelecting its President through a hierarchy of politicians buying votes with taxpayers' money. Perhaps it is also worth noting that except for men originally elected as Vice Presidents successfully running for re-election to the Presidency, the Republican Party has never successfully nominated a presidential candidate from east of the Allegheny Mountains. Today, we have experienced a rise of big-city voters with the result that the Republican Party has become a sectional majority party unable to elect a national President and thus achieve national power.

So great was the Republican strength in the Northern States that for all the time between the election of McKinley to the election of Hoover, it did not need a single electoral vote from the Southern States, or from what we call the border States. During that period, the Republican candidate never received less than 84 percent of the northern electoral vote. The defeat of Hughes was close, but even he, running from east of the Alleghenies, received 73 percent of the electoral vote in the Northern States in 1916.

It is true that the 1932 Republican defeat might well be looked upon as the result of a depression and the 1912 Republican defeat was probably the result of a party split. There are those who say that Roosevelt's re-election in 1936 was the reelection of a popular President. However, the size of the vote by which the Republican Party was defeated should be alarming to its leadership. Thomas Jefferson, a Democrat idol, refused to accept a third term in the interest of freedom. Yet, the Republicans in 1940, with all of their ancient tradition, were unable to stop the political hierarchy growing on socialism and handouts and its third-term Democrat candidate. The Republican weakness had to be admitted in 1914, when they could not stop a fourth-term candidate who was even redefining the word "liberty" to hold political power and build socialism with its regimentation of free people. The Republicans, in 1948, seeking to unseat a weak majority party candidate, were aided by a strong diversionary new party in the South and were also aided by an effective third party movement (Wallace) in the North. Even then, the Republican Party refused to draw the issues for family life and responsibility, and with nothing to talk about to educated people and with candidates only offering a slower piece-meal movement toward socialism, they were unable to deny

an electoral majority to President Harry Truman.

The aspects of the sectional character of the Republican Party are numerous and important in the coming election.

It offers a real contest in less than 404 electoral votes in the States north of the Mason and Dixon's line and in the border States. This leaves to the Democrat Party, 127 electoral votes south of the Mason and Dixon's line without a real contest. To win national majority, the Republicans need 266 electoral votes. To accomplish that, it must win two-thirds of the 404 electoral votes outside of the South. To be successful without considering the border States, it must win three-fourths of the 352 electoral votes in the Northern States.

Two hundred and seven of the three hundred and fifty-two electoral votes belonging to the Northern States are in eight large States. Those eight large States have 11 cities with populations over 500,000. There are only 145 electoral votes in the remaining 24 States.

During the presidential elections of 1940, 1944, and 1948, there were 24 State-wide elections in the 8 Northern States mentioned hereinabove as having 11 cities over 500,000 population. The Republicans won only 6 of the 24 State-wide elections. Two of the six that they won, were in New York and Michigan in 1948. When the Wallace party took a substantial Democrat vote, those two elections were won by the Republicans by mere pluralities. During those 3 presidential elections in those 8 States, there was a total of 622 electoral votes at stake. In the 3 elections, the Republicans won only 157 of the 622 votes. Without the aid of Wallace, they would have won only 91. Those States are New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Ohio, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin.

Under present party alignment, those States are crucial to Republican victory. It is true that prior to 1932, large Republican majorities outside the big cities overcame opposition majorities in the cities themselves.

If the eight crucial States were divided between the 15 counties that make up the large cities of over 500,000 population and the remaining counties of those States, a clear picture is presented as to what happened in the 10 years following 1930 to reduce Republican Party strength. This condition is best seen in the greatly increased volume of voters in the big-city counties as compared to the other counties, and when viewed in the light of a relatively comparable population change in those counties.

State	Big-city counties	Population increase, 1930-40, all other counties	Voter increase, 1932-40	
			Big-city counties	All other counties
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
New York.....	7.3	6.7	45.5	22.0
Pennsylvania.....	2.6	4.0	37.9	33.8
Illinois.....	2.4	5.1	27.0	30.6
California.....	20.3	21.1	45.0	43.4
Ohio.....	1.3	4.5	50.1	23.4
Michigan.....	6.7	9.7	34.8	20.7
Massachusetts.....	1.9	2.5	29.8	27.9
Wisconsin.....	5.7	7.1	35.4	21.3
Together.....	2.6	9.5	41.6	26.4

It is also interesting to observe that since 1940, there has been a very minor variation in the total popular vote for presidential candidates of major parties in those eight States. Since 1940, the State-wide variation was only 377,000 in more than 26,000,000 votes. In those 8 States, since 1940, the total vote was 26,560,000 in 1940; 26,214,000 in 1944, and 26,183,000 in 1948. The most

important characteristic of this comparison, however, is that the Republican vote was more stable than the Democrat vote. The Republican vote varied only 46,000 out of more than 12,000,000. The Republican vote in the large 8 States was 12,562,000 for 1940; 12,538,000 in 1944; and 12,584,000 in 1948. Perhaps the most sound measure of Republican strength in those eight States is best found by comparing the effective Republican vote State-wide to that vote inside the big-city counties and outside the big-city counties. If that measure is used, voters will see revealed the ideological conflict in which we are engaged that has reduced the Republican Party in 75 years from its position of a majority national party, even though just a sectional party, to its present position of a sectional party above the Mason-Dixon line and outside of the big cities. However, it is now a minority national party.

Republican percentage of effective vote¹ in last 3 elections

State	Year	Entire State	Big-city counties	All other counties
New York.....	1948	46.3	36.6	60.4
Do.....	1944	47.5	39.4	58.9
Do.....	1940	48.2	39.9	59.4
Pennsylvania.....	1948	51.3	46.2	54.6
Do.....	1944	48.6	41.8	52.9
Do.....	1940	46.5	40.7	50.0
Illinois.....	1948	49.6	45.5	54.9
Do.....	1944	48.3	42.0	55.8
Do.....	1940	48.8	41.5	53.0
California.....	1948	47.4	46.6	48.2
Do.....	1944	43.2	42.2	44.4
Do.....	1940	41.9	40.9	43.0
Ohio.....	1948	49.2	43.8	50.3
Do.....	1944	50.2	39.7	52.4
Do.....	1940	47.8	37.6	49.8
Michigan.....	1948	49.7	38.3	57.5
Do.....	1944	49.5	36.3	58.2
Do.....	1940	50.2	38.0	57.8
Massachusetts.....	1948	43.3	27.5	46.8
Do.....	1944	47.1	37.3	49.4
Do.....	1940	46.6	36.3	49.0
Wisconsin.....	1948	46.8	41.3	48.8
Do.....	1944	50.9	41.0	54.4
Do.....	1940	49.1	38.5	52.5
Together.....	1948	48.1	41.7	52.9
Do.....	1944	47.6	40.4	53.5
Do.....	1940	47.3	40.6	51.9

¹ Vote for major presidential candidate.

We have heard many students of current political affairs say that there are many millions in the United States who do not exercise their franchise to vote. Those spokesmen leave the implication that if those citizens would vote, the Republicans could easily win. In the absence of the Republican Party drawing issues through competent candidates and an understandable platform, so that the average everyday American can understand that the present creeping socialism does not mean increased liberty and progress, but is, in fact, reaction, those spokesmen are utterly and completely wrong. If we look at the actual facts presently existing in the eight large States, we can best see what the Republican prospects, among known voters in those States, are, unless the real story is taken home in behalf of responsible family life.

There was slightly more than 60 percent of the total population of the United States that were citizens over 21 years of age in 1940. That 60 percent represents the maximum potential vote. However, it would be substantially reduced by the many legal qualifications of voters in many States and because of illness and other causes of absenteeism on election day. If we compare the big-city counties of the eight large States with the other counties of those States, it is apparent that in the geographical area, where the Republicans are weak (big-city counties) we also find the area where the largest reservoir of potential voters exists. This seems to explain why a low vote helps Republicans and why a general get-out-the-vote cam-

paign will not benefit them. It should also be noted in the following table that the voters in the counties outside of the big cities of five of our eight large States represent a higher proportion of the total population of those States than do the voters of the big-city counties of those States. Those five States are New York, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Massachusetts.

Percentage of the total population voting for major presidential candidates

State	Big-city counties		All other counties		Point gains	
	1932 ¹	1940	1932 ¹	1940	Big-city counties	All other counties
New York.....	32.2	43.6	45.2	51.7	11.4	6.5
Pennsylvania.....	29.0	45.6	30.0	38.9	16.6	8.9
Illinois.....	41.8	52.0	47.8	51.9	10.2	7.1
California.....	41.9	50.5	37.0	44.2	8.6	6.3
Ohio.....	30.8	45.7	41.1	48.6	14.9	7.5
Michigan.....	28.8	36.3	38.0	41.8	7.5	3.8
Massachusetts.....	33.7	44.5	38.1	47.6	10.8	9.5
Wisconsin.....	35.8	45.8	38.6	44.5	10.0	5.9

¹ Calculated on 1930 population

When considering this subject, it should be remembered that these 8 large States together have 207 electoral votes—only 59 less than a majority of the electoral college. It should also be remembered that these States are crucial to the Republican Party as the parties are now aligned. These States are the source of Republican defeats at the hands of the big-city majorities. This condition cannot change, so long as those States do not draw the issues in statewide campaigns and so long as the Republicans of those States take the "me-too-ism" of creeping socialism among Republicans seeking national office.

It is to be assumed that Republicans believe their party will continue in existence. Yet, we find that many Republican leaders in local areas who display interest in politics only at election time, feel that we must win elections by offering a platform with sufficient "me-too" socialism to the people of metropolitan areas, in order to control the electoral votes of the eight large States. This is ridiculous, and from a political party standpoint, means party suicide. In this connection, it should be remembered that the House of Representatives has been conservative for the past 10 years on all vital issues. President Truman claimed a mandate as a result of the 1948 election. The Eighty-first Congress elected that year killed his program. Informal alliances of Republicans and Southern Democrats took negative control of both Houses of the Congress to stop New Deal and Fair Deal socialism. The fact that those alliances occurred frequently on all important issues, and the men who participated in those alliances were later not defeated at the polls, is evidence that this country is still a conservative country.

A majority of the people of the United States want family responsibility, they want to enjoy the results of thrift; they will demand that the issues be drawn by the opposition party (Republican) against this administration's socialism. That opposition throughout the Nation will cast off the Republican Party as useless if it elects a "me-too" President in 1952, who brings the Congress of the United States a substantial amount of Harry Truman's Socialist program in January of 1953. The Republican Party will be cast off as useless because it will have destroyed all organized opposition to Fabian socialism in the National Legislature. When that time occurs the Democratic Party of the House and Senate will be under the control of the intellectual social planners. The new Republican administration offering creeping

socialism will have control of the committee structure and the House structure of the Congress. Yet it is to be presumed that at least 100 Congressmen from South of the Mason and Dixon's line and the border States will be joined with over 150 Republicans in opposition to such a program. The economic state of the Nation under such circumstances will demand an organized political opposition to the new Republican Executive and the winning Democrat Socialists out of power but still controlling the Democratic Party. Such condition will no longer be able to operate through informal alliances. The

new structure will necessarily have to be formal, so that it may operate in a manner to control the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The foregoing thoughts prompt the question: What is the location of the conservative strength in the United States? It can be seen in the party division of House seats in the geopolitical sections of the Nation. The big-city majorities do not have the political strength by congressional districts which they wield in the electoral college. In the electoral college they (big-city majorities) wield a strength far beyond their numbers.

Party division of seats in House of Representatives with Republican losses in 1948 and gains in 1950 elections by sections of the United States and subsections of Northern States

Area	Total House seats	80th Cong		Republican gains		82d Cong	
		Democrat and other	Republican	1948	1950	Democrat and other	Republican
Entire United States	435	180	246	-75	28	236	199
41 Southern States	105	104	2			104	2
6 border States	42	22	20	-15	5	32	10
32 Northern States	288	64	224	-60	24	101	187
Subsections of the 32 Northern States							
In or partly in big cities of over 500,000 population	177	35	42	-22	8	50	28
Including all or part of cities of 250,000 to 500,000	21	7	14	-7	2	12	9
All other seats	190	22	168	-31	14	39	150

¹ 78 seats in 81st and 82d Congresses due to Illinois redistricting.

² 189 seats in 81st and 82d Congresses due to Illinois redistricting.

In discussing this subject, it must be remembered that the southern Democrats are also a sectional majority party. They are so strong in the 11 Southern States that they can and do defy a Democrat President. The elected Representatives from those areas defy the President of their party without any danger of defeat by Republican opponents or other Democrats on their own primary ticket. They are more conservative than many Republicans. It seems obvious that it is an understatement to say that this strong sectional majority in the South should be joined with the sectional majority of the North in order to give the majority of the American people what they want in free government. The fact is that either those majorities will be joined by a proper opposition from the Republican Party to creeping socialism, or one of three results will occur:

1 Multiple party government at the national level will occur, requiring a coalition of parties to control the Houses of Congress. This would give the Southern States terrific power because our Government would not fall if the coalition fell, as is the case when a Prime Minister is chosen in England and other countries;

2 The Republican Party will commit suicide by successfully nominating and electing a me-too candidate in 1952, or

3. The failure of organized opposition on the part of the Republican Party will result in the Executive acquiring so much power that government as we know it under our Constitution will no longer exist.

There are 22 Southern Senators and 47 Republican Senators (about 7 Republican Senators are accepting piece-meal socialism). It, therefore, appears that 62 Senators, out of 96, presently in office, are opposed to the present policies of the administration and past me-too Republican platforms. They, of course, lose much of their power because they are not bound as a party group operating under the rules of the Senate. They do not caucus together and establish a program.

There are 103 Members of the House of Representatives from the South. About 35 Republican Representatives, out of 199 presently in office, cave in on some of the Socialist program. It is thus seen that where

218 represents a majority of the House, 267 Members presently vote conservative. Their strength is also lost because they cannot operate as a party unit under the rules of the House.

Recently, polls taken indicated that a majority of Republicans favor some kind of formal tie-up between Republicans and southern Democrats in the Congress. A Gallup poll of January 21, 1950, on the question of a new party under a new name, showed that 50 percent of the Republicans and 40 percent of the southern Democrats having opinions, were in favor of so drastic a political change. It is, of course, true that a change of the rules under which the Houses of Congress operate, might provide a formal alliance and not require a change of party label. It has been suggested that the present two-party system by which the Congress is operated and responsibility placed on the party in power on election day should be changed. This seems utterly ridiculous because we need a responsible two-party system where our Government cannot go to the people except at a presidential election every 4 years. If the Republican Party will draw the issues in their platform and provide a candidate who believes in the American system of government and is respected for his ability, his honesty, his training, his integrity, and his belief in responsible family life, they will then offer to the Southern States the program for which the Southern States fought a Civil War and will also offer the opposition demanded in the South to the present administration. It is the writer's opinion that the Republican Party cannot enter into any such alliance without eventually destroying itself just as it will if it again fails to draw the issues in 1952. Any alliance with the elected representatives of the South by Republicans from the North, would either destroy the two-party system by which the Congress operates or would eventually destroy the Republican Party.

CONCLUSION

The Republican Party, in 1950, lost the tenth of the last 11 congressional campaigns in the sense that it failed to gain control of the House or Senate. The Republican Party lost five out of the last five presiden-

tial contests. It is, therefore, at the present time, a national minority party. It is a national minority party because it refuses to draw the issues for responsible family life against creeping socialism and regimentation even though its leaders know that a majority of the people of the Nation are demanding that those issues be drawn. The Republican Party confuses itself by looking to its unusually strong sectional power. In the section north of the Mason and Dixon's line and outside of metropolitan areas, it is a sectional majority party. If it is to again become a national majority party, it must stand for those issues desired below the Mason and Dixon's line and oppose the trends destructive of the individual liberties of workingmen. On November 7, 1950, the Grand Old Party won 187 seats in the House of Representatives, in the 32 Northern States, to 101 for the Democrats. However, in the five border States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Oklahoma, they won only 10 out of a possible 42, all of which were anti-welfare State seats. In the 11 southern States violently opposed to the administration's program, the Republicans won only 2 out of 105. The Republicans have not drawn the issues since the campaign of Alf Landon. If they had been drawn for the last 12 years, it is reasonable to assume that the Southern States would now be joined with us against the carpetbaggers in the White House. This, of course, would require the Republican Party in its national platform to admit the realities of local control of police programs and race issues.

When this session of Congress commenced, Senate seats were divided 45 in favor of northern Republicans to 19 for their northern opponents. This, of course, is an overwhelming majority. However, in the border States, there are eight Democrat Senators to two Republicans, and in the Southern States, the Republicans do not hold a single seat. Twenty-two of those seats are now held by Democrats who must oppose this administration with the Republicans, if they are to be reelected in the South.

If the Republicans are to win a majority of the seats in the House of Representatives (218), they can only lose 70 seats in the Northern States. In the Northern States and the border States combined, they can only lose 112 of the 330 seats involved. If they fail to draw the issues and take the story of creeping socialism and demagogery to the everyday American workingman and his wife, the Republican Party is not strong enough to overcome such handicaps. Under such circumstances without third-party movements such as the Wallace movement and the Dixiecrat movement in 1948, there is no reason to believe that the Republican Party alone can ever again elect a President of the United States.

There are those who believe that the fact that Republican nominees have won gubernatorial elections in large States like New York, Pennsylvania, and California, while giving lip service to much of the welfare state of socialism, is evidence that they can win a Presidential election in 1952. It is submitted, however, that men are sometimes elected to office when a majority of the people are not voting for him but are voting against his opponent. It is also submitted that such actions by the opposition party (Republican) can be undertaken at the State level without disastrous consequences. However, if the American people elect a "me-too" candidate and a "me-too" platform at the national level in 1952, in order to avoid corruption, pervers in office, police action wars involving our whole economy without the consent of Congress, it may well represent the last bid of the Republican Party in a national Presidential campaign. If the American people have no choice but to throw out present corruption and socialistic philosophies, and accept as the only

alternative, 50 or 60 percent of the same program, they will have wiped out the present political party organization that is supposed to represent, and is obligated to represent, organized political opposition to creeping socialism. The vast majority of the American people that are electing a conservative Congress demonstrate that they still believe, as the English-speaking people have believed for several hundred years, a liberal political movement means more rights and responsibilities to the individual and his family with less interference by government. There will be no political miracles in the next election except for those Republican leaders who want the power and prestige of office. Even then, it will not be a miracle. The vast majority of the American people will be voting against our present Socialist administration. They will evidence their desire to vote against the welfare state that the Republican Party has offered them in the last three Presidential elections. A few people may gain power as Republicans, but the Republican Party and its grass-root workers will go out of power.

We have all heard many people say that there is a worldwide resurgence toward conservatism. Yet political history demonstrates that that resurgence is for individual responsibility and rights as against government. That movement has always been identified as liberalism in political history until the New Deal, Fair Deal, and Republican "me-too-ism" changed the definition. Those Republicans who believe that the world-wide resurgence just mentioned will lead to a successful Presidential campaign are wrong, when they assume that the United States will also display that conservatism. The fact is that those people have not studied the elections of the House of Representatives for the past 10 years hereinabove analyzed. The American people have voted conservative by a vast majority for that 10-year period and have been given piece-meal socialism by an Executive elected by the unit-vote system of many large States in the electoral college.

There are other Republicans who point to the last Presidential election to show that small shifts of popular votes in many States would have put the Republican column in control of the last election. By this arithmetic, they convey the impression that the Republicans lost by a very narrow margin. Thus, many point to the fact that Ohio was lost by only 7,107 votes in 1948, and California, by only 17,865. They completely overlook the fact that Henry Wallace was in that race as a third-party candidate. If Wallace had not run, Ohio would have been lost by at least 40,000 votes, and California by more than 200,000 votes.

There are others who believe a very glamorous candidate can give the Republicans victory in 1952 by winning votes in the large northern cities without losing any of the "out-city" votes. These people are again assuming that they can write a platform that will fool a sufficiently large part of the big-city votes part of the time and at the same time, fool all of the "out-city" votes part of the time. This attitude gives no consideration to the very strong group and class antagonism aroused in the big cities by Roosevelt in the thirties. It also gives no attention whatever to the tremendous increase of voters in those cities among people, who, even in 1932 had taken no part in the oldest political disputes between Republicans and Democrats in the conduct of national affairs. These people do not see that the old inter-party disputes between Republicans and Democrats have been completely swallowed up in the new intraparty ideological conflicts presently existing in the Republican Party. This intraparty ideological conflict is best described by the phrase of "Liberalism versus socialism."

Unless the opposition party (Republican), through a well-trained, and well-respected candidate, and a sincere, forthright and honest platform, carries the story to the voters of the metropolitan areas, the voters of those areas will be justified in believing the statements of other politicians, dignified by the cloak of public office, who tell them that it is all right to covet your neighbor's goods, so long as you do it in political groups called unions or political parties, and that is all right to steal your neighbor's goods so long as you use only economic force. Those of us in the Republican Party from the out-counties must insist that the Republican Party draw the issues against all of the demagogues' carpetbagful of bills for FEPC, socialized medicine, public housing, economy of scarcity, etc.

If these issues are drawn, the present condition of our Nation can be disclosed to the American citizens in metropolitan areas. The condition of our Nation will demonstrate to those citizens that the program of this administration is against the interest of the workingman and his family. It will demonstrate to them conclusively that it is the workingman that must protect individual liberty if it is to be saved. It will demonstrate to him that the average businessman will buy anything that he can mark up and sell for a profit, including regimentation and socialism. To fail to draw the issues in this eleventh hour is to shirk our responsibilities as the opposition party in free Government. It is no excuse to say that the economic questions are so complex that the workingman, being deceived by a left-wing press, is not qualified to understand. Such an attitude is an admission that Lord Macaulay, the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and our present labor barons are right when they assume that the vast majority of Americans are not fit to be free because they are poor.

IN REGARD TO THE PRESENT CONDITION OF OUR COUNTRY

We are completing about two decades of planned economy. Even though history records that movements and revolutions for liberty were to establish more rights in the individual as against government, liberalism today has been redefined. Many of our Republican leaders participate in this new liberalism which tolerates the usurpation of individual liberties and responsibilities by executive departments of government. Liberty means government according to laws passed by free legislatures, whose members are elected by free people and whose laws can be enforced in local courts by poor men. Under such circumstances, free government requires an opposition party in its legislature. It requires members of the legislature who desire to be defeated in supporting what they believe to be the true principles of individual freedom. Since our theory of government assumes that the States will determine who should represent them in the Houses of Congress, the policies and principles of the executive heads of the respective States greatly affect the position taken by Republican Members of Congress when the chief executive of their State is Republican. The fact is that many of the Republican governors of our larger States have assumed they are "Mr. Republican" in their State and have sought to stimulate left-wing support in their metropolitan areas by offering their version of creeping socialism and the welfare state. The result has been that Republican opposition to the congressional practice of delegating its powers and responsibilities to the executive and tolerating the usurpation of individual rights by the executive has been too feeble. It is not looked upon as the party in which the stalwarts of liberty can place confidence for opposition to regimentation.

The result is that we now have what is referred to as big government. It represents concentration of power over the 48 States and their local communities as well as all business, and even the individual citizens by bureaus in Washington. This transfer of power is accelerating at a startling pace. It is coming so fast it escapes notice and is being taken for granted by many people.

This trend, to those who read the lessons of history, constitutes a threat to our system and form of government and to the liberties of the individual citizen as great as any peril we may face from communism in foreign countries. Perhaps the difficulty is that our attention is so centered on the threat to the free world from world communism that this other insidious threat gets little attention.

The process was hastened by the device of the States matching Federal dollars on road-building programs. Those building power in Washington spread that device to cover social programs, the entire scope of security, pensions, and so forth. These Federal dollars, matched by the States, were not a gift from Washington, but were dollars from the standards of living of the people taken first to Washington and returned in part to the State or local levels. An average of 15 percent of such moneys are retained in Washington, for high bureaucrat salaries and political purposes. The big point is, however, that the Federal Government always insisted on retaining complete power over every fundamental principle involved in these matchings. Big Government or bureaucracy began interfering with and dictating almost everything that had been regarded as local responsibility. About the only field untouched today is education and the bureaucrats are reaching out to control education from Washington.

Thomas Jefferson is accepted as almost the patron saint of the Democratic Party. It was he who pointed out that in excessive taxation and more excessive spending lay the great threat to the individual citizens from the tyranny of government. It is the party that looks to Jefferson as its philosopher which has gone completely wild on big government, big bureaucracy, and which seeks to give Washington unrestrained power over the individual citizen. Recently, Dene Malott, president of Cornell University, pointed out that a new Federal Government employee was going on a payroll every 45 seconds, 24 hours a day, 365 days in the year. He also reminded us that as of today, one person in four received a check from the Washington Government in some form or other. We should bear in mind that hundreds of thousands of our citizens also receive checks from State and local governments. It goes without saying that with millions of jobholders and with more millions of check receivers, there follows the attendant concentration of political power in Washington, even though we must admit that many of the jobholders are necessary and many of the checks otherwise received are doubtless worthy. However, that was the whole strategy of the new deal, and it has been carried to excessive extreme by the so-called fair deal. It is the use of Federal spending and Federal payrolls to perpetuate the existing regime in power. Some Republicans say that explains much of the last three presidential elections when the Republican Party did not oppose them with forthright platforms and bold candidates willing to be defeated on the issues. They say the cards are stacked against a change in behalf of the Republican Party. However, the cards are not stacked for an opposition party drawing the issues for all of those people who elected an opposition House of Representatives for the past 10 years. It is not literally true that if you spend enough

and put enough people on the payroll, you start off with an advantage that is almost impossible to overturn. Such tactics breed corruption, which is seen even by those working for Government. That is the only reasonable explanation of why the Maryland counties and Virginia counties, where Washington employees reside, voted substantially against the President and his administration in 1948. Those people were alarmed. They did not have to rely on a deceptive press nor did they need a bolder stand by the "pushy-footing" Republican Party, because they saw with their own eyes and as Americans rose to the issue.

It is pretty generally agreed that had the President not declared war without the consent of Congress last year, we would have had a price collapse due to overproduction at the present time. Such a collapse would have been relatively certain before November 1952. His action in sending the boys to battle required the Congress to finance them. He has now issued the call for 3 more divisions in the Army, making a total of 21 divisions called to that service. He has successfully forced through Congress a budget which, together with power for contract authorizations, totals about \$97,000,000,000. This represents two times the amount of the total national income about 15 years ago. It probably represents more durable goods than the American industry could produce in 1 year if it did not produce anything else. Yet, it has been placed on top of our peacetime economy, so that the industrial East heretofore politically regimented at the expense of the consumers of the United States, may have wage increases and higher prices. Such industries will stay in black ink by virtue of this tactic until after November 1952. Even though we are supposed to be at peace, our people will pay to the Federal Government, when the new tax bill is added to the present one, more than twenty billions a year above the amount paid by this Nation at the height of World War II. That additional twenty billion represents about \$570 for every family in America. We have reached the point in Washington where even those writing the tax legislation believe that little more can be squeezed from the patient taxpayer short of confiscation.

It should be obvious to everyone that when business is drained so heavily to face the exactions of Washington, peacetime business cannot make the expansions and produce the broader economy this Nation must have to keep growing and absorbing in useful jobs the millions of people that come into the employment army every year. There is only one result. More borrowing by business is necessary, and if that is not possible, then borrowing from Government will be accepted. This increases again the Government's heavy hand in control of our business, our jobs, and our everyday life. To those Republicans in the opposition party who still believe that we must say "me too" but that we will do it better and for less money and for less taxes, the important question is: Why does this system keep going? They justified past "me-to-ism" as a means to tide our country over until its people are awakened. They overlook the fact that the average citizen will not be aware of these problems unless the opposition party draws the issues with respectable citizens and debates the merit of political measures in an open and free press.

The average everyday housewife must be given an opportunity to understand that there is \$500 in taxes in a workingman's automobile, together with about \$400 in wage differential paid to coal miners, auto workers, steel workers, and electrical appliance workers, and others where labor barons are supposed to turn over the vote. They must be made to understand that milk is 20 cents a quart because it is half taxes; the same is true of meat, clothing, ice boxes, refrigera-

tors, etc. As long as the opposition party seeks to fool the people part of the time on election day, this tactic will continue. As long as employment and high wages can be handed out by spending moneys to be earned by our children and grandchildren at a time in world's history when no other country will question the value of our bonds or currency, the smash can be avoided. However, it can be carried on only by continuously augmenting inflation. The Government heads in Washington have talked much about the dangers of inflation. They have talked more than anyone else in the United States. Yet it is the very policies laid down by those officials and carried forward by them that have brought on inflation. The only way they have been able to collect this tremendous increase in taxation and national income of the people is by cheapening the dollar. It is true that the Eighty-first Republican Congress took about 8,000,000 low-income earners off the income tax rolls by increasing allowances, etc. However, it is also true that this administration has put them back on the income tax rolls without the consent of Congress by cheapening the dollar, reflected in increased salaries, which put those people on the rolls as taxpayers, even though they receive no additional actual purchasing power.

The result of these Government policies, unopposed by Republican "me-too-ism" is obvious. Business tries to keep up by raising prices. However, the huge new taxes make that almost impossible at the present time. Organized labor tries to keep up by forcing another round of political wage increases in those areas where labor barons are supposed to turn over the vote. These efforts of business and labor are reflected in higher prices. The farmer has insisted on parity, which is determined by the cost of things to him, so we have the mad race of the big groups which produce necessities. They help themselves to keep apace with the cheapening dollar or to get ahead of the other groups on condition of political friendliness. This is at the expense of the consumers generally in the country, 45,000,000 of whom are not in organized labor and many millions of whom, even though in organized labor, do not get the political pay-off.

The sad part of the story is that someone has to foot the bill. At the present time, it includes those making 75 cents an hour or less. There were 12 million of those in interstate commerce alone last year. However, the people paying the heaviest today are those who in their youth felt that they had a contract with Government in that they would work hard, be thrifty, and provide for their old age and family security with Government protection. It is those on fixed incomes, the thrifty who laid away for their old age, the retired, those living on fixed salaries, who are the victims. Since 1939, and that's only 12 years ago, the dollar has dropped to where it is only about 53 cents of its 1939 purchasing value.

Is it too much to ask of the opposition party that they say boldly that the "welfare state" in United States has already confiscated nearly half the life savings of the thrifty people of this country and those who by individual excellence raise the standard of living for all of their neighbors, including incompetents. Even the millions that bought savings bonds have contributed their toll. This is the field where the first confiscation of the people's money has fallen. It is the field which history tell us always falls prey to Government tyranny. If we ask who will be next as the tax hand falls heavier and as spending increases, the answer is obvious. If Washington took every dollar that anyone in United States made over \$100,000, it would only acquire enough new money to operate our national Government for about three hours at last year's

cost. If it took every dollar earned by anyone over \$10,000, the additional revenue would run our country for about three and one-half months at last year's cost. If the President's request for an additional \$10 billion dollars is granted, it will require taking practically all of the money anyone earns over \$4,000. The absurdity of the whole program is that there are billions for spending abroad, but not enough to take care of flood victims at home. Can anyone in the Republican Party believe that many thousands of voters in metropolitan areas, understanding these facts, will not support the Republican Party when it is the only method by which individual citizens can save sufficient money to invest in private enterprise? From the foregoing, it should be obvious that when the President said, a year and a half ago, that he was going to increase the national income beyond \$300 billion dollars and the average person's income to a minimum of \$3,500 a year, he was going to cheapen the dollar so as to collect additional taxes in terms of dollars for his political machine.

There is no doubt but what Thomas Jefferson was right. The power of taxation thus used is the power to rule, unless the people rise up and smite the spenders. They have no opportunity to rise unless the opposition party draws the issues for them on election day. If the opposition does not draw those issues next November, the people will smite the opposition party and create an organization that will draw the issues for them, just as they did in 1850. Every nation in the world that has felt the heavy hand of tyranny, knows that unlimited taxation is the power to rule.

There are other phases of big government presently existing which are just as alarming to thoughtful people looking to the future. The keystone of liberty is free speech and free press. Under the Constitution, it is the States who determine who should represent them in the Congress. When the Constitution was drafted, the United States Senators from the States were looked upon as ambassadors of sovereign States. Yet, we see presently a strong movement in the United States Senate to throw out Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin. Yet, he was sent to the United States Senate under the constitutional right of the people of Wisconsin to choose him as their representative. That is a decision that should be left to the people of Wisconsin in the American way. In World War I, President Wilson said we need no censorship even in military matters, in wartime. What we need is more information going to our free people. Even in World War II, the New Deal and Fair Deal would not ask for the imposition of censorship. The newspapers were called in and a voluntary censorship was worked out to protect the national security. Today, while we are in peace, the White House, by Executive decree, has ordered not merely that the Defense Departments classify material for security reasons, but every civilian branch of the Government. The express purpose of the order was that it was an endeavor to keep our secrets from the enemy. Yet, it gives every civilian branch of Government power to classify. It gives them power to withhold from the Un-American Activities Committee, from Joe McCarthy, from Sen. Pat McCarran, and other investigating executive personnel and policies corroborating governmental information establishing the truth of subversive and inefficiency in Government. It gives the dictatorial powers of Hitler, Napoleon, Mussolini, Stalin, and all other totalitarians, to the Administration. This is the power to lock up material they don't want the public to know about. Only a few hours after the Executive order came, a directive from the Office of Price Stabilization instructing its bureaus to give out

nothing that might embarrass the Administration, was issued. It was so raw that it was almost immediately countermanded.

However, the incident gives the tip-off as to how Government can use this new Executive order. The American people must be given the right to express themselves against the symptomatic order of the Office of Price Stabilization above-mentioned. They know that power breeds the lust for more power and more such orders. We are all rightly concerned about the power of world communism. By growing government creeping insidiously, encroachments of government made through taxation, through reaching out for more controls and powers, will affect the everyday citizen in his living and his future. It will not profit us if we should keep the world free and lose our own system of dignity of individual freedom and family life.

We have seen that the Republican Party is a majority party north of the Mason and Dixon's line and outside of metropolitan areas at the present time. We have also seen that the Republican Party is, in fact, a national minority party. If it is to win the next presidential election, it must in some manner become a national majority party on election day. That can only be done by gaining strength south of the Mason and Dixon's line and in the border States, or by gaining strength in the metropolitan areas of the North.

I believe it must be admitted that to gain strength in the northern metropolitan areas will be difficult for the reason that the economy of that region has now built itself around reciprocal trade agreements which give them metals below the cost of production in our Western States. They have also built their economy around a new system of banking and Government loans at the expense of all of the citizens of America, most of whom live outside of that area. It is, perhaps, for these reasons why the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Time magazine, Look, Life, Newsweek, and many other publications did so much to nominate Willkie and Governor Dewey twice in the last three elections. That probably explains why they are presently slanting the news for some new international-thinking Republican candidate. Such candidate must be willing to tax our people so that military budgets can be placed on top of the civilian demands in the durable-goods industries, in order to keep those industries in black ink and continue the policy of wage differentials in durable goods at the expense of the other consumers of our country. Surely no one in the Republican Party will now hesitate to take these facts to the workmen and their wives, including those in the metropolitan areas who do not get the political payoff and at whose expense the political payoff is made. There is much other unfairness to the workmen and women of our Nation which can be explained to them if the issues are drawn through a candidate that will speak out.

There is convincing evidence at the present time that the top minds in the Pentagon believe that they must control these Frankensteins created by the New Deal and Fair Deal in the interest of national security in time of emergency. They are planning the control of our industries, our unions, our press, and our whole economy. This is military socialism. You need only talk to a well-advised man on the street to learn that he, too, believes that it may be necessary to control our labor barons and others voicing the threat of minority revolution in order that our people may eat and be comfortable. If these things are true, why then do we still have "me-too" Republicans? Why do they not insist that the Congress and State legislatures define new equitable rights that are believed to exist, into laws enforceable in local courts by poor people? Why do they

hesitate to deny the existence of certain rights by which demagogues are building revolution? Why can't we stand up and say that we need no army to control our unions, if we give a generally secret ballot to union members to elect their union officials, vote on strikes, and give the power to local courts, supported by local public opinion, to enjoin the closing down of any industries necessary to national security?

It has been only a few years since the idea of old-age pensions was growing in our State of California. It, of course, is a responsibility of Government to take care of the destitute. However, it should now be demonstrated to the people, even in metropolitan areas, that poor men with families to raise are paying 8-cent taxes on a quart of milk, a similar tax on a loaf of bread, \$3.50 taxes on a pair of children's shoes, when they have no surplus money in the bank, in order to pay a stipend every month, through taxes, to people who have \$20,000 worth of salable assets. This is an example of how all of the welfare state programs generate unfairness unless they are opposed. The Republican Party can draw these issues successfully. They probably can never win a national election unless they do. They can gain strength in metropolitan areas by demonstrating to the people that many cities are now levying an average tax per family of \$600 per year for city government, a similar amount per year for county government, \$900 per year for State government, and \$1,285 per year for National Government. They must be told that the present requests in Washington will increase that family cost to about \$2,500 per year.

What the Republican Party should do immediately is to tell the people of the Southern States that most of its carpet-baggers have joined the so-called Democrat Party; that there are a few of them left in the Republican Party who cry "me too" and say they stand for the welfare state to be operated by some executive in such manner as he may deem charitable. The Republican Party should tell the South that it is ridding itself of all carpet-baggers and that it wants the help of the South in opposition to the regimentation now going on in metropolitan areas with the support of many of the newspapers of those areas.

I have not made this statement with the view of opposing any particular candidate for the Presidency or to support any such candidate. The response that has come to the resolution heretofore passed by your committee has prompted the feeling in me that I wanted to say something to your committee about it. I know that this committee is not opposed to our governor. However, I know that this committee, like many other Republicans and many members of the Democrat Party, believe that we must have our candidates speak out on these subjects and that we should not support a candidate who fails to speak and say what we desire to hear in regard to individual freedom maintained through law and order. Finally, it is the responsibility of the Republican Party to take the true story in regard to social security to the workmen of the Nation. Those who drafted the tax bills for our present administration admit that we have reached the point of diminishing returns. That means that if we raise the tax rate, we actually collect less money. The only field left is confiscation of accumulated wealth, which action could only supply us for a few years. It is now apparent that the social security laws passed by this administration and its predecessor was merely a new system of taxation. Over \$20,000,000,000 have been collected but have been spent in the general fund to help people in Europe or any place that might have been desirable. Therefore, the fact is apparent. We need a military budget to support our economy, which cannot pay more taxes. That is a temporary

condition which must lead to depression and unemployment. When that time comes, the tax drafters of our administration have now admitted that they cannot collect additional taxes to pay the obligations of unemployment insurance.

Williams Hits Jackpot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of October 9, 1951.

This is another example of the tireless and courageous efforts in behalf of good government of the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, senior United States Senator from the State of Delaware.

WILLIAMS HITS JACKPOT

For 2 years, a smiling, soft-spoken Senator has been persistently prodding the Internal Revenue Bureau into a clean-up.

In his efforts to force results, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has been investigating. His investigations have paid off in a series of exposures.

More than any other man, Senator WILLIAMS has forced the whole sordid Internal Revenue scandal into the open.

He has just come up with the jackpot scandal of them all. It is chapter II in the story of Dan M. Nee, internal revenue collector in Kansas City from 1933 to 1948. Nee is a partner of Ardeis H. Myers, also of Kansas City.

In chapter I, Senator Williams revealed last month how Nee, Myers, and three others chartered a new company and within 7 days had leased public property from one Government agency and leased it back to another Government agency at a net difference of \$363,000 in 20 months.

Chapter II is even more fantastic.

Senator Williams now reveals that Nee also is attorney for Myers in a tax case. In this case, the Government has assessed \$675,000 against Myers for taxes he did not pay over a period of 5 years while Nee was the income-tax collector.

"This \$675,000 outstanding tax account," says Senator WILLIAMS, "has been allowed to gather dust, first in the Kansas City collector's office under Dan M. Nee, and now on the shelf here in Washington."

There is so much dust on this case that \$170,000 of it now is noncollectible, because the statute of limitations has run.

When Senator WILLIAMS exposed chapter I of this new Kansas City story, he said the taxpayers had been taken for a ride.

He can say that again.

Letter of Donald W. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to two Members of this body, copy of which was furnished me:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 16, 1951.

HON. JOHN TABER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: My attention has recently been called to page 12880 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 10, 1951, wherein the following appears:

"Mr. BENDER I find in the committee print the Federal Security Agency listed here. Is it not true that this Donald W. Smith, who I understand was relieved of his post, has been taken over by Oscar Ewing's Federal Security Agency? And what is his work if that be true?"

"Mr. TABER As I understand, Donald W. Smith was released from RFC when Mr. Symington went in after Mr. Smith's connections with very questionable performances had been exposed by a committee representing the other body. Mr. Oscar Ewing apparently figures that the release under those circumstances qualified Smith to be taken in at \$42.50 a day as a consultant for 60 days in the Federal Security Agency. That is all I know about it, but those seem to be the facts. I cannot give you the exact date that he was taken in, but it was some day in September."

I am confident that neither you nor Representative BENDER intended any unfair injury to me. Consequently I conclude that you must have been misinformed as to the facts and hope that this letter will serve to set the record straight.

The portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoted above leaves the impression that I was discharged from my position at the RFC and that I was connected in some way with questionable activities at that agency. The fact is, that my position at the RFC was abolished as a result of the recent reorganization of that agency. Although by virtue of years of prior service and veteran's preference, I had rights to other positions in the agency, I chose voluntarily not to exercise those rights. Moreover, nowhere in any Senate report or in any Senate testimony or in any other proceedings have I at any time ever been charged with any irregular activities whatsoever in connection with my work with the Government or elsewhere, nor have I ever been connected with any questionable activities of any kind.

In order that you may have a better understanding of my qualifications, I would like to outline briefly my career in the Government covering the past 12 years.

I entered Government service in 1939 with the Federal Housing Agency, and shortly thereafter transferred to the RFC, Personnel Division. I remained there until my entry into the Armed Forces in 1942. Upon my return from military duty in 1945, I was appointed Assistant Chief Placement Officer for the Corporation. Later I was promoted to Chief Placement Officer. In 1949 the Board of Directors appointed me to the position of Director of Personnel. While I was in this position the Board recommended me for the Arthur S. Flemming Award for outstanding service in the field of personnel administration. In January 1951, at the request of the Board, I was appointed Assistant Manager to the Board. I remained in this position until it was abolished in April 1951.

I am sure that you are anxious, as I am, to correct any misimpressions which may have been caused, and I trust the above information will serve to do so.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Representative BENDER.

Very sincerely yours,

DONALD W. SMITH.

Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call attention to the fact that Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin, president of George Washington University here in the Nation's Capital, this fall commences his twenty-fifth year as president of that institution.

I am personally proud of Dr. Marvin and his achievements because he was born and reared in my home town of Findlay, Ohio.

During this 25-year period his record demonstrates his leadership both locally and nationally in educational, national, and community affairs.

Dr. Marvin was a captain in the Army aviation service during World War I and for his services during World War II has received the United States Army award for exceptional civilian service for "exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service" as deputy director and acting director of research and development, War Department general staff, from September 1946 to August 1947.

The Cosmopolitan Club of the Nation's Capital gave him its award for community service in 1946. The citation emphasized particularly his part in bringing to Washington city the new George Washington University Hospital.

In the realm of public service he also has served as chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Education Committee of the House of Representatives; chairman of the United States Delegation to the Pan American Scientific Congress; president of the National Parks Association; and chairman of the District of Columbia Bicentennial Commission.

His education contributions on a national scale have been likewise notable.

He promoted the development of theoretical physics in this country and his leadership led to the establishment of the Washington Conferences on Theoretical Physics, annual conferences sponsored jointly by the George Washington University and the Carnegie Institution of Washington to which the world's outstanding nuclear physicists were brought. It was during a meeting of one of these conferences, held in a university classroom, that Niels Bohr, Copenhagen scientist, made the first announcement in America of the fission of uranium with the release of atomic energy.

Dr. Marvin's contribution to education in the National Capital has been no less significant. He now begins his jubilee year as chief of an institution whose growth has been phenomenal during the past 25 years. No other American college president now in office has served so long in one position.

His direction has made it possible for young men and women from every State

in the Union and from most foreign countries to obtain a first-class education in what is perhaps the richest of centers as regards the materia of education, this Nation's Capital which contains at once rich record collections in virtually every field of knowledge and which is the seat of history in the making.

I know that everyone interested in the advancement of education throughout the country, together with the residents of the District of Columbia and Dr. Marvin's many friends in Ohio, are proud of his achievements and all join in congratulating him in this jubilee year of his presidency at George Washington University.

Pittsburgh's Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial titled "Pittsburgh's Example," which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, October 16, 1951:

PITTSBURGH'S EXAMPLE

Pittsburgh is giving the country a practical demonstration in how to rebuild a slump-pocked and traffic-strangled city. Its mayor, David L. Lawrence, told the story the other day at the annual conference of the National Association of Housing Officials. We think it ought to be echoed and reechoed through every American city that has permitted itself to become afflicted with blight and stagnation, and that is most of them. Certainly the story should be read with eager interest in Washington, where urban redevelopment is still in its infancy in spite of much talk and years of planning.

Two large projects involving a combined investment of more than \$100,000,000 are under way in Pittsburgh. Both are being constructed through united community effort without Federal aid. One is the Gateway Center in Pittsburgh's downtown area. A 60-acre jumble of decaying warehouses, third-rate office buildings, parking lots, rooming houses, and a worn-out hotel has been cleared by the State of Pennsylvania. Part of the land will be used for modern office buildings in a garden setting and part for new highways, bridges, and parks. The developer is the Equitable Life Assurance Society.

Mayor Lawrence says of this project:

"The community gains are very great. There will be a substantial tax increment for local government. We eliminate an unproductive area of blight, and substitute a showplace. We retain in Pittsburgh the home offices of great business enterprises, with all that means in employment, civic leadership and prestige. We got a new traffic pattern. We create an area for future growth. We decentralize in our downtown, by making the land over.

"But above all, this Gateway Center project is valuable to us as a demonstration."

Pittsburgh's second project involves the expansion and modernization of the Jones & Laughlin Steel plant with accompanying smoke- and stream-pollution control, street

changes, and the elimination of a blighted residential area. Now the city is tackling a third project that will require Federal aid and that will clean out an overcrowded 105-acre slum in which the tuberculosis rate is three times the city-wide rate. Here space will now be found for a cross-town boulevard, a sports area and auditorium, and parking lots that are urgently needed.

Mayor Lawrence attributes the success of Pittsburgh in this pioneer work to cooperation among its civic groups and businessmen. The first necessity, he says, is for public bodies to work as brothers, not rivals. Here is a hint that the numerous agencies working in this field in Washington ought to heed. No less important, we surmise, is the enlistment of leading citizens and business interests in the undertaking. Pittsburgh has set an example that deserves wide emulation.

Radio Address by Wes Izzard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I arise this morning to call to the attention of the House the contents of a radio address delivered by Mr. Wes Izzard over radio station KGNC, at Amarillo, Tex., on October 1, 1951. This address is being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your study. It follows:

The letter-writing crusade is beginning to take shape, but the shape is somewhat different from the original suggestion made through this program about a month ago by an Amarillo registered nurse. You may remember that the original idea was to prevail upon American people in all walks of life to write letters to their counterparts in towns behind the iron curtain. An American student would write to a student in, say, Prague, Czechoslovakia. A housewife would write to a housewife; a machinist to a machinist, and so on. The letters were to be nonpolitical, simply expressing friendship and telling something about the way we live in this country; about our homes and churches and schools and so on.

Several obstacles presented themselves. First, there was the matter of language—the difficulty of having the letters translated into the languages of the various iron curtain countries. Then there was the matter of censorship: Would the letters be delivered? And some question was raised as to whether such activity might not actually place the recipients of these letters in jeopardy from the secret police.

So we decided to get in touch with the staff of the Crusade for Freedom and ask for advice and suggestions. The Crusade for Freedom is the free-enterprise American organization that operates Radio Free Europe, and is planning to expand its operations to include a Radio Free Asia. Some members of the Crusade for Freedom staff are refugees from behind the iron curtain. They know conditions there. They know what the effect of such a letter-writing campaign as was proposed here would be. So we posed the problem to the New York office of the Crusade for Freedom.

We have just received a reply from Abbott Washburn, one of the organization's active directors. And here is what he says:

There would be danger in a widespread and uncontrolled letter-writing campaign. The recipients of such letters, if they should get by the censors, would be in grave jeopardy; because, although the letters might not be addressed personally to the people who would finally receive them, the mere possession of such a letter would be dangerous.

However, the Crusade for Freedom is delighted that the people of the Panhandle are so interested in the problem of contacting their counterparts behind the iron curtain. And Mr. Washburn has made this offer: Go ahead and write your letter. Address it in general terms to a student or a businessman or a postman or a cab driver or a person in any walk of life you choose. Write it in English. And send it, not direct to the iron curtain country, but to the Crusade for Freedom. Not only will Radio Free Europe broadcast the fact that these letters are being written, but the staff will select certain letters and read them over Radio Free Europe. These broadcasts are beamed to the iron curtain countries, and are listened to avidly by as many people as can manage to operate a receiving set secretly.

Thus the effect will be that thousands of these iron curtain people will be told the story of how the Panhandle of Texas launched this great letter-writing campaign to prove our friendship for the people under Communist domination. And as many letters as practicable will be read over the air, after being translated into the language of the country to which the broadcast is beamed. Thus the effect will be much the same as though the letters actually were delivered, yet the secret police will never be able to pin down any individual as the recipient of a letter, because the actual letter will never go behind the curtain.

It occurs to us that Mr. Washburn's offer removes all the obstacles that had been posed. The Crusade for Freedom staff will handle the translations. They will, in effect, "deliver" the letters by telling the story of the campaign over the air, and reading selected letters in full, and this will bypass the censor. If any letter writer should inadvertently include information in violation of our own security, the Crusade people will catch that, too.

So let's go to work. Pick out a town in one of the countries behind the iron curtain. Pick out the sort of person you would like to write. Sit down and write your letter in English. Tell about yourself; about your work, about your church; your clubs. Don't try to propagandize, the people of Europe are sick unto death of propaganda. Don't be political. Just be friendly, and informative.

Here is something to remember: The people of Europe, particularly in the Balkan countries, have a vast curiosity about Texas. When Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Garlinghouse, of Amarillo, visited Yugoslavia last summer, they took their car with its Texas license. They told us when they returned that nothing they had or did caused the excitement that the little yellow tag on the back of their car elicited. Children ran after them down the street calling, "Texas," "Texas."

So talk about Texas. It would be great if some of you people living on ranches would write letters. Tell about the cowboys and the round-ups.

Also, there are people of many religions represented in these iron-curtain countries of Eastern Europe. There are, for example, lots of Methodists in Hungary. In fact, if we recall correctly, Ferenc Nagy, the exiled premier of Hungary, who now lives on a farm on the east coast of this country, is a Methodist. There are, of course, many Catholics in most of these countries, and there are Baptists, too, and others. The Orthodox

Church is represented in many of these areas. But the thing is that, while there is usually a dominant religion in each country, other churches are represented too, and while the church is being persecuted, the people hug their religious convictions to them in spite of everything the secret police can do.

So mention your church and your Sunday school.

There used to be Boy Scouts, or their counterparts, in these nations before the Reds banned such organizations and turned them into Communist youth groups. So some boy might write about his Scout troop, and the 4-H Clubs—we hope some of you young people will tell about the work you are doing on the farms in your 4-H Clubs, and with the FFA—the Future Farmers of America.

Write your letters, and send them either to us, here in Amarillo, or direct to the New York office of the Crusade for Freedom. If you send them to us, address them to Wes Izzard, the Globe-News, Amarillo, Tex. If you send them direct to the Crusade for Freedom, address them at 308 Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. We'll repeat that address: The Crusade for Freedom, 308 Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., and address them in care of Mr. Abbott Washburn.

The letters should, of course, be varied. Here is a sample of what we mean:

"To a Farm Boy in Czechoslovakia"

"DEAR FRIEND I am a Texas boy 15 years old. I live on a ranch in the Panhandle of Texas. We have cowboys on our ranch. But they don't always ride on horses; sometimes they ride in jeeps. I have a horse of my own named Buster. He is black, and is a fine roping horse. I am a member of what we call the 4-H Clubs. They are farm and ranch boys and girls, and each year I choose a project to follow. This year I am raising a fine Hereford calf and plan to show him in the Amarillo fair stock show. Mr. Smith, our county agent, shows me how to feed and take care of this calf. When I take him to the show I will sell him at auction. Maybe if he wins a prize I will get a great deal of money for him. In this way, you see, I learn not only how to do things on the ranch the best way, but I learn how much it costs to raise livestock, and how to make a profit by doing these things. I keep books on how much it costs me to raise this calf, and then when I sell him I will know whether I made a profit or not. Some day I will have a ranch of my own and I want to know how to operate it successfully, and that is why I am learning how to feed a calf and make money on him.

"I wish it were possible for you to visit me and for me to visit you. We could learn a great deal from each other. Maybe some day thousands of young people from Europe can come to America and visit, and we American boys and girls can visit you in return.

"Your friend,

"DICK JOHNSON."

Now that is, of course, just a sample. And we must break down and admit that there is just a tiny bit of propaganda in there—that bit about making a profit on the calf. But it is not obvious—and it certainly is the truth.

This program of letter writing should not, of course, be confined to the young people. Anybody can get in on it.

And if you are in doubt about the addresses to which you can send your letters so they will get into the hands of the Crusade for Freedom people, just write for a copy of this script. Just drop me a card and a copy of this script will be sent to you.

And while we're at it, we'd like to tell you just a bit more about the Crusade for Freedom. Its principal activity, as we said, is operating Radio Free Europe. There are, as we understand it, now three transmitters

blanketing the Communist areas of Eastern Europe. One is in Berlin, another in Frankfurt and the third near Munich. Each day at noon the sound of the Freedom Bell, which hangs outside the station in Berlin, rolls through these transmitters across the Communist-enslaved areas. It is a distinctive signal, as famous today as the three dots and a dash—the V-for-victory—were during World War II. It reminds all that hear it that there are millions of Americans who have forgotten them—millions of Americans who believe in personal liberty as a God-given right for all men everywhere. And at the end of each program four notes of the bell are heard with the words: "That was the Freedom Bell to remind you that you are listening to Radio Free Europe."

This organization is not Government-sponsored. It is a free-enterprise undertaking, but has the blessing of the State Department, which cannot cut loose and do the thing on its Voice of America that a group of free Americans can do on Radio Free Europe. For example, Radio Free Europe is constantly calling names of traitors to freedom in the various slave countries—men and women who have thrown in with the Reds and are spying on, and selling out, their friends. Refugees who have escaped the Communies tell their stories over Radio Free Europe, speaking directly to their friends in a language their friends can understand.

There is a growing realization that the frame-up of William Oatis, the Associated Press bureau manager, in Czechoslovakia may have been a direct result of the effectiveness of the giant 135,000-watt Radio Free Europe transmitter at Munich, which is beamed directly at the Czechs. It is probable that the Czech Reds hoped to convict Oatis, then trade his freedom for the silencing of Radio Free Europe.

The Czechs, you know, are an essentially freedom-loving people having had strong ties with the United States. Their Communist bosses have ground them down until their hope of freedom has become pretty dim. And it is probable that Radio Free Europe is slowly, surely, and deliberately fanning that spark back to life, and the Red oppressors are becoming desperate.

Radio Free Europe is doing a magnificent job—a hard-hitting job that the Government can't do. It sends messages back in behind the curtain from escapees, it identifies quislings by name, it spikes Red propaganda lies. It is feared by the Reds and blessed by the people who manage to hear it. Some of those Polish sailors who escaped recently to Sweden credited Radio Free Europe with inspiring them to try the dash for freedom.

There is nothing questionable about this outfit. If you are asked to support it—in fact, whether you are asked or not you should. Here is a way you can do something. If there is one question that is asked us more than any other about this world mess it is, "But what can I do?"

You can get behind the Crusade for Freedom. A lot of fine people are supporting it. General Eisenhower says: "In the battle for truth, you and I have a definite part to play through the Crusade for Freedom." And President Truman has said: "I hope all Americans will dedicate themselves to this critical struggle for men's minds."

The only way the Crusade for Freedom can operate, and keep Radio Free Europe on the air, is through contributions from the free men and women of America. It doesn't take much, in these days of millions and billions; but it takes some. And this month, throughout the United States, the Crusade for Freedom is seeking funds to keep going another year—and to build more and more transmitters for Radio Free Europe, and to launch a Radio Free Asia. Here in Amarillo

the Crusade for Freedom chairman is Seldon Simpson, World War II hero and son of Col. E. A. Simpson, who had a similar record in the first World War. Mr. Simpson's office is in the First National Bank Building, in case you want to talk to him about it.

But the thing we are trying to get over is simply that the Crusade for Freedom is a sound organization, backed by the finest patriots in the land. Don't be afraid of it. It is not, like so many groups using such terms as "freedom" and "peace" in their titles, a Red front organization. It is one of the bitterest and most effective foes of communism, and you can support it to the hilt without any qualms.

Now let's take the few minutes we have left and look in on a couple of the world's trouble spots we discussed last week and see what the new developments have been.

We've had a new outbreak since we took our quick tour last Monday night—the revolt in Argentina. We're not going to say a lot about it, though, because we don't know a lot about it. This is a good example of what happens when a government controls the press and radio. Except for a little truth that might leak out, the only information that comes out of such a country is what the dictator wants to get out, and that can usually be discounted about 99 percent. All we know is that an army group in Argentina revolted against the Peron regime, and that the leaders apparently were two generals who have been in and out of politics down there for years—Generals Rawson and Menendez. Rawson seems to have escaped. Menendez is in jail. A purge is now going on. Hundreds of politicians in and out of the army are being rounded up; and there is suspicion that the whole affair might have been engineered by Dictator Peron to justify such a purge. Anyway we can't get excited over it. Peron will be elected President again in a few weeks, and that will be that.

Incidentally, the editor of the great South American newspaper, *La Prensa*, seized by Peron because it criticized his administration, is going to speak over NBC and this station from Chicago tonight, at 10:30 o'clock. Since this is National Newspaper Week, and Editor Gainza Paz is much in the limelight, both as one of the world's foremost newsmen and a former power in the country where the revolt broke out last week, his remarks should be worth hearing.

As for the oil squabble in Iran, it seems no nearer a solution tonight than ever. The Security Council of the United Nations is taking the case up at the insistence of Britain, but do we hear any bets that Russia won't toss in a veto and block the whole deal?

In this connection, Leroy Pope of the United Press offered an interesting comparison today between the prospect of Iran's running her own oil industry and what happened in Mexico in 1938 when the Mexican Government expropriated the oil down there. He writes:

"As in Iran, the foreign oil companies in Mexico had been having intermittent rows with the Government since the discovery of oil around the turn of the century. The companies were the favorite targets of Mexican politicians, who accused them of imperialism, of bleeding Mexico, and of exploiting labor.

"At the time of the expropriation, Mexico was a bigger figure in the world oil picture than Persia. The Mexican Government company proved utterly unable to operate the wells and refineries and had no tankers in which to ship the oil. As a result many of the wells were ruined and production dropped to a trickle. Mexico soon was importing oil. Even the critical world need for oil during

the war did not enable the Mexican fields to revive rapidly.

"And today, 13 years after the expropriation, Mexico still is only producing a little more than half as much oil as before the expropriation and most of that is being sold to and handled by the companies who developed the wells, and from whom they were seized.

"When the fields were taken, the companies claimed the properties were worth \$400,000,000. The Anglo-Iranian properties in Persia today are said to be worth \$500,000,000—but the dollar would buy a lot more in 1938.

"The Mexicans claimed the properties were worth only about \$35,000,000. After negotiations lasting years, the claims of 17 foreign countries finally were paid off by Mexico for a total of about \$80,000,000. Some of the claims were settled privately, but the biggest were settled by negotiations between Mexico and the American, British, French, and Dutch Governments. But the expropriation taught the American companies a lesson they haven't forgotten.

"The companies got more than cash out of the settlements, in the long run they got the right to serve as middlemen for the Mexican oil at a sure profit whereas the Mexican Government now has to shoulder the big prospecting and drilling costs, and biggest item of all—the labor headaches.

"For it was the demands of the 10,000 oil-field workers in a strike in 1937 that led to the expropriation. Before that the Mexican Supreme Court had blocked attempts in 1921 and 1925 by Mexican Presidents Carranza and Calles (Kal-yez) to get control of the oil industry.

"The court said that because the concessions antedated the 1917 Mexican constitution, which reserved oil and minerals to the Republic instead of private landowners, the constitution could not be retroactive and the industry couldn't be expropriated.

"But after the 1937 strike, the Mexican Labor Board awarded the oil-field workers a 40-hour 5-day week with pay for 56 hours, paid sick leave and vacations, pay while on strike, free insurances, and free pensions amounting to 85 percent of their wages at retirement.

"This would have cost the companies \$12,000,000 a year.

"That seems a small sum now, but the oil companies thought the principles involved were important and did not realize that World War II was just around the corner. Oil was plentiful and cheap in 1938.

"Also the companies thought the Roosevelt administration should force Mexico to back down. But President Roosevelt thought otherwise—that it was strictly a Mexican matter.

"The Mexican courts upheld the Labor Board and President Lazaro Cardenas warned the oil companies they would forfeit their concessions if they did not obey the decree. The companies again refused, saying they could not afford to meet the new labor conditions.

"So the oil fields were expropriated.

"It was a big political victory for the Cardenas administration, but a costly one economically. The Mexicans naturally had great difficulty in getting any foreign help in handling their oil fields or selling the oil and could not do it themselves.

"Only now that the administration of President Aleman is showing an eagerness to cooperate with big foreign oil companies is Mexican oil again becoming an important factor in the world.

"Expropriation in Iran could have the same costly result unless a peaceable solution is found.

"Even if the Iranians should turn to the Russians to handle and market their oil it

might take a long time to get pipelines built across Persia to handle the oil."

We began this discussion by talking about letter writing. If you are still in a letter-writing mood, we suggest you might write some to the people in Washington—your Senator or Congressman or any friends you might have in the State and Defense Departments—about the latest developments in Korea.

Here are some questions you might ask them.

Do you realize that the 86,000 American battle casualties in the 15 months of the Korean war exceed those of the first 15 months of World War II?

Are there any plans, beyond further appeasement of the Chinese Reds, for ending the war?

Where are all those fantastic weapons our leaders have been bragging about? Are they being made for some future war that may never come, or will they one day be made available to the slogging GIs, now entering another winter in Korea, so that they can get the police action over with a little sooner?

Why are hundreds of thousands of American fighting men being sent to areas where there is no war, and where there may never be another war, while American GIs are fighting and dying in a war of which nobody, even our leaders, can predict an end?

Why, as the editors of United States News and World Report ask, are the fears of people in Europe, who could defend themselves if they would, getting more attention from Washington than the needs of American boys now fighting a war?

Are our leaders going to keep the Korean war going as a testing ground for future wars that may never develop, or for political reasons, or out of sheer lack of leadership?

Is General Bradley in Korea with plans for more appeasement of the Reds?

In short, Mr. Senator, or Mr. Congressman, or Mr. President, has anybody in authority any idea how or when we can expect an end to the slaughter in Korea? Has anybody any plans for victory?

New England's Attitude Toward Federal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the New England News Letter of September 1951:

NEW ENGLAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD FEDERAL POLICIES

Among the more controversial recommendations contained in the report on the New England economy, prepared for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, are those dealing with Federal contributions to improve the economy of the region. As discussion of this controversial report continues, it appears that the committee's statement regarding the attitude of New Englanders toward the acceptance of Federal aid is the core of the argument.

The text of the economy report covering these subjects follows:

"In recent years, the Federal Government's participation in the economic life of the country has grown rapidly. This has been costly to New England since the Federal Government takes much more cash out of New England than it puts in. The amount involved was about \$877,000,000 in 1948, or about 6 percent of the area's income.

"Federal policies also affect the area in other ways. Insofar as farm policies raise farm prices, New England pays more for its imports of food and raw materials. Since in the last 17 years Federal policies have tended to open New England's markets to foreign competition through tariff concessions and to raise farm prices, these Federal policies tend to favor farm against industrial interests. This tendency has worked against New England's interests. In still another field, Federal policies may injure New England's interests. The Wagner Act tended to advance unionization much more rapidly in the Northeast than in the South, and the Taft-Hartley Act tends to freeze that situation."

SHUN FEDERAL AID

"We do not mean to imply that there may not be strong arguments for these policies from a national viewpoint. In fact, we insist that some of these policies are in many ways indirectly beneficial to New England. But we would point out that a drain of resources from New England, which may have been justified as a national policy in an era when New England's per capita income was greatly in excess of that in many other regions, should now be reconsidered as the differences in per-capita income tend to diminish. New England is no longer outstandingly more prosperous than the country at large. Economic change in the last two decades has gone far toward reducing inter-regional differences in per capita income.

"One of the most perplexing problems facing New England however, is its attitude toward Federal activities. In general, influential people of New England with the important exception of many labor groups are critical of Federal policies and urge retrenchment. Moreover, they do not want to be bailed out by the Federal Government. One leading New England businessman told our committee that he regretted the publication of the study of the Boston Federal Reserve Bank which showed how much the Federal Government is draining out of this area since he feared the result would be agitation to spend more Federal money on hydroelectric and other enterprises. (In New England alone there is no Federal hydroelectric development, though there are 156 Federal hydro projects in the country.) Business leaders in New England almost universally insist that the Federal Government should not support the New England economy, and that it should not drain money out of New England.

"Here is the great issue which New Englanders will have to face. They must decide whether, as Federal operations continue to expand, New Englanders should stand idly by while their income is drained off to benefit other areas and should continue to shun Federal aid of all kinds. Or are New Englanders going to seek a larger share of the Federal outlays that increase markets, reduce costs, and bring other regional and national advantages? This is an important issue which should be understood and debated more fully by all groups in the region.

"In so far as national interest dictates farm support and tariff liberalization which may be harmful to the older industrial areas, Federal policies ought to compensate for these effects in other ways, for example, by reduction of tariffs or increased quotas on food, feed, and raw materials heavily con-

sumed in the region but not produced there in quantity; by increased slum clearance and urban redevelopment aid; by advanced legislation on working hours, minimum wages, and the like on a Federal level, and by aid to retrain and rehire older workers, possibly by remission of part of old-age pension to employers of workers over 65."

RECOMMENDATIONS

"We have shown that the net effect of Federal taxation, borrowing, and spending is a loss of about 6 percent of the area's income. Two constructive approaches to this problem are obvious. First, reduction of Federal spending, to curtail the outward drain and discourage outlays which improve the competitive position of other areas at New England's expense, second, an increase in New England's share of these outlays where such an increase is consistent with the objectives of national policy. In line with these approaches we make the following recommendations:

"1. We urge the Federal Government to be as economical as possible, given the important responsibilities thrust upon it. We do not urge an indiscriminate curtailment of Federal expenditures. But we do urge the need for careful consideration of the productiveness of various Federal expenditures and the need for efficiency in the conduct of the Federal Government.

"2. We urge the Federal Government to revise its tax structure so that the tax burden will impair incentives less and fall more on surpluses and less on costs. Thus, some shifts from business to income taxes might be helpful.

"3. We urge State and local governments to consider carefully all Federal programs which might contribute toward the improvement of the New England economy or toward a higher standard of living for its inhabitants.

"We are struck particularly by the large drains suffered by Connecticut and the relatively small outlays by the Federal Government in Connecticut. We realize, of course, that in some classes of expenditures—e.g., farm aid—New England is bound to come off badly. But we are not equally convinced of the inevitable outcome in other classes of Government expenditure—e.g., river development, housing aid, aids to recreation and to small business, and similar programs listed above.

"We take this position even though we are aware that a large segment of the New England business community on principle would not ask for Federal funds. Although this attitude is probably more prevalent in New England than in most regions, we are not convinced that this is the position of the majority of the citizens. For this reason we hope this issue will be widely discussed.

"4. We recommend that the Federal Government, in its outlays, pay more attention to the needs of the older industrial regions. For example, increased outlays on unemployment insurance via a reinsurance program or a federalization of unemployment compensation would divert a larger proportion of Federal outlays to States suffering disproportionately from unemployment. Liberalization of old-age insurance and programs for retaining older people in employment would also help New England because her proportion of older people is large.

"5. Finally, any outlays which promote mobility of workers would be especially beneficial to New England. Its history in the last generation shows that the injury done by structural maladjustment would be greatly relieved if mobility of its population were increased. For example, improved employment exchanges and financial assistance to aid in moving workers would help."

**Department of Justice Lax in Prosecuting
Administration Favorites**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the former collector of internal revenue in St. Louis was indicted and charged with accepting money from persons who faced tax difficulties and possible prosecution. This indictment would never have been returned except for the courageous insistence of United States District Judge George H. Moore, of the eastern district in Missouri. On three occasions Judge Moore spurred the grand jury on when there appeared to be a reluctance on the part of the Justice Department and the United States district attorney to push the investigation. Judge Moore's charge to the grand jury, which he delivered on March 1, authorized the grand jurors to investigate prosecuting authorities themselves when he said:

If prosecution has not been brought in cases that have been investigated and prosecution recommended by investigating officers, it may become a proper matter on investigation by you to determine why there has been no prosecution.

A former Intelligence unit agent of the Department of Internal Revenue wrote a letter charging that cases involving tax violators represented by lawyers friendly with President Truman and Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder, were not being prosecuted vigorously. Judge Moore charged that certain parties in official quarters did not show much zeal in giving the grand jurors all the assistance to which they were entitled. Judge Moore in his charge to the jury used strong language when he denounced the damnable, gnawing viper of special privilege. He referred to the fact that the law had not been applied impartially and scored tax evaders and fixers in Government circles. Judge Moore also charged that this grand jury had not received the "support and guidance which you should have received from some quarters, but failed to get."

This is another instance of the dual standard of morality applied by the Truman administration. Under this system there is one set of principles and one set of penalties for all average American citizens. Those with influence in the Truman administration, however, are subject to an entirely different set of rules and penalties. They, in truth, are the princes of privilege.

The present Attorney General of the United States, J. Howard McGrath, was chairman of the Democratic National Committee before he became Attorney General. Mr. McGrath, prior to that, was the dominant figure in Rhode Island Democratic politics. Mr. McGrath knows the efficacy of political favors in building

up a political machine. In view of the fact that there has been reluctance on behalf of the agents of the Department of Justice to enforce the law, as clearly demonstrated in Judge Moore's charge, it must be assumed that pressure was put on from the top to take it easy on administration favorites. If this is a fact, the Attorney General is directly responsible. The Attorney General, as the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, must be above suspicion. He should not be subject to the charge of tampering with justice for political motives. This St. Louis grand jury case has caused Attorney General McGrath to be put in such a light that his effectiveness has been destroyed. He should resign immediately. The position of chairman of the Democratic National Committee is vacant. If Mr. McGrath wants to play politics, he should once again become the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, but he should not play politics as the Attorney General of the United States.

Recent news releases state that Judge George H. Moore, senior Federal judge of the eastern district of Missouri, has charged that the Department of Justice refused to cooperate in the investigation by the grand jury which brought about the indictment of James P. Finnegan, collector of internal revenue in St. Louis. Judge Moore stated that the Justice Department channels for obtaining aid in this grand jury investigation were "dammed up and blocked up."

The Attorney General has now replied that Judge Moore's statements are "damnable and contemptible lies." Such mouthings from the Attorney General of the United States were "damnable and contemptible" themselves and proved beyond a doubt that McGrath should be ousted immediately.

This statement of the Attorney General of the United States proves beyond a doubt that he has outlived whatever usefulness he might have been as Attorney General of the United States. He has cast a reflection upon the character of the senior district judge of Missouri, who has a reputation of being a most able jurist as well as a man of impeccable character. Judge Moore is held in the highest esteem by all the members of the bar as well as the citizens of Missouri. He is a distinguished judge and a man of the highest character and ability.

It is a disgrace for a cheap politician like J. Howard McGrath, the former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, to cast such aspersions upon a very distinguished jurist such as Judge George H. Moore. It proves beyond a doubt that McGrath should resign or be ousted and return to the corrupt political field where he fills the necessary qualifications much better than as Attorney General of the United States.

The breakdown of law enforcement, particularly in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, must be attributable to the refusal, neglect, negligence, or connivance of the Justice Department under a discredited Attorney General.

The Late Karl Stefan

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the following statement has been sent to me by Daniel Francis Clancy—Chief Big Writer—continental chief of the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians. It pertains to the life and work of our late colleague, the Honorable Karl Stefan. I wish to extend my remarks by including this statement:

The recent death of Congressman Karl Stefan is greatly regretted by the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians.

Representative Stefan, who was appointed a continental councilman in this confederation a few days before his death, was the most adopted Member of Congress. He had been inducted into four Indian tribes.

My regret is expressed in behalf of the State great chiefs of our confederation—Hon. James A. Farley, of New York; Gov. G. Menen Williams, of Michigan; Mgr. Nicholas Wegner, of Nebraska; Congressman E. Y. Berry, of South Dakota; Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio; George H. Bechtel, of Kentucky; Rod Van Every, of Wisconsin; B. W. Jolly, of Oklahoma; William E. Grace, of California; and Charles L. Anderson, of Indiana—along with members of our national advisory board, which is headed by George M. Barmann, of Ohio.

America's adopted Indians mourn the loss of a fellow, and I am sure the Indians feel the loss of a friend.

DANIEL FRANCIS CLANCY,
Continental Chief, Continental Con-
federation of Adopted Indians.
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

The Rights of 14,000 Farmers

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Los Angeles Times of October 10 clearly expresses my sentiments in connection with this problem in southern California:

THE RIGHTS OF 14,000 FARMERS

Rarely has a Federal officeholder expressed such contempt for Congress and ordinary citizens as was voiced here Monday by United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath in commenting upon his Federal suit to seize water rights in the Fallbrook-Camp Pendleton area.

McGrath bluntly inquired, in effect, what harm was being done by the suit and why all the fuss?

NOTHING UNUSUAL?

The mere fact that 14,000 farmers and their families are being summoned into Federal court to try to save their water from a Federal claim of "paramount" rights apparently was of no importance to him at all.

The fact that all must hire attorneys and fight the United States Government to try to rescue their farms and homes seemingly is of no consequence. The fact that established rights dating back almost a century are being challenged with all the power and might and money of the United States Government obviously does not impress him.

McGrath, in fact, stated that there is nothing "unusual" about the suit and that the Government is not claiming anything more than a private citizen might claim.

What private citizen could sue 14,000 defendants, send deputized United States marshals scurrying across the countryside serving complaints, dispatch helicopters over the homes of thousands of defendants to take pictures, set up an office inside a military base and man it with Marine officers and snap his fingers at aroused public opinion?

CALLOUS ATTITUDE

The callous attitude of the United States Attorney General, who should be concerned with the rights of American citizens rather than engaged in an attempt to destroy those rights and the amazing disclosures made Monday before a congressional investigating committee in Washington concerning the Fallbrook case combine to indicate the necessity for renewed efforts to repudiate the doctrines enunciated by McGrath's office.

The attempted brushing aside by McGrath of the congressional committees inquiring into the Fallbrook case may of course be mere bravado.

It bears every evidence, however, of a genuine feeling of contempt for the Congressmen attempting to remedy the situation he has created with the suit.

In addition, the complete lack of a reasonable or common-sense basis for the gigantic suit was evidenced again in Washington when an official spokesman for the Navy testified that Camp Pendleton needs only about 4,000 acre-feet (an acre-foot is about 325,000 gallons) a year maximum. Yet the Federal suit demands 35,000 acre-feet a year—and the average flow of the Santa Margarita River is only about 25,000 acre-feet.

Despite the attitude of the Federal officials one thing has been accomplished to lessen the hardship inflicted upon the Santa Margarita farmers. This is the delay granted them in the time required for filing answers to the Federal suit.

THE GRACE PERIOD

Originally any farmer who failed to hire counsel and file a formal answer in court within 20 days faced automatic forfeiture of his rights.

The Times and certain Congressmen protested so loudly over this that the United States Attorney General was compelled to ask the court to extend this period. The grace period was extended to November 1. Now, according to the United States Attorney General, a new extension will be sought.

Even this is merely temporary, however.

The basic question is whether the Attorney General should have embarked upon the suit in the first place or whether he should persist in it now.

Much evidence points to the fact that even though the suit has proved to be an enormous mistake McGrath does not dare give it up. Loss of face is involved.

So, according to his interview here, the suit will continue unless Congress by specific enactment causes its abandonment.

That of course is what Congress is working on right now. But time before adjournment is short. The legislation may not clear all the hurdles before the session ends. That would mean January or February before action can be taken to halt McGrath.

Meantime the battle must go on unabated. Great principles are involved.

Californians cannot surrender to Federal domination and confiscation of this character.

Appoint Cadets and Midshipmen From the Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, a month or so ago, I introduced a bill, H. R. 5202, which provides that all cadets and midshipmen must, before their appointment to West Point or Annapolis, serve at least 1 year as enlisted men, and must successfully pass a competitive screening examination before nomination. My bill also provides that Reserve cadets and midshipmen shall not be appointed to the various Reserve Officer Training Corps college programs unless they shall first have served at least 1 year in the enlisted ranks of civilian components of the armed services. They, too, must pass a competitive, screening examination.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, has created a great deal of interest, and is being met with favor, almost universally. I fully realize that to be effective many details must be worked out, but the basic idea has met with little unfavorable comment.

Some comment has been made, however, that service in the enlisted ranks would retard a prospective officer; increase the average age of commissioning as ensign or second lieutenant. This delay, it has been suggested, would retard their careers.

I discount this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, because this Congress has already gone on record as favoring universal military service, and that program will retard the careers of all young men.

Mr. Speaker, in order to throw some light on the type of officer we may expect from the enlisted ranks I have asked the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to furnish me with a list of general and flag officers who had enlisted service. Some of these officers entered the academies from the ranks, others were commissioned through other channels. The armed services also sent me the official biographies of these men.

As a part of my remarks, I include a list of these officers, showing their ranks, the theaters of operation in which they served during World War II, and whether they have been in combat in the United Nations action in Korea. I also list the medals each has earned.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this list shows that these officers are some of the finest we have on duty today. I call particular attention to Major General Dean, who is still technically carried as on active duty, but whose heroism may have

cost him his life in Korea. His case is well known to us all. I noticed also the name of Gen "Chesty" Fuller, a real Marine Corps hero, whose exploits in Korea are also well known to us all. I could single out many more for comment, but the listing suffices.

Many Members of Congress, in both Houses, have seen military service. To indicate the type of man we could expect from the enlisted ranks, I have listed Senators and Representatives who have served as enlisted men. Many of these men served as both enlisted men and officers. It is interesting to note that each House has a man who served in all ranks from private to major general. They are the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

I have had the list of Congressmen and Senators compiled from information contained in the Congressional Directory. In many cases it was not clear whether a Member served as an enlisted man. If I have omitted any Members it was due to this.

The above-mentioned follows:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO HAVE SERVED AS ENLISTED MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

ALABAMA

EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIFD, Member of Congress

LAURIE C. BATTLE, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

ARKANSAS

BOYD TACKETT, Member of Congress

CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks)

JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks)

DONALD L. JACKSON, Member of Congress.
CARL HINSHAW, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks)

COLORADO

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks).

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

CONNECTICUT

JAMES T. PATTERSON, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

GEORGIA

PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

E. L. FORRESTER, Member of Congress.
JAMES C. DAVIS, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks)

W. M. (DON) WHITLER, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

IDAHIO

HERMAN WELKER, United States Senate.

ILLINOIS

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks)

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks)

FRED E. EUSDEY, Member of Congress.
LEO E. ALLIN, Member of Congress.
HAROLD H. VELDE, Member of Congress.
MELVIN PRICE, Member of Congress.

INDIANA

HOMER E. CAPEHART, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks).

SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

WINFIELD K. BENJON, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

IOWA

GUY M. GILLETTE, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks).
KARL M. LeCOMPTÉ, Member of Congress.

KANSAS

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Member of Congress.
MYRON V. GEORGE, Member of Congress.

KENTUCKY

EARLE C. CLEMENTS, United States Senator (commissioned from ranks).
CARL D. PERKINS, Member of Congress.

LOUISIANA

OVERTON BROOKS, Member of Congress.

MAINE

OWEN BREWSTER, United States Senator (commissioned from ranks).
ROBERT HALE, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).

MARYLAND

J. GLENN BEALL, Member of Congress.

MICHIGAN

CHARLES E. POTTER, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).
JOHN LEWINSKI, JR., Member of Congress.

MISSISSIPPI

FRANK E. SMITH, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).

MISSOURI

CLAIRE MAGLE, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).
O. K. ARMSTRONG, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).

MONTANA

ZALF N. ETON, United States Senator.
MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, Member of Congress.

NEVADA

GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator, (commissioned from ranks).

NEW JERSEY

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, United States Senator, (commissioned from ranks).
GORDON CANFIELD, Member of Congress.
PETER W. RODINO, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).
HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).
BERNARD W. KILARNEY, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).
KENNETH B. KEATING, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, Member of Congress.
WILLIAM E. MILLER, Member of Congress, (commissioned from ranks).

NORTH CAROLINA

HERBERT C. BONNER, Member of Congress.
THURMOND CHATHAM, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

OHIO

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Member of Congress.

OKLAHOMA

CARL ALBERT, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
TOM STELL, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
JOHN JARMAN, Member of Congress.
TOBY MORRIS, Member of Congress.

PENNSYLVANIA

EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator (commissioned from ranks).
WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., Member of Congress.
PAUL B. DAGUE, Member of Congress.
ALVIN R. BUSH, Member of Congress.
LEON H. GAVIN, Member of Congress.
JAMES F. LIND, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
EDWARD L. SITTER, Jr., Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

SOUTH CAROLINA

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, United States Senate.
W. J. BRYAN DOWN, Member of Congress.
JOSEPH R. BRYSON, Member of Congress.
JAMES P. RICHARDS, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
JOHN L. McMILLAN, Member of Congress.

TENNESSEE

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
JERR COOPER, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

TEXAS

TOM CONNALLY, United States Senate (commissioned from ranks).
WRIGHT PATMAN, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
OLIN E. TRAGUE, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
CLARK W. THOMPSON, Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).
WINGATE H. LUCAS, Member of Congress.
LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Jr., Member of Congress (commissioned from ranks).

UNITED STATES ARMY GENERAL OFFICERS WITH ENLISTED SERVICE

Lutes, Lt. Gen. Leroy, ETO, Pacific; Bronze Star, Legion of Merit; DSM; Honorary Commander, the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.

McLain, Lt. Gen. Raymond S., ETO; DSM; DSC, Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star, Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre; Netherlands Order of Orange-Nassau, Grand Officer with Swords; Commander, Belgian Order of Leopold with Palm, Belgian Croix de Guerre.

Armstrong, Maj. Gen. George E., China-Burma-India; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon; Chinese Cloud Banner and Ribbon, and Honorary Nobility Ribbon. Beiderlinden, Maj. Gen. William A., ETO, Far East.

Beightler, Maj. Gen. Robert S., Pacific; DSC, DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Purple Heart; Legion of Merit, Cluster.

Chase, Maj. Gen. William C., Pacific, DSC; DSM, Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Purple Heart, Army Commendation Ribbon.

Clarke, Maj. Gen. Bruce C., ETO, Pacific; DSC, DSM, Silver Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Medal; Commendation Ribbon, French Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre and Fourragere, Belgian Croix de Guerre with Palm.

Collier, Maj. Gen. John H., ETO; DSM; Legion of Merit; Silver Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Russian Order of Alexander Nevsky; Netherlands Order of Orange-Nassau, Belgian Croix de Guerre with Fourragere.

Dean, Maj. Gen. William F., ETO, Pacific, Korea; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, DSC; DSM.

Eberle, Maj. Gen. George L., ETO, DSM; Legion of Merit; Commander of the British Empire; French Legion of Honor; Brazilian Medal; Italian Commander, Sts. Maurice and Lazarus.

Feldman, Maj. Gen. Herman, ETO; Legion of Merit; DSM.

Frederick, Maj. Gen. Robert T., ETO; DSC, Oak Leaf Cluster, DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Air Medal; Purple Heart, seven Oak Leaf Clusters; numerous foreign decorations.

Gavin, Maj. Gen. James M., ETO; unknown.
Grow, Maj. Gen. Robert W., ETO; DSC; DSM; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, French Legion of

Honor and Croix de Guerre; Belgian Croix de Guerre; Luxemburg Order Nationale de la Couronne.

Hellemann, Maj. Gen. Frank A., Pacific; DSM, Legion of Merit; Bronze Star; Army Commendation Ribbon.

Hershey, Maj. Gen. Lewis B., France; DSM; DSM (Navy); DSM (American Legion).

Hickey, Maj. Gen. Thomas F., Pacific, ETO; DSM, Silver Star, Legion of Merit; Air Medal; Army Commendation Ribbon; Purple Heart; and the French Order of Palms.

Horkan, Maj. Gen. George A., ETO, DSM.

Irvine, Maj. Gen. Willard W., Pacific; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster.

Jaynes, Maj. Gen. Lawrence C., ETO; DSM; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star; Army Commendation Ribbon; British Companion of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath; French Legion of Honor, degree of officer and legionnaire first class; the Brazilian Medal of War; and from Italy, the Italian Cross of the Grand Officers in the Order of Sts. Maurice and Lazarus and the Order of the Crown of Italy.

Jenkins, Maj. Gen. Reuben E., ETO; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon; Commander, Order of the British Empire; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre; Greek degree of commander, Royal Order of King George I.

Lanahan, Maj. Gen. Francis H., ETO; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star; Order of the British Empire, French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre; Luxemburg Grand Ducal de la Couronne de Chene; Belgian L'Ordre de la Couronne avec Palme and Croix de Guerre.

Lewis, Maj. Gen. John T., ETO; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster, and decorations from French, British, Dutch, Belgian, and Polish Governments.

Mathewson, Maj. Gen. Lemuel, ETO, Legion of Merit, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Bronze Star; French Legion of Honor; Belgian Croix de Guerre; Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle.

McKee, Maj. Gen. John L., ETO; Legion of Merit, Silver Star; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; French Croix de Guerre with Palms.

Noce, Maj. Gen. Daniel, ETO, DSM, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Legion of Merit; Brazilian Order of Military Merit, Order of the Bath; Belgian Croix de Guerre and Order of the Crown; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre, and from Italy the Order of the Crown of Italy, Medal of the Volunteers of Liberty, the Lateran Cross of the Vatican State, and the Polish Gold Cross of Merit with Swords.

Parks, Maj. Gen. Floyd L., ETO; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star; Air Medal; Commendation Ribbon; Abdon Calderon, Third Class (Equador); Companion of the Bath (Great Britain); Order of Kutuzov, First Class (Russia); Order of Polonia Restituta, Commanders Cross (Poland); Order of Dannabrog, Commander First Class (Denmark); Legion of Honor (France); Order of Orange-Nassau (Netherlands); Belgian Croix de Guerre.

O'Daniel, Maj. Gen. John W., ETO, Korea; DSC; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit, Silver Star, one cluster, Air Medal; Bronze Star, two Clusters; French Croix de Guerre and Legion of Honor, Italian Silver Medal; Purple Heart.

Rice, Maj. Gen. John K., ETO, Pacific, Korea; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; and the French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palms.

Sawyer, Maj. Gen. Bickford E., Pacific; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon, Oak Leaf Cluster.

Shea, Maj. Gen. George D., ETO; DSM; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Dutch Order of Orange-Nassau.

Shepard, Maj. Gen. Whitfield P., ETO; DSM; Legion of Merit

Thorson, Maj. Gen. Truman C., ETO, DSM; Legion of Merit.

Timberman, Maj. Gen. Thomas S., Far East; Legion of Merit, two Oak Leaf Clusters; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster; Commander of the British Empire; Siamese Order of the White Elephant; and Chinese Special Collar Order of Yun-Hui Medal, Special Collar Order of the Precious Tripod, Special Breast Order of the Precious Tripod.

Weible, Maj. Gen. Walter L., Pacific; DSM; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon

Whitlock, Maj. Gen. Lester J., Pacific; DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster, Legion of Merit; Honorary Commander of the British Empire; Distinguished Service Star of the Philippines. Young, Maj. Gen. Robert N., ETO, Silver Star; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Purple Heart, DSM

Balmer, Brig. Gen. Jeasmond D., ETO, DSM; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star.

Bell, Brig. Gen. Marcus B., Pacific, Silver Star; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster

Brittingham, Brig. Gen. James F., ETO; DSM, Bronze Star; Legion of Merit; Purple Heart, Silver Star.

Brown, Brig. Gen. Robert W., Far East; Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Ribbon.

Campbell, Brig. Gen., Boniface, Pacific; Legion of Merit

Carter, Brig. Gen. Leslie D., ETO; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster

Clarke, Brig. Gen. Carter W., Pacific, DSM, Conley, Brig. Gen. Joseph P., ETO; DSM; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star; Army Commendation Ribbon, Oak Leaf Cluster

Crawford, Brig. Gen. David J., ETO; Legion of Merit

Cross, Brig. Gen. Thomas J., ETO, Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster, Silver Star; Bronze Star, two Clusters, Army Commendation Ribbon

Davis, Brig. Gen. Merle H., Pacific; Legion of Merit, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster

Deitrick, Brig. Gen. Carroll H., ETO, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star

DeShazo, Brig. Gen. Thomas E., ETO, Korea; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Medal.

Eastwood, Brig. Gen. Harold E., Pacific; DSM, Legion of Merit.

Elder, Brig. Gen. Eugene V., ETO; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon

Feringa, Brig. Gen. Peter A., ETO, Silver Star Cluster, Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star, three clusters, Purple Heart, British Military Medal

Ferrin, Brig. Gen. Charles S., Pacific, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star

Fitts, Brig. Gen. William T., ETO; DSC; Purple Heart, Legion of Merit; Silver Star; Bronze Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Army Commendation Ribbon.

Grice, Brig. Gen. Letcher O., Pacific; Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Ribbon, two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Guest, Brig. Gen. Wesley T., ETO; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star

Hammond, Brig. Gen. Elton F., ETO; DSM; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster.

Harrison, Brig. Gen. Eugene L., ETO; DSM; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star.

Hastings, Brig. Gen. Kester L.

Hendrix, Brig. Gen. Raleigh R., ETO; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star.

Hess, Brig. Gen. John B., ETO; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star.

Higgins, Brig. Gen. Gerald J., ETO; Silver Star, Legion of Merit; Bronze Star; Belgian Fourragere and Croix de Guerre with Palm; French Legion of Honor, Fourragere and

Croix de Guerre with Palm; Order of Leopold I and II; Order of Orange Nassau.

Honnen, Brig. Gen. George, Pacific; unknown.

Jacobs, Brig. Gen. Fenton S., ETO, Pacific; DSM; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Commander of the British Empire; Belgian Order of Leopold II

Kiefer, Brig. Gen. Homer W., Pacific; DSM; Silver Star; Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal; Air Medal.

Klein, Brig. Gen. John A., ETO; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, Army Commendation Ribbon

Kurtz, Brig. Gen. Guy O., ETO; Legion of Merit; Silver Star, Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal; Commander of the British Empire; French Croix de Guerre, Grand Officer Crown of Italy, Brazilian War Medal.

Lastayo, Brig. Gen. Edward H., ETO, DSM; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon

Lieber, Brig. Gen. Albert C., ETO, Silver Star, Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Army Commendation Ribbon, French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm, and the Luxemburg and Belgian Croix de Guerre

Maglin, Brig. Gen. William H., ETO, Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster, Army Commendation Ribbon

McConnell, Brig. Gen. Frank C., Pacific; Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal.

McFadyen, Brig. Gen. Bernice M., ETO; Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Army Commendation Ribbon, Oak Leaf Cluster

Michaelis, Brig. Gen. John H., ETO, Korea; DSC; Air Medal, Silver Star; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Oak Leaf Cluster, French Croix de Guerre with Palm; Belgian Fourragere and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Netherlands Bronze Lion.

Mood, Brig. Gen. Orlando C., ETO, Korea; Legion of Merit, two Oak Leaf Clusters, DSM; Army Commendation Ribbon, French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm, Belgian Order of Leopold with Palm and Croix de Guerre with Palm, Luxemburg Croix de Guerre.

North, Brig. Gen. Thomas, France; DSM; Purple Heart; French Order of University Palms, Brazilian Order of Knight of the National Order of the Southern Cross.

Pence, Brig. Gen. Charles W., ETO, DSM; Silver Star; Bronze Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters; Army Commendation Ribbon, Purple Heart

Peploe, Brig. Gen. George B., ETO, Korea; Legion of Merit, Silver Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters, Bronze Star, DSC.

Post, Brig. Gen. Elwyn D., Pacific, Korea; Legion of Merit; DSM, Army Commendation Ribbon.

Read, Brig. Gen. George W., Jr., ETO, DSM; Silver Star, Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster, French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Chilean Order of Merit, Belgian Croix de Guerre with Palm; Luxembourg Couronne de Chene and Croix de Guerre with Palm.

Robert, Brig. Gen. Frank N., Far East; Navy Cross, DSM, two Oak Leaf Clusters

Sams, Brig. Gen. Crawford F., Pacific, Middle East; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Army Commendation Ribbon; United States Typhus Commission Medal; Order of the British Empire and British African Star.

Smith, Brig. Gen. Wayne C., Pacific; Bronze Star; Legion of Merit; Soldiers Medal.

Smythe, Brig. Gen. George W., ETO; Purple Heart; DSC; Bronze Star; Silver Star; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre; Russian Medal of Bravery; Most Excellent Order of the British Empire; Belgian Officer of Order of Leopold with Palm, Croix de Guerre

with Palm, and Fourragere with two Citations.

Standlee, Brig. Gen. Earle, ETO; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster

Stokes, Brig. Gen. John H., Jr., ETO; Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star; Army Commendation Ribbon; Russian Order of the Wars of the Fatherland, French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; the Czechoslovakian War Cross.

Thornton, Brig. Gen. Richard B., ETO; Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Ribbon

Tychsen, Brig. Gen. Andrew C., ETO, Korea, Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster, French Fourragere with Star and Fourragere with Palm; Chinese Special Order of Yun-Hui.

Uncles, Brig. Gen. John F., ETO; Bronze Star, Legion of Merit, DSM.

Van Brunt, Brig. Gen. Rinaldo, ETO, Korea; DSM; Silver Star; Bronze Star; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palms

Waldron, Brig. Gen. Norman E., Pacific; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star

Watson, Brig. Gen. Numa A., ETO, Korea; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon; Purple Heart; Bronze Star

Weckerling, Brig. Gen. John, Pacific; DSM; Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Ribbon; Belgian Order of Leopold II

Williams, Brig. Gen. Samuel T., ETO; Purple Heart, Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star; Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star, Army Commendation Ribbon; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Czechoslovakian Order of the White Lion and War Cross, Russian Order of the Red Banner

Wright, Brig. Gen. Edwin K., ETO, Far East, Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm, Order of the British Empire; Luxemburg Couronne de Cheve and Croix de Guerre; Belgian Order of Leopold and Croix de Guerre with Palm.

NATIONAL GUARD GENERAL OFFICERS WITH ENLISTED SERVICES

Fleming, Raymond H., DSM; Army Commendation Ribbon.

Hudelson, Daniel H., ETO; Silver Star; Bronze Star, French Croix de Guerre, Order of Goums, Moroccians

Strickler, Daniel B., ETO; Legion of Merit; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Purple Heart, French Croix de Guerre, Belgian Croix de Guerre; Belgian Order of Leopold, Verdun Medal.

Abendroth, William H., Pacific, Legion of Merit.

Bettenburg, Philip C., ETO.

Eaton, Homer O., Jr., Pacific; Silver Star; Bronze Star

Naylor, William H., Pacific; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster.

UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE GENERAL OFFICERS WITH ENLISTED SERVICE

Milton, Maj. Gen. Hugh M., II, Pacific; Legion of Merit; Silver Star, Bronze Star, Oak Leaf Cluster.

White, Maj. Gen. Miller G., ETO, DSM, Oak Leaf Cluster.

Vaughan, Maj. Gen. Harry H., Pacific; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star.

Biddle, Brig. Gen. Anthony J. D., ETO; Legion of Merit; Order of the British Empire; French Legion of Honor; French Croix de Guerre; Palmes d'Academies; French Fourragere of the Legion of Honor; Cross of Valor, Poland; Polonia Restituta, Poland; Grand Cross of the Order of St. Olav, Norway; Grand Cross of Orange-Nassau, Netherlands, Order of Merit, First Class,

Yugoslavia; Order of the Crown of Yugoslavia; Grand Cross of the Czechoslovakian Order of the White Lion; Czechoslovakian Medal of Merit; Order of Leopold, Belgium; Order de la couronne de la Chene, Luxembourg; Ordine della Corona d'Italia; Military Cross First Class, Belgium; Meritorious Medal of the State of Pennsylvania for cementing Polish-American Relations
 Danford, Brig. Gen. Edward C., Jr.; Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster.

UNITED STATES NAVY FLAG OFFICERS WITH ENLISTED SERVICE

Foskett, Rear Adm James H., Atlantic; Legion of Merit, Commendation Ribbon; Order of the British Empire, Commander.
 Goodwin, Rear Adm Hugh H., Pacific; Bronze Star, Legion of Merit.
 Hague, Rear Adm Wesley McL., Pacific; Legion of Merit, Gold Star.
 Henderson, Rear Adm. George R., Pacific; Legion of Merit, Four Gold Stars; Purple Heart, Oulssam Allouite, French Moroccan, and the Medal of Grand Commander in the Order of King George I of Greece.
 Miles, Rear Adm. Milton E., Pacific, DSM; Legion of Merit, one cluster, Purple Heart with Gold Star, three times received Order of Yun Hui from China
 McConnell, Rear Adm Robert P., Pacific, Asiatic, Silver Star; Navy Unit Citation.
 McMahon, Rear Adm Frederick W., Pacific, Legion of Merit, Commendation Ribbon, Presidential Unit Citation.
 McQuiston, Rear Adm Irvin M., Pacific; Legion of Merit
 Pride, Rear Adm. Alfred M., Pacific; Legion of Merit; Commendation Ribbon; Presidential Unit Citation
 Stokes, Rear Adm. Thomas M., Atlantic, Pacific; Navy Cross.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS GENERAL OFFICERS WITH ENLISTED SERVICE

Cooley, Brig Gen Albert D., Pacific; Navy Cross, Bronze Star, Air Medal, Presidential Unit Citation.
 Cushman, Maj Gen. Thomas J., Pacific; Bronze Star, Legion of Merit.
 Fellers, Brig. Gen William S., Pacific; Legion of Merit, one Gold Star, Presidential Unit Citation, one Star; Nicaraguan Medal of Distinction with Diploma
 Halla, Brig Gen John, Hawaii; Secretary of Navy Commendation
 Liversedge, Brig. Gen Harry B., Pacific; Navy Cross with Gold Star, Letter of Commendation with Ribbon; Presidential Unit Citation
 Meece, Maj Gen Vernon E., Pacific, Bronze Star, Legion of Merit; Navy and Marine Corps Medal; Peruvian Aviation Cross, First Class.
 McKittrick, Brig. Gen William L., Pacific; Legion of Merit, one Gold Star; Nicaraguan Cross of Valor with Diploma
 Pate, Brig Gen Randolph McCall, Pacific; Legion of Merit, Gold Star, Presidential Unit Citation with one Star
 Puller, Brig. Gen Lewis B., Pacific, Korea; Navy Cross with three Gold Stars; DSC; Silver Star, Bronze Star, Purple Heart; Presidential Unit Citation with two Bronze Stars; Legion of Merit, Haitian Military Medal; Nicaraguan Presidential Medal of Merit; Nicaraguan Cross of Valor; Korean Presidential Unit Citation.
 Rea, Brig. Gen. Leonard E., France, Pacific; Navy Cross; DSC; Silver Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; Purple Heart; Legion of Merit; Nicaraguan Medal of Merit with Diploma, and the Netherlands Order of Commander of the Orange Nassau with Swords.
 Robillard, Brig. Gen. Fred S., France, Pacific; Navy Cross; Legion of Merit; Haitian Distinguished Service Medal; and from the Netherlands the Order of Orange Nassau with Swords, Commander.

Robinson, Maj Gen. Ray A., Pacific; Legion of Merit with Gold Star; Bronze Star; Presidential Unit Citation with two Stars, Navy Unit Commendation with Bronze Star.

Sanderson, Brig Gen Lawson H. M., Pacific; DFC, Presidential Unit Citation; Legion of Merit; Nicaraguan Medal of Merit with Silver Star

Schilt, Maj Gen. Christian F., Pacific; Congressional Medal of Honor; Bronze Star; Legion of Merit, Presidential Unit Citation; Nicaraguan Medal of Merit with Silver Star; Nicaraguan Cross of Valor with Diploma.

Selden, Maj Gen. John T., Pacific; Bronze Star; two Legions of Merit; Presidential Unit Citation with one Bronze Star, Navy Unit Citation with two Bronze Stars

Silverthorn, Lt Gen. Merwin H., Pacific; Navy Cross, DSC; DSM, Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster; Legion of Merit; Letter of Commendation with Ribbon, Purple Heart; French Croix de Guerre, French Fourragere; Presidential Unit Citation with one Star

Thomas, Maj. Gen Gerald C., Pacific; Korea; DSM; Silver Star, Purple Heart; Legion of Merit with Gold Star, Presidential Unit Citation with one Star; Commander in the Order of Orange Nassau with Crossed Swords, French Fourragere

Wensinger, Brig Gen. Walter W., Pacific; Navy Cross; Legion of Merit, Roi-Namur with Gold Star, Presidential Unit Citation with two Stars, Nicaraguan Medal of Merit with Diploma; and a special letter of commendation by the Secretary of Navy

Whaling, Big Gen. William J., Pacific; Navy Cross; Silver Star; Legion of Merit with Gold Star; Purple Heart; Haitian Order of Honor and Merit, Haitian Distinguished Service Medal; Bronze Star, Presidential Unit Citation with two Stars, Chinese Order of the Cloud and Banner

Williams, Brig Gen. Gregon A., Pacific; Korea, Navy Cross, Bronze Star, Legion of Merit, special letter of commendation by the Secretary of the Navy, Presidential Unit Citation, Dominican Medal of Merit, Nicaraguan Cross of Valor and Diploma.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE GENERAL OFFICERS WITH ENLISTED SERVICE

Armstrong Maj Gen. Harry G., Eighth Air Force, England, Legion of Merit, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Order of the British Empire; French and Belgian Croix de Guerre and Palms

Banfill, Brig Gen Charles Y., ETO, Okinawa; Legion of Merit

Barker, Maj Gen John DeF., ETO, Legion of Merit, DSM

Beau, Maj Gen. Lucas V., Pacific, ETO; Legion of Merit

Bevans, Maj Gen James M., ETO, DSM; Legion of Merit, Bronze Star.

Bondley, Brig Gen Charles J., Jr., Africa, Italy, Far East, Legion of Merit, one Oak Leaf Cluster; DFC, Bronze Star.

Borum, Maj Gen Fred S., ETO; Legion of Merit, Commendation Ribbon, Grand Officer, Order of the Crown of Italy

Brandt, Maj Gen Carl A., ETO, Pacific; DSM, DFC, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Legion of Merit, one Oak Leaf Cluster; Army Commendation Ribbon

Carroll, Maj Gen. Franklin O., Far East; DSM

Carter, Maj Gen Warren R., Southwest Pacific, Far East; Legion of Merit; DSM

Chapman, Maj. Gen. Thomas H., Far East; Legion of Merit.

Chauncey, Maj Gen. Charles C., Eighth Air Force, England; Legion of Merit; DSM, one Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star.

Cook, Lt. Gen. Orval R., Southwest Pacific; Legion of Merit; DSM.

Craig, Lt Gen Howard A., ETO, North Africa; Legion of Merit; DSM; one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Dillon, Maj. Gen. Joseph DeP., North Africa ETO; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, C. B. E.; Italian Grand Commander, Crown of Italy; Imperial Capitol Military Order of St. George of Corinthia; Cavalier of the Grand Cross of Merit; Moroccan Oulssam Alouite, Grand Officer.

Douglass, Maj. Gen. Robert W., Jr., Pacific; Legion of Merit; D. F. C.; Bronze Star; Air Medal.

Eubank, Maj. Gen Eugene L., ETO, Pacific; D. S. M., Silver Star; D. F. C., one oak-leaf cluster.

Ferguson, Brig. Gen. James, ETO; Legion of Merit, one oak-leaf cluster; Bronze Star, one cluster; D. F. C.; and Air Medal, one cluster.

Gates, Brig Gen. Byron E., South Atlantic; Legion of Merit

Hayden, Brig. Gen. Gilbert, Pacific, Far East, Legion of Merit; Silver Star, Bronze Star.

Haynes, Maj. Gen. Caleb V., Burma, China; D. S. M.; Silver Star, one cluster, D. F. C., two clusters; Air Medal, one cluster; Commendation Ribbon, one cluster.

Hicks, Brig. Gen. Joseph H., Far East; Legion of Merit.

Hoag, Maj. Gen. Earl S., Africa, China, ETO, Legion of Merit; DSM, Air Medal, Commendation Ribbon; British Honorary Companion, Most Excellent Order of the Bath; Norwegian Order of St. Olav, Commander with Star, Chinese Special Collar Order of Yun-Hui; French Legion of Honor, Chevalier, and Croix de Guerre with palm.

Hodges, Major Gen. James P., Eight Air Force, England; D. S. M., one cluster; Silver Star; D. F. C.; Air Medal, Order of the British Empire, French National Order of the Legion of Honor, Belgian Croix de Guerre with palm; Chinese Special Necklet Cloud Banner.

Hovey, Brig Gen. Burton M., ETO; Legion of Merit, one cluster; Bronze Star.

Ignico, Brig. Gen. Robert V., Aleutians; Legion of Merit, one cluster, Air Medal, Army Commendation Ribbon.

Irvine, Maj Gen. Clarence S., Pacific; Legion of Merit; D. S. M., Silver Star, D. F. C., one cluster, Bronze Star; and Air Medal, one cluster.

Johnson, Brig. Gen. Bertrand E., China; Legion of Merit.

Johnson, Maj Gen. Harry A., England, Far East, Legion of Merit, one Cluster; DFC; Air Medal, one Cluster; Cruze de Boyaca from Republic of Colombia; and Commanders Cross of Orange Nassau with Swords from the Netherlands

Kane, Brig Gen. Clarence P., ETO; Legion of Merit, DSM, Bronze Star.

Kepner, Lt Gen. William E., ETO, Pacific, DSC; Purple Heart; DFC; DSM, Bronze Star; Air Medal; Legion of Merit, two Clusters; Commander of French Legion of Honor; British Order of Commander of the Bath; Polish Restitute; Belgian Order of Crown; French Croix de Guerre with Palm; Chinese Special Necklace, Paoting, Belgian Croix de Guerre with Palm; Individual Freedom of the City of Norwich, England.

Kiel, Brig. Gen. Emil C., ETO, DSM; Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Air Medal; French Croix de Guerre, British Commander of the British Empire

Langmead, Brig. Gen. Edmund C., ETO; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star.

Martenstein, Brig. Gen. Austin W., ETO; Far East; Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon.

McDaniel, Brig. Gen. Carl B., Pacific.

McMullen, Maj. Gen. Clements, Pacific; DSM; Air Medal.

Partridge, Lt. Gen Earle E., Pacific, Korea; DSC, Silver Star; DSM; DFC, two Clusters;

Air Medal, ten Clusters; Bronze Star; Legion of Merit; Polish Legion of Honor; French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with two Palms; British Companion of the Order of the Bath, Belgian Croix de Guerre with Palm.

Phillips, Maj. Gen. James F., Japan, Legion of Merit.

Rawlings, Lt. Gen. Edwin W., Hawaii; DFS; DSM, Commendation Ribbon, Degree of Honorary Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.

Schneider, Brig. Gen. Max F., ETO; Legion of Merit.

Schreuder, Brig. Gen. Otis B., ETO, Army Commendation Ribbon, one Cluster.

Smith, Brig. Gen. Wallace G., Pacific, Legion of Merit; Army Commendation Ribbon; Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Degree of Officer.

Spry, Maj. Gen. James W., India, Legion of Merit, Air Medal.

Street, Maj. Gen. St. Clair, Pacific, DSM, two clusters, Legion of Merit, DFC of Italy, grade of officer.

Thomas, Brig. Gen. Arthur, ETO, Italy, Pacific; Legion of Merit, one cluster; Bronze Star, Army commendation ribbon, commander Order of the British Empire, French Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm, Italian Order of Sts. Marius and Lazarus.

Thomas, Maj. Gen. Charles E., Jr., Pacific; Legion of Merit, one cluster.

Twining, Gen. Nathan F., ETO, Pacific, I+C, DSM, Bronze Star, Air Medal, French Legion of Honor, British KBE, Polish Gold Cross of Swords, Yugoslavian Order of Patriotic Star, 1st class.

Vanaman, Maj. Gen. Arthur W., ETO, Legion of Merit, two clusters, Bronze Star, Purple Heart; Belgian Croix de Guerre with palms.

Wade, Brig. Gen. Leigh, Greece, DSM, Legion of Merit.

Webster, Maj. Gen. Robert M., ETO, Italy, north Africa; DSM, one cluster, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Air Medal, one cluster.

Weikert, Maj. Gen. John M., Pacific, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Purple Heart.

Whitten, Maj. Gen. Lyman P., ETO, Pacific, Burma, DSM, Bronze Star; Legion of Merit, one cluster; Italian Order of Saints Maurizio and Lazzaro, French Legion d'Honneur and Croix de Guerre avec Palme; and Polish Order of Virtuti Militari, third class.

Wolfenbarger, Maj. Gen. Willard R., Egypt, Pacific; Legion of Merit, one cluster, Air Medal, Army commendation ribbon; Purple Heart.

The Four Pillars of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech by W. G. Vollmer, president, the Texas & Pacific Railway Co.:

THE FOUR PILLARS OF FREEDOM

Most of us today are knee deep in confusion and uncertainty.

We are not quite sure which way to turn or what to do.

Within the Nation, we see and feel the effects of inflation upon our income and our savings.

We see communistic termites trying to destroy the very foundation of our free Government and our free economy.

We see the Nation's political leaders divided among themselves over what should be done to arrest inflation and to meet the challenge of communism.

We see more and more of our earnings being consumed by taxes.

We see all of these things, and more. It's enough to arouse fear, to cause confusion, and to create uncertainty.

In view of the turbulent present and the uncertain future which all of us face together, we need to examine the cause of our trouble.

If we turn back a few pages of history, we find that the threat to our free way of life is the root of our trouble.

Twice in one generation we have fought two World Wars in defense of freedom.

Today we stand on the threshold of a third world war. And again it is in defense of our freedom.

A considerable proportion of our public debt of approximately \$256,000,000,000 was created by wars fought to preserve freedom.

And a major portion of our 70-odd-billion-dollar national budget this year goes for the cost of wars—past, present and impending—all in behalf of freedom.

Yet, over the years, many of us have taken freedom for granted.

By now we should be acutely conscious of the fact that freedom, like everything else in life, comes at a price.

But no matter what that price may be, we must pay it, for nothing could be worse than to lose our God-given rights and our human dignity.

The outlook is not bright. We'd be deluding ourselves and betraying our children if we considered the present conflict a little international skirmish. It's nothing of the sort.

We're at war, whether we want to call it that or not. Approximately 60,000 casualties in the first 10 months of the war attest the fact.

When the smoke of the conflict clears away, either the free people of the world or the Communist will emerge victorious.

It now is self-evident, if it has not always been, that democracy and communism cannot exist side by side.

Democracy is founded upon faith in God, in the dignity of man and upon the concept that the government is the servant of the people, not their master.

Communism is founded upon atheism, strife, fear, tyranny and the philosophy that the government is the supreme master of the people.

Thus, the principles upon which democracy and communism are founded are as far apart as love and hate, or as good and evil.

Since the cause of freedom is founded upon justice and righteousness, we and the other free peoples of the world are invincible if we unite in purpose and in action.

I say this because we have the know-how and the productive capacity to turn out the goods and services essential to the preservation of freedom.

But it's going to take more than money and machines and know-how to win. It's going to take the will and the courage to work, to save, to vote, and to pray.

In the midst of our dilemma, here are four basic points upon which I feel all of us can unite.

I call these four points the four pillars of freedom because no matter how great our trials and tribulations may become, we can preserve our freedom if we have the will and courage to work, save, vote, and pray.

I realize there are other important pillars of freedom, but I have suggested these four

because they are basic, and because each of us can have a part in giving them life and meaning.

First, there is work.

There is no substitute for work. Ever since the dawn of history man has had to work in order to survive.

There is no way to supply our needs and protect our freedom except by work.

Nature has a way of balancing the books of life.

If we work wisely and efficiently, we produce abundantly the goods and services essential to better living.

If we work poorly, or not at all, we live poorly or not at all.

The reason we in America live better than any other people of the world is because we have developed to a high degree the tools of production and the technique of using them.

There are any number of countries in the world equally as rich in human and natural resources as the United States. The thing that makes the difference between abundance and poverty is the wise and the efficient use of tools.

Approximately 95 percent of our productive energy is provided by tools. Only 5 percent represents animal and human energy.

In the countries where famine and starvation stalk the people all the days of their lives, the energy percentage of productivity is just the reverse.

There's a vital relationship between the abundant life and these energy-producing percentages. The higher the percentage of tool energy, the better people live; the lower the percentage, the poorer they live.

In our fight against inflation, the only sound way to overcome it is to increase our production. The fundamental law of supply and demand cannot be changed by governmental decrees. Increased production is the real antidote to inflation.

This brings me to the next point of "The Four Pillars of Freedom."

Save. How did we come to have the great mass of energy-producing tools? By saving. Past thrift is one of the principal reasons why America is strong today. Millions of people, young and old, rich and poor, saved part of their income instead of spending it as they earned it. Then they invested their savings in factories, machines, mines, oil fields and, yes, in railroads.

These savings made possible our great productive capacity and thus the great outpouring of goods and services which we, in America, enjoy today.

These savings made possible the bulwark of our defense against communism.

Each American worker is now supported by machinery—that is, the tools of production—which cost an average of more than \$10,000 per worker.

In the railroad industry, the investment averages \$21,000 per worker.

What was it that encouraged the American people to save a portion of their earnings instead of spending all of it?

It was the freedom to enjoy the fruits of their labors. The right to have and to hold what they earned and saved.

If we should ever lose that right, then savings will dry up and there will be no private money to provide the tools of production.

Of course, our Government could provide the tools, as is done in communistic countries. But then the people would be ordered to "invest" a portion of their earnings in Government bonds. And that is one of the things we are fighting to prevent.

The need to save does not rest alone with the individual.

The Government should set an example of thrift by abandoning nonessential expenditures. The various so-called social programs,

benefits, bounties, and aids should be discontinued.

The Government does not owe anyone a living, unless it be a person injured in the service of the country.

When the Government undertakes to provide a living for any person or group of people, the cost of that living must come out of the work and the earnings of other people. And that sort of living cost comes high for the people who foot the bill through taxation.

The people of the cities and communities of the Nation should join in saving public funds. They can do this by ceasing to demand Federal funds for local pet projects—many of which are neither militarily essential nor economically sound.

To make America strong, the Federal, State and local governments should join with the individual in saving. Unless governments are thrifty, individuals have little opportunity to save.

Heavy taxation takes care of that.

The third point of our program is vote.

In recent years, there's been a good deal of conversation about getting out the vote. But like the weather, which provokes a great deal of talk, many of us merely talk instead of acting.

As evidence of this, only 26.7 percent of those eligible to vote in Texas cast their ballots in the 1948 national election.

Forty percent of the registered voters did not vote. And what happened here in Texas prevailed generally throughout the Nation.

It has been estimated that approximately 40,000,000 people in the United States failed to vote in the 1948 Presidential election.

Why? Different reasons—or rather, different excuses. Seldom is there a good reason why we should not register and vote. Most of the time, it's just too much trouble to register and then go to the polls on election day.

Some of us brush it off by saying that "our vote doesn't count, anyway." If every person did that, our Republic would collapse. And our freedom would be lost.

Every vote does count, no matter what the election.

Voting is one thing we must do for ourselves. We can't delegate it to someone else. That responsibility is ours, not the other fellow's.

It's our sacred obligation to protect our right to vote. And the only way we can do that is by voting.

Failure to vote at any time is dangerous, but with freedom at stake as it is today, failure to vote now can prove disastrous.

It could be that our failure in years gone by to do our full duty in this area of citizenship is responsible, in part at least, for our present predicament.

Perhaps unthinkingly we have shown too little pride in the priceless gift of personal liberty, thereby permitting others to trade off our personal opportunity and part of our freedom. If we have been negligent in this respect, we have been disloyal to our country and unfaithful to our children.

So next election, no matter what kind, nor how much it may inconvenience us, let's go to the polling place and cast our vote. And let's urge our friends and neighbors to do likewise.

If we do that as wisely and as well as we know how, then we have fulfilled that important part of our citizenship responsibilities.

In discussing the four-point program to help make our country strong, I have placed prayer fourth in an effort to give it additional emphasis.

It is, of course, the most important single thing we can do today.

We need to pray for an abiding faith in God and faith in ourselves.

We need to pray for faith in our fellow man.

We need to pray for guidance and wisdom.

We need to pray for the Americans who are suffering and dying on the battlefields of Korea that freedom—your freedom and mine—will be preserved.

We need to pray earnestly for the return of peace.

We need to pray for the courage to do those things which, in our heart, we conceive to be right and honorable.

We need to pray for the strength to bear whatever burden we may be called upon to carry.

We should ask God to make us good soldiers, whether it be on the battlefield or the home front.

The responsibility for freedom and for peace does not rest in Washington, London, Moscow, or Paris—or the other capitals of the world—but in the hearts of the people of the world.

We have at our command the tools to preserve freedom, and to aid in restoring peace to a tired and unhappy world.

Let's use these tools—work, save, and pray—patriotically and unselfishly.

Let's work hard and earnestly at the task of strengthening ourselves spiritually, morally, and economically.

Let's save our free American way of life, no matter what the sacrifices may be.

Let's vote at every election for people who place the welfare of their country above their personal political welfare.

Let's pray for the wisdom and the courage to do our duty as good Americans, faithful to God and to our country.

English Expert Points Out United States Lending Abroad Promotes Anti-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House passed a bill to increase the lending power of the Export-Import Bank. I opposed that increase because I am convinced that this lending is an evil policy.

Not only is this lending socialistic and inflationary at home; but also, in the long run, it will make enemies, not friends, abroad.

Mr. Paul Einzig has outlined the sobering logic of this situation in the following article:

INVESTMENT IN UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS NO CURB TO COMMUNISM

(By Paul Einzig)

LONDON, England.—In a recent article I pointed out the broader implications of the repudiation of the Anglo-Persian oil contract. The principle involved is of considerable interest to the American investor and the American taxpayer, and deserves consequently close attention. Nor are its implications confined to the purely financial sphere. A mistaken policy of lending to underdeveloped states is liable to entail grave political consequences. So far from strengthening resistance to Russian or Chinese Communist imperialism, such a policy may in given circumstances pave the way to a leftward orientation of the countries concerned.

Substantial investment of American, British or other western capital in under-de-

veloped countries tends to encourage anti-Western agitation, not only by Communists but, as the example of Persia clearly shows, also other unscrupulous and ambitious elements who seek to gain cheap popularity by advocating the confiscation of foreign enterprise and the repudiation of foreign debts. This assertion is not based on mere theory. We had ample practical experience in support of it. For example in Burma the fact that British investments run into many hundreds of millions of dollars has strengthened considerably the hands of left-wing politicians. The nationalization of British enterprise amounted to virtual confiscation, because no Burmese Government would have dared to pay anything like adequate compensation. In any case the amounts payable have been borrowed from the British Government, and, having pocketed the British loans and subsidies, the Burmese Government repeatedly defaulted on the agreements concerning the payment of the inadequate compensation agreed upon. No Burmese Government could have acted otherwise without risking to be overthrown and replaced by an even more left-wing government with a program of full repudiation.

The reason why in Burma and in Indonesia the existing near-Communist regimes are the only practicable alternatives to 100 percent communism is the large size of foreign capital invested in these countries. There is ample opportunity for unscrupulous politicians to gain popularity by agitating for repudiation and nationalization without compensation. Nationalists flirt with communism in pursuance of this game, or at any rate they play up communism against the sympathizers of the western investor and creditor nations. Nationalization has become a nationalist as well as Socialist device. The majority of the public opinion in such countries has completely lost its moral sense. While during the interwar period default on foreign obligation was generally considered something for which the defaulting nation had every reason to be ashamed of itself, the postwar generation glorifies in repudiation.

Unfortunately there seems to be very little to be done to save the capital already invested. A large number of British owners of enterprise in India sold out their investments to Indian interests at bargain prices while the going was good. Everybody is not in a fortunate position, however, to be able to save a relatively substantial portion of their capital invested abroad. Much of it may now be considered as a virtually total loss, or it will have to be so considered before very long. There is no reason, however, for throwing good money after bad by adding to the amount that is doomed to be written off eventually. Private investors are naturally reluctant to do so. But their place seems to have been taken by the governments, in particular as far as the United States and, to a much less extent, Britain, are concerned. This means that the loss will be borne by the taxpayer instead of the investor.

If this sacrifice of the taxpayers' billions resulted in at least the safeguarding of the countries concerned against Communist infiltration, the money would be considered to have been well spent. In reality the increase of the foreign indebtedness of the countries concerned tends to increase the temptation and opportunity for dishonest politicians to gain popularity by agitating in favor of repudiation. The larger the amount involved the more popular the idea of repudiation is likely to be. So far from achieving popularity in these countries by granting them loans, the United States tends to encourage anti-American agitation by increasing the financial and political advantages of an anti-American policy. The only way in which this could be avoided would be by continuing to lend more and more, in which case the advantages of obtaining fresh money would outweigh the advantages of repudiating the

existing loans. But even the United States could hardly afford to pour her billions into a bottomless sink in such manner.

It is high time for enthusiastic supporters of point 4 and other methods of financial assistance reconsidered their attitude in the light of the British experience in Persia and elsewhere. Admittedly in many instances it may appear to be a matter of political expediency to support certain countries financially. If and to the extent to which this is the case, it is much wiser to decide that the support should assume the form of outright grants or subsidies instead of loans or investments. Even if the support assumes the form of loans or investments the lender or investor will never see his money again. It is sheer self-deception to pretend in most instances that there is a chance of obtaining interest or dividends for any length of time, and of recovering the amounts lent or invested. Why not be realistic and write off the amounts granted?

In special circumstances this may be wise. In all circumstances it is wiser than indulging in self-deception that the amounts granted are investments. The United States, after the experience of the inter-Ally debts of 1914-18 and of lend-lease in 1941-45, should be well aware of this. And yet there seems to be a tendency toward self-deception.

The advantage of subsidies compared with loans and investments in the countries concerned is that the former would not tend to generate anti-American feelings. If the dollars received by these countries constitute outright grants the transactions would not provide Communists and unscrupulous politicians with opportunities for gaining popularity by advocating repudiation. From an American point of view the money will be a dead loss in any case. But if the form of subsidies is chosen the loss will be merely financial, while if the form of loans and investments is chosen then the loss will be political as well as financial.

Needless to say, in special circumstances it may be necessary and advantageous to assist underdeveloped countries in the development of their resources, in order to relieve world-wide scarcity in essential raw materials. Owing to the lack in native experts or to the corruption and inefficiency of the native governments, subsidies would not solve the problem. American capital and enterprise would have to take an active hand even at the risk of the ultimate loss of the capital invested. What matters is that those concerned should assume their commitments with open eyes. They must be fully aware of the risks arising from the present attitude of underdeveloped countries toward foreign capital and enterprise, and must make their calculations accordingly.

PAUL EINZIG

Einzig, Paul, D. SC.; British financial expert; b. in Hungary 1897; educated Oriental Academy Budapest and University of Paris. Paris correspondent "Financial News" 1921, foreign editor 1923-; political correspondent 1939-; also foreign editor "The Banker"; political correspondent "Financial Times". Publications: "International Gold Movements" 1929, "Exchange Control" 1934, "The Exchange Clearing System" 1935, "The Theory of Forward Exchange" 1937, "Bloodless Invasion" 1938, "World Finance" 1939-1940-41, "Hitler's New Order" in Europe" 1941, "Appeasement Before, During and After the War" 1941, "Can We Win the Peace?" 1942, "The Japanese New Order" in Asia" 1943, "Currency After the War" 1944, "Freedom from Want" 1944. 120 Clifford's Inn, London, E. C. 4; and Suffolk, Ashurst Wood, East Grinstead, Sussex.

Source: "The International Who's Who," 1948, p. 252.

Why the Communists Approved the Wallace Report on China in 1944 Although He Says He Thought It Was Anti-Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following from Human Events of October 17, 1951:

AND NOW THE SMEAR OF THE MCCARRAN COMMITTEE

(By Freda Utley)

The "revisionist" school, and others who have tried to lift the historical blackout, have reason to be grateful to the Eighty-second Congress. Both the hearings of the Senate joint committee which investigated General MacArthur's recall, and the present investigations of the McCarran Internal Security Committee, have revealed vital facts hitherto successfully hidden, or obscured by the professors, journalists, and politicians, who strive to justify the ways of Roosevelt and Truman to the world.

Bit by bit the missing pieces of the jigsaw puzzle which, when completed, will present the whole tragic story of United States policy during and after the war, are being found and fitted into place. Evidence is also piling up concerning the individuals mainly responsible for our having "snatched defeat out of the very jaws of victory." It is as yet impossible to distinguish the goats from the asses. We do not know, and may never know, who among our policy makers were Communist sympathizers, and who were just plain dumb and incompetent, or actuated by the ambition to make good in the era which it was profitable to be pink, and safe to be red. But there is no longer any doubt that the influence of the Chinese Communist cabal in Washington accounts for the policy which turned China into our enemy, and led to the Korean war.

The revelations made by Eugene Dooman, Harold Stassen, Louis Budenz, and Professors Colegrove and McGovern, of Northwestern University, to mention only a few of the witnesses who have appeared before the McCarran committee, are so damaging to the "men of Yalta," including General Marshall, that it was to be expected that an effort would be made to discredit them and the McCarran committee. Mr. Joseph Alsop, long an apologist for the Roosevelt and Truman foreign policy, led the attack.

Specifically, Alsop charged that the McCarran committee was taking false testimony, to wit: Budenz' statement that John Carter Vincent was a Communist is disproved, according to Alsop, by the anti-Communist recommendations made by Wallace in his cable to the President from New Delhi on June 28, 1944. Vincent accompanied and advised Mr. Wallace during his mission to China and Siberia in that year. As evidence of the anti-Communist advice given by Wallace after consultation with Vincent, Alsop cited the fact that he recommended the replacement of Stilwell by the anti-Communist General Wedemeyer.

II

For a few days it seemed that this thesis served to discredit the testimony of Budenz, and also the credibility of the case being built against the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and the Institute of Pacific

Relations. But on September 28, Prof. William M. McGovern who, during the war, served with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and really knows the score, turned the tables. McGovern testified that in 1944 General Wedemeyer, far from having been known as an anti-Communist, "had never expressed his views on communism" and was regarded as a "Marshall man" who could be relied upon to "go along with the Communists." According to McGovern, Wedemeyer had served as spokesman for Marshall on several occasions in discussion with the British planners; so that some people wrongly thought that Wedemeyer would go along with the Communists because, with the Joint Chiefs, he thought we should not invade the Balkans or interfere with the Russian campaign in Eastern Europe.

Other well-informed persons, who cannot be quoted because they still work for the Government, have informed me that Wedemeyer's first appointment to the East was due to Winston Churchill's desire to remove from Washington the man whom Marshall relied upon to squash British plans for a strategy designed to delay invasion of Western Europe and to keep the Russians out of Eastern Europe.

From all the evidence available, it would seem that until he went to China, and had his eyes opened to the Communist menace, Wedemeyer had been a military planner whose sole aim was to win the war as quickly as possible with the least loss of American lives. Initially he rose from the rank of major at the beginning of the war to that of a three-star general, thanks to General Marshall. The latter, recognizing his brilliant talents, had selected him to draw up the plans for the cross-channel invasion of Europe. In short, Wedemeyer was everywhere regarded as a loyal adherent of Marshall's policies.

According to Budenz, who supported his assertions with copies of articles in the Daily Worker in 1944, Stilwell's recall and Wedemeyer's appointment to China were regarded by the Communists not merely as a useful compromise, but as potentially advantageous to their cause. In the first place, it eliminated any possibility that General Chennault might get the appointment—a contingency which the Reds had greatly feared because he was known to be strongly anti-Communist.

In the second place they hoped that Wedemeyer would succeed (where Stilwell with his rough approach had failed) in persuading Chiang Kai-shek to give way to Communist demands, and remove the blockade which had hitherto to some extent kept them in check while the Nationalists fought Japan. Wallace, in recommending Wedemeyer, cabled Roosevelt that he was persona grata to Chiang and suitable for the post because "it should go to a man who can establish himself in Chiang's confidence to a degree that the latter will accept his advice in regard to political as well as military actions." Specifically, Wallace hoped that Wedemeyer would persuade Chiang to establish at least a semblance of the united front and subordinate all other considerations to the necessity of reaching an understanding with Russia.

On October 5, 1951, in his second appearance as a witness before the McCarran committee, Budenz explained in detail what the Communist Party line had been in 1944 and how closely it resembled that of Wallace in the latter's recommendations to the President, while being guided into the right channels by Vincent and Lattimore. The Communists realized at this time that it was premature to try to sell the idea of a coalition government in America. It was first necessary completely to discredit Chiang Kai-shek by representing him as inefficient, incompetent, and reactionary. In Professor

McGovern's words, the Wallace recommendations "gave aid and comfort to the Communists, trying to disparage the National Government entirely, and trying to throw his weight behind support of a pro-Russian policy."

III

Since the attackers of the McCarran committee have shown acquaintance with the political and historical material on this phase of China's story, it is difficult to understand how they overlooked the above points. Surely, they could not have been ignorant that previously Wedemeyer had been regarded as one of the Marshall "Trust Stalin" school and one of the strategists who had placed winning the war above political consequences. It should have been easy to find out what the Communist line was on the matter, to note that the Daily Worker in 1944 pronounced itself as eminently satisfied with the result of Henry Wallace's mission. Indeed, that paper went so far as to compare the Vice President favorably with Browder—in a review of Wallace's pamphlet on the Pacific, published by the Institute of Pacific Relations, written for Wallace by Mrs. Lattimore.

We can expect more assaults by pro-administration columnists. The guns are being trained on Stassen, once deemed a liberal Republican, but already the subject of an abusive column by Lowell Mellett (Washington Star, October 6) for revealing the influence enjoyed in the State Department by Owen Lattimore and other admirers of the Chinese Communists.

Were it not for the fact that the reporting of the proceedings of the McCarran committee has for the most part been, to say the least, inadequate, the critics of the committee would have no chance of success in their efforts. Unfortunately, there has been what amounts to a conspiracy of silence concerning the most important facts revealed by the key witnesses before the McCarran committee. McGovern's important testimony about Wedemeyer has been practically ignored. Budenz's testimony has been only partially reported. Moreover, when Mr. Lattimore chooses to make a statement it is usually reproduced in extenso by the New York Times and by most other newspapers; whereas the Times failed to report McGovern's testimony that Lattimore wanted the Japanese Emperor and his family treated as war criminals.

The New York Times, which once did publish *All the News That's Fit to Print*, now ignores important testimony from Eugene Dooman, assistant to Secretary Grew. Dooman testified that General Marshall (in the spring of 1945) held up as premature a statement which Grew and the Secretaries of State and War had approved, assuring the Japanese that their Emperor would not be deposed if they surrendered. The effect of withholding this announcement was to help prolong the Pacific war until the Soviet Union was ready to come in to harvest the fruits of Yalta.

Most newspapers rely on the news agencies whose Washington correspondents tend to concentrate on a highly competitive battle to obtain spot news. Therefore, the public is being kept in ignorance concerning the highly important information which the McCarran committee is painstakingly accumulating, while refraining from pronouncing any judgments, or seeking publicity, until all available evidence is obtained.

IV

The present campaign to discredit the valuable congressional group, combined with unsatisfactory reporting by most of the press, give grounds for real apprehension. Have we entered the era which may end in the grim world depicted in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four* when knowledge of all facts which do not serve the interests of the ruling party are consigned to limbo?

Getting Politics Out of the Office of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me during the course of the debate today, I submit for printing in the Appendix the newspaper editorial and release to which reference was made by me.

The editorial and release are as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE FOR TAX COLLECTORS

In the last few months major scandals have developed in four of the Nation's largest Internal Revenue offices. Lesser scandals have come to light in some others.

The basic reason for the scandals is the fact that the top jobs in the Internal Revenue Bureau are politically filled. The President, with the approval of the Senate, appoints the collectors. The collectors appoint their deputies.

In most cases these jobs are handed out as political rewards to persons who have no expert knowledge of taxation. Frequently the collector has a business of his own, which he continues to operate. Usually he views his Federal job as the political thing it actually is. He knows his office would operate as well without him as with him.

Senator WILEY, concerned about the recent scandals, is now suggesting that collectors and their deputies be brought under civil service, as the actual workers in the Bureau long have been.

It is not a new idea but it is nonetheless worth while because it has not hitherto been acted upon. The whole Bureau should be in the hands of career men—of persons who have made tax work their specialty.

At present, no revenue worker, however qualified, can hope to rise to the top. Under the present system, the career man must always work under a politician boss, who knows little of the details of tax collection and who may take a soft attitude toward some tax debtors, as well as money contributions for the party in power.

It is a bad situation at best and has often proved to be an intolerable one.

The thing to do is to reorganize the Bureau so that the collectors will in fact be the heads of the offices, instead of useless adjuncts. The way to do that is to fill these top posts with men from the ranks who can qualify by examination for jobs that should be the most, rather than the least, important in the service.

WILEY URGES WAYS AND MEANS SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW POLITICAL NATIONAL COMMITTEE INFLUENCE IN INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, former member of the Special Crime Investigating Committee has urged the House Ways and Means Subcommittee Investigating Internal Revenue Affairs, to make a complete investigation of any influence by the Democratic and "for that matter, though far less likely, the Republican National Committee in the affairs of the Bureau of Internal Revenue."

Senator WILEY stated that the stakes of exerting influence in Internal Revenue affairs "make the RFC stakes look almost like chicken feed. The Internal Revenue Bureau is a \$60,000,000,000 affair. The 64 collectors of internal revenue are politically chosen and they represent a happy hunting ground

for political influence. Such influence can be exerted by the breaking of the spirit if not the letter of the tax law."

WILEY recommended that the whole system of appointment of collectors of internal revenue be changed, "be removed completely from political patronage, and be set up instead on a 100-percent merit, competition basis."

In a supplementary statement, WILEY indicated that if the House subcommittee did not look into this problem, he would suggest that the Senate Executive Expenditures Permanent Subcommittee explore it fully.

NUMEROUS REPORTS OF FIXING TAX CASES

WILEY pointed out that the Internal Revenue Bureau is "the pipeline for sustaining the very fiscal life of the Nation. If that pipeline becomes muddled or blocked, it can result in terrific damage to the entire national solvency." He stated that he, like other Senators, has received word that "there is a considerable amount of political 'fixing' inside the Bureau, that is, fixing of tax assessments, fixing of recommendations to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution, and so forth," but that he will state no more at the present time other than to urge the committee to investigate such charges.

The Senator pointed out that he believes, as most observers, that the number of employees in the Internal Revenue Bureau who are actually guilty of malpractice is comparatively small, but that "this minority can do and is doing considerable damage to the integrity of operations of the entire bureau."

TEXT OF THREE LETTERS

There follows excerpts from three letters:

1. WILEY's original letter to Commissioner John Dunlap of the Internal Revenue Bureau, dated October 3.

2. Dunlap's reply, dated October 9.

3. WILEY's letter to Congressman KING, dated October 10.

WILEY'S LETTER TO COMMISSIONER JOHN DUNLAP

"In November, 1950, it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Special Senate Crime Investigating Committee which visited the west coast for the purpose of analyzing problems of interstate crime and related activities. At that time, there was brought before us certain evidence with regard to irregularities and corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau in that region.

"Unfortunately, it has taken all this while, from November 1950 to September 1951, for a major start to be made by the bureau toward cleansing of that situation.

"I do not state this by way of adverse comment insofar as you yourself are concerned, Mr. Commissioner, because I know that you have only just recently taken over the responsibility as Commissioner. I mention this, however, by way of background to the following question which I should like to submit:

"Have there been any contacts by an official or employee of the national committees of any party organization with the Bureau of Internal Revenue on behalf of any particular attorney and/or any client or clients or any other individual who had a tax case pending before the Bureau?

"By political national committee, I refer to either the Democratic or Republican National Committees. By contact, I refer to any phone call, visit, telegram, letter, directly or indirectly.

"According to information which I have received, there have indeed been such contacts and I feel that they should be brought out in the open, just as there should be fully presented to public view the nature and extent of all contacts between national committees and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"I draw no implication at the present time from the report of such contacts, but I

merely feel that the public has a right to be informed of them.

"I would like to obtain from your office, therefore, a statement within the next week or 10 days describing all such contacts, the names and nature of the cases involved, and any other information which you might feel it possible to present in writing.

"I realize that the actions of Internal Revenue Bureau officials and employees, including your own, are bound by the statutory prohibition against revealing incoming tax data. However, I do feel that the minimum information which I am requesting in this letter would in no way be subject to that statutory prohibition and that it could and should be made available to me, or for that matter, to any other requesting legislator."

DUNLAP'S REPLY TO WILEY

"It is believed you will appreciate, for obvious reasons, that the pursuit of an inquiry into this matter would necessarily entail a Nation-wide survey which would require a considerable expenditure of time and effort. Accordingly, it is suggested alternatively that any specific cases concerning which you have information be referred to me for investigation. If this is done, you may rest assured that the facts will be ascertained and made available to you.

"In the event any duly constituted investigative committee of the Congress should decide to explore this matter, my office will cooperate fully in making available for inspection such files and records as may be required, both in Washington and in the field."

WILEY'S LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN KING

"I am willing to you respectfully to suggest that your subcommittee look into the matter of any contacts made by officials or employees of the Democratic and/or Republican National Committee with the Bureau of Internal Revenue on behalf of any particular attorney and/or client or clients or other individuals involved in tax cases considered by the Bureau.

"I am enclosing, herewith, correspondence which I have had with Commissioner Dunlap in which I have urged the review of such contacts and of the effects of such contacts.

"As you will note from the Commissioner's reply of October 9, he indicates that he would be happy to 'cooperate fully in making available for inspection such files and records as may be required, both in Washington and in the field'.

"He points out that in order to make a Nation-wide survey of any such contacts which have occurred, 'a considerable expenditure of time and effort' would be required. To my way of thinking, such an expenditure would well be justified because.

"I have received definite word to the effect that there have been substantial contacts made by an individual or individuals within the Democratic National Committee with the Internal Revenue Bureau (I cannot offer any information beyond that basic fact).

"2 The ultimate stakes of such political contacts in Bureau matters are infinitely larger than the stakes in, let us say, the RFC investigation. As you so well know, on the basis of your excellent investigation thus far, when a Bureau is looking through some \$60,000,000,000 of tax returns, it has an infinitely greater amount of discretion than does the RFC whose loans do not aggregate a fraction of that revenue total.

"We both know that wherever there is such an immense amount of discretion there is possibility of official favoritism and connivance.

"3. A third reason for such exploration is that the collector of internal revenue, being politically-appointed, have long been a 'happy hunting ground' for influence by party organizations. It is only reasonable to expect that so long as an official, let us say, the Democratic Party organization,

is responsible for helping to put a collector of internal revenue in that particular post in the first place, thus making that collector politically indebted to him, there will be opportunity for the collector to 'repay' that debt in a great many tax cases which may later come up.

"To my way of thinking, therefore, the appointment of the 64 collectors of internal revenue should be completely removed from political influence and should become 100 percent a matter of merit competition.

"I submit these views to you hoping that they may be of some use and hoping that your efficient subcommittee will be able to start the wheels rolling on this phase of investigation which I am recommending.

"My purpose in raising this question, I assure you, is not a partisan one, because I would equally deplore any contacts made by the Republican National Committee or its members or its officials, as I would deplore any contacts made by the Democratic National Committee. In view of the fact however that the latter has been in power for some 18 years, it is undoubtedly true that most such contacts which have been made have been made by the Democratic National Committee. What is really at stake here, however, is a principle and not a partisan question, as I know you agree.

"I do want to say that I think that when Congressman Dunlap asked me to name specific cases on which I had information, he was not quite justified, but was playing rather 'hard to get.' It is obvious that

"1 Staff assistants of the Commissioner could no doubt name a great number of cases right off hand without consulting any file cases in which they know quite well that such contacts have indeed been made.

"2 No matter how much information I personally or any other Senator-Congressman had, I could not possibly name all of the cases of which such contacts may have occurred.

"3 The Commissioner would have been on infinitely stronger ground if he had volunteered the information on major cases instead of asking me or anybody else to dig for it.

"The information is there, I feel sure. It is available to the Commissioner. It should be volunteered by the Commissioner so as to be of maximum help.

"Having served on the Senate Crime Committee for a year and a half, I know that when public officials say 'You name the case and I will tell you the facts,' it is not as reassuring an answer as when they say, 'Let me run down some of the cases which you probably have in mind. I will submit the facts, and you can ask me questions about them'.

"I do hope that I may be hearing from you on this issue."

CARE Packages for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter from India, which was sent from the Simpsons Medical Centre in Madras following the receipt of several institutional gift packages consisting of 700 pounds of dried skim milk, cheese, butter, and dried beans for feeding and agricultural retraining in one of that country's most stricken areas. The gift was forwarded

to India through the offices of CARE. The letter, which is one of the most inspiring and touching of all those I have ever seen, is addressed to a pseudonym covering the identity of the donor who desired to remain anonymous, but who is an outstanding humanitarian.

The letter deserves printing in the RECORD as a report of what happens to the food arriving in India and is an example of the importance of people reaching out to people even at so great a distance.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMPSON'S MEDICAL CENTRE,

Chintadripet, Madras, August 18, 1951.

E. DUKE, Esq.,

Dupont Circle Building,

Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR MR. DUKE: A very lucky star must, I think, hover over your undertakings. For your very overwhelming gift arrived on Tuesday, the day before Indian Independence Day. There had been small reason to celebrate it in Pudukkottai Village, which lies just over the back fence of our company farm on which I live and experiment. The villagers are illiterate for the most part. They only know that they are always hungry, and must now wait until mid-January for hope of enough to eat.

We have only one monsoon on the east coast, but may hope for "mango showers" in April, when the mango blossoms are set by rain. Then when the west-coast monsoon boils up in June, it should be strong enough to send some of its clouds high up over the 9,000-foot peaks which divide us. Meeting the scorching heat of the eastern plains the rain is dumped on us and farmers may plow and plant in late June a 3 months' crop of paddy and millets (ragi) which is harvested just before the monsoon floods us in mid-October.

This year both the April and June rains failed us. The countryside is a scorched desert, except for tiny fields about deep wells. The water table continues alarmingly to fall. Landowners cannot plow and plant and the huge group of casual farm labor has no work.

To the west and north of the farm, lies the Sonnallur Reserve Forest. It once stretched in dense growth from Madras for 300 miles to the south and over a mile in depth. South of us the two districts, North and South Arcot are a corruption of the Tamil aru Kadu (six forests). As an inducement to the railway, when it was built in the last generation, permission was given to cut timber, free of charge. Replanting was not required. On the farm we have magnificent manogany, teak, and jackwood trees, the latter being one of the loveliest golden woods grown anywhere. The tree is at its best when over 100 years old. The forest is now a knee-high scrubby growth. How it keeps alive is a mystery. As I drive the 30 miles to and from town each day, I see literally hundreds of people from the surrounding villages, chopping off branches, and worse still, digging out the roots, which they pound and eat as a sticky form of tapioca. The twigs are sold as firewood. Its price is so high, a family, by working hard, can earn about rupee 1 daily. If I had starving children, I would do the same, of course, but the effect upon our rainfall and climate is appalling to contemplate.

Every day we can keep people out of the forest is a day of victory. If, in mid-October, it rains, there will be field work for all, and they can manage somehow until the 6 months' crop of paddy is harvested.

There seemed no hope of this happy event, until your wonderful parcel came. The rail receipt arrived Tuesday morning, and at once we alerted our SRVS lorry service. In the

afternoon the great pile of boxes and the bags of beans arrived. It was one of our scorching afternoons, and we heavily anointed the beautiful cardboard boxes with floods of perspiration as we unpicked them for easier delivery to the farm. The metal strips which sealed the boxes will be sold, and cooking oil purchased. The boxes are flattened and transported to the farm for the villagers to use as fuel, and the ashes brought to us for the fields. The milk and butter tins are emptied and sold for 4 annas each, with which we purchase more cooking oil. The gunny sacks once filled with beans are sold for rupee 1 12 0 each.

Costly petrol is a problem, so each day I bring out in the jeep the day's ration. The beans must be soaked overnight, though when we gave them out, it was difficult to restrain the people from munching them raw. So, each day we give out milk powder and cheese and issued beans for 2 days until they were exhausted.

Arriving at the farm, Independence Day evening, word was sent to the village, of the celebration next day. At dawn, we put up the Indian flag in the center, and on its right the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack on the left. Everyone arrived immediately, and set down in orderly rows. The flags were explained to them briefly, and the kindness of friends whom they will never see, far away in that mothers country as they call the United States of America. They have all seen my mother's picture, and some of them know the college which my husband founded and which was his daily joy until his death in 1943.

How can I explain to you the mystery of cheese for those who have never seen it? We opened one of the lovely golden, 4-pound parcels, and told them it was the United States of America form of curds, which all hope can be a part of the daily diet. All people here long to eat some form of sour milk daily so this could be understood. The lovely color was a special delight. In Madras I had been told that it would be a waste to issue cheese as the villagers would not enjoy its flavor. I wish you could see them gloating over it. Each 4-pound length is cut into 20 pieces, and the small children hold it in their hands, then up to the light to admire the color, and then with shining eyes, break off bits like grains of wheat and slowly consume all of it, beaming at me when I can summon courage to look at them. Usually, I find work elsewhere, as the one luxury we cannot afford these days is pity.

The truly joyful detail is that the 200 people who will have a ration of your food daily for the next 10 days, will for that time, stay out of the forest. When that precious possibility occurred to me, I was desperate over how to control the crowd arriving to share.

The story of the Pilgrim Fathers came handily to mind, so I told them of how hard people in the United States of America worked in order to earn the money to send such wonderful gifts, and we must do our part, so one day when God sends us rain we may grow enough food and then kind American friends may send their gifts to other countries. Then we went off to the compost piles, which must be turned. I gave them an easy stint, so they may rest as they feel the need. And so importantly, they are not now humbly taking charity, but working for what they get. I do wish that you could hear the chattering and the laughter, a happier tide of sound than I have heard since I moved here January 1, 1949. When the piles are finished, we shall pick up stones on the rocky hillside which will be reforested when it rains with thousands of trees the Forest Department gives me.

The beans are exhausted, and now we issue cheese and milk powder, and have not yet told them about the beautiful butter. I know what they will do with it. It will be adored, and then they will trade half of

each day's gift for grain, and make a porridge and add the butter, and how happy they will be.

So, you give hope to a village of wonderful people, and laughter for a little while. Before the food gift is finished, we shall be starting the 8-mile-long Famine Relief Road, which will travel from the highway, past the farm and on northward to villages isolated on a stony cart track, too difficult for hungry little cart bulls to manage now. The people will be paid in grain each day, so that will get them through the last desperate weeks before the monsoon permits work on the fields. Thus, your gift is doubly a gift, for it came at the one moment when it was most needed. The village will be writing to you. Meanwhile, for them and for myself, may I say thank you, from a depth of gratitude you will find it difficult to comprehend.

Sincerely yours,

MARIE BUCK.

The State of Our Mobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of The Record an address regarding the state of our mobilization program, delivered by the Honorable Donald C. Cook, Vice Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the National Conference of Business Paper Editors, on October 4.

Mr. Cook is particularly well qualified to speak on this subject, as he has served as chief counsel for the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee since its beginning. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cook's remarks be made a part of the record, as I am sure that the Members of the Senate will be vitally interested in this resumé of our mobilization program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A LOOK AT THE MOBILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to be with you this afternoon and to have this opportunity to speak on a subject which is close to us all—our preparation to meet aggression.

I prize your invitation to give you my views on the current mobilization program. The publishing profession has always had my profound respect and admiration—as have the men and women who give it vitality.

Your industry is the circulatory system of democracy. Through your papers, periodicals, and books flow the information and ideas which shape public opinion. Without an informed electorate democracy could not long survive. To enslave the populace Hitler first captured the press. Here the press contributed mightily to the preservation of democracy in time of war, and it continues to do so in the twilight peace which we now enjoy.

Today our democratic way of life faces a new test—perhaps the greatest in our history. An imperialistic and militant Soviet Russia can no longer hide behind a mask of innocence and peaceful intentions.

For many years you people have been countering the false Communist propaganda

of Soviet Russia with fact and logic. This is an important role in our struggle for survival, and one which you must vigorously continue. But with a gun in our backs, that is not sufficient. Exposure of the unsoundness of the Communist system will be of no avail if in the meantime we fall before the military force of the Soviets. The leaders of the free world have recognized this, and have begun to mobilize—to avert war if possible—but if it comes, to win it.

In this critical period of mobilization, the publishing field has added burdens and responsibilities. While you produce no weapons, your industry's contribution to the preparedness effort is nonetheless vital. From your efforts and through your presses flow technical manuals, trade and professional journals, textbooks, and general news periodicals. On your pages appear mobilization data of all kinds—historical, reportorial, analytical. Through your media of communications is funneled the vital exchange of information and ideas by which science advances, industry functions more powerfully and smoothly, and by which our mobilization program can be both guided and tested.

Not the least of the fundamental problems facing our mobilization effort results from the kind of mobilization it is—mobilization for defense. If we were an aggressor planning an attack, the whole program would be greatly simplified. We would then decide when, where, and how the hostilities would begin. Military and civilian requirements of all types could be predicted with much greater accuracy. The danger of producing quantities of weapons destined to become obsolete would be diminished. The likelihood of our country becoming a principal battlefield would be lessened. Obvious advantages appear all down the line.

But we are not mobilizing for attack. Our preparedness is for defense, and we must accept and solve the greater problems presented by a defensive rearmament program.

As I see it, there are three major objectives in our current mobilization effort. First, we must speedily build up our military machine to a level adequate to meet the present threats of Soviet aggression. So long as Russia remains aggressive and unwilling to cooperate in a realistic international disarmament program, we must constantly maintain our Military Establishment in a position of readiness. It must at all times be sufficiently strong to deter the Soviets from launching an attack.

This period of vigilance and preparedness may extend over many years. If so, it will inevitably result in waste—in maintaining large unformed forces; in producing weapons, tanks, and planes which certainly will become obsolete and require periodic replacement. And, such waste will be duplicated as we furnish similar military assistance to our friends in the free world. But this is an unavoidable concomitant of defensive mobilization. We can only hope by careful planning and watchfulness to keep such costs to a minimum, consistent with our primary objective of insuring that our Armed Forces are always capable of fighting a present and future war, not a past one. The Maginot line taught us what befalls a nation that prepares to refight the last war.

Obviously our second mobilization objective is to expand our industrial plant and maintain it in a healthy condition, capable of quick harnessing to the requirements of an all-out war. There is no assurance that a future war will be like World War II—a war of production. But we simply cannot gamble on the chance that it will be a short war, or the type of war which does not require a constant stream of enormous quantities of all types of military armaments and of essential civilian goods. Every indication we have is that modern warfare will put an even greater strain on our industrial plant than did World War II. One thing is cer-

tain. We cannot hope to win a modern war unless our industrial machine is capable of making our military force superior in power to that of our enemies.

Since we are mobilizing for defense, we must maintain industrial flexibility. While we must build a large military production potential, it must not be so heavily committed in any direction that it cannot quickly be diverted and readjusted to meet new developments and requirements. Because our enemy will initially determine the time and place of battle, we must keep our preparedness alert and pliant, ready to proceed swiftly along that course which, when the attack comes, seems to afford our greatest strategic opportunities.

In planning and building our industrial plant for wartime production we must anticipate that many of our production facilities may be knocked out by direct attack or sabotage. In our highly centralized mass production system it would not be too difficult for an enemy to cause substantial reductions in output. Still another factor to be taken into account is the large impact of civil defense requirements on our industrial potential in the event our great cities are bombed. Our survival may well depend upon how clearly we recognize the dangers to our industrial plant and how effective our planning is in organizing to avoid these risks or, if they materialize, to absorb their impact without serious interruptions to the vital flow of military supplies.

We are today producing at the phenomenal rate of almost \$330,000,000,000 annually. And it is estimated that in 1952 private corporations will spend \$25,000,000,000 to replace and expand plant facilities. This indeed is action in the right direction, and it must continue. For an indefinite period we must count on having to produce substantial quantities of military supplies in addition to normal civilian requirements. Because we do not and cannot know when, or even if, war will actually come, we must have a permanent expansion of our productive capacity if we are not to have a permanent reduction in our standard of living. Further, while the coin of inflation may have too much money on one side it certainly has too little goods on the other. And should production for total war finally become necessary, the burden will be less heavy and spirits much lighter if the sad event is not preceded by too much brown bread and austerity.

The third major objective of the mobilization program is to insure that industry has an adequate wartime supply of all strategic and critical materials. It is on this aspect of mobilization that the Senate Preparedness Committee has been devoting a substantial portion of its time and energy. Its importance is manifest. Having the largest and most efficient industrial plant in the world will give us cold comfort unless it has an ample supply of all, not most, but all, of the strategic raw materials required alike for peace or war. End products combine dozens of materials, and a shortage of any one can result in a fatal bottleneck and lost production.

On the strategic and critical list of materials being stockpiled under the National Stockpiling Act are 93 items. Domestic production of most of these raw materials is either nil or far below even normal industrial requirements. Moreover, the sources of many of these items are outside the area within the Western Hemisphere from which we could hope to maintain a reasonable flow of imports during wartime.

To achieve this third objective our Government is doing several things. It is stockpiling; it is encouraging and assisting in the development and expansion of domestic production of these raw materials; it is trying to induce friendly foreign countries to increase their output of raw materials; and, it is urging and sponsoring research and development of substitutes for materials which are

either in short supply now or which would be the minute war broke out.

The investigations of the Preparedness Committee have disclosed, unhappily that none of these courses was being pursued either with the warranted vigor or the needed results. Even after the match of Communist aggression kindled the flames in Korea, key portions of our defense effort reflected a dangerous lethargy and complacency. Through the reports of our investigations we have tried to eliminate this attitude by an unvarnished presentation of problems faced and solutions yet wanting. In each instance we have made recommendations which, for the most part, have been promptly implemented by the departments and agencies concerned. And, I should add, with good grace, too.

We found that in some cases our rate of stockpile acquisitions was too rapid, in others, too slow, some stockpile objectives were excessive, while others were inadequate. We found that the efforts to develop and expand domestic production of strategic materials and to induce foreign countries in the freedom bloc to expand their output were being pressed neither with the vigor demanded by the urgency nor the firmness necessary to insure success.

Perhaps the best way I can illustrate these raw-material problems is to give you a few specific details about some of the investigations conducted by the committee.

Immediately after war broke out in Korea, and even before the Preparedness Committee, of which he is chairman, was established, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, took steps to improve our national rubber situation. Through his efforts the sale of several synthetic rubber facilities as surplus was prevented. It is largely to his credit that we have rehabilitated and reactivated the synthetic-rubber industry and achieved the present rates of production as fast as we have. Contrasted with a production rate of approximately 270,000 tons annually in January 1950, we are now turning out synthetic rubber at an annual rate of about 830,000 tons. In addition, plans to increase this production another 140,000 tons annually are under way.

Encouraging as is the progress made and planned in synthetic rubber, we have by no means solved our rubber problems. Even if synthetics were a complete substitute for all essential uses of natural rubber, we are not yet able to produce our total annual rubber requirements which last year amounted to about 1,250,000 tons. But more important is the fact that substantial and vital wartime rubber products, such as heavy truck and airplane tires, require certain minimum percentages of natural rubber. Coupled with this are the equally unhappy facts that we must import every pound of natural rubber we use—95 percent of it from southeast Asia, an area which undoubtedly can be foreclosed to us in any future war.

Our short-term rubber objective is to achieve preparedness through expanded synthetic production for use in the present and completion of the goal of our natural rubber stockpile for use in the future. The time schedule for accomplishing this latter goal is obviously affected by the impact of our first mobilization objective—the immediate buildup of our military forces to meet present threats of aggression. Current military and essential civilian requirements for rubber have been met without delays. But this, together with the necessity of continuing additions to our stockpile, has made it necessary to restrict the use of natural rubber in the manufacture of various civilian products.

These conservation measures have been at best mild and at worst inadequate. In order to increase the rate of additions to the stockpile they will have to be made more stringent. Increased purchases of natural rubber would probably drive an already ex-

cessive price still higher. Hence economical stockpiling can come only from conservation.

Still another aspect of our short-term rubber objective is the development of a domestic source of natural rubber from certain rubber-bearing plants, such as guayule and the saghyzes. The purpose of this program is to insure a supply of natural rubber in the event war should break out before our stockpile objective is filled. Although this project is still largely in the seed and seedling stage, sufficient progress has been made that we now can be sure of producing some natural rubber in the United States if the need arises. This program is one of insurance and we will not regret the premium paid if a kind providence makes it unnecessary for us to file a claim under the policy.

Our long-term rubber objective is to reduce our vulnerability by becoming self-sufficient in rubber. We can accomplish this in two ways. First, by perfecting synthetics so that complete substitution for natural rubber is possible. Second, by encouraging and assisting South American countries in the establishment of a substantial and commercially feasible hevea-tree rubber industry. Both courses must be vigorously pursued for, until we have ended our dependence upon southeast Asia for rubber, our national security will remain in serious jeopardy. The work of the committee, I believe, has hastened the day when our rubber security will be complete.

Another raw material which came under the committee's scrutiny was tin. There we found ourselves front-row spectators at a dramatic market spectacle. From a pre-Korea price of 76 cents, tin rose steadily on the world markets to almost \$2 per pound.

A number of factors combined to produce this result. Current consumer demand increased sharply; our Government was committed by contracts to substantial purchases for the stockpile at prices fixed in the Singapore market (regarded by some as susceptible to being rigged); speculators plunged into the market with a vengeance, and, tin production remained about constant, at a level far below the then existing demand.

As you know, tin, like rubber, has many essential uses, in peace, as well as war. As with natural rubber, there are no domestic sources of any consequence. It must literally all be imported. But fortunately, unlike natural rubber, its sources are not so heavily concentrated in distant southeast Asia. Substantial quantities are produced in Bolivia and Africa, areas which can reasonably be counted on as being accessible to us during any future war with any presently identified enemies.

The largest use for tin is in the manufacture of tin cans. Normally this use amounts to about one-third of the tin consumed in the United States, which, of course, has been for years the largest tin-consuming nation. A recent announcement that an aluminum and plastic-coated can has been developed to replace the tin can is important, encouraging news. But nevertheless tin will probably remain on the strategic and critical list for some time to come. Right now aluminum will probably do more for us in airplanes destined for the fighting fronts than in cans destined for the city dump.

In this investigation the committee discovered that the tin stockpile objective had been set unrealistically high; faulty calculations had been made. The Munitions Board thereupon revised it downward. But the amount of tin in the stockpile is still significantly short of the lower goal. While we still need tin, our need is happily not as desperate one. We have in the United States today more tin than we had when the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor. And we ended World War II with large stocks left over.

As was the case with rubber, the Preparedness Committee recommended a program of action designed to eliminate the causes of the tin shortage. Our goal was to establish circumstances which would enable us to buy greater quantities of tin, but at reasonable rather than extortionate prices.

To accomplish this goal we proposed two courses of action. The first course was comprised of steps which the United States could take alone in order to terminate immediately the costly and entirely unnecessary purchase of tin at excessive prices. The committee recommended that the RFC be given exclusive authority to import and sell tin in the United States. It urged that all current stockpile purchases be suspended, and that at the earliest opportunity the tin metal contracts with the Belgian Congo and Indonesia be canceled. These measures were all promptly implemented by the executive agencies concerned.

The second course of action was designed to solve the remaining tin problems through the full cooperation of both tin producers and tin consumers. We recommended that an international tin conference be held at once to work out agreements to increase production and to make suitable allocations of world supply at stable, reasonable prices. The committee recommended that our Government furnish financial and technical assistance to the foreign tin producers to help them expand production, that tin-producing governments grant tax benefits and other aid to encourage production-increasing projects; that our stockpile figures be disclosed to the tin producers and that long-term, fixed-price contracts be offered to assure producers a known large and stable demand. In addition, assurances were to be given that our accumulated stockpile would not be used to control the tin markets.

The conference was held, in March of this year, but proved a complete failure. The tin producers are a fairly well-knit group. If they are not actually a cartel, the resemblance is startling. They have traditionally controlled world tin markets by establishing production levels and quotas. Their position at the conference was in accordance with this tradition. They refused to increase production and allocate supply. They demanded exorbitant prices. They wanted the United States to join with them in a formal cartel, on the theory I suppose, that the anti-trust laws do not apply to the United States. The producers were more concerned with the possibility of losing their monopolistic control over the tin markets, and with the fear of tin surpluses in the distant future, than they were about the terrifying dangers now facing the free world.

I suppose, too, that they thought the United States didn't have the courage to stop buying tin and that they could continue to sell at \$2 a pound. But we had the courage and today tin is about \$1.10 a pound. The producers have learned a lesson they will long remember.

We are now hopeful that they will recognize the soundness and fairness of our position and will cooperate in the formulation of a sensible tin program. But until they do, we will continue our present course of centralizing tin importing, suspending stockpile purchases, and imposing restrictions on the use of tin for nonessential goods.

Two other materials investigated by the committee, nickel and tungsten, serve to bring out still different problems facing our raw materials preparedness efforts. Both are of vital importance, having many essential industrial uses, and both are in critically short supply.

Eighty-five percent of the free world's nickel is produced by International Nickel Co. of Canada, which has an obvious and formidable monopoly in the field. Inco states that it is now producing at capacity

and, because of difficult mining and metallurgical problems, is unable substantially to increase its productive capacity.

As a result we have to look to the few smaller producers and other sources for additional production which will help narrow the wide gap between current supply and requirements.

In pursuing this approach we discovered that one obvious additional source of nickel was being dangerously neglected, even as much as 6 months after Korean hostilities commenced. The Government's Nicaro plant in Cuba, which ceased operations shortly after World War II, was still standing idle and steps to restore it to production were proceeding at a snail's pace. Under the prodding of the Preparedness Committee the rehabilitation and reactivation of Nicaro has been very substantially speeded up.

Nicar's output can increase the free world's supply of nickel about 10 percent. Its present capacity is 16,000 tons annually. Although during World War II actual production never reached capacity, we intend to make sure that it is attained now.

Because our major source of nickel is so close at hand, there is a constant danger of complacency in the way we handle this problem. The active gray market in nonessential-use nickel, recently exposed, is a reflection of this attitude. The military and essential civilian requirements for nickel are already so great, and constantly increasing, that it is apparent we must develop more effective allocation and conservation measures. Finally, unless new sources are discovered, other metals will have to be substituted for nickel.

The tungsten story is a preview of how total war could deprive us of our principal sources of strategic and critical raw materials. As you know, large quantities of this metal are required for high-speed steels and cutting tools, electronic equipment, and for cores in high velocity armor-piercing shells. China historically has been the world's largest producer of tungsten, and, of course, we have been unable to procure any tungsten from that source since well before its intervention in the Korean struggle. The United States is only capable of producing less than half of our wartime tungsten requirements. With a far from completed stockpile objective, and virtually no other substantial sources readily accessible, this is a far cry from real preparedness.

One of the most regrettable oversights of the Munitions Board in establishing stockpile objectives occurred with respect to tungsten. Until December 1948, its calculations failed to take into account the enormous military requirements for tungsten armor-piercing cores. In the meantime, the Communists were overrunning China and cutting us off from that vast source of supply.

In this situation we recommended measures to increase domestic and foreign tungsten production. We were successful in persuading the Army to test a process developed as long ago as 1948 by which cores from low-grade concentrates can be produced. If successful, this method will save both time, money, and tungsten. But it is clear that if we are to achieve anything approaching an adequate supply of tungsten for wartime requirements we must now pare its non-essential use to the bone.

Assuring adequate wartime supplies of strategic and critical materials like rubber, tin, nickel, and tungsten, while we are at the same time drawing heavily on current supplies for our immediate military build-up program, presents many challenging problems as does virtually every other part of our mobilization program. Those problems can and will be solved. But they will be solved neither by the releases of public relations officers nor by over-optimistic quarterly reports. They will be solved by hard work, by ingenuity, and by respect for the cold facts.

Together the free nations of the world must dedicate their hearts, their heads, and their hands to the task of becoming and remaining militarily and industrially strong. That and that alone can convince the Soviet imperialists that any war they start will result in their downfall. Complacency must be cast out. The business-as-usual attitude still prevalent in the country to a marked degree must end. The necessary sacrifices and hardships must be accepted. All of us in the free world must realize the grave character of the threats to our security, and how little time we may actually have in which to prepare. With imagination and vigor and above all with action now we will ensure that no future historian will write of us, "They mobilized, but too late, and with too little." In this task yours is a great role. It is for you to kindle the conscience of America. For America aroused is unconquerable.

The Fight for Justice for American Citizens—The Case of the Amendment to House Joint Resolution 289

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me during the course of the debate today, I submit, for printing in the Appendix, the statement prepared by me entitled "The Fight for Justice for American Citizens—The Case of the Amendment to House Joint Resolution 289," and a letter dated July 30, 1951, addressed to me by Leo T. Crowley, to which references were made.

The statement and letter are as follows:

A DEMAND THAT THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN NOT PULL ANOTHER SHADY TRICK BEHIND CONGRESS' BACK

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

DO WE BELIEVE IN FAIR PLAY FOR EVERY AMERICAN?

Like a great many other Americans I had for a long time been comparatively unfamiliar with one of the lesser known Government agencies known as the Office of Alien Property Custodian. To be sure, I recalled the scandals which occurred in the administration of alien property after World War I.

Up until recent years, however, it had been my belief that the situation had been corrected and that legislation which Congress had enacted to forestall such scandals had begun to serve as an effective check and balance in that custodial operation. It has always been my opinion that checks and balances are essential against every Government agency, and for that matter, against every human instrumentality, lest there be abuses of power. Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

In recent years, in various contacts with that agency, which I shall hereafter refer to as the APC, I have noted a certain high-handedness, a certain apparent lust for power, a certain "We can do no wrong philosophy," a certain attitude of "We are the boss; we are the king, we shall not be interfered with by Congress or the courts," which is very unfortunate in this agency, or for that matter, any agency.

LITTLE DICTATORS IN THE APC

I recognize the right of men to differ with one another. I have never questioned another man's motives—his honesty, his integrity simply because he holds views differing from my own. But when individuals within or outside a Government agency approach subjects in the manner of little dictators, when they get the concept that they are the absolute boss, that they can defy every basic rule of fairness and justice, then I say that it is time to call a halt. It is time to blow the whistle. It is time to put the little dictators in their place.

Recently I offered, at the suggestion of a distinguished citizen of my State, a simple amendment to assure a fair judicial hearing in a case involving United States Government citizens. Government witnesses presented their views in opposition to the amendment. That is and was their right. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee defeated my amendment, drafted a new one, narrowed its scope, and reported it favorably to the Senate floor.

By then, however, the Office of Alien Property had begun to scream like a monster that had been wounded. "How dare the Congress tell us to go to the courts," it seemed to say. "The record is closed on this case. It must not be reopened."

The agency, or rather a group within it, yelled, ranted, howled. It raised all sorts of extraneous issues.

It started to paint horns on the sponsoring Senators as if by their act of fighting for justice they were defiling the American flag. What a base campaign. What a shocking effort to intimidate. What a tissue of mistruths it has spread to the unsuspecting. The Alien Property Office knows that it has been guilty of peddling sheer bunk to the public and to the press.

I HAVE FAITH IN THE PRESS; YES, EVEN IN MY CRITICS

Let us expose that bunk. Let's look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. Let the press—in whom I have a deep and abiding faith—see how it has in some instances unfortunately set off in defense of errant bureaucracy. Yes; let those folks in the press who have criticized the amendment read the affirmative case for it. I have faith in their ultimate judgment. They may not completely agree with the case for affirmative, but they will see that the sponsors have naught but elementary justice in mind.

I am going to present a review of this entire case, summarized to as great an extent as possible. I will present it in question-and-answer form. Although the bulk of these comments will be related to the past, and although I am intensely interested that there be a thorough review of that past, I am infinitely more concerned with the future.

THERE MUST BE NO QUICK-RIGGED SALE OF DISPUTED PROPERTY RIGHTS

I am going to state that, in my opinion, the United States Government has acted unfairly in a case involving American citizens. I am going to state that there must be a court examination of the record of the United States Government. But I am going to make an additional recommendation—a very strong recommendation—and that is, that the Alien Property Custodian Office not attempt to pull any more tricks on the United States Congress or on the courts of the United States. There is grave danger, according to well-informed observers, that in order to complicate this issue beyond possibility of unravelling, the Alien Property Custodian may force a quick sale of the General Dyestuff Corp. property. In that way, APC would bring into play title of a third party; thus, the possibility of assuring ultimate justice for the original owners of this property would be tremendously endangered.

PEOPLE WAKING UP TO APC

This concern as to this possible "trick" by the APC has a very definite foundation. On this very day, the newspapers of our Nation are carrying reports regarding the questionable history of the APC. There are "signs in the sky" that the days of the APC's relative immunity from investigation are fast drawing to a close. There are signs that the American people and the American press are starting to wake up to the realities of just how this agency has been operating in many respects.

As I shall point out later on, the work of the APC is difficult work, complicated work. A great many fine Americans have served in that agency as its head and on its staff. There cannot be and must never be a blanket accusation of those men. But there have been a comparatively small group of official connivers who, in the opinion of a great many qualified observers, must stand before the bar of public opinion and account for their, let us say, "most peculiar practices."

It is shocking indeed that this very same type of individual has, during recent days, been the type who has been screaming about an alleged "plot" and alleged "secrecy" in connection with the Congressional fight for justice in the Halbach-General Dyestuff Corp. case. Obviously these individuals are simply putting up a smoke screen, hoping to obscure their own guilt. Obviously, they are hurling the very same accusations which they know really describe their own activities, rather than the activities of anyone in Congress.

I WOULD WELCOME ANY INVESTIGATION WITH OPEN ARMS

Remember, Mr. President, it is unfair to yell "plot" against the Congress (or anyone) when there is no plot, "secrecy" when no secrecy is or was intended, "scandal" when a legislative situation, far from being a scandal, involves an elementary fight for justice. If anybody wants to investigate this or any other APC matter, I will welcome them with open arms. I would be perfectly delighted; the quicker the better, the more complete the better. Initially, however, it is the courts which should handle the review of this particular highly technical case.

But would APC want an investigation? Of course not. It would shrink from investigation; it fears investigation; there are too many skeletons rattling in too many APC closets.

Now, let us present the case in question-and-answer form.

First, let us look at this agency itself.

IS THERE THE POSSIBILITY OF ABUSE WITHIN THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN?

In my opinion, the answer is a 1,000 percent yes! This agency has one of the most enormous areas of discretion of any Government agency. Even an administrator with the wisdom of Solomon could make mistakes—very big mistakes—in that office.

And if an individual who did not possess the wisdom of Solomon or the conscience of Solomon headed it and if unconscionable individuals staffed it, immense damage could be done.

I want to reiterate, however, in all fairness to the great many individuals who have worked in that agency that many fine Americans have indeed served there. The Honorable Leo Crowley, I believe, is one of them, and there are many others.

But just look at the fantastic financial empire controlled by this agency. Between March 1942 and June 1950, it "vested" property with a net equity of \$341,000,000. This included \$116,000,000 of interest in business enterprises, \$74,000,000 of interest in estates and trusts.

The office has in addition vested thousands of tremendously valuable German and Japanese patents.

Since the primary aim of the Office of Alien Property Custodian is to prepare those properties for liquidation or sale to nationals of the United States as soon as is practicable, there is obviously an immense opportunity to sell to a favored few sons and favored companies, thus possibly creating immense fortunes for the favored few.

Meanwhile, with the properties being managed under the Office of Alien Property Custodian, there is a tremendous opportunity to put favored sons in as officers and directors.

These facts are obvious to everyone.

I make no charges at the present time. Let all who read, draw their own implications. The possibilities for abuses by this agency, for misuse of assets, are literally fantastic.

Think for a moment of the General Audline & Film Corp., whose total assets in mid-1950 were \$112,000,000, or of the Shering Corp., with total assets of \$11,500,000, and so on down the line of companies controlled by OAPC.

Think of how relatively easy it would be for OAPC to (a) prevent rightful owners from resuming control of a corporation which might have been improperly seized initially.

(b) Sell that corporation to some favored sons before the courts or Congress or public opinion could catch up, so to speak. This is identically what is feared in the Halbach-GDC case.

WHAT IS THE HALBACH GDC CASE AND THE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 229 ALL ABOUT?

The case concerns the challenging of an unfair so-called compromise agreement under which rights to so-called enemy-owned stock were induced to be sold to the Government in effect for 20 cents on the dollar. The purpose of the amendment to House Joint Resolution 229, therefore, is to permit court review of the merits of that whole settlement (or some few similar settlements) in the interest of fair play and justice.

WHAT IS WRONG ABOUT SUCH COURT REVIEW?

Nothing. But, the Alien Property Office doesn't want it. It's scared of it. It is screaming against it. It fears a thorough judicial review.

DOES THIS MEAN THAT ALL FOLKS CONNECTED WITH THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN NOW OR PREVIOUSLY ARE AGAINST THE AMENDMENT?

Definitely not. The Honorable Leo Crowley, formerly APC Administrator, is a prime force respectfully urging action on such an amendment. That is a matter of record which Mr. Crowley has been happy to make known repeatedly. Mr. Crowley had with considerable doubt, signed the vesting order on that stock. (The compromise agreement was, however, signed during the regime of Mr. Crowley's successor, Mr. James Markham.)

In a comprehensive letter of July 30 to me, Mr. Crowley stated "I would be willing myself to testify before your committee in support of such an amendment." (An original amendment broader than the present amendment.)

JUST HOW DID THIS CASE START?

The United States Government, through the Department of Justice and in turn the Office of Alien Property, vested stock of the General Dyestuff Corp. of New York. Almost all of the owners of the stock were native-born citizens of German heritage. Note that—native-born citizens (not enemy aliens).

The holders of more than half the stock at the time of vesting were American-born trustees holding the stock for the native-born daughters of Ernest Halbach of Short Hills, N. J.—as a result of a gift in trust made by Halbach prior to the war.

WHAT IS THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF VESTING PROPERTY?

As described in the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, United States Department of Justice for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

"The Office of Alien Property is charged with the responsibility of elimination of enemy interest in property in the United States owned or controlled by the governments and nationals of Germany and Japan. The initial step in this program involves the identification and vesting of this property in the name of the Attorney General of the United States. Control is obtained through the issuance of a vesting order and vested property is administered by the Office in the national interest."

I invite attention to the fact that vesting theoretically only takes place in connection with "enemy" interest. Yet, as Mr Crowley pointed out in his comprehensive letter to me, while the stock of the Halbach children was identified as "enemy" in nature, Ernest Halbach himself, (who was for many years president and manager of the company and who was one of the outstanding dyestuff technicians in America), was continued by the Alien Property Custodian Office in actual charge of the company's operations during the entire war. Obviously, he was not an "enemy." Obviously, he was "cleared" to hold this post.

As a matter of fact, he was commended for his war work by the War Production Board and Gen Brehon Somervell

WAS THERE THUS CLEAR PROOF THAT THE OWNERSHIP OF THE STOCK WAS ENEMY IN NATURE?

Very definitely not. Mr. Crowley stated that there was serious doubt on that point. He commented, however, that as a general policy, "if any doubt existed as to the possible enemy character of the property and the property was essential to our war efforts and needs, I resolved that doubt in favor of the Government and issued vesting orders."

Mr Crowley stated further that his premise was that he expected normal judicial remedy would be available under which citizens would later reclaim their property, if it had been improperly vested.

Now, with regard to the doubt itself, Mr. Crowley stated, "Special investigations within my own office conducted after the vesting created substantial doubt within my office as to the basis for vesting, particularly a report by Judge John J. Burns of Boston, Mass., a highly respected judge and lawyer."

WERE THERE ANY UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES DURING THE WAR WHICH WOULD HAVE PRESSURED THE OWNERS OF THE STOCK TO SELL AT LESS THAN FAIR VALUE?

Of course there were. Everybody recognizes that during a period of war, there are tensions, hatreds, fears, subtle and overt pressures which very obviously tend to force individuals to make settlements which might be unfair.

To quote from Mr. Crowley: "From my own experiences of the atmosphere in which the Alien Property Custodian's Office operated, I agree with amendment and urge its adoption."

From Mr. Crowley, I quote further: "At some point during the proceedings, Mr. Halbach was induced by the Department (whether as a price of being permitted to retain his employment with the company and thus preserve his reputation before the public during the war, or otherwise) to cause the daughters' trustees, and former associates to compromise" and sell their stocks at less than book value.

WHAT THEN DOES THE ISSUE BOIL DOWN TO IN THE HALBACH-GENERAL DYESTUFF CORP. CASE?

The issue is whether the Halbach daughters and others in a similar situation shall be given an opportunity of a full trial on the merits in court in order to clear their reputations and their property.

To get such a trial, there must first be removed all procedural impediments.

DOES THE AMENDMENT PREJUDICE THE RIGHTS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT?

Of course not. As stated by Mr. Crowley in connection with the original amendment, "the language of the amendment could not hurt the United States nor the rights of any third parties."

IS THERE A PRIMA FACIE CASE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT'S CONDUCT OF THE CASE?

Absolutely. To cite just one phase, the Alien Property Custodian Office bought the Halbach stock at \$118 a share when the book value of the stock, as publicly stated by the Attorney General at the time, was nearly five times that amount. What is fair about that sort of settlement?

Later, another block of stock was bought for \$365 a share. How could \$118 be fair if the same Office of Alien Property Custodian later bought another block of stock at over double the amount; which in turn was far less than the \$540 estimated by the Attorney General to be the book value of the stock?

RETURNING TO MR. CROWLEY, WHAT IS THE BACKGROUND OF HIS CONTACTS WITH SENATORS IN THIS CASE?

On July 17, Mr. Crowley came to my office accompanied by another good friend, a distinguished Republican Senator of the United States.

Mr. Crowley factually described the Halbach Dyestuff case. He stated that he felt that an injustice had been committed and that the United States Government should allow a full judicial review of the merits of that case.

I told Mr. Crowley that I was glad to get his expert judgment and I asked him to prepare a letter setting forth all the basic facts and enclosing an amendment which might be submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for review. This he did, and on July 30 he sent me the afore-mentioned letter which I am making a part of this record.

On Friday, August 17, we discussed this issue in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A representative from the Department of Justice appeared before us. He opposed the amendment. He stated, moreover, that the whole subject might better be handled if at all, by a special private bill and not as an amendment to the termination of war resolution.

Members of the committee like myself agreed that it might indeed for some reasons be preferable to have this amendment considered as a special bill, although it was not inappropriate, as I shall mention later on, to include it in House Joint Resolution 289. We stated that in view of the time factor involved and in view of other factors which militated against the passage of a private bill, we might just as well bring the issue up for debate in committee and on the Senate floor as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 289. It was quite clear that the same forces which opposed the amendment to House Joint Resolution 289 would also oppose the private bill.

After the committee debate, the amendment which I had introduced on behalf of Mr. Crowley, was defeated. That ended the matter so far as I was concerned. A number of Senators indicated, however, that if the amendment were redrawn so as to narrow its scope, they would favor it. Still others said they would support a private bill but not an amendment of this nature, however restricted, to House Joint Resolution 289.

I want to point out, however, that the defeat of this amendment did conclude the matter as far as I was concerned. I had pleaded the case as I saw the equities. The majority of the committee had not held with me. I felt that it was up to us to proceed to other business.

I subsequently left to attend the San Francisco Japanese Peace Conference as an official delegate of the United States Government. I left specific instructions on my departure that I did not want the over-all war-termination resolution held up on my account. Nevertheless, the resolution as a whole was held up in view of the opinion of a majority of the committee to the effect that this matter should be reconsidered.

When I returned, I found House Joint Resolution 289 pending before the committee once again. A leading Democratic Senator moved reconsideration of the whole subject. A new amendment identified as "the committee amendment" came up for review that Monday, October 1. This amendment was passed, 6 to 2, including both Republican and Democratic favorable votes. Let it be mentioned again that the committee amendment was more restrictive in the number of cases to which it pertained as compared with the original amendment. This then is the amendment now pending on the Senate floor. There we have a brief history of the background of my own interest in the amendment. There are no other basic facts, no other motives, no other interests to my knowledge which have entered into the situation at all. The amendment has been offered in good faith. It will be voted up or down in good faith.

IS IT INAPPROPRIATE TO HAVE IN THE TERMINATION OF THE WAR RESOLUTION AN AMENDMENT OF THIS NATURE?

No. In the first place, as stated in Senate Report 892

"Since the executive branch of the Government has deemed it appropriate to protect the operations of the Alien Property Custodian Office by the inclusion of a proviso in the present resolution (continuing the powers of the Alien Property Office—my addition) the committee believes that it is also appropriate and just to furnish those who allege injury an opportunity to be heard on the merits of the case."

A second reason why it is not inappropriate to include this matter as an amendment to the joint resolution is that by this amendment, we will be proving to the German people that in the United States of America, we believe in a system of impartial administration of justice.

We believe that every individual no matter who he is or what he is, whether he be a Nazi, Fascist, or Communist, or whether he or his heirs or relatives be alleged to have such associations or financial interests, is entitled to his day in court.

AMERICANS DESPISE LEGAL LYNCHING

In the United States of America we do not believe in legal lynching. We do not believe that a real or alleged Nazi, Fascist, or Communist can be deprived of his rights, if he is an American citizen.

This does not mean that we will allow any individual who does not believe in the American way of life to sabotage this country directly or indirectly. No one who is familiar with my record of opposing all totalitarian movements and individuals would doubt for one moment my steadfast fight against such individuals. However, we cannot throw the Consultation out of the window simply because it comes up in a case which does not particularly suit our political beliefs.

I have no brief for the infamous I. G. Farben Corp. or any cartel. I have always fought monopolies and trusts, domestic or foreign. But I do have a brief for the United States Constitution.

AMERICANS DESPISE COLD OR HYSTERICAL PERSECUTION

We all recall during World War I, the hysteria which prevailed against German-Americans. We recall that a great Senator of Wisconsin and of the United States, the Honorable Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., was hanged in effigy, reviled, smeared, because he would

not join in the hysteria against Germans or German-Americans.

To those who oppose this amendment, may I ask, Do you perhaps want us to don white robes and go out and lynch individuals who are alleged to be Nazis, Fascists, or Communists? Do you want us to confiscate outright their property? Do you want us to adopt the horrible tactics of nazism, fascism, and communism under the guise of fighting them?

What has happened to our American concept of civil liberties? What has happened to our concept of freedom for the thought we hate espoused by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes?

I am sure that the very sources which have been critical of this amendment have splendid records of fighting for civil rights. Let them not forget their own fine records in this respect. Let them not violate their own inherent sense of fair play. Let them not endanger the rights of all minorities by this terrible precedent.

One million Americans have died during our history in various wars for freedom. Let their fight for civil rights not be lost.

CAN THE HALBACH DAUGHTERS SECURE REMEDY FOR THEIR ALLEGED INJURY AT PRESENT WITHOUT THIS AMENDMENT?

They can if they prove fraud and duress; but every lawyer recognizes how difficult it is to prove fraud and duress.

The Halbach daughters have instituted proceedings in the Federal courts in New Jersey. But they are being threatened with their compromise settlement of 1945 as a bar to their attempt to have a trial.

This compromise settlement on its face was an obvious farce.

What do I propose at the present time? First, I propose that the Senate debate this issue up or down. I repeat, I never for one moment have sought to delay action on the over-all resolution to terminate a state of war with Germany. Obviously, this resolution is of paramount importance with or without this amendment.

If the Senate does not agree with this amendment, let it defeat it; if it does, let it pass it. Let the issue be thoroughly debated.

Second, there is a possibility this issue may not be acted upon one way or the other because of Congress' adjournment. In that event, I propose, indeed I emphatically urge that the APC not indulge in any quick sale trick such as envisioned in the earlier part of this statement. The eyes of America are on you, APC, don't attempt to pull a fast one on the Congress or the people.

IN SUMMARY, IS THERE ANY BASIS FOR DEFAMING MR. LEO CROWLEY OR ANY SENATOR WHO HAS SPONSORED THIS AMENDMENT?

Of course not. There is no reason to doubt for one moment the integrity, the honesty, the efficiency of Leo Crowley. He has received a great many honors from his country and from his religious faith. He has won great distinction in private business life. He has prized his record and reputation. He has followed up on this Halbach matter because he has a deep and deserved pride in his Government and he feels that his Government—our Government—should not ban redress of a wrong. He has no personal interest, financial or otherwise, in this whole matter except as an issue of principle.

If a Senator of the United States cannot heed the judgment voiced by an expert of Mr. Crowley's stature and voiced by other Senators, then the question is: Whose judgment can be heeded?

We Senators who have backed this effort number both Republicans and Democrats. Party politics is not an issue. I congratulate those Democrats who by their support have signified that they dispute "the king can do no wrong" philosophy of the APC office. I am sure there are many present and past APC employees who disagree with the

tactics which we Senators have also condemned.

Remember, the original Wiley amendment was defeated. It died. A new amendment was drafted by administration Senators and took its place. That is the issue now pending before us. The case rests with the Congress and the people.

QUESTIONS FOR THE OPPOSITION TO ANSWER

Mr. President, I have thus presented a considerable number of questions on which I have offered what I feel to be accurate and fair answers.

Now let me present a series of questions which I ask the opposition to answer.

Is it not a fact that the newspaper criticisms which have been published against the amendment by their very text, betray the amazing contradictions in the Government's treatment of the General Dyestuff Corp.?

Is it not a fact the Government alternately accused Halbach of being a German, and at the same time in complete inconsistency kept him in control of one of the most essential wartime industries for 10 years?

Is it not a fact that the Government arranged what was obviously an illegal purchase of Halbach's daughters' stock when if the stocks were really tainted, it did not need to pay them a single dime?

Is it not a further fact that the files of the APC Office contain exhaustive reports on Ernest Halbach and his relations with German interests and that these reports refute the allegations made about Halbach?

Is it not a fact that one of the reports was written by a very well-trained former FBI investigator and that one was written by a reputable judge and attorney of the deepest moral convictions who possessed vast experience both inside and outside of Government?

Is it not a fact that both reports were completely in Mr. Halbach's favor, and stated that there existed not the slightest basis to justify seizure by the Government of his daughters' stock in the first place?

Is it not a fact that in one of those reports there is a strong recommendation that the stock be returned forthwith to its owners on the elemental principle that an act of injustice had been done by the United States Government?

Is it not a fact that the moneys paid out to General Dyestuff Corp stockholders came illegally out of their own pockets?

Is it not a fact that the APC Office did not have money to buy stock because the Congress of the United States had not appropriated any money for that purpose, so lacking cash with which to effect the compromise the APC simply declared a dividend out of the corporate surplus of the company and gave it back to the corporation stockholders?

Is it not a fact that the net cost to the United States Government was thus nothing, and the net gain to the corporate stockholders was nothing because they received their own money? And is it not a fact that this whole procedure was brazenly illegal?

Is it not a further fact that the whole compromise was legally questionable because many experts believe that the Attorney General does not have the power to deal with vested property with uncontrolled discretion?

Is it not a fact that the Congress set out very complete and rigid orders in the trading with the enemy law regarding the disposition of vested property?

Is it not a fact that there is a rumor going around Washington to the effect that the Department of Justice realizes that if it has to go to trial it cannot win the suit?

Is it not a fact that behind-the-scenes influences reportedly already have an inside track in purchasing this property and their plans would be smashed if the suit were lost?

Is it not a fact that in the postwar investigation conducted in Germany while our

occupation forces were there with all German files available to our investigating agents, there failed to be produced any evidence to support the original charges concerning General Dyestuff and Mr. Halbach?

Yes, Mr. President, is it not a fact that the reluctance of the Department of Justice to accept this amendment is because there are so many controversial issues, so many points of difference, so many substantial doubts as to the propriety of vesting this company in the first place that the whole situation cries to high heaven?

CHICAGO, ILL., July 30, 1951.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This will acknowledge your letter of July 25, concerning the proposed resolution for ending the state of war with Germany.

You ask me for my opinion, as former Alien Property Custodian, concerning an enclosed proposed amendment to the proviso continuing the powers of the Alien Property Custodian over German property.

As I read the proposed amendment, in substance it would insure American citizens their day in court in situations where their property was confiscated, during the existence of the state of war, under suspicion or accusation that the citizens represented or cloaked German interests.

Such citizens would have an opportunity to have a final determination by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction, after trial on the merits, as to whether they did or did not represent enemy interests without being barred in such suit by so-called compromises or purchases by the Government of such property already seized by the Government which the Government induced such citizens to sign during the stress and pressure of the war period.

From my own experience of the atmosphere in which the Alien Property Custodian's office had to operate, I agree with this amendment and urge its adoption. You may so represent my views to my friend Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of your committee, and the other members of the committee, and convey my willingness so to testify before the committee, if desired.

Fair opportunity through the courts to American citizens to clear their names, particularly to those citizens of German heritage who were accused of enemy affiliations during the war, is compelled by our own sense of American justice, as well as to insure us the full psychological benefit of ending the state of war with Germany.

I would judge that only a very few cases will be affected by this amendment and that in all such cases it will be found that the United States Government still holds the confiscated property concerned without any rights of third parties having intervened.

But I agree that the principle of fairness involved is fundamental. In respect of any affairs with which I dealt as a public official, I am as concerned that we should be as zealous to protect American citizens from abuse of power by their own government as I was concerned before the war by the deprivation of the liberties and properties of honest German citizens by the Hitler government—and as I am concerned over what other totalitarian regimes are doing to the liberty and property of their own citizens today.

With respect to the Halbach and General Dyestuff Corp. vestings to which you refer, these cases would undoubtedly fall within the intent of the amendment—and I feel most justly so. Nothing with which I dealt in my experience as a public official has more disturbed me, although I have not known any of the individuals involved except in my capacity as a public official.

The Halbach-Dyestuff situation involved the property rights in the stock of General Dyestuff Corp., a New York corporation hereinafter called "GDC" wholly owned by American citizens, almost all of whom were native-born and of German heritage. The holders of more than half the stock at the time of vesting were American-born trustees holding the stock for the native-born daughters of Ernest Halbach, of Short Hills, N. J., as a result of a gift in trust made by Halbach prior to the war.

Halbach himself—native-born in Philadelphia in the year 1883—had for many years been the president and manager of the company. He was and is recognized as one of the outstanding dyestuff technicians in the country. (One of the inexplicable contradictions in the situation is that although, under the circumstances, later detailed, the stock of the Halbach children was vested as "enemy," Halbach himself was continued by the Alien Property Custodian in actual charge of the company's operations during the entire war—and he continued in that capacity even up to a year ago. He was, in addition, an important member of the Dyestuff Committee of the War Production Board, and was commended for his war work by the War Production Board and by General Somervell.)

Prior to my taking office as Alien Property Custodian—as a matter of fact, almost immediately upon the declaration of war—the Treasury had vested General Anilino & Film Corp. (hereinafter called "GAF"), in which enemy interests undoubtedly exercised some control. GAF's chemical output was very important to the war effort. The seizure of GAF immediately created difficulties for GDC because of a contract between GAF and GDC, which had been in existence for many years prior to the war, whereunder GDC had the exclusive selling rights for certain but not all GAF products. Because of the existence of this selling arrangement which was made the most effective operation of the vested GAF difficult without concomitant control of GDC, I ordered the vesting of the GDC stock.

Throughout my term as Alien Property Custodian, I conceived it to be my duty to make the fullest use of property needful to the war effort. I also conceived it my duty to be restrained in dealing with property where ownership clearly appeared to be in United States citizens but if any doubt existed as to the nonenemy character of the property and the property was essential to our war effort and needs, I resolved that doubt in favor of the Government and issued vesting orders. In so doing, I always had in mind that the Trading with the Enemy Act provided a clear and adequate remedy to the citizen to reclaim his property, that when property was vested, it was in effect trustee property which would not be dissipated or lost, and that when and if a citizen recovered his property, no substantial damage would have happened to it. I refer particularly to the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act which accorded every citizen whose property was seized an opportunity to institute suit in the Federal courts to have a final determination, after trial on the merits, as to the enemy or nonenemy character of the property.

The foregoing brief statement of policy explains my attitude at the time of vesting of the GDC stock. In a very real sense, it was a protective vesting to secure to the United States the benefits of the continued operation of GAF in conjunction with GDC. On the other hand, I depended for ultimate justice to the individuals involved upon those provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act which secured them the right of trial in the Federal courts for the return of their property. It was always my opinion that the fact of enemy interest was a jurisdictional requirement for vesting and reten-

tion of property; and that that question could only ultimately be determined within the four corners of the statute by a determination by a court after trial on the merits.

I left the stock vested when I left the APC's office, notwithstanding that special investigations within my own office, conducted after the vesting, had created substantial doubt within by office as to the basis for vesting—particularly a report by Judge John J. Burns, of Boston, Mass., a highly respected judge and lawyer. In not seeking to divest the stock in the face of such doubts, I was again relying on the expectation that the ultimate question of my right to vest and retain would, as a matter of law, have to be taken care of in the courts, and again relying upon my legal advisers and, in particular, Judge Burns, I felt that my earlier administrative determination was one which I could not then reverse.

In the course of these difficulties, the Foreign Relations Committee, or at least Senator CONNALLY, will remember that I appeared before the committee to justify my course of action in view of the anomaly that the president of the corporation, Mr. Ernest Halbach, a native-born American (whose family was the largest owner of the vested stock), was regarded so highly as a loyal American citizen that we not only maintained him in actual charge of the operations of the company for the duration of the entire war, but the War Production Board also made extensive use of his services as chief consultant of the War Production Board in the dyestuff section.

Meanwhile, the Halbach interests and others—undoubtedly to protect their personal reputations during the war excitement and to preserve their rights—had made protective filings of suits in the Federal courts pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act for a determination of the charges that they held their property for the enemy. They undoubtedly did not expect a trial during the war.

The Department of Justice, however, pressed for early trial in the middle of the war. At this time, I was no longer Alien Property Custodian.

At some point during these proceedings, Mr. Halbach was induced by the Department (whether as a price of being permitted to retain his employment with the company and thus preserve his reputation before the public during the war or otherwise) to cause his daughter's trustees and his former associates to compromise and sell their stock to the Alien Property Custodian at a price of \$118 a share when the book value of the stock, as publicly stated by the Attorney General at the time, was nearly five times that amount.

Earlier this year (1951) the Alien Property Custodian, by similar purchase and compromise, acquired another block of the GDC stock (vested at the same time the Halbach stock was vested) from a Mrs. St. George at a price of \$365 a share. Obviously the very disparity among the amount paid the Halbach daughters (\$118) the amount paid Mrs. St. George (\$365), and the amount of the estimate of the Attorney General (\$510) is prima facie evidence that Halbach, a competent judge of the value of such property, was not permitted to deal at arm's length to defend the property.

In at least the cases dealing with the interests of the Halbach daughters and others similarly situated, the Government paid them the bargain compromise price by having a Government-appointed board of directors declare a cash dividend to the Alien Property Custodian on the vested stock out of cash surplus in the company's own treasury—a transaction which Judge Burns has always advised me was completely illegal.

I have never been able to comprehend where and how the Alien Property Custodian acquired legal authority either to compro-

mise the uncompromisable issue of the enemy or nonenemy character of the property or, having done so, to expend Government funds for the purchase of property to which the Alien Property Custodian already had clear title, without paying compensation, by reason of my act of vesting.

As a part of the sales transaction, the Halbach daughters, the trustees of a trust created by Halbach, and Halbach himself were required to consent to the dismissal, with prejudice, of the suit in the Federal Court which had never reached the point of trial on the merits. The Halbach daughters, I understand, have again instituted proceedings in the Federal Court seeking to reopen their case and have a trial on the merits, and are being threatened with their compromise agreement of 1945 as a bar to their attempt to have a trial.

As GDC is still in the power of the Alien Property Custodian, I feel it is very important, since the powers of the Alien Property Custodian are continued by this resolution closing the war with Germany, that the Halbach daughters and others similarly situated should be accorded an opportunity of a full trial on the merits in court to clear their reputations and their property and that all procedural impediments to such trial should be removed. I do not believe that the Alien Property Custodian's war record should close on the deprival of American citizens of their day in court on the basis of administrative expedients of, to say the least, the most doubtful legality.

So far as I can see, the language of the amendment that you propose could not hurt the United States nor the rights of any third parties. But it would guarantee that the affairs of the Alien Property Custodian's office would close on a note to the effect that every effort had been made to see that the Government of the United States had not overreached its citizens during a period of war stress which the resolution is now bringing to a close.

I would be willing myself to testify before your committee in support of such an amendment. I would suggest, too, that Judge Burns of Boston, who was my adviser and my conscience in this affair, should also be called to testify. Should he not be available for any reason I should be happy to present to you a copy of certain reports rendered by him to me under dates of October 20, 1942, and December 14, 1943.

Respectfully yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY.

Work for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following copy of a letter mailed to all New England governors on October 15, 1951, by Mr. Frank J. Benti, president, Rhode Island State CIO executive council:

His Excellency DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor of the State of Rhode Island
and Providence Plantations,
State House, Providence, R. I.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROBERTS: This letter is simultaneously being addressed to you and the governors of the other five New England States in the fervent hope that through the medium of the Governors' Council imme-

date action may be taken to determine why our New England industrial area has been given only a limited opportunity to fulfill governmental defense orders so vital to our own economy and our Nation's mobilization program.

Throughout the Nation a shortage of workers is reported to exist in most areas. Yet in New England today we have tens upon tens of thousands of unemployed skilled workers, while in other areas, particularly the South, a defense-work boom is well under way.

In Rhode Island alone more than 34,000 able men and women are unemployed, and approximately 26,000 of this total are now receiving unemployment compensation. This same situation is true in varying degrees in many other industrial centers of New England.

Furthermore, in New England we possess a reservoir of the most qualified workers in these United States; workers whose technological know-how in textile, metal working, machine tool, jewelry, rubber, leather, plastic, and electrical industries is of a definitely superior level; workers whose skills made it possible for this region to make invaluable contributions to the World War II defense effort.

The fact that defense production is booming in other areas of the Nation and is so negligible in New England is due solely to the dearth of defense-work contracts being channeled into this region by the Defense Department and other governmental procurement agencies, this despite the fact that New England industry needs the work and has proved in the past that it can do the work by meeting the most exacting standards and schedules.

The debilitating effects of large-scale unemployment—measured by the drains upon our unemployment compensation funds, the lowering of our labor-management morale, and the weakening of the over-all economic structure of our region—demands that prompt action be taken to correct a most unjust situation.

Action in the form of congressional investigation of the situation already has been proposed by both Democratic and Republican members of our New England congressional delegation. In this respect Representative LANE, of Massachusetts, has pointed out the Government's failure to expedite defense-contract allocations to this area while, at the same time, it is issuing certificates of necessity to southern textile mills.

Furthermore, Representative LANE has rightfully noted that New England possesses "the machinery, the manpower, and the know-how eager to go into production."

However, it is our suggestion that any congressional probe should be implemented by action on the labor-management level as well—in order that Washington may be convinced of the complete unanimity of opinion shared by labor, management, State, and national officials and the general public concerning the discrimination being evidenced by the Defense Department and other agencies toward our New England economy. Therefore, we propose the following:

1. That the Governors of the six New England States meet in council at their earliest convenience and that they appoint six-member committees from their respective States—these committees to consist of three members each representing industry and labor. (The three-member labor delegation, in turn, might well be made up of one member each representing the CIO, the AFL, and a major independent union.)

2. That this 36-member New England Labor-Management Committee To Expedite Defense-Work Contracts promptly convene after its appointment and make arrangements for an immediate conference in Washington with qualified representatives of the Defense and Commerce Departments.

3. That all New England congressional Members be invited to participate in this conference.

4. That emphasis be placed upon New England's unemployment situation and the imperative need for immediate distribution of governmental defense-work contracts to take up this slack; upon New England's outstanding defense production record of World War II, as well as upon its supply of highly skilled workers, upon the need not only for textile contracts but also contracts for qualified firms in need of orders in the metal-working, machine-tool, jewelry, leather, rubber, electrical, plastic, and computable industries.

5. That the supporting testimony supplied at this proposed conference also be made available to any congressional committee appointed to look into the situation.

We make this proposal for such a joint committee only because we feel it will properly supplement and abet a congressional probe. Furthermore, we are not unmindful of the fact that responsible leaders of Congress are declaring that adjournment of that body is in the immediate offing.

Because we feel that swift, alert, constructive action must be taken to correct a most inequitable situation we urge that you exercise your good offices in making our proposal—or some comparable suggestion—a reality by the concerted action of the Governors of New England.

Respectfully,

FRANK J. BENTJ,
President, Executive Council, Rhode
Island State CIO.

Inadequate Food Control and Relief for Flood Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, there are many sadly disappointed people in the Midwest in view of two of today's congressional acts.

In the first place it was hoped that the conference report on civil-functions appropriations would include construction funds for Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue, and for Toronto Dam on the Verdigris. The report includes only planning money, but there is every reason to believe that building funds will be made available in the coming year. With this start, they can hope for rapid progress.

The other cause for heavy hearts in the Midwest is the failure of the Senate to include in the so-called flood-relief bill any funds for grants-in-aid to those who need it most. As I pointed out in the debate when the House considered this measure, all it did was to give the flood sufferers a chance to go more deeply in debt.

There was no provision for helping those who lost most, if not all, of their earthly possessions by direct grants to help them refurbish their homes and reclothe their families.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, only a week ago countless millions were made available, though not with my vote, to refugees

and the unfortunate around the world. The present policy seems to be to grant billions for global help, but not a dime for flood-stricken victims.

If the administration, from the President on down, really desires to help those refugees from the Nation's greatest, most disastrous flood, support can be given, and immediate hearings undertaken on H. R. 5681, which I have introduced and which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. Enactment of this bill will give, in part, at least, the help these unfortunate flood victims so urgently need.

As I have said so often, Mr. Speaker, the need is great; the need is now.

Tribute for Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of the House will want to read a tribute given to a former outstanding Member of this body, by the publication known as *Armed Force*, published here in Washington, D. C., at 1833 Jefferson Place NW.

A splendid editorial of commendation and appreciation in connection with the service and accomplishments of Brig. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, appeared in the issue of October 6, 1951. So that his many friends in the House may read it, I have asked permission to insert this splendid editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It follows:

VICTIM OF WAR

Ironically, it was just about a year ago an editorial appeared in these columns lauding Brig. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, for his superlative efforts in behalf of the formulation of realistic and workable Peace policy. As the chairman of a Defense Department subcommittee, General Maas and his associates worked speedily and strenuously to rectify the injustices and inequities which were just beginning to emerge from the illogical call-up of civilian component forces at the outbreak of the Korean war.

It is now our distressing duty to report that the excessive strains, burdens and demands on his time and energies, placed upon him by his activities of the past year, have taken a heavy toll of "Mel" Maas. He lies convalescing from a serious illness at the Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., and is apparently faced with the prospect of a considerable stay before he recovers. Even after his physical recovery, he is faced with the serious impairment of his eyesight, perhaps even to the point of near blindness.

Mel Maas is a victim of the Korean war just as surely as if he had been in the front lines. Colleagues who had followed closely his numerous and effective appearance before congressional committees and other official bodies concerned with manpower and Reserve force policies had expressed concern months ago about the state of his health, but he continued to give of himself, and of his strength, with an almost fanatic dedication. While this falls into the realm of guesswork, and second guessing at that, it is quite likely

that had he slowed the pace, had he taken better care of his health, to the detriment of the cause for which he was fighting, the nature of his subsequent illness might have been less critical.

He was largely responsible for the reforms in Reserve force policy which were adopted by the Defense Department last fall, many of which were wiped out almost immediately by the disturbing turn of events in North Korea. Despite reversals and rebuffs, he continued to fight for the establishment of a sound, long-range Reserve policy, without regard for the expediences of the moment. His long experience as a Marine officer, as a legislator, and as a public-spirited citizen, plus his first-hand personal knowledge of Reserve problems and Reserve thinking, drove him on long after it would have been prudent for him, if he had been inclined to act selfishly, to have slowed his pace.

Rarely have the columns of Armed Force been used for a purpose such as this, but we know that the many friends of Mel Maas throughout the Nation, particularly the members of MCROA, which he headed so effectively, and of ROA, of which he is still legislative chairman, would like to know about him. He's immobilized now out at Tower 16, Bethesda Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., and a note or call from those of his friends who heretofore have not known about his illness would help a lot to raise his spirits and bolster his morale. For our part, this editorial is one of the few ways we know to pay tribute to General Maas, the marine who kept on fighting, selflessly and conscientiously, a battle in behalf of hundreds of thousands of reservists, without regard to service or branch.

Farmers Oppose Central Control of Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CARVER COUNTY FARM
BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
Waconia, Minn., September 12, 1951.
Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Representative WAITER JUDD,
Senator EDWARD J. THYE.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: A meeting was held at the city hall in Waconia on the evening of September 11 to consider the work of the various Government agencies dealing with agricultural problems. The chairman of the local FMA committee presided at this meeting and he also had one of his clerks present to assemble notes on the remarks made by the people who were present.

For your information, it was the unanimous opinion of the people present that the farmers of Carver County and the surrounding area are definitely opposed to central control of farm programs. They also expressed their opposition to the proposed Office of Information as suggested by the department heads of the Department of Agriculture. We feel that this agency would bypass the work of the land-grant colleges and experiment stations and that the costs would be excessive.

A recommendation was made favoring the election by the borrowers of four instead of

three directors of the Crow River NFLA. This, too, was an expression in favor of more local control of all our farm programs. We feel that governmental agencies should not participate in policy making because this is a function of our elected representatives.

We hope that you can give these matters your favorable consideration when and if Congress is asked to consider these programs.

Respectfully,

DONALD ANDERSON,

Secretary, Carver County Farm Bureau.

Consideration of Remaining Hoover Reorganization Commission Recommendations Urged When Congress Reconvenes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement released by him today urging immediate consideration of the remainder of the Hoover Reorganization Commission recommendations when Congress reconvenes next January.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

On September 28, 1951, Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University and national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, addressed a message to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, in which he said "The time has come for plain speaking on the report of the bipartisan Commission on Organization (the Hoover Commission)." This message should be taken to heart by every Member of the Eighty-second Congress. We ought to do something about it.

Dr. Johnson points out that the present Congress has, in its first year increased the Federal budget by approximately 70 percent. Yet, the Congress stands practically at the point of adjournment without having taken substantial action on the Hoover Commission's recommendations for reorganization, efficiency, and economy. Authorities in management maintain that these reforms could yield operating economies of \$5,400,000,000 a year—if intelligently and ardently administered.

An overwhelming majority of the Members of both Houses and of both parties of this Congress have, in one way or another, expressed general endorsement of the Hoover report and its legislative recommendations. For my own part, I have repeatedly expressed unqualified support of the Commission's program. To my mind, the Hoover report is a plan, a complete plan, for the vitally needed modernization of the Federal structure. I see no sense in half measures when we consider its adoption.

Admittedly, no plan is perfect. Admittedly, there may be "i's" which could be dotted and "t's" which could be crossed in the Hoover report. Nevertheless, this is the most authoritative and comprehensive plan of its kind ever created. It deserves a fair trial. It will not get a fair trial unless it gets a complete trial.

If, therefore, there were some way of voting the remaining 50 percent of the Commission's recommendations into effect tomorrow, I, for one, would welcome the opportunity to do so. I am well aware that powerful opposition pressures would develop. Let us remember, however, that every single one of the reorganization reforms which have so far been adopted have met with similar opposition. Every department and agency fights change. Every one of them is supported in this fight by its "sweetheart" private organizations.

But mark this well. Of the 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans so far enacted, not one has done harm. Most have done great good. Yet, in every single case, either the bureaus or their "sweetheart" organizations predicted dire catastrophe. It just wasn't so. In the one case out of the 46 where trouble appeared to be brewing, Congress took remedial action, in plenty of time.

Since there is no possibility of completing the reorganization job at this session, I do strongly urge prompt action when Congress reconvenes on January 8, 1952. The efforts of the Eighty-second Congress will not be wholly lost if we expedite action on the following measures, which have already had some congressional consideration.

Item No. 1, Federal-State relations (S 1146): The Senate should pass this bill immediately. It considered a similar bill during most of the Eighty-first Congress. This bill was passed once during this session, only to be recalled from the House through the motion of the senior Senator from Louisiana. We have been working on this particular measure for 3 years now. It has cost the Senate much time and much money. It is high time that we passed the bill, once and for all.

Item No. 2, overseas administration (S 1166): This bill was passed by the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress. It was passed again by the Senate in the present Congress, only to be recalled from the House by the motion of the senior Senator from Louisiana. Here, again, we have spent far too much time and money to permit this measure to go down the drain. It also should be passed immediately.

Item No. 3, Post Office Department (S 1148). Without wishing to intrude into the affairs of a committee of which I am no longer a member, I would like to point out that this matter was discussed extensively during the Eighty-first Congress by the cognizant committee. Once more, during the Eighty-second Congress, it has been discussed in extenso. There seems to be no earthly reason why this bill cannot be reported and passed.

Item No. 4, personnel (S 1135): This bill provides for modernization of Federal recruitment. It is my understanding that a version, for the most part in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations, has been ordered to be reported by the cognizant committee. In my opinion, the Senate should take up this bill immediately and pass it.

Item No. 5, general executive management: In this field, the administration has done absolutely nothing this year. In the Eighty-first Congress they sent down 34 reorganization plans. In this Congress they have sent down only one so far, the RFC plan, which represented only a part of the Hoover Commission recommendations for that agency. There are some among us who might allege that this plan was sent down more with a view toward taking the heat off that agency—to dampen the proclivities for mink coats—than to give us better organization in our Government. The Committee on Expenditures has addressed a letter to President Truman requesting him to submit more plans. He has responded by singling out the four plans that were de-

feated last year and asking the committee how they would draft them so that these plans could be (a) made to conform to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and (b) assured of passage.

This action of the administration was nothing more than some high-grade buck-passing. The Reorganization Act of 1949 does not state anything to the effect that the Senate Committee on Expenditures is required to draw up reorganization plans for submission to the Congress. The law explicitly places this responsibility on the President, and it should be noted that this law was not the idea of Congress in the first place. It was the President who asked to have this authority and responsibility placed upon him.

Item No. 6, reorganization of the Department of Agriculture (S 1149): Hearings have been completed by the Committee on Expenditures. Once more, it would be scarcely appropriate for me to make recommendations to this distinguished committee, which has established a record amongst us for thoroughness and constructiveness. However, I, for one, would hope that they would give us an opportunity to vote upon the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture without much delay.

The Congress must be in a position to move forward toward vigorous and complete action in the early months of 1952. Otherwise, we face the danger of bogging down completely. Dr. Johnson rightly points out that "If nothing is done, buck-passing and blame-fishing will be the order of the day. The Congress can blame the administration and the administration can blame the Congress. The Democrats can blame the Republicans and the Republicans can blame the Democrats. There will be just enough merit in all these allegations to provide a partial 'alibi' for everyone."

But who wants an alibi? Here we have an opportunity to tell one of the greatest success stories in history. Always in the past, it has been assumed, cynically, that no reorganization program could survive the opposition of organized bureaucracy, the forces of group selfishness and public indifference. Now, for the first time, we have seen that unselfish citizens of both parties will think about their Government and will applaud sincere efforts toward its improvement. These citizens have shown great faith in the Congress. We must not let them down.

Now, I would not be a good Republican if I didn't fix a share of the responsibility with the administration. President Truman asked the Congress for the Reorganization Act of 1949. We gave him a greater opportunity than any previous President has had to reorganize the executive branch. In 1950, to be sure, President Truman was active in reorganization. In 1951 he has hardly lifted a finger to advance the program. He would now appear to claim credit for the fact that 50 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have been adopted. This is presumptuous. I call attention to his recent statement to the Nation's postmasters that "Whenever there is any economy and efficiency in the Government, the President of the United States has been responsible for it, and don't let anybody tell you different."

This is preposterous.

I would not be a good American, however, if I stopped at merely reproaching the President. The fact remains that the Congress created the Hoover Commission by unanimous vote. The fact remains that the Congress has an essential responsibility for reorganization—and don't let anybody tell you different.

The fact remains that the Congress could, if it chose, enact the reorganization program

in its entirety, regardless of the violent protests of the bureaucrats.

This can be done, however, only by the strong bipartisan initiative of the entire Congress—a Congress determined to live up to the bright promise and to act on the same high level on which it originally brought the Hoover Commission into being.

We have before us the choice of a bipartisan triumph which will provide endless credit to every participant or a bipartisan failure for which no one can escape the blame. For such a failure, we may contrive alibi satisfactory to partisan constituents, but not to our own hearts. It is the clear duty of every economy-minded Senator to insist that the first order of business, when we return on January 8, 1952, be to expedite action on the balance of the Hoover Reorganization Commission report.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address which I delivered at the fall conference of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations at Columbus, Ohio, on October 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am sincerely grateful for the great honor of addressing this meeting of patriotic Americans who are loyal to the principles of the Republican Party.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my deep appreciation of the warm welcome I have always received in the great State of Ohio.

It is a pleasure to bring you greetings from your friendly neighbors of Pennsylvania. We share your pride in the greatness of Ohio and your place of outstanding importance in the economic, cultural, and spiritual life of the United States.

All the elements of real Americanism have entered into the building of your State. The early pioneers who came into the Ohio country did not find an easy way of life. They were a sturdy, courageous race of men and women who endured severe hardships and constant danger. They suffered the tragedies of Indian attack and many years of frontier warfare.

Into the new West came hard-headed Scotch-Irish, thrifty Pennsylvania Germans, and enterprising New Englanders. Virginia, Kentucky, the Carolinas, and many other areas were represented among the settlers who established new homes in the fertile valleys of the Ohio, the Muskingum, the Scioto, and the Miami. They were industrious and self-reliant. They worked hard and they prospered. They built schools and churches. They had the spirit and the will to stand on their own feet and to plan their own lives. They were free to take full advantage of the social, political, and economic opportunities open to all men of initiative and energy.

Upon that foundation of individual freedom the people of Ohio have created a true cross-section of American progress. You

have developed great centers of industrial production which contribute to human welfare in every part of the civilized world. You have a great wealth of natural resources in coal, oil, gas, and quarry products.

Your agriculture is strong and progressive, its mainstay being the many thousands of family-sized farms within easy reach of the city markets.

No State in the Union has produced so many outstanding leaders in Government, politics, industry, military affairs, education, and the church.

When I refer to Ohio's illustrious sons I can point with the greatest pride to your United States Senators, BOB TART and JOHN BRUCKER.

Since I became a Member of the Senate, nothing has given me greater pleasure than my association with these distinguished statesmen. They serve their State and Nation with exceptional ability and the highest integrity. They are patriotic Americans who battle fearlessly for the principles in which they believe.

No one in Washington has a more thorough knowledge of government or a more comprehensive understanding of national and international problems than your great Republican Senators BOB TART and JOHN BRUCKER.

When I recall that seven native sons of Ohio have been President of the United States, I am impressed with the possibility that the people of our Republic may look again to Ohio for the capable, courageous leadership so badly needed in these critical times.

I am proud to salute the Republican women of Ohio and all the women of America who have taken their places as shock troops in the front line of battle to preserve the American system of government.

The women of America are awake to the dangers that confront our Nation in these days of confusion, corruption, and communism.

The women of America are aroused to the evil conditions that threaten to bear down and destroy freedom of the individual and to rob their sons and daughters of all opportunity in the years ahead.

The women of America are preparing to fight for decency in government—to sweep away all the filth that has accumulated at Washington through the years of the so-called Fair Deal, and the scandalous years of the corrupt deal which is a stench in the nostrils of every self-respecting American.

And I mean every American, of both political parties, who places honor, principle, and integrity above selfish interest.

I mean every American who is disgusted with the lies, deceit, and trickery of men trained in the Pendergast school of corrupt political practice.

Of course, those who are riding the gravy train see nothing wrong. They are guided by the example of a little man in high office who has surrounded himself with a crowd of political gangsters, whom he defends as all honorable men who have done nothing illegal.

It is not denied that their misuse of public office for their own enrichment was unethical. It is admitted that some of their double dealing with public funds was immoral. But with brazen defiance of all decent standards they proclaim that they did not overstep the strict letter of the law—that they could not be taken into court and be convicted of any crime.

And that, my fellow Americans, is the phony justification for calling them all honorable men.

You and I believe in a different type of honor. We believe such morally bankrupt characters, who observe only the minimum standards necessary to keep out of jail, should be kicked out of the Government.

They should be brought before the bar of justice instead of being given free access to the White House.

If the Republican Party can be said to have one paramount objective—one cause to which it is committed above all else—it is to drive out corruption and to restore decency, integrity, and morality in our Government. The real clash now is between right and wrong. In this there can be no middle ground—no compromise.

We have had enough of shabby trickery, deception, concealment, and double talk.

We have had enough of government by crony, political favoritism, Executive direction, and government in defiance of the Constitution of the will of Congress.

We have had enough of Government that creates confusion, coddles communism, and conceals corruption.

At this critical time in world affairs, our Nation's greatest need is to return to the sane, sound system established by the founding fathers when they drafted the Constitution of the United States.

As Americans and as Republicans we believe that plan of government has been productive of more human progress and more happiness than any other system since the world began.

We Republicans believe in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as the foundation of American liberty. We believe the rights enumerated in those immortal documents are God-given rights.

For too many years we have seen the fundamental law warped, twisted, and misinterpreted to serve selfish political purposes and to strengthen the power of the so-called Fair Dealers.

For too many years we have seen freedom of the individual weakened by riotous spending without regard for the solvency and stability of our Nation.

We have been led along the primrose path of false prosperity which can only end in financial collapse and national bankruptcy.

We hear a great deal about prosperity these days.

Just a few weeks ago, in a speech at Washington, President Truman said, and I quote: "The United States is now at the peak of its prosperity."

But when we remember that this so-called prosperity is built on excessive taxation, unlimited Government spending, and never-ending emergencies, we must realize that we are in the most desperate situation in the history of the American Republic.

And most important, if we can attain prosperity only through the tragedies of war, paying for it in the lives of our boys who are dying in Korea, I want to say right now, that the price is too high.

Our situation cannot be fundamentally sound so long as it is based on high taxes, deficit financing, bigger debt, and restrictive laws which exert inflationary pressure and send the cost of living higher and higher.

Our situation cannot be fundamentally sound so long as we face spending programs that will cost the taxpayers at least \$100,000,000,000 a year.

Our situation cannot be fundamentally sound so long as our Government is so big, so unwieldy and so cumbersome that it is beyond the power of any individual to comprehend its complex ramifications.

On the domestic front there is grave danger in the flow of power from the hands of the people into the hands of the Government. That is the process by which government creates the dictatorship of an all-powerful socialistic state. When government plans and controls the lives of the people all initiative is destroyed and freedom of the individual is lost.

On the international front we have continued a confused and uncoordinated for-

eign policy which shifts from day to day and holds no promise of restoring peace with honor and justice to the world.

In this time of national peril the American people cry out for leadership in which they can place full trust and confidence.

They want leadership in which they can entrust the safety and security of the Republic.

They want leadership that will not concede, conceal, or protect corruption.

They want leadership that will set an example of honesty and morality and will be an inspiration to every boy and girl in America.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the White House today.

We cannot expect that kind of leadership from the socialistic-minded Democrats or Republicans who would replace our system of government with one patterned after European failures.

No, my fellow Americans, the Republican Party is the only political organization which is fighting to preserve the sacred ideals of American freedom and independence.

The Republican Party is the only hope of good government—the only source from which our Nation can regain the material, moral, and spiritual strength upon which our Republic became great and powerful.

The most dangerous threat to the future of our country is not from any foreign foe. It is from within.

We have a great task ahead. It is a task which calls for loyal adherence to the principles of patriotic Americanism. Those are the principles of the Republican Party.

As Republicans we must carry the truth to the people.

We must point out that corruption in Government means a breakdown in the moral standards of the people.

We must fight against every socialistic proposal that holds out the false promise of security without effort and robs the people of initiative, self-reliance, and opportunity.

We must fight waste, extravagance and excessive spending at all levels of government.

We must demand a tax program that will encourage business and industry and will give the little fellow a chance to save and get ahead.

We must demand sound fiscal policies that will preserve the value of the dollar against the destructive force of inflation.

We must oppose pressure groups that demand the expenditure of public funds for selfish purposes and their own special advantage.

We must fight communism at home with 100 percent Americanism. None but Americans of unquestioned loyalty should have a place in our Government, or in our schools and colleges.

We must oppose Government competition with private enterprise.

We must uphold our fundamental concept of government by law and not by men. We must support the constitutional legislative process against government by Executive directive.

We must demand a foreign policy that we can afford and that the people at home and abroad can understand. There must be no more secret commitments or agreements that betray free people into slavery behind the iron curtain. The American people have a right to know the obligations we assume in foreign lands.

Above all, we must arouse among our people a deeper recognition of their personal responsibility for good government. We must fight against apathy and indifference on the part of so many citizens who take no interest in government.

I have outlined some fundamental truths which should appeal to every right-thinking patriotic American.

On every farm, and in every home, in every village, town, and city we must awaken the righteous indignation of the American people. We must arouse the fighting spirit of our decent citizenship to drive out the grafters, the bribe-takers, the dealers in influence, and all the other rascals of high or low degree who have betrayed the public trust.

I do not pretend that any one political party has had a monopoly on wrongdoers. But I do say that never before in American history have the leaders of our Government concealed, condoned, and protected corruption with such arrogant disregard for all ethical and moral standards.

Let me tell you how one President of the United States—a Republican President I am proud to say—handled corruption when it was revealed in his administration.

During the term of Calvin Coolidge the Nation was shocked by the Teapot Dome scandal, involving the leasing of Government-owned oil lands.

Before the full facts were disclosed, President Coolidge made a ringing declaration which can serve as a model for the present administration.

President Coolidge said, and I quote:

"If there has been any crime it must be prosecuted. If there has been any property of the United States illegally transferred or leased, it must be recovered. . . . I propose to employ counsel of high rank, drawn from both political parties, to bring action for the enforcement of the law."

"Counsel will be instructed to prosecute these cases in the courts so that if there is any guilt it will be punished, if there is any civil liability it will be enforced, if there is any fraud it will be revealed; and if there are any contracts that are illegal, they will be canceled."

"Every law will be enforced and every right of the people and the Government will be protected."

Criminal prosecutions followed. A cabinet member accused of taking a bribe was convicted and sentenced to a prison term. The Attorney General who refused to turn over certain files and records to a Senate investigating committee was summoned to the White House and dismissed from office.

That is the kind of leadership—honest, determined, vigorous and courageous—that the Republican Party will give to the people of America in January of 1953.

We are about to enter a national campaign with many vital issues—but most important is the moral issue of honesty against dishonesty.

On that issue the true women of America, no matter whether they are Republican or Democratic, will fight for the protection of the American home. They will fight to uphold the moral standards by which we live, based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible.

At the Chicago convention next year we will select a standard bearer to lead the American people to victory. He must be a great American, imbued with all the American ideals. He must have the courage, the will, and the determination to slug it out with Trumanism and all it stands for. He must believe in economy in Government, balanced budgets, and sound fiscal policies.

And above all else, he must be a man of unimpeachable honesty and integrity and there must be no question that he is a real Republican.

With such a man as our candidate we can march to victory—restore honesty in Government and firmly establish our rightful place of leadership for peace, freedom, and sound prosperity in the United States and the world.

Grab-Bag Congress**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record a syndicated column by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post October 18, 1951.

Last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported out a very effective bill to separate the hidden airline subsidies from so-called mail pay.

Although this bill in amended form passed the House unanimously, the bill died with the Eighty-first Congress because the Senate did not act.

As noted in this column, the Senate has now put through a bill which unfortunately incorporates many weakening amendments.

It is, therefore, my hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House will reject these weakening amendments and stand by its report of last year, House Report No. 3041 of the Eighty-first Congress.

I hope, therefore, that the House will enact a really effective bill, H. R. 508 or H. R. 190, and not a watered-down version.

The article follows:

GRAB-BAG CONGRESS—EXPOSURES CONFINED TO SMALL FRY

(By Marquis Childs)

The Congress that is now grinding to the close of a singularly tortuous session might well be called the grab-bag Congress. While a few of the small-fry influence peddlers have been exposed to the light of day, seldom has there been such jostling, such pulling and hauling, among the big boys seeking privileged access to the billions of dollars being spent by Government.

The vast armament contracts and the special tax amortization granted as an inducement to armament manufacture cause the big corporations to grow bigger. The giants of American industry are daily becoming more gigantic as they expand to proportions that even a few years ago were undreamed of.

One of the few men in Congress who has been working to stem this tide is Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama. As chairman of a small-business committee he has worked particularly hard to try to save the small nonscheduled airlines that receive no Government subsidy.

A report of the Sparkman committee recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Board reconsider the position of the nonscheduled and come up with a solution that would give them a chance to compete—without subsidy—in providing low-cost coach service. Of the CAB, the report said:

"It has a direct obligation to the public to use its very considerable powers to develop reliable and economical service on a greatly expanded basis. Should it fail at this point to develop policies toward that end, the Board would, indeed, lend credence to the charge that it is servile to the interests of the certificated airlines and that it lacks the scope and daring required at this moment, which sees American aviation standing at the

threshold of vastly expanded development and service."

The CAB ordered a study of the future of the nonscheduled. But at the same time the Board has proceeded by regulatory measures to pronounce sentence of death on the unscheduled lines.

Under prolonged pressure the Board has just wrestled with the task of separating subsidy from mail pay for the certificated carriers having admitted that currently 87 percent of mail pay is, in fact, subsidy. A rate of 45 cents a ton-mile has been allowed for the main trunk lines.

This figure compares with 23 cents a ton-mile the airplanes charge for carrying freight and express and 34 cents, which is said to be the cost of carrying mail. Analysts who have studied the separation plan with no axe to grind believe the rates allowed are, to say the least, overgenerous.

The subsidy dispute was aired in a remarkable Senate debate that got little or no attention. This centered on the effort of Senators who have repeatedly shown their interest in cutting Government spending to force a similar separation between subsidy and mail pay for American lines flying international routes. Led by Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, the group included Senators DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware; and LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York.

On the other side were loyal friends of Pan-American Airways which has repeatedly been charged with driving toward a monopoly of all foreign routes. To such faithful friends as Senators MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, and BRISWATER, Republican, of Maine, was added Senator McMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut. They wanted contracts without reduction for a period of 10 years. At one point the forthright AIKEN said:

"If there is any bill which this Congress has to consider which tends to build up an almost airtight monopoly for a single part of a single industry, this bill is it. . . . It is one of the worst bills the Senate has ever had before it."

Finally, the period was cut from 10 to 5 years, with the economists hammering away at the burden imposed on the American taxpayer. One estimate puts the amount of airline subsidy paid out since VJ-day as high as \$250,000,000.

In its swiftly expanding phase since the end of World War II the airline industry is still very new. It is possible to see the developing pattern of monopoly as it threatens to freeze into being the present set-up with its limitations on the progress of a means of transportation as yet in infancy. There are other industries long past this stage with the freeze so solid that the antitrust laws are completely irrelevant.

of Communist dictators. The penalty awaiting these deportees is generally liquidation.

The supreme board of the Croatian Catholic Union of United States of America gathered at its meeting in Gary, Ind., October 12, 1951, on the occasion of its thirtieth anniversary celebration, seriously discussed the matter of the demand of the Yugoslav regime of Tito that Dr. Andrija Artukovic, a prominent Croatian opponent of communism, be deported into the custody of Yugoslavia.

In the name of the Croatian Catholic Union of United States of America and its thousands of members who are loyal citizens of America, prepared to sacrifice everything and even their lives for American freedom and democracy, we protest against such requests of Yugoslavia's communistic regime that Dr. Artukovic be deported to Yugoslavia. We base our protests on the following reasons:

1. Dr. Andrija Artukovic committed no murders and crimes such as he is accused of by the Yugoslav regime; we know positively, that these accusations are purely political means of the Yugoslav Communist dictatorship to rid itself of its political opponents in the world who oppose its communistic tactics in Croatia.

2. Dr. Artukovic is well known as an opponent of communism even from his youth.

3. The Yugoslav Communist regime, as we know, first demanded the deportation of Dr. Artukovic on the basis of political reasons, and when it failed to be successful, it changed the charges against him to murder and criminal action of which he was never guilty.

4. The law of the Kingdom of Serbia of 1902 can in no way be applied to Dr. Artukovic since he never had been either a citizen or resident of Serbia.

5. If free and democratic America permits Tito's communistic regime to take Dr. Artukovic, it will pave the way for allowing Tito's regime to seek the deportation of any and all of its political enemies or opponents who raise their voices in foreign lands against communism in Yugoslavia and other parts of the world.

For the above reasons and for the sake of human rights, we appeal to our American officials not to deport Dr. Andrija Artukovic to Tito's Communist regime, for in no case can a political rival deal fairly with his political opponent. If Dr. Artukovic erred and broke any laws, let the unbiased, democratic American courts decide the matter.

Deportation of Anti-Communists**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, adopted by the supreme board of the Croatian Catholic Union of United States of America, sets out a just appeal that steps should be taken by our Government to protect citizens of iron-curtain countries who have been actively fighting communism from being deported into the clutches

Conference Report on the Tax Bill**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, when the 1951 tax bill was before the House, I voted for its passage. Much as I dislike the idea of imposing an even heavier tax burden on the American people, we, as a Nation, have embarked on a huge defense mobilization program, which nearly everyone agrees must be done. Now the bill must be

paid—either honestly, through taxes which everyone can see and understand, or through the hidden tax of inflation, whereby the burden falls primarily on the shoulders of the working people of this country and on the elder people who are retired and living on fixed pensions.

So, Mr. Speaker, the country is desperately in need of additional revenues if we are to bring the budget within hailing distance of being balanced. But that does not mean that this House must accept any bill that comes before it. While no one enjoys the thought of higher taxes, I firmly believe that the people of this country are willing to share in paying for the defense effort, so long as everyone is paying his fair share. The conference report now before the House does not distribute the tax load fairly, and I do not intend to lend my support to any tax bill as inequitable as this, no matter how great the need for revenue. I intend to vote against the conference report.

To show the unfairness of the changes from the House bill made by the conferees, I should like to show what has been done about distributing the individual-income-tax burden. The conference bill imposes \$264,000,000 less in individual income taxes than the House bill. Of that \$364,000,000 reduction, only \$86,000,000, or less than one-fifth, goes to families with incomes of less than \$5,000, yet these families comprise 80 percent of all individual taxpayers. At the same time, a \$278,000,000 reduction has been granted taxpayers with incomes of over \$5,000.

This seems to me to be an upside-down arrangement, when 80 percent of the taxpayers get 20 percent of the relief—comparing the House bill with the conference report—and 20 percent of the taxpayers get 80 percent of the relief. I cannot support such a proposition.

Many of the provisions of the House bill which would have assured a fair share of the load for everyone in the community have been eliminated in the conference bill. For example, the House bill made the new corporation tax rates effective on January 1, 1951, following the practice of nearly every corporate tax bill since 1913. The conferees changed this effective date to April 1, 1951, thus exempting the record-high first quarter corporate profits from the new tax rates, and sacrificing \$500,000,000 in revenues. The corporations were advised that the effective date of the new taxes would probably be January 1. They have all set aside appropriate tax reserves. If this \$500,000,000 is not raised this year through taxes, it will fall on the helpless section of our population in the form of higher prices and inflation. To me, this does not represent equality of sacrifice.

The House bill contained a permanent reform for our tax system that would have yielded an additional \$323,000,000 in revenues each year—not by raising anyone's tax rates, but merely by collecting taxes which should be paid now, but are not being paid. I am speaking of the system of withholding the tax on

dividends and corporate-bond interest, just as the tax is withheld on wages and salaries. It is argued that this system will impose hardships on thousands of widows and pensioners who now do not have to file tax returns, but who would now have to file for their refunds. I would have more sympathy for this argument if I did not know that both a survey of individual tax returns by the Treasury Department and a sample survey by the Federal Reserve Board show that 92 percent of the families in this country with incomes of less than \$3,000 receive no dividends or interest whatsoever. Those with incomes of \$10,000 and over receive 63 percent of the dividends paid in this country. No one seems to complain on behalf of the millions of wage earners, most of them in the low- and middle-income category, who are under a withholding system, and to whom nearly a half-billion dollars in refunds are made each year. Every year, the receipt of dividends is under-reported by over \$1,000,000,000—not necessarily intentionally, but often because the dividends come in small checks which are easily forgotten. The withholding system recommended by the House Ways and Means Committee and passed by the House merely assures that those who should be paying taxes actually do.

The capital-gains rate, which is available primarily to those with considerable means, has not been raised since Korea, despite the fact that the current tax bill contains the second increase in ordinary income-tax rates. The House bill raised the capital-gain-tax rate from 25 percent to 28 percent, which in my opinion is a minimum; the conferees eliminated this increase, and left the capital-gains rate at 25 percent.

The House bill contained a provision which would make all current corporate earnings in excess of 75 percent of the highest 1946-49 earnings taxable at excess-profits rates. The Senate bill struck this provision, and left the earning base at 85 percent of the 1946-49 profits. The compromise reached by the conferees was 83 percent—only 20 percent of the way toward the House bill. I do not think this is a true middle ground such as we might expect would emerge from conference.

I am particularly disturbed that the conferees have seen fit to include in the conference bill a modification of the so-called Jenner amendment, which is nothing more than a rider to this tax bill. It has nothing whatever to do with raising taxes, which is the purpose of this bill. This provision makes it possible to publish the names, addresses, and amounts of assistance of the millions of self-respecting persons on the assistance rolls.

I have long felt that the provisions in the Social Security Act providing for aid to certain groups of our needy citizens constitute one of the most humanitarian programs ever established in this country. The criticisms that have been made about the so-called confidentiality of records provision are in my opinion grossly exaggerated and it is my earnest

hope that the Members of this House will insist on the retention in the Social Security Act of the provisions which require that information about worthy recipients be kept confidential.

I can think of nothing more abhorrent to me than the idea of publishing, or otherwise making known the names of the unfortunate members of our community who are recipients of public assistance. To my mind, it is misfortune enough for a person to be in need and to be forced to apply for assistance. To have to endure the publication of one's name and circumstances where they can be seen by all persons is humiliating to an already distressed person who needs help rather than persecution because of his circumstances. Such people need not only financial assistance, but also protection under the law against the exploitation and the indignity to which publication of their names would subject them. This protection is in keeping with the American ideal of respect for the worth and dignity of every human being.

I do not know to what extent there are persons receiving assistance who are not eligible for aid. From all the information I have, I am convinced that this number is small. The many aged, blind, and disabled persons, and the dependent mothers and children who are receiving assistance have no other choice but to seek aid from the programs which the Congress and the States together have established to meet their needs. They have no other way of providing for themselves. It is the responsibility of the States to determine the eligibility of the persons applying for and receiving aid through the State program. Applications for assistance are made to the local welfare departments and an investigation must be made to determine whether they meet the conditions of eligibility set up by the States. Once assistance is granted, the necessity for continuing payments is reinvestigated periodically, and as the circumstances of the recipients change. This is not to say that some people may not seek to take advantage of these programs or that abuses may not occur. But it is our State and local welfare officials who have the responsibility of administering the public assistance program who should see to it that any "chiselers" are dropped from the rolls.

We all should be, and are vitally concerned in the administration of our public-assistance program. As taxpayers and as persons deeply interested in providing assistance to the needy, we want to be sure that only eligible persons receive assistance, and that every effort be made to help them regain self-support, where this is possible. This is the aim of the States in administering their various assistance programs. However, in my opinion, the indiscriminate publicity that is being proposed here would not promote but would hamper the efficient administration of assistance

as well as impose needless humiliation on needy people. I am not convinced that publication of names would reveal ineligible persons. Rather, I believe that this publicity would merely frighten away many needy people whose pride is great enough to discourage them from accepting the aid they need, if publicity is a condition of such aid. In establishing their eligibility, persons often give personal and private information regarding the circumstances which brought them to apply for aid. This becomes part of the record of eligibility, and the prospect of publicity of such information could only reduce the possibility of establishing understanding and confidence in and between the welfare agency and the applicant.

The Social Security Act limits the disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to persons directly connected with the administration of assistance. However, as I understand it, this restriction does not operate so as to prevent the publication of certain kinds of information which throw light on the operations of the public assistance agency. I know that States can and do publish information such as the cost of public assistance, the financing of these expenditures, the number of recipients and causes of dependency, and the standards and methods used for deciding the need of the people applying for help. And this requirement does not prevent giving full information, including the names and other information about recipients, to legislative and administrative groups charged with studying the operations of the public-assistance department. This information can also go to auditors, law-enforcement officers and others in connection with the administration of public assistance.

I hope that my colleagues will think twice before they vote to change this provision in the Social Security Act, and thus to expose needy people, the aged, blind, children, and the disabled, to the kind of publicity which is being urged upon them in this House. Let us continue to treat the unfortunate with the dignity and respect which the Social Security Act now assures them. To subject them to the pressures of political or commercial exploitation and to make their personal affairs a matter of public record is to go back to the abandoned tradition and methods of the old poor laws. Let us not lose the progress we have made through the Social Security Act by discarding the provisions on the protection of confidential information.

There are other provisions of the conference bill which reinforce my conviction that this is both an inequitable and an inadequate tax bill. The defense bill must be paid, but there is no reason why it cannot be paid in a fair and equitable manner. I shall vote against this conference report in the hope that the conferees will reconsider their action, and that some of the provisions of the House bill which I have mentioned will be retained.

"The Decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff To Increase the Air Force to at Least 140 Groups Will Give Us an Air Force Second To None, Which in All Probability Will Prevent Any Future War"—Chicago Herald-American

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a clipping from the Chicago Herald-American of October 10, 1951, headed "Air power in keeping with our needs."

It is a short editorial. It discusses the legislation which we passed to give the Air Force an extra billion dollars for immediate expansion—and another \$4,000,000,000—as soon as the detail plans for further expansion are formulated.

Mr. Speaker, no bill that Congress has ever enacted has proven more popular throughout the length and breadth of these United States than has this—to provide these United States with an Air Force second to none.

I have said before, and I repeat on this floor, that the peoples of these United States, whether they live in the coastal cities or in the great Mississippi Valley Corn Belt, all know that the United States Air Force is their first and greatest powerful defense against enemy attack. Further, they know that victory in the next world war, is going to perch on the banners of that nation which has supremacy in the air.

The tremendous achievements of our Air Force in Korea are far and beyond the expectation of any military authority. Top-flight Army officers, one after another, have complimented the Air Force on its splendid work. Many have frankly stated that—were it not for the Air Force—the ground forces, our own as well as the United Nations, would have been thrown out of Korea a long, long time ago.

While nobody has ever thought of an airplane as a weapon designed to kill individual enemy soldiers and enemy personnel on the ground—authoritative sources report that United States air power has already accounted for more than 47 percent of all enemy casualties in Korea—72 percent of all enemy artillery destroyed, 81 percent of all enemy trucks destroyed—to say nothing of the hundreds of bridges, highways, and dams destroyed, and the other enemy delaying actions accomplished by our flying forces.

Only last week came report by way of NBC television, on the Battle Report, Washington program, that—

F-51 Mustangs are taking off laden with rockets and napalm bombs on strafing missions in Korea. Along with our jets and bombers they succeeded in one 24-hour period this week end—in destroying or dam-

aging a record-breaking 1,121 Communist trucks ferrying supplies and reinforcements to the front

Mr. Speaker, without further ado, I include herein a short editorial from the Chicago Herald-American, which reads as follows:

AIR POWER IN KEEPING WITH OUR NEEDS

The National Defense Establishment of the United States is now in a fair way to becoming, for the very first time since the advent of military aviation as a decisive element in warfare, an air power of a stature in keeping with our minimum needs.

This vital position is now definitely in prospect by virtue of the decision of the American Joint Chiefs of Staff to increase the Air Force to at least 140 groups, the present strength being 95 groups.

Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, a Republican but often a spokesman for the administration in matters pertaining to national defense, reported this decision to the Senate while the Air Force appropriation bill was nearing final disposition.

The main provision of the bill is to give the Air Force \$1,000,000,000 for immediate expansion, with as much as four additional billions to be forthcoming as soon as detailed plans are formulated.

This fits squarely, and logically and most laudably, into the pattern of Air Force expansion contemplated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It also brings nearer to realization a policy that has long been advocated by the Hearst newspapers, to wit. An Air Force second to none.

The American people should be appreciative of the fact that they are soon to have an Air Force which will be the main offensive, and therefore defensive, arm of their Military Establishment, and which will be capable of winning any future war.

In all probability, such an Air Force will prevent any future war.

The only concern of the American people is that the country does not have that kind of an Air Force now, as it should have had long before now, in order that the desired security might be a matter of present enjoyment rather than future prospect.

The Tax Bill

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 17, 1951.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS
House Office Building:

We are greatly disturbed by House action on tax bill. Farmers don't like to pay taxes any better than anyone else. However, in view of appropriation authorizations approved by Congress, the choice available to the American people is to pay for these expenditures through taxes or through inflation. Let us not forget the people pay the bill either way. Although farmers recognize the dangers inherent in increased taxes, we fear far more the sequence of rising prices, production-strangling controls, and loss of personal freedom which are inevitable

consequence of inflation resulting in failure to balance Federal budget. We believe proposed tax bill represents the best bill that can be devised this session, and therefore urge its passage.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President,
American Farm Bureau Federation.

Build Howell Mill Shoals Dam Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following radio address delivered by me entitled "Build Howell Mill Shoals Dam Now":

"Sheathe your swords, take back your men, take back horses; you will need them down there to develop that great fertile country for which God and nature have done so much."

These words were spoken at Appomattox at the time when General Grant refused to accept the sword of the gallant Gen. Robert E. Lee. Since this dark day in the history of the South, Alabama has made great strides in following the advice given by General Grant. It is highly encouraging to see the booming industrial development in our State. The Institute for Economic Research has given Alabama its highest rating, that of superior growth. During 1950 almost \$200,000,000 was spent in Alabama for new construction and for expanding and improving existing industries. Today she is a great producer of iron and steel products, coal, lumber, textiles, naval stores, pulp and paper, and is making progress in the manufacture of clothing, oil refining, chemicals, farm equipment, aluminum, electrical fixtures and appliances. Only the surface has been touched and if Alabama could develop her great water resources she could become the Ruhr Valley of the United States. This is a great river basin which extends from the Blue Ridge Mountains of northwestern Georgia and southeastern Tennessee, beginning at Rome, Ga., and running a distance of almost 650 miles across the Piedmont Plateau to the lowlands of the Gulf coastal plain which, if developed, will revolutionize the industrial economy and wealth of this great section. The Coosa-Alabama River system is formed by the union of the Etowah and Oostanaula Rivers near Rome which becomes the Coosa River; the Coosa and the Tallapoosa flow through the middle part of the basin to form the Alabama River, the Alabama River flows across the gently sloping coastal plain to join the Tombigbee River, empties into the Mobile and thence flows southward to the Gulf of Mexico. In this basin is found a moderate climate, abundant rainfall, and fertile soils. The raw materials needed by industry are present and the supply of labor is adequate and stable.

The Corps of Engineers has been intensely interested in the development of the great Alabama-Coosa Basin for over 80 years. Among the first improvements constructed was a series of locks and dams in the Coosa River for shallow-draft navigation to reach Rome, Ga. In recent years, a more important step toward the development of the basin was the appearance of the 308 Report in 1934. This report recommended locks and dams on the Alabama River and on the Coosa River above the existing power dams, and with locks in the power dams, it was

planned to provide a 9-foot channel for navigation upstream to Rome, Ga., and additional power. Increased industrialization intensified requests that this 308 Report be reviewed. Flood control and flood protection works have been built at Prattville, Ala., and at Rome, Ga., and the mighty Allatoona Dam and Reservoir has been built on the Etowah River 48 miles above Rome. This is the first Federal power plant in the basin and generates 74,000 kilowatts of power.

In 1941 the Engineers submitted a report recommending a new program of development of the basin's water resources in accordance with the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers. This was adopted by Congress and the President in the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, Public Law 14, Seventy-ninth Congress. This program calls for a navigation lock and dam and two power dams with locks on the Alabama River below Montgomery and a power dam with lock on the Coosa River at Howell Mill Shoals Reservoir. Other reports are being prepared which will provide for a modern 9-foot barge channel to Montgomery and additional power and flood control. The remainder of the program contemplates three navigation power dams with locks on the Coosa, a flight of locks in each of the three power dams on that stream and in the Howell Mill Shoals Dam and 20 power and storage dams on the Tallapoosa and tributary streams. The completed development would add some 942,000 kilowatts to the installed capacity in the basin; the average annual output would be almost 2,236,000 kilowatt-hours. The total outlay based on 1949 construction costs would be about \$525,000,000.

The immediate need for this development is supported in a statement by Mr. Crelin, director of the Southeastern Power Administration. He has stated, "that there is a need for additional power everywhere in that area." This statement is based on a study by the Atlanta regional office of the Federal Power Commission in 1950. This report further says, "Since no one can now predict how long the defense effort will of necessity be prolonged, plans must not be delayed beyond the year 1953. * * * Construction should be started at once on those projects determined to be needed to meet the future power loads in the area. * * * Any other course might at best result in serious restriction of commercial, industrial, and residential use of electrical energy, or at worst badly limit the effort which must be made to assure adequate defense." This report points to the Howell Mill Shoals project as follows:

"Howell Mill Shoals is located within easy service distance of one of the most highly industrialized areas in the South. Large amounts of cement, steel, and steel products are produced in the area centered on Birmingham, Ala.

"The regional engineer of the Federal Power Commission has indicated the possibility that a defense plant may be built in Alabama which will require a substantial block of power. Howell Mill Shoals would be a desirable source of power for that plant. In addition ordnance facilities are being activated, and other defense facilities may be constructed, extended, or reactivated. These may require an additional power supply beyond that allowed for the present Federal Power Commission estimates.

"The river regulation from Howell Mill Shoals Dam will increase generation at existing power company dams downstream by about 60,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year and it will substantially increase the dependable output of those plants. These feed into a system which serves the Birmingham industrial area as well as a short-supply area further to the south.

"Detailed plans for this project have been well advanced, but construction cannot be initiated until funds for that purpose are

appropriated by Congress. With larger appropriations and construction at a maximum rate, the first power unit could be placed in operation in 1954."

It is imperative that this dam be built to insure Alabama's full contribution in the coming struggle for power. We now have almost a million and one-half people in this basin and there is a growing tendency for industry to move into this section. There are now about 130 textile mills which employ about 43,000 people. Steel and iron mills in Gadsden, Anniston, and Rome use coal and iron ore mined nearby and employ about 10,000 men at 33 plants. There are 64 establishments in the chemical-manufacturing group and about 70 concerns in the glass, clay, and stone group, making out stone, marble, building brick, and tile.

A tremendous growth in population is taking place in the northern part of this basin as shown by the 1950 census reports. Calhoun and Talladega Counties show a growth in population of almost one-fourth each since 1940.

Some of the greatest military centers in the country are found in this basin. With the beginning of the Korean war the gigantic Anniston Ordnance Depot was ready to supply our soldiers with tanks, guns, and ammunition. It has almost doubled in personnel since June 1950 and is now undergoing an expansion of about \$12,500,000. Fort McClellan, which was one of the best infantry-training centers in World Wars I and II, is continuing to train National Guard troops and is the new home of the WAC officers-training center and the chemical-warfare-training school. A tremendous expansion is underway there. Craig Air Force Base at Selma is expanding and again training first-line pilots for Uncle Sam's Air Force. Childersburg, which was one of the four greatest powder-producing plants in World War II, is now contributing its part through a great new phint mill and rayon plant and is standing ready to again supply this country with vital ammunition. Added to these expanding plants and installations there are many foundries and steel plants in this area which are busily working on defense orders and many others which can be converted over night to the manufacture of tanks, armored vehicles, shells, guns, and other war material. Recently, the General Electric Co. has started construction on a new industry which will manufacture defense items. New plants have been recently announced at Talladega and Selma, Ala.

The tremendous increase in the population in this area places a growing strain on consumption of power by the civilian population. Practically every city in the northern part of this basin has shown a growth in population, thereby increasing civilian power demands. The cities of Selma, Anniston, Talladega, Gadsden, Jacksonville, Pell City, Piedmont, and Rome show rapid growth principally from the influx of war workers in World War II who have now become permanent residents. Further industrial expansion is needed in many of the counties, such as Clay, Coosa, Autauga, and Elmore, which have lost people because of the lack of industrial opportunities. A great power supply would attract new industries thereby saving the economy of these counties.

One of the basic reasons for the development of this basin will be the benefits which will result from flood control. While most of the urban cities are not subject to overflow, the flood of March 29, 1951, created havoc and left damage and devastation in its wake. Roads and bridges in more than three counties were destroyed. Many homes were flooded. Cattle and crops were destroyed, and thousands of people found it necessary to flee their homes because of the lack of proper flood control on this river system. It is estimated that almost \$3,000,000 in property damage was sustained. In a letter, dated June 7, 1951, the Corp of Engineers estimated

that if the Howell Mill Shoals Dam had been in operation stages of the March-April-1951 flood would have been reduced by about 8½ feet at Childersburg. Such a reduction would have resulted in a flood crest about 3½ feet below where serious urban damage starts and 4½ feet below where serious agricultural damage starts.

In his book *Man and the Soil* Dr. Hugh Hammond Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, has declared, "The rate at which nature builds soil under the most favorable conditions has been estimated all the way from 300 to 1,000 years for a single inch." Further, he points out that in the red clay subsoils of the Southeastern States erosion progresses with dramatic rapidity. He further estimates that more than 300,000,000 tons of surface soil are carried regularly each year by the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico. Think of this. It is the equivalent of 7,000 100-acre farms. He further estimates that the equivalent of 10,000 100-acre farms is lost every year to the United States through water erosion. The lesson of soil exhaustion may be found in the ruins of the ancient and once rich civilizations of history.

In the early development of this section, the Alabama and Coosa Rivers furnished the most convenient traffic arteries to a large part of Alabama and Georgia. Shallow-draft navigation served the larger commercial and financial cities of the basin. With the coming of railroads and improved highways, river commerce on the Coosa disappeared. There is still some movement on the Alabama River, most of the traffic being made up of gravel, sand, logs, and pulpwood barged or rafted to Mobile on the lower part of the Alabama River. With the development now projected, and so badly needed, it is estimated that even from Mobile to Montgomery, the navigational facilities would develop some 442,000 tons of water-borne commerce annually with an annual saving in transportation cost of \$1,500,000.

Extensive recreational facilities constitute an attractive feature of this development. Two State-park areas, three county-park areas, and cabin and club sites would be developed. Much of the area would be devoted to upland game conservation, grazing agriculture, and scenic protection. Fishing, hunting, and outdoor activities will result in wholesome and helpful recreation for the people of this section.

The Southeastern Power Administration estimates that the existing dams will be greatly benefited and that approximately 40 percent more power will be developed by the building of the Howell Mill Shoals Dam. So far as has been determined, there is no opposition from private utilities to the building of this dam. The Georgia Power Co now buys the output of the Allatoona Dam and distributes it to its customers.

The Howell Mill Shoals Dam must be built now. Unless the people of this basin become active in promoting this development it may be lost for all time. The leaders of the people in the northwestern section of this country are spending huge sums of money in the promotion of the development of the Columbia River. The same is true of the Southwest. However, these sections are within easy bombing range of our potential Russian enemy. The Coosa-Alabama River Basin is located at a remote point from Russia, but in the Southeastern section of the United States. It is well protected by military installations within easy air distance of such as Maxwell, Gunter, and Craig Air Force Bases, all in Alabama; others such as Robins Air Force Base in Georgia, Pensacola Naval Station, and Eglin Field in Florida, and Kessler Air Force Base in Mississippi. A tremendous fighter screen could be thrown up by these fields to protect this great industrial section.

Development of this system will furnish an additional medium of transportation

which will be cheap and in many instances where heavy goods are carried, it will be faster than highway and railroad transportation. It will provide cheap water transportation, thereby making it possible for new industries to compete successfully with other sections.

It will attract new industries overnight and increase employment and give a greater per capita income to a section which has long been strangled by a low per capita income. It will enable our people to buy goods produced in other sections of the country and to build a secure and stable economy thereby enabling this section to carry its proper load of taxation.

In recent years it has been generally agreed that the lack of newsprint is a serious menace to a continued free press. Over four-fifths of our newsprint is furnished by the Dominion of Canada and in order to improve our position as a buyer in the world market additional plants must be built in this country. The Coosa-Alabama River Basin furnishes every element which will make for the successful building and operation of these plants. There are over 19,000,000 acres of forest land in Alabama, a great portion of which is concentrated along the watershed of this river system. Alabama can be reached by water from Texas and Louisiana which are the principal sources of sulfur supply. Recently new plants at Lufkin, Tex., and Childersburg, Ala., have demonstrated beyond question the South's ability in this new field.

Rich mineral deposits lying on the banks of these rivers consist of bauxite, clays, coal, gold, lead, graphite, granite, marble, mica, lime, manganese ore, iron ore, silica sand, and asbestos. Many of these are in sufficient quantity to warrant shipment by barge if adequate channel depth were made available. An increase in the production of these vital minerals would be made overnight if cheap water transportation were possible thereby making the mining of these minerals profitable.

Nearby this basin and meshed with its economy are the great industrial and distribution centers of Birmingham, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga. Much in the way of engineering, scientific, and technical skills is readily available for the building of new industries and for the integration of existing facilities into a war economy, or a civilian economy that will be the envy of people all over the world.

Time is short. Now is the time for leaders in agriculture, business, manufacturing, and all related fields to demand that this section be given what it so richly deserves—the right to contribute its full share and to demonstrate that it is the Nation's No. 1 economic opportunity. I appeal to every person within the sound of my voice to join me in bringing this great development to our section. It will bless you and generations yet unborn.

Thank you and God bless you.

Naugatuck, Conn., BPOE, No. 967, Calls for Oatis Release

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, although the United States State Department seems to have relaxed its efforts to effect the release of William N. Oatis, prisoner of the Czechoslovakian Communists, the people of America have not.

I include as a portion of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Naugatuck, Conn., Lodge No. 967, BPOE, decrying the illegal trial and imprisonment of this American citizen.

The Elks are ever mindful of the rights of even a single citizen and unceasing in their efforts to obtain justice.

I am pleased to submit the words of my home-town brother Elks for the RECORD:

The following resolution was adopted by the members of Naugatuck Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, at the regular session held on Tuesday, October 2, 1951:

"Whereas the Communist dictators of Czechoslovakia have arrested and imprisoned without benefit of fair and proper trial, an American citizen and newspaperman, William N. Oatis, and

"Whereas the conviction of William N. Oatis was designed as propaganda to embarrass the United States and hold up to ridicule the constitutional privilege of freedom of the press; and

"Whereas William N. Oatis, who was charged with the responsibility of obtaining factual news and reporting it, did perform these services as chief of the Associated Press in Prague; and

"Whereas William N. Oatis was secretly arrested, held incommunicado, denied counsel of his own choosing, convicted and sentenced by a prejudiced dictators' court, and denied contact with any representative of the United States.

"Now, therefore, the members of Naugatuck Lodge, No. 967, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America pledge to the President of the United States their full support of the strongest measures that may be necessary to obtain the immediate release of William N. Oatis."

EDWARD V. FOX,

Exalted Ruler.

JOHN F. MCGROARY,

Secretary.

NAUGATUCK, CONN., October 16, 1951.

Report of Projects Committee, National Rivers and Harbors Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Projects Committee, National Rivers and Harbors Conference:

WASHINGTON, D. C. May 11, 1951.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
President, National Rivers and
Harbors Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT. In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on May 10, 1951, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 44 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 17 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of \$231,-823,180. Nine proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 13 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports on such surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find three proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find two are without necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on their worth. However, we desire to give the applications sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this Congress in reaching a solution to their problems. We have, therefore, not classified these but have suggested that the Secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data upon the receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposals.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

Since the session of this organization a year ago, a major omnibus flood control and river and harbor bill (H. R. 5473) was enacted into law and approved on May 17, 1950 (Public Law 516, 81st Cong.), supplementing and expanding previous flood control and river and harbor law. Additional projects were authorized, as well as additional investigations of other desired navigation and flood control improvements. However, also in the past year, the threatening international situation has required a greater concentration of our national activities on defense, and investigation and construction of projects not clearly having defense aspects have been curtailed.

Your projects committee wishes to point out that many navigation, flood control, drainage, irrigation, and other projects improving the use of our rivers and land and water resources have important defense values, either immediately to the military or to civilian and industrial activities concerned with the defense effort. Works already accomplished, such as flood protection of the great industrial center of Pittsburgh, multiple-purpose developments for flood control, water supply, power, and other uses, as in the Ohio, Missouri, and Columbia River Basins and various projects affecting food and fiber production readily illustrate the important place and great value that the national program of river and harbor development have in our present crises, as well as in normal peacetime pursuits. Both defense and ordinary economic values illustrate the foresightedness of the Congress of the United States in formulating a national policy and program for the development of our natural resources and for the security and welfare of our people.

For the immediate future, it will be necessary to concentrate on those water resource development investigations and projects necessary to our security as a Nation. These projects will, of course, also have important beneficial effects on the civilian economy, as in the past. When peace becomes once more

secure, we can look forward to reexpansion of river and harbor development for the added purpose of increased peacetime activities and for gaining and enhancing increasingly higher living standards.

We renew our former recommendation that at least \$70,000,000 be provided annually for maintenance of rivers and harbors.

Respectfully submitted,

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

NOTE A—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be re-examined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification, but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—Endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

Appendix A

(Letter R following the project number indicates revision of a previous application)

CLASS I—PROJECTS ENDORSED

(Endorsed. This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.)

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
709 R-3	Monongahela River, Opekeiska and Helderland Locks and dam.	West Virginia	O. R.
722 R-3	Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington (including widening the transition channel at the downstream end of the anchorage basin)	North Carolina	S. A.
741 R.	Boston Harbor, extension of President Roads	Massachusetts	N. E.
744 R-3	Oregon Inlet and related channels	North Carolina	S. A.
745 R-3	Masonboro Inlet	do.	S. A.
748 R-2	Norfolk Harbor-Craney Island disposal area	Virginia	N. A.
769 R....	Weymouth Fore River	Massachusetts	N. E.
817 R....	Ohio River New Cumberland Locks and Dam.	Ohio and West Virginia	O. R.
828 R....	Mystic River.	Massachusetts	N. E.
854.....	Central and southern Florida flood-control project	Florida	S. A.
856.....	Michigan Bottom levee district bulk-protection works on Arkansas River	Arkansas	S. W.
859.....	Kaunahae Harbor	Hawaii	S. P.
861.....	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. bridge (also known as the Staten Island Rapid Transit Co. drawbridge) over the Arthur Kill	New York and New Jersey	N. A.
862.....	Vincennes flood-protection project	Indiana	O. R.
866.....	Hanapepe River flood control	Hawaii	S. P.
867.....	Kawahine Swamp flood control	do.	S. P.
869.....	Middle Rio Grande Basin, comprehensive plan for flood control and reclamation.	New Mexico	S. W.

CLASS II—PROJECTS CLASSIFIED AS MERITORIOUS

(Meritorious. This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further consideration by the committee.)

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
648 R.	Agupadilla Harbor improvements	Puerto Rico	S. A.
768 R.	Chelsea River	Massachusetts	N. E.
781 R-2	Ravstown Reservoir, Juniata River and tributaries	Pennsylvania	N. A.
790 R-2	Hudson River, New York to Albany	New York	N. A.
793 R-2.	Cheves flood-protection project	Ohio	O. R.
843 R....	Farmers' levee and drainage district (dikes east of Champaignville)	Illinois	G. L.
858.....	Honolulu Harbor	Hawaii	S. P.
860.....	New York Harbor, South Channel	New York	N. A.
871.....	Saline River (Benton Dam)	Arkansas	L. M. V.

CLASS III—EXPEDITIOUS REPORT ON AUTHORIZED SURVEY REQUESTED

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested. This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
725 R-3	Carolina Beach	North Carolina	S. A.
770 R....	Saginaw River Basin flood-control project	Michigan	G. L.
847 R....	Mobile Harbor	Alabama	S. A.
852.....	Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel.	Virginia	N. A.
853.....	Town River, Quincy	Massachusetts	N. E.
855.....	Savannah Harbor	Georgia	S. A.
867.....	CACHE River-Bay Creek Development	Illinois	O. R.
863.....	Boston Harbor, reserved channel	Massachusetts	N. E.
865.....	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River	New Hampshire	N. E.
868.....	Cumberland River, Big South Fork (Helenwood and Devils Jump rapids)	Tennessee and Kentucky	O. R.
870.....	Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea and Philadelphia to Trenton	Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	N. A.
872.....	Wallapa River Channel, widening Wallapa Harbor	Washington (Pacific County)	N. P.
879.....	Miami River and mouth	Florida	S. A.

CLASS IV—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR SURVEY

Recommended for survey. This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
864.....	Monongahela River, Lock and Dam No. 5, replacement	Pennsylvania	O. R.
873.....	Diavos Harbor, ship channel and turning basin	Texas (Brazoria County)	S. W.
874.....	Myrtle Grove Sound pollution.	North Carolina	S. A.

Resolution Sponsored by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution, which was read and adopted on the occasion of the commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, on October 14, 1951, at Pulaski Place, Wilmington, Del. This resolution was sponsored by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress:

Resolution read and adopted by the assembled at a commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, sponsored by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs and the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress, held on Sunday afternoon, October 14, 1951, at 3 o'clock at the Pulaski Place, Wilmington, Del.:

"We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Pulaski Place to commemorate the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who gave his valor, courage, and his life to the American cause for liberty and independence, coming to America from Poland to lend his aid in winning the Revolutionary War, to whom the principles of liberty was uncompromisable with any enemy of such, later these principles were created and kept wholly up to the time of the Tehran Conference.

"Further, we, Americans of Polish descent, are upholding the American principles for which General Pulaski gave his life, having our sons and brothers all over the world who shed their blood, in War I, in War II, and who are shedding their blood in the present so-called police war in Korea, of whom a number have made the supreme sacrifice for the principles stipulated in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," which were to bring freedom and independence to all nations and peace to the world.

"Further, we, Americans of Polish descent, rightfully condemned the Yalta pact, predicting that it would leave in its wake tragedy, slavery, and war—and it has. When pro-Soviet sentiment swept the entire country we manifested political wisdom and moral courage by being the first to go on record against Yalta and Soviet aggression. We were, we are, and we always will be anti-Communist. We stood alone courageously defending Americanism at a time when it was popular to favor the Reds.

"Further, we join with the Polish-American Congress, with the Polish Government in exile in London, and with all other groups urging that the United States of America should not change or attempt to change the presently established western boundaries of Poland.

"Whereas the Polish Nation is not governed by representatives of its own choosing; that it is governed by the puppets of Moscow and controlled entirely by the rulings of Moscow; calling this fact to the attention of the American people so that the acts of the

puppets foisted upon the Polish people by Moscow should never be accepted as the willful acts of the Polish people, and that the words spoken by the so-called Polish delegates at U. N. meetings and at other conferences should not be taken or adopted as the words of the Polish people and the Polish Nation.

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States adopted resolution 390, to bring to light the truth about the monstrous crime committed in the Katyn Forest during the winter of 1940 slaying 5,000 officers of the Polish Army. That the investigation will uncover the fate of another 10,000 Polish officers that are missing from the time of the Russian invasion of Poland, and

"Whereas there are few instances in history, indeed, of a more heinous, more brutal, more barbarous mass slaughter. It was unspeakable in horror and degradation. It was an act of perfidy and bestial cruelty. It was an incident of frightful and devilish inhumanity. It was in violation of every principle of civilization, and

"Whereas there has been a shameful delay in moving to get all the real facts in this mass slaughter, evidence known to and available to officials of our Government was suppressed and overlooked, these officials were willing to hide these hideous facts, block a real investigation of them because they were unwilling to offend Soviet Russia, the committee should bring to light these officials who have put the soft pedal upon this uncivilized outrage and for what reasons and considerations, and

"Whereas the traditional American theory of government was and is that our basic rights are 'retained by the American people' even as against the Government itself, and are not subject to change or modification unless the Constitution be changed by the people themselves; and

"Whereas, since the people expressly reserved these 'retained rights' and did not grant their control to any agency of Government, our governing officials have no constitutional power to take them away, or modify them, by treaties or otherwise, and

"Whereas the United Nations are a group of nations banded together for the sole purpose of preserving peace in the world; and

"Whereas the plans of the United Nations are usurping and will eventually usurp the vested rights and privileges of American citizenship, and

"Whereas power has been delegated by our national Congress so that the power of the United Nations is superior to the power of the United States affecting the individual rights of the American people; and

"Whereas the dangers inherent in government by treaty as proposed under U. N. procedure should cause every thoughtful and patriotic American to reread and restudy the Constitution of the United States so that he may be sure in his own mind that in striving for a world ideal, we are not yielding some of our precious liberties to supergovernment shaped in an Old World design; and

"Whereas the Constitution was written by men who understood better than we the price of liberty and the blessings of free institutions, we should not scrap it for something that may destroy our heritage, and

Whereas the Constitution makes Congress the legislative organ of the United States, not GATT or NATO or UNESCO or any other international body. Yet, we are entangled in the decisions of these various agencies; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States of America a resolution whereby the Congress would formally declare that world government is the fundamental objective of American foreign policy; and

"Whereas a world government would deprive the citizens of the United States of inalienable rights, privileges, and immunities now guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and

"Whereas Senators and Representatives of our Congress of the United States, judges, our representatives in the U. N. and a number of our high-ranking Federal officials after taking the oath of allegiance to the United States of America and to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution and laws not to any world government or Atlantic union and yet we see their names on world government and Atlantic union literature, and

"Whereas the President of the United States did send to the United States Senate, on June 16, 1949, a proposed treaty or convention entitled "Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide," with a recommendation for ratification, and

"Whereas the present document is so drawn that it does not apply to genocide as practiced by Stalin in Russia or in the Russian satellite countries, in drafting article 11 of the convention and in order to appease the Russians, genocide was limited to 'national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups.' The political group was omitted. Hence, dictators can sign the genocide convention with complete immunity. All they need to do is to classify a particular group as enemies of the state, and

"Whereas there is not a word in the convention which denounces as genocide the mass killing and destruction of peoples by governments if the Genocide Convention is ratified as treaty, it will supersede every city and county ordinance, every State law, and every State constitution, as well as every Federal statute on the same subject, it threatens the American concept of freedom of speech and of the press as guaranteed by our Bill of Rights.

"Whereas you will find no U. N. flags on any British flagpoles; France does not accord it equality with her flag, even little Belgium would rip it down if anyone dared to hoist it alongside her flag—in Russia if anyone would dare to place it alongside the hammer and sickle, he would be shot instantaneously—yet, in our country we have people who call themselves Americans brazenly clamoring to have the U. N. flag replace our Stars and Stripes, and

"Whereas it is possible that we of this generation have become so degenerate and craven that we can stand by and let knaves and traitors desecrate our flag without lifting a hand or a voice to defend it?

"Whereas present are terrible times of national emergency, the Red menace from within is reaching out to destroy not only our bill of rights, but America itself. It is abusing everyone of our constitutional privileges by using them as a cloak in which to hide its nefarious activities. To afford it the protection of these liberties as a safety zone in which to destroy our rights is national madness and suicide, and

"Whereas so-called intellectuals, liberals, and other false prophets of a philosophy which knows no God, have been gradually undermining all that is fundamental in the American way of life; and

"Whereas they proclaim that God's plan has failed, that security is preferable to liberty. That freedom of the individual should be surrendered to a planned and regimented economy directed by an all-powerful central government. This is the philosophy of communism. In every country where the people have followed such a false philosophy, religion has been destroyed, the self-respect of the individual has banished; and

"Whereas the rot of appeasement spreading from men in high posts in this country

through our social structure, is more dangerous than any Soviet atom bomb; and

"Whereas in the present crisis it is important that the citizens of the United States present a united front against any forces that tend to destroy our American heritage. Americanism needs fanatics to combat contrary philosophies which seek to destroy our way of life.

"Resolved by the assembled, That the United States—

"1. Repudiate the Yalta pact, the source of the world's evils.

"2. Immediately withdraw its recognition of the present Polish Government in Poland, because it does not represent the Polish people, but is merely the obedient pawn of Stalin, yielding to his every wish and demand.

"3. That the Katyn murders and their perpetrators be brought to full light and that the responsible criminals be made to answer for the greatest single crime in world history.

"4. That in view of the heroic deeds and the unswerving loyalty for which Poland was called the inspiration of nations there will not be any further mutilation of the boundaries of Poland in favor of the German imperialists.

"5. Support only the proper and legitimate aims and purposes of the United Nations in their efforts to bring about and maintain world peace and security.

"6. Only the flag of the United States, the Stars and Stripes, is the revered symbol of the sovereignty of our country, the symbol of liberty throughout the world, and the only flag to which American citizens owe and may pay allegiance.

"7. Should be unalterably opposed to the movement for World Government and Atlantic Union as being intended to reduce all the peoples of the world to the slavery of the state-dominated nations behind the Iron curtain and the destruction of all the ideas of freedom of the individual upon which this country has become a great nation.

"8. Outlaw the Communist Party, drive the Reds out of the schools, Government, industry, press, movies, and television, before they can do any more damage.

"9. Build American military, naval, air, and atomic strength to a point where it has no equal.

"10. That the Congress of the United States submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the representative form of Federal Government, consisting of the Congress, the executive, and the judiciary, the sovereignty of the governments of the several States, the express limitations on the powers of Congress, the guaranties of individual liberties and the independence of the Federal judiciary, contained and guaranteed in and by this Constitution and in particular the first 10 amendments thereto, shall not be abolished nor altered by any treaty or executive agreement.

"Resolved further, on this one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski of Poland, the land of our forefathers, we send this message: 'Do not lose faith, the enemy will one day be driven from Polish soil.' As for America, it is our country, her flag is our flag, it is a symbol of everything we love most. Guard the United States well, for with all its imperfections, it is still the most wonderful country in the world. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to all United States Senators."

ADAM J. ROSIAK,

Chairman of the Commemoration Meeting.

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,

Secretary of the Meeting.

Operation Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, throughout the summer and fall I have noted with keen appreciation a highly appealing program which has been conducted in Washington under the auspices of the American Newspaper Women's Club for the entertainment of servicemen and servicewomen stationed in or near the Capital. These patriotic women of the fourth estate have given to their program the distinctive name Operation Home Front. Either at their clubhouse in Washington or at the country estates of various outstanding citizens of this area they have entertained large groups of servicemen. Several Members of the Senate, along with their wives, have been privileged to be among those present. Any American would be made happier to see these young Americans enjoying the instrumental music, the group singing, the swimming, and other outdoor sports, the card games, the friendly conversation and laughter, and the abundance of excellent food which have made these occasions so truly delightful. I am sure that the effort is worthy of strong approval and of emulation elsewhere.

I heard, with particular interest at one of these occasions, a statement by Brig. Gen. C. W. Christenberry, Chief of the Special Services Division of the Army, which I thought included some paragraphs which fully deserve incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to offer herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the informal address of General Christenberry.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Defense Establishment is pleased with the fact that the city of Washington has provided Operation Home Front; and we of the military service are appreciative to those who have given of their time and opened their homes and estates for this purpose. For this unselfish home hospitality, given a new impetus here in the Nation's Capital, may well prove contagious, inspiring, an already generous citizenship throughout the Nation to invite your son and mine, your daughter and mine, when in uniform and away from home, to share other fine home atmospheres in a free and friendly manner, just as these 350 enlisted men and women are enjoying today this wonder estate.

You do not need to doubt the fitness of our uniformed personnel to deserve a welcome into the best homes. I am informed by Mrs. Patricia O'Malley Strickland, president of the American Newspaper Women's Club, that over 950 of our young men and women have recently been guests in several of the fine homes of this area; and not one instance of untoward conduct or damage to furniture has occurred. The parents of these servicemen and women would be proud but not surprised to hear this. Those of you here today—especially our distinguished Senators and their wives—will be interested

to know that increased emphasis is being placed on the planning of clean, healthful, recreational opportunities for service personnel during their free-time, or off-duty hours. Participation in off-the-job activities of their own choosing provides an essential balance for enlisted personnel in the programs of intensive military training so necessary in this emergency. Variety in choice of free-time participation not only provides a balanced training schedule with necessary recreation; it also develops leadership, culture, self-confidence, community interests, and eventually returns thousands of young men and women to their home towns better equipped for effective citizenship than when they first donned the uniform. Our service libraries, clubs, music programs, soldier shows, various types of crafts, and wide sports program all point in this constructive direction; and these activities are coordinated with the chaplain's activities, and with the division handling information and education. And most important, Operation Home Front, as well as our entire special services program, is truly democratic, for it aids in doing the thing that General Eisenhower recently stated was so important; it helps preserve the dignity of the individual, the very heart of our American way of life.

And finally, let us recognize and be grateful for the close cooperation between the civilian and the military in this extended emergency. Communities all over this great Nation are sharing their cultural, recreational, and religious facilities with local camps, posts, stations and bases. This fine party today for enlisted personnel on this beautiful estate, sponsored as a phase of "Operation home front" by the American Newspaper Women's Club, is a specific example of such cooperation.

This growing unity (and the resultant better spirit of understanding) between the military and the civilian, adds immeasurably to the efficiency of national defense. Above all, it adds a zest and willingness to cooperate in the defense of our precious freedoms and way of life. When the citizen in civilian dress, doing an arduous defense job in factory, or in governmental work, feels that the importance of his position is genuinely understood and appreciated by those in uniform, self-respect is enhanced, a will to produce is furthered, and a recent motto coined, I believe, by General Bradley, "Teamed for defense" progressively begins to mean a completely unified citizenship for defense—which simply cannot fail.

These are not generalities. Specific cases are available. For instance, this joint understanding and laboring together of the military and the civilian, produced in the last war, civilian-minded leaders, one of whom could be shifted easily and naturally from such a key job as Supreme Commander of all our Allied Forces in Europe, presidency of one of our largest universities (General Eisenhower), or to give another instance, the personality of one of these leaders so expressed warmth and human understanding that his high qualities of leadership could be readily transplanted from the command of armies in Europe to the top position of the vast and complicated Veterans' Administration (General Bradley). This close cooperation of the civilian and military in all ranks aids in bringing about one, undivided citizenry. We should all—in and out of the military services—realize the great significance of this too-little recognized fact, that young Americans can, in an emergency such as this present one, undergo a sustained period of rigid discipline and intensive training in large groups and under severe stress, and yet maintain their distinct individualities and their personal dignity. This is firm American policy—and it is succeeding. It can be no other way in

this great Nation. For to lose this great sense of the importance of personal dignity and individual freedom—even in the face of great military victories—would actually be defeat.

**Unpaid Tax Account of A. H. Myers,
Kansas City, Mo.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a brief statement in which is embodied a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, John B. Dunlap, relative to the unpaid tax account of A. H. Myers, Kansas City, Mo.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

On October 8, 1951, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 12760 and 12761, regarding the unpaid tax account of A. H. Myers, Kansas City, Mo., totaling \$675,344 16, representing extra assessments for the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive.

In that statement I said that while the statute of limitations had not expired on the criminal phase of this case, it had expired on civil fraud for three of these years.

It has been called to my attention by the Treasury Department that I was in error in that statement and that it should have read that the statute of limitations on the criminal phase had expired—but not on the civil phase.

The full text of the Commissioner's letter pointing this out is as follows:

OCTOBER 15, 1951.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 8, 1951, at page 12760 and following pages, contains a statement of Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, concerning the income-tax returns of Mr. A. H. Myers, Kansas City, Mo. Senator WILLIAMS said, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in substance, among other things, that he was not attempting to pass upon the merits or demerits of a proposed assessment of the taxes but on the other hand, some explanation should be forthcoming as to why the assessments were allowed to elapse without any effort being made to collect.

In deference to the Senator's suggestion, I should like to set forth the following facts with reference to the investigation of Mr. Myers' income-tax returns for the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive.

The fraud investigation of this case was started on October 1, 1947, and Bureau Special Agent Park submitted his report on July 20, 1950. After this report was reviewed by Park's superiors it was transmitted by Special Agent in Charge Lohn to the regional counsel of the Penal Division under date of August 16, 1950. This is the normal course these cases follow. The years covered by this report were 1942 to 1946, inclusive; and criminal prosecution was recommended for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946.

A final conference had not been accorded taxpayer's representatives while this case was under investigation and in accordance with the usual administrative procedure the lawyers for the taxpayer and the Bureau's representatives conferred on the case at Kan-

sas City September 26, 1950. After this conference, further consideration was immediately given the case by the Bureau's representatives, and after the most careful review of the evidence it was concluded that further information would have to be developed in order to make the case suitable for criminal prosecution purposes. The evidence as the case then stood was in the opinion of the lawyers deemed insufficient for criminal prosecution purposes, where the Government has to carry the burden of proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and for that reason further investigation was undertaken. Under date of March 29, 1951, the Bureau's agents submitted a supplemental report covering these evidentiary deficiencies. This supplemental report was forwarded to the Bureau's lawyers on April 2, 1951.

The substantial prosecution years in the Myers case are 1945 and 1946, which involve a liability of approximately \$200,000 and \$130,000, respectively. On October 12, 1951, the case was referred to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that Myers be prosecuted for attempted income tax evasion for 1945 and 1946. Such a prosecution may be undertaken any time before March 15, 1952.

As is usual where the tax is not in jeopardy, no efforts have been made to assess or collect the civil liability pending disposition of the question of possible criminal action.

The files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue disclose that waivers executed by the taxpayer to extend the periods within which assessments may be made are on file for the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive; the statutory periods for later years, within which assessments may be made, have not expired. The statute of limitations for the assessment and collection of the civil liabilities for all years involved (1942 to 1946, inclusive), therefore, is still open without regard to whether the returns are finally determined to be false and fraudulent.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner

It should be noted that this does not alter the other facts which I pointed out in my speech of October 8, 1951, namely, that—

1. Mr. Myers does have outstanding tax assessments of \$675,344 16 and that this account had not been referred to the Department of Justice at the time I made my statement. (It was referred on October 12, 1951—4 days later.)

2. Mr. Dan M. Nee, former collector of internal revenue, Kansas City, and collector during the years involved, is now representing Mr. Myers as his attorney.

3. Mr. Myers and Mr. Nee are partners in the Mid-West Realty Co., a company which leased 153 Government buildings at Camp Crowder, Mo., at an annual rental of \$11,270 and 4 days later leased this same property back to another Government agency at a rental which grossed them \$382,201 11 during the next 20 months.

4. While it is understood that all of this gross income was not carried to net, nevertheless in the General Accounting Office's audit report, the net profit realized for the first 11 months was stated as being \$94,226.55 and the same report carried the notation that profits during the ensuing months would be at a substantially higher percentage basis due to the fact that during the first few months all of the expenses of getting the property ready were written off.

5. The lease for this Camp Crowder property was negotiated by Mr. Myers, Mr. Nee, and their associates through Quirk J. Bernard, Kansas City official representative of the War Assets Administration. At the time this lease was negotiated, Dan M. Nee and Quirk J. Bernard were also partners in another business enterprise.

America Needs All of Us

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the Congress the fine work being done by the Bureau of Reclamation and private industry in helping the physically handicapped.

On the great Hungry Horse Dam in Montana comes a heart-warming story of how the physically handicapped are given opportunities for employment on this project.

The following story from the October issue of the Reclamation Era should be of great interest to all of us and furnish hope for our physically handicapped citizens:

AMERICA NEEDS ALL OF US

In cooperation with the President's Committee on National Employment the Physically Handicapped Week (NEPH Week, October 7-13, 1951), and in response to a request from the chairman of the committee, Vice Admiral Ross T. McIntire, Marine Corps, United States Navy, retired, we present these typical examples of the part the Bureau of Reclamation is playing in offering opportunities to handicapped persons, on the farm, in the office, and on the construction job.

HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

From the Hungry Horse project in Montana comes a heart-warming story of a tough, hard-boiled construction outfit that is doing an outstanding job in employment of physically handicapped workers.

Hungry Horse is the fastest growing concrete dam in the world. Set up originally on a drumhead tight schedule, the job is being highballed to get reservoir storage capacity and power generation at the earliest possible date to help supply the critical power requirements of Pacific Northwest defense plants.

And the job has all the dangers inherent in construction of the world's third highest and fourth largest concrete dam. Working on a giant construction job like Hungry Horse Dam, a man needs better-than-normal physical equipment—not less.

But General-Shea-Morrison, prime contractor for the Hungry Horse Dam and power plant, has a strong policy of employing physically handicapped men on jobs which they can handle. Mel Hord, assistant to Project Manager C. W. "Smoky" Wood, is quick to point out that the policy is the result—not of altruism—but of the knowledge that these men, when placed in the right spots, frequently do a better job than men with unimpaired physical faculties.

As you make the rounds of the job talking to men who have been crippled by war, polio, tuberculosis, accidents, you find the reasons. They are simple, compelling reasons that should make sense to every man who has the responsibility of staffing a job, whether it be construction, shop work, farming, or a business office.

You talk to Ed Sizer, electrician for G. S. M., who had his right leg blown off just below the knee when he and 26 other members of a First Marines' observation post were caught in a deadly hail of machine gun and rocket fire behind the Japanese lines in Okinawa. Today, Ed skis, skates, swims, and packs a bowling average as high as

169. The determination and the will to succeed that have enabled Ed to overcome his handicap and engage successfully in these sports are 'h' qualities that make him a valued employee in the G-S-M organization. Ed's artificial leg doesn't bother him much. In fact, he seems to be much more sensitive about his receding hairline—always bows with a cap on.

At the contractor's heavy-duty machine shop, you run across Art Stratton who has to be careful that he doesn't weld the hook that serves as his right hand to the tractor frame he is working on. Art lost his arm and his right leg under a railroad car many years ago, but the tragic accident didn't keep him from doing his part as a welder in the Lake Washington shipyard during the Second World War. He's been on the Hungry Horse job for 3 years, and his shop foreman, Leo Lefester, says welders don't come any better than Art.

It is significant that a majority of the physically handicapped men on the Hungry Horse job are employed as cableway operators or cableway signalmen. This is startling, to say the least, when you realize the tremendous responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the men who fill these jobs. They are keymen in a high-speed operation that keeps concrete moving from the mixing plant to the dam at an average rate of 7,600 cubic yards, or 30,400,000 pounds every 24 hours.

You make the long climb to the operators' tower anchored high on the canyon wall and step into one of the glass-enclosed booths. Through the window in front of the operator you see the 139-foot high concrete mixing plant and Montana's shortest and busiest railroad on which Diesel-powered "dinkies" shuttle back and forth carrying concrete from the mixing plant to the cableway buckets. The operator leans forward tensely and his hands flick over the controls quickly and surely in response to a series of flashing lights and staccato buzzer signals. Then, through a speaker, comes the low voice of the operator's signalman, "Give us a little headtower, Ralph—easy, hold it—now bring her down a bit. This is a tight spot—not much clearance—O K, dump her and highball it." Following the operator's eyes, you see the big 8-cubic-yard concrete bucket leap skyward as it drops its 16-ton load of concrete in one of the massive concrete blocks rising in the river canyon.

As he flips the controls that swings the bucket back across the canyon to the loading dock, cableway operator Ralph Olson turns and greets you.

Then you make a surprising discovery. Ralph is literally bolted to his job. A special steel joint, designed by Ralph and machined in the General-Shea-Morrison machine shop, connects his artificial left arm with the cableway speed control. The special joint, which has a ball-bearing swivel to give it the smooth flexibility of a man's normal wrist, screws on to the artificial arm and bolts firmly to the speed-control handle.

You learn that Ralph lost his left arm above the elbow 17 years ago when his car was sideswiped by a truck. He broke in as a cableway operator at Shasta Dam in 1911 and has been operating cableways steadily since that time. You learn from other men on the job that he is one of the best.

You drop to the operator's tower on the graveyard shift and talk to Al Black who started operating a cableway at Hungry Horse in April 1951. Al worked as a signalman at Hungry Horse last year—his first job since his recovery from almost fatal injuries received in a 65-foot fall from a whirly crane at Davis Dam in 1947. Al's permanent injuries include a crippled left arm from which the elbow joint has been removed, and a crippled left leg. But his

bad left arm handles the cableway controls as quickly and surely as his good right arm.

Physically handicapped signalmen working on the Hungry Horse job include John McKee who lost his right arm above the elbow in a logging accident. He also wears a brace on his paralyzed right leg.

Then there's Al Hendrickson who spent 13 of his first 15 years in hospitals fighting TB of the spine and leg. He started working at the project as a guard in 1948, later tried his hand at clearing work in the 34-mile-long reservoir area, and then returned to the dam where he was a checker at the mixing plant for a time before starting his present work as signalman.

Up at the concrete-mixing plant, Cal Crouch, dock foreman, gets around with amazing agility, in spite of his polio-crippled left leg. Cal works the graveyard shift, supervising clean-up in the busiest and most dangerous spot on the Hungry Horse job.

Looking back on your hurried trip over the project and your talks with these men who are doing their jobs in spite of lost or maimed arms and legs, you wonder a little that you haven't realized before how many there are on the job. And then the truth dawns on you. They are doing their jobs so quietly and so efficiently that you just don't realize that they have physical handicaps.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Of the approximately 2,000 employees of the Columbia Basin district in the State of Washington, a quick count reveals approximately 175 are 10-point preference veterans.

Typical of these is Ellis Shorthill, photographer, who was in the Pacific theater when he received a head injury from an exploding grenade, which paralyzed him completely. After about 3 months in an American hospital during which time he regained his ability to walk, he was captured by the Japanese and was a prisoner of war for 2½ years. He continues to have difficulty with the left side of his body but the handicap does not prevent him from doing good photographic work.

William S. Lovercheck a World War II paratrooper living on irrigation block 1 of the Columbia Basin project, has overcome his serious wartime injuries so well that very few people can tell the extent to which his injuries interfere. If at all, with his farming.

JEAN CAMERON

Blind since birth, Miss Jean Cameron, an employee in the Commissioner's staff offices in Denver, has proved that a physical handicap is not of necessity a deterrent to the leading of a full and happy life.

Jean is employed as a dictating machine transcriber. She came to Reclamation in 1944 as a stenographer transferring from Lowry Air Force Base in Denver where she had been employed as a clerk-typist for a year and a half.

Jean and her seeing-eye dog, Mabel, have become an essential part of the environment in the Bureau of Reclamation offices at the Denver Federal Center. Jean arrives at her job every morning in her own automobile. An extremely satisfactory arrangement with fellow workers who live in her neighborhood whereby they drive and Jean rides, permits her the comfort of personal transportation to and from her office.

Born in Lehi, Utah, Jean attended the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind in Colorado Springs, Colo. In 1933 she enrolled at Colorado Woman's College in Denver, concentrating on psychology, history, social sciences, and Spanish. She completed the prescribed 2-year course, and was awarded an associate in arts degree in 1935.

She is an accomplished vocalist, plays the piano and organ, and has had magazine articles published. She is keenly interested in music, stage plays, and movies. Her "handicap" in no way hinders Jean's full participation in practically all types of social activity.

In her present position as dictating machine transcriber, one of Jean's principal tasks is the transcription of the proceedings of meetings in which several speakers participate. Following the initial introductions, Jean depends solely upon the speaker's voice for identification. Final preparation of drafts of the proceedings is also her responsibility. An award for superior accomplishment in 1948 and consistently high yearly efficiency ratings attest to Jean's capability.

It seems incongruous to speak of Jean Cameron as handicapped. Her ability and her independence exceed that of many who have complete possession of their physical faculties. Those who know her well are quick to point out her ability to be the life of any gathering in which she may participate. Her cheerfulness, ability, and lively interest in all aspects of life provide a model for any who know Jean Cameron.

STUART M. BLYDENBURGH

"Stu" Blydenburgh was employed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1949, following his graduation from Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio. He was awarded a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from this institution in June 1949. Prior to his entry into the Army, he attended Ohio Wesleyan University for 2 years. Summer employment between semesters as an engineering aide with the Buffalo district office of the United States Corps of Engineers preceded his permanent employment by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Shrapnel wounds while in action in France in 1944 resulted in the loss of Stu's left arm. This loss has affected neither his desire nor his ability to get ahead.

Mr. Blydenburgh is now assigned to the special assignments section of the Dams Branch in the Division of Design and Construction in Denver. He recently completed a series of the rotation assignments in which many of the Bureau's young engineers participate. Stu's ability to do an outstanding job has been recognized by a recent raise in grade and salary.

As a civil engineer in the Structural Behavior Unit of the special assignments section, Stu is responsible for preparing detailed drawings from rough sketches, notes, and oral instructions. He also assists in the compilation and analysis of data received from field offices in the form of reports and instrument readings.

Stu's missing left arm has not affected his ability to perform high-caliber work. Equipped with a prosthetic limb, he has become proficient in its use. It permits him, for example, to hold the steering wheel of his auto or to pick up objects if the occasion demands.

Stu's supervisors have rated as outstanding his dependability and his willingness to cooperate in the accomplishment of work to be done.

HARRISON J. HURLBURT

A little more than a year ago, on September 14, 1950, to be exact, a strapping Air Corps veteran walked into the Bureau of Reclamation's Yakima project office in the State of Washington. He was a lucky winner of one of the 11 Roza homesteads. The ex-lieutenant, who had lost his foot in the service of his country, had come to claim his farm.

This year, farmer Hurlburt has an artificial limb and is not dependent any more on the use of crutches. In the meantime, he has raised over 50 acres of crops—25 acres of peas, planted with alfalfa that will be raised for seed, 17 acres of red Mexican beans, and 12 acres of sweet corn—doing most all the work by himself, with the aid of his faithful tractor. Except initial planting and harvesting, Mr. Hurlburt estimates he has not spent over \$50 for outside labor.

He even built his own house, obtaining it from the White Bluffs area (Hanford

atomic energy work vicinity), had it moved in three sections, built his own foundation, and reassembled it with the aid of one other man. He has electric power and hopes to obtain domestic water through a proposed cooperative well agreement of neighboring farmers.

Hurlburt has invested all of his capital in the farm and plans to stay with it—says it is too short a time yet to decide whether or not he will be successful, but doctors have certified that he has the makings of a successful farmer and is equal to most others.

On page 125 of the July 1951 issue appears another example of a wounded World War II veteran who made good on his Home in the West.

Resolutions of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the annual executive conference of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation. This committee is the New York link in a Nation-wide chain of interstate commissions which are seeking through legislative and administrative channels to strengthen State governments and thus check our headlong rush toward overpowering centralization of government in Washington.

The first of these resolutions calls for the creation of a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, authorized to study and recommend a proper allocation of responsibilities, jurisdictions, and tax resources as between Federal, State, and local governments. Such a step was recommended by the Hoover Commission, and several bills, including H. R. 5251—Ostertag—are now pending to bring this about. It should not be necessary to labor before this body the urgent importance of this measure. The officials of virtually every State of this Union have written me in recent weeks pleading for the enactment of legislation of this kind; and the enormous grants of fiscal and jurisdictional power given to the National Government by this Congress, under stress of the defense emergency, only underscore the vital importance of counter-balancing with legislation such as this proposal.

The second of these resolutions is somewhat related to the first. It calls for enactment of legislation to provide proper and adequate compensation in lieu of taxes to State and local governments where Federal installations have removed taxable properties from the tax rolls. It should be pointed out in this connection that real estate is the only tax resource now left exclusively to State and local governments by the Federal Government. Every other tax resource has been invaded and/or preempted to

meet the insatiable demands of our ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy.

The third resolution calls for early action in expediting the pending civil defense and forest fire protection compacts with Canada. These are interstate compacts in which the cooperation of the contiguous Provinces of Canada is of vital importance, and every effort should be made by this Government to surmount the legal and technical difficulties which have thus far prevented their approval.

The fourth resolution deals with the vital matter of development of water and power resources, and stresses the importance of State and interstate development and control of these resources.

The fifth resolution deals with an important problem which the States are handling themselves through reciprocal legislation, namely, the enforcement of support of dependents. Under this legislation, which has now been enacted in 39 States and three possessions of the United States, breadwinners who abandon their families are required to continue to support them, even though living in another State. The effect of this program is to keep many dependents off the public-assistance rolls, thus saving taxpayers many thousands of dollars. At the moment the District of Columbia does not have a law of this kind, but I expect to introduce such legislation within the near future.

The five resolutions follow:

I—COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Whereas it is evident that intergovernmental relations in the United States are becoming increasingly complex, notably in the field of fiscal relationships; and

Whereas a thorough examination and review of such intergovernmental relations is urgently needed and action leading to reforms in the fiscal field should be provided at the national level; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation urges prompt action by the Congress of the United States for the establishment of a national commission on intergovernmental relations as embodied in Senate bill 1146 and in the Ostertag bill (H. R. 5251) now pending before the Congress.

II—PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Whereas problems raised by the exemption of Federal property from State and local taxation have long been serious and were sharpened by the impact of the wartime expansion of Federal facilities; and

Whereas the States have long urged Federal action to meet this problem through a general plan of payments in lieu of taxation of federally owned property; and

Whereas a bill to provide such relief now is pending before Congress after years of delay and many hearings, some of which were sponsored by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation recommends the prompt enactment of H. R. 5223, with an amendment changing the date from which payments will be made from 1946 to 1939.

III—CIVIL DEFENSE AND FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACTS

Whereas the State of New York and its neighboring States are vitally interested in

the extension of the provisions of two interstate compacts, the civil defense and the forest-fire protection compacts, to neighboring Provinces of the Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation is informed that legal and technical difficulties have arisen in this connection on the Canadian side. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee respectfully requests the United States Department of State to explore with the Government of the Dominion of Canada methods by which Canadian participation in the interstate arrangements established by these compacts can be effected.

IV—WATER AND POWER RESOURCES

Whereas the Federal Government recently has shown unusual interest in the surveying of the water and other natural resources of the Nation through the country-wide activities of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission and the regional studies of the New England-New York Interagency Committee; and

Whereas the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in its report has outlined certain policies and advocated legislation which, if enacted, might well have the effect of adversely influencing, if not directly superseding, the wise and salutary actions already initiated by the several States and interstate agencies in furtherance of their respective inherent rights and responsibilities to regulate and control their own water and power resources; and

Whereas it seems apparent that an attempt may be made to have the studies of the New England-New York Interagency Committee translated into Federal policies and legislation. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation urges that the Federal Government recognize the inherent right of States and local governments to regulate and utilize their own resources and the full ability of these governmental units to fully and successfully cope with these problems, and be it further

Resolved, That Federal resources policies and law recognize the ability of the States through interstate compact agencies, existing and future, to formulate and effectuate plans for the control of resources of a regional character to the best interests of the people of these areas; and be it further

Resolved, That such local State and interstate agencies be consulted prior to any attempt by the Federal Government to promulgate national resources policies and that such legislation be implemented and strengthened in order to preserve the rights of the States and interstate agencies to control, develop, and resolve their own resources problems, and that the role of the Federal Government be limited to the establishment of broad national policies and practices which will serve to encourage, guide, stimulate, and aid such local action, limiting Federal activity to cooperation where national and local interests make such action imperative.

V—SUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS

Whereas 39 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have enacted reciprocal legislation to enforce the support of dependents; and

Whereas the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation was instrumental in initiating this type of legislation; and

Whereas since the original New York draft was promulgated, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has formulated and recommended a new uniform act known as the Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee undertake studies based upon experience in the administration of the New York law to evaluate the need for amendment or revision in accordance with the new uniform act.

Manufacturers' Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

PEERLESS MANUFACTURING CORP.,
Louisville, Ky., October 3, 1951.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSON,
Administrative Economic Stabilization
Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On August 1, 1951, the new Defense Production Act became effective, which provided, among other things, that manufacturers' ceiling prices should reflect increase in materials, direct factory labor, factory overhead, administrative overhead up to July 26, 1951.

Our understanding of the new act was to direct the Office of Price Stabilization to provide formulas under a revised CPR 22 so that manufacturers could recalculate their prices so as to be compensated for increases and more necessary, to be able to include those overhead costs which are just as legitimate as material and direct labor costs but which were denied inclusion under the original CPR 22.

It seems to us the Office of Price Stabilization has ignored the will of Congress by unduly delaying publishing a revised CPR 22 that will provide for the inclusion of these denied costs in ceiling prices. To make matters worse, our costs are still going up, costs that even under the new Defense Act we cannot include in our prices, because on September 10 last, we agreed with our union to put into effect a wage increase of 7 cents per hour, which was also extended to our office personnel.

What is so irksome to us about this situation is that we complied faithfully with the regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization by filing ceiling price forms under CPR 22 before the deadline of May 28 last. The filing of these forms required that we reduce our major product line about 10 percent below our general ceiling prices, but, the Office of Price Stabilization granted an extension beyond May 28 to those who did not file by the deadline date. In the meantime, Congress froze the whole pricing set-up until July 1, while developing the new act. Now the Office of Price Stabilization postpones indefinitely the filing of price forms under CPR 22 and leaves those who did not file, under their old General Ceiling Price Regulation, but makes those who complied with CPR-22 stuck with their reduced prices. We feel that we have been discriminated against, and that we should have the same rights as those who were permitted to stay under their old general ceiling prices.

With labor costs continuing to rise, how are we to get relief? Certainly we cannot be expected to absorb these costs continually.

Yours very truly,

PEERLESS MANUFACTURING CORP.,
T. W. BARRY,
Executive Vice President.

Congress Has Failed Miserably To Discharge Its Obligation to the Aged of This Nation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, no group of Americans is suffering more from the high cost of living than those who have to rely on old-age pensions.

While Congress has been busy appropriating billions of dollars to foreign nations under our foreign-aid program it has been impossible to get action on legislative proposals of either the Townsend or American pension groups. The Congressional Steering Committee of which I am a member always gets the same old answer from the Ways and Means Committee that it is busy with other matters.

Mr. Speaker, there is a discharge petition on your desk containing 157 of the 218 required signatures of Members of this House in an effort to force the Townsend bill to the floor for a vote. A similar effort has been made by the American pension group through questionnaires and the majority of the membership of the House have indicated by these questionnaires that they want action on old-age pension legislation.

It is nothing short of a national disgrace that the aged of our Nation are continually ignored by Congress.

We cannot escape the fact that the cost of living has aggravated the general problem of old-age pensions and that present benefits are wholly inadequate.

The plight of the aged of this country is best told by Sylvia Porter in her column which appears in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, because she tells the truth about the predicament of our elderly citizens in their battle against the high cost of living. Miss Porter's article follows:

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING BRINGS ADDITIONAL WORRY FOR AMERICAN PENSIONERS

(By Sylvia Porter)

In 1938, the cost of providing an elderly couple with a decent, healthy standard of living was \$70 a month.

Today, that same budget—allowing few, if any, of the small luxuries of living—demands \$115 and \$120.

Most elderly folks, dependent on pensions and living in decidedly moderate circumstances, simply cannot obtain that extra \$45 to \$60.

Thus, somehow, some way, they now must struggle along with only three-fifths of the goods and services considered necessities by the most objective nutrition experts.

And if they are to live above the subsistence level—are to have a few things beyond their absolutely minimum physical needs—their monthly budget today runs to \$150.

Again, most elderly couples, relying on pension checks and either too bewildered or too feeble to get outside jobs find this even more impossible of attainment.

Thus, to them, luxuries are just a dream. Subsistence is their way of life.

And the pensions that just a short while ago they thought would give them comfort in their older years are a cruel mockery.

This dramatic illustration of what inflation is doing to the millions of pensioners in our land was outlined to me this week by Laurence D. De Trude, of the National Industrial Conference Board.

What is particularly painful about the figures is that they emphasize that this is happening to our older folks—to our fathers and our mothers who worked a lifetime, scrimped and saved in the expectation of enjoying independent, proud later years.

And what is particularly pertinent about this story now is that it shouts a deeply vital message and warning to those groups who insist on fighting for greater and greater financial security—and yet, who are ignoring what inflation is doing to that security.

Pensions and pay checks in terms of dollars mean little in periods of this sort.

The benefits makes sense only when translated into terms of food, clothing, shelter—what the money will buy in the market place.

The food that cost \$1 in January 1939 now costs \$2.15.

The clothing that cost \$1 then now costs \$1.49.

The housing that cost \$1 then now costs \$1.16.

And on the same \$1 comparison, house-furnishings cost \$1.63.

Fuel, gas, and electricity cost \$1.33.

Sundries cost \$1.59.

The cost of food and shelter, alone is now as great as the total budget for an elderly couple before World War II—leaving nothing, just nothing, for all the rest.

And as De Trude added, "the farther down the scale of living you go, the more disastrous the inflationary effect has been. As funds diminish, an increasing percentage of income is spent on food."

"The cost of foods commonly consumed by elderly couples has increased much more than the average for all items over the past 10 years, cutting in half the purchasing power of those living on smaller incomes."

Instead of being laggards or indifferent followers in the battle to stabilize the dollar's buying power, all those with pension arrangements, with private retirement income policies, with special corporation retirement deals, should be far in the lead.

Otherwise their benefits won't mean much when they get around to collecting them.

There can be no financial security to all unless we stop this insane cost-of-living spiral. Just glance back at the few figures in this report if you still wonder why.

Quick of Tongue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Thursday, October 18, 1951:

QUICK OF TONGUE

When the Attorney General of the United States accuses a reputable Federal judge of telling "damnable and contemptible lies"

presumably he should know what he was saying.

J. Howard McGrath, the Attorney General, said it of Federal Judge George H. Moore in St. Louis. And apparently didn't know what he was saying.

Without Judge Moore there might have been no grand jury investigation of the Internal Revenue Bureau in St. Louis, an investigation which now has led to the bribery indictment of the ex-collector, James P. Finnegan.

The judge said yesterday he called Mr. McGrath last March after the local United States attorney reported he couldn't get clearance for the probe. He said Mr. McGrath told him these things had to "go through channels."

"But what do you do," the judge said he replied, "when the channels are dammed up and blocked up?"

Mr. McGrath retorted to these statements by calling them "damnable and contemptible lies." Last night he had a change of heart after discovering, he said, a memo which recorded the telephone call. So he sent Judge Moore "apologies and regrets."

Maybe Mr. McGrath ought to look up some more memos.

Last May, for instance, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, who has done more than anyone else to uncover the scandals in the Internal Revenue Bureau, said available evidence had been withheld from the grand jury.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch charges the Justice Department, which Mr. McGrath heads, twice tried to interfere with the investigation.

A congressional committee is investigating alleged attempts to interfere with another scandal in San Francisco.

And Senator WILLIAMS charges the dust has been collecting on the Government's \$2,000,000 claim against Big Bill Lias, notorious Wheeling racketeer, while Lias was disposing of his assets among members of his family.

A quick tongue does not always make friends and influence people. Nor answer important questions. Memos are better.

Dr. Bunche and Jewish Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of October 10, 1951:

DR. BUNCHE AND JEWISH HOSPITAL

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, director of the department of trusteeship for the United Nations, is the latest in the growing line of world-famous personages who have come to the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital to autograph the mural, "Children of United Nations," in the children's pediatric ward.

Like the Duke and Duchess of Windsor, former Ambassador Halifax, the late Wendell Willkie, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, General Romulo, General Bradley and others who have come to the hospital on previous occasions, Dr. Bunche was thrilled by his experience. His recent letter to Max Abelman, the institution's public relations director, pays a great tribute to the hospital. After speaking of its "sense of dedicated service to humanity," he declared that it is at once "a

monument to the fine public spirit of Brooklyn and a noble example of democratic medical service for the Nation."

We believe it is fitting that the people of this community be made aware of the high regard in which Jewish hospital is held. The borough may take just pride in its accomplishments and in all those who have any part in bringing them about.

40 Et 8 Establishes Scholarship Enabling French Student To Attend the Uni- versity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Northwest (Ark.) Times of October 13. This is an excellent example of the way in which the exchange of persons program is inspiring the private citizens of our country to cooperate in the great work of bringing about better relations with the free peoples of the world. I especially want to congratulate the Voiture Locale No. 956 of the 40 and 8 of Fayetteville and their Chef de Gare, Joel Bunch, an outstanding legionnaire of Fayetteville. When a Government program enlists the cooperation of the citizens, as this one is doing, it is certain to succeed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

40 ET 8 ESTABLISHES SCHOLARSHIP ENABLING FRENCH STUDENT TO ATTEND THE UNIVERSITY

An annual scholarship enabling a French student to attend the university has been established by Voiture Locale No. 956 of the 40 et 8, honorary organization of American Legionnaires. It is believed to be the first 40 et 8 Voiture in the country to establish a foreign student scholarship. Dr. Richard Hostetter, president of the university's foundation for international exchange of students, said in announcing the scholarship.

Each year, including this year, a French boy or girl whose father is a veteran will receive the scholarship. The nationality of the student was selected because of the French origin of the 40 et 8.

Joel Bunch, of Fayetteville, chef de gare of the Voiture, said the scholarship fund was raised by personal subscription. The organization, he declared, established the scholarship because the foreign scholarship program is aimed at world understanding and peace, for which the American Legion and 40 et 8 also work. Another aim of the veterans' organizations, that of assisting youths, is carried out by providing the scholarship, he said.

The Voiture has members in Springdale, Fayetteville, Lincoln, Prairie Grove, Winslow, West Fork, Rogers, Eureka Springs, Berryville, Huntsville, and Green Forest.

The recipient of this year's scholarship is Jacqueline Solet of Paris, France, daughter of a World War I veteran. In sponsoring her year at the university, the 40 et 8 Voiture joined forces with the Greater Little Rock

Federation of Women's Clubs and seven Fayetteville families, to provide her tuition and fees, room and board, books and supplies, and some vacation funds. Her round trip travel expenses from France are covered by a Fulbright Act grant.

Another Disaster Hits Midwest Flood Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the flood victims suffered another disaster when the administration leadership in Congress failed to furnish them the financial help they so urgently need.

In his message to the Congress on August 20, 1951, President Truman proposed the liberalization of loan conditions and an increase of available funds for that purpose. He also proposed that the flood victims be indemnified for a portion of their loss of real and personal property and said:

Loans, even on liberal terms, are not enough to meet this situation. For these reasons I consider it essential to provide some rehabilitation grants, directed particularly to assist wage earners and small farmers and businessmen, whose losses in this flood represented personal financial tragedy.

Bills for various types of relief for the flood victims were introduced. In the hearings which opened before the Appropriations Subcommittee on September 19, Col. A. E. Howse, speaking for the administration, said:

The program is not a pork-barrel proposition to replace, say a pair of shoes for Joe Smith in Kansas City (p. 34).

It is not intended to reimburse the home owner for household goods, furniture, or personal possessions. . . . It is not in any sense of the word to compensate for the general losses that occurred during the flood (p. 35).

This is nearly a month later. . . . We have eliminated the crops, the livestock, the household goods, the personal possessions, and in that elimination my personal view is that we have pretty well eliminated the humanitarian point of view also. We have presently restricted this program in our thinking to the rehabilitation of productive plant (p. 112).

Between the date of his message and the date of the hearing before congressional committees it is apparent that the President and the administration had abandoned the idea of direct grants to cover personal losses, and were concentrating on restoring farms, rebuilding factories and businesses—in other words—production.

When this so-called relief bill came before the House on October 4, I pointed out that all it did was give flood victims a way to go further in debt and that it failed to help those who needed help most, namely, wage earners who owned

nothing but their clothing, furniture, and personal possessions—who lost everything they owned except the clothing they wore when they fled the on-rushing water. I offered an amendment to the bill to create a Federal Flood Claims Commission, with authority to pay claims for losses of personal property—furniture, and so forth—suffered by these individuals, up to \$3,000, and proposed an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for that purpose. That amendment was ruled out of order by the Presiding Officer—Democrat—in the House, thus preventing its consideration. I have now introduced a bill, H. R. 5681, containing the same provisions but I do not expect the administration to do anything about it.

In my remarks to the House when the bill was up for vote, I called attention to the fact that taxes taken out of Kansas made it impossible for Kansans to provide the needed relief; that we were asking only for the return of a small portion of the billions we had sent to the United States Treasury in the last few years; and that if this country could afford to send billions to rehabilitate the refugees of other lands overseas, we certainly could afford a few millions to help our own folks here at home.

The Democrat leadership in Congress—the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the majority leaders in both Houses, the chairmen of committees, all Democrats, and the Democrat majorities in both Houses—is just about all-powerful. With that line-up I am sure the President could have obtained the relief these unfortunate people need so urgently and to which they are entitled, if he had sincerely wanted them to have it; if he had lived up to the publicity about what was to be done. For some reason, the administration changed the program and as Mr. Howse said, they had decided not to make direct grants for furniture and other personal property. Why?

The Townsend Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend Clubs of Pennsylvania, at the annual convention held in Erie, Pa., October 6 and 7, 1951, unanimously adopted the following resolution extending greetings and appreciation to the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress and to all Members who have signed Townsend discharge petition No. 4 in behalf of the Townsend pension bill.

The resolution follows:

Be it hereby resolved, That we, the officers, delegates, and representatives of all Townsend Clubs in the State of Pennsylvania, in convention assembled at Erie, take this opportunity of expressing our sentiments and the sentiments of the entire Townsend State

membership, to all Pennsylvania Representatives in Congress.

We sincerely appreciate the concern manifested for the welfare of our senior citizens and the cooperation offered to help provide the proper measure of economic security for all unfortunate, impoverished, and disabled citizens, by many Pennsylvania Congressmen, who have in recent weeks signed the discharge petition No. 4, to bring the two Townsend bills out of committee and on the floor of the House for action.

We pledge our best support and cooperation to each Member of Congress, who now has signed this petition, or will soon place his signature thereon.

To all of the Pennsylvania Representatives, who have not yet signed this discharge petition No. 4, we respectfully request that they do so at the earliest opportunity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed, by the secretary of this State convention, to all Representatives of Pennsylvania.

E. B. GRUVER, *State Organizer.*

Mrs. ANNA L. REIDENBACH, *Secretary.*

PITHIEP J. BARBER, *Chairman, Resolutions Committee.*

Stopping Interstate Dealing in Undersized Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF CHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, fishing always has been one of the natural recreations of man from the earliest time. And in order to preserve one of nature's oldest pastimes, conservation departments, State and Federal, have grown up to assist in preserving this recreation for our citizens. However, it seems in the face of all of this there are loopholes, one of which is the interstate shipment of illegal undersized fish. The practice has seemingly gone on for years with State officials unable to take action while interstate transportation is in progress. However, the Federal Government can be of aid by stopping such transportation of undersized fish in interstate commerce and I have introduced the following bill to prevent the shipment, transportation, and movement of illegal undersized fish in interstate commerce. Such action would stop the movement of undersized fish between the States, and the various States have full authority to carry on enforcement laws within their own States:

A bill to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of illegal undersized fish

Be it enacted, etc. That the sending, shipping, and transportation in interstate commerce of fish, undersized or otherwise illegal according to the law of the State wherein such fish were netted, taken, possessed, transported, or shipped, shall be a Federal offense.

SEC. 2. Any person, firm, or corporation found guilty of violation of section 1, of this act, shall be fined not less than \$100 for the first offense, not less than \$200 for the second offense, and not less than \$1,000 for offenses thereafter.

Statement of Attorney General McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly distressed upon reading the full text of Attorney General McGrath's statement on his belated recollection of a telephone call to the Attorney General from Judge George H. Moore, senior Federal judge of Missouri. After referring to Judge Moore's statement as "damnable and contemptible lies," the Attorney General now admits that he now thinks he prepared a memorandum subsequent to such call from Judge Moore to the Attorney General's office. Yet it took a day's search of the Department's files to convince the Attorney General that he had in fact received such a call, and it was in a most grudging and ungracious fashion that the Attorney General attempted correction to his unnecessarily violent outburst at the senior Federal judge of the State of Missouri. I should like to quote this statement of the Attorney General of the United States at this point:

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL J. HOWARD McGRATH

In further reference to the question of a telephone call which Judge George H. Moore, of St. Louis, says he made to me in March complaining about the handling of certain tax cases before a grand jury at St. Louis, which call I denied having any recollection of, I ordered a thorough search of departmental records that could have any bearing on establishing whether or not such a call was received, and in a file in the Tax Division there appears a memorandum which was sent to that Division on February 21 by Mr. Peyton Ford, then Deputy Attorney General, in which he advised the Tax Division that Judge Moore had called the Attorney General and expressed dissatisfaction with the handling of tax cases in St. Louis. The Attorney General's memorandum instructed the Tax Division to look into this matter immediately.

Thereafter, on March 6, in pursuance of the Attorney General's direction, the Tax Division sent Mr. Ellis Slack, chief of the Appellate Section of the Tax Division, to St. Louis to confer with Judge Moore and the grand jury and to cooperate with the United States Attorney.

Having strongly denied any recollection of Judge Moore's call, the Attorney General regards the memorandum in the file as conclusive evidence that such a call must have been made and therefore feels that he should and has communicated with Judge Moore and has expressed his regrets and apologies.

The Attorney General's calendar indicates that he was out of the city on the day that Judge Moore's call was received and it is probable that the call was transferred to the Attorney General through the departmental switchboard and upon the Attorney General's return to the office he now thinks he prepared the memorandum herein referred to.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this example of ineptness and confusion in high places in the administration of justice, I respectfully urge the appointment of a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate thoroughly the situation involving the grand juries

in St. Louis and San Francisco which obviously now transcend tax matters, and which may well involve an attempt to coerce and control the judicial branch by the executive branch. At the very least, a pattern of impeding, or minimizing, the proper course of courts and grand juries is amply demonstrated.

It is my opinion that Mr. Drake Watson, the district attorney of St. Louis, whom I understand will leave that office within the next few days, might have some extremely valuable information for the appropriate committee of Congress on the actual current operations of grand juries and grand jury investigations. While, so far, this has been a matter involving the Bureau of Internal Revenue, it would seem to me that any examination of the operation of the grand jury system is not only within the purview of the Judiciary Committee, but would also assist in relieving the already heavily burdened subcommittee investigating the administration of the Internal Revenue System.

I do not believe any stone should be left unturned, even in the hectic and trying closing days of Congress, if in moving one more stone we can uncover the reptilian tracks of entrenched evil.

Baseball Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since the subject of baseball is before the Judiciary Committee and the problems of the Pacific Coast League have been aired, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following opinions expressed by one of the outstanding sports writers of the West, Ned Cronin, sports editor of the Los Angeles Daily News:

NEW YORK, October 12—That soft, humming noise that was heard along the Pacific slope about 10 30 a. m., Pacific standard time, some 10 days ago might have sounded like the familiar buzz of a million television sets being turned on.

Actually, it was the death knell of the Pacific Coast League as the West's principal representative of the horseshoe dodge. The coast league may not be dead as of this very minute, but it is dying and is well on its way to the morgue.

Television killed it. Not because a camera-eye version of the sport will ever take the place of baseball in the flesh, but due to the fact that having seen the game practiced by the best talent in the land, the western sports fans no longer will be satisfied with the third-rate product that is currently being foisted upon them by the coast league owners.

A vast majority of southern California residents have seen little or no baseball. During the past 10 days, they were able to sit before their television sets and watch the greatest play-off series in the history of the game and follow that with the World Series itself.

As we said at the outset, this is a pretty cheap imitation of the real thing. The

screen on a TV set can accommodate only what is seen in the camera's eye. The overall picture of the changing defensive set-ups as different hitters take their stance in the batter's box, the many intricate little maneuvers indulged in by the big leaguers are not perceptible.

But what can easily be seen is the unalterable fact that baseball in the Coast circuit and in the majors is the difference between a Stanley Steamer and a Cadillac sedan. The western fans will never be happy with what is laughingly called triple A baseball again. Something like asking a man with a thirst to go back to draught beer after he's been gargling champagne for a week.

The apparatus that brought the World Series across the Nation for the first time in history couldn't have struck at a more untimely moment insofar as the Coast League is concerned.

The boys in our neck of the woods have just finished a season that is a cinch to set baseball back a good 40 years. The old-timers in the circuit caved in all at once as if they had been struck by an epidemic of muscular collapse, the youngsters failed to pan out, and the guys in the middle were just that and nothing more.

LIKE VARSITY TURN-OUT AT LINCOLN HEIGHTS

For the most part the customers couldn't stomach the mediocrity that was being peddled to them by the Coast league owners, and as a result, the attendance figures looked more like the varsity turn-out at Lincoln Heights on Saturday night than anything identified with what is known as the national pastime. Take San Francisco, for instance. The paid attendance up there was 198,000. Not for 1 week, but for the whole season.

Plays that seem positively amazing are taken in stride by those accustomed to watching the major leaguers go through their exercises. I recall a couple made by Bobby Brown, the Yankee third baseman. He's good, but he's certainly no bearcat in the fielding department when compared with some of his colleagues.

He picked up a bunt in a game against the Giants and fired the ball down to second. At the moment, it seemed to this observer to be a singularly foolish thing to do, for the runner coming down from first was under a full head of steam and only a few feet from the bag when Brown got his dukes on the ball. Bobby cut it loose, the ball zinged into the shortstop's glove, the umpire's arm flew up to indicate an out, and I'm sure I was the only person in the ball park who was the least bit surprised by it all.

Again, and these incidents are recounted purely as examples, the Giant batter was falling away from a pitch that came winging smack toward his wishbone. When Brown saw the hitter back off he relaxed. To his surprise, the ball struck the bat and bounded down toward third.

CRONIN'S FACULTY OF PERCEPTION WAS WARPED

Brown had to rock back off his heels, chaige in, pick the ball up, and make the long throw to first, which he did just in time to retire the runner. Struck me as being a pretty worth-while exhibition of rapid-fire recovery, but nobody whooped it up much except perhaps a few personal friends that Brown had got some tickets for.

Then it occurred to me what was happening. My faculty of perception was warped. I was looking at these various situations through the eyes of a gent who has just finished a season of watching coast leaguers under similar situations. I had thought they were remarkable plays because, with a few notable exceptions, nobody on the western slope would have been able to make them.

I had forgotten that the major league baseballers were more generously bestowed with the necessary talents for keeping the game at a high level, or had not reached an age

where the mind was willing but the body weak.

These birds don't take so long to pick up the ball, and having flagged it down, they require but a fraction of a second to send the pellet on its way. Additionally, they throw much harder, the ball traveling with such speed that a runner who appears to be safe one instant is out the next.

[Having tasted of baseball's golden fruit once more, along with the millions of westerners who lapped it up over their television sets, it is easy for me to understand why the stuff served up by the Coast league will never again satisfy the sport fans' appetites.

COAST CIRCUIT IS IN A BIND

It didn't exactly knock them loop-legged this past semester, what with people avoiding ball parks in such great numbers as to fracture the financial hopes and aspirations of the club owners from one end of the circuit to the other.

A veritable gold mine during the boom days of the immediate postwar series, the Hollywood outfit suddenly found itself saddled with a budget that not only tapped the till for everything that came in at the gate, but went so far as to dig into the dumper for additional funds that had accrued during the lush years. Only trouble with this was that the aforesaid monies had either been already divided up, or had gone into the depths of the stockholders' kickers and it became necessary to borrow, beg or—wup, I almost said steal.

The Coast circuit is in a bind. Television has removed the curtain that has obscured or clouded the difference between the brand of baseball played in the West and that practiced by the top clubs in the majors.

The owners on the sunset side of the Rockies have to come up with something that can be sold to the fans on the basis of a worthwhile product. They've got to put up something for sale that represents value received in the expenditure of the pleasure dollar.

Offhand, I would say the Coast league has a better chance of going out of business than going outlaw.

Somebody has to move over and let major league baseball come in.

Investigate Russian Fur Shipments to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, members of the Teamsters Union and International Longshoremen's Union, of New York City, have discovered in a New York warehouse 150 bales of Russian furs, weighing 150 tons, and valued at millions of dollars, that have been smuggled into this country, contrary to our Nation's laws, according to a news article by Victor Riesel, widely known writer on labor affairs, which appears in the October 11, 1951, issue of the Daily Mirror.

Union workmen, the Riesel article says, ripped open several of the bales and found they contained Russian furs. The inner packages, bearing Russian lettering, the Riesel article states, had been completely covered with canvas to

conceal the nation of origin of the shipment. Such camouflaging, if proven, obviously was done to circumvent the laws of our country.

If Mr. Riesel's facts are correct, they clearly indicate that fraud and deception was employed by the Russian shippers and American importers to get this illegal shipment of Russian furs into our country. The seriousness of the offense warrants a prompt and thorough investigation by the proper Federal authorities.

The Riesel article of October 11, 1951, in the New York Daily Mirror follows

UNCOVER 40 TONS OF SMUGGLED SOVIET FUR
(By Victor Riesel)

The underground smuggling route used by Soviet Russia to pour slave-labor furs into the United States was uncovered yesterday when 40 tons of camouflaged skins, valued at several millions, brought illegally into this country, were discovered in a lower West-side warehouse.

The contraband shipment, contained in at least 150 bales, came to light when Pat Connolly, vice president of the International Longshoremen's Association, and Patrick Riley of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters paid a surprise visit to the Apex Trucking Corp. warehouse at 38 Bethune Street, near Washington Market.

Ripping open several of the bales, the union leaders discovered they contained black karakul furs—banned for entry into the United States—and that the inner wrapping, over which camouflage canvas had been placed, was imprinted with Russian script. A violation of customs regulations was immediately evident in that the outer coverings failed to indicate the country of origin.

Investigation by the union leaders, who with Joseph P. Ryan, president of the ILA, have been cooperating with the Mirror in a campaign to keep Russian slave-labor products out of this country, disclosed that the furs left Leningrad early in September. They were detoured to Stockholm, where they were remarked and rebound in canvas and addressed to a free-trade zone.

A Moore-McCormick freighter carried them to where they were unloaded, on pier 82, in Philadelphia, on September 27, while Ryan and his lieutenants were negotiating here with stevedoring companies over a new contract.

On their return to Philadelphia, the union leaders were apprised by the longshoremen of their suspicions that the cargo was contraband. A probe was started.

It was found that Apex trucks had moved the bales out of Philadelphia to New York and were resting in the Bethune Street warehouse, awaiting delivery to the consignees.

According to Ryan, the bales of furs, which were shipped here in direct violation of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951, aimed at the importation of products of the U. S. S. R. and Communist China, are only a small part of the tremendous shipments of materials which the Communist government is attempting to slip into this country.

This huge smuggling activity is actuated, it was stated by Ryan, by the Reds' acute need of millions of dollars to fill the vast monetary deficits caused by the cost of the Korean war and the Russian development of the atomic bomb.

Similar shipments, according to Ryan, have been brought into the United States through Montreal and other Canadian cities. Efforts will now be made by the ILA to enlist the cooperation of all AFL unions concerned in the handling of such shipments to uncover further violations and to plug the smuggling loopholes.

Privileges of Newspapermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced a bill in this House which provides that in certain cases newspapermen and others dealing with public information shall not be required to reveal in Federal courts the source of their information. Considerable interest has since then been shown in the matter. From various parts of the country people engaged in newspaper, radio, television, and similar information media have written to me in support of this measure.

I trust that early in the coming session the House Judiciary Committee, to which the bill has been referred, will hold hearings and give these people an opportunity to appear and present their views. In the meantime, I desire to place in the RECORD a brief article by Chalmers M. Roberts, noted staff member of the Washington Post, dealing with this subject. Mr. Roberts' article, which appeared in a recent issue of the Guild Reporter, is as follows:

WASHINGTON ROUNDUP

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

For the first time in a long while there's a chance, but not much more as yet, that Congress may pass a bill to grant newspapermen the privilege of refusing to reveal sources of information to a Federal court.

Representative Louis B. HELLER, an aggressive New York Democrat, has filed a bill to do just that and hearings are likely when Congress gets back in January. The reason I think there is some chance of passage this time (a dozen similar efforts in the past 25 years having gotten nowhere) is the part newspapers have been playing recently in disclosures of crime, graft, and corruption. Much of the important information has come from sources who would talk to reporters only in confidence.

HELLER's bill would provide:

"A witness who is employed by a newspaper, news service, newspaper syndicate, periodical, or radio or television station or network, as a writer, reporter, correspondent, or commentator, or in any other capacity directly involved in the gathering or presentation of news, shall not be required in any court of the United States to disclose the sources of any information obtained in such capacity, unless in the opinion of the court such disclosure is necessary in the interests of national security or to avoid the concealment of a crime."

HELLER's bill is the outgrowth of a declaration by Federal Judge John C. Knox in New York last spring that Leonard Lyons as a newspaper reporter or columnist had no right to claim a privilege "akin to that which exists between a lawyer and his client, a minister and his penitent or a doctor and his patient." Knox said he had gone into the law thoroughly and "I find he has no such privilege."

Recently reporter Ted Link refused to tell a Senate committee some of his news sources and the Senators didn't press him; in fact several made it clear they would oppose any move to do so. In effect, this particular congressional committee (investigating the Bill Boyle, et al., case) granted the privilege. But that's different from a Federal court.

The law in general recognizes that certain communications are confidential; husband-wife, attorney-client, doctor-patient, cleric-penitent. But the fight to establish a reporter-news source relationship with the same privilege has had only partial success; 12 States so far have granted the privilege in State courts.

The Library of Congress Reference Service says these States have such statutes: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Efforts in other States to get similar laws on the books have flopped but it is heartening to know that 11 of the 12 successes have come since 1936.

In 1948 the Law Revision Commission of the State of New York reported it found no evidence that the administration of justice has suffered as a result of any of these State laws. But that wasn't enough to get a bill through Albany.

John Peter Zenger went to jail back in 1734 for refusing to identify a letter-to-the-editor writer and a fair number of fellow newspapermen have done so in the intervening years.

At this year's guild convention at Pittsburgh, the delegates adopted a resolution noting that recent court cases have renewed the question of "professional ethics" among newsmen as to their sources, and directed that a code be drafted for consideration of the 1952 convention.

The language of the Heller bill seems to me to be quite reasonable. The courts must have discretion, even though "in the interests of national security" and "to avoid the concealment of a crime" are broad phrases. Of course, the libel laws would still protect the public against stories with anonymous sources.

As of this writing Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee has not yet ordered hearings on the Heller bill so there is time for newspapermen around the United States to get together case histories they think ought to be presented to Congress as reasons for passing such a bill.

What's Wrong With Washington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this article by Mr. George Todt, published in one of the principal newspapers in my district, the Highland Park News-Herald, showing what the people back home are thinking about—the regular taxes plus the hidden taxes which go to pay for the reckless spending by the bureaucrats:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH WASHINGTON?

There is too much nonpaying freight aboard the bureaucratic gravy train.

There are untold numbers of unnecessary workers to pad the gargantuan public payrolls throughout the Nation.

Who pays their passage?

You are graciously allowed to pick up the check to pay their costly fare.

You are constantly paying for them in the countless little hidden taxes with which the country is plagued today.

Whenever you buy a loaf of bread or quart of milk.

Whenever you buy necessary clothing for your family.

Whenever you take them out to the ball game or to the movies.

As a matter of fact, two or three times more is drained away from you in this manner each year than for that whopping big income tax you must pay to the Government outright.

It is unfortunate that about 90 percent of the citizens who are forced to chip in to make up the wasteful costs of the overstuffed gravy train—like it or not—are people with incomes below \$600 per month.

This is you, Mr. Average American.

Whom else did you think it was?

You—not the idle rich but you—are painfully paying the enforced left-handed pensions to these smug bureaucratic workers on the excessive public payroll system.

You ought to try to do away with bureaucracy in Government. Besides putting an unnecessarily big squeeze on the private citizen, it is also the breeding grounds for the stupidity of socialism.

Why don't you awaken to the menace of this form of creeping paralysis and attempt to do something positive about it?

What could you possibly do?

Simply this: Legislate to require the Washington spendthrifts to live sanely within the financial means of the American people to afford their spending.

How can it be accomplished?

Only through some hard work on both your and your neighbor's part. You can still express your will by working together through majority vote.

From this could result some sound and conservative legislation designed to keep financial lunatics from destroying the economy of the Nation through dreaded inflation and devaluation of the time-honored American customs of thrift and savings.

For instance, it might become possible to work out some certain proportion of the national income to become a ceiling for Government spending.

Since the Government puts curbs on everybody else, perhaps it is time we commenced to put curbs on its astronomical spending powers.

Five or ten percent of the national income ought to be far more than enough to run the entire costs of the Government which are legitimately necessary—less defense costs, of course.

But a realistic ceiling of some kind should definitely be set.

Then we should say something like this to the bureaucrats:

"Only this much money for you, and no more. Here is your allowance—see that you stay within it. Either get the job done, or get out."

The water in Washington would quickly find its level after such an ultimatum from the people.

Much of the bureaucratic frills of waste and padding would go down the drain immediately.

Savings accomplished from this type of surgery might later be utilized by turning it into new venture capital to expand production on all fronts.

Vital new sources of productive jobs would be provided by this action.

But here a sad note begins to creep in: The able-bodied young bureaucrats tossed bodily off the gravy train would then be forced to go to work in commerce and industry to earn their pay.

There is a question whether many of these parasites really want to do useful work of any kind, however.

Riding the gravy train is the only work they know.

They should be taught how to go from parasite to producer in one easy lesson.

Is it possible to raise the American standard of living without new and increased production?

In the final analysis, we cannot have more unless more is produced and distributed thereafter. This is the law of supply and demand.

The way to attain it, however, is not to sit supinely by and watch the Government milk away the surpluses of wealth producers.

It would only be doled out later to the excessive hordes of politicians who make up the ugly bureaucratic mushroom—possibly the adstool would be a more fitting description.

These leeches provide little enough for the charity which is given them for their upkeep—except mountains of useless red tape and whole rivers of bungling attempts which only succeed in confusing the public.

Their efforts are only herculean when it comes time to add more names to the pay-rolls.

This is done to justify increases in top-level salaries later on.

This excess baggage—and every single one above the minimum amount compatible to getting an adequate job done is pure excess—cannot be classified as real wealth of any kind.

They are only economic millstones around our very necks, and it is very difficult to breathe while we have to wear them.

They cost us far more than the Marshall plan every year.

Worst of all, they are a sheer negative factor in American wealth production.

What we need more than the proverbial 5-cent cigar is top leadership that knows how to wield an ax with surgical skill to pare down the wasteful excess.

The bureaucrats must be taught to live within their means—our means, actually.

We must not allow their preoccupation with self-perpetuation to destroy the capitalistic goose of free enterprise in America which lays the golden eggs.

The bureaucrats must be warned to either become sensible or get out.

They cannot be supported forever by the Government's loot of the surpluses of those who produce goods and services in the Nation.

It is just too bad we can't dispense with the services of the noble bureaucrats altogether.

Wish I was allowed to use that paring ax I mentioned earlier.

Category IV Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include portions of a letter received from an American officer in Korea whom I know personally. Why are our military leaders still unable to straighten out the confusion and inequities in the handling of reservists which has led to such ridiculous misuse and unjust treatment of good intelligent American citizens?

KOREA, September 21, 1951.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
Congressman State of Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The shameful, un-American treatment of Category IV officers has become unbearable. The recall of these officers in the main was made without regard whatsoever to reason. The handling after recall has been even worse. I personally know of many, many

cases here in Korea but I will dwell mainly with my own.

In World War II my life was interrupted by a war which I believed to be just and unavoidable. In this present war, due to vacillation of the State Department, administration weaknesses, and refusal of the Government to believe people who knew something of the Far East, such as yourself, we were drawn into the awkward position of having to fight again. Because of what they called my ability and qualifications, I had to leave my family again, sell my house, and risk life and limb for a principle no right-thinking person will be able to understand. That principle seemingly being that it is better to always "yes" instead of "no" until one is so involved that more "yesses" are impossible. The face of our State Department and administration as a whole is not worth saving at the cost it seems we have to pay.

Frankly most of us are more than willing to do our share if those who are or should be better qualified were doing theirs. The active reserves in the main have not been touched. The morale of the Category IV involuntarily recalled officers is the lowest I have seen in anyone in 5 years of military service. Surprisingly enough, efficiency has been high but in the last few weeks it has assumed an all-time low and will go lower. Concrete action is necessary immediately.

In 1945, after receiving my commission, I was sent to the University of California to study the Chinese language for 4 months. I was then sent to India and made no use of what little language I had learned. I was released in 1946 and had no contact with the language again until 1950, when I was sent to the Presidio of Monterey, Calif. There I was supposed to receive several months of instruction in Chinese. Unfortunately no one at the school knew I was coming and the only instruction available was 2 hours a day, 5 days a week for 2½ months. The balance of the time I had to study alone. Even after diligent application, I failed the fluency tests miserably, which the instructors anticipated, as they knew the school's shortcomings. I was sent to Tokyo and took the language tests again. After failing the tests again I was classified as a linguist anyway, and when I asked if it was because of my investigative experience rather than language, they admitted that was true. Because I was classified as a Chinese linguist I am frozen in Korea, even if the classification is erroneous. Were I classified in the Army as an investigator I would not be frozen in Korea.

Now I have been assigned to help train ROK troops in the field. When I was assigned to this job, I was told that I was the only man qualified to handle the job, yet I am an Ordnance officer, frozen in Korea because of Chinese language, doing infantry work, far removed from either the language or my qualifications in investigation.

The situation is as nonsensical as it is unbelievable but nonetheless true and no different from many other service inefficiencies.

Yours truly,

Since Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of all of my colleagues the fact that there is now in

print a very graphic "Photo History of Our Time—Since Stalin." It is one of the best publications yet put out showing the history of communism. It is a contemporary history, illustrating the dark birth, the bloody adolescence, and the sordid maturity of communism, all of which has happened within our own lifetime.

The book is edited by Boris Shub and Bernard Quint, who are especially qualified, and it is published by Swen Publications Co., Inc.

Analysis of Senate Bill 1889: Transportation Act of 1952-53

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an analysis of Senate bill 1889, being the Transportation Act of 1952-53, made by Mr. Hugh C. McCarthy, former counsel to the Subcommittee on Domestic Land and Water of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 1889, TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1952-53, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE PRACTITIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAPTER, OCTOBER 16, 1951, BY HUGH C. MCCARTHY

Of course, you all know that the bill (S. 1889) developed out of the studies and hearings under Senate Resolution 50 (81st Cong., 1st sess.), which, in turn, sought to meet the postwar transportation problems, as a whole (A) domestic land and water, (B) air, (C) maritime, and (D) communications.

Similar action was taken after the First World War, following Government control, and the Transportation Act of 1920 ensued. That act marked a change in congressional policy from antimonopoly to a consideration of the needs of the carriers.

In due course, I assume that much the same sort of action will follow the studies under Senate Resolution 50.

The question now is, "What are some of the problems of transportation?"

As practitioners, you know more about the problems of the areas in which you specialize, than one engaged in over-all studies.

The over-all problems of rail, motor and water transportation were presented by experts at the hearings under Senate Resolution 50, and in the simultaneous House committee hearings. Accordingly, there is nothing new or novel in the bill.

However, there may be differences as to views in regard to remedies or to the weight to be given the problems presented.

The comparative print which I have made available gives more detail than can be here presented, as it covers existing law, section by section, and proposed changes—with references to hearings and committee report, in order to permit of adequate comparisons and conclusions.

It is a matter for others to determine whether the solution should be piecemeal or by an over-all approach. I may quote

Hon. Clarence Lea (former chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce), who recently said to me, in substance:

"The present law is a patchwork of years of different ideas."

The bill (S. 1889) in parts, shows inconsistencies in existing law which need revision—and they were included in order to draw attention of the committees, and others interested at this time, to the inconsistencies.

In the light of the patchwork nature of existing law, it is a tribute to our quasi-judicial processes that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been able to apply the law without destroying the national transportation system.

I have in mind the grandfather clauses and the tacking process which will extend transportation facilities to kingdom come, unless Congress acts.

Surplus transportation facilities with cut-throat competition in normal times, means bankruptcy for many operators when the Korean war is over.

It is generally conceded that the hearings were outstanding in the reasonable approach of experts to the current transportation problems.

The 1940 bill went to conference committee three or four times because of the unwillingness of some groups to be regulated. They are now under the umbrella, in part, and there is now some basis on which to determine their operations in relation to each other and the national transportation system. The hearings show the pressing need for uniform transportation statistics.

The bill and the comparative print were prepared with an eye to the obstacles in the way of passage, to show fully and clearly just what is intended by each provision and its source—in order that there may be a meeting of the minds, as near as may be, before committees are asked to judge what the solutions should be.

Primarily, the bill is a shipper's bill—those who have to use common carriers and who do not afford enough traffic to own, operate, or contract for their own transportation facilities.

What is profitable to haul? Generally, high-rated manufacturers.

Are common carriers (rail, motor, and water) going to be limited to low-rated traffic, to a large degree, and pass on their costs to these shippers? The coal witnesses seem to think that this is so.

Comes the war, are common carriers necessary?

Or, if they run at a loss because enough of the high-rated traffic has gone to the unregulated or private carrier (which will probably lead to industrial cartels), will the Government bail them out?

Then, will the Government permit any kind or character of competition with its "babies"? The French, German, and English Governments protect their own government carriers with restrictions on privately owned carriers little dreamed of here. The price of gasoline in France is out of this world.

Probably, it would be best to do the job now—while the body is still warm and the patient can stand the loss of blood.

Existing law, in many respects, fails to adequately establish principles for application by the Commission—and attempts to spell out cures which ought to be administrative determinations. For instance:

(A) Favoring agricultural exports in domestic transportation while ignoring all other exports.

(B) The use of "grandfather" clauses in infancy and failure to permit the Commission to determine the "public convenience and necessity" of operations in maturity.

(C) Specifying the number of vehicles (20) free of acquisition restrictions,

(D) Applying an antitrust provision to a public utility, the provisions for the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity in the act—contemplate an exclusive franchise under regulation—and rejects the theory of laissez faire competition, contemplated in the antitrust laws.

(E) Granting "exemptions" that lead to "leasing practices" which tend to destroy the national transportation system—instead of permitting the Commission to determine whether the nature, character or quantity of the transportation impairs regulation.

(F) Favoring one type of carrier over another—like permitting the use of publicly financed waterways and of highways, at less than the full cost.

(G) Granting of water preferentials on rates * * * where the joint rail-barge case shows the theory to be unsound, as water terminal costs have wiped out the "inherently lower water cost" even on free waterways.

(H) Granting of theoretical "certificates of public convenience and necessity" where existing carriers fully and adequately meet the demands of the shipping public—e. g. section 207.

These provisions of existing law may be described as "statutory arbitraires" rather than statutory principles for general application to all carriers alike.

Some of the principal considerations covered at the hearings and treated in the bill, may be summarized as follows:

(The reference "EL" means existing law.)

(The reference "B" means the bill.)

(1) Surplus Transportation Facilities—Brought about by (a) "Grandfather" clauses; (b) no control over number of vehicles (sec. 208 (a) (EL)); (c) contract carriers as substitutes for common carriers (sec. 209 (a) and 309 (f)).

The bill—

(a) Limits certificates to transportation where the nature, character, or quantity of transportation does not impair regulation (sec. 4 (4) b). This merely extends a provision of existing law to all carriers (sec. 204 (a) (4a) EL).

(b) Controls leasing of vehicles (sec. 4 (8) (c) B).

(c) Limits certificates where existing carriers provide adequate service (sec. 4 (1) B).

(d) Eliminates contract carriers.

The hearings indicate that contract carriers constitute a preference for big shippers with volume and discriminate against shippers forced to use common carriers at higher rates—note supplement to OPS Regulation 25 of August 25, 1951, establishing preferentials and where contract carriers are not even controlled, even in some measure, by Commission.

(2) Revocation of certificates, permits, and licenses (sec. 212 (e) EL).

The bill (a) limits dormant certificates to 90 days (sec. 8, B); (b) requires revocation where the nature, character, or quantity of transportation impairs regulation (sec. 8, B).

Under the Administrative Procedures Act, there should be no revocation without cause. In spite of widespread abuse of Commission regulations, there have been few, if any, revocations because, under the act, abuses can be cured and repeated.

(3) Acquisition of control of carriers (sec. 5 (2) a, EL).

The bill (a) removes present artificial restrictions and recognizes the business of transportation (sec. 9 III, B); (b) eliminates conditions subsequent (sec. 4 (8) B).

(4) Preferentials: Water (sec. 307, EL).

The bill omits them.

(5) Free or reduced rates (sec. 1 (7) and sec. 22, EL).

The bill (a) restricts to Commission determination (sec. 39 (a) B), (b) controls Government action (sec. 36 (b) B).

(6) Carrier classifications (sec. 204 (b) EL).

The bill (a) proposes two classes of all carriers—common carriers and private carrier's.

The commodity distinction is eliminated in the interest of a national transportation system, with all carriers required to serve the public generally and not specially. The highways and waterways are public and, in time, will be so treated. Sixty percent of the country's traffic moves by rail, which hauls everything, and unless shown to be inadequate should not, in the public interest, be faced with the "specialty" haulers skimming the cream of high-rated traffic, particularly, where they do not pay the full cost of transportation—e. g. the use of public facilities at less than full cost.

(7) The Commission (sec. 17, EL).

The bill (a) makes the chairman the permanent administrative officer (sec. 51 (2) B); (b) suggests revision of conflicting provisions (sec. 72, B).

(8) Intrastate rates, abandonments (sec. 13 (3) and (4) EL).

The bill (a) requires that the Commission determine "undue burdens" on interstate commerce (sec. 75 (1) B).

(9) Economic justification for, and user charges on, expenditures of public funds (sec. 78-8).

The bill—

(a) Provides that the Commission, as an arm of Congress, look at the over-all national transportation system in the use of public funds for transportation facilities (sec. 78, B).

(b) Provides a method of reimbursement for public expenditures, by way of taxation rather than by uncertain tolls (sec. 81, B).

(c) Equalizes the tax on transportation of property and persons (sec. 81, B).

(d) Delegates to the Commission the power to establish and maintain sizes and weights of interstate motor vehicles in the public interest (sec. 79, B).

(e) Requires manifests of weight and lading of interstate motors (sec. 79, B).

In the matter of taxation rather than tolls which would probably require a long and expensive study—(the result of which would be something like the provisions of the bill, in the view of many familiar with the problem)—the bill merely reapplies the provisions of existing law—consolidating the Internal Revenue Code section 3460 with section 3475.

The Ways and Means Committee approached this problem in the current tax bill (H. R. 4475) which the Finance Committee suggested requires further study.

From a transportation angle, it is striking that where a commodity moves by pipeline over a privately owned and maintained right-of-way it bears a 4½-percent tax, but where the same commodity moves by barge free on publicly developed and maintained waterways, the tax bill proposed a 3-percent tax charge, which the Senate eliminated; yet, after leaving the barge terminal, the commodity usually moves privately over public highways free of any such tax and at less than the full cost of transportation to boot, but if moved by common carrier under identically the same circumstances it is taxed 3 percent.

This raises the question, when looking at the over-all picture of national transportation:

"Is it so arbitrary as to constrain to the conclusion that it is not the exertion of taxation but a confiscation of property in violation of the fifth amendment?"

"Is it so wanting in the basis of classification as to produce a gross and patent inequality as to inevitably lead to the same conclusion?"

The remainder of the bill (S 1889) is largely a consolidation of existing law, elim-

inating duplication and repetition, and an attempt to undertake to apply the same rules (as near as may be) to transportation as a whole in a national transportation system, rather than patch up the crumbling walls until hard times do not permit of a sound, well-considered, leisurely approach to problems that appear to be bound to become critical under more normal world conditions. The return on rail common carrier investment in 1949 of 2.89 percent indicates the margin of safety.

Thank you.

The Fulbright Ideal: A Great International Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the magazine *Pacific Neighbors*, published by the Australian-American Association of Australia. This article, written by an Australian, is further evidence of the effectiveness of the exchange-of-persons program being conducted by our Government. I sincerely hope that some of the leaders of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate will take the trouble to examine this material and will be persuaded to support this program more effectively.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FULBRIGHT IDEAL: A GREAT INTERNATIONAL EXPERIMENT

(By Geoffrey G. Rossiter)

On November 26, 1949, Dr. H. V. Evatt, then Australian Minister for External Affairs, and Mr. Pete Jarman, United States Ambassador to Australia, signed an agreement to provide for a program of educational and cultural exchange between Australia and the United States. Referring to the agreement, Mr. Jarman said that it was the greatest single step which could be taken to cement complete understanding between Australians and Americans.

It is, as yet, too early to attempt an overall assessment of the value of this exchange. But on that day in November 1949, Australia gave her support to a grand experiment and joined with a whole family of nations who gladly accepted the generous offer of the United States Government to turn the materials of war into an instrument for the preservation of peace, for the breaking down of barriers of misunderstanding, the removal of intolerance.

For this is the essence of the FULBRIGHT program—the belief that peoples of diverse races, creeds, and cultures can, by the exchange of peoples and ideas, come to the realization that, despite superficial differences, they have and will continue to have, many common interests, and that they are faced with many common problems, the resolution of which can be achieved most efficiently as the result of common action; the belief that the mobilization of the forces of education, science, and culture are as es-

sential to the maintenance of world peace as the mobilization of military power, the belief that the most effective path to enduring peace lies in the building up of understanding and good will amongst the free peoples of the world by a concentrated emphasis upon individual human relations.

A LONG-RANGE PROJECT

The FULBRIGHT program is a vast enterprise which, given peaceful conditions, will extend over a period of about 20 years. It will involve the award of scholarships and fellowships to more than 100,000 individuals from more than 20 countries at an expenditure of approximately the equivalent of 70 million Australian pounds.

These are not simply cold statistics but telling evidence of the basic belief that an increasing number of educated citizens, imbued with a world outlook, can be a potent influence for good in the troublous times through which we are passing. This is essentially a long term project, the true benefits of which cannot reasonably be expected to become apparent for some years to come. But the seeds have been planted in more than 20 countries, and there are many who believe that they will bear fruit abundantly.

Support for the Fulbright program throughout the free world has been overwhelming. In the United States public interest is clearly evidenced from the spate of Fulbright applications—more than 12,000 for approximately 1,000 opportunities available in the various participating countries during the academic year 1950-51. Similar response has been forthcoming from the other participating countries and no country which has been offered the opportunity of becoming a partner in the enterprise has refused.

The general reaction of official circles in countries which have Fulbright agreements can perhaps be summed up in the following statement, issued by the British Foreign Office after the Anglo-American agreement had been signed: "The arrangements being made represent one of the greatest experiments of the postwar world. They are based on the feeling that if the mass of the people in all countries can be brought to know each other and can be allowed to communicate as freemen, a solution can be found for their common problems."

QUESTION OF RECIPROCITY

There have been critics of the program and undoubtedly these criticisms will continue in the future. The most trenchant of them attack the enterprise at its most obvious point of weakness—the apparent lack of complete reciprocity. The very nature of the program, which is based upon the use of nondollar funds, makes complete reciprocity difficult of attainment. This challenge is being accepted, and since the passage of the Fulbright Act more than 4 years ago, the question of complete reciprocity has been the subject of constant attention.

Through the cooperation of Government and private agencies in the United States means are being devised to assist students and scholars from dollar-starved countries to participate in the vast exchange program, even though the only contribution available to them from Fulbright funds consists of traveling expenses. Under the Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, commonly known as the Smith-Mundt Act, the United States Government allocates varying amounts of dollars to assist students, lecturers, and research scholars to meet their living expenses while in the United States. Six Australian Fulbright students were assisted last year in this fashion to continue their studies at American universities, and during the present year as many as 15 students and 8 more senior scholars will receive similar benefits.

American universities, and other private agencies, traditionally generous in providing scholarships, fellowships, or teaching assistantships for non-American students, have also increased the opportunities which they offer, and it is the belief of the United States Educational Foundation in Australia that any students with a first-class academic record will not be turned away empty-handed if it is his serious desire to pursue further postgraduate study in the United States.

But perhaps the most telling example of the genuine desire of Americans to ensure true reciprocity in the Fulbright exchange comes from Italy. American Fulbright students to that country in 1949, wishing to express in a practical fashion their appreciation for the opportunities afforded them by making it possible for more Italian students to benefit from a period of study in the United States, contributed to a fund for the establishment of a scholarship for an Italian student who went to the United States during 1950-51. This plan has been continued, and Fulbright students now in Italy are busy raising funds in order that similar assistance might be afforded another Italian student during the academic year commencing next September. This type of response is surely the best answer to criticisms of "lack of reciprocity."

There cannot be the slightest doubt but that the Fulbright ideal has found practical expression in "the greatest fellowship program in the world's history." As such it merits our whole-hearted support but, in addition, it requires our sympathetic understanding. The vastness of the enterprise and its reliance upon the ready cooperation of numerous agencies and institutions in many parts of the world will continue to present problems of no mean magnitude to those called upon to administer the program both in the United States and the "Fulbright countries."

As Charles E. Odgaard of the American Council of Learned Societies says "Anyone who has had the slightest connection with the operation of a fellowship program knows the difficulties involved. In the case of the Fulbright program, there is, and will continue to be, a steady stream of new problems calling for rational analysis and policy determination. The indulgent sympathy of the entire educational world in America and abroad is needed."

"At the same time, it is important that those who are gratified with various aspects of the program as it unfolds should make that gratification known. The Fulbright Act is a tool which has been fashioned in the expectation that it would lead to better international understanding. Those who believe in such efforts have a responsibility not merely to criticize mistakes of operation, but also to make known in all appropriate places the full meaning in terms of human experience and understanding of a Fulbright year."

The Problem of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared entitled "The Inflation Engine," and I submit it now.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INFLATION ENGINE

I have introduced a resolution to limit the taxing power of the Federal Government. It appears to be the only course left to avoid ultimate disaster.

We are presently pursuing a strange course. The theory is that since production for war will diminish the supply of civilian goods but continue to put more and more dollars in the consumers' pocket, there must be heavy income taxes to drain off this supply of dollars. This is supposed to reduce consumer purchases and keep the supply of money and goods in balance and prevent a rise in prices. This course of action is further fortified with price, wage, and rent controls in the belief that this combination will head off disastrous inflation.

But what is the inexorable logic of the situation which confronts us? The long hand of Government reaches into the pocket of consumer and corporation alike to take away the dollar they might otherwise spend. Considerable brokerage is involved because it costs hundreds of millions to collect the tax. Thus, the Government is richer and the consumer is poorer by the amount taken by the tax man.

The supply of spending money has not been reduced. It has merely been transferred from the consumer spender to the Government spender. The Government then proceeds to spend the same dollars for payrolls, tanks, atomic-energy plants, uniforms, rations, planes, buildings, and a host of other items mostly of a military nature. The pile of consumer goods is not increased. In fact, it is diminished.

Thus the flow of money back to the consumer continues. As wages rise, the supply of spending money increases. Full employment is sustained by increased Federal spending and by the production of war goods. And full employment naturally sustains a lively demand for food, clothing, motorcars, and all manner of goods and services. So prices rise as Government spending increases the supply of spending money while the same Government diminishes the supply of available goods and services.

What then is the net economic effect of high taxes? They are an item of cost in the production of goods and must therefore be passed on in the form of higher prices. This in turn shrinks the value of the dollar in the consumers' pocket and provokes a demand for higher wages, to offset not only the shrinkage in the dollar but the additional tax upon the consumer himself. This in turn must be reflected in further price increases and finally requires more and more taxes by Government because it must also pay more for the war commodities which it buys.

And what is the ultimate effect of this tax-around upon the country? The Government will continue to pour fiat money into the economic bloodstream. It will impart a momentary but superficial glow of health to our economy. Jobs will continue plentiful. Money will jingle in the pocket for a time at least. The dollar continues to shrink. The value of insurance policies goes down. The value of money in the bank goes down. The billions that frugal, hard-working people have accumulated in the Social Security accounts shrink as they grow older and move toward the shadow of retirement. People on pensions will find their standard of living reduced. Those receiving old-age assistance will find the going increasingly difficult and demand larger allowances. The clamor for more and stricter controls will grow and it will be eloquent testimony that controls do not control. They merely dislocate the whole machinery of pro-

duction and distribution. The power to make economic decisions will more and more, be transferred from what was once a free market into the hands of the bureaucracy. The volume of directives and decrees will grow. We shall find that control is only Socialism in action. And we shall also find to our dismay that through the back door by means of administrative power, we shall have socialized our economy without nationalizing a single railroad or coal mine or by taking over a single bank or steel plant.

A freely elected Congress will have helped to bring this unhappy condition upon the country. It will have been done within the framework and form of a government that was once dedicated to freedom. It will have been done without a man on horseback. We shall have done it to ourselves.

Is there an answer for this dismal prospect? I think there is. It lies in the proposal I have introduced to limit the amount which Government can take from the citizens in the form of taxes. Taxes are the fuel which makes the spending engine run. The spending engine is the engine of inflation, and it is already out of control. As Mr. Charles Wilson said in response to my questions before the Banking Committee of the Senate "We cannot halt inflation. We can only slow it up."

Only by putting a brake on Federal spending can we avoid economic disaster. Only by limiting the amount of spending money which Government can extract from the pockets of the citizens can this be achieved. Only by writing it into the Constitution can we be sure that it will be effective. And that is the purpose of the resolution which I have introduced.

The Farmer's Stake in Meat Market Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Before You Beef About Beef Prices, Know the Story," published in the Minneapolis Star of October 12, 1951. It is a very pertinent editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE YOU BEEF ABOUT BEEF PRICES, KNOW THE STORY

Beef, the darling of the American consumer when he has the money in his pocket to buy the food he loves best, is becoming a public relations villain for the farmer, who gets at least part of the blame for the high cost of living.

This red meat is currently fetching the farmer who feeds a special kind of cattle 149 percent of the parity price American agriculture holds sacred.

Veal and lamb, red meats that ride along with beef where prices are concerned, share a small part of the villain role in the high cost of living drama—small because veal and lamb don't amount to much in the total consumption of meat.

But through the whole range of things the farmer raises to fill the Nation's market baskets, prices are below the sacred parity point—and well below the point at which ceilings could lawfully be imposed upon them.

THE POTENTATE

Parity, the exalted potentate of Federal farm programs, is a tough thing to explain if all the gimmicky details are taken into account. The gist of it, however, is that the prices farmers get for the produce they sell ought to square with the prices they pay in about the same way they did in 1912.

Take the wholesale price the dairy farmer gets for milk. If the average dairy farmer got the parity price for each hundredweight of milk he sold he'd net \$4.79 a hundredweight. Instead he averages \$4.60 a hundredweight.

For hogs, which are an enormous part of the meat eaten in the United States, the farmer gets an average of \$19.70 a hundred pounds. If he got the parity price he'd be getting \$21.30 a hundred pounds. Hogs, incidentally, are selling comfortably above the price at which the Government might have to step in, yet a long way under the point at which the Government could put a ceiling on prices.

WHEAT AND CORN

Wheat, the raw material for the staff of life, is bringing the farmer an average price of \$2.13 a bushel, whereas the parity price is \$2.41 a bushel. And corn, the No. 1 raw material for meat making, is selling for 14 cents a bushel less than the official parity price.

A few of the farm-produced items that go on the consumer's back rather than into the market basket are giving beef a close run for leader in the price race. But they don't loom very important in the whole picture of the farmer's income.

The market picture of beef right now, according to the Government experts who watch it day by day, is complicated by the very fact that consumers are so willing to pay premium prices for beef—but not for other things the farmer raises.

CORN VERSUS BEEF

The ordinary farmer who raises a few beef cattle and feeds a drove of hogs is hanging on to his young beef cattle rather than send them to market. He isn't doing this because he's a hoarder, but because it makes sense in terms of the corn he'll husk in his fields this fall.

If he feeds that corn to beef animals he'll have a product that promises to sell for close to 150 percent of the sacred parity price. But if he feeds it to his hogs, they'll sell for around 92 percent of parity.

Why should he sell his young steers when he can keep them and make them bring him a fancy price for his corn?

Naturally, the farmer, like the housewife, has beef on his mind. But where his pocket-book is concerned, his wheat, corn, oats, milk, etc., are calling the turn.

NAT S FINNEY.

Editorial Comment by Memphis Commercial Appeal on Address Delivered by Senator Fulbright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on October 7 I delivered an address at the dedication of the new hospital at West Memphis, Ark., which was constructed under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. The Crittenden Memorial Hospital

is the first to be built in Arkansas under the provisions of this legislation and is located in the rich delta area across the Mississippi River from Memphis.

In the course of my speech at the dedicatory ceremonies, I made the following comment on the fact that the facilities of the hospital were being made available equally to both white and Negro citizens:

I think that one of the points of greatest significance about your hospital is that its facilities are available equally to both white and Negro citizens. There are 50 beds for white patients, there are 50 for Negro patients. Food and all accommodations are the same for everyone. The hospital's doctors will administer to all who need treatment, regardless of color. This policy, I think, is certainly in keeping with the one set recently by this city of West Memphis in providing for the educational needs of its colored population. It is a vigorous and healthy sign and one which points to the particular progressiveness of our State in this direction. You people of Crittenden County are attacking your problem by giving a three-story brick and concrete example of racial tolerance for all the Nation to see. This is the real answer of the South to the misguided policies of the reformers of the North.

I believe that the progress which is being made in racial relations in the South is not fully understood and appreciated by many persons elsewhere in the country, who still believe that the practice of lynching is widespread in our section. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record the attached editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which supports my statement relative to the far-sighted attitude which has been followed by the persons responsible for the Crittenden Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSPIRING EXAMPLE

For many years, wiser counselors of this Nation representing all sections of the country and both racial groups, have argued that relationships between the races must be worked out primarily on a regional basis, according to specifications basically just and mutually acceptable. For political profit, other persons have argued that interracial relationships must be dictated from Washington, by persons who have neither knowledge of the problem nor sincere interest in its solution.

It was heartening all the more then when Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who has won the esteem of men in all walks of life in far places, hailed the opening of Crittenden County's new memorial hospital at West Memphis as a concrete example of racial tolerance for all to see.

The county and city have earned humanity's plaudits for having built this hospital, and in the policy of making its facilities available to members of both races. Crittenden County and West Memphis have voiced the most effective rebuttal to those political opportunists who make capital of setting man against man.

The county and city already had shown a disposition to deal justly and honestly with people within their boundaries through expanded educational facilities for Negroes. This hospital and its availability to all who need it, regardless of color, is an added testimonial to the inherent sense of justice and kindness which even the South's most bigoted detractors must admit.

Here is one more step toward peace, harmony, and prosperity, and the most reassuring part of it all is that it was motivated from the local level, not by executive mandate from afar.

The Crittenden County Memorial Hospital will serve its area well and wisely, and particularly are we of the South grateful to Senator FULBRIGHT for calling the world's attention to this new testimonial to our sense of fitness and right.

Private Investment in Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of principles by the steering committee of the National Planning Association. The statement is entitled "Private Investment in Underdeveloped Countries," and it was released on the day before yesterday, namely, Tuesday, October 16, 1951.

The purpose of the statement, as set forth by the National Planning Association, is to explore ways for stimulating increased participation by private enterprise in international economic development and to examine questions of the relationship of public financing to private investment.

I am told that the lead in the making of this statement and its development was taken by Mr. Charles J. Symington, chairman of the board of the Symington-Gould Corp.

I point out to the Senate the relationship of this most interesting statement, as issued by the National Planning Association, to the so-called Benton amendment to the Mutual Defense Act, the appropriations for which were voted by the Senate today, and which is designed to encourage much more widespread development throughout the underdeveloped areas of the world, to be stimulated by private investment as well as by Government action.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES¹

Members of the steering committee of the National Planning Association are concerned about the lack of speed with which the United States is moving to help people in the vast underdeveloped areas of the world in their efforts to achieve better economic and social conditions. The fundamental principles which should guide our programs for assisting people of underdeveloped areas to help themselves were put forward in the steering committee's statement of February 19, 1951.²

¹ To be printed as NPA Special Report No. 30, for sale to the public.

² The United States and the Lesser Developed Countries of the World, Special Report No. 29 of the National Planning Association.

That statement stressed that there are a number of ways to finance developmental activities in underdeveloped countries. There should be an increased channeling of the countries' own domestic capital into their development programs. There is need for increased external financing of health, education, and other public services through government-to-government loans and grants and for financing of business by foreign private investment in the form of bond flotations or direct investment.

Private investment can play an important role in the economic and social improvement of underdeveloped countries of the world. In recent years, however, it has received too little attention—due, probably, to the fact that conditions have not been conducive to risk-taking by private capital. The purposes of this statement is to explore ways for stimulating increased participation by private enterprise in international economic development and to examine questions of the relationship of public financing to private investment.

ROLE OF PRIVATE FINANCING

Private saving and investment—whether it be from domestic or foreign sources—is the foundation upon which any country's long-run progress will be built. Public investment for developmental programs is indispensable, but long-term public investment in most fields should have as one of its principal aims creating acceptable conditions for the accumulation and use of private funds.

The steering committee's earlier statement on United States policy in regard to underdeveloped areas like the Report to the President by the International Development Board issued in March 1951—stresses the need for balanced social and economic development; for progress in the fields of health and sanitation, education and technical training, public transportation and communication, irrigation, flood control, and agricultural experimentation, as well as the growth of local financial institutions and of industry.

Enlightened private capital has played a part in providing many public services. This is perhaps most notably exemplified by the major American oil companies in Latin America and in the Middle East. However, the development of basic public services by private enterprise is naturally secondary to the achievement of other ends and their extent and location are influenced more by economic than by political or humanitarian considerations.

Basically only public authorities, national or international, can press development of public services sufficiently rapidly and on a broad enough front. This also may be true of large-scale power development programs where the prospects of commercial profits may be insufficient to justify the risk of adequate private capital.

Even within the sphere of public enterprise, however, the ultimate objective of progress through private initiative can be served. Improvement in health, diet, education, and basic services will always directly assist commercial development, and in some cases it may be indispensable. The underdeveloped countries today are mainly agricultural. Many of them are, nevertheless, unable to supply their own populations with an adequate diet owing to a variety of causes, including overpopulation, inefficient farming methods, and lack of even the simplest of tools, shortages of fertilizer, and need for irrigation developments. Agricultural production in such countries should be increased. But real improvements in agricultural production, highly desirable in themselves, frequently depend on expanding the production of basic commodities and manufactured goods for domestic consumption and export trade. To further such production is the normal function of private capital.

The warmest friends of private enterprise must agree that international private equity investment since World War II—apart, perhaps, from the mining and petroleum industries—has been far too small to justify any optimism that it can play a major role in the advancement of the underdeveloped countries. However, it must be equally recognized that decisions on investment policy reflect a balancing of prospective profit and risk. Generally speaking, foreign investment carries serious risks beyond those involved in domestic investment, so that a correspondingly greater return must be expected. This is particularly true during a period of high business activity when investment opportunities are favorable in the domestic market. To stimulate foreign investment, therefore, foreign risks must be minimized so far as possible and profit opportunities enhanced.

DIFFERENTS TO PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

The principal factor militating against a normal flow of private investment funds abroad, and particularly to underdeveloped countries, is the existing world tension. Management is faced with unpredictable political and military risks which it is reluctant to assume. However, other factors exist which, even in a more peaceful world, would discourage private investment abroad. These include (1) Unduly high or discriminatory taxes; (2) unrealistic exchange rates; (3) taxes on foreign exchange transactions; (4) requirements covering the employment of local personnel and inclusion of local capital which are impractical and cause inefficiency; (5) and—most discouraging—the possibility of interrupted operations, destruction of equities, or eventual expropriation.

A normal pattern for private equity investment in underdeveloped areas would show an initial and prolonged period of relatively high risk with low return. This should be followed by a period of relatively high profit to justify the initial venture. Private capital naturally would hesitate to accept the risks and privations of the early period in the face of a strong probability that the eventual rewards would be lost through expropriation—even expropriation with "compensation." Private investment can hardly flourish so long as a country's public policy suggests that the private investor will be welcome during the risk-taking period, but not permitted to enjoy the fruits of success.

Even where the toleration of foreign investment could be expected on a permanent basis, other local factors may discourage investment. For example, certain countries levy taxes at high rates which on the surface appear to be nondiscriminatory, but which fall very heavily on the foreign investor. In some countries with sharply progressive rates the only enterprises large enough to be affected by the ultimate progression are foreign-owned. Discrimination exists in cases of export taxes where the exporters are substantially all foreign investors or, for that matter, when any income taxes are levied at such high rates that practical enforcement is slanted against the alien. Similarly, taxes on foreign exchange transactions (as in the Philippines) or multiple exchange rates (as in Indonesia) operate to discriminate against the foreigner and, hence, to discourage further foreign investment.

The foreign investor, by improving his welcome, can himself do many things to encourage fair treatment. Among these are to follow sound, fair, and progressive labor relations policies and, particularly, to carry out programs for the training and advancement of nationals in the activities for which they are responsible. No one would question the propriety of national policy favoring the employment and training of local citizens in commerce and industry and the utilization of

local capital where it is available. In many countries, however, local private capital is unavailable and there is a serious lack of local managerial competence. In the face of these practical difficulties, a program requiring the enlistment of local capital and impractical speed in up-grading local staff may have a serious deterring effect on economic development, if pressed more with an eye to national pride than with regard to sound economic practice.

INCENTIVES TO FOREIGN INVESTORS

Certain steps to minimize the risks of foreign investment can be taken by unilateral action in the United States.

Consideration might be given, for example, to moving in the direction suggested in the report to the President by the International Development Advisory Board. That Board recommended the "adoption of the principle that income from business establishments located abroad should be taxed only in the country where the income is earned and should therefore be wholly free of United States tax." It seems clear that a positive incentive for the introduction of foreign capital can most easily be afforded by allowing a relatively high return on investment, net after taxes, in the recipient country. Such efforts to encourage inflow of American capital, however, may be largely frustrated by high tax rates in the United States. This point is already well understood in several Latin-American countries.

Another suggestion has been that certain of the risks peculiar to foreign investment, notably the nonconvertibility of foreign currencies, might appropriately be covered through governmental insurance arrangements. Such proposals are controversial in that they may imply a degree of governmental supervision and control of private investment abroad. They have, nevertheless, received substantial support from business interests as well as from governmental and advisory groups and merit further serious consideration.

The people and governments in the very countries where the need for development is greatest are today highly suspicious of private foreign capital—sometimes with cause, sometimes without. Many foreign countries, by facing up to the fact that the exploitive practices more characteristic of a past day are no longer followed by typical private investors, could do much to stimulate greater private investment from abroad.

It has been suggested that Government financial assistance to underdeveloped countries should normally take the form of loans. However, grants to countries which are credit worthy, except where the grants are essential in order to make loans feasible, tend to deter potential borrowers from applying for loans. It seems equally true that the scope for private investment may be seriously limited if the underdeveloped countries are given easy access to long-term, low-interest public loans for the same purposes as might otherwise be served by private investment. In countries where the foreign capitalist is considered, at best, a necessary evil, governments may take no steps to encourage such foreign private investment while capital funds are available from governmental sources. On the contrary, they will not hesitate to erect barriers against foreign investment or to continue or accelerate policies which discourage the potential investor from overseas.

We believe that public capital should avoid competing in the normal sphere of private investment where the latter is available or can be encouraged. There is some feeling among persons interested in the practical aspects of foreign investment that international lending agencies should clearly define their fields of activity, and that thought should be given to restricting the activities

of such agencies in fields clearly more appropriate for development by private capital.

An international lending institution may properly recommend to the borrowing countries such reforms in fiscal and monetary matters, and general economic policies, as are considered essential for their economic development. Where it is in a position thus to encourage sound economic policies in the recipient countries, an international lending institution can assist economic progress by making the extension of public grants or loans conditional on the recipient's adoption of policies which would encourage the concurrent and increasing investment of private funds.

Consultation with existing and potential foreign investors in specific countries would disclose which particular factors constitute impediments to private initiative and new commitments. Both technical guidance and financial aid by international agencies, and through intergovernmental agreements, are clearly indispensable to rapid and comprehensive economic progress in underdeveloped areas. Even so, public disbursing agencies, governmental or international, might well consider how their prestige, influence, and economic power could be used to insure that recipient governments exercise the maximum practicable efforts to attract private investment capital before supplementary public investment is made, lest the public-aid program merely facilitate a drift toward state socialism.

SELF-FINANCING

The growth and marshaling of domestic capital is the soundest long-run method for developing the economy of any country. Such a development of local capital, however, must be on solid ground. We must remember that United States' progress in the nineteenth century was aided importantly through the use of European capital. This hastened the process of gradual accumulation and reinvestment of substantial United States capital, until this country became the greatest reservoir of private capital in the world. The accumulation and investment of local capital is highly desirable, but efforts to foster it should not so unfairly penalize foreign investment that the end result is the failure of private foreign capital to supply the need before the creation of a domestic capital structure sufficiently strong to stand alone in international competition. Such a policy, however attractive politically in the short run, must eventually defeat itself.

CONCLUSION

As long as the present international tension lasts, the investment of American private funds abroad—except under Governmental guarantees which would tend to remove the transactions from the ordinary hazards and normal conception of free competitive enterprise—will probably be limited in scope. We hold firm to our belief in the free competitive enterprise system and would like to see it spread to an ever-growing area once the tension is relaxed. It, therefore, seems only prudent to try to explore the obstacles with the dual purpose of minimizing them so far as possible at present and planning now for the time when they can all be effectively removed.

This statement was prepared for the NPA steering committee under the leadership of Charles J. Symington, member of the NPA business committee and board of trustees and chairman of the board of the Symington-Gould Corp.

NPA members of the steering committee who, in addition to Mr. Symington, sign the statement are:

H. Christian Sonne (chairman, NPA board of trustees and steering committee), president, Amsinck & Co.

Clinton S. Golden (vice chairman, NPA board of trustees, and chairman, labor committee), labor consultant, Economic Cooperation Administration.

Luther H. Gulick (member, NPA board of trustees and international committee), president, Institute of Public Administration.

Albert J. Hayes (member, NPA board of trustees), international president, International Association of Machinists.

Allan B. Kline (member, NPA board of trustees, agriculture committee, and international committee), president, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Donald R. Murphy (vice chairman, NPA board of trustees, and chairman, agriculture committee), editor, Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead.

Clarence E. Pickett (member, NPA board of trustees and international committee), honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee.

Elmo Roper (member, NPA board of trustees and business committee), Elmo Roper, Marketing.

Beardsley Ruml (vice chairman, NPA board of trustees and chairman, business committee), New York City.

The Importance of the Federal Grand Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the new members of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the eastern district of New York on September 24, 1951, at the Federal Building, Brooklyn, N. Y., by Anthony W. Fitzgerald, counsel for the association:

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FEDERAL GRAND JURY

Gentlemen, our president, Mr. Raymond A. Young, has made an unusual request of me this evening, that is, that I should say a few words of welcome and counsel to you, the new members of this association, who have just experienced the great pleasure and honor which service on a Federal grand jury entails.

I am not going to make a long speech, much as members of my profession are wont to and like to do. I would like just a few minutes of your time to consider a situation which has become appalling, desperate, and even frightening in some aspects.

A mere reading of the newspapers nowadays is an unpleasant experience. I do not refer to the war being waged on Korean soil nor to the presence in our midst—and often in high places—of those traitors who owe sole allegiance to the worst despot in history in Moscow; I do refer to the existing mess in which our own country, our own State, and, in particular, our own city find themselves. The average citizen—and Federal grand jurors are average, intelligent members of the community—feels shocked at recent disclosures and knows not where to turn.

Review with me the events of the past spring and summer: the disclosures at the Kefauver hearings with squirming, perjurious witnesses, the conviction of Mr. Moran, who held a post of trust in our city administration, the recent Gross fiasco, with District Attorney Miles F. McDonald, one of our

most capable lawyers as victim, the nasty mess on Staten Island where a hapless woman was intimidated and refused due process of law by a man in high office. Smell out with me the odors arising from the RFC, where one gentleman admitted that his conscience would not balk at a ham as bribe, just so it did not weigh more than 12 pounds.

All of this is old hat; you have heard these things or read them and discussed them among yourselves. Oh, it is easy to groan and growl and shake your head and play the ostrich by hiding from the evil rampant in our community. It is easy to turn on your TV set and bury your cares in a Dodger game or a western "thriller." The hard thing is to do something about it.

Some will refer to the ballot box as the great reformer and discourse with vigor and some wind on the value of the power of the vote. That may be so, but what choice can we make by setting one party against another? There have been recent offenses by members of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Is there anything constructive, anything practical that you as grand jurors can do to alleviate this intolerable situation?

Remember that we are not persons of power and, although our association has influence in many quarters, nevertheless we are unofficial and private citizens. We cannot hurl mighty thunderbolts to smite the evildoers or, what is much worse, the lax public officials who have forgotten what their oaths mean.

We have at hand a sharp and fearsome tool, the Federal grand jury itself. Criminals do not like to be indicted and tried before Federal juries, for there pull and leal gymnastics are of little avail. Federal juries have a record of convictions, fairly arrived at but impressive indeed. Federal jurisdiction sweeps across artificial county barriers and scorns attempts to evade it by legal devices.

When you seive on the Federal grand jury, remember that its powers are almost unlimited. Remember you can initiate an investigation, can demand action from the Federal attorney, can even remove him from the grand jury room at any time. A Federal grand jury, proceeding with due regard for the processes of law, is one answer to the present mess. It can hale offenders before it, dig into the facts, question Federal officials who may seem or are lax and render indictments against the guilty. What the grand jury must have is courage, guts, as we would say it ordinarily. It must be fearless, questioning, skeptical and tireless. Can you do that when you serve again? Will you? Don't forget the very future of this beloved country of ours may depend on your courage and determination.

Coupled with the idea of courage is also an idea former United States Attorney Saypol has told us tonight: that of humility. It is the humble man whom our enemies most fear, for he is a persevering man; slow to move but look out once he gets started. We must each of us act in his own way and according to his own powers—protest vigorously, yes; be alert to what is going on, yes, and be ready to strike at crime and those who have harbored it.

In closing, I would like to remind you of the motto of another group which is helping in our national crusade against communism—and collaterally, against those who would ruin our national life by coddling criminals. I refer to that humble but courageous group who do not rant and rave about the way things are, who do not sit back and wait for the inevitable but who do something about it. I mean the Christians, whose motto it is: "Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." Let that be our motto, too, Federal grand jurors.

Star Farmer of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, every citizen of Oklahoma is proud of Harold DeWayne Hodgson, 21, of Freedom, Okla., who on October 9 was named the Star Farmer of America. This award was made in Kansas City at the twenty-fourth national convention of the Future Farmers of America Foundation. Each year a Star Farmer is selected from the FFA members who receive the American Farmer degree, which is the highest degree conferred by the organization. The four degrees, Green Hand, Chapter Farmer, State Farmer and American Farmer are all based on achievement.

This is not an award limited in interest to any one State, however, for DeWayne serves as an example to the rural youth of the entire United States. At 21 he has proved that with initiative and hard work it is possible to make one of the finest contributions any man can make to his country. Through constant study and zealous devotion to his job, he has turned 320 acres of run-down land into a producing farm—and he has made money while he was at it.

During the present national emergency we have heard over and over again of the importance of defense production and the need for more workers in the defense plants. I am not here to minimize the importance of building up our defenses, but it seems to me that we cannot afford to overlook the vital significance of the farm when we are thinking of this emergency and of the future of our country. We cannot forget our rural people, and we need to remind them of the valuable services they are rendering.

The loss of rural population to the cities has been a matter of increasing concern to me. It is primarily this concern which prompts me to rise in praise of a young man who has demonstrated effectively that life on the farm is challenging, rewarding and profitable.

Several years ago, when Harold DeWayne Hodgson was still in high school, he read a story about a Star Farmer of America and told his father that some day he wanted to win the award. His father, who was a tenant farmer for many years and who weathered the depression on a farm, gave DeWayne every possible encouragement, but warned him that he could lend no financial assistance. I think everyone in the United States would like to know how young DeWayne—now married and the father of a 15-month-old son—has at the age of 21 accumulated assets worth \$30,495.40. It is not a story of intrigue; it is the story of a young man, willing to work and with a desire to make good, who took advantage of every opportunity to use his knowledge of farm management and who

learned to profit from his own experiences. No other country in the world can offer such opportunities. With young men like DeWayne Hodgson on our farms we cannot lose.

Upon graduating from high school, DeWayne rented 320 acres of run-down land from his grandfather. There was not enough grass on the land, the barn was dilapidated and the house had once been used to store wheat. Young Hodgson has renovated the buildings, put up fences and improved the land. Later on he was able to borrow \$8,000 to buy the property and sold one-half the mineral rights for \$2,000. He now figures the land is worth \$14,000. In applying for the American Farmer award, he listed the following additional assets: His livestock was valued at \$9,538, his farm machinery, equipment, and buildings were worth \$7,265, his growing crops were estimated at \$6,000 and he had miscellaneous assets of \$742.40. He still owes \$7,450, which includes a \$6,500 mortgage on the farm. His net worth is \$30,495.40. He now rents 255 acres of land in addition to the farm he owns.

It takes real courage to achieve such a farming record. The Star Farmer from Freedom, Okla., has had constant advice and encouragement from his father. I am sure both father and son would pay a great tribute to the Future Farmers of America for the inspiration, leadership and training which that organization gives to every farm boy. By giving young Hodgson the \$1,000 Star Farmer award, the Future Farmers of America have given Nation-wide recognition to an outstanding farmer. This is not the complete story, however. Only one boy can receive the highest award each year, and \$1,000 is certainly a prize worth going after, but we cannot overestimate the value of the example DeWayne Hodgson has set, nor can we overestimate the value of the inspiration which the Future Farmers of America organization gives to its 350,000 members. This group, the Future Homemakers of America, and the 4-H Clubs are working constantly with young people to maintain their interest in rural life.

In 1947 another farm youth from the Eighth Oklahoma District, Ray Gene Cinnamon, of Garber, Okla., received the Star Farmer of America award. We are justifiably proud of these two boys and of Wayne Booth, of Cordell, Okla., who was named the Star Farmer of America for 1943.

This year 14 young Oklahoma farmers were honored by the Future Farmers of America at its Kansas City convention. In addition to Harold DeWayne Hodgson, who received the Star Farmer award, the following Oklahoma boys were given American Farmer awards: Max Brissey, Broken Arrow; Charles Brown, Chickasha; Ray Watson, Verden; Donald Coffin, Guthrie; Charles DeBord, Perry; James Gilmour and Wayne Karrenbrouk, Kingfisher; Rudy Hanza, Lawton; Harold Dean Hepner, Freedom; J. D. Travis and Robert Kupa, Clinton; Jack Litzell, Waynoka; and Ernest Rexroat, Helena.

While I am naturally proud of the record of my district and of my State, there is another reason why I am asking that

my remarks be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The value and importance of rural living cannot be over-emphasized. In times when we are more and more aware of the dangers which threaten our Nation, we need to place more stress on the advantages of the most American of all of our institutions—the farm.

Centennial Anniversary of Lackawanna Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to give my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, at a banquet in Hotel Casey, Scranton, Pa., on October 15, 1951, ending the 3-day celebration of the Lackawanna Railroad's centennial anniversary:

FINE LINKS RAILROAD TO HISTORY OF PENNSYLVANIA—GOVERNOR SAYS DELAWARE & LACKAWANNA ASSISTED IN STATE'S GROWTH

Gov. John S. Fine coupled the Lackawanna Railroad's one hundredth anniversary with the observance of Pennsylvania Week last night in his address at the Hotel Casey dinner which climaxed the road's 3-day centennial program.

The text of Governor Fine's address follows:

"It is indeed a great pleasure for me personally, and as Governor of our Commonwealth, to extend congratulations to the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, which has reached the ripe old age of 100 years.

"There is an old saying that the first hundred years are the hardest, and I hope that this proves true about the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, a railroad which has played such a colorful and important role in the building of America and in its social and industrial life.

"Famed in song and service, in history and in legend, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad has seen much of, and contributed materially to, the growth of Pennsylvania, which now ranks foremost of all the States in industry. Like all the other railroads in this country, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western has had its ups and downs, varying with the economic prosperity or depression of the Nation itself.

"A railroad is one of the main arteries in the intricate body of State and Nation, and the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western has most certainly been such an artery in Pennsylvania. We could not possibly have risen to preeminence in the industrial world if our great factories and plants had been deprived of necessary transportation. Because we in Pennsylvania have always considered it of paramount importance to have only transportation of the very best and of all forms, we have been eminently successful."

STARTED AS SMALL LINE

"The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western got its start in the fabulous days of high finance, a game which then was played quick and hard. Beginning as a small coal-hauling line, it became a vital link in the country's transportation system and established one of

the earliest and busiest commuting services to New York City. It has contributed materially to the growth of the Commonwealth, as beautiful and scenically lovely suburbs sprang up all along its right-of-way.

"From George D. Phelps, first president, on through the years, men of wisdom, energy, and perseverance built up the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western. Its 100 years of operation were marked by terrific competition in a field so vital to the pulsating life of the State and Nation."

[Governor Fine deviated from his prepared speech at this point to dwell on Pennsylvania Week now being observed. He cited the State's many and great industries, schools, and system of highways. The Governor said Pennsylvania is proud of what it has to offer America to help make it the great Nation it is.]

"Pennsylvania was a pioneer in the development of the American railroad. Certainly one of the earliest evidences of what was to become a great network of transportation was the horse-drawn railroad in use over a short track as early as 1809. This was at Lelleville, not far from Philadelphia."

"The railroad and its history are woven close into the history of Pennsylvania itself. Not far from here where we meet tonight, the Mauch Chunk Railway was completed in 1827, less than 25 years before the completion of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western. It was built for the transportation of coal from the mines, and its 9 miles of track at that time formed the longest and the most important railway in the entire Nation."

"Only 2 years later, in 1829, the first train ever drawn by a steam locomotive in America made two trips between Carbondale and Honesdale on rails which had been laid by the Delaware & Hudson Canal Co. I said they made two trips, because these trips were never repeated. The locomotive proved to be too heavy for the light rails, but those two trips made history because, in fact, they were the beginning of the American steam railroad. Of course, railroads today have huge investments in their properties. They, like everything else, even including government, as I so well know, face continually rising costs for operation. Volume of business carried, even during the war periods, has not come anywhere near a comparative return on money invested."

STATE APPROPRIATED CASH

"It seems almost inconceivable, therefore, in the light of present-day operating and construction costs, to learn that a railroad from Philadelphia to Columbia, just south of Harrisburg on the Susquehanna River, some 81 miles long, was built through an appropriation by the Pennsylvania General Assembly for \$2,000,000. That railroad was built in 1834 and was the eastern link of rail and water transportation which ultimately linked the two biggest cities of the Commonwealth—Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Here was a whole railroad line built at a cost—well, I don't think you could get many locomotives for that amount of money today."

"As we look back over the history of railroading, we see that, in the pioneering days as well as today, the operators of railroads knew that their biggest source of revenue was the hauling of freight. The very first passenger-carrying railway in the world was a 38-mile horse-drawn line in Great Britain, built in 1825. However, 2 years before the opening of this English railway, the Philadelphia-Columbia Railroad, of which I have just spoken, was chartered in 1823 as a steam railroad for the transportation of both passengers and freight."

"The industries of Pennsylvania have always been closely allied to the railroads, and each has been dependent on the other. Our earliest railroads used coal as a fuel for operating steam locomotives and it was Penn-

sylvania anthracite which supplied the motive power."

"There is an interesting little anecdote about railroads and the public. When the charter was granted to the Philadelphia-Columbia Railroad in 1823, the public was so ignorant regarding this method of transportation that a reader wrote to a Pennsylvania newspaper inquiring, 'What is a railroad?' Perhaps this public ignorance was not entirely upon the reader's side because the editor, who probably didn't know either, replied, 'Perhaps some other correspondent can tell.'"

PENNSYLVANIA IN FOREFRONT

"In the century and a quarter since the publication of that inquiry Pennsylvania has been in the forefront in railroad development in the Nation. It is a fact worthy of note that every county in Pennsylvania, except Fulton County, is served by the network of railroads which cross and recross our State. It is a happy fact that, although Pennsylvania has only 1½ percent of the total area of America within its boundaries, she ranks third among all the States in main-line railroad mileage. The Interstate Commerce Commission credits Pennsylvania with 9,747 miles of main-line track, but our own department of internal affairs says that the total mileage, including branch lines, is 11,281 miles."

"Now with all this mileage in the State and with the number of railroads, including the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western whose centennial we observe today, it is little wonder that Pennsylvania not only led in railway development but also has always been a foremost user of rail transportation. From the very beginning of our industrial history, Pennsylvania has shipped and received more carload freight than any other State in the Union. In most years the industries of Pennsylvania ship one-seventh of all the carload freight carried by American railroads. One-eighth of all the carloadings carried by American railroads comes to Pennsylvania destinations."

"Let's go back for a moment in history to reveal some of the many firsts Pennsylvania contributed to the development of the railway industry in America."

"The first railroad locomotive equipped with a cab for the protection of the engineer and fireman was built in Philadelphia for use on the Lehigh Valley Road in 1835."

"The first railroad sleeping car ever constructed in the world was a rebuilt day coach which ran between Harrisburg and Chambersburg in 1836. This car was really a bunkhouse on wheels, lighted by candles, and provided with the then modern convenience of one wash basin."

FIRST BRIDGE AT MANYUNK

"The first iron railroad bridge in the United States was built near Manyunk on the outskirts of Philadelphia in 1845."

"What was probably the first railroad telegraph in America was a line, still operated by the Reading Co., which went into use on May 10, 1847, between Philadelphia and Reading."

"The dining car, now an accepted necessity of railroad travel was first operated during the Civil War between Philadelphia and Baltimore."

"The first tank car ever to transport oil in the United States began its run in November 1865 from Titusville."

"Perhaps the most important development in all railroad history after the invention of the steam locomotive was that of the automatic airbrake, developed by George Westinghouse of Pittsburgh between 1869 and 1872. This invention made possible safer, high speed transportation on railway lines, and has been adopted in every country in the world."

"Pennsylvania railroads were among the first in the Nation to make use of the tele-

phone. One year and two months after the first transmission of a telephone message by Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, the inventor began the installation of telephones in the Altoona shops of the Pennsylvania Railroad."

"Among the 71 railroad companies operating in the Commonwealth, there is the shortest railway in the United States—the Valley Railroad of McKean County, a little more than one-half mile long and the company with the longest track mileage and the heaviest traffic—the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. The total trackage in the various States through which it operates is more than 25,000 miles."

"This list by no means completes the story of Pennsylvania's part in the history of the American railroad. It is only fair to say that though the railroads made possible the intensive industrial expansion in our State, Pennsylvania's contribution to the development of the railroads is fully as important as the railroads' contributions to the development of Pennsylvania."

I MUST WRITE FRESH CHAPTER

"I hope that we may continue to contribute to each other's development and prosperity. I trust, too, that, as I said earlier, the next 100 years will be easier, healthier and more profitable to the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad. True, problems of grave magnitude will confront you and will challenge solution by you. In solving them it would be arrogant to ignore suggestions from competent quarters or to discard records of human experience. Sometimes we are too disinclined to let the dead hand of the past weigh too heavily upon us. We must remember, however, that the past has a living hand also and if we aspire to write a fresh chapter of the railroad's history worthy of pursuit or emulation, we cannot afford to ignore the well-thumbed pages preceding it. Duty, service and courtesy to the public have no date mark. Those changeless needs undergird the changing railroad company and while generation after generation, we ought to grow into their fuller comprehension and their wiser embodiment, all talk of progress becomes a farce if we began to think that the hour has now struck for growing out of those needs. They are basic and fundamental. They are constant guide posts springing for the trestle board of a useful past to guide and pilot the changing plans of a changing future."

"May the road of Phoebe Snow confidently adapt herself to the challenges of tomorrow. May her rails which traverse our lands, climb our mountains, cross our streams and bind together her life with our economy continue this century of progress and promote a better and greater Pennsylvania."

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a Neckyoke Jones Says column published in the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press on October 10, 1951:

NECKYOKE JONES SAYS

"Did you seen where ol' ALBIN BARKELEY, the Vice President, said him an Truman had been doin' a top job together?" I inquires of my ol' pardner, Greasewood today. "Yep," he rejects, "but that may or may not

be a matter of opinion. At first glance, it'd look like as far as investment is concerned ol' ALBIN is just about a total loss to the taxpayers—but on the other hand costs of every thing is goin' up so that even wind is gettin' to have some value. Ol' ALBIN has been peddlin' that there commodity for a long time an' apparent he wants to give the taxpayer value received—an' fer the money you kin git more wind outen him than anybody in Washington—where there ain't any shortidge noticible as yet. Yessir, ifen there is anythin' folks could suffer along withouten for 4 years come 1952—it'd be ol' ALBIN, an' from what you hear even the Demimycrats don't ilgger he is the indispensable man." Looks like Greasewood thinks ALBIN is sufferin' from senile delusions. Hopin' you are the same, I am.

Yute Iren,

NEWYOKKE JONES.

"Listen Bud, I Never Had It So Good"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the last time I was home, I visited one of the feed lots west of town. I had heard a lot of talk about the beef shortage. So I wanted to get the story straight from the horse's—scuse me—steer's mouth.

Going into the lot, I walked up alongside a likely looking steer—a fleshy animal pushing the 1,200-pound mark. I asked him to tell me—off the record, of course—how he was getting along.

He was in a talkative mood. Here are his views as I remember them:

Listen bud, I never had it so good. I'm getting all I can eat three times a day and ottener if I want it. I'm getting a balanced ration—you know—everything that's good for me, corn, protein meal, minerals, everything. I've got a veterinarian that looks after me good to be sure I don't get sick or anything. My owner, he does all the worryin'—makes sure the grounds are in good shape, and that I'm protected from the weather.

Let me tell you, I never had it so good. I wouldn't trade this deal for the old rugged days out on the ranch where I had to rustle, and lots of times, I didn't have a full belly at night. Now I'm on full feed all the time. Yes, sir, I never had it so good.

As I was leaving the lot I happened to see the owner. He said to me:

How do you like the looks of this bunch of steers? I'm sending them to south Omaha for slaughter Monday.

The next day, Mr. Speaker, I started back for Washington. Along the route I heard some people say, "I never had it so good."

Somehow or other, an unpleasant thought began to form in my mind. I recalled that again, the third time in 35 years under a Democratic President, people were saying, "I never had it so good."

I remembered, also, that each time the young men of our country, like the steers in the feed lot, were sent to the slaughterhouses of war.

The feed-lot steer, Mr. Speaker, was a dumb animal. So of course, he would not know—or worry—about where he was headed.

You would expect him to say, "I never had it so good."

But when the Government conscripts young men to fight and die in foreign wars for the third time in 35 years, is not there something ominous about the boast, "I never had it so good?"

Every hour of every day the lifeblood of more American boys soaks into the soil of Korea.

Have you wondered how those lads must regard that smug crack, "I never had it so good?"

Or how those lads feel about those who use that glib chatter to promote their political fortunes?

"Well I Remember When Senator Charles Fenwick and Arlington Delegates Magruder and Damm Called, Soliciting My Support for the Hill-Burton Bill—They Told of Six Virginia Counties Without a Single Doctor and of Conditions in Arlington Hospital, Where the Corridors and Sun Porches Were Filled With Beds Occupied by Military and Federal Government Workers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would, for a short time, like to discuss with you, sir, and with my colleagues of this House, the condition of our Nation's health, in general—and, in particular, the magnificent results that are now beginning to accrue to the benefit of Arlington County and to the Nation—by way of the enactment of the Hill-Burton bill. This was a measure passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1946, which was designed to expand medical facilities, and do so particularly in rural and urban areas.

Naturally, we are all interested in the health of our families, our neighbors, our constituents, and in the well-being of our State and of the Nation. Inasmuch as my congressional duties necessitate my being in Washington so long as Congress is in session, I have been domiciled for the past several years in Arlington County, Va., just across the Potomac. In consequence thereof, I have had a particularly fine vantage point from which to view the results of the Hill-Burton Act upon the well-being of a cross section of both our rural and urban people.

Mr. Speaker, I need not tell you that Arlington County, Va., contains Arlington National Cemetery—the home of the great and beloved statesman, soldier, and patriot, Robert E. Lee, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and other noted and

historic spots closely associated to the early history of this Nation. Neither do I need tell you that Arlington County is today one of the fastest growing and most progressive areas in the entire United States.

I well remember a story that was told to me 20 years ago by a noted political economist who had been charged by the Federal Government with developing a plan to provide the most efficient, economical, and ideal system of local government that could be devised. The purpose of the study was more than theoretical. Application was to be made to such gigantic Federal communities as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Greenbelt, Md., development, and other Federal developments then in the making.

This great authority had already completed extended research studies of local governments in Europe and in the Scandinavian countries as well as in the various States throughout the Nation. He was himself surprised to learn that the government instituted by Gov. HARRY BYRD in Virginia was—as of that day and hour—acknowledged to be the most efficient, the most representative, and the most economical—at both county and State levels—that we had in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, that statement—by such a distinguished economist—was to me both provocative and thought-compelling.

You can readily understand, therefore, why I, as a representative of an urban and a rural constituency embracing the great city of Charleston S. C., should look into this system of government left to the people of Virginia by Senator HARRY BYRD when he entered the United States Senate—in order that I could better inform my mind with respect to the ideals in government from the standpoint of Federal administration.

It is, in part, because of this interest that I became a keen observer of county government, of the fast-growing community of Arlington County, which is, itself—and due to its origin—one of the most peculiar subdivisions of government in the United States.

Arlington County is that narrow strip of land on the south bank of the Potomac which the Commonwealth of Virginia deeded to the Federal Government when the District of Columbia was established. Its acquisition was desired because the Federal Government would then control both banks of the Potomac at the new site of our Nation's Capital. It would, also, have made the District of Columbia a body of land exactly 10 miles square. However, it was never developed as part of the Nation's Capital—and was returned to, and became part of, the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the average county in the country today is about 35 miles square, and is made up of 36 townships, each 6 miles square. Thus, the average county has an area of about 1,200 to 1,400 square miles of land. The accepted reason for making counties of that size—with the county seat laid down in the middle—was because it was approximately 17 miles from the edge of

the county, or about a day's ride with a team of horses from practically any part of the county—into the county seat and back home.

There are but few counties in the political subdivisions of one sort or another. Some contain great metropolitan cities, with even smaller cities, towns, and villages and boroughs situated within the county limits. However, Arlington County, Va., which is today as cosmopolitan and as metropolitan a community as exists in the United States, has no political subdivisions of government whatever, nor any governing body other than that afforded by the county board of commissioners administered by a county manager.

There are no cities, no towns, no villages in Arlington County, largely due to the fact that the entire county itself embraces a piece of land of but approximately 24 square miles in area, which is only two-thirds the size of an ordinary township. You will find, as I said before, 36 townships in the average county.

Despite any vexations that might have occurred, I have long counted my sojourn and life in beautiful Arlington as happy and pleasurable as it could possibly be so long as I had to be apart from my own kinfolk and constituency in the First District of South Carolina.

Notable among the men who have so maintained those delightful living conditions in Arlington, I shall always remember that beloved, distinguished, and esteemed first citizen of the county, the late Honorable Harry K. Green and the "big three" that had worked with him so hard, so ardently, and so long for the people of Arlington in the general assembly at Richmond, the Honorable Charles R. Fenwick, State senator from Arlington; the Honorable Maynard Magruder, and the Honorable George Damm, members of the house of delegates.

It is, therefore, understandable how happy I was to listen over that little radio station in Arlington to an address delivered in the manner and style of the Commonwealth itself. No vituperation, no vilification, no name-calling, just a mere recitation of what three Virginia office holders and gentlemen—the Honorable Charles R. Fenwick, State senator from Arlington County, Va.; the Honorable Maynard Magruder, and the Honorable George Damm, members of the Virginia House of Delegates—have done to bring more and better, sorely needed hospital facilities to Arlington County and the Commonwealth of Virginia under the Hill-Burton hospitalization program fostered by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasurable for any man to look back in retrospect and review the little part that he played in achieving some good for a community.

How well I remember the day that Charlie Fenwick, Maynard Magruder, and George Damm called on me, soliciting my support for the bill. They told me of the fearfully crowded hospital conditions in Arlington County, where the corridors and sun porches were filled with the beds of military and civilian personnel who worked for the Federal

Government in the Pentagon or elsewhere in Washington.

You can gain some idea of the plight of Virginia at that time with respect to a lack of hospital facilities. The State had six counties in which there was not even one single doctor. In 12 counties, there was but 1 doctor for 12,000 population.

Mr. Speaker, you will, therefore, see why I worked for the passage of the Hill-Burton bill—both in the committee and on the floor. I am glad that, even as far back as 1946, Maynard Magruder and George Damm offered a resolution in the general assembly, authorizing the Commonwealth of Virginia to participate in the Hill-Burton Federal hospitalization survey and construction program, and I am glad also that State Senator Charlie Fenwick introduced into the succeeding general assembly a bill that made it possible for that great Commonwealth of Virginia to match the Federal funds provided under that act, and thus bring to perfection the construction of greatly enlarged hospitalization facilities sorely needed by Government workers and their families on the grounds of Arlington Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership in this House may know of the splendid work in that particular instance—that has been accomplished by Senator Fenwick and his associates in the house of delegates, Maynard Magruder, and George Damm—and that, by unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I include in the Record a radio address made by Senator Fenwick over Station WARI in Arlington the afternoon of September 30.

That address is as follows:

Good afternoon friends, \$274,000 for the Arlington Hospital. This is the good news that I bring you today.

Back in 1946, Messrs. Magruder and Damm offered a resolution in the general assembly authorizing the State of Virginia to participate in the Hill-Burton program. This measure passed by the Federal Congress and supported by both political parties was designed to expand medical facilities, particularly in rural areas and areas serving rural people.

The situation in Virginia had been shown to be acute as the result of a commission which I headed in 1942. Prior to that, we had undertaken a medical scholarship program which would encourage doctors to serve in rural areas, be awarded the scholarship in the medical school as a condition to their serving 1 year in a rural community for each year of the scholarship. It was realized, however, that it was necessary to have medical facilities if doctors were to adequately practice in those areas, that 45 percent of the cost of construction should be raised by the locality, the remaining 55 percent to be provided between State and Federal Government.

Some idea of the need back in 1942 may be gained from the fact that there were 6 counties that did not have a doctor and 12 where there was 1 doctor for more than 12,000 population. The resolution to participate in the Hill-Burton program was adopted by the general assembly.

Shortly thereafter, the Virginia Health and Medical Care Council was formed, composed of representatives of professional and lay groups for the purpose of advancing public health in Virginia. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the legislative committee of this council. A health program was adopted, one of its objectives being to have

the State appropriate money under the Hill-Burton program to assist localities for public health centers and hospitals.

By the time the legislature convened in 1948 no money was contained in the budget for this purpose. It was imperative that the State appropriate funds in connection with the critical need for hospital and health centers.

Knowing that the Governor came from a tobacco-growing section and that there was great need for medical facilities in southside Virginia I introduced a bill which placed a tax on cigarettes and earmarked the money for the Hill-Burton program. At the time I introduced the bill I told the Senate that my sole purpose was to raise money for the health program and that if the money was appropriated I would forget the bill. Incidentally, Virginia was one of the few States which did not have a State cigarette tax.

The Virginia Health and Medical Care Council then went to work. The needs of the State were carried to the grass roots and hundreds of people wrote in, urging that my bill be supported.

The first break came when a group of southside Senators conferred with me and asked if I would withdraw the bill, provided sufficient money was appropriated. I told them that I would, that I was only interested in doing something about the situation. They then arranged for a joint hearing before the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Appropriations Committee of the House and people came from all over the State. It was one of the greatest demonstrations of public interest ever held in the State Capitol.

By this time, the appropriation bill had gotten to the Senate with still no appropriation for Hill-Burton funds. I was asked if I thought \$500,000 would be sufficient. I shocked the Finance Committee by saying we needed \$2,500,000. I then conferred with the Governor and he agreed to recommend \$1,500,000 outright appropriation and \$1,000,000 conditionally. This was adopted by the finance committee and passed by the general assembly. Needless to say, my tax bill on cigarettes did not get out of committee and everybody was happy.

In the year 1949 the Governor not only released the \$1,000,000 which had been conditionally appropriated but created a deficit appropriation of another million dollars for this program. Virginia became one of 6 States in which contributions were made at the State level to the Hill-Burton program.

To date, 17 hospitals and 7 health centers have either been completed or are under construction as a result of this program.

The resolution adopted by the general assembly provided for a State survey to establish priorities as to hospital beds. It also created a council to administer Hill-Burton funds and pass on applications. Twenty outstanding citizens, including doctors, hospital administrators and businessmen were appointed and I had the distinction of being the only member of the legislature appointed to the commission.

It is also interesting to note that a Negro doctor and minister were appointed to the council to represent their race.

A reappraisal of needs is made every year so that as hospitals are constructed, priorities change.

The question naturally asked is: "What does this mean to us in northern Virginia?" Well, with the action taken this week it means that what had looked like a hopeless situation for several years to come may prove an almost immediate reality.

The Arlington Hospital having 115 beds, along with the Alexandria Hospital, has been attempting to serve a population of over 350,000 people. People naturally say, "Well, if we can't get a bed in Arlington or Alexandria we will go to the District." Unfortunately, the hospital-bed situation in the

District is becoming tighter and tighter so that the matter cannot be disposed of as easily as this. There is another problem which is overlooked. Northern Virginia, with its network of roads, has a terrific number of accidents. The emergency room of the Arlington Hospital averages over 800 cases a month. This is a 20-percent increase over the corresponding period last year.

When a person is involved in an accident you don't have time to telephone around to try to find a bed. You rush them to the nearest hospital, which is usually Arlington. Many times these are bed cases and with the hospital operating at 115-percent occupancy, there just aren't any beds available. Then what is the hospital going to do? Do you realize that almost 21,000 patients were served by the Arlington Hospital in the last 8 months, and at least 50 people a month are denied admission.

The hospital board decided last year to apply for Hill-Burton funds, but, unfortunately, the Federal appropriation was cut so that only projects already started could be completed. They then decided to attempt to raise \$400,000, knowing that this would be a long haul. One hundred and forty thousand dollars was raised, and it was decided to put on an annual drive in an attempt to raise enough money for the addition. The hospital board and the representatives of the legislature arranged for conferences with the director of the Hill-Burton program. The need was evident. The question was whether Arlington's need was greater than that of other sections of the State.

It was pointed out that not only does the Arlington Hospital serve the immediate population but at least 50 percent come from Fairfax, Prince William, and Falls Church, not to mention the innumerable accident cases which represent people from all over the country.

At the time of the meeting of the State hospital council there were applications in an amount exceeding \$11,500,000 with only a little over \$3,000,000 available from State and Federal funds. It then became a question of selling Arlington's need above that of many other projects. I can assure you that even though I was a member of the steering committee and of the council that unless Arlington's case could be sold on its merits it would have been impossible to obtain these funds.

A terrific campaign was launched at the last minute by the Richmond Memorial Hospital Association, which represents a new general hospital of 300 beds to cost \$5,500,000. They pointed out that over 50 percent of their money was already raised, and because Richmond was a teaching center these beds were badly needed. They based their plea primarily on the fact that they are serving most of the northern neck and territories as far away as Williamsburg. It was shown, however, that even if this population were accredited to the Richmond area, in view of the beds now available they would only have advanced one position in priority, which would have still left them far down the list. Another point stressed in opposition was that the amount required was so large that it could only have taken the form of a split project, and since the funds are made available from year to year, it is not wise, except in acute cases, to approve projects which cannot be completed out of funds available in any 1 year.

When the final vote was taken by the 20-man council, \$600,000 had been approved for a new hospital at Lexington, \$505,000 for a new hospital at South Hill, \$274,000 for Arlington, \$433,000 for an addition to the University of Virginia Hospital, \$440,000 for the Martha Jefferson Hospital at Charlottesville, \$303,000 for expansion of facilities for the Northampton-Accomack Hospital on the Eastern Shore, and an addition to the General Hospital at Bristol, Va.

Among those localities which had made application and did not receive funds were

Roanoke, Bedford, Williamsburg, and Richmond.

Naturally, George Damm, Maynard Magruder, and I came home extremely pleased and when I called John Anderson, administrator of the hospital, on the telephone I could almost hear him say a prayer of thankfulness.

Too much credit cannot be given to the hospital board, whose chairman is Gilbert Hall, the hospital fund campaign committee, directed by Clarke Daniel, and Bill Ames, who made a trip to Richmond and talked to Dr. Roper, the late commissioner of health.

The problem now confronting Arlington is to raise some \$80,000 so that they may receive \$274,000 from the State and Federal Government. Under the terms of the award, bids for construction must be available for approval by March 31, 1952. Undoubtedly, the hospital board and the campaign committee will get together and decide on means of raising the required money.

It has been nice talking to you and thanks for listening. Goodbye until next Sunday at 3 o'clock.

Railroad Rate Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House a situation existing with reference to rail rates insofar as the port of Tampa, Fla., is concerned, and which, to my mind, establishes conclusively that the rates governing the traffic on exports from and imports to the port of Tampa are unjust and discriminatory.

The port of Tampa has served the Nation well in time of war and emergency. Tampa has shown that its financial institutions can handle and finance the commerce carried by the port; that adequate repair yards, wharfage, and stevedoring facilities were and could be made available. Today, however, this port does not get its fair share of export and import business because of rail-rate discrimination on exports; a discrimination which the rail carriers into Tampa are willing to remove, but other rail carriers and ports that in times past sought relief themselves, are now objecting.

The national transportation policy, the decisions of the ICC, and the repeated announcements of Congress contemplate there should be no such discrimination as exists against this port in my district. The Congress has authorized a further expansion of these port facilities and the Army engineers have spent substantial sums on their development. This port, which has proved to be vital to the welfare of the Nation, should not have to depend for existence on local import and export business, but should have the advantage of fair import and export rates in order to provide regular sailings. It is an economic loss to have a ship take bottom cargo in Tampa and then move on to other ports for its top cargo—and this is the condition today.

Tampa is a growing and progressive city. It has made great efforts to obtain

cargo for export through its port, but the higher rates applicable to Tampa have proved an insurmountable obstacle. The Interstate Commerce Commission, created by Congress to prevent discrimination, has recognized that the character of steamship service is determined by the traffic. Traffic flow is determined in large part by rates. The Commission used these words in Galveston Commercial Association against G. H. & S. A. Railway Co.:

The character and frequency of the steamship service from or to any port is generally determined by the character of the traffic flowing through that port.

Again, in the same case:

The greater the variety of the commerce, the greater the number of ports for which commerce is handled, the greater the number of steamship lines that will serve that port and the more frequent the sailings therefrom.

The Interstate Commerce Commission in the Corpus Christi case has set a pattern for relief within which the port of Tampa falls; a pattern which, when properly applied, will give to Tampa the relief to which it is so justly entitled.

Tampa comes within South Atlantic and Gulf groups when distances are considered. Tampa is nearer Cincinnati than is Beaumont, Houston, Corpus Christi or Galveston, Texas, and the distance from Corpus Christi to Chicago is greater than the distance from Tampa to Kansas City, Joplin or Memphis. Tampa is nearer to Atlanta than either Wilmington or New Orleans, and Tampa is nearer Louisville, Pittsburgh, and Akron than is either Beaumont, Houston or Galveston. These are only a few illustrations. Many others can be cited. As compared with distances to certain South Atlantic or Gulf ports, Cincinnati, Louisville, Evansville, St. Louis, Chicago, Peoria and Omaha are only a few of the interior points that are less distance from or approximately the same to Tampa on short tariff routes.

If short line distance is considered, Tampa is less distant than some of the preferred ports; or if we consider short-tariff route distance, again Tampa is less distant than some of the preferred ports. Also, the short tariff route of Tampa is considerably less distant than the long tariff routes to the many preferred ports.

The Congress, in its wisdom and out of its experience, created the Interstate Commerce Commission to prevent discrimination. It is in the national interest and in the interest of commerce to remove this discrimination, to give Tampa the chance it so justly deserves. This discrimination should no longer exist. Tampa should be treated as a Gulf port, and I hope that the Tampa people will continue to fight for more equitable export rates, and ask that the full membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission be given an opportunity to remedy the situation, as it has done for Corpus Christi and other ports in the past.

The Congress, in amending section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act, contemplated the use of the ICC as a forum for relief such as Tampa needs, and did not require complaints or inter-

vention from interior shippers. Congressional intent may be taken from the report of the committee on the amendment to section 3, wherein it is said:

It will encourage and promote the freedom of the movement of export, import, and coast-wide commerce through the ports of the country. The committee considers that it is to the interest of the public that such commerce be permitted to move freely through as many available ports as the governing circumstances will reasonably permit, and that no restrictions upon and impediments to the free movement thereof should be imposed that are not clearly shown to be sound or economically justified. The recommendation of the committee that this bill be enacted is intended to afford competing ports a forum in which to complain of rate adjustments which tend to concentrate the movement of the traffic and deprive other ports of an opportunity to handle a part of such traffic.

We are clearly entitled to invoke this forum, and the elimination of this discrimination will give to this port a fair and equal chance to develop into a great port; to become a great asset to the commerce of the world, and to provide additional strength to our defense and our transportation system.

Farley Finds No Saints at Harvard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Heffernan, from the Brooklyn Eagle of August 29, 1951:

HEFFERNAN SAYS FARLEY FINDS NO SAINTS AT HARVARD

Since the late Wendell Willkie circumnavigated the world and found that it was not only round but that it was one world, no modern emulator of Magellan has traveled the route more extensively and with greater attention to what he hears and sees than James A. Farley. And Mr. Farley, having seen and heard much that many of us neither see nor hear, considers it an obligation of good citizenship to let us in on the good news.

Some years ago, when Dr. Einstein devised equations to prove that everything that has been never was, President Hutchins, of Chicago University, called it the "good news of damnation." There followed the rise of the secularists in this country and much else, which is neither of good repute nor high hope. Our leading statesmen abandoned the things that had made America great, and placed all their reliance on the atomic bomb. As distinguished a statesman as Bernard Baruch returned from Europe not long since with the announcement that General Eisenhower was doing the best bit of crusading work in Europe since Peter the Hermit, a comparison that would no doubt puzzle the robed rallier of Christendom as much as the present organizer of Europe's scattered forces.

Mr. Farley, speaking at Loras College, Dubuque, finds hope in France, and even more in England and a revival of faith in many lands, and contrasts it with the universal panic that almost won the world.

United States Assumes Mantle of Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I made the statement in a public address that it was evident that our country was assuming the mantle of imperialism that Great Britain was forced to lay down.

Of course I was soundly berated in some quarters but the statement was and is still true.

In this article by Mr. George Sokolsky he brings out the fact that the role of empire has been assumed unbeknownst to the people of our country and certainly without their votes.

It would perhaps be well to find out if the people want to assume this part all over the world. At least the issue would be clearly stated and voted on in the American way.

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Beginning with Woodrow Wilson's 14 points and his advocacy of the League of Nations, the United States accepted, not without considerable internal opposition, the role of leadership in world affairs. What that meant in practical terms has been that the United States succeeded to what had been for at least two centuries, Great Britain's place in international affairs.

There has been no evidence that any large element of the American people aspired to this role. At no time since the defeat of the Paris Treaty in the Senate in 1920 has any kind of referendum been submitted to the American people over the role this country is to play in international relations.

In no political campaign since Warren Harding was elected President has an issue of peace or war, of international leadership, of imperialism been submitted to the American people. The grand-scale developments in this field, involving this Nation in war and in bloodshed, are the result of day-by-day administrative decisions and acts which face our people as facts accomplished.

There is no use speculating on what might have happened had Willkie or Dewey debated these questions or if Senator Vandenberg had not purchased the bipartisan foreign policy. The fact is that by agreement between Democratic and Republican leadership, the foreign policy of this country and the actual implementation of that policy have never been submitted to the American people. Nor has the entire truth concerning it been documented so that the people understand what has happened and what the cost has been.

We have been going back and forth over the China situation with a bitterness and recrimination that is now strictly personal and is likely to be a principal issue in the next Presidential campaign.

Yet, for most Americans that issue is not clear, shall they believe Harold Stassen or Philip Jessup, Louis Budenz or Owen Lattimore? Are they to believe Gerald Swope about the Institute of Pacific Relations or the documents found in E. C. Carter's barn in Lee, Mass.? Is Joe McCarthy a liar or even crazy, or is Dean Acheson hiding something that is itching to come out?

The public will have to know one day why they are stuck with the Korean war.

They will have to know why to date there have been 90,000 casualties in what was obviously an avertible war. No brilliant publicity planning can save the architects of that error.

But that is not at all that will have to be understood. This role of leadership is becoming burdensome. Here we are involved in Iranian oil. What are we going to do in Iran? Are we going to force the Persians to capitulate to the British? Are we proposing to make those people hate us? Do we plan to drive them into Russia's arms? Are we trying to convince the entire Moslem world that the United States is their enemy?

What decision of the American people, in Congress assembled or at an election has authorized anyone to give the Moslem world, from Casablanca to Pakistan, cause to hate the United States? It was apparently intended to include Iran in the Truman containment document, which somehow was watered down to Turkey and Greece. Why Turkey and not Iran? Why Greece and not Formosa?

How deeply are we going into Egypt? Are we entering upon a police action on the Suez Canal? Will the British do it alone or shall we step in too? And what if the British go it alone and the Egyptians defeat them? After all, Israel beat the British and the Egyptians combined. There is no telling what can happen in these nationalistic days when some men fight for power and others for glory.

Is this Suez Canal just plain old-fashioned imperialism or is it one of the United Nations resolutions to maintain everywhere the status quo of 1945?

What happens if Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Yemen, and even distant Pakistan get into this quarrel between Islam and Britain, are we not involuntarily involved under the North Atlantic Pact? Should not NATO act, with Eisenhower, at the head of a European army consisting of American troops?

Leadership is not just words and speeches; it involves fighting, constant, interminable war. Leadership has brought to our shore the permanent war. We worry about Joe Stalin, but that is only one front. What of the Islam front? The Indian front? The Indo-Chinese front? The Philippine front?

It is a big world and nobody loves the leader.

Sensible Censorship Supervision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there have been few occurrences, of recent date, causing more comment among our individual citizens than the President's security directive designed to prevent the unwise release of vital information that might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

On this subject, as on so many others, the extremes of opinion have not materially contributed any suggestions toward a sensible supervisory diligence that would, at once, withhold the publication of that, which the enemies of peace could use against us, and allow the publication of facts to practically enlighten the American people as to our national and international objectives with the consequent morale uplift and

approval which knowledge of the truth inevitably brings.

I have, myself, been personally concerned in this issue for I very deeply feel the majority of our loyal citizens, particularly among the armed services, were not being presented with enough of the truth to place wholehearted spirit behind our Government's basic objective to pursue every avenue toward peace simultaneously with our necessary preparations to defeat any aggressor's armed attack if it should come.

I brought my convictions on this score to the attention of the military officials some months ago and I am happy to say real advances have been made in the troop information and education program which is now a part of everyone's training in the military service.

With respect to the general public, I have asked the President to review his directive for the purpose of making some qualified additions to the present Security Council membership, so that the Nation at large will not get the unfounded impression that this Government intends any program of imperial censorship. In my judgment we must be careful indeed to guard against unwitting infliction upon our own people of any of the freedom-destroying policies we so openly oppose and criticize in the governing actions of the totalitarian dictators.

I am, therefore, glad to call the attention of my colleagues to a very timely and practical article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond on this subject, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor issue of October 16, 1951.

His editorial follows:

STATE OF THE NATION—POSITIVE APPROACH TO CENSORSHIP

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON—There is a reasonable prospect that President Truman either will amend the new directive tightening the release of official information or will allow it to be softened in application.

A number of the President's advisers counseled against its issuance, and now that it has run into almost unanimous—that is, unanimous outside the Government—criticism, their position has been considerably strengthened.

At the moment, it is the views of the Defense and Central Intelligence Agency officials which have prevailed, and their primary responsibility and training are on the side of keeping things secret, not keeping the public informed. Obviously there is always a danger of overinforming the enemy, which all acknowledge, but there also is a danger of underinforming the Nation, which too often is overlooked.

There is always a conflict within government over what and when to release information to the public and it is this positive side of security which has been neglected. Though there are risks involved—democracy is not the easiest form of government, just better—security is more served by keeping the country in the light than it is by keeping the enemy in the dark.

If the President had given due heed to recommendations which had been laid before the administration by the Committee for Economic Development in its report on National Security and Our Individual Freedom, he could have avoided the pitfall into which his recent directive unwittingly fell. I say unwittingly because the President does not believe in censorship any more than other loyal Americans. He simply was overim-

pressed by the negative side of his responsibilities.

The committee is as well qualified and balanced a citizen group as there is. Its four pertinent recommendations are:

That there be added to the National Security Council (President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board) three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities.

That one of these new full-time members be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security.

That another be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

That vigorous efforts be made to stimulate discussion throughout the country on the problems of national security and their relation to freedom.

This approach is positive and constructive. It puts the negative part of censorship into proportion—about 1 to 3—1 part of keeping the enemy uninformed to 3 parts of keeping the Nation informed.

Everything the President rightly seeks to put additional safeguards around secret data is here. But there is also (a) allocation of responsibility to see that security is not used as a cloak to cover up incompetence, (b) continuous review of the security program; and (c) top attention to seeing that the essential facts flow to the public, without which there can be neither adequate support nor adequate criticism of public policy.

If the President's one-sided security directive leads to enough sustained public outcry to produce the reforms which the CED advocates, it will have served a beneficial purpose.

Crowley Tells of War Years—Warns Radicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1951, Mr. Leo T. Crowley, who served as ECA Director during World War II, delivered a speech in Milwaukee, Wis., that casts new light on the question of who wanted to give our atomic bomb secrets to Russia.

A Milwaukee Journal reporter who covered the speech reported that Mr. Crowley "gave a strong impression that Truman, Acheson, and Wallace actually favored giving the bomb to Russia as a gesture of good will." The reporter quotes Mr. Crowley as saying the matter was discussed at a Cabinet meeting in August 1945. The Milwaukee Journal account of the speech follows:

CROWLEY TELLS OF WAR YEARS—WARNS OF RADICALS

President Truman once "brought up the question" of giving atomic bomb secrets to Russia and Dean Acheson and Henry Wallace indicated that they favored the idea, Leo T. Crowley told 275 Catholic men at a Holy Name Society meeting Sunday. Crowley, who served as foreign economic administrator during World War II, spoke at a breakfast meeting at St. Monica Catholic Church, 5631 North Santa Monica Boulevard. The

meeting had been announced as open to men of all faiths. Many visitors from other parishes attended. After his speech, however, Crowley insisted that he had been told the meeting was closed and asked that most of his talk not be reported.

The society president, George Robinson, 5630 North Santa Monica Boulevard, confirmed that the meeting had been open to the public. Father John Barry, parish priest, said that it was a closed meeting, however, and that he had assured Crowley that his remarks would not be fully reported. Crowley released an advance text which he said was not off the record, and consented to the release of some of the statements he had made during the meeting.

TEXT, SPEECH DIFFER

The text differed widely from the speech, which was a sharp attack on the influence of communism and "intellectual radicalism" in our Government. Crowley emphasized that he knew of these dangers because of his intimate connection with the Government under Roosevelt and Truman. "I know the philosophies of the people who have influenced our policies," he said.

But if the press reported these stories of his experiences, it would violate the confidence he had shared with the late President Roosevelt, he said.

"In August 1945, at a Cabinet meeting, Mr. Truman brought up the question of exploring the advisability of giving to Russia the secrets of the atom bomb," Crowley said after the meeting. "It was stated that it would take about \$3,000,000,000 for Russia to build the bomb unless they were given economic aid. Acheson, who was sitting in for Mr. Byrnes, said that he knew Mr. Byrnes would oppose the idea but that he (Acheson) thought it should be considered. Mr. Wallace made similar remarks."

NEVER ACTUALLY URGED

Crowley said that the question was never brought up again and that neither Acheson nor Wallace had ever actually urged giving the atom bomb to Russia. He had described the incident much more vividly in his speech, which gave a strong impression that Truman, Acheson, and Wallace actually favored giving the bomb to Russia "as a gesture of good will."

Acheson was Under Secretary of State at the time and Wallace was Secretary of Commerce. Wallace later resigned. Acheson later became Secretary of State. Crowley quit his Government posts in October, 1945.

"Extreme intellectual radicals are out to destroy the home and the church," Crowley warned at the start of his address. Afterward he added that he saw "a great difference between liberalism and intellectual radicalism." He declined to identify the persons he was warning against, but he said they are "in and out of Government and in our educational system."

TOLD ROOSEVELT ANECDOTE

He told the following anecdote:

One of the last visits he had with President Roosevelt was in a railroad station as the President was leaving for Warm Springs, Ga., where he later died.

"I told him that the German war was near an end," I said, "I'm going to start immediately to reduce the amount of aid to England and Russia, in keeping with their contribution to the war with Japan."

"President Roosevelt said, 'You go ahead and handle those things as you always have. You know Stalin has insulted me several times. I have yet to get my first compliment from him.'"

During his speech he had charged that Roosevelt had always taken Stalin's side at Big Three meetings. "At every conference we had Roosevelt went along with Stalin and Churchill took a different position," he said.

At the Yalta Conference, Crowley said, they (the Russians) traded China out of Manchuria and Korea. Roosevelt said to me, "The old man (Chiang Kai-shek) is going to be awfully mad. We had better arrange to give him two or three billion dollars in economic aid."

Afterward he asked that these remarks be modified to say simply that Roosevelt once thought he could do business with Stalin, but later became disillusioned.

KEEP ECONOMY STRONG

The theme of his speech was that America has been right in being idealistic, but must be firmer in its dealings in the future. He said we should "try to keep our economy strong, try to support Eisenhower, give those countries some economic aid if they have to have it, but make them assume some responsibilities for their own economy." He warned against radicals who might "lead us by the nose" into believing we can live side by side with communism.

Lend lease, which he headed, should have been given "with an understanding of the kind of peace we were going to have," he said.

Crowley, a prominent Catholic layman, is chairman of the board of the Milwaukee Road. His home is in Madison. He headed the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from 1934 to 1939 and held eight wartime governmental jobs.

Hill-Burton Progress and Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report by Dr. John W. Cronin, Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service, presented at the conference of hospital architects at the fifty-third annual convention of the American Hospital Association, St. Louis, Mo., on September 17, 1951:

HILL-BURTON PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS

(By John W. Cronin, M. D.)

The modern hospital is the result of a profound change in the concept of hospitals; their design, function, and place in our society. The advance in medical science and in technology have strengthened popular demand for hospital care and resulted in a tremendous expansion in our hospital system. No longer is the hospital concerned only with cure of illness. The modern hospital is now concerned with prevention as well as cure.

This is not the place for me to develop the history of hospital construction in the United States. All of you are familiar with it. It will be sufficient to point out that during the thirties construction of new hospitals was virtually at a standstill. Although the early 1940's saw some emergency construction, this construction did not scratch the surface of the long accumulated deficit in hospital construction. The Commission on Hospital Care summarized the cumulative effect in its report when it pointed out (1) The shortage of hospital beds in the United States, (2) the poor physical condition of the existing hospital plant, and (3) the maldistribution of hospital especially with respect to rural areas.

The culmination of all of this resulted in the passage of Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth

Congress—the Hill-Burton Act—on August 13, 1946. For the first time the country was embarked on a systematic, Nation-wide hospital construction program with financial aid from the Federal Government.

It is now 4 years since the first State plan was approved. It is of particular interest at this time to compare the situation regarding existing acceptable hospital beds in 1948 with that of 1951.

In 1948, 868,000 hospital beds were classified by the State agencies as acceptable. These met 49 percent of the Nation's total need (as based on the formula toward which we can build). In 1951, a little more than a million beds were classified as acceptable. Now 54 percent of the total bed needs of the Nation are met. The States need 840,000 additional beds and the territories 33,000 to meet their formulated needs.

Total bed needs does not tell the story, however. It should be pointed out that the story with respect to general hospitals has been an excellent one. Within the categories, new construction has most markedly increased the supply of general hospital beds. In 1948, the States reported a supply of 388,000 acceptable general beds. In 1951, they reported 489,000 acceptable general beds. More than two-thirds of the general bed needs have now been met. It is in the fields of mental and chronic bed needs where the impact of new hospital construction is yet to be felt. These two categories constitute two-thirds of the Nation's present bed deficit.

Let us now take a look at the trends in hospital construction. No separate data are available on the number of beds constructed outside the Federal-State hospital construction program. However, an estimate of the dollar value of this construction is available from reports by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor. In 1950, the total value of "work put in place" on hospital and institutional construction amounted to \$812,000,000. (It is estimated that institutional construction constitutes only a small percentage of the total.) Privately financed construction amounted to \$221,000,000; publicly financed construction, including construction for the Veterans' Administration not participating in the national hospital survey and construction program, amounted to \$359,000,000; project construction under the hospital survey and construction program amounted to \$232,000,000.

It should be pointed out that the dollar value of new projects as differentiated from additions, alteration, or replacements, are roughly equal between those participating in the Federal-State hospital construction program and nonparticipants. This would seem to show a more nearly equal number of beds added to the Nation's pool of hospital beds than the dollar volume indicates. Additions and alterations frequently involve additions to or replacement of adjunct services and nonacceptable beds.

As of August 1, 1,600 projects have been approved under the Hill-Burton program; nearly 500 are completed and in operation and about 1,000 are under construction. More than \$1,200,000,000 will be expended on these projects of which the Federal share is \$433,000,000. Of all projects approved, nearly 75 percent are for general hospitals; 15 percent are for public health centers; 5 percent for mental hospital projects; 3 percent for tuberculosis projects, 1 percent for chronic disease projects.

The general hospital projects account for 84 percent of the total funds and a like percentage of the Federal share of the costs. Nearly three-fifths of the general hospitals are for completely new hospitals. The remainder is made up of additions or alterations to existing plants. The development of hospital services in needy areas especially rural areas is slowly being accomplished. Most of the new hospitals are being built in small towns which serve the rural areas;

three-fifths of the new general hospital projects are located in places of 5,000 population or less and nearly four-fifths in places of less than 10,000 population. More important is the fact that two-thirds of the new general hospitals are being located in areas which heretofore had no general hospital or had hospitals whose beds were classified by the State agency as nonacceptable.

How big are the new general hospitals being built? Three-fifths have 50 beds or less. Only one out of six will have more than 100 beds.

From such data it becomes apparent that the new general hospitals are being built to serve rural areas. The construction of these hospitals have had an impact on these small communities. The primary benefits accrue, of course, to the patients who are admitted and cared for. Equally important, however, is the effect of construction of a new hospital in an area where no hospital previously existed on the availability of medical services. The construction of new hospital facilities furnishes the motivation for physicians to move into the community. Frequently the opening of a new hospital results in the establishment of a prepaid hospital insurance plan for the first time. It also attracts nurses and technicians living in the community who had dropped out of their professional fields because there was no such employment readily available. Many of them are now willing to return to work on a part- or full-time basis because they can remain in their home communities.

Again I would like to emphasize, there are dangers in building small hospitals and these must be considered in the administration of the Hill-Burton program. Sometimes competitive civic pride between communities in close proximity must be overcome. Methods of avoiding them must be worked out in a feasible, practical way. Small hospitals cannot always provide the variety of service that can be given in larger hospitals. Low occupancy rates are frequently found in the small hospital. There is a relationship between demand for hospital care and the ability to pay for it and the lower the financial resources of the community the lower the use of the hospital beds. Relatively low income in a small town and rural community forces the small hospital to operate marginally. As a result the small hospital in a small community has found it difficult to set aside sufficient funds for the purchase and maintenance of modern equipment, or for the employment of specialized personnel. The existence of a fine physical facility should never be a substitute for adequate training and skill in the physician.

The indiscriminate building of small hospitals in all rural areas is not sensible. The provision of such facilities where they can effectively serve their purpose of bringing needed medical services to the population is acceptable. Careful study and sound community planning is a must. The provision in the Hill-Burton Act for survey and planning has proved to be one of the soundest features of the law. Each community fits into a pattern of service as outlined in the State plan. The community must determine the size of the facility that can be supported and the services to be included. The local community planning features are one of the major reasons why the Public Health Service believes that a program for what we now call defense impacted areas, with increased populations, should follow the Hill-Burton concept. Service at the local level is the objective of the program for war impacted areas. Therefore, advice from the communities where the affected people live is essential. Conversely, State and Federal advice to local planning groups is important if the planning is to be really effective. Small hospitals should not stand alone but should share with the larger hospitals of the hospital-

service area and accept services and assistance as well as render services and assistance to those hospitals. This is the basis of the coordinated and integrated hospital system. It is the key note of modern medical care.

Planned construction of hospital facilities means community planning. There is need, therefore, for teamwork among many groups. The contributions of every group concerned with making available good health services is necessary. The architect's role is important in the construction of facilities which meet the community needs. I would be remiss if I did not note your contribution to the success of this program professionally and as citizens contributing through the advisory councils in the States.

In addition to the Hill-Burton program, with its obvious limitations for hospital construction resulting from the present emergency there are several programs designed to provide assistance. These programs involve allocation of scarce materials, civil defense, and war impacted areas.

We are experiencing little difficulty in getting materials and equipping the projects. To date the problem of shortages has not been insurmountable. We may anticipate that the situation may become more acute. In the administration of the Hill-Burton program we have strongly urged that substandard and "ersatz" equipment not be used in the civilian hospitals. It would be disastrous if the communities of the Nation were forced to replace plumbing, sterilizers and other equipment in a short period of time due to such action. Those in charge of programming, distribution and allocation of scarce materials will not overlook the importance of hospitals and hospital construction in our Nation's defense effort. The Federal Security Agency has been designated the claimant agency for hospitals and health materials, supplies and equipment. The Division of Civilian Health Requirements in the Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is responsible for carrying out the assigned functions.

The Federal Civil Defense Act does not contemplate the making of grants for hospital construction. It does provide for the incorporation of shelter areas or other construction designed to provide protection of the occupants against enemy attack. Funds, however, are very, very limited.

The Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act was passed by the present Congress and signed by the President. Title III of this act relates to community facilities and resembles in some respects the Lanham Act of World War II. The provisions of this act include hospital facilities and services for the care of the sick, as well as facilities for water, sewage, sanitation and other community facilities. Federal funds in the amount of \$60,000,000 are provided for the construction, maintenance or operation of community facilities in areas designated by the President as critical defense housing areas. In the case of assistance for hospital construction, these funds will be available only if funds are not available under the Hill-Burton Act. This legislation provides that maintenance and operation payments will not exceed the portion of the maintenance and operation expenses attributable to the national defense activities in the area. The act also specifies that the function, powers and duties with respect to health, refuse disposal, sewage treatment, and water purification shall be exercised by and vested in the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. This latter provision properly relates the health activities to those existing in regard to the Hill-Burton program. The success of this legislation depends entirely upon local, State, and Federal cooperation and coordination of hospital and health services—the kind of

cooperation which has proven so eminently effective to date.

There is another advantage which has accrued to the Nation from the construction of the Hill-Burton hospitals in the small towns and cities of the country. Over 600 new general hospitals have been approved for construction throughout the country. Three hundred and seventy-five of these will serve in communities which now do not have a single hospital bed. One hundred and fifteen more will replace hospitals which have beds in them classified by the respective State agencies as nonacceptable. These beds will be available to meet any catastrophe, great or small. Today atomic and bacteriological catastrophes are a concern of many of our more densely populated communities. Three-fifths of the new general hospital construction is located in communities of 5,000 or less, only 7 percent are in cities of more than 50,000 people. This to me points up the providential nature of the Hill-Burton program. There is a duality of purpose noted. I pose the question, "Cannot these Hill-Burton hospitals be regarded as evacuation centers for our potential target areas?" I hope we will never be called upon to put this statement to a test, but we may be. Although our original purpose was to meet the needs of the highest priority areas in the States, the emergency possibilities of the Hill-Burton hospitals cannot be overlooked.

Taxeena Calls Her Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the people back home are becoming more and more conscious of the spending program of their Congress. They want it stopped.

I submit the following verse written by Ethel Durnal Posegate, of Plainville, Kans., as portraying a vivid picture of our present-day plight:

TAXEENA CALLS HER UNCLE SAM
(By Ethel Durnal Posegate)

Taxeena—

Uncle Sam, this is Taxeena.
My word! where have you been?
I've tried for years to call you but
They said you were not in.

Uncle Sam—

I've been right here, Taxeena.
I never leave at all.
But lately some employees have
Developed lots of gall.
They've shoved my desk back 'gainst the
wall—
Built a Mularkey screen.
I'm not consulted very much
And never, never seen.

Taxeena—

That's just what Mrs. Public said:
"We don't see Sam no more."
They've likely locked him in a room.
Filed bureau 'gainst his door."
We need you badly, Uncle Sam—
I'm growing 'way too fast,
I wish you'd help reduce me like
You did in years long past.
I've tried to pull those certain strings
That kept me tightly laced.
It simply makes no difference 'cause
It all just goes to waste.

Uncle Sam—

I've worried 'bout you Tax, my girl.
You are my favorite niece.
I feared without my sound advice
You'd rapidly increase,
But I've been handicapped my dear
Through all the years expanse
Since F. D. R., with taking ways
Who took my striped pants,
Then next he donned my long-tailed coat
And by and by—my vest.
I blame near lost my shirt, my dear
I had to fight my best
The fit was none too good, Tax, my girl.
But he put in a V.
And I'll be blest, he pulled the wool
And called it victory.

Taxeena—

O, that was awful Uncle Sam,
I, too, was made a dupe.
I gained because they stuffed me with
His alphabetic soup.

Uncle Sam—

I've known things were not going right,
I've heard 'em at t'ie till
But it's indecent to appear
In my scant dishabille
But Tax, my girl, I'm glad you called.
You tell folk I'm not licked.
An old goose grows more feathers
Each and every time he's picked
Your first reducing lesson is
To use your little voice
And order a reducing pill.
From your own voter's choice.
I have some good friends working who
Are watching for a chance
To see if they can find for me
My striped pair of pants.

Taxeena—

You give me courage, Uncle Sam,
I'd like to kiss your cheek.
Nobody loves me cause I'm now
A bloated circus freak.

Uncle Sam—

Tell John Q Public I said if
He'd write some letters, too,
Perhaps he'd find conditions changed
By nineteen fifty-two.
And if he finds a good, sound nag
Whose "spirits" don't run high,
To swap him in midocean and
To all I'd say "Good buy."

Hospital Dedicatory Address of Hon. J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the complete text of an address by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT at the dedication of the new Crittenden Memorial Hospital at West Memphis, Ark., on Sunday, October 14, 1951:

COMPLETE TEXT OF SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S
HOSPITAL DEDICATORY ADDRESS SUNDAY—
PEOPLE OF CRITTENDEN COUNTY ARE CON-
GRATULATED; CITES HOSPITAL AS EXAMPLE OF
RACIAL TOLERANCE

It is pleasant to be in West Memphis today on this fine occasion. I want to thank you for letting me come and be with you for the dedication of your magnificent new Crittenden Memorial Hospital.

As I drove into your city today, I thought how particularly fitting that this hospital

the first to be built in our State under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, should be erected in West Memphis, which in less than 12 years has more than quadrupled in population. Surely this is indicative of the worth of its people.

You, who have watched this hospital grow day by day above these cotton fields, have the immeasurable satisfaction of knowing that the hospital is your hospital, the product of your planning, your energies and your devotion. It is the product of the splendid vision and untiring labors of Hugh Brinkley along with Harvey Adams, Henry Banks, Lawson Garner, Judge Oliver, Judge Johnson, J. W. Young, Bert Dickey, the late Alex Stirewalt, and your other hospital trustees and hospital officials. I, along with the citizens of Crittenden County and the State of Arkansas, congratulate each of you.

This hospital marks a new day of medical care for the people of West Memphis, Crittenden County, and this section of the Delta. It will give them the finest medical and surgical care. No resources of time and money, of architectural planning or materials have been spared to make this hospital the most modern, the best-equipped hospital of its kind.

Here are operating rooms, laboratories, obstetrical and pediatric rooms; departments for physical therapy, and emergency and clinical treatment. Here is the finest X-ray equipment for treating cancer and other diseases. The broad grounds of this hospital offer the convalescent the healing, strengthening benefits of light and air and sunshine in pleasant surroundings.

I think that one of the points of greatest significance about your hospital is that its facilities are available equally to both white and Negro citizens. There are 50 beds for white patients; there are 50 for Negro patients. Food and all accommodations are the same for everyone. The hospital's doctors will administer to all who need treatment, regardless of color. This policy, I think, is certainly in keeping with the one set recently by this city of West Memphis in providing for the educational needs of its colored population. It is a vigorous and healthy sign and one which points to the particular progressiveness of our State in this direction. You people of Crittenden County are attacking your problem by giving a three-story, brick and concrete example of racial tolerance for all the Nation to see. This is the real answer of the South to the misguided policies of the reformers of the North.

In building your hospital you confirm the wisdom of our hospital act, the wisdom of helping the people to do for themselves. You show that when the Government helps to meet the need for hospitals by providing assistance grants, the people, with their sense of local responsibility and local leadership are eager to meet the opportunity and build their own hospitals.

This hospital is built for the future. And even as its doors are opened, I urge you to draw again upon that fine cooperative spirit that brought it into being, to move on to the next vital step for securing its benefits to all the people, the step of integrating voluntary health insurance facilities with your hospital.

We are often reminded that too little thought and effort are being devoted to our health, our most vital personal and national resource. I imagine some of our Army doctors could tell us a great deal about the miracles of modern medicine in rescuing the lives of battle casualties and of the rate at which disease is weakening our manpower resources. They could tell us that the physical rejection rate today under selective service is higher than during World War II. Since Korea the equivalent of 17 infantry divisions have been rejected for physical defects. Think of it. Three hundred thou-

sand young men between the ages of 19 and 25, the flower of our defense manpower found physically unfit to serve. What better warning do we need before we move on all fronts to correct this appalling situation caused in such large measure by neglect of our Nation's health.

When I talk about health and what we must do for the health of our people, I like to speak of the six pillars of health—doctors, hospitals, preventive medicine, research, education, and the soil—each vital to everyone of us and to the Nation's well-being.

You have good doctors here in this section of the Mississippi Valley. This hospital will help to insure that you continue to have good doctors. But throughout the Nation there is a serious shortage of both hospital and medical personnel. We must train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians. We must follow your example and build the hospitals we need to give all our people adequate hospital service.

The marvelous strides that we have made against typhoid fever, scarlet fever, diphtheria, malaria, smallpox, pellagra, and other such diseases is proof of what can be accomplished through our public health services in the field of preventive medicine. We must provide urgently needed help to the States, their counties, and cities in their never-ending struggle against disease—cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, mental disease, infantile paralysis. We must help them in the advancement of such specialized programs as maternal and child care.

We must provide more intense and greater research to study the causes of disease and to bring forth new discoveries for prevention and cure. Surely a Nation that can produce the atomic bomb can find the cause and cure for cancer.

I wonder if you were surprised when I named the soil as one of the pillars of health. You and I know what happens to an automobile if we put the wrong kind of oil in it, or if we get grit in the gasoline. The same thing applies to the machinery of the human body. The right food that we put into our bodies makes for health and strength. The wrong food makes for weakness and sickness. The minerals and nutrients which feed and make up our bodies come to us from the plants and products of the soil. More and more doctors and scientists attribute diseases to differences of minerals in our soil.

Down in Deaf Smith County, Tex., they have no decay of the teeth because the minerals in the soil of that county prevent such decay. Missouri does not just happen to be a mule-raising section. It produces big, tough mules because of the phosphorus and other minerals in its soil. Cotton of this delta is of superior quality because of the composition of its soil.

And so the farmer in his farming practices and soil conservation, is working and contributing to your health and my health and the health of all of our people. That is why it is so important that we continue to help the farmer in his soil conservation. In helping him we are helping all.

Education is essential to health. Health and education go hand in hand. It is the educated person who knows best how to take care of himself and preserve his health. The more uneducated and illiterate people are, the more sickness and disease we find among them. We must make certain that America's children, tomorrow's citizens and defenders of our democracy, have the opportunity for the education that will equip them for responsibilities of citizenship and the building of lasting peace.

These are the six pillars of health. All must be strong if our people are to be strong and healthy and we are to have a strong America.

The great hope of all of us today is for peace. And our hope for building and keeping the peace lies in a strong America.

America must be strong in her Armed Forces, her armed might. She must be strong in her economy and strong in the united determination of her people to save and build the peace.

We know that during the last war the final victory of our fighting forces was made possible by production. American workers and American management produced more war materials than the rest of the world combined. American farmers pushed food and fiber production to record heights.

As we produced to win the war, we must produce today to defend our freedom and win the peace. As you increase the harvest of your acres here in the Arkansas delta, as you increase the production in your mills and factories, you can know that you are waging the fight for peace and freedom in the spirit of that great statesman, Woodrow Wilson, who gave us these words, the finest tribute ever said to a people:

"There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

This afternoon, as we dedicate your healthful hospital, we know that this is Sunday, the day of Him whom we call the Great Physician. In His name and in His spirit, let us dedicate this hospital to the heroic war dead of Crittenden County, Ark. With their sacrifice in mind, begin the work of healing your sick and binding up their wounds.

The World on Your Doorstep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD today an important address delivered by Dr. Deane Malott, president of Cornell University, at the meeting of the American Bankers Association in Chicago last week.

Dr. Malott, prior to becoming president of Cornell University, was chancellor of the University of Kansas, where he made an outstanding record as a college administrator. He is one of the foremost educators in this country.

The address follows:

THE WORLD ON YOUR DOORSTEP

As the first back-sliding black sheep in a banking family of several generations, I am especially privileged today to address the American Bankers' Association, but I speak to you as to individuals, for assembled in this hall is a substantial part of the thinking leadership in the world of banking and finance. And never before in the history of the Nation has your leadership been so badly needed, your voices so necessary to avoid the dangers that lie ahead.

These are not times for traditional sedateness in the banking fraternity nor for mere pious analysis of the value of loan collateral. Storm signals are flying in the very financial structure of this Nation and the future of the world is literally on your doorstep.

By what means it arrived there is too long a story for this morning, but suffice it to

say that all of the dilemmas of our tormented day did not just happen. They have had their seeds deep in the furrows of history, nurtured by both indolence and aggression, by intelligence and stupidity, by selfishness and Utopian dreams, as well as by the statesmanlike efforts of countless men of good will throughout the world. All of these forces of power and of frustration have left their imprint on the crowded course of human events, and these same forces are carrying us hurriedly forward with dramatic suddenness, into an unpredictable future.

It has been 175 years since our founding fathers struggled with the American declaration of freedom, a small part of which reads:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It was the beginning (back there in 1776) of another epoch in man's long struggle for freedom. It was not new; other men had sought it from the beginnings of recorded history. Some had attained it and with their republican governments had built up rich civilizations which had risen to great heights of cultural and material well-being, and then withered again, stultified by the eventual emergence of arrogance in government and public clamor for the fulfillment of promises beyond the power of any government to give. History is strewn with the wreckage of nations who have gone down to ruin under the insidious belief that government can answer all of the problems of harried peoples.

In every case in history the weak link in the structure has been financial tinkering in nations living beyond their means. In some cases it has led to debasement of the currency and ruinous inflation, in some cases it has paved the way for tyrannical seizure of government powers, in still others it has wiped out the educated and cultured classes, and given way to barbarism and chaos. But in all recorded history, man's experience with successful democracy has been brief, sporadic, and beset with dangers.

I am convinced that the American way of life as we know it will not survive these turbulent days of revolutionary change, without the niggard and aggressive leadership of our bankers and financiers, leadership such as President Shelton so vigorously called for in his presidential address yesterday, and as so well exemplified by the resolution passed today. No banker would allow any customer to get into the position of our Federal Government, living extravagantly and wastefully beyond its means, fostering inflation, borrowing increasingly, and consuming with utter abandon the Nation's raw material resources, with little heed for tomorrow. While the danger point of Government debt is largely determined by the psychological temper of the people, should we not look to the bankers of America to be everlastingly and vociferously and aggressively pointing out the dangers and the consequences of unmitigated profligacy?

In this mad dance of the billions our public debt has increased 2 times since 1910, and is six times as much as it was in 1939. Interest alone on the public debt is now nearly six times the debt itself of 40 years ago. In the last 4 years our Federal Government has spent \$12,000,000,000 more than in all of the 150 years from 1789 to 1939. In only 3 years in the past 20 has the annual budget of the Government been balanced, and new additional civilian employees are being added to the payroll of the Federal Government at the rate of about 1 every 43 seconds, day and night, week in and

week out. Nearly one in every four people of the population are regularly receiving a check from the Federal Government for services, for relief, for pensions, or for participation in agricultural programs.

On the rolls of the great Federal bureaucracy is a growing army of Federal spenders. And the public gets only occasional glimpses of our fiscal operations, such as the discovery a few days ago that the Army and Air Force were planning for two radio and television entertainment programs at a total cost of \$688,000, and of course it has long been known that there is overlapping, and duplication, and chaotic administration in many a division of government.

You and I might well inquire if it is necessary to have 7,139 employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, why there should be 35,928 employees of the Federal Security Commission, whether many of the 59,194 employees of the Department of Interior, for instance, could not be eliminated, why there is one employee in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for every six Indian families in America and whether the taxpayer is getting value received from 2,523 employees of the Office of the Housing Expediter. Do we need, and can we afford, as much government as is now being saddled upon us?

I hope you have taken time to read the Federal Budget, the greatest current publication in America today and to make known to your Congressional leaders your point of view on this vital matter.

The American people with alarming docility are becoming accustomed to regimentation. The farmers are willing to accept regimentation if it's their kind, businessmen cry for it, particularly under threats of depression; workmen seek it if it will make labor a scarce commodity.

The master planners who would bring us utopia under Government aegis fail to realize that the incentives of private enterprise do not and cannot pervade Government operations. The civil service cannot grade men in loyalty, vision, integrity, and teamwork; it leaves little to hope and ambition, but merely allays fear, in a milieu where ability and performance above average do not hasten progress, while performance below average is not a retarding influence.

Meanwhile the administration calls for ever higher and higher taxes to meet the costs of this fast-growing gargantuan. Concern is expressed everywhere that excess profits taxes will kill the sources of venture capital, that income taxes will destroy the wealth, and the incentives for wealth which lie at the foundations of our economy.

But hidden taxes, too—excises and sales taxes—take their toll, until today the tax bite on an automobile is nearly 50 percent of the cost; on a railroad ticket costing \$12.75 taxes claim \$2.25; on 14 cents worth of gasoline the average tax take is 11 cents; taxes eat up \$2 on every \$4 telephone call; and for every 10 cents spent for bread, one-half is the measure of the tax lag.

This is a throttling yoke which in times of huge and abnormal spending can be carried, but with serious recession the clamor for more Government programs of relief and aid will rise and with it the costs of Government will mount. Then, if the tax burden is too great, there follows a panicky swing to Government control and operation, and our freedom, slowly and insidiously and under the hue and cry of emergency, recedes as in the cases of many other great civilizations before us.

America needs strength—not only economic strength but the strength of an intelligent and vocal electorate under the leadership of those in the community who have the respect of the people, and the judgment to distinguish between immediate advantage and long-term stability.

Now of course all of the problems of the world on our doorstep are not financial nor can anyone hold the bankers entirely responsible for the accumulating dilemmas of this harried world.

Education has a large share of the responsibility for a literate citizenry, but education is neither self-propelled nor self-supporting, and depends upon the will of the people—a will which has not been overly firm or insistent, when we realize that today we are spending in this country \$2,500,000,000 for all public elementary and high school education, yet the Nation's tobacco bill is four billions a year, while nine billions flow annually into alcoholic beverages. Is it the measure of the relative importance of things that the citizens of this Nation believe the cocktail hour to be roughly four times as important as the twelve first and formative years in the preparation of America's greatest raw material, the young people who will so shortly inherit the trusteeship of our civilization?

No dinner-table conversation in the length and breadth of our land tonight would be complete without a discussion of the long shadow of communism with its sinister implications for our economic, political, and social future, as intriguers and plotters behind the iron curtain scheme and plan for our downfall. The gnome in the Kremlin may be waiting, counting on the unwillingness of us Americans to tighten our belts, or waiting with stubborn assurance for the day when free capitalism will have spent its substance, and its people become enslaved.

Yet it seems clear to me that the problem of America's responsibility is not alone that of meeting Russian communism. The outstanding problem in the world today is human misery. The down-trodden peoples in India, Asia, and Africa constitute the greatest threat to world stability, the greatest challenge to our leadership.

Our eyes must be focused upon Asia rather than so exclusively upon Europe. Every Russian could die this morning, every Communist be obliterated, and this problem of underprivileged millions would still remain. These people now know, as the world shrinks closer together, that their poverty and misery is not necessary, that there are ways of life that will bring a measure of security and dignity to those who seek the means. They know that capitalism has food and money, and medicines, and good houses, too. They also know that Russian communism has promised them some measure of order, some food for their stomachs, the opportunity for literacy. We of the democratic countries, however, have no program for them, except the unimplemented and vague promises of point 4, and they are suspicious of our wealth, of our imperialism, of our multiple-minded lack of a firm conviction in our relations with them.

As someone has pointed out, we too often fail to realize the condition of other peoples, somehow assuming they possess the same backgrounds, the same opportunities, the same general status which we enjoy ourselves.

Most people in Asia will go to bed hungry tonight. Most people in Asia can neither read nor write. Most people in Asia live in grinding poverty. Most people in Asia have never seen a doctor. Most people in Asia have never heard of democracy. Most people in Asia have never known civil liberties. Most people in Asia believe anything would be better than what they have, and they are determined to get it. Most people in Asia believe that the freedom of free enterprise means the freedom of Western colonial powers to exploit Asians. Most people in Asia distrust people with white skins. Most people in Asia are determined never again to be ruled by foreigners.

This is the back-drop against which American foreign policy must be formed and im-

plemented. Only the sentimental "do-gooder" would suggest that we solve the problem of these underprivileged races by gifts from the acknowledged rich resources of America. We have neither enough money, enough skilled technicians nor enough raw material resources to bring satisfaction to those untold millions of struggling people. We should go down to bankruptcy in any such attempt.

Nor can we bring economic, political, and social salvation to those great Asiatic centers of world destiny by encouraging private enterprise under our free-enterprise system. Private enterprise cannot enlist its stockholders' property to provide literacy, good roads, better health and hygiene, or stable governments to peoples on the far side of the world.

It cannot be done by imperialism because the shackles have been loosened and these people and their leaders have glimpsed a way of life in which they will no longer be subservient to foreign domination and to a foreign government's control.

Our aid and responsibility, therefore, is to help them through a cooperative, friendly program, whereby capitalistic nations and newly awakened peoples work together, in a program which has some chance of eventual success, in filling stomachs and in alleviating misery. This need be no sketchy and idealistic program, but can be implemented specifically by us. Assuredly it does not mean cramming our form of government and our way of life down the throats of other nations and other peoples. We can furnish them some scientific and technical help. We can cooperate to broaden the educational opportunities for their nationals in our institutions of higher learning; we can extend limited and emergency help to start their ventures, and we can firmly announce our belief in their rights to freedom and self-determination. This latter is the most important step of all, and lies in a field of negotiation where we have been most confused because of the pressures of European politics and their inevitable implications of Europe's age-old imperialism in Asia, as we inaugurate the vital task of arming Atlantic Pact nations.

These are some of the areas where we as citizens can extend a pervading influence as we undertake the task of leadership which we have inherited, inherited from our colonial forefathers who never dreamed as they sat around the village stores and argued for their individual freedom that in the short space of 175 years America would become a mighty empire, trustees, and the only hope of the future for a large part of the world's two and a half billion people.

If all of this sounds reactionary to you, I must challenge you in that point of view. We stand in human history as the greatest revolutionaries of all times, not just we Americans, but all of us in the free nations.

As a great newspaper editor has recently put it, "We in the Western World are the true standard bearers of a great and emancipating doctrine. But we have allowed ourselves to be thrust into the indefensible position of seeking to protect the status quo. Our tradition is not static, but is constantly dynamic. Our tradition strikes off chains. Totalitarianism would put them back on again."

These are stirring times. The issues are clearly before us. The bankers of this Nation have both a stake and—let me emphasize—a responsibility in America's future. Either we free Americans will stand firm and clear and courageous, or little by little we shall surrender those great freedoms for which our forefathers paid such a desperate price, and for which we now stand as trustees for those in the generations down the distant future.

Beyond Containment to Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when a great nation gets into trouble it is usually because something has gone wrong with the thinking of its leaders. The entire philosophy of the New Deal, and its successor, the Fair Deal, has been that the end justifies the means. They acted upon the notion that social and economic inequalities require correction; that the Democratic Party is the one most dedicated to make progress in this field; that the Democratic Party could do this by remaining in office, and using the public Treasury for the purpose of buying votes and using patronage and permitting abuse of power in order to maintain itself in office. Its leaders acted upon the theory that since their objective was sound and popular with the majority of the people, the means and methods by which they sought to obtain their objective need not be moral, honest, just, legal, or constitutional. This is the way in which our constitutional safeguards have been seriously impaired. It has resulted in corruption of the morals of the people, the lessening of incentive, and all of the other attendant evils with which we are familiar. The moral issue thus raised is the outstanding issue in the country today. A revitalized Republican Party thoroughly grasping the problem, understanding it, and capable of making it clear to the voters, would not only get back into control, but having dedicated itself to reform on the basis of this important principle, would restore our Government to the path toward which our founding fathers dedicated it.

The most penetrating analysis I have seen of the confusion of so many of our modern mis-called liberals is the following article by Bogdan Raditsa from the September issue of *Commentary*. Raditsa is one of the leading political exiles from Eastern Europe in this country. He was chief of the foreign press department of the ministry of information in the Yugoslav coalition government formed by Tito and democratic exiles in 1945. He broke with Tito, as he had broken with the exile government of King Peter, when Tito moved toward tighter dictatorship rather than liberal democracy. He raises boldly the question of why America and its Western Allies seem to have no plan to free the exiles' homelands from the totalitarian yoke, or for using the democratic faith and political knowledge and capacities of the exiles in such a struggle of liberation.

The article follows:

BEYOND CONTAINMENT TO LIBERATION—A POLITICAL ÉMIGRÉ CHALLENGES OUR MACHIAVELLIAN LIBERALISM

(By Bogdan Raditsa)

(Bogdan Raditsa is one of the leading political exiles from Eastern Europe in this country. Mr. Raditsa was chief of the foreign

press department of the Ministry of Information in the Yugoslav coalition government formed by Tito and democratic exiles in 1945. He broke with Tito, as he had broken with the exile government of King Peter, when Tito moved toward tighter dictatorship rather than liberal democracy. He here raises boldly the question of why America and its western allies seem to have no plan to free the exiles' homelands from the totalitarian yoke, or for using the democratic faith and political knowledge and capacities of the exiles in such a struggle of liberation.)

Since the end of World War II, the United States—rather to its own surprise—has become the haven for a large flock of political refugees sweating out in America the eventual liberation of their homelands. A number of specialists among them are working with United States intelligence agencies or have accepted positions in private American business firms or schools. But most are receiving asylum and assistance through the National Committee for a Free Europe and its two main divisions, Radio Free Europe and the Mid-European Studies Center. These exiles have not suffered from any lack of hospitality. On the contrary, they have received employment, been set to work on interesting projects, and provided with the assistance of hundreds of graduates from America's finest universities. Yet, I trust I breach no canon of courtesy when I say frankly that many of them have found their American experience discouraging and depressing.

The political exile from Eastern Europe is genuinely fond of the Americans among whom fate has thrown him, to say nothing of being grateful to them. But it does not take long before their relationship becomes salted with irritation and dismay. The underlying cause of this antagonism between the exiles and so many of their American friends and colleagues is the difference with which they approach the problem of the fight against communism.

The exiles regard that fight as of primary importance to civilization, know that communism's appetite for expansion cannot be appeased or placated, and are convinced that the Soviet dictatorship in Russia and East Europe can be overthrown by the democratic forces within these countries, if these forces are properly encouraged and guided. Their American colleagues regard the struggle against communism as merely another trial in a life of good works, and—this is the crucial point—do not consider democracy and totalitarianism as necessarily irreconcilable. It does not take the exile long to discover that the staff of such an organization as the National Committee for a Free Europe—like many colleges, magazines, and government agencies—is permeated with what we might call, for want of a better term, Machiavellian liberalism.

The Machiavellian liberal, whose leading oracles are Walter Lippmann and Barbara Ward, is not necessarily a liberal in any classic sense of the term. In fact, he is as likely to emerge from a patrician as from a plebeian or petty-bourgeois environment, and is almost as often a Republican as he is a Democrat. His self-styled liberalism has one distinctive hallmark: an ambivalent attitude toward despots and despotism.

The Machiavellian liberal's fundamental premise is that the Bolshevik capture of power in Russia represents a historically progressive revolution in a backward area. Although, as an anti-Communist, he knows there is no democracy in the Soviet orbit; he is not sure that the peoples of East Europe could stomach too rich a diet of Western democracy. Communism east of Trieste and the Elbe represents a triumph of historical necessity. Industrialization and the liquidation of the large landowners are, in these benighted lands, moving along the line of civilized progress. To

the Machiavellian liberal, the exile is an unfortunate fellow who may be personally charming but who is much too emotional and prejudiced about communism, and in any case is a historical failure.

The Machiavellian liberal respects success above all else. He is deferential toward political power because this is something real, and we live in a world of Realpolitik—our liberal is above all a realist. He dislikes communism but is intrigued by Marshal Tito, in whom he believes he has found a secret weapon in the struggle with Stalin.

"Was wirklich ist, das ist vernünftig," Hegel once remarked: "Whatever is, is rational." That, whether he knows it or not, is this latter-day liberal's motto; he believes in historical inevitability and slips into Marxism and/or Leninism without even being aware of it. His famous objectivity consists of not being bothered about communism so long as it does not, at this time, move aggressively westward. No Communist sympathizer now or ever, as he is eternally assuring you (in most cases quite truthfully), he distrusts emotional (serious) anti-Communist writers and has a special contempt for the ex-Communist "renegade"; he hopes to do business with Stalin, and such people are apt to rock the boat. He agrees with George Kennan (Foreign Affairs, April 1951) that "all distinction between freedom and authority are relative," and that "90 percent of them are no business of ours when they affect a foreign country." And with Walter Lippmann, who has written: "I believe in the simple idea that the danger of war in Europe lies not in the ideology of communism nor in the internal system of the Soviet Union but in the fact that a powerful Soviet army, far more powerful than the occupation of Germany requires, is standing 500 miles west of the Soviet frontier." The European who encounters this Machiavellian liberal is bound to be reminded of the state of mind of Europe during the era of the Napoleonic wars. But he will note a difference: men like Talleyrand, Alexander I, and Metetrich were intelligent enough to realize that they could stop war only if they could check the revolution that was bringing war. These statesmen understood that, for Bonaparte, revolution was an instrument for the subjugation first of France, then of all Europe. At the Congress of Vienna they sought to get at the root of the Napoleonic menace by destroying the revolutionary movement that was its source and inspiration. They established peace in Europe on the basis of a positive political principle, monarchical legitimacy; the peace lasted, with minor interruptions, for a hundred years.

The statesmen of the West at Yalta, true Machiavellian liberals, lost the peace by refusing to recognize that communism was a revolutionary movement whose momentum inevitably would bring about a war—unless it were countered and replaced by a different political principle, in this case the principle of representative democracy. They could see no connection between totalitarian terror at home and totalitarian aggression abroad. Whatever unpleasantness the association with Stalin entailed was explained away—and still is, for that matter—with a sage reference to age-old Russian imperialism, or the innate affinity for despotism of the Asian mind.

The Machiavellian liberal mind is phillistine to the core: "The Communists are different from us"—but let's not think about it too strenuously. Hamilton Fish Armstrong says that we can meet the representatives of different social systems on a plane of complete equality and even understanding provided they will accept the same principle: live and let live. To the Kremlin's thesis that the Communists are the vanguard of a historically inevitable world revolution, he responds with the antithesis of relativism:

There is no absolute truth in human affairs, and the way to make progress is to debate the differences. George Kennan would discount ideology entirely maintaining that forms of government are forged mainly in the fire of practice, not in the vacuum of theory. Common to all such political analysis is the presupposition that it is really a waste of time—and a bore to boot—to regard communism as seriously as Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin have regarded it. Amateur geopolitics is much easier, and it is more pleasant to consult a map than to study Lenin's *The State and Revolution*. But, alas, *The State and Revolution* happens to be essential to an understanding of Soviet policy; if we have not read it, we shall never know why Stalin refuses to behave like the sick old czars of yesteryear, or how Soviet expansionism differs in essence from age-old Russian imperialism.

The Machiavellian liberal whom the East European meets today can often be identified by his admiration for the diplomacy of the British Foreign Office, which—whether in China or in the Balkans—he regards as the highest form of political realism, and this despite the fact that America, from Jefferson to Lincoln to Wilson, has stood in constant opposition to Britain's balance-of-power policy. He would laugh at the claim that the ideals of the American Revolution were closer to the yearnings of the people in Soviet-dominated lands than the ideals of the Bolshevik coup d'état. He blithely ignores the fact that it was a democratic revolution that overthrew the czar, and that Wilson's Fourteen Points had a greater impact on the East European masses than the Bolsheviks' overthrow of Kerensky's constitutional republic. And he has no patience with what he regards as the old-hat idea that the great revolution still to be attained in East Europe is not communism, industrialization, or agrarian reform, but, plainly and simply, national independence, the right of the people freely to choose their own rulers in their own national states within a European community. That is what America has represented to the people of East Europe, and this is their own unfulfilled dream.

The Machiavellian liberal considers all this to be inadequate, unadvanced, and even irrelevant, and says—unconsciously echoing Leninist-Stalinist materialist determinism—that the political feelings of eastern peoples are determined by their standard of living. But the east European knows that if America is to have a policy that appeals to the peoples of the satellite countries, she must base it on one prime theorem: Lifting the standard of living comes after a government has been established that has the consent of the governed; without liberty there is neither security nor the fruits of modern industrial civilization. (Poland, Hungary, and Rumania, besides, are not Iran or Egypt; there was little mass exploitation or famine in the former countries, and the standard of living was astronomical by Soviet standards.) The greatest revolution to be achieved in East Europe is the establishment of a just national power, freely accepted by the people.

His tolerance of despots and despotisms makes the Machiavellian liberal skeptical of the possibility (or the desirability) of popular struggle by the peoples under Communist control against their Communist regimes. He overestimates the efficiency and strength of totalitarianism—both at home and abroad—so that he is inclined to take a dim view of the potentialities of shrewd psychological warfare against these regimes, and would prefer to restrict propaganda to the refuting of specific Communist lies about America while "holding out hope" to the enslaved peoples. At the same time, the Machiavellian liberal's overestimation of totalitarian capabilities makes him act as though the decisive battles of the worldwide civil war

between representative government and despotism must needs be fought—though he hopes never to have to fight them—in the democratic rather than the Communist-controlled countries. The roundabout colossal effort of perfecting the "Western way of life" (including the immediate raising of the living standards of the entire Asian and African continents) seems to him more relevant and urgent than the organization of the anti-Communist forces that actually exist within the Soviet orbit. Meanwhile, he hopes—by building up "areas of strength" in West Europe, South Asia, Africa, and the Americas—to arrive at some kind of negotiated "settlement" of the cold war.

At the same time, his passion for "objectivity" and cool Realpolitik makes the Machiavellian liberal rather wary of the increasing anti-Communist temper of the American people. The fires of anti-Communist passion among the American people would burn much, much higher—and would have a more enlightened glow—could the exiles reach them more directly and effectively. But apparently, the Machiavellian liberal would hate to see the American people eager to help the peoples now under totalitarian rule to liberate themselves by democratic revolutions, after the 1776 model. That would be anti-Communist hysteria: their preference is for "debating the differences" between tyranny and freedom. Consequently, the Machiavellian liberal would limit the exiles' efforts at arousing sympathy and indignation in America over the sufferings of the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe.

All of these attitudes and predispositions of Machiavellian liberalism are translated directly into the activities of—to take a good rather than an easy example—the National Committee for a Free Europe. I am sure the overwhelming majority of the exiles would prefer above all to be stationed in the frontier cities of the cold war—Trieste, Vienna, Berlin, etc.—turning out underground literature, making subversive radio broadcasts, working as intimately as possible with the underground organizations in their home countries. Yet only a small proportion of them are able to engage in such work at present (the Czech exiles who operate Radio Free Europe's new radio station near Munich are happy exceptions), and what there is of it is done in the Empire State Building offices of Radio Free Europe under the close supervision of Americans. On the whole, the exile is kept busy at minor works and studies and is enjoined to be careful, scholarly, and above all "objective"; generally, these works are never published. As a result of these discretionary limits politely imposed on the exiles, only the cases of the Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty, the Americans Vogeler and Oatis, and the Titoist Rajk have been really dramatized for the American people. The selection of these three symbols is in itself interesting. The plain fact is that the fate of the many democratic leaders (including Socialists, trade-unionists, and liberal intellectuals) killed or imprisoned in East Europe has been, in effect, played down.

At the same time, this velvet curtain of silence prevents the exile from meeting his authentic American counterparts—labor leaders, farm leaders, educators, journalists, Congressmen. Instead, he is invited to monthly teas where he meets solemn old ladies from Park Avenue to discuss the weather and family affairs. The secretaries of the mid-European center of the National Committee for a Free Europe are very careful to see that the exiles attend; their names are inscribed on a list, and their presence or absence is checked in a special notebook.

Seeing little of the real America in his isolated state, kept busy at scholarly studies that are rarely published and often become the center's property, the exile is seldom cheered by the encouragement of his col-

leagues. He tends to become gloomy and begins to doubt the authenticity of the American anti-Communist struggle with which he has associated himself. He wonders, at odd moments, what happened to the country that gave encouragement and support—as well as refuge—to such men as Kossuth and Masaryk. He hopes that the Stalinist dictatorship will be overthrown, but thinks privately that it will have to be, not because of, but despite, American leadership. In office suites in Manhattan and Washington, surrounded by Machiavellian liberal diplomats, assistant professors, and career bureaucrats, he finds it hard to understand the moral revolutionary force which America and her people have exerted on the world for a century and a half. He is pessimistic about the possibilities of a forthright ideological offensive, based on the traditional American faith in democratic revolutions, to weaken, and ultimately destroy, totalitarianism.

What can be done? How can the European exile better contribute to the common anti-Communist struggle? How can his stay in America be made profitable both for the American people and for the suffering people of his own country? There are, it seems to me, four lines of action which should be explored:

(A 1) Withdraw United States recognition of all Communist governments

(1) There ought to be a broadening and intensification of active political work directed at each exile's home country. In addition to making the greatest possible contribution to the fight against communism, this kind of work would also prevent the exile from becoming demoralized by the infectious ease of American life. It would transform his status psychologically from a "stipendist" to a resistance leader. Therefore, I believe the facilities of Radio Free Europe should be expanded as much as possible, both to increase its radius in the Communist world and to improve its programs. But radio is not the only form of political struggle. The exiles should be given the means to prepare and arrange for the distribution of leaflets, pamphlets, booklets, and underground literature of every type. Such work is being done on a major scale by Americans and Germans in West Berlin, and, as a result, both East Germans and the Soviet forces stationed among them are the least reliable of Stalin's subjects.

(2) Exiles in America should be exposed to every possible facet of the American democracy, and not through conducted "quickie" tours either. The East European Socialist should be placed in contact with American labor leaders, should be encouraged to observe the functioning of American unions in Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, Toledo, and other great industrial centers. The exile peasant leader should spend most of his time in the Midwest farm belts, studying the varied forms of American agricultural life. The intellectual should be encouraged to tour American universities, and so on. All of these exiles should be permitted to learn at first hand what makes democracy work in America, what it means to Americans. The exile will then have the chance to learn that political power in America is rarely reserved for the few, but is essentially an open door to all. He should study the operation of sectional, industrial, labor, agricultural, and cultural pressures, and how all of these must be harmoniously reconciled in a national policy capable of being defended before the electorate. These are things the American takes for granted, but they furnish an inspiring lesson of which the exile is still only dimly aware.

(3) Means should also be devised to give the entire American people the benefit of the exiles' knowledge and experience. The Free Europe organization should encourage and arrange lecture tours and personal appearances; it should help the exiles establish

contact with editors, publishers, and working journalists, with business, labor, and other civic groups. Furthermore, it should drastically revise its present emphasis on lengthy, scholarly, and private publications written in East European languages, and concentrate instead on short popular publications in English, intended for wide distribution. At the present time, many of the popular books which deal with East Europe are full of ignorant misstatements, and quite a few of them are written from a neo-Communist viewpoint. A series of monthly or semi-monthly monographs should be started similar in style to the Foreign Policy Association bulletins, to provide background information on and expert evaluation of contemporary events.

(4) Finally, and most important, the exile must be provided with American colleagues who have the same seasoned understanding of communism that he has. All of the above recommendations, which seem so simple and logical, have not been translated into action primarily because of this lack of understanding on the part of so many in the American leadership. The exile is disheartened, not because effective potential leadership does not exist in America, but because it is kept on the sidelines. Anyone with a slight knowledge of American intellectual life will recognize that the American writers, thinkers, historians, and journalists who have the most thorough knowledge and understanding of communism and its methods, and the deepest commitment to the struggle against totalitarianism, are pretty much excluded from America's official, semiofficial, and private anti-Communist activities. Regardless of their political differences (there are, among them, conservatives, liberals, and socialists), they have emerged from the experience of the past decades with a sophisticated expertness concerning the true nature of the Communist threat. They are rarely rattled by Communist tactical shifts, and really, should it be held against them that they are supremely concerned with the fate of the peoples under totalitarian rule? Would the democratic cause not have fared better if we had had the benefit of their solid knowledge and deep-rooted concern in handling the Korean question instead of having to depend on the ignorance, realism, and cleverness of the Machiavellian liberals?

In Europe, the last three decades have shown that you cannot destroy an ideological enemy without being yourself ideologically prepared. Thousands of people have endured misery, destruction, and dictatorship because what should have been ideological wars—against nazism and fascism, against communism—have been conducted by diplomats and bureaucrats in conventional terms. Both in the League of Nations and in the United Nations, the diplomats have refused to fight ideas with ideas, and have contented themselves with pulling undercover diplomatic strings while the world burned. Let us remind ourselves again that Talleyrand showed himself a great diplomat because he worked in the service of a Europe united on a political principle; the French and British career diplomats of the 1930's proved themselves ineffective because they did not seriously believe in the principles on which their own democracies were founded. With "live and let live" as their motto, they tried to make deals with dictators, lost themselves in efforts to discover "practical" distinctions among Nazi, Communist, and Fascist totalitarians, and eventually placed their false hopes in the strength of French divisions whose morale has already been undermined. The diplomats and bureaucrats of our times, uninterested in ideas and concerned only with "expediency" and Realpolitik, follow ever shifting policies (flirting with Tito, or Franco, or the hopelessly decadent feudal regimes of the Arab world) which, in the last analysis, rest on faith in sheer military force

in the event of the showdown which these shifting policies bring ever closer. Their most potent weapon—democratic idealism—is left to rust in the attic.

The work of an architect cannot be done by a mason. American money invested in anti-Communist activities can only bring results if the Americans who lead the struggle understand it. ("By the same token, even the most effective independent anti-Communist enterprises can do little if they are hampered by an inconclusive official United States policy"—an informed American who read this manuscript commented to me.) If official, semiofficial, and private American groups are interested in a serious crusade for freedom all over the globe, the political exile from east Europe will wholeheartedly become part of that crusade. He will no longer consider himself an orphan, but rather an integral member of a true international democracy, passionately dedicated to the universal establishment of liberty. But America must not wait longer to summon its militant democrats of experience and understanding to lead a world effort of the oppressed peoples against totalitarian reaction; otherwise the victims of communism will not be able to rid themselves of it without world carnage.

Texans Want To Get Out of the United Nations—Pass Resolution for Complete Withdrawal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of my bill H. R. 5030 to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, I have received hundreds of letters from individuals endorsing my bill, and many organizations are being set up in various parts of the United States to work diligently for its passage.

Among these is the American Heritage Protective Committee of San Antonio, Tex., which at a public meeting on October 3, 1951, unanimously passed the appended resolution. Other organizations like the United States Flag Committee of New York State are working diligently in support of H. R. 5080.

The many letters I am receiving convince me that the American people are awake to the dangers of such entangling alliances, and far ahead of Washington in their thinking, as we Members of Congress will soon find out when we return to our home districts.

SICKENED BY SLAUGHTER IN KOREA

The American people are sickened by the senseless slaughter in Korea; shocked by exposures of corruption in government; and outraged by the half-truths, double talk, and lying propaganda disseminated by the administration at the expense of the taxpayers.

But what disturbs the American people most is the terrifying realization that the pseudo economists of the New Deal-Fair Deal have made such a mess out of our domestic economy that they must

promote war and war production to keep our economy going.

WHAT A GHASTLY PARADOX!

While American mothers fervently pray for peace the administration feverishly prepares for all-out war and sets the stage for a European debacle that will make the Korean war look puny by comparison.

The beating of the war drums, the barkings of the dogs of war, the over-exploitation of the atom bomb, and the exaggeration of Russia's war potential have so distracted our attention and unhinged our reason that we seem totally oblivious of the fact that we are being rushed headlong into a situation worse than war—total economic collapse. That will mean unbridled anarchy throughout the world, the breakdown of civilization, and a throw-back to the Dark Ages.

This situation is the more tragic because so absolutely unnecessary, and could be corrected in 90 days without cost to the American taxpayers, without economic disturbances of any kind, and without sacrificing the life of a single American boy in foreign wars, merely by carrying out a legislative mandate that has been on our statute books for more than 50 years.

The Texas resolution follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE PROTECTIVE COMMITTEE IN SAN ANTONIO, TEX., OCTOBER 3, 1951

The American Heritage Protective Committee desires to submit to the membership and visitors at this meeting (October 3, 1951) an opportunity to endorse H. R. 5080, a bill introduced in Congress by the Honorable JOHN T. WOOD. This bill calls for the complete withdrawal of the United States from its membership in the United Nations.

We believe that continued membership of the United States in the United Nations Organization will ultimately result in the destruction of our Republic as a sovereign Nation, and urge the support of H. R. 5080 for the following reasons:

1. Because membership in the United Nations Organization has the binding force of a treaty, and in cases of conflict of our domestic law with the United Nations Charter, the latter will supersede our own domestic law, thus rendering our Constitution a meaningless document.

2. Membership in the United Nations has a direct tendency to destroy free enterprise, our American way of life, and to act as a restraint on our inherent rights as a sovereign of our own country.

3. Membership in the United Nations strikes at the very source of the inalienable rights of the American people, namely, the right of freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, and the most cherished of all our rights—the right to worship God according to the conscience of the individual.

4. Membership of the United States in the United Nations is a wholly unwarranted and unnecessary burden on the taxpayers of our Republic, because the American people are defraying the major portion of the expenses of the United Nations where foreign and decadent European ideologies are brought to force on the American by a mandate of the United Nations.

5. Because the United Nations is composed almost entirely of men and women who advocate and think in terms of political and economic theories diametrically opposed to our American heritage of freedom.

6. Because the United Nations, in its cumbersome and negative policies, is causing an

international confusion among nations, and instead of promoting peace, is actually promoting the very conditions which breed wars among men, and needlessly and brutally prolong those wars which are already in process.

7. Because the leadership of the United Nations is, of record, Socialist-Communist, which has resulted in the subordination of the wishes of the American people and the continuing and seemingly endless prolonging of the Korean tragedy.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to every Member of the United States Senate.

The Borg-Warner Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in seeing whether President Truman backs up the Defense Department, his Defense Mobilizer, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, and the Wage Stabilization Board, or whether he backs down to his labor-leader supporter, President Walter Reuther of the CIO-United Auto Workers.

I refer to Mr. Reuther's defiance of a Wage Stabilization Board request in connection with the 9-day-old Borg-Warner Corp. strike.

My interest in the matter arises from the fact that 1 of the 10 plants of the corporation—the Ingersoll Products Division—is located in Kalamazoo, Mich., in the Third Michigan Congressional District.

In addition, I have received letters from workers at the Kalamazoo plant who have been ordered out on strike against their wishes, asking that I do something about it. Of course, there is little that I can do as a Member of Congress, but these letters very naturally have increased my interest in seeing that the right thing is done in the matter.

The show-down confronting the President is in connection with the certification of this labor dispute to WSB, on grounds of serious interference with military production. This certification was granted by the President on urgent representations made by Defense Mobilizer Wilson and the Defense Department. The CIO-UAW president has refused a WSB request for a recess of the strike pending its investigation and hearings. Mr. Reuther has also demanded that the President withdraw the certification.

The alleged basis of Mr. Reuther's defiance is the claim that only 15 percent of the corporation's output of automotive parts goes into military vehicles. The strike itself is the result of union efforts to secure a company-wide labor contract replacing the present plant-by-plant contracts.

I am not disposed to comment on the strike issue beyond the single observation that this issue might very well be one for settlement under NLRB processes and by methods which would not

involve loss of either production or earnings by the employees.

I am very much interested, however, in finding out whether the President will stand back of his subordinates in the executive department whose only interest is uninterrupted war production—whether that production happens to represent 15 percent or 100 percent of a given plant's output—or whether Mr. Truman will capitulate to Mr. Reuther.

I am interested in finding out whether the President will continue to accept the reports of responsible subordinates—the Defense Department and the Defense Mobilizer—or whether he will decide, under pressure, to accept the say-so of the UAW president.

I am well aware that Mr. Reuther is reported as saying that where it can be shown that defense work is actually involved, the union will sit down with Government officials and work out a way to resume production. But that raises the question of just what sort of showing Mr. Reuther requires, since he has refused to accept the official representations to that very effect as given by the Defense Department and Mr. Wilson, and has defied the action of the President which was based on those representations. Is Mr. Reuther trying to "out show me," the gentleman from the "show me" State?

The position taken by Mr. Reuther in this dispute means that while he is being shown, to his satisfaction, that defense work is actually involved in the Borg-Warner strike, more time and more war production is being lost, along with more employees' wages.

Crime Probe in Reading and Berks County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a statement on the crime probe in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Congress about the confused situation in my district of Reading and Berks County, Pa., since a Senate committee made an investigation there on organized crime. I am sorry to say that we are further away from a solution of the crime problem than before the probe started.

I regret this, Mr. Speaker, because I am aware of the evil influence of the crime syndicates. Every good citizen wants to wipe out this immoral and corrupting force in our community.

When I first learned that a crime investigation was to be conducted in Reading I shared the views of many good citizens that it would be a splendid opportunity to clean up some of the evil which was apparent to every interested person.

But discouragement followed, Mr. Speaker, when it became evident that the

probers were being influenced by a small group of local people who were using it, not to eliminate crime syndicates, but to promote the political ambitions of a group who were far more interested in advancing their own selfish interests, and in destroying the social gains of the average citizen, than they were in wiping out the rackets.

The net result of the probe was not good. Nothing effective was done that will put the rackets out of business. On the credit side, three persons were indicted on a contempt charge who are suspected of interstate crime operations. But that will change nothing so far as local operations are concerned.

Early demands for a full and complete probe which were made by a citizens committee proved to be phony. This hand-picked citizens committee suddenly lost interest in a complete probe when I offered my help in having the probers go all the way in an effort to get the full truth and all the facts.

The suggestion that offered something effective and concrete in fighting the rackets got no consideration whatever by the so-called citizens committee. The local press monopoly which gave lip service for a complete probe also soft-peddled and even ridiculed this suggestion and made an attack on its author.

The suggestion was for the establishment of a representative citizens committee to advise public officials. It was in line with the recommendation in the third interim report of the Kefauver committee which proposed that—

A local crime commission charged with the duty of observing and reporting on local crime conditions would be helpful in every large community.

The selection by such organizations as farm, labor, business and religious of their own representatives is an effective approach. A front organization or a hand-picked committee is neither fair, honest or effective in finding a solution for the crime problem.

I was discouraged, Mr. Speaker, when there was no interest shown by the so-called citizens committee in a State crime-probe bill which was introduced in the Pennsylvania Senate by Frank W. Ruth. Senator Ruth is a clergyman of the highest moral character and integrity, and he introduced his crime-probe bill when there were strong demands for a full and complete probe which then seemed unlikely.

I soon learned that the citizens committee did not really want a complete probe. They wanted it to stop before it reached too high in Republican State politics and to heads of that party in their own district. This committee, it has been revealed, is financed by certain wealthy and powerful interests which have always been big contributors to the Republican Party. These interests are influential in State politics and contribute handsomely to GOP State campaigns. If it was the desire of this group, which pulls the strings for the citizens committee, it could wipe out crime syndicates and rackets in Berks County at the wink of an eye.

I am not surprised at the activity of this group and their desperate attempt

to seize political power by setting up a smoke screen and masking as crusaders for good government. But, Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed because of some of my own experiences and some of the discoveries I made while the crime investigation was going on in my district.

My first incination that something was terribly wrong came on reports of the activities of the man who headed the Reading probe, Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell of the Senate staff. His performances were more like those of a Nazi storm trooper. But something seemed even more serious. The fellow appeared to be under the influence of the so-called citizens committee and spent a lot of time with the editor of one of the monopoly newspapers. I began to wonder who was really running the probe and deciding who was to be tainted with subpoenas, and who was to be spared.

I contacted the office of the Senate staff and reported what I learned. I asked that there be a full and complete probe. Several weeks later the hearing on the Reading probe was conducted in Washington. It was there that I first met Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, assistant chief counsel of the staff, who headed the Reading probe. I noticed that he was greatly disturbed by my presence. He became very nervous when I told him I expected to volunteer as a witness. Seeing that I was serious he threatened to bring suit against me if I mentioned his name. I gave him absolutely no reason to suspect that I was thinking of him. When he saw his threats did not frighten me he became friendly and began to blame others for some of the things that happened which he suspected I was aware of. I felt sorry for the man because I thought then that he permitted himself to be unduly influenced by others. He begged me to keep his name out of any statement I would make because it would ruin him and his law business.

I noticed that others were disturbed by my presence at the hearing. Downey Rice, associate counsel, became angry after I questioned him on the manner in which he let down on questioning when he had an opportunity to bring out some important information if the witness dared to talk. I lost faith, completely, in the probe.

I notified the probe chairman that I would like to appear before his committee and that I would like to put something into the record. I was called to the House floor for a vote on an important bill, but on my return the hearing was ended.

In the presence of a group in the Senate Office Building I expressed my feeling on the matter of not being able to testify.

A Reading Eagle reporter asked if I wished to make a statement to the press and I immediately responded that I certainly would. On his request I held the story until the following day for publication in the Eagle.

Next day I gave the story to the reporter. About a half-hour later I got a threatening call from McDonnell. He insisted that I withhold the statement from the press. He said that I would

make some important Senators sore if I released the report. When he saw I was persistent and not frightened he again started to talk. He told me to withhold his name and he would have something important to tell me. He invited me to go with him for a cup of coffee. He called my office several times that day and invited me to have dinner with him at the Army and Navy Club that night. I accepted his invitation, but after talking with some of my colleagues in Congress I came to the conclusion that I had better stay away.

In his talk with me that day, McDonnell proposed that he meet with Wilson Austin and I. Why did he so abruptly bring in Austin's name I wondered. I felt that it was his guilty conscience. I felt more sure when he began to tell me how subpoenas were issued in the probe. He said plans were discussed to subpoena Mitchell, a Republican candidate. That would have left only one mayoralty candidate untainted by a subpoena. But the plan fell through, he said.

I got the biggest surprise when I learned that the Reading Eagle did not carry a word of my statement on the probe. I said it was a half probe, and like a half-truth it leaves doubt and suspicion. But the story was suppressed.

I got another surprise on my return to Reading when Mr. Austin informed me that he had a long-distance call from McDonnell. McDonnell asked Austin how well he knew me and whether he could talk to me and ask me to keep quiet.

This experience naturally increased my suspicion about the whole matter. I recalled the strange things that happened when the crime committee first opened its Reading office. McDonnell used voluntary women secretaries recruited from the Junior League. Accountants were selected with ties with the Wyomissing Industries. Background information was given McDonnell by leaders of the Chamber of Commerce. This entire group was made up of people who have long been actively associated with the Republican Party and were bitter opponents of the liberal program of the Democratic Party. For years the newspaper editor who had McDonnell's ear was using his paper to discredit the Democratic Party and to create internal friction between party leaders and public officials.

In the Reading Times of last June 29, this statement appeared:

The Reading Chamber of Commerce offered its services to the O'Connor committee investigators as soon as they appeared in Reading. The probers, under R. P. S. McDonnell, accepted the aid of members of the Chamber of Commerce in an effort to find interstate offenders the probers sought to determine.

But, Mr. Speaker, the people who once advised McDonnell and who so strongly influenced his action and the course of the probe are now trying to disassociate themselves from him. The reason may be found in the fact that McDonnell was recently arrested in Washington on a threat charge by a telephone operator. He is now being held for a mental test. According to a Washington newspaper report McDonnell was a mental hospital

patient previously and was released shortly before he took charge of the Reading crime probe.

I have no desire to denounce a man if he is mentally ill. But can there be any wonder why there is so much doubt in my district about this probe?

The people of my district are a good people. They are of strong and sturdy character. They are mostly industrial workers and small farmers and little-business men. The overwhelming majority of them want to see racketeering and corruption wiped out because they are the major victims of such evil. But they will not be victims of a gigantic fraud to deceive them.

There is much more that can be said about this probe. I made previous reports to the Congress on July 6 and 10 and submitted them to the people of my district. I include herewith a report I made on the newspaper suppression of my statement which was broadcast over station WHUM on July 17 last.

TWO EVIL MONSTERS EXPOSED THE CRIME DRAGON AND THE NEWS MONOPOLY DRAGON

Mr. Speaker, in my district there was a crime probe and hearing conducted by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. The newspaper monopoly there, masking as a champion of clean government, made a strong plea for the probe and hearing.

After the hearing was conducted, I issued a statement but it was suppressed by the news monopoly. I am accustomed to press black-outs but I never expected such a brazen insult to the intelligence of the citizens of Berks County.

People have the right to know what their Congressman is doing in Washington, especially on a matter of such great interest to the citizens of our community.

A policy of news suppression, silence treatments, distorted and colored news and deceptive headlines is dishonest and dangerous because it leads us down the road to totalitarianism and disaster.

Yesterday I made a radio address over station WHUM on this matter, and I am putting it in the Record. It should be of interest to other Members of Congress. What is happening in my district may be a pattern of what is happening in other parts of the Nation.

"Today, ladies and gentlemen, I will confine my remarks to the recent crime probe and matters pertaining to the probe. I will also speak out to Mr. Herbert Kohler, editor of the Reading Times.

"In the recent Reading crime probe and hearings, I saw a determined effort to gain political advantage by a group which has always opposed liberal legislation and policies which would promote the well-being and happiness of the people. I saw a newspaper monopoly withhold news about the probe.

"Dishonest editors, armed with poison pens, devoid of principle and armed with the might of a monopolized press, unfortunately have a strong influence on public opinion.

"A newspaper has the means for readily reaching and influencing the public. It has the power to suppress the voices and opinions of all with whom they disagree or to give all the news and views. It has the power to use the news columns to play up certain groups advocating sales taxes and to black-out other groups and statements favoring liberal measures or it can be fair by treating all groups alike.

"The press has the power to build up public officials who serve the selfish interests of the monopoly. It can smear and try to crucify those it cannot control. That is a corrupting influence which breeds confusion, suspicion, disunity, and which lowers the ethical and moral standards of a community.

"A newspaper, with an honest desire to wipe out organized rackets in a community, could be a more powerful force for good than all the probes and all the law-enforcement agencies combined. But dishonest newspapers have never made an honest attempt in that direction.

"Like the gangland chiefs, they too have a desire to control public officials. They, too, have selfish interests to promote, interests which are usually in conflict with the public welfare.

"The gangland racketeers want permission for law evasion. The respectable gentlemen of an unfair press are more clever. They want to control the people who make the laws and those who administer them.

"We were told in a Reading Eagle editorial that the dragon is not yet dead, meaning the crime dragon. It wants you to support good candidates, meaning their candidates. I say there are two dragons in our midst. If these dragons put on a fake performance of fighting each other, some of us might lose sight of the real stakes involved in this fight, and of the real issues which the smoke screen is expected to hide.

"If we are fooled by this show it will be a costly performance for the average citizen, and especially for the most needy among us. Neither of these mighty dragons care about the things that mean a decent livelihood for the people. Neither cares about decent homes for the citizens. Neither of these dragons care about skyrocketing prices which rob our most needy people and the low- and middle-income families. Neither cares about our cherished freedoms. The monopolistic dragon wants free speech for itself, and only blows about it for others. It wants the power to bind and gag and club those who dare to challenge the monster's ruthless might and power.

"I despise the crime dragon and the underworld characters whose influence has always favored my Republican opponents each time I was a candidate for Congress. That is common talk everywhere in this community and something that Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, of the Senate investigating committee staff, undoubtedly knows.

"I have spoken out against rackets, illegal and legal ones, which conflict with the public welfare. I have spoken out on the Reading crime probe, not only because I want crime syndicates wiped out but also because I saw the other dragon at work—the monopoly dragon—hoping to benefit by a well-worked-out plan to take over the city and county government while the people were watching the crime show and the so-called attack on the crime dragon. I saw the clever maneuvering of the monopoly dragon to smear and weaken its mortal foes.

"And now comes that great champion of the free press, the self-appointed authority on morality and clean government, Mr. Herbert Kohler, of the Reading Times. All the time when I was speaking out on the crime problem the news monopoly, of which he is a leading part, suppressed my statements. They wanted to silence me and now, in saintly fashion, Mr. Kohler demands that I speak out.

"How are Eagle or Times readers expected to know what I have said about this probe so far, Mr. Kohler? You are talking about things I said, but my statements were suppressed in the Eagle and Times.

"So where am I to speak out, Mr. Kohler? Is it in your paper or is it over this radio station, which you apparently must frequently tune in to get the news that your paper suppresses?

"Who do you think you're fooling, Mr. Kohler? Have you no respect for the readers of your newspapers? I assure you that they are much smarter than you think. Don't you think it's about time you gave an apology to your readers? Tell them, if you dare, why my statement on the crime probe was suppressed by the Eagle and chopped to

pieces and buried in the Times. Tell your readers that I offered to appear in a panel radio discussion with civic and religious leaders, and with you, too, Mr. Kohler, and your friend, the great investigator of the Senate staff, Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell.

"Again, I want to repeat what I said many times—that the representatives of the clergy was one group which I know were sincere in all they have done. To them I say, again, I am ready to fight the gangland syndicates and their corrupting influence. But I insist that we keep our eyes on both dragons.

"And now, Mr. Kohler, you ask me to speak up. You ignore my challenge to debate, you suppress my statements, you black-out news of my activities in Congress, you put a gag in my mouth, you try to silence me—then you pierce me with your poison pen, hit me with your monopolistic club, and demand that I speak out.

"I said plenty already, Mr. Kohler, but there is so much more to say. I will speak out some more. But are you going to continue to suppress my statements?

"How can I speak out on your news outlet? Fortunately for the good citizens of Berks County, you do not have complete control of all the sources of news and information.

"Yes, Mr. Kohler, there are a lot of things I would like to say. I would like to talk about Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, whom I am told was in frequent touch with you during the probe here. I understand that McDonnell is no longer with the Senate staff. I never took the trouble to call to find out whether he quit or was fired. I don't care, but I do know that he should have been fired for his disgraceful and contemptible conduct here and the totalitarian practices he pursued. Perhaps the great investigator had poor advice and was a victim of some politicians who are far more interested in destroying the social gains of the people than they are about combating organized crime.

"It might be well if Mr. Kohler speaks out now and repeats his praise for the great investigator. Tell us, Mr. Kohler, what your real objective is. Try to explain to the people the reason for your policy of news suppression.

"Tell your readers, if you dare, why they are not permitted to know what their Congressman is doing in Washington. Tell them why my statement on the crime probe was suppressed by the Eagle-Times. I know the people are eager to know.

"You like to talk about red herrings, Mr. Kohler, but you are the champion when it comes to dragging them across the trail.

"Speak up, Mr. Kohler; let your readers know if you expect them to believe your editorials and have faith in what your crowd is doing.

"And if you dare to let me speak, if you dare to let me use the column you used to attack me or your front page, I will speak and I'll say plenty more that has not yet been told. But I don't want you to tell me what I must say. I want to speak without censorship just as you always do, and I expect the same space as you used to attack me.

"Will you let me talk, Mr. Kohler, or do you want to continue with your present act? It's a clever show, but a lot of people are getting wise."

The Greatest Subversive Plot in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith appending an article pub-

lished by the American Flag Committee, 876 Granite Street, Philadelphia, Pa., bearing the title "A Report to the American People on UNESCO."

How anyone who venerates and loves Old Glory as the symbol of the deathless march of the United States through the years to fulfill its destiny as a free and independent Republic can read this documented evidence of the greatest and most malignant plot in history against the future of this country, and its children's children, is more than I am able to comprehend.

Just how careless and unthinking can we be that we permit this band of spies and traitors to exist another day in this land we all love? Are there no limits to our callousness and neglect of palpable and evident treason stalking rampant through our land, warping the minds and imaginations of even our little children, to the lying propaganda and palpable untruths we allow to be fed to them through this monstrous poison?

It is my sincere hope that every parent of every child in America may be able to read the inroads that this infamous plot has already made in the educational system of America, and, reading, may feel impelled to do something about it, both locally and nationally; and particularly at the voting booth.

A REPORT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON UNESCO BY THE AMERICAN FLAG COMMITTEE

UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is a subversive association. It is consciously furthering a campaign calculated to pervert the teaching profession in this country, and so destroy the worth and integrity of America's first bulwark of freedom—our tax-supported public schools.

Strong words? Yes, but not strong enough to alert you and the American people to a proper understanding of the UNESCO menace, which, unless met squarely and eradicated by the concerted action of parents, teachers and the general public, may shortly transform our schools into laboratories for the systematic destruction of all sense of national allegiance and loyalty in the minds and hearts of America's school children.

SCHEME TO PERVERT PUBLIC EDUCATION

UNESCO's scheme to pervert public education appears in a series of nine volumes, titled "Toward World Understanding," which presume to instruct kindergarten and elementary grade teachers in the fine art of preparing our youngsters for the day when their first loyalty will be to a world government, of which the United States will form but an administrative part. The booklets bear the following individual numbers and titles.

I. Some Suggestions on Teaching About the U N and Its Specialized Agencies.

II. The Education and Training of Teachers

III. A Selected Bibliography

IV. The U N. and World Citizenship.

V. In the Classroom With Children Under 13 Years of Age.

VI. The Influence of Home and Community on Children Under 13 Years of Age

VII. Some Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography.

VIII. A Teachers' Guide to the Declaration of Human Rights.

IX. Some Suggestions on the Teaching of World History.

COLUMBIA HOTBED OF BRITISH FABIANISM

These booklets are cheaply priced for maximum distribution and are printed by Columbia University Press, New York. This seems appropriate, considering the role Columbia's Teachers College has long played

in developing new methods for radicalizing and internationalizing public education in this country. The institution has become well-known as a hotbed of British Fabianism, that peculiar type of creeping socialism which sired the present Labor Government which has reduced England to a fourth-rate power and a star boarder in the European section of America's world charity ward.

TEACH DISLOYALTY TO CHILDREN

UNESCO's booklets read like the propaganda put out by United World Federalists, Inc., which has been denied tax exemption because of its specifically political nature. They begin by advancing the totally un-American doctrine that the prime function of public education in the United States must be that of capturing the minds of our children, at the earliest possible age, for the cause of political world government. The teacher is urged to devote every classroom minute to this end, and every subject taught must serve, or be revised in such a manner that it is made to serve, this same central objective.

The program is quite specific. The teacher is to begin by eliminating any and all words, phrases, descriptions, pictures, maps, classroom material or teaching methods of a sort causing his pupils to feel or express a particular love for, or loyalty to, the United States of America. Children exhibiting such prejudice as a result of prior home influence,—UNESCO calls it the outgrowth of the narrow family spirit—are to be dealt an abundant measure of counterpropaganda at the earliest possible age. Booklet V, on page 9, advises the teacher that "The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. Not only can it correct many of the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership, at about the age of seven, in a group of his own age and habits—the first of many such social identifications that he must achieve on his way to membership in the world society."

POISONING THE MINDS OF TEACHERS

Following this same line of attack upon patriotism and its parental encouragement, the same booklet, on pages 58-60, goes on to further poison the minds of our teachers by adding:

"As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism. Education for world-mindedness is not a problem that the school can solve within its own walls or with its own means. It is a political problem even more than an educational one, and the present position of teachers does not, in general, permit them to intervene in the field of politics with the requisite authority. We thought with cautious optimism that educators could also try to influence public opinion. Certain members of our group thought that educators might now besiege the authorities with material demands in the manner of a trade union. In our opinion it is essential that, on the one hand, a children's charter should secure for all children such education as is summarized in this report, which alone can create the atmosphere in which development of world-mindedness is conceivable, and that, on the other hand, a teacher's charter should secure for all members of the teaching profession the liberty to provide such an education by the means they decide upon, as well as the right of access to commissions and councils responsible for the organization of public education."

Aside from encouraging the public school teachers to make war upon the ideals of patriotic national devotion which UNESCO sees as infecting our children in the home, precisely what kind of instruction would the authors of these UNESCO booklets intro-

duce by influencing public opinion, besieging the authorities with material demands in the manner of a trade-union, and by pressing for a Children's Charter and a Teachers' Charter, which refer to instruments prepared in treaty form, making UNESCO principles the supreme law of the United States? Let's see

TEACHERS URGED TO SUPPRESS AMERICAN HISTORY

First of all, teachers are urged to suppress American history and American geography, which might enhance pro-American sentiments which UNESCO wishes to sterilize. Here is how booklet V, on page 11, treats the problem as it affects children aged 3 to 13 years:

"In our view, history and geography should be taught at this stage as universal history and geography. Of the two, only geography lends itself well to study during the years prescribed by the present survey. The study of history, on the other hand, raises problems of value which are better postponed until the pupil is freed from the nationalist prejudices which at present surround the teaching of history."

Translated into less abstruse phraseology, the teacher is instructed to purge American geography from the elementary school classroom, by divorcing it from its national element, and to completely ignore the teaching of history until the pupil enters high school, since this subject cannot be similarly internationalized, and so is too risky to advance until the youngsters' patriotic spirit has been thoroughly emasculated. Parents who take a bit of time to investigate may find (as we found in eastern Pennsylvania) that a number of elementary schools have already dropped American history as a standard, required subject.

LOGICAL TEACHING METHODS TO BE DISCARDED

Logical and orderly teaching methods are also to be discarded if found to obstruct UNESCO's program for de-Americanizing the minds and hearts of little children. Discussing the usual method of teaching geography, booklet V, page 11, continues:

"One method much in use now is to teach geography in a series of widening circles, beginning with local geography (i. e., the classroom, the school building and its surroundings, the village, the country) and proceeding to a study of the nation and the continent. Only when that routine has been accomplished is the child introduced to the rest of the world."

"This progress from the particular and the immediate to the general and the remote may be logical, but does it serve our purpose?"

The booklet goes on to conclude that it certainly does not, since it is found that this manner of presentation will lead pupils to the mistaken conclusion that what is nearest to them is the most important and vice versa. UNESCO-indoctrinated teachers must therefore reverse the procedure, upset the rule of logical sequence, and begin by teaching the 8-year old child about the distribution of land and water, of air and sea currents, hydrography, climate, occupations, etc. But, even before this, and certainly before the youngsters are given any kind of formal study of their own country, every opportunity should be taken to enlarge the child's imagination and encourage him in an interest in all that is remote and strange. This is accomplished by occupying the impressionable mind of the very young child with the games, occupations, tools, domestic animals, etc., of foreign lands. The purpose of this is not simply to teach our kindergarten and elementary pupils about alien peoples, but to cause them to identify themselves in their imagination with people different from themselves.

TRUTH IS TO BE SUPPRESSED

Truth, like orthodox and reasonable teaching methods, is to be suppressed wherever

and whenever it stands in the way of glorifying those things which are foreign above those which are particularly American. On page 14, booklet V, there appears the following advice:

"Certain delicate problems, however, will arise in these studies and explorations. Not everything in foreign ways of living can be presented to children in an attractive light. At this stage, though, the systematic examination of countries and manners can be postponed, and the teacher need seek only to insure that his children appreciate, through abundant and judicious examples, that foreign countries, too, possess things of interest and beauty, and that many of them resemble the beauty and interest of his own country. A child taught thus about the different countries of the world will gradually lose those habits of prejudice and contempt which are an impediment to world-mindedness."

And there you have the UNESCO instructions on geography and history. Suppress American studies in these fields; accentuate, by abundant and judicious examples, all that is especially worth while and attractive in foreign modes of living, but, as soon as the point of unfavorable reporting seems to be approaching, simply postpone further study, leaving the children with the false and truly prejudiced notion that the nations of the other continents are paragons of virtue, beauty and over-all perfection.

LIKE A PASSAGE FROM MARX COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

What else does UNESCO's teachers' guides recommend that our little ones be taught? For one thing (booklet V, p. 16), "the methods for putting the resources of the globe at the disposal of all people," which reads like a passage from Marx Communist Manifesto. Following the same line, page 51 of the same work proposes an international anthem for American classrooms (and tomorrow for all the inhabitants of the world). It is interesting to note that the booklet we are reviewing was prepared in 1949, and that a United Nations anthem was previewed by the U N in 1950, being presented to the public on October 1 of that year in California's giant Hollywood Bowl. The anthem describes how things will be when its flag [the spider-web banner of the U N—editor] waves over every land.

We have quoted extensively from booklet V, because it contains the most flagrant of UNESCO's anti-American propaganda, and develops it the most extensively. Now, in the space left us, let's quote from other volumes in the series.

OBJECTIVE: A ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

Booklet IV, on pages 13-14, sympathetically deals with the various methods for converting the United Nations into an actual world state. The original concept of the U N as an assembly of delegates representing free and sovereign governments is being challenged, teachers are informed, in an effort to break up the concentration of political power in the hands of national governments, especially the great-power governments, which includes the United States of America. There are two alternative proposals. The first, to popularly elect U N representatives, the second, to appoint representatives who will be organized specialists in limited fields. The latter proposal follows the Fascist ideology which developed the corporate state of Italy, under Benito Mussolini. UNESCO is not perturbed on this score, however, since "it would be a beginning of functional world government based on transnational rather than international cooperation."

CORRUPTING THE MORALS OF YOUR CHILDREN

Booklet VI contains a series of research suggestions which indicate an intention to stimulate ultimate classroom expeditions into the field of detailed sex education. Here are a few samples of the type of questions

which UNESCO, which is heavily subsidized by the tax dollars of many Americans who feel that sex training rests within the domain of the home or of the tenets of their own particular religious faith, propounds for our public-school teachers: "Are there devices . . . for limiting the family?" "What are supposed to be the typical feelings of pregnant women?" "Do parents undress before the child?" "What is he (the child) told about where babies come from?" A sense of propriety prohibits us from quoting the even less modest projects which appear with the above.

YOUR JOB AS A LOYAL AMERICAN

Space does not permit us to further examine the other booklets in the series, but this brief analysis should serve to alert the citizen to the menacing nature of UNESCO's activities. Once alerted, then, it is his job—your job as a loyal American—to take the next step. Contact your friends and neighbors, show them this Newsletter, ask them to join with you in forming a local committee to obtain further data and fight this danger. Order those nine booklets of UNESCO, and also the heavier paper-bound book titled "A Handbook for the Improvement of Textbooks and Teaching Materials," which suggested another UNESCO project (to eliminate Americanism from schoolroom reading material) which we may deal with in the very near future. Read this material for yourselves; then, as a committee, go into action.

Firstly, prepare your own report and submit it to your local school board. Introduce the matter before your parent-teacher association. Interview the teachers in your community and ask their assistance in obtaining action. Join with the American Flag Committee in demanding that your United States Senators introduce and support legislation withdrawing our Government from UNESCO membership and terminating its activities in this country. Many other ways will occur to you, in which you can help safeguard our American system of public education from infiltration and undermining by UNESCO's America last propagandists.

UNESCO MUST ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY

One further word remains to be added. Several of the booklets discussed bear a preface which states that the views expressed are those of their authors, and that they do not represent the official views of UNESCO. If this weak-kneed attempt to avoid responsibility is brought to your attention by a UNESCO apologist, tell him that one who administers poison to a Nation's youth is guilty of a crime, whether the prescription is official or other.

Address of Hon. J. Howard McGrath,
Attorney General of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, October 13, 1951, the first annual sports dinner of St. Peters College Alumni Association was held in the college gymnasium in Jersey City.

The gathering was addressed by Mr. Jack Lavelle, famous football scout; Very Rev. James Shanahan, S. J., president of St. Peters College; Hon. John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City; and Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney Gen-

eral of the United States, who delivered the featured address. Mr. Richard I. Nevin was toastmaster.

The Attorney General spoke with his usual eloquence and intensity and completely captivated his large audience. The speech he delivered on that occasion is appended herewith:

Reverend Father Rooney, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, members and friends of the alumni of St. Peters College, it is a real pleasure and a distinct privilege for me to be with you this evening. I am always delighted to gather with graduates of an institution like yours. As an alumnus of Dominican Providence College, of Providence, I am cognizant of the common values you and I have received from institutions of learning affiliated with one of the great Christian churches. You and I have been taught and inculcated with those principles and phases of human knowledge which must be translated into action by mankind in order to dispel the elements of confusion, fear, and bewilderment which have gripped the world of today. We were imbued during our college days, and as alumni I hope, have retained, a love for God's moral laws, a profound reverence and realization of those age-old customs and solid principles of complete and wholesome living that from time immemorial have been the mainstay of a decent living in every age and generation. These are the moral doctrines which will serve to perpetuate our system of government as it has been preserved for us by our ancestors.

The American people, during the past 150 years, have created a magnificent temple—a government of law, under which all men, regardless of race, creed, or color, are free. This inspiring edifice of government, erected by countless hands, stands as a glorious cathedral of justice, a promise of hope for men and women throughout the world.

Today, in this year 1951, however, violent winds are whipping the international skies and attempting to destroy the shrine of freedom. Never, since the days of Washington and Jefferson, has the American way of life been so challenged. Communist thunderclouds have blotted out the sunshine of freedom in many areas of the world. Tyranny, for millions of people, has become the order of the day, liberty a mocking rebuke. The achievements of mankind, won through centuries of toil, despair, and sacrifice, are being tossed away like chaff in a roaring storm.

The Communists are determined by every possible means, legal or illegal, to reconstruct the world in their own image. They strive, not for limited objectives, but complete mastery. Every continent, nation, and people, every living human being, must be totally subjected. That is communism's dread danger—it distorts the very souls of men, ripping away free will, self-expression, and personal responsibility. Man is transformed into a mechanical dot, a breathing lump of matter on the vast cipher pad of Communist strategy. He is no longer a man but a beast, measured not for intelligence, honor, or integrity but by the number of acres he can plow or the pounds he can carry. The wheels of history are reversed, the struggle is no longer, as conceived by our forefathers for greater liberty, equality, and personal development, but for the self-aggrandizement of the few at the expense of the many. Communism is a tyranny, purposive, deliberate, and premeditated.

I speak with great feeling. I know as Attorney General what the Communist conspiracy at this very minute is endeavoring to accomplish. They are busy at work undermining your Government, plotting to destroy the liberties of every citizen, and feverishly trying in whatever way they can to aid the Soviet Union. America's defenses

must be manned, the task of every patriotic citizen is to keep our temple of free government sturdily anchored so the light of freedom may shine undiminished for all men who love and are willing to die for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Communists are here in the United States roughly 37,000 strong. These men and women are the handmaidens of revolution, the hands which if the opportunity arises will plant the hammer and sickle throughout the land. They are fanatical, well-trained, and highly disciplined. Each has his assignment as club organizer, courier, fund raiser, or party official. Others, not assigned full time to party work, are employed in industries, key transportation areas, or strategic locations. In numbers they are few. That is true. But through strategic placement, fanatical training, and unbounded energy they pose an immeasurable threat to the life of this Nation. They are the raw materials of revolution, the ingredients of sabotage, espionage, and sedition. They are the hard core of disloyalty.

The Communist Party, U. S. A., during recent months in particular, has steadily been dropping underground. Historic policy, of course, dictates that the Communist Party, though operating above ground, should always maintain an underground apparatus. Legal, open, above-ground methods, if possible, are utilized, but at the same time illegal, clandestine, and secretive plans are also pursued. They form two strands of the same thread. Today the Communist Party is virtually completely underground—the barest fraction of a periscope showing. The party may be likened to a submarine—it can cruise, if advisable, above water, with only the bottom of the hull under water. But, if necessary, with astonishing speed, it can crash dive, so only the periscope shows, or, in cases of extreme emergency, it can completely submerge.

Let's take a few examples to illustrate the clandestine character of the Communist Party. You will then see just how they are operating today.

Meetings are being held to a bare minimum, and never attended by over three members. Party business is transacted chiefly by courier, often by prearranged codes. Party records have been destroyed or hidden—sometimes so securely that party officials themselves can't even find them. In addition, the party carefully investigates its own membership, requiring new recruits to execute detailed personal questionnaires. This information has a twofold purpose: To determine, from his employment, past experience, and talents how he might best serve the interests of the party, and secondly, to discover any item which might indicate he wouldn't make a loyal member. And if there is even the slightest doubt about loyalty, out he goes. Rules of evidence? The right to a fair hearing? These do not apply in the Communist kangaroo courts. Expediency is the final test. To be innocent is not a mitigating factor. No, indeed. A study of the judicial processes of the Communist Party, if we can even use the term "judicial processes," would be highly enlightening to any person who still believes that communism represents an advanced form of liberalism.

Your Government has been alert—carefully watching and taking steps to combat the Communist danger. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, for years, has thoroughly, meticulously and patiently investigated the Communist Party, United States of America. Much of this work, most necessarily, has been unpublicized. The very nature of communism, clandestine, underground, secretive, made for slow, careful, and at times, most delicate investigation. Moreover, in years past, the lack of public awareness of the true Communist danger, a failure to appreciate the deadly, insidious, and uncompromising character of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy,

presented serious and handicapping obstacles. But the start was made—a start which is today paying rich dividends.

In October 1949, as you will recall, 11 members of the Communist Party's national board—the American Politburo—were convicted after a lengthy trial in New York City for violation of the Smith Act. This was an unprecedented step and represented the Government's first major move against the party itself. Literally years of effort went into the Government's case: the painstaking work of the FBI, procuring admissible evidence, developing informants inside the party itself, interviewing potential witnesses, and the advance preparation and efficient handling of the case in court by Department of Justice attorneys.

Nobody was more surprised at the strength of the Government's case than the Communists themselves. How could this happen? A trusted member this morning, a Government witness this afternoon. This trial literally shook the inner core of the American Communist Party. It went deeper and deeper underground, developed new clandestine contacts, and prepared to entrench in the catacombs of stealth.

The conviction of the Communist leaders, later sustained by the Supreme Court, was accomplished in the highest traditions of American justice. These men, who disdain the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln and would at a moment's notice, slash the Bill of Rights into pieces, were given every benefit of the judicial system they so bitterly abhor. They had their day in court, like any other accused person. The trial record, complete with Communist delays, harassment tactics, and diversionary haggling, is evidence not only of the legal bankruptcy of their case, but of the contempt they bear for democratic institutions. The Communist leaders and their attorneys attempted to use the trial as a circus staging ground, utilizing every technique of showmanship, propaganda, and deceit to overturn the operations of American justice. They failed: the patient, steady hand of Judge Medina defeated their foul purpose and made democratic processes the victor.

That is the strength of the American system—that we can meet every challenge, even the Communist threat, through democratic means. The sacred liberties of this Nation—freedom of speech, press and religion, habeas corpus, trial by jury, the right of appeal—must not, in the least iota, be sacrificed. National security must be safeguarded—yes, indeed. But national security does not mean the sacrifice of civil liberties. Security and freedom are inextricable links in the same chain; they are complementary, not contradictory. National security can be strengthened by allowing the free exercise of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. To do otherwise is to copy the methods of the dictator.

In totalitarian states the handling of subversion is a relatively easy problem. The security police, if suspicion is directed toward a citizen, immediately swoop down, arrest him, and accuse him of disloyalty. The so-called trial processes of Communist states are well-known: the fancy court trials, the confessions, torture techniques, the propaganda overtones, then prison or death. For thousands of lesser known persons the elaborate court setting is missing—but the same penalties, imprisonment, slavery and death, are meted out. To be innocent is often a handicap to the defendant and an embarrassment to the authorities. On other occasions, the state deals with great masses, not taking the time or trouble to accuse them on an individual basis. The horror of mass arrests, the forced migration and torturing of entire peoples in Communist Europe are blots of inhumanity which will stain the canvas of time for years to come.

The contrast of democratic law enforcement is striking—and also revealing of some

of the special problems involved. The Government has dealt, and is today dealing, with each Communist on an individual basis. The FBI's investigations are designed to identify, determine the activities, and develop admissible legal evidence on each individual, especially the Communist leaders. You can readily see the staggering responsibility which has been thrown on the FBI today, when you consider there are only 6,300 special agents pitted against thousands of Communists, to say nothing of the FBI's other duties. I have often marveled at the manner in which the FBI operates and how it accomplishes so much with so few. The task is mounting daily, as the Communists burrow deeper and deeper underground, utilize aliases, invent code systems and hide their intentions. The Communists are now as jumpy as Mexican jumping beans—constantly fearful of being followed, watched or overheard. Since the recent arrests, they have scattered like wild rabbits, doing everything in their power to go undercover. Some obviously will be difficult to find. Our problem now is the most effective application of the FBI's manpower.

In recent weeks a number of regional, State and local leaders of the Communist Party, some from California, have been arrested. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has consistently opposed mass, wholesale arrests. I concur in that position. The Department of Justice is proceeding on a highly selective basis, giving its attention to key leaders, those persons who are in a position to do the greatest damage to the Nation. These individuals, as the 11 members of the national board, will be given their day in court.

But the problem, unfortunately, does not rest there. The recent jumping of bail by four of the convicted Communist leaders reflects another facet of Communist policy—designed to frustrate, hamstring and obstruct American justice. These Communists, as they were rightfully entitled, utilized every legal avenue to escape conviction. This is standard Communist policy—to bend to their own advantage every freedom, privilege and opportunity provided by democratic processes. However, when the die was cast, when every legal appeal was exhausted, and prison loomed, they jumped bail—abusing this legal device to escape the consequences of the law. The Department of Justice's authority and responsibility for these individuals, of course ceased with the granting of bail. Unfortunately, however, the courts which granted the bail do not have to seek their apprehension. If this were the case, I hazard the guess that some judges would be more realistic. This is Communist treachery, fully in accord with the strategy which dictates the use of illegal tactics as a supplement and, if necessary, a continuation of legitimate endeavors. This is the enemy we face—cunning, ruthless, disdainful of our judicial processes, yet at the same time attempting to extract every possible privilege from the very freedoms they abhor.

I am amazed to think that, at this very hour, despite all the tactics, maneuvers and open defiance of the Communist Party, there are still lawyers in this country who can assert that the prosecution of the Communist leaders is thought control or infringement of civil liberties. I assert, and I know you will agree, that communism and American jurisprudence are incompatible—any person, especially a lawyer who has been trained in the great traditions of Anglo-Saxon law, who asserts to the contrary, must look into the Marxist-Leninist core of his own heart for the answer.

The Communist danger, of course, has manifest itself in the espionage field. Every full-fledged Marxist-indoctrinated Communist member is a potential espionage or sabotage agent. However, the problem is not that simple. Russian espionage is a specialized art, embodying professional

agents, highly clandestine communications, and access to valuable material. Literally years may be spent in developing one informant, preparing an espionage front, or perfecting a contact. Communist members do serve the espionage apparatus—but, strange as it may seem, many of the best Russian agents are not and never have been Communist Party members. Harry Gold, for example, was not a member of the Communist Party, nor was Alfred Dean Slack. Yet these individuals were duped into supporting this alien conspiracy. The anonymous character of Soviet espionage agents who look, live, and act like millions of others, is the terrifying aspect of Communist espionage. To be concerned exclusively with Communist Party members is not sufficient. The FBI through hard work, intensive and patient investigations, must identify and bring to light these conscious—and in some instances, unconscious—agents. This is a terrific responsibility. The names of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, Alfred Dean Slack, David Greenglass, Ruth Greenglass, Morton Sobell, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg are testimonials to the indefatigable endeavor of the Department of Justice.

The FBI during recent months has investigated a great number of cases involving allegations of sabotage. However, as during World War II, the vast majority of these cases were determined to have resulted from industrial accidents, carelessness, or foolish horseplay. To date, no cases of sabotage have been prosecuted. Moreover, no evidence has been found to indicate any Communist-directed or -inspired sabotage. However, the FBI remains alert and any allegation of sabotage received is immediately, thoroughly, and completely investigated. The recent fires and explosions have been carefully investigated, but no evidence of sabotage was found. The FBI, of course, is strictly an investigative agency. It has no jurisdiction whatsoever for the physical protection of the Nation's industrial plants. The Munitions Board, under the Office of Secretary of Defense, is responsible for formulating the policies, procedures, and standards from a security standpoint in plants manufacturing defense materials.

The Government, in view of the Communist danger, has taken steps to protect itself. The FBI first began conducting investigations into the loyalty of Federal employees during the 1942 fiscal year, and in 1947, of course, the Federal employees-loyalty program was instituted. As of August 18, 1951, under this program, a total of 3,821,641 loyalty forms have been processed by the FBI, and 99.5 percent have been returned to the Civil Service Commission marked "No disloyal data." A total of 16,662 full field investigations have been conducted. The program is being handled on a current basis by the FBI. The FBI's role is to report the facts to the Civil Service Commission without bias, conclusions or recommendations. It is the responsibility of the employing agencies and the loyalty hearing boards to weigh the facts and decide the proper administrative action. As of August 18, 1951, the Loyalty Review Board has reported that 268 incumbents and appointees have been removed or denied employment, 2,313 resigned or otherwise separated or withdrawn from consideration, and 9,028 were retained or accepted. The overall result of the loyalty program has been a resounding victory for free government.

In this connection, I want to emphasize one facet of internal security investigations frequently overlooked—the proving of innocence. Too often, I am sure, the outside observer will think only in terms of proving guilt. That is true, we want to know the identities of our enemies. But also, and equally important, is the absolute need for fair impartial and unbiased investigations—to clear the reputation of a man or woman

falsely accused. That is the spirit of Americanism. Character assassination, branding by innuendo or malicious slandering, has no place in the life of this Nation—it hampers, not increases, national security. These irresponsible methods create a climate of hysteria, violate civil rights, and incite mob actions. The one way—and the only way—is the American way of carefully ferreting out the facts, and thereby determining guilt or innocence.

We have come a long way—the Communists, though dangerous are today, because of the Government's actions, severely handicapped. They are finding it difficult to operate efficiently underground, they are jittery, and, according to our recent information—and rest assured the FBI still has informants inside the party structure—rumblings of dissent are beginning to appear. The Government is watching carefully, and in the event of a national emergency, stands ready to quickly and effectively immobilize our internal enemies.

The treasured liberties of this great Nation are our most sacred possessions. A damaged building, a wrecked home, even a ravaged continent can be rebuilt—but we can't recapture liberties, lost either by forfeit or conquest. The Department of Justice is doing everything possible to safeguard the security of this Nation and to maintain the liberties we all cherish. It can be done—and, with your help, will be done. Only by working together, in dedicated unison, will we be able to keep the flag of justice flying proudly over America's shrine of freedom.

You, as alumni of St. Peter's College, have gathered tonight to renew old acquaintances, to reminisce of joyful experiences, to enrich memories, and to renew your allegiance to a beloved institution. It is fitting that you take advantage of an occasion of this character to rededicate yourselves to the continued adherence to those principles which your alma mater has indelibly impressed on your minds during your college days. With the help of the Almighty and with your spiritual and moral commitments we shall see a better world in the not-too-distant future.

Register Right To Have Your Vote Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, several times since I have served in Congress I have sent last-minute reminders to friends back home to get out and register; otherwise they could not vote for me in the primary of the following year.

This action has served as a reminder to good supporters some of whom are wont to overlook the dates necessary to enroll in our State. It has never failed to pay off whenever I have done it, so my office staff redoubled our efforts this year.

Nearly 4,000 letters went into Broome County, and since then I have received score upon score of answers assuring me of my friends' continued loyalty.

The following is one which I have sifted out and will show the interest HALL supporters are expressing as the result of my exposure of so many sub-

terranean plots not only in the southern tier but in the whole State.

You can bet I will capitalize on all of these and more, too, before I get through.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.,

October 15, 1951.

Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: I want you to know for the first time in my life I have registered as a Republican in order to vote for you in the primary. You once did a favor for me for a friend of mine whose husband was in the service, and I haven't forgotten that. I consider it a privilege to be able to do this.

I and all my forbears have always been Democrats. I had an uncle who was Attorney General for the Confederacy and afterward became Governor of Alabama. I am a native Georgian. My uncle was known as War (Between the States) Governor of Alabama.

I was home (Atlanta) this summer, and more than one southerner told me they were voting Republican if Truman was nominated.

This is a two-party Nation and the Democrats have already been in too long.

Here's hoping you win with flying colors, and you may rest assured I will do all I can and what influence I have with my friends will be used in your behalf.

Yours truly,

Mrs. L. McK.

Welfare State Proposals Get Deaf Ear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one of the few heartening features of the Eighty-second Congress is the fact that it has very largely turned a deaf ear to President Truman's demands for enactment of his welfare state legislative program, despite Democratic majorities in both Houses.

It is especially significant that these measures have been blocked in committees even though the chairmen and majority membership of the committees are Democratic.

In my opinion, two factors account for this opposition—recognition of the fact that our economy cannot withstand the demands of the Korean war and national defense program and the welfare state program, and the vigorously expressed unwillingness of the people to entrust new powers to the administration.

Here is a résumé of the major items in the Truman Fair Deal program which have received the cold shoulder from the Eighty-second Congress:

First. Although bills to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act have been introduced, no hearings have been held or scheduled in either House or Senate committees.

Second. Most of the proposed public power projects designed to compete with private enterprise have been turned down. Among the measures which have failed to get out of committee are the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, the central Arizona project, the Cumber-

land River project, and the Hell's Canyon project on the Columbia River.

Third. Not a single bill has been introduced to carry out the President's budget message request for funds for production payments to farmers—a revival of the rejected Brannan plan.

Fourth. Committees have held no hearings on the President's proposals for Federal aid to education or medical insurance.

This is all to the good, but it would be a serious mistake to ignore the fact that the vast spending programs which the Democratic-controlled Congress have approved involve a grave threat to the economy. While the road to socialism represented by the welfare state proposals has been blocked, the Nation is plunging headlong down the road to insolvency, by the route of confiscatory taxes and continued deficit financing.

The \$5,750,000,000 tax boost approved by the conference committee last week brings the total tax increase since the start of the Korean war to \$15,700,000,000. The total tax bill for the next year, as a result of this latest increase, will be a record-breaking \$97,000,000,000.

The disheartening fact which, I suspect, has barely dawned on the American people, is that despite these tax increases there is no end in sight for deficit financing.

I was advised last week by the office of Senator Byrd's Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures that the Federal deficit for the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1952, is expected to be close to \$20,000,000,000.

If that estimate proves correct, the national debt will be in the neighborhood of \$277,000,000,000 by next July 1. And at the same rate the national debt will be nearing the \$300,000,000,000 mark by the end of Mr. Truman's term, some \$42,000,000,000 more than when he took office in 1945.

The sins of commission of the Eighty-second Congress, in terms of reckless spending and wild extravagance, unfortunately outweigh even the virtues of omission so far as refusal to enact Mr. Truman's welfare state legislative program is concerned.

Remarks of Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin at Governors' Conference in Gatlinburg, Tenn., on October 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include excerpts from the remarks of Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, at the Governor's Conference in Gatlinburg, Tenn., on October 3:

First, I am strongly opposed to the pending Senate bill 1529 which proposed to give quasi-legal recognition by the United States Government to gambling operations in the States. I am not unmindful that some very respectable and sincere persons have indi-

cated support of the measure, but to my mind the suggestion is quite shocking that where crime is not adequately suppressed by State authorities, the National Government should step in, collect taxes, regulate the bookkeeping requirements, and generally treat such undoubted criminal conduct like it would legitimate business. I can think of nothing that would so completely and certainly discourage and subvert the efforts of honest policemen and prosecutors in a difficult undertaking. It is altogether intolerable for the State to denounce activities as criminal while the National Government gives them implied sanction by according them treatment similar to that given to legitimate business. A business cannot be put on a tax basis and regulated by one government without pulling the rug from under the feet of enforcement officials of the other government whose duty it is to stamp out that very business.

Taxes at Danger Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the most important legislative issue before the Congress today is the pending tax revenue measure now in conference.

In my considered judgment the basic question to be asked in determining any acceptance of the proposal to increase the present heavy burden on the American taxpayer is simply this—assuming an attempted pay-as-you-go policy is desirable, can the average working American and industry meet these proposed tax raises without danger of destroying our national economic stability?

The reason why I personally voted against summary acceptance of this tax bill on Tuesday was because of my lack of conviction that this fundamental question had been thoroughly explored and clearly answered. It was my intention, by that vote, and my hope that a re-examination of the entire provisions of the tax bill by the conference committee will result in a quick surgical removal of any unjust tax increases, particularly on the low-income groups, and also inspire an intense scrutiny, for reduction, of extravagant expenditures in various governmental agencies in no wise concerned with our vitally necessary defense effort.

Nobody will challenge the absolute need for us to fully prepare to repel any armed Russian aggression if such should come. A great many of us openly ask for clearer proof that the staggering military budget can, itself, be justified. Without such assuring proof I could not bring myself, as a conscientious Representative of my people, to vote to place this added tax imposition upon their already overburdened shoulders. The only reasons why I ever contemplated any approval of increased taxes, outside of military necessity, was because any excessive revenue would be applied to national debt reduction and the collection of it

might be of substantial aid in preventing the floodgates of inflation from being opened wide.

That we are fast approaching the danger point in tax imposition upon the American family and the American economy should be of paramount concern to each and every Member of the Congress.

Personally and cooperatively, in this time of emergency, I have felt it my patriotic, as well as representative, duty to demand the elimination of every Government expenditure not contributing to essential American defense and public service. There is no doubt that is the action each and every constituent desires and expects from his own Representative in the Congress.

That such is the case is evident from the widespread comments heard from every discussion group and from repeated publication in our alert newspapers. In that connection I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a most timely editorial warning which appeared in the October 16 issue of the Framingham (Mass.) News.

The editorial follows:

TAXES AT DANGER POINT

At the President's insistence that the Treasury needs \$16,000,000,000 more per year at least, the House responded with a bill to raise an estimated \$7,200,000,000. The Senate bill provided \$5,500,000,000. The conference committee has agreed on a bill about half way between these two measures.

The inescapable conclusion emerges from the debates and deliberation of Congress that taxes have reached the danger point. Members of Congress, constantly importuned by the administration to provide more revenue to meet prodigious outlays, also realize that taxation has the power to destroy.

The plain fact is that many if not most Members of Congress believe that taxation is at the danger point and that some provisions of the new bill carry taxation above that point. Some Members of Congress contend taxation already has put a damper on production in many instances. Certainly income taxes have put a damper on initiative.

Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, a leading tax expert in Congress, says some provisions of the pending bill are too high and will compel alleviatory action by the next Congress. How can such action be taken if spending reaches a constantly higher level? The only alternative to higher taxes is less spending.

It is frequently asserted that when a government takes 40 percent of the national income, that government has achieved total power. The United States is approaching that point.

Jackson-Jefferson Day Dinner Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the citizens of St. Louis were singularly privileged to have as their honored guest at

the recent Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner in that city our beloved and distinguished Vice President.

It was my great pleasure and privilege to be present on that occasion, and to see the cheering enthusiasm with which his words of wisdom and inspiration were received.

I am sure that my colleagues in the Senate would like to read the Vice President's message, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ALBEN W. BARKLEY AT THE JACKSON-JEFFERSON DAY DINNER, ST. LOUIS, MO., OCTOBER 6, 1951

I am proud to be the guest of the Democrats of Missouri and the Young Democrats of America at this Jackson-Jefferson Day banquet in the city of St. Louis.

I am proud to be in the home State of the President of the United States, with whom I have collaborated in one capacity or another for the last 16 years, first as United States Senators, second when he was Vice President, and, since the 20th of January, 1949, as President and Vice President of the United States. I am happy to be able to say, because it is true, that in the whole history of the Nation no two men occupying these positions have cooperated more completely, more wholeheartedly, or more conscientiously in the service of the American people. When the story of the Truman administration has been written, it will be found by the historian that, in a period when tragic and important decisions had to be made in domestic and foreign affairs, President Truman has acted with a vision and a courage which the American people have a right to expect of a man whom they have chosen as their leader and spokesman. When the history of his administration has been written in the perspective in which history will place them, the petty annoyances and petty controversies will fade into insignificance, as will petty efforts to discredit him and his administration and those who work with him.

I am glad to be in the home State of Senator TOM HENNING, who is making one of the best Senators from any of the States and one of the best Senators the State of Missouri has ever sent to Washington. He is able, conscientious, hard-working, and courageous, and it is a pleasure to work with him and to come to his home State to pay tribute to him.

We meet to celebrate the memory of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson at a time when all that they stood for in freedom and the rights of the people is under world-wide attack.

We meet at a time when all that democracy stands for in America and in the world is under world-wide attack.

It would seem that, after all the centuries which mankind has spent in the effort to rise from ignorance to the light of intelligence, from slavery to freedom and the enjoyment of the dignity of man under just and honest governments, it would not now be necessary to defend human rights under any form of government more representative and righteous than the governments seeking to destroy these ancient bulwarks of human freedom.

Nevertheless, we find that it is necessary to do so. We find that a godless ideology, proclaiming that religion is the opiate of the people, is seeking to destroy all the vestiges of the freedoms which have made America

so great and which are essential in the development of man's destiny.

The relation between man and his God is a personal relation. It is not one that can be controlled by the state. In the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, embodied in the Bill of Rights, adopted soon after the parent document was framed, we have forever separated organic politics and organic religion. The Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Congress can pass no law prescribing the form of any man's worship, the church to which he wishes to pay allegiance, nor prohibiting him from exercising the right to worship his God as he may see fit.

Yet one of the fundamental doctrines of communism is that religion is the opiate of the people, designed to lull them into insensibility while capitalism or political dictators work their will upon them.

We in America know the falsity of this doctrine. We know that our great institutions and our freedom are based fundamentally upon freedom of worship, the separation of church and state, the exercise of every man's right to worship, to speak, to write, and to assemble for every lawful purpose and for the mutual advancement of all the people.

It would seem that, after nearly 2,000 years of the Christian religion, and even longer years of other religions, it would not be necessary to fight a world-wide battle to preserve the inherent rights of every man to freedom of worship, of speech, of the press, and of assembly.

Yet we find at this very hour we are compelled feverishly to indulge in extraordinary expenditures in resources and blood, and in the concentration of power and authority, in order that we may be prepared to defend these things which are so dear to us and will free people from the onslaughts and machinations of the godless and ruthless horde who would snuff out all individualism and individual enterprise and all freedoms, including the freedom to own one's home, to educate one's children, to pursue one's lawful ambitions, and grind all these things into the dust for the sake of power. In such an ideology the state is everything, the individual is nothing. In our democratic institutions the individual is primarily the object of the state and, as Jefferson said, "All governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

How many governments behind the iron curtain or within its shadow derive their just powers from the consent of the governed or derive any of their powers from the consent of the governed. Having been privileged to visit these countries, I know that not 15 percent of the people would vote to tolerate the kind of government they live under, if they had a free ballot and a free choice and their ballots could be counted as cast.

In view of these circumstances, the American Nation and the American people dwell under a peculiar challenge and obligation as the leader among the free nations of the world.

It is not necessary to inquire how we became this leader, but it is appropriate at this hour and under these circumstances to proclaim the theory that it was largely under the influence of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson that our institutions became an example of freedom to all the people of the world. No man ever wrote more eloquently on the subject of freedom of man than Thomas Jefferson, and no man ever fought more valiantly on the battlefield and in the chambers of legislation or in executive position to maintain the kind of freedom Jefferson proclaimed than Andrew Jackson.

It is fortunate that our country today is not only the leader in the fight for freedom but that it is qualified for such leadership and that it has the resources to endure whatever impact the fight for freedom may involve, without the destruction of our own economic foundations.

The Democratic Party has been in power for nearly 19 years. Some people proclaim that that is long enough for any party to enjoy power, but it depends altogether on how that power has been exercised. It depends on whether it has been exercised in behalf of the people or against them. It depends on whether its economic theories when applied to politics and economics have been sound and wise and have promoted the welfare of the people rather than destroyed the foundations of their faith in American institutions.

If this be the test, then we are willing to compare the last 19 years under Democratic administrations with the previous 12 years under Republican administrations and let the people draw their own conclusions as between them. Not only are we willing to draw this comparison as to the positive economic remedies which we have promoted in behalf of the people to dig them out of the depths of a Nation-wide depression that brought business stagnation, wholesale unemployment, financial disaster, and loss of faith in our very institutions, but we are willing to compare the morality of the people's government and the morality of the men in public life during this period with that of those who preceded it during the previous 12 years prior to the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 4, 1933.

All we have ever asked the American people to do is to look at the facts, take the record as it has been made. Whenever they have done that they have rendered a sound judgment and an accurate verdict. No matter who the candidates may be in 1952—and as to that I make no predictions—the Democratic Party will go before the American people in 1952 with a record of performance in the domestic and foreign fields never equaled by any political party in the history of the Nation. When the American people go into the ballot boxes and write their verdict on that record, they will not be dissuaded nor stupefied nor frustrated nor swerved from the performance of their duty by the petty wailings of those who have no record of their own to boast of, but only seek to tear down that which we have made. The American people will not be blinded as to the character of men in public life by the petty efforts to destroy their faith in men and in institutions they themselves have created, simply because other groups of men desire to obtain control of our political institutions.

On both sides let Democrats and Republicans alike tell the American people the truth. We are willing to tell them the truth, because we are not afraid of the truth. Let those who seek to regain power after a long season of its abuse and its misapplication show an equal frankness with the American people in telling them the truth. Surely the American people will not allow themselves to forget a lot of the truths which were fresh in their minds after twelve years of Republican administrations under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. In this statement, I cast no reflections upon any of those men, but I ask the American people to refresh their memories as to what their condition was when this period had ended.

We are enjoying today a prosperity never experienced by any nation in the world. Our productive capacity is at an all-time peak; our national income is at an all-time peak; our employment rolls are at an all-time peak. Out of our resources we are seeking to preserve our own liberty and the validity of our own institutions and to assist the free and liberty-loving peoples in doing the same.

In this great conflict of ideologies at home and abroad we are proud to know that the people of Missouri and of the Nation are ready for the decision. We are not only a world power of which we are proud, but destiny has placed a transcendent part in the history of our country and must play a transcendent part in the type of leadership which we shall give to the world.

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, probably one of the greatest tributes that has been paid to the memory of Christopher Columbus is that he has been accorded the unusual dignity of being made into an international citizen. In these days of national tensions and extreme nationalism, it is a heartening thing to me that Columbus can be the rallying center for so many diverse nationalities. It is truly unfortunate that there are few in the history of the world who are accorded equal praise by a variety of nations.

That he merits this global regard is proven over and over as more modern biographers study and reveal his truly remarkable life and actions.

Samuel E. Morison, historian of the United States Navy, in his magnificent biography of Columbus, Admiral of the Ocean Seas, fills his pages with exclamations of surprise and admiration not only for the personal character of the great discoverer but for his astounding knowledge of navigation. The navigational ability of Columbus appeared to be almost intuitive because his reckonings made with the crudest kind of instruments, including a dry-card compass, checked in a major degree with the findings of the most scientific apparatus.

In celebrating Columbus Day, we pay tribute to the splendid courage and fortitude which he displayed and to the bravery of those pioneers from all countries who followed his example in crossing the waters and exemplified the same spirit of determination. They occupy a unique place in our history and in our hearts.

National Security Demands an All-Out Domestic Mica Mining Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include my remarks on the important

subject, National Security Demands an All-Out Domestic Mica Mining Program:

The eyes and brains of present-day military planes, ships, tanks, antiaircraft guns, and many automatic weapons are the units of highly complex electronic equipment which they contain or which are used to direct and operate them, as the case may be. Without the electronic equipment now required for accurate, split-second detection, calculation, and controls our present-day weapons would be ineffective if not useless.

Large quantities of mica are required in the manufacture of electronic equipment for increasing military and industrial applications. Large quantities of mica also are required for the manufacture of electrical equipment, including motors and generators and communications apparatus. In fact, practically all mica, other than scrap and ground mica, is used as an insulator in the manufacture of electronic and electrical equipment. Mica is indispensable for such purposes.

In view of these facts, it becomes evident that an assured and continuing supply of mica is essential to the future defense and economy of the United States. However, in the last few years only 5 percent or less of the mica consumed in the United States, other than scrap and ground mica, was produced from domestic sources of supply. We have been dependent upon India for approximately 85 percent of all such mica obtained from foreign sources of supply.

Considerable amounts of mica have been produced in the United States in years gone by. The average yearly domestic production of mica other than scrap and ground mica for the 1941-45 period amounted to 25 percent of the domestic consumption.

There are some 3,000 known mica deposits in the United States of which 700 are said to be located in the Southeastern States, including a number of mica deposits in Avery and Mitchell Counties of North Carolina, which are in my own district. These mica deposits, together with those that remain to be discovered, might well yield considerably in excess of the 25 percent sufficiency attained in the past should the Government provide an adequate incentive purchase program as authorized by the Defense Production Act.

The United States can ill-afford to continue its dependence upon India, Brazil, Madagascar, and other overseas sources of supply for 95 percent or more of its mica requirements.

The defense and economy of our Nation make it imperative that the defense agencies immediately put into effect a mica purchase program which will reopen and obtain maximum production from the 3,000 or more domestic mica deposits over the next 5 years. Any effort less than this may well be regarded as a half-hearted attempt or gesture which could be expected to end in disillusionment and financial distress to hundreds of small venturing enterprises and in the ultimate failure of the program to obtain significant quantities of mica.

The defense agencies have taken close to 11 months to develop a simple mica program. Details of the program have been ready for announcement for several weeks, however, activation of a mica program now awaits the pleasure and approval of the Deputy Director of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

I am informed that under the proposed mica program the Government would, over a 3-year period, offer to pay producers approximately \$600 a ton for hand-cobbed mica containing stipulated percentages of useful and strategic mica meeting certain specifications, delivered at buying depots to be located in the principal mica producing areas

of the United States. The Government plans to contract for the processing of the crude mica purchased from mine operators. Total cost of the program as now proposed, including processing and administrative expenses, is reported to be approximately \$20,000,000.

After 11 months of inexcusable delays and indecision we still do not have a mica production in operation. I urge that a 5-year domestic mica program which will obtain the all-out production of useful mica from domestic sources of supply be announced and activated immediately. The national security demands such action. The supply of mica from India and other overseas sources of supply may be denied us in the future.

Columbus Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following address delivered at the Columbus Day Association, of Lackawanna County, Scranton, Pa., October 12, 1951, by Mr. George A. Tosoro, Deputy Economic Adviser, Office of Western European Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Tosoro's address follows:

There is a strong parallel between the Great Explorer's voyage to the New World and Italy's postwar recovery. Columbus was, and is, a symbol of resourcefulness, courage, and energy. Postwar Italy gave to the world ample proof of the resourcefulness, courage, and energy of the Italian people.

The progress made by Italy in the 7 years between 1944 and 1951 is truly amazing.

In 1944 the economy of Italy was badly shattered, especially the economy of central Italy, which for long months was the battleground for some of the fiercest and most destructive encounters of World War II. In fact, in central Italy 90 percent of the power plants were destroyed or out of commission, 90 percent of the bridges were destroyed or badly damaged, industrial production was limited to 20 or 30 percent of capacity. At the same time 90 percent of Italy's merchant marine was destroyed or out of commission. The diet of Italian city dwellers was around 1,500 or 1,600 calories, very close to the starvation level (in our country we have an average caloric intake of 3,200). In the financial field, inflation was rampant, prices skyrocketed.

If we look at the Italian economy now, as compared with 1938, we find that electric power production has doubled, and industrial production has increased by 40 percent. Foreign trade is now 10 or 20 percent larger than prewar, and the Italian merchant marine has been restored to 90 percent of the prewar level. Inflation is not a danger any more, and monetary stability has been achieved since the end of 1947. In 1944 Italy's social situation was as dark as the economic one: black market, organized gambling, and prostitution were the striking symptoms of moral disruption and decay. Today, in 1951, social conditions are again normal.

The political situation, and the conditions prevailing in public administration, show a similar striking change since 1944. At that time, the northern part of Italy was under

Nazi control, southern Italy under United States and United Kingdom rule. Only a nominal Italian administration existed, with a coalition cabinet in which the Communist and the Socialist parties had equal voice with the democratic parties. The only bright spot in the picture were the Italian partisans, who valiantly fought against the German armies in northern Italy, with the support of, and in collaboration with our soldiers fighting on the central mountains of the peninsula.

Now, Italy has a stable government, with a cabinet composed only of representatives of democratic parties, under the leadership of Alcide de Gasperi. Now, Italy is an accepted and respected member of the family of nations, of the OEEC, of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and of the Council of Europe. She is not a member of the U. N. only because of the Russian veto.

The fact that Italy has made amazing progress in the economic, social, and political fields obviously does not mean that everything is bright. It does not mean that the process of reconstruction which was made necessary by 20 years of fascism and 4 years of warfare has been completed. Much work is still to be done in many directions. In fact, Italy's financial policies have probably been too strict in the last 2 or 3 years, and only now are being relaxed. Not completely unrelated to such policies, unemployment still looms large in Italy, around the 2,000,000 mark. A program of land reform has been discussed since the end of the war and was partially enacted into law, its implementation, however, just started a few months ago, and there is a long way to go. The tax system is still antiquated and has features of regressivity which must be eliminated, a new tax law, prepared according to the pattern of the United States income tax, was recently enacted, but the first effects of its implementation will not be felt for a long while. Progress has been made in the field of labor unionism with two democratic unions, the CISL and the UIL, now in existence, still the largest union is the Communist-dominated CGIL, with 3,000,000 members. The problem of developing the backward areas of southern Italy still presents the same tremendous difficulties which worried the great Italian statesmen of the Risorgimento, the Italian Government is just now starting to face the problem through the fund for the South, which was established last year. A tremendous amount of work still remains to be done also in this field.

All these weaknesses, all these negative factors, however, should not be considered as indicative of the over-all state of Italian affairs. There are clouds, dark clouds, but we must not focus our attention on the clouds only. We must not look at the trees and lose sight of the forest. If we look at the forest, happily we can see a much brighter picture—the picture of a tremendous progress made by the Italian people in the short span of 8 or 7 years.

As you know, the Italian people did not do all this alone. On Columbus Day, 1944, President Roosevelt stated on the radio: "To the people of Italy we have pledged our help . . . and we will keep the faith." We did keep the faith, we did give our help to the people of Italy—for an amount of approximately \$2,300,000,000. This was certainly a tremendous amount, if you consider it in itself, but in fact it was small, if compared with the enormous needs created by war destruction and economic disruption in Italy. In other words, we helped Italy, we contributed to her recovery, but the Italians themselves did most of the job.

In 1941 or 1942, the first time I went to Washington, I was looking at the Columbus Memorial on the Union Station Plaza, and Columbus seemed to me to be sad-looking, rather dejected. With Mussolini at the helm of the Fascist government, Columbus

could hardly be the happy symbol of friendly relations between Italy and the United States. But the Fascist regime was overthrown, and the great majority of the Italian people aligned themselves with the Allies in the fight against nazism. Victory was won. Friendly relations with Italy were restored, and a peace treaty was signed. In 1947 the Italian Premier de Gasperi came for the first time to this country. He was received at the airport by protocol officers and minor State Department representatives. A few weeks ago, Premier de Gasperi came to Washington for the second time. He was received at the station, in the shadow of the same Columbus Memorial, by President Truman, by Mrs. Truman, Margaret Truman and by practically all members of the Cabinet. The Columbus Memorial looked much brighter on that occasion—almost as bright as the equestrian statues which were cast in Italy as a gift to the people of the United States of America from the people of Italy, and which were dedicated at the Arlington Memorial Bridge Plaza on September 26, in the presence of President Truman and Premier de Gasperi. The ceremony of the dedication, with Ezio Pinza singing both national anthems, gave a real indication of the present status of the relations between Italy and the United States, and of the present standing of Italy, and its Government, in the international field.

Again, not all the picture is bright. The peace treaty is still to be revised, although the first steps toward a partial revision have already been agreed upon among the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France, and will certainly receive the support of all peace-loving signatories of the treaty. Italy is still to be admitted to the U. N., and the problem of how to overcome the Russian veto is being seriously considered. The question of the Free Territory of Trieste is still to be settled, although we do hope that the Italian and the Yugoslav Governments will be able to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on this question. Finally, the surplus population of Italy still presents tremendous economic, social, and political problems for Italy, but we will help Italy to solve this problem through some international machinery.

In short, tremendous progress was made by Italy in all directions since actual fighting ceased in Italy, enough progress to be proud of, both as Americans, and as Americans of Italian descent. First, we can be proud of what the Italians did themselves, which, of course, was 99 percent of the job. Second, we can be proud of what we all did, as Americans, to help the Italians to help themselves. Now, thanks to our joint efforts, a reborn democratic Italy is moving forward. Today Italy is one of our best allies in the present troubled international situation, we can count on her contribution in our efforts to maintain peace, in our resolves to uphold western civilization.

Where Does the Money Come From To Lobby for the St. Lawrence Seaway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it has been frequently charged that the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, the Nation-wide organization opposed to

the St. Lawrence project, although composed of some 250 labor, civic, business, and taxpayers' organizations, is largely financed by the Association of American Railroads.

So I think it quite pertinent to point out that while the project is advanced as a national defense necessity, the money for the campaign of the proponents comes exclusively from interests which would benefit from the waterway.

Last year, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, the organization supporting the project, received in contributions, according to its lobby report, roughly \$58,104. Of this amount approximately \$49,000 came from the six Midwest companies which have invested in Labrador-Quebec iron ore and which want the subsidized waterway for a competitive advantage over their fellow steel operators.

For the first 6 months of this year, this association reports receipts of \$58,622. Of this amount, \$28,968 came from four of these steel companies; \$10,000 from the city council of Detroit; \$5,000 from the Wayne County—Detroit—Board of Commissioners; \$7,000 from three other Detroit companies, and \$5,650 from the authorities of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and St. Lawrence County, N. Y. This is a total contribution by "special interests" of \$54,618 of the \$58,622 reported as receipts by this association.

Why Read the Bible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today in our modern world where so many new fangled ideas keep springing up, and old fashioned ones are speedily being cast off, so many of us have overlooked, some have forgotten—yes; and there are even a few of us who have never gotten acquainted with—the best seller of all time—the Bible.

In these days of trial and tribulation, when the foreign hateful and godless ideology is raising its ugly head beclouding the hopes of man, it should certainly be a necessity that we look into the "Good Book" to find words of encouragement and wisdom.

What would be a better source to follow for learning how to live? The problems of life as outlined in the Bible are just as modern today as they were in the time of our Lord—so, in this, National Bible Week, I would like to urge each individual to devote some part of his daily life to the reading of his Bible.

I am sure the following newspaper article, which appeared in the Newark News, of Newark, N. J., on October 16, will stress to all the importance of reading the Bible:

WHY READ THE BIBLE?

Never, if by any chance it has been lost, can there be a better time to renew acquaintance with the world's greatest book than in

this, National Bible Week The mores change Daily Bible reading in the home with morning and evening prayers is less frequent than it was even half a century ago Yet the Holy Bible continues to be, year after year, the world's best seller.

National Bible Week is a nonsectarian movement, directed to all people throughout the land Protestant, Catholic, Jew, even those who in an age of science find it difficult to believe in direct revelation, can get from the Bible an inspiration they cannot afford to lose. To the Christian it offers the hope of salvation and a future life through the death of the meek and gentle Jesus, the man who more than any other has affected the course of the world To the Jew the Old Testament offers hope of God's kingdom on earth with a reign of righteousness and peace

From the Bible can be derived consolation for those stricken by bereavement, spiritual relief for the despondent an attitude of justice and good will toward men, whether it be derived from the teachings of Jesus and the disciples and apostles who carried on His work, from Moses and the prophets or from the psalmists, who have been a boon to the weary in spirit

Why should we get out our Bibles and read them? Because, among other reasons, had it not been for this great work of many men, there would be no civilization as we know it, with a code of morals based upon its fundamental precepts Let us not forget that it was devout believers in this book who settled the Western Hemisphere

So much else to read? Yes, there is no doubt From a selfish standpoint, even, the would-be cultivated man or woman cannot achieve his or her aim without understanding of the Biblical references with which the literature of all western nations abounds

For those who seek an interesting approach, Genesis and Exodus, the easy reading of two evenings contain, from the account of the 6-day creation to the return of the Jews from slavery in Egypt to the Promised Land, the greatest adventure story ever told Read that Bible, it will do something to you, and that something's good.

The British are far from blameless for the situation that has developed, just as they were for their loss of control of their oil industry in Iran. They were too late in recognizing the danger that was developing and in taking steps to avoid a crisis.

The plan for international defense of the Suez Canal, which has been proposed by the United States, Britain, France, and Turkey, and promptly rejected by Egypt, would have been a fair and effective solution of the problem Under that plan British armed troops would be withdrawn from the area and replaced by an international force, including Egyptian as well as British troops Thus Egypt would participate with the other countries in the defense of the canal

If this proposal had been made a year ago it might have been acceptable to Egypt But what happened in Iran changed Egypt's attitude Seeing how little Iran ran the British out and took over their oil interests, the Egyptians were emboldened to believe the time was ripe for them to run the British out of their country and take over control of the canal property

Even though the canal was cut through Egyptian soil when it was constructed nearly 100 years ago, it never has been owned by the Government or nationals of Egypt. It was constructed by a French corporation. It still is owned by a corporation in which British and French are the major stockholders The British Government and English capitalists hold about 40 percent of the stock

In the present period of Soviet aggression and ambitions for conquest, it would be dangerous to the west for the defense of the canal to be left exclusively in the hands of Egypt

In effect it might be about as dangerous to the western anti-Communist world as it would be to the United States for the defense of the Panama Canal to be left in the hands of the Republic of Panama exclusively, when an aggressor nation like Russia was anxious to gain control of the strategic lifeline between the Atlantic and Pacific

Yes, the United States, as well as Britain, France, and the other western powers, has a vital stake in the Suez Canal controversy.

The Evening Star article follows:

PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS—POKING LOOP-HOLES IN IMMIGRATION LAW

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Private bills to bring aliens into this country or to keep them here put such a burden on the public lives of some Congressmen that they believe the immigration laws may be inept as well as incomplete

Yet, in the opinion of Representative DOLLIVER, Republican, of Iowa, overhauling of the general statutes would be time-consuming and almost endlessly argumentative. It might do serious injustices to worthy individuals seeking immediate entry or safety in the United States, he explained

Since Congress convened last January it has received about 1,500 such bills. Before it adjourns this fall it probably will have passed fewer than 200

Unlike most of the thousands of other measures annually introduced in House and Senate, each one of these private immigration bills involves in a very particular way a specific human being, Mr. DOLLIVER noted

Each requires a particular kind of study and handling, especially by a group of House Democratic and Republican objectors, of which Mr. DOLLIVER is one. The complicated process extends also to several administrative agencies of the Government. It has been greatly aggravated by world conditions since the war

Private bills in this category propose, in effect, that Congress halt or delay operation of some provision of the immigration laws. They have been described as personal favors for individual aliens

Actually, they are tied in with many other factors, domestic and foreign as well as personal. Few are exactly alike in their application. Some present the toughest kind of tangles for Congress and immigration officials to unravel

For one reason or another, an apparently deserving alien cannot come to the United States under ordinary quota restrictions or comply fully with the letter of other regulations. Perhaps he faces possible deportation through no direct fault of his own. And so a Member of Congress, on his own initiative or at the request of constituents or organizations, sponsors a bill "for the relief of" the alien.

Congressional authorities concede that the practice has been seriously abused at times and that the system still has flaws and dangers. They report progress in correcting shortcomings, setting up stronger safeguards, and providing stricter supervision

"The job of being one of the six designated objectors to private bills in the House certainly doesn't help to make friends," Mr. DOLLIVER commented.

It also doesn't give the objectors much time to themselves. The daily grist of private bills, having been screened in various other official quarters, is parceled out among the objectors for additional study and checking

The first and third Tuesdays of each month are private calendar days in the House. Many private bills are called up but comparatively few are chosen for passage. By the time the immigration bills get as far as the Private Calendar the objectors find they have relatively little objecting to do.

Much of the work is done ahead of time, occasionally a year or more ahead. At least 600 of the private immigration bills dropped into the House hopper this year were presented in the Eighty-first Congress and got nowhere.

That does not mean the repeaters are necessarily undesirable or doomed. Some require more investigation or information than could be given last year

Nevertheless the introduction of a private bill, under certain circumstances can stop

Whole Western Free World Has Big Stake in Suez Canal Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following able and timely editorial carried in the Charlotte Observer on Thursday, October 18, 1951:

WHOLE WESTERN FREE WORLD HAS BIG STAKE IN SUEZ CANAL CONTROVERSY

Regardless of who is right or who is to blame for the Anglo-Egyptian controversy over the Suez Canal, the United States and the whole anti-Communist world have a large and vital stake in the outcome. That life line between the Atlantic and southern Asia is of major importance in the struggle of the west against Russian aggression.

Russia knows that, and, therefore, would give much to gain control of that vital gateway between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. And that might be what would happen if its protection and control were left exclusively in the hands of the Egyptians, as they demand.

Private Immigration Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Evening Star on Monday, October 15, 1951. Regarding this article, it is certainly comforting for the hard-working members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization to know that the man who checks on our work, Mr. DOLLIVER, one of the official objectors, approves of our judgment and sense of fairness

I wish to assure the House that after H. R. 5678, revising and codifying our immigration and nationality laws, is enacted there will be fewer private bills taking up the time of the Congress. Many inequities and shortcomings of our present immigration system are being corrected in this new bill, and I therefore sincerely trust that very early in the next session the House will favorably consider this important legislation.

or delay the administrative processing of an individual alien's case until Congress acts one way or another. That, according to some Members of Congress, may account for re-introduction of some bills, particularly to enable aliens to remain here as long as possible.

Any prolonged abuse of that kind is unlikely, according to House Judiciary Committee experts who examine private bills. If the immigration bureau has sufficient grounds for believing delay would be dangerous to the security of this country or otherwise be undesirable, the bureau notifies the committee and prompt action probably can be taken.

The large majority of private immigration bills, however, present different types of problems because of their volume and individual questions.

They are so numerous that the House Judiciary Committee's immigration subcommittee meets almost daily. Mr. DOLLIVER, a member of that subcommittee, said this involves not only study but hearings before any bills are reported to the full committee on the private calendar.

"It also brings up some of the most difficult human problems," he added. "One case may concern the efforts of American parents to bring into this country a baby they adopted in Europe. The next one might be the plea of a young alien woman trying to avoid being sent back to a country where she has been declared stateless."

"I don't suppose that any single new section of the law could be written to cover all the situations in the private bills we get. Of course, as in the case of American naturalized citizens who were blocked from return to this country because they voted in the Italian elections, a special blanket bill proved practical."

"It might seem there is something inept about the immigration laws if this is the only way we can handle cases of this kind."

Mr. DOLLIVER, a nephew of former Senator Dolliver of Iowa, and a House Member since 1945, glanced toward the latest batch of private bills on his desk.

"Maybe this is the only way to handle such individual problems," he said. "Anyway here they are in front of us from all over the world. Almost every one of them might effect a human destiny, and some of them perhaps could touch the destiny of our country."

A Record of Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the September 4 issue of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, discusses at length the fine speech which our distinguished colleague, Hon. Louis B. HELLER, delivered in the House last June, recounting the sordid history of Russia's violations of its agreements with the United States.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial:

A RECORD OF INFAMY

If the record is any guide, United States and Allied nations' diplomats who gather at San Francisco to negotiate the Japanese Peace Treaty will find themselves confronted by a campaign of insincerity, deceit, and cynicism unparalleled in modern history.

Already the Russians have indicated that they expect to sabotage the proceedings if at all possible, but upon sober reflection, the civilized world must be reconciled to the harsh fact that even if Russia should ratify the treaty as proposed, they would reserve the privilege to repudiate their sacred obligations.

Strong and compelling evidence to this effect comes in a speech by Representative Louis B. HELLER, of New York (Brooklyn), before the House early in June of this year, a speech entitled "Russia's Violations of Its Agreements With the United States." Here, in adequately documented manner, Representative HELLER charged and proved that:

1 Although all other countries beneficiaries of lend-lease during World War II have made some settlement or agreement to settle for lend-lease materials, the Government of Russia has refused to agree on any settlement on aid totaling more than \$21,000,000,000. Moreover, the Russians have refused to consider the return of 670 vessels provided under lend-lease, the reason given being the United States does not need them.

2 At the Tehran Conference Russia agreed with other nations to guarantee the maintenance of the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Iran. Stalin agreed to withdraw all Soviet forces from Iranian territory not later than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. Instead of withdrawing Red forces, Russia then proceeded to use armed power to set up a puppet government to oppose the National Government in Tehran. The Russians withdrew only after United Nations protests.

3 In direct violation of terms of the Yalta agreement, Russia blocked the formation of a democratic government in Poland. Elsewhere in Central Europe the Russians violated the agreement by nefarious activities in Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

4 Under the Potsdam agreement, the Russians undertook to join with other allies in considering Germany as a single economic unit. Then the Russians set up their blockade to hinder the flow of goods between east and west, while the United States and other allies kept their part of the bargain. This Russian move eventually took the form of a blunt and undisguised attempt to freeze the United States and other allies out of Berlin, in shameless violation of the agreement.

There are other instances, but these are the most shocking. Throughout this long succession of postwar violation of treaties and agreements, the Soviet Union has made it clear that they take the coldly realistic, Machiavellian attitude in diplomacy, that agreements are made and maintained for the sheer convenience of one party, and the moment it becomes inconvenient to abide by them, they are bypassed, discarded, violated, and repudiated in fact.

Representative HELLER performed a service to his country and to diplomats at the San Francisco peace meeting by listing and documenting these and other examples of Russia's cynical attitude toward honor and decency. The speech has been made available in pamphlet form, so that all delegates may have ready access to this record of infamy.

Fantastic Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the October 16,

1951, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune, on the subject of fantastic weapons, discusses a subject that is of paramount importance to the American people.

The editorial follows:

FANTASTIC WEAPONS

* Two men who know considerable about America's armed strength gave warnings Monday against overconfidence in the "fantastic weapons" mentioned by President Truman, and the Air Force some time ago.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, a member of the House Armed Services Committee and of the House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee, and Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett Monday struck warning notes on the "fantastic weapons" idea.

The President recently spoke of the strange and deadly new devices this country is developing. He gave no indication as to whether they were ready for action, in production, or drawing-board models.

Shortly thereafter, the Air Force made its announcement of Matador, the guided missile, a bomb with wings, which can attain great speeds, and be delivered without a pilot to its target.

Immediately, demands were made that this country draw up a new defense program, based upon these "fantastic weapons." It was said that we could save money on national defense by building these "concentrated horrors," the idea being that a few of them would be the equal of vast numbers of the conventional type of high explosive and normal weapons.

But, Congressman VAN ZANDT told the House Monday that the United States does not have atomic tactical weapons or guided missiles now ready for use.

"Recently," he said, "there has been in high places much irresponsible talk about fantastic weapons, when the fact is that most of them are either on the drawing board or in experimental stages."

Secretary Lovett told the Legion national convention in Miami that the United States does not yet have a stockpile of atomic super-weapons which can bring a cheap victory in war.

He said there is grave danger the American people are pinning their hopes for security on new weapons which haven't even been proved to be reliable.

It is worth our remembering, then, that wars still are fought by the GI toting a rifle, and the pilot flying the fighter and the bomber.

Repeal of Obsolete Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Evening Star of October 11, 1951, regarding the repeal of archaic laws. Mr. Julius Silverstein, a member of the faculty of National University School of Law, supervised the study of the Government's property laws to determine what laws should be repealed and cooperated wholeheartedly with the Congress in obtaining legislative action.

The news item follows:

**ARCHAIC, CONFLICTING UNITED STATES LAWS
UP FOR WHOLESALE REPEAL**

The United States Commissioner of Education no longer may be charged by law with selling male reindeer and buying female reindeer to be distributed to the natives in Alaska.

And there will be no excuse in the future for applying to the Secretary of Agriculture for "one American bison."

Obsolete laws relating to Federal property are in process of being repealed, and when Congress repeals laws instead of enacting more of them—that's news.

The reindeer herds, which the Commissioner of Education used to have in his jurisdiction, now are under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The buffalo—about 4,000 of them—are the property of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the zoo wanting one of the animals applies there.

Earlier this month the Senate, after study by its Expenditures Committee, passed an act repealing 174 sections of laws and amending 63, all relating to Federal property. A similar bill is before the House.

STABLES GOING LEGALLY

Another section of the laws which would be repealed in one charging the Army quartermaster general with the duty of maintaining stables in the District for the President's horses and carriages. President Wilson was the last President to have a horse-drawn carriage.

The legislation now before Congress is the result of much work, by a staff of attorneys headed by Julius Silverstein, member of faculty, National University School of Law, chief counsel of the legislation and regulations division of the General Services Administration.

The last real revision of the Nation's statutes occurred in 1873. Meanwhile there has been a codification of the laws, but this chiefly calls attention to conflicts in them. The present legislation, therefore, is regarded by lawyers as a milestone in clearing the statute books of deadwood.

The work which Mr. Silverstein headed was directed to be done by Congress when it passed the Federal Property Act of 1949. That act set up GSA and made it responsible for the procurement and administration of Government supplies and the disposal of Government surplus.

The staff of attorneys examined more than 25,000 sections of laws, paying particular attention to more than 3,500 relating to the purchase and disposal of Government property to weed out those which have been superseded by the 1949 act or which are obsolete.

1798 ACT FACES REPEAL

The earliest act facing repeal goes back to 1798. It provided that all purchases for the Army or Navy shall be under the direction of the chief officers of those services.

Mr. Silverstein explained that at the start the Government had central purchasing, carried out by the Treasury. The Army and Navy in 1798 were able to break away, followed by other agencies. Central purchasing was not reestablished, at least to some extent, until 1933, when it was again placed in the Treasury.

The act of 1949 placed all purchasing in GSA. But to take care of the special needs of the military, the Defense Department, GSA and the Budget Bureau have agreed on areas where the military may operate on their own.

The Senate also has approved a measure repealing sections of laws dealing with Federal records. Records management is another duty assigned to GSA and carried out chiefly through the National Archives.

One of the sections to be repealed is an act of 1892 directing that the records of the

Revolution and the War of 1812 be transferred to the War Department from the Treasury. Since then Congress has directed that the records be placed in the National Archives.

The Training of Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an exchange of letters between the commanding officer, the chaplain, and the parents of a boy in the service. These letters portray a fine sense of duty, devotion, and patriotism. They stand in sharp contrast to much of the activities and attitudes of contemporary life. It is my hope that other commanding officers are following the fine example of Maj. Gen. R. C. L. Graham and corresponding with the parents of the boys that serve with and under them. They will find that America contains many people like the Parkers that are happy to do all that is rightfully expected of them if they are treated as fellow human beings and citizens.

The letters follow:

HEADQUARTERS, FORT LEE, VA.

DEAR "MOTHER" OF A SOLDIER: You may be the mother, aunt, or sister of the soldier I am writing about, or perhaps this letter should be more properly addressed to you as his father, uncle, or brother. But as far as he and I are concerned you are the one at home who thinks of him most often and wonders most frequently what he is doing here at Fort Lee.

He was sent to the Quartermaster Replacement Training Center to learn to be a soldier. First he will receive basic training where he will learn to drill along with the other skills that all soldiers must know whatever their military assignment might be. After completion of basic training he will be classified by expert personnel specialists to determine what his aptitudes are and how he might best serve the Army. Prior to his selection for any specific school training, close attention will be paid to his previous record both as a soldier and a civilian and he will be interviewed to determine his interest in any of the fields mentioned below. If possible, he will be assigned to the course which he requests. We teach many trade specialties, including shoe repair, tailoring, canvas and leather repair, operation and repair of field laundries and bakeries, supply handler, supply records specialist, bath processor, subsistence clerk, and utility repairman. Upon completion of his training here, he will be available to a unit for further on-the-job training in the specialty for which he has been schooled at Fort Lee.

The course of training he receives will be given by select instructors well versed in their subjects. It incorporates the most up-to-date doctrine and methods obtainable and I feel that he will be better qualified to successfully face the future, whether it be in civil or military life, as a result of this training.

Life at Fort Lee will not be all work and no play. We have planned an extensive recreational program as well. Our theaters have the latest movies, and plays by both soldiers and civilians are shown frequently. The service clubs at Fort Lee are some of the

model clubs in the country. There soldiers can attend dances, read a book, or engage in any of the dozens of activities we have planned for them. Also, the Fort Lee Hobby Shop offers opportunity for those interested in woodworking, leathercraft, photography, ceramics, and many other fields.

Nor have we forgotten the physical and spiritual well-being of our soldiers. The food they eat is the finest the Army can buy, its preparation is supervised by expert dietitians. They receive the finest medical care, Army doctors and dentists will keep them in tip-top physical condition. To fulfill the soldier's religious needs, Fort Lee has fine chapels; our chaplains are carefully selected from all leading denominations.

Soldiers have the opportunity of living with other young men of their generation, from all walks of life and from every corner of the United States. They will get to know young men from Texas, Oregon, New York, Alabama, young men, who after their Army service is over, will become businessmen, political leaders, and husbands and fathers of America. By working with these young men, by sharing with them the experiences of military service, they will come to know their fellow Americans better—and by so doing learn to know America better. I feel that this is most important, and I know that you as a patriotic American, will think so, too.

Some reasonable restrictions will be placed on your boy's movements. Except for emergencies, he will not be granted a leave during his training period. Upon completion of 6 weeks training, however, he may be granted a pass. These passes are issued for Saturday evenings, Sunday, holidays, and evenings preceding holidays. He must get up and go to bed at regular and early hours. You can help him by letting him know frequently that his family and friends are thinking of him. When you write be sure to include his rank, full name, Army serial number, company and battalion in the address as listed below.

I know that the letters written you from Fort Lee by your boy will keep you informed about his life here at the Quartermaster Replacement Training Center better than any words of mine. We hope that when he returns to you, you will find that his Army training has made him physically fit, mentally alert, and imbued with those democratic principles upon which the whole structure of our American life is based.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. L. GRAHAM,
Major General, United
States Army, Commanding.

PARKER CHEVROLET,

Pittsburgh, Pa., September 20, 1951.
Maj. Gen. R. C. GRAHAM,
United States Army, Commanding Of-
ficer, Quartermaster Reserve Train-
ing Center, Fort Lee, Va.

DEAR SIR: Today I received a letter signed by you in regard to the treatment and care given to the soldiers under your command at Fort Lee. I have read and reread the letter several times. In fact, I have passed it along to some of my department heads for them to read. This letter is so all-inclusive as to just what we, as parents, can look forward to in the training of our sons to be good soldiers in the Army of the United States.

Your letter also points out to me as a businessman that you and your group in command in the Army have realized the same thing we are realizing on the economic front—that is, the price of freedom is service—service to our fellow men, regardless of race, color, or creed.

My son has written several letters during his short term in the Army. His letters are a pride and show the highest esteem and regard for his commanding officers, his sergeant, and his lieutenant. His call on the

phone, which we requested he do, and his enthusiasm for the training he is getting really surprised me until I got your letter today. Now, I can better understand why his enthusiasm is so great. As he said on the phone to me, "Dad, I'm going to do my best to be a credit to the outfit to which I belong."

We here on the home front can be thankful we have officers of your caliber and I sincerely hope this attitude and understanding is borne throughout all branches of the service. As you well know, those young men are those on whom we must depend to carry on the future of our country and to fulfill properly the leadership of the world, with the care and understanding that is necessary to have our main goal fulfilled—that of peace on earth—good will to all men.

It is letters such as yours and the understanding behind it that will do much to make this aim of all time come true in the not too distant future.

Thanking you for your fine letter of understanding, I remain,

Very truly yours,

S. H. PARKER.

THE QUARTERMASTER REPLACEMENT
TRAINING CENTER,
Fort Lee, Va.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. PARKER: I had the pleasure of meeting Private Samuel Parker at the Replacement Training Center Chapel at Fort Lee, Va., and personally welcomed him to this post.

Your letters to him will be of great importance while he is away from home. I encouraged him to write home often, attend church regularly and to take an active part in all recreational and athletic activities of his unit. He will have ample opportunity to further his education.

Our whole program can be summed up in one phrase: "The Army builds men." I am sure I was speaking for both of us when I said to him "Work hard, play hard, live clean and your record will be the measure of a man."

Every officer on this post stands ready at all times to serve you both. We trust that you will remember us in your prayers as we daily remember you.

Sincerely,

ORAN E. A. BOLLINGER,
Chaplain (Captain), USAR.

When Economy Is Not Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the October 1951 issue of the National Municipal Review, which is a publication of the National Municipal League:

WHEN ECONOMY IS NOT ECONOMY

A year ago the National Municipal Review reported the good news that Congress had passed, and the President approved, a new law providing for a "census of governments" in 1952 and each fifth year thereafter. The enactment presumably provided an improved statutory basis for periodic reporting of basic statistics on State and local governments—a

vital information service regularly provided by the Federal Government since 1850.

In accordance with this law the Federal Budget this year included a proposal for funds to conduct such a census. To help prepare for this job the Census Bureau enlisted the advice of such recognized authorities as William Anderson, Frank Baue, Frederick L. Bird, Carl H. Chatters, Rowland Egger, Luther Gullick, Simeon E. Leland, and Clarence E. Ridley. Associations of governments and public officials such as the Municipal Finance Officers Association, the National Association of Tax Administrators, and the National Association of County Officials pledged their cooperation.

It now develops, however, that no funds have been provided to carry out this important task, which Congress explicitly authorized a year ago without a dissenting vote and on which much important preliminary work had been invested. The only reason given is in the comment by the House Appropriations Committee:

"In view of present world conditions and the amount of expenditures necessary for defense purposes, the committee is of the opinion that there are many more urgent undertakings at this time and has therefore denied the budget estimate of \$2,250,000 for this purpose."

By rather similar reasoning, a business firm, hard put to keep up with current orders, might decide to save money by dispensing with its periodic inventory or with its auditing of accounts. Or, on such reasoning, Congress might eliminate the Budget Bureau or the General Accounting Office to free employees for work in Federal defense agencies.

The unfortunate fact is that less basic statistical information is available about State and local governments than about any comparable segment of our economy. These governments provide a wide variety of vital services; their cost approaches one-tenth of the national income; they employ about 1 out of each 15 persons gainfully occupied; they receive over \$2,000,000,000 a year from the Federal Government. Yet the Government, now and in recent years, has issued far more statistical information about literally scores of fields of industrial, commercial and agricultural activity than it has regarding State and local governments.

The most recent census of governments was for 1942. Limited figures available indicate that State and local governments have more than doubled their expenditures and have increased their indebtedness to an all-time high since then. But, unbelievable as it may seem, there is no official source of information for any of the past 8 years as to the nation-wide total of spending by local governments, nor as to comparative totals of State and local revenue, expenditure and debt. To find such totals for local governments by county, one must go back 20 years to the census of governments for 1932.

As State and local officials and civic groups know only too well, the present period of chronic crisis and national preparedness greatly increases the problems and difficulties that confront State and local governments. Up-to-date information as to their status will surely not solve these problems. But the information that could be provided by a new census of governments should permit savings, through better public policies and administration at all levels, far exceeding the project's cost.

Our system is necessarily a complicated one. Complexity frustrates the citizen with the result that ultimate control slips farther and farther from his hands. For this reason, a continuous flow of accurate up-to-date information about all our governments and their activities is the very breath of life to our democracy. With each passing year, the

need for affirmative action by government to supply relevant information about itself becomes greater. The heavier the load imposed upon government, as in the present emergency, the greater the need.

Elimination of the appropriation for the census of governments is not a measure of economy but rather one of improvident extravagance. Neither is it a measure to reduce the Federal establishment. Rather it will tend to expand it, because the less information there is available to citizens about State and local governments, the more they will be drawn as by gravity to dependence upon the central government. Any believer in real economy or in keeping as much as possible of the business of government at the State and local levels should insist upon adequate appropriation for the census of governments.

The Federal Government Should Not Sue States Without Their Consent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, I introduced a bill, H. R. 5773, which prevents a suit by the Federal Government against a State without its consent or specific authorization by Congress. This bill writes into our statutes what many lawyers considered to be the law before the so-called tidelands cases resulted in a ruling by the Supreme Court which allowed the States to be sued by the Federal Government without their consent.

A State cannot sue the Federal Government without its consent and since under our constitutional system the States are sovereign entities retaining all powers not delegated to the Federal Government, it appears to be contrary to legal logic to hold the Federal Government immune from suits brought by sovereign States while permitting the Federal Government to sue States without their consent.

The need for this bill appears to be increasing. The tidelands decisions deprived the States of property, the ownership of which was never questioned throughout our history until the recent agitation for greater Federal power resulted in the filing of the tidelands suits by the Federal Government against the States. Such suits asserting new and novel Federal rights are a threat to every State in the Union. They are brought in Federal courts and these courts are drifting toward an ever closer relationship and association with the executive branch of our Government. Supreme Court Justices are too often selected because of political activity favorable to the executive branch if not on the basis of activity actually within that branch of our Government.

This close association of the courts particularly with the Department of Justice, which Department has great influence upon appointment and promotion of judges, presents a real threat to

our constitutional system. The States are at a real disadvantage when sued by the Federal Government in Federal courts. Suits that are justified can, pursuant to my bill, be filed with consent of the States or of the Congress. If the bill is enacted, future contracts between the Federal Government and the States can provide for a waiver of immunity where disputes involving the contracts arise, but of course no coastal State would consent to a suit calculated to deprive it of its historic ownership of submerged coastal lands or the products thereof.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including at this point in the Record five tables prepared for me by the

U. S. Government foreign aid, postwar period

SUMMARY

	Fiscal year 1952 estimate ¹			1945-51 aid provided ^{1 2}					Total 1945-52 ¹			Population	Aid per capita
	Military	Economic	Total	Military	Economic			Total 1945-51	Military	Economic	Total 1945-52		
					Grants	Loans (gross)	Total						
Europe.....	5,212,943	977,000	6,189,943	934,653	13,841,118	8,416,185	22,257,303	23,191,956	6,147,606	23,234,303	29,381,809	254,500,000	\$115.00
Near East and Africa.....	255,783	205,000	460,783	090	214,156	274,390	488,546	488,179	256,443	692,516	948,959	92,550,000	10.25
Asia and Pacific.....	535,250	282,150	817,400	190,502	2,738,110	195,803	3,253,919	3,430,480	741,812	3,536,075	4,207,887	652,000,000	6.55
Latin America.....	38,150	21,245	59,395	---	139,375	488,079	627,454	674,454	38,150	598,690	636,840	138,200,000	4.61
Total.....	6,042,126	1,485,401	7,527,527	1,131,875	16,932,765	9,623,127	26,556,192	27,708,067	7,174,001	28,001,593	35,235,594	1,137,250,000	30.98

¹ Aid provided figures do not include undetermined amount of assistance in pipeline. During this period in excess of \$1,050 million principal was collected on loans and \$874,000,000 was received as reverse grants and returns on grants.

² In thousands of dollars.

U. S. Government foreign aid, postwar period

EUROPE (TITLE I)

	Fiscal Year estimate ²	1945-51 ^{1 2}			Total 1945-52 ¹	Population	Aid per capita
		Grants	Loans (gross)	Total			
Austria.....	\$101,000	\$811,540	\$21,801	\$833,341	\$937,143	7,100,000	\$132
Belgium-Luxembourg.....	---	544,946	213,623	758,569	758,569	8,600,000	85
Denmark.....	30,000	200,001	52,041	252,042	282,135	4,200,000	66
France.....	160,000	2,308,632	2,111,627	4,420,259	4,498,257	42,700,000	105
Germany (Federal Republic).....	100,000	3,332,832	110,543	3,443,375	3,543,365	47,740,000	74
Greece.....	170,000	1,308,280	111,925	1,420,205	1,490,205	7,970,000	187
Ireland.....	6,000	13,280	3,524	16,804	22,803	143,000	159
Italy.....	160,000	1,907,012	413,459	2,320,471	2,480,471	46,400,000	53
Netherlands.....	10,000	677,750	437,414	1,115,164	1,220,194	19,150,000	63
Norway.....	20,000	150,349	115,289	265,638	294,638	3,280,000	90
Portugal.....	---	8,272	25,058	33,330	34,330	8,670,000	4
United Kingdom.....	---	2,117,071	4,727,836	6,844,907	6,844,907	50,800,000	135
Yugoslavia.....	40,000	328,221	48,965	377,186	417,186	16,300,000	26
Total country distribution.....	892,000	13,515,418	8,416,185	21,931,503	22,823,503	254,500,000	90
Undistributed.....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economic.....	85,600	325,800	---	325,800	410,600	---	---
Military.....	5,212,943	934,653	---	934,653	6,147,596	---	---
Total assistance.....	6,189,943	14,775,771	8,416,185	23,191,956	29,381,899	254,500,000	115

¹ Represents "aid provided" and does not include undetermined amount of assistance in pipeline. During this period \$635 million principal was collected on loans and \$821 million was received as reverse grants and returns on grants.

² In thousands of dollars.

NEAR EAST AND AFRICA (TITLE II)

	Fiscal year 1952 estimates ²	1945-51 ^{1 2}			Total 1945-52 ¹	Population	Aid per capita
		Grants	Loans (gross)	Total			
Egypt.....	\$634	\$340	\$17,934	\$18,284	\$18,918	20,000,000	\$0.95
Ethiopia.....	700	239	3,340	3,588	4,288	12,500,000	.34
Iran.....	23,450	(7,397)	33,125	25,728	40,178	17,000,000	2.89
Iraq.....	1,762	---	889	889	2,654	6,000,000	.55
Israel.....	14,050	43,486	68,066	111,552	121,502	1,400,000	90.86
Jordan.....	4,680	---	---	---	4,680	1,300,000	3.60
Lebanon.....	2,350	14	1,550	1,564	3,914	1,250,000	3.13
Liberia.....	1,100	430	19,264	19,693	20,793	1,000,000	20.79
Libya.....	1,100	1	---	1	1,101	1,000,000	1.10
Saudi Arabia.....	600	1,647	17,644	19,291	19,681	5,000,000	4.00
Syria.....	4,390	45	---	45	4,435	3,200,000	1.39
Turkey.....	45,000	175,339	111,530	286,878	331,878	20,000,000	16.88
Yemen.....	450	---	---	---	450	3,000,000	.15
Subtotal.....	101,266	214,156	273,360	487,516	588,772	92,550,000	6.36
Undistributed:							
Economic.....	103,744	---	---	---	103,744	---	---
Military.....	255,783	660	---	660	256,443	---	---
Total.....	460,783	214,816	273,360	488,176	948,959	92,550,000	10.25

¹ Represents "aid provided" and does not include undetermined amount of assistance in pipeline. During this period \$46,000,000 principal was collected on loans and \$8,000,000 was received as reverse grants and returns on grants.

² In thousands of dollars.

ASIA AND PACIFIC (TITLE III)

	Fiscal year 1952 estimates ¹	1945-51 ^{1 2}			Total, 1945-52 ²	Population	Aid per capita
		Grants	Loans	Total			
Afghanistan.....	\$150	\$35	\$7,400	\$7,435	\$7,585	12,000,000	\$0.63
Burma.....	14,000	397	5,043	5,440	10,440	19,000,000	1.02
Ceylon.....	240	22	22	22	262	8,000,000	.03
Formosa.....	81,000	1,573,523	229,378	1,802,901	1,883,901	9,000,000	209.32
India.....	54,565	5,093	44,555	49,648	104,213	361,000,000	.29
Indochina.....	24,693	3,632	3,632	28,325	28,000,000	28,000,000	1.01
Indonesia.....	8,000	88,817	63,749	152,566	160,566	74,000,000	2.17
Korea.....	45,000	420,359	24,928	445,287	445,287	20,000,000	21.51
Nepal.....	60	3	3	3	63	7,000,000	.01
Pakistan.....	10,778	29	136	165	10,943	75,000,000	.15
Philippines.....	32,000	663,595	114,399	777,994	809,994	20,000,000	40.50
Thailand.....	7,000	961	6,215	7,176	14,176	19,000,000	.75
Subtotal.....	277,486	2,756,466	495,803	3,252,269	3,529,735	652,000,000	5.41
Undistributed:							
Economic.....	4,670	1,650		1,650	6,320		
Military.....	535,250	196,562		196,562	731,812		
Total.....	817,406	2,954,678	495,803	3,450,481	4,267,887	652,000,000	6.55

¹ Represents "aid provided" and does not include undetermined amount of assistance in pipeline. During this period \$144,000,00 principal was collected on loans, and \$45,000,000 was received on reverse grants and return on grants.

² In thousands of dollars.

³ South Korea

LATIN AMERICA (TITLE IV)

	Fiscal year 1952 estimate ¹	1945-51 aid provided ^{1 2}			Total, 1945-52 ²	Population	Aid per capita
		Grants	Loans (gross)	Total			
Bolivia.....	\$1,504	\$2,752	\$26,181	\$28,933	\$30,437	4,000,000	\$7.61
Brazil.....	2,298	10,084	60,059	110,040	112,438	52,400,000	2.14
Chile.....	920	4,707	105,496	110,203	111,132	5,800,000	19.16
Colombia.....	655	1,943	35,371	37,314	37,060	11,300,000	3.36
Costa Rica.....	986	2,378	85	2,463	3,449	800,000	4.31
Cuba.....	265	486	10,490	10,976	11,271	5,300,000	2.13
Dominican Republic.....	264	583		847	2,100,000	2,100,000	.40
Ecuador.....	1,198	3,031	11,575	14,606	15,804	3,100,000	5.10
El Salvador.....	520	1,318	576	1,891	2,414	1,000,000	1.27
Guatemala.....	273	4,212		4,212	4,485	2,800,000	1.60
Haiti.....	797	3,188	511	3,699	4,496	3,100,000	1.45
Honduras.....	782	824	223	1,046	1,828	1,500,000	1.19
Mexico.....	1,052	91,168	120,939	212,108	213,160	25,400,000	8.59
Nicaragua.....	847	523	733	1,370	1,500	1,100,000	1.25
Panama.....	609	617	2,500	3,117	3,786	800,000	4.73
Paraguay.....	995	2,578	795	3,373	4,368	1,400,000	3.12
Peru.....	1,523	4,920	5,947	10,867	12,390	8,100,000	1.48
Uruguay.....	455	917	8,048	9,045	10,320	2,100,000	4.30
Venezuela.....	278	1,532	4,379	5,911	6,189	4,600,000	1.35
Total country distribution.....	16,320	137,771	433,972	571,743	588,063	138,200,000	4.26
Undistributed:							
Economic.....	4,925	1,604	4,107	5,711	10,636		
Military.....	38,150				38,150		
Total assistance.....	59,395	139,375	438,079	577,454	636,849	138,200,000	4.61

¹ Represents "aid provided" and does not include undetermined amount of assistance in pipeline. During this period \$226,000,000 principal was collected on loans and \$363,000 was received on reverse grants and returns on grants.

² In thousands of dollars.

Doorway to Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD 12 newspaper articles on drug addiction written by Edward J. Mowery, of the New York World-Telegram and Sun.

The articles follow:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of June 18, 1951]

THE TEEN-AGE DRUG PERIL—CHILD DOPE SLAVES BEG CARE, NOT JAIL—OUR CITY, TWENTIETH CENTURY MARVEL OF SCIENCE, IS FAILING ADDICTS; HANDS OF AUTHORITIES ARE TIED

(Narcotics addiction used to be associated almost exclusively with shadowy figures who

existed more in fiction than in real life. Today it is a grim problem confronting more people than the authorities can count accurately, and a startling percentage of them are teenagers. This article is the fifth of a series telling the scope of the scourge, the chances of your own child becoming an addict, and what you yourself can do to fight the menace.)

(By Edward J. Mowery)

A weary squad attached to the police narcotics bureau filed into headquarters annex, slumped into chairs, and grinned at Detective Sgt. John Cottone.

"Yep, pretty good bag," one sleuth observed. Sergeant Cottone, wily nemesis of underworld scum, nodded.

"But what are we going to do with these kids?" he asked. "Most of 'em aren't criminals. They're sick. Desperately sick. What are we supposed to do with the kid addict who pushes a couple of caps of 'H' (heroin)?"

"That's our most baffling problem. We take this child into special sessions. The court is empowered to do only one thing—send him to a penal institution (Rikers Island Penitentiary.) You know what that means. It's cold turkey withdrawal.

"The Lexington Hospital in Kentucky? That's run by the Federal Government. Should we fill our jails with these unfortunates?"

"The bona fide peddler is another matter entirely. We're flushing these bums out by the hundreds. The department has easily made 2,000 arrests since January 1. The kids—that's our headache."

OFFICIALS HELPLESS

Down Centre Street, in the magnificent Criminal Courts Building, we asked Dorris Clarke, the magistrates courts chief probation officer, for her opinion of this vicious cycle.

"The Federal, State, and city governments," she stated, "have closed their eyes to the teen-addict problem for a year. It's a crying shame that in the face of vastly increased addiction and an avalanche of publicity on this evil that not a single facility is yet available to treat these kids.

"The court or public official faced it—a detected young dope addict is utterly helpless. There is no adequate solution. We're flooding correctional institutions such as Elmira and the New York City Reformatories.

"We've sent 50 girls to Westfield State Farm during the last several months. Of

course, all these people have both addiction and delinquency histories. But what happens when they get into these institutions? There's no adequate facility for treating and rehabilitating them, even if they've undergone cold-turkey withdrawal.

"It's fantastic. Hundreds of adolescents need the right medical care now. There's no answer to the problem."

A BITTER JUDGE

Society's callous disregard for human life received another jolt in the chambers of Special Sessions Justice Matthew Troy.

"Of course, we're frustrated," he said bitterly. "The city of New York, the State, the Federal Government must bear the onus for this tragedy. This city is swimming in illicit narcotics."

"Many of the kids who came into this court are now pleading for us to discharge them so they can go into the Army. Imagine. The addict-peddler would spread the poison to our Armed Forces. It's already started, in fact. Heroin was being sold inside one Army camp."

"The Army doesn't want them. As for the Federal addict farm, the Lexington Story is a farce and has been for years. Addicts pour in and out of Lexington. Now it's being sought as a refuge for those facing the draft."

"We haven't medical facilities even to screen the peddler from the peddler-addict."

"They shudder at horse rooms, bookies, cop graft. Profits from these rackets are peanuts compared with the untold millions pouring into the international dope cartel. The human equation? Children are dying."

SPIRIT OF FUTILITY

These are the opinions of responsible, realistic public officials trying honestly to appraise society's disregard for the tragedy that is teen-age addiction. Their hands are tied.

This spirit of futility hovers like a wraith over New York fully 14 months after the World-Telegram and Sun first warned that addiction would prove a curse unless checked.

Early last fall, in a grim recital of deaths from narcotics, this newspaper again alerted public officials that medical care of addicts was of vital importance. Children—from your own neighborhoods—were in agony.

Later came the ghastly narcotism toll: 1946 deaths, 11; 1950 deaths from dope, 58. A 500-percent increase.

In March, Bronx Assistant District Attorney David Blatt shocked the faculty of Junior High School 51 with this statement:

DOPE LEADS TO CANCER

"Kids are using crude devices—home-made syringes, cotton filters, and match-box covers—to get their heroin dosage. The 'snorters' who sniff the powder aren't aware that this practice leads directly to nose cancer. Dependence on heroin is a compulsion impossible to break."

New York City, the educators learned, is acclaimed as the 20th century marvel of science. But there is no medical hospice available to child dope addicts killing themselves with deadly heroin.

The United Parents Association, in a bitter press release, said its membership of 250,000 parents would use every communication facility at its command to drive the tragic story of teen-age addiction home.

"Cases have been reported to us," the UPA spokesman declared, "where attempts to deprive children of their accustomed drugs resulted in such violent reactions they had to be sent to Bellevue's emergency ward. It's imperative that the city provide some place where these unfortunates can get medical and psychological treatment found effective to cure drug addicts."

This indignant protest was filed in January.

On April 14, a group of grief-stricken mothers of teen addicts took up a vigil at the very steps of City Hall in their mute plea for help.

A lamp was lighted there symbolizing a vigil of prayer to be kept for 48 hours, which is the average time addicts suffer the physical agonies of withdrawal in the prisons of New York.

Then the small band of parents disbanded. Their efforts were futile.

On May 25, a Bronx committee of outraged citizens scoffed at the statement by Superintendent of Schools William Jansen that only 154 young addicts could be found in the school system.

Carl Colodine, of 3165 Decatur Avenue, Bronx, spokesman for the group, said a meeting would be called to high light the city's apathy toward child dope addicts.

"We will also protest," he said, "New York's penal approach to the sickness that is drug addiction leading to such tragic deaths as that of Edwin Gonzales, 17, of 1004 Simpson Street, Bronx, a possible addict recently shot dead by police while stealing 30 cents worth of candy."

"We'll meet in repentance for our share of community responsibility in this tragedy."

Society has had ample warning of the dope scourge. An army of sick, bewildered children still await the answer.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of June 19, 1951]

UNCLE SAM PLEADS BEFORE U. N. TO STOP FLOW OF DOPE—SMUGGLED HEROIN POURS INTO COUNTRY

(By Edward J. Mowery)

Uncle Sam, whose generosity has gone out to virtually every nation in the world, stands as an abject international beggar on the dope problem at the portal of the United Nations.

Not a single ounce of opium is produced in the United States. Yet, opium-producing countries are pouring this drug's most deadly derivative, heroin, into this country.

At this moment, American taxpayers are being asked to underwrite \$7,200,000,000 in foreign aid. And in Lexington, Ky., the Government's only hospital for addicts has cut its personnel and juggles a waiting list of pain-crazed victims of foreign-grown narcotics. No money.

New York City, experiencing the worst dope scourge in history, puts child addicts with the mentally ill or with criminals. No hospital. The State, cross-hatched with hospitals and clinics, plans an emergency haven for addicts at a women's penitentiary.

MAKES PLEA TO U. N.

On May 1, Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger virtually begged Italy, Turkey, Greece, North China, and Manchuria to destroy their stocks of diverted (illicit) drugs and reduce their production to strictly medical needs. He made his eloquent plea before the U. N. Narcotics Commission at Lake Success.

He stressed that Chinese Communists in Hong Kong are trying to dump 500 tons of raw opium on the world market. He revealed that heroin, the terror drug, is pouring from underworld laboratories in Tientsin to Japan, where thousands of American troops are exposed to the danger.

The U. N. Commission reportedly agreed to exert every effort in destroying diverted drug stocks which have made addiction a world-wide crisis.

Mr. Anslinger, appearing before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, said ominously:

"Large quantities of heroin * * * smuggled from China to Japan, will be coming to the United States. This is a disturbing matter and the Chinese Communists should suppress this traffic. Through the

U. N. and other channels of international cooperation, our Government has been exerting every effort to eliminate external sources of narcotic drugs."

"Chinese tongs are becoming active again after several years of relative quiet, and we intend to take care of that situation."

Then Mr. Anslinger added this shocker:

"A number of draftees are claiming drug addiction to escape the draft. We are working with military authorities to break up this racket. The narcotics traffic is a vicious, commercial racket which lives on the slow murder of its customers. It must be dealt with more drastically and realistically."

URGES SPECIAL SQUADS

As evidence of this country's inability to halt the flow of foreign drugs which has made thousands of youths unfit for military service, the official continued:

"We've been endeavoring for many years to have police departments in the larger cities set up specialized narcotic squads. We've succeeded in several localities."

"This leaves our Bureau free to concentrate on large-scale traffickers. With our small force of less than 200 men (actually 138) to cover the entire United States ' ' ' we cannot do everything."

Was New York City—the Nation's prime reception and distribution point for drugs—one of the cities with sufficiently large narcotics squad?

"Los Angeles (a squad of 28 men) is the Nation's only city which has taken the initiative and established an adequate narcotics squad," he said.

In closed session before the Senate committee, the Federal official revealed that fully one-fourth of America's top gangsters are reaping the dope harvest.

"Of the list of 800 (top mobsters) I furnished your committee in closed session," Mr. Anslinger stated, "200 have narcotics records."

None will say how many key gangsters were among the 6,163 arrested by Federal agents last year—the highest bag in the Bureau's history.

CARE FOR ADDICTS

While Mr. Anslinger made no reference to wholesale traffic in marijuana, another Federal expert declared that the deadly hypnotic can be waded across the Rio Grande for hundreds of miles with little fear of detection by either United States or Mexican border patrols.

Customs?

Again it's a case of too little and too late. The force of agents could be tripled without making a serious dent in the international drug fiasco.

As to medical aid available to the thousands of desperately ill adolescent addicts, Mr. Anslinger commented at a later date:

"For the past 20 years, we've recommended that each State set aside wards in State hospitals to take care of addicts. California was the only State to respond. It established a separate institution to hospitalize addicts but it discontinued it some years ago."

Concerning dope's inroads on draft-eligible youths and the current trend toward phony addiction by would-be evaders, the World-Telegram and Sun learned from a former addict in Connecticut that this practice is rampant.

"Nonusers by the score," he declared, "are using this artifice to keep from serving their country. They plant a few caps of 'H' (heroin) in their pockets, get arrested and a commitment to Narco (the Lexington, Ky., addict farm)."

"Such commitments mean a year's probation. They get off a bus or train in Lexington, pay a local doctor \$5 for a shot of 'H' and present themselves at the hospital's gate. They'll pass the physical tests as addicts and they're out of the draft."

The former addict added grimly:

"However, the joke's on them. Hospitalized with bums and criminal addicts, they learn how to use the stuff in short time and come away junkies."

The joke's not on them. The shame is on America. Even Mr. Anslinger, who formerly characterized 10 addicts as "hoodlums," now excludes high school kids from this stigma.

WHAT'S THE SOLUTION?

What's the solution to the wholesale bondage of dope addiction?

Certain conclusions are obvious.

On the Federal level, Congress must cope with smuggling from Europe and Asia with every facility at its command. Federal narcotics bureau manpower should be immediately tripled (600 men) and this agency's budget (\$1,750,000) increased by \$3,000,000. These are minimum requirements.

The States—especially New York, New Jersey and California—should improvise hospitalization for teen addicts now and formulate plans for long-range medical care and rehabilitation.

New York City is faced with a double emergency. Immediate hospital facilities for addicted children and a vastly enlarged narcotics squad. In the early twenties, the late Dr. Carlton Simon fought an upsurge in the dope traffic with a squad of 125 men.

Before his death, the founder of New York's narcotic squad told the writer New York needs "at least" 250 trained men to track down the vicious dope rings now plaguing adolescents. The squad currently totals 49. Finally, parents of this city can send up a crescendo of protests against New York's greatest disgrace. The chips are down.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of June 13, 1951]

IT'S 1 IN 50 YOUR CHILD TAKES DOPE—BUT THAT'S ONLY A GUESS—OFFICIALS ADMIT THEY DON'T KNOW REAL ODDS.

(By Edward J. Mowrey)

Can your child become a dope addict? Exactly what are the chances of your boy or girl joining the legion of youngsters now hooked on heroin or marijuana?

The answer, as nearly as experts can estimate, is that 1 youngster in 50 between the ages of 16 and 18 could become an addict.

However, since child addicts are extremely secretive and normally induce three to five of their friends to try illicit drugs, police probation officers and court officials frankly concede no one can safely estimate the number of New York City children currently taking dope.

The estimates have run as high as 20,000. Police, who have made thousands of narcotics arrests in the last year, say there are a minimum of 5,200 teen-agers in the city on heroin and reclus. The recent report of Superintendent of Schools William Jansen that there are only 154 known addicts (requiring or having received medical care) promptly brought indignant protests that the figure was ridiculously low.

Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein, conducting the State's teen-age addiction probe, replied that at least 5,000 New York youngsters were addicted. The school's own enrollment figures of children in the 16 to 18 age group (the most popular age for neophyte addicts) clarify the issue.

They are. Age 16, 88,641; age 17, 95,727; and age 18, an estimated 90,000, for a total of 274,368. If 5,000 of this number are dope addicts, it means that the evil has claimed 1 child out of 50.

No one, to repeat, can truthfully gage addiction's devastating impact upon adolescents. Narcotic rings using cunning, migratory tactics, have enslaved 11-year-olds on rare occasions. And court records disclose many children of 12 and 13 exposed to the menace.

BOROUGH ESTIMATES

The police narcotics squad under Lt. Bernard Boylan and Sgt. John Cottone has blueprinted concentrations of teen addicts throughout the city. Manhattan has 2,000; Brooklyn, 1,500; Bronx, 1,000; and Queens, 700.

Addiction has made negligible gains on Staten Island, but it has become a serious problem in virtually every other part of the city. Police estimate that half of the junior and senior high schools have been hit in varying degree. Pushers—dope sellers—are working close to elementary schools, all of which have been alerted to the danger.

Heavy use of heroin and marijuana has been reported in some vocational high schools in Manhattan and Brooklyn. And the incidence rise in child addiction generally follows activity of underworld rings in specific areas.

Parents, residing in east and west Harlem, the lower East Side and the old San Juan Hill area of the west side of Manhattan are warned that peddlers have done a lush business near their homes. Other danger zones include the east Bronx, especially the Westchester Avenue zone, the Brownsville, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and east New York sections of Brooklyn, and the vast Jamaica area of Queens.

PAD JOINTS FLOURISH

Teen-age addiction in these areas has mirrored the sharpest rise. Pad joints, where reeler smokers and "mainliners" (addicts using needles for injections) congregate, flourish in direct relation to ability of police to abolish them.

Children have lately been enlisted as dues-paying members of addict clubs. The fees insure a minimum dosage of heroin. Their insignia, like the hip flask of prohibition days, is a hypodermic needle and a bent spoon.

It's a popular fad in numerous teen-age groups to take a shot of "horse" (heroin) before going to the community dance. The fad has even touched college campuses.

PARENTS DECEIVED

Addict paraphernalia has been found in school rest rooms and peddlers have brazenly operated in school cafeterias. Gym teachers have been alert for months for needle marks in physical education classes. Detectives have been assigned, in some cases, to actual posts inside schools.

Even parents who realize dope's inroads on youth and use every precaution in protecting their children are often fooled. Child addicts have been known to secrete their paraphernalia in a bullet-shaped missile in toilet bowls. They may meet their "connection" (peddler) on the street when the family has retired.

Heroin capsules have been known to be camouflaged in bubble-gum wrappers and brazen pushers will even accost groups of kids on sand lots. One shot, they promise, will make Johnny play ball like Babe Ruth.

EATING AT UNITED STATES DEFENSE

After Johnny is hooked, he may rendezvous with his pusher in a theater, cellar club, hotel lobby, or across the street from school. Johnny will find him. Johnny would be in agony without him.

This is the child narcotics addiction picture today, a problem which Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, former chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, calls the most pernicious, most insidious evil facing America.

Erie Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, who will appear in New York at the Legion's 3-day clinic on adolescent addiction this week end, declared:

"Organized traffic in illicit drugs is eating at our defense potential and destroying our moral fabric."

The odds on your child being addicted may be 50 to 1. However, there is no doubt about

dope's murderous grip on our children. Five teen-agers died from addiction in recent months. Fifty-eight New Yorkers (23 under 25 years of age) succumbed to this blight in 1950.

A veteran police official put it this way: "Like the fisherman who runs into a school, all we're sure of are the ones we caught. Who knows how many got away?"

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of June 14, 1951]

CHILD ADDICTS HARD TO SPOT, BUT BEHAVIOR CAN BE CLUE—DOPE VICTIM OFTEN DUCKS FAMILY, PALS

(By Edward J. Mowrey)

The mother of a teen-ager phoned the writer and said softly:

"My boy is in his bedroom banging his head against the wall. He wants us to kill him. Please, in God's name, what can we do?"

She sobbed for a few moments, then continued:

"My child is a heroin addict. He's a good boy and we've tried to help him. We waited 3 hours at a hospital before an intern gave me some pills and sent us home. Later my boy went into spasms."

This mother was witnessing what doctors describe as the most pitiful sight human eyes can endure—a child narcotics addict undergoing "cold turkey" or sudden withdrawal from drugs.

But the symptoms of child addiction aren't always so patent. In fact, they sometimes defy expert diagnosis. Authorities on narcoticism agree that the day-by-day behavior pattern of a child introduced to drugs is nature's initial signal of impending disaster.

ADDICT'S IRON CURTAIN

Addiction's iron curtain is furtiveness. The child will deviate from his or her usual routine. The thrills of TV or a stickball game may fade. Johnny will disappear and keep his destination a mystery. He may be gone for hours or far into the night. When questioned, he'll evade, lie.

In many cases, he'll eschew old pals (whom he couldn't get to try dope) and meet in cellar clubs or on street corners with questionable companions. Parents should immediately investigate both Johnny's haunts and friends.

Johnny won't wash his hands before another member of the family if he has gone to the needle. And if he's been dragooned by a dope peddler into the role of "pusher," he may blossom forth in "sharp" clothes, expensive shoes and flashing neckwear. Johnny's pockets may also jingle.

LIKE BURGLAR TOOLS

If the child successfully masks the needle marks on his arm, he will guard his addict paraphernalia like burglar tools.

The advanced addict's rig consists of heroin capsules, hypodermic needle syringe, rubber arm band (tourniquet), medicine or eye dropper, and a teaspoon (the handle usually bent and the bottom burned). As Johnny's bodily tolerance for the drug increases, however, he becomes ingenious in administering dope.

Police have found numerous cases where child addicts puncture the skin with a bent pin or nail to get at the main artery. The enslaved adolescent ignores the possibility of gangrenous infection. But the records of narcoticism deaths in the medical examiner's office don't.

As effects of the drug wear off, the child has no alternative. He must continue. And the more he takes, the more he needs.

"If the drug is suddenly withdrawn, a medical authority warns," acute illness develops. The victim will stop eating, may vomit, develop diarrhea, suffer intense muscular pains of the arms and back. Considerable weight

may be lost in a single day. Sleep is out of the question.

"The person dependent on drugs cannot take it or leave it. Since self-control is lost, the situation presents a state of slavery."

INHIBITIONS SHATTERED

The tragic aspect of child addiction is the victim's utter isolation from society. Cut off from his loved ones, his doctor, his minister and teacher, little Johnny becomes reckless, amoral. His inhibitions shattered, delinquency and crime become his bedfellows under the iron mastery of the infamous peddler who seduced him.

The child is deadened to the gradual moral deterioration that made him an outcast. And he's dangerous. One New York adolescent told horrified probation officers she would kill her mother or father "if they stood between me and a shot."

How did our hypothetical Johnny get on drugs? What is heroin or marijuana?

ADDICT'S PARADISE

Like the thousands of others who became hooked, Johnny may have had to maintain face by accepting a dare. Psychologists call it status. A brave teen-ager put it this way in a composition: "Most of the boys and girls I know said if I didn't try heroin, they'd call me a punk."

A classmate, neighbor or even a stranger may have asked Johnny to try a reefer (marijuana stick), a sniffer or a shot. The neighborhood, Johnny learned, was wallowing in the stuff. All the kids want the kicks.

Johnny may have flunked an exam, experienced a disagreeable home squabble. He welcomed such a lift or bang. The gang on the corner may have jeered: "Be a regular guy. Don't be chicken. It won't hurt you."

So Johnny accepted a free reefer and sucked its acrid fumes into the pit of his stomach. Marijuana—the key to an addict's paradise.

And a passing word to all parents about marijuana:

While the habit-forming aspects of this intoxicant are occasionally challenged, there is virtually no disagreement concerning the acts of bestiality resulting from marijuana's persistent usage.

THE TERROR DRUG

Marijuana (the Mexican name) comes from the upper leaves and flower of the hemp fiber plant (Asiatic). Its viciousness as a drug is highlighted by the fact that the English word "assassin" is derived from Hashashina, the name of a murderous Mohammedan sect which used the drug in their wild orgies. It can be grown in window-boxes or cultivated in empty lots.

Marijuana has little or no use in medicine.

Heroin—the terror drug—is an opium derivative with no medical value which is currently pouring into the United States from China, India, Iran, Turkey, and the Soviet Union. Its powdery granules undergo numerous adulterations through the underworld market to reach the New York youngster at about 5 percent purity. A cap (capsule) of 1½ grains sells from \$1 to \$2.

The child, first approached by dope peddlers, may get a free shot for a few days. He can snort the powder, mix it with water over a match in a spoon for "skin popping" (injected under the epidermis) or main-line the deadly concoction into the main forearm artery.

Heroin is the most dangerous of drugs and the most popular among criminal addicts. Its jolt on the system is more severe than that of morphine and because it is outlawed, its victim must look constantly to the underworld for dosage.

The heroin addict is truly hooked.

Our Johnny, victimized by greedy criminals, can become society's lost child unless his parents are realists. And it shouldn't happen to Johnny. He's the bulwark of our future generation.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of June 15, 1951]

DOPE SLEUTHS FACE JUNGLE CUNNING—ONE VENDOR USED PET FERRET TO FITCH HEROIN PACKETS FROM CACHE UNDER FLOOR OF ROOM (By Edward J. Mowery)

When veteran New York narcotics squad detectives compare notes on the cunning of dope rings the classic tale of the Manhattan retriever bobs up.

Police made four abortive raids on a tenement visited by numerous suspected addicts. The occupant stonily professed his innocence and invited a search. The siege went on. Finally, one addict was caught with a container of dope in his pocket.

"Don't know where he hides it," the victim expostulated, "because he never lets anyone inside."

From the vantage point of a fire escape, the cops learned why. The peddler had a confederate. A pink-eyed trained ferret on a leash sat at his feet. When a patron knocked on the door, the ferret darted into a floor aperture, brought back a container of dope soaked in liver blood and was rewarded with a chunk of liver.

CHILD CARRIES DOPE

Drug rings preying on teenagers haven't resorted to animal training as yet, police declare, but they're using every artifice known to the underworld in keeping the junk flowing. An upper Manhattan peddler with scores of adolescent customers strolled near schools with a 3-year-old girl.

Her pockets were stuffed with heroin capsules. He was clean.

Peddlers in one school posted a girl "connection" beside the cafeteria coffee urn at lunch time. A nod or a wink meant that "H" (heroin) was in plentiful supply around the corner. One school child told officials that heroin was administered by the shot on a Manhattan street at fixed times.

Addicts lined up for their dose like unfortunate in a depression bread line. A veteran addict who loses an army of teenagers dying on the heroin vine told the World-Telegram and Sun that New York now has about 10 big narcotics rings fighting for the children's business.

TWO THOUSAND KIDS A YEAR

One ring, he said, will use 10 runners to distribute drugs to 90 pushers. Its constant aim is to make a peddler out of an addict.

The monthly gross in New York alone runs into untold millions. As to addiction:

"At least 2,000 kids are indoctrinated each year," he explained. That's an entire college enrollment swung into the use of junk and on the way to potential criminality. What can these kids do? Their constant fear is a hospital with bars. So they slink off with their gang and try to recruit other kids.

Children introduced to heroin for the first time are amazed at the dog-eat-dog frenzy of peddlers fighting for dope's ever-ready dollars. Pushers are not only working two to the block in some localities, but laboring overtime to reap the harvest. Their routes frequently take them to the very steps of school buildings.

"The average peddler handles three pieces (2½ to 3 ounces) each day," this addict declared. That means he's selling around 700 caps, mostly to school children. Sure kids are dying. I'd say more than 500 have died in New York since the early forties from overdosage or chemically impure heroin.

MESSAGES IN CODE

How does a dope peddler, a perfect stranger—accost your child?

He may give Johnny a cops-and-robbers pitch on the sandlot, in a hotel lobby or at a community dance. This may consist of coded letters and a telephone number. The peddler may meet Johnny at the appointed time and flash heroin capsules from a hat box or a grocery bag.

It's more than likely, however, that Johnny's connection will appear through a mutual friend. If Johnny calls the right number and has the right password, he may meet the peddler in a bus terminal or hotel lobby. The peddler will take the money and disappear.

In Johnny's hand will be a slip of paper with another phone number. That of a booth in the lobby. Johnny's heroin will be taped to the bottom of the arm rest.

Many successful peddlers selling to children rarely approach their victims directly. They may patrol neighborhoods in flashy cars and carry a load of nylon stockings in the trunk to prove they're "salesmen." The heroin cache may be secreted far away in a rented apartment in a respectable neighborhood.

GANG POPPERY

They patrol certain areas to see how their addict-pushers are making out. They have even set up district headquarters in the mezzanine of a theater.

Adolescents, intrigued by this air of mysticism and intensely loyal to their clique of fellow addicts, frequently adopt forms of behavior which identifies them as dope users.

They may use a special type of slang, affect special haircuts, or wear bizarre clothing ensembles. Other teen-agers, impressed by this array of gang popper, may plead to join up. They're initiated into "horse" (heroin) and the constant fear of arrest insures their loyalty to the group.

Police have learned through hundreds of interviews with child addicts that the duplicity of organized dope rings must be met in similar vein. Detectives have posed as blind men in accompanying teen-agers to the "plant" (rendezvous point). Peddlers have no fear of being identified by one who cannot see.

So Johnny buys his "H" from the pusher while the "blind" cop watches. Then the dragnet closes.

CRIMINAL AFTERMATH

Women detectives have taken jobs as maids in apartments, manned switchboards and posed as molls to smash vicious gangsters in the dope traffic. And when a ring is suspected of expansion to other States, phone taps on court order provide a monitoring system that functions day and night.

What's been the aftermath of this wholesale enslavement of youngsters?

Muggings, robberies, prostitution, assaults, and murder.

Two teen-agers allegedly murdered a matron strolling in Central Park for the few cents they found in her pocketbook. They were starved for another shot of heroin.

Medical cabinets in schools have been rifled for hypodermic needles and medicine droppers. Physicians on night mercy calls have met, instead, dope-starved youths who would kill for the little black sachet.

Kid addicts have stolen and pawned untold thousands of dollars' worth of clothing, radios, and home accessories to get the needed dosage. In New York and across the country addicts are amassing thousands of mail boxes and stealing checks of old-age pensioners, disabled veterans, and recipients of welfare doles.

DEATH PENALTY DEMANDED

This is one facet of the unsavory child addiction picture which has motivated Representative L. GARY CLEMENTE of New York to introduce a bill providing for the death penalty for peddlers selling to teen-agers.

Representative CLEMENTE, praising the World-Telegram and Sun's 14-month anti-dope campaign, told the writer:

"No crime, in my opinion, is worse than this exploitation of our young people, but I believe it would stop almost immediately if we put forth the same effort that was necessary in stamping out kidnaping in this country."

"I have introduced legislation that will, if enacted, bring death to the racketeer who enslaves our children with dope."

PUBLIC CRUSADE OFFERS NEW HOPE FOR DOPE VICTIMS—LONG YEARS OF OFFICIAL APATHY SHATTERED BUT VICTORY IS STILL FAR AWAY

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of June 16, 1951]

(By Edward J. Mowery)

What's being done to protect your child against dope rings spreading deadly heroin into every section of New York City? What happens if your youngster is hooked?

There are no full, immediate answers to these questions. But indications of action to come may be found in the outburst of public horror that finally has rocked the city after sordid revelations about the dope evil began in the World-Telegram and Sun on April 15, 1950.

First disclosures ran into a wall of public apathy. But through the months this newspaper kept up its fire. Revelation followed revelation. And although officialdom remained indifferent—or at least inactive—the truth became more generally recognized by citizens.

Finally, about 9 months after depravity and crime among teenagers, brought on through the enslavement by narcotics, were fully documented, the lid blew off. Public alarm culminated this week in the current State investigation by Attorney General Nathaniel I. Goldstein.

He and his staff of expert investigators have startled New Yorkers with "flesh" and wire-recorder testimony of youthful victims of the drug pushers and of experts on the peril that threatens to make one out of every 50 children a victim of dope.

Mr. Goldstein is only digging into the mounting morass. It will take the legislature months to cap his disclosures with a solution.

But the battle is on. Peddlers must be crushed and victims salvaged.

Your youngster, if he is hooked, must be saved. He needs immediate and adequate hospital care and rehabilitation.

A drive to obtain the necessary hospital facilities is being pressed vigorously by the American Legion and Irving Geist, philanthropist and realist. They declare children must not be lost in a sea of official and nongovernmental apathy.

1946 WARNING IGNORED

As early as 1946 efforts to protect the city's youth from its present mushrooming danger were rebuffed. That year a group of eminent physicians tried to warn city hall that teen-age dope would become the city's scourge.

But Dr. Lester C. Spier and other members of the New York County Medical Society committee received a brush-off. "We were sent home like schoolboys without seeing Mayor William O'Dwyer," Dr. Spier disclosed.

As this newspaper revealed the alarming rise in adolescent drug addiction, officials parried the blows and shrugged. Finally, as 1950 wore on, the truth dawned on a cluster of indignant, militant citizens. Then it swept to the organization level.

The State Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution calling for official action, parent groups, doctors, social workers, bar associations, veterans' units, and scores of frantic mothers and fathers whose children were jeopardized deluged city hall with protests.

On December 12, Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri called a meeting of his department heads, told them to study the problem and make a report. The report never materialized.

However, 5 weeks earlier an interoffice memo in the magistrates' courts heralded a revolutionary move to cope with the flow of teen-age addicts.

The Youthful Offender Act would be activated. And in the youth part of Special Sessions Court, Justice Matthew Troy left the bench after surveying a line of kids on heroin.

"It makes you sick to see them," he declared. "We're completely frustrated."

Justice Irwin Davidson said the problem was appalling and District Attorney Frank S. Hogan expressed shocked indignation.

DEATH RATE CLIMBS

While State Senator Seymour Halpern hastily prepared legislation to cope with the evil, teen-agers were dying on Manhattan stoops, in hallways, in hospitals. Two pals of one boy rushed him to a Brooklyn hospital—and ran. He died.

Mass meetings, investigations, studies by two-score groups of the Welfare Council. But no affirmative, high-level action to stem the tide.

What's being done now by city and Federal agents?

A totally inadequate narcotics squad is rabbit hopping over New York in frenzied effort to round up dope peddlers. In many cases, the men and women of this unit work around the clock.

The Federal narcotics agents?

NOW FOR THE VICTIMS

With only 188 men to police all the Nation, they're pecking at the tidal wave of dope's overlords who make New York the Nation's prime distribution point. Sparsely manned, the task of this force seems hopeless.

Stop smuggling?

The customs service has 200 agents to police New York harbor's 600 piers per shift for all types of contraband. Dope is cascading in.

But what about the child who already has succumbed to heroin's slavery? He has bypassed the splendid efforts of FAL, the Settlement House vigilante committees, the school system's delayed syllabus of instruction.

Where can this child go for medical aid?

At present he has three ways to reclaim his respectability. None offers much refuge. Johnny can brave the wrath of his parents and appeal for treatment through the family physician. It means iron-clad restrictions on his movements, gradual, safe withdrawal from the drug, eschewing his former addict friends.

But the doctor will tell Johnny's parents he doesn't run a clinic. He can't police Johnny's actions. And dope, plenty of it, is just around the corner.

THE FEDERAL ANSWER

Private sanitariums? Yes, if Dad can stand the tariff. Proper treatment takes 4 months.

What about the city's answer?

Johnny may be committed before a magistrate. If he goes to Rikers Island Penitentiary, he writhes out his "cold turkey" withdrawal agony with felons. If he goes to Bellevue or Kings County Hospitals, he's placed with the mentally ill and he may stay about 2 weeks. After that he's freed—possibly to return to dope.

What about the State? There's no succor there.

And the Federal Government's answer? Johnny's parents would shudder at this solution.

On February 12, 1951, the World-Telegram and Sun disclosed that the United States Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky.—known to thousands of addicts as Narco—was caring for 135 patients beyond its maximum capacity of 1,300.

Dr. Victor H. Vogel, the hospital's medical chief, frankly conceded that children from 14 up were hospitalized with criminals and perverts. Segregate them? Walls don't bulge even for Uncle Sam.

Despite revolting conditions at Narco, parents of adolescent addicts, seeing their children sinking into a life of depravity, told

the writer they were planting heroin on their children and giving them up to Federal agents.

CRYING NEED FOR ACTION

"It broke my heart," one mother said tearfully, "but my boy won't die in a gutter from heroin if he's behind bars at Lexington."

Demands for adequate hospitalization for young dope victims descended on Washington. A Bronx group petitioned United States Public Health Service officials to make use of hospitals in the New York area being closed. The pleas were fruitless.

On January 18, 1951, this newspaper reported 2,000 dope pushers enslaving an estimated 30,000 New Yorkers. And the Fathers' Club of Public School 90, Bronx, continued to plead with five top city officials to "rescue our children from the precarious predicament of becoming hopeless drug addicts."

Then came mass meetings for hospitals (Public School 52, Bronx), open-air dramas (Manhattan), clinics (Association of the Bar of the City of New York), radio discussions of New York's dope crisis, raids on "pad joints" and lairs of underworld traffickers. But dope, now a social blight, has continued.

Now the State has launched full warfare. The strategy, the tactics, remain to be decided. But at least the public and its servants are aroused, and the parents of victims—and prospective victims—are demanding nothing less than full victory.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 6, 1951]

PEASANTS HARVEST 11 TIMES MORE OPIUM THAN ENTIRE WORLD NEEDS FOR MEDICINE - FARMERS IN EUROPE AND ASIA DEPEND ON HUGE POPPY CROPS FOR LIVELIHOOD

(By Edward J. Mowery)

(Dope addiction can be controlled—when the nations of the world agree to limit production of narcotics for medicinal needs only. The problem is complex. It involves peace, international intrigue, racketeers and the daily bread of European and Asiatic farmers. This is the first in a series pointing to the solution.)

In the great subtropical belt stretching from the coast of China to the Adriatic Sea papaver somniferum is a highly-esteemed, tenderly reared plant on which hundreds of thousands of peasant farmers depend for their bread.

The fact that the plant produces opium, the wrecker of untold thousands of lives, means little to the men, women and children toiling in the hot, dry fields of Turkey, Iran, India or China.

To them it means ready money, not only for the opium but also for the millions of tiny poppy seeds whose oil brings back 66 cents for every dollar obtained for the drug.

It is a way of life.

From its humble beginning in the well-drained, rich soils, where swaying poppies dot the country-side in red and white array, opium and its derivatives follow a tortuous and ever more criminal course. Eventually it slips past customers and border guards and fattens the wallets of the underworld.

To stop pushers here in New York, experts agree you must go back to the fields half-way around the world and plow under the crop which brings a living to peasants . . . and misery and crime in America.

DRIVE BEGUN IN 1783

Meeting this week in Geneva is the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which will study proposals of the U. N. Narcotics Commission to limit world opium production to legitimate needs.

It isn't the first time that nations of the world have tried to break the shackles of the narcotics habit. As far back as 1783 Warren Hastings of the British East India Co. said the drug should be strictly limited "in compassion to mankind."

But it wasn't until 1909 that President Theodore Roosevelt proposed the interna-

tional investigation that led to the first opium convention drawn up at The Hague 3 years later.

It was a slender reed and soon was honored more in the breach than in the observance. Because the peasants in India, Burma, Greece and Iran needed papaver somniferum to market their fields pay their way. And others, more venal found the trade richly rewarding.

What relief may be expected from the UNESCO sessions?

How long can the United States—experiencing the worst addiction scourge in history—parry the blows of criminal bands against our youth?

Not even the most optimistic U N delegate believes that a global opium control will come in a year or two. Yet most nations recognize the dope crisis and want sincerely to solve it.

WANT SUBSIDIES

One U. N. spokesman from an opium-producing country put it this way:

"We'd gladly eliminate cultivation of the poppy overnight. But what revenue could we be assured of to replace our profits from opium? And unless we do replace this revenue we face national bankruptcy."

At the U N Commission on Narcotics Drugs hearings recently concluded producing nations failed to adopt a monopoly plan to curtail harvests and control prices. What they wanted, in effect, was a subsidy if they cut their opium crops and sacrificed vital governmental revenue.

Yet, it would take another Marshall plan to underwrite the losses of such producing nations.

The humanitarian aspects of the cause fell under the weight of dollar-and-cents realism.

How much opium is the world producing? How much is necessary for scientific and humane needs?

None can safely estimate current production. Where the drug is cultivated under so-called national monopolies, the admitted harvest exceeds 2,000 tons annually.

This estimate excludes production in Red China, Manchuria, Eastern Russia, Siberia (western areas), and Russian Asia. One expert believes that opium produced under the Soviet might approximate the admitted world production of 2,000 tons.

Another barometer is available in the total seizures of illicit opium as reported to U N. by various countries. These figures, compiled by the U. N. Secretary-General for the fiscal year ending May 31, 1950, were submitted by 32 nations.

ELEVEN TIMES THE NEED

The totals indicated 1950 opium production hovered around 3,200 tons, with a vast quantity of the contraband of unknown origin.

A U. N. spokesman explained that illicit drugs falling into the hands of authorities make up less than 10 percent of the illegal trade. Thailand alone confiscated 13½ tons of contraband opium, with Burma and Egypt sharing an additional 8½ tons.

High medical authorities, however, say flatly that the current global opium harvest is 11 times the world's medical needs.

Those needs are 450 tons.

Somewhere between these totals lies the true production. Perhaps around 4,000 tons. And the significance of this stupendous opium production when applied to the heroin needs of addicts is breath taking.

Diverted from legal channels or harvested clandestinely in Asiatic mountain areas, 4,000 tons of raw opium become the chemical equivalent of 8,000,000 ounces of heroin. One ounce of this opium derivative is extracted from every pound of the poppy drug.

In terms of the addicts' daily needs, 8,000,000 ounces of heroin provides 242,426 kilograms at 100 percent purity. Through systematic cutting in the underworld, the cache of powder destruction supplies more than

16,000,000,000 capsules (2 grain) at 5 percent purity.

In other words, today's opium production, translated into the outlaw drug heroin, is sufficient to provide 20,000,000 addicts with three caps per day for a year.

TRAIL OF DEBAUCHERY

This is the key to the trail of debauchery addiction is blazing throughout the civilized world.

The extent of the production and traffic in marijuana—heroin's indoctrinating agent—defies research. Indian hemp, whose leaves make the heady reefer, flourishes over millions of acres in virtually every country in the world.

Indicative of its prodigious growth, nearly 20 tons were confiscated last year in 17 countries stretching from Zanizar to Australia. Mexican marijuana, pouring across the Rio Grande, spews through a transcontinental network to the most remote sections of the United States.

The Federal Narcotics Bureau's agents last year confiscated 46,000 ounces. During the same period in the heart of the hashish belt, Egyptian police impounded 17 tons of the hypnotic.

Cocaine, entering the American market principally from Peru and Bolivia, has almost disappeared on the illicit market. This dearth has been attributed to the smashing of a giant cocaine ring by the Peruvian and American authorities 2 years ago.

While the coca shrub is also cultivated in Java and Ceylon, natives of Peru and Bolivia have chewed its stimulating leaves for centuries.

This approximates the picture of illicit drug production which has led to the worst dope addiction epidemic in world history.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 7, 1951]

CONTROL OF WORLD DOPE TRAFFIC HOPELESS AS LONG AS SOVIET MENACES FREE WORLD—ONLY PEACE CAN SAVE NATIONS WHICH RAISE OPIUM FOR CASH

(By Edward J. Mowery)

The world needs peace to halt the international drug traffic.

It needs peace to cure the financial ills of war-ravaged countries and to bring the recalcitrant Soviet bloc back into the family of nations.

For the poverty of many lands, makes opium and its derivatives a prime source of foreign exchange, which they require to restore their prewar economy. And refusal of the Reds to play ball, blocks an ironclad global limitation of production of narcotics to medicinal needs.

This was the core of the thinking of a man who has served for years on the United Nations Narcotics Commission. Before that, he was a member of his country's foreign service.

DIM VIEW

He took a dim view of events. "Let's not kid ourselves," he explained. "The world is not at peace. And this attempt to agree on the illicit narcotics menace is almost hopeless."

If the world were at peace, our diplomat ventured, the United States with its prestige and dollars probably could whip the rest of the world into line through international agreements.

If there were peace, for instance, Uncle Sam could advise Iran and Turkey, the two biggest opium producers in the world, that they could expect no favors from us unless they really got down to business and cut their opium production.

But the United States needs Turkey—and Greece and Yugoslavia, other important opium producers—as the eastern anchors of their wall against Russia. And the Atlantic Pact nations need the oil of Iran to power their war machines and industry against the feared attack from behind the Iron curtain.

"So how," this diplomat asked, "can the United States now put pressure on opium-producing nations to stop the flow of narcotics with Russia menacing the free world?"

Aside from blocking international agreements on virtually every proposal found on the U. N. agenda, Russia is strongly suspected by experts on the world dope crisis of using narcotics in the cold war.

K. W. Yu, of the Chinese U. N. delegation, flatly accused the Soviets of deliberately flooding dope into southeast Asia and encouraging addiction.

MAKING ADDICTS

"It is a diabolical plan, well conceived," he declared, "to soften up these peoples. Their countries will undoubtedly become the Communists' next objective."

Making dope addicts of millions of potential serfs, he explained, has two prime objectives.

"The Reds mulct fabulous amounts of money from their prospective victims of aggression and simultaneously wreck them, physically and economically. The pattern first took shape in the Orient when the Japanese poured opium into occupied China."

"Shikichuan, the city and rail juncture between Honan and Shensi Province, was the focal point for opium distribution. As the deadly drug entered prostrate China in abundance, the Japanese actually encouraged both civilians and the military to use it freely."

"Who could offer less resistance to a conqueror than a populace inert from hypnotics?"

The Reds, this statement charged, are cultivating huge amounts of opium in Shansi, Szechuan, and Jehol, northern China areas adjoining the Manchurian border. The traffic is moving to Hong Kong over inland routes to Burma, Indochina, and Malaya.

Hong Kong opium, American authorities have reported, is also cascading into Japan, where our troops may be jeopardized.

The Soviet Union, however, maintains strict internal controls over its opium production in east Russia, western Siberia, and Russian Asia. Russians never become dope addicts . . . within their own borders.

A few weeks ago a report echoed through the United Nations majestic building in New York that 100 tons of opium showed up in Saudi-Arabia or Afghanistan. Could this enormous cargo have originated in Soviet Asia?

None could tell.

CAN'T BE ESTIMATED

Rafko Pleic, counselor of the U. N. Yugoslav delegation, characterizing the illicit drug traffic as the "world's greatest social problem," said there was no way possible to gauge Russian opium production.

God only knows what this figure would amount to. You can't even make an estimate of Russian steel production.

"How could one possibly arrive at the total Russian production of opium that is flowing into the world market?"

Aly Fahmy, first secretary to the U. N. Egyptian delegation, told this newspaper that Red China "is morally obligated" to limit poppy cultivation and abide by U. N. proposals to combat the illicit drug traffic.

"This vicious problem can't be solved by one or two countries," he said. "It's international, and Red China and all opium-producing nations should vigorously curtail and police their harvests."

Mr. Fahmy also praised Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger for his "competent, helpful aid in appraising the world narcotics evil."

Mr. Anslinger himself put the finger on Red China for cascading opium and heroin into Japan and the islands of the former mandate.

On May 1, before the U. N. Narcotics Commission, he pinpointed contraband drug

movements by the Reds and reported that former heroin factories in Tientsin, North China, and Manchuria have been reactivated.

HEROIN VIA JAPAN

"There is evidence that some of this heroin is getting into the United States and other countries via Japan," Mr. Anslinger declared. "Japanese agents seized 20 pounds of heroin in Kobe. Four of the 19 packages bore labels of the Drug-Well Pharmaceutical Laboratory, Luck Street, Tientsin."

"Previous large seizures in Japan have probably originated from this factory. This traffic should be suppressed by Chinese Communist officials."

While an occasional shipment of illicit drugs may be traced to a specific poppy field or laboratory, the vast bulk of the world's opium production cannot be laid specifically to an offending producer nation.

The U. N. Narcotics Commission hopes to end this aura of dope's mysterious origin shortly.

Early in 1950 international collaboration in laboratory research on the origin of opium began modestly under the direction of the opium distribution center. It has twin goals: To pinpoint cultivation centers of opium and determine its morphine content.

Opium samples have been coming in slowly and at least two more years will elapse before the laboratory gets positive results.

Meanwhile, the civilized world writhes under the impact of dope addiction, with the lives of thousands of children hanging in the balance.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 8, 1951]

LOST OPIUM FINDS ITS WAY TO ADDICTS—LEGAL CROPS NOT ALL USED FOR MEDICINE

(By Edward J. Mowery)

It's a hot, cloudless day in the Turkish countryside as the small army of peasant farmers, armed with Amasya knives, approach fields of opium poppies.

There's no mirth in this corps of tireless men, women, and children. And they realize they have only a few hours to harvest the dark, gummy substance which is their life-blood.

They had ploughed their fallow fields in the spring, weeded them with hammers and sewn the seeds immediately after the first rains.

They nurtured their crops carefully through the 3-week germination and smiled as the first delicate leaves appeared. Yes, the stems looked sturdy. Varicolored flowers, Providence permitting, should mature in 50 days. And then, the knob-like, plumed capsules.

This was the day

JUICE HARVEST

The peasant foreman scanned the sky. No sun. Just heat. He waved to the others as they skirted the rows—poppies imbedded in volcanic soil. The workers handled their knives like surgeons with scalpels.

They drew the knives two-thirds around the capsules, taking extreme care that the incisions did not penetrate to the interior. This was to prevent the opium juice from flowing inside and becoming lost. If this happened, the seeds probably wouldn't ripen and yield oil.

For 72 long hours they toiled. Slashing and gathering the coagulating juice. If the night became humid, they rested away from the odoriferous fields. Otherwise they'd become dizzy from the fumes of the potent gum.

The next morning they scraped the capsules, transferring the partly coagulated juice to poppy leaves they held turned up in their hands. They continued to collect the juice, wrapping one leaf over the top of another as the leaves filled up. Then they placed the leaves in the shade to dry for several days.

When the brownish cakes were finally tabulated at the Soils Products Office, each worker was paid 17 cents per hour for the kilogram of opium harvested.

This kilo of pure opium was produced under strict governmental supervision predestined for humane use in the field of medicine. It wasn't diverted at the farm level or raised clandestinely to feed greedy dope rings here and abroad.

However, untold thousands of kilos have been diverted from the 35,000,000 acres under Turkish poppy cultivation. And bands of dissident farmers in mountain regions never declare their harvests with the central monopoly.

FORTUNE AS HEROIN

The practice is also rampant in India, China, Mexico, Yugoslavia, and Iran. Many officials of these countries admit it.

And 1 kilo of pure opium—which reimbursed the peasant a paltry \$12.24—is worth a fortune when translated into heroin in the underworld market of America.

Ilhan Savut, counselor to the Turkish U. N. delegation, told the World-Telegram and Sun his Government is doing everything humanely possible to police the harvests and comb the mountains to halt illicit opium traffic.

"We think we can account for 97 percent of our authorized crops," he declared, "and severe penalties await those who divert opium or raise it clandestinely."

"However, there's no doubt that some opium is lost during harvest and unauthorized cultivation may be under way in mountainous regions."

Turkish farmers, he explained, report the areas being cultivated, the expected yield and harvest progress. It's mandatory that their entire crops be sold to the Government. Turkey is the world's largest opium producer.

"We have no way to estimate illicit production or diversion into illegal channels," Mr. Savut added. "You realize, however, that heroin or morphine may be extracted from opium with simple implements in a home kitchen. We've outlawed heroin in Turkey, and we're constantly on the lookout for heroin traffickers."

"Of course, opium can be carried over our border from Syria in a basket or it can be smuggled from Istanbul by seamen."

He agreed that all nations must reach international agreement upon crushing the illicit drug traffic "if mankind isn't to be enslaved."

WHOLESALE DIVERSION

Dr. Djafar Abdoh, deputy Iranian representative to the U. N., also deplored wholesale diversion of opium and said the addiction phase of the dope menace is now being closely studied by his country.

In 1949, Mr. Abdoh stated, Iran cultivated 10,000 acres of opium which yielded 1,000 tons of opium, twice the world's medical needs.

"We exported (legally) 145 tons of the harvest," he said, "but we do not know, frankly, where the other 851 tons went. We're fighting against smuggling and we've recently established a special narcotic police force."

Would Iran be agreeable to halting opium production if adequate means of substitute revenue were available?

"We certainly would," he said. "In fact, we're limiting our opium cultivation until some satisfactory solution to this problem comes along. I believe that if cotton were grown in much of the opium acreage, it might solve our economical problem."

Opium revenue from Iran's 1949 crops totaled 98,000,000 rials (35 rials to the dollar).

While both Turkey and Iran admit to serious diversions of their opium crops into illicit channels, Ratko Pleic, councillor of the Yugoslavia U. N. delegation, denied that any of his country's opium enters the underworld market.

"In 1949, in Ankara," Mr. Pleic declared, "our opium production quota was set at 63 tons annually. We've never produced that much and our highest prewar yield never exceeded 30 tons. Last year our harvest was about 11 tons."

DON'T USE OPIUM

"Yugoslavs don't use opium and the surrounding countries don't. Our farmers cannot sell into the illicit trade because their harvest is under vigilant, air-tight control. We cultivate opium mainly along the Serbian border and in Macedonia."

Yugoslavia, the diplomat stated, has actually offered premiums to opium farmers as an inducement to greater effort.

"But," he explained, "we have insufficient manpower to realize this objective. We're studying ways to stimulate production so we can meet our international quota (for medicinal needs)."

Urging immediate decrease in opium production "by the big opium growing nations," Mr. Pleic conceded that huge amounts of opium are flooding the world from Asia and that more stringent international police measures should be taken to strangle the illicit traffic.

"But," he said haltingly, "we're now fighting against a consequence when we should be eliminating the cause of the consequence."

The consequence isn't too alarming for Yugoslavia, which has no addiction problem. America, faltering under the weight of illicit drugs, sees its consequence in the pasty faces of untold thousands of kid dope addicts.

The consequence may prove America's greatest social curse.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 9, 1951]

SECRET LABS NEAR WORLD PORTS PUSH HEROIN INTO UNITED STATES AT FANTASTIC PROFITS—ONLY 20 PLANTS MAKE DRUG LEGALLY

(By Edward J. Mowery)

Heroin and morphine can be extracted from raw gum opium with the simplest of equipment.

They can be produced with the utensils any housewife has in her own kitchen.

It admittedly takes know-how and care, but the process which yields 1 ounce of heroin from 1 pound of opium is—scientifically speaking—one of the most elementary.

Morphine, one of the 19 alkaloids extracted from opium, is derived through chemical processes. Heroin is extracted from morphine by the addition of acetic acid radical. Compared with the tricky process of making nylon from coal, air, and water; it's like brewing a cup of tea.

Heroin has been outlawed in the United States as having no medicinal value. It is used legally in various European countries, however, as an asserted aid in fighting tuberculosis at childbirth, etc.

In 1949, 20 plants authorized to manufacture heroin by the Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva, produced nearly a ton of this terror drug.

FACTORIES NEAR PORTS

The factories, in most instances, are easily accessible to large ports where illicit drug cargoes have been pouring into the underworld traffic. The factories:

France: Paris (two), Nolsley-le-Sec and Glos-sur-Lizieux; England: Edinburgh (two), Switzerland: Basle (two) and Zurich; Italy: Turin, Milan (three) and Como; Sweden: Stockholm and Sodertalje; Hungary: Budapest; Finland: Helsinki; Belgium, Brussels.

Nobody knows the extent of diversion of heroin from these plants into the illicit market, although gigantic amounts of the drug have admittedly been diverted from the Italian factories.

This is the legal aspect of heroin production.

On the clandestine side are huge plants which have flourished sporadically in Marseille, Hong Kong, Istanbul, Barat, Tientsin, Trieste, and Mexico City.

These factories, plus the thousands of tiny laboratories set up near the world's great ports, are pouring the deadly drug into the United States. Rotterdam, Marseille, Milan, Athens, Bombay, and Tientsin have been acknowledged rendezvous points for international dope-ring couriers.

In many cases, the plant's output has an assured market and predestined itinerary.

INNOCENTS SUFFER

Adding to the mountainous stockpile of illicit drugs being bartered throughout Europe are stocks impounded by the German armies and dumped indiscriminately when the Allies closed in.

As a result, nations which produce no opium are wallowing in it. And criminal bands are combing the European market for a sure bonanza.

What happens to the countries that do not produce opium but are caught in the vortex of the transcontinental dope traffic?

Egypt, the crossroads of the Middle and Far East, is undergoing the worst smuggling evil in its history.

"Our battle against the illicit drug evil," Aly Fahmy, first secretary to the U. N. Egyptian delegation, declared, "is hopeless unless the entire world cooperates. Without this assistance, dope threatens to become a permanent curse."

"Egypt doesn't grow opium. Yet, it's being smuggled into our country from Turkey, Persia, everywhere. Last year we seized 3,680 kilos (nearly 4 tons) which indicates terrific overproduction with harvesters trying to jettison it on all sides."

EGYPT FIGHTS EVIL

"To combat this menace, we've coordinated the authority of our health, defense, justice, and finance ministries. We've set up a central narcotics bureau—a branch of the security department—with specialized squads to fight the traffic."

"We've instituted a special camel corps of trained narcotics police to patrol our desert borders on the east. And last October, we set up a central narcotics agency for the Arab League which resulted in whole harvests being destroyed in Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine."

Egypt, Mr. Fahmy conceded, has always had its hashish problem. At present, about 130,000 adult addicts smoke the pulverized hemp in the odd-shaped bowl and tube known as the "nargilas."

Egypt's perennial fight against hashish addiction, however, has been complicated by the opium smuggling upheaval.

"We know that Egypt is not a transit country for hashish. But since few if any Egyptians smoke opium, we also know that we're an international dumping ground for this drug at the moment. If we catch anyone selling illicit drugs, he may be fined up to £6,000 and imprisoned at hard labor for 5 years."

"If he's a foreigner, he serves his sentence and is then deported. Like the profits in illicit opium, the reward for the hashish smuggling is terrific. A kilo of hashish on the farm level is worth \$1,650 in the underworld."

MUST RESTRICT HARVESTS

Hard labor, the diplomat explained, is just that for the dope trafficker. He breaks stones under the broiling desert sun. As for a solution to the opium-smuggling throughout the Middle East, Mr. Fahmy said crisply:

"It's not enough to mobilize armies to patrol the borders of nonproducing nations. Opium poppy harvests must be severely restricted and illicit stocks destroyed if

the world is to survive this terrible evil. I'm optimistic that the U. N. will find a way to accomplish these goals."

Mr. Fahmy's optimism, to date, has foundered on the rocks of international protocol.

As to destruction of illicit opium stocks, few realistic nations will obliterate a marketable commodity. Only the United States plows under a harvest.

Last year, nearly 21 tons of illicit opium were seized by authorities of Thailand, India, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Burma. No word has come from these dope traffic centers that this fabulous cache has been destroyed.

No such word is expected even if humanity, itself, is at stake.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 10, 1951]

WHY NOT STOP HEROIN PRODUCTION?—DRUG CALLED NONESSENTIAL FOR MEDICINE LUCIANO LINKED TO ILLICIT TRAFFIC

(By Edward J. Mowery)

Is Italy the world headquarters for the narcotics rings pouring heroin into the United States?

Is Charles (Lucky) Luciano, erstwhile vice lord, the behind-the-scenes director of this dope combine?

Two men of widely divergent interests gave the World-Telegram and Sun startling answers to these questions. And documented them.

"There's not the slightest doubt in my mind," declared Marco Francisci, secretary of the U. N. Italian observer's office, "that Luciano is the connection between Italian dope mobs and American hoodlums engaging in this abominable racket."

AFTER LAST WAR

"Italy's narcotics problem started to be acute at the end of the last war. In the 3 years after Allied liberation of Italy, the United States expatriated several hundred gangsters to Italy. It's my opinion that most of these hoodlums are in the lucrative dope racket and that Luciano is their guiding force."

Mr. Francisci, a slender, pensive man reminded the writer that his country lost the war and was beset in the mid-40's with the usual internal upheavals of the vanquished.

"The Italian police organization was functionally weak during this period," he continued. "It's prewar stamina was shattered. It just could not cope with the problems arising out of this influx of hoodlums from the United States. In fact the police force as a unit was virtually helpless."

"These people ran the gamut of undesirable—white slavers, gamblers, thieves, and racketeers. In some instances, they came back to Italy with complete organizations to carry on their nefarious work. They had lots of money to bribe and corrupt. Oftentimes, morality is a question of money."

DOPE RING PARADISE

Italy—largest producer of heroin—was a dope ring paradise, Mr. Francisci declared, with five heroin laboratories operating (adjacent to Milan) under license of the Italian health commissioner. Heroin, outlawed in the United States, is used to ease the ravages of tuberculosis in Italy.

Italy, importing double the amount of raw opium needed for its legitimate heroin quotas, quickly became the international headquarters for a gigantic underworld heroin cartel. Mobsters flocked to the vicinity of the heroin laboratories like homing pigeons.

"In 1947-48," Mr. Francisci explained, "we imported 17,100 kilos of raw opium, 11,430 the next year, and 10,000 in 1950. Our importation this year won't exceed 8,000 kilos."

"With our huge heroin production, there was and is a terrific amount of smuggling and diversion of the drug. In addition, Italy is in an extremely difficult geographical po-

sition with extended coast lines and numerous ports easily accessible to smugglers."

ANOTHER CRUCIAL PROBLEM

Another crucial problem in northern Italy was to ferret out untold amounts of illicit drugs dumped there by the Germans during the 1943-45 occupation.

So the army of racketeers moved in and tremendous cargoes of illicit drugs began to flow into the United States. Couriers made connections in Antwerp, Rotterdam, Marseilles, Liverpool. Murders—gang style—stalked dope's spoils in America. The notorious One Hundred and Seventh Street mob—Luciano's own—became a potent underworld combine.

An undermanned Federal Narcotics Bureau tried desperately to chart and intercept the mob's activities.

Prostrated by war, Italy became involuntary host to Luciano's international syndicate—Dope, Inc.

"How can we legally imprison Luciano?" Mr. Francisci asked. Then he added: "We have him under 24-hour surveillance. I'm told, too, that Interpol (International Police, Geneva) never lets him out of their sight. But what can we charge him with? I believe he maintains two homes. One on Capri, the other in Rome. He's rich, clever. He knows all the answers. He's an old hand at dealing with the law."

WHAT CAN WE DO?

"He can corrupt. He can travel. His current passport, I believe, has visa privileges in France, Switzerland, Spain, and Great Britain. Capri, you must realize, is a strategic port for racketeering in the middle of the Gulf of Naples. But how can we arrest him? He's broken no Italian law yet."

What can the United States do to protect its youngsters against dope rings operating in Italy?

"We have reduced our annual heroin output to 50 kilos (from 200)." Mr. Francisci said, "and we're working closely with American narcotics officials to crush this ghastly racket. I'd say, though, the United States must strengthen its internal controls against the dope menace."

"This is a poor substitute for sniffing out the source of the trouble, but there will be no solution until opium-producing nations rigidly limit their production to world medical needs."

LUCIANO THE ABSOLUTE

Downtown in the Federal courthouse, Charles Siragusa told the World-Telegram and Sun:

"I agree that Luciano is the absolute head of the crime cartel now functioning in Italy. And there's no doubt that expatriation of Italian-born gangsters has complicated Italy's internal problems."

Mr. Siragusa, a Federal narcotics agent loaned to the Senate Crime Investigating Committee for the last 5 months, returned last month from a tour of Europe. He combed narcotics rings' operations in Italy, France, Greece, and Turkey.

FOUR OUT OF FIVE

"About 50 of the deported mobsters form the core of the international dope ring which Luciano rules. He's their absolute boss. And every consignment of dope from Europe bears Luciano's O. K. Sure the Italian police are working hard to track down these bums."

"But Italy could deal a death blow to the heroin traffic with one move. Halt heroin production. They say it's beneficial in fighting TB. The United States gets along without it. Why can't Italy? They've curtailed production. Why not stop it? Heroin is being diverted from four of Italy's five factories."

"This is the stuff that's flowing into the United States. Why Milan, where most of the drug is made, is Luciano's international dope-ring bastion."

Mr. Siragusa, small and wiry, methodically ran off Luciano's dope cartel board of directors on his fingers.

"There's Joe Picl, Lucky's prime contact man for the American branch, now on the lam in Italy after he smuggled himself back into the United States, made a killing in a single drug consignment, and left. He served 30 years here as a white slaver, was deported in 1946 when Luciano returned to Italy and the big dope operation started to function.

A DIRECT CONNECTION

"Picl, closely linked with the Kansas City Mafia mob, actually tested the American dope market before the gang started its big-time smuggling. And there's Frank Callace, alias 'Chick 99,' keyman of the One Hundred and Seventh Street mob who fled to Italy after an FBI indictment. He and his nephew (same name) established a subheadquarters for dope in a Milan hotel where packages were exchanged with other Luciano henchmen.

"This was a direct connection between the One Hundred and Seventh Street mob and Lucky."

Mr. Siragusa pondered a moment and continued to list the Luciano dope hierarchy:

"Niccola Gentile, under a dope indictment here, set up the Naples branch; Ralph Li-guori, manager of the Rome office; Gaetano Chiofalo, who may be using GI's as dope couriers in the Udine-Trieste area, Giacomo Giometti and Carmine (Peanuts) Tufarelli, pals of Picl and big wheels in the Rome office; Michael Cerani, now in an Italian jail, but a key Luciano mobster.

"We knew that Meyer Lansky visited Lucky in Italy and so did Sylvester Carollo (deported in February). Other American racketeers check in with the boss at intervals.

"We [Senate Crime Committee] have been trying to locate another man who visited Luciano some time ago. He's Joseph Blondo, 54, of 77-12 Thirty-fifth Avenue, Jackson Heights. We haven't anything against this gent. Just like to ask him a few questions."

Mr. Siragusa smiled grimly and observed:

"Let the Italian police work out a little more on Luciano. Ask him where he gets his money, why he refuses to list the names of his pals who go to Italy, why he travels consistently to Milan where heroin is made.

"And, if they get the answers to any of these questions, we'd be more than interested."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 11, 1951]

UNITED STATES PINCHES PENNIES, DOPE POURS IN CUSTOMS PATROLS ARE ALERT, BUT THEY'RE UNDERMANNED

(By Edward J. Mowery)

Aboard a small passenger ship en route to New York from San Francisco via the Canal Zone an old messboy died of a heart attack. The captain and a seaman, in accordance with tradition, searched the effects of the dead man.

In his footlocker was the usual assortment of oddments collected over the years by a \$30-a-month sailor. Then the skipper's eyes opened wide. Three bankbooks showed balances of \$100,000. And deep in the personal belongings were neat packages—heroin and cocaine.

Joe, the shoddy, unobtrusive messboy, methodically enriched himself on the misery and enslavement of young dope fiends. Like hundreds of other treacherous seamen, Joe knew an army of guards protect American shores and borders against hoof-and-mouth disease. But not against deadly narcotics. The Government has no money for that—it says.

"Our investigative unit," a high customs official explained, "has only 188 men in 9 districts to police the entire Nation. (The

Federal Narcotics Bureau, ironically, has the same personnel.) The customs border control just doesn't exist.

"The port of New York? Exactly 338 men in the port patrol are charged with screening the 700-mile water front. Fifty-eight of these posts aren't filled. Sure, dope is cascading in. We're using pea shooters to halt a major invasion."

The official, consulting the latest customs roster, drew forth two ominous dates in America's war on the international dope front.

PATROLS HANDICAPPED

"We had fairly decent patrols along the Canadian and Mexican borders up to July 1, 1947. Then the Canadian detail was abolished. A year later, the Mexican unit crumbled. And look what has happened to the United States in the 5 years narcotics rings have flooded us with poison.

"Dope has addicted thousands of kids in every major city in the country. What can we do about it? They're wading it across the Mexican border at scores of points. We have a total of 63 men to screen the Texas-Arizona-California region. And they're not patrolling the border.

"They're stationed in fixed posts in El Paso, Eagle Pass, McAllen, Del Rio, Brownsville, San Antonio, Nogales, and other strategic points. Because they're few in number, they must wait for tips of smuggling operations and try to corral their major strength for the zero hour."

WHO PROTECTS CHILDREN?

The official's eyes narrowed as he declared: "Our men are pretty bitter about these bums addicting kids. And especially when they see 500 border guards attached to the Bureau of Animal Husbandry riding horses in search of animals with hoof-and-mouth disease.

"Immigration, too, has a large border patrol—around 800 men—to grab aliens squirming across the Rio Grande. These units are necessary. But who's protecting our children against vicious dope rings?"

Heroin, this spokesman admitted, is pouring into the United States but only small amounts—if any—go through the port of New York, where an average of 105 active ships are tied up daily. His list of suspected seamen-smugglers is "a mile long."

"Seamen are giving New York a wide berth these days," the spokesman said. "But heroin can be coming into such ports at Philadelphia, Chester, Pa., Norfolk, Savannah, and Charleston. We have 14 investigative unit inspectors to guard against contraband in these ports.

CUSTOMS EVER ALERT

"We made three grabs in a row at Charleston, and the collector there had to augment his inspector squad. Of course, customs boarding squads are hitting ships coming into New York pretty hard. The investigative unit processed 329 narcotics cases here for the year ending June 30. The total was identical in 1949."

The herculean task of customs in screening cargo and passengers of hundreds of ships—2,263 were boarded by searching squads last year—is intensified while ships are loading for a week. Longshoremen, crew members, and visitors pour on and off the vessel and pier by the hundreds.

"There's a new development in the dope menace," the official warned. "A South American mob may be planting cocoa seeds in the hills of Cuba. If that materializes, watch out. Cocaine has been absent from the underworld market since six Peruvian laboratories were closed and a big ring smashed in 1949."

NEW MARIJUANA THREAT

Down at 54 Stone Street, where crack members of the customs searching squad

wallow in the gimmicks seized from would-be dope smugglers, Herman Lipsky, squad chief, voiced another warning:

"Marijuana seeds that are germinating have been coming in the past few months from South America and Spain. They're potent, and as you know, may be cultivated wholesale. We're watching this phase of the racket closely.

"I agree that big dope shipments are missing New York. We're getting seizures but not quantities. And they're burying the stuff deeper. We find dope under bulkheads, anchor chains, engine-room floor plates, and coils of rope.

DOPE IS BARTERED

"They plant the stuff in ceiling electrical hook-ups, in oil drums (cellophane bags), hand-carved book ends, built-in life-belt pockets, and hollowed-out logs lying conspicuously in the hold. One clever smuggler used magnetized metal boxes which he stuck on any steel surface."

Is dope a bartering commodity on the other side?

"Certainly is," Mr. Lipsky said, "but thieves fall out. Some seamen take gold to Europe and bring narcotics back. Others deal in nylons, canned goods, and clothes. Then, a short time ago, sailors discovered they were getting phony money abroad for their contraband. Now they insist on the payoff being in dope."

Over at the customhouse, Collector Harry M. Durning said emphatically that the big narcotics shipments were bypassing New York.

Yes; Congress cut customs appropriations some time ago and this trimmed his port patrol force more than a third.

"But our men are working hard and I'm satisfied dope isn't coming into the United States through the Port of New York," Mr. Durning explained. "Where is it coming through? We've got long coast lines."

THE SOLUTION

This is the essence of the dope addiction scourge that is gripping young America today. What can be done to banish a menace that threatens to haunt coming generations?

First, international agreement to limit opium production to bare medicinal needs must be forthcoming.

Second, every agricultural resource must be exhausted to replace poppy cultivation with substitute crops of adequate earning power, such as cotton, etc.

Third, producing nations must guard rigidly against opium diversion in the field and clandestine cultivation.

We now come to trafficking by underworld mobsters who have apparently made their international headquarters in Italy.

Italian police must crush these rings with the aid of other nations' and smash their laboratories as they appear.

CONGRESS MUST HELP

The United States, which buys half the world's legitimate narcotics production, seemingly has a strong voice in arriving at an equitable solution of the problem.

However, a niggardly Congress cannot expect tireless bands of Federal agents to halt the flow of narcotics into our ports with their hands tied. Nor crush international dope cartels now terrorizing America's major cities.

Customs and Narcotic Bureau personnel must be tripled immediately to halt dope's tidal wave. And hospitals for dope's tragic victims must be readied without delay.

These are musts—even if a high U. N. official told the writer that the narcotics problem doesn't compare with other matters facing the U. N., including the possible carnage of world war III.

The dope crisis is a matter of life or death to our children.

Adequate Schools**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
SCHOOL BUILDING
ASSISTANCE COMMISSION,
Boston, October 17, 1951.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: Is it important to build schools?

If you think it is, you had better plan to do something about it. Consider these facts:

1. The National Production Authority allocated 21,000,000 tons of steel for the fourth quarter of 1951 for all purposes.

2. For this period they allocated 3,300,000 tons of this amount (15 percent) for automobiles.

3. They allocated 100,000 tons of steel (one-half of 1 percent) for school construction.

4. The steel now allocated for schools will barely complete projects now under construction. The outlook for needed new projects is dismal.

5. Allocation for schools of 1 percent of national steel production each quarter would enable America to meet its educational-plant needs.

Do these figures show that the people, their Congress, and the organization set up to allocate essential materials believe in education? Do they reflect your feeling about the importance of housing our children for effective education? Do you consider education a definite part of the over-all defense effort?

There is evidence that steel is available for needed schools without handicapping defense. The difficulty seems to lie in obtaining recognition by the National Production Authority of the importance of adequate schools.

Massachusetts schools need your help.

Key men are Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Board, and Charles E. Wilson, Chairman of the Defense Production Authority. Will you let them know that you believe schools can be built without hampering defense?

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. MARSHALL,
Administrator.

Tax Suspension on Zinc Imports**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting tax suspension legislation on zinc imports is most gratifying.

I am pleased that this was done in a

short period of time subsequent to my introduction of this measure.

There is unanimity of opinion as to the need for tax suspension. Every defense agency of the Government concerned with zinc supplies acknowledges the need for the importation of additional zinc without tariffs. The domestic supply cannot hope to meet the needs of industry in this period of accelerated production for defense.

Brass industries in the Naugatuck Valley have already felt the impact of the zinc shortage. This metal must be combined with the available copper to produce many brass products essential to our security.

I had contemplated an amendment to the bill providing for automatic reimposition of the tax when the price of domestic zinc fell to 17 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents per pound for 30 days. Inasmuch as the committee saw fit to use the figure of 18 cents per pound in this same manner, I have no objection to passage in that form. The difference is not substantial enough to chance any hopes of congressional adoption during this session.

The acceptance of this bill will materially assist in overcoming the zinc shortage which has retarded production efforts of Naugatuck Valley industries.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement by him, together with a letter addressed to him by Mr. Louis E. Leverone.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to include a letter received from Mr. Louis E. Leverone, former president of the National Aeronautic Association, past president of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, present governor of the National Air Council, and one of the outstanding businessmen of Illinois, who makes some very appropriate and timely observations on the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and its work:

OCTOBER 15, 1951.

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: Within the last few days the writer was a guest of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at the biennial inspection of the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory in Cleveland. This laboratory is one of three such scientific proving grounds operating under the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Several hundred of us were included in this inspection group, and numbered among the guests were representatives of all branches

of the armed services, high governmental officials, aircraft and accessory manufacturers, scientists, and a number of businessmen, such as myself.

The methods and experiments which we were permitted to see were an impressive tribute to the diligence of those who direct the policies of this effort. Certainly one could leave the laboratory with a feeling that all steps which are necessary for the preservation of our national security in aviation were being very capably handled.

Many of us, I am sure, received a comprehensive education in such matters as atmospheric altitudes, supersonic speeds, and other fantastic developments which are almost beyond the bounds of imagination.

As a taxpayer it was my very definite impression that this is the type of Government expenditure which pays tribute to the wisdom of those who have fought for these objectives. It would probably be very safe to say that after this inspection had been concluded it was the consensus of opinion of those who were privileged to attend that even greater appropriations would be justified to further these splendid efforts.

To keep America first in the air has been the lifetime vocation of a select few of our leaders in aviation thinking. Certainly the efforts of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics are the objective means to such an end.

Finally I should like to pay my humble tribute to Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Chairman of the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, director of these wonderful efforts, and to Dr. John P. Victory, who, as coordinator, has performed a fine and outstanding public service in bringing about these constructive results.

Please be assured that you have my complete support on any decision which you may make concerning further development or expansion of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Their efforts are a step in the direction of progress, and as such will receive support of all patriotic citizens.

With best wishes, I am, believe me,

Cordially and sincerely,

L. E. LEVFRONE,
President.

Administration Costs Overseas**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including at this point in the RECORD three tables prepared some months ago by the State Department, the first showing, for the ECA European program, the number of American and local personnel, and estimated expenditures for administration and information projects for the fiscal year 1951; the second giving a comparative statement of the staffing pattern and annual salary rates for the State Department and other United States Government units in certain European and near-eastern countries; the third giving a comparison of ECA, USIE, and German-Austrian public affairs costs.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Economic Cooperation Administration—European program, American and local personnel, and estimated expenditures for administration and information projects, fiscal year 1951

	Total American		Total local		Information				Total administrative expenditures	Dollar equivalent local currency information projects expenditures	Total expenditures	Dollar equivalent local currency savings	Net dollar requirements
	Number	Annual salary rate	Number	Annual salary rate	American		Local						
					Number	Annual salary rate	Number	Annual salary rate					
Austria.....	53	\$320,130	87	\$82,023	5	\$30,630	12	\$11,349	\$661,070	\$744,000	\$1,405,070	\$1,082,600	\$322,380
Belgium.....	34	211,480	20	34,320	4	23,040	5	7,200	367,170	12,000	379,170	234,230	144,940
Denmark.....	42	235,350	33	51,888	19	47,970	14	20,550	506,420	300,000	806,420	630,300	176,030
France.....	119	666,190	133	231,337	11	68,490	69	116,505	1,987,230	2,450,000	4,437,230	3,986,950	450,280
Germany.....	64	460,330	54	79,456	5	31,930	6	9,242	1,378,200	1,922,000	3,300,200	2,815,600	484,600
Greece.....	51	345,130	65	87,461	2	14,040	21	23,270	2,052,100	356,000	2,408,100	2,004,080	404,020
Iceland.....	4	19,320	2	3,168					52,470	100	52,570	36,110	16,460
Ireland.....	15	96,520	10	11,467	1	6,990			195,050	50,000	245,050	181,700	63,260
Italy.....	90	572,100	183	268,287	9	57,370	28	44,684	2,076,650	2,770,000	4,846,650	4,448,740	397,910
Netherlands.....	43	256,560	44	62,241	5	27,330	16	20,016	510,550	680,000	1,190,550	988,180	202,370
Norway.....	25	147,980	40	52,029	3	18,270	14	17,050	364,120	45,000	409,120	286,570	122,550
Portugal.....	24	149,690	15	23,127	1	7,710	5	7,511	395,210	18,000	413,210	306,220	106,990
Sweden.....	25	154,060	6	7,518	4	28,260	3	4,116	289,120		289,120		289,120
Switzerland.....	4	17,340	2	3,570					47,150		47,150		47,150
Trieste.....	8	56,250	15	17,002			8	11,184	143,420	115,000	258,420	202,370	56,050
Turkey.....	41	263,950	97	187,400	4	21,420	16	35,555	965,750	195,000	1,160,750	908,310	252,440
United Kingdom.....	97	585,170	87	115,408	8	47,720	20	29,661	1,764,000	900,000	2,664,000	2,120,620	543,380
Total country missions.....	742	4,506,750	803	1,318,502	71	431,170	237	357,893	13,754,740	10,557,100	24,311,840	20,232,910	4,078,930
Office of the Special Representative.....	509	3,453,490	787	1,205,852	81	552,210	250	508,240	9,956,860	2,800,000	12,756,860	9,622,400	3,134,370
Total ECA, Europe.....	1,311	8,020,210	1,690	2,524,354	152	983,380	487	866,133	23,711,600	13,357,100	37,068,700	29,855,400	7,213,300
Lapse.....	138	827,910	231	351,354	16	103,520	68	120,901					
Man-years.....	1,203	7,192,300	1,446	2,173,000	136	879,860	419	745,219					

¹ Includes personnel of the Scandinavian Information Service Center (6 Americans, annual salary rate \$37,080, and 10 local, annual salary rate \$15,100) which coordinates information programs and services.

Authorized positions fiscal year 1951—Comparative statement, staffing pattern, and annual salary rates¹ for State Department and other U. S. Government units in certain European and near-eastern countries

	State Department general program		USIE		USIE support		ECA Administration support by State Department		Commerce (including CAA)		Treasury		Agriculture		Public Health Service ²	
	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate	Number of positions	Annual rate
1. Austria:																
Americans.....	80	\$431,802	46	306,000	1	\$3,912	6	\$17,800							9	\$24,957
Locals.....	82	121,032														
2. Belgium:																
Americans.....	57	287,533	8	42,480	3	11,736	5	27,549			5	19,496				
Locals.....	87	128,412	21	30,055	7	9,555	11	10,334								
3. Luxembourg:																
Americans.....	10	61,801														
Locals.....	8	11,808														
4. Denmark:																
Americans.....	39	190,815	6	31,040	2	7,824	4	11,220					1	\$6,000		
Locals.....	41	60,516	21	24,961	7	9,555	13	16,000								
5. France:																
Americans.....	223	1,103,452	68	339,980	23	89,976	73	247,580	5	\$34,725	9	58,630	4	32,000	13	69,373
Locals.....	218	360,048	215	278,712	72	98,280	58	84,100								
6. Germany:																
Americans.....	302	1,455,942	507	43,627,170							5	28,147			26	82,479
Locals.....	296	400,704														
7. Greece:																
Americans.....	47	219,745	28	151,640	9	33,813	1	6,990	12	67,250	2	7,491				
Locals.....	57	64,638	104	130,285	35	39,515										
8. Iceland:																
Americans.....	17	92,674	4	18,000	1	3,912	3	13,248	16	64,700						
Locals.....	7	10,332	3	6,830	1	1,365										
9. Ireland:																
Americans.....	21	115,300	2	11,540	1	3,912	1	2,970	6	32,400						
Locals.....	51	75,276	3	2,400	1	1,365	5	3,088								
10. Italy:																
Americans.....	217	1,073,320	70	311,170	23	89,976	54	107,240			6	34,461			5	26,266
Locals.....	217	364,572	283	348,631	84	114,000	24	62,046								
11. Netherlands:																
Americans.....	45	242,220	9	47,630	3	11,736	3	9,079					3	18,150	4	13,087
Locals.....	70	112,176	38	36,248	13	17,745	11	9,240								
12. Norway:																
Americans.....	39	218,757	9	48,076	3	11,736	6	25,560								
Locals.....	44	64,944	10	13,598	3	4,095	2	1,820								
13. Portugal:																
Americans.....	42	220,026	6	30,180	2	7,824	3	14,870								
Locals.....	52	76,752	11	9,347	4	5,400	7	6,072								
14. Sweden:																
Americans.....	48	255,396	10	51,980	3	11,736	5	21,430			2	11,800				
Locals.....	59	87,084	25	30,427	8	10,920	6	6,300								
15. Trieste:																
Americans.....	9	59,422	6	35,240	2	7,824	2	6,060			2	8,800				
Locals.....	1	1,476	21	23,524	7	9,555										

¹ Annual rate means full salary for full year. Actual costs will be less owing to existence of vacancies occurring in some positions.

² Figure include 27 positions paid from funds allocated to Public Health Service from Displaced Persons Commission

³ 2 positions (annual rate \$13,160) financed from USIE funds. Balance from appropriation "Government in occupied area of Germany."

⁴ Financed from appropriation "Government in occupied area of Germany." Not a charge against USIE appropriation.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6575

Authorized positions fiscal year 1951—Comparative statement, staffing pattern, and annual salary rates for State Department and other U. S. Government units in certain European and near-eastern countries—Continued

	State Department general program		USIE		USIE support		ECA Admini- stration support by State Department		Commerce (including CAA)		Treasury		Agriculture		Public Health Service	
	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate
16. Turkey:																
Americans.....	59	\$287,434	23	\$168,230	11	\$41,327	11	\$34,950	43	\$259,609						
Locals.....	72	81,648	105	177,725	35	39,516										
17. United Kingdom:																
Americans.....	186	939,314	21	135,010	7	27,384	11	38,070	11	64,776	13	\$75,428	2	\$15,400	32	\$120,979
Locals.....	323	476,748	59	66,481	20	27,300	25	27,252								
Total.....	3,201	9,795,058	1,782	6,591,854	391	763,513	350	810,478	93	523,520	44	244,643	10	72,150	89	314,111

	MDAP program direction by State Depart- ment em- ployees ¹		MDAP admini- stration sup- port		MDAP military assistance advi- sory groups		Marine guard at mis- sions, Num- ber			MDAP program direction by State Depart- ment em- ployees ¹		MDAP admini- stration sup- port		MDAP military assistance advi- sory groups		Marine guard at mis- sions, Num- ber		
	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions ²	Annual rate ⁴				Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions	Annual rate	Num- ber of posi- tions ³	Annual rate ³			
1 Austria:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
2 Belgium:																		
Americans.....	2	\$14,750	6	\$19,432	77	\$308,137	10											
Locals.....																		
3 Luxembourg:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
4 Denmark:																		
Americans.....	2	12,620	7	21,570	68	257,105	5											
Locals.....																		
5 France:																		
Americans.....	4	31,900	21	66,000	130	537,801	27											
Locals.....																		
6 Germany:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
7 Greece:																		
Americans.....	2	14,300	29	128,209	319	1,172,617	6											
Locals.....																		
8 Iceland:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
9 Ireland:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
10 Italy:																		
Americans.....										4	\$32,300	10	\$32,520	78	\$326,704	19		
Locals.....																		
11 Netherlands:																		
Americans.....	2	10,500	8	25,448	67	283,332	10											
Locals.....																		
12 Norway:																		
Americans.....	2	12,620	7	22,590	66	258,577	10											
Locals.....																		
13 Portugal:																		
Americans.....	2	16,450	5	19,560	46	194,104	6											
Locals.....																		
14 Sweden:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
15 Trieste:																		
Americans.....																		
Locals.....																		
16 Turkey:																		
Americans.....	2	10,620												82	3,456,437			
Locals.....																		
17. United Kingdom:																		
Americans.....	73	450,186	23	81,006	43	174,293												
Locals.....																		
Total.....	95	606,636	116	417,025	1,776	6,969,372	106											

¹ Does not include local employees paid from nonappropriated local currencies made available pursuant to bilateral agreements.
² Includes both civilian and military personnel. Salary of military calculated on basis of average for each rank and grade represented. Figures do not include allowances or military. Civilians paid from MDAP funds, military personnel paid from military appropriations.
 Note.—Defense Department did not wish to release figures on attachés through another department, but will make information available to congressional committee on receipt of direct request.

Comparison of ECA, USIE, and German-Austrian public affairs costs

Authorized positions, fiscal year 1951	USIE personal services		Total cost, USIE operation	ECA information program, personal services		Total cost, ECA infor- mation program	German-Austrian information pro- gram, personal services		Total costs, German- Austrian information program	
	Number positions	Annual rate		Number positions	Annual rate		Number positions	Annual rate	Germany	Austria
1. Austria:										
Americans.....	2	\$13,160		5	\$30,630		44	\$292,840		
Locals.....				12	11,349					
2. Belgium:										
Americans.....	8	42,480		4	23,040					
Locals.....	21	30,055		5	7,200					
3. Luxembourg:										
Americans.....										
Locals.....										
4. Denmark:										
Americans.....	6	31,040		9	47,970					
Locals.....	21	24,961		14	20,550					
5. France:										
Americans.....	68	359,990		11	68,490					
Locals.....	218	278,712		69	116,505					
6. Germany:										
Americans.....				5	31,930		567	3,627,170		
Locals.....				6	9,242					
7. Greece:										
Americans.....	28	151,640		2	14,040					
Locals.....	104	130,285		21	23,270					
8. Iceland:										
Americans.....	4	18,309								
Locals.....	3	6,830								

¹ Approximate figures. Final calculations for 1951 cost following take-over from Army not yet complete.
² Includes personnel of Scandinavian Information Center.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Comparison of ECA, USIE, and German-Austrian public affairs costs—Continued

Authorized positions, fiscal year 1951	USIE personal services		Total cost, USIE operation	ECA information program, personal services		Total cost, ECA information program	German-Austrian information program, personal services		Total costs, German-Austrian information program	
	Number positions	Annual rate		Number positions	Annual rate		Number positions	Annual rate	Germany	Austria
9. Ireland:										
Americans.....	2	\$11,540		1	\$6,990					
Locals.....	3	2,400								
10. Italy:										
Americans.....	70	341,170		9	67,370					
Locals.....	253	348,631		28	41,084					
11. Netherlands:										
Americans.....	9	47,030		5	27,330					
Locals.....	38	36,238		10	20,016					
12. Norway:										
Americans.....	9	48,070		3	18,270					
Locals.....	10	13,598		14	17,050					
13. Portugal:										
Americans.....	6	30,180		1	7,710					
Locals.....	11	9,347		5	7,511					
14. Sweden:										
Americans.....	10	53,950		4	28,260					
Locals.....	25	36,427		3	4,116					
15. Trieste:										
Americans.....	6	35,240								
Locals.....	21	21,521		8	11,181					
16. Turkey:										
Americans.....	33	108,230		4	21,420					
Locals.....	105	177,725		16	35,555					
17. United Kingdom:										
Americans.....	21	135,010		8	47,720					
Locals.....	59	65,481		20	29,661					
Paris (Office of Special Representative):										
Americans.....				81	552,210					
Locals.....				250	508,230					
Total for listed countries.....	1,171	2,671,844		639	1,849,503		611	\$3,920,010		
Total program positions outside listed countries.....	7,096			102			158			
Total administrative support positions.....	2,348			(^c)						
Grand total.....	10,615			741			769			
Total cost of personal services, lapsed and otherwise adjusted.....			\$24,241,974			\$1,839,598			\$3,962,044	¹ \$206,240
All costs other than personal services program.....			73,613,415			⁴ 13,919,400			10,887,455	¹ 1,254,200
Administrative support or other contingent expense.....			6,110,286			⁵ 957,891			⁶ 1,343,884	¹ 192,500
Total cost, information program.....			104,265,705			10,716,889			16,193,383	¹ 1,742,940

Prepared by Office of Budget and Finance, Department of State.

¹ Not available on comparable basis.⁴ Except for approximately \$280,000 (for stateside and certain minor far eastern expenses), total represents dollar equivalent of obligations incurred in counterpart local currencies rather than in appropriated dollars.⁵ Basis of calculation differs in certain respects from basis used in computing USIE administrative support.⁶ Includes travel and representation allowance.

Attorney General J. Howard McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious offense to interfere with the administration of justice. The Attorney General is the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States. J. Howard McGrath, as Attorney General, sought to interfere with the administration of justice when he attempted to divert a grand jury in St. Louis from its investigation of charges against the former collector, James P. Finnegan. When the man charged with enforcing the law seeks to prevent its enforcement, he is absolutely unfit for his position.

The position of Attorney General of the United States is one of great honor. It must be filled by a man of discretion and dignity. Like Caesar's wife, he must be above suspicion. Certainly this is not the case with J. Howard McGrath. He stated that one of the most distinguished and revered Federal judges in the United

States was guilty of damnable and contemptible lies when that judge, the Honorable George H. Moore, stated that McGrath had called him on the telephone regarding the Finnegan investigation; and yet on the very next day he retracted this statement, saying he had called Judge Moore. Certainly these are not the actions of a man of discretion, of candor, of dignity, or of impeccability.

J. Howard McGrath is a self-discredited Attorney General. He is a discredit to the legal profession. It is within the power of the President to demand his resignation. I think that the Congress should immediately make known to the President its sentiments. Therefore, I have introduced a concurrent resolution which would make known to the President these views.

Unfortunately, Congress is about to adjourn. In the last-minute rush, it probably will not be possible to have action taken on this concurrent resolution. I am requesting the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, of which I am a member, to immediately appoint a subcommittee to investigate McGrath's actions and to make a report on this resolution. The investigation should commence immediately and continue during the recess. If that is done,

the Congress will be in a position to act on this resolution when it reconvenes in January unless the President has seen fit to remove McGrath in the meantime.

Obligations of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently Col. John J. Griffin, vice president of the Bank of St. Louis, made an excellent address on the responsibilities of citizenship. All of us, I think, are inclined too readily to take for granted the privileges and protection conferred upon us by reason of our being citizens of the United States, and to give only lip service to the obligations which this imposes upon us. Colonel Griffin has pointed up some specific instances in which many of us are delinquent. His address is well worth reading, and I ask unanimous con-

sent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP

The definition of a "citizen" that I like is the one given in Webster's: "a person, native or naturalized, who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to protection from it." I think that definition probably fits everyone in this country so qualified. Let us look into the record and see how we who are today enjoying the blessings so abundantly showered upon us repay them.

There is no doubt in my mind that if anyone were to accuse over 50 percent of our population of the crime of not being good citizens, they would find a reaction from those so accused that would be not at all pleasant. But are they good citizens?

My definition of a good citizen is one who not only accepts the protection that this great Government offers to him, but realizes that with such acceptance there comes a responsibility to meet the obligations imposed by the acceptance of such blessings. What are these responsibilities? Under the laws of this land you are entitled to the protection of the rights that are yours, and it is the duty and the obligation of the Government to so protect your rights from infringement. But that places upon you as good citizens the direct obligation of obedience to the laws as prescribed in your particular community, State, and Nation, so that you shall not violate the rights of other citizens.

Unfortunately, today there are too many people in this country who have disregarded completely the laws of the land, and are living a lawless and selfish existence for their benefit and their benefit only, in defiance of both the moral and legal law. That, you may say, is a far-fetched statement. Nevertheless, the record shows the statement to be true. So let us again consult the record.

Uniform Crime Reports, published by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, reports that every 5 minutes during 1950 someone in the United States was feloniously assaulted or killed; during each day of the year 1950, 146 persons were robbed; 458 cars were stolen; 11,029 places were entered by burglars; and every 30 seconds throughout the year a larceny was recorded. During that period of time the crime record had increased in percentage figures from $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent to 10 percent above the 1949 figures. But the sad part of the record is that 41 percent of those arrests were for major violations, that age 21 predominated in the frequency of arrests, and, believe it or not, 9.6 percent of the total were females.

I am merely outlining and sketching this report. If you wish to make a more detailed study by city, town, and State, you can write to J. Edgar Hoover, and I am sure that he will be happy to send you a copy. A study of the figures in these reports shows an alarming trend to utter disregard of the law. This indicates that there is much opportunity and need for an education program to bring people back to living under the laws honestly and decently, which, after all, is the only worth-while way of living.

Of course, you can say to me, "I do not violate any law—this doesn't apply to me." That may be true. Perhaps there is no record of your having violated the law. But examine your conscience and you will find that there are many, many times that you have been violators and have not been apprehended. When you drive your car, are you considerate of your fellow travelers on the highway? Do you observe the speed laws? Do you observe the stop signs, and are you careful of the safety of the pedestrians, particularly in the observance of the traffic regulations surrounding the schools?

Now, there are many ways in which you can become an indifferent citizen and therefore, by inference, not a good citizen, by failing to do the things that good citizens should do.

It is alarming to realize that in the last national election only approximately 50 percent of the people of this Nation eligible to vote for the President of the United States were sufficiently concerned to go to the polls and cast their ballots. Therefore, by their indifference and neglect, the other 50 percent of eligible voters disfranchised themselves. They failed to take advantage of the blessings that are theirs in America in being able to go to the polls, and, without fear of reprisals of any kind, cast a ballot of free men. They failed to participate in the process of picking and choosing public officials who, in their opinion, were qualified, competent, and able to assume the tremendous responsibility of operation and control of this Government as we face one of the greatest crises in our history.

There has never been a time in the history of our Nation was it more necessary to elect men to office, whether it be in high or low places, who are more concerned about the safety and security of this Nation than they are with personal gain or party success. And to my way of thinking, the people who were eligible to vote and did not vote, either through indifference or neglect, failed to fulfill their obligations and thus cannot be called good citizens. Remember, you will get the type and kind of government you ask for—no better, no worse. You, as an individual, are responsible and must answer, not only to yourself, but to your fellow-citizens for any and all disappointments that come through your indifference and neglect.

As a good citizen, voting is not only a duty and responsibility that you should not shirk but one that you should perform with pride, and with a prayer of thanksgiving in your hearts that today you still have the right to express your likes or dislikes at the ballot box. There are millions of people behind the iron curtain who would gladly and willingly change places with you, and who, I am sure, would not fail in their responsibility in this respect.

You may say that you are not interested in politics; that all politicians are crooked, that all politics is dishonest; therefore, you do not vote. By your very neglect and indifference you are contributing to whatever fault you may find in the operation of your government, whether it be local, State, or National, because you have done nothing to protect it. Of course, you may say, "I have not violated any of the law. I have not failed to exercise my right of suffrage at the polls, so this doesn't apply to me."

Now, there is another duty of good citizenship that it is equally important to exercise, and that is jury duty. I would venture to say that were an officer of the law to appear in this room tonight and serve jury summons on everyone here, requesting that they present themselves before a court to qualify as jurors in a trial, more than 50 percent of those present would make every effort to avoid such jury service. The judges of your courts can give you the answer to that. Efforts to be excused from jury duty may not be as prevalent in the small community as in the large city, yet, repeatedly, we find people who are too busy, who haven't the time, who are going to be out of town, who use political influence, and who even attempt to get medical certificates to avoid jury service. That, in my opinion, is not a mark of good citizenship.

If and when you are served with a summons to appear to qualify for jury duty, before attempting to avoid such service stop and ask yourself this question: If I, personally, were on trial would I want the better class of citizens avoiding the duty imposed

by law of granting to me a trial by a jury of my peers? Why is it that your professional men, your businessmen, your outstanding citizens, are too busy to give the few hours a year they would be called upon to give to uphold the laws of the land, in granting to a fellow citizen, regardless of his social or financial status, an opportunity of a trial, of being judged by twelve men, chosen by the court for such purpose, without any attempt by any of the twelve to evade the responsibility?

I have just scratched the surface of how one can, through indifference and neglect, take unto himself the title of bad citizenship. This description, of course, could be expanded and would require, not only hours, but probably days and weeks, to go into in its entirety.

You might say, what are we going to do about it? One of the first things we must do is to take our place on the firing line, and assume willingly the responsibilities imposed upon us by our acceptance of the great privilege of citizenship in this country. Let us not forget that if every community in America were to clean up its own local situation, and if each and every citizen in each small community in America were to assume the responsibility of citizenship, then the major problems in America would become minor because the Government is you. The United States is merely a gathering together of all the small communities into statehood and of all the States into the national picture. As each community meets its responsibility, then the State must meet its responsibility, and that, in turn, assures us of a national picture that is healthy and wholesome and secure.

We must, in our system of education, train the youth in such a way that they will have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the responsibilities that are theirs as citizens. Teaching the youth in our schools to recite the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights verbatim, word for word, does not answer the question, because you could teach a parrot to do that. But teach them the meaning of that Constitution and that Bill of Rights, what it means to them, what it cost in the sweat and blood of the forefathers of our Nation to preserve it intact as a heritage to hand down to us—that is important and will instill the seeds of good citizenship in the youth of this land.

It is a peculiar situation today, that in these times of increasing crime and violence of our Nation, it has been declared unconstitutional to teach a child in the schools that there is a God, and the things that that God stands for. But it has not been declared unconstitutional to teach them there is no God.

Looking toward the future of this country, we realize we are in great danger today of losing everything that we hold sacred and dear. The enemy must feel a tremendous consolation, as they look at the crime record, as they examine the sorry spectacle of our indifference and neglect in exercising our right of suffrage, as they gleefully enjoy our avoidance of jury service. Adding these things up and taking it for granted that there is a complete breakdown of the moral law in this land—what pleasure they must derive from it. To them it looks as though the democracy of free men has failed, that it has disintegrated. And they look with joy and glee to the day when they can become victors, not by force and violence, but by the disintegration of the moral fiber of our people, and by that most insidious enemy—defeat from within.

I think it would be well if all of us were to obtain one of the small circulars that Uncle Sam is distributing to promote the sale of savings bonds—to bring into our homes the message of a soldier in Korea, who asks us to look out the window into our front lawn, and see there, in a fox hole, a cold, tired, and hungry soldier, alert, defending

our home. That is exactly what every man in Korea is doing. Now, what a mockery it would be if you and I, through our neglect, lose here what those defenders of our homes are fighting for over there.

It is your community. It is your State. It is your government—yours, personally and individually. It will be as honest, decent, and great as you wish to make it. Or it will degenerate into the depths you force upon it through your failure to exercise your citizenship intelligently and to participate in the operation and support of your government.

Proposed National Arts Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 105, providing for the establishment of a National Arts Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY WITH REGARD TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 105, PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL ARTS COMMISSION

It was my privilege within recent days to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 105 under the cosponsorship of four distinguished colleagues who have long been widely known for their championship of significant social and economic reforms. I refer to Senators HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS and KEFAUVER.

This resolution provides for the establishment of a National Arts Commission as the citadel of those basic American cultures which form the foundation of the very civilization which we are spending precious lives and untold billions of dollars to preserve as the heritage of free men. We are presently engaged in the greatest sales campaign in history; we are striving to convince hundreds of millions of people around the world that the American way of life is superior to the slave existence that the totalitarian aggressors would thrust upon them. And our very existence as free men may well depend upon the success of our sales effort.

But while we have been promoting the American system, we have neglected to safeguard at home the cultural pursuits in the field of fine arts that are the very cornerstones of the civilization that supports our American way of life. Our swiftly changing economic picture and the technological progress that made America strong enough to resist successive armed aggressions have, strangely enough, weakened our promotion of the fine arts and worked hardships upon the skilled practitioners in those fields. High taxes have all but eliminated the contributions of our erstwhile wealthy private patrons of the arts; mechanical reproduction of cultural artistry without continuing reward for those who performed has decimated the ranks of artists and discouraged would-be newcomers to these pursuits. They are the forgotten men and women who need desperately the help that our Government can give them through the agency of a National Arts Commission such as is provided in Senate Joint Resolution 105.

This resolution provides for a Commission of 19 members, comprising the President as

ex officio chairman, the President of the Senate, the Honorable Speaker of the House, four members each from both Houses of the Congress, and representatives of national nonprofit organizations fostering various fine arts endeavors. It would be responsible for the preservation and development of our cultural pursuits at the National, State, and local levels.

There is nothing new or revolutionary in this procedure. Such commissions have been the cornerstones of the cultural heritage of other nations for centuries. Only recently, a Royal Commission recommended the establishment of such a national body in Canada because it found "that it is entirely impossible for the Canadian composer to gain a livelihood by his art, and that earning a living for either the Canadian concert artist or the Canadian professional musician is extremely difficult."

In this connection it is interesting to note that while the plight of the musician in these United States is equally serious, he and his Canadian neighbor have done something affirmative to help themselves. Theirs is an interesting experiment that began several years ago when Mr. James C. Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada, was able to cushion somewhat the effects of mechanical music by creating, in agreement with the recording and transcription industry, a royalty fund that spends about \$1,500,000 annually for the employment of live musicians in hundreds of localities to perform free music for the public.

I was particularly interested last May when I was in Geneva as a United States delegate to the International Labor Organization to find that organization studying the Petrillo formula in working toward a world-wide convention that would establish the rights of artists to payment for work done when their performances are multiplied mechanically for profit. Unlike the author and composer, these entertainers have no protection under the copyright laws, and I sincerely hope such a convention will be adopted.

If you will inspect our Economic Cooperation Administration program in Europe you will find that this government is investing in the preservation of the culture of the Old World. This is sound business because it recognizes that man does not live by bread alone.

But, while we carry out our responsibilities as missionaries to a foreign land, let us not neglect our own souls.

Therefore, I commend to my fellow Senators Senate Joint Resolution 105.

Summary of Work of First Session, Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the October 22 issue of Newsweek magazine, published yesterday, there appears an interesting and informative summary of the work of this session of the Eighty-second Congress. It pays a high, and in my judgment, a well-deserved tribute to our majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix

of the RECORD for the information of Members of this body.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS. BEHIND THE RECORD

Tongue in cheek, Senate Majority Leader ERNEST W. McFARLAND picked up his desk phone and called Speaker SAM RAYBURN last week. The Senate, said McFARLAND, was considering a 30-day recess while conference committees haggled their way to agreement on the few vital bills not yet delivered.

RAYBURN was outraged; invariably, it had been the House which rested while the Senate toiled. He summoned CLARENCE CANNON, stubborn and uncompromising chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. RAYBURN's comments pierced the thick walnut doors of his office; soon afterward, House lobbies and cloakrooms were abuzz with indignation at McFARLAND's hint.

House hurries: Wednesday evening, the Appropriations Committee hurriedly reported out the \$7,482,527,790 allocation for foreign economic and military aid. At 10 a. m. the next day, the House met to consider the measure. Though ordinarily it would have spent a week on the job, it finished the task by 7:48 p. m. The Senate Appropriations Committee, simultaneously taking up the same measure, miraculously concluded its hearings in the same single day after listening to Secretaries Acheson and Lovett and ECA chief Richard Bissell, Jr.

Tax-bill conferees, bogged down for days and talking darkly about putting off final action until next year, astonished the press galleries by announcing at a Thursday afternoon briefing that they had reached agreement.

This Tuesday, however, the House voted 203 to 157 to reject the tax-bill agreement, and adjournment this week seemed unlikely.

If McFARLAND wanted to assess his stewardship in figures, then the first session of the Eighty-second Congress had been a slug-gard. The "do nothing" Eightieth, in its first session, passed 395 public laws, the Eighty-first, 440. For the Eighty-second, the first session's total would approximate 180.

Security wins. But its accomplishments included, in addition to the Mutual Security Act (the foreign-aid bill), authorization for Army, Navy, and air bases all over the world, for construction of 140 major naval vessels and conversion of 292 others, and for transfer of 24 destroyer escorts to six nations as part of the mutual-defense program; authorization of universal military training and an extension of the draft to mid-1955; establishment of a policy governing United States aid to nations trading with the Soviet half of the world; provision for eliminating excess profits from defense contracts; and Senate approval of four additional divisions of troops for Europe. Of total appropriations of approximately \$96,000,000,000, the staggering sum of \$80,884,538,928 would go for defense and mutual security.

Wage and price controls had been extended through June 30, 1952, export controls to June 30, 1953, and reciprocal-trade agreements to June 12, 1953. A billion and a half dollars had been allocated to Government-insured mortgages for housing, community facilities, and services related to defense. India had been lent \$100,000,000 for food.

Postal rates had been readjusted to trim the deficit, Government employees had been granted pay rises, the RFC had been reorganized, the copper tax had been suspended, and \$10,000 free life insurance had been granted to each man in the armed services.

There had been 133 congressional investigations, ranging from the Kefauver and McCarthy to-do's to examinations of consumer

price indexes. Midwest floods, communism in the movies, industry, and Hawaii, tin stockpiling, boxcar supply, 5 percenters, color television, Senator JOE McCARTHY, the Katyn massacre, and monopolies in aluminum and baseball.

SIGNIFICANCE

From President Truman's point of view, the Eighty-second's record thus far is far from satisfactory. Mr. Truman has made 57 specific requests for legislation and Congress has approved 22 of them—in varying degrees. The matter of degree is important. For example, the President first asked for a \$16,000,000,000 tax increase, then for \$10,000,000,000; this week Congress was still debating an increase of \$5,750,000,000.

Similarly, the President asked for a stiff economic-controls bill and got a weaker one than had been enacted when the Korean crisis first erupted. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as renewed, is much worse—in the President's opinion—than the one the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress passed.

Civil-rights bills have not even received a hearing. Neither have the President's proposals for compulsory medical insurance, increased unemployment insurance, or Federal aid to education. Expansion of medical-school facilities has been quietly pigeonholed after reaching the Senate floor. The Brannan plan is very dead. The President's public-power projects are either—like the St. Lawrence seaway—tied up in committee or forgotten. Though Mr. Truman has not specifically asked for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, he has urged "improvement of our labor laws." He has obtained only a single modification, permitting union-shop negotiations before union-shop elections.

The truth is that the Democrats control the Senate by 50 to 46 and the House by 235 to 199, but the administration doesn't control the Democrats. In domestic affairs, the Republican-southern Democratic coalition is singularly effective, and the Fair Deal is comatose.

But in the field of foreign policy, the coalition ceases to exist; Southern Democrats present a solid front with the rest of the party, whether the issue is more troops for Europe, foreign aid, or the dismissal of General MacArthur, and whether or not they are in personal agreement with the President. (Many southern Democrats believed the foreign-aid bill should have been cut much more than it was, yet doomed all serious efforts to slash it.)

For these blessings, the President can thank MCFARLAND—whose selection as majority leader originally caused Mr. Truman little joy. Unlike his predecessors since the first days of President Roosevelt's regime, MCFARLAND has refused to function as a White House messenger who tries to ram Presidential proposals down the Senate's throat. He doesn't hesitate to tell Mr. Truman—politely but firmly—that certain bills or nominations don't have a chance. He won't push foredoomed legislation simply to "make a record" for the next election.

Therein lies the secret of MCFARLAND's effectiveness as majority leader—a point even the liberals concede.

Even with MCFARLAND's help—and the Arizona voted for 96 percent of the administration's proposals—the President can expect little more from the Eighty-second's next session than he got from this one. Where defense is concerned, there will be small argument. Congress is determined to face and fight a cold war for a quarter of a century, if need be. It made the point clear when it authorized construction of barracks designed to last 25 years. But on domestic issues, Congress will pay attention to the President only when it agrees with him. And it will agree with him no more frequently after a recess than it did before.

The Rochambeau Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast over WMBG, Richmond, Va., by Charles Farmer, of the Senate Radio Gallery, on the subject the Rochambeau Road.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER FROM WASHINGTON

(By Charles Farmer)

On this day, October 19, 170 years ago—that makes it 1781—Lord Cornwallis surrendered the British forces to General Washington at Yorktown, Va. This final American victory in the Revolution established the independence of the Colonies and brought a new nation into being—the United States.

That victory was due, in large part, to the valiant support of our French friends. For, as Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON has just reminded me, "General Washington had more French troops than Americans under him at Yorktown." Quite true. Our Continental Army numbered only 5,500 men; and the Virginia militia but 3,000 rifles.

The French lieutenant general, Count de Rochambeau, commanded a total of 7,600 foot soldiers, and Comte de Grasse's French fleet of 28 ships of the line and six frigates were manned by 19,000 seamen and marines. Even one Continental force at that siege was headed by a Frenchman—the illustrious Marquis de Lafayette.

Not so long ago this Nation was praising General Douglas MacArthur for the success of Inchon landing—for MacArthur's brilliant synchronizing of land and sea and air forces at that point in the Korean theater. Yet a far more important military movement—one calling for equally flawless timing—was directed by Gen. George Washington at Yorktown when he coordinated two armies by land—initially hundreds of miles apart with a fleet starting out from its base in the West Indies—that in a day when ships were propelled by vagrant winds, and riflemen slogged through unpaved mire.

So well made were Washington's plans, so skillfully were they executed by our allies that Rochambeau marched 4,000 French regulars through Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and into Virginia in time to bottle up the British on the Virginia Capes.

Just when Cornwallis was looking toward a sea escape, into the Chesapeake came Admiral de Grasse with his French ships. In answer to Washington's plea he had sailed in from the far-off Caribbean, bringing 3,000 more foot-soldiers, some field artillery—and a large sum of money he had borrowed from Spanish sources in Havana. First, he vanquished British Admiral Graves' armada in the Battle of the Chesapeake, then hemmed in Cornwallis' men on the Cape—Cornwallis sent his sword to General Washington.

Stephen Bonsai tells in his historical work, *When the French Were Here*, that France's fighting premier, Clemenceau, planned to revisit America and follow the trail taken by Rochambeau's men in that famous march from Narragansett Bay to the Virginia Capes. Death came to the "Tiger" before he could return to America and make the historic pilgrimage.

It is just as well; for Clemenceau would have been chagrined at our failure to mark the route of one of the great military marches of history—on the success of which the destiny of our new nation swung.

Why not mark out that route, now? It winds through many a picturesque hamlet—it can become one of the great highways of history—the Rochambeau Road. I asked Senator ROBERTSON what he thought of marking the route—knowing his deep knowledge of the founding of our country. He highly approved, saying, "I think the marking of this route would be appropriate, and a fitting memento to the spirit of those fine French who came to our side in those dark days."

Senator HARRY BYRD said this victory way should be indicated at least by markers "a march by friends that we should never forget."

Representative TOM STANLEY suggested that the historical societies of the States in question might mark the route through their borders.

Why not the appointment—by the President—say of a National Rochambeau Road Commission, composed of civic leaders, to coordinate and direct this work from Narragansett Bay to the Virginia Capes? His Excellency the French Ambassador, M. Henri Bonnet, should be appointed honorary chairman. What do you think of the idea? asks Farmer from Washington.

Dental Services to British Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding a story carried in the Washington Post of October 16 regarding treatment of school children by dentists under the British nationalized health services, together with an excerpt from the pamphlet National Health Service, distributed by the Ministry of Health, Whitehall, England.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

Many readers of the Washington Post were undoubtedly confused by a story carried October 16 headlined "London dentist says 9 out of 10 school children are denied dental care under British nationalized health services." The dentist in question was Dr. Cyril de Vere Green, of London. He was reported as speaking to the annual meeting of the American Dental Association as an official representative of the British Dental Association. He was quoted as warning American dentists "to take your lessons from our experience."

Undoubtedly American dentists would do well to look at the experiences of the British program. At the same time, they should scan a lot more closely the credentials of Dr. Green himself. American dentists and American readers have a right to ask how representative of the views of the British dental profession itself are Dr. Green's statements when, by his own admission, he is one of the few dentists who declined to serve in the dental service plan.

How unrepresentative Dr. Green is likely to be is best evidenced by the fact that 9,500 dentists—more than 95 percent of the profession in Great Britain—serve voluntarily in the program. Dr. Green is one of those dissenting 5 percenters. Opponents of the British Health Service certainly had to search far and wide to uncover him, bring him to America, and then blow up his views as those of the British dental profession.

This procedure is grossly unscientific. It works great harm to the British program and, even more important, to American dentists and the American people. We are all entitled to the facts, not to propaganda. Have we heard the facts from Dr. Green or propaganda?

Now, as to the warning brought by Dr. Green—this British 5 percenter. The first warning, as I see it, is that no amount of complacency, slogans, and million-dollar propaganda barrages can fill one neglected cavity, save one infected tooth, or restore to fitness the teeth of a single person, whether child or adult.

What we need is not propaganda, but constructive plans to enable people to pay dentists for needed service. What does the British experience show us?

The British experience shows that the money barrier can be stripped away from dental or medical care. When money is no longer an insurmountable barrier, people are desperately anxious to avail themselves of the expert care hitherto denied them. The British experience shows that by stripping away the money barrier, every family—not just the very wealthy and perhaps the very poor—can benefit from medical and dental advances. Under our present backward, out-moded, fee-for-service system, the average middle-class family must all too often forego these benefits or take them at the risk of being plunged into debt.

There is a second lesson which British experience can teach our American doctors of dentistry—and incidentally their colleagues, the doctors of medicine. The lesson is this. If we are to take care of the health of our people properly, we must greatly increase the supply of trained health professionals.

The American Dental Association, I rejoice to say, is well aware of this fact. American dentists vigorously support the bipartisan bill, S 337, to help our professional schools train the added numbers of dentists, physicians, and nurses we need so badly.

Unfortunately, that emergency health training measure was blocked October 4 by two forces: the medical lobby and its new-found ally, the senior Republican sponsor of the bill itself, Mr. TART.

Those of us who have sponsored a comprehensive National Health Program have always stressed the need to build up our supply of trained personnel. But we have always insisted with equal force that insured purchasing power must also be available if people are to benefit from the build-up of more medical personnel and health facilities. The two go hand in hand toward building up our supply of health professions. The bipartisan Emergency Health Training Act of 1951 encourages the education of dental hygienists. The dental hygienist is the dentist's valuable ally—and particularly useful in extending preventive dental services to children.

Outstanding American dental authorities have urged the Senate to help the dental schools train more dental hygienists and allied technicians. In view of their considered judgments, it is strange to read in the Washington Post that this British dentist, Dr. Green, speaks harshly of special training programs toward the end of speeding dental care for British children. He appears against the very steps which our American dental authorities are urging as sound.

I will go along with the views of our American dental authorities—not those of a single British dentist, however much publicity may be drummed up for him.

Those of us who have sponsored the comprehensive national health program have looked long and hard at the British program. We have watched and know its history. It was conceived by the Liberal Party. It was formed by a wartime coalition government under Winston Churchill. Finally it was set into motion by the Labor Party. We note that now all three parties claim credit for it, and that it is so universally popular with the British people that no public figure would advocate its abolition.

Here, for example, is the position of the Conservative Party: "We pledge ourselves to maintain and improve the health service." This is the road, conservative election manifesto.

And here is the position of the head of the Conservative Party, Mr. Churchill: "All parties are equally desirous to maintain the social services and, where necessary, improve them." Electoral Broadcast, February 17, 1950.

The British Health Program, despite Dr. Green, is accepted and endorsed by the professional societies which speak for the average British doctor and dentist—the British Medical Association and the British Dental Association.

Indeed, such endorsement by the British health professions is most damaging and embarrassing to the medical lobby in this country. Through its multi-million-dollar campaign, the medical lobby seeks constantly to hide the fact that British doctors and dentists support and approve the broad outlines of the British Health Program and have said so again and again.

But to obscure that support, the medical lobby, for example, has hired—actually hired—an erstwhile British physician to parade up and down the United States and misrepresent the program. In him, the medical lobby has found and is exploiting a man so disgruntled, so embittered, and also so lacking in professional devotion to the scientific spirit that he is willing, for a fee, to renounce the major canons of his profession. This erstwhile British physician, according to the medical lobby's own reports, filed with the Congress, was paid \$19,000 in salary and expenses for his propaganda activities.

Among the informational data he palmed off on Americans, in return for \$19,000, is that under national health programs operating abroad, witches fly on broomsticks, drugs are bootlegged, and there is black-market practice of medicine.

Dr. Green, the British dentist, is obviously a man of less imagination than the AMA's hired man, Dr. Ralph Campbell.

Let us eschew propaganda and look at the facts.

Some of the facts that are at hand reveal that Dr. Green has exaggerated the problems of the British Health Service to a rather surprising degree.

Consider these facts: that since July 1948, when the program started, to June 1951, 23,600,000 patients were treated—children as well as adults.

And the figures for 1949—the only year available to me—show that 2,807,000 British children were inspected and roughly 60 percent were referred for treatment. And the children actually treated numbered 1,422,000. Thus, 1,422,000 British children were treated of the 1,761,000 referred for treatment.

By American arithmetic, I make that out to be about 80 percent were treated, which hardly sounds like the 90 percent Dr. Green said were not treated.

My figures of 80 percent treated are for 1949. It may well be that the number of British dentists serving in the school program has dropped. Some have undoubtedly been lured into general practice under the national health service because of the high

rate of compensation. But Dr. Green might also point out that these same dentists are still available to school children, regardless of the office set-up at the moment. A British child can be taken by his parents to any practicing dentist under the national health service and be treated. The treatment would be made, not by a salaried dentist connected with the school service, but by the private dentist of the family's own choice.

How, under these circumstances, Dr. Green can make the statement that 90 percent of Britain's children are denied dental service is somewhat of a mystery.

Our study of the facts of the British operation convinces us that while it has scored major successes, it is a program designed to meet British needs. Its successes and its shortcomings are not a model for our own use.

The national health program, of which I have the honor to be a sponsor, and which the President has repeatedly endorsed—is a far more conservative program—designed to meet American needs. We have realistically assessed the trained professional health manpower of the country, and have provided that priority shall be assigned to the needs of our children in particular. Thus, well in advance of the introduction of any program, we have already provided safeguards against some of the temporary shortcomings of the British program.

A system to remove the dollar barrier which now separates dentist and patient takes thought and cooperation on all sides. Progress will not be advanced by one-sided propaganda sessions such as those referred to above. Progress will come quickest when we in Congress can sit down with bona fide representatives of the health professions—with doctors, dentists, and nurses, not their lobbyists and propaganda directors.

We made such progress in dental health legislation which resulted in a dental research act thoroughly acceptable to the dental profession and holding great promise for the children of this country. At the time of its enactment in 1948, it was most gratifying to me that the American Dental Association saw fit to give me "special credit for * * * exceptional service." I recall that Dr. Flagstad, chairman of the ADA's committee on legislation said, "Senator JAMES F. MURRAY, from Montana, also merits the association's appreciation because he introduced the original dental research bill 8 years ago and has reintroduced it in every succeeding session of Congress. Senator MURRAY has consistently and energetically fostered our dental research bill and secured its passage through the Senate in two different sessions of Congress."

This proves progress can and has been made in the health field with government assuming its rightful responsibility in helping our free, unfettered doctors, dentists, and nurses care for our people.

We have made such progress particularly in the field of heart disease, cancer, mental hygiene—to cite but a few.

Now we must move on and tackle the broad economic questions. The piecemeal approach is not good enough. To advance our people's health we must develop a comprehensive national health insurance program. We need the help of our doctors and dentists in perfecting that program as an effective alternative to socialized, State-controlled medicine and the regimentation of patient and doctor which we all abhor.

To help our 83,000 dentists and their 154,000,000 patients, here are authoritative statements on the dental program provided under the British National Health Service.

I attach herewith an excerpt from the pamphlet, National Health Service, distributed by the ministry of health, Whitehall, England, April 1949, page 2:

"DENTAL SERVICES

"Dentists, like doctors, are free to serve whole-time or part-time and to have private

as well as public patients. Up to mid-February 1949, 9,252 out of 10,000 dentists had joined the service. Patients do not have to register with any particular dentist but are free to go to any dentist in or out of their area who is taking part in the service and is willing to accept them.

"The dental service has also proved very popular and up to the beginning of February 1949, about 4,150,000 people had applied for dental treatment, complete treatment had been given in 2,710,000 cases, and of these about 40 percent were for dentures. It is thought that about 8,000,000 people will apply for dental treatment within the first year.

"There is no need for the patient to obtain a dental form or authority before seeking treatment. The dentist is able to carry out at once all normal conservative treatment (i. e., fillings), emergency treatment, and ordinary denture repairs. He only needs to get prior authority before undertaking treatment when it involves the removal of teeth necessitating replacement by dentures; the provision of dentures; extensive and prolonged treatment of the gums, gold fillings, bridges, crowns, special appliances, and aural surgery. Prior authority of this kind is given by the Dental Estimates Board, consisting of a dental chairman, six dental members, and two lay members. The Board also authorizes all claims for payment submitted by dentists. A dentist can also, with the approval of the Board, charge his patient extra for gold fillings, or metal dentures where these are not clinically necessary, but the patient wishes to have them."

The Responsibility of Congress to the Banking System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by William A. Lyon, superintendent of Banks of New York, and president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks.

The Senator from New York assures me that this address is worthy of study by Members of the Congress of the United States, and is most timely.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS TO THE BANKING SYSTEM

(By William A. Lyon)

These annual conventions afford us an occasion for looking back over recent years to see whether any new tendencies are coming into view that seem likely, as they grow and mature, to cause marked changes in banking and bank supervision. No institution, including banking, is really the same today as it was yesterday. Today does not grow out of nothingness; its roots are set in yesterday. We are not helpless before these evolutionary forces. We can mold them if we will. But we should know that the forces are never at rest; they are dynamic, not static.

I should like to use the time set aside for the president's report to talk about how some of the new tendencies may affect the dual system. The dual system is a well-worn phrase that is, I am convinced, absolutely meaningless to the public. It is not self-defining. We might better speak of our State-Federal banking system.

If any dangers exist today threatening the State-Federal banking system, they do not arise out of openly acknowledged efforts to undermine the system. Practically everyone who mentions the dual system does so to include himself among its supporters. Frequently actions are proposed which, upon analysis, seem likely to invade the States' sovereignty in banking. But they are usually accompanied by protestations of belief in and regard for the dual system. Any threats to the system right now are pretty largely threats of inadvertence. I am afraid, however, that there are occasionally developments which are not less threatening because they are not admittedly hostile to the system.

I have a few such developments in mind. Their common denominator is that they spring from neglect by Congress of the field of banking for a decade and more because of its absorption in wars and the problems growing out of wars. When Congress does not follow closely and shape the trend of banking powers, it permits a vacuum to be created. The vacuum does not remain unfilled very long. It is being filled with policies and developments and powers that have not been reviewed and approved by Congress. Some of the new developments proceed from mystic interpretations of statutory language used years ago before applications now made of it could possibly have been thought of.

I should like to talk to you about three such developments. The first involves the extent to which States can authorize banking organizations to be established that differ in their powers and functions and can forbid the use of terms by federally chartered institutions that would blur the distinctions between them. New York State has believed for half a century that it could reserve the word "savings" for the use of savings bank and savings and loan associations. Over a century and a quarter the people of New York State have come to associate the use of the word "savings" with mutual institutions, having closely circumscribed loan and investment powers. Since they do not do a demand-deposit business and therefore have a more stable deposit level, they were permitted to become more fully invested than commercial banks and to have their funds employed at longer terms. Since they do not create money as commercial banks do, they were exempted from reserve requirements. All these things make it possible for them to earn a higher average return on their assets and in the main, year in and year out, to pay a higher rate on the funds entrusted to them by the public. Commercial banks, of course, were given full freedom to accept passbook accounts, but in the interest of minimizing confusion with mutual savings institutions the law required that they should not call those accounts savings accounts.

For half a century national banks doing business within our borders have respected the State's preference in this matter. Now, however, our right to insist on compliance by national banks has been challenged. In those States that have no well-developed system of savings institutions, the problem is of scant importance. But it is an issue grounded in tradition and history in some States. One of the advantages of the dual system has been the opportunity it afforded to recognize these regional conditions and preferences, without at the same time weakening the banking structure. It is too much to ask the courts to read a clear expression of congressional intent into a statute adopted

long ago when there was no reason to believe that the merits of the point at issue were being passed upon. If that principle is to be changed, if in our case 125 years of banking history are to be cast aside, then I strongly believe it should be only after Congress has considered what is at stake and has, in full consciousness of all the implications, made its decision.

My second point concerns the difference between the organization of State and Federal supervisory powers. In the States it is the usual policy to concentrate in one banking department responsibility for various types of banking organizations. The Federal system does not provide the means for weaving policies for the different types of institutions into a consistent pattern.

The watertight compartments in which Federal commercial bank agencies function, on the one hand, and the Federal savings and loan regulatory body functions on the other, could exist only in the vastness of the Washington scene. There is a sharp difference in the design of the Federal and State supervisory structures. For the most part, the States have gone in for putting banking organizations of all kinds under one supervisory jurisdiction. The banking laws in a majority of the States do not provide for a superintendent of commercial banks, a superintendent of savings and loan associations, and a superintendent of savings banks. This arrangement is in direct contrast to the Federal system of independent supervisory agencies, each concerned with only a highly specialized phase of the supervisory picture.

The question that I raise is whether Congress is leading from strength or weakness when it fails to provide means of coordination among the various scattered agencies to which it has delegated powers in the lending and banking fields. I believe the unconnectedness of the Federal supervisory plan does not make for strength. It is pretty easy to show that it makes for opportunities to play one institutional type off against another. A tendency is appearing among some institutions, and perhaps by or on behalf of one or more of the agencies, to exploit the uncoordinated status of the Federal agencies to the disadvantage of the unified State supervisory structure.

I can furnish some examples from New York State's experience. One of our institutions converted to a Federal charter not long ago. Among the reasons given was the following:

"We prefer the Federal charter because the governing authority is primarily concerned with the interest and development of savings and loan associations rather than in the supervision of a number of different types of financial institutions with the rivalries that inevitably appear from time to time."

What this says is that the Federal system permits the supervisor to act as champion of the rights of its special type of institution, with no responsibility to consider what the position of other institutions may be. The independent status of the agencies is not in this instance put forward as a means of dealing with these rivalries in accordance with a settled national policy. Unfortunately there is no genuine national policy for banking that sets out plainly the role which the different types of institutions are to play. There is only confusion. While Congress looks the other way, one type of banking organization conducts itself as the competitor instead of the complement of another, and the separate Federal types then seek to take advantage of the coordinated design of the State financial structure.

I do not see how any lasting good can come from efforts of banking institutions of any one type to try to gain advantage over other types by playing off one supervisory agency against another. Nor do I believe the agencies themselves should hold out that they

can, because of their specialization, offer more benefits to their institutions than other agencies with broader responsibilities can hope to match. An instance has recently come to my attention of what competitive rather than coordinated agencies will sometimes do to attract institutions to themselves if their desire to expand is their chief motivating influence.

There are no federally chartered savings banks. This situation has been leading to some interesting developments. On the one hand, some of the commercial banks have been, in effect, aggressively challenging the wisdom underlying New York State's traditional policy of maintaining a savings bank system. A number of national banks appear to be the leaders in this movement. Against the opposition of the commercial banks the savings banks have been having difficulty in advancing their plans to make savings bank facilities available in communities in the State now without them. Their problems on this score are very different from the relatively smooth sailing with branches that the Federal savings and loan associations have encountered. With the Federal Home Loan Board deciding to ignore State laws on branches, the Federal associations have gone ahead opening up branches on the broadest kind of assumption of power.

While the savings bankers are wrestling with their branch problem, an official of the Federal Home Loan System has injected himself into the scene by strongly intimating that Federal savings bank charters might be the answer to it all. The implication here is that, under Federal charter, savings banks might have all the branch powers Federal savings and loan associations now enjoy. No doubt this is true. We now have, therefore, this extraordinary situation: Institutions operating under one kind of Federal charter—that is, national banks—are opposing the grant of power to a type of State-chartered institution—savings banks—which they themselves enjoy and which another kind of federally chartered institution—savings and loan associations—is already exercising.

This is not a dual system we are talking about. It is a double standard. Under it Federal institutions would have maximum powers, and State institutions would have minimum powers. Obviously this does not promote the well-being of the dual system, the State-Federal system, of banking.

To describe this state of affairs is to expose its absurdity. Federal banking is able to squeeze the State system in this fashion because Congress has been preoccupied with other interests for the last decade and has not itself been the coordinating influence that it ought to be. Nor has it set up any other device for accomplishing this coordination between the parts of the Federal banking apparatus.

One of the oldest responsibilities of Congress, specifically set forth in the Constitution, is money and banking. In earlier days, when the number of Federal agencies was smaller, Congress kept tabs closely on how the agencies it created were living up to specifications. The Federal Reserve, for example, has frequently come under the congressional microscope. But in the creative abundance of the depression days Congress brought into existence agency after agency, with their powers set out in large outline only. Little thought was given as to how any one agency was to work with others in related fields.

I submit that some person or body in the Federal Government should have direct responsibility to see that the interests of the different types of banking institutions are respected and reconciled. Agency rivalry is not healthful, and the more thoughtful Members of Congress would recognize this situation if their attention were not being so completely engaged elsewhere. The State

type of broad responsibility and the Federal type of narrow responsibility are not compatible. Either the States will have to work toward the Federal system, which fosters institutional rivalries by types, or the Federal banking policy will have in some way to provide for the kind of coordination which the States believe to be essential.

The Hoover Commission proposed that a National Monetary and Credit Council be appointed and that such a council become the medium through which the Federal agencies thresh out a consistent and coordinated policy. The proposal for such a council deserves more careful consideration by Congress than it has so far received. At least it is worth a trial. In addition, the Banking and Currency Committees, through their vigilance and continuing interest in banking matters can encourage and promote better agency coordination. Clearly, the present chaotic situation must give way to an orderly and consistent handling of banking policy under the guidance of Congress or an agency that Congress sets up.

The third and last point about our State-Federal system that I'd like to talk about has to do with branch power. There is an inconsistency in Congress' approach to branches. On the one hand, it has rightly required national banks to hold to State policy in branch establishment. The arrangement on commercial bank branch powers is one of the keystones of the State-Federal banking system. It permits variations in branch powers according to the preferences of the various States growing out of the nature of their economies, the character of their banking structures and the historical development of their institutions. This policy on commercial bank branches has not kept the national banking system from growing in strength and from meeting the needs of the public for banking services.

On the other hand, the branch powers of Federal savings and loan associations have grown up in an entirely different way. As it now stands, the Federal home-loan statute is silent as to respecting the policies of the States in the matter of branches. Indeed, the statute is silent about branch powers. The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has said in an opinion¹ this year.

"The statute does not give explicit authority to the Board to permit branch offices for associations set up under its guidance."

After considering the arguments on both sides of the question as to congressional intent with respect to savings and loan branches, this same court said:

"But it may be granted that a microscopic examination of the statutory words alone does not bring one to any conclusion not open to reasonable differences of opinion."

In drawing up the Home Loan Act in the early thirties Congress was silent about savings and loan branch powers. I daresay, because branches at that time were pretty far from the minds not only of Members of Congress but of the savings and loan field as well. New York State was one of the leaders in the savings and loan movement and our statutes exerted wide influence through their example. It was not until 1939 that our laws were amended to permit the opening of savings and loan branches.

For the first decade and more of its existence the Home Loan Board gave little thought to branches either. Only in recent years has it really begin to devote itself to branch establishment. Now the Board is showing an increasing amount of interest in branches and is by statement of policy alone affecting the financial structure of the

country. It is trying to shape the relationships between Federal and State power in a fashion that should be the exclusive prerogative of Congress.

The Home Loan Board is going ahead with the expanding of its branch powers, without consulting anyone, because Congress is so preoccupied with other matters. We have come to the extraordinary pass of the third circuit court of appeals reading significance into the failure of Congress to give attention to savings and loan branch bills that were introduced. The court seemed to think that Congress was pretty well satisfied with the way things were going since it refused to put any limitation on the Home Loan Board's authority.

Some of us will not find it easy to square this interpretation with certain other facts regarding the bills that we know about at first hand. After the branch bills were introduced in the Eighty-first Congress at the request of our association, several of our members urged the chairman of one of the Banking and Currency Committees to permit the bill to be reported out of committee so that it could be debated and considered on the floor.

He wanted to know whether the Home Loan Board approved the bills. When he was told that it did not, he said he would not allow the bills to be reported out. It was a rule he always followed, he said, that bills must be approved by the Federal agency concerned before they could come out of his committee. And he has been as good as his word. Under such an arrangement, it was not Congress but the Home Loan Board which acquiesced in the Board's assumption of branch powers.

I offer two reasons why Congress itself should consider and approve what it believes to be the savings and loan branch policy best suited to the requirements of our people. First, the Home Loan Board, now setting its own rules, is not equipped, and because of its very specialized responsibility is not disposed, to pass objectively on the part which savings and loan branch establishment should play in our banking structure.

Because the Board itself and the pressures behind it are not prepared to take a broad view of our banking system, and because the Board in its isolation appears to regard the rest of the banking world as unfriendly and acts accordingly, there is a need for Congress to review the whole savings and loan branch picture. Congress must decide affirmatively, and not merely by keeping hands off, what the course of future development should be.

The second reason why Congress should lay down our Federal savings and loan policy by statute rather than let it be developed by agency determination is the lack of consistency that now exists between what is being done with national bank branch powers and what is being done with savings and loan branch powers. By a law passed in 1927 Congress gave national banks the right to open branches where State laws permitted State banks to establish branches "affirmatively and not by implication or recognition, and subject to the restrictions as to location imposed by the law of the State on State banks."

The Home Loan Board has, without reference to any other interested party, worked out its own branch policy. In a statement of policy made available to the States last February, the Home Loan Board said " . . . the Board has concluded that, in passing upon branch offices for Federal savings and loan associations, it will not approve their operation in a State where the State statutes or the State constitution expressly prohibit the operation of branch offices by both savings and loan associations and banks chartered by the State."

¹ *North Arlington National Bank v. Kearny Federal Savings and Loan Assn.* (187 Fed. 2d 564 (C. C. A. 3, 1951)).

This is without doubt one of the most important policy declarations on branches ever arrived at in the banking history of this country. So far as I know it has not been made public. Since it is purely an administrative decision, it is subject to change—that is, to enlargement—without notice. The application of the policy is interesting, not to say startling. The Board appears to take the position that when any State banking institution, be it commercial or savings, can open a new branch under any condition, no matter how circumscribed, then its own branch approval power is deemed to be unlimited.

Reading the policy statement I have just quoted, one might have a hard time figuring out that by that language the Board was asserting its right to approve a branch across State lines. Of course, the Board never derived that power by analogy with State laws anywhere. We do not know in New York whether the Board would respect our banking district lines. Already it is brushing aside various provisions in our statutes, such as those having to do with population, which limit the right to establish branches.

Clearly we need to know in banking and in State supervision where the Federal Government stands on savings and loan branch power. We need to have it determined by Congress whether consistency should be achieved by adopting the national-bank-branch approach. This would preserve the right of the States to choose the kind of branch power best suited to their needs. It would be more conducive to the respecting and preservation of the sovereignty of the States in certain aspects of banking. It would prevent the State-Federal banking system from being despoiled by indirection and without express authorization of Congress.

Or we need to have it determined by Congress whether we should achieve consistency by abandoning the national-bank-branch approach and by according to the Comptroller of the Currency the same wide latitude as to branch powers that the Home Loan Board now enjoys. I think that Congress should delve deeply into all phases of branch establishment and set our course for the future with full and conscious knowledge of what is involved. If Congress wishes to recapture from the States the privilege they have had—and used wisely, I believe—to decide whether they wanted to have branch banking and under what conditions, that should be a decision openly and consciously arrived at. This is too important a policy to be determined by one Federal agency strictly on an ex parte basis. This is no time for Congress to permit the long-established position of the States to be uprooted without giving them a chance to be heard and without weighing what dangers of overestablishment of branches may be found to exist in the present course.

These I take to be the three outstanding problems in the State-Federal banking relationships today.

One is the decision of national banks to disregard a State law a half century old. Another is the narrow and uncoordinated responsibilities of the Federal agencies and the failure of Congress to see our banking system steadily and see it whole. The other is the need for an all-embracing review and determination of our branch policy. Each in its own way has a direct bearing on our dual system. Whatever comes from the interplay of present forces should come from decision, not drift. The responsibility for that decision lies with Congress. The dual system—the State-Federal banking system—has served us well. It has earned the right to expect that Congress will guard it against the inroads of neglect.

The British-Egyptian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "State Department in a Dilemma," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT IN A DILEMMA—EVEN SKIRMISHES BETWEEN BRITISH AND EGYPTIAN TROOPS AT SUZ CANAL WOULD START UPROAR FROM INDONESIA TO MOROCCO

(By Constantine Brown)

The State Department is in a serious dilemma over what to do in Egypt. The Cairo Parliament has taken action and the government cannot be budged from its demands that British troops immediately evacuate the Suez Canal zone. Neither the promise of economic aid nor the offer to Egypt of a key role in a middle eastern defense pact was sufficient inducement to change Cairo's determination.

The problem which faces our diplomats is whether to invite serious trouble in the Middle East by taking a strong stand against Egyptian national aspirations or to urge the British that it would be wiser to "compromise" with a government which makes expulsion of British troops the primary condition for a compromise.

The situation is entirely different, our top policy makers admit, from that in Iran when we were able to induce the British not to use force.

Britain's military prestige was not involved in the evacuation of Abadan. Quite the contrary, the London government was able to say to its people and the world that it preferred losing important economic interests to using strong methods which might have precipitated another war.

The task of our diplomats is far more complex now. It is no longer a question of a dispute over economic concessions or privileges. Britain's prestige throughout the world is involved. There are upward of 10,000 British troops along the Suez Canal today. It is no longer a matter of ordering 300 civilian engineers and oil experts to withdraw to avoid trouble with the Iranian Government. It is a question of a British army leaving Egyptian territory, bag and baggage, under peremptory orders of the Cairo Government. And neither the Laborites nor the Conservatives in Britain want to accept this humiliation.

The State Department already has indicated to Cairo that the United States stands firmly behind Britain. But this diplomatic indication is not taken seriously by the Egyptians. They know that the American people, who already have their hands full in Korea, will not allow their Government to draw them into another military adventure, much as they dislike a further humiliation of our strongest ally in Europe.

It is true that the military forces of Egypt, which were supposed to be organized and equipped by the British under the 1936 treaty—but were not—are not in a position to fight even the small British naval and air forces in Egypt and in the immediate neighborhood. But the State Department is

also aware that if even skirmishes occur between the British and regular Egyptian forces, the whole of Islam from Indonesia to Morocco would be in an uproar in a few weeks. And this represents a population of some 350,000,000 occupying some of the most important strategic lands in the world.

Moscow is only indirectly involved in the present disturbances. Its agents have been preaching nationalism, not communism, since the end of the war. Their words have fallen on receptive ears. Colonialism received a death blow at the end of the war when a number of Asiatic countries heretofore controlled by Britain, France, and the Netherlands received their full freedom.

Egypt, which was supposed to have been a sovereign country since the end of World War I, feels today that it is still under British control, since British troops are garrisoned on its territory. The problem which faces our policy makers is whether to help Britain and take a chance of alienating the whole Islamic world in which case the Kremlin will have an opportunity to step in and replace the west—or to insist that Britain get out of Egypt, under duress, and thus cause the collapse of what is left of that empire.

Washington and London have bungled the situation in Egypt much as they have bungled it in Iran with the "too little and too late" policy. The Cairo government has asked since 1946 for a revision of the 1936 treaty which provided for a condominium in the Sudan and the withdrawal of British troops from the Suez Canal in 1956. An agreement was actually initiated in 1946, but London found loopholes to reject it. The matter was brought before the United Nations in 1947, but that body shoved it aside, urging the two parties to continue their discussions and find a solution by themselves. The British indicated that they did not wish to "precipitate matters" until the expiration of the treaty in 1956.

There is no doubt that the defeat of Britain in Iran encouraged the Egyptian Parliament to act for immediate solution. The wave of nationalism is on the rise now from the Persian Gulf to the western Atlantic. The Cairo government feels that the tense international situation will not permit the Western Powers to create another explosive zone in the Middle East. Last year, soon after the outbreak of the Korean war, there was a strong possibility of reaching an agreement between London and Cairo on the basis of a voluntary withdrawal of the British troops within 1 or 2 years. Today this seems impossible. And unless the west wants to face the hostility of 350,000,000 Mohammedans, the British may have to leave Egypt under coercion.

Statement of Policy by Board of Directors of Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce Relative to Withholding of Federal Social Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a statement of policy by the board of directors of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce relative to the withholding of Federal

social-security funds from the State of Indiana by the Federal Security Administrator.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING STATE WELFARE PROBLEM

The General Assembly of the State of Indiana has decisions of considerable national importance to make during the special session now called to meet a financial crisis surrounding the public-welfare program, brought about by withdrawal of Federal matching funds.

The denial by the Federal Security Administrator of \$20,000,000 annually of Federal funds on the basis that the Indiana anti-secrecy law violates a Federal requirement for safeguards restricting disclosure of information concerning welfare recipients to purposes directly connected with the program, raises basic issues that transcend in importance any arguments pro and con concerning the opening of welfare records.

The real problem, which has broad national implications, is that of Federal control over locally administered governmental programs. As applied specifically to this special session of the Indiana Legislature, the issues surrounding the basic problem are:

1. Should the State of Indiana be interested only in regaining Federal aid?
2. If Federal aid is accepted, to what extent should there be Federal controls?
3. Or is Federal aid for the welfare program wrong in principle?
4. If it is wrong, is Indiana willing to disclaim such aid and accept full financial responsibility?
5. Are the consequences of full financial responsibility the transfer from the Federal Treasury to the State and local units of that part of all welfare costs previously borne by the Federal Government?

6. Or, has public welfare grown beyond all real need, and large sums of public funds being spent to provide assistance where it is not needed and where it results in pauperizing individuals and families?

7. If this be true, should not full effort be made by every State and local official who has responsibility—the Governor, the legislature, State and county welfare boards, and welfare administrators—to adopt changes in policy which will apportion public assistance on a more realistic basis of need, and deny such charity to those who have the ability and the opportunity to provide for themselves?

The cold figures of today's outlay for public welfare and relief—Federal, State, and local—as contrasted with the amounts spent during the worst of the depression, lends credence to the belief that today's welfare costs are excessive. In Indiana, current expenditures for welfare and township poor relief are at the rate of \$48,000,000 annually, as contrasted with approximately \$16,000,000 spent during the depths of the depression, when the WPA program was in full swing. Even today, at a time of peak employment and business activity, more than a billion dollars are being spent annually by the Federal, State, and local governments for public welfare purposes. Never before were so many people employed, with unemployment at its lowest ebb since 1943, the peak year of war production during World War II.

The public-assistance feature of the social-security program adopted by the Federal Government in 1935 was adopted as a stop-gap measure to the old-age and survivors insurance program. As the social-security insurance program developed, public assistance on a needs basis was supposed to disappear from the Federal scene, with public relief programs existing only at the State or local levels. However, current Federal commitments based upon policies of the Federal

Security Agency appear to point to an indefinite postponement of that possibility.

Current relief rolls may be justifiably high, or they may be entirely unjustifiable, in that numbers of people actually are being pauperized—deprived of individual incentive and made permanent wards of the State—by finding it easy to live off government bounty. If this be true, it would be the result either of laxity on the part of the administrators or of a determined policy of the administrators themselves.

The latter may be a more important factor in current extreme relief costs than the administrators would be willing to admit. The secrecy provisions of the Federal social-security law are, themselves, an example of the existence of a policy to spend without caution or limit. Throughout the burgeoning growth of the whole Federal relief program beginning in 1933, it has been a principle of the administrators to make the acceptance of relief, if not attractive, at least honorable and dignified. There is ample documented evidence of administrative policies which made it incumbent upon the administrators to seek out all who might even be thought to be eligible for public assistance and make sure they applied for it and received it, whether they initially desired it or not.

Full acceptance of the principle that the community of citizens as a whole should conduct a public-assistance program which prevents suffering does not mean going to the extreme of making relief so easy and permanent that many people are pauperized and lose all incentive for self help.

Involved also in this problem is a real concern as to the end result of skyrocketing public spending. In spite of some reassurances from high places, few Americans can look with composure on a situation where one-third of the national income is required for public spending, and even that tremendous burden is minimized by the expanding ideas of governmental departments for many billions more within the next year. There is a limit to public spending. This country cannot go on forever spending more and more, with the amounts increasing by arithmetic progression. The hazards of inflation spurred on by Government spending may cause today's 50-cent dollars shortly to become 10-cent dollars or 1-cent dollars or dollars of no value whatsoever. This country is not any more immune to the laws of economics than have been all the nations before.

If present Federal spending is to be curtailed and kept within bounds, there must be a beginning point. In this situation, Indiana has an opportunity to lead the way for the whole Nation in the field of spending for relief and welfare. Instead of accepting as inevitable the substitution of State and local money for the loss of Federal aid for this purpose, a first attempt should be made, at least, to determine if there is waste in this field that can be eliminated. There is now a good opportunity to apply the brakes to public spending.

The general assembly and governmental leaders should be encouraged to pursue the following course:

First, contest the right of the Federal Government to dictate local policies. That principle should be tested in the courts to the fullest extent. If the courts finally uphold the right of the Federal Government, such dictation should be taken away by congressional action.

Second, hold the line on policy. The Indiana law lifting the veil of secrecy of the relief rolls is right in principle. It should not be compromised or withdrawn under Federal pressure.

Third, before any move is made to appropriate more State or local money to the local welfare departments, each one should re-examine its policies, as well as its rolls, and be required to operate to the fullest possible

extent, without causing suffering, within their existing appropriations.

Fourth, if more State and local money then is needed, legislative bodies must face the fact with courage and provide the money.

Fifth, these efforts should be regarded as the starting point to cut away dependence upon the mirage of Federal aid and the effects of Federal controls, which grow out of a system that is basically wrong and foreign to fundamental concepts of a Federal Government.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce,
SEPTEMBER 13, 1951.

The Wetback Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Dead Ashes of Bright Promises," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 19, 1951. It deals with the wetback problem in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAD ASHES OF BRIGHT PROMISES—BOTH PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS HAVE FAILED TO MEET WITH VIGOR PROBLEMS AFFECTING SEVERAL MILLIONS OF PEOPLE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

At about this stage of events, when Congress comes toward the end of a session, you can—if you are curious and not easily discouraged—sift the dead ashes of once bright and glittering promises held up before you by the gentlemen of Congress when they were campaigning for election.

There are, of course, the inequities in the more publicized major measures affecting all of us. Such, for example, as the revenue bill that jumps up the little fellow's taxes, even including his beer and cigarettes, while doing nothing about the big oil corporations' excessive depletion allowance, a fat deduction—just a symbol of numerous other inequalities. Or, for another example, the failure of Congress to protect the consumer properly in the inflation control law.

Those are obvious. Not so obvious are lesser publicized matters.

Among these is the failure of both the President and Congress to meet with sufficient vigor a big human problem that affects directly a large section of our country and several millions of people, and ramifies in its indirect effects to the whole Nation.

This is the problem dramatized in newspapers and magazines in recent months involving the wetbacks, that army of Mexican migrant workers who cross the Rio Grande illegally and follow the crops in the big ranches and plantations of the Southwest and South. They are herded together in insanitary hovels and shanties, exploited on low wages, and create conditions that not only are hazardous to their own health and well-being and that of the communities where they subsist, but lower wage and living standards of native American farm workers, many of whom are driven from their natural habitats to find work elsewhere.

You may recall that, when President Truman several weeks ago reluctantly signed a bill passed by Congress to regulate the wetback traffic, he found it so inadequate that he summoned congressional leaders to the White House and announced afterward that they had promised to seek enactment of supplementary legislation to help meet the wetback invasion and its harmful derivatives. These included increased appropriations for the Immigration Service to hire more agents for the border patrol to tighten enforcement; for the Labor Department's Farm Placement Division to improve domestic recruitment of farm workers; for financing reception centers for entry of legal Mexican workers, and a bill fixing penalties for hiring illegal workers. As for the last, you'd be surprised at the substantial and prominent plantation and ranch owners who work illegally admitted Mexicans.

This penalty measure is safely buried, beyond chance of action. As for the appropriations, that for the Immigration Service had been cut more than half, from \$6,500,000 requested to \$3,000,000, when last heard of in the pell-mell rush for adjournment, while the \$386,000 for domestic recruitment had been slashed to \$75,000, and \$2,800,000 for reception centers had been cut in two. Final results may show even further reductions.

So much for promises—though how anything else might have been expected by President Truman is hard to see. For, on this problem, he was facing a skillful southern Democratic faction which is seeking to protect big plantation owners on cheap labor. The southerners were able to enlist enough Republicans in the familiar coalition pattern.

Meanwhile, something else very interesting has occurred to reveal the belligerent resistant attitude of the big farmers. This is creation of the South Texas Association which is raising a \$50,000 fund to lobby against the appropriations and the penalty bill, assessments being fixed at 10 cents an acre, or higher if necessary. Affiliated with it are local chambers of commerce, Farm Bureau units, and the Texas Citrus Commission, a State agency. The aim of this move is to prevent the Immigration Bureau "from fully enforcing the immigration laws along the Texas-Mexican border," it is charged by Representative EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who led the fight in the House for a stronger wetback control bill originally. He said that if the lobby is successful the result would be "a relatively freer flow of illegal wetback Mexican labor into Texas," a complaint echoed also by the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., headed by H. L. Mitchell, which has fought an uphill battle to protect exploited farm workers.

The South Texas Association also announced its intention to lobby with the Mexican Government. This has been called to the attention of the Justice Department by Representative MCCARTHY as a possible violation of the Logan Act, which forbids an American citizen from carrying on intercourse with foreign governments to defeat measures of the United States.

Behind the Scenes With Jesse Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Jesse Jones' observations in his new book, Fifty

Billion Dollars, are certain to draw fire from the ardent supporters of the late President who regarded him as beyond criticism. Mr. Jones suggests that Mr. Roosevelt was basically a political opportunist who used every possible circumstance to ensure his continuance in office. The world-wide situation which led to World War II was used by President Roosevelt to further his ambitions, and on a lower plane, Mr. Jones declares that the President was not averse to using RFC funds for the relief of such political friends as the late Al Smith, who was worrying over the operation of the Empire State Building. Jones declares that the President asked him to investigate the possibilities of buying the entire building for Federal purposes, and describes Mr. Roosevelt as a total politician.

A many-sided public figure like the late President undoubtedly presented many phases of his personality to many different people, but Jesse Jones was close to him in the crucial years of his Presidency, and it will be difficult for the defense to minimize his contribution to the biographical record.

Truman Fails To Make a Case on News Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star, Wednesday, October 17, 1951, issue, entitled "Truman Fails To Make a Case on News Control":

TRUMAN FAILS TO MAKE A CASE ON NEWS CONTROL

President Truman has been trying to justify his recent Executive order on suppressing news from civilian Government departments for security reasons. But his efforts have made his case worse.

He cited to newspaper reporters a survey which declared that newspapers and magazines have published 95 percent of the Government's secret information. The President said that was sufficient justification for the security order.

But reporters quickly established the fact that the secret stories to which Mr. Truman referred had all been authorized for publication by Government officials. He appeared to be blaming the press for not exercising judgment that ought to have been exercised in the first instance by responsible Government officials.

Mr. Truman was urged to give an example of the kind of information leak he was trying to prevent. The President then referred to Fortune magazine's use of maps showing the location of the Nation's atomic energy plants.

It happens that this particular information was cleared for publication by no less an agency than the Atomic Energy Commission, generally reputed to be the tightest security agency in Washington. The Atomic Energy Commission is under strict statutory control on security and other matters. It represents a special case. Being a defense

agency, it would have been placed under careful security regulations long ago if it did not already have other safeguards in force.

So on two counts, the information from the Atomic Energy Commission was the poorest illustration the President could have chosen. The new Executive order has no bearing on it whatever. And in addition to that, the Commission had approved the maps in question.

Is President Truman being honest in implying that the press ought to exercise a voluntary censorship over information previously approved by Government officials? Not even in wartime was that burden imposed upon the press. We see no reason why newsmen should be expected to substitute their own judgment on security questions for the judgment that ought to be exercised by Government authorities.

Or is Mr. Truman's defense of his order to be interpreted as a blanket indictment of the judgment of heads of Government departments and agencies? If so, something more than a censorship order is needed to correct the situation.

Information that is really vital to national security must be protected. No one disagrees with that. But whether we have an effective system for protecting it is an unsettled point. And the President's highly confused and improvised defense of his security order is a dubious contribution to the solution of the problem.

The American people have a right to expect more logical and coherent argument from their President, even if his aides have to supply the reasoning. In this instance, Mr. Truman has not made out the barest elements of his case.

Red China's Plan to Destroy the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Edward Hunter, writing in the New Leader for October 15, 1951, says that General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Red Army, has declared that the United States must have its head smashed by China in the Far East. When we are defeated then Chu Teh says that the Soviet Union will defeat America in Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this article by Mr. Hunter should be read and understood by every citizen. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article:

RED CHINA'S PLAN

On March 11, 1950, Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Red Army, gave the principal graduation address at the Northern Revolutionary University of Peiping, a prime center of the Communist indoctrination program. His speech lasted 3 hours. Talking before a gathering of what he presumed to be thoroughly indoctrinated Communists who would participate in the party's future, he frankly outlined its global program. He discounted fears that the United States could not be overthrown, and in a very succinct manner outlined the strategy by which, he said, the Asian and European Hemispheres would work together as a pincer to crush the United States, utilizing and fanning racial antagonisms for this purpose. The Chinese

did not have to worry about American obstacles to communism, Chu Teh said, because "America is lame; one of its legs is held tight in Eastern Europe by Soviet Russia."

"With the union of 700,000,000 to 800,000,000 people, achieved by bringing Soviet Russia and China together, we can smash in the tiger's head," my informant, Chi, heard him boast. "When we succeed in smashing the tiger's head in the Far East then we can return to Eastern Europe and cut off its legs. We are on the eve of the destruction of American imperialism."

Chu Teh outlined the military program of the Chinese Communists. "Communism constitutes one entity—a united country," he told the graduates. "Capitalism, in spite of the fact that the capitalist countries have the same general ideas, is like the blowing sand. Countries such as India, Burma, and Indochina are striving to learn from the experience of China. Burma and India formerly thought that China's revolutionary tactics were wrong. But now they are learning that we were right. So these countries are coming to know that to start a revolution you have to gather a revolutionary force, and for this you need the farmers. In India and Burma it will be easier to create a people's revolution because those countries were under imperialist oppression."

This allusion to a race revolution, with its fearsome connotation, was startling to me but not to Chi. He had heard it often. Later I was to come across it frequently in Communist Chinese indoctrination textbooks and in the standard school books put out by the new regime. They frankly referred to China's "national racial revolution."

Here, in Chu Teh's talk, he was referring to an anticipated "people's race revolution" in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, clear evidence of Communist policy to arouse and exploit latent racial feelings between the white and yellow races.

Inside China, and in the area of insurgency in Asia generally, the Communists have given a yellow-race-against-the-white-race coloration to the struggle. This was all the more callous and irresponsible in China itself, for there the people have been brought up to consider themselves a race, distinct from the other peoples of Asia.

How did this propaganda twist affect Soviet Russia? Wasn't this just as much a threat to her as to Europeans generally? "Oh, no," said Chi. "Everyone knows that the Russians are Asians. Didn't Stalin himself say, when he met the Japanese envoy before World War II broke out, that he, too, was an Asiatic?" Indeed, while the West interprets the risings in the East as mere nationalism, in the minds of most Asians nationalism is confused with race. The national revolutions in Indochina, Indonesia, and elsewhere were started as part of a racial movement, encouraged by underground means for half a century by the Japanese ultranationalists as part of their pan-Asia movement. The Communists, when it became evident that Japan was to be defeated, quickly moved into the race field in Asia, and in numerous instances worked together with the Japanese agitators. Whether this was farsightedness on the part of the defeated Japanese extremists or infiltration on the part of the Communists is purely academic.

In his graduation speech, Chu Teh went on to tell the students, who were about to go out themselves on their assigned missions, that many Communist students from Southeast Asia and the Middle East were coming to Red China to learn how to succeed as the Chinese Communists did and how to coordinate policy.

"Many students have already come to North China from those countries to study our experience," he said. "Some have come to learn our experience in the economic field, others in politics, and still others in the military sphere. Some have already taken an active part in our work in every part of

China. They are learning from experience by working alongside us in China."

"They will have much to offer to the revolutions in their countries, and meanwhile we have many men working in their lands. I am speaking frankly before you because you are all standing in the same front line of the world Communist revolution. Our men working in those countries do not have any titles, but they hold very important posts. If America wants to start world war III, all of Southeast Asia will be under the leadership of China. This I can guarantee."

A few months later, a Chinese newspaperman, dressed as a coolie, wandered about the countryside outside his home in central China to get the feel of the land. He happened to hear a high-ranking officer addressing his troops. It was the early fall of 1950.

"They were the warmest-dressed Chinese soldiers I ever saw," this reporter told me shortly afterward, when he had managed to leave Red China. "I stood on the roadway among villagers and listened to what the soldiers were being told. Imagine my surprise when I heard the speaker exclaim, 'When we were in need, before our liberation, our big brother came to our assistance. Now our big brother needs our help. We are going to Soviet Russia, therefore, to give him the aid he asks of us.'" ("Big brother" is the label used by the Chinese Communists referring to Soviet Russia. Korean Communists use the same expression in referring to either the Chinese or the Russians.)

"Of course, I knew, and the speaker knew, that his troops weren't going into Russia," the Chinese reporter said to me. "But his soldiers didn't know it. North Korea, North Manchuria, or Siberia; it was all the same to them."

SENSE AND NONSENSE

The Red officer's statement just didn't seem to make sense. At first hearing, it sounded as if this political officer had simply lied to his men. This wasn't necessarily so, however. Outsiders would evaluate his words in the framework of their own normal lives and put their own sense of values on them. Then, of course, what he said sounded like a lot of nonsense. The Chinese troops were not crossing the Soviet frontier, and Moscow was not yet engaging in any overt war with anybody. But this wasn't what the Chinese officer meant when he made his statement. He was thinking in terms of the North China People's Revolutionary University, in the language of discussion meetings and the Question of Thought, and in the mental framework of guerrilla camps in Indochina, Malaya, and Korea. Then what he said made sense, a great deal of sense.

This was because we were thinking in patches, but the Communists were not. Americans were talking about the Korean war. Englishmen were speaking about the Malaya war. Frenchmen were referring to the Indochina war. But neither the Chinese Communists nor any other Communists in Asia used that terminology. They spoke of the all-Asia war, of the Korea-China-Indochina-Philippines front, of the anti-imperialist war. What was more, they weren't just thinking of the fighting in those broad terms, they were planning their operations and implementing them on that basis. While non-Communist authorities outside the Communist sphere were thinking and acting locally, the Communists were operating globally. Asia was one front to them. Korea, the Philippines, Indochina, and the other lands of Asia were only sectors on that front, and this strategy gave the Communists decisive advantages in the military sense. It was the equivalent of many divisions to the Reds. Handling Asia as one big front meant that the Communist high command could keep the pressures going indefinitely, allowing a lull in one sector when tactics required it and putting on the heat somewhere else.

CHENNAULT'S WARNING

What that Red officer, deep inside China, said to his troops also made real sense when considered in the context of the history, literature, and science books of Red China's schools. He was brushing aside all trivialities and make-believe. After the ideological defeat that Stalinism had suffered in Yugoslavia, world communism simply could not allow a territorial defeat in Korea. It was as simple as that.

About that time, eyewitness reports were coming from China proper telling of Communist divisions being dispatched to Manchuria for service in Korea. I had an interview with Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault on July 4, 1950. He told me that he had been informed by his old wartime friends inside China that several hundred thousand Communist troops had been moved to the border of Korea and were ready to join the fighting. "And I hear that more are being sent all the time," he told me.

Americans didn't want to believe this, though, and neither did the Europeans. We preferred wishful thinking. I was with the ill-fated Thanksgiving Day drive in Red Korea that was going to send the boys home by Christmas. I was witnessing—had been witnessing for some time—as extraordinary an effort at self-deception as I had ever seen in my more than a quarter century of journalism around the world.

America's worst enemy was not the Communist troops. As I sat in a command-post tent, one night, listening to the mortars swoosh overhead, the generals of the Twenty-fifth Division explained their offensive to a small corps of newspaper correspondents. America's worst enemy that night was wishful thinking. Wishful thinking about the scope of the warfare and about the duration of the war. Wishful thinking that first had the enemy folding up after the masterful Inchon landings. Wishful thinking about whether we could terminate the warfare at the thirty-eighth parallel; wishful thinking about whether the thirty-eighth parallel meant anything more to the enemy than did the thirty-seventh or the thirty-ninth. Wishful thinking about whether the Chinese Communists were actually participating.

There was a dirty word, a hush-hush word, at press conferences in Tokyo and at the front. Nice people just didn't mention the Chinese. When the subject was brought up, a pained silence would fall over the assembly, that heavy sense of disapproval that silences a boor who utters a nasty word. Outside of this theater of war, a state of mind had been created that made you seem a very backward individual indeed if you fell for such sensationalism as the reports that Chinese Reds were moving into the war in force. A cynical "Did you hear the latest Formosa rumor?" was the tone required in mentioning such a touchy subject if you didn't want to lose face with your friends.

After the set-back in North Korea, everyone blamed someone else for the strange psychology that had made Americans fool themselves. This again was an unrealistic approach. Every sort of American I met was taken in by this, from my fellow colleagues in the press corps to the diplomats, the military, and the businessmen. With a few notable exceptions, they were all using their own frame of reasoning in judging what the Chinese Communists were going to do, instead of the point of view expressed in such basic Communist textbooks as *The Modern World Revolution History* and *The Chinese Modern Revolutionary Movement History*.

DRAINING OUR BLOOD

The reasoning that seemed mainly responsible for our belief that the Chinese Communists would not join the Korean fighting in force was an argument I heard always when I did succeed in bringing up the subject. It was the clincher, and it made sense to all "practical people." This

was that if the Chinese Communists had intended to come into the Korean War, they would have done so in the beginning when they could easily have flung us into the sea and occupied all of Korea.

But if they had done this, they would not have been Communists. They would have been us, and there would have been no war in the first place. The entire Soviet strategy in Asia, the strategy which it is confident will win, has been, since VJ day, a delaying tactic, a bleeding operation. Anything that interfered with that slow draining of our physical and economic blood interfered with that fundamental Communist program and so had to be avoided.

Either an all-out victory or an all-out defeat for the Communists in Korea would have been such an interference. The former would have brought the entire world conflict to a head, the last thing Moscow wanted at that time, and the latter would have been too costly a setback in morale—and either would have ended our bleeding on that sector of the Asia front.

Is There No End to Crookedness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is There No End to Crookedness?"

This editorial appeared in the Haviland Journal, Haviland, Kans., October 12, 1951, and is most timely, in view of the disclosures being made in the various collectors offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Our citizens have a right to expect honesty and efficiency in the collection of their taxes. This must be especially true at a time when we are collecting approximately one-third of the Nation's income for Federal, State, and local taxes.

There must be a thorough house cleaning in the collectors offices over the Nation and our people must have their confidence reestablished in this agency. The payment of taxes to the Federal Government on the basis of bribes and adjustments must stop. The faith of our citizens in their own Government is determined by the integrity of those who hold positions of honor and trust.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE NO END TO CROOKEDNESS?

As if there had not been a plethora of scandal, crookedness, and skulduggery, and undue sale of political influence in Washington, an epidemic of corruption and graft in the tax collecting department of the Government is being disclosed. It has developed that one internal revenue collector, who has now resigned, was drawing a salary on the side from firms who had tax difficulties with his department. Another has been dismissed for embezzlement. Still another, who had sent notices to delinquent taxpayers, was found to be delinquent himself and he shrugged it off by saying he did not have the money to pay it. Evidently he was not

as hard-boiled with himself as he was with other taxpayers.

And then, just as this latest scandal broke, President Truman came up with an Executive order that hereafter the heads of all Government agencies including the tax department—shall be the sole judges of what information shall be released for publication. It appears to be nothing more nor less than a censorship to keep the public from knowing what is going on. Peron of Argentina has never clamped on a more stringent cover-up order.

President Truman, with his usual stubborn haughtiness and scorn, passes it off by saying what a small percent of Government employees are involved, and then goes on to say that the critics of his administration would have the people believe that all of them are crooks. No one has made any such charge, but if there is only 1 percent crooked, it is too many. It is not the honest, hard-working employees who are being indicted; it is the heads of departments, practically every one of whom was appointed by the President himself, and a number of them are from the Missouri crowd. His boasted loyalty to his friends is a typical demonstration of the workings of a political machine, for the operation of which Mr. Truman got his training in Kansas City under Tom Pendergast. He, too, was loyal to his friends, but he ended his political career in the penitentiary.

Loyalty is a commendable trait, but not when it is at the expense of the country.

F. J. C.

Federal Power Commission Fails To Curb Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Congress a bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies. This is House Resolution 88. I am for safety improvements in the transmission of gas. We have witnessed one accident and disaster after another over the period of the past year caused by gas explosions and fires which resulted from lack of proper safety precautions. Why, in Ohio alone, one gas-transmission company had four serious line breaks between May 6, 1949, and July 15, 1950, all of which resulted in explosions and one created a fire of serious proportions. Another company operating in Ohio had 30 pipeline breaks in a period of less than 4 years—June 12, 1946, to December 10, 1950, and all of these created serious hazards to the communities in which they were located. We have got to correct and improve this situation, but in view of the record of the Federal Power Commission, I have grave doubts that it would effectively use any such authority that we might give it in this connection.

I refer to the recent decision of the Federal Power Commission in relation to bringing natural gas to the area of northeastern Ohio. That decision is embodied in the opinions of the Federal Power Commission, Nos. 205 and 205-A, the latter being issued on September 20,

1951. There the Commission granted certificates of convenience and necessity to a company that proposes to use as part of its transmission system 17 miles of 27-year-old pipeline located in the Fairport-Ashtabula, Ohio, area. This old pipeline was never constructed to handle natural gas, and was built to transmit manufactured gas at relatively low pressures. The condition of this line is subject to serious doubt, and even after some tests were conducted, is still subject to serious doubt. This old line has a history of leaks, and at the request of my constituents, I appeared before the Federal Power Commission as a Member of Congress in accordance with the Commission's rules, and specifically pointed out the great hazard to the health and safety of the people living in the Fairport-Ashtabula, Ohio, area that would result from the use of this old line. Other Members of the Congress from Ohio brought this same point before the Commission. Our protestations on safety were ignored.

This area in northeastern Ohio is thickly populated. It requires natural gas, and it, like all areas where natural gas is to be used, needs that gas delivered with a maximum of safety and protection against explosions, fire, and other hazards which may result from the use of improper facilities. I told the Federal Power Commission that this old line was an incubator of disaster, and I repeat it here.

In the town of Brighton, a suburb of Rochester, N. Y., during the week of September 24 of this year, there was a hideous gas disaster that required 35 fire companies and 475 firemen to control. Five city blocks in Brighton were reduced to shambles. Forty-four houses were demolished or damaged. Twenty-three people were injured, and three killed. We do not want this repeated in northeastern Ohio or any other place. We must find a way to prevent these things, but the Federal Power Commission does not seem to want to avail itself of the opportunities that it presently has to guard against disaster. This matter deserves immediate study, and if the Federal Power Commission will not attempt to use its present powers to protect the people living in areas where gas is used or is going to be used, then we had better look for another solution to this problem.

Are Federal Employees Being Reduced to Second-Class Citizens?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Dean George M. Johnson, of Howard University Law School, to the convention of the National Alliance of Postal Employees, Houston,

Tex., August 20, 1951. This address appeared in the September issue of the Postal Alliance, official organ of the National Alliance of Postal Employees, whose editor is Mr. Snow F. Gingsby.

Dean Johnson's speech deals with three problems of vital interest, not only to the Federal employees they so intimately affect, but also to every American. These problems are instances of the eternal conflict of a free society between that society's interest in its own well-being and preservation on the one hand, and the economic, social, and political rights of the individual on the other.

Howard University's dean of law poses the question:

"Are Federal employees being reduced to second-class citizens?" The manner in which we resolve the difficulties he has pointed out will answer this question and I commend Dean Johnson's analytical and reflective approach to the reading of my colleagues.

The address follows:

ARE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BEING REDUCED TO SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

Four years ago it was my distinct privilege to address the convention of the National Alliance of Postal Employees assembled in Cleveland, Ohio. Well do I remember that a popular Congressman from the Buckeye State took sharp exception to some of my remarks. Those of you who were present that evening will recall that the Congressman exercised the prerogatives of his high office and made a lengthy extemporaneous speech in which he sought to minimize the seriousness of some of the problems that troubled us then. I got the impression that he was trying to assure us that God was in His heaven and all was well with the world, as he led us in singing hymns.

Tonight, I am more disturbed about some of the problems that troubled me, then, than I was 4 years ago. I venture to suggest that if that affable Congressman were with us tonight he might agree with me that while God is still in His heaven, all is not well with the world. The present international crisis which is essentially a struggle to establish and preserve the democratic way of life against the growing menace of communism, threatens to explode any day into world war III, with all its catastrophic consequences. In this colossal struggle our country is cast in the role of the staunchest and most powerful champion of the democratic way of life. In my humble judgment, it is the duty of every loyal American to assist in making this Nation what it professes to be, in the international arena.

The democratic way of life is frequently championed without too much thought as to what it involves. Gunnar Myrdal in *An American Dilemma*, uses the term "the American creed" to describe American ideals, and points out that, the essential dignity of each individual, the belief in his equality and the recognition of certain fundamental rights, liberties or freedoms for every person, as basic to the American ideal or the democratic way of life. Whether one subscribes to Myrdal's thesis or not, it is generally agreed that the democratic way of life embraces the concept of equality and the absence of second-class citizenship, as well as the notion that certain rights are essential to full citizenship.

With this admittedly general and perhaps somewhat vague description of the democratic way of life, which all loyal Americans want to establish and preserve, I should like to direct your attention to a large group of

Americans—over 2,000,000 in number—whose status may well be degenerating into that of second-class citizens. I refer to the employees of the Federal Government, a substantial number of whom are represented by the National Alliance of Postal Employees. The frequently uncritical assumption that because Federal employment is a privilege and not a right, the Federal Government has unlimited discretion to restrict the activities of Federal employees in various phases of our own national life. I should like to refer briefly to three areas of activity and at least raise certain questions for your possible consideration.

The first area is that involving labor organizations.

The second concerns political activities, and

The third embraces the nebulous area covered by the present loyalty program of the Federal Government.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Under date of August 10, 1951, the following statement appeared in a syndicated column in newspapers throughout the country:

"SHOULD CIVIL SERVANTS BE ALLOWED TO JOIN BIG UNIONS?"

"The effort now being made on the organization of the police force in New York City into a regular union affiliated with the A. F. of L. or the CIO brings up a question that a great many of us must have considered many times in the past

"Is it possible for civil-service employees who work for government or for police or firemen to join any of the large unions and make themselves subject to general rules which apply to people working in industry?"

"It seems to me the situation between civil servants and industrial workers is entirely different. There is no question but that Government employees should have representation, and the Government should appoint representatives to hear complaints. But even in peacetime is it possible for this particular type of employee to go on strike? He can resign, of course, and in the original contract there should be provision made whereby the rights of an employee who does resign should be safeguarded. But it seems to me a very difficult question as to whether there can be affiliation within a large association of unions

"Logically, if a fireman or policeman can form a union, then soldiers who are professional soldiers, could form a union. And this would, I think, be a very difficult situation to plan for.

"I am really not much interested in whether the A. F. of L. or the CIO succeeds in organizing any group of Government workers, but I am interested in the fundamental question of whether you should work for city, state, or National Government and actually belong to one of the big union organizations.

"I think the whole question deserves very careful thought and I would like to hear some of the more thoughtful people in the labor movement and in Government express their views on this subject."

In view of the current attitude toward civil-service workers generally, the fact that this question is being raised is probably surprising to few, but when I tell you that the author of this column is none other than our beloved Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, I am sure that you will agree with me that it is occasion for deep concern.

It is reasonably apparent that Mrs. Roosevelt's principal concern is as to the propriety of Government employees going on a strike, but she raises the broader question as to the propriety of Government employees affiliating with large unions such as the A. F. of L. and the CIO, even though they do not possess the right to strike.

Strikes by Government employees are objectionable from several points of view, and

although strikes are doubtless the most effective weapon available to labor organizations in collective bargaining, labor organizations of Federal Government employees without the right to strike, do exist, and have been effective and beneficial in representing their members.

As early as 1912 Congress expressly recognized the right of postal employees to belong to labor organizations "not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike . . . against the United States." This recognition, set forth in section 652, title 5, United States Code, seems to say that so far as Congress is concerned it is proper for a labor organization of postal employees to affiliate with the A. F. of L. or the CIO, provided only that such affiliation does not obligate postal employees to strike against the United States. As a matter of fact the two largest organizations of postal employees, the National Association of Letter Carriers with a membership of 70,000, and the Federation of Post Office Clerks with 60,000 members, are both A. F. of L. affiliates. I am not aware of any instance where the legality of such affiliations has even been questioned by the United States Supreme Court, although the question was raised in the celebrated *Corsini* case involving the racial exclusion policy of the Railway Mail Association. It will be recalled that the *Corsini* case involved the question whether the Railway Mail Association was a labor organization and, therefore subject to the provisions of the New York State civil-rights law, forbidding racial or religious discrimination in membership by labor organizations. In the lower court (the State supreme court) it was held that the Railway Mail Association was not subject to the Civil Rights Act; that it was not and could not be a labor organization, because a labor organization of civil-service employees "is contrary to public policy" (see Opinion of Justice Murray, 44 N. Y. S. at 607) and that acceptance of A. F. of L. affiliation was an ultra vires act. The Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court reversed this decision as to the applicability of the Civil Rights Act, but ignored the lower courts holding that civil-service employees were prohibited from forming labor organizations. The New York Court of Appeals affirmed, ruling among other things that the United States Government has recognized the right of mail clerks to organize for collective action in the presentation of grievances though not for collective bargaining (293 N. Y. 324; 56 N. E. 2d 725). When the *Corsini* case reached the United States Supreme Court in 1941, that court not only recognized the existence of the Railway Mail Association as an affiliate of the A. F. of L., but held that it was a labor organization subject to the New York civil-rights law. In reference to the broad question raised by Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Justice Reed, for the court, simply said, "Under customary practices Government employees do not bargain collectively with their employer." As a significant group of Federal civil servants, the National Alliance of Postal Employees has a vital interest in this question as it seeks ways more effectively to represent its members. I am sure Mrs. Roosevelt will welcome the results of your considered judgment on the broad question she has raised.

A final decision by the Congress, the President or the United States Supreme Court, that Government employees may not affiliate with the Nation's large labor organizations, even though such affiliation does not include an obligation to strike, would deprive Government workers of a right enjoyed by other American workers. Since, however, the right of workers to organize and to deal with employers through their chosen representatives is, generally speaking, not a constitutional right, it may be argued that this right, though important, is not a right essential to

the exercise of full citizenship. A more serious problem is presented, however, by depriving Government employees of the right to engage in certain types of political activity associated with the basic constitutionally protected freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and petition.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

In a democratic government such as ours, which was so ably defined almost a century ago as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, political activity on the part of all loyal citizens is more than a right, it is a patriotic duty.

Of course, the right to engage in political activity, that has its roots in the right to freedom of speech, press, assembly, and petition, guaranteed by the first amendment of the Federal Constitution, like other constitutional rights, is not absolute. It can be curtailed in the interest of good government. The United States Supreme Court has developed rigid tests for determining whether limitations on basic constitutional rights are justified. In the minds of many thoughtful men and women today, there is serious doubt as to the justification for some of the limitations existing with respect to political activity by Government employees.

As early as 1907 the solicitation of political contributions from Government employees was interdicted. In the nature of things, such a limitation can be justified as a reasonable method of preventing political corruption. Since that time more doubtful limitations have been added. The Hatch Political Activity Act of 1939 which was greatly extended by the 1940 amendment thereto has accomplished what one writer has described as the "political sterilization" of most Federal employees. Under the Hatch Act, the Federal employees to which the act refers, and incidentally, it refers to most of them, may not take active part in political management or in political campaigns. To be sure, the act provides that Federal employees are free to express their political opinions publicly and privately, but how is the employee to know whether or not his expressions will be construed as taking an active part in a political campaign?

The provisions of the Hatch Act to which I have just referred, were held constitutional by the United States Supreme Court in a 4-to-3 decision, in the Mitchell case in 1947. I will not burden you with an analysis of that decision further than to point out that Mr. Justice Reed, speaking for the majority, held that Congress felt the prohibited political activity on the part of Federal employees was "a menace to the integrity and competency" of the Federal civil service and, therefore, the curtailment of the rights of Federal employees was constitutional. On the other hand Mr. Justice Black in a vigorous dissenting opinion pointed out that "there is nothing about Federal and State employees as a class which justifies depriving them or society of the benefits of their participation in public affairs. They, like other citizens, pay taxes and serve their country in peace and in war. The taxes they pay and the wars they fight are determined by the elected spokesmen of all the people. They come from homes, communities, schools, churches, and colleges as do the other citizens. I think (Mr. Justice Black said) the Constitution guarantees to them the same right that other groups of good citizens have to engage in activities which decide who their elected representatives shall be." Mr. Justice Black described the political activity still available to Government employees as follows:

"They may vote in silence; they may carefully and quietly express a political view at their peril; and they may become spectators at campaign gatherings, though it may be highly dangerous for them to second a mo-

tion' or let it be known that they agree or disagree with a speaker."

Mr. Justice Douglas, in his dissenting opinion, recognized the evils of the "spoils system" and the problems involved in regulating the political activity of Government employees so as to remove those evils. He said:

"The difficulty lies in attempting to preserve our democratic way of life by measures which deprive a large segment of the population of all political rights except the right to vote."

He objected to the failure of Congress in the Hatch Act to recognize the differences in the dangers from the political activities of administrative workers on the one hand, and industrial workers on the other. Here is a suggestion that Congress in regulating the activities of Federal employees, which generally speaking, it has the right to do, is under a constitutional obligation to adjust its regulations and prohibitions with reasonable regard for the obvious differences between the types of employment embraced in the Federal civil service. A partisan political campaign speech by a Federal employee in an administrative or supervisory position might have a coercive effect upon employees under his supervision and thus lead to political corruption, the same speech made by a file clerk could not possibly have any coercive effect upon other Federal employees. As the Justice points out, "The public interest in the political activity of a machinist or elevator operator or charwoman, is a distinct and different problem" from that presented by the political activity of an administrative official. To be sure, it is easier to prohibit all Federal employees from making political campaign speeches and such a blanket prohibition would certainly reach the problem of political coercion by administrative personnel. Simplicity is not enough to justify deferring all Federal employees of their constitutional right to make political campaign speeches. Congressional limitations on basic Constitutional rights of citizens, including, of course, Federal employees, must be reasonably designed to protect a substantial national interest. Congress may not "burn down the barn to get rid of the rats."

A story is told of a frontier community whose citizens were troubled by bears. These citizens hired an expert and gave him authority to use all reasonable means to rid the community of the bears. The expert adopted the simple expedient of placing poisoned food at vantage points on the farms throughout the community. He got rid of the bears all right, but he also poisoned most of the farmers' livestock as well as some valuable hunting dogs.

As previously stated, the United States Supreme Court has developed standards for measuring the constitutionality of congressional and other governmental limitations upon the basic freedoms enjoyed by citizens in our democratic society. The four members of the Court constituting the majority in the Mitchell case differed sharply with the three dissenters, and Congress in the light of the Mitchell case may yet be persuaded to remove some of the existing limitations on political activity by Government employees. It is disturbing, however, to note that the notion that because Federal employment is a privilege and not a right, the "burn down the barn to get rid of the rats" technique which characterizes Government regulation of the political activities of civil servants, is evident in the Government's present loyalty program.

THE PRESENT LOYALTY PROGRAM

In the current struggle between democracy and communism, our Government has adopted a program, the avowed and altogether necessary and proper purpose of which is to prevent the infiltration of disloyal

persons into the Government service and to remove disloyal persons already in Government employment.

As a Negro-American who must daily face the disadvantages, humiliations and deprivations resulting from the undemocratic policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination, I know some of the glaring inconsistencies between my country's democratic ideals and its actual practices. I intend to continue to use my energies and such talents as I may possess, in opposition to all forms of racial segregation and discrimination. However, I have not the slightest interest in, or sympathy for, communism. I prefer to try to work out the problems I face because of my race, within the framework of our democratic Government. I am opposed to racial bigotry because it is a menace to democracy. I am opposed to communism for the same reason. I am in favor of removing all disloyal persons from Government but I am interested as a loyal American, without regard to my race, in a loyalty program that is designed to expose actual disloyalty and at the same time protect the basic constitutional rights of loyal, Government employees.

Most of the present loyalty program, applicable to Government workers as a class, is embraced in Executive Order 9835 issued by the President in 1947, and the subsequent amendments thereto. Among other things, this order sets up the administrative machinery and procedure to be followed in determining the loyalty of Federal employees. An employee is to be discharged if "on all the evidence there is a reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved."

Prior to April 28, 1951, the standard was, if, "on all the evidence reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal."

In *Bailey v. Richardson*, decided in March 1950 by United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, two of the three circuit judges upheld the constitutionality of the procedures used in bringing about the discharge of Miss Bailey. The record of the case reveals that the only evidence against Miss Bailey was that the FBI reported that certain undisclosed informers, believed to be reliable, had made general statements purporting to connect Miss Bailey with the Communist Party. Miss Bailey denied under oath any membership in, relationship or sympathy with the Communist Party or any activities connected with that party or with communism. The Loyalty Board nevertheless found that on all the evidence, there were reasonable grounds for believing she was disloyal. As previously stated, two of the three circuit judges saw nothing unconstitutional in this procedure. They held that Miss Bailey had no constitutional right to be confronted with the FBI informers because this was not a criminal prosecution and she was not being punished in the constitutional sense. They held that she was not deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, because due process does not apply to the holding of a Government office. These two judges said that if Miss Bailey was discharged because of her political beliefs, no constitutional rights were violated because Federal employment is a privilege not a right. They suggested that arguments based on fair play should be addressed to Congress or the President, not to the courts.

Circuit Judge Edgerton wrote an impassioned, dissenting opinion, in which he took the position that the Executive order gave Miss Bailey the right to be confronted with the FBI informers and to cross-examine them; that dismissal for disloyalty is punishment requiring all the safeguards of a judicial trial, and that Miss Bailey's dismissal violated her basic constitutional right to

freedom of speech and assembly. Judge Edgerton was impressed by the fact that during the course of her hearing Miss Bailey was asked whether she had ever written a letter to the Red Cross about the segregation of blood and what was her personal position about that. In connection with this type of questioning Judge Edgerton makes the following significant statement.

"No doubt some boards are quite aware that unconventional views and conduct have no tendency to indicate disloyalty. But the fact remains that some boards imagine the contrary. This fact is only too well known. It puts Government employees under economic and social pressure to protect their jobs and reputations by expressing in words and conduct only the most orthodox opinions on political, on economic, and social questions.

"A regulation that restrains constitutionally protected speech along with other speech cannot be enforced against either. Legislation is unconstitutional as a whole if it does not aim specifically at evils within the allowable area of State control, but . . . sweeps within its ambit other activities that in ordinary circumstances constitute an exercise of freedom of speech or of the press . . ."

Judge Edgerton was of the opinion that even though Federal employment is a privilege and not a right, in granting Miss Bailey the privilege of working, the Government constitutionally could not impose conditions which required her to relinquish her constitutional rights.

When the Bailey case reached the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Clark took no part and the other eight Justices divided 4 to 4. For this reason the Court of Appeals opinion stands. It must be remembered, however, that one Court of Appeals Judge and four Justices of the United States Supreme Court were, and doubtless still are, of the opinion that the present Loyalty program offends the Federal Constitution. The last chapter in the present loyalty program cannot be written until the grave constitutional questions that have been raised are more satisfactorily resolved either by modifications of the Executive Order or perhaps, another court decision. The National Alliance of Postal Employees may wish to consider joining with other National organizations of postal employees and organizations of employees working in other Government agencies and agree on future strategy. Postal employees might well initiate such a joint endeavor because the close connection between the postal service and freedom of speech and of the press gives postal employees a keen awareness of the importance of the basic constitutional rights involved.

CONCLUSION

The fact that I have not touched upon the numerous handicaps which Negro Federal workers suffer solely because of their race, must not be construed as indicating that I think these handicaps are inconsequential or relatively unimportant. Racial segregation and discrimination in the Federal service are normally, logically, and constitutionally indefensible. So long as they continue, the National Alliance of Postal Employees will have a special function and service to render, not only to Negro postal workers and the postal service, but to the Nation as a whole. In performing this special service, however, I know that those who guide the destiny of the Alliance and formulate its policies, realize that Negro postal employees have many problems in common with all Federal workers of every race and creed. In the solution of these common problems, all Federal employees can and should work together. In working together they will see the irrelevancy of racial differences that seem to separate them, and true democracy within the Federal service can become a reality.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on every previous occasion when Bob Taft has been mentioned, the Democrat bigwigs immediately opened up on him. How come "No comment" now?

Maybe they read the election returns in Ohio for 1950.

Help Daughters of the American Revolution Secure Materials for Memorial Bell Tower at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I am inserting a letter which I just received from Mrs. John Morrison Kerr, treasurer general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which is self-explanatory.

It reads as follows:

OCTOBER 18, 1951

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: Again I am appealing to you for assistance which you are always so gracious to give. Since 1941 the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, have been collecting funds to build a memorial bell tower to house the carillon at Valley Forge, Pa. This is a memorial to the men who have fought from the time of our American Revolution through the present conflict. We are now completing the first half of this tower which includes the memorial room in which memorials to our valiant men and women will be placed.

In March of 1950 we signed a contract with Samuel Yellin, of Philadelphia, Pa., to make metal gates for this tower. As these gates could not be made until such time as the contractor was ready to receive them the Yellin Co. was forced to wait until this spring before executing the contract. By this time it was necessary to secure permission from the National Production Authority, Department of Commerce, in order to use this metal for these gates. I am sorry to say that the request was turned down. Copy of letter enclosed. The architect informed us that it would be possible to secure these gates from England where there is no priority on materials and so we have been in communication with an English firm. Within the past few days we have received the estimate and find that the cost would be prohibitive.

It seems too bad that our country cannot spare the small amount of material necessary for executing this contract which is to protect memorials to our national heroes and that a foreign country will have to be

resorted to. As a matter of fact, the funds for the greater amount will not be available as we have already obligated ourselves to erect the gates for the contract price to Yellin Co. Any assistance that you can give us in the matter will be greatly appreciated.

With my very best personal wishes to you and your family, I am

Sincerely,

FRANCES WASHINGTON KERR,
Mrs. John Morrison Kerr,
Treasurer General, NSDAR.

Mr. Speaker, it seems ridiculous to me that these glorious Daughters of the American Revolution cannot get the material in this country with which to construct this Memorial Bell Tower at Valley Forge, without going all the way to Great Britain, the very country our forebears were fighting at Valley Forge to gain our independence, and paying the enormous price demanded for this material.

I am appealing to the National Production Authority of the Department of Commerce to see that this material is provided, and I hope every Member of Congress will take it up and help secure this material for this most worthy cause.

I can say, without fear of contradiction, that there has never been a more patriotic group in this country than the Daughters of the American Revolution, and I think we owe it to them to do everything possible to assist them in securing the materials for this most worthy project.

Report to the People of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin—My Record and Vote on Major Issues in the First Session of the Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe firmly that the people of our country have the right to know exactly how their representatives stood and voted on the various measures acted upon by Congress.

In accordance with that conviction, I have conscientiously tried, from my first week in Congress, to keep the people of my district informed of my actions as their Representatives. I did this through semi-monthly newsletters, through radio and newspaper reports, and by periodic visits to the district.

In addition, knowing that such summaries are not always easily available, I have followed the policy of preparing a brief résumé of major legislative actions at the end of each session of Congress. In the current summary which follows, I included the issues and record of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, indicating my position and my votes on the most important measures.

A Foreign Affairs subcommittee, of which I am the chairman, will leave shortly for Europe to study conditions

in Germany and in other countries. Because of this assignment, I will be unable to report personally to all the people in my district on the accomplishments of Congress during this session. For that reason, I shall present and circulate as widely as feasible the following report for the scrutiny and judgment of the people whom I have the honor of representing.

IMPORTANT DAYS

As the last days of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress are drawing to a close, the events of the past 10 months are vivid in our minds. This was a year of important decisions, and of far-reaching consequences. While the Western World has enjoyed an uneasy peace, the fires of war have been smoldering in parts of Asia, tension has reached a high point in the Near East, and our ears were struck by sounds of dissatisfaction and rebellion behind the iron curtain.

The American people have enjoyed a year of comparative quiet and prosperity. Unemployment has all but disappeared. Farm and labor incomes have risen to new levels, and even corporation income and dividends are almost at an all-time high. Even with the high level of taxes necessary to meet our defense expenditures, the American people on the whole have bought more, and saved more, than ever before in a comparative length of time.

Underneath this apparent air of prosperity and contentment, however, a feeling of uneasiness has prevailed. During my visits to the district, and from my mail, I have noted how anxious the people are about the war in Korea, and the possibility of preventing the outbreak of world war III. The shadow of uncertainty is hanging over our lives.

FREE NATIONS STAND TOGETHER

For that reason, it was heartening to watch the progress of the free nations in their united effort to discourage aggression and promote peace.

Bolstered by our aid and leadership, these nations have been rapidly gaining strength, both economically and militarily. During the past 5 years, economic recovery was stressed in the Marshall plan and in the individual domestic programs carried by each free nation. Real progress has been made in this field. While most of the nations still have financial and economic problems to cope with, the over-all conditions have improved to the extent that we are now able to start terminating the European recovery program.

The accent is now being shifted to military matters. Faced with the growing Communist menace, the free nations are planning a mutual defensive force. They are creating regional organizations for this purpose, such as the North Atlantic Treaty organization and the proposed Pacific and Near East defensive pacts. The object of these pacts is to combine and strengthen area defenses.

In Europe, under the brilliant leadership of General Eisenhower, the highest officers of the free nations of the North Atlantic community have been working together for several months, integrating the military establishments of the var-

ious countries. General Eisenhower stated that, even in the darkest days of World War II, he had not received as much cooperation in military matters as he is receiving today. The nations have learned that unity and cooperation are the prerequisites of success. They are determined to defend themselves, and they have the manpower to do it. It will be our task, however, to aid them in supplying some of the military equipment for that manpower.

Some people claim that this accent on military matters is driving us away from peace, toward war. With them I cannot agree. Weak nations, when faced with an aggressor, can only talk about peace. Strong nations, on the other hand, are in a position to do something about it. Past events have shown us that might is the only thing which the Communists respect and understand. Therefore we must be in a position to command respect if we expect to talk peace effectively. Otherwise, we would be risking the safety and welfare of our Nation.

THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

While the above-mentioned events were taking place, the first session of the Eighty-second Congress was in progress. It was a long session, stretching for 10 months—3 months longer than provided by law. More than in the preceding Congresses, it was a session filled with partisan bickering, with headline-seeking sensationalism, and with disappointingly slow progress in legislative matters.

To better understand its achievements and shortcomings, we must consider the political complexion of the Eighty-second Congress, the problems which it had encountered, and review the major legislative measures which it had approved.

POLITICAL COMPLEXION

On paper, the Eighty-second Congress had a Democratic majority in both Houses. In practice, however, this division crumbled as Members of both political parties deserted their party ranks. A few liberal Republicans consistently supported both the international and domestic programs of the administration. On the other hand, a considerable number of Democrats—particularly from the Southern States—joined with the remainder of the Republicans to form a coalition which steadily opposed all measures favored by the administration.

As a result, Congress did not steer a straight course in legislative matters, but moved at times in one, then in the other direction. Although all the blame for the indecisive results cannot be placed on its shoulders, the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition played an important part in blocking the enactment of several important measures.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

There were other factors which contributed to the lack of progress on general legislative matters. The great number of congressional investigations was among them. During the first 8 months of this session, for instance, Congress conducted about the same number of special investigations not connected with pending legislation as it had passed laws.

A report published in September by the Independent Congressional Quarter-

ly News Features showed that, to that date, Congress had conducted some 130 investigations, at the cost of over \$2,000,000. They ranged from the very important Far East policy investigation, to such inquiries as the probe of concert booking agencies. Many additional probes were demanded by Congressmen and various pressure groups, but were not undertaken mostly due to lack of time.

There is no doubt that many of these examinations were much needed and beneficial. Without them Congress could not, at times, have the facts necessary for drawing up, and acting intelligently on, various bills.

REFORMS NECESSARY

There were, however, many features of these probes that were open to criticism. Some of them degenerated into publicity stunts for partisan motives. In others, overlapping of functions was evident. In some, the investigating committees did not have adequate staffs or the help of sufficient expert aid. It was also noted that safeguards against unfair defamation of innocent persons during committee hearings are very much needed. All in all, the entire investigating system in Congress should be overhauled.

APPROPRIATIONS

There is another field of congressional activities which is sorely in need of improvements. I am referring to the congressional function of appropriating public moneys for our domestic and international programs.

For the current fiscal year, \$57,200,000,000 is being appropriated for the Armed Forces, in addition to approximately \$17,500,000,000 for other national and mutual security programs and the Korean conflict. The remaining governmental expenditures, including veterans' benefits, require about \$20,000,000,000 in appropriations. It is estimated that the actual outlays for all these purposes will amount close to \$68,400,000,000 for the 1951-52 fiscal year. And, as you know, Congress has to authorize all these outlays and appropriate funds for them.

At the present time, appropriations are handled in the following manner: First of all, each Federal department and agency estimates its financial requirements for the coming fiscal year. These estimates are compiled by the Bureau of the Budget, which belongs to the executive branch of the Government, and then submitted by the President to Congress.

In Congress, the estimates are reviewed and either cut or approved in their entirety by the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate. These vital committees are terribly understaffed, and are physically unable to determine whether each and every estimate, some of them running into millions of dollars, is justified or padded. As a result, both the Senate and the House sometimes have to vote on appropriations not knowing fully whether the taxpayer's money is actually being spent wisely.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Even with these handicaps, the Eighty-second Congress has made some real economies this year. A reduction in

Federal personnel is expected to save some \$800,000,000. Graduated vacation leaves for Government workers ought to save additional \$200,000,000. The reduction in the size and weight of parcel-post packages, which have been to all practical purposes subsidized by the Government to the tune of approximately 15 cents per each large package, will cut the postal deficit by \$153,000,000. An increase in certain postal rates will further reduce the deficit of the Post Office Department by over \$200,000,000. In addition, we saved millions through curtailment or elimination of automobiles and chauffeurs for Federal agencies, and through reduction of administrative overhead.

Each and every appropriation bill considered by Congress was cut by the Appropriations Committee and by House action below the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. These cuts were made in funds for our Armed Forces, for our domestic and foreign policy programs, and for various civil functions.

There were, however, many economies which should have been made, but were not. Proposals were advanced for cuts in rivers and harbors, agricultural price, and overhead costs appropriations which could have saved hundreds of millions of dollars. These, unfortunately, were overridden.

As in the past, I have given my full support to all realistic measures intended to keep governmental expenditures to an essential minimum. I have not, however, favored some demagogic proposals which would deprive us of needed medical research, public health, or veterans services; which would do away with programs intended to protect our natural resources; or which would jeopardize fair treatment for post office and classified civil-service employees. I do not believe in such false economy, and I would like to point out that savings in the above instances are meager in comparison with the cuts which were fully justified, and should have been made, in other places.

WAYS TO SAVE MORE MONEY

More stringent economy in governmental expenditures is necessary. In my opinion, the only way in which we can achieve it is through closer congressional control over all appropriations. Such control should be attained by more effective cooperation with the General Accounting Office, which is a congressional agency. This office checks expenditures and could also consider pre-examination of estimates. Further, there should be more adequate staffing of congressional committees on appropriations. These suggestions have been advocated by economy-minded representatives, and ought to be put into practice.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Glancing briefly at the legislative record of the Eighty-second Congress we notice that measures pertaining to foreign policy fared out better than did the domestic bills. Bipartisan support of some of these measures, contrasted with frequent bipartisan opposition to domestic programs, was the reason.

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 constituted the major legislative act in the field of foreign affairs. This bill emphasized military assistance to free nations. Provisions for foreign economic aid were considerably reduced in conformance with our earlier expectations, and it is anticipated that the Economic Cooperation Administration, which supervised the Marshall plan for Europe, will be liquidated next year.

EUROPE

The act carried \$5,028,000,000 for military and \$1,022,000,000 for economic aid to Europe for fiscal year 1951-52. As I mentioned earlier, the free nations of Europe are beginning to build their military strength, and they expect to have a fully effective military defense by 1954.

In the meantime, they are in a precarious position, lying in the direct path of possible Communist aggression. Their defenses are weak, since they had to devote their primary effort in the past few years to economic reconstruction. While they possess the manpower for defense, they lack military equipment and they are as yet in no position to manufacture that equipment themselves in sufficient quantities. Without our aid in this instance, the mutual security program would face insurmountable obstacles.

NEAR EAST

This area is of grave importance to our Nation and to the entire Western World. If it should fall into Communist hands, it would give the Soviets enormous oil resources for their industrial and war machinery, control of the Suez Canal, and virtual mastery of the entire Mediterranean. In addition, such a misfortune would isolate the Near East, parts of Africa, and all of Asia from the Western World, giving the Communists a "go" sign for the extension of their domination over those vast areas.

The Near East problem is aggravated by the existing social, economic and political conditions. High rate of illiteracy, poor health conditions, depressed standard of living, fanatical animosity toward the west in some circles, and the absence of forceful leadership—all offer fertile ground for subversive Communist activities.

The admission of Greece and Turkey into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or the formation of a Near East Defensive Pact, would establish good basis for defense of that area. In addition, peace must be preserved there, particularly in the Israel-Arab relations, and the development of the entire region should be advanced.

The Mutual Security Act provides, for refugee relief, \$50,000,000 to Israel and the same amount to the Arab States, as a part of the \$160,000,000 for the economic development of the entire region.

THE FAR EAST

The Far East is the scene of active Communist expansion at the present time. In Korea, Communist aggression has been met, and stopped, with the aid of United Nations' forces. In China, it is ruthlessly destroying all opposition under the dictatorial rule of the Communist dominated regime. In Indo-

china, the Communist forces have engaged the French in a full-scale war. There are also other regions in the Far East which are in imminent danger of open Communist expansion.

Although at present limited to a series of defense agreements with various Pacific states and the treaty with Japan, our policy in the Far East is tending toward the consolidation of the whole Pacific area in a mutual-defense pact. The Mutual Security Act provides for \$535,-250,000 in military, and \$237,500,000 in economic aid to this region.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

In the field of domestic affairs, the record of the Eighty-second Congress is not to date very imposing. The major bills which were approved had many shortcomings. In addition, a number of important measures is still awaiting congressional action.

For instance, Congress approved the extension of the Defense Production Act, providing for price, wage, and rent controls. This legislation is, however, inadequate and contains many loopholes. Agricultural prices, which basically determine the cost of food, were given continued and extended preferential treatment. Provisions guaranteeing profit margins to distributors and manufacturers, and special restrictions on imports of fats and oils and other dairy products, brought in new inflationary pressures into play. Further, prohibition on meat roll-backs and on slaughtering quotas, intended to control black market in meat, add to the difficulty of keeping the prices in line.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Revenue Act of 1951, approved after much debate during the closing days of this session, will not be very popular. Personal income tax increases are expected to raise about \$2,280,000,000; additional corporation taxes, \$2,-207,000,000; and new tax rates, \$1,204,-000,000. The law is far from being perfect and may be charged as inequitable. These facts are enough to arouse critics who will perhaps neglect to remember that, in passing the bill, the majority of Congressmen placed the economic welfare of the entire Nation above political expediency.

There are two points we should keep in mind when speaking of this tax legislation. First of all, that Congress and the many civic, educational, industrial, and labor organizations and committees which studied the national budget with great care and detail, realized that we could not meet our defense expenditures without raising taxes and recommended such increases. Secondly, that many industries and individuals are today reaping special benefits from our defense effort through increased production, reduction in unemployment, and greater over-all business activity.

Unless we want to add to the burden of future generations, and unless we want to resort to inflationary deficit financing, we must pay for our defense expenditures on a pay-as-you-go basis. Those who receive unusual benefits from defense production should be the first to pay their just share, with each one of

us being willing to contribute a bit more in proportion to our means. Surely the preservation of our nation, and of all the benefits of freedom which we enjoy each day, should be worth that much.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

In this field, the record of Congress during this session is very poor. The remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which were not enacted during the Eighty-first Congress, are still gathering dust in various committees. Time and time again, the President and those of us who supported governmental reorganization have urged the chairmen of these committees to take favorable action on these measures. For motives which may be political, the pleas were ignored.

VALUE OF SENIORITY

This is just one more instance where the value of seniority in Congress strikes one's eye. The majority of important positions in Congress, and all the chairmanships of the committees, are allocated on the basis of seniority. As a result, the southern Representatives, who are repeatedly reelected to office, have captured most of those choice assignments, while the North and the West are direly underrepresented in important posts.

It may be indicated for all of us, when voting for our national Representatives, to keep in mind the value of congressional seniority. The retention of good Representatives in office, can further the cause of good government.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

In this realm, the Eighty-second Congress has achieved very little. As the schedule which appears below shows, only a number of minor bills were approved. A bipartisan opposition to the administration's program as well as the need for curtailing all nondefense expenditures, prevented the enactment of any substantial measures.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The same applies to this field, in which the public interest has chiefly lost out two scores. In the first place, no action was taken on the St. Lawrence seaway project, which is considered very important to our national defense and economy, and which would aid tremendously in the industrial and shipping development of the Midwestern States.

In addition, the House had voted to give to the individual States the permanent possession of lands and natural resources, such as oil deposits, located under marginal sea and navigable waters. These tremendously rich deposits are at present considered to belong to the people of the entire Nation. Fortunately, the Senate has not taken any action to confirm this "steal."

LABOR

I am pleased to report that legislation in-reasing the salaries of postal and classified civil-service employees has been approved. Postal employees will receive a flat \$400 raise, while classified civil-service employees will obtain 10-percent increases, ranging from a minimum of \$300 to a maximum of \$800.

This legislation was long overdue, and it acknowledges the increase in the cost of living since 1949, the year in which the last salary increases were granted to Federal employees.

A graduated vacation leave is also replacing the former uniform leave allowances of postal and civil-service workers. The annual vacations will now range from 13 days for employees with up to 2 years of service, to 26 days for those with 15 or more years to their credit.

In addition, increases in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act have been approved. The benefits for pensioners and annuitants were raised 15 percent. A 33½-percent increase for survivors of deceased workers, and a 25-percent increase in lump-sum survivorship cases, were also provided. Further, the taxable base would remain the same and a spouse-benefit provision of not to exceed \$40 per month is included.

Congress also approved an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, validating certain union-shop elections, and rejected a proposal to reduce the position of labor on the Wage Stabilization Board, which today has equal representation in tripartite structure composed of management, labor, and the public.

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

For servicemen and veterans, Congress acted upon a considerable number of measures. All the members of our Armed Force were provided with a free \$10,000 service life-insurance policy, which expires 120 days after they leave service. It is estimated that if we had this system in effect during World War II, the taxpayers would have saved approximately \$500,000,000 on administration costs.

Congress also extended the time for admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizens who are members of the Armed Forces, and passed the Armed Forces Reserve Act to establish a unified Reserve program, eliminating many inequities in the calling up of reservists.

Under this act, which would become effective 6 months after it is signed by the President, the reservists would be divided into three groups: The Ready, Standby, and Retired Reserves. The President could call upon the Ready Reserves at will. Before issuing a call for the Standby Reserves, the President would have to obtain from Congress the permissive number of such Reserves that could be summoned and they could only be called up upon the declaration of war or emergency by Congress. The retired reservists could only be called after all members of Ready and Standby Reserves have already been taken.

Readjustments were made in the compensation and pension of veterans and their dependents. The presumptive periods for veterans with psychoses, and multiple sclerosis were liberalized, and a study was authorized of the effects of malnutrition and starvation of prisoners of war and civilian internees of World War II. Further, overriding the President's veto, Congress granted \$120 pension to veterans of World Wars need-

ing full-time attendants because of non-service-connected disabilities.

Voting record—82d Cong., 1st sess.

Total roll calls.....	217
Not voting.....	7
Paired.....	2
Absent on roll and quorum calls.....	13

Voting record--82d Cong., 1st sess.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Stand	Issue	Status
Voted for...	Mutual security program...	Approved.
Voted for...	Extension of reciprocal trade agreements	Approved.
Voted for...	Emergency loan to India to alleviate famine	Approved.
Voted for...	Ban on export of strategic items to Russia and satellite lines	Approved.
Voted for...	Termination of state of war between United States and Germany	Approved.
Voted for...	Resolution asking U. N. to declare Chinese Reds aggressors in Korea	Approved.
Voted for...	Suspension of import duties on certain critical materials	Approved.
Voted for...	Expression of our people's friendship for all people of the world	Approved.
Voted for...	Resolution opposing admission of Red China to the U. N.	Approved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Voted for....	Extension of Defense Production Act.	Approved.
Favored.....	Strengthening of controls law and closing of loopholes	Pending in Senate.
Voted for....	Universal Military Training and Service Act	Approved.
Voted for....	Navy Ship Conversion and Conversion Act	Approved.
Favored.....	Strengthening of Marine Corps and promotion of Commandant to membership of Joint Chiefs of Staff (sponsor)	Pending.
Voted for....	War-risk insurance	Approved.
Favored.....	Development of our merchant marine	Pending.
Voted for....	Construction of military bases and essential access roads.	Approved.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Voted for....	Revenue Act of 1951.....	Approved.
Voted for....	Increases in certain postal rates	Approved.
Voted for...	Limitation on size and weight of parcel-post packages.	Approved.
Voted for....	Study of overlapping and duplication of taxes.	Approved.
Voted for....	Creation of Select Committee on Small Business.	Approved.
Favored.....	Investigation of crime and racketeering in interstate commerce	Approved.
Voted for....	Prohibition on frauds by radio and TV advertising	Pending in Senate.
Voted for...	Increase in penalties for criminal violation of Sherman Antitrust Act	Pending in Senate.
Opposed....	Making "good faith" a complete defense against charge of price discrimination	Pending in House.
Favored.....	Antigambling legislation...	Pending in both Houses.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Favored.....	Hoover Commission's recommendations.	Pending in both Houses.
Voted for....	Reorganization of RFC under one head	Approved.
Voted for....	"21 day rule" in the House	Rejected.
Favored.....	Creation of Commission on Ethics in Government.	Pending in both Houses.
Favored.....	Separation of subsidy from air-mail pay.	Pending in House.
Favored.....	Creation of Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget.	Pending in both Houses.

Voting record—82d Cong., 1st sess.—Con.
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Stand	Issue	Status
Voted for...	Aid to housing and community facilities in defense areas	Approved.
Voted on...	Renewal of direct loans to veterans for housing	Approved.
Voted for...	Flood disaster relief	Approved.
Voted for...	Grants to States for public assistance	Approved.
Favored.....	Aid for development of public health units, medical and nursing education	Pending in House.
Voted for...	Increase in penalties for illegal traffic in narcotics	Pending in Senate.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Voted for....	Increase in limitations on Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act	Approved.
Favored.....	St. Lawrence seaway.....	Pending in both Houses.
Opposed....	Giving individual States title to oil and other resources found under marginal sea and navigable waters	Pending in Senate.

LABOR

Voted for...	Increase in benefits under Railroad Retirement Act	Approved.
Voted for...	Pay increase for postal employees	Approved.
Voted for...	Pay adjustment for classified civil-service workers	Approved.
Voted for...	Graduated system of leave for Federal employees	Approved.
Favored.....	Amendment to National Labor Relations Act validating certain union-shop elections	Approved.
Favored.....	Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act	No action

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

Voted for...	Free service life insurance to members of Armed Forces	Approved.
Voted for...	Reorganization of military reserves	Approved.
Voted for...	Hospital and medical benefits for veterans of Korean war	Approved.
Voted for...	Uniform pensions for Spanish-American War veterans	Approved.
Voted for...	Adjustment of monthly compensation and pensions to veterans and dependents	Pending in Senate.
Voted for...	Extension of presumptive period for veterans suffering from certain diseases	Approved.
Voted for...	\$120 pension to certain totally disabled veterans needing full time attendant.	Approved.

Restore the Crosses to the Graves of Our
Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today received communications relative to the removal of the crosses from the graves of our patriotic dead in Hawaii, containing a resolution adopted by the

Veterans of Foreign Wars in New York, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO REMOVAL OF THE
WHITE CROSSES FROM THE VETERANS' GRAVES
IN MILITARY CEMETERIES

Whereas the military cemetery in Hawaii known as sacrifice hill contains some 13,000 graves of veterans; and

Whereas, the removal of these crosses is deemed by the members of this Sixth District, Department of New York, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, as a most despicable, unpatriotic, and most disrespectful act, ever shown to veterans who have made the supreme sacrifice for the honor and glory of God and the Stars and Stripes of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, do hereby demand the immediate replacement of these white crosses to the graves from which they were removed; be it further

Resolved, That this cemetery, and all cemeteries, and graves of our departed comrades the world over, shall be (perpetually) and (respectfully) maintained by the Government of these United States of America.

Respectfully submitted.

R. V. WINDRATH,

Commander, Sixth District, Department of New York, VFW.

Retreat From Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very thought-provoking article, by William H. Chamberlin, appearing in the October 18 issue of the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Chamberlin's practical and wise analysis of our current foreign policy is well worth reading by every student of our foreign-policy objectives and their progress thus far. The editorial follows:

RETREAT FROM VICTORY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

A main trend in American foreign policy today is the attempt to escape from some of the undesirable consequences of victory in the late war. Within the last few months there have been four conspicuous examples.

A peace treaty which excludes crushing reparations and provides for restoration of Japanese sovereignty, with no further outside interference in Japanese internal affairs, has been signed with Japan. A contractual agreement aiming at the same objectives is in process of negotiation with the West German Government at Bonn. One hears no more of that empty, if mouth-filling phrase, unconditional surrender. There is certain to be a good deal of hard bargaining over a good many conditions before a satisfactory inclusion of Germany in the general West European defense scheme is achieved.

America, Great Britain, and France have urged other signatories of the Italian Peace Treaty to lift the arms restrictions and promote Italy's adhesion to the United Nations, and Franco Spain is being seriously

reckoned with in European defense plans, after being subjected to a period of sterile and futile boycott.

There is certainly no merit in persisting in a proved blunder. The whole conception of a ruthless, punitive peace, to be imposed on the Axis Powers of the late war and maintained by the combined strength of the United Nations, became untenable from the moment when Soviet ambitions proved irreconcilable with the interests and security of the Western Powers. It would have been the height of suicidal folly and a clear case of playing the Kremlin's game to have carried on a permanent feud with Germans and Japanese, Italians and Spaniards, at a time when Stalin was feverishly arming every population group under his direct or indirect control, from North Koreans to East Germans.

REALISM VERSUS SENTIMENT

It is, however, fair to ask whether this swing in policy may go too far; whether a policy of building up Germany and Japan may backfire, in time, like the policy of giving unlimited trust and support to the Soviet dictatorship in the last war. It would certainly be an illusion—and it might be a disastrous illusion—to assume that our assorted new allies and associates, from Franco to Tito, are 100-percent champions of democracy.

Attempts to remake German secondary schools in the American high school image have not been successful. The Japanese, in their overpopulated islands, on their 1- and 2-acre rice farms do not and cannot perhaps be expected to have an American psychology regarding individual opportunity. One should not bank too much on the effectiveness of a writ of habeas corpus in the domains of either Franco or Tito.

But when one turns away from sentiment and considers the promptings of national interest, a much more reliable determinant of national action, the prospect does not seem so dark. Those who think of Germany and Japan as reviving "menaces" overlook the very great weakening of both countries as a result of the war.

Under the contemplated arrangement with the Lonn regime substantial Allied forces will remain on German soil. It is highly significant that both the German Government and the representatives of the leading opposition party, the Social Democrats, are eager and even insistent on the proposition that more foreign troops should be sent to form a shield behind which German rearmament can take place. This is not the attitude of men who are scheming to turn against the west at the first convenient moment. The security arrangement with Japan provides for the maintenance there of American sea and air forces.

ATTITUDE OF FORMER ENEMIES

Moreover, if there were not a foreign soldier on German or Japanese soil, a severance of economic ties with the Western World would be a catastrophe for both these countries. West Germany is far more dependent on imported overseas foodstuffs and raw materials than the Germany which existed before the war. Japan has lost overseas sources of food and raw materials in Manchuria, China and also in Korea and Formosa. It is most unlikely that the Soviet Union would have either the will or the ability to supply the deficits in the German and Japanese economies which would be the result of breaking off economic relations with the United States, Great Britain, and the Commonwealth area.

Still another consideration of elementary self-interest tends to weld Germany and Japan with the western powers, regardless

of differences and grievances on some subsidiary issues. Assuming that the men who are politically active in Germany and Japan today possess the most elementary instinct for self-preservation, they must know that they would be marked for prompt liquidation in the event of a Communist seizure of power.

The fact that Russia today is not only a national state but the center of an international revolutionary conspiracy has its handicaps as well as its advantages. The Communist fifth column in other countries are an asset to a Soviet foreign policy. But men like Adenauer and Yoshida can hardly miss the significance, for themselves, of what happened to Jan Masaryk and other non-Communists who sincerely tried to get along with the Communists in the iron-curtain countries.

WHERE THEIR INTEREST LIES

The range of choice open to Germany and Japan is not as wide as some Germans and Japanese may dream. To attempt to pass over to the Soviet side in the world duel for power would mean first a tremendous worsening of already low standards of living, secondly, the elimination, probably physical as well as political, of all who had been actively identified with politics since the end of the war. Of course the measure and heartiness of German and Japanese political and military cooperation depend a good deal on the farsightedness and intelligent self interest of America, its Atlantic Pact allies and the friendly powers in the Pacific.

It would be bold and rash to predict that Germany and Japan will never cause international concern in the future. After all, anyone who predicted when Japan surrendered in August 1945, that America would be fighting again in Asia within 5 years—against North Koreans and Chinese—would have probably been shrugged off as a crackpot. But for the predictable future the danger is remote that Germany and Japan will be able to set out on new careers of international conquest—certainly they cannot unaided by other foes. The greater danger is that these two countries will prove to be so shattered militarily, economically, and morally that they cannot play any effective part in their own defense. America's retreat from victory did not begin a moment too soon.

Open Relief Rolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Monday, October 15, 1951, issue of the Peoria Journal entitled "Open Relief Rolls":

OPEN RELIEF ROLLS

The States have won a victory over Federal bureaucracy, and the people of Illinois automatically are now assured of their right to know where their tax money earmarked for public relief is going. This was accomplished last week when the Senate-House tax conference committee agreed to drop a 1939 Federal restriction which forbade publications of names of recipients of relief payments originating in part from the Federal Treasury.

When the House Ways and Means Committee, about 3 weeks ago, rejected by one vote the Jenner amendment designed to remove this restriction, we thought that the issue would be dead for this session of Congress. We are glad that we were wrong. The new action by the joint committee assures removal of the old Federal ban. Now, States like Indiana, which fought hardest for it and suffered a withdrawal of Federal relief payments, by opening her relief rolls to public inspection in defiance of the Federal regulation, will be jubilant. The \$20,000,000 withheld from her now will have to be shelled out by a reluctant Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, who ruled to deny the money to the State.

The Illinois General Assembly, at its last session, passed laws making public the old-age assistance, blind assistance, and other public welfare rolls which did not involve Federal subsidies. In addition, a law was passed also making public the poor relief rolls, if and when the Federal requirement of secrecy was removed. General relief funds are derived jointly from State and Federal sources. As we understand it, the new Illinois law automatically activates itself immediately upon repeal of the Federal ban.

Thus it appears that Illinois now has, or will shortly have upon completion of legal formalities, completely open public welfare books. The day of reckoning has come for the chiselers—those who have been illegally attached to the relief rolls when they had no need of public assistance. The State department of public welfare uncovered a good many cases of chiseling on its own several months ago. How many more will come to light in view of the new open-books law remains to be seen. Now that the taxpayers who foot the bill can determine where their money is going, it is less likely to be wasted from now on, and the total cost of the relief program should show a substantial drop as a result.

The Schuman Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the signing in Paris of the Schuman-plan treaty is an act of historical importance.

It is, above all, a long step toward world peace.

The ministers of six nations signed the treaty—Belgium, France, Western Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and Luxemburg.

A little over 6 years ago these same nations were locked in a deadly struggle. Four of them had been occupied over a period of years. The dead on both sides were numbered in the millions.

Those of us who have been in Europe during World War II or since have grim memories of what that war meant to these nations and their peoples. I think we have wondered, many of us, whether or not the scars could ever heal. I have asked myself sometimes if I personally, under such circumstances, could forgive or forget. Frankly, I am not too sure.

And yet these countries, 6 years later, have put aside their bitterness. They have turned their backs on memories.

In the Schuman plan they have set the framework for an enduring peace between their peoples. To grasp its full significance, we cannot consider the plan solely from a technical point of view, as a particular solution to the particular problems of two particular industries, steel and coal. In the final analysis it is a plan for the construction of a new and peaceful Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we ask what the Europeans are doing for peace. Here, I think, is the answer.

The author of the plan, Robert Schuman, is, to me, an exciting and dramatic figure. A modest man, M. Schuman would, I am sure, blush to hear himself so described. I doubt if he sees himself as dramatic.

And yet—think of the man. Born in Alsace, twice in his own lifetime he has seen his homeland devastated by war. A Frenchman, he was inducted into the German Army during World War I and forced to wear the uniform of his country's enemy. In World War II he saw his country again invaded, again devastated. Truly, if any man could be forgiven for bitterness, Robert Schuman is that man.

And yet, last August in Strasbourg, before the assembly of the Council of Europe, Mr. Schuman said:

I accept the principle of the renunciation of sovereign rights not for itself, not as an end in itself, but as a necessity . . . as the only means we have of rising above the national egotism, antagonisms, and narrowness which is killing us.

He told the Council members:

In this way . . . we will give to our anxious people . . . the assurance that side by side with our legitimate concern for security, there does exist hope and the will to live and work in peace and for peace.

No drama, note. And yet there are trumpets in those words.

Robert Schuman believes that the peace he seeks—the peace sought today by all men of good will—can be won. But only if the measures adopted are bold and imaginative. Only if they are commensurate, in their scope, with the dangers today threatening peace.

For the vision and leadership he has given us, the name of Robert Schuman deserves to be listed for all times among his country's—and the world's—great. He stands in the forefront of the crusaders for peace.

Nor do I think we should forget the other names connected with the plan. The farsighted Jean Monnet has worked for it. André Philip, Karl Arnold—there are dozens of others.

The West Germany Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, deserves particular mention. Adenauer was among the ministers signing the treaty in Paris, the first German chancellor to visit the French capital since the war.

In supporting the Schuman plan, Adenauer is risking his own—and his party's—political neck.

And he is taking that risk. He is putting the peace of Europe—the peace of the world—first.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been a time in all history when the world needed

more desperately this type of leadership. This is true statesmanship—the 1951 model.

In his recent book, *Peace Can be Won*, Paul Hoffman has this to say of the Schuman plan:

The very idea would have been unthinkable a generation ago.

True enough. But if there had been a Schuman plan a generation ago, there might have been no World War I and II. Paul Hoffman sees the plan in its broader aspects. He says:

Its political aims are bold and far reaching enough to become stepping stones toward that European federation which many believe is the next necessary step in Western Europe's political evolution.

The French, themselves, see the plan in this light. In first announcing the proposal, the Quai d'Orsay declared:

This proposal will lay the first real foundation of an European federation which is essential to the preservation of peace.

Many of us in this country have been impatient with the progress of this proposed federation. The French, always a practical people, remind us:

A united Europe will not be achieved all at once nor in a single framework. It will be formed by concrete measures which first of all create a solidarity in fact.

The heart of the plan is that the coal and steel industries of the member countries are to be treated as if no national boundaries existed among them. These boundaries are, in fact, to be eliminated as far as these two particular industries are concerned.

The member countries are to abandon all narrow nationalistic interests and allow these industries to develop and to operate in a common market.

To an American, accustomed as we are to the free interchange between our 48 States, this does not seem to be so very extraordinary.

But there is a difference.

Suppose, let us say, that New York and Pennsylvania were different countries. That they spoke different languages. That their people cherished different traditions. That there had been wars between them for centuries.

We know what the Civil War did emotionally and economically to certain sections of our country. Even today—seventy-odd years later—the scars are there.

Multiply that feeling a thousandfold. Throw in the language differences. Custom differences. Habits of thought. And you have the European problem.

But these men—Schuman, Monnet, Adenauer—see the possibility—no, the probability—of overcoming these obstacles. They are going ahead with the first great step.

The plan is so new—so overwhelming—that it has, not unnaturally, created a certain amount of suspicion. It is, for example, denounced as the forerunner of a new vast cartel of selfish interests. It is said to be a policy of social reaction. The Communists, of course, have branded it as just another scheme of Wall Street—an imperialistic plot.

None of this is true.

The fact is that, far from being a cartel, it is just the opposite. Paul Hoffman says:

The . . . Schuman plan will be empowered to abolish not only national trade barriers but also private restrictive agreements. This approach should be compared to that behind the formation of the European steel cartel in the 1920's under which producers and sellers divided markets, rigidly pegged and protected prices and held back production . . . The Schuman plan, on the contrary, is an anticartel plan to fuse and expand rather than to divide and restrict the coal and steel resources of Western Europe.

The cartel system, by its very nature, is opposed to economic progress. Thanks to it, factories badly managed, badly equipped, badly located are kept alive. Productivity stands still since producers either refuse to modernize or direct modernization solely toward increased profits.

The plan, in reestablishing competition, could, no doubt, eventually drive out of business some marginal producers. That it will do it now, with the emergency demand for steel at its height, is not probable. Under the treaty signed last month, in fact, transition measures are provided which will give the inefficient time, and some help, to catch up. They will be required only to shed their complacency and indifference and get in step with contemporary methods.

There can be no reasonable objection to such a procedure. It is indispensable if general productivity in the industries is to be raised.

The plan—and let me emphasize this—seeks not to close down enterprises but to modernize them.

As to social reaction—well, the fact is that European labor leaders have worked closely with the authors of the plan. They endorse it as a means of bettering labor's working and living conditions. Increased productivity, as European labor is finding out, means higher standards of living. It means better wages. It means more jobs.

The attainment of higher productivity means—and this, too, European labor is learning—labor and management working together. It means the free exchange of information within the industries themselves. It means, in short, the kind of cooperation proposed under the Schuman plan.

One of the principal objectives of the plan is improving the standard of living of the European workers. It means giving them the benefits of high productivity in a vastly expanded market.

Full employment is one of the goals. Under the treaty, the member nations will be committed to the elimination of virtually all restrictions in the hiring of experienced steel and coal workers who are nationals of the other countries. Particular emphasis will be placed on removing barriers to the reemployment of displaced workers.

The treaty makes special provisions for the care of workers affected by shifts in coal and steel facilities. These workers will be assisted in making the necessary readjustments, either through liberal separation pay, retraining courses, or payment of resettlement ex-

penses. The financing of new industries to absorb these workers is contemplated.

There are other positive objectives for labor. The plan proposes, for one thing, the elimination of the deliberate use of wage reductions as a technique of competition. The treaty, in fact, prohibits any reduction of wages except in certain clearly defined circumstances, such as, for example, when living costs have declined. Abnormally low wages, already in existence, will be given consideration and steps taken to adjust them.

The Communist charge that the Schuman plan is a "Wall Street scheme" is untrue on its face. The plan is not even an American plan. It has our hearty approval, but it was born in the brains and in the hearts of the Europeans themselves.

Back in May of last year, when the plan was first proposed, Paul Hoffman, then ECA Administrator, said:

The French proposal . . . shows real determination to achieve a high degree of economic integration among the free nations of Western Europe. It is the principle and not the exact methods which ECA considers of the utmost importance. The ways and means, as I have told the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, must be determined by the countries themselves.

He said further:

Americans who fully appreciate the technical and political difficulties involved admire the spirit and determination of the free peoples of Western Europe to preserve their freedom by the way we have preserved ours . . . through closer union. A free united Europe and a free united America, standing together, can discourage future aggressors and lead the way to lasting peace.

The Schuman plan, in short, was born of the determination of European leaders to find some other answer than war to their age-old problems and to bring to the masses of their peoples the benefits, social and economic, of modern technological advancements.

The French see very realistically that the peace of Europe depends upon peace between France and Germany. Any action taken, they declare, must first of all concern those two countries.

Let me read you this—an excerpt from the French announcement of May 10, 1950:

The community of production which will in this manner be created . . . will clearly show that any war between France and Germany becomes not only unthinkable but in actual fact impossible.

This, remember, from a country just victorious in its second war in less than 50 years. The victor, not the vanquished, proposes a scheme to make future wars impossible. Who could know better than the French that in modern wars there are no victors?

The French did not, however, limit their plan solely to these two countries. In the first announcement an invitation to participate was extended to all European nations. As you know, four others—Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—responded.

Work on drafting a treaty began. The draft was initiated March 19 and the final treaty signed April 18.

The preamble of that treaty states the purposes of the plan:

To substitute for historic rivalries a fusion of their national interests, to establish, by creating an economic community, the foundation of a broad and independent community among peoples long divided by bloody conflicts and to lay the bases of institutions capable of giving direction to their future common destiny.

A unique feature of the treaty is a supernational authority—the high authority, it is called—created to handle the operation and problems of the two industries.

The creation of this high authority will, it is hoped, overcome one of the principal obstacles in the way of European federation—the sensitiveness of the national states.

The plan gives this sensitiveness full consideration. Instead of building on ground already occupied by existing governmental structures, which would require tearing down to make room, it proposes the foundation of a new but common structure on ground almost untouched.

Like any other government, this high authority would have an executive body. It would have a legislature to which the executive would be responsible. And it would have a court to hear cases rising from the problems of the industries involved.

In addition, the treaty calls for a special council of ministers, the primary function of which would be to insure the coordination of the activities of the high authority with the over-all economies of the nations involved. The impact of the plan upon such national problems as defense, inflation control, balance of external accounts, and so forth, was early recognized. This special council was proposed to prevent any difficulties in these areas.

I will not attempt to discuss the treaty in further detail. It has yet, as you know, to be ratified by the legislative bodies of the member countries. It could be rejected.

Personally, however, I am quite optimistic as to its chances. I have great confidence in the ability of the European people to subordinate their concept of sovereignty and the interests of special groups to the grander concept of unity and peace.

This is, I repeat, not an American plan. It is completely European. However, it will affect the United States in the same degree to which it will affect all members of the Atlantic community. On its successful conclusion and, more importantly, on its faithful execution will depend not only the lasting recovery of Europe but the peace and security of us all.

The immediate benefits of the plan may be economic, but the alternative will be political. It is, in fact, the political significance of the plan that raises it to the global supernational level. It is the political implication that concerns the United States.

For this reason, and for this reason above all, the people of the United States take a profound interest in the early ratification of the plan. It is our peace as

well as that of Europe that is in the balance. It is our future as well as theirs that is at stake. Two world wars in which we became involved have taught us the extent to which our peace and future are involved in the peace and future of Europe.

Nothing could cause greater disappointment and greater disillusionment to me, personally, than to see the people of these six nations fail their leaders on this issue. Nothing, I am sure, could more dishearten Americans generally.

As an American, I am deeply interested in the Schuman plan. I am even more deeply interested, however, as a citizen of the world community, which has been—twice in my lifetime—dragged into war because of the failure of politicians and statesmen in the past to take such concrete steps as the Schuman plan to make war impossible.

Need for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Washington Star of October 18 with reference to the allocation of critical materials for the construction of schools. I also include a resolution adopted by the Texas Association of School Administrators on need for critical schoolhouse building materials. The expansion of our school facilities is essential and calls for a more realistic allocation of critical materials for that purpose. The editorial and resolution follow:

[From the Washington Star of October 18, 1951]

A PRICE WE SHOULD NOT PAY

If the defense program means that we are arming ourselves and the rest of the anti-Communist world at the expense of failing to provide necessary school facilities for millions of American children, we need some new evaluation of the net losses involved in saving democracy.

There were about 28,230,000 children enrolled in schools throughout the Nation (through the twelfth grade) in 1940. By next year that total will have increased by 2,400,000. By 1960 the total will have grown to 37,138,000. There were many shortages of school buildings in 1940. But with the unavailability of building material during World War II, which postponed so much construction, and with the new shortages threatened now by the defense program and the great increase of school population, we are not providing either for current needs or for those that lie ahead.

For the first quarter of 1952, communities throughout the Nation have made requests for 255,400 tons of steel for school-building construction. The National Production Authority has allotted, in the face of that demand, only 81,000 tons. The demand, and the allocations, cover all types of construction in the field of education. But the greatest need for school construction is in the primary grades. Unless this need is more

adequately met, there are going to be millions of young children who will be forced to use makeshift schoolrooms, on part-time schedules, throughout all of their school days. Some way should be found to increase the allocation of steel in this field particularly. The communities affected are paying for the construction. What they need is the steel. The allocations must be increased, regardless of where they come from. We can get along without many things. But adequate school construction is not one of them.

RESOLUTION OF THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON NEED FOR CRITICAL SCHOOLHOUSE BUILDING MATERIALS

The NPA has allotted only one-third of the actual need of structural steel and other critical materials for schoolhouse construction in the United States. As matters now stand, buildings presently under construction will require the major part, or all, of the 1952 allotment of such materials. That means the schoolhouses now on the planning boards cannot be contracted for in 1952, and that accordingly, no new schoolhouse construction will be available in the falls of 1953 and 1954. This action on the part of NPA shows a lack of understanding of the need for schoolhouses in America. If all the structural steel needed for school buildings were allotted, it would equal less than 1 percent of the total steel production of the industry, and would not, accordingly, hamper the defense program or the civilian economy. In Texas alone there will be an increase of 100,000 school-age children from September 1951 to September 1955. In Texas today 180,000 children are housed in temporary buildings and rented churches. The immediate need in Texas is for 5,300 new classrooms; an additional 3,400 will be needed by September 1955.

Since the NPA apparently does not understand, as demonstrated by its allocation of critical materials, that schoolhousing is at such a premium, and that it will be at a greater premium from year to year for the next decade, and since to neglect the education of the children now is to negate the possibility of an educated, democratic citizenship of the future; be it

Resolved by the Texas Association of School Administrators, assembled in Austin, Tex., this fifteenth day of October 1951, That our two Senators and Representatives in Congress from Texas be urged to sponsor or support legislation which will assure to the schools of the Nation an adequate amount of structural steel and other critical materials necessary for schoolhouse construction.

EDWARD T. ROBBINS, President,
Alamo Heights, San Antonio, Tex.

Attest.

FRANK W. RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Henrietta, Tex.

Put None but Americans on Guard Tonight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many patriotic organizations are springing into being, fully armed, as did Athena from the head of Jove, whose only excuse for existence is to bend every effort to get America out of our iniquitous

and ill-judged adherence to the United Nations.

This tremendous ground swell of public opinion, the surges of which are even now impinging upon this Congress, shall yet become the tremendous tidal wave of indignation which shall sweep into innocuous desuetude the Members of Congress who have either rendered lip service or wholehearted support to this alien monstrosity, which is designed to destroy America and transplant us into a world state wherein we shall be outvoted 51 percent by population.

To these patriotic minutemen I seek to herewith transmit the word of the father of our country, George Washington, when his nebulous country was in the forming: "Place none but Americans on guard tonight."

It has been the history of many organizations in the United States, which were originally formed for very wise and patriotic reasons, that the subversives have infiltrated such groups, and later have taken them over lock, stock, and barrel. There is every reason to suppose they shall attempt the same tactics with ours.

Consequently, do not accept for membership anyone who cannot pronounce the "Shibboleth" of true American patriotism. Accept no subterfuges. Refuse membership to cranks of any sort, or any group which would attempt to place other aims side by side with that of our liberation from the United Nations, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

Tioga County Is in the Broome Orbit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, according to Gauleiter Pfeiffer's plan to gerrymander me out of Congress, Tioga County will be in my new district.

Tioga County is almost as desirable a balliwick from my standpoint as the counties now in my district.

In the first place, Tioga is in the Broome orbit. All of the news out of Broome County filters into Tioga and I know that I am as well known in that county as I am in the rural part of western Broome County.

Tioga, therefore, will be fertile field. I have always had a lot of friendly mail from there and a lot of folks down in Owego think your Congressman is their Congressman. It is all right with me too.

The best part of Tioga's being brought into the fold is its close proximity to the Endicott Johnson and IBM plants. Hundreds of people who live in Tioga County commute daily to the Triple Cities, where they earn their living.

That is why I have always answered the heavy mail I get from Tioga. It would be easy to represent this great

American county because it is right in my own front yard.

I have never turned down a request from Tioga and I never will.

The following letter is an example of what I mean:

APALACHIN, N. Y., October 11, 1951.
Congressman EDWIN A. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: Thank you for the opportunity to obtain some useful booklets. I have marked those which I need and would very much like to have; although I found I could not hold it down to a smaller number I hope you can send all those checked.

We moved here in Tioga County a year ago, from Broome County (Vestal). Am a Republican, and always voted for you back in Broome County, and if this area is included in the new district and you are on the list, will be pleased to do so again but try to keep down those taxes a bit, will you?

Yours respectfully,

DON WYKSTRA.

Address of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the national convention of the American Legion at Miami, Fla., on October 17, 1951:

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to address those who brought victory to American aims in the past two great wars of world history. I do so as a member of this Legion holding no public office, advocating no partisan cause, and animated by the sole desire to help restore, preserve, and advance those great American principles and ideals of which we have been beneficiaries ourselves and are now trustees for future American generations.

No fraternity of men ever rested upon a more noble concept than does the American Legion. The indestructible bonds which unite its members were welded in a heat of battle by those who laid life and limb upon the altar of self-sacrifice. From its very inception, it pledged itself to those high principles which form the preamble to its constitution "For God and country" it reads, and to these it has remained invincibly faithful. It has written a record of service to the Nation which commands the gratitude of every citizen.

To me it is a source of added inspiration that the women's auxiliary has joined us here today. None will dispute the strength they have brought to the Legion in the fulfillment of its tasks. In these challenging times, they stand as a mighty spiritual force to inspire faith that we may maintain in American life the moral base upon which our true greatness has always depended.

Of all the issues which today confront our people, possibly none is of more immediate concern to the Legion than is the direction of our military policy. That policy necessarily and traditionally has found its general orientation in the political thinking which has guided our foreign affairs. But so closely interwoven have our military and

foreign and even domestic policies become that it is impossible to ignore one when considering the others. To understand the general direction of our military policy, we must therefore understand the animating impulses which guide our domestic and foreign affairs. Both, under the leadership now administering our Government have departed sharply from tradition and constitutional mandate.

At the birth of the Nation, Washington counseled strongly against our entering upon entangling alliances abroad lest we find ourselves involved in Europe's wars. This was sound advice then, but has been necessarily outmoded by the progress of civilization. For with the development of means of rapid communication, existing gaps between the several continental land masses have been narrowed and ocean barriers in themselves no longer set the stage for continental isolation nor offer an assured degree of protection for continental shores. As a consequence, it is impossible to disassociate ourselves from the affairs of Europe and Asia. Major warfare in either has become our immediate military concern, lest they fall under the domination of those hostile to us and intent upon predatory incursions against our own land. To counteract the potentiality of this danger, we have acted both in the east and in the west. In the Pacific we and our friends maintain an island defense chain off the coast of continental Asia which must be preserved inviolate at any cost. Despite some public statements to the contrary, there is reason to fear that it is still the overriding purpose of some of our political leaders, under the influence of allies who maintain diplomatic ties with Communist China, to yield the island of Formosa at an opportune time to the Chinese henchmen of international communism. The effect of such action would be to breach our island defense chain, threaten peace on the Pacific, and ultimately endanger the security of our Pacific coastal area. There is little doubt that the yielding of Formosa and the seating of Communist China in the United Nations was fully planned when I called upon the enemy commander in Korea on March 24, to meet me in the field to arrange armistice terms. This I did in view of the fundamental weakness of his military position due to the lack of an industrial base in China capable of supporting modern warfare. The opposition I expressed to yielding Formosa and seating Red China, with the overwhelming support it received from the American people, unquestionably wrecked the secret plan to yield on these issues as the price for peace in Korea. There followed the violent Washington reaction in personal retaliation against me for what was actually so normal a military move.

Across the Atlantic we have no similar island defense chain; but, in view of the openly flaunted intention of international communism to destroy throughout the world the concept of freedom and bring peoples everywhere under the subjugation and terror of police rule, it has become necessary to help the free nations of Western Europe prepare against the threat of predatory attack by Communist forces now occupying Eastern Europe. And generally, throughout the world, our policy has been enunciated to extend a helping hand to others whose freedom is threatened and who have the will but lack the entire resource essential to their own defense. The soundness of this concept will depend upon the wisdom with which it is administered. Recklessly and abnormally applied, it could encompass our own destruction. This country obviously lacks the resource militarily to defend the world. It has the resource, however, reasonably to assist in that defense. But such assistance must be contributory to, rather than in place of maximum local national effort. It should be extended only upon condition that assist-

ance to others be really for defense and that it should be so limited as not to deplete our own resources to the point of imperiling the survival of our own liberties; and that those we would assist be animated by the same love of freedom as we, and possess the will and determination to pledge their own lives and full resource to secure their own defense.

On the strict observance of these conditions, rests our hope that present efforts to bolster Western Europe may justify the additional burden it places upon our own people. There are, however, many disturbing signs and reports to the contrary. There are many of the leaders and people of Western Europe who mistakenly believe that we assist them solely to protect ourselves, or to assure an alliance with them, should our country be attacked. This is indeed fallacious thinking. Our potential in human and material resource, in alignment with the rest of the Americas, is adequate to defend this hemisphere against any threat from any power or any association of powers. We do desire to retain our traditional friends and allies in Europe, but such an alliance must rest upon spiritual bonds fabricated from a mutuality of purpose and a common heritage of principle—not an alliance to be secured at a price.

There are other disturbing signs that some of the peoples we seek to bolster are showing a lack of will to muster their own full resource in their own defense. There appear to be many among them who feel that their defense is, and should be, our sole responsibility and that beyond a token military collaboration they should confine their own energy and resource to the building of their civilian economy—some indeed who go so far as to advocate that money appropriated by our Congress for their military defense should be diverted to civilian purpose. The startling thing is that such viewpoints are not lacking in support among our own leaders. Apparently, some of them, more in line with Marxism philosophy than animated by a desire to preserve freedom, would finance the defense of others as a means of sharing with them our wealth. This wealth, accumulated by our own initiative and industry under the incentives of free enterprise, would then serve as the means of covering Socialist or Communist deficits abroad. The ultimate effect, whatever the intent, would be to reduce our own standard of life to a level of universal mediocrity.

We have committed ourselves to contribute six ground divisions to Western Europe, notwithstanding that only a small fraction of the great masses of its peoples have been called to the colors. Indeed, if the human resource and industrial potential of the Western European nations were effectively employed for defense, there would be minimum need for American ground forces or even great quantities of American munitions—air and naval power, yes, but little honest necessity for ground troops—unless it be solely for morale purposes. Actually, if the European nations have the will to defend themselves, no question of morale would be involved. Our efforts to whip up enthusiasm among the Western European peoples for the defense of their own liberties find neither precedent nor support in common sense or logic.

One thing we must clearly understand is that the very course on which we are now embarked carries within itself grave risks to our own survival. The exhaustive effort to build our own military power and supplement that of other free nations, however justified, is probably more or less in accord with Soviet planning. For just as we expend our resources to build military strength, inversely we progressively reduce ourselves to economic weakness, with a consequent growing vulnerability to the internal stresses and strains manipulated by Communists and their agents in our midst. It may indeed

prove that the preparation for a war which may never occur will exhaust us materially as completely as would such a war itself. Our leaders must throw off the complacent belief that the only threat to our survival is from without. All freedoms lost since war's end have been the result of internal pressures rather than external assault.

What action then do we propose to take against those Communist nations whose provocations have brought upon us so sad a state of affairs? We now hear talk of force as bulwarking our foreign policy, but in Korea we restrain the use of the very force we possess where challenged on the battlefield. And, while we hear such talk of force and our soldiers fight against our self-imposed odds, we and our allies continue to give the Soviet and its satellites the aid and comfort and immense satisfaction of full diplomatic relations and, with but limited exceptions, the rights, privileges, and opportunities of trade and commerce normal to friendly international intercourse. We negotiate and negotiate and negotiate, never seeming to learn that you cannot profitably negotiate with Communists any more than you can with any other type of malefactor in civilized society. The only persuasion that will move them is the resistance to their abusive pressure by adequate counterpressure.

Recent events points to a startling and dangerous shift in our basic military concept. After Communist China committed itself to war against our forces in Korea, our political and military leaders set aside our traditional military policy calling for the employment of all available power and means to achieve a prompt and decisive victory and adopted instead the doctrine of defense. Every distinguished military leader of the past and all military experience from the beginning of time warns this but invites failure. Under this new conception, novel indeed to American military character, we are required in the midst of deadly war to soften our blows and send men into battle with neither promise nor hope of victory. We have deprived them of supporting military power already on hand and available which would blunt the enemy's blows against them, save countless American lives, fulfill our commitment to the tragic people of Korea and lead to the victorious end of a war which has already left so many thousands of American soldiers maimed or dead. More than this, it could and would have removed the Chinese Communists as a threat to freedom in Asia and the peace of the world for generations to come.

The reason given for such a course has little validity. It has been argued in justification and seemingly to soothe the public concern that the application of conventional war measures against our enemy might provoke the Soviet into launching the third world war. Yet, since the end of the Second World War, without committing a single soldier to battle, the Soviet, aided by our own political blunders, has gained a dominion over territory and peoples without parallel in all history—a dominion which it will take years for it to assimilate and administer. What then would be its purpose in provoking a war of most doubtful result to the Communist cause? I have strong doubt that the start of a major war anywhere enters the Soviet plans at this stage. If and when it does, it will be at a time and place and under circumstances dictated with scarce regard to the incidents of Korea.

Could there be anything more discouraging and shocking to our soldiers on the line than the deprecating reference to their fierce and savage struggle as a police action? Could anything be more agonizing to the mothers of their dead than the belittling reference to it by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the "Korean skirmish"? What a lack of perspective. What a failure to place first things first.

What a complete callousness to human feeling and soldier dignity. Two great questions about Korea still remain unanswered. First, why did they start the war if they did not intend to win it? And second, what do they intend to do now?—go on piling up our dead indefinitely with no fixed purpose or end in sight? Hardened old soldier though I am—my very soul revolts at this unnecessary slaughter of the flower of our youth.

I recall so vividly the American Legion's warning to the country at the close of the war some 6 years ago. Its resolution read as follows:

"The only present guaranty of our Nation's safety and freedom and the best presently available assurance of world peace is to have in the hands of this great peace-loving Nation the mightiest armament in the world."

Sound and far-sighted advice which considered the present and drew upon the lessons and experience of the past. Had it been heeded by our political and military leaders, we would have been able to consolidate our great moral and military victory and lead the world to an enduring peace. We would not now be frantically endeavoring to restore our dissipated military strength. The Soviet would be but a negative influence upon world affairs, and the earth would be a much gentler place on which to live. But our leaders failed to heed that advice. They failed to recognize the opportunity for leadership which victory had cast. They failed to see the enormity of the Communist threat to an impoverished postwar world. And, failing this vision, they became animated solely by what appeared to be the political expediencies of the hour. They disarmed and demobilized our military power with reckless haste. They disposed of our vast stores of military equipment with such irresponsible abandon that, when I sought to arm and equip a modest military reserve of 75,000 Japanese to help fill the power vacuum left in Japan when we moved our occupation divisions to the Korean front, I was informed that it would take 18 months, at a very minimum, before the requirements could be filled.

After reducing our military strength to possibly the lowest relative degree in American history, they suddenly reversed the process, to rearm with no less precipitate haste under the pressure of an artificially aroused fear psychosis throughout the land. It is quite natural that such sudden changes in basic policy have left our people confused and bewildered, and have lost us the faith of many other peoples. The issue of war or peace is not based upon any sudden and unexpected change in the course of world events, or even direction of Soviet policy. Long before even the Second World War, the Soviet was known to plan suppression of the concept of freedom and the advance of communism throughout the world, as rapidly as conditions would permit. We, ourselves, molded these conditions to the Soviet's plan by providing extraordinary facility for it to so deploy its military forces as to permit direct and decisive pressure upon many of the free nations of Europe and Asia.

This is now, of course, past history. The immediate problem calls for a dynamic political and military policy designed to secure the future and regain the lost faith of others in order that our moral influence may reassert itself to guide the world toward reason and right. And, in the formulation of such policies, it is well that we understand that battles are not won by arms alone. There must exist above all else a spiritual impulse—a will to victory. This can only be if the soldier feels his sacrifice is to preserve the highest of moral values.

The American Legion, composed of men who know and detest war for the scourge that it is, is peculiarly well fitted to stand guard over our heritage of American liberty. It must exercise unrelaxed vigilance. It must

insure that neither political expediency nor foreign infatuation influences the expenditure of the vast sums now under contemplation for freedom's defense.

It must exercise its great influence to the end that we rearm, as rearm we must, in an atmosphere of confidence in our inherent strength, not under the hysteria of an artificially created fear; that it is our implacable purpose to retain undisputed control of the seas, to secure undisputed control of the air, to vigorously implement our atomic program with a full commitment to the use as needed of the atomic weapon, and while maintaining a well-balanced and highly developed ground force, to charge to our allies the main responsibility for ground operations in defense of their own spheres of territorial interest; to curb the growing tendency of political and military leaders to publicize for political advantage classified data concerning scientific developments incident to our military effort, and thus to yield the all important element of surprise; to do all, reasonably within our power, to help preserve freedom for those who have the will and determination to do all in their power to defend their own freedom, to avoid being drawn into unreasonable and unnecessary expenditures for armament to create an artificial domestic prosperity for political ends, to avoid contributing the fruits of our system of free enterprise to support socialism or communism abroad under the spurious pretense that it serves our own military security, to avoid allying ourselves with colonial policies in Asia and the middle East, lest we invite the enmity of the traditionally friendly peoples of those vast areas of the world; to give primary concern to our own security and the well-being of our own people; to avoid distributing our wealth for the purpose of buying the loyalty of others, or of sharing with others the wealth and security which we hold in sacred trust for our progeny; to apply all possible pressure, short of war, upon the Soviet or any associated power which by abuse and pressure upon us forces the expenditure of such vast outlays of our energy and resource as a measure of self-preservation, to avoid a protracted and indecisive war in Korea with its endless slaughter—the Chief of Staff of the Army recently testified before a congressional committee that it might last for 10 years, to regain military faith in ourselves and the policies upon which our victories in past have always rested, to do all, reasonably within our power, to assist the Filipino and Japanese people to advance and fortify their liberties, and the Chinese people to regain theirs; and, above all else, to preserve inviolate those great principles and ideals of moral authority upon which is based the American way of life, and the nobility of the cause for which our soldiers fight.

I do not associate myself with those who believe that world war III is imminent or inevitable, nor do I associate myself with those who hysterically talk of American cities being laid waste. I believe that this Nation has such potential strength, both spiritual and material, that no power or combination of powers would dare directly to attack it. We must rebuild the military power, wantonly dissipated despite your warning and the clear portents of the situation in 1946, calmly and wisely and with sole regard to military requirements—not political expediency. We must not again permit our leaders to gamble with the national security to serve political ends. We must rebuild our power, not so much as a measure of defense against any imminently threatened attack, but as a means to regain the faith of those peoples of the world—traditional friends of our country—who now languish in the chains of Communist slavery or whose wills are controlled by Communist threat, treachery, coercion and brutality and to whom only the

relativity of force no longer has practical meaning.

The complexity brought about by dislocations in the wake of two world wars has caught our beloved country in the vortex of a confused, distressed, and frightened world. It has been a time when the lack of a strong and positive and wise leadership—a leadership capable of rising above the level of petty politics with moral courage, self-effacing conviction, and resolute patriotism—has been most sorely felt. I have faith that the wisdom and determination of the American people are not going to permit our country to continue down the road to national jeopardy. They will insist that American policy be reoriented to American tradition, American thinking, and American needs—and will stop our headlong plunge toward socialism and economic disaster. Americans will not be fooled by the bombast of violent propaganda and vulgar language which inevitably meets every honest criticism directed at the Government. They were neither fooled nor their confidence impaired in the gallant marines committed to battle in Korea when that fighting body of men of such illustrious tradition and fame was so grievously and unjustly assailed. They will not be ensnared by a sly Pied Piper technique which says one thing but does another.

The issues now confronting the Nation call for American solutions. They should interpret the national need and be responsive to vision and moral courage. The voice of the people must be heeded. Counsel such as yours must not again be disdained. The implacable guide must be faith in those immutable principles and ideals which give spiritual strength to our Constitution. There must be reflected that degree of humility which recognizes the religious base upon which our Nation was founded, with an indomitable determination to preserve it. The threat to freedom in peace is no less sinister than in war. Our country's future must not go by default. The veteran must not fail the Nation's trust.

Rascality of Political Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a timely article by Mr. George Morgenstern which appears in the current issue of Human Events. I commend this very interesting article to all Members:

ON POLITICAL MORALITY

(By George Morgenstern)

I

"Character," said Thomas Paine in *The Crisis*, "is much easier kept than recovered."

The profound simplicity and truth of this observation will appeal to the more sensitive of the citizenry who watch with trepidation the present tortured struggles of the Republic. On every hand the cry is for elevation of the moral plane of government, for a rediscovery of ethics to meet the moral crisis of our political life, for the creation of a commission of ethics in the Federal Government, or for the enunciation of a congressional ten commandments. Every second Senator has possessed himself of an old suit of armor and is busy shining it up in order to parade his superior pretensions to virtue before his fellows and the public. Even Mr. Truman has come forward in the

role of moral monitor. The accusing finger is invariably pointed at the next fellow.

The most resounding breast-beating comes from the President and members of his party, for the evident reason that the rascals who get turned out are necessarily those that are in. Temptation assails the party in power because it possesses motive, means, and opportunity. These are the conditions prerequisite to successful crime. The motive is political or financial profit, or both. The means consist of command of the easy money and of influence to turn the desired trick. The opportunity resides in a position of dominant political power, which has not been successfully challenged in almost 20 years.

Thus, widespread evidence of crookedness and corruption has accumulated against the administration. It encompasses the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Democratic National Committee, numerous other officials and agencies of Government and the White House itself.

II

Mr. Truman and his party associates, although morally calloused by long apprenticeship in the tutorial school of the late Pendergast and its Chicago, New York, and lesser branches, suffer an understandable anxiety. It cannot be called embarrassment, for that feeling is not possible in a climate of total moral imperviousness, the distinguishing characteristic of the present era of grafters. Even a Fall and a Daugherty were not entirely lacking in a sense of shame, and a Denby though innocent of wrongdoing, could die of a broken heart when scandal touched his office. Today, when somebody is caught, the rejoinder is, "I didn't do nothin' illegal, and, if I did, prove it."

So Mr. Truman, after his national chairman finds himself in hot water, his departments, bureaus, and agencies are caught in cahoots with crooks, and his family fortunes and the fortunes of his hand-picked candidate in the crooked Jackson County Democratic primary of 1946 are improved by the judicious locating of a military air base, thinks that it would be salutary if politicians disclosed their incomes each year.

"Attempts," he says, "have been made through implication and innuendo, and by exaggeration and distortion of the facts in a few cases, to create the impression that graft and corruption are running rampant through the whole Government. . . . I am told that people all around the country are getting a mistaken and distorted impression that the Government is full of evildoers, full of men and women with low standards of morality, full of people who are lining their own pockets and disregarding the public interest. This is a terrible distortion of the real facts about our Government."

Compare that with the statement of President Coolidge on Teapot Dome, January 26, 1925: "If there has been any crime it must be prosecuted. If there has been any property of the United States illegally transferred or leased it must be recovered. . . . Counsel will be instructed to prosecute these cases in the courts so that if there is any guilt it will be punished, if there is any civil liability it will be enforced; if there is any fraud, it will be revealed; and if there are any contracts that are illegal, they will be canceled. Every law will be enforced, and every right of the people and the Government protected."

Mr. Truman obviously feels that justice, honesty, and decency are beside the point. He feels that attack is the best defense. White House aides, furnishing copies of the message to reporters before it was read at the Capitol, obviously were delighted, we are informed, with the President's political strategy.

III

On the same day that Mr. Truman demonstrated this subtle sense of strategy, Sena-

for WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, former partner of the inefable Chester Bowles in the allied huckstering arts of advertising and ballyhoo, presented himself before a stacked subcommittee to call for the expulsion of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin. Mr. BENTON had qualified himself as an expositor of moral standards in Government in the receptive columns of the New York Times Magazine, issue of August 12, wherein he registered well-simulated indignation over Senator McCARTHY's efforts to obtain something approximating an investigation of charges that various people in and about the State Department were not unsympathetic to the Communist cause.

Mr. McCARTHY, who used to fire a machine gun out of the tail end of a Marine Corps plane, has a positive gift for upsetting the sensibilities of Communists, members of the Truman persuasion, and refined intellectuals not above sharing martinis and scones with the first two classes. Besides, he had had a part in giving dear old Millard Tydings the dear old heave ho in Maryland. The very mention of McCarthyism will cause a legion of editorial writers in a hundred scattered Fair Deal riosques to start beating out standardized denunciations.

To give Mr. McCARTHY his due, he is somewhat rough in his approach, but he fought his country's enemies in one war and he is fighting those he conceives to be its enemies now, and it is not a job to be undertaken wearing a velvet suit and a Buster Brown collar. The Senator has the belief that Communists are rather more dangerous even than crooks in government, and that neither would be tolerated unless fared by a moral corrosion in high places.

Mr. BENTON, pursuing the Truman line that aggressive action may at least result in a blocked kick, offered a brief against Mr. McCARTHY founded on the premise that although there may be nothing necessarily wrong about Communists, or those who protect Communists, or those who, consciously or unconsciously, play the Communists' game, there is everything wrong about Senators who are so indelicate as to discuss these matters. Mr. BENTON is most righteous in his posture, but the public is not informed what Sunday-school medals he is entitled to wear. All that appears in the record is that, in his advertising days, he fostered a large number of radio operas occasioning a vast corruption of the public taste, and that as a promoter of piped-in music and encyclopedia sets he added to a very large fortune, most of it accumulated before he began imposing the present tax rates on his fellow citizens.

The activities of Mr. Truman and Mr. BENTON demonstrates a very real concern over the issue of morals now before the country. They have adopted the standard legal maxim, "If you have no case, abuse the prosecuting attorney." By this device, the defendant seeks to convey the illusion that he is the plaintiff.

It may work, but only if the people forget the maxims laid down by that great master of the moral law, Mr. Roosevelt. On February 24, 1932, long before his \$200,000 telephone conversation with the late John Hartford, Mr. Roosevelt delivered himself of various dicta in reference to the removal of Thomas A. Farley as sheriff of New York County.

"Passive acquiescence by unthinking people in the actions of those who shrewdly turn to personal advantage the opportunities offered by public office," said he, "is out of step with modern ideals of government and with political morality. Such personal gain is not to be excused because it is accompanied by the respondent's popularity of person and great public generosity. Public office should inspire private financial integrity. . . . The State must expect compliance with these standards because if

popular government is to continue to exist it must in such matters hold its stewards to a stern and uncompromising rectitude. It must be a just but a jealous master. Public office means serving the public and nobody else."

IV

Mr. Roosevelt could hardly have expressed the indicated sentiments better, and it is a pity that he and his clan did not keep them sufficiently in mind to restrain themselves from commercializing the White House as never before. One phrase in particular stands out: the thought that the venal conduct of officeholders is in no wise extenuated by displays of public generosity.

When one contemplates the record of a political succession now extending through its fifth term in office, the thought inescapably occurs that no voting segment useful to the formation of a majority amalgam has been neglected in the distribution of favors. The administration has paid the people a commission for the privilege of robbing them, and to date both sides seem satisfied. This is the really terrible consequence of the decay of political morals. The victim has been corrupted by the victimizer.

As Paine remarked, virtue is more easily kept than recovered. If it has been lost, it is because the people have forgotten that the politician is their natural enemy. Of all evils, according to Cicero, ambition and the disputes to public posts are the most deplorable. The man who seeks position, power, and privilege will promise anything and stop at nothing to attain his desire. Once installed, he will defend his advantage with every blandishment and bribe which the people themselves have placed within his reach.

GOP Must Fashion Program in Interest of All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Morning Herald of Hagerstown, Md., on October 16, 1951:

GOP MUST FASHION PROGRAM IN INTEREST OF ALL AMERICANS

Any American who wants his democracy to flourish must wish for the continued health of at least two major political parties. For if he has only one, that great lever of the democratic system—the right to choose among alternatives—is missing.

Consequently, whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, you ought to be troubled about what might happen to the Republican Party should it go much longer without winning the White House in a national election. Power is life-giving sustenance to a political organization; and the GOP has not held supreme power since 1932.

Thomas Jefferson was a stout believer in the idea of rotation in office. After him the notion developed strongly that it was wise to change the leaders of government from time to time. The fear was that men who held power too long grew lax and irresponsible and corrupt. Occasionally, the unfolding of American history provided evidence in striking support of this philosophy.

It is furnishing that kind of evidence right now. A Democratic administration nearly

20 years in control of the White House is pockmarked with corruption. The RFC, the Internal Revenue Bureau, the Federal Power Commission, these may be but samples of the full story. The concept of honor in the public service is sadly frayed and torn.

Unquestionably a feeling of revulsion against scandal and confusion grips many Americans. Probably a good share of them would like a change. This would seem to be the moment, above all, for the Jeffersonian doctrine of rotation to come into play, for the good of Republicans and Democrats alike.

Yet the Republican Party can have no guaranty that it will ride back to power on this wave of revulsion. It may, but again it may not. The rules of modern political life are not so simple as "throw the rascals out." In the early 1920's, the GOP itself was rocked by the Teapot Dome scandal, an affair easily dwarfing in magnitude the messy doings of today's Democratic regime. But the Republicans were resoundingly reelected in 1924.

The point is that elections are decided by a variety of factors. To rely wholly on your adversary's shortcomings is risky, they may not finally be dominant in the voters' minds.

In short, the Republicans, as has been said many a time, cannot count on winning with a purely negative approach. They must have a program—a program for all elements of the American population. It need not be a plan for appeasing everybody with Government hand-outs. But it must be one which will appeal to Americans in every walk of life as genuinely in their interest.

Public opinion polls offer the GOP no encouragement that it has yet devised such a program. Too many people still regard the Republican Party as the advocate of the rich and the privileged. It has a hard fight to overcome this popular notion, and it can only do it with solidly fashioned weapons.

Time is running fast. American voters hitherto have shown themselves impatient of popular programs whipped up for election years only. As a service to their own cause and to the Nation, the Republicans should lose no moment in preparing their party for the kind of positive, purposeful, and normal Government the people yearn for.

A Timely Statement on Current World Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following statement from one of my constituents, Mr. Eugene P. O'Grady, wherein he has given serious thought to and ably analyzed current world conditions, and I consider his observations well worth perusal:

Amid the turmoil and confusion of a world madly preparing for another world holocaust of even greater proportions than either the First or Second World Wars, or the results of both combined, there is ever that unanswered question piercing the heavens, the hearts, and the minds of men, "have all the peoples of the world gone mad?"

Today all mankind is divided into two armed camps, bent upon annihilation. Factories are working overtime in all countries beating plowshares into weapons of destruction; the best minds and genius of man are working around the clock, planning and

designing new weapons of war far more destructive and devastating than any we have invented or used in the past; slaving, as it were, against the time when the zero hour will come upon the human race and the inevitable disintegration of civilization will have arrived.

While this maddening race is on, the common people of the world shudder with the fear of what the consequences shall be, the suffering and death, and they try in wonderment to answer that question racking their hearts and minds—why? Yes, why this suicidal race by a supposedly enlightened and civilized world? And, the answer that comes thundering back, "The wages of sin is death." The world refuses to obey God's eternal law.

Within the hearts of all mankind is embedded a belief that man is subject to a spiritual or divine power, that is truth and right, that controls and operates this universe and everything within it. Consequently, it follows that there must be a right side to all these vexed questions that have brought the human family to such a state of mind that hope seems crushed for a peaceable solution. That which is opposed to the right side must logically be the wrong side so that we might arrive at a right or wrong answer to our question depending upon whatever promise we use in seeking a solution. It would further follow that a division of mankind would place it within two categories, the right and the wrong, and an analysis of the philosophies emanating from these two categories should prove interesting.

First. There are the governments and people who refuse to acknowledge a supreme or spiritual relationship. It is their philosophy that they are supreme within themselves, that the code of laws is established upon the principle that might makes right, that citizens are slaves of the state, that man is not immortal, that recognition of divine or spiritual leadership is superstition, that man is a machine to be used as dictators order; that rights of the individual are subject only to material power, that love of neighbor is foolish and that your neighbor's property belongs to him only as long as he is able to hold it by superior force. Such is a brief sketch of an atheistic government and her people, such is the philosophy of Russia and her satellite states.

Second. There are the governments and people that recognize a divine relationship between God and man. It is their philosophy that man is a creature of a spiritual power that rules the universe, that all men are children of God; they believe that the code of laws given by God to Moses should be the basis for all world governments and peoples, they believe that love of neighbor is next to the love of God, and that in all relationships in this world, man, being a child of God, in his faith in a supreme being, is in direct contrast to the atheistic tenets of Russia and her satellite states. It is further believed by these governments and people that every man has a soul that will not die and which God has, in His goodness, given to man that he might become a part of His eternal kingdom—which is again in contrast to the philosophy of the atheistic governments that man is a machine without a soul, without a relationship between himself and God, and that existence ceases for him with death as it does in the animal kingdom. Such is the philosophy of the governments and peoples who align themselves against Russia and her satellite states.

Without delving into the various proofs of a divine power and basing our discourse upon the dictates of man's conscience, we would, after analyzing the foregoing philosophies, have to place the philosophy of those believing in a divine power on the right side and those believing in the philosophy of the atheistic governments on the wrong side.

I would venture to state at this point that 95 percent of the people of the world would feel insulted if you were to place them among those on the wrong side as we see it in our relationship to a divine or spiritual power.

Now taking the above analysis as being correct and recognizing that the vast majority of the world's inhabitants believe in the supremacy of a divine power, why should we fear a world catastrophe or a third world war? If God created this universe, and everything within it, if He gave a code of laws to follow in operating our Governments and our peoples, if He holds the power to win or to lose in the palm of His hand, then why should we be afraid of the outcome were we to become engaged in a world conflict?

Perhaps we fail to obey God's laws. Perhaps we who claim to be on the right side are hypocritical in our expressions of belief and weak in our faith in that divine power which may bring to us much suffering and death as a just punishment for our unfaithfulness in obedience to His laws. Since we are not Simon pure, we should expect to pay in atonement for our disobedience and lack of faith.

But in our acknowledgement of God's supremacy, even if our effort is mediocre, we still can rely upon our all-powerful Creator to help us crush the enemy whose sole purpose is to blot out the light of Heaven from our world.

However, we cannot expect, though we be on the right side, that God is going to perform a miracle in our behalf. We, the governments and peoples on the right side, must make a sacrifice, for nothing worth while is ever obtained without sacrifice. We must be materially prepared to meet the foe. We must have an ample supply of material forces to meet the enemy and engage him in his own method of warfare. And, when I say, "we," I mean all governments and peoples who have aligned themselves against Russia and her satellite states. To materially prepare our side will demand great expenditures in money and supplies from our own Nation. But to guarantee our way of life, the sacrifice must be made. Generations yet unborn need our sacrifices now to protect them against the slavery to which they would become heirs if we are negligent in our defense of freedom. Our dollars and our blood are not too much, if necessary, to pay for victory against such a damnable enemy.

Above and beyond the material forces we must have today in order to banish fear, crush our enemies in short order, and bring all our people to a firm belief in a Divine Power, we need dynamic leadership. Leadership with faith, with courage, with trust in God, and with the will to make an honest effort to apply God's laws to man. That then is the right side, the winning side.

Constantine did not fear the onrushing hordes of the barbarian foe when he beheld that symbol of man's redemption, the Cross, in the morning sunlight. And with that immortal slogan, "In this sign, you shall conquer," he led his armies into battle and won a glorious victory. In the eleventh century, the High King of Ireland, raising a crucifix before his troops, bade them drive the invading Norsemen out of Ireland. Before sundown that day, he had won a great victory, with the enemy crushed and fleeing from his native land.

Nor should we forget the immortal Joan of Arc leading the people of France to victory, proving, if proof is necessary, that on the right side is God, the Author, the Creator, the Divine Power that rules the universe, and that in every age, those who put their trust in Him were never disappointed. Christ said, "Fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul" (Matthew 10: 28).

The philosophy of Russia and her satellite states would deprive man of a soul, would place man on a plane with the dogs in our streets. Yet, we enlightened citizens of the world who recognize and believe in an omnipotent God, who consider ourselves His children, have so little faith that we have to deal and even surrender ourselves to some of the policies enunciated by those atheistic governments. We should bow our heads in shame.

Why not now, even at this late hour, have the courage to proclaim by formal pronouncement our policies and principles on the side of right, on the side of God, on the side of justice, on the side of equality for all men, on the side of law as given to man by our Creator—then, go forth with such a proposition supported wholeheartedly by the United Nations who stand on the right side to a weary world. The enemy will crumble, as enemies of God and man always crumble when faced by a force on whose banner is emblazoned in golden letters, "Love of God and love of neighbor," and peace—yes, a real and lasting peace—will be ours because it will be a peace patterned upon God's eternal law.

Integration of Migrant Farm-Worker Families Into Community Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the August 1951 issue of the Labor Information Bulletin published by the United States Department of Labor. It describes the success of the city of Hollandale, Minn., in integrating migrant farm-worker families into the community life.

I believe this article will be of interest to my colleagues, and I believe it is a real tribute to the men and women of Hollandale.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

MIGRANT WORKERS FIND BETTER WORLD IN MINNESOTA TOWN—HOLLANDALE CITIZENS JOIN TO AID CHILDREN AND PARENTS

Things are looking up this year for the 800 migrant farm-worker families who annually help gather the crops around Hollandale, Minn.

All groups in the community of 355 persons—school officials, church leaders, growers, farm worker recruiters, and other citizens—have joined together to see that school-age children of the migrant workers are not employed during school hours, as required under regulations of the Federal wage-and-hour law, and that they actually attend school.

In May of this year, the State department of health sent a mobile X-ray unit to Hollandale and examined both migrant and local children and adults.

NEW STATE BILL

Under a bill introduced in the Minnesota State Legislature by State Senator Earl L. Engbritson, who resides in Hollandale, the State board of health is authorized to regulate the construction and maintenance of equipment insofar as they concern sanitary

conditions in the migrant-labor camps. The bill was approved in April of this year by the Governor.

Hollandale is surrounded by an extensive area of intensive farming. Potatoes, cabbage, onions, and asparagus are the major crops. Sugar beets and spinach are also grown. During the agricultural season, which extends from June to early November, the 800 migrant families more than double Hollandale's population. Most of them come from Texas and are of Mexican origin.

Few of the children in these families attended school. They worked in the fields instead. Housing was poor and sanitary facilities in many cases nonexistent.

During the 1950 season investigators of the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division, with the help of Minnesota State labor-law inspectors, launched an educational program to get the cooperation of school officials, church groups, growers, and those who recruited labor for the growers in providing school facilities for the migrant children—and seeing that they attended school. The Fair Labor Standards (Wage-Hour) Act provides that no one under 16 years of age may be employed at agricultural jobs during school hours by a producer who ships directly or indirectly in interstate commerce.

GROWING INTEREST

At first the community was resistant to the idea of taking migrant children into school, but increasing insight into the many problems that beset the migrants has resulted in a growing interest in these families and a local action program to help work out answers to their problems. School officials made plans for them. One minister urged more than 100 growers in his congregation to tell the migratory workers that their children should be in school. In another church attended by many of the migrants, the priest gave his congregation the same information.

REMAINED THROUGH WINTER

During last winter several families from Texas, whose earnings had been very low because of poor crops, stayed on in Hollandale. The 25 children in these families continued to attend school. The small amounts charged for school lunches were provided by donations from churches, the parent-teacher association, and other groups. The families were supported by public funds.

Then, this spring, one local grower, who recruits in Texas for himself as well as for other growers, prepared contracts in Spanish for the workers to sign. These contracts included a clause informing the workers of the Minnesota school-attendance law. Another clause explained the Federal minimum-age provision.

Copies of these contracts were left with the Texas State Employment Service offices. Families migrating to Hollandale were told to bring birth certificates and school records of their school-age children.

Early in May, representatives of the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division and the Bureau of Labor Standards, as well as representatives of the Minnesota State Industrial Commission, visited Hollandale. They found 65 migrant-family children in the Hollandale elementary and high school that day, though the influx of workers from Texas had just begun. They expected an enrollment of not less than 120 before the end of the school year. The principal of another school was preparing to take in children from other districts where space was lacking.

The investigators were agreed that things were looking up, particularly for the migrant children, and they believe that what Hollandale is doing, and what its citizens plan to do, can be adapted to thousands of like communities throughout the Nation.

The William B. Bankhead National Forest Is a Great National Asset From Which the People of the United States Are Receiving Big Returns; the People of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama Enjoy Many Local Benefits From This Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, a Presidential proclamation on January 15, 1913, created what is today the William B. Bankhead National Forest, located in parts of Franklin, Winston, and Lawrence Counties in Alabama.

When he issued the proclamation, President Woodrow Wilson named the area of 198,426 acres of land the Alabama National Forest.

Eighteen years later on June 19, 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed another proclamation increasing the boundaries of the forest to include 560,604 acres, and changing the name from Alabama National Forest to the Black Warrior National Forest.

In June 1942, legislation enacted by Congress changed the name of the forest once again. This time it was designated as the William B. Bankhead National Forest, named in honor of William B. Bankhead, who had for many years before his death on September 15, 1940, represented the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama which I now have the honor to represent in Congress. Approximately one-half of the forest is located in this district.

Mountainous in its topography, the William B. Bankhead Forest is typical of the Southern Appalachian Highlands. It is composed of mixed pine and hardwood, to which efficient methods of fire protection and planned management measures are being applied.

Within the boundaries of the forest the Government actually owns 178,184 acres of the total 560,604. Located in the Seventh Congressional District are 88,921 acres of the Government-owned property, or 139 square miles.

NATIVE WILDLIFE DEVELOPMENT IN THE FOREST

With its abundant streams and plentiful food supply, the forest is an ideal breeding ground for native wildlife. This fact was recognized early in the history of the forest, bringing about establishment of the 16,000-acre Sipsey River Game Refuge. A deer herd of 100 was released, and since then the deer have multiplied rapidly.

In 1938 this game refuge was expanded to 98,800 acres by a cooperative arrangement between the United States Forest Service and the State Conservation Department of Alabama. A full-time game warden protects the increasing wildlife population. The area has been posted and improvements constructed to aid in the proper management of the refuge.

HUNTING, FISHING, AND PUBLIC RECREATION IN THE FOREST

Recognition is given the fact that if the number of wild animals grows so large as to cause a food shortage, unhealthy animals will be the result. Thus hunting is permitted in order to provide control over the size of the wildlife population.

Annual hunts are held under the control and direction of the United States Forest Service and the Department of Conservation of Alabama. Hunters are governed by State laws, and by hunt rules designed for the protection of the hunter and the game.

In 1938 a dam was constructed across Owl Creek in the forest, thereby creating an artificial lake of approximately 40 acres. Known as Brushy Lake, it is located about 4 miles northeast of Moreland near the center of the forest. It was built as a part of the program of the Civilian Conservation Corps which was functioning then.

Brushy Lake has been stocked with game fish, and year round fishing is permitted, subject to State laws, upon payment of a nominal fee to defray the cost of management of the lake. A swimming area is also provided. Many people visit the lake during the summer months to enjoy the opportunities for fishing, swimming, and picnicking.

SIPSEY RIVER RECREATIONAL AREA

Another outstanding feature of the forest is the Sipsey River recreational area located on the Sipsey River at a point where it is crossed by the Cranial Road. Picnic tables, shelters, and outdoor fireplaces have been provided for the convenience of those who enjoy picnicking under beautiful primitive forest conditions. Several thousand persons visit this area each year.

ROADS AND TRAILS IN THE FOREST

A well-planned road and trail system prevails throughout the forest. It is maintained to permit year round travel in connection with management of the forest. Ten percent of the gross income from the forest is spent for road work within the forest area.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FOREST

The forest area is under direct supervision of a district forest ranger with headquarters at Haleyville, Ala. Excellent fire look-out towers have been erected. Telephone lines stretch over 100 miles to provide prompt communication with fire-fighting crews. These crews are equipped with tools and food supplies to enable them to stay on the job until a fire is put out. During dry seasons, lookouts watch night and day for the start of a fire in order that immediate dispatch of a fire-fighting crew may be made.

Many buildings have been constructed in connection with development of the forest. Some of the more important buildings are located at the administrative site at Central Tower on the Cheatham Highway, south of Moulton, Ala.; the Turkey Foot game warden dwelling on the Sipsey River; and dwellings and other buildings at Basham, Black Pond, Moreland, Kinlock Towers, and at Grayson.

All of Alabama's national forests, the William B. Bankhead, the Talladega, and the Conecuh, are supervised by Mr. C. F. Burnham, with offices in Montgomery, Ala. All of these forests are located in region 8 of the operations of the United States Forest Service. Mr. Charles A. Connaughton, with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga., is regional forester for region 8. The United States Forest Service has jurisdiction over all national forests. It is a part of the United States Department of Agriculture, and is headed by the Honorable Lyle F. Watts, as Chief, with offices in Washington, D. C.

INVESTMENT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD NATIONAL FOREST

Everybody in the United States has an investment in the William B. Bankhead National Forest.

Since establishment of the forest 34 years ago, a total of \$2,089,120.86 of Federal Government funds has been spent in maintaining the area. The money has gone toward forest improvements, such as purchase of land and timber, tree planting, road construction, recreational facilities, communications, guard dwellings and other buildings, fire towers, warehouses, and shops.

It is interesting to note that the average price paid by the Government for land it has bought for the forest was \$4.66 per acre.

Equally as interesting is the fact that over half the total investment has been spent on roads in order to make the forest accessible for purposes of administration, for logging and sale of lumber, and for the use of people who desire to use the area for recreational purposes.

Statistics show that 10 percent of the gross returns from timber sales is expended on road work within the forest. Since 1937, the year in which timber sales started, the Government has, under this provision, expended \$95,845.77 on the forest roads.

RETURNS ON THE INVESTMENT

The people have received something in return for their investment in the William B. Bankhead National Forest.

The Government has sold, through the United States Department of Agriculture, \$905,926.93 worth of timber. In addition, it has collected, as a part of the purchase price of timber sold, \$128,019.73 for what is called "betterment" of the area from which the timber is cut.

"Betterment" funds are used by the Government to pay the cost of planting new trees and removing undesirable trees or other growth on the land where trees are cut for sale. To do this work the United States Forest Service hires local labor, thus contributing to the support of the people who live in the forest area.

However, if we disregard entirely the income of \$128,019.73 paid by timber purchasers for betterment of the land from which they cut their timber, the stumpage value of the timber sold—\$905,926.93—equals a total return to date of 43 percent. Average returns on the money

invested for the past 3 years have been 9 percent annually. I do not know of many better investments.

RETURNS TO STATE

The State of Alabama also shares in the returns from the forest. The law provides that 25 percent of the proceeds of timber sales be paid to the State. Since tree cutting began in the forest, the Federal Government has paid the State of Alabama a total of \$239,614.43 under this provision.

Based upon location of the timber, \$2,202.13 of this return has come from timber sold from that portion of the forest lying in Franklin County, \$120,095.46 from sales from the part in Lawrence County, and \$117,316.94 coming from timber sold in Winston County's share of the forest.

LOCAL EMPLOYMENT

The William B. Bankhead National Forest provides an excellent source of local employment.

The United States Forest Service has 19 full-time employees and 31 part-time employees, the latter averaging 10 months employment annually.

The Clancy Lumber Co., a large sawmill at Grayson, Ala., in the center of the forest, is engaged in cutting national forest timber on a large part of the area. This operation is planned on a long-range basis, designed to harvest the mature timber and place the forest in the best condition for continued growth.

Clancy Lumber Co. operations account for approximately 230 employees. One hundred and ten of these work in and about the operation at Grayson, and 120 are employed by the company's timber contractors or woodsmen.

Numerous other smaller sales to private operators are made from time to time, and it is estimated that at the present, these lumber production firms afford employment to approximately 85 additional persons.

The game management area furnishes employment for 3 State game wardens full-time and 3 part-time. In addition, some 18 farmers have agreements with the United States Forest Service which allow them to put small portions of the forest to agricultural use.

Therefore, we are justified in saying that, at the present time, the William B. Bankhead National Forest accounts for the employment of approximately 350 people, and in all its operations has the effect of being, within itself, one of the largest industries in the entire area.

REMAINING VALUE OF THIS NATIONAL ASSET

Significant conclusions can be drawn from a study of the Bankhead National Forest.

Approximately \$2,000,000 has been invested in the forest, with almost \$1,000,000 of this already returned. One-quarter of a million dollars has been paid to the State of Alabama.

Operation of the forest furnishes employment to 350 people of the vicinity.

However, this is not the full story, because the land itself, since its purchase

by the United States Forest Service, has increased in value from year to year like everything else. My estimate is that this land, excluding merchantable timber, is worth more than the entire amount which the Government has invested in it.

But, regardless of the value of the land itself, the forest now has approximately seven and one-half million dollars worth of saw timber and pulpwood.

To state the matter in another way, all the people of the United States own, as a national asset, the William B. Bankhead National Forest which cost \$2,000,000. Nearly \$1,000,000 has been returned. The asset is worth, not counting the value of the 178,184 acres of land about \$7,500,000.

Of the 178,184 acres owned by the Government in the three counties, about one-half lies within the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. Besides this, the Seventh District embodies 701 square miles of proclaimed forest area. I think it might reasonably be expected that the future growth of Government land ownership in this proclaimed forest area will occur largely within the Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letters and documents, which chiefly comprise the sources for my remarks about the William B. Bankhead National Forest.

First. My letter of May 30, 1951, to Mr. C. M. Granger, Assistant Chief, National Forest Division, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, dated May 30, 1951;

Second. Reply to foregoing letter, by Hon. Lyle F. Watts, Chief, United States Forest Service, dated June 4, 1951.

Third. Letter from Mr. Charles A. Connaughton, Regional Forester, Southern Region, dated July 6, 1951, to which is attached a report on the William B. Bankhead National Forest, and a tract styled "The Alabama National Forests," and another styled "William B. Bankhead National Forest."

Fourth. My letter of July 17, 1951, propounding additional inquiries to Mr. Charles A. Connaughton, Regional Forester.

Fifth. His answer to the foregoing letter, dated August 20, 1951.

MAY 30, 1951.

MR. C. M. GRANGER,
Assistant Chief, National Forest Division,
Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

DEAR MR. GRANGER: I am engaged in an intensive study of the William B. Bankhead National Forest in northern Alabama, and would appreciate your sending me information to answer the following questions, at your convenience:

1. How many square miles, how many acres of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama are in the William B. Bankhead National Forest?

2. Are lands presently being acquired in the Seventh District for addition to the William B. Bankhead National Forest, and if so, at what yearly rate and under what laws?

3. What is the value of all merchantable timber in the Seventh District portion of the William B. Bankhead National Forest?

4. How much value is added each year by natural growth?

5. What is the total investment the United States has in the William B. Bankhead National Forest? Please include the investment in everything, including land, timber, telephones, fire towers, roads, and recreational facilities.

6. What is the value of the timber sold from the forest since its establishment? Please list sales for each fiscal or calendar year.

7. Please send me a general history of this forest if one is available.

Thanking you for supplying this information, and with kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

CARL ELLIOTT.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, June 4, 1951.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Reference is made to your letter of May 30.

Much of the detailed information which you desire is not readily available here and therefore it is necessary to ask the Regional Forester at Atlanta to assemble the data. Some searching of the records will be necessary in order to complete the report, but I am sure the work will be done as expeditiously as possible.

In order to avoid any unnecessary delay we are asking the Regional Forester to send the information directly to you, with a copy to this office.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS, Chief.
By C. M. GRANGER.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE, SOUTHERN REGION,
Atlanta, Ga., July 6, 1951.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Reference is made to your request for information regarding the Bankhead National Forest.

C. F. Burnham, forest supervisor at Montgomery, Ala., assembled the information which is attached. I have reviewed the supervisor's report and feel that it will give you the information you desire. I would like to call your attention to the value figures for the standing timber and value of the annual growth. As pointed out in the report, these were derived by applying unit rates received for stumpage in relatively small, short-term sales during fiscal year 1951. Not knowing the use you plan to make of these figures, I have no suggestion for revising them, but 1951 stumpage rates are probably too high for use as a base in determining investment values.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please feel free to call on us.

Very sincerely yours,

CHAS. A. CONNAUGHTON,
Regional Forester.

REPORT ON WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD NATIONAL FOREST

1. The tabulation below shows the acreage for both the William B. Bankhead National Forest and the Seventh Congressional District portion of the forest. The gross acreage represents the total area within the forest boundary as set by Presidential proclamation and the net acreage is that owned by the Federal Government.

	Seventh Congressional District		William B. Bankhead National Forest	
	Gross	Net	Gross	Net
Acres.....	448,841	88,921	500,004	178,184
Square miles.....	701	139	876	278

2 Because of presently high land values and decreased appropriations, there has been no acquisition on the William B. Bankhead by purchase since fiscal year 1941. Acquisition of desirable tracts by exchange of national forest land or timber for privately owned lands under the General Exchange Act of March 20, 1922 and the Weeks Law Exchange Act of March 3, 1925, is contemplated for the present.

From July 5, 1913, when public lands in this area were withdrawn from entry (the Alabama National Forest, now the William B. Bankhead National Forest was proclaimed as a national forest on January 15, 1918), through fiscal year 1939, lands were acquired in the William B. Bankhead Forest from the following sources:

Source	Seventh Congressional District	William B. Bankhead National Forest
	Acres	Acres
Public domain.....	8,876	21,872
Purchase, Weeks law (act of Mar. 1, 1911) (36 Stat. 981), as amended.....	79,761	151,891
Donation.....		40
Total.....	88,637	178,703

Acquisition and source by fiscal years, 1940 to date

	Seventh Congressional District	William B. Bankhead National Forest
1940: Weeks law purchase.....	109	1,166
1941: Weeks law purchase.....	80	80
1942: Dropped.....	132	48
1943-50, inclusive: No acquisition.....		
1951: Exchange.....	127	127
Total to date.....	88,921	178,184

¹ Dropped because of insufficient title.
² 159 acres acquired in exchange for 32 acres national forest land or a net increase of 127 acres

3. The volume and value of the timber on the Seventh Congressional District portion of

the forest and the William J. Bankhead National Forest, as a whole, is as follows:

	Seventh Congressional District		William B. Bankhead National Forest	
	Volume	Value ¹	Volume	Value ¹
Saw timber.....	247,667	\$3,292,565.67	543,522	\$7,156,163.10
Pulpwood.....	97,800	146,700.00	200,000	300,000.00

¹ Value of timber is based on the average rate per unit paid by purchasers for timber cut during fiscal year 1951.
² M board feet.
³ Cords.

4. Each year approximately 108 board feet per acre is added to the growing stock through new growth, which at the current average value per million board feet would equal \$255,368 on the forest as a whole and \$127,432 on the Seventh Congressional District portion of the forest. In addition, it is estimated that stands containing timber of pulpwood size are producing a total additional volume of 5,000 cords annually having a value of \$7,500 for the forest as a whole, half of which is in the Seventh Congressional District.

5. The present total investment that the United States Government has in the William B. Bankhead National Forest is itemized as follows:

Land and timber.....	\$728,209.78
Tree planting.....	38,210.00

¹ No investment value is assigned to acquisitions from public domain to donations. The investment in land and timber was determined by applying the average purchase price of \$4.68 per acre to the 156,185 acres purchased.

Roads.....	\$1,126,750.49
Recreational facilities.....	127,201.55
Guard dwellings and buildings.....	30,285.25
Communications.....	23,428.57
Fire towers.....	10,911.87
Warehouses and shops.....	4,117.35

Total investment..... 2,089,120.86

6. The volume and value of the timber actually cut from timber sales is given below. The cut prior to fiscal year 1937 was negligible. Records permitting a breakdown by counties has been maintained only since 1947, therefore volumes and values for the Seventh Congressional District are shown only for fiscal years 1947 to date. Values for stumpage are the gross returns to the United States Treasury. Values shown under sale area betterment represent additional funds collected under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act of June 9, 1930 (46 Stat. 527).

Fiscal year	Seventh Congressional District			William B. Bankhead National Forest		
	Volume, M board feet	Value, stumpage	Value, sale area betterment	Volume, M board feet	Value, stumpage	Value, sale area betterment
1937.....	72	\$430.98				
1938.....	262	1,540.27				
1939.....	798	7,381.01				
1940.....	1,548	4,041.78				
1941.....	2,078	12,263.19				\$224.80
1942.....	910	4,851.83				42.50
1943.....	2,057	20,080.62				545.48
1944.....	7,319	59,235.41				1,405.00
1945.....	4,332	31,062.68				1,808.93
1946.....	4,896	33,250.22				2,381.70
1947.....	6,251	\$34,443.30	\$1,628.42	11,532	63,518.36	3,063.92
1948.....	14,255	86,708.88	12,611.47	17,183	104,030.40	15,090.43
1949.....	12,668	86,380.14	17,764.31	16,822	139,650.92	25,501.38
1950.....	12,096	154,271.36	25,208.27	20,100	245,929.15	40,185.26
1951.....	9,543	107,855.02	22,818.24	17,191	188,361.02	39,850.05
Total.....	56,623	481,748.70	79,980.71	108,220	905,925.93	128,019.73

7. A copy of the historical information sheet on the Alabama National Forests, a part of which describes the William B Bankhead Forest, is attached. Recreation map of the national forests in Alabama is also attached.

THE ALABAMA NATIONAL FORESTS

Forests comprise more than one-half of the total land area of the State of Alabama. These forest areas have played an important role in the development of the State and the Nation. During World War II, when enormous quantities of lumber and other forest products were needed, the Nation turned to the South with its vast timber lands for these materials. The demand for wood products has continued since the war years.

The part which the State of Alabama has played in furnishing these forest products is outstanding. Reliable estimates indicate that more than 9,000,000,000 board feet of lumber were cut in the State during the 5-year period 1944 to 1948, inclusive. This production of lumber is even more remarkable when we realize that essentially all of this material was cut from second growth timber stands. The original forest had long since been cut and used. We were harvesting a second and sometimes a third crop of trees from our forest land. The wartime demand for forest products imposed a drain on the timber resources of Alabama which was considerably in excess of the material being replaced by annual growth. The need for housing and industrial building in the postwar period is making additional demands on our forests. The need for wise planning to restore and improve the forests of Alabama must be apparent to everyone concerned with the continued development and prosperity of our State.

The United States Forest Service is under the direction of its Chief, Lyle F. Watts, Washington, D. C., and the Service as a whole is divided into 10 regions. The southern region in which we are located includes 11 Southern States and is known as region 8. Charles A. Connaughton, with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga., is the regional forester.

The United States Forest Service is dedicated to the task of developing and demonstrating the best methods of managing forest lands. There are three national forests in Alabama with a total Government-owned area of well over a half million acres of land. On these national forests owners and managers of timberland can find answers to many of the problems which are confronting them in growing a crop of trees. Also available on the national forests are facilities for hunting, fishing, swimming, hiking, and other types of outdoor recreation. These facilities have been developed for public use and offer a splendid opportunity for healthful outdoor recreation.

The three national forests in Alabama are the William B Bankhead National Forest in the northern part of the State, the Talladega National Forest in central Alabama, and the Conecuh National Forest in the southern or flatwoods section. All of these areas are administered from a forest supervisor's office located at Montgomery, Ala. A district forest ranger is in charge of each unit or ranger district. The William B. Bankhead and the Conecuh National Forests are each a unit or ranger district in themselves. The Talladega National Forest, due to its large size, is divided into three ranger districts. There follows a brief description and history of the Bankhead National Forest area in Alabama.

WILLIAM B BANKHEAD NATIONAL FOREST— WILLIAM B BANKHEAD RANGER DISTRICT

The William B Bankhead National Forest first came into being as the result of a

Presidential proclamation on January 15, 1918. It was called the Alabama National Forest and existed in Franklin, Lawrence, and Winston Counties. There were 198,426 gross acres within the proclaimed boundary and the area was administered as a part of the Cherokee National Forest with headquarters at Athens, Tenn. On June 19, 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed a proclamation increasing the gross area to 560,604 acres and changing the name to the Black Warrior National Forest. In June 1942, legislation was enacted by the Congress of the United States changing the name from Black Warrior to William B. Bankhead in honor of one of Alabama's distinguished native sons. As it now stands, the William B Bankhead National Forest has a proclaimed gross area of 560,604 acres, 177,976 acres of which are Government-owned or controlled lands.

The area is under the direct supervision of a district forest ranger with headquarters at Haleyville, Ala. The area is of mountainous topography typical of the southern Appalachian highlands. The forest is composed of mixed pine and hardwood species and is responding in a very satisfactory manner to the fire protection and planned management measures which have been applied.

During the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, over 17,000,000 board feet of lumber were cut from the forest. This represents the largest annual timber-sales business in the history of the unit. The lumber is harvested by private timbermen who buy the timber from the Government on a stumpage basis. At present, a large sawmill at Grayson, Ala., in the center of the forest is engaged in cutting national forest timber on a large portion of the area. This operation is planned on a long-time basis designed to harvest the mature timber and place the forest in the best condition for continued growth. Numerous smaller sales to private operators have also been made. Plans for the current year call for the cutting of 19,000,000 board feet of timber. This amount of cut is needed to give room to healthy younger trees which are growing for future use. After sale, 25 percent of all gross returns to the Government from these operations is returned to the counties within the forest for their use. During fiscal year 1948 this return to the counties amounted to \$27,806 on the Bankhead National Forest. An additional 10 percent of the gross income is expended by the Forest Service in road work within the counties. The William B Bankhead National Forest is well on the way toward a sustained management basis. This will mean a permanent dependable source of profitable employment to local labor and a substantial monetary return to the counties involved.

The forest affords an ideal breeding ground for native wildlife. The area has abundant food, good cover, and dependable water sources. Soon after the forest was created, the Sipsey River Game Refuge, an area of 16,000 acres, was established and 100 deer were released. This deer herd increased rapidly. In 1938 the Alabama Conservation Department and the United States Forest Service, acting jointly, established a cooperative wildlife management area of 98,800 acres including and surrounding this refuge. A full-time game warden was assigned to the area to protect the increasing wildlife population. The wildlife area has been posted and improvements constructed to make possible the proper management of the refuge. Regulated public hunts for deer, turkey, and squirrel are being held annually. Good game management dictates that periodic hunting must be permitted in order to provide proper control of the size and condition of the wildlife population. If the amount of game increases beyond the point which can be supported by the available food, unhealthy animals result. The annual hunts are administered jointly by the For-

est Service and the State Conservation Department. The hunters are governed by State laws and hunt rules designed to protect the hunter as well as the game.

In 1938, as a part of the CCC program, an artificial lake of approximately 40 acres was created by the construction of a dam on Owl Creek. This lake, known as Brushy Lake, is about 4 miles northeast of Moreland near the center of the forest. The lake has been stocked with game fish and year-round fishing is permitted, subject to State laws, upon the payment of a nominal fee to defray the cost of management. A swimming area has been provided at this lake and many people visit the lake during the summer months to enjoy the fishing, swimming, and picnicking opportunities afforded.

Another point of interest is the Sipsey River recreational area. This area is located on Sipsey River where it is crossed by the Cranial Road. Picnic tables and shelters, as well as outdoor fireplaces, have been provided for the convenience of those who enjoy picnicking under beautiful primitive forest conditions. Several thousand persons visit this area each year.

When the land was acquired by the Federal Government, an organization was assembled to protect the timber from fire. A ranger, guards, and lookout men were employed and trained. Five fire lookout towers have been erected and over 100 miles of telephone line built to provide prompt communication with fire-fighting crews. Crews are equipped with tools and food supplies to enable them to stay on the job until a fire is extinguished. During dry seasons lookouts watch night and day for the start of a fire in order that prompt dispatch of a suppression crew may be made.

A large number of buildings have been constructed in connection with the development of the forest. Some of the more important structures are located at the administrative site at central tower on the Cheatham Highway south of Moulton, Ala.; the Turkey Foot game warden dwelling on the Sipsey River; and dwellings and other buildings at Basham, Black Pond, Moreland, Kinlock Towers, and at Grayson. A well-planned road and trail system has been constructed and is being maintained to permit year-round travel incident to the management of the forest.

JULY 17, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES A. CONNAUGHTON,
Regional Director, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR Mr. CONNAUGHTON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 6th, enclosing the very excellent information which had been assembled by Mr. C. F. Burnham, forest supervisor at Montgomery, Ala.

There are one or two further questions that I would like to propound to you and they are as follows:

On page 3 you set out some very excellent figures about the forest, but I do not know what the last column of figures "Value Sale Area Betterment" means. For instance, the 1951 figures show "The value sale area betterment" of the William B Bankhead National Forest is \$39,850.05. How is this sale area betterment value measured? What factors are taken into consideration in arriving at this figure? Can I use this figure as being a cash figure, or is it arrived at through some evaluation of intangibles which would require further explanation for my use?

Also, on the mimeograph sheet styled, William B. Bankhead National Forest, there is a statement in the third paragraph as follows: "After sale, 25 percent of all gross returns to the Government from these operations is returned to the counties within the forest for their use."

I would like to have you furnish me with the table of the returns thus made to the counties involved, individually, for the years that you have them available.

In the same paragraph is the statement: "An additional 10 percent of the gross income is expended by the Forest Service in road work within the counties."

Please tell me what amounts under this statement have been going to the counties involved, individually, over the years that you have a record of it.

Also, I would like to know, insofar as it is possible to ascertain, the number of men now receiving employment as a result of this forest being there.

Thanking you, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CARL ELLIOTT.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE, SOUTHERN REGION,
Atlanta, Ga., August 20, 1951.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Your request of July 17 regarding the information on the Bankhead National Forest previously sent to you on July 6 has been referred to me for reply in the absence of Regional Forester Connaughton.

The last column of figures, "Value sale area betterment," on page 3 of the report on the William B. Bankhead National Forest, are cash deposits made by purchasers of national-forest timber in accordance with the terms of the timber-sale agreements. Those deposits are made in addition to payments for stumpage. Such deposits are covered into the Treasury of the United States as a special fund for paying the cost of (1) planting; (2) sowing with tree seeds; or (3) cutting, destroying, or otherwise removing undesirable trees or other growth, on the national-forest land cut over by the purchaser in order to improve the future stand of timber. As each logging unit is prepared for sale the necessity for sale-area betterment work and its cost are determined by on-the-ground examination of the proposed sale area. When the timber is offered for sale one of the conditions of sale is the deposit of a stipulated sum or sums, in addition to the payments for stumpage, by the purchaser for sale-area betterment work. It is our practice to hire local labor for sale-area betterment work. The sale-area betterment deposits contribute to the support of the local communities.

In reply to the request made in the fifth paragraph of your letter of July 17, 1951, the allocation of the 25-percent fund is not made to the individual counties but to the State. If the allocation were made on the basis of area on the national-forest land in each county, the proration by counties and the total is as follows:

Year	Franklin	Lawrence	Winston	Total Bankhead
1937.....	\$1.49	\$80.82	\$97.18	\$149.20
1938.....	9.91	525.20	455.84	990.95
1939.....	25.32	1,206.24	1,240.92	2,532.48
1940.....	6.37	318.75	312.38	637.50
1941.....	32.19	1,000.40	1,072.22	3,218.81
1942.....	17.46	984.34	959.80	1,961.70
1943.....	71.46	4,026.88	3,928.81	8,027.15
1944.....	87.43	4,026.88	4,906.80	9,021.03
1945.....	82.32	4,638.84	4,527.94	9,249.10
1946.....	78.04	4,397.91	4,262.77	9,708.72
1947.....	129.38	7,290.85	7,116.55	14,536.78
1948.....	247.48	15,946.07	15,612.66	27,806.21
1949.....	342.40	19,248.54	18,851.75	38,459.69
1950.....	508.24	28,650.73	28,001.55	57,170.52
1951.....	562.04	28,127.25	27,564.71	56,254.00
Total.....	2,202.13	120,085.46	117,316.94	239,614.43

¹ Estimated.

In regard to your request in the first paragraph on page 2 of your letter of July 17, 1951, the 10 percent fund is expended by the Forest Service on a State-wide basis for roads on the approved forest development road system without particular reference to ranger district or country boundaries. The amount of the 10 percent fund earned from Bankhead National Forest receipts is as follows:

Year:	Total 10 percent fund, Bankhead
1937.....	\$59.72
1938.....	396.38
1939.....	1,012.99
1940.....	255.00
1941.....	1,287.52
1942.....	784.68
1943.....	3,210.86
1944.....	3,928.41
1945.....	3,699.64
1946.....	3,507.49
1947.....	5,814.71
1948.....	11,122.48
1949.....	15,395.88
1950.....	22,868.21
1951.....	22,501.80
Total.....	95,845.77

¹ Estimated.

The estimated number of men currently receiving employment as a result of the establishment of the Bankhead National Forest is:

	Number of individuals	
	Full time	Part time
Forest Service employees.....	19	31
Clancy Lumber Co.....	230	-----
Other lumber and products firms.....	65	-----
Game management area (State game wardens)	3	3
Farmers with agricultural uses on national forest land.....	18	-----

¹ These employees average 10 months employment per year.

² 110 employees of Clancy Lumber Co. and 120 by the company's contractors.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please feel free to call on us.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. CONNAUGHTON,
Regional Forester
By REZIN E. PIDGEON, Acting.

Mr. Taft States the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1951

MR. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, no one in the Republican Party is better qualified to state the Republican position on almost every controversial issue before the Nation than "Mr. Republican," Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. His announcement that his hat is in the ring for the Republican Presidential nomination rings as true and clear as everything BOB TAFT has ever done.

Liberty, integrity, and sound judgment are the watchwords of his program. He is opposed to the socialism and excessive Federal spending of the administration

at home. He is ready to wage an all-out attack on the fatal mistakes made by the Truman government in foreign policy, including the Korean war, the build-up of Russia and the faulty judgment of the men who are running the Nation today. He is pledged to the restoration of honesty and integrity in our Government.

Republicans will find millions of Americans lined up solidly behind BOB TAFT in this program. It is clear, it is honest, it is sincere. MR. TAFT has stated the case. Let us win it, not for partisanship, but for America.

What Makes Democracy Worth While?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

MR. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the real test for the validity of an idea is time—its ability to keep enough support to sustain itself, generation after generation. To no small degree in this day the idea of democracy and individual rights is competing with other ideas for the arrangement of society. Granted that it is extremely difficult for anyone realizing the incomparable attributes of a democratic way to understand how anyone would choose or desire any alternative, we must nonetheless live in a world where the Devil's apostles are finding converts for their theory of a controlled state.

In this regard, I am pleased to call attention to four short essays written by junior and senior students of the Glenwood County High School of Glenwood Springs, Colo. These carefully reasoned articles hold an answer to the question, What makes democracy worth while?

I recommend a reading of these short but expressive essays for they show plainly that American youth has not been fooled, that the idea of democracy has full support from our coming citizens, and that the idea which they, and the rest of us, hold dear shall not perish from the earth.

[From the Glenwood Post of October 11, 1951]

STANDARDS OF FREEDOM JUDGED BY GCHS PUPILS

WHAT MAKES DEMOCRACY WORTH WHILE?
(By Eleanor Graves)

People from all over the world have come to the United States to share in this thing called democracy. Why? What is there about this form of government that makes it so worth while?

In a democracy we, the people, may move about as we please. We may go from our homes to work or to play, wherever we wish, without the constant fear of being seen. We may go to another State without getting official sanction, we secure permission to travel to another country simply by getting a passport. We are not prisoners behind an immovable barrier of a government policy of ignorance.

We who live under a democratic form of government are free to think and to say what

we think. We may use our minds to our own advantage; we may share our thoughts with the entire Nation and with other nations. We may praise or criticize, and do so freely, without representatives of the state accusing us of plotting against it.

Our democracy enables us to be a part of the Government, and we vote for any candidate for a Government office that we choose in the elections. It is important that we take an active part in our Government, because the people are the foundation of democracy. If we are lax in our duties of voting and of keeping ourselves informed as to what our Government and the officials in it are doing, we may lose this democracy and find in its place a Government where the people are controlled by the state rather than being controllers of the state.

I believe there are two definite things that make democracy worth while—the freedoms which it grants, and the importance of the individual in its working structure.

WHAT MAKES A DEMOCRACY WORTH WHILE?

(By Norman Ross)

"A democracy is founded on the theory that the average man is qualified to participate in the affairs of State and that he is particularly qualified to select rulers who will govern in the interests of the Nation." This statement alone makes a democracy worth while. Where else does the common man have so much power? In what other type of government may one express his ideas and thoughts so freely?

Many of us today do not realize that there are many countries that do without these privileges. In fact, we do not even realize that our own country was, at one time, without these same privileges.

The Bill of Rights is the foundation of our democracy. Does anyone ever stop to think what would happen to the ordinary person, such as you and I, if these rights were taken from us and a cheap substitution such as communism or socialism were to replace them? If we realize that today our Armed Forces are fighting in Korea to protect these rights, perhaps our democracy would be even more worth while to us. Through democracy comes progress in many fields: education, industry, yes, and even progress in war to protect our democracy.

In itself, democracy is one of the most powerful educational forces in the world today, lifting entire peoples from the contemplation of their own personal affairs to a consideration of problems of national and international magnitude. Yet, this is only a small part of our worth-while democracy.

WHAT MAKES DEMOCRACY WORTH WHILE?

(By Nadra Benedek)

True democracy is government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It gives us the right to do what we want to do, live as we want to live, and speak the things we want to without fear. America as compared with other countries, has this freedom.

Looking at other nations, we might well evaluate the advantages of our country—a democracy. We have free enterprise, freedom of speech, religion, the press, and other privileges not granted to totalitarian nations.

Were we under such a regime, we would be subjected to questioning and possible imprisonment, whereas, we as a free Nation have the right to express our views and ideas in public without any fear of arrest. We are given the opportunity to think by ourselves and do things of our own will, not of one supreme leader.

Democracy must be founded on a sound basis combining the policies of all political parties, or it will never succeed. Dissension is the basis from which democracy is based, but until all dissenters, after argument, can form a basic agreement, then and then only can democracy succeed.

Today more than any time in our era, we are faced with the complete dissolution

of democracy unless we meet the facts and bring ourselves to realize even through war, it might be necessary to propagate the principles of democracy. The United States has and always will encourage the cause of freedom, justice, and democracy throughout the inhabited nations. By so doing, democracy cannot fail.

WHAT MAKES DEMOCRACY WORTH WHILE?

(By Ken Hubbard)

For many centuries men have fought and died for their personal rights. For our own country, we have fought many wars to keep our personal freedoms and what we call a democracy. Democracy has been defined as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Why is this so important? Why have men fought and sacrificed their lives for this system of government?

To begin with, no country using the democratic system can claim a true democracy, but this does not stop men from striving to improve the government and to make it more closely resemble true democracy.

Faith is the most important thing that makes democracy worth while. We have the faith that someday every nation will discover that men can live together in harmony without fighting. But in order to make this come true, we must practice harmonious living ourselves. We must also have faith in God, for our democratic system is based on His work. We must also have faith in our officials, for we elect them and they are supposed to abide by the wishes of the people. If they do not always do this, we say our democracy does not work properly. But we may always criticize and get things changed to the way that we feel they should be. Sometimes the right of criticism seems to be the only democratic right that we have. But when we feel this way, let us consider other countries and compare our rights, freedoms, and living standards with those they have. Then we see that democracy is worth while; and that it is we, the people, who must keep it that way.

Jerry's Second Letter Equals First in Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

JOHNSON CITY, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL, I was so surprised when I saw my letter in the newspaper. Thank you very much for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and of all the nice things you said about me.

You were very right when you said that propaganda doesn't influence the youth of America. I don't think it can influence the common person either, because he is one that believes in what he sees or experiences and not what he reads or the terrible slams he might hear from very critical people.

People don't believe all they read in the paper or take it seriously. If they believe what they read in the newspapers, these people will lose their faith in mankind.

As for you, Mr. HALL, most everyone can see why the Communists are so against you. The first people they attack are the common people who feel neglected. Now these Communists know that you are interested in every problem, wish, and criticism that the working class may write to you. This makes the fac-

tory worker feel safe and the Communist plotters angry. What can they do? There's only one thing left and that's to spread propaganda, and, in turn, get you defeated. Personally, I don't think it's working because people don't forget easily and most of them have something to be grateful to you for. They know that you're on their side and are fighting for them.

God bless you.

Your teen-age supporter,

JERRY.

The Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at Poplar Bluff, Mo., in June of this year:

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

May I say to you at the outset that I have never considered myself a Red-baiter. In fact, I speak to you as one who was long sympathetic with Russia. From a reading of history, I know the conditions that existed under the czars. The people were poverty-stricken and in ignorance. They have advanced from less than 25 percent literacy to surpass that in the United States. The peasants of today perhaps have more security, if not as much liberty. I never felt that we were justified in joining with France and England to fight an undeclared war against the Soviets after the First World War. I thought we should have recognized the Soviet Union before we did.

But we did recognize that Government. We carried on trade relations with her. Some of our best engineers went to Russia to assist in building her dams, manufactories and other projects. We allowed her citizens to come here to inspect our plants, study our assembly-line methods and advanced agriculture. They were on their own. We sent no Government men to direct their activities or spy on them. It is true that during all this time, we had many newspapers and many news commentators who criticized her Government. Some of our Congressmen did the same. Perhaps there was some reason for Russia to be suspicious of us. Through it all, I could understand her viewpoint.

Then came the war, when we were allies in a great global conflict. We admired the tenacity of a fighting people who withstood the Nazi hordes. Stilled then were the voices of criticism in our country as we poured tons of armaments to her shores to aid in that defense. Yet, during those war years, Russia failed to cooperate with us or the other allies in the exchange of military information concerning inventions, etc. If any of you served, as I did, in the Air Corps during World War II, you know that we knew less about the aircraft of Russia than we did about the aircraft of enemy nations. Then, toward the war's end, we found that all this time, she had spies in North America. What else happened? We demobilized from 14,000,000 men to 600,000. Russia kept her armies intact and marched them into the weaker countries to enforce her rule.

But this next I consider the most significant of all. We had developed during the war a terrifying weapon—so terrifying, in fact, that when the United Nations was organized we offered to abolish this weapon and never make another—on one condition.

This was that an international board be appointed to inspect the war plants of all nations to make sure that they were not making the bomb that we had agreed not to make. But this former ally of ours refused to cooperate. It refused this generous American offer to abolish the atom bomb. This one country refused to have the United Nations inspect its war plants, even though we were willing to have ours inspected.

When the Soviet Union did this, she aligned herself against all humanity, against all progress and against common decency. Around herself and the world she entwined the bloody hands of Mars. How hollow now sound the words of peace. How hypocritical now sound the words of those who say they entered Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the other nations of Eastern Europe to help the downtrodden and unfortunate of those countries.

What else have we witnessed? We have lately heard the leaders of the Communist Party brazenly declare that in time of war, if that war were with the Soviet Union, they would not support our Government. This statement was made without qualification. In other words, even though the Soviets made an unprovoked attack upon us, we must assume that the allegiance of the United States Communists will be with the enemy. It logically follows that they would engage in espionage and sabotage and that they would use all manner of means to stifle our war effort. We well remember in World War II, when the Berlin-Moscow pact was in force, that certain of our aircraft plants were shut down because of the actions of a small group of Communists. However, when Hitler invaded Russia, the Communist attitude in this country changed overnight.

Let me say here that the word "communism" as exemplified by the Soviet Union is a misnomer. Communism or the Socialist state portends an idealistic system of life and government where the people exist on a plane of social and economic equality, sharing in the work and in the goods produced. It involves common ownership of the agents of production and a fair distribution of the products of industry. But the communism of Russia is none of this. Actually, her system is state capitalism. The standard of living between the ruling class and the working class is as pronounced there as it is between the extremely wealthy and the extremely poor in this country.

Lately, Russia announced price cuts on foodstuffs and clothing. An analysis shows the following: To earn enough to buy a pound of bread, the Soviet worker still has to work 16 minutes, compared to United States workers' 8. A quart of milk, if and when available, still takes 47 minutes of labor in Russia, 9 minutes in the United States. A pound of beef, not often available to most Russians, still takes 41 minutes of labor for a Soviet laborer, compared with 35 here. A pound of sugar calls for 48 minutes of labor there, and only 4 here. A man's shirt in Moscow costs 16 times as much, in terms of the average worker's earning power, as in the United States. Socks cost 24 times as much, shoes 20 times.

Time was in our country when we permitted deplorable conditions for our workers. We witnessed, in the textile mills of the South, in the manufacturing centers of the East, and garment factories of the Middle West, men, women, and children who slaved in despair. We allowed this—in the name of individual liberty and initiative, in the name of free enterprise. We saw the farmer sell the products of his farm at less than the cost of production. We saw undernourished girls working in the sweatshops of our land at 60 cents per day and forced into lives of shame and dishonor because they could not make enough to keep body and soul together. We saw the poorhouses of our country filled with the downtrodden forms of the aged and hopeless. But we have

corrected those conditions, and never again will they return. We did it, not by bloodshed and revolution, but through our democratic processes.

So I cannot understand why we have in this country 43,217 known and active Communists with several thousand more, at least on the fringe, as aiders and abettors.

One midafternoon I walked from the House Chamber and witnessed a crowd of some 3,000 men and women in the corridors of the Capitol. About one-half of them were white and one-half colored. Had one of our penitentiaries been emptied into that space, I believe they would have measured up better in appearance. These folks were said to be Communists from New York City, and they were demanding the right to call upon certain legislative leaders, even though Congress was then in session. They were herded outdoors by Capitol Police amid curses, grumblings of persecution and charges that they were denied their rights as American citizens. No arrests were made. No blows were struck by the police, and I wondered at the time whether these people ever paused to think what might have happened to them had they been residents of the Soviet Union and had tried to storm the sacred portals of the Politburo to demand that certain legislation be enacted. Maybe they never thought about that, or maybe they just didn't give a damn—sorta' like the 11 convicted Communist leaders who would debase and flaunt the Constitution until they were placed on trial; at which time they were quick to invoke all the rights and privileges guaranteed thereunder.

I think none of us would deny the right of any people to live under the type of government which they might choose. We have no fight with Tito. However, the Russian borders do not mark the boundaries of that country's kind of ideology. The writings of Stalin speak of world revolution. By lies, deceit, fraud, and infiltration, they would undermine all democracies.

For many years, Soviet agents have permeated every country in search of converts. Many of the smartest and most promising of these converts have been taken to Moscow for intense training and indoctrination. A little while ago I stood in London's Hyde Park and listened to agitators relieve themselves of their pent-up fury. One evening I saw there a Communist speaker; shabbily dressed, rough in appearance, but earnest in demeanor, with all of the persuasive attributes of a great orator. Finally, as he spoke, some bystander, who was anti-Communist, hurled a question at him. Just then another man, who no doubt was a Communist, shouted at the questioner. "Please keep your mouth shut. Can't you wait until the speaker is through to ask questions?" It was then most interesting to see the technique, the psychology used by the speaker. Instead of agreeing with his champion, he pointed his finger at him and said "You are the one to keep quiet. This is a public meeting. We believe in free expression. Let me say here and now that we welcome questions, and any of you are at liberty to ask them, even though you break in the middle of a sentence which I'm uttering."

The following night I saw there three Negroes from Algeria who took turns in boldly proclaiming the cause of communism. One of them warned in bitter tones that the day would come when they would meet the English with machine guns; that they were soon to be through with slavery and autocracy. Just then a young, fair-headed boy standing near me said: "What could your machine guns do against our atom bombs?" To which the Algerian replied in a sarcastic manner: "Why, young man, you ain't got no atom bombs." The boy was not to be outdone, so he said: "You must remember the United States helped us in two World Wars. Maybe they'd help us again. You'll have to admit they have the

atom bomb." "Oh, yes, a kind of one. It's got a bomb just about like a football that might be taken up high and dropped down on somebody's head. It might hurt some, but not much." Then the boy said: "I suppose you think Stalin has something worth while?" "Yes," said the speaker, "That man ain't a-takin' much, and when a man don't talk much, he got somethin'."

My friends, on every continent, in every land, stealthily march the stooges of Stalin, more dangerous by far than were the beasts of Berlin. A crisis is upon us. Before us stands the most sinister influence the world has ever seen, threatening the conquest of the world. American intelligence tells us they have 5,000,000 men under arms, with 14,000,000 reserves that could be fully equipped and in the field in 2 months.

Today she dominates some 800,000,000 people and 13,000,000 square miles of territory. Some 32 percent of the world's population bows to the whims of the Kremlin.

Our Nation is a great giant, but a giant of only potential strength, a naked giant. To fight effectively, he must be clothed and armed and equipped—not alone with airplanes, guns and ships; but with all the agencies and instrumentalities which make for strength and power. Of course, we must suffer some inconvenience. We must sacrifice some freedom of action and suffer some restraint of our liberties.

It is all very costly. The 1952 budget provides that 59.5 cents will go for national defense. For military and economic aid to other nations, the figure is 9.9 cents. Veterans' benefits account for 6.9 cents. Interest on public debt takes 8.1 cents. Defense production and economic stabilization accounts for 2.0 cents. It will therefore be noted that out of every budget dollar, 86.4 cents is to be used to pay for past wars or the present national emergency—excepting interest on national debt, which was not wholly war-contracted. However, it is a fixed item and cannot be reduced.

I have been most confused about how far we should go in our attempt to contain communism. I have questioned whether we had the ability in men and resources to save the world, especially that part called Asia. I voted against aid to China, because I thought we could never pour enough billions in there to save a regime that, in my opinion, had done little or nothing for its teeming millions. Most of what we did send fell into the hands of the Communists. Our great difficulty lies in the fact that so much of the world's population lives under a freedom of poverty and disease or political and industrial slavery. They live in surroundings of futility and distrust; and it is only human nature to turn to any ideology which may promise a fuller life. The exigencies of the moment may force us to render assistance to a government that is not democratic, as we did in Greece; but we do so as an emergency matter, and with the hope that such nations will gradually become democratized.

It is my judgment that if communism should envelop all of Europe and Asia, we could not long endure as a free nation. In the field of medicine alone, there are hundreds of drugs that we must get from overseas. In industry, we must have manganese to use in steel production. Since Russia has cut that supply, we have turned to India. Stop that, and you see where we would be. We need tungsten from China or Indo-China. We need tin and rubber which comes from Southeast Asia, uranium which comes from the Belgian Congo in Africa. Countless other materials we need. Again, we are a Nation of surpluses and must sell abroad. If Asia and Europe fall, the Soviet Union, by shutting off our foreign trade, could have us in an economic shambles within a few short years, and perhaps without ever firing a shot.

To combat this threat requires the best thought and most earnest consideration of

all our people. In my judgment, our foreign policy must espouse and promote liberal, humanitarian programs for the masses who are underprivileged. We are making a start in that direction with our point-4 program.

Certainly in combatting communism at home, we must retain American fundamentals. We must not be swept away with hate or hysteria. We should never brand a man a Communist simply because he espouses some ultraliberal cause. Nor should we call another man a Fascist because he is ultraconservative.

In March of last year, while walking down one of the streets in Paris, I saw inscribed on a window: "This is the room in which Voltaire died." It brought to my mind a statement that he had once made in speaking of an opponent: "I hate that man's opinions and will oppose them with all my might, but I would fight to the death, if necessary, for his right to express those opinions."

Once we start circumscribing the rights and freedom of others, we have paved the way for a similar abridgment of our own rights.

THIS TOO, under Henry VIII of England, there was a famous preacher named John Bradford. Wherever he preached, great throngs came to hear him. He was the church leader of his time. One day he saw a band of prisoners being led to the stake to pay with their lives for holding beliefs contrary to the religious group then in control.

With sorrow he watched them walk to their doom, and he uttered those words that time soon proved to be a prophetic prayer. "There," he said, "but for the grace of God, goes John Bradford." Time brought changes. Another religious group gained the ascendancy, and the day came when John Bradford was led to the stake to pay with his life for holding beliefs contrary to the mob, and as the flames that bigotry had lighted leaped about him, he saw again the spectacle of those unhappy wretches of years before in whose place John Bradford now stood.

Today, those outside the realm where persecution rages are the John Bradfords of modern times. As they watch the martyrs of today being led away to persecution and perhaps death, they well may meditate. "There, but for the grace of God, go the Catholics, the Protestants, the Freethinkers. There, but for the turn of fate, go all who think their own thoughts, who follow the dictates of their own consciences, who dare to disagree with the bigots who for a brief moment have usurped power."

This is a Republic, founded on the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the intelligence and patriotism of the people. In every republic like ours, there is absolute necessity of free speech. Free speech is the diamond of an American soul. Words are the bodies of thought, and liberty gives those thoughts wings, and the whole intellectual heavens are filled with thought. Every individual has the right to the general air and to give the reason for the course he pursues. When you stop free speech, when you say a thought shall die, shall not be born, it must have the same effect in the intellectual world that stopping springs at their sources would have in the physical. Stop springs at their sources and they cease to gurgle, the stream ceases to murmur, and the great rivers cease rushing to the embrace of the ocean. Stop thought in the brain in which it is born, and degeneration follows, and this Republic would again become a desert of ignorance, peopled by savages.

Our country has been built upon the theory that individuals may have free expression; that they may dissent from the existing order, that they shall not be punished for words or even acts unless they

lead directly to crime. Communism cannot take over in an America well-clothed, well-housed and well-nourished, but all the repression in the world cannot prevent social upheaval if the people perish from bad business and social institutions. The task before the country is to promote the general welfare, not to punish individuals who complain that our system is not promoting that welfare.

The late and distinguished Judge Merrill E. Otis once said: "No intelligent man opposes revolution merely because it is revolutionary. No intelligent man opposes radicalism merely because it is radical. Take the radicals out of science and you go back to witchcraft; take the radicals out of religion and you go back to a world barren of love and hope, take the radicals out of politics and you are slaves again under despotic kings."

Repression has generally increased and strengthened the very evils against which it was directed. It was the ruthless execution of this policy that finally overthrew the French autocracy in the eighteenth century and the Czarist regime in the present century.

You may recall from history that in Germany, Bismarck procured the passage of the famous anti-Socialist laws. At the time the Socialist Party was small and insignificant. Yet in 18 months it had grown to huge proportions. The laws were then repealed and the party soon wasted away.

Again in our memory, the theory of repression was applied to Hitler and the followers of the swastika. The same was true of Mussolini and his Black Shirts. They became martyrs, and the day came when they were the majority.

Every so-called radical thinks he has some grievance or the solution to some wrong. Repression makes him more determined, until he may become a fanatic. Is it not better to let him state his grievance openly; and, if he is in error, refute it with the truth; but if he is in the right, set about to remedy the evils of which he complains? Was not this the primary cause of the establishment of free Government?

If we are to retain democracy in this country, we must be tolerant in thought and act. We must be temperate in speech. Intemperate speech carries with it the cloak of insincerity. It is the garb worn by the professional charlatan. Herod professed the desire to worship, but when the Wise Men were gone he wrote a decree that imbued his kingdom with the blood of the innocents. Peter in one breath exclaimed, "Lord, I will follow Thee even unto death"; but later in the palace said, "I know Him not." Judas Iscariot pledged fidelity to his Savior, but that night, for 30 pieces of silver, betrayed his Master with a kiss; and 2,000 years ago a prophet of Galilee said unto His disciples, "Not everyone who saith, 'O Lord' shall enter the kingdom." Then turning unto the pack of hypocrites that barked at His heels, said, "Ye are like unto whited sepulchres, beautiful indeed on the outside, but inside full of dead men's bones."

In conclusion, let me say that my concern for the future does not make of me a pessimist. The international situation presents terrific problems. No human can know the exact best course to pursue, but I am glad to report to you that my short time in the Congress has convinced me that men of both political parties have sought to do what they conscientiously believed to be best. There has been a minimum of partisanship in this field, and loyalty to country and hope for the world have been the prime motives.

Last year Mrs. Magee and I were on a 30-minute broadcast over the NBC network from Washington. The announcer told me that all the questions excepting one would be at random. However, to end the broad-

cast he would ask me the following question to be answered in 2 minutes. "What do you see for the world in general and for the United States in particular in the coming months and years?" In concluding these remarks, I give you that answer.

"To answer that in 2 minutes, one needs the help of a Delphian oracle. As Thomas Paine once said: 'These are times that try men's souls.' This morning's news is alarming, but I find solace in the words of John Erskine: 'Pessimists who despair as they look at the world, forget the solidarity of our people, the intelligence and wisdom of youth.' It is written in holy script: 'Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' I have faith in the ultimate triumph of truth over superstition and ignorance. I believe that goodness and mercy will some time prevail over the forces of sham and greed."

"Since the world began, man has sought a better way of life. I envision a time when our late advances in science will be used solely for the benefit of mankind. If the atom bomb could be abolished and the peacetime secret of the atom shared with the world, it would do more to change the course of everyday living than any happening of the past. Toiling humanity would have lifted from its shoulders much of the burden of physical labor. It would give us the greatest ascendancy over nature, the greatest command over our surroundings ever attained."

"I cannot but believe that some day the iron curtain will be lifted, and that somehow the destinies of the people of the world will be guided by the love and spirit of Him who witnesses the fall of each tiny sparrow."

"I firmly believe that it is the destiny of the United States to lead the way. Victory can never come on the battlefields alone. The fight against false prophets must be finally won in the factories and fields, where men labor and struggle for a full life. Our people must be secure, and we must render assistance to democratic ideals elsewhere. We shall pay taxes until it hurts; but let us ever remember that liberty and free government were purchased at a price. That men might be free, thousands of heroic souls have lain in dungeons, have felt the thumbcrew and witnessed the terrible torture of the gibbet."

"I believe it was Lord Beaconsfield who said 'The man who does not look up, will look down, and the spirit which does not dare to soar, is destined to grovel.' I think the spirit of America is looking upward."

Pensioners Should Be Encouraged to Augment Their Incomes by Part-Time Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe, in times such as these, that we have a law in this country which, in effect, penalizes Americans for looking for the kind of a job they are able to do, and at the same time insists that these same people live on an income which averages less than \$50 a month. Yet, that is exactly what one small clause in our Social Security Act does to some 5,000,000 Americans who, because of age, misfortune, or illness, are now on

our public-assistance rolls. Under this clause, as it is interpreted by most State welfare agencies, every dollar earned by a welfare recipient must be reported, to be deducted from their pitifully inadequate monthly allowance.

In spite of the fact that the demand for workers is at an all-time high; in spite of the fact that the cost of living for all of us has almost doubled since 1939; and in spite of the fact that this restriction discourages assistance recipients from taking jobs; we have allowed this depression-born clause to remain on the books. It is time, I submit, that we look at the facts of this situation as it operates in 1951—and then that we do something about it. To that end I am today introducing a bill which will allow recipients of public assistance to keep two-thirds or \$50, whichever is greater, of the income they receive in any month without having it deducted from their assistance payment.

Such a change in the law is dictated not only by humanitarian considerations but also by the relentless facts of the world we are living in today. The first essential fact which we must face has to do with the starvation payments those people are receiving today. Remember that the average assistance payment throughout the Nation is less than \$50 a month. In August 1951, the average payment for persons on old-age assistance was \$43.67 a month. That, ladies and gentlemen, totals \$524.04 a year. During the same month the averages for other groups receiving public assistance payments stood at \$46.82 for the blind; \$44.46 for the permanently and totally disabled, and \$21.27 for dependent children. Out of these meager allowances must come the cost of the food they eat, the clothing they wear, and the place they live, together with other living expenses. I call on every Member of this Congress to bear in mind, every time he enters a grocery store, that we are, in effect, prescribing under present law that around 5,000,000 of our fellow Americans must try to live on around \$50 a month—and not just for food alone, but for food, clothing, and shelter. More than that, we are saying that if these neighbors of ours who are trying to make out on these amounts can find a little job to help bring that amount up a little, he or she must take a cut in the assistance payment. As Robert C. Townsend has said, such a provision makes "poverty compulsory for millions of United States citizens."

The second essential fact which we must understand, in considering this legislation, is that today's dollar, as compared with 1939, is worth only 53 cents. It was a 57-cent dollar before Korea. It is now a 53-cent dollar. In the last 12 months it has lost more than 4 cents of its purchasing power. Most of us do not need to be told that today's dollar buys just about half of what it would buy in 1939—but most of us are also getting more dollars in each pay check. But for our dependent aged, the disabled, the blind, and for needy children, there has been no such increase. It is true that even the present inadequate payments are slightly higher than they were in

1940. But the extent to which they have lagged behind increases in income for the rest of the population can also be demonstrated by some cold, hard statistics. The facts show that while income for most Americans has increased by 160 percent between 1940 and 1950, the proportionate rise in public assistance expenditures has been less than half of that amount. As a result, the ratio of assistance expenditures to income payments has declined about one-third from 1940 to the fiscal year 1950, and four out of five States are now using a smaller proportion of income payments to meet "need" under the four State-Federal public assistance programs in 1950 than they used in 1940.

Clearly, therefore, in terms of their buying power, and in terms of our ability to share with them, we have actually lowered our standards of "need" to less than a bare subsistence. This is another reason why I call upon the Members of this Congress to act promptly in remedying the situation along the lines proposed in my bill, H. R. 5817.

But, someone will say, why do not the people on public assistance rolls now go out and get a good job which will take them off the rolls permanently? Someone else, I am sure, will label my proposal as a wholesale raid on the Treasury which will make it possible for relief recipients to live in the lap of luxury at the expense of the public. Now I have never been able to understand how any thinking person could maintain that any appreciable number of persons would prefer living on a relief budget—and remember that average of less than \$50 a month—to getting a good job if he or she is able to get a good job. Again, of course, they are simply overlooking the real facts of the case. And the essential fact here is that the great majority of persons now on public assistance rolls would not be considered for a full-time job under present hiring practices. Nine-tenths of all persons on these rolls are at least 65 years of age, or under 18, or blind, or totally disabled. The average age of persons receiving old-age assistance payments is about 75.

The truth of the matter then is that the only persons on public assistance rolls who are affected in any degree by high employment are those who can get jobs and hold them. The reality of the situation is that many of them are quite unable to work; practically all of them are considered "unemployable" by labor market standards, and cannot get a job because they are too old or too young; and all of them are penalized if, by some fortunate chance, they can find part-time employment which would help to bring their purchasing power up to the subsistence relief levels of 1939.

Surely it is sound public policy to lift the ceiling on indigence by allowing those men and women on the assistance rolls who are able to work, and can find a means of supplementing their meager assistance payments up to the level of a bare living, to do so. Here is the way it would work. Suppose for example, that a 66-year-old man has been forced to retire because of his age, and is trying to live on the average of \$43.67 a month paid by old-age assistance. And suppose

that this is the total family income since his wife is not yet 65 and therefore not entitled to old-age assistance. Under my bill, if the husband is able to get a part-time job that pays say \$40 a month, only one-third of that \$40—or \$13.33—would be deducted from his pension payment. His total monthly income would thus be \$70.34, made up of \$40 from his own earnings and his reduced assistance payment of \$30.34. But under present law the entire amount of his earnings would be deducted, in order to hold his total monthly income down to \$43.67 a month. In effect we are saying to such a man that he can't receive more than \$43.67 a month whether he works or not. We are saying that he must be re-investigated if he is fortunate enough to get a part-time or a seasonal job that would pay him around \$45 a month for a short period of time. We are saying that honesty in reporting outside earnings is rewarded by a reduction in an already inadequate assistance payment.

Surely it is only a matter of simple justice to allow the men and women on our public assistance rolls to increase their monthly income to an amount which is still under the minimum required for health and well-being, if they are able to do so through their own efforts. By such means we would be encouraging them to accept part-time jobs without penalty. We would be helping some of them to increase their incomes gradually until they were able to become self-supporting. We would make it possible for many of them to participate in the rehabilitation programs which are training disabled persons to become at least partially self-supporting. We would permit the elderly or disabled person, or a widow with dependent children, to bring the amount of their monthly income up to 1940 relief standards without any increase in the amount they are now receiving from public funds. And we would be facing up to 1951 needs and requirements by allowing these fellow Americans of ours to help overcome the severe handicap they suffer from the rapid rise in the cost of living, at the same time that they can help to do many of the jobs which need to be done today, up to the limits of their ability.

I urge your considered and conscientious support for H. R. 5817 as one practical way to partly solve one of the problems which arises under our existing law. Our social-welfare laws need a complete revision but pending this H. R. 5817 is a step in the right direction.

Sound Democrats and Republicans Should Combine for Country's Sake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the

Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Sound Democrats and Republicans Should Combine for Country's Sake," written by James M. Thomson, of Gaylord, Clarke County, Va.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

SOUND DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS SHOULD COMBINE FOR COUNTRY'S SAKE

(By James M. Thomson, of Gaylord, Clarke County, Va.)

Small minorities and splinter parties have set the policies and largely dominated the Government of our great country for 20 years. Our young people, a majority of our qualified voters, who have come of age in that period have not known normal government under the traditional American system. As a result, the healthy and sane, progressive, and balanced American system established by the founders of our Republic is known and remembered only by the older Americans. These younger people have seen emergency piled on emergency, and they have seen emergencies created as a pretext for changing, curtailing, and destroying their liberties and rights. They have seen tax piled on tax until their freedom, their earnings, and their savings are by way of being destroyed.

The shrewd demagoguery by which Mussolini took over Italy, Hitler took over Germany, and by which Lenin and Stalin took over Russia, have been imported, given an American label, and put to work to create an American executive bureaucracy and dictatorship. We all know that the dictatorships of Italy, Germany, and Russia evolved quickly into warlike and bloody tyrannies. America needs a reorganization of parties now if she is to avoid the road which most of the world has traveled since World War I.

Recently a United States Senator, KARL E. MUNDT placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which he has made in various places pointing out quite clearly some of the reasons for the political distortion of the will of a majority of the people in England and in America. Senator MUNDT from unimpeachable figures shows that the Conservative and Liberal Parties combined could have easily elected a safe majority of the British House of Commons. Both oppose the Socialist dictatorship which is being created in England. They divided their votes and handed England over to socialism. Senator MUNDT's figures on England are irrefutable. From England's example and from the Senator's long fight against communism in our own country he recognizes the danger of the splinter party domination of our own Government in years past. And as a remedy Senator MUNDT, a liberal Republican from South Dakota now advocates the political merger of those Democrats and Republicans of America who believe in constitutional government. Senator MUNDT is no demagogue, no dreamer. He is comfortably situated politically and must be credited with motives of sincere patriotism in the stand he now takes.

THE SOCIALIST-COMMUNIST COMBINE

Senator MUNDT evidently believes a reorganization of parties would result in the Socialist, Communist, and radical political elements of our country assembling in an opposition party. As matters stand these elements are in both our national parties. We have in reality four or even five political parties in our National House and Senate. This constitutes the same danger for the United States that it has constituted for Russia, Germany, Italy, and other European countries—notably France. As politics is a business that now absorbs just about a third of all the wages, profits, and earning power of every American, every major politician knows what has happened to our country.

But as this vast tax revenue taken from the people provides jobs and keeps many politicians in office and power there are many politicians who are neither as patriotic nor as candid as is Senator MUNDT.

The American presidency is the greatest political prize in the world. An Army and Navy of over 3,000,000 men, between two and three million civilian employees, billions of dollars in contracts, judicial appointments, control of expenditures for pensions, relief, subsidies, grants, control of conscription, of income tax, of farm and food prices, power to prosecute great or small business and great or small individuals—all these powers come under the presidency. Also there is control of the radio, of a vast propaganda machine, of moving pictures, television, and control of money and credit through direct Government lending and through Federal inspection and control of banks. The vast Federal executive machine through direct and indirect control of tax money can buy votes, influence primaries and elections of Congressmen and Senators, and through its patronage and party powers can deprive Congressmen of legitimate patronage and can subject them to party discipline. Is it to be wondered at that profit from this system or fear of a growing tyranny paralyzes the spirit of so much of the American public?

THE SOUTHERN ACE IN THE HOLE

How have the minorities been able to control the historic Democratic Party? The answer is simple. Votes in the electoral college determine the presidency. The South and border States of the United States have two-thirds of the electoral votes necessary for a majority of 266 in the electoral college. Southern Democrats normally dominate national elections in these States. They constitute the ace in the hole for any one achieving a Democratic nomination. The Republican Party, running on a Civil War record, was able for three-quarters of a century to count certain Northern and Western States as solidly Republican. But that condition no longer exists. It has not existed for many years. It will not exist again. The result is that the Republicans cut out of this captive Democratic vote have a fighting chance only among two-thirds of the electoral vote in the electoral college. The Democrats outside the South and border States have to fight for only one-third of the electoral votes in order to secure an electoral college majority. For these votes they trade foreign and domestic policies and jobs with the Communist- and Socialist-controlled splinter parties of the North.

If a presidential candidate gets a majority of the electoral college—266—votes he is winner. And the winner takes all. So the Democratic candidates have to seek the electoral vote of only a few States. One of these is New York with about 10 percent of the votes in the electoral college. Add 10 percent to 33 percent and you have 43, that leaves only 8 percent of the electoral votes in order to have a majority. In New York the old-time Republicans have normally about 45 percent of the popular vote. The old-time normal Democratic vote is about 45 percent. Ten percent is independent or doubtful. To win either party must get more than half of this doubtful vote. Result, a few hundred votes more than a popular majority in New York swings about 10 percent of the votes in the electoral college. The Democrats have to win a majority in only a few States to control the electoral college. The Republicans have to win almost all the States of the North and West to control the college.

NEW YORK AN EXAMPLE

Now let us take New York as an example of several States north and west with large populations and large electoral votes. There are several small tightly knit political parties in New York. Separately they appear

unimportant. But united they cast some four or five hundred thousand popular votes. They are composed of voters tied together on racial, religious, or economic lines. Many of these voters cannot speak English. Many have never been west of the Hudson River. What has happened to their former homeland in Japan, China, Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Puerto Rico, or any one of a hundred foreign countries constitutes a voting issue with them. Or putting a relative on relief or getting one a job may be the determining factor. While America slept the coldest-blooded, most unscrupulous country in the world has worked at the top among the leaders of these people. So Russian communistic tyranny has greatly influenced and often controlled these splinter parties in New York.

Space is lacking to go into the now rather well-known Communist technique in dealing with American city and industrial politics. The Old World is run by executive dictatorship. And the men who came into control of the deliverable margin of splinter party voters in New York traded with both parties for jobs and for legislative policies. The Federal service has been filled for a fifth of a century with key men placed by these minority groups. The policies of the Government have been framed and carried out by these people. And Federal legislation has been shaped by them. Communist fellow-travelers, Socialists, radicals, parlor pinks, theorists, and liberals. If you wanted to know the direction of the executive departments of the Government you consulted the organs of these minority groups, the Nation, the New Republic and daily papers in New York and Chicago owned by Marshall Field, PM and the Chicago Sun.

All told these groups in New York and other key States probably commanded a million votes. But this million has been paramount in Federal policy and legislation. To those Democrats who sought the Presidency it gave the margin for victory, the last few inches in the race which put their horse first under the wire. Again these marginal voters have become so important in the minds of politicians that in a State like New York, for example, they virtually write the platforms and select the candidates for both of our great national parties. Willkie and Dewey in platform speeches and policies advocated, were largely "me too" candidates for the Presidency.

CATER TO FRINGE PARTY

Thus in most matters of national policy the votes of America are controlled by this splinter controlled 5 percent in presidential elections. The reason is that the majority are divided into two parties operating under Republican and Democratic labels. And the tragedy of the situation is that a Republican national victory under present party divisions would not insure control of America by a majority of its voters. It would probably be only a temporary thing. For the Republicans to hold office would immediately have to cater to this fringe element in the doubtful States.

To effect a permanent realignment of parties it is necessary for the South and the border States to move into a new party alignment. Three years ago some four Southern States moved away from old-line Republican and Democratic nominees to a States' rights Presidential ticket. States' rights, local self-government, has today more of an appeal North than it has South. For the Communist-Socialist elements in the North are seeking to have the National Government confiscate the earnings and the accumulations of the people of the wealthier States and distribute some of this money where it will buy the necessary margin of electoral votes in the poorer States. They want to use the power over taxes to destroy the initiative and savings of people everywhere. And to this end they have made some converts in the South.

A curious political condition exists in the United States today. Nine out of ten southern Democrats who work for their own living and have no connection with the several million Federal payrollers or officeholders know that they have nothing in common with either New Deal or Fair Deal national policies. The southern lawyer, merchant, farmer, worker in Alabama, Texas, Georgia has identical interests in national economic, social, and political problems with the lawyer, merchant, farmer, and worker of Kansas, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska. One votes a ticket with a Democratic label, the other a ticket with the Republican label, and thus they cancel out and kill one another's votes and allow a largely socialistic, alien minority element to govern our country.

NEGRO AND FOREIGN BORN

There has always been merit in a political issue which aimed at the protection of the weak and the poor. This issue has been variously used by the Republican Party to help and protect the Negro slaves and by the Democratic Party to help and protect the newly arrived immigrant. It is now being used by the New Deal party to join the Negro, who has been freed for almost a century, and the recently arrived immigrant to oppress old-time Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike. The fact is the old-time party divisions and issues no longer exist. The Negroes of America are better off than are any members of their race anywhere in the world, and our foreign born are far better off than are any of the people in the countries from which they came.

They are welcome to have a party and to vote as they please in this country. They may continue to control the Democratic Party in name. But when the message is taken to the old-time Democrat who votes 10 votes to their 1, the real Democratic Party will move away from them. This it should do. And the real Republican Party members should move away from its New Deal, Fair Deal Republicans and join with real Democrats who think as they do.

The people who can bring this about in the South and among Democrats are the rank and file of independent Democrats. When these independents associate themselves and let their local office holders, their governors, national committeemen, and their Federal Representatives and Senators know that they are in earnest there will be no difficulty in most instances in the South. The office holder naturally wants to hold his office. Moreover most of these southern Democratic officeholders are sick unto death of the things they have been forced to stand for and defend in their party's name. What's more, in a new victorious party they can continue to hold their patronage. That is the practical side. Today these southerners are really people without a party. There are very, very few "reactionary Republicans" who have not been more welcome at the White House and in our executive departments for 20 years past than have genuine southern Democrats. Very few of these real southern Democrats can run for office without either ignoring or repudiating their national administration. Socialism and communism are alien to the southern Democratic voter.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE THE ANSWER

While four out of five Americans will agree that there should be an amalgamation of people politically who think alike, a great many people are under the impression this would be hard or impossible to accomplish. This is not true. Those who spread this idea are those who favor the status quo, who profit from the splinter party racket. What counts for the election of a President is a majority of the national electoral college. And the electoral vote of each State in the Union can be controlled by the people of that State. And not a majority, but a plu-

rality of the voters of each State control the electoral vote. In the opinion of this writer whose lifetime has been spent in the South and Border States an amalgamation of the old-line Democrats and the old-line Republicans can carry almost every State in the Union, thus insuring the election of a President of their choice. This is neither a socialist nor a Communist country. And it may be that the loss of countless thousands of our young men, and safety from destruction of the liberties and the solvency of all the people of this country depends on some such program as this being worked out for our next presidential election.

As a college student I saw Grover Cleveland hand over the reins of government to William McKinley. Nearly forty years ago I attended my first national political convention. Subsequently I was privileged to take part as a delegate in a number of Democratic conventions. Of necessity I acquiesced in Franklin Roosevelt's first nomination. As a matter of conscience as well as conviction I could not support him, nor would I have supported anyone else for a third term. I accepted membership in a delegation to the Chicago Democratic Convention whose objective was opposition to Roosevelt for a fourth term. In that convention were many decent, high-grade patriotic men and women. Yet it represented an all-time low in national conventions. Its music and its program came from the political sewers of Washington and Chicago. In Hitler's palmy days he exerted no more control over the German Reichstag than was exerted by Roosevelt over this allegedly governing body of a once great national party. Roosevelt designated a Russian-born leader of one of New York's political minority blocks to pass on the eligibility of all candidates for Vice President. Roosevelt's payrollers and patronage beneficiaries were sufficiently numerous to insure his own nominations. A great element in the convention felt that Roosevelt was a sick, probably a dying man. The Wallace-for-President leaders acted as if they were convinced that in supporting Wallace they were nominating not a Vice President, but a President. Wallace came within an ace of being nominated. Truman was the only possible alternative choice because barring Wallace he was the only candidate with convention strength who had received the blessing of Sidney Hillman.

BUYING VOTES WITH TAX MONEY

I was born in the Shenandoah Valley. My father was a Confederate veteran. His only brother, a Confederate officer, served throughout the war and was killed in the fighting around Appomattox. I, like many others of southern descent, inherited my membership in the Democratic Party. It is a matter of conviction with me that a citizen should vote. So I voted for Willkie, for Dewey, and in the last election I voted with enthusiasm for the Southern States Rights ticket, Thurman and Wright.

I am now convinced that the next Democratic Convention will be controlled by officeholders, Government contractors, and beneficiaries of the present administration policy of buying alien and domestic influence with American tax money. To the extent of my small personal influence I will join with those independents who will work among the upstanding American elements of both parties to form a soundly progressive political party.

The Civil War should never have been fought. Almost a century has passed since it started. It was precipitated by a minority of hot heads and resulted from a splitting up of parties. Its result was economic slavery for black and white for several generations. If that war had not been fought slavery could not have lasted 20 years.

When America ceases to have in its population a majority of sane, patriotic, and

soundly progressive people this country will go the way of all the world leaders. It won't do for the outs to claim all the virtues and accuse the ins of all the corruption and decay which comes from too long terms of power.

The coalition of sound Democrats and of sound Republicans that exists today in the House and Senate furnishes the basis for a sound political party. For example, GEORGE and RUSSELL of Georgia, WHERRY and BUTLER of Nebraska, are able men, patriotic and independent and politically as well as personally honest. Many other examples could be cited. All men of this type should be kept in office by an amalgamated party. Only by the coalition and organization of independent men of both parties can a new party be brought into existence. Once the will is expressed by enough people the way can easily be found.

Our America at war, loaded with debt, oppressed by unprecedented taxes, threatened with destructive inflation, burdened with a growing executive dictatorship, can no longer afford the destruction of substance and liberty which demagogues and incompetents would continue to heap upon it.

Sound Democrats, sound Republicans and sound independents can no longer afford to be governed by splinter parties and divided by false issues or matters of no moment.

The real democracy of the South and of the Nation should organize and seek association with the real Republicans of the North. And the real Republicans should put aside their present hope of a partisan victory and align themselves with sound Democrats for the sake, not of political office but of the good of the United States of America. For at home and abroad we are in great peril.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the original tax bill passed earlier this year in this House. The Senate, unfortunately, mutilated that bill. For that reason today I voted against the tax bill in its final form.

Today's version raised a billion and a half less in revenue than did the original House bill. That is one important strike against it. And who benefits by that one and a half billion dollar slash? Twenty-three percent of this cut went to the people who earn less than \$5,000 a year. But 77 percent, or \$218,000,000 of this cut, goes to people with earnings over \$5,000 a year. That is not equality of sacrifice.

These are not the only things wrong with this bill which was rejected today. There was the complete exemption from any share of the defense tax load accorded to people with capital gains. These people—if they have net income of \$18,000 a year, if single—or, \$36,000 a year if married, pay no additional tax whatever on their capital gains under this bill. They receive an extra tax dividend of \$54,000,000 that would have been due under the House bill. Whereas people with less income pay an additional 11¾ percent on their capital gains.

There are many other features in this bill which caused a majority of the Members of the House to send it back for further consideration. Now the committee in charge will have to come back with a new report, probably later this week. Taxes should be based on an ability to pay, but my study of the bill offered today proved to me that the "ability to pay" principle was not applied in its writing.

Planning for Hospital and Health Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Dr. John W. Cronin, Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service, at the Christian County Medical Society, Hopkinsville, Ky., on August 28, 1951:

PLANNING FOR HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES

Each hour, each moment we stand on the threshold of the unknown. This statement holds true for each of us as individuals and also for all of us as a nation. It is in times such as these that our real worth as freemen becomes manifest.

The foundation upon which all of our great progress as a nation has been built has been our ability to plan for the future. In isolated instances the planning has been done by a single individual, but in the vast majority of times the planning has been the result of the work of many individuals, competent in many skills, getting together, working together, sharing trials and tribulations, but ever pushing forward to achieve the common goal for the betterment of all. That is democracy in action.

All planning is based on recognition of need. One of the greatest needs in our whole country today is adequate health services for our people. We need to maintain and improve the quality of our health services. Equally as important, we must extend the scope of these services so that they will be available to those in need of them. This is true in time of peace, but in time of potential war, hot or cold, it is imperative that the health resources of the Nation be mobilized to meet any catastrophe, great or small. Today atomic, bacteriological, radiological catastrophes are a concern of many of our communities. Those of us who deal with services to our fellow men in time of illness have an even greater duty during the preparation for the defense of our country.

It is well to take stock of some of the important aids available to the Nation in building up our health resources.

In 1946, by the action of the Seventy-ninth Congress and the President, Public Law 725 established the hospital survey and construction program. This program, known popularly as the Hill-Burton program, was designed basically to assist the States to provide needed hospital and health facilities in needy areas. These areas were primarily rural. The mechanics of this act have proven it to be one of the most soundly conceived statutes ever enacted by Congress in providing for local, State, and Federal cooperation in providing hospital services. It is admin-

istered on the State level with the local community retaining the incentive for local initiative and local operation of the completed nonprofit, nondiscriminatory, community-service type of facility. An inventory and analysis by the State of the existing facilities and definition of the need for additional facilities is required before Federal funds become available on a matching basis for construction purposes.

The State establishes the percentage of Federal funds to be made available annually for each project in its borders. The total amount of Federal funds granted to the respective States is determined by a formula in the law. The controlling factors, however, are population and per capita income of the State.

In 1949 the basic law was amended to include Federal aid for research in the field of hospital services. An appropriation to implement the amendment was under consideration at the outbreak of the hostilities in Korea. With the increased demands on the distribution of our Federal funds there has been no appropriation made available for this type of research.

As of July 31, 1951, a total of \$467,500,000 has been appropriated for hospital and health center construction. This has made possible the approval of 1,600 projects which will provide 77,000 additional hospital beds. An analysis of all the State plans shows that there are in existence today approximately 1,100,000 acceptable hospital beds and a deficit of nearly 830,000. In other words we have only about 54 percent of our needed hospital plant in this country at this time.

Of the 1,600 approved projects, 475 are completed and rendering a community service, 1,000 are under construction and 125 are still in the planning stage. Total construction costs are estimated at slightly more than \$1,200,000,000. The Federal share is about 36 percent of this amount.

Of all the projects approved, nearly three-fourths are for general hospitals. This includes new hospitals as well as additions, alterations, or remodeling of existing hospitals. Next in order are public health centers—about 15 percent, then mental hospital projects—about 5 percent, tuberculosis projects—3 percent, with only about 1 percent for chronic disease facilities.

It is apparent that most of the emphasis has been on general hospital facilities. About 55 percent of the general hospital projects are for completely new hospitals. Most of the new hospitals are being built in small towns and in the smaller cities, nearly 61 percent of the new general hospitals are located in towns of less than 5,000 population; only 7 percent are in cities of more than 50,000 people.

This, to me, points up the providential nature of the Hill-Burton program at this time. There is a duality of purpose noted. I pose the question, "Cannot these Hill-Burton hospitals be regarded as evacuation destinations for our potential target areas?" I hope we will never be called upon to put this statement to a test, but we may be. It certainly was not our original purpose.

Of the total Federal funds made available, \$15,551,132 has been allocated to Kentucky. State aid to communities has also been granted. To date, 47 projects have been approved; 28 are for general hospitals, of which half are completely new facilities. The balance is made up of projects that provide for the replacement of old buildings or for additions or alterations to existing general hospitals. Six projects are located in tuberculosis sanatoria and four provide additional psychiatric facilities. Seven health centers have been constructed, three of which are combined with new general hospitals.

Two of the projects are located in Hopkinsville and others in this section are at Clinton, Cadiz, Princeton, Owensboro, and

Leitchfield. With the exception of Owensboro, these projects will provide completely new facilities.

The provision in the Hill-Burton Act for survey and planning has proved to be one of the soundest features of the law. Each community fits into a pattern of service as outlined in the State plan. The community must determine the size of the facility that can be supported and the services to be included. The local community planning features are one of the major reasons why the Public Health Service believes that a program for what we now call defense-impacted areas, with increased populations, should follow the Hill-Burton concept. Service at the local level is the objective of the program for war-impacted areas. Therefore, advice from the communities where the affected people live is essential. Conversely, State and Federal advice to local planning groups is important if the planning is to be really effective. Those involved at all levels should take part in it, not simply be brought into the program after the plans are made.

In addition to the Hill-Burton program, with its obvious limitations for hospital construction in war-impacted areas there are several action programs designed to provide assistance.

The Federal Civil Defense Act does not contemplate the making of grants for hospital construction. It does provide for the incorporation of shelter areas or other construction designed to provide protection of the occupants against enemy attack. Funds, however, are very, very limited.

The bill sponsored by Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and Representative SPENCER, of Kentucky, known as the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act was passed by this Eighty-second Congress and signed by the President. Title III of his act relates to community facilities and resembles in some respects the Latham Act of World War II. The provisions of this act include hospital facilities and services for the care of the sick, as well as facilities for water, sewage, sanitation, and other community facilities. Federal funds in the amount of \$60,000,000 are provided for the construction, maintenance or operation of community facilities. In the case of assistance for hospital construction these funds will be available only if funds are not available under the Hill-Burton Act. This legislation also provides that maintenance and operation payments will not exceed the portion of the maintenance and operation expenses attributable to the national defense activities in the area. The act also specifies that the function, powers, and duties with respect to health, refuse disposal, sewage treatment, and water purification shall be exercised by and vested in the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. This latter proviso properly relates the health activities of those existing in regard to the Hill-Burton program. The success of this legislation depends entirely upon local, State, and Federal cooperation and coordination of hospital and health services—the kind of cooperation which has proven so eminently effective to date.

The communities in western Kentucky are affected by the defense activities currently taking place at Paducah, Camp Breckinridge, Camp Campbell, Fort Knox, and in the TVA areas. It is important that plans be made at once for health resources in this general area. Based on successful planning on other areas this may be accomplished as follows:

First form a planning committee. Community health planning has many facets. There is need for teamwork among many groups. The key groups are the medical societies and the trained and experienced local public-health officials. But these cannot do the job alone. The team must have representatives of volunteer health agencies,

other professional and educational groups, organizations concerned with fields related to health, and all those groups which might be called consumers of health services. The physicians properly should lead the way.

Second, gather factual data on existing resources and need. It is estimated that the peak population influx is expected to increase the population of affected communities in this section of Kentucky by about 50 percent. Hopkinsville has already had at least a 12-percent increase. Problems in sanitation, tuberculosis and venereal-disease control have already arisen. Hopkinsville has a sanitary land-fill system of refuse disposal but other communities in this area have less adequate systems.

Such matters as the role of insects as disease carriers and their control must always be considered.

Resources across State lines must be considered. For example, a 125-bed hospital is being constructed in Clarksville, Tenn., which may provide for patients from this area if adequate arrangements are made. Data should also be obtained on the provisions needed for mental, tuberculosis, and chronic-disease patients.

The Public Health Service in cooperation with Commissioner Bruce Underwood, of the Kentucky State Health Department, made a survey for the Atomic Energy Commission in February 1951 and recommended that 80 hospital beds and an additional nurses' residence were needed to care for the influx population in Paducah. These beds were proposed in addition to the expansion planned for Riverside Hospital under the Hill-Burton program. It is possible that a 100-bed Baptist hospital, begun some years ago, may be completed. If the fund drive for the Baptist hospital is successful and it is created, will there be a need for additional beds, and if so, how many?

These are typical questions for which answers must be sought by the local communities.

Third, bring to the attention of local community professional and lay groups for the joint study and solution of the problems and for the correlation of all programs and services affecting health: preventive, therapeutic, and environmental.

One successful method of filling in gaps in hospital services is by coordination and cooperation among hospitals. There is good evidence that the small hospital cannot—by itself—provide all of the services needed by the people it serves. A solution is to develop relationships among hospitals whereby the larger and more completely equipped can provide the smaller with the needed services.

The concept of a regional hospital coordination system includes many lines of affiliation and sharing among hospitals. For example, such a system envisions intern and resident physician services on a rotating basis to hospitals which otherwise would not have the advantage of such services (interns for small hospitals are a rare commodity today); the provision of consultation and part-time specialists services, including radiology, pathology, and other diagnostic services to small institutions; clinical conferences in small community hospitals; educational courses for all classes of hospital personnel; postgraduate training of physicians from small communities, provision for the search for knowledge related to modern hospital practice in administration and clinical services; stimulation and exchange of information on improved hospital administrative methods; group purchasing; uniform medical records and bookkeeping systems; joint planning of hospital and public-health programs. All these are directed toward better patient care and when combined with adequate hospital licensure programs are effective in achieving that goal. Coordination of facilities and services indicates the

need for a regional planning committee composed of representatives from each of the community planning bodies.

Out-patient departments may be used as a means of alleviating hospitalization in communities where the demand for beds exceeds the supply. Home-care programs have aided in this regard. Out-patient service provides one of the best means for hospital participation in preventive medicine, particularly in the fields of mental illness, venereal disease, and tuberculosis. Rehabilitation services started early and adequately conducted shortens hospital stay and permits return of the individual to an economically competent status. The results of this type of service pay big dividends especially in State and other governmentally supported institutions.

Fourth, interpret the findings to the public. Constant efforts should be made to increase public participation in planning. In this way valuable health education may be accomplished relative to the proper use of existing services and facilities.

Fifth, develop methods of effective implementation of the plan. The best method to assure this is through education of all the people in the community of the need for it. Planned publicity of the educational type, combined with planned public relations of a high order, are of great value.

The objective of community planning should be to make available to every individual the curative and preventive benefits of medical science at its best. Preventive medicine is a function of every physician and every hospital. Diagnosis, treatment, restoration to health, rehabilitation, prevention of disease and health promotion, and health maintenance are the obligations assumed by every physician. The hospital should be the health center of the community. It is the mobilization depot of modern medical science. The practice of medicine should not be confused with the business of medicine by the physician or the hospital administrator; however, the relationships must be understood.

A community health program which combines curative and preventive aspects to attain health promotion and health maintenance will be not only of inestimable value to the defense effort but also pay two great dividends to the sick and the well at any time. The accomplishment of this objective will require dynamic leadership, imagination and cooperative effort of the highest order.

In closing I think it is appropriate to recall the official motto of this great industrial and agricultural State: "United we stand, divided we fall."

Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Yale University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as an alumnus of Yale University I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a short statement on the achievements of this great educational institution on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its establishment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

Yale University is 250 years old today.

This great university grew from a little school founded 250 years ago in a farmhouse at Branford, Conn., and it descends in a direct line from such ancient seats of learning as the University of Paris, from Cambridge and Oxford.

The whole ideal of the university is rooted deeply in Western civilization—older than parliaments, older than the modern state itself—and over the centuries it has assumed many functions. It has been a refuge for scholars, a treasure house of facts, an incubator of new ideas and ideals. It has been the preserver, propagator and perpetuator of human wisdom.

The proper function of the university, wrote Newman, is "teaching universal knowledge." United States universities have sometimes gotten away from that maxim, but the return to the teaching of universal knowledge is well under way, and nowhere is it more visible than in Yale. It is most obvious in Yale's imposing facilities—toplight schools of law, medicine, divinity, the Nation's oldest forestry school, the world's second largest university library.

Universities such as Yale, of which I am an alumnus, perform a special function, it seems to me, in trying times such as today. They keep alive the spirit of free inquiry into fact and of free discussion of fact. Academic freedom is preserved at Yale—at a time when the free expression of opinion is being curtailed for many, even in America.

We are fortunate that such citadels of freedom as will be found at Yale still exist. And we must resolve that this always will be so.

The Government In Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Dr. Max Seham, which appeared in a recent issue of the Reporter on the Government in Medicine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Dr. Seham, who has an outstanding reputation as a pediatrician, is associated with the University of Minnesota Medical School and is an outstanding citizen of our State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT IN MEDICINE

(By Max Seham, M. D.)

Over the air, in newspapers, magazines, and political speeches, the American people are incessantly warned about Government interference with the private practice of medicine. It is menacing, they are told—incompatible with the "American way of life," the first step toward the "welfare state." The President's program for national health is "Kremlin-inspired," "socialistic and communistic," "inciting to revolution."

Is all this true? Would the President's program "enslave the medical profession and

cause a deterioration in the quality of medical care"? The American Medical Association, from whose literature these quotations are taken, thinks so.

Many Americans, whatever their motivations, close their eyes to the true reasons for Government participation in promoting the health of the people. No administration, Republican or Democratic, has ever attempted to "enslave the medical profession." Except in war or depression, the Government has "encroached" upon private practice only when a local community or a State has been too short of funds, personnel, or enthusiasm to cope with a situation. We Americans have short memories indeed if we have forgotten what happened during the depression. Who can forget the idle factories, the millions of unemployed, and the poverty which produced widespread deficiencies in diet, neglect of teeth, and the postponement of necessary treatment of disease? Without Government cooperation, private physicians and voluntary health agencies would have reached an impasse, and the foundations of this country's health might have been destroyed.

Thousands of farmers, unemployed workers, and their families were furnished free medical care out of general taxation. In spite of all dire predictions, when the emergency was over the Government withdrew and the status quo was restored.

PARTNERSHIP

The partnership between Government and the medical profession began in 1798, when Congress enacted a law protecting the health of merchant mariners. This first system of compulsory health insurance arose from the provision of the Constitution giving the Congress power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare. . . ." It was based upon the principle that the Federal Government could provide medical services and hospitalization, financed by a payroll tax and general taxation, for certain classes of self-supporting citizens.

In the next 50 years the line of demarcation between public and private medicine was sharp. The attitude was "The business of the public-health officer is to prevent disease, the business of the private physician is to cure it." Public-health agencies—first Federal, then State—limited their activities to quarantine, sanitation, and the prevention of epidemics.

INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

In frontier days more than two-thirds of the people lived in rural areas. With the Industrial Revolution tremendous changes took place in the social and economic status of the majority of the citizens. Overcrowded living quarters became disease-producing slums; great factories were foci of many preventable diseases and occupational hazards. Workers in mines, in smelters, and on railroads demanded more adequate protection from industrial accidents. The medical resources of industry were insufficient, and the medical needs of the families of employees were neglected. The health conditions of thousands of workers became so flagrantly bad that for its own protection management hired medical personnel to establish what is now known as industrial medicine.

Survey after survey by disinterested experts revealed that illness hit hardest among the groups least able to meet the cost of medical care. The poorer the family the less care it received. Chronic disabilities, particularly hernia, tuberculosis, varicose veins, blindness, and deafness, were much more prevalent in the low-income groups. Disparities in the infant-mortality rates between Negroes and whites and between the Southern and Northern States reflected the differences in the amount and quality of medical care.

In the first decades of this century, militant action brought about a number of health reforms. Public opinion, lay and pro-

fessional, became more acutely aware of the fact that poverty and disease were tandem evils: that poverty was responsible for sickness, and that sickness in turn produced poverty. Health organizations, national and local, public and voluntary, medical and lay, were formed in large numbers, especially in the big cities. Churches rendered invaluable services by building and maintaining non-sectarian hospitals. Venereal diseases, blindness, deafness, physical handicaps, polio, and mental illnesses soon became focal points of attack. Practically all these voluntary health activities had nothing to do with the Government at the beginning. It soon became clear, however, that only with Government help, either through general taxation or grants-in-aid to the States, could there be any hope of solving such national problems as tuberculosis, infant and maternal mortality, immunization against contagious diseases, and old-age and mental diseases.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

There can be no doubt that national and local voluntary foundations and agencies, either alone or with the cooperation of Federal and State public-health agencies, prevent much suffering and illness. But there is no standardization of techniques and services. Administration is largely in the hands of amateurs. These volunteer efforts arise in a blaze of glory and collapse because of loss of interest or lack of funds. The trend is toward more Government participation, not less.

The real issue today, political sophistry and propaganda aside, is not whether the Government should help fight those diseases labeled "hands off" by the medical guild, but how far it should go. The American medical system today is a mixture of what may be called limited state medicine—or socialization through Government financing and/or control—and private practice. Each is indispensable to the other. Both are responsible for the splendid progress this country has made in the science and art of medicine during the last half century.

In 1949 America spent nearly \$9,500,000,000 for medical care. Of this more than \$7,000,000,000 was spent for private care and more than \$2,000,000,000 for Government medicine out of general taxation.

The accomplishments of Government in the field of health are too many and too far reaching to record in detail. The United States Public Health Service in Washington alone is responsible for 40 health units. It furnishes emergency health services to Federal employees, including Senators and Congressmen. Its research covers a multitude of subjects, among them cancer, spotted fever, typhus, mumps, yellow fever, and, more recently, diabetes, heart disease, and arthritis. This Federal bureau has the approval of the most rabid "free enterprisers."

Over 19,000,000 veterans have access to Federal medical care, which is a joint enterprise of full-time Army physicians and part-time civilian physicians. About 78 percent of all the hospital beds in the country are controlled or financed by Federal, State, or local governments. In New York City alone about 50 percent of the people get their medical services through Federal, State, or municipal funds. In more recent years Federal participation has extended the care of the chronically ill—those suffering from tuberculosis, mental diseases, leprosy, heart disease, infantile paralysis, or cancer. Thanks to workmen's compensation insurance, workers who are victims of occupational diseases and accidents are now freed of the worry of becoming public charges.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

Opposition to this trend has precipitated the question: When does any health program become the responsibility of the Government? There is no disagreement whatsoever about the role of Government as re-

gards sanitation, the control of communicable diseases, and the like. Nor is there much dispute about the principle of public responsibility for adequate medical care. But there are wide differences of opinion as to the extent to which the principle should be applied, and as to the forms of organization that would best serve the purpose.

Twenty-five years ago the armamentarium of a physician was his bag of drugs, his prescription pad, and his stethoscope. Today he needs nurses, technicians, and secretaries to function efficiently. He must call freely on a variety of specialists. The use of laboratories, X-ray, expensive new drugs, and many other diagnostic and therapeutic aids is also reflected in the patient's bill. It is not that physicians overcharge or that the services are not worth the price; it is merely that the purchasing power of the patient has not increased as fast as the cost of medical care.

THE MEDICALLY INDIGENT

In 1946 about 13 percent of all families, representing 18,000,000 people, had an annual money income of less than a thousand dollars. It is extremely unlikely that any of these families could pay for all necessary medical care.

Another 15 percent, or about 22,000,000, had incomes between one and two thousand dollars. This group might be able, with hardship, to pay for some medical care through the reduction of charges by their physicians and with the help of some prepaid voluntary insurance plans.

Nearly 20 percent, or 28,000,000, had incomes in 1946 of between two and three thousand dollars, and 31 percent between three and five thousand. In other words, about 79 percent of all families recorded in the 1946 survey had incomes below \$5,000. When we say that people in the \$2,000-\$5,000 bracket can afford voluntary prepaid health insurance, we must understand that this is not total coverage. It is limited to hospitalization, surgery, and obstetrical care. The insured receive no home or office visits, which obviously have the first call on the family budgets. Only one conclusion can be drawn from the above figures: that 40,000,000 people in families with an annual income below \$2,000 are certainly medically indigent. Probably another twenty medically indigent. Probably another 20,000,000 with incomes of \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year will have a great difficulty paying for medical care.

Even with the rise in dollar income since 1946, the possibility of heavy expense for hospital and medical care is a source of great insecurity and anxiety to about 75 percent of the American people. Under such circumstances society owes it to itself to take organized action in behalf of the sick individual and the community. If the individual cannot meet his health needs, the local community should; if the local community cannot, the State should; and if the State cannot, the Federal Government should and must.

CHILD HEALTH

Another controversial phase of this question centers around the health of our children. A generation ago it was the consensus of health departments and medical societies that only the children of the indigent should be furnished services for the prevention of contagious diseases with State or Federal aid. For many years the problem of mass immunization was left to the private physician. Because of the dollar barrier and because the private physicians were unable to reach a sufficiently large part of the population, especially in rural areas, the community as a whole was not protected, and many children were sacrificed.

In 1932, fewer than 20 percent of the school children in a midwestern city had been immunized against smallpox. Overnight, smallpox struck. Within a month, more than

2,000 adults and children were down with it. As usual, people clamored for a padlock after the horse was stolen.

Today any child, rich or poor, not only has access to free vaccination but also to free immunization against all the contagious diseases whose prevention is known. This service is paid for from public funds. All families have the free choice between their private doctors and the public clinic. In such a situation, no hard and fast lines can be drawn between preventive and curative care, between public and private medicine. Wherever public health has joined hands with private medicine the former has furnished the funds and the facilities, and private physicians have administered care unhampered and for remuneration. The Government or the State limits its role to financing, and to seeing that the patient gets the service. There has never been any attempt to dictate to the doctor how he should practice his art. Nor has the fear of loss of income proved a problem. Because of public education and exhortation, people get to know more about health needs and more people come to the private doctors to fulfill those needs. Today the private doctor takes care of a much larger number of well infants and examines many more school children in his office than ever before.

The best authorities are of the opinion that dependence upon the private doctor alone to diagnose and treat defects in school children resulted in the large number of draft rejections during the last war. To quote former Surg. Gen. Thomas Parran of the United States Public Health Service: "There has been almost no progress during the last 25 years in the decrease of incidence of physical defects amongst school children." The present system of medical inspection in our public schools is woefully inadequate, particularly in small towns and rural areas, a fact brought sharply to light in the 1938-1940 survey by the United States Office of Education. Of 487 cities ranging in population from 10,000 to 30,000, only 73 percent employed full-time nurses and 36 percent had no school physicians. In the majority of the schools the inspections were found to be superficial and casual, frequently over the clothing. With few exceptions, the services were found to be limited to first-aid diagnosis, and advice on nutrition and health habits.

For over 50 years there has been the same laying on of hands, the same recording of defects on cards, the same finding and re-finding of defects. Obviously there is little use in inspecting without correcting. Why diagnose defective vision and not furnish glasses? Why record diseased tonsils and not have them taken out? The incidence of physical and mental defects will never be decreased without the assistance of State or Federal programs.

THE PHYSICIAN SPEAKS

Thus far I have spoken as a citizen. I also have a vested interest in this matter as a physician. In this capacity I have no fear whatsoever that the Government will swallow me "lock, stock, and barrel." As a practitioner of medicine for 40 years I have learned to regard Uncle Sam, M. D. as a fair and ethical consultant rather than as an aggressive competitor. Many a time during my four decades of observation, Uncle Sam has given life-saving transfusions to citizens en masse. I see no reason why we of the medical profession should consider the Government agencies and the voluntary agencies to be opposing and hostile forces.

Although it must be admitted that the majority of the medical profession, as represented by organized medicine, distrust and resist Government efforts in behalf of the sick individual, the rank and file, especially the more recent graduates, are becoming less resistant to "Government interference" with private practice. They are beginning to

realize that public clinics and health centers will benefit them professionally and financially. Many physicians now receive a considerable part of their income from public sources.

HEALTH: A NATIONAL RESOURCE

In this day of world crisis, the waste of our manpower through illness and death is a threat to our very existence. A national health program on a long-term basis to supply adequate medical care for the bulk of our population is a national concern. It cannot be accomplished by advertising campaigns, slogans of hate, and threats against the Government. Nor can we reach our goal by using horse-and-buggy methods of medical distribution. It is imperative that we dedicate ourselves to the search for what is best for the Nation as a whole, rather than for ourselves as individuals or groups. It is time that we surrendered our hates and our prejudices against the Government and approached this urgent domestic problem of the Nation's health in the spirit of the scientist—objectively, and in search of the facts.

In the words of Dr. Charles-Edward Avery Winslow, an eminent public-health officer, "Is it not possible that politics and polemics and paid propaganda may be laid aside and that the statesmanship of competent experts may establish a sound policy of directed gradualism leading to ultimate solution of this most urgent problem of midcentury public health?"

Conservation of Our Water and Land Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, having served as a member of the Committees of the House of Representatives on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, and Irrigation and Reclamation, and having served as president and chairman of the board of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, I am tremendously interested in conservation and utilization of all our water and land resources.

With our increasing population and increasing demands, not only in the domestic consumption, but in foreign commitments, I know that we must do everything in our power to make our Nation strong. No war can be successfully waged without a sound economy at home. While wanting the good will and friendship of all nations we know we cannot become strong by giving away everything that we have.

America is a broad and diversified land with many requirements. We must consider not only our domestic water supply, irrigation, land drainage, navigation, flood control, development of hydroelectric power, conservation of our timber, grazing lands, crop production, soil conservation, and stream pollution control, but all other aspects related to the conservation and utilization of all our land and water resources.

It is to be hoped that the many benefits that shall be derived in the future

will be for our own citizens first, before scattering our hard-earned earnings all over the world.

Early in 1950, President Truman appointed the Water Resources Policy Commission. That Commission was made up of very outstanding engineers and educators who studied the problem extensively and intensively for over a year.

On last May 11, Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer, Department of Water and Power of Los Angeles, Calif., delivered an address before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress giving us the essence of that commission's report.

Let it be thoroughly understood, sir, that I do not agree with everything in the speech delivered by Mr. Morris, or the report by the commission, but I do think that so much valuable information is given in the address by Mr. Morris that it should receive the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. Whether one agrees or disagrees he will certainly appreciate the fund of information revealed, and will want to carefully consider the suggestions made.

The above-mentioned follows:

THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION

(By Samuel B. Morris)

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has long been primarily interested in the historic policy of the United States in developing and maintaining its waterways in order to promote its commerce and industry and its military strength and defenses.

Economically developed navigable waterways, accompanied by low-cost shore handling facilities, frequently offer the cheapest mode of transportation of bulk raw materials and heavy commodities basic to agricultural and industrial production. Of course, both water and land transportation are vital to the maintenance and growth of the Nation's commerce and defense. Sound national transportation policy as well as sound national water policy require that our navigable water resources be developed and used to the fullest economic extent.

Continuing Federal interest is shown by total Federal expenditures for the improvement of rivers and harbors. From the beginning in 1824 through June 30, 1948, these expenditures amounted to \$3,400,000,000, of which construction cost was \$2,200,000,000 and maintenance and operation \$1,200,000,000. Of these expenditures, nearly \$1,200,000,000 was for construction of inland and intercoastal waterways, requiring about half this sum for operation and maintenance. These figures in themselves amply indicate that the public should be interested in the Federal Government's program for river and harbor improvements.

Historically the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has had jurisdiction over rivers and harbors. Though Congress established the Mississippi River Commission in 1879, it was not until after the major floods of 1915-16 that funds were appropriated for the construction of a levy system in the lower Mississippi River Valley. The 1917 act provided for an expenditure of \$45,000,000. Prior to the 1930's major expenditures for flood control were made by the United States only on the Mississippi River, the Sacramento River in California, and Lake Okechobee in Florida.

Under the direction of Congress in 1925, and beginning with the authorization and appropriations in the 1927 River and Harbor Act, the Army engineers have prosecuted extensive surveys of those navigable streams

and their tributaries where power development appears feasible and practicable. The objective was the formulation of general plans for improvement of navigation and the carrying out of such improvement in combination with the efficient development of potential water power, the control of floods and provision for the needs of irrigation. By June 30, 1949, 191 streams had been surveyed and reported upon, leaving only 3 percent of the work to be completed.

With this adoption of the 1936 Flood Control Act, the United States embarked upon a broad flood control policy and program, including construction of reservoirs and treatment of watersheds, provided that local agencies furnished the rights of way, agreed to save the United States harmless against damage, and agreed to maintain the works. In 1938 Congress broadened these provisions and, under certain conditions, permitted the United States to make the total expenditures for reservoir regulation and to maintain the works.

Between July 1, 1936 and June 30, 1949, the expenditures by the Army engineers for flood control exceeded \$1,750,000,000, over one-half the amount spent in the preceding period of more than a century in Federal navigation improvements. These projects included the installation of 1½ million kilowatts of hydroelectric power. These heavy expenditures indicate the interest of the United States and of the public in flood control as well as navigation.

While the membership of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been mostly interested in navigation, flood control, and incidental power development, it will be helpful to appraise the economic development of water resources for all uses, and to consider an entire river and its drainage area and all needs for water with related land uses within that area.

Water falls on the forests and pasture land of the mountainous areas, and on the hills and valleys, and runs off the land to the streams and rivers. With rainfall and runoff there is some erosion. It has been so throughout geologic time. The physiography of the country as we see and know it is largely the result of erosion of the high lands and the filling of the fertile valleys. Forest growth, pasture land, and farm land affect the quantity, distribution, and quality of the water which enters the soil or runs off to the rivers for later use by man.

Constructing works on a river, diverting water to cities and to industries, or turning it onto lands, and the subsequent return of much of this water to the river, affects not only the river itself but the economy, health, and welfare of the entire population within the drainage area and adjacent to the river. The river thus has a vital effect upon all the people and the economy within the basin in much the same manner that the blood supply and vascular system affects all activities of the human body, including life itself.

The problems of the interdependence of water and related land uses on the river systems and within the drainage basins of the United States, are now recognized as being of deepest import to this Nation. Indeed they are fundamental, for upon their proper solution, millions of Americans of the future must depend for actual survival.

To give the broadest consideration to these problems, Mr. Truman in January 1950 appointed the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. This Commission's studies, extending over a period of a year, have sought to correlate the experiences of this Nation in the uses of its land and water resources, and on the basis of present and future needs to make recommendations for a national policy to guide the actions of Government from this point on.

Perhaps it will be helpful first to view quantitatively the picture for the Nation as

a whole. Upon the area of the continental United States of about 1,935,000,000 acres falls an annual average of 30 inches of precipitation. Of this amount, 21 inches is lost to the atmosphere by evaporation and transpiration. The remainder, about 9 inches in depth, runs off to the sea, in the average amounting to 1,300,000,000 gallons of water per day, about a third of which has penetrated the soil to appear again in the form of ground water. Domestic uses constitute about 1 percent of the available water supply. All uses, including those of industry and irrigation, total about 10 percent of the average annual runoff, as nearly as is known. Unfortunately, there is no national agency that collects and publishes all data on use and consumption of water, in the manner that the Federal Power Commission accounts for total power capacity and kilowatt hours sold for various uses. It is something of a paradox that electricity, the rather mysterious form of energy which we cannot see, can be measured more accurately and be more fully accounted for than the very tangible elemental substance, water.

To speak of average annual rainfall or runoff, however, omits from discussion the important factors of unequal areal distribution, and the great variations through the seasons, from year to year, and for long cycles of years. Much of the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian constituting the 17 western States, receives less than 20 inches of rainfall. West of the Rockies there is generally 6 months of summer with almost no rainfall, requiring the irrigation of crops. There are, however, some areas of the Far West with more than 100 inches of rainfall, still others with less than 5 inches, some with 100-inch depth of runoff, some with none. Problems of storage, regulation and long-distance transportation of water from areas of surplus to areas of need are usual not only in the arid West but frequent in the humid East, particularly where there are large aggregations of population in cities and metropolitan areas.

In the rapid growth of our Nation, we have been profligate with its natural resources. Timber, gas, oil, fertile topsoil, iron, copper, and other metals and minerals have been exploited with all too little thought of conservation. Water, land, and air are the continuously renewable resources required by human, animal, and vegetable life. The continuing increase in population of the Nation results in ever increasing need for these natural resources. War and national defense make for increased requirements and demands. It is, therefore, not untimely for the Nation to give renewed interest and consideration to its water and related land uses.

Our Nation has led in production by the efficiency of the private enterprise system. It is the province of government, however, to provide the plans and means under which there will be continuously available water and land to provide adequate forests for our timber, grazing lands for cattle and sheep, and fertile lands to produce food and fiber for ever-increasing populations and we hope for ever-increasing standards of living. In time of national emergency this responsibility is greatly increased in order to make our Nation strong enough to resist enemy attack and to wage war when it becomes necessary. Private enterprise must have these fundamental natural resources in abundance and at reasonable cost in order to produce.

At the present time we are intensely engaged in increasing our armament. The pressure to make the best use of time, materials, and financing to advance the defense effort will undoubtedly lessen the immediate construction budget for Federal water projects. But this same period should give us the "creative pause" we need for collection of more adequate data, and for more thorough planning and consideration of water and

land-use policies for projects best designed to meet the new conceptions of expanding population and industries, which we may expect in the immediate decades to come.

The development of the Nation's water and land-use policies began on the individual-project basis. These individual projects have been for domestic water supply, for irrigation, for land drainage, for navigation, for flood control, for hydroelectric power, for timber, grazing, and crop production, for soil conservation, and for stream-pollution control. Such developments have been by individuals, by corporations, municipalities, and other local government, and by the United States. Such development has frequently produced dual-purpose projects such as domestic water supply with incidental power development. Projects of this kind were effected by San Francisco and Los Angeles with their great aqueducts conveying water from the High Sierras to these cities and producing power through aqueduct hydroelectric plants. Many irrigation projects have also provided for incidental power development. Many flood-control and navigation projects similarly have been combined in dual purposes.

The Boulder Canyon project was, however, the first great multiple-purpose water-resource development, combining most of these objectives into a single program. Construction of this project, of which the Hoover Dam is the major structure, began only 20 years ago. This dam storing nearly 2 years' flow of the Colorado River, provides flood control and silt control to the irrigated lands adjacent to the lower river. It provides irrigation for a million acres of land and hydroelectric power of more than 1,000,000 kilowatts, and an average of about 5,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. Though construction of the Colorado River aqueduct by the metropolitan water district of southern California water is being conveyed to 32 cities from Los Angeles to San Diego with a population of more than 3,500,000. While this aqueduct is at present being used only to about 20 percent of its capacity, the full capacity of a billion gallons per day will ultimately provide water supply for more than 5,000,000 people. This supply added to local water and waters imported from the Sierras will provide for a population of not less than 8,000,000 on the coastal plain of southern California. Truly the benefits of the great multiple-purpose Boulder Canyon water project, built by the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and being paid for in full by water and power users of the area served, is still one of the best examples of multiple-purpose water developments.

Beginning in the early thirties, and urged on by the depression, a large number of multiple-purpose water projects were conceived, designed, and constructed or under construction by the United States, including such well-known works as Bonneville, Grand Coulee, McNary, and Chief Joseph Dams on the Columbia River, and Fort Peck and the many dams under construction on the Missouri River. These projects have been divided between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers as constructing agencies. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the conception, planning, and management of its coordinated river development have developed the Tennessee River in a truly great single coordinated enterprise, approaching a billion dollars in expenditures for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and improved land use practices.

The basic laws under which the several Federal agencies operate are dissimilar, and have been fundamentally drafted upon the single-purpose rather than multiple-purpose project basis. The fiscal requirements for authorization and repayment have varied greatly under Federal authorizations depending, in part, upon the construction agency selected. In general, domestic and industrial water projects and hydroelectric projects

have met their full costs returnable with interest in 40 to 50 years; however, there have been several domestic water projects authorized which are to return to the United States the capital cost in 40 years without interest.

The Reclamation Law of 1902 with its many amendments now provides that projects may be authorized if the cost allocated to irrigation is returned without interest in 40 years plus a 10-year development period. In general, low-cost irrigation projects able to meet the above standards cannot now be found. To meet increased costs beyond the ability of the irrigator to pay, the general taxpayer has been called upon to subsidize these irrigation projects largely through foregoing the so-called interest component and applying this interest to the retirement of irrigation capital by increased power rates and other means. Many bills providing for specific projects have also provided for longer periods of repayment without interest, in some cases as long as 75 years or more. While the opportunities of land drainage are comparable to the opportunities for irrigation, little has been done under national policy. Land drainage has largely been accomplished by local districts.

Prior to 1936, the Federal Government participated in flood control only on the lower Mississippi River, the Sacramento River, and Lake Okechobee in Florida. In that year the first flood control act was adopted under which the United States would carry the entire cost of flood control construction, provided that local agencies procured the rights-of-way, agreed to operate the works, and to save the Government harmless against damages. Only 2 years later, in 1938, the act was further amended to enable the United States, under certain conditions connected with flood control storage projects, to carry the entire costs without any local assessment or contributions.

Improvement of navigation, the preservation of fish and wildlife, and provision for public recreation have also received the consideration of the Federal Government in the planning and development of water projects. Navigation of inland waterways has been supported by the Federal Government ever since 1824 and the improved waterways are free from toll. Under an amendment to the reclamation law, Federal expenditures for fish and wildlife have been declared non-reimbursable. Effort has also been made to declare expenditures for recreational purposes, silt control, general salinity control, transportation, national defense as non-reimbursable, but no general act has so far made such provisions. In a number of special acts authorizing particular projects, recreation has been included as a non-reimbursable expenditure.

The dense industrialized population in such areas as the Ohio River Valley where almost 50 percent of the total flow of the river at low flow has been through industrial processes or sewers has intensified the problems of stream pollution control. The 1948 Water Pollution Control Act declares it a congressional policy to recognize the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution. A program of financial assistance by the Federal Government, however, is provided through loan of money to local governmental agencies at low rates of interest, and through the appropriation of funds allocated to States for conducting investigations, research, and studies related to the control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes.

Confronted with these conflicting provisions of individual statutes providing for piecemeal plans of water development in the United States, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission early in 1950 began its work. President Truman named seven men to serve on this Commission.

Morris L. Cooke, consulting engineer of Philadelphia was named Chairman. Others appointed on the Commission were Dr. Paul S. Burgess, dean, college of agriculture, University of Arizona, a biochemist, Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president, University of Arkansas, an economist; Leland Olds, former member of the Federal Power Commission; Dr. Roland R. Renne, president of Montana State College, a land economist; Dr. Gilbert F. White, president of Haverford College, a geographer, and Samuel B. Morris, general manager, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, an engineer.

The Commission was asked to make recommendations for a comprehensive policy of water resources and related land-use development, giving particular consideration to (1) The extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water resources programs, (2) An appraisal of water-resources priority program from the standpoint of economic and social needs; (3) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of such projects, (4) desirable legislation, or changes in existing legislation.

The Commission immediately met in Washington in January of 1950 and organized a staff of about 50. The staff, largely gathered from Federal departments and bureaus, and universities, was organized into a series of committees in each major field, such as, basic data, coordination of planning and projects, water resources policies involving land use, economics of inland water navigation, etc. One of the committees was on the evaluation of selected typical water-resources projects already constructed, to furnish experience of successes and failures as guides to future project selection policy. One of the very important committees was on water law. In nearly every instance the chairman of the committee was a staff member of the Commission.

At its first meeting the Commission decided to open the doors of its discussions to every available angle of public and private opinion. The Commission sought to tap technical, economic, and social knowledge by establishing relations with a great variety of sources. Questionnaires were sent to faculties of many colleges and universities, to each of the 48 governors, to departments and bureaus of the Federal Government, to engineering, economic, and scientific societies.

Eight field conferences were held in widely separated areas: Sioux City, Iowa, Spokane, Wash., Berkeley, Calif., Denver, Colo., Fayetteville, Ark., Columbus, Ohio, Springfield, Mass., and Atlanta, Ga. More than 2,000 people attended the regional conferences, and 500 individuals expressed themselves on various phases of water resources development programs and policies.

In recommending a basis for action in dealing with the country's water resources, the Commission sought to look into the needs of a selected region, and to examine the possible effects of proposed policies upon that region and its communities. This was done by studying 10 river basins selected for diversity of size, hydrology, economic needs, and water-development possibilities. The basins selected were the Columbia, Central Valley of California, Colorado, Rio Grande, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, Alabama-Coosa, Potomac, and Connecticut. For each of these basins, representing all the major sections of the United States, the interested Federal agencies were asked to pool their information and experience in stating the problems of the basin and in suggesting outlines of program which might be expected to contribute most helpfully to its future development. In these cooperative appraisals the Commission brought to bear all of the accumulated findings, the hundreds of State and Federal surveys. From these have come a series of 10 portraits which are printed in the second volume of the Commission's report.

The first volume of the report of the Commission was filed December 1, 1950, under the title "A Water Policy for the American People" and consisted of 445 pages. A summary of recommendations in the form of a 24-page pamphlet was released with the first volume on December 17. Volume 2, entitled "Ten Rivers in America's Future," 801 pages, and volume 3, "Water Resources Law," 777 pages, were both released during February 1951. The Commission has completed its work, including the draft of a proposed Water Resources Act but which has not yet been released. The Commission considers itself discharged.

The Water Resources Policy Commission early came to the conclusion that the river basin should be the fundamental unit for comprehensive planning of water and related land uses. It recommended that a uniform policy be applied to all water and land-use development irrespective of the Federal agency which may have jurisdiction. This, of course, would be simplified if the recommendations of the Hoover Commission should be adopted. It will be recalled that the Hoover Commission task force recommended the creation of a new natural resources department and that all water resource agencies be placed in the new department under a secretary member of the President's Cabinet. The Hoover Commission itself recommended that all Federal water resource agencies be placed in the Department of the Interior.

President Truman's instructions to the Water Resources Policy Commission asked that it confine its studies and recommendations to matters of policy and not to organization, as the Hoover Commission had reported on organization. However, the Water Resources Policy Commission did find it necessary to make some recommendations involving organization, without necessarily changing the existing structure of Federal agencies having to do with water-resources development. One recommendation calls for the creation of river basin commissions under the guidance of an independent chairman appointed by the President, with membership on these commissions representing the affected States and the Federal agencies in the field of water-resource development. These commissions would be responsible for Federal, State, and local cooperation in comprehensive plans for best utilization of water and land resources of each river basin. The commissions would coordinate the work of all Federal agencies operating in the basins.

Another recommendation proposes a Federal Board of Review to coordinate the functions of the river-basin commissions and prescribe uniform standards of evaluation, authorization, and reimbursement, and to assure carrying out of the single, uniform national water-resources policy. The Board of Review would study and evaluate all requests for authorization of surveys, plans, projects, or programs before submission to the President for transmission to Congress. Projects would only be authorized by acts of Congress.

Each river-basin commission would prepare estimates of cost of projects and estimated benefits, both direct and indirect. In addition to a statement of all monetary costs and benefits, each commission would describe such other costs, detriments, and benefits as are not subject to monetary evaluation for transmission to the Board of Review.

The Board would submit annual reports consolidating basin-committee requests. It would continually survey all Federal legislation and functions relating to water-resource development, with a view toward seeking legislative changes to eliminate conflicts and inconsistencies and to continually improve the Nation's water and land resources.

Another recommendation is for a standard uniform system of accounting which

would show at the project level, the river-basin level, and the national level, capital, operation, and maintenance costs, and allocations of cost to the various uses, such as irrigation, domestic water supply, power, flood control, etc. All capital, operation, and maintenance, and interest costs would thus be clearly shown by projects, and would be aggregated by basins. The recommendation emphasizes financial accountability and stresses local and State participation not only in the planning and administration of projects but in contribution toward their cost.

I have briefly related earlier in this paper existing policies regarding repayment. The Water Resources Policy Commission recommends that the following principles govern repayment to the United States on new water-resources projects:

Domestic and industrial water supply: Essentially a matter of local concern and responsibility, but where construction is by the United States, the beneficiaries should repay the United States the entire allocation of cost to these uses within 50 years, with interest equal to that paid by the United States on long-time borrowings.

Power: Beneficiaries should repay with interest in 50 years, the same as in the case of domestic and industrial water supply.

Reclamation: Reclamation by either irrigation or drainage should be on an equal basis, and the beneficiaries should repay the United States, without interest and within their maximum ability to pay, the cost allocated to irrigation or drainage. The benefited States and local areas should make payments for reimbursement to the United States through the organization of conservation districts or other means by which States and local agencies may share in the cost of irrigation development and flood control.

Flood control: The present policy under which the United States carries all flood-control costs is not endorsed. The cost of flood control should be borne in part by the States and local government through the formation of flood control and conservation districts and payments should be made to the United States without interest, within the ability to pay, as in the case of provisions for reclamation.

Navigation: The Federal Government should not improve rivers merely as a means of reducing railroad rates. The Water Resources Policy Commission believes that waterways are important additions to transportation facilities. As such they should be built and improved when and where such action is economically desirable, and where waterways can properly carry their costs and haul goods at lower rates than the railroads they should do so. Railroad rates should not be lowered on rail lines paralleling waterways, and correspondingly increased on rail lines which do not parallel waterways. If and when water and rail transportation can be fixed on a cost basis, the Commission believes that tolls should be charged on inland waterways, in order that water traffic may bear its just portion of the cost of river improvements allocated to navigation.

Recreation—fish and wildlife: The Commission believes that multiple-purpose water projects providing, in part, for recreation, fish and wildlife, should have their capital allocations to these fields met out of general Government taxes except to the extent that revenues are derived from fees and charges. An exception also seems justified in cases where recreation facilities are primarily of local significance and the cost should therefore be borne by the local interests benefiting.

Stream-pollution control: The Commission believes that the 1948 pollution control law should be continued, keeping pollution control as a responsibility of State and local

government. The United States should loan money at a low rate of interest to permit States and local government and industry to mitigate pollution problems, and the Federal Government should lead in scientific and technical investigations to determine improved methods of pollution control, particularly against industrial contamination. After 10 years it is recommended that a re-examination be made to determine the effectiveness of the 1948 pollution-control law.

The Water Resources Policy Commission has made no estimate of the probable cost of these Nation-wide coordinated programs which it recommends. However, it is interesting to note the following figures, representing the water resources plans and proposals of existing Federal agencies. The figures are in terms of "yesterday's dollars" as reported to the Senate in 1948:

Federal construction program completed to date	\$5,000,000,000
Authorized and under construction	5,000,000,000
Planned and available for authorizations	20,000,000,000
Proposed at a later date	30,000,000,000
Grand total	60,000,000,000

Many questions are asked regarding agricultural surpluses and the heavy drains on the Federal Treasury for supporting agricultural prices, running into billions of dollars. The Commission is in full agreement that the program for bringing new lands under cultivation should be geared to the necessities of agricultural production. At the present time there are 375,000,000 acres of cropland. There are over 600,000,000 acres of forest land, of which 350,000,000 acres are grazed. The total area grazed is 1,052,000,000 acres. It requires several acres of grazing land to produce the equivalent of an acre of cropland. The Department of Agriculture estimates the present total agricultural and grazing land as equivalent to 542,000,000 acres of cropland.

There has been a reduction in acreage required for feed of draft animals from a peak of 90,000,000 acres before tractors came into common use to a present of about 30,000,000 required to support draft animals. It is expected that this area will be reduced by further substitution of machines for animals so that an ultimate reduction to 12,000,000 acres may be expected.

It is difficult to estimate the loss of acreage and loss of fertility through erosion of top soil. Observations on test plots have shown a loss of soil as great as 100 tons per acre in a single storm. In 1938 during one storm in southern California, there was a measured average erosion in the San Gabriel Mountains of the Angeles National Forest amounting to 80,000 cubic yards per square mile, with record drainages showing as much as 100,000 cubic yards per square mile. There is no adequate record of the rate of loss of crop lands through erosion.

A person flying across the United States cannot help but see how the blighting fingers of erosion are extending into farm lands, especially west of the Mississippi River. On the other hand, improved farm practices, contour plowing, terracing of slopes and better strains of seed have actually increased the yield per acre of crop lands in the past decade.

One of the highly uncertain factors in the problem is that of agricultural export, which for the past decade has been requiring the produce of 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres.

Estimates are that the increase in the Nation's population in the past decade will continue in the immediate decades to come. A United States population of 170,000,000 in 1960, and 190,000,000 in 1975 has been estimated as most likely. During the past dec-

ade the Pacific Coast States have grown by nearly 50 percent, and the seven far Western States from 25 to 50 percent, while the largest gains east of the Mississippi have been of the order of 15 percent. The greatest upsurge in population in history is taking place in the West where rainfall and runoff average less than in the rest of the country.

The Water Resources Policy Commission strongly urges careful continuing surveys and studies which should reveal the amount of additional crop acreage required. There are likely opportunities of securing additional acreage by land drainage at costs lower than much of the proposed irrigation. The Commission's conclusion drawn from best information available is that the increased population forecast for the immediate decades ahead, with likely increased standards of living, will require substantial additions to crop acreage and that present crop surpluses will be wiped out.

The Water Resources Policy Commission was fortunate in having a staff of legal consultants derived largely from Federal departments and under the chairmanship of Bernard A. Foster, Jr., special counsel, Federal Power Commission. This committee of lawyers has prepared volume 3 of the Water Resources Report entitled "Water Resources Law," a most useful document. This volume reviews the constitutional considerations under which the United States has engaged in water resources development under its commerce power, proprietary power, war power, and general welfare power, and under equitable apportionment and interstate and international compacts. A comprehensive study of existing legislation was developed for all water uses.

Water is a property right subject to the law of many States. The humid States adhere to the riparian doctrine and the common law of England, whereas the 17 Western States observe the appropriative principle, "First in time is first in right." However, California and to a limited extent the State of Washington have both riparian and appropriative doctrines. The legal report reviews the water law of the 17 Western States in a section prepared independently by Wells A. Hutchins, of the Department of Agriculture.

America has been richly endowed with natural resources, extensive and varied forests, fertile lands, and an abundance of minerals and fuels beneath the soil. While many projects have been constructed to conserve and utilize water and land resources, the design, operation, and financing of the present programs of Federal, State, and local agencies fall far short of the opportunities and necessities for the future.

With the continued expansion of population, much greater demands for water and land use development will occur, including the many uses for navigation, flood control, domestic and industrial water supply, irrigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and an ever-increasing need for pollution control. As shown above in the table of costs of present and future water-resource projects, the projects planned and proposed but not yet authorized account for costs at least five times as large as the total expenditures made to date and contemplated for those under construction. Accumulated experience with Nation-wide programs offers intelligent guidance for wise planning of river development and for obtaining the basic data so essential to reaching sound conclusions. As a matter of fact, most river basins are relatively undeveloped. There is still time to make the necessary plans and develop coordinated programs. There is a sobering finality in the construction of river-basin development, and its behooves us to be sure that we are right before we go ahead.

Congressman Dollinger Reports to His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom since I was elected to represent the Twenty-fourth District of New York, to render reports from time to time to my constituents. In the following report, I have outlined some of the results of this session of Congress, as well as my efforts toward the enactment of vitally important legislation.

CONTROLS

Due to present unsettled world conditions and the existing emergency in our country, our defense program with its many aspects was of major importance. The Defense Production Act contained among others, provisions on price controls and Federal rent control. As early as February 1951, I urged in the House of Representatives that prices be rolled back to the pre-Korean level. I pointed out that the roll-back to prices existing in January 1951 was utterly useless; that the average American family could not afford the bare necessities of life, and that many were suffering from lack of essential foods because prices were prohibitive; that further, the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization was predicting even then that prices would continue to soar, and it was the duty of Congress to halt the inflationary rise in prices.

At the time that the Defense Production Act was being considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, I fought with every weapon at my command for strong effective controls. I was shocked by statements made by representatives of the meat industry who appeared before our committee and threatened the return of the black market if controls were established and prices rolled back. I felt that we should not be dictated to by individuals who were more interested in unconscionable profits than in the welfare of our country, and that our people should be protected against their greed. I therefore advocated that as soon as a black market appeared in the meat industry or any other industry dealing in essentials, or there was a deliberate curtailment in the production of such essential items so they would not be available in normal quantities for all to purchase at fair prices, the United States Government should seize and operate such industry in its entirety. If that were done, the producers would receive a fair price and the consumer would not be subjected to the vicious practices of black markets. I also urged the committee to include strong rent control provisions in the bill and introduced a rent-control bill in February of 1951 that would protect tenants from gouging landlords. However, my efforts

proved futile, and a weak, ineffectual, control bill was offered to the House for consideration.

I was tireless in my efforts to have the Defense Production Act amended, when it was being debated in the House, so that the average wage earner would be enabled to meet living costs and would have the protection of strong controls. Maintaining that a ruined economy meant a ruined Nation, I offered necessary amendments from the floor and did all I could to strengthen the bill. I charged that the bill as submitted to us was a betrayal of the American people; that additional roll-backs in prices of meats and other foods and commodities must be provided, as well as strong Federal rent controls if Mr. and Mrs. American were to live decently and able to obtain the essentials of life.

The enemies of the administration's control bill did all they could to kill controls, and they foisted upon the people of this country a measure which was saddled with exemptions for the special interest groups. It was a sorry imitation of what a truly effective Defense Production Act should be, and a grave disappointment to me. I shall not lessen my efforts to procure strong price and rent controls to the end that our people and our Nation may be adequately protected in these days of crisis.

CONSUMERS ADVISORY BUREAU

I feel that in this time of constantly soaring living costs, American consumers must be thrown some life-line. I introduced a bill to establish a Consumers' Advisory Bureau in the Department of Commerce which would enable purchasers to get best values for the prices paid for food and other commodities. We know that the public is being gouged on every hand in the cost of food, and we face a 5 to 8 percent increase in living costs during the coming year. Further, the American public overpays millions of dollars in the purchase of food and other commodities because it does not have complete and accurate information concerning the relative quality, utility, and abundance of commodities available on the retail market.

Millions of dollars are spent in advertising certain products, but the best-advertised product does not necessarily make it the best buy. Also, the American consumer has no way of determining for himself how other makes or brands actually compare with the products expertly advertised by press, radio, television, and other mediums. He often pays a higher price than necessary, as the little-known product can in fact be of higher grade and cheaper. I believe that it should be a function of the United States Government to procure and make such information available to the consumer, so that he may receive full value for every dollar he spends, as no other facilities or organizations can accomplish the desired results.

The Consumer's Advisory Bureau provided for in my bill would establish categories of consumers' goods based upon their uses and functions; it would investigate, analyze, test, and evaluate consumers' goods within each cate-

gory, and would make available to the consuming public, by publications and other appropriate means, full, complete, and accurate information covering the categories. Such a bureau would render invaluable service to the public and would save our people millions of dollars yearly.

HOUSING

The housing shortage remains acute in the New York City area and elsewhere. New construction has been slowed down due to the fact that materials and manpower are now being channeled to defense program activities. However, people must have decent shelter, and the Federal Government has recognized its obligation in this regard. I have done everything in my power to bring about passage of legislation to provide homes for low-income families at rentals they can afford. I was gratified when we were successful in getting an appropriation for the construction of 50,000 low rent public housing units. I shall continue my efforts to the end that every person in this country may enjoy suitable housing conditions.

DISCRIMINATION

My active campaign to wipe out discrimination has continued, and early in the session I reintroduced numerous bills to end this evil.

Of major importance is my bill providing for an FEPC. We know that discrimination is the greatest threat to individual freedom, and a menace rampant in this country. It is a disgrace that we permit persons seeking employment to be discriminated against because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. In June of 1951, I also introduced a resolution calling upon the President to provide for and reestablish fair employment practices in Government and defense industries. President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued such an order on June 25, 1941. I pointed out that in order to assure our victory in the terrible struggle in which we are engaged it is as necessary now, as it was in 1941, that we put to use all our available manpower, resources, and talents so that our defense program can go forward.

My bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin is very important, for Americans are already suffering as a result of discriminatory practices found in many of our colleges and universities. During World War II our civilians were left without sufficient doctors and dentists to care for them. These professional men are now being called to active duty and civilians again face lack of adequate medical care. Still, our colleges continue to limit the number of students allowed to study medicine and dentistry. Under quota systems used, many brilliant students are prevented from studying professions of their choice. This situation should be corrected without delay. The bill would also withhold aid from colleges which permit students to be members of student organizations which practice discrimination.

Another bill I introduced would refuse Federal funds for housing with respect to which there is any discrimination. Other vitally important bills introduced by me prohibit segregation of passengers on account of race or color; prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States. I also introduced anti-lynching and anti-poll tax bills.

It is a sad commentary upon us that although American men are engaged in bloody battle to preserve liberty, fighting side by side, shot at with bullets which strike indiscriminately regardless of the victim's race, color, or creed—the evils of discrimination sadly affect millions in our country today. I, for one, shall not rest until they are wiped out, and I feel that the legislation I have proposed is a constructive step in that direction.

LABOR

The problems affecting labor continue to receive my attention and sincere efforts. I again introduced a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and to revive the National Labor Relations Act, and shall continue to work for the repeal of this law which is so unfair to labor.

I also reintroduced my bill to establish a \$1 minimum hourly wage. The minimum of 75 cents fixed by Congress in 1949 is woefully inadequate to meet high living costs today. I took that same stand when the bill was passed. Living costs have increased tremendously since then, and are increasing daily. We all know that the average worker cannot take adequate care of the needs of his family on the pay he now receives. Persons in the lower income brackets are carrying the biggest part of the defense load. We should recognize their great contribution to our Nation as well as their great need, and it is our duty to assure them of a living wage.

PAY RAISES

I was happy to vote for the bills giving pay raises to postal and other Federal employees. This was much needed and long overdue legislation. I urged passage of the measures early in the session, as our postal and Federal workers were suffering real hardship due to the insufficient wages they received. While the raises granted will help, I feel that a greater increase should have been allowed in view of soaring living costs and high taxes.

TAXES

During the debate on the new tax bill I stated that the bill was unsatisfactory to me, as there were glaring injustices which I felt should be corrected. I urged that the bill be amended to make it more fair and equitable to all, as it favored those who could afford higher taxes and penalized those in the low-income brackets who were already taxed to the limit. Also I advocated that all persons dependent upon a small annuity or pension for their existence should be granted exemptions. Some groups are already exempt under the law, and it is only fair that all persons so dependent should have comparable exemptions.

FOREIGN AID AND ISRAEL

I advocated passage of the foreign-aid bill when it came before the House. I

felt it was the most effective contribution we could make toward world peace and a sure preventative of world war III. We know that the United States cannot singlehandedly defeat the forces now warring against the democratic ideal. We must rely upon those other nations which share our ideals for cooperation in peacetime as well as for military strength in case of a war emergency. Therefore it is to our interests that we give them the material assistance they need so that they can make themselves strong and secure against aggression.

I also emphasized the importance of assistance to Israel, our loyal friend and ally, the only democratic nation in the Near and Middle East. Against almost unsurmountable odds she has taken her place among freedom-loving countries as a power for democracy and freedom. However, this new and struggling nation needs and must have help, and I urged that Israel be given the full amount proposed in the bill, \$50,000,000. I pointed out that the help we give Israel is a sound investment. She is our staunch ally and would prove herself of inestimable value in holding the line of our defenses in the event of any world conflict.

When the question of giving wheat to India came before us, I urged that we give the wheat as a grant, free of any shackling conditions or demand for payment. I stated that to haggle and bargain with India over the wheat she needed at once to save millions from starvation, would lose us forever the prestige we have earned not only as a powerful Nation but as a generous Nation. Our wish to save lives is its own reward. There is no ground so fertile for the seeds of communism as empty stomachs. Aside from our humanitarian interest, I felt that we must grant the aid India requested to avoid the catastrophe of her succumbing to communism.

PUERTO RICO

On January 23, 1951, I introduced H. R. 1937, to enable the people of Puerto Rico to select their own form of government. During the Eighty-first Congress, a bill was passed, granting the people of Puerto Rico the right to adopt their own constitution, which was to contain certain stated rights.

However, there have been many demands that the people of Puerto Rico should be allowed to decide for themselves what form of government they wished. Without taking any sides in the controversy, I introduced a bill which would give the people the right to make their own choice. The procedure advocated in the bill is, I think, the most democratic and fair way to settle the issue. I hope that Congress will see fit to take action on the measure during the coming session.

IRELAND

I heretofore introduced a resolution which recommended that a plebiscite be held throughout Ireland so that all the people of Ireland could vote on the question of unification and how they wished

to be governed. I was happy to vote in favor of House Resolution 82 when it came before us, and regret that it met with defeat. However, the unification of Ireland has my sympathetic interest, and I shall continue to support legislation which would assist in accomplishing it.

VETERANS

Our veterans who have made such great sacrifices for our country, in preserving our liberty and safeguarding our lives, deserve all the assistance we can possibly give them. Legislation for their benefit will continue to have my active support. It came to my attention that countless veterans would suffer financial loss, and in many instances would lose their opportunity to have an education, due to the time limitation for education and training under the GI bill. I, therefore, introduced a bill to provide an extra time period within which veterans could apply for such education and training.

RESURGENCE OF NAZISM

I have been alert to the dangers of a resurgence of nazism in Germany. The reprieve by American authorities of Nazi war criminals who had been sentenced to death, and the pardoning of others, including Hitler's loyal ally, Alfred Krupp, came as a great shock to me. These reprieves, in my opinion, granted to persons who had committed the worst crimes against humanity in all history, struck a death blow at the very foundation of our American system of justice, and assured further the rise to power of former Nazi war lords.

Immediately after the reprieves were granted, I introduced a resolution calling for a complete and immediate investigation of the United States military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, and a report as to why the mass clemency order was issued. I also reintroduced my resolution calling for a complete investigation with reference to the extent to which we have permitted or encouraged the reestablishment of cartels, the resumption of power by former Nazis and the resurgence of fascism and anti-Semitism in Germany. I am doing all I can to get action on these resolutions.

CONCLUSION

I have tried, in this report, to emphasize those topics and measures of major importance to my constituents. Space does not permit my discussion of all questions of interest; there are many others I should like to cover if it were possible.

The problems and opinions of my constituents are of great importance to me. I maintain a congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, which is open daily. The people of the Twenty-fourth District of New York are most welcome to call there and discuss matters of interest to them. I wish to assure the people I represent that it is my earnest desire to serve them to the best of my ability, and that my efforts in their behalf will continue.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcription:

RADIO ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE VICTOR WICKERSHAM, OF OKLAHOMA, AND HUGH H. BENNETT, CHIEF, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OCTOBER 19, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This is your Congressman, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital in Washington, D. C. Today we are fortunate in having as our guest our good friend, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

He is known variously as "the Chief" and "Big Hugh" to his coworkers and thousands of the Nation's farmers everywhere. He has worked and consulted on soil and water conservation and other land problems throughout the Americas and much of Africa and Europe. He has devoted his lifetime to the vital matter of taking care of the land. He also is personally familiar with the soils and erosion problems in any one of our western Oklahoma counties you'd care to name.

As you know, Dr. Bennett, I think conservation of our soil and water, for the fullest use of our own generation and those to come after us, is just about the most important matter there is for any of us to be concerned with. Productive land is the most important of all our basic natural resources. Whether we live in town or in the country, all of us depend on the land's ability to produce the food, fiber, timber, and other things that are essential to our good standard of living, and to our very existence. Our national welfare and security are rooted in the fertile soil of Oklahoma and the Nation.

Dr. Bennett, I recall seeing where somebody stated recently that our capacity to consume the food and other essential things that come from our farms and ranches would catch up with the land's ability to produce these necessities within another couple of hundred years. I believe it was. But whatever the time might be, it certainly is true, isn't it, that we not only have damaged or ruined a lot of our soil, but that destructive erosion is still going on?

Mr. BENNETT. It would be extremely difficult, Congressman, to set any exact time when we might run short on our land supply. In order to produce the food crops and other essentials, we must safeguard our remaining productive land through the use of adaptable conservation measures, such as we are now using on a constantly expanding scale. Our capacity for agricultural production continues to increase—through conservation farming, crop and livestock improvement, disease and pest control, bringing idle land into production, and so on. But it is a matter of plain mathematics that if we should be so foolish as not to conserve the good land we have left, we couldn't go on indefinitely producing enough to maintain the good standard of living we now enjoy.

Here are some of the facts: Census figures show that our population passed the 154,000,000 mark last summer, and that the increase is continuing at the net rate of 2,000,000 a year. At the same time, we are still losing probably not less than 500,000

acres of land every year through the ravages of uncontrolled soil erosion. We have only about four hundred and sixty to five hundred million acres of good, productive cropland left in the country, as well as can be determined. And that includes substantial acreage which would have to be cleared, drained, or irrigated before it could be brought into production.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (interrupting). And how about the land damage we had already suffered, before we started to get busy on our conservation program?

Mr. BENNETT. When we first began to carve the country into farms, the average depth of the topsoil was about 9 inches. Today, it is only about 6 inches. In other words we have—in a comparatively brief time, as the life of a Nation goes—watched roughly a third of our productive topsoil wash out or blow out of our fields—carried away to where it no longer can produce anything for anybody.

The half-million acres of land we are still losing annually through erosion—that could readily be controlled—is equivalent to 2,500 farms of 200 acres each, or 25,000 such farms washed away in the course of only one decade. I realize that while your western Oklahoma farms usually are quite large, the average American farm, however, includes only about 200 acres. As each farmer today is counted on to produce food and fiber for himself—and some 15 other people, most of them living in cities—the impact of any such soil losses on our urban population would not be comfortable to think about, should soil losses be allowed to continue.

So, getting back to your first question, Congressman WICKERSHAM, we can say this: The terrific toll we have been permitting erosion to take from our national supply of productive land has brought us to the point where we have little more than enough left to meet the needs of our growing population. What always must be kept in mind is the fact that all of our food, except a limited amount from the sea, comes from the soil and from nowhere else. Moreover, all of our wood products, wool, cotton, leather, tobacco, vegetable oils, and still other raw materials of industry come from the land, too. It is clear enough for anybody to see, I think, that every acre of productive land ruined for further cultivation, or for economic livestock production, amounts to a reduction of our source of supply for food and other products of the soil.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, we folks out in my part of the country can appreciate that fact all right, Dr. Bennett. All of us were either in or mighty close to the old "Dust Bowl" of the 1930's, you know. The memory of hard-working and once prosperous western Oklahoma farmers having to pull stakes during those dark wind erosion days and move out, is still fresh in our minds. Our western Oklahoma population has dropped so much, in fact, that we've had to redistrict the State for congressional representation, losing two Congressmen in the process. As a result, my new district will take in, besides the present Seventh District, all of the Oklahoma Panhandle counties and all of the old sixth congressional district except Canadian County. I don't say that soil erosion has been entirely responsible for this, of course, but I do know that past unsafe, uneconomic use of a lot of our farm and ranch lands contributed a great deal to this situation.

What we would all like to see, I assure you, is for our population to build back up—on a sound and prosperous basis. I am glad to say that many, many farmers and other people in our western Oklahoma counties agree with me that a vigorous soil and water conservation program, carried on through the soil conservation districts, is one of the best hopes we have for a return to a stable and prosperous agriculture in our part of the country.

Mr. BENNETT. I am mighty glad to hear you say that, Congressman, because what you say holds true, in one way or another, for almost any section of the country, whether it has lived through anything like the dusty days of the 1930's or not. Our natural resources, as people are beginning to understand, represent our real wealth and strength—community by community, county by county, State by State. It is productive land—and water, plants, animals, and minerals—by which we live as the world's strongest nation.

We have been reckless in the use of all these resources in the past, but now we are, at last, doing a great deal to protect and prudently use the land, which is our most basic and utterly indispensable resource. In my opinion, one of the most important responsibilities shared by all the people of any State, county, or community is the safeguarding of our basic soil and water resources—and making wise and profitable use of all of them at all times. Such conservation, to be fully effective, must be applied on every acre of land needing protection—every acre treated according to its needs and used within its capabilities. It is a continuing task—until the basic conservation measures have all been applied to the land. Thereafter, there will be the continuing job of maintaining the work and improving on it whenever new discoveries are made.

So far, we have done part of the job only—in Oklahoma and throughout the country, but this is a very important part. Occasionally some uninformed person will say "The conservation job will never get finished at the rate we are going." But when we examine the record, it is seen that we have made really remarkable progress. This is true in western Oklahoma, in Oklahoma as a whole, and in the entire Nation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I can vouch for that personally, Dr. Bennett. I've been out and seen the fine conservation work the farmers and ranchers are carrying on, particularly in their soil conservation districts with the help of your service in our own Washita Valley, out in the Panhandle, and elsewhere. I've also flown over all of it—as I have flown over 44 countries and all 48 States—and you can easily tell the difference between where soil- and water-conservation measures are being used on the land down below and where there isn't any of this kind of farming yet. I'm proud to see it and we realize it has meant a lot to Oklahoma.

Mr. BENNETT. You have good reason to be proud of the way the farmers and ranchers of Oklahoma have taken hold of soil and water conservation. It was among the first States to enact a soil conservation districts enabling law. The first district was voted in back in 1937 and now the State is 98 percent covered by these farmer-organized and farmer-managed districts. The first soil erosion experiment station to be established anywhere in the world was the Red Plains Station at Guthrie, Okla., and it is still actively carrying on important conservation research.

Your own Seventh Congressional District is entirely covered by soil conservation districts, as I am sure you know. I can give you the figures showing the commendable progress which has been made in those districts in conservation surveying, farm planning, and land treatment. That is, with combinations of needed measures such as contour farming, stubble-mulch tillage, strip cropping, range and pasture improvement, conservation irrigation, and drainage.

And the work being done in the Washita Valley flood-control program has attracted national attention among the 11 such major watersheds so far authorized by Congress. I wish we had time to talk about some of the

work going on in the Sandstone Creek, Owl Creek, and other tributaries of the Washita, and to recount some of the outstanding examples of how the conservation work has proved very effective in flood reduction. I had the pleasure of taking part in the celebration as you did, near Cordell in 1948 on the occasion of the completion of the work along Cloud Creek, a tributary of the Washita.

The people of the Washita Valley are due much credit for their vision and courage in helping to make this undertaking a reality—when they gathered at Chickasha and with your assistance, perfected organization of what is now the Washita Valley Council of Soil Conservation Districts. Other interests, both business and civic, have helped also.

Among other benefits of the Washita Valley flood control work which was authorized by you and other Members of Congress will be, of course, keeping silt out of the Denison Dam.

Mr. WICKERSHAM That work in the Washita watershed certainly means a lot to Oklahoma, Dr. Bennett. It is unfortunate that a cut in funds available this year for the Washita and the other 10 flood-control projects came about and slowed up the good work there accordingly. I introduced a bill calling for \$800,000 in supplemental appropriations for your Washita work, especially needed, I understand, in the Chickasha area. People in Oklahoma are beginning to get sold on small dams, and we don't want any of this important work to be held back.

To my way of thinking, there isn't anything you are doing in your conservation program that isn't of high importance. I am thinking, for example of the fine results obtained on the land utilization project in Roger Mills County—

Mr. BENNETT (interposing). We are proud of that, too, Congressman WICKERSHAM. During the past decade, since we started converting the unsuitable cropland in the project to grass, some 11,000 acres have been seeded. All the 34,000 acres of land has been brought up to the point of profitable production. This vegetative improvement contributes to flood control on the Washita.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Along with tree wind-breaks and shelter belts and other measures. In fact, the very first tree planted in the old shelter-belt program was on a farm near Willow Lake Creek community, in Greer County. For the country as a whole, Dr. Bennett, would you say that we have turned the tables yet on our soil erosion and land-use problems?

Mr. BENNETT. Not quite. We have not yet caught up with the rate of soil loss by erosion throughout the country as a whole. But, as well as we can determine from our own Soil Conservation Service records, the conservation job has been completed, up to the stage of maintenance and improvement, on about 21½ percent of the Nation's farm land needing protection. This does not include other conservation work that brings to at least 25 percent that part of the job which actually has been completed—and possibly somewhat more, maybe 30 percent. I am more confident than I ever have been that we are not going to pause in this vital undertaking, or slacken our pace, until the job is finished. We have too much sense and patriotism for that, especially in times of emergency like this when our best possible productive capacity is so urgently needed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And I am sure we're not, either, Dr. Bennett. I know the people of western Oklahoma, anyway, are not going to let the country down in regard to soil and water conservation. It means so much to our youth and to everybody, in our own country, where you, Dr. H. H. Bennett, are doing such a swell job, as well as in other countries—where our other Dr. Bennett—Dr. Henry G. Bennett, who heads up the

point 4 program, is doing such good work in promoting better agriculture and more wholesome living.

This is your Congressman, VICTOR WICKERSHAM. You have just heard Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and myself on the subject, Soil Conservation.

Air Power and Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article by Eugene E. Wilson as it appeared in Spotlight of this date. Here is one of the most significant, forward-looking documents of our time: a proposal for transforming the airplane into an instrument of peace and freedom. This article cannot be dismissed as an idealistic dream, for its author, a former naval officer and industrialist, is one of the most hard-headed realists in the aviation field. As a naval staff officer, he helped conceive and work out the idea of the carrier task force. While president of United Aircraft Corp. he helped develop the American aircraft industry. And while chairman of the board of governors of the Aircraft Industries Association, he wrote industry's air policy statement.

The above-mentioned article follows:

AIR POWER AND MORALITY
(By Eugene E. Wilson)

Some of the most brilliant minds in the Department of Defense are reported to be asking: "Is our strategy right?" They are said to question the wisdom of a military policy which places almost sole dependence upon population bombing.

Wilbur Wright died regretting that he helped to create the airplane. For he saw it used, not primarily as the dreamed-of argosy of commerce, but as the fiery chariot of war. Discovery of the principles of mechanical flight touched off a resurgence of barbarism and a return to military policies so bankrupt as to threaten the survival of civilization.

Indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations is poor strategy, false economics, bad politics, and worse morals. Stupid leadership has brought western Christian civilization to the verge of extinction. Lacking the directive force of moral precept, it has been unable to define any long-term objective, political or otherwise, or any military strategy other than that of destroying everything within its path. This was the strategy of Genghis Khan and of the Dark Ages.

Future historians may well adjudge population and strategic bombing as the classic blunder of all time. And the climax of this folly, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, may have revealed such irrelevance for human life on our part as to have cost us the moral leadership of the world. Despite our air superiority—or, more precisely, because of its misuse—our civilization, once considered the loftiest in evolution of the human spirit, now stands on the defensive.

Our vaunted material superiority, flanked right and left and breached in the center by hordes of Asiatics, has begun to assume

some aspects of the Maginot line. Threat of an atomic stockpile dwindles as a deterrent to a barbaric enemy who refuses to oblige us with suitable tactical targets, to say nothing of the inviting strategic objectives which we offer him. A sterile air policy has infected our military and naval policy and our foreign and domestic policies as well.

Dread of such an outcome long pervaded aviation circles. Bitter controversy has raged ever since that December day in 1903 at Kittyhawk when the Wrights demonstrated mechanical flight. One school, led by the Wrights, visualized the airplane as primarily a vehicle and thus a potential boon to civilization. The other, led by the military, saw it as a revolutionary weapon.

The original prophet of population and strategic bombing was the Italian, Gen. Giulio Douhet. As early as 1909, he tried to interest his government in the potentiality of air bombardment of urban areas as a cheap short-cut to power. In 1921, he said in his book, *Command of the Air*, that "a body of troops will stand fast under intensive bombings but workers in a shop, factory, or harbor will melt away after the first losses."

This doctrine found ready acceptance among military minds of an era which produced Balbo and Mussolini, Goering and Hitler. And disciples continued to preach it even after experience proved otherwise. Citizens of London, Berlin, Tokyo, and other cities not only failed to melt away but reacted with fanatical resistance. The A-bomb at Hiroshima appeared to support the theory, but it is now known that the Japanese had already decided to surrender to pressure of sea blockade.

Sober second thought now suggests that blockade might have been more efficient in the long run. Certainly, it would have been more economical because we are still pouring out treasure to rebuild institutions we battered down. One thing is clear: neither our natural allies nor our late enemies relish the idea of being liberated by our atom bomb tactics.

The Russians exploit our lapse, claiming that their use of military aircraft is confined to tactical support of ground forces and that instead of threatening to use atomic bombs against civil populations, they apply atomic energy to the construction of public works. Thus does godless leadership exploit to its own advantage precepts of western Christianity which the west has forgotten. Grandmother Russia puts on a good act in the international Red Riding Hood drama, while we have let ourselves be cast in the role of the villain.

In placing sole dependence on the explosive force of an uncontrollable weapon, we have neglected the most potent force in our possession—the catalyst of moral principle. To get back into character, we must first reassert adherence to principles of human conduct which made us what we are. For example, we might announce our intent to ban the use of all weapons against civil populations and confine their use to legitimate military targets. This is not the usual impractical suggestion of outlawing weapons or of limiting armaments, but rather a return to their proper employment.

Such a program takes for granted maintenance of a military air force capable of effective reprisal against a potential disturber of peace. It calls for a statement of fundamental national objectives which should be publicly debated and supported. First requisite is restoration of individual freedom, especially in trade, and this implies freedom of movement to all, by land, sea, and air. Under this doctrine, the mission of armed forces would once more become that of guaranteeing the security of trade routes. Then, just as the Great Chinese Wall crumbled beneath the feet of private traders, backed by Britain's benevolent sea power, so

would the iron curtain rise one day to welcome the western ideal of a fair break for the other fellow.

Then would come the opportunity sensed by the Wrights at the dawn of this century. Just as the Berlin airlift reversed the role of the bombing blitz, so might airlift come to its own as the catalyst for a new era comparable to that which began with the geographic discoveries of the fifteenth century. Here Pax Aeronautica might replace Pax Britannica, and therein lies one example of hope in the air.

Fortieth Anniversary of Polish-American Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 20, there will roll off the presses of the Polish-American Journal the fortieth anniversary edition of this outstanding Polish-American publication. I know that many of my colleagues here in the House are well acquainted with this weekly newspaper and its editorial policies; I am sure that all of the Members have read some of its editorials and feature articles which have been inserted in this RECORD from time to time.

Forty years of continuous reporting of the news affecting the United States and Poland have been dedicated to the preservation of American freedom and the struggle for the liberation and freedom of Poland. Under the aggressive leadership of its present editors, Mr. Henry J. Dende and Mr. Leopold Dende, the Polish-American Journal has vigorously carried on the fight against the scourge of communism that has engulfed one European nation after another and which is so rapidly spreading its tentacles to every corner of the world.

As a tribute to the Polish-American Journal on this, its fortieth anniversary, I take pride in inserting in this RECORD its creed and program which will appear on the editorial page of tomorrow's issue:

OUR CREED

Today's edition marks the Polish-American Journal's fortieth year of continuous service to the Americans of Polish ancestry.

As during the past four decades, the Journal will continue its traditional policy

It will encourage persons of Polish descent to preserve their native customs, their thrift, the industriousness, their traditions, their love of music, art, and literature, their deep respect for God, church, and family, and those other Polish attributes which they have so graciously contributed and so harmoniously blended into the fiber of America. These characteristics must not be allowed to die for from them have sprung the American patriotism of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, the genius and statesmanship of Paderewski and the courage of the Polish people during the defense of Warsaw.

The Polish-American Journal will strongly support the activities of Polish organizations who fight against communism and who struggle to have Poland, the "land of the White Eagle" free from its present despotic

and cruel oppressor, namely, Communist Russia.

Hand in hand with this stated policy this paper will continue to carry on a militant and relentless campaign against communism.

The Journal believes that the democracies have conceded enough. Each concession has been met with a new demand, another encroachment, and another stalemate.

The time has come when we must take a firm stand, for we will not compromise our way of life.

The democracies prefer the conference table to the battlefield. But if the enemies of freedom will not drop their sinister scheme of world domination then we also can lay aside our diplomatic tools. If necessary we can exchange the silk hat and frock coat for the armored suit, and the portfolio for the sword.

This paper is wholeheartedly in accord with the determination of the democracies to retreat no farther. We shall continue our efforts of mediation and arbitration of world problems but we shall not sell our souls. But if the world is not to be plunged into another holocaust of war then the Soviet Union must stop its vicious practice of coming to the peace table with a glove in one hand and a dagger in the other.

This paper, then, has taken up the torch of freedom and has thrown the gauntlet into the face of communism.

On the fortieth anniversary, its mailed fist is thrust against the iron curtain.

PROGRAM AND PLATFORM OF JOURNAL HAILED BY MANY AS OUTSTANDING

In the summer of 1949, the editors of the Journal together with Adam Dunn, prominent industrialist, and Leo Nejelski, management consultant, mapped out a program and platform which was to be the guiding light of the Journal. Immediately upon its release to over 250 prominent civic, political, and religious leaders in the country, it was enthusiastically received and hailed as a great step forward in the Polish-American newspaper field.

On this, our fortieth anniversary, we are publishing it, for the benefit of our thousands of readers and friends.

This is our platform:

1 We affirm once more our allegiance to the United States. We pledge our strength to the ideals of freedom and democracy for which America stands. We are unmistakably on the side of the Americans who believe that the freedoms we find here provide the most certain road to truth, dignity and well-being for all men.

2 We take new pride in our Polish heritage. We of Polish ancestry brought to America an undying thirst for freedom, a capacity for lasting loyalty and the courage to translate our ideals into practical realities. We aim to keep Polish culture and Polish interests alive, and to encourage other groups to do likewise, because the rich variety of American life depends on the vitality of the many peoples who share the United States between them.

3. We plan to do everything in our power to strengthen the purposes and the leadership of Polish-American organizations. We will always be partial to those groups that, in addition to their specific goals, are devoted to the American ideals of democracy and freedom. We will work especially hard for the groups that add to the prestige of all American Poles.

4. We will support and encourage those Polish Americans who make the great effort to achieve distinction and success. We will applaud those who reach out to help others. Where possible, we will take initiatives to bring together those individuals and groups who can strengthen one another, whether in business, education, the professions, the arts, politics, finance, or organizations.

5 We pray to God for strength to adhere to our ideals. And we hope that we will be joined by ever-increasing numbers of Americans of Polish descent who believe with us that a great age of peace, understanding, and freedom can be ours if we work hard enough for it.

This is our program:

1. To print the news of persons of Polish ancestry everywhere, with particular emphasis on personalities and events that advance the causes of democracy and freedom.

2 To editorialize constantly on the five planks of our platform, sparing no frankness where situations become serious or where individuals are impeding or destroying the progress of their groups.

3 To encourage leaders who are devoted to the advancement of their groups, and of Polish Americans in general, while criticizing those who through self-seeking weaken the effectiveness of their groups.

4. To stimulate the ambitions of Polish Americans who are interested in business, education, politics, finance, the professions, or the arts, and to bring them in touch with individuals and groups who can counsel and assist them.

5 To search for ways whereby American Poles can realize their proportionate opportunities in business, politics, and all other walks of life.

6 To suggest methods whereby Polish-American fraternal and organizations can use their resources to advance the causes of American Poles, and to encourage methods of development that can add to the strength and stability of these organizations.

7. To honor Americans of Polish descent who are seriously interested in advancing the common good and who are doing things to accomplish this goal.

8 To keep alive the traditions of Polish arts by supporting the individuals and groups working in these fields and by providing opportunities to encourage new talents.

9 To create interest in Polish history, and to encourage studies of contributions to American development made by men and women of Polish descent.

10. To speak out against individuals and groups who are seeking to create disunity among Polish-American groups, at the same time to clarify why we are in the opposition.

11 To revitalize interest in Polish cookery and in Polish folk arts and crafts.

12. To support Polish-Americans who are active and outstanding in various sports, and thus add to the prestige of their groups.

13 To clarify the cause of American Poles for individuals and groups who are misled or misinformed.

14. To stimulate interest in group activities that increase the opportunities for Americans of Polish descent in all walks of life to achieve happiness, pride, and well-being.

15 To undertake competitions that will encourage American Poles to exercise their abilities and talents for their own accomplishment and to increase the store of prestige for the entire group.

The Need To Stop Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication which I have received from

one of my constituents. I believe her communication to be worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAINFIELD, N. J., September 9, 1951.

To the Members of the United States Senate,
Courtesy of Senator Robert C. Hendrickson.

GENTLEMEN: Please, please. Do something to stop this inflation. This plea comes from the heart of a worried wife of a young professional man. It becomes urgent as I read the registered mail notice of a rent increase; when I must pay \$1.25 per pound for necessary meat, and when I consider the cost of equipment for the baby soon to be with us. A lawyer does not benefit from union pressure on the Wage Stabilization Board, and subsequent relaxation of wage ceilings. There are no official edicts to help him ride the wave of increasing living costs. It is incomprehensible that Members of Congress individually are not frightened as I am, for most of you are yourselves professional men. But collectively, you show no evidence of fear of this horrible thing—inflation—which is without question threatening to destroy our economy and our beloved democratic way.

I'm afraid that our small family may go down before it, and to help check its force, we will willingly pay our taxes, make budget room somehow for savings bonds, and refuse to release our funds on time payments. All I ask is that you, as our chosen representatives, be aware of our fright, ignore short-sighted pressure lobbies, and make every sincere effort to crush this thing before it crushes us.

Very truly yours,

ELIZABETH H. BANGS.
Mrs. John K. Bangs.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address. I shall deliver over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, October 22, 1951, 7:45 to 8 p. m., on the subject Federal Workers Also Deserve Jobless Pay Protection:

Friends of the radio audience, I wonder how many Americans sense the slow but far-reaching changes that are taking place within our Nation?

Not the new buildings and cars that are brightening the face of the landscape. I mean the steady income flowing into more pockets than ever before and bringing with it the confidence born of security.

Most of it is in the form of pay-checks that are the reward of productive effort, on the part of people who are actually working.

There are other types of income, such as pension, disability compensation, and unemployment checks—that have come into prominence in recent years.

On our own, and on the basis of private investment, we have for generations purchased more insurance than any other people on earth. This, however, has not been enough. A man can be in the best of health, happy, and hard-working in his job only to

be informed some day that he has been laid off through no fault of his own. That man is disabled, from the viewpoint of his ability to earn a living, just the same as if he were sick or injured.

We had to find a way to protect him against such hazards. We called upon government to do that which he could not do for himself. As a result, old-age and survivors insurance—and unemployment compensation—were conceived and legislated to save the individual and the Nation from the economic shocks that threatened us during the 1930's.

We made this beginning in social engineering. It was designed to give our people some security against the economic uncertainties of life and to do it within the framework of our Constitution. We took the middle road of compromise to build a society in which all would have the opportunity of sharing in the Nation's progress without sacrificing the precious liberties upon which the United States was founded, and through which it has prospered beyond all others.

We had to make a beginning in 1936 and we had to go slowly in order to find our way.

Step by step we have been adding to the structure of social security. Many people are now covered and the benefits have been increased, but we still have some distance to go before this national insurance is complete.

I want to speak tonight about one group that has been overlooked, namely, the 2,000,000 civilian employees of the United States Government.

The average man in the street thinks that anybody who goes to work for Uncle Sam gets a lifetime job with no "slack times" and no lay-offs. But they forget agencies such as the Veterans' Administration that was greatly enlarged to meet the needs of millions of World War II veterans and is now dismissing employees because the educational and job-training benefits under the GI bill of rights have expired for most ex-service men and women of that conflict.

Likewise, the hundreds of thousands of civilians who worked for the navy yards and Government arsenals from 1941 to 1945 were let go after the war, with no unemployment compensation to help them out while they were trying to find new jobs in private industry. The same situation prevails today. Federal payrolls are increasing. This form of employment may last for a long time, and then again, it may not. When the inevitable reduction in force comes—what then?

I believe that we should give priority—when the Congress resumes business in January 1952—to a bill amending the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees.

The first point to make is that Federal employment is not as stable as most people think. During the calendar year 1950, about 450,000 separations took place, according to the United States Civil Service Commission. This amounted to one-fourth of all Federal civilian employment which is a high rate of turn-over. In 1949, they were more numerous, coming close to the 500,000 mark. Nearly 45 percent of the separations were involuntary, meaning that the employees did not give up these jobs of their own free will. The dismissals came about through reductions in force and through termination of temporary appointments. The rest were quits, retirements, deaths, and transfers to other agencies.

In such nonmanufacturing industries as banking, insurance, and transportation turn-over is always low and employment is steady. The workers in these latter industries have been covered by unemployment insurance from the start, yet Federal workers have been denied this protection.

Without it, displaced Federal workers have been forced to rely upon accrued leave and retirement fund withdrawals to keep them going until they could find other jobs. Reliance on this saved-up leave is a misuse of a system that was intended for recreation purposes. It was patterned after the vacation pay of private industry and was supposed to be used in the same manner. But many Federal workers do not take all the time off that is coming to them, thereby hoping to build up this backlog for a rainy day. During 1949, separated workers received an average of \$192 in lump-sum payments for accrued annual leave, representing an estimated 15-days pay on the basis of an average weekly salary of \$65.

Now as to refund of their contributions to the civil-service retirement fund.

During 1939, these withdrawals averaged about \$315, representing approximately 2 years of service. Nearly 230,000 separated employees received refunds in 1949, or more than four out of every five who were entitled to get back what they had paid in. They had no unemployment insurance to fall back on and so they withdrew the savings which had been deducted from their pay checks in order to provide them with old-age security. In other words, they were obliged to trade in their pension rights for a little ready cash to carry them over a present emergency. And all because they had no unemployment insurance protection.

Recent legislation, furthermore, has restricted the use of these two alternatives as a substitute for unemployment compensation.

Newly hired Federal employees are being given emergency appointments only. They are being covered by the old-age and survivors insurance program, instead of the civil-service retirement program. The former does not permit withdrawal of contributions. Other legislation requires them to use up annual leave instead of accumulating it.

So sum it up, Federal workers can no longer depend upon retirement refunds and accrued annual leave to give them some income after they have been let go by the Government. From their very first day of unemployment they get no compensation.

As long ago as June 23, 1944, Senator George, chairman of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, said, and I quote: "Government workers in arsenals and shipyards and in other Government agencies have worked and lived side by side with workers in private industry. The Government, through its war contracts, has paid the cost of the unemployment-compensation tax on those working for private war plants. The committee sees no reason why it should not pay it for those on its own payroll. Many of these men gave up accumulated benefits under the State systems in order to take places in federally operated war plants and Federal war agencies, and they should be placed in the same position that they would have enjoyed had they been engaged in war work for a private employer."

In 1944 and again in 1945, the United States Senate passed bills providing for coverage of Federal employees. When those bills came over to the House they were bottled up by the Ways and Means Committee which felt that certain discriminations would result. The effect of granting unemployment compensation to Federal employees would be to extend those benefits to seamen, for example, employed by the Federal Government, while at the same time denying benefits to seamen employed by private operators.

Legislation since enacted overcomes these objections.

In 1945, Congress extended unemployment insurance to cover Federal employees working for the Bonneville Power Administration,

so we already have Congress on record for extending coverage to one small group of United States Government workers.

In the Social Security Act Amendments of 1946, seamen employed by the Government were provided with reversion unemployment benefits. Seamen in private employment were also included under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

Suppose we go to the other extreme and cite that most stable of all Government agencies—the Post Office Department. It grows with the needs of the population generally and is not subject to the fluctuations which result from the rapid expansion or contraction of other United States agencies. Even here there are some separations.

The Congress has acknowledged a duty to the unemployed. It has recognized that income must be supported for a reasonable time to permit the displaced worker to find another job. The arguments for extending legislation to cover the employees of the Federal Government are just as compelling as the evidence justifying such benefits for the employees in private industry. Upward of 50,000 temporary postal employees are now on the rolls with little or no possibility that they will ever be granted permanent classified appointments. These employees are covered neither by retirement nor social security, and at their present wages cannot put anything aside to pay for rent and food during any period of involuntary unemployment.

From 1939 through 1950 there have been 4,970,000 applications for refunds from the Civil Service Retirement System. This is well over double the number of those now working for the United States Government. It proves that these employees, upon severance, desperately needed cash to carry them over the interval between jobs. That they had to forfeit their claims for old-age security in order to get immediate help is the fact that clinches their right to be protected by unemployment insurance.

This can be done in any one of three ways:

1. Federal employees would be entitled to Federal benefits with eligibility conditions and other requirements uniform for Federal workers just as the Congress has provided for railroad employees under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

2. The Congress would provide for unemployment compensation in accordance with the provisions of State laws, as was done for maritime employees subject to such terms and conditions as the Congress deems appropriate.

3. The administration of the benefits, and some other matters, would be left to State laws and procedures, subject to Federal review, as was done in the case of benefits payable to former servicemen of World War II under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor have endorsed the principle of unemployment compensation for Federal civilian workers.

Both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations favor it.

The 17 distinguished members of the Advisory Council on Social Security, after studying the proposal, have come out for it unanimously.

The whole unemployment insurance program is weak as long as it protects some workers and denies that same protection to others.

It cannot be called a form of social security until all men and women in the category of employees, and that also means civilian servants of the Government of the United States, are protected by out-of-work insurance.

The next session of the Congress cannot fail to establish this right by law.

Drive on Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am including, under a leave to extend my remarks, an article which appeared in the Washington Post, date of October 18, in Drew Pearson's column which goes into detail with an explanation of why certain prominent Republicans are trying to remove Guy Gabrielson as Republican National Chairman.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I first exposed Mr. Gabrielson's connection with Carthage Hydrocol and his repeated successful attempts to influence the RFC to put up Government money for companies which certainly had adequate finances of their own.

Mr. Pearson reports that the Carthage Hydrocol Co. is now unsuccessful and that GOP leaders fear a Democratic charge that the blue-chip backers of the concern are trying to let Uncle Sam share in their loss. I think the Republican leaders have the grounds for such fears and I do not think there is any question but what the blue-chip backers of Carthage Hydrocol do intend to let the taxpayers share in the loss. Of course that will not concern Mr. Gabrielson who in the meantime has up to date drawn \$201,000 in fees and salary from this outfit, which is not a success, and which has \$18,500,000.00 of the taxpayers' money borrowed.

You will also remember, Mr. Speaker, that I have been critical of the Democratic National Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Boyle so that I cannot be accused of being partisan in this matter but in all fairness to everyone concerned I would like to point out that the loan which Mr. Boyle is accused of influencing is for only \$565,000 as is pointed out in this newspaper article whereas the loan which Mr. Gabrielson influenced and I say influenced, emphatically, was for \$18,500,000.

A careful reading of the article will bring out that Mr. Gabrielson was hired when he was Republican national committeeman from New Jersey at a time when the Republicans were in control of Congress and when he was in a position being connected with the party in power to make his weight felt around the RFC.

In spite of all of Mr. Gabrielson's pious denials of influence peddling, I do not think that anyone with a little common sense can figure that there was anything else connected with it but influence peddling on his part. He got the \$201,000 only because he was able to get the eighteen and a half million from RFC.

The article referred to follows:

DRIVE ON GABRIELSON

(By Drew Pearson)

There are some interesting backstage reasons why Republican Senators are so insistent that Guy Gabrielson resign as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

One is a comparison between the two RFC loans obtained by the two chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees.

Democratic Chairman Bill Boyle's loan for American Lithofold in St. Louis totaled \$565,000—a relatively small amount.

GOP Chairman Gabrielson's loan for Carthage Hydrocol was for \$18,500,000—one of the bigger loans granted by the RFC.

Gabrielson drew a salary and fees totaling \$201,000 from Carthage Hydrocol during the period that he was either Republican National Committeeman from New Jersey or Republican National Chairman. He has been president of Carthage Hydrocol since April 26, 1946, and did not resign after he became national chairman.

Boyle claimed he received a fee of only \$1,250 from the American Lithofold, though upon becoming Democratic chairman he sold his legal practice to his partner, Max Siskind, who paid him in annual installments.

The Democrats, many Republicans feel, could score some points on this comparison during a campaign.

Actually, the RFC was established for the purpose of helping companies which could not obtain loans from private banks, and American Lithofold might have been in that category. However, it was not so much the RFC loan as the way American Lithofold wangled huge printing orders from the Government and paid Government officials on the side to get those orders that made the public hold its nose.

BLUE-CHIP BACKFERS

But what worries Republican Senators about the Gabrielson loan is that Carthage Hydrocol appeared not to have needed a loan at all. Its owners include some of the most powerful companies in the United States with top credit ratings, and the ability to borrow millions from the banks, insurance companies, or the public.

Instead they used politics to get an RFC loan of \$18,500,000. They retained Gabrielson, then a rising figure in the Republican Party, just at a time when the Republicans were nearing their peak power in the 1946 election and appeared sure winners of the Presidency in 1948.

Carthage Hydrocol was organized to make gasoline out of methane gas, which is the dry part of natural gas and which never before has been used for gasoline. However, the experiment, after 4 years operation near Brownsville, Tex., is reported unsuccessful and GOP leaders now fear a Democratic charge that the blue-chip backers of the concern are trying to let Uncle Sam share in their loss—through the RFC.

Chief backer of Carthage Hydrocol is the Texas Co., one of the largest oil companies in the world with gilt-edge credit. Another owner is United Gas, a holding company controlled by Electric Bond & Share, one of the biggest power companies in the world.

Another owner is Stone & Webster, hitherto never known to have been paid up for cash. Other owners are the Niagara Share Co., the Forest Oil Corp., La Gloria Corp., the Chicago Corp., Newmont Mining (a J. P. Morgan concern), Western Natural Gas and White, Weld & Co., the Boston bankers.

Another backer is Henry L. Shattuck, Boston blue-blood financial leader, Robert Winthrop, Boston banker and insurance mogul; William A. Coolidge, another blue-chip banker, and N. C. McGowan, one of the biggest gamblers in the business.

The amazing thing is that this group, with unlimited resources not only wangled an RFC loan but when the loan's first installment was due, wanted to postpone payment. It was last month, when the first \$250,000 was due to be repaid the RFC, that Chairman Gabrielson approached Stuart Symington and asked for a postponement. Later, when Symington demurred, the installment was paid, but

this postponement move left Gabrielson open to a possible charge that his blue-chip backers wanted to let Uncle Sam hold the bag.

These are some of the background factors which have caused GOP leaders to demand the ousting of genial Guy Gabrielson.

Power Is in Congress, Not the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from a Wisconsin resident which is pertinent to problems confronting Congress today. I commend it to the attention of the membership. It follows:

MADISON, WIS., October 9, 1951.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I wonder what the people will say when Congress adjourns. Almost the unanimous comments I hear are to the effect that Congress has ruined the country. I have not met a single person who defends the astronomical appropriations Congress has made and astronomical debt that is being imposed upon the people of the country and their descendants.

I am not blaming you for I know you struggled to prevent the gross extravagance of Congress; nevertheless, I believe the enclosed clipping expresses a solemn truth, and that, about taxpaying time, the reaction of the taxpayers will be very antagonistic. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I doubt that I will be able to pay much of an income tax. I am a retired university professor, 81 years of age, and have an invalid wife. With the inflated currency, for which the Government is responsible, I will have a hard time to make both ends meet.

Let me be a little more specific; the billions that are to be spent in building military fields all over the globe will provoke war and not prevent it. Their appropriation and expenditure is a menace to a peaceful world. Suppose Russia started building military bases in Mexico, Cuba, Newfoundland, etc., how would we react? Henry J. Taylor has visited every country in Europe and reports that none of them expect a world war unless we provoke it. If we attended to our own business instead of meddling in the affairs of other peoples, there would be less likelihood of war. We cannot feed, educate, train, and fight the battles for all the peoples of the world. It would require a book to state and analyze all the shortcomings of Congress, but that is not the purpose of writing this letter.

Will you please read the article entitled "Washington Tyranny A Case Study," on page 63 of the October number of the Reader's Digest? If that article states the facts correctly, I wonder why some Congressman has not started impeachment proceedings against the President. Under the Constitution the power of the Supreme Court extends "to controversies to which the United States shall be a party." It does not give the President the power to review the decision of the Court. What is the matter with Congress? Are all decisions of the Supreme Court to be subject to a Presidential review?

Another dictatorial act is his order to Government agencies not to report or give any information to the press that might be of use to our enemy. In the first place, What

nation is our enemy? We have a Russian Ambassador and other agents in this country, and likewise we have diplomatic representatives in Russia. How is the word "enemy" defined diplomatically?

In conclusion, I apologize for trespassing on your time, but I had to get some of these things out of my mind.

Respectfully yours,

C. M. JANSKY.

"How the New York Times Lost Its Nerve"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by myself, dealing with some correspondence I have had with the New York Times, together with certain correspondence and information relative thereto.

There being no objection, the statement, together with the correspondence and information relative thereto, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER

HOW THE NEW YORK TIMES LOST ITS NERVE (Pt. II)

Mr. President, some months ago, on June 5, 1951, I made an address in the Senate dealing with our China policy. In this address I critically examined the New York Times Sunday reviews during the years 1945-50 of books about China.

The address provoked a correspondence between Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the Times, and myself.

On August 13, 1951, in deference to Mr. Markel's expressed wish, I asked that this correspondence be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This was done. (See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A5063.)

But the matter did not stop there, Mr. President.

In my original address I cited numerous passages from New York Times Sunday book reviews that betrayed a pro-Communist bias. Mr. Markel denied that the exhibits showed such bias. His letters kept on coming and they were more and more peculiar. It was as though his first letter had been written on impulse and then, since it was discovered that the Times had been gravely compromised by many of its Sunday book reviews on China, he began to flounder.

The whole series of Markel communications is truly astonishing. It might be described under some such title as "How the New York Times Lost Its Nerve," a correspondence between Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, and Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, June 18, 1951-October 18, 1951.

At last I wrote to Mr. Markel and said that, as an editor of the New York Times, he had access to print as well as I.

I said that, since he was so intent on the publication of the whole correspondence, it seemed to me only fair that the Sunday Times open its book review section to the complete exchange. Did not the New York Times regard itself as the standard newspaper of record? Surely I had done my part.

Was it not just and proper that the Times reciprocate?

It was here that Mr. Markel's courage began to ooze away with great rapidity. Could it be, was it possible, since his paper's motto is "All the news that's fit to print," that Mr. Markel lacked the moral fiber to submit the New York Times' dirty linen to a thorough washing in its own pages?

The charge, implied in the question, Mr. President, I find, is sad but true.

To make a long story short, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix the final, and as yet unprinted, series of letters between Mr. Markel and myself.

Mr. President, first comes Mr. Markel's letter to me dated August 22, 1951. (This is actually Mr. Markel's third letter. The first two were printed, as already stated, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 13, 1951.)

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
Times Square, August 22, 1951

HON. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: This is my concluding letter in the series that has passed between us. It is obvious that there has been achieved neither a meeting of the minds nor an agreement about the facts. I am informed that you have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire correspondence up to this point. But I feel strongly that the RECORD will be neither true nor complete unless this final communication is included in it. Let us dispose first of the factual questions.

I am gratified that you corrected the error in the tables; that was indeed misleading.

As for your defense of the second inaccuracy, I am astonished. That inaccuracy was the suggestion that those who reviewed books on China for the Times "often reviewed one another's books." I demonstrated statistically that the statement was false so far as the Times was concerned. You reply that in your statement you were referring both to the Times and Herald Tribune. No fair judge would expect my answer to go beyond the Times. Do not mistake me; I have the highest regard for the Herald Tribune, but it seems to me fantastic to suggest that I should have included in my reply to you a defense of the record of any other newspaper.

Third, you question my statement that Tillman Durdin has written "both book reviews and magazine articles for the Sunday Times." You make no reference, in your answer, to the magazine; I assume, therefore, we pass your test there. But you do ask me to show you a place in your table where Mr. Durdin had a book published or reviewed one for the Sunday Times. None appears in your list but I call your attention specifically to a review by Mr. Durdin on page 6 of the Times Book Review of June 12, 1949—a review of *The Rise of Russia in Asia*, by David J. Dallin. That book and review were omitted from your list. I assume that was inadvertent, but checking reveals other omissions of this kind—I shall be glad to supply the details if you desire them.

Fourth, you keep insisting that my memorandum on the Irene Kuhn article in the American Legion magazine is meaningless so far as your speech is concerned, you assert that you have not read it. I can only say it is surprising that it has not come to your attention—especially because there is an amazing coincidence of argument and parallel of illustration between your Senate speech, the Kuhn article, and sections of the Utley book. As a matter of fact, a note in the Utley book makes specific mention and endorsement of Mrs. Kuhn's article.

These are disturbing matters but not the major issue. I now come to that.

You alleged in your speech that the tables you published demonstrated "the remarkable success of this effort to explain in glowing terms the Chinese Communist cause." You cited, in support of that charge, only a review by Nathaniel Peffer of a book by Gunther Stein.

In your letter of August 13 you again cite the Peffer review and you quote excerpts from five other reviewers who wrote for us during the past 6 years. It is interesting that, to prove your point, you quote from only 11 of the 31 reviews listed in your table and from only 6 of the 18 individuals who reviewed books on China for us during that period. It is more than interesting to note the manner in which those quotations are used by you. Let me take two examples.

Your quotation from Mr. Peffer consists of a line from the first paragraph of his review followed by a line from the final paragraph; everything in between is ignored. Yet in this same review there is this sentence: "Gunther Stein . . . appears to have got to the point where, if not actually willing to suspend critical faculties, he could not help feeling that too close an examination would be churlish." And, further, this: "What is fair to ask is whether the first criterion for a Communist China would be Russia's foreign policy or China's own national interest. That is a question that Mr. Stein did not get Mao Tse-tung to meet."

Is this, as you would have the reader believe, a complete and blind endorsement by Peffer of Stein?

You allege that John K. Fairbank's review of *Thunder Out of China* was designed to "give the reader the impression that Chinese Communists are noble liberators." How does this statement square with the following paragraph out of the identical review? "Kuomintang China contains a legion of fine modern Chinese who could develop good government, but they are not the gangster-politicians whose hold on power is confirmed by our ignorant and fearful support. Shame and chagrin will haunt the pages of our recent history in China. We have let our fears of Russia and of communism, on which the Kuomintang plays so skillfully, drive the Chinese revolution further into dependence upon Russia and upon communism. This is the road to Armageddon."

Is this the all-out statement for the Chinese Communists which your excerpt suggests?

No, Senator, this is not a fair quotation, nor are others of the excerpts you have produced.

But there is no point in continuing this debate over the meaning of words; let us look at the basic issue.

I do not assume for a moment, Senator BREWSTER, that you are acting out of any motives except loyalty to the United States and devotion to its cause. I trust you make the same assumption about me. Then let us examine, honestly and unemotionally, the fundamental question raised in this debate.

There was in 1945 and in the years immediately following a sharp division of opinion over what course we should pursue with China. There were, in the main, two groups. The first believed that the only hope lay in giving Chiang Kai-shek all the help we could, so that he might conquer the Communists and so save China for the West. The second group believed that the Chinese Nationalist Government was so discredited that no amount of help, short of direct intervention, could salvage it; that the Communists, as a result of the misdeeds and mistakes of the Chiang government, had won a commanding following in China and that, therefore, the only course for us to pursue was to reach some kind of accommodation

with the Communists so that they might be kept out of the hands of the Russians.

There was deep thought given to the problem, for it was deeply complex. The lines were not sharply drawn. General MacArthur himself indicated that the second course should be tried. When he was asked in December 1945 for his advice about a possible coalition government between the Nationalists and the Communists, he cabled Washington:

"It is suggested that the United States assistance to China, as outlined above, be made available as a basis for the negotiations by the American Ambassador to bring together and effect a compromise between the major opposing groups in order to promote a united democratic China."

Is he, General MacArthur, to be labeled pro-Communist because in 1945 he advocated a coalition with the Communists?

In this connection, despite your insistence that I have "dragged" Tillman Durdin into this discussion, I repeat what I said in my letter of July 17: "On page 143 of the *China Story* Miss Utley refers to Mr. Durdin as 'politically one of the best-informed correspondents' and continues 'It was also Durdin who gave me what is probably the fundamental reason why so many American correspondents in China fell under the Communist spell during World War II. You must understand, he said, how easy it was to believe in the Communists. It was so utterly hopeless in Free China. The graft, the misery, the lack of will to fight any more. Even I felt that it could not be worse and must be better in Communist China.'"

So here is Miss Utley's witness saying virtually the same things as these other reviewers whom you condemn so completely.

Which of the two courses was right no one can say because neither was tried. But that is not the point. In the light of what is now happening, the only important consideration is this: that the leading advocates in both groups were actuated by a desire to help the west and therefore the United States and that the divergence was not an issue of communism or anticommunism but an honest difference of opinion based on different appraisals of the facts.

Let us, then, look at it this way, squarely and unemotionally and nonpolitically. If we do, then I think we shall be furthering the Nation's cause because we shall thereby help to stem the trend toward dangerous emotionalism which is likely to blind us to true judgment at a time when, as never before, true judgment is needed.

One final point. In my letter of July 17 I said that "the implications of your remarks seem to me obvious—that those in charge of the *Times Book Review* during this period were either fellow travelers or dupes."

You say, "I never said anything of the kind" and then you add: "But I now say this: On the basis of the record, it seems very clear that some more than casual effort, some peculiar and deliberate intent was working somewhere. On the basis of the record, I believe that some investigation, some heart searching, and some admissions are due from the *Times* rather than the sort of protest shown in your correspondence with me."

In the light of this new paragraph of yours, I say again: that you are implying that those in charge of the *Times Book Review* are either fellow travelers or dupes. How else can one read that paragraph? What kind of investigation, Senator, are you proposing? And exactly what are you suggesting that the *Times* investigate?

I am asking, therefore, that this letter be added to the exhibit you have placed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*; and that, inasmuch as you or someone else has distributed re-

prints of your original speech, you arrange that the rest of this exhibit be transmitted to those to whom the reprints were sent.

Yours, cordially,

LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor.

Here is my reply, dated September 11, to Mr. Markel's August 29, 1951, letter:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1951.

Mr. LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor, *New York Times*,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MARKEL: I have your letter of August 22, 1951 (in reply to my own of August 13), with your continued discussion of my Senate speech of June 5, which dealt with the China policy, Miss Utley's book, the *China Story*, and a survey of book reviews in the *Sunday Times* and *Sunday Herald Tribune* for the years 1945-50, inclusive.

I note your statement: "This is my concluding letter in the series that has passed between us."

But you go on to say: "But I feel strongly that the record will be neither true nor complete unless this final communique is included in it" (i. e., the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*).

In your letter of July 17, you asked that the matter be granted space in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* in a position of prominence equal to that of the original allegations.

I promptly acceded to your request and on August 13, 1951, inserted the entire correspondence in the Appendix of the *RECORD* (p. A5063 ff.).

Now I have a proposal. You too, have access to print. You are the Sunday editor of the *New York Times*. If my understanding is correct, the *Times* prides itself on being a standard newspaper of record.

Are you willing to print our entire correspondence, including a detailed reply from me to your letter of August 22, in an early (say within 90 days) issue of the *New York Times Sunday Book Review*? In this way the *Times*' readers would be fully apprised of the whole discussion. That they would find it of interest, I have no doubt. Furthermore, since the *Times* publishes a separate index, the correspondence would be made the more easily accessible to journalists, researchers, investigators, and the like.

I feel that my proposal is fair and just for at least two reasons:

1. Up to the time of your most recent letter (August 22), I have acceded to your every wish in placing the discussion in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

2. Your August 22 letter raises numerous fresh points that I would like to pursue. For example, your insistence on dragging in Tillman Durdin and his review of Dallin's *The Rise of Russia in Asia*. In my original speech I tried, and said as much, to confine the list of books and reviews as closely as I could to nonfiction works on China. Had I wished to move completely at large outside this bound, I could have listed numerous books where the reviews displayed the most flagrant bias. You chide me for ignoring the review of Dallin's book, which is primarily focused on Russia. I can imagine your sentiments if I had included Nathaniel Peffer's review of George Creel's *Russia's Race for Asia*, a prime example of butchering an anti-Communist book. Creel's book was, like Dallin's primarily focused on Russia and so was omitted. Your whole discussion of this Durdin review strikes me as more than devious. It raises still another point, in relation to the reviews in the period covered, that I would like to examine.

I have striven to cooperate with you, Mr. Markel, and sincerely hope you will provide the readers of the *Times* an opportunity to review the entire correspondence. After all,

the Soviet Government conceded the publication of not only Herbert Morrison's criticisms, but also the Senate resolution of friendship. Don't you think that you might do at least as well?

Cordially yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

Here, dated September 27, 1951, is Mr. Markel's reply to my suggestion that the Sunday Times Book Review publish the correspondence. This is where Mr. Markel throws in the towel:

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
Times Square, September 27, 1951.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I have been hospitalized for a period and so this is my first opportunity to answer your letter of September 11.

I have discussed your proposal with some of my associates, including Mr. Sulzberger, who has had correspondence with Senator MUNDT on the same question. We believe that the charges you make against the Times are without foundation, and therefore we see no reason for giving them further currency merely for the purpose of retorting them.

You made a speech which contained what we consider inaccurate statements about the Times. I asked you to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum in answer to that speech. When you inserted that answer in the Record you added a long communication of your own making new accusations against us. That communication was mailed to me only on the day in which it was inserted in the Record. You allowed me no opportunity to reply to it. And now again you ask for the last word, as well as the first.

Our position is quite simple. The exchange was started by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and we feel that it should be completed there. We cannot understand why you hesitate about taking that course.

Yours sincerely,

LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor.

Finally, Mr. President, here is my last letter to Mr. Markel. I must say that the total effect of Mr. Markel's performance as a gladiator is feeble. He advances into the arena, grinding his teeth in imposing rage. Then he falters, wobbles, and sags until, terror-stricken, he flings away his net and trident and beats it at a dead run.

Goodbye, Mr. Markel. Communists and fellow travelers are dangerous playfellows. One of their mottoes is "never give a sucker an even break." But by now, of course—or rather, I trust—you have learned this bitter truth.

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

MR. LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor, New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MARKEL: I have your letter of September 27 in which you decline my proposal that our correspondence be published entire in the New York Times Sunday Book Review.

It is not an edifying spectacle to see an editor of the New York Times undertake a defense of his paper (for it was you and not I who initiated this correspondence) and then make a panic-stricken retreat with his tail between his legs. But as Hamlet says, "Thus conscience does make cowards of us all."

I shall indeed see to it that the whole of this correspondence is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Cordially yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

Muscular Dystrophy—A Few Sobering Facts About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

MR. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, while you and all of my distinguished colleagues of this Congress know that I am not a doctor of medicine nor an authority on health, but instead an attorney at law by practice and profession; nevertheless, the facts and information which had come to me from sources I believe to be reliable on this important subject are, in my judgment, such facts and information as are of importance and so impressive that I am pleased to present them for your attention and consideration.

It has always been one of the great and inspiring characteristics of the American people that, when they realize the form and magnitude of any killing danger that threatens them or their loved ones, they face this danger. They use their brains and resources against it, and they never give up trying to conquer it.

Now there is once again need to alert our American people to the devastation wrought by a killing agency in our midst. It has become necessary for us to pause in the midst of other pressing activities and to plan how we can beat back this killer and stamp out its deadliness.

In the year 1951, the great scientific and medical centers of the United States tell us that this killer has put the brand of death upon 200,000 of our countrymen. To our great dismay, those among us who have to face this deadly visitation in their own families, and who know that no one has yet won the battle for a human life against this killer, have come to realize that even the Nation's great founts of learning, and even our wonderful multimillion-dollar research centers in the United States, enjoy only sparse and partial knowledge about the existence and the nature of this mortal affliction of which we must all be warned.

Now there are 200,000 lives at stake. The grim precedent of the past has made it positive that every one of these 200,000 persons of whom I speak is doomed to die. They all must die unless research in the laboratories by a handful of devoted men can save them. None has a chance to survive his normal span of life unless efforts of leadership are exerted from the halls of the United States Congress to save these victims of a most malignant danger, of which only too few amongst us are aware.

The killer which has been striking down our people with such stealth is the disease of muscular dystrophy. Let me present a few very sobering facts.

A generation ago, there were less than 20,000 persons known to be sufferers from muscular dystrophy. Now there are 200,000 victims, and like the 20,000 of a generation ago, they all face a hopeless bat-

tle to live out their lives, unless some new agency of research and scientific study can find a control for the disease. At the present time, there is no known effective treatment for this affliction. There is no known cure.

More than 50 percent of the muscular dystrophy victims in the United States are children between 3 and 13 years of age. Few of these children will ever reach adolescence. Almost every one of them dies before maturity. Little boys outnumber the little girls who are victims of this disease in its childhood stage by almost 5 to 1.

These stricken little boys, often from the Nation's best families, and often among the brightest and most promising of our country's children, are victims of a disease whose cause and whose nature are both unknown. It is a disease which brings about complete degeneration of the muscles of the human body. The disease is a progressive disease.

It attacks the voluntary muscles, being chiefly noticeable in the inability of little boys to walk properly, to keep their balance, to learn to climb stairs, to get up when they fall down. The disease attacks the voluntary muscles of the body, one group at a time, and generally first depriving the legs of power, until motor paralysis of the body is complete.

The anguish and horror of an American family when it comes to realization that this cruel and sneaking disease has clutched some tow-headed little boy who was just starting to school, and who does not know that his inability to run and jump and slide and hold his own in a physical way against the other boys, is but the start of a long, drawn-out heart-break, is a pitiful matter in this day and age.

Most pitiful is the fact that, until now, because of the lack of knowledge on the part of the public, and on the part of those leaders of the public who include the bulk of the country's physicians, and on the part of the bulk of the country's elected leadership in such eminent positions as those of the United States Congress, it was not known that muscular dystrophy has actually marked off 200,000 of our living fellows for a lingering decline toward death.

Now is the time of America in the warmth of its heart, and the magnitude of its humanity, to make its fellow feeling manifest for the benefit of these hundreds of thousands of sufferers who go slowly down the dark path before the bereft gaze of their own fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers, neighbors and companions.

The history of this disease, now beginning for the first time in human experience, to be appreciated in its fearful immensity, is that of a complete lack of knowledge and neglect, until in recent years and in a few scattered centers of the United States and Paris, there has been an effort to ferret out the cause, and a panicky haste to devise a treatment.

So far both cause and treatment have eluded the limited efforts that have been possible, and the innocent little victims, not knowing what is the matter with themselves, have gone on in an unending procession of suffering and mortality.

Where there are 400,000 victims of cancer in the United States today, there have been research funds of \$90,000,000 raised to help these victims.

Where there were 32,500 persons stricken with polio in 1950, the money spent in polio research has amounted to \$9,000,000 since 1941.

But with 200,000 victims of muscular dystrophy estimated to be fighting their inevitably losing fight in the United States today, the pitiful sum of \$50,000 was spent during 1950 on research against this killer.

There happens to be two agencies in the United States fighting muscular dystrophy. Each of them is characteristically American. One is a movement which started with the private efforts of two girls, Texas sisters, who have been wasting from the disease. The other is the grouping of family members who first joined together in New York City to learn as much as possible of the obscure blight that was weakening their little boys, and who then pooled their efforts to back the research effort of one devoted and unselfish research physician who, much ahead of most of the others, had recognized the disease, charted symptoms, and launched out into a one-man research effort to take the deadliness out of it, in a hospital in New York.

Both these organizations of private citizens, that of the Texas sisters, and that of the New York group, have spread their word of alarm and education as much as they have been able to do so, in the good, old word-of-mouth manner.

But no private resources have been adequate to keep the little boys, and the adults who contract muscular dystrophy from dying. And it is felt that a fund of at least \$250,000 must be gathered from someone or many interested sources in 1951 in order to conduct a minimum research program, if there is to be any hope for the victims of this dread and mysterious affliction.

In a description of the nature of this disease which came to me, as a Congressman and an interested inquirer to the National Institute of Health at Bethesda, Md., this autumn, Dr. James V. Lowry, acting director of the National Institute of Mental Health, makes these explanations:

Progressive muscular dystrophy is a disease characterized by increasing weakness which results from degeneration of voluntary muscle fibers. The degenerated muscles are replaced to some extent by fat and connective tissue.

The physiologic disturbance underlying the muscular wasting is not known.

It is estimated that there are some 200,000 persons in the United States suffering from this disease. Males are affected more frequently than females. The onset of the disease usually occurs in childhood, more than half the sufferers being children between 3 and 13 years of age. In some cases, however, the onset is delayed until late in middle life.

There is evidence that hereditary factors may play a role in the illness. The course of the disease is progressive, usually leading to complete incapacitation within a few years, although in some cases the disease progresses so slowly that the patient is not incapacitated until middle life.

There is no known treatment of value at the present time for progressive muscular dystrophy.

The main source of encouragement in this illness lies in the fact that in an effort to determine the nature, causes, and treatment of the illness, research studies have been going on in various medical centers in this country.

The Public Health Service is currently supporting two projects amounting to \$91,500 dealing specifically with muscular dystrophy. In its total grants program, the Public Health Service has studies concerned with muscular dystrophy. The two active projects mentioned are included in these seven.

It might be mentioned that the most extensive of these projects was begun in July 1945 and is continuing today. It is a study of progressive muscular dystrophy and other conditions which may be classified under the heading of degenerative or hereditary disorders, or both. The research is being done at the University of Utah, College of Medicine, by Dr. M. M. Wintrobe and his associates in other departments of the medical school.

In addition to the research in muscular disorders, 11 research fellowships have been awarded for study in this field. Public Health Service is supporting a total of 30 fellows in neurological research at a total cost of \$99,200.

There is a certain amount of intramural research, of course, being conducted at the National Institute of Health, which is related to the subject of muscular dystrophy. The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases is conducting basic research in enzyme chemistry which is related to growth and metabolism and may contribute to our knowledge of the muscular dystrophies.

Enzymes make possible such essential reactions as the derivation of energy from food, and enzyme studies have contributed greatly to the understanding of body functions.

Following the completion of the Clinical Center at the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service, additional intramural studies will be possible on progressive muscular dystrophy as well as other illnesses. Such studies may be carried out by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness or by other institutions from time to time as their research programs develop.

In addition to the research mentioned above at the University of Utah School of Medicine, it might be well to tell of other current research programs at John Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, where Dr. Joseph L. Lillenthal, Jr., is doing research relating to muscular dystrophy.

At the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, Dr. Ade T. Milhorat has been investigating this subject for many years. At the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry in Rochester, N. Y., Dr. Karl E. Mason is working in this field also.

Mr. Speaker, in May 1950 the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America was founded and incorporated under the New York State laws as a nonprofit organization. This group is made up of parents of children suffering from the disease and of adults who have the disease. Its purpose is to raise funds for research programs, to establish fellowships, and to promote vocational guidance and adjustment to normal living of sufferers of the disease.

One of the first grants from the association for research was to Dr. Ade T. Milhorat whose work at the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center in New York City, has caused a feeling of hope

to enter into many of the 150,000 family circles of the afflicted.

The Muscular Dystrophy Association has produced a 5-minute sound and color film entitled "Today and Tomorrow." The film, showing the general nature of the disease, is available for showing to groups throughout the country. The Muscular Dystrophy Association also has literature available for the lay public on this disorder. The address of the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America is at 21 East Fortieth Street, New York 16, N. Y.

There was a very informative article published in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of September 29, 1951, which was titled "The People No One Can Cure." This article related the steps toward arousing attention of the Nation, and of pooling information among sufferers, their families, and physicians, which started with the unselfish and devoted efforts of two young women, Sallie and Nadine Woods, sisters who reside in the little southeast Texas city of Liberty, Tex., a place of 5,000 population. The organization which resulted from their efforts to do something for themselves and for the thousands of other sufferers of whom they became aware in their quest for facts, has the chartered title of the National Muscular Dystrophy Research Foundation. Sallie, now 30, and Nadine, 25, had the disease as children. Their efforts to get the facts, have helped them any many other in keeping up the buoyancy of spirit which characterizes a great many of the 200,000 afflicted Americans who have fallen victim to this unaccountable disease.

The board of control of the organization started by the Texas sisters, has prominent scientists from the universities of Harvard, Chicago and other noted medical faculties, trying to help in the search for the cause and the cure. But like the New York association, the big need is for funds to cover the research expense, and more funds, to cover the cost of enlightening the Nation so that the fight for a cure can have backing.

The All-American Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the misinforming statement of my esteemed colleague, JOHN MURDOCK, which appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A6331, needs no answer. A careful perusal of his remarks will demonstrate to all concerned that the basic history of the Colorado River controversy has been distorted and the facts grotesquely misstated.

As an example of this half-truth approach to the sincere differences of opinion which exist between the sovereign States of California and Arizona, witness the misrepresentations concerning the

use of Colorado River water for the production of hydroelectric power at Pilot Knob power plant.

There is now, as everyone realizes, a considerable amount of Colorado River water that wastes into the sea. To a large extent this water represents the portion of the upper basin allotment which the upper basin States have not used to date. None of the lower basin States may construct facilities to use this water permanently, as such water legally belongs to the upper basin. Arizona twice attacked the Colorado River compact in the United States Supreme Court, unsuccessfully, because she wanted the right to establish rights to the unused portion of upper basin water.

An additional amount of water now flowing into the sea is part of the undisputed water reserved for use in Arizona. My colleague must realize that the Gila project is to use 600,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water, and the Colorado Indian Reservation an additional 400,000 acre-feet.

So, assuming there is approximately 6,000,000 acre-feet not now consumed by the various States using Colorado River water, why does my colleague object to utilizing the flow of this water for the generation of electricity? Millions of barrels of fuel oil, at the rate of over 250,000 per year, have been lost each year that Pilot Knob development has been blocked by the obstructionist tactics of the Arizona Representatives in Congress.

Yet my colleague would lead the Congress of the United States to believe that the water flowing through Pilot Knob would be consumed by California.

Water which will flow through Pilot Knob wasteway cannot be consumed in California. It is delivered to the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission. This is below any California point of diversion. My colleague forgets that this Congress, with California's concurrence, authorized the State Department to condemn the Andrade properties below Pilot Knob, in order to insure complete control by the United States of all water deliveries to Mexico. The Mexican water treaty was advocated by Arizona on the very ground that it would put all deliveries of water to Mexico under the control of the United States State Department.

My colleague hints that water used for the production of power at Pilot Knob will be sold to Mexico, at a profit. If such is the case, he had better investigate the State Department. California agencies are on record with a proposition in which they agree to deliver to the State Department, for delivery to Mexico under the Mexican Water Treaty, free of charge. Arizona has objected to this California offer.

The waters of the Colorado which are not presently utilized by the upper basin States can be permitted to flow down the bed of the Colorado and waste into the sea without developing the power potential available. That is what my colleague demands. On the other hand, the same water may be diverted through the All-American canal, allowed to pass through Pilot Knob power plant, and

out at the precise point where it would arrive if it flowed in the river channel instead of the All-American canal. At this point, called Rockwood Gate-Hanlon Heading, the American section of the International Boundary and Water Commission receives the water into its custody and determines the amount which will flow to Mexico through the headworks of the Alamo canal, also acquired by the United States Government from California agencies under the Mexican Water Treaty, and how much will pass to Mexico via the main stream. Obviously all the water that reaches this point on the border has to flow on to Mexico; there is no place else for it to go.

Pilot Knob power plant will consume no water, nor will the water which is allowed to flow through this plant be delivered to Mexico by any California agency at a profit. It is all delivered to the State Department of the United States, not to Mexico. Instead, development of power, vitally needed power, will be made possible by utilizing these surplus waters when available. California can acquire no right to the use of the water for irrigation purposes merely by developing the power potential.

Moreover, all the water passing through the power plant passes out of California's reach; it goes instantly beyond California's last point of diversion, bypassing that portion of the canal which turns west to carry irrigation water to California, and plunging down instead into the Rockwood pool, owned by the United States Government and controlled by the State Department under the treaty.

My colleague has attempted to mislead the Members of this Congress by his remarks. He has charged California with the total consumption of the surplus waters in the river merely because he assumes all unused portions of the river will flow through Pilot Knob power plant. Such an absurd conclusion is not only unconscionable, it insults the intelligence of Congress.

California seeks only the share of Colorado River water available to her under the Colorado River compact and related laws, statutes, and documents. California will continue to fight the central Arizona project as an attempt to destroy reclamation in the West through unwarranted extensions of doctrines of feasibility and an unauthorized grab at the Federal Treasury. These vindictive attacks on California are merely repeated attempts to cloud the issue and throw in red herrings so Congress cannot grasp the true intent of the pork-barrel central Arizona project.

remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a very important editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Thursday, October 18, 1951.

It is most important that attention be given in our defense programming to the necessary and urgent needs of school construction. This important phase of our national life must not lag.

The editorial is as follows:

A PRICE WE SHOULD NOT PAY

If the defense program means that we are arming ourselves and the rest of the anti-Communist world at the expense of failing to provide necessary school facilities for millions of American children, we need some new evaluation of the net losses involved in saving democracy.

There were about 28,230,000 children enrolled in schools throughout the Nation (through the twelfth grade) in 1940. By next year that total will have increased by 2,400,000. By 1960 the total will have grown to 37,138,000. There were many shortages of school buildings in 1940. But with the unavailability of building material during World War II, which postponed so much construction, and with the new shortages threatened now by the defense program and the great increase of school population, we are not providing either for current needs or for those that lie ahead.

For the first quarter of 1952, communities throughout the Nation have made requests for 255,400 tons of steel for school building construction. The National Production Authority has allotted, in the face of that demand, only 81,000 tons. The demand, and the allocations, cover all types of construction in the field of education. But the greatest need for school construction is in the primary grades. Unless this need is more adequately met, there are going to be millions of young children who will be forced to use makeshift schoolrooms, on part-time schedules, throughout all of their school days. Some way should be found to increase the allocation of steel in this field particularly. The communities affected are paying for the construction. What they need is the steel. The allocations must be increased, regardless of where they come from. We can get along without many things. But adequate school construction is not one of them.

Soviet Peace Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

SOVIET PEACE TERMS

The latest exchange of views between Moscow and Washington has produced a mixed reaction throughout the world. The State Department is, of course, right in regarding the new Soviet note primarily as another propaganda blast, amounting to a rebuff of the American effort to enlist Soviet aid in the truce negotiations in Korea. And President Truman is equally right in standing by his statement that, under present circumstances, any agreement with the Soviet Union is not worth the paper it is written on.

A Price We Should Not Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my

But this attitude has been always subject to the important qualification that agreements with the Soviet Union will be welcome and necessary as soon as we have created positions of strength adequate to negotiate with the Soviets on a basis which the free world can accept and firm enough to compel the Soviets to keep the agreements made; and that we must therefore continue to explore the possibilities for agreement against the day when the Soviets come to the same conclusions. In that sense the latest American approach was another test of Soviet temperature, and the Kremlin's reiteration of its professed desire to discuss measures for the improvement of international relations including relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, coupled with the Communist reverses in Korea and the rising strength of the free nations, gives added interest to the Soviet reaction. In any case, the Western Powers contemplate new discussions with the Soviets during the United Nations Assembly meeting in Paris next month. And Mr. Churchill is proposing another big power meeting on the highest level, which he would be bound to press if he should become the next British Prime Minister.

This makes it pertinent to examine the latest reading of the Soviet thermometer. Unfortunately, the results are not encouraging. For the new Soviet note is not only negative on Korea, but couples the Korean question with all other outstanding issues, the listing of which, read in the light of the familiar Soviet stand on each issue, amounts to a presentation of the Soviet terms for peace.

These terms may be summarized as follows:

1. Withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea, beginning with a "reciprocal" withdrawal from the thirty-eighth parallel as a condition for a cease-fire, to be followed by a peace settlement which, by creating a vacuum of power, would leave all Korea open to a Communist conquest.

2. A "unified, peaceful, democratic and independent Germany," which in Soviet terms clearly means a neutralized, demilitarized and undefended Western Germany attached to the militarized Soviet zone and open to both Communist penetration and to the pressure of Soviet armies on the Oder.

3. A new peace settlement with Japan, assuring its permanent demilitarization and defenselessness against Soviet pressure.

4. Dissolution of the "aggressive" North Atlantic Alliance and elimination of all American military bases abroad—with the inevitable result that no European or Asiatic nation would be in a position to defend itself.

5. Unenforceable prohibition of atomic weapons and the same percentage-wise reduction of the armed forces of the big powers—steps which would preserve and, in view of the growth of the satellite forces, even enhance Soviet military predominance under a spurious international control which the Soviets could nullify by iron curtain secrecy.

6. Conclusion of a "peace pact" between the big powers, which would leave the Soviets free to attack countries not in the pact while keeping the Western Powers from interfering in Soviet designs—until their own turn had come.

7. Prohibition of war propaganda, which in Soviet terms means suppression of any opposition to either Soviet or Communist aggression.

It goes without saying, of course, that these terms also imply recognition and sanction of all Soviet conquests made thus far, and therefore abandonment of all the nations and peoples already under Soviet domination.

We doubt that any responsible official in the Western World is ready to talk agreement with the Soviets on such terms as these.

Railroad Retirement Act Amended To Increase Benefits to Retired Railroad Workers and Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I realize after months of effort that Congress has passed the necessary legislation to increase benefits to retired railroad workers and their families, and, otherwise improve their welfare.

NEED FOR INCREASING BENEFITS

The need for increasing the amount of monthly benefits paid to retired railroad employees and to survivors of deceased employees is urgent. The necessary relief must be given at the earliest possible day.

For several years now the scale of the benefits to retired railway workers and their families has lagged far behind the steadily rising cost of living. This has produced a situation that could not be ignored any longer. The condition of some of these retired workers and their families, whom we seek to aid by increased benefits, is desperate. They need help and they need it now without further delay. This bill which we have passed does the all-important thing, namely, increases benefits to all beneficiaries now under the railroad retirement system and thereby grants immediate relief to enable them to live more in accord with what they are entitled to have as a result of long years of service and the high rate of taxes that have been paid into the retirement fund. The increase also applies to future beneficiaries. This bill provides additional aid in an easy and effectual manner by providing an across-the-board increase of 15 percent to annuitants and pensioners and 33 1/2 percent to survivors, over and above the amounts they now receive. This will be effective immediately upon enactment of the bill.

SUMMARY OF BENEFITS AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

In order that there may be a full understanding of all that has been done to improve the welfare of retired railroad workers and their families, I wish to set forth a list of the worth-while things that have been done, as follows:

First. Increase of pensions and annuities 15 percent.

Second. Increase in survivor annuities 33 1/2 percent.

Third. Increase in lump-sum benefits 25 percent.

Fourth. A wife's annuity with a maximum of \$40 at 65 years of age.

Fifth. Integration and correlation by adjustments between Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivor insurance trust fund. This it is estimated will strengthen the stability of the railroad-retirement fund by \$95,000,000.

Sixth. The taxable base remains the same as under present law, \$300 per month. There is no increase in the taxes to be paid to the fund by increasing the taxable base.

Seventh. There will be a \$300-a-month credit in computing annuities instead of the \$250 limit in existing law.

Eighth. Credit for service after 65.

Ninth. Increase in annuity benefits for the individual who elected a joint- and-survivor annuity and whose wife has died.

Tenth. Increase in time limit for filing application for annuities from 60 days to 6 months.

Eleventh. Guaranty for employees with more than 10 years of service of benefits under railroad retirement would not be less than what they would have received under social security.

Twelfth. Revocation of joint and survivor elections, that is, any joint and survivor elections would be automatically revoked if the wife in whose favor the election was made should have predeceased the individual or employee making the election, together with right to cancel before death if so desired.

Thirteenth. Adjustment of benefits applicable to the case of an individual entitled to two or more benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act alone or under it and the Social Security Act.

Fourteenth. An annuity for a widower after 65 if at least one-half of his support was provided by wife employee at the time of her retirement or death.

Fifteenth. There is no \$50 work-limitation clause provision. A retired worker can continue to earn whatever is possible without losing his or her annuity.

I assure you that it has been very gratifying to me to have had a part in bringing about these important and worth-while amendments.

I am also pleased that the Congress has adopted a resolution to provide a further study of the entire Railroad Retirement Act, to the end that ways and means may be found to still further increase benefits and improve condition of retired workers and their families, and, at the same time, strengthen the stability of the retirement fund without increasing the taxes to be paid by the workers.

I give assurance of my continuing interest and desire at all times to be of every possible assistance in promoting the welfare of all classes of retired workers and their families.

Mr. Grant's Message to the People of Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a message of the Honorable Hugh G. Grant to

the Albanian people over Radio Free Europe, New York, N. Y., recently.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Hugh G. Grant was appointed United States Minister to Albania by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 9, 1935. Mr. Grant served in Albania until September 27, 1939, when he closed the American Legation, pursuant to instructions from his Government, following the Italian occupation of Albania which began in April 1939. Mr. Grant, who was the last American Minister to Albania, has retired from the Government service and is now engaged in lecturing and radio commentary on international events. Now, here is Mr. Grant's message:

When I was appointed United States Minister to Albania by President Roosevelt in August 1935, I was serving as political officer in the Division of Western European Affairs of the State Department in Washington. Since Albania was included in another geographical division of the State Department I had no first-hand knowledge of the country or its people. I immediately began an intensive study of Albania. The study was fascinating and proved to be even more so following my arrival in the country with my wife. Mrs. Grant and I were destined to reside in Albania for 4 years, and to witness much material development and progress of the country, and finally, unfortunately, Albania's destruction as a sovereign nation in April 1939, the result of Mussolini's invasion and occupation.

From the moment of our arrival at the port of Durazzo, early in November 1935, Mrs. Grant and I felt that we were in an atmosphere of friendliness and hospitality. The Director of Protocol of the Albanian Government met us at the port, gave us a very cordial greeting, and escorted us to the capital, Tirana. Within a few days of our arrival I was invited to present my credentials as the American Minister to His Majesty King Zog. The King, together with high civil and military officers, also received me most cordially. I then began my long period of service as the American Chief of Mission.

Having been born and reared in the southern section of my own country, which has a reputation for the open door to visitors, I decided to see something of the life and customs of the Albanian people. To accomplish this it was necessary to go into the towns and small villages of the country, and so I adopted the plan of taking time out from my regular diplomatic duties in order to make extensive tours throughout the country as often as possible. Since I did not speak the Albanian language I was always accompanied by an Albanian interpreter, enabling me to talk directly with the people in their homes. I also visited many of the schools and religious institutions of the country, and I am happy to state that among my warm friends, made during these visits, were leaders and laymen of the three great religious orders in Albania in addition to Albania's educational leaders. Moslem, Orthodox, and Roman Catholic leaders were my friends. And these friends honored me by visiting the American legation in Tirana as guests of the American Government. And I want to say here that I was greatly impressed with the splendid spirit of religious tolerance among the Albanian religious leaders and people. Moslems, Orthodox, and Catholics lived and worked side by side in Albania without those violent religious animosities which are so prevalent in many other sections of the world. Among my good religious friends also were two members of the American Protestant Church, Dr. and Mrs. Phineas B. Kennedy, who resided for 28 years in the city of Korca.

Whenever I visited the principal cities and towns of Albania I always called upon the civil, military, and religious leaders of the community. Among these officials were the prefect, the subprefect, the mayor, the military officers of the Government, and the chief muftis, bishops, and other high officials of the three religious orders. I would frequently spend 2 or 3 days in the larger cities, including Scutary, Korca, Durazzo, Argiro-castro, Berat, Valona, Alessio, Elbassan, and many other towns and villages. Mrs. Grant frequently accompanied me on these tours, and she, too, was always cordially received by the Albanian officials and people.

I also visited the high and rugged mountains of Albania, going into tiny villages which were inaccessible by automobile. I, therefore, traveled from time to time on foot and on horseback. In the course of these tours into the high mountains of Albania, I came to have full appreciation and understanding of the real name of the Albanian people, Shqipetar. Many times, Mrs. Grant and I visited the picturesque village of Kroya, perched high on the side of one of Albania's majestic mountains. This quaint village was the home of the immortal Scanderbeg, the great Albanian national hero. It was Scanderbeg who, on November 28, 1443, raised the red banner with the double-headed black eagle as the Albanian national emblem. It was Scanderbeg who kept the invading Turkish armies out of the country for more than 20 years. The friendly Albanian people invariably expressed to me their gratitude to the American poet, Henry W. Longfellow, who wrote a poem, entitled, "Scanderbeg."

I wish to say in all sincerity, that, in all of my travels in many parts of the world, I have never witnessed a deeper feeling on the part of a people for a national leader than that exhibited by the Albanian people toward the great Scanderbeg. It reminded me of our American attitude toward George Washington, leader of the American Revolution and first President of the American Republic. Scanderbeg and Washington had many similarities of character, of leadership, and splendid accomplishment. The attitude of the Albanian people toward Scanderbeg is indicative of the intense patriotism of the people. This love of country has existed throughout the long history of the Albanian people who are believed to be the oldest race in southeastern Europe. Despite numerous invasions and military conquests of foreign armies through centuries of time, the sturdy people of Albania have retained their national language, their customs, and their intense love of individual freedom. They were patriotic Shqipetars many centuries ago. They are patriotic Shqipetars today in this modern twentieth century of ours.

Albanians, we Americans who know you and who know the Albanians who reside in America, have great respect for you and your country. And, we have faith in your ability to carry on under great adversity and to throw off the yoke of tyranny which today grips your picturesque land through the rule of Soviet Russia, aided by a little group of Communist agents. Your ancestors established the reputation, and you have carried it on, of patience and tenacity of purpose in the face of great obstacles. You have a long-range view of life. You look ahead. These attributes of character will surely bear fruit in Albania in the coming days, as they have in the past. Without a doubt, you will regain your individual freedom and the political integrity of Albania from the Communist tyranny. The Albanian flag, the red banner with the double-headed black eagle, and the golden helmet of Scanderbeg, will fly again at the mastheads of your Government buildings. Albania will take her rightful place among the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Shqipetars, I salute you.

United Nations Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the great faith which our people have in the United Nations is demonstrated each year in the local celebrations of United Nations Day which occur in cities, towns and villages throughout the length and breadth of our land.

This year, on October 24, United Nations Day will mark the sixth anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

With the assistance of the Citizens Committee for United Nations Day, which coordinates the efforts of 85 national organizations, local committees are now planning meetings, ceremonies, entertainments and other civic events in communities in every State of the Union.

Perhaps the keynote of the entire event is a statement which was written for the 1951 United Nations Day by Oscar Hammerstein II, a great writer and public-spirited citizen who has so often been able to express the feelings of the American people in his immortal songs. It is being reprinted in a million copies, for distribution by the Citizens Committee and other groups. Because it is so short and is so effective a summary of the work of the United Nations, unanimous consent heretofore granted, I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the hope that Members will call attention of educators and community leaders to this simple but eloquent profession of confidence in the United Nations:

MORE THAN A DREAM

(By Oscar Hammerstein II)

More than a wish, more than a pretty ideal of well-meaning philosophers, the United Nations is a going concern. It is 6 years old. It has not attained permanent world peace, or freed every part of the world from hunger, or accomplished perfect international understanding—not in 6 years. But in this time it has taken longer steps toward the realization of these aims than any other agency in the history of mankind.

In Palestine, Kashmir, Indonesia, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Berlin, Greece, and Korea—wherever international conflict has threatened the peace of the world the United Nations has explored every method for preventing war: by active mediation; by orders to stop fighting; by persuading disputing nations to negotiate directly; and finally, in the case of Korea, by calling upon the armed forces of its member states to combine and halt an aggressor. This great and growing congress of nations has fought flood, famine, and sickness. It has sent missions of experts around the globe to provide technical assistance to countries that needed it. It has taken steps to curtail illegal production and distribution of narcotics. It has sent food and relief to distressed children. Its Charter provides the best hope for a future worldwide unity of nations and people.

The United Nations is now costing each American about 60 cents a year. Do you think it's worth the money? It needs your 60 cents. But above all else it needs your

faith. Believe in it with all your heart. Work for it, talk for it, give to it. Nothing will repay you more. The health and progress and peace of the world are the richest dividends you can reap. No other dividends are worth anything without these.

A Message From Bishop Klonowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Polish-American Journal of October 20, 1951:

A MESSAGE FROM BISHOP KLONOWSKI

DEAR MR. DENDE: May I extend to you my sincere congratulations of the fortieth anniversary of the Polish-American Journal.

To serve the public in the field of journalism is a responsibility at once neither light nor inconsequential. For people depend upon it regularly and widely to a great extent as a source of much of their information; many look to it for the shaping of their opinions, because it is difficult to think and they leave others do their thinking for them; and, furthermore, many are prone to accept unquestioningly whatever they read just because they see it "black on white." Hence it is that, together with the home, the school, the church, and one may add today the radio and the television, the press is regarded as one of the greatest formative influences of society.

We are fortunate in the United States to enjoy the freedom of the press by virtue of the very first amendment to the Constitution, which states that, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom . . . of the press," and by reason as well of the attitude of the public mind on this question. Evidently the only way to preserve this freedom—a freedom which makes possible so many opportunities to do good—is to adhere carefully, discriminatingly and unflinchingly to the principles of truth, and justice and charity, by wholehearted devotion to high and noble standards, and by espousing the common good without injustice to the individual.

In congratulating, then, the Polish-American Journal for the good it has accomplished during the past four decades, we wish it every blessing for the future.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

HENRY T. KLONOWSKI, S. T. D.
Auxiliary Bishop, Scranton.

The Proposed Aluminum Project for Montana—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over a month ago I requested explanation from various Government departments about allegations made over the radio and in the press by Mr. Drew Pearson and in the Appendix of the RECORD by

Hon. JOHN SAYLOR of Pennsylvania. I also requested investigations by the Department of Justice and the Hardy Subcommittee on Government Operations. I have received answers to all my requests and these answers have been placed in the RECORD. I had hoped the Hardy committee would have made its report before Congress adjourned. As this has not been done I am inserting with my remarks at this point a letter I wrote to the Honorable PORTER HARDY on October 18. If the Hardy committee does not today submit a report based on its investigation, I hope to at least receive an answer to this communication:

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1951.

Hon. PORTER HARDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives.

DEAR PORTER: You will recall on September 19, 1951, I requested your committee to investigate the allegations made against the Harvey Machine Co., by Mr. Drew Pearson in his radio broadcast on Sunday, September 17, and in his newspaper columns of September 18 and 19, 1951. I also requested your committee to investigate allegations made by the Honorable JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, in his statement which he put into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 18, 1951. As almost a month has passed since I made this request and as Congress will be adjourning shortly, I am writing to you to ask that your committee make known its findings at the earliest moment, and if possible, before this session of the Congress adjourns.

I feel very strongly that an answer to the charges made should be forthcoming and as you know, I have done my very best to have the questions raised looked into by the Department of Interior, by Mr. Stuart Symington of RFC, by Mr. Manly Fleischmann of DPA, by the Department of Justice, and by your committee. I have received replies from all the Government agencies and I have also sent copies of these replies to your committee for its consideration. The establishment of an aluminum plant in the Flathead Valley of Montana is vitally important to the people of my State. With Hungry Horse beginning to generate power next fall, it is imperative that a decision be reached just as soon as possible so that these allegations can be proved or disproved and so that a permanent aluminum industry can be brought into the Flathead Valley to start construction of the needed facilities to take advantage of the power which will be forthcoming in 1952. I know that you and your committee appreciate the importance of this matter to the people of the State of Montana, and I would be deeply grateful if a decision could be arrived at and a decision made known to the Congress and the people of Montana at the earliest opportunity.

May I take this means of thanking you for the wholehearted cooperation you have shown in granting my request for this investigation because I know that in the rush of the adjournment of this session of Congress it has put an added strain on you and your committee. I sincerely hope that this report will be forthcoming shortly so that the people of Montana will know where we stand and so that we may go ahead with the development of an aluminum industry in the Flathead Valley of Montana.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Letter Concerning Peanut Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter concerning peanut allotments:

GORMAN, TEX.,
October 15, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest your article in the Sunday Dallas News in regard to the acreage allotments on peanuts. This is a bitter pill to me and a lot of other farmers in this section of Texas.

Here is the case history of my farm. In 1936 I purchased a tract of 160 acres in this county of Eastland. I put this out in a commercial peach and apple orchard. In 1949 a tornado ruined this orchard. And to make a long story short orchards in this country are not successful from the standpoint of making one a living. This farm carries a 3½-acre peanut allotment. This is all I can get and you know that will not make a living. I have had the old trees removed and have tried to get an increase in allotted acres but instead the allotment has been cut each year until this 3½ acres is the net result in 1951.

As a result of this allotment business I have been forced to stop farming and try to make a living otherwise. In Eastland County where my land is located, peanuts is the only cash crop one has. I have tried to sell the farm and cannot do so on account of this little peanut allotment. The only way I can sell the farm is to take a big reduction in the price, as to what I could get if there was a decent allotment, in comparison to the other farms in this community. I have 123 acres in cultivation and that amount of acres around me carries somewhere from 25 to 50 acres of allotment for peanuts.

In other words, this has practically confiscated my farm, has forced me to stop farming, has reduced my property from 40 to 60 percent in value. I sometimes wonder if this is democracy. Every time you go to a PMA office they tell you they can't do anything, that so and so is the law as set out in Washington.

I would like to see something done to even up the acreage and as in my case where I have been forced to change from one crop to another, give a man an even break on acreage so he can at least make a living.

If anything can be done to get this matter righted it would be appreciated by people all over Texas. So far as I have been able to determine you are the only one up there that has taken any interest in this deal handed out on allotments.

If the Agricultural Department does not intend to make any adjustments in allotments on peanuts, then I think they should set up some provision whereby they should be permitted or forced to pay a person for his land, where reduced allotments have confiscated the land, or forced the value down, to the point of a sacrifice.

I would appreciate it very much if you could find out from the Agricultural Department if there is any way I can secure a fair allotment. They will not tell you anything or help you any way locally, so just what can we country boys do in cases like this.

We hear every day over the radio and from the newspapers about economic aid to the foreign countries and everyone else,

But I was told that charity begins at home. Yet here they force you to stop farming and stack your equipment that you have spent your life accumulating and get off the farm and try to make a living.

In case they will not increase the allotment, maybe they will build an airfield next door where I can sell out and go buy a farm that has some allotment where I can make a living. Guess you are tired of reading by now but there are a lot of us boys back in the country that are tired of the red tape and the unfair practices that are forced upon us by men in the PMA and those agencies. It is time that something is being done for people that these rules and unfair things have driven from homes they have struggled to pay for and are now being forced to hunt jobs.

Yours very truly,

J. LLOYD BROWNING

Mining Laws Abused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD four articles and an editorial, all appearing in the Denver Post. These articles point out how the provisions of the mining law are being abused and through this abuse permit the acquisition of public lands contrary to the real intent and purpose intended when Congress authorized the filing of mining claims.

I am calling these abuses to the attention of the Members of Congress with the hope that the appropriate committees will make the proper study and recommend laws adequate to remove these abuses.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Denver Post of October 11, 1951]

**MINING LAWS ABUSED—PRIVATE OPERATORS
FILL POCKETS FROM PUBLIC LAND**

(By Robert W. Lucas)

Public timber, grazing, and recreation lands in the vast public lands States of the West are being converted to private occupancy and use without proper compensation to the Public Treasury and contrary to the public's interests, a Denver Post investigation has revealed.

Millions of board feet of public-owned saw and pulp timber may fall under the ax to the profit of people who have neither bid for it nor will pay for it, but may pocket the proceeds, from its barter or sale.

Mountain cabins, tourist resorts, filling stations, and other private facilities have been built and are arising on public lands without permits and free of rental obligations and requirements of safety and sanitation normally required by governmental agencies.

Grazing permits are being withdrawn or reduced because the management of grazing lands is being interfered with by private individuals who are encroaching, willy-nilly, on the grazing domain of national forests.

Mile after mile of the western playgrounds' most abundant fishing streams are being withheld from public enjoyment by the simple act of posting against trespass—an

act done by people who have learned a legal way to squat on public property.

How has all of this been permitted to come about? Are these shadows of another Teapot Dome scandal? Are the laws of the United States being set aside by an alliance of powerful interests and corrupt public officials?

SPRING FROM MINING LAWS

No, these raids upon the public domain are sanctified by customs and laws that have been in effect for almost 75 years. They are the mining laws that date back to the basic law of 1872. One tiny section in those laws fails to distinguish between surface and subsurface rights in the establishment of a mining claim. That is opening the door to the situation outlined above.

This has been going on since 1911. Why is the situation coming to light only now?

The answer is fourfold: (1) High timber prices in recent years; (2) the fantastic growth of the recreation industry; (3) the enlarged part that fun and travel play in the lives of modern Americans; (4) the inundation of the frontier west by the great western migration of the last decade.

WHERE'S REMEDY

Does the remedy lie in dislodging claimants and occupants of public lands? Does adequate but reasonable protection of the public domain conflict with the legitimate interests of the great American mining industry, or weaken incentives to necessary prospecting, discovery, and development of the Nation's mineral wealth?

Among those who have given the problem closest study the answer to both questions is "No." But whether the National Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and the mining industry can agree upon the necessary remedial legislation is another question.

The mining industry, legitimate miners or their use of the mining laws are not at issue. The trouble, investigation shows, has arisen from practices by interests who are subverting the mining laws for purposes other than mining. Bona fide mining men do not wish to take up claims for an unlawful or disguised purpose.

PRODUCT OF MANY YEARS

Still, the mining laws are the product of many years of judicial interpretation, during which much time, money, and effort have been spent in perfecting them and in understanding both the rights and obligations under law. Anything that would bid to disturb the mining laws or disorder the precedents and court decisions that give them force and meaning would be eyed skeptically, if not opposed strongly, by the mining fraternity.

But those who are confronted with present difficulties in the management of public lands insist the record demands some compromise. In cases where mining claims have been protested successfully, on the grounds that the claimant really had something besides mining in mind for the land in his claim, rather liberal tenure permits have been granted for continued occupancy.

And the National Forest Service insists that a separation of surface rights from subsurface rights in claims need not hamper mining in any essential detail, even though it might require more negotiation than at present.

Meanwhile, what has actually been happening under the mining laws as they now stand?

[From the Denver Post of October 12, 1951]

MINING LAWS ABUSED—UNITED STATES VIRTUALLY HELPLESS TO PROTECT PUBLIC LAND

Public lands belong to all the people of the United States, to be managed for maximum benefit of all the people. Yet in Colo-

rado some persons have legally claimed use and possession of certain lands, at highly nominal cost, and have profited in enterprises wholly foreign to that implied in their claims.

The misuse of mining claims in Colorado and throughout the West is revealed in this second of a Denver Post series on what amounts to a steal of public lands under the guise of law.

The law recognizing mining claims is complex. A claim may be established by the performance of a few simple acts such as doing \$100 worth of work on it each year. To establish a claim and to patent it, Federal law requires that the locator must have made a discovery of valuable minerals. There are other provisions, all of them simple and also inexpensive by today's standards.

LAWS FAVOR CLAIMANT

The quality and kinds of material that are recognized in law by court decisions as minimum to the assertion of either a temporary claim or a permanent patent make it possible, however, to file a claim almost anywhere, anytime. But the burden of proof that a claim is invalid rests with the Government. And the laws are stocked in behalf of the claimant.

Even though a mining claim is successfully challenged by the Federal Forest Service of the Bureau of Land Management, another claim, with only minor changes in metes and bounds, can immediately be filed. And the time-consuming and costly process of examination must be undertaken all over again.

What does this all mean to the people of Colorado and to the United States?

It means that through a loophole in a body of law devised to protect and promote the great mining industry of the United States, certain proprietary functions granted to the Government are being hamstrung or bypassed entirely.

It means that the forest service in Colorado could not prevent a syndicate of men from obtaining clear patent to the surface of 10 times the land needed to dig out a single material, then sell the grazing lands for private use at a profit of \$1,500.

It means that an individual was permitted to obtain title to valuable gravel and a commercial site at an intersection of major highways in Colorado, as part of a 145-acre tract, merely by filing a piece of paper at the county courthouse. His costs of "prospecting" the claim to meet the requirements of law were more than repaid from the sale of gravel to the State, which formerly obtained it free from Uncle Sam. Having established patent on the claim, he now owns it, to develop, sell or barter it as he will.

The people of the United States, in whom this land was supposed to be held in trust, will realize nothing from this claim. Having passed from public to private ownership, virtually without compensation, the tract is taken from public supervision and control. The claimant himself is blameless. He enjoys knowledge of the law and how to use it.

MINER BUILDS RESORT

There is a spot in Colorado where a veteran miner, wise to the laws and possibilities thereunder, has systematically built a mountain resort of great value on his own land and contiguous mining claims. He is not only exempt from the payment of Federal permits and fees. He is free of regulations with respect to fire and sanitation, rules established by the Forest Service for other licensed tenants on public lands in this country.

The Izaak Walton League has struck out against a rising tide of posted fishing streams, some of which are known to be on tracts obtained through mining claims by persons who had no honest intention of mining them.

Such abuse of mining laws has been bitterly protested on the world-famous Rogue River in Western Oregon.

FEAR WORST TO COME

Those most concerned about the trend toward private exploitation of public lands say it is only the beginning. They say that as the knowledge of how to take advantage of the weakness in the mining laws spreads, along with the pressure for timber, grazing or recreation lands and sites, the problem will become wholly unmanageable.

At present the minerals examiners for Uncle Sam are literally years behind in their work, and are falling behind farther by the month. The conditions detailed here as existing in Colorado are duplicated elsewhere in playgrounds of the West.

[From the Denver Post of October 14, 1951]
SIXTY MILLION DOLLARS OF PUBLIC'S TIMBER
HELD PRIVATELY

(By Robert W. Lucas)

More than 7,000,000,000 board feet of the public's timber is in the hands of persons holding mining claims in the 12 Western States.

That timber has not been bid in from Uncle Sam through the United States Forest Service, which acts as custodian for the people's timber resources. Yet it is held, in some cases temporarily, and in others in complete ownership, without compensation to the Public Treasury. It is worth something like \$60,000,000.

This timber is one gigantic item of exploitation that is frustrating the conservation and management laws that are under current exploration of the Denver Post. What will happen to it is paradoxically beyond the ken of the Federal agency charged with responsibility for it. Why? Because of a soft spot in the United States mining laws.

TWO MILLION ACRES COVERED

Because a mining claim may include up to 160 acres of surface rights, some 73,000 such mining locations cover almost 2,000,000 acres of the national forests in the West. Less than 3 percent of all these locations is producing minerals in commercial quantities.

The percentage of production is highest in Utah, Nevada, southern Idaho and western Wyoming. But in California where more than \$36,000,000 worth of timber is tied up in 17,000 mining claims, only 1 percent of them is grinding out minerals.

A high official of the United States Forest Service recently said:

"As long as it is possible, under the mining laws to acquire a possessory right to the surface and timber of a mining claim, by making a discovery of mineral sufficient to justify a prudent man in doing development work, we are going to be seriously hampered in our administration of the timber and land resources of the national forests."

He pointed out further that "it is easy to find a 20-acre claim in the Douglas fir country of Oregon or Washington with \$20,000 worth of timber standing on it, and anyone familiar with that region could locate claims with over \$50,000 worth of timber."

PUBLIC PAYS OTHER WAY

Does this mean that this enormous timber value is being harvested at will by persons who have acquired it for virtually a song? Not quite. But the existence of vast acreages of vaguely located and isolated mining claim timber costs the public money in ways other than losses from its direct sale.

The reports from regional foresters covering many national forests tell the story.

Here is a tract of ripe and merchantable timber that cannot be sold, although there is a willing buyer, because a mining claim

blocks the right-of-way for a logging road. The timber on the claim contains snags that should be felled as a precaution against fire—fire that wipes out millions of board feet in a flash.

But the claimant is adamant. He might be willing to sell right-of-way—which means he is selling something that belongs to the people, but over which he has legal control.

On one lot of 70 mining claims in one Oregon forest, 1,400 acres carry 35 million board feet of timber. A road through it is kept under lock and key. This timber belongs to the people of the United States. Until and unless the mining claims upon which it is located are patented, that vast stand of timber can be used only to develop the claim on which it grows.

In a national forest of Idaho mining claims are precluding the logical development of summer homes and public recreation on the shores of Priest Lake, Upper Priest Lake, and Lake Pend Oreille.

CALIFORNIA EXAMPLE

Mining claim locations scattered throughout the Payette forest's heavy stands of commercial timber are causing loss of time and are piling up costs of administration neces-

Region	Mining location	Acres	Percent producing minerals in commercial quantity	Timber on claims	
				Volume (board feet)	1940 value
(1) Montana, north Idaho.....	15,395	307,530	3.0	972,000,000	\$4,226,000
(2) Colorado, east Wyoming, South Dakota.....	12,711	321,300	2.0	182,175,000	978,800
(3) New Mexico, Arizona.....	9,418	118,711	3.0	126,970,000	689,985
(4) Utah, South Idaho, Nevada, west Wyoming.....	15,626	373,153	5.0	443,657,000	1,888,351
(5) California.....	17,719	640,427	1.0	3,429,917,000	36,522,084
(6) Oregon, Washington.....	5,988	184,673	3.0	1,945,842,000	13,246,060
Total.....	73,845	1,845,794	2.6	7,099,511,000	57,251,280

[From the Denver Post of October 15, 1951]
MINING LAWS ABUSED—MINERAL VALUE
PRIORITY HELD AID TO LAND GRABS

(By Robert W. Lucas)

United States mining laws give an arbitrary priority to mineral values on national-forest land, regardless of whatever other public values are involved. That simple statement of fact is dropping the bars to a grab of timber, recreation, and grazing lands which those who wrote the mining laws never contemplated.

But an investigation by the Denver Post has put a spotlight on innocent abuse—innocent in that it is legal, but abuse nonetheless—of basic tenets of the conservation and protection of natural resources.

The peculiar liberality attached to the filing and patenting of mining claims is described by United States Forest Service officials as an obstacle to the proper management of public lands.

Forest Service objections are not directed against the framers of mining laws or the mining industry. Indeed, there are illustrations of close cooperation between the two, as in the Big Horn National Forest near Sheridan, Wyo.

There a 5,000-acre mining exploration is tearing up the range as prospectors search for a strategic material known as monazite, a rare earth element that is going into the defense effort.

There are many examples of close and effective cooperation between custodians of public lands and legitimate miners who are carrying on widespread and important industrial activity.

REWARD TO FINDER

A Forest Service minerals examiner, addressing a rangers' training camp at Woodland Park, Colo., not long ago, recognized the

sary to run lines and mark claim boundaries so that timber sales and management may be carried on.

There are 860 acres of timber in one group of unpatented mining claims in a national forest of California. The mining claimant refuses to permit cutting by a purchaser who is harvesting surrounding Government timber. And 12,000,000 board feet of the public's trees stand in custody of persons who have not paid a dime for it.

The same story is true, though in terms of less value, among the forests of Colorado and in the Black Hills of South Dakota. The loss to the people from hamstringing forest and grazing land management in claim-studded national forests and open public domain is enormous. And the source of difficulty, a hitch in mining laws, is far removed from the legitimate interests of the actual needs of miners and mining.

The following table is from reports of national forests in 12 western States. Not included is the fact that the forest service considers valid 14 percent of the mining claims filed. The figures were taken from conditions existing at about Jan. 1, 1950. Estimates of timber values involved have increased substantially since that time.

logical and necessary development of laws and safeguards for mining in these words:

"Wherever and whenever in the course of human history there have been free men the search, the element of chance, and the ultimate discovery have almost universally been conceded to convey some measure of proprietorship to the discoverer. When this has not been so, men were not free."

The problem that has arisen over adapting mining laws and precedents to modern conditions of land management is one of qualifying proprietorship to harmonize governmental practice with the clear intent in conserving and wisely using natural resources.

Those closest to this problem and most profoundly aware of it say its solution is "touchy". They hesitate to advocate corrective legislation lest they start a political war. The question has been discussed "among individuals." Tentative legislation, containing a simple change in what constitutes a surface mining claim, has been kicked around. It would include a "right to occupy and use so much of the surface of the land covered by the location as may be reasonably necessary to carry on prospecting and mining."

In the case of timber it would provide "that any person entering said lands shall not acquire title, possessory or otherwise, to the timber now or hereafter growing thereon, which timber may be managed and disposed of as provided by law."

But the remedy, which must come from Congress, is another story. And it is a long way off, in the opinion of students of mining law and public policy. Meanwhile special reports have been made in recent months for the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service. These reports spell out incidents of interference in timber and range management and utilization, resulting from ill-defined and widely scattered mining claims.

LEGISLATION NEEDED

Unless some legislation is devised soon, with the endorsement and support of mining interests as well as the National Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, mining claims will continue to—

Hold up timber sales; hold open the possibility that valuable public timber may be converted for private profit without adequate compensation and through poor harvesting practices, interfere with range use; block road locations and permit the exacting of tolls for rights-of-way; prevent recreation development on public lands and give mining claimants unfair advantages over permittees in national forests.

Roy M. Robbins, in the book *Our Landed Heritage*, wrote "Not until the nineteenth century, almost coincident with the passing of the American frontier, did a few thinking men begin to realize that the Nation's natural resources were being exploited in such an alarming fashion that the time was near when these vast resources of wealth would be completely under the control of a few individuals who had no regard for their proper utilization and little respect for laws which would attempt to regulate their disposition."

What would appear to be defects and conflicts in laws governing use of public lands is reopening the question of their conservation and protection at the midcentury point.

[From the Denver Post of October 13, 1951]

PHONY MINING CLAIMS ROB THE PUBLIC

A revision of United States mining laws, to plug a loophole which is permitting the filing of bogus mining claims, was recommended by the Hoover commission task force's report on natural resources, dated January 1949.

On page 54, under point 4 of recommended revisions, the report says:

"The liberal provisions of the mineral laws which permit the acquisition of surface rights in addition to subsurface mineral rights have opened the way to the filing of numerous claims to secure valuable surface rights under the guise of mineral claims."

Later in the report, under section (a), "Changes in laws pertaining to mining locations and patents," the report recommends in point 11:

"Recognize the presumptive right of the holder of a mineral claim to the surface but restrict surface uses, prior to patenting, to those necessary in connection with exploration activities. Grazing and cutting of timber shall be in accordance with regulations of the forest and range service and should be limited to the needs of the proposed operation."

Point 6 under the same section says: "Give the geological survey the right to cancel new unpatented claims at any time, if it is requested to examine the ground by the agency administering the land, and if it finds the prospective value of the ground too slight to warrant further expenditure of money or effort on its exploration."

Efforts of the bureau of land management and the United States Forest Service to obtain changes in the mining laws in line with the Hoover recommendations are viewed with great suspicion by important elements of the mining industry. The bureaucrats, it is felt, are attempting to freeze free private enterprise out of the public lands.

The feeling is entertained by some that the Department of Interior really wants to change existing law so that instead of a prospector being able to get a clear title to mineral lands, he may have title only to mineral deposits, but may otherwise have

only a lease. The Department of Interior has denied such intent.

The facts indicate, however, that there is more of a problem here than that presented only by the ambitions of bureaucrats. The Hoover Commission task force which took cognizance of bogus mining claims included some eminent men who should have understood relative rights in land law and the problems of the mining industry as well as those of administrative agencies. The special committee included the former governors of Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado, and the president of the Homestake Mining Corp., Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin.

Parties most interested in correcting what they allege to be defects in the mining laws—and those include the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management—should be encouraged to press for amendments as needed. If there is a phony case, set forth only to disguise unwarranted encroachment upon the legitimate interests of private enterprise by power-hungry officials of Government, that should be brought out, too.

Some leaders of the mining industry oppose revision of the laws and insist that administrative officers in the Forest Service and Bureau of Lands have ample authority to prevent location upon or the patenting of forest lands under the guise of their being mineral lands.

Whether revision or enforcement of the laws is the answer, certainly inaction will not put a stop to the robbing of the public and the obstruction of lands management by the filing of bogus mining claims.

Federal Employees Pay Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the roll-call vote on the conference report accompanying S. 622, a bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, I was recorded as not voting. I want to explain that the reason I did not vote on this bill was because I was called from the House Chamber shortly before the vote was taken to participate in a conference concerning the matter of obtaining more materials for school construction. This is a matter of extremely vital concern to the people of my district and one on which I have been working for many months. Nevertheless, I would not have done anything which would have caused me to miss a roll-call vote on this conference report if I had any doubts about its being approved. This is borne out by the fact that it was overwhelmingly approved by a vote of 315 to 26. However, I want the record to be clear that I favored the conference report accompanying S. 622 and would have voted in favor of it if I had been present when the roll was called. I also want to point out that when this legislation was first considered by the House earlier in the session, I voted for it.

The Seaway Issue Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on October 1, 1951:

THE SEAWAY ISSUE TODAY

Congressmen who have smugly blocked construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for years past are due for some soul-searching reappraisals of their position. Now that Canada has announced she is going to turn the project into an all-Canadian undertaking and build it for her own benefit, the position of those American interests opposing the seaway becomes more untenable than ever before.

It was one thing for short-sighted Senators and Representatives to say, "We are blocking construction of this seaway because it would help the development of inland United States, and we don't want that part of the country developed any further." They had selfish regional support for such a stand.

Now, faced with the fact that a foreign country is going to build and operate this seaway alone if we still hang back, the new question before these Congressmen is this: Can we afford to be held politically responsible for letting a foreign power acquire control of a border navigation project which will affect the national security and defense of the United States and all its people?

Of course, Canada is a friend and ally. That makes small difference in the basic, long-range considerations. It is elementary that the United States should have a direct voice in the planning, building, and operation of waterways upon which a large amount of its commerce will be dependent for ingress and egress. Yet this voice will be denied us if we stubbornly force Canada to go it alone on the vital lower reaches of the seaway.

The St. Lawrence issue has resolved itself into the simple question of whether the Congress of the United States is to protect the national interest by becoming a partner in a development which is going ahead regardless of whether or not we participate.

St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three excellent editorials relative to the pending St. Lawrence project. One editorial entitled "Reviving St. Lawrence," appeared in the October 6 edition of the Providence (R. I.) Journal; and the second editorial entitled "Seaway Stalemate," was published in the October 3 edition of the

Decatur Herald at Decatur, Ill. The third editorial entitled "New Confidence in the St. Lawrence Waterway," appeared in the October 11 edition of the American Metal Market.

The editorials follow as above-mentioned:

REVIVING ST. LAWRENCE

Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, have revived the issue of construction of the St. Lawrence waterway probably too late to get positive action this session. Several months ago General Marshall and Defense Mobilizer Wilson greatly altered the complexion of this ancient controversy by declaring that construction of a seaway through the St. Lawrence is essential to national defense. Mr. Wilson went so far as to label it a "vital" and "urgent" project.

Two important considerations prompted Mr. Wilson to reverse his long-held critical view of the proposed St. Lawrence undertaking. One is the increasing importance of foreign iron ore in American defense. If we are to achieve our objective of producing annually 130,000,000 ingot tons of steel by 1960, we must have ore from such outside sources as Labrador, Venezuela, and Brazil. The St. Lawrence River is not only the natural but indispensable transportation artery for delivery of this foreign ore to the steel mills in the Great Lakes area.

The second consideration is the possibility that enemy attack, either directly or through sabotage, might suddenly wreck the Sault Ste. Marie locks through which passes the entire output of the Mesabi Range iron ore. Such a blow would cripple our steel industry. Hence not only the wisdom but the urgency of having an alternative source of vital supply. The St. Lawrence development project is the key to this source. More than 7 months have elapsed since Marshall and Wilson urgently advocated positive action. Meanwhile the Canadian Government has indicated its impatience with American dilatoriness. If it is now too late for Congress to take affirmative authorization action this session, clearly in the name of defense the St. Lawrence seaway should be given high priority when the next session begins.

SEAWAY STALEMATE

The United States has fumbled plans for the construction of a St. Lawrence seaway until Canada in desperation has volunteered to foot the \$219,000,000 bill, and do the work alone.

To which President Truman protests that the United States would prefer joint development of the seaway by the two countries. The President is reasonable, however, to the extent that if Congress cannot be prodded into some sort of action soon on the seaway, he would approve the Canadian plan as second best.

One would not suspect it from the manner in which Congress has handled previous plans for the St. Lawrence River project, but the seaway and power project is immensely important to the neighboring nations. In the beginning there was long controversy over whether the seaway should be built at all. That has been decided, and the issue now is whether it would be better to let Canada build and own the project or share it with the United States.

Since the seaway would be of mutual advantage, it seems obvious that the United States owes Canada fullest cooperation in the project. Contemplated is the dredging of the St. Lawrence River to open the way for large ocean-going vessels as far west as Detroit, to insure a steady flow of iron ore to the midland steel mills of the United

States from new-found deposits in northern Quebec and Labrador.

If this project is completed—and engineers say it is a possibility by 1956—it is easy to envision the opening of a navigable channel from Detroit to Lake Huron, which would allow large ocean freighters to reach Chicago and Duluth. The prospect of ocean-going ships at Chicago docks is most attractive.

Canada has offered the United States a proposal as near an ultimatum as can be exchanged between two friendly neighbors. It is this: Help us build the seaway, or give us permission to do it alone.

The obligation of the United States is obvious.

NEW CONFIDENCE IN THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Two developments have taken place in the past fortnight which direct new attention to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. At an official conference in the White House, Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada, presented to President Truman a plan under which the waterway would be constructed by Canada alone. Several days later a new bill to build the project, with both the United States and Canada participating, was introduced by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed on the vital importance of the seaway to the economy and defense of the two countries, and also that cooperative construction is most desirable, but if Congress does not soon act, then the Canadian plan would be "second best." No one can deny that there has been lengthy dilly-dallying over the program and a considerable amount of confusion, especially since numerous groups opposing the waterway have disseminated large amounts of literature in many directions. Canada has grown weary of waiting with the result that her plan to build it alone has been tentatively submitted to the Parliament in Ottawa, which reconvened on October 9. We believe that our good neighbor is taking the logical step and will work out the matter of electric power with New York State, assuming that reasonable time first will be given for Congress to take up the Blatnik proposal.

Despite the importance of the project as a transportation system for Labrador-Quebec ore to the Middle West for coal, aluminum and many other goods and as a potential source of perhaps 3,000,000 horsepower of cheap electricity, the House Ways and Means Committee shelved the matter in July. The margin held by the opponents on the committee is understood to have been small. But new hopes are now arising and these must not be considered as lacking significance or weight. The construction would not place an excessive strain on the supply of manpower and materials because the needs would be spread out over about 6 years.

Mr. BLATNIK has designed a bill with a new approach which was developed after careful consideration of the numerous criticisms presented at the protracted hearings held in the House this spring and which are recorded in two thick volumes. Briefly, his resolution recommends: (1) complete exchange of information between the two countries on costs, rates, overhead, etc.; (2) assurance of United States-Canadian agreement on tolls to make the program self-liquidating and self-supporting; (3) a bipartisan commission to study and supervise construction along with Canada; (4) mutual agreement on the retirement of the investment within 50 years; (5) the Secretary of the Army to keep an accurate check on costs, amortization, operations, and fiscal performance; and (6) setting up of a special St. Law-

rence fund in the Treasury and issuance of bonds to facilitate accurate accounting.

While the new bill will not reconcile all the objections previously presented by the railroads, barge, and coal interests, chambers of commerce, port groups, electric utilities, and some unions, it definitely does appear to meet their views by much more than halfway. Obviously specific tolls for specific commodities cannot be definitely set until all the construction and operational cost factors are known. The cost of building is estimated at about \$900,000,000, but the proponents are gaining new confidence in that they can now present to Congress a program that apparently will work as a business enterprise without subsidization. It would not be adopted until after substantiating economic and engineering studies were made.

The seaway is a highly important undeveloped asset which seems destined inevitably to be carried through to promote new trade and in turn will spread out more traffic to the railroads. It would not only aid the steel and aluminum industries but also many others. The House committee is holding hearings on the plan and is expected to take a vote this week. The Blatnik resolution deserves approval; for then it will have a chance to reach the floor in January. If its provisions are followed through we will not be taking on a costly venture until we see where we are going in a very business-like way. Since it would be best for the United States and Canada to share the benefits and burdens it is to be hoped that Canada will not rush in to do the thing independently. If the Blatnik measure should receive the committee's green light, and there are pretty good chances that it will, then we may be quite sure that our neighbor will hold off and cooperate fully on the new plan as projected. If Congress again sidetracks the seaway, Canada's initiative will be most welcome.

Ambassador to the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the President today announced the appointment of Gen. Mark Clark as United States Ambassador to the Vatican. This is a historic step. It will be the first time that our Government will have had an accredited ambassador at the Vatican. The Honorable Myron Taylor was the President's personal representative. Until 1867 we had a legation there, but provision for its continuation was stricken from the appropriation bill in that year.

The establishment of full diplomatic relations with the Vatican marks an important step in our network of foreign contacts. The church is a world-wide organization with loyal followers in all parts of the world. Its members come from every strata of society. From all corners of the globe messages pour into the Holy See that gives a coverage no other post provides. This makes the Vatican one of the most important listening posts in the world.

Under the leadership of His Holiness the Catholic Church has fought the forces of hate of bigotry, tyranny and dictatorship wherever they have appeared. I am happy, as are millions of Americans, that our Government and the Vatican are regularizing their relations and joining their strength in the common fight against communism.

The Friendly Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, up in my district there is a living example of what a poor boy can do in the United States by application, hard work, and the desire to accomplish, and I am including the story from the Toledo Blade covering Tony Szymanowski, the boy who has made a great success of the bakery business throughout northwest, ern Ohio and is called the friendly baker:

TONY'S THE FRIENDLY BAKERY

Back in 1918, Anthony (Tony) Szymanowski was baking what his neighbors called "the world's finest doughnuts" in a little backyard shed in Fremont. The first day's production was a modest eight dozen, two dozen of which were sold for 40 cents. As the months passed, Tony, riding his bicycle with a basket of hot doughnuts perched on its handlebars, became a familiar sight to Fremont housewives. Today Tony's original doughnut machine has given way to a modern miracle that rolls out an unbelievable 200 dozen doughnuts per hour. In addition, Tony's Bakery produces a million loaves of bread each month, as well as cakes, cookies, sweet rolls, biscuits, and coffee cakes.

A happy combination of baking skill and friendly salesmanship have prospered Tony's Bakery to the point where 90 bakery trucks now carry a complete line of baked goods all over northwestern Ohio. Sprawled over 2 acres, Tony's Bakery is one of the top industries in this part of the State. Yet, in spite of its phenomenal growth, a good 80 percent of Tony's sales are still made on a house-to-house basis, using the same friendly, personal approach begun by Tony in the days when the man, the bicycle, and the basket of doughnuts were a familiar and welcome sight to Fremont housewives.

National Security and Hemisphere Solidarity Are Paramount in the Consideration of Oil Imports Under the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1951, Mr. Elmer Patman, of

Austin, Tex., appeared before the Inter-departmental Committee for Reciprocity Information in a hearing incident to the renegotiation of the trade agreement with Venezuela. Mr. Patman appeared as a representative of an independent petroleum producer, the Superior Oil Co., which has production in some 15 States in the United States.

In the Eighty-first Congress the House Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted an extensive investigation on the effects of foreign oil imports on independent domestic producers. I was a member of the subcommittee which conducted the investigation and, needless to say, my interest in the subject of petroleum continues unabated. This is true not only because of my intense interest in the adequacy of petroleum supplies during our present national emergency but because of my membership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Small Business Committee. Moreover, I should like to point out that the production and refining of petroleum is vitally important to my own State of Montana.

I have read Mr. Patman's statement with a great deal of interest and I commend his careful analysis of the oil imports situation to my colleagues in the House. Mr. Patman's statement follows:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SUPERIOR OIL CO., BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

(By Elmer Patman)

My name is Elmer Patman. I am a lawyer. I live in Austin, Tex., and represent the Superior Oil Co., an independent producing company with production in some 15 States of this Nation.

Throughout the years we have concerned ourselves, as have many others similarly situated in the industry, with the economic impact of imports of crude oil and its products into this country, particularly, as to the possible adverse effect thereof upon what we believe to be a competitive, virile domestic industry, vitally important to the security and welfare of our country. As Americans we are interested first in the security of our Nation and its ability to have available adequate quantities of petroleum and petroleum products, particularly in times of emergency. We recognize that petroleum is the largest single item that moves in foreign commerce and its importance to the economy of the United States as well as to other nations of the world cannot be minimized.

During recent years there have been many statements made by various officials of our Government, in both the legislative and executive branches, concerning the necessity of Western Hemisphere solidarity. Defense of this hemisphere is a part of our national policy. It is clear that a partnership in fact in the Western Hemisphere is absolutely essential, and it is important that we take all possible action to assure the solidarity of that partnership.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND HEMISPHERE SOLIDARITY ARE PARAMOUNT CONSIDERATIONS

In the beginning, we would like to advise this Committee, though it might not be material or pertinent to the inquiry, that while we have no production in Venezuela and own no concessions to produce, we have, in the last several years, done considerable geological and geophysical exploratory work in Venezuela with, I might add, the full cooperation of the Venezuelan governmental authorities. We, of course, are interested

in an opportunity to translate this exploratory work into actual attempts to bring into production as yet probable undiscovered reserves in that country so that they may be added to the reserve producing capacity of the Western Hemisphere and made available in whatever emergency might face the Western Hemisphere. We know of many other independents that are in this position.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America is authority for statistics disclosing that three companies in Venezuela produce in excess of 90 percent of its total production, which currently approximates some 1,750,000 barrels daily. On the other hand, the producing segment of the United States domestic oil industry is composed of some 20,000 to 30,000 individuals and companies.

THE POLICY ADOPTED IN 1949 BY THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL IS SOUND

We have never opposed the importation of crude oil or products thereof into this country within supplementary requirements. We have never believed, and do not now believe, that the importation of crude oil and products thereof into this country should occur in supplanting quantities. We thoroughly subscribe to the statement of a desirable national oil policy adopted by the National Petroleum Council in January 1949:

"1. The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.

"The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

"The implementation of an import policy therefore should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.

"Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry, which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security (p. 19 of NPC Policy)."

"Oil from abroad should be available to the United States to the extent that it may be needed to supplement our domestic supplies. The availability of oil outside of the United States, in places well situated to supply our off-shore requirements in time of emergency, is of importance to our national security (p. 17 of NPC Policy)."

CONGRESSIONAL STUDIES HAVE BEEN VALUABLE

About 2½ years ago the trend of steadily increasing imports from the Middle East, as well as the Western Hemisphere, with a sharply compensating decline in domestic production and development, reached beyond supplementary requirements to the point of actually supplanting domestic production and was the cause for serious alarm. We are familiar with the conditions and circumstances that brought about the creation of the Subcommittee on Oil Imports of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States House of Representatives in June 1949. We followed the work of this subcommittee as well as the whole committee, and are familiar with its report. We commend the work of this committee, and be-

lieve that it performed a useful public service. This committee pointed up for the first time, to my knowledge, the relation and meaning of imports in supplementing and supplanting quantities. We find no fault with the report of this committee and commend it to this committee. The tremendous work that went into it undoubtedly would be of aid and assistance to you. The conditions that existed in the first half of 1949 that brought about the creation of this congressional committee do not exist today. Whether these conditions will return or not we do not know. We believe, however, that in the event they do there is now adequate machinery provided by the Congress to meet the problem head-on if the law is administered in accordance with its apparent intent.

IMPORTS ARE WELL WITHIN SUPPLEMENTARY QUANTITIES

We believe that the importation of crude and products into the United States at the present time is, and for some time past has been, well within supplementary quantities. Let us take a look at today's supply-and-demand picture. As of September 22, it is estimated that the average daily crude-oil production in the United States approximated some 6,222,000 barrels per day, compared with a daily average of 6,129,000 barrels in June 1951. This is against an estimated total demand second quarter 1951 of 7,063,000 barrels daily; some 934,000 barrels daily on the short side. This demand is up 10.8 percent over the same period of 1950, and forecasts showed a demand for the third quarter of 1951 of 7,239,000 barrels daily, and for the fourth quarter of 7,761,000 barrels daily. Thus, current domestic daily demand (including military) exceeds current domestic daily production by over 1,000,000 barrels. All these figures are roughly 11 percent higher than for comparable periods in 1950.

Against these production-and-demand figures, as of September 15, 1951, crude stocks (above ground) amounted to some 250,490,000 barrels; gasoline stocks 114,318,000; kerosene stocks 32,945,000; distilled stocks of 92,528,000; and residual stocks of 47,972,000. All of these product stocks, except residuals, are somewhat higher than they were in the previous year. On the other hand, taking into consideration the increased demand in 1951 compared to 1950, as evidenced by actual consuming experience, we fail to see how anyone could find that these stocks are too high. The best qualified opinion in the industry, including the judgment of the Texas Railroad Commission, as publicly stated, would indicate that anything up to 280,000,000 barrels of crude stocks would not be too high.

On the question of imports, we find importation of refined products into this country in June 1951 approximated 300,000 barrels per day from the Western Hemisphere and 16,000 barrels per day from the Eastern Hemisphere. On the crude side, we find that imports into this country in June 1951 approximated 380,000 barrels per day from the Western Hemisphere, and 200,000 barrels per day from the Eastern Hemisphere. Since the Iranian crisis, we understand that, under an agreement approved by the Attorney General of the United States, world-wide oil companies have generally agreed that Eastern Hemispheric oil will be left to supply the needs of the Eastern Hemisphere, leaving Western Hemispheric oil for the Western Hemisphere. We have not the information nor are we prepared to make a valid appraisal of what the future holds with reference to the relation of Eastern and Western Hemispheric oil and where it will go in the international channels of commerce. This will have to be factually examined under any changed condition.

DOMESTIC RESERVE CAPACITY IS INADEQUATE

We do know that our reserve-producing capacity is dwindling at an alarming rate. According to the August 1951 estimate of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, the United States reserve capacity of all oil, as of January 1951, was 835,000 barrels per day. However, increased production since then, occasioned in part by the increased demand to fill the vacuum created by the Iranian situation, has materially depleted this admittedly inadequate reserve. Today the estimated reserve is not over 300,000 barrels per day. Furthermore, even when the reserve figure stood at 835,000 barrels per day, the Defense Department announced that an additional 1,000,000 barrels per day of available oil was necessary to meet the reserve requirements of the present emergency.

Thus, with a steadily increasing world wide consumption; unprecedented military requirements; demand created by the Iranian situation; plus a shortage of tubular goods in this country for domestic exploration and development, it is simple arithmetic to conclude that our requirements today must be supplemented from outside sources.

THE SEARCH FOR NEW RESERVES IN THIS HEMISPHERE SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

The Defense Department has stated very recently that this additional available oil should come first from the United States and second from the other producing areas in the Western Hemisphere. My company is trying every day to make a contribution to this objective. In 1950 we were credited with one of the major discoveries in the United States—a field on the Texas Gulf coast. We are in the business of an ever increasing and constant search for new reserves and proper development of existing reserves.

In the light of the realities of these times, it seems clear that these objectives cannot be realized without full consideration of the needs of all the Western Hemisphere countries who are concerned. In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Oil Imports to the House Small Business Committee, June 15, 1949, Rear Adm. Burton B. Bridges, executive secretary of Munitions Board Petroleum Committee, stated:

"The potential productive capacity of the United States alone would be seriously inadequate in event of a major war. Therefore, it is necessary to look to the other areas which would appear to be freely accessible during war. These areas are located in the Western Hemisphere. Considerations of national security, whether of an economic, political, or military nature, should clearly recognize the essentiality of Western Hemisphere oil in event of war.

"Under the current concepts of the problem, should there be a war in the near future, and with present estimates, all the oil production of the Western Hemisphere would be required to meet the requirements of the United States military forces and essential civilian demand of the hemisphere, with some allowances for the allies. There would be none to spare; and the rationing, at best, would need be extremely close."

In commenting on Admiral Biggs' statement, the report concluded:

"In the absence of any better authority, the subcommittee accepts this statement. Would it not follow that if we imposed overly stringent restrictions on oil imports, we might find these Western Hemisphere sources unavailable to us in time of war? The production from wells in these foreign areas, if they are to be made available to us in time of emergency, should receive reasonable treatment in entering our market places."

We strongly favor carrying on a vigilant search for more reserves in this country but,

at the same time, believe it would be sound policy to encourage actively the development of additional reserve-producing capacity in Venezuela, the nation involved with the United States in these hearings. In addition to its producing areas, Venezuela has a vast potential reserve area which has been more or less extensively explored geologically but has never been thrown open for competitive development.

We have never advocated but, indeed, have always opposed proration on the basis of reserves; or, stated another way, division of the markets of the world on the relative basis of the calculated reserves of the world. There are many reasons why this is not sound. There are many reasons why this will stymie and retard technological advancement. Technological advancement has never occurred in the history of mankind without an opportunity for application. On the other hand, we recognize and admit that, in Venezuela, and probably in other areas of the world not the subject of this hearing, there probably exist large quantities of undiscovered oil reserves that need to be developed and should be developed under the security appraisal by the United States Defense Department and in the light of current conditions. In this connection I want it emphatically understood that I am not one of those that believe that we are running out of oil in this country; neither do I believe that we have discovered all of the oil in this country that will be discovered. We are only talking about supplementing oil and domestic efforts; not supplanting them.

PRESENT TARIFFS DO NOT EXCLUDE OIL IMPORTS; THEY ONLY INCREASE IMPORTED COSTS

In our opinion, the present tariff on the importation of crude oil into the United States does not keep a single barrel out. We do not believe that under present conditions a continuation of this amount will keep any oil out. It follows that, if under a valid appraisal of our needs for hemispheric solidarity and security, reduction of existing tariff becomes necessary in our negotiations with Venezuela, such action ought to be taken.

We do not advocate keeping oil from being imported into the United States within supplementary requirements. We think imports are undoubtedly now within supplementary requirements and that at the same time we are probably a little on the high side in this country on production considering the present condition of our reserve producing capacity, as well as from a conservation standpoint.

We have no information nor any experience with reference to cost of production in foreign and domestic areas. We do know that costs of production in the United States have materially increased in the last 12 months. Everything that it takes to find and produce a barrel of crude oil in the United States costs more today than it did 1 year ago, while the price of oil has remained constant. Likewise, we agree that Venezuela is undoubtedly experiencing the same trend in relation to what they buy from us as compared to what they sell to us since the price of their oil is pegged with ours. In this connection, I heard Secretary Chapman of the United States Department of the Interior just last month in Caracas, Venezuela, state that Venezuela purchased some \$400,000,000 worth of various commodities from the United States annually and in turn sold to the United States \$300,000,000 annually worth of petroleum and petroleum products.

CONCLUSION

The views that we express here are specifically limited to conditions as they are

today, and are not to be construed as any attempt by us to forecast the uncertainties of the future. We are living in a world of ever and constantly changing conditions. It may well be that in the future the facts upon which this committee will necessarily base its decision pursuant to these hearings, with reference to crude petroleum and products thereof, will change to the extent that a reappraisal will not only be desirable, but will be necessary. The Trade Agreements Act as passed by the Eighty-second Congress and signed by the President provides adequate safeguards and machinery to meet these changed conditions when and if they occur. If the peril point and escape clause provisions of this act are applied and administered with the rule of reason, the domestic petroleum industry will be adequately protected from expressed fears of what might happen in the future, which no one here can forecast with any degree of accuracy.

Underground Liberation Movement in Communist Countries May Be Jeopardized by UN Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act which recently was passed and signed by the President provides a method whereby the United States can render aid for underground liberation movements in the Communist countries. This provision is contained in an amendment which was offered by me in the House and accepted.

It now appears that on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly, scheduled to meet on November 6 in Paris, is a draft code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind. Section 5 of article 1 of this proposed code would outlaw "the undertaking or encouragement, by the authorities of a state, of terrorist activities in another state, or the tolerance by the authorities of a state, of organized activities calculated to carry out terrorist acts in another state."

You will note from the wording of this section that it might be possible for someone to misconstrue this section to outlaw outside aid to any liberation movements in Communist countries on the grounds that they were "terrorist acts." And not only would the United States or any other country be prohibited from aiding any such liberation movements, if they were defined as "terrorist acts," but no country could permit any private groups or individuals, on their own initiative, to help in the liberation of their Communist-dominated countries.

I therefore strongly urge that the United States delegation in the steering committee of the United Nations Assembly oppose the inclusion of this draft

code from the agenda at Paris. There has been very little time for a thorough discussion of this proposed draft code in the United States. This is contrary to article 16 of the Statutes of the U. N. International Law Commission which provides:

When the General Assembly refers to the Commission a proposal for the progressive development of international law, the Commission shall follow a procedure on the following lines:

(a) The Commission shall appoint one of its members to be Rapporteur;

(b) The Commission shall formulate a plan of work;

(c) The Commission shall circulate a questionnaire to the governments, and shall invite them to supply within a fixed period of time data and information relevant to items included in the plan of work;

(d) The Commission may appoint some of its members to work with the Rapporteur on the preparation of drafts pending receipt of replies to this questionnaire;

(e) The Commission may consult with scientific institutions and individual experts; these experts need not necessarily be nationals of members of the United Nations. The Secretary-General will provide, when necessary and within the limits of the budget, for the expenses of these consultations of experts.

(f) The Commission shall consider the drafts proposed by the Rapporteur.

(g) When the Commission considers a draft to be satisfactory, it shall request the Secretary-General to issue it as a Commission document. The Secretariat shall give all necessary publicity to this document which shall be accompanied by such explanations and supporting material as the Commission considers appropriate. The publication shall include any information supplied to the Commission in reply to the questionnaire referred to in subsection (c) above;

(h) The Commission shall invite the Governments to submit their comments on this document within a reasonable time;

(i) The Rapporteur and the members appointed for that purpose shall reconsider the draft taking into consideration these comments and shall prepare a final draft and explanatory report which they shall submit for consideration and adoption by the Commission.

(j) The Commission shall submit the draft so adopted with its recommendations through the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.

If this code is removed from the agenda at Paris, it will give us here in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government time to study over section 5 and many other detailed provisions of the proposed code in accordance with provisions of article 16.

My concern over this section 5 prompted me to write to Mr. Warren R. Austin, our United States Representative to the United Nations. Mr. Austin responded and stated that he did not think that extending a helping hand to the enslaved people of Eastern Europe could be classified as terrorist acts. Wrote Mr. Austin:

To attempt to restore a people's freedom does not seem to merit the characterization of "terrorist" to such activity.

I do not share Mr. Austin's optimism as to how such underground liberation activities would be characterized.

To say that terror would play no part in a liberation movement in Eastern Europe is to be utterly unconvulsant with what constitutes a liberation movement. One of the main objectives of a real liberation movement is to strike terror into the hearts of the Communist tyrants. Liberation will not be achieved merely by propaganda and parliamentary maneuvers; it will require strong action at the proper time.

Communists themselves are much more realistic in their understanding of the nature of the conflict between the Communist and anti-Communist world. Here is how they express their views on the struggle for supremacy in the world:

The bourgeoisie resorts to every means of violence and terror to safeguard and strengthen its predatory property and its political domination. Hence the violence of the bourgeoisie can be suppressed only by the stern violence of the proletariat (p. 36, Program of Communist International, 1936).

Is it merely a unique coincidence that the word "terror" is used both in section 5 of the proposed draft code and in the program of the Communist International of 1936?

It should be mentioned that one of those charged by the Lithuanian-American Council and the Polish-American Congress with having a hand in drafting of this section 5 is Vespasian V. Pella, who, I am informed, was formerly a subordinate of the ruthless Communist leader of Rumania, Anna Pauker.

We are clearly forewarned by this Communist International program that the acts of bourgeoisie in opposing their domination will be characterized as "terrorist acts" and hence prohibited under this section 5. Thus, if the draft code is ratified we may reasonably expect that the Communists will charge the United States or any other country endeavoring to aid in the liberation of Eastern Europe with an offense against the peace and security of mankind. The Crusade for Freedom, now raising funds throughout the United States, could not be tolerated and the United States Government would be obliged to abolish it—so the Communists could charge.

Not only is this proposed draft code fraught with danger, but it appears that our own United States delegation itself intends to support this code. I infer this from Mr. Austin's letter to me in which he stated:

The purpose was clearly to prevent the type of subversive tactics presently used by Communist Russia to carry forward its stated purpose of dominating the world.

It is to be hoped that our delegation will become convinced of the real danger of this draft code before the U. N. Assembly convenes on November 6.

Still another danger lies ahead in the consideration of the proposed code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind. If the code is adopted in the form of a convention treaty and ratified by the United States Senate it might be binding on the American Government and the American people.

Formal action taken by the United Nations cannot be dismissed lightly as being of any legal significance here in the United States. This precise point has not been determined by our Supreme Court yet and no doubt it will be argued by some people that actions of the United Nations Assembly are binding on the United States. The Second District Court of Appeals of California on April 24, 1950, in the case of *Sei Fujii v. the State* (217 Pac. 2d 481) stated that the United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land and is binding on the Government and the citizens of the United States, notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Constitution. Although this is a decision of a lower court and not a final judgment by an appellate court, it serves to warn those people who think that actions of the United Nations are not of significance. We in the United States should watch carefully the actions of the United Nations and be sure that none of our rights and privileges are in any way complicated by U. N. actions. I am strongly opposed to the idea that any U. N. action can ever override the Constitution of the United States.

I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the American magazine, October 8, 1951, a copy of my letter to Mr. Warren R. Austin, and Mr. Austin's reply:

THE REDS COULD ENTRAP US AT PARIS

Just a year ago we expressed our concern over a draft code of "Offenses against the Peace and Security of Mankind" prepared but kept restricted by the U. N. International Law Commission. How large, we asked, was the part played by Communists and Communist sympathizers in its drafting? We inquired because, 2 years previously, the Soviets had tried to have the crime of genocide in just such a code, instead of in a separate convention. If they had succeeded, they would not have been liable under the code for their own patented form of genocide, which they perpetrated in times of peace. But they failed (Am., November 4, 1950, p. 126), and on December 9, 1948, the U. N. Assembly adopted a separate Genocide Convention at Paris. It has since been ratified by 32 nations, but not by the United States.

Meanwhile, 12 members of the International Law Commission completed the final draft of their code of offenses. Remarkably enough, though no iron curtain experts participated, the crime of genocide is included in the code. It deals, besides, with such touchy matters as incitement to war, preparations for war, arms, military training, location of armed forces, and fortifications. The document has already been placed on the agenda of the U. N. Assembly, which begins November 6 at Paris.

Normally, such legal drafts are submitted to member governments for 1 year of study. This has not been done in the case of the completed code. Why this reluctance to let the governments study the code before submission to the Assembly?

The Lithuanian-American Council and the Polish-American Congress think they have one answer. They charge that section 5 of article 1 was deliberately designed to outlaw their efforts to assist the Lithuanian and Polish undergrounds. They likewise charge that Vespasian V. Pella, mysterious ex-envoy

of Rumania's notorious Anna Pauker, inspired this section.

A. M. Rosenthal, for the New York Times, and Peter Kihss, for the Herald Tribune, interviewed Mr. Pella September 21 about his part in drafting the questionable code. Mr. Pella bitterly denied that the code was meant as a blow at liberation movements. He also declared that the code was not based on his opinions but was largely the work of a Greek expert, Prof. J. Spiropoulos.

Let us see. Section 5 of the completed code outlaws "the undertaking or encouragement, by the authorities of a state, of terrorist activities in another state, or the toleration by the authorities of a state, of organized activities calculated to carry out terrorist acts in another state."

The Lithuanian-Americans and the Polish-Americans proudly admit their guilt under this section, and claim that if the code were adopted, the United States could be found guilty of tolerating their activities.

What of Mr. Pella's assertion that the code was not based on his opinions? On November 24, 1950, the U. N. published a 216-page basic memorandum on this code by Vespasian V. Pella. No. 122, page 157, reads:

"Acts of terrorism affecting international relations: Under the code it should be a punishable act to incite, encourage or tolerate activities designed to spread terror among the population in the territory of another state."

The give-away is the presence in both drafts of the key word tolerate. Why such modesty, Mr. Pella?

The Lithuanian-Americans and the Polish-Americans demand that the draft code be taken off the agenda of the Paris Assembly in order to give the United States and its allies time to study its provisions, which, they claim, touch upon many phases of Western security. That study may even reveal that, except for the section on genocide, the code remarkably resembles a legal formulation of Vishinsky's famous speech against warmongering delivered at the U. N. Assembly on September 18, 1947.

OCTOBER 9, 1951.

HON. WARREN AUSTIN,
United States Delegate to the United Nations, New York N. Y.

DEAR MR. AUSTIN: I noticed an article in the American Magazine of October 6th entitled "The Reds Could Entrap Us at Paris." In the article reference is made to section 5 of the completed code drafted by 12 members of the International Law Commission, which quoted section outlaws "the undertaking or encouragement, by the authorities of a state, of terrorist activities in another state, or the toleration by the authorities of a state, of organized activities calculated to carry out terrorist acts in another state."

The import of the article in America is that such a section, if adopted, might prevent groups in this country, as well as our government, from assisting in the liberation of the peoples of the Eastern European countries and other countries presently enslaved by the Communist tyranny.

If this is the fact, it would appear that the Communists are being very clever in preventing any attack upon their slave state system. It certainly would have prevented the French in our Revolutionary War from aiding the American colonists. It might also prevent the implementation of that portion of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, which is nearing final action which provides for \$100,000,000 for aid to underground organizations in Communist-dominated countries.

I would be pleased, Mr. Austin, if you could advise me as to the possibility of the accept-

ance of such a section as above referred to and if it is accepted what your idea would be of its interpretation with particular regard to assistance to the enslaved peoples in order that they might ultimately be liberated.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
Member of Congress

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York City, October 10, 1951.
The Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
*Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KERSTEN: The draft code referred to in your letter was drawn up in their expert capacity by representatives of free countries. Its purpose was quite the opposite of the interpretation referred to in the article from America magazine. The purpose was clearly to prevent the type of subversive tactics presently used by Communist Russia to carry forward its stated purpose of dominating the world.

I agree that, as it reads, section 5, alone, does seem to militate against the efforts currently afoot in the free world to rescue the peoples of satellite countries from Russian bondage. As you know from our experience as a legislator, however, much depends upon the interpretation of key words. The key words seem to me to be "terrorist activities" and "terrorist acts." The intention, I am sure, was to give meaning to these words which would apply descriptively to the activities of Communist and Communist-front organizations which are bent on furthering the domain of the U. S. S. R.

While I do not know the exact type of activities, other than those of the Voice of America, currently used by our Government, or contemplated by it in the Mutual Security Act provision you refer to, by which we extend a helping hand and hope for the future to the enslaved peoples of eastern Europe, I feel certain that the broad objectives could not be classified as "terroristic." To attempt to restore a people's freedom does not seem to merit the characterization of "terrorist" to such an activity.

The aid given the Colonies by the French during the Revolutionary War is, perhaps, another matter. After all, we were at war, whether it be called rebellion or revolution. One must admit that the condition of the world today calls for something a little different from the ancient rules of international law.

Among recent changes in international law is that wrought by the United Nations Charter. France in the last quarter of the eighteenth century was supposed, by the international law of the day, to remain a neutral. She chose rather to aid the cause of freedom. In retrospect, can anyone raise a finger of protest? Only the ghost of George III.

The law of neutrality must come up for serious consideration in view of the new general obligations of the Charter upon all members of the United Nations. In the undeclared war against tyranny and the oppressors of human freedom, there is no room for neutrality. One must be either for or against. Any code worthy of the label of the United Nations could not fail to recognize such a fact of life today. Viewed in this light, I see no danger from this section of the code to whatever activities our Government undertakes in behalf of human freedom.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

How to Help the Largest Number of People Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the title of these remarks is suggested as a motto which might be framed and put on the wall of every city and village council chamber and might well be a motto on the walls of Congress. It is the subject of an article written to the American City, by C. S. Hunsinger, coordinator of the Rural-Urban Coordination Service, Flat Rock, Ohio, and is as follows:

In order to get public projects accomplished it is usually necessary to dramatize them in some way to stir the public to favorable action. Why not include this feature at the start of a project instead of fighting an extended battle against powerful minority groups?

As a community coordinator, I have found it best to consider carefully the viewpoints of those who will naturally be opposed to a project and to give them an opportunity to present their side at the start of a campaign. This will help them to explode their anger—to get it out of their systems and thus reveal any selfish viewpoints to the public.

Then, after a reasonable cooling-off period, again bring the project to attention, with answers to the arguments and emphasizing the viewpoint: How will it help the largest number of people—most? This viewpoint—and much depends upon viewpoints—builds an unselfish public spirit which is so essential for favorable action.

A simple, practical, and effective plan for communities to handle the most crucial projects is for the mayor to invite the heads of four leading groups—educational, religious, economic, and social—to meet informally to discuss the project. He will thus have a powerful coordinating council—a cooperation of real public spirit.

The Interstate Commerce Commission: Past, Present, and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Commissioner Hugh W. Cross, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, delivered at Chicago, October 4, 1951, at the twenty-second annual meeting of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners:

THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION:
PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

The most recent of the perennial Washington taxi driver jokes coming to my attention is as follows: Two visitors to the Nation's Capital were seeing the sights by taxicab. Passing the National Archives Building they noticed on the base of one of the statues the

inscription: "What is past is prologue." One of them asked the driver what it meant. "That," said the driver, "is Government language, and what it means is 'You ain't seen nothin' yet.'" If this incident is true, I think you will agree that the driver succeeded admirably in viewing the very prevalent mood that today concerns us all as to the future of our Nation, free enterprise, and the security of our individual lives.

In that context I shall talk about the Interstate Commerce Commission, its past, present, and future. Within the next 6 months the Commission will have completed its sixty-fifth year. In this span of time the Commission has succeeded in establishing itself as a so-called independent regulatory agency with at least a fairly good reputation for ability and integrity. Attainment of that status has not been easy. Agencies of its type always have been disturbing to those who make a fetish of the tripartite distribution of governmental functions. In the first 20 years of the Commission's life the judicial branch seemed intent on preventing any important exercise of power by this upstart agency. Only through the sagacity and vision of Commission members and leaders in Congress was the Commission perpetuated. In its last 20 years people advocating more and more centralization of authority and power in the executive branch have taken over the job of finding ways to curb the Commission and similar agencies, for which it has served to a considerable degree as a prototype.

Since the close of the last war it has been said that even the Congress, determined as it is upon preserving the free competitive system of private enterprise among the several types of carriers, often looks upon its own Commission as a stepchild. When billions for national defense, billions for Europe, taxes and more taxes, inflation, Korea, atomic warfare, the threat of world war III are but some of the issues demanding the utmost in ability and statesmanship of the elected representatives of our people, who can wonder, much less criticize, the neglect of the parent in ameliorating the distressed condition of an agency whose duties are merely to administer the national transportation policy and to preserve a transportation service adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States and the national defense.

In citing this reputation of the Commission for integrity, I do not want to bemoan a theme of self-praise, but I do believe that at this particular time we are entitled to the satisfaction of reminding ourselves that the Commission is in no way responsible for the fact that the Congress is considering the formulation of a code of ethics to govern the relations between governmental agencies and private individuals who profit by the actions of those agencies.

In seeking the reason for the Commission's good reputation we may well turn to the last address of my distinguished predecessor, the late Joseph B. Eastman. Perhaps you can recall the following passage in that address:

"The statutes which the tribunal administers should be well, simply and carefully formulated, but the personnel which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men produce with a good law."

Also the following:

"In any large administrative tribunal, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, a vast amount of the real work must necessarily be done by the staff. It is a difficult problem to give the individual members of the staff the proper recognition for work well done—recognition on the outside as well as the inside."

This brings me down to the present time. You are aware of the fact that the most pressing immediate problem before the Com-

mission is how it shall live within its income and perform its duties during the present fiscal year. The Commission, of course, is not unique in having to wrestle with this problem, but we should consider nevertheless some of the implications.

For the sake of comparison, our agency, which regulates all forms of land and inland water interstate transportation, is not a large agency so far as the number of its employees is concerned. The 1950 average employment for the Civil Aeronautics Administration was 17,208 employees; for the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, 4,502; the Bureau of Public Roads, 3,615; the Railroad Retirement Board, 2,459, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, 2,161. So restricted has the Commission been in the number of its employees that since 1940 its personnel has actually shrunk from 2,649 to 1,911 on September 1, 1951, despite many new duties added by acts of Congress, including parts III and IV of the act, the Mahaffie Act, and the Reed-Bulwinkle Act. This shrinkage has been accelerated since 1948 by successive appropriation curtailments.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1941, the Commission's total appropriation was \$9,322,750, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, it was \$10,474,535, a total increase of but 12 percent. I ask you how long a trucking company or railroad could avoid bankruptcy with but a 12 percent increase in its budget or how long any labor union would tolerate a wage increase of but 12 percent when the cost of living index has almost doubled?

The effort to comply with the wishes of Congress in making adjustments necessary to conform to our reduced funds involves complications. For example, the reduction seems to have reflected the feeling of some that we have been spending too much money in the Bureau of Valuation and the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics and in the Section of Safety in the Bureau of Motor Carriers. The Bureau of Valuation has long been used as a whipping post by those who have questioned our administrative policies. Since 1937 its staff has shrunk from 242 persons to 83, and there is very little room for further contraction unless we are to abandon the bare minimum work now being done by it in compliance with the valuation statute which Congress has not seen fit to repeal or amend. Our duties with regard to motor carrier safety are likewise prescribed by statute, and, despite the belief held by some persons, these duties do not overlap or duplicate the duties of the States in policing and protecting the highways. If we interpret the congressional mandate as calling for curtailments equivalent to the abandonment of this duty, will we be blamed by the public for official negligence in case of some shocking accident, the explosion of a truck carrying high octane gasoline or explosives? As for statistics, some years ago you will recall the Commission embarked upon a modest research project which seemed to be desirable in order to keep up with the trend of the times. On this score we were complimented by the task force of the Hoover Commission.

While baring our weaknesses is distasteful and to some degree humiliating, I feel that within this family of friends here assembled I should cite two other examples.

After the war it was foreseen that motor-carrier work for a period of time would increase and then might taper off. However, this leveling trend has not been reached, as filings are still upwards. Since I have been on the Commission a very concerted effort has been made to speed up the handling and processing of motor-carrier cases. In order that Division 5, of which I am a member, may currently know of the cases under its jurisdiction and thereby spur the work, detailed tabulations of application cases are made twice each month. It is noteworthy

that for the year ending August 31, 1951, through the Section of Complaints in the Bureau of Motor Carriers, 3,988 cases were disposed of, covering applications for operating authority, finance, rate, and other matters. Considering the growing complexity and increasingly huge records in many of these cases, no one can gainsay this was a formidable showing. Nevertheless, during the year our backlog increased over 11 percent, with nearly 3,000 matters pending. How can we convince our critics in the motor-carrier field, as well as the Congress, that we are not lagging and have not permitted cobwebs to grow around our activities?

I feel duty bound to present one other picture in somber shades. The Bureau of Formal Cases has the primary duty of hearing formal complaint cases and conducting investigations on motion of the Commission, functioning until the final disposition of these cases. As of August 31, 1951, there were 921 cases pending, as compared to 463 on the docket on August 31, 1946. In 1951 there were 72 examiners as compared with 78 in 1946.

The Traffic World in a recent issue commenting on the exceedingly complex issues raised in *Ex parte 175* commended the Commission for having produced such an exhaustive report in such a comparatively short space of time, pointing out that the public participation in the proceeding did not end until 3 weeks before the promulgation of the order. The view was expressed that "It would take considerable imagination to assume that any other of our Federal bureaus could have done so well. Indeed, we can think of some specially constituted bodies for transportation investigation that work much longer and spend a lot more money without bringing forth anything half as helpful and rational."

To examiners in the Bureau of Formal Cases must go a large share of the credit for this expeditious and judicial report. At all times in the difficult rate controversies the Commission, because of the magnitude of its duties and functions, must lean heavily upon this Bureau. Here we must confess a further weakness. Of the 72 examiners in the bureau 29 have passed the age of 60 and 15 more are in the 55-60 age group with voluntary retirement rights, over one-half of the total staff. A serious recruitment project for this bureau is long overdue and cannot be undertaken too soon.

These examples of our deficiencies through lack of funds might be augmented by many others covering every bureau within the Commission. The threat of dismissals and payless furloughs is having its effect upon the morale of our staff, and to me this is most disturbing. Just before leaving Washington, I learned that since January 1, 1951, 305 separations from the Commission have occurred, 111 of these were occasioned by employees transferring to other Federal agencies at increased pay.

I now come to the future. In the various studies intended to promote more efficiency and economy in Government the Commission has not escaped notice, and, of course, it has no right to expect immunity from consideration. Certain modifications of our internal organization have been suggested and will be considered in this convention. I shall refer to them briefly.

One is that the Commission lengthen the term of its Chairman and broaden his responsibilities, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. You are familiar with all of the reasons which have been advanced for and against the proposal. The plan was tried from 1939 to 1941. I assure you that I have an open mind on the question whether this plan should be revived.

It has been suggested that we need an executive officer or general manager to do our housekeeping, as it were, working with and

at the direction of the commissioner in charge. A recent attempt by the Commission to create such a top-grade position was turned down, and it is doubtful whether we could now secure a person of the requisite competence who would be willing to serve for the salary which the Commission would be permitted to pay.

The Commission has been told repeatedly by its friends that it does not know how to make a case for itself before Congress and that we have been backward in the presentation of the matters which I am called upon here to detail to you. We have been chided for not having someone to whom this responsibility is delegated and for failing to keep abreast of the times, when other agencies and departments of government consider this part of their necessary responsibility. It has been pointed out, and I have no reason to question the statement, that the Department of Defense has a larger staff handling public relations than the entire staff of the Commission. If public relations becomes part of the responsibility and duty of the Commission in order to function, then we must confess error, because we have never had one single person on the payroll to handle this work.

It is of the utmost importance that we do our very best in our reduced circumstances to prevent any lowering of our performance standards which would be immediately seized upon by those who would like to do away with an independent agency of Congress in the regulation of transportation. The suggestion has been made that efficiency would be served by the transfer of some of our activities to the Department of Commerce. To this I would say that these activities, such as safety, statistics and car service, are more or less closely tied in with rate regulation and other matters and should be retained, for the time being at least. I question whether those activities could be administered for any less money than we would require for a good job. I venture the assertion that it would take much more, and I doubt whether the results would be as good as we have been able to accomplish, even with our limited personnel. The ultimate responsibility for successful performance, now vested in 11 Commissioners, would be lodged in a cabinet officer whose tenure, dependent upon political fortunes, would necessarily be limited and uncertain and whose decisions might be tinged with political expediency.

In this day and age when people have learned to lean more and more heavily upon government, we have heard repeated many times the slogan, "Let's make a law." Those who adhere to concentration of power in the executive branch of Government are perhaps the most severe critics of our independent agencies and no doubt they would join in that refrain. They believe in more and more centralization of power.

I would like to give you one example of how this has worked out. In an analysis of the Federal budget for the year starting July 1, 1951, prepared for the board of directors of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce by a leading accountant in the United States, it was estimated that the expenditures in the regulation and services to transportation and communications would be \$51,000,000 as compared to \$28,000,000 for the 3-year average of 1946-48, or an increase of over 82 percent, whereas the estimated increase to the Interstate Commerce Commission for 1952 over 1948 was but 8 percent. Parenthetically, I might add that in the bill finally approved the amount appropriated to our Commission was actually less than for 1948, despite increased duties, increased costs, and mandatory wage increases.

Such a transfer of our powers might result in inefficiencies, friction, and jealousy growing out of the division of responsibility, as has resulted in similar situations in the

past. The house divided against itself argument of Abraham Lincoln still holds good. Eventually there would come a proposal that an executive department take over from this agency of Congress the complete regulation of land transportation.

Let those who may think that the usefulness of an independent regulatory commission in the field of transportation is passing remember that the weakening of such an agency may well undermine the foundation of private ownership upon which such transportation has always rested. It would be hailed as a great victory for those who believe in the nationalization of transportation and who would follow in the footsteps of Great Britain in her present struggle for national socialization of industry.

What is the relation of the practitioners to what I have been talking about? First, be patient with us, if our efforts to deal with the omnipresent problem of procedural delays seem slow and unproductive. We know you are much interested in the progress of our work, and we shall welcome suggestions, but please bear in mind, for example, that we suffer from the chronic shortage of examiners and stenographers, and that difficulty is at present beyond our control.

You can help us by exercising care in the preparation and trial of your cases, avoiding needlessly lengthy evidence, by writing briefs which clearly present your position and do not distort the facts established by the evidence, as well as by adjusting yourselves to hearing assignments that must be scheduled to the best use of our curtailed examiner staff and economy in travel costs.

As advocates you can do a public relations job for us that we cannot do for ourselves. You can make it your business to help us in our business. You can help to develop a better public understanding of our duties and bring about a better appreciation of the necessity for the preservation of a strong independent, nonpolitical agency capable of discharging its duties. We hope it may be understood, and I here emphasize again, that we have no desire to build up a large staff of employees and that we are only dedicated to the faithful performance of the duties which Congress has seen fit to delegate.

I would not have you think that I am gloomy as to the future. Economy in government must ever be the watchword. In these perilous times there is often a lack of opportunity for thoughtful evaluations. We are all likely to have many more dilemmas, disappointments, and frustrations. This situation will inevitably affect the Commission and its work. We will try to do what is right as we see it under all circumstances. We are content to rest our case on the record that has been made through the years.

Protest Against Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I beg to include herein a paper written by Hon. Hunter A. Gibbs, of Columbia, S. C., a very prominent lawyer in my district, on the subject of crime engaged in by newcomers to this country, who, apparently, have not and do not subscribe to the high ideals of our American Government and the law and order which

make such a great country as ours possible.

This country gets a great many excellent citizens from other countries each year. It is most regrettable that some of those who are given an opportunity to come to this country do not subscribe to our high ideals of citizenship and by so doing are making it difficult for others to have the opportunity to transfer from their present countries to America.

Mr. Gibbs' statement is as follows:

The Senate investigation of crime in the United States, and the resulting well-written book entitled "Crime in America," by Senator ESTES KFFAUVER, should receive serious attention of the people, and definite remedial legislation by the Congress.

It appears that an appalling wave of lawlessness started during national prohibition days and has continued to grow through the years. It is big business of the underworld and permeates local, State, and National politics and the industrial life and business of practically every important city of the United States. It involves unlawful gambling, robbery, murder, hijacking, bribery of public officials, prostitution, sale of narcotics, racketeering in labor organizations, and evasion of income taxes.

It is interesting, and even alarming, to note that the investigation and the book above-mentioned show that a large majority of the names involved in crimes of the underworld are foreign. Most of them are Italian. Many of these persons of Italian names came from Sicily, notorious in the world of crime for centuries. Some are ex-convicts. Not a few are evidently members of the Mafia, a secret organization based on crime. Here are some of the names shown in the book, *Crime in America*, and in magazine articles: Salvatore, Moretti (recently murdered), Longano, Anthony D'Anna, Balestrere, Osadchey Garretta, Luciano, Adonis, Carl Carromisra, Profaci, Louis Crusco, Benito Binlon, Loooco, Capone, Vincent Mangano, Tony Lippino, Binaggio, Phillip Mangano, Tony Trombino, Tono Braucato, Dan Seritfullo, Tony Arcado, Greasy Thumb Guzik, Jim Colossimo, John Vitali, Thomas Buffo, Sebastiano Naul, Tony Gri'zo, James Licavali, Santo Perroni, Gasper Peronne, Mafiosi, Mike Caserta, Bugsy Siegel, Torrio, Anastasia, Frank Liversi, John Orusouti, Paul Ricca, Frank Nitti, Louis Campagna, Charles Gioe (alias Joy), Catina, G and J. Bacolla, Cusano, Catena, Armando Flores, Jimmy Call, Salvatore Italiano. Judging by pictures, crime is written so plainly on the faces of most of them to the extent that he who runs may read.

Here are a few names apparently not so Italian in origin: Mickey Cohen, Moe Kleinman, Louis Rothkoff, Moe Dalitz, Glessey, McGinty, Zwillman, Lansky, Reinfeld, Wexler, Tiplitz.

Several of the persons represented by names above set forth have been murdered, apparently by mobsters of rival gangs. Not one of the murderers has been tried and convicted. The police have been in "caboot" with the underworld, or else the mobsters are more clever than the forces of law and order. If the latter be true, then perhaps we should reform some of the underworld and hire them as policemen.

Some of the persons above mentioned are aliens, and should be ejected from the country. The ancient law of banishment provides that we owe no duty to aliens who fail to meet the obligations of decent citizenship. Efforts should also be made to expel those who are naturalized citizens. For the most part the Italians deserving deportation are from Sicily. The continental Italian seems to be of a superior breed. Yet continental Italy sends us also many lawless people. We

have many who qualify as good material for American citizenship. The notorious organization for crime known as Mafia originated in Sicily. Its members should be hunted down and deported.

In the past we have been entirely too complacent in the matter of admitting foreigners of an unworthy type and breed. On account of the bane of politics and foreign influences we have unwittingly added to the growing list of members of the underworld. In some respects these people are more powerful than the forces of law and order. They are a menace to government, just as much so as Communists. On account of a fundamental lack of loyalty, in case of war, they would be potential traitors.

The right of banishment is a fundamental law of Government dating back more than 6,000 years. It is based on the principle that government has the right to protect itself. It should be, and is, a right of law higher than the binding force of a written constitution. In times of war this principle is recognized by frequently ignoring the Constitution. In peace time there are occasions likewise when the mandates of the Constitution should be disregarded for the protection of government and the Constitution itself. The time may come when the Supreme Court will be compelled to take this view as a measure of protection from the influences of lawless aliens and traitorous Communists and spies who now invoke the Constitution to protect themselves in their plans to wreck the country and destroy the Constitution.

It is all very well to eliminate the evils of a Pendergraftian democracy such as muckraking, deep freezism, bribery in the tax system, irregularities in the RFC but the grave menace of foreign criminals and Communists should not be neglected.

Senators, Congressmen Hail Polish-American Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Polish-American Journal of October 20, 1951:

SENATORS, CONGRESSMEN HAIL POLISH-AMERICAN JOURNAL

Senator JAMES H. DUFF, Republican of Pennsylvania: "It is a real pleasure for me to congratulate the Polish-American Journal upon the occasion of its fortieth birthday.

"In recent years I have been a frequent reader of the Journal and I feel that this newspaper plays a very important role in the lives of many Americans who maintain historic ties with Poland.

"If the Journal could be circulated in the Poland of today, I believe that the cause of freedom in that oppressed nation would be greatly advanced.

"It is my sincere hope that the Polish-American Journal will serve a growing number of readers in the years ahead."

HARRY P. O'NEILL, Congressman from Lackawanna County, Pa.: "Congratulations on your fortieth anniversary. Your newspaper is a spearhead in the fight against Soviet tyranny and a champion of a free Poland.

"I feel proud that this newspaper is published in my congressional district, for many

of my colleagues in Washington are ardent readers of your fine publication."

Senator BATES MCMAHON, Democrat of Connecticut: "The need for maintaining firm bonds of friendship linking the people of the United States and the people of Poland is greater now than it ever was before.

"The Polish-American Journal is splendidly equipped to inform its American readers about the heroic struggle of the Polish people against Soviet enslavement. It also serves the good purpose of letting the people of Poland know that we have not forgotten them.

"On this fortieth birthday, I sincerely hope that the Polish-American Journal may enjoy many more years in which to advance the cause of genuine Americanism and to continue the fight against Soviet tyranny."

Representative RAY J. MADDER, Democrat of Indiana: "I wish to extend my hearty congratulations to the Polish-American Journal on your fortieth anniversary.

"Your newspaper has contributed greatly to the welfare of the people of Polish descent and also to the cause of Free Poland. Your publication has also made a great contribution to your State and Nation, both in war and peace.

"Congratulations and many years of success in the future."

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania: "I hope you will permit me to use this means of expressing to you my compliments on the fortieth anniversary of your distinguished paper as a Polish-language newspaper.

"It is interesting to observe that during the last three years the Polish-American Journal has been published in English—the only Polish-American weekly of international circulation which is printed in English. I say international circulation because on my recent world tour I saw the Polish-American Journal on desks of the most distinguished Polish leaders in Rome, Paris, and London.

"As you know, I have the honor of representing Luzerne County, Pa., where resides one of the greatest populations in the country of Americans in whose veins flows the proud blood of Polish ancestry. Having been born and raised among these good people, I am in a position to say to you and to the world at large that no more loyal, patriotic, energetic and God-fearing American citizens exist.

"I feel there is a great need for such a publication as the Polish-American Journal and I wish you many more years of prosperity."

Senator HERBERT H. IEHMAN, Democrat, of New York: "The fortieth birthday of the Polish-American Journal is an occasion for real pride on your part and on the part of the Polish-American community your publication has served so long.

"As the only English language weekly devoted to Polish-American matters, your paper has performed, from all that I have ever heard, fine and notable service. Your paper has served in the good traditions of American journalism without losing touch with the noble, libertarian traditions which the people of Polish origin and descent have brought to this country. The Journal, along with the Polish-American community generally, has been in the forefront of the fighters against tyranny and repression wherever it has occurred.

"I know that, as the Polish-American Journal enters its forty-first year, it looks forward to the day, as we all do, when the people of Poland can again enjoy the liberties which we in America prize and cherish so highly."

Representative ANTONI N. SADLAK, Republican of Connecticut: "I am happy to participate in observing the fortieth anniversary of the Polish-American Journal.

"Your 40 years of outstanding achievements in the field of newspaper publishing prompts me to convey to you, your staff, and readers most sincere congratulations. Your patriotism in combating the evils of communism is particularly worthy of commendation.

"I believe the Polish-American Journal fills a gap which would otherwise deprive the subscribers of many informative and interesting articles and special features which I feel is most important to Americans of Polish heritage. The fact that the Polish-American Journal is publishing this anniversary edition confirms its excellence, its service, its Nation-wide appeal and interest.

"My heartiest wishes for the continued success of the Polish-American Journal."

Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Republican of Wisconsin: "The Polish-American Journal performs a great service to the Americans of Polish descent by keeping alive their traditions and their interest in their homeland.

"Poland's long sorrowful history of repeated invasions and suppressions makes the active support of the Polish people in America most necessary. Today it is the Poles living in America and other countries outside of Poland who can keep alive the hope of liberation in Poland.

"The Polish-American Journal serves as an excellent medium for this purpose and I wish them continued success. Some day I hope that we Americans who are not of Polish descent may again rejoice with those who are when the day of real freedom again returns to Poland."

Church, State, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith excerpts from a speech recently delivered by Glenn L. Archer, executive director of Protestants and Others United for Separation of Church and State. His views present the pertinent arguments on one side of perhaps the most controversial question on the American domestic scene. In view of continuous inroads against our traditional law of separation of church and state, I think it is well to have this viewpoint again presented.

Realizing quite well the tactics of those who desire to break down this traditional American law, and in full appreciation of the usual charges that are heaped upon those who dare present the concepts contained herein, I still believe this is a subject that needs to be brought constantly into the open and presented to the American people in its true light. Those who differ cannot fairly and honestly object to a full presentation of the views of those who desire to retain the one constitutional concept of government which has made America greater than any other nation—separation of church and state.

The excerpts follow:

The question of human freedom is the supreme question which the church and state have in common. Indeed, the crucial question in church-state relations in the world of today centers around the interpretation and expression of freedom. Religious liberty in the United States and throughout the world is conditioned by what interpretation is given to human freedom and what expression is made of it.

The real issue in this country is not whether we shall yield to Communist totalitarianism—we are well aware of its dangers to freedom and are prepared to resist them—but the chief single issue is whether we shall compromise with a clerical totalitarianism which parades as the only enemy of communism, and is now selfishly exploiting America's fear of Communism with evil results to freedom.

In a time when contemporary events thrust this whole question into the focal point of church and state concern, it is natural that we at this significant gathering should concentrate our attention upon it. I am profoundly grateful to Baptists for their singular leadership in the march of freedom. If I were to engage in a purely historical inquiry, I would find a host of trail blazers of religious liberty among Baptists. We are all proud beneficiaries of this tradition, unique to, if not created by Baptists. It is, however, more important for us, their successors inspired and oriented by what these notable reformers said and did in their generation, to make a fresh study of their deeds that we may be challenged to meet the great onslaught against freedom which confronts us today. I am grieved to state that the streams of human freedom in many parts of the world have dried up. In the United States the ocean of freedom we once knew is at low tide.

A GLIMPSE OF THE WORLD PICTURE

Brave, indeed, is the man who can look at today's newspaper headlines without flinching. These headlines tell of totalitarian forces on the march across the world, of communism engulfing Asia, of war in Korea, of Peronism in Argentina, of religious persecution in Spain and Portugal, and of large masses of humanity suffering from poverty, ignorance, degradation, disease, and persecution. Dr. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, points to causes when he states, "In countries which have come under the complete control of Roman clericalism or Soviet imperialism, countries such as Spain or Rumania, freedom is dead."

Regardless of time or place, the real reason for the eclipse of freedom is the formation of a vacuum at the heart of liberty. In Russia, the vacuum began with the corruption of the Tsars. It continued as the Communists fought fire with fire in an effort to survive and overcome the unjust rule of a decadent ruling class. In China, exploiting feudal war lords brought ruin to themselves and to their people. History teaches that a starving, desperate people will embrace any change that offers hope, however slight. It is a bit of irony that many who now complain of Communism in China set the stage for it. In Italy, Spain, Portugal, and in the Balkan States, the light of religious liberty burns low for all except members of the state church, and even for them economic liberty was dead until resurrected by aid from the United States. The church which boasts of control and dominance of a nation for centuries, which has crowned and deposed kings at will, and which is today the real voice in Italy is hard put to absolve itself of the responsibility for creating a vacuum at the heart of

liberty. Praying for peace in public, however commendable, does not alter the fact that 10,000,000 citizens in Italy, the center of Roman Catholicism, voted Communist.

The same great American newspaper (New York Times, August 2, 1951) that tells of Communist repressions in Indochina relates the contents of a repressive pastoral letter issued by the Roman bishops of Argentina, denying Catholics the right to vote for any candidate who favors church-state separation, and freedom of worship to all creeds. Cardinal Copello, who heads the hierarchy in Argentina, has been an ardent supporter of the Peron dictatorship.

In Czechoslovakia, Roman Catholics who supported the Communist regime have been excommunicated by the Pope, and now (RNS, July 28, 1951) Roman Catholic priests who have gone over to the Communist side are "excommunicating" Vatican agents. This is not the first instance that the Communists have copied from the church a technique for denying freedom to people.

Religious leaders are also grieved over reports of the denial of religious liberty in many other lands. A leading correspondent of the New York Times shocked Americans with a series of articles on Roman Catholic persecution of religious minorities in Spain, Colombia, a land once known for liberal and democratic policy, lies under a cloud as a state-favored church constantly harasses Protestants in the smaller rural areas. Witness the situation in Argentina, where one of the world's outstanding newspapers (La Prensa) has been denied freedom of the press and closed down entirely, while other papers (La Nacion) are in danger of being closed.

A Religious News Service dispatch tells of a 50-year struggle to build a Protestant hospital in Naples, Italy, which ended in failure, it is charged, because a Roman Catholic mayor swore he would never sign a permit for any Protestant hospital. The very same week, the Roman Catholic lobby in Washington, helped secure the passage in the House of Representatives of a bill providing outright grants to denominational hospitals in the District of Columbia, with approximately \$4,000,000 slated to be used for the construction of a new Roman Catholic hospital in the Nation's capital.

I digress to say that I fear that all who take a complacent view of the allocation of public money for sectarian institutions are impairing their own liberties. Historians may record that the great traditions of a Protestant Southland died when their leaders signed the Hill-Burton hospital-aid bill. Today, religious liberty is being stifled under a mass of defective social welfare bills.

To a large extent, the world today credits the claim of the Roman Catholic Church that it is the principal enemy of Communism. But the Roman Catholic Church itself must share the blame for this monstrous evil of communism. Thoughtful scholars who have studied the origin of the evil have pointed out that at the time Marxist communism was born, the Roman Church was conventional and dead. The people, embittered and anguished by corrupt priests and politicians working under church-state union, had lost faith in the religion imposed upon them. John MacMurray states, "There would be nothing paradoxical in the discovery that a religion that had lost its faith in God must be overwhelmed by a faith which had rejected religion." The Communists have found dialectical materialism an equivalent to Deity largely because the trappings of a pagan ceremonial church had obscured the real Deity. I must observe that Communism has made little progress in Protestant countries. An understanding of the history of Communism should teach free

Americans their paramount duty to live closer to God in order that they may keep their faith alive and strong.

What distresses me most concerning church-state relations in the United States is the moral bankruptcy of both the state and the church. Emerging from this sad condition are forces—strong, mighty forces—which, in an effort to salvage lost prestige of both state and church, drive in the direction of the union of the two. Witness the close alliance of the Roman hierarchy and the corrupt city political machines; witness the lack of moral fiber in government officials who weakly yield to gamblers. Public apathy and moral breakdown are twin enemies of church-state separation. A spiritual church does not need state support. A moral state does not require its deeds to be sanctified by the church. Baptists, mindful of your glorious tradition, I do not hesitate to exhort you to hold fast to your ideology of church-state separation. Implement that ideology with proper action; but above all, look well to your spiritual moorings. Herein lies a mighty fortress for free worship.

TWO SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

These coercive practices which strike at the heart of the American Bill of Rights are perfectly logical consequences of a philosophy which condemns church-state separation, regards itself as the sole custodian of all truth, and ruthlessly seeks to achieve at all costs its goal of cultural domination.

Pope Pius IX, in the Syllabus of Errors, proposition 55, condemned the theory that the church must be separated from the state and the state from the church. Leo XIII, in the Christian Constitution of States, wrote, "The ideal secular state is bound to profess the Roman Catholic religion." Gregory XVI, in his *Mirari vos* of August 15, 1832, stated, "nor can we hope for happier results either for religion or for the civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the church be separated from the state, and the concord between the secular and ecclesiastical authority, be dissolved. It is clear that these men, who yearn for a shameless liberty, live in dread of an agreement which has always been fraught with good, and advantageous alike to sacred and civil interests."

But, you may say, these are outmoded pronouncements, more fitting to the darkness of the Middle Ages. Let us see. On November 20, 1948, the modern view of church-state separation entertained by the Roman Catholic hierarchy was expressed in the *Christian in Action*. Here, the American constitutional principle of separation of church and state, the legal framework under which the Roman Church has flourished without precedent, was denounced as a mere shibboleth and with it the United States Supreme Court was attacked for holding that public funds should not be used to aid sectarian schools.

Again, you may say, this is only a point of view, an ideological presentation. Why have any concern over it? Our concern grows out of our knowledge of history, both past and present—our knowledge that the Roman Church has been highly successful in forcing its will upon other nations with disastrous results to freedom. * * *

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Roman Catholic philosophy concerning public schools is probably well known to you, but it is useful to refresh our memories by quoting authoritative statements.

Pope Leo XIII, attacking the religious neutrality of public schools (1885), complained that in such schools: "Religious questions are held to be wholly a matter of private judgment; the judgment of the individual conscience is deemed independent of all law;

any opinions about worship may be publicly expressed; everyone has unbounded license to think whatever he chooses and to publish abroad whatever he thinks" * * * "To Leo XIII, this democratic state of affairs was intolerable.

The Jesuit weekly, *America*, in an editorial, October 3, 1925, declared: "That the Catholic and non-Catholic school systems are absolutely irreconcilable is an indisputable fact."

Bishop John F. Noll of Indiana (editor of *Our Sunday Visitor*), published a pamphlet called *Our National Enemy No. 1*, and identified the "enemy" as the public school.

Canon 1374 of Canon Law, "Catholic children shall not attend non-Catholic, indifferent schools, schools that are mixed, that is to say, schools open to Catholics and non-Catholics alike. The bishop of the diocese only has the right, in harmony with the instructions of the Holy See, to decide under what circumstances, and with what safeguards to prevent loss of faith, it may be tolerated that Catholic children go to such schools."

Father Paul L. Blakely, S. J., in a pamphlet entitled "May an American Oppose the Public School?" published in 1937 under the imprimatur of Patrick Cardinal Hayes, proclaimed: "Our first duty, to the public school is not to pay taxes for its maintenance."

* * * The first duty of every Catholic father to the public school is to keep his children out of it. * * * "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school" is the command of the church. * * * Discussion is at an end. The obligations imposed by obedience are alone to be considered."

What is the dialectical approach to the realization of this ideology? Leaders in the National Education Association assert that the Roman hierarchy has stacked the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives against Federal aid for 25 years.

It is generally known who attacks the public schools as "godless," and "secular." The purpose is to discredit public education and deprive it of needed support. We live too close to Mexico and Quebec not to realize the disastrous results of these tactics to both education and morality. A new feature has been injected into the campaign against public schools. Now, it is asserted that every little red school house has a little red teacher. As they behold this vicious assault on the public schools, thinking Americans must oppose the payment of tax funds to support a school system whose educational policy emanates, not from this country, but from an "infallible" divine who sits on a throne in Rome.

PROGRAM OF ACTION

Free Americans desire to preserve the concept of separation of church and state in the United States, as championed by Madison, Jefferson, and Mason, and as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court. The Roman Catholic hierarchy calls this a bigoted and fanatical endeavor.

Free Americans believe that religious instruction should be handled primarily in the home, church, and denominational schools, rather than in the public educational system. The Roman Catholic hierarchy scorns such a view as atheistic.

Free Americans believe that the American public school system must be preserved; that public funds must not be used to support parochial schools; and that those who wish to send their children to such schools must bear the burden of the cost. The Roman Catholic hierarchy says that this is tantamount to double taxation, and to denying their children equal opportunity, even though the public schools are open to their children as well as to others.

Free Americans disapprove boycotts of newspapers, magazines, books, movies, and

businessmen to suppress free discussion. The Roman hierarchy uses the boycott as a means of controlling the press, the radio, and free speech.

Free Americans view with alarm persecution of non-Catholics in predominantly Catholic countries. The Roman hierarchy condones the situation by pointing to the "overwhelming majority" of Roman Catholics in the populations of those countries. In other words, they preach the doctrine that majorities have the right to oppress minorities. If we were to apply that doctrine over here, Catholics would be persecuted. But we reject this doctrine wholeheartedly—fortunately for Catholics as well as non-Catholics. * * *

CONCLUSION

At no time in history has it been of such life-and-death urgency to appreciate, proclaim, and stand firmly for that view of freedom which has been enshrined in the life of Baptists and in the history of this Nation since the dawn of the Republic. We stand for freedom to worship God according to a free conscience. We stand for complete separation of church and state. We stand for freedom to propagate our religious faith. We stand for freedom to educate our children in our faith. We stand for the right to change our faith. We stand for a free press and free speech. Because these great principles are dear to our hearts and our lives, we must stand in opposition to any and all forces, institutions, and agencies which would deny to us our free heritage. Critical times call for men of stout hearts and brave souls. Thank God, among Baptists, America has men—men and women, courageous and unflinching, who, in the face of all the pressure, will proclaim, "I will stand firm. I will be true to American principles."

The Fight Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fight against cancer, which yearly takes a toll of more than 200,000 lives. At the same time I wish to pay tribute to the thousands of volunteers, both men and women, who are giving freely of their time and money in New Jersey and elsewhere in an effort to control the upward trend of this disease.

Our own Federal Government through the National Cancer Institute, is contributing millions of dollars for research into the causes of the disease. The fund is increased through contributions to the American Cancer Society by the people of every State in the Union. More than \$15,000,000 was added this year in this manner to the funds to fight cancer, and in New Jersey alone more than \$700,000 was contributed to the programs of education, service, and research.

Campaigns urging the necessity of periodic health examinations and the need to look for the "Seven Danger Signals" are being carried on throughout the country. Clinics have been opened. In New Jersey there are 39 where patients may have access to the latest equipment to fight the disease; and, in addition, medications, dressings and many other services are made available to those who are medically indigent.

In New Jersey, my own State, the achievements of the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society have been outstanding. Organized 5 years ago by George E. Stringfellow, who served as president 2 years, and was succeeded by J. Wesley Goldthorp, of Camden, the division is now under the direction of William C. Cope, D. C. S., of Newark. To these men I wish to pay tribute for the fine way in which the programs are being carried on in my State.

One of the high lights of the activities is the annual editorial contest which is carried on during April, which is Cancer Control Month. Three judges select the winners, and they are given the George E. Stringfellow plaques.

The winners in 1951 were the *Elizabeth Daily Journal*, in the daily field, for an editorial written by John T. Hall; and the *Bergen Herald*, of Waldwick, in the weekly field, for an editorial written by Mrs. Nella Bradbury.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two winning editorials on the important subject of cancer control be inserted in the Appendix of the *RECORD*, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Elizabeth Daily Journal* of April 24, 1951]

HOW CANCER CAN BE CURED

The blockade of cancer is getting tighter. When it grows tight enough, cancer will be whipped. A blockade that can't be penetrated will win any war. The blockade that cuts off the source of supply for a killing disease will stop the killing.

Cancer is a disease, a ruthless destroyer that knows no rules and plays no favorites in its choice of victims. But the blockade is tightening. How can it miss as more and more people harken to the pleas of the American Cancer Society, not so much for help as to help in establishing an impenetrable blockade?

This is cancer month—the last few days of cancer month that deserves unique standing. For untold generations the mere thought of cancer has been enough to make people quake and pale. The Kefauver exposé made adult people shiver and blanch. But behind the shivering and the blanching, back of the quaking and the paling, there was a cause, an ugly root that went unnoticed until the horrible harvest was at hand.

When detected early, cancer can be cured. Remember that. That is the warning and the lesson the American Cancer Society has taken onto the highways and into the byways. Don't wait for the root to become a tree. To chop it down then will still leave the roots intact. See your doctor at the first sign of a root.

This has been the emphasis of cancer month—an emphasis not to frighten, but to reassure. And the persuasive stress attend-

ing the emphasis is reflected in the result that finds cooperation eddy out to include all ages and all groups. We read of the Cranford High School youngsters who found in the death of a beloved teacher a command to take up arms, and we hear of a Junior Cancer Society of Roselle, the first to be formed. Then we turn to the men and women of the Simmons plant raising a fund with their own minstrel show—an appreciated fund that will help yet not help as much as the contribution they have made by focusing the attention of so very many people on the aims of the blockade.

Getting dollars is important. More important is getting people to understand and to look to their own welfare. The help that the American Cancer Society is giving is beyond measurement. Help it to help

[From the *Bergen Herald*]

HE WAS MY FRIEND

Yesterday I passed the house of a man I used to know. It is a neat, white house with a well-tended lawn in which my friend took a lot of pride. In the middle of the lawn, facing the sidewalk, he had placed a sign with his name on it in plain, black letters. I remember the spring evening when he drove the supporting stake into the ground.

"There," he said, "that's me. All this is mine." The sign was a symbol of achievement. At last he owned a home. Inside were his pretty wife, his healthy son, and his big, devoted dog. It had taken a good many years to be able to set up this monument. He was very proud.

When I went by that house yesterday, a strange man was carrying away the sign. He carted it off to the back yard and threw it on a pile of other bits of lumber, old plaster, and a few broken bricks. A little girl I didn't know sat on the steps and watched him. A woman was busy washing the windows. There was no dog in the yard.

That's right, reader. The man is dead and the child and the wife and the big friendly dog are gone. Cancer, the swift and deadly enemy, had come suddenly over the carefully tended lawn and driven them from the house.

A greater knowledge of the ways of the attacker might have stopped it ere it could have passed into that house. Science had done its best but not even the doctors knew enough to halt the swift advance.

This is just one of thousands of such simple tragedies happening in your town, on your street, maybe in the house next door. It can happen in your house, too. Do you want to stop it?

Give to the American Cancer Society's fund when you are asked within the next few days. One quarter of every dollar goes for research so that doctors can learn more about the dreaded scourge. Part is used in service to cancer patients and their families and part goes for public education. You'll want your share in helping science to help you keep the sign of ownership in front of homes everywhere.

Article by Former Senator Albert Wahl Hawkes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to

insert in the Appendix of the *RECORD* an article by former Senator Albert Wahl Hawkes. This may involve an estimated cost. The printer was unable to furnish me the estimate until tomorrow morning. I do not expect to be here, and I want to know whether I may have unanimous consent for its insertion, if there is no objection, with the appended estimate of cost?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Without objection, the matter will be inserted in the Appendix of the *RECORD* upon receipt of the estimated cost from the Public Printer.

(Subsequently an estimate was received from the Government Printing Office, indicating that the article would exceed by three-fourths of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost would be \$307.50.)

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

EQUITY FOR LABOR AND CAPITAL

(By Albert W. Hawkes)

I have chosen for my subject Equity for Labor and Capital. I purposely put labor before capital, as it is very easily proved that capital or property is the fruit of labor. It might be properly called the stored-up or canned-fruit of labor—something that is available for use at times when required to build jobs and keep the human endeavors for life and progress going.

The brand of canned capital fruit, known as surplus in corporations, is something that makes available fruit out of season, when the trees of industry are not producing profits. Labor comes first, the same as the tree comes before the fruit—in fact, the tree is responsible for the fruit.

Before I get into my subject I wish to state that I am a believer in our American form of representative government—the Constitution of the United States, with its included powers of amendment by certain prescribed processes—and in the free-enterprise system of economics, which has made this country the greatest place on earth to live. Nothing that I say herein should be construed by anyone as not squaring with sound economics and our American system and way of living.

I believe that the usefulness and happiness of human beings in this country is in the inverse ratio to the amount of paternalism that is shown to people physically able to work and earn a living. The aged, the sick, and the incapacitated are recognized by all right-thinking people as being our charge, and I do not believe this country will ever deny that the fit and capable are their brother's keeper. But I believe in the last analysis the people of this country will resent part of the fit taking care of another part of the fit through any system invoked by any agency along the lines of paternalism.

I am not going to deal with wages or hours, working conditions, wage incentives, bonuses, group, life, and health insurance, vacations with pay, or even some of the fine plans of forward-thinking companies which have devised or are endeavoring to devise plans that give the workers a participation in profits after the payment to the stockholders of a reasonably sound dividend. Those things will be taken care of by other speakers.

A DOUBLE PROBLEM

It has been said that labor is the No. 1 problem of industry and business. I might be permitted to make an amendment to this statement by saying that labor and capital

combined are the No. 1 problem in industry and business, because, after all, industry is made up of two distinct factors, namely, labor, on the one hand, and capital and management, on the other. Labor, under our economic system, can do little in establishing a business or making jobs for itself without capital. Capital can do little in establishing a business and making returns for itself without labor. Therefore, labor and capital must find a way to cooperate wholeheartedly and sincerely to produce satisfactory benefits.

Every man and woman of legal working age in this country is a potential laborer. Some labor with their hands, some with their brains; and some a combination of brains and body.

Many men in industry say they never had any real labor problems. They mean they never had labor problems which they were unable to solve through a fair and honest discussion.

I recall the story concerning a United States Supreme Court Justice, who had just celebrated his fiftieth wedding anniversary. He met a Senator and Congressman just after the celebration and one of them said, "Good afternoon, Judge. You are certainly looking fine." And the Justice replied, "I am feeling fine, gentlemen. This is my fiftieth wedding anniversary and we have just had a few very dear friends to luncheon with us. I am a most fortunate man because my wife and I have lived together 50 years in complete harmony, without a cross word." The Senator then said, "Judge, it is wonderful for you to be able to say that. I wish I could." Whereupon the Congressman interposed and said, "Go ahead, Senator. Why don't you?" The Judge said it.

Now the Justice did not mean by his remark there never had been any differences of opinion or problems, because problems and differences of opinion come to all people in every human relationship in life. The Justice meant that he and his wife had established a relationship based on faith, confidence, and equity, and when problems and differences of opinion arose they were promptly settled and not permitted to grow into a breach.

If labor and capital could deal on the same basis as the Justice and his wife, there would be no need of laws attempting to control their actions. Such laws usually breed class hatred and bitterness—and class hatred and bitterness have never successfully solved a single important problem in the history of the world.

THE RULE OF EQUITY

Common law in itself is crystallized common sense, resulting from the experience of the majority of human beings from time immemorial. The administration of common law is sometimes bounded by hard and fast rules; and statutory law is still less flexible. Equity is more flexible—it is the soul and spirit of righteousness. Equity has been described as "the spirit and the habit of fairness, justice and right dealing, which should regulate the intercourse of men with men." Justinian, the great Roman emperor, described equity, "To live honestly, to harm nobody, to render every man his just due." Perhaps the best definition of all is in the words of the Man of Galilee, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Equity must come from within labor and capital—it must be born, it cannot be legislated. It is born of right thinking and a good conscience. Equity, the child of these two, should serve as the keystone of cooperative efforts of labor and capital—thereby bringing happiness and satisfaction to those invoking its aid.

Equity must rule human acts so far as humanly possible in this world. This means many new decrees of equity (public opinion) will appear as humanity develops. For instance, humanity has yet to decree that a woman doing a given piece of work as well as a man, should get the same pay. Sex should not determine the rate of pay.

The important thing in the procedure of equity is that humanity cannot absorb great changes too rapidly without damaging many of the good things it has accomplished.

Hence, the "tempo" of each change is quite as important as the change itself—as related to the successful system we have produced.

MAKING THINGS WORK

The paramount problem confronting capital, management, and labor today is the same as has confronted human beings through all recorded history—namely, to make things work and to give every man his "just due." The signers of the Declaration of Independence and the makers of the Constitution of the United States, had this in view when they summarized in the Declaration of Independence the inalienable rights of men as "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." They then endeavored to so frame the Constitution as to carry this announced principle into effect.

If this great principle of equity is abandoned, human relationships—small or great—fall to pieces, with the result that misery and suffering and chaos are brought, not only to those who destroyed this great principle, but to all who live within the boundaries where the destruction takes place.

The world has been looking at the United States of America for more than 150 years, watching the experiment of the American system of representative government. Undoubtedly there have been many who have wished it failure. Many nations have been born and have perished. Dictators have risen and fallen and risen again—but our great country has successfully gone on with its progress in making things work, because the American people have tried to hold fast to the cardinal principle of equity, upon which our country is founded, and I believe the great majority of American citizens are interested in giving every man his "just due."

The genius of America has always been to make things work. The steam engine, telegraph, telephone, automobile, radio, airplane, and a thousand other important developments, have been brought into existence for the benefit, comfort, and happiness of mankind.

It is our responsibility now to make things work in human relationship. Just as the engineer is called upon to find out why the engine or machine will not work when it ceases to operate and then to reappraise stresses and strains, considering the particular nature of the work of the machine is called upon to do—so we at this time are called upon to make human relationship work satisfactorily.

Labor and capital and management should carefully examine the delicate and intangible thing that holds them together and makes them work, because we are living in a new world era where changes require constant examination and reexamination of those human relationships.

This is our job today—the job of labor and capital and management, as engineers of the human industrial machine of America. Capital cannot function successfully without labor, and labor cannot function successfully without capital. Hence the indispensable cooperation between the two.

WHAT IS A MAN'S JUST DUE?

The first thing management should do is to ascertain as far as humanly possible,

what is the just due of each grade of manpower employed in an industry? This is a difficult job and all human minds could never be expected to reach precisely the same conclusion. However, if the great majority of men charged with directing the affairs of industry, business, and agriculture will seek earnestly and in the proper spirit for the truth of what is every man's just due—I feel that we can develop sufficient patience and tolerance to enable us to proceed in a cooperative way on a basis of mutuality while we are moving steadily in the direction of the objective, namely, equity for labor and capital.

We all have a very heavy responsibility resting upon us right at this period of our lives—and history will record whether we are equal to the task. We must realize that the price of failure will be disaster to all of us and our country. But I say we shall not fail because I have absolute confidence in the desire of the great majority of those in the industrial and business arena to solve this problem as promptly as possible in a way that is satisfactory to the great mass of the American people. We must and will solve this problem the same as we have solved other problems in the past—the American way for the common good of all.

No man in this country can successfully act in disregard of public opinion. After all, public opinion creates governments and the form of governments, and it changes them at will when it is sufficiently crystallized.

THE CHARACTER OF LABOR

As I consider the many representatives of capital and management whom I know, and the many laboring men whom I also know—I am sure that a cross section of all human beings is pretty much the same. There is just about as much selfishness in one quarter as another. There is just about as much good in one quarter as another. There is just about as much love of country and our form of living in one quarter as another.

I believe the intelligent working man who has been taught the story of this country and our enterprise system is strongly in favor of it, and that he recognizes the fact that in every country where the system of free enterprise has been destroyed, the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," have been endangered or taken away. If we can proceed on the basis that the laboring man is just as good a citizen as the capitalist or those engaged in management (and I believe he is), we will make tremendous progress. After all, the court of equity in this case of cooperation between capital, management and labor, is nothing else than the great American people, who—after hearing the case—form public opinion, which is the decree of equity. Public opinion, with the power of the American public back of it, can and will enforce its decrees upon any group of people.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LABOR

"He who comes into equity must do so with clean hands"—which means to me that neither capital and management, on the one hand, nor labor, on the other, can expect to get into equity unless its hands are clean. Then when capital and management and labor find themselves before the court of equity they must follow another cardinal rule, which is that "He who asks equity, must do equity."

I believe a small portion of labor and a small portion of capital have been wrong most of the time. But I also believe most of labor and most of capital have endeavored to cooperate most of the time. There is no reason why most of labor and most of capital should not cooperate all the time, if they understand each other thoroughly and com-

pletely and each knows that the other is thinking straight, playing the game on the square, and only wants equity—its just due.

That labor is a dignified and honorable calling will not be disputed by any fair-thinking person. Our great President, Abraham Lincoln, accepted honorary membership in the Workingmen's Association of New York on March 21, 1864, and stated to the committee: "The honorary membership in your association, as generously tendered, is gratefully accepted."

Then this great man of humility, with malice toward none and charity for all, gave labor a rating of honor and dignity in his speech to them, partly as follows:

"Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. * * * Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between capital and labor, producing mutual benefits. * * * Again, as has already been said, there is not, of necessity, any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed to that condition for life. Many independent men everywhere in these States, a few years back in their lives, were hired laborers. The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages for a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress, and improvement of condition to all. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. * * * The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people. * * * Nor should this lead to a war upon property of the owners of the property."

And still quoting Lincoln in the same speech to labor:

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

CAPITAL AND MANAGEMENT

Now so much in commendation of labor, and we can turn to a little commendation of capital and management—because, after all, there are thousands of men called captains of industry, who, by their life's work, have demonstrated their love of their fellow men and a square deal in their behalf. We must remember that our American justice is presumed to rest on the theory that it is better that a hundred guilty men should escape than that one innocent man should be punished.

So why should all of labor or all of capital be punished for the sins of a few?

Man can only be custodian of funds. He can only eat so much a day and sleep in a single place at one time, and all of those who have accumulated wealth through our free-enterprise system have found that the very plan of life—brief as it is—makes them custodians of funds in an involuntary trusteeship or stewardship. Hundreds of them have spent a large part of their lifetimes trying to make comfortable jobs that give a satisfactory living standard to the men working for them or for the company they represent.

The Rockefeller interests have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in creating jobs for and to benefit mankind through research and other fields. Endicott Johnson have created thousands of good jobs and used their money wisely for the benefit of the people. George Eastman, and many others, gave a substantial part of their wealth to the benefit of mankind. B. Altman, right in this city of New York, gave his store to those who helped him build his business.

I could go on with hundreds of others who have done likewise—but there are so many known cases it seems unnecessary to cite them to prove my conviction that most successful men recognize they can only be custodians of funds in the interest of others.

If this be true, as I believe the records prove, then both sides have much to be said in their favor and little to be said against them. Jobs must either come from the use of private capital or from the use of public funds—and from what I know of the history of the world, I have no hesitation in saying I would rather see funds to create jobs handled by private individuals who created the funds, than by politicians who frequently use funds for a short period of time without the responsibility of having created those funds themselves. The individual who created the funds lives with the job he is doing until he gets his final summons. The politician frequently has a short tenure of office and regardless of his sincerity, does not have that continuing responsibility.

A MUTUALITY OF INTEREST

This means to me that the important problem lying in front of both sides of industry is adopting a policy that is founded upon true mutuality and then working to create the patience and tolerance that are necessary to find the truth and solve the problem on the basis of equity for all. The interested parties in this discussion are so interwoven in their relationship that their objectives must be the same, if either or both are to be satisfied with the results achieved.

I believe capital and management have been wrong many times in assuming that labor in the past has been happy, when it was dissatisfied. This reminds me of a little story of a Negro circuit preacher who was just closing his year with the congregation. He liked his pulpit and his comfortable little home, and the only way he could remain there another year as the pastor of the church was by having the congregation vote that they wished to keep him. So on the last Sunday of the year he said:

"Brethren and sisters, dis am the last Sabbath in the year, and I must move on unless you vote that you wants me as your parson for another year. All those in favor of me remaining for another year, please raise their right hand."

Not a hand went up.

"All right, brethren and sisters, all those in favor of me remaining another year will signify by saying 'Aye'."

Not an "aye" was heard. Whereupon the parson said:

"Thank you all, very much, brethren and sisters. Is your parson for another year, because silence gives consent."

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT

I believe a great many of the troubles of the past have come through the assumption that silence gives consent. Therefore, I recommend that every manufacturer who is interested in the continuance of our enterprise system and our form of government make it his business in the future to do the following things:

1. Regardless of fine wages, working hours, and other conditions—wherever the size of the company permits, see that at least once a year all the employees of the company have

a chance to look at you or some of the upper officers to see that you do not have horns. In large companies, I recommend the heads of the subsidiaries or plant divisions carry this policy into effect.

In our company we feel this contact—meeting the men face to face and showing them we are human beings—is one of the important contributing factors to the fine understanding between the management and the employees. This is illustrated by comments individually made by workmen in one of our plants following a meeting at which several of the officers of our company attended. Here are some of those comments:

J. H. said: "Enjoyed the talk and can see that he (Mr. Hawkes) is as interested in the workman as in the rich man. Every man I spoke to enjoyed the talk and the party. These men came to us as perfect strangers and in no time at all we saw they were just one of us."

T. H. said: "I was afraid to meet Mr. Hawkes and the other officials. I thought Mr. Hawkes was very tall and fat. After I saw them I enjoyed being around them. They are just regular men like you and me."

E. M. said: "I figured he would come down, say his speech, hello, and get the hell out. Sure surprised me."

J. R. said: "Would like to have his salary (referring to Mr. Hawkes), but not his job. Guys like him work too hard."

These remarks show that the men had a fine, friendly feeling toward the management after a personal visit and enjoyable little party.

2. If your company policies do not square with the progress of human relationship in this country, then square them as far as is possible, based on sound economics, and make it your business to see that your men understand them.

3. Don't mislead your employees by bidding for popularity through doing the unusual or economically unsound thing which cannot last and which damages not only the company that tries it but all industry, because human beings still relate and compare what happens to their neighbors with what happens to them.

4. Be sure that no superintendent, foreman, subforeman, or supervisor attempts to be sharp or shrewd in dealing with the manpower of the company.

5. Be certain that no man between you and the men down the line breaks the chain because he misunderstands the company's policy or fails to carry through the instructions of management.

6. The definition of a corporation in the past has been "An invisible, intangible being, existing only in contemplation of law, without heart and without soul." We must prove that a corporation can have the equivalent of a heart and soul and that the representatives employed to direct its affairs serve as an agency of human beings—if it is to remain a useful agency for the conduct of business.

7. Have your men in the plant understand that the laborer of today is the potential capitalist of tomorrow. That his interests of tomorrow may be identical with others of today, and his acts of today should be so measured that he will be willing to have similar acts from others tomorrow.

One of the most interesting experiences the management of our company has had was when we raised wages at a crucial time, the men—of their own volition—sent a committee to the superintendent to inquire if the company could afford to raise wages, in view of competition, low prices, and lesser volume of business.

Think of this interest in the welfare of the company of which they were a part.

WHERE INDUSTRY CAN SERVE

Industrial management should support the fine movements for the dissemination of correct information regarding our free-enterprise system, to the youth of America. The Junior Achievement Movement I believe justifies our support. The plan back of the Institute for Industrial Progress was most excellent. The general educational plans of intelligent, far-sighted business managements in training and educating superintendents, foremen, and the men in their plants, all contribute a great deal toward this end.

The fine women of this country can play a most important part in backing up industry and business if they (the women) are convinced industry and business are operating along fair and sound lines. Most of those who know about the businesses in which their husbands are engaged believe in the fairness of those particular institutions—whereas, not knowing about other businesses, they frequently are in doubt about them—and being in doubt, are not good sponsors for them.

This avenue, I believe, offers one of the most valuable and hopeful opportunities available to us to bring the truth home to a very large percentage of the population. Women train the minds of youth, and youth of today will be our industry and business of tomorrow.

To keep the Government from stepping into business further than necessary or desired, men must be able to do things by themselves as well as or better than the Government can do those things for them. If men can do the job and labor and capital will cooperate, understand and respect each other—their combined power will keep Government where its founders deemed it could serve its people best. And further, their combined strength will remove from the statute books any bad laws that have been put there and will keep from enactment further bad laws that are incubated in the minds of politicians.

POINTS TO REMEMBER

Remember, next to wages, labor is interested in regular work on a permanent job. Management should endeavor to work out such a system to accomplish this—but that system must square with sound economics or it will fail.

Remember, giving labor its just due in wages and working conditions, will increase labor's determination to work, rather than to be satisfied with relief or relief work.

Remember, workmen standing with the management, will resent the acts of any outside agency or laws that injure business, because they will understand such things injure their interests also. When such understanding arrives, bad laws will be promptly corrected or repealed.

Remember, your men should thoroughly understand your company policies, principles, and objectives—don't leave anything to silence.

Remember, the local community should understand your company principles, policies, and objectives—and, understanding them, should vote the company a good citizen.

Remember, faith, confidence, and mutual respect must be in the picture with good practices. "Faith begets faith"—and confidence begets confidence. Both lead to mutual respect.

Remember, sharp practice anywhere along the line helps destroy faith, confidence, and equity.

Remember, the public is equity's court and public opinion is equity's decree.

Remember, labor and capital make industry, and with either one removed there is no industry.

Remember, Government only derives its just power from the consent of the governed—and, after all, it is nothing but a creature of the people, unless it gets out of hand and through force becomes the master of the people.

SIGHT BEING RESTORED

Two verses from the Bible are at this time worthy of consideration by both labor and capital—quoting from St. Luke's, chapter 8: "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

And then again this great question: "Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch?"

My answer is, the blind on both sides are coming into sight and have already begun to read the decrees of equity on the wall of public opinion. Hence, each with sight and patience can help both to keep out of the ditch. The National Association of Manufacturers and other vital organizations are helping tremendously to restore this sight, and labor and capital are showing daily evidence of their appreciation of the necessity of choosing good leaders who believe in law and order.

"He who comes into equity, must do so with clean hands," and "he who asks equity, must do equity." If understanding cooperation is accomplished between labor and capital, I predict both labor and capital will appreciate that no one-sided law can long bring benefits to the side it favors, because that is not equity.

If the President of the United States believes that the great majority of labor is understanding and trying to do equity, and that the great majority of the captains of industry are cooperating and trying to do equity—then I believe a definite and direct word from him to this effect would be most helpful to the country right now.

In closing let me urge that, in true Christmas spirit, we all join in fervently expressing the hope that the days to come will justify man's faith in his fellow-being. That his intelligence, industry, and goodness of heart will prevail over the destructive forces that have threatened his civilization. That he will come to the realization that but one heart beats for all, and that mutual love, respect, and understanding will make "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" a glowing reality.

Gen. Harry Schmidt, United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding a Nebraska native son of whom we are unusually proud, Gen. Harry Schmidt, commanding general of the glorious victory of Iwo Jima.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. HARRY SCHMIDT

September 25, on future calendars, may well be marked as the birthday of Gen. Harry Schmidt, of the United States Marine

Corps, a native son of Nebraska. General Schmidt's lengthy record of distinguished service to his country and corps may, however, be lost sight of by Americans anxious to honor him for a triumph that climaxed rather than established his fame. This climatic point was reached when General Schmidt, commanding the largest landing force of marines in the entire battle-studded history of this world-renowned fighting corps, led it to its smashing victory over the stout Japanese defenders of a compact little volcanic ash and rock island with the never-to-be-forgotten name of Iwo Jima. Nebraskans are doubly proud of the fact that General Schmidt's impressive victory at Iwo Jima was not gained accidentally as evidenced by the solid base of mounting important achievements marking his prior service. The often unheralded, sometimes tedious, and more frequently less spectacular service of more than 35 years which prepared General Schmidt to achieve his great victory at Iwo Jima provides much of inspirational value for present and future Americans desirous of serving their country.

The obscuring importance attached to the triumph of American arms at Iwo Jima is attested by many sources. Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, noted military biographer, has publicly reiterated that whenever he has been asked to comment upon the performance of the United States Marine Corps in World War II, he has felt that his pride in the Corps' many achievements could be embodied in two brief words: "Iwo Jima."

Similarly, Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, then commandant of the Corps, who had led our forces at Guadalcanal in our first successful major offensive in the Pacific, has since characterized the battle for Iwo Jima as "that operation in which more than 80,000 Marines, under Marine leadership, overran the toughest objective in Marine Corps history."

Princeton history professors Isely and Crowl in their definitive book *The United States Marines and Amphibious War*, refer to Iwo Jima as "The Supreme Test," "Acme of Amphibious Assault," and further state "The capture of Iwo is the classical amphibious assault of recorded history. . . ."

Finally, few will ever forget Admiral Nimitz's famous tribute to the Americans who fought on Iwo Jima: "On Iwo Island uncommon valor was a common virtue."

From these and numerous other tributes, it is easier to understand how General Schmidt's other, somewhat less spectacular achievements have come to be overlooked by Americans held captive by the drama of Iwo Jima.

With the passage of time, historians will undoubtedly broaden the niche that has been accorded General Schmidt as the conqueror of Iwo Jima. Americans may then find it profitable to study the path that General Schmidt trod which ultimately led to the summit of Mount Suribachi.

Paradoxically, perhaps, the land-locked territory of the great State of Nebraska provided the first home of this famous "soldier of the sea." General Schmidt was born in Holdrege on September 25, 1886. In his youth, the general's family also resided in Kearney and Stapleton, other typical Nebraska towns.

After graduation from high school, General Schmidt enrolled at Nebraska State Normal School. About this time he enlisted in the Nebraska National Guard and by diligent application shortly rose to commissioned rank. His service in the Nebraska National Guard proved very stimulating and encouraged General Schmidt to seek a full-time military career. Accordingly, he became an applicant for a commission in the United States Marine Corps. When his application was accepted, he was appointed a

second lieutenant of marines on August 17, 1909.

When he had accepted the proffered commission, General Schmidt was ordered for indoctrinational training to report to the Marine Officers' School at Port Royal, S. C.

When he was subsequently graduated from marine officers' school, where he ranked in the upper half of his class, General Schmidt was ordered to report for duty at the Marine Barracks, Guam, Marianas Islands. While he could hardly have guessed it then, General Schmidt was destined to play an important role in our reconquest of Guam some 30 years later. However, when he reported for duty in Guam in January 1911, Saipan and Tinian were merely names of some islands in the Marianas somewhere north of Guam.

Trouble developed in China about 1 year after General Schmidt's arrival on Guam. He was about to make the first of many visits to this country. He was assigned to command a detachment of Guam marines which formed an American expeditionary force unit assigned to protect American interests at Chefoo, China.

When this China duty was completed, General Schmidt was transferred to the Philippine Islands in October 1912. He remained on duty in the Philippines until he was detached in April 1913 and ordered to return to the United States for duty.

Upon his arrival in the United States, General Schmidt was ordered to recruiting duty in Minnesota. He discharged this less glamorous but very important task with characteristic application. When it was over he was glad to return to the Marine Corps. He was ordered to report to the Marine Barracks, New Orleans, La.

General Schmidt's tour at New Orleans was interrupted when he was ordered to go aboard the U. S. S. *Kearsage* and sailed for Vera Cruz, Mexico, in 1915. More sea duty followed. In May 1916 he was ordered to the U. S. S. *Oklahoma*. The next year found him assigned to the U. S. S. *Montana*. His tour aboard the *Montana* was interrupted by duty ashore in Cuba when he landed with the ship's Landing Force at Guantanamo Bay. He was ashore at Guantanamo from February 25 to March 22, 1917. His seagoing duties kept him afloat on convoy and escort duty with the fleet throughout most of World War I.

General Schmidt was detached from the *Montana* in September of 1918 and ordered to duty at the Marine Barracks, Norfolk, Va. Not quite 2 years later, in June 1920 he was again ordered to sea duty, this time as Commanding Officer of the Marine Detachment, U. S. S. *Tennessee*.

When he had completed a 2-year tour of duty aboard the *Tennessee*, General Schmidt was ordered to duty under instruction in the Marine Corps schools. Upon graduation, he was subsequently detailed as an instructor. He spent about 3 years in this exacting task.

General Schmidt's stint of duty as an instructor ended when he was again ordered back to recruiting duty; once again this assignment took him to Minnesota. Troublous times in China intervened to shorten his recruiting tour. He returned to China for a 6-month tour with the famous Sixth Regiment.

American interest in stabilizing the Central American governments next brought General Schmidt to Nicaragua in February of 1928. Until he was relieved in June 1929, General Schmidt served as intelligence and operations officer of the Second Marine Brigade in Nicaragua. His duties provided him with excellent experience in what has been characterized by the Marines as Small Wars operations. In addition, his duties gave him

an early appreciation of the utilization and application of marine air power—a talent which was to stand him in good stead in future battles in the Pacific.

General Schmidt's duties in Nicaragua made it requisite for him to have a sound knowledge of this country. He soon found this information could best be obtained first hand by making frequent aerial flights. In many instances, these flights had to be made over disputed territory, in aircraft that were a far cry from the present day's, and while subject to hostile ground fire. When aircraft were shot down or failed to return from missions, aviation personnel who were captured by dissident elements were invariably tortured to death. It was understandable therefore when his services were subsequently recognized by the award of the Navy Cross.

When he had completed his arduous duties in Nicaragua, General Schmidt was detached and assigned to duty under instruction at the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. He arrived at Fort Leavenworth in July 1929, a critical time in his career.

Students at Fort Leavenworth were required to make tactical horseback rides in connection with field problems. On one of his first rides, General Schmidt was thoroughly drenched by rain. His duty in the tropics had served to lessen his resistance to exposure in the more temperate climes. He contracted rheumatic fever which required skilled treatment and individual perseverance to pull him through before he could resume his studies. His perseverance was rewarded when he was graduated June 18, 1932.

Ahead lay a test of his versatility—a byword for which the Marines are celebrated. General Schmidt had to relegate much of the knowledge he had acquired at Fort Leavenworth, until a later date. His next assignment was to duty with the paymaster department of the Marine Corps. Undismayed by an immediate requirement for still more learning in a branch with which he was totally unfamiliar, he nevertheless applied himself assiduously. His subsequent duties with the paymaster department took him successively to headquarters at Washington, D. C., then to the department of the Pacific, San Francisco, Calif., to the Fourth Marine Regiment at Shanghai—his third tour in the Orient—thence back again to San Francisco. How well he applied himself to these tasks for the paymaster department can best be judged by the fact that he was later selected to be the commanding general of this department.

In June 1937 General Schmidt was detached from duty with the Paymaster Department and ordered from San Francisco to duty as Chief of Staff of the Second Marine Brigade then stationed at the Marine Barracks, San Diego, Calif. Shortly after his arrival in San Diego, trouble once again broke out in China. This time the Japanese were to blame. The Japanese invasion of China involved American interests, particularly in Shanghai. The Second Marine Brigade was shortly ordered to sail for Shanghai and on arrival to absorb and assume command over the Fourth Marine Regiment permanently stationed there. General Schmidt sailed with the brigade aboard the U. S. S. *Chaumont* bound for Shanghai in August 1937.

Upon his arrival in Shanghai, which marked his fourth visit to China, General Schmidt found himself in a diplomatic tinder box which required all his skill to prevent an international conflagration. The Japanese, bent on conquest, proved very difficult to deal with. Incidents were a daily occurrence and in December 1937 culminated in the Japanese bombing and sinking of the

U. S. S. *Panay*. Despite repeated aggravation, the marines under General Schmidt's coordinating efforts managed to maintain American prestige without becoming the cause of any serious international dispute.

When the brigade was ordered to return to the United States without the Fourth Regiment, General Schmidt complied with the Commandant's personal request that he return to headquarters and assist in straightening out the affairs of the Paymaster Department.

In Washington, he became personnel officer and executive officer of the Paymaster Department. In accepting this assignment it was generally believed that he had lessened his chances materially of ever being selected to become a general officer of the line of the Marine Corps. His loyalty, zeal, and professional ability in serving the Paymaster Department were recognized in 1938, by his selection to become the Paymaster General of the Marine Corps with the rank of brigadier general, which office he was to assume upon the retirement of the incumbent. However, long before the incumbent retired, and in the face of this selection, General Schmidt was shortly selected to become a brigadier general of the line of the Marine Corps.

After his promotion to brigadier general, General Schmidt became an assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Thomas Holcomb. In April 1942 General Schmidt became the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps and was appointed a major general. He remained in this capacity until he was directed to assume command of the Fourth Marine Division upon its activation.

General Schmidt assumed command of the Fourth Marine Division at a ceremony at Camp Pendleton, Calif., on August 18, 1943. While it was a new division, it had a nucleus of trained professionals and it was to be given just 4 months to get ready for its first battle—Roi-Namur, Kwajalein.

Organization and training proceeded apace. General Schmidt took full advantage of the forthcoming battle for Tarawa to send observers along. Upon their return, the lessons they had learned were quickly assimilated. New techniques and equipment that promised to lessen the pain of seizing a beachhead were adopted. Weather mitigated against a full-dress rehearsal. The division made the rigid time schedule and was the first to embark directly from the United States for an amphibious assault on a hostile shore.

General Schmidt was assigned to command the northern landing force with the mission of seizing, occupying and defending Roi-Namur, which with its adjacent islands formed part of the largest atoll in the world: Kwajalein, Marshall Islands.

For its first blooding, the Fourth Marine Division under General Schmidt's leadership, acquitted itself with creditable distinction. All organized resistance was overcome within 3 days after the initial landings. Marine casualties were some of the lightest of the war thanks to improved tactics, techniques and equipment so quickly put to use after the lessons of Tarawa had been learned. General Schmidt requested permission to be allowed to seize Eniwetok, the next target, before rehabilitating. When permission was denied, the division continued to mop up the atoll islands south of Roi-Namur at such a rate that before it was stopped by orders of higher authority, it had succeeded in capturing more than 70 percent of the territory comprising the world's largest atoll.

The Fourth Marine Division was subsequently withdrawn from Kwajalein to the Hawaiian Islands for rehabilitation and training for a sterner test. The new lessons

that it had learned in battle for itself, were now quickly put to practice. Once again a scant 4 months remained before the division was scheduled to do battle again.

On June 15, 1944, General Schmidt led the Fourth Marine Division in the assault landing against Saipan, Marianas Islands, this time on the right of the Second Marine Division. The Second had been responsible for many of the lessons learned by the Fourth's observers at Tarawa. Its more experienced Marines placed the Fourth on its mettle to match its efforts.

The importance of Japan's hold on the Marianas, particularly Saipan, to the Empire was immediately apparent when the Japanese Fleet put to sea to interfere with our landings. The famous "turkey shoot" ensued bringing victory to our naval forces in the battle of the Philippine Sea.

Twenty-six days of hard fighting were required to overcome stubborn Japanese resistance and the Fourth Marine Division managed to match the fighting qualities of the famous Second Division despite its relative inexperience, because of its able leaders. When organized resistance had been overcome, General Schmidt was directed to relinquish command of the Fourth to Gen. Clifton B. Cates, the present Commandant, and to assume command of the Fifth Amphibious Corps which included both divisions, for the forthcoming amphibious assault of nearby Tinian Island.

Rehabilitation and mopping up went forward simultaneously on Saipan in easy view of the Japanese on Tinian, so did planning for the forthcoming amphibious assault on the latter. Within 12 days after he had assumed command of the Fifth Amphibious Corps, General Schmidt led it ashore on the narrow northern beaches of Tinian. The enemy was completely surprised as to the location of the main landings. The assault on Tinian has since come to be regarded by many professionals as "amphibious perfection." Within 10 days all organized enemy resistance had been overcome.

General Schmidt's services in the Marshalls and Marianas were recognized upon his return to the Hawaiian Islands after the conquest of Tinian, by the award of the Distinguished Service Medal and a Gold Star in lieu of a second award. The citations accompanying these awards were similar in that they made mention of the fact that during the critical period of the landings "he fearlessly moved ashore with his men, establishing his headquarters within 300 yards (NAMUR) of the Japanese lines, continually exposing himself to intense, hostile sniper fire" while directing his troops "with such aggressive determination and brilliant tactical skill that his intrepid forces captured the island" in the surprisingly short period of time previously mentioned.

Now, once again, General Schmidt was left with about 4 months to ready his Fifth Amphibious Corps for its "supreme test." Much new battle experience had been acquired and the lessons had to be assimilated. Furthermore, except for the now famous Fourth, newly acquired divisions made up the corps.

On February 19, 1945, right on schedule to the minute, General Schmidt, as commanding general of the Iwo Jima landing force, led his newly composed Fifth Amphibious Corps across the beaches and against the dug-in defenders of that tight little island. Within 4 days after the first waves landed our flag was hoisted over Mount Suribachi, and there it remained for the next 20-odd days until our conquest was completed by the annihilation of the defenders. Our fighter aircraft were provided with a base from which they could support our long-range bombers making attacks on the Japanese homeland, our crippled bombers re-

turning from these strikes found a new haven to rest on.

Admiral Nimitz himself presented General Schmidt with a second Gold Star in lieu of a third award of the Distinguished Service Medal following his return from Iwo Jima. The citation accompanying the award read: "Major General Schmidt landed his troops on D-day against a fanatical enemy delivering a merciless rain of fire from incomparable natural defenses. Disposing the units under his command for maximum strength, he advanced them inch by inch over difficult, uneven terrain through adverse weather to blast the defending garrison and drive the Japanese from their deeply entrenched positions. A dynamic leader and brilliant strategist, he consistently maintained close control of his assaulting elements against terrific opposition, and after 26 days of bitter fighting succeeded in securing this vital enemy stronghold. His undaunted valor, resolute fortitude, and decisive conduct were essential factors in the success of our forces in extending United States control toward the shores of Japan, and his stout-hearted devotion to duty reflects the highest credit upon Major General Schmidt, his intrepid officers and men, and the United States naval service."

In January 1946 General Schmidt was ordered back to the United States and in March was promoted to the rank of lieutenant general. In the interim between this date and the battle of Iwo Jima, however, General Schmidt had not been idle. He had taken his depleted, famous Fifth Amphibious Corps to Japan to participate in the occupation of the homeland. For his service in Japan in command of the Corps he was subsequently awarded the Legion of Merit by the United States Army.

Upon his return to the United States, General Schmidt had been given command of Camp Pendleton, effective in May 1946. In June 1947, he was relieved of the Pendleton command to assume command of the San Diego area as Commanding General, Marine Training and Replacement Command. He continued in this latter capacity until his retirement for physical disability incident to duty. On July 1, 1948, he was retired with the four-star rank of general having been commended by executive order while in actual battle with an enemy of the United States.

General Schmidt's health has dictated his retirement in San Diego, Calif., where he resides at 3105 Elliott Street, today. The general was 65 on September 25, 1951, and the entire Nation has ample cause to wish him many more years of health and happiness.

A perusal of General Schmidt's record reveals that he has earned the right to wear the following decorations of this Nation and Nicaragua as well as the below listed medals: Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal with two Gold Stars, Legion of Merit (Army), Bronze Star, Presidential Unit Citation with one Bronze Star, Navy Unit Commendation, Expeditionary Medal with two Bronze Stars, World War I Victory Medal with Convoy and Escort Clasp, Yangtze Service Medal, Second Nicaraguan Campaign Medal, China Service Medal, American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Occupation Medal, Japan, Nicaraguan Medal of Distinction with Diploma, Nicaraguan Medal of Merit with Silver Star.

Nebraska is particularly proud of Gen. Harry Schmidt, one of her many illustrious native sons, but the first one in Nebraskan history to attain the rank of a four-star general. The Nebraska National Guard can take just pride in and credit for having inspired and launched the career that led Gen. Harry Schmidt, of Nebraska, to the top of that world famous fighting aggregation, the United States Marine Corps.

National Association, or Federation, of Citizens Crime Commissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an extension of my remarks concerning the proposal to create a National Association, or Federation, of Citizens Crime Commissions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KEFAUVER

Mr. President, I have just been informed of a very important step in the field of crime detection and prevention.

A group of nine local crime commissions, meeting in Chicago last Monday, appointed a committee to examine the possibility of forming a National Association, or Federation, of Citizens Crime Commissions.

This national association would serve as a clearing house for information between the various local crime commissions. It also would serve as liaison agency with established Federal organizations. It would keep the spotlight on crime and corruption at all levels.

Members of the committee who will investigate this possibility are Virgil Peterson, of Chicago; Jim Walsh, of New York City; Arlon Wilson, of Kansas City, and Daniel Sullivan, of Miami. All of these gentlemen are tops in their field, all associated with Citizens Crime Commissions in their own cities.

The Senate Committee to Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce, of which I formerly served as chairman, saw the need for a body such as this. In our third interim report one of our recommendations was the enactment of appropriate legislation to set up an independent Federal Crime Commission in the executive branch of the Government. We proposed that the Commission be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, that it have as its function the continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate criminal organizations throughout the country, reports on such activities to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, maintenance of liaison between Federal, State, and local agencies, appropriate social studies relating to crime, its punishment and law enforcement; the maintenance of files and records as a national clearing house of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce, and other functions.

There was considerable opposition to this. In fact it was the only proposal, I believe, on which the committee was not united. Senator ALEXANDER WILLY dissented, since he feared that this might lead to a national-type police force at some future time.

In our final report, recognizing this opposition, we changed the recommendation from a federally appointed National Crime Commission to a proposal for a National Crime Coordinating Council. We proposed that the council would be a body composed of representatives of privately established local crime commissions. We urged that it keep the searchlight of public vigilance turned upon crime and corruption in a manner that leaves at the local level the basic responsibility of law enforcement and at the same time affords centralized guidance and coordination to crime detection and preventive activities.

If the proposal of the nine local crime commissions proves feasible, and a national association, or federation, of citizens crime commissions is formed, then such an association may very well fulfill the need that we had in mind. I think the proposal has great possibilities and I hope it is fully supported and backed up by interested citizens and foundations.

North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, an extremely fine article entitled "North Dakota Comes Into Its Own," by Leo A. Borah, appeared in the National Geographic magazine for September of this year. This is one of the finest articles about North Dakota that has ever appeared in any magazine. I have ascertained that the cost of printing the article in the Record will amount to approximately \$250 more than the regular allowance, but I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in full.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA COMES INTO ITS OWN (By Leo A. Borah)

As this issue of the National Geographic magazine reaches society members, hundreds of combines are sweeping across the golden fields of North Dakota, harvesting one-tenth of the Nation's wheat crop.

North Dakota produces more wheat than any other State except Kansas. In hard red spring wheat and durum, source of macaroni and spaghetti, it ranks first. It led the country in flax in 1950, vied for top honors in barley and rye, and stands high in production of potatoes, sugar beets, and hay.

Under its western grasslands lie 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal, and last April high-grade oil was struck in a flowing well at Tloga, between Minot and Williston.

PEOPLE HAVE SPIRIT OF NEVER-SAY-DIE

Rich, deep soil and vast natural resources on the eve of development are tremendous assets, but the greatest wealth of North Dakota is in the never-say-die spirit of its people. In spite of blizzards, floods, drought, dust storms, grasshoppers, and all manner of devastating plant diseases, they have clung to their faith in the land. That faith has been justified by 10 successive crops which have brought them from near bankruptcy in the 1930's to such prosperity that the gross income from the average farm in 1950 was \$9,000.

No longer is agriculture in North Dakota the desperate gamble it was when the only crop was wheat, the unpredictable. Diversified farming, crop rotation, summer fallowing, irrigation, airplane spraying of fields to kill grasshoppers and to destroy weeds, and development of drought- and disease-resistant varieties of grain have removed some of the hazards. Undoubtedly there will still be bad years when acre yields will be curtailed, but even the most adverse conditions will hardly cause complete failure as in the past.

North Dakota is no place for the timid or the weak; its winters are too rigorous, its

summers often too hot and dry. To the courageous and hardy, however, it is truly a land of opportunity.

When I arrived in Bismarck in mid-April this year, to begin my last survey of the State, the capital city was crowded with oilmen. Courteous Frank Hayes, manager of the Patterson Hotel, who came to my rescue with a comfortable room, told me that speculators from outside the State were engaging whole floors in the hotels.

"It's even worse in Minot," he said. "They swarmed in the minute the news of the oil strike leaked out. I hear they are paying from \$5 to \$10 an acre for leases on farms many miles away from the Tloga well.

"There is no doubt that the oil is there, but whether it's near enough the surface to make drilling profitable is a question. The first well, already 11,000 feet deep, has cost \$400,000. The flow is 400 to 600 barrels a day."

Before I left North Dakota, the Tloga well had been capped, and the drillers announced they would deepen it to 13,000 feet.

SKYSCRAPER CAPITOL A BARGAIN

The 19-story capitol, tallest building in North Dakota, dominates the scene in Bismarck. Towering above a hill to the north of the town, it can be seen for many miles across the rolling prairie. The little city, with a population of less than 20,000, is built on bluffs above the Missouri River. Its streets are broad, its buildings low. In such a setting the height of the capitol is accentuated.

"Some people criticize us for building a skyscraper statehouse on the prairie," Russell Reid, superintendent of the State Historical Museum, told me, "but nobody can say the taxpayers didn't get their money's worth in the construction. Fire destroyed the old capitol in 1930, and the new one went up in the depths of the depression when prices for everything were down. The architects scoured the country for ideas and gave us an edifice with interior space 80 percent usable—one of the most efficient public buildings in the United States—for a total cost of only \$2,000,000."

Mr. Reid has in the museum a fine collection of Indian relics. Many decades before Plerie de la Verendrye—first white man to set foot on the territory that is now North Dakota—came up the Missouri in 1738, industrious Mandans, Hidatsas, and Arikaras were tilling the soil there and raising good crops.

The warlike, nomadic Sioux who ranged around the Turtle Mountains, westward into Montana and south into South Dakota, were bitter enemies of the farmer folk.

Today, most of the agricultural Indians live on the Fort Berthold Reservation on the Little Missouri. Near Rolla, close to the Canadian border, is the Turtle Mountain Reservation. The Fort Totten Reservation is south of Devils Lake, the Standing Rock Reservation, where, near Fort Yates, the famous Indian chief Sitting Bull is buried, is the home of Sioux tribesmen.

The Mandans and their farmer allies built houses of logs covered with earth. A full-size model of one of these early dwellings has been erected on the Capitol Building grounds.

"During the worst winter of the depression," said Mr. Reid, "relief agencies sent food to the Indians at Fort Berthold. There were potatoes from Maine—'coals to Newcastle' in this potato-growing State—and grapefruit from Florida. Of course, the Indians, some of whom speak only a few words of English, had no idea what the grapefruit were; but they would shoulder bushel bags of them and stride off for home in 30°-below-

zero weather. Doubtless the grapefruit were frozen solid before the Indians had carried them half a mile."

The Mandans, Hidatsas, and Arikaras actually raised corn on their northern farms. It was small and short-eared, but it matured in the brief growing season. Painstakingly, experts at the North Dakota Agricultural College have crossed that flinty Indian corn with larger and better varieties to produce strains that can be grown profitably throughout most of North Dakota.

Bismarck had turbulent beginnings as a port of call for steamboats carrying freight and passengers up the Missouri to Fort Benton, Mont., in the sixties. It was known simply as the Crossing when the Northern Pacific, first railroad in North Dakota, reached the Missouri River in 1873. Rails had been laid to Fargo in 1872, and transportation from there to the camp which became Bismarck had been by wagon trains.

THE BISMARCK TRIBUNE TOLD THE WORLD OF CUSTER

Lt. Col. George A. Custer and his Seventh Cavalry were bivouacked at Fort Abraham Lincoln, which included old Fort McKeen, across the Missouri from Bismarck in 1873. Here he and his attractive wife were the center of gay social activities. When Custer set out from Fort Lincoln in 1876 with his troops for the campaign which ended in the tragic Battle of the Little Bighorn in Montana, his wife rode gaily with him for a little distance.

On July 5, 1876, the steamer *Far West*, piloted by Capt. Grant Marsh, came into Bismarck with the desperately wounded from Maj. Marcus A. Reno's command. Marsh brought the news that Custer's entire command had been annihilated. Twenty-six women at Fort Lincoln learned that they were widows.

The Bismarck Tribune, oldest newspaper in North Dakota (it has been in publication continuously since July 11, 1873), had sent Mark Kellogg as a reporter with Custer's troops. Kellogg was killed in the battle, but his notes were found on his body. On July 6 the Tribune told the world the story of the Custer disaster, and telegraphed details to the New York Herald at a reported cost of \$3,000 for 24 hours' use of the wires.

Though most of the business in Bismarck stems from State government offices, the city has a thriving trade as the distributing point for a vast wheat-growing area. It has grain elevators, flour mills, creameries, and the largest seed house and nursery in the State, specializing in seed corn developed from the quick-maturing variety grown in early days by the Mandan Indians.

NO "PUTTING ON AIRS" IN NORTH DAKOTA

"Nobody has enough help here when the legislature is in session," the hotel manager said. "Some of the legislators bring their wives with them, and the women get tired of just sitting around. It's nothing unusual for them to take jobs to fill their time."

North Dakota is "plain as an old shoe." "Putting on airs" is unheard of, and even the wealthiest farmers toil in the fields with their hired hands.

A day or two after my arrival in Bismarck, a companion and I rode 75 miles northwest to Garrison Dam on the Missouri and the new, ultramodern town of Riverdale, population about 4,000, conjured upon the bare prairie by United States Army Engineers.

Eight tunnels—one, 26 and two, 22 feet in diameter, for flood control, and five, 29 feet in diameter, for power—were nearing completion; and the tremendous embankment was growing rapidly as giant trucks, each carrying 30 cubic yards of earth, dumped their loads upon it.

When completed, Garrison will be the biggest rolled earth-fill dam in the world. It will contain approximately 67,000,000 cubic yards of earth, packed down by sheep's-foot

¹ See *Indians of Our Western Plains*, by Matthew W. Stirling, National Geographic magazine, July 1944.

rollers which exert upon it 640 pounds pressure to the square inch. Steel sheathing and rock facing will prevent erosion by the water.

The dam will furnish eventually 400,000 kilowatts of electric energy. A part of the Pick-Sloan plan for control of the Missouri River, it will prevent floods and metamorphose agriculture.²

The Fort Peck Dam in Montana is completed. The Garrison in North Dakota will be finished by 1954, and the Oahe and Fort Randall in South Dakota are scheduled for completion thereafter.

From a point of a short distance below the Fort Peck Dam it is proposed to divert water to irrigate a vast area in North Dakota and to raise the level of Devils Lake, largest body of water in the State.

The Garrison Dam will create a lake 200 miles long, and the Oahe, near Pierre, S. Dak., will back water up to Bismarck. Thus a land now semiarid will be converted into a well-watered area suitable for intensive farming.

In excavating for the Garrison Dam, the Army engineers uncovered thousands of tons of lignite coal. This has been separated from the earth and clay and piled in great ridges below the embankment. It is used as fuel to furnish power for the construction machinery.

The dam will be 12,000 feet long, 2,600 feet wide at the base, 60 feet wide at the top, and 210 feet high. Its crest will carry a four-lane highway. Earth dug to build the dam would leave a hole a city block square and more than 4 miles deep.

From Riverdale north to Minot the smooth highway goes through wheat country. Traces of snow from heavy winter falls still lingered along the way, and seeding was late. Here and there were shallow pools dotted with wild ducks and geese. The spring migration was in progress. An estimated 65,000 snow geese and Canadian honkers had descended on Devils Lake a few days before.

We saw scores of ring-necked pheasants along the fence rows. Sometimes these game birds are so numerous that motorists are cautioned to drive carefully to avoid killing them on the highways.

We watched two ring-neck cocks, handsome fellows, sparring near the road. They put up a battle for the favor of the drab-looking hens. Shooting is prohibited by law in the spring, and game birds seem fearless then.

In the fall, however, North Dakota is a huntsman's paradise. Most of the pheasants were imported from China several years ago. On a main flyway of the midcontinent, North Dakota lakes and streams are breeding places for myriad ducks and geese.

Minot, which sprang up overnight in 1887 when the Great Northern Railway was being pushed toward the Pacific coast, is a fast-growing city of 21,924, third in size in North Dakota. Near it are the Souris waterfowl propagation areas. The slow-moving Souris River winds for 8 miles through the city. From this stream hundreds of acres of rich farmland are irrigated.

Time was when conductors on the Great Northern trains approaching the city are said to have called, "My-not: Prepare to meet thy God." The town was then a rough frontier settlement which had grown to 5,000 population in a few weeks. Today it is a clean, prosperous business and residential city, seat of Minot State Teachers College, largest of five North Dakota normal schools. Others are at Valley City, Mayville, Dickinson, and Ellendale.

In the Minot area farms are generally larger than in the Red River Valley to the east. Wheat is the principal crop, and the city has an important privately owned grain-shipment inspection station. Besides wheat and other crops, Minot farms raise fine sheep and cattle.

BADLANDS, REGION OF MYSTERY AND BEAUTY

The area west of the Missouri River is North Dakota's wild west. Here are the mysterious and weirdly beautiful Badlands, a considerable portion of them included in Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. The south unit of the park is near Medora, west of Dickinson, the north unit south of Watford City.

To regain his health and recover from grief after the loss of both parents and his wife, Roosevelt came to Medora in 1883 at the age of 25. He was actively engaged in cattle raising here from 1883 to 1887. A cabin he lived in has been removed to the grounds of the Capitol Building at Bismarck, where it is used as a museum of Rooseveltiana.

At the time of Roosevelt's sojourn in the Badlands, a young French nobleman, the Marquis de Mores, set up at Medora the first meat-packing plant in North Dakota. He built a magnificent chateau, which can still be visited, and erected for his bride the first Catholic Church in the region. His packing plant and other enterprises failed after three disastrous years, and De Mores returned to France.

Though carved like comparable areas in South Dakota and Montana by the action of water on clay and sandstone, the North Dakota Badlands are different from those in the neighbor States. They are mighty clay and stone hills with color-streaked walls thrust up from flat land. On the bluff sides are alternating stripes of red and brown, spotted with red scoria. Black outcroppings of lignite and sparkling patches of snowy selenite mingle in brilliant patterns.

Among the hills are spaces covered with sagebrush. Twisted evergreens, showy cacti, fragrant evening primroses, and clumps of willow grow along stream beds.

Through the 4,000 square miles of the rugged country the Little Missouri winds a tortuous course, often dropping a thousand feet in 20 miles. Black Butte, 3,468 feet, highest point in North Dakota, towers 700 feet over the floor of the area. Here are petrified forests, caves holding ice even in midsummer, and all manner of Nature's sculpture.

Some observers believe part of the mineral coloring in the Badlands to be due to the burning out of beds of lignite coal. Near Amidon and at two or three other spots in the region, unquenchable underground fires are still burning. The fires have advanced only a few hundred feet in 50 years. Probably they have been raging for centuries.

Relics of prehistoric Indians are found north of Williston, the most notable the strange Writing Rock between Grenora and Crosby. Archeologists have uncovered evidence in this area suggesting human occupation millenniums before the coming of the known Indians.

The part of North Dakota between the Missouri River and the Badlands is predominantly range country, though it contains many large farms where wheat and other crops are grown. With considerably less rainfall than the drift plains in the central part of the State and the Red River Valley in the east, it is better suited to stock raising than to general farming.

At Bowman, in the southwestern corner of the State, is a plant where Van Dyke brown is made from lignite. North Dakota produces more than 50 percent of the Van Dyke brown dye used in this country.

WHERE THE OLD WILD WEST STILL LIVES

At Mandan, a railroad town of 7,268, across the river from Bismarck, the atmosphere of cowboy days still lingers. The annual rodeo here attracts entrants from all over the West. Dickinson, too, near the edge of the Badlands, and the little town of Sanish, near the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, put on big wild West shows.

Besides the usual broncobusting, steer roping, and bulldogging, these rodeos feature races between teams of cowboys to capture, saddle and ride wild horses from herds driven into the arena. Another unusual competition is between teams who rope wild cows from a herd and milk them. The team first to take half a cup of milk to the judges' stand wins.

The manufacture of briquettes from lignite coal overshadows the wheat and cattle businesses in Dickinson, a city of 7,457. This fuel is made by charring the lignite and blinding it into small briquettes with substances extracted from the raw product. For each ton of briquettes about 28 tons of lignite are used. The briquettes burn like charcoal, with intense blue flames. From a large, modern plant 50,000 tons of briquettes are shipped out annually. They are superior fireplace fuel.

Williston, 7,353 population, has an important experiment station of the North Dakota Agricultural College. Here are conducted studies in scientific irrigation and tests of rust- and smut-resistant grain. Both sprinkler and siphon irrigation are tested. In the cool, dry air of North Dakota all-day watering in full sunlight can be carried on without danger of wilting crops.

Excellent crops of high-quality wheat are grown by dry farming in the Williston area. To preserve the soil and conserve moisture, summer fallowing is practiced. Ingenious machines called surface tillers are used to remove all weeds and pulverize the soil to a depth of four inches. This process creates a dust blanket which holds moisture.

Just after the spring rains and three or four times more in the course of the summer, the surface tillers go over the fields. The result is that enough moisture is retained under the dust blanket to give the following year's crop a good start. Contour plowing and strip farming are also practiced with success.

FLAT NORTH DAKOTA NO LONGER MONOTONOUS

I took the Northern Pacific train across terrain ever more level to Fargo, the metropolis of North Dakota, a bustling city of 37,981. On previous visits this flat country had seemed to me monotonous and uninteresting. Now I had acquired new respect for it. It was once treeless, stretching away in unbroken sweep to the far horizon. Nowadays it is dotted with groves and tree rows planted to foil the winds that cause dust storms and erode the land.

A State-wide campaign of tree planting is under way. With mechanical planters thousands of seedlings from the State nurseries at Mandan and elsewhere are being set across the farmlands. The only sizable natural forests in the State are those in the Turtle Mountains near Bottineau, where the State School of Forestry is located. In a few years, however, there will be hardly a farm in the State without its groves and tree-row windbreaks.

At Fargo, William P. (Bill) Sebens, field representative of the Greater North Dakota Association, met me. Bill knows and loves every part of North Dakota. Under his guidance I obtained an intimate view of the most interesting things in the State.

² See *Taming the Outlaw Missouri River*, by Frederick Simpich, National Geographic magazine, November 1945.

³ See *Montana, Shining Mountain Treasureland*, by Leo A. Borah, National Geographic magazine, June 1950.

⁴ See in the National Geographic magazine: *The West Through Boston Eyes*, by Stewart Anderson, June 1949, and *South Dakota Keeps Its West Wild*, by Frederick Simpich, May 1947.

Fargo is as typically midwestern as an Iowa or Indiana city. By eastern standards it is small, but population is no index to the importance of North Dakota cities. Fargo is the distributing point for a vast agricultural empire which ranks as one of the richest in the world.

In recent years it has taken much business from Minneapolis. Here are farm-machinery plants, flour mills, and a big packing plant of Armour & Co. Across the Red River in Fargo's twin city, Moorhead, Minn., is a big sugar factory which handles enormous crops of beets, raised extensively on both sides of the river.

Bill and I went first to the 70-acre campus of the North Dakota Agricultural College in the outskirts of Fargo. Here North Dakota crops are safeguarded and improved by the most efficient system of research I have ever observed.

President Fred S. Hultz expressed for me in a few words the purpose of the college.

"We have in North Dakota," he said, "more hazards than the average farm State. Because of moisture uncertainties, our problems are difficult. We try here at the college and in our experimental farms throughout the State to combat natural hazards and insure our farmers against calamity."

I talked to Dean Harlow L. Walker of the College of Agriculture. He pointed out to me that North Dakota has three distinct levels and three different types of soil: the Red River Valley—containing the lowest point in the State, altitude 750 feet—the flat bed of ancient Lake Agassiz where the soil is deep, black chernozem, rich as the Valley of the Nile, the drift plain, a higher, glaciated area, with earth still rich but somewhat lighter in color; and the Missouri slope, still higher, with thin, light soil best suited for grazing.

"We try," he explained "to develop seed and methods of farming adapted to each of the three levels."

TWO CROP MAGICIANS HAVE WORKED MIRACLES

Since North Dakota Agricultural College opened its doors to students in 1891, many of its faculty members have rendered distinguished service to farmers. Two have made such remarkable records that no description of the State would be complete without reference to their achievements.

These men are Dr. Henry L. Bolley, now retired, who rescued the flax crop of the world from deadly wilt, and Dr. Lawrence R. Waldron, plant breeder, who has developed strains of rust-resistant wheat which save North Dakota farmers at least \$20,000,000 annually. When I visited Dr. Waldron in his office at the Agricultural College Experiment Station, he was working on crosses to combat a new rust which threatens calamity to even his highly resistant Mida and Rival wheat.

When Dr. Bolley began work on flax, a devastating wilt was ruining crops everywhere. He began planting seed from all over the world in an experimental plot at the college which some of his colleagues scornfully dubbed "Bolley's Folly." In the soil of that plot were spores of all the diseases known to flax. Dr. Bolley reasoned that if he could develop a strain that would grow in such soil, he could solve the flax problem.

After exhaustive research and endless crossings of plants, he discovered the fungus parasite that caused the fatal wilt. He then produced wilt-resistant varieties that defied the infected soil of Bolley's folly and saved the crop.

In his greenhouse at the experiment station Dr. Waldron makes crossing of hundreds of varieties of wheat. He removes the stamens from a plant of one kind and carefully fertilizes it with pollen of another. Usually one of the wheats used in the cross is a popular heavy-yield type, the other a kind found to be impervious to rust and smut.

Seeds from scores of the crossed plants are placed carefully in separate pots. When the plants mature, the wheat each yields is planted and grown in the greenhouse.

In 16-foot rows the new varieties are planted in an experiment station plot which has produced crops for 80 years without being fertilized. The crop is harvested at the end of the season and tested for disease resistance, acre yield, protein content, and bushel weight. Kinds obviously unsatisfactory are discarded, and the few remaining are tested for bread-making qualities.

Thus Dr. Waldron has developed his wonderful Mida wheat and other strains now in general use. Seven out of ten farmers in North Dakota plant one of Dr. Waldron's varieties of wheat. He has raised the average acre yield by 3 bushels.

When I told him President Hultz had estimated his value to the State at twenty to twenty-five million dollars a year, he modestly replied, "That's a bit exaggerated, I'm afraid. I still have this new B 15 rust to lick."

Few sights can be more beautiful than a vast field of flax in bloom; its exquisite blue sweeping to the horizon, or than an ocean expanse of golden wheat rippling in the breeze. North Dakota farmers have Dr. Bolley and Dr. Waldron to thank for their magnificent crops of these grains.

At Grand Forks, second city in North Dakota, is the State University, where the new lignite research laboratory of the United States Bureau of Mines is finding hitherto unsuspected uses for the State's tremendous supply of 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal. Alex C. Burr is in charge of the laboratory and the pilot plant where 400,000 cubic feet of heating gas has been made in a day from the low-grade fuel. The gas from the plant may soon supply needs of the university and the city of 26,617.

"We have found out a few of the many ways to use lignite," Mr. Burr said. "When it comes out of the ground, it is 30 to 40 percent water, consequently, to ship it far from the mines is not economical. By intense heat from furnaces we can drive off the water, then ship the coal to plants where further treatment reduces it to liquid fuel and heating gas."

"There is enough lignite in North Dakota to keep the entire United States in abundant fuel for generations. Just now the cost of producing gasoline and gas from raw lignite is high, but eventually petroleum from oil wells will become more expensive and the processing of lignite cheaper; then our product will be in high demand."

"Lignite in char form may be used to reduce low-grade iron ore, sufficiently freeing it from impurities to make mining profitable. From lignite also we are already obtaining considerable quantities of creosote. The uses of this newly tested natural resource are numerous."

Like the State Agricultural College at Fargo, the university labors constantly to improve North Dakota. It is the home of the State Medical Center, supported by a 1-mill tax levy and created to improve medical services and to educate doctors, nurses, and technicians.

Founded in 1883, as the University of Dakota Territory, the university opened its doors less than 10 years after the Battle of the Little Bighorn. North Dakota did not become a State until 1889.

CREAM OF WHEAT STARTED IN GRAND FORKS

President John C. West proudly directed my attention to the fine new buildings going up on the campus. The school is growing rapidly and now has an enrollment of about 3,000 students.

Grand Forks has considerable industry: flour mills, a packing plant, a large potato-flour factory; across the river, in East Grand Forks, Minn., is a beet-sugar refinery. In the

surrounding country diversified farming is the watchword. I was interested to learn that Cream of Wheat was manufactured first in Grand Forks before the company moved to Minneapolis.

Bill and I talked to several of the leading farmers at a potato growers' meeting. John Scott, who farms 4,500 acres, told us he plants about 800 acres to potatoes, half that area to beets, and the rest to wheat, flax, rye, barley, and alfalfa. He rotates his crops and occasionally summer-fallows a part of his land.

Agriculture in the Red River Valley is more highly mechanized than in any other area I have visited. Machines plant beets and potatoes, weed the fields, and dig the crops. Machines handle the wheat and other grain from seed time to harvest, the combines reaping and threshing as they sweep across the fields.

Bill showed me color motion pictures he had taken of agricultural processes in all seasons throughout the State. One reel featured airplane spraying of crops to kill weeds. I watched the plane flying low over a field depositing 2-4-D on spring wheat. A later part of the film revealed the same field several weeks later. The grain appeared green and weedless save for a 15-foot strip of bright yellow mustard across the center. Evidently the pilot had misjudged his flight and missed that strip with his weed killer.

"Grasshoppers were terrible before we began spraying them from planes," Bill declared. "They would descend on a section of growing wheat in the morning and by sunset there wouldn't be a spear of green left. They wouldn't eat poisoned bran spread on the ground."

"But now we spray or dust the growing wheat with poison that really kills them. They are turned from a deadly menace into a fairly useful fertilizer."

Some of the motion pictures showed ingenious machines in action. In one sequence a wheat farmer was pulling with a tractor a seeder consisting of three 14-foot units hitched together. He was seeding a strip 42 feet wide each time he crossed the field—160 acres easily in a day.

"That kind of speed saved crops in 1950," Bill told me. "Spring was so late that it looked as if we'd never get the wheat in time to mature before frost. Luckily, we had a mild October, and by working combines from early morning till long after dark, we got in the third biggest crop in the history of the State."

If a farmer cannot find a machine to do the sort of work he wants, he devises something for his purpose. Some farms in the Red River Valley are so flat that it is difficult to run irrigation water across them. Often shallow swales in the fields become mudholes. By the use of terrace plows, ranchers fill the swales and dig sloping ditches which readily carry the flow of water.

The average farm in North Dakota has approximately 600 acres; the average for the whole United States is about 200. Of late years there has been a trend toward increase in size of Dakota farms, and some ranches are 10,000 acres or more in extent. Naturally, such large holdings are worked best by machinery. The coming of irrigation will bring more intensified agriculture and tend to reduce the size of individual farms.

In the early days of land settlement in North Dakota, when the Northern Pacific was encouraging homesteaders, enormous bonanza farms were owned by eastern capitalists who hired manager to operate them. These ranches ranged from 3,000 acres to 65,000 in the famous Grandin farm.

The slogan of that time was 30 bushels of wheat to the acre, and a dollar a bushel. Because of careless use of the land and periods of drought, the wheat yields became lower, and eventually the bonanza farms were broken up into smaller units and sold.

A GIRL WHO GAVE HER LIFE FOR OTHERS

Nowadays most main paved highways are kept open during the winter, but 30 years ago roads were often impassable. One dark winter afternoon in 1920, 16-year-old Hazel Miner started to drive her younger brother and sister home from school. She lost her way in snow driven by a 60-mile wind. The sled tipped over, and the horse broke from it.

The girl covered the younger children with every robe she could find in the overturned sleigh and finally lay over them to protect them. The next morning Hazel was found frozen to death, her brother and sister unharmed. At the courthouse in Center stands a granite monument to the young heroine.

The North Dakota countryside burgeons with wild flowers in spring and summer. First to appear are the delicate pasque flowers, which come up amid drifts of melting snow. Later come the wild rose, the State flower, and a galaxy of other blooms, to vie with the blue of flax fields and the green of wheat.

A visitor from the East reported standing in 1864 on the plain where Fargo is now located and looking across the land dappled with blossoms. "It's a beautiful land," he wrote, "but I doubt that human beings will ever live here."

Strangely, farmers from wooded areas looked askance in the early days at treeless country. They felt that ground from which forests had been cut was far richer.

One evening Bill took me with him to a community club meeting in the little village of Chaffee, where he lectured and showed his motion pictures of the North Dakota water program. Interested in irrigation, farmers had come from miles around to attend the meeting.

Everywhere in the State, folk are eager to learn new methods of agriculture.

NORTH DAKOTANS READY TO TAKE CHANCES

"They are the greatest people I ever saw for taking a chance," Bill told me. "Whenever a fresh idea comes out on how to improve crops, they will try it whatever the cost."

We went from Fargo to Wahpeton one afternoon through a country of perfectly kept farms. Here is a rich dairy and livestock-growing section where purebred cattle are a specialty.

In Wahpeton is one of the unusual industries of the State, a pottery plant. It was established a few years ago by Laura Taylor, who had studied ceramics at the University of North Dakota. Robert Hughes, a successful printer, who later became her husband, backed the enterprise.

Mrs. Hughes was molding ash trays decorated with dog heads copied from the National Geographic magazine.

Clay handled in the plant comes from enormous beds near Mandan. At first it was used without addition of other substances, but now a little feldspar from South Dakota is mixed with it. Rosemeade glazed pottery is shipped all over the world. Because the designs feature birds and animals, it has become a favorite with collectors.

As a gift to his city, Mr. Hughes has created a recreation park in a once unsightly river-side flood area. Wahpeton is the seat of the State science school, where students are given vocational training.

The unpredictable North Dakota climate produced a snowstorm on a Saturday late in April, but the following Monday when Bill and I drove to Valley City and Jamestown the snow had disappeared. This flare-back of winter was delaying the seeding, and the only traces of green we saw were a few fields of winter rye. Ordinarily, wheat is all sowed before the 1st of May.

At Valley City we drove past the trim campus of Valley City State Teachers College and dropped in at an unusual clothing store. This store, though located in a country town of less than 7,000 population, carries a stock of men's wear fully as varied and up-to-date as that of the best eastern shops.

"People here want the best money can buy," the proprietor explained, "and they have the cash to pay for it. Probably this store looks too elegant for a small city, but it is a profitable venture."

I had noticed an unusual number of expensive automobiles on the highways everywhere in the State. Gross farm income of North Dakota in 1950 was nearly \$610,000,000.

At Jamestown is the only independent college in North Dakota. Jamestown College, an endowed school under the sponsorship of the Presbyterian Church, is nationally known for its low fees. Here a student can work toward a bachelor's degree in liberal arts or toward a registered nurse's certificate for less than \$700 a year, all expenses included—tuition, books, room and board. The college is fully accredited. On the campus this spring were about 300 students.

The college, started in 1883, was the first institution of higher learning in what is now North Dakota. In the beginning it had only one building, on a hill overlooking the frontier settlement of Jamestown.

The panic of 1893 forced it to close its doors, and the lone edifice stood deserted until 1909. That year Barend Kroeze, a young college president from Washington State, saw the neglected building and determined to resurrect the college. He resigned his position and took the presidency of the moribund school.

When Dr. Kroeze retired from the presidency of Jamestown in 1946, the college had 11 modern buildings on its fine campus and an endowment sufficient to permit the enrollment of students at fees for all expenses half those of many schools of equal rank.

The southern part of James River Valley is one of the richest farming areas in North

Dakota, second only to Red River Valley in fertility. With completion of the water program, it will be under irrigation.

It is a veritable mecca for wildfowl. Every autumn sportsmen come here from all over the country for pheasant shooting. Until recently hunters were permitted to carry large bags of game out of the State, but laws in force now have put an end to this privilege, which would soon have decimated the birds.

A VIRILE LAND FINDS ITS POWER

The future of North Dakota holds amazing promise. Awakening to a realization of its resources, the virile young State is building its power. It does not forget the tribulations of the past, but profits from bitter experiences. No longer will it be known as a land of blizzards and dust storms.

It looks back proudly upon its victory over handicaps. Truly it is coming into its own.

Cause and Extent of Damage Caused By Pipeline Breaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I now want to make available the results obtained by the Federal Power Commission from reports of 28 gas transmission companies covering cause and extent of the property damage and the number of deaths and injuries resulting from the pipeline breaks together with references to the causes of these failures. This is as follows:

Code No.	Cause	Extent of damage	Distance from point of failure that damage resulted
13	Pipe exposed due to wash-out.....	\$500 property damage.....	200 feet
	Escaping gas ignited.....	\$750 property damage.....	At point of fracture.
	Excessive strain due to soil stress.....	\$1,881 property damage.....	6 acres.
10	Longitudinal groove fractured.....	Crop damage.....	450 feet
	Lack of fusion in longitudinal weld.....	Damage to farmland and barns.....	350 to 400 feet
	Electrolysis.....	Damage to surface facilities of oil wells.....	Adjacent to break.
	Geophysical crew drilled into line.....	Truck and drilling rig destroyed.....	At point of break.
1	Top blew off 500 "B" meter.....	Employee killed.....	Do.
	Damaged pipe.....	3½-acre crop damage.....	600 feet along axis of line.
5	Landslide.....	Slight damage to farm outbuildings.....	150 feet.
6	Pipe ruptured by dozer.....	Operator killed—dozer destroyed—bad fire.....	
7	Contraction break caused by cold weather.....	Fire damage to adjacent house and property.....	125-foot radius.
	Lamination in plate.....	Minor crop damage.....	250 feet by break, 450 feet by fire
9	Inadequate penetration of girth weld.....do.....	235 feet by break, 525 feet by fire.
do.....do.....	85 feet by break, 300 feet by fire.
	661 breaks in longitudinal weld during testing	\$71,850 property damage.....	Not shown.
	Operation.....		
14	Break in longitudinal weld.....	\$18,000 property damage.....	Do
do.....	\$26,000 property damage.....	Do.
do.....	\$12,000 property damage.....	Do.
	Defective field weld.....	\$1,800 property damage.....	Do.
16	Undetermined.....	6 houses and 2 autos destroyed, 2 deaths.....	1,500 feet.
23	Pull-out due to landslide.....	\$225 damage.....	200 feet.
	Blow-out due to corrosion.....	Crop damage.....	
22do.....	Land and livestock damage.....	
do.....	Land and property damage.....	
	Defective longitudinal weld.....	Crop damage.....	
	Faulty field weld.....	Property damage.....	300 square feet.
	Rupture caused by faulty pipe.....	10 acres property and crop damage.....	500 feet.
	Pipe laminated.....	2 acres property damage.....	1,500 feet.
21	Not determined.....	Crop and property damage in a 1,000-yard area—3 persons killed, 2 injured.....	1,000-yard area.
24	Faulty field weld.....	Crop damage, 2 acres.....	
	Inlet header ruptured.....	Filling station and dwelling damaged.....	

Code No	Cause	Extent of damage	Distance from point of failure that damage resulted
25	Backfill removed by contractor	2 employees fatally injured	Localized.
	Negligence on part of outsider in setting off dynamite blast.	Damage to railroad property, electric line, highway, 2 pick-up trucks, and 1 trailer truck; 3 persons injured.	500 feet.
	Broken weld	8 1/2-acre property damage, 500 feet of fence burned.	350 feet.
	Corrosion	2,500 feet of fence destroyed and 2 head of stock killed.	500 feet.
	Corrosion	Minor property damage	
27	Split in pipe	do	
	Crack in weld	do	
	Blow-out	do	
	Corrosion	do	
	Blow out	do	
	do	do	
	Blown gasket	do	
	Split seam	Dwelling, outbuildings and crops damaged.	600 feet.
	Ruptured pipe	Dwelling automobile and utility equipment damaged	200 feet.
	Break in weld	Minor property damage	
28	Assumed that failure occurred in longitudinal seam	4 1/2 to 5 acres secondary timber destroyed	800 feet.
	Pipe damaged in construction	Slight damage to land and fence	240 feet.
	Faulty longitudinal weld	6.4 acres farm land damaged	175 feet.
	Damaged by construction equipment	Farm buildings damaged or destroyed, 2 persons slightly burned	2,418 feet.
	Unknown	Fire damage to old buildings, timber was burned—telephone and power transmission lines damaged—2 persons suffered superficial injuries	3,150 feet.
	Damaged pipe	3.2 acres timber burned	275 feet.
	Split pipe	1 employee killed 6 acres of timber destroyed	330 feet.

Cause of failure	Code No	Number of deaths	Number of injuries
Top blow off "B" meter	1	1	
Pipe ruptured by dozer	6	1	
Undetermined	16	2	
Do	21	3	2
Backfill removed by contractor	25		2
Negligence on part of outsiders in setting off dynamite blast	25		3
Damaged by construction equipment	25		2
Undetermined	25		2
Split pipe	25	1	
Total		8	11

Canada "Grabs Ball" on Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Washington Post, dated October 14, 1951, entitled "Canada 'Grabs Ball' on Seaway":

CANADA "GRABS BALL" ON SEAWAY

(By G. V. Ferguson)

MONTREAL.—Parliament opened its fall session Tuesday with the traditional speech from the throne which outlines the legislation the Government will propose. In domestic circles, chief interest centers on the proposal to bring payment January 1 of old-age pensions of \$40 a month to all citizens over 70 without a means test and as a matter of right. A special contributory tax will be levied to pay the pensions, whose initial annual cost is estimated at \$330,000,000 with 700,000 persons on the rolls.

But interest in the United States is more likely to focus on the proposals for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. Canada,

now in its greatest era of expansion, demands the seaway and has become increasingly linked by the blockade in Congress of any legislation to make possible American participation.

The Canadian support stems from two chief sources. The first has already been mentioned: National expansion needs the seaway, particularly since the development of the vast Quebec-Labrador iron-ore field makes water transportation to United States steel mills more important than ever.

The other is the national sentiment that it is time for Canada to assert itself against its powerful neighbor. National pride refuses to accept the congressional blockade. The cry now is for Canada to go it alone, if necessary.

While Canada wants the seaway badly, there are difficult legal problems to be settled before even a solely Canadian development can take place. It is agreed that the canal and the power should be made available together. Nothing prevents Canada from constructing canals on its side of the St. Lawrence, but power development means the construction of dams, and a dam across the St. Lawrence has its south end on American soil.

Is it within the power of President Truman to permit the construction of such a dam? Or does he require congressional approval? If he needs the latter, we are, for all our brave words, right back where we started. Canada proposes Congress disposes.

There is, in the Canadian view, much obscurity about the legal position in the United States. It begins, Canadian experts say, with the fact that there is a difference between the known law on the subject in Canada and the United States. In Canada, for instance, the water flowing in a navigable stream (such as the St. Lawrence) is under Federal control. The bed of the river, however, is under Provincial control, the equivalent of American States' rights. So far as is known here, United States courts have not laid down the law on this point.

Over and above that is the question whether the President can grant permission for Canada, a foreign power, to build a dam abutting at one end on United States soil. Canadian experts believe that he can, and they have so informed the State Department. But such a foreign opinion is not conclusive, and it may be that, on the verge of a presi-

dential election, Mr. Truman might be reluctant to raise a controversial point.

He is friendly to the seaway and wants it. But friendliness and effective power do not always march hand in hand.

Meanwhile, Canada is reluctant to wait. The rich and powerful Province of Ontario must either have St. Lawrence power soon or it must build steam plants to generate electricity. Cost of power produced in steam plants (incidentally, out of United States coal) would raise the price of electricity to four times its cost from existing electric sources.

If the President is powerless to act, and if Congress persists in its blockade, the chances are far too great of a rapid rise in anti-American feeling in Canada. It is, though not serious, high enough as it is.

Australians Asking if Gold Standard Is on Way Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may place in the Appendix a very significant article entitled "Australians Asking if Gold Standard Is on Way Back," written by Albert E. Norman, chief of the Australasian News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, and published in the Christian Science Monitor, October 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTRALIANS ASKING IF GOLD STANDARD IS ON WAY BACK

(By Albert E. Norman)

SYDNEY.—Does the present brisk business in solid gold South African doorknobs mean American and the rest of the free world are on the way back to the gold standard, last heard of in 1933?

Two resounding monetary events have touched off that question among Australian gold producers: One is the report that the International Monetary Fund has decided to wash its hands of all further responsibility in holding the line on free-gold sales by member nations at above the official United States Government price of \$35 an ounce.

Insight shows that this decision virtually was inevitable after IMF finally cleared South Africa's persistent applications in 1949 to sell some of its gold for industrial purposes at prices above the 17-year-old fixed price of \$35 an ounce.

Since then an increasing South African export of solid-gold doorknobs, door knockers, and other industrial gold, has set up an ominous pounding on IMF's dignified portals, some say even on the future of IMF itself as an international price-fixing institution for currencies.

ASK WHERE UNITED STATES POLICY IS HEADED

For the present, however, such predictions must remain in the realm of speculation. What the Australian gold-mining industry wants to know is: Just what doors to new financial opportunity are the South African golden doorknobs likely to open up? Or more specifically: Where is American gold policy headed?

Taking the second resounding monetary event, it would now seem these expensive doorknobs have opened at least one profitable door in Canada. In that big gold-producers country, Finance Minister Douglas Abbott has announced producers may now sell gold on the world's free market at what they can get for it.

It is worth noting that among the few official strings attached to this new selling freedom was a provision stating that Canadian gold-export licenses would not be approved unless payment was in convertible exchange, preferably in United States dollars.

A possible explanation is the growing desire of governments to run down dollar balances rather than clear them with gold exports to the United States.

This trend to preserve and build up national gold reserves was dramatically pointed up by recent large-scale Italian and Dutch Government gold purchases from the United States gold reserve notwithstanding both countries badly needed the dollars for other purposes.

This desire to increase national gold reserves accounts for the drain on the United States reserve estimated at \$3,000,000,000 since devaluation of currencies in September 1949.

Under the United States Gold Reserve Act of 1934 foreign governments have the right to purchase gold at the standard price of \$35 an ounce. Nonofficial but vocal American viewpoints in Australia do not regard such government-to-government transactions at this price as good business. Obligated to sell at the same price, under IMF rules, Australian gold producers have been saying much the same thing for a long time.

GOLD NOW SEEN UNDERVALUED

Both parties seem agreed that \$35 an ounce is too low a price for a commodity which actually is the most readily convertible currency known to man.

That conclusion also suggests that as a commodity the present American gold reserve of \$23,000,000,000 is considerably undervalued compared with today's ruling commodity prices.

It is this fact which perhaps best illustrates the political value of gold in world trade and commerce. And the present official movements toward a world free market in gold are filled with political implications which extend all the way to a revived gold standard itself.

In fact, when it comes to the political value of gold the words of Dr. W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of the executive board of the National City Bank of New York, reported in this newspaper almost 2 years ago on the subject, are well worth repeating.

Said Dr. Burgess: "The great political conflict we are facing today (1949) is the conflict between the so-called welfare state and sound money.

"Historically, one of the best protections of the value of money against the inroads of political spending was the gold standard—the redemption of money in gold on demand. This put a checkrein on the politician. For inflationary spending led to the loss of gold either by exports or by withdrawals by individuals who distrusted Government policies. This was a kind of automatic limit on credit expansion (i. e., inflation)."

This, of course, was strong advocacy for a return to gold. But while that prospect still remains heavily clouded, the fact is that every government's gold reserve is subject to erosion in value while the arbitrary IMF price of \$35 an ounce holds this one commodity down while all others are permitted to rise.

IMPORTANCE TO BRITAIN

For the British Government faced once again with a dollar crisis, this erosion in the

value of national reserves is of first rate importance. While some government critics possibly would consider any writing up of the British reserve as inflationary, there is the counter argument that it would provide more buoyancy for wallowing commonwealth finances.

To cushion the economy against the impact of recurring British dollar crisis, the Australian Federal Treasurer Sir Arthur Fadden has now revealed this country is building its own gold reserves.

Australia suspended gold shipments to Britain about a year ago, Sir Arthur said. He also revealed the Australian Government wanted to see a higher price for gold. This is regarded as evidence Australia is prepared to support the free market now getting under way.

This new attitude is an historic shift in Australian fiscal policy. It means this country is no longer prepared to put all its golden eggs in the British Commonwealth dollar pool. It means Australia wants to pursue a much more independent line in its transactions with the United States. And gold will be the basis of that independence.

Australian, Canadian, South African, and others growing support for a free market in gold brings up the question of currencies.

As seen from here, the formation of a free market in gold necessarily means an automatic revaluation of paper currencies. These will be put to the acid test of how much or how little is required to buy a fine ounce on the free market. This, of course, will also apply to the dollar.

On the other hand, it is possible for the United States by planned releases from the vast Fort Knox hoard, to keep the free market price bobbing around the arbitrary IMF \$35 level.

SNYDER'S DENIALS NOTED

Where does the dollar officially stand in relation to gold in these moves? The strong denials of Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder that the United States Treasury intends to increase its price above \$35 have not been missed in Australia.

Some of the more unbelieving financial scribes and Pharisees here have likened them to the spate of firm Crippsian denials preceding sterling devaluation.

But if the Mr. Snyder denials are accepted, the steady foreign sales from the United States gold reserve suggest that Washington mainly is intent on a better distribution of gold throughout the free world.

This redistribution would offer two immediate advantages. It would increase the quantitative value of the gold available for world trade, presently insufficient. It would facilitate the return and stable operation of a free market (as now indirectly approved by IMF) and therefore would be a move toward elimination of present restrictive exchange controls.

It must be remembered that this latter move is a major tenet of United States international trade policy.

It also must be remembered that a free market would encourage increased gold production, thereby increasing the world gold supply.

A genuine world free market with its automatic revaluation of paper currencies seems necessary before any general return to the gold standard could be contemplated as practical politics.

In the long run, such a return would be anti-inflationary. If the United States and Britain decided to return to gold the decision would be superb news.

It would mean that citizens once again could see the golden color of their money at the bank. More significantly, it would indicate in the Burgess formula that these two countries were putting a checkrein on the politician; a kind of automatic limit on credit expansion (inflation).

Bureau of Valuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statements:

BUREAU OF VALUATION OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The peak of the work of inventorying the railroad properties came in the middle of the period of calendar years 1916-1920, when the appropriations averaged about \$3,300,000 a year, and the employees varied from 1391 in 1917 to 1,124 in 1920, when the Transportation Act of 1920 was passed. From then on the employees have steadily decreased in number, but appropriations were increased from approximately \$1,600,000 for 1922 to \$3,200,000 for 1932, when the peak of the recapture work was reached and passed. From that time on to the present time the appropriations have steadily shrunk and the personnel have been progressively reduced. With recapture out of the way by repeal, and the Commission was relieved from the duty of going further with telegraph and telephone valuation, the force was cut from 917 as of December 31, 1933, to 360 at the end of 1934. By the end of 1939 it was reduced to 187 and continued at about that figure until 1944. December 31, 1944, there were 155 employees. There are now 81. The construction of the independent offices bill for which some contend, based on the report of the House conferees, would reduce the staff of the Bureau to 61.

Under section 19a (f) the Commission is given a mandate to keep itself informed of all new construction, extensions, improvements, retirements, or other changes in the condition, quantity, use, and classification of the property of all common carriers as to which original valuations have been made, and of the cost of all additions and betterments thereto and of all changes in the investment therein. The Commission may keep itself informed of current changes in costs and values of railroad properties, in order that it may have available at all times the information deemed by it to be necessary to enable it to revise and correct its previous inventories, classifications, and valuations of the properties; and, when deemed necessary, may revise, correct, and supplement any of its inventories and valuations.

Under paragraph (g) of that section the carriers have been furnishing reports and information to the Commission required for the purpose of permitting the Commission to perform its duty under the provisions of paragraph (f).

During the lean years, the pipelines of the country have been valued. All but 4 of the 79 on the original list of properties and 9 recently constructed small pipeline systems have been completed.

The force assigned has been utterly inadequate to perform either the field work or the office work necessary. For instance, there are now but 6 out of 12 field offices for land appraisals in operation, and one of these (Chicago) is practically closed, as the appraiser in charge has reached retirement age and the Commission cannot employ a successor. The land section is without the service of any field force in many sections of the country. As to the auditing work, the Commission's Bureau of Valuation is 2½ years behind in auditing valuation order returns which are required under section

19a (g). For the verification of original cost, other than land, it is 1½ years behind currency. As to the land inventory it is 8 years behind, and on property other than land 7 years behind being current.

The Commission has repeatedly pointed out in its annual reports to the Congress that the valuation work is falling lamentably behind. With the backlogs indicated, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Bureau to prepare reliable data for the use of the Commission in the general rate-increase cases, or for other purposes. This was pointed out in the 1950 annual report, page 125, as follows:

"The Commission should not be required to accept reports of carriers without check and a certain amount of policing. It is this guardianship of the accuracy of the public record that gives it probative and practical value."

Without continued scrutiny of the carriers' returns by the Bureau's forces it is safe to assume that the valuation records already made, and the mounting mass of carriers' reports remaining unchecked and unaudited, will soon lapse into a chaotic state, and can no longer be relied upon as representing the value of the physical property of the railroads, or the cost thereof.

Inspection of railroad and pipeline properties, the checking of inventories, the ascertainment of maintenance prices, and the depreciation studies have had to be deferred. The Commission does not now have in its service a hearing examiner or trial attorney who is thoroughly familiar with valuation history, theory, and practice. The competent staff of these law officers that had been assembled is completely dissipated.

The situation is bad, and as one who has dealt with the problem of valuation of public service properties for 45 years, I deplore our inability to give the public the protection the valuation act demands from the Commission.

Respectfully,

CLYDE B. AITCHISON,
Commissioner

BUREAU OF VALUATION

Employees on the rolls (active duty) close of business August 31, 1951:

Director's office.....	6
Engineering section.....	31
Accounting section:	
Office.....	15
Field.....	12
Total.....	27
Land section:	
Office.....	12
Field.....	6
Total.....	18
Total employees.....	82

¹ One employee on loan to DTA on reimbursable basis.

BUREAU OF MOTOR CARRIERS (From Commissioner Rogers)

The Bureau of Motor Carriers is seriously handicapped by lack of funds in three principal phases of its duties. These are the handling of formal proceedings, its highway safety work, and obtaining compliance with the provisions of the statute and regulations.

Our formal proceedings include hearing and determination of applications for operating rights and complaints involving the reasonableness of motor-carrier rates. The time involved in holding hearings and preparing reports has been unreasonably long

for years. For the past 2 years we have been slowly catching up on our backlog, but the Budget Bureau recommended a cut of \$185,000 in this work for the current year. Because of this proposed cut we lost a number of examiners by transfer and did not fill the positions because of the uncertain outlook. The appropriation bill for 1952 provided for a reduction in the staff assigned to this work, although the reduction was smaller than that recommended. As a result we will probably be unable to fill any of the existing vacancies. By the end of October 1951, there will be approximately 750 applications for operating authority awaiting hearing and 1,650 applications which are ready for a decision but not decided. Because of this situation, we will not hold hearings on new applications for the following 3 months in order that our examiners may prepare reports in as many as possible of those cases which have already been heard. We are also unreasonably behind time in hearing and deciding the pending rate cases. No immediate relief from this situation is possible for the reason that it takes a considerable time to train additional examiners and their value in reducing our backlog would not be apparent for some time. The immediate appointment of a substantial number of new examiners in the lower grades is essential in order that we may prepare to resume the reduction in the backlog and the handling of formal proceedings on a current basis.

Under the appropriation for 1952 our staff for handling highway safety has been almost entirely eliminated. This is especially unfortunate at the present time because of the large quantities of explosives which are moving long distances interstate over the highways. As our highway safety work is concerned principally with the development of safe operating practices, including driving time, by motor carriers, this work cannot be taken over by the separate States through which the motor carriers operate, even if all of those States had regulations and adequate policing within their own borders. Few States have any limitation upon driving hours and half of them have no provision for inspection of vehicles. Although our staff for this work has always been substantially less than the minimum required to do an adequate job, their work has been demonstrably effective. Comparison of the records of individual carriers which have adopted safety programs in line with our safety regulations shows a 50 percent reduction in accidents within a period of 2 years. The over-all accident record of carriers holding operating authority from us shows that the number of accidents is substantially less than the general average and the increased hazard due to the increased number and mileage of vehicles on the highway.

Not only compliance with our safety regulations, but also compliance with all regulatory provisions will substantially decrease because of the reduction in our safety staff and in our law and enforcement staff. The number of attorneys has been substantially reduced and the number of persons available for investigating violations has also been substantially cut. Our field staff, whose principal duty is the obtaining of compliance with our regulations and preparing cases for prosecution where necessary, must be reduced by more than one-third over the number available last year. As we had only 339 field employees scattered through the entire country, it is obvious the reduced staff will not be able to do even a reasonably adequate job in obtaining compliance from the more than 20,000 separate motor carriers holding authority from us or the much larger number of interstate truck and bus operators which are subject only to our safety regulations.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORT ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

(From Commissioner Splawn)

The authority to require reports from the various classes of carriers from which the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics compiles the official statistics necessary for our regulatory functions is provided under the following sections of the Interstate Commerce Act:

Part I, section 20 (1): Steam railways, electric railways, sleeping car companies, carriers by pipeline, express companies. Section 20 (6): Persons furnishing cars or protective services against heat or cold to or on behalf of the railroads or express companies.

Part II, section 220 (a): Motor carriers.

Part III, section 313 (a): Carriers by water.

Part IV, section 412 (a): Freight forwarders.

And in addition the report requirements of the Accident Reports Act, approved May 6, 1910.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics had funds for 151 positions. Because of extra work added in recent years the Commission requested 77 additional people including the filling of vacancies for fiscal 1952 which would have made a total of 228. The Bureau of the Budget allowed only 8 additional positions instead of the 77 requested. The House Appropriation bill directed that \$375,000 be taken out of valuation and transport economics and statistics together. That meant a cut of about one-third. With that bill hanging over its head the Commission left all of the vacancies in the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics unfilled so that the staff of the Bureau had deteriorated through retirements and transfers to 143 as of October 1, 1951.

If the Independent Offices Appropriation Act is construed in accordance with the legislative history that the House intended to cut this Bureau by one-third, the staff would be reduced some 50 positions under the 151 positions of the date specified in the House bill. There are other bureaus in dire need of additional people. The way to provide for these people is through additional appropriations.

The staff of the entire Commission has deteriorated during 1951 down to a total of 1,891, which is 51 less than the 1,742 authorized under the Jensen amendment—article 805, section 2 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act. Since the staff of the Commission is already below what is required to satisfy the cuts provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, it seems altogether unfair further to cut the Commission's staff by pinpointing three bureaus to the extent of about 250 people. If the work of motor-carrier safety, of gathering and compiling financial and operating statistics from reports of the carriers and the work of valuation for rate-making purposes are of such basic importance, an impairment of the bureaus affected would be tragic.

Pipeline Failures and Causes, as Reported to the Federal Power Commission by 28 Major Gas-Transmission Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of

H. R. 88, providing for the establishing of a safety code applying to the operation of gas-transmission companies, I

now want to make available a tabulation showing the number of failures and the causes as reported by 28 major gas-

transmission companies, together with certain other pertinent information. It is as follows:

Code	Failure during—	Period	Weld			Couplings		Machinery		River cross-ings		Pipe				Auxiliary equipment	Unknown	Total
			Field		Shop	Blow-out	Pull-out	Road	Other	Wash-outs	Other	Corrosion	Damaged	Split	Bend			
			Acetylene	Electric														
1	Operation	10 years	4	5	1	9	8	11	6	5	22	2		7	3	1	84	
	Testing			1	1									2	6	1	11	
2	Operation	do		51	10		1	1	30	3		6		2	3		107	
	Testing			2											2		4	
3	Operation	do		1	2												111	
4	do	do		2		2			3							1	8	
	Testing			8									1		1		10	
5	Operation	do		1		10	13			2		6			3	5	41	
	Testing					1											1	
6	Operation	do							2	3			1				6	
	Testing				3												3	
7	Operation	do	6	13		1		2	2	2		1			9		37	
8	do	6 years		3		2	2	1	2			8	3			1	22	
	Testing			5	1				1			15		1	2		25	
9	Operation	1 year		1													1	
	Testing					1								1			2	
10	Operation	10 years		1	1					1		1			1		5	
	Testing					3				1							1	
11	Operation	Not shown			2		2										4	
12	do										1						1	
13	do	10 years			3		4	2	10	6	1	10			6		42	
	Testing				1										1		2	
14	Operation	4 years		1	19					1		1					22	
	Testing					661											661	
15	Operation	10 years		2	1	7	2	6		20		8		3		5	54	
	Testing					76	23										99	
16	Operation	do		1		2	21					2		1	1		153	
17	do	3 years			1	4	12		4	2		3			1	12	28	
18	do																39	
19	do	5 years	6		1					1		5			1		1	
20	do	10 years		1		1						1				1	11	
	Testing					1									7		1	
21	Operation	7 years		5	1				2					1	1		12	
	Testing					1											1	
22	Operation	10 years			1					2		4					7	
	Testing					2									1		3	
23	Operation	do			2		97							4	8		111	
	Testing					1									2		3	
24	Operation	do		3	8		2	1		2		30		4		2	52	
	Testing					1									1	1	4	
25	Operation	do		3	2	1	1	7				1		1	1	1	20	
	Testing					1	2										3	
26	Operation	do								6							21	
27	do	do		4	8	33	12	2	6	6		9	3	15	1	7	106	
	Testing				1	2									16		19	
28	Operation	2 years		1				1	1		2						5	
	Testing					2			3								1	
Total failures during operation			19	97	63	72	183	27	68	63	25	98	7	38	46	22	848	
Percent of total failures			1.1	5.7	3.7	4.2	10.7	1.6	3.9	3.7	1.5	5.7	.4	2.2	2.7	1.3	49.5	
Total failures during testing				20	755	26			5			15	4	30	5	1	864	
Percent of total failures				1.2	41.1	1.5			.3			9	.2	1.8	.3	.2	50.5	
Total failures			19	117	818	98	183	27	73	63	25	113	11	68	51	23	1,712	
Percent of total failures			1.1	6.9	47.8	5.7	10.7	1.6	4.2	3.7	1.5	6.6	.6	4.0	3.0	1.3	100.0	

Forest Resources of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, 63 percent, or 4,000 square miles, of the land

area of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is covered with forests. The corresponding percentage for the Nation as a whole is 30. The percentage in Alabama as a whole is 57.

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT RANKS THIRD AMONG THE NINE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF ALABAMA IN PERCENTAGE OF AREA IN FORESTS

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama ranks third among the nine Congressional Districts of the State in the percentage of its area in forest lands. Only the first and ninth districts exceed

it in percentage. Likewise its 4,000 square miles of forest lands place it in third place among the nine Congressional Districts in the number of square miles of forested area. It is exceeded only by the First Congressional District with 5,267 square miles and by the Second Congressional District with 4,971 square miles.

Thirteen and one-half percent of Alabama's forest lands lie within the boundaries of the Seventh Congressional District.

Under leave to extend my remarks, at this point I include a study made at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress styled "Selected Statistics on the Forest Areas of Alabama and the United States," and a photostatic table showing Alabama forest resources by Congressional Districts, based upon the Southern Forest Survey, 1932-36:

SELECTED STATISTICS ON THE FOREST AREAS OF ALABAMA AND THE UNITED STATES

Forest areas by counties in the Seventh Congressional District:

County	Forest area		Percent in forest
	Acres	Square miles	
Blount.....	247,700	357	60.5
Cullman.....	213,600	334	45.0
Fayette.....	289,000	453	72.2
Franklin.....	258,500	401	62.7
Lamar.....	239,000	373	61.7
Marion.....	269,200	408	63.0
Pickens.....	372,600	582	65.6
Walker.....	337,800	528	65.2
Winston.....	304,100	476	75.1
Total.....	2,562,400	4,004	63.2

2. The Seventh Congressional District:

Forest area:	
Acres.....	2,562,400
Square miles.....	4,004
Percentage of land in forest.....	63.2

3. Percentage of land in the United States in forest: On the basis of 623,828,000 acres of forest land in the United States, 30.5 percent of the total area of 1,956,362,000 acres is so classified.

4. Percentage of land in Alabama in forest: Alabama's forest area of 18,877,700 acres is 57.7 percent of the total land area of 32,689,920 acres.

5. Congressional districts in the United States having a percentage of forest area greater than that in the Seventh District of Alabama: With 63.2 percent of its area in forest, Alabama's Seventh District ranks among the more heavily forested Congressional districts of the country. There are, however, a number with a higher percentage. Data is not currently available on which to make complete and accurate comparisons, either on the basis of forest area or the volume of the timber stand. Individual districts might, however, be selected from several of the forested States. For example, the 11 counties in the Seventh Congressional District of Arkansas have 64.6 percent of their area in forest. This unusually productive District is selected because the forest growth reflects 30 years or more of cooperation between local forest industries and State au-

thorities. The area, however, exceeds that of Alabama's Seventh District and the forest stand of 10,778,100,000 board feet is twice the 5,071,400,000 feet in the Alabama district.

6. Congressional districts in the United States having a percentage of forest area less than that in the Seventh District of Alabama. More than two-thirds of the United States is open land and without forest. Included are great areas of open land in the Great Plains States. One may assume, therefore, that more than two-thirds of the Congressional districts have a smaller percentage of their area in forest than does the Seventh District of Alabama. An enumeration of them would require more data than are presently available, and even a partial enumeration would require statistical data not available at the present time.

7. Forest areas in each Alabama Congressional District:

Congressional district	Total area		Forest area		Percentage in forest
	Acres	Square miles	Acres	Square miles	
1.....	4,728,000	7,389	3,370,400	5,267	71.3
2.....	5,131,000	8,022	3,181,000	4,971	62.0
3.....	4,086,000	6,339	1,829,200	2,859	45.1
4.....	3,491,200	5,455	1,978,000	3,062	56.1
5.....	3,179,520	4,968	1,635,900	2,558	51.1
6.....	4,109,440	6,421	2,430,000	3,829	59.6
7.....	4,051,840	6,331	2,562,000	4,004	63.2
8.....	3,223,040	5,036	1,490,000	2,293	46.4
9.....	714,880	1,117	498,200	778	70.0
Total.....	32,689,920	51,078	18,877,700	29,490	57.7

8 and 9. Congressional districts of Alabama rated according to percentage of area in forest.

Rating	Congressional district	Percentage of board in forest
1.....	1	71.3
2.....	9	70.0
3.....	7	63.2
4.....	2	62.0
5.....	5	60.1
6.....	6	59.6
7.....	4	56.1
8.....	8	46.4
9.....	3	45.1

10 and 11. Trees common in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama: The forest is about two-thirds pine and one-third hardwoods. Loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) is the most abundant single species and is followed closely by shortleaf pine (*Pinus echinata*). Longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*) occurs on the tops of some ridges and occasionally elsewhere in isolated patches. Originally it covered a much larger area, but as it was logged off it was generally replaced by loblolly or shortleaf pines. The more com-

mon hardwoods are red oaks, hickories, white oaks, red gum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), yellow poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), and black gum (*Nyssa sylvatica*). Bottomland hardwoods grow along streams and consist chiefly of red gum and black gum, water oaks, yellow poplar, elms, American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), hickory, and maple. Other varieties are present in small numbers to include most of the 180 tree varieties credited as native in Alabama. None of these trees are peculiar to the Seventh District, but all are found over much of the State.

12. People employed by forest industries: At least 5,000 people were employed during 1947 in 219 establishments which the Census of Manufactures reported as devoted to the manufacture of lumber and forest products in the nine counties of the Seventh Congressional District. This may be low, because the Forest Service reported 730 active sawmills in the district in 1946. These included eight medium-size, permanent mills, and 189 portable mills which were operated more or less regularly. All the other mills were portable and operated intermittently. Greatest sawmilling activity was reported in Fayette, Walker, Pickens, Marion, and Lamar Counties.

Of the 219 establishments reported in the Census of Manufactures none were engaged in the manufacture of furniture. They were grouped into 168 with 1 to 19 employees, 45 with 20 to 99 employees, and 6 which employed 100 or more.

Of the \$49,530,000 reported as having been paid in wages and salaries to the 37,392 employees credited to 1,618 lumber and forest products establishments in Alabama, approximately \$6,500,000 may be credited to those located in the Seventh Congressional District.

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Agriculture, volume I, part 4, Bureau of the Census; Census of Manufactures, 1947, volume II, Bureau of the Census; Basic Data on Forest Area and Timber Volumes for the Southern Forest Survey, 1932-36, Forest Survey Release No. 54, February 1946, Southern Forest Experiment Station, New Orleans, La.; Timber Resource and Timber Use Information Bearing on Pulp Mill Possibilities in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, prepared by the Southern Forest Experiment Station, New Orleans, La., February 1, 1950, Forest Resources of North Central Alabama, Forest Survey Release No. 50, September 30, 1940, Southern Forest Experiment Station, New Orleans, La.; Check List of Native Trees of Alabama, 1926, Page S. Bunker, State Forester, Pamphlet No. 5, State Commission of Forestry.

Neither the Seventeenth Census of the United States, 1950, nor the report of the southern forest survey as presently being conducted by the United States Forest Service are printed, so that more recent data are not available.

Alabama forest resources by congressional districts

[From the Southern Forest Survey, 1932-36]

First district	Choctaw	Clarke	Marengo	Mobile	Monroe	Washington	Wilcox	Total
Approximate total land area.....acres ¹	587,520	794,240	625,920	798,720	692,400	684,160	576,000	4,728,000
Forest area.....do.....	459,200	629,800	313,300	633,900	412,100	638,200	283,800	3,370,400
Land area.....square miles.....	918	1,241	978	1,249	1,035	1,069	900	7,389
Forest area.....do.....	718	984	490	991	644	977	443	5,267
Percent in forest.....	78.2	79.3	50.1	79.4	62.2	93.3	49.3	71.3
Softwood, M. M.....million board feet.....	765.1	1,192.3	430.8	349.9	811.2	927.1	468.0	4,943.4
Hardwood.....do.....	380.0	593.0	289.4	112.1	610.9	381.5	155.1	2,822.6
Total.....do.....	1,145.7	2,085.3	720.2	462.0	1,422.1	1,308.6	623.1	7,766.0
Cords.....thousands.....	4,531.5	7,341.6	2,168.0	2,428.6	5,009.8	5,148.0	2,575.4	20,202.9

¹ Approximate land area, 1940. Sixteenth Census of the United States. County Table I. Census of Agriculture—Alabama.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Alabama forest resources by congressional districts—Continued

Second district	Baldwin	Butler	Conecuh	Covington	Grenshaw	Escambia	Lowndes	Montgomery	Pike	Total
Total land area.....acres ¹	1,032,320	494,720	544,000	661,760	391,040	615,680	458,240	605,600	430,720	5,134,080
Forest area.....do	834,000	314,000	374,000	434,700	197,100	440,400	218,400	174,900	186,000	3,181,000
Total land area.....square miles	1,613	773	850	1,034	611	962	716	790	673	8,022
Forest area.....do	1,305	492	584	679	308	698	341	273	291	4,971
Percent in forest	80.8	63.6	68.8	65.7	50.4	72.5	47.7	34.6	43.2	62.0
Softwood.....million board feet	766.5	788.6	922.0	619.1	316.9	794.7	373.5	134.6	226.3	4,542.2
Hardwood.....do	397.4	301.3	187.0	162.4	207.0	162.8	207.6	170.9	238.3	2,034.7
Total.....do	1,163.9	1,089.9	1,109.0	781.5	523.9	957.5	581.1	305.5	464.6	6,576.9
Cords.....thousands	5,802.7	4,116.8	3,214.2	2,717.1	2,407.1	3,601.4	2,313.5	1,214.1	2,099.1	27,006.0

Third district	Barbour	Bullock	Coffee	Dale	Geneva	Henry	Houston	Lee	Macon	Russell	Total
Total land area.....acres ¹	575,360	393,000	433,280	358,400	369,920	361,600	369,920	301,680	394,240	408,960	4,056,960
Forest area.....do	271,700	144,100	205,500	180,100	180,300	167,600	124,000	198,800	210,500	173,300	1,820,200
Total land area.....square miles	899	615	677	560	578	565	578	472	616	639	6,339
Forest area.....do	429	225	321	235	282	262	194	311	329	271	2,850
Percent in forest	47.7	36.6	47.4	42.0	48.7	46.3	33.5	50.8	53.4	42.4	45.1
Softwood.....million board feet	352.1	174.5	289.0	211.2	199.1	227.2	157.8	272.6	316.5	289.4	2,489.4
Hardwood.....do	184.1	119.3	155.1	165.8	210.8	182.3	120.4	93.8	187.0	108.8	1,827.4
Total.....do	536.2	293.8	444.1	377.0	409.9	409.5	278.2	366.4	503.5	398.2	4,016.8
Cords.....thousands	2,362.2	1,022.7	1,953.4	1,611.8	1,770.4	1,610.3	1,192.3	1,408.1	1,851.8	1,401.8	16,184.8

Fourth district	Autauga	Calhoun	Clay	Coosa	Dallas	Elmore	St. Clair	Talladega	Total
Total land area.....acres ¹	383,360	300,100	385,920	414,720	624,640	401,920	410,240	480,000	3,491,200
Forest area.....do	202,100	199,300	270,000	282,300	275,600	180,200	230,100	249,000	1,978,600
Total land area.....square miles	599	460	603	648	976	628	641	730	5,455
Forest area.....do	316	311	422	441	431	282	360	389	2,952
Percent in forest	52.7	51.1	70.0	68.1	44.1	41.8	56.1	51.9	54.1
Softwood.....million board feet	205.8	236.0	265.7	403.3	311.4	163.8	387.0	262.1	2,265.1
Hardwood.....do	126.5	41.9	93.7	129.4	399.8	194.5	86.0	70.1	1,141.9
Total.....do	332.3	277.9	359.4	532.7	711.2	358.3	473.0	332.2	3,407.0
Cords.....thousands	1,407.1	1,247.2	1,741.6	2,522.4	2,817.1	1,642.7	2,170.8	1,656.3	15,295.2

Fifth district	Chambers	Cherokee	Cleburne	De Kalb	Etowah	Marshall	Randolph	Tallapoosa	Total
Total land area.....acres ¹	382,720	384,000	367,360	497,920	375,200	365,440	371,840	475,140	3,179,320
Forest area.....do	149,600	205,300	301,300	258,000	119,200	113,200	180,400	279,100	1,636,900
Total land area.....square miles	598	600	574	778	575	571	581	711	4,108
Forest area.....do	234	321	471	403	233	177	282	437	2,558
Percent in forest	59.1	73.5	82.0	61.8	42.0	31.0	48.5	61.5	60.1
Softwood.....million board feet	188.8	230.6	348.8	401.0	218.5	246.5	235.0	319.3	2,435.5
Hardwood.....do	102.0	63.5	65.8	107.5	59.3	88.5	67.6	189.5	743.7
Total.....do	290.8	294.1	414.6	508.5	277.8	335.0	302.6	508.8	3,179.2
Cords.....thousands	1,196.1	1,708.6	2,215.5	2,741.3	1,185.4	1,397.0	1,325.9	2,322.4	17,922.2

Sixth district	Bibb	Chilton	Greene	Hale	Perry	Shelby	Sumpter	Tuscaloosa	Total
Total land area.....acres ¹	400,000	447,360	412,800	424,320	469,760	512,640	584,960	857,600	4,100,400
Forest area.....do	307,000	296,200	198,900	177,300	218,300	371,600	271,600	608,500	2,450,000
Total land area.....square miles	625	699	645	663	734	801	914	1,340	6,421
Forest area.....do	480	463	312	277	341	581	424	951	3,829
Percent in forest	76.8	66.2	48.4	41.8	46.5	63.5	46.1	71.0	59.6
Softwood.....million board feet	306.9	370.3	194.0	317.4	247.4	558.2	464.3	819.4	3,277.9
Hardwood.....do	125.7	133.5	200.0	181.3	97.8	309.3	309.3	467.5	1,678.9
Total.....do	432.6	503.8	394.0	501.7	345.2	719.0	773.6	1,286.9	4,956.8
Cords.....thousands	2,101.9	2,546.0	1,629.5	1,856.3	1,538.8	3,210.2	2,814.4	5,697.4	21,394.5

Seventh district	Blount	Cullman	Fayette	Franklin	Lamar	Marion	Pickens	Walker	Winston	Total
Total land area.....acres ¹	409,600	475,520	401,280	412,160	387,200	475,520	597,680	617,760	405,120	4,051,840
Forest area.....do	247,700	213,600	289,900	258,500	239,000	299,200	372,000	337,900	304,100	2,502,400
Total land area.....square miles	640	743	627	644	605	743	887	809	633	6,331
Forest area.....do	387	334	453	404	373	468	582	528	475	4,004
Percent in forest	60.5	45.0	72.2	62.7	61.7	63.0	65.6	65.2	75.1	63.2
Softwood.....million board feet	547.7	434.2	325.9	138.8	252.5	201.1	409.5	651.9	626.0	3,487.6
Hardwood.....do	100.2	122.0	161.2	150.7	176.4	157.9	350.2	173.6	191.6	1,883.8
Total.....do	647.9	556.2	487.1	289.5	428.9	359.0	759.7	825.5	717.6	5,071.4
Cords.....thousands	2,781.0	2,451.5	2,481.2	1,959.7	2,141.3	2,168.0	3,412.8	3,750.8	3,230.3	24,412.6

¹ Approximate land area, 1940 Sixteenth Census of the United States, County Table 1, Census of Agriculture—Alabama.

Alabama forest resources by congressional districts—Continued

Eighth district	Colbert	Jackson	Lauderdale	Lawrence	Limestone	Madison	Morgan	Total
Total land area..... acres ¹	394,240	719,360	440,320	439,040	348,800	613,920	367,360	3,223,040
Forest area..... do.....	242,400	471,900	162,900	146,500	87,400	168,700	132,200	1,460,600
Total land area..... square miles	616	1,124	686	686	545	803	574	5,039
Forest area..... do.....	379	730	255	306	137	284	207	2,284
Percent in forest.....	61.5	65.5	37.0	44.5	25.1	32.8	36.0	45.4
Softwood..... million board-feet.....	136.3	266.1	49.0	173.5	24.1	15.2	95.2	759.4
Hardwood..... do.....	166.8	504.1	72.4	280.2	104.4	192.0	96.3	1,400.2
Total..... do.....	303.1	770.2	121.4	453.7	128.5	207.0	191.5	2,175.4
Cords..... thousands.....	2,033.9	4,286.6	1,122.4	2,382.5	639.2	1,470.9	980.4	12,924.9

Ninth district	Jefferson	State	Total
Total land area..... acres ¹	714,980	Total land area..... acres ¹	32,680,920
Forest area..... do.....	498,200	Forest area..... do.....	18,877,700
Total land area..... square miles	1,117	Total land area..... square miles	51,078
Forest area..... do.....	778	Forest area..... do.....	28,496
Percent in forest.....	70.0	Percent in forest.....	57.7
Softwood..... million board feet.....	1,102.0	Softwood..... million board feet.....	25,301.5
Hardwood..... do.....	237.3	Hardwood..... do.....	13,180.5
Total..... do.....	1,339.3	Total..... do.....	38,491.0
Cords..... thousands.....	5,542.1	Cords..... thousands.....	167,408.8

¹ Approximate land area, 1940. Sixteenth Census of the United States. County Table I. Census of Agriculture—Alabama.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very intelligent and enlightening editorial by Ralph Thornton, on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The editorial appeared in the Minneapolis Star on Thursday, October 11.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RFC HAS PROVED TARGET OF POLITICS FROM VERY FIRST

Abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, advises Herbert Hoover who proposed its organization in 1931.

Keep RFC, answers Stuart Symington, the new Director, who has been doing some vigorous housecleaning in the agency since he took control.

So the Democrats are defending it, the Republicans attacking. That's a reversal of positions in 20 years. Its history is interesting.

Hoover proposed RFC as one of a series of moves to stop the depression. He met great opposition from the Democratic-controlled Congress.

But the bill passed both Houses on January 18, 1932, in version which curtailed many of Hoover's original recommendations. These were never restored, in spite of his vigorous efforts. (They were, however, quickly given when asked for by Roosevelt.)

By March 25, more than 600 institutions (many of them small banks) in 45 States had been assisted by the agency.

A CAMPAIGN A YEAR

On June 26, 1932, runs began on several Chicago banks; the Dawes bank and a whole group of Illinois banks were threatened.

Fortunately, two of the Democratic members of the RFC Board were in Chicago.

They immediately recommended that the RFC extend an advance to keep open the Dawes and other banks. This action undoubtedly averted a national panic at the time.

On July 6, 1932, Speaker of the House John Garner insisted that the recipients of loans from the RFC should be published. The campaign of 1932 had begun. Campaign assertions claimed that the RFC only helped banks and corporations, did not help the common man.

Unheard in the din were the voices of economists who tried to explain that strengthening the bank which represented his savings and the industry which provided his income did benefit the workingman.

The RFC directors protested the publication of the loans, and the bill passed after the provision was limited to confidential filing of the RFC reports with the clerks of the Houses of Congress.

However, after the elections of November 1932, and at the insistence of Speaker Garner (then Vice President-elect), the Clerk of the House allowed the current monthly reports to be publicly released.

On January 4, 1933, the House, under Speaker Garner, passed a resolution requiring all loans made before July 21, 1932, to be published as well. The RFC board again objected.

Runs on banks had already begun when the first monthly reports were published.

President Hoover, on February 20, implored Congress to repeal the procedure of publishing the RFC loans. His words fell on deaf ears.

NO COOPERATION

The Democratic Party, waiting to take control within 2 weeks, seemed content to let the Nation's economy suffer the destruction of confidence caused by publication of the loans until they officially took over the reins. Publication of the loans was suppressed as soon as the Democrats came into office.

On February 17, President Hoover wrote to Roosevelt asking for a statement of policy from the incoming administration which might restore public confidence and stop the runs on banks. He also suggested that Roosevelt speak with congressional leaders

about stopping the publication of the RFC loans.

By February 27, a wholly unnecessary panic was in full swing. The President-elect still had not replied to Hoover's letter. On February 28, Hoover again wrote Roosevelt.

On March 1, Roosevelt answered lamely stating that his secretary had neglected to mail the reply to Hoover's February 17 letter. Roosevelt did not even mention the RFC.

On March 3, Roosevelt was again asked if a bank holiday should be declared until the panic could be dispelled by a statement from the incoming administration. The President-elect said that the governors of the States could take care of the necessary closings. In no case should such a general proclamation be issued, he said.

Two days later, on March 6, all banks in the Nation were closed by proclamation of President Roosevelt. Most of them reopened on March 15.

The country was not ruined; 92 percent of its banks were still solvent, thanks, in many cases, to the help of the RFC backing.

RALPH THORNTON.

An All-Canadian Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An All-Canadian Seaway," published in the Bismarck Tribune of October 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ALL-CANADIAN SEAWAY

North Dakota has long been interested in the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. Members

of the State's congressional delegation have endorsed it and the State's governor and legislature have gone on record in favor of its early construction.

The State's interest, of course, derives from the fact that the opening of the seaway would bring ocean shipping thousands of miles closer to North Dakota, lessening shipping costs on North Dakota products which go into international commerce.

Now Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada, has indicated that Canada may proceed with construction of the seaway on its own hook, since it cannot secure cooperative participation by the United States.

It is not surprising that Canada may be approaching such a decision, because Congress has had a St. Lawrence seaway bill before it for session after session, and has never acted upon it. It is only 2 months since the House Public Works Committee laid aside a measure authorizing United States participation in the project.

President Truman, moreover, has indicated that if Canada goes ahead with building of the project, it will be with his blessing.

If Canada does proceed with an all-Canadian project on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence River, the procrastination of Congress may prove costly to the United States. It would then be probable that Americans will pay the greater share of the cost of the project without acquiring the advantages of joint ownership and control. Americans would be using a foreign-controlled waterway vital to American commerce, and they would be beholden to the Canadians for its use at terms set by the Canadians.

Sectionalism has been responsible for the delay in action by Congress. Some parts of the country, including the eastern seaboard and the Gulf coast, have opposed it because they felt it would deprive them of the control they now have over international shipping. They don't want to see lake ports such as Superior and Duluth and Milwaukee become ports of call for ocean-going vessels which could, for example, load up at Duluth with North Dakota wheat and carry it without any of the rehandling that is now necessary to England or Greece.

The St. Lawrence seaway should be an international project, built by the United States and Canada together for the benefit of both. But it would be unreasonable to expect Canada, if it really wants the seaway to shelve the project just because the United States won't get in on it. If Congress won't authorize United States participation, Canada should go ahead with the project on its own and it should get the lion's share of the benefits from it. That apparently is what Congress is forcing Canada to do.

Boxscore for the Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a debate on the subject Boxscore for the Eighty-second Congress, held on October 14, 1951, on the American Forum of the Air, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

BOXSCORE FOR THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

ANNOUNCER Good afternoon. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air, dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues vital to you and your country.

This afternoon, the American Forum of the Air examines the Boxscore for the Eighty-second Congress.

Here with us today to add up the totals are two congressional teams: Senator ROBERT KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma; Representative JOHN ROONEY, Democrat of New York; Senator GEORGE MALONE, Republican of Nevada, and Representative LEONARD HALL, Republican of New York.

The founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik, is convalescing this week, but here, to take his place, is Frank Blair.

Mr. BLAIR. The Eighty-second Congress came to life in the blackest days of the Korean war last January. With artillery booming in the background, Congress pushed aside many home-front bills and flashed the go-ahead signal to national defense and foreign aid legislation.

Did the Eighty-second Congress do too much, or hasn't it done enough? Today we will find out.

First a question for Senator KERR.

Senator, in your opinion, what has the Eighty-second Congress accomplished?

Senator KERR. Well, that is a very good question and I will try to answer it. The first session of the Eighty-second Congress has been a "P" session, "P" standing for preparedness, peace, prosperity, prevention, and I might add, probing. Never in time of peace, and only three times in war, has a session of Congress devoted more time or provided more money for the national defense. In addition to the appropriation bills, this Congress has passed or is enacting 28 major defense bills.

Out of this session of Congress have come the debates and the establishment of facts and principles which have proved that the Democratic administration's foreign policy is the best for America to follow; a foreign policy which gives us the best chance to achieve a lasting peace.

On the home front we have also met our responsibility in the form of flood control, bills for American agriculture, bills for the veterans of the Korean struggle, and the present emergency, the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements, food to prevent famine in India and Yugoslavia and elsewhere, and then we have passed a new defense production act providing reasonable controls, a new defense housing act, and we are about to pass a vital tax bill, to the end that business is continuing, defense needs are being met, and we are going to come closer to the achievement of our goal—a pay-as-we-go basis—and without ruinous inflation.

And too, Mr. Blair, we have refused to spend all of our time watering last year's crops. The Republicans spend their present in the past—they refuse to build for tomorrow. They are too busy trying to tear down yesterday. We have refused to let the Republican leadership force us to devote all our time and energy to writing obituaries for the Government of Chiang Kai-shek. We just don't believe in putting past things first. We have refused to permit the tail, which is MacArthur, to wag the dog, which is Congress. We have refused to let the MacArthur advocates in the Senate lead us

into declaring war on Communist China. We have refused to go it alone with General MacArthur into an all-out war in Asia that would have handed victory to Russia on a silver platter. We have refused to let the elder Mr. Hoover lead us in a rout and retreat to the citadel of the Waldorf Astoria. We have refused to let the armchair generals, Bob Taft and others, neutralize and destroy the usefulness and the leadership of the most brilliant and able combined Chiefs of Staff in our history. We have stayed on the high road to production, prosperity, and peace, and refused to spend the summer in the labyrinth of detours into which the Republicans have constantly tried to seduce us.

Mr. BLAIR. Thank you, Senator. Senator MALONE, how would you answer that question?

Senator MALONE. I would simply say that whatever has been done can be blamed on the Democrats of the Congress. They are in full control of both Houses of Congress and the White House.

If this is a peace Congress, I have never seen a war Congress. This is the third Democratic war in my generation. I have been in both of the others, and maybe they will get down to me in this one. We are in a war in Korea, in which we have lost in killed, maimed, and wounded 160,000 boys. Our State Department won't let the boys win it, and they don't dare lose it, and so there is no end to it.

Now, for 18 years, our taxpayers have assumed that each piece of legislation proposed by the administration was a separate unit to be considered on its own individual merits. Although the taxpayers of this Nation have not liked this legislation, they have not associated it in its place in the over-all pattern.

What the public and the majority in Congress has not seen is the pattern of the plot which, taken as a whole, is eating the heart out of our economic system. High spots in the plot are: First, the recognition of Communist Russia in 1934 without any safeguards; second, the removal of the metal base for our money in 1934, laying the groundwork for unlimited spending; third, the application of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, dividing our markets with the foreign nations of the world; fourth, deficit financing resulting in printing-press money almost without limit; fifth, the sending of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money to foreign nations, on the Karl Marx principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

The Eighty-second Congress, trained as it is to jump through the administration hoop at each suggestion of the President, apparently does not see this Fabian-Marxist pattern of a one-economic world, nor do they see that the financing of the governments in Europe by us is part of the plot.

The legislation passed by the Eighty-second Congress in 1951 included: First, a 2-year extension of the so-called reciprocal trade program, which continues to place in the hands of a thoroughly discredited State Department the power of life or death over the workers and investors of this Nation, through the division of the markets of this Nation with the sweatshop nations of Europe; second, appropriations of \$8,500,000,000 to Europe without conditions attached, such as provision for a United States of Europe and free convertibility of currencies, and integrity of private investments within the borders of the countries we help, and equal access to the trade of these areas, particularly those areas that we are committed to defend; third, a tax bill which continues the theory that taxes must be continually raised to siphon off the raises in wages and any dividend checks that a

taxpayer might receive on his investments, all on the theory that if an individual spends earned income in the market places on the necessities and comforts of life it will cause inflation, but if the Government spends it there will be no inflation. All of these things were initiated or continued through legislation of the Eighty-second Congress.

We are holding our economic structure together by continued "emergencies". If we should suddenly run out of emergencies, the excuse for deficit planning, for selling additional bonds, for printing more money, for constantly increasing taxes, our economy would crumble within 90 days. The administration has dissipated in a short 18 years the assets of our great Nation, assets built up over a century of time. If the national debt were to be transferred to the 48 States on a per capita basis, 38 of the States would owe more than the taxable value of the property within their borders. And the Eighty-second Congress is responsible for much of this.

That, Mr. Moderator, is the box score of the Eighty-second Congress.

Representative HALL. Mr. Blair.

Mr. BLAIR. Yes.

Representative HALL. I have listened with interest to what Senator KERR had to say. I noticed that he spent about one-half minute talking about the box score of the Congress and the other making a campaign speech. Well, I can understand that very well for the reason that if you look at the box score, Senator, you will find that the Eighty-second Congress has spent more time doing less than any Congress in history.

Representative ROONEY. Mr. Chairman.

Representative HALL. Just a moment. I want to finish my statement. I have the official box-score right here before me. I didn't pick the items on this. The clerks up there do that, and they list the major bills for the first session. There are several major bills, five of which have become law: trade agreements, India emergency food relief, defense housing, universal military training, and the Defense Production Act.

Mr. BLAIR. Congressman ROONEY.

Representative HALL. That is all we have done in this first session of Congress.

Representative ROONEY. Well, let me point out to you, Congressman HALL, a few of the things that have happened in this first session of the Eighty-second Congress. Before I do that, let me say to Senator MALONE that listening closely to his remarks, one would never realize that since 1933, the national income has gone up from \$40,000,000,000 a year to \$288,000,000,000 a year and that corporate profits, which were \$3,000,000,000 in the red in 1932, have gone up to plus \$46,000,000,000.

But, Congressman HALL, let me point out some of the things that this Congress has done. This Congress, with regard to housing, passed a bill to the extent of \$1,600,000,000 to provide housing in defense areas. It has renewed direct home-purchase loans for veterans. It has eased credit curbs for veterans in low- and medium-cost housing. It has appropriated \$50,000,000 for low-cost public-rental projects and slum clearance.

Senator KERR. Don't you know that those are not major items to the Republicans?

Representative ROONEY. I was just mentioning a few.

Senator KERR. Go right ahead.

Representative HALL. Can I break in there? I am a little bit surprised today because we have two leaders here from the Democratic Party—

Representative ROONEY. Thank you, sir.

Representative HALL. Mr. KERR and Mr. ROONEY, and I know that the keystone of the Truman Fair Deal program has been about three items. We have had the Brannan plan;

we have had the Ewing compulsory health program; and we have had the civil-rights program. And here we have two leaders of the Fair Deal party and they haven't even mentioned these.

Have you scrapped those now?

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Rooney.

Representative ROONEY. You seem to forget the Old Deal. Don't you remember the Old Deal in 1932?

Representative HALL. I would like to have an answer to the question.

Representative ROONEY. Don't you remember when nobody had anything?

Do you think that people in their standard of living are a bit better off today than they were in 1932? Why, as the President said at a luncheon in San Francisco some weeks ago, you folks on the other side of the aisle think you should have 1951 profits at wages and hours of the first term of the McKinley administration.

Representative HALL. At that time we had our boys at home and not in Korea.

Mr. BLAIR. Senator Kerr, we haven't heard from you for quite a while.

Senator KERR. Thank you very much.

My friend, Senator MALONE, talked about this administration eating the heart out of the economic system of America, and that we are paying more taxes than ever before. Now, that last statement is true, but let me remind him that we have more left after we pay the taxes than we ever had before.

As my colleague said, our national income has grown to where it is now nearly 5 times what it was during the 12 years when we hardened under Harding, cooled under Coolidge, and hungered under Hoover. The per capita income of our people has gone up from less than \$400 until now it is above \$1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Those are levels undreamed of and unheard of B R T. That means "Before Roosevelt and Truman."

Mr. BLAIR. But, Senator, do you attribute all of that to the Eighty-second Congress?

Senator KERR. I say that the Eighty-second Congress is of that pattern. When our good friend, Mr. HALL, over there from New York, talks about what the cardinal principles of the Fair Deal and the New Deal are, he is just another Republican that never did learn and never will know them.

Representative HALL. How about the answer to it?

Senator KERR. The cardinal principle of the Democratic Party is the welfare of the people. Go ask the people how they are getting along and you will find out.

Representative HALL. I would suggest to you, Senator, that Mr. Truman said that the Brannan plan, the compulsory health program, and the civil rights program were "musts." Now, what is your answer to that? You skip the answers very well.

Senator KERR. My answer is that Mr. Truman has never said that the Brannan plan was a "must."

Representative HALL. He certainly did.

Senator KERR. Mr. Truman has never said that the compulsory-health program is a "must."

Representative HALL. He certainly has. Where have you been?

Senator KERR. I have been where a number of things are happening and not where men are indulging in memories of the past.

Mr. BLAIR. Senator MALONE.

Senator MALONE. I think this is a very enlightening discussion and it would be an illuminating discussion if we stayed on the subject. Senator KERR, my good friend, speaks of the five-fold increase in the national income. The Democrat administration with the help of the Democrat majority in Congress has stolen one-half of the savings and the insurance and the incomes of the people of the United States by inflation

in the last few years. A Government agency reports that the dollar of 1939 is now worth 53 cents. Now, the facts are, if you will permit me to finish my statement—

Senator KERR. I will.

Senator MALONE. If you will please let me finish my statement now (I remember Senator KERR on other programs.)

Mr. BLAIR. Senator Malone has the floor, gentlemen.

Senator MALONE. I would say that by inflation you can have a \$500,000,000,000 income in a little while, but that doesn't mean anything if the value of the dollar goes down as the income goes up. I think we will possibly have a \$500,000,000,000-a-year income because we are going off the deep end of inflation.

Now, let's get back to other things we are doing.

England and France have a pact, a military and economic pact, with Russia. As a matter of fact, all of the 16 nations that we are financing in Europe have trade agreements with Russia and the iron-curtain countries, and they have been, from the beginning of the Marshall plan, sending everything needed to arm Russia and the iron-curtain countries.

The English trade with tin and rubber in China.

Representative ROONEY. Senator—

Senator MALONE. Will you permit me to finish my statement? In the Senate, we have to yield. I don't know how it is in the House.

Representative HALL. We can only speak for 5 minutes over there.

Senator MALONE. We are never going to be able to stop that trade between the Marshall plan countries and iron-curtain countries. They are trading now as usual. We had the Kern-Wherry-Malone resolution which would have stopped that, but the Democrat-controlled Eighty-second Congress replaced it with a bill that allows the administrator to confer on the Secretary of State the power to determine what they will be allowed to sell; and the Secretary of State has been on record at times that he doesn't object to this trade. So, what the Eighty-second Congress is doing is to bring about this situation. The taxpayers of the United States have furnished 60 percent of the material in Korea that has gone to shoot their sons.

Representative ROONEY. Senator MALONE, I have about as much respect for your judgment with regard to domestic issues as I have with regard to your ideas that Eisenhower is presently in Europe doing a blood-dogging job. You have opposed the entire matter of the North Atlantic Pact, the arming of a free Europe in order to beat our common enemy, and you have taken this position now for quite some time.

So that I can say to you that I have about as much respect with regard to your judgment on domestic affairs as I have on foreign affairs.

Representative HALL. Mr. Blair, can I break in here for just a minute?

Mr. BLAIR. Well, for just a second, Congressman.

Representative HALL. I can't do it in a second. I would like to speak on this prosperity that Senator KERR spends so much time on.

The prosperity we have today, Senator—and you know it as well as I do—is based on war and preparation for war. We had millions on relief in 1938 until World War II. Preparation for that war and preparation for this police action—I am sorry—in Korea—is the reason why we have this great prosperity that you are boasting about. Now, Hitler had that kind of prosperity based upon war and preparation for war. Mussolini had it for a while. Dictators and kings of old have had it.

I would certainly like to see this administration get down to a point where we have prosperity in normal peacetime. And you can't tell me that anything we have today is based upon anything but war manufacturing, and with that of course, we have our boys fighting in Korea.

Senator KERR Congressman, you are a very unrealistic thinker. You have this threat of war

Representative HALL. Yes.

Senator KERR. Now, it is even beyond the dreams of the Republican Party to provide a means to prevent the threat of war. Realism demands that we be prepared to meet it.

Representative HALL. Have you stopped any war?

Senator KERR. I will ask you.

Mr BLAIR Senator, will you hold that just a minute, sir? We will continue in just a minute. But first, I would like to take a minute, if I may, to pay tribute to the editors of the magazine Radio and TV Mirror, which is now on your newsstands. Now, this current issue of this magazine is devoted to NBC's twenty-fifth anniversary and is truly a story and picture record of our network. We on the American Forum are particularly pleased with the article on page 66, which deals with Mrs. Theodore Grank, the first lady of the American Forum. I would like you to have a copy of that magazine. Again, we express our appreciation to the editors of Radio and TV Mirror.

We will continue with this discussion in just a moment, but first, here is an important announcement.

Mr BLAIR We are ready once again, and Senator KERR you were saying—

Senator KERR. Well, thank you, I said that my Republican friends were unrealistic in their thinking. They know and we know that after 1932 this Nation had been driven to its knees. They know that under Democratic administrations we came back up out of the valley of the shadow of poverty, depression, and want. They know we were on the road to recovery and prosperity when World War II was forced upon us. They didn't want it—

Representative HALL. How many were on the relief rolls?

Senator KERR. They didn't want it and not even we wanted it. The challenge to the Democratic administration has come in being able to fight this war and win it, and in being able to meet the threat of war today and still keep prosperity.

Representative HALL. One little question, Senator. Is any of this prosperity you are talking about based upon the expenditures for the war effort?

Senator KERR. This prosperity—

Representative HALL. You can answer that in one word.

Senator KERR. It is based upon production and the welfare of the people—

Representative HALL. Where does that money come from?

Senator KERR. It comes from the production by the people, from the farmers and from the workers.

Mr BLAIR Senator MALONE?

Senator MALONE. Now, Mr ROONEY, I just want to call your attention to something about the Atlantic Pact and all such pacts. We had a Kellogg Pact. We had other pacts. The only pact that kept the pacts was us, whenever it became convenient, for reasons of the other nation's best interests, to break it, the other nation broke it.

The reason I am against all pacts that say we are automatically in war when another nation goes to war, is that we gain nothing; because a nation was with us in World War I, or World War II, they are not necessarily with us in world war III. I will call your attention to this. England's policy, voiced in 1858, by a great Prime Minister,

has never changed. It was reaffirmed by Churchill in 1945 when he said, "We have no permanent friendships or enmities; we have but permanent interests." That means that unless we support England's colonial system all over the world, we don't have England.

In 1945, Mr. Roosevelt, in one of his lucid moments, asked Churchill why he didn't get out of Hong Kong to save us future trouble. Churchill answered in words that rang around the world, "I did not become the King's first Minister to liquidate the British Empire."

Now, the United States started in Yalta when our President gave Manchuria to Russia, with no safeguards whatever, and this laid the groundwork for Korean trouble—leading to the "police action," causing 160,000 of our boys to be lying out there in graves or in hospitals.

Mr BLAIR Senator—

Senator MALONE. I just want to—

Mr BLAIR. We told our audience that we were going to discuss the congressional box score. I would like to get back to that subject.

Senator MALONE. That is exactly what we are discussing.

Senator KERR. That is the thing the Republicans want to discuss.

Senator MALONE. It is exactly what we are discussing, if you will allow me to finish.

Representative ROONEY. They want to talk about the past.

Mr BLAIR Senator MALONE, you may finish, and then we will get to today's topic.

Senator MALONE. I am on today's topic. What is this war today out there but today's topic, the accomplishment of this Congress?

Representative ROONEY. Senator—

Senator MALONE. I did not yield.

Mr BLAIR Senator MALONE has the floor. Representative ROONEY. He has had the floor now for the last several minutes.

Mr BLAIR. Go ahead, Senator MALONE.

Senator MALONE. We are going to be in Iran and in Egypt supporting the colonial system, according to Acheson, just like we are in Korea. Now, how did we get into Korea? We are in Korea because of trying to hold up something, in this case the division of Korea. We are going to get into more trouble by trying to hold up something else. We are supporting the colonialism slavery system of the empires, that is, the British, the Dutch, the Belgian, and the Netherlands. We are supporting the colonial system throughout the world, and there is no way in the world we can hold it up. Thus we are going to get into these police actions all around the world.

Representative ROONEY. I wonder if I could interrupt to say a word?

When you express the thoughts that you have just expressed, you are not expressing the thoughts of the responsible leaders of your own party. I happen to be one of the group who went in June to Paris to interview General Eisenhower and the people who were at the head of the NATO program, the North Atlantic treaty nations, and we found that most of the folks in charge of that program, beginning with Mr. Charles Spofford in London, and others, are all members, registered members of your party. You do not represent the thinking of Republicans such as Senator LONG of the Senate and many others.

Senator MALONE. I am quick to admit that I believe it is generally said that my thinking represents sound Republican doctrine.

Representative ROONEY. You are an isolationist, and you want to stay with that regardless of what we can do about it.

Senator MALONE. I say, let's extend the Monroe Doctrine. Extend the areas of the Monroe Doctrine. I am no isolationist, neither am I a fool.

Mr BLAIR. Do you gentlemen feel that the Eighty-second Congress spent more time on

national defense and items related to the national defense than on home-front legislation?

Representative HALL. I think I posed that question at the beginning.

First, I want to congratulate you, Senator MALONE, for keeping the floor from Senator KERR.

Senator MALONE. Thank you.

Representative HALL. Anyway, I posed that question at the beginning. I said that the keystone of Mr. Truman's domestic program is civil rights, the Brannan plan, and the compulsory health program, and I haven't heard Mr. ROONEY or Mr. KERR say anything about them.

Representative ROONEY. That isn't it at all. So far as I am concerned, there is no one any more opposed to socialized medicine than I am.

Senator MALONE. If I may interrupt—

Representative ROONEY. I beg your pardon, Senator.

Senator MALONE. I was just trying to pay you off.

Representative ROONEY. That is perfectly all right.

There isn't anyone in the Congress more opposed to socialized medicine than I am. I will have no part of it.

Senator MALONE. Not the Democratic administration.

Representative ROONEY. That is not an achievement of the Eighty-second Congress. We are prepared here to tell what the Eighty-second Congress has done.

Representative HALL. It is right here in this paper.

Representative ROONEY. So far as the Republican leadership of the Eighty-second Congress is concerned, their only program is to oppose. They are anti everything.

They are utterly bereft of the program. They will be bereft of a program when they get to the floor in 1952.

Senator MALONE. As I say, we are favoring the Monroe Doctrine, which has a record of 128 successful years.

Senator KERR. That was not in the Eighty-second Congress, Senator.

Senator MALONE. I did not yield. I was just going to say that we could recover the area with our Monroe Doctrine and thus we would not be dependent upon, nor committed to fight for, another nation's colonial system.

Mr BLAIR. The time is up. Thank you, gentlemen.

You have been listening to the boxscore of the Eighty-second Congress, I was told.

Our speakers have been Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, Senator GEORGE MALONE, of Nevada, Congressman JOHN ROONEY, of New York, and Congressman LEONARD HALL, of New York.

This is Frank Blair, substituting for Theodore Grank, founder of the American Forum of the Air.

Resolutions Affecting Federal-State Relations Adopted by Governors' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions affecting Federal-State relations adopted by the Forty-third Governors' Confer-

ence at Gatlinburg, Tenn., on Wednesday, October 3, 1951.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Governors' Conference at its meeting held at White Sulphur Springs in June 1950, and therefore, it is a distinct pleasure to call these resolutions to the attention of the Senate.

I urge the Senate to give serious consideration to the motion made by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, seconded by Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, in regard to the appointment of a special committee to confer with appropriate committees of the Congress for the purpose of securing the creation of a commission designed to clarify and simplify our Federal, State, and local relations.

This, in my opinion, is a most important step in the future preservation of our democratic form of Government.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS AFFECTING FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS ADOPTED BY THE FORTY-THIRD GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AT GATLINBURG, TENN., OCTOBER 3, 1951

CIVIL DEFENSE

In view of unsettled world conditions today, an effectively operated civil-defense program is essential as a first line of security for the Nation. In case of enemy attack, all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—must be prepared to cope with the situation by means of adequate civil defense.

Because civil defense is an integral part of our national security, the Governors' Conference recognizes that guidance and over-all planning should come from the National Government through appropriate channels, including the civil-defense establishment and the Department of Defense. However, the governors' conference also wishes to state its conviction that the State governments and the governors in particular have a special responsibility to cooperate with the Federal authorities in dealing with civil-defense problems and to implement Federal policies and interstate civil defense compacts in order to protect the lives and homes, the farms and industries of our people.

In order to achieve a state of readiness, virtually all of the States have recently enacted basic civil-defense legislation and have established the necessary organization for civil defense. Many of the States have ratified compacts among themselves for effective interstate cooperation and mutual assistance in civil-defense activities. However, State and local civil-defense programs have been hampered by the failure of Congress to appropriate funds adequate for cooperative Federal-State civil-defense operations and stockpiling.

The governors' conference urges that the Congress of the United States promptly make adequate provision for a well conceived civil-defense program. We further recommend that all States which have not done so take immediate action to ratify the uniform interstate civil-defense compact as developed by the Council of State Governments and the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

In order that the enrollment of civil-defense forces may be facilitated, the governors' conference also urges that the Congress enact pending measures for indemnification of duly constituted civil-defense personnel who voluntarily assume civil-defense duties and who may be injured or killed in the performance of their duties. Such indemnification should be financed entirely by the Federal Government.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Many governmental problems that transcend State lines require common solutions

by the States working together within regions and throughout the country. Any lack of cooperation results inevitably in the transfer to the Federal Government of powers, duties, and functions which are State responsibilities. Much recent progress has been made by the States cooperating through the mechanism of interstate compacts, and a large number of such compacts were ratified at the 1951 State legislative sessions. However, the States on occasion have been delayed in securing congressional consent to the detailed and specific agreements entered into among the States.

Therefore, the governors' conference strongly urges that the Congress take prompt action granting consent to interstate compacts now pending before it, and that in the future there be enacted general consent in advance legislation permitting the States to enter into agreements among themselves in broad fields of action for which the States have primary responsibility under our Federal Constitution.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

The governors' conference recalls the extreme difficulty which the States encountered in securing the return of the State employment services following their "temporary" federalization during World War II. We now note there is legislation pending in Congress, H. R. 5044, which would permanently transfer the State employment services to the United States Department of Labor. The governors' conference is strongly opposed to any Federal legislation designed to accomplish this purpose.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The governors' conference has taken no position on the advisability or propriety of publicizing welfare rolls. The governors' conference is, however, unanimous in declaring that the publicizing of welfare rolls is a matter for determination by the individual States.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The last four meetings of the governors' conference have recommended passage of statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska. The governors' conference again urges prompt action by the Congress to permit these two Territories to achieve statehood.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Attorney General's Conference on organized crime, the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, and the American Bar Association Commission on Organized Crime have produced reports analyzing the problem of crime control and pointing to remedies. Some States have taken action to strengthen State and local law enforcement.

In order that States may be assisted in taking steps to control such organized crime as may exist within their borders, the governors' conference requests the drafting committee of the Council of State Governments to prepare specific drafts of suggested State legislation designed to remedy any present deficiencies.

We insist, however, that the prime responsibility for the elimination of such evils as may exist lies in the vigilance of local law enforcement officials.

It is the sense of the governors' conference that public concern for local law enforcement should be invigorated by every legitimate means to combat the sinister menace of commercialized crime.

CRITICAL MATERIALS

Resolved, That the problem of procurement and allocation of critical materials, including particularly structural steel for hospitals, schools, public institutions, and highways, be referred to the executive committee of the governors' conference with a request that, consistent with the requirements of the national defense, appropriate action be taken looking toward the furnishing of such ma-

terials to the several States as quickly as practicable.

A motion made by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, seconded by Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, and passed unanimously by the governors' conference at the executive business session on October 3, 1951: "I move that the chairman of the governors' conference be authorized to appoint a special committee to confer with appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States for the purpose of securing the creation of a commission and appropriate formula, designed to promote a return to a working federalism with an accompanying clarification and simplification in the Federal-State and local relations, insuring a substantial reduction in the total cost of administering government while promoting greater efficiency and better service to the public and between various levels of Government."

General Overcomes His Modesty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "General Overcomes His Modesty," written by Mr. Lowell Mellett, and published in today's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

G. NERA... OVERCOMES HIS MODESTY—TILLS AMERICAN LEGION MUCH BIGGER AND BETTER STORY THAN HE TOLD BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE LAST SPRING

(By Lowell Mellett)

If you are one of those who in the heat of argument sometimes say General McCarthy when they mean General MacArthur or Senator MacArthur when they mean Senator McCarthy, don't feel too bad about it. It is easy to get the two confused at times. That is not merely because the names sound so much alike. It is also because the men themselves sound so much alike when their voices run away with them.

For example, down in Miami the other day General McCarthy—I mean Senator MacArthur—no, I mean, well you know who I mean, the general—the general was making a speech to the American Legion. It was the sort of passionate self-justification that has become familiar, but, carried away by the cheers of his former companions in arms, he added something new. He said:

"There is little doubt that the yielding of Formosa and the seating of China in the United Nations was fully planned when I called upon the enemy commander in Korea on March 24 to meet me in the field to arrange armistice terms."

"The opposition I expressed to yielding Formosa and seating Red China, with the overwhelming support it received from the American people, unquestionably wrecked the secret plan to yield on these issues as the price of peace."

President Truman, asked about this at his press conference, said the general's statement was not based on fact and that the general knew it was not. There the matter might have rested, with some people believing the President and some believing the general. But someone in the Washington

bureau of the New York Times remembered testimony of the general in the hearings of the Senate Armed Forces and Foreign Relations Committees last spring when the general's summary dismissal was being investigated. The cause for the dismissal, it will be recalled, was the general's personal peace offer and ultimatum addressed to the Communist commander. It was charged that this message of the general not only was couched in language that was certain to cause its rejection, but that it jumped the gun on a planned peace proposal by all of the nations engaged in the Korean campaign and thereby destroyed the possibility of making such a proposal.

In the record of the hearings the Times man found that Senator MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, asked the general if his action could be considered in violation of administration policies. That, of course, would apply to any secret as well as nonsecret plans. The general—and this was only a matter of weeks after the disturbing incident and while all the surrounding circumstances must have been fresh in his mind—replied: "I don't believe there is the slightest validity in that comment What I said seemed to me to be in complete support of everything the administration was desirous of doing, with every directive outlining the missions that we had to consummate."

So the general last April thought that his bold bit of insubordination was in complete harmony with the administration's plans. Now he thinks it was something much bigger and braver, a one-man wrecking operation on a nefarious "secret plan." In other words, he confesses to being a greater hero than even he realized at the time or, in his modesty, cared to admit to the Senate committee.

Let's see if Senator McCARTHY can tie that.

Nevada's Place in America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr MALONE. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the winning essay in the senior division of the State-wide American Legion Essay Contest in Nevada. It is entitled "Nevada's Place in America Today," and was written by Robert Quilan, a graduate of the 1951 class at Carson City, Nev., high school.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEVADA'S PLACE IN AMERICA TODAY

I am the voice of Nevada, listen to me, America. Although my population is not as great as that of many other States, I still have an important role in this country.

My towering mountains, spacious deserts, and colorful bodies of water, add to the scenic beauty and help make me a popular tourist State. Some of my other attractions are short residence requirements for divorce, historical monuments, Lehman Caves, Lake Tahoe, Reno, the biggest little city in the world, and projects such as Hoover Dam and Ruth Copper Pit.

Keep listening America, and I'll tell you my history. I was born in 1864, just 87 years ago, and since that time, I have become more and more prominent in the eyes

of the United States. I first came into the limelight with my abundance of mineral deposits. Lately, however, agriculture and cattle raising have surpassed mining as my most vital business.

I pride myself on having no sales tax or inheritance tax. I depend on my existence through taxes received from gambling and property.

In the political field I have two very able Senators fighting for my cause at all times. Both hold very prominent positions in Senate committees at the present. They are GEORGE W. MALONE and PAT MCCARRAN.

Recently I have received more acclaim from the fact that my desert was used as an atomic testing ground for new atomic weapons. I was further honored when Great Britain asked to use some of my vast territory for her research tests also. These tests were conducted on my desert near Las Vegas, one of my prized possessions.

I hope to become even more prominent in the eyes of the people of this country in the near future and compare favorably with the best of all the other States.

Housing in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Friday, October 19, 1951:

COURT IN BOSTON TO SETTLE DISPUTE BETWEEN PUERTO RICO AND UNITED STATES BUILDER—ISLAND GOVERNOR REFUSES TO GRANT TAX EXEMPTION

(By W. Clifford Harvey)

By some strange quirk in the administration of Federal jurisdiction, the future of housing and slum clearance in Puerto Rico seems about to be settled in no other place than Boston.

Just why the Federal court in Boston should be asked to decide a housing controversy between the Government of Puerto Rico and a South Carolina builder operating in the island possession is one of those things that dates back to earlier American justice.

"Maybe it seemed the right thing to do back about the turn of the century," declared a Boston court authority, "to give Boston appellate jurisdiction over the island of Puerto Rico. By the same token, Philadelphia has appellate jurisdiction over the Virgin Islands."

BUILDER WELCOMED

When Leonard D. Long, of Charleston, S. C., was selected by the Federal Housing Administration to mass produce houses in Puerto Rico the island's governor, Jesus T. Piñero, welcomed him with Latin enthusiasm. Mr. Long had no way of knowing that a new governor would step in and attempt to block his work.

The Federal court of Boston now must decide whether Luis Muñoz-Marín and his one-party government now in power has the right to set aside the provisions of the previous governor under whom Mr. Long has been building houses. One of these provisions is vitally important—tax exemption for housing.

It all started when the Piñero government looked to Washington for help in solv-

ing its postwar housing shortages. Washington, in turn, looked to Mr. Long, who had built whole cities for war personnel in this country.

PERSUADED TO STAY

In 1947, he completed his first development in Puerto Rico and considered his mission accomplished—that of erecting 52,000 houses in the face of impractical building codes, official government opposition, foreign language barriers, and primitive conditions contingent upon an alien land.

None of these obstacles would have been serious in the United States. But in Puerto Rico they were nearly disastrous.

Yet, having finished his initial mission, Mr. Long was persuaded to stay on by the Piñero government, talking of bigger and better housing projects. From this came his second project—Puerto Nevo—a city of 4,428 houses and 35,000 persons rising from the levels of a cow pasture.

Mr. Long has convinced Governor Piñero that this project of homes selling for only \$3,995 without any down payment, and carried for \$30 a month, was feasible only if the builder could avail himself of a new island law permitting tax exemption.

SHIFT IN GOVERNORS

Before the project could be completed, Governor Marín was elected to office and Mr. Long's path became beset with new obstacles. The new governor did not favor Mr. Long. He has refused to honor Mr. Long's petition for tax exemption, as approved by the previous governor.

So, Mr. Long has gone to court. His case is being carefully watched throughout the United States by American businesses that have contemplated the opening of branches and new plants on the island.

Suit or no suit, however, Mr. Long's achievements in Puerto Rico have been amazing. Through mass production methods, he has achieved a rate of 30 new houses every day, each consisting of two bedrooms, combination living-dining room, kitchen, bath, and porch.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FROM FHA

His apartment houses in four cities have swimming pools, restaurants, entertainment centers, snack shops, air conditioning, lounges, elevators, penthouses, incinerators, telephone, and electric services. He has brought \$50,000,000 in FHA expenditures to the island possession.

He has built 100 miles of sidewalks, 55 miles of paved streets, and 40 miles of water lines. He has used 3,000,000 square yards of plaster, 75,000 doors, 90,000 windows, and imported enough steel rod to build a fence around the entire island.

Mr. Long's basic philosophy is simple. "If a home is made available to the people at prices they can afford, they become capitalists," he said. "This means they become good citizens, more immune to the doctrines of communism and other isms tending to undermine progress and social security."

Soil Conservation Districts' Growing Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. H. Bennett, Chief, United States

Soil Conservation Service, at the annual meeting, Florida Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Marianna-Graceville, Fla., September 19, 1951:

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS' GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

It is a pleasure to be a guest today of you Florida soil conservation district supervisors here in Graceville. It is stimulating to meet this way with those who hold such an important and responsible position as you, individually and as a group, in the economy of your own communities, the State, and the Nation.

It is my conviction, as I have stated repeatedly, that the democratically constituted soil conservation districts represent not only the greatest land movement of all time but the most promising vehicle for taking advantage of the powerful force of landowners and operators working together as they do in the districts. It is through your democratic units of State Government that the soil and water conservation job on the farmlands of the Nation is being done in an effective and lasting manner—and in an economical manner—as never before achieved anywhere. The districts are in an ideal position for landowners and operators to work together and take advantage of counsel and assistance of one another, as well as of various local, State, Federal, and private sources.

This practical and realistic approach to the tremendous conservation job which is still ahead of us is most important. Our soil-conservation program is growing. It is not static. But it must continue to grow, and we must be capable of growing with it. My own observations convince me that, with few if any exceptions, those who are charged with supervising soil-conservation district affairs are entirely capable in this respect.

That is why I have selected the growing responsibilities of the soil-conservation districts as one of the main points of my remarks. Actually, the degree to which the supervisors of soil conservation districts exercise their responsibilities of leadership and direction in developing the programs and applying the work of their districts is of utmost concern to the Soil Conservation Service as an assisting technical agency. That, of course, is because we have no authority in any district, and we have no desire to run the affairs of districts, even though our ability to help get the conservation job done depends directly on efficient district management.

We need go no farther than Jackson County here to see how the soil-and-water conservation program has enjoyed a healthy and successful growth from the soil-erosion control demonstration project days of the 1930's to today's soil-conservation district operations. Jackson County leaders well may be proud of the fact that they and their neighbors in Holmes County voted the first soil-conservation district in Florida, the Holmes Creek district, and that the Chipola River district—your annual meeting host this year—likewise was one of the early soil-conservation districts to be organized in the State. From what I have had time to see in this area, as well as on our way across north Florida from Jacksonville through Tallahassee, your accomplishments in getting conservation on the land have been substantial. The main thing now, of course, is to push ahead vigorously with this work so well begun.

You conservation leaders of Florida all are to be congratulated on the progress of your district organization, with approximately 90 percent of all the farms in the State in soil conservation districts by July 1 this year, and 89 percent of all its farmland in districts. There is, of course, no point in my undertaking to review what you have been doing here in Florida; but I do believe it is worth

while to look for a moment at the encouraging record of soil conservation district accomplishment, Nation-wide.

By July 1, 1951, for example, more than a million (1,000,000) complete farm conservation plans had been prepared by district farmers and assisting Soil Conservation Service technicians. These plans provided for the needed conservation treatment and use of 275,000,000 acres of the Nation's farm and ranch lands. More than 140,000,000 acres already had received this combined conservation treatment in districts by that date. And detailed conservation surveys had been made on more than 376,000,000 acres.

It is useful to keep this record in mind, not because of any self-satisfaction in what we have done (although we are proud of it), but because it is a measure of our ability for future accomplishment. We admittedly are not yet moving fast enough with the soil and water conservation job, and are still suffering heavy losses of soil. But we are, nevertheless, moving ahead at a rate which is not at all discouraging. Moreover, we are now in a position to move faster, and we expect to move faster—within the limits of technical manpower and other available facilities—in getting conservation treatment on the land, through the intensified cooperation which has been provided with the agricultural conservation program through memorandum 1278, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture February 15, 1951, and in other ways with which you are familiar as a result of the accelerated planning and treatment procedures which already have been initiated.

As well as we can determine from our own Soil Conservation Service figures, the conservation job has been completed—up to the stage of maintenance and improvement—on 21.4 percent of the Nation's farmland needing protection. This does not include the spread of practices where, for instance, farmers look over the fence of their neighbors and seeing successful conservation work go ahead with similar practices themselves on their own land. We know there has been a great deal of this spread of practices but we don't know how much. Nor do our figures include the areas of grass established and other conservation practices farmers have put into effect under the agricultural conservation program in addition to the soil conservation district work. So, in my opinion, at least 25 percent of the job actually has been completed, and possibly somewhat more than that, although I am not prepared to say precisely.

An encouraging aspect with respect to the rate of progress is that it is increasing progressively. For example, in 1942, basic conservation measures were applied to something more than 5 million acres; whereas, in 1950, the same kind of treatment was applied to 26,000,000 acres. This increase was about 380 percent—nearly 5 times as much work done—with operating facilities increased for the Soil Conservation Service by only 50 percent. Where this complete type of conservation work has been carried out, as I don't need to tell most of you here today, per-acre yields have been increased almost invariably. This increase usually runs from about one-third up to 100 percent, or even more, over the Nation. The work is paying good dividends in the form of increased income taxes from these increased per-acre yields. Nobody has ever done this kind of work before.

You may be interested in some figures we have assembled, showing the consistent progress of accomplishment in soil conservation districts, the few oldest of which have not been in operation long enough yet, of course, to have completed basic treatment on all their lands. We find, however, that some already are starting to plan for celebrating 100-percent completion of their basic programs, with 16 districts having fin-

ished more than 80 percent of their work up to the stage of maintenance and improvement. Meanwhile, approximately 150 districts have completed 50 to 97 percent of their work, and approximately 300 districts have finished 25 to 50 percent. Among the younger districts, which naturally comprise the greater part of the total number, approximately 800 have done 10 to 25 percent of the basic job, and up to 10 percent has been completed in the other active districts, including some very new ones (approximately 1,100 districts in this group).

Looking ahead with respect to time that may be required to complete the job for the Nation, you may be interested in knowing that the total job (farmland area according to 1945 census) amounted to 1,098,000,000 acres, not counting roads, building sites, etc. Land treated for soil and water conservation, plus the equivalent in acres covered by our surveys and the equivalent in acres covered by our farm-planning work, by July 1, 1951, amounted to 235,000,000 acres, according to our records. This leaves the uncompleted job at something like 863,000,000 acres, as roughly estimated.

The original area of 1,098,000,000 acres consists of the following classes of land, as computed by extending soil conservation surveys to the problem areas in soil conservation.

Land in farms (1945 census), excluding farmsteads, roads, lanes, etc.

	Approximate acreage of land capability classes	Percent
I.....	61,000,000	5.6
II.....	210,000,000	19.1
III.....	242,000,000	22.0
IV.....	107,000,000	9.7
V.....	49,000,000	4.5
VI.....	197,000,000	17.9
VII.....	227,000,000	20.7
VIII.....	5,000,000	.5
Total.....	1,098,000,000	-----

When we carried our soil-conservation techniques from the soil-conservation experiment station plots out to the operating farmers within watersheds through erosion control demonstration projects, selected cooperatively with the States, we found in many instances that the farmers had been waiting for just this long-needed conservation information and technical assistance. As fast as they got acquainted with the work we were doing, they wanted more and more of it as fast as they could get it. At first—and quite naturally—they were rather slow to move; but now there are on file with the soil-conservation districts of the country nearly 200,000 more farmer requests for conservation farm plans than it has been possible to develop immediately. Here in Florida, I understand, you have 2,350 applications ahead. That is a healthy situation, but it serves to emphasize the growing responsibility of supervisors, technicians, and everybody else concerned to redouble our efforts in striving for the single goal of complete conservation on every acre of land needing it, in Florida and everywhere else.

I hardly need to remind anyone here today how many and varied are the problems which have confronted us and which we will continue to face in carrying this vital conservation job on to successful completion. By its very nature, the task requires the best brains and energies which everybody involved or affected has to contribute—farmers and their districts, State and Federal agricultural agencies, private interests ranging from banks to earth-moving contractors, from newspapers and radio stations to schools and churches. You district supervisors, as independently responsible officials of the district units of State government, are in the

most advantageous position possible for drawing on the assistance and support available from the various sources—extension and other educational institutions; service clubs and other urban interests; local, State, and Federal governmental avenues of assistance, and so on.

When Congress passed the first national soil conservation act and changed the name of the Soil Erosion Service to the Soil Conservation Service in 1935, we in the service, and in the Department of Agriculture, reached the decision that two main things were necessary to insure adequate progress: (1) that the technical services of trained conservationists should be made available to all farmers desiring such help; and (2) that some type of local government unit should be established to assist in bringing about necessary cooperative action and to place responsibility for getting the job done and maintained on the local farm people who are intimately associated with the land problem. Anybody who has taken the trouble to observe or to learn anything at all about the operation of the soil conservation districts since 1937 must agree, I am sure, that the soundness of this democratic concept has been amply borne out in their performance—thanks to the intelligent, responsible leadership of progressive landowners and operators like yourselves, the country over.

There is no use closing our eyes to the fact, however, that there still is room for improvement in many places. I am referring to the leadership and responsibility that district supervisors and farmers in the districts generally can and should, I think, exercise in order to assure maximum, economical results in their district programs. I do not mean to imply that anybody expects the district supervisors and cooperators to do all the thinking. But you can't hope to have the best possible help and service from those assigned to help you without the best possible direction on the part of the supervisors themselves. We must make the most advantageous use of the time and skills of the technicians working with the districts. It should be seen to that these men do not waste time looking after minor details—making unnecessary repeat trips to individual farms on trivial questions, etc.—while somebody else's farm planning and application of conservation practices wait.

The present period of emergency greatly increase the pressure and responsibility on all of us. What some people still don't seem to realize is the fact that men with guns and bullets can't fight without food, and that there cannot be enough food from poor land.

The soil-conservation districts—every supervisor, every cooperator, and every potential cooperator—should redouble their efforts in safeguarding our productive land. Every dollar of Government money available for soil and water conservation—whether from Federal, State, or other sources—should be budgeted and spent so as to make sure of its utmost contribution to real and lasting conservation.

Meetings like this one here at Marianna are important and constructive. I have always found such State district association meetings to be hard-working sessions by serious men with specific plans and purposes. That is why you are spending your time here devising means for speeding up the job of conservation, surveying, planning, and treatment. But, as I said at the national association meeting in Oklahoma City last February, the worth of no association or other organization can be measured on the basis of its occasional meetings alone, even when such a meeting is enhanced by a tasty barbecue dinner. Your association, and every board of supervisors in it, will need to be fully active and vocal 12 months in the year. There is great need to get out and get things done. You have a golden op-

portunity in this respect, with so many educational, planning, and other tasks awaiting your attention and action.

One of the best ways we have found for speeding up the application of the basic measures in a given soil conservation district is for every farmer to learn as quickly as possible how to carry out as much of his conservation work as he possibly can, and how to keep up his structures and maintain his other conservation developments, with a minimum of technical assistance. In that way particularly now when the time of our limited number of experienced personnel is so fully occupied in furnishing technical assistance to the increasing list of soil conservation districts and ACP participants—each technician can be freed for that much more new planning and assistance in new land treatment.

Also highly important in speeding up the conservation job is the teamwork of cooperating district farmers through neighbor group action. Natural groups of farmers within districts all over the country are doing this by planning together and working together, lending one another machinery and seed, and cooperating in conservation work in many other ways. The Soil Conservation Service is now working with some 20,000 of these natural groups. In a great many instances these groups are coming together in planning and application meetings, and they are helping the district supervisors and their own neighbors in routing equipment, distributing seed, and meeting seasonal farm needs. The more they work together, I heard a member of such a group say recently, the better they understand one another, the more cooperative they become, and the greater they enjoy life.

Meanwhile, the educational job which still confronts us as soil conservationists and conservation farmers is tremendously important. Not only is there the task of getting everybody to know about the problem and the generous and continuing returns that are being derived from conservation farming, but the job of getting them to understand that the work is still far from completion and demands our continuing best efforts. One of the gravest dangers is that of people being misled into the adoption of substitutes, short cuts, or panaceas for genuine soil conservation. By this time everyone should know there is no substitute, no panacea, no short cut. You will have to do the job yourselves—you can't hire substitutes.

It is important that you district supervisors in particular, as well as all of us who are engaged in soil-conservation work in any way, keep always in mind various basic facts which bear on our common problem and so largely determine our success in solving it. First among them is the basic principle that every acre must be treated according to need and used according to capability. And we need to be alert to certain misconceptions that still seem to prevail in the thinking of some people and groups, and be prepared to help dispel them. Some of these, briefly stated, are:

1. That soil conservation is of secondary importance, has already been taken care of, or can be postponed.
2. That there are short cuts to conservation, that farmers can do all the necessary conservation work without technical assistance, or that district farm plans are too technical for farmers.
3. That soil conservation costs more than it is worth.
4. That we have all the good land we need.
5. That soil erosion is an inevitable part of Nature's scheme.
6. That the job will never get done at the rate we are going.
7. That they themselves, or others that they recommend, can do the job better than it's being done.

8. That soil-conservation districts are not needed.

It is an essential part of your job and mine to be constantly on the alert and to acquaint farmers, business people, educators—everybody—with the true facts of erosion and conservation at every opportunity. We have, as indicated, made remarkable strides in soil and water conservation in recent years; but we still have not closed the gap between the rate of soil loss and the rate at which we are safeguarding our land through soil conservation. We are still losing hundreds of thousands of acres of land every year—probably not less than 500,000 acres—through the process of unnecessary erosion which damages many areas beyond further practical, immediate cultivation. That is because we are not yet practicing true conservation on all our land.

I mention these facts, not to discount in any way the fine progress that is being made, but by way of emphasizing the fact that we cannot at any time afford to be too complacent about the problem, so long as the main job still lies ahead. There is no excuse for our not going ahead with the job, at the fastest possible rate consistent with doing the work right and within the limits of available facilities. Today, we cannot plead ignorance of either the problem of erosion and water waste or effective methods of dealing with the problem. We have measured the size of the problem, located and mapped the various problem areas, and perfected the conservation tools for coping with the problem.

We cannot be satisfied with current progress, and must constantly seek improvements for continued acceleration of the conservation work. As I say, we have greatly increased progress, particularly in recent years, and propose doing everything in our power to maintain this progressive advancement. It is my belief, based on experience, that we could, with adequate facilities, get the job of applying the basic conservation measures to the land completed in about 20 years. After that, there would remain the continuing task of maintenance and improvement.

Right now—and probably as much as at any other time—there is much that all of us need to be thinking about, talking about, and doing something about, both as district officials and as assisting technicians. I feel that the importance of positive and vigorous leadership within the soil-conservation districts in bringing conservation treatment at the earliest practicable date to every acre of land still needing it cannot be overemphasized. This, of course, is neither more nor less than fulfillment of the original soil-conservation districts concept.

The Soil Conservation Service, for its part, works primarily with your districts at your request; and it cooperates, in turn, with the different agencies and groups with which you find it helpful to work. I am sure you are aware, for example, of the cooperative work which we have engaged in with the different branches of the Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, and with the contributions the research and findings at the stations have made to development of a sounder and more adaptable soil-erosion control and water-management program in many instances. Similarly, as you know, the work of the Soil Conservation Service nurseries, which have produced various outstanding results in conservation grass and legume development, is in cooperation with the experiment station and others at the agricultural college and branch stations.

I wish I had time to talk more about some of these developments—such as the discovery and spread of the Pensacola strain of Bahia grass throughout the Southeast, or the similar spread of blue lupine through the activities of the Soil Conservation Service and the soil-conservation districts of the South. A small supply of blue lupine seed was first obtained by the Service from the experiment station at Quincy, Fla. Your districts have

proved to be a most efficient medium for making available to large numbers of farmers over wide areas such highly worth-while contributions to improved agriculture. Doing this constitutes another of your important responsibilities.

Before I left Washington, I was looking over a number of reports from Florida on specific and outstanding accomplishments by different districts, farmer groups, and individual farmers in your districts—in group-drainage and water-control projects, sprinkler irrigation field trials, planting citrus groves on the contour, and various profitable experiences with grasses and legumes. They all are excellent and most encouraging in pointing the way in which your districts are moving. You know about such examples and experiences in your own districts, and I only hope you will not be at all hesitant in getting out and telling other people about these good works.

I know you are going to meet these and your other growing responsibilities which now have come to be expected of soil-conservation districts everywhere. As your Program for Greater Service sets out, the success of your districts depends on "the active initiative exerted by the members of their governing bodies with the assistance of all local leaders." We may sum up the overall job that has to be done something like this:

1. Complete the national land inventory at the earliest date facilities will permit
2. Complete the organization of the Nation's agricultural lands into soil-conservation districts and strengthen district responsibility and work with a scientifically developed soil-conservation plan for every farm in the country.
3. Urge active participation of all interested rural and urban groups—business, professional, and patriotic—in achieving Nation-wide conservation.
4. Make a real conservationist out of every farmer in the country.

That is a big order, but I am more confident than I have ever been before that we are not going to let anything interfere with getting the complete conservation job finished in reasonable time—in Florida and throughout the Nation.

Final budget figures, as finally submitted, including some extras totaled \$103,610,000,000 and the appropriations were \$4,522,000,000 below the President's budget estimates.

The House of Representatives, including the House Appropriations Committee and especially the Republican members of the committee and of the House of Representatives, have had a very considerable part in keeping the appropriations down, and I feel that they are entitled to great credit for it. The House of Representatives itself can feel very proud of the reductions that they have made. It has contributed very largely to the solvency of the United States.

I believe that now it can safely be said that the revenues of the Government will show at least \$12,000,000,000

increase in the fiscal year 1952 over fiscal year 1951 resulting very largely from the inflation which the President has promoted. With the new tax bill the very least that I can see for the net revenues is \$65,000,000,000 and I expect it will be \$67,000,000,000.

While the expenditures will be reduced as a result of the refusal of the Congress to give the President all the money he wanted and by reducing his estimates by \$4,552,000,000.

With the cuts that have been made in expenditures I believe that the President's estimate of expenditures of \$71,400,000,000 in January for the fiscal year 1952 will be reduced at least to \$65,000,000,000 and perhaps to \$63,000,000,000, and that we are unquestionably showing a surplus for the fiscal year 1952.

Appropriations comparisons, 1st sess., 82d Cong.

	As per original budget document	Request to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Public Law
1951 supplemental items, combined.....	\$10,951,581,848	\$7,317,400,734	\$6,942,452,523	\$6,874,776,642	\$6,808,581,632
1952 items*					
Disaster relief.....	15,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Treasury-Post Office.....	2,956,425,000	2,958,125,000	2,918,827,000	2,921,518,344	2,928,398,000
Labor-Federal Security.....	2,776,801,060	2,733,203,760	2,642,166,361	2,528,794,386	2,512,954,270
Interior.....	564,717,000	559,286,000	496,764,500	518,065,353	511,811,816
Independent Offices.....	6,640,344,465	6,837,077,465	6,144,549,355	6,212,100,643	6,162,825,175
Agriculture.....	898,161,638	820,005,546	717,295,233	826,578,130	802,988,626
District of Columbia.....	12,000,000	12,000,000	10,800,000	12,000,000	11,400,000
Civil Functions.....	611,950,000	640,647,843	611,427,400	638,578,213	597,262,713
Legislative.....	73,344,906	68,953,320	60,335,370	73,820,507	73,805,705
State-Justice-Commerce, etc.....	1,404,662,641	1,256,236,141	1,045,940,115	1,045,452,863	1,042,867,887
National Defense.....	57,577,325,700	57,577,325,700	56,034,717,200	61,103,656,030	56,939,568,030
Defense Construction.....	52,512,609,000	4,555,594,158	4,186,321,758	3,760,637,550	4,890,299,392
Foreign Aid.....	9,544,476,271	8,894,255,086	8,849,255,086	8,575,128,706	8,495,631,282
Flood Rehabilitation.....	400,000,000	400,000,000	53,440,000	53,440,000	53,440,000
First supplemental.....	3,345,000,000	2,302,871,116	1,580,587,316	1,745,393,006	1,679,246,076
Second supplemental.....	150,000,000	590,901,412	242,036,212	269,560,716	256,110,716
Items not acted on.....	555,000,000				
Permanent, net.....	6,068,835,175	6,068,835,175	6,068,835,175	6,068,835,175	6,068,835,175
Total, 1952.....	98,144,217,156	96,262,967,732	91,597,270,091	96,368,848,642	92,240,472,793
Total, 1951 supplemental and 1952.....	109,095,799,004	103,610,368,466	98,539,631,614	103,213,625,274	99,058,054,395

Appropriation Bills of the Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request granted today, I submit a table showing in detail the situation with reference to the appropriation bills that have been considered by the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

I show separately on that table the items that were supplemental or deficiency to the 1951 budget.

It will be noted that the over-all budget estimates as submitted in January called for budget estimates then submitted or to follow during the session of \$109,095,000,000 in appropriations or reappropriations. The public laws which have been enacted call for \$99,058,054,395 or \$10,037,000,000 below the President's January figures.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I make no secret of the fact that I am very partial to the Jesuits.

I consider it a privilege to have been educated by the Jesuits in high school in New Orleans and to have graduated from the Jesuit High School in New Orleans with the class of 1920.

I believe therefore it is also understandable that I feel great pride in any accomplishment by a student or graduate of the Jesuit High School in New Orleans.

Recently, a young Jesuit student, George A. Frilot III, brought distinction to himself and honor to his school by being declared the winner of an oratorical contest conducted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans and called, I Speak for Democracy.

So impressed was I with the address delivered by this young man that I ob-

tained a copy of his remarks and now bring them to your attention.

I only wish more young men and more young women would have comparable appreciation of just what democracy means.

From this young man have come the following words of wisdom:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By George A. Frilot III, Jesuit High School, New Orleans, La.)

This is the voice of Tyranny, speaking for democracy. I feel that I can speak for democracy, for I have known it since my first existence—known it as an enemy. I have hated democracy, and I have fought it. I have been the aggressor. I have routed armies and enslaved nations. I have plundered homes, seized fortunes, and from millions I have taken life. But I have failed. History will curse my name. I have learned my lesson, and learned it the hard way.

But the memory of my past will forever haunt me. I need but look back a few years, to a time when I had seized power in a free country, by a free ballot.

The place was Germany, the year was 1933. The rights and liberties of 80,000,000 people were jeopardized, but no one would act decisively. It was here that I began my work in the personage of Adolph Hitler. I had Hitler persuade Hindenburg that the country could be saved only if he, the leader of the Nazi party, were appointed chancellor of

Germany. By means of lies and treachery, it was accomplished. But I was not securely in power. Hitler's party did not have a majority in the Reichstag. So, a week before the 1933 elections, the Reichstag building was burned down. Hitler blamed his opposition—and the country believed him. It was 5 days later that the German people marched up to the polls and by an overwhelming majority gave Hitler and his party control of Germany. My reign had begun. I ruled Germany with a dictatorship, and I had gained my rule by the free vote of a free people. I had conquered Germany from within her bounds, and I had done so through the legal ballot of an irresponsible electorate.

There is no time now, no need, to recount the tragic story of what Hitlerism has since meant to Germany and to the world. It has been told and retold on the free press everywhere. It has been written in blood over the face of the world.

Think, America, think of it! You live in a democracy. There is no absolute power packed into the hands of an individual. Yours is a Government of the people, by the people, for the people. Yours is the finished product of western civilization. Your democracy has been founded on respect for the dignity of the human person. It means equal opportunity for all. It means the full enjoyment of every civil liberty: freedom of worship, of speech, of press, and of election. It means a government that is the servant of the people, not its master.

But you take too many things for granted. If only your family were suddenly transferred to a country ruled by me, tyranny, you would realize how essential these taken-for-granted rights are. You would find life a long nightmare of lingering fear, fear of the consequence of an impulsive word or even a timid remark, fear that a forbidden book might be found in your possession; fear that something you had done which was lawful yesterday might be a crime tomorrow, and one for which you would be tried in a secret court, without jury, without witnesses, without hope of acquittal.

You have the Bill of Rights. It secures the free ground you tread, the free air you breathe. There is not an instant by day or night that these hard-won rights do not protect you and guard you in every move you make, every word you speak, every thought you think. Guard this wealth of freedom with the same spirit of courage that moved Washington and Franklin, Jefferson and Hamilton. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. I know, I, Tyranny, democracy's antagonist, her mortal enemy, her very contradiction—I know only too well. That is why—I speak for democracy.

Hemorrhage From a Sore Toe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hemorrhage From a Sore Toe," which was published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, October 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEMORRHAGE FROM A SORE TOE

For more than 12 years the Texas-rich Jesse Jones was pleased to lend his name as RFC

Director and Secretary of Commerce to the Roosevelt administration. He abided until he was asked to abide not. Whereupon, sour as Cactus Jack Garner, he sulked home to regard his navel and his sore toe. The result of these galled meditations is Jones' memoirs. It is an unsparing attack on the man he called Chief for so many years.

So much to say howdy to Jones' spiteful motives. If he were as righteous as he protests, one wonders why he didn't delouse himself with a whoop and a bellow at the time instead of abiding the evil until decommissioned and until it became virtually a convention for men of his bent and circumstance to scorn Roosevelt.

But the fact that the book is bound in wormwood covers has nothing to do with whether Jones' allegations are true or false. Without such hemorrhages from sore toes neither newspaper exposés nor history could be written.

One chapter is entitled "F. D. R. Asks Us To Buy the Empire State Building." This building was a white elephant, partially owned by the Democrats Al Smith and Raskob. Jones testifies that FDR wrote him:

"We all know that the * * * building is a losing proposition, but on the other side, it is ideally located for a central office building."

Jones said he thought the price too high, and despite Roosevelt's spoken wish "to do something for Al Smith," evaded the use of RFC funds to bail the building out.

Jones' account of this incident may be the precise truth. But it is not entirely in harmony with an equally reliable account, Charles Michelson's *The Ghost Talks*. Michelson was the famous publicity chief for the Democratic National Committee. *The Ghost Talks* says:

"A friend came to me with a mass of figures and charts. * * * He demonstrated to me that the Government could save a huge amount in rentals by exchanging its various New York offices for a centralized headquarters in the big city, and he proposed that the Government buy the Empire State Building, at a figure \$7,000,000 less than it had cost to erect that white elephant."

"It sounded like a good business proposition, even though he offered me a \$50,000 commission if the sale went through."

"'Change that,' I told him 'to have 10 men contribute \$5,000 each to the Democratic campaign fund, and I'll see what I can do.'"

"Negotiations * * * were barren. * * * So I finally got to Jesse Jones and told him the story. He thought that in time something could be worked out, with mortgages or some other of the banker expedients, but * * * nothing happened. * * * The Government did not buy the * * * building, but rented some acres of the vacant floor space—and our campaign fund did not get the \$50,000."

That account does not discredit Jones' account, but it puts it in another light. Michelson wrote his book after his retirement and he had a rather neutral feeling about Roosevelt, admiring chiefly as the greatest of circus barkers. *The Ghost Talks* relates another story bearing on the Roosevelt ethics:

"We did not take all the money that was offered us. For example, one day an eminent gentleman called on me and told me he would produce \$200,000 for our campaign funds. * * * I mentioned it to the President. * * *

"'You know,' [Roosevelt] said, 'that that gentleman is a candidate for a high diplomatic position?'"

"'I believe he is.'"

"'Well, you know he is not going to be appointed to that place?'"

"'I know it now.'"

"'If the committee [Roosevelt went on] took that money he would have a right to as-

sume that he had bought something. So you will have to get along without it.'"

"I did not communicate any further with my \$200,000 man."

Thus the Roosevelt haters can gorge Jones' defamatory stories to their comfort, the fervent Roosevelt idolaters can cite the other kind to support their fixed notions, and those who are interested in true judgment will conclude that in general both stories are true mirrors of Roosevelt—that he was this way one day, that way the next day * * * like all great men and little men made of flesh.

Suggested Abolition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 2167, which I introduced September 22, and which provides for the abolition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, I should like permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time the testimony of Mr. Robert Yellowtail, of Lodge Grass, Mont., on February 26, 1948, when he appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in hearings on S. 2037, a bill to transfer to the Territorial government of Alaska the administration within such Territory of laws relating to Indians and for other purposes, and Senate Joint Resolution 162, a joint resolution to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1946—Forty-ninth Statutes, page 1250—and for other purposes. His testimony will be found on pages 334 to 339, inclusive, of the printed hearings.

Mr. Yellowtail, a Crow Indian, was formerly superintendent of the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana for 11 years.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT YELLOWTAIL, PAST SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. YELLOWTAIL. I would like to preface my impromptu remarks by telling the audience I was a superintendent in the Indian Service until 2 years ago, having been appointed shortly after President Roosevelt was inaugurated as President.

Naturally, I am acquainted with the problems on the questions being raised here, and I want to say to the committee in all fairness, that an Indian on an Indian reservation is a person with hardly any constitutional rights. Now that makes it pretty, pretty, pretty definite. An Indian on an Indian reservation cannot go to the superintendent of the reservation and secure his funds without his permission, Mr. Chairman. On an Indian reservation, an Indian's money is deposited to the credit of the superintendent of the Indian reservation and that superintendent or his many clerks in the Indian office keeps it in the Indian office and these are based on regulations in the Department of the Interior, having the force and effect of law. That Indian, Mr. Chairman, cannot go the superintendent of the department and demand his money without the superintendent's approval.

You can only find the counterpart to that power in Russia or in divided Germany or Italy, which we hope is being transformed.

Now, if that throws a little light on the subject—I make that assertion as one of the Government's employees who has not been out of the service over 2 years. I have a letter here on that subject that I would like to file with this committee. It is addressed to the Public Lands Committee, the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. Just let me read one or two things in it. Now, the different and many regulations, that is what he talked about a while ago, are as old as the Bureau itself, they are out of date, they take no cognizance of the Indians' individual rights or personal property. They give the superintendent absolute control of the people's money, authority for abuse, which is too great, and that is one of the complaints we are making to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress, to rectify the condition which Senator ECTON has stated here.

Now the property regulations that concern the land, the horses, that he talked about, your cattle and all that sort of thing—it is a crime and a shame in his case, and when an Indian—take myself for instance.

My deceased wife's allotment is an inherited allotment, and I have no authority to say who shall lease it up there without going to a superintendent, a total stranger, whom I never saw until a year ago and ask him in all humility can I lease that land up, and Mr. Superintendent, I think I can do just as well as you can do, and he is my successor.

Let me stop right there. I left the office, and the next day I had to go down and make that request of the superintendent who succeeded me. If that isn't an analogy that extends into the 7th degree, I want somebody in Washington to tell me.

We have to make that kind of request, and it is all found in your black book which I have found in the eleventh year as superintendent of the Crow Indian Reservation, the law and order book which he helped to formulate, perhaps.

Mr. COHEN. That was before my time.

Mr. YELLOWTAIL. And there is nothing more oppressive under the American flag than the treatment of the American Indians at this moment.

My mission here is to go before the Secretary of Interior and ask the Secretary of Interior, as the chief law officer of the Indian Bureau, "For goodness sake, in the interest of humanity, can't we be released from these iron-clad Stalinic regulations that they call Commissariats." And the flag that flies upon the Capitol Dome here, that says under the Constitution, every man shall have his day in court, every man shall have his personal rights, his property protected—that means absolutely nothing on an Indian reservation. When you come down to it, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is a dead document on an Indian reservation. Then it is time for a committee of this sort. Because under the law, Supreme Court Justice White, speaking to Chief Lone Wolf, said, " * * * we do not want you to understand as implying the United States Supreme Court shunned the question. Relief must be sought by appeal back to the body and not to the courts." That is this body—the Senate—and the House of Representatives. Therefore, we are here, American citizens, begging the Congress of the United States after two world wars, who furnished 50,000 soldiers and 1 soldier to put the flag on Mount Suribachi, that Pima Indian has no more right than the rest of us have here. The gentleman down in Oklahoma, who had the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded to him for annihilating a large German force single-handed, up here has no more right on an Indian reservation than the rest of us, and has no more

right than the rest of them, having served the Government.

I have no more right than the rest of them, having served the Government as one of its agents for 11 years. So when we come to those questions—this is an Indian document and I want to present it to the chairman of the committee at this time as a most appropriate document on this subject, and I am telling all Members of this Congress it is authentic.

(The document referred to above is as follows.)

"THE INDIAN BUREAU'S MANAGEMENT OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES"

“(Submitted by Robert Yellowtail)”

“Senator Moore, of Oklahoma, discussing this subject before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Public Lands Committee with respect of S. 405 said:

“For the last 15 years, the Indian Bureau has cost the taxpayers of this country approximately \$600,000,000, or an average of about \$40,000,000 a year. This Bureau is the trough at which about 11,000 Federal bureaucrats feed under the guise of supervising the lives of 390,000 people, 90 percent of whom are probably more capable of handling their own affairs than the bureaucrats.”

“The Seventy-eighth Congress made a survey of conditions among the Indians of the United States. The result of that survey is set forth in Report 310 of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee and is signed by Senators Elmer Thomas, Burton K. Wheeler, Dennis Chavez, and Henrik Shipstead. Under the heading, ‘The Indian Bureau Should Be Abolished,’ commencing on page 17, is the following statement of the committee:

“The further usefulness of the Indian Bureau has been challenged at various times during the past 50 years even by some of its own higher officials. Commissioner Rhodes was appointed in 1929 and proposed that he work himself out of a job by expediting the assumption of its functions by other departments of the Government. Certain well-informed Congressmen and others active in national life have challenged the further need for the Indian Bureau, but it has always been able to effect some compromise whereby it could continue and also become further entrenched and get an even greater portion of public funds and public services.

“The original purpose of the Indian Bureau was to fit the Indian into the commonwealth of citizenship, to help him to make adjustments to the developing situation in which they found themselves, and to help regulate governmental adjustments to them. It was intended as a service rather than as an administrative bureau. The Bureau was expected to recognize values in and to cooperate with missionary effort; to cooperate with the States and with the various functional divisions of the Federal Government in their relations to the Indians. It has few executive functions but gradually acquired such functions under a purpose which became dominating.

“As soon as it developed into a full-fledged administrative bureau, it began to set up functional divisions competing with missionary, State, and Federal authorities, functions, and sanctions; Indian schools were established, an Indian Land Division, Indian Inheritance, and other divisions were set up, until the Bureau became a miniature Federal organization. All of this made the Bureau functions more complex and completely clouded the original purpose which was to make the Indian a self-respecting, contributing citizen.”

“The Bureau has been concerned with building up a system instead of service; attempting to build self-perpetuating institutions, making material improvements for the Indian Service at the expense of Indian life;

furnishing physical relief that was not needed nearly so much as economic and civic encouragement; breaking down assisting agencies; segregating the Indian from the general citizenry; condemning the Indian to perpetual wardship; making the Indian the guinea pig for experimentation; grouping the Indians for convenience of supervision for which they are presumed to exist; tying him to the land in perpetuity; forcing a conventional type of education on him; attempting to compel all Indians to engage in agriculture and stock raising under the supervision of an extension department which is an end in itself.

“While congressional appropriations to the Indian Bureau hold the attention of the public, they are by no means the whole of the Bureau's resources for spending which may be listed under the following heads:

“1. Congressional appropriations to the Bureau from the United States Treasury.

“2. Indian tribal funds

“3. Permanent and indefinite appropriations from which the Bureau may use several million dollars annually.

“4. Transfers of funds from other Government agencies, including funds appropriated to the President and for the Office for Emergency Management. Such transfers to the Bureau have been enormous during the past 10 years. For instance \$19,034,550 from Public Works Administration alone in 1934. Other contributing agencies included Work Projects Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Farm Security Administration, Federal Emergency Relief Administration surplus relief, Emergency Conservation Works, and still others.

“5. Cooperative contributions from private foundations and institutions.

“Fair dealing by the Federal Government with the Indian tribes, and how shall we accomplish this, is the issue at the moment. The Supreme Court as long ago as 1886 spoke its mind upon the matter when it said ‘Because of the local ill feeling, the people of the States where they are found are often their deadliest enemies.’ *U. S. v. Kagama* (1886 118 U. S. 375, 384). We could go a step further and add. Because of the indifference, and often a hidden ill feeling generated by race hatred on the part of Indian Bureau officials and employees in the field and on Indian reservations and in reservation agency offices, who are paid from the people's Federal Treasury to minister to the needs and wants of the Indian people, there is now existing on nearly every Indian reservation in the United States, autocracy and tyranny of the fashion employed by Hitler and Stalin. The Indian soldiers who served in the Armed Forces and who helped to squash to earth tyranny, autocracy, and regimentation of the masses in foreign lands, returned to their homes on Indian reservations to find themselves face to face with the same kind of conditions under Indian Bureau rule.

“The Constitution with all of its guarantees of liberty, freedom, and home rule is a dead document and of no meaning on Indian reservations. Congressional awards and citations for heroism in the late war mean nothing to Indians on Indian reservations, as all must bow alike to the arbitrary dictum of reservation superintendents on every Indian reservation in the country. A winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor or the Indian Marine who assisted in hoisting the American flag on Iwo Jima means nothing to a reservation superintendent and his Indian Bureau regulations. To him, they all are still just Indians.

“The Indian Bureau until last year was manned by a personnel of 11,000. Consuming over \$40,000,000 of the people's money in a useless adventure which has not, and never

will, return value received, back to the Federal Treasury or the American people. Today, this same Bureau instead of reducing its demands upon the Congress for money, has increased its budget demands for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, to \$67,785,970. The breakdown of this request is as follows:

"Total available for expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949

"General funds.....	\$52,843,835
Revenues from power.....	1,868,815
Revenues operation and maintenance collections irrigation projects.....	1,000,000
Tribal funds.....	12,073,320
Total.....	67,785,970

"The Indian Bureau is the most undemocratic institution under the American flag. Under its administration, the lives of the Indians under its control are regimented and regulated in totalitarian and communistic fashion. The dark days, the medieval form of existence, the feudal system which strangles economic independence and which regiments the Indian's life in every phase of his daily existence, is the kind of despotism he is forced to bow down to today.

"In their tribal state, and on Indian reservations, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution, the Atlantic Charter and its four freedoms are all dead documents and have no meaning what over. The Indians by the act of March 3, 1871, 2079 Revised Statutes, were remanded to the generosity of Congress. They, since, have been governed by regulations from the Secretary of the Interior's office based upon acts of Congress. Hence, they are wards of the Government, and, in fact, serfs—still living under serfdom. This is their legal status today.

"Thirty thousand Indian soldiers served our country and fought for human liberty, security, and freedom in the war just concluded. Twenty thousand likewise, served our country in World War I. Yet, upon returning home after a conspicuous record of achievements upon foreign battlefields where they helped to smash the enemies of democracy and human liberty, they are forced by the Government they served and helped to preserve, to submit to the indignities of the autocratic and mail-fisted rule of Indian Bureau officials, who have the support of Federal law, and the courts of our country. Surely this kind of treatment of the Indians who are citizens of our country, makes mockery of the Constitution which guarantees human rights, liberty, and security, and also, of the frequent declaration of the leaders of our country, who have solemnly declared to the world, that ours, is a country where human liberty, security, freedom, and equal treatment before the laws of the land, is guaranteed to all alike.

"The Indian Bureau is a closed corporation. An iron sheet excludes the public from interfering in any manner with the inside operations. Its administrative policy is decided in secret by its top officials. The Indians, 400,000 of them to whom such actions are directed, are never consulted. They have no voice, not even a suggestion, nor are they or their tribal councils ever consulted in such matters. This is not government by the consent of the governed; nor, is it 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people.' Instead, it is government for the Indians, devised to suit themselves, by the top officials of the Interior Department, backed by the Government of the United States in Hitler fashion.

"The appeals for a redress of grievances by individuals or by the tribal councils of the Indians to the Interior Department, the

President, and the Congress, whether by petition or by personal appearances before the committees of the Congress have brought but little relief to the Indians—their appeals have invariably fallen upon the deaf ears of those responsible for Indian administration. Near total disregard of the appeals of the Indians has been the rule. Again, the Indian Bureau is the most undemocratic institution under the American flag.

"The Indian Bureau consumes \$40,000,000 of the taxpayers' money from the Federal Treasury every fiscal year—from July 1 to July 1, to carry on its conduct of the affairs of 350,000 American Indians. The record has been one of the shameful waste of the people's money in the prosecution of a shameful disregard of the human, political, and legal rights of the Indians of the United States, 50,000 of whom are veterans and, therefore, are members of, or entitled to membership in, the American Legion.

"Home rule," is the Macedonian cry of the Indians at this moment, and, if the over 50,000 Indian soldiers of World Wars I and II have not with their blood, purchased the right to select their own agents and employees who govern them, then, there is no justice for the Indians and such declarations are mere mockery and hypocrisy. Yes, they were good enough to be invited to don the uniform of our country and to fight and die on foreign battlefields far removed from their homes for democracy and human liberty and freedom which they are denied under our Government.

"Yes. It makes mockery of Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg speech wherein he declared 'Our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.' And, likewise, the great inaugural speech of President Wilson when he declared 'The scales of heedlessness have fallen from our eyes, we have come to deliver to every man his just dues.' Also the Statue of Liberty holding aloft the flaming torch of liberty to all the world. And the inscription, 'Equal justice to all,' on the Department of Justice Building in Washington.

"The Indians as humans are struggling for.

"1 The protection of their civil liberties and rights

"2 The absolute independence of the individual

"3 Equal respect and protection under the laws of the land

"4 That government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. The Indian Bureau should likewise consult the Indians in the administration of their affairs.

"5 The Indians are struggling for their economic independence, for their civil rights and equal protection under the Constitution, also, for the absolute independence of themselves individually, for a political and civil recognition of their right to assert and demand that.

"(a) They stand on an equality with the rest

"(b) They, too, can say that, 'This too, is my air, my water, my sunshine, my earth,' and that, 'I have the same right to life,' to hope, and to aspire for the better things in life and to labor and to enjoy the fruits of that labor as the Constitution guarantees alike to every citizen of this, my native land, and my country.'

"The Indians are now determined to shake off the shackles of the feudal system they have been living under—to demand the right, now, to say how they shall spend their money without the interference of the Indian agent and his numerous employees; to say how he shall use or lease his lands and

to whom he selects, and not to those selected by the Indian agent. These are the things that caused the five devastating wars this country engaged in for the protection of human rights. When, then, are the Indians denied that right? We rebel against this kind of treatment and are determined to carry out our fight to the last place of relief under our political set-ups and let those who disagree with us answer the question herein raised."

How To Win the United States Senate in 14—Ah, Simple—Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How To Win the United States Senate in 14—Ah, Simple—Lessons," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN THE UNITED STATES SENATE IN 14—AH, SIMPLE—LESSONS—IF THEY LAUGH WHEN YOU SIT AT THE PIANO YOU CAN ALWAYS PLAY AMERICA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 18—Though Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, and Philip Jessup, of New York, have had trouble getting confirmed by the Senate in recent days, most observers here believe that confirmation can be achieved by paying attention to a few simple rules.

Among those are the following:

1 Be sure you are for the things that are going to be popular 6 or 7 years from now.
2 Don't join anything, ever.
3 Don't let your wife join anything, either.
4 Don't get involved in foreign affairs questions at all if you can help it. If you can't help it, back the Monroe Doctrine and the open-door policy, and be against communism.

5. If you must have political convictions about foreign policy questions (which is not recommended), make sure the President sends your nomination to Capitol Hill at a time when your convictions are popular.

6. Be suspicious of the British. And if you know what they're up to today in northern Rhodesia, all the better.

7 Don't write books.

8 Master various clichés that are popular on Capitol Hill, including the following:

(a) I am for adequate defense, but we must not spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

(b) I am for helping other countries, but they must first prove that they are helping themselves.

(c) America cannot defend the whole world.

(d) Communism is merely socialism in a hurry and I hate both from the depths of my soul.

(e) I am not and have never been a Communist or a member of any Communist-front organization.

9. If possible, be Irish. This pleases Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada.

CAN YOU GET BARUCH?

10 Keep up with the Senate's favorites. A word of praise on your behalf by Bernard M. Baruch, for example, is worth maybe 40 votes. Similarly, if you have any friends who are unpopular on Capitol Hill, abandon them, or better, denounce them publicly.

11 Glorify the days when we had no entangling alliances. This proves you are a "sound fellow, longing for the happy, sunlit past."

12 Stay out of the Far East. If you go there, you will be expected to have views on it, and somebody is bound to disagree with any views you have. Ignorance about it, however, is no disqualification.

13 If possible, have at least one reformed Communist testify on your behalf, preferably Louis Budenz, former editor of the *Daily Worker*.

14. Never accept any invitation to any off-the-record meeting at the State Department without finding out first whether Harold Stassen is to be there.

This set of rules is not, of course, guaranteed. Many other rules apply simultaneously and all are subject to change without notice. For example, the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee voted down Dr. Jessup today and voted in favor of Ambassador Warren Austin.

Both Ambassadors have been associated with the administration's far-eastern policy. In fact, Ambassador Austin voted for the resolution in the United Nations under which the United States agreed that if a cease-fire were arranged in Korea the United States would discuss with the Chinese Communists such questions as the future of Formosa and whether the Communists should get into the United Nations.

Two rules apply in this case, however, that are not listed above. These are that Senate confirmation is much more certain if the nominee is (a) a former Senator, and/or (b) a Republican.

LOOK TO THE FUTURE

The first rule, however, is the important one, namely, that one must be sure to be for the things that are going to be popular 6 or 7 years from now.

For example, a man who opposed recognition of the U S S R throughout the 1930's is in clover, and anybody who favored letting the Germans and the Russians destroy one another in 1941 would have no trouble with the Senate at all.

Nevertheless, one cannot vouch even for those potential nominees who have the gift of prophecy, and the rules listed here must be regarded merely as policy guidance. Not even a former Republican senatorial prophet, without ideas or previous connection, can be sure of confirmation in the present state of affairs in Washington.

All the foregoing is merely unofficial advice, put forward in accordance with the terms of the following story, now current in the Capitol.

According to this story, an improvident grasshopper who made no plans for the winter went to an ant and asked him how he should live through the cold winter. The ant replied that this was easy: the grasshopper should merely turn himself into a cockroach every October when the frost came, find himself a warm spot behind a radiator or in some good kitchen, live there until spring and then turn himself into a grasshopper once more.

This scheme overjoyed the grasshopper until, at the end of the conversation he inquired:

"But tell me, how do I turn myself into a cockroach?"

"I'm sorry, I don't know about that," replied the ant. "I was merely giving you policy guidance."

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a resolution on William N. Oatis, Associated Press Bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, who was imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia, without explanation, which resolution was passed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 487, Winnemucca, Nev., on September 10, 1951, signed by Vance G. Nelson, worthy president, and Harold E. Howland, secretary, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The resolution urges the Federal Government to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis and to bar correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass and all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences until Mr. Oatis' release has been secured. I also ask unanimous consent that identical resolutions passed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 1213, Las Vegas, and by Aerie No. 1006, Carson City, Nev., be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas, William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative or trusted legal counsel, and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press, and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being, and

Whereas, by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of Government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Winnemucca Aerie, No. 487, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executive of the Asso-

cated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie, No. 487, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 10th day of September 1951, Aerie, No. 487, city of Winnemucca, State of Nevada

Attest

VANCE G. NELSON,
Worthy President.

HAROLD E. HOWLAND,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative, or trusted legal counsel, and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information, which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional, and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous kangaroo court, completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being, and

Whereas, by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world, and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Las Vegas, Nev., Aerie No. 1213 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 1213 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass as well as all satellite-nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 11th day of September 1951, Aerie No. 1213, city of Las Vegas, State of Nevada

Attest:

C. G. ANDRESS,
Worthy President.

Q. J. McLAUGHLIN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative or trusted legal counsel, and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of insisting on obtaining accurate, correct and verified information, which is the definition of the work of a free press, and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional, and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous kangaroo court, completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being, and

Whereas by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world, and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of Government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Carson City, Aerie No. 1006, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie No. 1006, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Adopted this 18th day of September 1951, Aerie No. 1006, city of Carson City, State of Nevada

Attest

ELMER J. SHERMAN,
Worthy President,
OLIVER F. PRATT,
Secretary.

Address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne Before Service Clubs at Bismarck, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, William E. Warne, at a joint

meeting of service clubs at Bismarck, N. Dak., on October 18.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be here with you today, at a time when the State of North Dakota stands on the threshold of what I believe will be the greatest period of business expansion in its history.

The Department of the Interior is pleased to be a partner with people in North Dakota in the development of the mineral, land, and water resources that will be the base of your economic growth. Our agency has responsibilities in the fields of petroleum production and lignite development, in irrigation, and in electric power. From these fields will come the expansion that I foresee.

In all of these fields new industries will be established. Industrial development will fill what has been historically the principal need for a balanced economy in this State. Since the time of first settlement, North Dakota has depended on dry farming. Industrialization and agricultural diversification through irrigation will begin, I confidently expect, within the next 10 years. Through developments along the lines I have indicated, the needed bulwarks against the economic ills growing from dependence on one basic activity—dry farming—can be provided. The awful consequences which have occasionally stemmed from droughts and floods can be avoided to a great degree.

A second future, however, can be assured only through a balanced development of the latent resources. Signs of unbalance are already developing, and the time to take corrective action is now, while the problems have not yet become serious.

This afternoon I want to discuss with you some of the potentialities of the enormous lignite deposits which are found in North Dakota and to talk about problems in irrigation and electric power associated with developments of the Missouri River Basin project. The slow progress so far in irrigation development is the unbalancing factor to which I made reference a moment ago.

North Dakota has 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite in the ground, of which at least half is recoverable. This is approximately 10 percent of the entire world supply of lignite and constitutes some 30 percent of all the coal reserves in the United States. This tremendous resource is of great significance to the Nation as a whole as well as to you of North Dakota.

In many places lignite lies close to the surface and can be mined by open-pit methods. Despite this convenience, however, its widespread use still presents a difficult challenge to scientists and industrialists alike. The Department of the Interior, through its Bureau of Mines, has been, for many years, engaged in research in lignite utilization. The new laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., is the Nation's leading center for lignite research. It must be admitted that plans for the use of North Dakota lignite are still in their early stages. Therein lies its challenge and the measure of its opportunity for the people of this State.

The Bureau of Mines, however, has gone far enough in the development of lignite processes so that they are now being applied by industrialists in Texas on a large scale. In that State a power company and an aluminum company are going to use lignite for aluminum production. Tar will be an important byproduct. Both aluminum and tar are commodities highly important in our current defense program. The Texas plants are being established in the heart of the area which leads the Nation in the production of two other important fuels—oil and gas. This is an indication of the favorable

competitive position which lignite may hold in relation to other energy sources.

Your North Dakota lignite lies relatively close to the iron-ore deposits of Minnesota and the mineralized area to the nearby West and Southwest. As additional technologies are developed, it seems reasonable to expect that processed lignite can economically enter the mineral and metallurgical fields not only as a source of power but also as reducing carbon, as electrodes, as gaseous reducing agents, and as a source of thermo-process energy.

Still other uses for lignite products may be found in supplying active carbon for sugar beet refining, in water purification, and as material for fuel briquets, a stable, storable and high heat-value domestic fuel.

In sight, but more or less over the horizon, are possibilities for the production of phenolics and plastics from them, disinfectants and animal dips, wood preservation materials, electrode and other special carbons, sources of materials for detergents, and many other specialized products.

Lignite is capable of bringing relief, eventually, to the present heavy demands on irreplaceable coking coals of the Appalachian area. Lignite can accomplish this by providing an alternate source of fuel for power and space heating. This is significant in view of our growing need to husband these coking coals, which are basic to the Nation's steel production. This production is, of course, a prime component of the American industrial civilization and the backbone of our preparedness program.

The key to these industrial processes is low-cost lignite such as you have in enormous quantities here in North Dakota.

I confidently predict that during the next decade many companies and individuals will be beginning to use lignite for the profit of themselves, and the Nation as a whole in pursuit of the opportunities which I have briefly outlined here. Why not some or much of this activity in North Dakota?

So much for the optimistic outlook for lignite. It is an outlook for new opportunities in North Dakota which can be matched by few other communities in the United States.

Let us look now at a few other reasons for optimism in North Dakota's immediate future. North Dakota has joined the ranks of the oil-producing States. The recent oil and gas discoveries in Williams County, northwestern North Dakota, have excited the interest of the Nation. The Williston Basin may some day be an important oil province, providing a much needed addition to our country's depleting petroleum reserves.

Another reason for optimism is the fast-growing development of hydroelectric power. Garrison Dam, upstream from you a few miles on the Missouri, is scheduled to start power production in April 1955. Fort Randall Dam, down in South Dakota, will be producing power by November 1953. A new unit at Fort Peck Dam, over in eastern Montana, is almost completed, and within a few weeks will add 35,000 kilowatts to the power resources of this area.

The Interior Department is charged by law with the responsibility for marketing power generated by all Federal plants in the Missouri River Basin, whether they be constructed by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. In the carrying out of this responsibility, our Department has begun construction of backbone transmission lines which will interconnect the major hydroelectric plants and carry their output to the major load centers. These high-tension lines are already a familiar feature of North Dakota landscape. Partial operation of North Dakota's Federal transmission loop will begin this winter. This loop interconnects Bismarck, Garrison Dam, the new steam plant of the REA cooperatives at Vol-

taire, Devils Lake, and Jamestown. The loop is about two-thirds completed now, and it will be in full operation next spring. Initially, pending installation of generators at Garrison, power will be fed into the loop from Fort Peck via the Federal line from there to Garrison.

In the marketing of Federal power the Interior Department is bound by law to give preference to cooperatives and public bodies. This is particularly significant to you of North Dakota. Your State does not rank high in percent of farms served by central electricity. As of June 30, 1951, 74 percent of the farms in North Dakota had electric service as compared with the national average of 84 percent. Ninety percent of Minnesota's farms are electrified.

The preference provision of the Federal power marketing law will be a highly significant factor in improving this situation so that North Dakota farmers will be on a par with those in other States. Make no mistake about it, the attacks which are now being made on the preference provision of that law by those who would give the lion's share of Federal power benefits to the private companies are sure to weaken the rural electrification program. So will stringent policies on taxation of cooperatives, which are being advocated by some who pose as friends of the farmers. We in the Department of the Interior are proud of our record in helping rural electric cooperatives get a successful start by supplying low-cost power under the preference provision. The North Dakota transmission loop will aid in furthering rural electrification in the territory through which it passes. We want to continue support of rural electrification in North Dakota as new sources of power become available.

Speaking of power, I feel obliged to cite a few of the rather disquieting facts about the Nation's power situation in general. They have a bearing on your situation as well. Ever since the beginning of the defense program I have maintained publicly that the Nation has faced and is facing a power shortage which demands extraordinary effort by both the private power companies and the Federal Government to rush to completion new power facilities. This is necessary to avoid serious curtailments in electricity consumption by domestic consumers, and still worse, by defense industries.

For making these statements a year ago I was attacked by representatives of the private power industry. Less than a year ago the then president of the Edison Electric Institute was quoted in the New York Times as claiming there was more than enough electricity to meet the heaviest possible demand. The Edison Electric Institute is the trade organization of the private power companies. The vice president of the institute in the same piece was quoted as saying that my public warnings of a power shortage sought to imply a condition that did not exist. Shortly afterward, a magazine which caters to the private power industry challenged me in an editorial entitled "Who Is Kidding Who?" to back up my warnings.

Here is what has happened.

In the Pacific Northwest vital supplies of electricity for aluminum production had to be cut off a month ago because of impending low water conditions. Fortunately, rains in that region have made it possible to restore this production in subsequent weeks.

Let me quote you a few statements made less than a month ago by a representative of the Defense Electric Power Administration, an agency made up principally of private utility employees who are helping the Government to solve the power problem. Here is what he said about the kind of power situation we now face:

"In the Pittsburgh area, electric furnaces used to produce needed alloy steel are being interrupted almost daily because of insuf-

ficient generating capacity. The denial to these steel plants amount to as much as 60,000 kilowatts.

"In the Carolinas, adverse water conditions have already caused curtailment of ferro alloys and aluminum.

"Load growth in the Gulf Coast, central and northwest Texas area have diminished operating reserves to a point where dependable capacity will not be available in 1952.

"Deficiencies in capacity as high as 80,000 kilowatts are forecast for the Cleveland area in the fall of 1952.

"Milwaukee faces a deficit of 40,000 kilowatts during the winter of 1952.

"The general area known as the Industrial North Central region (including Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky) is expected to be short about 1,000,000 kilowatts before the end of 1952.

"At no time during World War II did the electric power supply picture look so threatening as it now appears for the fall and winter of 1952." All right, "Who was kidding who?"

Once more, the private-utility representatives have been caught in an attitude of complacency about the Nation's power supply. The Nation as a whole may suffer for it. I reiterate what I have consistently said since the beginning of the defense program, that our country faces the most severe power shortage in its history and that all power agencies public and private must proceed with all possible dispatch to remedy the situation.

Despite the threatening national picture on power, you in North Dakota can look forward to improvement stemming from the large Federal hydroelectric projects which I have described as being ready to add to the power resources of this region. The general outlook on power in this area warrants optimism for forthcoming growth of new wealth and profits for you of the business community in North Dakota. This stems directly from the power phases of the Missouri Basin project. The dams must be kept on schedule and the transmission lines must be built on time. In response to my request, the Bureau of Reclamation has completed a new power report for the Missouri Basin. Some of the additional opportunities to expand generating capacity that it cites must be seized if the growing needs of the area are to be met and this region is to be enabled to add to the national strength the full weight of its potential.

Let us turn now to a type of development for the economy of North Dakota which is the laggard. I refer to irrigation.

Irrigation has historically been the principal interest of the Department of the Interior in the development of the West. Irrigation is still a primary interest of the Interior Department as part of our program for balanced river basin development, which includes also flood control, protection of watershed lands, preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, provision of recreation facilities, mineral development, and hydroelectric power.

Seven years ago the Congress of the United States approved a comprehensive plan for development of the Missouri River Basin. That approval came on the heels of the most terrifying drought in the history of the United States, which laid waste untold investments and caused awful human misery and suffering. The plan was intended to put the water resources of the Missouri River Basin to work to provide needed regional stability and to protect the people of this and adjoining areas from the terrible consequences of both flood and drought.

Since the plan was approved, we have made splendid progress in fields of flood control and hydroelectric power development. But I regret to say that our irrigation pro-

gram has not come along as fast as we had hoped. There are a number of reasons for this but I assure you that the Department of the Interior has never relaxed its efforts, and we intend to reach the kind of irrigation goals that this State and this region need so urgently.

In a year like 1951, when, if anything, North Dakota received too much rain, we are likely to forget the terrible consequences of a drought like that of the thirties. It is human, I am afraid, to take action to relieve our adversities only when they are upon us.

It would be a healthy thing, I believe, for us to look back 15 years while we are reveling in the warm, rosy glow of optimism for the immediate future of North Dakota.

In the worst year of the drought, more than half the people in North Dakota were on relief. The State lost more than 5 percent of its population. Businesses failed by the hundreds and the State was seized with a gloomy atmosphere of defeat and depression. The farmers in six counties in northwestern North Dakota were forced to sell nearly half of their cattle and over a third of their sheep and lambs. From 1930 to 1933 the farmers in these same six counties had to abandon 31 percent of their crops. The figure was greater than 50 percent in 1934 and 1936, the 2 worst years. Relief expenditures for the seven Great Plains States during the drought totaled a staggering billion and a quarter dollars. That figure still greatly exceeds all that has been spent in the many years since for Missouri Basin development as an offset against such adversities.

Communities in irrigated portions of the Great Plains grew and flourished throughout the drought. Scott Bluff County, Neb., which includes part of the North Platte irrigation project, gained 18 percent in population during the critical decade from 1930 to 1940. The city of Scottbluff gained 45 percent during that time, although the population of Nebraska as a whole declined almost 5 percent.

The statistics on the terrible effects of the great drought in North Dakota are frightening facts when we view them, as we must, in the light of the certainty that drought will come again to the Great Plains. It may be decades before we are visited again with a drought of that duration and intensity, but such a one might begin next year. Whenever it comes, we had better be prepared to meet its problems. There is no better insurance than irrigation, and year in and year out, irrigation will pay its way. The industries which will come to North Dakota as a result of developments in lignites, petroleum, and hydroelectric power will help greatly to ameliorate the effect of a drought. But North Dakota will remain dependent to a large degree on stable agriculture.

The plan approved by the Congress in 1944 contemplated the irrigation of 1,260,000 acres in North Dakota, a far larger acreage than that contemplated for any other States in the Missouri River Basin. I hate to have to say that so far not an acre in North Dakota has been irrigated under the 1944 authorization.

Through all of these years the Interior Department, as I have said, has exerted constant effort to go forward on an orderly schedule. The problems we have faced have been many and unique. One of the principal ones has been lack of a lively interest on the part of you people here in North Dakota in furthering irrigation development during these years of adequate rainfall.

Another obstacle has been questions which have been raised with respect to the suitability of some of the land in the original plan for irrigation development. The Interior Department cannot invest hundreds of millions

of dollars in irrigation facilities unless it is reasonably certain that the lands supplied with water can be made productive through irrigation. You know, of course, of the questions raised concerning the Bowbells block. After conferences in Washington last week, the Bureau of Reclamation and the State, through your governor, are to select a joint review board to pass judgment on the facts disclosed. Whatever the fate of the particular area in question, additional studies have disclosed that there are hundreds of thousands of acres in North Dakota of fine land that are irrigable and that meet any proper standards. The Missouri-Souris plan, itself, is still very much alive and could survive the loss of the Crosby-Mohall area. The Federal Government and you of North Dakota, however, would be foolhardy indeed if we should proceed with any specific construction except the best plan that can be devised to include land that is certainly, permanently usable under irrigation.

Still another problem is that of adapting our irrigation policies prescribed by law to the requirements of farmers in an area like this where sufficient rainfall for profitable dry-land farming is received in a substantial percentage of the years. Federal irrigation programs have had their greatest success in the areas of the West which are completely arid. In those cases, the value of irrigation was clear and farmers were quick to agree to repay the cost of irrigation facilities to the extent of their ability.

Not so in the Great Plains area. Here we must find ways of contracting with farmers which are satisfactory to them and which, at the same time, will also protect the Government's investment in irrigation facilities.

This problem is nowhere better exemplified than in the Heart River Division of the Missouri River project right at your doorstep. The Department of the Interior has constructed two reservoirs on the Heart River for irrigation and flood-control storage. They served remarkably well in alleviating flood damage, notably in the Mandan area, during the spring runoff in 1950. The irrigable lands of the Heart River Division are largely parts of farms utilized for livestock enterprises under dry-farm conditions, all privately owned. On Saturday, I intend to hold a public hearing in Mandan to get from the farmers involved their views as to how they would like to see irrigation development go forward. From this hearing I am hopeful that we can find a solution to the irrigation problem of the High Plains area. The farmers, we know, are eager to have irrigation, we in the Interior Department are eager to provide it. We are hopeful that we can find the answer.

Meanwhile, the Department has made good progress, though on a limited scale, in development of the Buford-Trenton project over near the Montana border on the Yellowstone River. In that area 12,000 acres have been brought under irrigation.

An irrigation contract recently has been completed with the Fort Clark Irrigation District, about 50 miles north of Bismarck on the Missouri River. It is a pumping unit in the Missouri Basin comprehensive plan.

Progress is being made. You can have confidence that the Interior Department will continue to work on the problem of North Dakota irrigation until satisfactory solutions are found.

The balanced development of lignites, petroleum, hydroelectric power, and irrigation will make North Dakota stronger and in doing so contribute a vital part to the strength of the Nation as a whole. That strength is important in these times when the clouds on the international horizon require a position of strength on our part. The time has gone when you of North Dakota can be complacent about the thousands of miles which separate you from the oceans in a critical international situation. Jet bombers

can reach you in a matter of hours from bases in the lands of potential enemies. The lands that separate you from the oceans, like the oceans themselves, are no longer barriers to the onslaughts of a determined enemy. Isolationism in that circumstance is just as wrong as complacency about North Dakota droughts.

All of us must realize that our welfare and security demand a program of assistance to our friends abroad. Strong as we are, we cannot go it alone. We have no sensible alternative other than stopping of aggression in other lands, whether it be by force of arms or the power of economic assistance. We have found strength in unity at home and we must seek it in a common purpose among the earth's free peoples.

The future of North Dakota is a bright one. It can't help but bring you better business conditions than you have ever before experienced. I know that you will take action to correct the few unsatisfactory elements in the picture. We in the Department of the Interior are ready to go down the line with you for a greater North Dakota.

One-Man Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "One-Man Crusade," published in the New Orleans State of October 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-MAN CRUSADE

The Senate's stoutest foe of corruption in Government is JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who was little known in his native State, and unknown outside of it, when he was elected to the United States Senate in 1946. How he ever got into Congress is one of those inexplicables of politics. When destiny tapped him on the shoulder he was a small town grain and feed merchant.

In the Senate he remained silent for 2 years, with freshman propriety, but his inquisitive mind was neither silent nor inactive. Senator WILLIAMS was unobtrusively exploring corruption and malpractice in the Internal Revenue Bureau, following leads he had dug up himself.

When this hour for action came, a little less than 2 years ago, he presented the Senate one shock after another of the weird tax-collection laxities in the revenue department, always with quiet voice but a determination not to be silenced, nor diverted from his course.

What ensued in the shape of disclosure of political manipulation of tax collection, of favored treatment of big shot politicians and their allied racketeers, must be familiar to all who read the newspapers.

WILLIAMS prodded the Revenue Bureau into a clean-up. There were resignations, including that of the commissioner. There were dismissals. There were indictments. There were lamentable exposures of graft, corruption, negligence, favoritism.

The whole rotten mess now is being explored by Senate and House investigating committees, grand juries, and the courts. The inquiry was set in motion by the Delaware Senator. He pointed the probers at

the shocking fraudulence unearthed in Kansas City, St. Louis, northern California, Nevada, Boston, and the strong suspicion of it in Detroit, New York, and possibly other revenue districts.

Senator WILLIAMS has forestalled the loss of untold millions of dollars of tax revenue to the Treasury, by compelling more efficient collection and action against delinquents, and by ending the unholy alliance between political bosses and the Internal Revenue Bureau staff.

With a few more Members like him in the upper House, the problem of corruption in the Government might soon vanish.

The Need for Development of the Mulberry, Sipsey, and Locust Forks of the Black Warrior River, for Flood Control, Navigation, Hydroelectric Power, Soil and Water Conservation Is Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, as this first session of the Eighty-second Congress comes to a close, I desire to call the attention of the House to the great need for the future development of the headwater streams of the Black Warrior River. I refer to the Mulberry Fork of the Black Warrior, the Sipsey Fork, a tributary of the Mulberry Fork, and the Locust Fork of the Black Warrior.

These streams lie above lock and dam 17 on the Black Warrior, in Alabama, and with their tributaries they serve as drainage arteries for some 2,000 square miles of area, lying largely in Walker, Winston, Cullman, Blount, and Jefferson Counties.

These streams form the headwaters of the great Warrior-Tombigbee River system, and tie the high-grade coals of the Warrior coal field, and the steel of Birmingham, by water highway to the great gulf port at Mobile.

As the area served by these headwater streams—the Mulberry Fork, the Sipsey Fork, and the Locust Fork—grows in industrial importance, and in my judgment the coal, iron ore, limestone, clays, timber, and possibly oil of the area assure its continued growth, the need for developing these streams with an area-wide perspective will become increasingly acute.

These rivers should be developed with the objectives of flood control, increasing their navigation potentials, recapturing the kilowatts of hydroelectric power inherent in their racing waters, the conservation of water for increasing industrial uses, the prevention of soil erosion in the drainage area, and other allied purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get the work started, on yesterday, I introduced H. R. 5797, which has been referred to the House Committee on Public Works, and for the enactment of which I will press with all the vigor and ability I possess during the next session of Congress.

As I see it, the streams of America are one of the greatest, if not the very greatest natural resource we have in this country. These streams should be developed for the use and benefit of the people of the United States. I am confident that the Corps of United States Engineers will find improvements on these streams, such as locks and dams, to be economically justified.

Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of my bill, H. R. 5797, as introduced on October 18, 1951.

H. R. 5797

A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation, and allied purposes

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation, and allied purposes of Warrior River and its tributaries, above lock and dam 17, Alabama, to be made under direction of the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made for runoff and water-flow retardation and soil-croscion prevention on such drainage area, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

Also, Mr Speaker, I include information about the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers taken from a pamphlet prepared by the Office of the District Engineer, Corps of United States Engineers, Mobile, Ala., as last revised in May 1948.

BLACK WARRIOR, WARRIOR, AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, ALA.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Rivers included in the project. The river system that is improved and maintained under the project for the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala., is composed of the Mobile River, Tombigbee River, Warrior River, Black Warrior River, Locust Fork of Black Warrior River, Mulberry Fork of Black Warrior River, and the Sipsey Fork, a tributary of the Mulberry Fork. The Warrior and Black Warrior Rivers are in reality the same river with the name changing at Tuscaloosa, Ala., the section below Tuscaloosa being the Warrior River and the section above Tuscaloosa the Black Warrior River. The two names are used to conform to the names used in the congressional acts authorizing the improvements of the two sections. These rivers, together with Mobile Bay, form a waterway from the coal fields of northern Alabama and the industrial district of Birmingham, Ala., to the Gulf of Mexico.

The lower limit of the project is on the Mobile River 4.75 miles above its mouth, at its junction with Chickasaw Creek and beginning at this point the portion of each river composing the system is as follows:

Mobile River, from Chickasaw Creek to the junction of the Tombigbee and Alabama Rivers, 42 miles.

Tombigbee River, from its mouth to the mouth of the Warrior River near Demopolis, Ala., 177 miles.

Warrior River, from its mouth to Tuscaloosa, Ala., 129 miles.

Black Warrior River, from Tuscaloosa to the junction of the Mulberry and Locust Forks of the Black Warrior River, 46 miles.

Mulberry Fork, to a point 46 miles above its mouth, 46 miles.

Sipsey Fork, to a point 5 miles above its mouth, 5 miles.

Locust Fork, to a point 22 miles above its mouth, 22 miles.

Total length of rivers included in the project, 467 miles.

Location: The entire river system lies within the State of Alabama, having its source in the northern part of the State and flowing in a general southwesterly direction and emptying into Mobile Bay at Mobile. Above Tuscaloosa the territory traversed is mountainous, while the territory traversed below Tuscaloosa varies from rolling to marsh land. The principal towns located on the system are Mobile, Jackson, Demopolis, Tuscaloosa, Cordova, and Port Birmingham. Port Birmingham, on Locust Fork 11 miles above its mouth, is connected with Birmingham by rail and paved highway.

Authorization of project: The first project for the improvement of this system was adopted in 1871, and covered the Tombigbee River below Demopolis. Subsequent to the adoption of the original project, the improvement of other sections of the system was authorized by various acts of Congress, and the act of June 13, 1902, merged all projects into the one project under the title, "Black Warrior, Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala." Various acts of Congress have since extended the project to its present limits.

The two most recent are (1) the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, which added the Mobile River to the project and authorized the construction of a lock and dam at Tuscaloosa to replace three low-lift locks and dams, the construction of 12-foot crest gates on dam 17, and the dredging of a cut-off channel in the vicinity of Sunflower Bend on the Tombigbee River and (2) the River and Harbor Act, of March 12, 1945, which authorized the construction of a lock and dam near Demopolis to replace locks and dams Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7, and an increase in the capacity of the spillway at lock No. 1 by increasing its length.

Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers—Table of locks

	Mile ¹	Year constructed	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Depth over miter sills (feet)	Lift (feet)
Tombigbee River.						
Lock 1	101.6	1909	281.9	52.0	8.0	12.0
Lock 2	172.6	1915	296.0	52.0	8.5	8.8
Lock 3	195.6	1915	296.0	52.0	8.5	10.1
Lock 4	221.3	1908	285.6	52.0	8.5	10.3
Warrior River						
Lock 5	230.5	1908	285.6	52.0	8.5	9.8
Lock 6	257.3	1908	285.6	52.0	8.5	9.9
Lock 7	272.0	1903	284.7	52.0	8.5	10.0
Lock 8	298.9	1903	284.7	51.65	8.5	9.0
Lock 9	304.5	1902	284.7	52.0	8.5	11.2
Tuscaloosa lock	250.2	1939	490.0	95.0	10.8	30.0
Black Warrior River						
Locks 10, 11, 12 inundated.						
Lock 13	359.5	1905	285.5	52.0	10.6	11.1
Lock 14	362.9	1910	282.1	52.0	9.5	11.0
Lock 15	369.8	1910	282.1	52.0	9.5	14.0
Lock 16	376.0	1915	285.5	52.0	9.5	21.0
Lock 17	377.4	1915	285.5	52.0	8.5	72.0

¹ From Government St., Mobile (Bankhead Tunnel).

TERMINALS AND COMMERCE

TERMINALS

There are two public terminals within the limits of this project and three public terminals at Mobile, Ala., immediately below the lower limit of the project, all of which serve traffic on this river system. The descriptions of these public terminals follow. Mileages shown represent the distance from the foot of Government Street at Bankhead Tunnel, Mobile.

Mobile, Ala., mile 0.25, foot of St. Michael Street: Character of facility: Municipal dock; served by Gulf Mobile & Northern Railroad and city streets. Purpose for which used: Interchange of package freight between barge, rail, and motortruck carriers. Owner: City of Mobile.

Mobile, Ala., mile 1: Character of facility: State docks; served by Public Belt Railroad and city streets. Purpose for which used:

Channel, locks, and dams: The primary objective of the improvement is to provide all-year water transportation from the high-grade coal fields of Alabama and the Birmingham industrial district of the Gulf Coast. This has been accomplished by the construction of a system of locks and dams and by dredging and snagging. The existing lock system consists of 16 locks and 15 dams, the extra lock being at dam No. 17. The lifts vary from a minimum of 8.5 feet to a maximum of 72 feet, the high lift being at lock and dam No. 17, where 12 feet were added to the height of the dam in 1937 by the construction of vertical lift steel gates on its crest. This lift of 72 feet is equally divided between two locks in tandem. All except one of the locks are constructed of concrete, the one exception being constructed of stone masonry. The lock gates are made of structural steel and are of the mitring type. All locks, with the exception of the one at Tuscaloosa, are approximately the same size, the controlling inside dimensions being 52 feet in width and 282 feet in length, and 8 feet minimum depth over miter sills, making the size of tow that can be handled in one lockage 50 feet in width and 280 feet in length.

The dams are all of the fixed type with the exception of dam No. 1 and dam No. 17. Dam No. 1 is equipped with A-frames which are raised and lowered manually. Dam No. 17 has vertical-lift gates operated by power machinery. Six of the dams are of concrete, one of stone masonry and eight of stone-filled timber crib type, and they vary in length from 299 feet to 1,170 feet.

A channel width of 100 feet and controlling depth of 8 feet is maintained throughout the year over the entire system. The existing project provides for increasing the depth to 9 feet, and the width to 200 feet, where practicable; the construction of a new lock and dam near Demopolis, and increasing the spillway capacity at dam No. 1.

Interchange of all freight between carriers. Owner: State of Alabama.

Mobile, Ala., mile 1, east bank: Character of facility: Electric track crane and wharf, served by railroad and United States Highway 90. Purpose for which used: Interchange of coal and ore between all carriers and also with storage yard. Owner: Federal Barge Line.

Tuscaloosa, Ala., mile 353.4: Character of facility: Derrick loading platforms, and warehouse (area 4,500 square feet); served by Belt Line Railroad and improved highway; purpose for which used: Interchange of miscellaneous package freight between barge lines, warehouse, rail and motortruck carriers; owner: City of Tuscaloosa, leased to private interests.

Port Birmingham, Ala., mile 408.1: Character of facility: Two electric derricks and warehouse (area 36,900 square feet);

equipped with overhead electric trolley system, served by tracks of Warrior River Terminal Co. and by paved road, purpose for which used Interchange of all commodities between barge, rail, and motortruck carriers; owner: Federal Barge Line.

In addition to the above public terminals, there are numerous private loading stations, consisting principally of derricks on the bank of the river, coal-loading chutes, and pipelines and pumps for handling oil. These privately owned terminals do not serve the general public. Of the privately owned terminals, the terminal owned by the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. is the most important. This terminal is described as follows:

Port Birmingham, Ala., mile 408.6: Character of facility Electric gantry cranes served by tracks of Warrior River Terminal Co. and paved highway, purpose for which used Interchange of manufactured steel, pigs, billets, ores, and sulfur between barges and railroad cars.

Tows and towboats: A typical tow consists of a towboat and seven barges, each of the barges being 25 feet wide and 140 feet long, with a draft of 8 feet when loaded, capacity of each barge being 500 tons. This size tow can pass through the locks in two lockages and also navigate the sharp bends with a minimum of delay in maneuvering. The recent increase in river traffic has resulted in some use of 11 barge tows instead of the 7 barge tows formerly used for through traffic. Although the larger tows have some difficulty in navigating the river and require three lockages to pass through the small locks, the gain in tonnage carried more than compensates for the added travel time.

Types of towboats used, include Diesel electric twin screw, steam twin screw, and Diesel and steam stern wheel. The dimensions of the towboats operated by the Warrior & Gulf Navigation and the Federal Barge Lines are 25 feet wide, 140 feet long, with a draft of 7 feet. The barges are of the hopper type and are used as open barges or with covers consisting of frames in portable sections that are covered with tarpaulins, the nature of the cargo determining whether or not the open or the covered barge is used.

COMMERCE

This river system in its unimproved state was navigable as far upstream as Demopolis, Ala., only about 8 months of the year, and as far upstream as Tuscaloosa, Ala., about 4 months of the year. Above Tuscaloosa there was no navigation except at extreme high water and then only by rafts. For these reasons commerce was very small. As the improvement of the system developed, commerce increased slowly until the year 1915, when lock and dam No. 17 was completed and placed the navigable channel within reach of the Birmingham industrial district and the coal fields of north Alabama. The trend-of-tonnage chart shows the movement of tonnage from 1915 to the end of 1946. Since the beginning of 1947 there has been a very pronounced upward trend and, according to preliminary information received from shippers, carriers, and other sources, the 1948 tonnage will probably equal or exceed the peak years of 1929 and 1941.

Prior to the improvement the cargo consisted principally of packet freight, rafted logs, lumber, cotton, and other farm products. Since the improvement there has been a considerable increase in the variety as well as volume of cargo, the principal items of cargo handled at present being gasoline, oil, sugar, sand and gravel, manganese ore, sulfur, canned goods, sodium sulfate, phosphate rock, fuel oil, crude rubber, fertilizer, coffee and salt, iron and steel, limestone, coal, pulpwood, barged logs, rafted stone, pig iron, lumber, slag, billets, fullers earth, and cotton. In the past downstream

tonnage represented about 80 percent of all river commerce. At present, however, due to the large upstream shipments of oil and gasoline, river commerce is nearly equally divided between up-bound and down-bound tonnage.

RECENT IMPROVEMENTS

TUSCALOOSA LOCK AND DAM

Location: Tuscaloosa lock and dam, completed in 1940, is located 350.2 miles above Mobile on the Warrior River within the corporate limit of the city of Tuscaloosa, Tuscaloosa County, Ala.

General description: Tuscaloosa lock and dam is the first modern structure with higher lift and larger lock to replace any of the present low dams and small locks for the ultimate development of the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers for navigation.

The new lock and dam has a lift of 30 feet and replaces old locks and dams Nos. 10, 11, and 12 which were removed to provide a clear channel for traffic. The lock is constructed of concrete, has a clear inside width of 95 feet and is 460 feet long, with a minimum depth of 10.8 feet over the miter sill. It was designed to pass the largest standard tow for this river system in one lockage. A three-story concrete building located on the inside lock wall, houses the power machinery necessary for the operation of the lock gates.

The dam is a fixed-crest, gravity type, constructed of concrete and has a spillway 700 feet long. A fish ladder is located on the abutment at the right bank end of the dam.

Construction of Tuscaloosa lock and dam was started January 1937 and was completed and accepted on April 30, 1940.

CREST GATES ON DAM NO. 17, BLACK WARRIOR RIVER, ALA.

General: Lock and dam No. 17 was completed in 1915. It is located on the Warrior River at mile 377.4 above Mobile. In 1937, crest gates were constructed on the original dam which raised the pool elevation 12 feet and extended the navigable channel 13 miles into the rich coal field of north Alabama.

The gates are the vertical-lift type and are operated from two cars located on the bridge above the gates. These cars travel the length of the dam on a rail track and contain the Diesel-powered hoisting drums used to lift or lower the crest gates. There are 20 gates 52 feet in length and two gates 24 feet in length installed between concrete piers.

Stop logs are used to block the space between the piers when it is necessary to make repairs to the gates. The stop logs are handled by a revolving crane which is also used for removing drift that accumulates above the gates.

Benefits: The construction of these gates in addition to extending navigable water into the coal fields of north Alabama, increased the depth and width along other sections of the river above dam No. 17, which is of considerable aid in navigating the numerous sharp bends on Locust and Mulberry Forks.

Construction of these gates commenced in December 1935, and was completed on July 4, 1937.

SUNFLOWER BEND CUT-OFF

Sunflower Bend cut-off is located between miles 77.8 and 79.7 above Mobile on the Tombigbee River, in Clark and Washington Counties, Ala.

The combined length of the two cut-off channels is approximately 8,500 feet, which reduces the length of the river about nine miles. The channel was dredged to a depth of 11 feet below mean low water and has a bottom width of 150 feet.

Dredging was started December 1937 and was completed March 29, 1938. In addition to navigation benefits because of the shorter channel this improvement eliminates approximately 80,000 cubic yards of maintenance dredging annually.

IMPROVEMENTS AUTHORIZED

The River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, authorized the construction of a new lock and dam near Demopolis and an increase in the capacity of the spillway at dam No. 1, by lengthening it 85 feet on the right bank. The proposed dam near Demopolis will consist of a gravity-type open spillway, 1,485 feet long, crest elevation 73 feet mal, a 40-foot lift lock 110 feet wide and 600 feet long. Demopolis lock and dam will replace existing locks and dams No. 4, 5, 6, and 7.

CONNECTING WATERWAYS AUTHORIZED

The Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, will join the Tombigbee-Warrior waterway at Demopolis. This project, when completed, will provide a navigation channel not less than 9 feet deep with a minimum bottom width of 170 feet connecting the Tombigbee-Warrior waterway with the Tennessee River. Locks will be 110 feet wide by 600 feet long.

The Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala., project authorized by River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, provides for a navigation channel 9 feet deep at low water from the mouth of the Alabama River to Montgomery, to be obtained by canalization.

AVAILABLE MAPS AND CHARTS

Navigation charts of the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee project, Alabama River project, and the Gulf section of the intracoastal waterway, showing such features as connecting waterways, navigation aids, topographic and hydrographic features, bridges, overhead and submarine crossings, and other data have been prepared. These charts are separately bound and are available as follows from the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, 2301 Grant Street, Mobile, Ala.:

Navigation charts of Tombigbee, Warrior, and Black Warrior Canalized System, price \$1.

Alabama River, Ala., navigation charts, price \$0.50.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, New Orleans, La., to Apalachee Bay, Fla., in 21 sheets, price \$1.

Alabama's Per Capita Income Increased 211 Percent 1940 to 1950; Her Vast Undeveloped Resources Indicate Great Growth in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the per capita income of Alabamians rose from \$269 in 1940 to \$836 in 1950, to triple from 1940 to 1950. This was a rise of 211 percent in 10 years, and compares with a Nation-wide rise of 150 percent for the entire period.

As we begin to be able to see the decade 1940 to 1950 in some degree of perspective, we are amazed at the tremendous economic growth of the Nation evidenced by an increase of the physical volume of output of more than one-half, an increase in population of 20,000,000 persons, and a reduction in unemployment from 8,000,000 to the present practical minimum of 2,000,000.

But, with all this, Mr. Speaker, Alabama still ranks fourth from the bottom

in average per capita income. This indicates again and again the need for greatly expanded industrial development, and increased processing by manufacture of its raw materials into finished products. Alabama's resources leave little excuse for her to remain a poor State.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article styled, "State Income Payments in 1950," taken from the October 1951 issue of Alabama Social Welfare, published by the Alabama State Department of Public Welfare.

**STATE INCOME PAYMENTS IN 1950—DATA
RELEASED IN SURVEY OF CURRENT BUSINESS—
AUGUST 1951**

INCOME CHANGES OVER THE PAST DECADE

Alabama's per capita income has tripled in the last 10 years, rising from only \$269 in 1940 to \$836 in 1950. Even with this rapid increase Alabama still remains one of the poorest States, only 3 States having per capita income payments lower in 1950. It is somewhat heartening to Alabamians in noting that the percentage increase for Alabama (211 percent) from 1940 to 1950 in per capita income payments is much higher than it was for the Nation as a whole (150 percent). Per capita incomes have moved up at considerably above average rates since 1940 in the Southeast (which includes Alabama), Southwest, and Northwest—the three regions with the lowest income averages.

The last 10 years have been a period of tremendous economic growth for the Nation as a whole. The Nation's physical volume of output expanded by more than one-half, the population increased by 20,000,000 persons, and unemployment was reduced from 8,000,000 (one-seventh of labor force) in 1940 to 2,000,000 by the end of 1950, virtually a practical minimum in relation to the enlarged labor force.

In the southern and western areas every State received a larger share of the Nation's total income in 1950 than in 1940. In these regions the stimulus to income expansion during the war was unusually great, but, despite the impact of reconversion, these regions have largely retained, or actually increased the relative gains achieved in that period.

Government income payments increased threefold or more in the Southeast, Southwest, and far West between 1940 and 1950 and provided an unusually important impetus to total income growth in these regions. The chief element swelling total Government disbursements to individuals in these areas was the relatively large concentration of military personnel in them.

Agriculture was the only major income source in the Southeast and Southwest which did not advance at rates above the national average from 1940 to 1950. Of particular interest in this regard is the declining emphasis placed upon agriculture as an industry in these two areas. In 1940 nearly one-third of the employed labor force in the South was engaged in agriculture. By 1950 the proportion was down to one-fifth—a significantly larger reduction than that occurring nationally.

Even though per capita incomes have increased considerably since 1940 the dollar will not buy what it has in previous years. Recent releases from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that the present purchasing power of the dollar is only 52 cents as compared with its value in 1935-39.

INCOME CHANGES FROM 1940 TO 1950

Per capita income payments to individuals were higher in 1950 than in 1949 in every State of the Nation with the exception of

one. The year 1950 opened on a strong note of recovery from the business downturn of 1949. Alabama's per capita income increased from \$767 in 1949 (revised 1949 figure) to \$836 in 1950; that for the Nation increased from \$1,320 in 1949 to \$1,436 in 1950—approximately a 9 percent increase in both instances. Percentage distribution of major sources of income payments in Alabama and the United States in 1950 were as follows:

	Alabama	United States
	Percent	Percent
Agricultural income	11.5	7.5
Government income payments	20.5	16.2
Manufacturing payrolls	20.6	22.6
Trade and service income	21.9	26.3

There was a 14 percent rise from 1949 to 1950 in Government income payments (15 percent for Alabama). The 1950 Government life insurance dividend disbursement was of considerable importance in swelling total incomes throughout the Nation. Because of its relatively uniform distribution, however, it had little effect on differences among States. As a result of the heavy concentration of military payrolls in the two Southern regions, together with the relatively large increase in them, however, these two areas scored above-average gains in income flowing from the Government.

**States ranked according to per capita
income payments, 1950**

United States	\$1,436
District of Columbia (1)	1,986
Delaware (2)	1,909
Nevada (3)	1,875
New York (4)	1,864
Connecticut (5)	1,766
Illinois (6)	1,752
California (7)	1,751
New Jersey (8)	1,689
Washington (9)	1,642
Montana (10)	1,605
Massachusetts (11)	1,600
Michigan (12)	1,583
Ohio (13)	1,582
Rhode Island (14)	1,561
Maryland (15)	1,547
Oregon (16)	1,523
Pennsylvania (17)	1,523
Wyoming (18)	1,509
Nebraska (19)	1,467
Indiana (20)	1,451
Wisconsin (21)	1,431
Iowa (22)	1,417
Missouri (23)	1,401
Colorado (24)	1,392
Kansas (25)	1,338
Minnesota (26)	1,332
South Dakota (27)	1,308
North Dakota (28)	1,298
Idaho (29)	1,287
New Hampshire (30)	1,282
Texas (31)	1,278
Utah (32)	1,271
Arizona (33)	1,240
Florida (34)	1,210
Vermont (35)	1,184
Maine (36)	1,161
Virginia (37)	1,158
New Mexico (38)	1,109
Oklahoma (39)	1,070
West Virginia (40)	1,049
Louisiana (41)	1,045
Georgia (42)	969
Tennessee (43)	962
North Carolina (44)	951
Kentucky (45)	911
Alabama (46)	836
South Carolina (47)	831
Arkansas (48)	825
Mississippi (49)	698

Defensive Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Appendix of the Record a statement of a constituent, Mr. William Douglas Leonard, of Wichita, Kans., wherein he expresses the opinion that agreement with Japan along the lines he outlines in this statement is essential at this time.

Last January our very able Hon. John Foster Dulles was empowered by the President of the United States to draft a peace treaty with Japan and given the title of Ambassador. After many months of conference with our now friendly nations and allies an agreement was reached by the majority of them, England, France, Holland, Australia, New Zealand, and others to sign said treaty on September 4 at San Francisco, Calif. All members of the United Nations are invited to attend the signing and as witnesses, but of course may or may not sign as they desire. Russia and one or more of her subjected nations may attend but will not be expected to sign and may state their objections, if any, but that is all the latitude to be allowed them. After the signing the approval of the United States Senate is necessary, but there is no doubt of the ratification.

By the terms of the treaty Japan is allowed a limited rearmament. Our troops, naval, and air forces to remain and occupy bases until Japan is in position to defend itself. While Japan becomes a sovereign nation, she in fact only becomes a weak defensive one. The treaty covers many subjects and is good as far as it goes but does not go far enough.

Immediately after the signing of this treaty the United States and Japan will sign a military bilateral treaty, providing that in case either nation is attacked the other will come to its defense, and so forth. This is excellent, placing Japan in a very favorable position but is not sufficient. A much stronger treaty is required by the present world status.

Japan armed to the teeth as the ally of the United States is the key to world peace.

Secretary of State Acheson claims the United States will be compelled to expend \$25,000,000,000 in Europe in the next 3 years to preserve the present unstable peace. The facts to be stated hereafter can do so with approximately one-fifth of that amount if commenced at an early date.

As soon as the Dulles treaty becomes effective, Japan becomes a sovereign nation and an additional bilateral offensive and defensive treaty should, be concluded with her, irrespective of the objections of any other nation, for a period of 25 years for the purpose of preventing the spread of communism in Asia and elsewhere if necessary to preserve world peace.

It would cost the United States several billions of dollars, (possibly 5) to supply Japan with arms, machines, tools, airplanes, munitions, and other instruments for war and for other necessary purposes.

Japan to grant the United States all bases for any purpose desired and agree not to bear arms against any other nation during the life of this treaty without the approval of the United States.

While not necessary it would be of great importance in the eyes of the nations of

Asia and the Communists in general if the President of the United States and the Emperor of Japan personally sign the treaty which of course has to be ratified by the United States Senate.

A militant Japan, armed to the teeth at the back door of Russia would turn the growling Russian bear into a timid white rabbit. Russia would plead for any kind of peace and in the years to come, sooner than expected possibly, communism would die a natural death.

Europe would be saved as Russia fears two wars at once, knowing we would have the whip hand in Asia and could devote our attention to our European allies. Russia also fears the eventual taking over by Japan of Siberia and her loss of domination of Outer Mongolia and Tana-Touva. She is too much afraid of Japan to ever attack her.

Japan has made wonderful progress in the manufacture of steel. All her factories are intact and ready for use for war purposes, awaiting machines and tools to commence work. A 7-day week will be looked upon as no hardship by its labor—only as a matter of duty.

Japan has from ten to twelve million fighting men ready and willing to fight, if called to; an unlimited number of skilled and unskilled labor. Her people are very adaptable and a few weeks of training can turn her ordinary labor into skilled labor.

The Nation can be placed on a wartime footing in a matter of weeks if provided with equipment and material.

Japan is, with one exception, the only Nation we can count on in Asia and desires more than anything to remain her place in the sun and in the family of free-loving nations and as our ally is willing to do anything asked of her. The mere fact of her being armed will be enough to tranquilize Asia as every Asian nation fears Japan and would fear to antagonize her.

The Book From Here to Eternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 29, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter written by Gerald Kennedy, bishop of the Methodist Church of Portland, Oreg., to the Christian Century, July 18, 1951, dealing with the book entitled "From Here To Eternity," written by James Jones.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FROM HERE TO ETERNITY

"IT IS AN ANTI-UMT TRACT," SAYS BISHOP

SIR. I have just read From Here to Eternity by James Jones (Scribner, \$4.50). It is a first novel and promises to reach a new high as a best seller. Part of its appeal is a copious use of four-letter words and a frank discussion of (one might almost say a morbid fascination with) a soldier's sex experiences, which run all the way from adultery to homosexuality. It portrays a shameful sadism in an Army prison, and the only nobility to be discerned is in the stubborn rebellion of a few private soldiers against the whole military system. Here, in a word, is one man's description of our peacetime

army. Any number of former GI's have told me that this is about the way it was even in wartime, and a number of men with first-hand experience have assured me that it is even more difficult to maintain morale and morals during peacetime.

Now the thing that interests me in all this is the barrage of propaganda put down by UMT proponents which blithely ignores everything that From Here to Eternity reveals. I should like to ask these brethren if this is the way military life is, what are they proposing to do about it? Is there any guaranty that they will make it different? More serious than that, is there any way it can be made much better even if their intentions are entirely honorable? My guess is that, when military training becomes the central thing, everything else takes on a secondary importance and hence fares about the same as a snowball in you know where.

Before UMT is voted on by Congress—as it will be sometime soon—let every parent read the book and ask if this is the kind of environment he wants to throw about his son. And if you are still on the fence, read the book and ask for precise methods of preventing these degrading experiences being offered our sons. Let me stress that actual plans and procedures must be clearly defined and written into law that will convince our educators. The kind of generalities which have been characteristic of the UMT proponents so far can be trusted about as far as you can throw a tank.

James Jones may be horrified to hear that his book is regarded by a benighted bishop as propaganda against UMT. I have no doubt that this was far from his mind when he wrote it. But that is precisely what makes it a tract for the times. Our historic American faith is that the military represents a necessary arm of society to whom we owe our profound respect and our service. But that same faith, on the basis of plenty of evidence, assures that the military makes a very bad master. We ought not to deny that faith from here to eternity.

GERALD KENNEDY,

Bishop, Methodist Church, Portland, Oreg.

Address by Senator Chavez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by me at a luncheon of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, at Milwaukee, Wis., October 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to come to Milwaukee at the invitation of Associated Third Class Mail Users to meet with you, the leaders in the mail-order field. My good friend and colleague in the United States Senate, OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, had hoped to be here on this occasion, but as the first session of the Eighty-second Congress draws to a close, he, as chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, finds it necessary to remain in the Nation's Capital to participate in the debate on a number of important bills which come under his leadership.

Senator JOHNSTON has never been to Wisconsin and both he and his lovely wife had looked forward to spending a few days in this great State. The demand for his presence in the Senate, therefore, has deprived him of the opportunity to meet you good people.

You will have other conventions and other meetings, and you will be missing a good bet if you do not invite Senator JOHNSTON to address you at some future time. He knows the postal picture better than most men, and you mailers are indeed fortunate that he is at the helm of a committee which handled legislation so vitally important to all of you.

I served for 10 years on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and was ranking minority member during the Eightieth Congress. When my party regained control of Congress in 1949, I had a choice of heading up either that committee or the Committee on Public Works. I chose the latter assignment, for, frankly, my own State of New Mexico is more vitally affected by public-works legislation than it is by postal legislation.

That is not to imply that New Mexico has no concern with postal matters. To the contrary. The mailman to us is more important than he is in more densely populated States. It has always been my view that a sound post-office system has been one of the major factors in the development of our great Nation. The vast reaches of the Western and Southwestern States have served to isolate many of our people. The department store is not a streetcar ride away.

The rancher cannot walk a block and get the afternoon edition of a newspaper. The lonely miner cannot get his supplies by local delivery truck.

All of these Americans must look to the post office to deliver the free press and essential products purchased from afar. They look to you mailers to supply many of their needs. You will be able to provide that service as long as we have an efficient postal service operating under reasonable rates.

One thing is certain—America would not be the great country it is today if the Congress had insisted that the Post Office Department operate at a profit.

And it is this very profit question which has caused us so much wrangling before our Post Office Committees and in the Halls of Congress. The Postmaster General has asked us several times to go on record to the effect that the Department is and should be a service organization; that deficits must be expected. I believe he is entitled to such a policy statement from Congress and it soon may become possible for us to give it to him.

The speaker who preceded me, James J. Doran, has pointed out that 39,000 district offices operate at a loss. These are the smaller post offices which service widespread rural and mountain populations. They can never be expected to operate at a profit. No one will question the right of the lonely rancher way up the canyon to have his mail delivered to him, but let us not delude ourselves into believing that a 3-cent stamp fully covers the cost of that service. The citizen has got to be subsidized not by one group of mailers but by all of the people.

If a private business corporation were operating the Department, the board of directors would undoubtedly vote to close down all offices which did not show a profit. That is standard operating procedure under the capitalistic system. But, can you imagine the roar of disapproval that would sweep across the plains and over the mountains of America, if millions of Americans were suddenly shorn of a service upon which they have come to depend for their very existence?

The question answers itself. No Congressman would ever vote to eliminate such

service Yet no one can deny that it costs a great deal of money to keep these 39,000 offices operating. Yet, it does, but so do a lot of other functions of Government. And I daresay, that outside of our expenditures for national defense there is no Government outlay of funds as warranted and profitably spent as the appropriation for the support of our great postal system.

That brings me to the bone of contention—How great shall the deficit be and which categories or mail are not and should now be paying more than they do? Here we get into that field of wrangling I mentioned before.

There is no rate making proceeding in America more important than that which concerns postage. Postal rates affect all of our people, the great and the small, the rich and the poor. Thousands of business organizations such as your own are vitally affected by any sudden increase in rates. As mailers, one of your most important cost items is postage. If we in Congress legislate unwisely, without full information or prudent study, our bad judgment will cause many of you to close your doors. Since the goods you market are produced by American labor, bankruptcy or depression affects thousands of American workers.

I have listened to a good many witnesses during my membership on the Post Office Committee, Government witnesses and businessmen alike. I believe I have a pretty good working knowledge of your problems and those of the Department. It is knowledge which has not been easily or casually acquired.

A decade of listening and study has been required to obtain that understanding. Since only a very small fraction of Representatives or Senators ever have the opportunity to study the postal problem so fully, their decisions presently must be based on the recommendations of the appropriate committees of Congress and the petitions received from the people in their own districts and States.

A vast volume of mail is directed to Senators and Representatives on the subject of postal rates. Undoubtedly, you gentlemen have generated some of it. In spite of all the words written on the subject, I believe you will find many of them confused because of the charges and countercharges constantly being made. Congressmen would like to make intelligent decisions on this most important of rate-making proceedings, but they lack the time and opportunity to delve into the question as deeply as they would like.

Postal rates are among the most difficult and complex of any of the numerous rates which Congress must assess. At the present time it is admitted by all concerned that the cost-accounting system of the Department is actually unable to tell us in any way the actual cost of handling any particular category of mail. The Department knows what the various categories produce, but is completely in the dark as to what it costs to handle a first-, second-, third-, or fourth-class delivery. The only thing it has been able to do is to arbitrarily apportion the deficit among the different classes—and this has often resulted in strange and irreconcilable figures. To note one example, departmental figures show that a third-class letter costs more to handle than a first-class letter—which is obviously impossible.

This being the case, I am opposed to rate making with such scanty and inaccurate information as the basis for setting rates for the entire postal service. In 1949 I wrote to the Senate Post Office Committee something which I feel holds true now more than ever, and I should like to quote from that letter. "Under the present circumstances," I wrote, "rate making is crude and arbitrary, with the less vociferous users of the mails,

and the general public, being in the poorest position to protect themselves. If we make rates now without a proper foundation of knowledge we may not only discriminate against the weak and force hardships and inequities on various groups, but we may start an inflationary spiral."

Before we make radical and unprecedented increases in the rates I feel that prudent and sober judgment dictates that we obtain all the facts and bring some searching insight into this problem.

I am opposed to the rate bill at this time, until we have the facts.

As you know, in the present session of Congress there was introduced a resolution sponsored by 9 members of the 13-man Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I am told that Associated Third Class Mail Users were in the forefront sponsoring this legislation. The measure provides for a full study of the Post Office Department and the rate-making machinery. There is one charge consistently leveled at the Post Office Department—its failure to install modern business methods. Many experts feel that the adoption of these methods, including certain mechanization, would serve to so reduce the deficit that no rate increases would be required. I for one believe that there is a great deal of merit in these charges.

For that reason the resolution received my wholehearted support. The Postmaster General himself should welcome such a study. Certainly, if the joint committee created under the resolution, cooperating with representatives of the mail industry, comes up with some sound recommendations pointing the way to a substantial reduction in the Department's deficit, Mr. Donaldson should be happier than anyone. If he can give the American people better postal service at the same or lower rates, no one is going to kick very hard.

As many of you know, I participated actively in the debate on S. 1046, the bill to readjust postal rates. With respect to bulk third-class mail, I considered a 50-percent increase dangerous and unconscionable—and I said so on the Senate floor. I pointed out that this category of mail was increased 17 percent in the last rate bill and that the most which should now be asked was 25 percent. That is an over-all increase of 42 percent—a substantial hike in a very important cost item for thousands of small third-class users throughout America. I believe Mr. Donaldson made a serious error when he characterized third-class mail as junk mail. If, as he alleges, everybody who receives this deferred service, byproduct mail simply tosses it in the waste basket, then you gentlemen certainly are a pack of fools for throwing your time and money away so foolishly.

Your executive manager, Harry Maginnis, told me of a recent visit to Mr. Sheridan's office in the miscellaneous mails section of the Post Office Department. Mr. Sheridan is a fine young gentleman and nothing I say here will reflect ill of him. Mr. Maginnis informed Mr. Sheridan that he was there representing Breck's of Boston, a member of Associated Third-Class Mail Users, who had some problem or other having to do with a large mailing of their catalog. Mr. Sheridan remarked that he had just that morning received Breck's latest catalog and that he had ordered an item or two. The catalog had reached him via bulk third-class mail.

It is my contention that whatever medium is conducive to the marketing of products made by American labor is good for America and that all of us—the Post Office Department, the public, and Congress alike—should take a second look before we unjustly smear that medium. You gentlemen, through your business firms, are helping to make a better and greater America. I want all of you to know that you can count on my sup-

port whenever you are under unjust attack. As I have said, I know your problems, and I will always arise to defend you on the Senate floor whenever you are in the right.

Let me give you one parting bit of advice. A strong trade association is your most valuable ally. In any problem as complicated as postal rates, it is essential that you band together and gather the best information possible. Congressional committees are extremely anxious to hear from competent and expert witnesses. It lightens their burden and enables them to reach sounder decisions. In spite of the impression which has gained ground in some quarters, all wisdom does not repose within the walls of Federal bureaus. The representatives of Associated Third Class Mail Users presented your case intelligently and well. They have not made a nuisance of themselves, as many people sometimes do, but they have responded to the Congress' request for information in a speedy and cordial manner. I am only too happy to say this good word in their behalf.

In closing, allow me to quote from some of the statements I made when the postal rate bill was before the Senate last month. It sums up my philosophy on the postal question:

"One of the prime factors in developing our country has been the postal service. I stated earlier that when the founders of the Nation and those who gave us the written law of the land provided for post offices and post roads they intended to give service to the American people. It was not sheer caprice on the part of the founding fathers that they insisted on a postal service, and it is significant that the Postmaster General was one of the first Cabinet officers to be created along with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General.

"Recently we have heard comments that the Post Office must be run as a business, and that it should show a profit, or break even. This type of thinking is absurd and stems from ignorance. How would it ever be possible to develop such States as the Rocky Mountain States, or my own New Mexico, were it not possible for the remote farmer, lumberman, miner, to do his shopping and keep in contact with his friends and family via the mails?

"Of course the postal deficit is large. Much of that deficit is due to added burdens, subsidies for aviation, and other carriers, which have been tacked on to the postal budget. There is free Government mail. There are other burdens placed on the Department.

"Let us not be stampeded into an orgy of rate raising, only to discover that we have actually acquired no additional revenue and merely crippled the Department in the field of general public service, for which it was originally created."

Pawns, Not Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, satellites are obsequious dependents.

Is not an injustice committed on the floor of this House each time captive states bordering the Soviet Union are called satellites? They do not fawn to follow the foul fakers in the Kremlin.

Let us call them as we see them—pawns, not satellites.

Resolution of National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners, Resolution of Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissioners, and Address Entitled "Valuation: the State Commissions, and Section 19A," by Clyde B. Aitchison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me during the course of the debate this afternoon, I submit for printing in the Appendix a resolution of the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners; a resolution of Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissioners, and an address entitled "Valuation: The State Commissions, and Section 19A," by Clyde B. Aitchison.

The resolutions and address are as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., October 18, 1951.

It is hereby certified that the annexed resolution was unanimously adopted by the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners, at its annual convention, this day held

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILWAY AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS.

GEO. H. FLAGG, *President*.

AUSTIN L. ROBERTS, Jr., *Secretary*.

"ANNEX"

"Whereas complete up-to-date valuation of the railroads is absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of the Interstate Commerce Commission in cost accounting, capitalization, regulation, reorganization, proceedings and other cases; and

"Whereas due to insufficient funds the Interstate Commerce Commission has been unable adequately to carry on this work, be it

"Resolved by the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at its thirty-third annual convention, That it go on record as favoring such an increase in appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, as will enable it adequately to bring and keep up its present valuation studies; be it further

"Resolved That the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners request the Committee on Interstate Commerce and the appropriation committees of the Congress, make every effort toward an adequate appropriation by the Congress for this purpose"

CHARLESTON, S. C., October 17, 1951

It is hereby certified that the annexed resolution was unanimously adopted by the Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissioners in meeting assembled at Charleston, S. C., this day.

RALPH C. HORTON,

Chairman.

HOWARD FREAS,

Secretary.

"ANNEX"

"Whereas complete up-to-date valuation of the railroads is absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of the Interstate Commerce Commission in cost accounting, capitalization, regulation, reorganization, proceedings, and other cases; and

"Whereas, due to insufficient funds the Interstate Commerce Commission has been

unable adequately to carry on this work: Be it

"Resolved by the Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissioners in meeting assembled this 17th day of October 1951, That it go on record as favoring such an increase in appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, as will enable it adequately to bring and keep up its present valuation studies; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary and the State commissions of the conference request the Committee on Interstate Commerce and the appropriation committees of the Congress and the Senators and Representatives of the 11 Western States to make adequate appropriation for this purpose; be it further

"Resolved, That a similar resolution be prepared and presented to the executive committee of the NARUC for similar action at this convention.

VALUATION: THE STATE COMMISSIONS AND SECTION 19A

(An address before the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Charleston, S. C., October 18, 1951, by Clyde B. Aitchison)

The invitation to appear before you does not suggest the scope of this address. Having freedom of choice, I shall direct attention to a basic subject which recently has not received the consideration its importance should command. I shall recapitulate the early development and general concept of valuation as a factor in the rate-making process, the role of the State commissions, past and present, in that development; and shall call attention to pressing immediate problems which inhere in administration of section 19A of the Interstate Commerce Act, which provides for the valuation of the properties of carriers subject to the provisions of part I of that act. These matters are of concern to the States as well as the Federal Government. Many of the matters will be familiar and my remarks may be reminiscent, but I feel certain that some are but imperfectly understood and need to be stated clearly, and with greater force than I can command.

I

The concept of value as a basic factor in the determination of reasonable rates, or as a "rate base," evolved years before the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act. It originated with certain early State commissions, and long antedated the famous opinion of Justice Harlan, *Smyth v. Ames* (169 U. S. 465), decided in 1898. This interesting fact was developed by the research of John E. Benton, for many years the able and forceful representative of the State commissions in Washington as general solicitor of this association after service as a member of the New Hampshire Commission and as Solicitor of the Bureau of Valuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. Benton, speaking in 1937 at the exercises commemorating the semicentennial of the Interstate Commerce Commission, said:

"In this historic fair-return-on-fair-value rule, which in recent decades has been so often a stumbling block in the pathway of State regulation, and for which the United States Supreme Court is now so roundly condemned in some quarters, the Justice merely announced a rule which State commissions long before had developed for their own guidance, and extended the approval of the Court to elements, enumerated for consideration in applying that rule, which the reports of the State commissions showed they had long been considering.

"The State commissions, however, used fair return on value as a working rule, subject to other tests of reasonableness. It remained for a State legislature to make the rule statute law, and for the United States Su-

preme Court to engraft it upon the Federal Constitution."

Also interestingly, the cost of reproduction as a test of value gained a place in the famous fair-value rule of *Smyth v. Ames* because of the opportunistic argument of William Jennings Bryan before the Supreme Court, in his attempt to sustain the Nebraska maximum-rate law. His argument followed an earlier report of the board of secretaries in his State, who had applied cost of duplication as a test of value of railway property, instead of original cost. It was of common knowledge that the original cost of construction and the sums invested in the railways of the State during and following the Civil War were high, and swollen by wastes and rascalities which constituted a public scandal. The case came on before the court during the depression days of the nineties, and counsel for the State could well point out that whatever the cost of the road it would be far less if it were presently being constructed. In this way the court's opinion came to state that in ascertaining value "the present as compared with the original cost of construction" was to be considered.

But times change, and we change with them. A generation later, when railway construction costs had risen to a higher level, the railways seized upon and pushed to fantastic limits the cost of reproduction test, and thus turned this element of the rule to their advantage.

Without elaborating the point, it has seemed to me that the original cost versus reproduction theories were merely unconscious resort to marginal utility from the standpoints of the producer and the user of the service as a test of the worth of the transportation performed and utilized. Alfred Marshall would have said it was a question which blade of the scissors was entitled to the distinction of being the cutter. Again, those who urged the original-cost theory referred the public service to the law of agency, by which the principal (the public, users of the service) was bound to reimburse the agent (the carrier) for his reasonable outlays or reasonable use of his property for the benefit of his principal. Those who favored the fair-value test found analogy in the law of eminent domain—a forced taking of service, for which the Constitution insured fair compensation for the value of the thing taken.

Valuation and rate of return based thereon, together constituting fair return, became burning economic and political issues in the first decade of this century, in general simultaneously with enactment of numerous State statutes reducing passenger fares and freight rates. This movement was roughly contemporaneous with the agitation which brought about enactment of the Hepburn amendment of 1906, and the Mann-Elkins Act of 1910. Those acts gave the Interstate Commerce Commission for the first time workable powers for the fixation of freight and passenger charges by railroad. The same economic causes led to enactment of the 2-cent fare and the Cashman Act by the States, and to the vitalizing by Congress of the act to regulate commerce. During this period there were grave doubts as to the soundness of the financial structures and practices of the railroads, as to the accuracy and truthfulness of their accounts and records, and as to whether the roads were bearing their fair burden of taxation. These were times of investigations, and the facts developed engendered more investigations and more controversy. The value of the properties of the carriers, under the accepted rule in *Smyth v. Ames*, was a central point in all these controversies, but the facts were only imperfectly known, and many of the economic and legal theories governing their application were obscure, confused, and contradictory. Parenthetically, while we are now more sure of the facts, theories still remain in an enigmatical state.

So the Commissions, State and Federal, and courts and legislatures, as well as the carriers, in the first decade of the century generally took the fair-value test of *Smyth v Ames* as well settled as the law of the land. In applying the rule, there began the development of elaborate techniques for valuation ascertainment. The prime issue was confiscation, as in the *Smyth-Ames* case; secondly, it was recognized that value was a necessary factor in solving the problems of the infant art of cost-accountancy and determination of the relation between the cost and price of particular services. Incidentally, questions of taxation and capitalization were involved. The carriers had the advantage of the longer purse than the public authorities, and more experienced and better organized staffs of experts; besides, they had the most at stake and therefore could be more aggressive than quasi-judicial public authorities. The public authorities had to be consistent, the carriers were not under the same disability.

The original act to regulate commerce (sec. 20) required reports from the carriers as to "the cost and value of the carrier's property, franchises, and equipment." This provision is still in the act. In 1888 the Interstate Commerce Commission reported to Congress that it was impossible to secure accurate information or opinions as to cost, value of property, franchises, or equipment from the reports of the carriers. Even at that early date the Commission was well aware of the metaphysical difficulties in ascertaining value, and prophetically anticipated later contentions. " * * * a railroad property is not necessarily worth what it would cost to replace it, and, on the other hand, it may be worth very much more than that "

This was 40 years before *Smyth v Ames*, but long after John Stuart Mill had thought that valuation principles had all been well settled in the body of economic theory.

During this decade under consideration, many States set up valuation departments and vigorously undertook to get the information necessary to informed and effective action as to the rates and fares of their carriers, or to defend their orders. And the carriers, as the Commission said in its 1908 annual report, showed a growing tendency to meet attacks upon their rates by making proof, through their own experts and officials, of the value of or the cost of reproducing their physical properties. The Commission there painstakingly showed how unequal the contest was. From then on until in 1913 when Congress enacted the valuation amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act, successive annual reports of the Commission urged the need of an official valuation of interstate carriers, to be available in rate cases to complaining shippers, and also to the Commission by which such issues should be decided. It also urged that such an appraisal was a necessary predicate to an honest and informative balance sheet and to give of railway capitalization, over-all, and by light which would determine the propriety of railway capitalization, over-all, and by specific carriers. It said "the change which has gradually taken place in the past few years, as well as the increased responsibilities imposed upon the Commission by the amendment to the act to regulate commerce, makes continually clearer the importance of an authorized valuation of railway property, made in a uniform manner for all carriers in all parts of the country."

The States were forced to the same conclusion. Their rate proceedings were tremendous in scope and importance in their economic and political life. The State commissions were expected or required to appear in support of citizens of the States before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to defend in the Federal and State courts State-made rate or service orders. The Fed-

eral Government, the States, and the shippers, as has already been indicated, were often outmatched by the well-organized carriers. This is shown by the 1908 report of the commission already cited. The commission referred to its recent experience in the hearings of the important Spokane case, then much in the public eye. The affected railroads had compiled and put in evidence elaborate and detailed valuations, in defense of the unsalable transcontinental rates. This testimony would have gone unchallenged, for want of any champion of adverse interests, but for the fortuitous circumstance that the Washington State commission then had well under way an appraisal of the railroads of that State, which included portions of the transcontinental routes in controversy. But for the production by the State of Washington of its own capable and resourceful expert as a witness, fortified by the results of the State's investigation, the record before the Federal Commission would have been left wholly one-sided, and but inadequately tested.

Obviously, if claims of the carriers are to be tested or met, it must be by the action of public bodies. This situation is as true now as when in the Spokane case the Federal Government found itself helpless, the shippers were powerless, and the State commission, which alone could be of aid, could meet only partially the needs of the situation. Said the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"It is obviously impossible for shippers who are the complainants in such cases to meet and rebut such testimony, or even intelligently to cross-examine the railroad witnesses by whom such proof is made. In addition to the large expense of retaining experts competent to make such investigations, neither the shippers nor their experts and agents under existing statutes have any right of access to the property of carriers, or to their records showing the cost of construction and other necessary information. The carriers, on the other hand, being in possession of the information, or having access to the records and to the property from which the information may be compiled and gathered, can use it or not in any given case as their interests may require."

II

The movement for a Federal investigation became irresistible. Over a series of years the railroads insisted upon increases in freight rates, and the 1910 general proposals of increases precipitated an amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act conferring jurisdiction upon the Commission to institute on its own motion proceedings of inquiry into the reasonableness of rates, and to suspend or investigation the effective date of tariffs filed by the carriers. The public interest became intense. Compared with more recent increased rate proceedings, what was then sought seems absurdly moderate. The revelation of serious financial irregularities added impetus to the movement.

A bill for the Federal valuation of the physical properties of the carriers subject to the act was passed by the House. The procedure prescribed was relatively simple. The Senate considerably modified the House bill, persuaded to do so by the arguments of public-minded economic experts, that investigation should reach each common carrier in such detail that every fact which possibly could be wanted by any court, regulating commission, State or Federal, taxing authorities, investors, or other person, would be found and made public, in form to be used before the Commission or in the courts. The result was a very elaborate act—far more meticulous in detail and in its procedural requirements than the more simple form of appraisal, such as that which the States of Michigan and Wisconsin had made for limited purposes. Through the years

much has been made of the absurd relation between the original estimates as to the cost of such an appraisal and that which was actually incurred. The fallacy is that the estimates of costs made were upon the basis of a simple type of appraisal, and not for the elaborate scheme which the Senate substituted for the House bill. Further, no one at that time could foresee the ultimate of the intricacies which the technique of valuation was to develop, or could imagine the bitterness that came to mark the conduct of so many phases of the general appraisal inquiry. What all concerned had in mind in agitating for a Federal appraisal was a much more simple form of procedure than was adopted.

The Senate view prevailed, and was expressed in section 19a. It provided elaborately for initial appraisals, and equally elaborately for keeping the appraisal up to date. The act cast upon the Commission the most stupendous task of engineering inventorying and appraisal that the world has ever known or is likely to know. An administrative organization had to be built from the ground up, within the limitations of the Civil Service Commission's regulations. Complexities and obscurities with resulting disputation as to the meaning of many parts of the valuation act added greatly to the difficulty of the work and by consuming valuable time in the planning stages, delayed ultimate completion. There is little wonder that former Commissioner Prouty, the Director of the Bureau, exclaimed, "I would rather undertake to write the Chinese alphabet backward than read the thing (i.e. the valuation act) anyway, because it doesn't mean anything after you have read it."

The valuation was intended to be for the benefit of the States as well as for the purposes of the Federal Government. Therefore, the individual States largely discontinued valuation work, and tendered their files and assistance to the Federal Commission. Both files and assistance were accepted gratefully, and the task went forward in a spirit of cooperation between the States and the Federal Commission. Many experts of the States became members of the staff of the Bureau of Valuation. As tentative valuations were issued, the States which could do so scrutinized the data submitted, and if necessary filed protests and produced competent and relevant expert testimony at the hearings. This was done in connection with the Washington representatives of the Association, throughout the course of the whole of the primary valuation program.

I think I can epitomize the general feeling of the State commissioners, of whom I was one, which led them to establish their valuation counsel at Washington. They had great confidence in the individual members of the commission and in the guiding heads of the bureau of valuation who planned and directed its work—Director Prouty, who had rendered brilliant service as a member of the commission; Commissioner Staples, of the Minnesota commission, who was virtually assistant director, and eventually succeeded Director Prouty, Commissioner Maltbie, of the New York Public Service Commission, for a short time while the work was being planned; Patrick J. Farrell, who was made solicitor for the bureau, after brilliantly overturning in the Supreme Court thirty-odd adverse opinions of the Commerce Court, one after another, Joseph W. Folk, chief counsel of the commission, a prosecutor and executive who courageously and effectively broke up many iniquities, and Dr. Charles W. Needham, former president of George Washington University. But the State commissions were fearful that the commission might be led or high-pressured to adopt unsound theories of valuation or be led to undue liberality either in details or over-all conclusions. It is but fair to say that what was dimly feared never materialized.

The Interstate Commerce Commission before getting too deeply committed to any valuation program or set of theories set down a series of hearings upon the basic principles and technical procedural questions involved. The members of a special committee of the National Association of Railroad Commissioners on the invitation of the Commission took an active part in these conferences and arguments. But it became apparent that continuance of this practice would become too much of a burden upon individual State commissioners, and that there was need for day-by-day representation of the generally accepted point of view of the State regulating authorities, especially in the period of development of practices and the initial formulation of valuation principles. After long consideration, the association, at the San Francisco convention in October 1915, determined that the States should be represented by counsel in the valuation program and at the hearings, and authorized the committee on valuation "to do any and all things which will enable the States to assist the Interstate Commerce Commission in reaching a fair and just conclusion in this most important matter."

The Washington office of the association was therefore established on a very modest scale on May 22, 1916, upon this cornerstone, and the committee designated as its counsel your present speaker. This enterprise was welcomed by the Interstate Commission with warmth and sincere encouragement.

A considerable period of time can be swept over in a single sentence: The original solicitor, and his successors, particularly Charles E. Elmquist, of Minnesota, and John E. Benton, of New Hampshire, participated actively and, I think, effectively in shaping the procedural course and the principles of valuation finally adopted.

Too much cannot be said for the devoted and effective service of the members of the valuation committee itself during the early years of the work. The members were in addition to the solicitor, Commissioners Elmquist, of Minnesota; Bristow, of Kansas; Eastman, of Massachusetts; Niles, of New Hampshire; Shaw, of Illinois; and Taylor, of Nebraska, with the president of the association, Commissioner Thelen, of California, as an ex-officio member.

The result justified the labor and expense. No one ran away with the valuation, or succeeded in high-pressureing the Commission. Defense of the public interest was not easy, for the sums at stake were stupendous, and members of the Commission's staff and representatives of public bodies had to oppose the keenest and most resourceful experts in the country. What Congress initially intended to be administrative investigations developed into bitterly contested and intricate litigation. Commissioner Eastman spoke of the "sorry spectacle of many of the valuation proceedings which have attended public-utility regulation in recent years. Often they have been characterized by a riot of prolonged, demoralizing, and more or less disgraceful controversies over violently conflicting claims, with 'high value' experts on the one side and 'low value' experts on the other. Enormous amounts of time and money have been expended with very little satisfaction to anyone concerned" (170 I C C 526).

The work was prolonged far beyond all expectation, partly because investigation was metamorphosed into litigation, and in part by the effects of World War I, which demoralized the staff of the Bureau of Valuation. Further delay was due to the determination of the Director General of Railroads that as to roads under Federal control, valuation should be held in abeyance. Nonetheless, the Commission decided its "guinea pig" cases, and set the pattern of valuation. But not until 1932 could the Commission complete the last of the 1,035 primary valuation

reports upon the 1,685 steam railroads originally listed for valuation. Many were of great volume and intricacy. The procedural complexities of the act and its demand for extremely detailed particularity had delayed final results and added greatly to the labor and expense of the valuation, and opened broad fields for dispute before the Commission and in the courts. Illustrative of the procedural detail is the requirement for service of a tentative valuation upon the Attorney General of the United States. That officer, representing the Government, did not protest or appear in the hearings upon any of them.

III

With the completion of the primary valuations came into operation the duty of bringing records to currency. Valuations to be of practical use must not become obsolete, and the vast amount of work performed in ascertaining the original valuation, inventories, and land records must be supplemented periodically so as to reflect current conditions at all times, as closely as practicable. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (see 1932 Annual Report, I. C. C., p. 89) clearly stated the principle: "The basic work, now completed at great cost, should not be permitted to become useless by reason of obsolescence just when it is becoming what it is designed to be, a practical working tool and guide for the Commission in its many regulatory duties, or to Congress itself when the railroad situation is become acute."

Therefore, the primary activities of the Bureau of Valuation from 1932 on were centered on bringing the inventories and land records of the railroads down to date, and on completion of valuations of communications companies, and much later, of pipelines subject to the act. As to the communications companies, that duty is now lodged with the Federal Communications Commission.

The House committee in speaking of the many regulatory duties of the Commission, evidently had in mind especially two very burdensome tasks which had been imposed upon the Commission by the Transportation Act, 1920, 7 years after the enactment of the valuation act. One was the rule of rate-making, added as section 15a of the act (since materially amended), and the other the recapture plan, which in effect required the Commission to test the rate of return of net railway operating income of every carrier for each year, with the object of basing a claim for recovery of one-half of any excess earnings over a stated percentage of value in any year, to be covered into the Public Treasury as a fund for certain designated purposes.

The valuations for rate-making or recapture purposes were to be brought to date, periodically, in like manner to the original valuations. How burdensome were the prescribed details of the like manner procedure has already been stressed.

Neither the rule of rate-making nor recapture worked practically, or proved to be founded upon sound theory. The world economic conditions fluctuated too wildly in the twenties and thirties of this century. The architects of the Transportation Act of 1920 could not foresee these changes, and their theory got out of fit.

Tremendous labor had been expended in the attempt to administer the recapture experiment, until it was repealed, retroactively, June 16, 1933. In the same act, the like manner procedural provisions of the original act were eliminated with respect to the revision and correction of the original valuations.

While the procedure for keeping valuations current has been simplified, the Commission has been given a definite mandate as well as a wide discretion. It is required that upon completion of the original valua-

tions, the Commission "shall thereafter keep itself informed" of all new construction, extensions, improvements, retirements, or other changes in the condition, quantity, use, and classification of the property of all common carriers as to which original valuations have been made, and of the cost of all additions and betterments thereto and of all changes in the investment therein. This is obviously a task of inventorying and verification. To "keep informed" is not the same as "to accept without verification." The Commission may keep itself informed of current changes in costs and values of railroad properties, "in order that it may have available at all times" the information deemed by it to be necessary to enable it to revise and correct its previous inventories, classifications, and valuations of the properties; and, when deemed necessary, may revise, correct, and supplement any of its inventories and valuations. These provisions apply only to the process of keeping valuations current as to properties originally valued: The "in like manner" provisions apply to new properties coming on for valuation.

To enable the Commission to carry out these provisions, every common carrier subject to part I of the act is required to make reports and furnish such information as the Commission requires. This power has been implemented by suitable orders, and the carriers in response have submitted an enormous body of material which, the act contemplates, shall be utilized by the Commission in order to revise, correct, and supplement previous valuation reports.

Repeal of the recapture provisions permitted a sharp reduction in the number of employees in the Bureau of Valuation. At the height of the field work and the making of inventories, the valuation force reached a total of 1,391, on December 31, 1917, and the staff remained at about that figure through 1920. Within 1921 and 1922 the staff was more than cut in half. But the recapture attempt required progressive recruiting of additions to the force until in the year 1932. In that year the last of the primary valuations was issued, but the force had been increased by the recapture work to 960 for 1931 and 1932. Completion of the primary valuations and the liberalization of the statutory directions for keeping valuations current enabled a cut in the force from 917 to 360 at the middle of the fiscal year 1934.

From that time until the present day the decreases in successive appropriations have continued, and have required progressive reductions in the valuation staff. The number of employees when these words are written is but 81. One-third of the valuation employees of 2 years ago have been dropped from the roll. It is difficult to determine what further cuts will be forced by the obscure provisions and the confusing legislative history of the current appropriation act. One construction would reduce the present staff—hardly entitled to be called a skeleton organization—from 81 to 51 persons. This would so reduce the force, already reduced to the stage where efficiency is well-nigh impossible, that even nominal or colorable compliance with the duties imposed by the valuation act would be impossible. The cumulative effect of this long-continued process of compounded declamation is most alarming.

Under conditions as they are, and even more so as they are threatened, the Commission's duties as to correction of its valuations and keeping informed of changing conditions cannot be performed with justice to the public interests involved or to the carriers themselves. In recent successive increased rate proceedings the carriers have shown that many important property changes have been made in the way of replacements and improvements, and by re-

tiring less efficient operating property. These items presumably have all been reported to the Commission, and the duty of the Commission is to keep itself informed concerning them so that it may revise or supplement its earlier valuations. An enormous amount of detail has thus been furnished to the Commission in the last few years, but for want of provision of a staff competent to police the returns and make necessary property inspections in the field, the valuation work is "falling lamentably behind." With the backlogs indicated, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Bureau to prepare reliable data for use in the general rate-increase cases, or for other purposes. All previous experience has shown that acceptance of returns at their face value is not safe, or consistent with the public interest, or fair to the carriers which have gone to great expense to make the reports. Guardianship of the accuracy of the public record gives it probative and practical value. And beyond the testing and policing lies the practical need for revision of preexisting inventories, which is still another task of importance and magnitude. All these matters have repeatedly been brought to notice in the successive annual reports of the Commission.

The present situation has not entirely been brought about by the effort of Congress to retrench expenditures, or reprisal for lack of confidence in the integrity of the work. It is in large part, I think, due to acceptance of the thought that certain recent decisions of the Supreme Court, have so diminished in importance valuation and rate of return as factors in the rate-making process that they may be wholly ignored. The thought has been expressed that of all the functions of the Commission, the duty of keeping informed as to the value of the carrier property in the country could be abandoned or curtailed with least possible injury to the public interest. I disagree, both in economic principle and from the standpoint of what the governing statute requires from the Commission as administrative practice. By wishful thinking which has colored the reading of these recent decisions, we have lulled ourselves into a false sense of freedom from the need of considering matters which we desire to reject, and have rejected them without the necessary predicate for finding them to be useless as tests.

Too much reliance has been placed upon this sort of reading of recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as to administration of provisions of the natural-gas acts, of which the *Hope Natural Gas* decision (320 U. S. 591) is a leading case. It has been read from those opinions that the Court has "discarded the eminent-domain theory and basis of rate making, as announced in *Smyth v. Ames* . . . and has gone back to the doctrine as originally announced in *Munn v. Illinois* . . . to the effect that rate making is price fixing through the exercise of the police power of Government." A reasonable end result is assumed to satisfy the Constitution (and the particular statute which governed), but nowhere has the Court said "The rule announced in *Smyth v. Ames*, and heretofore followed by us in many subsequent cases, is accordingly overruled." It might, or might not, be wholly desirable and consonant with justice and sound economic principles, for the Court to have overruled the case cited, but it has not done so.

The carriers still may show the value of their property and the rate of return thereon. Certainly, in administering the Interstate Commerce Act, the Commission must consider all the elements of value detailed in section 19a. Valuations made under that section are prima facie evidence of value for all purposes growing out of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Commission has had the humiliating experience of reversal when it substitutes its own concept of what the act

ought to be for what the law says it shall do. It was even rebuked in one instance, although the court itself had said in unmistakable language that the matter required to be found was "incapable of rational determination." It is perilous for those charged with protection of the public interest to ignore *Smyth v. Ames*, particularly with section 19a still the law and requiring findings as to the matters which *Smyth v. Ames* said should be considered.

In certain recent rate cases of great magnitude before the Commission summarizations of the elements of value prepared by the Commission's bureau have been received in evidence. But although received without forceful objection to their reception, their effect has been challenged in testimony submitted to cast doubt upon the accuracy of the estimates.

But if either the prudent investment or original cost test is to be followed, and they are not the same, and all other valuation elements required under section 19a should be considered as read out of the act by judicial construction, neither cost nor investment can be determined in the true sense of that word without adequate polling and testing of the returns that are made by the interested carriers.

These are and have been times of continued rising prices, and in recent years the carriers have been able to show the need for more revenue without invoking the constitutional protection against confiscation. But prudent administrators, charged with the duty of keeping informed as to value, must look ahead to the time when the trend of rising prices will reverse itself. When the inevitable process of deflation acts in, we will have the situation presented that reduction rather than increase in rates will again be in order. Then value and rate of return once more will become a central factor in the inquiry as it was in 1922, following the deflation of 1921.

Are either the Federal and State authorities now prepared to see that the public interest takes no harm when value is the significant issue to be determined? In answering, the terrific intricacies of the problems of accountancy, engineering, land appraisal, and law involved must be borne in mind. Every valuation issue involves each of these subjects, and each subject is conflicting and ramified. At the present time the Interstate Commerce Commission has no hearing examiner in its Bureau of Formal Cases qualified by past experience to undertake the important responsibilities of developing an adequate record in a complex, hotly contested valuation proceeding. Nor is there available an attorney in the general staff of the Commission who participated actively in the former valuation proceedings, and who, with the confidence borne of long experience with the subject, could undertake either cross-examination of what Commissioner Eastman called the high value expert, or to carry on the examination of experts from the Commission's own staff. Five men in the field are obviously incapable of keeping up with changes in land values all over the country. As far as the participation of this association is concerned, I take it from perusal of the reports of the Washington office and the proceedings of the annual conventions, that the interest of the association largely was turned away from common carriers with the abandonment of recapture and modification of the old rule of rate making in section 15a of the act. However, as to this, officers of the association can speak more definitely than can I. The State commissions severally cannot be expected to set up organizations comparable to those they maintained until the Federal Government undertook the valuation job. And, I understand, the experience of some of the State commissions in attempting to

apply to their communications cases the same valuation rules that have been followed in the natural gas cases, has not been fortunate, to say the least.

I do not think I can do a greater service to this association, of which I have long been a member, than to remind it of the admonition of its own committee. I quote from the report found in the 1915 proceedings, at page 370.

"In conclusion, we suggest that because of the wide experience of State commissions in valuations of properties of different classes of utilities for some or all the purposes herein specified, it is the solemn duty of the various State commissions to their States and to the Nation to render all possible assistance in the Federal valuation."

The greatest possible assistance which the States can render now will be in helping the Federal Government to carry on its valuation adequately and thus protect the public interest and carriers alike. To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to perform its duties there should be provision for a continuing force, adequate and competent to make valuations in compliance with the law, that can be relied upon for any and all purposes for which the people of the States and of the Nation may desire to use it.

I have spoken hastily and in terms of restraint. I trust that neither my haste nor my restraint may tend to disregard of the seriousness of the situation which confronts us.

Statement of Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of presenting the whole truth in regard to previous mistaken statements heretofore placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting a statement by Joseph Rauh, Jr. Mr. Rauh has requested my assistance in this matter in order to clarify the facts regarding the counsel fees paid to the law firm of Winthrop & Simpson.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR., COUNSEL FOR WILLIAM W. REMINGTON

On October 17, Congressman VELDE made certain statements concerning moneys received by the Remington defense from the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust. The facts are as follows:

1. The Remington defense received \$20,000 from the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust. Payment was made by two checks for \$10,000 each, which were made out to me and immediately endorsed by me to the firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam, and Roberts, thus making it clear that they were not a fee to me. These funds were paid to Winthrop, Stimson to cover their actual expenses at the trial and on the successful appeal. No attorneys' fees were paid to me or to anyone else from the trust fund or otherwise. Mr. Chanler of Winthrop, Stimson took the Remington case as a matter of principle and without fee in the great tradition of his law firm and of its founder, Mr. Henry L. Stimson.

2. There is a confusion between the Robert Marshall Foundation, from which the Remington defense received no funds, and the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust, which aided the Remington defense. They are entirely separate organizations and all of

the contributions listed by Congressman VELDE were made by the Robert Marshall Foundation except the one to the Remington defense. The Civil Liberties Trust has been strongly anti-Communist in its operations. Indeed, its chairman, James Marshall, is a very distinguished conservative lawyer in New York who has served that city well for many years as chairman of its board of education. The Remington defense never accepted 1 cent from anyone with even the remotest sympathy with or leaning toward communism.

3 Counsel for William Remington undertook his defense at great personal expense because they believed and believe him to be innocent of the charges against him. In a proceeding such as this, with the Government spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on the prosecution, it takes substantial sums to cover out-of-pocket expenses without any attorneys' fees whatever. It is the American way that every man accused of a crime shall have his day in court. Mr. Remington's case is still pending; so that he too may have his day in court, I am asking that this statement be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JOSEPH L. RAUM, JR.

Current National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me during the course of the debate today, I submit, for printing in the Appendix, an advance copy of a speech to be delivered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Mooney] before the Economic Club of Detroit, Monday, October 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Judge Picard, distinguished guests, fellow Detroiters, I am very glad to come back to the Economic Club and talk with you this noon about some of the problems that are facing our Nation. The last time I spoke here, nearly 10 years ago, I was running a double tandem with Cliff Prevost as a fellow newspaper correspondent in Washington. Today, I have a new sort of responsibility and so has Cliff, who, if I know him, is having a great deal to say these days about the way the city of Detroit is running and by whom.

It is a trite phrase, gentlemen, but I honestly consider this a real opportunity. Our country is facing problems and dangers that it has never faced before. As a man who has had a considerable exposure to those problems, and who feels keenly aware of the danger not only to his own family, but to our system, our country, and our freedoms, I welcome the chance to discuss with you some of the broad phases of this picture as I see them.

When I have finished, I shall be happy to submit myself to as many, as specific, as searching questions as you have time for. I'll stay here as long as you will. I will do my best to answer them all, and if there are any that I can't answer, I will say so.

On some fundamentals I am sure we can all agree: First, we must prepare to protect our country and our freedoms against aggression which may come from the heart of the slave world in Moscow. Weakness would

be an invitation to disaster. Adequate strength will require single-minded devotion to that job, with absolute priority. It will mean a vast expansion of our atomic arsenal and a broadening of our atomic strategy. It will require sacrifice. It will, unfortunately, require great expense.

Second, we must not only be ready to win an atomic war if it comes, and we all pray God it never does, but we must make ourselves so strong that it would be the act of an imbecile—an obvious act of suicide—to attack us or our allies. I include our allies in that because, as I hope to demonstrate to you this noon, our allies are vital to our own strength. Mutual security in the free world is essential to our own survival.

Third, we must prevent our system from being destroyed from within the very process of building our military strength. That includes a program to check inflation.

It includes vigorous action to stamp out subversives and traitors within our shores. (I might say in passing that the determined efforts of our Government to quash that danger have greatly diminished it. J. Edgar Hoover's Federal Bureau of Investigation and other enforcement agencies of the Department of Justice have probably broken the back of the Communist Party in America. We must have a loyalty program, operating incidentally under the able chairmanship of a former Republican Senator from Connecticut, which is keeping this under close check.)

It includes the elimination of waste in Government, which in turn requires a basic revision of Congress' system of handling the Federal budget.

It is imperative that we get vigorous, intelligent and selective reduction in those expenditures of Government which are not essential. In writing a syndicated series of articles more than a year ago, I acquired some very definite ideas on how the economy job should be done, and how it cannot be done.

In essence, the story is this. You will never get real economy in Government by the methods and under the system which we have now on Capitol Hill. Congress must get expert advice. We must have staffs of men as familiar with the spending departments and agencies as the budget makers of those agencies themselves. Only that way can we tell where the budget can be cut and where it cannot be cut. I do not think that the way to save money is to make a slice of 5 to 10 percent off the top. That simply is not the way to do it. The results prove that it is not. It is not the way you do it in your business. It encourages padding. It is would-be economy in the dark.

We reported out of the Senate Expenditures Committee a measure called the McClellan bill which would set up such a system. It was sent back to another committee by action of the minority leader and we have just been able to get it out of that pigeon-hole. I hope that in the next session we will get action on it.

Speaking again of fundamentals, fourth—or perhaps first—we must have a high standard of ethics in Government. We must have in public life men who are primarily devoted to the public interest and not to their own interest or some selfish interest. We must root out of appointive or elective position those who would either despoil the people or who would deceive the people.

Ethics in Government should require the resignation of men in places of public and political trust whose practices may impinge on or violate the principles of clean Government. It requires equally the elimination of mink coats and fake composite pictures; of influence loans and of vicious character assassination carried on behind a cowardly use of the cloak of congressional immunity.

What else does achievement of a high standard of ethics in Government require?

Obviously, it does not require retirement from the public service of every official who is subjected to the third-degree methods of fear, ignorance, bigotry and smear. Obviously, it does not mean a gullible acceptance of every irresponsible charge made by the unscrupulous.

But I think we can agree that it does mean a strict separation of political leadership from influence exercised against the public interest in any instance, by anybody, in either political party. It does mean a refusal to accept pressures exerted upon public men against the public interest. It does mean a greater sense of responsibility by some of those of great private power who seek to exert such pressures.

Public officials do not bribe themselves. We must not forget that for every Government official who is corrupted, there is a businessman who has not only violated his own integrity but has contributed to the destruction of confidence in his Government.

Proper public ethics requires vigorous prosecution of anyone who has violated his public trust, whether he be in the Bureau of Internal Revenue or elsewhere. It also requires public contempt for those party leaders who shove forward professional political ax men to do their dirty work for them.

In other words, ethics in Government would end unscrupulous attempts to mislead the people, or to mislead the people, by anyone.

What we must have in the months ahead is an honest effort by the leaders of both political parties to bring the real issues before the country. That is the basis on which our leadership must be chosen.

In my judgment, the American people can tolerate no approach except the propublic approach. For today, our system, the way of life we have built up over the decades, our freedoms, and our very survival as a Nation are in real jeopardy.

Slippery forces springing from the selfishness and egomania of evil men have come upon the world before, but never until now, not even in the evil genius of Hitler, has such a menacing complex of a godless and unscrupulous will to dominate been linked with such a terrible war potential, with such a pervasive patience, and with the science which has shrunk distance and created the means with which to destroy civilization.

There is nothing facing us that we cannot overcome if we realize what we are up against and act accordingly. But we can meet this danger only if we face up to the real situation.

Let me say this with all the emphasis at my command: We cannot afford the luxury of illusions, or of catering to our prejudices.

We must face the facts of life today not as we should like them to be but as they are. We are confronted, if we should fail to build our strength, with the threat of atomic war which could destroy our cities and annihilate our civilization. And Detroit, of course, is widely discussed as the No. 1 target of Red atomic bombers.

We are confronted internally with the danger that by being soft and complacent, by clinging to outmoded and unintelligent provincialisms, we could permit the free-incentive system which has enabled us to build the greatest country in the world to be burned out by the terrible, destructive fires of inflation.

We can no longer afford to face politics and political issues as though it made no difference what we said or did because life would go on about us anyway. This is the first time—Isn't it?—that we in Detroit have been within the bombing range of airplanes from bases on enemy soil, planes we know they have, which could drop atomic bombs we know they have.

Our country has never been in a position where, in a period of half-war, we have had

to devote \$50,000,000,000 a year to the creation of military equipment. Never before, except in time of world war, have we had the economic problems caused by diversion of that much production from normal channels, the tax problems to pay for such a Military Establishment nor the necessity, entirely aside from any possible economy, of so much expense to pay for the strength essential to protect ourselves.

If I sound alarmed, let me assure you I am not alarmed. I am confident I firmly believe we have within our grasp the means to repel this threat to our country and to our freedom. Let me emphasize. There is nothing facing us that we cannot handle.

But we must not imagine that it is going to be an easy task; that it will be a comfortable task; that it will be an inexpensive task, that we can be complacent; that we can automatically assume we will be physically secure in the future as we have been in the past.

To meet today's threat, we must understand that the politician who says that we are handed emergency after emergency after emergency, as though our danger were synthetic, as though it were dreamed up from the depths of political manipulation, and that the Kremlin had nothing to do with the world situation, is either misleading the people deliberately or just doesn't know the score.

Our danger synthetic? Nothing could be further from the truth. Anyone who discussed today's emergency, as some of my colleagues have, as though it were fictitious, is insulting the intelligence of the American people.

We must have a program for survival. I believe we have that program. We are going to carry it out.

It is a program worked out, in its broadest international phases, jointly by a Democratic President and Secretaries of State and Defense, and some of the greatest Republican leaders of yesterday and today—albeit a minority wing of the Republican Party—guided until recently by the late great Senator of whom our State is so proud, who was big enough to change his opinions and to put country above party.

In its domestic phase, the program has been worked out and carried out by a Democratic President on a completely unpartisan basis with the help of some of the ablest businessmen of America—men like Charles E. Wilson who gave up a \$400,000-a-year job as president of General Electric to come to Washington to serve his country, like Eric Johnston, who is the owner of four independent businesses in the Northwest and whose knowledge and judgment on public questions is so well thought of that he was paid by a great industry \$175,000 a year in salary and expenses. And he gave that up to serve his Government.

It has been charged that this emergency program is socialistic. Is there anyone so out of touch with reality as to believe that either Wilson or Johnston is a Socialist—or has become a captive of Harry Truman's chain?

Today, our external program, embodying a strong course in international action against communism is under political attack. The equally strong course of internal action against inflation, conceived so that we will not be destroyed by the very process of strengthening ourselves against the external threat, is also under political attack.

I do not believe that our policy has been perfect by any means. I have often been sharply critical of some phases of it. No person—no program—can ever avoid all mistakes.

But I do deplore the fact that politics no longer stops at the water's edge. I do deplore the fact that men who, when the step was taken, recognized clearly and publicly the need for our leading United Nations

action in Korea, now descend to partisan criticism of that step.

I do deplore the words of those who call our mutual security program, which is absolutely vital not only for the survival of our allies but of our own country, a grandiose scheme to give away needlessly the money of the American taxpayers.

Let us not be fooled. Appeals to the natural impulse to get by without sacrifices if we can, will, if they are successful, destroy us. The false faces of political demagoguery can do more harm than those crouched behind them seem to realize.

What we must do, as I see it, is to distinguish clearly between our real danger and the phony "dangers" raised by those unable to grasp the magnitude of the real ones; by those desiring to make political capital by appealing to the preconceptions of certain groups of our people.

For example, if we exposed ourselves to Red aggression by failing to build our military strength, that danger would be very real. If we failed to protect our economic structure against the inflationary pressures generated by our military program, that danger would be very real.

If in the face of our huge necessary expenditures, we failed to exercise prudent and vigorous economy in less essential areas of Government, that could weaken our system. If we swallowed every irresponsible allegation about our national leadership, made on the Senate floor or elsewhere, that would endanger us, because it would—and I'm afraid it sometimes does—confuse and divide us.

If we should turn back to the Fortress America concept which seems to ride so actively and so close to the skin of some of our leading figures who have announced their renunciation of isolationism, that would put us in terrible danger, as I shall endeavor to demonstrate in a few moments. If we do not now carry out our program for survival, then we are not only in danger from attack from without but of regimentation and destruction of our system from within.

But we must not waste our attention and be diverted by mock dangers which do not exist.

For example, we have heard a lot of talk that our Government is leading us toward socialism or some other sort of un-American "ism." I assure you that is simply that—talk. Socialism is not coming to America because of the Government's participation in certain public services. Just think a few moments. Do you consider the delivery of mail socialism? The Government does it.

Do you consider public roads socialism? Do you now consider social security for the aged and unemployed, which was denounced in this city in the heights of the 1936 political campaign as "viciously socialistic," a factor that undermines (or strengthens) the structure of the country?

Do you feel it is socialism to control wages and prices at a time when huge expenditures for military goods will exert tremendous pressures on price levels?

Would it be better to let higher prices and wages and costs and still higher prices pyramid one upon another in ever-accelerating pace until our system toppled?

Some of you may feel that Detroit's ownership of its street railway system is socialistic. But it was advocated by a great newspaper in this town that I have never considered socialistic, and I know something about that newspaper.

According to Charlie Weber, the usually accurate reporter of the Detroit Free Press, the city government gives 433 different services to the people of this city. Does that make Al Cobo a Socialist?

You may recall the cries of "boondoggle" and "socialism" which arose when the Government undertook to build the great multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia and

Tennessee Rivers back in the thirties. Those were projects which never would or could have been undertaken by private capital because they had too many facets to be suited to private investment. They involved navigation; they involved flood control, they involved the irrigation of vast tracts of farm land; they affect erosion of the soil in large areas. They also created a vast supply of hydroelectric power.

Did these projects strengthen or weaken our free-enterprise system? Let's see.

They did involve the use of Government capital, but they also augmented the national wealth, they increased our power to produce. Since they were not suited to be developed by private capital, would the country have been better off if the Government had just skipped the whole thing? Should the resources have gone undeveloped?

Well, let's take a look at that one. Look at your industrial maps. Where are the great aluminum plants, which, of course, are owned and operated under private enterprise? What made those plants possible?

The great expansion of aluminum capacity was near these dams. That was no coincidence. That was the place, the only place, the power was available. And if the power hadn't been available, we wouldn't have had the aluminum and we might never have had the air fleet that we needed to win World War II.

Where are the basic atomic plants which are also operated by private concerns? Had you ever heard of Hanford, Wash., or Oak Ridge, Tenn., before the days of the atomic bomb? Of course not. And you never would have heard of them had it not been for the development of power that made it possible to split the atom which according to the estimates of the Joint Chiefs of Staff saved the lives of 750,000 American boys by bringing the war against Japan to an end.

Where did we get the electric power to create that fissionable material? We got it from those power projects. Yes, those public power projects in which the strength and the authority of the public undertook to develop the resources of our own country in a way that private resources never would or could have done it.

Did that make for a stronger, more secure America, or a weaker, more vulnerable America?

Is it not ridiculous to allege we are being taken into socialism by doing things which strengthen our free-enterprise system? By doing things that increase our standard of living under that system and giving more people a greater stake in preserving it? That system has given us the greatest productive power in the history of any nation of the world. It is never going to be changed or undermined unless we commit one of two terrible blunders.

The first blunder would be to permit sharp inflation of prices. If you really want government in your business, just turn loose this deadly spiral and drive prices and wages and costs up and up and up. That would not alone make cruel victims of the American consumer. It would not alone increase the amount of taxes we would have to pay, to obtain the same number of military items, by billions and billions and billions of dollars. It would not alone squeeze the small-businessman. It would not alone put the farmer back where he was in the early 1920's and then after a decade of chronic depression, in the early 1930's. It could also destroy the most powerful unit of our economy, those who (materially) have the most to lose if our system were destroyed. For inflation could destroy our system. How?

In today's situation, with the tremendous load of the debt piled up in the process of winning World War II overhanging us, with the tremendously greater social and economic pressures that have developed in our country in the last two decades, we might have after

the peak of such an inflation, a crash that would plunge us downward into a depression that would make the last one seem like the good old days.

If we allow that to happen, if inflation whirls our economic engine to such a white heat that it freezes and stalls, then millions once more will be out of work. Production will stall. And, incidentally, profits will melt away.

Then whatever party were in control of Congress, whoever were President would be forced, just to keep people eating, to put government into business to an extent never before approached at any time, even wartime.

Call it socialism. Call it what you will. It would do nothing any of us here today want to happen.

But there is another way that we could undermine our free system. That way is even more dangerous. For by following that route, the route of isolationism, we might not alone subvert our structure from within. We ultimately would find ourselves alone in the world to fight against a Red empire many times more powerful and more resourceful than the Kremlin is today.

That is the reason why I indicated to you a while ago that our international program is not based merely on a humanitarian impulse to rescue, at great expense to ourselves, the lives and countries of those people who believe in freedom as we do. It is equally essential to our own survival.

No real expert on actual conditions in Europe, be he Paul Hoffman, or "Ike" Eisenhower, or John Foster Dulles, or anyone you might name but would tell you that the Marshall plan saved Western Europe from communism. It was American leadership that provided not only the dollars and materials but the momentum and the hope which has enabled our allies (with all their faults) to build themselves back from the destruction and horror of war in the most remarkable economic and social recovery in the history of the world.

It is perfectly evident, I think, to anyone who has studied conditions with an open mind (and I, as most of you know, have had the opportunity of doing so at least once each year since the war, thanks to the broad approach on international questions of my former employer, the Detroit News) that France and Italy would be Communist today had it not been for the Marshall plan. That would mean a Red Europe. (What effect would that have, by the way, on Michigan's export business?)

Yet, we have had highly respected public figures advocating a retreat to "Fortress America," saying in effect that we would be better off to go it alone in the world; saying in effect that we are wasting our money when we help our allies; saying in effect that our industry and military potential is so great that we never need worry about our physical safety here. And if you think there are no longer any velled isolationists on Capitol Hill, I invite you to a careful scrutiny of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recent months.

And, Detroiters, remember this: Just as we would have lost Europe by following the advice of those men then, so we can lose it in following them now. They will no longer counsel us to walk out on our allies. The folly of that would now be too patently obvious. But they continue reluctant. They continue to try to obstruct and undermine. They still seem to resist carrying out a program that is adequate to stop the Communists and erect a wall around the Red empire which ultimately will force it to crack up from within.

In my judgment, there is one great, big, glaring hole in the viewpoint of the velled isolationists. That is that our great industrial complex, which is the most powerful force for peace in the world today, and which

we are all proud to say centers in our city of Detroit, is self-sufficient.

Every one of you men in the automobile business knows that it isn't. You must have copper. You have to have nickel. You need tungsten. You require chrome. And most of all, as I have been telling Manly Fleischmann in every way but flying for the last few weeks, you sure do have to have steel.

There are 167 critical materials which we must import in order to keep our industry going. One of them is uranium. You all know why we need that. Another is manganese. You can't make a pound of steel without manganese.

I wonder what Mr. Fleischmann's problems would be today, or what the problem of the automobile industry would be today, if because we had cast away Europe and all of Asia to the Reds by failure to carry out an adequate international program, we were scraping the bottom of the barrel on manganese.

What would be the situation today when Detroit industry and Detroit unions and Michigan Senators went to NPA and asked for steel to keep our great plants going? Remember that if we had lost our allies, the Reds would have gained them. If we had followed the advice of the velled isolationists in 1947 and 1948, we would be facing a far deadlier and more powerful foe today.

And incidentally, if we make the mistake of turning for leadership toward those men who so grievously miscalculated before, we could find ourselves surrounded, outnumbered, outproduced, and outarmed in the future.

Failure to carry through our program of international leadership, of assembling the force of the free world against communism, and—with or without the label—we would find ourselves isolated. We would be confronted by the most menacing military force in history under the command of men whose single purpose is to enslave us and destroy our freedom.

What would we do then? First of all, to have hope of protecting ourselves, we would assuredly have to build a vastly greater force than has ever before been conceived. Today there are other free peoples on our side. Then the enemy would be much stronger. But—and here is the core of it—the very loss of allies which would make us the weaker of the two forces in the world, would strike a solar plexus blow at our great industrial power.

First. If we were cut off from our supply of uranium, we would be crippled in our attempt to carry out the program outlined the other day by Connecticut's great Senator BRIEN McMAHON for vast expansion of atomic energy.

This, incidentally, offers the best hope over the long pull of a substantial reduction in military expenditures.

Second, the lack of manganese and other critical metals would strike at the vitals of our power to produce. To build a military force such as we would then need would certainly require plenty of steel. Where would we get the manganese to produce even the steel needed to build that vast military force? And, if we were having trouble getting enough manganese and enough steel even to meet our military requirements, how many automobiles per quarter do you think Mr. Fleischmann could allot us steel for then.

How great then, do you feel, would be the wrench on the industry and on the people of Detroit?

How heavy then do you think the impact would be on the American farmer, if the buying power of his city consumer dwindled? What would then happen to the small-business man? What would happen then to the profits of our Detroit corporations, which

we are proud to say number among the greatest and most profitable enterprises in the world; corporations which have been doing quite well, thank you, under the modern American system of the 1940's and the 1950's while so many mental malaprops have kept on babbling about socialism in America.

But distort and weaken our system by shriveling its supply of steel and production would stall. Tides of unemployment would sweep across the Nation. When we needed to be strongest, our sinews would be sapped. And, whoever was President, whatever party was running the Congress, you would find the Government in the management of our system so deeply and inextricably that our freedom would have been automatically destroyed.

By blindness, by failure to do the things now that can be done to avoid any such situation, our own inflationists and isolationists would have proven his case for Karl Marx—that ultimately we would destroy ourselves. They would have handed a crushing victory to Stalin and his gang in the Kremlin.

Let me say again, for emphasis: I do not believe that America ever need get itself into any such predicament. But I do hope that when people talk about socialism and the danger of subverting our system, they will think about the factors that might really bring it about. I hope they will not continue to confuse themselves and the American people by bellowing as though they had been bitten every time the Government takes action to help stabilize and preserve the very free system to which we are devoted.

In closing, I should like to get back again to fundamentals. We may not agree on everything. But I think and I hope that all of Detroit, and all of Michigan, can agree on the five specific points of this program for survival.

(1) A military program great enough to make attack on us obvious suicide, (2) strong international leadership by the United States; (3) an adequate and effective program to check inflation; (4) responsibility and high ethics on the part of both public and private men associated with government, (5) the maximum amount of government economy which is possible without undermining essential functions of government or crippling our military program.

If we can unite on that program, if we can keep always in mind the fact that we are involved in a bigger and deadlier game today than ever before, and the fact that our enemies are fanatical, ruthless, devious, powerful, and infinitely patient; if, as individuals we always give this program for survival absolute first priority—as absolute priority as a draft board exercises when it lays its hands on the shoulders of a young man and if we never forget that we need God's help as well as our own utmost effort to win through, then we have it in our power to preserve our liberties, our system, our prosperity and, in the end, peace.

Policies and Practices of National Shipping Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a report from the United States Maritime Ad-

ministration upon their stewardship of the National Shipping Authority.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 15, 1951.
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Reference is had to letter sent you under date of August 16 by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, Maritime Administrator, acknowledging yours of July 27, in which inquiry was made as to policies and practices of the National Shipping Authority in the appointment of general agents and in the allocation of vessels to such agents.

Up to the present date we have appointed a total of 45 American shipping companies to act as general agents for NSA operated vessels. In making these appointments the following basic requirements have in all cases been observed.

1 The applicant must have a working capital of at least \$50,000 and a minimum net worth of \$300,000.

2 The applicant must have a satisfactory credit standing with the National Shipping Authority and the Maritime Administration, and must have no outstanding obligations to others which in the judgment of a prudent businessman would render its employment not in the best interests of the United States.

3 Each applicant must qualify as a citizen of the United States within the meaning of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (U. S. C. title 46, sec. 802) and section 905 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

4 Applicant must own and operate either in its own name or in that of a closely related company at least one vessel of not less than 1,500 gross tons under United States registry actively engaged in the ocean commerce of the United States.

5 Applicant must possess practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the ocean commerce of the United States and employ an adequate and qualified staff of supervisory shoreside personnel capable of conducting, in the opinion of the Director, National Shipping Authority, an efficient and economical operation of vessels in the services required under its service agreement GAA-3-19-51. Appointments to date have been limited to companies with going organizations, capable of handling at least five Liberty-type ships without requiring any material increase in supervisory staffs.

6 Consideration has also been given to the applicant's degree of cooperation with policies of the United States as expressed in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and other acts relating to the foreign commerce.

In connection with the above-listed requirements, we are enclosing a copy of our NSA Order No. 3 (AGE-2), which includes the formal application governing the appointment of general agents and berth agents, together with a copy of NSA Order No. 1 (AGE-1), which prescribes the form of general agency agreement under the terms of which the vessels are operated for our account.

To date a primary requisite to general agency appointment has been ownership and operation of United States flag tonnage, and each of the companies thus far appointed owns and operates at least one vessel under United States registry either in its own corporate name or in that of a closely related company. This is in line with our advice to all applicants to the effect that preference would be given to owners of American flag

vessels (copy attached). In this letter you will also note our statement to the effect that we could give no assurance of assignment of vessels to any individual company despite the fact that the company might meet all of the necessary requirements. It has been and is our belief that adherence to the ownership policy is justified during the emergency period of operation short of war or of full mobilization, in which we are now engaged. In this connection, the argument has often been advanced that we should allocate vessels to general agents on a pro-rata basis according to the number of American flag vessels owned and operated. We have not adopted such a policy for the reason that to do so would tend to concentrate an exceedingly large part of our vessel operations in the hands of a relatively limited number of companies normally engaged only in the berth or liner services. Then too, it does not necessarily follow that a large company engage in a multiplicity of operations with its own private fleet can at the same time give better care and attention to the operation of an additional group of vessels for Government account than can a capable and efficient smaller company whose principal activity is general agency operation. However, that is not to say that we have not made a substantial number of allocations to the larger owner-operators, since the opposite is the case, as is reflected in one of the attachments to this letter.

You will appreciate that when authority was granted to commence the operation of Government-owned vessels, space available in privately owned vessels was very short and, as a result, freight rates were increasing daily. Consequently, it was necessary that we place our vessels in the market with the least possible delay. To accomplish this we immediately assigned vessels to 17 companies which had acted as general agents for the War Shipping Administration and Maritime Commission and which, for the purpose of breaking out, stripping, laying up, and so forth, of our vessels, had retained their Agency agreements in active status. In this manner we eliminated a considerable delay which would have occurred in handling the administrative details of entering into new agreements. Subsequently, of course, all of these companies executed the new General Agency Agreement. They are as follows:

American Export Lines, Inc., American Foreign Steamship Corp.; American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.; American President Lines, Ltd., Bildberg Rothchild Co., Inc.; Diekmann, Wright & Pugh, Inc.; Farrell Lines, Inc.; Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.; Olympic Steamship Co., Inc.; Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Co., Prudential Steamship Corp., South Atlantic Steamship Line, Inc.; T. J. Stevenson & Co., Inc.; United States Lines Co., Waterman Steamship Corp., Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc.

In the light of the then existing and prospective heavy ECA and other national interest shipping requirements, we proceeded to enter into general agency contracts as quickly as they could be processed with another group of 15 thoroughly qualified applicants, as follows:

American Mail Line, Ltd.; A. H. Bull & Co.; Coastwise Line; Grace Line, Inc., Isthmian Steamship Co.; Matson Navigation Co.; Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., Pacific Far East Line, Inc.; Pacific Transport Lines, Inc.; Polaris Steamship Co., Inc.; Pope & Talbot, Inc.; Seas Shipping Co., Shepard Steamship Co.; States Marine Corp. of Delaware; Union Sulphur & Oil Corp.

All of this latter group, with the exception of the Pacific Far East Line and Pacific Transport Lines had also acted as General Agents for War Shipping Administration and operated large numbers of vessels for Government account in that capacity. The two exceptions are postwar steamship

owners and operators of a substantial nature who operate scheduled sailings from our Pacific coast ports. They were both qualified to charter Maritime Commission tonnage after the war and consequently were familiar with Government procedure and accounting practices. Appointments of the aforementioned 32 companies were made during the latter half of March and in early April of this year. Since that time it has been possible for us to proceed more slowly and to date we have approved an additional 13 companies, as follows:

Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc.; Alaska Steamship Co.; Stockard Steamship Corp., Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc.; New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.; A. L. Burbank & Co., Ltd.; General Steamship Corp., Ltd.; North Atlantic & Gulf Steamship Co., Inc.; Wessel, Duval & Co., Inc.; Arrow Steamship Co., Inc.; Bloomfield Steamship Co.; West Coast Trans-Oceanic Steamship Line; Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc.

Of this last group, all but four were wartime general agents of the War Shipping Administration. The four exceptions involve companies established since the end of World War II, and having substantial operating experience as well as ownership interest in the American merchant marine. They are: Arrow Steamship Co., Inc., which owns three vessels, Bloomfield Steamship Co., which owns eight vessels; West Coast Trans-Oceanic Steamship Line, which owns three vessels, and Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., an operating company, which through its majority stockholders controls 13 affiliated companies which together own 34 American registered vessels. Stockholders of the latter companies also own substantial interests in 16 additional companies which own a further group of 22 vessels. Stock in the 29 corporations is owned more than 50 percent by United States citizens, and all of the 56 vessels fly the American flag. They are all managed and operated for the individual corporations by Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc.

Another matter in which you have expressed interest is the consideration which has been given to the appointment of "liner" companies as compared with "tramp" companies. In this respect, as in regard to many other phases of our activities, there have of course been advanced arguments in favor of preferential use of one or the other type of operator. Our operating activities to date have been solely of the "tramp" type. However, we have not selected our General Agents nor allocated vessels to such agents according to the type of vessel operations normally performed. Instead, and to the extent of our need for General Agents to date, we have endeavored to appoint all qualified companies which have made application to us. Not all of the established American liner companies have sought appointment. As to those which have, all have been appointed except for a few that for one or another reason are still under consideration. In this connection, it is of interest to note that certain of our liner companies holding General Agency appointments have of late formally or informally declined to accept further vessel allocations, either because of dissatisfaction with the amount of compensation being paid or because of unwillingness at this time to undertake the staff expansion required to adequately handle the additional workload involved in operating more vessels for our account. There is of course no question that the liner companies can adequately service the "tramp" type operations in which our vessels are engaged, since most of them have engaged in such operations either as a normal part of their over-all fleet operations, as bareboat charterers of Government-owned tonnage since the war, or

as General Agents for the War Shipping Administration during and after the war. Conversely, however, we do not hold eligible for berth agency appointment the "tramp" or non-liner type company, and if and when it should become necessary for General Agency vessels to engage in general cargo berth type operations, the cargo activities connected therewith will be entrusted to qualified and duly appointed Berth Agents.

You have also inquired as to the consideration given to foreign flag connections of applications for General Agency appointment. It is of course the case that a very large number of American shipping companies have foreign affiliations of one sort or another, such as ownership of foreign registered vessels, charters of such vessels, agency relationships, pooling agreements, etc. Affiliations and relationships of this nature are in the main directly attributable to the international character of merchant shipping, and by no means can all of them be said to be detrimental to the American merchant marine. Nevertheless, we have given very careful consideration to the nature and extent of such relationships in our consideration of General Agency appointments, and have appointed those companies involved in such relationships only after having arrived at the conclusion that the present and potential benefits derived from having their talents and organizations devoted to serving the Government far outweigh any possible detriments flowing from the foreign affiliations.

As concerns the consideration given to the manning of ships by the respective unions, it is our policy, insofar as it can reasonably be done, to maintain the preexisting ratio of union employment afloat. In other words, we feel that no one union group should be allowed to unduly increase its membership at the expense of another through the allocation of general agency ships. However, in the actual implementation of this policy we are confronted with many practical difficulties. We have mentioned that certain of our large and well-established liner companies have declined further general agency allocations, others have from time to time declined allocations because the reactivation work was to be done in areas too far distant from their headquarters. Still others have not wanted to take vessels at particular periods of time. We cannot allocate vessels solely in relation to the union element involved, but must at all times give consideration to equitable distribution between agents, their capacity and willingness in each case to handle additional vessels at a given time, and many other individual factors involved.

Despite these stated problems and difficulties, we feel that we have been able thus far to maintain our allocations on a basis of reasonable distribution as between the major seafaring unions involved, and in this connection we forward herewith a summary statement setting forth the number of vessels allocated to date together with the primary unlicensed union affiliation of each general agent. You will note that at the present time 18 of the companies are affiliated with the National Maritime Union, 9 with the Seafarers International Union, 15 with the Sailors Union of the Pacific, and that 3 maintain joint affiliations with the National Maritime Union and the Sailors Union of the Pacific. You will also note that to date 157 ships have been allocated to National Maritime Union companies, 84 to Seafarers International Union companies, and 115 to Sailors Union of the Pacific companies.

The use of general agency vessels thus far has been devoted entirely to the transportation of bulk commodities moving under voyage charter terms and conditions and to the transportation of military cargo for account of the Military Sea Transportation Service. In all cases, the use of general agency vessels

has been supplemental to the availability of American-flag privately operated vessels. In order to assure the proper implementation of this policy a procedure has been instituted whereby owners of all American-flag vessels furnish weekly reports indicating the employment and location of their vessels and stating whether they are interested in handling bulk commodities between given areas.

Prior to assigning general agency vessels to lift outward or homeward cargoes, we are thus reasonably assured that privately operated ships are unavailable to perform the services requested by the Economic Cooperation Administration or other appropriate agency. This applies to the outward bulk cargoes of grain, coal, etc., sponsored by the Economic Cooperation Administration and also to the relatively few inward bulk cargoes, consisting primarily of metallic ores. It is contemplated that this type of operation will continue to prevail during the foreseeable future. Should it become necessary to handle other than full shipload lots of bulk commodities, the berth agency principle in effect during War Shipping Administration days will be reinstated.

In regard to the rules governing the appointment of berth agents we refer you to article 3 (h) of the general agency agreement which reads as follows:

"The general agent (solely as agent of the United States and not in any other capacity) shall select its subagents, but any subagency agreement shall be terminated by the general agent whenever the United States shall so direct.

"In the event that any vessel assigned to the general agent under this agreement is allocated by the United States for use (1) in a service in which another operator (a United States citizen) maintained a berth operation with privately owned United States flag vessels on June 25, 1950, and is recognized by the United States as a regular berth operator in such services, or (2) in a trade, not served with privately owned United States flag vessels on June 25, 1950, or not served on the date of such allocation by a United States citizen who is deemed by the United States qualified to conduct an efficient berth operation, where the United States deems another operator to be qualified as an operator in such trade, such regular or other operator, as the case may be, may be designated by the United States as the berth agent of the United States to conduct such of the business of the vessel in such service or trade as the United States may require.

"During any period while any such vessel is assigned to a berth agent, the general agent shall be under no obligation to perform with respect to such vessel duties which are imposed upon the berth agent under the terms of the berth agency agreement prescribed by the United States."

The berth agency agreement has been drafted and will be published within the next few days. As previously stated, if our activities expand to the extent of requiring the allocation of ships for general cargo service, it is our intention to select companies as berth agents who qualify under the provisions of the article heretofore quoted. It is our policy, however, to give the liner operators every opportunity to provide service in their respective trades with their own or privately chartered tonnage, and, where such tonnage is not adequate, with ships chartered from the Maritime Administration pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended by Public Law 591 of the Eighty-first Congress. The appointment of subagents is governed by article 3 (h) of the general agency agreement. Under this provision, the general agent has the right to select his subagents but we retain the right at all times to require the termination of any subagency appointment by the general agent whenever the circumstances are such as to make it desirable or necessary to do so.

In conclusion, may I again thank you for the interest which you have shown in our activities. Needless to say, as in all newly established agencies, we have made mistakes and it is possible that some inequities have resulted. However, to the best of our ability these have been or are being rectified and we hope to do a good job in the trying days that appear to be ahead of us.

Should you desire any further information on this subject or any other phase of our activities, I hope you will free to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. McGUIRE,
Director, National Shipping Authority.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on September 8 the National Broadcasting Co. presented a refreshing and stimulating program, the American Youth Forum, for the first time. This program was offered simultaneously by radio and television. The founder and director of the program is Mr. Theodore Granik, who has long been known throughout the country as the founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air.

I was so fortunate as to have been a recent guest of the American Youth Forum. This favor permitted me to answer questions offered by some among a group of 60 intelligent and curious young Americans. Without reflection on any other current radio and television program, I believe that the American Youth Forum is an outstanding and extremely worth-while opportunity for the young people and their weekly guest. The program has no rehearsal. The young people are encouraged to ask any question and on any subject which is of concern to them. The American Youth Forum provides us older people with a splendid chance to listen to what young America has in mind. I do congratulate NBC and Mr. Granik for what they are attempting to do for young Americans.

Because of the interest which my colleagues may take in the form and character of the American Youth Forum, I ask unanimous consent that the script of the September 15 program, in which I participated, be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Guest. Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, Washington.

Moderator. Theodore Granik.

Question. I want to know your views on universal military training.

Question. I want to know, should the United States recognize Red China?

Question. I want to know why General MacArthur was not invited to the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

ANNOUNCER. There are a few of the questions young America is asking today. What are the answers? Youth wants to know. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Youth Forum, a program dedicated

to the principle that the future of America rests with the young people of our Nation. And to help resolve some of the questions in their minds, here is the founder and director of the American Youth Forum, Theodore Granik.

Mr. GRANIK. Tonight a distinguished United States Senator accepts our invitation to give the answers that youth wants to know. In our audience, to question Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington State, are 50 young men and women brought here under the auspices of the American Legion.

Now, a few words about our guest. The Senator from Washington State is one of the most energetic men on Capitol Hill. He has been in the forefront on many important and divergent issues. A great admirer of General MacArthur, he was a leading questioner in the hearings on the general's ouster.

Senator CAIN has also started a battle on the domestic scene by proposing that Congress investigate the sport of boxing.

Just this week, he suggested that American authorities in Germany hold a Czechoslovakian railroad train and its 107 passengers until the Czech Government releases American newsmen William Oatis. In short, Senator CAIN covers the field.

Now, let's see how he answers the questions. Senator, we'll give you the choice and let you select the teen-ager to ask you the first question.

Senator CAIN. Ted, I was fascinated by each of the three questions that were posed. If that young man who is rising now would restate his question, about UMT, I would like to take a try at it.

Mr. LANGERMAN. My name is Sam Langerman.

Senator CAIN. I want to know how you stand on universal military training.

Senator CAIN. Sam, in a word, I am and have been and will continue to be for universal military training because in your name as well as mine I believe young Americans should be trained for life, not for death.

You ought not to forget that a distressing amount of the war in Korea is being fought by those veterans of World War II but thousands of other young Americans have died already and been wounded because they were not properly trained. It is the concept of those of whom I am but one who support the foundation on which UMT is built, that it will train so many young Americans for any future emergency that we shall make war that much less likely.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you want to come back for another question?

Mr. LANGERMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. I also want to know why 4-F's like Mickey Mantle, who seem to be healthy on the baseball diamond, are not given desk jobs to relieve able-bodied men.

Senator CAIN. I cannot give you a satisfactory answer to that question. There has been established a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee whose function is continually to examine the reasons which justify deferment for any so-called 4-F. I have a sympathy and understanding for your question. I cannot answer why those who seemingly are already prepared and able to carry on athletic endeavors are not called into the service for limited duty.

But let me say to you that until we do get an answer, you should not criticize people like Mickey Mantle and others who have walked up to their draft boards, taken their examinations, and been deferred on the basis of physician's reports. If anyone is to blame, it is the Congress of the United States and the Military Establishment, not those fine, young Americans like Mickey Mantle.

Mr. GRANIK. Young lady, you have a question?

Miss ARANOFF. Senator, I want to know, do you agree with the 18½-year-old draft?

Senator CAIN. Yes; I am strongly in support of it. As a matter of necessity, I would rather see an 18½-year-old American called into the service and trained to carry his share of the responsibility of this generation than to require those who fought so well and so valiantly 5 years ago to hold the fort in your name. I take it that you young people of this generation want to carry your share of a very monumental burden. I am for the 18½-year-old draft.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead, young lady.

Question: Don't you think UMT will make us a militaristic nation?

Senator CAIN. It is not my view. I must speak out of my own personal experience. When I was just about your age, I became a cadet in a military school. I spent five of the best years of my life in this school. I learned how to live with my fellows. I was exposed to discipline which I learned to respect. I began to understand how to use a weapon to protect myself when I was your age. Fifteen years later, when the time came that I was called to the colors and the service of my country, I was a much better equipped and trained young American to carry my load of obligations.

This training had not made me previously a militarist. I am not one today. I lived through World War II partly because I was lucky, but, in part, because I knew how to use the weapons to which I had been exposed as a youngster. I hope the same privilege comes to all of you young men.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you have a question on UMT, young man?

Mr. CAIN. My name is Matt Cain.

Senator CAIN. I am delighted to know you.

Mr. CAIN. I am no relation, Senator.

You say you favor the draft of 18-year-olds. I want to know. Do you favor the exemption of college students, and if you do, on what basis?

Senator CAIN. As a matter of fact, I did. I cannot remember exactly what happened to that proposal. The Senate of the United States supported not the exemption, but the deferment of those selected for special training in scientific and medical schools and technical schools of one kind or another. The House, as I recall, disagreed with this view. I think that in the conference the deferments were not agreed to.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead with the next question.

Miss HALL. Senator CAIN, you said you thought that 18-year-olds are old enough to be drafted. Don't you think if they are old enough to be drafted at 18, they are old enough to vote?

Senator CAIN. The State of Georgia has decided that question affirmatively. If I had the opportunity to vote in favor of giving the franchise to those who were expected to die in support of the franchise, my answer is that I would give it to you.

The question is not presently before the Congress. I would not duck my responsibility, but I will not sit here and give you a speech that it ought to be done tomorrow when in fact it is not presently being considered.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead, young lady.

Miss BLACKWELL. My name is Patricia Blackwell. I would like to know if you would support Senator McCarthy in 1952 in the primary and the election?

Senator CAIN. In the State of Wisconsin?

Miss BLACKWELL. Yes.

Senator CAIN. On the basis of Joe McCarthy's status as of this minute, I have every intention, if requested, of doing everything I possibly can to see that JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of the sovereign State of Wisconsin, is returned to the Senate of the United States.

Miss BLACKWELL. Does that mean you necessarily endorse his views or his methods?

Senator CAIN. Patricia, it does not necessarily mean that I endorse his methods. It certainly means without question that I en-

dorse his views. You either take Senator McCarthy or you discard him on the basis of both his views and his methods. With reference to that choice there is but one choice this Member of the Senate can make, and that is JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and I wish him well with reference to 1952.

Mr. GRANIK. Another question on Senator McCarthy?

Miss RYAN. Not on Senator McCarthy.

Senator CAIN. Please go ahead anyway.

Miss RYAN. I would like to know what the Senate is doing to ratify the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Senator CAIN. The Senate does not as yet have the Japanese Peace Treaty before it. The treaty was signed, as you know, by 59 nations, including Japan, in San Francisco just a few days ago. At his convenience, and he can do it any time he wishes, the President of the United States over a covering letter will submit the treaty for ratification to the Senate of the United States. I hope he moves in no great hurry.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead. You may come back if you like.

Miss RYAN. You said you hoped he moved in no great hurry. That opinion has been expressed by a number of people.

Do you think it is because people in the textile industry and the fishing industry are afraid of competition?

Senator CAIN. No; there is no relationship between the two. The peace treaty had no economic provisions in it. Trade and economic treaties will be signed in due time by the United States and by Japan, but those who urge not moving too rapidly in ratifying the treaty are thinking back to the mistakes that the Senate of the United States has made since the war in ratifying other treaties. Some of us in the Senate, though I don't know that this is the majority view, are anxious to know more about what Japan as a sovereign nation is likely to do with reference to signing a peace treaty with some government in China, Red China, or Nationalist China than we do now know. We think there is no great need for hurry. We moved in a great hurry when we signed the Italian treaty. Many of us who have signed it have regretted that signature almost from the day we agreed to that ratification.

Mr. GRANIK. There is a question about Douglas MacArthur.

Question: I want to know why Gen Douglas MacArthur was not invited to the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Senator CAIN. Young man, about 150,000,000 Americans in the United States, and I think you are raising a question which at least 95 percent of more than 150,000,000 people would express if they had that opportunity, would like to know the answer. There is no answer. Let me say it was suggested by Ted Granik that I am a devotee and a great admirer of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. That is an understatement. I love him with an affection as man between man because he is one of the great citizens this world has ever developed or produced anywhere. But General MacArthur was the architect who created the atmosphere through which it became possible finally to have that gathering which was for the signing of the peace treaty out in San Francisco. The fact that he was not invited to watch the culmination and the consummation of one of the most magnificent jobs in all of history is, I think, something that should not be reflected on because there is no answer for it.

Mr. GRANIK. Another question on the same phase? Go ahead.

Mr. PELLONE. My name is Nat Pellone. I would like to know by what authority President Truman removed General MacArthur as Commander in Chief of the United Nations Forces.

Senator CAIN. I can give you only an inadequate answer.

Mr GRANIK The Senator listened to many days of testimony, weeks, in fact.

Senator CAIN I am, on the basis of conviction, in support of the strategy and tactics and views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, but I always felt and have said so many times, the General MacArthur with reference to his position in the Army of the United States is no different from any other officer within that Army, be he a second lieutenant or a four-star general. From that point of view the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of America, and he had ever legal and any other kind of right to remove General MacArthur.

With reference to your United Nations question, many people are still in doubt as to whether or not after the United Nations had delegated to the United States the command function in Korea the President, unilaterally, on his own authority, had the right to remove General MacArthur without consultation with those who created General MacArthur's position. That is the best answer I can give. The question is not being pressed at the present time. I suppose there is no book to which one could refer for a conclusive answer.

Mr GRANIK The young man there is bubbling with a question.

Question On this college deferment question I want to know if you think it is good to go to college for a year and then be drafted? Wouldn't it be better if these tests were given upon graduation from high school?

Senator CAIN I am not qualified to answer that question as well as I would like to. As I remember the issue when it was before the Senate it seemed very important to me that a number of young Americans could conveniently and wisely be deferred in order to carry on certain technical studies, after which they must be called to the colors to serve their period of time.

Mr GRANIK You have a question, young man?

Mr BECKER I was wondering what you expect to find out with these inquiries into boxing, Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN That is a domestic question out of which I derive a great deal of satisfaction. The Senate has one important national and international question after another every day. Occasionally one likes to think of the importance of clean sports. I became interested in the International Boxing Club because a man whom I knew, Harry Matthews, by name, and by reputation perhaps the greatest light heavyweight in all of the world, has successfully been prevented from having a title fight.

I likewise was interested in Archie Moore, a distinguished Negro fighter who has been the No. 1 challenger for the light heavyweight title for some 12 years and never been given a chance. The Senator from Idaho, Mr. WELKER and myself thought, it proper to raise the question of why if the International Boxing Club is going to present a bout for which you are expected to pay very good money—\$30 in New York the other night—

Mr GRANIK That is what a friend paid for my ticket.

Senator CAIN That you are not given a first-rate contest rather than a second-, third-, or fourth-rate exhibition, as you recently got when the light heavyweight champion presumably defended his title against Bob Murphy a red-headed Irishman who ought to be complimented for his courage, but sent back to a boxing school so he can learn what to do. Our boxing inquiry seeks to provide every qualified challenger with a chance to fight for the championship.

Miss STEVENS My name is Mary Jane Stevens. I would like to know how can the average American pay check afford the pay-as-you-go taxation program?

Senator CAIN I do not think it can. If I am right in saying that it can't, then we find

ourselves in the greatest financial dilemma this country has ever been faced with. I agree with you that we cannot raise taxes sufficiently high to pay our way as we go in this defense program, but because the needs of defense are outstanding, that only means we are going to have to continue to spend money, young people, we do not have. And who is going to pay those debts? You of your generation, not of mine. I share your concern. I like and respect your question.

Mr GRANIK Go ahead, Miss.

QUESTION If the American pay check cannot afford to pay taxes that high, how can the American pay check afford the high prices which are in effect now and which will be higher as price controls are weakened?

Senator CAIN I have never written a book on this question, but it would take the length of a book to try to answer the question of high prices as I understand it. I don't claim to be an authority, but there are too many dollars in circulation because of the literal spending of billions and billions of dollars for defense and for other things, more dollars in circulation than there are domestic or consumer goods. Competition merely requires that you spend more dollars for the product that you want. The people in the lower levels are the ones who suffer the most.

QUESTION Didn't you vote in favor of the National Defense Production Act which weakened price controls?

Senator CAIN Yes, I did.

QUESTION Couldn't controls have lowered prices, or, at least, kept them from rising?

Senator CAIN The only thing that price controls, so far as I know, can do, is to stabilize, and with many exceptions at that, prices. Price controls in themselves have absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with lowering prices. Might I say with reference to this aspect of a price-control law or proposal, prices can be rolled back, but any time you roll back a price you do a benefit to one segment of your society and you confiscate the property and the inventories and the resources and the profits of other segments of your society. You can only believe in roll-backs if you are one of those who benefit. But you cannot if you are one of those who suffer as no government should require you, an American citizen, to suffer.

Mr GRANIK Young man, you have a question on roll-backs or price controls?

Mr KENNEY My name is Edward Kenney. I want to know why on the occasion of General Marshall's resignation as Secretary of Defense, you stated that no military man should accept the position of Secretary of Defense.

Senator CAIN I was the only member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. There may have been others who shared my view who made such a comment, but I made it because when the National Security Act of 1947 was written and approved by the Congress, and signed by the President, it included in its legislative history a solemn declaration that the best interests of this country would be served by maintaining a balance within your Military Establishment of things military and things civilian. Young man, you can only do that if you have a civilian as the Nation's Secretary of Defense. I paid my respects to Gen. George C. Marshall, the soldier. I expressed my undying cheer that a soldier cast as he was as Secretary of Defense had been retired to private life. For as long as I am in the Senate, I will never give my vote, and will always use it against any soldier who is nominated to fill a job which somebody sitting right out there presumably, and I hope, will be qualified to fulfill some day.

Mr GRANIK I think there is a follow-up question.

Mr KENNEY Senator, who is better qualified to serve as the Secretary of Defense and have charge of the Nation's defense than a man of present or previous military experience?

Senator CAIN That is an entirely different question. What you are saying is that the people of the United States, 150,000,000 strong, should have no person representing them who stands between them and the military. I think the adoption of the suggestion you have in mind, which, by the way, a good many people actually believe in, would give rise to a legitimate fear that at some time in the future which we hope will never happen, the military would take over the operation of the United States of America. This, to my mind, is much less likely and presumably will never happen if we have civilian Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and over them, one of the finest civilians that we can find as Secretary of Defense.

Mr GRANIK You have a question, young man?

Mr BARRISH Senator, my name is Robert Barrish. I want to know your views as to the propriety of Senator BENTON's resolution to expel Senator McCarthy from the Senate because of his conduct unbecoming a Senator.

Senator CAIN You know that we are all pretty good friends in the Senate of the United States.

Mr GRANIK That is an exclusive club.

Senator CAIN If sometimes we do not always respect each other as individuals, but very generally we do, we always respect the seat which a sovereign Member of the Senate of the United States occupies. I think in being just as cautious as I can, that all I ought to say is that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] had reason to know, because there was no reason for the introduction of the resolution in the first place, that the citizens of the State of Wisconsin will judge the merits of JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY. Mr. BENTON knew that the resolution was never going anywhere. It was introduced to play to the weaknesses and the prejudices of tens of thousands of Americans who in not knowing JOE MCCARTHY, thought they did not like him. I am against the resolution, and in that instance I would take Mr. BENTON on for argument here or anywhere else, 6 or 7 days a week.

Mr BARRISH, Senator CAIN, Senator MCCARTHY has made some rather slanderous remarks about high Government officials—I don't think I need name any—which he cannot exactly prove. Don't you think those statements serve only to undermine the public as to those officials? It does not give the people a very good opinion of those officials.

Senator CAIN That is a very good question. I think there is a logical answer.

For weeks if not months I have read and heard commentators and columnists in this country saying that Senator JOE MCCARTHY of Wisconsin, only made such comments about others when protected and covered by the immunity provided to him in the Senate of the United States. About 3 weeks ago I went home to the State of Washington where I had the very great pleasure of introducing JOE MCCARTHY before an audience in the city of Spokane and within 24 hours before an audience in the city of Seattle. JOE MCCARTHY said nothing different in the State of Washington than he has said on the Senate floor. I don't know whether his comments are based on fact or not, but out in the open JOE MCCARTHY has said to these people, "You are guilty of this, that, and the other thing." Now, it is for those people to rise and sue him if they wish to support the comments made by these commentators and other news reporters. My thought is that very few of them will dare to rise and deny in a court of law what JOE MCCARTHY has maintained against them.

Mr GROSS My name is Phil Gross. I would like to know why only nine Members of the Senate were present to vote on the \$6,000,000,000 military construction bill which included a provision for a \$19,019,000

hand-out for President Truman's home town of Grand View, Mo. for an airport.

Senator CAIN. I cannot answer your question. We live in a very strange and a very bewildering day in which the Congress is confronted with problems which if taken individually 25 years ago would have aroused a national controversy and a national discussion over each of them. Now, they come so fast that if some Senator or some small group of Senators will not create an actual controversy over a bill, that practically by unanimous consent at the end of an afternoon a bill such as the one you discuss was and will be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Yet, Senator, this was brought out in the House of Representatives in debate that this was a \$19,019,000 appropriation and which later has been proved, or rather charges have been made that land speculation has played a part in this hand-out.

Senator CAIN. Without burdening you or taking time from anyone else, I would say with respect to the particular item that you have raised a question about, I am not familiar with it. I read about it in the paper after that bill was brought up.

Mr. GROSS. You were not present to vote on that bill?

Senator CAIN. I think I was, to show how these things work. My mind tells me I was one of a handful of Senators who late in the afternoon agreed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. And it was a voice vote.

Senator CAIN. As I recall it I do not approve of the method. But I was guilty of being a part of it.

Mr. GRANIK. Go ahead

Mr. HILL. I would like to know whether you think Soviet Russia would take an active hand in the Korean war if the U N forces should be able to drive the North Korean and Chinese back to the Manchurian border?

Senator CAIN. To over-simplify the question, my feeling has been since the war in Korea began. No. What I do think now is that as every successive day goes on with its fighting in Korea the likelihood of Russia taking a hand in that Korean war becomes more likely. I thought the time to have won that war was shortly after we first entered the war for in several months we accumulated forces between ourselves and our allies sufficient to that task. With the entrance of Red China, that is when we should have made the big effort against our enemies, the North Koreans and the Red Chinese. Now that we have entered an uncertain and confusing period of negotiations, goodness knows how many other forces, including Russia, are likely to begin to take a part in the war.

Mr. GRANIK. You have a question.

Mr. KIRBY. I would like to know what measures have been taken in order to fulfill the relations of the Crime Committee. I was personally appalled at what they proved, and I would like to know about it.

Senator CAIN. All I can tell you is all I know as a result of the Crime Committee hearings. The Crime Committee itself offered various pieces of legislation to the appropriate standing committees of the Senate. Some of those committees presumably are holding hearings on the questions raised by the proposed legislation. That happens to be the status, and no action has yet, to my knowledge, been taken on any of the recommendations. It does take time. Whether or not it could be done more rapidly, I am not qualified to say.

Mr. GRANIK. Young lady.

Miss VANSIVER. My name is Gloria Vansiver. I understand you are a former paratrooper. I would like to know your opinion of this Korean war from the fighting man's point of view.

Senator CAIN. What time is it? There are only 3 minutes to go. All I can say from

the fighting man's point of view is, if I understand him correctly, he wants to be supported by his Government and his allies with two things—the tools with which to fight and the encouragement which will permit him to go ahead. That fighting man, or he who yet lives, has never forgotten, nor will he ever, that last November, before the Red Chinese entered the war, our forces were on the shores of the Yalu River, and months and months later we are back on or about the thirty-eighth parallel. This situation nauseates the fighting man and every fighting man who ever lived. That is the best answer that I can give in a hurry.

Mr. GRANIK. Ten seconds.

Miss BURRELL. I want to know: Do you think that the world will ever find a remedy for war?

Senator CAIN. Yes. If and when the world, and let us all believe the same thing because there is only one answer: Total disarmament. Anything short of that will continue for economic and political reasons to cause more wars in the future.

Mr. GRANIK. I wish we could continue, but our time is up. Senator CAIN, thank you for answering questions of our teenagers tonight. I know all agree from the nature of the questions the young people of America are keenly interested in problems of our Nation and the world.

Our thanks to the American Legion for their support in this new program, the American Youth Forum.

The young people who questioned Senator CAIN tonight were brought to our Washington studios as part of the activity of the Nation-wide youth program of the American Legion.

This is Theodore Granik saying good night from our Nation's Capital.

ANNOUNCER. This has been the American Youth Forum, a new program dedicated to the youth of America. Tonight's guest was Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington State.

The American Youth Forum is founded and directed by Theodore Granik, and was presented from the NBC Television Theater in Washington, D. C.

Overhauling Our Reservist Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the serious dislocations of family life which have been caused by the current policy of our armed services in recalling reservists, active and inactive alike, should be eliminated by the new reserve program in the works. As matters now stand, many men in their thirties, who have served up to 4 years in the Armed Forces and have just begun to get on their feet financially have been summoned into service at great personal and financial loss to their families.

The program which the House has passed would classify reservists in three groups: Those who are Ready, Stand-by, and Retired. Only those in the first classification can be called at the determination of the President. In order to enroll the others, the Congress would be required to decide how many would be called, and when.

Such a policy will restore to the Congress much of the authority seized by

the President and his military departments in recent years. It remains for Congress now to take one additional step and to provide that no men may be used outside the continental limits of the United States for military purposes without congressional action.

The John H. Kerr Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the proceedings on this crowded last day of the session, to pay a much deserved tribute to one of the outstanding Members of the House, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR.

By solemn act of Congress, the great dam now nearing completion at Buggs Island, on the boundary between the Old Dominion State of Virginia and the Tar Heel State of North Carolina has been named "The John H. Kerr Dam."

No action by the Congress could have been more appropriate. Judge KERR has envisioned this great enterprise for many years. As he witnessed the devastating ravages of uncontrolled water courses through these two States and the resulting erosion of their fertile soils carrying away to the sea vast areas of some of the most productive land in the world, he conceived the idea of meeting the situation by impounding the runaway waters and rehabilitating the farmlands, and at the same time producing for this important section of the South cheap electric current to supply all needs of its cities and farms, homes, and factories, thus contributing immeasurably to the progress and prosperity of his native State and her progressive neighbor.

His position on the Appropriations Committee, where he has served as ranking member for many years, gave him opportunity to keep in touch with similar flood-control work over the Nation and he has constantly and unceasingly labored with departments, economists, engineers, and colleagues until today he has seen his vision materialized and this vast project, one of the notable utility, conservation, and engineering plants of the world, come into being and begin its beneficent service to mankind.

Judge KERR is one of the most influential and best loved Members of the House and in his long service here has contributed in many ways to the welfare of his section of the country and to the country at large. When the South was suffering from crop specialization, and its products were largely confined to cotton and tobacco, he added a new product to southern agriculture and industry. Cultivation of the peanut had been so curtailed by competition with the products of coolie labor shipped into our markets from China as to be practically negligible. Judge KERR secured the enactment of a tariff law through which this crop has become one of the most

important produced south of the Mason and Dixon's line. As result of this legislation Judge KERR is known throughout the South as the father of the peanut industry. And today, with the enactment of this law, the civil functions appropriation bill of 1951, he becomes also the father of the John H. Kerr Dam. I congratulate Judge KERR and I congratulate the Congress of this richly merited tribute conferring honor on one to whom honor is due.

Columbia, the River of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "Columbia, the River of the West," delivered by Mr. W. L. Williams before the thirty-eighth annual convention of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, the Port of Portland Commission and the Commission of Public Docks of the City of Portland jointly extend to our visitors a hearty welcome. We are honored indeed to have the privilege of being hosts to this convention.

Perhaps I should, before commencing my talk, take the opportunity to add my few words of congratulations to those who have worked so diligently to bring this gathering together. They, throughout the years, have given much of their time and talents to build and maintain an association of port authorities on the Pacific Coast where we can all meet on a common level, air our views and work harmoniously toward the betterment of our respective ports and continue the fostering of overseas and other water-borne commerce.

Naturally I shall take as my theme this afternoon "Columbia, the River of the West"—its importance to us who live in the Northwest, its importance to you who live in California and other Western States, and indeed to everyone who lives in the United States. Here perhaps there would be no point in elaborating or emphasizing the importance of the natural and inherent features of the Columbia River in connection with the over-all defense preparation of our country and the free world.

Over the years we have been living in what we like to term the free-enterprise era, and we have come to recognize that we have the right to choose the kind of lives we should live. We have taken as a matter of fact most of the blessings that have been bestowed upon us, and yet we are reluctant to acknowledge that most of the benefits and privileges we now enjoy came as the result of the labors, disappointments and accomplishments of our predecessors. We have almost come to believe that the system we live by is of our own making. As prosperous as we all are, we have become slightly jealous of each other's prosperity, and in the process of sniping at each other, we are becoming blinded to the sinister menace that threatens our very existence.

How strange it is to hear intelligent people proclaim the disadvantages of a world port located in fresh water 100 miles from the sea such as Portland, Oreg., is; to publicize and ridicule a Columbia River bar that does not exist, and to slander the very basis of one of our greatest economic advantages—a highway broad and deep reaching from the ocean to the far reaches of our hinterland—by referring to our sea approaches as being the graveyard of the Pacific. Yes, you have heard all of this, so have I.

I have a very vivid recollection of my first sight of the Columbia. This was 30 years ago. I saw her through the eyes of a sailor—how beautiful she was, how sweet her breath, and what depth of character. No wonder I never left her since. I recall how deeply impressed I was with the possibilities and potentialities of this great area. I was sold as thousands of other have been sold since. I stayed and I have never regretted it. Since that time I have been either directly or indirectly connected with some phase of her maritime development. Any contribution I may have been able to make is just a mere token of gratitude for the privilege of being here, of being accepted by people like yourselves.

It would be inappropriate indeed to start reading into this informal talk the statistical records of the four major areas of the Pacific Coast or to attempt to compare the maritime record of one area against another, or to start proclaiming the advantages gained by the use of one port as against another, we will leave that to the chambers of commerce. We all have advantages, the greatest of which is that we all belong to the Pacific Coast. Let there be no misapprehension, unless the Pacific Coast works as a unit on its over-all development we are quite apt to find other areas taking away some of the things that are inherently ours.

We have witnessed, even since the end of the last war, a sharp decline in commercial trade handled through the ports of the Pacific as compared with prewar records. Even at that, there seems to have been a reluctance among the sister ports of the Pacific Coast to cooperate with each other for the benefit of the whole. We seemed to want to justify this foolish approach on the basis that it was the era of bitter competition, and that instead of closing ranks, each should go out on its own systematically to drive the business away from the other. It is gratifying to know that this condition has not lasted too long, and that—through the efforts of this and other organizations—port bodies, transportation agencies, and chambers of commerce are now acting in unison under the auspices of the Western Transportation Council to promote the economy of the Pacific coast as a whole. How much more effective it is to sit around the table together to discuss and settle minor differences on the broad approach of mutual confidence for united we stand divided we will fall. By the way, what a service the Pacific Coast port authorities could perform if, in this convention at Portland, Oreg., a code of ethics were adopted based on the three C's—common decency, common sense for common good.

I have observed in my travels abroad that the great maritime nations stress above all the importance of continued development of their ports and harbors. Show me a country or an area that has grown in stature, and I will trace back that success through the portals of its harbors to the avenues of world trade. Conversely, history has shown us that decline and decay of countries usually sets in around the seaboard.

I have drifted away somewhat from my original thought of speaking of where the Columbia River fits into the over-all scheme of western trade promotion and the common welfare. We even hear serious sug-

gestions of the best possible means to divert some of our pure, clear water, which we have in abundance, to you poor, parched Californians. We have no particular objection to help promote such a scheme—we are not selfish in that regard—we would just as soon start exporting some of our water after it had completed its work irrigating our lands, transporting our river commerce, and generating electric power which in time we also plan on having in exportable quantities. With some of our power and water, just think what it would mean to your highly developed manufacturing and agricultural areas. Not a bad thought and certainly one that should harmonize with our basic thinking.

During the era when Spain and England were vying for world-wide trading supremacy—when their mariners were out seeking new lands—a startled Old World heard rumors of a great new land bordering on the Pacific Ocean, rich beyond all dreams in natural resources and abundant in game. It was also said that beyond a doubt a great river existed which, when discovered, would bring to the country that planted its flag upon its shores, a prize so rich as to dwarf the wealth of the Indies. It was inferred that there also might lie a short cut to and from Europe that would reduce the hazards of the tedious and dangerous passage around the Horn, or up by the tortuous route through the Pacific Islands. As word got around, the river was actually named before it was discovered, and it was spoken of as "the River of the West."

Well, that was not a bad guess for those old fellows. Could they but glimpse the river of the west as we know it today, and trace back through the pages of history the successive harvests of prosperity that have been reaped directly attributable to it, they surely would recognize the modesty of their original evaluation. The wealth is yet untouched, the prize still greater than ever. No doubt, future generations evaluating our foresight and wisdom will probably gasp at our limited imagination.

Looking back over the past 30 years, what intrigues me most is that I have been privileged to witness the great transition of the River of the West from that of a magnificent river drawing through its tributaries the run-off of the eternal snows of the Rockies to that of a great highway of commerce, served by ships of all nations, distributing their cargoes to the far reaches of the world, succoring the famished and helping mankind in general.

I am not unmindful of the blood, sweat, and tears that it has taken to reach the point where we are at today. Nor do I forget those determined pioneers who made their own clearings on the banks of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers sufficient to build their shelters and to till a few square yards of ground. But I must also pay my humble respects to many of my own generation—men of foresight and courage, men who knew the real meaning of cooperation, men whose broad vision saw the need of a deep-water channel from Portland to the sea, and the building of waterfront facilities capable of accommodating the largest deep-water vessels serving the Pacific coast. I should here also mention the pioneers who have in most recent years blazed the trail for modern transportation to the upper Columbia and Snake Rivers, it now looks as if the fruits of their efforts are ripening, for it will not be long before we will have almost slack-water navigation to the very doorstep of that tremendous wheat country of eastern Washington and Oregon—truly a broad basket if there ever was one.

It would be rather difficult to put into simple words what this great river and its tributaries mean to the economy of the Pacific coast. Perhaps we can, by scanning a few simple facts, understand better the reasons why people of this and past

generations have faced the future with such determination, faith, and confidence.

One need go no farther than an ordinary map to discover that the area drained by the Columbia and her tributaries is larger than France, twice the area of the British Isles, or almost equal to all eastern seaboard States from Maine to the southern boundary of the State of Virginia. Trace the meandering of the main stream from its headwaters 2,600 feet above sea level in the Canadian Rockies, down through the gorges and fertile plains of eastern Washington and eastern Oregon, through the Cascades and on to the ocean at Astoria—a distance of approximately 1,200 miles.

Without much difficulty one can learn that as of today over 4,000,000 acres of what used to be unproductive land is being irrigated and under the magic touch of the sweet water of the river have sprung to life to give further health and happiness to man. Nor is this all—an additional 5,000,000 acres is yet to be irrigated, and when this comes into bloom there can be no doubt as to the additional benefits we will all obtain.

Now, this means people and more people. Never has the prospect been brighter. From all over this great land of ours vigorous men and their families will come to till the soil and reap the harvests of this abundant land. The fruits of their efforts will find their way into the channels of trade—new communities, new cities, greater cities will spring up. A great empire, indeed, is in the forming.

If by chance there should be in our minds, one just has to survey the record of population increase to recognize the trend. Between 1940 and 1949 the population increase in the Pacific Northwest has 44 percent against a 13 percent over-all increase in the United States. What better proof do we need?

Earlier in this talk I touched briefly on the matter of hydroelectric power. Here we have one of our greatest potentials—the very lifeblood of modern industrialization. We all recall when the first great dam, Bonneville, was projected to produce the fantastic figure of 500,000 kilowatts there were many who predicted that this kind of power was not needed and could not be used. Nevertheless the great dam was built, and what a boon it proved to be when practically overnight we were thrown into the greatest war man had ever known, and what a contribution it made to our ultimate success. There is no telling how history might have changed had it not been for the hydroelectric power production of the Columbia. With the building of Bonneville and the lessons learned thereby, man's harnessing of the mighty river moved forward to meet the ever-increasing need for power and more power. The great industrial plant began to take shape. Other great dams were projected and built or are building. Still further plans were made and are being made. There seems to be no limit to the demand for industrial hydroelectric power. Thus what seemed to be a far-off dream a few years ago has developed into a very live realization today, and yet the storehouse of potential wealth is bulging at the sides.

From Bonneville with its 500,000 kilowatts we have, in a very short space of time, moved to Grand Coulee, McNary, Hungry Horse, Chief Joseph, Rock Island—the equivalent to nine Bonneville in kilowatts produced. "More and still more" the demand cries out: We must have Ice Harbor, the Dalles, and Hells Canyon Dams too and others besides. What a story, what a river. And this is not all. Even by the most conservative estimate, there remains still untapped within the United States boundaries power potential of 30,000,000 kilowatts, equal to 60 more Bonneville Dams, and maybe one-third more in Canada.

I have endeavored to wind into a brief and simple narrative the story of the River of the West. The human mind can barely conceive the background through the mil-

lions of years of its existence, much less solve its mysteries, nor can it peer into the too far distant future with any reasonable degree of accuracy. All we know is that this magnificent system of rivers, born with the making of this world of ours, has flowed on and on throughout the ages. In terms of time man has watched the flow but for a fleeting moment. In that brief moment he has conceived and created instruments of usefulness by harnessing the river for the use of man.

The gods of nature have been generous with their gifts, the Good Lord has indeed smiled on us here in the West. If my enthusiasm for this great Columbia and the Pacific Northwest country appears to be tense and deep, it is because I see in it a vision of still greater glory and promise.

I know of no better way to conclude this brief talk than to recite the words of the poet who wrote:

"Land of the empire builders,
Land of the golden West
Conquered and hailed by freemen
Fairlest and the best
Onward and upward ever
Forward and on and on,
Hail to the land of Heroes,
My Oregon.

"Land of the rose and sunshine,
Land of the summer's breeze
Laden with health and vigor
Fresh from the western seas.
Blessed by the blood of martyrs,
Land of the setting sun,
Hail to thee land of promise—
My Oregon."

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a letter which appeared in the New York Times of October 2, 1951. This letter urges that the Eighty-second Congress pass the Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills, as an important factor in our defense of the Pacific. My own position on these matters, I think, is well known to my colleagues. I ask for the printing of this letter in the Record because I believe it reflects the beliefs and hopes of many people in my State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ACTION ON STATEHOOD BILLS ASKED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

The majority leader of the Senate recently called to the attention of the upper chamber the fact that two important pieces of legislation still await action and approval. These are the bills to provide statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. No assurance was given, however, that this legislation can achieve any priority on the calendar before Congress adjourns next month.

The Eighty-first Congress gave considerable attention to the statehood bills: extensive hearings were held, the House passed H. R. 49 (Hawaiian statehood bill) and generally the legislation was looked upon with favor in the Senate. President Truman gave his blessing to the bills and sent a

letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs urging passage of the bills.

Despite the sanguine outlook, the Senate managed to delay a vote on the bills, and they died when the Eighty-first Congress finally adjourned.

We are fighting today in the Pacific, and we are building up our military strength as rapidly as production will permit. Yet the Congress continues to lag on one of the most important components of our Pacific defense: the incorporation of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union.

It is now up to the leadership of the House and Senate to cut through the red tape and make certain that this "must" legislation is not lost in the final shuffle.

KENNETH HASKEILL MANTEL,
Brooklyn, September 25, 1951.

Fifteen Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

FIFTEEN YEARS OF PROGRESS—THE AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION AND RELATED PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA

The agricultural conservation program encourages and assists farmers in the use of soil saving and soil improving methods. Visual evidence of the progress that has been made under this program during the past 15 years can be noted on individual farms in all sections of the State.

Terraces have been used to protect the sloping fields on thousands of Oklahoma farms. This is one of the practices that begins immediately to stabilize or protect farm land and continues to add accumulative benefits over a long period of time. Though terraces have been built to protect more than 2,000,000 acres of Oklahoma cropland since the beginning of the agricultural conservation program in 1936, it is estimated that this type of protection is needed on an additional 9,000,000 acres. In developing the agricultural conservation program for recent years, greater emphasis has been placed on speeding up the terracing work.

Construction of farm pond dams provides multiple benefits. From the standpoint of increased livestock production, well-spaced watering places give better use of the forage on pasture land and help to prevent the overgrazing that occurs around watering places that are insufficient to serve the area. The better cover of forage which results aids materially in preventing erosion on pasture land.

Farm pond dams, by holding excess water in the upper reaches of drainage basins, also aid in preventing erosion and flood losses in downstream areas.

While some 90,000 farm-pond structures have been completed during the 15 years of agricultural-conservation-program operations, there is need for an additional 90,000 to 100,000 structures for which acceptable sites are available. The additional structures would contribute greatly to livestock production, and better utilization of pasture areas which do not now have livestock water.

FOOD IS NO RICHER IN MINERALS THAN THE SOIL FROM WHICH IT COMES

Of 46,000 soil tests made over a 3-year period covering most counties in Oklahoma,

\$9,000 showed some degree of phosphorus deficiency. Of 48,000 soil tests made in Oklahoma, 34,000 revealed a calcium deficiency. Our mineral account is overdrawn. If we are to continue spending our soil fertility we must make mineral deposits. Healthy animals and nutritious plants cannot be produced on mineral deficient soils. In addition to improving the quality, greatly increased volume of crop production is often secured by application of the needed minerals.

Under the agricultural-conservation program during the period 1936-50 limestone has been applied to 1,300,000 acres of land on 58,000 farms. Under the program during the same period 1,900,000 acres on 74,000 farms have been treated with phosphate. Soil tests to determine deficiencies are required before program assistance for mineral application may be obtained.

Lime: One of the primary benefits from the agricultural-conservation program is its effect of encouraging farmers to use practices which are new to an area and which would not otherwise be readily adopted or used. Only limited use of the liming treatment for soil had occurred from many years of teaching and demonstration of the benefits from limestone application. Beginning with the agricultural-conservation program of 1936 there has been a consistent and sometimes spectacular increase in the use of agricultural limestone on Oklahoma farms.

PHOSPHATE

The use of phosphate has steadily gained in favor with Oklahoma farmers. Encouraged in the early program years to make use of phosphate under legume crops, through the share-the-cost provisions of the agricultural-conservation program, and recognizing the possibilities for increased production from this method of fertilization, farmers have sharply increased their demands for phosphate in each year of program operation. There is no indication of a lessening in the demand for phosphate.

Known deposits of phosphate materials in the United States are sufficient to last for 2,000 years or more. The problem thus becomes one of getting the materials in form for use and transported to the areas where needed at a cost farmers can afford to pay. The assistance given farmers under the agricultural-conservation program for use of fertilizers and minerals also serves as encouragement to private business for development of sources of materials, arranging for processing, and providing distribution outlets for the materials. For example, in Oklahoma there has been a private capital investment, in quite recent years, of more than a half-million dollars in fertilizer plants at two locations.

INCREASING LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION--PASTURE IMPROVEMENT PRACTICES

Per capita consumption of meat has increased greatly since the prewar period with the heavier demand for meat by consumers contributing to higher meat costs. The increase in livestock numbers since the start of the last war has failed to keep pace with consumer demand. A constantly increasing population will tend to build demand for meats and dairy products still higher in future years. Under these conditions, the expansion of livestock production can play a big part in future Oklahoma agriculture. Ready markets for all the meat and milk that can be produced will favor shifts toward greater livestock production. An increased supply of livestock feed and forage will be an essential part of any program for increased livestock production.

The agricultural conservation program has carried a number of pasture improvement practices during the past 15 years, such as seeding or reseeding adapted grasses, overseeding grasses with legumes, brush control, and weed mowing, application of needed minerals and others. Pasture improvement

practices have met one of the needs of Oklahoma farmers.

VETCH ADDS NITROGEN

Research has shown that nitrogen from the air can be stored in the soil faster during the cool months of the year. Oklahoma farmers have found that, in vetch, they have an excellent cool weather legume. Our soil scientists estimate a vetch crop in Oklahoma, which reaches a good growth and is left on the land until maturity, will deposit in the soil on each acre approximately 70 pounds of nitrogen. At current fertilizer prices this is equivalent to \$8 worth of ammonium nitrate.

The table below, which gives the acreage seeded to hairy vetch, serves as the best evidence that Oklahoma farmers are fully recognizing the value of vetch as a soil builder.

Vetch acreage

	Acres
1940.....	10,849
1941.....	11,099
1942.....	26,614
1943.....	48,362
1944.....	32,662
1945.....	43,590
1946.....	58,551
1947.....	79,222
1948.....	82,701
1949 (95,000 acres harvested for seed).....	213,269
1950.....	297,828

Vetch is recognized not only as an excellent soil builder and winter cover crop, but also as a good cash crop and a valuable supplemental pasture and hay crop. Good financial returns have been realized by Oklahoma farmers through harvest and sale of seed. Oklahoma now leads all States in the acreage of vetch planted for seed harvest.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

In the past 15 years price-support programs have had a two-fold function in contributing to the welfare of both consumers and producers. Price supports have encouraged abundant production by protecting farmers against loss through disastrous price drops. Abundant production, in turn, benefited consumers by assuring ample supplies of food and fiber, as well as by tending to combat excessively high food costs in periods of high demand.

Price-support programs have as their primary purpose the securing of a fair return to farmers for the commodities they produce. Farm prices have held close to the lowest level provided under support programs.

The better income enjoyed by farmers under price-support programs has materially benefited all industry and a large portion of the Nation's labor force. The more stable income to farmers has kept them in the market for a great variety of manufactured articles, thus contributing to high level employment and greater industrial production.

During World War II years, when price ceilings were in effect, agricultural prices remained well below the highest levels permitted under price-control legislation. This is in sharp contrast to the price picture for many nonagricultural products.

THERE'S A JOB TAKIN CARE OF

Farmer interest in soil-saving work usually grows as soon as he sees an erosion problem cured or a field improved on his own land by use of an approved agricultural conservation program practice. This increased interest often shows up in the form of additional practices carried out by an individual farmer in excess of the limited amount of financial assistance that can be offered.

The educational value alone of practices carried out in Oklahoma farms during the past 15 years moves us a great step ahead in the big job of properly protecting and caring for soils.

AND THAT'S NOT ALL

In addition to the conservation practices treated in earlier sections, farmers have,

during the past 15 years, under the provisions of the agricultural conservation program—Stripcropped 376,000 acres as a protection against wind erosion.

Contour farmed intertilled and close sown crops on 15,000,000 acres.

Have grown green manure and cover crops on 9,000,000 acres to improve fertility and add organic matter.

Have carried out protected summer fallow operations on 3,500,000 acres of cropland for moisture conservation.

Have from year to year carried out other approved practices as specified in annual agricultural conservation program provisions as best adapted to their farm and farming operations.

The Crime of Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Serbian National Defense Council of America has prepared a documentary pamphlet entitled "The Crime of Genocide," adding to the accumulation of evidence concerning the practice of genocide by the Fascist puppets in Yugoslavia before 1945 and describing the current efforts of the Soviet Union to scuttle the genocide pact designed to punish such practices in the future. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this pamphlet, digested by the officials of the Serbian National Defense Council, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE PAMPHLET, THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE

It is inconceivable that civilization can survive if the world is to allow nations, races and religious groups to be exterminated. This world must be made safe for a diversity of nations, religions, races and cultures.

GENOCIDE HAS DESTROYED SOME 20,000,000 PERSONS IN THE LAST 50 YEARS—THE WORLD MUST FACE THE PROBLEM OF GENOCIDE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

While the nineteenth century was marked by the liberation of the individual and his entrance into political life, as well as by a strong movement of national liberation which helped many nations to achieve their unity and independence, the twentieth century is a century in which collective violence directed not so much against men in their individual capacity, but against entire nations, races and religious groups has become typical.

Therefore, the world should now focus its primary attention on the phenomenon of the mass extermination of human groups and should organize collective measures to meet collective crime of great dimensions and fatal consequences for mankind.

GENOCIDE COMMITTED ON THE SERBIAN PEOPLE

For centuries the Serbian people have stood in the Balkans as a bulwark of Christian civilization against invaders and oppressors. As a consequence of their stand, great losses have been inflicted upon them in the course of centuries. * * * Genocide in its worst and most destructive form, however, was inflicted upon the Serbs in 1941-45 by the members of the Croatian Fascist movement, the Ustashi. In 1941, after

the invasion of Yugoslavia by the Axis, a Croatian puppet state was created by the Axis under the name Independent State of Croatia and all power was given to the Ustashi. In that state, which comprised about 3,500,000 Croats and over 2,000,000 Serbs, the odious crime of genocide was perpetrated on the Serbian people by the Ustashi and large segments of the Croatian population.

This crime was not a consequence of aggression but was organized and directed against the Serbs as a nation and as a religious group with the aim of wiping them out and creating an ethnically pure Croatian territory, according to Ante Pavelic, the head of the Ustashi who became head of the Independent State of Croatia.

APPEAL TO HUMAN CONSCIENCE

The tragic experiences of the Serbian people are offered here not in a sense of recrimination but with the constructive purpose of awakening the conscience of the whole world to the necessity of adopting the law against genocide.

It is up to the nations of the world, and especially the leading democracies, to make the choice between indifference which amounts to encouragement, or decisive action by ratifying the Genocide Convention and indicating the moral and legal repudiation of the greatest crime against civilization.

The Genocide Convention deals with national, racial, religious, and ethnic groups, that is all inhabitants of a country belonging to the same nationality, religion, or race.

The above provisions find full application to the genocide perpetrated by the Fascist, Croatian Ustashi, on the Serbian people. The leaders did not conceal their intent to destroy the Serbian national group.

Dr. Mile Budak, member of the Cabinet of Ante Pavelic, stated publicly: "One part of the Serbs we shall kill, another we shall deport . . ." On May 28, 1941, the head of the Ustashi at Banja Luka, Dr. Viktor Gutic, referring to his conference with the head of the C. A. S., Ante Pavelic, stated that . . . "In the shortest time possible there will be no trace left of the Serbs, and the only thing that will remain of them will be a bad memory. . . . Tomorrow I will begin to tighten up. Spines will be broken. . . . There will be no mercy."

The massacres were carried out in various ways: by invading villages and towns and killing people in their homes, or after assembling them in schools, town halls, or horse stables. . . .

Sometimes they were assembled in churches. The massacres carried out in the Serbian Orthodox Church in Glina between May and August 1941, belong undoubtedly to the darkest chapters of human depravity in modern times.

Babies were torn from their mothers' arms, and while they were held by their feet, they were swung forcibly against walls, smashing their heads before their mothers' eyes . . .

The mutilations defy all imagination. Limbs were cut open, salt put inside the wounds and then the limbs were tied together and bandaged. Tongues were torn out, ears, noses, and genitals cut off. . . .

Eyes were gouged from living men. Some of these eyes were sent to Zagreb to Ante Pavelic on whose desk the famous Italian writer, Curzio Malaparte, saw them in a basket. Malaparte mistook the eyes for oysters, but Pavelic explained to him that it was 40 pounds of human eyes, a gift from his faithful Ustashi.

Cases are known where Croatian Ustashi would proudly wear necklaces of human eyes and tongues cut from their Serbian victims. . . .

The crime of genocide perpetrated on the Serbs was neither a spontaneous phenomenon nor the result of a clash of armies at war. It was the execution of a previous conspiracy adopted as a program of the

Ustashi political movement. . . . In the late evening of April 9, 1941, a speech of Ante Pavelic proclaiming the Ustashi revolution was broadcast. It was followed by a fiery speech by Andrija Artukovich who instigated the Croats not only to kill the Serbian officers and soldiers, but even children in their mothers' wombs. The next day, a Croatian government was formed in which Artukovich was appointed minister of interior. . . .

. . . the Convention requires implementation through domestic legislation of every nation concerned. The law-making body of every nation has to adopt legislation, and only through this type of legislation will the Convention operate upon the citizens of every country. Domestic legislation must be enacted in accordance with the constitution of every country . . . article I, section 8, point 10, of the United States Constitution says: "The Congress shall . . . define and punish piracies . . . and offenses against the law of nations." Genocide is a crime against the law of nations, and as such is clearly within the scope of the American Constitution . . .

Some people have claimed that since in American law treaties are the supreme law of the land, the mere ratification of the Genocide Convention becomes automatically binding on American citizens. This is incorrect because the Genocide Convention as a treaty will become supreme law of the land with all its provisions, including article V which requires domestic legislation. It is well established by decisions of the United States Supreme Court that a treaty provision which is made dependent on legislative action does not take effect as the law of the land until such action is taken. (See *Foster v. Nielsen*, 2 Pet. 253, and *U. S. v. Percheman*, 7 Pet. 513.) This position was taken by the subcommittee of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee which has recommended ratification . . .

Article VI provides also for the possibility of punishment by an international criminal tribunal. This provision, however, does not constitute an obligation but is a matter of choice for every government . . .

Article VI makes it clear, and this should be emphasized, that the Genocide Convention, as submitted, does not imply that the United States is obliged to deliver its citizens for eventual trial for genocide by an international criminal tribunal. . . .

HOW THE SOVIET UNION FIGHTS THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

In order to divert the attention of the world from Soviet genocide, the Soviet delegation proposed a resolution on November 20, 1947 (U. N. Document A. C. 6/201) to the effect that the United Nations should disregard the resolution of 1946 calling for a genocide convention and rather treat genocide as one of the crimes against humanity, which appear in the Nuremberg judgment. The Soviet Union preferred this solution because crimes against humanity do not deal with the specific matter of the destruction of nations, races, and religious groups and do not show but rather permit concealing the intent of the destruction of specific human groups.

Moreover, the Soviet delegation urged on November 20, 1947, in the U. N. the adoption of a code of offenses against peace and security of mankind, obviously with the intent to protect their territorial acquisitions under a Pax Sovietica. (U. N. Document A/P. V. 123, p. 152.)

A memorandum concerning a draft of such a code was recently prepared . . . and issued as a document of the United Nations (No. A. C. N. 4/39). Taking in account this document the United Nations International Law Commission prepared a draft code of offenses against peace and security of mankind, which contains provisions which for all practical purposes permit to indict states for tolerating on their territory national and

democratic liberation movements (art. 1, points 4 and 5 of the Draft Code of Offenses Against Peace and Security of Mankind).

In such manner all those who in the free world are fighting for the liberation of their countries from the Communist yoke and all those free countries which are helping them and fighting Soviet aggression and genocide, might find themselves indicted as offenders against the peace and security of mankind.

Therefore, it appears that if the democracies do not show enough vigilance the Soviet Union might succeed in her plans to scuttle the genocide convention, despite the fact that it came into force.

Leaders of Free Poles Salute Polish-American Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Polish-American Journal of October 20, 1951:

LEADERS OF FREE POLES SALUTE POLISH-AMERICAN JOURNAL

August Zaleski, legal president of Poland: "On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Polish-American Journal it gives me great pleasure to congratulate your achievement and to wish you and your staff continued success in the good work you are doing for the cause of Poland."

"It is extremely important that the American people who are today preeminent in the defense of the liberties of all humanity against Russian-Soviet imperialism should be well informed about the rights and aspirations of the Polish people. I am sure that the many millions of American citizens of Polish descent will play a very important part in this respect."

"It is of paramount importance for public opinion in America to realize that the last two world wars have started as the result of their imperialistic endeavors of one nation to seize the hegemony first in Europe and then in the world. Now another great power is attempting to do the same. This new attempt must be withstood without putting the previous offender in a position to start a new bid for hegemony. But such a result can be attained only by restoring freedom and independence to the now subjugated countries of eastern-central Europe. Only if Europe again consists of free and independent nations can it unite for the maintenance of peace."

Gen. Roman Odzierzynski, Prime Minister of the Polish Government in exile:

"It is with real pleasure that I am sending you, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of your distinguished newspaper the Polish-American Journal, my best and most sincere wishes for continuous success and prosperity. I am fully aware that for the past 40 years it has faithfully defended the rights and interests of the Polish Nation, and truly represented thoughts and feelings of the American Polonia. In this manner, it has remained loyal to its new as well as to the old country."

"May I be allowed to stress at this instance that during the 20 years of its independent existence, Poland has proved herself to be the sole bulwark of liberty of all the nations inhabiting Eastern and Central Europe, when in 1939 Poland lay prostrate

under the heel of two allied imperialisms, German and Soviet, the independence of all the nations between the Baltic and the Black Sea, also quickly collapsed.

"This gives me the opportunity to declare that the United States of America which has always been the champion of freedom and free democratic institutions, always possessed, and will continue to possess, a faithful ally in the Polish Nation.

"In conclusion, may I say that we Poles in Great Britain fully appreciate the highly valuable role which the American Polonia is playing in its struggle for the restoration of liberty and independence of the old country. But, when thinking of Polonia, we are also bearing in mind the role of the Polish press in America. For this reason, I greatly appreciate the work done by your distinguished newspaper whose anniversary we are commemorating today."

Lt Gen. W. Anders, CB, commander in chief of the Polish armed forces in exile

"On the fortieth anniversary of the existence of the journal widely known during the last 3 years under the name of the Polish American Journal I wish to present to this publication my sincerest congratulations for, and deepest appreciation of, its tireless and fruitful work.

"The Polish American Journal not only steadfastly defends the interests of Americans of Polish ancestry but also devotedly serves the Polish cause, championing the fight for the freedom of the Polish nation suffering now under the cruel Communist domination.

"In the present fateful times the activities of the Polish American Journal are of great importance and have special merit not only as concerns the informing of the American public opinion about Poland and Polish problems but primarily as the means of sustaining and of fostering the Polish spirit of patriotism and soldierly morale.

"I send the Polish American Journal my warmest wishes of further achievements and prosperous development."

Lt Gen. Izidor Modelski, Ph. D., former Under Secretary of Defense in the Polish Government in exile

"DEAR EDITOR: I am glad to extend my congratulations and friendly good wishes on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Polish American Journal.

"You should be proud of being the first who perceived that besides serving the interests of the Americans of Polish ancestry in the Polish language it was also necessary and very important to have some independent intermediary messenger to the other Americans just in English.

"You did it perfectly, and I wish you that more successes will follow your constant endeavors to win the sincere American friends Poland needs so much as not to be harmed again on the international stage and to make the other Americans more acquainted with the Polish past and contributions paid by the Poles to the common cause of the free world."

Tomasz Arcelewski, chairman of the executive board of the Polish Political Council:

"On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Polish American Journal, I am sending my sincere congratulations and best wishes.

"I hope that you will continue to work for a better Polish-American understanding and to serve the interests of Americans of Polish ancestry."

Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski, former commander in chief of the Polish home army "I would like to express my best wishes to the Polish-American Journal on the occasion of its jubilee.

"You are doing an important service both for the United States and for Poland, fighting vigorously for the cause of liberty. The support we are getting from the Americans of Polish descent, organized in the Polish

American Congress, and from the Polish American press, is of tremendous importance to the people of Poland and of other enslaved countries of central and Eastern Europe.

"The Polish-American Journal serves this purpose very well indeed."

Jerzy Kuncewicz, chairman of the Polish Peasant Party, Freedom; vice chairman of the Polish National Council:

"For centuries the idea of human rights and freedom has been a link between the Polish and the American peoples.

"In the coming days of struggle against the Communist oppression we hope for such help from the American heroes in liberating our country as was, once, given by Pulaski and Kosciuszko to the courageous sons of young America fighting for her independence.

"The Polish-American Journal was and still is championing the cause of freedom most effectively. The grateful thoughts of all freedom-loving Poles go to its editors and staff in the paper's well-deserved jubilee year."

Air Power and Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 30, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article written by Mr. Eugene F. Wilson, entitled "Air Power and Morality," in which Mr. Wilson sets out a proposal for transforming the airplane into an instrument of peace and freedom. I do not offer the article with complete agreement, necessarily, but I believe it is quite thought-provoking, and I commend it to the careful reading of the Members of the Senate.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

AIR POWER AND MORALITY

(By Eugene F. Wilson)

Some of the most brilliant minds in the Department of Defense are reported to be asking: "Is our strategy right?" They are said to question the wisdom of a military policy which places almost sole dependence upon "population bombing."

Wilbur Wright died regretting that he helped to create the airplane. For he saw it used, not primarily as the dreamed-of agency of commerce, but as the fiery chariot of war. Discovery of the principles of mechanical flight toughed off a resurgence of barbarism and a return to military policies so bankrupt as to threaten the survival of civilization.

Indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations is poor strategy, false economics, bad politics, and worse morals. Stupid leadership has brought western Christian civilization to the verge of extinction. Lacking the directive force of moral precept, it has been unable to define any long-term objective, political or otherwise, or any military strategy other than that of destroying everything within its path. This was the strategy of Genghis Khan and of the Dark Ages.

Future historians may well adjudge "population" and "strategic" bombing as the classic blunder of all time. And the climax of this folly, the atomic bombing of Hiro-

shima, may have revealed such irreverence for human life on our part as to have cost us the moral leadership of the world. Despite our air superiority—or, more precisely, because of its misuse—our civilization, once considered the loftiest in evolution of the human spirit, now stands on the defensive.

Our vaunted material superiority, flanked right and left and breached in the center by hordes of Asiatics, has begun to assume some aspects of the Maginot Line. Threat of an atomic stockpile dwindles as a deterrent to a barbaric enemy who refuses to oblige us with suitable tactical targets, to say nothing of the inviting strategic objectives which we offer him. A sterile air policy has infected our military and naval policy and our foreign and domestic policies as well.

Dread of such an outcome long pervaded aviation circles. Bitter controversy has raged ever since that December day in 1903 at Kittyhawk when the Wrights demonstrated mechanical flight. One school, led by the Wrights, visualized the airplane as primarily a vehicle and thus a potential boon to civilization. The other, led by the military, saw it as a revolutionary weapon.

The original prophet of population and strategic bombing was the Italian Gen. Giulio Douhet. As early as 1909, he tried to interest his government in the potentiality of air bombardment of urban areas as a cheap short-cut to power. In 1921, he said in his book *Command of the Air*, that "a body of troops will stand fast under intensive bombings but workers in a shop, factory, or harbor will melt away after the first losses."

This doctrine found ready acceptance among military minds of an era which produced Balbo and Mussolini, Goering and Hitler. And disciples continued to preach it even after experience proved otherwise. Citizens of London, Berlin, Tokyo and other cities not only failed to melt away but reacted with fanatical resistance. The A-bomb at Hiroshima appeared to support the theory but it is now known that the Japanese had already decided to surrender to pressure of sea blockade.

Sober second thought now suggests that blockade might have been more efficient in the long run. Certainly, it would have been more economical because we are still pouring out treasure to rebuild institutions we battered down. One thing is clear: neither our natural allies nor our late enemies relish the idea of being liberated by our atom bomb tactics.

The Russians exploit our lapse, claiming that their use of military aircraft is confined to tactical support of ground forces and that instead of threatening to use atomic bombs against civil populations, they apply atomic energy to the construction of public works. Thus does godless leadership exploit to its own advantage precepts of western Christianity which the west has forgotten. Grandmother Russia puts on a good act in the international Red Riding Hood drama, while we have let ourselves be cast in the role of the villain.

In placing sole dependence on the explosive force of an uncontrollable weapon, we have neglected the most potent force in our possession—the catalyst of moral principle. To get back into character, we must first reassert adherence to principles of human conduct which made us what we are. For example, we might announce our intent to ban the use of all weapons against civil populations and confine their use to legitimate military targets. This is not the usual impractical suggestion of outlawing weapons or of limiting armaments, but rather a return to their proper employment.

Such a program takes for granted maintenance of a military air force capable of effective reprisal against a potential disturber of peace. It calls for a statement of fundamental national objectives which should be

publicly debated and supported. First requisite is restoration of individual freedom, especially in trade, and this implies freedom of movement to all, by land, sea and air. Under this doctrine, the mission of armed forces would once more become that of guaranteeing the security of trade routes. Then, just as the Great Chinese Wall crumbled beneath the feet of private traders, backed by Britain's benevolent sea power, so would the Iron Curtain rise one day to welcome the western ideal of a fair break for the other fellow.

Then would come the opportunity sensed by the Wrights at the dawn of this century. Just as the Berlin airlift reversed the role of the bombing blitz, so might airlift come to its own as the catalyst for a new era comparable to that which began with the geographic discoveries of the fifteenth century. Here Pax aeronautica might replace Pax Britannica, and therein lies one example of hope in the air.

Natural Gas Pipelines Failure and Causes as Reported to the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of H. R. 88, which I filed on January 3, 1951, I have now received and wish to make available a report of the results of an inquiry made by the Federal Power Commission having a bearing upon the problem of safety in connection with the use of natural-gas transmission pipelines.

At this time I want to include the text of the explanatory material which is as follows:

Shortly after the Federal Power Commission indicated its support of H. R. 88 to the Congress, it was realized that the committee investigating H. R. 88 would desire some definitive information with regard to failures which have occurred and may occur on natural-gas transmission pipelines. Consequently, a letter of inquiry was sent to 28 of the major natural-gas pipeline companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. These companies were chosen on a basis of miles of transmission pipeline and the region in which their facilities are located.

The results of this inquiry have been tabulated by the staff of the Commission and accompany this memorandum. It should be noted at the outset that these answers do not constitute a solution to the problem of pipeline failures nor do they indicate in any manner how failures may be prevented in the future. These answers show some of the causes of failures and some of the safety problems which must be considered in the design of pipeline transmission facilities.

The first tabulation accompanying this report is entitled "Pipeline Failures and Causes." To better understand this tabulation, a short explanation of each item shown on the tabulation follows. These explanations will be of the major headings across the top of the tabulation.

Code: This merely designates by a number the pipeline company reporting.

Failure during: Under this column for each company reporting are the words "op-

eration" and "testing." This indicates whether the failure occurred during operation of the pipeline or whether the failure occurred while the pipeline was being tested. Testing usually takes place before facilities are placed in operation and on other occasions when question exists as to the ability of facilities to perform as designed.

Period: This is the period in years which the report of the company covers. In general, a period of 10 years is shown. The questionnaire of the Commission to the companies requested that the information be on a 10-year basis. The art of construction of pipeline has progressed materially, and it was felt that a period longer than 10 years would give undue weight to failures on pipeline systems which were constructed in a manner quite different from the practice of the industry today.

Weld: This subdivision covers three types of welds in which a failure may have occurred. The three types are as follows:

Acetylene: Prior to the development of the present portage electric welding generators, field methods of joining lengths of pipe included welding by means of the so-called acetylene process. This weld was produced by the burning of the acetylene gas by means of a special torch. The flame thus produced caused the melting of a special steel rod, which molten metal fused with the metal contained in the lengths of pipe to be connected forming a continuous steel pipeline.

Electric: Present-day practice in the industry calls for the construction of pipelines by means of electrically welded joints. The field welding of a pipeline is similar in all respects to procedures which would be followed in a shop. It is believed that the electric-welding process is sufficiently known to all so that further explanation is unnecessary at this point.

Shop: In fabricating steel into pipe, a number of different methods are employed. One method is the bending of a long steel plate into a cylinder and the joining of the edges of the plate by means of an electric weld. Where a failure in a weld of this type occurred, it is listed under shop weld.

Couplings: Prior to the widespread utilization of electric welding, lengths of pipe were joined together by means of couplings. This was a device whereby two rubber rings were installed on either side of the proposed joint. These rubber rings were compressed into a steel sleeve by means of steel rings joined by bolts. Whereas a welded joint makes a continuous length of steel pipeline, use of couplings constituted a series of short lengths of pipe not rigidly interconnected. The pipe is free to move in these couplings. A failure of the line could occur at one of these couplings by corrosion of the bolts or of the steel ring in back of the rubber ring or the rubber itself could deteriorate and fail. Such a failure would be classified as a blow-out.

Another type of failure which can occur at a coupling is that classified as a pull-out. As previously mentioned, in a pipeline joined together by couplings, the individual lengths of line have a certain degree of freedom of movement. The causes of movement of pipelines are many and varied. Where such movements occur and the pipe physically moves outside of the coupling, such a failure would be classified as a pull-out.

Machinery: Under machinery are listed two types of pipeline failure. In general, pipelines are buried in the ground at a depth sufficient to protect the line from damage from ordinary farm machinery. This applies chiefly to the larger sized pipelines which are constructed across farming areas. Many of the older lines, particularly in areas west of the Mississippi River and in regions where farming was not productive in years past, many pipelines were laid in very shallow ditches or, in some cases, on the surface of the ground. In such cases, machinery used for construction of new roads could very

easily damage the pipeline. Even though a line might be constructed in a trench with normally adequate ground cover, the construction of new roads where cuts through a hillside are to be made to eliminate steep grades makes it conceivable that road construction machinery could damage a pipe line.

The chances of such a failure occurring are quite remote since the pipeline companies employ men to patrol their lines, and these men could inform company officials of such construction in a particular area. Therefore, under machinery there are listed the two classifications of failure one under "road," which are failures due to road-machinery operation and one under "other" which are failures caused by other types of machinery.

These other types of failures are those which were caused either by farm-machinery, stripping operations, bulldozers grading an area, or construction machinery other than road-building equipment.

River crossings: In the construction of a long transmission pipeline, it is necessary to cross many creeks, streams, or rivers. In some cases the pipeline is carried across the water by means of small, specially constructed overhead bridges or carried on a large highway bridge. In general, the pipelines are laid in a trench under the stream bed. River crossings constitute one of the major problems in pipeline construction. Flood conditions of the waters may cause washing out of the banks of the stream. These wash-outs expose a portion of the line going into or out of the stream bed. Such wash-outs generally result in a failure of the pipeline on the stream bank. These excessive flow conditions may also cause the river bed to be scoured off the top of the buried pipeline and cause failure of the line. Therefore, under river crossings, these are listed as failures caused by a wash-out.

In some cases, it has been necessary for pipelines to be constructed under rivers which are also utilized as anchorage areas for large ocean-going vessels. Two failures were reported as being caused by vessels dragging their anchors and the anchors pulling out the pipeline. Ice conditions in a river may also damage a pipeline. One such failure was reported. Damage caused by these two means have been classified as other. It will be noted opposite company code No. 1 that there are 22 failures listed under river crossings "other." The causes of these failures were reported as unknown by the reporting company.

Pipe: The tabulation lists four different types of failure of the pipe itself. Natural-gas transmission pipelines, being constructed of steel are subject to corrosion. Many of the older pipelines were installed in the ground without any protective measures being taken against corrosion. In addition to oxidation (rusting), steel is subject to corrosion from soil chemicals and electrolytic action. Stray electric currents set up either by the composition of the soil or from electric-power sources will travel along a pipeline. At some point, due to ground conditions or the construction of the line itself, these currents will leave the pipeline. At such points as the current leaves the pipeline, the currents carry away a part of the steel from the line. Present-day practice calls for the protection of pipelines insofar as economically possible from corrosion damage. Failures reported as being due to corrosion of the pipeline either chemical or electrical are listed under "corrosion."

In the construction of a pipeline, individual lengths of pipe must be handled numerous times between the point of fabrication and actual installation in the ground. Each handling of the pipe length constitutes a hazard of damage to the pipe length. The transportation of the pipe by rail or by truck may also be considered a hazard insofar as

damage to the individual length of pipe is concerned. During the construction of a pipeline and after the line has been laid in the ditch, the machinery used in constructing, handling, and covering the pipe may in some way or another cause the pipe to be damaged. Pipeline constructors and owners attempt to guard against damaged lengths of pipe insofar as possible. It is, however, impossible to obtain perfect results. Failures to pipelines which the reporting companies have been able to attribute to damage to the pipe in handling have been listed under "damage."

A number of failures were reported under "split" pipe. These are failures in the pipe itself and not in the longitudinal weld which are reported under the general heading "weld-shop." Steel is not a homogeneous material. Between its original molten state and its fabrication into plate, it is possible that certain foreign materials are not completely eliminated. These substances in the steel structure cause weakness. In fabricating steel into pipe, particularly where a longitudinal weld is employed, it is possible that the welding action may damage the steel plate itself and even if the weld were true, a failure may occur at some short distance from the longitudinal weld where the weakness caused by welding action occurred. Whatever the cause, where the pipe itself ruptured, such failures have been listed under "split."

It is not possible to construct a pipeline that is perfectly straight. Bends of some kind are necessary. Some of these bends are fabricated in shops and transported to the construction site. Other bends are made by the construction crews in the field. The shop bends are subject to corrosion, damage in transit or from construction machinery, or to the same causes of failure as those which are listed under "split." Field bends are subject to the same failure potentials plus the fact that they are not fabricated under as ideal conditions as obtained in a fabricating shop, however, field bends are generally not as radical in degree as those fabricated in a shop. In other words, a field bend does not make as sharp a turn as a shop bend. The reports submitted to the Commission did not permit of a further breakdown as to whether or not the failure occurred in a shop or a field bend, therefore, all failures in this category are simply listed as a "bend" failure.

Auxiliary equipment. Under auxiliary equipment are listed failures which have occurred on any part of the system other than the line pipe. This includes failures which occurred at control valves, metering stations, etc.

Unknown. Under the general category of "Unknown" are listed the failures which cannot be placed in any of the foregoing captions. The number of such failures is comparatively small.

Total. In the column headed "Total" are listed the total failures for each company for those occurring during operation and during testing with a final total of all failures for each of the reporting companies.

On the last page of this tabulation are shown the summaries of the total failures during operation and the total of the failures which occurred during testing broken down into the various types of failures. There are also shown the grand total of all types of failures during operation and during testing. In addition, there is shown the percentage which each type of failure bears to the grand total of all failures. It will be noted under the column headed "Total" that approximately half of all failures occurred during operation and the other half occurred during testing. This figure is a little misleading.

It will be noted that for reporting company code No. 14 there were 661 failures during testing and all of these 661 are listed as

shop failures. Special mention must be made of these 661 shop failures. This particular pipeline was laid during World War II for oil transportation. In order to meet the exigencies of the wartime conditions and to complete this pipeline at the earliest possible date, testing of the pipe was eliminated. In addition, the pipe fabricator was also faced with the same necessity for speed which resulted in a product which apparently was substandard. When this particular pipeline system was converted to natural-gas usage after the war and failures became prevalent, the company systematically set about to test the complete pipeline. The 661 failures reported were discovered during this extraordinary testing program.

It is evident that the inclusion of these 661 failures distorts to a marked degree the final result as shown by the tabulation. If the 661 failures were to be eliminated, the total failures during operation would increase from 49½ percent of the total reported to approximately 80.6 percent of those reported. In other words, the testing of a pipeline prior to placing that pipeline into operation does not eliminate 50 percent of the possible operating failures, but, according to the reports submitted to the Commission, eliminates approximately 20 percent of the possible failures. Similarly, if the 661 failures of this one company were eliminated, the percentage of failures in each classification would be increased. In other words, the percentages shown in the very last line of the tabulation would all be increased approximately 60 percent with the exception of the figures shown under "weld shop," which would decrease to approximately 15 percent.

The second tabulation contained in this report is entitled "Cause and Extent of Damage Caused by Pipeline Breaks." One of the questions contained in the Commission's questionnaire was the extent of damage to property other than that of the pipeline owner that resulted from the failure. Another question was distance from point of failure that damage to property of others resulted. The answers to these questions are summarized on this tabulation. The extent of the dollar damage was not given in all cases. It must be remembered that many miles of pipeline are constructed in regions where little or no farming is carried on. In addition, failures in farm areas can take place during nongrowing periods of the year. As a result, failures may occur which do little if any damage to property other than that owned by the pipeline company.

Under the column headed "Distance from point of failure that damage resulted" are figures which give some indication of the destructive force unleashed by each failure. It was the intent of this question to determine the distance on either side of the pipeline that damage or destruction to property of others occurred. The answers received indicate that many of the reporting companies gave a longitudinal distance along the axis of the line as the answer to the question. Therefore, the figures shown under this column are wholly inconclusive.

The third tabulation summarizes the failures which caused either death or injuries. It is believed that this tabulation is self-explanatory.

As mentioned at the very outset, the answers to the questionnaire submitted by the Commission to the pipeline companies do not constitute a means whereby future failures of pipelines can be eliminated. These results can merely be used at this time to indicate possible points for further study in order to reduce the number of such failures. Pipeline design and construction practice have changed materially in the past 15 or 20 years. Such progress in the arts will eliminate many causes listed herein as already exemplified in improve-

ments from welding failures because of electric-welding superiority to acetylene welding. Although the first tabulation tends to indicate a greater number of electric-weld failures percentage-wise than those that occurred in acetylene welds, the picture is not a true one, since there are undoubtedly a far greater number of electric welds installed than there are acetylene welds. As previously mentioned, the picture as to possible weld failure is greatly exaggerated because of the failures which occurred because of a war-installed facility. Again it would appear that a shop weld is not as good as a weld made in the field. It must be remembered, however, that for every field weld there would be at least six times the equivalent length in shop welds. The same type of analysis would also apply to couplings since they are no longer employed as a normal method of pipeline fabrication. Each individual type of failure reported requires analysis in the light of present-day construction practices.

Included in this report are failures from companies which operate primarily through sparsely populated areas. Insofar as possible, pipeline companies tend to avoid traversing populated sections. However, with the increasing demands for natural gas, natural gas pipelines have and are entering the more populated areas and are coming in closer proximity to dwellings and other structures. Therefore, it would appear that if some of the causes of failures which have occurred in the past are not eliminated the damage to property and the danger of life may increase.

The Unfair Preference for Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. POW. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has been gathering strength, among our State public utility commissioners, a movement in opposition to the so-called preference clause in various Federal statutes, whereby public power developed at the expense of the taxpayers must be sold under a system of unfair discrimination in favor of public agencies such as municipal plants, public utility districts, and cooperatives.

Last May in Seattle a group of western States commissioners passed a resolution condemning the preference clause as an unfair burden on the customers of tax-paying, business-managed electric utility companies. The leader of this movement was the president of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, the Honorable H. N. Beamer, who expressed his position in an excellent article published in a recent issue of *Public Utilities Fortnightly*.

In view of the fact that this resolution of the western utility commissioners was subsequently endorsed by a group of New England commissioners, and on October 18 at Charleston, S. C., by the national convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, I believe the Members will read with profit and interest the text of President Beamer's article, upon which, I understand, the Charleston resolution was

largely based. I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD as it appeared in the Public Utilities Fortnightly of September 13, 1951.

THE UNFAIR PREFERENCE FOR PUBLIC POWER
(By the Honorable H. N. Beamer)

A paramount function of utility regulatory commissions is to see that electric users are supplied with ample electricity at reasonable rates and without discrimination.

All commissions, both Federal and State, obtain their jurisdiction and authority from their enabling statutes, which prohibit preferences and discrimination. No commission would, or lawfully could, permit a supplier of electric power to favor one town over another, either as to rates or availability of service; or allow benefits to be denied customers in one area that are granted to those in another, or permit that preference be given (for reasons of political expediency or otherwise) to any group or locality.

Surprising it is, then, that various Federal statutes not only permit, but require that preference and discrimination be the rule in the sale of electricity from Federal power plants constructed by the United States Government, with taxpayers' money, for reclamation, flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

This policy stems from so-called preference provisions in Federal statutes, requiring that preference (and, more recently, priority) in the sale of project power be given to public bodies, municipalities, cooperatives, public-utility districts, and other similar agencies and organizations.

The statement, sometimes made, that such preferences in power sales are the result of long-established Federal policy—having had their origin in an early Reclamation Act of April 16, 1906—is inaccurate and misleading. That act (which dealt with the withdrawal of lands for town-site purposes) merely provided that whenever a development of power was necessary for irrigation, or an opportunity was afforded for the development of power under any such project, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to lease any surplus power or power privilege for a period not exceeding 10 years, giving preference to municipal purposes.

That preference was based upon the use of power, and was for the benefit of the power user—that is, the municipality itself, as a consumer of power for street lighting, water-works, and other service needs—and not upon the manner of distribution, or the type of agency which distributes the power to consumers.

Present Federal preference requirements, on the other hand, give no consideration whatever to the consumer of power, but are based entirely upon the type of distributor involved. Therefore, they are a discrimination against customers of regulated utility companies, in favor of those who obtain their service from preferred distributors—as they deny to citizens and taxpayers the benefits of Federal power developments unless they are served by so-called preference agencies.

This policy should be thoroughly reviewed by Congress. Federal power plants are built by public funds provided by all the taxpayers of the Nation, and electricity from such projects should be made equally available to all citizens and electric users. As it is, the public agency preferences are forcing a change from private to public ownership of distribution facilities, and unless this trend is halted, socialization of the electric industry is bound to result.

In December 1937 David E. Lillenthal, then a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, testified before a congressional appropriations subcommittee as follows:

"Mr. WIGGLESWORTH You think there is a field for profitable operations by existing

companies alongside the TVA, under this program?

"Mr. LILLENTHAL. I think there is no question about that.

"Mr. FITZPATRICK In other words, you do not want to go in and destroy the investments of citizens who have already put their money in these electric companies, and there is no intention of so doing.

"Mr. LILLENTHAL. That is exactly correct.

"Mr. Lillenthal said further:
" * * * the law * * * provides that while we might sell power to public utilities and municipalities and cooperatives and industry, we must give the municipalities a preference.

"Now, we have no control over that municipal preference which is provided in the law, and we are bound to carry it out. But I do not foresee the calamitous consequences that have been indicated follow from that statutory provision."

Even then, TVA's monopolistic program was under way, and its 1938 report refers to its "negotiations to acquire existing electric systems and avoid duplication and competition." The results have been that some 30 electric companies have been put out of business in the TVA service area (which extends far beyond the confines of the Tennessee Valley), to establish the greatest electric power monopoly that the country has ever known—not by the Power Trust but, of all things, by a corporation created by the Government of the United States.

The public agency preferences, as presently existing and administered, had their beginning in the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, which provides that in the sale of TVA power, preference shall be given to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations.

Next in point of time was the Bonneville Project Act of 1937, in which the preference provisions have been carried to a greater extreme than in any other legislation. Similar provisions are contained in other statutes and, with one exception, these preferences govern the entire field of power sales by Federal agencies from Government plants.

The law setting up the Boulder Canyon project in 1928, as amended in 1940, provides a different policy covering the sale and disposition of project power, with the stated end in view that as large a portion as possible of the project costs shall be repaid from power revenues. It provides that the Secretary of the Interior may contract for delivery of power at the switchboard to States, municipal corporations, political subdivisions, and private corporations, and contracts shall be made with responsible applicants who will pay the price fixed with a view to meeting the revenue requirements as provided in the act.

The Boulder Canyon acts recognize the equal rights of all citizens, as electric users, to obtain power from Federal projects for their needs, regardless of whether the distributor which serves them is a preference agency or a public utility company. And although the congressional policy for the sale of Boulder Dam power is a source of irritation to the Department of the Interior today—having been referred to by one high Interior official as "the screwball policy of the past, embedded in concrete, steel, and copper at that dam"—the fact remains that the Boulder Canyon project is recognized as being financially successful and economically sound, due in part, at least, to the principles of equal and fair treatment of both publicly and privately owned utilities, and their respective customers.

In contrast, the preference and related provisions in the Bonneville act merit examination. Section 4 begins with the statement that "In order that the facilities for the generation of electric energy at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit

of the general public" (a laudable objective, but with a left-handed approach that, if the matter were not so serious, would be somewhat humorous in view of what comes later), "the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives."

Section 4 goes on to state that in order "to preserve and protect the preferential rights and priorities" of preference agencies, if "there shall be conflicting or competing applications" for Bonneville power from a preference agency on the one hand, "and a private agency of any character on the other," the application of the preference agency shall be granted—and this regardless of public necessity or any other consideration, except the fact of preference classification. Section 5 provides that when contracts are entered into with public utility companies, such contracts may be canceled if, in the judgment of the Administrator, the power is likely to be needed to satisfy the requirements of preference customers, to the end that their "preferential rights and priorities * * * shall at all times be preserved."

One may well pose the question: What part of the people are not a part of the general public in the Pacific Northwest? The answer obviously is: Those electric users who are not served by preference agencies.

Bureaucratic administration of the preference and priority to public power agencies goes far beyond the law. As evidence of this, reference need only be made to the Memorandum on Power Policy to All Staffs of the Department of the Interior, issued by the then Secretary of the Interior on January 3, 1946, in which it is stated:

The following principles are designed "to implement the congressional policy." They will guide all staffs and officials of the Department who deal with power:

Under the heading Operation and Sales, the first directive reads as follows:

a. Active assistance, from the very beginning of the planning and authorization of a project, shall be given to the organization of public agencies and cooperatives in each project area. The statutory objectives are not attained by merely waiting for a preferred customer to come forward and offer to purchase the power.

The policies and practices so established have been carried forward by succeeding Secretaries, and are a part of the Department of the Interior's and Bonneville Power Administration's basic philosophy and procedure today.

Agency action and administration have extended the preference provisions so as virtually to exclude the customers of regulated electric companies from effective participation in supply of power generated at Federal plants. They are being utilized under policies and practices which, if engaged in by any power supplier other than agencies of the Government itself, would be in outright violation of State and Federal regulatory statutes, and might well be considered as combinations and conspiracies in restraint of commerce and trade under existing laws. BPA has consistently refused to enter into reasonable-term contracts with utility companies, and the active assistance of its representatives has been carried to the extent of open agitation and propaganda for formation of public power groups as potential customers.

The ideology behind the preference provisions was severely criticized by President Harry E. Polk of the National Reclamation Association, at the annual convention held at Salt Lake City in November 1940. He said:

"With the pooling of power that is planned under basin-wide development, every State should be entitled to its just share of power created at major dams, without any threat

of reprisal because of its choice in the operation of its power business—whether it be through private or public ownership.

"There is something constitutionally wrong in a situation in which the Federal Government can come into any area, build dams, flood productive lands to provide protection for downstream States, generate power at those dams, then tell any State that the major portion of the power will go to preferred public-power agencies in other States unless that State is willing to go public power."

The Socialistic implications of the public-power preferences are beginning to receive the recognition that they deserve. At a meeting of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee in April 1951 the committee was urged to seek modification of existing Federal laws. As reported in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal on April 19, 1951:

"The suggestion was made before the river development policy group by a long-time river-program supporter, George R. Call, of Sioux City. Call is a director of the Mississippi Valley Association and a member of the advisory board of the Federal bureau of Reclamation."

"Call appeared before the interagency committee asking how additional power could be obtained for Sioux City for defense industries. He was told that sale to private companies could be made only after demands of rural-electrification associations were satisfied."

"It is disturbing when businesses moving to the Midwest want power and we have to tell them it's not available," he said. "If we are going to be limited, I don't know how any man believing in free enterprise can support the river program."

At a meeting of western public utility commissioner representatives at Seattle, Wash., in May 1951, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas provisions contained in various Federal statutes give preference to public bodies and cooperatives in the sale of electric power produced at Government power plants, which preferences unjustly discriminate against numerous citizens and electric users who are served by electric utility companies under State commission regulation; and

"Whereas such preferences have been and are being used to foster and expand public power projects to the detriment of the customers of regulated utilities; and

"Whereas the benefits of power produced at Federal projects should be made available to all users of electricity on equal terms; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to adopt a Federal power policy which will make the power generated at Federal projects available to all citizens and users without discrimination; and that the provisions contained in existing statutes relating to the disposition of electric power and energy from Federal projects be rescinded."

To this, I subscribe. The right to obtain Government power should be in accordance with the requirements of public convenience and necessity, and not on the basis of ideologies imposed by law.

Federal power projects are costing the taxpayers of the Nation not millions, but hundreds of millions of dollars. These monumental developments are tax-free, and have all the low-interest credit and borrowing power of the Federal Government behind them.

Power users—as American citizens and taxpayers—are entitled to equal treatment from Government agencies, even though their electric needs are supplied by the private enterprise system.

Meat Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, upon receipt of a letter from the National Live Stock Producers Association, dated September 27, 1951, which was sent to all Members of Congress, I immediately contacted the Office of Price Stabilization and asked for their comments.

I am now in receipt of a letter from Mr. DiSalle, the Director of Price Stabilization, which completely refutes the statements contained in that letter.

In order that there may be no further misunderstanding about this, I am placing in the RECORD both letters, which are as follows:

NATIONAL LIVE STOCK

PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,

Chicago, Ill., September 27, 1951.

To Members of Congress

GENTLEMEN: In a telecast originating in San Diego, Calif., on September 25, 1951, Michael V. DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization, attempted to place the entire blame for his unworkable meat controls on the livestock and meat industry. We are enclosing copy of the press release prepared by OPS which we hope you take the time to read carefully.

Coming from an official who is the Director of one of our Government agencies, these statements cannot do otherwise than to arouse the indignation of all of us who know something about the livestock and meat industry. We wish particularly to call your attention to pages 2 and 3 of this OPS press release where Mr. DiSalle has made some especially vicious statements concerning what he calls dishonest practices of livestock producers.

As you know, most of the livestock marketed in this country is sold at markets which are under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture and where all marketing practices are regulated by that Department under provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Mr. DiSalle is presuming to tell the American public that he knows more about livestock marketing than another Government agency which has been charged by Congress with the regulation of livestock marketing practices over a long period of years.

The facts concerning livestock marketing practices can be obtained from the Livestock Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture. We think it would be in the interest of an efficient defense program for Congress to obtain these facts and release them to the public.

Very truly yours,

NATIONAL LIVE STOCK PRODUCERS

ASSOCIATION,

P. O. WILSON, Secretary-Manager.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY,

Washington, D. C.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. MULTER: This refers to your letter to Harold Leventhal, chief counsel, Office of Price Stabilization, dated October 5, 1951, enclosing a letter from Mr. P. O. Wilson, secretary-manager of the National Livestock

Producers Association, dated September 27, 1951. Mr. Wilson's letter referred to a speech made in San Diego, Calif., on September 25, 1951, in which I discussed meat price controls.

Mr. Wilson apparently misunderstands my statement as a blanket indictment of all livestock producers for dishonest practices. Mr. Wilson observes that most of the livestock marketed in this country is sold at markets under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. He states that I am presuming to tell the American public that I know more about livestock marketing practices than another Government agency charged by Congress with the regulation of livestock marketing over a long period of years. He recommends that Congress obtain the facts concerning marketing practices from the Livestock Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture.

It is clear that my statement was not a condemnation of the entire meat and livestock industry. It explicitly separated the honest and cooperative members of the industry from the chiselers. For example I said "Time after time individual members of the industry have come into my office, stating their willingness to cooperate." Reference was made to the "honorable people in the meat industry," and the "many packers [who] have told me that the regulations issued by the Office of Price Stabilization are workable and do not impose unfair restrictions or impossible conditions on the industry." But they felt the program was doomed because of the large number of people within the industry who not only would not cooperate with a control program, but who even in normal times engaged in a great many sharp practices.

It is also clear that I was not presuming to tell the American people that I know more about livestock marketing than the Department of Agriculture. On the contrary, not only was there no explicit or implicit criticism of the Department of Agriculture in the statement but a number of the charges made by me were based on facts obtained from the Department of Agriculture, which has always conscientiously attempted to discover and prosecute the violators of its regulations and which in my judgment has done a good job. Thus the facts which Mr. Wilson recommends that Congress obtain from the Department of Agriculture will substantiate my charges.

The first explicit charges of dishonest practices adverted to concerned short weight violations. In the Chicago market alone the Department of Agriculture has recently uncovered between 55 and 60 cases of improper market weighing. Similar improprieties were found in Kansas City.

Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has jurisdiction over only 340 posted markets, at which about 65 percent of the livestock is marketed, out of a total of some 2,000 markets in the United States. Thus, the Department has no jurisdiction over or responsibility for some 1,660 markets.

A number of the practices adverted to are of the sort which occur at these smaller markets. For example selling cattle as "fully fed" which have been fed only long enough to get a deceptive cover is the sort of practice that might occur at a country buying station or small nonposted market. The same observation is true of misrepresentations of hogs as "corn-fed" when they actually were not. Information about these practices has been obtained from honest members of the industry or discovered by our enforcement officers.

Other practices mentioned also concerned activities over which Agriculture has no jurisdiction and for which it has no responsibility. The sharp practice of meat whole-

salers and retailers referred to fall into this category. Information as to these violations and others was obtained by me from the many honest members of the various production and distribution levels of the meat industry who conferred with or complained to me. Investigation by the OPS enforcement staff has also been the basis for and confirmed many of these statements.

With reference to misleading grading, it was stated that slaughterers may, on self-graded meats, represent the meat as better than it is and that retailers sometimes lead the customers to believe that meat is a higher grade than it actually is. The Department of Agriculture's grading requirements are permissive, not mandatory. The Office of Price Stabilization's grading requirements are mandatory. Thus, no criticism of the Department of Agriculture can be inferred from these statements. Furthermore the misleading grading referred to is by self-graders and retailers. In this context, the Department is not involved at all. The truth of such charges has also been borne out in numerous cases by reports from members of the industry and confirmed by OPS investigations.

The charges that water, ice, and cereal are sometimes added in the preparation of hamburger, that lungs, melts, tripe, and illegal amounts of cereal are used in processed meats and that excessive fat is left on retail cuts did not imply any criticism of the Department of Agriculture. These charges were limited to the activities of certain nonfederally inspected operators and small-shop keepers. The Department has no duties relating to sharp practices by these persons, no obligations as to retailers and no jurisdiction at all over activities solely in intrastate commerce.

The most impressive confirmation of my charges is furnished by the results of an intensive enforcement drive in the last 2 weeks. OPS enforcement agents uncovered 1,849 alleged violations of its meat regulations by 740 meat firms. The investigation has already resulted in injunctive action against 85 firms and the filing of four criminal complaints. A total of 1,953 packing plants were inspected. This indicates that between 37 and 38 percent of the firms investigated were in violation.

If you have any further questions concerning my statement, I will be very glad to answer them.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Director of Price Stabilization.

Nothing Sure but Death and Taxes and Tax Collectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in medieval times the tax collector was an object of universal scorn. His job was based upon his ability to drain taxes out of every source and he kept a portion as his own. In modern times the tax collector has become an administrative official, and he has been popularized as a good fellow who does his duty no matter how much it hurts—the other fellow.

From every indication on the current scene some of our collectors appear to be reverting to the old-fashioned gentry. In the St. Louis inquiry it now appears that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John W. Snyder, talked to the Federal judge conducting a grand-jury investigation implying that the Treasury Department could do the job of cleaning up things by itself. Sweat on, Mr. Taxpayer, sweat on.

The Accomplishments of the Eighty-second Congress, Their Importance and Significance to the Peoples of the United States and of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach adjournment of this, the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, I know that all of us must be reflecting upon our achievements and accomplishments during the almost 10 months of our labors and work together during this continuous session.

It has been my custom and privilege to return to the district which I have the honor to represent, following adjournment—to report to the people, to visit and talk with them, discussing with them the work of their Congress. I have never failed to find them very much aware of the issues of their Government and informed of the problems which are involved in the proper and efficient operation of the largest Government on earth. I have made it a practice, as a part of my obligation as a Member of Congress, in reporting to the people of the district, to give to them an accounting of the work and the accomplishments of the Congress.

I know that many will ask, "What have been the accomplishments of the Eighty-second Congress, thus far?" In answer to this proper inquiry, I feel that it can be said that "the accomplishments of the Eighty-second Congress have been of almost unprecedented importance and significance. They have been far-reaching and of great significance in the present and future role which the United States has been called upon to play in the pursuit of peace which is the aim and aspiration of the freedom-loving peoples of the world."

The accomplishments and achievements of the Congress have been vital to the defense and security of our own country and of great importance toward bringing about order and stability throughout the world. The Congress has measured up to the challenge of making our country strong and prepared. This has been the field in which this session of the Congress has primarily worked—

for peace and security both at home and abroad.

To sustain my statement in this regard let us review some of the specific actions during this historic session.

DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Since the outbreak of the Communist aggression in Korea—a threat to freedom and liberty everywhere—and following the emergency declared by the President—the Congress has directed its energies and attention to the problems of preparedness and defense—to the cause of peace and the security of our Nation. As all citizens of our great Nation know and recognize, freedom and liberty are priceless—peace does not come cheap and security is not a matter of luck.

The Eighty-second Congress, in full reflection of the deep desire of all citizens of the United States to attain peace and security, has taken the most immediate steps toward that attainment—that is, the providing of the necessary funds for the building up of our defenses, and for the attainment of America's peace and security.

More than that, the Congress—also in reflection of the decent impulses of the people of the United States—has provided the world of free nations with the inspiration and the will to exert their own best efforts toward a firm and determined stand against the threats of Communist aggression. The forthright actions of the Congress to build up our Nation's defenses and to assist other nations—who only a short time ago were flat on their backs and devastated far more—constitute an important and historic step forward in the field of peace.

The actions of the Congress in this regard represent steps in the enlightened self-interest of our own Nation—the making of friends and allies. We are constructing an impregnable military defense through building our own Army, Navy, and Air Force into the most powerful in the world.

To assure our own adequate military defense, the Congress voted funds in the amount of \$56,000,000,000 for the building up of the military forces alone. These funds, the largest defense appropriation ever voted, will go toward the creation of an Air Force of 95 wings, an Army better trained and equipped than any other army in the world, and a two-ocean Navy—the world's most powerful—with a super aircraft carrier in each ocean.

Included with this appropriation are funds for necessary research and development in the field of atomic energy, jet propulsion and every modern device which would give our Nation added strength and security.

Toward the attainment of military superiority, provisions were made for adequate funds for the development of the great Air Engineering Development Center in Coffee and Franklin Counties in Tennessee, and for the expansion and development of Sewart Air Force Base, at Smyrna, Rutherford County, Tenn. Funds for this latter purpose in the

amount of \$15,000,000 have been authorized and \$9,000,000 of this sum appropriated is now available. In addition, the Military Installations Construction bill includes appropriations for other similar projects throughout the Nation. The Oak Ridge atomic plant, also in Tennessee, and other atomic plants, the new hydrogen-bomb plant and similar projects have been provided for and strengthened.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

World War II proved that no nation may isolate itself and withdraw from the world and selfishly find security. Time and modern civilization have drawn us closer together and made neighbors of all the peoples of the world.

In recognition of that fact, Judge Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, when Secretary of State, conceived what is now known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for furthering good will among nations through the medium of friendly trade and commercial relations. This has been called one of the greatest instruments for permanent peace ever set forth. The Congress, during the session just ended, has again extended this great act, restricting its benefits only to Communist-dominated countries.

In a further effort to protect our shores from invasion and to provide a buffer against further Communist aggression in Europe, Congress approved a further extension of the mutual-security program for military aid to European nations—our allies and friends in Europe—in the building up of a European Defense Army under the command of General Eisenhower. Funds in the amount of \$6,000,000,000 were voted to further this program. Passage was based on the belief that Europe, in its present economic condition, can provide men more readily than it can arm them and a dollar spent to build up Europe's defenses now will be as valuable—or more so—as a dollar spent at home for defense at this time. The main objective, under this measure, is to keep war away from our shores—to build up a defensive wall of strength against the further spread of Communist aggression. Under this program, our Nation will furnish arms and equipment for European troops. This assistance is turning weak nations into strong nations—buffers against communism—all in our own best interest.

ECONOMY—INFLATION—CONTROL

On the home front and affecting our civilian economy, one of the foremost legislative measures passed was the Defense Production Act.

This law has a twofold purpose. First, adequate production for the military build-up and for essential civilian requirements, and second, the prevention of run-away inflation.

As civilians learned during World War II, a high rate of military production calls for diversion to the Armed Forces of the greater portion of our vital materials, thus reducing substantially the amount of such materials which can go into the manufacture of civilian goods. As shortages of civilian goods are thus created some form of price controls is

considered highly desirable and essential to prevent ruinous run-away inflation.

Under the bill written by the Congress in this respect, controls are provided without an undue restriction of private enterprise. The full impact of the drain which military production will take from the total output of civilian goods will not be felt until 1952 and 1953 but the Congress in moving at this time to impose moderate controls has thus checked and forestalled an inflationary build-up which would rob our citizens of the fruits of their labor and their savings. Inflation, which would throw our Nation into economic chaos, would be encouraging to Communist aggression and, therefore, it must be prevented by every proper means possible.

AGRICULTURE

Provisions were made for the continuation of the great work of the Department of Agriculture—such beneficial programs as soil conservation, rural electrification, rural telephone service, agricultural credit programs, and for agricultural production, marketing, and research.

Funds for the continued operation of the Agriculture Department in the amount of \$720,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1952 were appropriated. While this amount is slightly under what was appropriated last year, the reduction represents economy cuts and does not impair or curtail essential services rendered by the Department. The production of an adequate supply of foods and fiber was never more highly essential and agriculture legislation enacted during this session was directed toward meeting the present great requirements for these commodities.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Congress made adequate provisions for the continuation of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In consideration of the annual TVA appropriation Congress rejected all proposals to cut funds for this vital agency. Efforts to cripple the TVA did not succeed. Such a victory for the TVA was a tribute to the success and the necessity for this great development both from the standpoint of defense work and from the point of view of domestic needs within the area of the Tennessee Valley. In the budget for the current fiscal year, the sum of \$248,000,000 was requested for TVA and this sum was approved in full, representing a great victory for the friends and supporters of TVA and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Still another victory for TVA was achieved by the supporters of this program in bringing about the defeat of an attempt to impose a tax of 3½ percent on TVA power distributed by municipalities. This was a poorly disguised attempt of the enemies of TVA to cripple the program. The defeat of this provision in the general revenue bill represented a resounding victory for TVA supporters over the powerful private power interests.

VETERANS

Much legislation of great benefit has been enacted in the interest of our veterans—not the least of these benefits being the extension of veterans rights and

benefits to include the Korean war veterans.

One of the first benefits to be voted in behalf of the Korean veterans was the \$10,000 free life insurance policy for all men serving in the Armed Forces subsequent to June 25, 1950—the date of the start of hostilities in Korea. Our Korean veterans will have the privilege of converting this insurance policy into permanent national service life insurance—by the payment of a small premium—upon honorable discharge from the service.

Another major action was the extension of benefits of Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care to veterans of the Korean fighting. Provision has also been made for providing increased compensation and pensions to \$120 per month to veterans having permanent and total disabilities. Assistance in the purchase of automobiles for amputee veterans has been extended.

As our Korean veterans are being rotated and returned home—the Congress is making every effort to bring their benefits in line with the benefits heretofore extended to other veterans. At an appropriate time, Congress will make provision for extending other provisions of the GI bill of rights to our Korean veterans—thus granting educational and other benefits similar to those granted to veterans of World War I and World War II.

SMALL BUSINESS

One of the most beneficial portions of the Defense Production Act was the establishment of a Small Defense Plants Corporation for the direct aid and assistance of small-business enterprises of the Nation during this period of emergency.

As authorized by the Congress, this service is to be a consolidation of a number of small-business services rendered by various agencies of our Government—this consolidation effecting a substantial economy in operations. It will, in effect, merge and consolidate all small-business offices into one for the purposes of, first, aiding small-business concerns and small manufacturing companies to obtain defense contracts or subcontracts; second, giving information on procedure for obtaining such orders and interpret regulations and directives in the mobilization program; third, fairly distributing among large and small business the supply of critical materials so that small business will receive its fair share; and, fourth, aiding in the financing of small-business expansion and retooling so that maximum participation in the defense program may be achieved.

POSTAL RATE ADJUSTMENTS AND SERVICE

The Congress for several years past has sanctioned an annual deficit in the Post Office Department under the belief that the post office performs an essential and basic service to the people of the Nation. Over the years, however, this deficit has grown so that, despite the essential nature of the postal service, it was deemed desirable in the interest of economy to reduce this operating deficit as much as possible.

Since many of our postal rates have been in need of modernization, the Congress undertook to bring some rates in line with services rendered in its effort to reduce the deficit. This action took the form of the elimination of the postal subsidies which have heretofore benefited large business concerns—such as mail-order houses—but not individual citizens. Principal among these increases was the raising of rates on certain types of fourth-class mail matter—such as books and magazines—and heavy freight parcels, shipped within city limits from first-class offices. This latter provision does not apply to second-, third-, and fourth-class offices and mailing to and from rural routes.

The price of the old penny postal card was raised to 2 cents after it was found that 95 percent of all postal cards sold are used by business firms for advertising and soliciting business and that the Government takes an actual loss of 1 cent for each postal card sold. The special delivery rates were raised but all other first-class letter mail rates were unchanged. These rate adjustments, it is believed, will help to reduce the Post Office Department's operating deficit and put the Department on a more efficient operating basis.

TAXES

The question of a tax increase proved to be a most controversial subject during the course of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. Members of Congress took up this issue with reluctance and hesitation because of the heavy tax load already being carried by our citizens—but also with a full sense of responsibility that the tremendous cost of the defense program must be met somehow and that a pay-as-you-go program is the wisest course. The majority of the Members of Congress were of the opinion that our boys fighting in Korea should not have to come home to pay the bills for defense and face the costs which the conflict against Communist aggression entails. The feeling was that the program of defense and security should be financed on a current basis so far as possible and not leave the indebtedness to future generations.

The taxpayers of our country would have, in the course of normal events, expected that the tax rate would be lowered rather than increased. The national tax rate was lowered following World War II, but upon the declaration of a state of emergency at the start of hostilities in Korea, the pressing necessity arose to step up greatly our defense program with resulting increased costs.

Therefore, a tax increase was deemed necessary. The President requested a boost of \$10,000,000,000 in taxes. The House approved a boost of \$7,000,000,000 and the Senate a boost of \$5,000,000,000. When the bill went to conference a compromise of approximately \$6,000,000,000 was worked out. This increase was far below the amount which the President had requested, but it was as high as the Congress felt should be imposed, believing that further economies should be effected in the operation of the Government rather than taxes increased.

INVESTIGATIONS

One of the primary functions of the Congress—in addition to its function to legislate—is the duty and responsibility to investigate. Without proper and full facts and information through investigation, the Congress would be unable to legislate wisely and properly in the interest of all our people. This applies with respect to the enactment of laws to extend benefits and to correct inequities and plug loopholes and also to the matter of the proper functioning of the departments of the Government.

There have been numerous investigations in a variety of fields during this session of the Congress.

Among the investigations may be listed the inquiry into the facts surrounding the dismissal of General MacArthur from his command on the Pacific. Also, the Senate crime investigation in which it was disclosed that the criminal element has infiltrated into legitimate businesses and that crime syndicates are in operation in our large cities. Much corrective legislation has been proposed following the crime investigation.

The RFC investigation has resulted already in changes and improvements being made in that agency. The investigation of the Maryland election will result in many changes being made with regard to the conduct of political campaigns and elections—changes which will bring about a higher standard of ethics in the conduct of State and National political campaigns.

The national investigation of the operation of the veterans' education and training program which disclosed many instances of irregularities has resulted in the savings of millions of dollars to the Government—as well as the assuring of a better and improved training program for our veterans.

One of the byproducts of all these investigations has been the fact that, by and large, the great majority of our Government employees and public servants are not included in the dishonest class but are scrupulous, loyal, and honest public officials. The exposure of some bad apples in the barrel has focused attention on the fact that the vast majority of the apples are not bad, but are sound and good. All should not be condemned.

UNITY

There have been divisions and disagreements in the Congress—and this is inevitable in the exercise of our democratic form of government—but on the important issues, national defense and security, the Congress has demonstrated a firm unity.

This same unity is evident among the people of the country who have placed national defense and security and the winning of the war in Korea above everything else in our national life today.

The times call for the exercise of unity, the welding of our citizens into a solid front against the threats of communism and Communist aggression. Only through unity did our country grow into the greatest Nation in the history of the world, and only through a demonstration of basic unity of our people and

faith in our institutions and our Government will our country remain strong.

There is not the slightest doubt that our Nation will survive the present conflict and emergency, and, in surviving, will grow to even greater heights, as the United States assumes its rightful role of leadership and destiny. The road ahead to peace and security will demand the best of the people of our Nation.

Texas Tidelands and the 48 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the remarks of Mr. M. K. Weitzel, secretary, Statewide Tidelands Committee of Texas, made at the convention of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce at Jefferson City on October 8, 1951:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, if Gov. Allan Shivers could be here today, he would feel equally honored, as I am on this occasion. Governor Shivers sends his invitation to visit the State of Texas. We like to entertain people from Missouri. When people from the "Show Me" State come to Texas, we are forced to prove our Texas brags, just between you and me, most of the time we can do it.

The tidelands controversy is not an oil company fight. The State of Texas is not the cat's paw for the oil companies. The bylaws of the Statewide Tidelands Committee of Texas, which I represent, absolutely forbid the acceptance of any funds from any oil company for the prosecution of this effort to regain our submerged lands. I make these statements to spike the guns of the opposition.

The oil companies who hold leases in the Gulf of Mexico made contracts in good faith with the State of Texas. We believe in the sanctity of those contracts. We are making every valid effort to live up to our agreement with respect to those contracts. We know that the oil companies have gone so far as to propose a compromise in this controversy in order that they may proceed with their drilling operations. But, much as we respect the sanctity of a contract, Texans will never willingly accede to a compromise on this great issue.

Speaking of the sanctity of contracts, the recent Supreme Court decision which, in effect, turn over our submerged lands to the Federal Government, also abrogate the solemn contract entered into between the United States and the Republic of Texas when Texas was admitted to the Union in 1845.

Congress had the choice of admitting Texas, taking over her public lands, and paying off the public debt of Texas. Congress chose to admit Texas with the new State retaining its public lands and paying off its own public debt. Other nations have cause to consider whether we, as a Nation, acknowledge the sanctity of our international agreements, when our Federal Government so lightly disposes of an agreement with one of its own components.

But, to get on with our discussion, for over 100 years, every coastal State had enjoyed

the ownership of their submerged lands without any question. That ownership was bolstered by international law, the common law, and 53 decisions of the United States Supreme Court. It wasn't until 1933 that any question was raised with respect to the ownership of the marginal seas. Then, some smart lawyer conceived the idea that a killing could be made, if the ownership of the marginal seas could be put in question. Lease applicants began to bombard Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes with applications.

To the earliest of these, Mr. Ickes replied that it was settled law that California owned the submerged lands along her coast and that such submerged lands could not be appropriated without the consent of California. But the lease applications continued to pour in. Pressure was brought on Secretary Ickes from these speculators, their lawyers, and political friends. Mr. Ickes and his successors have succumbed to the pressure.

Incidentally, one of the most flagrant examples of these lease grabbers was exposed in the September 24 issue of Time magazine. He is no other than E. L. Cord, something of a financial genius who eventually got into a little ruckus with the Securities Exchange Commission.

Cord has been scouring the country, looking for the heirs of veterans of some of our old wars. He is buying up the land scrip which was issued to veterans, so that he can file claims on public land. Some of this scrip was issued to veterans of the War of 1812. Using this scrip, he is now filing applications on thousands of acres of California and Louisiana submerged lands.

Cord contends that the oil companies, who made good-faith leases with the State of California, are mere squatters since the United States Supreme Court enunciated the so-called paramount rights doctrine. Fantastic as this scheme appears, the Department of the Interior has not yet denied Cord's applications.

Now the Federal authorities are screaming that the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas are holding up production of vitally needed oil for national defense. The irony of all this is that, even should the Federal Government prevail, the leases will merely be transferred to the same big oil companies under Interior Department control. I'm sure you all remember the unwholesome stench of the Teapot Dome oil scandal.

The Federal authorities forget to tell the American people that Texas, California, and Louisiana were developing the oil resources of the marginal seas when the Federal Government precipitated this controversy by filing suit against the State of California.

They forget to tell the American people that development of the oil resources in the submerged lands of Texas and Louisiana are at a complete standstill because the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate has constantly bottled up a bill which would restore full ownership of marginal seas to the several States involved.

They conveniently forget that the States of Texas, Louisiana, and California established an unparalleled record during World War II for the production of oil. These States stand ready to surpass their record if international events require it.

The proponents of Federal ownership have come up with another joker. They say it's a dirty shame that three States should hog tidelands resources. Senator Lister Hill proposes that the submerged lands be turned over to the Federal Government, and that the revenues be put in a special fund. A National Advisory Council, another nest of bureaucrats, would then be set up to disburse these revenues to the several States for school purposes.

The Federal Government is like a gigantic octopus with a thousand tentacles. Each of these tentacles is squirming and wriggling into every crevice and cranny of our economic endeavor, seeking new tax sources which it can suck dry. This school fund scheme of Senator Hill's is just a new tentacle.

It is time we began to whack off some of these tentacles. Then, our State, county, and municipal governments would have some tax sources with which to carry on their legitimate functions.

Then, our school systems would not have to look to the Federal Government for Federal aid to education. Then, the mothers and fathers of this country would retain their voice in what is taught to our boys and girls. Then, we need not fear that our children will be indoctrinated with the party line as it is dictated from Washington.

Actually, Senator Hill is stealing some Texas thunder. For years the revenues from our public lands have been put into our permanent school fund—a stockpile of capital to assure the education of our children when the oil and gas is gone.

The decisions against California, Louisiana, and Texas have announced a new concept of law. This concept of paramount rights is not defined in law. Not one of the three decisions actually measures the extent of the dominion which may be exercised by the Federal Government with relation to the properties involved.

But the United States Supreme Court did say that the claims of California, Texas and Louisiana were mere property rights—get that—mere property rights which must give way to the necessities of national defense. No one denies the Constitutional power of the Federal Government to commandeer our property, or our very lives, when the national defense so requires. But, as a result of this four-to-three decision of the Supreme Court, it appears that whenever a mere property right collides with the requirements of national defense, the Federal Government may ignore the Constitution and exercise its power of eminent domain without compensation. Do you wonder that Texas is trying to mobilize the citizens of every State against this unprecedented attack upon our Constitution?

Several attempts have been made to pass legislation which would remove the cloud on the title of the States. The first time there was any discussion of legislation to restore title to the States, President Truman pointed out that the matter was before the Supreme Court, and that legislation would not be necessary, since it was a judicial matter.

After the decision was rendered in the California case, legislation in the House of Representatives and the Senate was passed, by a large majority, restoring full title to the States. This legislation was vetoed by the President. In the Eighty-first Congress, the House of Representatives again passed legislation restoring title to the States. This legislation died in the Senate in the waning days of the session.

Again, on August 9 of this year, the House of Representatives passed full State ownership legislation by a majority of 285 to 109. Senate consideration has been delayed by Senator O'MAHONEY. Meanwhile, the proponents of Federal ownership assert that these legislative attempts to restore title to the States are usurpations of the Judiciary and destructive of our system of checks and balances.

However, the Supreme Court, in the California case, of all places, recognized that this matter was one for the legislature. Mind you, in the very first case enunciating the "paramount rights" doctrine, the Supreme Court said:

"Article IV, S3, Cl 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress 'Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations re-

specting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. *United States v. San Francisco* (310 U. S. 18, 29 30).

"Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies, could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power." In spite of these judicial pronouncements in the very case at issue, Senator O'MAHONEY still thwarts Senate consideration, and President Truman still threatens to veto.

There is a multitude of evidence that the issues in this controversy are national in character and consequence. We believe that the inland waters of every State are imperiled by these "paramount rights" decisions. We believe that the ports, docks, wharves, recreational areas, fisheries, sand, gravel, and mineral deposits of whatever character in the submerged lands of navigable waters are imperiled by these decisions. We believe that the "paramount rights" decisions are the entering wedge to the nationalization of all natural resources.

Of course, you will want to know if there is any legal basis for this line of thinking. Well, let us take the United States Supreme Court case of *Illinois Central Railroad v. Illinois*, 146 U. S. 387. In substance, this case holds that the Great Lakes and the submerged lands thereunder partake of the same character as that of coastal waters.

Now, it follows that, if the Federal Government can take over the submerged lands of the Coastal States, by virtue of the Illinois case, they can likewise take over the submerged lands of the Great Lakes of the Nation. From there it is but a step to Federal assertion of dominion over all inland waters.

Our Federal officials, including Attorney General McGrath, insist that the Federal Government is not interested in taking over inland waters. They insist that the "paramount rights" decisions are not authority for such confiscation. Can we relax our vigilance because Mr. McGrath assures us that inland waters are not in danger?

Despite Mr. McGrath's assurances, a suit has been instituted in California against water-rights owners—small farmers, mind you—on the Santa Margarita River. When the master-minds in the Pentagon purchased land and water rights for Camp Pendleton, they underestimated their water requirements.

Now, the Department of Justice has brought suit against water-rights owners on the upper reaches of the Santa Margarita River, to rectify the Pentagon errors. These farmers and their predecessors have held these water rights for over 80 years.

The Department of Justice is using personnel of the United States Marines to serve subpoenas on some 12,000 landowners on the Santa Margarita River. If this isn't police-state methods, nothing is. And what is the theory of law being used in this case?

Despite Mr. McGrath's assurances, the suit is bottomed on the "paramount rights" doctrine. Here is an example of mere property rights being confiscated by the National Government. And please note the suits are directed at inland waters.

Is there any other evidence that the submerged-lands controversy is a national issue? About 4 months ago, the Maritime Commission sent up a trial balloon. It proposed that, in view of the national emergency, it should take over the Port of Houston. In the past 35 years, the city of Houston has developed from a port of relative unimportance to the third greatest seaport in the Nation, in point of tonnage.

The chamber of commerce, the municipal government, the Houston Port Authority, all joined in common defense and sent a delegation to Washington to protest this confiscatory proposal of the Maritime Commission. The trial balloon burst in midair. But,

knowing government bureaucracy as we do, we realize that the issue is merely dormant and not dead.

I urge you to give this incident some serious thought, in view of the shipping installations all up and down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, which you folks have built. And please note—the Houston Port installations are on inland waters, and it is wharves and docks, not oil, that the Maritime Commission is proposing to confiscate.

Is there any more evidence of confiscatory schemes? The State of Mississippi has recently made some leases on her submerged lands, despite the paramount rights decisions. Consistency would make it incumbent upon Attorney General McGrath to sue the State of Mississippi. It is not improbable that Alabama and Florida will likewise lease some submerged lands for mineral exploration.

The Dow Chemical Co. in Michigan is now producing vital chemical products from the submerged lands of Lake Michigan—products as vital to the war effort as is petroleum. To be consistent, Mr. McGrath will have to institute a suit against Michigan. In short, instead of having 3 malefactors, Mr. McGrath will soon have 48.

At a dinner of the Smith County Bar Association in Tyler, Tex., early this summer, Attorney General McGrath made the statement that suit would be instituted against any State if products vital to the national defense were discovered in the submerged lands of any State.

Every State has submerged lands. Missouri, for instance, has 258,560 acres of submerged lands in her navigable waters, with millions of dollars invested in wharves, docks, and recreational improvements in the State, to say nothing of the known sand, gravel and other mineral and marine wealth. From the standpoint of the area involved, Texas has only 3,854 square miles at stake in marginal seas, while Michigan has 38,459 miles at stake on the Great Lakes.

The people of Michigan, and their representatives, are aroused and fighting mad. Actually, Texas has only 2.9 percent of the submerged lands of the United States, but we will fight just as zealously for that 2.9 percent as Michigan will fight for her 28.9 percent.

Are there any more examples of Federal attempts to usurp the sovereignty of the States and take over their resources? Let's have a look at another one in Texas, on the Brazos River. During the spring rains, the Brazos River is a rampaging gully-washer, destructive of people, livestock, and agricultural crops. Erosion is a major problem along this river.

During the fall and winter rains, the river again goes on the rampage. During the summer months, this river is virtually a dry stream; a yearling steer could wade it without getting its belly wet. During the summer, there is a genuine shortage of water for all purposes.

So, the folks along the Brazos, at a point just west of Fort Worth, formed a water district. Consulting engineers planned the necessary dam and outlet works to curb the destructive power of the Brazos River during the spring and winter and to provide an ample water supply for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes during the summer.

The water district arranged for financing in accordance with the estimates of their consulting engineers. Mind you, all this was done at the local level, under State statutes. But the busy little bureaucrats in Washington descended upon this local project and stopped it cold. They instituted a suit to prevent continuance of the project on the grounds that the Brazos River was navigable, and hence under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

As a result, officials of the water district and their witnesses spent months in Washington to prove that the Brazos River was not navigable. The Brazos River folks won their case, but meanwhile, the river continued on its destructive rampages and the area was deprived of a water supply during the months of their greatest need.

Worst of all, materials priorities and the advancing cost of materials combined to the end that this worthy project, inspired by grass-roots people, may never be built. They fell victim to the power-hungry bureaucrats of the Federal Government.

The folks of Texas are quick in their sympathies. We fully appreciate the tragedy of the floods along the Missouri. On a lesser scale, we have the same problem on the Colorado, Brazos, Trinity, and Nueces Rivers of Texas. But the long-term results of the floods on the Missouri may not yet be apparent.

The tragedy is that the destruction of lives and property is going to generate an insistence upon control of the Missouri River. Fear of a recurrence of the recent destructive floods may cause the people of Missouri to relax their vigilance.

As one citizen to another, I beg of you not to be mouse-trapped by any gratuitous schemes which will provide water conservation and flood control at the expense of your hard-won liberties.

Despite the fact that I may be running counter to some firm convictions among this audience, I am going to take the liberty of saying that, while I approve in principle most everything recommended by the Hoover report, I certainly do not concur with the recommendation that all public works and construction be concentrated in the Department of the Interior.

The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have a lurid history and a dangerous philosophy of centralization, a disdain for State and local rights, a high-handed, dictatorial disregard for the individual, which should be feared and fought by every freedom-loving citizen in the land.

Let me revert to this scheme to divide our oil revenues in the submerged lands among all the States for school purposes. All the States are friendly components of a great nation. I don't see why we should fight over who owns what.

After all, it's just a geologic accident that Texas has mineral deposits in her submerged lands. It's just a geographic accident that Missouri has her magnificent climate and her fertile fields. And it's just a biologic accident that Missouri is the birthplace of the Missouri mule—and the President of the United States.

In past years, I have been closely associated with chamber of commerce activities. I know the caliber of men and women who associate themselves with chamber of commerce work. And I am positive that, if and when you recognize the national aspects of this controversy, you will roll up your sleeves and make this fight your fight.

You may question your power to be of any help. Whatever you do, you will be in good company. Let me name the national organizations that have passed resolutions and requested Congress to restore the tidelands to the States.

First, there is your own national organization, the United States Chamber of Commerce. Incidentally, the entire State of Texas is proud that your national organization saw fit to elevate Deck Hulcy, of Dallas, to the national presidency of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

In addition to your own great organization, the following organizations have joined in this fight:

The Council of State Governments.
The National Governors' Conference.

The National Association of Attorneys General.

The National Association of Public Land Officials.

The National Association of County Officials.

The National Conference of Mayors.

The American Association of Port Authorities.

The American Bar Association.

The American Title Association.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The National Reclamation Association.

The National Water Conservation Association.

The American Municipal Association.

The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

You can be of great help in this controversy. You can let your Senators and Congressmen know how you feel about this matter. You can bring this matter to the attention of your editors and publishers throughout Missouri, in order that they may publicize the grave national consequences of a Federal triumph in this controversy.

I should like to quote from the address of Gov. Allan Shivers before the American Bar Association in their convention in New York on September 17, 1951. Governor Shivers, on that occasion, said:

"The ideology of the tidelands decisions, and the administrative policies reflected in it, are merely glaring examples of a trend toward a type of statism that is repugnant to me. It does not appeal to any citizen who believes in the States assuming their proper responsibilities and retaining their due rights."

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that those words exemplify the attitude which every citizen should take toward this great national controversy.

Our Internationalist Foreign Policy Is a Sure Road To Victory—For Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this peril before. On March 18, 1947, 5 days after Mr. Truman made his first challenge to the Russians, I spoke in the House with this title "Is Truman Playing Into Stalin's Hands?"

It seemed clear then, and events since relentlessly confirm the conclusion that the administration foreign policy follows a pattern that will bring self-destruction to America with a minimum cost to the Kremlin, except patience. To sustain this awesome judgment, let me go back a bit.

In outlining in March 1947, the probable consequences of the Truman Doctrine, I made what many pooh-poohed then as an outlandish set of forecasts.

Here they are:

First. Peacetime conscription—arrived June 1948.

Second. War in Korea—arrived June 1950.

Third. Return to large-scale deficit financing—arrived 1951.

Fourth. Reestablishment of OPA—arrived January 1951.

Fifth. Deterioration of the dollar by renewed inflation—arrived 1950-51.

Sixth. Economizers "would be branded as Stalin lovers"—arrived 1951—the Senator Douglas affair on the Senate floor, September 10, 1951, is exhibit A on this item.

Seventh. "Truth-telling will generally disappear"—arrived officially with President Truman's shocking censorship order, September 24, 1951.

ADMINISTRATION STRATEGY MUST PLEASE STALIN

The foregoing list is only part of the inevitable consequences I pointed out then. I report them at the risk of seeming immodest, simply to demonstrate that our present unhappy situation should not surprise anyone. We are reaping what was sowed.

To claim that our policies since 1947—as before then—have been unsatisfactory to the Kremlin, is to disregard both the evidence and the gains they have made.

Yet, neither in 1947 nor now, do I question the motives of President Truman. My exposition relates entirely to the unsound nature of the administration's efforts to preserve this Republic.

If you had been in Stalin's shoes in 1945, what would you have done? If you were as canny as he proved himself to be in World War II, you would say, "Our most important goal is to get the United States to overextend itself—and keep overextended."

To sharpen this concept, let me create an illustration from American business.

Suppose you were a small independent auto maker and wanted to get strength to match General Motors. I think you would decide quickly that the only way you might catch up with the great General Motors organization would be if General Motors were enticed into dissipating its resources and organization in far-flung and weakening corporate adventures.

If General Motors did that, the inevitable end would be reorganization or bankruptcy in short order. In the political field, this is what the administration policy is now doing. It has America attempting to finance, police, and control the behavior of the non-Russian world.

Can you imagine a more fantastic objective or a more certain road to national suicide? I cannot.

OUR POLICY TAKES US TOWARD ECONOMIC SUICIDE

Mr. Speaker, we have been following the policy that Stalin needs, which is the steady undermining and destruction of American freedom and American economic strength. Even yet, almost every week sees our commitments abroad expanded, and our strength further dissipated. We are activating Lenin's boast, "I shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction." Is not that now clear?

And Stalin's timing has been skillfully designed to accelerate this purpose. Korea was a good example of his timing. An old adage says, "Let sleeping dogs lie."

If Stalin did not want us to spend tens of billions on a vast rearmament program, would he have moved south in Korea in June 1950? I believe not.

He could anticipate what the response would be in Washington—and if he were trying to lull us to sleep, that action would have been the last thing he would have done—especially with MacArthur close by in Japan.

GIGANTIC MILITARY SPENDING HERE SUITS KREMLIN

The sound conclusion, thereby, becomes that the present armament program in America is not in reality objectionable to the Kremlin. Their clamor and protestations about it are simply a smart smoke screen to conceal their satisfaction, and to exploit its terrific propaganda advantages.

Our colossal military exertions can contribute mightily, and ultimately decisively, to their twin goals: The destruction of freedom in America and the socialization of American enterprise. Stalin knows what these evils are doing to American free enterprise.

It is said that Washington's death resulted from the stupid medical practice in vogue at that time of "bleeding the patient." Already weak, the body of the Father of our Country was reportedly drained of its remaining strength by the ill-conceived practice of bloodletting.

It would be a strange irony of history, if the country he founded should go to its doom via a similar stupidity.

But who would dare say today that we are not on that road?

FREEDOM FOR AMERICAN YOUTH IS GONE

Personal freedom for our youth has been wiped out by peacetime conscription. No amount of sugary propaganda can change that truth. This servitude nullifies the personal freedom pledged in the Declaration of Independence—for a segment of our people that cannot defend itself. Peacetime conscription is also Article 132 of the Soviet Constitution.

Economic independence is fast becoming a receding mirage for our middle classes, as the rotting of the dollar proceeds. Personal freedom becomes impossible for most people when the currency is ruthlessly debauched. That is happening in America—now.

The gnawing of the rats at the foundation of a structure is usually not visible on the surface. When the structure tumbles in, it is too late to do anything about it.

So it will be when the flight from the dollar begins in earnest. That flight will come if deficit spending and printing-press currency continues without end.

INFLATION IMPERILS FRUGAL MIDDLE CLASSES

The end of that road has not varied in 4,000 years, despite new and bigger OPA's. It means savings, insurance, and pensions will shrink to a small fraction of their original value.

But perhaps you say, "Wait a minute. The Kremlin must be frightened at all our military preparations. Surely they do not want us to build up a war machine that can, in the event war eventuates, wreck their country."

This contention is the pivotal idea on which our present foreign policy rests. How sound is it?

First of all, how many signs indicate that the Kremlin is growing frightened? Do you find such evidence in their ac-

tions? The State Department cannot find it, because they are daily becoming more vociferous in attacking the behavior of the Russians. Where is the evidence? Can you find any? I cannot.

All right, then, what is the Russian view of our defense effort, including our increasing number of military alliances in the four corners of the globe?

Of course, we cannot see into their minds, but, like a good football team, we should try to discover our opponent's strategy.

Suppose the military overload and operation rat hole everywhere proceeds without effective resistance by Americans either to the loss of personal liberty or to socialism replacing capitalism?

STALIN CAN BE VICTOR WITHOUT WAR

That will mean that by relatively peaceful tactics, cunning needling, and the clever help of accomplices in the Fair Deal—now enrobed in the mantle of anticommunism—Stalin will have brought us to socialism and communism without even a direct shot being fired.

Stalin is not sacrificing his seed corn—the youth of the land—in any indecisive conflicts 8,000 miles from Russia's heartland. We are.

If, however, the American people ultimately begin to resist vigorously growing casualty lists and all-out militarism, plus inflation and corruption, war with Russia could result at any time.

War has often arrived when a ruling group, internally frustrated, provoked conflict abroad in order to silence opposition at home. A foreign foe makes those in power almost irresistible. History is replete with this maneuver.

Then the America of liberty, free enterprise and Christianity would be gone for sure. Immediately, our remaining freedoms would be curtailed to the point of extinction. The seductive propaganda and occasional terrorism of recent years would be replaced by most of the procedures practiced in totalitarian states.

Perhaps the most devilish, certainly the most tragic aspect of this course, is the fact that it has been a primrose path so far.

MANY DRUGGED BY "FOOL'S GOLD"

Thus far the admonitions of wise people like Herbert Hoover and General MacArthur have gone unheeded.

The phrase "I never had it so good" is on millions of lips. Business is good, more people have more things than they had before—"the goose hangs high." Only those with loved ones lost in Korea or in that slaughter zone now, plus those already ground down by inflation, are paying for our national sins.

Too many are like the marijuana addict at the ecstasy stage of his binge. And, like the dope addict, they are secretly terrified at the prospect of normal conditions.

SOME NECESSARY GOALS

What can be done? A book could be written on this question, but certainly four objectives are imperative:

First. A resurgence of responsible individualism. That means all-out support to those in and out of Government who are fighting to expose the incom-

petent or disloyal persons who steer us into one crisis after another—without end.

Second. Vigorous patriotic resistance to the schemes to militarize us and have America finance and police the world. We destroy ourselves if that inflationary overload continues on the present scale. A drastic contraction in our dollar hand-outs and military outlays is imperative. No man can run 5 miles at the speed of a 100-yard dash. We must contract military spending in order to avoid fatal economic regimentation at home.

The obvious scheme to deploy our young men in ground fighting over Europe and Asia, if war eventuates, is a reckless gamble with America's most precious resource, a resource in which other nations have overwhelming arithmetical superiority.

Third. A house cleaning at the polls in 1952. Nothing will do more to preserve human liberty everywhere than a genuine Republican victory in 1952. That victory is imperative, if the two-party system on which liberty depends is to be preserved. We must nominate and elect Republican candidates not selected by the fair deal or their fellow travelers who profess to be Republicans, but whose actual political allegiance is to the Socialist philosophy of the administration. The Republican Party must be courageous enough to offer a genuine alternative to the national socialism of the Democratic Party.

In foreign affairs the sense or nonsense of our fighting and financing wars on a world-wide basis should be made the clear-cut, thoroughly debated issue. The answer would be decisive. The voters would determine whether our young men were destined to live decent lives in the American way or to have just decent burials under a global military machine.

Fourth. We must secure widespread understanding of this awesome truth—that Americans will lose more than all other peoples put together from another global conflict.

This consequence would happen regardless of the military outcome. The cruel consequences of World War II have affected only a relatively small number of American homes so far. It will not be so in the case of another global war.

ADMINISTRATION TALKS AGAINST COMMUNISM,
BUT EMBRACES ITS ACTIONS

The greater peril to America is in Washington, not in Moscow.

Undoubtedly President Truman believes he is a modern Sir Galahad in his recently assumed role as the world champion of anticommunism.

But his administration is rolling us hell-bent toward the collectivist goals of militarism, inflation, socialism, and human servitude. Actions, not words, are the true measure of the performance of the Truman administration.

A policy that results in war with Russia probably assures the collectivist philosophy of world-wide dominion. Communism has been the only victor in two World Wars.

Communism was nothing but a back-alley conspiracy until World War I enthroned it in Russia. The Second World War multiplied its power over two con-

tinents. Another global conflict can end with its evil, materialistic concepts strangling human decency everywhere in the world.

And so America must reinstall in high places a determination to achieve peace, which means that those people with influence must begin to work courageously for peace while there is yet time.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy is foundering in the quicksands of over-commitment, and that failure imperils our very existence.

If our children, and our children's children, are to have the blessings of liberty, we must as a nation heed the simple wisdom voiced by the greatest leader of men of all time—the Man of Galilee—who counseled against attempting the impossible in these words:

For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he hath sufficient to finish it?

Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him saying,

This man began to build, and was not able to finish (Luke xiv: 28-30).

Americanism Means Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Walter Winchell, in a recent article, brilliantly and succinctly described that great American sport—baseball—and its influence on American life and ideals.

The sports engaged in by the people of any nation reflect the national character. That we make heroes out of those engaged in a peaceful game bespeaks our fundamental beliefs in peace and the inalienable rights of freedom and equality for all. As Mr. Winchell so aptly says, the words "Americanism" and "fair play" are synonymous, and of this we can be proud.

Following are excerpts from the article which appeared in the Daily Mirror of October 4, 1951:

THE PLAYOFF, POLO GROUNDS

The manifold meanings of the national pastime are the source of its magical lure. It is economic and artistic, emotional and spiritual, philosophic and psychological. Baseball is a commercial enterprise for players, yet it frequently becomes a brilliant poetic drama for sports writers. The enthusiasm it generates has offered a more effective emotional therapy than psychiatry. And for many Americans it represents an act of faith: Catastrophic changes sweeping the world never disturb the changeless pattern of the game. It is the essence of joyous normalcy. The ball park becomes an island of innocent excitement in a world of wild despair. It is the sunny fortress of youthful memories amidst the threat of a dark future. The walls enclosing the field temporarily block the horizons of a civilization flashing with perilous lightning. Thus the game becomes a symbol of the mainspring of life: Hope. For the national pastime is an expression of a national aspiration—the pursuit of happiness.

A nation can be judged by its sports as well as its politics. Baseball reflects the national character. It is not merely an ornament of our society, but an integral part of our culture. And that cultural legacy is handed from one generation to the next. It is significant that what we value most about our sports is sportsmanship. That word defines Americanism: Fair play. And it is inspiring to realize that we make national heroes out of those engaged in a peaceful game.

The children of this Nation are never instilled with ambitions to conquer the world. They would rather hit a home run.

Washington Daybook—Forrestal Diaries to Play Part in Fight Against Taft in 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the column known as Washington Daybook which was released on October 8, 1951, and appeared in numerous newspapers around the country. This particular article is related to the part the Forrestal diaries play in Senator Taft's campaign. I think it is extremely interesting and that the public knows that the 1948 campaign was not unanimous from the point of view of all Republicans.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON DAYBOOK—FORRESTAL DIARIES TO PLAY PART IN FIGHT AGAINST TAFT IN 1952

(By Reed Blaine and Marietta Duke)

WASHINGTON—GOP opponents of Ohio's Republican Senator ROBERT A. TAFT are anxiously waiting for publication of the Forrestal diaries which are now appearing in some papers because of a very interesting report that the late Secretary of Defense makes on a letter sent by TAFT to President Truman after the 1948 Presidential election.

Under the date of December 20, 1948, Forrestal wrote:

"The President mentioned the fact that he had a letter from Senator TAFT, congratulating him on the election and saying, while the Senator might disagree on certain matters with the President, he would do everything possible to cooperate. Taft in his letter also mentioned the fact that 'as the President might gather, neither he nor his wife were particularly disappointed in the result of the election.'"

This is indeed a damning bit of the past for Mr. TAFT, or "Mr. Republican" as GOP National Committee Chairman Guy Gabrielson wants him called, to be faced with at this time.

It is evidence offered by a man who has at times been a hero for many Republicans, even those from the Navyless Midwest, in the fight 2 years ago over the B-36 bomber, that the regular candidate of the party regulars for the Presidency in 1952 did not give his wholehearted support to the party candidate in 1948.

For this letter that Forrestal cites as written by TAFT to Truman in effect tells Truman that TAFT was glad that Truman defeated Tom Dewey for the Presidency.

Dewey is today one of the leading proponents for nominating by a draft if necessary,

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower for the GOP candidate for President next year.

The fight between the pro-Ike and the pro-Taft forces is deep and bitter. It has flared up occasionally. But when this evidence is generally revealed, the flare-ups of the past will look pale beside the bonfire that it will ignite.

Indeed, certain members of the Eisenhower faction who already know about it but are not yet talking are swearing that they will no more work for Taft than Taft apparently did for Dewey. That means, they say, not at all. Some even talk of bolting the GOP entirely.

After the publication date of the diaries, the split will really be in the open.

Elaine Exton on Educational Study and Career Preparation in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that parents of teen-age boys across the Nation would worry a lot less about their youngsters going into the Armed Forces if they could realize that this period of service can, in many instances, contribute positively to their future.

For the information and guidance of all concerned, and especially for these worried parents, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts of an article by Miss Elaine Exton. It appears on page 34 of the School Board Journal for October 1951 and is called Continuing Educational Study and Career Preparation in the Armed Forces.

I am told the material in the article has been reviewed and cleared by top officials in charge of the education sections of the information and education divisions of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. Accordingly, I list it below:

WORD FROM WASHINGTON—CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL STUDY AND CAREER PREPARATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

(By Elaine Exton)

Young people joining the United States Armed Forces seldom realize that in entering military service they become eligible to participate in the largest adult education program in the world. Nonetheless their service gives them access to more than 6,500 different courses from the first grade through college levels in numerous academic, technical, and vocational fields.

After entry into the Armed Forces they soon find that in accordance with their individual interests and experience they may sign up for classes or correspondence courses in off-duty hours that will help them in their jobs—in or outside the service—indulge in a hobby, or earn credits toward high school or college graduation. They find, too, that whether on land, afloat, at the battle front, in a remote outpost, in America or overseas, no effort will be spared to provide them with the facilities for continuing desired studies in their spare time.

Off-duty education

These voluntary educational opportunities are offered service men and women not only to make each one's period of military duty as useful and educationally productive as possible but also as a means of raising the educational level of service personnel so as to increase their efficiency and value.

Though distinct from required training conducted for purely military ends, off-duty education is officially considered as an auxiliary to such training. As explained in Army regulations "the serviceman must be capable of absorbing and utilizing the training necessary to make effective use of the complex weapons and machinery of present warfare, a requirement which demands continual emphasis upon the mental development of the individual."

However, within certain limitations, a young person in the armed services can advance his education in high school, college, and/or vocational fields at a very nominal cost. This has made it possible for many youths to take college work who, for economic or financial reasons, might not have found it feasible to attend college during civilian life. Also, as a result of study in the off-duty educational program, which had its beginning in 1941, it is estimated that more than 2,500,000 servicemen have received some civilian academic credit, a circumstance that has enabled many to go on to college without having to return to high school classrooms.

An Armed Forces report for the period ending July 1, 1951, shows 148,384 servicemen—soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen—taking correspondence courses through the United States Armed Forces Institute and an additional 28,000 marines receiving instruction through the United States Marine Corps Institute. Participants in group study classes conducted by 1,459 civilian and 1,555 military instructors numbered 50,710 and 19,296 persons were enrolled in classes conducted by civilian colleges and universities (14,484 of whom were in this country and 4,812 overseas), as of March 31, 1951, the latest date for which this information is available.

Preservice advisement

Facts as these make it important for American schools to furnish preinduction educational advisement to their students. As defined by Dr. Charles W. McLane, director of the American Council on Education's Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences, this includes assisting the student to develop an educational plan and giving him reliable information about the educational programs open to him through the United States Armed Forces Institute and the Marine and Coast Guard Institutes as well as through other available off-duty facilities.

"He should be told, too," he adds, "that the services operate many formal training schools for which academic credit may be granted by civilian institutions and that almost every military unit has an information and education office where he can go to talk over his educational interests and obtain advice on courses to take while in service and how to submit this experience later to a civilian school or college for academic credit."

In cases where, despite anything the school can do to dissuade a young person from dropping out prematurely, he decides to enter military service or accept a full-time job before graduation, he should be encouraged to discuss his situation with the principal or guidance counselor to find out if he can be allowed to complete the requirements for his high-school diploma during his military duty. The student should also be reminded that it is the established policy of the Armed Forces to encourage young people to obtain

as much civilian education as possible before entering military service or taking up a career.

Literacy training

The low educational level of many young Americans reported in Education, an Investment in People, a United States Chamber of Commerce publication which disclosed that "14 percent of our population over 25 years of age have had less than a fifth-grade education and that in the States of Louisiana and South Carolina 35 percent have had less than five years of schooling," is showing up now in the large number of young people rejected for military service because of mental deficiency and in the equally dismaying number of those inducted for whom the Army finds it necessary to provide a basic education.

Since the North Koreans erupted into South Korea in July, 1950, 296,000 American boys, the equivalent of almost 15 infantry divisions (counting 20,000 men to a division) flunked a simple fifth-grade intelligence test. Under the Selective Service law then in effect 13 was the minimum score for passing the Armed Forces qualification test. This standard has been dropped to 10 under the new Universal Military Training and Service Act thus making some 150,000 men originally rejected for failing to pass an I. Q. test now eligible for duty.

Persons entering who cannot read and write English with facility or who have had less than five years of schooling are sent through basic military training and then assigned to school full time by their commanding officers until they have successfully completed the fifth grade. This training is compulsory.

All services have plans for providing literacy education to men requiring it, at the outset of their military duty, in the event of full mobilization. Up to now the Army, which depends largely on the draft to fill its ranks, has had the lion's share of the problem. Last year 9,200 and during the first six months of 1951 a total of 11,000 young Americans in the Army were graduated from fifth-grade classes.

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

United States Armed Forces Institute

The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) authorized initially by the War Department in December 1941, as an Army institute to provide a correspondence school for enlisted Army personnel, is now cited as a successful example of military unification. After the Navy's request to share in its services was granted in September 1942, it was renamed USAFI. Now its useful facilities are also made available to Marine, Air Force, and Coast Guard members regardless of rate or rank.

The original offering of 64 courses at secondary and junior college levels has been expanded to encompass more than 6,354 courses in academic, technical, and vocational subjects that stretch from elementary to postgraduate study. Some 325 of these courses are available from USAFI itself for a single \$2 registration fee per serviceman. The remainder may be taken, for about half their normal cost, through 47 cooperating colleges and universities under contract with USAFI.

Subjects range from American Government and Art Today to Typewriting and Trigonometry and include such practical ABC's as Auto Mechanics, Business Law, and Carpentry.

Several overseas USAFI's have been established outside the continental United States. These use materials from the parent institute but process the papers and tests completed on the spot. The Air Force maintains USAFI-Alaska, the Navy operates USAFI-Guam, while the overseas USAFI's in Hawaii, Japan, and Europe are under Army supervision. Both the European and Far

East Army commands use USAFI mobile units to take educational materials to remote outposts.

A Mobile USAFI Railway Unit sponsored by the Eighth Army Troop Information and Education Section brings schooling to American servicemen in Korea as close to the front lines as the tracks will carry it—sometimes within earshot of artillery fire.

The three-man team in charge of this train administers tests and examinations to applicants and enrolls them in USAFI courses. The main car, reports Pacific Stars and Stripes, is equipped not only with a large library of books and magazines, but with a shower for soldier students to wash away the grime and dust of battle before settling down to reading or study.

The United States Armed Forces Institute (Madison, Wis.) is the only agency authorized to issue official reports on USAFI courses and test results. It is also the sole source for reports on achievements in all other courses conducted under the Armed Forces education program in which USAFI or non-USAFI materials and tests are used—with the exception of the Marine Corps Institute (Washington 25, D. C.) which handles all records on the offerings in its own curriculum and courses conducted by civilian schools and colleges on their own campuses or at military installations.

Any student wishing to submit study carried out while in the service for academic credit toward a high school or college degree, or the school itself, can, as circumstances indicate, request that USAFI, the Marine Corps Institute, or the civilian institution concerned forward his record of accomplishment to the school. Since marines are only permitted to enroll in USAFI courses when comparable ones are not available through their own institute, a marine who has utilized Marine Corps Institute facilities will have to write there for his record on courses taken under their auspices.

The actual granting of academic credit on the basis of the submitted data is, of course, a matter to be determined by the civilian school itself.

United States Marine Corps Institute

The Marine Corps Institute (MCI) which celebrates its thirty-first anniversary this year, is the oldest school of its kind in the Armed Forces. Like USAFI, it furnishes correspondence-type courses on high school, college, and vocational-technical subjects. Based on standard texts these are prepared, brought up to date, and the related lessons and examinations graded by marines who are chosen for their educational qualifications and work under the general guidance of civilian staff instructors. The USAFI faculty, on the other hand, is composed entirely of civilian educators.

All United States Marines as well as other military personnel attached to and serving with Marine Corps units may register for one or more Marine Corps Institute courses free of charge. The current enrollment is close to 28,000. Some 11,000 lessons are received monthly at the institute's Washington headquarters.

Group study classes

Many military units in all branches of the armed services supplement correspondence offerings with voluntary group study programs at duty stations. Such instruction is based on demand. Classes are organized on a given subject when 10 or more servicemen (15 in the Navy and the Marine Corps) have signified interest.

RESIDENCE COURSES

In the United States

The off-duty program of the Armed Forces also utilizes the civilian school system of our Nation to help its personnel progress toward educational and vocational goals in

which they have expressed interest. In conformity with prevailing needs and the facilities available local commands arrange with nearby educational institutions for courses at their own base or on a college campus.

More than a hundred American colleges and many high schools have such arrangements with the various services.

If a serviceman wishes to attend late afternoon or evening classes at a nearby accredited university, junior college, or civilian high school, he can apply to his commanding officer for tuition assistance from appropriate funds. All services now pay three-fourths of any tuition costs incurred for such courses, or up to a maximum of \$7.50 per semester hour, \$5 per quarter hour, or \$22.50 per Carnegie (high school) unit. Other expenses are met by the student.

In distant lands

When foreign assignments prevent men in service from attending recognized institutions of higher learning in our own country, it is often possible for them to continue their studies in American university centers set up for their use abroad. First to enlarge its campus to provide educational facilities for service students in distant lands was the University of Maryland which established six such centers in Europe in October 1949.

The present overseas enrollment in more than 50 University of Maryland centers located in Germany, England, France, Trieste, North Africa, and Newfoundland exceeds 4,000. Completion of satisfactory work in them entitles students to residence credit leading up to a B. S. degree which can be granted without their having to live on the University of Maryland's American campus.

Courses in these and similar centers abroad are usually available to personnel in all branches of the service and to American civilians employed by the military services and the State Department. Most are assigned only one instructor at a time. After teaching a three-semester-hour course in his specialty in a 2-month period he changes places with a colleague who has been lecturing on a different topic in another of the sponsoring university's overseas centers.

In the Far East, where the University of California (Berkeley) brings to military personnel in Japan, Guam, and Okinawa a similar program to that available to United States troops in Europe through the University of Maryland, these instructors after finishing their "teaching tour" fly from one assignment to another and are called "Flying Professors." United States servicemen stationed in the Far East may also attend classes at Sophia University in Tokyo.

The University of Hawaii and the University of Alaska offer comparable opportunities in those Territories. Louisiana State University established similar college centers for the Caribbean area in July 1951. American International College at Springfield, Mass., provides for Air Force and other military personnel in the Azores, Bermuda, and at Dhahran in Saudi Arabia instruction that is equivalent to the courses on its own campus.

Final semester plan

An additional incentive for completing college work while in the service is available to Air Force members who are within six months of attaining a baccalaureate or master's degree at an institution in our country. They may request temporary duty at an American school or university for a maximum of six months to complete final semester residence requirements, providing they signify that they intend to remain in active duty for at least 18 months after completing their academic assignment.

While attending college for this purpose, a student-airman without dependents receives a quarters allowance of \$45 a month as

well as a basic subsistence allowance of \$22.50 a day. He pays his own travel, tuition, and textbook expenses. The Air Force is the only service branch sponsoring a program of this kind at present. Due to the Korean emergency the Army has had to suspend its final-semester plan and in the Navy educational opportunities of this type are provided for through its professional officer training program.

Accrediting educational service experience

In addition to the civilian-type education activities just discussed, the information phase of the Armed Forces Education and Information program contains many educational elements, especially the projects emphasizing citizenship education and current issues in national and international affairs.

Moreover, the training programs of the armed services for military purposes run into thousands of additional courses. Some of these are entirely military without academic counterpart in civilian education, while others include instruction of academic value.

Perhaps several hundred in all include substantial academic content and have been evaluated for credit by the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences established by the American Council on Education to assist educational institutions and National, regional, and State organizations in the evaluation of the educational experiences of military personnel.

Women's National Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of a member of the Women's National Democratic Club, I am including in the RECORD the address of welcome delivered by Mrs. Madeline Maloney on the occasion of the annual Missouri Day luncheon at the Women's National Democratic Club House, in Washington, D. C., October 18, 1951:

WELCOME

Comes once a year Missouri day,

And we're just bursting with pride
To honor our great and wonderful State
Best of all in the Nation wide

For we have everything in it
That man could ever need
To make for personal happiness
In thought and word and deed.

We have rivers and lakes and mountains,
And plains and valleys green,
With orchards and farms and gardens,
And cornfields in between

There are mines of zinc and iron,
Enough coal to heat the earth
Cattle, horses, and mules,
And pigs of generous girth.

And the people of this great State
Have had their place in the sun:
Frankie and Johnnie, and Mark Twain,
Jesse James with his big bad gun.

Thomas Benton, George Vest, and Champ Clark,
And of course, we wouldn't be human
If we didn't point with pride
To our great President, Truman.

I know you could never "show me"

Any States that can compare
With our own Imperial Missouri,
The heart of the Nation so fair.

Now, a real welcome to you,
Who break bread with us this noon,
Then on with our interesting program
Tempus fugit all too soon.

Message of Pope Pius XII to the Bishops of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of Pope Pius XII to the bishops of Poland:

To the Venerable Brothers, Archbishops, Bishops, and Ordinaries of Poland enjoying peace and communion with the Holy See

VENERABLE BROTHERS Greetings and apostolic blessing.

It is now 5 years since you, venerable brothers consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary your dioceses and your whole nation. Therefore, because of our love for the ever strong and faithful Poland, we express to you what, during some time past has been the object of our reflections in order to renew the lively confidence which you then placed in the Mother of God and the mother of men, and with which you may remain intrepid among such great dangers.

First of all, we feel with you a sense of sadness because not all the bishops who were present at those memorable ceremonies are still living. Cruel death has taken away August Cardinal Blond, outstanding for the wisdom and value of his works, who led along a hard road the flock committed to his care, and fashioned the spirit of the newly resurrected Poland. He spent his life in the service of his country, of the church, of the vicar of Christ and of God. We have more recently mourned the passing of Stephen Cardinal Sapieha, who, strong and courageous, never retreated before pressure or violence, and "who in his life propped up the house and in his days fortified the temple . . . and took care of his nation and delivered it from destruction" (Ecclesiastes 50: 1-4). He was "as the tree which is planted by the running waters" (Psalms 1. 3), a tree bearing fruits and very firm which was looked upon with confident joy not only by Poland but by the whole of Christianity.

There have passed away also the Bishop of Luch, twice exiled, the Bishop of Czestochowa "Guardian and Legate" of the miraculous image of the Blessed Virgin of Czestochowa, and finally the Bishop of Wroclawek who suffered so much during the recent war. We raise to God fervent prayers that all these pastors who have done so much for Catholicism be granted eternal light and peace. To you dear brothers, we wish increased strength and virtue, following their lofty example. Experienced in adversity, as good soldiers of Christ, lift your eyes up to the mountain from whence there will come to you the necessary help, to that mountain which your fathers called "Jasna Gora" to the mountain on which the Mother of God and your queen established her sanctuary and from whence her maternal image smiles on the suppliant multitudes.

HISTORIC EVENTS

Well knowing your ardent piety and devotion to the Virgin Mother of God, we can imagine how keen was your sorrow at not being present in Rome when, for the glory of Almighty God, in veneration of Christ, to increase the adornment of His mother and to fill the whole church with joy, we proclaimed the dogma of the Assumption of Mary into Heaven. Rightly joyous because of so great an event, we hoped to see you here since we knew full well that already for a thousand years your most noble nation has been bound by the closest ties to the Mother of God assumed into heaven and that you are aflame with an ardent devotion to her that it is incomparable. Indeed, as soon as the mystery of the cross was preached in your country, at once the Poles venerated and loved the Mother of God with sweet and affectionate respect as their own mother and the patroness of their country. The first church erected at Onieznio by the illustrious Prince Mieszko, with the consent of our predecessor John XIII, was consecrated in honor of Mary, Virgin assumed into heaven. That temple was later the mother and the head of other innumerable churches resplendent with that same title.

With intimate joy did we see and converse with your venerable brother, Stephen Wyszynski, Archbishop of Gniezno and Warsaw, when he came to Rome to venerate the tombs of the Apostles. In him we embraced and greeted all of you. He expressed to us the loving veneration of the Polish nation, and assured us that the reverence and faith with which your people, following the example of their forefathers, are united with this See of Peter, have not in any way lessened. He told us also of the immense work, done in spite of all forms of difficulties, with which you, with the efficacious support of the priests and the faithful have reconstructed your country ravaged by war, and of the concern for the development and purity of the Catholic religion.

The Christian education of youth and all that concerns a just solution of the social question, where arise very great difficulties and the most pernicious dangers, no doubt form the object of your concern and your anxious cares. Do not lose courage. May God strengthen your courage. God will help the courageous, and the Mother of God, your Queen, will not refuse Her aid to a people which enjoys Her maternal protection. Your celestial Mother and Patroness whom you, for long centuries with the ardent affection of loving children honor in the sweet hymn *Bogu rodzica-Dziewiczy* (Mother of God and Virgin) will certainly lead the Polish nation to a peaceful haven after the dark storms. Recall how many times during the centuries, with the evident assistance of the Blessed Virgin, Mother of the Saviour, your people have won astounding victories. The echo has not yet died away of that battle of Jasna Gora when a few monks and valiant knights of Mary forced the mass of enemies to abandon the siege and retreat beyond the frontiers of Poland. To that same heavenly Queen of Jasna Gora the famous Jan Sobieski, who with his exceptional courage, liberated Christianity from the age-old threat of enemy invasion, entrusted himself. Later, as if foreseeing the calamities that were to befall Poland, the Polish bishops placed a golden crown on the miraculous image of Our Lady of Jasna Gora, a crown received from our predecessor Clement XI, and entrusted the tottering kingdom during the unfavorable period of your history to the protection of the Mother of God.

PRESENT STRUGGLES

The Blessed Virgin, assumed into Heaven, invoked with supplicant prayers, gave to your newly arisen country which had found itself threatened in its existence and was passing through days of mortal fear, marvelous aid

against the wicked attempts of the enemy, which was witnessed by our late predecessor Pope Pius XI. We ourselves, during the raging recent war, saw clear signs of the piety and confidence of the Poles in the Mother of God. Amid the smoking ruins of Monte Cassino they erected an altar after the victory and adorned it with the image of the Blessed Virgin. Shortly after that they saved from fire and destruction the holy house of Loretto struck with incendiary bombs, regardless of the danger to their own lives. In acknowledgment of that we recommended that these courageous soldiers, defenders of the temple of Mary, be decorated with papal orders.

The battle still rages. Your "struggle is not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of this world of darkness, against the evil spirit hostile to supernatural things" (Eph. 6: 12). You are repulsing heavy enemy attacks. But the Mother of Mercy, cause of your certain salvation, who will never fail you, is watching over you. She, the mighty Virgin, conqueror of the powers of hell, will bring you magnificent triumphs and will preserve intact the treasure of inestimable value, the faith which you received from your forefathers. She will truly show herself worthy of the hymns of praise that you sing in her honor "Thou art terrible to the devil as an army well arrayed, be a refuge and safe haven for Christians." With every right should noble Poland confide herself to her sure patronage and place in her hands the hope of a better future. Thus strengthened and fortified, "living you the name of the Lord and the mouths that sing His praise shall not be closed" (Est. 13, 17). Wishing you this, venerable brothers, from our heart. We pray Almighty God for your intentions and plans. As a pledge of supernatural assistance to you, to all the clergy who work with you, to the monks and nuns of the contemplative and active life, and to all the faithful committed to your care, we impart the apostolic blessing with the most ardent love.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter, September 1, 1951, thirteenth of our pontificate

PIUS PP. XII.

Dead Ashes of Bright Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Dead Ashes of Bright Promises" which appeared in the Washington Star of October 19, 1951. This article sets forth in detail the fact that Congress has failed to meet the wetback threat to American free labor as I, for one, felt sure they would fail when we heard the great promises when the wetback bill was passed originally. I am glad to note, Mr. Speaker, that my able colleague, Representative McCARTHY, of Minnesota, is still fighting to see that we have a stronger control bill. I would like to associate myself with Representative McCARTHY in his efforts to fight for free American labor against illegal Mexican labor which is flooding the country and working for starvation wages thereby taking jobs from American citizens.

The article follows:

DEAD ASHES OF BRIGHT PROMISES—BOTH PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS HAVE FAILED TO MEET WITH VIGOR PROBLEMS AFFECTING SEVERAL MILLIONS OF PEOPLE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

At about this stage of events, when Congress comes toward the end of a session, you can—if you are curious and not easily discouraged—sift the dead ashes of once bright and glittering promises held up before you by the gentlemen of Congress when they were campaigning for election.

There are, of course, the inequities in the more publicized major measures affecting all of us. Such, for example, as the revenue bill that jumps up the little fellow's taxes, even including his beer and cigarettes, while doing nothing about the big oil corporations' excessive depletion allowance, a fat deduction—just a symbol of numerous other inequities. Or, for another example, the failure of Congress to protect the consumer properly in the inflation control law.

Those are obvious. Not so obvious are lesser publicized matters.

Among these is the failure of both the President and Congress to meet with sufficient vigor a big human problem that affects directly a large section of our country and several millions of people, and ramifies in its indirect effects to the whole Nation.

This is the problem dramatized in newspapers and magazines in recent months involving the wetbacks, that army of Mexican migrant workers who cross the Rio Grande illegally and follow the crops on the big ranches and plantations of the Southwest and South. They are herded together in insanitary hovels and shanties, exploited on low wages, and create conditions that not only are hazardous to their own health and well-being and that of the communities where they subsist, but lower wage and living standards of native American farm workers, many of whom are driven from their natural habitats to find work elsewhere.

You may recall that, when President Truman several weeks ago reluctantly signed a bill passed by Congress to regulate the wetback traffic, he found it so inadequate that he summoned congressional leaders to the White House and announced afterward that they had promised to seek enactment of supplementary legislation to help meet the wetback invasion and its harmful derivatives. These included increased appropriations for the Immigration Service to hire more agents for the border patrol to tighten enforcement; for the Labor Department's Farm Placement Division to improve domestic recruitment of farm workers; for financing reception centers for entry of legal Mexican workers, and a bill fixing penalties for hiring illegal workers. As for the last, you'd be surprised at the substantial and prominent plantation and ranch owners who work illegally admitted Mexicans.

This penalty measure is safely buried, beyond chance of action. As for the appropriations, that for the Immigration Service had been cut more than half, from \$6,500,000 requested to \$3,000,000, when last heard of in the pell-mell rush for adjournment, while the \$386,000 for domestic recruitment had been slashed to \$75,000, and \$2,800,000 for reception centers had been cut in two. Final results may show even further reductions.

So much for promises—though how anything else might have been expected by President Truman is hard to see. For on this problem he was facing a skillful Southern Democratic faction which is seeking to protect big plantation owners on cheap labor. The southerners were able to enlist enough Republicans in the familiar coalition pattern.

Meanwhile, something else very interesting has occurred to reveal the belligerent resistant attitude of the big farmers. This is creation of the South Texas Association which is raising a \$50,000 fund to lobby

against the appropriations and the penalty bill, assessments being fixed at 10 cents an acre, or higher if necessary. Affiliated with it are local chambers of commerce, Farm Bureau units, and the Texas Citrus Commission, a State agency. The aim of this move is to prevent the Immigration Bureau from fully enforcing the immigration laws along the Texas-Mexican border, it is charged by Representative EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who led the fight in the House for a stronger wetback control bill originally. He said that if the lobby is successful the result would be a relatively free flow of illegal wetback Mexican labor into Texas, a complaint echoed also by the National Farm Labor Union, AFL, headed by H. L. Mitchell, which has fought an uphill battle to protect exploited farm workers.

The South Texas Association also announced its intention to lobby with the Mexican Government. This has been called to the attention of the Justice Department by Representative MCCARTHY as a possible violation of the Logan Act, which forbids an American citizen from carrying on intercourse with foreign governments to defeat measures of the United States.

Champions of Fundamental Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, throughout all history mankind has sought for true happiness, but generally has failed in his quest. Nevertheless it has constantly become clearer that success in this search requires the realization of absolute good.

For ages, men of understanding and good will have sought to realize absolute good and so make possible the enjoyment of true happiness. Invariably, in their earnest search for the good, the true, such men have learned that practically complete consciousness of those elements of life, which we call freedom of mind and equality of rights, is first required in order to experience the rapid development and realization of all the other virtues of being.

Throughout the centuries men have protested because the few persons with little or no effort on their part have acquired fabulous quantities of what is essential for human life and comfort, while on the other hand the great mass of humanity has struggled early and late for enough only to assure mere existence. At first men were perplexed by such inexplicable injustice, and yet it was not long before these harassed throngs of humanity sensed the existence of universal wrong as the cause of their suffering.

It is heartening to know, however, that, notwithstanding the age-long injustice, there have been some eager hearts and noble minds striving to expose and to abolish the indescribable injustice which has oppressed the human race.

Yes, it is wonderful to know that self-sacrificing men and women have persisted in their earnest efforts and unself-

ish devotion to the general welfare, although, notwithstanding their sincerity, they have generally misunderstood the cause of the distress, and have, instead, misinterpreted the evidence of the injustice and so have, mistakenly, proclaimed the symptom or evidence of wrong to be the cause itself of injustice.

In view of such almost unvarying and universal failure in earlier efforts to understand the seeming lack of harmony between human experience and the fundamental principles of justice, it was not surprising that Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, with its emphasis on individual freedom and equal rights, should have engaged the attention of innumerable thoughtful people. The author did not mistake symptoms for cause, but by his unanswerable logic and irresistible appeal, he aroused for the cause of economic righteousness in the great majority of all who heard and understood the incomparable Henry George, the ardent zeal for service to their fellowmen.

Among those who were destined to be influenced by the great mind and the earnest and logical appeal of Henry George, in his brave effort to undo the wrong, which throughout the centuries had distressed and blighted the lives of countless millions of human beings, was a young man named Tom L. Johnson. Although he had known hardship as a boy, he had nevertheless from his early twenties on through his thirties enjoyed remarkable success as a street-railway operator. Before he was 30 years of age, Johnson controlled street railways in both Indianapolis, Ind., and Cleveland, Ohio, and consequently was required to travel regularly by railroad between the cities just named.

On one of his trips the train commodity vendor had dropped in Mr. Johnson's seat in the chair car, a copy of a book entitled "Social Problems" by Henry George. Later the news butcher returned, noticed that Mr. Johnson had not examined the volume and mentioned that fact "Oh, No!" said Mr. Johnson, assuming that the volume treated of the problems of the social evil, "I am not interested in such matters."

The Pullman conductor, an acquaintance of Mr. Johnson, told the latter that the book discussed a different and very important subject, and that he was sure Mr. Johnson would like it. Mr. Johnson bought and read the book. He said later that he had read the book almost without stopping. He then bought all of the other books of which Henry George was the author and studied them thoroughly.

When Johnson had finished reading George's famous book entitled "Progress and Poverty," he had in reality accepted as a new religion, the principles stated therein. He not only had acquired a new enthusiasm, he was actuated from then on by a burning desire to be helpful to his fellow man.

Not long after he had become converted to the principles presented in *Progress and Poverty* he took the train from Cleveland to Brooklyn, N. Y., and went to the home of the great author and philosopher, Henry George. When

the door was opened by the writer himself, Mr. Johnson introduced himself as Tom Johnson, stated that he had read Mr. George's *Progress and Poverty* and that he was greatly impressed by it. He told the famous author that the book answered the questions which had often bothered him, that its arguments were unanswerable from a logical standpoint, and that its lofty tone was most inspiring. He then explained that he desired to help and would like to know from Mr. George what he should do. He said also "I can make money if that will help." Mr. George replied that, of course, money was helpful in promoting a cause such as that discussed in "*Progress and Poverty*" but his advice to Mr. Johnson would be that he should enter politics. Johnson immediately said that that was impossible, and on being asked why, answered: "Because I cannot make a speech."

Mr. George then asked if Mr. Johnson had ever tried to make a speech, and the latter answered "No." He was then told by the great author that he had better try before declaring his inability to speak. Shortly afterward, while Mr. Johnson was on a brief vacation, the Democrats in Cleveland nominated him as their candidate for Congress, for the Twenty-first District of Ohio, at that time represented by a Republican. Almost immediately the Republicans issued a challenge for a debate between Theodore Burton and Tom L. Johnson. Thereupon two men, who, by party leaders, had been named as a congressional committee for Mr. Johnson, called upon the latter to warn him not to accept the challenge. Mr. Johnson then protested that he could not refuse to debate. He insisted that he had no right to the nomination if he could not defend the principles for which he stood.

The committee, after further effort to persuade Mr. Johnson to refuse the challenge, evidenced a feeling of futility and said that if he were to accept, he would be responsible for his defeat. Johnson insisted upon acceptance, but in doing so, said that as the challenged party he had the right to name the terms of the debate. The opposition said: "Very well, that will be satisfactory." Johnson then stated that the terms of the debate were to be these: "Each party should have altogether an hour, 10 minutes of which to be devoted to opening statements, the remaining 50 minutes should be divided into 5 minute periods." This was readily accepted by the Republicans. Johnson also said that the subject of the debate should be the Protective Tariff Against Free Trade, the latter being supported by Johnson. The opposition said that that subject was most satisfactory. The debate began in halls in the business part of Cleveland where such halls could be secured, but after only a few days it was found that the halls could not accommodate the crowds which attended the debate.

Mr. Johnson learned, in the meantime, of a man who was using a large tent for exhibition purposes, and he arranged with the owner for the use of his tent for the remaining nights of the campaign. In a short time the people of

Cleveland became so interested in the discussions that the contest in the Twenty-first Congressional District occupied practically their whole interest, and when the votes were counted it was found that Johnson had been elected in a Republican district by more than 4,000 majority.

When the newly elected Congressman had arrived in Washington to assume his duties he was placed on the District of Columbia Committee of the House. This gave him an opportunity to advocate an investigation of land valuation in the District of Columbia. He insisted, of course, that it is absolutely necessary to determine the true value of land in order that taxes may be justly levied.

Mr. George came to Washington to be immediately available for consultation by his enthusiastic disciple while the latter was leading in his great legislative struggles for the equitable principle of land tenure.

Mr. Johnson soon attracted support from such public spirited Members of Congress as Judge McGuire, Jerry Simpson, John DeWitt Warner, Tracy of New York, and Harter of Ohio. In a short time Johnson's investigation of the District of Columbia's land valuation began to receive attention from the newspapers in general.

Mr. Johnson also became very active during the discussion of the tariff bill in the administration of President Cleveland. He denounced the tariff bill as a betrayal of his party's promise for real tariff reduction. This action on Mr. Johnson's part was used by his enemies in Cleveland to defeat him. He continued, however, to denounce the prohibitive tariff in caustic terms and was called a traitor to his party because he opposed the bill as a surrender to the special interests.

Upon leaving Congress he arranged to devote the remainder of his life to the promotion of the great cause advocated by Henry George. He disposed of practically all of his private business holdings so that he would be free from any entanglements in the effort he planned to make for the sacred principle advocated by George. He felt, also, that he could promote the cause better as the chief executive and political leader in a great city than as a Member of Congress. He was elected mayor of Cleveland on April 1, 1901.

He was reelected three times and finally was defeated in 1909. Shortly before Mr. Johnson's first election as mayor on April 1, 1901, proceedings were begun by the city administration, then in authority, to convey to private interests the city's rights in the lake-front property. Mr. Johnson was earnestly opposed to the transaction, and secured an injunction preventing the city from going on with the proposal. That injunction was to expire on April 4, 1901.

When it became apparent that Johnson had been elected mayor, he pleaded with the election officials to do everything possible to complete the official count before the time stated for the expiration of the injunction. The count was completed a little before 10:30 a. m. of April 4. Johnson immediately took

the oath of office, filed the bond required to qualify as mayor of the city of Cleveland. He then proceeded to the office of the mayor where he was greeted by Mayor Farley with the salutation, "Well, Tom, when do you plan to take over?"

Mr. Johnson said that he did not desire to hurry Farley about getting his personal belongings out of the office, but that he, Johnson, had already qualified as mayor and therefore would assume his official duties at once.

He arranged for the repeal of the ordinance against which he secured the injunction and there was no longer any danger of Cleveland's losing the lake-front property.

It would require volumes to tell of the long battle which was immediately started by Tom L. Johnson to restore what he explained to be the rights of the people in the streets of Cleveland. A number of franchises which had been granted in the years gone by were expiring, and Mr. Johnson, of course, was fully aware of that fact. That was why he planned his great effort to assure street-railway service on terms just to the people. The old companies, of course, would not accept the renewal of franchises which required them to operate at a 3-cent fare, and Johnson refused to yield on that question.

Mr. Johnson then tried to induce others whom he had known in the street railway business, in previous years, to come to Cleveland, and to accept a franchise on terms that would provide for a 3-cent fare. He succeeded in persuading a number of persons sympathetic enough with his low-fare idea to invest their money for the operation of the lines on a 3-cent fare basis.

Mr. Johnson, however, was very much obstructed in connection with his low-fare program because of the hesitancy of people generally about investing their money when a great concern like the Cleveland Electric Railway was fighting furiously against the idea of operating at 3-cent fare. Consequently, during a lull in the struggle Johnson was making toward his ultimate goal of municipal ownership of street railways, Edward W. Scripps, the principal owner of what was then known as the Scripps-McCrae papers—and a man of wealth, discussed with Mr. Johnson the practicability of operating streetcars on a 3-cent fare basis. Having been completely assured by Mr. Johnson that the stockholders in such low-fare companies would not lose money, he asked Mr. Johnson whether or not he would join with him (Scripps) in making a public guaranty to protect against loss all who might buy stock in the low-fare companies, which were to operate in the streets where the old companies' franchises had expired. Mr. Johnson did join with Mr. Scripps in such an undertaking.

Immediately the old companies' lawyers went into court and secured an injunction against the granting of a franchise by the city of Cleveland to a low-fare company on the ground that as the mayor of the city he could not lawfully sign such an ordinance because of his financial interest involved in the joint guaranty signed by himself and Mr. J.

Scripps. This was one of the most harmful injunctions that had been granted against Johnson, and retarded seriously the efforts Johnson had been making to put his plans into effect.

I have already indicated that everything possible was done by the opposition to frustrate Johnson's efforts. In all there were between 55 and 60 injunctions secured by the street-railway interests of Cleveland, although many were ultimately dissolved. Every effort Johnson would make seemed certain to be followed by an injunction requested by the old street-railway company.

Toward the latter end of the long struggle, it became necessary for the low-fare lines to reach the center of the city, and the old street-railway company resorted to every device to prevent the success of this effort by the low-fare company. It was clear that if the low-fare lines could operate their cars from the west end of the viaduct to the public square in the center of the city, most of the low-fare company's troubles would be over. The old street-railway company was always ready, however, to request an injunction.

On one occasion, however, Johnson conceived the idea of working at night and of having the rails, ties, and trolley poles all delivered when it might be possible that nobody would be thinking of running to the court for an injunction. The trolley poles consisted of two 2-inch by 4-inch pieces of studding nailed together to serve as posts and long enough to reach from the ground to the height of 2 feet above the level of the trolley wire. These poles were supported at the bottom in barrels filled with heavy slag in the bottom and surrounding the end of the poles. In the midst of the hurried effort, however, the officers of the court came to serve an injunction to stop the work and the job was therefore not finished in time.

It seemed to those of us who were intensely in earnest concerning the struggle which Johnson was making to establish low fares that success was certain when suddenly Mayor Johnson was attacked along new lines.

During his third campaign for the mayoralty, in which Congressman Theodore Burton was his Republican opponent, the head of the old street railway system had made an agreement with the street railway workers which provided that if the old street railway and its allies should defeat Johnson in the campaign, the wages of the company's motormen and conductors would be increased to the extent of 2 cents an hour. As already explained, Mr. Johnson defeated Burton.

Immediately after election, negotiations for the settlement of the controversy were conducted by Mayor Johnson, representing the city of Cleveland, and Fred H. Goff, a prominent attorney, representing the old street railway interests. By the terms of the settlement, the ownership of all the street railway properties in the city was to be consolidated in the Cleveland Railway Co.

The Cleveland Railway Co., by the terms of the agreement, was to lease to the Municipal Traction Co., which was

a holding company, organized for the purpose of taking over all of the street railway lines previously operated by the various companies. The Municipal Traction Co. was to operate the street railway lines and pay to the old company 6 percent on the shares of stock which had been stipulated and approved by the two negotiators. The most important part of the agreement provided for the granting of a 25-year franchise to the Cleveland Railway Co., covering not only all the streets on which, prior to the agreement, the old Cleveland Electric Railway Co. still held franchises, but also included the streets where the low-fare companies had their tracks and low-fare companies' lines, which under the agreement, were to be conveyed to the Cleveland Railway Co., which in turn included the same in the aforesaid lease to the Municipal Traction Co. The "security franchise," as it was called, was to become effective in favor of the Cleveland Railway Co. if and when the Municipal Traction Co. should fail to carry out its promises.

Shortly after the Municipal Traction Co. began to operate the street railway system of Cleveland, the head of the Street Railway Union, with headquarters in Detroit, argued that the terms of the said agreement of the street railway workers with the old street railway system for 2 cents an hour increase in wages were assumed as a matter of law by the Municipal Traction Co., which, therefore, was legally bound to pay the same.

Mr. Johnson explained that it would be difficult, at the beginning of operations, for the Municipal Traction Co. to reduce fares to 3 cents as promised and at the same time to increase wages by 2 cents an hour. He proposed an adjustment according to which the Municipal Traction Co. would furnish the men with two uniforms each year and also give them a raise of 1 cent an hour at the beginning. The offer was rejected, however, and the old companies' men filed a petition for a referendum vote on the security franchise. By a narrow vote the security franchise ordinance was voted down.

All of this created such confusion in the minds of the voters, which together with the gross falsehoods of the opposition during the mayoralty campaign, which immediately followed, resulted in the defeat of Mayor Johnson.

He was disappointed, of course, but he never wavered in his efforts for his sacred cause. He never lost sight of the glorious harmony which he felt sure would be ultimately established and recognized. Almost to the end, in his addresses, he spoke feelingly of this rule of harmony to which he figuratively referred as the "City on a Hill."

Mr. Johnson lived a little more than a year after his defeat, when he finally passed away on April 10, 1911. His remains were taken to Brooklyn, N. Y. From the time the funeral procession started from Mr. Johnson's Cleveland residence until it reached the railroad station where the casket was placed on the train, a distance of more than 5 miles, both sides of the streets all of the way to the railroad station were jammed

by crowds of people, to help whom, Johnson had struggled so nobly and unselfishly. The reawakened consciences of even those who had temporarily deserted their great leader, caused them to grieve deeply. Strong men wept unashamed as all that was mortal of the people's champion moved slowly to the train which was to carry the body to Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, N. Y., where his remains were interred near the grave of his great prophet and hero, Henry George.

As we have followed in our minds the noble but strenuous effort of Tom L. Johnson, the great disciple of Henry George, we cannot have failed to recall Mr. George's own words when he was asked about the likelihood of success for his cause. He said no one could tell just when complete success would be achieved, and then added these significant words: "But it will find friends, those who will toil for it, suffer for it, and if need be, die for it. This is the power of truth."

Even if he had lived and witnessed Mr. Johnson's efforts, Mr. George could not have described more accurately the course of his disciple's wonderful effort, climaxed by the fulfillment of George's prediction that his cause would "find friends who, if need be will die for it." "This," said George, "is the power of truth."

My friends, especially you who have been earnestly devoted to the all-important principle announced and expounded by our great leader, Henry George, I hope that by taking the time to relate some details in the interesting and important experiences of Henry George and his beloved disciple, Tom L. Johnson, I have not disappointed you, you who rightly feel that the principle of land tenure for which these leaders struggled and died, is more important than all else. I am aware of your feelings, to which I have just referred, but I am sure also that you will agree that since this year is the fiftieth anniversary of Johnson's great effort to apply the philosophy expounded by Henry George to municipal government, we should pay tribute to these illustrious men.

There have been other earnest converts to the just system of land tenure advanced by Henry George, converts who could accurately state the George proposal in detail, with all its glorious advantages but who did not possess the power manifested by Henry George and Tom Johnson. Why was it then that Mr. George and Mr. Johnson manifested such impressive power in connection with their cause? Why were they so irresistibly attractive to all those who came within their presence? My answer is that from the very beginning of their conscious lives these men felt themselves in the universe where good only exists. To them it was illogical to even suppose that the Creative Power, in establishing an harmonious universe, could have failed to provide what is required to assure the perfect happiness of mankind.

Confidently, and expectantly, therefore, did these great men peer with true vision to discover the good which they felt to be universal. In other words,

they sought the truth, otherwise called the real, instead of accepting false appearances. This is called inspiration by some, and according to the correct understanding of the word, they were inspired. Those whose worth we celebrate tonight disregarded false appearances. The mental fog which to most persons seemed to distort the good, the true, to these leaders did not even seem to be.

They then saw, with their real vision, the unity of Creation, the brotherhood of man, in other words they saw the universe as the reality, the truth of being itself, Truth which is all life and hence is the brotherhood of man.

Yes, Truth, the embodiment of all good, Truth, another name for all reality—the realization of the Truth is the goal of all mankind.

Throughout all history we find, on one hand, the erroneous belief in the reality of selfishness as opposed, on the other hand, to the glorious manifestation of the unity of creation, the universal brotherhood of man. This states the real nature of the seeming conflict in the universe but the apparent strife is generally looked upon as a struggle for supremacy by one or more groups of humanity with mistaken notions as to self-interest.

Notwithstanding this general misunderstanding, a few great men have nevertheless been able to expose this fallacious assumption and to demonstrate the fact that the greatest obstacle to the realization of truth and justice has been the aggressive denial of the equal rights of all, inherent in man by virtue of his very existence.

To understand the true nature of the power and influence of Henry George and Tom Johnson one must, indeed, consider their achievements from an almost metaphysical standpoint.

It was clear to the great understanding of these men that all that is real is good, and according to the law of life and the creative power is available to every human being. George and Johnson were sneeringly called idealists—and so they were according to the definition of the term by Thomas Carlyle. Carlyle said: "The ideal is the real well seen." They rightly felt that the unjust distribution of wealth and its allied evils were the consequence of the violation of the law of equal rights established by the Creator of all that exists. They regarded the earth as the apparent but inexact likeness of the true universe and therefore urged the universal recognition of the just principle of land tenure. These pioneers in the crusade for absolute justice for all men, advocated this concrete application of the truth, which has been emphasized as the right of all men to equal rights in universal good. They advanced the principle that since the earth and all human beings are the creation of the one Supreme Power, then certainly, as a matter of morals and logic, the people of the earth, as children and heirs of said Power, have equal rights in the earth.

They reasoned that since the earth is the common heritage of all mankind, what is known as the economic rent, that is, the value of the yearly possession of land, belongs in common, as economic

rent to all the people. Each individual paying such rent to Society should and would, of course, be assured exclusive possession of the land as long as he should continue to pay the rent.

According to this principle, the self-interest of every man would induce, yes compel him to make the most efficient possible use of the land in his possession, in order to enable him to pay the economic rent. This would soon put an end to unemployment, because no one could afford to hold land out of use and pay the economic rent, and he would, therefore, be compelled to make the most efficient possible use of it. This would create a demand for labor and the demand for workers would relieve the pressure among workers seeking employment at other places.

In other words, involuntary unemployment would cease in a short time, and then the compensation of workers would be determined on the basis of justice. It was because their clear vision enabled George and Johnson to explain so simply this great but fundamental truth that they have received the appreciation and praise of hosts of grateful people throughout the world.

The marvelous achievements of every true defender and promoter of human rights have been due to their awareness of the fundamental cause of the wrong which they opposed.

Emphasis, of course, could be placed by supporters of the George philosophy on the simplicity of the George tax plan, that it is easier to collect and free from temptation to the crime of perjury and misrepresentation prevailing in other systems of taxation. There could also be stressed the freedom from annoyance by the ridiculous formalities connected with excise, personal property, sales taxes, and so forth. These explanations and statements of advantages, although correct, would mean little to those in great distress because of want or fear of want, resulting from the prevailing but fallacious system of land tenure permitting special privilege and the monopoly of mankind's heritage.

Mr. George's plan would, of course, assure to the person continuous possession of land during the time the possessor thereof will have continued to pay to the Public Treasury for the privilege of holding the land, the economic rent, the value of its yearly possession.

I know, however, that I need not contend at any length with this audience that the only tax that should be tolerated is the tax on land values. I cannot, however, refrain from again calling attention to the fact that the great champions of humanity, the unwavering opponents of the greatest of all injustices, namely the monopoly of the earth, were successful in their efforts because they exposed the fallacy and disapproved of systems providing for the distribution or redistribution of wealth in accordance with personal, although official, discretion.

It will be found, too, that the tremendous effectiveness of men like George and Johnson, is due to the fact that they engaged in the struggle for right, because it was right and not because of any vain desire to show their skill and

talents, but rather because without their planning they were in the very center of all consciousness, and so, in reality had a feeling of at-oneness with all life. Such men, so to speak, are caught up by a spiritual wind which advances them willy-nilly in a great cause, which may possess them, rather than to be striving to perfect the technique of human efforts according to conventional and superficial standards.

Such men, fired with zeal for the good and true, men who are indeed inspired, inevitably arouse the admiration and gratitude of their fellow men, and leave an indelible record in history.

O my friends, how joyful is the thought that with the realization of the great ideal of Henry George, then no longer will injustice and hardship plague mankind.

Released, then, from the power of the oppressor, no longer the victim of want and forever free from the awful feeling of want and the fear of want, men will joyously obey their noblest and best impulses. In their spirit of freedom and with gladness men will embrace the inspiring principle of justice and eagerly devote their hearts and minds to expressing the harmony of life. Then from the earth will vanish the meanness, the envy, the jealousy, and hatred which now blight our harassed civilization.

Along the grand highway of life, with songs of joy pealing from their hearts and the spirit of justice shining from their eyes, will march the sons of men in the glorious cause of brotherhood. In joyous assemblage, then, men will be truly free men and the grandeur of creation will be manifest throughout the land.

The National Hospital Survey and Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report of Dr. John W. Cronin, Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service, presented at the College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Department of Preventive Medicine and Industrial Hygiene, on December 19, 1950:

THE NATIONAL HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(By John W. Cronin, M. D., F. A. C. S., Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.)

The hospital-construction program is of vital interest to all of us as individual citizens and as physicians because it is expected it will be a \$2,000,000,000 program of providing health facilities. As taxpayers and as physicians we have a vested interest. In the latter part of the 1930's, when we were beginning to prepare for the role we were to play in World War II, it began to be very apparent that there was a great need for hospital services in many areas of the United

States. Due to shifting of population groups to new and rapidly growing areas of industrial and military mobilization, the medical-care needs of these areas were a major problem. Other needs such as those related to schools and housing also required immediate measures. The Lanham Act was passed and, according to one of the provisions of that act, Federal funds became available for the building of hospitals. It was soon apparent, however, that there should be a sound, long-range plan for the acquisition and utilization of hospitals throughout the Nation. Representatives of the health and hospital fields, both in and out of Government, jointly set forth to study the problem and to seek a means of improving the hospital-care facilities throughout the country.

The Commission on Hospital Care was organized and began its studies. Impressions soon were replaced by facts. The facts revealed the true state of affairs as an acute shortage of hospital beds and a lack of facilities to provide modern medical care. Physicians were leaving the rural areas for the more urban areas. Hospitals were not always available in areas where the needs of the people indicated they should be located. The leaders in the field of health and hospital services, as well as those of the American Hospital Association and the American Medical Association joined with the representatives of the consumer public in sponsoring a movement which led to the passage of Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress—the Hill-Burton Act—on August 13, 1946. This act, in addition to providing Federal funds in the amount of \$75,000,000 annually for a period of 5 years, also provided that the elements of sound local community and State survey and planning, as well as State and local control be established. Federal funds were not made available for construction purposes until the States had surveyed their needs and developed plans directed at meeting the needs at the local community level.

Each State was required to designate a State agency. In all but six States at present the State health department is the designated agency. In the remaining six States there have been established official State agencies as units of the State government. Each State was required by law to establish a State advisory council on hospital construction. These councils, like the Federal Hospital Council, are composed of members of the health professions and also members of the consumer public. Each State also was required to prepare and submit to the Surgeon General for approval a State plan for hospital construction which is mandatorily revised each year. The respective State plans have been of great guidance in locating hospital construction within the State on a planned basis related to relative need for hospital and health facilities as between service areas. The State advisory councils have been very helpful to the State agencies in many instances.

On the basis of the State plans and the Federal regulations required by Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress, communities began to plan hospitals utilizing the provision that one-third of the cost would be borne by the Federal Government.

The allotment made to the respective States was prescribed in the law. The important factors controlling each State's allotment were the population and per capita income of the State. The State plans established a method of priorities for projects based on need for services.

Hospitals are acquired by a four-step method:

First, the community applies to the State agency for a hospital. The State agency investigates the community in relation to its need for and size of hospital desired and either approves the project, defers, modifies, or rejects it. If it approves the hospital then

the project is referred to the regional office of the Public Health Service for study and consideration for approval by the Surgeon General's representatives.

Second, when the State agency and the Surgeon General have both approved the project then the community must show that it has its share of the estimated total cost to match the Federal share. It must also give reasonable assurances that it has sufficient funds with which to defray the anticipated operating-cost deficiencies for a 2-year period. This plan must also be approved by the State agency and the Federal Government.

Third, the community then must show clear title to the property and submit reports on soil investigations of the site. These also must be approved by the State agency and the regional office of the Public Health Service.

Fourth, the final step is the submission of the architect's schematic plans, construction drawings and all essential plans to the State agency and then to the regional office of the Public Health Service for approval. When all four parts as described have been approved by the State agency and the Surgeon General's representatives then a contract document to which the signatures of the sponsor, the State agency official and the delegated official representing the Surgeon General is drawn up. The Federal share for the project is set aside in the Federal Treasury. The sponsor then advertises for and receives bids, accepts the lowest one (or shows just cause why the lowest bid is not acceptable) and lets the construction contract. The total process may require several months to complete before the hospital construction is actually begun. The construction itself, depending on the size of the hospital, frequently requires many months to complete. The first Federal payment may be made after the construction of the hospital is 25 percent complete and the State has certified that an inspection for payment purposes has been made and the work found to be in conformance with the approved plans. There is no restriction on the number of payments that can be made but usually payments average about four to a project. The law specifically forbids the Federal Government from operation of any of the hospitals under the Hill-Burton program.

It was apparent after 3 years of operation of the program that many of the A priority areas were not acquiring hospitals because the community could not raise its required two-thirds to match the Federal one-third of the project cost. As a result on October 25, 1949, the Eighty-first Congress passed Public Law 380 which was approved and signed by the President as an amendment to Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress.

This amendment liberalized the original law in the following ways:

(a) It extended the program until June 30, 1955.

(b) It increased the contract authorization from \$75,000,000 for each subsequent year of the program to \$150,000,000.

(c) It permitted the States to set their own Federal share at not less than one-third but not more than the State's allotment percentage. No State could acquire more than two-thirds of the total project cost from Federal funds.

(d) It permitted the States to adopt either (but not both) a flat percentage of Federal participation for all projects or adopt a variable type of Federal share (based on need, economic status, and other relevant factors) for all projects.

(e) It provided a method of assisting projects which were begun outside of the Hill-Burton program but on which construction had been stopped due to lack of finances. These were identified as hardship cases.

(f) It raised the minimum Federal allotment to a State from \$100,000 to \$200,000 per annum.

(g) It provided authority for research, demonstration, and studies in methods of more adequate medical care.

(Other technical amendments were also made.)

In 1950 the sum of \$150,000,000 was appropriated and allotments were made to the 48 respective States, Virgin Islands, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

The following factual outline is of interest.

1. Six States adopted a variable rate for the Federal share.

2. Sixteen States give State aid in addition to the Federal share.

3. The average Federal share is now 47.2 percent.

4. All States have submitted and had approved their State plans.

5. As of September 30, 1,489 projects have been approved; 791 are approved and under construction; 398 are initially approved but not yet under construction.

6. The total estimated cost of all projects as of September 30, 1950, is \$1,032,005,950, the Federal share is \$380,204,879.

7. Three hundred projects have been completed and are in operation.

8. Of all projects approved 75 percent are for general hospitals, 16 percent are for public health centers, 5 percent are for mental hospital projects, 3 percent for tuberculosis projects, and less than 1 percent are for chronic disease projects.

9. The general hospital projects account for 86 percent of the total funds and a like percentage of the Federal share of the costs. The public health centers take last place in the share of construction costs largely because of their relatively low cost per project.

10. In general the average bed cost is \$13,500, the average square foot cost is \$17; the average cubic foot cost is \$140. It is estimated that these have increased about 15 percent due to current economic and international situation.

11. One-half of the general hospital projects are for completely new hospitals. The balance is made up of replacement of old buildings or for additions or alterations to existing ones.

12. Most of the new hospitals are being built in small towns and the smaller cities, at least 70 percent of the new general projects are located in places with population below 5,000. Only 12 percent are in communities of more than 10,000.

13. The projects for replacing, altering or adding to already existing hospitals are generally from the larger cities; only one-fourth are from towns with less than 5,000 population.

14. The new general hospital with less than 50 beds accounts for two-thirds of the new general hospitals being built. Only 1 out of 10 new general hospitals will have 100 beds or more. On the other hand, most of the hospitals being replaced, added to, or altering their present buildings are medium-sized or larger hospitals.

15. Nearly two-thirds of the hospitals with less than 50 beds will have between 20 and 35 beds. Some of the smaller projects have but 10 and 16 beds and could be called community clinics rather than general hospitals. However, they do meet specifications for a hospital in that they render 24-hour service.

16. Two-thirds of the hospitals under 50 beds are in towns of less than 2,500 people. Nearly all are in towns of less than 5,000 population.

17. A little more than one-third of the Federal money being used for all new general hospital projects is for small facilities of less than 50 beds. This is not surprising, since we know that the larger institution because

of more elaborate and more complete facilities costs more per bed than the small institution.

18. Over one-fourth of the hospitals under 50 beds are being located in areas which heretofore had no general hospital, another one-fourth are in areas where some facilities exist but where they are completely inadequate to meet the need for hospital care. Most of them are in rural areas, according to the State's classification.

There are dangers in building small hospitals, and these must be considered in the administration of the Hill-Burton program. Methods of avoiding them must be worked out in a feasible, practical way. Small hospitals cannot always provide the variety of service that can be given in larger hospitals.

Low occupancy rates are frequently found in the small hospital. There is a relationship between demand for hospital care and the ability to pay for it and the lower the financial resources of the community the lower the use of the hospital beds. Due to relatively low income of small towns and rural communities charges for hospital care must be kept comparatively low. As a result the small hospital in a small community has found it difficult to set aside sufficient funds for the purchase and maintenance of modern equipment, or for the employment of specialized personnel. The temptation given to a small hospital staff to perform services beyond their skills may bring harm to the patient.

There is a real need for the small facility in many small communities and rural areas. We do not believe in the indiscriminate building of small hospitals in all rural areas. We do believe that the provision of such facilities where they can effectively serve their purpose of bringing needed medical services to the population is acceptable. This requires careful study and sound community planning. Small hospitals should not stand alone but should share with the larger hospitals of the hospital service area and accept services and assistance as well as render services and assistance to those hospitals. This is the basis of the coordinated and integrated hospital system. It is the keynote of modern medical care. Such plans as the Rochester, N. Y., plan; the Bingham Associates (Massachusetts) plan, and those in Virginia, Michigan, Kansas and North Carolina among others are pointing this way.

The Division of Medical and Hospital Resources works very closely with the Division of Hospital Facilities in the Public Health Service in developing guide lines for the national hospital construction program. When we realize that for nearly 20 years the hospital plant of this country lay dormant we know the need is great. In the depression years money was not available for hospital construction; during the war years materials were used for purposes other than hospitals. The normal attrition rate for hospitals is estimated at \$75,000,000 per year. At \$13,500 per bed that means a 6,000 bed loss per year. A review of the State plans shows that we now have about 1,000,000 beds and based on the formula toward which we can build as stated in Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress we need 900,000 more beds for normal peacetime. (The formula is roughly 4.5 beds per 1,000 population for general hospitals, 2 beds per 1,000 population for chronic disease; 5 beds per 1,000 population for mental and 2.5 beds per average annual death (1939-44) for tuberculosis; and one health center per 30,000 people.)

With the onset of the Korean incident on June 25, 1950, the need for and value of all our health resources became greatly enhanced. The Hill-Burton program will undoubtedly in time be geared to new and greater responsibilities in line with the defense of the Nation. Its scope and content will be changed to meet the need. It should

not be forgotten that we are only slowly making an inroad on our normal peacetime need.

The trends of the national hospital program can be summed up as follows:

1. The development, slowly but surely, of hospital services in needy areas, especially in rural areas

2. The establishment of the hospital as the health center of the community.

3. The regional coordination of hospital services.

4. The coordination of hospital and public health services.

5. The strengthening of the centers of medical education through acquisition of facilities to permit these centers to play their vital and much needed role

6. The demand for the general hospital to be more truly general and include services for the mental, tuberculous, and chronic type of patient.

7. The realization that prepayment plans for hospital care are the only sound feasible plan.

8. The fact that good planning, good design and construction, and good administration is the basic tripod of success for hospital services to the patient.

9. The programs of basic research and consultation are imperative to each aspect of that basic tripod.

10. The need for and value of regional health councils to determine health needs of the region and community, evaluate existing facilities, and determine methods and means of acquiring the needed additional facilities and services.

11. The fact that local community, State, and Federal groups can successfully work together toward a common goal and achieve it

12. Modern medicine demands a health promotion, health maintenance and health conservation type of program, rather than just the treatment of disease.

The objectives of the national hospital program are being reflected in the trends being manifested. In short, the objective is to make possible the provision of quality medical care as economically as possible to those receiving it and as conveniently as possible for those who have the responsibility of providing it to the patient.

The cut-back of \$550,000,000 in the appropriation for the operation of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1951 included \$75,000,000 of Hill-Burton funds. The effect on the States is to require a great deal of replanning and reconsideration of plans already made. This is currently being done. Many communities which had planned on acquiring hospitals may have to have their projects postponed until a later year.

The Division operates through the 10 regional offices where a typical staff consists of a program director, a health program representative, an architect, a construction engineer, and a mechanical engineer. The staff at headquarters is divided into a Program Operations Branch consisting of individuals trained in medico-socio-economic aspects of hospital services; the Technical Services Branch made up of architects, construction engineers, mechanical engineers, specification and estimates experts, wage-rate authorities, electrical engineers and others; the Equipment Section with trained equipment personnel; the Program Evaluation and Reports Branch with personnel trained to obtain adequate reports and to evaluate them; the Information Section and the usual administration, fiscal, and budget personnel. A very close liaison is maintained with professional groups throughout other divisions of the service as well as non-Federal governmental and private organizations since the national hospital construction program in its ramifications directly and indirectly affects our daily lives and professional

careers. The national hospital construction program is a fine example of how the local community, State and Federal Government can cooperate in achieving a common goal of better medical care for those who need hospital services.

Attack at Midnight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following two editorials from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post on the subject of unmonitored disc-jockey commentators who broadcast opinions on a wide range of subjects and who are free from regulations prohibiting vilification, malignment, or broadcasting unqualified opinions on important subjects on their after-midnight shows:

SPECIAL RIGHTS FOR JOCKEYS?

A disc jockey, as we understand the term, is one of those gents who play musical recordings in radio stations and who, between records, talk about everything under the sun. This is called in the trade ad libbing, from the old musical term which allowed a performer to interpret music according to his own taste or pleasure.

Some of these record spinners are humorous and intelligent, especially when they talk about matters (or platters) with which they are familiar. But there are others. These fellows get into politics, sound off about persons in public life, and express half-baked opinions on national and international problems, to the disgust of vast segments of their audiences.

The obnoxious stuff cannot be laughed off because they do have a big audience and there are still some people who believe almost everything they hear. There has been a tendency to confuse the ramblings of disc jockeys with those announcers who read the news dispatches.

The material they have been ad libbing is their own and it vanishes as soon as it is spoken. Congressman ALBERT P. MORANO has asked the Federal Communications Commission to put an end to this feature of their activity. Our Congressman wants to know if these radio station employees have a special right to broadcast, unhampered by scripts, records, or monitoring of their spoken opinions. What right have they, he asks, "to delve into political harangues and personal opinions?"

The question was put up to the Fairfield County Representative by Bernard Yudain, managing editor of Greenwich Time, who said that in one of these running commentaries from a New York station, he was subjected to "a vicious personal attack." When he tried to get a transcript of the broadcast he was told that no record was kept, nor was the program monitored, or supervised.

The editor said he had been attacked personally because his newspaper had opposed a certain Government expenditure for recruiting. The newspaper is a permanent record of this opposition. There is no record of the disc jockey's criticism.

This unfair and weak method of operation could be corrected by the issuance of one directive by the FCC ordering radio stations to make tape recordings of all the ad lib pro-

grams These could be filed for a reasonable length of time and if no complaint were registered, erased and used again.

It is a very simple and inexpensive job, and one that would give the public full protection against personal attack.

IRRESPONSIBLE BROADCASTING

Congressman MORANO has asked the Federal Communications Commission to look into the status of disc jockeys who make their comments over the air without any supervision or without any transcript or record being kept of what they said. He wants to know why this special privilege, leading to possible misuse of the air waves should be accorded to these men when other broadcasts are carefully supervised and transcripts are kept.

The matter was called to his attention by Editor Bernard Yudin, of Greenwich Time, who had been told by several persons that he was viciously attacked and personally maligned over the air waves by one of these disc jockeys. When he tried to investigate he found that the radio station involved had no record whatsoever of what the fellow had said.

The trouble began, it seems, when Yudin wrote in a newspaper column that he thought it a waste of public money for the Army recruiting service to hire disc jockeys and crooners to gain recruits.

What red-blooded male was ever seduced into the Army by a crooner? At the risk of being put on the proscribed list we heartily second Editor Yudin's motion. In fact, we think this is a typical piece of "dem" nonsense—"dem" in this case not being an abbreviation for "damn" but from Democrat—meaning the present administration in Washington.

And while the recruiting service is so hard up why doesn't it recruit the crooners and disc jockeys themselves? Send them to Korea—nobody will object. In fact, they might be formed into a special unit, "The Item Bomb Brigade."

Separation of Subsidies From Air-Mail Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr WOLVERTON. Mr Speaker, it is my hope that early in the next session the House may pass a really effective bill to separate subsidies from air-mail pay.

At present payments for carrying the mail and subsidies to the airlines are lumped together in one sum, all charged to the Post Office. Neither the President, nor the Congress, nor the taxpayers have any means of knowing how much those hidden subsidies are.

This separation reform was recommended 3½ years ago by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, headed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]:

It is the recommendation of the committee that the subsidy element in airmail pay be separated. It has been suggested that this could be arrived at by accounting procedures in the Post Office Department. However, this procedure would not eliminate the basic objection which is that, under the present situation, we have an administrative board allocating public funds through which

basic public policies are established without action directly by the Congress. The better solution is to make provisions for subsidies directly to the Civil Aeronautics Board (H. Rept. 1958, 80th Cong, 2d sess., by Mr. REES.)

Last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce favorably reported a very effective bill to separate the subsidies from the mail pay, thus relieving the Post Office from carrying this heavy burden, and also bringing the subsidies into public view where the Congress can pass upon them.

During our period of adjournment, I hope all members will study this report from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], House Report 3041, Eighty-first Congress, second session. It covers only 15 pages and it gives an excellent analysis of all the issues involved.

I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will again report favorably the same legislation described in this report, and that a really effective separation bill will finally be enacted.

This will put another worth-while reform, recommended by the Hoover Commission, on the statute books.

News Suppression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include excerpts from a letter to me received from Mr. J. Robert Knecht, of Rapid City, S. Dak., in which he says on the subject of news suppression:

This idea of news suppression is actually a foolish thing. For the past month we have read of air battles between the MIGs and Sabre jets: Always the same story—no American losses, but always several Russian planes being shot down. This just isn't possible, no matter how superior our air equipment is. If you would check into this I am sure you would find that we have lost considerably more than are reported.

Consider casualties. Always at least 10 to 1 in our favor. This does not make very intelligent reading either—lists reporting missing men who, in all probability, are dead.

During the last war I saw many things in different lands that our papers wouldn't report, nor would they ever obtain this information because the government suppressed it. As an example. Find out how many men ever came back from the Persian Gulf Command during the last war, until they were no longer needed—even though they were on the verge of mental and physical breakdown. Also, find out about the price of fuel oil purchased from the British at the Port of Abadan Refinery. Find out about the barge rentals in this area.

On the subject of deficit spending Mr. Knecht has this to say:

Being a businessman, it would seem logical that if I have to meet my bills then any other business—Government included—should meet theirs. Therefore, if the Government

keeps on a deficit spending spree and people lose faith in the business ability of the Government, which I believe some people are already starting to do (witness the rise in personal savings and decrease proportionately of defense bonds purchased and other Government bonds) then if this follows a pattern and something isn't done soon, the Government cannot borrow enough money from the people to pay the interest and principal due on former obligations.

Investigation of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr MEADER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post underscores the necessity for a penetrating investigation of the Department of State.

This editorial, entitled "Obfuscation, Inc.," takes the State Department to task for "double talk" and the growing deception that might be described as the cult of the disingenuous answer.

The editorial poses this \$64 question: "Is it any wonder that Congress and the country lose faith in the administration's words?"

The entire editorial is as follows:

OBUSCATION, INC.

Secretary Acheson's firm statement of support for the British position in Suez should dispel some of the wishy-washiness that has characterized the American pronouncements to date. It was high time that we let both London and Cairo know just where we stand. But Mr. Acheson's clarification by no means atones for the double talk of a highly placed Government official who briefed correspondents early this week about the proposed international command in the Middle East. This official, who declined to permit the use of his name, emphasized repeatedly that the plan for such a command does not envision sending American divisions to the Middle East, nor will there be any firm "commitment" of American air and naval forces requiring congressional sanction. At the same time he ducked the question whether the United States will support British resistance if Egypt attempts to throw British troops out of Suez.

Yet at the very time this official was speaking, the terms of the proposed NATO extension were being announced in London. The London communiqué makes it very clear that under this revision the American military commitment would be extended to cover not only Greece and Turkey but also the whole eastern Mediterranean, including such bases as Crete and Cyprus. And how, pray tell, is it possible to extend the NATO guaranty to these areas without also extending the commitment of NATO members, including the United States, to send troops if necessary to protect them? And how can the United States support the British position in Suez if one of its officials tells all and sundry that we have no idea of using troops?

Altogether this little semantic exercise in "when is a commitment not a commitment" reminds us of Secretary Acheson's disastrous assurance to Congress in 1949 that the United States did not contemplate sending troops to Europe. The double talk is a part of a growing deception that might be described as the Cult of the Disingenuous Answer. Is

It any wonder that Congress and the country lose faith in the administration's words?

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 1, 1951, I offered a resolution in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments urging a penetrating investigation of the Department of State, including but not limited to its organizational structure, its procedures, its personnel, its performance and its relationship to other Federal agencies. My discussion on this resolution on the floor of the House appears on page 9318 of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* for Wednesday, August 1, 1951.

I inserted in the Appendix of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* on page A6082 my letter to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments setting forth my reasons why such an investigation should be undertaken.

The committee has not acted on my resolution, although the chairman stated that authority existed and appropriations were adequate for the committee to undertake such an investigation if the chairman elected to do so.

The editorial above referred to is simply another instance of the public awareness of the lack of candor with which the State Department conducts the foreign affairs of the United States.

Previously we had been treated to the rather unsavory spectacle of an admission by the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, before the Senate committee investigating the MacArthur dismissal that the State Department had deliberately falsified in a public statement regarding Formosa. This situation was called to the attention of the House by the Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan, in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* for June 6, 1951.

I would like to offer for the record another example of lack of candor in one of the lowlier offices of the State Department. In January 1945 it was my privilege to act as counsel for a subcommittee of the Senate War Investigating Committee conducting an investigation of military installations and supplies in North Africa and the Middle East. This subcommittee consisted of the former Senator James M. Tunnell, of Delaware, and former Senator Harold H. Burton, of Ohio, now associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The subcommittee took considerable testimony regarding the airport at Rabat-Sale at the capital of French Morocco. The subcommittee sought to ascertain how much investment the United States had in the improvement of that airport and received estimates ranging from \$50,000 to \$1,000,000. This testimony was developed in a hearing in Casablanca on January 1, 1945. The testimony also showed that the day the American forces abandoned the Rabat-Sale airfield, the British obtained a lease on that airport from a French officer for use of the airport until further order without charge and without any limitation as to its use. We were further informed that the British proceeded to use the field as a terminus for trans-Atlantic flights.

When the subcommittee returned through Casablanca approximately 2

weeks later, the American consul at Casablanca informed the subcommittee that the British consul had inquired of him about the subcommittee's interest in the Rabat-Sale airport. The American consul then proceeded to tell the subcommittee almost boastfully that he had denied to the British consul that the subcommittee had had any interest in the Rabat-Sale airport or had made any inquiries regarding it.

That episode impressed me because the subcommittee had not requested the American consul to conceal its interest and certainly had not requested him to lie about it. His attitude was one that as a matter of course he regarded it as proper to be deceptive.

It is because of such practices on the part of the State Department which the editorial in the *Washington Post* so severely condemns that the American people and, indeed, the rest of the world have come to have such a low opinion of our Department of State. I suppose there are those who believe that diplomacy is synonymous with deceit, devious methods, double dealing, and double talk. The American Congress, however, should not accede to any such views without thoroughly exploring all alternatives.

Certainly confidence in the pronouncements of an agency is the basis for its influence and the acceptance of its leadership. When confidence in the integrity of an agency is destroyed, its usefulness is destroyed.

The American people are entitled to a State Department of which they can be proud, not one for which they must hang their heads in shame. The Congress cannot escape its responsibility to the people of the United States to do all within its power to strengthen and build up the agency through which we conduct our relations with other countries of the world in these critical times in international affairs.

Times Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* the following editorial from the *Canton Repository*, Canton, Ohio, of Thursday, October 18, 1951:

TIMES CHANGE

Senator TAFT's bid for the Republican presidential nomination in 1952 has revived an opinion put into circulation by his opponents many years ago and kept alive by their diligent efforts.

They want as many people as possible to believe that the Ohioan would make a bad campaign if he ran for the presidency. They concede he would know what he was talking about, that he would be intellectually honest and that he has one of the keenest minds in public life. But they harp endlessly on the theme that Senator TAFT would make a bad campaign.

All this started with the invidious comparison between the late Franklin D. Roosevelt's charming manners as a campaigner and the Senator's dry, factual presentations of his viewpoints. While Mr. Roosevelt lived, there was a high premium on his particular brand of charm in politics, just as there was a high premium on flute-like radio voices. But times change.

Charm did not save either Mr. Roosevelt or the country from failure to think through the consequences of many policies undertaken in the name of charm. It did not offset the repercussions of intellectual dishonesty. By 1950, when Senator TAFT ran for reelection in Ohio, voters in his own State had found something they valued vastly more than charm—a political candidate who talked intelligently about the issues and was not afraid to say what he thought, even though his voice failed to be fruity. A thumping majority of Ohioans found Senator TAFT to be utterly charming in 1950.

Voters in other States would be just as receptive to his kind of fact-discussing campaign if he ran for the presidency.

No Magic Weapons As Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the *Christian Science Monitor*, Thursday, October 18, 1951:

WISDOM FROM MR. LOVETT

Only a fortnight or so ago Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett performed a useful service in shepherding the Joint Chiefs of Staff into a better team approach to budget decisions. Now, on his first major public appearance since taking his new post, Mr. Lovett makes a contribution to general sanity by admonishing the national convention of the American Legion that although development of fantastic weapons is being pressed, no magic is yet in sight.

The enemy in Korea, therefore, and any armed aggression elsewhere still must be met with orthodox arms, greatly improved, and with men better trained to use them. Timed with the convention and Mr. Lovett's speech is the President's appeal to the Legion for continued support of the basic idea of universal military training.

Needed as are Mr. Lovett's warnings as an antidote-in-advance for unnecessary and unjustified disillusionment, there is another and more positive side of the picture. Improved orthodox weapons are here. And so are men trained to use them.

The solid fact underlying the confidence emanating from Korea, the one great argument which says that the Chinese Communists do want a cease fire on the best terms they can get, is the enormous mobile fire power possessed by the U. N. forces—fire power delivered by small arms, automatic weapons, artillery, and interdicting airplanes. The fear of human sea tactics is gone. One front-line officer has told correspondents that 15,000 U. N. troops are pushing forward successfully against 100,000 of the foe.

It is reassuring to hear from Mr. Lovett that weapons development along new lines goes forward. But the forces arrayed against Red Imperialism are doing quite well with what they have. And that is comforting, too.

Taxes Go Up and Up and Up**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the people are beginning to make themselves heard and felt in the Halls of Congress. This week's action on the tax bill in the House of Representatives proves that. Defeat of the measure last Tuesday, even though nullified by final passage Friday, serves notice on the public spenders that there is a limit to the continued application of the tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect theory.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted against the tax bill all three times it came before us. I did so because I felt the people I have the honor to represent are against the continuing increase in taxes so long as there is no corresponding effort to reduce Government spending. Spending for defense is a "must" in our present hour of international peril, but all Government spending is not defense spending. There is plenty of room for economy in the non-defense activities of Government. And even in the vast defense-spending program, there is no excuse for waste.

The people are aroused at long last, and the vote of protest against the tax bill proves it. That this view is widely held on the home front may be seen from a timely editorial on this subject, published by the well-informed Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News. Under permission granted to me, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TAXES GO UP AND UP AND UP

The administration is stunned, say Washington reports, by the action of the House in turning down the five billion seven hundred and fifty million tax increase. Be that as it may, some huge hike will be forthcoming. Assuming that it will be about five billion seven hundred and fifty million it will bring the total annual Federal tax burden to sixty-seven billions.

This figure—sixty-seven thousand millions—is twenty-one and a half billions more than the highest Federal tax levy of World War II.

It is more than the total national debt before the war.

It is reached by three tax increases since the outbreak of the Korean war totalling seventeen billions.

The increases alone are more than three times the total Federal taxes collected before 1940.

Regardless of what may be thought of the \$50,000,000,000 to which the seventeen billions has been added in less than a year, the seventeen billions, at least, is ponderable.

It is not the cost of rearming. It is the price to be paid by the American people for the refusal of their Government to tighten its own belt while repeatedly urging the people themselves to do so, and while writing tax bills that compel them to do so.

In the face of known extraordinary expenditures, the President last February declared that his \$71,600,000,000 budget contained "every economy that can be made." But in June Secretary Snyder offered revised spending estimates bringing the total down to sixty-eight billion four hundred million.

Evidently the administration found that it could not spend money as fast as Mr. Truman had estimated 5 months before. And the hope of a balanced budget now with sixty-seven billions in taxes, rests on the fact that the tooling-up for defense has fallen behind schedule in some areas and as a consequence the rate of military spending may not be as fast as expected.

More than a year has elapsed since the new emergency showed the need to make adjustments in nonessential spending so as to keep the tax burden tolerable. The net result has been zero.

The Hoover Commission's recommendations for economy and efficiency in government have been ignored by the present session of Congress and the President.

The Federal payroll has swollen.

Nothing has been done to eliminate non-essential bureaus or nonessential activities of other bureaus. Meanwhile the spending excesses of practically every Government agency have become notorious.

Last May Comptroller General Lindsay Warren told a Senate committee:

"You and I know that there can be no real economy unless there be weeded out and completely abolished those Government functions which, perhaps well advised at their inception, have long since outlived their usefulness, and unless there be eternal vigilance against the creation of new functions and programs that are not absolutely essential. I have always said that the Government is too large, and even in this day of war and emergency it is too large. It can be reduced if there is a will to do it."

But there was no will to do it either in administration or among the leaders in Congress. The added tax you pay is not the price of preparedness. It is the cost to you of the lack of will to hold spending to essential needs.

**Attorney General McGrath Defies
Congressional Committee****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, people who hold public office for a long time very often think that they own that office and have only contempt for people who have elected them to that position. This is true not only of elected officials but also of political parties, and especially those individual members of a political party who occupy appointive offices.

As Members of Congress, we know that the high military brass resent being called to account by congressional committees. We also know that the bureaucrats in all of the departments made end-runs around our committees in order to accomplish their goals which they have set up before even asking the appropriate congressional committee's permission to play the game. As Members of Congress, we have become almost accustomed to defiance from the executive branch of our Government.

No doubt many of my colleagues have already taken a resigned attitude, but I wonder whether or not we will sit idly by and overlook and ignore statements

of the United States Attorney General, a former national Democratic chairman and a one-time Senator, when he says, in effect, that Congress can investigate matters until hell freezes over and it will not bother the Justice Department.

Recently in California, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, displayed supreme and unreserved contempt for Congress when he said that his Department intends to press a lawsuit until told by Congress to stop. I will not discuss the issues involved in the suit of the United States against the Fallbrook Irrigation district and others, although I feel that they are important not only to that particular district but to the entire United States because of the principles involved. I desire to have my fellow Members of Congress think about protecting the rights of their constituents.

Mr. McGrath said in a special interview with Ed Ainsworth—and none of the statements or quotes contained in Mr. Ainsworth's article have been challenged or denied—that any time the Justice Department starts to do something it is threatened by Congress. I wonder whether or not Mr. McGrath will tell the Members of Congress when they threatened to stop the Justice Department in the matter of deep-freezers, mink coats, 5-percenters, back-door pay for fixing income-tax troubles or the various shortages in the Internal Revenue offices. It seems to me that Attorney General McGrath and his staff can be overzealous in some matters and pitifully blind and negligent about others.

The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, as well as the House Judiciary Subcommittee, headed by my distinguished colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, have learned at firsthand that the bureaucrats in the Attorney General's office make laws to suit themselves, write their own rules of procedure, and do whatever they want until congressional action makes them respect the rights of the people. These two subcommittees have found out the manner in which the executive branch of the Government disregards Congress when we started the investigation of the shotgun lawsuit involving the rights of over 14,000 farmers, landowners, churches, pastors, and cemetery associations over water rights on the Santa Margarita River in California.

This suit in California may be tried in the courts a long way from Washington and may directly affect only the constituents of a few Members of Congress, but if the Attorney General is successful in his suit, the precedent established there will affect the rights of the constituents of every Member of Congress.

This lawsuit has stirred up a tremendous issue on the west coast but it raises a far bigger problem in the manner in which the executive department ignores the Constitution and the laws of our land. Under the Constitution the Members of Congress are the representatives of the people and as such are the group which makes the laws for the guidance

of our country and it is the duty of the executive department to carry out those laws. United States Attorney General McGrath does not share this view. In the interview which I have referred to I find many defiant and contemptuous statements by the Attorney General, none of which to my knowledge Mr. McGrath has repudiated.

Some congressional committee is looking into everything we do, every case we have. No congressional committee is going to push the Attorney General into dropping this suit.

Since Congress is the representative body of the people, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that they are not only entitled to look into anything any governmental department does, but it is their duty and responsibility to see to it that, in carrying out the laws of Congress, the executive branch does not unduly infringe upon the rights of any individual or group of individuals.

The Los Angeles Times, in its editorial of Wednesday, October 10, entitled "The Rights of 14,000 Farmers," has ably expressed this same conclusion. This editorial was introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable NORRIS POULSON of California on October 17, 1951, on page A6490.

I include as a part of my remarks the article of Mr. Ed Ainsworth in the Los Angeles Times, entitled "McGrath Defies Fallbrook Farmers in Water Dispute."

McGRATH DEFIES FALLBROOK FARMERS IN WATER DISPUTE—UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL TO PUSH SUITS DESPITE CONGRESS PROBE

(By Ed Ainsworth)

United States Attorney General McGrath, visiting here yesterday, issued an ultimatum to the farmers of Fallbrook.

It is that the suit against them by the United States Government over their water rights on the Santa Margarita River is going to continue despite the investigations of any congressional committees.

His edict was issued in response to specific questions by the Times in a special interview.

The Attorney General, here for the \$100-a-plate Democratic Jackson Day dinner held last night at the Palladium, said earlier yesterday that, in his considered opinion President Truman will be a candidate for reelection.

CITIZEN CAMPAIGN ISSUES

McGrath, Democratic national chairman in 1948, said he believes the dominant issues in the next Presidential campaign will be claims for success in managing foreign affairs, continuing domestic prosperity, and blocking of Communist forces in Europe. He expressed optimism over Democratic chances in this campaign.

"The party," he said, "is confident and united."

Getting back to the Fallbrook case, which is aimed at about 14,000 individual defendants, McGrath said the Federal suit will continue unless the entire Congress, by formal enactment, forbids him to proceed further.

Joining him in a portion of the interview was A. DeVitt Vanech, Assistant United States Attorney General, who did make one concession to the thousands of small farmers.

NEW TIME EXTENSION

Vanech, with McGrath's approval, announced that he will ask the United States district court at San Diego on November 1 to extend once more the time given defendants to answer the suit. Originally,

when the complaints were filed, each defendant was required to answer within 20 days or forfeit his water rights.

This procedure was fought so strenuously by the Times, on behalf of the small farmers, that the United States Attorney General's office was forced to go into court and request the original delay to November 1, which was granted by the court.

Now, the practical effect of the new announcement is to indicate that defendants will have still further time before facing forfeiture.

PENDING LEGISLATION

McGrath's disclosure yesterday that the serving of complaints will continue no matter what are the recommendations of congressional committees investigating the suit, was in response to a question concerning pending legislation before Congress. This legislation, introduced by Democratic Representative CLINTON MCKINNON, of San Diego, would have the net effect of nullifying the Attorney General's suit, if it is passed by Congress. It followed a hearing in Fallbrook by a congressional investigating committee headed by Democratic Representative CLAIR ENGLE, which denounced the suit in the strongest terms.

However, Congress is in the closing rush and it is doubtful whether the legislation can be enacted prior to adjournment, although it is considered probable that it will pass when Congress reconvenes in January.

"In view of Congress' concern with this Fallbrook matter and the probability that it will take some action, at least in the next session, would you consider a sort of truce in the serving of complaints pending its reconvening in January—to save money on process servers and all the attendant expense?" was the question asked McGrath.

He hesitated about answering at first.

Then, later, he said with emphasis that positively the serving of complaints will not be slowed and the suit will be pushed ahead as fast as possible.

He declared that "some congressional committee is looking into everything we do, every case we have," and that to slow up pending congressional action would disrupt his entire department.

SEES NOTHING UNUSUAL

"But, Mr. McGrath," he was asked, "this case has been described as the biggest in the West with these 14,000 or so defendants, and we all know it is very costly. Wouldn't it be possible to save a lot of money if further complaints were held up until Congress can decide on this legislation which may nullify the suit?"

"There's nothing unusual about the case," he countered.

"Why, we've had one just like it up in Oregon," Vanech asserted.

"What was that?"

"Well, it was a case involving 1,800 defendants."

"In a military establishment?"

"Well, no."

The so-called Fallbrook case involves Marine Camp Pendleton adjoining Fallbrook.

FOURTEEN THOUSAND DEFENDANTS

United States Attorney General McGrath is suing the 14,000 defendants ostensibly to determine the water rights of Camp Pendleton, although the camp and the Navy had worked out a perfectly amicable arrangement with local citizens over water of the Santa Margarita to be stored behind a new dam. This agreement was overturned by the Attorney General's office.

McGrath insisted yesterday that his department does not wish to take anything away from the rightful owners but that the suit was the only way to determine those rights.

That it is the only way has been vigorously challenged by California water lawyers, all the Congressmen who have investigated the

case, and many legal authorities in other parts of the Nation.

Even Democratic State Attorney General Brown—after much prodding by the Times and others—finally intervened in the case, too, on behalf of the people of California.

But McGrath contended yesterday that it would not have been sufficient to determine the water rights under California law and California procedure and that it had to be done with a Federal suit in Federal court.

He was particularly vehement in stating that no congressional committee is going to push the Attorney General into dropping the suit.

He declared the suit is being brought on behalf of the United States taxpayers to determine Camp Pendleton's rights in the only way it can be done.

The defendants—the thousands of small farmers—have contended that the whole matter could have been settled so the camp had an assured supply and the local people got the safe remainder, if the Attorney General had not upset the agreement with the Navy.

Power Revolution on the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Hon. Claude R. Wickard:

POWER REVOLUTION ON THE FARM

(By Claude R. Wickard)

Sixteen years ago, 9 out of 10 farms in the United States looked like this: dim coal-oil lamps lighted a little of the home, wood-burning stoves were used for cooking and heat. There was no refrigeration, no running water or indoor plumbing. When the wind failed to blow, all water was pumped by hand and the farmer and his wife hauled it in buckets to meet household and livestock needs. Wood had to be sawed by hand. Milk and farm produce spoiled for lack of refrigeration. Lanterns flickered in the darkness of predawn and the darkness of evening as farmers hand-milked their cows. Men and women grew old before their time. Farm youth migrated to the cities by the thousands. As it had been for centuries farming was still a tedious hand-labor economy.

Today on nearly 9 out of 10 farms there has been a magic transformation. Electricity, on the farm and in the home, has brought new ways of producing and preserving food, as well as modern conveniences. It has changed farm management as radically as the industrial revolution changed the factory. Farmers have the best in home and farmyard lighting, refrigeration, motor-powered pumping systems and motor-powered tools. Electricity milks several cows in a few minutes and keeps down the bacteria count by sterilizing the equipment and by refrigerating the milk. There are more than 400 farm uses of electricity. All of them contribute much to the increased quality and quantity of food production. Rural power is responsible for a new and better way of life on the farm.

In 16 years of helping to bring this power to rural America, the Rural Electrification Administration, a loan agency of the Department of Agriculture, has had an object lesson in the capacity of people to administer their own affairs at the local level, to solve new and difficult problems and—working as

groups—to make democracy a living and vital force.

The experience of REA as a loan agency and the experience of our borrowers are a tribute to the flexibility and strength of the free, private-enterprise system. Out of this experience has been developed a set of working principles which have come to be known as the REA pattern.

The REA pattern is a democratic working arrangement between the people and their Government in which the people in need of a service provide the initiative and assume the management responsibilities locally, while the Government provides the credit facilities and the initial technical advisory services needed to enable local management to function effectively. An outstanding feature of the pattern is that it utilizes the powers of Government, not to extend Government ownership and operation, but to create and help develop new local private service enterprises. Its result is decentralization of ownership and control at the grass roots.

The pattern was based on, and developed out of, certain assumptions which are essential to the success of such a program. One is that the program must fill a real need. Another is that filling that need must at the same time promote the general welfare. A third is that the program must be self-liquidating, which means that its eventual costs must be borne by the beneficiaries themselves at a minimum of cost to the Government and to the Nation's taxpayers. In other words, financing of the program must be done not through grants but through loans to be repaid to the Government with interest. The Rural Electrification Act embodied these assumptions.

Since 1935, when REA was established, mechanization and rural electrification have permitted the farmer to start making the technological advances which industrial plants made many years ago. The REA pattern was not planned. It grew out of experience. When REA was established it was assumed that the existing utility companies would welcome long-term, low-interest loans to extend their lines into rural areas. The great majority of these companies, however, were reluctant to do so. They believed it would be unprofitable to serve the more sparsely settled rural areas and they were of the opinion that practically all farmers who could make good use of electricity were already being served.

Since the Congress had decreed that rural electrification was to be accomplished through loans rather than grants, the lack of interest on the part of the power companies would have been fatal to the program if the farmers had not decided to take things into their own hands. Farm groups experienced in operating and managing their own cooperative associations of various types formed themselves into new enterprises and submitted loan applications which would permit them to build and operate their own rural electric systems.

As these loan applications mounted in volume, REA made what was probably its most important administrative decision. As bankers, REA officials accepted the integrity of the American farmer as loan security. It was a calculated risk that one might depend on the inherent capacity of our people to administer their affairs with competence and pay their debts when due.

One must have a deep and abiding faith in America to make such a decision. What it meant was that REA would then make 100-percent loans to rural borrowers who had no experience in the construction operation or management of a rural electric system. Even though the Government held a mortgage on the system, revenues to pay off the loan would not develop unless the farmers really made use of the service offered and the enterprise were soundly managed.

If REA loans are unique in banking practice, the results are equally so. In 18 years REA has made loans amounting to more than \$2,850,000,000 to 1,076 borrowers, including 925 rural electric cooperatives. The latter have borrowed 95 percent of REA's loan funds. REA borrowers have built more than one and one-tenth million miles of line and serve nearly three and one-half million rural consumers, of whom three-fourths are farmers.

Do REA borrowers pay their debts? As of March 31, borrowers had returned \$282,196,238 in principal and interest to the Government, and less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the amounts due cumulatively was more than 30 days overdue. In 16 years REA has had to foreclose on only one borrower, a small commercial utility whose system was wrecked by a severe storm. Out of more than \$2,000,000,000 in loans our loss to date is about \$40,000.

Is it possible that farmers can direct the affairs of a business so complex as a rural electric utility and do so successfully? The record proves that it is. The accomplishments of REA borrowers are sound support for our working principles that a program can fill a need and at the same time pay its own way.

But what about the general welfare? Through REA loan funds more than a thousand new enterprises have been started. Directly, they have created new jobs for about 30,000 people in rural communities. But they have also generated considerable industrial production and employment. Three and a half million rural households are new consumers of electrical appliances and equipment. For example, without the electric motor to run the pump it is not practical to have modern plumbing in the farm home. At a conservative estimate, each user of electricity on the lines of REA borrowers has already invested an average of at least \$1,000 in electrical goods and services.

Labor, contractors, dealers, and manufacturers have benefited from the new demand to the extent of about \$3,500,000,000, over \$1,000,000,000 more than the amount of loan funds actually advanced. The new market is only beginning to show itself. It will expand each year as farmers learn to use electricity still more productively and as new uses for electricity on the farm are developed. Television is one example. Where it is available 10 percent of farm homes in the area have already installed sets.

Because power is now more readily available in rural areas thousands of new industries have been established in rural locations. It has meant the modernization of schools, churches, and business establishments in the villages and at the crossroads. REA borrowers are the sole source of power for hundreds of mines, oil wells, airway beacons, and radar stations. Then, there is the vast contribution which electricity makes to farm income. Dozens of tasks of food processing and other chores around the farmyard are done now by electricity to permit the farmer to spend more time at work in the fields. The influence of rural power is indicated in recent figures which reveal that although there are a million and a quarter fewer farm workers than in 1941, farm production is 40 percent above the level just before World War II.

If the proper function of money is to create new wealth through increased production, we feel that our program contributes to that objective and also makes a substantial contribution to the Nation's welfare through helping to restore the economic balance of one segment of our population which was lagging behind in its opportunity to produce. The increased capacity of farmers to produce and to buy goods and services tends to benefit everyone.

The principles of the REA pattern would be meaningless without a motivating force.

In the rural electrification program we believe that the motivating force is the practice of democracy by the home-owned and locally controlled rural electric cooperatives.

What has democracy got to do with rural electrification? Perhaps if we examine the form and structure of what might be termed an average REA borrower, the question will answer itself.

In terms of statistics, our average borrower will have \$2,000,000 in loan funds which have been used to build a rural electric distribution system covering 1,000 miles and serving around 3,300 rural consumers.

The borrower's enterprise will be a non-profit cooperative association chartered under the law of the State in which it operates. The loan is made to the enterprise, not to farmers individually. Membership of the cooperative is made up of those who use its services. At their annual and special meetings, the members select from their number a group to serve as directors or trustees. The board of directors serves without pay, and is responsible for policy making and over-all management. The board hires a manager to direct day-to-day operations and the manager in turn hires a staff. Just as any elected official is subject to the veto power of the voting citizen, so are co-op boards subject to the will of the membership.

Rural electric cooperatives follow the tradition that elections are held by secret ballot and that each member has only one vote. All have an incentive to keep informed about their co-op's affairs because each member is part owner of the rural electric system which serves him. Just as a home owner gradually pays off his mortgage, so the members of the rural electric cooperatives are gradually repaying the Government loans.

To do this, each member's bill for electric service is computed to cover the actual cost of operations (wholesale price of power, labor costs, taxes, etc.) and a small margin which can be used to pay off the mortgage. In most of the co-ops careful records are kept of each patron's margin of extra payments, for these establish his individual share of equity in the ownership of the electric system which serves him.

The rural electric co-op is usually the largest enterprise in the community and frequently one of the biggest taxpayers. Running a \$2,000,000 business takes vision, courage, and management skill. Each day, boards of farmers demonstrate their increasing competence in the application of sound management principles and practices.

Thousands of our rural citizens have come to their full stature of leadership through service on rural electric co-op boards. As they rotate in term of office, they are building a pool of experienced leaders and administrators in rural communities. These men have had experience in making big decisions. They formulate policies and get them down in writing. They demand standard procedures, effective budgets, job descriptions, and planned operations in the cooperative businesses they supervise. Through regular reports and audits, they have learned how to check on execution of policy by operating management.

More important, rural electric co-op directors are learning how to exercise leadership in conformity with the democratic processes as they work with and through groups. This addition to the human resources of the community is a byproduct of rural electrification, but it is an important one.

Now that these new enterprises have been established and now that nearly 9 out of 10 farms have power, what is the job ahead? On the face of it, some may say that the work is about done and that there is no longer a need for loan funds and technical assistance to these rural enterprises. The fact is that there are two big assignments yet to be accomplished. The first is to extend power to

the more than three-quarter million farms which are not yet served; and the second is to assure farmers of a future supply of adequate, reliable, and economical power.

Reaching the farms which are more isolated, farms over the hill and off the main roads, takes hard work and shrewd planning. REA borrowers make it a matter of paramount policy that if anyone in the area can have electricity, then everyone in the area is entitled to it—and at the same rates. Each loan is made with the understanding that the borrower balances revenues from the more thickly settled sections to permit lines to be constructed to serve those farms in sparsely populated areas. Actually the feasibility of the loan depends not so much on how many farms there are to a mile of line but how much electricity farmers will use.

It is the increasing amount of electricity which farmers are using and plan to use which creates the demand for loan funds to insure adequate, reliable, and economical service. But of what use has been our work thus far if farmers are unable to get enough electric power to meet their needs—reliable power which will not burn out their motors and power that is cheap enough to permit them to make full productive use of it?

In areas where the wholesalers of power are unable to deliver a supply which is adequate, reliable, and reasonable in price, REA borrowers meet their own needs through the development of their own generating plants or the construction of transmission lines to tap hydroelectric power generated at Federal dams. In their view, their efforts are not competitive. The consumers whom they serve are consumers whom existing companies formerly expressed no interest in reaching. Farmers see no difference between farm groups building a generating plant to serve their own needs and United States Steel installing a massive generating plant to increase its production. REA's policy in making loans for generation or transmission requires that borrowers show that more adequate or more economical power would result than is now available from existing sources.

We believe that increasing America's capacity to produce is just as important on the farm as it is in the factory. Electricity is the most important factor around the farmstead in producing more and better products with less labor, which the American farms must do to meet the demands of the Nation.

REA borrowers distributed 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity over their lines in 1950. This was 20 times the amount used in 1940. At the measured rate of use, the demand for rural power will double again this year. Our borrowers generated only 13 percent of their requirements in 1950. The remainder was purchased from power companies and other suppliers. The rural electric distribution systems developed with REA loans paid the power companies \$37,000,000 for electricity in 1950.

The success of the REA pattern in the rural-electrification program does not mean that we recommend it for all programs where the need is national in scope. But its success did result in the Congress giving REA the assignment for the new rural telephone loan program which is now under way. In any such programs, we feel that Government has three major responsibilities. First, to serve as a source of loan funds, second, to act as a central pool or clearing house where borrowers may obtain technical advice and assistance; and, third, to withdraw that advice and assistance progressively and as rapidly as borrowers develop operating and management maturity.

Such a program puts the emphasis on local ownership and control and insures local benefits. Its effect is just the opposite of the trend toward centrally controlled national chains for the distribution of goods or services. Where financing comes from

far-away cities, financial control and control of management and technical skills remain with the absentee owner. Not only do the revenues go back to other points, but local people have no voice in making the decisions which affect their own affairs.

In the rural-electrification program REA assembles and makes available the total experience of its borrowers for the use of any one of them. The role of the Government is to advise and assist but not to order or direct. Without the central pool of technical assistance, the mortality rate of the new and inexperienced enterprises might have approached that of business in general.

The REA does not own or operate a mile of line. The accomplishments of our cooperative borrowers as they operate and manage their locally owned private enterprises are adequate proof of the basic strength of democracy and the free private enterprise system.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-second Congress will go into history as that which armed the free world—with spiritual force, economic vitality, and with military strength—to halt the global ambitions of communism.

I desire to tell the country that this Congress knows its responsibility and has accepted it.

It is dedicated to peace. It is determined to make America and the other free nations so strong that the Kremlin will not dare start war. Freedom through strength has guided the course of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, now drawing to a close.

This is a Congress charting a course of global defense for free nations.

World developments abruptly brought a change in the whole concept of legislative programing. Many meritorious measures that a normal peacetime Congress would consider were forced aside. The work of this Congress cannot be compared with any previous Congress in which the survival of freedom was not then a pressing problem.

We have had to find a way to provide armaments without wrecking our economy at home.

We have had to proceed carefully.

The criticism we hear most is that this Congress has been slow and reluctant. This is high praise of the Congress. For the problems are so grave, and the risks so great, we would be foolish to rush into any action without time to gather all the facts and study and meditate upon them. And, of course, we have been reluctant to appropriate billions of the people's money and levy new taxes and put new controls on our economy, without first being sure that our own safety as a Nation requires it.

Take a look at the Eighty-second Congress' record thus far:

Proving our desire for peace, one of our first acts was to renew the Recipro-

cal Trade Act, as a treaty of commerce and friendship for all nations that respect freedom and want to be friends.

The Congress then voted \$56,937,808,030—far more than the total cost of World War I—to build up America's armed might—to sustain the fighting in Korea and to halt the march of Communist imperialism the world over. We have provided other billions to strengthen our allies militarily and economically, and to expand our own military installations.

Not only has this Congress extended the Selective Service System to July 1, 1955, but it also raised the ceiling on the Armed Forces to 5,000,000 men. Moreover, it laid the foundation for universal military training looking toward a permanent system of international safety.

Ahead of the general appropriations for defense, we authorized \$2,700,000,000 for conversion of naval vessels and the construction of new ships for the Navy, including a 57,000-ton carrier.

We set up a comprehensive program of public works construction at Army, Navy and Air Force bases, totaling around \$5,000,000,000.

We renewed the Defense Production Act, providing machinery for continuation of the program to mobilize the Nation's economic forces behind the defense program, and to deal with the factors that bring about inflation. A Small Defense Plants Administration is set up to help little manufacturers share in the productive effort.

In addition to price and wage stabilization powers, this act includes extension of rent controls and authority to control imports.

In this field of tuning the economy to the necessities of defense, and looking after the needs of the workers, we have passed a bill to meet urgent housing needs in the mobilization program.

While attending first to the primary purpose of preparedness, it has taken time to enact more laws benefiting veterans and service people, including a free \$10,000 life insurance policy for each member of the Armed Forces. The Congress responded to the appeal for emergency aid for India, providing a loan for the purpose of 2,000,000 tons of grain. The Congress moved quickly to ease suffering from floods in the Midwest, making a direct appropriation of \$25,000,000. Other relief is on the way.

We cleared all of the regular appropriations bills.

The only true gage of how well we have performed our task is to measure what has been done against what needed to be done.

When we convened on January 3 we faced the momentous task not only of supplying our Armed Forces with the immediate means and manpower to fight in Korea but also of providing for the long-range buildup of our military power and of our industrial production.

We had the obligation of aiding our allies of the free world both militarily and economically to assure their readiness to meet any thrust by an enemy anywhere in Europe or in Asia.

We faced the responsibility, moreover, of maintaining the stability of our

economy to support the program abroad while at the same time meeting normal requirements of our civilian population at home.

We had to perform, in addition, the regular essential housekeeping duties of the Congress, such as raising revenue, providing appropriations, and enacting much other needed legislation on the domestic and international fronts.

It was our job, in short, to make this Nation and its allies so strong as to deter an attack by any would-be aggressor. It was our job to wage peace by making ourselves strong enough to wage war.

The Eighty-second Congress can boast that it has provided—short of all-out war—for the greatest mobilization of America's economic, military, and manpower resources in our history.

We have likewise provided a program for cementing our relations with friendly nations all over the globe.

The Eighty-second Congress—now less than 10 months' old—will complete its program designed to protect America's liberties and to help free peoples stay free.

Like Bureaucratic Rule? Take Look at Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the Alliance (Ohio) Review of Saturday, October 13, 1951:

LIKE BUREAUCRATIC RULE? TAKE LOOK AT INDIANS

(By G. S. Benson)

At a time when so many Americans are being charmed by visions of a Federal welfare state which promises to remove the vicissitudes of life and set up a guaranteed standard of good health, adequate education, economic welfare and security for all, it would be wise for us to take a good look at how well the American Indians, who have lived for a century in such a welfare state, have fared.

For 126 years the Federal Government's Bureau of Indian Affairs has been the benevolent guardian of most of our Indian citizens. No Indian under the paternal wing of this Great White Father in Washington has had to worry about food, shelter, or old-age security, regardless of whether he's been energetic or lazy, well-behaved or unruly. The Government has provided education too—or, rather, it guaranteed to do so.

TWO LESSONS

Many Indians have declined to enter reservations or otherwise submit to Government paternalism. I have seen numbers of them in Oklahoma who have made their own prosperity and security and are splendid, independent citizens. But the facts about the several hundred thousand Indians under Government guardianship provide two lessons which all free citizens should learn and learn well:

1. While wards of politically-managed bureaucracy our Indian citizens have become a stagnant, if not actually a disappearing

race. Their once magnificent pride, native resourcefulness and unmatched self-reliance has withered. Dependency has stunted their capability. They are the only minority group in America that has failed to make great strides of progress in the last half century. They are also the only racial group whose members have been wards of a welfare state.

2. On the basis of the 126-year record of the Indian Bureau, political bureaucracy has utterly failed as a caretaker of human hopes. The Bureau's oft-repeated claim of "taking care of the Indians" becomes a shameful mockery when all the facts are known.

SICKNESS AND SQUALOR

Here are some results of the Government's "taking care of the Indians"—as reported by the Marquette League for Catholic Indian Missions:

Health, education, and welfare standards of the Navajos (one of the tribes under Government guardianship) have been running steadily downhill for 83 years. The one-room hogans (homes) of the Navajos are windowless, unsanitary, uncomfortable overcrowded, and the entire family sleeps, eats, and lives on the dirt floor. Due to the neglect of the Government, tuberculosis and infant mortality have reached what is believed to be the highest rate in the continental United States. The Navajos are among the sickest people in the Nation, with the least amount of medical service, in spite of the fact they are wards of the Government.

Seventy-five percent of the Navajo Tribe is illiterate as compared to Negro illiteracy of 16.1 percent, foreign-born white illiteracy of 9.9 percent, and native white illiteracy of 1.5 percent.

The Rev. Bernard A. Cullen, of the Marquette League, one of the best informed authorities on the plight of these wards of our Government, says: "We have driven the Indian into an abysmal pit of darkness and misery, and the very least we can do is lower the ladder of opportunity to help him to climb into the sunlight and know again the pride that was once his."

Freedom of opportunity for the Indian and the unfettered chance to redevelop his self-reliance and pride—these are the best gifts within the province of our Nation, not mere bureaucratic paternalism. The Indian is not inherently a second-class citizen. If reborn into independence, he could do equally well for himself as the millions of immigrants have done who came to America penniless and illiterate. But with the continued political guardianship of a Federal bureau taking away all of their natural instincts and characteristics the American Indian would become, as would any other branch of the human race, mere creatures—with final extinction probable.

Had Enough War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Americans have had enough of the warfare state.

Three major wars in 27 years is the record.

In the years under Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, we lived in peace with all the world.

In the 27 years under Wilson, F. D. Roosevelt, and Truman, we have had 8 years of three wars with nearly 1,500,000 battle casualties.

These administrations made no effort to keep out of these wars. President Wilson, elected in 1916 because he kept us out of war, had already pledged our entrance to Lord Balfour. President Roosevelt said again and again and again that our boys would not be sent to fight in foreign wars, at a time when he had already decided to lead us into World War II. President Truman, after Senator TOM CONNALLY and Secretary Dean Acheson had said Korea was not part of our strategy, took us into the Korean war without constitutional authority to do so.

We are now in a total war, a savage bloody treadmill war of attrition pitting the lives of American boys against Red China's countless masses. Our total casualties are approaching the 200,000 mark—95,000 battle casualties and about 100,000 non-battle casualties. It is a war we dare not lose—yet we are afraid to win it.

The architects of the Korean war are now setting up a defense for Europe. On this record, what basis have we for the hope that the European project will be sounder than the one in Korea? If the leadership of this administration is unable to prevent Red China from destroying Korea, can this same leadership save Europe if Russia strikes?

After our decisive military victory in World War II, can we trust an administration which failed to win the peace with preparation for war, the conduct of war, and responsibility for peace should world war III come?

This year the Congress has appropriated \$75,000,000,000 for defense. This is \$15,000,000,000 more than the Government calculates can be collected in taxes. In addition, we have a \$20,000,000,000 item for the cost of the civil government. Then, the various State governments have a total budget of \$18,000,000,000. This session of Congress has appropriated \$95,000,000,000 in this 1 year. Our national income is estimated at \$260,000,000,000. This means that more than one-third of a citizen's income is seized by the Government. When this is so, a citizen is no longer free and independent. He works more than 1 day in 3 for Government. He, along with 150,000,000 other Americans has become what the socialist want, an incipient ward of the state.

As late as 1941, only 15 percent of our national income went for taxes. In 1945—27 percent went for taxes. In 1951—30 percent goes for taxes, and by 1952—32 percent. Unless we put the brakes on, just as 15 percent became 30 percent, and 30 percent will become 32 percent, under the tax bill we passed today, the 32 percent will become 35 percent, then 40 percent as it is in Britain today, and then 60 percent as it is in Soviet Russia. Then the Government, which should be the servant of the people, will have become the master. The socialists will have their socialism but Americans will have lost their freedom.

But, despite the back-breaking taxes, we will have a deficit this year of about

fifteen billion, thus adding to our present national debt of two hundred and fifty-six billion.

This deficit spending means further depreciation of the dollar.

There are 72,000,000 life insurance policies in America. They constitute the principal item of security which husbands leave their widows. As inflation from deficit spending mounts, insurance payments, widows' pensions, and Government bonds depreciate.

Inflation, unhalting, will lead us to the controlled state—just what the Fair Deal wants.

In spite of the fabulous spending, we are not getting national security. In Korea, we are outnumbered on the ground and in the air. Our allies send only token forces. There the destiny of our boys lies in Stalin's hands.

In Europe even our military leaders do not give a forthright statement that the proposed 60 divisions can save Europe should the Red Army strike. At home our fleet can prevent large-scale enemy invasion but according to General Vandenberg we have insufficient air defenses to prevent enemy bombing.

This all adds up to gross incompetence, mismanagement, and, in certain instances, disloyalty. The American people are sick of this administration coddling Russia which created a Frankenstein with which they are totally unable to cope.

Thank God, our Constitution places the power in the people. Fair Deal officials are responsible to the people.

We have had enough; 1952 is the deadline.

Tax Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Reese Amis, outstanding editor of Alabama, from the Monday, October 15, 1951, issue of The Huntsville Times entitled "Let's Keep Tax Picture Straight":

LET'S KEEP TAX PICTURE STRAIGHT

There is a great tendency these days to exaggerate to make statements that are only partially true, or that do not give the complete context, and to distort the true picture about public matters.

A sample of this kind, which confuses many indifferent or unthinking readers, at a time when taxes are becoming so much heavier, is the propaganda emanating from many political sources, leaving the inference that tax increases are due to normal expenses of the Government.

This Congress has appropriated just over \$100,000,000,000, a near record exceeded only by the levy in 1944 for war expenditures.

Of this astronomical amount, \$80,000,000,000 is for defense preparation, the waging of the Korean war, and for assistance to our allies in the cold war against Russia.

The remainder, about \$20,000,000,000, is for conduct of the Government's normal operations.

There is plenty to criticize these days, without resorting to misrepresentation, or to befuddlement of people who are groaning under the burden of crushing taxation.

All of us are simply paying for our own shortsightedness, after World War II, in throwing down our weapons around the globe, calling all the boys home too soon, and allowing the Russians to take over, because of our own military weakness.

Atomic Energy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RADIO INTERVIEW OF MR. GORDON DEAN, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, BY CONGRESSMAN WICKERSHAM, OCTOBER 18, 1951.

Question. I am glad to have you here today, Mr. Dean, to tell the folks in Oklahoma something about our country's atomic energy program. Just what is going on in the atomic field these days that you think would be interesting to the people in Oklahoma?

Answer. Well frankly, Mr. Wickersham, we are in the weapons business more than anything else. Our main goal today is to make atomic weapons as rapidly and as efficiently as we can. We are doing this because we want to maintain and if possible increase our lead over those who might be entertaining the idea of attacking us or our friends in the free world. I believe strongly that it is important to maintain our lead in atomic weapons so that we can negotiate from a position of strength in our efforts to bring about a peaceful and honorable solution to the world's problems. I might add that we're not in this weapons work through our own choice—we are in it through the choice of the men in the Kremlin. As far as we ourselves are concerned, we would much rather be devoting all of our attention and energy to realizing some of the potential peacetime benefits of the atom, but I don't believe that any right-thinking American would suggest that we follow a course different from the one we are following.

Question. Do you mean, Mr. Dean, that our atomic weapons program has brought to a halt all progress toward realization of the peacetime promise of atomic energy?

Answer. Oh no, not at all. It is true that in many ways our weapons work hinders us in our work on peacetime applications, but in some ways it actually helps us. As you may know, one of the main characteristics of atomic energy is that most of what we do has both a military and a peacetime application. That's why the atomic energy program—in both its military and peacetime phases—has to be controlled by the Government, at least in these times.

Question. Just what is the main peacetime promise of atomic energy, Mr. Dean?

Answer. Well, I would say that when most people think of peacetime promise of the atom they think of atomic power—cheap power to do man's work and to bring light into the dark corners of the world.

Question. Are we making any progress toward that?

Answer. Oh, yes; but again, because of the state of the world, we will have atomic power first for military use. I mean specifically an atomic engine to propel a submarine. That

will be the first practical use of atomic power. We have a research machine out at our testing station in Idaho which we hope will produce some power shortly as an experiment, but the first practical use will be the propulsion of a submarine.

Question. Are we very far along on that?

Answer. I can't tell you just when we think we'll have our first atomic submarine, Mr. Wickersham, because to tell the American people would also tell the Communists and that is one of the things we don't want them to know. But I can say that we now have under construction out in Idaho the first land-based prototype of an atomic engine suitable for submarine propulsion. And, as you may know, the Navy has announced that it has awarded a contract for construction of the kind of a submarine that can operate on one of our atomic engines.

Question. What about airplanes? Hasn't there been a lot of talk about atomic airplanes lately?

Answer. Yes, there's been a lot of talk about atomic aircraft, as there always seems to be about anything that has the word atomic in it. The fact is that both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Air Force have contracts out for work on this problem. It's in only its earliest phases now, however, and we'll see an atomic submarine before we'll see an atomic aircraft. But I think there is no question that someday we're going to have both, and if we can make atomic power plants for submarines and aircraft we will be a long way along the road toward producing power for civilian use.

Question. Strictly from the layman's point of view, Mr. Dean, I would think that it would be easier to build a stationary, land-based atomic power plant to say, light a city, than it would to build the small, intricate kind you apparently would have to have to power a submarine or an aircraft. Isn't that true?

Answer. Well, yes, in a general way, it is true. But there is one important difference between a submarine engine and a commercial atomic power plant, and that is demand. There is an immediate demand on the part of the military services for an atomic submarine at almost any cost within reason, whereas there is not today a commercial demand for atomic power at the prices at which it would have to be sold. A commercial atomic power plant built today with the knowledge we now have available would be an expensive proposition, and the power it produced would be expensive—much more expensive than power produced today from coal, gas, oil, or hydroelectric systems. People just wouldn't buy it because of the cost. Our main objective, then, is, through research and development, to get these costs down to where atomic power will be competitive. I think someday we will do it, and I think our work on these military engines will help, but commercial atomic power is not right around the corner.

Question. Aren't there some private industrial firms looking into the possibility of building privately financed atomic-power plants in the near future?

Answer. Yes, and we are cooperating with them. We are making available to them all of the information they need to make a thorough and comprehensive study. Their idea is to build atomic machines that can produce at one and the same time explosive material for the Government and power for commercial use, thus making it possible to sell the power more cheaply than would otherwise be the case. In this way they hope to make the power cost competitive. We're all for them, and we're doing all we can to help them succeed.

Question. It is interesting, Mr. Dean, to have this report on just what is going on in the development of atomic power, but there is one thing which has bothered me somewhat, and that is this. To produce power,

we need to use uranium, and to produce weapons, we need to use uranium. Isn't there a competition here? Do we have enough uranium to go around?

Answer. Yes; there is a competition. It is perfectly true that the atomic-energy materials that are in our national weapons stockpile cannot be put to work producing power as long as they are in weapons, and right now very nearly all of our materials are going into weapons. But there is one thing that I think everyone should know, and that is that all of these materials that are now stored in the form of weapons can some day, if they are never used as weapons, be used to produce power. They do not deteriorate, at least for many, many generations, and they are there for us to use for peacetime application anytime we feel it is safe to do so. They are actually one of our great national resources.

Question. That is very good to know. It is good to know that all of this investment we are making in atomic energy is not wasted from the peacetime standpoint. Speaking of investment, just how much have the American people paid out to date for atomic energy, Mr. Dean?

Answer. Just about \$5,000,000,000. Mr. WICKERSHAM, including the \$2,000,000,000 spent during the war by the Army and the \$3,000,000,000 that the Atomic Energy Commission has spent since. Next year our costs—because we are in the middle of a big expansion program—will come to about \$1,800,000,000, more than double last year's.

Question. Does the Atomic Energy Commission spend all that money itself?

Answer. Yes, but it goes to the private scientific and industrial contractors that do virtually all of the work. This is mainly an industrial enterprise, Mr. WICKERSHAM, and it is mainly done by industrial and scientific people. As of today, for example, of the more than 100,000 people who are engaged in atomic energy work in this country, less than 6,000 work for the Government. The remainder work for the more than 500 prime contractors and major subcontractors, both industrial and scientific, who perform nearly all of the functions carried on within the framework of what we call the atomic energy program.

Question. That sounds like you have a big program there, and one that penetrates rather deeply into our economy. Just what are the American people getting out of this investment in money and people and materials?

Answer. I'd say we're getting national security and the hope that through our atomic strength we can find a peaceful way out of the current tense international situation. I'd say we're getting, too, considerable progress toward our peacetime goals.

Question. I noticed you said peacetime goals—that is, in the plural. Do we have some peacetime goals besides the power one?

Answer. Oh yes, very definitely, and most of them stem from the production and use of the atomic energy materials called radiolotopes. Unlike atomic power, these materials are already on the market and have been for a number of years. I don't think the usefulness—both actual and potential—of these radioactive materials can be underestimated. It may well be in the long run, that they will constitute atomic energy's greatest contribution to man's welfare.

Question. You say these materials are already on the market. Are they in wide use?

Answer. Yes; they are. To date more than 21,000 shipments of radiolotopes have been made from our Oak Ridge, Tenn., isotopes production center to more nearly 700 research institutions and industrial concerns in the United States and to nearly 200 research institutions abroad. The institutions and industrial concerns using them include 11 in Oklahoma.

Question. I think the people in Oklahoma might be interested in knowing the names of some of these concerns.

Answer. Well they would include in Tulsa the Dowell Co., the Elda & McNulty Co., Engineering Laboratories, National Tank Co., Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., Arthur C. Sweeny, Jr., and Wells Surveys Inc. Others are the Phillips Petroleum Co. of Bartlesville, Oklahoma A & M. College, and the University of Oklahoma Research Institute and Medical School. In addition, both Oklahoma A & M. and the University of Oklahoma have a number of direct research contracts with the AEC for atomic energy work.

Question. These radiolotopes certainly appear to be in wide demand. I would like to know why. Just what are they good for?

Answer. Well, they are useful in a number of different fields. In medicine, for example, they are useful in the diagnosis and treatment of certain diseases, particularly of the thyroid and circulatory system, and in research leading to the development of new and better methods of preventing, diagnosing and treating many different types of disease. In agriculture, they are very useful in learning more about the utilization of fertilizer and for the development of better plants and livestock. In industry, they are useful directly in process control, testing and the making of precise measurements, and in industrial research leading to the development of better products and better ways of manufacturing products.

Question. They sound very useful indeed. But let's take one example and pursue it just a little further. How do radiolotopes, for example, help us to raise better livestock?

Answer. There are a number of different ways but I'll cite just one example. It has been found that cattle need extremely small quantities of some very rare elements in their diets, and these are not always provided in the soil the cattle graze upon. When these are lacking the cattle are sickly, even though they may otherwise have an excellent diet. Through radiolotopes, it is possible to find out which of these elements may be needed, and, if they do not occur naturally in the soil at a given location, to supplement the cattle's diet with them in some other way.

Question. How are radiolotopes used in Oklahoma?

Answer. For a number of different purposes, notably, I would say, for various kinds of industrial and medical research and for such things as radiography and oil well logging. Radiography, you know, means using the radiations they send out in roughly the same way that X-rays are used—that is, to figuratively look into solids to discover hidden flaws in industrial products, etc.

Question. What about oil well logging? How are they used there?

Answer. Well, different types of soil and rock react differently to various kinds of nuclear radiations. By lowering radiolotopes into the ground, therefore, it is possible to determine the different kinds of strata an oil well passes through, and to determine whether the geology is favorable to oil.

Question. That seems to me to be a very useful application of a product our atomic energy program has produced. I would like to ask you some more questions, but I see our time is up and I want to say I have been very glad to have you here today, Mr. Dean, and to learn how much more there is to this atomic energy business besides weapons.

Answer. Thank you, Mr. Wickersham. I am glad you asked me over. There certainly is more to this atomic energy business than just weapons and I think it is particularly fortunate that atomic energy can serve the dual purpose of helping to bring us a better life through its peacetime applications while helping us to live to enjoy this better life through its military potential.

The 90 Dismissed Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following communication I received today from Louis T. Byrne, secretary-treasurer of the West Point Society of Western New York.

The letter follows:

WEST POINT SOCIETY OF
WESTERN NEW YORK,
Buffalo, N. Y., October 15, 1951.

The officers of the West Point Society of Western New York have been studying the case of the 90 dismissed cadets, have reached a decision, and have drawn up their findings.

We were flabbergasted to learn that for many years the academic board at West Point has been giving identical tests throughout the academic year to two distinct divisions of the student body on successive or intervening days.

The decision to do this was a function of the academic and tactical instructional staffs. The necessity for such procedure is not understood and is necessarily attributable to either stupidity or laziness or to both.

Whatever the reason for this procedure, no reasonable person would expect, honor code or no honor code, that any student would resist the temptation to give study tips to friends in a group taking a later exam. The so-called dishonesty for which dismissal was decreed by the Pentagon consisted of giving these study tips or receiving them, or knowing that they were being given or received and not reporting or squealing on the boys involved. The reason that intercollegiate athletes figure so prominently in this matter is because they are the only grouping of cadets from both regiments who associate together daily—in the dressing rooms, in the shower rooms and then three times a day at the special training tables.

Cribbing and cheating, a term usually applied to class-room dishonesty, did not at any time exist at West Point and was not charged against the dismissed cadets and the work actually performed in the exam room was the cadets own work.

A supposedly intelligent academy administration should have known that this system of identical exams on intervening days could not have been practiced over a period of years in any student body, honor code or no honor code, without advantage being taken of same. We believe that the practice of giving and receiving study tips such as it is evident was being practiced at the academy over a long period of years could not have existed without the knowledge and nodding approval of the academy staff.

We believe therefore, that the academy instructional staff was directly responsible for this condition and it could properly be charged to either stupidity or laziness or both.

The dismissed cadets were really made the goats for a system which appears to have been in operation long before their time and that had apparently received the nodding approval of at least a part of the Academy staff over a period of years. There are probably a great many officers who graduated in 1951 and for many years before that who committed the same identical offense.

We are not sure that the investigations were conducted in a manner which would

meet with public approval—it is evident that legal aid was denied all, veiled threats might have been employed and all cadets were cautioned not to discuss the matter with anyone, including their parents. Respecting the nature of the investigating board procedure, we note that Robert Daru, general counsel to the Committee on Justice of the New York Criminal and Civil Courts Bar Association is conducting hearings in New York. We believe that their findings will prove to be very interesting and perhaps educational.

The manner of announcing the offenses and the incorrect deductions made therefrom by press, radio, and commentators gave the citizens of the United States and the officials of colleges and universities an entirely erroneous conception of the affair and did unnecessary harm to a group of the very finest young men in America today.

We believe that Congress should take notice of this in a just, judicial manner and should direct the reinstatement of these cadets after a suspension of 1 year from the first radio broadcast on August 3, 1951.

We believe that Congress should moreover direct that the practice of giving identical exams on successive or intervening days should be discontinued at once.

LOUIS T. BYRNE,
Secretary-Treasurer.
(For the officers of the society.)

The Jessup Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson from the Washington Post of October 19, 1951:

JESSUP ROW SEEN PLAYING HISTORIC ROLE (By Drew Pearson)

Historians who evaluate the closing days of the Eighty-second Congress will probably make special note of the debate over Ambassador Philip Jessup.

1. It marked the high-water mark in this country of legislation through fear. Such Senators as GILLETTE of Iowa and SMITH of New Jersey were fully aware of the unfairness of the charges against Jessup but bowed to their fear of a small, intolerant, vociferous public sometimes called McCarthyites.

2. It also marked a period when newspaper editors were criticizing the White House on freedom of the press, while one wing of the press seriously confused the public by distorting or suppressing important facts so necessary to a free press.

Unquestionably the timidity of certain Senators was due in part to this confused and poorly informed state of public opinion. Unquestionably also the great majority of newsmen in this country are anxious to protect the truth of the press as well as its freedom; for without the first the second cannot survive.

Therefore, let's look at some of the facts in the Jessup hearing and see how brazenly some of them were twisted by certain publishers with political axes to grind. Take, as an example, the New York World-Telegram, published by Roy Howard, high-ranking Republican and bitter critic of the State Department, who also publishes 18 other papers from Pittsburgh to San Francisco and who is one of the largest stockholders in the

United Press which once sold its service widely in China prior to Chiang Kai-shek's overthrow.

Here is how the World-Telegram lived up to its obligation of a free and truthful press in reporting the Ambassador Jessup debate.

On October 7: Harold Stassen accused Ambassador Jessup of lying. Jessup had sworn under oath that he did not attend a White House conference at which cutting off aid to Chiang Kai-shek was discussed.

"This matter goes to the heart of the veracity of Jessup," Stassen insisted with great vigor. He stated that his memory of a conversation with the late Senator Vandenberg was crystal clear; that Vandenberg reported Jessup was present. Stassen demanded that Vandenberg's diary be produced.

The World-Telegram played up this story, critical of Jessup, on page 1.

On October 9: The State Department showed Senators confidential documents regarding conversations with other governments on the recognition of China. Even Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, admitted that they showed Stassen to be wrong. Jessup had not favored recognition of Communist China.

This story, favorable to Jessup, the World-Telegram buried inside on page 19, though failing to report that Senator SMITH supported Jessup on this point.

On October 10: Warren Austin, a rock-ribbed Republican former Senator from Vermont, now Ambassador to the United Nations, stated the U. N. records showed Jessup to have been in New York on the date Stassen claimed he was at the White House conference on China. This completely refuted Stassen's charge that Jessup was a liar.

However, the World-Telegram, after playing up the Stassen charge on page 1, buried Austin's refutation deep inside the paper, way back on page 28.

On October 15 General Eisenhower confirmed Jessup's statement that on February 5, 1949, the date of the White House conference on China, Jessup was in New York conferring with Eisenhower on extending his leave of absence from Columbia University. This again made Stassen the liar, not Jessup. The World-Telegram carried this on page 5.

VANDBENBERG'S DIARY

Meanwhile, Senator Vandenberg's diary had been made public, showing that Jessup was not at the White House conference—despite Stassen's statement that his memory was "crystal clear." Stassen had also claimed "This goes to the heart of the veracity of Jessup." But despite this, Stassen kept bringing new charges, while his friends on the World-Telegram kept on featuring them.

On October 11—Stassen charged that Ambassador Jessup had urged recognition of Communist China at a State Department round-table discussion. He demanded that the record of the meeting be published. "Every factor in my recollection of the round-table meeting can be substantiated by the transcript," said the former Governor of Minnesota.

Next day, October 12, the State Department promptly published the transcript. It showed Jessup had taken no part in the discussion, that the State Department actually had opposed recognition of Communist China, and that those favoring recognition were private citizens, led by business executives William Herod, president of the export branch of General Electric, and William A. Robertson, of American and Foreign Power, one of the biggest utilities on Wall Street.

Despite this, the World-Telegram next day featured an editorial blasting the State Department. The same issue also carried a United Press report that "Stassen offers new evidence against Jessup."

This is how one powerful publisher stacked the news for the American public,

thus contributing to the confusion of the reader, the intimidation of the Senate, and the annihilation of one man's character. The story of another powerful publisher will follow shortly.

Message of Hope to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Polish-American Journal of October 20, 1951:

GENERAL BOR-KOMOROWSKI ASKS UNITED STATES TO SEND MESSAGE OF HOPE TO POLAND

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski, former Prime Minister of the Polish Government in exile and leader of the Polish underground during World War II, delivered the following speech at the General Pulaski memorial dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria hotel here.

"Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski shines on the pages of American history as one of the heroes of the War of Independence and a soldier unflinchingly devoted to the cause of liberty.

"A man of great personal courage with an outstanding ability for leadership, Pulaski was, even as a youth, taking an active and prominent part in the struggle to liberate Poland from the uninvited protection of Russian bayonets.

"Forced to leave his country he found after years of exile a hospitable haven on the American soil. Unable to serve his own people Pulaski offered his heart and military experience to those who raised the banner of freedom in America.

"The best way to pay homage to the memory of this distinguished soldier is to turn our thoughts toward his native country Poland and to visualize in our mind the situation in that country today.

"Almost 200 years ago, when Pulaski was undertaking an armed struggle in the defense of his country, Russian imperialism was greedily stretching out its arms in an attempt to annex Poland's national territory. Today it is Soviet imperialism, much more dangerous than its predecessor, which tied the noose of Communist slavery around the neck of Poland, and endeavors by force to turn the Polish people into a vanguard of the Soviet march toward world conquest.

"POLISH RESISTANCE"

"The Polish nation, however, hardened in long years of struggle against aggression and consistently refusing to submit to foreign domination, offers today a stubborn resistance against the enforced encroachment of Communist ideology. The moral resources of the people which prevent them from becoming submissive tools of communism and Soviet Russia have been greatly enhanced by the blood shed during the last war in the defense of national independence and of those values which are supreme to every Pole. Liberty and justice.

"To all practical ends Poland lost her independence at the moment when, with the approval of the Western Powers, which continually acceded to Stalin's demands, she found herself within the Soviet sphere of influence, and when in 1945 a Government composed predominantly of Communist and

Soviet agents was imposed upon the people against their will.

"Russia entered the conquered countries of Central-Eastern Europe with a methodical and premeditated plan for their subjugation and sovietization. According to Soviet doctrine, the road which leads to the reconstruction of the conquered countries in Communist vassal states patterned after the U. S. S. R., often extends over a period of 10 or more years, depending on the internal conditions of each country.

"This plan is based on the Soviet's own experience and is divided into several phases through which the noose of slavery is tightened and the Communist ideology imposed by force. For each of these phases Moscow prescribes specific tasks and aims to be fulfilled. The length of every phase of sovietization may vary in accordance with the internal conditions of a given country. This may create an impression that Moscow applies a different system to each of her victims. But such an impression is erroneous; Soviet tactics may differ, but the end remains uniform and unchanged and that aim is the ultimate reconstruction of the conquered countries into Communist states modeled after the Soviet Union.

"The first phase of the Soviet domination of Poland, known as the period of people's democracy was characterized by a certain degree of pseudo tolerance. In that period the puppet regime attempted to convince its subjects that Poland is being reconstructed as an independent state, closely associated with her eastern neighbor. Some of the Poles entertained the illusory hope that their country could maintain a system of government intermediate between eastern totalitarianism and western democracy. Others believed that they might live and work in peace as long as they abstained from politics. There even were some, obviously unaware of the long-range Soviet goal, who became quite enthusiastic about the people's democracy.

"It is difficult to determine precisely when this first preparatory and transitory period was replaced by the next phase known as the building of a Socialist state. Anyway, the end of 1949 and the subsequent months were already marked by a speed-up in the structural changes of the state administration and the introduction of the Communist monopoly system. The entire legal and traditional structure of the Polish state has been adjusted to the Soviet example and the Communist Party emerged as the wielder of monopolistic power.

"All that remains now is the enactment of a new Constitution which would closely follow the Soviet one. A constitutional commission is presently at work on the adoption of a new Soviet-style Constitution which is expected within the next 2 months.

"In spite of the raging terror, the ever-increasing number of arrests, in spite of the show-trials at which the defendants confess to all charges just to put an end to the torture of the so-called investigation, in spite of the system of total violence applied to the entire nation, the Poles—in their overwhelming majority—have not accepted the foreign ideology. So deeply rooted are the Christian traditions, loyalty to ancestral faith and beliefs, ideological ties with the Western World and the desire to live as free men. This applies not only to the intelligentsia, but also to the workers and farmers.

"POLES HATE RUSSIA

"The attitude of the entire Polish society toward communism and the regime is decidedly negative. The age-long dislike of Russia changed into hatred as Russia is considered the source of all sufferings which have befallen Poland in recent years. But on the other hand people are weary of their constant struggle and resistance to sovietization, a struggle which they wage in complete

isolation. Aware of the hardships and sacrifices still to come the people have adopted an attitude of survival and preservation of strength for the future. The fight against the hated regime and the introduction of Soviet institutions assumes the form of a passive but stubborn resistance.

"It was not an accident that Konstantin Rokossowski, a marshal of the Soviet Union and trusted man of the Kremlin, was appointed commander in chief of the Polish armed forces and Minister of National Defense. Rokossowski commanded the Red Army which in 1944 reached the gates of Warsaw, but having learned of the outbreak of the uprising against the Germans ordered his troops to stop the offensive. Standing on the Vistula River, in full view of the burning capital, Rokossowski refused any assistance to the insurgents thus dominating the city to ruin and the valiant patriots to death. From the time when he assumed the command of the Polish Army, all pre-war officers, even those who cooperated with the Communist regime, were arrested and replaced by Russian officers imported from the Soviet Union. At present there are hardly any Polish nationals in higher positions in the Polish armed forces.

"The Polish soldier is now under Soviet command and supervision. In a similar way Russia expands the Soviet police network in Poland which controls all aspects of private and public life. Poland is being shaped as a part of the Soviet military machinery for use in the future conflict with the western powers.

"WANT TO SURVIVE

"It may look on the surface as though the people accept such a state of affairs. In reality, however, the Poles refuse to bleed themselves white in overt opposition to the regime. They are trying to adjust their lives to the conditions which have been enforced upon them. They want to survive spiritually and physically and to preserve their strength and manpower for future contingencies. The Polish people firmly believe that the present situation is transitory and cannot last long.

"The regime is detested by the people and stays in power solely through the ruthless application of police state methods and the aid of the Soviet Army, which surrounds Poland from all sides.

"One may ask why was Poland punished so severely by fate? Why Poland, which was first to oppose the German aggression by arms and fought through 5 war years faithfully on the side of the Allies, both in the underground and on all fronts from Africa to Norway, became after the war a prey of Soviet imperialism? Have all our sacrifices been in vain? Has the world forgotten the heroic Warsaw uprising, the tragic end of which was sadly remembered 5 days ago on its seventh anniversary?

"Poland is now in chains because the western world entertained false hopes that the friendship of dictators can be bought by concessions, while tyrants understand and respect only a policy of strength. In Tehran and Yalta the principles of international morality were abandoned on the illusionary premise that totalitarianism can . . .

"Today the western world is paying for these errors by the blood of its young people. Numerous Polish-American names on the Korean casualty lists constitute painful proof that dictators cannot be appeased.

"The western democracies have at last become aware of the mortal dangers which confront them.

"POLES LOOK WESTWARD

"The people of Poland are asking if the west still remembers them, if the wartime western Allies will support their just aspirations to live as a free country.

"The western world must answer this question if Poland is to maintain her spirit of resistance against Russia and communism,

and to remain the first defense line in the present global conflict.

"The answer must be clear and unequivocal if the hundred million enslaved people behind the iron curtain in Europe are to remain spiritually in the democratic camp. The friendship of these people may become particularly important should the present cold war be ignited by an armed conflict.

"MESSAGE FROM UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"This great country of yours can provide such an answer. Your immense moral and material resources provide a firm foundation for a policy of strength and clear-cut decisions. All countries enslaved or endangered by the march of aggression look hopefully toward America. The Poles who listen intently to the American broadcasts are still awaiting the message of supreme hope that the United States stands for liberation of Poland and her neighbors, and that the injustices inflicted upon Poland in Yalta will be rectified. The liberation of the enslaved nations of Europe and Asia should be made one of the principal aims of the American foreign policy.

"If such an answer is given the resistance against communism behind the iron curtain will be considerably enhanced.

"It is most encouraging to see the policy of the United States gradually taking this highly desirable course. Amongst the hopeful signs is the recent formation by the House of Representatives of a special congressional commission to investigate the massacre of the Polish prisoners-of-war in Katyn. I hope that this investigation will be followed by the just punishment of those who perpetrated this monstrous crime.

"GERMAN DANGER

"As the former commander of the underground army I consider it my duty to draw the attention of the American people and Government to the dangers of resurging German nationalism which within recent decades embarked on the road of armed aggression, causing untold misery and destruction. The Polish Nation will welcome enthusiastically the western armies of liberation but for obvious reasons—the eventual German contingents of the western European army would be looked upon with suspicion, distrust, and fear. Any attempt to change in favor of Germany the present Polish-German border on the Oder and Neisse Rivers would be unanimously opposed by the entire Polish nation.

"As former commander of the Polish forces and former prime minister of the Polish Government I have always worked toward a close cooperation between the United States and Poland. We believe in the same principles based on a common heritage of Christian ideals. Having full confidence in the indestructible vitality of the unconquered Polish people and aware of the great moral and material power of America, I am looking hopefully toward the not too distant day when Poland will join again the family of free nations."

Letter of Her Majesty Queen Juliana of the Netherlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter of Her

Majesty Queen Juliana of the Netherlands to the President of the United States, presented by the Netherlands Ambassador, Dr. J. H. van Roijen, on September 21, 1951:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In these postwar years I have been thinking more and more about the evergrowing problem of the refugees and the homeless in all parts of the world.

Regardless of the causes for this distressing situation I am deeply concerned with the needs of the refugees and the expelled and most of all of the residual groups which for a long time to come will be in the need of care and maintenance.

I fully realize the magnificent and wonderful work which in the course of these years has been done and the results that have been achieved by UNRRA, IRO, the churches, and the voluntary agencies. In all these efforts the American people provided the greatest share as regards workers and means. We in the Netherlands try to do our share, too, notwithstanding our own grave overpopulation.

IRO is now finishing its task. A high commissioner has been appointed by the United Nations to provide international protection for large groups of refugees, but international protection is not enough. International machinery has been established for Korea and the Arab refugees, but elsewhere such machinery is lacking. There is no guaranty that material aid will be given to large groups of refugees who badly need it. Nor is it certain that the necessary measures will be taken designed to make possible the assimilation of nonresettleable refugees in the countries of their residence.

As the free nations are overburdened by the political, military, and economic issues of the day, the refugee problem might vanish into the background.

But you will surely agree that political questions can be most dangerously aggravated by the discontentment and restlessness of millions which are numerous enough to populate a major country.

In this uncertainty I put the problem before you in all its urgency for this moment and for the future. I would like to ask you to take the initiative for a new approach to cut this sore spot out of the body of humanity, where otherwise it will remain an imminent, political danger.

This can only be achieved, as I see it, by relieving these people from their feeling of discontentment and frustration and so helping them to regain their independent and self-respect. I believe that the best way to help them is by integrating them into economic life in order to make them able to bear the responsibility for those who are dependent upon them.

The assimilation of refugees must be the aim. In many cases this will require further material assistance, but—as you will agree—that can only be effective when given in a Christian spirit of mutual responsibility and laws. Then only the individual will feel that effective care is being taken of this problem in its different aspects, and that the sum total of his basic human rights, which the United Nations have proclaimed, is being implemented. I feel that in such a spirit only we can find a solution for this and other great human problems.

They should—so to speak—be looked at through the eyes of the social worker. Too often the refugees are dealt with only on the basis of their value as a labor potential. Insofar as they are unable to work they are then considered as a liability. We cannot, however, disregard the old, the sick, the disabled, and the children. Nor should we allow conditions under which families are being split up. As long as these things happen the world must seem to them a hostile place. This must embitter them deeply—and we all learn our lesson as to how embittered people are liable to adhere to totalitarian ideologies.

In measures of relief quality is still more important than quantity, and here like always any therapy can only achieve results when applied in a spirit of respect for the freedom of each person and each people since only such freedom will enable them to play their part in the building of a sound world.

Knowing how heavy the burden is on the shoulders of the President of the United States I have hesitated to approach you in this matter. However, I know that you not only see its political importance but that you also have the human understanding and the faith which are needed to tackle it.

Yours sincerely,

JULIANA R

SEPTEMBER 11, 1951.

Railroad Retirement Pension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated on previous occasions, my interest in the railroad retirement pension stems from a long relationship with railway employees. I personally know many of the railroad men, many are relatives of mine, and I count some of these people among my closest personal friends over a long period of years.

When I was a Member of the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly in 1949, the record will indicate that I voted favorably for all of the legislation that was supported by the railroad brotherhoods. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have felt the same interest in these railroad employees that I have felt throughout my previous years.

In these spending times, with the Federal budget mounting to more than \$75,000,000,000 per year, it is a great source of satisfaction to me personally to vote for a bill which does so much good for so many deserving people without costing the Federal Government any money. We are more frequently called upon to appropriate large sums of money or to levy additional taxes to support the ever-increasing cost of Government. The railroad brotherhoods and railroad management are to be congratulated on their pension plan, which is self-supporting and actuarially sound.

The value of any insurance or pension program cannot be disputed. It is truly an insurance against the time when physical handicaps or old age overtakes the employee and either reduces or eliminates his capacity to earn a living. With a properly conducted insurance or pension plan, personal security is provided for his declining years.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had many bills presented in behalf of the retired railroad people who would benefit from the pension. An unfortunate inflationary condition has overtaken this country with the result that the purchasing power of the dollar has been decreased to such an extent that the pension received at the present time is inadequate. Thus, it was vitally

important that these deserving people should be given greater benefits for the investment of their money which they had made for their retirement years. I feel that the committee is to be congratulated because every member was regular in attendance and participated in discussion when it was possible for him to do so.

It happened, however, that the railroad brotherhoods were not in full agreement on the type of benefits that were to be approved. Likewise there was a lack of agreement even among the members of the Railroad Retirement Pension Board. Thus, the committee had the responsibility of resolving two different points of view in an attempt to improve the benefits for all parties concerned.

For my part I was very hopeful that some measure could be reported by the committee that would resolve these differences of opinion into one working arrangement that would be satisfactory for all. I feel that the conference committee, in its Report No. 1215, which was accepted by the House on October 19, has accomplished this purpose.

During the hearings and consideration of the bill I received letters from many railroad employees and others who were interested in their welfare. I also wrote hundreds of letters to these people throughout the Fifth Indiana District in order to have their personal thinking. All of the answers that I received in reply to the questions I asked and the comments I received indicated certain factors which I felt should be respected. All of these points are embodied in the present bill.

This indicates that at the grass-roots level, the men are thinking for themselves rather than blindly accepting the dictates and recommendations of some of the heads of their respective organizations. In fact, some of the letters even indicated that this was the condition and they wanted to express their personal opinions which they felt should be reflected through their organizations and to the Members of the Congress.

The procedure of any legislation through the House of Representatives and the Senate means that if there is any difference of opinion in the legislation passed by those two bodies, a conference committee, composed of Members of both Houses, must be appointed. This committee then is charged with the responsibility of reaching some agreement on the points of disagreement. In this case, it is apparent that the committee did an excellent piece of work which seems to satisfy both Houses of the Congress, and, insofar as I can determine from my correspondence and contact with railroad employees, will be very acceptable and a greatly improved benefit for all.

Some of the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act may be summarized as follows:

First. Fifteen percent increase in all annuities and pensions now being paid to retired railroad employees and in annuities to be awarded in the future.

Second. Spouse's annuity—A new annuity to wives over 65 years of age of retired employees who are receiving annu-

ities or pensions and who are also over 65. (This also applies to the dependent husbands of retired women employees.) The amount will be one-half of the annuity or pension retired employees are receiving, not to exceed \$40 a month.

Third, Thirty-three and one-third percent increase in all survivor annuities now being paid and to be awarded in the future.

Fourth, If any annuity under items Nos. 1, 2, or 3 above is less than the amount that would be provided by the social security formula, there is an integration arrangement whereby the employees, with 10 years or less of service and a current connection with the railroad industry, will receive an amount equal to that which those who are under the regular social-security plan would receive. For this purpose, an arrangement, which might be termed a reinsurance plan, is established whereby the social security is purchased by the Railroad Retirement Pension Trust Fund. The purpose of this is to guarantee those with less than 10 years of service with the railroads assurance of the same retirement benefits that is accorded those under social security.

Fifth, Twenty-five percent increase in lump-sum death benefits to be paid in the future.

Sixth, No increase in taxes (the increase from 6 percent to 6¼ percent at the beginning of 1952 has been in the present law for the last several years). The increase in taxable wages to \$350 or to \$400 provided in some of the bill was omitted in the bill passed by the Congress, which leaves the maximum wages taxable at \$300, the same as it has been.

Seventh, The bill passed by the Congress leaves the present law unchanged as to work restrictions. Some of the other bills before Congress provided that a retired employee could not engage in work covered by social security at a wage exceeding \$50 a month without losing his railroad retirement annuity for that month.

Eighth, Railroad service after age 65 will now be credited in figuring annuities. Under the present law this has not been credited to him.

A further reason for supporting this measure and working so zealously for its passage is the fact that actuaries apparently agree that the provisions of the amendments would in no manner jeopardize the fund. Some of the other proposed legislation would have been very detrimental to the fund and even might have depleted the fund within the next 50 years. For this reason, it seemed to me the better part of wisdom to be on the cautious or conservative side because I knew that both contributors—the railroad employees and railroad management—were very jealous of this fund which they rightfully want to protect.

Another factor that I felt very worth while was the creation of a study committee to give further consideration and study to any other benefits that could be added without impairing or jeopardizing this fund.

It was the feeling of the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and also, I know, of the con-

tributors to the railroad retirement pension fund that the financial soundness of this system must be preserved.

I believe that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, both Houses of the Congress, and the conference committee have met the situation honestly and squarely. This legislation has provided the most relief possible and the benefits will or should come to the employees with the next remittance check.

The bill is a very simple one and should be administered very easily and I am hoping that the increased benefits will help to relieve the situation of many of the deserving people who have worked and contributed so faithfully for years.

Housing at Camp Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Thirty-seventh Division which is the Ohio National Guard has been ordered to Camp Polk, La., in January. A recent report of a Senate subcommittee states that veterans in this military installation are being gouged for housing for their families which does not even deserve the name of housing. Officers and men of the Thirty-seventh Division who hope to take their families with them to Louisiana in January are greatly heartened and encouraged by the recent certification of the community contiguous to Camp Polk as a critical defense housing area. It is certainly to be hoped that this will be followed by vigorous action on the part of all Government agencies to the end that these men who are giving up these years to prepare for the defense of this country may, at least, have proper housing for their families while they are stationed in this country. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks to include an editorial from the Toledo Blade of October 17, 1951, which expresses this viewpoint well.

HOUSING AT CAMP POLK

Representative FRAZIER REAMS' request that the area around Camp Polk, La., be designated critical from the standpoint of defense housing has met with prompt action on the part of the Defense Department and the Office of Defense Mobilization. This is welcome information for the families and friends of the men in Ohio's Thirty-seventh Division of the National Guard, which will report for duty at Polk in January.

Since several thousand soldiers in the Thirty-seventh come from Toledo and vicinity, the accounts which have been published about housing around the Louisiana camp have caused much concern. Because although the military authorities may try to discourage men in the Armed Forces from bringing their families along with them to training areas in the United States, many of them will certainly do so if it is at all possible. And even if the men tried their level best to make their families stay at home, some wives would insist on being near to their husbands no matter what inconveniences and actual hardships were involved.

The break-up of a home, even temporarily, is about the highest cost that is chargeable to debit side of the military ledger. It's a perfectly human and understandable thing for a couple to resist being separated for as long possible. This being so, it would appear that the Defense Department may be forced to give more consideration to the housing facilities for military dependents in camp areas than was shown when it assigned the Thirty-seventh to Polk.

The few small towns in the countryside about the Louisiana post are ill-equipped for receiving large numbers of soldier families. The post itself has quarters for only three families. The upshot has been that some civilian landlords have been able to gouge exorbitant rentals for one-room dwellings and other inadequate shelter. Nor have civilians been the only profiteers, since at least one master sergeant established himself in the housing business to exploit his buddies' needs.

Now that the Camp Polk region has been officially listed as in critical need of defense housing, perhaps the conditions which a Senate committee described as deplorable can be eliminated. The Government will be able to ease credit restrictions on residential building. Blanket rent control may also be established. As a consequence, the Ohio men reporting for duty in Louisiana may find some improvement over the present situation.

But critical defense area or not, Camp Polk's housing problems may require more than a couple of months to solve. Ordinary prudence and concern for the comfort of their families would indicate that the men of the Thirty-seventh assure themselves that suitable quarters are available before a change of residence.

Address by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer Before Ohio State University Advertising Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent obtained during the debate, I submit for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of an address delivered by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer before an Ohio State University Advertising Conference at Columbus, Ohio, on October 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY: ITS PROSPECTS AND POSSIBILITIES

We hear continually of the need for economy in Government. It is discussed, many times with heat, in and out of the Halls of Congress. Nobody disputes that the costs of Government should be cut. As a theoretical objective, everyone is for it. Problems become difficult as they become practical. The way to cut costs is to cut. There is a theory that by so-called streamlining of Government activities and reshuffling of functions, great savings can be accomplished. This theory is attractive, but is it sound? Some savings can be made by streamlining—great ones require a different treatment. Fundamentally I can conceive of no large savings of Government funds—the taxpayers'

money—except by eliminating things which the Government does. Large savings must be made in the places where we are making large expenditures.

I propose to discuss this matter from a completely realistic and objective standpoint. That being so, we must recognize that we are dealing with an extremely difficult problem. The difficulty lies in the fact that everyone favors economy as applied to the other fellow—few favor it when it strikes home.

Many reports on efficiency and reform of Government procedure have been produced. The most recent and outstanding and helpful of these are known as the Hoover Commission Reports, the result of long and serious study by competent and experienced men. The President has made a conscientious effort to carry out the recommendations of these reports by 35 so-called reorganization plans which he has periodically submitted to the Congress. Of these, the Congress has adopted 27, rejected 8. The Hoover proposals are constructive and honest efforts are being made to carry them out.

The great trouble with most reports on efficiency in Government (and this is true of reports on many subjects) is that the reports are filed away and thereafter never seen or used. We now have, in my judgment, sufficient studies and suggestions with reference to reorganization.

What is needed is to put the suggestion into effect, but beyond this is the need to recognize that reorganization in itself will not accomplish a major result. Studies which deal with a dream world and bear little relation to reality, full of graphs and charts and regrouping of functions, will not bring about great savings.

I might interpolate that the drafting of studies and programs is a Washington obsession, which in itself calls for the expenditure of more money, the use of more manpower, the occupying of more space. In many cases it results in a recommendation that a further study be made or that a new commission be appointed to take over the problem which has been discussed.

For great savings we need—not more studies—but action. What kind of action is required? As I said at the beginning, to accomplish great savings we will be forced to cut down or get rid of certain functions now being performed. With such action, and in fact with any specific suggestion along this line, there will arise a howl of protest and anger from every affected individual or group throughout the country.

There are, however, some practical steps which could be taken short of the drastic one I suggest, and the ideas I am about to set forth have been based not upon any commission study but on observation of what goes on in government as I have lived with it myself. My first suggestion is perhaps impossible of fulfillment, but here it is.

Each department of the Government is required to submit periodically its estimates of expenditures for the coming year. This "year" is a fiscal year which begins on July 1. Appropriation requests must be developed at least 1 year in advance of the next fiscal year. This confusing use of a fiscal year starting July 1, should be abandoned and all Government expenditures—after an appropriate interval for adjustment—be placed on a calendar year basis. Furthermore, requests for appropriations should be made as closely as possible to the period for which the funds are intended. If appropriations hearings for the calendar year 1952 were held by Congress near the first of that year, it would afford the Congress and the Government departments the advantage of utilizing up-to-date information. I appreciate that this is a drastic proposal and difficult to achieve—the legislative machinery tends to grind slowly. The processing of

a Federal budget currently requires weeks if not months because of the necessity for hearing each official identified with a particular appropriation. I am informed that one bureau in a Federal department had as many as 80 separate appropriations until a short time ago. The Government has moved to reduce the vast number of appropriations, which I am satisfied is a step in the right direction.

In connection with the budget submitted by each department, the operations and probable expenditures of the department are outlined in great detail. These figures are carefully scrutinized. The department head who is desirous of promoting economy, questions his agency subordinates as to the amounts of money requested to carry on each activity. Strength of character is needed to cut down these requests—first, because the men who make them are honestly enthusiastic about the activities in which they are engaged, and second, because the suggestion is continually made that in other agencies and in other departments the urge to economize is not equally present. The Congress has been fine in giving credit to my Department for its endeavor to economize, and for that reason I have suggested that a particular effort be made to operate within the amounts appropriated, and if possible to come up with a surplus. The answer from an operating official is that if he shows a surplus he gives Congress the impression that the original request was excessive and the agency head a poor administrator. Instead of being rewarded for his success in economy he fears that he will be penalized by reduced appropriations for the following year. This has gone so far that toward the close of the fiscal year if a surplus in any particular account is found to exist, extraordinary efforts are made to discover ways of spending it.

It is obvious that these frantic efforts—and I use the word "frantic" advisedly—at the close of the fiscal year represent expenditures which could be avoided. The remedy for this disturbing situation lies partly with the administrative heads and partly with the Congress. I have stated repeatedly to my bureau heads that I will not tolerate any such practice. As the result of my action, the amount of \$6,220,000 of the funds available to the Department of Commerce for the past fiscal year was saved. These funds will be returned to the Treasury as required in the case of all unexpended balances and other receipts such as those from the sale of documents and publications, which last item, incidentally, amounted to \$1,009,810 50 for the current year.

Savings can be made, of course, by improvements in management. In my department as well as others there are agency heads who make honest and effective efforts in saving. In the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce, for instance, over \$3,000,000 was saved through improvements in operation—in streamlining of organization and management. In the Patent Office, one of the smaller bureaus in my Department, savings to the Government of over \$123,000 were brought about through reductions in printing costs alone.

These savings are laudable, but the agency head should get something besides praise. He should be able to feel that what he has accomplished brings some reward to his particular agency. We need a recognition of the value of incentive. We must devise and make effective incentives for saving the taxpayers' money, instead of incentives for spending it. If the agency head were permitted to retain for purposes of administration money received from the sale of publications and documents or similar services, we could cut down by these amounts the requests for appropriations. If he could

spend as he chose on agency activities even a part of the money he had saved, it would furnish a powerful incentive for economy.

I am convinced that an inherent weakness in the present Federal budget system is the tendency for the Congress to make many separate appropriations for separate functions in a single department. For example, the appropriations in my Department are made separately to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and so forth. It would be helpful if the Congress were to make the several appropriations to the head of a department, so that he, as a matter of operation within his over-all budget, could see that the money was spent in the best possible manner. This would permit the department head to do a better management job by holding costs to a minimum. If a department head is to be fully responsible for running his agency, he should have full authority for all expenditures in his department.

There has recently been exhibited in the Congress a feeling that the only way the executive branch can be forced to save money is by across-the-board cuts. This feeling is understandable. I would like, however, to make this suggestion: If the Congress feels that a percentage cut is necessary, let it permit the department head to distribute this cut throughout his department as he sees fit. Let him decide where the cut should be made.

I realize the difficulty of carrying out these suggestions. Members of Congress themselves have very definite ideas as to where money should be spent. Furthermore, they face continued and vigorous appeals from constituents for the financing of various projects. Any action by a department head which would adversely affect a particular project would meet with prompt and loud objection in some quarter. Nonetheless I know that these suggestions are sound. The appropriation committees of the Congress could still, of course, exercise final authority over the executive expenditures. If they felt the administrative head had been arbitrary, frivolous or unwise, they could make their own suggestions for the next budget. I am certain that the executive head would give preferred attention to these suggestions.

Another point should be made with reference to the impact of these across-the-board cuts. If one department has been run extravagantly, spending much more than was necessary, a cut in that department's budget would not affect its operation, except perhaps to improve it. The same would not be true of a department which had been rigidly economical. The department head whose sincere wish is to economize is halted continually by the feeling that others are not being equally economical, that his economy will penalize his own operations while others benefit, or at least are not similarly penalized.

If the President were authorized to make a flat cut of a certain percentage in the over-all expenditures, with discretion as to where the cuts should be made, it would tend to reduce, although it would probably not eliminate, the discrepancy between the department which is economically managed and the one which is not. I'm well aware of the difficulties which such a plan would present and the arguments which might be made against it; but the arguments in its favor outweigh those against it, and I'm certain that adoption would bring about many helpful economies.

One desirable change in the Federal book-keeping and budget-making would be a separation of the capital from the operating account. When Congress is appropriating money for capital expenditure it is doing something quite different from appropriating

ating for an operating expenditure. There is no reason why capital investment of the Federal Government should not be treated as such and good accounting practices applied to appraising its value, writing it off in a way similar to that done by private business. Furthermore, it is not only proper, but in my judgment highly desirable to set up and maintain continually the difference between a capital expense, which is theoretically permanent, or semipermanent, and operating expense which is not recoverable.

Since the department head and the bureau head do not at present receive credit for savings made, they have no great incentive to retain and encourage the more efficient employees and to get rid of the opposite kind.

In an effort to protect the civil servant and remedy the evils of the so-called spoils system we have created a body of practices, precedents, and laws which tend to treat employees as automatic units or robots and which do not adequately recognize the difference in quality of service which employees render. In spite of my years of contact with Government procedures, I am not yet accustomed to hearing an employee referred to, not by his name, but as "that GS-12 or 16"—referred to, in other words, by his salary grade.

If Government service is to be improved and the taxpayer is to get more for his money, certain things in the field of Government employment must be accomplished. First of all, the prospective employee and his employer must proceed on the basis that employment by the Federal Government is a privilege, not a right. Many seem to labor under the concept that a citizen has a vested interest in employment by the Federal Government or at least an inherent right to a job once obtained. In judging an employee, recognition must not only be given to his loyalty and honesty, but to his competence. It is not sufficient to get only qualified employees; it is essential to get the best qualified available within the present pay scales. This leads to vesting in the department head greater responsibility in the selection of employees than the present mere drawing of names from a so-called eligible list. It is necessary to recognize that while all men may be created equal they rapidly develop differences. Some are alert, some sluggish; some industrious, some lazy; some brilliant, some stupid. We should make a more determined effort than has so far been made to distinguish between a person's real qualifications and a paper record of achievements and to reward those who are efficient and get rid of, or at least not promote, those who are second rate.

In connection with the budgets which are presented to me periodically, one of the always recurring items is within-grade salary increases. This means in effect that automatically, since now almost all employees are rated "satisfactory," the employee gets an advance. Almost no supervisor will face the risk of time and effort necessary to prove an "unsatisfactory" rating or to make the decision which would prevent the automatic raise.

It should be easier than at present to eliminate incompetents. An American citizen has certain inalienable rights, but guaranteed employment by the Federal Government is not one of them. Every agency head has learned over the years that any effort to remove an employee is fraught with a most annoying and disappointing, if not disastrous result. It is, of course, obvious that the agency head should not from whim or caprice be able to discharge an employee. He should, however, have more leeway than he has at the present time. In all fairness it can be said that the regulations and procedures and the philosophy back of them are designed primarily to keep the employee in

his job. Frequently the trial of an employee for incompetence results instead in the trial of the agency head for prejudice or intolerance or worse. I recognize there is some risk involved in granting greater latitude to the agency head to discharge or demote an employee but in my opinion he should have such latitude.

Many an agency head has finally come to the conclusion that he will leave incompetents on the payroll rather than go through the unpleasant ordeal of trying to get rid of them. Having learned his lesson, he gives up his attempt to crash through all the maze of procedures and gradations which have been established and moves unenthusiastically with the current. It seems to me that greater administrative discretion, with protection of the individual from whim or prejudice, should be allowed without interminable appeals, some of them outside the agency—at least in the important policy-making positions.

On the other hand, there are in the public service, just as there are in business or elsewhere, those employees, devoted to their work, who will try in every possible way to do a superior job and give everything they have to the public service. To encourage and promote and adequately reward such employees is of the utmost importance. Here, as elsewhere, the question boils down to one of real incentive. The importance of this concept cannot be overlooked or minimized.

I have discussed some possible methods by which Government expenditures can be cut down.

The real solution to mounting Government expenditures and perhaps the only solution is, however, wholly different. It is drastic but simple. It is embodied in the statement that there is a limit to what we can do. No amount of streamlining of Government service will be a substitute for facing this unpleasant fact. There is a limit to the number of Government activities we can undertake. When we face this fact and move on from there we immediately confront almost insuperable but not really insuperable difficulties—for the question then is—what things can be eliminated? Which among the many laudable and worthwhile undertakings of Government are to be abandoned?

One way to keep out of this distressing dilemma is not to add new agencies where it can be avoided; new agencies which must later painfully be endured or liquidated. It is easier to prevent the creation of a new agency than to kill an old one.

We have a mania for new agencies, commissions, and study groups. When a new problem confronts us, it is common practice to suggest that some outstanding man of great ability (the theoretical man is always one of great ability) be brought to Washington to head up a new commission or agency to handle the problem. He is usually given a large amount of money to operate with. I will give you two illustrations.

One of the objects of solicitude of many both in and out of public office, and one of the matters deserving close and continued attention, is the situation and in some cases the plight of the small-business man. It is, of course, not true, as some claim, that the small-business man has been or is being completely crushed out in this country. Until recently the growth in the number of business enterprises has been steady and great. There are now slightly over 4,000,000 business enterprises, most of them small. About 300,000 are manufacturers. At this time, however, the small-business man does have his problems—plenty of them. There are in the Government, and have been, several agencies which are undertaking to be of help to the small-business man. This is true in the General Services Administra-

tion, the various branches of the armed services, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Department of Commerce, and others. Within the Department of Commerce the National Production Authority, which handles critical materials and allocates them, has given particular attention to the small-business man's problems and is making great efforts to help him solve them.

The Congress has also been considering his problems, and has come up with a new agency. It is to be called the Small Defense Plants Administration, and the law specifically provides that it shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government. It has been proposed that this Agency be given a total of \$50,000,000 to spend. The administrator is to receive \$17,500 salary, and his two deputies are to be paid at the rate of \$15,000 each. While I shall, of course, do everything in my power to help carry out the wishes of the Congress, I feel, as I have stated before several congressional committees, that the work could have been done by existing agencies effectively and with a great saving of the taxpayers' money. Here, as elsewhere, the creation of a new agency to supplant a number of old ones results only in the new agency being added to the old ones.

I will give you a second illustration of my point. We have since World War II spent on foreign aid of one kind or another many billions of dollars. It is, aside from our military expenditures, the biggest item in our budget. These foreign-aid activities are carried on by many Government agencies. There has been a growing move lately, supported by many men of prominence and organizations of importance, to create a new superagency to handle foreign aid. The recent act of Congress dealing with foreign-aid discloses disturbing progress along this line. In my opinion, as I said recently in a letter to Senator CONNALLY, this would create serious if not insoluble administrative and foreign-relations problems, and in the long run would produce an unbearable drain upon the taxpayers.

Aside from other arguments which might properly be brought against this suggestion, one is, in my judgment, unanswerable. No department at Cabinet level should be created whose sole function is to give away money. We don't need a Santa Claus department. Santa Claus should operate as a private, not a public, enterprise.

In connection with the problem involved in curtailing the agencies which we already have, we must begin with the realization that we are not dividing the sheep from the goats. We are not retaining only those activities which are beneficial and eliminating those which are useless. In almost every case we will be forced to a decision to retain or abandon activities which are in varying degrees beneficial. Obviously, this presents a difficult problem and will prove to be a very unpopular job.

We are faced initially with the question of the relative importance of Government activities, in fact that is the fundamental question. Let us take, for instance, the matter of research. The oldest and certainly the most eminent governmental research authority in the country is the National Bureau of Standards, of the Department of Commerce. The Bureau was appropriated about \$8,500,000 for its operation this past year. In contrast, the annual appropriation for the Department of Defense currently for research and development is \$1,400,000,000. The Office of the Secretary of Defense alone is given \$90,000,000 for these purposes. This latter figure itself is about the equivalent of all the money which has been appropriated for research and development in the National Bureau of Standards since it was organized

50 years ago. The typical question, therefore, would be: If appropriations for research and development are to be cut, where is the cut to be made? The question is not simply between civilian and military expense since the Bureau of Standards, outside of its regular appropriation, does a vast amount of research for other agencies, chiefly the Department of Defense.

Two years ago there was passed out to the potato growers of this country the sum of \$190,000,000. This was more than the total amount spent that year in my Department for the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Patent Office, the Bureau of the Census, the Office of Business Economics, all the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and the Office of International Trade.

Last year the United States, through the Economic Cooperation Administration, provided Western Europe with \$374,000,000 for machinery and equipment to be used in constructing or rebuilding its plants and \$817,000,000 for raw materials to be used in European industries—a total of \$1,200,000,000. In connection with national defense during the past year there was committed a billion dollars for defense plants and an additional \$1,100,000,000 for defense supporting facilities in the United States. Here is a possible alternative contrast.

I am not undertaking in any one of these cases to suggest which of the contrasted appropriations is more important. The answer may be clear to you. It is clear that when we talk about economy and mean it, we are facing a very tough problem. We really must answer the question: the \$64 question—or shall I say the \$64,000,000,000—what do we eliminate? It seems clear that the first thing required is a certain community of approach by the legislative and executive branches. There is, however, no reason to be discouraged, and if the American people mean business the savings can be accomplished.

The backbone of our capitalistic system is Government credit. Lenin once said that the surest way to destroy a capitalist regime is to debase its currency. That is still true. I do not suggest that we must at all times and under all circumstances balance the budget. The failure to recognize an emergency may be just as fatal as the failure to recognize the end of an emergency. We cannot avoid, however, the unpleasant task of self-discipline which is involved in meeting this problem of economy. There is a limit to what we can do. We should be making choices continually. Eventually we must make some drastic ones.

Hawaii Is Ready for Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the vital issues crying for prompt action by the Congress is approval of statehood for Hawaii. So well documented is the case for admission of Hawaii to the Union that this House has twice passed such a measure. New consideration of this step so essential to the welfare of the Nation should be given as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January.

As an indication of the readiness of Hawaii for statehood I call attention

to the analysis of the proposed constitution for Hawaii. The study was made by S. Gale Lowrie, on the faculty of the University of Cincinnati at Cincinnati, Ohio. It was published in the October issue of the American Political Science Review. Because it comes from a scholarly and unprejudiced source, the study further supports the contention that the citizens of Hawaii are well schooled in the underlying principles of representative government and ready to assume its responsibilities as well as its benefits. Under permission granted me by the House, I include the text of Dr. Lowrie's study, as follows.

A CONSTITUTION FOR HAWAII

(By S. Gale Lowrie, University of Cincinnati)

A convention assembled in Honolulu on April 4, 1950, to draft the constitution for the new state of Hawaii which the framers hope will soon be created by Congress. On July 22 the constitution was signed in the throne room of the old Iolani Palace in a colorful ceremony. Sixty-two of the sixty-three delegates signed the document, and the Territorial legislature, at a special session called for that purpose, approved its submission to the electorate by a unanimous vote in the lower house and with but two opposing votes in the senate. The voters ratified the constitution at the general election on November 7, 1950, by the substantial majority of 82,788 to 27,109. Sentiment for statehood has been increasing in the islands until it has reached the proportion registered in the referendum on the adoption of the constitution. The minority in opposition was small, and it is probable that a number of those voting in opposition registered disapproval not of statehood but of the document as written. The only organized opposition came from the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which is on record as recently as May 1950 as favoring the admission of Hawaii to the Union of States.

The act of the Territorial legislature of May 20, 1949, authorizing the convention may have seemed premature, since congressional approval for statehood is yet to be secured. But hope was high that the Eighty-first Congress would admit Hawaii as the forty-ninth State, and in calling a constitutional convention before admission was assured, the Territory followed the precedent set by 15 of our States. The House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress did in fact adopt H. R. 49 to grant statehood to Hawaii by the vote of 232 to 110, and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended the measure for passage. The Senate was strongly urged by the President and the Secretary of the Interior to take action before the congressional session drew to a close, and a majority of the Senators expressed themselves informally as favoring statehood. However, the issue was not brought to a vote and must now be considered anew by the Eighty-second, or a later, Congress. But there is confidence that the events of 1950, in the islands and in Washington, will hasten favorable congressional action.

Although several States have in recent years revised their constitutions and others have adopted amendments proposed by conventions, there have been no original documents for new States since New Mexico and Arizona were admitted in 1912. Much careful research has been given State constitutions in the intervening years, and Hawaii prepared her draft in the light of these studies. Most of the States have constitutions which have been outmoded by the technological and social changes of the last half century. Hawaii had an unusual opportunity to draft a modern document.

A striking feature of the Hawaiian Constitution is its provision for a strong Governor to be elected for a 4-year term. In addition to the usual duties ascribed to that office—responsibility "for the faithful execution of the laws," recommending measures to the legislature, granting reprieves and pardons, acting as commander in chief of the State's armed forces—he is given important appointive power, and each principal department is placed under his supervision. Through his control over the purse, he is to possess ample authority to dominate the State's activities. Unless the legislature should provide otherwise, no other executive officer is to be chosen by election except the lieutenant governor. Instead of organizing the administrative departments by constitutional provisions, the legislature is commissioned to establish not more than 20 principal departments in accordance with major purposes; and, unless otherwise provided, these are to be headed by simple executives. These department heads are to be appointed by the Governor for terms ending with his own, and they are subject to removal with the senate's consent. The constitution requires the Governor to appoint an administrative director to serve at this pleasure.

Under the organic act which now governs the Territory, the President of the United States appoints the Governor and secretary of state. The latter acts for the chief executive when the Governor is absent from the State, with authority to exercise all powers vested in the chief executive's office. This valuable provision is to continue when Hawaii becomes a State. The lieutenant governor, who will probably serve as secretary of state ex officio, although other duties may be provided by law, will, in the absence of the Governor from the State or his incapacity to exercise and discharge the duties of his office, have the powers and duties of the chief executive devolved on him. If the office of Governor becomes vacant, the lieutenant governor will become Governor.

It is made a duty of the Governor to submit to the legislature a budget comprising a complete plan of operating expenditure and capital improvements, together with a statement of anticipated receipts and recommendations for new revenue from taxes or borrowing. He is given specific authority to veto or reduce items in appropriation bills. A section of the article on "Taxation and Finance" requiring that provision be made "for the control of the rate of expenditure of appropriated State moneys, and for the reduction of such expenditure under prescribed conditions," probably contemplates a continuation of the present territorial system of allotments. This system clothes the Governor with the power of expropriation, even with respect to those departments organized for continuing policies under board administration, such as the department of education and the State university. In their desire to hold the chief executive accountable, the farmers have, at least potentially set up one of the most powerful executive offices in the United States.

The office of the Governor is further strengthened by the restrictions placed upon the legislature, particularly in limiting the sessions to 60 and 30 days. The legislature is to consist of two houses, a senate of 25 members elected for 4 years, and a house of representatives of 51 members elected for 2-year terms. The organization of this branch of government was affected by the unique geographical features of the proposed State, which consists of eight principal islands, unequal in size, population, and wealth, and so separated that passenger travel between them is principally by air. To represent the geographical areas, senatorial districts are established in the constitution, and these may not be changed except by constitutional amendment, which must be approved by a

majority vote in the State as a whole and also by majority votes in a majority of the counties. Representation in the lower house is apportioned on the basis of population. The desire to give the island of Oahu (which not only is the most populous of the islands, but also is the seat of government and the economic and financial capital) equal representation without reducing existing representation from the outer islands, resulted in increasing the size of this body to 51, from its present size of 30 in the Territorial lower house. Compared to the size of legislatures of other States, a legislature of 76 members is not a large one. The story is different when one considers that the islands have a population of less than half a million. Under present conditions, there will be one member of the legislature for each 1,780 registered voters.

Regular sessions of the legislature are to meet annually, but it is only in the "general sessions" to be held in the odd-numbered years that general laws are to be enacted. The sessions held in the even-numbered years are to be known as "budget sessions," limited to consideration of appropriations for the succeeding fiscal year, capital improvements, revenue necessitated thereby, constitutional amendments, and bills to call elections. Urgent legislation may be introduced upon the demand of two-thirds of the full membership of each house. General sessions must conclude in 60 days and budget sessions in 30 days. The Governor may extend any session 30 days. The Governor may call special sessions, but may not limit their agenda, as he may in some States.

A provision of the New Jersey constitution which calls for the return of the legislature after 45 days to act on bills vetoed by the Governor, has been borrowed and incorporated. No steps were taken to avoid the legislative jam which too often accompanies the closing days of legislative sessions, by arranging for continuing or periodic sessions. With respect to those bills which are passed during the last 10 days of the session, the Governor is allowed 45 days for consideration. Those he vetoes during this period are to be reconsidered by the legislature in a special veto session. The legislature is to return after this 45-day period to revise the bills to meet the Governor's requests, to pass them over his veto by a two-thirds vote in each house, or, by failing to do so, to acquiesce in the veto.

Although the legislature is empowered to create administrative or regulatory boards, the only ones provided in the constitution are the board of regents for the University of Hawaii and the board of education to control the public-school system of the State. Both boards are to be appointed by the Governor with the consent of the senate and are to be representative, at least in part, of the geographical subdivisions of the State. In the appointment of members of the board of education, names are to be taken from panels to be submitted by local school advisory councils. Central control of the educational system of the Territory now exists under the provisions of the organic act enacted by Congress for the Territory.

The convention is to be commended for its faith that the legislatures of the future will be competent and can be trusted to deal with the problems of their day. In consequence, it placed fewer restrictions on these bodies than are to be found in most constitutions. A controversial issue arose respecting home rule for political subdivisions. The article incorporated grants local agencies the right to frame and adopt charters for self-government, but the article is not self-executing and the powers will be exercised within such limits as may be prescribed by law. This provision, consequently, grants little to local bodies, but it is doubtful if much more local autonomy could have been established by

constitutional mandate. Centralizing administrative forces are at work. Public education is already centralized; the entire island of Oahu is for most municipal purposes an administrative unit. The geographical nature of the proposed state may demand special treatment for certain areas, and technical changes affect governmental operations.

The decision to establish the judiciary on an appointive basis will be approved by many who believe that the elective system in most of the States fails to secure the most competent judges. The supreme court will consist of a chief justice and four associate justices. There are to be circuit courts and such inferior courts as the legislature may establish. Judges of the supreme and circuit courts are to be appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the senate, the former for 7- and the latter for 6-year terms. They may be removed, for causes provided by law, by a two-thirds vote of each house of the legislature sitting in joint session. If an agency (to be set up by law) shall certify to the Governor that a judge of the supreme or circuit court seems so incapacitated as to prevent performance of his duties, the Governor shall appoint a board of three to make inquiries, and on their recommendation the Governor may remove the judge.

No provision is made for the initiative to propose either statutes or constitutional amendments, nor for the referendum, except on constitutional amendments. Constitutional amendments may be proposed by the legislature or by conventions called for that purpose. The legislature may submit amendments which have received a two-thirds vote in each House, or majority votes at each of two successive sessions. Conventions to consider constitutional revision will be called if a majority of the voters so demand when the issue appears on the ballot. The convention issue may be submitted by the legislature at any general or special election, and must be submitted every 10 years. The Lieutenant Governor will place the matter before the voters if the legislature fails to act during this interval. Amendments, proposed by legislature or convention, must be approved by a majority of those who vote on the issues, and, in addition, by 35 percent of those who vote at the election, if submitted at a general election. Issues voted at special elections must have majorities on the issues and the approval of 35 percent of the registered voters. The voting age is 20 years.

No limitations have been placed on the State's power to tax, but a debt limitation of \$60,000,000 is established, which may not be exceeded except by a two-thirds vote in each house of the legislature. By these majorities, the legislature may contract debt up to 15 percent of the assessed value of real estate. Debts of local subdivisions are limited to 10 percent of the value of real estate in the subdivision. These limitations are not applicable to debts to raise funds to suppress insurrection, to repel invasion, or to meet disasters. They are not applicable to bonds secured by the revenues of enterprises and public corporations, nor to refunding bonds. The procedures to be followed in the passage of appropriation bills and in debt administration are set forth in some detail.

The convention which framed the Hawaiian constitution, while conservative, was mindful of the social obligations of a modern state. But rather than outline constitutional procedures for the State to follow, it was content to assert the basic duties of the State, leaving it to the legislatures of the future to devise appropriate means of meeting these obligations. The State must take measures to promote the public health, provide domiciliary care for mentally or physically handicapped and assist those unable to maintain living standards compatible with health and decency. The State may assist in slum clearance, in providing housing for those with low

incomes, and in rehabilitating substandard areas. Public lands are to be used as fully as possible to encourage farm and home ownership. For the development of places of beauty and of historical or cultural interest, private property may be subject to reasonable regulation.

The constitution contains the usual guarantees to protect civil liberties. Influenced by experiences in the Islands during the Second World War, the power of suspending the writ of habeas corpus, or laws, is to be exercised only by the legislature, or, in particular cases, as the legislature may expressly provide. There will be no discrimination or segregation on the basis of race or religion.

The civil service is to be governed by the merit principle, and the retirement system, which is to include the judges, is declared a contractual relationship. Public employees may organize and make known their grievances and proposals; private employees may organize for collective bargaining.

The style and arrangement of the proposed constitution are excellent. It is a brief document which contains fewer provisions of a statutory character than will be found in the constitutions of most of the States.

The Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The agricultural conservation programs of the United States Department of Agriculture are carried out under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, Public Law 481, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved February 29, 1936. This act amended and supplemented the Soil Erosion Act of 1935, Public Law 46, Seventy-fourth Congress. Its enactment provided for a new agricultural conservation program. The Soil Erosion Act of 1935 expressed the policy of the Congress "to provide for the protection of land resources against erosion and for other purposes." The amendments approved February 29, 1936 (The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act), added the expression of the policy of the Congress "to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources." More specifically, the amendments state that the policy and purposes of the act are: (1) Preservation and improvement of soil fertility; (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; and (4) protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control.¹

ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Previous to the reorganization of the soil conservation and agricultural research activities of the United States Department of Agriculture announced by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan on February 16, 1951, the soil conservation programs consisted

¹ 49 Stat. 1148.

basically of two programs, one administered by the Soil Conservation Service and the other by the Production and Marketing Administration.

THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE PROGRAM

The Soil Conservation Service has been considered the technical agency of the Department of Agriculture which aids in bringing about physical adjustments in land use to conserve soil and water resources, establishing a permanent and balanced agriculture, and in reducing the hazards of floods and sedimentation. In carrying out its program, the service conducts studies to determine the character, causes, effects, and extent of soil and water loss and to develop, adapt, and improve conservation farming practices and methods which will adequately protect our farm land and water resources. The development and improvement of practices is accomplished by laboratory and plot work to develop basic information and by experiment station field trials or practices. The work of the service is conducted in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations and other Department of Agriculture agencies, and is correlated with the programs of the Agricultural Research Administration.

Federal Government expenditures for soil conservation research and soil conservation operations carried on by the Soil Conservation Service during fiscal year 1950, totaled \$52,846,176.^{*}

The accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service during fiscal year 1950, have probably been greater than in any previous year. Throughout the year, planned soil conservation measures and land use adjustments were applied in amounts equal to complete treatment on approximately 26,000,000 acres. Complete conservation plans were made according to the needs and capabilities of the land, for about 132,000 farms and ranches. These plans covered nearly 39,000,000 acres. In addition to the conservation plans carried out on the farms and ranches, detailed soil conservation surveys were completed on more than 31,000,000 acres. This work was all done in the soil conservation districts by technicians of the Soil Conservation Service working with the farmers.^{*}

In carrying out its program for fiscal year 1950, the Service cooperated with 2,200 soil conservation districts. These districts included approximately four-fifths of all the farms and ranches of the Nation. The Service did not give these districts all the help they desired and requested, however, because of its limited facilities and personnel.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY THE PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

The agricultural conservation program, administered by the Production and Marketing Administration is the means by which the Government offers to help farmers finance specific conservation practices that are needed and that will be needed in the future. This program is designed to restore and maintain the national soil and water resources by encouraging and assisting farmers to carry out on their farms approved soil-building and soil and water conserving practices in greater volume and variety than would be performed without such assistance.

Financial and other aid is available on request, under the program, to all farmers in the United States, Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Funds appropriated for this purpose are distributed among the various States, Territories, and insular

areas on the basis of their conservation needs. The amount of assistance required by any one State or area is estimated on the basis of the physical characteristics of the land, climatic conditions, crops grown, and the extent of particular practices needed to prevent wind and water erosion, to conserve water and improve its utilization for agricultural purposes, and to maintain and increase soil fertility.

Assistance offered on individual farms provides an incentive to farmers to carry out effective soil conservation practices. Financial assistance is given to farmers for practices which represent orderly progress toward the accomplishment of practical conservation farming. The payments to farmers for completing authorized conservation practices average less than 50 percent of the cost of carrying out the practice, and consist of materials, services, and reimbursement payments. The practices for which farmers can obtain Government assistance generally include four major classes: (1) Construction practices such as terracing and leveling land; (2) establishing and improving pastures of perennial grasses and other permanent cover, (3) growing annual or permanent cover crops, and (4) applying minerals such as lime, potash, and phosphate, to pasture and hay-land sods.

The agricultural conservation program is administered locally by State, county, and community Production and Marketing Administration committees. The county and community committees are elected by the farmers of their respective counties and communities. The State committee is also a farmer committee, its members being appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The farmer committees, with the advice of the technical committees composed of representatives of Federal, State, and local agricultural agencies, select and develop the conservation practices which make up the State and county programs. These farmer committees also determine in a large degree the manner and extent to which the agricultural conservation program applies to individual farms, and they have the responsibility of administering the program in the interest of the entire Nation, and in such a way as to obtain the greatest possible conservation with available funds.

Farmers in every agricultural county and community in the country are cooperating in the agricultural conservation program. During the crop year 1949, these farmers carried out approved soil- and water-conservation practices on 2,686,791 farms, comprising approximately 62 percent of the Nation's cropland.

These practices were carried out on a share-the-cost basis. The cooperating farmers, on the average, paid for about half the out-of-pocket cost and in addition did the work. The investment of the Nation in protecting its soil and water resources and in building a more productive agriculture is paying dividends in maintaining high production from our farms. Continued high farm production and protection of the Nation's soil and water resources are important parts of our national defense effort.

The 1949 program was a continuation of the program of the previous year. Changes for 1949 came as a result of experience with the previous programs. Acreage allotments on a number of the major crops provided an opportunity for farmers to use the land taken out of the allotment crops to carry out conservation on a more intensive scale. Particular encouragement was given to increase the acreages of grasses and legumes. A survey of grass and legume seed needs and special emphasis on seed production gave further encouragement to this aspect of conservation.

Cooperating farmers, during the 1949 program year, encouraged and aided by assist-

ance provided under the agricultural conservation program on a share-the-cost basis—Seeded 5,035,975 acres of pasture.

Constructed 58,261 dams for livestock water.

Established 17,379,703 acres of green manure and cover crops.

Built 443,328,000 linear feet of terraces.

Farmed 3,336,249 acres of intertilled and 2,539,575 acres of close-sown crops on the contour.

Carried out contour strip cropping on 229,075 acres.

Constructed 39,787 dams for erosion control (storage type) and 1,842 dams for irrigation.

Applied 24,933,957 tons of liming materials, and 3,109,972 tons of phosphate (20 percent P₂O₅ equivalent), to aid in establishing and maintaining stands of grasses and legumes.

Planted 95,573 acres of forest trees and shrubs.

The accomplishments of program year 1949 added to conservation measures carried out since the beginning of the agricultural conservation program in 1936 have helped to increase the country's assurance of continued abundant production from the land. From 1936 through 1949, farmers cooperating in the agricultural conservation program have carried out the following soil- and water-conservation practices:

Seeded 45,837,893 acres of pasture and range land.

Constructed 917,122 storage-type dams and reservoirs.

Improved the farm land of the Nation with 232,760,415 tons of lime.

Enrich the soil with 21,195,371 tons of superphosphate (20 percent P₂O₅ equivalent).

Established 231,972,655 acres of green manure and cover crops.

Terraced 16,944,432 acres of farm land.

Farmed 126,811,567 acres of farm land on the contour.

Field-stripped 71,643,300 acres to control wind and water erosion.

Planted 784,023 acres of trees.^{*}

The estimated gross assistance to farmers for conservation practices during the 1949 program year was \$223,855,000. Although the maximum assistance allowable was \$750 per farm operator, actually, individual payments averaged \$79.15 for the 1949 program. It is alleged, however, that this assistance represents only a small part of the value of the conservation practices carried out. Farmers, matching with their own funds and labor the assistance provided, and carrying out additional conservation measures because of the encouragement and aid given, more than doubled in value of conservation practices the funds made available through the agricultural conservation program.

Conservation work was further stimulated through the farmers' and rancher's conservation program initiated during the last half of the fiscal year 1949 in a few counties and expanded to 73 counties in 33 States. In 1950. Under this program, farmers were encouraged to develop their own conservation program and then available assistance from all sources. Federal agencies, State and local groups, and private enterprises, was fitted so far as possible to the needs of the individual farm.

Some of the leaders in the agricultural conservation movement feel that this work has accelerated thinking and action in meeting conservation problems on individual farms, and that although many of these problems are local in nature, they vitally affect the welfare of the Nation. It is believed by administrators of the program that this approach will provide more complete and exact information, farm by farm, as to

^{*} U. S. Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration.

^{*} U. S. Department of Agriculture.

^{*} U. S. Department of Agriculture, Report of the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, 1950, p. 8.

the conservation problems which exist, making it possible to develop and operate a more effective agricultural conservation program for the country as a whole.⁵

THE CONTEMPLATED AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FOR 1951

Efforts to promote conservation and development of agricultural land and water resources will be continued during 1951. It is estimated that \$257,500,000 will be available for conservation payments to farmers to assist them in carrying out approved conservation practices on their farms. Many of the practices approved for the past year will be continued throughout the 1951 program year. In working out the conservation program for 1951 the program will be planned to fit in with the national preparedness program. Farmers are being encouraged to produce more cotton, corn, wheat, and other grains. This means that some conservation practices emphasized during the past year will not be carried on as extensively in 1951. Practices will be planned and approved that will lead to adequate production of commodities needed for national defense both now and in the future.

Assistance will be given to farmers carrying out conservation practices under the 1951 agricultural-conservation program in accordance with the provisions of the 1951 National Bulletin issued September 1950, as amended. The following is a general description of the conservation practices applicable to the continental United States, which are contemplated for the 1951 program year:

- 1 Practices to develop cropping systems that protect the soil and restore, improve, and maintain soil productivity.
- 2 Practices to restore and maintain range and permanent pasture.
- 3 Practices to conserve and obtain efficient use of agricultural water.
- 4 Drainage practices to permit land-use adjustment needed in establishing soil-conserving cropping systems, or to permit other measures required to conserve soil and water resources.
- 5 Practices to establish, restore, and maintain farm woodland.
- 6 Practices to protect soil from wind and water erosion.

The above list includes the major classes of conservation practices that will be carried out during the 1951 program year. Numerous specific program will be used to achieve the desired results under each of these general classes.

COORDINATION OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICES

On February 16, 1951, the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, announced the reorganization of the soil conservation and agricultural research activities of the United States Department of Agriculture. He stated that the administrative changes being put into effect seek to carry out the objectives of the President's Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the group generally known as the Hoover Commission—as they pertain to soil conservation and agricultural research. Mr. Brannan explained further that he felt that the changes will enable the Department of Agriculture to do its work more efficiently and economically and that the Nation would be assured of more soil conservation per appropriated dollar.

As now organized, a single policy will govern the soil conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture, and the activities will be carried out through a unified and interlocking administrative organization.

"The basic physical objective of soil conservation activities by the Department agencies shall be the use of each acre of agricultural land within its capabilities and the treatment of each acre of agricultural land in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement."

The conservation programs of the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Production and Marketing Administration, will be supervised by an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Under the supervision of this official these agencies will jointly determine the soil conservation practices and rates of payment for the agricultural conservation program. These are decisions for which the Production and Marketing Administration has had sole responsibility, although in practice PMA has consulted the other agencies.

The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture will also maintain a continuous survey of the agricultural resources activities of the Department and determine with the Secretary such action, including transfer of functions, as may be necessary and appropriate to insure integration, effectiveness, and economy of these activities.

The land and water resources staff of the Office of the Secretary will be assigned to the Assistant Secretary in charge of agricultural resources conservation services, to assist him in carrying out the Department's responsibilities relating to flood control, river basin investigations, and various other matters concerning land and water utilization.

The reorganization plan also provides for unification of the agricultural conservation field work. In each State and county, personnel of the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration will be housed in the same building as soon as possible. At present, farmers and others having soil conservation business with both the Production and Marketing Administration and the Soil Conservation Service may have to go from one office to another in the same town or even in different towns.⁶

Why We Are Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CLARENCE CANNON OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of columnists and broadcasters, but the most pertinent column on Missouri and American affairs is the column by H. J. Blanton, which has appeared regularly for many years in the Monroe County Appeal, of Paris, Mo.

Mr. Blanton has received every honor—local, State, and national—that could be conferred on a newspaperman, and both he and the Appeal have been the subject of numerous articles and features, notably in the Saturday Evening Post and other national magazines.

Under leave to extend remarks I am including a couple of paragraphs from last week's issue of his famous column:

NO ENTHUSIASM FOR GREATEST WAR

Young men who come back from Korea are shocked to find how little interest the

⁵ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, Memorandum No. 1278, February 15, 1951.

⁶ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Memorandum No. 1278, February 15, 1951.

general public is showing in what is going on over there—how little it knows about why we are fighting, and how little it cares about the outcome. There are no send-offs for departing soldiers, no welcoming parties for returning veterans. There is no singing of war songs. There are no orations about the invincibility of American arms. There are no sermons about the justice of our cause, few editorials whose purpose is to mold sentiment for what we are undertaking to do.

This, too, when the world destiny hangs on the outcome of that war, and when democracy and Christianity never had more at stake. While we are bearing most of the burden, that war really is being fought by the United Nations, not by the United States alone. Its purpose is to put an end to aggression, to make this world safe from any present or future attempt at world domination. If it is lost, communism will win.

If communism wins, Christianity will receive the greatest set-back in 500 years. What is happening in Russia, where religion is not tolerated, and China, from which all missionaries are being expelled, and in Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, in which preachers and priests are being imprisoned, is what will happen in other countries on every continent. If our side wins, it will mean an end to aggression. It will mean freedom of religion, freedom of the press, a continuance of our way of life, and freedom to carry the Gospel wherever we please. With so much at stake how can pulpit, press, and people be so indifferent?

Let's Avoid a Greater Korea in Iran— Milwaukee Sentinel Makes Common-Sense Proposal To Avoid Explosion in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, three editorials recently set forth in the Milwaukee Sentinel, in common with other Hearst newspapers throughout the United States, proposes a plan formulated by J. Kingsbury Smith, European general manager, INS, which seems to be the common-sense approach to avoid a greater Korea and a possible explosion that might inaugurate world war III starting in Iran.

It would be a grave mistake for us to support exclusively British policies in Iran or any place else, particularly if those policies are inimical to the Iranian people or other people elsewhere.

The Milwaukee Sentinel editorials provide a just basis for a settlement when they propose that the rights of the Iranian people are primary in any settlement of the Iranian oil question.

Particularly pertinent is the editorial written by Mr. Joseph Packman, No Blood Bath Over Iran's Oil. I wish to set forth hereinafter the three editorials: [From the Milwaukee Sentinel of October 9, 1951]

ACT NOW TO PREVENT WAR IN IRAN

Unless swift and decisive steps are set in motion by an administration which has

⁵ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Report of the Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, 1950.

badly bumped the problem up till now, America faces a super-Korea in Iran should a shooting war detonate in that oil-rich area.

The spark that could touch off a third world war is clearly flickering and it is the urgent duty of our Government to snuff it out while there is still time.

Each passing day edges us closer to war, as America's involvement is a foregone conclusion should violence flare.

British power would be pitted against Iranian fervor in the early stages, with Stalin waiting in the wings for the cue that would propel the Red Army over the border in response to the Soviet-Iran pact of 1921.

The United States has no chance of keeping out once England and Russia commit armed forces to the scramble.

Thus far our efforts to mediate in the trouble zone have not been distinguished by their sagacity.

The same rigid adherence to Anglo-American unity that shackled General MacArthur in Korea has paralyzed our chance to effect a settlement satisfactory to both sides.

The time has come for a new approach, and the Hearst newspapers believe the formula is to be found in the plan advanced by J. Kingsbury Smith, European general manager for International News Service.

Mr. Smith advocates the formation of an international committee, composed of representatives from Iran, England, and countries which have received Iranian oil in the past.

This group would recognize the just rights of both Britain and Iran; it would insure the continued production of oil, so urgently needed to fuel the western world's rearmament effort.

Most of all, it would prevent prostrate Iran from falling into the yawning embrace of communism.

Prospects of a quick settlement through the United Nations are not bright, but the Smith plan at least should receive as much consideration as any other proposal.

It favors the Iranians who would still control their oil industry. It would provide needed revenue to finance their country's economic development and thus lift the living standards of a majority of the poverty-stricken population. And the funds for such a program would be made available in Iran and not be handled by politicians.

A stumbling block in any U. N. decision is that Soviet Russia still holds the power of veto. The Russians could be expected to exercise this power if only to keep the pot boiling in Iran.

Couldn't the dispute be settled outside the U. N.?

The time to act is now. Our leaders have already delayed too long. The State Department should act quickly to inject reason into a passionate dispute that could become the tinder box of world war III.

The American Government should throw its influence behind the Smith plan, a formula for peace that would forestall once and for all a super-Korea in Iran.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of
October 6, 1951]

NO BLOOD BATH OVER IRAN'S OIL

Great Britain has shown good sense in deciding to take home her oil experts from Abadan, as demanded by Iran.

By so doing she has avoided a strong possibility of getting a black eye in the United Nations, at the least. And by bowing to Iran's national pride she has made a significant, although tardy, move for peace.

For this Americans should be grateful, because it would be foolish to think we could avoid involvement in a British war to enforce her oil contract in Iran. Just as fool-

ish as to try to unscramble an egg. Having entered into the global wrestling for world power in the First World War and its natural sequel in the Second World War, no war involving any major nation could break out without affecting our interests.

While Russia could possibly stay out of open involvement in the war in Korea if it went against her interests, she could find it convenient to jump into Iran if Britain tried to defy the Persians. Not only is Russia in a good military position there, but she would be doubly armed with the moral excuse of going to the aid of a little neighbor resisting invasion.

Such a clash in Iran would bring America in up to its neck. But such a war would lack the moral reasons for all of our previous resort to arms. Such a tragedy would find us in the position of fighting to enforce a commercial contract gained by a great nation from a small, inexperienced country.

Contracts as we like to look at them are agreements of mutual interest between parties who are equal before an impartial court. Agreements involving nations, at this stage of world organization, are finally enforceable only with war.

We are sure Englishmen don't want to fight such a war.

And the Iran Government surely knows it could not win such a war. And we don't want to go to war over this issue.

It really wouldn't make any difference who quit fighting first, nobody would win that war.

This is certain, that short of war Iran has the sovereign right to change its mind about who is going to exploit her very valuable oil property.

This much is also certain, that we of the industrial west, England and America, etc., need that oil—and we can pay the best price for it. We can pay in more than gold. We can pay in food and machinery desperately needed to put Iran on its feet.

So then, without any further loss of time, let's work this whole problem out on a business and humane basis. The Hearst newspapers have started the ball rolling in proposing a new international company to do business with Iran in place of the British firm the Persians now refuse to tolerate.

Let's not turn Iran's pool into a blood bath.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of September
30, 1951]

A PLAN FOR IRAN

READERS CAN HELP PROGRAM TO SAVE PEACE

Only one thing is clear concerning the muddled oil dispute between Britain and Iran: Every day in every way we're being drawn deeper and deeper into the mess.

Britain's Socialist Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, is calling on President Truman to do all he can to help keep the British oil men in Iran.

The new American Ambassador to Iran, Loy Henderson, couldn't wait to present his credentials to the Shah before he went into conference with Premier Mossadeq over the troubles of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which is owned by the British Government.

Secretary Acheson and British Ambassador Franks went into a huddle in Washington and said that they were giving every consideration to further possible action in the crisis.

Within the last 24 hours the problem has been placed before the Security Council of the United Nations, but experience would indicate that a Russian veto or unlimited debate could prevent a solution for months.

Stalin has said nothing. But he has a treaty giving him the right to enter Iran if that country is invaded. And Stalin has many convenient ideas of what invaded means.

What with the British paratroops mobilized in the Near East, the 50 British warships in Iranian waters, the ugly temper of Iranian ultranationalists and the incitation of its Tudeh Communists, we are confronted with the hot and ready makings of a super-Korea.

To make the picture worse, Churchill has demanded that Parliament oppose any British withdrawal in Iran. Should Winnie get his old job back, he may try again to get the generous American support supplied by Mr. Roosevelt in 1940.

Ordinarily our advice would be for the United States to keep as far away as possible from this dirty squabble. But should one spark ignite a shooting war between the British and the natives and should the Russians declare themselves in—well, figure it out for yourself. While you're about it try and recall any "police actions" we've kept out of recently.

Can the explosion which seems inevitable be forestalled? Can the United States save itself blood and treasure by coming forward with an emergency solution that would resolve the deadlock?

J. Kingsbury Smith, European general manager for International News Service, spent several weeks in Tehran as the dispute neared the showdown stage. He talked with and listened to all the principals involved and wrote a penetrating analysis of the situation which was published in the Hearst newspapers at the time.

A few weeks ago Mr. Smith amplified the coverage with a report. In the report he suggested a simple plan which respected the rights of both sides in the argument and provided the basis for a peaceful settlement.

The Hearst newspapers believe that the Smith plan has solid merit and advance it at this time for the consideration of our readers.

"Main objection of the Iranian Government to an agreement with Britain is that it no longer wishes to have a British-owned company control its oil industry. The Iranians feel the British gave them a raw deal, treated them as inferior people.

"Why not create an international company to act as the operating agent for the National Oil Co. of Iran?

"The international company could be composed of representatives of Iran, Britain, and other countries which are the chief consumers of Iranian oil.

"Under such an arrangement, Iran's right to control its own oil industry would be recognized. At the same time, efficient operation of the industry and continued flow of Iranian oil to the free world would be assured.

"As part of this plan, the Iran Government might be persuaded to use its increased oil revenue to finance a program for the economic rehabilitation of the country—whose people are among the most poverty-stricken in the world.

"Such a program already exists. It was formulated by a group of American economic experts. It was adopted by a former Iranian Government. It came to nothing, however, because of lack of funds.

"With an international company handling the production and distribution of Iran's oil resources on a profit-sharing basis, the necessary funds would become available for implementation of that program.

"The Iranian Government could probably be persuaded to have the funds for the program administered by an international group of experts under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

"This would be a safeguard against corruption in the use of the funds. It would mean that the common people of Iran would be the chief beneficiaries."

If Mr. Smith's idea makes as much sense to you as it does to us, there still may be

time to force a statesmanlike American approach to the Iranian problem. Here is what you can do. Clip this editorial and mail it to your Senator at the Senate Office Building in Washington, D. C. The Senators from Wisconsin are ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH McCARTHY.

It may still not be too late to head off another Korea.

University of Illinois Students Urge Voting Age Be Lowered to 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the perplexities of our times is the large number of our people who fail to exercise their most precious right—the right to vote. It is refreshing, therefore, to find a demand among a growing number of our young people that the voting age be lowered to 18 in order that they may begin to exercise this right earlier than at present. Statutory control of voting qualifications is a State matter, of course, but it appears noteworthy to me to report a movement presently taking place at the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana to obtain legislative consideration for a proposal to lower the present age limit from 21 to 18 in the State of Illinois. Reliable figures indicate there are approximately 465,000 persons in the State between the ages of 18 to 21 who would thus become eligible to cast a ballot.

There are several persuasive reasons in favor of the change. The present limit of 21 was determined in a period when the public was without the means for obtaining with ease a general knowledge of public affairs, public issues, and candidates for public office. Greater educational opportunities and present-day newspaper, radio, and television facilities bring the problems of the day to all the people, young persons included.

Perhaps most important is the fact that the Nation has had to turn to its youth for the defense of the land twice in the first half of the present century, and at this moment is doing so for a third time. The national leadership has recognized the fact that at 18 a young man is mature enough to fight for his country. Surely he is mature enough to think for his country as well.

Another reason with some measure of weight is the fact that good government, by our standards, demands the fullest possible reflection of public sentiment at the polls. Voting, or not voting, is a habit. We recognize the fact that good habits should be developed early in life. A young person interested in meeting this primary responsibility of representative government is likely to continue that interest and continue to meet that responsibility.

The case for lowering the voting age has been well supported by an informa-

tive editorial appearing in the student newspaper, the Daily Illini, of which Garland Fritts is editor in chief. Under permission granted me in the House, I am including the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

LOWER THE VOTING AGE

Because of its great import on the subject of lowering the Illinois voting age to 18, we quote in full President George D. Stoddard's statement on the subject from a recent book.

"Now is a good time to abandon the idea that at age 21, and not before, the American citizen is entitled to full voting privileges. In the light of researches in child development and experience with in-school and out-of-school youth, voting for all persons at age 18 is clearly indicated.

"By that age, most persons have finished school and are meeting real economic and social responsibilities. Their intelligence, energy, and sense of participation adequately counterbalance the wisdom and life-experience of voting citizens in the later decades. Moreover, by voting, they might learn what voting means. Their interests, if specialized at all, would be attached to the needs and problems of youth, and that would be all to the good.

"However, no means of test, short of a legal verdict of incompetence, should be attached to the 18-year-old voter; as for the 21-year old, any such test, except by purely chronological, would lead to an unreasonable loss of suffrage. It simply could not be well administered.

"For American life in the middle of the twentieth century, to deny the franchise until age 21 is to hold back persons who are capable of assuming social and political responsibilities. There is no magic power in 20 or 19 or 18, but the last figure represents a young person further along (thanks to science, education, and democratic procedures) than the 21-year old of the preceding century."

It would be well at the outset to explain to the doubters and cynics that this campaign for a lower voting age in Illinois is no fly-by-night affair.

The idea was a long time in the making and has received top grade help from administrators and faculty members throughout the university. Students formulated the idea and went to those men for advice.

Origin for the idea cannot be claimed by any person now at the university.

Many persons have thought about this problem, particularly since the beginning of World War II. Most of them laid down their beliefs on the subject because of the great amount of legal red tape necessary for its completion.

Youth have had little contact with real red tape, and for that reason possibly, the students at this university are willing to undertake getting passage of the necessary State of Illinois constitutional amendment.

Before going any further it should be pointed out also that this campaign is not a publicity stunt of any individual.

There is a group of persons here who sincerely believe the 18-year-olds of this State ought to have the right to vote.

Persons within this group have pledged to keep individuals and organizations, as much as possible, out of the campaign for what they consider a great moral issue.

They believe this campaign is a good one and are hoping to receive the backing of the entire student and faculty body. Petitions now being circulated by the Daily Illini will give a rough indication of student sentiment.

Student senate members have suggested referring this subject to a general student referendum. We approve such a move as long as it is well handled and every student and faculty member be able to vote easily.

We include the faculty in this referendum and petitioning because its members are an integral part of this campus. No issue of such vital concern should be undertaken leaving them out of it.

Four State leaders Thursday approved the student senate resolution for lowering the age qualification on all legal questions in the State.

So far in the campaign no organized opposition has shown itself. The Daily Illini, in spite of its editorial position in favor of this idea, will continue its policy of printing both sides of every issue.

When, and if, any opposition does arise to this campaign we pledge our wholehearted cooperation and full use of the news columns for unbiased coverage.

It has never been our idea that this will be an easy task.

It was mandatory the subject be brought up now for consideration by the 1953 general assembly. It is impossible to get consideration of a topic brought up the last minute before the legislature meets.

Now the subject can be debated throughout the State and by persons involved in the coming gubernatorial election in 1952.

Another point backs the idea of bringing this topic into the light at this time. Most persons now on the campus will be able to make definite opinions on the subject.

These same students will be of age to vote when the topic comes up in the legislature. They can then influence the assembly members in the manner they believe correct.

Another advantage is that critics of the campaign cannot point to persons now at the university and say it is selfishly inspired.

We believe the 21-year-old ruling is grossly unfair. We hope to alleviate that injustice for those men and women following us.

This is a moral issue of the highest caliber.

Women have every legal right offered them in the State of Illinois when they reach the age of 18—except one—the right to vote.

Eighteen-year-old men and women are as qualified to vote for the leaders of our country and State as anyone over 21.

Although we cannot deny the existence of some younger persons not capable of voting intelligently, we do not believe the old generation can claim completely intelligent voting by all persons in its ranks.

Citizens of Illinois are given the right to make wills at the age of 18 in 1943. That was only a small beginning.

All citizens, 18 and over, should have the right to vote, sell property, buy property, and carry on in other legal practices.

We urge a university-wide referendum. We also sincerely believe in the importance and high quality of this move to lower the legal age in this State.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete accord with the proposal. I feel the State of Illinois, and other States as well, would advance the cause of representative government by considering favorably a lowering of the voting age to 18.

Appropriation Bills, Eighty-second Congress, First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report of the appropriations made

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. The following table

sets forth the amounts of estimates considered, the amounts approved by the

House and the Senate, and the amounts finally appropriated:

Appropriation bills, Eighty-second Congress, first session

Title	Estimates considered by the House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by the Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Law
Regular annual, 1952:							
Defense agencies and activities:							
Department of Defense:							
Independent agencies:	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	(1)	\$1,760,000
Secretary of Defense:	544,800,000	528,800,000	528,800,000	544,800,000	5,529,450,000	(1)	528,100,000
Department of Army:	20,798,845,700	20,113,524,200	20,113,524,200	20,798,845,700	20,025,170,000	(1)	19,888,032,030
Department of Navy:	15,737,920,000	15,843,648,000	15,843,648,000	15,737,920,000	15,844,801,000	(1)	15,877,891,000
Department of Air Force:	20,494,000,000	19,846,986,000	19,846,986,000	20,590,300,000	20,001,585,000	(1)	20,642,785,000
Total:	57,577,325,700	56,034,717,200	56,034,717,200	57,679,625,700	61,103,850,000	\$59,508,008,629	\$59,889,568,030
Independent offices:	5,770,323,000	5,190,924,875	5,172,689,875	5,770,323,000	5,215,731,470	5,215,731,470	5,177,968,970
Mutual security:	7,527,527,700	7,482,527,700	7,482,527,700	7,527,527,700	7,208,401,400	7,208,401,400	7,328,903,976
Total, Defense activities:	70,875,176,400	68,708,169,865	68,689,934,865	70,977,476,400	73,527,988,900	71,932,142,499	69,446,440,976
Nondefense agencies and activities:							
Treasury-Post Office:							
Treasury:	597,251,000	586,100,000	583,327,000	597,251,000	593,294,647	593,294,647	587,598,000
Post Office:	2,360,874,000	2,335,800,000	2,336,800,000	2,361,174,000	2,344,400,000	2,328,223,697	2,340,800,000
Total:	2,958,125,000	2,921,900,000	2,918,827,000	2,958,425,000	2,937,694,647	2,921,518,344	2,928,398,000
Labor-Federal Security:							
Labor:	231,280,000	223,506,500	223,506,500	231,280,000	223,536,801	223,042,156	222,804,944
Federal Security:	1,874,887,900	1,793,228,461	1,792,550,861	1,880,887,280	1,729,799,868	1,729,799,868	1,715,027,843
Related agencies:	626,077,500	625,547,000	625,149,000	626,077,800	575,002,366	575,002,366	574,471,488
Total:	2,732,253,700	2,642,279,961	2,641,206,361	2,744,245,700	2,528,338,831	2,527,844,386	2,512,004,270
Interior Department:	559,286,000	520,031,500	498,764,500	564,186,000	520,082,307	518,065,353	511,841,816
Independent offices:	1,067,354,465	980,832,866	971,850,450	1,067,579,465	1,006,228,150	998,468,193	984,856,205
Agriculture Department:	820,005,546	720,157,433	717,205,233	820,205,546	751,770,130	826,578,130	802,988,626
District of Columbia:	(140,513,150)	(137,776,375)	(137,776,375)	(140,546,650)	(138,407,290)	(138,407,290)	(138,216,150)
Federal Contribution:	12,000,000	12,000,000	10,800,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	11,400,000
Civil functions:	640,637,843	514,427,400	514,427,400	662,437,843	637,278,213	638,578,213	597,282,713
Legislative branch:	68,958,320	60,335,370	60,335,370	81,921,586	73,767,651	73,820,507	75,805,507
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:							
State:	283,086,476	231,432,000	226,337,000	283,086,476	205,877,838	227,877,838	228,104,861
Justice:	184,356,000	181,567,000	181,567,000	184,356,000	181,567,000	182,137,600	181,602,000
Commerce:	765,763,925	612,698,000	612,098,000	703,763,925	609,500,500	609,500,500	607,242,911
Judiciary:	26,489,740	25,918,115	25,918,115	26,489,740	25,936,865	25,936,865	25,918,115
Total:	1,258,296,141	1,051,715,115	1,046,940,115	1,258,296,141	1,022,882,263	1,045,452,863	1,042,867,887
Total, nondefense activities:	10,116,912,075	9,423,399,344	9,377,446,459	10,169,305,341	9,490,042,192	9,560,325,969	9,463,425,024
Grand total, regular annual, 1952:	80,992,088,505	78,131,569,209	78,067,381,324	81,146,781,831	83,018,031,092	81,492,468,468	78,911,866,000
Supplemental and deficiency, 1951							
Additional legislative:	806,155	831,155	831,155	806,155	831,155	831,155	831,155
Additional District of Columbia:	(34,350)	(21,250)	(21,250)	(34,350)	(21,250)	(21,250)	(21,250)
Third supplemental:	843,405,879	478,586,368	473,165,368	805,796,293	430,102,477	431,127,477	364,932,477
Fourth supplemental:	6,472,981,000	6,408,208,000	6,408,208,000	6,489,653,000	6,438,998,000	6,442,968,000	6,442,668,000
Additional legislative:		150,000	150,000		150,000		150,000
Total supplemental, 1951:	7,317,260,734	6,947,773,523	6,942,352,523	7,380,375,448	6,870,078,632	6,874,776,632	6,808,681,632
Supplemental, 1952.							
Defense agencies and activities:							
The supplemental, 1952:	2,080,095,000	1,509,225,500	1,446,985,500	2,080,095,000	1,540,235,625	1,547,521,505	1,491,136,375
Veterans' Indemnities:	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Second supplemental, 1952:	4,937,534,158	4,398,523,208	4,386,321,758	4,972,781,158	3,947,937,550	3,950,937,550	4,080,290,392
Total, defense activities:	7,017,629,158	5,907,748,708	5,833,307,258	7,052,876,158	5,493,173,175	5,503,459,055	5,586,432,767
Nondefense agencies and activities:							
Disaster relief:	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
The supplemental, 1952:	222,776,116	168,840,816	139,801,816	229,395,657	210,961,156	197,861,501	185,110,601
Flood rehabilitation:	400,000,000	53,440,000	53,440,000	400,000,000	53,440,000	53,440,000	53,440,000
Second supplemental, 1952:	106,661,412	42,036,212	42,036,212	114,735,910	68,760,716	69,260,716	66,110,716
Total, nondefense activities:	744,437,528	278,817,028	260,078,028	759,182,573	348,161,872	345,562,217	310,661,317
Grand total, supplemental, 1952:	7,762,066,686	6,186,565,736	6,093,385,286	7,812,058,731	5,841,335,047	5,849,021,272	5,906,094,084
Total appropriations during session:	96,071,405,985	91,265,908,468	91,163,119,133	96,340,166,010	95,729,446,771	94,216,286,392	91,628,641,716
RECAPITULATION							
Total, defense activities, 1952:	77,892,805,648	74,615,918,873	74,523,242,123	78,030,362,648	79,021,162,075	77,435,601,554	76,032,673,743
Total, nondefense activities, 1952:	10,861,349,603	9,792,216,372	9,637,524,487	10,928,437,914	9,538,204,064	9,605,888,206	9,785,086,341
Total annual appropriations, 1952:	88,754,155,251	84,318,134,945	84,160,766,610	88,958,790,562	88,559,366,139	87,341,489,760	84,817,960,084
Permanent appropriations, available automatically not subject to annual review, and indefinite appropriations (estimated):							6,116,000,000
Grand total appropriations, 1952:							90,933,960,084

¹ Totals by agencies not available because of general reduction by Senate not applied to individual agencies.

There has been some criticism of the Committee on Appropriations this session and its failure to effect reductions in appropriations. The newspapers have frequently referred during the past few months to the economy drive on the floor of the House revising the appropriation bills and making large reductions which

the committee should have made. The following table shows the amounts reduced by the committee before the bills were reported to the House and the further reductions made by the House. The committee effected reductions during the session of \$4,805,497,517, while this much touted economy drive on the floor suc-

ceeded in taking out only \$162,789,335 additional, only 3½ percent of the amount already taken out by the committee. In other words the committee reduced estimates 5 percent and the House effected further reductions of less than two-tenths of 1 percent.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6745

Comparison of action by Committee on Appropriations and by House

Title	Estimates considered by the House	Reductions by House Committee on Appropriations	Further reductions by the House	Estimates considered by the Senate	Total passed by Senate	Law
Regular annual, 1952						
Defense agencies and activities:						
Department of Defense						
Independent agencies	\$1,700,000			\$1,700,000	(1)	\$1,700,000
Secretary of Defense	544,800,000	- \$16,000,000		544,800,000	(1)	529,100,000
Department of Army	20,798,845,700	- 685,321,500		20,798,845,700	(1)	19,888,032,030
Department of Navy	15,737,920,000	- 194,272,000		15,737,920,000	(1)	15,877,891,000
Department of Air Force	20,494,000,000	- 647,015,000		20,596,300,000	(1)	20,642,785,000
Total	57,577,325,700	- 1,512,608,500		57,079,025,700	\$59,508,009,029	56,939,508,030
Independent offices	5,770,323,000	- 579,398,125	- \$18,235,000	5,770,323,000	5,215,731,170	5,177,068,970
Mutual security	7,527,527,790	- 15,000,000		7,527,527,790	7,308,101,100	7,328,063,976
Total, Defense activities	70,875,176,490	- 2,167,006,625	- 18,235,000	70,977,476,490	71,932,142,199	69,446,440,976
Nondefense agencies and activities:						
Treasury-Post Office						
Treasury	597,251,000	- 11,151,000	- 2,773,000	597,251,000	591,294,647	587,598,000
Post Office	2,360,874,000	- 25,374,000		2,361,174,000	2,328,223,697	2,340,800,000
Total	2,958,125,000	- 36,525,000	- 2,773,000	2,958,425,000	2,921,518,341	2,928,398,000
Labor-Federal Security:						
Labor	231,289,000	- 7,782,500		231,289,000	223,042,156	222,501,944
Federal Security	1,874,887,200	- 81,660,700	- 675,600	1,886,887,200	1,729,790,865	1,715,027,843
Related agencies	620,077,500	- 530,500	- 398,000	620,077,500	575,002,365	571,471,483
Total	2,726,253,700	- 89,973,700	- 1,073,600	2,744,253,700	2,527,844,386	2,512,004,270
Interior-Department						
Independent offices	559,286,000	- 39,251,500	- 23,267,000	561,186,000	518,065,153	511,841,816
Agriculture-Department	1,067,351,165	- 80,501,900	- 9,002,085	1,067,579,165	986,468,193	984,850,205
District of Columbia	820,065,546	- 99,848,113	- 2,862,200	820,265,516	826,578,150	802,988,626
Federal contribution	(140,513,150)	(2,736,775)		(140,586,650)	(138,107,290)	(138,216,150)
Civil functions	12,000,000		- 1,200,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	11,400,000
Legislative branch	610,637,813	- 126,210,143		612,137,813	678,578,213	597,262,713
State	68,953,320	- 8,617,950		81,921,586	73,820,507	73,805,507
State-Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary						
State	283,686,476	- 72,254,476	- 5,075,000	283,686,476	227,877,838	228,104,801
Justice	181,356,000	- 2,689,000	- 100,000	181,356,000	182,137,600	181,602,000
Commerce	763,763,925	- 151,065,925	- 600,000	763,763,925	609,500,500	607,242,911
Judiciary	26,480,740	- 571,625		26,480,740	25,916,865	25,918,115
Total	1,258,206,141	- 209,581,025	- 5,775,000	1,258,206,141	1,015,452,863	1,042,867,887
Total, nondefense activities	10,116,912,075	- 693,512,731	- 45,952,885	10,169,305,341	9,560,325,989	9,465,125,024
Grand total, regular annual, 1952	80,992,088,565	- 2,860,519,356	- 64,187,885	81,116,781,831	81,492,468,188	78,911,566,000
Supplemental and deficiency, 1951:						
Additional legislative	806,155	+ 25,000		806,155	831,155	831,155
Additional District of Columbia	(11,350)	(- 13,100)		(31,350)	(21,250)	(21,250)
Third supplemental	813,166,579	- 364,877,211	- 5,421,000	895,769,293	431,127,177	394,032,477
Fourth supplemental	6,472,981,000	- 1,775,000		6,489,653,000	6,442,608,000	6,442,608,000
Additional legislative		+ 150,000		150,000		150,000
Total supplemental, 1951	7,317,250,734	- 369,477,211	- 5,421,000	7,386,375,448	6,871,776,642	6,808,581,632
Supplemental, 1952						
Defense agencies and activities:						
The supplemental, 1952	2,080,095,000	- 570,860,500	- 62,240,000	2,080,095,000	1,547,521,505	1,491,136,375
Veterans' indemnities	(5,000,000)			(5,000,000)		(5,000,000)
Second supplemental, 1952	4,917,534,158	- 510,010,950	- 12,201,450	4,972,781,158	3,950,937,550	4,090,296,302
Total defense activities	7,017,629,158	- 1,080,871,450	- 74,441,450	7,052,870,158	5,503,459,055	5,580,432,767
Nondefense agencies and activities:						
Disaster relief	15,000,000		+ 10,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
The supplemental, 1952	222,776,116	- 51,135,300	- 28,739,000	222,806,657	197,861,501	185,110,601
Flood rehabilitation	400,000,000	- 346,560,000		400,000,000	53,430,000	53,410,000
Second supplemental, 1952	106,694,412	- 64,625,200		111,735,916	60,260,716	56,110,716
Total, nondefense activities	714,476,528	- 465,620,500	- 18,739,000	759,132,573	345,562,217	319,661,317
Grand total, supplemental, 1952	7,762,066,686	- 1,575,500,950	- 93,180,450	7,812,008,731	5,849,021,272	5,906,094,084
Total appropriations	96,071,405,885	- 4,805,197,517	- 162,789,335	96,345,186,010	94,216,266,392	91,626,511,716

¹ Totals by agencies not available because of general reduction by Senate not applied to individual agencies.

In closing the appropriation records for the session, it is hardly necessary to call attention to the untoward effect of the discontinuance of the consolidated bill. It is too obvious to be overlooked.

The single package appropriation bill was attacked on two major grounds:

First. It delayed appropriation bills beyond the beginning of the fiscal year and they could be handled much more rapidly as individual bills.

Second. Greater economies could be effected through the individual bill approach because of the greater attention which could be given to details.

The record of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress proves the fallacy of both of these arguments. In fact

it is conclusively demonstrated by the record of action on appropriation measures this year that just the reverse is true on both counts.

As to the delay here is the record: For the fiscal year 1951: Conference report on the general appropriation bill, making provision for all agencies, agreed to on August 28.

For fiscal year 1952: First conference report agreed to on August 9. In all, five bills agreed to by August 20. Remainder of bills not agreed to until month of October, the last being on October 20.

It is obvious that the charge of delay does not hold water. The earliest bills enacted were only a few days ahead of

the date of the single package bill and the others were so much delayed as to greatly embarrass the agencies involved, including the State, Commerce, Justice, and Defense Departments.

As to the question of greater economies here is the record:

For fiscal year 1951: Single package bill, total reduction below estimates. 6 percent. Total reduction on other than Department of Defense items. 9.2 percent.

For fiscal year 1952: Individual bills, total reduction below estimates on regular annual bills: 2.7 percent. Total reduction on other than Department of Defense items. 6.3 percent.

The figures speak for themselves.

While the consolidated procedure would have made it possible for the House to pass all regular supply bills before the Easter holidays—with the exception of the military bills which had to be delayed pending receipt of estimates—we were not able to take final action on the last of the annual appropriations until after the expiration of more than a quarter of the fiscal year 1952. Never has there been such delay and confusion and attendant waste as there has been this year. No business can be operated successfully or economically when its programs and policies are held in suspense over a quarter of the new year, and the Federal Government is no exception to the rule.

It could not have come at a more unfortunate time. Seldom has there been such need for prompt and expeditious action on the money bills as at the present session. The President in his budget message of January 15 handed the Congress a pay-as-you-go budget. The excess of projected expenditure from past appropriations and the new appropriation requests were to be met by added revenue. Congress was expected to preserve the pay-as-you-go principle, whether by following the budget recommendations or by reciprocal adjustments between expenditures and additional revenues. To determine the minimum of additional revenue which would have to be raised in order to balance the budget, it was necessary to know with reasonable accuracy how much the Congress might be expected to pare projected expenditures. The only method by which this could be effected was through the procedure of the omnibus bill. As it was, no one knew what the relation of the various departmental expenditures would be to each other and no one could tell definitely the total amount of expenditures until the last week of the session. And the tax bill, which should have been predicated on the amount of revenue needed to cover current expenditures, and which should have been passed early in the session to provide the needed revenues, was not disposed of until the middle of October.

Every major nation in the world, every State in the Union, and every metropolitan city in America uses the consolidated procedure. Why should the United States Congress be the only exception in continuing the use of the quill pen and the horse-and-buggy methods of the last century?

Flood Relief and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which I have addressed to certain

newspapers carrying erroneous reports of proceedings in the Committee on Appropriations and in the House:

EDITOR, KANSAS CITY TIMES:

The suggestion in news columns and editorials that I have opposed aid and insurance programs and other measures for flood control is absurd. My district, at the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, receives every drop of water that passes Kansas City and added water from tributaries in between.

The next morning after the news of the flood came I got through a resolution providing \$25,000,000 for immediate relief. Just as soon as Colonel Howse provided the data I appointed a special committee to draft a report and the House passed the bill in record time. It did not include indemnities or insurance for the simple reason that 85 percent of the Members of the House and Senate would not vote for either.

I gave a luncheon in order to get the Congressmen from Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma together and organize support for the program while the hearings were in progress. No other attempt was made to organize support for the program. At this meeting, with all newspapermen present, I stated unequivocally that I was for the whole program, including aid and insurance and urged cooperation of the three delegations as no other State was directly interested. The AP telegraphed this to all its correspondents and yet newspapers reported that I was against the program and was delaying the bill. I was for the program and there was not 1 minute's delay in the committee or the Congress. Colonel Howse was responsible for the delay as the printed hearings clearly show. All members of the three State delegations were favorable and cooperated but the bill that was passed was the best we could get. And the Senate passed it without changing a line or a word.

The charge that I am against the engineers is even more ridiculous. Any work in the nature of flood control must be done by the engineers. There is no other agency. But they have not completed the plans and told us they would not have the definite project report ready until next year. In the meantime they say they can spend any amount of money we give them. Of course they can. But how will they spend it? They testified before our committee only a month or two ago that the regular routine is to complete the definite project report before asking for construction money. Even after the definite project report was completed they had to move the Gavins Point Dam 8 miles from its original location. And after they had the definite project report and had completed the Wappapello Dam on the St. Francis River and had assured everybody that it would control all floods for all time to come, the area supposed to be protected by the dam suffered the worst flood in its history. The people in my district have been holding mass meetings at the county courthouse and all over the inundated area calling attention to the work done on the river for the last 70 years and insisting that the floods grow more destructive every year, that the more money the Government spends the less protection they get.

Even with the most careful planning the engineers have made ghastly mistakes. We cannot afford to make mistakes this time. Too many people and too much property and vast Government appropriations are involved and we must not take any more chances on incomplete or inefficient planning.

I enclose printed copies of the hearings and report.

CLARENCE CANNON.

Stamps for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an editorial from the August 4 New York Times:

STAMPS FOR PEACE

The handsome new stamps soon to be issued by the United Nations are something more than just a philatelist's delight. They are symbols of what could be, what may well come to be, the greatest mechanism for peace this broken world has ever known. One of the stamps bears the words "United Nations" in Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish, the five official languages of the United Nations. The Russians at least are with us in name. Perhaps they will be with us in spirit some day. Another stamp says "Peace, Justice, Security." The first of these is what the United Nations forces are trying to achieve in Korea and will go on trying to achieve wherever it is necessary. And from peace will flow justice and security, without which there is no true peace. The stamps are symbols, as are all stamps of all countries. Let us hope that these stamps will never become obsolete curiosities, like the stamps of once-free Czechoslovakia, once-free Poland. Let us hope they will be symbols of a living force for peace in the world.

Address of Hon. Charles H. Silver at Exercises Marking Donation of Clothing by Nurses of Beth Israel Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me special pleasure to include as a part of my remarks under leave of the House the address made by my friend, Charles H. Silver, president, Beth Israel Hospital, New York City, when the Korean Ambassador was welcomed and was presented with a sizable donation of clothing by the nurses of this hospital.

I should like to make clear my own strong feeling that democracy, as a way of life and not as a dogma, is at the international crossroads of its existence in the government of man.

If we are to meet totalitarian competition in the market place of ideas, we must show by deeds and not by words alone that the color of a man's skin, the gods he worships, the economy he endures, the politics he suffers, make no difference to our ideas of justice through law.

When the underpaid nurses of a great charitable hospital can find the means of donating to the far-away Koreans, it is time for the rest of us to bring our own actions in line, whether it involves grain to India, integration of the fire-fighting

forces of the District of Columbia, or taking care of our own disinherited

REMARKS OF CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BETH ISRAEL HOSPITAL, IN NEW YORK CITY GREETING KOREAN AMBASSADOR Y C YANG, AT SPECIAL CEREMONIES IN THE HOSPITAL, ON SEPTEMBER 21, 1951

It is with a feeling of great pride that I welcome you, Dr. Yang, to these special exercises where the nurses of Beth Israel Hospital have contributed large quantities of clothing for the brave people of the Republic of Korea. It is my hope that other institutions of this kind will do their share in this great humanitarian campaign in the United States to bring some measure of material aid and comfort to those who have suffered such terrible blows from the invaders who would enslave ultimately the men, women, and children of all liberty-loving nations.

The Republic of Korea is one of the vitally important bastions of democracy. Upon its soil men have fought and are now fighting so that human dignity will not be destroyed. They have been men of all races and creeds but in fighting for a common cause they have stood shoulder to shoulder as comrades in a spirit of brotherhood, engaged in a great task for the benefit of free men everywhere.

It is of more than passing interest that the clothing should be given at a ceremony where the nurses at Beth Israel Hospital are capped. These young women are not only doing wonderful work from a technical and medical standpoint but they constantly maintain a spirit of understanding and compassion toward their patients.

And so today in sending clothing to the people of Korea they are projecting a similar spirit of understanding and compassion to those who have not yielded and will not yield to the invaders who would take away from them their priceless freedom.

This clothing is a symbol of our deep devotion to all people in all countries who are fighting against communism. It is our duty—and I include every one of us—to contribute generously to the campaign which is now in progress and which has for its goal 20,000,000 pounds of clothing before the advance of another bitter Korean winter. We have read of the heroism of the Koreans and we also know how the armies of the Allied forces have fought, and are now fighting tenaciously, under the most trying conditions to stop the aggressors.

I want to assure you, Dr. Yang, that all of us at Beth Israel Hospital, administrators, members of the board of trustees, doctors, and nurses will not stop in our efforts as individuals and collectively to give clothing for the hard-pressed people of your country. For us, this will be a continuing drive until the aggressor has been hurled back and the Republic of Korea is put on a solid foundation as a sovereign nation.

And now, my friends, before presenting His Excellency Dr. Yang, I would like to read to you part of a proclamation issued by President Truman August 31. The President said in his proclamation:

"Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby set aside and proclaim the month of September 1951, as a special period of intensive effort during the course of which, as an additional sincere and tangible gesture of American friendship and sympathy, the clothing collection appeal of American Relief for Korea, Inc., may receive the utmost support of all Americans. I call upon our citizens, our schools, our churches, and all our civic and patriotic organizations to respond promptly and bountifully to the appeals of American Relief for Korea, Inc., and its associated agencies, for clothing and kindred supplies for the people of Korea."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now my privilege and pleasure to present His Excellency Dr. Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States.

Oil and Gas Possibilities in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the pinch of war and related defense activities on the Nation's supplies of oil and natural gas will undoubtedly stimulate new prospecting and exploratory development in areas not now producing oil and gas.

In my judgment the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama has very great possibilities in this field, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article recently prepared at my request by Miss Erin Woodall, of the Economics Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The article follows:

GAS AND OIL POTENTIALITIES OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

With the exception of Blount County and possibly the eastern half of Cullman County, the Seventh Congressional District is considered to be an important potential oil- and gas-producing area. Its importance is surpassed only by the southwestern section of Alabama which includes the Gilbertown Field now producing oil commercially. The discovery of oil in the Gilbertown Field, Choctaw County, on February 17, 1944, stimulated a geophysical and drilling program which indicates that Alabama is destined to become a major oil-producing State in the near future. The gas and oil possibilities of Alabama have been studied by various noted geologists since 1911, but much subsurface geology remained unknown until lately. These resources can now be interpreted and appraised with some measure of confidence. According to the State geologist, Dr. Walter B. Jones, more than half the area of the State is considered to be possible gas and oil territory.¹

The major portion of the Seventh Congressional District lies in the Warrior Coal Basin and in the west includes areas where the coal measures lie underneath the upper cretaceous rocks. Structures seem to be fairly common throughout this territory although most of them have not been tested. In addition, areas of similar structure elsewhere in the Appalachians have had good oil and gas production, and there does not appear to be any reason why this region should not also be productive.

Geologic studies as early as 1911 predicted good possibilities of gas and oil pools in the Warrior Coal Basin.² The northern part of Fayette County, western part of Walker County, the eastern part of Lamar County, all or at least the southern part of Marion County, and the western part of Winston County were thought to contain areas where all the structural conditions necessary to the occurrence of oil and gas were present.³ This view has been upheld by later geologic studies. A report on oil and gas in Alabama by Dr. D. R. Semmes excluded only Pickens

and Blount Counties from the probable area for gas and oil.⁴

One of the most striking indications of oil in the northwest section of Alabama is the "showing" of asphalt in the Hartselle sandstone and in the Gasper and Bethel formations, where these outcrop along the northern margins. The asphalt is the residue left from evaporation of crude oil at the outcrop. Therefore, there is good reason to believe that some oil was trapped in structures to the south.

In addition, to these surface indications, almost every well drilled in this region has showed good gas and oil potentialities. There was commercial production of gas in the Fayette gas field in 1912-14. The gas production of this field was not too great, but the reservoirs were depleted early because of the inadequate technique of drilling, finishing off, and producing wells at that time. It is thought that with modern equipment and operating skill several other wells in this region could have been producers. Other evidences of gas and oil were found from drilling within the limits of the Warrior Coal Basin during this period. Oil-saturated sands were discovered at Atwood in Franklin County and Hamilton in Marion County.⁵

More recent exploratory wells within the boundaries of the Seventh Congressional District seem to sustain the promising predictions of the geologists. In December 1944, Glenn D. Rose began drilling operations on a structure located between Manchester, Walker County, and Poplar Springs, Winston County. The first well struck gas, was acidized to increase its productivity, and tested at about 750,000 cubic feet of gas per day. Two other wells were begun on this same structure, both of which had good evidence of gas and oil in limestone, but neither were finished before Mr. Rose abandoned the project in 1947. It is believed that both of these wells could have finished off as commercial producers.⁶ Neither of the wells appears to be on top of the structure which has a northwest-southeast trend.

A well was brought in on February 20, 1950, about 4 miles southwest of Hamilton, Marion County, by Harry L. Cullet. This well was treated with 600 quarts of nitroglycerine before its capacity was tested. The potential capacity of this gasser is calculated at about 2,000,000 cubic feet per day. Several good oil shows were encountered both above and below the gas horizon so that it seems probable that the field may produce both gas and oil. The oil found in the higher formation was black, heavy (19.5 API) crude oil. Mr. Cullet plans to drill further in this area.

The latest drilling operations have been undertaken in the Cedar Creek Valley, Franklin County. The drilling has been done on the largest known structure in the county. The first well struck a good gas horizon before water was encountered which destroyed that site. Further drilling is being done and plans for commercial production and distribution of the gas is contemplated.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama comprises a very promising oil and gas region in the State. The predictions of potential gas and oil production in this area are based on geophysical evidence as well as actual testing by exploratory drilling of wells. Geological studies show that the land formations in many parts of this region have all the necessary characteristics. This area greatly resembles productive areas elsewhere in the Appalachians and there are phenomena present that normally accompany gas and oil, which include asphalt beds, tar

¹ Geological Survey of Alabama, Oil and Gas in Alabama, by D. R. Semmes, special report 15, 1927, p. 37-38.

² Jones, Walter B., op. cit., p. 28.

³ Geological Survey of Alabama, Concerning Oil and Gas in Alabama, by Eugene A. Smith, Circular No. 3, 1917, p. 8.

⁴ Jones, Walter B., op. cit., p. 28.

¹ Jones, Walter B., Alabama's Promising Oil and Gas Possibilities, the Oil Forum, January 1950, p. 27.

² Geological Survey of Alabama, Reconnaissance Report on the Fayette Gas Field by M. J. Munn, Bulletin No. 10, 1911, p. 63.

³ Ibid., pp. 64-65.

springs, bituminous sandstones, and bituminous limestones. A continuing drilling program gives further proof of the presence of gas and oil in this area. Only further drilling can show how extensive these hidden reservoirs of gas and oil are.

Does Congress Really Want Private Medical Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herewith an article in the magazine *America* in the issue of October 20, 1951:

Does Congress Really Want Private Medical Schools?

In a mysterious maneuver, the Senate on October 4 defeated, 42-23, the so-called Pastore amendment to S 337 and then sent it back to committee.

S 337 is a bill to bolster health education through Federal aid (*America* October 6, p. 1, where "\$1,000" should have read "\$2,000"). There is rather general agreement on the need for Federal assistance. The Nation's medical schools alone require something like \$40,000,000 (beyond tuition) merely to survive. Their costs have gone sky high because of inflation and constant improvements in expensive techniques.

A good index of the impossibility of getting any such sum from private sources is the experience of the National Fund for Medical Education, of which Herbert Hoover is chairman. The national fund, aiming at a total of \$5,000,000 with which to assist medical schools, has collected only about \$1,000,000 in nearly 2 years. Mr. Hoover and his colleagues agree that a very large part of the money needed must come from public funds. They support Federal aid.

Thirty-five of our seventy-nine medical schools already rely on State aid and local taxes. The 44 private, nonprofit institutions constitute the chief problem. Some of them enjoy relatively large endowments. The fact remains that three-quarters of them have been running into serious deficits. Their plight is worsening. Private gifts, because of high taxes, are dwindling. Costs, meanwhile, are skyrocketing.

It is generally agreed, moreover, that the rate at which we have been producing physicians, dentists, and nurses is below par. The Nation faces serious shortages in health personnel. In some places the shortages are already acute. The needs of the armed services and of civil defense will probably create very severe vacuums in health facilities. How soon they will appear no one can predict.

This dual problem—the financial undernourishment of present institutions and the need of increased personnel—should have been tackled right after the war. It got bogged down in the controversy over compulsory health insurance. In the spring of 1949 the Senate drew up a special bill to grant \$500 per student (less than one-fourth of the cost) to medical schools to help cover operational expenses, a bonus of \$500 per student for enlarged enrollments, and \$5,000,000 a year for capital expansion. (The bill made provision, at lower figures per student, for dental and nursing schools.) With bipartisan support and the approval of the health-education professions—including the American Medical Association—the bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote.

Although amended to meet objections, it raised a storm in the House. On June 19, 1950, after the AMA had turned against it, the bill was defeated in committee by one vote.

In February of this year, S 337—amended to satisfy the criticisms of 18 professional associations, including those of American medical and dental schools, and the Catholic Hospital Association—received preliminary bipartisan approval in the Senate. Then, late last month, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare made a radical change. It lowered the grant per medical student to \$200 and increased the bonus for increased enrollments to \$2,000 per student.

This Russell-Kerr amendment was adopted to please southern Senators, who felt the great need in the South was for larger enrollments. When Senator Pastore introduced it 2 weeks ago, enough southern Democrats and northern Republicans (still professing allegiance to the "principle" of Federal aid) raised serious objections to this and that provision to overwhelm the little band of proponents.

Are those who can always find some reason for defeating this bill serious about trying to save private medical, dental, and nursing schools? Aren't they the same Senators who profess to be alarmed at government control? Their inaction on S. 337 helps undermine the one chance private health institutions have of surviving. State-supported schools will survive and grow and multiply because they already are government controlled. If that is what the Senators want, why don't they say so instead of pretending to be so concerned about private enterprise in the field of health?

The American Farmer Should Have the Benefits of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Under the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard many statements on every side of the proposition of whether we should amend Federal law so as to allow the publication of names and addresses of persons receiving monthly old-age assistance allowances, which are largely paid for by the Federal Government, under the old-age assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

It seems to me that by far a more pressing question is whether or not we will extend the old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, so as to cover the one large group of our population not now covered by any retirement system. I refer, of course, to the farmers of this country. There is no good reason why we cannot amend the Social Security Act to cover farm owners and farm tenants.

Through the years we have provided various old-age security programs for segments of our population. The Federal Social Security Act, with the amendments to the law by the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, now covers practically all our industrial and commercial workers. It is estimated that

nearly 50,000,000 workers are now covered by this system. The civil-service retirement system covers practically all Federal employees. Many of those not covered by mandate of this law have the privilege of electing to become covered by it. The various States, counties, and towns have retirement systems covering their employees. Those that did not have their own systems were permitted by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 to come into the Federal Social Security System. Some professions, such as the teaching profession, have separate retirement systems. Railroad employees have their retirement system under the Federal Railroad Retirement Act. Many private corporations have a retirement system for their employees. Some of the larger of these systems are found in the coal, steel, and auto industries. Members of the Armed Forces are covered by their own retirement system. Veterans of our wars, who are 65 years of age, and whose income is not above \$1,000 if single, or \$2,500, if married, are entitled to a Federal pension of \$60 per month. Some church organizations provide for pension systems for their aged clergymen.

It is true, of course, that farm wage laborers, some 2,000,000 of them in this country, are now covered by the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, but this leaves several million farmers, owners, and tenants who are covered by no old-age retirement or security system other than the meager benefits provided by the old-age-assistance plans of the various States.

I believe that farmers want to be covered by the Federal Social Security Act. I believe that they should be covered by this system. To do so would greatly lower the amounts necessary to be spent for their care in a near-destitute old age under the old-age-assistance system.

The cost of the old-age-assistance system is largely borne by the Federal Government. Present laws provide that the Federal Government will put up \$15 when matched by \$5 by one of the States. Thereafter the Federal Government matches with the States, dollar for dollar, up to a total assistance benefit of \$50 per month. Unfortunately, however, many of the States of the Union cannot, or have not, matched available Federal funds, and so we find persons drawing old-age assistance in Alabama, for instance, being paid approximately \$20 per month, \$15 of this by the Federal Government and \$5 by the State. Under this kind of system, the needy old people of the poor States are discriminated against because their States cannot match available Federal funds.

The only long-range solution to this problem that I see is to bring those persons not now covered by the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act under that coverage.

There is no valid reason why they should not be covered by the system. There is no reason why practically every gainfully employed person in America should not be covered by a retirement system which he contributes to as he works from year to year.

According to the 1950 census, the Seventh Congressional District of Ala-

bama, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, has more than 34,000 farm families, which families account for approximately 63 percent of all the people of the district. Only a few of these people, those who happen to work on farms for wages or salaries, are presently covered by the old-age and survivors insurance system.

Even though the farmer is not covered by old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act, he must help pay for the benefits for those who are covered. When he buys a tractor, a truck, a car, a washing machine, a refrigerator, a shirt, pair of overalls, he pays an additional amount, because the workers who manufacture these products are all covered by the social-security system, and, naturally, the taxes which those workers and their employers pay for coverage under the system, is passed on to the farmer as an additional cost of the article which he buys.

We must no longer delay to bring the farmers of America under coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system of the Social Security Act.

On August 23, I introduced a bill, H. R. 5279, to extend the old-age and survivors insurance system to the farmers of America. This bill is now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. I hope the bill will have early consideration.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a statement written by E. J. Niederfrank, extension rural sociologist, United States Department of Agriculture, and originally published in June 1949:

FARM PEOPLE AND SOCIAL SECURITY CONTENTS

Security is a universal hope.
Security programs are not new.
Farm people are among the least protected.
The fundamental question.
Some farm people participate in social insurance.
Farm people already pay now.
Other questions.
What the proposed social insurance means to farm people in costs and benefits.

MEANING AND BACKGROUND

Security is a universal hope, not merely a pension or program. Let us look at the term broadly. Farm people, like all other people, hope for security. It is an objective of their strivings and desires just as it is of industrial workers and other nonfarm people. Most rural people want to have a good home and a happy community life. They want to bring up their children well and educate them; they want to have good health; they want to earn enough to provide a comfortable living and some savings for retirement and for giving their children a start in life. Furthermore, these things have always been among the main hopes and ambitions of rural people, and they still are. For farmers the fulfillment of these hopes depends basically on successful farming and satisfactory prices.

But illness and poor health, accidents and resulting disability, death, and other emergencies frequently prevent the accomplishment of these goals; then there is the period of old age itself usually accompanied by reduced earning capacity. Farm people of today want freedom from these insecurities; this also was the hope of farmers of yesterday.

In grandfather's time rural people handled these insecurities and met the problem of retirement in various ways. For example:

Some held their level of living low throughout life in order to save enough for old age and emergencies.

Some let disease and other health needs go uncared for.

Some continued hard work in old age, thereby shortening life.

Some lived on meager savings with a consequent lowering of their level of living.

Some lived with their children or other relatives or friends.

Some turned to their church or a fraternal organization.

Some had to turn to the county poor farm as a last resort, and often had to accept pauper status to do so.

But times have changed. The changes that have taken place have made former sources of security inadequate or harder to provide, and also have created more insecurity. Today families are smaller, there are fewer children to share the responsibility of caring for parents. Young families find it more difficult to accept this responsibility because the cash costs of their living have increased, they have smaller homes, and because now there is little work that older people can do around the home to increase family resources. These factors have increased the desire of young families to live by themselves; more also desire to be free from being tied down by care of old people. Institutional care has also become more and more insufficient and costly, owing to the increase in the number of old people and to the higher standard of care demanded. Old-fashioned neighborliness has lost ground, because families move more often, make contacts over wider areas or larger communities, and have less dependence upon one another.

The rapid developments toward commercialized and mechanized production in agriculture since 1920 have affected the hopes and securities of farm people. They must have more capital to get started in farming and need more ready cash to meet farming and living costs. Farm returns are more dependent upon prices and demand at harvest time because perishable produce constitutes a larger proportion of the total than formerly. Economic depressions may sharply decrease or completely wipe out a lifetime's savings—the farmer's traditional security for old age. Employment on farms for farm laborers is less steady, and it is harder for them to save, too. Because of all these changes, the issues and problems of security and insecurity of those engaged in agricultural production are more and more like those of industrial workers and others who are an integral part of the national economy.

Improved health services and practices in urban areas have led rural people, quite rightfully, to desire higher standards of medical care than they can have individually. They need such care both for numerous disabling accidents and for illnesses. Accidents that disable farm people are numerous—more numerous today than ever before because of the increased mechanization of farming and because farmers travel more. The most recent data of the National Safety Council indicate that 1,800,000 injuries by accident occurred to farm residents in 1947, or about 67 per 1,000 farm population. From sample surveys made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, it was estimated that \$36,000,000 was spent for medical attention because of accidents alone, not including fatalities and total permanent disabilities. And illness is even more important. The BAE estimated from surveys made in 1948, that farm people lost in 1947, 80,000,000 man-days because of illness, compared to about 17,500,000 man-days because of accidents.

Security programs are not new: Over a period of years, private and public groups and agencies have tried many methods of pro-

viding protection from the insecurities of life. The purchase of individual and group life insurance has spread enormously, and accident and sickness insurance companies have had phenomenal growth. Many people have joined hospitalization insurance plans and other cooperative health plans. A very limited amount of insurance providing cash benefits for permanent and total disability is written by several companies. Only persons who can meet several strict qualifying conditions can ordinarily obtain such insurance. The development of State workmen's compensation protecting workers against some of the costs of injury while on the job began many years ago. Many industrial concerns have profit-sharing plans and pension or annuity plans for their employees. Special groups of workers, through their unions and other efforts, have brought pressure for the establishment of disability funds, welfare funds, and retirement pensions. Other organizations have set up retirement funds for some or all of their members, for example, the pension funds of some church bodies provide for aged clergymen and their widows. Some local and State governments, and the Federal Government have set up retirement systems for their career employees. Many educational institutions have done likewise. The idea of insurance, pensions, and bonuses, for war veterans has been increasingly stressed through the years. Noncontributory or public-supported State old-age pensions were initiated some time ago. In 1935, the broad social-security program of the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, was inaugurated. It concludes unemployment compensation, public-supported old-age assistance or relief, self-contributing retirement and survivors insurance, and other benefits for special dependent groups.

All these developments have been undertaken to provide a basic minimum of security that will stabilize the conditions of life in old age, unemployment, illness and disability, premature death, and other insecurities. Some of these programs have met the security needs of many people, others have not worked so well. Certain large elements of the population, such as farm people, have been left out or do not participate in these programs to the same extent as do other groups. Nevertheless, the existence of these programs shows that people have been concerned about security for a long time and have tried in various ways to obtain it. The ways they have tried are in line with the good, old American way of providing it for themselves.

TABLE 1—Life insurance per capita in United States, 1946

State:	Amount per capita
Alabama.....	\$180
Arizona.....	600
Arkansas.....	420
California.....	1,070
Colorado.....	1,220
Connecticut.....	1,630
Delaware.....	1,920
District of Columbia.....	1,920
Florida.....	910
Georgia.....	850
Idaho.....	730
Illinois.....	1,610
Indiana.....	1,180
Iowa.....	980
Kansas.....	890
Kentucky.....	720
Louisiana.....	650
Maine.....	920
Maryland.....	1,330
Massachusetts.....	1,430
Michigan.....	1,210
Minnesota.....	1,090
Mississippi.....	380
Missouri.....	1,220
Montana.....	940
Nebraska.....	1,020
Nevada.....	800
New Hampshire.....	1,180

State:	Amount per capita
New Jersey.....	\$1,820
New Mexico.....	520
New York.....	1,850
North Carolina.....	760
North Dakota.....	660
Ohio.....	1,440
Oklahoma.....	700
Oregon.....	790
Pennsylvania.....	1,510
Rhode Island.....	1,530
South Carolina.....	780
South Dakota.....	670
Tennessee.....	770
Texas.....	860
Utah.....	980
Vermont.....	1,060
Virginia.....	940
Washington.....	910
West Virginia.....	830
Wisconsin.....	1,160
Wyoming.....	780

Average United States total... 1,200

Sources: Spectator Year Book and Institute of Life Insurance

Farm people are among the least protected by various private and public security programs. Take life insurance, for example: Only 55 percent of the farm families in the United States have one or more owners of life insurance, as compared with 90 percent of the families in business and the professions, 87 percent of the families of clerical, skilled, and semiskilled workers, and 71 percent of the families of unskilled workers. Table 1 shows that people in agricultural States have the lowest amount of life insurance per person. Even among farmers with life insurance few have retirement annuities.

Group hospitalization insurance plans also reach relatively fewer families in rural areas than in the cities. Very few farmers and farm workers have sickness or disability insurance or workmen's compensation protection against work-connected accidents and illnesses. The programs for special groups, furthermore, such as the welfare funds of labor unions, and the retirement plans of industries and organizations, include few farm families. The only farm families that benefit from these programs are those of part-time farmers who work under such plans long enough to obtain benefits. Most important of all, farm operators and farm laborers are not included in the self-contributory old-age and survivors' insurance program established under the Social Security Act of 1935.

But all needy people, including farmers and farm workers, are eligible for old-age assistance or relief payments under the Social Security Act. The main difference between these two programs is that the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance program, for which farm people are not eligible, are paid from an insurance fund accumulated from social security premiums paid by the employees and employers in the industries and firms covered by this act. Benefits are paid to all insured workers when they stop work after age 65, regardless of how much rent or other income they receive from investments. On the other hand, the old-age assistance or relief program, which is the program available to needy farm people, is not paid for from specific funds contributed by the recipients themselves, but from State and Federal funds raised by general taxes. In other words, the first program pays its own way. The people who benefit have paid into an insurance fund in advance. Under the latter program the people who benefit must qualify for grants by meeting a needs test under their State law, and the money comes from public funds. The amount of the monthly relief or assistance payments under this latter program varies from State to State. In some States the

public assistance or relief payments are very meager, frequently not even providing for minimum needs; in other States the assistance program is being expanded to provide a regular, substantial payment to all needy aged persons. A minimum income of \$75 a month is the standard of the State that has the most liberal provision.

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

New attention is being given social security. The term "social security" is now customarily used to denote the Federal and Federal-State programs inaugurated by the Social Security Act of 1935, although as mentioned before, the idea of security itself is much older. This act is now up for legislative discussion and revision. The basic current question of concern to farm people is: Should farm people—farmers and farm laborers—be covered under the retirement and survivors' insurance program?

But the fundamental question regarding social security for farm people is not simply the question of protection or no protection for farm people, for they are already eligible for public-supported assistance or relief as mentioned before. The main question is something far deeper. Looking at the whole idea of security, the fundamental question is: How can we maintain the maximum freedom in our economic life and also provide the desired security for the individual and his family? Does the Federal Government have a responsibility toward farm people in this regard? And if so, how is the best way? The alternative questions are: (a) Is a comprehensive social-insurance program, to provide stability or a floor of security for all people, the correct philosophy and approach? Or (b) would it be better to provide flat pensions and bonuses to special pressure groups as they demand them? Or (c) would it be better to rely on a system of giving public-supported assistance or relief payments to the needy persons.

Some say that in the long run a broad over-all, comprehensive social-insurance program, paid for by the people who benefit through general compulsory insurance premiums, would be less costly and more satisfactory. They say that this would be less hazardous to State and Federal general funds, which otherwise would be under constant pressure for special pensions, larger pensions, and other security plans. People are less likely to ask for large social-insurance benefits if they must pay for them directly than they are for pensions which are paid from general funds.

Also under a public-supported assistance and flat-pension plan the continued demands for special pensions, bonuses, and other benefits for special groups, and for larger payments, make it that much harder to supply funds for roads, schools, extension work, research, and other services which the people might like State and Federal Governments to provide. In short, the more that people, through social insurance, pay their own way for retirement and disability the less that is needed for relief, pensions, and similar payments from general Government funds. If the insurance program is widely extended, taxes for relief payments and special pensions could be considerably reduced. A minimum amount of assistance, however, would be needed to care for persons who failed to qualify for insurance benefits and for those whose benefits might not be large enough to meet their needs.

The significance of these questions is that the number of beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors' insurance program is proportionately much greater in the so-called urban States, where large numbers of people work in industries and commercial firms covered by the program, than in the States in which large percentages of people are engaged in agriculture and consequently are not under the insurance program. This means that in these agricultural States the

burden of assistance payments is proportionately greater; it will become even more so as the number of people reaching old age increases in the years ahead. In 1940 there were slightly more than 9,000,000 people aged 65 and over in the United States; by 1975 there will be 17,600,000 at these ages according to present estimates. The proportion of the total population that will be aged 65 and over, which was 68 percent in 1940, is expected to rise to nearly 11 percent by 1975. The increase in the proportion of old people will be even greater in some States. Thus, it is said that to place the future aged population under a self-contributory pay-as-you-go retirement and survivors' insurance program now would considerably lessen the cost of care for the aged to be borne by future generations.

Farm people already pay for the care of their aged and survivors: Paying for social security would not be new to farmers. They now pay the costs of old age, disability, and the care of families whose breadwinner dies. They pay through individual sacrifice for doctor bills and the support of family members in need; they pay through taxation and charity to finance public supported pension assistance, and other relief programs. They also pay part of the costs of the social insurance programs, which benefits other people, they pay in the higher cost of manufactured goods and services to the extent that social security premiums are passed on to consumers. For example, farmers who buy tractors pay part of the social security premiums of the workers who produce and distribute tractors. Farmers pay the part of these premiums that is considered an operating cost and consequently raises the price of tractors.

Other questions: Although extending coverage of old-age and survivors' insurance to farm people might be desirable, can farm people stand the cost of it? Would it be any higher than general taxes for public-supported flat pension or assistance programs? (Costs and benefits are mentioned in the next section.) Farmers under the insurance program, obviously, would need to keep a record of their income and of the wages paid hired farm workers. Most farmers already keep such records to compute their income taxes.

Also, what effect would the social insurance program have upon the ideas of thrift, individual independence, and other values which are traditionally characteristic of rural life? What would it do to one's relationship to government and his attitude about this relationship? Would these be any different for farm people than for those already covered by social insurance? Would these values and ideas be less affected, or more affected, by a self-financed insurance program than by public-supported old-age pensions, assistance, or other special relief?

Another factor to consider in analyzing the subject is that farm people are not all alike as to security resources. Among the people engaged in agriculture are well-to-do farmers, a large proportion of relatively small-scale operators, and approximately 2,000,000 hired farm laborers. Then there is the question of security equality between farm people and urban people, both as to inclusion in a program for its benefits, and as to whether farm people should not also pay for the security benefits they would receive from government, like those who are now covered or are proposed to be covered must pay for their old-age insurance benefits.

The social security insurance program does not guarantee an average level of living. Presumably, it will merely establish a minimum floor of security as a means of helping to give some stability of income and feeling of certainty for old age and times of emergency about which farm people have always been concerned. Above this floor, there would still be room for continued

family savings, for more life insurance, for farm price programs, or for other governmental, individual, or group efforts which people may wish to undertake to achieve higher levels of living or greater protection against certain insecurities.

It all comes back to a basic question: What should be the basic objectives and responsibilities of governmental cooperation in affording farm people a measure of security, and what principles should be observed in doing so? Do farmers and farm laborers want governmental social security protection of any kind at all or not? Do they need it? How many will require old-age relief or suffer from emergencies in the years ahead, if social insurance is not available to draw on then? Which social security method is best over the long pull for the farmer, for the farm laborer, for the other people already under compulsory social insurance, for the general economy, and for State and Federal Governments? To sum up, below are a few factors to consider in analyzing the subject

- 1 Upward trend in numbers of old people
- 2 Economic and social changes affecting living patterns, standards of security, and ability to attain it.
- 3 Difference among farm people as to security resources.
- 4 Less coverage of farm people by insurance and other private or public security programs
- 5 Comparative costs and benefits of different governmental social security methods to farm people, to other parts of the population, and to State and Federal funds
- 6 The self-contributory insurance principle versus public-supported assistance or relief according to degree of need or pauperism.
- 7 Effect on accepted cultural values, such as self-reliance.

All the Perfumes of Arabia Cannot Cover Our Disastrous Far Eastern Policy— The Case of Naval Lt. William H. Evans, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith some newspaper articles and editorials pertaining to the case of Naval Lt. William H. Evans, Jr., of Edgewater, Md.:

[From the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register of June 5, 1951]

NEW DEAL POWER CULT FIRMS ANOTHER OFFICER
(By Robert H. Williams)

Vindictive Truman and the pro-Communist clique behind him seem determined to stamp out the growing rebellion among military personnel against his destructive policies.

The latest of a growing list of victims is a naval lieutenant (William H. Evans, Jr., of Edgewater, Md.) who, while risking his life in Korean waters, fighting "with both hands tied" by Truman's policies, dared to protest these policies.

While it is against regulations for a military officer on active duty publicly to protest policies of the administration, this honest and loyal officer chose to violate the regula-

tion and risk the consequence because he saw that the Truman policies were merely chopping up our troops in Korea without leading us to victory (while giving Stalin and Mao Tse-tung time to train a Red Chinese air force and army).

Wrote Evans, "We are out here waiting for 'Acheson's agrarian reformers' to attempt an invasion of Formosa. Now, instead of allowing the Nationalist Chinese and the Seventh Fleet to attack the mainland to break up any such plans before they start, we have to fight with both hands tied behind our back, one hand bound by Acheson and his—gang and the other hand by the pro-Soviet United Nations."

"That pro-Soviet one-world administration of ours and our senile, ignorant Congress would rather have Americans slaughtered than attack Red China everywhere." * * * The Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson-United Nations followers in the United States should be loaded onto ships and used as shock troops in Korea, instead of America's best citizens. Americans are dying by the thousands, thanks to the pro-Red administration."

We have increasing evidence that the Frankfurter-Acheson power cult behind Truman is trying to censor all opinions and criticism even by retired and Reserve military men. The list of their victims grows: Captain Crommelin, Admiral Denfeld, General of the Armies MacArthur, his intelligence officer, Major General Willoughby, the Far East expert, Lieutenant General Wedemeyer (the last two having felt forced to resign)—and now Lieutenant Evans.

Some readers will recall that I myself was given an honorable discharge from Military Intelligence Reserve last December 21—the very day on which Anna Rosenberg was confirmed by the Senate as Assistant Secretary of Defense after I had published part of Mrs. Rosenberg's long Communist-aiding record.

At that time I pointed out in the Santa Ana Register that my discharge served notice on all military personnel—active, retired, and Reserve—that they might be disciplined if they dared to expose subversion in the administration.

I quoted a new regulation in the uniform code applying to the military, which provided punishment for any active or retired person who used "contemptuous words against the President, Vice President, Congress, Secretary of Defense, or a Secretary of a Department, a Governor or a legislature of any State, Territory, or other possession of the United States in which he is on duty or present."

It seemed to me then (last February) that this new provision was aimed specifically at General MacArthur, to keep him from telling what he knew, should he retire. His removal was not then foreseen. The manner in which he was removed and his importance and the issues at stake gave him an official hearing before Congress, where he was exempt from the above regulation.

I do not think the new regulation will silence men with MacArthur's courage and integrity, men who have bowed their necks against the New Deal and its Communist backers. But I have received letters from some high-ranking retired officers revealing that the administration is threatening them for public statements they have made against Truman's Communist-inspired policies.

It looks highly doubtful that the power cult can stop the growing resentment at its subversive policies. A storm of protest is gathering and it may break with a great deal of force over the White House, the State Department, and the Department of Defense, if the administration does not soon adopt policies which may give us the initiative in the cold war and a clear chance for victory in Korea.

[From the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel of June 2, 1951]

ARE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PUPPETS FOR
WASHINGTON?

(By Junius B. Wood)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—"I took an oath to defend my country against all enemies. I put duty to my country above that to any individual."

That is what the young Navy lieutenant (junior grade) told Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy. Three days later, May 28, his commission was revoked and he was discharged from the service. The order specified that the discharge was honorable, possibly in deference to the constitutional questions involved.

The career of one American in only one step above the lowest commission grade may be a small incident in the fortunes of several million men and women in our armed services. It also may be overshadowed, certainly in the public furor, by the similar forced retirement of a five-star general, Douglas MacArthur. However, the parallel cases put a question squarely before the American people: "Are the services of public employees, civil or military, for the people or are they exclusively for transitory elected and appointed officials?"

This young man, William H. Evans, Jr., who now has retired to civilian life at Edgewater, Md., is a graduate of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, class of 1948. After less than a year's active service he resigned to go into the Naval Reserve and to take post-graduate studies at the University of Maryland. He specialized in political economy, a particularly live subject since our involvement in global affairs, but banned in military circles unless the high ranking military conversationist has reached Ambassador or Cabinet level. In December 1950, he had returned to the service and was assigned to the U. S. S. *Rogers*, a 2,200-ton picket destroyer, off the coast of Korea.

Relaxing from his duties as assistant navigation officer on March 16, Lieutenant Evans wrote to Alfred Kohlberg, of New York City. Kohlberg, an old China hand, is the extremely active head of the American-China Policy Association. Evans said his letter could be made public and, 2 weeks later, copies were going out to the association's extensive mailing list, also to newspapers who received it with gusto.

Evans did not say much which others have not said without being kicked into outer darkness. He had some pertinent suggestions on the long delayed and now being considered Japanese peace treaty—give the Kurile and Sakhalin Islands to Japan instead of to the Soviets, not assess an indemnity as the United States would pay it in the end and other features debated by the United Nations.

He also made pungent comment on the dubious success of the late President Roosevelt and the present President Truman at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, the policies of Secretary of State Acheson and his predecessors. It was an excellent demonstration of too much knowledge being a dangerous thing, especially for anybody in uniform.

Evans, now a civilian, held a well-attended press conference, Thursday, a novelty for one of his modest rank in Washington teeming with admirals, top-flight generals, and fancy titles. He is a stocky blue-eyed lad with a crew haircut. His only Navy regalia were white shirt and tan shoes. To please the clamoring photographers, he placed the Navy uniform cap and service-ribboned jacket into a suitcase—"Good-by to Uncle Sam." He told his story simply and without heroics.

The official lightning was slow in striking as the radio message to report in Tokyo was not received until April 25. He was ordered to Susono, Japan, the following week, where

a hearing was held. He was the defendant but on the last day, his status was changed to witness. From there he was sent to Washington for a board of inquiry which started on May 11.

Both inquiries, also Secretary Matthews in the later audience, emphasized that he was not being tried for the content of the letter but for violating regulations in making it public. Navy general order No. 16, specifies that anything for publication must go through the chain of command while Operation Navy No 37-50, a confidential order to officers, specifies that anything relating to diplomacy must be cleared through the State Department and to military through the Defense Department. Evans insists he was not shown the latter order until after the inquiry started, a month after he wrote the letter. Obviously the letter never would have seen the light of day if it had gone through channels.

Despite the insistence that he was bounced only for violating regulations, the order of Secretary Matthews says: "Revocation of commission and discharge from the United States Naval Reserve under honorable conditions. . . . This action is taken by reason of your action in addressing and mailing a letter which contained highly intemperate criticism of the foreign policy of the United States and impugned the motives and good faith of officials in the highest levels responsible for the formulation and implementation of that policy. Your action in this respect is considered to have constituted unsatisfactory performance of duty in that it had a foreseeable tendency to promote disunity and disaffection among other persons in and outside the Armed Forces, rather than singleness of aims and purpose in an hour of national peril. Your action was in violation of a directive of the Chief of Naval Operations, requiring advance clearance of statements concerning foreign policy by members of the naval service. Moreover, the contemptuous words used in your letter with reference to the present and a previous incumbent in the office of President of the United States, and to the present Secretary of State, constitute grave misconduct on the part of an officer of the naval service."

The order's theatrical fears of possible mutiny as a result of a humble officer's letter and his reference to our hour of national peril contradict the official explanation that Korea casualties are only a police action and that runaway inflation is not a peril.

But it is a summary warning to other letter writers in uniform. The American public is to learn of its sacrifice and fate only through sugar-coated press releases of high-level officials.

[From the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch of June 3, 1951]

IT TOOK GUTS TO SPEAK UP

That young naval officer, William H. Evans, Jr., who has just been fired for criticizing the Russiavelt Acheson betrayal of the American people deserves a medal. Of course he won't get one—medals aren't handed out to officers who have been sacked. Nevertheless, young Evans has rendered a brave service to his country just as much as if he had performed some feat of valor in battle. It really takes guts for a junior officer to protest the betrayal of his country under the circumstances in which Lieutenant Evans spoke up. Had young Evans observed a fellow serviceman turn traitor in battle he would be justified in protesting the betrayal. The betrayals he has called attention to are just as real. Regardless of Navy Department rules I, and I am sure millions of other Americans, can understand how he couldn't stand to remain quiet about the betrayal he knew took place at

the Yalta conference on the part of Franklin Russiavelt, Alger Hiss, etc., as well as about the betrayal in Korea by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the other rascals, who have been satisfied to let American boys die rather than cut off war supplies going to Red China from our so-called United Nations allies; the refusal to use Chiang Kai-shek troops to save American lives, etc.

Lieutenant Evans said some things that all Americans should think about. For instance, "Americans in Korea are not afraid of the enemy in front of them. They are afraid of the enemy behind." Also, "Damn the United Nations, long live the United States."

The Evans blast at the United Nations recalls what a Congressman named Wood, from Idaho, said in Congress not long ago: "We should never have joined the United Nations. It was conceived in iniquity and born in sin, with Alger Hiss the midwife."

We need more young men like ex-Lieutenant Evans to keep America safe. We need also to hear from more young servicemen such as he. Along with calling in the top brass to testify regarding the MacArthur ouster, the congressional investigators should call in young men from the ranks—the young men who have been doing the actual fighting and the dying. The investigators wouldn't have to call on boys still serving in the Army or Navy or Marines. Those lads might not talk up as bravely as did Lieutenant Evans, for fear of being punished. They could call on the disabled veterans of the Korean war—lads who have been blinded or who have lost their limbs, lads who have had their hands and feet burned off or frozen off. Those boys could give their opinions freely because their injuries have put them out of the service, and out of the reach of Dean Acheson, George Marshall, and their assistants.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of June 4, 1951]

THE EVANS LETTER SPEAKS VOLUMES

The letter written by Lt. William H. Evans, of the United States Navy, to Alfred Kohlberg, chairman of the board of the China Policy Association, brought to light in the Senate hearings, is a damning indictment of the Truman administration's policy in the Far East.

The great point in this Evans letter is that patriotic, conscientious men in the military service feel as he does.

Evans claims that a large percentage of the men fighting in the Far East share his feelings, and the assertion of the Navy Department that a poll of his shipmates did not substantiate that fact does not disprove his claim. In a Government poll of servicemen, opponents of Government policy are likely to be wary, and they have ample reason to be, as the crack down on Lieutenant Evans proves.

The fact is that Evans' letter is not an isolated incident. Many similar letters have been sent home to parents and friends by GI's in Korea. This newspaper has received several of these letters. Illicit firing by the Government will not cure this situation. Such measures only will intensify dissatisfaction among servicemen by deepening the sense of injustice. And do not forget that these are the men who must do our fighting, and that their morale, which is based on the justice of their cause and the way it is being handled, is supremely important.

The firing of Evans is just one more example of the attempt by the Truman administration to cover up its bungling and incompetence by the tactic of suppression employed so ruthlessly by Stalin, and which was used so flagrantly by Truman in the firing of MacArthur. This tactic will not heal the bleeding ulcer that is eating at the heart of our national morale. Healing can come

only by restoring the confidence of our people in Government policy by putting that policy in the hands of men of demonstrated competence.

Make no mistake about it. This Evans affair reaches further than disciplinary action in the military forces. It strikes at the very heart of our national security. It shows clearly that there is something seriously wrong in Washington that must be corrected before it completes our destruction. The boys in the field are sensing this fact.

And the situation has an even more sinister meaning. This suppression of the traditional American right of free speech in the military services that is going on today to silence criticism of Government incompetence accentuates an immediate danger. Today the members of the military services are silenced. Tomorrow it will be the press for publishing criticism. The next day the ban will be clamped on every American. Then the Hitlerian gag will reign in America.

Don't say that this is farfetched. It isn't. It can happen here, and it is happening. The American people must rise in righteous indignation and demand that the present bungling, dictatorial incompetence end.

How Late Do You Think It Is?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tenn.:

How Late Do You Think It Is?

(Baccalaureate address at Ripon College, Ripon, Wis., June 8, 1951, by Walter R. Courtenay, D. D., pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn.)

My message to you today cannot be classified as a sermon. Dealing as it does with the contemporary American scene, it must be more than a sermon. Let us then call it a sermon—address, a sermon because it seeks to honor God and serve the welfare of this Nation, an address because it deals with matters of Government and business. As a matter of fact, my message must begin as if I were a Republican seeking support in 1952, but I hope it ends where it ought to end, namely, on the major note of spirituality.

Let it further be said that I speak to you as a Jeffersonian Democrat. Not a New Dealer, if you please, and certainly not an admirer of Mr. Truman or the Fair Deal state. As a Jeffersonian Democrat I have no national party to represent me. The Democratic Party as it exists today would be roundly condemned and excoriated by such men as Jefferson and Jackson. The ethical stooping down which characterizes so much of the politics of our era, the lowering of standards, the Roman-circus atmosphere which surrounds Washington, bode little good for the perpetuation of the greatness of this Nation. Like millions of other Americans I am a man without a party, a man worried by the antics of leaders who are often profane in both speech and intent; worried, too, by the moral decline of America which strangely coincides with the history of the present administration. Its example in the realm of divorce and broken homes, its close association with big-time bossism and crime, its waste of public funds, its dis-

tortion of truth, its distribution of favors to racketeers and unworthy enterprises, its duplicity in foreign policy, its use of official Government agencies for propaganda purposes, its sale of special privileges in return for customer support, can only nauseate those citizens north and south who would honor God and would live constructively for the well-being of the State.

I am a Christian minister, but I am also an American citizen. My citizenship must be directed and empowered by my faith, and my faith must elevate my concept of what citizenship means. Always and everywhere I must live, not now as clergyman and now as citizen, but always as Christian citizen, whether I walk the streets of America or speak from platform or pulpit.

There are those who feel that I ought to confine my interests to the activities of the Hitites and Jebusites who lived some 3,000 years ago, or at least to the events which occurred in the state of Palestine in the first century. But I would remind them that my moral responsibilities do not fall in those eras of history. I live in the year 1951, and my responsibilities are here.

With these things in mind I would say three things to you this day:

1. It is late.
2. It is later than many Americans realize.
3. I pray God that it is not too late.

IT IS LATE

I do not know how you read the calendar or clock, but to me the hour of our history is late. When I compare the opening century of our history with the history we have recorded in the last two decades I believe it is late. When I compare the leadership we have been getting with men like Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Webster, and Hamilton, I know that it is late. When I remember that the founding fathers and their supporting citizens fought a war to be rid of big Government—that they created a Constitution to prevent big Government's return to this country—and then mark the course of events which make big Government inevitable, the hour seems very late. Through the processes of indifference on the part of some, neglect of duty on the part of others, and the direct intent of many, Washington grows in its power over us. It now threatens to be the brains and the blood of all activities, so much so that no hand can move or foot stride or voice speak except it be directed and empowered by those elected to serve, but who legislate to enslave.

When I further ponder the fact that we are more and more controlled by minority groups, directed and controlled by persons who were appointed but not elected; when I realize that bureaucracy has become so inflated that national inflation is inevitable, I look at the clock of destiny, and I am afraid.

When a congressional committee can threaten the right of free speech without stirring up a wave of national protest, we ought all to be afraid. In a country where stealing becomes legal simply because it is the government that steals; where the five percenters roam the halls of influence like ambassadors from royal courts, where crime is investigated outside of government, but not too deeply in government, where RFC disclosures give America the flavor of an overripe barnyard, where men like Hiss and Vaughan, Mungon and Dawson, and hundreds whose names are known but not yet challenged, flaunt their freedom to abuse all rules of decency and decorum, who is safe from fear? When a nation sells its friends down the river as we sold both China and Korea, and where we have done so much by way of connivance to increase the power of Russia in the world; when ex-captains of artillery whose record is average can dismiss five-star generals whose record is excellent;

when we are compelled to face peace-shattering events with our national ranks split because we lack adequate leadership; when we spend billions on preparedness without ever getting preparedness, and other billions on our so-called foreign friends who are about as honest and fair as a Yalta agreement, and who may or may not stand with us in the hour of crisis, the hour of this Nation is late.

IT IS LATER THAN MANY AMERICANS REALIZE

If I were to characterize my position on matters of church and state I would call myself a progressive-conservative. I am all for holding fast to the principles and values that have proven their worth across the history of America and of mankind. I would strengthen and perpetuate the kind of thinking and living which add moral and ethical fiber to both individual and nation. But I would do more. I would seek new ways of doing old things better, creating new paths of progress, and opening new doors of opportunity. With one hand I would hold fast to that which is good, and with the other I would reach for better tomorrows.

We have little to fear from the so-called conservatives of America. At least we know they are Americans who love America. There is no question about their loyalty and intentions. Nor need we fear the honest liberal. The liberal spirit has always been, and always ought to be, part of this Nation's life. We must have those who strive to cut away the walks of the unknown and the untried, creating thereby avenues of new advance. Progress is the result of the interplay of the conservative and liberal thoughts and manners of men, and it is good.

But there are three groups we ought to fear.

1. The radicals, the persons who are not true liberals. The liberal tinkers with things with a view to correcting mistakes and improving the procedure or product. But the radical does not tinker—he destroys. He feels that he must crush everything that is, no matter what the cost in terms of blood and tears, and begin anew.

It is right here that I would pause to say that while socialism comes by ballots and communism comes by bullets, we can vote ourselves—yes, and spend ourselves—out of business as a free enterprise, a democratic Nation. The radical Socialist is as dangerous to us, nay, more dangerous than the radical Communist. We must watch both, and must match in cleverness their schemes.

2. The do-gooders. These are the people who intentionally or unintentionally close their eyes to the lessons of history and of human nature. They dream of Utopia, concentrating on how heavenly life would be if we were free from sickness and poverty, fear and folly, selfishness, and avarice, and all the traits and strains that weaken us as individuals and as corporate groups. Seeing only the ideal, and ignoring the real, the practical, the down-to-earth ingredients with which we work, they seek legislation and propound social schemes which can never work because they are contrary to our natures and contrary to the earth as it now constituted. If we could drain from the minds and hearts of men the poison that sickens our race, leaving only the lovely and the lovable, such schemes would work; but as matters now stand their schemes become wasteful of resources, both natural and human, and the fiber of our people declines in quality.

Much of the legislation of recent years stems from the do-gooders who dream or from the politicians who do not believe in dreams, but who see in utopianism an opportunity to capitalize on man's inherent envy, avarice, selfishness, and lethargy. Hence, the efficient are made the pawns of the inefficient, and the superior are penalized be-

cause they are superior. Thus, legislation becomes narcotic, acting like a drug in the people who are needled with government dope until they become government-addicts, people who cannot live without the dope, and who have no will power to resist it. They lose personal security, the courage and confidence of standing on their own feet, using body, brain, and heart to face and conquer life. They become victims of government, made socially secure by law, but at the same time made creatures of fear, fearing to live as free men and to do the work of free creatures.

I personally fear the do-gooders of our day more than I fear either the liberal or the radical. The gimme-boys of America have increased amazingly in recent years. Whereas the Statue of Liberty stands with hands of dignity, hands that hold high the light and gesture benevolently toward all God-fearing men, the hands of many of our people and leaders are the hands of the beggar who holds no light, and whose intent is the robbing of fellow citizens. By their hands ye shall know them.

3. The promoters of the welfare state: Nothing declares the lateness of the hour more than the rapid, frightening strides we have taken toward state socialism, the advocating and implementing of laws that would further rob us of personal security and make us the duped victims of big government. I stand belligerently opposed to socialized education, socialized medicine, socialized agriculture, socialized business, socialized labor, and the creation, through Federal aid, of a set of mind that negates the laws of thrift and teaches a man to let George and Harry do for him what he ought to have manhood enough to want to do for himself.

The time has come in America when we must either return to a truer form of Americanism or lose ourselves in the quicksands of the Socialist state. While resenting and resisting those areas of free enterprise wherein good morality is not practiced, I stand wholeheartedly behind the principles inherent in our historic system, the system which produced modern America, the only system that works for the welfare of all the people. The germs of socialism are already here. We cannot go on living half Socialist and half free enterprise any more than we could exist half slave and half free. We must now either sicken into the state of health endured by the British or revive and return to the strength, courage, faith, and fearlessness of the America we used to know.

Here I pause to lay special emphasis on several points that further indicate the lateness of the hour.

1. Our search for happiness. In spite of history and literature, men still believe that there must be some place in the world where they can be free from the worries and hurts of life. But there is no such place. It has always been, and still is, a phantom island.

Happiness is not something we get by seeking. It is a byproduct of a way of thinking and living. It is a state of mind which produces a state of life. Men confuse it with what they call pleasure. Pleasure may or may not lead to happiness. It may destroy happiness. It may so drug us that happiness becomes impossible for us. One can have pleasures without getting happiness. One can have happiness apart from so-called pleasures. Until we know the difference between the two we have small chance of finding the contentment and peace that passes understanding.

2. Our search for security: The world is filled with people today who believe that life can be made secure, protected against the forces that jeopardize well-being and happiness from the cradle to the grave. We talk in terms of social security, health security, happiness security, security from want and fear, but history will repeat her lesson:

There is no way of making life secure. The only security worth having is spiritual security, the security of self, the security that comes from one's loyalty to the best he knows, and to the God who seeks to love us into greatness. There will never be money enough, health enough, brains enough, happiness enough to make it possible for all men to have an equal amount. The wealthy are still heirs to sickness and worry, the price of sin and the cost of living. No man and no government can guarantee security to any of us. Only God can make us secure, and even He is limited to a world beyond this world. Aids to animal security governments can—and sometimes ought to—give, but true security comes from a proper rapport between man and God.

One thing I am grateful for: I am glad our forefathers on the Atlantic seaboard did not live under the legislation and philosophy which characterize our day and generation. If they had, they would have remained right there until the Federal Government had built roads across the mountains and prairies, bridged all rivers, created ferries for all lakes, all the way to the Pacific. They would not have moved a foot until all Indians had been shut up in reservations, all buffalo properly corralled, all lands divided into farms, the fields cleared of trees and stumps, the farms fenced in, and buildings erected. And even then I doubt that they would have taken a chance unless the Government had handed to each family cash for outfitting, maintenance, expenses from home to destination, a deed to the property with all taxes paid for 20 years, and a tidy subsidy to protect them against all losses or to permit them to make a good living while they fished, hunted, snoozed, and boozed.

That is not how America was born and reared, and unless there is an end to the legislation that bottle feeds this Nation of adult people, encouraging us to remain infants through all our days, the future of our Nation is shadowed and shortened. Under modern ideas, America will become like a dairy farm wherein we are all well pastured, well housed, well fed, and well milked.

3. Our search for equality. Here is an island that modern man loves dearly, but let me assure you that it is a phantom island. It has no real existence.

I have no patience with the idea. I do not believe in equality, for the simple reason that I do not believe God does. In creating the universe He made some stars large and others small, some bright and others dull. In creating the earth He did not make lakes and rivers to measure the same in surface or in depth. The mountains know nothing of equality, in fact, the contours of the earth demand another pattern. I find no equality in cattle, horses, or sheep, or equality among grains or sunset glories. Horses and men run races on the basis of inequality rather than of equality.

Look at your own graduating class. Are you equal in grades? Is something wrong because 5 percent of you received 100 percent of the top grades given? Is it unfair and unjust to give some of you B, others C, and the rest a mongrel mingling of lower grades? How shall we make those who lack leadership the equal of those who have developed it? How can we give to you whose knowledge is limited the education of those whose knowledge is large? How can we make you equal to one another?

As I read the record of the natural and the human worlds, inequality seems the rule.

Let me add this other thought: The superiority of the few must not be used as a weapon against those less well endowed, but neither must the inferiority of the many become handcuffs on the creative few. Let us make our peace with inequality, each using his endowment for the security of self and society, remembering that we are

one in flesh and nature, even though unequal in many things.

I have often thought of the story of the man from Illinois who visited Louisiana during the heyday of the Kingfish. A colored man enthusiastically described the program: the Kingfish was going to confiscate all money and all property and then divide the wealth of the State into portions so that every citizen would get an equal amount. The visitor responded by saying, "Uncle, but look here; if you divided all the wealth equally on Monday morning don't you know that by Saturday night 15 percent of the people would again own 85 percent of the wealth?" To which the colored man replied, "Sure, I know that, but I thought the Kingfish was going to divide it up every Saturday night."

I never play golf with the boys who believe in equality, and when any that I do play with begin picking balls out of the rough and putting them near my ball on the fairway, or lifting the wee pellets from the sand traps and putting them on the green near mine (when I am fortunate enough to be there), saying, "We have just as much right to be out here as you have," well, right then and there we stop playing golf.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is late, very late, and later than many Americans realize.

IS IT TOO LATE?

The major question we must consider is not either of those with which I have dealt, but this one: Is it too late? Is there yet time for us to do something about the trends of decline? Can we stem them and start a movement that will prove constructive in America and the world?

Many believe that this is the twenty-fifth hour, the hour beyond our saving. Others tell us that we are now in the twilight zone of the senescent age and that nothing can save us from the destiny of darkness that lies ahead. They point beyond the hour and the age to a new dawn when a remnant of faithful men and women will take up the task of rebuilding a broken world. They say the hour is very late. But how late is it?

Two things are essential if we are to win the battle of the century, our war against socialism and communism. These two essentials are the faith that builds righteousness into life and the courage that bids men do right regardless of personal consequences.

MacArthur was right when he declared that the basic problem of modern life is theological, meaning by the phrase that if modern life lacks spiritual dimensions nothing can save it from decay and death. It is the hand reaching for God and goodness that has always kept the world standing upright. Whenever we stop reaching for God and goodness our moral bodies slump, and the power of gravity pulls us earthward.

A bridge that is built in contradiction of the laws of the Universe will not stand. The Universe will shake it down. A life, either of a person or of a nation, which is not shaped and anchored according to the laws of the Universe will also fail. There is in this world a force that is determined to pull everything down that is not built in obedience to the higher laws of the spirit and of God's purposes. Call morality and ethics old-fashioned if you will; ridicule the pure and the straight if you care to; but face up to the fact that moral decline always robs the person and the nation of the power to stand upright, and without uprightness there is no tomorrow worth our craving.

The prophets and the Christ still haunt us. The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount echo even in this generation of strident sounds. The higher paths of achievement and righteousness remain untrodden save by those few who are lured to the heights by the vistas of grandeur or the need for a place of improved perspective. Until more of us are willing to pay the

price of climbing higher, as long as most of us are satisfied with the paths in, or just above, the valley floor, how can we build into modern life the stuff of God which fills out our flabby frames and makes us people of divine worth and strength?

We need religion that is religious, that purifies our motives and our loves, that makes us gloriously dissatisfied with ordinary attainments and procedures, a dissatisfaction that makes us restless until we rest in God and express our faith in ways of goodness.

But we also need the courage that commands us to do right regardless of personal consequences.

I do not know how you define courage, but to me it does not mean the absence of fear. We all need our fears. Proper fear teaches us caution, makes us safety-minded, forcing us to be considerate of the welfare of others. It is only neurotic fear, unfounded fear, that we need fear.

I would define a courageous person as one who does what he has to do in spite of personal danger. Every brave man has his moments of cowardice, even as every coward has his moments of courage, but the brave man is courageous in most instances, while the coward is cowardly in most instances.

One definition of a Christian might well be this: A Christian is a coward who is made courageous by faith in Christ. His companionship, His approval of the right, His demand that Christians prove themselves worthy of His love, makes men and women strong when they otherwise would be weak, winners when otherwise they would miserably fail.

There is no substitute for courage. With it love, faith, loyalty, citizenship, and religious excellence become possible. Without it there can be no humanity worthy of the name, and no divinity worthy of our desire. Men who lack courage are never real men.

I have always liked the reply given by a coast-guard officer to an enlisted man when the young fellow complained that the waves were too high and the wind too strong to permit them to run out to a stricken ship and return. Here are the words of the officer: "What you say may be true. We may or may not make the ship, and if we go we may not get back. But you see, we don't have to come back, but we do have to go."

I am only one person in the midst of millions, and at times I feel impotent and alone. But this I can do, I can strengthen my life until it becomes a strong link in the chain of God that would anchor America and the world to the things that really matter; I can keep abreast of the trends of my day, speaking and voting against those who would cut us loose from common sense and the Christian standard, setting us adrift in socialistic or communistic seas which can only mean our wrecking. I can hold aloft a higher way of life for all, challenging men to be men, God's men, to seek personal security in terms of character, and to fight and die as brave men ought.

Given a steady increase of citizens who have the faith that builds righteousness into life and the courage to do the right regardless of personal consequences, the future of America is assured. It is not too late, not if we are doing what each one ought to do for God and country.

In 1864, when the War Between the States was at its height, letters poured into the White House calling President Lincoln's attention to the fact that the moral life of America was in danger. Citizens all over the North called on the President to do something about it. One suggestion was this: Choose a verse of Scripture and stamp it into the coins of the realm. Both Mr. Lincoln and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Chase, thought well of the idea—but which verse? It was decided to use the middle verse of the Bible. An Army chaplain disclosed that the

middle verse was the eighth verse of the one hundred and eighteenth psalm, which reads: "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man." When Mr. Chase complained that the verse was too long, Mr. Lincoln shortened it to read: "In God we trust."

But this verse was born out of a great experience in the life of the psalmist. Let me give you a Courtenay imaginative translation of the fifth verse, the one which gave birth to the words, "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man":

"I was in a deep gorge. The precipitous walls were all about me. The path beneath my feet was steep and slippery, and there was only a tiny wisp of heaven blue above my head. As I walked that steep and slippery path I prayed to the Lord for guidance and strength, and as I walked and prayed I suddenly found myself in the open countryside."

There you have a picture of our present situation. The precipitous walls we all know. The path so steep and slippery is beneath our feet. The tiny wisp of heaven blue is high above our heads. Our situation is not enviable. But what shall we do about it?

Is it too late? Not if we are willing to walk and pray, not if we fasten our gaze on the wisp of heaven blue above our heads, not if we keep going in the right direction, not if we are willing to discipline life and make it creatively obedient to God.

Hear the words again. "I was in a deep gorge with precipitous walls all about me. The path beneath my feet was steep and slippery, and there was only a tiny wisp of heaven blue above my head. As I walked that steep and slippery path I prayed, and as I prayed and walked, I suddenly found myself out of the gorge and at liberty in the open countryside."

Ladies and gentlemen, that is both our situation and our solution. There is no other, and you can and should do something about it. You, and only you, can answer the brutal question. Is it too late?

The Strategy of Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an article in the September 1951 issue of the *Freeman* entitled "The Strategy of Defeat," by Suzanne La Follette:

THE STRATEGY OF DEFEAT

(By Suzanne La Follette)

Senator JOE MCCARTHY has been frequently and not always fairly attacked for his commando tactics in the rough and tumble of debate on the issue of Communist influence in our Federal Government. But when he makes a full-dress speech in the Senate it is likely to be well documented and worth reading. That was true of his speech of March 30, 1950, which, if the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were as widely read as it should be, might have spared him a great deal of unmerited abuse. It is even more so of the recent 70,000-word speech on Gen. George C. Marshall (RECORD, June 14, 1951), in which he dared to lay iconoclastic hands on one of the most revered idols of the administration and the press, a man who, as William Hard once remarked of President Wilson, is "suffering from premature canon-

ization." To be sure, the gilt was cracking, thanks to Marshall's dubious role in the MacArthur affair; yet the aura of sainthood was still blinding enough that the speech was contemptuously dismissed by most of the ambassadors of the press in Washington. It is perhaps the most widely condemned and least read speech of recent years. But it will find readers. Not long after these words appear in print it will be published in book form by Devin-Adair. Line forms on the right.

The task MCCARTHY set himself was to find out if possible who had been responsible for Marshall's influence on the conduct of World War II, his role at Yalta, and his disastrous policy in China. That he did not succeed in doing, but he came up with an analysis of Marshall's record, documented from sources in the main not unfriendly to Churchill, Stimson, Leahy, Deane, Chennault, Hu'll, Mark Clark, Sherwood, and Hanson Baldwin, to name a few—which makes the question one of vital interest in view of Marshall's present powerful position. For this array of evidence reveals a frightening thing: that the political and military policy stubbornly pursued by the man who was Chief of Staff throughout the war, who was able to impose his iron will on the aged Stimson, who had the willing support of the mercurial, irresponsible Roosevelt (eager propitiator of Stalin) and later of the ignorant and incompetent Truman, the man chiefly responsible for the betrayal of China—this man's policy has consistently ignored the interests of the United States and paralleled those of Stalin.

One must bear in mind that Marshall acted against the background of a powerful pro-Soviet propaganda in which almost the whole American press (and the administration itself) participated. When he echoed the Soviet demand for a second front in Europe as early as 1942, he was expressing a sentiment shared not only by our Communists and fellow travelers but by many eager and ill-informed Americans. Yet this hardly explains or excuses his insistence on a cross-channel invasion—"the only way," said Churchill, "in which we could possibly lose this war"—even after the British and Mark Clark (at that time commanding American forces in Britain) had persuaded Roosevelt and Admiral King that it could end only in disaster. Neither does it excuse his wanting Roosevelt to threaten the British that if they refused his demand, this country would withdraw from Europe and busy itself with the far-eastern war, or his cabling Churchill shortly before the north African invasion that the American Joint Chiefs considered that operation too hazardous—this after he had insisted upon throwing unseasoned troops against Hitler's formidable channel fortifications and a German Army of more than a million men. It must be remarked here that Stalin, for obvious reasons, was opposed to any allied action in the Mediterranean.

Churchill and Stalin, says General Deane, were thinking at Tehran of their relative positions in the postwar world, whereas Roosevelt was thinking only of winning the war. But MCCARTHY cites an American estimate of the postwar world. It had appeared at the first Quebec Conference in the custody of Harry Hopkins; and Sherwood in "Roosevelt and Hopkins," describes it as "a very high-level United States military strategic estimate" which had an important influence on American policy. In brief it declared that, with Germany crushed, Russia would dominate Europe after the war, with "tremendous military forces." To be sure, Britain was building up a position in the Mediterranean, but might not be able to oppose Russia there "unless she is otherwise supported." (MCCARTHY shows that Marshall was so stubbornly opposed to any action in the Mediterranean that at Malta he threatened to resign if the British continued

to press for any further undertaking in that theater. Unfortunately his bluff was not called.)

What conclusions would you think were drawn from this estimate? That the United States and Great Britain should employ their decisive military might to prevent Stalin from getting a foothold in the Mediterranean, the Balkans, Central Europe? That the United States should confine Soviet lend-lease—without which, as Stalin once admitted, Russia could not have won its war—to the minimum requirements for victory? That instead of creating a power vacuum in Germany through the fatal policy of unconditional surrender, the Western Allies should attempt to drive a wedge between the Nazis and the German people and encourage Hitler's overthrow by elements with which they could treat? You would be wrong. The obvious conclusion was that policy of appeasement which to this day vitiates our resistance to Soviet imperialism.

"Since Russia is the decisive factor in the war [sic], she must be given every assistance and every effort must be made to obtain her friendship. Likewise, since without question she will dominate Europe on the defeat of the Axis, it is even more essential to develop and maintain the most friendly relations with Russia."

The final recommendation urges the importance of persuading Russia to enter the far-eastern war.

Do you recognize the documentation of Roosevelt's calamitous "great design"? Do you see why Mark Clark's Italian campaign, designed to lead into the Balkans, was rendered meaningless because Stalin for obvious reasons insisted at Tehran (with the support of Marshall and Roosevelt) that Clark's best troops be used for an invasion of southern France, as if the pursuit of Kesselring's retreating army to the Balkans and the heart of Europe would not have provided an offensive from two converging directions? Do you see why Eisenhower halted the victorious armies of Montgomery and Patton, thus permitting Russia to take Berlin and Prague? Do you see the betrayal of Mihailovich and the Polish patriots and the grim forecast of Chiang's betrayal at Yalta? Do you see why the proposal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in January of this year, that we really fight the Chinese Communists, died on Marshall's desk? It is all there in that incredible document which only 5 months ago guided Marshall and Acheson in the unprecedented action of removing General MacArthur because he wanted to win the Korean war.

Chiang Kai-shek was not invited to Yalta, and we need hardly wonder in view of what was in preparation, Stalin, MCCARTHY shows, had three times expressed his intention to enter the far-eastern war—to Harriman, Huxley, and Hull. It would probably have taken force to keep him out, for the war involved his designs on China. Yet Harriman and Deane had been sent to sound him out on terms, and naturally he made them steep—the recognition of all the old czarist imperialist claims. It was not hard to persuade Roosevelt, the liberals around him had convinced him that old-fashioned imperialism such as that of Britain in Hong Kong and India was bad, but the new Communist imperialism good—MCCARTHY brings out that he had offered Dairen to Stalin even as early as Tehran.

But it is Marshall's behavior at Yalta which was most remarkable. So bent was he on having Russia in the Japanese war that he presented Roosevelt with false intelligence estimates of Japanese strength and concealed the peace feelers which Japan was already sending out. The "master of global strategy" was planning another invasion, this time of the Japanese islands, in spite of the opinions of Leahy, MacArthur, and Nimitz that Japan had already been defeated by sea and air power and no invasion would be

necessary. He even insisted at Potsdam on bribing Russia into the war, after the atom bomb had been successfully tested at Alamogordo.

McCARTHY suggests that Marshall went to China in the winter of 1945 to see that the Yalta agreement was carried out. If so an excess of zeal must have overtaken him, for his services to the Communists went far beyond the terms of Yalta. Both before he went and after his return he told Admiral Leahy, who "thought he was wrong both times," that he was going to force Chiang to come to terms with the Communists, who had resumed their operations against the Chinese Republic, or get along without American aid. Marshall's tough attitude was in all probability conditioned by the pro-Communist stand of Gen. Joseph Stilwell, whom he had recalled on Chiang's demand but only after "direct and positive orders" from Roosevelt. And here the whole pro-Communist State Department crowd enters the picture—the men who surrounded and influenced Stilwell in China, as they influenced Acheson in America—beginning with Stilwell's adviser John Paton Davies, devoted friend of the Soviet agent Agnes Smedley.

Marshall's "deadly blows" at free China during this mission were four, according to McCARTHY. He pressured Chiang, as the price of a truce with the Communists, into ceding them the vitally important cities of Chihliang and Dolun, gateways from north China to Soviet-held Manchuria. The Communists broke the truce and captured the important city of Changchun. When the free Chinese forces drove them out, Marshall forced a second truce upon Chiang. Then he imposed an embargo on American military aid to free China and persuaded the British to do likewise—an action which, as McCARTHY rightly says, more than anything else "made the victory of Russian imperialism in China inevitable," for Stalin of course continued to supply the Chinese Communists, largely with material provided by the United States for his 6-day "conquest" of Manchuria. The final blow was Marshall's insistence, on threat of his own recall, that Chiang accept yet another cease-fire just as his victorious troops had taken Kalgan, described in the white paper as "one of the political and military centers of the Communist Party," and commanding the Kalgan Pass into Manchuria.

There is much more to Marshall's China story as McCARTHY relates it. Part of it has already been publicized; for example, Marshall's suppression (when Secretary of State) of General Wedemeyer's 1947 report proposing measures to check Chinese Communist aggression—Marshall deceived Senator Vandenberg about the reasons for this action. Space does not permit me to cite further instances from McCARTHY's wealth of material. Suffice it to say that Marshall's actions and attitude toward the Chinese Republic were consistently tough and inimical, while he has consistently befriended the Chinese Communists and served their interests, in total disregard of America's vital interest in a free and friendly China. The conclusion is inexorably dictated by the evidence which McCARTHY adduces.

Is there an American interest? More Americans than Marshall and Acheson would like to believe are asking today whether their Government knows or cares just what it is. They are asking why, in the face of the tremendous Soviet military power predicted in that strategic estimate, the greatest military machine in history was destroyed—not demobilized but destroyed—after the war. They are asking why their sons are fighting in Korea a costly and needless war which the administration confesses it is afraid to win because winning might annoy Stalin. They are asking why it is that for all the administration's tub-thumping against Soviet aggression, its actions invari-

ably have the effect of serving Soviet interest. If the American people had been allowed to learn the substance of this important speech, they could never doubt that the great conspiracy, as McCARTHY maintains has its dupes and agents inside the administration—and very near the top. And they would understand why the administration's heaviest guns have lately been trained against its author. The general unawareness of this heartbreaking record of betrayal is startling proof of the abyss which the press has created between the people and their representatives in Congress.

Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include excerpts from an article written by Jeter S. Ray, Associate Solicitor in the Department of Labor, and appearing in the September issue of the Labor Law Journal.

I believe this article is exceptionally well written and is a good analysis of a very important subject.

The article follows:

INTERNATIONAL REGULATION OF LABOR RELATIONS

(By Jeter S. Ray, Associate Solicitor, Department of Labor)

(The views expressed represent the personal opinion of the author and are not necessarily the official views of the United States Government.)

INTERNATIONAL FREE TRADE-UNIONISM CAN BE A PRIME BULWARK AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF TOTALITARIANISM

Generally overlooked, despite the extensive attention given to labor relations legislation during the past decade and a half, is that international organizations have been dealing with the subject of labor legislation for over half a century—at least since the International Congress on Labor Legislation held in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1897. Without question, the International Labor Organization established under the peace treaties of World War I has been the agency primarily responsible for directing international attention toward, and achieving international action with respect to, the many and complex problems in the fields of labor standards and labor relations.

The ILO, an autonomous association affiliated with the League of Nations, was founded to aid in the maintenance of peace by the improvement of living and working conditions. The preamble of its constitution contains the declaration that "recognition of the principle of freedom of association" is one of the means of improving the conditions of the workers and securing peace. Article 41 of its constitution recognizes "the right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers." Voting delegates, representative of employer associations, worker associations and member governments, participate in its deliberations. The notable purpose of the ILO, together with its tripartite representation, has endowed it with the necessary strength and vitality to survive not only the dissolution of the League itself, but the disruptions of World War II as well.

Prior to World War II, the International Labor Organization conventions and recommendations were concerned primarily with such aspects of the worker-employer relationship as the regulation of night work for women, minimum wage legislation, requirements regarding the maintenance of statistics of wages and hours of work and the establishment of standards with respect to maritime employment.

Under the aegis of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, the governing body of the International Labor Organization placed the question of freedom of association on the agenda of the thirtieth session of the conference held in 1947. Despite past failure of the ILO to attain international regulations regarding this matter, there now appeared a maximum chance of success. As is well known, freedom of association progressively had been suppressed in the interval between the two World Wars in countries which had adopted totalitarian regimes and the countries dominated or occupied by the Axis Powers. Continuous efforts, during this interval, by the International Labor Organization to achieve international action on the subject were paralyzed effectively by such external political obstacles. The end of the Second World War involved the collapse of many totalitarian states, however, and such political difficulties had considerably diminished.

Freedom of association—ILO conference reiterates rights

It was not until a year later, however, at the thirty-first session of the International Labor Conference, held in San Francisco, that constructive and positive action with respect to this subject took place. On July 9, 1948, without a dissenting vote, the Conference adopted what was probably the most significant convention adopted up to that time. That convention (No. 87), entitled "Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right To Organize," covered all essential aspects of the life of organizations from establishment to dissolution.

The adoption of convention No. 87 was viewed as only the initial step in dealing with the problems, limited as it is to a definition of the fundamental guarantees which workers, employers, and their organizations should enjoy—guarantees to which the state members undertake to give effect under article 1. Recognizing that the exercise of the right of freedom of association, especially with respect to the right to organize might be endangered unless protected, the thirty-first session of the conference recommended that there be placed on the agenda of the thirty-second session the question of the effectuation of the principles of the right to organize and bargain collectively. The governing body of the ILO accepted this recommendation and placed the subject on the agenda of the thirty-second session held in Geneva in 1949.

According to its usual procedure, the conference referred the question to its Committee on Industrial Relations which immediately proceeded to consider it on the basis of a proposed text that had previously been prepared by the Secretariat of the ILO after receipt of the views of the member governments.

Not-to-join amendments cause disagreement

One of the substantive issues upon which unanimity could not be obtained was evoked by the proposed amendments to article 1, offered by the employer group. These amendments were designed to include express provisions in the instrument affirming the right of workers not to join.

The significance of this series of amendments is that they would protect nonmem-

bership in a union, thereby rendering it impossible for workers and employees to negotiate union-security clauses in collective-bargaining contracts. Obviously such amendments extend beyond an affirmation of the right of workers to refrain from organizing if they so desire. The international regulations under consideration were intended simply to make the principle of freedom of association effective by guaranteeing workers the right to establish their own organizations which could function without interference. * * *

U. N. declaration of human rights not applicable here

In this connection, proponents of the proposed amendments emphasized the principles expressed in article 20, paragraph 2, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which provides that no one may be compelled to belong to an association. It was pointed out, however, that the application of article 20 (2) of the declaration appeared to be open to doubt in the light of article 23 (4) which deals specifically only with the right to form and join trade-unions and not with the right "not to join." Some committee members felt that it would be undesirable to attempt to interpret an existing international document by the terms of the proposed convention or to interpret the convention by reference to the Declaration of Human Rights. * * *

* * * Needless to say, these proposals provoked lively discussion in which the committee members from the United States actively participated. As is usually the case, full and open debate on the subject produced a practical solution. As stated in the committee's report:

"The committee finally agreed to express in the report their view that the convention could in no way be interpreted as authorizing, or prohibiting union security arrangements, such questions being matters for regulation in accordance with national practice."

Article 2 of the text proposed by the office, dealing with the protection of workers' organizations from interference by employers or their associations, was amended by the committee to incorporate a principle of reciprocal protection against interference with employers' organizations. In other words, the amended article protects the rights of employers' organizations as well as organizations formed by workers. The inclusion of protection of the rights of employers' organizations does not suggest that properly constituted trade unions would perform acts of interference with the affairs of such organizations. The absence of any such implication was clearly asserted by spokesmen for the employer group. They insisted such a safeguard was necessary, however, under totalitarian regimes and even in democratic countries where the attempt was being made to undermine the democratic character of institutions, and to disorganize employers' organizations. The majority of the worker members of the committee adopted the principle in a spirit of compromise. * * *

Article 6 of the office text provoked considerable debate and presented a challenge to the committee to find an appropriate text reflecting the extent to which the members considered it desirable or practicable to apply the regulations to government employees. The worker members and some of the members representing governments would have preferred that the convention apply to all government employees. In their view, the large number of workers in the service of their governments should not be deprived of the protections enjoyed by private workers. The employer members, however, expressed the view that each government should be

permitted to determine for itself the extent to which the guarantees laid down could be applied to its public officials and other employees. Other members representing governments pointed out a need for some restrictions on the rights of public servants, not so much with respect to the right to organize as with respect to the right to bargain collectively. In the end, recognizing the validity of some restriction on strikes by government workers, the committee phrased article 6 in the language ultimately adopted by the convention. In this connection, it should be noted that the legislative history of the article seems to indicate that article 6 is intended to provide an exception with respect to public servants of the constituent states or other divisions of a federal government, as well as public servants in the employ of the Federal Government itself. * * *

Convention No. 98

A comprehensive report on its activities was prepared by the Committee on Industrial Relations and made available to the thirty-second session of the general conference. Some of the afore-mentioned proposals which had been voted down in the committee were nevertheless again proposed before the conference. There was no lack of opportunity for debate, and extensive discussion took place. Ultimately, however, the proposals of the committee were adopted.

Articles 1-6 of the convention contain the substantive provisions, while articles 7-16 deal primarily with such matters as reporting, ratification, territorial application, and revision of the convention. * * *

Effect of Convention No. 98 in the United States

Next we consider the question of the effect of Convention No. 98 on the laws and practices of this country. How are we affected?

First, it should be noted that the ILO constitution (article 19) contains special provisions for federalized members, such as the Argentine Republic, Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, Mexico, Switzerland, and the United States, because of the division of authority between the central and constituent governments of each. Under those provisions, the United States is permitted to decide whether a convention or recommendation adopted by the ILO is, in whole or in part, appropriate under our constitutional system for action by our constituent States. If considered by this Nation to be appropriate for action by our Federal Government, the obligation of the United States is to refer the matter to the President and Congress for the enactment of legislation or other action, which includes in the case of a convention the possibility of ratification as a treaty. If not considered appropriate for Federal action, the convention or recommendation is referred to the Congress and to the several States, for enactment of legislation or other action, as they may consider appropriate, and steps are taken to promote, within our country, such coordinated action as will give effect to the provisions of the ILO regulation. The ILO constitution does not contemplate that this Nation should ratify a convention which is partially or exclusively appropriate for action by our States.

Consideration has been given to the convention by the interested departments and agencies of the United States Government. It is the coordinated view of these branches of the Government that the provisions of the convention are appropriate in part for action by the Federal Government and in part for action by the States. Hence, under the provisions of the ILO constitution applicable to federal states, there is no obligation on the part of this Government to consider the instrument for ratification as a treaty. The convention has been referred to the States for "enactment of legislation or other ac-

tion" as each State may deem appropriate. And, upon the recommendation of the interested executive departments, the President transmitted, on June 21, 1951, the convention to the United States Senate and House of Representatives for such action as those bodies may consider appropriate. No specific legislation has been recommended, but the suggestion has been made that Congress should give consideration to the provisions of the convention in connection with its continuing study of legislation in the field of labor relations.

It seems clear that ratification of this convention by the Federal Government would be inappropriate under our constitutional system, since our constituent States, as a proper exercise of their police power, may exercise jurisdiction under certain conditions in the labor-relations field. Thus, if this country were to enter into an international treaty relating generally to the rights of workers to organize, it is not difficult to visualize the possibility of extinguishing State jurisdiction and superseding conflicting State laws in the field under the provisions in article VI of our Constitution making international treaties the supreme law of the land.

It is in recognition of such situations in federalized states that the ILO constitution so appropriately contains special provisions whereby federalized members are permitted a certain latitude in order to achieve internal compliance with the terms of a convention without the necessity of ratification of a treaty. Thus, by allowing federalized states to determine for themselves whether the terms of a convention are appropriate for Federal or State action, there arises no question of the possibility, through ILO participation, of the loss of State jurisdiction over fields constitutionally reserved to them. We are in a position to preserve the constitutional division of powers between our State and Federal Governments and yet remain a full participant in an effective program for the promotion of better conditions of labor and higher standards of living throughout the world.

Conclusion

While the principles and objectives of Convention No. 98 are substantially recognized in the laws of this country, nevertheless its passage represents significant progress in promoting the institution of basic rights in many areas of the world. In this convention, government, worker, and employer representatives of 62 nations have fashioned a framework of minimum rights and guarantees deemed necessary to foster peaceful industrial relations. This cooperative venture, it is submitted, provides reason to believe that, through the offices of this convention, the need for protection of workers' freedom to associate will be more widely recognized, and that action will more likely be taken by countries whose laws may be deficient in that respect. To the extent that it fosters and encourages the growth of free trade unionism throughout the world, to that extent has the convention aided in strengthening a prime bulwark against the expansion of totalitarianism.

We Get What We Pay For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MULIER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Maurice R.

Franks, appeared in the July-August 1951 issue of the magazine *Partners*, official publication of the National Labor-Management Foundation. It speaks volumes.

PENNY-WISE—IF WE WOULD WIN BETTER MEN AS GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, EDUCATORS, AND LABOR LEADERS, WE'LL HAVE TO DROP REAL CASH IN THE KITTY

We Americans have managed pretty well throughout our history to avoid the pitfalls of false economy. We discovered fairly early in the game the futility of pinching mere pennies when such meant pinching off future dollars. We have learned well the basic rule of investment. The Scriptural statement, "As ye sow, so shall ye reap," has made a lot of sense to the business minds of our Nation. Dollars, not pennies, were sown by American enterprise, hence the harvest has been in gold, rather than in copper.

Americans, in a word, have been dollar-wise—not penny-wise. The result of our economic wisdom has been our exalted standard of living—a standard which is the envy of the entire world.

To appreciate the scope of our bright and continuing harvest we need only pause long enough to realize that our dollars, even while financing the reconstruction of most of the civilized world, are still numerous enough to provide the vast majority of our own people with every essential, along with an incredible inventory of pure luxuries.

No, surely we Americans have no reason to hang our heads when less successful people point fingers of scorn at our coffers and taunt us for our "dollar wisdom." If anything there be for which we should be ashamed, it is that our dollar wisdom is not as yet complete—that in a shocking number of vital instances we are still penny-wise and dollar-foolish.

The situation is all the more shameful because of who and what we are—and because it is we, more than any other nation, who have come up with the right economic answers.

THE CASE OF THE UNDERPAID

Two streams of poison afflict our American way of life. The one is mediocrity. The other is crookedness.

Both, unfortunately, descend from the high places and dribble their paralyzing poisons down across the entire face of our national life and into the deepest reservoirs of our future security.

We suffer from mediocrity and corruption in Government. We suffer from both poisons in the field of education. The dual affliction is obvious in many social services—particularly in the profession of labor leadership.

In each instance, the reason for this deadly condition is the same—insufficient investment—penny wisdom and dollar foolishness. And in each instance the remedy, tested and true, is already written in gold in the book of American accomplishment.

PENNY ANTE FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Have mediocrity and corruption made of government in the United States a top-heavy and inefficient machine—one which is completely out of step with the powerful and efficient machine represented by our industry? All right, we are getting precisely what we pay for. In hiring governments to represent us, we offer each officeholder comparatively speaking, a pittance. And that goes for all Government officials, from the small ward politician to the highest officeholders in Washington.

By offering small change for running the largest and most complex government machinery in the world, we attract mostly small change in terms of human capacity and integrity. By setting up a scale of remuneration we otherwise pay to average men, we get exactly what we pay for: mostly average men,

with their modest store of experience and their limited ability in the handling of outside problems. By playing penny ante for Government service, we staff our public offices for the most part with men whose horizons are circumscribed and whose spirit of enterprise does not go beyond an unenlightened willingness to indulge in a bit of a killing whenever and however they can.

It our halls of government swarm with two-for-a-cent characters—when billion-dollar decisions are confided to their inadequate care—we have only ourselves to blame for the obvious results of penny wisdom.

Until we rise to the occasion and make a proper investment in good government, we are doomed to witness a continuance in office of just such a squander trust as is losing billions of our good dollars today. Worse, we shall be progressively afflicted by armies of petty Government job holders morally and temperamentally prepared to sell our magnificent economic heritage for a mess of collectivist pottage.

THE UNDERPAID SCHOOL TEACHER

If bad government can sell us out as a nation, bad education can certainly pave the way for the irresponsible auction. And that is just what the minds of our young are today receiving.

From the grade school, through high and prep school, into the dimly-lit classrooms of college and university, it is becoming more and more the rule of thumb to question our economic institutions and denounce the pattern of our American way of life. The cynic becomes the mouthpiece of our history and of our economic and political theory. The Red threads of communism are discernible in the educational fabrics being woven for our youth to wear, and everywhere the palsied hand of mediocrity writes nonsense on the blackboard as the only answer to the charges of Red cynicism.

The situation in the educational field is becoming really serious, but, again, we have only ourselves to blame. Again we are reaping only the harvest of our penny wisdom. The teaching profession is notoriously underpaid—considering the responsibilities with which it is charged. And I don't mean by a few coppers—I mean by thousand-dollar brackets. By what queer betrayal of our better judgment do we presume to pay a vital profession less than we pay our unskilled labor?

Naturally, the underpaid school teacher is a discontented character, and therefore is ready meat for subversionist doctrine. If, being underpaid, he is on the other hand contented, he is something as bad if not worse, he is a mediocre of the mediocre.

Needed, as in the case of our attitude toward the Government official, is a complete revision of our estimate of the school teacher's annual worth to our society. Excellence is an absolute requirement on teaching staff and faculty, if we would preserve our economic sanity and carry it over into the oncoming generations, but to attract such excellence, the money must be there. Penny pinching will never turn the trick.

THE UNDERPAID LABOR LEADER

No great imagination is required to realize the vital part which the leader of organized labor can and will play in the saving or scuttling of the America most of us still love and revere. We have entered a phase of our national development wherein labor is fast becoming the dominant voice. For better or for worse, the "laboristic economy" announced by Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, of Columbia, may indeed be upon us already. Very well, it is therefore all the more important to our future as a nation that our labor leadership shall be up to the tasks confronting it. Give us mediocrity and corruption as the badges of such leadership and we'll not last out the century, possibly not even

the present decade. Already the boys in the Kremlin are licking their chops over the prospect, based on current symptoms.

Here again, penny wisdom on our part can turn out to be the open sesame to Moscow's dearest hopes for this country. Here again, dollar wisdom—sound and lavish investment—is immediately called for.

Labor leadership is a fast-moving and responsible profession. No other profession, it is safe to say, comes closer to holding the keys to our future as a nation. All right, with what kind of material are we going to people this profession? With rats and racketeers? With stumblebums and ignorant? With short-sighted contractors for socialism? Or with men of superior intelligence, moral fiber and social vision? We'll get what we pay for—make no mistake about that. The choice is up to us.

NOT A HOPELESS PICTURE

The picture is not a pleasant one, most of us will admit. Government, education, labor leadership—three powerful machines manned by individuals who, in character and capacity, but slightly resemble the men in better-paid walks of life who through the years have created American industry and commerce and enabled all of us to realize a fabulous return on their investment. The picture is not a pleasant one because of the damage our long neglect has piled up in our midst. But the picture is not a hopeless one.

With the book of the past open on our knee, the answer to our dilemma is clearly defined. In exploration, industry, commerce, finance, etc.—in all that is wrapped up in our American business world—we have invested heavily in the excellence which resides in our people, and have reaped a mighty harvest. In Government, education, and labor as a profession, the field is still fertile. As we sow, so shall we reap. This we know from experience. Here, as elsewhere, the dollar must be our trusted servant. We cannot afford to be pennywise.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Proposed Aluminum Industry for Montana, No. VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in response to my letter of October 18, and also I am inserting a letter I have received from the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, relative to hearings on my bill, H. R. 5410, a bill to provide for the establishment of a clearing house of information in the Department of Justice, to furnish agencies of the Federal Government with information concerning the qualifications of Government contractors. I am also inserting a copy of this bill, H. R. 5410.

I am deeply disappointed that the Hardy subcommittee was not able to furnish a final report of its investiga-

tion of certain allegations made concerning the Harvey Machine Co. over the radio and in the newspapers by Mr. Drew Pearson and in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania. It is my hope that this matter will come to a head at the earliest possible opportunity so that the status of the aluminum industry for the Flathead Valley in Montana can be settled. The people of Montana are, at the very least, entitled to this consideration at the earliest possible time.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES,
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 20, 1951.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: This is to acknowledge your letter of October 18, 1951, in which you expressed the hope that this subcommittee will issue a report in the near future with respect to its investigation of certain allegations which have been made concerning the Harvey Machine Co.

Immediately upon the decision of the subcommittee to comply with your request for an investigation of this matter the staff began an examination of all pertinent departmental files and records having to do with all phases of the Harvey matter. This study has been in continuous progress since that time, and the results of the study have been presented to me in a staff memorandum. Unfortunately, there has been insufficient time for members of the subcommittee to analyze the work of the staff with a view to determining the proper course of action. Copies of the staff memorandum are, however, being sent to members of the subcommittee so that at the first opportunity we can decide what our next step should be.

I know you will appreciate that the adjournment of the Congress at this time is unfortunate from the standpoint of being able to wind up our action on this matter promptly.

Sincerely yours,

PORTER HARDY, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1951
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have your letter of October 4 concerning your bill, H. R. 5410.

Please be advised that I am today referring H. R. 5410 to subcommittee No. 3, presided over by our colleague, Mr. BRYSON.

With kindest greetings, I am

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman

H. R. 5410

A bill to provide for the establishment of a clearinghouse of information in the Department of Justice, to furnish agencies of the Federal Government with information concerning the qualifications of Government contractors

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide all agencies of the Federal Government with full, complete, and accessible information concerning certain persons who have heretofore contracted or may hereafter contract with the Federal Government, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to establish and maintain within the Department

of Justice a clearinghouse of information as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. (a) The clearinghouse established pursuant to the first section of this act shall contain such information (including information with respect to credit, integrity, loyalty, efficiency, and performance) concerning each person who contracts with an agency of the Federal Government as the Attorney General shall deem appropriate.

(b) Each agency of the Federal Government shall, from time to time, submit to the Attorney General such information concerning persons who contract with such agency on or after the date of the enactment of this act as the Attorney General may require in accordance with subsection (a).

(c) Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, the Attorney General shall submit to each agency of the Federal Government a request for such information as he deems appropriate in accordance with subsection (a) concerning persons who have contracted with such agency within the 10-year period immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this act, and each such agency shall within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act furnish to the Attorney General the information so requested.

Sec. 3. (a) Upon the request of the head of any agency of the Federal Government for information concerning any person who has contracted or may contract with such agency, the Attorney General shall furnish to such agency any information concerning such person which is available in the clearinghouse established pursuant to section 2 (a).

(b) If any information requested by the head of an agency of the Federal Government pursuant to subsection (a) is not available in the clearinghouse established pursuant to section 2 (a), the Attorney General, upon the further request of the head of the agency, shall conduct such investigation as may be necessary to secure the information requested and shall furnish such information to the agency.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this act—

(1) the term "person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, and any other business entity; and

(2) the term "agency of the Federal Government" means any department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, and any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

Sec. 5. The Attorney General shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Address of Hon. Zales N. Ecton, of Montana, Before the Montana Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Montana Bar Association in Butte, Mont., June 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure, and I deem it a great honor, to have been invited to address

the Montana Bar Association this afternoon here in Butte.

Having worked with numerous lawyers for the past several years, I have reason to say that members of the bar are always most tolerant and understanding. Some of the very finest and best friends I have, both in Washington and in Montana, are lawyers.

We have 63 lawyers in the United States Senate, representing 43 States. Apart from the warm, personal friendship I have with many of them, I can assure you that the Senate is a more capable, more deliberate, more tolerant, and a more dignified body because they are part of it.

Their legal training, their experiences in private practice especially equip them as public servants. Their respect for the opinion of others, their tolerance under trying circumstances, and their dignity as individuals inure to the credit of the legal profession.

We are living in a restless, unpredictable, and dangerous age. Mankind is beset with apprehension and fear as to the future and to the future of the country. Almost every plan of action by individuals and government is impregnated with calculated risks.

America today stands hesitant and trembling at the crossroads. The old cocksure confidence in the manifest destiny of American principle to save mankind has given away to fear and frustration. And why?

I know that in your minds is poised the same question that everyone else is asking. Why? With all the able men and good minds we have in this country, why has this America of ours drifted into the state of confusion and fear so evident on every hand?

From the observations and analyses which I have made, it seems to me the answer lies primarily under two headings:

1. This country has been governed too long by men instead of by law, as was intended and defined under the Constitution.

2. This country has been drifting too long on a hit-and-miss foreign policy, a foreign policy which has been weak, vacillating, compromising, and appeasing.

During the past 18 years, in the ever-expanding governmental bureaucracy, rubber-stamp Congresses have delegated more and more powers to the President and the executive branch of the Government. Thus, the legislative branch has been shorn of many of its constitutional powers and rights as direct representatives of the people.

The poet, Tennyson, once wrote: "Ring in the nobler modes of life with sweeter manners, purer laws." Unfortunately, too many political lawmakers have taken that poetic admonition entirely too literally. The Ten Commandments have been supplemented with laws pertaining to almost every subject under the sun, but there are few who would say that much improvement has been made either upon the manners or morals of the country or the world.

Our Capitol at Washington has been infested with many brain trusters and demagogues who call themselves liberals who have been entrusted with the administration of these delegated powers and who believe we can create peace, prosperity, and morality by legislative action. Actually they have been much less interested in the nobler modes of life than they are in controlling the lives of our citizens.

These so-called liberals have organized what I can best describe as a secret force within our Federal Government. They have a new lure in their bag of bait they call security and it is peddled by every leftist in the land. The result is that today there are millions who are willing to endanger not only their own future, but the future of America itself, in their mad scramble to lay their hands on this modern golden calf, called "security." Opportunity, as the American way, has been dropped from their vocabulary.

The route they are pursuing to reach this unknown goal is strewn with the bleached bones of people and nations led to destruction by demagogues and dictators who used that same old bait—the welfare state and security. Such promises have won influence and power for both frauds and tyrants ever since man first lived under organized government.

Not until after people have traded their freedom for the promise of security do they learn that man's real security is to be found only in his own industry, integrity and self respect. Modern history gives us undeniable proof of that.

Despite these proven facts, we Americans have lowered our guard and we are now paying for that folly.

When a one-sided Congress side-stepped its duty 17 years ago and began delegating authority, upsetting our constitutional system of checks and balances between the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Government, this country took its first steps in Government by edict and delegated authority.

Most of you recall when an army of Federal employees was first sent out over the land to boost prices. That delegated authority, the NIRA, was foisted upon us during a drought and depression. The Supreme Court of the United States saved us then.

Along about that time the executive branch of our Government had become saturated with groups of intellectual soap boxers and pinkos. These nefarious fakers, charlatans and quacks covered their tracks and intentions by labeling themselves saviors of the common man.

The propaganda machine began to roll. Groups were organized by appealing to the selfish thirst for power in certain individuals and they were given power, by taking away from some and giving to others. Then the groups were carefully balanced against each other by a master political craftsman so they could not consume the political architect. The unified support of all groups was ensured politically by dangling the bait of more and dominant authority before each group, without ever delivering it in sufficient quantity to upset the balance. Our domestic give-away program was inaugurated and the political strategists geared it to the indirect buying of votes.

Is it any wonder people are asking, "Why?" Such corrosive methods and intellectual dishonesty can only breed moral decay in the body politic and engender fear and apprehension.

Then, on the newsstands came that book, the Nine Old Men. This was followed by a bold attempt to pack the Court with their satellites. That battle raged for months.

Temporarily halted in their blitz to gain complete control over the Court and business life of the Nation, another plan was developed. The heralded crises and emergency declarations circumvented those in the Congress who patriotically defended the Constitution. The result was that we have been struggling along under emergency declarations ever since. We had them before the war. We had them during the war. We have them now.

Emergencies provide an excuse for rule by men, regulations by the ream and red tape by the mile. Commissions and bureaucrats ignore the Constitution, representative government is denied and the executive power is increased accordingly. The tempo has been doubled and trebled and the system remains supreme, masquerading in the name of democracy. It is akin to that same kind of democracy that masquerades in Russia, Red China, and some other places.

Russia repeatedly refers to her Communist state as a democracy. Whatever significance may have been attached to the word in the past, the term "democracy" is certainly no longer a dependable key to the

secret of a free society. The word is totally inadequate and fatally misleading in describing the political system of our country which is definitely in a class by itself.

One of our troubles is that too many people have been sold on the idea that America is and should be a democracy. But it was never intended to be a democracy. The United States of America is a republic. Democracy is domination by the majority. A republic means representative government under a constitution which protects the individual and the minorities from the majority. The single official purpose of all American Government is to secure and protect the unalienable God-given attributes of the individual human being.

The word "democracy" is not mentioned anywhere in the Constitution of the United States, nor is it mentioned in the Constitution of any State in the Union. But the Socialists and the Communists and the welfare-staters and the security promoters are bent upon destroying this Republic and its representative Government and changing it into a Socialist democracy which they can dominate.

The secret government within the Government, with an army of 3,500 publicity agents and 40,000 public-relations workers, has been bombarding the people and the Congress day in and day out for years on this proposition.

Just a few years ago this Government functioned very capably with approximately half a million civil employees. Today we have five times that many—2,500,000.

Just 11 years ago President Roosevelt sent over his budget request and practically apologized for asking for \$7,000,000,000 to pay the cost of Government in 1940. Today President Truman is asking more than 10 times that much. Next year it will require more than \$8,000,000,000 just to pay salaries to civil employees.

Today we have an annual budget running well over \$70,000,000,000 and a demand that the already stifling taxes be increased another \$10,200,000,000.

When we started to prepare for World War I, the Federal debt was a little more than \$1,000,000,000. When we started to prepare for World War II, it was a little more than \$40,000,000,000. As we start to mobilize again, that debt stands more than a quarter of a trillion. This country has been on a deficit financing basis in 19 out of the past 21 years. The national indebtedness now amounts to \$6,786 per family in the United States.

The salaries and expenses of the publicity workers alone now cost approximately \$500,000,000 a year. I have not been able to get the exact figures for 1950, but the travel expense for just the executive department in 1949 cost \$335,000,000.

Government by edict and rule by the executive branch has reduced the role of Congress to the point at which it is little more than a tax-levying, money-appropriating body.

We are not at war because of any act by Congress. The President ordered our Armed Forces into war without even consulting Congress. We are sending divisions of troops to Europe, not by act of Congress, but by decree of the President. The fundamental law of the land, the Constitution of this Republic, has been ignored by the Executive.

Eleven years ago the 15th of this month, a fantastic piece of legislation was introduced in Congress. It was Senate bill 4141, and was introduced on June 15, 1940.

Its preamble read, and I quote: "To provide revenue and facilitate and control the economic and industrial structure of the Nation, for the successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

I want you to note that date, June 15, 1940. That was a full year and a half before Pearl Harbor was bombed. But our super

Government was going to "control the economic and industrial structure of the Nation, for the successful prosecution of the war and for other purposes." What war? What other purposes?

What did that bill propose? I will read you the opening paragraphs. "The President is hereby authorized" (you will note the unmistakable delegation of authority) "to require, under such rules and regulations as he may establish, the registration of all or any class of persons engaged in the management or control of any . . . establishment of any kind whatsoever, whatever the form of ownership thereof, corporate or otherwise."

This bill would have given the President authority, and again I quote from the bill itself:

"To prohibit the publication of prices quoted on commodities, . . . to regulate, limit, or prohibit the purchase, sale, use, transportation, manufacture, or illustration of any product, foodstuff, material, commodity, real estate, or right."

You would not only have been required to register and obtain a license, but you could have been prohibited from conducting your own business, or even selling your property. Every business from the biggest manufacturer down to the one-man business would have had to have a license, whether he was a manufacturer, merchant, farmer, mechanic, lawyer, newspaper publisher, or a doctor. That is what that bill would have authorized, and it definitely states, "any person . . . or establishment of any kind whatsoever."

Fortunately, that was a little too much for even a rubber-stamp Congress to swallow—especially just 5 months before election.

Now the OPS is trying to revive it, and the President has requested the licensing power, as he says, to control black markets. We were not at war in June 1940, but we are now, and if this secret government within our Federal administration could possibly elect enough of its stooges, the bill would probably be enacted.

The OPS with its eventual 35,000 to 50,000 employees could control a lot of votes, and if it gets the licensing bill, it would have another quarter million employees spread over the Nation and telling you how to conduct your business. They say now they must have such a bill to curb black markets. We already have laws against black markets.

The Brookings Institution, a nonpartisan organization, deals with the gradual steps taken by another once great nation when its leaders conspired to gain complete control over the people. I will quote directly, but briefly, what some of those first steps were.

"In the first place, reliance was placed primarily on a rather flexible system of rationing."

"A system of priorities was the distinguishing feature of the second phase."

"Unified allotment of all materials required for a given contract or operation marked the third phase."

"Special methods, including ration banking, were used to control the distribution of consumer goods."

"The freezing of existing prices characterized the first stage of general price control."

"Raising and lowering prices for a variety of objectives mark the second stage of general price control."

"The corporate income tax and other taxes applicable to business earnings were increased sharply."

"Special levies on one business were used to pay subsidies to another business."

The Brookings Institution recorded these steps as they were taken in Germany after a paper hanger by the name of Adolf Hitler became chancellor.

Hitler promised the people security, employment, prosperity and freedom.

The ways of fascism, nazism, and communism were all founded on the writings of Karl Marx. J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI told a congressional committee that we have almost 50,000 dues-paying Communists in America, all agents of Stalin, and a half million fellow travelers taking their cues from those 50,000 Communists. And we have several million gullibles and dupes in and out of the administration willing to take their cues from such fellow travelers. Let us wake up. It can happen here.

The result of this transition in our one-time government of checks and balances is that we have ruinous inflation, vicious taxes, a terrific national debt, printing press money backed by little more than promises, national insecurity and an administration that preaches fear of Red China, fear of Russia, fear of losing defensive allies and fear of an atomic bomb attack on this country.

There is fear and confusion in our land because we have been ruled by men instead of by law.

The American taxpayer has paid billions to develop and perfect the atomic bomb.

Communist Russia may be able to blow our cities off the face of the map. I don't know and no one else does. But of one thing we can be certain—the Soviet did not get into any such position by their own efforts. They were aided by men on our own Government payroll.

Remember the names of the five spies, Klaus Fuchs, Bruno Pontecorvo, Allan Nunn May, David Greenglass, and Harry Gold? Between them, they gave Russia what the Atomic Energy Committee admits to be "a particular well-rounded picture." The first three were scientists of great ability but turned out to be loathsome spies.

It was common knowledge that May was a member of a Communist-dominated scientific society and that Greenglass had joined the Communists before he was inducted into the Army. Yet, when patriotic citizens tried to call attention to such matters, they were denounced by the cry of "red herring."

The present is molded by the past. We must therefore outline the recent past to reach conclusions about the present and to influence the future.

Our fighting forces won the greatest war in history, both on the Atlantic and Pacific fronts, but our Government lost it at the international council tables. A million fine Americans gave their health or their lives to preserve freedom. But when the "big shots" arose from the international poker table, 600,000,000 more human beings were committed to Communist slavery.

Today South Korea is a shambles, and only recently when General MacArthur was being questioned by a joint committee of the Senate, he stated that under the present policies which were being pursued, our forces in Asia could not win and that the best we could hope for was a stalemate.

Even General Wedemeyer, who recently testified before that committee, also referred to that same sort of stalemate which General MacArthur referred to.

General Wedemeyer even went further and intimated that it was impossible to win against the dense Communist hordes in Korea by just shooting them when they advanced toward us; that if we did not intend to use our full naval and air strength for fear of an oil-out war, it would be much better to withdraw from Korea and thus save further useless bloodshed.

I concur in that conclusion.

Testimony has been brought to light through the Senate hearings which backs up the belief that our diplomatic service in the State Department has been a dominant factor over our military and our military strategy. It was the failure of our diplomatic service and our State Department to take a strong and realistic attitude toward communism in

time to avoid the dangers and pitfalls which this country has fallen into. It is the foreign policy of this country which is the crux of the whole evil.

The Russian Communists long ago denounced the church, Christianity, and the truth. Their aim is and has been world domination by revolution, infiltration, bankruptcy, corruption, and war, based on the principle of force, fear, and reward.

Many many people in this country have recognized the Communist aim for a long time. Why was it that the leaders in our own Government and those in positions responsible for giving away the peace could not recognize the truth in regard to such revolutionary and imperialistic forces? President Truman recently stated that he recognized the danger from Communist intentions back in 1945. Why was it then that he repudiated the Eightieth Congress and called it the worst in history after it had authorized and appropriated the money for a 70-group Air Force? He deliberately refused to carry out the law as passed by the Eightieth Congress and now we shiver and shake because we're unprepared to defend ourselves adequately.

Why was it that our leaders always seemed to be dominated by fear which compelled them to compromise and accede to every demand and every whim of the Communists?

Why were they induced to halt our troops in World War II at the Elbe and thus permit the Russians time to get into Germany and take Berlin?

Why were they induced to sign an agreement setting up the military zones in Germany without an avenue of ingress or egress over Russian territory?

Why was Manchuria given to Russia when it naturally belonged to China and when China had been promised it after the war?

Why was this tragic deal consummated when Nationalist China had been our friend and ally all during World War II? Why were munitions and supplies withheld from Chiang Kai-shek's army fighting so desperately in China? Why was it that the guns delivered to Chiang's army, supposedly for support, direct from this country were minus a trigger or a firing bolt?

Why was it when responsible people called the administration's attention to how the Nationalists were being sabotaged that investigators returning from China reported that there was nothing to fear from China, that they were just peace-loving agrarians trying to effect good government?

Why was it that after General Wedemeyer was asked to make a report on conditions in China that his report was suppressed and withheld by our State Department until just recently? When he made his report, after studying conditions in China for 8 months back in 1946 and 1947, that report was hidden away in Secretary Acheson's secret files. Wedemeyer at one time was slated to become Ambassador to China, but he did not get the appointment because, as Acheson told him, the Communists objected strenuously. He was not being appointed ambassador to a Communist government; he was supposed to be appointed to the Nationalist or Chiang Kai-shek's government, but the Communists objected, said Acheson, and Wedemeyer's appointment was withdrawn.

The answers to all these questions can only be found in the fact that our foreign policy has been one of weakness, appeasement and fear. Stalin knows how to use his pawns in the great game of international chess. The whole technique of communism is based on a fear complex. We in America cannot succumb to that type of technique and we cannot be dominated by fear of Russia or any other nation on the face of the earth.

In February 1947, Stalin admonished a great gathering in Red Square, Moscow, that,

"War, until the death of capitalism, is our aim." Another of his hatchetmen stated in the Russian press, "The United States and capitalism are the real enemies of communism and of Russia. They can be exterminated only by war."

Secretary Acheson has stated that our future foreign policies must be conducted through the United Nations. If the President continues to take the power and right upon himself to send troops in various parts of the world to engage in police actions without congressional sanction, it would be very easy for this country to become so thinly spread over the world as to endanger our very safety here in this country.

Many people are laboring under the misapprehension that the United Nations is a potent factor in preserving the peace of the world. So far it has proven to be a political bazaar and worthless from a military point of view. Even the United Nations has been willing to appease Russian communism on numerous occasions. They have been willing to accept Red China as a member, even while our boys are being killed by the Red Communists in Korea.

If the United States of America is to take her place in the vanguard of civilization, it will be essential that we be prepared to go it alone if necessary. A nation that is thus prepared and knows she is prepared and proud of her heritage and determined to preserve it, instead of finding herself alone will find that the Christian nations of the world will all be flocking to her.

This idea of not taking firm stands on this Communist issue for fear of alienating friends or former allies is fallacious. Furthermore, we have been too easy and too compromising with some of our other allies. It is impossible to buy the friendship of nations as well as it is of individuals. They look upon us as easy marks and eventually with contempt. We have given of our substance and money to no end. We have not caused our allies to be better and more determined allies, to suppress aggression and militarism throughout the world, but instead we have made them the more dependent upon us for supplies and for money, even to the point of expecting our own military forces to protect them.

This is not the type of leadership which is necessary to preserve the peace and freedom of the world.

Well, what should we do about all this?

No. 1: We should stop all appeasement.

No. 2: We should make every reasonable and honest effort to reach an agreement on the Korean situation but if it develops that Russia is not acting in good faith in the present peace negotiating then we should break off diplomatic relations with her immediately, and should track down the international organization operating in this country which is directed from Moscow.

We should proceed to do the latter in any event.

No. 3: We should build our strength in the Western Hemisphere and concentrate on air and sea power.

We should be able to control the airways from our western coast to Japan and from the Atlantic coast to France. The ground troops for the defense of western continental Europe would be the prime obligation of the nations of Europe.

We have found that we cannot buy them with money and likewise America cannot create their spiritual forces. We must put our own house in order and build and preserve our own strength.

Above all, we need a national unity and it can be achieved with the proper national leadership. We know that during the Revolutionary days America was made up of various and sundry nationalities, religious groups, local and isolated communities with a great divergence of thought and ideals and yet all of these elements were unified into

one common band for their self-preservation because they had a common enemy and a common purpose. That purpose was freedom of the individual man.

Today, all the people and elements in the United States have a common enemy and we all have a common purpose—to preserve that freedom and that heritage which our forefathers made possible and passed on to us.

The American people are put together with a hard core of integrity. We must be realistic. We should realize that we cannot fight half the world and feed the other half and have business as usual, comforts as usual, and politics as usual.

We need a resurgence of morality, of self-respect, of effort, and of courage in this country to undo the wrongs which have been committed.

We must follow the admonition of Thomas Jefferson, who said "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none."

We must have men in this country who are worthy of the offices they fill, men who are worthy of our country they serve, men who are worthy of the boys who fight and die on the bloody fields of battle, men who are worthy of our forefathers—those men who became great by their dreams and hopes for a great people, a great country, and a great world.

Christianity's Debt to Judaism—Why Not Acknowledge It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that I call to the attention of my colleagues the following very famous sermon by the Reverend Dr. John Haynes Holmes, renowned minister of the Community Church, New York City. He is one of the most prominent civic and religious leaders in America. His reputation as a dynamic, fearless preacher has spread far and wide. His many-faceted career as a lecturer, author, traveler, and leader for civil rights has made him a unique figure in the ministry and political life. He has served the Community Church since 1907 and his pulpit and forums have won a great host of adherents. He is a founder of the American Civil Liberties Union, a founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was chairman of the City Affairs Committee of New York for 9 years. Dr. Holmes is a graduate of Harvard University and its divinity school.

CHRISTIANITY'S DEBT TO JUDAISM—WHY NOT ACKNOWLEDGE IT?

(By Dr. John Haynes Holmes)

In speaking to you this morning, I have two very definite propositions in mind. One is the proposition that Christianity owes a heavy debt to Judaism. The other is the proposition that Christianity ought to be willing to recognize and pay this debt, as any honorable debtor recognizes and pays his obligation.

When I speak of Christianity, let me say, I am not speaking of theological doctrines or ecclesiastical instructions—very little of what is contained in the actual history of

the church. Rather am I speaking in terms of that pure religion and undefiled which sprang from the heart of Jesus, was propagated far and wide by his disciples and apostles, was recorded in the pages of the New Testament, and remains to this day the greatest single spiritual influence in human history. This religion, it should be known, is in reality Jewish in origin and content. It is only an accident that it did not remain in the end what it was in the beginning—a part and parcel of the Jewish world. Now that it is one of the separate religions of mankind its parentage should be confessed, and its heritage duly honored.

Let me begin what I have to say this morning with Jesus, who is the center and soul of Christian faith. There are three things to be made plain about this man.

In the first place, I would remind you that Jesus' parents were Jews. Whether His father, Joseph, was of the stem of Jesse, and thus of the royal house of David, as the Bible states, is altogether unknown and quite improbable. The genealogies to this effect in the New Testament are valueless. As a matter of fact, we know very little about Joseph—only that he lived in Nazareth in Galilee, that he was a carpenter by trade, and that he died, in all probability, before Jesus came to manhood. In much the same way, we know little about Mary, the mother of Jesus. She is a shadowy figure who emerges into the light only in the last few hours in the career of her eldest born. But amid all this obscurity, there remains the indubitable truth that these two persons, who are so venerated by the Christian church, were both of them Jews.

The second fact is, of course, that Jesus, as the oldest child of these parents, was thus Himself a Jew. Two attempts have been made to break down and destroy this simple fact. The first is theological, and is to be found in the dogma of the Virgin Birth, which represents Jesus as born not of Joseph and Mary, but of a divine conception of God upon Mary. But this leads to the fascinating and impressive conclusion, seldom mentioned in doctrinal discussion, that out of all the tribes of earth, God chose a Jewish maiden for the incarnation of His dearly beloved and only begotten son. The second attempt to dispel the fact of Jesus' Jewish origin is purely pagan. It is to be found in the assertion of the early opponents of Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world that Jesus was born out of wedlock from a Jewish girl who had contact with a Roman soldier. This has been revived today, in one form or another, by anti-Semitic Nazi propagandists. But this suggestion leaves Jesus at least half-Jewish, and thus quite as much outside the pale of the Nazis as though He were a full-blooded Semite. Suffice it to say that there is as little in this story as in the dogma of the Virgin Birth. There exists not a scrap of evidence to substantiate it outside of sheer anti-Semitic prejudice. If we know anything about Jesus at all, it is that He was a child of Jewish parents, born in a Jewish home as the first-born of a large family, and thus Himself a Jew.

The third thing to be said about the Jewishness of Jesus is that he was reared and trained in the Jewish faith. His parents were pious Jews, they went up each year to Jerusalem to keep the feast of the Passover. They taught Jesus, by precept and example, to attend the synagogue where he became acquainted with the Bible of his race. In his early manhood it was his custom to go to the synagogue on the Sabbath Day, which is more than a good many Jews do today, and he began his public ministry, so the record tells us, by standing up in the synagogue in Nazareth and reading from the Prophet Isaiah. In spirit as well as in blood, this Nazarene was a son of Israel.

It is from these three points of view—his parents, his birth, and his religious train-

ing—that we must agree that Jesus was a Jew. It is to the Jews that the Christians owe this peerless leader and founder of their faith. I would go so far as to say that we cannot understand Jesus unless we acknowledge that his rightful place in history is that of the last and greatest of the Jewish prophets. It is to me as incredible that the Jews do not recognize this fact as it is discreditable that the Christians do not recognize it.

So much for Jesus. Next only to this august figure of the Nazarene stand three elements which are central in Christianity. For all these three elements the Christians are indebted to the Jews.

In the first place, there is the Bible, the sacred Scriptures of the Christian church. This Bible consists of two parts—the Old Testament, so-called, and the New. The Old Testament, which comprises some three-fourths of the Bible, belongs not to Christianity at all but to Judaism. The Old Testament, let it be said is the Jewish Bible. I know of no more high-handed piece of impudence in all history than the action of the early Christians in taking over the Old Testament into their churches, and saying, "This is ours." It is as though we Americans should possess ourselves of Shakespeare and Milton, and Dryden, and Poe, and Keats, and Shelley, and Tennyson, and Browning, and solemnly declare that the writings of these men belonged to us and were the basic part of our native literature. Saying so, of course, does not make it so. These poets are not Americans, and, by the same token, the Old Testament is not Christian. It is Jewish through and through; and whenever we use it we should remember that we are turning to Jewish sources for instruction and inspiration. That is the reason why I am careful in our services here to refer to the Old Testament, whenever I read lessons from its text, as "the Scriptures of the Jews." As for the New Testament, this is our own. This portion of the Bible is "the Scriptures of the Christians." But even so, it is only fair to recognize, it seems to me, that the New Testament is throughout a Jewish book. Every word of it, from the first chapter of Matthew to the last chapter of Revelations, was written by Jews, and thus is saturated with the Jewish spirit and ideals.

Next to the Bible comes the church, by which I mean not the hierarchy, which belongs to a later period of history, but the simple fact of the congregation of men and women meeting together on a Sunday morning for the worship of Almighty God. Where did this reality come from? Why, from the Jews—more specifically from that generation of Jews which suffered the tragic experience of the exile.

In the ancient times, among all peoples, there was no church, or congregation, as we know it today. The centers of religious worship were temples, dedicated to the god or gods of the nation, where national festivals were held, where holy offices were performed by priestly agents of the state, and where the people came at periodical intervals to lay their offerings upon the sacred altars. This was as true in Palestine as it was in Egypt, Babylonia, Greece, and Rome. The great temple of the Jews was in Jerusalem, and there was worship offered to Jehovah. There were times, to be sure, when local worship was set up in what was called the "high places", but this was uniformly discouraged, and all religious rites thus centered in the city of the king.

Then came the exile, in 586 B. C. The Kingdom of Judah was overrun, Jerusalem captured and destroyed, and the people carried away as slaves into the far realms of their conquerors. Here they remained for two generations, lost to their homeland and to all the high practices of their religion. How could they sing the Lord's songs in a strange land? How could they worship God without temple or altar? They must keep

in touch with their deity, and plead for his pity and help—otherwise they were surely lost, and their children with them. But with the temple so far away, how could they reach God, or perform the rites which he expected? The answer came out of the very necessities of the situation. Robbed of their temple as of their holy city, the exiles, settled in scattered towns and villages, came together on the Sabbath Day, wherever they were, and remembered Zion and read from the sacred pages of the law. These meetings came to be regular gatherings, which in due course were organized, and later developed customs and practices and a sanctity of their own. They were called synagogues—or whatever is the Hebrew word for a "gathering together," or congregating, of men and women for the holy purpose of religion.

It was thus, in a time of dire extremity, that the law of Israel was preserved, and the memory of Jehovah, the God of Israel, not forgotten. In due course the Jews returned to Palestine, and there set up the Temple once again upon Mount Zion. The central worship was thus restored, and the priests once again commissioned to guard the people's destiny. But the habit of the exile was too strong and people would not give up their local or congregational meetings in their villages, or even houses. The synagogue became as well recognized an institution of Judaism as the Temple itself, and held in time the first devotion of the people. Jesus knew the synagogue of Nazareth from His youth up, and in this synagogue began His ministry. When, following His death, His followers carried on His work, it was first in synagogues, and only later in churches of their own, that they proclaimed the gospel.

But these churches, when they came, were modeled precisely on Jewish example, and thus were the daughters of the synagogue. When Christians meet today on Sunday mornings to worship God and to consecrate their lives to His service, and to preserve the sacred traditions of the faith, they are doing not only what the early Christians did, but what the Jews have done since the sad days of the exile. We have a church because the Jews first had a synagogue. The former is the direct descendant of the latter.

This brings us directly to the third of these essential elements of Christianity. In addition to the Bible and the church is Sunday as the sacred day of rest and worship—the one day in seven set scrupulously aside for purposes of physical recreation and spiritual regeneration. Where did this Christian Sunday come from? Why, obviously, from the Jewish Sabbath.

It is true that the Jewish Sabbath is the last day of the week—traditionally the day when God rested from His labors after the 6 days of the creation. "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made" (Genesis 2:2). The Christian Sunday, in contrast, is the first day of the week, so celebrated because it was on this first day that Jesus is supposed to have risen from the dead. "And when the Sabbath was past . . . very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher . . . and saw that the stone was rolled away" (Mark 1:3). So the first day among Christians came to take the place of the seventh day among Jews. But this detail is unimportant. The central fact is that the Christian Sunday is the rebirth of the Jewish Sabbath—the Christian once again taking his religious practices from the Jew.

We are beginning now, perhaps, to understand how stupendous is the debt which Christians owe to Jews. Not only Jesus Himself, but the Bible, the church, and Sunday all come from Jewish sources. But not yet have we gotten to the heart of the matter. What about the teachings of Christianity—those great truths of the moral and spiritual life which constitute the essence of the Gospel? The things which Jesus taught—were those original with Him, or did they spring

from the Judaism in which Jesus was born and reared?

This question reminds me of an experience in the early days of my ministry in this city. I was attending a meeting of the liberal ministers club of which certain Jewish rabbis were members along with the Christian clergymen. I chanced to be sitting beside a very eminent rabbi of that day—the head of the great Temple Emanuel. In the course of our conversation together, I made some reference to what I called the originality of Jesus. What was my surprise to hear this rabbi retort that there was no originality in Jesus—that the Nazarene was one of the most unoriginal men who ever lived. As a young and ardent preacher, I was greatly shocked by this remark. In late years, however, I came to feel that my friend, the rabbi, was on the whole correct. It is true that Jesus was original in what He said—or rather in the way He said it. Of all the religious teachers of the world He ranks as incomparably the most poetic. The Sermon on the Mount and the various parables are unmatched for sheer power and beauty in either ancient or modern literature. Jesus was original also in His spiritual insights—in His discernments of truth in unusual circumstances, and in His application of this truth to the common way of life. He had a genius for spirituality which is unparalleled. But His supreme and unique contribution to Christianity, of course, was His personality. Within this Man was a radiance of the inner life which made it easy for His contemporaries to join with the Roman centurion in the declaration, "Verily, this Man was the Son of God." But in the actual content of His teaching, Jesus was not original. The substance of His faith and vision was all derived from Israel. Let me see if I can make this plain.

On New Year's day, recently, a civic ceremony was conducted at the city hall by Mayor LaGuardia, in which a Catholic priest, a Protestant clergyman, and a Jewish rabbi were the participants. In the course of his remarks, the mayor referred to the Golden Rule and the Lord's Prayer, and said that if men would only live up to the precepts of these two teachings, there would be no trouble in the world. It would seem as though, in this reference, the mayor was flattering the Christians and leaving out the Jews. As a matter of fact, he could not have made a better selection, for the Golden Rule and the Lord's Prayer belong quite as much to the Jews as to the Christians themselves.

The Golden Rule, it must be said belongs to neither Christians nor Jews in any exclusive sense of the word. It is a part of all religions. Thus, I have found it in the scriptures of no less than nine of the world's religions—Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Grecian, Roman, Judaism, and Christianity. The Golden Rule, as it appears in the New Testament, is familiar: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." The Jewish Golden Rule is negative rather than positive in its formulation, but is identical in meaning. It reads: "Whatever ye do not wish your neighbor to do to you, do not do unto him. This is the whole law, the rest is exposition."

But the Lord's Prayer—this surely is original with Jesus. So it is in its formulation into one of the simplest and most beautiful compositions that can be found in the world's religious literature. But in its content it is derived from beginning to end from Jewish sources. There is not a line in the prayer which cannot be duplicated in these sources. In substantiation of this sweeping assertion, let me cite the testimony of two scholars who have a right to speak, as I do not. The first is a famous German authority, Theodor Keim, whose biography of Jesus, written many years ago, still ranks as one of

the greatest studies ever made of the life and teaching of the Nazarene. Referring to the Lord's Prayer, Keim writes, "Not only the address of God, together with the first two petitions, but pretty well all of it in detail, appears here and there in Jewish Talmudic prayers." The second witness is a great Jewish scholar, Joseph Klausner, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, whose Jesus of Nazareth is regarded as the ablest biography of Jesus ever written by a Jew. In this authoritative work the author says of the Lord's Prayer that it is "a remarkable prayer, universal in its appeal, earnest, brief, and full of devotion. Every single clause in it, however, is to be found in Jewish prayers and sayings in the Talmud." So the Golden Rule and the Lord's Prayer alike belong to Jews as well as Christians.

Next only to these two documents, I would name the Beatitudes as the most precious sayings to be found in the Christian Scriptures. Here again we have a formulation of truth which is a supreme illustration of Jesus' poetic and spiritual genius. But the content of what is said is again almost wholly derivative. "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted"—if you would know where this comes from, turn to Isaiah 61:2. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth"—turn to Psalm 37:11. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled"—turn to Isaiah 55:1. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God"—turn to Psalm 24:4. Thus are the phrases and thoughts of this great passage all anticipated by the Jews.

If any statement of Jesus is commonly cited as the complete and perfect summary of his religion, it is the dual commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself." Where does this come from? First of all from the New Testament story of the lawyer who tempted Jesus, saying, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" But originally from the Old Testament, in two famous passages. The first is from Deuteronomy 6:4. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." The second is from Leviticus 19:18. "Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge . . . but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

If anything is original with Jesus, it would seem to be his nonresistance—his injunction in the Sermon on the Mount to "resist not evil." This received its supreme expression in Jesus' commandment that we should love our enemies. This is very obviously a protest against and correction of the Jewish law of retaliation—"an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." This law, without any question, appears in the Old Testament. Jesus was mindful of it, and would get rid of it. But he was not the first to take this stand. Long since the Jewish prophets had laid hold upon the doctrine of love and forgiveness, even of enemies. But in one brief passage of the Old Testament we have an anticipation of this positive aspect of nonresistance which is breath taking.

If I were asked to name the most beautiful expression of Jesus' teaching on this point, I would turn to St. Paul's great epistle to the Romans, and read the closing verses of the twelfth chapter: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." If there is anything original in Christianity, this would certainly seem to be it. Yet turn to the twenty-fifth chapter of the book of Proverbs, the twenty-first verse, and what do you find? "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink, for thou wilt heap coals

of fire upon his head." Even in his teaching of love, for enemies as well as friends, Jesus was only faithful to the noblest precepts of the Jews.

All of this shows what Jesus was really doing in His ministry. Not practicing a new religion, but reviving the pure and undefiled religion of Israel. Not starting a movement of revolt against Judaism, but only a movement of reform inside of Judaism. Not forsaking the Jewish synagogue and starting the Christian church, but cleansing the Jewish synagogue, even as He cleansed the temple of the money-changers. Nothing would have surprised Jesus more than to have learned after His death that His work had led to a new religion largely hostile to His own. To this day He would not have understood the meaning of Christianity and Christian doctrine. Jesus was a Jew, in the great traditions of the prophets. He saw a religion in His time, as Isaiah and Amos and Jeremiah had seen a religion in their time, which had become overlaid and encrusted with a vast growth of theological and ecclesiastical literalism which was fatal to the pure essence of the faith. He found the people beset and betrayed by all kinds of rules and regulations, the minutiae of law and rite, which were killing out the simple practices of righteousness and truth. Worst of all, He beheld a priesthood which was feeding upon the corruption which they themselves were fostering in the worship of Israel.

All this He sought to sweep away. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." The Nazarene wanted to end that spirit again. Therefore did He seek, like the shepherd his lost sheep, that great body of Jewish prophecy which was the real religion of Israel as contrasted with the sheer superstition of the priests and Pharisees. So everything that was precious in Judaism came to life again in Jesus. He was teaching what was truest and noblest in the tradition of His own people. He sought for nothing but the restoration of Israel to its true faith. What wonder therefore that He was not original, since He did not seek to be original? "Think not that I am come," He said, "to destroy the law or the prophets. I am come not to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Here was not a Christian speaking, but a Jew. All that was distinctively Christian came later and was unknown to the Nazarene.

Such is the debt which Christianity owes to Judaism. Not Jesus merely, nor the Bible, the church and the Sunday, but the whole substance of Christian teaching. To take account of this debt is to come face to face with two facts, which I would emphasize in closing.

First, we find here one explanation at least, and every important one, of why the Christians dislike and persecute the Jews. They hate them and would get rid of them because they are so heavily indebted to them. This is a simple law of psychology, illustrated by the experience of every day. Thus, did you ever hear of a tenant who loved his landlord? Have you ever encountered a borrower who is devoted to the money lender who has given him money? How often do you see a taxpayer who folds in his affectionate embrace the tax collector? The publicans in ancient Israel were hated for nothing except that it was their business to receive the taxes for the government. And now the burden has fallen upon the Jews—that they have given so much to the Christians that the latter feel embarrassed and at least outraged that they owe all this to Israel. There are many reasons for anti-Semitism—for tortures and massacres, the pogroms and exiles, which the Jews have suffered all these centuries from Christendom. The problem is

complicated and difficult—the pattern hopelessly entangled. But one strand in the snarl may be unraveled, and that is the one which has to do with the Christian's debt to Judaism. Until that debt is paid, or at least acknowledged, there will be little peace.

The second thing which I would emphasize is this payment of the debt. Is it not time that payment began? And how shall it be done?

First, the debt must be acknowledged, somewhat as I have tried to acknowledge it this morning. Why should not Christians everywhere recognize Jesus as a Jew? Why should they not have the grace to refer to the Old Testament, when they use it, as the Jewish scriptures? Why should they not acclaim the kinship of the church with the synagogue, and of the Christian Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath? As for the Gospel, what would be lost and what not gained, if the Jewish sources of this teaching were at last made plain? All this is not very much, perhaps, in the serious business of paying a heavy debt, but it is at least something. A first step is taken in discharging an obligation when it is acknowledged that it exists.

Secondly, why may we not pay this debt to the Jews by fighting anti-Semitism? All around us rages this noisome and fatal plague. It works its havoc not merely in Germany and Europe, but right here in America. Half-hidden, half-confessed, whispered rather than shouted, taking shape not in hideous persecutions but in countless little irritations and injustices, but nonetheless fatal as a prejudice which poisons the soul, this curse is our curse, as it is Christianity's curse, and it should be ended for very shame. Here the church, in the very name of Jesus, should take the lead in stamping out this pestilence that devours ourselves as well as our victims. To fight and destroy anti-Semitism—this would be a large payment on the debt.

Lastly, as a means of paying Christianity's debt to Judaism, there is the opportunity now abundantly given us to succor the Jewish refugees who wander the world in misery. Christianity has already done much for these refugees. The Catholics and Protestants of Germany and the occupied countries have lifted up their voices in protest against the Nazi horrors, and on more than one occasion have identified themselves with those who suffered. In England and in this country have Christians given generously in relief, and offered shelter and sustenance to the homeless hordes of Israel. But all that we have done is little enough. More—more is needed, till every Jew the world around has found home and country once again, his place in the great body of humanity. To succor the Jews in this their hour of greater distress than they have endured since Jerusalem fell to Titus, this is our plain duty. And it should be our welcome opportunity to discharge the debt which all too long has gone unpaid.

To bring Jews and Christians together, not by converting or merging one with the other, but by recognition of that spiritual kinship which makes them one—this is our holy task. To end the injustice and horror of the ages in finding and binding that "unity of the spirit which is the bond of peace." Already Jews and Christians are one in all that is central to the inner essence of our faith. Why should we not similarly be one in all that is central to the outer relations of our lives? In both branches of the severed family there rests the obligation to shake off separatism and end isolation—but most heavily and immediately does this obligation rest upon Christians, who have the numbers, the power—and this debt which must be paid.

I keep thinking, as I talk to you, of that great scene in Lessing's drama, *Nathan der Weise* (Nathan the Wise), which touches upon this truth. Some of you may have

seen this drama when it was produced in New York this past winter. If so, you will remember the scene to which I refer—that scene where the Christian friar has just discovered some great deed of generosity and sacrifice which has been performed by the Jew, Nathan. In his enthusiasm and gratitude, and desiring to honor Nathan with the greatest praise that he knows how to speak, the friar exclaims:

"Nathan, you are a Christian. Yes, I swear You are a Christian—better never lived."

To which the big-hearted and wise Nathan replies.

"Indeed! the very thing that makes me seem Christian to you, makes you a Jew to me."

United States International Information and Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a series of five articles by Mr. Frank Stout, a staff writer for the *Scranton* (Pa.) Tribune, published in that paper October 8-12, 1951. Mr. Stout worked 8 months for the State Department's propaganda program as a general writer, White House and State Department reporter. He quit his job, disillusioned and disgusted. He sets forth in the articles his observations while so employed concerning the State Department's information and educational activities.

I am one who believes in the purposes of the international information and educational activities of our Government, including the Voice of America. Today we are fighting a war against communism—a battle for men's minds. We must fight it with ideas; we cannot win with guns alone.

When the State Department appropriation bill was before the House, I voted against an amendment to cut the funds provided for the United States information and education program below the \$85,000,000 approved by the Committee on Appropriations. However, I am now deeply alarmed by the charges of inefficiency, waste, and incompetence made by Mr. Stout with respect to the operations of the State Department's propaganda program. The matter should be thoroughly investigated. The articles follow:

GOVERNMENT WASTE IS HOPELESS, SAYS WRITER WHO QUIT CAPITAL

(By Frank Stout)

I could have stayed in Washington, but I quit my Government job because—though I was a little wheel in an \$185,000,000 propaganda machine—I could see the taxpayers' money going hopelessly down the drain.

I say hopelessly, because during 8 months in the bureaucratic morass of Washington I met only one or two men who would know a taxpayer if they fell over him. To most Government workers—even though they are taxpayers themselves—a taxpayer is a vague myth conjured up by editorial writers to

frighten politicians just before elections. For instance:

A few weeks ago I stood on the steps of a State Department building two blocks from the White House. A colleague greeted me and said, "I hear you're leaving us." I agreed that I was. "Why?" he demanded in a tone of shocked disbelief. I told him I was returning to the newspaper business. "And beat your brains out?" he asked incredulously.

I then suggested to my coworker that some people liked to earn their living and that, besides, Congress might some day carry out its economy threat and eliminate his job.

"That's all right," he assured me. "I've got civil-service status, and I can float to another agency. I like it here; it's a nice, easy job."

I walked away thinking that here, in one man, was the embodiment of thousands upon thousands of Government workers who long ago forgot that someone—in Scranton, Syracuse, Bowling Green, Ohio, and every city and hamlet in the United States—is paying their way.

If you accuse a Government worker of lack of conscience, whether he's a filing clerk or a full-blown, mahogany-desk bureaucrat, he replies with an injured bellow that you've challenged his patriotism and the honor of his public service. That's the standard answer Government workers use that answer to salve the conscience just as others shout, "Stupid," at anyone with whom they disagree.

But it's not a sufficient answer and it's a convenient dodge of the facts.

During 8 months as an information specialist for the State Department's International Press Division, I worked at various times in the White House, the State Department news room and various other Government agencies. Eight months seems a short time. In Washington it's a lifetime of waste, frustration, and ridiculous make-believe.

My job was to write news and feature stories that we hoped would be printed overseas in foreign newspapers or magazines to throw some light on the truth about the United States—the truth that the Communists have been working overtime to deny. Many of these stories were broadcast by the highly publicized Voice of America. That's where part of the rub comes in. How much of this truth is being heard? How much is being printed—and in fact, is it being presented in such a fashion that the rest of the world even will bother to hear it or read it? I don't believe the answer has ever been given to those questions. Not the whole answer.

The obvious question should come up here. If the Voice of America, for which the taxpayers spent nearly \$100,000,000, were doing its job, why were the same taxpayers called upon to donate more millions to the privately sponsored Radio Free Europe? Is it that the private citizen has more courage for telling the truth than our own Government has?

In the State Department's International Press Division, where reams of news and feature stories are written every week for various kinds of publications, there is a staggering amount of duplication of personnel, time, and effort. A similar amount of duplication on a private newspaper or magazine would make it bankrupt in jig time. But then, the private newspaper or magazine is not supported by tax revenue.

I know of one case where a worker in a supervisory capacity was so lacking in experience and tact that the unit in this person's charge was losing its best personnel. The superiors decided finally that something had to be done. But because experience and tact were the touchy problem, they could find no direct way to better the situation. Government workers long ago lost the ability

to do things directly. The last suggestion I heard was that they dream up a new project for their difficult supervisor and transfer him to that. A convenient method of changing a tough situation and spending more of the taxpayer's money at the same time.

The duplication of jobs, the bureaucratic tendency to sit things out, the careless regard for money, are in themselves a widely known fact about "big government," and the butt of many jokes. Even the bureaucrats have jokes about themselves.

The discouraging element lies in the fact that the big and little Government worker has lost all individual conscience about the waste, red tape, and obstructive confusion that surround him. He's resigned to it and doesn't give a hoot in hell. The Government—that vague, paternalistic cornucopia—owes him a living, and he's going to get it.

Meanwhile, the cornucopia stands on end and down the drain goes the taxpayers' money.

CONFUSION IS THE KEYNOTE IN CITY OF GOBBLYDGOOK

If your grandmother falls downstairs and breaks her neck, and if the sight of it doubles you over in laughter, you should board the next train to Washington. You'll die laughing in Washington, the Capital of Confusion. For instance.

Last February, my boss in a propaganda division of the State Department asked me to write an office memorandum addressed to the staff of about 25 writers. He handed me a clipping from the Washington Star.

The newspaper story listed eight objectives of the United States propaganda project. My boss, with all the aplomb of a Minsky burlesque straight man, told me the chief of the chief of the division had outlined the eight objectives, but they were classified as confidential, so we'd have to pick them up from the newspaper. There's nothing like keeping your employees in the dark about what they're supposed to do—in Washington, at least.

In Scranton, if someone asks you where you work, you tell him—right out, like this: "I work for the Murray Corp." or, "I work for Scranton Lace." But not in Washington. In the Capital of Confusion you give your questioner a fast shuffle in the language of gobbledygook. The longer you're in Washington, the more gobbledygook you know. As a case in point, I worked for the International Press Division of the Department of State. But you don't say that. You say INP, using initials. Multiply this by all the Government agencies in Washington, all their thousands of subsidiaries, and the combinations of letters in the alphabet, and down you go—buried in a blizzard of gobbledygook.

I called the State Department Bureau for information one day, identified myself, and said I worked for INP. The man on the other end asked, "Are you in government?" He seemed afraid I might be one of those private citizens you hear about now and then. I assured him I worked for the Government—in fact, I added, he and I both worked for the State Department. He was stunned. He'd worked for the State Department 10 years, he chuckled, and never heard of INP. It was just too funny for words. It didn't make much difference because he referred me to another set of initials, who referred me to another set of initials. The men who worked for the various initials were unwilling to take the responsibility for telling me what I wanted to know, so the sole benefit of the entire exchange was lung exercise for me. I got that lung exercise several times a week.

When the State Department's propaganda officials went before congressional committees some time ago to present their case for a new appropriation they ordered one of their artists to prepare charts to be used in explaining the program and its expenses.

"Make the charts good," the artist was told, "but not too good. If you make them too good the Congressmen will think that's all you do around here." The artist backed off in a daze and at last reports was still trying to divine the fine line between "good" and "not too good."

And the memorandum. Bless the memorandum. In the event you're a taxpayer private citizen with your nose to the grindstone, you may never have seen a memorandum. You haven't missed a thing. All memorandums are printed in the Government Printing Office. Some are small blue ones, some are long blue ones, others are white and long. Across the top, it says: "Office memorandum." Then in a line down the left side, is this:

"From:

"To:

"Subject:"

You'll find reams and reams of these memorandums stuffed into drawers, filing cabinets, and piled in the corners of any Government agency. I remember one irreverent wagster walking down a State Department hallway one day carrying an armful of blank memorandum pads. Like a program hawker at a ball game, he was shouting:

"Get your memorandum here, folks. Can't tell one bureaucrat from another without your memorandums."

Walk into any Government agency and ask the first man you see at a desk for some simple information. Chances are three in five, he'll answer you like this: He'll burrow into a drawer or a filing cabinet and mumble.

"Just a minute, please, I've got a memorandum around here someplace that covers that."

No successful bureaucrat says anything unless he can find a memorandum covering it. If he's wrong, he can always blame the memorandum.

When news stories are written about world or national events by State Department propaganda writers, their output is guided by a policy staff which determines what line the stories should take to beat point up the United States position on the subject. And you can probably see right now that this is a perfect spot for the memorandum. It is, indeed. In 8 months, all the policy memoranda I ever saw arrived 1 or 2 days after the story had been written and sent overseas. It was fun, however, to read those confidential memoranda to find out what you should have said in your story—which, 99 times out of a hundred, you said anyway.

Sure, you'll find a lot of laughs in Washington. You'll just die laughing. Washington is a regular riot of whacky doings. Of course, the price is high, and you might find the laughs sticking in your throat if you started to tally up the bill.

VOICE OF AMERICA RESULTS MAKE IT COSTLY PROGRAM

The State Department's propaganda project is costing you, the taxpayer, about \$185,000,000. It spent about \$100,000,000 last year and has an appropriation of \$85,000,000 this year. That staggering amount of money would run many of the Nation's big cities for a year.

Propaganda—good, hard-hitting United States propaganda—is a must to counteract the vicious innuendo Russia is spreading throughout the world about you and me. But are you, the taxpayer, getting your money's worth? Or is the timid, inefficient State Department pouring your money down the drain? Let's have a look.

From a good Democrat, whom you would expect to praise the State Department's propaganda, came this criticism only a few weeks ago, "The United States is hiding its light under a bushel."

That criticism came from Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic national committeeman

for Washington, D. C. He had toured 2 months in France and Italy and came home shocked at the efficiency of Russian propaganda and the lack of ours.

Hildreth's criticisms were published in the Washington Post, a newspaper with strong administration leanings, but which rarely hesitates in calling a spade a spade. Hildreth said, "We've been too afraid of bragging and strutting in the past." The Voice of America, he added, is not enough. "Not everyone has radios."

The Communists, Hildreth said in the Post article, are plastering hundreds of posters all over Europe, angled to rouse anti-United States feeling over "problems that affect the people closest." But the United States isn't answering adequately, Hildreth concludes.

This is a good time to ask why—if we're spending \$185,000,000—we are not answering the Communists. You'll never get your answer from the State Department people who run the propaganda program. Not even the congressional subcommittee that investigated our propaganda last June could get an answer, and as a result, Congress cut the State Department's propaganda request from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000.

Let's go to the record, which in this case are the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, which was studying the State Department's request last June for \$115,000,000 to carry on the propaganda program.

The record discloses that as of last June, 8,287 people were working in the State Department's information division. At the end of 1952, the record shows, the State Department hoped to have 10,369 at work on propaganda.

The record also shows this: The State Department hired the British news service, Reuters, to analyze Voice of America results in Europe. Here are excerpts from a few Reuters reports, which even the Congressmen didn't question.

For London: "The over-all percentage of listeners [to Voice of America] is small. Britains listen to the BBC, or European stations."

For Stockholm: "About 1 Swede in 25 listens more or less regularly to the Voice of America."

For Madrid: "Spanish radio listeners to the Voice of America had considerably decreased in the last few years, but since the Korean hostilities many more people are listening to it again. One radio-listening expert said that he considered that at the moment 60 percent of those who have a short-wave radio set listen to the Voice of America." (But the survey doesn't say how many short-wave sets are owned in Spain. So 60 percent could be 2 listeners or 2,000,000. Who knows?)

For Vienna: "The Voice of America is listened to widely but casually in Austria."

For Istanbul: "Too much United States domestic news and too much 'high' diplomatic matter presented in an 'Olympian' manner lessen the value of Voice of America programs for listeners in the iron-curtain countries, is the unanimous opinion of leading political refugees of the Istanbul Refugees Mutual Aid Committee. . . . Each refugee represented a different country."

For Albania: "There is too much news of no importance for simple Albanians. They should choose themes of special interest to Albania."

These aren't intended to show that the Voice of America is a failure by any means. To the contrary, the Voice of America wins as much praise as criticism in Europe. But the fact remains there is much qualified criticism and so far the State Department has done little to evade such unfavorable comment.

In addition to the much publicized Voice of America, which is only a part of the

propaganda program, the State Department sends out material for use in foreign newspapers and magazines, also makes moving pictures for showing in foreign countries, carries on an exchange of students, and finally sets up libraries abroad where United States books, magazines, and newspapers are available.

In addition, the State Department publishes a magazine called Amerika, printed in the Russian language and distributed in Russia under contract with the Soviet Government. The Senate subcommittee hearings disclosed in June that the magazine costs more than \$500,000 a year to produce. Originally, the Russians said they would put 50,000 copies on sale, but, breaking their word as they usually do, the Russians cut that number to 24,000.

Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada, expressed amazement that a magazine costing half a million dollars was getting to 24,000 known readers in Russia. He charged that such a tremendous expense was poor management. No, it wasn't poor management, said the State Department man defending the expenditure. It was a political problem. There you have it again. Who cares about management when you're spending the taxpayers' money? It comes easy.

Some 400 men and women in Washington are pouring out hundreds of thousands of words every month for foreign newspapers and other publications, but no one in the State Department has as yet proved whether the stuff is being used abroad, and if it is, is anyone reading it or believing it?

Commenting on the State Department's blasé attitude toward the millions it is spending, Senator McCarran said bitterly:

"The State Department information people come in here for more money, but they never can show any use for it. They always say, 'We are going to do better next year—just give us more money, and we will do better next year.' We cannot tell you what we have done this year or for the year before."

And that's about the size of it. The State Department is spending the money, but has never really said for what.

STATE DEPARTMENT MISSES BEST PROPAGANDA SHOTS

A dictatorship, by its very nature, is ruthlessly efficient. The Russian propaganda apparatus follows that pattern and, with a straight face, tells colossal lies about the United States wherever anyone in the world will listen. Meanwhile, our State Department, steeped in the striped-pants tradition of caution and timidity, fails to tell the truth about race relations in the United States, and once tried to muzzle its own mouthpiece when Robert Vogeler told the story of his tortures in Communist Hungary.

Several weeks ago when 22 Negro children left New York City for Vermont, where they were to spend 2 weeks on farms with white families, it was suggested to the State Department's International Press Division that stories and pictures of the event should be published to counteract Russian exaggerations of our treatment of Negroes.

A couple of people in the International Press Division thought it was a good idea, but the chief of the division vetoed it. Why? His reason was that a southern Congressman might hear of the story and accuse the State Department of promoting anti-segregation. And besides, he added, the State Department was before Congress right that minute asking for propaganda money and it couldn't risk Congressional anger.

Someone had the courage, rare in Washington, to carry the idea further. Still fearing Congressional reaction, it was decided to check the political affiliations of the people involved in the plan. The 22 Negro children were sponsored by the Abyssinian Baptist

Church, of New York City. The church and its pastor were found to have no subversive connections, but a minister who read a prayer at the railroad station when the children departed, and who had only a vague connection with the project, once was affiliated with a committee to free Communist Earl Browder.

So the State Department's policy advisers decided they would not "cover" or write the story of 22 Negro children living with white families in Vermont. Their reason? The State Department was seeking appropriations from Congress and had to lie low, taking no chances on the ire of Congress.

A few weeks later Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, toured the Far East, the Middle East, and Alaska. In Singapore he was shocked to find the newspapers there carrying eight-column headlines and four-column pictures from Cicero, Ill., U. S. A., about a young Negro and his wife who were stoned out of their apartment in a white district. It didn't take three guesses to know who provided the Singapore newspaper with all the details, and the exaggerations to boot. Dewey was so concerned he delivered a lengthy speech to Singapore officials, trying to explain that race relations in the United States are not nearly as bad as the Communists picture them.

So while the State Department, with an \$185,000,000 propaganda program, was too timid to tell the story of 22 Negro children visiting white people, Governor Dewey was belatedly and futilely shouting into a tide of Communist propaganda in Singapore.

A few months ago Robert Vogeler was freed from a Hungarian prison where he had spent 17 months on a phony charge of espionage. He returned to the United States, a nearly whipped man. After coming out of Bethesda, Md., Naval Hospital, he gave a long speech at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C. It was a hair-curler. He described the stimulants, the tortures, and the ruthlessness of the Hungarian secret police.

Three major wire services of the world—the Associated Press, United Press, the International News Service—carried the story in great length, one of them carrying practically all of Vogeler's words. When a State Department reporter returned from his coverage of the Vogeler address, he was dumbfounded to find that someone—I don't know who—in the Hungarian section of the State Department was unwilling to let the Vogeler story be carried in the State Department's propaganda outlets. Why? It never was explained. But a good guess would be that the same old caution, the same old inability to make a decision had hamstringed some job-fearing minor bureaucrat.

Finally, after 2 or 3 hours, when it was proven that the Vogeler story had been flashed to all the world by private wire services, the State Department policy Solomons allowed their propaganda division to go ahead with it.

Perhaps these instances of fear, indecision, and lack of conviction explain, at least, in part, why such private organizations as Crusade for Freedom have set up Radio Free Europe to spread the gospel of democracy, or why it took a private organization to have the imagination to send balloons floating over the iron curtain with their messages of hope for enslaved peoples.

So far, the State Department, even with its \$185,000,000 for propaganda, has done nothing so imaginative and bold as Winds of Freedom which loosed the balloons over Eastern Europe. Such a maneuver excites the minds of men, especially the minds of enslaved people.

The minds of our State Department propagandists are so preoccupied, however, with dodges and alibis to preserve themselves in their jobs that bold ideas may never occur to them.

STATE DEPARTMENT SPIES GUARD FENCES FOR BUREAUCRATS

If Members of Congress knew that State Department reporters and writers, hired to gather propaganda, were spying on them, they would be furious—and justifiably.

And if you, the average taxpayer, would take into account that these men whom you are paying to write propaganda, are using much of their time spying on the deliberations of Congress, you should be furious, also. It's your money they're using to preserve themselves in their jobs so they can go on spending your money year in and year out.

The State Department's International Press Division, as a routine matter, has reporters covering both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate to pick up news that is of interest in foreign countries. That's fine.

But on many occasions—I could not even estimate the number accurately—these men, and others, are assigned to watch committees studying State Department propaganda appropriations hearings. They have been under orders to report immediately to their superiors.

What they report has no possible use as propaganda overseas, but is simply information for the bureaucrats who run the program. They, in turn, use this information to build their defenses and lay their tactics for the time when they are to ask for even more money.

You, the taxpayer, remember, are footing the bill for this, while these men who are hired to write propaganda are spying on Congress simply to ferret out information to save their own skins, their salaries and expenses are coming out of your pocket.

For myself, I have been told time and time again by my superiors in the State Department's International Press Division to watch the teletype machines, the newspapers, and all else for any stories or speeches that criticize the propaganda program or the Voice of America. On at least five occasions I have called aides to Edward Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, to report such critical items. Immediately, of course, Barrett's office sets its defense mechanism in motion.

I ask, how in the world can we get a vital propaganda job done in these dangerous days, days when our leaders in it spend half their waking hours fashioning alibis? It seems obvious that if they had any confidence in themselves or their product they wouldn't be in the least concerned about criticism, except as a routine part of their work.

Our fear-ridden, faint-hearted State Department propagandists have grown into the habit of working on the principle that the best way to avoid embarrassing mistakes is to do nothing.

One thing I am sure they will do, however, and quickly, if these articles reach their attention. They will start with blanket denials and then turn on the smears. They'll call me a sorehead, a malcontent, and unqualified to criticize.

Smears or not, it's about time someone asked some pertinent questions about where the \$185,000,000 is going for propaganda—and got an answer.

One of the principal reasons why the American people are not getting nearly their money's worth in the propaganda program is the fact that the State Department International Press Division is dominated by former Office of War Information workers. The Office of War Information was merged into the State Department in 1946. Many of its memorandum-writing experts held onto their Government jobs, and today hold the top positions in the International Press Division.

In one section alone, former OWI men hold virtually every top post from general manager on down the line. Why is this bad, you ask? It is bad because these men are,

like all men, creatures of habit, and they are now the victims of too much time in Government. They move slowly, with painful caution and are frozen toward new ideas. Holding the jobs they do, they are in position to deny, or shut out, good paying posts for men from private industry—men who might have fresh ideas and imagination and the ingenuity to get them through the red tape of bureaucracy.

Congress, or the State Department itself, must take stock of United States propaganda and tear down the defenses that now surround it. We need propaganda. We need friends in the world. We must compete just as hard for the minds of men as we do for high ground on the Korean battlefield. But we can't spend \$185,000,000 every couple of years and get the pitiful product we're now getting. We haven't got that much money, if some Congressmen are right. And we certainly don't have the time.

Congress, or some other agency, should ask a commission of the top newspaper, magazine, and radio executives in the United States to give their time to move into the State Department's propaganda program and clean house. This commission of top executives should be given unlimited powers to hire and fire, rip out the red tape, dismiss the faint-hearted, and put men with ideas and authority into the leading jobs.

The State Department will say that there is a United States Advisory Commission on Information already set up to do such a job. But the Commission hears and sees only what the State Department's propaganda people want it to see and hear. Besides, the members of the Commission are too busy with their private businesses to give full time to the job.

The task of cleaning house in the State Department's Information Division will take time and solid effort. There must be many private citizens in the United States who could—and would—do the job. But, first, they must be given a free hand.

And the job must be done soon. Anything less would mean a victory for communism in the battle for the minds of men or, at the very least, the loss of more millions of dollars with nothing to show for them.

Karl Stefan, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Karl Stefan was my great and good friend. I am sure that every Member of this House who knew him can say those same words, because Karl Stefan was the kind of person who made friends of all with whom he came in contact. But to me he was a very particular friend, a special friend, because we have had many interests in common, and hence many associations in our work here in the House of Representatives.

Among other things, he and I have been deeply interested in the subject of aeronautics. I have long admired Karl Stefan for his keen understanding of aeronautics and communications. He not only was a careful student of these subjects but he was one who enjoyed flying and, in fact, had flown over most of the world. As a member of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the

Eightieth Congress he served on its Subcommittee on Transportation and made many important contributions to the report of the subcommittee as well as to the report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. That report is known as Senate Report No. 949 of the Eightieth Congress, second session.

Karl Stefan was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing, among other agencies, with the Department of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Board. In that capacity he was in a position to know every detail of the Government's activities in relation to civil aeronautics, and to advance those important interests. His untimely and sudden passing comes as a piercing shock to us all. To those concerned with aeronautics his death removes a real pillar of strength that will not soon be replaced.

Mr. Speaker, these poor words of mine, inadequate as they are in expressing my own grief upon losing my friend, are only a supplement to the many beautiful things that have been said of Karl Stefan, and which I would like to be able to find the words for myself. My heart goes out to his lovely wife, his real companion over the years, with the hope that she may find some consolation in the knowledge that we here, in our ways of men, likewise loved her husband as a true and steadfast friend.

Routing the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, here is a priceless reply to the Communist Party, United States of America, when it tried to infiltrate into the United Committee for Civil Rights in Portland, Ore. The writer, David Robinson, regional director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in that area, was named by the committee to answer the Communist bid for affiliation. The United Committee consists of 55 Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish groups, civic, labor, students, and political agencies.

The civil-rights ordinance lost in the referendum, but Robinson's answer is one of the clearest indictments of communism and a splendid essay on the privileges and rights of every freedom-loving American.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U S A.

OREGON STATE COMMITTEE,

Portland, Ore.

(Attention: Mr. Mark Haller, chairman; Mr. Mort Newman, organizational secretary.)

GENTLEMEN: Your application for affiliation with the United Committee for Civil Rights was given consideration by the executive board and the writer was appointed to prepare the committee's answer to your letter and to inform you of the action taken on your application.

It is our firm conviction that if there was any sincerity of purpose in your statement favoring adoption of the civil-rights ordinance you would be anxious to withhold the kiss of death impliedly involved in endorsement by you.

We have every reason to question the good faith of the Russian-inspired and controlled Communist Party of the United States in expressing desire to affiliate with our committee. Our aims and purposes are totally at variance. We are first of all loyal Americans, trying within the framework of law under constitutional guaranties to effect enactment of legislation through democratic processes.

The humblest citizen of Portland will have an opportunity to cast his ballot in secret without molestation or fear, and his ballot will be counted, and as much weight given to it as to the ballot of the wealthiest or most influential person in the city. We are unwilling to trade this privilege of the free ballot for the dictatorship of a politburo.

The right of *habeas corpus* wherein the judicial branch of our Government can be set into motion for an open public inquiry into the cause of a prisoner's detention is a constitutional guaranty in this country.

Even members of the American branch of the Russian Communist Party have sought and been given the protection of this safeguard to our liberties. We are not willing to exchange this civil and liberty right for the police state of Russia, where in the dead of night, citizens are taken into custody without warrant and without trial and are transported into life servitude. It seems ironic that those who seek to destroy the American Constitution are always quick to invoke its provisions when their liberty is threatened. It is tragic that the freedoms thus protected are directed to make America subservient to a foreign totalitarian state wherein the dignity of the human personality is not recognized.

Our country is made up of people of various religious faiths. Many of the immigrants to these shores came to escape the bigotry and persecution which prevented their unrestricted worship according to dictates of their consciences. While the United States has not always been free from acts of prejudiced men, there has always been the great fundamental law, the Constitution, which is both a bar against imposition of a state-approved religion and a sanctuary of protection against those who would interfere with the right of free worship. Here Catholic, Protestant, and Jew are protected in the right to observe and preserve the tenets of their faiths. These precious rights we are not willing to surrender or trade for what has been set up in Russia where God and the moral law have been dethroned and instead deification of the state and its rulers has been substituted.

Notwithstanding the charity and love in their hearts for all men of good will, the Protestants, Catholics, and Jews who make up the bulk of the membership of the United Committee for Civil Rights do not desire affiliation with an organization which seeks to accomplish in the United States the destruction of religious freedom.

The insignificant membership of the American branch of the Russian Communist Party is convincing evidence that our conception of free political institutions and the democratic structure of our society with all the room for improvement which admittedly exists make the field a sterile one for growth of Russian-controlled communism. That undoubtedly is the reason the Communist Party desires the failure, not the success, of the significant social changes which are steadily being achieved.

These social changes could be magnified and accelerated were it not for the delib-

erate and malicious design of the Russian Government to create unrest, war and collapse of the United States and other democracies.

If proof were needed that the American branch of the Russian Communist Party was guilty of furthering this design, the references in your own letter to "United States aggression against the Koreans" and "the unjust character of the (Korean) war" and "American troops that are intervening against the people of Korea" convict you. It is such expressions and conduct which are a corollary of these attitudes which create apprehension and induce legislation caused by fear. If your comrades in Russia would say or write such a traitorous thing, their lives would be quickly forfeited.

I am not happy that Congress was confronted with a situation which the members believed called for enactment of the McCarran Act. The Communist Party can claim the dubious credit for provoking the passage of the act. One thing is certain and that is the repeal of the law as soon as the emergency which called it into existence is over. How long that emergency lasts depends on how long some traitors within our midst give allegiance, aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

Peace and stability could come to a peace-hungry world if there was the slightest desire for it on the part of the Communists who control Russia. The gigantic sums now being spent for military preparedness would be available to study the cause and cure of disease, for building educational institutions and for improvement of mankind generally. That, however, is not the program of the Kremlin.

You have no place in the United Committee for Civil Rights. Your program and tactics are to create turmoil, unrest, and confusion. We want none of this. We are taking our case to the citizens of Portland in the American democratic way. We are asking the voters to approve the civil rights ordinance so that human beings will be able to purchase food and shelter without religious or racial discrimination. This is in keeping with the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations of which the United States is a signatory. I am hopeful and confident that the voters of Portland will approve the ordinance which was unanimously passed by the city council. I am equally confident that the rulers of the Kremlin and their American followers would hail the defeat of the measure with great glee. I hope that this pleasure will be denied to them.

By unanimous vote of the executive committee of the United Committee for Civil Rights, your application for affiliation has been rejected.

Sincerely,

DAVID ROBINSON,
Member, Executive Committee.

Alabama Forest Fires in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1950, 2.3 percent of Alabama's protected forest acres were burned by fire. Four hundred and fifteen thousand eight hundred and twenty-six acres, out of a

total protected acreage of 18,044,938, were destroyed by fire.

At this rate of destruction—assuming its uniform rate, and that forests are totally destroyed on the acres burned—Alabama's forests could be completely destroyed in 43 years, or one generation.

Our forests are one of our very greatest and most valuable natural resources.

It is a resource that can be preserved by properly guarding against fires—a duty of every citizen.

It is a resource that can be replenished by reforestation—the planting of tree seedlings which are available, at least in some degree, to every Alabama farmer.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, has the third largest number of fire protected forest acres—2,389,027—among all the nine congressional districts of the State.

In acres burned by forest fires in 1950, with 51,183 acres it ranks fourth among the congressional districts of the State.

But, in percentage of total forest acres burned it has the very good rating of seventh among the congressional districts of the State.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table which I have prepared under the heading "Alabama's forests, 1950, by congressional districts," and a table of "Selected statistics on forest fires for the State of Alabama by congressional districts" prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I also include an article from the September 4, 1951, issue of the Haleyville Advertiser styled "Alabama Third in Nation for Lumber Industry."

Alabama forests, 1950, by congressional districts

	Protected acres	Acres burned	Percent burned
District 1	3,770,242	83,441	2.48
District 2	3,190,291	78,616	2.46
District 3	1,715,133	38,557	2.24
District 4	1,750,542	52,282	2.98
District 5	1,193,494	35,753	2.42
District 6	2,341,120	48,146	2.06
District 7	2,389,027	51,183	2.14
District 8	1,280,169	11,551	.90
District 9	522,400	16,006	3.06
Total	18,044,938	417,826	2.30

Selected statistics on forest fires for the State of Alabama by congressional districts, 1950

County	Number of fires	Area burned (acres)	Average size fires	Protected forest (acres)	Percent of protected area burned
Cherokee	187	6,484.1	34.7	402,700	1.40
Clarke	86	5,711.2	65.8	641,100	1.14
Marion	109	6,197.2	56.8	277,300	2.21
Mobile	465	35,440.7	76.3	624,542	5.67
Monroe	288	7,552.4	26.2	402,100	1.83
Washington	185	22,400.6	122.2	611,200	3.71
Wilcox	135	4,268.2	31.6	288,300	1.48
Total	1,458	83,443.6	51.1	3,370,242	2.48

Selected statistics on forest fires for the State of Alabama by congressional districts, 1950—Continued

County	Number of fires	Area burned (acres)	Average size fires	Protected forest (acres)	Percent of protected area burned
SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Baldwin	471	22,795.5	48.3	856,138	2.67
Bullock	231	3,073.1	13.3	312,700	.98
Conecuh	350	8,099.1	22.6	356,700	2.26
Crenshaw	86	12,229.4	139.0	214,400	5.70
Escambia	731	22,813.8	31.2	452,109	5.04
Lowndes	28	812.0	29.0	219,500	.37
Montgomery	19	1,475.0	77.6	213,200	.09
Pike	68	2,603.0	38.3	188,900	1.38
Covington	140	4,715.0	33.7	372,644	1.26
Total	2,135	78,615.9	48.1	3,190,291	2.46
THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Barbour	180	8,667.5	48.2	294,500	2.95
Bullock	93	3,220.0	35.7	117,300	2.83
Collee	64	3,286.0	47.6	191,200	1.69
Dale	60	1,886.0	30.1	138,700	1.43
Geneva	43	2,929.0	68.1	156,220	1.87
Henry	56	2,267.3	40.5	162,300	1.40
Houston	104	2,195.1	21.1	120,200	1.83
Lee	170	4,359.0	25.6	163,900	2.69
Macou	89	4,036.0	52.1	187,261	2.48
Russell	134	4,960.2	37.0	183,800	2.70
Total	1,003	38,556.8	40.6	1,715,453	2.24
FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Autauga	79	6,471.0	81.9	232,400	2.78
Calhoun	100	4,304.8	43.0	161,164	2.67
Clay	112	5,391.7	48.1	180,958	2.98
Cossa	127	8,042.8	63.3	281,300	2.86
Dallas	120	4,874.5	37.8	291,692	1.67
Elmore	34	2,207.1	64.9	173,500	1.27
St. Clair	153	13,294.5	86.9	236,492	5.62
Talladega	114	7,095.1	67.5	193,036	3.99
Total	839	52,281.5	61.7	1,750,542	2.98
FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Chambers	62	4,367.9	70.5	126,400	3.46
Cherokee	36	669.6	18.6	197,200	.34
Cleburne	114	12,523.0	109.9	196,528	6.37
De Kalb	55	1,880.5	34.4	250,800	.75
Etowah	121	2,909.0	24.0	154,140	1.88
Marshall	156	3,298.7	21.1	143,226	2.31
Randolph	100	6,224.0	62.4	181,400	3.44
Tallapoosa	226	3,551.0	17.0	228,900	1.68
Total	870	35,752.7	44.7	1,479,304	2.42
SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Bibb	102	1,006.0	9.9	242,358	.42
Chilton	240	11,397.0	47.5	268,259	4.25
Greene	79	5,004.4	63.3	218,300	2.29
Hale	37	1,619.0	43.8	173,396	.62
Perry	81	2,140.0	70.3	206,370	1.06
Shelby	290	16,809.5	58.2	338,600	4.71
Sumter	45	552.8	12.3	207,300	.21
Tuscaloosa	408	9,807.5	24.0	612,334	1.60
Total	1,232	48,436.2	41.2	2,347,120	2.06
SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Blount	136	6,316.0	46.4	212,800	2.97
Cullman	103	2,614.5	25.4	216,700	1.21
Fayette	60	2,207.6	36.8	259,500	.85
Franklin	108	1,951.8	18.1	248,116	.79
Lamar	133	7,109.0	53.5	236,000	3.01
Marion	159	9,159.6	57.6	296,200	3.10
Pickens	140	6,588.8	47.1	341,700	1.93
Walker	350	9,590.2	27.3	364,900	2.62
Winston	163	5,656.0	34.7	213,111	2.65
Total	1,352	51,182.6	38.5	2,389,027	2.14
EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Colbert	92	2,282.9	24.8	213,180	1.07
Jackson	142	4,229.6	29.8	474,200	.89
Lauderdale	49	1,601.8	33.9	148,400	1.12
Lawrence	31	783.6	25.3	103,265	.76

Selected statistics on forest fires for the State of Alabama by congressional districts, 1950—Continued

County	Number of fires	Area burned (acres)	Average size fires	Protected forest (acres)	Percent of protected area burned
EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—continued					
Limestone	1	14.0	14.0	81,716	0
Madison	33	841.1	16.4	149,028	.36
Morgan	51	2,037.7	40.0	110,700	1.84
Total	399	11,550.7	26.3	1,280,469	.90
NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT					
Jefferson	650	16,006.2	24.6	522,400	3.06
Grand total	9,947	415,826.1	41.8	18,044,638	2.30

NOTE.—The entire forest area of Alabama is under organized protection against fire.

Source: State of Alabama, Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation, Monthly fire report by forest ranger districts, December 1950.

[From the Haleyville (Ala.) Advertiser of September 4, 1951]

ALABAMA THIRD IN NATION FOR LUMBER INDUSTRY

Actually growing a never-ending stream of money which flows into Alabama from all sections of the Nation, this State today ranks third among the 48 States in the production of lumber. Department of Commerce figures just released show the prominent position of Alabama in this industry. Annually, Alabama tree farmers are paid close to \$30,000,000 for their raw timber. Alabama sawmills, numbering more than 3,000 cut and dressed and sold this lumber for a total price exceeding \$100,000,000. Since small farmers and land owners account for nearly 70 percent of the tree growing land in the State, this means that the great flow of wealth from the lumber industry was widely diffused throughout the State, and that thousands of farmers gained a profit in this field.

What Jews Should Know About Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article which appeared in the June 1951 issue of Liberal Judaism, written by Willard Johnson, national program director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is entitled to the greatest possible publicity. It will do much to create good will among Christians and Jews.

WHAT JEWS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT CHRISTIANITY

It is good that Christians and Jews should look at some aspects of one another's religion so that we avoid the commonplace but

dangerous statement that "After all, there's not much difference between Christianity and Judaism." As a matter of fact, and despite many common elements in both religions, there are many very great differences between Judaism and Christianity, insofar as the majority of Christians are concerned.

These differences, of course, need not lead to hostility and prejudice. Neither should we try to build up a false and superficial sense of good will by glossing over the differences. The clear, frank facts are that we must live together as neighbors in spite of our differences and that if we do not respect one another and cooperate for our commonly held objectives, Christianity and Judaism both may be driven underground, perhaps even to the point of virtual extinction in the coming years. This has become a truism in these last 20 years but its urgency must constantly be kept in mind and on all occasions lest we falter in our struggle against the materialism, atheism, and totalitarianism which enslave a third of the people of our world.

Let us not fear differences. They are a part of nature. According to the scientists there are no two objects in the universe exactly alike. No two atoms, no two grains of sand, no two thumbprints, no two faces (thank God!), no two personalities. Infinite variety and diversity are the creation of God. So, why should we fear differences? Why should we not teach our children to look for and adjust themselves to differences? Only dictators try to make people the same—and they do not succeed because they are violating a basic fact of nature.

Let me be clear—I am talking about differences among people—I do not refer to truth itself. There is only one truth but people's acceptance and interpretation of that truth differ.

To be sure we must also see the mutual and common elements which bind together people of every race, creed, and nation. These common characteristics of human beings are also God's handiwork. They, too, must form part of the education we provide for our children since education, to be adequate, must deal with all of life.

Keeping in mind, therefore, the naturalness of both diversity and our common humanity, let us explore some of the characteristics of Christianity which may not be well known to Jews.

First in importance, I believe, is the Christian doctrine that Christianity is revealed or given to man by a direct act of God. Jews believe this about Judaism, too. Both are revealed religions. That is, their adherents do not consider them as natural religions growing out of the evolutionary process of thought and social development. They are supernatural; God gave them to man, according to the doctrines of both.

But Christians believe that Christianity is a later, higher, and superior revelation of God. It is necessary to keep this in mind. Christians believe that Christianity is the new dispensation while Judaism is the old.

Along with this are numerous related considerations. For example, most Christians have been taught that Judaism is basically a religion of law, rigid and stern, while Christianity is a religion of love, mercy, and forgiveness. I believe this is a false thesis. Nevertheless, many Christians believe it. I was taught it as a boy in Protestant Sunday school.

This is not to say that Christians believe that Jews, as people, are inferior or that they are doomed to eternal damnation and destruction. I must admit that these ideas have prevailed among some Christians at various times and still do today, but many Christian theologians are trying to point out that these inferences are false.

A complete statement of this seeming dilemma would involve tedious argument, but

to put it simply, Christianity also holds that man must abide by the dictates of his conscience. That is the ultimate and final determinant in all branches of Christianity. If a man has sought knowledge diligently and believes he has the truth he must follow that truth or be lost.

It is therefore consistent to the vast majority of Christians to believe that Christianity, and their branch of Christianity, is the one true faith revealed by God and at the same time to believe that non-Christians who are true to their knowledge and their conscience are entitled to full salvation and are their equals in society as persons and before God as His children.

There is specific teaching on this subject by qualified spokesmen of all branches of Christendom, including the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant. Conscience's final and ultimate and yet Christianity is the one and only true faith. If a Christian truly and honestly should believe that Christianity is false and another faith is true, he must accept the other faith or be lost. Christians, of course, believe that since God gave Christianity as the final revelation to man all people everywhere must and will some day accept it. The truth must prevail. This explains why Christians believe they are obligated to try to convert Jews to Christianity.

Parallel with this belief is the doctrine that Christ is God, the incarnation of God on earth and therefore the revealer of this new and final dispensation. The belief is too well known to be given more attention here but it must be recognized.

Jesus of Nazareth as a man was a Jew who lived as a simple carpenter and teacher. But he was God bringing the new and final revelation to man, first to the Jews, who had received the earlier and incomplete revelation through Moses, the prophets and others, and then to all people everywhere.

The vast majority of Christians believe this, substantially. Some, such as Unitarians (or those who are Unitarian in belief and yet members of other denominations) believe either that Jesus was not God but a great religious teacher, or that all human beings reveal God's nature through the spark of the divine that is in each person and that Jesus was such a revealer of God par excellence. But these Unitarians are only a tiny fraction of the Christian world.¹

Perhaps one of the most important facts in this connection is a rapidly growing awareness of the Jewishness of Jesus, that he taught good ethical Judaism and that his whole life was lived among Jews. George Foote Moore, J. M. P. Smith, Travers Herford, James Parkes, and Conrad Henry Mochlman are chiefly responsible for this awareness.

¹ Some American Protestant Liberals who read this interpretation may say, "I do not accept this version of Christianity. Only the orthodox believe such old-fashioned ideas." To which it is necessary to point out that there are about 750,000,000 Christians in the world. All Protestants in the United States number about 55,000,000; of this number perhaps 10 percent may not accept such beliefs as the superiority of the Christian revelation, the compulsion to convert non-Christians, and the divinity of Christ. In fact, this figure of 5,000,000 is probably high. In other words, 99 percent of the Christians of the world probably accept the orthodox beliefs about the divinity of Christ, the superiority of Christian revelation and the necessity of trying to convert non-Christians.

Many Christian clergymen who speak at synagogues are liberals whose beliefs are not as orthodox as the vast majority of Christians or are men who in deference to their audiences do not present their own beliefs with candor.

Another Christian belief of interest to Jews is that Christianity has continuity and much in common with Judaism. Every Christian accepts the Bible of the Jews, its lawgivers, teachers, poets, and prophets and its history as part of Christianity.

Moses, Joshua, Joseph, Jacob, Solomon, David, Isaiah, Nehemiah, and Micah, as well as the cities and lakes of the Holy Land, are personal possessions of all Christians. They are, for example, some of my most prized and precious childhood memories from Sunday school lessons.

This is likewise true of the great ethical teachings of Judaism, such as the Ten Commandments, and the teachings, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," "What doth the Lord require, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

Most Christians believe that Christ, Paul, and other early Christian leaders taught a new way of life. They often say, as I have already stated, that Judaism is dominated by law, while Christianity is motivated by love. Many Christians would try to prove this by quoting such passages as the teaching of Christ, "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, that you love one another," or the famous thirteenth chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, which ends, "Now abide faith, hope, love, these three, and the greatest of these is love." Equivalents of these, they would say, are not in the Jewish Bible.

A considerable number of philosophers and theologians, however, have studied carefully the ethical teachings of both religions and can discover very little, if any, difference. One of the errors is that some Christians have tried to contrast Christian teachings of their own era with the principles of Judaism of 2,000 years prior to the Christian era. That, of course, is ridiculous. When Judaism and Christianity of similar periods of time are looked at together there is little difference in ethical and moral teaching.

To be sure, some parts of Judaism are legalistic, but so are some parts of Christianity. The differences are not in the realm of ethics and morals, either taught or practiced, but in the realm of dogma, history, ritual, and institutional structure, and government with major contrast arising from Christian beliefs about revelation, the person of Christ, and the concept of the church as the institution of God.

Now I call your attention to a problem that will disturb Christian-Jewish relations for many generations as it already has. I refer to hostility toward Jews which is found in some parts of the New Testament. These texts are in the New Testament because the early Christian church broke away from Judaism and some Christians who had been Jews were trying to defend their new faith, to make it appear as superior and their old as inferior. Likewise there are actual conflict incidents reported in the New Testament. Often you will read such a passage as "and the Jews set upon Paul and drove him from the city." In the gospel of John there is constant reference to the Jews as hostile to Christ, so much so that some Protestant clergymen always substitute the word "people" for "Jews" in public reading of the gospel of John. They base this on two assumptions: (1) There is no historical proof that all Jews of Jesus' day rejected him (note the triumphal entry of Palm Sunday when the people hailed him) and (2) the universalism of the sinfulness of man should be kept in mind by Christians who will not become smug by thinking only of Jews as the rejectors of Christ.

If these passages are read without understanding the background and if they are not interpreted correctly in the light of basic Christian ethics, it is not difficult to see why some Christian children have had their

minds set against Jews at a very early age and with the sanction of the Holy Bible, which, to most fundamentalist Christians, is the final word of God.

Furthermore, this Bible in its essentials cannot be changed. It is the word of God which was fixed in its present form by the church, the representative of Christ on earth. If any Jew expects drastic change of the New Testament in the conceivable future to extract the anti-Jewish passages he is seeing a mirage and cherishing a false hope. It will not be done. But these passages can be, and are being interpreted so that they do not contribute to anti-Semitic attitudes.

Incidentally, it should be noted here that every responsible Christian group about which I know has condemned anti-Semitism without qualification or reservation. Most of them have indeed gone beyond this condemnation and have implemented their statements by specific curricular materials, and study projects.

Great change has taken place, for example, in the teaching of the story of the crucifixion. Take my own experience as an illustration. I was raised in several small towns of Iowa and attended Protestant churches. I recall that my good Sunday school teachers taught me that Jews were responsible for the death of Jesus on the cross. But when I went to seminary I was given what I now accept as the correct interpretation, namely, that some Jews conspired with the Roman rulers to get Jesus out of the way. Neither the Roman rulers nor some of the Jewish religious leaders wanted Jesus to interfere with their domination of the people of Palestine. I was also taught that it was contrary to Christian teaching and immoral to hold responsible either all the Jews of Jesus' day or any Jews who have lived since for the death of Jesus in which they had no conceivable part.

Further I learned that many Christian churches such as the Roman Catholic teach that Christ died for the sins of all mankind and that all who sin take part in a continuous crucifixion.

These teachings and interpretations are becoming increasingly dominant. They are to be found in the catechisms and basic instructional courses of Christian churches. You will hear sermons about them. Some untrained, thoughtless teachers deviate from these principles but the overwhelming trend is to the points I have just stated.

Jews also should know that many Christians cannot in good conscience worship with non-Christians or those who are not members of their own denomination. For example, such large groups as Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, many Lutherans, and Southern Baptists do not permit clergymen of other groups in their sanctuaries. Several large Christian groups will not permit their members to participate in any kind of religious service other than their own.

They believe that theirs is the true faith and therefore that worship conducted by any other clergyman must be false. Whether we accept this position or not, we must respect it for it is a matter of conscience. We should not ask people of any group to violate their conscience by worshipping with others, any more than we would expect them to ask us to violate our conscience by accepting their position. On such matters we should not argue. They are affairs of conscience and faith and we simply must accept the situation as it is.

In conclusion it should be noted again that the differences among religious groups are sharp, pervasive of most of life, and long in years. We must hope and pray that our common humanity, our common purposes and goals, our common enemies and, above all, our common God will bring us together and hold us together in brotherhood, in mutual respect, and in love.

**Hon. Mike Mansfield, of Montana, Reports
on Project Developments in Western
Montana**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in accord with my annual custom, I am happy to include with my remarks a summary of appropriations approved by the Congress for specific reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Indian Office, and Army engineer's projects in the district I have the honor and the privilege to represent. The time covered by these appropriations is for the period during my service as a Representative from the First District of Montana and follows up similar reports sent out by me in previous years.

These projects, with the coming into western Montana of new industries in the Butte-Anaconda and Hungry Horse areas, mark the beginning of the development of our State, a diversification of our economy, and greater security for our people.

Reclamation projects

1 HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

1946.....	\$1,700,000
1947.....	867,210
1948.....	2,500,000
1949.....	14,611,650
1950.....	22,093,125
1951.....	29,500,000
1952.....	22,000,000

Total..... 93,271,985

2. CANYON FERRY PROJECT

1946.....	\$236,270
1947.....	106,205
1948.....	775,000
1949.....	2,950,000
1950.....	7,928,300
1951.....	5,800,000
1952.....	8,000,000

Total..... 25,795,775

**3 CANYON FERRY-GREAT FALLS TRANSMISSION
LINE AND SUBSTATION**

1951.....	\$365,000
-----------	-----------

4. HELENA VALLEY PROJECT

1948.....	\$29,000
1949.....	21,000
1950.....	90,000
1951.....	75,000
1952.....	30,000

Total..... 245,000

5. JEFFERSON RIVER PROJECT

1946.....	\$25,945
1947.....	80,000
1948.....	82,800
1950.....	236,000
1951.....	100,000
1952.....	116,000

Total..... 640,445

6. THREE FORKS PROJECT

1946.....	
1947.....	
1948.....	\$151,000
1949.....	299,600
1950.....	104,000
1951.....	118,000
1952.....	100,000

Total..... 770,600

7 BITTERROOT PROJECT

1946.....	
1947.....	\$89,238
1948.....	
1949.....	40,000
1950.....	50,000
1951.....	

Total..... 179,238

8 MISSOULA VALLEY PROJECT

1945-47 (completed)..... \$269,355

Bonneville power projects

	Cash	Contract authority
Hungry Horse-Keri No 1 trans- mission line.....		
1950.....	\$167,450	
1951.....	(0)	
Hungry Horse-Hot Springs transmission line.....		
1950.....	99,480	\$408,850
1951.....	600,000	1,079,000
1952.....	2,754,000	
Hot Springs-Anaconda trans- mission line.....		
1950.....		321,000
1951.....	500,000	2,817,000
1952.....	5,478,000	
Hot Springs-Spokane trans- mission line.....		
1950.....	271,150	1,514,450
1951.....	3,977,000	835,000
1952.....	2,836,000	
Kalspell substation addition.....		
1950.....	4,250	57,800
1951.....	71,000	
1952.....	Completed	
Hot Springs switching station.....		
1950.....	4,250	183,850
1951.....	33,000	
1952.....	713,000	
Miscellaneous facilities.....		
	37,000	
Total.....	17,515,550	7,218,950
Bonneville office for western Montana (estimate).....		
1950.....	30,000	
1951.....	51,000	
1952.....	56,000	

1 Completed

Army engineers projects

1949: Orchard Homes flood-control
project (expended \$40,000)..... \$140,000
1950: Libby Dam—authorized—May 17, 1950.
(Estimated cost, \$220,000,000; estimated
capacity, 550,000 kilowatts).

Indian Office projects

1. Indian Tuberculosis Hospital,
Warm Springs:
1949..... \$750,000
1950..... 750,000

Total..... 1,500,000

2. Polson drainage project. 1950..... 100,000

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS

1. Ravalli County Electric Cooperative,
Inc., Corvallis, Mont. (it includes Ravalli and
Missoula Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943-50.....	859	809	\$495,900
1951.....	866	799	200,000
Total.....			695,900

2. Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Inc.,
Twin Bridges and Dillon, Mont. (it includes

Jefferson, Madison, Silver Bow, Beaverhead,
and Broadwater Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943-50.....	1,630	879	\$1,743,000
1951.....	1,708	951	500,000
Total.....			2,243,000

3. Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mis-
soula, Mont. (it includes Ravalli, Granite,
Powell, Missoula, Mineral, and Lake Coun-
ties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943-50.....	748	478	\$11,145,000
1951.....	739	401	
Total.....			1,145,000

4. Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc.,
Kalispell, Mont. (it includes Flathead and
Lake Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943-50.....	1,614	843	\$1,218,700
1951.....	1,817	923	755,000
Total.....			1,973,000

5. Elmo Electric Cooperative, Inc., Polson,
Mont (it includes Lake County):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1940-50.....	190	135	\$330,000
1951.....	190	135	
Total.....			330,000

6. Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., For-
tune, Mont (it includes Lincoln and Flat-
head Counties). Construction not com-
pleted.

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1940-50.....	24	20	\$107,000
1951.....	309	143	125,000
Total.....			732,000

In addition, funds allocated to the North
Idaho Electric Cooperative were used to
energize lines and serve farms in Sanders
County, and funds allocated to the Park
County Electric Cooperative were used for
similar purposes in Gallatin County.

History With a Twist?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under
leave granted to extend my remarks in
the Record, I include the following
article:

HISTORY WITH A TWIST

History of Louisiana. You might enjoy
reading this Louisiana history again, if
you've read it before. We have, some place,
but Secretary Bruce McCoy, of the Louisiana

Press Association, reports that it is making the rounds of newspapers in the Northwest. It's entitled "History of Louisiana".

"The Post Office Department in Washington, D. C., was making a careful investigation of title of proposed post-office sites in Louisiana. In due course, the Department received an abstract of title to a tract under consideration.

"Replying, the Post Office Department commented on the fact that the title record began with the year 1803, and stated that while the title seemed to be complete and satisfactory so far as it went still, as a justification for the investment of the sum contemplated, the Department would require to know more of the origin of the title involved, in records back of 1803.

"In due course, a reply was received from one who signed himself as attorney for the owners of the land. He wrote:

"I note your comment upon the fact that the record of title sent you, as applying to the lands under consideration, dates only from the year 1803, and your request for an extension of the record prior to that date.

"Please be advised that the Government of the United States acquired the Territory of Louisiana, including the tract to which your inquiry applies, by purchase from the Government of France, in the year 1803.

"The Government of France acquired title by conquest from the Government of Spain.

"The Government of Spain acquired the title by discovery by one Christopher Colum-

bus, traveler and explorer, a resident of Genoa, Italy, who by agreement concerning the acquisition of title to any land discovered, traveled, and explored, under the sponsorship and patronage of Her Majesty the Queen of Spain.

"The Queen of Spain had verified her arrangement and received sanction of her title by consent of the Pope, a resident of Rome, Italy, and ex-officio representative of viceroy regent of Jesus Christ.

"Jesus Christ was the Son of God.

"God made Louisiana.

"I trust that complies with your request."

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith my third annual

Roll-call record, 1st sess., 82d Cong.

report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. In 1949 and 1950 I prepared reports on my voting and attendance records during the first and second sessions of the Eighty-first Congress. This is a similar compilation for the first session of the Eighty-second Congress complete to the date of adjournment on October 20.

By means of news letters and conferences throughout the district during congressional recesses, I have attempted to inform my constituents and report to them on my stewardship as their Representative in Washington. This voting report is in keeping with my purpose of keeping the people of my district as fully informed as possible on congressional issues.

It is a complete record. It is not a hand-picked list of a few so-called key votes compiled by some lobbyist, pressure group, or political campaign committee. The whole record is there in concise form for the people to examine and evaluate for themselves.

If more complete information on any measure considered, or an explanation of any particular vote, is desired, I shall be glad to respond to such requests.

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote	Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
1951				1951			
1	Jan 3	Quorum call	Present	26	Apr 10	Amendment to H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriations bill, reducing administrative funds for commodity credit corporations by \$750,000 (Rejected, 159 to 250)	Aye
2	do	Election of Speaker of House (Rayburn, 241, Martin, 192)	Martin	27	Apr 11	Quorum call	Present
3	do	Previous question on H. Res. 7, adopting rules of 81st Cong as rules of 82d Cong. (Vote for previous question cut off all amendments.) (Not ordered, 179 to 211)	No.	28	do	do	Do
4	do	Substitute amendment to rules of House, striking out provision permitting committee chairman to call bill up for debate even though rejected by Rules Committee (Agreed to, 215 to 178)	Aye	29	Apr 13	do	Do
5	Jan 17	H. R. 1001 authorize construction of "super" aircraft carrier, 500,000 ton, of naval vessels, and conversion of 1,000,000 ton of existing vessels. (Passed, 365 to 0)	Do	30	do	Motion to recommit S. 1, 1951 amendments to Selective Service Act, and establishing Commission for Universal Military Training (Rejected, 121 to 296)	Aye
6	Jan 19	Quorum call	Present	31	do	S. 1, 1951 amendments to Selective Service Act, and establishing Commission for Universal Military Training (Passed, 52 to 44)	Do
7	Jan 23	H. R. 1725, providing for renegotiation of Government contracts for national defense, where such contracts exceed \$100,000 per year. (Passed, 377 to 0)	Aye	32	Apr 18	Quorum call	Present
8	Jan 24	H. R. 1, establishing a program of gratuity in demerit for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, each serviceman to be covered in the amount of \$10,000. (Passed, 380 to 0)	Do	33	do	Jensen amendment to H. R. 3709, appropriations bill for Federal Security Agency and Labor Department, limiting replacement of personnel (with certain exceptions) to 25 percent of vacancies. (Adopted, 208 to 115)	Aye
9	Jan 31	Quorum call	Present	34	Apr 21	Quorum call	Present
10	do	do	Do	35	Apr 25	do	Do
11	Feb 6	do	Do	36	Apr 26	do	Do
12	Feb 7	Pearl-point amendment, providing for congressional notification by the President prior to reduction of tariff below level determined by Tariff Commission to be a pearl point, to H. R. 1612, extending authority for reciprocal trade agreements. (Adopted, 225 to 168)	Aye	37	May 1	do	Do
13	Mar 7	Motion to recommit H. R. 2615, increasing peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas. (Rejected, 174 to 212)	Do	38	May 2	do	Do
14	Mar 8	Quorum call	Present	39	do	Gary amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, deleting \$3,400,000 for Southeastern Power Administration constructions. (Adopted, 218 to 119)	Aye
15	Mar 13	do	Do	40	do	Harris amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, reducing by \$550,000 the funds for construction by Southwestern Power Administration. (Adopted, 222 to 173)	Do
16	do	H. R. 1545, to authorize emergency reorganizations of executive agencies, substantially increasing existing Presidential authority in such reorganizations. (Rejected, 167 to 227)	No	41	May 2	Short amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, to prevent use of funds for developing western Missouri project. (Adopted, 247 to 152)	Aye
17	Mar 14	Quorum call	Present	42	do	Ford amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, cutting \$53 million from funds allotted for Bonneville Power Administration construction. (Adopted, 225 to 167)	Do
18	do	H. Res. 112, disapproving President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relative to the REC. (Failed of adoption, 200 to 197, a constitutional majority of 218 being required to disapprove reorganization plan.)	Aye	43	do	Pickett amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, cutting \$800,000 from the funds allocated for management of lands and resource, and to earmark \$1,200,000 for use in soil and moisture conservation. (Adopted, 249 to 148)	Do
19	Mar 14	H. Res. 166, providing for consideration of H. R. 2988, for Federal "defense" public housing and community facilities and services. (Rejected, 170 to 219)	No.	44	do	Taber amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, reducing by \$10,000,000 the funds provided the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects. (Adopted, 237 to 160)	Do
20	Mar 21	Amendment to H. R. 3282, appropriating funds for Treasury and Postal Departments, reducing postal operating funds by \$22 million (1.2 percent). (Rejected, 136 to 138)	Aye	45	do	Keating amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriation bill, preventing use of funds to construct duplicate power transmission facilities where wheeling service contracts have been entered into. (Adopted, 226 to 165)	Do
21	Apr 3	Quorum call	Present	46	do	Jensen amendment to H. R. 3790, Department of Interior appropriations bill, permitting the filling of not more than 25 percent of vacancies that occur in Department of Interior during year (with certain exceptions). (Adopted, 224 to 169)	Do
22	Apr 4	do	Do				
23	Apr 6	do	Do				
24	Apr 9	do	Do				
25	Apr 10	H. R. 2612, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time. (Passed, 278 to 115.)	Aye				

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6773

Roll-call record, 1st sess., 82d Cong.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote	Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
	1951				1951		
47	May 3	Quorum call	Present.	96	June 29	Quorum call	Present
48	do	H. Res. 220, providing for consideration of H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and independent offices and agencies, and waiving points of order against the bill. (Adopted, 219 to 159.)	Aye.	97	do	H. Res. 204, providing for consideration, under a closed rule, of H. J. Res. 278, to continue for 31 days the Defense Production Act of 1950. (Adopted, 207 to 85.)	Aye
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.	98	do	Cooley amendment to H. J. Res. 278, temporarily extending Defense Production Act of 1950, to prevent roll-backs or lowering of price ceilings below those on enactment date, and prohibiting new price ceilings during temporary extension period, except agricultural commodities which may exceed parity price. (Agreed to, 232 to 159.)	Do
50	do	Gossett amendment to H. R. 3880, executive and independent offices appropriation bill, limiting to 5,000 the public dwelling units to be started during fiscal year. (Adopted, 181 to 113.)	Aye	99	do	Conference report on S. 1500, extending rent control in the District of Columbia for 1 year, and raising salary of Administrator. (Adopted, 242 to 126.)	No.
51	do	Phillips amendment to H. R. 3880, executive and independent offices appropriations bill, reducing President's emergency fund to \$1,000,000 and permitting carry-over of unexpended funds. (Adopted, 160 to 128.)	Do	100	June 30	Conference report on H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations for July, caused by failure to pass appropriation bills prior to beginning of 1952 fiscal year. (Agreed to, 256 to 12.)	Aye
52	May 7	Quorum call	Present.	101	July 5	Quorum call	Present
53	May 9	H. R. 3576, extending Displaced Persons Act for 6 months, without increasing number of authorizations for admission. (Passed, 312 to 63.)	Aye.	102	do	do	Do
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.	103	do	do	Do
55	May 15	do	Do	104	July 6	do	Do
56	May 17	do	Do	105	July 9	do	Absent
57	do	Overriding of President's veto of H. R. 3396, to require congressional approval of certain land transactions by armed services. (Veto overridden, 312 to 63.)	Aye	106	July 10	do	Present
58	do	Tensen amendment to H. R. 3073, Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, permitting the filling of not more than 25 percent of vacancies that occur in Department during year, with certain exceptions. (Adopted, 214 to 153.)	Do	107	July 11	do	Do
59	May 22	Quorum call	Absent	108	July 12	do	Do
60	May 23	do	Present.	109	do	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 3709, Labor Federal Security appropriation bill, with instructions to conferees to insist on Tensen amendment, which bars filling more than 25 percent of vacancies that occur during fiscal year, with certain exceptions. (Agreed to, 223 to 170.)	Aye
61	May 24	do	Do	110	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
62	do	H. R. 3791, to furnish emergency food relief to India by loaning \$190,000,000. (Passed, 263 to 94.)	No	111	July 16	do	Do
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.	112	do	do	Do
64	do	do	Do	113	do	do	Do
65	do	Motion to adjourn (made to delay consideration of H. R. 4141, District of Columbia law-enforcement bill). (Rejected, 9 to 224.)	No	114	July 17	do	Do
66	do	Motion that House consider H. R. 4141, District of Columbia law enforcement bill. (Agreed to, 220 to 3.)	Aye	115	July 18	do	Do
67	do	Quorum call	Present	116	July 19	do	Do
68	June 5	do	Do	117	July 20	do	Do
69	June 6	do	Do	118	do	Andresen amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, limiting imports of fats, oils, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice, until June 30, 1951, if such imports would affect production, storing, or price supports of such domestic commodities. (Agreed to, 265 to 148.)	Aye
70	do	Conference report on H. R. 3791, furnishing emergency food relief to India by loaning \$190,000,000. (Agreed to, 255 to 82.)	No.	119	do	Davis (Wisconsin) amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, establishing a single central claimant agency to serve State and local governments and their tax-supported agencies. (Rejected, 164 to 251.)	Do
71	do	Motion to strike out enacting clause of (and thus kill) H. R. 4141, to provide for establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington. (Agreed to, 224-117.)	Aye	120	do	Hope amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, preventing the placing of quotas on livestock slaughtering. (Adopted, 240 to 167.)	Do
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present	121	do	Wickett amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, deleting President's authority to erect plants, factories, etc., but permitting installation of Government-owned equipment in Government or private plants. (Agreed to, 232 to 184.)	Do
73	do	Conference report on S. 1, extending and revising selective service and establishing a Commission on Universal Training and Service. (Agreed to, 439 to 41.)	Aye	122	do	Hardy amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, deleting authority to create new Government corporations by Executive order. (Adopted, 250 to 167.)	Do.
74	June 11	Quorum call	Present	123	do	Committee amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, authorizing a roll-back of 10 percent below May 10, 1951, prices of agricultural commodities, but barring further roll-backs on such commodities. (Agreed to 234 to 183.)	Do.
75	June 13	do	Do	124	July 20	Cole (Kansas) amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, providing a fair and equitable margin for each species of livestock processed. (Rejected, 166 to 249.)	Aye.
76	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1386, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, with instructions to insert so-called Tensen amendment to limit reemployment to 25 percent. (Agreed to, 170 to 165.)	No	125	do	Davis (Georgia) amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, to provide that for a period of 120 days, prices and wages shall not be raised above level of July 7, 1951, except for agricultural products below parity. (Rejected, 172 to 243.)	Do
77	June 15	Motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 75 to 161.)	Do	126	do	Page-Cole (Kansas) amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, to establish a formula for arriving at ceiling prices for all commodities to insure a reasonable profit. (Rejected, 181 to 234.)	No.
78	June 18	Quorum call	Present	127	do	D'Ewart amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, exempting strategic metals and minerals from ceilings when in short supply. (Rejected, 200 to 216.)	Aye.
79	do	S. J. Res. 70, suspending application of certain laws governing conduct of Federal employees with respect to attorney for Senate committee and Nimitz Loyalty Committee. (Defeated, 120 to 164.)	No.	128	do	Committee amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, deleting licensing of businesses and suspension of such licenses. (Adopted, 333 to 82.)	Do
80	June 20	Quorum call	Present	129	do	Committee amendment to H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950, deleting language relating to control of commodity speculation. (Adopted, 241 to 173.)	Do
81	do	do	Do	130	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950. (Rejected, 117 to 269.)	Do.
82	June 21	do	Do	131	do	H. R. 3871, amending and extending the Defense Production Act of 1950. (Passed, 323 to 92.)	
83	June 22	Motion to recommit H. R. 1473, raising taxes \$7,200,000, to Committee on Ways and Means. (Rejected, 171 to 230.)	No.	132	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
84	June 22	H. R. 1473, raising taxes \$7,200,000. (Passed, 233 to 160.)	Aye				
85	June 25	Quorum call	Present				
86	do	H. R. 1431, extending and revising District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act. (Passed, 171 to 120.)	No				
87	June 26	Quorum call	Present				
88	do	Conference report on S. Con. Res. 11, reaffirming the friendship of the American people to all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union. (Agreed to, 349 to 6.)	Aye.				
89	June 27	Quorum call	Present				
90	do	H. J. Res. 287, extending and amending Agricultural Act of 1949, for recruitment of agricultural workers from foreign countries on the mainland of the Western Hemisphere. (Passed, 240 to 139.)	Aye.				
91	do	Quorum call	Absent				
92	June 28	do	Present				
93	do	Motion for previous question on H. Res. 287, providing for closed rule (and hence no amendments) for consideration of H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31. (Previous question ordered, 196 to 192.)	No.				
94	do	H. Res. 287, providing for closed rule for consideration of H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriation through July 31. (Agreed to, 195 to 191.)	Do				
95	do	Motion to recommit H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31, with instructions to effect a 10 percent reduction in funds of departments and agencies, except Department of Defense. (Rejected, 190 to 200.)	Aye.				

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Roll-call record, 1st sess., 82d Cong.—Con.

Roll call No	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote	Roll call No	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
	1951				1951		
133	July 25	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 3880, independent offices appropriation bill, to committee on conference with instruction to insist further on disagreement with Senate amendments. (Agreed to, 188 to 186.)	Aye	179	Sept 24	H. R. 4410, to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ up to 15 retired members of the armed services as teachers of military science and tactics. (Passed, 238 to 53.)	Aye.
134	July 26	Quorum call	Present.	180	do	Quorum call	Present.
135	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1740, appropriating for State, Commerce and Justice Departments, and the Judiciary, with instructions to reduce amount for information and educational activities of State Department from \$85,000,000 to \$70,000,000. (Rejected, 141 to 215.)	Aye.	181	Sept 25	do	Do.
136	July 27	Quorum call	Present.	182	do	S. 2006, to increase the lending authority of the Import-Export Bank of Washington by \$1,000,000,000 and extend life of bank 5 years. (Passed, 259 to 60.)	Aye.
137	do	H. J. Res. 289, terminating the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany. (Agreed to, 378 to 0.)	Aye.	183	do	H. Res. 429, providing for consideration of H. R. 39, to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. (Agreed to, 210 to 112.)	No.
138	do	H. Res. 335, providing for consideration of H. R. 4484, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters, etc. (Adopted, 270 to 92.)	Do.	184	Sept 26	Motion to recommit to Committee on Agriculture H. R. 39, to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. (Agreed to, 180 to 162.)	Aye.
139	July 30	Quorum call	Present.	185	Sept 27	Quorum call	Present.
140	do	Conference report on H. R. 3871, amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950. (Agreed to 294 to 80.)	Aye.	186	do	H. Res. 430, to provide for consideration of H. Res. 82, expressing the sense of the House that Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland. (Not agreed to, 139 to 206.)	No.
141	do	H. R. 4484, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters, etc. (Passed, 285 to 109.)	Do.	187	do	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 31	Quorum call	Aye.	188	Oct 4	H. R. 5118, to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees. (Failed to get two-thirds vote required for suspension of rules. (197 to 140).)	Aye.
143	do	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 3790, Department of the Interior appropriations bill, with instructions to insist on Jensen amendment, which (with certain exceptions) prohibits filling more than 25 percent of vacancies in personnel occurring during year. (Agreed to, 189 to 170.)	Aye.	189	do	Quorum call	Present.
144	do	Quorum call	Present.	190	Oct 5	Quorum call	Do.
145	Aug 1	do	Do.	191	do	Conference report on H. R. 5113, Mutual Security Act of 1951. (Adopted, 235 to 98.)	No.
146	Aug 2	do	Do.	192	do	Quorum call	Present.
147	Aug 8	do	Do.	193	Oct 8	H. Res. 436, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction (particularly defective housing whose loans were guaranteed by Government agencies). (Adopted, 284 to 15.)	Aye.
148	do	do	Do.	194	Oct 9	Motion to recommit S. 1950, amending National Labor Relations Act to validate union-shop elections held prior to time of taking non-Communist oath by labor-union officials, and to dispense with requirement of election before union-shop agreement may be made. (Rejected, 22 to 304.)	No.
149	Aug 9	H. R. 5051, Department of Defense appropriation bill. (Passed, 348 to 2.)	Aye.	195	do	S. 1950, amending National Labor Relations Act to validate union-shop elections held prior to time of taking non-Communist oath by labor-union officials, and to dispense with requirement of election before union-shop agreement may be made. (Passed, 307 to 18.)	Aye.
150	do	Quorum call	Do.	196	Oct 10	Quorum call	Present.
151	Aug 10	H. R. 4914 to authorize construction of Army, Navy, and Air Force public works in amount of \$5.78 billion to accommodate 3½-million-man Armed Force. (Passed, 352 to 5.)	Aye.	197	Oct 11	Motion to recommit H. R. 5650, second supplemental appropriation bill, with instructions to strike out funds for construction of facilities at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo. (Rejected, 127 to 183.)	No.
152	Aug 13	do	Do.	198	do	H. R. 5650, second supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed, 301 to 19.)	Aye.
153	do	H. R. 4914 to authorize construction of Army, Navy, and Air Force public works in amount of \$5.78 billion to accommodate 3½-million-man Armed Force. (Passed, 352 to 5.)	Aye.	199	do	Motion to concur in Senate amendment to H. R. 4750, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, which would have effect of weakening House inserted provision limiting United States contribution to international agencies to 33½ percent. (Agreed to, 200 to 126.)	No.
154	do	H. R. 4914 to authorize construction of Army, Navy, and Air Force public works in amount of \$5.78 billion to accommodate 3½-million-man Armed Force. (Passed, 352 to 5.)	Aye.	200	do	H. R. 5684, making appropriations totaling \$7,482,527,790 for the mutual assistance program. (Passed 222 to 99.)	Do.
155	do	H. R. 4914 to authorize construction of Army, Navy, and Air Force public works in amount of \$5.78 billion to accommodate 3½-million-man Armed Force. (Passed, 352 to 5.)	Do.	201	Oct 15	Quorum call	Present.
156	Aug 15	Quorum call	Present.	202	do	H. R. 5411, amending existing legislation to provide school assistance in critical defense housing areas. (Passed, 287 to 55.)	Aye.
157	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3880, independent offices appropriation bill, with instructions to insist on House provision limiting new public housing starts to 5,000 during fiscal year and prohibiting advance commitments on housing without congressional action. (Rejected, 169 to 206.)	Aye.	203	Oct 16	Quorum call	Present.
158	do	Conference report on H. R. 3880, independent offices appropriation bill. (Agreed to, 292 to 80.)	No.	204	do	do	Do.
159	do	Quorum call	Present.	205	do	Conference report on H. R. 4473, tax revision bill of 1951. (Not agreed to, 157 to 204.)	Aye.
160	do	Wolcott amendments to S. 319, Defense Housing Act of 1951, fixing termination date at June 30, 1952, instead of June 30, 1953. (Rejected, 184 to 168.)	Aye.	206	Oct 17	Quorum call	Present.
161	do	Cole amendment to S. 349, Defense Housing Act of 1951, limiting acquisitions of sites for development in connection with isolated defense installations. (Rejected, 175 to 199.)	Do.	207	Oct 18	H. Res. 463, rule providing for consideration of H. J. Res. 285, to authorize participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of establishment of U. S. Military Academy at cost of \$95,000. (Agreed to, 179 to 149.)	No.
162	Aug 16	Quorum call	Present.	208	do	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug 17	Overriding President's veto of H. R. 3163, granting \$120 pension to veterans of World Wars I and II whose disabilities have no connection with their military service who need the constant aid and attendance of another person. (Bill passed over veto, 318 to 45.)	No.	209	do	S. Con. Res. 36 authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. (Adopted, 237 to 74.)	No.
164	do	Motion that House recede from its position in failing to grant funds for spruce bark beetle program in Colorado, and agree to place \$1,000,000 in H. R. 3973, Department of Agriculture appropriations bill conference report for that purpose. (Agreed to, 222 to 138.)	Paired against.	210	Oct 19	Quorum call	Absent.
165	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 5113, to provide economic and military assistance to friendly nations, with instructions to cut the funds for economic aid by \$30 million. (Agreed to, 186 to 177.)	Paired for.	211	do	Conference report on S. 355, to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. (Agreed to, 339 to 7.)	Absent, general pair.
166	do	H. R. 5113, to provide economic and military assistance to friendly nations. (Passed, 260 to 101.)	Do.	212	do	Conference report on S. 622, to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government. (Agreed to, 317 to 26.)	Do.
167	Aug 20	Quorum call	Absent.	213	do	Quorum call	Absent.
168	Aug 21	do	Do.	214	do	Second conference report on H. R. 4473, tax-revision bill of 1951. (Agreed to, 185 to 100.)	Paired for.
169	do	do	Do.	215	do	Conference report on H. R. 3660 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to increase monthly benefits to retired railroad employees. (Agreed to, 339 to 0.)	Absent, general pair.
170	Sept 13	do	Present.	216	Oct 20	Quorum call	Present.
171	do	do	Present.	217	do	Overriding of President's veto of S. 1684, authorizing payments by the Veterans' Administration on purchase of automobiles (or cash in lieu thereof) by certain disabled veterans. (Passed over veto, 223 to 83.)	No.
172	Sept 14	do	Do.				
173	do	do	Do.				
174	do	H. R. 1005, to amend the Tariff Act to provide free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. (Passed, 210 to 41.)	Aye.				
175	Sept. 18	Quorum call	Present.				
176	Sept. 19	do	Do.				
177	Sept. 20	do	Do.				
178	Sept. 24	do	Do.				

The Macedonian Question**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to me I would like to submit the following:

The thirtieth annual convention of the Macedonian Political Organization (MPO) of the United States and Canada held at Columbus, Ohio, on September 2, 3, and 4, 1951, guided by the cause of attaining a lasting Balkan peace, and having under consideration the existing state of conditions there, deems it as its imperative duty to make it known to the world public opinion the following declaration:

1 From the beginning of the present century to the present time, the Balkan States have always presented a danger point in Europe. The chief cause for the existence of this situation is Macedonia, a country of 25,000 square miles and with a population of nearly 3,600,000 people.

While the Ottoman empire still partially dominated the Balkans, the population of Macedonia was subjected to a brutal oriental regime. Taking advantage of the existing hard state of conditions in Macedonia, some of the Balkan States promptly directed their political and territorial aspirations toward Macedonia. They did not even bother to conform with the fact that the population of Macedonia, in the name of its own cause, had already been organized for a struggle whose aim and purpose was the creation of a free and independent state within the geographic limits of Macedonia. The Balkan States, encouraged by some of the great European powers, obstinately followed their egotistic designs. This situation quickly brought them to conflicts, contradictions, and rivalry which readily ensued into wars. Because of Macedonia, in the course of three decades (1912-41) four wars occurred in the Balkans.

2 The Turkish regime over Macedonia was overthrown in 1912. But the Balkan Christian nations, who miraculously allied themselves, declared war on Turkey in order to free Macedonia. Such was, at least, their avowed. Instead of carrying out the objective of their open declaration they soon began to quarrel among themselves, and as a result Macedonia was divided into three parts. United under the Turkish rule, Macedonia emerged, in 1913, partitioned by her "emancipators." Macedonia now assumed the position of eighteenth-century Poland.

Today Macedonia remains divided among Yugoslavia, Greece, and Bulgaria. The Paris peace treaties of 1919 did not alter the existing Balkan situation. The injustices inflicted upon Macedonia after the second Balkan War (1913) continued to exist. The period between the First and Second World Wars was full of threats to world peace. Again, because of Macedonia, the Balkan States were unable to achieve friendly understanding, this unfortunate situation hastened to encourage Hitler's aggression toward the Balkans.

3 Although the Second World War terminated with a crushing defeat of nazism and fascism, no substantial change has taken place in the Balkans. The conditions as created at Bucharest in 1913 remain. The Atlantic Charter had the same fate as President Wilson's 14 points. Today a new aggression endangers the Balkans. They again constitute a danger point in southeastern Europe. And the center of this danger point is Macedonia, toward which the several

Balkan States have directed their territorial appetites.

From the north Communist Tito entertains ambitions that some day he might be able to acquire an outlet to the Aegean Sea. Until June 1948 Tito's Yugoslav press has more than once written about this pretension. To attain this objective numerous guerrilla bands were dispatched from Yugoslavia to Greek Macedonia so that they may capture this province and reach Salonika. Currently the Bulgarian Communist government continues to plead for the annexation of Yugoslav and Greek Macedonia. In Athens, on the other hand, many declarations are being made to the effect that, for the security of Greece, the annexation of Bulgarian and part of Yugoslav Macedonia is necessary.

4 It is quite obvious that, by the creation of and the continued existence of such conditions in the Balkans, there may yet generate the necessary spark to ignite the third world war. In this case, it is noteworthy that not a single one of the interested Balkan states ever cares to know the wishes of the Macedonian population. In the three parts of divided Macedonia the inhabitants have no way of expressing their own wishes as to their destiny. Since 1893, when the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO), was created and again during 1903 (when the Macedonia population rose with arms in hand against the Turkish rule) the population of Macedonia declared that it wishes to govern itself. It cheerfully accepted the motto of the renowned British statesman, William Gladstone, "Macedonia for the Macedonians." And today, if the Macedonian people are free to express themselves, the great majority of the population would demand the creation of a free, united and independent Macedonian state unit, which may eventually serve as a nucleus for the formation of a Balkan federation.

5 While the Macedonian question remains unsettled there will never be peace in the Balkans. The best solution of this question is, of course, to let the Macedonian people govern themselves under the protectorate of the United Nations. With such an arrangement, no one of the Balkan states could have the courage to provoke war because of Macedonia. And as a consequence, the population of the whole Balkan peninsula would pacify itself and devote its energies to creative economic endeavors, which are so necessary for the prosperity of the Balkan peoples and the peace of mankind.

"Where There's a Will"**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the old adage that "where there's a will there's a way" applies most aptly to the matter of economy in the Federal Government.

Some of the recent newly professed interest on the part of a few Democrats in Congress in ways of achieving economy would be considerably more impressive if that interest were matched by a corresponding past record of a will for economy.

The unexpected House rejection of the conference report on the tax increase last week is a case in point. Unquestionably some of the House Members who switched to a "no" vote have become

aware of the rumblings of revolt among alarmed and angry taxpayers back home, and felt that an economy gesture was in order. But those who switched their vote for this reason have repented too late. The damage was done when these same Members consistently and recklessly voted for excessive appropriations and for more and more blank checks for the administration.

Consider the fact, for example, that after spending 9 months trying to devise methods of increasing taxes by \$5,750,000,000, the House took only 4 hours of debate to vote a give-away of \$8,800,000,000 for so-called foreign aid.

When Members of Congress who voted for the reckless and excessive expenditures suddenly shy away from voting a tax increase which will go only part of the way toward paying the fiddler, the genuineness of their will for economy is certainly in doubt. It looks more like a belated and futile attack of political jitters.

Recently the appointed junior Senator from Michigan BLAIR MOODY, has been making more headlines for himself by urging enactment of the McClellan bill which would create a joint House-Senate Committee on the Budget and a staff of fiscal experts, perhaps 75 in number, who would check on the way in which departments of the executive branch spend the money appropriated by Congress, thereby providing the proposed Committee on the Budget with information and guidance.

It sounds very fine. But this splendid display of interest in the way to achieve economy would be more convincing if there were evidence of a corresponding will for economy.

MOODY's record, so far as the will for economy is concerned, is entirely clear. On 27 roll calls involving actual economy proposals totaling \$7,966,384,713, he voted for economy on measures aggregating only \$222,334,430. He voted against economy on proposals aggregating \$7,640,362,783. And he was absent and unpaired on roll calls involving an additional \$103,687,500. By way of contrast, Republican Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, cast an economy vote or was paired in favor of economy on all of the items totaling \$7,966,384,713.

There is another matter of record so far as the will and the way to economy is concerned.

In 1947, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Republican-controlled House Appropriations Committee for the first time created a full-time staff of 10 investigators who made detailed, systematic and continuing economy studies, including nearly a dozen special studies of executive department agencies with a view to ferreting out waste and inefficiency and establishing sound economies. Largely through these efforts, the Republican Eightieth Congress balanced the budget 2 years in a row. It made savings of \$9,800,000,000. It reduced the national debt \$7,000,000,000. It cut \$4,800,000,000 off the tax burden, with 71 percent of the tax relief going to persons with incomes under \$5,000. It took 7,000,000 persons off the tax rolls entirely—all lower bracket taxpayers. Yet this Republican Eightieth Congress voted more funds for

national defense than Mr. Truman permitted to be used.

The very first thing that the Democrats did after Mr. Truman's surprise victory in 1948 was to fire this Appropriations Committee investigating staff and return to the old system of having executive department personnel make investigations of executive department expenditures—which is like having a bank examined by members of its own staff.

Yes, where there is a will for economy, ways of achieving it will be found. And vice versa.

Ohio Power Co. Maintains Service During 41-Day Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to me I would like to submit the following:

The Ohio Power Co., one of seven operating companies of the American Gas & Electric Co., experienced during the months of July and August a 41-day strike. The strike started in the company's three major generating plants on July 21 and spread to include one of five operating divisions on August 1. Approximately one-fourth of its 4,000 employees were involved.

The Ohio Power Co. serves 367,000 customers in 50 of Ohio's 88 counties. These customers include all the essential services which are vital to our everyday living, commercial establishments, municipalities, residential areas, both rural and urban, and hundreds of major industries, many of which are engaged in defense work.

During this 41-day strike service was maintained to all of Ohio Power Co.'s 367,000 customers. Not a single industrial plant was shut down because of lack of power, or were any asked to curtail operations.

The company operated its three power plants and the division with supervisory personnel throughout the strike.

While many things contributed to the company's ability to give full electric service during the strike, there were four primary factors which characterize the Ohio Power Co.

First. The company, as a public utility, fully recognizes its obligation and responsibility to its customers. Therefore, over the years it has built an electric power system and an organization of people capable of fulfilling its obligation and responsibility even under most adverse conditions.

Second. The company is efficiently organized under sound management policies. Its supervisory personnel, through years of service and advancement, are well trained, experienced, and have a thorough knowledge of the many phases of the business, thus were personally able to operate the facilities during the strike.

Third. The company's facilities and equipment are in excellent condition, which has been the result of careful planning and high standards of maintenance.

Fourth. The Ohio Power Co. is interconnected by a network of high voltage lines with sister companies in the American Gas & Electric system, and also with other nearby electric utility companies. With such an interconnected system, had there been a major equipment failure in the Ohio Power Co. customers still would have received service.

Let GOP Stick to Facts on Our Asia Policy: They're Damning Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune:

LET THE GOP STICK TO FACTS ON OUR ASIA POLICY: THEY'RE DAMNING ENOUGH

The case against the administration's China policy has been presented recently before committees where questions of subversion or disloyalty were paramount; the effort has been to shadow the motives of various individuals concerned. It is an effort which has not been very astutely or very fairly carried out, and its results to date have been singularly unconvincing.

This approach has disturbing implications for the Republican Party: for it may mean that one of the great issues, which should form the substance of debate and choice in the campaigns ahead, will be lost. On finding that nothing subversive was involved in our China policy the public may very well jump to the conclusion that nothing has been wrong with it.

The collapse of a case argued on narrow grounds, and pursued with methods often reckless and irresponsible, may be taken for the collapse of an infinitely sounder and broader case against the statesmanship, the competence and the foresight of the Democratic administration.

REPROOF NEEDED FOR MISCALCULATING

Subversion, disclosed and proven, is a monstrous evil; but a free people cannot afford to forget that miscalculation also needs to be reproved. A series of mistakes, even where motives are beyond question, needs to be defined and the responsible party rebuked.

In Britain today it seems not to have occurred to the Conservative opposition that the retrenchment in Iran is the result of disloyalty, and yet the Conservatives are quite properly making this a prime issue in the elections. They know that faulty statesmanship is the best of all reasons for calling upon the voters to throw out a government, that fateful and costly diminutions of national power are by themselves powerful arguments for a change.

In this spirit the Republicans must get the China issue—now bemired in committees—out into the broad light of the public meeting. It is a matter that needs to be expounded and judged, not merely investigated.

Rarely does an opposition party have an issue on which it can go more confidently before the voters than that which has fallen to the Republicans through the defection of the great nation that had so long been America's friend, that had been a principal ally in the last war, and that had promised to be a bulwark against tyranny in the post-war world.

The Republicans were not responsible for this defection. As for the Democrats, they may claim that they meant well, that none would have done better than they, that they only suffered the inevitable; yet they held power during this whole period and they cannot escape the onus of a gigantic failure.

This is the fact which must be made clear. It will be a tragedy for the Republicans, and a severe blow to the two-party system, if this fact is lost sight of in abortive efforts to defame individuals.

Let the Republicans hold the mirror up to the melancholy truth; let them show by what steps and stages, by what misjudgments and temporizings, the prize of Asia was cast away. The voters can be counted on to do the rest.

Hiss, Chambers, and the Age of Innocence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the questions loyal American people are always asking is "Why do people like Hiss become leftists?" Under leave to extend my remarks, I include from Commentary one of the best analyses I have seen of this troublesome question.

Was there really "a generation on trial" in the case of Alger Hiss? And if there was, what was its crime? Leslie A. Fiedler here examines the Hiss case in the light of the political—and moral—history of our time. Mr. Fiedler, associate professor of humanities at the University of Montana, has published fiction, poetry, and literary criticism in various periodicals.

[From Commentary of August 1951]

HISS, CHAMBERS, AND THE AGE OF INNOCENCE—WHO WAS GUILTY—AND OF WHAT?

(By Leslie A. Fiedler)

(You will either aid in molding history, or history will mold you, and in the case of the latter, you can rest assured that you will be indescribably crushed and maimed in the process. . . . History is not a blind goddess, and does not pardon the blindness of others—Whittaker Chambers in 1931.)

Alger Hiss is in jail. The last legal judgments have been passed. The decision of the courts stands: Guilty as charged—guilty in fact of treason, though technically accused only of perjury. It is time, many of us feel, to forget the whole business: The prison doors have closed; let us consider the question also closed. But history is not so easily satisfied. Like some monumental bore, it grabs us by the lapels, keeps screaming into our faces the same story over and over again. The case of Judith Coplon, the case of William Remington, the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the inevitable case of tomorrow's Mr. X—the names change but the meanings are the same, and we protest that we have long since got the point. But have we? Of what was Alger Hiss guilty anyhow?

The statute of limitations protected Hiss against the charge of having passed secret material from State Department files to his accuser Whittaker Chambers, of having placed in the hands of agents of the Soviet Union documents which, whatever their intrinsic value, enabled our present enemies to break some of our most important codes. The transaction had taken place in 1936 and 1937—a war away, in years we ourselves find it difficult to remember, in years some of us do not want to remember. It is a painful thing to be asked to live again through events 10 years gone, to admit one's identity with the person who bore one's name in a by now incredible past. It is hardest of all to confess that one is responsible for the acts of that past, especially when such acts are now placed in a new and unforeseen context that changes their meaning entirely. "Not

Guiltily!" one wants to cry, "that is not what I meant at all."

And yet the qualifying act of moral adulthood is precisely this admission of responsibility for the past and its consequences, however undesired or unforeseen. Such a recognition Hiss was called upon to make. Had he been willing to say, "Yes, I did these things—things it is now possible to call treason—not for money or prestige, but out of a higher allegiance than patriotism"; had he only confessed in the name of any of the loftier platitudes for which men are prepared publicly to admit the breaking of lesser laws, he need not even have gone to prison. Why did he lie?

Had Hiss told the truth, the whole meaning of the case might have been different, might have attained that dignity of tragedy for which Alistair Cooke looks through its drossers in vain. The defenders of Hiss, and of the generation they take him to represent, would have been delivered from the intolerable plight that prompted them, during the trials, to declare at one and the same time that (a) Hiss was innocent of the charges, the victim of a malevolent psychopath and (b) even if he was technically guilty, he had the moral right, in those years of betrayal leading to Munich, to give his primary loyalty to the Soviet Union. Why did he lie, and lying, lose the whole point of the case in a maze of irrelevant data: the signature on the transfer of ownership of a car, the date a typewriter was repaired?

The lie, it is necessary to see, was no mere accident, but was of the essence of the case, a clue to the deepest significance of what was done and to the moral atmosphere that made the deed possible. We can see Hiss' lie now in a larger context, beside William Remington's even more vain denials of Elizabeth Bentley's charges, and the fantastic affirmations of innocence by Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. These were not, after all, common criminals, who plead innocent mechanically on the advice of counsel, these were believers in a new society, for whose sake they had already deceived their closest friends and endangered the security of their country. In the past (and even yet in the present—the F. o r t o R i c a n nationalists, for instance) such political idealists welcomed their trials as forums, opportunities to declare to the world the high principles behind their actions, the loyalty to the march of history and the eventual triumph of socialism that had brought them to the bar. They might have been, in some eyes at least, spectacular martyrs; they chose to behave instead, before the eyes of all, like blustering petty thieves.

¹Alistair Cooke, *A Generation on Trial*. In addition to Mr. Cooke's book, a thorough and scrupulous work, though one with many of whose interpretations I disagree, I have used for this article de Toledano and Lasky's *Seeds of Treason*, which is marred by a journalistic and melodramatic style, but contains much valuable background material and sets the Hiss case in an illuminating context of Communist espionage on two continents. I have also consulted the newspaper accounts of the case, particularly those of the New York Times, and the printed hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee; while for further background, I have turned to the New Masses for 1931, and various other official Communist publications. I do not know personally either of the principals in the case, nor have I made any attempt to communicate with them. I have no private or special sources of information. What I have attempted in this piece is an analysis based on publicly available documents, considered in the light of my own experience and knowledge of that world of values and beliefs out of which the incidents of the case arose. It is the lack of such experience and knowledge which makes even Mr. Cooke's careful and subtle book miss what seems to me the essential point.

Not that the avowals of innocence, especially in the case of Hiss, were not affecting. Despite the absurdity of his maunderings about "forgery by typewriter," there was something moving—for a generation brought up on stories of Dreyfus and Tom Mooney, and growing to social awareness through the Sacco-Vanzetti trial and the campaigns to free the Scottsboro boys—in Hiss's final courtroom pose as the victim. Even now, it is hard to realize how little claim he has to the title. For here was no confessed revolutionary, marked by his avowed principles, his foreign accent, his skin color, as fair game for the frame-up, here was a supereminently respectable civil servant from the better schools, accused by the obvious outsider, the self-declared rebel and renegade, Whittaker Chambers. Hiss seemed to desire both the pathos of the persecuted and the aura of unblemished respectability. His is, as we shall see, the popular front mind at bay, incapable of honesty even when there is no hope in anything else.

After the hung jury, the second trial, the reams of evidence that rittered away the drama in boredom, one thing is quite clear. Twenty of twenty-four jurors, presumably twenty of twenty-four of us, believed that Alger Hiss was guilty of the perjury with which he was charged, of the treason with which he could not be charged.

For many, that verdict may be sufficient; for some, it is not enough. These cannot help feeling that the total issue of the guilt or innocence of Alger Hiss remains still to be solved. The verdict of the courts applies only to the facts as defined by precedent and law, a few fragments torn from their rich human contexts and presented to a group of men deliberately chosen for their relative ignorance of those contexts, and for the likelihood of their not being sympathetically involved with the passions and motives which underlay them.

Is there any sense in which Hiss is symbolically innocent—in which he may, indeed, have made the mistake of having passed certain papers via Chambers to the Russian agent, Colonel Bykov, but out of such naive devotion to the good that it is a travesty of justice to find him on merely technical grounds guilty? It sometimes seems possible that when a Remington or a Rosenberg or a Hiss speaks publicly of his innocence, he is merely using a convenient shorthand for an account of motives and actions too complex to set before an ordinary jurymen without completely reeducating him. One of the distinctive features of the recent series of spy trials has been that the accused and the chief accusers have been intellectuals, whereas the jury, the lawyers on both sides, even the judges, were not. And since in this country the intellectuals have been notoriously set apart from the general public, living, especially since the Russian Revolution, by different values and speaking a different language, communication is difficult. How can people who do not read the same books, and whose only relationship is one of distrust, arrive at a common definition of innocence and guilt?

One might argue on these grounds that what a jury could have meant by voting "guilty" is ridiculously far from the truth; that Hiss is not what the average mind, brought up on E. Phillips Oppenheim and pulp fiction, means by a "traitor", that he can surely feel himself neither venal nor skulking, for he has always been faithful in intent to his true fatherland, Humanity, that if in fact he has ended up by helping the interests of just another imperialist power, the Soviet Union, it is not his crime but that of the Soviet Union, which he took in good faith to be the deputy of mankind's best interests.

This was Henry Julian Wadleigh's defense: A minor source of information for Chambers in the prewar years and a witness at the Hiss trials, he attempted to declare his innocence

and guilt at the same time. With no sign of contrition, he admitted passing secret documents to Chambers, but insisted that his course had been justified by history, it had not even struck him, he explained, condescendingly, as a matter of conscience; though merely joining the Communist Party had, and he had finally not signed up.

The comic aspects of Wadleigh strike one first—the cartoonist's pink-tea radical, with his thick glasses, disordered hair, and acquired Oxford accent. The articles which he wrote for the New York Post are classics of unconscious humor, monuments to smugness and self-pity, and trailers for the novel which (of course) he was busy writing about his experience. When Hiss' lawyers found they could not pin on Wadleigh the stealing of the papers Chambers had disconcertingly produced, they were content to make him the butt of their jokes. At several points during his questioning, the judge had to cover his mouth with his hand to preserve the dignity of the court. Wadleigh is the comic version of Alger Hiss.

The clowning of Wadleigh reveals what is not so easily read in Hiss—a moral obtuseness which underlies the whole case. Mr. Cooke tries to make of Wadleigh his tragic figure, but the true protagonist of tragedy suffers and learns. Wadleigh has learned nothing. He cannot conceive of having done anything really wrong. He finds in his own earlier activities only a certain excessive zeal, overbalanced by good will, and all excused by Munich. Was he not a better man for having tried to counter, however ineptly, the shameful appeasement of Hitler? That the irony of events had made him, just insofar as he was more idealistic and committed, more helplessly the tool of evil, he cannot conceive. In the end, his "confession" is almost as crass a lie as the denial of Hiss—a disguise for self-congratulation, a device for clinging to the dream of innocence. He cannot, even in the dock, believe that a man of liberal persuasion is capable of wrong.

It was this belief that was the implicit dogma of American liberalism during the past decades, piling up a terrible burden of self-righteousness and self-deceit to be paid for on the day when it would become impossible any longer to believe that the man of good will is identical with the righteous man, and that the liberal is, per se, the hero. That day came at different times to different people—for some it was the Moscow trials, for others the Soviet-Nazi pact, and for a good many (including a large number who had, during the war, regained lost illusions) it came on August 17, 1948, when Hiss and Chambers were brought face to face before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The facts were clear from the moment of confrontation, but for many the facts did not matter. Chambers stated flatly that Hiss had been a Communist, his associate in the underground; Hiss as flatly denied it. Simply to ask cui bono would have been enough, which one of the men stood to gain by lying? But somehow such a common-sense approach seemed excluded. The most fantastic psychological explanations were dredged up. One heard via the intellectual underground the unlikely, proto-Dostoevskian stories to suggest reasons for Chambers' self-vilifying testimony. Psychopathia sexualis was hailed out, and Freud quoted glibly by the same skeptics who had laughed at the psychologizing explanations of the Moscow trials.

But there remained still the detailed circumstantiality of Chambers' memories, the documents stolen from the office in which Hiss had worked, the microfilms taken from the dusty dumbwaiter in Brooklyn and hidden in the famous pumpkin on Chambers' Maryland farm. For all the theatrical instincts of Chambers, who seemed to possess a flair for adding one artistic touch too many to any situation, out of God knows

what compulsion, the documents were there—the undeniable goods.

An unbiased look at the proceedings of the House committee reveals that from the start Hiss quite apparently lied, or more precisely, half lied and equivocated with the canniness of the trained lawyer. During the trials his version of the events was delivered with great aplomb, but before the committee one can see him uncertainly feeling his way into the situation, cautiously finding out at each point how much he will have to admit to escape entrapment.

At first, he said simply that to the best of his knowledge (the qualifying phrase hardly seemed significant, a lawyer's habit), he had never met the man Chambers who had named him as one of a Washington cell of infiltrators. There was no mention of espionage, it must be remembered, until Hiss had forced Chambers' hand. Then, advised perhaps of the convincing nature of Chambers' testimony, he began slowly to shift ground, first, however, taking the initiative and charging with increasing surliness that the committee had been leaking back to Chambers everything he said. At this point the committee, which had handled him until then with more than normal sympathy, began to press him hard. He could not say for sure, Hiss now testified, but he thought that certainly he had known no one who called himself Chambers, or anyone who looked very much like the photographs he had been shown. They were, however, not very good pictures, so he could not be positive. Indeed, the face on the photograph before him might be that of the chairman of the committee. It was his last joke.

Finally, he admitted that he had, after all, known the man in question, under a name he had written down on a pad in front of him. It was George Crosley (Chambers was later to say that, although he had used many names, he was quite sure he had never used that one), a dead-beat writer whom he had known casually, and with whom he had occasionally talked over possible story material, though he had really found the man despicable. As a matter of fact, he had even once, for certain obscure reasons, let the dead-beat move into his apartment for a couple of days, or was it weeks; and when Crosley had wailed on the rent, Hiss, for reasons even more obscure, had given him a car—just a little old car, it must be understood, with a "sassy" rumble seat, though one, Hiss admitted, to which he had been sentimentally attached. It is a fantastic story, enough to send anyone less well placed to jail without further ado. Later, there was to be a good deal of trouble over the dates of this strange transaction, and records were to turn up proving that the car had never been presented to Crosley-Chambers at all, but apparently to the Communist Party.

All the while this amazing farrago was being served up by Hiss, Chambers was patiently building up the story of their actual relationship, born in intrigue and common devotion to an ideal, and destined to end in bitterness and mutual accusation. They had been comrades and close friends, Chambers said, he and the promising young lawyer, whom he was still able to describe as of a great gentleness and sweetness of character. At first, their dealings were concerned only with dues and reports, but they had quickly grown closer together, in the sort of relationship hard to parallel outside the party, the two of them utterly dependent on each other's loyalty, and both betting their self-esteem on the truth of the Marxist-Leninist dream.

They are men who could never have met outside the Communist movement, and even as Communists they were utterly different; Chambers, the romantic recruit of the twenties, hating a world that had rebuffed him at every encounter, and choosing the movement as an alternative to suicide; Hiss, universally respected, and by nature an oppor-

tunist, but with a streak of social conscience (personified in his earnest wife, who could not even let a casual visitor call the day "fine" without reminding her of the plight of the sharecroppers), choosing the party to protect himself from a merely selfish kind of success. Different as they were, Chambers had found Hiss a real Bolshevik, perhaps sensing in him a kind of hardness to which he himself could only aspire, and had defended him against the sneers of their Russian boss, Bykov, who always referred to Hiss condescendingly, as "our dear lawyer."

The quality of the feeling that must have existed between the two men is revealed by Chambers' last-minute attempt to draw Hiss with him out of the party, after he himself had become convinced that the Soviet Union was serving not justice but her own selfish national interests. Feeling that he might well be killed by party agents after his desertion (such political murders have occurred even in America), Chambers, nevertheless, risked exposing himself by a final visit to Hiss' home. But Hiss had stood firm, scarcely listening to the arguments of Chambers, though he had finally wept a little (the scene stays in his imagination, the completely unexpected, uncharacteristic tears), and had given to Chambers a trivial Christmas present for his daughter—a little rolling pin.

Perhaps, even before the break, Hiss was already tired of Chambers as a person, a little ashamed of his admiration for the shabby writer who wrote nothing, and who had a tendency to remake his experience as he told about it, retouching and bringing up the high lights here and there. Mrs. Hiss had distrusted him from the first, finding him, with a strange inconsistency for a genteel internationalist, "too foreign." They had pretended finally, Alger and "Crosley," that "Crosley" was a Russian, which made him all right, of course, and Chambers had played up to it with all his love of subterfuge.

Whatever the status of their personal relations, when Chambers had come to Hiss with his talk about the Moscow trials and the betrayal of the revolution, Hiss already could not afford to listen to him. He had by then too much to lose, for, without ceasing to be a Bolshevik, he had become a success, a respectable citizen. To acknowledge that Russia could be fundamentally wrong would have changed the whole meaning of his own life, turned what had perhaps seemed to him his most unselfish and devoted acts, the stealing of State Department documents, into shameful crimes—into treason. Only the conviction that there was no final contradiction between his activities, public and private, could have made Hiss' life tolerable. He must have felt that what he had done as a New Deal lawyer, helping to expose the munitions makers in the Nye committee, or working for the AAA in the Department of Agriculture, did not contradict what he tried to do as a member of a left-wing faction in the State Department, urging certain attitudes toward Chiang Kai-shek; and that what he had sought in both these capacities was merely completed by his secret work as a purveyor of information to warn the Soviet Union—his Soviet Union, mankind's Soviet Union—of the forces that worked for and against her in the inner world of diplomacy.

He was not a "traitor." What the Un-American Activities Committee could not understand, what the two juries were certainly not able to comprehend, is that to Hiss, his service to the party and the Soviet Union is an expression of loyalty, not treason. Before consenting to marry him, Remington's former wife had made him solemnly pledge not to succeed; to so many of the generation of Remington and Hiss, the bourgeois success of the American dream was the final treachery, and each step forward in their personal careers had to be justified in terms of opportunities provided for infiltration.

Hiss offered his espionage as an earnest to the inner few whose opinion mattered to him (in those days chiefly Chambers, and always himself) that he had not sold out to the bourgeois world in which he was making a splendid career.

No wonder Hiss was inaccessible to Chambers' arguments against the party. No wonder he seemed scarcely willing to admit his existence, refusing him his very name. It was as if Hiss had wanted to shrug off his accuser, not like a real being in the outside world but like a nightmare. Indeed, the persistent voice of the man he had once admired must have seemed to him to possess the quality of a nightmare, speaking in its characteristic half-whisper the doubts, thrust down in himself, that could destroy his self-esteem.

And so Hiss had spoken out over the condemning voice, protesting his innocence with a vigor that contrasted oddly with Chambers' quiet tone. All the accounts speak of the voice of the accuser as one that, symbolically enough, could scarcely be heard. There is, even in the printed testimony, a sense of a counterdesire not to be heard along with the resolve to speak out. Far from seeming the vindictive persecutor of some accounts, Chambers strikes us as oddly reluctant, willing for a long time to risk perjury rather than reveal the full guilt of his former comrade. What Chambers really seems to be after is a confession of the truth from Hiss; he does not feel he can hide forever what Hiss has done, but he would prefer him to speak out himself.

Hiss, on the other hand, baits Chambers furiously, daring him to become the complete "rat," as if knowing Chambers will suffer in speaking out, as if wanting to shame and punish him. He seems to have felt sure that Chambers could not really harm him. A man does not unflinchingly succeed from high-school days to early middle age without losing something of humility, and forgetting that a single failure of the most superb luck is enough for destruction. When the end comes, when the threat of a suit for defamation against Chambers leads to the disclosure of the damning papers, to the trials of Hiss for perjury, and to the final conviction, one has the sense that both of the men are surprised.

Some of the commentators on the case have spoken of the anti-Red hysteria that prevailed at the time of the case, as if in such an atmosphere the cards were hopelessly stacked against Alger Hiss. But precisely the opposite is the case. He is just the type that does not normally get caught in the indiscriminate witch hunt, which tends to pick out those who look like witches, the visible outsiders. A woman like Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna M. Rosenberg, for instance, foreign-born and a Jew, is much more likely to be haled up without any evidence against her, while a man like Hiss can slip past the ordinary Congressman, to whom Red really means loud-mouth or foreigner or Jew (RANKIN, who was on the committee that examined Hiss, apparently spent his spare time thumbing through Who's Who in American Jewry, and turned all his fire on—Chambers).

The committee did not want to believe Chambers. They were convinced by his and his wife's, astonishingly specific memories: though some members of the committee had been eager to get the goods on the New Deal, to catch out the State Department at last, they had apparently found it difficult to put much faith in Chambers. It was impossible to like him, as one instinctively liked Hiss for the boyish charm we think of as peculiarly American. Chambers seems to have worn his unprepossessing air (he is the sort of person of whom one believes immediately quite unfounded stories of insanity and depravity) deliberately, as if he had acquired in his revolutionary days

the habit of rebuffing all admiration based on anything but his role in the party.

Every word he spoke declared him an ex-tractor, a present turncoat and squealer, and Hiss, sensing his inestimable advantage in a society whose values are largely set in boyhood when snitching is the ultimate sin, had traded on his role as the honest man confronted by the "rat." Really, Hiss kept insisting, they'd have to call the Harvard Club, say he'd be a few minutes late to dinner—after taking care of this unpleasantness. For a while it came off quite successfully, coming from one who visibly belonged, whose clothes beautifully fitted, whose manners were adequate to all occasions.

We learned later, of course, how much the genteel aspect of Hiss was itself a mask, imposed on a background of disorder and uncertainty not unlike Chambers' the suicide of his father and sister, the undefined psychological difficulties of his stepson, into whose allowance from his actual father, we remember, the Hisses sometimes dipped for contributions to the party. It was as if Alger Hiss had dedicated himself to fulfilling, along with his dream of a new humanity, the other dream his father had passed on to him with his first name—from rags to riches. How strangely the Marxist ideal and the dream of Horatio Alger blended into the motives of his treason.

Any good bourgeois bristles when confronted with Whittaker Chambers. His years as an editor on Time (he is brilliant, of course, but the adjective is itself ambivalent), his present role as a small farmer, cannot conceal his real identity as the outsider: the butterball who could not even learn to play marbles, the writer of poetry for little magazines, the obnoxious young radical expelled from college, the uncomfortable spirit that either blasphemes or is too religious for respectability. At one point, Chambers is asked by a committee member how he spent his time during a week-long period when he had borrowed Hiss' apartment, and when he says, "reading" one feels the troubled silence. How could anyone read so long? It is the suspicious vagary of the kind of man who once believed in Stalin and now believes in the Devil.

After his years in the underground, he still seems ill at ease in our daylight world, and beneath the guise of the magazine executive, assumed only, we remember, to establish an identity for himself as a protection against being murdered by the GPU, the old Chambers persists. Everyone who had known him in his revolutionary days—except Hiss, of course—had no difficulty in recognizing Chambers at the time of the trial.

The jowls and the new teeth do not fundamentally change the face we can still see on the inside back cover of the Communist literary magazine, the New Masses, for July 1931. After 20 years, the young Chambers looks up at us still with the sullen certainty of one who has discovered in the revolution an answer to the insecurity and doubt which had brought his brother to suicide, him to months of despair and near paralysis. In the movement he had found a way out of immobility, a way to join with the other insulted and injured of the earth to change the world which excluded them. To appear in the New Masses in those days was not merely to be a writer, but to subscribe to a new myth of the writer, summed up in the blurb under the photograph: "Youth as a periodically vagrant laborer in deep South, Plains, Northwest. Brief Columbia College experience ending with atheist publication." * * * Joined revolutionary movement 1925."

Hiss, who really knew Chambers, of course, better than anyone else except Chambers' wife, put his finger on the sources of this myth when he told the committee that Chambers thought of himself as a kind of Jim Tully or Jack London. To understand Chambers, one must understand the concept of the literary bum as hero that came

out of Tully and London, a special Marxist class-angling of the old Bohemian ideal. Chambers' once living in the same quarters with an old whore, and his stealing of library books of which Hiss' lawyers and psychiatrists were to make so much during the trials, his name-changing and wandering, were all standard procedure for the rebel intellectual in those days.

The life style he adopted was perfected in the Communist third period, in the years before 1935, and it is the third period we must first of all understand. The term is Lenin's, invented to describe that last stage of imperialism, the age of cataclysmic wars and revolutions, but it comes also to describe the way of life of those who believed themselves the sole carriers of the future in those final days. To the young comrades in their blue work shirts or flat-heeled shoes, there was no need to come to terms with the dying bourgeois world. Marx had told them that the point was to change it. They lived in a fine apocalyptic fury, issuing leaflets to ROTC units in midwestern agricultural colleges, urging the peasants and soldiers to turn their guns the other way, they cried for an autonomous Negro republic to be carved out of the deep South, and in the few cities where they had sufficient numbers, they were forever rushing into the streets to shout their resolve to defend the Soviet Union against their own bourgeoisie in case of war. The only reality in their paranoid world was the workers' fatherland, still encircled and unrecognized by our own Government. Here is a typical passage from an editorial that appeared in the New Masses in 1931, and which may actually have been written by Chambers.

"It is only a question of time until all the imperialist powers mobilize their manpower and hurl its bleeding masses in a rain of steel across the frontiers, to destroy the first Socialist republic. In this situation what are the intellectuals to do? * * * They realize, however imperfectly, that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics represents the advance guard, the hope of human progress and civilization. * * * And they desire, the most advanced of them, to employ their minds as weapons in the fight to save the Soviet Union from its reactionary enemies."

Reread in the pages of the old magazine, in the heavy black format that seems to shiek at us across the years, and surrounded by the pen and ink drawings with their incredibly depraved bosses and their unbelievably noble workers, the banal paragraph seems merely unconscionably funny, like a bad silent film. But when we remember the universal loss of faith in those years of mass unemployment and of seemingly endless depression, we can appreciate the attractiveness of the Marxist answer, guaranteed by the miraculous existence of the Soviet Union, the last best hope of human culture. We sense, too, the appeal of violence in a world of words, an instant of bloodshed and the whole golden future unfolds.

No Third Perioder could have become, like a later type of Communist, really a "traitor" as distinguished from a mere "spy." How could they betray a world they publicly disavowed? Romantic and ridiculous, they were still revolutionaries, their allegiance single and unconcealed. When such Communists went underground they hid, but they never pretended to be good bourgeois. When the call came in 1932 from Max Bedacht, asking Chambers to disappear as the individual he had been in order to take on "special" work, Chambers seems to have welcomed the chance. He had already sacrificed his will to party discipline, his fate to history. He had little more to offer up beyond his name and the small frame that had become attached to it in the movement: the praise he had received in the Russian press for his stories of Communist life, the popularity of the play Can You Hear Their Voices,

based on one of his works, already presented at Vassar and about to be produced in Russia.

Something in his temperament seems to have greeted the prospect of self-immolation; even before he entered what the Communists mean by the underground, he had been, in the Dostoevskian sense, an underground man, his own enemy. It had apparently pleased him to take the final step, to become one whose death it would be forbidden to notice. What did Mundt or Rankin or Dixon know of Dostoevsky, or those 24 jurors of the kind of alienated life that conditioned Chambers? What trick of history brought them and him into the same room, pushed them toward an uneasy alliance?

It was Hiss—the embodiment of the subsequent popular-front era, as Chambers was the embodiment of the third period—who provided the common link. Hiss who had as desperately to look respectable as Chambers had not to. The New Deal had moved American politics left, and had opened the doors of the trade unions and the Washington bureaus to the university intelligentsia at the very moment when that intelligentsia had been penetrated by the Communists, and communism had undergone two decisive changes. First, the national Communist parties had lost all initiative and internal democracy, coming under the absolute control of the Russian bureaucracy, and second, world Stalinism had adopted the popular-front line of collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

No longer was the ideal Bolshevik the open rebel, the poet-bum chanting songs of protest, but the principled Government worker with the pressed suit and the clean-cut look. It was the day of fronts and mass organizations, of infiltrating and capturing and boring from within. As the head lines in the Daily Worker declared peace-with-capitalism, a new kind of underground Communist moved into Washington, unnoticed among the purer, pragmatic New Dealers.

Hiss is the prototype of the new-model Bolshevik (Lee Pressman and Henry Collins and John Abt, Noel Field and George Silverman were others) who was the more valuable as he seemed less radical. Far from being urged to sell the party press, he was even discouraged from reading it. These new secret workers had never been open members of the party, they did not merely hide, but pretended to be what they were not. For the first time, a corps of Communists existed for whom treason, in the sense of real deceit, was possible. There were not revolutionaries but Machiavellians, when with a double allegiance, making the best of two worlds and often, like Hiss, profiting immensely within the society they worked so hard to destroy.

Doubtless some of these new Bolsheviks were able to deceive themselves into believing that there was no actual contradiction between their real allegiance and their pretended one. What helped the self-deception was the rise of Nazi Germany as the chief threat on the world scene, and the changing role of the Soviet Union in international affairs. The blanket phrase "antifascism" covered over conflicts as deep as life itself. On the one hand, the New Deal had finally recognized the new Russian regime, and on the other hand, Communist Russia had joined the fellowship of nations. In the League of Nations (which Lenin had long before called a den of thieves), Litvinov was calling for the unity of the antifascist world. The watchword was no longer "Defend the Soviet Union," but "Establish collective security." The Communists insisted that the interests of Russia and the United States were forever identical, and the majority of liberals collaborated in the hoax which was to crash with the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact, be ridiculously revived during the war when we were allies, and collapse once

more at the foot of the iron curtain. Here are the words of Earl Browder, written in the first flush of the Popular Front honeymoon:

"In this world movement, there stand out before the peace-loving peoples of the world two centers of resistance to the Fascist flood, two points from which leadership and inspiration can be given to the majority of mankind struggling for democracy and peace, two rallying grounds for the hard-pressed forces of progress and culture—the Soviet Union and the United States . . . The Soviet Union and the United States have common problems, common interests, and common enemies. That is a central fact in the new world situation."

The platitudes, read in their context of rallies-for-Spain sponsored by the big names from Hollywood and Broadway, seem only a little less old-fashioned and absurd than those of 1931, but we must read them with attention, remembering that they made treason easy. The bureaucrat, busy making himself a niche in the Government service while transmitting secret material to the Russians, didn't even have to pose to himself a moral either/or; in both his roles, he could consider himself serving what Browder liked to call the spirit of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln.

Before the popular-front Communist the ordinary Congressman is helpless, unless there is a renegade willing to make revelations. The average legislator pursues ordinarily one of two policies in regard to Communists, springing from his profound inability or unwillingness to tell a Stalinist from a liberal. Either he lumps together as Reds everybody left-of-center (and even an occasional right-winger by mistake), or he refuses to recognize as a Communist anyone who denies it. The one kind of Communist likely to be missed by both approaches is the genteel Bolshevik who keeps his nose clean and never even reads the New Republic.

That is why the committee was at first so completely buffeted by Hiss. When he thundered righteously, "I am sorry but I cannot but feel to such an extent that it is difficult for me to control myself that you can sit there, Mr. HENRY, and say to me casually that you have heard that man [Chambers] and you have heard me, and that you just have no basis for judging which one is telling the truth," HENRY could only stutter lamely something about the degrading necessity of using low stool pigeons like Chambers and Miss Bentley.

It is easy enough to understand the shouts of "red herring" raised in the earlier days of the case by certain old-line Democrats led by President Truman. They did not dissent on principle, but merely on party lines. If a venture sparked by Republicans is admitted to have succeeded, the Democrats stand to lose votes; and one denies anything that might lose votes. But the real liberals, in and out of the Democratic Party, from whose ranks most of the actual believers in the innocence of Hiss are drawn, are a different matter. They had not even listened to the earlier testimony, out of a feeling that paying any heed to the House Committee on Un-American Activities was playing into the hands of the enemy, and that, in any event, the personnel and procedures of that committee made it impossible for it to arrive at the truth. During the trials they paid attention for the first time.

Chambers' documentary evidence was still there, of course, and his circumstantial story was told again; but by this time Hiss was able to make a better showing than he had, taken unawares, before the committee. He was imperturbable and glib in his testimony; and his lawyers were able to make Chambers seem more than ever a moral leper, turning his very virtues (the lies and half revelations by which he had attempted to protect Hiss) against him, and mocking his new-found religion. All the world distrusts a convert,

but no part of it does so more heartily than the liberals. Finally there were the psychiatrists, prepared on the basis of courtroom observation to call Chambers seriously unbalanced.

But most important of all, there arose to stand beside Hiss, one by one, a series of respectable character witnesses, an elite corps, as it were, of the New Deal, distinguished civil servants and honored judges, until it seemed as if the whole movement that from 1932 on had swept the country out of fear and toward prosperity was staking its very reputation on the innocence of this single man. We know the character witnesses did not deliberately lie. But if they were not liars—as they certainly were not—they were, in some sense, fools. It is not an easy admission, certainly not for them, but not even for those (among whom I include myself) who have admired in them a vision of national life that still appears worth striving for.

Even the wisdom of Franklin Roosevelt, the final culture hero of our liberal era, is brought into question. For he seems personally to have pook-pooked the suspicions, relayed to him in 1940 by Ambassador Bullitt, about the reliability of Hiss. How could he have done otherwise? Was not Hiss one of those young men, mocked by the reactionary press as "brain trusters," it had been his special pride to bring into political life? The big-city bosses, the unprincipled experts, and the party hacks, he had been forced to carry with him for expediency's sake, but these young idealists he had supported for the sake of principle. Superficially, the history of Hiss is the prototypical history of the New Dealer at his best. The distinguished years at Harvard Law School, the secretaryship to the almost mythical Justice Holmes, the brilliant career that began in the Nye committee and culminated at Tehran.

Certainly, a generation was on trial with Hiss, on trial not, it must be noticed, for having struggled toward a better world, but for having substituted sentimentality for intelligence in that struggle, for having failed to understand the moral conditions that must determine its outcome. What is involved is not any question of all or most of the younger New Dealers having been, like Hiss, secret agents of the GPU, but of their having been so busy denying that there was a GPU or that it mattered, that they could not identify an enemy of all the values in which they most profoundly believed.

They cannot even flatter themselves on having been fooled by master tricksters. Hiss was, perhaps, an extraordinarily accomplished dissembler, but what of the Pressmans, the Wadleighs, and the Remingtons, more obvious in their intended deviousness? Lest the New Dealers seem "Red-baiters," they preferred to be fools. Even in the case of Hiss, disquieting reports were transmitted to his superiors from time to time, and it was noticed, on at least one occasion, that information which passed through his hands had an odd way of leaking out. At one point A. A. Berle, after a conversation with Chambers, had gone to Dean Acheson, then Hiss' immediate superior, to report the rumor that "the Hiss boys" were members of a secret Communist group, and Acheson called in Donald Hiss to ask him if he and his brother were really Reds.

The naïveté of the thing is monumental. He asked Donald Hiss, and when Hiss said no, Acheson was satisfied. After all, he had known the Hiss boys since they were children; they had gone to the same schools, belonged to the same clubs, could speak man to man. Dean Acheson simply could not bring himself to believe that if the Hisses, who were gentlemen, were also Communists, they would, as a matter of course, lie. One thinks of Mrs. Roosevelt, under somewhat similar circumstances, calling the leaders of the American Student Union into her draw-

ing room, asking them please to tell her the real truth: were they Communists?

In part, the lack of realism shared by Acheson and Mrs. Roosevelt came from belonging to a world in which liberals and conservatives (and even radicals) are assumed to share the same moral values, the values of the old Judeo-Christian ethical system, however secularized; but in another sense, it arises from long conditioning of the public mind by the front organizations of the late thirties, through which the bulk of the liberals learned to maintain the paradox that (a) there were really no Communists, just the hallucinations of witch hunters and (b) if these were Communists, they were, despite their shrillness and bad manners, fundamentally on the side of justice. After all, the Communists are "left," and everyone knows that only the "right" is bad. This absurd metaphor of "leftness" managed to conceal from men of good will and some intelligence the essential fact that the Communists had ceased to subscribe to a political morality universally shared, whatever its abuses, until 1917. How many victims of this confusion were able to spend years moving in and out of Communists fronts and say blandly in the end, "To the best of my knowledge, I have never known an actual Communist."

Seen in this larger context, the half-deliberate blindness of so many decent people, which is a vital part of the total Hiss case, explains itself. The erstwhile defenders of Hiss' innocence show a growing tendency to remain silent, but their silence does not mean, alas, that they are finally convinced. Looking through Carey McWilliams' recent *Witch Hunt*, for instance, one is startled to discover in a study of the rising tide of accusations of communism, no mention of the name of Alger Hiss—nor, indeed, of Klaus Fuchs. So significant an oversight must mean, if not active skepticism about Hiss' guilt, a feeling that his case is somehow less relevant than those in which charges of communism have not been substantiated.

We must clearly understand that the failure of Hiss to confess, far from casting doubt on his guilt, merely helps to define its nature. If Hiss' guilt is of the sort I have tried to indicate, it is clear that, without some change of heart or values, he could not possibly have confessed. One has only to think of the recent trial of the 12 members of the national committee of the Communist Party. Even these avowed and open leaders of the movement, whom one had perhaps expected to cry out their faith proudly before the tribunal, could only plead—so ingrained had the popular front lie become—in the teeth of the evidence of their own early writings, that (a) they had never advocated revolution and (b) by God it was their inalienable right as American citizens to do so. What could one expect from Hiss?

If there is a note of tragedy in the case, it is provided by Chambers, the informer driven to mortify himself and to harm those he still loves. The third perioder, still pursuing the absolute, makes a tragic final appearance as the scorned squealer; the popular front can only exist in the role of the hopeless liar. It is difficult to say what factor is most decisive in cutting Hiss off finally from the great privilege of confession; opportunism or perverted idealism, moral obtuseness or the habit of Machiavellianism; they are all inextricably intermingled.

In the end he failed all liberals, all who had, in some sense and at some time, shared his illusions (and who that calls himself a liberal is exempt?), all who demanded of him that he speak aloud a common recognition of complicity. And yet, perhaps they did not really want him to utter a confession; it would have been enough had he admitted a mistake rather than confessed a positive evil. Maybe, at the bottom of their hearts, they did not finally want him to admit any-

thing, but preferred the chance he gave them to say, he is, we are, innocent

American liberalism has been reluctant to leave the garden of its illusion; but it can hardly no longer: the age of innocence is dead. The Hiss case marks the death of an era, but it also promises a rebirth if we are willing to learn its lessons. We who would still like to think of ourselves as liberals must be willing to declare that mere liberal principle is not in itself a guarantee against evil; that the wrongdoer is not always the other—"they" and not "us", that there is no magic in the words, "left" or "progressive" or "socialist" that can prevent deceit and the abuse of power.

It is not necessary that we liberals be self-flagellants. We have desired good, and we have done some, but we have also done great evil. The confession in itself is nothing, but without the confession there can be no understanding, and without the understanding of what the Hiss case tries desperately to declare, we will not be able to move forward from a liberalism of innocence to a liberalism of responsibility.

The Association, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, Never Speaks Except on Matters Affecting Their Farm Constituency—Because of This Self-Imposed Restriction and the Conservatism Which Has Always Characterized Their Esteemed Secretary, C. C. Hanson, Members of Congress Are Usually Ready to Lend a Helping Hand to Any Request Which He Might Make

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a letter from C. C. Hanson, Washington representative and executive secretary of the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

It is my judgment that there is no trade or other organization or association in these United States which commends itself more to me and to the vast majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress than does the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, consisting of the 13 duly elected or appointed commissioners of the cotton-producing States of our Southland and the State of West Virginia, represented by Hon. J. D. McLaughlin, Commissioner of Agriculture.

The Association of Southern Commissioners never speaks with respect to any matter except such as have to do with the well-being of their farm constituency.

It is because of that self-imposed restriction and the natural conservatism which has always characterized its esteemed secretary, C. C. Hanson, Members of Congress are usually ready to lend a helping hand to any request which he might make.

As you all know, last year the Treasury of the United States took a loss of some \$40,000,000 in price supporting the peanut crops by way of acquiring surpluses in order to maintain peanuts at what this Congress legislated to be equitable prices.

PEANUT INDUSTRY IN DISTRESS

With respect to this year's crop, more stringent regulations and controls were invoked to make effective the expenditure of funds to maintain prices. Rigid allotments were made for each planter—but despite all that was and could be done, again our peanut industry is distressed—and it looks as if, again, the Federal Government will have to help this year's peanut crop to the extent of \$14,500,000.

In the several conferences that Colonel Hanson and their agricultural economist have had with me, the colonel told of the studies which the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture had made with a view to reducing the moneys necessary to support the peanut prices—and, in fact, said that they looked hopefully for the day when the price support for that crop could be entirely abated.

In detailing their own economic studies, he stated their findings indicated a possibility that a more intensive study of consumer preferences would possibly be the one way to solve the problem—and do so with the expenditure of a comparatively small sum.

He pointed out what the improved packaging of vegetable oil has done to increase the sales of such products as Crisco—and how the housewife prefers a shortening sold under that trade name to many other vegetable oils of equal quality—merely because she knows that when one takes the lid off the can, it is pure white and creamy—and that it remains that way. She knows, also, that she does not have to keep it in the refrigerator—and that wherever she buys a can of that brand, it will look like all other cans, and possess the same wholesale appearance at all times.

In pointing out how much aggressive merchandising will mean to increased peanut consumption, he handed me an article by Mr. Procter Campbell of the United States Department of Agriculture, which reads, in part, as follows:

How can peanut consumption be increased? That is the question the peanut industry and Government are trying to solve today. The importance of the question is highlighted by the fact that in recent years consumption has lagged far behind production of one of the Nation's important food crops.

The peanut industry has made efforts to increase consumption of edible stocks. Some significant advances have been made in quality of the products offered, particularly in peanut butter, where a great degree of stability has been gained in the standard product. Peanut butter has been combined with honey and yeast in appetizing spreads. Individual firms have conducted research in new product development. High quality roasted stock has been marketed in handy packages and pleasing mixes.

ADVERTISING KEY TO EDIBLE MARKET

Equally important has been the strong advertising campaign carried on by many in the industry. A few firms have been particularly active in keeping their good product before the consumer—the man who must be

sold if the central problem is to be pared down without long delay. Every firm that handles peanuts, whether a sheller, peanut butter manufacturer, salter, and roaster, or confectioner, should be interested in increasing the volume of peanuts that go into edible uses. However, there is still evidence that some firms are taking the path of least resistance and are not exploiting the edible peanut market to the maximum.

Development of methods for increasing the use of peanuts at the edible price level are being investigated by the Fats and Oils Branch of the Department of Agriculture under a Research and Marketing Act project. While quick results cannot be expected from this work, possibilities for developing new and expanded market outlets for peanuts and their products will be passed on to the industry as soon as they are developed.

RICE PREFERENCE STUDY

Colonel Hanson told of the results that came out of the studies that had been conducted under the direction of Mr. Forrest E. Clements, head of the Division of Special Surveys in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of consumer preference on rice—and of the tremendous amount of information garnered, and to which the increased consumption of rice in these United States can directly be traced.

Mr. Speaker, this economic report, made by the Division of Special Surveys, on rice and the patterns of rice usage disclosed not alone the users and nonusers of rice—but the characteristics of those who use it—the frequency of their servings—how rice was used in the home—the reasons for its usage—the methods of cooking and the foods which it replaces.

Of tremendous interest to the rice producers, the rice industry and markets—was the information that they garnered apropos of quick-cooking rice—ready-to-eat rice breakfast foods and rice crispies. The type and size of the packages that were most desired by the housewife—the housewife's preference for certain brands—and distribution of printing recipes on packages—all afforded suggestions for increasing the use of rice—which when introduced into marketing practices, paid off handsomely.

Typical of the price factors in marketing of rice, the survey disclosed that less than one-third of those who were interviewed said they would use rice more extensively if the prices were lowered. Very few, at the time of the survey were conscious that rice and potatoes cost about the same, while a third thought it cost less.

Out of this special survey came data of inestimable value to the rice producers of these United States—and, in fact, the television today is almost daily carrying programs and marketing commercials which tell of rice cooked in 1 minute—which has meant the sale of millions of extra pounds of rice by the rice producers.

Mr. Speaker, how well I remember some years ago of a call made at my office by Col. C. C. Hanson, the Honorable Bob Goode, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Alabama, and the Honorable J. E. MacDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the great State of Texas.

Commissioner MacDonald told at length of the hundreds of thousands of

boxes of grapefruit that were being thrown into the irrigation ditches of the Rio Grande Valley as well as the surplus of oranges left to rot on the trees because of the inability to obtain even as much as the freight that it would have cost to ship these valuable food products to market.

CITRUS FRUIT PREFERENCE STUDY

Mr. Speaker, this brought forth another research study by the Division of Special Surveys on citrus preferences among household consumers—and again came a veritable arsenal of informative data obtained from householders as to their likes and their dislikes for citrus fruits and fruit juices.

In this study, one of the questions asked of each homemaker was as to her preference and her use of fresh oranges and grapefruit, and canned orange juice, grapefruit juice, and various citrus blends.

Those who said they "never used this or that type" were asked, "How does it happen that you never use the same?"

Those who indicated that they used a product less than once a week were asked, "How does it happen that you don't use it more often?" Those who stated they used some one product once a week or more were asked, "Why, in general, do you use it?"

With respect to lemons, nonusers were asked the regular questions as stated above—but additionally, those who used lemons less than daily were asked—why they did not use them more often, and the reasons reported.

The study made in Louisville, Ky., revealed the fact that both in serving and dislike of taste were by far the most frequently mentioned reasons for not using oranges. In Nelson County, taste alone was given as the predominant reason.

The overwhelming majority of all who made frequent use of oranges said they did so for health reasons. Approximately one out of three of the frequent users emphasized the general food values and a similar proportion indicated that they considered oranges as essential parts of the diet of children.

These facts as to consumer preferences—pertinent to millions—apropos of the food value of fresh oranges and grapefruit versus that of canned juices, and the reasons for using or not using either fresh fruit or canned juices, the use of the mixture of fruit blends per capita consumption, plus a multiplicity of other data pertinent to the use of citrus-fruit products, has tremendously increased the consumption of fruit juices in these United States.

FRUIT AND JUICE PREFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the ever-increasing standard of living has in large manner accounted for the increased consumption of all fruit and vegetable juices during the past 10 years. In that interim, however, we have seen tomato juice increased from 2.76 pounds per capita to 4.5 pounds, or a 63-percent increase—and all juices, including prune, pineapple, and so forth, and vegetable, from 5.88 pounds per capita to 13.7 pounds, or an increase of

133 percent. While other juices increased in somewhat lesser percentages between the years of 1939 and 1950, the consumption of citrus-fruit juices has been expanded to the tremendous consumption of 229 percent during that decade.

While some percentage of this increase in the consumption of citrus-fruit juices may be attributed to the standard of living, the great preponderance of the increase and benefits which have accrued to the citrus-fruit producers, is directly due to the increased advertising, marketing, and other benefits that arose from knowing exactly what consumer preferences were, as were so ably disclosed in the work done on that product by the Division of Special Surveys.

CONSUMER PREFERENCE ON POTATOES

With a marked decline in potato consumption in the United States from 195 pounds per capita in 1910 to an approximate 125 pounds per capita in 1948—and despite a progressive decrease in acreage, the increased yields per acre had maintained the production of potatoes in the United States at a fairly high level.

Between 1930 and 1948, the average yield in bushels per acre rose from 110 to 186—chiefly because of the better utilization of lands—and technological advances made by our potato farmers, the introduction of new fertilizers and powerful insecticides and the guidance of our county agents.

Wartime legislation which gave farmers price incentive toward higher production saw a record-breaking harvest reported but a few years ago. Inasmuch as potatoes is a highly perishable crop, this created one of the greatest agricultural surplus production problems ever faced by our agricultural economy.

It was at that particular time that the Division of Special Surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, made that illuminating study on potatoes—particularly directed to disclosing the potato preferences among restaurant and hotel buyers.

The report of that study editorially and statistically constitutes one of the most illuminating reports on an agricultural product which I have ever read. Looking to the increased sales of agricultural products—and in the same class are the studies made on preferences among household consumers on potatoes, apples, and winter pears, women's preferences among textile products, and a host of other studies.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the peanut situation in these United States today with respect both to the Virginia-type and the Spanish-type is such as warrants studies comparable to those which I above recited.

PACE REPORT ON PEANUT FUNDS

Our good friend, the Honorable Stephen Pace, ex-Representative of the Third District of Georgia, while serving here in this body—devoted months if not years to intimate study of the welfare of the peanut planters of our great South. Well I recall one of his reports wherein he stated that all of the money expended by the Department of Agricul-

ture in its various studies on peanuts—edible and inedible—for hay, nuts, hull, and hogs—did not amount to as much as \$150,000 in any 1 year.

Contrast that small amount of expenditure for research on this great basic agricultural crop with the billions that we lay out for research in the Department of Defense and the millions upon millions of dollars that are spent each year for research in other departments of the Federal Government.

Contrast that small expenditure of \$150,000 for research by the Department of Agriculture—on its studies with respect to peanuts—with the \$45,000,000 that was spent last year by the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the peanut price structure established by this Government.

Better yet, Mr. Speaker, compare the few thousand dollars that are necessary to effectuate the results desired by the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, with the \$14,500,000 of Federal funds that will be employed to support the peanut price structure in this crop year, and you will see why it is that our good friend, C. C. Hanson, is writing to ask congressional assistance in the matter of dealing with this problem.

The problem to be dealt with in making the study which the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, is requesting, is to obtain factual information which will aid in determining the ways in which the market for peanuts and peanut oil may be expanded.

The area of the general problem to be examined in the proposed study is the uses made by household consumers of peanuts, peanut butter, peanut oils, as well as the uses made in agriculture of the peanut hulls themselves.

SCOPE OF PROPOSED STUDY

Additionally thereto, ascertainment is to be made with respect to the attitudes of householders and for preferences regarding the manner in which they would like to see the peanut products flavored, packed, and improved. It is desired that special studies and attention should be directed toward perfecting a peanut product which can be sliced and inserted between slices of bread just as bologna and other meats, together with a host of other pertinent questions, all of which are directed toward extending the markets for peanuts and peanut products.

Some degree of success has already been achieved. The Fats and Oils Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, of the United States Department of Agriculture, with George L. Pritchard as its chief, has already produced a sample run of peanut butters—not alone carrying the natural flavor—but other peanut butters that are chili flavored, chocolate flavored, lemon flavored, and orange flavored. This highly valued idea of making peanut butters of various flavors already holds great promise of expanding present markets.

CONSUMPTION IS STABLE

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the consumption of peanuts during the last two decades has varied by a small percent per capita from year to year. The

actual consumption is recited in the following tables:

Domestic use of peanuts for food 1929-48 (shelled basis)

Year	Total	Per capita
	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>
1929	519,000,000	4.2
1930	417,000,000	3.4
1931	570,000,000	4.6
1932	536,000,000	4.3
1933	472,000,000	3.7
1934	442,000,000	3.5
1935	532,000,000	4.1
1936	608,000,000	4.7
1937	581,000,000	4.5
1938	566,000,000	4.3
1939	573,000,000	4.3
1940	652,000,000	4.9
1941	671,000,000	4.7
1942	807,000,000	6.1
1943	881,000,000	5.7
1944	951,000,000	5.8
1945	871,000,000	6.4
1946	715,000,000	5.0
1947	676,000,000	4.7
1948	615,000,000	4.3

From the above table, it becomes apparent that if we can but increase the use of peanuts by as little as 10 percent per capita per year, which is less than one-half pound per person, that it will mean an over-all market for more than 75,000,000 pounds per year.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the above as well as other reasons that the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, through their Washington representative, have made their plea. They desire that the sum of \$140,000 be made available to the Division of Special Surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in order to extend their marketing studies with respect to peanut preferences, as well as to carry on the splendid work being done by the Fats and Oils Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I share the confidence of the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, that when these studies are complete, a veritable arsenal of data will have been garnered that will lead to the extension of the market for peanuts, both at home and abroad. Moreover, I feel with the Commissioner of Agriculture that the expenditure of the small sum of \$140,000 directed to that purpose will aid in abating the large sums which are annually spent in supporting peanut prices in accordance with legislation enacted by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all Members of this Congress sitting on both sides of the aisle and both ends of the Capitol may have the opportunity to read the plea of the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, made by their executive secretary, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD his letter dated October 15, 1951.

Colonel Hanson's letter reads as follows:

ASSOCIATION, THE SOUTHERN
COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 15, 1951.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOYKIN: This writer shall always remember the first ses-

sion of the Eighty-second Congress as one of the most interesting and hardest working sessions that the Nation has seen in many decades. Nothing but the urgency, with respect to the well-being of Alabama and our Southland could cause me to write you in the last closing hours of the Congress.

Your own contribution to the well-being of the peoples of the First District of Alabama in particular, and to those of the Nation in general, has been tremendous. Nothing but that strong, vigorous frame with which God has endowed all the Boykins, from whatever State they come, has enabled you to carry on your duty from 5 o'clock in the morning until long after sundown day after day, week after week, month after month, laboring ceaselessly and untiringly for your own constituents in Alabama and for Americans everywhere.

There is a matter with respect to the peanut crop to which this writer would like to direct your attention, convinced as he is in the belief that there is no other man who could bring a greater depth of understanding to that problem or more quickly institute an action program to relieve the distress than your own good self.

Once again our peanut planters have produced a surplus crop and are in distress, not alone those planters in Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and the Carolinas, and Virginia—who produce the long runner type of nut—but also those planters in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, who produce such a tremendous volume of the Spanish type nut.

It is unnecessary for this writer to point out to you that peanuts for hay, peanuts for nuts, oil, and hulls, both edible and inedible, make peanuts in value the third basic crop produced in our great Southland.

The Nation's Congress has long since recognized the inability of the peanut planters to produce and profitably market their crops without the aid and assistance of the Federal Government. Agreeable to that finding, the Congress has on several occasions declared that it was its policy "to aid and assist in the marketing of that crop," which assistance has, in the last decade, taken diverse forms.

Notable among the instrumentalities was the establishment of a guaranteed price for crops produced and under acreage allotment control with the acquisition by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the surplus, and in their operations, millions have been spent from Federal Treasury funds in trying to effect economic production.

The remedies taken have been only partially effective. This has been largely due to variations of seasons, inability to effectively control production, the inadequacy of storage and handling facilities, to say nothing of the ordinary visitation of insects, rodents, and fungi to which the nuts are subjected.

It is in part because of the foregoing reasons that the Department of Agriculture has been compelled to go before Congress on various occasions to request certain legislation in the matter of the production of peanuts, the power to effectuate certain controls, and the appropriation of large sums of money for the purchase of surplus peanuts, in order that peanut planters adversely affected would not be impoverished, due to the conditions above described.

For the past several years the Department of Agriculture, through several of its various agencies, has been making further heroic efforts to reduce subsidy payments on a great variety of agricultural products and they have succeeded in doing so—to an incredible degree.

Consumer preference studies with respect to selected textile products, potatoes, apples, winter pears, citrus fruits, and other items of research have unquestionably not alone expanded the agricultural market at home

and abroad, but they have saved untold millions of dollars of the Federal Treasury.

In addition to the many consumer preference studies on many products done by the Division of Special Surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Fats and Oils Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration has also been carrying on researches with respect to peanuts, peanut oil, hulls, and meal.

Their recent work in bringing out maple, orange, chocolate, and other flavors of peanut butter are studies that hold great promise for expanding the use of peanut butter as a spread. Their work of creating a sandwich filler by the production of a peanut product that can be sliced, much as liverwurst or bologna can be sliced, will undoubtedly prove of inestimable value in expanding the markets for this delicious basic crop of the Southern States.

Additionally thereto, the project which they are carrying on in your own State at Auburn, with respect to improving the handling and storage facilities, is showing tremendous prospect of reducing losses.

Congressman BOYKIN, as you well know, ex-Congressman Stephen Pace, who for years devoted his energy to the study of problems of the peanut growers of the State of Georgia, at one time estimated and made reports that all the researches done on peanuts by the Department of Agriculture did not amount to as much as \$150,000 in the very year that the price supports cost \$40,000,000.

The studied findings of the economist of the Association, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, indicate that tremendous results can be obtained by instituting a consumer-preference study in behalf of the peanut producers with respect to consumer preference on peanuts and peanut oil.

Authoritative estimate is made that this objective can easily be accomplished when the sum of \$140,000 is made available for such a study, either by the diversion of \$140,000 from other funds now in the hands of the Department of Agriculture or by the supplemental appropriation of said sum by the Congress.

The Association, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, has just completed extensive study of what, in their opinion, can inexpensively be done to improve the peanut situation, first with respect to abating subsidy payments, and second with respect to expanding the market for peanut products.

This study, conducted by an eminent agricultural economist, is supported individually and collectively by those who constitute the Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture. They indicate that the real solution lies in an extensive study in packaging and marketing the edible peanut crop as well as in an educational campaign with respect to the high quality of peanut oil. This can and should be carried out by the Division of Special Surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

To that end, the Association, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is seeking your help—

1 To have the sum of \$140,000 diverted from the Agricultural Research Administration to the above Division of Special Surveys for the study, or

2 The appropriation of that sum by the Congress and for that purpose.

Thanking you for your always considerate helpfulness to me, as the Washington representative of the Association, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture and your never-failing and continuing courtesies, I am,

Very truly,

C C HANSON,
Executive Secretary.

None Called Him Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review which was published in the Parkersburg News, of Parkersburg, W. Va., of an interesting new book entitled "None Called Him Neighbor," written by Marie Wood, a reporter on the Parkersburg Sentinel.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONE CALLED HIM NEIGHBOR—MARIE WOOD
WRITTS FASCINATING BOOK ON BLENNERHASSSETTS

(By Albert Woofter)

"None Called Him Neighbor" is the striking title of a new and well-written book by a well-known Parkersburg newspaperwoman, Marie Wood, reporter of the Parkersburg Sentinel.

The book, which is being published here Wednesday, tells the story of Harman and Margaret Blennerhassett, for whom historic Blennerhassett Island was named.

Mrs. Wood's own research was undertaken more than a dozen years ago, and her story is told with numerous picturesque details not usually found in history books. School children should find the lifelike characters fascinating.

The author is the talented former Marie Beyer O'Brien, who has spent 20 years in newspaper work. She is a former employee of the Parkersburg News; also worked on newspapers in Huntington and Glenville. She spent a year with the Pittsburgh Press and 4 years with the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald, and was known for her brilliant literary abilities.

She is the author of a 200-page book on Germany, written for the United States Army during her 2-year stay in Europe as editorial adviser for the Information and Education Branch. The book ran to an overseas edition of 29,000 copies, but has not been made available in this country.

Mrs. Wood is the mother of twin sons, 8 years of age. But despite the time and care which must be devoted to two growing boys, plus her duties on the Sentinel, she found time to compile the 32-page story of the picturesque island just south of Parkersburg in the Ohio River.

Six characters move through the pages, taking their places in history—and in the story.

They are:

A 50-year-old general who is commander in chief of the American forces and a paid agent of Spain.

A statesman, desperately in need of funds, brilliant, handsome, irresistible to women, and unscrupulous and designing. A former Vice President, he is under indictment in two States for the fatal shooting of the former Secretary of the Treasury, the feud reported to have had its start in affairs of heart when both were junior officers in the American Army.

A wealthy, disinherited beauty, mistress of an island mansion—one of America's showplaces.

Her husband, who was forced by the scandal of his marriage to his niece to leave Europe and who has come to America. Here he becomes a figure for caricature and ridicule among his neighbors for his snobbery and arrogance.

The President of the United States, diplomat and politician extraordinary and rounding out nearly 40 years of public life. His enemies know his deeply vindictive nature, and in the East he is held in such hatred that clergymen preached and prayed against him by name from the pulpit.

The Chief Justice of the United States, a 52-year-old former Virginia Congressman, midnight appointee of a bitter and defeated man who spent his last hours in the White House filling offices with foes of his successor. Both he and the President hate each other with equal venom.

Those are the characters which move through the story which begins with Harman Blennerhassett's marriage and continues through to his death to include a series of snobbish and shabby acts.

Interwoven through is the duplicity of Gen. James Wilkinson, who had two countries—both for sale—and the scheming of Aaron Burr to wrest an empire out of the Southwest. To the latter scheme Harman, because of flattery, pledged financial support far beyond his resources in an effort to recoup his fortune as well as leave the Ohio Valley, where the threat was becoming greater that his hated neighbors would learn the scandal of his marriage.

The bitter fight between President Thomas Jefferson and Chief Justice John Marshall, too often overlooked by historians, has an important place in the story.

Happenings in Washington—Program
No. 52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a broadcast by me on program No. 52, Happenings in Washington.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

The best evidence of the feelings of the people of Pennsylvania comes to me in the mail. The letters I receive from my constituents are an unfailing guide to their opinions on questions affecting the national interest and legislative proposals.

I cannot tell you how much I appreciate these letters. They come from sincere, patriotic Americans who are so deeply concerned about the welfare of their country. I am glad to get them for a number of reasons.

First, because the person who takes the trouble to write to me, in most cases, has a definite viewpoint to express.

Second, because a great many suggestions I have received have given me valuable guidance and helpful assistance.

Third, because the increasing volume of mail indicates a growing interest in the affairs of government and a deeper understanding of the problems and difficulties of these troubled times.

That is most important. The cause of good government cannot be advanced if there is indifference and apathy among the people.

Only an aroused and enlightened citizenship can measure up to its responsibilities

under the American system in which the people are the government.

It is extremely significant that more and more of my mail has to do with the tremendous expansion in Government spending.

It is plainly evident that most Americans are worried about how to make ends meet in the face of high taxes and high prices.

They are worried about the vast increase in the size and cost of government.

They know that every dollar the Government spends must come out of the earnings of those who work for a living.

They are worried about the new and bigger deficits which, in the next few years, will send the national debt far above the present level of \$260,000,000,000.

The people show an increasing awareness of the fact that the runaway expenditures must be paid for.

Many are aware that today the annual interest on the public debt alone is more than the entire cost of operating the Federal Government only 20 years ago.

Now, you know and I know that we are rearming to protect ourselves and our Nation against the naked aggression by the Godless forces of communism. That will cost many billions of dollars.

But I know—and your letters tell me that you also know—that a lot of the spending here in Washington is wasteful and unnecessary. We know that many Federal functions could be suspended or curtailed while we build the Nation's defensive strength.

But the spending pressure grows stronger and stronger. Every attempt to economize meets with determined and unyielding resistance from the free spenders now in control.

I wish every man and woman in America would understand how much the financial situation of the Government affects the individual citizen. According to an official Government report, the taxes paid to Federal, States and local government last year averaged \$360 for each man, woman, and child in our Nation. That is an average of \$1.440 for each family of four persons. It is more than double the taxes we paid in 1942. More than 90 percent of all the taxload was laid on the backs of our people by the Federal Government to pay for Federal spending. Increased taxes this year will push the burden upon each individual above \$500 or more than \$2000 for the average family.

Over and above all these taxes, there is the growing national debt. Already the share of that debt for each family of four persons is nearly \$7,000. It will be higher in the next year. The national debt is borrowed money which must be repaid. It is a mortgage on the future for many generations to come.

Now, I should like to read to you some of the views on taxation and spending expressed in some of the letters I've been getting. Time will permit me to quote from only a few. But, believe me, they are typical of thousands upon thousands of such letters which have been reaching my desk in recent months.

I have here a letter from a young married man with two children, from Souderton, in Montgomery County. He writes, in part:

"If taxes are further increased, or even held to present levels, it would cause a hardship due to the fact that the cost of raising a family is continuously on the rise. I trust that you will continue to fight against efforts to ever-increase our tax load. The only way to do it is to resist with all the strength at your command the efforts to continuously spend and spend, and to ever increase the scope of private government."

Now I have a letter from a Philadelphia businessman, who states:

"It appears to me that if Congress were to devote half as much time to backing measures aimed at reducing the size and cost of government as it does to bills for increasing taxes, the pressure on taxpayers could be alleviated."

I thoroughly agree with both of these men. Let me assure them that, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I fought hard to keep down every increase proposed in the new tax bill. My voting record in the Senate will show how I have fought to reduce unnecessary spending.

Now let me read you two letters of a type that are more and more frequent in my mail. To me, they are heartbreaking letters and I wish more could be done to help people like these.

A woman in Pittsburgh writes:

"When one is living on the income from savings, the income tax and other taxes wipe it out. I am in the forgotten class, and must do without necessities to keep a horde of Government employees."

Then there is this letter from an elderly man in Ridgway, Elk County. He writes:

"This matter of taxation is getting to be a back-breaking strain. I don't know how much longer I can stand the strain. I am a retired man and have a limited income and find it impossible to stretch the money to meet my obligations."

These letter writers are representative of a large class—those who have retired and who live on a fixed income.

Taxes bite a bigger and bigger share of their limited pension and annuity checks. Inflation makes their few dollars buy less and less. And because most of them are well along in years, they cannot return to work. They can't get jobs.

They can do nothing but to tighten their belts. It is tragic that runaway Federal spending deprives many of those worthy people of the comforts for which they worked and saved and, in many cases, even the necessities of life.

I have another letter from a disabled pensioner in Doylestown, Bucks County, who presents the same problem and goes on to add:

"The Communist leaders in Russia boast they can make the United States spend itself into bankruptcy. At the present rate their boast is likely to come true."

Now I want to read you a letter from a worried farmer of Erie County, who urges this:

"Every expense proposed by anyone, especially from the White House, should be carefully examined to see that the crazy drive to ultimate bankruptcy and socialism is stopped if it isn't already too late."

In that same vein is a sober warning from a school teacher, who says:

"During 28 years of teaching American government and economic problems in the public high school, I have become a firm believer in, and a strong advocate of, the free-enterprise system. If the Federal tax increase and the stifling controls demanded by President Truman are granted, we will be far down the road to socialism."

A man in the coal business, down near the West Virginia border, tells me in a letter:

"The salvation of our country depends upon Congress cutting the expenditures both at home and abroad. We should have a strong, sensible defense program, but the country can and is being destroyed by excessive governmental spending."

These are typical Americans—a farmer, a teacher, a merchant. Underneath they share the same uneasy concern. They feel, as they so well express it, that no nation can continue to tax and spend as our Nation has been taxing and spending, without eventually taxing and spending itself into disaster.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, many thoughtful Americans are expressing that viewpoint, these days.

A man in Pittsburgh writes as follows:

"Let us have more efficiency and economy in Government and we will then have lower taxes. If industry operated the way the Federal Government does, there would be no profits to tax."

From Williamsport comes this comment:

"It is time Congress weeded out and pruned down the Government to logical size. Let us have billions for defense and a few less billions for bureaucracy."

And a citizen of Lancaster adds:

"The average citizen is so confused and bewildered by the tactics that are being used in Washington that he has a unstable sense of security. Please try to do something about the proposed tax burden that is being imposed supposedly to curb inflation by reducing our buying power. How can a family cause inflation by overbuying when our purchasing power has been reduced by high prices and present high taxes, without considering the new tax increase?"

To my friend in Lancaster, I'd like to reply that I am doing—and shall continue to do—all that one Member of Congress is able to do in the face of the spending spree which is unparalleled in our country's history.

I vote against every proposed increase in spending unless the bill is directly related to the national defense.

I vote in favor of every proposal to cut down Government spending—unless such spending is for the national defense.

In speeches and public statements I warn against reckless spending, extravagance and excessive payrolls. I am opposed to the growing power of the Federal bureaucracy which moves in every direction to absorb functions which can be handled more efficiently and at lower cost by State and local governments.

The letters from which I have quoted are just a few of the many, many thousands that pour into my office. To me they represent a ground-swell of protest against reckless spending and excessive taxation.

These letters, from rich and poor, from housewives, working men and women, pensioners, from Republicans and Democrats in the 67 counties of Pennsylvania, are truly the voice of the people.

They encourage the hope that the sound, common sense of the American people will prevail and that the spirit of economy will return to preserve freedom of enterprise and freedom of opportunity.

I shall heed those letters. I shall continue my fight for sound fiscal policies and balanced budgets.

I hope you will continue to write to me and give me the benefit of your views on the great public problems of the day.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Statement of J. Donald Kingsley, Agent General of United Nations Korean Re- construction Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the problem of reconstructing Korea is a most important one. When we finally defeat the Communists in Korea, we will face the important problem of helping the Koreans to help themselves. For this purpose the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency—UNKRA—has been established and the United States is a contributing member. The task of reconstructing Korea is important not only to help these poor unfortunate

people but also to demonstrate to the world that through technical assistance and leadership, the United States through the United Nations can offer a forward-looking program and that communism is, therefore, definitely not the answer in underdeveloped areas—or any other areas.

I think we are fortunate that the United Nations has selected an American, Mr. J. Donald Kingsley, to head up this program. Mr. Kingsley recently outlined his program before the advisory committee meeting of UNKRA in Geneva, Switzerland, on September 10, 1951. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY J. DONALD KINGSLEY, AGENT GENERAL OF UNITED NATIONS KOREAN RECONSTRUCTION AGENCY (UNKRA), TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF UNKRA IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, ON SEPTEMBER 10, 1951

Since the last meeting of the Advisory Committee the military situation in Korea has improved to a certain extent, but the conclusion of active hostilities has been delayed beyond our expectations and is not yet in sight. While we had hoped by this time to be on the threshold of full-scale operations, that hope has not materialized and no one can say at this moment when, in fact, it may do so.

Meantime, the continuance of bitter warfare constantly increases the magnitude of the task confronting us and multiplies the difficulties of its accomplishment. In the second liberation of Seoul, which I recently visited, for example, destruction was far more extensive than in the first. Seoul, which had been a fine modern city, the finest in Korea and one of the finest in the entire Far East, is now little more than a burned-out shell. Industrial facilities in the area have been about 80 percent destroyed, 60 percent of the houses are burned out, and the capital and government buildings are twisted shells. Water, sewage, light, and telephone systems were completely knocked out. They have now been restored on a limited emergency basis by the Army, but their final restoration must await the conclusion of hostilities and will in all probability fall to UNKRA.

I have used Seoul as an example, but it is by no means the most striking. It has changed hands only four times, whereas other towns and villages have been fought over six, eight, and ten times. There is, for example, the town of Ouljonbu, located on a strategic road intersection some 20 miles north of Seoul and a few miles from the present front. Ouljonbu was once a thriving community of some 25,000 people. When we visited it at the end of July it was nothing but a mass of rubble about 3 feet high with no more than a dozen walls still standing as high as 5 feet above the ground. The destruction is absolutely total and, while there are no towns that have been harder hit, there are many others in the same condition and very few outside the Pusan perimeter which have not been badly damaged.

Under prevailing circumstances, it is next to impossible to come by valid statistics, and I am not yet in a position to estimate accurately the capital destruction and loss suffered thus far by South Korea. We are making studies industry by industry and the Army is surveying the situation on a provincial area basis. Moreover, the Republic of Korea Government has recently completed a massive survey of war damage, which we are currently analyzing. I think my present guess—subject to future revision—would be that South Korea has suffered about a \$2,000,000,000 loss in capital goods, including factories, public

buildings, houses, damage to rice paddies, public works, transport and destruction of draft animals.

If, I think, quite clear that no loss of this magnitude is likely to be made up directly by international assistance. The vast bulk of any reconstruction effort must be made by the Koreans themselves, and this fact must constitute a primary assumption underlying our whole approach to the problem. UNKRA cannot—and should not—reconstruct Korea. It can—and should—inspire, stimulate and assist the Korean Government and the Korean people to reconstruct their own country, and in so doing to demonstrate to all of Asia and the World, the dynamic and creative force of a democratic approach to critical social and economic problems. The opportunities in this respect are enormous.

I am now convinced that, given peace, an imaginative and sympathetic approach and a good bit of luck, such an objective can, in fact, be realized. The obstacles in the way are massive but not, I think, insurmountable. There are stirring in Korea today the same dynamic forces of nationalism and the same urge for social and economic progress which are everywhere apparent in Asia. These forces can lead to destruction and chaos—as they have done in some places. But if channelled to constructive ends they can—as all history demonstrates—lead to unbelievable achievement.

This is the real challenge confronting UNKRA, and it is difficult to state it without falling into abstractions or risking a charge of impracticability. But if we are to succeed in any large sense and not merely to accomplish a dreary task of relief without historic result, we must so develop our program and so utilize our resources that the Korean people themselves experience a sort of renaissance with all of the cultural, social and economic creativity implied in the term.

I feel this very strongly after talking with Korean leaders from all walks of life. It means, I think, that we have to consider our task not merely in terms of sustaining imports—though these will be essential to its achievement—or of the replacement of capital goods—though such replacement is basic to the establishment of a healthy economic life. Our task must be more broadly conceived than this, even though these be the tools we employ to achieve it. Its emphasis must be upon encouraging the social, cultural, and economic creativity of the Korean people themselves. We must bring them into the planning and execution of our program to the maximum extent possible—and from all walks of life—even though, in some instances, initial efficiency may thereby be sacrificed. We must encourage them to develop new types of economic and social institutions, designed to foster individual initiative, freedom, and security. We must assist them to discard the deadening vestiges of Japanese colonialism which to this day stifle economic life; to develop vigorous and democratic rural cooperatives, and other forms of democratic self-help, to achieve land reform; to encourage private initiative in industrial development; to construct a democratic educational system from the ground up, to improve the health knowledge of the people. These, and dozens of other things, can be done only by the Korean people themselves. But we can help them through advice, encouragement, and pump-priming expenditures. We can help them through democratic leadership.

I am aware that I am suggesting in very general terms a far more difficult approach than is involved in the development and direct execution of an economic aid program. But unless we can succeed along these lines, we will confront in Korea a bottomless pit capable of swallowing up an astronomical volume of international assistance with no permanent result. In that event, UNKRA will fail in Korea and the

United Nations will have lost in Korea and perhaps in the world.

So much for generalities. The immediate situation before us is governed by the major factors: (1) the continuance of active hostilities with all that that implies in terms of military necessities and consequent limitations upon UNKRA activities, and (2) the constantly increasing inflationary pressures in Korea resulting from large military expenditures, the virtual absence of consumer's goods in the market, and inadequate governmental fiscal policies. These pressures are reflected in fantastic price levels (during the week ended August 3, when I was last in Korea, the retail price index maintained by the Bank of Korea stood at 2,776 6 on a base of 1947 equals 100, having risen 140 points during the week). They are reflected also in a tremendous gap between the official and "free" market rate of the won (2,500 against 9,000 on July 30); and in a constant increase in currency issue by the Bank of Korea. Unless the inflation can be checked in the near future, there is very real danger that it may become run-away. For that reason, we are putting considerable emphasis in our technical assistance program on financial and fiscal questions, and are giving priority in our initial schemes to those which will have a minimal inflationary impact.

In the economic field, the broad conclusions so far reached and which are governing our initial programing may be summarized as follows:

(a) Every effort should be made to improve the Korean foreign exchange situation. We are, therefore, fully supporting the request of the Republic of Korea Government for the immediate repayment of won advances to the United Nations Command, for which a dollar credit has been established in Washington;

(b) We believe that the foreign exchange thus made available together with that currently held by the Republic of Korea should be used immediately for two purposes: (1) the importation of consumer's goods for sale; and (2) small-scale procurement by individual undertakings of necessary repair parts and other reconstruction goods. To facilitate such purchases, Korean procedures for procuring foreign exchange should be simplified.

(c) As a general proposition—and with the exception of necessary relief items—UNKRA funds should not be used for the importation of consumer's goods. UNKRA's main emphasis should be placed on large-scale reconstruction requirements.

(d) We should encourage the Republic of Korea Government to raise won for reconstruction purposes by the sale of currently held vested properties, as well as through improvement in fiscal policies. Most of the vested properties now held by the Government constitute a drain on the budget, rather than contributing to it.

(e) At some point, when the situation has been sufficiently stabilized, consideration will have to be given to currency reform and conversion.

In the general economic area, as in all others, our policies must be flexible and dynamic and are, therefore, subject to constant adjustment as the situation develops. There is no room for doctrinaire approaches in Korea today.

After considerable difficulty and delay, formal agreement was reached with the United Command on July 18, 1951, concerning the phasing of UNKRA operations and the arrangements agreed upon were formally concurred in by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea on July 27, 1951. We have, therefore, since the end of July, had an operating basis. I believe the agreement is a reasonable and satisfactory one in the circumstances, although it obviously presents many operational difficulties. It provides, as you

know, that the United Nations Command will have sole responsibility for all relief and short-term economic aid essential to military operations during the present phase and that UNKRA will be limited to: (1) technical assistance to the Republic of Korea Government; (2) assistance to the Civil Assistance Command in the conduct of relief and short-term programs; (3) long-term planning for phase II, when UNKRA will have full operational responsibility; and (4) the implementation to the extent permitted by the military situation, of aid programs additional to those of the United Nations Command.

Aside from technical assistance—where we have a broad scope, our immediate programing is therefore rather narrowly confined within a frame provided by the inflationary pressures on the one hand and military necessities on the other. There are, however, even under these circumstances, many significant things that UNKRA can do and is already doing and we shall continue to develop worth while projects in the months ahead. But any program so restricted will necessarily lack the well-rounded character of the type we should have in phase II and will appear more as a collection of unrelated projects than as a balanced attack on the problem. During this phase, therefore, budgeting and planning are extraordinarily difficult, for we must be ready to move in whenever and wherever opportunity presents, but it is not possible to predict in advance precisely what opportunities will or can be developed.

The immediate program thus far developed under those circumstances falls into three parts. (1) a program of cooperation with and assistance to the Civil Assistance Command, now charged with responsibility for relief and short term economic aid; (2) a rapidly developing and substantial program of technical assistance to the Republic of Korea Government; and (3) a series of longer range reconstruction projects which can be undertaken within our current limitations.

COOPERATION WITH THE CIVIL ASSISTANCE COMMAND

Relief and emergency rehabilitation are currently administered by the Civil Assistance Command of the Eighth Army through 14 provincial teams. Each team is composed of both military and civilian personnel and consists of medical officers, welfare officers, sanitary engineers, supply and transport officers, and administrative officers. To these have been added, in some instances, civil and electrical engineers and experts in various industrial specialties. Since February, we have been assisting the United Command by undertaking recruitment of the civilian members of these teams. Many of these have been seconded by the specialized agencies or by national Red Cross societies, but others have been recruited directly. Some, after a tour of duty, have been taken on our payroll and again seconded to the Civil Assistance Command. This was true, for example, of 12 medical personnel from the Danish hospital ship *Jutlandia*, who wished to stay on and work in Korea when the *Jutlandia* left in July.

We expect to continue and to intensify this type of assistance, so that by the time we assume responsibility for relief in Korea we will, in fact, have our teams built and will be in a position to take over a going concern at a moment's notice.

Other areas are beginning to emerge in which we may be able to render real assistance to the Civil Assistance Command and at the same time contribute to the solution of a long-term problem. The situation in respect to unaccompanied children is an instance in point. Our best estimate at the moment—and it is no more than an estimate—is that there are approximately 100,000 unaccompanied children in South Korea at present. How many of these are, in fact,

orphans is not known for it has not yet proved possible to establish tracing machinery to assist in reuniting families. That is a step which should be taken in the immediate future and which I propose to discuss at once with the United Nations Command. Highly trained staff is available for such a purpose as a result of recent sharp contractions in the operations of the International Tracing Service.

But whether orphaned or merely separated from relatives, unaccompanied children require special care. There are not adequate child welfare staffs in Korea at present and I believe the military will welcome assistance on this score. But the basic problem—as with nearly everything else in Korea—is a matter of accommodation, of housing, not only for the children but for staff as well. Only about one-third of the estimated number of unaccompanied children are in orphanages or institutions of any kind at present—in large part because space cannot be found for them.

We are undertaking to assist in this matter, if it proves feasible to do so, and are currently discussing with UNICEF the possibility of their passing on to us an offer of prefabricated buildings made to them by Yugoslavia. There are still a number of details to be worked out, including shipping arrangements and the provision of space in the Korean pipeline and we have not yet put the question to the military in any formal way. We are, however, pressing forward with this as a possible project and may have to allocate ocean freight costs for it in the near future.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

I think there is very little I need to say today about the technical assistance program, which was discussed in some detail at the last meeting of the committee. Since that time, however, we have rapidly built up our staff in this area and now have actually in Korea, en route, advisers in a number of specialties. We have been working our program out in close cooperation with the Technical Assistance Administration of the United Nations, who have been of great help to us, and who have now seconded to our staff in Korea a Technical Assistance Adviser. The program will continue to expand as new problems arise and in response to new requests by the ROK Government. It is temporarily stabilized at present despite many additional needs, as a result of the severe problem of accommodation and transport in Korea. We have reached, in fact, a point where we cannot squeeze in any more staff until we can get housing built for them and increase our transport.

This is, indeed, the most critical and urgent administrative problem we face in Korea. There is no housing, there is no office space, there is no transport, there are no facilities of any kind. Our staff, even the very limited staff now in Korea, is living under completely intolerable conditions, which have to be experienced to be believed. There is no privacy, there are no adequate sanitary facilities, there are not even places to hang up clothes, which are piled on cots. In two of the Quonset huts we are occupying, water covers the floor to a depth of 3 inches during a good rainstorm, and it sometimes rains for weeks. Aside from the impossibility of doing good work under such circumstances, the health risks, always heavy in Korea, are extreme.

Until we can remedy these conditions, we will neither be able to recruit new staff nor long hold what we have. We are, therefore, bending every effort to get new housing built and hope to have decent accommodations for perhaps 75 ready by the first of the year. But this problem will be constantly with us for a very long time, even after the conclusion of hostilities. Eventually, we shall have to consider dependent housing as well, for a staff of the size and quality we require

cannot be recruited only among bachelors, and there are clearly limits to the length of time men will agree to be separated from their families.

In Tokyo, where we have a small liaison and procurement staff, conditions are immeasurably better. But even here there is an extreme shortage of housing and office space and our staff are living in Japanese hotels, two to a room, at very high cost.

INITIAL LONG-RANGE PROJECTS

It is, I believe, of the utmost psychological and political importance in Korea that we initiate and carry through some long-range projects as quickly as possible. The Korean Government and Korean people, despite their heroism, are at present understandably discouraged. They have seen their country destroyed, and while they have been saved from subjugation, the possibility of a unified Korea seems to them as remote as ever. They appreciate in the most poignant terms the staggering reconstruction task before them, and they are understandably impatient to get on with it. They are, however, realists, who believe in concrete achievement but suspect promises of future action. To a large extent, therefore, the standing of UNKRA in Korea—and the possibility of our developing the type of cooperation I have earlier emphasized, will depend upon our ability to make some substantial contribution at an early date. We believe that we can do this, even under the severe restrictions prevailing at present, in connection with at least five projects.

DRAFT CATTLE PROJECT

The first of these upon which I wish to consult you is a project for the importation of draft animals and the development of breeding and agricultural experiment stations. Oxen and other types of draft cattle are of major importance in Korea's rice economy. Losses of such animals as a result of the war have been very substantial—how substantial is not precisely known, but is estimated by the Republic of Korea Government at 200,000 head, including a large part of the breeding stock. The program which we are developing, in conjunction with our FAO agricultural adviser, envisages the importation of 20,500 working cattle and approximately 1,000 breeding cattle over a 3-year period. The working cattle will, in all probability, be obtained from Japan and the breeding cattle from Pakistan, with a few experimental breeds like the Brown Swiss from other areas. Our hope is to bring in 500 working cattle this autumn, 10,000 in 1952, and the remainder the following year. Five hundred breeding cattle would be imported from Pakistan next spring.

As a part of the program, we propose to rehabilitate a former cattle station at Incheon to serve as a quarantine station with a capacity of 500 animals per month, to construct a new station and agricultural experiment center on Chejudo Island to accommodate 500, and to develop six smaller stations on the mainland for a total of 650 cattle. With the exception of the Incheon quarantine station, all of these would also be used for breeding and agricultural development purposes.

While the total program in this calendar year will not cost over \$100,000, it will run to more than \$2,000,000 in both 1952 and 1953.

The full cattle program has not yet been cleared with the military authorities, although I discussed it in principle with the deputy commander of the Eighth Army and with President Rhee and his cabinet on my last trip to Korea. It has the merit of requiring no large won counterpart expenditures, which would contribute to inflationary pressures, and we can utilize some of the smaller ports to disembark the cattle near the programed quarantine stations. Consequently, there would be no interference with military supply.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROJECTS

The second project we are starting immediately is that for the establishment of two vocational training centers, primarily for the training of Korean instructors who can then establish their own centers as a part of the Korean educational system. As members of the advisory committee know, there is a severe shortage of all types of skills, even the most elementary, among the Korean people. This is due to the established Japanese practice of filling even the semi-skilled positions in Korean industry with Japanese nationals and excluding Koreans from all but manual labor. There is not at present, therefore, the skilled manpower available in Korea to carry out a large-scale reconstruction program and such a labor force must be built up as rapidly as possible.

Our approach to this problem is to open two demonstration training centers to train Korean instructors. The Koreans themselves will then open other centers for the training of the general population. The advance staff for this project is already in Korea and we are now engaged in choosing suitable sites for the two installations. At least one of them should be in operation by the first of the year. The skills to be taught will be directly related to Korean needs and the curriculum is being developed by one of the outstanding vocational training experts in the world who has been loaned to UNKRA for this purpose by the United States Department of Labor.

Again this program is one which requires a minimum of won expenditure in its initial stages and imposes no serious burden on military pipelines.

MEDICAL REHABILITATION PROJECT

A somewhat related program is that for medical rehabilitation, which, again, is the sort of thing which can be fitted in under present circumstances. There are large numbers of amputees in Korea—resulting from war injuries—for whom nothing at all is being done at present. We propose to start with them and to develop in conjunction with the program a small industry for the manufacture of artificial limbs.

In this connection, the IRO has operated one of the most extensive rehabilitation programs ever undertaken by a civilian authority, in the course of which one of our men developed a simple artificial limb which the displaced persons themselves have been able to produce. We have been fortunate enough to obtain the services of this man and he is now in Korea working on the particular problem there. We are currently recruiting a medical director for the project.

It is possible that, were we now in phase II, we would not have given first priority in a medical program to this project. But it is an urgent and appealing problem and one which we can tackle immediately. Budget estimates have been included to cover its initial stages.

There are two or three other programs which I wish to mention today, for we are anxious to get on with them, although we do not anticipate substantial expenditures on them before the next meeting of the advisory committee.

SCANDINAVIAN HOSPITAL SCHEME

One emergent program upon which commitments may have to be made in the near future is that for the establishment of a medical center and teaching hospital in Seoul.

The present Scandinavian medical units operating under military control in Korea have all demonstrated an anxiety to participate in the field of medical services to the civilian population. A project was initially proposed by the Danish Government which has not developed into a proposal for a joint Scandinavian medical unit to provide a service to the civilian population after the end of hostilities. Toward this end the Danish Government has already promised the sum

of \$860,000 and initial responses from other interested governments have been favorable although so far still unofficial and unconfirmed.

It is proposed to submit to these governments immediately a detailed project for their joint consideration. The plan is to establish a teaching hospital in Seoul in connection with the faculty of medicine of the Seoul University. At this time it is considered unwise to plan a full scale undergraduate medical college until such time as we can obtain a guaranty of continuity of outside support for a very considerable number of years. During the initial period of operation, it is planned to develop a teaching project which will concentrate primarily on postgraduate medical training in all fields of medicine, including public health, together with specially designed short courses for rural physicians, nurses, medical technicians, and sanitarians. The scheme will operate in close conjunction with the Korean medical faculty for undergraduate education in order that its standards may be influenced, but especially in order to lay a sound foundation in the hope that with long term outside assistance a total medical education program may be developed. The Korean Government has agreed to place at the disposal of UNKRA the necessary hospital and auxiliary buildings, including the University of Seoul Medical Hospital. This is a very fine 1,000-bed hospital, the buildings of which have thus far escaped damage. The equipment has, however, all been stolen or destroyed and the unit will have to be completely equipped in every respect, at an estimated cost of \$400,000 to \$500,000.

I expect, in the immediate future, to propose to the interested governments the establishment of a joint committee to work out complete details. As we have conceived the project, its financing will be tripartite: partly by contributions from the governments, partly by the ROK government, which will meet local expenses like maintenance, heat, food costs, and so on, and the balance by UNKRA. The details have not been sufficiently worked out to permit us to present budget estimates at this time.

While we hope to get this project started as soon as possible, our programming effort in the field of public health is proceeding along broader lines. We hope, in cooperation with WHO, to develop an integrated and comprehensive health program which can, at an early date, be implemented by the ROK government. I shall be reporting on this more fully at future meetings, for the health and sanitation problem which will be left when hostilities cease will be a staggering one.

HOUSING

A major reconstruction requirement will obviously be for the construction of housing. About 600,000 houses have been destroyed thus far and additional losses are occurring daily, both along the battle line and as a result of guerrilla activities far behind the lines. The military, through the Civilian Relief in Korea Program (CRIK) have so far constructed 1,000 units in the Taegu area and have additional small projects planned. But the bulk of any housing program will fall to UNKRA when hostilities have been concluded.

We are not, at present, in a position to make a concrete contribution to housing needs, in view of military control of the materials pipeline. But I would like to see whether, in connection with our planning for posthostilities housing, we cannot develop some new and improved ideas among the Koreans themselves. We consequently propose to hold a design competition for both rural and urban housing, open to Korean architects and engineers. It will be interesting to see what we get and what interest is aroused. But I am thoroughly convinced that, if the Koreans are to accept new, improved, and simplified designs, they cannot be imported from outside.

In conclusion, therefore, I should merely like to stress again my feeling that we are embarked upon a great historic mission—one which if properly handled, may directly and largely affect the shape of future events, not only in Asia, but in the whole world. It is, however, a mission fraught with difficulties, whose successful accomplishment will require the devoted attention of the best brains and talent available among the United Nations and the sustained interest and support of their governments.

Air Mail Subsidy Separation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record an excellent editorial from the Baltimore Sun of last Sunday, October 14, 1951, concerning the separation of hidden air line subsidies from mail pay.

As this editorial notes, last year the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported out a much more effective separation bill than the one recently acted on in the Senate.

Last year's report, House Report No. 3041 of the Eighty-first Congress, made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is the best report on air mail subsidy separation which has ever been made by any Government body or private group.

Therefore I hope that the Interstate Committee will readopt its entire report of last year, and report favorably H. R. 508.

I should like to commend the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. CROSSLER], the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HESLTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCGUIRE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and many others, who have been instrumental in putting forward this important bipartisan reform which has been repeatedly recommended by the President of the United States, the Hoover Commission, and six different congressional committees.

The editorial follows:

AN UNSATISFACTORY AIRLINE SUBSIDY BILL

The intent of Senate bill 436 recently passed by the Senate on voice vote was to separate airline subsidy from pay for carrying the mails in both the domestic and the international field. With mail pay and subsidy doled out at present in one conglomerate sum by the Post Office Department it is impossible for the taxpayer to discover just how his airmail dollar is divided.

The bill passed by the Senate provides that domestic subsidies be determined separately from mail pay and that they be paid separately by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The bill sets a scale of rates for domestic airmail payments to take effect next July and authorizes the CAB in future to adjust rates and standards of compensation without ad-

ditional legislation. Though these standards are somewhat clouded by national defense considerations the bill does state that the mere existence of an airline certificate "shall not be deemed conclusive" justification for subsidy.

From the beginning this bill has been weak on the international side. It is worse as amended. The cost factor which serves as a guide in the fixing of domestic rates is completely ignored. The floor set is the amount paid to foreign carriers for handling the mail and the ceiling provided is the Universal Postal Union rate of \$2.86 per ton-mile. This, as we have pointed out before, is over three times the rate for a luxury passenger and seven times the rate for air-freight and express.

Amendments to the bill would permit the international carriers to obtain Federal subsidy contracts for periods up to 5 years, with the carrier to return to the Government at the end of the contract one-half of any net profit for the operation in excess of 10 percent of invested capital minus liberal deductions. Subsidies would be restricted to United States airlines holding certificates as mail carriers.

These amendments by Senators McMAHON and McCARRAN are the jokers in this Senate bill. Five-year contracts would dodge yearly congressional review of subsidies even though the Hoover Commission called for it. "Losses and subsidies [said the report] should be made clear each fiscal year and passed upon by Congress."

Also under these amendments the CAB could conceivably grant any number of certificated carriers 5-year subsidy contracts. And Congress would be obligated, making the lack of annual review a most serious out in the Senate bill.

Last year the House passed a much tighter measure to achieve separation. That was the Heslton-Kennedy bill which died in the Eighty-first Congress. To properly implement the separation idea the House Interstate Commerce Committee should now adopt last year's hearings and report favorably the same Heslton-Kennedy bill (H. R. 508) which they approved last year.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Fall Foliage Festival, Uniontown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address to be delivered by me at the Fall Foliage Festival of Pennsylvania Week at Uniontown, Pa., Saturday evening, October 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It is always a pleasure to come to Uniontown, particularly at this time of year when nature reveals her lavish gifts of scenic beauty in all their splendor.

This festival of fall foliage is indeed a notable part of your Pennsylvania Week celebration.

Here one may enjoy in full measure the magnificent panorama of your mountains and forests, covered in glorious colors that leave the spectator breathless in admiration.

One cannot stand in the presence of such grandeur without being uplifted in spirit or without reverent acknowledgment of God's blessing upon our State and its people.

There is patriotic inspiration for every American in the proud record of old Fayette. Upon its soil were enacted events which shaped the course of civilization on the North American continent and in the world.

In the thrilling pageant of your county history we see the development of Pennsylvania's western frontier.

We see George Washington, as a young officer, leading his first command in battle at Fort Mifflin. That was the opening engagement in many years of warfare which brought to an end French sovereignty in America.

We see the British and Colonial troops of General Braddock cutting a road through the wilderness on his ill-fated expedition against the French and Indians at Fort Duquesne.

We see the great migration over the National Road as the hardy pioneers made their way westward to carve out a new empire of American progress.

Here in Fayette County we see the first small beginnings of the world famous western Pennsylvania industry based upon iron, steel, and coal.

Here was opened the first iron furnace west of the Alleghenies and the first mill in the United States to puddle iron and to roll iron bars.

Here was established the first glass works west of the Alleghenies and here the first bituminous coal was mined from the earth.

Many of the early settlers of Fayette County were veterans of the Revolution—courageous men who had endured the hardships and suffering of war because they loved liberty and independence.

They sought new homes where they could live in freedom—where they could be free to grow and prosper and to build for the future of their children.

They were men of deep religious conviction. Above all else they wanted freedom to worship God in the manner of their own faith, without fear of tyranny or persecution.

They found a land of fertile soil, virgin forests and broad rivers. They found a great treasure house of natural resources upon which they built the foundation of our economic strength and prosperity.

Since the earliest days of its history Fayette County has had an important part in making Pennsylvania the great industrial and agricultural Commonwealth it is today.

All of us who love Pennsylvania welcome Pennsylvania Week as a time to spread its fame and to share its glories with the world.

It is appropriate on occasions such as this to proclaim the greatness of our Commonwealth—not in the spirit of boastfulness—but with grateful appreciation of the elements that have given us a foremost place among the States of the Union.

It is a time to express our profound gratitude for the broad vision and deep humanitarianism of William Penn, illustrious founder of Pennsylvania.

Here, in Penn's Woods, he launched a holy experiment in government. It was a government based on social, political, and economic freedom of the individual, and good will, tolerance, and the love of God.

"If we are not ruled by God," William Penn asserted, "we will be ruled by tyrants."

That principle of freedom under God attracted liberty-loving people from every colony and many nations. These were sturdy, industrious, self-reliant men and women, willing to toil early and late in order that they might enjoy civil and religious liberty.

They did not ask the government to guarantee their security. They didn't dream of subsidies or hand-outs. All they asked was opportunity.

That spirit built the greatness of our State and Nation. It developed our rich natural resources. It built our great industries, our railroads, our centers of education and culture, our splendid churches of every faith and every creed.

We are fortunate in Pennsylvania that our people represent a mingling of varied national origins, of every race and creed, living and working at peace with each other in mutual respect and helpfulness.

Many of our forebears fled from oppression and persecution to this land of liberty and opportunity. They absorbed the ideals of patriotic Americanism and have been fused into the great body of loyal American citizenship.

And when I speak of patriotic Americanism I am reminded of a movement launched here in Uniontown that has the greatest importance to all of our people and to the future of our Republic.

Nineteen years ago a group of your fellow citizens started the annual observance of Americanism Day as a public manifestation of patriotism and loyalty.

They were veterans of World War I. They had served in a time of national peril for the preservation of our liberties.

They were alarmed at the increasing influence of communism. They saw followers of that godless, subversive philosophy working to undermine faith in America by poisoning the minds of our young people.

Under their leadership, plans for Americanism Day were formulated and while subversive organizations were holding Communist demonstrations, Uniontown proudly proclaimed its Americanism under the Stars and Stripes.

Since then Americanism Day has gained national recognition. It is observed with parades and patriotic exercises in many cities and towns. It has become an effective means of uniting and inspiring our people in loyalty and allegiance to the sacred ideals upon which our Republic was established.

I am happy to salute the founders of Americanism Day and to congratulate them on their splendid contribution to the strength and security of our Nation.

The Fall Foliage Festival which we are celebrating is dedicated to the glories of Nature and to community progress.

But when we think of all the beauty which surrounds us and all our material achievements, we must remember that the God who bestowed such rich blessings upon us gave us freedom at the same time.

Freedom of the individual is God's greatest gift to mankind. It is the driving force which sustained the pioneers. It is the fundamental principle of American liberty and independence. It is the right of every American to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

These are not rights granted by government. These are not rights that government can take away. They are inalienable rights, which we hold sacred as an endowment from Almighty God.

Today we are engaged in a great struggle to preserve these rights.

We have reached a time when all our patriotism and all our fighting spirit is called upon to safeguard freedom of the individual from the evil influences that would destroy the American system of government.

Our freedom is being undermined by crime and corruption and the breakdown of moral standards in public and private life.

Our freedom is being weakened by the inroads of communism.

Our freedom is threatened by the increasing dependence upon government which robs the citizens of self-reliance, initiative, and the will to advance through individual effort.

Our freedom is placed in danger by excessive spending, by big government which is plunging headlong into national bankruptcy and the dictatorship of state socialism.

We have all been shocked by recent disclosures of graft, bribery, political favoritism and other forms of corruption in our Government.

We have reason to be alarmed by the widespread breakdown of morality and decency which has been revealed before congressional investigating committees.

Never before in the history of our Nation has there been such a callous disregard for honesty in the conduct of public affairs.

Never before have such outrageous departures from all ethical standards been tolerated, condoned, and protected as they are today.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, when I call attention to this scandalous situation, I do so without any thought of political considerations. I speak as an American who is gravely concerned and deeply worried—just as I know you are.

Corruption must be driven out; the guilty must be punished, no matter whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

History teaches that corruption in public life has always preceded the downfall of nations.

We must awaken the righteous indignation of the American people. We must arouse the fighting spirit of our decent citizenship. We must drive out the grafters, the bribe takers, the dealers in political influence and all others who look upon public office as a source of personal gain.

This is not a political issue. It is a great moral issue of honesty against dishonesty. It will be supported by every American who places honor, principle, and integrity above selfish interest.

Victory over racketeers and grafters can be achieved only if every decent, right-thinking citizen takes an active interest in government.

We can have good government only if we elect to public office men of high moral standards who are imbued with real Americanism.

Good government in our Republic is the strongest safeguard of freedom of the individual.

The second danger to which I have referred is the poisonous influence of communism here at home. As I said before, Uniontown has set a good example by fighting this threat to our freedom with 100-percent Americanism.

Unfortunately, the Communist doctrine has made inroads among some so-called intellectuals and has resulted in subversive teachings in many of our schools and colleges.

We must drive out of every educational institution every teacher who would undermine faith in the American way of life.

We must drive all Communists and Communist sympathizers out of our Government, our labor organizations, our fraternal societies, and every other group where they can do harm.

We must teach our young people that communism is an alien philosophy which denies God and would destroy all human freedom.

We must teach the youth of our land that communism means enslavement under dictatorship and tyranny while America means liberty and unlimited opportunity.

Communism rejects the teachings of religion and worships the state. America was built on faith in God.

Corruption and communism are grave perils to the future of the United States, but the most dangerous threat to our freedom of the individual is reckless disregard for the financial stability and solvency of our Nation.

Extravagant spending by all levels of government, excessive taxation, increasing debt and deficit financing are the road to disaster.

We are a rich Nation, but there is a limit to the spending we can sustain. There is a

limit to the burden of taxation that can be placed upon the people without plunging them into financial collapse and national bankruptcy.

We have just about reached that limit now.

The latest available figures indicate that the Federal Government expects to spend \$68,000,000,000 in the fiscal year that began last July 1. In the years ahead expenditures will climb up to 80 or 90 billion dollars a year.

Do you realize what that means?

It means that the present high level of taxation will have to be almost doubled if we are to meet this tremendous cost of Government out of current revenues.

It means more deficit financing, more billions of debt, more inflation, and finally complete disruption of the free enterprise system.

When that day comes the American plan of self-government will be crushed. The people of the United States will be robbed of their freedom.

Every business, every industry, every farm and every job will be controlled by the Government. Our lives will be regimented and restricted by an all-powerful bureaucracy.

That is the direction in which we are traveling. That is the inevitable result of the wild riot of extravagant spending which always takes more and more from the pockets of our workers in taxes and high prices.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, let me impress upon you that the ultimate responsibility rests upon the people themselves.

They alone have the power to enforce the growing demand that we get back on the right road through economy in Government instead of higher taxes.

They alone have the power to preserve the solvency and stability of our Nation from the ruinous effect of Socialistic schemes that have failed in every country where they have been tried.

I recommend to you the advice of George Washington who in the dark days of the Revolution, issued an order to his officers in which he said:

"Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

Let us now resolve that we, too, will entrust the future of our country only to real Americans who will carry out the American ideals of government.

Let us resolve to place in public office only men who believe in freedom of the individual as the God-given foundation of all human hope and happiness.

We must solve our problems in the American way.

In our industry, our culture, our spiritual life and in the betterment of government there are vast opportunities if we live the lives of Americans.

If we have the patriotism, courage and faith of our forefathers we can preserve the greatness of our free Republic for all time to come.

of the Federal Trade Commission which I have had the pleasure of making with our former colleague, Senator James M. Mead, now Chairman Mead of the Commission.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KILGORE. In the business world we hear much these days about the great need of seeing that small business has a chance to survive in the competitive battle with large corporations. Much is said also about the need for special care in protecting the buying public by seeing to it, as goods and merchandise pass through the channels of trade to the ultimate consumer, that consumers are not imposed upon by unfair trade practices or the exploitation of monopoly. I feel that our people are rightly concerned about these matters and that they should have the opportunity to learn of what the Government is doing in this respect. The Federal Trade Commission is concerned not only with the Government's effort to protect the buying public from unfair and deceptive trade practices, but also of serving as a continuous check against the inception and growth of monopolistic power which tends to snuff out small business. I have with me an old friend of mine, the Honorable James M. Mead, a former Senator from the State of New York. He is now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. Senator Mead, I should like to ask you to tell the people of West Virginia something about the functions of the Commission and what it is doing to protect their interests.

Chairman MEAD. I shall be happy to do that, Senator. It is a great pleasure to me again to be with you here after so many years of our close association in the Senate. In answer to your question, let me say that the Federal Trade Commission has many duties and functions, and all of them are concerned with the task of keeping the operation of industry and trade on the basis of free and fair competition so that monopolistic combinations and unfair competitive tactics are not resorted to. While it is often said "Competition is the life of trade," competition is truly the basic principle of our American economy. The Federal Trade Commission has the duty of acting in the public interest to keep out of the operations of industry and commerce practices which are harmful and destructive of fair competition. Our work is directed to safeguarding free enterprise, to preventing the growth of monopoly, to preserving small business, and to protecting the consuming public in buying the things they need. Congress gave us powers of investigation and authorized the Commission to investigate and proceed against alleged offending business concerns and as a corrective to issue cease and desist orders upon evidence and hearing. These orders may be reviewed and enforced through the courts. The powers conferred on the Commission are designed to enable it to take protective action against those types of business methods which may be resorted to from time to time as harmful to the public and destructive of the principles of free and fair competition upon which our industrial and commercial system is based.

Senator KILGORE. During times of emergency when prices are high and substitute materials need to be used in many products, it seems more important than ever that our people be protected in their purchasing from being misled about the quality or character of the merchandise they need to buy, and against situations which artificially interfere with the possibilities of competition between different manufacturers and marketers by which they seek the consumers' dollar. How does the Federal Trade Commission fit into that picture?

Chairman MEAD. Among the business practices with which the Commission deals are unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce which Congress has declared to be unlawful. Under this provision, any form of deception practiced by a manufacturer or distributor in commerce in the sale of his goods would, upon proof, be subject to this law and to a cease and desist order which the Commission may issue against such offender. Under this heading, all types of deceptive selling in commerce whether practiced through the medium of advertising over the radio or by the printed word, or through deceptive marking or labeling of product or through any other sales promotion which tends to mislead the buyer, are subject to corrective proceedings by the Commission. But deceptive practices used in the marketing of goods do not form the only category of harmful trade methods dealt with by the Commission as necessary for protection of the public's interest in the maintenance of free and fair competition.

Senator KILGORE. What are some of the others?

Chairman MEAD. Various types of business problems and practices have been declared by Congress to be unlawful by reason of their tendency to suppress competition or restrain trade and thus deprive the public and business itself of the benefits of unlettered competition. Correction of these evils constitutes another category of our work. Among this type of unlawful practices are:

(a) Discriminations in prices, services, and facilities furnished to dealers and purchasers in the sale of goods, wares, and merchandise of like grade and quality, as covered by the Robinson-Patman Act.

(b) Use of tying contracts by manufacturer or distributor to prevent dealers from handling the goods of a competitor, as covered by section 3 of the Clayton Act.

(c) Consolidation or merging of two or more competing corporations by acquisition of their stock or assets, which may lessen or destroy competition. This inhibition is embodied in the antimerger legislation which Congress recently strengthened by revising section 7 of the Clayton Act.

(d) Another Commission duty is that of preventing interlocking directorates between large competing corporations, as provided in section 8 of the Clayton Act.

To protect the interest of the public the Commission has the further duties of supervising associations of firms or corporations engaged in export trade under the Webb-Pomerene Act of 1918, and administering wool products labeling program. We are also inaugurating a new program to require honest labeling of fur garments under recent legislation. The Commission likewise acts as an arm of Congress in making surveys and studies of large economic problems. Much new legislation of highly constructive character has been enacted by Congress with the aid of such surveys and studies by the Federal Trade Commission.

Senator KILGORE. The manifold duties of the Commission undoubtedly require carefully thought out programs of the Commission operations. What are the principal operational programs of the Commission?

Chairman MEAD. We have several very active programs. One is our anti-deceptive practice work. It deals with all types of deceptive business practices which are harmful to the consuming public or to competition. This includes advertising of commodities, sales promotions, lack of proper labeling of wool products to enable the consumer to know what, if any, admixtures of cotton, rayon, or reused wool, has been introduced into fabrics and garments which have the appearance of wool. Furthermore, our anti-deceptive practice program embraces the big field of prevention of false and deceptive advertising of foods, drugs, devices, and cos-

The Work of the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio interview broadcast on the work

metics. Under such program, as had occurred in actual cases, orders, and stipulations to cease and desist are issued in many instances to stop deception of the buying public and harm to scrupulous competitors. To illustrate, a manufacturer placed on the market knit underwear described as "wool" when in fact it contained only 10 percent wool.

In respect to Ponderosa lumber marketed throughout the country to home builders and others, a widespread attempt was made to sell it as white pine, whereas the Ponderosa tree is not true white pine as understood in the trade.

In relation to a brand of baking powder long promoted as a cream of tartar powder which became expensive to produce as a result of war emergency, the manufacturer switched the ingredients to a phosphate powder, which was cheaper, but continued advertising as before without letting the public know he had changed the ingredients, thus deceiving the housewife as to the type of baking powder she was buying under the brand name in question.

More recently, a proprietary medicine was improperly advertised as a cure for a host of diseases, including such ailments as cancer, tuberculosis, etc.

All these cases illustrate instances of the many practices of deceptive and fraudulent character which have been stopped under our antideceptive-practice program.

Another phase of our work comprises our antimonopoly program. This includes action against price-fixing combinations, restraints of trade, mergers, marketing discriminations, and other violations. The extensive proceedings we have had in stopping price-fixing conspiracies and combinations of competitors in the steel and cement industries are illustrative cases in this field of our operations.

Third, we have a large program of industrial economics. Inquiries and surveys of economic questions are conducted which are of great moment to the Nation and of special significance in aid of the mobilization effort. Reports of these studies are made to Congress and to the defense agencies. They include special cost-accounting studies and financial reports of basic data needed by the Price Stabilization Agency and the Defense Production Administration. While serving the defense effort, this work is of primary value in the over-all job of preserving our free competitive enterprise system.

Senator KILGORE. I am told that unfair and harmful practices when indulged in are, generally speaking, resorted to by a minority of the industry members and that this makes it feasible to take action against the relatively few who may stoop to such methods. Sometimes, however, objectionable trade methods appear to have spread to the point where virtually all of the concerns doing business in that field, either as a means of meeting competition in kind or for the purpose of just following the crowd, are pursuing the objectionable practices. What do you do in that kind of a case?

Chairman MEAD. Well, it is often impracticable to handle that situation by individual case litigation. We attempt to give such a problem industry-wide treatment through our trade-practice conference procedure. This is another one of our programs to protect fair competition and the public interest. In such procedure we invite all members of the industry to a conference to discuss the problems to work out trade-practice rules to correct them. These rules, after study and approval as desirable and constructive, are put into effect on a given date with the view of having all members of the industry simultaneously abandon the objectionable practices and get their businesses back on a sound basis of fair competition. Such work is based on industry

and Government cooperation in elevating the standards of fair practices to keep our competitive system functioning as it should. It has proved gratifyingly successful in meeting mass problems of the kind to which you described.

The Federal Trade Commission has still another program which is highly important to defense mobilization. The Commission conducts the compliance surveys of industries under the control and allocation orders of the National Production Administration. These surveys go into the questions of how the NPA orders are operating in actual practice, the degree to which they are being complied with and what changes if any should be made. Further, in its defense work the Commission processes, under section 708 of the Defense Production Act, industry voluntary agreements and programs entered into for the purpose of advancing our national defense and security.

Senator KILGORE. I notice you seem to stress the importance of having the work of your agency lend the maximum aid in the national defense work. How do you feel about that?

Chairman MEAD. Senator, to meet the task confronting the Nation we all have our part to play; we all have a substantial contribution to make. It is by our combined efforts, by our intelligent fitting together of all our resources and of the many different segments of our industrial and commercial activities that we can meet the challenge and preserve our American way of life. We can not only preserve that way of life but also hold it aloft as the peerless example to the world—a beacon to lead humanity out of darkness into the light of human freedom and security.

There is need for substantial contribution from every segment of our economy whether it be that of big business, small business, agriculture, labor, Government, or the professions.

We in the Federal Trade Commission have recast all our work programs from the standpoint of affording the maximum aid to the defense effort. Our special task is to aid in every way possible and at the same time to see that our cherished freedom of competitive enterprise survives the emergency in a strong and healthy condition.

Senator KILGORE. Thank you, Senator Mead. It has been a real pleasure to have you on this broadcast to discuss the important work of the Federal Trade Commission.

The Sword and the Bible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an article which I have written for the October 21 issue of This Week magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the first time in history our Government and our people are afraid of a foreign foe. We are afraid of the governments of Russia and of China and of the organized power of the Soviet satellites.

In part, this fear is felt and spread by our National Defense Department in the Pentagon. So far as this fear is natural and spontaneous, it is easy to understand. In part,

however, the spreading of this fear is purposeful, faced with what seem to be enormous armed resources aimed against us, we can scarcely expect our Defense Department to do other than keep the people in a state of fear so they will be prepared, without limit, to furnish men and munitions.

There is also, perhaps, an internal and psychological basis for this fear-feeling in the Pentagon. The reorganization plan has not worked too well. Our Defense Department is still to a disturbing degree disorganized. It lacks confidence, consciously to some extent—subconsciously to an even greater degree.

Another center from which fear is spread throughout our people is our Department of State. Our diplomacy has gone on the defensive. The real independence of our Department of State is on arms, armies, and allies. There is no confidence left in anything except force. The fearfulness of the Pentagon and the State Department complement and reinforce each other.

True, we have the Voice of America and related activities which are concerned with building up our defenses and organizing offense in the psychological and spiritual field. But after all, in the minds of the State Department leadership—to mention no names—the Voice is an incident. The forces of which it is a feeble agent are unimagined, disbelieved, and unregarded.

Not only are the Pentagon and the State Department full of fear, but our people themselves are frightened. We are scared stiff of Communists. Our fear has led us to hysterical extremes, yet that fear is based on knowledge of successful espionage and revelations of a network of Communist influence extending how far and how deep none of us knows.

The question of attaining military, political, social and spiritual health, and of overcoming fear is not a simple subject to discuss. Yet its broad outlines can be given in condensed form. The weapons by which we will conquer fear, and perchance save the world from it, are two—the sword and the Bible.

PART I THE SWORD

To one who believes, as does the writer, that the moral law is supreme in human affairs and that the victories of the sword in our time have not brought peace, the question may well be asked—as has been done by the Quakers and others—as to why we should not give up our dependence on the sword and rely on the Bible. Is it not contradictory to advocate both the sword and the Bible?

The answer to that is simple. Massed military power in the wrong hands can for an appreciable length of time destroy the organizations and the individuals who are seeking to make the spiritual forces effective. Over generations or over centuries the spiritual forces will revive and make their strength felt. But meanwhile the death or enslavement of helpless peoples continues. Today's mass deportations in Hungary simply continue the history of Eastern Europe, the Baltic countries, and great areas in Russia itself. Unrestrained, the Communist threat approaches nearer and nearer our own shores.

So it is not wrong for us to feel a deep responsibility for our own time and for the people now living with us on this earth. In our domestic affairs we need a background of force in restraining crime and injustice. The great globe itself is no different in this respect. It is only enormously greater. Let us, therefore, see what can be done to brighten and sharpen our sword.

It was said earlier that one of the causes of fear in our Department of Defense was that the Reorganization Act and its administration had not succeeded in integrating the various branches of the service into an organized whole. To reduce this cause of fear, it is necessary to take a new look at the normal functions of each of three branches and to redefine them in such a way that they

can integrate themselves into an organized instrument for the common defense.

1. The Air Force has two functions which have not fitted together very well in actual practice. One of these functions is that of strategic bombing, the other is that of tactical support of ground forces by observation, interception, bombing of supply depots and supply lines, strafing of personnel, and other operations in support of ground troops.

These day-by-day chores of tactical air support are extremely important. But the great bombers and their flights of thousands of miles, their attacks deep in the heart of enemy territory, strongly stir the imagination which refuses to be attracted to the humble daily chores so necessary to the support of ground troops.

Some of us felt the unwisdom of this when the Reorganization Act was before the Congress, but we were not military experts. We were just boys from the country. We were talked down—but we were right. The Army should have its own tactical Air Force. Only thus can the necessary air support of the ground forces be assured.

There is perhaps an intermediate activity which may be described as providing air cover for general military operations. It is possible that some study may need to be given to this phase of air power to see to what extent, if any, it should be delegated to the Army and to what extent, if any, it should continue within the province of the Air Force itself.

2. The Army in our reorganization should be primarily a highly technical body, well equipped with the best and the latest in arms, in artillery, radar detection, communication, and all the multitude of scientific developments already made, being made, and to be made, including atomic weapons. This—together with a tactical Air Force—constitutes the heart of what should be our professional Army.

Supplementing the professional army should be the civilian army with its graduates, the Reserves, always on call. We are for the present, owing to the existing situation in Korea and the fear of larger-scale involvements, pursuing our training with older men already organized as a part of our Armed Forces. As soon as we can clear ourselves of this situation we must carry out the principles of universal military training, but on a more realistic plan than that which Congress wrote into the manpower law.

We can best assure ourselves of a supply of manpower with the least disruption of individual and family life by training young men for service at the end of their secondary education in public high schools or private preparatory schools. These young men have not started their life work. The moral influences of family and church have become ingrained in them now if ever. A 1- or 2-year period at this time is best fitted to their own interests and their country's.

3. The Navy and its subsidiary, the Marine Corps, will likewise have defined duties. The Navy will be charged with keeping the ocean communication clear by the detection and destruction of submarines and will likewise play its part in clearing enemy planes from the air over the ocean.

It is an axiom, which we have not always recognized in practice, that the Navy is in a constant state of mobilization. This axiom has its effect on naval policy so far as its air services are concerned. In an unexpected emergency it takes time to build airfields. The airplane carrier is a floating airfield constantly mobilized for service wherever air offense or defense may be required. Carriers are an essential element of the Navy's equipment for both tactical and strategic flights. For these it will be possible to use bombers less massive and of less range than the great intercontinental bombers. The Marines as a subsidiary of the Navy

must, like the Navy itself, be kept permanently mobilized.

These are the functions of the various branches of the military forces. Organized along the lines of these functions, many of the differences and disputations, top-heavy organization and overlapping lines of responsibility will disappear.

Curing our deficiencies along these lines or related ones could remove one of the bases of fear in the Pentagon. Confidence and competence would replace disorganization and frustration.

We can, then, brighten and sharpen the sword, but what if we do not have the strength to use it? That is the next problem.

The fundamental danger here is that our preparations for war may be and are, in fact, becoming so vast that they will exhaust our economy and destroy our social and political organizations. Consequently, defense efforts and expenditures must be kept within limits.

The dangers of too heavy expenditures are already evident. One of them is inflation. This is generated by heavy expenditures for armament which end up, in a large measure, in the hands of consumers. Yet the volume of consumer goods is restricted, so prices shoot up.

There is another respect in which these excessive expenditures undermine our society. Inflation leads to social conflict. Farmers, wage earners, and businessmen find it harder and harder to cooperate, therefore, find themselves in conflict with each other. We are going through the beginnings of this social conflict at the present time. Unless we can organize our effort into a better course of action, this social conflict will deepen.

What are the possibilities of reducing this heavy burden of defense expenditures? At the moment it is around \$60,000,000,000, with more billions added for economic and military aid abroad, and the certainty that the \$60,000,000,000 is only a beginning. The soothing promise of the military men is that we must go through a peak expenditure period for 2, or at the most 3 years, after which we can drop back and level off. There is nothing in past history which would let us place much confidence in such soothing sirup. The military has never considered cost, has never had enough of the things it wants. In the nature of its training and experience, we cannot expect that it ever will have a limit to what it feels to be its needs. We cannot accept the point of view that this is a peak load. It is not a peak load, it is a new way of life.

We are truly faced with a new way of living, and we must recognize the fact. What we have to do is to refuse to be pushed about by continuous new crises. We have to dig in for a national effort over the long pull. So far as this relates to the fiscal problems of the Government and the personal financial problems of its citizens, this means setting a top limit to defense expenditures. This top limit must be high. It must involve austerity on the part of the people of the country. But it must not be so high as to produce economic chaos, political dissolution, and social conflict.

This high budget limit can produce an even higher defense performance in absolute terms than would be done by greater expenditures—if the services organize for economy within the limitation, and if they reorganize themselves for improved effectiveness.

An essential part of their activity lies in the sensible doctrine that ex-Secretary Marshall recently enunciated. It is that our expenditures shall be primarily directed to the establishment of production lines and equipment rather than to accumulating vast stores of fabricated war material which may quickly become obsolete. Our military strength lies largely in our productive strength. The establishment and constant

revision of our lines of production, turning continuously at moderate speed, will fit them at almost a moment's notice to go into high gear when the emergency arises, turning out a flood of material of the latest and most effective design. This is the way to arm and this way of arming far surpasses in ultimate effectiveness the piling up of military supplies.

PART II. THE BIBLE

So much for establishing military strength. But we are making a fatal error if we rely on the sword alone. The sword has its necessary place in the restraint of evil-doing, but in these times of the widespread assault of evil on innocent multitudes, it can act only defensively and for the short pull. In the long run, true victory will be won only by spiritual forces.

Americans do not like to remember that we have had two smashing World War victories in a space of 30 years—but no resulting peace. When we do remember this, we have another cause for fear.

This is the fear that world war III, which seems approaching after a shorter interval than that between Wars I and II, can end only in a military victory whose cost will be far beyond that of any previous wars. Its resulting economic, social, and political disorganization will verge on chaos. The sword is strong to win battles; it is helpless to win peace. For that we must trust to more powerful forces.

There is a moral law in the universe as there is a physical law. That moral law has never been broken. It cannot be broken. We can break ourselves against it, but the law remains firm. It shows itself to us in two aspects. If we see it and follow it, it is full of blessings. If we disobey it, we suffer punishment.

The moral law is unlike statute law, which can be broken. It is unlike statute law in that punishment is not inflicted after indictment, trial, and judgment. The punishment is an indissoluble part of the law itself. The unlawful act carries its own punishment.

In these respects the moral law established by God for the ordering of the moral universe more nearly resembles the physical law for the ordering of the physical universe. If we decide to walk on the air and for that purpose step out of the tenth-story window, we are punished by a swift fall to the ground and sudden death. The punishment is part of the act. The same is the case with the moral law.

What is the moral law? It has been understood and taught by religious leaders of all climes and all ages. For us the Old Testament is an unfolding record of the search of a morally conscious people for the laws of the universe.

And in the New Testament we find the capstone, the pinnacle, of the law which was so finely set forth in the Old. Jesus gave His final definition of the law in His life and in His words. He summed it all up in the twenty-second chapter of Matthew.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

So we have now arrived at this word "love." In our day it has been given meanings and connotations which sap its strength and hide its power. As a matter of fact, it is the strongest thing in the world. We must put it to the test. The question is, How shall we do it?

The world is ready

In the first place, the world is ready for such a test. Today, from pole to pole, throughout the 360 degrees of longitude, there are no peoples who want war. There are no peoples who do not hate it. There are no peoples who would not do everything

honorable and just and within their power in order to avoid it.

Not so with governments. It is peoples who in their fear and hatred of war recognize thereby their common interest and common brotherhood. Governments, not peoples, are the agents of evils.

Our State Department itself plays the game of power. With moves and counter-moves on the chessboard it plays a game which is mostly that of blocking, for it has no policy of offense worthy of the name.

There is only one way to a victorious peace. With luck we may avoid such large-scale conflict as can properly be called world war III. But if it must be, then let it be waged in a spirit and by means which the world has not yet experienced—through unloosing the spiritual powers of love and an actively practiced brotherhood.

What does this mean in practical policy? Already we have made some feeble advances toward it which we should note.

1. There was, for example, the President's speech before the United Nations Assembly a year ago, in which, like a brief, bright, pure flame in the midst of the smoke and thunder of his defiance, he made a plea for universal disarmament based on unanimous agreement and unanimously accepted safeguards. This was a direct appeal to the united desire for a disarmed world which exists among the peoples of the earth.

2. A second step was taken when 9 Members of the House and 14 Senators sent a letter to the President on February 26 of this year, reminding him of his plea to the Assembly and urging him to prosecute it with the utmost skill and energy. A gracious reply was received from the White House, but the President's proposals are going unnoticed and unadvertised through the tortuous official machinery of the United Nations.

3. A third example is to be found in Senate Resolution No. 11, expressing friendship of the American people for the people of Russia, and asking the President to transmit the message to them. This has been done and a reply received by correspondence between President Truman and President Shvernik of Russia. While the text has been published to the Russian people, it has not succeeded in breaking through the protective barrage of propaganda which the Soviet has so skillfully laid down.

4. Finally, some of the output of the Voice of America has served to strengthen this bond of brotherhood between peoples whose governments are at enmity. Too much of it, however, is still a part of the antiphonal chorus whose refrain is "You're another." We must rise above this noisy, childish disputation.

The way for this is clear. We must state and support a cause which is high enough and simple enough to override all the disputation and minor conflicts. That cause has already been stated. It is that of guaranteed disarmament.

But we must go whole hog. We must be simple and direct in our proposals. We must put aside complication and subtlety. And our proposal must be cast in iron-clad form which permits no deceptions or betrayals because it provides for foolproof international controls, including of course the establishment of a United Nations military force. This is a time for going all the way in unmistakable terms.

Taking the initiative

As a matter of tactics, we will win even though the Soviet delays and complicates and refuses. We will have taken the positive role and the Politburo will be the objectors to something which will appeal to the hearts and minds of the people the world over.

Already we have witnessed the power and appeal even of Moscow's phony "peace propaganda." Now is the time for us to take the play away from them. If we are simple

enough, if we are positive enough, if we are strong enough in our presentation and if we are everlastingly sincere, then the Soviet Government will find itself in a hopeless defensive position in the eyes of the world. That will be something new. It is time there was something new.

"Guaranteed disarmament"

The theme, the key phrase, of our moral offensive will be "guaranteed disarmament." To an impoverished, war-weary world that in itself is an explosive idea. But this one idea also carries in itself the seeds of other ideas, equally explosive. For the end of armed aggression automatically means the end of satellite states and human slavery; the return of free elections and freedom to trade, to travel, to speak, to worship God.

Here is a strategy which leads to victory and peace—if we proclaim it to all the world.

Along with the negotiations in the United Nations and between governments must go a continuous, unrelenting, constantly repeated message as to our desires and purposes directed to all the peoples of the earth. The message must go by every possible means. We must reach the people of China. We must reach the people of Russia. We must reach the enslaved people of the satellites. We must reach the neutrals for whom our present policy of a struggle for power has no attractions whatsoever.

America's real aim

Until the goal is in sight, our sword must remain unassailably strong. But let us never be confused about our final aim. The drive for guaranteed world disarmament, pursued in season and out of season, through failure and success, must be the foremost point in American foreign policy.

It must be for this that our State Department exists. It must be toward this that the words and actions of our representatives abroad are directed.

This must be the deepest aspiration and expectation of the American Government, representing the deepest hopes of the American people.

For—whatever the short-range necessities may be—our long-range goal is a world which will be, not an armed camp, but a place where all peoples may live in brotherhood and peace.

Truman Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, on August 18, 1951, in the Topeka Daily Capital in the column entitled "Clif Stratton Writes," Mr. Stratton, who was Washington correspondent for the Topeka Daily Capital and for many years connected with former Senator Capper, distinguished Senator from my State, carried in his column a guest editorial written by Walt Niebarger, editor and owner of the Tonganoxie Mirror.

It is a most interesting, thoughtful, and frank article, and I ask that it be placed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CLIF STRATTON WRITES

Personal guest writer today is Walt Niebarger, of the Tonganoxie Mirror, who writes:

"The Truman foreign policy has been aired by MacArthur and Congress, and probably will come in for further airing in 1952. By all means, let's have the airing.

"What is the Truman foreign policy? You can't tell by what is said, but only by what is done and the results that accrue. By that measuring stick, the Truman foreign policy is a war policy.

"With war goes armament, inflation and controls. We have all of these. In addition, we still are technically at war with Germany and Japan 6 years after the fighting stopped.

"We have been double-crossed by Russia and Red China, allies [sic] of World War II. The United Nations, instead of preventing war, has underwritten one in Korea.

"If Russia now is able to threaten, the Democrat administrations placed it in position at Yalta and elsewhere. Does the administration deny what it did yesterday? So when you hear people say the foreign policy is bipartisan, or that Republicans support the Truman foreign policy—what are they supporting?

"And who are these Republicans, nominal or otherwise? Are they not Republican manufacturers with war orders, companies with oil in Arabia, or little people gadding around the world with expenses paid, sticking their noses into everybody else's business?

"Yet these, and perhaps other internationalists who profit by war are going to insist, it is said, that Republicans nominate a candidate who favors Truman foreign policies—say, General Eisenhower—so the people, the little people, will have no choice in that issue in 1952.

"Isn't that of itself a 50-percent endorsement of the Democrat administration by Republican leadership? Do they think they can elect a Republican President by going around the country saying the Truman administration is half right to begin with?

"We say the people want the Republicans to tell them in plain words what is wrong with the Truman policy—where it is leading—and if they want more of the same.

"Do the people want a group of junker militarists in control digging up war scares so they can grab billions in Congress to militarize this country as completely as prewar Germany?

"Shouldn't anyone arise to inquire—with-out being termed an isolationist—what the military policy did to Germany and why we should expect the same system to work differently here?

"Do we not have universal military training and the draft here as they did in Germany—while at the same time proclaiming individual liberty? How much liberty is likely to exist in a military state?

"How genuine is our opposition to Communist philosophy when Communists and fellow travelers infest our own Government—some even convicted of spying against it? How, for example, does it happen we send American dollars to a Communist dictator in Yugoslavia and an anti-Communist dictator in Spain? Are we not drumming up a new war and lining up allies with no questions asked?

"How many American young men have been lost in every American community as a result of military adventures all over the world? Does the average person want the logical results of a war policy to extend on down to the children now playing in the streets?

"It does make a difference what kind of man is elected President. If the people defeat those responsible for wars—past, present, and future—and elect a man sincerely for peace and able to accomplish some things in that direction—wouldn't it make a difference?

"What can the average person do about it? First, refuse to fall for a policy propaganda line designed to confuse him.

"Second, fight those Republicans who want a 50-50, bipartisan, mealy-mouthed election in 1952 with no choice as to issues.

"Third, vote against any more Trumanism, domestic or foreign, in Washington. Clean the place out

"Brother, if you don't, your kid is in the chute and headed for the slaughter house.

"Wherever a military power is created others eventually arise to defeat it. Should that fate—as a byproduct of present policy—befall America in this later day?

"It wouldn't take more than one election to cure most of what is wrong in this country and return it to the Christian concept of 'peace on earth and good will toward men.'"

In 1949-50 Alabama Led All States in the Nation in the Rate of Cattle Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Alabama's beef cattle industry is expanding faster than that of any other State.

Alabama has many natural advantages in this field:

First. The State is nearer the big markets than are the States of the West.

Second. The climate of Alabama is so mild that generally speaking shelter and special care is not needed for stock. Severe winters are rare.

Third. Beef production can be expanded four times in Alabama, without encroaching on other crops

Fourth. Two acres of southern pasture will support a cow compared to 40 or 50 acres in the West.

With these natural advantages Alabama will, in my judgment, within the next 20 years become the leading beef cattle State in the United States.

The Seventh Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, fits beautifully into this picture. It has all the advantages which I have listed, and is rapidly getting into beef cattle production. More elastic credit procedures would greatly hasten the progress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the eminent agricultural economist, Dr. Paul W. Chapman, styled "Progress in Alabama," which appeared in the October 1951 issue of the Progressive Farmer. The article follows:

PROGRESS IN ALABAMA

(By Paul W. Chapman, associate dean, Georgia's College of Agriculture)

Alabama has been the Nation's leading State in percentage increase in number of cattle during the past 2 years.

The 10 top States in percentage gains in cattle population for 1949 and 1950, in order of rank, were Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Oklahoma. These ratings were made by Harold F. Breimyer, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture.

Alabama's percentage gain in cattle and calves on farms for the 2-year period was 23 percent. This compares with 21 percent for Georgia and 20 percent for North Carolina.

For 10 years, States of the South have competed with each other for national leadership in cattle expansion. With an increase of 66 percent for the 10-year period, Alabama is among the five highest-ranking States.

Naturally, the South's livestock progress is watched with interest by other regions; it is checked and charted for the Nation's leading financiers and businessmen. Under the heading "Dixie beef drive," for example, an article appeared recently in *Forbes Magazine* of Business, New York. The following paragraphs were part of the article:

"The Southeastern States are a 'natural' for the cattle business. They are nearer the big markets (than are the States of the West). They have a tremendous potential market within their own boundaries, growing with the gains in farming techniques and with industrialization. Most of these States have climates so mild that no shelter or special care is needed for stock. Severe winters are rare.

"Authorities say beef production can be multiplied four times in the Southeast without encroaching on other kinds of agriculture (It takes 2 acres of southern range to support one animal against 50 acres in the West.)"

Many factors and groups are contributing to the South's gains in livestock farming. Most important is the "discovery" of grass and legumes—not native range, but seeded pastures and grazing crops

"Wherever you go in Alabama, you hear people talking pastures—and best of all, they are doing something about it," says J. C. Lowery, extension agronomist at Auburn. "Farmers know that one of their best opportunities for increasing income by better use of more land and more efficient use of labor and equipment is through grazing."

County agents reported that more than 2,000,000 acres of permanent pastures have been seeded or reworked during the past 15 years. Of these, 500,000 acres were seeded last year.

At Alabama's main agricultural experiment station at Auburn and at almost all substations, experiments have been conducted to determine how the best all-year grazing and forage crop systems can be developed; how much land is needed to produce feed for an animal unit, what costs and income can be expected. Here are three good examples of such fundamental research

1. Tennessee Valley substation, Belle Mina. At this northern Alabama substation, a 7-acre grade-B dairy experiment over the 4-year period of 1943-46 returned a net annual income of \$5,531 or \$63.57 per acre, to labor, management, and money invested from the sale of manufactured milk, seed, and grain. Permanent pasture, alfalfa, crimson clover-ryegrass mixture, and winter oats provided practically year-round grazing and hay. Cows wholly on pasture or forage (getting no concentrate) averaged 6,354 pounds of milk per year in the 4-year period.

2. Main station, Auburn. Ten beef cows and 25 acres of forage crops—10 acres of *Lespedeza sericea*, 7 acres of alfalfa, and 8 acres Johnson grass, and reseeded crimson and bur clovers—were used in a utilization study at the main station. All feed for the brood cows and their eight calves was produced on the 25 acres, and a surplus was sold. Returns (1948 prices) included Eight calves (4,115 pounds), \$822; 21 tons surplus alfalfa hay, \$840, and 2½ tons surplus Johnson grass hay, \$50. These add up to a gross of \$68.48 per acre, or a return per acre of \$58.64 to capital and labor.

3. Black Belt Substation, Marion Junction: In the 1945-47 3-year period, an 80-acre Grade B dairy experiment at the Black Belt

Substation returned an average annual net income of \$2,585 to capital and labor chiefly from the sale of milk for manufacture. Forty-four acres of white Dutch clover-Dallis grass pasture, 18 acres of Johnson grass following oats, and 18 acres Johnson grass following Caley peas provided year-round grazing and hay for the 25 grade Jersey cows that were used in the experiment

Two acres of white Dutch clover-Dallis grass pasture and 1 acre of Caley peas-Johnson grass supplementary pasture for each beef brood cow and calf in a 3-year management experiment at this substation yielded annually an average of 182 pounds per acre of beef as fall- and winter-dropped calves. In this experiment, 1946-48, fall- and winter-dropped calves were more profitable than spring-dropped calves; fall and winter calves averaged ½ pound greater gain per day, graded higher, sold at nearly 7 cents a pound higher and yielded a higher percentage of dressed weight

Alabama's farmers have always earned a very large part of their cash incomes from cotton—on a very small percentage of their total acres.

The fact that cotton acreage decreased 62 percent in 15 recent years increases the need and opportunity for making noncotton acres produce more income. The practical solution, of course, both from land use and efficient farm management is: Balance crops with livestock. This means grass and feed crops on several million more available acres.

OPPORTUNITIES STILL HERE

A traveler moving through Alabama from Muscle Shoals to Mobile Bay hears talk of expanding farm operations and higher land prices. Experienced cattlemen are moving in from the West to make their homes in Alabama

"Land has proved to be the safest long-term investment, under unsettled conditions. * * * Investors now turn to land. * * * To find land that is still cheap is difficult—but it is cheap in sections where old farming patterns have been somewhat abandoned and new patterns have not been fully formed. * * * The Cotton Belt is the only section of the Nation where such a situation exists

"In the section south of the prosperous tobacco-growing areas of the Carolinas and Tennessee there appeared to be a relatively greater shortage of investment capital than elsewhere. This has tended to retard development of new types of farming and to hold land prices down.

"This region comprises the greater parts of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi; it extends westward to the oil-producing sections of Texas.

"Climatic conditions in the Southeast are favorable

"Taxes in the Southeast are low.

"The labor situation in the Southeast is satisfactory.

"Good outlets for grain, meat, and dairy products exist. The section is experiencing a strong industrial expansion. Towns are growing rapidly.

"The upper coastal plains of Georgia and the black belt offer among the best investment opportunities to be found in the United States today. These two areas are among the few where it is logical to expect increasing values in land, even without further inflation"

This appraisal of land values in the Southeast was made by one of the Nation's best-known farm-management organizations after surveying the entire United States. It recognizes the natural economic advantage of the region: A long growing season plus ample rainfall—a combination of favorable conditions existing in no other section of the United States. Alabama, in the heart of Dixie, lies in the exact center of this favored area.

A CHANGING ECONOMIC PATTERN

Alabama is moving definitely and consistently toward a better balance between crops and livestock. This trend is shown in figures compiled by Ben T. Lanham, agricultural economist, Auburn, and published under the title "Changes and Trends in the Agricultural Economy of Alabama Since 1920." This publication shows that in the 5-year period of 1925-29, livestock accounted for 15 cents of every dollar of cash farm receipts.

Also, of general interest and importance to the entire South is the fact that Alabama's steel output—greater than that of all other Southern States combined—will be increased. The Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., Birmingham, this year bought land in Mobile to receive rich iron ore imported from the "iron mountain" which was discovered recently in South America.

New plants continue to locate on the water front of north Alabama—the navigable Tennessee River. Among these, Chemstrand Corp.—a combination formed by Monsanto Chemical Co. and American Viscose Corp.—located at Decatur has created Nation-wide interest. Here will be made a synthetic described as "un-American fiber, conceived for American living." This is another example of the fact that the chemical industry which is growing faster than any branch of American manufacturing is finding the South its most favorable plant location.

Industrialization is creating new and better local food market outlets for farmers. It is also creating jobs for more Alabamians can live at home in this age of science in which materials for clothing are created in chemical laboratories, and in this age of power in which—to cite but one example—two men with the latest mechanical equipment can produce as many peanuts (Alabama's No. 2 cash field crop) as 12 with old methods.

Even to those of us who live with such changes from day to day, they are impressive. But imagine how astounding they would be to those forebears of today's Alabamians who selected for their commonwealth the nickname "Cotton State."

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Pennsylvania Week Celebration, Brockway, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by me at the Pennsylvania Week celebration of the Brockway Area Chamber of Commerce, at Brockway, Pa., Friday evening, October 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is real pleasure in meeting again with the fine citizens of Brockway and Jefferson County.

The history of your county recalls the expansion of our frontier into northwestern Pennsylvania. Most of the first settlers were veterans of the Revolutionary War.

They came into this great pine forest region in search of virgin land, new homes and new opportunities.

Their progress was slow while they fought the stubborn wilderness. Their first industry was lumbering and for many years some of the largest lumbering operations in the State centered in Jefferson County.

When the timber was exhausted the people turned their initiative and energies in the development of the mineral resources. They established new industries based on mine and quarry products. Today, Jefferson County produces coal, oil, gas, clay, building stone, and a great variety of manufactured goods, including glass products, radio equipment, metal products, and food products. All of these have added to the wealth of the Commonwealth and the welfare of our people.

We meet tonight to demonstrate pride in the greatness of Pennsylvania.

We sons and daughters of the Keystone State are not a boastful people—although we all know that no State of the Union has more to brag about.

No State in the Union surpasses Pennsylvania in material achievement, in the strength and stability of its diversified industry in the development of its natural resources, or in cultural and spiritual progress.

No State of the Union is richer in historic and patriotic tradition.

No State of the Union is more steadfast in loyalty and allegiance to the sacred American ideals of social, political, and religious liberty.

Therefore, I am glad that the annual observance of Pennsylvania Week brings us an opportunity to sing the praises of our Commonwealth. It is a time to glory in the great heritage that has come down to us from the past and to express confidence in a future of greater achievement.

Pennsylvania may be truthfully described as a great empire within a great Nation. It is the Keystone State of the Union, not because of its geographical location, not because of the resources of its mines, farms, and forests, but because of its people.

Pennsylvania was most fortunate in the courageous, hard-working, God-fearing character of its first settlers.

In Philadelphia and the surrounding counties, the early arrivals were English and Welsh Quakers. They were peace loving, pious, industrious, and able at commerce.

The region a little farther west became the home of the Pennsylvania Germans. They excelled in agriculture and for 200 years their farms have been models for the entire world.

Into the same area came the Scotch-Irish. They were restless and pushed westward through the unbroken wilderness and across the Alleghenies. They understood government. They loved liberty and freedom of action above all else.

These three basic groups differed in their form of worship, but they met on common ground in their belief that freedom of the individual is God-given.

They built their homes, schools, and churches. They cleared the land, tilled the soil, and built roads.

The only thing they asked of government was protection of the good people from the lawless. They demanded economical and clean government.

They laid the foundation for the migration that poured into Pennsylvania—English, Welsh, Germans, Scandinavians, and then later from Italy, Poland, and the Balkan countries.

They brought with them many Old World skills and crafts. They were assimilated into this new melting pot, each group contributing to the growth and progress of the Commonwealth.

Today there are 21 States of our Nation that have a smaller population than the city of Philadelphia alone. More people live and work in Allegheny County than in 16 States.

Pennsylvania know-how has been an important factor in the development of industries in many parts of the country. The oil industry is one outstanding example. Our State was the birthplace of that great industry, and skilled technical men, trained in Pennsylvania, went into the South and West and had a big part in opening the vast oil fields of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and other States.

The world knows Pennsylvania as a giant of industrial production, yet more than half of the State's area is covered with forests.

We have big industries. We have billion-dollar corporations, and we have 17,000 small industries in every section of the Commonwealth.

We have 170,000 family-sized farms and, at the same time, more cities and towns than any other State.

Our industries, mines, and farms require the services of 3,000,000 men and women. Another million are given employment by our utilities, mercantile establishments, and other service units.

Pennsylvania is first in the manufacture of 56 classes of useful products.

And here in Pennsylvania we have more churches and more institutions of higher learning than any other State in the Nation.

Today, our great Commonwealth continues in the forefront—not only in production for peace and war, but also in the never-ending struggle to preserve the God-given freedoms under which our country and its people have flourished so mightily.

Today, as in the past, Pennsylvanians are leaders in the struggle to maintain sound constitutional government against socialistic schemes that would destroy freedom of the individual.

We Pennsylvanians know that when all authority is concentrated in an all-powerful central government incentive is wiped out, initiative is lost, and the people become easy victims of dictatorship and tyranny.

Pennsylvania Week is a good time to pause and give serious thought to the future.

In many parts of the world today people are suffering because they yielded to the false promise that government would provide security and a life of comfort—free of all cost.

Little did they realize that the supposed security would be purchased with their own money, paid in taxes. Little did they think that they would lose their freedom of choice and the right to exercise their own initiative. The result has been shocking.

The most well disposed of all such governments is the one in Great Britain, where the standard of living has not gone up but has come down under socialism. Many of its people are cold and hungry.

The free-born Briton today is thoroughly regimented. His basic industries, his health, his welfare, his opportunity for employment are all in the hands of his Government. Is he better off today?

Oh, no—he is worse off. His taxes climb higher and higher. He lives under rigid wartime levels of food rationing and many other restrictions.

What is the result of all the experimenting and all the manipulating by his socialistic government?

That great country, one of the world's mightiest powers only a quarter of a century ago, would crack up and fall apart without the steady stream of financial aid, pumped in by the United States, like an unending blood transfusion.

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is the most benevolent result of socialistic invasion upon freedom of the individual.

At the other extreme is the Russian Communist dictatorship—the brutal, iron-fisted version of socialism, which means slavery for the people. That will be the next step when the British variety of socialism fails.

Or it may come when the blood transfusion from the general, free-enterprise system of the United States is no longer available. It cannot continue forever without bleeding America white.

Pennsylvanians are on guard against another danger—the steady encroachment of big government upon our local and State governments and into our very private lives.

We must arouse all the people against that form of creeping paralysis which is destroying the fundamental spirit of Americanism.

Local government is self-government. It is home rule. It is the last line of defense against the advance of centralized bureaucracy. Local control of local affairs is the foundation of good government. It must be maintained in health and vigor if freedom of the individual is to be preserved.

The driving force of freedom which inspired the Pennsylvania pioneers and every American generation in the past must remain vigorous and unshackled. It must be here for our children and for generations of Americans far into the future.

When that flame dies, America as we know it, shall also die.

And that flame will surely die if we permit it to be smothered by a centralized, planned, and regimented economy patterned after the socialistic failures of other countries.

Because so much of our State's prosperity is dependent upon its factories and mills, we must be on guard to protect our industrial plant from bureaucratic dictatorship.

As you know, the administration advocates of a planned and controlled economy have been trying for many years to take industry away from Pennsylvania and transplant it into undeveloped areas of the South and West.

In recent years a number of attempts have been made to enact legislation which would give the administration the power to carry out that scheme. It was claimed that such a move would result in social and economic gains for the Nation as a whole. But each time the proposal was defeated.

When the Defense Production Act was before Congress this year the proposal bobbed up again. This time it was presented as a defense measure—under the pretext that it was needed to minimize the danger from atomic attack.

Again it was defeated by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress.

Nevertheless, in defiance of the expressed will of Congress, President Truman issued an Executive order empowering the various agencies of Government to do the very thing that Congress had refused to authorize.

He put into effect a national industrial dispersal policy which could place all production under a virtual dictatorship.

Under this order an industry can be denied materials for new construction or expansion unless it builds where the bureaucrats say it must build.

But that's not all. Unless industry submits to this new form of control it can be denied defense contracts, emergency Government loans, accelerated tax benefits, and allocation of critical materials.

This order is a threat to the growth and expansion of every productive enterprise in Pennsylvania.

It holds over thousands of working men and women the danger that they may be forced to break up the homes where they have been established for years and seek new jobs and new homes wherever the Government directs industry to go.

I am not unmindful of the President's statement that his order merely suggests placing defense industries a few miles apart. But the fact remains that the order itself makes no mention of a few miles. It places no limitation upon the distance which can be required for the location of new or expanded industry.

What I fear most is that this is another disguised attempt to give the socialistic planners the power of life and death over American industry and the entire economic life of the Nation.

The real purpose is revealed in one paragraph of a booklet issued by the administration. It states, and I quote:

"Industrial dispersion is more than a defense measure. It is also an investment in the future welfare and progress of the Nation. It offers the added advantage of long-term economic and social benefits beyond its defense-security contributions."

In this paragraph, those who would push us into State socialism told what was really in their minds. They would force the dispersal of industry—irrespective of all practical and economic considerations—because it fits into their schemes to make over the American system.

Pennsylvania Week is a good time to get into the fight for free enterprise.

A free, unhobbled, un-socialized America, with freedom of the individual, offering opportunity for every man, is worth fighting for. I hope you will all join in this great struggle.

Federal Contributions to Highway and Road Building in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is the duty of a Member of Congress to inform the people he represents in the Congress about the spending of Federal funds generally, and in particular about the spending of Federal money in the district which he represents.

It is with this thought in mind that I will speak today about the money which the Federal Government has spent in 1949, in 1950, and through August 31 of 1951, on the roads and highways of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, consisting of Blount, Cullman, Fayette, Franklin, Lamar, Marion, Pickens, Walker, and Winston Counties, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. The period I will discuss, January 1, 1949, through August 31, 1951, substantially covers the period I have served in the Congress to date.

Under laws passed by Congress, the roads and highways of the Nation are entitled to Federal aid for improvement purposes.

I will not go into the technical details of the law, but to say that improvements made to approved roads and highways in Alabama are made on the basis of one-half of the cost of the improvements being paid by the Federal Government, and the other half by the State of Alabama itself, or in some cases, depending upon the character and type of the road, by the State of Alabama and by the county where the road is located.

From January 1, 1949, through August 31, 1951, the Federal Government and the State of Alabama, and the county governing bodies, spent or bound them-

selves jointly to spend \$10,234,630.05, on the roads and highways of the Seventh Congressional District.

The Federal share of this undertaking was \$5,119,623 73, or slightly more than one-half of the total.

This money was spent, or contracted to be spent, on 63 separate projects, some of which are located in every county of the District.

The projects already completed, and those that are being worked on now, will, when completed, result in the improvement of approximately 300 miles of the roads of our district.

The work done on these projects consists primarily of paving, grading, draining, and building bridges on the various roads being built or improved.

In some cases the work done has been the removal or elimination of the dangerous hazards of railway-highway crossings, or the reconstruction of existing railroad grade crossing bridges, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings entirely. In these cases, the entire cost of such projects is borne by the Federal Government, less the amount paid by a participating railroad, and with the further limitation that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs connected with such improvements may be paid with Federal funds.

The expenditure of these \$5,119,623 73 of Federal funds on the roads, highways, and bridges of our Seventh Congressional District has made highway improvements that are apparent to all of us. These improvements and those that will be made in the future will make our District a better place in which to live. They will improve communications from point to point within the District, and with points on the outside. They will, by the improved means of travel, save time for our people, and will open up our vast natural resources for inspection by interested people, and hasten the day when we will be able to bring about increased development of those resources for the use and benefit of our people.

The Federal funds spent or obligated to be spent during the period mentioned are as follows in each of the counties of the Seventh Congressional District:

Blount.....	\$731,433 25
Cullman.....	1,079,522 39
Fayette.....	373,106 23
Franklin.....	365,201 90
Lamar.....	432,594 87
Marion.....	381,876 67
Pickens.....	217,000 00
Walker.....	759,715 03
Winston.....	679,061 83

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, addressed to me under date of September 26, 1951. This letter goes into some detail with respect to the administration of the laws pertaining to Federal-aid road projects.

I also include a statement prepared for my use by the said Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, setting forth pertinent detail about each Federal-aid highway project programed under contract or completed in the

Seventh Congressional District of Alabama between the dates of January 1, 1949, and August 31, 1951.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1951.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Your letter of September 13, 1951, requested information concerning highway improvements involving Federal-aid funds in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, and the operation of the Federal-aid program.

The enclosed tabulation reflects the status as of August 31, 1951, of all projects involving Federal-aid and forest highway funds in the Seventh Congressional District which have been programed, placed under contract, or completed since January 1, 1949. The projects shown as secondary projects and carrying the prefix "S" are the improvement on roads included in the Federal-aid secondary system approved for Alabama. This system includes the principal secondary roads or "farm-to-market" roads.

With respect to the operation of the Federal-aid program, Federal-aid funds are available under the controlling legislation to assist the States in the financing of improvements on eligible highways when requested by the State and matched in an appropriate amount by funds under the control of the State. For Alabama the matching funds are 50 percent except for railroad grade crossing projects in which case section 5 (a) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides that the entire construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings, including the

separation or protection of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, less the amount paid by a participating railroad, may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds. The act also provides that not more than 10 percent of the sums apportioned to any State shall be used for such railway-highway projects.

A highway, to be eligible for improvement with Federal-aid funds must be included in the Federal-aid highway system or the Federal-aid secondary system. The Federal-aid highway system is selected by the State highway department, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, and is divided into two parts. The rural portion is termed the Federal-aid primary system. The portion within urban areas including all cities of 5,000 or more population is termed the Federal-aid urban system. The Federal-aid secondary system is composed of principal secondary or feeder roads in rural areas outside of municipalities of 5,000 or over in population in accordance with the latest available Federal census, including farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, and school bus routes not on the Federal-aid highway system. The roads are selected for inclusion in the Federal-aid secondary system by the State highway department, in cooperation with the local road authorities, for our approval.

Federal-aid primary funds may be used in the improvement of roads on either the

rural or urban portion of the Federal-aid highway system, that is, on highways included in both the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid urban systems. Federal-aid urban funds are restricted to use on highways and streets included in the Federal-aid urban system. The use of Federal-aid secondary funds is restricted to the improvement of roads on the Federal-aid secondary system outside of urban areas.

The initiation of improvements involving Federal-aid highway funds rests with the State and the initiation of improvements involving Federal-aid secondary funds is the prerogative of the State, acting in cooperation with the local road authorities.

Under the Federal-aid legislation, the State, subject to our approval, makes the surveys, prepares the plans, acquires the rights-of-way, and supervises the construction of improvements involving Federal-aid funds.

Forest highway funds, under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads, are applicable for use in the improvement of routes on the forest highway system. Both in the selection of routes to be included in the forest highway system and projects on the system to be programed for improvement are based on the joint field recommendation of the State highway department, the regional forester of the Forest Service, and the division engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Very truly yours,

THOS H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

Alabama—Seventh Congressional District—Federal-aid highway projects programed, under contract, or completed since Jan. 1, 1949, as of Aug. 31, 1951

County	Project No.	State or U. S. Route No.—	Terminal	Character of work	Total estimated cost	Federal funds	Miles
PRIMARY PROJECTS							
PROJECTS PROGRAMED BUT NOT UNDER CONTRACT							
Cullman.....	FI-151 (3)	State 3.....	Point 2.5 miles north of north city limits of Cullman, north. Gun north toward Hamilton to Buttabatchee River.	Grade, drain, 2-lane high-type pavement.	\$1,000 00	\$1,000 00	-----
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 31.....		do.....	500,000 00	250,000 00	10.900
Marion.....	F-173 (4)	State 13.....		do.....	500,000 00	251,000 00	10.900
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 43.....					
Subtotal.....							
PROJECTS UNDER CONTRACT BUT NOT COMPLETED							
Blount.....	F-442 (3)	State 38.....	Blount-Jefferson County line north toward Cleveland	Grade, drain, bridges, and pavement.	318,061 70	159,015 85	6.811
Do.....	F-442 (4)	do.....	North end F-442 (3) north to pavement northwest of Cleveland	do.....	676,100 00	338,050 00	9.814
Cullman.....	FI-082(2)	State 3.....	2.9 miles north of north city limits of Cullman, north to Morgan County line.	Grade, drain, bridge, and pavement.	1,049,311 31	524,451 00	5.786
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 31.....		do.....			
Pickens.....	F-127(7)	State 6.....	At Little Bear Creek near south city limits of Gordo	Bridge and approaches.....	76,200 00	37,600 00	.738
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 82.....					
Walker.....	FG-116(4)	State 4 and 5.....	S. L. & S. L. R. R. crossing 1 mile southwest of Sumiton on U. S. 78.	Overpass.....	38,610 92	38,103 52	.035
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 78.....					
Do.....	F-330(2)	State 69.....	North city limits of Oakman, north to U. S. 78.	Grade, drain, and pavement....	322,400 00	157,900 00	7.589
Subtotal.....					2,519,713 93	1,269,152 37	30.793
PROJECTS COMPLETED							
Blount.....	FAP-FI-84(2)	State 3.....	5.5 miles north of Jefferson-Blount County line, north to 1.3 miles north of Blount Springs.	Grade, bridges, and pavement..	150,063.00	73,973 91	1.720
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 31.....		do.....			
Cullman.....	F-318(1)	State 69.....	From Bremen, northeast to approximately 5 miles south of Cullman.	Grade, drain, bridges, and bituminous surface.	466,180 63	226,371 27	9.608
Do.....	F-318(2)	do.....	From Sipsey River bridge northeast to Bremen.	do.....	423,807 55	206,358 68	9.864
Walker.....	F-116(3)	State 4 and 5.....	From Locust Fork to Mulberry, Fork of Warrior River.	Grade, drain, and pavement ...	660,295 35	319,544 81	6.545
Do.....	do.....	U. S. 78.....			37,013 84	18,336 05	.361
Do.....	F-318(3)	State 69.....	0.5 mile southwest of Cullman County line.	Reconstruct road where slide occurred.	166,650.00	80,250 00	9.117
Do.....	F-330 (1)	do.....	Tuscaloosa-Walker County line North to SR 18 at Marietta.	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface.			
Do.....	FG-330 (3)	do.....	S. L. & S. F. crossing 0.5 mile south of a point on U. S. 78, 2 miles west of Jasper.	Overpass.....	30,300.00	30,300 00	.037
Subtotal.....					1,934,340.37	955,124.72	37.261
Total, primary projects.					4,957,054.30	2,475,277 09	78.954

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Alabama—Seventh Congressional District—Federal-aid highway projects programed, under contract, or completed since Jan. 1, 1949, as of Aug. 31, 1951—Continued

County	Project No.	State or U. S. Route No.	Terminal	Character of work	Total estimated cost	Federal funds	Miles
SECONDARY PROJECTS							
PROJECTS PROGRAMED BUT NOT UNDER CONTRACT							
Fayette	S-138 (1)	State 171	From 0.2 mile north of Fayette, South to Tuscaloosa County line	Grade, drain, and bridges	\$380,000.00	\$190,000.00	11.440
Do	S-529 (1)	County	From intersection with FAS Route 558, north to Marion County line, At Big Bear Creek 2 miles north of Red Boy	Grade, drain, bridges, and bituminous surface	260,000.00	82,470.00	13.300
Franklin	S-445 (5)	do	From near Atwood to 0.8 mile west of Vma	Bridge	50,250.00	28,125.00	.037
Do	S-445 (6)	State 172	From 0.8 mile west of Vma to SR 24 in Red Boy	Base and 2-lane bituminous surface	40,400.00	20,200.00	4.370
Do	S-445 (7)	do	Vernon west to Mississippi State line	Grade, drain, bridges, and bituminous surface	252,000.00	126,000.00	6.470
Lamar	S-273 (5)	State 18	Bridges on road between Millport and Vernon	Base and 2-lane bituminous surface	84,400.00	42,200.00	8.435
Do	S-525 (1)	State 19	At Creek 2 miles southwest of Double Springs and 1 mile northeast of Lynn	Bridges and approaches	110,000.00	55,000.00	1.000
Winston	S-443 (1)	County		Bridges	120,000.00	60,000.00	.100
Subtotal					1,303,050.00	603,965.00	45.152
PROJECTS UNDER CONTRACT BUT NOT COMPLETED							
Blount	S-399 (4)	do	At Locust Fork of Warrior, 4.5 miles southeast of Brooksville	Bridge	87,000.00	43,500.00	.059
Cullman	S-201 (2)	do	From 1.2 miles northeast of U. S. 31, to 2.5 miles southwest of Walter	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface	88,960.00	44,480.00	2.401
Do	S-288 (4)	State 67	From 3 miles southeast of Somerville, south to SR 112	Grade, drain, bridges	21,818.88	10,909.44	1.439
Franklin	S-445 (1)	County	From near Atwood to 0.8 mile west of Vma	Grade and drain	103,500.00	51,750.00	4.374
Marion	S-506 (1)	do	At Buttahatchee River south of Poplar Log Church	Bridge	65,400.00	33,700.00	.059
Do	S-511 (1)	do	From 4 miles south of Hamilton north to Franklin County line	Base and bituminous surface	107,400.00	53,700.00	13.425
Pickens	S-492 (1)	do	From point U. S. 82, west of Coal Line, to south of Andrews Chapel	Grade, drain, bridges, and bituminous surface	209,600.00	104,800.00	8.67
Walker	S-487 (1)	do	From point on Leper Nauvoo Road toward Carbon Hill to point 0.5 mile west of Prospect	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface	58,550.00	29,275.00	3.510
Winston	S-304 (2)	do	From 1 mile south of Natural Bridge to 0.5 mile south of Delmar	Grade and drain	231,900.00	115,950.00	5.466
Subtotal					976,158.88	487,954.41	39.320
PROJECTS COMPLETED							
Blount	S-44 (2)	County	From 0.5 mile southwest of Hayden, southwest to point on U. S. 31	Grade, drain, bridge, and bituminous surface	157,318.99	72,213.49	4.870
Do	S-34 (3)	do	Bridges on road from Hayden north to North	Bridge and culverts	39,611.20	17,450.00	.032
Do	S-399 (1)	State 74	At Mulberry Fork of Warrior River	Bridge	64,480.61	27,290.00	.054
Cullman	S-201 (1)	County	At Brinkley and Duck Creeks on road from U. S. 31 in Hanceville, northeast to Holly Pond	Bridges	103,900.00	51,950.00	.111
Fayette	S-253 (1)	do	From 6.7 miles southwest of Winfield, northeast to Marion County line	Base and bituminous surface	20,200.00	14,600.00	4.466
Do	S-960 (1)	do	From SR 18 in Berry south to Tuscaloosa County line	Grade, drain, bridge, and bituminous surface	111,001.80	49,780.73	3.645
Do	S-800 (1)	do	From U. S. 34 at Bankston, northeast to county road near Cleveland Chapel	Bridge and bituminous surface	75,360.01	36,257.50	2.282
Franklin	S-254 (1)	do	At Bear Creek 3 miles north of Vma	Bridge	99,405.61	39,178.00	.124
Do	S-445 (1)	State 172	West city limits of Hodges west northwest 5 miles toward Vma	Grade and drain	88,666.84	39,038.62	5.056
Do	SG 445 (2)	do	1. C. R. R. crossing 3.4 miles west northwest of Hodges city limits	Overpass	27,954.22	27,389.32	.032
Do	S-435 (3)	County	West city limits of Hodges, west northwest 5 miles toward Vma	Base and bituminous surface	39,193.98	18,630.96	5.054
Do	S-464 (1)	do	At Little Bear Creek 5.7 miles south of Blount	Bridge	29,800.00	14,900.00	.040
Lamar	S-106 (2)	do	2.6 miles west of west city limits of Millport, west to 1.4 miles east of Mississippi State line	Grade, drain, and bridges	112,735.70	52,403.67	4.647
Do	S-106 (3)	do	do	Base and bituminous surface	45,302.67	22,423.82	4.627
Do	S-106 (4)	do	From Millport west to Mississippi State line	Grade, drain, bridges, and bituminous surface	143,430.00	70,040.00	4.271
Do	S-257 (1)	do	0.5 mile west of Kennedy, northwest to 1.5 miles south of Vernon	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface	117,323.29	70,637.38	9.564
Do	S-257 (2)	do	At Loxapallala Creek, north city limits of Kennedy	Bridges	44,100.00	20,600.00	.046
Do	S-257 (3)	do	From SR 18 at Crossville north toward Mansfield	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface	68,926.70	27,600.00	4.120
Do	S-273 (2)	do	Bridges on road from SR 19 in Vernon west northwest to Mississippi State line	Bridges	49,000.00	24,500.00	.088
Do	S-273 (3)	do	From SR 19 in Vernon, west north east toward Mississippi State line	Grade and drain	53,020.00	26,240.00	4.678
Do	S-273 (4)	do	From S-273 (3) to Mississippi State line	do	42,460.00	20,870.00	3.757
Marion	S-396 (1)	do	From Gunn, northeast 4.3 miles and southeast 5.1 miles to Winfield	Bridge and bituminous surface	51,484.41	26,903.91	9.448
Do	S-396 (2)	do	From Brilliant southwest to Twin	do	18,115.95	8,875.36	5.790
Do	S-429 (1)	do	5.4 miles northeast of Hamilton, north to Franklin County line	Base and bituminous surface	28,417.13	8,668.71	5.670
Pickens	S-265 (1)	do	From Carrollton, north to 2.6 miles southeast of McShan	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface	160,690.32	74,600.00	7.211
Walker	S-559 (1)	do	From Summit northeast to Empire	do	93,027.80	44,285.65	5.019
Do	S-172 (1)	do	1.5 miles south of Cordova south toward Gorgas	do	84,120.00	41,840.00	5.653

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6799

Alabama—Seventh Congressional District—Federal-aid highway projects programed, under contract, or completed since Jan. 1, 1949, as of Aug. 31, 1951—Continued

County	Project No.	State or U. S. Route No.—	Terminal	Character of work	Total estimated cost	Federal funds	Miles
SECONDARY PROJECTS—CON.							
PROJECTS COMPLETED—CON.							
Winston.....	S-289 (2).....	State 31.....	Near west fork of Sipsey River, east to intersection with Cheatham Road.	Grade, drain, and bituminous surface.	\$117,423.42	\$55,126.65	3.181
Subtotal.....					2,128,306.65	1,004,311.37	104.945
Total, secondary projects.....					4,407,518.53	2,090,260.81	180.417
No urban projects.							
FOREST HIGHWAY PROJECTS							
PROJECTS PROGRAMED BUT NOT UNDER CONTRACT							
Winston.....	1-B.....		From Winston-Lawrence County line, south 10.6 miles.	Grade and surface.....	298,000.00	149,000.00	10.5
PROJECTS COMPLETED							
Winston.....	10-A.....		Double Springs, east 5.3 miles.....	do.....	235,873.22	104,000.00	5.348
Do.....	10-B.....		From Cullman-Winston County line west 11.3 miles.	do.....	334,184.00	295,085.83	11.315
Subtotal.....					868,057.22	548,085.83	27.193
SUMMARY							
Total:							
Primary projects.....					4,957,054.80	2,475,277.09	78.954
Secondary projects.....					4,407,518.53	2,090,260.81	180.417
Forest highway projects.....					868,057.22	548,085.83	27.193
Grand total.....					10,234,630.05	5,119,623.73	295.564

Housing for Veterans' Legislation and Results—Loan Repayment Record of Veterans of World War II Has Shown Them To Be Excellent Credit Risks—Two Million Five Hundred Thousand GI Home Loans Have Been Made—Direct Loan Program Has Brought Homes Within Reach of Rural Veterans Who Could Not Obtain Loans Through Private Sources—Program Must Be Extended to Korean Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to review in some detail the various housing laws enacted by the Congress as they pertain to veterans of World War II, and the results achieved under these programs. "There is no place like home." This is evidenced by the vast amount of work we do, the long hours we give to our Congressional work during the closing weeks and days of a session of Congress. It often occurs to me that if we worked as hard in the early days of a session, and with a singleness of purpose that we do in the last days that we could easily finish our work at a reasonable time each year so as to be

able to spend more time in our home districts. I personally feel the great loss that comes from the long sessions we have had for the past 3 years. Since I came to Congress on January 3, 1949, we have averaged staying in session 10 months of each year. A Representative in Congress is supposed to stay close to the people he represents so that his work will adequately reflect their viewpoints, their considered wishes, their mature judgment. I hope some way can be found to lengthen the time we can spend at home in the coming years. I believe that every effort should be made to cut the sessions of Congress to at least 8 months duration. The newspapers amuse me when they refer to adjournment as providing a "vacation" for Congressmen. I believe that all Members, and I am sure I speak for myself, work just as hard when at home in their districts as they do here. The point I am trying to make is that it is necessary that the work in the district be done, that the close contact with the people be maintained. Of course, I do not believe that we should adjourn until the necessary legislative work is finished. And, before I finish my statement I shall propose in one or two instances that this session of Congress does not adjourn until certain legislation pertaining to housing for veterans of the Korean war has been enacted.

VA GUARANTEED GI LOANS FIRST AUTHORIZED BY GI BILL, 1944

The loan-guaranty program of the Veterans' Administration was created by title III of the Servicemen's Readjust-

ment Act—Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress—enacted June 22, 1944, as a readjustment benefit for the purpose of enabling veterans of World War II to secure loans from private lenders for the purchase, construction, alteration, or repair of homes, for the purchase of farms and farm equipment or for the purchase of business property or engaging in business. The favorable mortgage financing terms were to be made possible by reason of the fact that a substantial portion of the loan was to be guaranteed by the Government, thereby materially reducing the lender's risk. Under the provisions of Public Law 346, the Veterans' Administration was authorized to guarantee 50 percent of a loan to an eligible veteran except that the amount of the guaranty could not exceed \$2,000. Such loan, with maximum maturity in 20 years, was to bear interest at 4 percent, and payment of interest for the first year was to be made by the Veterans' Administrator on that part of the loan guaranteed by the Government. The act permitted the Administrator to guarantee 100 percent of the principal amount of second mortgage loans provided that such loans did not exceed 20 percent of the purchase price and that the primary loan was insured by a Federal agency. The law also specified that the purchase price paid by a veteran could not exceed the "reasonable normal value" of the property as determined by a competent appraiser. Veterans were eligible to make application for loan benefit, within 2 years of their discharge, or the termination of the war, but in no event later than 5 years after

the termination of the war. Home loans guaranteed under the act were conditioned by the requirement that payments on the mortgage securing the loan must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income. In the case of farm and business loans it was stipulated that the veterans' ability and experience must be such as to make success in the venture reasonably likely.

The first loan under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was guaranteed in November 1944, and by the end of 1945 more than 49,000 loans were approved out of the 58,334 loan applications received. However, the first year of operation indicated that the program needed revision in order to meet the needs of larger numbers of veterans in obtaining GI loans and as a consequence the law was amended in several important respects by the enactment of Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress, on December 28, 1945.

PUBLIC LAW 268 OF 1945 LIBERALIZED GI LOAN PROGRAM

The amendments made by Public Law 268 raised the maximum guaranty of the Veterans' Administration to \$4,000—subject to the 50 percent limitation—with respect to realty loans, but the guaranty on nonreal estate loans remained at \$2,000. A system of loan insurance was set up whereby a lending institution could be reimbursed for losses up to 15 percent of the aggregate of the insured loans it made. The time in which a veteran could apply for a loan was extended to 10 years after the termination of the war. Additional liberalizing features of Public Law 268 provided that the maximum maturity date be extended up to 25 years for home loans, and to 40 years for farm realty loans. The procedures for processing veterans' loans were streamlined by a provision for an automatic guaranty for loans made by certain supervised lenders. Another change which greatly benefited the veteran was the redefinition of the property value standard to "reasonable value"—in place of the previous limitation of "reasonable normal value". Instead of the payment by the Veterans' Administrator of the interest on the guaranteed portion of the loan for the first year a gratuity payment equal to 4 percent of the guaranteed amount was paid by the Veterans' Administration to the lender for credit on the veterans' loan.

PUBLIC LAW 856, 1946, AUTHORIZED RFC TO PROVIDE A SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI MORTGAGES

The passage of Public Law 268, in conjunction with the fact that the effect of demobilization from the Armed Forces was then making a maximum impact, caused the volume of loan applications to increase sharply in 1946 so that by December 25 of that year, a total of 518,000 loans had been guaranteed with a principal amount of almost \$2,600,000,000. The trend toward increased GI loan activity during the latter part of 1946 was accentuated by the passage of Public Law 656, Seventh-ninth Congress, on August 7, 1946, authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to provide a secondary market for the purchase of

loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Although this authority was terminated by Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, on June 30, 1947, during the period of its operation the RFC purchased some 25,000 guaranteed GI loans with an original principal amount of about \$150,000,000.

After reaching a total of approximately 57,000 loans monthly in the fall of 1946, the volume of veterans' loans commenced to slacken in 1947 and 1948 as a result, in part, of the inability of veterans to afford the increased housing costs, and also of a decline in the relative attractiveness to investors of the 4 percent interest rate due to the rising yields of competitive securities. Thereafter, Congress passed legislation designed to channel more funds into GI loans through the resumption of purchase operations of a Government secondary market.

PUBLIC LAW 864 IN 1948 REOPENED SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI MORTGAGES THROUGH FNMA

Public Law 864, approved July 1, 1948, authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to provide, within certain specified limits, a secondary market for the purchase of GI home and farm loans guaranteed or insured subsequent to April 30, 1948. Another provision of Public Law 864 made evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the administrator conclusive proof of loan eligibility with the exception of certain reserved defenses.

PUBLIC LAW 901, 1948, ALLOWED FNMA TO PURCHASE 50 PERCENT OF LENDER'S GI MORTGAGES

On August 10, 1948, Congress enacted the Housing Act of 1948—Public Law 901, Eightieth Congress—which authorized the Veterans' Administrator, with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, to increase the interest rate of GI loans to 4½ percent, if he found such action required by the mortgage market. However, following an extensive survey and study of the question the Veterans' Administration determined no change in the interest rate was warranted. This act also expanded the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association to permit the purchase of up to 50 percent of a lender's eligible loan originations.

FIFTY-PERCENT LIMIT ON GI MORTGAGE PURCHASES BY FNMA INCREASED TO 100 PERCENT BY EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

This 50-percent limit was subsequently removed on October 25, 1949, by Public Law 387, Eighty-first Congress, which permitted a 100-percent Government—FNMA—secondary market in GI home loans.

AS A RESULT, GI LOANS CLIMBED TO 50,000 PER MONTH

Following a low of about 20,000 applications during the month of March 1949, the number of veterans' loans commenced to rise again as the Government's secondary market operations accelerated, and more home building was concentrated in the lower price ranges, so that as a result, in part, of these conditions, coupled with a decline in the yields of alternative long-term investments, the rate of loan applications

climbed to 50,000 per month by April 1950.

GI HOME-LOAN LAW GREATLY LIBERALIZED BY HOUSING ACT OF 1950

The spurt which developed in the Veterans' Administration loan program was given much additional momentum by the enactment of the Housing Act of 1950—Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress—on April 20, 1950. This law made several important changes in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The maximum guaranty of the Veterans' Administration for home loans was increased to 60 percent, or \$7,500, whichever was the less, for veterans who had not previously used any of their loan entitlement. The maximum term for home loans was upped from 25 to 30 years.

RECOGNITION OF HOME LOAN RIGHTS OF WIDOW OF VETERAN WHO DIED FROM SERVICE-CONNECTED CAUSES

A provision was included giving the unmarried widow of a veteran who died from service-connected causes the same rights to a GI loan that her husband would have had. In cases where a veteran's property was taken from him by condemnation, natural hazard, or other circumstances beyond his control, the loan guaranty rights used by him in acquiring such property were authorized to be restored. Public Law 475 also provided for the abolition by December 31, 1950, of the section 505 (a), the combination FHA-GI loans, which were more expensive to the veteran than the straight GI loan. The actual termination date was October 20, 1950. Veterans were also benefited by a requirement for minimum construction standards as a prerequisite to financing GI loans.

DIRECT VA LOANS TO VETERANS LIVING IN RURAL AREAS WHERE PRIVATE FINANCING NOT AVAILABLE

Another very important provision of Public Law 475 authorized the making of direct loans on a stand-by basis by the Administrator to veterans who resided in areas in which 4 percent loans could not be obtained from private lenders. The purpose of this provision was to assist more veterans to take advantage of the GI-loan program and prevent discrimination against those veterans residing in areas, mostly rural, where 4 percent money was unobtainable. The amount of a direct loan was limited to \$10,000 and could be made only after the Administrator was satisfied that the veteran was a satisfactory credit risk, and that the required monthly payments bore a proper relation to his income.

The Housing Act of 1950 also provided additional funds for the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, but terminated its authority to make advance commitments with respect to the purchase of loans.

GI LOANS JUMPED TO 71,000 PER MONTH

As a result of several factors, among them being the expanded operation of the Government secondary mortgage market and a changed governmental financial policy causing 4-percent money to become more attractive for investment purposes, funds for GI loans became increasingly plentiful so that during the

month of August 1950, the number of loans reached the record total of 71,000.

EFFECT OF KOREAN WAR ON GI LOANS

As a result of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea on June 27, 1950, it became necessary to sharply curtail normal housing activity in order to channel strategic materials into national defense activities. The Veterans' Administration on July 19, 1950, for the first time imposed a minimum down payment requirement for home purchasers which, in most cases, was 5 percent of the purchase price. Pursuant to authority contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950—Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress—the housing credit restrictions were tightened in orders promulgated October 12, 1950, with respect to GI, FHA, and conventional financing. Although preserving the relative credit preference of veterans, the down payment requirement for veterans under this order ranged from 5 percent for a \$5,000 house to 45 percent for a house costing in excess of \$24,250. These restrictions were modified somewhat on March 22, 1951, to allow more liberal credit for housing of defense workers and service personnel in critical defense areas. The effect of the drastic credit restrictions did not become immediately apparent inasmuch as the financing of housing already contracted for or subject to existing appraisal requests was exempted from the application of the orders. However, the expected downward trend in loan activity became evident in early 1951, and by July of this year the number of applications had fallen to the rate of 32,000 monthly. Coupled with the restriction on building activity were certain factors in the financial picture which also contributed to the decrease in activity of the GI-loan program. Prior to the imposition of restrictions, lending activity had been conducted on such an intensified scale that the heavy commitments of the lenders materially drained available funds and carried over into 1951 as a temporary mortgage glut. In addition, Government policy changes with respect to the withdrawal of support of the bond market by the Federal Reserve Board in March of 1951, increased the tightness of the mortgage money available. Consequently, during the spring and summer of 1951, many eligible veterans found it very difficult to obtain 4-percent loans from private lending sources.

PUBLIC LAW 139, SEPTEMBER 1951, EASES RESTRICTIONS ON GI LOANS

The Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951—Public Law 139, Eighty-second Congress—approved September 1, 1951, liberalized the financing on low-cost housing guaranteed or made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, by stipulating certain maximum down payments that may be required by regulation, as follows:

Four percent on housing with sales price up to \$7,000;

Six percent on housing with sales price over \$7,000 and up to \$10,000; and

Eight percent for housing with sales price over \$10,000 and up to \$12,000.

The down-payment requirement in these cost categories for other than loans

made or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration is 10 percent, 15 percent, and 20 percent, respectively. Public Law 139 also amended the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to provide a liberalized home-loan guaranty of up to 60 percent, or \$7,500, whichever is lower, for a veteran who had previously used part of his loan entitlement—except for GI home loans made subsequent to April 20, 1950. Increased control against excessive fees paid by a veteran to the seller of property was also provided by the act. Furthermore, in Public Law 142, Eighty-second Congress, approved September 13, 1951, it was provided that the sale of any property to a veteran under the loan program at a price in excess of the appraised amount, as determined by proper Veterans' Administration appraisal, would render the responsible parties liable to the veteran for treble damages.

DIRECT VA LOAN PROGRAM FOR VETERANS LIVING IN RURAL AREAS WHERE PRIVATE LENDING AT 4-PERCENT INTEREST NOT AVAILABLE EXTENDED TO JUNE 30, 1953, BY PUBLIC LAW 139, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, as the author of the House bill to extend direct VA loans to veterans living in rural areas where private lending at 4-percent interest is not available, I would like to say that in my judgment this provision of Public Law 139 is a very just provision, and it cures, at least in part, one of the major defects of the GI loan law. Hundreds of our rural veterans can meet the same qualifications for GI loans, as do their city cousins, but without the direct loan provision they could not obtain a loan with which to build their homes. The direct-loan program fills a gap in the practical administration of the law by extending the opportunity for home ownership to veterans living in rural areas. Of the approximately 3,100 counties in the United States, 2,600, or parts of 2,600, have been classified as areas where private financing at 4-percent interest is not available. The fact that this law is on the books encourages private lending institutions to extend their operations into rural areas, when they otherwise would not. Also, under this law, when a loan is approved, and as I understand it up until the loan is finally closed, the VA will allow any private lender to make the loan at the same terms that the Government had agreed to make it. Thus, at all stages of the loan procedure private lenders or lending agencies are encouraged to make the loan. If they do not, the VA makes it, and in that manner another veteran becomes a home owner. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation will ever regret what it has done during the past few years to extend the opportunity for home ownership to those who could not otherwise own homes, but for the VA guaranty, and direct home-loan programs, and the FHA programs as well.

I am happy to have been the author of House bill 3861 to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Veterans' Administration to make direct home and farmhouse loans in rural areas where private lending capital is not available. My bill passed the House of Representatives on June 18, 1951, and was later incorporated into the Defense Housing

and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951, and as a provision of that act it became a part of Public Law 139, Eighty-second Congress.

The operation of the direct home-loan program, which had temporarily expired on July 1, 1951, was thus extended through June 30, 1953, and the direct-loan fund was reconstituted as a revolving fund in order to make available for further loans, payments received by the Veterans' Administration from the sale of loans to private lenders or from repayments or prepayments by the veteran. As of September 25, 1951, the Veterans' Administration had approved 17,077 direct loans and there was approximately \$41,000,000 remaining out of the original direct-loan fund of \$150,000,000. In addition, principal repayments from loans previously closed amounted to about \$2,600,000 which is also now available for new loans. In the administration of the direct-loan program over 2,600 counties, or parts thereof, out of the approximately 3,100 counties in the United States, have been designated by the Veterans' Administration as eligible areas for direct loans.

OPERATION OF THE GI LOAN PROGRAM HAS SHOWN THAT THE VETERAN IS A GOOD RISK

During the operation of the veterans' loan-guaranty program from its inception through September 25, 1951, a total of 2,962,154 loan applications were received by the Veterans' Administration of which 2,778,668 have been approved. The principal amount of loans approved during this period totaled slightly over \$16,406,400,000 with closed loans aggregating slightly over \$15,560,300,000. By far the greatest bulk of this activity was centered in home loans as the principal amounts of farm and business loans accounted for but \$237,129,523 and \$431,189,498 of the closed loan figures respectively. The average amount of the GI first mortgage home loan is \$6,956 and the repayment has usually been amortized in nearly equal payments of principal and interest over a 20-year period. The operation of the loan program has clearly shown that the veteran is a good financial risk. The record indicates that foreclosure claims have been paid for all types of loans in less than 1 case out of every 100. For home loans, separately, claims have been paid in 1 case out of every 200 loans. The net amount paid out in claims on all types of loans has approximated \$23,183,100. Of this amount \$13,619,400 was paid on home-loan claims.

SUMMARY OF THE GI LOAN PROGRAM THROUGH SEPTEMBER 25, 1951

The accompanying tables show first, the number and principal amount of VA guaranteed and insured home, farm, and business loans closed and fully disbursed as of September 25, 1951, in the United States, in the State of Alabama and in the nine counties comprising the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama; second, direct loan statistics for the United States, with a separate column for the State of Alabama through September 25, 1951; and, third, a tabulation, through September 25, 1951, showing participation in the direct loan program of the counties comprising the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

VA guaranteed and insured loans closed—Cumulative as of Sept. 25, 1951

	Total, all types		Home loans		Farm loans		Business loans	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
United States	2,678,784	\$15,560,146,507	2,469,007	\$14,892,127,576	61,545	\$237,120,523	148,232	\$431,189,498
State of Alabama	37,638	200,812,214	31,078	190,954,001	2,533	6,263,584	1,027	3,654,629
Alabama counties								
Blount	209	518,383	35	96,475	163	381,609	11	40,209
Cullman	128	528,633	40	217,153	71	242,962	11	68,518
Fayette	12	52,270	6	37,300	6	11,940	0	0
Franklin	118	350,416	90	291,648	26	55,168	2	5,300
Lamar	7	40,206	2	8,000	2	3,206	3	29,000
Madison	9	32,690	4	17,450	5	15,240	0	0
Pickens	79	290,678	15	87,370	62	107,962	2	5,746
Walker	84	457,033	67	416,941	7	11,721	10	28,467
Winston	31	117,861	24	119,587	5	12,077	2	4,200
Total, 9 counties	677	2,316,173	289	1,291,927	347	843,308	41	180,948

Direct loan statistics—Through Sept. 25, 1951

	United States	Alabama
1 Applications received	28,369	1,777
2 Withdrawn or rejected	7,963	577
3 Approved		
Number	117,077	908
Amount	\$109,193,258	\$6,878,993
4 Closed and fully disbursed		
Number	13,787	710
Amount	\$86,967,948	\$4,894,345
5 Closed and partially disbursed		
Number	512	6
Amount	\$1,306,481	\$18,986
6 Awaiting closing	2,111	221

The number of loans closed or awaiting closing (lines 4, 5, and 6) is smaller than the total number of loans approved (line 3) since a number of loans are withdrawn after having been approved.

Seventh Congressional District of Alabama—Through Sept. 25, 1951

County	Number of loans approved	Loan amount
Blount	15	\$33,300
Cullman	16	107,300
Fayette	8	67,550
Franklin	13	92,100
Lamar	1	21,000
Madison	19	111,450
Pickens	5	44,450
Walker	27	195,843
Winston	7	51,600
Total	113	719,983

These figures reveal the following facts, Mr. Speaker, which I desire to emphasize.

First Under the VA loan guaranty program \$15,500,000,000 was invested in veterans' loans, under the various laws which I have discussed, prior to September 25, 1951. In addition \$87,000,000,000 was loaned under the direct-loan program for veterans living in rural areas. These are investments in the future of America. As a result 2,692,571 new homes have come into existence, in which a substantial portion of tomorrow's citizens will be reared.

Second. More than 38,000 of these loans have been made in Alabama, in the amount of approximately \$206,000,000.

Third. In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, 800 of these loans have been made in the amount of more than \$3,000,000.

These loan programs have been slowed down as a result of the Korean war, but it is expected that short of an all-out war

there will continue to be made a considerable number of home loans. I hope the loan program can continue to the point that every veteran in America who desires to do so can take advantage of the program.

HOME LOANS FOR KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will not adjourn until it has enacted a law providing for every veteran of the Korean war, that is, every veteran who has served in the Armed Forces since June 27, 1950, the same housing-loan privileges that have been extended to veterans of World War II. I think there is no question in the minds of any of us that we will eventually do so. The action should be taken now. There is no reason to delay further. The Korean veterans are entitled to every privilege enjoyed by those of us who are veterans of World War II. This includes housing, education, and training, and all other benefits to help them to rehabilitate themselves when their period of service is finished.

Kansas Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a statement which I have prepared relating to the appropriation of \$2,500,000 to begin construction of Kirwin Dam on the North Fork of the Solomon River.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, under the general authority to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in recording the final action of the Congress in including an appropriation of \$2,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to begin construction of the flood-control features of Kirwin Dam on the North Fork of the Solomon River in the State of Kansas. This important item was included on my urgent recommendation by the Senate Appropriations Committee for \$3,200,-

000, and in conference the amount finally agreed on was \$2,500,000, which I am informed will be adequate for the Bureau of Reclamation to start actual construction in the spring of 1952.

I am also informed by Acting Commissioner Lineweaver, of the Bureau of Reclamation, that the designs of the Kirwin Dam have been revised after consultation with the Corps of Engineers, represented by its Omaha and Kansas offices. The corps' recommendation to increase the height of the Kirwin Dam by 13 feet was accepted by Reclamation. The capacity for flood protection will be increased proportionately.

Kirwin Dam, when completed, will be another valuable contribution to flood protection in the Kansas River Basin in the event of repetition of the disastrous floods of the summer of 1951. Cedar Bluff Dam, constructed by Reclamation, and Kanopolis Dam, constructed by the corps, proved their worth in the floods this year. Without them the flood losses in Kansas would have been much greater.

I thoroughly agree, Mr. President, that dams in the Kansas River Basin having flood-control values must be operated in accordance with plans approved by the Corps of Engineers. It is my understanding that such plans are in effect or in the making. I am advised also that the Bureau of Reclamation so operated Cedar Bluff Dam, as shown by the attached news release from the Kansas River district manager of reclamation at McCook, Neb.

Now as to three other dams in the Kansas River Basin for which Congress has not yet provided construction funds, I refer to Webster on the South Fork of the Solomon, Glen Elder on the Solomon, and Wilson Dam on the Saline River.

Following the 1947 floods, the Budget Bureau recommended construction funds for the Bureau of Reclamation for these three dams in addition to Cedar Bluff and Kirwin. The Congress, however, appropriated in that year only for Cedar Bluff. Now funds are provided to start Kirwin. It is the hope of Kansas that construction funds will soon be provided for Webster, Glen Elder, and Wilson. I am informed that the Bureau of Reclamation has Missouri River Basin project investigation funds that can be used to prepare at least one or two of these projects for early construction in order that they may be ready to serve to protect life and property in Kansas. It is our hope that this preconstruction work will be prosecuted vigorously so that Congress can justify the appropriation of construction funds. The plans, by all means, should be developed in consultation with the Corps of Engineers.

Also, full consideration should be given to the irrigation and recreational features although construction of these features

might well be deferred until the urgent flood-control facilities are completed. In any event, we should conserve water for irrigation as assurance against drought wherever feasible.

The news release referred to is as follows:

"How the recently completed Cedar Bluff Dam and Reservoir, southwest of Ellis, Kans., assisted in reducing floods in the Kansas River Basin during the past summer is described in a report issued this week by H. E. Robinson, district manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Indianola, Nebr. Mr. Robinson reported that hydrologists in the district office had just completed an analysis of the flows of the rivers during the months of May, June, July, August, and September of this year and the hydrological conclusions reached were significant especially to the cities in the Kansas River Basin below Salina, Kans.

"Floods in the Smoky Hill River Basin completely filled the Cedar Bluff Reservoir irrigation pool and 44½ percent of the flood-control pool during the first year of operation. The maximum storage of 270,600 acre-feet was reached on July 2 which amounted to approximately 550 percent of the average annual flow of the river at the Cedar Bluff Dam. All but 11,000 acre-feet of this amount was accumulated during the period May 15 through July 2 while the Cedar Bluff Dam was still under construction. The dam constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Smoky Hill River near Ellis, Kans., was completed in September of this year.

"Water released from the reservoir during May 20 to July 20 period of flooding of the Kansas River and its tributaries was held to a minimum to aid in alleviating flood damage. This storage was made by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with request from the Corps of Engineers to protect the lower valley in spite of the undesirability of storing this quantity of water behind a green, unseasoned dam before construction on the dam was completed. The maximum discharge through the dam was held to 1,900 cubic feet per second occurring on July 2 through the ungated flood-control notch. The ungated flood-control notch was provided in the spillway for the purpose of limiting the discharge to 4,000 cubic feet per second which is the safe channel capacity below the dam.

"The storage of floodwaters in the Cedar Bluff Reservoir was effective in preventing the Kanopolis Reservoir from filling and overflowing through the large spillway. Thus flood damage was materially reduced during the June and July period of flooding of the Smoky Hill and Kansas Rivers. The Kanopolis Reservoir is located about 150 miles downstream from the Cedar Bluff Dam just 87 miles upstream from Salina, Kans. Because of the continuous repetition of spring rains during May 15 through July 20, and because of necessity of reducing the stage of the Smoky Hill River at Salina, Kans., the Kanopolis Reservoir continued to gain storage consistently and on July 14 storage level in the reservoir was only two-hundredths of a foot below the spillway crest. If the Cedar Bluff Reservoir had not been storing water, the Kanopolis Reservoir would have spilled during the June and July floods materially adding to the flood damage on the lower river particularly at Salina, Kans.

"All through the month of June when the Solomon and Saline Rivers were adding to the flood conditions of the Smoky Hill and the Kansas Rivers, the town of Salina was protected by the combined storage facilities of Kanopolis and Cedar Bluff Reservoirs. Release from the Kanopolis Reservoir were maintained at amounts to keep the river at Salina within safe channel conditions. When the 3-day rainfall of July 9 to 11 occurred with from 8 to 12 inches of rain falling be-

tween the Kanopolis Dam and Salina, the Kanopolis Reservoir was able to reduce its outflow to 1,300 cubic feet per second. Salina, Kans., suffered some damage from local tributary inflow with a peak discharge of 17,000 cubic feet per second at Salina, but if Kanopolis had not been able to store the inflow to the reservoir the flow at Salina would have been twice as much as it received or about 34,000 cubic feet per second. The area flooded in the city of Salina would have been far greater.

"The Smoky Hill Basin above the Cedar Bluff Reservoir received less than an average of 2 inches of rainfall during the July 9 to 11 storm, but the floodwaters held in the Cedar Bluff Reservoir during June made it possible for the Kanopolis Reservoir to store all the inflow reaching that reservoir during the July storm, thus reducing flood damage in the river below."

Record of the First Session of the Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the only logical yardstick by which you can measure the record of a session of Congress is by the determination of how well that Congress did the job handed it to do. World conditions handed to the first session of the Eighty-second Congress a very particular job—to work for peace and security both at home and abroad.

Is the United States today stronger and better able to meet the threat of aggression than it was on January 3? Is the rest of the free world stronger and in a better position to join in a united effort to halt the advance of communistic aggression? Are the NATO countries better organized and better prepared to provide the military power on the continent of Europe so necessary to contain this Communist threat to world peace?

The answer to each question is, definitely, "Ycs."

So when I am asked, "What have been the accomplishments of the Eighty-second Congress?" I feel that it can be said that the accomplishments of the Eighty-second Congress have been of almost unprecedented importance and significance—they have been far-reaching and of great significance in the present and future role which the United States has been called upon to play in the pursuit of peace which is the aim and aspiration of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The accomplishments and achievements of the Eighty-second Congress thus far have been vital to the defense and security of our own country and of great importance toward effecting order and stability throughout the world. The Congress has measured up to the challenge of making our country strong and prepared. This has been the field in which the first session of the Eighty-second Congress has primarily worked—

for peace and security both at home and abroad.

On the whole, then, Congress must be given credit for putting first things first, and the volume of work that it managed to get through in the 10 months of its first session is nothing short of staggering.

Because it was its main job the emphasis of the session was very strongly on defense and foreign policy, and even when Congress turned to domestic affairs most of its acts were in some way related to world emergency. This was unavoidable. Congress had to deal with circumstances as it found them. Nor is there any real doubt that in appropriating some \$57,000,000,000 for defense, in authorizing overseas bases to cost \$5,900,000,000, and in providing \$7,500,000,000 to bolster the defenses and economic systems of friendly countries, Congress was reflecting the will of the American people.

The same may be said of its authorization of a supercarrier and 140 other new naval vessels, its extension of the Selective Service Act, and its passage of the Defense Housing Act. There were some short-sighted actions, such as the Senate's attempt to limit the number of American troops that can be sent to Europe, but on the whole Congress responded realistically and courageously to the world situation.

Since the outbreak of the Communist aggression in Korea—a threat to freedom and liberty everywhere—the Congress has directed its energies and attention to the problems of preparedness and defense—to the cause of peace and the security of our Nation. As all citizens know and recognize, freedom and liberty are priceless—peace does not come cheap and security is not a matter of luck. The Eighty-second Congress, in full reflection of the deep desire of all citizens of the United States to attain peace and security, has taken the most immediate steps toward that attainment, namely, the providing of the necessary funds for the building up of our defenses, and for the attainment of America's peace and security.

More than that, the Congress—also in reflection of the decent impulses of the people of the United States—has provided the free nations of the world with the inspiration and the will to exert their own best efforts toward a firm and determined stand against the threats of Communist aggression. Since communism thrives on fear and on the inability of a nation to assert its national strength and vigor, the forthright actions of the Congress to not only build our own Nation's defenses but to assist other nations, only a short time ago flat on their backs and devastated from war, to build their own comes as an historic step forward in the field of peace.

The \$57,000,000,000 voted by Congress for our armed services, the largest defense appropriations ever voted, will go toward the creation of an Air Force of 95 wings and greater, an Army better trained and equipped than any other army in the world, and two-ocean Navy,

the world's most powerful. It will provide research and development in the field of atomic energy, jet propulsion, and every modern device which would give our Nation added strength and security.

In the past week the third Russian A-bomb test has been announced. In 1946 I said the only secret of the A-bomb was in the determination and effort put forth to make it. Russia has put forth that effort and today stockpiles A-bombs. As I have repeatedly said—since the Russians will not accept an honest plan for international control of atomic energy—our only formula for security in this field is to improve our position and stay far ahead of the Soviet in the atomic field. The Eighty-second Congress has taken steps along that line by increasing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and by authorizing expansion of its facilities. We have no choice but to place maximum emphasis on atomic armament.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on which I have had the honor to serve since it was created by law in 1946, has directed a resolution to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense to transmit to the committee by January 3, 1952, a "definite and concrete report on maximizing the role atomic energy can and should play in the defense of the United States." Aside from the superior effectiveness of atomic weapons, the committee believes that a possible atomic weapons program would result in an eventual defense savings of \$30,000,000,000 a year. That is a goal, but it is not immediately attainable because the desired weapons for tactical military use are still in the development stage.

World War II proved that no nation may isolate itself and withdraw from the world and selfishly find security. Time and modern civilization have drawn us closer together and made neighbors of all the peoples of the world. In recognition of that fact, former Secretary of State Cordell Hull conceived what is now known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for furthering good will among nations through the medium of friendly trade and commercial relations. This has been called one of the greatest instruments for permanent peace ever set forth. The first session of the Eighty-second Congress has again extended this great act eliminating Communist-dominated countries from benefits of the agreements.

In a further effort to provide for our security at home and to set up a buffer against further Communist aggression in Europe, Congress approved extension of the mutual-security program for military aid to European nations—our allies and friends in Europe—in building up of a European defense army under the command of General Eisenhower. Funds in the amount of \$7,500,000,000 were voted for this program. Passage was based on the tenet that Europe, in its present economic condition, can provide men more readily than it can arm them and a dollar spent to build up Europe's defenses now will be as valu-

able—or more so—than a dollar spent at home for defense at this time. It is the hope and expectation of this program that we can hit the enemy sooner and more effectively from over there than from here. The objective is to keep war away from us—the main objective is to make the free nations of the world strong enough to deter an aggressor. The building of a defensive wall against the further spread of Communist aggression now seems a necessary insurance policy. It may stop war—certainly, should war come our allies will be better prepared to resist the aggressor.

While preparing our defenses on a world-wide basis we cannot overlook the home front and those things affecting our civilian economy. On this side one of the foremost measures approved by Congress was the Defense Production Act. This law has a two-fold purpose: First, assuring the United States of adequate production for the military build-up while providing for essential civilian requirements; and second, the prevention of run-away inflation.

As civilians learned during World War II, a high rate of military production calls for diversion to the armed services of the greater portion of our vital materials, thus reducing substantially the amount of such materials which can go into the manufacturing of civilian goods. Shortages of civilian goods are thus created and some form of price controls is considered highly desirable and essential to prevent ruinous inflation. Controls over materials and over prices were thus provided without an undue restriction of private enterprise. The full impact of the drain which military production will take from the total output of civilian goods will not be felt until 1952 and 1953 but the Congress in moving at this time to impose moderate controls has thus checked and forestalled an inflationary build-up which would rob our citizens of the fruits of their labor and their savings.

Much legislation of great benefit has been enacted in the interest of our veterans—not the least of these benefits being the extension of veterans rights and benefits to include the Korean war veterans.

One of the first benefits to be voted in behalf of the Korean veterans was the \$10,000 free life-insurance policy for all men serving in the Armed Forces subsequent to June 25, 1950—the date of the start of hostilities in Korea. Our Korean veterans will have the privilege of converting this free policy into permanent national service life insurance, with a small premium, upon their honorable discharge from service.

Another major action was the extension of benefits of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical care to Korean veterans. Provision has also been made for providing for increased compensation and pensions to veterans having permanent and total disabilities. The legislation providing automobiles for amputees was liberalized and extended to Korean veterans. As our Korean veterans are being rotated and return home—the Congress is preparing to ex-

tend the full benefits of the GI bill of rights to them—granting educational and other benefits similar to those granted to veterans of World War I and World War II.

One of the most beneficial provisions of the Defense Production Act establishes the Small Defense Plant Corporation for direct aid and assistance to small-business enterprises of the Nation during this period of emergency.

As authorized by Congress, this service is to be a consolidation of a number of loosely operated small-business services in various agencies of the Government—the consolidation effecting a substantial economy in operations. It will, in effect, merge and consolidate all small-business offices into one for the purposes of, first, aiding small-business concerns and small-manufacturing concerns to obtain defense contracts or subcontracts; second, give information on procedure for obtaining such orders and interpret regulations and directives in the mobilization program; third, fairly distribute among large and small business the supply of critical materials so that small business will receive its fair share; and, fourth, aid in the financing of small-business expansion and retooling so that maximum participation in the defense program may be effected.

The question of a tax increase proved to be a most controversial subject during the course of the first session and Members took up the question with reluctance and hesitation because of the heavy tax load already being carried by our citizens, but also with a full sense of responsibility that the tremendous cost of the defense program must be met somehow and that a pay-as-you-go program is the wisest course. The majority of the Members were of the opinion that our boys fighting in Korea should not come home to pay the bills for defense and face the costs which the conflict against Communist aggression entails.

The taxpayers of our country would have, in the course of normal events, expected that the tax rate would be lowered rather than increased. The national tax rate was lowered following World War II, but with hostilities in Korea the pressing necessity arose to step up greatly our defense program with resulting increased costs. Therefore, a tax increase was deemed necessary and the House and Senate agreed on a compromise measure which will bring in revenue several billion dollars below the request of the President, but it was as high as the Congress felt it should be imposed, believing further economies should be effected in the operation of the Government.

One of the primary functions of Congress—in addition to its function to legislate—is the duty and responsibility to investigate. Without proper and full facts and information through investigation, the Congress would be unable to legislate wisely and properly in the interest of all our people. This applies with respect to the enactment of laws to extend benefits and to correct inequities and plug loopholes and also to the matter of the proper functioning of the departments of the Government.

There have been numerous investigations in a variety of fields during the session of Congress just closed. Exposures of corruption and irregularities in the conduct of public office were made by Democratic and Republican Members of Congress alike, and prompt and searching investigations were made of each charge.

Among the several investigations may be listed the investigation into the facts surrounding the dismissal of General MacArthur from his command in the Pacific. The Senate crime investigation in which it was disclosed that the criminal element has infiltrated into legitimate businesses and crime syndicates are in operation in our large cities. Much legislation has been proposed following this investigation.

The R&C investigation has resulted already in great changes being made in that agency. The investigation of the Maryland election will result in many changes being made with regard to political campaigns and elections—changes that will bring about a higher standard of ethics in the conduct of State and national political campaigns.

The current investigation of irregularities in the Internal Revenue Bureau is another investigation of a highly beneficial nature. Results of the investigation will be the ferreting out of the officials in that Bureau who have conducted themselves improperly. Like in all departments of the Government, honesty and integrity are essential to the maintaining of the strength of our national institutions.

The national investigation of the operations of the veterans' education and training program which disclosed many instances of irregularities has resulted in the savings of millions of dollars to the Government, as well as the assuring of a better and improved training program for our veterans.

One of their byproducts of all these investigations has been the fact that, by and large, the great majority of our Government employees and public servants are not included in the dishonest class but are scrupulous, loyal, and honest public officials. The exposure of some bad apples in the barrel has focused attention on the fact that the vast majority of the apples are sound and good. All should not be condemned.

There have been divisions and disagreement in Congress—such being inevitable in the exercise of our democratic form of Government—but on the important issues, national defense and security, the Congress has demonstrated a firm unity. The times call for the exercise of unity, the welding of our citizens into a solid front against the threats of communism and Communist aggression. Only through unity did our country grow into the greatest Nation in the history of the world, and only through a demonstration of the basic unity of our people and faith in our institutions and our Government will our country remain strong.

There is not the slightest doubt that our Nation will survive the present con-

dict and emergency, and, in surviving, America will grow to even greater heights, as the United States assumes its rightful role of leadership and destiny.

Applying the proper yardstick—whether Congress did its specific job—meeting the problems involving world security—I think it will be said of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress as I have stated earlier in this report that it responded realistically and courageously to the world situation.

NBC Radio Interview With Hon. John V. Beamer, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a copy of the statement which I made during a recent interview over the National Broadcasting Co. network when Frank Bourgholtzer of NBC asked me how I personally became interested in the case of William Oatis.

NBC RADIO INTERVIEW WITH HON. JOHN V. BEAMER, OF INDIANA

(Interview with Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Representative of the Fifth Indiana Congressional District, which includes Marion, Ind., the home of William Oatis, newspaper correspondent now imprisoned by the Czechoslovakian Government. Mr. BEAMER is the author of House Joint Concurrent Resolution 140, in behalf of William Oatis, which was passed by both Houses of the Congress.)

(Mr. BEAMER was asked to tell how he became personally interested in the Oatis case, and to explain his resolution.)

Mr. BEAMER. William Oatis was born and raised in Marion, Ind., which is in the Fifth Indiana District that I have the honor and privilege to represent. I never met William Oatis but I feel that I know him.

In April of this year, when the news of his arrest first came to our attention, I began to receive letters and telegrams from his friends in Marion, Ind., with urgent requests that something be done. These letters and resolutions came from his associates, from his Christian Church where he was a faithful member, from the YMCA in which he took an active part, from labor organizations that fight communism, from his former teachers, veterans' groups, and many others. They were repeated so often that I know from their sincerity that Oatis was their friend whom they wanted to help.

Oatis had chosen newspaper work as his career. His early work was with the Marion Chronicle Publishing Co. As a reporter he immediately proved his ability. He later was employed by the Associated Press in Indianapolis and shortly thereafter was transferred to Washington, D. C. Then came his assignment to Czechoslovakia, where he continued his work as a news correspondent. In this connection, Oatis was performing his duties as any newsman would do. Apparently, however, in Czechoslovakia, the normal gathering of news was interpreted as spying. This was the charge on which he

was arrested, and, also after a sham trial that was a farce, on which he was convicted.

Early in May, I introduced House Joint Concurrent Resolution 140, which expressed indignation and called upon the agencies of the United States Government and the United Nations to take action to secure the release of William Oatis. I also kept in touch with the State Department, but soon became convinced with others that little, if any, worth-while action was being taken. Accordingly, I submitted another resolution, which called for cancellation of trade relations with Czechoslovakia. Many other resolutions from members of both parties were submitted, but all of these resolutions remained in the House Foreign Affairs Committee and William Oatis remained in a rotting prison.

An aroused public opinion, as expressed by the press and the radio, found expression in action in this committee. The committee then sidetracked other important legislation to report the Oatis resolution to the House floor early in August. When this resolution came out of committee the provision to sever commercial relations was deleted, but an amendment on the floor of the House restored this worth-while and necessary provision that would make it more effective.

(Mr. BEAMER was asked the intent of his resolution.)

Mr. BEAMER. It expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States must protect its citizens. Since the usual procedure followed by other countries in behalf of a national were not recognized by the Communist-dominated Czechoslovakian government, it was felt that the most effective means would be to sever trade relations.

The pocketbook is an important part of any political economy. Only a few years ago the United States enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with Czechoslovakia but it has continued to dwindle until our exports to Czechoslovakia are an insignificant figure in comparison with her imports into our country.

For example, in the first 4 months of this year, our exports to Czechoslovakia were only slightly in excess of \$700,000, while the imports to the United States during the same period were in excess of \$11,000,000, or a balance of trade in favor of Czechoslovakia in the ratio of approximately 15 to 1.

Czechoslovakian exports are products made by slave labor and by so-called free labor that receives perhaps not more than 20 to 25 cents per hour, and their products complete with those made by American labor.

My resolution in behalf of William Oatis has passed both the House and Senate but a resolution is only as strong as the executive department, where it now rests, can or will make it.

For this reason, on August 22, I addressed a letter to President Truman, urging him to take the action that lies in his power. The President has replied that he was doing everything in his power to stop Czechoslovakian trade and communication with the West, and otherwise to secure the release of Mr. Oatis.

Newspaper reports recently indicated that Secretary of State Acheson handed the Czechoslovakian Ambassador Prochazka a copy of my resolution which was passed by the Congress.

It is hoped that the firmness expressed by the Congress in passing this resolution will be reflected in the same determination by the President and the Executive agencies of the Government.

Some of the methods employed to put into effect the cancellation of trade with Czechoslovakia are bearing fruit. First of all, travel visas were canceled and this had the effect of discouraging buyers from the United

States who might purchase Czechoslovakian products for resale in our country.

In today's newspapers we learn that the United States had won international authorization to scrap its trade and tariff concessions to Communist Czechoslovakia by a vote of 24 to 1, only Czechoslovakia voting against the United States' request. The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs approved the United States decision to end tariff concessions to Czechoslovakia. There also is the President's power under the basic Trade Agreements Act to withdraw any proclamation of reduced tariffs when it seems best in the public interest to do so. That method certainly would be most effective.

The new Czech Ambassador, who presented his ambassadorial credentials recently, is a top-notch Communist, trained in the highest circles of that Marxian philosophy, and he was a prominent author of the Czech Constitution and laws under which Oatis was convicted. He belongs to an order that recognizes only force and might.

If our Ambassador, Mr. Briggs, in Prague will make demands instead of requests, if our own State Department will depart from its apparent fear of "something," and if our President will show the same determination that was shown by many illustrious Presidents of this country in the past, then will the Czechoslovak Government begin to realize that the American people do not want appeasement and that the rights of American citizens are inviolate.

(Mr. BEAMER was asked what impression he gathered from the statement which Ambassador Prochazka made to the newspapermen on the Oatis case at the press conference which he held on September 25.)

Mr. BEAMER. It was interesting to note that Ambassador Prochazka, of Czechoslovakia, in his press conference on September 25 stated: "Negotiations looking toward the release of Oatis might be possible if the United States abandons its political economic warfare against Czechoslovakia."

Thus, it is apparent that Czechoslovakia is vitally concerned about the loss of trade with the United States. As previously stated, the pocketbook is a very sensitive part of the political economy of any country. This is especially true of Czechoslovakia, because apparently she wants American dollars to bolster her weakened economy, to carry on her propaganda and, perhaps, even to bull out convicted Communists.

For my part, and I know that the friends of Bill Oatis in his home city of Marion, Ind., and in the United States, share this feeling. I see no reason why or how we can trust the Czech Government, judged by its past actions to free Oatis if we withdraw the intention of this resolution.

It is gratifying that an aroused public opinion in this country now is being fruit, and I would urge that the executive agencies and the Congress of the United States continue steadfast in their demands.

There was some consideration of the severance of diplomatic relations. Editorial comment expresses the opinion that the Congress is doing its best but that the State Department was falling down badly on this matter.

Mere words are not effective weapons, but the Congress has expressed itself in adopting my resolution, which I appreciate, in behalf of the district that I represent and in which Bill Oatis was born and reared.

The question often has been asked why the executive department did not take this action without being pressured to do so by Congress. Perhaps its history of dealing with Communists within our own borders and in other countries is an answer to the above question.

With justification, many Members of the Congress have insisted that if Oatis is not released by the severance of commercial rela-

tions, then the next step would be to recall and remove all United States nationals from Czechoslovakia and close our Embassy and consulates in that country—in short, sever diplomatic relations.

This move must be considered very carefully, but action, and positive action, must be taken without delay. This action might be playing into their hands if our consulates were closed and Oatis cases could multiply if an attempt were made to remove our nationals.

Another reason that it seemed the better part of wisdom to impose only economic sanctions at this time is the fact that this would give another opportunity at a later date to sever diplomatic relations if it seemed necessary to do so to produce the desired results.

I remember so well the story of Theodore Roosevelt and his famous message to the Sultan of Morocco, "Perdicaris alive or Razula dead." In those days the American flag was respected, and other nations found it wise to heed the warning expressed by the motto of one of our famous fighting forces in earlier days—"Don't Tread on Me."

William Oatis is an American, a young man of promise, and he possesses a body that does not appear too strong. He is more than just a name in our country today. William Oatis is a symbol of the freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to fair trial—yes, even freedom of life.

Crusade for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have just received what I consider an accolade of high praise, consisting of an editorial from a Communist paper bitterly attacking me. The Communist paper to which I refer is *De Waarheid*, which is identified as the official organ of the Communist Party of the Netherlands and is published in The Hague.

An article in a recent issue of that publication, in the best Communist manner and tradition, attacks and vilifies a number of individuals in whose company I am proud to be. These include General Eisenhower, General Clay, Attorney General McGrath, and Commissioner Edward M. O'Connor, of the Displaced Persons Commission. This editorial was called to my attention by my good friend, Commissioner O'Connor, who felt as I did, that this criticism, leveled against both of us for our condemnation of the brutal mass deportations in Hungary, as well as for our association in the Crusade for Peace, is a mark of distinction. I am proud to be in such distinguished company as well as to raise my voice against crimes against humanity now being perpetrated in Hungary, and to associate myself with so many others in the great crusade for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a translation of this editorial from *De Waarheid*, the Dutch Communist newspaper, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHO ARE THE PEOPLE WHO DARE TO SPEAK OF HUMAN RIGHTS?—EISENHOWER, CLAY, MCGRATH, SENATOR LEHMAN, AND O'CONNOR AND COMPANY ORGANIZE CRUSADE FOR THE PEACE AND AGAINST DEPORTATIONS

The latest stunt of Wall Street imperialists is the American Crusade for Peace, which is said to be supported by 25,000,000 Americans. Unconsciously the USIS (the American Information Service) has proved once again that Wall Street is responsible for this act of warmongering, in that it mentions the names of the leaders of this action. And, as the old saying goes, "Names are hateful."

CRUSADE EISENHOWER

The USIS bulletin of September 5 says that the Crusade for Peace was inaugurated by a special radio broadcast from Paris in which General Eisenhower delivered the first address. Literally, he said, that every American should participate in this action inasmuch as it could prove an extremely important weapon in the struggle against Communist imperialism. The peoples behind the iron curtain long to hear the truth, for they are the victims of a godless dictatorship, he said.

It should be recalled that this Crusade for Peace is intended to combat communism in Europe and the Far East, and to this end, it is planned to strengthen Radio Free Europe.

So far all this does not sound very peaceable, but it is only directed against communism in an effort to cause the peoples of the Peoples' Democracies, of the German Democratic Republic, and of the Republic of Communist China to revolt against their governments.

We may be permitted to describe in a few words the noble crusaders against Communist imperialism and godless dictatorship; a description which is lacking in the USIS bulletin.

Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower belongs to the Rockefeller set, which dominates all oil interests. Himself a capitalist, he was directly appointed by Wall Street and the Standard Oil Co. to defend the interests of this corporation.

Who talks of imperialism and godlessness? Or does the Rockefeller-man Eisenhower perhaps represent the millions of poor American Christians?

As chairman of the action committee of the Crusade for Peace the USIS bulletin mentions Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

It is generally known that General Clay was Supreme Commander of the American Army of Occupation in Germany after the Second World War and in this capacity repeatedly gave provocation to the Soviet Union.

Like Eisenhower, Clay is also a capitalist and more in particular an instrument of J. P. Morgan, the world's richest banker, who has complete control of the United States Steel Corp.

General Clay is a director of the New York bank, the Marine Midland Trust and of the Newmont Mining Corp. (Morgan). He is president of the board of directors of the canning monopoly, Continental Can, and one of the directors of the Lehman Corp., an investment trust with a registered capital of more than \$100,000,000, which we will soon again mention.

CRUSADE M'GRATH

Another leader of the Crusade for Peace mentioned in the USIS bulletin is J. Howard McGrath, holding the highest position in the United States in the field of justice. Crusader McGrath is also a millionaire—although a modest one as he has "merely" \$4,000,000—but then he is only a henchman. Ten years ago he had only \$25,000. Now he

is a millionaire shareholder in a race course. He is the man who before a Senate commission declared that the American Department of Justice had no authority to expel the king of the underworld, Costello, one of the most ill-famed gangsters, as there was insufficient evidence against him. Like his political associate Harry Truman, now President of the United States and once supported by the gangster Pendergast, McGrath never seriously combated the American gangsters. On the contrary, the American "upper ten" and the American underworld maintain the closest relations.

And this very McGrath and his supporters, millionaires and lackeys of imperialism, are bent on "bringing the true facts before the people behind the iron curtain and on restoring freedom to them"

CRUSADER O'CONNOR

In addition to this message re the Crusade of Peace the USIS bulletin disseminates for the umpteenth time slander and distortions of the "mass deportations" in Hungary. On page 8 of the USIS Bulletin one reads the idiotic statement that "the mass deportations under the Communist reign demonstrate clearly that a plan has been set in motion to exterminate the Hungarians as a race of people." As long ago as May 20, 1950, the *Algemeen Handelsblad* (anything but a Communist paper) was better informed when it reported on the ever rising standard of living of the masses in the new Hungary.

This hysterical account of the extermination of the Hungarian people is the product of Edward M. O'Connor, the American delegate to the Displaced Persons Committee. This Mr. O'Connor reports that prominent people from all segments of the Hungarian people are being transported to unknown destinations. Of course, in the case of Mr. O'Connor, the wish is the father of the thought, for those who were removed from Budapest—a complete list can be found in the Hungarian paper *Szabad Nep* of August 7—were prominent people during the Fascist Horthy regime. Over 3,000 were deported: former members of the Ministries, former factory owners, former bankers, former merchants, former land owners, and their closest associates, in short the former Eisenhowers, McGraths, and O'Connors in Hungary, who attempted to make Budapest a center of conspiracy.

CRUSADER LEHMAN

In the same breath the USIS Bulletin mentions Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, who is in such a hurry to escape the fate of the Horthy Fascists—which inevitably will overtake him once the American people have gotten rid of imperialism—that he urges the American Senate to start direct warlike action. The United States must take all practical measure to bring Communist-created terror in Hungary to an end.

Who is Senator LEHMAN?

Jointly, with his brother Arthur, he controls the investment trust of which his fellow crusader, General Clay, is director: the Lehman Corp. He has close and personal relations with President Harry Truman. Benjamin Bittenweiler, his brother's brother-in-law, is deputy to the present super-American in Western Germany, General McCloy (who, by his marriage, is closely connected with the capitalistic monopoly and a brother-in-law of Chancellor Adenauer).

CRUSADERS TRUMAN AND ACHESON

We have referred to Mr. Truman several times in the foregoing. His Foreign Secretary, Dean Acheson, and he, himself, are closely watching the deportations in Hungary—according to the USIS bulletin.

Both gentlemen are denouncing it. Of anyone who, like Acheson, has interests in the Standard Oil concern, this is understandable. In addition, Acheson is allied with

Morgan (United States Steel) via Fred Searls, a director of the Newmont Mining Corp., and Herbert Swope whose brother was, for many years, a director of General Electric

A PEACE PACT BETWEEN THE BIG FIVE

The 60 families of the monopolists and their lackeys cannot carry on a war on their own against the Socialist part of the world. Hence, Truman has thus far not dared to definitely waive the proposal of the Soviet Union to conclude a five-power pact.

No one should believe that the warmongers cannot be forced to conclude a peace. This will be done the moment they will be isolated and will have been denounced before an overwhelming majority of humanity.

Inland Waterways Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion of recent changes in the management of the Inland Waterways Corporation. In order that the situation may be understood I am including in the RECORD the following correspondence:

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1951

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mr. William Duval, assistant clerk to the House Appropriations Committee, stated that you would like an explanation of the item appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on September 24, 1951, relative to Captain Ingersoll's resignation as President of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

Under date of April 3, 1951, Captain Ingersoll on behalf of himself and certain employees of the barge line, asked the Secretary of Commerce for permission to submit a proposal to organize a private corporation to purchase or lease the facilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation. The Secretary considered it highly improper for him to grant such permission, since it would involve the sale or lease of Government property to Government employees who were then engaged in the management of same. The Secretary told Captain Ingersoll that he should forget having submitted such a proposal and give his full time and attention to the operation of the line in the hope of reducing the annual deficit, instead of attempting to purchase the line.

Under date of September 13, 1951, the Secretary again received from Captain Ingersoll and certain of his associates a request for permission to organize a private corporation to purchase the assets of the Inland Waterways Corporation. The Secretary considered that Captain Ingersoll's action indicated gross insubordination and ordered his immediate dismissal. However, the Secretary did modify his original decision and permitted Captain Ingersoll to resign. A copy of pertinent correspondence is attached hereto.

The Globe-Democrat article of September 24, 1951, quotes Captain Ingersoll as saying that Secretary Sawyer had turned down at least four important proposals for the sale of the system. The four proposals he refers to are:

1. The proposal of Captain Ingersoll discussed above.

2. The proposal submitted December 15, 1947, by Mr. Theodore Brent, of New Orleans, representing the Committee Favoring Private Operation of the Federal Barge Line. This offer was predicated upon Congress passing remedial legislation which was not enacted.

3. The proposal by Henry DeBardeleben, of New Orleans, representing 13 barge lines, to lease the Inland Waterways Corporation facilities for 5 years with an option to buy. This offer was rejected by the Secretary, after consultation with the Advisory Board of the Corporation and members of his staff, as being wholly inadequate for the purpose of preserving the common carrier water service in accordance with congressional edict. In addition, it failed to provide for the necessary rehabilitation of equipment. The press release of February 15, 1950, which includes the Secretary's letter of rejection is attached hereto.

4. The proposal submitted by Arnold G. Stifel, of St. Louis, representing a group of New York, New Orleans, and St. Louis bankers. This proposal was rejected by the Secretary, after consulting with the Advisory Board and members of his staff, as not being adequate. A more detailed explanation of this is to be found in the letter of the Acting Solicitor dated February 20, 1951, to Mr. Stifel, a copy of which is attached.

With further reference to the Globe-Democrat article of September 24, I am at a loss to understand Captain Ingersoll's statement that Sawyer talks one way and acts another. The Secretary has been outspoken in his desire to transfer the operations of the Federal Barge Line to private interests just as soon as private interests will undertake the responsibility of rendering to the people in the Mississippi Valley the type of common carrier water service required by statute. The Secretary has encouraged the submission of offers and when same have been rejected he has invited revised proposals in the hope of obtaining an offer which he could accept under existing law.

The Secretary has, however, urged the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to rehabilitate the Corporation so as to replace that portion of its boats and barges which are obsolete, and which range from 20 to 30 years of age. He feels that the Corporation can then be put on a paying basis with no further loss to the Federal Treasury, can furnish adequate common carrier service to the people in the Mississippi Valley, and can operate on a sound financial basis, thereby enhancing the opportunity for sale to private operators.

If there is any additional information you desire, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

SOUTH THIMBLE, JR.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1951.

HON. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is my resignation.

When I accepted the position of president of the Inland Waterways Corporation 5 years ago it was with little knowledge of the task I was undertaking. I found a vast and moribund Government enterprise with no direction and little hope for the future. My examination of this enterprise convinced me that it was the intent of Congress 27 years ago that it be converted into a successful private enterprise as rapidly as possible. Toward this single goal I have labored under succeeding Secretaries of Commerce.

It has been my great good fortune to secure the assistance of as capable a staff as can be found in the river business; the measure of their worth can be seen in the progress they have made from multimillion

dollar annual losses to the modest profit achieved in the year just ended.

Progress toward financial success has been made unduly difficult by the well-known dubious condition of the Corporation's fleet, and I have accordingly watched with hope and disappointment the repeated efforts to secure funds from Congress and the Congress' refusal to finance this enterprise further.

Although I was a little skeptical of the willingness of private capital to take on the burden of this enterprise in the light of its record, nevertheless I encouraged and fostered the several would-be purchasers who have come forward in the last 5 years, and have been concerned at their regular failure to conclude a purchase of the Corporation.

The recent failure to secure the consent of Congress to the commercial financing of the rehabilitation of the fleet convinced me and my staff that only by the sale of the Corporation as a going concern could the rehabilitation of the fleet be accomplished and the future of the Corporation assured. We believe that only as a free enterprise can this barge line rebuild itself and survive to perform the services which have become so vital to the shipping public in the Mississippi Valley.

Accordingly, after endless study we prepared and submitted to you a proposal that the management staff, the men most directly concerned with the survival of the enterprise, organize a private corporation to purchase and operate the facilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation. We were confident that as a free enterprise we could finance the necessary rehabilitation and operate the barge line successfully. This proposal represented the culmination of 5 years' work to me, and its rejection leaves me, its chief architect, no alternative but to resign, effective at your convenience.

The work of the past 5 years has been an absorbing task, rewarding in many ways. It is with considerable reluctance that I leave it but since I cannot sympathize with the further continuation of the Inland Waterways Corporation as a Government enterprise, my usefulness is obviously at an end.

Respectfully yours,

A. C. INGERSOLL, Jr.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1951

Capt A. C. INGERSOLL, Jr.,

Inland Waterways Corporation,

St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR CAPTAIN INGERSOLL: I have your letter of September 21 in which you resign your position with Inland Waterways Corporation. This will constitute my acceptance of your resignation, and I have named Mr. W. C. Oliphant as acting president. He will relieve you on Tuesday, September 25, 1951.

I will comment upon only one of the points made in your letter. As you well know, I too, have had as a final goal the transfer of this enterprise from Government to private operation under the conditions which the Congress has laid down. Meanwhile, we are obliged to operate the line and this cannot be accomplished successfully by employees who are giving their attention to the possibility of winding it up. In order to make my position clear, I will not, as a matter of public policy, consider the sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation to any of its employees, past or present.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

(Copies to Mr. Henry Scherer and Mr. South Trimble.)

SEPTEMBER 26, 1951.

Memorandum to Mr. W. G. Oliphant, Acting President.

It may be well for me to send this message in order to dispel any concern on the part

of employees of the barge line who signed the request for permission to purchase which was engineered and promoted by Mr. A. C. Ingersoll, Jr., while serving as President of the Corporation.

The Secretary decided to discharge Mr. Ingersoll and asked for his resignation when it became clear that he was persisting, in spite of instructions from the Secretary, in his effort to engineer the purchase of the barge line from the Federal Government. While the Secretary felt that the sole interest of the employees should be in making it a success and not in preparing to liquidate it, he believes the responsibility for this activity rested entirely with Mr. Ingersoll. The Secretary of Commerce has told me that no one of them need worry about his job, and I would like to have you pass this word on.

Now that Mr. Ingersoll is out of the picture, I know that those remaining will give loyal and enthusiastic support to making the operation a success for the benefit of the shippers of the Midwest.

SOUTH TRIMBLE, Jr.
Chairman, Advisory Board

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF COMMERCE,

Washington, D. C., February 15, 1950

Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer today announced that, after a thorough review by the Department of Commerce and by the Advisory Board of the Inland Waterways Corporation, he had rejected a proposal by a group of private carriers for leasing the transportation facilities of the Corporation. The proposal was rejected, Secretary Sawyer said, because it failed to make adequate provision for rehabilitation necessary to provide proper service to the public, particularly to small shippers, and because it did not make adequate provision for getting the Government out of the business.

The Secretary stated that he was in favor of transferring the Federal Barge Line to private hands under conditions providing assurance of satisfactory service and reasonable expectation of profit. He stated further that he would be glad to consider any proposal that would accomplish that result.

In a letter to Henry F. DeBardeleben, of Birmingham, Ala., who represented the private carriers, Secretary Sawyer said: "The proposal, in my opinion, does not make adequate provision for rehabilitation of the Federal Barge Line with the most modern and efficient equipment, without which I do not consider satisfactory operation of the line possible, either in terms of service rendered or of financial returns. Neither the Government nor private enterprise can provide the type of service called for without the equipment needed to do the job."

The Secretary pointed out that rehabilitation was of particular importance in providing satisfactory service to small shippers of less than barge-load merchandise traffic.

The reaction of the Advisory Board of the Inland Waterways Corporation was expressed in a resolution on the proposal which it adopted at its meeting last week in St. Louis. The text of the resolution follows:

"While the Board favors transfer of the Federal Barge Line to private enterprise under conditions assuring satisfactory common carrier service and rates, the Board does not consider that the proposed lease give this assurance. The Board recommends that further efforts be made to get a completely satisfactory proposal for private operation of the Federal Barge Line which would provide assurance of satisfactory service at reasonable rates through rehabilitation of the Federal Barge Line with the most modern and efficient equipment. The Board also recommends that any lease or sale should provide that the lessee or purchaser take over the rights and liabilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation with respect to terminals. Since the Board is of the opinion that the improvements contemplated in the rehabilitation

program now before Congress will be needed after as well as before transfer to private operation and cannot be delayed without seriously endangering the services rendered by Inland Waterways Corporation, the Board strongly recommends that the Secretary urge prompt completion of congressional action authorizing and making appropriations for the proposed rehabilitation."

Members of the Advisory Board are: T. J. Maloney, Chicago, Ill.; George Call, Sioux City, Iowa; Frank E. Bourgeois, New Orleans, La.; Col. Malcolm Elliott, St. Louis, Mo.; Thomas N. Beach, Birmingham, Ala.; Henry M. Baskerville, Minneapolis, Minn., and chairman, South Trimble, Jr.

The Inland Waterways Corporation, organized as a Government agency, took over operation of the Mississippi-Warrior service from the War Department in 1924. The Corporation was transferred to the Commerce Department in 1939. It operates over 3,300 miles of riverway through 21 municipally owned or leased terminals, in addition to many private terminals. Its equipment consists of 21 boats and some 250 barges.

The text of Secretary Sawyer's letter to Mr. DeBardeleben is attached:

FEBRUARY 14, 1950.

Mr. HENRY F. DEBARDELEBEN,

Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. DEBARDELEBEN: I have given careful consideration to the proposal for leasing the Federal Barge Line which you made on behalf of a number of private carriers in your letter of January 12, 1950. I have also had my staff review the proposal and, as you know, the matter has been submitted to the Advisory Board of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and their recommendations have been obtained.

When I undertook responsibility for the Inland Waterways Corporation as Secretary of Commerce, I reviewed the entire matter to determine whether operation of the Corporation by the Government was still necessary and in the best interests of the public and the Government. This review led me to the conclusion that satisfactory common carrier service, particularly for less than barge-load merchandise traffic, can be provided at reasonable rates, on a profitable basis, but only if the Federal Barge Line is thoroughly rehabilitated and modernized with the most up-to-date and efficient equipment, both on the water and at the terminals. The service provided by the *Harry S. Truman* and the integrated tow demonstrates the benefits of modern and efficient equipment. It was on the basis of this study and this experience that I have recommended the rehabilitation program now under consideration by Congress. If the line were rehabilitated and modernized in accordance with this program, I am convinced that private enterprise would find it desirable to take over the operation of the line, on terms satisfactory both to the Government's financial interests and to the interests of the customers of the line and the public generally.

I have given particular attention to the proposal you have submitted, because it appeared that it might provide a suitable means of bringing about a transfer of the line to private hands. However, on the basis of our study of the proposal, I have come to the conclusion that the proposal does not provide a satisfactory basis for termination of the Government's activities.

The proposal, in my opinion, does not make adequate provision for rehabilitation of the Federal Barge Line with the most modern and efficient equipment, without which I do not consider satisfactory operation of the line possible, either in terms of service rendered or of financial returns. Neither the Government nor private enterprise can provide the type of service called for without the equipment needed to do the job.

In addition, the proposal, limited as it is to the transportation facilities, would

leave the Government encumbered with responsibilities and financial liabilities with respect to the terminals served by and serving the line, without control over the traffic for which the terminals were built and without an assured income to meet the financial obligations involved. This would leave the Government in an untenable position. Furthermore, I am as much interested in getting the Government out of the terminal business as I am in getting it out of the barge business.

Accordingly, I am unable to accept the proposal made in your letter of January 12, 1950.

I appreciate the efforts you have made to reach the goal we both wish to reach, transfer of the Federal Barge Line to private hands, under conditions providing assurance of satisfactory service to the customers of the line and the public generally and providing a reasonable expectation of profit for the business, without which satisfactory service would not be possible. If the group you represent could present a proposal which would give more adequate assurance of accomplishing these ends, I shall be glad to consider it.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce

FEBRUARY 20, 1951.

Mr. ARNOLD G. STIFEL,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. STIFEL: In your letter to me of February 15, 1951, you request further information about the basis of the Secretary's decision that the proposal made by your group for the purchase of the Inland Waterways Corporation was not acceptable.

As your letter indicates, the Secretary has on numerous occasions stated that he wishes to carry out the duty imposed on him by law to sell the Federal Barge Line to private interests, as soon as the various statutory requirements have been met, if an offer is received which he considers acceptable, both from the point of view of the Government's financial interests and from the point of view of protection of the territory served by the line through assurance of continued service.

As your letter also indicates, Assistant Secretary Davis, Mr. Trimble, and I felt that the proposal submitted by your group on January 17, 1951, deserved thorough consideration by the Advisory Board of the Inland Waterways Corporation and by the Secretary, as it provided for an investment of new capital in the business and for a substantial purchase price, even if somewhat delayed, and as it provided some degree of assurance that continued service would be provided. Whether the offer would be accepted, we could not, of course, state, though we were compelled to point out that some of the secondary conditions specified were clearly not acceptable, such as the commitment to provide steel and the commitment to provide an RFC loan.

In accordance with our advice to you, the proposal was presented to the Advisory Board and to the Secretary, and, as my letter of February 10, 1951, stated, the matter was reviewed and considered at length by both the Board and the Secretary.

It was on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Board, and his own review of the proposal, that the Secretary decided not to accept the proposal. I understand that this decision was based partly on his opinion that the offer did not compensate the Government adequately for the property to be transferred, and partly on his opinion that the proposal did not provide sufficient assurance that the service now provided by the line could be maintained in the future. The Secretary's decision was not based, of course, on the reasonableness or fairness of the proposal, but upon his opinion of the desirability of the proposal to the Government and to the territory served by the line.

I had intended in my letter to make it clear that the Secretary would be glad to discuss with you in person, or with your group, the factors which entered into his decision, if you would care to do so. Please let me know if you would like me to make an appointment with him for this purpose, or if I can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW HALE,
Acting Solicitor.
(Copies to Mr. Trimble, Assistant Secretary Davis.)

Governor Murray, of Oklahoma, Blasts Federal Domination of States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Tulsa Tribune of October 16, 1951. Our Governor, Governor Murray, of Oklahoma, blasts Federal domination of the States. It is worthy of interest for the reason that Governor Murray is a staunch Democrat and apparently is convinced that the Federal Government is dominating the States to a degree that is almost intolerable.

The article follows:

MURRAY BLASTS FEDERAL DOMINATION OF STATES

CHICAGO, October 16.—Gov. Johnston Murray of Oklahoma, today charged that the national administration is violating "every conception of States' rights and local self-control," and called up the plain folks to stop it with his one-word prescription—action.

Murray, addressing the United States Independent Telephone Association here, urged the people to put an end to centralized power in Washington by returning more self-government to the States.

"The National Government," said Murray in a speech he called nonpolitical, "to keep up the ever-increasing hordes that have attached themselves like leeches to the body politic, has invaded every known field of taxation—a thing, which prior to passage of the income-tax amendment, was virtually unknown."

"And we now find both the States and the National Government alike imposing every conceivable type and kind of taxes."

"That's not all," he warned. "While one horde imposes, another is delving into the depths of human ingenuity, seeking to invent more and different kinds to impose."

Dwelling at great length on how the Constitution of this country was born, and the ideals which were incorporated into it, Murray said that such overlapping of the power to tax never entered into the minds or thoughts of the Founding Fathers of this great Nation.

The Oklahoma chief executive declared his speech was strictly nonpolitical, then explained why. As he did so, there was a degree of contradiction in his statement, particularly as to his criticism of the present National Government.

Just a few days ago the governor declared he would not join a States' rights revolt against the administration. He said he would stick with the regular Democratic Party.

"Let me say . . . that my remarks here are intended to be, and are, strictly nonpolitical and that the evils of which I

speak are as strong in one locality as they are in another.

"It is the over-all trends to which I refer, and not to specific instances, and therefore when I speak of the National Government, or of State governments, let it not be construed that I am speaking in condemnation of the present administration."

Later, he said, "It is not my intention here to enter into a defensive discussion of the national tendencies."

Murray said that although from time to time, since the Constitution was framed, onslaughts were made to enlarge the powers of the central Government and limit the sovereignty of the States.

Then he stated "until the last quarter of a century . . . we regained what might be termed a constitutional equilibrium," but that during that 25-year period "we find the ark which contains the covenant swiftly drifting toward the precipice of doom."

He then charged that the gradual and willing surrender that has been made by the people and the States to the central Government is more responsible for the Government's economic ills than any other single contributing factor known to us at this time.

"Sure," he declared, "we cuss, condemn, criticize, and castigate the President, Congress, the bureaucrats, and the many alphabetical divisions of the National Government for a condition which we know is wrong, and which is gradually but surely leading us to the place where rights of the individual and of the States will vanish into oblivion."

He said many of the surrenders he charged to people and the States have been made under the "sugar-coated guise of benefits to be received." Under such conditions, he contended, the National Government is taking from the States their rights and privileges in matters of education, public roads, public health, and the like.

This, the States have deliberately placed into the lap of the Federal Government and, in effect, said "Here is our business, here are our rights, here are our individual privileges. Take them, become our master, let us be your slaves," Murray said.

"So," declared Murray dramatically, "while these seeming benefits flow back, by reason of our surrenders, to us from the National Government, we should pause, think, and look toward the horizon when we come to the end of the trail and stand dejected, looking into the abyss, the last vestige of individualism and retained power torn from us, while we are ground away and rendered lifeless, an infinitesimal cog in the wheels of statism."

Murray called attention to the fact that many of these powers the Federal Government is exercising today—which he said violate every conception of States' rights and local self-control—have been caused by the willful and voluntary surrender by the States of their own rights and privileges.

"Year after year, session after session, we find our State legislatures entering into compacts, passing laws authorizing the creation of entities which have for their purpose dealing with the Federal Government and surrendering the rights of the States to exercise their power in matters such as public welfare and many others of vast importance."

"We know full well when we do it that if the Federal Government is going to underwrite a program for any purpose, that it is going to exercise complete control over the project so underwritten whatever it may be," Murray continued.

He said the advocates of strong centralization are neither willing to rest nor be satisfied, they seek now to enter the fields of private industry, private professions, and that this is particularly true in the public utilities division of private enterprise.

He then explained why he vetoed the Rural Telephone Act passed by the Oklahoma Legislature last session.

"I vetoed it because it seemed to be an effort to strengthen the theory of strong centralization and special privileges instead of an advocacy of the sovereign rights of the State," he declared.

"I might have been wrong, but to me it seemed to be an act that had for its purpose broadening the gate through which the Federal Government might invade a private utility," Murray said.

He said he could find no reason why a cooperative corporation should enjoy special privileges and immunities simply because it bore the name "cooperative."

"I have long taken the position that such exemptions in the matter of taxation whenever and wherever granted, are basically, fundamentally, and economically unsound."

"My father (W. H. 'Alfalfa Bill' Murray) before me advocated this doctrine," Murray said, "and vigorously opposed tax exemptions while he was Governor of Oklahoma."

"But other administrations have seen fit to grant special tax exemptions until those exempt almost equal the number of those who pay. In fact, they may exceed the number of those who pay," he said.

Murray then said the plain folks have been sleeping, and that Rip Van Winkle was a piker as compared to the sleeping proclivities of the taxpaying American citizen who ought to be awake.

He declared the Oklahoma Legislature received his requests for rigid economy in State government with fear and trembling.

"Throughout the session," he charged, "I was never able to create the public demand" for his innovations, such as retrenchment in Government activities, abolition of overlapping boards, commissions, and department, and a complete new system of tax evaluation and assessment.

He said the plain folks ought to be willing to surrender some individual liberties and their States some sovereignty when matters of national security are in jeopardy, but that in our zeal to give, they must not fail to say to the Federal Government.

"These rights and privileges (temporary surrender in time of emergency) must be returned when the emergency ceases to exist."

In conclusion, Governor Murray said that unless a man is willing to fight for what he believes is right in the administration of his government; fight until he is bloody and beaten, then stagger to his feet and fight some more, he should not be heard to complain about the manner in which it is operated.

"On the other hand, you show me a citizenship that is informed, alert, and which approaches, and which considers the business of its government a part of its business, and I will show you a nation that will stand against the ravages of 'isms,' creeds, and time."

All Engineers Are More or Less Definite in Their Opinion That Our Coal Reserves Will Greatly Outlast, by Hundreds of Years, Our Supply of Petroleum and Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, all civilization is powered by the fuels which give man the energy with which to build, and with which to make war. All our

sources of energy—coal, wood, water power, oil, natural gas, atomic power, power from the sun's rays—are of the utmost importance. On the one hand we must conserve, and on the other develop the most efficient means of using the energy sources we have. This is emphasized by the fact that the assured reserves of petroleum are only 16 times the recent average annual production. The assured reserves of natural gas are only 38 times the recent average annual production. Of course, it is recognized that new sources in the course of exploration and development will be found, but the fact remains that of the total area of the United States which has been definitely tested by drilling for oil and gas only 2 percent has proved to be productive.

On the other hand the recoverable reserves of coal in the United States amount to 484 times the recent average annual production.

Some experimentation is being carried on by the United States Bureau of Mines in the field of coal gasification, such as the experiment at Gorgas, in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which is a joint endeavor by the Bureau of Mines and the Alabama Power Co.

It is my judgment that all experimentation in the field of synthetic liquid fuels should be speeded up against the day when the drain on our petroleum fuels may be so heavy as to make it immediately practical that we go into widespread production of synthetic liquid fuels. I think the day has arrived when our experimentation in this field should be greatly expanded. It was with this thought in mind that I introduced in this session of Congress House Resolution 471, a bill to authorize the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation. I am hopeful that the second session of the Eighty-second Congress will take this bill up and pass it to the end that experimentation in this field may point the way to new methods in the use of the energy inherent in coal.

The experiments in coal gasification, such as the one at Gorgas, Ala., can be regarded in the light of national insurance against the day when our need for synthetic liquid fuels may become acute.

Mr. Speaker, the coal industry has had its troubles for several years now. In 1949 the economy of many areas dependent upon coal suffered greatly. The coal-producing part of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, suffered considerably. In the Eighty-first Congress I introduced a bill—H. R. 7660—providing for the establishment of a commission to investigate and study the conditions and problems of the coal industry and report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations. I believe we made a mistake in our failure to enact this bill into law. True enough, conditions brought about by the impact of the Korean war and our resulting preparedness program have improved

the immediately existing conditions in the coal industry, but I believe the underlying problems in the industry are just as great now as they were then.

I believe now is an excellent time for the appointment of a commission to study the coal industry, so that it might make a more objective study and investigation when the immediate conditions of unemployment in the industry are not as pressing as they will likely become when the present war and defense program are over.

One happy development for the coal industry in recent years is the expanding use of coal for generation of electric power. In 1950 the utilities of the Nation used 92,000,000 tons of coal—18 percent of the national production.

At least one eminent authority has estimated that the use of kilowatt-hours of electricity will expand from the 275,000,000,000 of 1950 to 634,000,000,000 in 1965, or an increase of 250 percent in the next 15 years. It is then estimated that the electrical industry will use 211,000,000 tons of coal annually, or 41 percent of the production rate of 1950.

The Alabama coal fields will, of course, share in this increased use of coal for electrical generation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the major portion of a very fine address entitled "The Future Outlook of the Fuel Supply for the Southeast," delivered by Dr. Milton H. Fies, consulting mining engineer, Birmingham, Ala., before the Southeastern Electric Exchange, at Richmond, Va., October 4, 1951, in which he deals with present and future developments in the field of coal and other basic fuels. The address follows:

THE FUTURE OUTLOOK OF THE FUEL SUPPLY FOR THE SOUTHEAST

(By Milton H. Fies)

My reason for accepting the invitation to talk with you about fuel is to pay my respects and, as a mining engineer, to acknowledge the noteworthy and conspicuous achievements of the utility engineers who have enabled the people of our country as a whole during the past 10 years to obtain a product so essential to their daily lives on a cost basis equal to or less than that which prevailed at the beginning of this decade, despite the inordinate increases in every item which goes to make that cost.

The increase during the 10-year period 1939-49 in essential commodities necessary to the operation and maintenance of utilities runs something like this: Building materials, 114 percent; structural steel, 68 percent; lumber, 208 percent; nonferrous metals, such as copper and aluminum, 85 percent; motor vehicles, 91 percent; textile products, 100 percent; farm products, 153 percent; labor (all manufacturing industries), 120 percent; coal, 97 percent. Notwithstanding these factors and because of increased consumption, there has been a decrease in the cost of electricity from 1939 to 1949 of 14 percent to all consumers in the Nation. If I may be pardoned for referring to Alabama, the average cost per kilowatt-hour sold to residential consumers has been reduced 28.2 percent in that period; rural consumption, 34.7 percent; commercial lighting and power consumption, urban, 26.7 percent; and the industrial consumers, 1.1 percent. This record and that of the industry as a whole cannot be described other than by the word distinguished, and since I am only a part-time employee of utilities, I can, therefore, with less reluctance insist that this accomplishment should be

more widely proclaimed from the housetops. I know of no other group of engineers or administrative officials whose accomplishments measure up to those of electric utilities and I am happy to salute you. I doubt that you will be able to maintain this record due to great increases in your cost components since 1949, but what you have accomplished has no equal.

In our discussions of fuel this morning, because of my own lack of information, I am able to make only a passing reference to the use of atomic power in the production of electricity by utilities. This problem, as you are no doubt aware, is subject to intensive research. The recent determination on the part of the Government to build a submarine to be propelled by atomic power is at least some indication of its practicality without reference to cost, but we have no definite information as to the possibility of its use in the immediate future by utilities. Some authorities state that they can see no great probability of its use within 30 years. Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University, on a visit to the State of Alabama during the past year stated that in his opinion the use of power obtained from the underground gasification of coal held greater possibility than the industrial use of atomic energy. Howard W. Blakeslee, scientific editor for the Associated Press, in reporting on the meeting of the American Chemical Society in New York on September 5, quoted Dr. Conant as predicting that "our power will come in another half century from the sun's rays rather than atomic fission." This statement from so eminent an authority warrants serious scrutiny. But, since in considering the industrial use of atomic power we are dealing with an unknown, it is impossible to give atomic industrial power authentic position in our discussion today.

You have a great stake in this matter of fuel because of its essentiality in the production of electricity in the future. You have become one of the largest consumers of coal and you are justly classed as one of the largest consumers of fuel oil and natural gas and the trends indicate that you will greatly increase your consumption of fuel as the years roll on. The consumption of coal by the Nation's utilities in 1950 was 91,865,978 tons, approximately 18 percent of the Nation's production, 75,287,618 barrels of oil, and 627,978,581,000 cubic feet of gas. If we take 4.167 barrels of oil and 24.962 cubic feet of gas to one ton of coal, the total consumption of fuel on a coal basis for 1950 amounted to 135,103,983 tons. The oil which was used in 1950, if converted to coal, amounts to in excess of 18,000,000 tons and the gas in excess of 25,000,000 tons. The consumption of fuel by utilities through May of this year is at a greater rate than for 1950.

At the May meeting of the American Mining Congress in Cleveland, Ohio, in an address entitled "Coal and Kilowatts," Mr. L. R. Ludwig, assistant to the vice president in charge of industrial products, of the Westinghouse Electric Corp., made these observations. The market analysis of his company, which is a large manufacturer of electric machinery, estimated that the sale of kilowatt-hours will increase from 275,000,000,000 in 1950 to 634,000,000,000 in 1965, or two and one-half times. As compared to the approximately 82,000,000 tons of coal consumed by the electric industry in 1950, it is calculated you will burn a minimum of 211,000,000 tons in 1965. The total will, no doubt, according to Mr. Ludwig, exceed this figure since it is doubtful that the percentage of oil and gas consumed by the industry, namely 33 percent of the total, can be maintained. The cost of fuel for all electric-generating plants, large and small, represented on the average 74 percent of the total cost. This constitutes the most important item in your cost and it will no doubt prove to be more important as time passes. The

cost of mining, the effectiveness of coal preparation, particularly as to moisture reduction, and coal freight rates, in short the delivered price of coal, is a matter for vital consideration as far as your future is concerned.

Mechanical and electrical engineers have made almost unbelievable strides in reducing coal consumption per kilowatt-hour; nevertheless, as we understand engineering principles today, you have reached a point near the end of that road. In 1900 generating plant performance was such that, on the average, it was necessary to burn 7 pounds of coal for each kilowatt-hour produced, but by 1950 plant design and performance had improved to such an extent that, on the average, it was only necessary to burn 1.19 pounds of coal per kilowatt-hour, and as little as three-quarters of a pound of coal in some of the newest steam plants. Certainly marvelous progress has been made in this respect. The turbine designer made his contribution to this progress. In 1900 the first turbines required steam with a heat content of 23,000 B. t. u. for each kilowatt-hour produced, but by 1950 the heat requirements had decreased almost two-thirds, and only about 8,000 B. t. u. in the form of steam were required per kilowatt-hour produced. Considering the design and material problems involved this showing has not been excelled, so far as I know, by any other engineering group. But Mr. Ludwig raises this question: What of steam turbines tomorrow? He states that Westinghouse engineers took a machine of 1,200 and 3,206 pounds pressure (which is the pressure at which water and steam have the same density) and found that such a machine should produce 8 percent more kilowatt-hours per ton of coal than a 1,050" 2,000-pound turbine, both employing reheat. This, these engineers calculated, would give the thermal about a 40-percent efficiency, as compared to today's anticipated best of about 37 percent.

The opportunities, therefore, for economy in the production of electricity under presently understood engineering principles lie, it seems to me, in improvement in coal mining technique, better preparation and drying of coal and better transportation methods. It is to these elements of cost that your attention must be directed. After exploring the location and extent of the fuel reserves in the country, and more particularly in the Southeast, we shall consider the contribution the electrical industry can make in furthering these means of reducing the cost of its product by directing your talents and ingenuity to this all-important end.

In considering the fuel reserves of the United States and the methods employed in estimating these reserves, particularly with reference to coal, the results in all cases must be regarded as approximate. It has been stated by some geologists that the estimates of our petroleum and natural-gas reserves are generally regarded as proven, though not in the sense that mining engineers refer to coal as measured or proven. But even when limiting specifications such as thickness, depth of deposit, etc., in determining the coal reserves of the United States, all engineers are more or less definite in their opinion that our coal reserves will greatly outlast, by hundreds of years, our supply of petroleum and natural gas. There are some mining engineers who decry the assumptions on which the estimates of our coal reserves are made that coal 14 inches in thickness, down to depths of 3,000 feet, will never be regarded as workable. Who is there amongst us who could attempt to discount what engineers may accomplish 100 years from now? When one considers the progress of the past 50 years in mine engineering and mechanization, to attempt to read into 20 generations our standards of today strikes me as being nothing short of foolhardy. But even

with the restricted specifications imposed on recent estimates of coal in the United States, we need have no concern for hundreds of years to come. The United States Geological Survey in its November 1950 Progress Report on the Nation's Coal Resources made this comment. Calculations, "based more conservatively on appraisals of proved or definitely assured reserves show that the assured recoverable reserves of coal in the United States are 484 times the recent average annual production, the assured reserves of petroleum are 16 times the average annual production; and the assured reserves of natural gas are 38 times the average annual production."

Figure 1 [not printed] shows the coal fields of the United States from a map prepared by the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. If you consider the area east of the Mississippi and south of the Potomac, you will note that the coal fields are centrally located with reference to our Southern States.

Only 30 percent of the total coal reserves of the United States occur east of the Mississippi River, yet this area contains 60 percent of the total reserves of bituminous and anthracite coal. The coal-bearing States west of the Mississippi River contain 70 percent of the total reserves of the Nation, but most of the coal is lignite, subbituminous, or high volatile bituminous rank.

Figure 2 [not printed] shows the remaining reserves in the United States in January 1950, and if you consider those States southern, as Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia, it will be observed that there are vast reserves in these States, exceeded only by North Dakota, Colorado, Montana, Illinois, and Wyoming.

Figure 3 [not printed] shows the remaining reserves in the United States by States according to tonnage and heat value and of the total reserves on a 50-percent recovery basis.

Figure 4 [not printed] illustrates the proved reserves of liquid hydrocarbons in the United States estimated by the American Petroleum Institute, as of January 1, 1950, with a scale of 1,000,000,000 barrels shown in the right margin of the map. You will note the tremendous reserves of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. These reserves total 73 percent of our known reserves and such total is estimated as of January 1, 1950, at 28,378,000 barrels. Some petroleum engineers argue that despite the enormous consumption of petroleum products in the United States during the past 50 years, our reserves today are greater than they were 50 years ago and for that reason there need be no apprehension on the part of our people that such a condition will not continue more or less indefinitely. There are those, on the other hand, who contend that the cost of exploration for oil has increased tremendously; that it is obtained at greater depths, that the percentage of dry holes to total holes drilled each year is on the increase, that oil companies would not go into our Gulf coast, some 50 miles offshore, to drill for oil if there were an adequate supply on land, that we are importing in excess of what we export, 1,000,000 barrels of petroleum products per day, and have concluded, therefore, that we had best begin to look for another source for our liquid fuels. I shall make reference later as to the part that coal may play in that future.

Figure 5 [not printed] is a map of the United States showing the distribution of oil fields and unproductive areas classified with respect to their relative likelihood of yielding commercial quantities of oil. You will please note the extensive area in our country regarded as unfavorable or impossible, with a fair territory still remaining classified as possible. The oil fields themselves shown in extreme black, when compared with

the remaining area shown as possible, at least gives some idea of the limitations surrounding the discovery of oil. As a matter of fact, the Report On Fuel Reserves of the United States made to Congress states: "Of the total area in the United States definitely tested by drilling 1 to 2 percent proved to be productive."

Figure 6 [not printed] shows the proved reserves of natural gas in the United States as estimated by the American Gas Association. Here, again, you will note the tremendous reserves in the southern part of our country. As a matter of fact, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kentucky and West Virginia contain nearly 80 percent of the total reserves of the Nation.

Figure 7 [not printed] is interesting because it shows the natural gas reserves and the production from 1918 through 1949. The tremendous increase in production is evident and also the relationship between the total reserves and the production. It is extremely difficult to forecast what the future discoveries of natural gas may be. It is generally the opinion that intensified and deeper drilling for oil will likely result in future discoveries of gas. I am sure that there is no group of men in the United States who recognize more strongly than you the fact that the price of gas continues to rise, that most contracts for gas are interruptible, and that some consideration is being given by governmental authorities as to restricting the use of gas. Then, too, the increasing consumption of petroleum and natural gas should not be disregarded. I have seen recent estimates that the consumption of petroleum products in our country in 1951 will exceed that of 1949 by 20 percent.

In making these statements as to the extent of our reserves of petroleum and natural gas, I do not propose that you divide the reserves of natural gas and petroleum by the annual production in order to determine the life of these reserves. There will be additional discoveries and new fields, but even the most optimistic have concluded that as scientific techniques are accepted today, coal will prove to be the mainstay for production of electric power in the future. When one considers that petroleum is becoming increasingly important as a raw material for chemical manufacture, that 25 years ago we produced only 150,000 pounds of petroleum-derived chemicals, as compared to an estimated 8,000,000,000 pounds in 1950, and that natural gas and refinery gases yield about 3,000,000,000 pounds of ethylene per year, and that chemical products derived from petroleum and natural gas are only in their initial stage of development, the importance of coal to you must necessarily loom high.

At the risk of being repetitious, I would like to emphasize that the delivered price of coal must carry great weight in your thinking. The delivered price of coal is made up of two factors, one is the cost of production plus some reasonable profit, and the other transportation cost.

The cost of production of coal in the various sections of the United States varies greatly. As a matter of fact, it varies greatly as between mines in limited areas. Averages on the basis of cost of tons per man-day for individual States, or even the Nation as a whole, do not tell the complete story, and while they are indicative of trends, your investigations, I am sure, will lead you to the consideration of coal mines which possess advantageous physical conditions and good quality steam coal.

But even in considering national averages, great progress has been made in the tons of coal produced per man per day in all bituminous and lignite coal mines of the United States, underground and stripping. Although the working time underground has been reduced to approximately 7 hours, the number of tons produced per man per day in the United States since 1935 has increased

from about 4½ tons to nearly 6½ tons. That is an increase of about 44 percent. In underground mines the number of tons per man-day has increased from about 4.2 in 1935 to 5.5 in 1949. This includes all mines, good and bad, large and small. The difference, of course, is due entirely to mechanization. In 1949 mechanically loaded underground output and strip mined coal accounted for 73.1 percent of the total annual output as compared to 37.3 percent in 1939.

In those mines where large-capacity coal-loading equipment has been utilized with belts on cross working entries for the transportation of coal, the percentage of increase in tons per man-day has been significant, and where in recent months the new type machine has been used which rips or tears the coal from the face and loads it directly into shuttle cars underground, the reduction in cost in many mines has been almost unbelievable.

In one mine in Alabama which has been using three of these machines during the past year, it has been experienced that these machines can produce coal for one-third of the face labor cost of the conventional-type loading machine. In addition, no explosives are required, the cost of timbering is greatly reduced under certain roof conditions, and the attendant hazard of mining is greatly minimized. Few men connected with the mining profession have realized the damage inflicted on roof by explosives used in shooting coal and, as you know, 65 percent of the accidents that occur in this extremely hazardous business of mining, results from falls of roof and coal, mostly roof.

In this mine in Alabama which has been successful in the use of the continuous miner-type of machine, roof rock directly over the coal, called draw rock, and which could not be controlled or supported with the conventional method of cutting, shooting, and loading coal, remains in place with the new machine and is easily controlled. This new type machine offers great opportunity in coal fields of moderate or high cost and it is greatly to your benefit to not only interest yourselves in the progress of this and other type machines, but wherever possible to render a contributing hand from an engineering standpoint in the development of the machine and encouragement in its use.

In thick seams of coal 6 feet and over, where mine costs are low, the margin where-in costs may be reduced does not exist, and the difference in the actual cost of loading coal between the conventional machine and the new type of machine is not of great moment. However, the many other advantages mentioned, plus the fact that greater concentration of working places underground can be obtained with these newer machines, even in the thicker coals where new mines are to be developed, it will likely be found that the use of these newer type machines is economically desirable. One objection raised to these machines by coal producers has been that the machine grinds the coal and the undersize product is excessive. This now is being eliminated to a great extent in a new type cutting head for the machine, successfully employed in many mines.

A new type machine called an auger or recovery drill is being experimented with at a mine in Pennsylvania. This auger drill is designed for use in coal beds from 30 to 36 inches in thickness. It holds much promise for cost reduction in thin seams.

There has been developed largely through the research and effort of the United States Bureau of Mines in recent years a new method of supporting mine roof. This is known as "roof bolting" or "roof pinning" and is accomplished by anchoring bolts in a sufficiently strong rock above the strata immediately over the coal bed. These bolts are usually slotted at the end and have a wedge which fits in the slot and when driven into the strata expands the holes in the rock

which lies directly over the coal. Other means of supporting the roof are either with expansion bolts similar to the type of bolt used in supporting trolley-wire clamps along the haulage ways of mines, only penetrating deeper into the strata. Some 494 mines in the United States now employ this method of timbering which increases safety because the roof is supported immediately as the coal is removed, men are not required to handle heavy timbers and cross collars and the efficiency of loading machines, because of the absence of posts and props which may be knocked out in their operation, has been most marked. I have in mind one mine in Alabama where the efficiency of the conventional type of loading machine was increased from 25 percent to 30 percent.

Great progress has been made by coal producers in the preparation of coal. As mechanization has increased in mines throughout the country, and since the machine in loading does not differentiate between coal and extraneous matter, washing machinery has become absolutely essential. Dewatering screens have in many instances minimized the percentage of moisture in size, say, plus one-eighth, but with the minus one-eighth-size coal, much research is still required in order to overcome the moisture problem. After all, from the standpoint of heat units, a percentage of moisture does as much harm as a percentage of ash. The drying of minus one-eighth coal, whether by heat drying, centrifuges, or filters, has greatly improved this phase of coal preparation, but in the opinion of many engineers much effort must yet be put forth to attain the efficiency in the drying of coal that the situation demands.

As you are no doubt aware, there is a growing disposition on the part of utilities looking to the future, to make long-term contracts for coal on some reasonable margin of profit basis. This tends to stabilize the coal situation and serves as insurance. The most recent contracts of interest, with which I feel sure you are familiar, is one of a large Illinois utility with a large coal company, covering a period of 30 years; a large utility in Indiana with another large producing company, and in one of our Southern States a contract was made in 1947 for a period from 7 to 15 years covering a large quantity of coal for steam plants in that area. There are periods of depressed conditions in the coal market when coal can be purchased at prices lower than those obtained by the several utilities which I have mentioned, but if there is to be a stabilized situation with reference to this commodity, which constitutes such an important factor in the cost of producing electricity, the utilities cannot and I am sure do not expect to exist on the distressed situation in any industry. When one considers the significance of coal to the electric utility industry throughout the country, permanence of supply is fundamental.

This brings us to the matter of transportation. The cost of transporting coal in the United States from the mine to the consumer, on an average, amounts to more than the cost of the coal itself at the mine, and in many instances the cost of transportation is 25 to 40 percent more than the cost of producing the coal. The railroads have their own serious problems—increased cost of supplies, growing cost of labor, and the expansion required of them as of other utilities and industries has not been an easy task.

I hold no brief for the trucks which run over our highways, but it should be a matter of interest for your consideration, that the privilege which the trucks enjoy in selecting the type of traffic that they may choose to haul when and where they choose to haul it, has a direct bearing on coal freight rates. In other words, to meet the competition of trucks for certain classes of traffic,

the railroads must increase the rates on many commodities that trucks cannot haul, and this problem, which is essentially a railroad problem directly, may be one that affects utilities vitally from the standpoint of coal itself. It has no doubt been your experience that it is difficult for a regulated business to compete with one which is wholly or partially unregulated. It is not just.

The value of water transportation for coal has long been recognized. Good coal properties on navigable rivers have unusual value and frequently a combination of barge and railroad rates is attractive. Some large utilities, as you probably know, are investing heavily in barges for water transportation with established barge lines transporting such tons. Railroads recognize the competitive status of water transportation and the influence of such competition on rates has been marked.

But if coal can be delivered by some other means of transportation at a lower cost than the railroads presently deliver it, then those means of transportation must be utilized. The most recent interesting development is that of pumping coal through pipeline, which is now planned for construction near Cadiz, Ohio, by the Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa. The proposed line will be of 12-inch pipe and 17,000 feet long. Finley ground $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch washed coal will be mixed with water and pumped through the line on a continuous basis. The Bureau of Mines in report of investigation 4799 entitled "A Survey of the Hydraulic Transportation of Coal" has assembled the most recent data on this subject, which should be of great interest to you. The Bureau's conclusion is:

"From information available, it appears that coal may be transported economically in pipelines, especially in large tonnages, to supply a steady industrial market. Before coal pipelines can be built, many more actual pumping-performance data must be accumulated. Pumps, either centrifugal or reciprocating, will require much more development. The erosion of pipe and pumps, the degradation of coal, the most economical linear velocities, and the pressure drop in line must be determined accurately for each coal mixture."

The Southern Research Institute has among its more important projects, one from a large utility which relates to the hydraulic transportation of coal.

The lowest transportation cost of heat units results from the movement of oil in tankers. The next lowest means of transportation of heat units is natural gas through a pipeline. It should be fairly obvious that as natural gas becomes less plentiful in the years to come that gas made from coal will take its place, and it may well be that if a means can be found of lowering the cost of gasifying coal that before the time of natural-gas shortage comes to pass, gas made from coal and enriched with oxygen, or for transportation for greater distances carbureted with oil, may find an essential place in our economy. I am sure that this will be possible when the underground gasification of coal will have been perfected. I was privileged several years ago to discuss the initial experiment in underground gasification before your group in Birmingham and I know that you have sufficient interest to learn of the progress of this highly intriguing experiment.

The purpose of the experiment, as I emphasized in my references to the experiment in Birmingham, is to produce a power gas and a synthesis gas for the manufacturing of gasoline. Sixty to seventy percent of the cost of producing gasoline from coal under the Fischer-Tropsch process consists of the mining, preparation, drying, grinding, and gasifying of coal in retorts. When a synthesis gas is produced through this under-

ground gasification of coal, these five costly steps will be eliminated and the entire problem relating to synthetic liquid fuels will largely have been overcome. Give the chemist carbon monoxide plus hydrogen at a low enough cost and you open up to him the infinite in the chemical world. When we produce a synthesis gas by underground gasification of coal we produce a low-cost source of electric power, which in turn means low-cost oxygen, a further boon to mankind.

The initial experiment, which I described to you, while limited in size and scope, produced encouraging results and was regarded as successful by the Bureau of Mines, Alabama Power Co. engineers and others. It was determined that there was no difficulty in maintaining combustion in coal strata in the earth; that such coal strata could be completely gasified thus, and that under sufficiently high temperature changes were brought about in overlying rock strata that gave evidence of being favorable to and useful in the gasification process.

When the accumulated data from the first experiment was studied it was decided that they warranted a second experiment on a more elaborate scale. In this second experiment the coal was fired in March 1949 and continued for 22 months. The results of this experiment thus far may be summarized as follows:

(a) As in the first experiment, no difficulty has been encountered in burning the coal in the earth.

(b) In both experiments useful gases of reasonably constant properties have been made. The gas holds great potentiality for power production, either as a means of generating steam or through the application of the gas turbine. While a chemical synthesis gas has not yet been regularly produced in large quantities, it is the opinion of Alabama Power Co. engineers and those of the Government that such a gas can be made over a long period. During the course of this second experiment a gas turbine was operated for a sufficient period of time to effectively demonstrate its practicality.

An increasing phase of this work in the present experiment is the electrolinking of two holes bored from the surface to a coal bed by the use of electric power. In this experiment, which is being conducted without any mining underground whatsoever by the continued application of an electric current to the coal bed, it has been possible to raise the temperature of the coal to a point where distillation products were evolved and over a period of time some permeability to air in the coal bed was achieved. The application of electrical current raised the temperature of the coal to a point where combustion and later gasification with air has been possible. An excellent coal or producer gas has been attained. Rough estimates of the production of gas on a commercial scale under this electrolinking process reveal that the energy from coal may be obtained on a basis of less than \$1 per ton.

The results of the electrolinking process to underground gasification indicates that it can be applied for connecting boreholes drilled from the surface to a coal seam and by this method a permeable path of high-temperature carbonaceous matter can be made ready for subsequent gas making. The capacity of the system has been small, but it is expected that this can be built up by continued operation or through a modification of the experiment that is presently being conducted.

There is another means of attaining this end, and that is by the application of the Hydrafrac process, employed in fracturing impermeable oil strata. This process, patented by the Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., will constitute another phase of the experiment at Gorgas, and holds an especial promise.

Finally, I should like to say a word to this group of engineers separate and apart from coal and kilowatts, which has no direct bearing on either subject. Since you represent many educational institutions, particularly southern universities, I cannot resist the impulse under the circumstances.

These changing times and conditions in the affairs of men require earnest thinking and in the future will require even more intensive thinking. There has been no period within my lifetime when there was greater need for the analytical mind of the engineer than today, and this need will grow. It should be our purpose to see to it that young engineers of today are not deprived of the broader aspects of education which we were deprived of. The narrow viewpoint which handicaps most of us is due to the fact that we concentrated as students too closely upon the techniques of our profession. I would much prefer to see a greater specialization within the various branches of engineering—electrical, mechanical, mining, etc.—with opportunities to acquire a greater knowledge of the arts, history and civics and the science of human relationship, than a continuation of the restrictions to professional subjects alone in the college curricula for engineers. Here, too, the influence of men like yourselves is sorely needed.

I had occasion previously to refer to security and the perversion in the thoughts of many of our people concerning that which I consider unimportant. We of today have so concentrated on luxury and leisure that we have forgotten that hardihood and discipline are not ornaments, but weapons. No incident in modern life is more strongly illustrative of these tendencies than the degradation of the social amenities which once pertained to the cultural relationship of individuals and now are based upon materialism and show, and accordingly upon insincerity.

"Perhaps security is a good thing to seek and a bad thing to find. Perhaps it is never found and all our best is in the search." Through the days to come men like you can impress the world with the knowledge that "All we need in any age is character. From that everything follows. Leveling down is the fashion now," but we should remember "the bright spies—they caught the light first and held it longest."

Are We To Abdicate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr SCHWABE. Mr Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the September 29, 1951, issue of the Tulsa Tribune published at Tulsa, Okla. This editorial was written by Mr Richard Lloyd Jones, one of the best editorial writers in the United States.

I commend the reading and serious consideration of this editorial to all who cherish or want to preserve America and its traditions. The editorial is entitled "Are We To Abdicate?" It follows:

ARE WE TO ABDICATE?

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

One hundred and seventy-five years ago the purpose of our country was proclaimed to be our inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The patriots

who made us freemen made no provision for any foreign autocratic power or dictator to veto those rights.

We began to vacate the principles on which we were founded, on which we prospered and grew to greatness, when we recognized the despotism of the cruel Kremlin.

Our Constitution provides that all legislative powers shall be vested in the Congress of the United States. But we abandoned the Constitution when we set aside our self-governing rights to allow a congress of foreign countries, calling itself the United Nations, to assume legislative authority over us.

The sinister influence of the legislative assumptions of the delegates from foreign nations is beginning to alarm the American people who are smart enough to be alarmed.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a comprehending and patriotic Congressman from Wisconsin, recently introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution which is not merely prophetic but essential if America is to survive. His resolution reads:

"Whereas Congress is composed of elected Representatives foresworn to uphold, protect, and defend the United States flag and Constitution, and

"Whereas the United States Constitution precluded the delegation of its executive, judicial, or legislative powers to foreign assemblies or other bodies of individuals not qualified to act as elected or appointed agents of the citizens of the United States, and

"Whereas, notwithstanding the above, there have come into being organizations and associations whose programs would establish predominantly foreign executive, judicial, and legislative bodies, to which our citizens would be required by law to give recognition, and whose deliberations and acts would be binding upon all; and

"Whereas these programs would further require the radical disarmament of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces of the United States of America to a point where they would be rendered powerless to defend our citizens in case of aggressive armed attack, while at the same time providing for the concentration of supreme military, naval, and air power in a predominantly foreign-controlled world police force. Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives is unalterably opposed to any and all plans, programs, and proposals which tend toward the development of any form of world government, or toward the establishment of any organization or the strengthening of any such organizations as may already exist, which would abolish, abridge, or otherwise limit any of the rights, privileges, or immunities now enjoyed by the citizens of the United States."

The American Legion of the State of Maryland with over 30,000 members, was prompt to officially proclaim its support of this most-needed action. Congress must make such a declaration if we are to continue to have a Congress. In its statement the Maryland commander says:

"Our Nation, with only one-seventh of the world's population, owns a large proportion of the world's wealth. We would be glad to show the rest of the world how they, too, may achieve our enviable position of freedom and happiness, but we do not propose that they, including Soviet Russia and Red China, be given any authority over the lives of our people."

It is time every patriotic society in America rally to the support of such resolution and demand that our Representatives and Senators promptly proclaim it. It is unfortunate that the two fellows Oklahoma sent to the Senate do not loom very large as statesmen.

The Daughters of the American Revolution, which has grown alert and alarmed at the dangers that confront us, declares that "the surrender of our national sovereignty to a

world-governing body will forfeit our liberty, our free enterprise, and our independence."

Submitting to the legislative dictation of the United Nations means we give to other countries their power to tax us, their power to determine what military strength we have, and where our military forces are to be placed. They take command of our fighting forces, and we will do the fighting, as we do in Korea.

We are being handed over, body and soul, to the delegates of foreign nations who are to rule us.

This one-world propaganda has a poetic appeal to the gullible. But it is turning out to be a booby trap for the United States. Where has it got us in Korea? We fought the war with Japan and won it. Then we asked other nations that made little or no contribution to the winning of that war to join us in stating and signing the terms of peace. That un-American performance had one significant value—it showed the brutal meanness and the inhumanity of the Russian bully. The Russia that has murdered millions of people and enslaved millions of others. And we have allowed them to sit in this United Nations assembly which increasingly is assuming authority over the lives of free Americans. And they demand that with them we seat in this international legislative chamber the delegates from Red China. Have we filled our Capitol with dumb men?

We don't make intellectual giants any more. Our colleges turn out skilled technicians who are not smart enough to comprehend the noble obsessions that made us freemen.

Have we Americans lost our smartness? Are we indifferent to our dangers? Are we so devoted to partisan regularity that we have lost our patriotism? Is the common cause for which America was made to be abandoned? That is what Representative SMITH's resolution puts before the lawmakers of our land.

From her beginning America has been the great peace Nation. Our flag was never carried onto battlefield except in the defense of human liberty. We have played no miserable colonial game to enrich a royalty and a parasitic aristocracy that live on the wealth abstracted from conquered peoples. We are not an England. God forbid. We are not a Belgium. We never were an Italy or a Germany. We are not Russian, and we are not Asiatic. Yet we have permitted ourselves to be lured by promises of peace into subtle objectives that are adroitly working for the destruction of the United States Government.

Our Constitution declares that "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion. What about our Government officials whose source of power is the Constitution? When they advocate a world super government, as some of them have done, they advocate the end of our national sovereignty.

Peace, peace, they talk peace and there is no peace. Since its inception the United Nations has been confronted with numerous instances of aggression and has been unable to stop the fighting, much less to guarantee peace.

Every sane man and woman is eager to join the nations of the world in any peaceful relations and in any mutual pledge to peace. But we are finding this world of friendliness is a hoax. We have betrayed by those who have professed to be the friends of peace. Korea is the object lesson of that betrayal and hypocrisy.

The United Nations is no longer a house of diplomats. It has become a congress of racketeers. Their whole idea is to soak us. Tax us. Liquidate us. And this United Nations has increasingly become servile to Russia. Our pouter-pigeon Senators do nothing.

When such a one-worlder as Robert M. Hutchins, until recently president of the University of Chicago, joins with such a chap as Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, it is time for us to beware of our intellectuals. 'His Adler who was quoted as recently saying, "We must do all we can to abolish the United States." If we, the people, don't look out, our dumb politicians will give our country away.

Excerpts From MacArthur Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the MacArthur hearings.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 4 AND 5, 1951

Senator McMAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I have many questions, and I will make no apology for the time that I take because we are here discussing the survival of our Nation, which means the future of civilization itself.

GLOBAL PROBLEM OF COMMUNISM AND GLOBAL DEFENSES

General, we are faced, are we not, with a global problem in the ambitions of Communist Russia?

General MACARTHUR. Faced with what, Senator?

Senator McMAHON. A global problem.

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably.

Senator McMAHON. You have given that problem a great deal of thought, I assume? Don't you hear me, General?

General MACARTHUR. Yes. Yes; I have sir.

Senator McMAHON. And, therefore—

General MACARTHUR. With particular attention, of course, to my own theater.

Senator McMAHON. Pardon me?

General MACARTHUR. With particular attention, of course, to my own theater. My responsibilities are in my own theater.

Senator McMAHON. That is correct. As you have said on three or four occasions today, you are a theater commander.

General MACARTHUR. I was.

Senator McMAHON. I accept the amendment.

I believe you said to Senator JOHNSON that as a theater commander you had made no determination in your own mind on either universal military service or concerning the amount of troops or number of troops that we should have for our global defense.

General MACARTHUR. That is correct. That problem did not fall within my responsibilities or authorities.

Senator McMAHON. I take it, therefore, General, that you have not clearly formulated in your own mind—I do not say this critically because you were a theater commander—but you have not formulated in your own mind how we are going to put on a global defense if Russia decides to make global war upon us.

General MACARTHUR. I have my own views, Senator, but they are not authoritative views, and I would not care to discuss them. Because I understand I am here to discuss my own theater. There are other authorities that have all those responsibilities and authority. They are not mine, and I there-

fore would not superficially inject myself into those discussions.

CHANCES OF SOVIETS ENTERING WAR

I take it, General, that you believe that what we do in following out your recommendations will not necessarily bring the Soviets into the war. Is that your position?

General MACARTHUR That is my belief.

Senator MCMAHON. Suppose, General, you are wrong about that. You could be wrong about it, couldn't you?

General MACARTHUR Most assuredly.

Senator MCMAHON. You did not believe at one time that the Communists of China, Red China, would come into the conflict in Korea.

General MACARTHUR I doubted it.

Senator MCMAHON. They did. You now doubt that the Soviets—

General MACARTHUR In that I was, however, supported by practically everybody. The American Government through its Secretary of State, through its Central Intelligence Agency, who were the best-informed authorities, presented that fact.

Senator MCMAHON In other words, everybody that had to do with it turned out to be wrong.

General MACARTHUR Practically, although, Senator, I think everybody realized that that risk was involved. When we first entered Korea that was inherent to it and it was a calculated risk that was taken.

Senator MCMAHON And now, of course, we can't all agree that there is a possibility that the Soviets will come in if we adopt the recommendations that you propose to carry out.

General MACARTHUR There is that possibility, but there is the certainty as against that, Senator, that if you don't carry out those recommendations, you are going to lose Americans by the thousands every month.

SITUATION IN KOREA NOW

You are going to lose such a basis that it may endanger the entire preparedness program.

If you keep on losing men at the rate you do now for indefinite time, you may find the entire preparedness program will come up against such obstacles as might endanger it.

I believe that what you argue are possibilities. They are possibilities. Everyone will admit that, but what I am arguing against is a certainty.

There is no question about the war being in Korea. There is a great question whether the war would extend some place else.

You have got a war on your hands, and you can't just say, "Let that war go on indefinitely while I prepare for some other war," unless you pay for it by the thousands and thousands and thousands of American boys.

Now that is the responsibility of those who make this decision, and it is a responsibility, as far as I am concerned, I repeat I wouldn't want it on my shoulders.

Your policy as you enunciated there, Senator, means—

DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES IN CASE OF WAR

Senator MCMAHON. I haven't enunciated it yet. I am simply asking for information as to your views. You see, General, what I want to find out from you is this—that if you happen to be wrong this time and we go into all-out war, I want to find out how you propose in your own mind to defend the American Nation against that war.

General MACARTHUR. That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator. My responsibilities were in the Pacific, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the various agencies of this Government are working day and night for an over-all solution to the global problem.

Now I am not familiar with their studies. I haven't gone into it. I have been desperately occupied over on the other side of the world, and to discuss in detail things that I haven't ever superficially touched doesn't contribute in any way, shape, or manner to the information of this committee or anybody else.

GLOBAL ASPECTS OF UNITED STATES DEFENSES

Senator MCMAHON General, I think you make the point very well that I want to make, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, has to look at this thing on a global basis and a global defense.

You as a theater commander by your own statement have not made that kind of a study, and yet you advise us to push forward with a course of action that may involve us in that global conflict.

General MACARTHUR Everything that is involved in international relationships, Senator, amounts to a gamble, risk. You have to take risks.

Senator MCMAHON. I couldn't agree with you more.

General MACARTHUR What I faced in the Pacific wasn't something that was speculative in the future. It's right now. What are you going to do to stop the slaughter in Korea? Are you going to let it go on? Does your global plan for defense of this United States against war consist of permitting war indefinitely to go on in the Pacific? What is your plan or what is the other plan to stop the war there in the Pacific?

It is there. There is no sophistry of talk when you see thousands of battle casualties every month, you can't talk those off that there is no war. There is a savage war there.

If you are not going to bring the war to a decisive conclusion, what does the preparedness mean? You are faced with a fact in Asia.

You are speculating about what takes place in the rest of the global parts of the world. I assume that the plans that are being made are to meet the contingencies that may arise.

Otherwise the whole force of the United States would be poured into Korea.

Senator MCMAHON General, the purpose of this hearing certainly is not for any Senator and certainly not one who is as ill-equipped as I am, to argue this question with you at this time.

My purpose is to try to develop information that will be helpful to me in reaching my final conclusions on the matter. General, are you aware of what our atomic preparedness situation is today?

General MACARTHUR Only in a very general way, sir.

USE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Senator MCMAHON I am not asking you for numbers, but do you know the numbers in our stockpile?

General MACARTHUR I do not. I have no more information on that than the average officer would have. It's confined to a very select circle, you know.

Senator MCMAHON Have you ever asked about that? Have you ever asked for information on it, General?

General MACARTHUR On the atomic thing? Senator MCMAHON. Yes.

General MACARTHUR I have discussed it, but I have never attempted to pry into matters which I regarded as beyond my own authority.

Senator MCMAHON In the course of your conduct of your duties in the Far East, as a theater commander, did you ever make inquiry of the Joint Chiefs of Staff about our atomic situation?

General MACARTHUR I have made inquiries as to what might be the potentialities and possibilities of the use of the atomic

bomb in my own theater. I know what that is.

Senator MCMAHON. Have you at any time advocated the use of the atomic bomb in your theater?

General MACARTHUR Of the atomic bomb?

Senator MCMAHON Yes.

General MACARTHUR The limit of—

Senator MCMAHON Pardon me?

General MACARTHUR The limit of what I did was to ask for information as to whether there were any plans to use the atomic bomb in the Far East.

Senator MCMAHON. Did you recommend its use?

General MACARTHUR I did not. As I understand it, the use of the atomic bomb has, by fiat and order, been limited to the decision of the President of the United States.

Senator MCMAHON That is true. Of course, I wondered whether you made any recommendations.

General MACARTHUR Why should I, Senator?

Senator MCMAHON I am not asking you why, I am just asking whether you did, and you answered that you did not.

General, are you familiar with the fact that we held some tests out in Nevada a few months ago which were known as the Nevada tests?

General MACARTHUR I am aware of that.

Senator MCMAHON Are you familiar with the results of those tests?

General MACARTHUR Only in a very general way.

[Deleted.]

ATOMIC BOMB STOCKPILE OF RUSSIA

Senator MCMAHON Do you think or have you any intelligence, any access to intelligence reports about Russian potentialities in the building of atomic weapons?

General MACARTHUR Very little.

Senator MCMAHON Does that little give you an estimate as to how many they possess today?

General MACARTHUR No, sir.

Senator MCMAHON Have you sought to get that information?

General MACARTHUR Not at all.

Senator MCMAHON If, by following your recommendations, a conflict is precipitated with Soviet Russia, be it in the European theater or the United States itself, or in the Far East, you have made no study as to the kind of damage that they could do to our forces in Korea and our general situation in the Far East with their atomic weapons, is that correct?

General MACARTHUR I don't believe for a minute from my general knowledge of the situation that the enemy has the potential or the inclination to use his limited atomic weapons in such an area as Korea or China.

Senator MCMAHON You said this morning, General, that you did not believe that the Russians could land in Japan if we kept control of the sea around Japan, and in the air. Was I correct?

General MACARTHUR. Not quite, Senator. I said that they couldn't overrun Japan, that they would be limited to isolated efforts.

Senator MCMAHON Well, when I said take Japan, I meant take it effectively into their control, as I understood it, and you said it would be impossible.

UNITED STATES PREPAREDNESS FOR ALL-OUT WAR IN THE FAR EAST

General MACARTHUR With that explanation, I agree. As long as we hold command of the sea and of the air, no potential enemy can launch an amphibious force against us with any hope of success.

As long as we maintain sea and air control of the ports of Asia, from Vladivostok all the way down to Singapore, they can't successfully launch an effort against us. As long as we maintain that, the enemy would have grave difficulty in overrunning anything in our littoral island line of defense.

Senator McMAHON. Have we sufficient planes and ships, in your opinion, in the Far East today to maintain that kind of a defense, if the Russians should precipitate themselves into this battle?

General MACARTHUR. I believe they are available.

Senator McMAHON. Are they in the Far East today?

General MACARTHUR. I couldn't tell you, Senator, what the enemy would launch against us. It is speculative. I gave my best estimate of that this morning. We have certain reserves, and I am sure that if the enemy attacked in overwhelming force we could get our reserves there in time to combat them. I believe sincerely that we have the air resource to beat off such an attack, and the Navy resource is unquestioned.

Senator McMAHON. If they should precipitate that attack in the Far East, would the Russians—I take it, with the forces that they have in the Far East at this time, we would have to take some of our reserves from the continental United States and send them over?

General MACARTHUR. It would depend upon the force with which the enemy attacked.

RUSSIAN STRENGTH IN THE FAR EAST

Senator McMAHON. You said this morning that they had [deleted] thousand planes there, I believe.

General MACARTHUR. Some estimates were made. My own estimate was that they could maintain about half that at the start, and that their strength would diminish rapidly from wear and tear, but I believe that they are too far from their bases in continental Russia to keep up a magnified pressure. They have not got the potential to bring the gasoline, they have not got the potential to bring a great many things over.

I also said I thought from the disposition of the Russian forces in Siberia that they were defensive positions.

Senator McMAHON. Has your intelligence advised you of any message from the Russians as to what they intend to do if we bomb in Manchuria?

General MACARTHUR. None whatsoever. If such information exists, it has never come to me. If such information exists, I am sure it would have been sent to me.

Senator McMAHON. General, are you aware of the kind of civilian defense we have in the United States today?

General MACARTHUR. Only in a general way, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. You know it is very sketchy.

General MACARTHUR. I would assume so. Senator McMAHON. Have you thought about the possibility—

General MACARTHUR. For that matter, I am quite sure it is sketchy in every country in the world.

POSSIBILITY OF ATTACK ON UNITED STATES

Senator McMAHON. Have you thought about the possibility of the Russians launching a surreptitious attack on the United States and its vital production centers through atomic sabotage?

General MACARTHUR. In a general way only. Once again that isn't my theater of responsibility, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. I understand that, General. I am just trying to introduce a few of the considerations that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their Commander in Chief, I presume, must have in mind in determining what kind of action should be taken in any specific theater.

General MACARTHUR. That is quite correct, Senator, I have no doubt they do. But I have just read what the opinion was of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on January 12, which was to follow in general the same concepts that I have.

If they have changed, that is something else again. I wasn't informed of it, but at that time they agreed with my concepts.

Senator McMAHON. And, of course, general, that recommendation of January 12—and I do not assert it as a fact at this time, the joint chiefs will have to explain that themselves—but there is certainly the possibility that that concurrence, if you wish to call it that, was based upon the contingency of a forced evacuation of Korea.

That possibility existed; didn't it, General?

RISKS IN THE FAR EASTERN SITUATION

General MACARTHUR. That possibility exists; yes, sir. What you are driving at, as I get it, Senator, is our enunciating the risks that come if the Soviets should attack. All I can say is that those risks should have been discounted when we entered the war in Korea.

Nothing new has developed to change it. Those responsibilities of those who sent our troops into Korea were just as great at that time as they are now. The risks were just as great then as they are now.

That was a considered action taken by the Government of the United States. I didn't have a thing to do with it. This was a policy that was given me.

Now, those risks that you are enunciating now are the risks that were involved in the original decision. They were taken by the United States.

Now, the United States has committed itself there. All I am advocating is how we can accomplish our purpose or extricate ourselves from the difficulties that have been involved.

Senator McMAHON. And now, General, before it is too late, I want to examine the risks of the course which you wish to pursue because if the risks are so great as to prejudice the existence of this Nation, then it is time we stopped and weighed those risks, until we get into a position to rebut them and to meet them.

General MACARTHUR. You assume, of course, that relatively your strength is going up much more than the enemy's. That is a doubtful assumption, Senator.

STATE OF UNITED STATES PREPAREDNESS FOR GLOBAL WAR

Senator McMAHON. Well, General, if that is not true on the short-term basis, then it will come, I am sure, as news to everybody in the United States Senate. We have been proceeding on the assumption, as our mobilization-in-chief said the other day, of no attack until 1953. By then, we will be so strong that they can't attack us, because by that time we will have the planes, we will have the bombs—amounts that we haven't got today—we will have the men in uniform, and we may be in shape to meet this attack, which we are not in shape to meet today.

General MACARTHUR. And in 2 years what will be your casualty rate of American boys in Korea?

Senator McMAHON. And, General, I ask you what our casualty rate will be in Washington D. C., if they put on an attack, an atomic attack—and I had better change it from Washington lest I be thinking about myself, to New York or the other cities of the United States, to say nothing of the American boys who are going to die in the air and sea in this logistical sort of support of the forces into China?

General MACARTHUR. All those risks, I repeat, were inherent in the decision of the United States to go into Korea.

Senator McMAHON. General, I am not saying that they were not. What I am trying to say is that now is the time, it would seem to me, to stop, look, and listen and see where we are before we plunge into a course that may take us over the precipice before we are ready.

General MACARTHUR. What is your plan, then, to end Korea?

EFFECT OF DECISION TO DEFEND KOREA ON AMERICAN PRESTIGE IN FAR EAST

Senator McMAHON. I would like to quote to you your language on going into Korea,

which was very beautifully written, and I think it ought to be in the record:

"The decision of President Truman on June 27 lighted into flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was turning dimly toward extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area struggling for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distant from the actual scene."

General, do you regard the threat to us and to our national survival—

General MACARTHUR. The quotation that you read, Senator, is quite true. It did restore at one stroke the enormous prestige of the United States. It confirmed the people of the Far East that we were not going to let them slide into slavery, that we were determined we were going to meet aggression on every front that it showed itself, that we were not going to confine ourselves and say we will defend in this sector but all the other sectors globally we will let go.

It was the enunciation which was the very antithesis of defeatism, which has been so pronounced that we could not meet aggression except in one area of the world. It meant that we, if the enemy was going to encroach in two areas, we would meet him in two areas, in three areas, we would meet him in three areas, that he was just as divided as we were; that if we could not defend wherever he aggressed or started to attack, we admit before the conflict that we are going to be defeated.

This is global, as you said yourself, this is a global proposition, and you can't let one-half of the world slide into slavery and just confine yourself to defending the other. You have got to hold every place.

Now, in the Far East there was a tremendous belief that we were not going to defend the Far East, and when we moved in to defend Korea it gave an enormous uplift throughout that entire section of the world.

If there is anything that I have said that led you to believe that I was critical of the decision to defend Korea, I would correct it immediately.

Senator McMAHON. No, General; I just thought that was such a fine statement.

ENDING THE KOREAN WAR

General MACARTHUR. The only thing I am trying to do, Senator, is to settle the thing in Korea to bring it to a decisive end. I believe it can be brought to a decisive end without the calamity of a third world war. I believe if you let it go on indefinitely in Korea, you invite a third world war. I believe the chances of the terrible conflict that you so rightly dread—and all the rest of us dread with you—would be much more probable if we practice appeasement in one area even though we resist to our capacity all along the line.

That is all I am saying. I am saying it with the acute consciousness of the dreadful slaughter that is going on in Korea today. If it is possible to bring it to a successful and an honorable end, I believe we should take the chance of doing so.

Now, in all the discussions today there has been no proposal that has been made here as to how to end the Korean problem satisfactorily and honorably. I believe in the method, as I have enunciated, and on January 12, the Chiefs of Staff believed so, too.

Now, they may have changed, and shifted. I do not know.

Senator McMAHON. We will find out.

General MACARTHUR. They will speak for themselves.

Senator McMAHON. We will find out.

CASUALTIES IN KOREA

General MACARTHUR. But still I am of that opinion, and I shrink—I shrink with a horror

that I cannot express in words—at this continuous slaughter of men in Korea.

The battle casualties in Korea today probably have passed the million-man mark. Our own casualties, American casualties, have passed 65,000. The Koreans have lost about 140,000. Our losses, on our side, are a quarter of a million men. I am not talking of the civilian populations, who must have lost many, many, many times that.

The enemy probably has lost 750,000 casualties. There are 145,000 of them that are now in our prison bull pens, prisoners, so they might be excepted from that figure because they live, but a million men in less than 11 months of fighting, in less than 11 months of this conflict, have already gone and it grows more savage every day.

I just cannot brush that off as a Korean skirmish. I believe that is something of such tremendous importance that it must be solved, and it cannot be solved by the nebulous process of saying "Give us time, and we will be prepared, or we will be in a better shape 2 years from now"—which is argumentative.

I don't know whether we will, or not, and neither do you, because you do not know, and none of us know the capacity of the enemy.

He may build faster than we do. I couldn't tell you.

I don't know that you are gambling on chances; but I say there is no chance in Korea, because it is a fact—you have lost a million men now. You will lose more than a million if you go on another year. If you go until 1953, you will lose another million.

What are you trying to protect?

The war in Korea has already almost destroyed that nation of 20,000,000 people.

I have never seen such devastation.

I have seen, I guess, as much blood and disaster as any living man, and it just curdled my stomach, the last time I was there. After I looked at that wreckage and those thousands of women and children and everything I vomited.

Now, are you going to let that go on, by any sophistry of reasoning, or possibilities? They may be there, but this is a certainty.

What are you going to do? Once more, I repeat the question, What is the policy in Korea?

If you go on indefinitely, you are perpetuating a slaughter such as I have never heard of in the history of mankind.

Now, what I am trying to do is to find some reasonable and honorable way to stop that slaughter. It is not to conquer this country or China, or anything else.

It is to bring this thing to an honorable end.

If you go on, you are going to destroy not only the casualties that I speak of, which are military, but you are going to destroy that people.

Now, I just cannot bring myself to analyze it with that shrewdness of legal capacity that you enunciate in your argument, which is an argument, to let it by.

Your entire drift has been not to do anything, just keep on fighting, losing, and bleeding there, and I think we should make some extraordinary effort to bring it to an end.

Senator McMAHON. I am not going to characterize your proposition. I do not expect that you are going to characterize my position.

I will take care of that myself.

ATOMIC PRODUCTION CAPACITIES OF VARIOUS AREAS

Now, I would like to know this, General: Is there any atomic or plane-building capacity in the Chinese mainland that you know of?

General MacARTHUR. None that I know of. The backwardness of industrial development in China precludes even the concept of such an intricate potential.

Senator McMAHON. Then, General—

General MacARTHUR. They may have some of the natural resources that go into the manufacture of them, of the bombs, I couldn't tell you about that, but it will never be done in our day. Never in our day will atomic weapons be turned out of China.

They cannot turn out the ordinary weapons. They do not have the instrumentalities to turn out airplanes, big ships, big guns, many of the other attributes of modern warfare.

Senator McMAHON. Western Europe, however, has that capacity, has it not, General?

General MacARTHUR. Senator, as I said, I have not made a study of this matter.

I suppose it has, but I don't know.

Senator McMAHON. You would not deny that the capacity, both atomic and the production of planes, of Western Europe, combined with Soviet Russia, would outproduce the United States of America—you would not deny that, would you?

DEFENSE OF EUROPE

General MacARTHUR. Not at all, and any inference from your question that I don't advocate the fullest protection and assistance to Western Europe is quite fallacious, Senator. What I advocate is that we defend every place, and I say that we have the capacity to do it.

If you say that we haven't, you admit defeat. If the enemy has that capacity and is divided on all these fronts, we should be able to meet it.

Senator McMAHON. General, I do not admit defeat. I am thinking, if this war has to be fought, about the total and complete victory. I do not want to blind myself, and, speaking for myself, General, with a devotion for my country that I will match against yours or any man's, I am only speaking about a proposition which I believe is sound, and I know that you will give me credit for believing in that which I think, the same as I certainly give you that credit.

Now, General, do you think that we are ready to withstand the Russian attack in Western Europe today?

General MacARTHUR. Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be the authority now on those things.

When I was the Chief of Staff, 20 years ago that was my problem, and I would have answered it. The Chiefs of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me.

Senator McMAHON. And so, General, you concede, it seems to me by that statement, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, having access to global intelligence, having made global plans for our defense, may have in that information, and because of that information, made decisions contrary to your recommendations, which could be sound.

General MacARTHUR. They didn't on January 12, Senator. They had all the information available at that time, and they made the study, and their recommendations were as I read you this morning, which coincided with my own, that if you apply that type of sanction in the Far East you will bring this conflict to an end, that there is a strong possibility that that would be the result.

INTELLIGENCE ON CHINESE COMMUNIST ATTACK

Senator McMAHON. General, in September of 1950 did you have any intelligence that the Chinese were going to come in if we went to the Yalu?

General MacARTHUR. I had no concrete information, no, sir.

Senator McMAHON. Had you been advised by any of your intelligence officers to that effect?

General MacARTHUR. On September 15?

Senator McMAHON. In September, any time in September?

General MacARTHUR. I don't recall it, Senator. That the enemy was shifting his forces northward, I knew thoroughly. That he was massing forces along the Yalu, I understood. But he was at that time advertising to the world that such Chinese as went in were individuals and volunteers. He specifically proclaimed that Nationalist China was not involved in that struggle.

EFFECTIVE STRENGTH AND USE OF NATIONALIST TROOPS

Senator McMAHON. General, when you went down to Formosa, you made an estimate of the effective troops that they could supply, did you not?

General MacARTHUR. I beg your pardon, Senator?

Senator McMAHON. When you went down to Formosa, you made an estimate of the number of effective troops that Chiang could supply?

General MacARTHUR. That the Nationalist Chinese had on Formosa?

Senator McMAHON. That's right.

General MacARTHUR. They had about a half million, yes, sir.

Senator McMAHON. How many at that time did you think were effective?

General MacARTHUR. I think that the caliber of the personnel was good. Their equipment, as I explained this morning, was spotty. I think they're the same caliber of troops that we are fighting now in North Korea. I believe they could be brought to the same degree of efficiency, and I think those troops are good troops.

Senator McMAHON. In the report that you made on your visit to Formosa, did you state how many effective troops Chiang Kai-shek had, in your opinion?

General MacARTHUR. I couldn't tell you, Senator. The report that we made was made by a mission that I sent down there under General Fox.

Senator McMAHON. How many did General Fox report could be effectively mounted and used?

General MacARTHUR. They all could be if they were properly equipped and trained. How many were available at that time I really couldn't tell you.

Senator McMAHON. When the suggestion was made, General, that Chiang's troops be brought up to Korea soon after the outbreak of the hostilities in Korea, you made a finding as to their effectiveness at that time, did you not?

General MacARTHUR. I recommended that they should not be brought up to Korea at that time, that Formosa itself was threatened.

Senator McMAHON. You went so far as to say that they would be an "albatross" around our neck for months.

General MacARTHUR. That is correct. They were lacking in artillery, they were lacking in many of the necessities. We were at that time fighting in the Pusan beachhead, and untrained troops, only partially equipped, would have been of little effectiveness.

However, the main reason that I wished those troops held on Formosa was to defend Formosa, and when the Chinese troops that were threatening Formosa moved north to attack us in Korea, I recommended that the wraps be taken off of the Nationalist troops.

Senator McMAHON. That was based upon the fact that the Chinese Communist effectives had been moved north on the Yalu and they did not have anything on the mainland of China with which to carry on the attack on Formosa?

General MacARTHUR. Nothing that would seriously threaten Formosa, correct.

Senator McMAHON. Now who reported that to you, General, your own intelligence or CIA?

General MacARTHUR. I couldn't tell you. It came from various sources, largely from

the Chinese Nationalists themselves who reported the movement of the Communist troops

Senator McMAHON. And did they report to you that there were not sufficient effectives left in the south to carry on the raid on Formosa which you feared at the time that the Yalu troops were down in south China?

General MACARTHUR. There was no such report to me. That was my own estimate of the situation on the strengths and relative positions of the various forces

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Senator McMAHON. When did the CIA leave Korea, General?

General MACARTHUR. When did they what?

Senator McMAHON. The CIA, the Central Intelligence Agency operatives leave Korea?

General MACARTHUR. I couldn't tell you. The Central Intelligence Agency doesn't operate under me at all

Senator McMAHON. Were they directed to leave Korea after the Inchon landing by your command?

General MACARTHUR. I don't know what you are talking about, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. General, I understood that the Central Intelligence agents disappeared from Korea after the Inchon operation, that very brilliant operation which you directed

General MACARTHUR. The Central Intelligence agents, Senator, are not under me. As far as I know they never were in Korea. They may have been, but it is not an agency that functions under me. It functions under the Central Intelligence controls here.

AVAILABLE INTELLIGENCE ON CHINA

Senator McMAHON. You regard your information on China as today being much more extensive than it was 2 or 3 years ago, do you not?

General MACARTHUR. I don't know what you mean by that.

Senator McMAHON. General, do you think today that you are better informed about the internal situation in China, the general situation in China, than you were 3 years ago?

General MACARTHUR. I thought I was pretty well informed at both times, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. You think you were?

General MACARTHUR. Yes.

MAC ARTHUR LETTER TO EATON, 1948

Senator McMAHON. Well, I quote from the March 3, 1948, report to the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, in answer to the request that was made by the House committee to you for your opinion on things in the Far East, and you said, if I have a correct copy of it:

"China, as you perhaps know, is a theater of the United States Navy, controlled outside the scope of my existing authority. I have no representatives there, and apart from general background knowledge, such detailed information as has been made available to me has been derived largely by indirection. Exhaustive investigations of the Chinese situation have been made by responsible United States officials, but these studies are not within my channel of information or command, and in consequence I am not adequately familiar therewith. I have furthermore not had the opportunity to visit China for many years."

You have not, of course, had an opportunity to go there since this time, General?

General MACARTHUR. No, sir.

Senator McMAHON (reading). "With this background, you will readily perceive I am not in a position to render authoritative advice with reference to the myriad of details on which a definitive policy for this particular must necessarily rest."

General MACARTHUR. That is all correct.

Senator McMAHON (continuing). "The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its en-

tirety in the orientation of American policy. Fragmentary decisions in disconnected sectors of the world will not bring an integrated solution."

Senator WILEY. What is the date of that? Senator McMAHON. I quote from the letter of the general's, dated March 3, 1948.

You also said, General: "In the determination of our global policy care must, of course, be exercised to avoid commitment of our resources beyond what we can safely spare; the sapping of our national strength to the point of jeopardy to our own security and the overburdening of our people beyond their capacity to maintain a standard of life consistent with the energies with which they are naturally endowed."

I will be glad to submit for the record the whole letter.

You remember that letter, of course, General? You referred to it earlier today.

General MACARTHUR. The basic conditions have completely changed since that letter was written, Senator. The war has been precipitated in Korea, and to attempt to apply the rationale of what existed at that time and what exists today is quite fantastic.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Senator McMAHON. General, do you believe in the concept of collective security?

General MACARTHUR. What do you mean by collective security, Senator?

Senator McMAHON. Do you believe in the concept of collective security upon which our foreign policy is based?

General MACARTHUR. What do you mean by collective security?

Senator McMAHON. I mean the attempt to weld together a military alliance to keep the peace such as we have attempted to do in the North Atlantic Pact.

General MACARTHUR. I have only a superficial knowledge of the North Atlantic Pact, Senator. I am not prepared to discuss it in any way, shape, or manner.

Senator McMAHON. Neither its provisions nor its implementation?

General MACARTHUR. I have only the ordinary knowledge that any officer would have on it. You have experts on that. General Eisenhower and others have appeared before you very recently with all the intimate knowledge that comes from the authority and responsibility he has.

THE NOVEMBER DRIVE AS A RECONNAISSANCE IN FORCE

Senator McMAHON. General, yesterday you said that the drive in November was a reconnaissance in force; is that correct? Do you remember your testimony of yesterday?

General MACARTHUR. That is correct; yes sir.

Senator McMAHON. As I recollect it, General, last November you issued a communique in which you said that this was the end-of-the-war offensive which would bring the boys home by Christmas

General MACARTHUR. That was my hope.

Senator McMAHON. Did you anticipate that you could get them home by Christmas with a reconnaissance in force?

General MACARTHUR. The reconnaissance would have developed the strength of the enemy. If it was not sufficient to resist us, it would have been an all-out assault and, as I explained in my communique, it would have undoubtedly destroyed the last remnants of the North Korean forces.

Where a reconnaissance in force—the line between a reconnaissance in force and an assault attack is a rather nebulous one and depends upon circumstances. What starts out as a reconnaissance in force might well result in a full-scale assault so far as your forces are concerned.

PROPOSED LIMITATIONS ON NOVEMBER ADVANCE TO THE YALU

Senator McMAHON. Was there any difference in opinion between you and the Joint

Chiefs relative to how far you would go toward the Yalu in that advance?

General MACARTHUR. The movements, all tactical and strategic movements that I made, had the prior knowledge and approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Senator McMAHON. Was there any recommendation by the Joint Chiefs that it would have been wise in their opinion to stop about 5 miles this side of the Yalu on a defensible ridge?

General MACARTHUR. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believed that it would be probably advisable, based upon the considerations at that time, to occupy the north of Korea with South Korean forces. They were adverse to having other nationals there. But the tactical conditions were such that South Koreans were not able to do so.

POSITION OF THEATER COMMANDER IN GLOBAL PICTURE

Senator McMAHON. Yesterday, General, I pursued a line of questioning concerning the global implications of your proposals, and you informed me that being a theater commander you have not taken those into consideration. Now—

General MACARTHUR. One minute, Senator. That is not exactly what I said, if you will let me interrupt you. I said—I intended to convey the idea that the theater commander was only concerned in global studies insofar as his own theater was concerned to coordinate the demands of his own theater with the global problem; a general knowledge of the global problem, of course, is necessary by all theater commanders

Senator McMAHON. General, on page 207 of the testimony you stated in answer to my question as to whether or not we were ready to withstand the Russian attack in Western Europe today.

"General MACARTHUR. Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be the authority now on those things. When I was the Chief of Staff 20 years ago, that was my problem and I would have answered it. The Chiefs of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me."

Now, General, I went into that question for two reasons.

First, this committee, of course, has a very grave duty of weighing all factors in the defense of this country. We are not confined to a theater of operations. We are called upon to implement an over-all strategy

I asked you about it, General, because in your speech to the Congress you stated as follows:

"The issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector oblivious to those of another is to court disaster for the whole."

General MACARTHUR. Correct.

THEATER COMMANDER'S POSITION RELATIVE TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Senator McMAHON. Now, General, you are aware I am sure of the mechanics that this Government has set up for carrying out this business of weighing these interlocking factors—in other words, our global defense as a whole.

You are aware of that. You are aware that in 1949 the Congress of the United States passed what is known as the National Security Act. In this act, and although I will not take the time of the committee to read it, I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that at least the pertinent portions should be inserted at this point in the record—

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the act of 1947?

Senator McMAHON. This is the act, as it is entitled, "Coordination for National Security." I haven't got the date of the act, Mr. Chairman, but it is the act setting up the National Security Agency which pro-

vides that the membership of the National Security Council should be the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the NSRB.

That is the body that has been set up by this Congress to coordinate our total global strategy.

General, I take it from what you said yesterday that you have a high opinion of the members, the present members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General MACARTHUR I have.

Senator McMAHON And the present Secretary of Defense.

General MACARTHUR I have.

Senator McMAHON You recognize them as patriotic gentlemen of capability in their fields.

General MACARTHUR Unquestionably.

Senator McMAHON Now General, assuming for the sake of discussion that subsequent testimony brings out real differences between you and the Joint Chiefs on how far our far eastern strategy can best promote our global strategy, and assuming this difference of viewpoint, would you then be prepared to admit that the Joint Chiefs' judgment is better than yours and that the American people would be well advised to follow the judgment of the Joint Chiefs?

General MACARTHUR The authorities and the responsibilities of the Joint Chiefs are laid down and prescribed by law. Their position in the niche of American governmental procedure is entirely in accordance with the statutes.

Whether I should agree with it or should not agree with it is not pertinent to the actions of the Government of the United States.

As a theater commander I had my own responsibilities and I made my own recommendations, and would again. If they disagreed with those of higher authority, the question of the judgment of that higher authority is not within my hands, and I would not attempt to pass judgment upon it.

That is a matter for public opinion. I therefore would not attempt to answer such a hypothetical question as you put up, that if I were a theater commander and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their superior authority gave me a directive which I disagreed with, I still would implement it to the very best of my ability.

A THEATER COMMANDER'S PUBLIC EXPRESSION OF OPINIONS

Senator McMAHON General, there are some fundamental basic differences between the Government and yourself as to the wisdom of the best course to pursue in the east; that is true?

General MACARTHUR Naturally.

Senator McMAHON Do you consider, General, that it comes within the province of a theater commander to register publicly with persons in political life, or out of it for that matter, his differences of opinion while he is still in active charge of the theater?

General MACARTHUR I believe the theater commander has the responsibility of registering his views as he might see fit, if they are honest views and not in contradiction to any implementing directives that he may have received.

I do not believe the implications of your question, that any segment of American society shall be so gagged that the truth and the full truth shall not be brought out.

I believe it is in the interest, the public interest, that diverse opinions on any controversial issue shall be fully aired.

I understand completely that the totalitarian and the Soviet method is entirely in contradiction to that, that they do muzzle certain segments of society. I do not believe that is the American way.

And if your question is intended to mean that I would be subservient to and not reg-

ister within the proper processes my opinions, I would refute it at once.

Otherwise you do not get what is the foundation of the very liberty that we breathe, that the people are entitled to have the facts, that the judgment of the Government itself is subject to their opinion and to their control; and in order to exercise that, they are entitled to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, Senator.

EXPRESSION OF VIEWS BY SUBORDINATES

Senator McMAHON Now, let's assume, General, that one of your subordinate generals in the theater of your command had felt as you feel. He, too, is a military man and he, too, is subordinate to his higher command.

Do I take it that you would defend the right of a brigadier general on your staff to give his opinions as to the policy that was proceeding or that was being proceeded with by the Government of the United States?

General MACARTHUR I wouldn't have a brigadier general or anyone else on my staff that didn't freely and frankly give me his opinions in contradiction to my own. The very value of a subordinate is the freedom with which he expresses his initiative.

I have frequently had officers under my command, not only in my staff, but in my command, that disagreed with me completely and I listened to them and on occasions they have convinced me that I was wrong and they were right. That, I believe, is fundamental.

Senator McMAHON Now, General, we are not talking about the same thing, I don't think. I fully agree with you that it would be a poor commander, a poor executive of any kind, who insisted on having "yes men" around him and wouldn't listen to what they had to say.

However, General, that isn't quite what I am talking about. I assume that you had the right and exercised it at any and all times to bring any views that you might have to the attention of your superior officers.

Do you wish the question read?

General MACARTHUR I didn't get your—

Senator McMAHON Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

General MACARTHUR Naturally.

Senator McMAHON And you were never restricted in any way in bringing those recommendations or thoughts that you might have on any matter to the attention of your superiors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General MACARTHUR No restrictions whatsoever.

Senator McMAHON You see, General, what I was raising was the question of the advisability, if not the propriety, of any subordinate military officer to take his differences of opinion, on a governmental policy, when he is in the military command, and chain of command, to people in political life.

General MACARTHUR I do not know what you mean by "people in political life," Senator.

Senator McMAHON We have your answer, General, in the letter to Mr. Martin.

General MACARTHUR It seems to me that the American people are entitled to certain basic facts, when it involves the lives of their sons, and, perhaps, the future of our country.

I do not believe in the gag rule, if that is what you are talking about.

I am free to confess I do not quite follow what you are driving at, or how it appertains to this particular investigation.

Senator McMAHON General, you are not going to, by that statement, without a mild dissent from me, place in this record that I am in favor of what you choose to denominate as "the gag rule."

I am not an expert on military affairs. I was merely of the opinion, and always have been, from what I did know, that every officer and every man in the United States Army

reported to his superiors, and fought out his differences with his superiors.

COMMUNISM AS OUR MAIN ENEMY

Now, General, you have stated that the issue that faces this Nation is global in nature.

As I see it, there are three questions, fundamentally, in global strategy.

Who is overwhelmingly the main enemy, in your opinion?

Senator SALTONSTALL What was that question?

Senator McMAHON Who is overwhelmingly the main enemy—that we have to take into cognizance—take into consideration?

General MACARTHUR Communism, in my opinion.

Senator McMAHON When you talk about communism, do you mean as evidenced in Red China, or the Kremlin?

General MACARTHUR I mean all over the world, including the interior of many of the fine democratic countries of the world.

Senator McMAHON General, where is the source and brains of this conspiracy?

General MACARTHUR How would I know?

Senator McMAHON Would you think that the Kremlin was the place that might be the loci?

General MACARTHUR I might say that it is one of the loci.

Senator McMAHON Would you say it was one of the main loci, the main place?

General MACARTHUR I think the world public opinion would so locate it.

Senator McMAHON Pardon me?

General MACARTHUR I say, I should think that the world public opinion would so locate it.

Senator McMAHON You would not differ from that opinion, General?

EFFECT OF A CHINESE WAR ON RUSSIAN ARMED STRENGTH

General, if we were to fight a victorious war with China, will you tell this committee how the strength of the Soviet Union, the armed strength of the Soviet Union, would be impaired, assuming she does not come into the war?

General MACARTHUR Will you repeat the question, please?

(The question pending was read to the witness by the reporter.)

General MACARTHUR As I have said so frequently, Senator, our purpose, as I see it in the Korean war, is to force China to stop her aggression in North Korea. It does not necessarily mean the overwhelming of China, it simply means that sufficient pressure be brought upon her to make her stop killing our boys by the thousands in Korea.

Just how that might impinge with reference to the Soviet forces is purely speculative.

Senator McMAHON Well, General, you make a pretty good speculation if Russia does not come in, and we do go into China in a limited way for the further extension of a now limited war. Is it not true that it wouldn't impair the 175 divisions that the Soviets are reputed to have, or the 16,000 operational aircraft, nor her stockpile and growing stockpile of atomic weapons?

General MACARTHUR If you mean to say, as you yourself said yesterday, calling attention to the alliance between the Soviet and China, that the diminution of China's potential power doesn't diminish the total power of communism throughout the world, why, that would be fallacious, Senator.

Senator McMAHON I asked, General, about its diminution of their military striking power, and I listed their aircraft, their atomic weapons, and their 175 divisions. It is obvious that we agree they are our main enemy—that the Soviet Union is.

General MACARTHUR I didn't agree to it. Senator McMAHON You do not agree?

General MACARTHUR. I said that communism throughout the world was our main enemy.

Senator McMAHON. I see.

General MACARTHUR. It is your argument to confine it to one section of the world.

Senator McMAHON. I see.

And you have the feeling that if we take over China, that we will have made—

General MACARTHUR. I didn't say we would ever take over China, Senator. I said to the contrary yesterday, that we had no objectives in China proper, except to put sufficient force on China so that she would stop her depredation in North Korea.

FACTORS AFFECTING GLOBAL POLICY

Senator McMAHON. General, as I take it, you have no opinion to give us as to when we will be best prepared for a war that would include the Soviet Union, if one had to come?

General MACARTHUR. Such studies, as that, Senator, are made by higher authority than my own. They are available, I am sure, to you.

Senator McMAHON. And, as a former Chief of Staff of the Army, you realize that those higher authorities have to take into account many factors which a theater commander cannot take into account?

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably.

Senator McMAHON. What are some of those factors, General?

General MACARTHUR. Some of those factors are the general resources that would be available to us and our allies; the strengths that would be available to the enemy, the disposition of the forces, the general political atmosphere that prevails, the controversial questions that might arise between the governments, and many other things which, of course, would be much beyond any sector commander's responsibility.

Senator McMAHON. That is very helpful, General; and those are the factors which you assumed that these men whom you believe to be competent have weighed, and must weigh, in relation to our global policy and our global defense.

General MACARTHUR. That is not only their responsibility, Senator, but it is their authority.

Senator McMAHON. And, General—

General MACARTHUR. It is inherent in their command position.

Senator McMAHON (continuing). If they show up here and say that they have weighed all of those factors, and they believe that the policy which we are pursuing in the east is the correct one, I assume that you would agree with them inasmuch as you have not studied those factors which will influence the opinion of these competent men?

PUBLIC OPINION AND DEFENSE DECISIONS

General MACARTHUR. Any decisions they'd make, Senator, are like all other human decisions. They have to pass before the high court of public opinion.

The fact that any group in authority, in carrying out its responsibilities, makes decisions, that when they make that decision every man accepts it as an infallibly correct one is absurd.

Senator McMAHON. General, I hope I am a democrat, with a small "d" as well as a large one. I say I hope I am a democrat, with a small "d" as well as a large one, but I wonder if the logical extension of your last observation does not mean that we should take a national poll or referendum on how we should conduct the strategy of defending America. You do not wish to be put in that position, General, do you?

General MACARTHUR. Not at all, Senator. Every military man is subject to assignment. If he doesn't perform his duties satisfactorily, he is subject to removal. If an administration doesn't conduct its processes satisfactorily, every 4 years we have a referendum.

Our system of government is based upon that. If you mean that I would in contradiction to that purely democratic method would accept a Soviet method of placing every issue that comes up before a vote of every member of the citizenship, I would, of course, not agree.

There is a great difference between pure democracy and a republican form of representative government. The latter is what we're operating under.

Senator McMAHON. Mr. Chairman, I still have my juncture in mind, if the chairman will just indulge me for a couple of minutes more.

LIMITED WAR IN CHINA

General, your recommendations for our operations in China would still be a limited war. We would not commit American ground forces to the operation in China under any circumstances, as I understand it.

General MACARTHUR. I would not advise it; no, sir. That is, of course, with the general limitation of the contingencies of campaign.

I believe it would be a master folly to contemplate the use of United States ground troops in China. I do not believe it would be necessary.

I believe, as I explained several times yesterday, that the application of the, if you want to call it, limited pressures would be quite sufficient to bring Red China to a reasonable attitude to gather around a peace conference table to end this savage slaughter.

Senator McMAHON. General, of course we have had undisputed command of the air in Korea, and those northern Chinese troops keep pouring down into North Korea.

General MACARTHUR. The reason, Senator, that the Air has not been more successful in stopping that pouring down is because they don't have the latitude of operation to hit deeper than the Yalu.

You understand the Yalu is only 2 or 3 days' march from the front line, and it gives the Air a very limited opportunity, especially when you would have a couple of days of obscure weather where the Air couldn't hit, you could get troops down from the Yalu to the front line without being subjected to any air attack, but if the Air could go where they are assembling, could go to the foundation roots where these armies are being assembled to be thrown at us, they could destroy them.

At least they could so decimate them that their efficacy when they reached the front lines would be most materially decreased.

The Air has done a magnificent job in Korea. Under the limitations placed upon it, it has been far in excess of any anticipation that I had.

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR ALLIES

Senator McMAHON. General, I haven't had an opportunity to review the testimony of yesterday except very hastily, but I saw one of the newspapers had a headline that you said yesterday that we would go it alone if necessary. I am sure, General, that you do not underrate the importance of having our allies with us.

General MACARTHUR. Senator, I am not responsible for what the papers say, but in answer to your question I would say indubitably it is advantageous for us to have all of the allies that we can get and procure.

The great difficulty in the contributions that are being made, they're not in commensurate strength with what we put in. The forces we have in Korea are only token forces from everybody except the South Koreans and ourselves.

We have plenty of allies, but the numbers of them do not contribute in the same generous and noble way in which we do.

Senator McMAHON. Thank you, General. And they should put up more. These allies do have many assets which we must think about in any global struggle.

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably, Senator, and no one is more fixed in that hope that we can protect them.

UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Senator McMAHON. General, you said one thing in your speech—and I will now come to an end—which interested me very much. You said many things that interested me, but this in particular I thought was interesting. You said, and I quote you: "What the people strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, and a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of the normal nationalist urge for political freedom."

I thought, General, that that was a very cogent analysis of the yearnings of the people of the world.

Although I will try to later, I will not take the time now, except to suggest this question: Have you thought out, and could you give us the benefit of your wisdom as to a program that we can adopt in this country in taking the initiative against the Communist menace which is built up on the existence of conditions which you described?

General MACARTHUR. I think, Senator, that the United States has already contributed with a degree of generosity, nobility, and the breadth of character which is unique in the annals of the world, along just the lines that you are suggesting.

Senator McMAHON. I am very happy to hear you say that. That means, of course, that you see some sense in the point 4 program.

General MACARTHUR. Senator, I am not going to discuss any details that I am not familiar with.

Senator McMAHON. I see.

General MACARTHUR. I know no more about the point 4 program than what I have read in the papers. My observations were based upon my own experiences in the Far East.

Senator McMAHON. Those experiences in the Far East have brought you to the opinion that it is this kind of physical condition of the people which has made the inroads of this world-wide conspiracy possible?

General MACARTHUR. It has helped it enormously, beyond doubt.

MACARTHUR SPEECH AS CHIEF OF STAFF IN 1932

Senator McMAHON. General, and this is my closing observation, I would like now to read into the record a statement that was made by you when you were Chief of Staff in the year 1932, and I quote:

"The national strategy of any war, that is, the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in obtaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war, are decisions that must be made by the head of state, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Government. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions.

"For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be obtained has involved the Army in land attacks against areas held by the enemy. In every instance missions have been prescribed for the Navy that had in view the assisting and facilitating of the Army efforts. Yet in no case could these missions and objectives have been properly described by the Secretaries of War and Navy acting in unison, or by a single supersecretary acting for both. The issues involved are so far-reaching in their effect and so vital in the life of the Nation that the phase of coordinating Army and Navy efforts should not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation but rather abdication."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General MACARTHUR. As I look back, Senator, upon my rather youthful days then, I am surprised and amazed how wise I was. Senator McMAHON. Thank you.

The Democratic Party Has a Record That Will Win in 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered today by that distinguished fellow Missourian, the Honorable Clark M. Clifford, to the Democratic Committee of Wisconsin at Wausau, Wis., makes an important contribution to our understanding of the issues that will confront the American people in November of next year:

I am very glad to be here in Wausau tonight, with the Democrats of Wisconsin, because it gives me a chance to talk with you about the great issues which face the American people today.

I am particularly glad to have this opportunity to be in Wisconsin at this Democratic convention, because I have heard so much about the new, young, hard-hitting Democratic Party which you have built here in recent years.

You are building a vigorous party organization around principles and ideals. And you are carrying on a tradition of liberal, clean, and independent political action for which Wisconsin is justly famous and may be justly proud.

With this kind of a Democratic Party, I think no one need worry about the future political good name of this great and progressive State.

Judging from the way your Democratic vote has been rising, I believe that people are going to find Wisconsin a Democratic State in 1952.

For nearly 2 years, I have been away from the White House and I have not held any official Government position. But I haven't lost my interest in the questions of foreign and domestic policy which confront the American people. As a private citizen, I travel more, and talk with more people, than I was ever able to do in the 4 years I worked for President Truman. I see more clearly now than ever before how essential it is to the welfare of every American family that we have a Government in Washington that works day in and day out for two overriding goals: Peace in the world, and the welfare of all Americans.

And after watching from the outside for 2 years, I am more convinced than ever before that the present administration in Washington is successfully leading us toward peace and the highest level of prosperity we have ever known.

Next year—1952—is a Presidential election year. People are already throwing their hats—and other people's hats—into the ring. Now, I didn't come out here to throw hats around, and I can't tell you who will be on the Democratic ticket in 1952. A lot of people are saying that President Truman will run, but, so far as I know, he has kept his own counsel and hasn't told anyone.

But this I do know.

The Democratic Party has a record to be proud of, and we will have candidates to be proud of in 1952.

The Democratic Party has a record that will win in 1952.

The Democrats will win because of our achievements in foreign policy, and we will win because the American people know progress and prosperity when they see it, and they know who is responsible for it.

There has been a lot of discussion of foreign policy this last year, because of Korea and the tense international situation. Unfortunately, a lot of the talk has been highly inaccurate, put out by those who are trying to discredit our foreign policy for partisan political reasons.

Tonight, I would like to put this matter of foreign policy in perspective. I think it is perfectly plain, when you look at it over the last several years, that we have developed a firm, clear, and consistent foreign policy—a policy that is designed to achieve peace and freedom and human progress in the world.

Let us go back for a moment to the fall of 1945.

At that time, the world must have looked pretty soft to the men in the Kremlin. Western Europe was in ruins. Hunger and unemployment were everywhere. Factories were closed. Farms were devastated. Thousands of refugees clogged relief camps.

It looked like a situation made to order for the Communists. It looked even better to the men in the Kremlin because the United States was disarming as fast as it could. The people of our country, naturally enough, wanted to return to peaceful pursuits. President Truman saw the danger in too rapid demobilization and he advocated a system of universal military training so that we would always have well-trained Reserve forces. But his plea went unheeded.

The Kremlin was convinced that the American people were turning back to isolationism, and that we would soon have a depression.

So the Kremlin started to move. First, the Russians tightened the screws on the Eastern European countries that the Red army had captured from the Nazis. They set up satellite governments, and began converting Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the other Eastern European countries into parts of the vast concentration camp that is the Soviet Union.

Then the Russians began pushing out beyond the area its armies had captured. They stirred up a civil war in Greece. They threatened Turkey. It looked as though these two countries would be the next to fall.

But what happened? The Kremlin had reckoned without the President of the United States. Backed by the Congress, the Truman doctrine saved Greece and Turkey.

Next, the Kremlin tried to move in on France, and Italy, and Western Germany. In these countries, the winter of 1947 was expected to be the most miserable since the war. It looked as though they would fall like ripe fruit into the Kremlin's basket.

But once again the United States acted. The Marshall plan revived the countries of Western Europe. They were saved from communism, and today they are free, strong, and staunch allies.

The Kremlin tried to take over Berlin by the blockade. But once again President Truman dumbfounded Stalin and his gang. We began the airlift. England and France joined us. Berlin was saved. Today, it is strong and free.

The Kremlin continued to build up large armed forces, in a state of battle readiness, pointing toward Western Europe. Again the United States acted. Together with Canada and 10 free nations of Western Europe, we signed the North Atlantic Treaty for common defense against aggression. We now have the combined strength of these 11 nations—and Greece and Turkey are about to join—to meet any aggression.

What a glorious change from the wreckage that was Europe in 1945.

In Asia, too, the Kremlin vultures have been busy.

They have made one great gain in Asia. The Nationalist government of China, ever with billions of dollars worth of help from the United States, was not strong enough to hold the mainland of China.

But in Japan, under progressive occupation policies, the people have made rapid strides toward freedom, and the Communists have fallen far behind.

Elsewhere in Asia, new nations have arisen. India, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Indochina, Korea—the list is long. The United States has been helping these countries maintain their independence and grow in strength.

We believe that freedom is indivisible, and that the free nations all around the world must work together for peace and prosperity if we ourselves are to remain prosperous and free.

We backed up our beliefs with action in Korea. When the Communist assault came in Korea in June 1950, the Kremlin expected at one blow to shatter the hopes of all the free nations of Asia, and to destroy the United Nations.

But they were wrong again. Because, as in every crisis in the last 5 years, the United States acted to preserve freedom.

The shock of the Communist aggression in Korea, and then the promptness of the American response, sent a thrill clear around the world.

A few days ago, our American Ambassador to Denmark, your neighbor from Minnesota, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, described the effect in Europe of the Korean decision this way. She said, "I can remember so well those anxious hours between the first word of the Communist attack and the moment when President Truman announced that American forces were on their way to Korea. I want to tell you that I was especially proud to be the American Ambassador that day."

"There had been great uneasiness during those hours. Would we really dare to match our fine words with bold deeds? * * * If the United States had not acted immediately and decisively then, the whole world would have known that both the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty were as dead and as empty as a haunted house."

But, under the President's far-sighted leadership, the United States did act. And since that time, this country's troops, together with troops from other members of the United Nations, have fought brilliantly and bravely.

The Communists have had well over a million casualties—many times the casualties of the United Nations. They have spent untold blood and treasure—and they are back behind the line they started from.

We have been fighting this conflict in Korea to prevent a third world war. So far we have done just that.

No one can promise that there will not be a third world war. The obvious fact is that the Kremlin can start it at any time.

But the equally obvious fact is that, step by step, over the last 5 years, we have taken a series of positive actions that have completely changed the world situation.

Five years ago, large parts of the free world seemed open to the Kremlin for the taking. Today, the Kremlin looks out to see itself confronted by a unified, determined group of free countries, ready to defend themselves against subversion and aggression, and prepared to work together for human progress.

I know—we all know—the outcome is still uncertain. There will be trying days, hard days, before we can feel sure of the result.

But we can be buoyed up by the knowledge that the free world today is stronger, more united, and more determined than it has been at any time since 1945.

A great deal of the credit for this result, and for the profound change in the world situation which has brought it about, is due to the vision, the determination, and the great moral courage of our President—Harry S. Truman.

The Democratic Members of Congress have given him strong support. We all know that there has been differences among the Democrats in Congress on some issues. But in the field of foreign policy, it is a notable fact that the Democratic Members of Congress as a whole have been united behind our positive, constructive foreign policy.

I would also like to pay tribute to those far-sighted members of the Republican Party who put aside partisan consideration in a sincere effort to support the President in his program to strengthen the security of the free world.

Senator Vandenberg was a great exponent of the principles of a bipartisan foreign policy.

I regret to say, however, that some members of the opposition have not followed Senator Vandenberg's example of putting our national security above political expediency.

Some of these men, who have no foreign policy of their own, try to make political capital out of every unfortunate turn of events in world affairs.

They always wait to see how our policies are going to turn out before they take a stand.

If it works, they say they were for it all the time. If the going gets tough, they say they were against it from the beginning.

They operate by hindsight, and their hindsight is truly brilliant. They can spot trouble in foreign affairs the minute they read about it in the newspapers.

But you can't run a government on hindsight. When it comes to devising a program to meet trouble or to avoid it before it happens, these men have a remarkably blank record. However, despite their obstruction, the free world grows stronger every day.

But we cannot successfully maintain our world leadership and carry out our responsibilities unless we are strong internally here at home.

We must be strong economically. We must be strong morally. We must be strong in our devotion to our democratic concepts of individual rights and liberties.

I ask you to look back at the progress this country has been making. The last 10 or 12 years have been years of vast change, and vast problems. During these years, the American people have had to carry the heavy burdens of a world war, and since then, the burden of helping to rebuild shattered cities and shattered lives all around the world. The people of the United States have had to spend billions of dollars for war and reconstruction.

Has that left us exhausted, worn out, with our factories falling to pieces and our farms run down?

No! The exact contrary is true. The immense productivity of our free society has enabled us to carry the tremendous economic burdens of the last 12 years—and we are better off today than when we started.

We have grown to peaks of prosperity and production that are the marvel of the world. This country today is turning out 80 percent more goods and services than it was in 1939. You can look at any of the figures—farm output, steel production, national income—and they all show the same thing.

But the figures that impress me more than all the statistics on steel and wheat and freight carloadings are the figures that show what the increased output means to the average man. You hear a lot of talk to the effect that all the increases in income that people have had have been eaten up in higher prices and higher taxes.

But even allowing for high prices and high taxes, the fact is that the annual income

per person in this country today is 40 percent higher than it was back in 1939. I repeat, after taxes, and after taking price rises into account, the average annual income in this country has increased by 40 percent.

Now these are remarkable facts. They would do credit to Paul Bunyan—but they are not imaginary. They are real.

Why has our country grown like this? One of the main reasons is the progressive, liberal program of the Democratic Party.

Look at the farmer. Twenty years ago the farmers of this country were in terrible shape. They were losing their homes and their land, and they were burning their crops for fuel.

But the New Deal and the Fair Deal brought strength and health and hope to farm families. Better credit was made available. Educational efforts were stepped up. Electricity was brought to the farm. Conservation measures were encouraged. Markets for farm crops were improved.

All these measures were immensely successful.

Why? Because they were based on the great secret of democratic progress; these measures freed the farmer from his old chains of debt and poverty and drudgery. And farmers, free to use their skill and energy, have responded magnificently to the challenge of recent years. Productivity on farms has gone up 25 percent since 1940—that means that 3 acres now will do the work that 4 acres used to do.

The income of farmers in this country is 50 percent higher than in 1939—after taxes and after allowing for higher prices.

But the farmer isn't the only one who is well off. Look at the industrial worker.

Twenty years ago, the workers in this country were in as bad shape as the farmers were. Jobs were scarce. Millions were unemployed. Unions were shattered.

Then came the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Social security and minimum-wage laws were passed. Housing and health programs were started. Collective bargaining became the basic element in labor-management relations.

And these programs were successful, too—for the same reasons our farm programs were. These programs set the workers of the United States free: free from sweatshop wages; free from poverty in old age; free to join unions of their own choosing, free to participate in decisions about wages and hours and working conditions.

The working men and women of this country have responded magnificently to their challenge of the last 10 years. Productivity per man-hour has risen more than 30 percent. The factories of America were the arsenal of freedom during World War II, and they are now again.

Working people have shared in increased prosperity. Annual wages and salaries of employees—after allowing for price changes—have nearly doubled since 1939.

Today the working people of the United States are better off—materially and spiritually—than any workers in history. The Democratic Party has had a lot to do with that, and we should all be proud of it.

So far, I haven't mentioned businessmen, and you may be thinking that all these gains for farmers and workers have come out of the hides of businessmen. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Business also was lifted to its feet by the New Deal in the early 1930's. Business, too, has prospered under the Fair Deal. The annual income of corporations, after taxes, and after allowing for price increases, has more than doubled since 1939.

But there are some other figures I am also proud of. Since 1939, the number of independent businesses in this country has grown from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000. That is evidence again that the New Deal and the Fair Deal are on the right track by helping

to turn loose the energies of our people—helping to free them from the iron grip of restricted credit, low wages, poor prices and business depression.

There is one great lesson to all this: It is within our power as a people to make full use of our tremendous resources of farm, and factory, and human skill. We know how to do it. We are doing it. We can continue to do it.

But we can maintain this progress only if we continue the positive, liberal type of Government we have had in this country since 1933.

Now, we hear a lot of talk these days about the danger of communism in the United States. Much of this talk is sheer nonsense. There isn't the slightest danger that the Communists can take over this country from within. The Communists were never at a lower ebb in this country.

This state of affairs didn't just happen. It is the result of a long, hard fight—a fight that this administration, backed by the liberal and progressive forces in this country, has been waging for years.

The great strength of this country is our best defense against communism, abroad and at home. Our productive power is the keystone of the resistance of the free world. Our prosperity is our best bulwark against communism at home.

The Communists are practically powerless in this country because, first of all, the policies our Government has followed have made the country prosperous. Communism doesn't spread when people have jobs and the economy is booming. Prosperous people don't accept the fallacious doctrines of communism.

Communist influence is at an all-time low today because the liberal elements in our population have fought against it. They have met Communist propaganda head-on in their labor unions, and in their political organizations, and have stopped it dead in its tracks.

Communist influence is at a low ebb because the Government has had a steady, practical program of anticommunism. Long before our political opponents began their present hue and cry, President Truman had begun the Government loyalty program to eliminate Communist influence from the Government. This program has worked—without fanfare and without injury to innocent persons. Furthermore, the administration has worked for years, successfully, to break up the illegal activities of the Communist Party. Leading Communists have been indicted, tried, and jailed, all in accordance with process of law. Communist espionage has been met with all the forces of the FBI.

This is the record, and it is a good one. Furthermore, this is the right way to fight communism. The wrong way is to spread reckless charges and rumors, to spread fear and suspicion, and to whip up such hysteria that free speech and the bill of rights are in danger.

That is the wrong way to fight communism, because it plays into the hands of the Communists. They function best in an atmosphere of fear and hysteria. It is the wrong way because it undermines our basic freedoms.

The theory that a man is presumed to be guilty until he proves himself innocent is as dangerous to our way of life as a Soviet atom bomb.

There is no use in spending billions to fight communism if we are going to frighten ourselves into another form of totalitarianism.

If we stick to the policies of the Democratic administration, if we keep our heads, and adhere to our principles of free speech and fair play, communism will never be a threat to the internal security of this country, no matter how recklessly charges of

communism in Government are thrown around.

Now, there's another form of smear that is being spread around the country, and it is one on which our opponents place great hopes. They are filling the papers these days with charges of corruption in the Federal Government.

Your Government—and I know the Government pretty well—is filled from top to bottom with hard-working, decent, honorable men and women. There have been some instances of dishonesty in the Government. There have been a few men and women who have betrayed the public trust. But they are rare and isolated cases, and the administration throws them out and punishes them whenever they are found.

I say to you there is no more honest man in America than Harry Truman. No one is more determined to stamp out every single instance of dishonesty in the Government service.

This smoke screen of accusations should not obscure the fact that our opponents are trying to divert public attention from the basic issues that exist. In five successive elections the other side has lost on the issues. This time they are trying the strategy of clouding the real points of difference and repeating over and over again the cry "corruption."

The Democratic Party must continue its efforts to locate and weed out all unfaithful servants and, at the same time, we must keep the real issues clearly before the public.

There is nothing that will kill off our opposition faster than getting the real issues across to the people. What we must do is to cut through all the scare words and propaganda, the smoke screens and phony issues, and get the truth to the people. For once, our citizens know what is really going on and what is really at stake in this country and the world—once they know these facts, the Democratic Party will have nothing to fear at the polls.

I have tremendous confidence in the good sense of the American voter. We all should have confidence. We should all remember what happened in 1948.

And we should all remember that every time we get the issues over to the people it will happen again.

That is our big job. And I know you Democrats out here in Wisconsin are going right to work on it. It is the greatest public service you can render to the people of this fine State.

After all, ours is the party that has a definite, positive program to put before the country—a program to benefit all Americans and all the free peoples of the world.

And ours is the party that can offer the country real leadership. We have demonstrated that time after time. President Truman and President Roosevelt before him have given our country—and the whole free world besides—a record of hard-hitting, firm, constructive leadership that is unequalled in our history.

Think what kind of man we have as President of the United States and as head of our Democratic Party. I only wish you all had the chance to know him as I have. And I want to tell you this about him—he has more courage, more integrity and more human decency than any man I have ever known. He is a wonderful representative of everything that is best in the tradition of our great Midwest.

That is why the record of this administration will have a great place in history. That is why the Democratic Party can go before the country with a program it can be proud of.

It is not an accident that the whole free world looks to America for help and guidance and support. It is not an accident that the people of this country have put a Demo-

cratic administration in office five times running.

These results have happened because our country under Democratic leadership has earned the trust and confidence of the free world by the firm positions it has taken and the deeds it has performed. And in just the same way, our Democratic administrations have been returned to office because they have earned the trust and confidence of our own people here at home.

We Democrats have a real program. We have real leadership. We stand on the right side, the constructive side, the forward-looking and progressive side of every major issue that confronts this country and the entire free world.

This is our record. This is our achievement as a party.

This is why I have full confidence that the Democratic Party in 1952 will triumph once again.

Government Planning Comes High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George S. Benson is president of Harding College at Searcy, Ark. He is a very popular lecturer in our part of the country and in great demand for public addresses. His lectures are both entertaining and instructive. Above all, I think he pitches them on the sound basis of the American free enterprise system, which has made this country the envy of the rest of the world.

My attention has been directed to an article by Dr. Benson, entitled "Government Planning Comes High," which appears in the September 1951 issue of the Independent Petroleum Association of America Monthly, and I am pleased to quote the same, as follows:

When the economic planners of England's Labor-Socialist government blithely wasted \$100,000,000 of hard-pressed Britain's money on a scheme for growing peanuts in British East Africa, and were obliged last January to publicly admit utter failure, the limit seemed to have been reached on the high cost of bureaucratic bungling. But the facts regarding our own Interior Department's plan for irrigating a small section of Arizona desert land, would suggest that the English Socialists are, after all, only small-time spenders.

The construction cost of our own economic planners' Arizona irrigation project, together with its so-called multipurpose trimmings, is to be \$738,780,000. But that's just the beginning of what the American taxpayers would have to pay. The Interior Department itself admits that actual cost to the taxpayers, counting interest on the borrowed money necessary to build it, would be \$2,784,509,000. That's almost 10 times the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the whole State of Arizona as recorded by the United States Census Bureau.

A FANTASTIC PROPOSAL

The astonishing facts about the Interior Department's central Arizona project are disclosed in an article by Towner Phelan, distinguished economist, in the July 16 issue of the Freeman magazine. "From the standpoint of costs in relation to expected benefits," he writes, "possibly nothing more fan-

tastic than the central Arizona project has ever been proposed."

Mr. Phelan points out that the \$2,784,509,000 figure is the economic planners' own estimate of the ultimate cost, with interest, and that actually the cost probably would be 2 or 3 times this amount—or from \$6,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000. "History shows," he says, "that in most cases the initial cost estimate of a Government project is very low, later estimates much higher, and the final cost higher still. The Hoover Commission gives many examples such as the Hungry Horse project in Montana. It was estimated to cost \$8,500,000 but actually cost \$93,500,000."

According to Mr. Phelan's well-documented article, the object is this: Water is to be diverted from the Colorado River to provide irrigation for 152,500 acres of land now being irrigated by a dwindling supply of ground water—pumped by private means, and an additional 73,500 acres of desert wasteland. To reach the land to be rescued the Colorado's water must first be raised nearly 1,000 feet by pumping, and then transported some 300 miles by canals and pipelines.

HALF A TRILLION

More than half the land to be watered by the Government's engineering colossus is owned by 420 landowners with 500 acres or more—thus more than half the multi-billion-dollar cost would actually be expended for the direct benefit of only 420 farmers. Mr. Phelan estimates that the cost allocated solely to the irrigation phase of the multipurpose project calls for \$7,159 of taxpayers' money to be spent for each acre of land to be irrigated—on the basis of the Government's own estimates. On past performances, this figure likely would be closer to \$25,000 per acre.

The writer shows that on a pro rata basis the economic planners are proposing to bring water to the 420 larger farms at an average cost to the taxpayers, counting interest, of \$2,118,000 per farm. His article also states significantly that the central Arizona project is only one of a batch of such projects that have been officially planned by the planners at an estimated cost of \$57,506,200,000 and which would probably cost \$500,000,000,000—half a trillion dollars.

Yes; planning by Government economic planners comes high. It is bankrupting England and pulling the citizen down to socialized poverty. Must we, too, become its victims?

LET'S LOOK AT ANOTHER SOCIALISTIC EXAMPLE

There once lived a popular political leader who seemed destined to change the basic economic and political concepts of his nation. He had been born to "blue blood," had attended the best schools, and as he'd grown into manhood he'd begun to influence people disarmingly with his charm and oratorical talents. When he rose to the administrative leadership of his nation, he immediately established a paternalistic program of economic planning and social reform to improve, he said, the plight of the common man.

Prices and wages were set by government decree. Virtually all of the tax load was placed on the middle and upper income brackets. Government pensions, unemployment compensation, and regular grants in all categories of welfare were begun. Special benefits were provided for various groups. Government bureaus were set up throughout the country.

The leader's ego thrived. It was said he actually considered himself incapable of error. Yet, after a number of years, the reform ideas began to go sour. Both the common man and his uncommon neighbor were in a sorry plight. The monetary structure of the government was giving trouble. The economic planning wasn't paying off. The peerless leader manipulated money values

but in the end this only aggravated the situation. Members of his administration were caught stealing public funds.

Within 10 years the country was critically weakened morally and financially. The impractical reformer was removed from office, his abortive programs cast off. Yet, the damaging effects lingered on. Some historians subsequently termed him "imposter" and "charlatan."

His name was Wang An-Shih. He was chief-of-state in China from 1069 to 1079. Historians are not in agreement on the long-range extent of the injuries done by his 10 years of political paternalism and economic planning. However, history does record that the nation did not have the necessary moral and physical strength when, many years later, the godless hordes of Genghis Khan, bent on world conquest, overrun and plundered the whole country.

The lesson. Throughout the ages paternalistic governments have been fashioned by peerless leaders and when continued for long they have ruined nations—again and again and again.

The New Call for Leadership in Business and Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix of the Record an address by W. H. Wheeler, Jr., president of the New England Council and president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn., before the Twenty-first New England Bank Management Conference, October 19, 1951, Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE NEW CALL FOR LEADERSHIP IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

I puzzled a bit over what I might say to you who are attending this annual New England Bankers' Conference. While I serve on the board of a bank, I am hardly an expert on banking problems, and what little I do know would certainly not do as the subject matter for a talk to such a knowledgeable group as this. But I can, as its president, extend to you the most cordial greetings of the New England Council to which so many of you have given your able help and support over the years—for the good of New England and the Nation. And I can give you some personal reflections on a few of the problems which face us all.

I am most fortunate in having this opportunity to talk to men of finance. No group carries greater influence in business thinking. We in business have the highest respect for your views as bankers. Even though you come to us most frequently when we don't need you, and we go to you most frequently when you don't want to see us, we just can't get along without one another. And I think we've done a good job together in New England in the past.

These are fretful, if not fearful times. Management and capital are worried about rising costs, taxes, and the state of political affairs. Labor is worried about wages, rising prices, and profits. The huge, amorphous white-collar group is worried about getting caught in the inflationary squeeze,

and about its relative impotency in an age of organization and power. The Government, apparently, is worried about all of us, and everything. And we, all of us together, are faced with the threat of moving from one costly war to a larger, more horrible one.

The Politburo could not have planned a more diabolical effort to undermine us. There is good cause for this worry. And it is only normal that each group should be worried about the things which most directly affect it. The curious thing, however, is why, with this unanimous concern over the state of things, are we not doing better?

As I see it, there are two reasons:

First, while it is quite true all of us are worried about our economy, it is not quite true that we have faced up to the full implications of the job we have set for ourselves. Guns and butter is a most appealing idea. We would be less than human if we didn't find it so. But I believe we must begin now to question seriously whether it is practical or not. We are committed to a goal of preparedness and strong defense, but we are not, so far, committed to the enormous task which this goal imposes on all of us. And by all I mean just that—business, labor, agriculture, the general public, and Government.

Second, our worries do not produce more curative actions because, I think, too many of us insist that our particular narrow point of view gives the only answer. We lose much of our strength in argument and conflict. Divide and conquer threatens to work even here.

The ancient story of the three blind men coming upon an elephant and each reaching a different conclusion as to the shape and nature of the elephant because of the particular part he laid his hands on, has never been more appropriate. It seems to me, than now. You will remember, one feeling his tail, said he was like a rope, another feeling his trunk said he was like a vine, and the last feeling one of his legs said he was like a tree.

"Perhaps so," you may agree, "but what has this got to do with New England? Are we doing any worse than any other section of the country?" My answer is most assuredly not, we are probably doing better. But the question is, Are we doing as well as we should? Are we furnishing the very high degree of leadership which our favored position and heritage should induce? I say "favored" advisedly, because I believe that we here in New England are probably the most fortunate group of people to be found anywhere on this earth. We have our economic problems, of course—many. But we have a top standard of living. We have a traditional ruggedness and courage of character that is unsurpassed anywhere. And, as the oldest culture in the new world, we should have the wisdom to use it effectively.

Character and wisdom together are an unbeatable combination. I'm sure none of you will quarrel with me as to essentially of character if we are to meet our No. 1 national problem of mobilization—guns with less butter for all.

You may differ as to what constitutes wisdom. But to be on the practical level, wisdom is simply the ability which enables us to visualize all parts of the elephant and see him function as a whole, instead of only those parts which we are accustomed to feel and handle. Mere knowledge of the parts alone is not wisdom.

Judge Learned Hand once wrote that "The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure it is right . . . which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women . . . which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias."

I would say that applies equally to wisdom—and without wisdom we certainly shall not long preserve the liberty born here in

New England and of which the judge wrote so eloquently.

Two old men—one a bit deaf, were once listening on a park bench to an outdoor orator. After half an hour the deaf one, who was able to catch only a word here and there, despite much sonorous language and gesticulations on the speaker's part, leaned forward to his friend, his hand cupped to his ear and whispered loudly, "What's he talkin' about?" The other old man disparagingly spat on the ground and replied, "He don't say yet."

To escape that accusation, but at the risk of inviting others, I am going to venture a few of my personal reactions on several controversial issues, as an indication of what I think more New England wisdom in business might contribute toward meeting national and regional problems.

And as a prelude, lest I be misunderstood, let me say I could make, I believe, quite an effective, though perhaps less controversial, speech dealing with the failures and shortcomings of Government, labor, and even the public. But we have had plenty of such speeches, perhaps too many from our own group. Let's examine the mote in our own eye, if any, for a change. We may be able to do something about that, even if we can't get the one out of the other fellow's eye.

First, it seems to me that economic wisdom requires a broad philosophic understanding on the part of businessmen that the whole progress of civilization can be measured by the extension of more equality of opportunity to human individuals, that the trend is not only good but absolutely inevitable, that eventually it must be world-wide; that our problem is basically one of maintaining an orderly rate of improvement susceptible of digestion without sacrifice of the opportunity itself, here or abroad, but that in any case the trend will not and cannot be denied, particularly in a democracy like ours, except by the destruction of democracy itself. Socialism comes when we leave the furthering of that trend entirely to Government, instead of helping it along ourselves.

Second, it seems to me we must recognize that while business leadership has made tremendous strides in the past generation in a new-found sense of public responsibility, we must go even faster in the next generation if we are not to further abdicate in favor of Government. Government must inevitably play an increasing part in human affairs, but our job is to keep Government the servant of the people and to improve it by active participation.

Next, more of us must frankly recognize that real business leadership essentially involves a high degree of courage and morality; that we are presently suffering from a rash of pseudo-public and industrial-relations programs which are synthetic and expedient and which will not permanently meet the challenge, that no expediency, no smartness, no sophistication, can ever equal character leadership in any sphere; that the lack of principle in political and labor circles which we decry has its counterpart in too many segments of business, that if we are competing for leadership with Government and labor, that competition is basically in terms of character and in no other.

I don't like to wear a hair shirt any more than you do, but if character and wisdom involve earnest self-examination, then let's take a look at some recent issues:

On the specific issue of Korea, I think more of us should see that, despite the superficial futility, risk, and stalemate, probably no American lives have ever been sacrificed for as great a chance of ultimately gaining world peace and averting another world conflict.

On our far-eastern policy since the war, let each critic be sure his foresight would be as good as his hindsight, and that neither are blinded by politics.

On inflation, I think that there are not enough of us in business and banking who really understand that we, as well as the public, Government, and labor, have been to blame for the necessity for Government controls and the difficulties of administration, that on the whole we failed in our position of public leadership after Korea, failed in not aggressively discouraging scare buying, in not refraining from raising prices and wages and from buying up scarce raw materials. Yes; we contributed our full share, if not more, to inflation.

On high business taxes—and particularly the excess-profits tax—it seems to me a great many of us asked for them. Too many instances of high profits, due to lack of restraint after Korea, made it virtually a political impossibility to avoid the inflationary excess-profits tax.

On the castigation of men in public office we reached an all-time high, or low if you prefer, when one of our leading industrial organizations characterized two great businessmen in Government, Charles Wilson and Eric Johnston, as prisoners of their subordinates, the bright slide rule and figure boys who get up the charts, interpret the statistics, write the speeches and feed them the data on which their thinking is based. Can you think of a better way to keep able men out of Government? And we certainly haven't sent enough of them into public service.

A number of you must have been as shocked as I to read in John Harriman's Boston Globe column the other day, this comment by a businessman consultant to NPA with whom Harriman had talked recently: "There is no longer the slightest hesitation on the part of industry to evade or to ignore the spirit as well as the actual rules of the game as laid down by our defense mobilization program."

"It's a Boston Tea Party with our whole economic stabilization effort being dumped into the harbor," Mr. Harriman continues.

"What this means, actually, is that the business, farming, and, to a lesser extent, the labor interests of this country are refusing to accept controls under conditions short of a shooting war," he concludes.

This picture may be exaggerated, but not too greatly. One of industry's top leaders this week publicized a reference to the Wage Stabilization Board as the "wage stimulation board" and spoke of its practical collapse. If it does collapse the record will show it was due as much to the pressure of management as to labor, management being unwilling to stand up to labor for fear of lost profits.

On the one hand we are worried sick about the dangers of inflation; on the other, scarcely aware of our contradictory behavior, we are tearing down the program designed to check inflation. How this must please Joe Stalin. He planned it that way. He didn't rank us high in either character or wisdom. And the pitiable part of it to me, is that all this is caused by a relatively small minority, whom the rest of us, with more tolerance and understanding, might at least render unpopular, if nothing more. It's time we were more vocal.

I know, of course, that all of us have every right to disagree forcefully when we question the wisdom of methods proposed by the Government, whether by Mr. Wilson or any other official. But none of us has any right, I believe, to circumvent and undermine the program once it is decided upon by Congress and becomes official policy. And we only hurt our own cause when some of us permit ourselves the luxury of name calling and motive questioning, as too many organizations and individuals often do. It's a form of demagoguery—business demagoguery—only unlike labor and political demagoguery, it makes no new friends and influences nobody. Certainly it wins no votes.

Don't misunderstand me. I don't say that as many in labor, agriculture, and Government have not been just as short-sighted, just as avaricious as some in business. But I am a businessman, and I am concerned about our getting our own house in order before we expend all our efforts in blasting and sniping those with whom we disagree.

You will remember the brief recession we had in 1949. When it started, too many businesses got panicky, talked depression, cut down too sharply on inventories, and laid off workers—more proportionately here in New England, incidentally, than elsewhere. I imagine that many were the same businessmen who had bitterly opposed the full employment legislation right after the war, insisting that Government should not be responsible for propping up a declining economy. I don't like that either, but if we want to avoid it, more of us must behave with courage and faith.

If we businessmen are to accept the challenge to provide leadership, an increasing number of us need to be more flexible in our social and economic thinking. I don't mean we should sacrifice principle, or cheapen our character. I simply mean we should be less rigid and dogmatic in our views. Perhaps the other fellow has as much character and maybe even more wisdom, particularly in the social and political fields where we of businessmen have necessarily had so little experience.

A case in point is the recent Report on the New England Economy, by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In my opinion it should be studied carefully by everyone interested in the welfare of New England. It deals with New England's undeniable problems, both material and psychological, as seen by a group of New England's outstanding economists. It cannot intelligently be laughed off by anyone as politically inspired or gratuitous Federal boondoggling. It is profound and far reaching.

I did not agree with every recommendation in the report. It is natural and good that there should be controversy about it. But it seemed to me too many people blinded themselves to what the report had to offer, by their inflexible attitude toward Federal aid or intervention.

Granted that many of the recommendations were so phrased that it was difficult to vote an unqualified no, the large response to the New England Council's poll by responsible and intelligent New England executives with a majority voting against only one of the report's 37 recommendations, may give some of us cause to wonder if there may not be a change in attitude taking place.

The fact that 6 percent of New England's income is being diverted through taxation to help other parts of the country is a point to arrest attention. That's not necessarily all wrong, but I am not at all sure that some of that cannot more properly and in sound principle be used by the Federal Government in New England to do "that which the people cannot do as well for themselves," as Abraham Lincoln once described the role of Government.

Actually, Federal aid itself is not the sort of thing that one can or should be either for or against, without qualification. New England already accepts much Federal aid—from social insurance to channel dredging—and apparently without suffering too much spiritual deterioration as a result. Isn't the question of Federal aid one which must be decided by careful study of each proposal involving it? It seems so to me. Federal aid can be dangerous and unhealthy, or it can be beneficial and necessary. I think, depending on what it is being used for. But I can't believe all Federal aid is a sin. If it is, the good, rugged State of Vermont which uses proportionately the most in New England, is the greatest sinner among us.

We need great character and great wisdom in the job ahead. Let not the one muddle

the other. The country is crying for strong and responsible business and financial leadership. As Deane Malott, newly elected president of Cornell, told the meeting of your own American Bankers Association in Chicago last week: "These are not the times for sedateness in the banking fraternity"—and I may add nor the business fraternity.

But what is there to do about all this? I haven't any pat panacea, but I do suggest that some of us might at least count 10 before expressing opinions on these things, if not pondering on some of them overnight with a searching wisdom and courage.

I would like to see more of us measure our own actions and utterances and those of others against the yardstick of public interest. I would like to see us render highly unpopular the smart move, the shrewd play, and the wisecrack, when the welfare of our region or of our Nation is really involved.

Those are just a few of the things we can do which I am sure occur to you as they do to me. The road is a tough one at best.

We have done a job together in the past and done it well. We did it, I think, because we were willing to take the leadership in developing our great region in the material arts and the physical sciences. Let us now also show the way in the human arts and social sciences which constitute the severest challenge of the future, here in New England, in our Nation, and throughout the world.

Taft's Vital Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Tulsa Daily World of October 17, 1951. I invite the reading of this clearly expressed opinion of the author to his consideration of TAFT's vital leadership:

TAFT'S VITAL LEADERSHIP

ROBERT A. TAFT is, literally, dynamically, out in front in the presidential race. His is the first positive announcement in the 1952 campaign, which will now proceed to take definite shape. His declaration is a challenge to President Truman to come out into the open, and it is a challenge to his opponents for the Republican nomination. It is requisite that those most concerned with the major-party nominations to follow the TAFT lead with unequivocal declarations.

Whether they favor him or not, most people with any worth-while political discernment will readily admit that Mr. TAFT is of presidential caliber and that he has nearly all the necessary elements of appeal. He is not glamorous and he has qualities of which politicians generally are not fond—Independence of thought and directness of action. He has for years been a real Republican leader. At times he has sided with the administration to an important extent—in matters of housing, foreign aid on a scale much reduced from the Truman plan, support of intervention in Korea. Perhaps his most conspicuous accomplishment, however, was directly against the President; that was in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act and its subsequent adoption over the President's veto. To do this he had to conduct a bipartisan fight and effect a temporary coalition between conservative Republicans and Democrats. That labor measure was supposed to

end his political career, it was supposed to confirm the Democratic-labor-big-city coalition for many years. Yet in 1950, 2 years after Truman had carried Ohio, TAFT got a truly sensational majority for Senator. That unavoidably put him in strong position for the fight he is now making.

Entry of Senator TAFT, ahead of at least two strong contenders and several eligible possibilities, reduces the Republican contentions to tangible form. It is now necessary for the Dewey-Duff-Eisenhower elements to declare their intentions. Gov. T. E. Dewey and Senator JAMES DUFF have taken over the Eisenhower campaign and are handicapped because the general doesn't say that he is a candidate. General Eisenhower is in a rather doubtful position. He could have stopped this talk of his nomination by simply saying "No," or he could have announced and ended a prevalent mystery. The general is further handicapped by the fact that Democrats are after him, too, and that a considerable element may try to nominate him on that ticket.

Senator TAFT has been conspicuous in presidential politics for 15 years. Three times he has been distinctly passed over—when Willkie and Dewey were named. He now bases his campaign on the flat declaration that "I am going to run because I believe I can conduct the only kind of a campaign which will elect a Republican to office." He is going all-out against the Truman administration and its principal doings.

The fact that Senator TAFT has held leadership so long and has been able to work with conservative Democrats to good effect may be a main reliance. He is running as a stalwart partisan, but he has effectually worked in several instances, with Senators WALTER GEORGE, HARRY BYRD, and PAUL DOUGLAS. They and their fellows form a real economy bloc in a spendthrift era.

In the matter of background, Mr. TAFT has emphatic advantage. He has worn well in strenuous political life. He has the advantage of his father's remarkable record—Judge, Governor General of the Philippines, Secretary of War, President, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The younger TAFT will not be running upon any reputation other than his own, but the family background, superior in many ways, will be no handicap.

Senator TAFT is probably the best qualified man in either party to be President of the United States. His unqualified announcement gives warning to any who wish to oppose him that they are taking on the champ when they start the battle.

"Oil for Education" Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

O. ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Dr. Arthur S. Adams, president, American Council on Education, advising of the endorsement by the executive committee of the council of the "oil for education" amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20.

The "oil for education" amendment is sponsored by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY],

the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and myself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,

Washington, D. C., October 20, 1951.

The Honorable LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL. At the last meeting of the executive committee of the American Council on Education, on October 4, the committee unanimously adopted the recommendation of the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government—

"That the American Council on Education endorse the Hill amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 20, and authorizes the president to communicate such endorsement to Senator HILL and through such other channels as he deems desirable."

The council has sent to all college and university presidents a copy of the speech which you made before the Congress in the original presentation of your resolution.

If hearings are planned on this resolution, please let us know in order that we may have someone present the policy of the council on this very important matter.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. ADAMS.

Summary of Legislative Record of First Session of Eighty-Second Congress—Digest of Major Legislation by Senator McFarland (S. Doc. No. 84)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with unanimous consent heretofore granted on Friday, October 19, there follows the summary of the legislative record of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress—digest of major legislation, Senate Document No. 84:

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE CONGRESS—SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (FROM JANUARY 3 TO OCTOBER 20, 1951)

SUMMARY OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

(By the Honorable ERNEST W. McFARLAND, majority leader, U. S. Senate)

When this Congress assembled in January of 1951, the very existence of the free way of life was under savage attack in Asia, and the alarm bells of danger were ringing throughout the world.

In the Far East, the entry of the Chinese Communists made the Korean conflict a showdown struggle between the slave em-

pire of communism and the forces of freedom. In Europe, the countries of the Atlantic alliance faced the menace of a Soviet attack with the bitter knowledge that arms and men were not available to stop the Red armies short of the English Channel.

Ten months later, when the Congress had completed the monumental tasks of its first session, the whole atmosphere of the world was transformed. The actions of the Congress played a vital part in bringing about that tremendous transformation.

With a tide of American arms authorized by Congress, the United Nations troops in the mountains of Korea had battered the Chinese Communists and the North Koreans to a standstill.

With American arms and men approved by Congress, the North Atlantic Treaty forces under General Eisenhower had grown strong enough to lift the cloud of fear from Western Europe.

Once again, America had become the arsenal of democracy.

Once again, the productive power of America had been turned in time into strength sufficient to halt the evil forces of totalitarianism.

Once again, American action had revived the fighting spirit and the hopeful faith of freemen everywhere.

In a year of great danger and great need, the American people looked to their leaders in Congress for bold and far-reaching initiative. Americans spoke up clearly and candidly, calling for courage and vision at home and abroad.

This Congress heard and heeded the call of the people. This Congress recognized the dangers and the urgent demands of this crucial hour of history. This Congress labored long and hard for America and the free world, and the results of its labors were felt from India to Korea, from the Rhine to the borders of Siberia, from one end of the earth to the other.

Under measures hammered into shape by this Congress, the United States astounded its friends and stunned its foes by proving that a great free nation could have guns and butter, too.

The United States worked one production miracle after another, arming and equipping millions of men, turning out thousands of tanks and millions of shells, expanding its giant atomic energy plants, sending to sea the most powerful Navy ever to cruise the oceans, developing fabulous new weapons, and at the same time building millions of automobiles, millions of television sets, thousands of new homes, and vast new networks of roads and highways.

In a year dedicated largely to rearmament, while the Nation girded itself to meet any Communist challenge that might come, the American people were better fed, better housed, and better clothed than they had ever been before. While bombers and tanks and artillery rolled from defense plants, the American standard of living went steadily upward—and American prosperity spread benefits to millions of other people all over the world.

How did the Congress help to create these magnificent achievements? Here are the principal accomplishments of the first session, briefly summarized in the main fields of legislative action.

National defense

Arming America to preserve peace through military power, this Congress put aside many matters which might have received much attention in other years.

The Congress concentrated upon the vital needs of national defense, knowing that the survival of America was at stake. The Congress gave thorough and thoughtful consideration to each big step taken this year, knowing that mistakes might mean disaster for 150,000,000 Americans and destruction for the free world.

Convinced of the necessity for a huge expansion of American military services, the Congress acted early in the session to summon young Americans to the colors on a fair and orderly basis. The manpower bill lowered the draft age to 18½, provided for the registration of all youths at the age of 18, and permitted the Defense Department to maintain a maximum of 5,000,000 men under arms. This bill also laid the foundation for universal military service, which has been advocated by American leaders since the days of George Washington, to give every citizen training for the protection of the Nation.

For arms, equipment, training, and the general operations of the Defense Establishment, the Congress appropriated nearly \$57,000,000,000 in one measure. Other bills provided additional billions for the construction of military bases here and abroad, and billions to buy arms for allies in the other free nations.

Altogether, the Congress appropriated more than \$77,000,000,000 for military and general national defense purposes—the largest sum ever granted by any Congress for defense, except in a time of all-out global war.

This sum included nearly \$3,000,000,000 for the modernization of the Navy and the construction of new ships—one of them a 57,000-ton aircraft carrier. It included money for the building of experimental atomic submarines which might revolutionize naval warfare. It included many millions for the development of guided missiles and pilotless planes which gave promise of becoming superweapons of enormous power.

Committees of the Congress constantly surveyed the work of the Defense Department, to eliminate waste, to improve conditions for men in training, to push along the creation of scientific devices which might save American lives.

Carrying out the will of the American people, this Congress took every possible step to make this country the strongest power and the most advanced Nation in the world.

International relations

After a long and thorough debate, which explored every aspect of a momentous decision, the Senate adopted a resolution approving the dispatch of American troops to Europe under the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. By voicing its approval of the President's policy on this issue, the Senate demonstrated to our allies that America was fully committed to a course of mutual endeavor for security against communism. The Senate vote proved conclusively that the old isolationism was dead.

The Congress also approved a vast mutual security program, consisting of \$6,000,000,000 in military assistance to allied nations and about \$1,300,000,000 in economic aid to enable these nations to maintain the economic strength necessary for rearmament.

By extending for 2 years the authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements, the Congress made it plain to the friendly nations of the world that the United States desires to continue the expansion of international commerce and the gradual removal of trade barriers.

Realizing at the same time, however, that trade with the Communist countries might help to increase their war-making powers, the Congress approved a strong bill banning exports of military items to Soviet Russia and her satellites, replacing the unworkable Kennan amendment. The new law denies American aid to any country making such exports on a wide scale.

In the humanitarian tradition of America, both Houses approved the granting of an emergency loan of \$190,000,000 to India, for the purchase of grain to alleviate famine in that suffering country.

Domestic affairs

Two of the most important steps taken by the Congress in the field of domestic policy were the extension of the Defense Pro-

duction Act for a year and the passage of a tax bill designed to raise enough revenues to meet some of the costs of rearming.

The Defense Production Act gave the President authority to allocate materials for defense uses, to control prices and wages in order to prevent disastrous inflation, and the power to limit civilian production to give priority to military construction.

The tax bill provided for increases in individual income taxes and in some excise taxes, both effective November 1, 1951. Corporation taxes were also increased retroactive to April 1. The bill is expected to raise at least \$5,690,000,000 in additional revenue, urgently necessary to meet rising defense costs and reduce deficit spending.

When major floods in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys destroyed hundreds of millions of dollars in property and crops, the Congress acted swiftly, appropriating emergency funds to repair roads and bridges, to rehabilitate devastated homes, and for temporary relief for thousands of homeless families. But more important, the ravages of the floods emphasized the need for long-range planning to conserve natural resources and the construction of dams to check the floods at the headwaters. It is significant that the flood loss to the taxpayers all over this country—not just in the flood areas—was four times as much as the cost of all the dams projected by the Army engineers to prevent such floods. Unfortunately, expenditures for conservation of natural resources always receive a severe set-back in times of urgent national defense spending. Since the outbreak of the Korean conflict the Congress has consistently refused to authorize any such projects, and no major irrigation or reclamation project has been authorized during this session.

In the fields of housing, health, and general welfare the Congress took several important actions.

Federal aid was provided for the construction of housing and community facilities for workers in defense areas, and direct housing loans to veterans were continued until July 1, 1953.

The Senate passed a bill authorizing Federal aid to State and local governments for the development of public-health units, and a similar bill was introduced in the House and pending when the Congress adjourned.

The House took no final action on a Senate amendment which provided for an increase in monthly payments to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. The Senate approved this amendment, which was introduced by the majority leader with the co-sponsorship of other Senators from both political parties.

Veterans and servicemen

The increase in the size of the Armed Forces and the fighting in Korea led to a recognition by Congress for the need for legislation to provide for new veterans and new servicemen called to active duty in the emergency.

Legislation granting the same benefits to Korean veterans heretofore made available to World War II veterans was drafted and undergoing hearings when the Congress adjourned. The Congress intends that educational and vocational assistance, housing loans, and loans to help them get started in business shall be available to veterans of the Korean fighting. A broad GI bill of rights is definitely slated for enactment by the Congress. Meanwhile, a number of important veterans measures were enacted in the first session.

Both Houses passed and the President quickly approved a bill extending to Korean veterans the same hospital and medical benefits available to veterans of World War II. Another bill made special provisions for housing loans for Korean veterans. Congress also enacted a bill which extended the time for prisoners of war to file claims under the War Claims Act and granted free

postage to members of the Armed Forces in Korea and other specified areas.

By large majorities, the Senate and the House voted to override the President's veto of a bill which increased pensions by about \$60 a month to veterans of World Wars needing full-time attendants because of disabilities not connected with military service.

Congress also authorized the issuance of free \$10,000 life-insurance policies for members of the Armed Forces, permitted veterans of both World Wars to renew their term insurance, and provided vocational rehabilitation and training for all veterans with service-connected injuries incurred after June 27, 1950. Still another measure made available to certain disabled and blind veterans, payments up to \$1,600 each, toward the purchase of automobiles.

Investigations

Although most of its energies were devoted to national defense and the development of foreign policy, both Houses took time to launch a number of investigations and hearings into the far-flung operations of the Federal Government. Tied in directly with national defense were the 2-month hearing into the dismissal of General MacArthur, a lengthy hearing on the sending of American troops to Europe, and a study leading to the enactment of the first universal military-training law in the history of the Republic.

Actually, during the first 2 months of the session, the time of the Members of the Senate was devoted almost wholly to participation in various hearings relating to foreign policy and national defense. The session also marked the wind-up of a year's study of interstate crime by a special committee and its recommendation for certain remedial legislation in this field, five such bills receiving committee approval and one, a measure sharply increasing penalties for narcotics law violations, becoming law.

While there were other investigations and hearings, involving charges of mismanagement in some Government agencies and attempts to wield influence, it must be admitted that in the main these congressional probes resulted from prior studies conducted by the agencies themselves. However, a noteworthy job was being done by the Senate Preparedness Committee, a subcommittee of Armed Services, which swung a steady spotlight on the military preparedness program. Following the practice of the Truman committee during World War II and conscious of the vast expenditures going into armament, this committee concerned itself with Army housing, the acquisition of strategic materials, and profiteering in the supplying of certain essential materials. Its work was expected to save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Work done

It is clear from an analysis of the record that the work of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress compares well with that of any preceding session. The House passed 1,193 measures. The Senate was in session 172 days, passed 1,059 measures, and confirmed more than 26,000 nominations. The work of the Congress resulted in the enactment of more than 200 public laws, but rarely in congressional history has the percentage of significant and far-reaching laws been as large. National defense appropriations totaled \$77,250,000,000 and accounted for 85 percent of the \$91,500,000,000 appropriated for all purposes during the first session. Significantly, a fact generally overlooked is that despite the huge amount appropriated, the Congress nevertheless made tremendous savings in cutting appropriations below original budget estimates by the departments and agencies; actually Congress sliced budget estimates by nearly \$4,750,000,000.

At home, as well as abroad, the actions of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress were designed to keep America in the

forefront of the free nations, for the welfare of the American people and the good of all mankind.

SECTION B DIGEST OF MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES DURING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (CONVENED JANUARY 3, 1951, ADJOURNED OCTOBER 20, 1951)

During the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Senate passed more than 1,000 public and private bills and resolutions, and confirmed the nominations of more than 26,000 individuals to positions in the executive and judicial departments of the Government.

National defense, however, was the primary concern of the Senate. With the exception of 3 years during World War II, no single session of a Congress in the entire history of the Republic passed more bills directly concerning the national defense or appropriated more money for the national defense. The first session appropriated approximately \$77,250,000,000 for national defense alone and its total authorizations for the same purpose were in excess of \$19,000,000,000. National defense spending represented fully 85 percent of the total of \$91,626,541,716 appropriated during the first session. An additional estimated \$8,874,689,207 is not included in this total since these are permanent indefinite appropriations such as interest payments on the public debt for which specific appropriations bills need not be enacted. Although appropriations were large, savings were proportionately large, the Congress actually having reduced budget estimates by \$4,718,624,204.

The first session also has been popularly described as an "Investigation Congress" and in the Senate nearly 3 months of the entire session was devoted to hearings, largely concerned with national defense matters.

The MacArthur dismissal hearings took nearly 8 weeks and, in addition to taking the full time of 26 Members of the Senate, were of such concern to most other Members that normal Senate business was brought almost to a standstill. Other lengthy hearings involved the problem of bringing to an enactment stage for the first time in the entire history of the Nation a universal military training law. Other studies and lengthy hearings were held on the progress of military and economic aid to European nations, aimed at building a bulwark against Soviet Russian domination and aggression throughout the world. Nonnational defense hearings which attracted major attention included those of the Special Committee to Investigate Interstate Crime, the hearing into operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and hearings involving 5-percenters and influence peddlers.

Legislation passed by Senate

The digest of bills which follows is a summary only of the major bills passed by the Senate during the session. Many became public law following House approval and signature by the President and public law numbers are shown, together with date of final approval.

For convenience sake, all appropriations relating directly to the national defense appear immediately following the digests of national defense legislation, and will be found under the index heading "National defense appropriations." These same appropriations are included in the complete "Appropriations" section.

National defense

Mutual Security Act of 1951. Authorizes total expenditure of \$7,483,400,000 for military, economic, and technical assistance to strengthen security by furnishing military and economic aid of—

(a) Six billion fifty million dollars to Western Europe of which \$5,028,000,000 will

be military aid and \$1,022,000,000 will be economic aid;

(b) Five hundred and fifty-six million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the Near East and Africa of which \$396,250,000 will be military aid to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, and \$160,000,000 will be economic and technical aid to various Near East and North African countries;

(c) Eight hundred and seventeen million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars to Asia and the Pacific areas of which \$535,250,000 will be military aid to the Philippines, Korea, and China, \$237,500,000 will be economic and technical aid to China and the Philippines, \$46,000,000 to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for reconstruction work in Korea;

(d) Fifty-nine million four hundred thousand dollars to the American Republics of which \$38,150,000 will be military aid, and \$21,250,000 will be technical aid.

Administration of military aid is to be carried out by the Secretary of Defense, administration of economic aid through June 30, 1952, by a mutual security agency headed by a director with a proviso that after that date the President is to advise the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees which powers and duties should be vested with the agency, administration of the technical aid by the Department of State, overall coordination of the entire program, including apportionment of funds between countries is vested in the President, law to terminate June 30, 1954, or earlier by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Public Law 165 (H. R. 5113), approved October 10, 1951.

Military and naval construction. Authorizes the expenditure of \$5,864,301,178 by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, to establish, construct, convert, or develop military installations as follows:

(a) **Army:** Inside continental United States, \$940,450,398; outside continental United States, \$175,341,130; confidential facilities, \$302,234,000; total, \$1,418,025,528.

(b) **Navy:** Inside continental United States, \$629,272,960; outside continental United States, \$89,043,090; confidential facilities, \$113,531,800; total, \$831,847,850.

(c) **Air Force:** Inside continental United States, \$1,993,603,800; outside continental United States, \$415,420,000; confidential facilities, \$1,071,638,000; total \$3,480,661,800;

(d) **Joint military installations** (all confidential): Army, \$55,766,000; Navy, \$15,000,000; Air Force, \$63,000,000; total, \$133,766,000.

These funds include authorizations for housing projects to be constructed under title VIII of National Housing Act. The Senate Armed Services report disclosed that the total housing expenditure proposed is \$1,438,480,820 of which \$1,174,055,108 is for troop housing inside and outside of the United States, \$153,280,212 for bachelor officers' quarters inside and outside the United States, and \$111,145,500 for family quarters inside and outside the United States.

Public Law 155 (H. R. 4914), approved September 28, 1951.

Naval vessels: Authorizes the construction of 140 major new naval vessels costing \$1,070,940,000, including (a) the construction of a new supercarrier; (b) the conversion of 292 vessels to cost \$1,297,143,000; (c) the acquisition of ammunition to cost \$382,000,000; and (d) prohibits the disposal of combat vessels without the approval of Congress.

Public Law 3 (H. R. 1001), approved March 10, 1951.

Transfer of naval vessels: Authorizes the transfer, under the mutual defense assistance program, of 24 old-type destroyer escorts to six countries, as follows: (a) eight to France of which six already are being used by her under lend lease, leaving two

to be transferred; (b) one to Great Britain already being used by her under lend lease; (c) eight to Brazil all of which are already being used by her under lend lease; (d) two to Denmark; (e) two to Uruguay, and (f) three to Peru. Title transfer to be made as soon as certain specific requirements are met by the recipient countries.

Public Law 146 (H. R. 3463), approved September 15, 1951.

Control radio emissions: Authorizes the President, in times of war or declared emergency, to control substantially all radio emissions in the United States, permitting shut-down of certain radio facilities to prevent radiations from such facilities operating as a radio beam for attacking aircraft or missiles. The President's authority extends to specified frequencies, including standard and FM radio, television, and those used for certain common-carrier facilities, industrial heating, and certain other uses. Fine and imprisonment for unauthorized use of radio facilities in violation of a shut-down is provided, but payment for damages sustained by such shut-down is authorized.

Public Law 200 (S. 537), approved October 24, 1951.

Selective service, UMT: Principal provisions include (a) selective service extended to July 1, 1955, (b) draft age lowered from 19 to 18½, registration at 18 with 19- to 26-year-olds to be inducted first; (c) period of service for inductees increased from 21 to 24 months; (d) sets ceiling of 5,000,000 men on active duty in the Armed Forces until July 31, 1954; (e) mental standards reduced from a score of 70 to 65 designed to bring in approximately 150,000 IV-F's; (f) until July 1, 1953, President authorized to call organized reservists or National Guard men for 24 months' active duty, but allows inactive reservists, who are World War II veterans, to be released within 17 months; (g) student deferment left up to local draft boards; (h) until July 1, 1954, suspends the existing 2-percent limitation on the number of women in the Regular components of the Armed Forces; (i) 4 months' basic training required before being assigned for duty outside the continental limits; (j) number of aliens to be enlisted by June 30, 1955, increased to 12,500 (raised from 2,500); (k) service required totals 8 years—2 active and 6 Reserve; (l) voluntary enlistments extended until July 1, 1953; (m) five-man National Security Training Commission is created to submit to Congress within 4 months following confirmation the broad outline of a UMT program to be acted upon 45 days after the recommendations are received by Congress.

Public Law 51 (S. 1), approved June 19, 1951.

Strategic minerals acquisition: Amends the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington from \$3,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 and extends to June 30, 1958, the period within which the bank may exercise its functions. Purpose of the \$1,000,000,000 increased capital is to facilitate the development and acquisition of strategic materials from foreign countries.

Public Law 158 (S. 2006), approved October 3, 1951.

Mutual security controls: Establishes a congressional policy with respect to trade carried on by nations receiving American military, economic and financial assistance under various aid assistance programs with the purpose of restricting trade with Communist Russia and satellites. Major provisions include:

(a) Shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war is prohibited to any nation or combination of na-

tions threatening the security of the United States.

(b) Military, economic, or financial assistance will not be given any nation unless it embargoes such shipments.

(c) All assistance may be terminated to any nation in violation after 60 days' notice of items covered.

(d) Mutual Defense Assistance Administrator made responsible for carrying out the provisions of the act.

(e) Administrator has primary responsibility to determine items to be embargoed after consideration of interested agencies' views.

(f) President may, on advice of the Administrator, continue assistance if circumstances indicate cessation of aid is detrimental to security of United States.

(g) Embargoed items to be reported to selected congressional committees.

(h) Administrator is to coordinate activities of the departments and agencies concerned with security controls over exports from other countries.

(i) Repeals subsection (d) of section 117 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 as amended (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.) and subsection (a) of section 1302 of Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.).

Public Law 213 (H. R. 4550), approved October 26, 1951.

Financing defense contracts: Amends the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, which was enacted for the purpose of inducing private financial institutions to participate in financing contracts under the defense program of that period, to: (1) Remove the requirement in existing law that copies of assignments be filed in the General Accounting Office; (2) eliminate requirement on assignees to repay any amounts received by them since July 1, 1950, under an assignment merely because the assignor may not have been entitled to receive or retain such amounts; (3) enlarge the authority now given the Defense Department to include a "no set-off" clause to be included in contracts entered into by the General Services Administration, Atomic Energy, or other departments designated by the President but such authority would hereafter be available only during time of war or national emergency; (4) amplifies existing "no set-off" clause to include any liability of the assignor on account of renegotiation fines, penalties, taxes, or social-security contributions, or the withholding or nonwithholding of taxes or social-security contributions whether arising from or independently of the assigned contract; (5) not affect or impair rights or obligations accrued prior to the date of enactment.

Public Law 80 (S. 998), approved May 15, 1951.

Defense contract renegotiation: Provides for elimination of excessive profits from national defense contracts by directing renegotiation of those contracts performed after June 30, 1950, and proceeds from which accrued after January 1, 1951. Creates a five-man board to administer the act. Limits renegotiation to those contracts and subcontracts in excess of \$250,000 in a single-year period but subcontractors with 1-year totals in excess of \$25,000 whose income is derived from commissions and fees are subject to renegotiation. Mandatory exemptions from renegotiation include contracts involving agricultural commodities, products of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, and transportation common carriers. Government agencies which come within provisions of the act include Defense Department, Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, General Services Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Canal Zone Government and Panama Canal Company, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and such others

as the President may designate. The law expires December 31, 1953.

Public Law 9 (H. R. 1724), approved March 23, 1951.

Troops for Europe: This resolution, having no force in law, (a) approves the action of the President in (1) designating Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, and (2) sending four additional division to Western Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, but suggests congressional approval should be first obtained before further forces are sent; (b) provides (1) that the United States should seek to eliminate all provisions of the existing treaty with Italy which imposes limitations upon her military strength and prevents fulfillment of her obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty to contribute to the full extent of her capacity to the defense of Western Europe; (2) for consideration of the revision of plans for the defense of Europe to provide for voluntary utilization of the military and other resources of Western Germany and Spain, but not exclusive of the military and other resources of other nations.

Senate Resolution 99, adopted April 4, 1951.

Troops for Europe: This resolution, also having no force in law but requiring House approval, contains the identical provisions of Senate Resolution 99 with the added proviso that Greece and Turkey are to be included in the suggested revision of existing plans for the defense of Europe.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, adopted April 4, 1951. Pending in House.

Gifts for defense: Reenacts a provision of the Second War Powers Act permitting the Government to accept gifts or services from donors who stipulated specific uses to further the defense effort. The original provision was repealed in 1946 which has since limited the Government to accept only unconditional gifts.

S 1230, passed Senate May 17, 1951. Pending in House.

Marine Corps: Authorizes four full-strength combat divisions with four full-strength air wings, and the necessary supporting organization in the Marine Corps; provides (a) that the Regular Marine Corps shall not exceed 400,000 in personnel, (b) that the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all its problems and have a voice on matters pertaining to the Marine Corps.

S 677, passed Senate May 4, 1951. Pending in House.

Korea-free postage: Extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1953, the present law providing free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in Korea and certain other specified areas.

Public Law 54 (H. R. 4393), approved June 26, 1951.

Postage-armed services: Provides that any first-class mail, including air mail, may be sent free of postage by a member of the Armed Forces of the United States while on active duty, or while confined in a military or naval hospital, to any person in the United States, including the Territories and possessions.

S 826, passed Senate June 21, 1951. Pending in House.

Alaskan civil defense: Removes the matching fund limitation for Alaska required from all States and Territories under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

S. 1244, passed Senate May 17, 1951, pending in House.

China embargo: Requests the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action which would lead to placing an embargo on the shipment by all member nations of all war materials to Communist China.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, adopted by Senate May 15, 1951; by House May 15, 1951.

Aircraft carrier. Directs that the first large carrier be named the *Forrestal* in honor of the late James V. Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense.

Public Law 90 (H. J. Res. 67), approved July 30, 1951.

Navy-Marine Corps officer personnel: Authorizes the President to set aside certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act so as to permit the retention on active service of some 300 Navy and Marine Corps officers. Existing law requires that when Navy and Marine Corps officers twice fail selection board approval for promotion they must be separated from active service, which would result in relieving about 300 officers from duty during the existing national emergency. The requirement was modified for the Army and Air Force, and this act will permit the same modification for the other services.

Public Law 67 (H. R. 4200), approved June 30, 1951.

Air Force reorganization: Establishes a more detailed organization of the Air Force by (a) reaffirming the authority of the Secretary of Air Force to administer the Department of the Air Force, (b) providing for a Chief of Staff to preside over the Air Force to be appointed for a 4-year term by the President by and with the advice of the Senate, (c) providing for Vice Chief of Staff and five Deputy Chiefs of Staff who shall be general officers of the Air Force detailed to these positions, (d) providing for an Air Staff, with the manner of its organization, performance of duties, and title of members left to the determination of the Secretary of Air Force, but requiring that an Air Force officer be assigned to advise the Secretary and Chief of Staff on matters relating to Air Force Reserve, (e) providing that, except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by Congress, not more than 2,800 officers of the Air Force may be detailed or assigned to permanent duty in the Department of the Air Force for tours of duty not to exceed 4 years.

Public Law 160 (H. R. 1726), approved September 19, 1951.

Experimental submarines: Amends the act of 1947 which authorized the construction of two experimental type submarines by increasing the cost limitation from \$10,000,000 to \$48,000,000. The original cost estimate was based upon 1944-45 construction experience and wage-price levels. The increased authorization is necessary because of a speed-up designed to obtain earlier delivery, within the next 6 months, thus increasing cost due to overtime and certain design changes.

Public Law 176 (H. R. 1227), approved October 16, 1951.

San Diego water supply: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to provide for new and enlarged facilities for the transportation of Colorado River water to the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure an adequate water supply for defense establishments there.

Public Law 171 (H. R. 8102), approved October 11, 1951.

Atomic tests: Authorizes the Navy Department to use the incomplete submarine *Ulua* as a target for certain atomic explosive and related tests. Existing law requires the Navy to complete construction of any vessel which was 20 percent or more complete on March 1, 1946, work on the *Ulua* was suspended in 1945 but was about 60 percent complete.

Public Law 173 (S. 1994), approved October 12, 1951.

Release atomic information: Amends the Atomic Energy Act to authorize the United States to release to other countries certain specified information or data relating to atomic energy under definitely prescribed conditions and circumstances to permit certain tangible benefits to the defense of the United States.

Public Law 235 (S. 2233), approved October 30, 1951.

National defense land transfers: Grants the Secretary of the Navy authority similar to that presently vested with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force dealing with condemnation of lands, granting of easements, and acquisition and disposal of real property generally; authorizes Navy to make nine specific easements in or near certain naval fields, depots, and stations for pipelines, roads, railroad tracks etc.

Public Law 210 (H R 1215), approved October 25, 1951

Air bases construction. Amends an authorization heretofore granted the Secretary of the Air Force of \$121,338,000 for the construction of certain facilities essential to the support of a 95-air-wing program by transferring the authorizations as follows: (a) \$50,792,000 to construct facilities at McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J., (b) \$1,746,000 for air defense facilities at Sioux City, Iowa, (c) \$18,800,000 for B 36 strategic reconnaissance wing facilities at Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.

H R 5425, passed Senate October 19, 1951
Pending in House

Reenlistment bonuses. Authorizes payment of reenlistment bonuses to members of the Army and Air Force who reenlisted for an indefinite period prior to October 1, 1949.

Public Law 217 (H R 5405), approved October 26, 1951

Military post offices. Authorizes the Postmaster General to establish postal stations and branch post offices at military, naval, and Coast Guard camps, posts, or stations during any national emergency which is proclaimed by the President.

S 2078, passed Senate October 19, 1951.
Pending in House

Increase espionage penalty. Increases the maximum penalty from 30 years to life imprisonment for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace or war.

S 1292, passed Senate October 19, 1951.
Pending in House

State military compact. Grants the consent of Congress to an interstate compact between New York and New Jersey which provides for mutual military aid in time of extreme emergency.

S 968, passed Senate October 19, 1951.
Pending in House

Withholding of patents. Provides that, when the granting of a patent would disclose information detrimental to the national security, the Secretary of Commerce shall withhold the patent and order that the invention be kept secret.

H R 4687, passed Senate October 20, 1951
Pending in House

National defense highways. Authorizes an additional appropriation of \$35,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 is to be made immediately available for contract, for the construction of access roads certified by the Secretary of Defense as being essential to the national defense. Also permits \$5,000,000 of the total authorization to be used for reconstruction, maintenance, and repair work on roads within military maneuver areas, on certification by the Secretary of Defense. The original authorization for access-road construction under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 was \$10,000,000. This bill increases the authorization to \$45,000,000. (See also Public Law 175 under Transportation and Commerce.)

Public Law 177 (H R 5504), approved October 16, 1951.

Schools in defense areas. Provides for the construction, operation, and maintenance of schools in critical defense housing areas by (1) authorizing the Commissioner of Education to extend Federal financial assistance to local educational agencies for construction of facilities in critical defense housing areas; (2) increasing Federal aid for operation and

maintenance of local educational agencies which have had an attendance increase of 10 percent in last 3 years because of Federal activities; (3) providing additional Federal assistance where the local educational agency is not otherwise able to operate.

H. R. 5411, passed Senate October 19, 1951.
Pocket veto.

National defense appropriations

Department of Defense Appropriations: Appropriates for the Defense Department—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps—\$58,939,568,030 for the 1952-53 and succeeding fiscal years (which is \$740,057,670 below the budget estimate) for the following major activities:

1. Nineteen billion eight hundred and eighty-eight million thirty-two thousand and thirty dollars for the Department of the Army, including (a) \$2,787,990,000 for the Quartermaster Corps, of which (1) \$1,506,681,000 is for clothing and equipment, (2) \$603,309,000 is for subsistence, (3) \$465,000,000 is for regular supplies of the Army, (b) \$1,213,707,000 for the Signal Corps, (c) \$307,792,000 for the National Guard and Organized Reserve, (d) \$1,214,412,700 for the Corps of Engineers, of which (1) \$1,166,049,000 is for engineer service, (2) \$48,363,700 is for military construction, (e) \$3,297,076,000 for Army pay, (f) \$269,580,000 for medical service, (g) \$22,300,000 for Army training (h) \$1,138,130,000 for general administration of the Department of the Army.

2. Fifteen billion five hundred and forty-four million eight hundred and ninety-one thousand dollars for the Department of the Navy including (a) \$2,538,541,000 for military personnel of the Navy and Naval Reserve which includes pay, allowances, travel, and authorized transportation of dependents, (b) \$97,570,000 for training, education, and general expenses of naval personnel; (c) \$580,604,000 for military personnel of Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve, including pay, subsistence, clothing, travel, and authorized transportation of dependents, (d) \$923,293,000 for aircraft and facilities, (e) \$4,000,000,000 for construction of aircraft and related procurement, (f) \$1,537,452,000 for ships and facilities, which includes design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels, (g) \$1,420,650,000 for construction, acquisition, and conversion of ships, (h) \$1,819,503,000 for ordnance and facilities, which includes production, procurement of ordnance and ammunition, (i) \$135,770,000 for medical care, which includes maintenance and operation of naval hospitals, procurement of supplies and training of personnel, (j) \$485,102,000 for service-wide supply and finance activities.

3. Nineteen billion nine hundred and seventy-five million seven hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for the Department of the Air Force, including (a) \$12,990,800,000 for construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment (b) \$3,018,700,000 for military personnel of the Air Force, which includes pay, allowances, subsistence, transportation, (c) \$106,943,000 for maintenance of Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard, (d) \$40,600,000 for expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation, and administration of the activities of the Air Force.

4. One million seven hundred and sixty thousand dollars for related agencies, including (a) \$160,000 for the National Security Council, and (b) \$1,600,000 for the National Resources Board.

5. One billion five hundred and twenty-nine million one hundred thousand dollars for the Office of Secretary of Defense.

6. Provisions are added: (a) terminating a contract if it is determined gratuities were offered a Government employee or officer; (b) prohibiting flight pay unless assigned duties involve actual combat missions or involve flight in excess of 20 hours per month;

(c) allowing release of involuntary reservists having served 18 months on active duty since June 26, 1950, if they served at least 12 months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945; (d) prohibiting retirement pay after October 18, 1951, for any officer who retires voluntarily unless physically unfit, has reached retirement age, or retirement is approved by Secretary.

Public Law 179 (H R 5054), approved October 18, 1951

Mutual Security appropriation. Appropriates \$7,328,903,976 (which is \$198,623,814 below the budget estimate) for the fiscal year 1952 for military, economic, and technical assistance to strengthen security which includes (1) \$5,840,852,457 to Western Europe of which \$4,818,852,457 will be military aid and \$1,022,000,000 will be economic aid, (2) \$772,405,866 to Asia and the Pacific of which \$535,250,000 will be military aid and \$237,155,866 will be economic aid, (3) \$556,250,000 to the Near East and Africa of which \$396,250,000 will be military aid and \$160,000,000 will be economic aid, (4) \$50,395,653 to the American Republics of which \$38,150,000 is military aid and \$21,245,653 is for economic aid, (5) \$100,000,000 is added for assistance to Spain.

Public Law 249 (H R 5684), approved October 31, 1951

Military bases appropriation. Appropriates \$4,094,546,392 for construction of various military installations in the United States and elsewhere and for other national defense purposes for the fiscal year 1952, including:

1. Three billion eight hundred and ninety million two hundred and ninety-six thousand three hundred and ninety-two dollars for the Department of Defense for military public works for (a) \$1,000,000,000 for the Department of the Army for military construction, (b) \$819,096,392 for the Department of the Navy for public works, (c) \$2,071,200,000 for the Department of the Air Force for acquisition and construction of real property.

2. Two hundred million dollars for the Atomic Energy Commission.

3. Four million two hundred and fifty thousands dollars for the Federal Security Agency for defense community facilities and services. Provisions are included that (a) not more than 50 percent of the funds appropriated by this act for employment of persons engaged in domestic information functions shall be used for that purpose, (b) Secretary of Defense must approve payments for cost-plus contracts where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 for work within continental United States.

Public Law 264 (H R 5650), approved November 1, 1951

National defense—fourth supplemental. Appropriates for national defense purposes \$6,442,608,000 for the 1951 fiscal year (which is \$46,985,000 below the budget estimate) for the following:

1. Fifty-nine million three hundred and twenty-three thousands dollars for Atomic Energy Commission.

2. Six billion three hundred and seventy-nine million six hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars for the Department of Defense of which (a) \$2,847,570,000 is for the Department of the Army, (b) \$1,645,439,000 for the Department of the Navy, and (c) \$1,886,664,000 for the Department of the Air Force.

3. Three million six hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars for the Department of the Interior for construction by the Bonneville Power Administration.

Public Law 43 (H R 3842), approved May 31, 1951.

Additional defense appropriation: Included in the independent offices appropriation bill is \$1,208,532,750 for national defense for the 1952 fiscal year for the following:

(1) One billion one hundred and thirty-ninth million nine hundred and thirty-two

thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars for Atomic Energy Commission;

(2) Sixty-seven million six hundred thousand dollars for National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which includes \$11,700,000 for contract authority for construction and equipment at laboratories and research stations;

(3) One million dollars as a fund for the President for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense.

Public Law 137 (H. R. 3880), approved August 31, 1951.

Additional defense appropriations: Included in the eighth supplemental appropriation bill is \$1,187,520,682 for national defense for the 1952 fiscal year for the following:

(1) Two hundred and sixty-five million nine hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars for Atomic Energy Commission;

(2) Seven hundred and ninety million two hundred and sixteen thousand five hundred dollars to the General Services Administration for acquisition of strategic materials;

(3) Seventy-four million nine hundred and forty-five thousand dollars for civil defense;

(4) Thirty million one hundred and fifty-four thousand dollars for Selective Service;

(5) Twenty-two million five hundred and fifty-five thousand one hundred and eighty-two dollars for Department of Defense of which \$22,500,000 is for government and relief in occupied areas;

(6) One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for National Security Training Commission;

(7) Three million five hundred thousand dollars for the National Science Foundation. Proviso is added requiring that any funds in this appropriation used for personnel engaged in domestic information services must be reduced by 50 percent.

Public Law 253 (H. R. 5215), approved November 1, 1951.

Total national defense appropriations (including Mutual Security appropriation of \$7,250,000,000).....\$77,201,739,830

Total national defense authorizations.....19,324,273,998

(Approximately \$13,000,000,000 of this total was actually appropriated and is included in total above).

Agriculture

Mexican farm labor: Authorizes the Government to carry out an agreement with Mexico under which Mexican nationals may be legally imported into the United States subject to the immigration laws for temporary agricultural employment if the Secretary of Agriculture certifies that such workers are needed and that American labor is not available. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to recruit farm workers in Mexico, transport them to the United States, and guarantee that American employers will comply with the individual work contracts entered into between them and the Mexican workers as it relates to wages and transportation. The law expires December 31, 1953.

Public Law 78 (S. 984), approved July 12, 1951.

Mexican farm labor appropriation: Appropriates \$950,000, of which \$750,000 is reimbursable, to carry out the terms of the Mexican Farm Labor Act.

Public Law 113 (H. J. Res. 311), approved August 16, 1951.

Farm mortgage loans: Amends the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act as follows: (a) Secretary of Agriculture authorized to insure up to \$25,000,000 a year of farm mortgage loans on the basis of bona fide applications and the availability of farms; no change is made in the use of the remaining \$75,000,000 original authorization which is loaned on the basis of farm population

and prevalence of tenancy; (b) Secretary is authorized to postpone refinancing insured mortgage loans until the borrower has sufficient equity to meet the requirements to which the holder of the insured mortgage may be subject in making uninsured loans; (c) the limit of initial production and subsistence loans is increased from \$3,500 to \$7,000 and the total outstanding indebtedness of any borrower on all such loans from \$5,000 to \$10,000; (d) term of repayment of operating loans and the maximum period which a borrower may be indebted in order to be eligible for further financial assistance is extended from 5 to 7 years; (e) Secretary is authorized to postpone the initial annual repayment of both real estate and production assistance loans for two full crop years after the date of the loan if it is determined that the farm income will not be sufficient to make the payment at an earlier date.

Public Law 123 (S. 684), approved August 23, 1951.

Poisonous weed control: Provides general authorization for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus, a poisonous weed growing on the range and pasture lands of the United States which has caused serious loss to the livestock industry. Establishes a Federal policy authorizing needed work without regard to land ownership and provides for cooperation between State and local agencies and the several agencies of the Federal Government having land management responsibility. Authorizes: (a) surveys to detect the presence and effect of the weed; (b) measures and operations necessary to control, suppress, and eradicate; and (c) authorizes funds to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, from time to time, as may be necessary to carry out this program.

S. 1041, passed Senate August 9, 1951. Pending in House.

Sugar tax and quotas: Extends the Sugar Act of 1948 to December 31, 1956, and amends the Internal Revenue Code by continuing excise tax on sugar to June 30, 1957. Increases annual quota allocation to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons and to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons. Establishes an annual quota of 300,000 gallons of liquid sugar for the British West Indies. Quota allocations for the various producing areas on the mainland of the United States, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands remain the same as in existing law. A slight increase is provided in the allocation to foreign countries, except Cuba, which ship sugar into the United States, restoring to these countries their prewar ratio of sugar imports. Cuba's percentage share of imports is reduced, but the actual tonnage of Cuban sugar to the United States is expected to increase.

Public Law 140 (H. R. 4251), approved September 1, 1951.

Peanut acreage allotments: Amends Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to authorize an increase in acreage allotments for edible and other types of peanuts for the 1951 crop year. Allotment increase of 84,900 acres for inedible peanuts is authorized; edible peanuts acreage increase is allotted on a proportional basis by States to farmers producing this type. Total acreage increase for all types is 97,743, making final 1951 allotment 1,771,117 acres, which is a reduction of 331,334 acres from 1950 allotment of 2,200,194 acres.

Public Law 17 (H. R. 2615), approved April 12, 1951.

Transfer horse-breeding farm: Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to Vermont Agriculture College some 942 acres of land comprising the former United States Morgan Breeding Farm, to be used by the college for general agricultural purposes, including the continuance of breeding Morgan horses.

Public Law 26 (S. 271), approved May 7, 1951.

Bar entry of destructive mollusks: Prohibits importation into the United States of certain land and fresh-water snails, and particularly the giant African snail, destructive to agriculture, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish rules for inspection and treatment of goods entering the United States, and establishes penalty of \$500 fine and 1 year imprisonment for violation.

Public Law 152 (H. R. 4443), approved September 22, 1951.

Federal land banks: Repeals the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to the capital stock of Federal land banks since such subscriptions are no longer needed by the Federal land banks.

S. 2091, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Tobacco quotas: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of certain findings to increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for certain types of tobacco sufficient to meet the demand.

Public Law 178 (H. R. 4475), approved October 17, 1951.

Timber sales: Raises from \$500 to \$2,000 the limitation on the amount of national forest timber that may be sold by the Secretary of Agriculture without advertisement.

S. 1517, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Virgin Island experimental station: Authorizes the transfer of certain lands and facilities in the Virgin Islands from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an agricultural research and extension service program in the Virgin Islands.

Public Law 228. (H. R. 4027), approved October 29, 1951.

Import baler twine: Authorizes the duty-free importation of twine used in baling hay, straw, and other fodder which is now subject to duty at 15 percent ad valorem.

Public Law 219 (H. R. 1005), approved October 25, 1951.

Appropriations

Agriculture Department appropriation: Appropriates for the Department of Agriculture \$802,988,626 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$17,216,920 below the budget estimates) for the following major activities:

1. Four hundred and thirty-four million one hundred and sixty-seven thousand four hundred and ninety-one dollars for Production and Marketing, Administration which includes (a) \$256,500,000 for the 1952-crop-year soil-building program, and (b) \$10,000,000 for the acreage allotment and marketing quota programs;

2. Seventy-one million four hundred and seventeen thousand eight hundred and sixteen dollars for Agriculture Research Administration of which (a) \$30,628,650 is for agricultural engineering research and plant quarantine, (b) \$23,828,928 for the Bureau of Animal Industry for meat inspection, animal research, disease control, (c) \$12,795,798 for maintenance of experimental stations throughout the United States and its possessions, (d) \$1,475,000 for the Bureau of Dairy Industry, (e) \$1,350,000 for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, (f) \$550,000 for eradication foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animal and poultry;

3. Sixty-three million two hundred and twenty-two thousand three hundred and eight dollars for Forest Service for research, protection, management, fighting forest fires, development of roads and trails;

4. Sixty million eighty-three thousand two hundred and ninety-one dollars for Soil Conservation Service which includes \$6,872,800 for flood control;

5. Seventy-six million eight hundred and eight thousand dollars to Commodity Credit

Corporation to discharge indebtedness incurred under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

6. Twenty-seven million, nine hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for cooperative agricultural extension work;

7. Twenty-seven million, eight hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for Farmers Home Administration but includes borrowing authorization of \$153,000,000 for production and subsistence loans to farmers.

8. Seven million, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars for rural electrification program but includes authority to borrow \$209,000,000 for loans to rural electric cooperatives.

9. Seven million, nine hundred and forty-nine, nine hundred and eleven dollars for Federal crop-insurance program;

10. Six million dollars for control of forest pests, which includes \$3,300,000 for control of white pine blister rust.

11. Four million, nine hundred and ninety-eight thousand, three hundred and four dollars for Bureau of Agricultural Economics of which (a) \$2,150,000 is to be used for economic investigations, and (b) \$2,848,304 for publishing crop and livestock estimates.

12. Four million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars for research and marketing.

13. Two million, seven hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for Farm Credit Administration of which \$2,325,000 is an advance from farm credit agencies.

14. Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars for Commodity Exchange Authority;

15. Six million, six hundred and fifty-six thousand, five hundred and five dollars for general administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture

16. Provisos are added reducing all appropriations for personal services by 10 percent and prohibiting filling more than 75 percent of vacancies in publicity and information service personnel

Public Law 135 (H. R. 3973), approved August 31, 1951

Civil functions appropriations: Appropriates \$597,262,713 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$65,175,130 below the budget estimate) for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, which includes:

1. Three hundred and sixteen million, five hundred and forty-four thousand and one hundred dollars for the general flood-control program including (a) \$7,060,000 for maintenance and operation of the program, (b) \$1,000,000 for planning of flood-control projects, and (c) \$308,484,100 for construction of approximately 84 flood-control projects.

2. One hundred and ninety-two million, six hundred and fifty-seven, six hundred and thirteen dollars for the rivers and harbors program including (a) \$66,965,000 for maintenance of rivers and harbors, (b) \$500,000 for planning of rivers and harbors projects, (c) \$125,192,613 for construction of approximately 43 rivers and harbors projects

3. Sixty million, five hundred thousand dollars for flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries

Public Law 203 (H. R. 4386), approved October 24, 1951.

Department of Defense appropriations: Appropriates for the Defense Department—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps—\$56,939,568,030 for the 1952-53 and succeeding fiscal years (which is \$740,057,670 below the budget estimate) for the following major activities

1. Nineteen billion, eight hundred and eighty-eight million, thirty-two thousand and thirty dollars for the Department of the Army, including (a) \$2,787,990,000 for the Quartermaster Corps, of which (1) \$1,506,681,000 is for clothing and equipment, (2) \$803,309,000 is for subsistence, (3) \$465,000,000 is for regular supplies of the Army; (b) \$1,213,707,000 for the Signal Corps, (c) \$307,792,000 for the National Guard and Or-

ganized Reserve; (d) \$1,214,412,700 for the Corps of Engineers, of which (1) \$1,166,049,000 is for the engineer service, (2) \$48,363,700 is for military construction; (e) \$3,297,076,000 for Army pay, (f) \$269,580,000 for medical service; (g) \$22,300,000 for Army training, and (h) \$1,138,130,000 for general administration of the Department of the Army.

2. Fifteen billion five hundred and forty-four million eight hundred and ninety-one thousand dollars for the Department of the Navy, including: (a) \$2,538,541,000 for military personnel of Navy and Naval Reserve which includes pay, allowances, travel and authorized transportation of dependents, (b) \$97,570,000 for training, education, and general expenses of naval personnel, (c) \$580,604,000 for military personnel of Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve, including pay, subsistence, clothing, travel and authorized transportation of dependents, (d) \$923,393,000 for aircraft and facilities, (e) \$4,000,000,000 for construction of aircraft and related procurement, (f) \$1,537,452,000 for ships and facilities, which includes design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels and facilities, (g) \$1,420,650,000 for construction, acquisition and conversion of ships; (h) \$1,819,503,000 for ordnance and facilities which includes production, procurement of ordnance, and ammunition; (i) \$135,770,000 for medical care, which includes maintenance and operation of naval hospitals, procurement of supplies and training of personnel; (j) \$485,102,000 for service-wide supply and finance activities

3. Nineteen billion nine hundred and seventy-five million seven hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for the Department of the Air Force, including: (a) \$12,990,800,000 for construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment; (b) \$3,016,700,000 for military personnel of the Air Force, (c) \$106,943,000 for maintenance of Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard; (d) \$40,600,000 for expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation, and administration of the activities of the Air Force

4. One million seven hundred and sixty thousand dollars for related agencies, including (a) \$160,000 for the National Security Council, and (b) \$1,600,000 for the National Resources Board

5. One billion five hundred and twenty-nine million one hundred thousand dollars for the Office of Secretary of Defense

6. Provisos are added (a) terminating a contract if it is determined gratuities were offered a Government employee or officer, (b) prohibiting flight pay unless assigned duties involve actual combat missions or involve flight in excess of 20 hours per month; (c) allowing release of involuntary reservists having served 16 months on active duty since June 26, 1950, if they served at least 12 months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, (d) prohibiting retirement pay after October 18, 1951, for any officer who retires voluntarily unless physically unfit, has reached retirement age, or retirement is approved by Secretary

Public Law 179 (H. R. 5054), approved October 18, 1951

District of Columbia appropriation: Appropriates \$11,400,000 (which is \$600,000 below the budget estimate) for District of Columbia for the 1952 fiscal year which is the Federal share of the total \$138,216,150 appropriation for general administration of the District government. The balance, \$126,816,150, is derived from District revenues such as taxes and special assessments

Public Law 106 (H. R. 4329), approved August 3, 1951

Additional District of Columbia appropriation: Included in the eighth supplemental appropriation bill is \$136,650 for the 1952 fiscal year for the Office of Rent Control for the District of Columbia. (Payable out of District of Columbia revenues.)

Public Law 253 (H. R. 5215), approved November 1, 1951.

Additional District of Columbia appropriation: Included in the third supplemental appropriation bill is \$1,122,740 for general administration of the District of Columbia. (Payable out of District of Columbia revenues.)

Public Law 45 (H. R. 3587), approved June 2, 1951

District of Columbia rent control—second supplemental: Appropriates \$21,250 for the administration of the District Rent Control Office through June 30, 1951. (Payable out of District of Columbia revenues.)

Public Law 11 (H. J. Res. 207), approved March 24, 1951

Independent offices appropriation: Appropriates for the Executive Office and independent agencies \$6,162,825,175 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$675,077,290 below the budget estimates) for the following major activities

1. Three billion, nine hundred and sixty-nine million, four hundred and thirty-six thousand, two hundred and twenty dollars for Veterans' Administration which includes \$2,112,230,000 for payment of disability compensation and pensions;

2. One billion, one hundred and thirty-nine million, nine hundred and thirty-two thousand, seven hundred and fifty dollars for Atomic Energy Commission;

3. Ten million, five hundred and thirteen thousand, five hundred and thirty-five dollars for Interstate Commerce Commission;

4. Six million, one hundred and sixteen thousand, six hundred and fifty dollars for Federal Communications Commission;

5. Four million, five thousand, three hundred and twenty-five dollars for Federal Power Commission,

6. Three million, nine hundred and forty thousand four hundred dollars for Federal Trade Commission;

7. Five million, three hundred and seventy-eight, four hundred and eighty dollars for Securities and Exchange Commission;

8. One million, one hundred and forty-four thousand, six hundred dollars for Tariff Commission,

9. Two hundred and thirty-eight million, three hundred and eighty-nine thousand, six hundred dollars for Tennessee Valley Authority.

10. Three hundred and thirty million, four hundred and fifty-five thousand nine hundred dollars for Civil Service Commission, which includes \$310,000,000 for civil-service retirement and disability funds.

11. One hundred and fifty-seven million, five hundred and fifty-eight thousand, nine hundred dollars for Maritime Administration under the Department of Commerce,

12. One hundred and fifty million, three hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars for General Services Administration;

13. Sixty-seven million, six hundred thousand dollars for National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which includes \$11,700,000 for contract authority for construction and equipment at laboratories and research stations.

14. Thirty-one million, four hundred and ninety four thousand dollars for General Accounting Office;

15. Twenty-three million, sixty thousand dollars for Housing and Home Finance Agency but includes authority to guarantee \$58,488,000 in loan authorizations;

16. Seven million, eight hundred and eleven thousand, two hundred and fifteen dollars for Executive Office of the President, which includes \$3,362,000 for the Bureau of the Budget and \$800,000 for disaster relief;

17. Seven million dollars for Displaced Persons Commission;

18. Three million, seven hundred and nineteen thousand dollars for American Battle Monuments Commission;

19. Three million, five hundred and forty-five thousand, two hundred dollars for Smithsonian Institution and National Gallery of Art,

20. Two hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars for Subversive Activities Control Board;

21. Eighty-nine thousand, six hundred dollars for Indian Claims Commission;

22. Provisos are added reducing all appropriations for personal services by 10 percent and prohibiting filling more than 75 percent of vacancies in publicity and information service personnel.

Public Law 137 (H. R. 3880), approved August 31, 1951.

Interior Department appropriation: Appropriates for the Department of the Interior \$511,841,816 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$52,344,184 below the budget estimates) for the following major activities:

1. Two hundred and twenty-nine million one hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred and twenty-two dollars for the Bureau of Reclamation exclusive of special funds and authority for transfer of various facilities;

2. Seventy-two million nine hundred and eight thousand four hundred and thirty-nine dollars for the Bonneville Power Administration;

3. Sixty-eight million nine hundred and seventy-eight thousand five hundred and twelve dollars for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which includes more than \$2,000,000 in tribal funds.

4. Thirty-nine million nine hundred and twelve thousand nine hundred and seventy dollars for the Office of Territories of which (a) \$31,900,000 is for Alaska public works, road and other construction, and (b) \$992,970 is for public works in the Virgin Islands but exclusive of an additional \$2,725,000 in advances and grants to the Virgin Islands Corporation;

5. Twenty-seven million six hundred and forty-six thousand five hundred and sixty-four dollars for the National Park Service;

6. Twenty-three million four hundred and twelve thousand eight hundred and fifty-six dollars for the Bureau of Mines;

7. Twenty-one million three hundred thousand dollars for the Geological Survey;

8. Twelve million seventy-seven thousand five hundred and fifty-five dollars for the Fish and Wildlife Service exclusive of funds derived as revenues from taxes on certain sporting goods and seal sales in Alaska;

9. Eight million four hundred and twenty-two six hundred and five dollars for the Bureau of Land Management exclusive of funds received from grazing, royalties, etc., for expenditure to States and range-land improvements.

10. Two million one hundred and fifty-four thousand nine hundred and eleven dollars for general administrative expenses of the Department of the Interior;

11. Provisos are added reducing all appropriations for personal services by 10 percent and prohibiting filling more than 75 percent of vacancies in publicity and information service personnel.

Public Law 136 (H. R. 3700), approved August 31, 1951.

Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation: Appropriates for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related agencies \$2,512,004,270 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$232,449,490 below the budget estimate) for the following major activities:

1. Two hundred and twenty-two million five hundred and four thousand nine hundred and forty-four dollars for the Department of Labor, which includes (a) \$169,576,919 for the Bureau of Employment Security, and (b) \$2,950,000 for general administrative expenses of the Department of Labor;

2. One billion seven hundred and fifteen million twenty-seven thousand eight hundred and forty-three dollars for the Federal Security Agency, which includes (a) \$346,710,408 for Public Health Service for tuberculosis, national heart, national cancer, mental health, etc., (b) \$75,000,000 for school

construction, and (c) \$65,000,967 for Office of Education;

3. One billion one hundred and eighty-nine million eight hundred and thirty-three thousand five hundred dollars for the Social Security Administration, which includes a limitation of \$58,110,300 from the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund;

4. Seven million eight hundred eighty-five thousand four hundred and eighteen dollars for the National Labor Relations Board;

5. One million ninety-two thousand two hundred and forty-three dollars for the National Mediation Board;

6. Five hundred and sixty-two million five hundred and thirty-four thousand four hundred and nine dollars for the Railroad Retirement Board;

7. Two million nine hundred and fifty-nine thousand four hundred and thirteen dollars for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service;

8. Provisos are added reducing appropriations for personal services by 10 percent and prohibiting filling more than 75 percent of vacancies in publicity and information service personnel.

Public Law 134 (H. R. 3709), approved August 31, 1951.

Labor Department—seventh supplemental Appropriates \$950,000 for the 1952 fiscal year (\$750,000 reimbursable from payments made to the United States by employers) for expenses in connection with the Mexican farm labor program.

Public Law 113 (H. J. Res. 311), approved August 16, 1951.

Legislative branch appropriations. Appropriates for the legislative branch \$73,805,507 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$8,116,079 below the budget estimate) for the following major activities:

1. Twelve million three hundred and ninety-five thousand six hundred and five dollars for the Senate which includes (a) \$6,481,545 for expenses of operating Senators' offices including salaries, (b) \$1,498,334 for operations of offices of Secretary of Senate, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, (c) \$1,928,583 for operation of Senate committees including salaries, (d) \$180,135 for operation of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and (e) \$126,532 for official reporting of Senate proceedings.

2. Twenty-two million eight hundred and twenty-two thousand one hundred and nine dollars for the House of Representatives which includes (a) \$14,730,450 for expenses of operating Members' and Delegates' offices including salaries, (b) \$1,219,390 for operation of House committees, (c) \$1,523,874 for operations of offices of Clerk of the House, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, (d) \$180,000 for operation of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and (e) \$114,935 for reporting House proceedings;

3. Seven million five hundred and one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight dollars for Architect of the Capitol which includes (a) \$2,456,468 for repairs, maintenance, and improvements of Capitol buildings, and (b) \$4,267,600 for operation and improvement of Capitol power plant.

4. Eight million six hundred and ninety-five thousand one hundred and sixty dollars for operation of Library of Congress.

5. Twenty-one million nine hundred thousand dollars for Government Printing Office for printing and other activities including distribution of documents.

Public Law 168 (H. R. 4496), approved October 11, 1951.

Legislative branch—first supplemental: Appropriates \$831,155 for the legislative branch for the 1951 fiscal year (which is \$25,000 above the budget estimate) for (a) \$633,655 for operating expenses of the Senate, and (b) \$197,500 for operating expenses of the House of Representatives.

Public Law 7 (H. J. Res. 195), approved March 19, 1951.

Legislative branch—fifth supplemental: Appropriates \$150,000 for the legislative branch for the 1951 fiscal year for expenses of inquiries and investigations.

Public Law 49 (H. J. Res. 267), approved June 15, 1951.

Mutual Security appropriation: Appropriates \$7,328,903,976 (which is \$198,623,814 below the budget estimate) for the fiscal year 1952 for military, economic, and technical assistance to various foreign countries as follows: (1) \$5,840,852,457 to Western Europe, of which \$4,818,852,457 will be military aid and \$1,022,000,000 will be economic aid, (2) \$772,405,866 to Asia and the Pacific, of which \$535,250,000 will be military aid and \$237,155,866 will be economic aid; (3) \$556,250,000 to the Near East and Africa, of which \$396,250,000 will be military aid and \$160,000,000 will be economic aid; (4) \$59,395,653 to the American Republic, of which \$38,150,000 is military aid and \$21,245,653 is for economic aid, (5) \$100,000,000 is added for assistance to Spain.

Public Law 249 (H. R. 5684), approved October 31, 1951.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriations. Appropriates for the 1952 fiscal year \$1,042,867,887 (which is \$215,428,254 below the budget estimate) including:

1. Two hundred and twenty-eight million one hundred and four thousand eight hundred and sixty-one dollars for the Department of State, including the following major activities: (a) \$85,000,000 for international information and educational service; (b) \$30,297,861 for contributions to international organizations, (c) \$12,030,000 for Rio Grande emergency flood protection and construction, (d) \$7,500,000 for acquisition of buildings abroad, (e) \$74,200,000 for general administration of State Department.

2. One hundred and eighty-one million six hundred and two thousand dollars for the Department of Justice, including the following major activities: (a) \$90,000,000 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, (b) \$36,400,000 for the operation of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; (c) \$25,970,000 for the operation of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, (d) \$12,990,000 for United States marshals and attorneys, (e) \$14,517,000 for general legal activities and administration.

3. Six hundred and seven million two hundred and forty-two thousand nine hundred and eleven dollars for the Department of Commerce, including the following major activities: (a) \$42,943,500 for the Bureau of Public Roads, of which (1) \$9,343,500 is for Federal aid to highway construction, (2) \$24,500,000 is for the forest highways, (3) \$3,500,000 is for access roads, (b) \$122,800,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, of which (1) \$28,700,000 is for the Federal aid to airports program, (2) \$525,000 is for construction, maintenance, and operation of Alaskan airports; (c) \$25,500,000 for the Weather Bureau; (d) \$13,700,000 for the Census Bureau; (e) \$12,200,000 for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, (f) \$11,500,000 for the Patent Office.

4. Twenty-five million nine hundred and eighteen thousand one hundred and fifteen dollars for the judiciary, including the following major activities: (a) \$1,238,250 for the Supreme Court; (b) \$2,180,000 for the Federal probation system; (c) \$588,900 for the Court of Claims; (d) \$433,165 for the Customs Court.

5. Provisos are added (1) reducing by 10 percent below budget estimate the total number of personnel in the agencies under this bill; (2) barring funds for filling more than 75 percent of vacancies occurring after August 1, 1951, but excepting from the 10-percent cut (a) positions filled from within the agency, (b) positions filled by Presidential appointment, (c) positions in the judiciary, FBI, CAB, CAA, Foreign Service, and so forth.

Public Law 188 (H. R. 4740), approved October 22, 1951.

Treasury-Post Office appropriations: Appropriates for the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department \$2,928,398,000 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$30,027,000 below the budget estimate) as follows.

1. Two billion three hundred and forty million eight hundred thousand dollars for the Post Office Department which includes \$2,315,000,000 for postal operations and transportation of mails.

2. Five hundred and eight-seven million five hundred and ninety-eight thousand dollars for the Treasury Department which includes (a) \$253,000,000 for Bureau of Internal Revenue, (b) \$162,700,000 for operation and maintenance of Coast Guard, (c) \$2,500,000 for Secret Service Division, (d) \$2,100,000 for the Bureau of Narcotics.

3. Proviso is added prohibiting filling more than 75 percent of the vacancies occurring among persons engaged in information or publicity services.

Public Law 111 (H. R. 3282), approved August 11, 1951

Supplemental Appropriations

Executive, legislative, and District of Columbia—third supplemental. Appropriates for the executive branch, legislative branch, and the District of Columbia government \$344,932,477 for the 1951 fiscal year (which is \$530,833,816 below the budget estimate) as follows

1. One hundred and fifty-nine million five hundred thousand dollars (out of postal revenues) for the Post Office Department for postal operations and transportation of mails

2. Seventy-nine million three hundred and seventy-two thousand five hundred dollars for various independent offices of which (a) \$27,418,000 is for the Veterans' Administration, (b) \$25,000,000 for Federal Civil Defense, and (c) \$20,000,000 for the "vessel operations revolving fund" of the Maritime Administration

3. Fifty million dollars for the Federal Security Agency in grants for surveys and school construction

4. Thirty-three million eighty-one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five dollars for the President's fund, of which (a) \$5,750,000 is for international child-welfare work, and (b) \$27,331,895 for expenses in connection with defense production

5. Nine million five hundred and thirty-three thousand nine hundred and thirty-nine dollars for the Department of State to carry on its international information and educational activities

6. Seven million eight hundred and seventy thousand dollars for the Department of Justice, of which \$5,872,000 is for the general administration of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

7. Seven million six hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars for the Department of the Interior of which (a) \$3,650,000 is for construction by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and (b) \$4,000,000 for construction work on the Alaska Railroad

8. Six million two hundred and thirty-four thousand three hundred and eighty-four dollars for the Department of Commerce of which (a) \$1,464,384 is for the payment of claims under the Federal Airport Act, and (b) \$4,250,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads.

9. Three million three hundred thousand dollars for the Department of Agriculture for the Forest Service.

10. Three million one hundred and three thousand eight hundred and eighty-one dollars for the payment of claims and judgments rendered against the United States by United States courts.

11. Three million dollars for the Department of Labor as an additional amount for the employees compensation fund.

12. One million five hundred and seventy-eight thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight dollars for general administrative expenses of the legislative branch of the Government and for repairs and maintenance of the Capitol buildings

13. One million one hundred and twenty-two thousand seven hundred and forty dollars for general administration of the District of Columbia to be derived from the District revenue.

14. Four hundred and eighty thousand dollars for the Treasury Department of which \$350,000 is for the Coast Guard.

15. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for the general administration of the judiciary

16. Public Law 22 appropriating \$10,000,000 for defense production for the 1951 fiscal year is chargeable against this appropriation.

Public Law 45 (H. R. 3587), approved June 2, 1951

National defense—fourth supplemental: Appropriates for national defense purposes \$6,442,668,000 for the 1951 fiscal year (which is \$46,985,000 below the budget estimate) for the following.

1. Fifty-nine million three hundred and twenty-three thousand dollars for Atomic Energy Commission

2. Six billion three hundred and seventy-nine million six hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars for the Department of Defense of which (a) \$2,847,570,000 is for the Army, (b) \$1,645,439,000 for the Navy, and (c) \$1,886,664,000 for the Air Force

3. Three million six hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars for the Department of the Interior for construction by the Bonneville Power Administration

Public Law 43 (H. R. 3842), approved May 31, 1951

Disaster relief—sixth supplemental: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for the 1952 fiscal year for relief in the Mississippi and Missouri River areas.

Public Law 80 (H. J. Res. 292), approved July 18, 1951

Executive and independent agencies—eighth supplemental: Appropriates for various departments and agencies of the Government \$1,676,246,976 for the 1952 fiscal year (which is \$628,214,681 below the budget estimate) for the following

1. One billion three hundred and thirty-four million one hundred and fifty-nine thousand two hundred and fifty dollars for various independent agencies, of which (a) \$835,582,500 for the General Services Administration, including \$790,216,500 for purchase of strategic and critical materials (b) \$265,965,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission; (c) \$74,945,000 for the Civil Defense Administration; (d) \$116,775,000 for the Veterans' Administration for the national service life insurance program, (e) \$30,154,000 for the selective service program; (f) \$4,575,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, (g) \$100,000 for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, (h) \$2,543,750 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be used for the Defense Transportation Administration; \$3,500,000 for the National Science Foundation

2. One hundred million six hundred and eighty-two thousand one hundred and five dollars for the Department of Commerce, which includes (a) \$39,737,500 for expenses of defense production program; and (b) \$60,000,000 for maritime activities.

3. Twenty-six million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the Department of State, to be used in governing occupied areas.

4. Twenty-two million five hundred and fifty-five thousand one hundred and eighty-two dollars for the Department of Defense, of which \$22,500,000 is to be used for government and relief in occupied areas.

5. Twenty-three million two hundred and eighty-seven thousand five hundred dollars

for the Department of Labor, of which \$21,287,500 is for the Bureau of Employment Security.

6. Six million one hundred thousand dollars for the Federal Security Agency.

7. Eleven million sixty-nine thousand dollars for the Department of Interior, of which (a) \$2,285,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation; (b) \$954,000 is for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and (c) \$5,000,000 is for expenses of defense production.

8. Two million fifty-nine thousand seven hundred and fourteen dollars for the Department of Justice.

9. Four hundred and eleven thousand six hundred and fifty dollars for the District of Columbia out of District of Columbia revenues.

10. Thirty-one million seven hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars for the Treasury Department, of which (a) \$28,000,000 is for the Coast Guard, and (b) \$400,000 for the Bureau of Narcotics

11. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the Small Defense Plants Administration.

12. One million seven hundred and eleven thousand two hundred and fifty dollars for the Office of Defense Mobilization.

13. Two million eight hundred thousand dollars for Defense Production Administration.

14. Ninety-eight million fifty-three thousand three hundred and seventy-five dollars for Economic Stabilization Agency

15. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for the National Security Training Commission

Provisos are included (a) reducing by 50 percent appropriations in this bill for domestic informational personnel; (b) reducing by 25 percent all appropriations this fiscal year for publicity and informational personnel for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency but exception is made for those engaged in the preparation or distribution of technical, scientific, or research publications, (c) specifically excluded from any reduction in information staff made by this or any other act are personnel in the Office of Defense Mobilization engaged in informing the public about the progress and purposes of the defense mobilization program or persons in the agencies assigned functions under the Defense Production Act who are engaged in informing the public about rules, regulations, and orders

Public Law 253 (H. R. 5215), approved November 1, 1951

Veterans' Administration—ninth supplemental: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for the 1952 fiscal year for payments to beneficiaries under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951

Public Law 169 (H. J. Res. 340), approved October 11, 1951.

Rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas—tenth supplemental: Appropriates \$53,440,000 (which is \$346,560,000 below the budget estimate) for the rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas (Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Illinois) for the 1952 fiscal year of which:

(1) Eighteen million four hundred forty thousand dollars is for the Department of Agriculture for restoration of productive capacity of farms through clearing sand, water, reestablishing pastures;

(2) Thirty million dollars is for the disaster loan revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture;

(3) Five million dollars is for disaster relief activities to supplement the \$25,800,000 previously appropriated by the Eighty-second Congress.

(4) The bill also increases the limitation on RFC disaster loans from \$40,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to provide funds to rehabilitate business and home owners and extends from 10 to 20 years the time limit fixed by law on loans for acquisition or construction of housing. (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.,

authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to make advance commitments up to \$200,000,000 to purchase eligible mortgages of which \$50,000,000 was reserved for housing for victims of the flood disaster.)

The above funds together with amounts already available through presently authorized programs in existing agencies for financial aid to the disaster area totals \$257,590,000.

Public Law 202 (H. J. Res. 341), approved October 24, 1951

National defense—military bases—eleventh supplemental appropriation Appropriates \$4,146,407,108 (which is \$941,109,966 below the budget estimate) for the fiscal year 1952, as follows

1. Three billion, eight hundred and ninety million two hundred and ninety-six thousand three hundred and ninety-two dollars for the Department of Defense for military public works for the following major activities: (a) \$1,000,000,000 for the Department of the Army for military construction; (b) \$819,096,392 for the Department of the Navy for public works; (c) \$2,071,200,000 for the Department of the Air Force for acquisition and construction of real property.

2. Two hundred and forty-five million six hundred and three thousand dollars for various independent offices, including the following major activities: (a) \$200,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission; (b) \$1,400,000 for the Civil Service Commission; (c) \$43,103,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, of which \$25,000,000 is for defense housing.

3. Four million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the Federal Security Agency for defense community facilities and services.

4. One million eight hundred and eighty-five thousand four hundred and sixteen dollars for claims and judgments rendered against the United States.

5. Five hundred and fifty thousand five hundred dollars for the legislative branch for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives.

6. Three million six hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars for the Department of the Interior of which (a) \$636,000 is for Indian Affairs; (b) \$3,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation.

7. One hundred and eighty-six thousand eight hundred dollars for the Department of Agriculture for flood control. Provisions are included that (a) not more than 50 percent of the funds appropriated by this act for employment of persons engaged in domestic information functions shall be used for that purpose; (b) Secretary of Defense must approve payments for cost-plus contracts where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 for work within continental United States.

Public Law 254 (H. R. 5650), approved November 1, 1951

Permanent indefinite appropriations for 1952 (estimated): These total \$8,874,669,207, but are not annual appropriations by the Congress. They are annual expenditures by the Federal Government, authorized by permanent legislation. They include the following general and special funds: (a) \$5,800,000,000 for interest on public debt; (b) \$16,000,000 for refunds and draw-backs on customs duties; (c) \$4,900,705 for interest on uninvested trust funds; and (d) \$2,768,000,000 for refund of internal revenue collections.

Total appropriations by Congress	\$91,626,541,716
Savings below budget estimates	4,718,624,294
Total permanent indefinite appropriations (estimated)	8,874,669,207
Total national defense appropriations	77,201,739,830

District of Columbia

Rent control: Extends the District of Columbia rent-control law until June 30, 1952,

and permits rent increases up to 20 percent above the January 1, 1941, level, inclusive of adjustments already made. New housing, if rented on January 1, 1951, will be frozen as of that date. (Public Law 10, approved March 31, 1951, extended the Rent Control Act for 3 months until June 30, 1951.)

Public Law 63 (S. 1590), approved June 30, 1951.

Settlement of claims: Authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits up to \$10,000 against the District; adds a new section (5) authorizing the Commissioners, with consent of the corporation counsel, to compromise a claim or suit, exclusive of taxes or special assessments, provided the compromise does not reduce the claim or suit more than \$10,000.

Public Law 95 (S. 262), approved July 31, 1951.

Cancer and malignant diseases: Authorizes the Commissioners to require that cancer, sarcoma, lymphoma (including Hodgkin's disease), leukemia, and all other malignant growths be reported to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia. These reports will be kept confidential except upon order of the court or upon written authorization of the Director of Public Health. Authorizes the Commissioners to prescribe a reasonable penalty or fine, not exceeding \$100, for the violation of any regulations under this act.

Public Law 83 (S. 260), approved July 27, 1951.

Disbursing office procedure: Provides that the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia shall disburse moneys in strict accordance with vouchers certified by the Auditor of the District of Columbia and holds both accountable for their official acts.

Public Law 84 (S. 259), approved July 30, 1951.

Disbursing office personnel: Provides that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint a deputy disbursing officer and such assistant disbursing officers as are necessary.

Public Law 88 (S. 494), approved July 30, 1951.

District of Columbia hospital construction: Authorizes the Federal Works Administration to meet up to 50 percent of the construction cost of new nonprofit hospital facilities for those hospitals in the District of Columbia which do not participate in the Hospital Center planned under Public Law 648, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Public Law 221 (H. R. 2094), approved October 25, 1951.

Finance, commerce, and industry

Defense Production Act: Amends the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 by establishing certain controls:

1. Extends price and wage controls through June 30, 1952, with certain provisos: (a) Ceiling prices on nonagricultural commodities cannot be lower than the lowest prevailing price at the time ceiling is established, or prevailing price between January 25 and February 24, 1951;

(b) Roll-backs of nonagricultural commodities permitted if the ceiling price either (1) is based on highest price received for material or service between January 1 and June 24, 1950, and reflects adjustments for subsequent increases or decreases in costs occurring prior to July 26, 1951, or (2) is established under regulations issued prior to enactment of this law;

(c) Slaughtering quotas are banned;

(d) Ceiling price on agricultural products, including livestock, cannot be set below 90 percent of price received by producers, on May 19, 1951.

2. Continues until June 30, 1952, authority to issue priorities and allocate materials for defense, requisition needed materials and acquire property by condemnation as well as

other means of transfer; and empowers Government agencies to stockpile defense materials, to establish mineral and metal production incentives, to contract for purchases and sales until June 30, 1962, and to use subsidy payments if an adequate supply of critical materials from high-cost sources is threatened.

3. Continues through June 30, 1952, Federal Reserve Board power to limit consumer credit, but relaxes regulation W for the purchase of new or used automobiles extending credit to 18 months with one-third down-payment required, permits trade-ins to be used as down-payment on household appliances and furnishings and extends credit period to 18 months; residential repairs require 10 percent down with 36 months to pay.

4. Continues rent control through June 30, 1952; in areas now controlled rent increases are allowed up to 20 percent over levels of June 1947; in newly designated critical defense areas rent roll-backs to pre-Korean levels are permitted (rent controls had previously been extended by two resolutions from March 30 to July 31, 1951).

5. Establishes Small Defense Plants Administration to assist small business.

6. Extends until June 30, 1952, import controls on fats, oils, dairy products, peanuts, and rice products.

Public Law 96 (S. 1717), approved July 31, 1951.

Defense Production Act amendment: Amends the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to permit the Office of Price Stabilization to set up ceiling prices on an industry-wide basis rather than on an individual seller basis under a formula requiring that the ceiling price cannot be lower than the highest level of prices prevailing just before the issuance of the regulation, or the highest level of prices prevailing between January 25 and February 24, 1951. OPS must take cognizance of cost increases up to July 26, 1951, which are necessary and unavoidable. Permits on application and showing only those suffering financial hardship to secure relief whereas under existing act any seller could request price adjustments regardless of whether he was sustaining financial hardship.

S. 2170, passed Senate October 4, 1951. Pending in House.

Defense housing: Authorizes the construction of housing, community facilities and services in connection with the national defense by providing (a) \$1,500,000,000 in Government-insured mortgages as an incentive for private construction of defense housing; (b) \$60,000,000 in loans and grants for the installation and maintenance of community facilities, exclusive of schools; (c) \$50,000,000 for Government construction of rental housing in critical defense areas but private builders would have 90 days in which to undertake such projects; (d) \$15,000,000 in loans for the production and distribution of prefabricated and mobile housing with a limitation that not more than \$500,000 shall go to one company or individual; (e) \$10,000,000 revolving fund for the acquisition and improvement of sites for defense housing for resale to private builders; (f) an additional 2-year period during which veterans will have the right to obtain GI loans at 4 percent interest from a Government fund of \$150,000,000 if the loans are not otherwise available; (g) relaxed credit controls on GI housing selling for \$12,000 by reducing scale of down payments to range from 4 to 8 percent and allowing 25 years to pay, similar relaxation on nonveteran housing selling for less than \$12,000 with scale of down payment ranging from 10 to 20 percent and allowing 25 years to pay; (h) suspension of residential credit restrictions under the Defense Production Act of 1950 relating to housing sold at \$12,000 or less, or rented at \$85 or less per month; relaxation of credit

restrictions on all other housing in such a manner and to such extent as the President finds necessary to obtain the production of housing needed in defense and military areas.

Note—Additional housing construction at military installations was authorized in a separate law, providing \$1,438,480,820 for that purpose. See Military and Naval Construction Act under "National Defense" heading in this section. See also "Appropriations" under "National Defense."

Public Law 139 (S 349), approved September 1, 1951.

Flood disaster housing: Authorizes the Federal Government to build temporary housing or other emergency shelter in flood disaster areas and relaxes credit regulations for Government-insured mortgages, permitting 100-percent guaranties in the disaster area instead of the customary 95 percent.

Public Law 107 (H J Res. 303), approved August 3, 1951.

National rent control: Extends National Rent Control Act for 3 months until June 30, 1951.

Public Law 8 (S. J. Res. 39), approved March 23, 1951.

National rent control: Extends National Rent Control Act additional month until July 31, 1951.

Public Law 69 (H J Res 278), approved June 30, 1951.

Price discrimination: Provides that in any proceeding charging price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act, the seller may show that his price differential or furnishing of extra facilities was made in good faith to meet the practices of a competitor, and this shall be a complete defense unless it is proved that he knew his competitor's practices were unlawful.

S 719, passed Senate 42 to 34 August 2, 1951. Pending in House.

Charter private corporations: Establishes as congressional policy to grant Federal charters to private corporations under following conditions

(a) Only nonprofit corporations organized and operated for charitable, educational, patriotic, or civic-improvement purposes will be awarded a charter by act of Congress;

(b) Corporations will not be chartered until the Department of Justice has carefully investigated the purposes as well as the incorporators

(c) Private corporations chartered by act of Congress will be subject to an annual audit by certified public accountants at the corporation's expense. The annual audit will be filed with the General Accounting Office and retained as a public record for at least 10 years, and the report of such audit will be made to the Congress by General Accounting Office

S 1898, passed Senate August 9, 1951. Pending in House

Parcel-post limitation Amends or repeals all existing laws relating to size and weight limitation on fourth-class mail, parcel post, and reduces package size to 72 inches in girth and length combined (present, 100 inches) for all zones, and lowers the weight to 40 pounds in zones 1 and 2 20 pounds in zones 3 through 8 (present weight is 70 pounds for all zones). The new limitations do not apply to parcels (a) addressed to any third- or fourth-class office or to rural areas, or (b) mailed at any third- or fourth-class office or on any rural or star route, or (c) containing baby towl, live plants, trees, shrubs, or agricultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof); or (d) to books which do not contain advertising

Public Law 199 (S 1335), approved October 24, 1951.

Export controls: Extends until June 30, 1953, President's authority to control exports by limiting shipments of scarce materials, by channeling exports to countries

where needs are greatest and where our foreign policy and national economy will best be served.

Public Law 33 (H. J. Res. 197), approved May 16, 1951.

Fur labeling: Requires mandatory labeling of fur articles and invoicing of furs moving in interstate or foreign commerce to show (a) name of the animal that produced the fur; (b) the country of origin; (c) whether the fur has been dyed, bleached, or is composed of inferior pieces such as paws, tails, or waste fur. Permits retailers to substitute own label for that of the manufacturer, jobber, or wholesaler, but record of such substitution must be kept for 3 years; failure to label properly and maintain required records is an unfair method of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act, penalty for lack of records is \$100 fine for each day of violation

Public Law 110 (H. R. 2321), approved August 8, 1951.

Cooperative bank debentures: Authorizes national banks and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System to receive commissions on the sale of debentures issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives as they do on the sale of other bonds.

S. 2025, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House

Bank mergers Establishes the terms for a merger of two or more national banking associations and for a merger of State banks with national banking associations and provides that only the dissenting stockholders of the absorbed bank may demand cash value for their shares.

S 2128, passed Senate October 2, 1951. Pending in House

Foreign relations

Reciprocal trade agreements: (1) Extends until June 12, 1953, the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements through the mutual exchange of goods, (2) reestablishes the peril-point system, adopted in the Eightieth Congress, which requires the President to report his reasons to Congress if he fails to follow the Tariff Commission's recommendations on import duties on goods which might cause injury to our domestic industry manufacturing competitive goods; (3) requires an escape clause in all future agreements and directs the President, as soon as practicable, to insert an escape clause in all existing agreements; (4) provides for the suspension or withdrawal of tariff concessions to Communist areas; (5) limits the imports of perishable farm commodities under certain circumstances.

Public Law 50 (H R 1612), approved June 16, 1951.

Aid to India Provides \$190,000,000 emergency credit aid to India for the primary purpose of obtaining food to relieve famine. Of the \$190,000,000 credit, not less than \$100,000,000 is to be made available from ECA funds appropriated for fiscal 1951, \$90,000,000 is to be made available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951, and, if insufficient, the balance is to be obtained by Treasury purchase of ECA notes. Credit terms are to be the same as those for Marshall plan loans with payment extended over a period of 33 to 35 years, interest rate of 2½ percent, and a grace period of 6 to 8 years before any principal payments are due. The terms include provision for partial repayment by transfer to the United States of certain critical materials not available in this country. Interest payments by India, as might be agreed upon for the first 5 years up to \$5,000,000 are to be held in a special account for educational, scientific, and philanthropic purposes in India. Assistance to India may be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, deems assistance is no longer necessary

Public Law 48 (S 872), approved June 15, 1951.

Friendship: Reaffirms the friendship of the people of the United States for all peoples of the world, including specifically the peoples of the Soviet Union, and requests the Soviet Government to inform its people of the text of the resolution.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, adopted unanimously May 4, 1951; adopted amended by House June 4, 1951; conference report adopted June 20, 1951.

Communist China: Requests that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

Senate Resolution 35, adopted unanimously, January 23, 1951.

Communist China in U. N.: Declares sense of Senate that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in United Nations as the representative of the Government of China. (House of Representatives adopted similar resolution, H. Res. 96, May 15, 1951.)

Senate Resolution 36, adopted, 91 to 0, January 23, 1951.

Protest to Czechs: Expresses indignation over the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, American citizen and bureau chief of the Associated Press, by the Czechoslovakian Government for "espionage", requests that the executive agencies take all possible action to bring about his release; and approves termination of all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia until Oatis is freed. House adopted August 14, 1951.

House Concurrent Resolution 140, adopted, 81 to 0, August 23, 1951.

Korean relief. Expresses the hope that Americans will respond generously to the appeal of American Relief for Korea, Inc., and authorizes the President to set aside as soon as practicable a period of at least 1 month for special clothing collection appeal for relief of the refugees in Korea.

Public Law 138 (H. J. Res. 281), approved August 31, 1951.

Mailing privileges: Provides for free transmission of official mail of members of the armed forces of nations serving with or under United Nations military commands with which the Armed Forces of the United States are serving. The official mail, not exceeding 4 pounds in weight, must have been addressed within these commands for delivery within the United States

S. 855, passed Senate June 21, 1951. Pending in House.

International Children's Fund. Authorizes an appropriation of \$12,000,000 for contributions to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund for the 1952 fiscal year, to continue world-wide operation of health training programs, mass health programs, and disease control in Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, as well as continue emergency relief in certain European and Near East areas. Contributions by the United States thus far amount to \$75,000,000.

S. 2079, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Ship sales to South Korea: Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, within 1 year from date of enactment, to sell up to 50,000 tons of United States war-built coastal vessels to the Government of South Korea.

Senate Joint Resolution 104, passed Senate October 1, 1951.

Diplomatic privileges: Authorizes the President to extend to representatives on the Council of the Organization of American States the same diplomatic privileges and immunities now authorized by law to foreign envoys in the United States; terms and conditions of the privileges are to be determined by the President and are subject to corresponding conditions and obligations

S. 2042, passed Senate October 9, 1951. Pending in House.

End war with Germany: Formally terminates the state of war between the United States and Germany, declared by Congress on December 11, 1941, and provides that the rights and privileges of the United States and its nationals which were acquired by the unconditional surrender of Germany on May 8, 1945, remain unchanged.

Public Law 181 (H. J. Res. 289), approved October 19, 1951.

Display United States flag: Prohibits the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence to the flag of the United States except that the flag of the United Nations may be placed in a position of superior prominence at the headquarters of the United Nations or where an official meeting of the United Nations is in progress. Violation is punishable by a penalty of \$250 fine and 6 months in jail.

S. 2039, passed Senate October 19, 1951. (Motion to reconsider pending.)

Foreign decorations: Prohibits the acceptance by an officer of the United States of any present or decoration presented to a foreign government unless it has been tendered through the Department of State after authorization by Congress.

S. 2165, passed Senate October 19, 1951. Pending in House.

General government

Readjusted postal rates—annual leave: Increases postal revenues by about \$117,000,000 first year, \$121,000,000 the second year, and \$125,000,000 the third year by (a) raising postal-card rate from 1 to 2 cents and drop-letter rate from 1 to 2 cents both effective February 1, 1952, (b) raising second-class rate (newspapers and magazines) by 10 percent annually each year for 3 years effective April 1, 1952, but exempts publications by nonprofit organizations and those designed for classroom or religious instruction; (c) raising minimum rate for third-class bulk mailings from 1 to 1½ cents effective July 1, 1952, but exempts from increase mailings of certain nonprofit organizations; (d) raising special-delivery rate from 15 to 20 cents. Another section of the bill provides for a graduated system of annual and sick leave for Government employees, allowing annual leave ranging from 13 to 26 days based on years of service and up to 13 days' sick leave annually.

Public Law 233 (S. 1040), approved October 30, 1951.

Postal employees pay increase: Authorizes pay increases from \$460 to \$800 annually for all postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, retroactive to July 1, 1951, with fourth-class postmasters to be increased not more than 20 percent of their present salary, and hourly employees to be increased 20 cents an hour over their present compensation; eliminates the first two grades in the automatic grades, and advances by two grades all those entering the service on or after July 1, 1945, who have not, through previous legislation, been advanced one or two grades but in cases where employees have advanced one grade, they would receive a one-grade promotion.

Public Law 204 (S. 355), approved October 24, 1951.

Civil service: Permits secretaries and law clerks who have served 4 years to any justice or judge of the United States, and whose separation from the service is involuntary and without prejudice, to acquire upon passing a noncompetitive examination, a classified civil-service status for transfer to a position in the classified civil service if the transfer is obtained within 1 year from the date of separation.

S. 216, passed Senate March 12, 1951. Pending in House.

Reorganize RFC: Reorganization Plan No. 1 proposing a reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by (a)

establishing Office of Administrator to be appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate; (b) abolishing present Board and transfers functions to the Administrator; (c) appointment by the President with the consent of the Senate of Office of Deputy Administrator; (d) prohibits other employment by the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator; (e) establishes Loan Policy Board, all ex officio members, Administrator as Chairman, Deputy Administrator as Vice Chairman, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Commerce, one other member designated by the President from among the officers of the United States who are required to be appointed by and with the consent of the Senate; (f) granting and denial of loans will be governed by Loan Policy Board; (g) providing that all applications for loans in excess of \$100,000 are to be considered by a board of review, to be made up of five persons designated by the Administrator from among personnel of the Corporation.

(NOTE—Resolution (S. Res. 76—CAPHEART) disapproving plan defeated 41 to 33 April 13, 1951. Plan became effective April 30, 1951.)

Government employment: Prohibits collection of a fee by a private employment agency from a person for referring his name to an executive department or agency unless such a service has been requested in writing by the department or agency. Penalty of \$1,000 fine or imprisonment of 1 year for conviction.

Public Law 141 (S. 15), approved September 13, 1951.

Administrative Rules Commission: Establishes an Administrative Rules Commission consisting of a Member of Congress, an Assistant Attorney General, head of an independent agency, the chief judge of the judicial circuits, the dean of a law school, and a practicing lawyer, to formulate and transmit to the Attorney General for report to Congress general rules of practice and procedure for agencies, including forms and appropriate rules respecting judicial proceedings for the enforcement or review of agency action. The rules of practice and procedure are to be presented to the Congress within 30 days of the beginning of a session and, unless disapproved by concurrent resolution, shall become effective 10 days after the adjournment sine die of that particular session.

S. 17, passed Senate June 21, 1951. Pending in House.

Postal service: Extends benefits now enjoyed by star-route contractors to screen vehicle postal contractors by authorizing the Postmaster General to renew any screen-vehicle contract for an additional 4-year term at the rate prevailing at the end of the contract term; permits readjustment of the compensation of the screen-vehicle contractor for increased or decreased compensation costs occasioned by changed conditions occurring during the contract term, in exactly the same manner as applies to star-route contractors. Screen-vehicle contract operation involves carrying mail to and from post offices to railroad stations, boat landings, etc., and requires special equipment suitable for such service.

S. 759, passed Senate June 21, 1951. Pending in House.

Rules of evidence: Amends United States Code to permit evidence to be introduced, whether the original is in existence or not, of photographic, photostatic, microfilm, microcard, miniature photographic, or other process, which accurately reproduces the original.

Public Law 129 (H. R. 4106), approved August 28, 1951.

Protect congressional witnesses: Amends sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code to make it a violation of law for any officer of the Federal Gov-

ernment, both civilian and military, to dismiss or discipline a Government employee for testifying before a committee of Congress.

S. 1390, passed Senate July 23, 1951. Pending in House.

Secret Service: Broadens the basic authority of the United States Secret Service by writing into substantive law certain authority now exercised by the Secret Service and supplementary existing law by providing: (a) that persons who fraudulently alter, deface, or mutilate United States coins or foreign coins in circulation as money in the United States, or who pass such coins shall be subject to a fine up to \$2,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, or both; (b) that persons who design, engrave, print, circulate, or use any professional card, notice, circular, or advertisement imitating an obligation or security of the United States shall be fined up to \$500; (c) that persons who make or possess likenesses of coins shall be fined up to \$100; and (d) authorizing the Secret Service, subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to protect the President and his immediate family, President-elect, and Vice President at his request, execute warrants issued under authority of United States, carry firearms, offer and pay rewards leading toward the apprehension of criminals.

Public Law 79 (H. R. 2395), approved July 16, 1951.

Condemnation suits: Amends subdivision of the general rules of practice and procedure in United States district courts to provide that parties to a condemnation suit may, on demand, request a jury trial on the issue of what is just compensation under a condemnation proceeding. Under existing law the Supreme Court submitted on May 1, 1951, a rule (rule 71) which abolished the right to jury trial in condemnation proceedings and permitting it only at the discretion of the court.

S. 1958, passed Senate August 9, 1951. Pending in House.

Government employees' pay increase: Provides an increase, effective July 1, 1951, of 10 percent or \$800, whichever is less, with a minimum of \$300, in the rates of compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government, but does not cover postal employees who are provided for under other legislation. The increases apply (a) to the entrance salary grade for all classified employees, (b) to the basic compensation for Foreign Service officers, physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; (c) and to the gross salaries of legislative employees, but excludes Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. The aggregate amount of the basic allotment for each Senator's office is increased by 10 percent but there is no automatic salary increase for employees in the office of a Senator or Congressman.

Public Law 201 (S. 622), approved October 24, 1951.

Modify Bankruptcy Act: Amends section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act by providing that the first creditors' meeting after adjudication of bankruptcy shall be not less than 10 days nor more than 30 days after the adjudication and that the meeting shall be at a place within the judicial district reasonably convenient to the parties in interest.

Public Law 32 (H. R. 3292), approved May 16, 1951.

Transporting obscene matter: Adds to the existing prohibition against transportation in interstate commerce of obscene matter by the mails or common carrier for commercial purposes, a similar prohibition against such transport by any person in a private conveyance. The prohibition applies to books, pamphlets, pictures, films, recordings, electrical transcriptions, or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, and a \$5,000

fine or imprisonment of 5 years is provided for violation.

S. 27, passed Senate January 29, 1951. Pending in House.

Notice to creditors: Amends section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act to provide that in addition to publication of notices to creditors the clerk of the court must mail such notices and certified copies of every court order in the proceedings to the local collector of internal revenue, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Comptroller General, and in the case of a debt to the Government of the United States a notice must be mailed to the head of the agency involved.

Public Law 71 (H. R. 1746), approved July 3, 1951.

Mailing obscene matter: Broadens existing law prohibiting the mailing of obscene matter to cover the mailing of all obscene, lewd, indecent matter. Existing law limits the ban to letters, packets, or packages containing obscene matter.

S. 34, passed Senate January 29, 1951. Pending in House.

Post Office Department checks: Authorizes the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or without fault of the owner.

S. 1411, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Drug prescription safeguards: Amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to bar the sale without prescription of certain barbiturates, narcotics, and new experimental drugs and to relieve retail pharmacists from unnecessary restrictions with regard to drugs sold for use without the supervision of a physician by (1) providing a statutory definition of certain prescription drugs and prohibiting their sale without a prescription; (2) permitting oral prescription by a physician for all drugs, (3) permitting refilling of a prescription, without reauthorization by physician, for drugs which are not dangerous.

Public Law 215 (H. R. 3298), approved October 26, 1951.

Administrative procedure changes: Subjects to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act, all administrative and judicial procedures under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1946, Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947, Housing and Rent Acts of 1947 and 1948, Rubber Act of 1948, Defense Production Act of 1950, International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, Export Control Act of 1949, and others which were exempt.

S. 1770, passed Senate October 11, 1951. Pending in House.

Personnel selection: Authorizes the Civil Service Commission to make certain changes in its operations which will provide a more effective method of selection of persons for positions in the competitive civil service, establish standards for personnel operations, and provide a systematic transfer plan for Federal employees.

S. 1135, passed Senate October 19, 1951. Pending in House.

Transfer Government jobs: Authorizes the Administrator of General Services to transfer over a period of 3 years 50,000 Government positions now located within 20 miles of the White House to locations beyond 150 miles from the White House, under a permanent decentralization program. Not more than 50 positions in any one agency may be transferred unless approval is obtained from the proper Senate and House committees.

S. 2251, passed Senate October 19, 1951. Pending in House.

Additional judgeships: Provides for the creation of 2 additional circuit court judgeships and 18 permanent and 3 temporary district court judgeships as follows: One circuit court judgeship for the fifth circuit and one for the ninth circuit, permanent district court judgeships for (a) the southern

district of California, (b) Colorado, (c) Delaware, (d) the southern district of Florida, (e) the northern district of Georgia, (f) the northern and southern districts of Indiana, (g) Nevada, (h) the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina, (i) the northern district of Ohio, (j) the eastern district of Pennsylvania, (k) the western district of Tennessee, (l) the eastern district of Texas, (m) the eastern district of Virginia, (n) the western district of Washington, and (o) Alaska. The present temporary judgeships for the southern district of Texas, the eastern and western districts of Missouri, and the northern and southern districts of West Virginia are made permanent. One temporary judgeship is authorized for Arizona and two for the southern district of New York. Other provisions include authority for the President to appoint additional judges when a judge eligible to retire for disability does not do so, and designates certain places for the holding of court.

S. 1203, passed Senate October 9, 1951. Pending in House.

Increase narcotics law penalties: Provides more stringent penalties for violations of laws relating to narcotics and marihuana by fixing maximum fine of \$2,000 for each offense with minimum and maximum prison terms of from 2 to 5 years for first offense, 5 to 10 years for second offense, and 10 to 20 years for third offense with no probation or suspension of sentence after the first conviction.

Public Law 255 (H. R. 3490), approved November 2, 1951.

Immigration—Naturalization

Admission of aliens: Extends for 12 months from date of enactment the period for admission of alien spouses or unmarried minor children of citizens of the United States who are members of the Armed Forces, and waives racial inadmissibility as a cause for exclusion. In the cases of alien spouses the marriage must have taken place before 12 months after the date of enactment of this legislation.

Public Law 6 (H. R. 1030), approved March 19, 1951.

Japanese evacuation claims: The Evacuation Claims Act of 1948 was enacted to authorize the Attorney General to determine, according to law, any claim by persons of Japanese ancestry against the United States for losses due to their forced evacuation from the west coast, Alaska, or Hawaii during World War II. A total of 24,684 claims have been filed against the Government amounting to in excess of \$130,000,000. This new law permits the Attorney General to effect compromise settlements not exceeding \$2,500 per claim, with the purpose of more rapidly disposing of a large majority of the 13,915 claims for amounts up to \$2,500, and a portion of the 3,939 claims for amounts between \$2,500 and \$5,000. The original act required the Attorney General to make a formal, regular, and final judgment of each claim and a more expeditious method of handling became necessary because of the unexpected large number of claims.

Public Law 116 (H. R. 3142), approved August 17, 1951.

Modification of deportation-immigration provisions: Requires the Attorney General to remove bar against certain involuntary membership in subversive organizations by clarifying the interpretation of the act of 1918, as amended, relating to exclusion and deportation of subversive classes of aliens. The act of 1918, as amended by the act of 1940, excluded from the United States aliens who were or have been members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches certain subversive doctrines. Thereafter, section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 added to the excludable classes of aliens those who are or were members of, or affiliated with, the Communist

Party, the Communist Political Association, or other totalitarian parties. The new law directs the Attorney General to provide by regulation that the terms "members of" and "affiliated with" shall include only membership or affiliation which is or was voluntary, and shall not include membership or affiliation which is or was solely (a) when under 16 years of age, (b) by operation of law, or (c) for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living.

Public Law 14 (H. R. 2339), approved March 28, 1951.

Passports—Citizenship: Provides that the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the passport laws and the laws relating to the falsification of citizenship be extended to 10 years instead of the 3 years under the existing law.

(Public Law 65 (H. R. 2396), approved June 30, 1951.

Displaced persons: Amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, to (a) extend to December 31, 1951, the termination date for the issuance of visas for eligible displaced persons; (b) extend to June 30, 1952, the terminal date of the period during which 5,000 nonquota visas can be issued to eligible displaced orphans.

Public Law 60 (H. R. 3576), approved June 28, 1951.

Alien detention facilities: Authorizes the Attorney General to establish facilities for the detention of aliens who are illegally in the United States and subject to deportation.

S. 1932, passed October 19, 1951. Pending in House.

Restore citizenship: Enables those persons who lost their United States citizenship by reason of voting in a political election or plebiscite in Italy on June 2, 1946, or on April 18, 1948, to regain it. The law will not permit reinstatement if citizenship has been lost for any other reason. Those qualified to regain American citizenship under this act must take an oath, within 2 years after enactment, that they have done nothing to promote the cause of communism. Approximately 3,000 former American citizens are affected by this act.

Public Law 114 (H. R. 400), approved August 16, 1951.

Natural resources and reclamation

Central Arizona project: Authorizes construction (but prohibits during present national emergency any appropriation or construction) of the central Arizona project at Bridge Canyon on Colorado River in northwestern Arizona, which includes (a) a dam and incidental works at Bridge Canyon, (b) certain necessary appurtenant dams and incidental works which will effectuate coordination with other Federal power projects on the Colorado or its tributaries, (c) a related system of canals for diverting the waters of the Colorado River to needed points which can be served by the project; (d) power generating and related transmission equipment for the production and transmission of electrical energy to various points in the Southwest, (e) flood control and related purposes.

S. 75, passed Senate, 50 to 28, June 5, 1951. Pending in House.

Conserve oil and gas: Authorizes the extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas for a period of 4 years to September 1, 1955. The purpose of the compact is to conserve petroleum resources, prevent their waste, and aid the industry to achieve a relatively stable situation. The act does not authorize the signatory States to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price, or to create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation. The original compact was entered into by six States in 1935, and 20 States now participate.

Public Law 128 (S. J. Res. 42), approved August 28, 1951.

Duck stamp fund: Amends the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934 to permit 15 percent of the migratory bird conservation fund (duck stamp fund) to be used for enforcement and administrative purposes and 85 percent for other purposes of the act. Existing law provided that Fish and Wildlife Service may use 90 percent of the fund for acquisition, maintenance, and development of wildlife refuges and 10 percent for enforcement and administration.

Public Law 182 (S 509), approved October 20, 1951.

Assessment—mining claims: Amends basic law (sec 2324, Rev. Stat.) by changing the year during which assessment work is to be performed from the 12-month period beginning on the 1st of July each calendar year to the 12-month period beginning on November 1. Assessment work required to be performed on mining claims during the period beginning July 1, 1950, may be performed during the additional 4-month period ending on November 1, 1951.

S. 1726, passed Senate June 26, 1951. Pending in House.

State-owned lands: Enables the State of Arizona to develop public lands by removing restrictions imposed by the Federal Government in the Arizona Enabling Act. Permits oil and gas leases to run for as long as oil and gas is produced in paying quantities after the primary term of not more than 20 years, reserves a royalty to the State of not less than 12½ percent of production, and extends the exemption from the restrictions contained in the original enabling act which now applies to agricultural and grazing lands to also include commercial and home-site leases.

Public Law 44 (S 108), approved June 2, 1951.

Grand Canyon-scenic views: Provides protection to scenic values by directing that on certain lands along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Road the rights of locators of subsequently filed mining claims would be limited to minerals, and title to the surface would remain with the United States; use of the surface by the locator would be restricted to the needs for mining purposes, the timber cutting would be subject to national forest timber cutting rules.

Public Law 77 (S 109), approved July 12, 1951.

Power facilities in Tennessee: Authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee at a cost of \$18,200,000.

S. 87, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Social welfare

Public health units: Amends the Public Health Service Act by authorizing the establishment and maintenance of local public health units under approved State plans, aided by Federal grants, and administered by the Surgeon General to provide the following basic services: (a) gather vital statistics; (b) control and prevent communicable and chronic diseases; (c) improve sanitation methods; (d) provide laboratory services for diagnosis and examination; (e) aid in maternal and child health care; (f) provide source for health education.

S. 445, passed Senate, 38 to 35, March 16, 1951. Pending in House.

Increase aid to aged: Authorizes an increase in the Federal share payment to States for the aid to the aged, blind, and disabled by \$3 per month bringing the Federal payment to \$33 per month, and \$2 a month for each dependent child bringing the Federal payment to \$18 per month. The provision was made through an amendment (by McFARLAND) to a bill excluding discharge of indebtedness from gross income for tax purposes.

H. R. 2416, passed Senate July 19, 1951. Pending in House.

Union elections: Authorizes discontinuance of mandatory election procedure in reaching union-shop agreements, but provides that a labor organization shall not be authorized to conclude a union-shop agreement unless, within the preceding 12-month period, it has received notice from the National Labor Relations Board that it is in full compliance with section 9 (non-Communist affidavit requirement) of the Labor Relations Act. Mandatory election is necessary if 30 percent or more of the employees in a bargaining unit disapprove a union-shop agreement and present a petition.

Public Law 189 (S. 1959), approved October 22, 1951.

School construction: Provides that no reduction should be made for prior construction under WPA, PWA, or NYA programs in determining the amount which local educational agencies are to receive for school-construction purposes. Existing law (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.) authorized funds for construction but allowed deductions for work completed after June 30, 1939, with Federal assistance.

S. 703, passed Senate August 27, 1951. Pending in House.

Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes: Extends for an additional 5 years the authority to make a semiannual per capita distribution of two-thirds of the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes and permits earnings and income from oil royalties, and income from all other sources, to be available for distribution.

Public Law 133 (S 950), approved August 30, 1951.

Menominee Indian payments: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to pay \$150 to each of the 3,000 Menominee Indians, the funds to be withdrawn from that portion of tribal funds now in the Treasury bearing interest at 5 percent. Payments come from funds derived from logging and sawmill operations and from a judgment for \$8,500,000 made by the Court of Claims to this tribe.

Public Law 118 (H R 3782), approved August 20, 1951.

Ute Indian payments: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to distribute to the Ute Indians \$1,000 per capita, and the tribal council to use about \$5,000,000 over a 3-year period for a rehabilitation program. Funds are to come from a judgment of \$31,460,216 awarded the tribe against the United States in payment for 11,720,000 acres of land taken from them, but not more than one-third of the judgment sum plus certain other trust funds totaling about \$40,000 may be distributed.

Public Law 120 (H R 3795), approved August 21, 1951.

Release of prisoners: Provides that a Federal prisoner who has served his sentence, less good-time deductions, shall be released unconditionally if there remains less than 180 days to serve under the maximum term or terms of his sentence.

Public Law 62 (H R. 2924), approved June 29, 1951.

Modify parole laws: Amends the Criminal Code (sec. 4202, title 15) to (a) permit the parole of prisoners serving a term or terms of over 180 days instead of limiting parole to offenders committed for more than 1 year as under the present statute; (b) provide that prisoners sentenced to terms of over 45 years may be considered for parole after serving 15 years; (c) includes youth offenders under the exemption now provided for juvenile delinquents. Existing law provides that a Federal prisoner serving a term or terms of over 1 year may be paroled after serving one-third of his term or 15 years of a life sentence.

Public Law 98 (H. R. 3455), approved July 31, 1951.

Rehabilitate prisoners: Authorizes the Attorney General, in his discretion, to make loans not exceeding \$150 to Federal prisoners out of commissary funds to be secured by the personal note of the prisoner and to be repaid monthly with interest up to 6 percent. The Attorney General is also authorized to accept gifts or money bequests for credit to the commissary fund.

S. 1365, passed Senate July 23, 1951. Pending in House.

War claims in Philippines: Authorizes payment out of the war claims fund to religious organizations in the Philippines which gave aid to American citizens and military forces in World War II and whose facilities for educational, medical, or welfare work were destroyed.

S. 1415, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Change railroad retirement: Amends the Railroad Retirement Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act to (a) increase pensioners' and annuitants' benefits by 15 percent; (b) increase survivors' benefits by 33½ percent; (c) increase a spouse's benefit up to 50 percent of the retired employees' benefit but not more than \$40 per month; (d) provide over-all guaranty that in no case will a railroad retirement beneficiary receive less than under social-security program; (e) provide that employees with less than 10 years' service upon retirement are to be paid benefits from the general social-security system and with guaranty that neither railroad retirement fund nor social-security fund will be adversely affected by this arrangement.

Public Law 234 (H R 3669), approved 9 30 a m (eastern standard time), October 30, 1951.

Taxation

Revenue Act of 1951: Provides total additional revenue of \$5,691,000,000 annually (\$2,280,000,000 from individual income taxes, \$2,207,000,000 from corporation taxes, and \$1,204,000,000 from excise taxes) by: (a) increasing individual income taxes by 11 percent on the first \$2,000 and 11½ percent above \$2,000, effective November 1, 1951; (b) increasing normal corporation tax by 5 percent to 52 percent, retroactive to April 1, 1951, and limits combined corporate normal and excess profits tax to 60 percent; (c) increasing excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, smoking tobacco, gasoline, automobiles, numerous electric appliances except washing machines and vacuum cleaners, all effective November 1, 1951; (d) imposing a new 10-percent tax on all money wagered and a \$50 occupational tax on those engaged in wagering but parimutuel installations are exempt; (e) subjecting a percentage of the income of mutual savings banks and building and loan associations, and the undistributed income of cooperatives to corporation tax, but patronage dividends and refunds by rural electric cooperatives and certain mutual insurance companies are exempted; (f) modifying provisions of the corporate excess-profits tax by lowering the present 85-percent exempt base to 83 percent of the average earnings of the best 3 out of the 4-year period 1946 through 1949, but allowing special hardship exemptions for certain newer corporations whose earnings in the base period were low and setting effective date as July 1, 1951; (g) increasing the rate on long-term capital gains 1 percent to 26 percent but limiting coal royalty income for capital-gain purposes.

The law reduces revenue yields by: (a) increasing some percentage depletion rates and extending depletion allowances to cover coal, asbestos, sand, gravel, sodium chloride; (b) providing some income-splitting advantages for an unmarried head of household; (c) taxing owner of an interest in a family partnership regardless of the method of acquisition; (d) providing that proceeds from sale of a residence shall not be treated as income except as it exceeds the purchase

price of a new residence, (e) removing present limit of 5 percent on deductions for medical expenses for taxpayers 65 years of age or over; (f) allowing regular \$600 exemption to be taken for dependents whose earnings are less than \$600 per year; (g) continuing to January 1, 1954, the existing exemption from income tax on the pay of members of the Armed Forces serving in Korea, (h) abating any income tax that may be due from a member of the Armed Forces who died in combat, or who is hospitalized as a result of wounds, (i) providing that no State may be deprived of Federal grant-in-aid payments because of State law which permits public access to lists containing names of persons receiving such assistance, if the State law prohibits the use of such information for commercial or political purposes.

Public Law 183 (H. R. 4473), approved 2 07 p. m., October 20, 1951.

Excess profits Extends the time for corporations to file excess profits tax statements from September 15 to November 15, 1951, grants Secretary of Treasury subpoena powers in cases involving the denial or revocation of industrial alcohol permits.

Public Law 145 (H. R. 4014), approved September 14, 1951.

Tax exemption Exempts gain realized from involuntary conversion of property from income tax where (1) taxpayer purchases replacement property before he receives the proceeds from the converted property; or (2) where a part of the proceeds from the converted property is used to pay off its indebtedness, and (3) eliminates present requirement that proceeds from the converted property must be traced into the replacement property.

Public Law 251 (H. R. 3590), approved October 31, 1951.

Suspend copper tax Suspends the 4-cent-a-pound import tax on copper, copper-bearing ores and concentrates, and the 3-cent-a-pound tax on various articles containing copper so long as the average monthly market price of copper is 24 cents or more a pound. The tax suspension applies to articles entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning April 1, 1951, and ending February 15, 1953, or at the end of the present emergency, but if during that period the average market price of electrolytic copper, delivered Connecticut Valley, has been below 24 cents per pound for one calendar month, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the end of that month, shall advise the President, and the President shall by proclamation not later than 20 days after he has been advised, revoke the tax suspension.

Public Law 38 (H. R. 3336), approved May 22, 1951.

Savings bonds Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to provide a convenient method of handling the maturity of series E United States bonds by either (a) paying holder cash, according to the original terms of the contract, or (b) permitting holder to retain present bond up to an additional 10 years after original maturity at the same rate of interest, or (c) permitting holder to exchange bond for a current income savings bond of series G in authorized denominations.

Public Law 12 (H. R. 2268), approved March 26, 1951.

Gasoline tax deduction Permits gasoline consumers to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes, beginning in the 1951 tax year, State taxes on gasoline or other motor-vehicle fuels imposed on wholesalers and passed on to consumers.

Public Law 29 (H. R. 136), approved May 12, 1951.

Military gift importation Extends for 2 years the law which permits members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad to return bona fide gifts, not exceeding \$50 in value, with-

out payment of customs duties, charges, or exactions, or internal revenue taxes.

Public Law 1 (H. R. 2141), approved February 21, 1951.

Refund estate taxes Extends until January 1, 1952, the authority to refund any additional Federal estate tax overpaid, if the overpayment resulted from the tax exemption of members of the Armed Forces who were killed in action or who died of wounds or disease incurred in line of duty between December 7, 1941, and January 1, 1947.

Public Law 34 (H. R. 2654), approved May 17, 1951.

Suspend scrap tax Continues suspension for another year until June 30, 1952, of the import tax on scrap metal which ranges from 37½ cents per ton on ferrous to three-quarters cent per pound on zinc, 20 cents per pound on magnesium, 2½ cents per pound on lead, 2 cents per pound on copper, and 1½ cents per pound on aluminum.

Public Law 66 (H. R. 3181), approved June 30, 1951.

Estate, gift tax changes Clarifies and simplifies certain provisions of estate and gift tax laws, relating to the power to determine the manner in which the property of another shall be disposed by repealing certain technical provisions enacted in 1942, and establishes standards on rules to determine taxability.

Public Law 58 (H. R. 2081), approved June 28, 1951.

Admission tax exemption Exempts members of Armed Forces from Federal admissions tax when admitted free of charge to sporting events, moving-picture theaters, or any other place subject to admissions tax.

Public Law 124 (H. R. 4601), approved August 24, 1951.

Panama Canal income tax Eliminates the retroactive provision of the 19.0 Revenue Act affecting Federal employees in the Canal Zone by making the tax apply to compensation received in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, instead of beginning December 31, 1949.

Public Law 82 (H. R. 3804), approved July 23, 1951.

Transfer of distilled spirits Permits any necessary national emergency transfers of distilled spirits and allows heretofore authorized tax-free removals to be made to and from industrial alcohol establishments if the spirits are 160 proof, provides that upon such transfer any liens for sales or otherwise shall be transferred to the premises of the transferee, except where spirits are transferred to an internal revenue bonded warehouse; and authorizes the Secretary of Treasury temporarily to exempt proprietors of distilleries from statutory requirements except payment of taxes.

Public Law 76 (H. J. Res. 73), approved July 11, 1951.

Tax on blended whiskies Exempts from rectification tax blended whiskies and brandies not under 80 proof, existing exemption limited to whiskies and brandies not under 90 proof.

Public Law 161 (H. R. 2745), approved October 10, 1951.

Transportation and communications

Long-range shipping Amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to extend aid and provide incentives for expansion of the United States merchant marine by: (a) granting unsubsidized and subsidized shipping operators the privilege of accelerated amortization at a rate not exceeding 10 percent of the adjusted tax basis of the vessel, (b) making available construction-differential subsidies to any citizen who builds vessels to be used in foreign trade and commerce of the United States regardless of whether vessel is to be used on essential trade routes; (c) providing that balances due on a purchase contract for a passenger vessel will be secured by a first preferred

mortgage and, in case of default in payment, the purchaser's obligation will be discharged by surrendering the vessel and all rights to the Government. (In order to gain the benefits of the nonrecourse loan provisions, the passenger vessel must be not less than 7,000 gross tons, have a speed of not less than 16 knots, accommodate not less than 200 passengers, construction cost be not less than \$10,000,000, and be approved by the Navy Department); (d) reducing the minimum age from 17 to 12 years in determining obsolete vessels for turn-in by the owner to the Government for an allowance of credit to be applied upon the purchase of a new vessel and authorizing the Government to purchase obsolete (documented for at least 10 years) vessels engaged in domestic trades (formerly allowed only for vessels engaged in foreign trade); (e) allowing unsubsidized lines to deposit their earnings in the construction reserve fund on a tax-deferred basis; (f) authorizing the use of construction reserve funds for reconstruction and modernization of vessels and for liquidation of purchase money indebtedness; (g) extending to vessels operating on the Great Lakes the right to extend use of construction reserve funds, (h) permitting officers and employees of subsidized companies to be paid salaries in excess of the present limitation of \$25,000.

S. 241, passed Senate August 21, 1951. Pending in House.

Philippine vessel charters Authorizes the Department of Commerce to extend to April 30, 1952, charters of certain United States vessels to private corporations of the Republic of the Philippines, continuing the original authority granted during the Seventy-ninth Congress, which made United States Government vessels available to the Philippines to replace vessels which had been destroyed by enemy action in World War II.

Public Law 25 (H. J. Res. 223), approved April 28, 1951.

Great Lakes shipping Permits vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between the United States ports on the Great Lakes during the 1951 shipping season. The number of available ore carriers in the American fleet is insufficient to handle the ore demands of United States steel mills.

Public Law 15 (S. 683), approved March 29, 1951.

War-risk insurance Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft, air cargo, aircraft crews, and persons transported by air, when such insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms from commercial insurance companies. This authority may be exercised only with the approval of the President and after consultation with interested Federal agencies as the President may require. Expires 5 years from date of enactment.

Public Law 47 (S. 435), approved June 14, 1951.

Alaskan airports Permits the Secretary of Commerce to lease real estate belonging to public airports in Alaska for periods of 20 years for purposes of erecting structures necessary to the operation of such airports.

Public Law 160 (S. 1183), approved October 10, 1951.

Water transportation to Alaska Extends until June 30, 1952, authority for Canadian-flag vessels to transport passengers between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and passengers and merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port.

Public Law 55 (H. R. 157), approved June 27, 1951.

Vessel transfers Prohibits transfer of ships owned or partly owned by a citizen or a corporation of the United States to foreign-flag registry without prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State.

must pass upon all requests to sell, mortgage, or agree to sell or mortgage any vessel or any interest therein owned by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States to any person not a citizen of the United States.

S 1704, passed Senate July 23, 1951. Pending in House.

Motor Carrier Claims Commission. Extends the termination date of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission to June 30, 1953, or until such time as the final report is made to Congress on all claims filed. This Commission was established in 1948 to hear and determine existing claims by motor-carrier transportation systems for losses and damages sustained by them as a result of seizure, operation, and use of their properties during World War II.

Public Law 75 (S 1042), approved July 11, 1951.

Communications Act changes. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify existing law and remove certain ambiguities, separate the judicial and prosecutory functions of the Federal Communications Commission, reorganize the administrative set-up of the Commission. The original bill was a Senate measure, S 658, but the Senate also subsequently added the provisions to a House bill which merely authorized the Commission to purchase land for the construction of buildings for monitoring and research activities.

S 658 (H R. 1730), passed Senate March 12, 1951. Pending in House.

Navigational aids. Authorizes the Coast Guard to install and maintain navigational aids in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States wherever naval and military bases are located or where such aids to navigation were established prior to June 26, 1948.

Public Law 52 (S 1025), approved June 22, 1951.

Air mail subsidy separation. Separates payment for the transport of domestic and foreign mail on United States airlines from subsidy payments to airlines by providing: (a) that the rates for the carriage of domestic mail shall be fixed from time to time by the Civil Aeronautics Board and payment made by the Postmaster General; (b) the rates for the carriage of American mail destined for delivery abroad shall be fixed by and paid by the Postmaster General; (c) that the amount of subsidy to airlines carrying mail both domestically and foreign shall be fixed by and paid by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Subsidy payment may be made only to certificated airlines which carry mail, each carrier must bear the burden of proving the need for and the amount of the subsidy, subsidy contracts may not be made for longer than 5 years with an airline operating to foreign countries, and for not longer than 3 years with a domestic airline providing it repays to the Government half of all profits over and above 10 percent of its capital investment.

S 436, passed Senate September 19, 1951. Pending in House.

Marine reserve fund. Extends for 1 year, until March 31, 1952, the time within which deposits in the construction reserve fund, under the Merchant Marine Act, may be used for the acquisition of new vessels.

Public Law 157 (H J. Res 333), approved October 1, 1951.

Emergency highway repair. Authorizes an increase of \$10,000,000 (present limit is \$5,000,000) in the amount available under the Federal Aid Highway Act as an emergency relief fund for the repair of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes.

Public Law 175 (H R 5257), approved October 15, 1951.

Grain transport on Great Lakes. Authorizes ships of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes until December 31, 1951.

Public Law 162 (H R 3436), approved October 10, 1951.

Safety at sea: Authorizes the President to proclaim certain regulations for the safe operation and navigation of United States vessels on the high seas which were approved by the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea.

Public Law 172 (H R. 5013), approved October 11, 1951.

Transportation policy. Amends the policy section of the Interstate Commerce Act to require that the Interstate Commerce Commission in considering application or transfers of certificates shall weigh factors which will tend to keep all modes of interstate transport under its jurisdiction free of racketeering, extortion, acts of terrorism, or unethical business practices, and declares congressional policy is to keep interstate transportation free of such evils.

S 1899, passed Senate October 1, 1951. Pending in House.

Bankruptcy Act changes. Amends section 77 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act to permit a railroad in bankruptcy proceedings to finance purchase of safety equipment by clarifying the powers of the bankruptcy court so that it can direct that indebtedness certificates for safety equipment purchases shall have repayment priority over all existing obligations, or State or local taxes.

Public Law 194 (H R 4693), approved October 24, 1951.

Treaties

Double taxation on estates. Establishes formal agreement between the United States and the contracting nation to prevent double taxation on the estate of a United States citizen who was a resident of one signatory country and domiciled in the other by (a) permitting the amount of tax due on the property in one country to be credited against the amount due on the same property in the other country, (b) but no credit may be established in excess of the amount actually paid to the country in which the property is situated, and (c) where the United States estate tax is due solely to citizenship, full credit for all estate taxes on property situated in other countries must be allowed. Regulations governing the imposition of estate taxes relating to citizenship, domicile, residence, and situs of property are agreed to and the signatory countries pledge each other to lend certain assistance in the collection of estate taxes.

Executive FF, between the United States and the Union of South Africa, signed April 10, 1947; ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive R, between the United States and Norway, signed June 13, 1949, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive E, between the United States and Ireland, signed September 13, 1949, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive K, between the United States and Greece, signed February 20, 1950, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive S, between the United States and Canada, signed May 24, 1951, ratified September 17, 1951.

Double taxation on income. Establishes formal agreement between the United States and the contracting nation to prevent double taxation on the incomes of citizens or corporations of the respective countries.

(a) With respect to corporations, United States enterprises in a treaty country are subject to a tax by that country on all income derived there if the enterprise has a permanent establishment in the treaty country and a reciprocal policy applies to treaty country enterprises in the United States.

(b) With respect to individuals, residents of the United States earning income in a treaty country are subject to a tax by that country on income earned there if they are in the treaty country more than 183 days out of the year and if they work for other than a resident of the United States and a recipro-

cal policy applies to residents of treaty countries earning income in the United States.

(c) To avoid double taxation, the tax imposed on United States residents by a treaty country for income derived there shall be a credit against the United States tax on the income of such residents and a reciprocal policy applies to the treaty country allowing credit for United States tax on residents of the treaty country but no credit may be established by the taxpayer in excess of the amount of tax actually paid to the country in which the income is earned. Reciprocal administrative assistance between the countries is provided to facilitate collection of taxes but extraordinary expenses in collecting shall be borne by the country seeking to collect.

Executive O between the United States and the Union of South Africa, signed December 13, 1946, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive J between the United States and New Zealand, signed March 16, 1948, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive Q between the United States and Norway, signed June 13, 1949, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive F between the United States and Ireland signed September 13, 1949, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive L between the United States and Greece, signed February 20, 1950, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive R between the United States and Canada, signed June 12, 1950, ratified September 17, 1951.

Executive N between the United States and Switzerland, signed May 24, 1951; ratified September 17, 1951.

Veterans

Veterans' insurance. Authorizes free life insurance to persons in the armed services by providing: (a) \$10,000 automatic insurance for all members of the Armed Forces on active duty after June 27, 1950, with protection covering period of active service plus 120 days after separation from service, (b) veterans may obtain nonparticipating Government veterans' insurance after separation from service if disabled in service and ineligible for a normal veterans' coverage, and in cases of total disability a waiver of premiums may be granted, (c) World War I or II insurance policies may be continued in force by those in active service or if such policy has been surrendered for cash, it may be reinstated or a new policy issued on the same plan and in the same amount without medical examination, (d) beneficiaries are limited to members of immediate family of insured, (e) maximum indemnity to be paid in monthly installments of \$92.90 each over a 10-year period and is exempt from claims of creditors and taxation, (f) application for a term policy up to \$10,000 may be made within 120 days after discharge at 2 1/4 percent per annum.

Public Law 23 (H R. 1), approved April 25, 1951.

Veterans' education. Clarifies misinterpretations by the Veterans' Administration of Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, which authorized funds for education and training of veterans, by declaring it the sense of the Senate that: (a) customary cost of tuition and other charges required by educational institutions for training of veterans are intended to apply to all courses of training covered by contract or other agreement regardless of calendar duration established or weekly hours of attendance required for such courses, (b) a contract, including tuition, fees, or other charges, for a course will be considered as an entity in determining the rate or rates to be paid to the institution for such course, (c) any institution will be regarded as a nonprofit institution for the purpose of applying the governing statutes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration relating to payment of tuition and other charges if it is exempt from

taxation under certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, no matter when it was certified as such by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and (d) the rate established in the most recent contract by any educational or training institution which has entered into one or more contracts in two successive years will be considered the customary cost of tuition.

Senate Resolution 124, adopted August 27, 1951.

Renew Insurance: Grants World War I veterans the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance every 5 years without further legislation.

Public Law 101 (H. R. 1072) approved August 2, 1951.

Pension rates: Fixes the pension rates for veterans of certain wars at \$60 a month for those with 70 days but less than 90 days service but \$78 a month if they require aid or attendance; and at \$90 a month for 90 days or more service but \$120 a month if they require aid or attendance. The new rates apply to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion.

Public Law 108 (H. R. 315), approved August 4, 1951.

Renew term insurance: Permits World War II veterans to renew for successive 5-year periods their 5-year level-premium term national life insurance policy without further medical examination and at the premium rate for the attained age. This removes the bar which limited such renewal only to policies issued before January 1, 1948.

Public Law 104 (H. R. 4000), approved August 2, 1951.

Gold Star lapel buttons: Provides gold-star lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose or lost their lives in any war activity of the United States (Applies to veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict).

Public Law 121 (H. R. 3911), approved August 21, 1951.

Veterans' representation: Permits veterans appealing separation from the Federal service to name as their representative an accredited representative of certain veterans' organizations provided the organization and its representatives comply with the rules of the Civil Service Commission.

S. 831, passed Senate May 17, 1951. Pending in House.

Government insurance dividends: Provides that unless the policyholder of veterans' insurance has advised the Veterans' Administration in writing that the dividend is to be paid in cash, any dividend payable after January 1, 1952, will be used toward payment of the premium. If a policyholder continues to pay premiums and permits dividends to accumulate, interest will be paid based on a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law 36 (H. R. 321), approved May 18, 1951.

Missing Persons Act: Clarifies and broadens section 12 of the Missing Persons Act of 1942 by providing for the transportation of dependents of dead or missing veterans from abroad to their home, and for carriage of any household goods, or automobile, from the embarkation port to the home of the missing or deceased soldier. Existing law was limited to carriage to the United States of personal property, including automobiles.

Public Law 131 (H. R. 1199), approved August 29, 1951.

War claims payments: Authorizes the War Claims Commission in making payments to claimants who are minors or under other legal disability, and for whom there was no provision under the War Claims Act of 1948 to certify such payments to those charged with their care. Payments would be made for the use of the claimant to the natural or legal guardian, committee, conservator, or

curator under the laws of the State of the claimant's residence, or to the superintendent, manager, or chief officer of the hospital or institution in which the claimant may be a patient or a resident.

S. 1669, passed Senate August 9, 1951. Pending in House.

Prisoner claims: Extends until March 31, 1952, the time for filing claims with the War Claims Commission and directs the Commission to make every effort to locate soldiers and civilians who were prisoners of the Japanese and advise them of their rights to secure compensation for periods of imprisonment.

Public Law 16 (S. J. Res. 40), approved April 5, 1951.

Philippine burial expenses: Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish a flag and to pay a sum not exceeding \$75 for the burial and funeral expenses of any person who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II. Included are those who served in organized guerrilla forces while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the July 26, 1941, military order of the President of the United States and permits claims to be filed for 2 years after the date of enactment.

Public Law 21 (S. 82), approved April 25, 1951.

Veterans' hospitalization: Extends to persons who have served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, medical and hospital care, compensation, or pension commensurate with World War II veterans.

Public Law 28 (S. J. Res. 72), approved May 11, 1951.

Automobiles for disabled veterans: Authorizes payment up to \$1,600 to eligible veterans by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance. Veterans eligible are those who: (a) served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of Congress, (b) are entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs at or above the ankle, loss or permanent loss of the use of one or both hands, or permanent impairment of vision of both eyes. Application must be made within 3 years after enactment, or within 3 years after the date of discharge if discharge occurs after enactment.

[Public Law 663 of the Seventy-ninth Congress was the first law enacted giving automobiles to certain disabled veterans of World War II. The Eightieth Congress enacted Public Law 161 continuing the authority and an additional appropriation of \$5,000,000 for this purpose was included in Public Law 271 of the Eightieth Congress. Public Law 785, Eightieth Congress, appropriated \$1,500,000 and Public Law 904, Eightieth Congress, appropriated an additional \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, extended funds and the law for automobiles until June 30, 1950. Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress, authorized the sum of \$800,000 and extended the law for 1 year to June 30, 1951, and Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, appropriated an additional \$375,000. To date \$42,675,000 has been appropriated for the purchase of automobiles and other conveyances for World War II veterans.]

(Passed Senate August 9, 1951; passed House September 17, 1951; President vetoed October 18, 1951; Senate override veto 55 to 10 October 19, 1951; House override veto 223 to 53 October 20, 1951).

Public Law 187 (S. 8664), enacted October 20, 1951.

Widows' pensions: Broadens eligibility of veterans' widows for pension payments by eliminating dependency clause, but requiring widow to be unmarried, at least 60 years old, to have married the veteran at least 10 years

prior to his death, to have lived with him continuously from date of marriage to his death, and is applicable to widows of veterans of Civil War, Indian wars, Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection.

H. R. 3549, passed Senate July 23, 1951. Vetoed August 6, 1951; no further action.

Non-service pensions: Increases existing pension payments for veterans with non-service-connected disability from \$80-\$72 to \$120 a month. Eligible are veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean campaign who (a) are totally and permanently disabled (not due to misconduct), or blind or so helpless as to require the constant aid of another person at all times, regardless of whether the injury is service connected; and (b) whose income is not more than \$1,000 annually if single, and \$2,500 annually if married. Note: The increase to \$120 makes the pension rates for veterans of all wars uniform, but the differences in eligibility requirements still exist with veterans of the Civil War, Indian wars, and Spanish-American War being entitled to a \$120 pension if they require the regular aid and attendance of another person regardless of the veterans' income. (Passed House June 20, 1951; passed Senate July 23, 1951; President vetoed August 6, 1951; House override veto by a vote of 318 to 45 August 17, 1951; Senate override by a vote of 69 to 9, September 18, 1951.)

Public Law 149 (H. R. 3193), enacted September 18, 1951.

Veterans' housing overcharges: Amends Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to permit veterans to sue for treble damages for whatever amount they were overcharged above the reasonable value in the purchase of property where a loan by the Veterans' Administration is involved. Determination of the reasonable value is to be made by an appraiser designated by the Veterans' Administration, and the liability for damages lies against whoever is knowingly involved in such sale whether or not they receive any part of the consideration. If the veteran does not bring action within 30 days from the time the overcharge is discovered, the action may be brought by the Government and in such case, the Government may recover two-thirds of the damages and one-third goes to the veteran.

Public Law 142 (H. R. 319), approved September 13, 1951.

Housing benefits for Korean veterans: Grants veterans of the Korean conflict the same benefits given to veterans of World War II under the National Housing Act, such as preference in the rental of low-rent housing units, in the purchase of war housing under the Lanham Act, and in obtaining special FHA mortgage insurance advantages.

Public Law 214 (S. 2244), approved October 26, 1951.

Multiple sclerosis: Increases from 1 year to 2 years after separation from active service the time limitation within which any veteran developing multiple sclerosis may claim a service-connected disability. Compensation for such cases range from \$15 per month for 10 percent disability to \$150 a month for total disability.

Public Law 174 (H. R. 3205), approved October 12, 1951.

Vocational rehabilitation training: Extends the vocational rehabilitation benefits enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress for World War II veterans to all service-connected cases who need vocational rehabilitation to overcome a disability handicap incurred in or aggravated by service since June 27, 1950. The extent and type of training to be determined by the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law 170 (H. R. 3932), approved October 11, 1951.

Veterans' disability benefits: Provides hospitalization and out-patient treatment for veterans of World War II who develop a

psychosis within 2 years from their release from active duty.

Public Law 239 (H. R. 320) approved October 30, 1951.

Correct military records. Authorizes the Secretaries of the armed services to correct any military or naval records where it is necessary to remove an injustice, and authorizes payment of any money which is found to be due as a result of such correction.

Public Law 220 (H. R. 1181), approved October 25, 1951.

Family Farmers—The Record Will Show in Many Instances I Have Tried to Help the Family Size Farmer—I Am Glad the Department of Agriculture Is Showing Much Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement by the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Charles F. Brannan:

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE FAMILY FARM POLICY REVIEW

(Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, prepared at the request of Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during hearings on S 1149, submitted October 19, 1951)

In such times of national emergency as now confront this country, there is an ever-increasing need for the maximum effort on the part of all agencies of Government to make certain that the programs they are operating are being carried out in the most efficient and effective and economical way possible.

Although the Department of Agriculture—as any good, operating, administrative agency should—is constantly studying its operations from the standpoint of improving efficiency and otherwise giving maximum assistance to the American farmer as authorized by the Congress, it seemed desirable that at this time a very thorough study of our operations in terms of their objective, methods, and efficiency should be undertaken. Such a study could be undertaken by the existing staff with relatively little additional expense, and could be completed in a few months.

In searching for the best common denominator of objectives for the programs of the Department of Agriculture, the decision was reached that this denominator was how the programs served the American farm family. There are many recitations in the statutes authorizing the programs of the Department which indicate that the principal objective, or, at least, the major objective, of practically all of them is service to the family farmer. Hence, the Family Farm Policy Review was selected as the identification of the program study. Our objective has been to carry on this study along with our other work during 1951.

All that we are doing is asking everyone interested to take a good look at our present programs and tell us if they are serving the family farms properly, or whether changes need to be made.

We feel that any group sincerely interested in agriculture should welcome such an op-

portunity for a constructive, critical analysis of our efforts. Across the Nation generally, that has been the reaction to this family farm policy review, despite a concerted effort of the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation to distort its purpose and make it some kind of a political issue.

THE BACKGROUND

From its very inception, the family farm policy review has been and continues to be a reappraisal and reexamination of the authorized programs of the Department to ascertain whether or not they are being utilized and are properly constituted to best serve family farming in the United States.

The Department of Agriculture maintains a standing Policy and Program Committee, consisting of representatives from each agency in the Department, to conduct a continuing review and study of ways of improving our programs, policies, and service to agriculture.

The current review is part of that continuing study.

As a program appraisal and review, it could well have been undertaken as a routine matter by the Department. It could well have been undertaken by the staff in Washington alone. But it seemed to us that the field organization of the Department should be given an opportunity to express its views, and in so doing to secure the reactions of farmers as to how the programs were affecting them. It also seemed to us advisable to consult the farm organizations, church groups, land-grant colleges, and other groups interested in the American farm. Hence, the inclusion of our whole Department field force and outside organizations in the study and review.

For this specific purpose a family farm policy review subcommittee was created, consisting of representatives from each agency of the Department, plus representatives from several nongovernmental groups invited to participate. Membership on the subcommittee was by agency or organization, rather than as individuals, with different persons participating at various times during the several months' series of meetings required to prepare for the broad review we have undertaken.

GROUPS PARTICIPATING

The National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Lutheran Council, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, and the American Farm Bureau Federation were among those invited to participate, and which were represented at meetings at which the study material was developed, and procedures for carrying the review out into the field were adopted. However, the Farm Bureau, at the final meeting of the subcommittee after months of participation, asked to be dissociated from the project.

All of these groups have been invited to send representatives again to meetings of our subcommittee later this year when it undertakes study of the reports now being compiled from open farmer meetings and discussions at the State and county levels, where we have also encouraged participation of church groups, farm organizations, and other groups interested in agriculture, as well as individual farmers.

PUBLIC REACTION

The criticisms brought to the attention of this committee represent but a small minority of the opinion that has been expressed in regard to the family farm policy review. In all fairness I believe some of the reaction of other groups should be called to your attention, including:

From the report of a conference on the churches and agricultural policy, sponsored by the National Council of Churches of

Christ in the United States of America at Haverford, Pa., in June.

"We are pleased to note the current re-examination of our own land policy and practices within the Department of Agriculture, known as the family farm policy review. We urge the Department to carry this study to a conclusion and boldly to institute such changes as will make it a full, effective ally of the family farm."

From the Reverend William J. Gibbons, S. K., of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

"The family farm policy review of the United States Department of Agriculture appeals to me as a good summary and guide for further discussion. It is unfortunate that all who are professionally interested in agriculture do not see fit to use it as a starting point for what should be a most important national discussion."

From Ray Gibbons, director, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America.

"The Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches vigorously supports the family farm. We believe it embodies many human and social values and contributes to others. We are eager to see it continued and strengthened as the dominant pattern of land tenure in America. We want you to know that we welcome and approve the family farm policy review, which we understand to be a genuine effort of the Department of Agriculture to strengthen its programs in behalf of the family farm. We are doing and shall continue to do all we can to cooperate with the review program and to solicit cooperation from our constituency."

From the Agricultural Bulletin of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

"In spite of some misunderstandings in a few States, the reaction to the family farm policy review and its purposes have been very favorable. There have been few signs that the statements of some of the Farm Bureau leadership have been backed by the rank and file farmers. In almost every State farmers have shown great interest and enthusiasm in the proposals of the Department for active local participation in its policy making. In Texas, for instance, the Governor set aside a week as Family Farm Policy Review Week. One could guess at two reasons for the attack of the Bureau leadership: Allan Kline's personal antagonism toward Secretary Brannan, and fear on the part of the leadership that many of the proposals of the USDA will be acceptable to the members of the Bureau."

During my testimony before your committee, I called attention to some of the deliberate attempts of the national president of the American Farm Bureau Federation to distort the purpose of this review, centering around misleading attacks upon the provisional report.

When plans for the review and procedures for compiling the provisional report were outlined to the farm organizations at the very inception of this project, Allan Kline, president of that organization, wrote to Under Secretary McCormick saying, in part:

"Let me say that the idea of a thorough review of the various activities in the Department seems to us a good one. Further let me say that the method which you have devised for use within the Department seems both unique and well-fitted to the purpose of an objective appraisal."

The criticisms that have been called to the attention of this committee represent but a very small majority of the opinion being reflected at thousands of meetings of farmers all over the country, and are based principally upon misunderstanding that has been deliberately created in opposition to our sincere effort to obtain constructive suggestions for improving our service to American agriculture.

A better idea of the extent of participation in this review can be gained from the fact that 950 community meetings have been held in Tennessee, and 760 in North Carolina. And those two States are just typical of what is going on right across the country.

CONCLUSION

In compliance with the committee's request, and for your further information, I am herewith submitting:

1. A copy of the leaflet, *The Family Farm's Future*, explaining objectives of the family farm policy review and inviting participation of everyone interested;

2. A copy of the provisional report and tentative recommendations of the Department of Agriculture's Family Farm Policy Review Subcommittee, compiled with the cooperation of nongovernmental organizations;

3. A copy of Memorandum No. 18 setting forth instructions to State agricultural mobilization committees for conducting the family farm policy review;

4. A copy of Memorandum No. 1280 designating membership on the State and county agricultural mobilization committees to whom the family farm policy review has been assigned.

Your attention is particularly directed to the leaflet entitled *"The Family Farm's Future"* for a thorough understanding of this project. On the cover of that leaflet I make the following statement which I believe sums up the Department's attitude toward this review:

"Because so much of the world is rural, every opportunity for farm people to better themselves and the conditions surrounding rural life can do for world peace something that great armies cannot possibly accomplish.

"If democracy is to be a continuing source of hope to rural people elsewhere in the world, democracy must continue to advance in rural America.

"Despite the remarkable progress of our agriculture these past 20 years, we all know that there are still many problems to be solved. That's why we have started an analysis of all our programs and agencies to see how we can improve our services to the Nation's family farms.

"I believe that all farm organizations and all public institutions concerned with agriculture can and will unite in a definite, vigorous program to strengthen family farming in America."

Publicity for the Cheaters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the *Reporter-Dispatch*, a newspaper published in White Plains, N. Y., on Tuesday, October 16, 1951. The editorial follows:

PUBLICITY FOR THE CHEATERS

It is encouraging to receive reports from Washington that at long last some practical, effective method is being sought whereby cheaters and chiselers on the relief rolls may be detected and tossed out of the public trough.

Under the present provisions of the Federal Social Security Act it has been ruled that Washington may deny Federal relief

funds to any State which opens its relief rolls to public inspection. Indiana, which dared to defy this edict, has been arbitrarily cut off and stands to lose \$20,000,000. But hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on legislation introduced by Senator JENNER, Indiana Republican, and Representative HARRISON, Virginia Democrat, indicate a strong public and legislative desire to see this antipublicity provision repealed.

The argument of opponents is that publicity might embarrass or humiliate recipients of relief. That argument may have been sound 50 or even 20 years ago, when it was considered disgraceful to accept public funds for support. But that sentiment has long since died under the bounty of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. There are so many now who receive fiscal aid that there is no longer any embarrassment whatever from any substantial percentage of recipients.

On the other hand, experience has proven beyond doubt that publicity and publicity alone will serve to get the cheaters and the chiselers off the rolls. There is more than a suspicion that thousands of such cases are fraudulently receiving aid not due them.

Those who are honestly deserving of relief, we feel, should be the first to demand that the crooks be kicked off. For by the amount which the crooks collect the honest recipients are deprived of legitimate aid.

Then, there are the taxpayers to consider. They are, we believe, willing to aid the deserving. But they are not willing and should not be called upon to support the lazy, the friends or relatives of relief supervisors, or those placed on the rolls for political purposes.

Only the right of public inspection of the relief rolls will end this expensive fraud.

Director of Refugee Division, World Council of Churches, Comments on New Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the following letter from Mr. Charles S. Sowder, director of refugee division, World Council of Churches, commenting on my bill, the Selective Immigration Act of 1951, H. R. 5313, which provides for the admission of alien workers possessing skills needed in the United States, with a priority for the surplus working force of those European nations cooperating in the European recovery and mutual security programs:

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,

Munich, September 15, 1951.

Representative JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I was pleased and encouraged to read in the *Stars and Stripes* about the bill you introduced to admit 500,000 aliens into the United States in the next 5 years.

The refugees of varying categories which are in western Germany, and present a serious economic problem and threat of tension, constitute a real potential asset to American life and industry. The adjustments they have made here under severe handicaps indicate that their adjustment in the United States would come comparatively easy. They

are worthy, fine people who are here because they prefer freedom to the easy way out.

The United States displaced persons program, and the IRO larger efforts have given us some valuable experience which would stand such a project as you propose in good stead.

The chief difficulty is the technicalities of the United States immigration laws and administrative procedures. For such a project to be successful, some of the present barriers would have to be removed by an act of Congress.

The present DP act, unlike the schemes of other countries, is permissive only. There is no provision for the aliens to be brought into the United States. They may come if someone else in the country provides the assurances. In most cases the assurances were provided by people who were total strangers to the DP's, and in many cases such strangers were called upon to go the extra mile and provide a \$1,000 bond. The religious organizations provided over 95 percent of the assurances. Without their work the program would have failed.

It was my job to procure the assurances for the Protestant organization (Church World Service). After that was done I came here to direct the selection and processing of the people so selected. It was very difficult to secure those assurances. The church groups went away out on the limb by signing the guarantees and providing the inland transportation, housing (frequently taking the DP's into their own homes), and the first costs of getting the families established. Industry, which benefited from the influx of these workers, did nothing to carry its rightful share of the costs. Getting the assurances is a very costly business, and the churches have already about reached the limits of their ability. The costs of securing assurances and making good on the breakdown cases is staggering. All this was borne by the church groups, with no help from the Government or industry. They now consider their obligation about discharged and are in no mood to do it all over again for another five hundred thousand.

Therefore, inasmuch as any immigration program under the present United States laws is primarily an assurance-procurement program, special legislation will have to provide the method and means of resettlement without expecting the churches and synagogues to do it again.

The best plan now in operation is the Canadian scheme. They handle the job through the Canadian consulate and a special selection mission. Applications are received within skill or professional categories, and people who qualify are processed within 2 to 4 weeks (the United States DP processing takes from 6 months to 2 years). The workers are then sent directly to their jobs in Canada. The families are visaed at the same time and sent to a retention center near the port of embarkation. They are cared for there at Canadian Government expense until the worker can find suitable rooms or housing and send their passage money. We find that the families follow the worker within 2 months on the average.

The Australian and New Zealand schemes did not work quite so well. Their plan was to move the entire family to a retention center in the countries of resettlement. The psychology of the Canadian plan is that each man is on his own after being given an opportunity, and the results are much better.

I am writing all this because I feel certain that most people who look at the DP program don't realize that underlying it all is the altruistic benevolence of churches and Jewish communities across the United States. This source of assurances cannot be taken for granted in a new and expanded scheme. I find that much of the church support was given begrudgingly. People feel that they were drawn into a sectarian plan

which they don't like. Then, too, different groups were able to secure assurances with different degrees of liberality. Thus the religious faith of a DP was the deciding factor as to whether or not he would get an assurance. Any new project should avoid being forced into a similar sectarian pattern. It should be handled on the good old American community basis. The communities (with all their social-service resources), industry and the Government should cooperate to handle the new scheme without throwing the burden again on the churches and synagogues.

One other important lesson from the DP operations is that people cannot be processed and moved fast enough under the existing machinery to provide workers when they are needed. Jobs will no longer be available at a given factory if the people straggle in over an uncertain period of 6 months to 2 years, and many not coming at all. There are a lot of employers still mad at the DP program and the voluntary agencies for just this reason.

I believe we now have enough experience to make such a project as you propose really successful if new legislation can correct the present cumbersome procedure. Your proposed bill will also have a great humanitarian effect here, as well as real benefit to the United States of America. More power to you!

Very truly yours,

CHARLES S. SOWDER,
Deputy Director.

South Carolina's Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the timber resource of my State is declining while every phase of our economic activity is demanding more and more wood. Thousands of my people find their livelihood in the growing and processing of lumber and paper and hundreds of other wood products, and yet we are not growing enough trees to keep pace with the cut. Timber products mean for my State a hundred and seventy-two million dollars from trees which were largely nature's gift, and we accept it with scant appreciation. New pulp mills and other industries are knocking at our door, but we are not now growing as much wood as our existing mills require. I am concerned as to what the people of my State and my district will think of me 10 years hence if I do not declare my position in this matter now.

The Southeastern Forest Experiment Station of the United States Forest Service, working in cooperation with the South Carolina Commission of Forestry, has just completed an interesting survey of the forest situation in my State of South Carolina. I am in possession of a comprehensive report on the survey which is full of interesting facts bearing on our timber stands, the rate of cutting and growth and various problems that affect forests and woodlands. The findings of this survey will enable my people to learn exactly where we stand in the matter of timber resources.

From what I have already learned, I am convinced that it is time we were doing a better job of conserving and rebuilding our forest resource. It is inconceivable that the newspapers of our country are largely dependent upon imports for essential newsprint.

I am sure that no one in my State in 1936 thought that the sawtimber resource would decline 10 percent by 1947. No one would have thought that the pine sawtimber in the southeastern part of South Carolina, one-third of the whole State, would decline 29 percent in the same 11 years. No one knows how much it has declined in the past 5 years of exceptionally heavy cutting for home building, for factories, for paper and other uses of wood. Pine trees grow like "hair on a dog's back" in many abandoned fields in our Piedmont country, yet the volume of trees 5 inches in diameter and larger declined by 5 percent from 1936 to 1947.

The number of wood-using plants in South Carolina doubled between 1936 and 1947. The use of wood for pulp is rising with each expansion of existing mills and with the erection of new mills in and adjacent to South Carolina. The demand for paper in many forms—newsprint, packaging, building paper, bookstock—continues greater than the supply. I am delighted with this show of economic prosperity, but I want to be sure that these great mills and the thousands upon thousands of people dependent on the forest resource, are safeguarded.

I am at a loss to understand why we let our timber volumes decline. We have nearly 12,000,000 acres in woods on which we are growing about one-fourth of the trees the land could support. One and two-tenths million acres, formerly in crops or pasture, were released for timber growth during the period 1936 to 1947. The area of land available for commercial forests in my district, the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina, increased by 25 percent from 1936 to 1947. We have all the land we need to grow timber, and we can be sure that the timber crop will sell. We can process every tree we can raise. Neither lack of land nor lack of a market is the cause of our failure to grow the timber. Our pine trees mature in far less time than do the spruces of Canada. Yet, under modern conditions, they are just as acceptable for newsprint. There are, of course, several forces involved in the reduction of our forest resources. The more important are fire, overcutting, mismanagement of land and tree disease.

We have an efficient, alert forestry commission in South Carolina. My State was the first in the South to have organized, State-wide forest-fire control. With 11,930,000 acres of forest land under protection in 1950, the average loss in South Carolina was only 2 acres burned for every 100 acres protected. This compares favorably with the record on 133,000,000 acres under protection in 11 States in the South. Nevertheless, careless or willful persons set over 8,000 fires in South Carolina last year, and the total area burned exceeded 239,000

acres. We lost a lot of growing trees in those fires.

Timber is a crop. It should be grown and harvested as a crop. But, the timber crop differs from other crops in the element of time involved in its growth. We cannot plant the trees in the spring for the fall harvest. The timber we cut during the next 10, 20, or 30 years will be grown almost altogether on the trees we save today as we harvest the crops of trees started 10, 20, and more years ago. We must husband the stands of immature trees now growing in South Carolina, if we would have timber to tide our processing plants through, until we can grow new crops from the seed we or nature hope to plant tomorrow and tomorrow. By husbanding the timber crop, I do not mean withholding all trees from cutting. Many stands in my district are overcrowded. If more thinning were done in my district, it would relieve some of the pressure on the coastal plain area of South Carolina. If the stands on the hill farms of our Piedmont were thinned, the trees left would grow faster so that we would never miss the wood salvaged in the thinning.

The South Carolina Commission of Forestry has a competent group of foresters available to advise woodland owners on their timber-harvesting practices. They have been doing a sound, competent job for a number of years. The pulp mills, the larger sawmills and other large landowners use good cutting practices on their own land. However, 3 out of every 4 acres of forest land in South Carolina are in small ownerships. One hundred and eight thousand small owners have 7,500,000 acres. These small owners average 69 acres per holding. Many small owners are under financial pressures of one sort or another so that they feel impelled to sacrifice their resource in young growing trees for immediate cash. Perhaps they have not learned how to manage timber land for successive crops of good quality timber. In spite of a competent and thorough job by the commission's foresters and by progressive industry representatives, only about two in one hundred of the smaller owners follow conservative cutting practices. Each owner who clears cuts young, thrifty growing stock, depletes our State backlog of timber for the difficult years ahead.

We have one large forest tree nursery in South Carolina growing some 28,000,000 trees a year, for use in planting idle forest lands. Our State forestry organization grows quality trees at minimum cost and advises woodland owners in planting. But, we have over 1,500,000 acres of idle and nonstocking forest land, and we are adding to it faster than we are planting. My district has well over 150,000 acres of idle land, much of which might properly be put to work growing trees. We have enough idle land to grow the trees required for the pulp industry in the State if we could get it all planted. We can supply all our present industries, and more too, if the existing growing stands are maintained while we grow our pulp requirements from seed.

We have still another problem. There is a disease on the short-leaf pine trees

down in our State that kills trees of any size within a very few years after they are attacked. It is known as the little leaf disease and centers right in my district. It is believed that the fire and erosion that has been going on for many years has weakened the trees so that they readily die from this new disease. Foresters are studying the disease, and perhaps they will have a solution one of these days. We salvage as many of the dying trees as we can, and we avoid planting short-leaf pine. That is about all we know to do now. Meanwhile, we lose a lot of our trees to disease and insects.

It would perhaps be more pleasant just to turn our backs on the situation. Some people argue that we do not need large trees for saw timber, poles, cross ties, and so on. They say that we can grind up the smaller trees and make anything we want. Others suggest that as the timber is exhausted we can use metals or plastics as substitutes. Some argue that when times become less prosperous we shall use less timber, and our forests will restock. This happened between 1929 and 1933, and our South Carolina forests did build up so that we had timber to cut for World War II and to use in the building boom since the war. Some of our industry people argue that the sole justification for growing these trees is for the grower and industry to make a cash profit. They want no surplus that might reduce the price of products made from wood.

But, I cannot reconcile myself to these and other similar arguments. The way I see it, the price of wood products is too high, even now. Even under the simple process of felling a tree and sawing it into a board that I know how to cut and nail, the price keeps on rising. What that board will cost me when it has to go through a multi-million-dollar plant and high-paid distribution system, I fear to guess. Then, too, the only resources we have down in South Carolina come from the soil. The experience of some 300 years suggests that the only crop for about 12,000,000 acres of our small State is trees. It will not help the economy of our State to substitute metals or plastics when we do not have metals or abundant supplies of other materials from which plastics can be made in competition with the products of other sections.

I do not think it will be helpful to the economy of the Nation to lose any more of the productive capacity of South Carolina's forest soils. Much of our timber and the products made therefrom are transported in raw or partially fabricated form for refabricating or use in other parts of the United States. Nor can I look forward with proper anticipation to the possibility that a set-back in our economy will force our people to do without various products including houses, paper in many forms, and other articles made of wood, while the tree crop catches up. Finally, I do not think we want to risk the possibility of a long, drawn-out struggle with Russia with our own timber resources dwindling. Russia has more timber and grows more timber than we. We must have wood in unlimited quantities to insure against defeat resulting from inability to supply

our fighting men with gunpowder, lumber, gunstocks and other wood products.

The report of the United States Forest Service and the State commission of forestry shows that South Carolina is growing 5,600,000 cords of wood in all forms of products. The State needs to grow 6,200,000 cords to meet current demands by the several industries. The forest lands of South Carolina could grow 12,000,000 cords, or more than twice what we are growing. The potentialities in our timber-growing lands are tremendous. Our return of \$172,000,000 from forest products could be increased to perhaps \$340,000,000. Therein lies a vast opportunity for our people—opportunity for employment, for factories, for satellite services.

Do you have doubts that our Nation could use twice as much timber as we are now growing? Well, let us go back a few years. What would you have said of the possibilities for expansion in the paper industry back in 1930? United States wood-pulp production averaged 4,000,000 tons annually through the twenties. Wood-pulp production in the United States today is over 15,000,000 tons and is increasing rapidly. This is four times the production of 20 years ago. In spite of this amazing increase, we are not yet producing enough wood pulp.

And so, I wish to take this occasion to reiterate the statement that our timber resources are declining. The example I have given from my home State is, I am sure, no exception. In fact, I am confident that South Carolina is, if anything, better than the average, both in the matter of existing forest resources and in efforts to conserve and rebuild them.

I wish to pledge my continuing support for measures that will bring the support of our Federal Government more adequately behind the several programs for the conservation and rebuilding of our forest resources.

Time Magazine—Jewish Theological Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the board of overseers of the Jewish Theological Seminary, which is located in New York City in the community which I represent in the Congress, I am gratified to insert the appended excerpts from the story published in the October 15 issue of Time magazine on Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, president of the seminary, and on the work of the seminary. I hope that it will be of interest to every Member to get a deeper insight into the moral and ethical teachings of the Jewish faith.

The excerpts follow:

A TRUMPET FOR ALL ISRAEL

Wrapped in his long-fringed, white prayer shawl, and dressed in a white linen robe,

Rabbi Finkelstein stood on the dais; looking to the east, with his back to the congregation, he faced the Ark of the Covenant. On the lectern before him lay the great scrolls of the Torah, the book of the law of Moses. Rabbi Finkelstein's clenched right hand beat upon his breast in the traditional gesture of sorrow. Clear and strong, in the twang and guttural of the Hebrew chant, his voice rose:

"Eloheinu velohe abotenu! Our God and God of our fathers, let our prayer come before thee, hide not thyself from our supplication, for we are not arrogant and stiff-necked, that we should say before thee, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, we are righteous and have not sinned; but verily, we have sinned."

Thus in Manhattan and in almost every other corner of the world, one day this week, as they have for thousands of years, Jews prayed to the God of their fathers. It was the most dreadful and solemn day of the solemn and dreadful Jewish year—Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement. During the 10-day period of penitence beginning with Rosh Hashana, tradition teaches, each man's deeds are judged in heaven, to be punished or rewarded in the year ahead.

It is for this that Jews call the 10 days the Yamin Noraim—the Days of Fear. But when the trumpet call of the ram's-horn, shofar, has split the air for the last time on Yom Kippur, the mood traditionally changes to one of joy and hope. The New Year has indeed begun.

For Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, teacher of future rabbis at Manhattan's Jewish theological seminary and leader of perhaps the most influential school of Jewish theology in the United States today, the shofar will herald the most stirring joy and hope of a lifetime. For he believes—and on abundant evidence—that United States Jews are returning to their synagogues and temples as never before.

The old, half-deserted synagogues are filling up again, new congregations are forming, new synagogues are being built. Young married couples are sending their children to religious schools to learn the fundamentals of their faith—then forming study groups so that they will know what their children are talking about. The word that such young Americans use, over and over again, when they are asked what they are looking for, is "heritage."

"When I was a seminary student 40 years ago," says Finkelstein, "it seemed so clear to us that our faith could not survive here that we even wondered for what purpose in the divine economy the Jews had been brought to the New World." The ghetto and the pogrom had annealed Judaism in the hearts of countless generations of Jews, almost since the great dispersion. But in the freedom and prosperity of the "melting pot," that braided faith seemed to be fading out, says Finkelstein.

"Then came a tragedy which none of us had foreseen. The great first century Rabbi Eliezer once said: 'The Messiah will never come until the Jewish people repent.' When they asked him, 'What if the Jews do not repent?' he answered: 'The Lord will raise up a king worse than Haman to smite them, and then they will repent.' This is just what happened. Hitler was something we never thought possible."

"I remember how stricken we were when 47 Jews were killed in a pogrom in the Ukraine. We had days of mourning and fasting. But 6,000,000! That dreadful calamity—and the whole spiritual and material crisis of our time—are bringing American Jews back to the faith of their fathers."

THE LAW ENDURES

There is no one spokesman for United States Judaism, no central authority, no high priest. All good Jews, in varying degrees of literalness, believe in the law, but United States Judaism is a spectrum shad-

ing off by minute gradations from ultra-orthodoxy, to ultramodernism. In this spectrum, Finkelstein, a traditionalist with one keen, dark eye on the future, stands almost dead center.

Judaism's spectrum can be roughly divided into three parts, roughly equal in number of active followers and reflecting three traditions in United States Judaism:

Orthodox Judaism tries to maintain the letter of the law. To the outsider it sometimes looks like literalism and nothing else. It is a religion that demands strict, hour-by-hour adherence to sacred custom. Promptly at sundown each Friday night, the Sabbath begins, and Orthodox Jews are required to be indoors (to travel in a vehicle on the Sabbath is counted as a sin). Twenty minutes before sundown, the housewife lights the candles which will burn through the Sabbath's 24 hours; any other lights must be turned on before that time. Synagogue services are entirely in Hebrew, and men and women sit apart, with their heads covered. The Orthodox Jew is expected to study the Torah every day and to observe the dietary laws with such strictness that separate plates and utensils must be used for cooking milk and meat dishes. On Yom Kippur, Orthodox Jews keep an absolute fast for 24 hours, and should spend about 13 hours at the synagogue in five services. Their strictly regulated life sets them apart from the rest of mankind, and is intended to, with a persistence undiminished by centuries, they feel themselves to be the chosen people.

Reform Judaism in the United States is barely 75 years old. It was affected almost equally by nineteenth century idealism and nineteenth century skepticism. Its first leaders were German rabbis, some of whom carried the new doctrines to Britain, France, and the United States. Reform Jews pay scant attention to dietary laws, hold their services mainly in English, the principal one on Friday evening instead of Saturday (a few hold it on Sunday), and stress the ethical teachings of the prophets more than the ritual laws of Torah and Talmud. With the Reform Jews, the sense of being a chosen people is dim or extinct.

Conservative Judaism is newer still, and born in the United States. It represents a middle way between Orthodox and Reform Judaism. Its founders considered orthodoxy too adamantly withdrawn from United States life, reform too spiritually attenuated. They fashioned a synagogue service in which English is used but Hebrew predominates. Men and women sit together, as they do in reform congregations; the men cover their heads, as among the orthodox. Conservative Jews are taught that, as Jews, they have been chosen by God for a spiritual purpose, but that those of other faiths, including Christians and Moslems, have also been chosen. Conservative Judaism is the middle ground on which Rabbi Finkelstein has taken his stand.

SERVICE IS NOT EXCLUSIVE

The citadel of conservative Judaism is the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Rabbi Finkelstein has been its president for 11 years. With his flashing eyes, floating hair, and black beard heavily streaked with gray, he looks, at 56, like a reasonable modern facsimile of an Old Testament patriarch. Sometimes he talks like one, sometimes like the scholar he is, and sometimes like the successful fund raiser that he is, too.

After graduating from the seminary, Finkelstein took a small congregation in the Bronx, where he stayed for 12 years. When he was midway in this work, the seminary's next president, Cyrus Adler, persuaded him to join the faculty for a year or two. He

stayed for 15 years, and when Adler died, 44-year-old Louis Finkelstein succeeded him.

SHIFT OF CENTER

The seminary he was called to lead was neither the oldest nor the biggest in the United States. It was founded in 1887, with eight students and three teachers, then met in a small Spanish-Portuguese synagogue. When Louis Finkelstein took over in 1940, it had a set of handsome, six-story Georgian buildings on Manhattan's academy-studded Morningside Heights—and perhaps the most distinguished faculty of rabbinical teachers in the English language. By the standards of 1940, it was turning out a fair number of graduates, 8 or 10 young rabbis a year, an equal number of qualified teachers for Jewish schools.

As he read the news from Europe, Louis Finkelstein saw a double challenge. (1) Thanks to Hitler's campaign against Jewish learning, the seminaries of central and eastern Europe—for example, Berlin, Breslau, Vienna—were being wiped out of existence, and (2) the massacre of 6,000,000 European Jews was leaving United States Jewry, by simple default, the central Jewish community in the world. Jewish Theological Seminary has grown to meet those challenges as swiftly as possible. It now has 1,000 students enrolled in its 4-year courses.

ZION TROUBLE

In exchanging the life of a teacher for that of an administrator, Finkelstein was true to one of the deepest currents of his faith. For Judaism is a this-worldly rather than an other-worldly religion, its basis is action rather than dogma. Obedience to the law is far more important than belief. For the law is truth set forth in terms of action.

ISAIAH'S MEANING?

This week the directors of the seminary announced that Dr. Finkelstein will assume a new post as chancellor. And that his presidential duties will be taken over by a three-man team of two vice chancellors and the seminary provost. Louis Finkelstein hopes the arrangement will give him more time for scholarship, for writing, and for travel. But most of all he hopes it means more time to work for a renaissance of spiritual Judaism in United States life.

The auguries of such a renaissance are on all sides, he is sure. "It is not just a transient phenomenon. I predict that within 25 years the vast majority of the 5,000,000 Jews in this country will have returned to their faith and will be keeping the Sabbath."

"I say 25 years, because the change will come mainly through the young people. Many of the fathers I know can't understand what has happened to their children. A friend of mine who is a very successful industrialist is still amazed by the fact that his son is turning into a brilliant theologian; just a short time ago I talked to the 16-year-old boy whose father runs a chain of retail stores. 'Father wants me to go into his business,' he said. 'I am the only child. But why should I waste my life in business? I want to go to the seminary and become a rabbi.'"

"[Philosopher] Alfred North Whitehead once said to me: 'What America needs is not a philosopher but a prophet.' What I see and what I hope for the Jewish community in America is that it will give birth to a school of prophets and rise toward its own spiritual potential as a holy people. And this will have a profound effect on America and on the whole world. Even a tiny minority, when they are spiritually dedicated, can have a deep influence on the world around them—like the Essenes among the ancient Hebrews, or the Pharisees, or the early Christians, or the Quakers."

"To me, the prophetic message is summarized in the idea of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah. The Christians take this to be the foreshadowing of Jesus Christ, but Jewish tradition sees it as the role of the Jews in the world. And the important part of the concept is the word 'servant.' Suffering, too, if necessary—and it often seems to be necessary. But suffering by itself is not enough."

IMPIOUS QUESTION

There must be action and example. One way in which United States Jews can serve their country and the world, says Finkelstein, is "by bringing people together and helping them understand each other."

Finkelstein himself has done plenty to bring people together. In 1938, he helped found the Institute for Religious and Social Studies, a "graduate school" of clergymen and lay religious leaders, Christian and Jewish which holds 13 sessions a year in Manhattan and 6 in Chicago. This year, for the twelfth time, he was elected president of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion, which meets each year at Columbia University. "When I am at work on those enterprises," he says, "I feel that I am obeying the Commandments just as much as when I go to the synagogue for prayer."

As they grow more spiritually minded, he thinks, United States Jews will more and more observe the law's injunction to make "peace between man and his fellow," a part of their religious duties. "When sometimes I am talking about this and someone asks me why we Jews should bear the burden when other groups don't seem interested in doing anything, I consider it an impious question. Jews must see themselves as God intends them to be—His servants and the servants of mankind."

CHALLENGE AND PARADOX

For many Jews, this will be a hard teaching. God has chosen them for a special purpose, but seemingly the price of God's election has been a bitter portion. Exile, humiliation, and persecution have dogged them through history, from Babylon to Buchenwald. Persecution has driven the Jews in upon themselves, they have sometimes set up barriers against the world simply in order to survive. But of what use is their survival, asks Louis Finkelstein, if their mission is forgotten?

The essence of that mission is a challenging paradox. To be a people set apart—and yet not apart. Louis Finkelstein calls on the withdrawn Jew to serve his old persecutors, his brothers, to join the human race, and calls on the assimilated Jew to take up his heritage.

In modern times, millions of men and women of Jewish origin have renounced Judaism as their spiritual country. Such men and women think (or say they think) that the word "Jew" should be on a par with "Baptist," "Congregationalist" or "Catholic"—and should apply only to the Jews who have elected to be, or to remain, Jews. Rabbi Finkelstein's Torah teaches him that the covenant God made with Israel is an inescapable covenant. "The choosing by God," says he, "was like selective service." It is binding on all Jews, to the last generation on earth.

Yom Kippur in this year 5712 was drawing to a close. In the synagogues of the world the chant went up: Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One.

Three times Rabbi Finkelstein and the congregation repeated: Blessed be His name, whose glorious Kingdom is for ever and ever. Seven times the shout arose: The Lord, he is God.

And the shofar of joy and hope sang in the ears of Israel its hoarse, triumphant cry.

The Attack on the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JENNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following broadcast by John T. Flynn, of America's Future. Mr. Flynn describes the way in which the collectivists have been working for decades to plant their propaganda in the schools, the textbooks, and the teachers' colleges in order to transform us into a Socialist dictatorship before we wake up to the danger.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

(By John T. Flynn)

THE ATTACK ON THE SCHOOLS

I want to talk to you today about something which I am sure is very close to your minds and your hearts as Americans. You have heard, I am sure, of what might be called the war in the schools. I refer to the war between those who want to use the schools to indoctrinate the children with Socialist ideas and those who are opposed to that. I have tried to tell this story in an article which I wrote for the Reader's Digest and which appears in the current issue of the Digest. It is called Who Owns Your Child's Mind? One thing we are all sure of and that is that the State does not own the child's mind—neither your mind nor your child's mind nor anybody's mind. That is the Russian system.

The function of education in our public schools is to train the child to use his mind, to give him information, to train him to think and to inculcate in him those principles of moral conduct which are the accepted code of our society.

Do you think a teacher has a right to use the classroom to change the religion of the child, to make them all into Catholics or Protestants or Christian Scientists? Such a teacher would be promptly dismissed. Do you think she has a right to use the classroom to make them into Communists or Fascists or Socialists or to teach them that our system of government and our Constitution are wrong and must be changed to be more like those in Socialist England? Now if a teacher does not have a right to do this, do you think a dozen teachers in a school have a right to gang up quietly and do it, to sneak socialism over on the pupils. Of course not.

Now I make this charge and I do it deliberately, knowing full well all the facts relating to it. I charge that a group of teachers, very important in the teaching profession, many of them high up in the councils of the national teacher organizations, have been carrying on a conspiracy for a number of years to use our public schools for the purpose of indoctrinating the students in the principles of socialism. I do not mean they have succeeded in all or even in most of our schools. I do say they have succeeded in many, and maybe, in your own town.

Now let me tell you what they did. One of the leaders in this whole left-wing educational group is a gentleman named Dr. George S. Counts, a professor of education at Teachers College in Columbia University. He is a distinguished educator and is entitled to his opinions. Away back in 1932 he wrote a book called Dare the Schools

Build a New Social Order? In that he said that we are in an era which has shifted away from considerations affecting human liberty and to considerations which have to do with the production and distribution and consumption of wealth. He then declared that our capitalist system no longer works, that there is no longer a choice between individualism and collectivism—that is socialism.

The choice is between two forms of collectivism: one democratic and the other feudal. Then he says plainly that the society of the future—and I quote him—"is to be a planned, coordinated, and socialized economy." Now that's plain enough, isn't it? How are we going to do this, he asks. We must do it through the schools. Dr. Counts says that the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest. He says they must shape the social ideals and behavior of the coming generation and they must shape it in the direction of collectivism or socialism.

Now you will say, after all, this is just one man's opinion. But he did not stop there. He and some other educators got a grant of \$300,000 from the Carnegie Foundation to make a study of the schools. They brought this study out in 17 volumes. And in the final volume the conclusions of the study was stated in plain language that no man can misunderstand. I read it exactly as it appears there. "The age of individualism is closing and the new age of collectivism is emerging." And then the report says that the teachers must go to work on the minds of the pupils to prepare them for the new collectivist society. And this report was brought out under the auspices of the American Historical Association and paid by the Carnegie Foundation.

Harold Laski, one of the leaders of the British Socialist Labor Party in England, read this study and said, "This report is an educational plan for a Socialist America. It is a direct criticism of the ideas that have shaped American capitalism."

Now I have given you their own words, and these people are not unimportant people. But they did not rest here. And I'll tell you what they did. How do you reach the mind of a child in the public schools? You reach them through the textbooks and through the teachers. Therefore, the first thing they set out to do was to get the textbooks slanted in the direction of collectivism. They do not call it communism or socialism. They are too slick for that. They sneak it into the child's mind with prettier words.

Now the next thing they set out to do was to get into the schools of education where teachers are made. They have gotten into some of the greater schools of education and to whatever extent they have been able to influence these schools they have been turning out Socialist teachers by the thousands.

Now if a citizen finds this sort of thing in his school and criticizes it, he is denounced by these birds as an enemy of the schools. The real enemies of education are this gang that is trying to sneak socialism into our public schools. They are the enemies of the schools.

Now let me call your attention to another magazine article printed in McCall's magazine and written by a gentleman who was at one time a commentator on the air for the extreme left-wing organ, the Nation. The article is Who Is Trying to Ruin Our Schools? Its principal purpose is to destroy the reputation of a brave and patriotic American woman who has been trying to combat this European collectivism in our American schools—Mrs. Lucille Cardin Crain. This article uses the well-known smear technique. Its purpose is to discredit Mrs. Crain.

The article picks out two other people—Allan Zoll, branded as a former Hitlerite, and the other Gen. Amos A. Fries, who mixes

up in his propaganda an anti-Catholic motif. Zoll on one side is discredited as pro-Hitler and Fries on the other side is discredited as anti-Catholic, and then Mrs. Crain is put in between these two in a kind of squeeze play to smear her with the odium which the writer attaches to Zoll and Fries. But Mrs. Crain is the real target and the whole article is written in such a way so far as she is concerned to make her seem like a crackpot. I know Mrs. Crain. She is an able, judicious, brave American woman, and this article on her is one of the shabbiest things I have ever seen in a magazine, with the assumed reputation of McCall's. This is a strange cause for McCall's to support.

Now let me tell you what Mrs. Crain does. She brought into existence an organization called the Educational Reviewer. Its only purpose is to study and review school textbooks to determine whether or not they are slanted in the direction of socialism. Books are referred to professional educators to study and the reviews are available to anybody who wishes to have them.

Now let me tell you how this organization came into being. A businessman sent his daughter through a leading women's college. Being a top student she won a scholarship to a famous British school—the London School of Economics. Not knowing anything about it, the parents sent her there. She returned in 2 years a confirmed Socialist. Of course she did. That is the official educational institution of the British Fabian Socialist Society. Its purpose is to make Socialists for the British Labor Party.

The parents wondered why an American college stercored their daughter into a British Socialist school. Her father wondered if there was anything like that in his community. He had the local high-school textbooks studied and was amazed at what he found. To help other parents he and some other gentlemen joined with Mrs. Crain in forming the Educational Reviewer. This highly intelligent and orderly institution has hit these sneak Socialists a very hard blow. They have set out to discredit and liquidate her. And McCall's magazine lends itself to the attack.

There's plenty more to this story. I intend to tell you more about it. I will introduce you to some of these textbooks and to some of the curious people who have been writing them. And I will tell you how to go about getting the facts straight about the schools in your town. Remember, they do not teach communism. They do not teach socialism as such. The scheme is first to break down the child's faith in our form of government and then to sell him a half dozen ideas which, when all put together, mean socialism. You will see this more plainly when I introduce you to some of the textbooks.

Phony Price Controls Fail on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, during the last reported period from August 15 to September 15, retail prices rose more sharply than at any other time since the freeze on prices and wages began. The cost of living index went from 185.5 to 186.6, which automatically meant a wage boost for some 100,000 workers.

Under present formulas of the Wage Stabilization Board, these increases be-

come part of a regular pattern. The net result is that prices push wages upward and wages then push prices still higher. The statisticians figure that the gross average hourly earnings of our factory workers have risen 3.8 percent while the cost-of-living index has gone up 2.8 percent since the phony freeze.

Somewhere along the line, someone with courage is going to have to cry "Halt." Otherwise, we shall find ourselves in the very difficult position of stabilizing instability. Nothing will be accomplished until the White House with its executive authority chooses to do something about inflation beyond its regular pious statements that it is making great progress. If Mr. DiSalle has learned nothing else during his Washington sojourn, he has learned how to say nothing and make it sound like something every time.

Letter From W. H. Evans, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from W. H. Evans, Jr., who was relieved of duty in the Navy because he warned that the State Department intended to let South Sakhalins and the Kuriles fall permanently under Russian control.

Mr. Evans was angry, but as he says, "It is no fun getting shot at and exposed to mines without being able to destroy the source of the attack."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U S S "ROGERS" (DDR-876),
CARE OF FLEET POST OFFICE,
San Francisco, Calif., March 16, 1951.

Mr. ALFRED KOHLBERG,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KOHLBERG: Keep up the good work. I just received your questions to Red Dean Acheson. I post your open letters for all the officers on the ship to read and they feel the same way as I do.

Now that the time for a Japanese Peace Treaty is nearing, for the love of God, let's keep our pro-Communist and pro-Soviet State Department from again putting the interests of Soviet Russia or the pro-Soviet United Nations above the welfare of the United States.

I greatly fear that the Red Dean Acheson clique will allow Soviet Russia to retain southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands because the insane or Communist Roosevelt (Alger Hiss) gave them to Russia. To hell with the Yalta betrayal. The Japanese Peace Treaty should be signed on American terms, as we did defeat Japan by ourselves.

Here is the essence of a sensible and pro-American-Japanese Peace Treaty:

1. Japan still owns Kurile Islands.
2. Southern Sakhalin to be returned to Japan. (Eventually all of Sakhalin when the opportunity presents itself.)
3. No reparations from Japan to anyone (because the United States will have to loot the bill as usual).

4. A fully rearmed and industrialized Japan in alliance with the United States to regain the balance of power in the Far East.

5. 1 Japanese, Nationalist Chinese, American alliance against communism in Asia.

We are out here waiting for "Acheson's agrarian reformers" to attempt an invasion of Formosa. Now, instead of allowing the Nationalist Chinese and the Seventh Fleet to attack the mainland to break up any such plans before they start, we have to fight with both hands tied behind our back. One hand bound by Acheson and his pro-Red gang and the other hand by the pro-Soviet United Nations. When are the American people going to wake up; when it is too late, I guess.

That pro-Soviet one world administration of ours * * * would rather have Americans slaughtered than attack Red China everywhere. In the history of warfare, was any Nation so restricted even though it could destroy its enemy readily if its hands were freed?

Damn the United Nations. Long live the United States.

The Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson-United Nations followers in the United States should be loaded onto ships and used as shock troops in Korea, instead of America's best citizens, Americans are dying by the thousands, thanks to the pro-Red administration.

If you desire, you may reproduce any portions of this letter and send an open letter to Congress in another appeal. I wish that you would because it is no fun getting shot at and exposed to mines without being able to destroy the source of attack.

God bless Alfred Kohlberg. There are too few like him though.

Most respectfully,

W. H. EVANS, JR.

A Statement on Behalf of John Hvasta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it gave me much satisfaction last August when this House—and later the Senate—passed a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 140, expressing its profound indignation at the arrest and unjust conviction of William N. Oatis, the Associated Press correspondent in Prague. I was very proud when the President and the Secretary of State expressed to the Czechoslovak Government in such forceful terms the protests of the American people at the shameful way it is treating this American newspaperman. And I certainly hope that the Executive will continue its resolute efforts to effect his release.

My one regret is that the Congress before its adjournment, was not able to take action in regard to John Hvasta, an American citizen whose case is very similar to that of William Oatis and in whose behalf I had the honor of introducing a resolution during the recent session. John Hvasta, a Czechoslovakian by birth but a naturalized American citizen and a resident of New Jersey, served in the American Navy in 1945 and 1946 and went to Czechoslovakia to study under the GI bill of rights in 1948. There, in 1949, after a secret trial, he

was sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment on sham charges of espionage. In 1950 his sentence, after another trial in secrecy, was increased to 10 years. For a long period no American official was permitted to visit Hvasta in the Red prison, although recently such visits were permitted.

The Communist treatment of John Hvasta is every bit as outrageous as that accorded to William Oatis. But the adjournment of Congress without any action on his behalf gives some substance to the statement that he is a forgotten man. Yet, Mr. Speaker, where American citizens are concerned there should be no "forgotten men." It is a basic principle of American democracy that there are no second-class citizens. When an American citizen entitled to that protection which the American flag gives, is persecuted, imprisoned, or otherwise unjustly victimized by a foreign tyranny, then it makes no difference what his status in life may be, or how many or how few may be the champions ready to spring to his defense. A relatively unknown and "forgotten" GI student is just as American as anyone else. I sincerely hope that the Eighty-second Congress will slam the door against any possible charge that the United States makes distinctions among its citizens, and will schedule the case of John Hvasta as its first order of business when the second session opens in January.

The Dismissal of General MacArthur and the Military Situation in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement summarizing the major findings of eight Republican members of the Joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the United States Senate as reported in Senate Document 69, Eighty-second Congress, on the MacArthur hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR AND THE MILITARY SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST: A SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS OF EIGHT REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE JOINT ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, AS REPORTED IN SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, ON THE MACARTHUR HEARINGS.

Mr. President, for 7 weeks ending June 27, 1951, the Senate Armed Services Committee, acting jointly with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, conducted a searching inquiry into the military situation in the Far East and the circumstances surrounding the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

As a result of that investigation eight Republican members of the joint committee—STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin; H. ALEXANDER

SMITH, of New Jersey; BOUWER B. HICKEN-LOOPER, of Iowa; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California; HARRY P. CAIN, of Washington; OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine; and RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont—established certain facts and reached definite conclusions. Since the joint committee had agreed to issue no formal reports, our views were printed in the appendix of the hearings. By order of the Senate on September 5, 1951, the views of the eight Senators were also printed as Senate Document 69, Eighty-second Congress.

We determined to make our conclusions public because we believe that we have a clear responsibility to the Nation and we are convinced that the discussion of a cessation of hostilities should not distract attention from fundamental questions in the conduct of our national affairs abroad. It is significant that in reviewing the evidence brought out in the exhaustive hearings we found that many of the points that were covered in our report were matters on which there is remarkable unanimity of agreement from all sides. Certainly it is clear that the inquiry was definitely in the public interest. The hearings have exposed some glaring mistakes, evasions, contradictions, and significant admissions which will enable the American people more properly to evaluate our future course of action.

Despite the fact that our report was over 100 pages long and documented in detail, the public has demonstrated considerable interest in reading and studying it. In order to make at least our major findings more widely available to people in all walks of life, I have prepared the following summary of highlights arranged under the headings of the major issues arising out of the investigation:

I. THE PRESIDENT'S REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

1. While the President's authority for the removal of a military officer is readily conceded, his method of removal was ill-advised and the reasons assigned for the removal were utterly inadequate to justify the act.

2. General MacArthur had never violated any military directives.

3. There was no serious disagreement between General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to military strategy in Korea.

4. The military in no way initiated or recommended the recall of General MacArthur.

5. The sincerity of MacArthur's motives in recommending military policy to end the Korean conflict in victory remains unquestioned. Throughout the hearings, many tributes were paid to his integrity, ability, and accomplishments. His contribution toward preventing the spread of communism in Japan is universally acknowledged.

II. DIPLOMATIC BUNGLING AND UNPREPAREDNESS THAT LED TO WAR

1. The administration's Far East policy has been a catastrophic failure, and sole responsibility for this failure rests with the State Department. Far-eastern policy was never a part of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

2. The foreign policy of the United States since the middle 1940's has been based on expediency rather than the principles of liberty and justice. Our military victory of 1945 in the Pacific has been squandered by our diplomats.

3. Yalta—a great tragedy of American diplomacy—was the turning point of American Far East foreign policy. The myths that Russian participation in the Japanese War was a military necessity, and that the Yalta concessions were necessary to achieve that participation, have been adequately refuted.

4. The advice and information of our ablest and most experienced officials has been ignored. Ambassador Hurley was not informed of the Yalta agreements; Admiral Leahy's advice on the lack of necessity for Russian entry into the Pacific war was not followed; General MacArthur was not consulted on the Far East situation when Marshall went to China, as Special Ambassador in 1945, nor was he consulted in 1950 before the President's decision to fight in Korea; General Wedemeyer's recommendations on China and Korea were ignored and suppressed; Admiral Badger's advice on the need for military assistance to the Republic of China was not accepted.

5. It has not been the consistent policy of the United States to support the Republic of China; some United States officials were so opposed to Chiang Kai-shek that they were automatically on the side of the Red regime. Despite administration claims that it is the "firm and continuing" policy of the United States to support the Nationalist Government, the record is replete with evidence of a lack of both moral and material support.

6. The administration has been unduly preoccupied with the defense of America in Europe to the neglect of the defense of America in Asia. If the Republic of China had received effective military aid from the United States as late as 1948, the Chinese Communists might have been defeated. The myth that the Republic of China fell because the Chinese troops refused to fight is again refuted by sworn testimony.

7. Throughout the hearings, it was not possible to determine who wrote the 1945 mission to China instructions for General Marshall. Under these orders he was to bring about the "unification of China" by encouraging acceptance of Communist officials into the anti-Communist Chiang Kai-shek government on a coalition basis, at a time when Russian domination of Chinese Communists was already known to United States officialdom.

8. The administration believed that Chinese Communists would work in harmony with the Nationalists in a coalition government despite our previous experience that the Communist objective is invariably to take over, "lock, stock, and barrel," any government of which Communists become a part.

9. The propaganda campaign against the Chinese Nationalist Government and the attacks on the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek were vicious. Mismanagement and corruption are not confined to the Orient; it ill behooves the Government of the United States to cast the first stone.

10. The State Department directive of December 23, 1949—announcing to our Foreign Service officers that Formosa was not of strategic importance to the United States and that control of Formosa by the Communists would not imperil our Far East position—was a policy statement calculated to prepare the way for the abandonment of Formosa to the Chinese Reds.

11. The military potential of the United States has not been maintained at a level commensurate with our potential commitments or financial expenditures since V-J day. From 1945 to the outbreak of the Korean war, \$95,000,000,000 was spent on national defense; yet General Vandenberg testified that we still have only a "shoe-string" Air Force, and Generals Marshall, Bradley, and Collins acknowledged the inadequacy of our present defenses.

12. The failure of the United States Government to train adequately and to supply equipment to the South Koreans made them tempting targets of aggression. Since the State Department and the United Nations has the sole responsibility in Korea, they must answer also for the failure of the intel-

ligence missions to anticipate the June 25, 1950, attack.

13. The publication of the 1947 Wedemeyer report on Korea might have alerted the Government and the people of the United States; but General Marshall, then Secretary of State, suppressed the report.

14. The problem of Communist infiltration in our Government is still unsolved. It is difficult to secure information from an administration which is determined to keep the facts from the Congress and the people.

III. PRESIDENTIAL ACTION AND UNITED STATES-UNITED NATIONS CONDUCT OF THE WAR

1. The involvement of the United States Armed Forces in the Korean conflict is without precedent in American history. Congress has not declared war nor has the President proclaimed a state of war. The Korean conflict, with its 200,000 American casualties, is improperly labeled a "police action." The United States should never again become involved in war without the consent of Congress.

2. Political considerations have prevented full exploitation of American air and naval superiority in the Korean war. The Secretary of State has assumed military functions. Despite these facts, our Armed Forces in Korea have acquitted themselves with a gallantry unsurpassed in our history.

3. The command function delegated to the United States by the United Nations has not worked out in practice and has been subjected to veto by a minority of participating nations. There has been a lack of adequate military support from United Nations allies; at the same time, we are unable to comprehend why the administration has persisted in its attitude of refusing the offer of 33,000 fighting men advanced by Chiang Kai-shek. Some of our allies, moreover, have displayed an unfortunate attitude with respect to economic sanctions against Red China.

4. The thirty-eighth parallel in Korea has no military significance, and its political significance has never been satisfactorily explained by anyone in the administration.

IV. PROSPECTS OF ACHIEVING A DECISIVE VICTORY AND PEACE

1. The administration has no positive plan for achieving a decisive victory. The successful completion of the Korean conflict is essential since the United States cannot afford the costly destruction of its manpower. The immoral policy of a military strategy which involves merely the killing of more Chinese Communists is unlikely to produce victory or to enhance the stature of the United States in the family of nations.

2. The risk of precipitating world war III through adoption of a positive program for victory in Korea is no greater now than before. It is utterly inconsistent for the administration to take the calculated risk of provoking Russia in Europe through the Atlantic Pact while cowering at taking a similar risk in Asia.

3. The limited war now being fought in Korea by the United States is impossible to define. Cessation of hostilities, based upon restoration of the status quo at the thirty-eighth parallel, will be a victory for aggression. Any peace short of the liberation and unification of Korea is a delusion. Any settlement at the thirty-eighth parallel is a Chinese Communist victory. The termination of hostilities in Korea will not eliminate responsibility in that area.

4. The United States will not allow Formosa to fall into hostile hands. It will continue to support the Government of the Republic of China. In the MacArthur hearings, no administration official advocated the unseating of the Nationalist Government or the seating of the Communist government of China in the United Nations. Time will tell whether the administration will hold to this admirable determination.

Sad Sack**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART**

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a copy of a telegram which I received from Mr. George Baker.

Mr. Baker is the creator and owner of the comic book character Sad Sack. This character was used several weeks ago in a book circulated by the Department of Defense to stimulate reenlistments in the Armed Forces.

At that time, one of my constituents objected to certain material in the book on the ground that it placed private employers in the worst possible light. I agreed with him. Subsequently, the Department of Defense destroyed the books, 500,000 copies of which had been purchased at a cost of \$17,544.06.

Mr. Baker sent me a telegram explaining his position with reference to the matter, and, in fairness to him, I wish to place a copy of that telegram and my reply in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under Washington dateline of September 10 the Associated Press carried a statement by you with reference to a comic book using the character Sad Sack and severely criticizing the content thereof. Relying on the American sense of fair play I am sending this wire to you so that the grave injustice done me as the originator and owner of the character Sad Sack will to some extent at least be minimized. For this purpose I give you the following facts which I shall verify if you desire verification in any form requested. As the owner of the character I was requested as a patriotic gesture to permit the use of Sad Sack in a comic book designed for use by the United States Army in procuring reenlistments. I gave my consent that the character might be used without 1 cent of profit or royalty or payment of any kind to me. The publisher of the proposed comic book, Harvey Publications, Inc., through Alfred Harvey informed me that it was printing the comic books as a public service. I had nothing whatever to do with the preparation of the content or material or story line in the comic book. When I saw the material prior to delivery to the Army I was informed by Mr. Harvey that every bit of material in the comic book had been cleared with the United States Army. Whatever question I may have had with reference to the content was resolved by the fact that the book was designed for a specific purpose by the Army and that the proper officials of the Army had worked with Mr. Harvey's staff in preparing the material so that I made no criticism of the content. I have subsequently been informed that the story line itself as set forth in the comic book was the joint product of Mr. Harvey's employees and designated officials of the United States Army who had charge of this project. I am endeavoring to verify this information and will give you the benefit of whatever material I am able to obtain as soon as I obtain it. If there is any other information which I can obtain that you may find helpful in your investigation please feel free to call upon me.

At this time however I would appreciate it if you would do whatever you can to remedy the damage caused me by your original statements.

GEORGE BAKER.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.

Your telegram of September 12 with reference to one of my favorite comic-book characters, Sad Sack, is deeply appreciated. At no point, of course, did I intend criticism of the character itself. It did and still does appear to me that Sad Sack was used in this instance for a propaganda purpose which I am sure you, as his creator and owner, never intended that he should be. Your patriotic gesture in permitting the use of Sad Sack for so worthy a purpose as procuring reenlistments is wholly commendable. What I believe we both object to is the use of the powerful Sad Sack influence in such a way as to belittle responsible American employers.

It is my purpose, as soon as the busy schedule of the Senate will permit, to bring the matter to the attention of my colleagues in a brief speech on the Senate floor.

It is my purpose, also, to be perfectly fair with both you and Sad Sack. Therefore, I will include the text of your telegram in my remarks to the Senate.

Thank you for calling to my attention the possibility that I may have been unfair to you. Any unfairness, I assure you, was wholly inadvertent and will be corrected by making your telegram a part of the record.

HOMER E. CAPEHART.

**Confusion in the State Department—
Double Dealing in China****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State Department is now finding some long-forgotten secret documents regarding its policy in China.

In an attempt to defend the nomination of Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, the Department has produced a hitherto secret memo dated July 18, 1949. In this long-suppressed interdepartmental note, Secretary Acheson instructed Jessup "that it is a fundamental decision of American policy that the United States does not intend to permit further extension of Communist domination on the continent of Asia, or in the southeast Asia area."

Why was such a clear declaration of policy a high secret of state from July 18, 1949, until October 4, 1951? Between those dates, the Nationalist Government had been driven from China, isolated on Formosa, denied effective military aid by the United States; the Communists had taken almost complete control of the China mainland and Tibet, driven deep into Indonesia and launched organized armed aggression against South Korea.

Obviously the Acheson memo of July 18, 1949, is sorely needed at this late date to absolve Jessup of charges that he, as an alleged Communist sympathizer, helped guide American policy in favor of the Communist triumph in Asia.

But the new Acheson memo trips up Secretary Acheson's testimony of June 1, 1951, before the MacArthur inquiry in the Senate. On that occasion Acheson testified:

I, in August 1949, as Secretary of State, reported that I could no longer guarantee that economic and diplomatic means would be successful in keeping Formosa out of the hands of a power which might be hostile to us.

So the full picture is this: Acheson wrote on July 18, 1949, that containment of communism was the first point of American policy in Asia, but 1 month later, in August 1949, he was already convinced that Formosa would fall to the Communists—which has not happened yet.

Upon receipt of Acheson's letter in July 1949, Jessup set up the historic China round table of October 1949. Harold Stassen, a delegate to the round table, says it was guided by Owen Lattimore to conclusions favoring the Communist conquest of Asia.

In denying Stassen's charge, the State Department acknowledges that 13 of the 18 men in its round table "recommended that recognition be extended to Red China." Lattimore was in this group. But Stassen and four others resisted recognition.

How fervently then did Jessup follow the Acheson secret memo of July 18, 1949, within 3 months, by October, he had assembled a round table overwhelmingly inclined toward immediate recognition of Communist China—at a time when the cardinal point of our Asia policy, it now appears, was to check and restrain the extension of Communist power.

In December 1949 the Defense Department strongly urged a broadening of United States military assistance to Formosa. Acheson told of this recommendation when he appeared before the MacArthur inquiry—page 1674—adding:

It was disagreed with by the State Department.

So our policy in July was to hold the line against communism, Jessup in charge. And by October the State Department round table favored recognition of communism in China—13 to 5. By December the State Department vetoed the Defense Department's recommendation for more aid to the Nationalists marooned on Formosa.

This conflict between the Defense and State Departments was carried to President Truman. Truman sustained Acheson—page 1675.

In that same month of December 1949 the State Department sent a top-secret memo to all its diplomatic agents in Asia warning them to prepare for the "possible fall of Formosa to the Chinese Communist forces."

This document was not made known to the American people until June 1, 1951.

It had been dispatched to China on December 23, 1949.

When had the State Department decided Formosa would fall to the Communists? Acheson gave the answer—page 1672:

There were two studies made, in September and October (1949) * * * Those

studies unanimously reported that the fall would occur, and would occur probably in the year 1950.

Why was this secret decision on vital policy withheld from public view until June 1, 1951?

Indeed what was our policy in China—to stem communism, as outlined in the July 18 memo to Jessup, or to recognize Communist China and surrender Formosa as determined by Acheson in October-December 1949?

If we had in fact two policies in China it would appear better that both should have been published.

Had these two diametrically opposing policies been disclosed, the American people might at least have inquired which were we actually following?

Such an inquiry in 1949 would have averted much misadventure and tragedy.

In the light of events, the real policy of our State Department obviously was to deliver Asia to communism. No other conclusion is reasonable as the facts are revealed.

But Mr. Acheson always had in the top drawer of his desk his secret memo of July 18, 1949, instructing Jessup to contain communism—should such a declaration be needed in a pinch.

The pinch came when Lattimore and Jessup were caught in the act of delivering Asia to communism.

Throughout the delivery of Asia to communism, extending over a period of 2 years, Acheson was always protected at his rear—by his secret memo of July 18, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, the facts in China policy as they are being revealed today leaves but one conclusion, namely that our policies directly resulted in the defeat of the Nationalist Government for many years our friends. The American people are today paying a terrific price for this inexcusable conduct. When the land mass in China was turned over to the Red Chinese with the help of the State Department, Korea was doomed, yet President Truman made the decision to send American boys into a undeclared war, contrary I am sure to the advice of his military leaders. I repeat—the Chinese and Korean policies have been “inexcusable and cannot be defended.”

The New Railroad Retirement Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, a statement by me explaining the benefits of the new railroad retirement law.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. President, Congress has now passed, and the President has signed, the much-

needed legislation to increase the railroad retirement benefits, bringing them more into line with the increased cost of living. The new law takes effect on November 1.

Since I had the honor of being chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee which held hearings on and reported this bill to the Senate, I have been asked to explain its provisions in simple terms.

By the time these remarks become generally available, most retired railroad workers and their families will have received checks from 15 percent to a third more than they have been receiving. In a very few cases, where the Railroad Retirement System will have to be keyed in with social security, there may be some delay, but everyone should be receiving the higher benefits by the first of next year.

I should like to point out that our subcommittee's actions in this matter were aimed at getting the very maximum in benefits that could be obtained while assuring that the railroad retirement system would remain financially sound. We wanted to make certain that we were maintaining the soundness of the fund so that its future beneficiaries would be completely cared for and protected.

SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS IN NEW LAW

With this in mind, we were able to include in the law the following new improvements:

(a) A 15-percent increase in pensions and annuities.

(b) A 33½-percent increase in survivors' benefits.

(c) A new benefit for a husband or wife aged 65 or over, amounting to 50 percent of the employees' benefit, up to a maximum of \$40.

(d) A guaranty that the railroad retirement benefits will at least equal social-security benefits.

(e) Credit for service after age 65, up to a maximum of 30 years.

(f) Unlimited right to revoke a joint and survivor annuity election.

(g) Transfer to social-security system of workers who leave railroad work after less than 10 years' service.

Let me explain each of these improvements more fully.

FIFTEEN-PERCENT INCREASE IN PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

There are two features in the new railroad retirement law which increase the benefits paid to pensioners and annuitants and their families.

First, the basic benefits themselves are increased by 15 percent.

Second, a new feature has been added to the railroad retirement system whereby any pensioner or annuitant who has a wife (or husband) 65 years of age or over gets an extra benefit amounting to 50 percent of his basic pension or annuity, up to a maximum of \$40.

TABLE SHOWS NEW BENEFITS TO PENSIONERS

The following table shows how the new system will work for pensioners:

Comparison of benefits for railroad pensioners—old law and new law

Former law	New law	
	Single or with husband or wife under 65	With husband or wife 65 or over
\$40.00	\$46.00	\$69.00
50.00	57.50	86.25
60.00	69.00	103.50
70.00	80.50	120.75
80.00	92.00	138.00
90.00	103.50	155.25
100.00	115.00	172.50

SIMILAR INCREASES FOR ANNUITANTS

The table below shows how the new law will work for railroad annuitants, who have paid into the fund for various lengths of service:

Comparison of benefits for railroad annuitants—old and new law

Average monthly compensation	Former law	New law	
		Single or with hus band or wife under 65	With hus band or wife 65 or over
10 years' service			
\$100	\$36. 00	\$ 50. 00	\$ 75. 00
200	36. 00	1 65. 00	1 98. 00
300	48. 00	1 80. 00	1 120. 00
20 years' service			
\$100	\$60. 00	\$80. 00	\$104. 00
200	72. 00	83. 00	123. 00
300	96. 00	110. 00	150. 00
30 years' service			
\$100	\$63. 00	\$72. 00	\$109. 00
200	108. 00	124. 00	164. 00
300	144. 00	166. 00	206. 00

¹ By reason of guaranty contained in bill that no beneficiary under the Railroad Retirement Act will receive less than he would have received had he been covered by social security.

BENEFITS TO SURVIVORS INCREASED BY ONE-THIRD

The next major step forward in the new law is an increase by 33½ percent of benefits to survivors of railroad workers, such as widows, children, and aged parents. The following tables show examples of how the benefits will increase for widows, either with or without surviving children, whose benefits are figured on the basis of both 10 and 15 years of taxable service:

Comparison of old and new survivors' benefits—10 years taxable service

Average monthly compensation	Former law	New law
Widow only, 65 or over		
\$100	\$27.00	\$38.00
200	35.00	49.00
300	39.00	60.00
Widow and 1 child ¹		
\$100	\$45.00	\$75.00
200	58.00	97.00
300	65.00	120.00
Widow and 2 children ¹		
\$100	\$63.00	\$84.00
200	82.00	109.00
300	91.00	130.00
Widow and 3 children ¹		
\$100	\$72.00	\$96.00
200	94.00	126.00
300	105.00	150.00

¹ By reason of guaranty contained in bill that no beneficiary under the Railroad Retirement Act will receive less than he would have received had he been covered by social security.

² Regardless of widow's age if dependent children are under 18.

Comparison of old and new survivors' benefits—15 years taxable service

Average monthly compensation	Former law	New law
Widow only, 65 or over		
\$100	\$28.00	\$38.00
200	37.00	46.00
300	41.00	60.00
Widow and 1 child¹		
\$100	\$47.00	\$75.00
200	61.00	97.00
300	68.00	120.00
Widow and 2 children²		
\$100	\$65.00	\$87.00
200	86.00	130.00
300	96.00	150.00
Widow and 3 children²		
\$100	\$75.00	\$100.00
200	98.00	150.00
300	109.00	150.00

¹ By reason of guaranty contained in bill that no beneficiary under the Railroad Retirement Act will receive less than he would have received had he been covered by social security.

² Regardless of widow's age if dependent children are under 18.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS GUARANTEED TO EQUAL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Another major feature of this new railroad-retirement law guarantees to every railroad worker that he will receive at least the same benefits to which he would be entitled had he been covered by social security. The new law also contains a guaranty that casual employees (those with less than 10 years of railroad service) will in no case receive less than the amount of their contributions to the railroad retirement fund, plus an allowance for interest. This corrects an inequity that has long stood in the railroad retirement laws.

SERVICE OVER AGE 65 NOW GIVEN CREDIT

Still another distinct improvement in this new railroad retirement law is the provision which gives full credit for continued service after age 65, up to a maximum of 30 years' service, in computing average monthly compensation. This is only fair, since anyone who goes on working under the system after 65 continues to pay his retirement contributions. There is no reason why he should not receive the credit.

Probably most railroad workers know that average monthly compensation—which is the basis for computing the benefits received upon retirement—is based upon the average monthly wage received during the period 1924-31 (in the event of railroad service prior to 1937), when wages were generally very low, and upon the average monthly wage received since 1937. Up to now, a railroad worker has been prevented from including the railroad wages he earns after the age of 65, even though these are usually the highest wages of his career and would be a big help in boosting his average monthly compensation. The new law permits such a worker to include the wages he receives after 65, up to a maximum of 30 years' service, so that the high wages he receives at the end of his career can pull up his average monthly compensation.

JOINT AND SURVIVOR ANNUITY ELECTIONS CAN NOW BE REVOKED ANY TIME

Before survivor benefits were incorporated into the Railroad Retirement System in 1946, anyone who wanted to provide for his

wife or family after his death could elect to reduce his own annuity payments during his lifetime, so that the remainder would be paid to his family after his death. However, he was not allowed to change his mind about the reduced annuity payments, even if his wife died before he did. When the survivor benefits were added to the system in 1946, there was a year during which those workers who had made the reduced-annuity choice could change their mind. The 1951 law withdraws the limitation entirely, so that the joint and survivor annuity election may be revoked at any time. This gives a wider range of choice to the annuitant to adapt the payment plan to the changing circumstances of his family.

NONCAREER EMPLOYEES WITH LESS THAN 10 YEARS' SERVICE TRANSFERRED TO SOCIAL SECURITY

One of the features of the new law designed to save money for the railroad-retirement system, and help finance the increased benefits, provides for the transfer to the social-security system of employees who leave railroad work after less than 10 years' service. There would be transferred to the social-security system an amount equal to the social-security contributions of such an employee. But since these are much smaller than his railroad retirement contributions, there will be a surplus of contributions left in the railroad-retirement fund, which will help to pay for the increased benefits provided by this law.

It should be noted, however, that these employees will get higher benefits by being paid according to social-security provisions than if they were to stay under the railroad-retirement system.

This is likewise a new advantage to the worker transferring out of the railroad industry, who, prior to this new law, could not carry with him into his new position any credit for the contributions he had paid into the railroad-retirement system.

CONTRIBUTION RATE HAS NOT BEEN INCREASED

We have been able to achieve these increased benefits without any substantial change in the present financing of the retirement system. We have relied principally upon certain savings features, such as the transfer of noncareer employees to the social-security system, to pay for these increased benefits. There is no increase in the present contribution rates. There is no change in the right of retired employees to work if they so desire. There is no change in the taxable or creditable compensation base.

THOROUGH STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEM PLANNED

While our Senate subcommittee felt that certain additional savings features should have been adopted, in order to assure the long-run soundness of the railroad retirement system, an additional safeguard has been provided. Our subcommittee recommended, and the Congress enacted a resolution setting up a Joint Congressional Committee on Railroad Retirement, made up of members of the House and Senate, with a competent staff, to make a thorough study of the system. This should enable us not only to determine what changes, if any, may be necessary to insure the long-run safety of the fund, but also to determine whether further benefits will be possible.

RETIREMENT BOARD TO PREPARE BRIEF PAMPHLET ON THE NEW LAW

I understand that the Railroad Retirement Board will shortly prepare a pamphlet explaining all the provisions of the new law in some detail. This should be available around November 9, in every field office of the Railroad Retirement Board.

In Illinois, these offices are located in Chicago at 844 Rush Street and at 208 South Canal Street; in Decatur, at the Standard

Office Building, 132 South Water Street, and in East St. Louis in the Goldman Building, 338 Missouri Avenue.

NEW LAW OFFERS PROTECTION AGAINST EFFECTS OF INFLATION

Mr. President, I know that inflation hits hardest at the most helpless in our society, those who are living on fixed incomes, such as pensions and annuities, who are less able to find work to supplement their incomes and who must sit by helplessly and watch rising prices eat into their incomes. That is why I have tried to fight inflation on all fronts in Congress, by trying to cut down on non-essential spending, to put this country on a pay-as-you-go system, and to control credit, and also by fighting for a strong price-control law. Yet prices have continued to rise, and the difficulties of fixed-income groups have likewise increased.

It was a real satisfaction to me, therefore, to head the subcommittee which helped push this much-needed railroad retirement legislation through to enactment during the 1951 session of Congress. I want to express the gratitude of our committee for the fine cooperation it received in working out this measure from our colleagues in the House, from the officials of the Railroad Retirement Board, and from the representatives of the various interested groups, particularly the railway unions.

I hope and believe that the increased benefits provided in this law will help to provide new protections against the harmful effects of inflation and rising prices for thousands of men and women who have given a lifetime of service to the American railroads.

Report of the President, Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution and report on the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.

PRESIDENT'S CALL FOR SPECIAL MEETING OF OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Whereas since June 25, 1950, the Armed Forces of the United States have been engaged in conflict with the forces of a foreign nation; and

Whereas on December 16, 1950, President Truman proclaimed the existence of a national emergency; and

Whereas it now appears unlikely that the armed conflict hereinbefore referred to will be settled in the very near future, and

Whereas the threatening international situation continues to constitute a grave peril to our domestic peace and tranquility,

Now, therefore, I, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, hereby issue this call for a special meeting of the officers and directors of the said Congress to convene at the Mayflower Hotel in the city of Washington, D. C., on Friday, the 11th day of May 1951, at the

hour of 1 p. m., eastern daylight saving time, to take such action as may be deemed appropriate or desirable in the premises.

The permanent projects committee of the congress will meet at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 10, 1951, in the Mayflower Hotel, to consider individual projects for which the endorsement of the congress is desired. The committee's rule requiring personal appearance before it is waived, and proponents of projects are requested to furnish in writing and by mail the supporting data called for by the committee for each project (Application blanks will be sent upon request to this office.)

Presidents, or the executive heads, of chambers of commerce, navigation, flood control, irrigation-reclamation and conservation associations; industrial, business, agricultural, labor and civic organizations, are invited to attend the meeting of the officers and directors of the congress and to give them the benefit of the views of the organizations referred to.

Assurance has been given by the management of the Mayflower Hotel that sufficient accommodations will be available provided a majority of those attending share double rooms. Early reservations are, therefore, advisable in order to insure satisfactory arrangements.

Dated at Washington, D. C., this 15th day of March, A. D. 1951

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
President.

Attest:

J. G. BURKE,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, OF ARKANSAS, NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 11, 1951

Officers and directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and invited guests, it is again my privilege and pleasant duty as your president, to report on the activities of this organization since we met in March 1950, for our fortieth annual convention. At that time we met in full congress, with accredited delegates from every part of the country.

This year, however, I felt the international situation and many other factors were not favorable to our undertaking a full meeting of the congress. I deemed it advisable therefore to limit this year's session to a meeting of the officers and directors, which might also be attended by a limited number of other interested persons.

It is always desirable and pleasant to report that progress has been and is being made toward our objectives. And we have made progress during the past year, but the trend of national and world affairs has presented a number of limiting factors. As I pointed out in the call for this meeting, since we last assembled our country has become engaged in war with the forces of another nation, our President has proclaimed the existence of a national emergency, we have been thrust into a rearmament and mobilization program that compels us to set up limitations upon the construction of projects of national development. We have been compelled to subordinate our program to that which is entirely pertinent and vital to the national defense.

During our deliberations at this meeting we must bear in mind the administration's position on the necessity for reduction of nondefense spending, and the inhibition against starting any new projects except those specifically mentioned in the President's budget as essential to the defense program. We are compelled to relate our consideration of flood control and navigational needs to the priority of national defense. To do otherwise would be unpatriotic and unworthy of the traditions and the record of this body's deliberations in the past

and would fall of the necessary support of public opinion.

In my judgment there are only two classes of projects which should receive attention and consideration during this special meeting—first, those that contribute directly and unreservedly to the national defense, principally power projects; second, those that are needed and come within the category of preserving and protecting projects already completed and improvements heretofore made.

The problems of orderly development of all aspects of our water resources, flood control, navigation, harbors, irrigation, and reclamation, and other related water uses are continually before us. We have noted with pleasure the final passage at the second session of the Eighty-first Congress of H. R. 5472, the authorization bill which provides for a grand total of \$1,564,814,825 for new projects. That same session also passed the civil functions appropriations bill, under which the civil works programs of the Army engineers was allocated for use during the current fiscal year appropriations totaling \$618,564,650. These congressional grants provide for a curtailed program of activity, screened to comply with Presidential and congressional defense criteria and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Major Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, gave assurances that his organization could carry forward this program of construction without any interference with the full and efficient execution of its military functions. He further stated these funds were adequate to assure continued progress on projects under construction.

Flood control activities of the current fiscal year received allocations of \$430,527,150, and \$186,142,500 is being spent on rivers and harbors. There is \$340,394,750 in the flood control general program, for 101 projects in 33 States. There is \$113,780,500 for rivers and harbors for 51 projects in 30 States and Alaska. The Mississippi River and tributaries flood-control project is allocated \$46,800,000 for construction. There is also \$2,016,500 for construction work on the Sacramento River flood-control project.

It appears self-evident that the provision of these funds by Congress in a year when efforts are being made on every hand to reduce Federal spending and whenever greater demands are being made upon the Federal Treasury reflects a growing public consciousness of the importance of this work to preserve and control and develop the water resources of the Nation.

Public opinion must also have measurably influenced the recommendations made in the President's budget message to Congress regarding appropriations for the fiscal year of 1952. Here we find the President and the Budget Bureau suggesting expenditures of an over-all \$220,240,000 next year for rivers and harbors, and a grand total of \$328,365,000 for flood control planning and construction. This totals \$548,605,000 proposed for expenditure in these two related fields, a total sum approximately \$250,000,000 less than was similarly recommended to Congress by the President in the last previous year.

This decrease, mainly in sums proposed for flood control projects, naturally is disappointing to all of us who have a very ardent and sincere enthusiasm for expansion of this national program rather than its reduction. We must bear in mind, however, that such recommendations, if enacted into law, will provide some continuity for the vast works already started, even though there will be no money available to initiate any new projects.

It is especially discouraging when we think of the World War II years during which this work was practically at a standstill and the Nation failed utterly to keep pace with increasing needs. The upswing in the program since the war ended must now give

way, at least partially, to new threats of war and the expenditures which must be made directly to meet these threats. This, added to the burdens of a Treasury already engaged in a headlong course of deficit spending, and with our fiscal difficulties mounting by the hour, leaves little to hope for in the immediate future. Rather may we be thankful for an enlightened public and Congress which sees complete justification of our aims, and enables the work to be continued, at least in small part.

The citizenry may rest assured that whatever these sums provided by Congress may amount to, they will be efficiently and conservatively administered under the guidance of the Army engineers, and that money spent for conserving and building water resources and to combat flood destruction of life and property will provide public benefits that far outrun their cost.

Continuance in the budget message this year of the policy initiated in the last previous message which made no provision for starting new projects, regardless of necessity and economic justification, and budgeting only for river and harbor and flood-control improvements already started, gives us increasing concern and it may be emphasized here that this policy is going to bring our program to a complete standstill if followed for another year or two.

We can only hope that an all-out war may be avoided, and in due time conditions will improve so that the Congress may resume making appropriations adequate to accelerate the construction of many needed projects in the scheme for full development of these great natural resources.

The immense wealth of our Nation has come about largely because of prudent development of our natural resources. Nor can we hope to prosper in the future by accident. There must be continued proper development of our land and water resources. The future of this work, coupled with the future safety of our people from devastating floods, is going to be measured by the amounts of money appropriated from the Federal Treasury. While these sums naturally must be consistent with the Nation's economic conditions, we hold that they should not be related to the economic status of other nations. Enormous expenditures abroad are more and more being required to run the gauntlet of these vital needs at home, time-tested and proven aids to the development and protection of this great land.

This Congress continues in its known opposition to President Truman's policy favoring creation of valley or regional authorities to administer all major river basins of the country. We regard such authorities as unjustified, unnecessary, and in opposition to our democratic principles, and we are most apprehensive lest complacency in this matter may lead to the removal of existing agencies from the field of natural resources development, with great danger to State interests, and those of the Nation.

We are in accord with President Truman's expressed views on the need for increased production and transmission of hydroelectric power, but we go further to emphasize that such production must come from projects which are economically justified, and we continue to hold that they should not be in competition with the private industry.

The faith of this organization in the work of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army in the planning, construction, and operation of Federal improvements for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes is an old, old story, but it loses nothing in the retelling. One of the few pleasures in the task of leadership assigned to me by this Congress has been to continue to lead the battle against encroachments in this field. We always have been, and still

are, unalterably opposed to any transfer of civil works function of the Army engineers to any other agency, regardless of who advocates it, or how strongly, and we regard the reasons advanced by such advocates as without merit.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been commended by this congress for its progress in reclamation of the arid and semiarid lands of the 17 Western States. These areas have acute problems of irrigation which will continue to require the devoted attention of the Reclamation Bureau in the foreseeable future. We urge that this Bureau be given adequate funds by Congress to do this job properly and well, as it has in the past.

Another problem which has received attention with notable progress to date is the problem of soil erosion which confronts the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. Erosion causes not only dangerous losses of fertile soil from hill lands, but results in choking the channels of navigable streams, and we believe that continued appropriations of Federal funds to the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers for continuance of their efforts to halt this danger will continue to pay national dividends.

This congress is already on record as favoring State ownership and development of tidal lands as promising to contribute to the national economy and our prosperity, provided that the States' right be subordinate only to the Federal right with respect to improvements for national defense, navigation and flood control. We reaffirm that proper development of tidelands will come only by this path.

Attacks which continue to menace the marine transportation industry cause this congress great concern. Railroads which have increased freight rates 87 percent from 1941 to 1950, seek now to eliminate competition of barge lines whose rates have actually declined during that period. The railroads claim they must have relief from section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, for specific commodity haul rates much lower than rates for short hauls. This congress must join this battle, and provide legislation to limit the Interstate Commerce Commission's powers to exempt rates.

We continue our active support of the American merchant marine, and urge the Government to interest itself in this matter to the extent of inducing private capital and the maritime industry to expand the present facilities; to devise fair and adequate Panama Canal tolls, with proper consideration of the Canal's tremendous value in the defense scheme; and to reinterpret and reactivate, if necessary, the policy laid down by the United States Congress in 1936 respecting the equal importance of the American merchant marine to other defense components.

I should like also to reemphasize the endorsement of this body which has been given to legislation pending before both Houses of Congress to provide additional authorization for funds to rehabilitate the Federal barge lines. Thousands of shippers in the Mississippi Valley area are served by the Inland Waterways Corporation, and such service is absolutely essential to the continued well-being of this vital region. With its equipment modernized, that corporation could not only operate without expense to the taxpayer, but could pave the way for eventual advantageous sale of the system to private enterprise. Speedy enactment of legislation to bring about this rehabilitation is strongly recommended.

In conclusion I am glad to announce that the important projects committee held its hearings yesterday and its report will be made available to us before the end of this session. We can expect its recommendations as always to be most constructive and helpful.

Congress' Actions Affecting Wisconsin Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a statement prepared by me on Congress' actions affecting Wisconsin farming.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS' ACTIONS AFFECTING WISCONSIN FARMING

What actions did the Eighty-second United States Congress take in its first session from January to October 1951 affecting American farming and Wisconsin dairying in particular?

The purpose of this report is to present an answer to that question.

Each year I report to the farmers of my State and to the folks of our city areas on important legislation, important votes, and important events in the Congress affecting them.

I am happy, therefore, to present this account, in this instance, to the farmers of my State on a dozen or so issues vitally affecting their welfare. I hope that they will find this report of interest. Their response to previous similar reports has always been very gracious indeed.

In this report, I will mention some of the leading controversies on the Senate floor. I will describe how I voted on some of the major issues, and will point out some of the matters still pending before us as we head into the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, which opens next January 1952.

The comments and reactions of my readers are more than welcome.

DAIRY PRICE PROBLEM

Perhaps the most important single issue facing the farmers of Wisconsin and the Nation is the matter of the price returns which they receive for their farm products.

No farmer need be told that his costs have constantly risen—the costs of labor, the costs of machinery, the costs of feed, the costs of repair on his farm buildings, the costs of farm supplies. Farmers have naturally wanted to make sure, therefore, that in the defense-production law they were guaranteed a sufficient return for their hard labor. The farmer after all does not work an 8-hour day; he and his family work long before sunup and long after sundown. Remember, too, a cow can't be put on a 5-day week.

MEAGER MILK RETURN

I would like to quote from a frank letter which I have received from a farmer in Scandinavia, Wis.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Why are most of the older folks having auctions and selling off their farms? They can't pay their young folks to stay on the farm. They get better pay in the city. Something has to be done. With the investment the farmer has, he certainly should have better income than the laborer has. Why can't the farmer have the conveniences that our city neighbors have?"

"It should be \$5 per hundredweight for 8.5 percent milk compared to other things. All we get around here is \$3.40 for 8.5 percent milk. You know how badly we need the family-sized farm. The farmer's milk price is his bread and butter."

These well-justified questions and comments written by a typical farmer in my State speaks loads in terms of the general reactions of the great agricultural segment of Wisconsin.

When the farmer points out that he is getting in effect only around 8 cents per quart of milk while the city consumer buys that same milk for triple or so that price) the farmer is pointing out the hard facts of life which he faces.

Now, let us look at a specific Senate vote in that connection.

MY VOTE FOR THYE AMENDMENT

1. On July 28, 1951, Senator EDWARD THYE (Republican, of Minnesota), offered an amendment on the Senate floor in connection with the defense price control bill, S 1717. Senator THYE sought to have the Secretary of Agriculture make sure that before ceiling prices were fixed on producers of milk or butterfat used for manufacturing dairy products, that such ceiling prices were reasonable and equitable. This, in my judgment, was a very fair amendment and was essential in order to assure justice for the dairymen.

I voted for the amendment, therefore. Unfortunately, however, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 29 for to 52 against. That defeat was a regrettable blow to the farmer.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DELAY

2. From the standpoint of midwestern agriculture as a whole, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project—with its low-cost transportation and electricity—remains as one of the important incomplete issues facing the Congress. During this session, as for 30 previous years, the blind, selfish opposition to the seaway—the eastern and southern ports, some of the private utilities, the railroads, the coal lobbies—have once again sabotaged seaway legislation. The whole American people are the loser as a result of such sabotage. Moreover, our Canadian good neighbor, a land which has been patiently waiting all these years for Uncle Sam to make up his mind on the project, has announced that it will have to go ahead on the seaway on its own. This would be very unfortunate, both for Canada and our country.

The seaway bill, of which I am again a cosponsor, is still pending before the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Public Works Committees; and we will insist when the second session gets underway that it be brought up for action.

VITAL SOIL CONSERVATION

3. On my farm in Barron County I have noted the tremendous importance of soil-conservation practices. It was only natural, therefore, that when the soil-conservation issue came up on the Senate floor I would recall my own and my son's personal experiences with soil conservation work. On July 26 there was brought up a committee amendment to increase the funds for soil and water conserving practices. The amendment provided \$280,000,000, rather than \$225,000,000 as the House of Representatives had voted. Those sound like large sums, but not when you divide them among all the States of the Union.

I voted for the increase, as did a majority of my colleagues. The increase was passed by a close vote of 41 to 39. Previously, we had beaten back an attempt to cut down that amount.

HARMFUL CHEESE IMPORTS

4. We of Wisconsin have always prided ourselves in the fact that our production of foreign-type cheese, for example Italian, Bleu, etc., has led the Nation in quantity and quality. We recognize, however, that it is very difficult indeed for a Wisconsin producer to attempt to compete with producers of foreign-type cheese in foreign countries.

Abroad they have lower living standards, lower labor costs, lower machinery costs, lower health and purity standards, for their products, etc.

Accordingly, when the Defense Production Act came up for a vote there was added to it an amendment which had been identified in the House of Representatives as that proposed by my colleague, Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN, Republican, of Minnesota. This amendment provided that where imports of foreign cheese, fats, and oils damaged the American market for these products, that the amount of such imports could be cut down. The Andresen amendment passed the Senate by a voice vote. I supported it, of course.

Now, however, the Democratic administration unwisely seeks to repeal that amendment. The administration says that this amendment on the part of our Government was a one-sided action, which is objected to by foreign governments. The administration ignores the fact, however, that these various foreign governments have not hesitated to clamp down all sorts of restrictions against American products whenever they felt like it. And so a major battle is shaping up for the Senate floor for January, when the administration's bill, S. 2104, to repeal the protective amendment, comes up for a fight. I will, of course, vote against repeal.

DRAFTING FARM HELP

5 As the Korean casualty figures have mounted, Wisconsin farmers, like farmers all over the Nation, have felt an increasing drain of vital manpower. More and more men have been inducted into the armed services to serve as replacements.

Now, we all know that the farmers of America have always gladly contributed more than their share of youths to the defense of our Nation. Farmers know, however, that they cannot possibly meet their expanded production quotas if they are not allowed to retain a minimum of manpower. Remember, too, you can't take an unskilled hand and expect him to do the thousand and one detailed chores around the farm. It takes years of farm experience.

Accordingly, I have taken up with the Selective Service Administration and with local boards throughout the State of Wisconsin various cases where I felt justice and equity would require reasonable deferment of certain experienced farm hands. We have not sought any preference or favoritism, but merely justice for these young men and for the overworked farmers for whom they work.

PROTECTING FARM CO-OPS

Now a sixth instance.

6. Wisconsin is one of the greatest cooperative States of the Union.

We have always prided ourselves on the fact that in America's dairyland cooperatives have become an integral part of our whole economy. Cooperatives, by helping to reduce the costs of distribution and marketing of farm products, have helped save Wisconsin farmers scores of millions of dollars.

Cooperatives right now pay a tremendous share of the ever-increasing Federal tax load.

During September the new tax bill, H. R. 4473, came up on the Senate floor for a vote. The Senate Finance Committee had decided on certain compromise provisions—I emphasize, compromise provisions—under which unallocated earnings of cooperatives (not definitely allocated on the accounts of patrons) would be subject to corporate income taxation. Patrons would be held responsible for paying the tax on such amounts.

This compromise committee amendment was estimated as capable of producing around \$10,000,000 in additional Federal revenue. The amendment was backed by the Senate overwhelmingly, including myself. However, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, sought to add an amendment to put a tax

on the co-ops themselves for all their undistributed earnings; thus, the tax would be on the co-ops, not the patrons. Fortunately, the Williams amendment was rejected. I felt that it was unfair and unreasonable and that it would have been seriously damaging to Wisconsin cooperatives. The amendment was defeated by an overwhelming vote in the Senate on September 24, 1951. I stated my opinion very definitely against that unreasonable Williams amendment.

MATTERS TAKEN UP WITH AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

During 1951, as in many previous years, I took up a great number of issues with the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies. Some of these issues were tied up with Federal legislation. Others were involved purely in administration.

7. For example, I took up with the Secretary of Agriculture the matter of additional appropriations for Brucellosis research. We all know what a terrific economic havoc Bang's disease causes among dairy herds of Wisconsin.

8. In addition, I took up with the Secretary of Agriculture and with the United States Immigration Service numerous arrangements in order to speed the importation of foreign agricultural farm labor in order to be of help for the canning of Wisconsin's crops.

There were a great many other issues in which I was happy to be of service to the great canning industry of Wisconsin—issues such as:

9. Assuring an adequate supply of critical materials for the canners.

10. Assuring fair price ceilings for them.

11. Trying to simplify regulations which they have to adhere to and trying to make sure that the Office of Price Stabilization recognizes their problems, etc.

CRITICAL MATERIALS FOR REA'S

12. Still another issue which I took up this year was the matter of assuring an adequate supply of critical materials for Wisconsin's rural electric co-ops. I had helped dedicate a new REA power project on the Flambeau River near Ladysmith, Wis. Thus, I had seen at first-hand how crucial REA's work is in this age of electricity. Kilowatt energy is indispensable to the modern farmer and to his family. REA's must continue to get sufficient copper to build new electric lines.

FARMERS INTERESTED IN ECONOMY, FREEDOM

I have confined this report thus far to issues facing Wisconsin farmers almost exclusively. It should be remembered, however, that the Badger farmer, like every other citizen in the State of Wisconsin, is interested in a great many public issues which do not pertain to farming directly.

The Wisconsin farmer is vitally interested, for example, in a prompt and successful ending of the long and bloody battle in Korea. He is interested in Government economy, an end to Federal waste and extravagance.

He is interested in the eradication of crime, communism, and corruption wherever they exist. He is interested in ending the pattern of Government favoritism, of \$9,000 milk costs to Government employees and deep-freezer gifts. The Badger farmer, moreover, is interested in the fight against socialistic trends of our times. He knows from experiences during World War II how the heavy hand of Government bureaucracy can damage him and all that he holds dear.

To take another issue, the Wisconsin farmer is feeling the effects of inflation. Like everyone else in our country, he knows that the real answer to inflation is in full and uninterrupted production.

He knows that every time there is a major strike in a leading American industry—an avoidable strike—that stoppage cuts down the amount of goods available. This serves

to increase inflationary pressure and causes prices to rise higher.

The Wisconsin farmer is a realist. He understands how the American way of life operates. He cannot be fooled or bamboozled by glittering high-sounding slogans or phony propositions. He wants to know what Government programs cost and how they will affect his liberties. He wants to know where the trend in American foreign policy is leading us. He wants to know what our commitments are throughout the world. Yes; all thinking Americans want to know the answers to these questions.

This year, as every year, Wisconsin farmers have written thousands of letters to me. They joined in the overwhelming denunciation of President Truman's dismissal of Wisconsin's great Gen. Douglas MacArthur. They joined in praising the efforts made by the famous Senate Crime Investigating Committee, a group on which I was happy to serve for over a year and a half from the beginning to its untimely end. They joined with other patriotic Americans in a great variety of issues which came up and which we faced as Americans all.

CONCLUSION

I have tried to cover the various major matters in which farmers are particularly interested. For detailed reports, however, on other issues which limited space has not permitted me to cover, I hope that our farmers will be writing to me. Their questions and comments will, as I have indicated, be welcome indeed.

So, to that farmer in Scandinavia, Wis., whose letter I quoted and to all other farmers in co-ops, in REA's, or as individuals, I say: Do let me hear from you, and thanks for your kind attention to this report. And do let me hear from folks in every occupation, every profession, every calling who are interested in their Government, yours and mine, in their America and their world.

Wanted: An American Leader for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including excerpts from an editorial by that distinguished journalist, Mr. David Lawrence, which appears in the current issue of U. S. News and World Report. Excerpts from that editorial follow:

What we need is an American leader who is willing to promote policies of peace and comradeship with free nations and to render to our allies wholehearted support in money and men. But we need also a leader who is interested in preserving the economic and social integrity of the United States.

What we need is someone who does not feel that the flag of the U. N. should be flown above the Stars and Stripes or that our men in Korea should be taught to look on the American flag as the symbol of a drooping nationalism.

What we need is someone who recognizes that the U. N. itself is an obsolete organization today and that events have passed by the concept of a world organization disciplined only by majority vote. The U. N. is useful as a forum. Because of the veto, it is useless as a military alliance or agency to enforce peace.

What we need is an idea that supersedes the old-fashioned doctrine that 50 or more nations can be assembled in a group and vote as equals when they are not equals. As long ago as 1907 that concept was assailed at the Hague Conference as impractical. Through the League of Nations and now the U. N., it has been demonstrated to be ineffectual and as merely a weapon of intrigue and a device to disintegrate the strong.

What we need is someone who sees the world of tomorrow in its realistic structure as a group of nations dedicated to freedom and liberty and ready to associate themselves on a basis of reciprocal sacrifice.

What we need is a frank appraisal of the power of the larger free nations to protect their peoples from destruction by the evil forces which recognize no sovereignty as they infiltrate us all. A world in which dependent nations lose their sovereignty is as bad as a world in which the self-reliant nations, with great resources and industrial strength, are slowly but surely sapped from within by the insidious type of warfare that Russia now is waging.

What is needed is an administration in Washington with a man of imagination in the Presidency and a man of imagination heading the Department of State—men willing to take risks in the field of propaganda, in the field of counterinfiltration, in the area of military help, and in the enlistment of manpower by all those nations which want an alliance for self-protection.

What is needed is a leadership that makes it clear to the American people that it is our own safety, our own wealth, and our own manpower which are at stake, and a leadership that can convince other nations allied with us that internationalism must be a two-way street if it is to strengthen the cause of our respective nationalisms.

What is needed in America is a leadership that will not be lost in the vagaries of left wingism or bogged down in those adventures into socialism which can only lead in the end to the triumph of Communist doctrines among us, thus preparing the way for the same subtle invasions that have ruined other countries.

What is needed in America is not isolationism—for that has been outmoded by the long-range bomber and the atom bomb—but an Americanism that is not afraid to send its troops to any frontier in the world to stop the enemy in his tracks and to keep future wars remote from our shores.

What is needed is the same spirit that dominated the founders of the Republic the spirit of the Thirteen Colonies expressed in that historic slogan, "Don't tread on me!" For this is a tragic period in history in which American boys have been trod upon and America itself has been trod upon, and we have not dared to use maximum power in defense of American lives—90,000 casualties already.

What is needed is a spirit of defense that is not afraid of an offensive concept and, above all, a spirit that does not adopt the cringing mood of the appeaser.

Grimes Golden Apple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend my remarks, I include an article about that most de-

licious of all fruits, West Virginia's famed Grimes Golden apple. The article, prepared by my old friend, Samuel Jacob, whose farm is located near the site where the first Grimes Golden apple tree grew, was published by the Wellsburg Daily Herald, one of West Virginia's oldest newspapers. It follows:

GRIMES GOLDEN APPLE

The writer has looked over his scrapbooks and consulted several persons, among them Capt. William D. Grimes, a great grandson of T. P. Grimes, in regard to information asked by R. A. W. Sager, of Petersburg, W. Va., in a letter that came to your desk and was referred to me. Mr. Sager would like to know who the judge at Martinsburg was and when and by whom he was presented a gavel made from the trunk of a tree from which the Grimes Golden apple started on its way to fame. I am unable to answer other than to say that when the tree fell in the year 1900, after a known history of 100 years, gavels were made from its wood for the West Virginia Horticultural Society. Possibly the commissioner of agriculture at Charleston could find some record of the matter if addressed.

A column article clipped about 1900 from a Pittsburgh paper regarding the display of apples at the Land Show, Duquesne Garden, Pittsburgh, has a subheading "Grimes Golden a monument to Brooke County." The clipping is preserved by Miss Martha Hervey in memory of her father, Henry C. Hervey, who is quoted at some length. An extract is "I remember the tree for at least 50 years. When I was a boy the apples were prized and my recollection is that about 50 or 60 years ago people in this section began to plant grafted trees." He goes on to say that his father planted such an orchard and that people of the neighborhood would drive to the Wood's Nursery in Ohio for stock. If Mr. Sager will write to some descendant of Alex. Clohan he might get some light on whether a Martinsburg judge got a gavel at the time Mr. Clohan did. Here is a further quotation: "A few days ago at the meeting in Martinsburg of the West Virginia Horticultural Society H. W. Collingwood, of New York City, presented to the president of the society, Alex. Clohan, a gavel made from a piece of the original Grimes Golden apple tree."

Mayhaps some of the many people who have picnicked at the Grimes Golden wayside stop-off on Washington Pike would like to know more of its history that they might express a kindly thank you to the Franklin County Women's Club for its monument to an apple tree and to the State road commission for a good public service. Autolists from Cleveland, Detroit, and other far-off places have also thought well of the wayside cool spring water, benches, fireplaces, and majestic trees as they stopped on their way to or from Washington and Baltimore.

The appropriateness of a monument to the Grimes Golden apple tree appears to have been suggested by Mr. Fred Sanders to his daughter, Miss Margaret, as they stopped to water their horses at the old trough on the edge of the pike near the home at that time of Dr. J. W. Gist. Miss Sanders placed the matter before the Women's Club of Franklin. The ladies raised \$600 in a country community and prevailed upon the county court to appropriate \$600 more for a new trough and a modest monument which were put in place by a contractor from Washington, Pa. Mrs. Love Douglas presided at the public dedication September 27, 1922. Nat T. Frame, of Morgantown, was the guest speaker and little Betty Fowler sang a ballad composed by Mrs. F. E. Chapman about the apple. The program and a picture of the old tree are in a small box in the corner of the monument. Mrs. E. H. Fowler has the key. The

location is on a farm once the property of Thomas Peter Grimes and now owned by Mrs. Harry Kauffman and children.

When in the possession of Mr. Grimes there grew on the place a tree that bore luscious yellow apples. Prior to 1872 when the property was bought by Dr. J. W. Gist a seedling or a graft from this tree was carried by Mr. Grimes to the A. W. Wood farm nursery near Smithfield, Ohio. Mr. Wood developed and marketed the progeny from Mr. Grimes' tree and its fine flavor became so popular that other nursery men soon took up its production and made it probably the most widely known variety of apple in existence. Transplanting has been reported from Europe and South America, and the apple has long been a very considerable article of export to foreign lands.

The first mention I find of Mr. Grimes is that he was one of the incorporators of the Wellsburg and Washington Turnpike Co., when it met on September 22, 1821. One of the interesting resolutions adopted was that subscribers could pay for their stock in farm produce. Prices were fixed as follows: "Flour per barrel, \$8; whisky, from home stills, per gallon, 33¼ cents; fresh pork, per pound, 4 cents; oats per bushel, 25 cents; bacon per pound, 8 cents; wheat per bushel, 50 cents; corn per bushel, 33¼ cents; rye per bushel, 33¼ cents; potatoes per bushel, 33¼ cents; country linen or flax or tow, linsie and country-made cloth of every description at cash prices in Wellsburg when delivered." Throughout the secretary's book are records of payments in livestock, grain, whisky, etc., which in turn were paid to the contractors and they in turn paid their men in kind. My information is from an address by W. C. Gist on November 5, 1939, at the centennial celebration of the completion of the road. Mr. Gist's great-grandfather, Cornelius H. Gist, was the first president of the company and William Patton its secretary.

In decreasing purchasing power of money, increasing taxation, large additions to the stupendous public debt, and the threat of four more to the 20 years of rule by socialistic-minded politicians at Washington, can there be found a portent of going back to some kind of bartering as of old?

SAMUEL JACOB.

Broadcasters Vigorously Oppose Presidential Board for Review of Radio and Television Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from Mr. Jack Todd, director of the Twelfth District National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, in which he enclosed a copy of the resolution adopted by his organization in Wichita, Kans., September 28, 1951. In this resolution, the broadcasters vigorously oppose the presidential board for review of radio and television programs.

The resolution follows:

Whereas proposed Senate bill 1579 and the companion resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 76—the so-called Benton bills, authored and initiated by Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut—would establish a presidentially appointed board of review

charged with reviewing the program performance of radio and television stations and reporting conclusions to Congress and the Federal Communications Commission annually, and

Whereas such procedure, in the view of the broadcasters of the twelfth district of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, would be contrary to guarantees expressed in the Bill of Rights, insofar as the proposed board would have the implicit power of censorship, and

Whereas the legislation, if adopted, would impose even further regulation upon a medium that stands as one of the important national guardians of free speech; and

Whereas such proposals are in contradiction of the rights of the people to a broadcast medium free of Government program surveillance; Be it

Resolved, That the members of the twelfth district of NARTE, in convention assembled, unanimously and vigorously oppose this legislation, and be it further

Resolved, That the NARTE president and staff continue their efforts to keep all broadcasters, members and nonmembers of the association, fully informed on this subject, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, to the chairman of such subcommittees as may be designated to hear testimony on these legislative proposals, and to the Senators and Congressmen of Kansas and Oklahoma.

"The Government Goes on TV—With a Vast Television Network Audience Including President Truman, Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, Each Sunday Presents His Battle Report, Washington, Program"—Arkansas Gazette, the Washington (D. C.) Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been reporting, for more than a year, the National Broadcasting Co.'s telecast presented each Sunday by Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President.

This is the teledocumentary whereon John Steelman causes a report to be made to the American people on the most important news items of that particular week—and by the particular officials of Government most intimately and directly concerned with the subjects which they discuss.

Battle Report, Washington, is now recognized to be one of the most important and anxiously awaited television programs of the week. I have personally received thousands of letters from all parts of these United States telling me of the great appreciation which the writers have for the remarkable sacrifice which John Steelman makes in assuming this extra task in order to inform the American people with direct

and authoritative report on Government activities of the day.

Prior to the recess of Congress, I was called to my home in Mobile, due to the death of my brother Charles. While attending to that and related matters the House took a recess, and I remained in Mobile and thus skipped inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial scripts of the Battle Report, Washington, program for some 2 or 3 weeks.

In consequence thereof I received several scores of letters asking why I had discontinued making these insertions and their attending comments. Many wrote that they regarded John Steelman's activities and the statements of his guests on Sunday afternoons as the finest summary of news available to them from Washington, D. C. Practically all letters received made plea that I continue to extend my remarks and include therein each Sunday's telecast as I had been doing in the past.

In the course of the past 2 weeks, I have received a number of clippings from papers located in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and elsewhere throughout the Southwest, carrying a news item written by our friend and well-known member of the Press Gallery, Elizabeth Carpenter. Mrs. Carpenter and her husband, Leslie, serve as special Washington correspondents for a number of papers located in the southwestern section of the United States.

Her article on John Steelman—intimately and pithily written—disclosed the fact that—

The No. 1 fan of the program Battle Report, Washington—and a booster from the moment the idea was suggested at the White House—is President Truman himself. Each Sunday afternoon when he is at the Blair House or on the *Williamsburg*, the presidential yacht, the President switches the dial of his television set to hear the announcer say, "And first—the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman."

The President more than likely is apt to hear a last-minute fill-in on some important international development which he gave to Steelman a few hours before the program went on.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether appropriate for me to tell you that this splendid telecast of Battle Report, Washington, is presented at one of the all-important hours on Sunday afternoon—by the National Broadcasting Co.—and without cost to any department of the United States Government. In the language of the day, "It's for free."

Dr. Steelman has delegated the liaison and managerial work of presenting this program to his able and capable assistant, Mr. Charles W. Jackson, while the National Broadcasting Co. has assigned to its production one of its topflight producers, Mr. Ted Ayers. The commentaries are by David Brinkley, an NBC television nationally known newscaster; its inimitable script is written by Lou Hazam, and the technicians assigned to the staff are the best electronics engineers available in the Nation's Capital, long noted throughout the world for their superior technical and scientific abilities.

In order that the millions of Americans that hear John Steelman each Sun-

day continue his personal global fight against the vicious forces of communism—and his friends elsewhere—presenting what has virtually become a veritable catalog of "Who's Who in Government" to his television audience—under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein two articles written by Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter—one clipped from the Arkansas Gazette of Sunday, October 7, and the other from the Washington Post of October 11.

The articles read as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette of October 7, 1951]

THE GOVERNMENT GOES ON TV—GLOBAL FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM SHOWN THE NATION ON VIDEO BY ARKANSAS-BORN DR. JOHN STEELMAN, PRESIDENT'S ASSISTANT

(By Elizabeth Carpenter)

WASHINGTON—Howdy Doody has millions of kids watching him perform on television each weekday afternoon. Kukla, Fran, and Ollie relax the tired businessman each evening. But Dr. John Steelman, who becomes a television star on Sunday afternoons, has an audience that includes his boss, President Truman, many members of the Cabinet and other top Government officials, plus the great mass of people who want to see the latest "Battle Report, Washington."

The one-time sociology professor from Thornton who now is assistant to the President of the United States, corrals an array of topflight Government talent each week to give his audience an unbiased straight-from-the-horse's-mouth report on this Nation's fight for freedom.

But while Howdy Doody's annual salary is said to run into six figures and Kukla, Fran, and Ollie make approximately the same, TV Commentator Steelman's salary, for his performance, is \$0. He looks on it, he says, as a personal contribution to good government designed to let the people know, in a 30-minute briefing, what is going on.

"People are hungry for information," Dr. Steelman explains, "and it's a great thing to let them see the men who are running the Government and hear them tell in their own words the significant developments of the past week. It does a great deal to inspire confidence in the Government."

So, while Steelman and other Government officials perform free, the National Broadcasting Co. puts up \$1,000 to \$6,000 each week to pay the cost of producing a professional show. Some 50 technicians, artists, writers, and stage hands turn their talents to production of this 30-minute briefing.

In the gymnasium-sized studio, half a dozen television cameras wheel from one set to another while Gen. Omar Bradley tells the people why it costs so much to arm the country; Special Assistant Averell Harriman explains there are no easy answers to the Iranian oil difficulties; and such newsworthy guests as Robert A. Vogeler explain, in his hesitant, prison-marked manner, his treatment by Russians who kept him jailed in Hungary for many months.

The program has been on the air for 56 weeks. A list of the guests who have appeared on the show is virtually a "Who's Who of Government": Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Publisher Oveta Culp Hobby, Gen. Jean de Latre de Tassigny, are typical of the guest artists.

No. 1 fan of the show and a booster from the moment the idea was suggested at the White House is President Truman himself. Each Sunday afternoon when he is at the Blair House or on the *Williamsburg*, the presidential yacht, the President switches the dial of his television set to hear the an-

nouncer say, "And first, the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman."

The President is apt to hear a last-minute fill-in on some important international development which he gave to Steelman a few hours before the show goes on.

This joint venture of Government and NBC into a television show was prompted by the enthusiastic response Dr. Steelman drew from a group of forums he held in Washington. In groups of 100, Steelman called business, labor, and civic leaders to the Capital to give them a briefing on what goes on here in the "citadel of confusion." This had been going on for 6 years and gaining momentum. Steelman served as moderator and coordinator. He gathered together the men from Government familiar with the big problems of the hour.

NBC came up with the suggestion that such a briefing could reach an even greater audience through television. Network officials approached Steelman and his assistant, Charles Jackson, who has had long experience in the big-time advertising field. Would Dr. Steelman undertake a similar Nation-wide briefing period each Sunday afternoon if given 30 minutes time on television by NBC?

Dr. Steelman liked the idea. So he carried the suggestion from his office in the south wing of the White House across to the Cabinet room and laid it on the table. The Cabinet liked it, too, but the warmest response came from the Chief Executive himself.

Being a man who has had first-hand experience in sending his popularity rating skyward through face-to-face contacts with people, President Truman recognized the value of showing the people the story of their country's problems and solutions over television.

Ted Ayres, a top production man for NBC, set about working out the format. He took 2 days off for thinking it out, and came back with the plan that the program still follows: a 5-minute introduction by Dr. Steelman, reports from the man handling the problem of the week in the Departments of Defense and State, newsworthy visitors, and films flown in from the Korean battle front. Throughout the reports, viewers are flashed mobile maps and other artwork illustrating the point under discussion.

Just how closely the TV audience watches the show was illustrated recently when Steelman wore a necktie with a picture of the United States Capitol on it. A raft of letters poured in commenting on "your new necktie."

In the 1 year that Dr. Steelman has been moderating the show, the number of television stations carrying it has increased from 7 to 13, and the audience has stretched from Maine to Florida, as far as Omaha, and is seen in the eastern area of Arkansas.

"The more the people know about their Government, the safer democracy is," Steelman says.

[From the Washington Post of October 11, 1951]

BATTLE REPORT—His AUDIENCE INCLUDES
MR. H. S. T.

(By Elizabeth Carpenter)

Howdy Doody has millions of kids watching him perform on television each weekday afternoon, Kukla, Fran, and Ollie get the tired businessman each evening. But Dr. John Steelman, a television star each Sunday (WNEB) at 3 p. m., has an audience including President Truman, members of the Cabinet and top officials, plus the great mass of people, who want to see the latest Battle Report, Washington.

The one-time sociology professor from Arkansas, now assistant to the President, corals an array of topflight Government officials each week to give the people an un-

biased straight-from-the-horse's-mouth report on the Nation's fight for freedom.

But while Howdy Doody and Kukla, Fran, and Ollie draw down a big salary, TV commentator Steelman's intake for the show is \$0. He counts it a personal contribution to good Government by helping let the people know, in a 30-minute briefing, what goes on.

"People are hungry for information," Steelman explains. "It's a great thing to let them see the men who are running the Government and hear them tell, in their own words, the significant developments of the past week. It does a great deal to inspire confidence in the Government."

While Steelman and other Government officials perform free, the National Broadcasting Co. puts up \$1,000 to \$6,000 each week to pay the cost of producing a professional show. Some 50 technicians, artists, writers, and stage hands turn their talents to this program.

In the studio at the Wardman Park Hotel half a dozen television cameras wheel from one set to another where Gen. Omar Bradley tells the people why it costs so much to arm the country; where special assistant Averell Harriman explains there are no easy answers to the Iranian oil difficulties, and where such newsworthy guests as Robert A. Vogeler explain in his hesitant, prison-marked manner his treatment by Russians.

The program, now under way for more than a year, has a list of guests which is virtually a who's who of Government. All Cabinet members have appeared at least once.

No 1 fan of the show and a booster from the moment the idea was suggested at the White House is President Truman. He looks in at the program whenever he's at Blair House, on the Williamsburg, or near a television set.

This venture of Government and NBC into a television show was prompted by the enthusiastic response Steelman had been getting from a group of forums of business, labor, and civic leaders, for whom he had been serving as moderator.

American Legion Votes No Confidence in State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

MR. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the subject of the resolutions adopted by the American Legion at its last convention in Miami, Fla. These resolutions condemned the State Department for its inefficiency and incompetency:

VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE

There are two deeply disturbing aspects of the American Legion resolution condemning the State Department—the nature of the resolution itself and the lopsided majority by which it was adopted.

The resolution was a wild verbal shot in the dark. It called for the immediate removal of the present corps of State Department leaders whose "every action" has reflected incompetency, indecision, and defeatism. And it said that "they must be replaced and the State Department reconstituted with men of unquestioned loyalty and

high purpose . . . to the end that the confidence of all Americans in the conduct of our foreign affairs may be fully restored."

Here is the most sweeping kind of blanket indictment and condemnation. Instead of imputing particular failures to named individuals in the State Department, the entire "corps of leaders" is directly condemned as incompetent, and indirectly challenged on grounds of loyalty. Furthermore, a minority resolution deleting the criticism of the department was defeated, 2,881 to 131, and when District Commissioner Donohue tried to speak in defense of Secretary Acheson, his words were drowned out by boos.

It can be said that this is grossly unfair to the State Department leaders. They have made their mistakes, and it is proper that they should be charged with responsibility for those mistakes. But to denounce the entire departmental performance without any bill of particulars and without any specific identification of the alleged offenders borders on the fantastic.

Saying this, however, does not answer the more fundamental question of why the Legion so overwhelmingly approved such an extravagant denunciation of the Department. If delegates to the Legion meeting represented no one but themselves, the matter could be brushed aside. But that can hardly be the case. The attitude of the Legion delegates must be at least approximately in harmony with the attitude of Legion membership, and the members can hardly be wholly out of tune with sentiment in the communities in which they live.

If this is correct, then it follows that the delegates, in their expression of no confidence in the Department, spoke for a very substantial number of people in the country. The only other reasonable assumption would be that the Legion convention was stampeded by irresponsible leaders. That has happened before and it may have happened at Miami. In the absence of proof of that, however, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the persistent undermining of the State Department has been much more effective throughout the country than in Washington.

**"Here in England, Just 1,500 Miles From
Moscow, the United States Air Force
Is Doing Things That Uncle Joe Stalin
Really Ought to See—There's a Lot to
Look at, if He Could Spare About 2
Weeks From His Job at the Kremlin"—
Howard M. Norton, London Bureau,
Baltimore Sun**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

MR. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, as time goes on, more than ever I am convinced that the greatest single thing that this Congress ever did to insure the defense and security of this country was to create and establish the United States Air Force as a separate branch of our armed services.

While there seems to be a sort of self-imposed censorship effective insofar as factual information with respect to the accomplishments of the Air Force in the

United States is concerned, there certainly is no dearth of good news with respect to what we learn from foreign sources.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the time that Rear Adm. Robert Edwin Peary made his trip to the North Pole, and how, for months, the newspapers were filled with the stories of his exploration. To get from America to the North Pole has long been regarded as a feat comparable to getting to the moon, and yet, Mr. Speaker, but recently I read a little news item telling of how men of the United States Air Force now make three or four training flights each week over the North Pole. Landing their ships on the Arctic ice caps, they go through their Arctic survival exercises, get into their sleeping bags and spend the night in the open at temperatures which range from 75° to 80° below zero. Their training practice completed, they get back into their airplanes and return to home bases somewhere in Alaska, or even, per chance, to air fields in the continental United States itself.

Last night while scanning my New York Times, I noticed an article telling of how United States airplanes are already utilizing two bases in Africa, from which our long-range bombers, our heaviest transports, and the hottest jet fighters in the world will operate.

That article went on to say that from these bases the Air Force bombers will be able to strike at targets spread over half of the globe, and that the transports will be able to supply Army and Navy installations thousands of miles away. Six months ago, these bases were being planned. A few months later, construction was begun, and, now, they are being operated.

Mr. Speaker, these are but some of the exploits of men who believe that our land should be defended from the skies, and from skies over areas far removed from the habitable portions of the earth.

I have now come upon another article, by Howard M. Norton, of the London Bureau of the Baltimore Sun. This tells of United States Air Force bases in England—bases which range from tremendous bomber fields to compact ammunition storage dumps and radio stations—a great string of fighter and bomber bases which our men are keeping open day and night on the alert to accommodate a tremendous air armada in a matter of but a few hours should the need arise.

If war should come to Europe—

Mr. Norton reports—

huge bases in England are ready to serve as home to air units fighting all over the continent—four of them with landing strips and runways built to take the shock of our B-36's. Each is designed to accommodate comfortably a medium bombardment wing—45 to 50 planes (B-50's and B-29's) and 2,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that Mr. Norton stated that if Joe Stalin should come to England—he would find a lot to look at because the B-50—our 1951 version of the B-29—is a ship which can make almost two round trips from England to Moscow and back without land-

ing and carry with them the biggest complement of atom bombs both ways.

When we think of the ring of air bases now built or being built around Russia and the satellite countries, we come to some real appreciation of what the Air Force has done to protect these United States, not alone at our coast lines and land borders but at all borders of our one great potential enemy.

It is in this manner that the infant service of the armed services of these United States is now carrying out the purposes which actuated the Congress to set up the United States Air Force to defend the peace and security of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of this Congress may have opportunity of reading this, the first of a series of air articles by Howard M. Norton, written in England, on The Growing Might of the United States Air Force in England, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the same in the RECORD.

Mr. Norton's first article reads as follows:

(By Howard M. Norton)

(This is the first of a special series of six articles by Mr. Norton on the growing might of the United States Air Force in England. Succeeding articles will run in the Sun this week.)

LONDON.—Here in England—just 1,500 miles from Moscow—is something that Uncle Joe Stalin really ought to see.

If he could spare about 2 weeks from his job at the Kremlin, and keep going 12 to 15 hours a day, he would have time enough for a quick look at most of the vast installations which the United States Air Force has quietly built up on this island in the last 3 years.

There is a lot to look at.

There are, for example, 26 bases and stations scattered over the length and breadth of England.

They range from tremendous bomber fields to compact ammunition storage dumps and radio stations.

Manning them today are well over 20,000 Americans in uniform, hundreds of civilian Americans and many thousands of Britons.

JUST A SKELETON FORCE

But even this huge chunk of manpower is only a skeleton force.

The string of great bomber and fighter bases which most of these men are engaged in building or keeping open, is designed to accommodate a huge air armada in a matter of hours if war should come.

Among these bases is one that covers 25 square miles—a base so big it would take several atom bombs to put it out of commission.

Stored at bases and stations in England are nearly a billion dollars worth of American supplies—everything from baked beans to bullets—enough to keep an air force fighting for many weeks without further help from home.

And the build-up of supplies is continuing as fast as storage space can be constructed.

Also set up and still expanding are great shops for the repair of damaged aircraft and engines.

If war comes to Europe, the bases in England are ready to serve as home to air units fighting all over the Continent.

Eight of the stations in England are now being used for operational flying.

And four big new ones are being built near the old university city of Oxford, with runways to take the landing shock of the B-36.

At each of these four new fields enough concrete is being poured to build an 18-foot road from Washington to Baltimore. And enough asphalt is being laid at each of them to carry the same 18-foot road on from Baltimore to Philadelphia.

Each is designed to accommodate, comfortably, a medium bombardment wing—45 to 50 planes (B-50's and B-29's), and 2,000 men.

When these bases were started, the plan was to close down most or all of the five old RAF bomber fields in East Anglia which the USAF is now using.

But that idea was quietly dropped; quietly because the left wing of the British Labor Party is getting extremely sensitive to further expansion of the American bases in England.

KEEPING SOME EAST ANGLIA BASES

Now, with the hearty consent of the RAF, the American Strategic Air Command intends to keep at least three of its East Anglia bases, and possibly all of them, even after the Oxford area bases are ready.

The Air Force isn't willing to pinpoint all the installations it has in England, but it admits to having, in addition to the five bomber stations in East Anglia and the four being built near Oxford, the following:

Two fighter interceptor stations permanently manned by the Eighty-first Fighter Interceptor Wing, flying the latest model F-86 Sabre jet fighters. These are at Bentwater and Shephards Grove, both in Suffolk.

One fighter escort station at Manston, near the mouth of the Thames, temporarily manned by the Twelfth Fighter Escort Wing, flying F-84 Thunderjets.

Two supply and maintenance depots (at Burtonwood and Sealand) near Liverpool.

One administrative flying station at Bovingdon, near London.

Two headquarters sites: the main one at Ruislip, about 12 miles from London, the other at Bushy Park, General Eisenhower's old headquarters in Teddington, on the Thames.

One personnel processing camp at Shaftesbury, 100 miles southwest of London.

One reconnaissance squadron, flying a half dozen four-jet RB-45's from fields in the north of England.

Three hospitals.

Roaring through the British skies on training missions this month are about 200 United States Air Force planes.

They are here as a result of one of the most important lessons learned in World War II—that air force units get rapidly more efficient after they have settled down at their overseas bases and adjusted themselves to conditions under which they have to fly.

UNITED STATES CREWS LEARNING TERRITORY

Thus, for the last 3 years, the Strategic Air Command has been familiarizing its crews with areas where they might have to operate.

The Pacific, Alaska, the Caribbean, Labrador, and England are the main regions this rotational training program has been concentrating on.

Forty-five of the latest model B-50 atom bombers are now in England as part of this training program.

These faster, higher-flying version of the old B-29 are flying practice missions that run as long as 23 hours (they could fly to Moscow and back in well under 12 hours). And from their British bases they are ranging as far afield as the Middle East.

Twenty-one of them have flown from England nonstop to Savannah, Ga. (4,240 miles) in the last 3 months—just for practice.

Working with the B-50's are 20 tanker planes, remodeled B-29's known technically as type KB-29P.

TANKER PLANES CARRY 6,000 GALLONS

These flying gas stations, their bomb bays bulging with nylon gasoline tanks, can make

a 5-hour hop, transfer 6,000 gallons of gasoline, then turn around and fly back again. They've given the bomber almost unlimited range. And to many Air Force leaders, they're the biggest thing that's happened since the development of jet power.

It is particularly important for these flying tankers to know their way around the skies over England and vicinity, for this island would be a big refueling base if war came to the European Continent.

Bombers flying from the United States might refuel over England and fly on to their advance bases—or to their targets—without having to land.

England is the only theater in the world where American forces of all services operate under the over-all command of the United States Air Force.

BURTONWOOD DEPOT SUPPLIES ALL

The big Air Force depot at Burtonwood is central supply headquarters for all American forces in uniform in the United Kingdom. It even provisions three United States Navy destroyers which call regularly at the port of Liverpool.

Top commander of the theater since the Air Force operations began in July 1948, has been Maj Gen. Leon W. Johnson, hero of the Ploesti oil field raids of 1943, and holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When Johnson and his advance party of Air Force men came to England in 1948 his command was known as the Third Air Division.

But by May of this year, it had grown so big that the Third Air Division was elevated to the status of the Third Air Force.

At the same time a new air division, the Seventh, was created to help with the increasingly complex operation.

HOW DUTIES ARE ALLOCATED

Today the organization set-up is this:

Third Air Force, under General Johnson, does all the "housekeeping," supervises the construction work, supports the Air Force groups training in England, and keeps the bases in readiness for instant use in case of emergency.

Seventh Air Division, now commanded by Gen John P. McConnell, supervises the Strategic Air Command's training program and has operational control of all units sent to England temporarily for training.

The only combat air units directly under General Johnson's Third Air Force are the F-86 Sabre jets which arrived toward the end for August for "permanent" duty in England.

BATTALIONS FROM FORT MEADE

Also under Johnson's command is the Thirty-second Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade—an Army outfit—which was sent to England early in the summer to ease the strain of British antiaircraft forces which had been guarding all American stations here.

But all the materials they use are furnished and paid for by the British.

"This is the kind of cooperation that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization dreams about," one high-ranking American officer said recently.

COOPERATION BETWEEN FRIENDS

"If we hadn't had British help in the last 3 years, I don't know what we would have done. Of course, we're helping to protect them, but they've gone a lot further than their agreement in helping us, even when it meant sharing materials and facilities that were insufficient even for their own needs."

If old Joe Stalin could come over here and have a look around, one officer suggested, it might make some difference in his plans.

"And of all the things he'd see, probably nothing would impress him more than the open-handed, open-hearted, friendly cooperation between the RAF and the United States Air Force."

"He Went About Doing Good"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave of the House I am inserting as an extension of my own remarks an address delivered by the Honorable Oscar Ewing, of New York, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, before a dinner meeting of commissioners of local housing authorities, National Association of Housing Officials in Washington October 10, 1951.

I particularly like the Administrator's quotation from the Bible—"He went about doing good"—for it gives scriptural authority for being a little less than our brother's keeper and a little more than a cold and selfish seeker after personal advantage.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF HOUSING

(By Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator)

A few days ago I came across some lines written a generation back by a great American named Jacob Riis. His words are probably familiar to all of you who are here tonight, but they seem to me to be so apt that they bear repeating. What Jacob Riis said was this:

"The most pitiful victim of city life is not the slum child who dies, but the slum child who lives. Every time a child dies, the Nation loses a prospective citizen, but in every slum child the Nation has a probable consumptive and a possible criminal."

Times have changed since that statement was made. We are beginning to make a real dent in the slums of America—partly because the people of this country have awakened to the essential truth of the warnings about the menace of bad housing, and largely because of the hard work and businesslike approach of citizens like yourselves. You as commissioners of local housing authorities have gladly accepted the responsibilities thrust upon you by your neighbors. You have taken on the job of making the way our people live better tomorrow than it was yesterday. You have a right to be proud of the progress you have made; and you, more than anyone else, have a right to point to the progress we must yet make. In a time of national emergency, you have an intimate knowledge of the way in which the pressures of international tension are already slowing up the steady American advance toward the goal of a decent housing for every family in the United States.

The complexities of our time have not yet made it possible for us to say that Jacob Riis' comments are merely ancient history—that they have no connection with 1951. They do have a very real connection, all too often. And Riis was very modern in his insistence on the intimate relationship between housing, health, and social behavior. We all recognize today that you cannot separate any one of these things from the others. We know there is not merely a relationship among them, but that they are all part of the same thing—that a nation cannot be free and prosperous and happy unless three-fourths of its people are well-housed, well-clothed, well-nourished, and, in the medical sense, just plain well.

The Federal Security Agency is the arm of the Federal Government responsible for carrying out laws affecting the health, the education, and the family security of the American people. Sometimes our critics describe our staff as do-gooders. I do not know

the origin of this phrase, as it applies to people who want to make America fulfill the great promise of its wealth and freedom; but I do know that one of the greatest single sentences in the Bible is this: "He went about doing good." I have enough religious feeling to believe that this simple description is worthy of emulation by lesser mortals.

Yet the curious fact is that doing good, in this sense, always means something more than doing the right thing, which, God knows, is a worthy end in itself. We have long since discovered that doing good means doing something which, in the long run, benefits ourselves. Sometimes the benefit merely rests in the satisfaction we may feel. There is a story about Abraham Lincoln, walking along a dusty country road in Illinois, arguing with a friend that no human being ever does anything except for selfish motives. As they were walking, they noticed a pig caught in a fence, squealing loudly, unable to move backward or forward. Lincoln glanced at the pig, walked on a few steps, and then suddenly broke away and freed the trapped animal. His friend was victorious. He asked Lincoln whether there was any conceivable selfish reason for having helped the animal. But Abe Lincoln had an answer for that. He said that if he had not done so, he would not have been able to sleep that night, and what could be more selfish than his desire for a good night's sleep?

We want decent housing for Americans, not only because the lack of such housing makes it hard for us to sleep at night, but also because we know that the safety, the security, the health, the prosperity, the very happiness of the entire Nation depends upon decent housing. Two years ago, in the 1949 Housing Act, Congress stated the basic aims of our national housing policy. Congress declared "that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require . . . the realization, as soon as feasible, of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

I go along with that. I am sure you do, too.

Right now too many people in this country still cannot afford satisfactory housing. In spite of the prior demands of military defense, we must continue to recognize that the housing program is important, that, in the long pull, it is essential to our survival as a Nation.

Every health official in America, or anywhere else, knows that good housing and good health go hand in hand. For slums are not merely places where unfortunate people find themselves compelled to live. They are also the homes of the germ and the virus, of the disease-carrying insect, of the unsanitary conditions that breed ill health. They are the homes of preventable disease, of preventable death, of human suffering. And they are centers from which spread out the health threats to the rest of the community as well. I do not need to tell you, who are experts in housing, that there is a vicious cycle that must be broken—the cycle of poverty, of malnutrition, of ill health, of inadequate education, of low living standards, of crime and delinquency. This is where most of our greatest social dangers arise. You may have heard a good deal in recent months about the terrible dangers of narcotics addiction among young people. But you should never forget that the overwhelming majority of adolescents who become addicts are products of this very vicious cycle.

A striking example of how all these forces tie together—and of how the Federal Security Agency is concerned in them—has just reached the point of public attention. It involves not only housing and health, but also mental stability and even our national defenses. This is a research study in mental health for which I announced just yesterday a Public Health Service research grant of \$27,850. The problem which

this study will investigate is how the overcrowded living quarters in a boom town, and the lack of community health and education facilities and recreation outlets affect workers' emotional stability and productive output.

That is certainly a timely and most urgent question. But there is no novelty in what I am saying now. A man could sit in an ivory tower, surrounded only by books and papers, and arrive at these conclusions by the simple processes of elementary logic. But in our Agency we see the theory borne out by the realistic requirements of our work. We know from practical experience that—although poor housing itself is not solely to blame—it is the residents of poor housing who most need the assistance of the health, welfare, and education activities of the Federal Security Agency. As local housing experts, I am sure you will corroborate my statement that a disproportionately large amount of your local welfare and health services, along with the fire and police services of your communities, are expended in the areas of substandard housing.

You know, better than I, how the rates of crime and juvenile delinquency and disease go down among the residents of your low-income housing projects after they have moved out of slum dwellings. That is why the low-income housing projects that you operate, and the slum clearance and urban redevelopment projects which are under way, are stepping stones in our American drive to raise the living standards of the people of this country. Without this essential fulfillment of their need for a decent home which they can afford, it is hardly possible to see how people with low incomes could go ahead and improve their health, pay their debts, open a savings account at the bank, and become self-respecting, self-supporting citizens.

Since 1949 we have had an agreement between the Housing and Home Finance Agency and our Public Health Service, formalizing the working relationship that has existed between them for many years. This agreement defines the basic principles of collaboration between housing and health authorities all over the country. It says, "Appreciation of housing and environmental conditions is fundamental to a full understanding of the problem of community health, likewise, an appreciation of public health is fundamental to an intelligent and informed approach to the problems of housing and community development."

Let's translate that into facts and figures. Somewhere between thirty and forty million Americans are living, at this very moment, in the kind of homes that endanger their health. The 1950 housing census shows that we have 6,800,000 overcrowded dwellings and 3,400,000 dwellings that are both dilapidated and lacking in hot water, private toilet, or private bath. We have 5,300,000 dwellings, not recorded as dilapidated, but without private bath or toilet. We have 6,900,000 that have no piped running water. Then there are over twelve million dwelling units with no bathtub or shower, and nearly two million where the bath or shower facilities are shared.

These places are seedbeds of preventable disease, crime, juvenile delinquency—and, I may add, of possible dissatisfaction with the American way of life. They are also a drain on our national finances.

I think you may know that I have for some years been expressing my concern over the high cost of medical and hospital care in this country. I believe that the President's health program would go very far in solving the problems raised by these high costs. But I think there are other ways that will help solve those problems, too.

Let me give you an example. We all know how expensive hospital care becomes for

patients with prolonged or chronic illnesses. Even if these persons have money of their own, they must often go into debt to pay their hospital bills. If they cannot afford to pay the bills, then the community must do so for them. Either way, the cost is tremendous. Now, one reason for these great costs is that many people are compelled to stay in hospitals for long periods simply because they do not have decent homes to go back to. In the slums you hardly find a suitable environment for recovery and treatment. Without toilet facilities, without adequate heat in the cold months, without the chance for elementary cleanliness at home, they would be returning, not to good health but, in all likelihood, to worse health than before. So they must stay on in the hospitals until their doctors are ready to take the risk of saying that they are strong enough to withstand the dangers of substandard housing. Recent studies in home care for prolonged illness show that if we had decent housing the cost of hospitalization would be cut down immeasurably.

In the same way, better housing for less money will free a portion of limited incomes for better medical care, education, and food. Careful planning and site selection will strengthen the stability of the neighborhood, will reduce traffic hazards and accidents, will make possible better recreational facilities, and will improve facilities for water supply, sewage, and refuse disposal. All these are needed for an improvement in public health. And I have not even mentioned what may well be one of the most important health considerations of all—the advantages of security, of physical health, of well-being, of dignity and pride in establishing of conditions making for better mental health.

I notice that recent studies seem to indicate that one of the reasons for the increase of mental illness has been the steady increase in the number and proportion of older people among our population. One does not have to be a psychiatrist to understand why this may be so. The blunt truth is that we have only begun to understand how badly prepared we are for the revolutionary change that has occurred in the make-up of our population in America. More and more Americans are living longer. The implications of that simple fact are well nigh staggering. For it means that we are going to have to adjust our national habits to the census statistics. Today, without meaning to be cruel or unfair, we are still too prone to reject the older people among us. There is too often no place for them in our crowded lives.

I think that, in the next few years, you will find yourselves spending more and more time on the problems of housing for older people. Already it is rare to find families living in houses or apartments large enough to make room for the old folks. When you combine this with the fact that older people are three to five times more likely to suffer from long-term illness, and with the further fact that more than half the women over 65 are widowed and alone, and with the additional fact that advancing years usually mean a reduction in income, you can understand the scope of this growing problem.

I think most older couples want to live in homes of their own. I do not believe they want to be segregated in villages for older people exclusively. They prefer to live in neighborhoods familiar to them. In Denver, units for older people are scattered through apartment buildings and public housing projects. I think this is a good pattern.

But I believe we have much research to do, beyond this. We need dwelling places especially designed for the needs of our older people—places that will satisfy their need for higher temperatures, that will give adequate light for failing eyesight, that will

make it easy for them to get around without staircases and high thresholds, that will have floors which are smooth but not slippery, that will afford easy access to warm water, that will be especially fire-resistant, that will guarantee special safety for gas appliances when people begin to lose their sense of smell. These and a thousand other considerations will be needed by older people, and in the next few years it seems to me that we must speed up our planning to satisfy such needs.

By 1980 we may expect to have twice as many men and women 65 and over as we have today. We cannot wait for 1980 to be upon us before we start to adapt our housing to their requirements.

One thing you may well want to consider right now. Last year, at the request of President Truman, I called the first National Conference on Aging. At the conference we discussed the housing problems inherent in the aging population of the United States. We recognized the growing pressure on local housing authorities to provide for older people who are physically capable of maintaining homes of their own but cannot pay an economic rent. We also recognized that public housing accommodates a certain number of older persons in the natural course of providing housing for low-income families. But, as families mature and children leave, as a husband or wife dies, many authorities feel that a single person who is left should move out and make room for larger families.

The conference felt that public housing ought to include accommodations for all kinds of people within the accepted income limits. To make this possible, it was suggested that the term "family" might well be redefined so as to include single individuals as well as couples among the aging. I think this is going to be increasingly important as time passes. Changing a definition will not accomplish very much by itself, but as additional funds become available in the future it will be possible for local housing authorities to make use of the changed definition by making room for these people who are now being left out.

As a matter of fact, many States and local communities all over the country are setting up committees to study older people's needs, including housing, and to help them solve their problems. I would like to urge you, as housing specialists, to join these groups whenever you can. You have a great deal to offer them, and by working with these people from the public health, education, social welfare, nursing, and other fields, you can make real progress even though you are waiting for funds.

And what about the other end of the scale of years the children of America? Surely I do not have to ring the changes on importance of decent housing for the future of our children. Jacob Rlis said that the slum child who lived was worse off than the one who died. Well, I have been reading the recent study of infant mortality in Chicago's public-housing projects, published in our Children's Bureau magazine, *The Child*. The survey showed that babies living in these communities had a better chance for surviving that first and most dangerous year of life than did those in neighborhoods surrounding the projects. As a matter of fact, they had a better chance than all babies in Chicago, and a better chance than all babies in the 106 largest cities in America considered as a whole. The reason was not only good housing but good health facilities as well. The study described the adequate living space, better light and ventilation, daily garbage disposal, complete sanitary facilities, central heating, screens to keep out the summer flies. It talked about one project, Altgeld Gardens, with 4,000 children, where you will find a nursery school, an elementary school, a high school, a prenatal clinic and

an infant-welfare station operated by the city board of health, a branch of the public library, a church, a consumer cooperative, a community-activities building, and many playgrounds.

You know as well as I do that a community like this is not only going to have good housing and good health, but also happy, well-adjusted self-supporting residents. You know as well as I do that the child who lives there not only has a chance to stay alive, but also a chance to make something out of his life. When Jacob Riis made his dour comment, he was propagandizing for just this kind of progress. Our job, it seems to me, is to carry this progress forward. And I commend to you the suggestions in this field that were made last December at the 1950 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Many of our aspirations as a nation have to make way temporarily for the pressures of the times. We aspire to a decent home for every American family. We aspire to adequate public housing that will meet the needs of all low-income families in America. We seek these things because they are good in themselves, and because they will strengthen the Nation as a whole.

But it is obvious that we are not going to be able to move ahead as rapidly as we would like. The shortages of materials, the diversion of funds for military and foreign-aid programs, the concentration on the very essentials of national defense—these take top priority. We can place the first blame on the men in the Kremlin for having slowed us up in our drive for a better life for the American people.

Yet, we shall have only ourselves to blame if we make the mistake of transforming temporary delays into permanent inactivity. Even yet we cannot tell whether we shall have to live through, not a year or 2 years, but a generation of emergency. If that happens, the needs that we recognize in housing, in public education, in public health, in social security, become themselves a key to the Nation's survival. We cannot fall into the trap, over the next 20 years, of dealing only with superemergency situations.

Recently we have had legislation for defense housing and community facilities and services, providing financial assistance for communities with critical needs created by the new situation. The job of administering this act has been given to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, along with the Federal Security Agency. This is important. But we would make a disastrous error if we thought it covered the whole job.

Over the long pull, the essential strengths of America will tell the tale of the ultimate victory of the free world. What are these strengths? Our devotion to freedom and democracy and the rule of law. Our religious faith. Our respect for the individual. These are spiritual things. Along with them, we have the physical strengths: Our capacity to work, and our great productive might. Our homes. Our health. Our knowledge. Our family security. Our readiness to accept responsibility for one another.

These are all abiding strengths. They can be the weapons which may very well win the world-wide struggle of ideologies for us without the need for unlimbering the terrible new weapons of our military arsenals. And what greater strength is there among these, except our faith in God, than the promise to every American, whoever he is, whatever he is, that his home will indeed be his castle, that it will be a good home, a safe home, a healthy home, a happy home, a home that stands as the very symbol of America? This is the promise you hold in your hands, as housing commissioners. You are to be congratulated for having a job that is so important, so good, and so right.

Utilization of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am advised at the present time there are over 2,500,000 employees working for the Federal Government. Although our country is at peace, this is an all-time high in the history of this country. It is estimated that the annual payroll for civilian employees during the next year will be more than \$10,000,000,000. It is equal to 16 percent of the total Federal revenues during the same year. In other words, with our revenues at the highest peak, one-sixth of the total amount is required to pay the employees in Federal service.

It is my view that if the Civil Service Commission, together with the heads of the agencies, would make a real effort to utilize its services and employment, the cost of civilian employment could be reduced as much as \$2,000,000,000.

For many years I have urged the Civil Service Commission to assume what I believe to be its rightful obligation under the Civil Service Act of 1893 and adopt an aggressive, forceful attitude in dealing with the personnel activities of the Federal Government. During the past several years, however, the Civil Service Commission has delegated many of what I believe to be its duties and responsibilities to the departments and agencies of the Government. This has had a serious effect upon Federal personnel administration and has produced inequities, violations of the Veterans' Preference Act and, in many instances, a complete disregard of the merit system. This neglect by the Commission has resulted in waste and inefficiency and is contributing to low morale among the rank and file of Federal employees in the Government service.

It is my opinion that in view of the salaries and wages now being paid to Federal employees, the public is entitled to the best of service. It is my belief that nothing should stand in the way of greater efficiency and economy in the Federal Government. I believe also that most employees want to render that service.

I am concerned with respect to the increased Federal employment that is presently planned for the remainder of the fiscal year. One agency alone, I am advised, wants to add 10,000 more employees to its payroll. By wise and judicious spending, I believe that the additional cost for salary increases can be absorbed by the departments and agencies of Government without additional appropriations. I also believe that with proper utilization of employment, additional workers are not necessary.

Many Federal employees have complained to me recently concerning the lack of a uniform personnel policy in the Government service. Personnel offices

are engaged in recruiting key personnel from other departments and agencies and this pirating is causing confusion and is producing inefficiency. The turnover by reason of the transfers between agencies is at an all-time high. This chaotic state exists because the Civil Service Commission lacks the courage and foresight to deal with the problem adequately. The Commission should be more than merely a policeman. It should prevent personnel abuses and require the departments and agencies to adhere to a uniform, consistent and basic personnel policy which recognizes the Government as a single employer. As matters now stand, certain departments and agencies make raids on the personnel of other departments and agencies.

If the heads of these agencies and bureaus would look around and alert themselves to their responsibilities as I think they should, they would find that in many places there is a duplication and multiplication of effort that is unnecessary, and they would also find that there is a considerable amount of overemployment in many places. Another thing they will find if they look around into the matter is that in many places employees are devoting a lot of time writing up job sheets in efforts to be put in higher grades, rather than follow the procedure of acquiring these positions in regular order. Along with that, they will find a lack of uniformity in job descriptions which causes one agency to employ persons at higher salaries than they would receive in other agencies performing the same work.

The numerous boards of examiners which have been created in the departments and agencies are further examples of waste of Federal funds. This practice should be eliminated and the Civil Service Commission should conduct examinations for most positions in the Government as it was originally intended to do. Continual violations of the Veterans' Preference Act must be stopped. An effective Government-wide promotional policy should be developed.

The Federal Government pays salaries equal to or in excess of those paid for similar work in private industry. It becomes the obligation of the executive branch to improve Federal personnel policies within the framework of civil-service law. Although the present national emergency has made it necessary to employ persons on an indefinite basis, there is no reason why the merit civil service must be scrapped. I believe that in times of national emergency, as well as in normal times, it is important to observe basic principles. These principles have not been followed for the past 10 years in the Federal civil service. I am hopeful that immediate action will be taken by the Civil Service Commission and the President to correct this situation.

I also call upon the heads of the various agencies, bureaus, and commissions to see to it that the personnel in Government service is utilized in every way possible, and that improvements for the betterment and for the efficiency of our

Government are made effective everywhere it can be done, and in addition thereto, see to it that the best possible service by all employees is rendered to the American people of this country. The public is entitled to it.

**Statement of Hon. Harry P. Cain, of
Washington**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement relating to Senate bill 458, introduced by me on January 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. President, on January 15, 1951, I introduced Senate bill 458, directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent-in-fee to Marie James Wilson, of Tacoma, Wash., to lands allotted to her on the Quinalt Indian Reservation in the State of Washington. Before introducing this bill, I made an exhaustive investigation into the matter as to whether or not this Indian is qualified to handle her own affairs and if it would be for her best interest and all concerned that a patent-in-fee should be issued. As a result of my investigation into this case, I am firmly convinced that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, by refusing to issue to her a patent-in-fee to her allotment so that she would be able to negotiate for herself a sale for her land and timber, has caused her grievous injury to body and mind, and is, by such action by the Indian Bureau, deprived of proper medical care and proper food and clothing.

Mrs. Wilson has not at any time lived under the Indian Bureau. She is an educated woman of the age of 42 years, she has been married, but is divorced from her husband and is now being dependent upon the State of Washington for relief assistance and is living with her relatives. She was educated in the public schools and business colleges in the State of Washington, and after graduation was employed for many years as a stenographer and bookkeeper. Mrs. Wilson is now in such a physical condition that she is unable to work for her livelihood and is compelled to depend on State relief and live with her sister who is 64 years old and who subsists on a Spanish War widow's pension of \$40 per month. Such a condition exists because of Indian Bureau policies. Although Mrs. Wilson is possessed of property valued at approximately \$30,000, the Indian Bureau, by its policies and its bureaucratic schemes, are cheating this woman out of thousands of dollars, and defrauding the State of Washington out of large sums of money by reason of the fact that this Indian woman is compelled to keep her land in a trust status so that the State of Washington cannot collect or be reimbursed for relief money paid to this Indian citizen, either during her lifetime or from her estate in case of her death.

Surely the Indian Bureau will permit Mrs. Wilson to sell her land to another Indian, by doing so, this land would remain in a trust status, and if this land is sold to another

Indian, Mrs. Wilson would be compelled to sell her allotment for a price far less than its worth. The price of \$10,000 has been declared as its value by the Indian Bureau and that is the price which another Indian would pay, which is an approximate loss of \$20,000 to Mrs. Wilson. If this land is owned in fee by Mrs. Wilson, which is her wish, she would be able to negotiate for herself for the sale of the timber on her allotment. She states that she now has an offer for her timber, which offer would realize to her from \$25,000 to \$30,000. She also states that if she is permitted to handle such transaction herself, she would not be compelled to pay out of the proceeds received from such sale 8 or 10 percent to the Indian Bureau for its alleged administration costs for handling such sale for her. If the fee title of this land is in Mrs. Wilson or disposed of by her, this land would go onto the tax rolls of the county and State, and the State of Washington would be reimbursed for the relief money which it has expended for and on behalf of this citizen.

In a recent letter which I have received from Mrs. Wilson, among other things she states:

"For the past year, I have been and am now destitute. I have been unable to work because of my physical condition. I have used up all my savings. I made application for relief in Tacoma, Wash., and for 2 months received food vouchers of \$20.95 per month and no other assistance. The welfare office wrote to Taholah Indian office in regard to me, and the Indian office advised the welfare office that they were trying to sell my allotment and that I was a ward of the Government of the United States. For these reasons, the welfare office cut off all assistance to me and said that I must look to the United States for assistance since I was a ward of the Government.

"I have been trying to get help from the United States through the Taholah Indian office since February 1947, without any success whatever. Three and one-half months ago, I was advised by the Indian office that I could sell my allotment to another Indian. I offered to sell the same at a sacrifice to Frank W. Law of Taholah, who is an Indian. Mr. Law obtained a description of my land from the office, but has never tried to make a deal with me for the purchase of my land, although I have contacted him many times. Mr. Law is not interested in buying my allotment, nor am I able to sell it to any other Indian that I know of.

"At the present time I am staying with my widowed sister, Mrs. Yerkes, who is 64 years of age and is the widow of a Spanish War veteran, and subsists on a Spanish War veteran widow's pension of \$40 per month. I have no place to stay except with Mrs. Yerkes and she has no home of her own. We are living with her son, Chester Millett, in Tacoma, Wash., and there are six of us in the household, and we are really imposing on Chester Millett to be staying with him. There are many times when we do not have enough or anything to eat, and I am supposed to be on a special diet of fruits and juices because of my kidney operation.

"I have made application to private charities, such as the Red Cross, for assistance, but I am always given the same answer, that since I am a ward of the United States, and have lands of my own, I should get my help from the United States.

"At the present time I am absolutely destitute, I have no money to buy food; I have no property except my Indian allotment, I have no clothes except the clothes that I am wearing. I am sick and unable to work and I will not be able to get well unless I can have money to buy proper food.

"I earnestly and respectfully request the Government of the United States to fulfill its duty to me as my guardian, and issue a fee patent to me for my land."

Mrs. Wilson first applied to the Indian Office for a patent in fee to her land in September 1947, but ever since that time, through its devious New Deal and Fair Deal methods, the Indian Bureau has continued to refuse to afford her relief. Mrs. Wilson is now destitute and living in poverty, although she is possessed of property which she can, if permitted to sell, realize from \$25,000 to \$30,000, which amount would be sufficient to care for her during the balance of her life.

The claim of the Secretary of the Interior and his Indian Bureau that this land is situated so that it must be operated as a unit with other allotments is indefensible. This 80-acre tract of land is situated one-fourth of a mile from a State highway and Mrs. Wilson has a 40-foot road right-of-way from the State highway to her allotment. Two Indian allotments adjoining Mrs. Wilson's allotment are being, or have been, logged off by the Indian owners so the contention of the Indian Bureau that the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Wilson's allotment would be detrimental to all Indian owners within the unit is fallacious, and such a statement by high officials of our Government has no place in the dealings with our Indian citizens or any other citizens. It shows lack of candor, lack of honorable and fair dealing. It is a case of deliberate action on the part of the Indian Bureau to distort the facts and conceal the true facts from the Congress, it shows an utter disregard for duty and reflects a contempt for the legislative branch of the Government.

I am among many who believe that the Indian Bureau has outlived its usefulness and should be abolished, but how can we get rid of this cancerous octopus? Demands for the abolishment of the Indian Bureau have been made in the past decade and longer, but the Indian Bureau seems to thrive on such demands, it seems to get stronger and more entrenched.

The declared policy and goal of the present Department of the Interior is "to bring about acceptance and full recognition of the Indian as a citizen of the State in which he resides with all the rights and privileges extended to other citizens, and also with the responsibility and duties of such citizenship."

Such a declaration, in my judgment, is simply some more lip service.

The investigating staff of the House Committee on Appropriations recently asserted:

"In general terms the effectiveness of the management of the Bureau (Indian Bureau) may be evaluated from the single statement that although the Bureau has, for many years, given lip service to the principle that its activities were pointed toward the eventual withdrawal of Federal supervision over Indian activities, the accomplishments have been nil."

The House Committee on Appropriations, in its recent report dated April 20, 1951 (H. Rept. 339, 82d Cong.), made the following declaration:

"The committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of Indians into the general population. Unless this is done, the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able fully to enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship."

Similar declarations of this House committee have been made practically annually for the past several years, however, such declarations apparently have left no impressions upon the Indian Bureau.

Perhaps the Indian Bureau regard such declarations by the House Appropriations Committee as "lip service" as that committee adopted a certain proviso contained in the appropriations bill on which it is said

report (H. Rept. 339, 82d Cong.) was made, the proviso reads:

"Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary."

This language has the effect of transferring the authority of the Congress to disburse such tribal funds to the Indian Bureau and its puppet tribal councils.

I shall cite you a case which happened to meet my constituents and the State of Washington.

Mrs. Lola M. Kiralfy of Spokane, Wash., a member of the Colville tribe owned an allotment situated within the boundaries of the Colville Indian Reservation, consisting of approximately 110 acres of land, which land is surrounded by white-owned land and no Indians living within several miles of it. Mrs. Kiralfy made application to the Indian Office for a patent-in-fee so that she could dispose of same. The Indian Office refused to issue to her a patent-in-fee claiming that the land was situated in an area which consisted of Indian-owned lands, which statement I am reliably informed is not true. However, on March 15, 1951, I introduced a bill, S 1153, directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mrs. Kiralfy a patent-in-fee to her allotment. Presumably, the Indian Bureau could not make their claim good that this land was not an isolated parcel of land, and since the Indian Bureau, together with its puppet tribal council, have control over the tribal funds of the Colville Indians, amounting to the sum in excess of \$1,000,000, the Indian Bureau and its puppet tribal council, I am reliably informed, doubled the price which was offered by the white man, and refused to accept the white man's bid, even though the white man was willing to meet the higher bid, and now this land will remain in tribal ownership and non-taxable, thereby the bureaucrats continue to entrench themselves at the expense of the Indians and the taxpayers, and this was done without the consent or the knowledge of the Congress.

Such a provision as the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate have permitted to become a law is detrimental to the welfare of the Indians and the taxpayers. If such a change in the policy in the use of tribal funds was contemplated, I submit that such proposed legislation should at least have been considered by a legislative committee. I am convinced that a legislative committee, where such proposed legislation could have been given full and proper consideration, would not have approved of such a policy.

The Indian Bureau continually comes before the committees of Congress with pleas for money and authority to use tribal funds to purchase additional lands so as to square up or block up the lands it now controls in order to make these landholdings simpler to administer. These bureaucrats always profess they can simplify their management problems if they could only get more land under their control. They never can see that their problems would be lessened and simplified if they disgorged themselves of part of the vast land holdings over which they now hold dominion.

Mrs. Wilson is an intelligent, educated woman and has not overlooked any effort to obtain relief from her present situation, such as appealing to the National Congress of American Indians, through Mr. Frank George of the Colville tribe, Nespelem, Wash., and appearing in person at its annual convention held at Bellingham, Wash., in the month of August 1950, but such efforts were

to no avail. I am informed that the Congress of American Indians is supposed to have for one of its objects to assist Indians with their problems. However, I am also informed that this organization was organized by Indian Bureau employees and ex-employees, and is practically an adjunct of the Indian Bureau, like Mr. Frank George, one of its vice presidents, is an Indian Bureau employee at the Colville Indian Agency of Colville, Wash., and one who does things for it. I fear this intelligent woman was ill-advised when she appealed to Mr. George and the Congress of American Indians for help.

Personally, I see no hope for the Indians nor the taxpayers so long as the present administration is in power with its impractical, visionary and socialistic planners, with the Ickes, Colliers, Cohus, Bronsons, James E. Currys, National Congress of American Indians, and other such Indian Bureau infused organizations, dictating the administration's policies. But, what do you expect when Mr. Truman refused to turn his back on such people. What we need is a Republican administration which will turn the rascals out.

I mailed a copy of the report of the Secretary of the Interior dated April 2, 1951, on Senate bill 458 to Mrs. Wilson with the request that she fully state the true facts concerning this matter, and I submit for the Record a copy of said Secretary of the Interior's report and the letter addressed to me from Mrs. Wilson dated May 26, 1951. The letters are as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C. April 2, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Reference is made to your request for a report on S. 458, a bill providing for the issuance of a patent in fee to Marie James Wilson.

I recommend that the bill be not enacted. The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Marie James Wilson, Quinalt allottee No. 1339, patent in fee to her 80-acre allotment on the Quinalt Indian Reservation, described as the east half northeast quarter section 15, township 23 north, range 11 west, Willamette meridian, Washington. This tract of land has valuable timber on it, appraised at about \$10,000, and is located within the Crane Creek timber sale unit. This unit was recently offered for sale, but the successful bidder failed to execute the contract and his deposit was forfeited and distributed among the allottees, Mrs. Wilson receiving \$274.13. Plans are under way to readvertise the entire unit, and if it is sold, Mrs. Wilson will be paid a part of the purchase price immediately and the balance in accordance with the terms of the sale.

Timbered lands must be administered, logged, and operated as a unit in order to make them attractive to the lumber companies and to bring the best prices for the owners. The issuance of fee patents to scattered tracts throughout a unit would be detrimental to all Indian owners within the unit and might result in sales at prices below the appraised values.

In the interest of Mrs. Wilson, of other members of the tribe who have holdings within the sale unit, and of the tribe it is not advisable to issue patents to individual tracts within the timber sale unit.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,
DALE E. DOTY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

TACOMA, WASH., May 26, 1951.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CAIN: Am replying to the adverse report made by the Secretary of the Interior to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in regard to my Senate bill 458, providing for the issuance of a patent in fee to lands allotted to me on the Quinalt Indian Reservation. I hope to prove in the following paragraphs that such a report from the Secretary of the Interior is erroneous, and I can easily prove my statements.

To begin with, I, Marie J. Wilson, am 42 years old, a member of the Quinalt Tribe, three-fourths degree Indian blood, and having an allotment (No. 1339) consisting of 80 acres of timber on the Quinalt Indian Reservation, situated at location as follows: The east half of the northeast quarter of section 15, in township 23, north of range 11, west of the Willamette meridian, Washington. The land described is one-fourth mile off State highway and is in what the Indian Bureau calls the Crane Creek unit.

I am a divorcee; I attended public school 9 years. I graduated from the eighth grade at Park Avenue School in Tacoma, Wash. I completed ninth grade at Weatherwax High School, Aberdeen, and an 8-month business course at the Grays Harbor Business College in Aberdeen, Wash. In 1928 you didn't have to be a high-school graduate in order to go to business college. I worked as a bookkeeper and typist for a number of years, during the Second World War, I was a shipping clerk in a furniture factory in Tacoma, Wash., and up to the day I was stricken on my way to work I had been a floorlady at a large frozen-food plant at the port of Tacoma, at Tacoma, Wash., having under my jurisdiction approximately 54 women.

June of 1946 I was struck ill with tuberculosis of the left kidney which I had removed at the Tacoma Indian Hospital. I have had an additional three more operations to date. When I was stricken ill I had a savings account and a number of war bonds saved. I lived off my savings until they were exhausted, thus forcing me to apply to the Pierce County welfare for aid. After 3 years, the Tacoma Indian Hospital advised me that they could not help me further, as in my case I needed specialists. I went to the welfare and they gave me my doctoring and medication to a certain extent, until May 1, 1951, when they discontinued it due to lack of funds. I am being cut 25 percent of my check the 1st of June 1951, leaving me a balance of \$51 a month for room, food, doctoring, and medication, which simply can't be done. I first wrote to the Taholah Indian Agency, February 1947, and stated my circumstances and asked for assistance of some kind. I have appealed to the Department of the Interior directly in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Secretary of the Interior, but all the assistance I received was a promise to help me in the near future.

I first wrote you, Mr. CAIN, January 1949, asking for help in my case. In June 1950, I wrote to the Governor of our State and asked him to intercede for me to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, being I was taken care of by the State. Governor Langlie then appointed Mr. William K. Moores, Assistant Director of Social Security to help me in any way or form. I was granted an audience at the State capitol July 1950, and stated my case.

Mr. Moores and I attended the National Congress of American Indians at Bellingham, Wash., August 1950, and met Justice N. B. Johnson of Oklahoma City. I also met D. S. Myer, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and

I stated my case to him, but as usual I received no help.

The Secretary of the Interior, in his adverse report, states that the Crane Creek unit was recently offered for sale, but failed to execute its contract, thus forfeiting the deposit money and paying me a sum of \$274.13. The unit was sold September 23, 1949, to Rayonier, Inc., at Hoquiam, Wash., the deposit was \$163,000. Two extensions of time were granted to Rayonier, Inc., by the Secretary of the Interior, the second extension expiring April 12, 1950. On November 16, 1950, I received \$274.13 from the forfeiture money, but what the Secretary of the Interior failed to add to his report was that I owed the United States Treasury the sum of \$180 for a reimbursable loan, and which the Indian Bureau so generously held out of the said \$274.13 (U S Treasury check No 41,276, November 16, 1950, symbol 892,224), leaving me a balance of \$94.13. How long does the Secretary of the Interior think this will last?

The Secretary of the Interior also reports that plans are under way to readvertise the entire Crane Creek unit and, if sold, I would receive a part of the purchase price immediately and the balance in accordance with the terms of the sale. In my case, I don't agree with a unit sale, and here are my reasons: The Secretary stated my tract of land was appraised at \$10,000. I have a buyer in Seattle, Wash., who has had his cruisers up on my claim and stated that I could easily get between \$25,000 and \$30,000 for my timber, and have offered me the same, if I were granted a patent in fee. My buyer would advance me \$10,000 and pay me as they cut the rest out. They are ready to move in just as soon as I get my fee patent. Can the Indian Bureau do as well for me and not keep me waiting? The cruise on a large-unit sale is based on standing timber, and a 1917 cruise at that. My allotment is half wind-blown; therefore, the cruise on the remaining standing timber wouldn't warrant a very large down payment. Indian Bureau advocates 25 percent down payment, which, in my case, would be approximately \$2,500, at the Secretary's own figure as to the valuation of my allotment. Then the forestry department in the Hoquiam office would then take out 8 or 10 percent for expenditures of handling contracts, cruisers, etc. Time the Indian Bureau deducted everything, I wouldn't have enough left to buy me a one-room house. If I did find one that cheap, then I'd be forced to go back on the Welfare for another 6 years until I received another payment on my claim. I'd be right back where I started, only difference would be I'd have a home to mortgage to the Welfare while they took care of me. I have a permanent disability and cannot work.

The Secretary of the Interior also stated that an issuance of fee patents to scattered tracts throughout a unit would be detrimental to all Indian owners within the unit. Again I disagree with the Secretary in regard to my own allotment. My allotment is situated one-fourth mile off the State highway. I have a lifetime 40-foot right-of-way directly to my claim. The right-of-way contract is held at the Hoquiam office, it goes through two of my nephews' allotments or parts of it. I started building a road in 1934 and my nephews have finished it practically to my southwest quarter of my land. One of my nephews, Censur J. Yerkes, has logged most of his own claim and part of his brother's, which is next to mine. The allotments I would have to go through are nearly logged or salvaged. The allotment on the southwest side of my claim has been salvaged, so therefore I wouldn't be breaking up forest lands, in fact the Indian Bureau has let three allotments joining mine to log and salvage, there if it's so detrimental to all Indian owners, to use the Secretary's own statement, why did the Indian Bureau let the three owners log? Two of the owners

being my own nephews? My nephews didn't just salvage, they took out green timber, over \$8,000 worth, and the Indian Bureau didn't stop them. What's more, the Indian Bureau didn't receive one cent for stumpage, but the owner kept same. How about those same three claims, aren't they being detrimental to my own allotment? Surely the Secretary of the Interior should have received more information on my case before committing himself as I don't make an accusation unless I can prove my point.

How about the order No. 420, which was approved August 14, 1933, by Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, precluding further sales of Indian allotments, issuance of fee patents, etc. I will quote from that bill "that no more trust or restricted Indian lands, allotted or inherited, shall be offered for sale, nor certificates of competency, a patent in fee, or removal of restrictions be submitted to the Indian Office for approval, except in individual cases of great distress or other emergency where it appears absolutely necessary that a restricted Indian tract of land be offered for sale for relief purposes." Doesn't the Secretary of the Interior think my case comes under this ruling? What more do I have to do to prove my case?

The Indian Bureau is always stating to the public at large that they want the Indian to be self-supporting and develop their natural resources. Well, my natural resources is my timber, and I'm qualified to handle my own affairs. I never bothered the Indian Bureau until my health broke and was forced to go on relief. Then I only asked to sell what is rightly mine. I wasn't begging, but wanted to sell my land and make a home for myself in my ailing years and to invest in a little business that would give me financial security the balance of my life. Is that asking too much of the Secretary of the Interior? Isn't that the American way of life that the Government officials in Washington are always talking about or does that rule only apply to foreigners and not to the American Indian?

I earnestly and respectfully request the Government of the United States to fulfill its duty to me as my guardian and issue a fee in patent to me for my land.

Sincerely,

MARIE J. WILSON.

Address of State Senator Russell Bontrager, of Indiana, Before Indiana Republican Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by State Senator Russell Bontrager, of Indiana, before a luncheon of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association at Indianapolis, Ind.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Indiana's Republican press, I deem it a privilege to be permitted to address a group of people who have long been numbered among those who can be depended upon to fight for the cause of liberty and freedom. Many have been the times

during the last two decades when you, as the representatives of one of America's few remaining completely free institutions, have gone to battle against the encroachment of those things which would destroy the fabric of our American way of life.

You have asked me to tell you about Indiana's historic fight with the fourth branch of our Federal Government—bureaucracy. I welcome the opportunity to do that because I consider the issues at stake to be fundamental, and the outcome of that struggle may well affect every American citizen. I say that because, in my humble opinion, the volley which we fired out here on the banks of the Wabash may well be recorded in history as the opening round in a crucial battle for the preservation of constitutional government.

As a preface to the story, permit me to draw upon a personal experience which was mine some 5 years ago. I will do so solely for the purpose of pointing up some observations which I will want to leave with you.

Five years ago this last spring, I discovered that a considerable area right in the middle of an otherwise lovely lawn surrounding my home had become infested with buckhorn. All of you know what the weed is and what it can do to a lawn. So numerous were the plants that it almost appeared as though the patch in question had resulted from a deliberate sowing of noxious seeds.

Of course I was concerned and immediately set about trying to do something about the situation. I started in the the only way I knew how. Sitting flat on the ground I began, with a long-bladed knife, to dig out that buckhorn, one plant at a time. All summer long I kept the situation under control. As each weed seedling appeared it was promptly destroyed and the plant from which it sprang was dug out of the ground. When fall arrived I felt sure the problem was licked.

You can well imagine my consternation when it was discovered, the following spring, that not only had my efforts to eradicate the original patch failed, but the area infested had actually increased in size.

You see, I had failed to get all of the roots.

During three consecutive summers the process of watchful waiting and digging was repeated. Each succeeding spring it became more and more apparent that no real progress was being made. While the lawn was kept in fairly good condition on the surface the roots kept right on growing and expanding down underneath where they couldn't be reached.

And then someone told me about one of the then comparatively new weed killing preparations. With considerable skepticism, and yet with renewed hope, I began the spray treatment. In its insatiable quest for more substance to feed upon, those little plants drank up every drop of the lethal doses administered. Sucking the stuff into its veins one plant after another carried the poison to the remotest molecule of its deepest root. And then it died.

Today, scarcely a scar remains on that lawn and when a new buckhorn dares to rear its head, one good shot of toxin does the job.

Somewhere along the path of America's history, my friends, someone has been guilty of sowing seeds of cockle. For a long time, now, patches of weed called socialism have been growing in America's fertile fields of liberty. In every patch that has appeared, the grasses of freedom are slowly but surely being choked out.

Last January, a majority of the legislators in your assembly came upon a patch of buckhorn; only it was called by a different name. In fact, the name was rather appealing. It was "public welfare." Even more deceiving than the name was the appearance. On the surface it blended well in color and texture with the surrounding grasses. But the cloak of secrecy which separated the foliage from the roots was so opaque as to

deny Indiana's citizenry an opportunity to see what was going on underneath. Some of us who thought we knew something about the hidden springs upon which the roots were feeding, decided to do something about it.

And so it was that Senator Wesley Malone and I fashioned for ourselves a knife with which to dig down beneath the surface. We wanted to get some of the roots for examination. We felt that maybe some of the pretty foliage that appeared on the surface had been grafted onto the roots of a more sinister plant.

We called our knife Senate bill 86.

As originally introduced, Senate bill 86 did no more than mandate county welfare departments to place quarterly reports into the hands of the county council, the prosecuting attorney, and the county auditor. Each of those officials was already entitled, under the law, to access to welfare records, but only for purposes directly connected with the administration of public welfare. We had information that those officials were, in many instances, being denied access to the records. We felt that county councils should have the information so that they could intelligently process allegations and complaints concerning frauds. And, we felt that the records should be on file in the auditor's office so that all public officials could have access to them.

Let me make it clear that Senate bill 86 was not an "anti-secrecy" bill, insofar as permitting public inspection was concerned.

When the bill was called for second reading, Senator Judson West, a Democrat from Indianapolis, offered an amendment which threw all welfare records open to full public inspection. That amendment was adopted without a single dissenting vote—either Republican or Democrat.

On the day before the bill was scheduled for third reading, the Indianapolis Star published a letter from Oscar Ewing, in which he threatened to withhold Federal funds if we passed the bill.

The following morning the Democratic Members of the Senate had a several hour caucus in the Governor's office, following which they voted against the bill to a man—including Judson West, whose amendment had a few days previously been unanimously accepted. The bill was passed on strictly party lines. As passed, in the Senate, it would have opened all welfare records to full public inspection.

The bill was sent on to the House for legislative processing. Before final passage in the House, the bill was again amended, putting it back into substantially the same form as originally introduced excepting that township trustees were added to the list of officials with whom the reports must be filed. Again the reason for including trustees is obvious. They, as you know, are charged by law with the administration of direct relief apart from the welfare program. We felt that they should have the lists as a means of guarding against duplication of assistance awards.

By the time the bill was passed by the house time was running out. There was danger of losing the bill entirely if it should be referred to a conference committee, so a motion was offered in the senate to concur with the house amendments. The motion prevailed, and the bill was enrolled and sent to the Governor for action.

As you know, the Governor vetoed the bill. In his veto message he stated that he had been informed by competent legal authority that the act violated the Federal statute, and to permit it to become law would result in losing Indiana's Federal funds. Significantly, I think, he failed to identify the "competent legal authority." It is custom-

ary for the Governor to base a veto upon the advice of his attorney general. We have every reason to believe that that was not true in this case.

Well, the Governor's veto was overridden, and senate bill 86 went into the statute books. Since it contained no emergency clause, it did not become effective until the acts were promulgated on July 20, 1951.

In the meantime, Governor Schricker, according to his own statement in his address to the special session of the assembly, given on September 24, directed the State department of public welfare to request a ruling from Oscar Ewing as to whether or not we were in conflict. He has never taken the trouble to explain to any of us just why he took the initiative in bringing about a hearing which ultimately resulted in a temporary loss of Federal funds. Nor has he told us why, after the withdrawal of funds, his appointee, Maurice O. Hunt, State director of public welfare, asked Oscar Ewing whether or not we could spend something in excess of \$1,000,000 of Federal funds already in our possession. That actually happened, and as one would naturally surmise, Ewing said "No." Some of us entertain a sneaking suspicion that maybe Henry had his ears trained toward Ewing while his eyes were focused on a seat in the United States Senate. To be blunt—we think he was playing politics. Events of the special session would seem to confirm that suspicion. Further support is lent to our suspicion by the quotation of Oscar Ewing, carried in the public press, to the effect that he had, at all times, had the cooperation of Gov. Henry F. Schricker and Lieutenant Governor Watkins.

A hearing was held before Oscar Ewing in Washington on May 15, 1951. I will not dwell upon that hearing, but I do suggest that as many of you as can find it convenient to do so, stop by the attorney general's office and spend an hour or two reading the transcript of that hearing. You will get at least a glimpse of how a power-drunk little man with dictatorial ambitions operates.

On July 31, Ewing booted Indiana off the gravy plane of Federal funds for welfare purposes. But he didn't realize that we had a parachute strapped to our back when he kicked us out. He forgot that Congress was still in session, and that we had BILL JENNER and CHARLEY HALLECK on our team. He underestimated the spirit possessed by president pro tempore of the senate, John W. Van Ness, and speaker of the house, W. O. Hughes. He didn't know the stuff of which the Republican members of the legislature were composed.

Equally important, he failed to properly measure the temper of the American people as expressed by the resolution adopted by 46 of the 48 chief executives of the sovereign States of the United States of America, demanding that Congress do something about the secrecy provisions of the Federal law.

On September 24 the legislature was called into special session. Governor Schricker, cooperating with Ewing, served notice that unless we would retreat by September 30, we would irrevocably lose the \$3,600,000 represented by the check which arrived in Indianapolis yesterday.

Lieutenant Governor Watkins and every soul in the Democrat delegations in both the House and the Senate likewise were still cooperating. Five times the Senate voted on the so-called escalator bill which will insure Indiana's needy against further arbitrary action by Oscar Ewing. Five times the Democrats voted solidly against it. And, finally, when the Senate was asked to concur with House amendments to a Senate bill which gave an insurance policy against reprisals from Washington, Lieutenant Governor Watkins, in one of the brazen pieces of "roller skating" ever witnessed in legislative halls, attempted to scuttle the whole program by completely reversing a previous

ruling, made by himself, and sustained a point of order addressed to the House amendments. On appeal from his decision, we overruled him, and on a roll-call vote on the motion to concur, every Democrat in attendance in the Senate once more voted "No."

And so the bitter struggle ended at 4:10 p. m. yesterday when the House adjourned sine die. The so-called "escalator-formula clause" bill now reposes in the Governor's office. It remains to be seen whether or not the Democrat legislators' desperate efforts to scuttle will finally prevail through the medium of a veto. Not later than next Wednesday p. m. we will know just how well Henry is cooperating with Oscar Ewing now.

The special session closed, we legislators will return to our homes to try to gather up the pieces of our several businesses and professions. You gentlemen of the press will have other subjects to headline. But, I trust, none of us will kid ourselves into believing that the fight against encroachment of bureaucracy upon liberty and freedom has been won. Make no mistake about it, we have done little more than clip a few seed pods. The roots are still intact.

We still have Oscar Ewing at the steering wheel of a vehicle powered by an ideology completely foreign to the American way of life as envisioned by the architects of our citadel of liberty. That ideology is summed up in one sentence taken from this booklet, which was printed by the United States Government Printing Office at the expense of America's taxpayers, a book which has been distributed by the Federal Security Agency as an interpretation for staff in public-assistance agencies: a book which has been a bible of instruction for welfare workers all over America. "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

No, my friends; you can't destroy that philosophy by opening relief rolls. You can't destroy it by digging out a few chiselers who have exploited the welfare program. And while I am not advocating an abandonment of public assistance, I am saying to you, that unless we do destroy the philosophy upon which the public-welfare program as presently constituted is built, it will carry down the drain the American way of life as we have known it.

Our experience here in Indiana has made us aware of the fact that we have come precariously close to the point where every man must come, hat in hand, seeking an alms from that government to the support of which we have given our all.

As a result of the action of Oscar Ewing we know that the price which we have paid for the "fools gold" which Washington has been pawning off onto us under the noble banner of security is bondage.

We know that in our blind mad quest for security, we have, little by little, been sacrificing our liberty.

We know that it is about time that somebody starts loading the spray-gun for action. That gun is going to have to be loaded with a lethal dose, the effects of which, when sprayed upon the cockle growing in American fields, will be carried to the farthestmost roots of the insidious plant that is slowly but surely crowding out our grasses of liberty and freedom.

We know the ingredients for making the dose. If we will but mix a little freedom of opportunity with freedom from bureaucratic control; throw in a handful or two of good old-fashioned incentive, add a shot of courage fortified with the moral and spiritual values possessed by our forefathers; stir with a liberal supply of faith in the American system as the one which truly offers the last

best hope of earth, and then temper the whole brew with the principles of constitutional government, we will come up with a prescription that will do the job.

You gentlemen of the press have the spray gun in your hands. It is the free press of America. What you will do with it is up to you. The best gun in the world, loaded with the most lethal spray obtainable, will be totally ineffectual if some one doesn't pump the handle.

Those of us who have been picking seed pods are willing to continue doing so. We will help you mix the ingredients for use as a spray. We only ask that you man the handles.

The Meat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on October 17, 1951, on the subject of the meat industry, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

MEAT INDUSTRY DEFENSE WINS SENATOR PRAISE—SCHOEPPEL CHALLENGES MORGAN CHARGES

Senator SCHOEPPEL, Republican of Kansas, is being showered with praise for his speech last week challenging Edward P. Morgan to put up or shut up in the latter's attack against the cattle industry.

Morgan, enforcement director of the Office of Price Stabilization, charged last week that the meat industry is sabotaging the entire price-control program.

SPEECH CIRCULATED

SCHOEPPEL's speech was given wide circulation by radio commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr.

As a result, SCHOEPPEL is receiving the congratulations of his fellow Senators, mid-western cattlemen who resent what they regard as Morgan's effort to defame them, and individual voters in his home State.

CALLED IRRESPONSIBLE

SCHOEPPEL called Morgan's claim that 38 percent of the Nation's slaughterers are violating meat controls an irresponsible accusation.

"In what I consider to be a high-handed fashion," SCHOEPPEL told the Senate, "this same Mr. Morgan has threatened to jail American businessmen who do not comply with the directives of his agency."

"If Mr. Morgan knows of any violation of the law, as an enforcement official, I am sure all of us would like to see him immediately proceed to prove those violations in a court of law and punish the violators. Let him refrain from indulging in these attacks."

WORKED WITH TYDINGS

SCHOEPPEL recalled that Morgan had been general counsel of the Tydings committee which was charged with investigating the infiltration of Communists into the State Department.

The Tydings investigation was labeled a "whitewash" by prominent Republican Senators.

SCHOEPPEL declared that Morgan was not as belligerent or militant in investigating subversives as he is in accusing American businessmen "of threatening to destroy the price-control program."

The Kansas Senator declared that Morgan allowed former Communist Party leader Earl Browder to live up to Browder's boast that he was using the Tydings committee as a "transmission belt for Communist propaganda."

BROWDER COOPERATIVE

SCHOEPPEL added that many persons believed Morgan did not lay a proper legal foundation for the contempt citations against known Communists. These citations were later dismissed by the courts, which found, SCHOEPPEL said, "that Mr. Browder was most cooperative with Morgan."

"Did this now bellicose individual, who is threatening American businessmen, threaten the Communists when they were before him? No, the record is clear," SCHOEPPEL told the Senate.

"My memory extends back to the Pearl Harbor affair," SCHOEPPEL continued. "Many called it a whitewash investigation, too. Who participated as counsel in those hearings?"

"Was it not Edward P. Morgan?"

DOUBTS THOROUGHNESS

"Did he dig in and present all the facts? There have been grave doubts expressed as to that."

"I for one am glad that the American Meat Institute, Inc., is not as cooperative with Mr. Morgan as was Earl Browder," SCHOEPPEL declared. "Let Mr. Morgan talk less and bring these cases into the open, into the courts. Let him cease to charge unidentified groups of American citizens."

"Let him refrain from accusing the great cattle and packing industry of the United States. Let Mr. Morgan put it on the line as to violations, or admit that he is just talking."

BLAMED ON OPS

SCHOEPPEL put into the RECORD a statement from the Meat Institute in Chicago, which replied that "time, and not loose talk and mischievous allegations will prove that everything wrong with meat is the result of OPS's own price-control regulations, which threaten complete destruction of the consumer's meat supply in legal trade channels."

The National Independent Meat Packers Association also declared restrictive price controls are keeping meat off the market. The packers association declared "there is a reasonably adequate supply of meat and the people ought to be getting it."

Opportunities Open in Foreign Service for Negroes Under Democratic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, some wit described the Democratic Party as a state of mind because of its heterogeneity and its lack of dogmatic approach to public issues.

That is a gentle impeachment, more praise than blame. Because the Democratic Party is free of dogma and of

domination by vested interests, it is able to make its actions speak louder than words from the Republicans. On racial questions, the Democratic Party is probably burdened with some of the most fanatic fanatics known to man.

The difference is that the huge civilized and progressive wing of the Democratic Party actually progresses in all branches of government despite the heavy burden. For decades the Republicans have been trying to live on Lincoln's greatness in human relations; but the myth is worn out.

Everywhere in America today there is less discrimination toward all minorities and less prejudice, too, because of the progressive Democratic administration.

A most shining example is the Department of State, which, under Republican administrations, established a tradition of not allowing an American Negro to rise above the grade of messenger except in relations with Liberia. Today discrimination has virtually disappeared in the Department of State, even in the Foreign Service.

It gives me pleasure to insert in the RECORD, under leave, the following news story by Miss Alice A. Dunnigan which appeared in the Washington Afro-American of August 14, 1951, testifying to the new opportunities:

FORTY SERVE IN DIPLOMATIC SERVICE IN FOREIGN FIELD

(By Alice A. Dunnigan)

WASHINGTON.—More colored Americans are serving the United States Government in diplomatic establishments, embassies, legations, and consulates abroad than ever before. Some 40 persons are stationed in a score of foreign countries, serving in various capacities. These range from an ambassador at \$15,000 a year and prerequisites down to stenographers and guards with salaries of about \$3,000.

For many years colored persons were confined to two or three foreign areas. Liberia has had a colored staff for years. There have been consuls and clerks at Lisbon, Portugal, Azores Islands, and Canary Islands. But Secretary of State Dean Acheson, with the approval of President Truman and the cooperation of half a dozen career men in the State Department, has pushed a change in assignments.

The State Department is more sensitive to the reaction of other countries to America's preaching of democracy than are other governmental agencies or business.

The representatives have had to bear the brunt of answering questions from foreigners, often black, brown, or yellow, about the status of colored people in democratic America.

GROUP BEHIND INTEGRATION

For a number of years a small group in the State Department has been urging the integration of colored persons into various embassy and legation staffs. They have sought to break up the solid colored staff in Liberia. Among those who have been working toward that end were:

George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State; Harold Sims, area officer, African Division; Andrew Lynch, now in Tripoli; Henry S. Villard; Garland Farmer, chief, African desk; Clare Timberlake, consul-general, Bombay; and Dr. Ruth C. Sloan, United States Information Service. The Korean war and current manpower shortage also have helped open up opportunities.

It is not easy to discover all of the colored persons in State Department service. Apparently no record is kept by race. Through contacting personnel officers and looking back over past records, it is possible to list most of the group. They are:

THOSE ON RECORD

Rudolph Aggrey is in Lagos, Nigeria. His father, a famous African educator, was one of the founders of Achimota College. John P. Baynard, of Pennsylvania, is in Liberia. J. T. Beaver, Jr., from Dayton, Ohio, is in Tenerife, Canary Islands. David B. Bolen, Heflina, La., is in Monrovia.

William P. Boswell, of New Jersey. Lena Bridges, of New York, and Lillie M. Hubbard, of Chicago, are at the consulate in Ponta Delgada, Azores Islands. Solomon H. Bostic is in the embassy at Athens, Greece. Beatrice M. Carson, of Louisville, is a stenographer in Paris. Florida E. Denham is on the staff at Frankfurt, Germany.

Charles Davis, of New York, is in Cairo, Egypt. Edward R. Dudley, Ambassador to Liberia, occupies the top rung in diplomatic assignments. Lamar E. Forte, Kissimmee, Fla., is an agriculturist in Liberia; Rita Garth, of New York, is stationed in Monrovia, as is John S. George, a native of Washington, D. C. His wife, Ida, is an attaché of the Liberia consul.

TRANSFERRED TO DENMARK

William C. George recently was transferred to Copenhagen, Denmark. Willis Holloway, of Phoebus, Va., is in Monrovia as is Thomas Hopkins. Charles Hanson, Jr., of New York City, last year became vice consul in Zurich, Switzerland. Giles A. Hubert, formerly of FSA and is now en route to Bombay, India, to be vice consul.

Rupert A. Lloyd, of the District of Columbia, has been second secretary and vice consul at the American embassy in Paris for 3 years. Carl T. Mebane, of Connecticut, is in the Embassy in London. Ruth Phillips, of Harrisburg, Pa., is in Monrovia. Frank E. Pinder, of Key West, Fla., of the agricultural mission in Liberia has returned to the United States on leave.

ONE IN INDONESIA

Eugene D. Sawyer, of Kansas City and Washington, has been serving as information officer for USIS in Liberia and now goes to New Delhi, India. Mack M. Speights, Jr., is in Manila, Philippine Islands. Herbert C. Tate, former attorney in New Jersey, has gone to Karachi, Pakistan. Myrtle E. Thorne is in Medan, Indonesia, while James Todd is at Cairo.

Orville Lewis, of Manassas, Va., Harold Ward and Albert Witcher are in Liberia; and Lawrence B. Wilson, of Los Angeles, is in New Delhi, India. Dean of the service is Clifford R. Wharton who serves as consul general in Lisbon, Portugal.

Forests and Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Col. William B. Greeley is one of Washington State's most distinguished citizens. He has devoted a lifetime of energy and intelligence to the development of the Pacific Northwest and to the management and preservation of its forests. Colonel Greeley has written *Forests and Men*,

which, in my view, is the best book written in our time on the struggle between man and forests, and the forces of competitive enterprise versus the social planners who dictate how each taxpaying tree in the United States be cut by mimeographed instructions from Washington, D. C., our Nation's Capital.

Mr. William D. Hagenstein, a personal friend and timber authority, has written a splendid review of Colonel Greeley's book. This review may well arouse a full measure of interest in thousands who have never visited the Pacific Northwest. It will certainly find favor with those who know anything about trees. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hagenstein's review be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FORESTS AND MEN BY WILLIAM B. GREELEY; 255 PAGES, DOUBLEDAY & Co., INC., NEW YORK, 1951

(By W. D. Hagenstein)

No man in the United States is more qualified to write the factual story of lumbering and forestry in America than Col. W. B. Greeley. After 50 years—half as a public forester, half as an industrial tree grower—Colonel Greeley has set down a chronicle which will hold the interest of every lumberman and forester.

He dedicates his book, *Forests and Men*, "to the men of the woods—the cruisers, loggers, rangers, and foresters," whom he knows so well.

Forestry has always seemed to advance following some great tragedy—a catastrophic fire, a disastrous insect epidemic, or a destructive war. Colonel Greeley begins his narrative with a stirring account of the desolating 1910 fires of Idaho and Montana. It was here where Forester Greeley first made his mark as a forestry leader. His conviction then as it is now was that the No. 1 job of American forestry was preventing smoke in the woods.

His saga of free land and timber tells the story of free land and cheap timber which over a century helped develop the United States as the best fed, best housed, most satisfied Nation on earth. He chronicles the abuses and misuses of land and trees, a big part of which occurred before general public awareness of or interest in converting the timber mine to the timber crop.

His chapter entitled "The Great Crusade" with intimate behind-the-scenes flashes of the Theodore Roosevelt-Gifford Pinchot era is a fascinating tale of determined men carrying the torch for ideals they fiercely believed. No pioneers in the history of the United States worked so hard as that handful of young foresters gathered around Pinchot to do so much for the wise use of the Nation's resources. The watchword of their crusade was timber famine and their dire predictions of the South, the Lake States and, indeed, the Nation, of running out of trees long before Colonel Greeley's book was written were used dramatically to make any lumberman who gambled his capital and skill in supplying a growing Nation with its lumber needs the arch enemy of conservation. No single crusade in history so changed American public opinion and American politics as did the cry of timber famine.

It took the young forestry profession a long time to change the color of the lens in its ideological bifocals so that it could clearly see the problems of converting a seemingly limitless virgin forest resource to the growing trees of a stable economy.

Hewing to his lifelong philosophy of first things first, it is no wonder that Greeley

teamed up with the western forestry genius, E. T. Allen, in working out practical cooperative forest fire protection which became the Clarke-McNary Act. Tree growing, without adequate protection, was a hazardous business at best, and Greeley as Chief of the Forest Service in the 1920's helped make the Clarke-McNary Act work with his watchwords of "cooperation and education."

After his monumental job as Chief of the Forest Service, it's no wonder that the west coast lumber industry turned over its helm to Greeley in 1928 to steer them out of the "dismal swamp" of chronic overproduction, cheap timber, inadequate forest protection, and adverse freight rates. During his tenure as secretary-manager of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association the end of cheap timber arrived and the longest sellers' market in the 300-year-old history of the American lumber industry has held away. Greeley's account of the impact of this market on forestry throughout the Nation is a story without precedent in the annals of American business.

Colonel Greeley, practical forester, has stood head and shoulders above most men of his profession in being a principal advocate for full crop utilization because of his realization that full use of what the forest is capable of growing is what pays the timber-growing bill.

Colonel Greeley's analysis of the ideological struggle between those who would grow timber by Federal fiat, as opposed to those who would grow it under the profit motive incentives of free enterprise is as clear-cut a picture as has ever been set in type in our day. Greeley maintains that "teachers" rather than "policemen" will bring forestry about in the American woods faster, more efficiently, and democratically.

Greeley's clear thinking and speaking has always been one of the glories of the forestry profession and the lumber industry. In one concluding paragraph, he neatly sums of his absorbing story.

"The forest story is very largely the story of America. The zest for free land and the almighty dollar, the creation of new skills and industries, the craze for bigger and better sawmills—all are part of our people and temperament. The commercial genius of the country was never displayed more dramatically than in the industrialization of the depleted pineries of the South or the teaming up of wood technology and forest management since the outbreak of World War II. And just as true to the American heritage are the challenge and idealism of conservation. From our own experience and leadership we have created an enduring philosophy of restraint and forethought in the use of natural resources."

Address by Telford Taylor, Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Telford Taylor, Administrator of the newly created Small Defense Plants Administration, made an excellent talk in Boston before the Smaller Business Association of New England. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

The most important part of my meeting with your association has already taken place. As you know I took the oath of office as Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration only a few days ago. The agency is a new-born infant, and its organization and program are in a very early stage of development.

If, therefore, the only purpose of my visit to Boston had been to make a speech, it would have been time ill-spent. And that is why I said that my major purpose in coming here has already been fulfilled. That purpose was to seize this early and welcome opportunity to sit down, informally, with the officers and members of your association, and hear from them, at first hand and with plenty of time for discussion, their statement of the problems that face small business today, and their suggestions for a practical and effective program of action. I didn't come to Boston to give a lecture. I came to listen and learn. I have been listening all day, and I think I have learned a lot.

As soon as some of the basic organizational problems of the new agency have been dealt with, I hope to make similar trips to other parts of the country. But I am especially pleased that I have had this chance at the very outset and before any of the inevitable mistakes have been made, to come to Boston. My parents were both born and raised here, and my grandfathers were both Boston businessmen—small-business men. So my family roots are here and my upbringing and education has been in the New England tradition.

But this occasion is fitting for other than personal reasons. Historically, New England is the cradle of our industrial and commercial life. It was here that the pattern was set. No other region of our country offers as rich and varied an example of small-business activity as New England. Of its business enterprises, 85 percent employ less than 100 workers and 94 percent less than 500. New England business is almost synonymous with small business.

New England, therefore, typifies the small-business tradition and contribution. But, of course, this is a Nation-wide problem. I happen to be an up-State New Yorker by birth and rearing, and a New York City lawyer by profession. New York City is stereotyped as the citadel of big business and bankers. But it is also a great center of small business. And it goes without saying that, throughout the rest of the country—North, West, and South—small business is a vital organ of our national economy.

There is no mystery, therefore, about the basis for the Federal Government's concern for the continued health and welfare of small business. For many years the Department of Commerce has laid great emphasis on the needs of small business, and has served them well. The Emergency Defense Agencies have established small business sections or offices to assist small business. What, then, is the reason for a new and independent agency?

I think the reasons Congress had in mind in enacting the law which established the SDPA are quite clear from the House and Senate hearings and reports. Despite the best efforts and good will of all concerned, procurement under the current partial mobilization program has shown a definite trend toward concentration in the very largest manufacturing corporations. I do not want to bore you with a lot of figures, or to pretend that I have a lot of figures at my command so soon after taking office. But, according to the latest figures released by the Munitions Board, the dollar volume of defense contracts awarded to small companies has declined from 24.5 percent in the fiscal year 1950 to 21 percent in the fiscal year

1951—a decline of nearly 15 percent. The proportion of prime defense contracts allocated to the largest corporations—whether you take the largest 10, or 20, or 50—is far higher than it was during the recent war.

Hand in hand with this trend toward concentration of procurement, we are now facing increasing shortages of materials. Only 10 days ago NPA Administrator Manly Fleischmann said that so far as the first and second quarters of next year are concerned, the outlook is, to use his word, "dismal." He went further, and told a group of Senators and Congressmen, members of the Small Business Committees and Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses, that: "The cuts that we have made will mean that there will be localized unemployment, loss of profits to many manufacturers of nonessential civilian goods, and the actual closing down of plants which cannot operate on the limited supplies of aluminum, copper, and steel which will be made available to them. We have hoped to hold such unhappy developments to a minimum, but there is no dodging the fact that many will be hurt."

Now, no new agency is going to be able to end the international tensions which give rise to these difficulties and dislocations. Nor is it going to be able to transmute wish into fact and discover large quantities of steel, copper, or aluminum when our actual supplies are in fact stretched to the limit. But I think Congress felt, and rightly, that the problems which are now swarming around the head of the small-business man, like so many bees, call for a creation of an agency whose sole and exclusive function will be to grapple with these problems and to be the spokesman of and claimant for small business. That is the way I envisage this job, and I know that is the way Congress envisioned it. The support for this agency was impressively broad and completely nonpartisan in both Houses of Congress. More than 50 Senators—Democrats, Republicans, easterners, westerners, and southerners—sponsored the legislation in the Senate. In the House, where the Small Business Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee have been so alert to small-business interests, the unanimity was equally impressive. And of the basis of this unanimity was, I am sure, the desire to have a focus of responsibility in an agency with no duties whatsoever other than to speak and claim for small business. As one of the Senators who has been most active in this field told me, "I am tired of beating on a score of administrative heads. I want one head to beat on." And then he made a significant gesture.

Now this is all very well, but the question remains, what is inside the head that the Senator proposes to beat upon? I did not pretend to the Congress, and I will not pretend here, that I have broad or long-continued experience with business, large or small. During most of the past 10 years I have been overseas. Nevertheless, both in my law practice and my earlier government experience, I have repeatedly been brought into contact with small-business problems and, I think, have developed at least an approach and a sympathy. In my law practice I have represented small businesses in the fields of electronics and communications and prepared food. Until I took this Federal office, I was a director of a small developmental electronics company in New York City. Before the war, when I served as general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission, I became deeply involved in small-business problems in the radio field. Much of what the Commission did at that time was for the purpose of preserving the health and independence of the small radio stations. So I can assure you that I am approaching this task with enthusiasm and a firm belief in its importance. And I hope to compensate for my lack of expertness with the help of associates and colleagues who

are better qualified in that respect, and by frequent consultation with associations such as yours.

I am not going to take your time with a clause by clause description of the SDPA legislative provisions and authority. I imagine that most of you are pretty familiar with the law already. Obviously, our task during the next few weeks will be to assemble the nucleus of an organization geared to serve small-business men. I am determined, as I know Congress is, that businessmen shall not have to run to Washington with all their problems. We want to be on the spot to help, and I have had many valuable suggestions from your association with respect to decentralization and regional representation.

It will be my purpose to assemble a lean, rather than a fat, organization. Manpower and talent are at a premium today just as much as steel and copper. The success of this new agency is not going to be gauged by its size or how much noise it makes. I hope that the agency will come to be respected for its economy of operation as well as for its sincerity of purpose to accomplish the ends for which Congress designed it.

The temper of the SDPA, therefore, will be determined but not combative. It will be a combination of a lubricant and a stimulant. This is not going to be any holy war between big business and small business. There is no reason for conflict, there is every reason for cooperation. Big business and small business are dependent upon each other for mutual health and, indeed, survival. The concept of a supple, flexible, and competitive economic structure is deeply imbedded in our law, and is a vital element of our political tradition, irrespective of partisan considerations. Monopoly means death to free enterprise, and inevitably leads to the internal decay of the monopoly itself.

These things I feel very deeply, and I have had abundant opportunity to observe the unhappy results which ensue under a monolithic, totalitarian, economy. Germany under Hitler went through a period of economic mobilization just before the war which the Nazis called the 4-year plan. Nearly 75 percent of the procurement under the 4-year plan fell to a single gigantic combine—the I G Farben Chemicals Group. The Farben chemists produced wonderful formulae, and learned how to turn German coal into gasoline and rubber and explosives which Germany so desperately lacked and needed. But Germany paid a terrible price for this concentration of industrial power, in economic as well as political and human terms. We cannot afford to go down this road and, if we do, we shall end in defeat, through our own short-sightedness, at the hands of the very forces against which our defense efforts are directed.

Least of all is it the purpose of the new SDPA to obstruct or delay the defense program. On the contrary, its purpose is to support and strengthen defense production by expanding its resources and giving wider scope and fuller opportunity for the contribution of ideas and products that small business can make. By this very process, we can also insure that the strains and stresses of defense production do not work a fundamental dislocation of our economic structure, and throw it out of balance in a way that would soon be harmful to the defense program itself, and ultimately fatal to the national welfare.

The purposes of the Small Defense Plants Administration are, therefore, not only in line with but an integral part of our political and economical tradition. They are highly conservative, in the best and most precise meaning of that much abused word.

I know, therefore, that New England businessmen, large and small, will welcome the new agency and support its purposes. It is here in New England that the free-enter-

prise tradition struck root and has found its most eloquent expression. I want to thank all of you for the invaluable support which you have already given the agency, no less than for the courtesy and hospitality with which I have been received. I am returning to Washington taking great comfort in the realization that we have formed a partnership—a conservative partnership—which will go far to insure the success of this undertaking.

The Fundamental Issue in the Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, not long ago I was privileged to address the Western Republican Conference which met in Seattle, Wash. This conference brought together Republican leaders and workers from the 11 Western States. I spoke to them of the fundamental issue which is of the greatest importance and significance to millions of American citizens. In order that citizens elsewhere may be given an opportunity to agree or argue with my point of view, I ask unanimous consent that the address to which I have made reference be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE IN THE CRISIS

(Address of United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN before the Western Republican Conference, Seattle, Wash., October 15, 1951)

I

This meeting of Republican leaders from the 11 far Western States has been called to consider the problems of the coming campaign.

The duty assigned to me for the day is to discuss briefly the fundamental issues.

I certainly welcome the opportunity.

My text is based on two recent quotations.

1 On September 20, the President said that Democratic victory was certain because the Republicans had no issues.

2 One day later a discouraged constituent said to me: "The farm leaders have sold out to the administration. The labor leaders have sold out to the administration. The business leaders have sold out to the administration. Is there anybody left who cares anything about the people?"

I recommend to the Republicans that they start thinking about the people.

You will recall that on September 4 the President addressed a meeting of Democratic Party workers in San Francisco. He was exultant in his prophecies about 1952. He was exultant in his claims that the administration had brought about peace and abounding prosperity. He was exultant when he said that voters knew it and would sustain the Democratic Party at the polls next year.

He spoke of prosperity but didn't say anything about the savage taxes that will hit our people with redoubled force next year.

He spoke of peace, but didn't say anything about the strange meat grinder war in Korea where American soldiers are forbidden to press to victory and instead ebb their blood away in a planned stalemate.

He spoke of prosperity and said never a word about the fact that where in 1940 you

could get a box of shredded wheat for 8 cents it costs 19 cents now. He didn't say anything about the fact that while in 1940 a pound of Maxwell House coffee cost 25 cents you have to pay 93 cents a pound today.

He spoke of peace and the achievements of the New Deal and the Fair Deal in promoting world concord, and said never a word about Yalta where Russia was all but handed the world on a platter.

He spoke of prosperity and said never a word about milk coats, RFC shake-downs, and the corruption, the bribery, and the grafting uncovered every day in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Yes, we have peace—a brooding, dreadful, blood-soaked peace that threatens to explode at any moment.

Yes, we have prosperity—a gangster prosperity of criminal alliances and 50-cent dollars.

The President says the Republicans have no issue.

I say the Republicans have many issues, but they have one issue above all. The future of the American people.

You know as well as I the depth of the anxiety that pervades this country.

The question is: What are the Republicans going to do about it?

Do you remember what happened at 12 o'clock noon, eastern standard time, on April 19, 1951?

An old soldier, through with many of the tasks of life, stripped of his command and discharged in disgrace by the President, addressed the United States Congress.

And throughout this country there occurred an extraordinary phenomenon.

From coast to coast work stopped.

In homes and in offices, in saloons, in front of garages, in movie houses, in schools, in the open air, wherever there was a television or a radio, crowds listened breathless to the old man. The emotional tension was often beyond bearing. Some Members of Congress wept and I saw them weeping unashamed.

And Congressmen were not the only ones in tears. It was common everywhere.

What do you suppose was the explanation of this outburst?

Was it because all these millions of people had day by day followed with meticulous care what this elderly veteran had done over the years?

Of course it wasn't.

Then what was the explanation?

It was this:

A harassed, badgered, and anxious people, baffled beyond endurance by the actions of their Government and fearful that in some dreadful way their country and their future were being betrayed, felt that someone who could be trusted was telling them what they had to do.

Like a lightning flash, the country's true state of mind was revealed.

An old soldier, in the sunset of his life, was making his last official farewell. He had done his duty and was through. And as he said good-by, he pointed out to his fellow countrymen in tones confident, serene, and unafraid, the truths which everyone knew in their hearts were true.

It was, in effect, a call to the younger men and women to shoulder the responsibilities which they had neglected, to take the risks which must be taken.

Then the echoes of the old man's voice died away and our people were left once more with the dreadful question of their country and its future.

Do you ask me if the Republicans have an issue?

They do indeed.

II

In November 1948, 22,000,000 voters declared for Dewey as against 24,000,000 who voted for Truman. That is an enormous vote and shows that Republican ranks still

hold and that the core of Republican strength is still sound.

But the situation before us demands a sense of blunt realism. Republicans must grasp the really crucial character of the coming election.

In this election, I believe, the great single issue of our time will be finally resolved.

The issue is this: Shall the people control their Government or shall their Government control them?

For 22 years, since the crash of 1929, this issue has been swaying in the balance. The decision cannot be postponed much longer.

I believe that the Republicans can win this struggle but they can do it only if they search their minds and hearts, rid themselves of cant, accept the issue on its merits, and fight.

It is absolutely essential that our young people understand what the issue is.

In large part this issue is going to be decided by the young men and women under 35, going straight down the line to those just out of high school and headed for the armed services.

What's the prospect ahead of a boy of 18 or 20 today?

The law now says he must put in 2 years of military service.

That's all right, but something tells this boy that it may be far more than 2 years.

He feels, somehow, he knows that if the Korean slaughterhouse is an illustration—our Government either has no policy or it has put one it does not dare to reveal openly.

In any case he feels, he knows that he will be callously flung into the meat grinder and that nobody at home—save his family—will care what happens to him.

And that boy is right, I must say that it's a pretty dreary day in the history of this Republic when we have to admit that the boy is right.

You have got to be able to look these young people in the eye and say:

"We are going to put this mess at home to rights. If it turns out that you have to fight for your country, we propose to fix it so that you know what you are fighting for, that your future is a matter of anxious concern of those at home and that you are not at the mercy of an irresponsible gang of grafters, fellow travelers and dead beats."

That is not all you have got to say.

You must say—and mean it—to these young people: "We propose to see to it, no matter what the cost, that you get a real chance in life, a chance to do something for your own future."

The Republican Party must stand or fall as the champion of individual effort and of private enterprise—be it farm, factory, profession, or trade.

I wish we had a new, a better phrase.

The expression "private enterprise" has become so frayed and dingy from misuse that it frequently raises a hoot of derision.

Nevertheless, for the moment, let the phrase stand. Concealed within it is a core of living fire, the natural impulse of every human being to reach for something better.

Whatever its mistakes or blunders may have been in the past, the Republican Party has scored its greatest triumphs and successes as the defender of the individual in economic effort.

It was the party for the young who wanted, as the saying goes, to get ahead.

History may record many instances when the Republican Party was faithless to its own principles. All of us can recall follies and stupidities of which Republicans have been guilty. But everyone knows also that the heart of Republican doctrine was the belief that any man or woman who wanted to get ahead should be welcomed, aided, and defended in the effort.

Republicans were willing to give away farms under the Homestead Act but a man

had to—as they said—"prove up" for himself.

It was this doctrine of opportunity, of aid and protection to effort that gave the party its unbelievable driving power and carried it from one victory to another.

The idea of getting ahead, of "proving up," linked up, reasonably enough, in the ideas of freedom of action, of opinion, of initiative and self-reliance.

Under this dispensation there grew up the most substantial middle class ever known, proud of its position, jealous of its rights, and tenacious of its privileges.

The restless and energetic of every country clamored to get in as immigrants and share the opportunity.

Then, in 1929, the United States and the entire world were shaken by the greatest financial crash in history.

The Republicans were caught by surprise, without a weapon in their hands, without a policy.

Nature abhors a vacuum.

In 1932 the Democrats swept the country. They have held executive power ever since.

III

Whatever the merits of some individual pieces of legislation may be, 20 years of Democratic power has completely changed the character of Government. Here are 10 of the most common outward evidences.

1. An enormous increase in taxation, with more increases in sight.

2. A similarly enormous increase in Federal spending, not only at home but in every quarter of the globe. Every day a Niagara of money is scattered by Washington to the ends of the earth.

3. A steady fall in the value of the dollar.

4. A tremendous expansion in the number of Government jobholders.

5. A tremendous growth in the power of the Executive.

6. An even greater growth in the power of the bureaucracy.

7. An increasing tendency toward secrecy and concealment in Executive action toward Congress, the people, and foreign governments, along with a determined effort to withhold information.

8. A weakening of the will and courage of Congress to resist dictatorial action.

9. A withering away of the power and influence of individual communities, cities, and States with increasing dependence upon Washington.

10. A sinister growth in influence of two groups: The Communists and their sympathizers and the criminal element. This common infiltration into Government of the Communist and the gangster is one of the most astonishing and terrifying developments of our time.

Today the crude and uneven outlines of the omnipotent social-service state are more or less revealed.

This welfare state is not yet consolidated; its power is not yet completely riveted, and it is this fact that offends the Republicans their great—and, as I think, their best chance.

I truly believe that unless Republicans seize this great chance, act decisively and press to victory, then the next 4 years will see the last of representative Government, the last of individual rights, and the last of freedom.

I ask you to look a little more closely at this picture.

Remember how in that great vacuum of 1932 the first tremendous grants of money and power were made.

Unemployment was a fact. The depression was world wide. Some sort of action was plainly necessary.

Then remember how, in the wake of the relief which, in some form, was inescapable, the great changes began to steal upon us. They did not come of themselves.

They were proposed and pushed by those who had been waiting for years for an opportunity.

Upon the surface they appeared to many people beneficent measures.

They guaranteed something to almost everybody.

They would guarantee an income to some, a wage to others; they would guarantee medical care, shelter, school—almost anything.

Of course, these things had to be paid for and this was done in two ways: reducing the value of money and driving the taxes even deeper.

More slowly it became clearer than these benevolences carried with them control, authority and autocratic decision.

I suppose the proposed Brannan plan is as simple an illustration as any: The Brannan plan would guarantee every farmer an income provided he agreed to let the Government tell him what he may grow and exactly how much. He must agree to let the Government tell him what he shall or shall not do in the management of his farm. In exchange for the income he sells himself into serfdom and shackles himself for good and all. The money to pay for this will come from taxes paid by you, whoever you are, wherever you live, whatever your occupation.

And now look at the subtle changes that begin to come over our people.

Little by little the vitality, the robust enthusiasm, the marvelous willingness to take the chances that made our country great, all these characteristics begin to numb and ebb away.

Simultaneously an indescribable change comes over Washington. I have seen it and it is horrible. It has become the gathering place of the timid and the greedy, the shy and the subversive. It is too often the exception in Washington who has retained a sense of manhood, decency, and self-respect, a willingness to stand up and fight for the real interests of our people.

You will search in vain the legislation I have described for any sign of interest in releasing the energies of our people or of recognizing the worth of individual effort.

The thing that the Fair Deal hates above all others is the man or woman who makes up his own mind and is determined to act upon his own decisions.

An interesting incident happened while the Hoover Commission was at work. One commission task force investigated the Federal personnel, their quality, their standards of performance, and their reputation. The task force was curious to know what the attitude of college students toward Government employment was and in an effort to find out circulated several thousand.

It took a load off my mind when I saw the results. The majority did not want to work for Government. They still felt the urge and the ambition to go it alone.

It is to that majority we must appeal. They are our last and best hope, and our appeal must be on the level.

We must have the young people on our side, and they will be on our side only if we guarantee, come what may, that the channels of individual effort are kept open.

The intention of the Fair Deal is to work its betrayal by offering our people protection from the cradle to the grave.

Our course is plain and clear: We have got to offer opportunity from the cradle to the grave and see to it that we deliver on our promises—no matter what the cost and effort to us; no matter what the blood, sweat, and tears.

Every businessman, every stenographer, every union organizer, every housewife, every farmer, every soldier, every school teacher, every physician, every man, woman, boy, and girl should burn into his mind and heart this truth:

If you throw yourself upon the mercy of Government in Washington, mercy and hand-outs for toeing the line are all that you can expect. You will wake up to find your freedom gone, you will find yourself at the mercy, mercy is the word, of arbitrary action taken far away.

IV

All over the world we have seen representative government go down under dictatorship. The dismembered British Empire shrinks slowly back to the little island taken over by William the Conqueror 900 years ago. The darkness of the Communist night descends.

Ours is the last of the free societies, and it is threatened.

By an accident the Republican Party, which had its birth in the effort to free the slave, now has thrust upon it the responsibility of saving the freedom of us all.

This is no idle statement.

Recall the solemn admonition of Washington in his first inaugural:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican form of government are justly considered, perhaps as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

You know the prospect before us. Can you face your children and admit that you will let them down, sell them out and supinely watch their future destroyed?

Never!

Let us take up the challenge. If we lose, we lose the whole game. But if we win—and win we must!—there is, indeed, hope, confidence, and courage for the future, come what may.

Democrat Congress Fails the People— Solves No Major Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a review of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress prepared by me, together with a summary of major legislation.

There being no objection, the review and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEMOCRAT CONGRESS FAILS THE PEOPLE—SOLVES NO MAJOR PROBLEM

The session of the Eighty-second Congress recently adjourned was a battlefield in which a continuous struggle was waged by the Republican membership against the Executive, whose power, ever growing through the last 18 years, now threatens to destroy the freedom of our people and undermine the common welfare.

It is most critically important that our fellow-countrymen understand the character of this conflict. Upon its outcome depends the security of our Nation and its financial and economic well-being.

At this session of the Congress some of the President's socialistic proposals, such as compulsory health insurance, federalized education, and unwarranted controls over industry and agriculture, were sidetracked or summarily rejected.

But these achievements were overshadowed by failure of the Democrat Congress to as-

sert its constitutional prerogatives in the determination of foreign policy and in providing for the national defense.

The Constitution provides safeguards for perpetuation of the Republic, through checks and balances in the development of foreign policy and national defense. They are especially designed to prevent a dictatorship by reserving to the people full sovereignty in the determination of policies through their representatives in the Congress.

Addressees by the President announcing his commitments to other countries and mere consultation by him with selected Members of the Congress do not fulfill constitutional mandate. During the first session of the present Democrat Congress there was abundant evidence that President Truman assumes the President alone possesses absolute power to commit the United States to major foreign policies affecting the security and resources of the American people.

The fundamental issue of government involved is of paramount importance to the people, because the President's foreign policies and the national defense burden incidental thereto, completely dominate the domestic economy, reaching into every household in the land. From these unfortunate policies stem all the major ills that now confront our Nation.

This Congress has failed to adopt an overall, guiding national defense policy as preparedness against the global threat of the international Communist conspiracy to rule the world.

This Congress has voted billions upon billions to implement the President's check-board foreign policies, but it has failed to comply with its constitutional responsibility to prescribe the duties and missions of the military, and to protect its prerogative of declaring war against the danger of violation by unwise policies of one man, the President.

It is mandatory that the President make full disclosure to the American people and officially to the Congress all that is involved in manpower, money, and other resources in his present and projected foreign policies.

The people and their Congress, have a right to know the full implications of the kind of defense plan for Western Europe to which the President has subscribed. They are entitled to more than "butterfly statistics" and wishful thinking on his commitments around the world.

It is for the people, through their representatives in the Congress, to determine the character of aid that shall be given in fulfillment of the North Atlantic Treaty. This right is reserved in the treaty.

The United States has complete freedom of action to emphasize ground forces or to obtain universal mastery of the air and maintain control of the seas to spearhead our preparedness for retaliation and to win if the potential enemy attacks.

Comparative costs and effectiveness and the capacity of the United States should be weighed. This is the right and duty of the Congress. It must not be usurped by the President.

This determination by the Congress becomes increasingly vital, since about 10 per cent of the appropriations for the Department of Defense is being earmarked by the administration for siphoning to Western Europe. These billions are in addition to the billions specifically appropriated by Congress for military and economic aid to Europe.

Republican Members of the Congress recognize the American people want to pull their full weight in defense of freedom, but they demand prudence and not confused frittering away of their manpower and material resources.

DEMOCRAT CONGRESS SOLVED NO MAJOR PROBLEM

The first session of the Democrat Eighty-second Congress floundered to its inglorious

end with no major problems solved, peace still the administration's will-o'-the-wisp, and these grim facts confronting the Nation:

1. The value of the dollar is being destroyed. A dollar is worth half what it was 10 years ago.

2. The President's demands for taxes are merciless. Had Congress granted all he asked for, taxes of all kinds would have taken 40 per cent of the national income.

3. Youths are helpless to plan for the future, a home and a family, because of military service that threatens to stretch out indefinitely.

4. A shrouded and devious foreign policy has condemned our soldiers to wars undertaken by Executive order, wars where victory is forbidden, wars where their blood ebbs away in humiliating stalemates—all under the fantastic notion of the President that he alone has the absolute power to order troops anywhere and into any situation which he alone deems wise for security of the United States.

5. The Internal Revenue Bureau, the engine that sucks up billions of tax money, has been revealed as a Democrat administration instrument, honeycombed with venal men who have made a practice of shaking down honest taxpayers while they, the tax collectors, were acting as partners in corruption with common criminals and gangsters. Scarcely a day passes but what an agency of the Truman administration is exposed as being shot through with fraud.

6. The White House has been shown as the headquarters of a milk coat-deep freeze bargain counter where the national assets are sold to insiders at cut rates.

7. Disclosure that pro-Communist infiltration in Government has been widespread, that Government officials were so derelict in their duty that secrets of the atomic bomb were stolen by Communist spies.

These bear evidence of the growth of a corrupt and decadent Federal autocracy which, if allowed to continue, will utterly destroy the freedom and the substance of our people.

In the face of this threatening development what have Republicans done in the Eighty-second Congress? Let the record speak.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DEMOCRAT ADMINISTRATION

The first session of the Eighty-second Congress was in continuous session from its convening on January 3, 1951, to adjournment October 20, 1951.

During this period the Democrat Party controlled the White House, the President's Cabinet, all major officeholders in the Executive branch and both Houses of Congress, including all committees and the program of legislation.

In a word, a Democrat administration controls the Government and must be held responsible for conditions affecting the welfare of the country.

In public addresses, the President constantly seeks to escape this responsibility. The essence of his tactics is to give himself and his Democrat Party all credit for the constructive achievements of Congress and Government agencies while denying responsibility for their shortcomings, mistakes, and failures. Whatever good is done, they have done it; but if any wrong occurs, others are responsible. The President's object and that of his party is to keep themselves in power, come what may.

But the people need not be taken in by such slick politics if they will remember the plain fact that a Democrat President, Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress means the maximum control a political party can gain over the policies and operations of the Government, short of absolute dictatorship. Such complete control carries full responsibility for the state of the Nation.

ROLE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party has no control over legislation, Government policies and operations. Its role in Congress is narrowly limited. No Republican can be chairman of a congressional committee. Republicans are in a minority on all committees. They cannot carry through legislation on their own. They cannot take administrative steps to solve national problems or to correct abuses in the Government of the country. They have no control over the conduct of foreign relations.

But in a two-party system such as ours, the opposition party has a clear and responsible public duty to perform. In the role of the opposition, Republicans can appraise critically the promises and performances of the Democrat administration. They can call the Democrat administration to account for its failures in discharging the public trust. They can expose mistakes, corruption, and other actions harmful to the public interest. They can press for high standards and principles in the solution of public problems and offer constructive suggestions concerning them.

Finally, by public debate, Republicans can take their opposition to the people who have the power to compel the administration to safeguard the national welfare or to remove it from office.

As the record set forth below will show, Republicans vigorously performed all these duties in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

In the field of domestic affairs, Republicans increased their resistance to the administration's efforts to limit individual freedom and to undermine private enterprise. They fought against further centralization of power in the Federal Government which for 18 years has sapped the strength of State and local government. They exposed and resisted the administration's persistent tendencies toward socialism. Wherever it was possible, Republicans blocked the administration's attempt to use the national defense program as a cloak to put over socialized medicine, the Brannan plan for Federal Government control over the Nation's farmers, Government control of education, and other centralizing-socializing measures.

Republicans insisted that the President should stay within the framework of the Constitution and respect the American system of free Government. They opposed giving him the broad powers he sought which would enable him to dictate the course of American life. They protested his Executive order giving every department of Government the power to withhold information from the press and from the people. They exposed Government propaganda designed to cover up mistakes and corruption, and to mislead the people into accepting Government attempts to plan and to regulate their lives.

Republicans continued their 18-year fight for sound money. They pointed out that dollar prosperity is a cruel and bitter illusion when the dollar buys half its former value in goods and services. They sought with every weapon at their command to cut down the lavish and irresponsible spending of Democrat administrations, insisting that the administration practice economy in its own house before it shifted the burden of Government spending to the people by higher and higher taxes.

Today's inflated prices are the direct result of excessive Government spending. Ceiling prices, credit restrictions and other economic controls cannot maintain the value of money as fast as Government spending destroys it.

INFLUENCE, FAVORITISM, AND CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT

In this Congress, Republicans intensified their fight for loyalty, honesty, and integrity in Government. They exposed in detail how

Government operations were influenced and corrupted by individuals appointed by the administration and by persons high in White House favor. When Democrats, who controlled congressional committees, would have been satisfied with the exposure of a little corruption *just to take the heat off the Democratic Party*, Republicans vigorously protested and demanded full investigations. Although blocked at every turn by an administration unwilling and unable to clean its own house, Republicans succeeded in compelling disclosures of disloyalty, influence favoritism and corruption that shocked the country.

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In the Eightieth Congress, Republicans put the Congressional Reorganization Act into operation. This was the first real attempt since 1910 to reform and to modernize the Legislative branch. But such major changes in legislative procedure as the Reorganization Act provided cannot be successfully accomplished in a 2-year Congress. When the Republican control ended in 1948, much remained to be done to improve congressional operations.

But although Democrats were in continuous control of Congress from 1949 to the present day, they did nothing to carry forward the promising start made by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Some hearings were held by Democrat committees; some legislation was proposed, but no tangible results flowed from it. Except for the changes made by Republicans, Congress still labors under antiquated machinery and processes. This is more than a problem for Congress. It deeply affects the liberties and welfare of every individual in the country. The creaking machinery of Congress is so appallingly inadequate for modern times that free representative government itself is endangered. The Democrat Congress has done little to improve the capacity of Congress to deal with modern problems, chiefly because the President and the Executive branch prefer to strengthen their own grip on the Nation and keep Congress weak.

Similar neglect marks the failure of the Democrat administration to do much of anything constructive about the Hoover Commission recommendations to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the Executive branch. A few departments made some changes and the President sent a few unacceptable proposals to Congress, but the real need of reform and modernization in the Executive branch went unanswered by the Democrat administration. The best proof of this situation lies in some 19 proposals filed by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report with the Senate Expenditures Committee. None of these proposals has been enacted into law.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS FUMBLES RESPONSIBILITIES

The political party in control of a Congress stamps it with a clear pattern of party policy and behavior.

It is no mystery, for example, that the Republican Eightieth Congress balanced the Federal Budget and lowered taxes while all Democrat Congresses since 1933 never balanced the budget and continuously increased taxes. The explanation is that the Republican Party has a high regard for sound money, for making outgo balance income in Federal revenues, and for allowing the individual to spend his own money rather than having Government tax and spend it for him.

The whole tenor of the Democrat Party has been in the opposite direction, as the record abundantly shows. Similar comparisons on many other subjects show equally clear differences in party performances.

When the record of this Congress has been fitted into the perspective of history, it will be found that its major tasks were to deal

with the tragic consequences of unwise policies, serious mistakes in judgment, and the highly unethical conduct of many persons high in the Democrat administration which controlled the Government for 18 years.

Time is running out on unwise policies, obscured so long by expedients, stop-gaps and flim-flam. Mistakes in judgment are catching up with the administration which made them. Unethical conduct, at last, is being recognized for what it is and is being brought out into the open.

In view of these conditions, the Democrat Eighty-second Congress had little choice but to direct most of its major legislation to the solution of grave problems created by Democrat policies and administration.

Efforts of Democrat Party leaders in Congress to put a new face on these attempts will not obscure the stubborn facts. For example, Democrat leaders in Congress have declared that this Congress will go down in history as the "great preparedness Congress." This is an attempt to turn a grievous fault into a virtue. The people will certainly want to know what the administration did with the \$50,000,000,000 Congress provided for national defense in the 4 years 1946-50. The testimony from many sources in the MacArthur hearings of our weakness in armaments in Korea was shocking.

Moreover, the people will want to know about "preparedness" for what? We had just achieved a victory in war at enormous expense. The Democrat administration had promised us peace. But in the 4 years since the close of a victorious war they conducted a checkered foreign policy and permitted Russia to be built up into such a menace that we now have to arm ourselves to the teeth at a feverish pace. This Congress may be called a "preparedness Congress" to be sure, but is it preparedness to bail out the administration's grave mistakes and incompetence?

The people will ask similar embarrassing questions about other self-praise coming from Democrat leaders in Congress. One such leader says: "This Congress has thrown the might of the greatest nation on earth in defense of freedom in the global struggle against the slavery of Communism." Democrats are given to such grandiose, chest-beating phrases. They are adept in turning faults into virtues. In fact, the instances of dissimulation are so many and so notorious, that it is difficult to know where deception ends and sincerity begins.

But the people want to know why must American lives be sacrificed all over the world? Why must American soldiers be stationed permanently abroad? Why must the United States itself become a garrison state with compulsory military service? Why must American labor and resources be withdrawn from the American people and distributed in billions to arm the world for another war? Why must taxes be at the highest level ever paid in peace or war? Can this be magnificent achievement, or is it a desperate attempt to cover up a bankrupt foreign policy?

Every examination of this session of the Eighty-second Congress reveals that its major legislation had to be enacted because of unwise administration policies, thereby compounding incompetence.

Having grounded past programs on a policy of cheap money, Democrats found this Congress compelled to deal with a 53-cent dollar and with increasing inflation of prices. This, together with the home and foreign defense program, is the reason for production- and price-control legislation.

Having followed a policy of extravagant Government spending Democrats found this Congress compelled by interests favored by the administration to continue spending on a lavish scale. Administration policies offer no hope of postponing less important programs as an offset to huge defense expendi-

tures. This accounts for the unprecedented \$97,000,000,000 appropriations.

Having adopted policies of spending without regard to Government income or balanced budgets, Democrats found this Congress compelled to deal with the rising danger to Government financial stability. This accounts for legislation offering interest inducements to discourage people from cashing Government E bonds and for the third tax increase in a little over a year, making the present tax level the highest in the history of the country.

Having promised the American people "freedom from fear," Democrats found this Congress compelled to deal with the greatest fear of economic instability and fear of foreign war which this country has ever known. This accounts for most of the legislation dealing with controls, defense, and foreign aid.

Having miscalculated Russian policy and having followed policies encouraging Russian expansion, Democrats found this Congress compelled to station American troops in Europe for the first time in a period of peace, to increase our Armed Forces in the Korean war, to establish a network of military alliances of doubtful value all over the world, and to finance the rearmament of these foreign allies. This accounts for the huge defense appropriations and for the continued large foreign-aid legislation.

Having built a Government bureaucracy to huge proportions, equipped it with unprecedented powers and money, and projected the Government into every field of private, State, and local affairs, Democrats found this Congress compelled to deal with favoritism, influence, unethical conduct, waste, and corruption in Government. This accounts for the extraordinary series of congressional investigations with findings that shocked the Nation, and even now the surface only has been scratched.

Having consistently followed a policy of discrediting critics and opponents, of name calling, of withholding and coloring of information, of using fine words to cover opposite intentions, and of deliberately flouting the law and intent of Congress, this administration continued to widen the breach between the President and Congress which endangers the people's faith in our system of government. This accounts for the "great debate" in Congress on troops to Europe which centered on Congress' distrust of the administration, for the refusal of the Senate to approve many Executive nominations, and for the writing into dozens of laws explicit directions forbidding certain Executive actions without prior approval of Congress.

In summary, the Democrat administration and prior Democrat Congresses having sowed the wind, this Congress—the Democrat Eighty-second—was confronted by the whirlwind. This is evident from the details of major legislation enacted in the session just ended.

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURES

Congress enacted appropriations which reached the highest total in the Nation's history except for the peak years of World War II.

The regular and supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 acted upon during the year aggregated \$84,817,960,084. The addition of \$6,808,581,032 in supplemental amounts for fiscal year 1951 approved by this Congress boosted the total to \$91,626,541,716. To this amount there must be added over \$6,000,000,000 in permanent and indefinite appropriations, most of which is for interest on the public debt. The grand total, therefore, exceeded \$97,600,000,000.

Last year, in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, a total of \$81,044,768,684 was appropriated. Thus, in a matter of months, appropriations have soared to the astronomical sum of \$178,600,000,000.

and yet the money demands of the administration continue unabated.

The postwar lows were the \$35,700,000,000 appropriated in the second session, Seventy-ninth Congress, in 1946, and the \$35,900,000,000 appropriated in the first session of the Republican Eightieth Congress, in 1947. It was the Eightieth Congress that lowered taxes and balanced the Federal Budget for the first time in 16 years, with a surplus of more than \$8,000,000,000. Republicans proved that Government spending and taxes could be sharply reduced without sacrificing essential Government services.

High as the appropriations of this session were, they would have been far higher if President Truman and Executive branch officials had been permitted to have as much money as they wanted.

Their spending mania proved so disturbing that one important Democrat leader of the Congress, Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, declared the tax bill which he managed on the Senate floor would be the last tax-increase bill "short of an all-out war or war crisis" that he would support. Also, on the last day of the session, Senator GEORGE was moved to comment "we cannot prevent corruption in government when reckless expenditures of public moneys, such as we are witnessing now, are taking place."

Republicans, aided by the more economy-minded among Democrats, did have some success in trimming administration requests in the processing of the appropriation bills through Congress. These cuts brought the total of the appropriations to about \$4,750,000,000 below the budget estimates. To this extent, economy advocates in Congress had met President Truman's challenge flung at them last February 8. At that time, at a press conference, he had said his budget was good and tight and he dared Congress to do anything about it.

Not all of the vast sums appropriated will be spent in this fiscal year, simply because the free-spending administration cannot get delivery of goods that fast. Nevertheless, the Federal Government's estimated outgo exceeds its anticipated income from taxes and other revenue sources by a considerable amount. This is the outlook, even though the new tax bill raises prospective annual tax receipts to a record of more than \$60,000,000,000. Thus the Government will again be forced to borrow money which will intensify the problem of inflation and further weaken the value of the dollar.

Actual expenditures for this fiscal year ending next June 30 are expected to be in the neighborhood of \$70,000,000,000 and to go beyond that amount by \$15,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1953, assuming that a third world war will be averted.

Chief responsibility for bringing about economy in Government rests primarily upon the President and the Executive branch. They know the details of Government projects and operations. They have hundreds of professional budget employees, distributed in every agency of Government, who work full time throughout the year.

Compared with the Executive branch, Congress is appallingly understaffed. The Appropriations Committees of both Houses have a total staff of 35 persons (professional and clerical) to deal with the gigantic appropriations in more than a dozen major appropriation bills. Sometimes a single staff member has to review a bill appropriating billions of dollars.

Democrats in control of Congress have done nothing to improve their antiquated and inadequate machinery. They have done little to impress upon a Democrat President, who is in control of Government spending, the urgent need for economy and elimination of waste. They rejected the idea of a single omnibus appropriation bill, which

offers some measure of congressional control over spending and economy. Under Democrat control of both the Executive and Legislative branches of Government, the volume of Government spending has mounted higher and higher. All history proves that loose fiscal policies result in collapse of government.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In national defense Republicans constructively criticized what they considered to be weaknesses in policy making and execution. They exposed and resisted wasteful and inefficient handling of defense matters. At the same time they cooperated in measures to correct deficiencies in and to expand military programs. A strong national defense has always been a basic principle of the Republican Party.

In the face of the fighting and bloodshed in Korea and the Communist threat generally, Congress extended the draft, lowered the draft age from 19 to 18½ years, lengthened the period of induction from 21 to 24 months, and established a commission to recommend a program of universal military training.

Close to \$57,000,000,000 was provided in the regular defense appropriation bill.

Additional billions were voted for atomic development, for air power expansion, and for construction of military bases in continental United States and at strategic points throughout the non-Communist world. Reserve funds were voted to the Maritime Board for expansion of the merchant marine.

Congress authorized the Navy to spend \$2,700,000,000 on a ship conversion and construction program, including a 57,000-ton aircraft carrier equipped to handle atomic bombers. This recalled what had happened to the super aircraft carrier approved by the Eightieth Congress. President Truman scrapped construction of that carrier on April 23, 1949, after \$20,000,000 had been spent on it.

In a move also to rectify its mistake in restricting the Nation's air power, the Truman administration asked this Congress to approve a build-up of the Air Force to 140 groups, or wings. This was a considerable change from the position President Truman took in October 1949 when he impounded \$978,750,000 of Air Force funds, refusing to allow more than 48 groups. The Republican Eightieth Congress had foreseen the need of a strong air force and in 1948 appropriated funds for a 70-group force. The President persisted in cutting this back and holding to only 48 air groups until after the Korean war broke out in 1950.

Safeguards against emasculation of the Marine Corps were written into law. The marines are to have three divisions and three air wings.

Efforts by Congress to legislate on military manpower matters were hampered by confusing estimates of the number of persons needed for the armed services. The first administration estimate after the Red attack in Korea was 2,100,000. Then it was 3,462,000 last January, and it is now said the Armed Forces must expand in size to 4,000,000.

Another manpower problem which plagued Congress was the Defense Department's mis-handling of Reserves. Inactive reservists were ordered into active military service ahead of Army and Air National Guard units and units of the services' Organized Reserves. In other words, those who should have gone last were called first, and those who should have been called first were called last. Also a number of Army and Air National Guard units throughout the United States were stripped of men and equipment with a consequent loss of efficiency and combat potential.

In investigating the strategic materials program the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee discovered that the administration

had fallen down on the job in stockpiling. Most glaring of these related to tungsten and tin.

The subcommittee concluded that "our Nation's tungsten position is little short of desperate," putting the major blame on administration officials.

In the case of tin, the subcommittee discovered that the United States Government was paying exorbitant prices for tin, when it was not necessary. After the tin report became public, the Government announced suspension of the tin purchase program, and the price of tin promptly fell.

Also in a recent report the Preparedness Subcommittee, while noting some improvement in the Nation's rubber situation over what it was in 1950, made these major criticisms: (1) a slowdown in the stockpiling program last spring was against the national interest; (2) despite the efforts to cut off exports of war-vital materials to the Communist bloc of nations, exports of rubber to China increased substantially in the first 5 months in 1951; (3) there is as yet no centralized direction and operation of our natural-rubber program; (4) little progress has been made in the development of a Latin-American natural-rubber program; (5) no friendly country, with the exception of Canada, has synthetic rubber-producing facilities in operation. Idle facilities in Western Germany are being reactivated only in small part.

With a shift in emphasis from economic to military aid, the sum of \$7,300,000,000 was appropriated for the use of foreign countries. But this is not the total fund of American dollars for foreign countries. Several additional billions are covered in the regular military appropriations, in funds appropriated for the Export-Import Bank, in State Department appropriations, and in other domestic measures. If these could be segregated and added to the foreign aid total, the funds would double the amount stated under the foreign aid label.

USING NATIONAL DEFENSE AS A CLOAK FOR SOCIALISM

The President and his administration planners repeatedly used the cloak of national security to push socialistic aims, to expand Government operations and controls, and urge other measures limiting individual liberties and private enterprise.

Some of these attempts succeeded in part. Others were rejected.

Congress extended the Defense Production Act of 1950 but refused to give the President the additional, dictatorial powers he requested. These powers would have given the Federal Government complete domination over the national economy.

Congress also incorporated some limitations into the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act which, together with other bills, included the administration's back-door approach to Government housing and Federal aid to education.

Bills leading in the direction of socialized medicine were rejected altogether by the Congress.

Where Republicans could not prevent administration attempts to use national defense as a subterfuge for socialistic measures, they made every effort to write safeguards into the laws to protect the liberties and rights of individuals and the system of private initiative and enterprise. An example is the requirement that credit restrictions on home purchases be relaxed in critical housing areas to insure the use of private capital in preference to Federal Government operations.

Nevertheless, the administration found the national defense to be a convenient cloak for obtaining legislation to increase Government powers. The fact is inescapable that, as long as a Democrat administration is in office, socialistic programs and expansion of Government powers will be pushed

by Government planners wherever they can find an opening.

In the case of national defense as in so many other critical problems, the administration lacked foresight. Urgently needed actions were delayed until events overran administration preparations, as did Russian aggression in war in Korea. Then the administration sought to make up in feverish haste, waste, and controls what should have been wisely, calmly, and systematically undertaken earlier. This incompetence is largely responsible for the emergencies and crises with which Democrat administrations have kept our people in turmoil for 18 years.

FOREIGN POLICY

The foreign policy problems which confronted the first session of the Eighty-second Congress served once again to confirm the desolate truth that the Yalta agreement of February 1945 is the watershed of modern history.

Before that time, despite many most deeply questionable decisions by the Executive, the security of the United States was indisputable and the advantage lay with our people.

The tragic surrenders at Yalta, ratified and confirmed by President Truman at Potsdam, compromised all.

The Yalta sell-out

It was at Yalta that the administration, despite the battle cry of the Four Freedoms, turned the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, and the Balkan peoples over to slavery without a word of protest. It was at Yalta that the administration broke its pledged word and betrayed Chiang Kai-shek who for years had carried on the war with Japan alone. It was at Yalta that the administration secretly gave to Russia the Chinese territory of Port Arthur, territorial rights in the Chinese port of Dairen. It was at Yalta that the administration made the deal whereby Manchuria was thrown open to the Chinese Communists, the same group that has cost more than 100,000 American casualties on Korean battlefields.

Since VJ-day in 1945—six short years!—billions of treasure have been spent in military expenditures, American soldiers have died by the thousand and the peace of mind of our countrymen has been shattered and our security put in jeopardy. All this was done by an administration that had promised peace and security.

China is prostrate under Communist control—largely because of the devious policy pursued by our State Department. We are still locked in a bloody and stalemated Korean war, a conflict which itself is the inevitable result of decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam.

The skeleton in the administration closet

What the administration dare not admit is that their mistakes and their long wooing of Russia gave the Soviet Communists the opportunity to threaten freedom throughout the world. What a record to take to the American people! What a reason to ask for a new grant of power! Desperately and administration now attempts, through its denunciations of Russia, to conceal the fact that the officials who made these ruinous decisions are still in office, still directing power.

On every hand the undermining influence of Russia can be seen and, as this report is written, in November 1951, demands are rising in both Egypt and Iran for alliances with Russia if concessions from the West are not forthcoming.

Confronted by these dismal circumstances Republicans in the Eighty-second Congress devoted themselves, as far as foreign policy goes, to unremitting effort to redress the balance abroad now tipped against us.

Efforts to block Communist China

Through a series of resolutions,¹ passed by the House and Senate, sometimes individually, sometimes jointly, they sought to prevent the recognition of Communist China, to prevent her admission to the U. N., to have her declared an aggressor in Korea, to have a U. N. arms embargo passed against Mao's regime.

Troops for Europe

Through Senate Resolution 99 the Senate, with Republicans leading the fight, served notice on the President that not more than four additional divisions of ground troops should be sent to Europe without congressional approval. Congress no longer trusted the administration's judgment in scattering American soldiers throughout the world. But this Democrat Congress, with administration lieutenants in key positions, has failed to bring order out of the confusion.

The Republican fight to keep war material from Russia

By a unanimous vote the Eighty-second Congress passed the Republican Kem amendment to an appropriations bill, which provided that no economic or financial assistance might be given to any country which exports arms, armaments, or military matériel to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

Boondoggles abroad

Republicans in the Eighty-second Congress worked ceaselessly to halt the indiscriminate squandering of billions of the taxpayers' money abroad. They asked why Americans who are hard pressed to pay their own rent with depreciated dollars, should have to pay for housing projects abroad. All along the line, Republicans in the Eighty-second Congress cut down foreign WPA projects and sought to force a measure of control on the Executive.

The Republican fight against Executive dictatorship

All these efforts have only served to underscore the fact that no clear and forthright foreign policy is possible until this administration is defeated. The whole system of checks and balances is being undermined by Executive erosion. Our representative government is being attacked at home as well as abroad. The administration which presided over the disasters abroad is still in power and the Executive, in his determination to pursue a policy—shown to be bankrupt in so many instances—continues to make arbitrary, unilateral decisions without consulting or warning Congress.

Intervention in Korea, the announced intent of sending troops to Europe (and anywhere else), the giving of ECA allocation authority to the State Department in April 1951 in defiance of the fundamental law that set up the ECA, the abrupt dismissal of General MacArthur and the successful insistence upon closed instead of open hearings at the subsequent investigation, the emasculation of the Kem amendment by letting down the bars to war shipments to Russia, and the interim appointment of Philip Jessup as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly after Senate subcommittee disapproval—all these are examples of the President's high-handed and dictatorial line of action. Nor can the Executive claim that his actions have brought success. The failures are obvious to all.

The President as autocrat

What has happened is that the Executive, in effect, has appropriated the War Power to himself. Once a decisive move is made, demands are served upon the Congress for money and legislation to implement the

decision. Through this device the threat now is very real that the country may be railroaded into socialism under the pretext of preparedness against war. Nothing is more clear to Republicans in Congress than this peril which now confronts all of us.

STATE OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The biggest domestic problem facing the first session of the Eighty-second Congress was inflation. By the time the Congress convened, inflation had already built up considerable steam. In the 6 months following the invasion of Korea the cost of living had risen 6 per cent. Over 3 per cent of the rise occurred after September 1950 when Congress gave the President broad powers over economic affairs which he failed to use. Not until prices reached the highest level in our history did the President impose a price freeze.

Senator BURNET MAYBANK, of South Carolina, Democrat chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, charged during debate on the Defense Production Act amendments this year that President Truman apparently delayed putting controls into effect last year because an election was "coming up" in November. MAYBANK also said the administration "apparently wishes prices to rise so that increased taxes could be collected from large incomes and thereby attempt to balance the budget." If these charges are true, it would not be the first time that the administration has played politics with the national interest.

In July 1950 the President claimed he did not want price control authority. But after he permitted prices to rise to inflationary peaks without using the controls given to him at that time, the President, in April 1951, requested not only an extension of controls, but much more drastic powers over the whole economy.

Where legitimate need for control powers was shown, Republicans supported the required legislation. But they refused to go along with the President's request for powers which would permit him to bring about complete Government dictation over the country's economic system. The Republican position on this point was so fundamental and strong that enough Democrats joined to prevent the President from having his way. The President asked the Eighty-second Congress to grant him authority to set up Government-owned plants, to establish Government corporations in competition with private industry, to disperse industrial facilities, to set up a system of so-called production subsidies, and to license almost all types of business.

In the 1951 amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950, Congress provided for price roll-backs and roll-forwards, relaxed some credit controls, banned slaughtering quotas for livestock, and set up import controls on fats and oils.

There was little the President liked about the bill, although it was sent to him by the Democrat-controlled Congress. He immediately requested repeal of the sections on livestock quotas, price changes, and import controls. While agreeing to hold hearings on the proposed changes, Chairman Maybank accused administration officials of criticizing the act "even before the ink is dry on it" and failing to give it "a fair trial." The Eighty-second Congress did not complete action on proposed changes before the first session adjourned.

It is clear that the President wants to use the control legislation as a political instrument for himself and against Republicans. He did not use powers given to him in 1950, in order to favor interests from which he seeks political support. As a result prices rose sharply by January 1951.

In the recent session, he deliberately singled out certain amendments to the price

¹ H. Res. 77, S. Res. 35, S. Res. 36, H. Res. 96, S. Con. Res. 31.

control law and claimed them to be "unworkable." Repeatedly he referred to the Capehart amendment and to the Butler-Hope amendment. These amendments were approved in Congress by Democrats and Republican alike, but by labeling them as "Republican" amendments and "unworkable," the President hoped to put himself in the position of telling the people that he could have protected them from high prices if it had not been for Republicans.

The time is past when by such tricks as these the President can shift responsibility for the Nation's welfare from himself and his party to his political opponents.

During the first session of the Eighty-second Congress there were other disturbing evidences of politics in the economic control agencies. Economic Stabilizer Alan Valentine resigned, declaring that he was "forced to choose between being a participant in large-scale patronage or of being a victim of it." Former Gov. M. E. Thompson, Democrat, of Georgia, also resigned from the Office of Price Stabilization in protest against "political" control and general wastefulness.

Republicans brought to light additional instances of Government waste, and within the limits of a minority party, sought to correct these situations. Democrat administration leaders showed little interest in eliminating waste. The President submitted only one Government reorganization plan—to set up a single administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This plan came only after disclosures of influence, favoritism, and other improprieties in RFC.

Otherwise, the Hoover Commission recommendations, calculated to save billions of dollars, were ignored by the administration and by the Democrat leadership in Congress.

Instead of adopting Hoover Commission recommendations for streamlining the Post Office Department, the Democrat leaders in Congress pushed through a measure increasing postal rates so as to bring in more revenue from its operations. The penny post card which symbolized low-cost communication for the American people, became the latest victim of the Democrat administration's inflation. Despite receiving more money, the post office continued to show large deficits, at the same time reducing postal services.

Republicans in the Eighty-second Congress gave support to continuing programs for agriculture, reclamation, flood control, housing construction, veterans' benefits, and the normal operations of Government that must be carried on within the limits the Nation can afford.

Taxes

At the request of the President, the Democrat-controlled Eighty-second Congress enacted the third tax increase since June 1950. Discussing the new bill, Senator George, Democrat of Georgia, pointed out that the two tax bills passed in late 1950 increased the tax burden of the American people "by almost \$10,000,000,000." The new tax law is estimated to increase that tax burden by \$5,691,000,000 additional.

This is the heaviest tax program the American people have ever had to support during peacetime. But it still isn't enough for the President. His original request was for an increase this year of \$16,000,000,000 instead of the \$5,691,000,000 which Congress approved.

The new law provides a tax increase on individual incomes of approximately 11 per cent. Normal and surtax rates on corporations are increased from a maximum of 47 per cent to 52 per cent. The excess profits tax credit is reduced from 85 to 83 per cent for firms using average earnings methods. Mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and co-operatives are taxed for the first time on unallocated income. Excise taxes on numerous items are changed, some increased and some decreased.

As the minority party, Republicans lacked the votes to make major changes in the tax bill as it went through Congress. In the House the Democrat leadership forced through a gag rule for consideration of the tax bill which prevented any individual Representative from offering any amendments to the bill on the floor of the House. No matter how inequitable a provision might be, it could not be altered except with concurrence of the Democrat-controlled House Ways and Means Committee. A Republican motion to recommit the tax bill to this committee was defeated on a party-line vote.

On the Senate side, Republicans won acceptance of the Jenner amendment prohibiting the Federal Government from denying social security funds to States that permit names of welfare beneficiaries to be made public. This was a victory on behalf of State governments over Federal bureaucracy, which had already suspended Federal payments to the State of Indiana.

In the Eightieth Congress Republicans cut the cost of Government, voted an expanded Defense Department, cut taxes, cut the national debt, and still produced an \$8,000,000,000 surplus. This record shows how the Republican Party operates when it has control of the Congress.

Under Democrat leadership the Federal debt has increased from \$22,500,000,000 in 1933 to \$256,600,000,000 in 1951. The current debt amounts to about \$6,000 per family. Instead of cutting Government expenditures, the Democrat Party has always imposed higher taxes.

The present Democrat President has yet to propose a cut in his budget for fiscal 1952. The President has referred to it as a balanced budget, providing the full tax increase is granted. But this budget does not even include the cost of the Korean war. In those circumstances, how can the budget be balanced?

A member of the President's own political party, Senator Brax, complained, "Actually, the domestic-civilian items in the President's budget include all the major socialistic programs of recent years—socialized housing, agriculture, and medicine, and federalized education. . . . While the domestic-civilian programs include the so-called defense production and civilian defense items, many of them are both priced excessively in the budget and are open to boondoggle exploitation by federal, state, and local agencies."

Nevertheless, the Democrat Party leadership seeks to convince the Nation that the administration's program is a pay-as-you-go plan. Such talk falsifies reality. The tax bill just enacted will not even cover the increased cost of the defense program resulting from inflation. Former Defense Secretary Marshall told Congress that price increases since the Korean war began have taken "\$7,000,000,000 out of the \$35,000,000,000 authorized" for national defense during fiscal year 1951.

Similarly, Democrat spokesmen insist that the administration practices sound financing. Yet the purchasing power of the American dollar continues to decline at an alarming rate. The administration's Commerce Department set the purchasing value of the dollar (August 1951) at 44 cents in wholesale prices and 53.9 cents for consumer prices in general, based on the 1935-39 average. This is a decline of 4 cents within a year. Commerce Department figures, coupled with a 22 per cent decline predicted by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, indicate the 1954 purchasing power of the dollar will be 39 cents or lower, based on a 1935-39 average of 100. These are hardly "butterfly statistics."

Inflation is a fact. When Defense Mobilizer Wilson predicted increasing inflation unless the Defense Production Act was changed to suit the President, Republican members of

the Banking Committee reminded him of the administration's August 3 wage stabilization order permitting "escalator" cost of living wage increases. Mr. Wilson was forced to admit the administration has "built an automatic inflation machine" which can't be stopped.

To label the current inflation as unprecedented prosperity, as some Democrat Party leaders are doing, is to cover with glittering words what actually is a dangerous threat to the Nation. The factors of runaway inflation are still present. Accelerated Government spending is applying increasing pressure on those factors. Unless a realistic approach is taken to the problem, the bubble of false prosperity will burst, to the delight of the Kremlin.

INVESTIGATIONS

More than 130 different congressional investigations were in progress during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. A political fact of great importance is concealed behind this figure. Most of the standing committees of both Houses are regularly engaged in investigations, but the sum total of these would come nowhere near 130.

What explains the figure? A great part of the explanation is this: The Eighty-second Congress was engaged in almost continuous conflict with the Executive, attempting to pry loose information essential in the drafting of legislation. The long delay in many appropriation bills, for example, was caused by the fact that the sums asked by the Executive were enormous and the justifications of what the money would be spent for were meager.

Two main investigation groups

There were two groups of investigations of special importance.

The first group was concerned, in one way or another, with the conduct of foreign policy.

The second group—and the work is by no means completed—uncovered evidences of corruption, favoritism, and waste in the Executive branch.

Taken together, they are really parts of an enormous whole—the two groups of inquiries show that while the administration is pouring out blood and billions abroad, at home the Democrat National Committee has been turned into a bargain counter for the disposal of national assets to insiders at cut rates.

What was going on abroad

MacArthur and the Far East

On April 10, 1951, President Truman abruptly discharged Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his Far Eastern commands. Three days later, on a request of Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, New Hampshire, the Senate Armed Services Committee voted unanimously to investigate.

From May 3 to June 27, 1951, this inquiry, made in concert with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, developed into an examination of our entire Far East policy. Republican efforts to force open hearings failed, but the pressure at least brought about the continuous issuance of censored testimony. This was no casual examination. The administration's Far East policy had collapsed in a bloody tragedy and General MacArthur was being broken because he wanted victory.

The Struggle for the Facts

The committee sessions—more than 2,000,000 words of testimony were published in five volumes—became an intense and bitter struggle to compel the administration to give all the facts about its secret maneuvers in respect to the Chinese Communists, the truth about Formosa and what was really being planned in regard to the Korean war and the recognition of Red China.

The Republican Report on MacArthur

The whole story has yet to be told but Republican Senators forced enough into the record to enable Senator BRIDGES and seven colleagues to issue, on August 20, 1951, a 104-page report on the investigation. The report attracted extraordinary attention throughout the country, many newspapers printing it verbatim. Unanimous consent was granted Senator CAIN, Republican, Washington, to have the report printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. 69, September 5, 1951).

The Institute of Pacific Relations, Jessup, and the State Department

Two months before the MacArthur investigation got under way, on February 14, 1951, Senator McCARRAN's Internal Security Committee (a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee) began to take apart the history of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The personal ties between this private organization and the State Department had been very close in time past and many of the IPR's officials had, in varying degree, Communist associations.

A Republican's Revelations

Philip C. Jessup, now United States Ambassador at Large, had been chairman and a trustee of the IPR. On September 25, 1951, Prof. K. W. Colegrove, of Northwestern University, testified about a State Department conference over which Jessup presided on October 6, 7, and 8, 1949. Former Gov. Harold Stassen was another witness who had been present at the same meeting.

The point of the testimony of these two witnesses was that at these meetings, over which Jessup presided, strong argument was made by Owen Lattimore and others for the recognition of Communist China, and that Jessup, in conversation with Stassen, endorsed the logic of these views. General Fortier, another witness, stated that Jessup had taken the same line in conversation with him.

Where the Investigations Linked Up

Thus the MacArthur and Internal Security investigations dovetailed at various points, and most certainly affected the later Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearings on the nomination of Jessup as a delegate to the U. N. General Assembly. This latter subcommittee disapproved of the nomination—3 to 2—but the President disregarded the findings and gave an interim appointment to Jessup.

Despite continuous exposures of policies favorable to Communism in his official family, the President persists in denying them and stubbornly refuses to cooperate with his own Democrat-controlled Congress.

Investigations on the home front

As the investigations of the Special Committee on Organized Crime, the Banking and Currency Committee investigation of the RFC, and other inquiries of the Eighty-first Congress moved on into the Eighty-second Congress, it became clear that their disclosures interlocked. One disclosure threw light upon another. House investigations began to edge nearer Senate investigations. It seemed not impossible that, before the probes were completed, the entire Executive branch would be revealed as flustered with corruption, extravagance and betrayal of public trust.

As the session closed, inquiries had begun into questionable aspects of the administration's disposal of enemy property in this country seized at the beginning of World War II.

The Tax Revenue a Democrat Slush Fund

What has happened is that during the past few years the Federal revenue laws have been breached from almost every angle. The administration demands enormous taxation to support its "world responsibilities." As this Niagara of tax money rolls in upon

Washington, Executive functionaries and operatives at Democrat National Committee headquarters became brokers of favors, contracts, and deals.

The RFC

The Banking and Currency Committee investigation of the RFC (especially the blistering minority report of Republican Senators BRICKER and CAPEHART) showed the close connection between the RFC and the Democrat National Committee.

The Lithofold Deal

The Senate Committee on Expenditures, in turn, followed up the American Lithofold Corp. case. Both Democrat Committee Chairman William Boyle and James P. Finnegan were involved. Finnegan was an attorney on the payroll of Lithofold while simultaneously acting as tax collector at St. Louis, Mo. Boyle also was in the pay of the company. Lithofold got more than half a million dollars from the RFC after having been turned down three times.

Selling Postmasterships

Yet again the Democrat National Committee and the Post Office Department were shown, by the Senate Committee on Expenditures, to have been involved in the sale of postmasterships in Mississippi. Evidence has been disclosed that members of the Democrat National Committee in Michigan have been shaking down Civil Service postmastership candidates for the Democrat slush fund. (See the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A5752.)

Grand Jury Indictments of Internal Revenue Agents

When Congress adjourned grand juries from coast to coast—in San Francisco, St. Louis, New York, and Boston—influenced by the work of Congress as well as acting on locally furnished evidence, were grinding out indictments.

Internal Revenue officials have been found to be involved in.

(1) Attempted shakedowns of persons in tax difficulties, as in the case of Collector Delaney, of Boston.

(2) Failure to prosecute tax fraud cases where underworld big shots are concerned, as in the cases of Costello, Adonis, and Guzik.

(3) Accepting fees from firms under an official's jurisdiction, as in the Finnegan case.

Deals in Defense Supplies

In the House Expenditures Subcommittee investigation of Army deals in connection with the Detroit and Toledo arsenals, General Crawford was found to be compromised by the acceptance of favors but the Executive was so callous to dubious conduct that the General was simply transferred to another job.

Still another House Expenditures Subcommittee investigation revealed that after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, the military were buying through favored middlemen—not only goods once declared surplus and given away to European countries, but engines and manufactured articles furnished the British via ECA.

Thus foreign policy and domestic policy meet at the trough. High service officers and civilian officials join in the business of sharing 53-cent dollars among themselves.

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

So overbearing have the President and the Executive branch become in their relations with Congress that something of a civil war between the Executive and the National Legislature marked the first session of this Congress. It centered about the President's efforts to push socialism in the guise of national defense, his open defiance of laws passed by Congress, his spendthrift policies at home and abroad despite the threat of ruinous inflation, and the mounting proofs of influence, waste, and corruption in Government operations.

The President repeatedly used the Executive order to get around existing law, to accomplish objects which Congress refused to enact into law, and to accomplish ends he undoubtedly knew Congress would reject.

Congress rejected an administration proposal to disperse industrial plants. Such a dispersal program would have disorganized the entire economic system. But shortly after Congress roundly defeated the proposal, the President issued an Executive order under which such a dispersal program may still be accomplished.

By his National Security Order, the President made it possible for Government agencies to withhold and to censor information from the press and public and even Congress may be denied information it needs in order to legislate properly.

Republicans entered a strong protest against censorship and Government suppression of information. Forty-four of the 46 Republican Senators comprising the minority representation in the Senate joined in signing a manifesto attacking the order as an invasion of the right of the press to criticize and of the right of the people to know the truth about their Government. Republicans also introduced bills to break this censorship of public information.

The President signed the law containing the Kern amendment barring economic aid to countries selling to Communist countries materials which could be used in building their war machines. The amendment contained a clause permitting a few exceptions in special cases. The President promptly used this clause not for special cases, but to exempt from the ban India and all of the Western European countries receiving economic aid. His act completely nullified Congress' determination.

The President asserted the power to send American troops throughout the world as he pleased. This would mean a military dictatorship over the lives of American citizens. Congress refused to approve such a grab of power and protected the people by Senate Resolution 99 expressing disapproval of the President's sending more than four divisions of ground troops to Europe without first obtaining congressional authorization.

Republicans took the initiative in this historic stand against usurpation of power by the President, Senate Resolution 99 being the substance of a resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

To protect domestic producers from serious injury through administration tariff cuts, Congress wrote certain safeguards into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Although the President repeatedly claims to seek peace, to protect the people's liberties, and to preserve the American system of individual initiative and private enterprise, his actions speak otherwise.

The President and his Executive branch persistently expand their powers, spend as they please at home and abroad, flout the law, push socialization and Government controls of American life, and suppress information about what they are doing.

Because of this practice of saying one thing and doing the opposite, a feeling of distrust marked the attitude of Congress in its dealings with the President and the Executive branch.

The first session of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-second Congress ended with a Nation in confusion and false prosperity, fearful of runaway inflation, burdened by mounting taxes and controls, struggling to maintain its freedom against the pressures of its own Government, and fearful of foreign invasion for the first time since it won its independence.

The present Democrat Congress under New Deal-Fair Deal leadership has failed to cope with these problems and lead the way to durable peace and solid prosperity in a free economy.

MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

AGRICULTURE

Sugar Act amendment (Public Law 140; approved September 1, 1951)

This measure extends to December 31, 1956, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to readjust domestic sugar production and to fix sugar import quotas, and to June 30, 1957, the excise and import tax of 50 cents a hundred pounds.

Farm mortgage loans (Public Law 123; approved August 23, 1951)

This act raises limitation on Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act loans from \$5,000 to \$10,000, and initial production loans from \$3,500 to \$7,000 and extends repayment period

Agricultural workers (Public Law 78; approved July 12, 1951)

Provides for recruitment and importation of agricultural workers from Mexico, under improved regulations, until December 31, 1953

FINANCE AND COMMERCE

Revenue Act of 1951 (Public Law 183; approved October 20, 1951)

Increases individual income taxes on the first \$2,000 of income (after deductions and exemptions) by 11 percent. Over \$2,000, the increased tax liability is 11.75 percent. Gives to heads of households 50 percent of the benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married persons

Provides a corporate income tax rate of 30 percent (old law—25 percent) on the first \$25,000 of each corporation's income and 52 percent rate on all income in excess of \$25,000 (old law—47 percent).

Puts a ceiling rate of 18 percent for excess profits tax and consolidated return purposes, which means that in no case will more than about 70 percent of a corporation's income be taken in income, consolidated return and excess profits taxes (old law—62 percent).

Reduces from 85 to 83 percent the proportion of the average base period net income which may be taken into account in computing the excess profits credit.

Imposes the regular corporate income tax on certain undistributed profits of farmer's purchasing and marketing cooperatives, mutual savings banks, and State chartered savings and loan associations, and Federal savings and loan associations.

Changes excise taxes in a number of respects. Almost all of the excise-tax revenue under the act is raised from the manufacturer's excises, the new taxes on gambling and the taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco. No rate increases are provided in the case of the retail excises, the excises on transportation and communication, or the admission taxes.

Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 (Public Law 96, approved July 31, 1951)

In this measure the Eighty-second Congress extends (to June 30, 1952) and amends the Defense Production Act of 1950, which sets up the basic machinery for the economic mobilization, inflation control, and defense production assistance. Among other things, the new act bans livestock slaughtering quotas, provides for import controls on fats and oils, grants authority for price roll backs and roll forwards, relaxes retail credit controls on automobiles, continues Federal rent control, and sets up an independent Small Defense Plants Administration. Although the President signed the bill into law, he declared that he would have vetoed the act if it had contained only the provisions relating to inflation. He requested immediate repeal of the livestock, import control, and price ceiling provisions, but the first session of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-second Congress failed to take final action on his request.

Renegotiation Act of 1951 (Public Law 9; approved March 23, 1951)

In order to eliminate excess profits on defense production, Public Law 9 provides for renegotiation of defense contracts and subcontracts which exceed a total of \$250,000 for any one contractor within one fiscal year. To administer these proceedings the law also establishes, as an independent agency in the executive branch, a renegotiation board of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

E bond interest (Public Law 12, approved March 26, 1951)

Authorizes individual owners of series E savings bonds to retain the same after maturity and to receive interest on such maturity values for a further period not to exceed 10 years

Regulations of exports (Public Law 33; approved May 16, 1951)

This legislation continues authority for the regulation of exports until June 30, 1953.

Export-Import Bank (Public Law 158; approved October 3, 1951)

Increases the borrowing and lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by \$1,000,000,000 and extends the life of the bank for five additional years, until June 30, 1958.

Defense contract financing (Public Law 30; approved May 15, 1951)

This act seeks to encourage the financing of defense contracts by banks and other financial institutions by amending the Assignment of Claims Act relating, among other things, to recovery or set-off by the Government against amounts paid to banks as assignees

Aircraft-war risk insurance (Public Law 47; approved June 14, 1951)

Amends the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide insurance and reinsurance for civil and other aircraft against loss or damage arising out of war risks.

Copper import taxes (Public Law 38; approved May 22, 1951)

Suspends import taxes on copper until February 15, 1953, or the end of the national emergency

Suspension of duty on metal scrap (Public Law 66, approved June 30, 1951)

To encourage importation of metal scrap necessary to the defense program, this legislation continues to June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on such scrap.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Readjustment of postal rates (Public Law 233, approved October 30, 1951)

Provides for doubling the rate on the penny post card, increasing second-class rates 30 percent over a 3-year period, and raising third-class bulk mail minimum rates by 50 percent. The act also establishes a system of staggered holiday period for Federal employees.

Size and weight limitations on parcel post mail (Public Law 199, approved October 24, 1951)

Lowers the weight and size limits on parcel post packages as follows: if mailed to the first two postal zones, not more than 40 pounds and not more than 72 inches in length and girth combined; and if mailed to the third through eighth zones, not more than 20 pounds. Existing limitations were 70 pounds and 100 inches.

Increased compensation of Federal employees (Public Law 201; approved October 24, 1951)

Provides a 10-percent increase in compensation for about 1,100,000 Federal employees, including the legislative and judicial branches of Government. Minimum increase

is set at \$300 and maximum at \$800. This is the first over-all pay raise for Federal employees since November 1949.

Adjusted compensation of postal employees (Public Law 204, approved October 24, 1951)

Makes adjustments in the compensation and grades of postal employees to meet the increased cost of living and to remove certain inequities in salaries resulting from previous flat increases in pay for postal workers. Provides employees in the automatic grades with a flat \$400 for those on an annual basis and 20 cents an hour for those on an hourly basis

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (Public Law 139, approved September 1, 1951)

In this measure Congress extends certain time limitations on basic authority for defense housing aids, and authorizes \$1,635,000,000 in Federal aid to housing in critical defense areas. In order to insure that private enterprise may do as much of the job of defense housing as possible the law provides for relaxation of credit restrictions and other means of encouraging private housing before resort is had to Government construction and financing. Of the amount authorized \$50,000,000 is for Government-constructed housing, \$60,000,000 for community facilities and services, \$15,000,000 for loans to prefabricated housing builders, \$10,000,000 for land condemnation in isolated areas; and \$1,500,000,000 for FHA mortgage insurance on privately constructed housing

Housing relief in Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood disaster emergency (Public Law 107; approved August 3, 1951)

Permits more liberal mortgage insurance for those building low-cost homes to replace their homes lost in a flood or other major disaster. Maximum mortgage amount is \$7,000, or in high-cost areas \$8,000, and the insurance could equal 100 percent of the value of the property.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Troops to Europe (S Res 99, agreed to by Senate April 4, 1951)

Approves the President's designation of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; and the President's plans to send four additional divisions of ground forces to Western Europe; but declares it to be the sense of the Senate that no ground troops in addition to the four divisions should be sent under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty without further congressional approval.

The resolution further urged the elimination of treaty restrictions preventing Italy from full participation in the defense of Western Europe and also urged the use of military and other resources of Western Germany and Spain.

Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, approved October 10, 1951)

Congress authorized a \$7,483,400,000 foreign military and economic aid program for foreign countries. Broken down by areas, the provision for military aid is \$5,028,000,000 for Europe, \$396,250,000 for Near East and Africa; \$535,250,000 for Asia and Pacific, and \$38,150,000 for the American Republics. Economic aid provided under the new act is \$1,022,000,000 for Europe, \$160,000,000 for Near East and Africa; \$237,500,000 for Asia and the Pacific (excluding Korea); \$45,000,000 for Korea; and \$21,250,000 for the American Republics.

Funds for military aid would be governed by provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. The Defense Department would determine the military needs of beneficiary countries, but the President would apportion the funds. In the case of the economic aid, the act abolishes the Economic Cooperation Administration and transfers its

functions to a new Mutual Security Agency, whose chief would coordinate the military- and economic-aid programs. The State Department would retain control of the point 4 program of technical aid to underdeveloped areas.

Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Public Law 213; approved October 26, 1951)

Provides for termination of United States military, economic, or financial assistance in certain circumstances where recipient countries export military or strategic goods useful in production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Soviet Russia or its satellites. Also provides for termination of such aid in the case of other materials, when the Administrator of the Mutual Security Administration deems necessary. Unlike the Republican Kem amendment which banned aid to countries exporting war-potential goods to Communist countries, operation of this act hinges upon the findings, determinations, and discretion of the Administrator. While the Kem amendment was still the controlling law, the Democrat administration nullified its intent by making blanket exceptions to the prohibitions contained therein.

Terminating the state of war between the United States and Germany (Public Law 181; approved October 19, 1951)

Effective the date of enactment, terminates the technical state of war between the United States and the government of Germany.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (Public Law 50; approved June 16, 1951)

This measure extends from June 12, 1951, for a further 2-year period, the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements. The act further provides for detailed proceedings by the President and the Tariff Commission and for reports to Congress in cases likely to cause or to threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951 (Public Law 48, approved June 15, 1951)

For the sole purpose of providing food grains to meet the emergency need resulting from the flood and drought conditions in India in 1950, the Congress voted a \$190,000,000 loan to India. Although the Senate had adopted a Republican amendment to require ECA authorities to get part repayment in strategic materials, including monazite sands and manganese, the conferees eliminated the mandatory nature of the Senate amendment. The act further provides that up to \$5,000,000 of the repayment sums be put into a special deposit account for an exchange program of students and technicians from the United States and India.

Admission of aliens (Public Law 14, approved March 28, 1951)

Clarifies regulations concerning admission of certain aliens by distinctions between voluntary and involuntary membership in totalitarian parties. The law was made necessary by the misapplication of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 by immigration and naturalization authorities which resulted in the exclusion of aliens not intended by Congress to be excluded.

Displaced persons (Public Law 60; approved June 28, 1951)

Amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by extending certain provisions to December 31, 1951, and also extending the terminal date for entry of orphans to June 30, 1952.

LABOR

Railroad retirement benefits (Public Law 234; approved October 30, 1951)

Increases benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax

Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Universal Military Training and Service Act (Public Law 51; approved June 19, 1951)

To increase the strength of the Armed Forces and otherwise provide for the national defense, this act amends the Selective Service Act of 1948 by authorizing the induction into the Armed Forces of men ages 18½ through 26 for 24 months of training, with a limitation on the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System set at 5,000,000. Regulations concerning enlistments, deferments, exemptions, and reemployment rights are specified. Establishes a National Security Training Commission which will set up a plan to govern the National Security Training Corps.

Construction at military and naval installations (Public Law 155, approved September 28, 1951)

Authorizes a \$5,800,000,000 construction, equipment, and facilities program in designated Army, Naval, and Air Force areas, including research and laboratory centers, in continental United States and outlying Territories.

Naval vessel construction (Public Law 3; approved March 10, 1951)

Authorizes a Navy ship conversion and construction program aimed to increase and to modernize the Navy, at an estimated cost of \$2,700,000,000. Included is authority for construction of a supersonic carrier similar to the carrier *United States* which had received approval in the Eightieth Congress in 1948, but which the President canceled in 1949 after its construction had been started. The delay increased the estimated cost by several million dollars. The law also prohibits the disposition of naval vessels unless authorized by Congress.

Servicemen's insurance (Public Law 23; approved April 25, 1951)

Congress herein provided for a \$10,000 cost-free life insurance policy for all members of the Armed Forces while they are in service with indemnity payable to immediate family beneficiaries in monthly installments over a 10-year period. The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 was amended to provide for a new system of insurance under which servicemen are given a chance to continue Government policies after they are discharged and providing insurance for persons suffering from disabilities.

Construction reserve funds (Public Law 157; approved October 1, 1951)

The effect of this bill is to extend until September 30, 1952, the time within which certain deposits in the construction reserve funds, established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, may be committed for the acquisition of new vessels.

Atomic Energy Act amendments (Public Law 235, approved October 30, 1951)

Allows the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into arrangements involving communication of certain restricted atomic data to other nations.

Air Force organization (Public Law 150; approved September 19, 1951)

To implement the National Security Act of 1947 this measure provides a statutory basis for the internal organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force.

Increase in construction cost authority of experimental submarines (Public Law 176; approved October 16, 1951)

Amends existing authority for construction of experimental submarines by increasing the authorized cost of construction of the two vessels being built under authority

of the act of May 16, 1947, from \$41,000,000 to \$49,000,000.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Construction of access roads essential to the national defense (Public Law 177; approved October 16, 1951)

Increases the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense, but puts a limit of \$45,000,000 on the amount authorized.

Reconstruction of flood-damaged highways and bridges (Public Law 175; approved October 15, 1951)

Increases by \$10,000,000 the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes.

VETERANS

Veterans' benefits (Public Law 28, approved May 11, 1951)

Provides for medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, burial benefits, and compensation or pension rights for persons serving in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, on the same basis as veterans of World War II.

Housing privileges for Korean war veterans (Public Law 214; approved October 26, 1951)

Extends to Korean war veterans housing privileges granted to other former servicemen, such as entitlement to loans under the GI bill and preference in obtaining certain housing.

Veterans' vocational rehabilitation training (Public Law 170, approved October 11, 1951)

Provides vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950.

National service life insurance (Public Law 104, approved August 2, 1951)

This law authorizes successive renewals for 5-year periods of national service life insurance policies which have not been exchanged or converted to a permanent plan of insurance, on a 5-year level premium plan, at the premium rate for the then attained age and without medical examination, provided the required premiums are tendered prior to expiration of such term.

Pension increase (Public Law 149; became law over the President's veto)

Over the objections of President Truman the Congress enacted this measure to provide \$120 pension to veterans of World Wars needing a full-time attendant because of non-service-connected disabilities.

Automobiles for disabled veterans (Public Law 187, passed over the President's veto, October 20, 1951)

The House and Senate overrode the President's veto of this act which authorizes the Veterans' Administrator to pay up to \$1,800 on cars for veterans of World War II and Korea fighting who lost one or both feet, one or both hands, or their sight in line of duty.

Treble action damages (Public Law 142; approved September 13, 1951)

Establishes liability for treble damages on the part of a seller of property paid for in whole or in part with proceeds of loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act when the consideration paid exceeds the reasonable value of the property as determined by a proper appraisal by a VA-designated appraiser.

Purchase of veterans' cooperative housing mortgages (Public Law 243; approved October 30, 1951)

This law authorizes the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into advance

commitment contracts to purchase not to exceed \$30,000,000 of securities issued to construct certain veterans' cooperative housing, if the commitments relate to mortgages where the Federal Housing Commissioner issued either a commitment to insure or a statement of eligibility prior to June 29, 1951. A limitation of \$3,500,000 is placed on commitments in any one State.

Multiple sclerosis (Public Law 174, approved October 12, 1951)

Amends the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected.

Treatment of veterans who develop psychosis (Public Law 239, approved October 30, 1951)

Provides for hospitalization and outpatient treatment of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service.

Nomination of Charles M. LaFollette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me for delivery on the floor of the Senate on the nomination of Mr. Charles M. LaFollette to the Subversive Activities Control Board be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON NOMINATION OF CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE, OCTOBER 20, 1951

I arise to address myself to the nomination of Mr. Charles M. LaFollette as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and in doing so want to point out that as the Senate adjourns today it is leaving his nomination as an important item of unfinished business. Mr. LaFollette's nomination will expire with our adjournment today.

We have heard much this week about the necessity of giving the Senate an opportunity to confirm Presidential appointments. I point out, however, that a number of my colleagues who seem so outraged with the fact that the Senate will not be given an opportunity to vote on Mr. Jessup's nomination are themselves preventing the Senate from acting on Mr. LaFollette's nomination.

Mr. LaFollette was first appointed to the Subversive Activities Control Board on October 23, 1950. His nomination was sent to the Senate on November 27, 1950, and resubmitted to the Eighty-second Congress on February 12, 1951. His nomination has been held up for more than 8 months without any hearings, reports, or any other official information from the committee. I am informed that a number of outstanding members of the bar and judiciary of Mr. LaFollette's home State of Indiana, and in the Nation as a whole, have urged his confirmation and I know of no recorded objections to his confirmation.

Mr. LaFollette is an outstanding American who served in the United States Army in Europe during World War I, and has been active in the American Legion in his State for many years. A distinguished lawyer, he

has served as a Republican member of his State legislature, and from 1942 to 1947 was a Republican Member of the House of Representatives from the eighth district of Indiana. From 1947 to 1949 Mr. LaFollette served his country in Germany, first as the deputy chief of counsel and chief prosecutor of the Nuremberg war crime trials, and then as director of the office of military government in Württemberg-Baden.

I had an opportunity to become personally acquainted with Mr. LaFollette upon his return from Germany when he served as director of Americans for Democratic Action at a time when I had the privilege of acting as national chairman of that organization.

Mr. LaFollette is a relentless foe of communism and has been serving effectively and well, first as a member and then as Acting Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. Mr. LaFollette has been Chairman of the three-man panel of the Board, conducting hearings on whether or not the Communist Party is an action group within the meaning of the McCarran Act. The Communist Party will undoubtedly challenge the legality of that proceeding and I regret the fact that the failure of the Senate to act on Mr. LaFollette's nomination will be both a propaganda triumph and additional legal ammunition for the Communist Party which seeks to discredit the Board as an illegally constructed tribunal.

I must, therefore, rise to express my disappointment and my sharp disagreement with the decision of the committee which prevents the Senate from passing on Mr. LaFollette's nomination.

What Do You Know About Price Controls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the final RECORD an article entitled "What Do You Know About Price Controls?" which appeared in the September 1951 issue of the Safeway News, published at Oakland, Calif.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT PRICE CONTROLS?

One cent, in America, isn't a fortune. It's only one one-hundredth of a dollar. That isn't very much coin in anybody's language. But you ask the average housewife about the value of pennies, and if she manages the family's budget, you'll hear her insist that you've got to watch the pennies if you want to bag the dollars.

The fact is, even in a large business such as Safeway, a penny is a mighty important sum of money. The average food retailer's net profit margin seldom runs more than a cent or a cent-and-one-half per dollar of sales. Last year, for example, out of every dollar that Safeway took in on sales, the company made about 1½ cents net profit.

Now consider this: If the average food retailer's net profit were wiped out entirely—less than a couple of cents on a dollar—there would be little benefit to the consumer. The point is: It is not the retailer's profit margin that is responsible for inflation.

Most food retailers are now operating at greatly reduced rates of profit. Safeway, for instance, has been losing hundreds of thousands of dollars per week because the un-

reasonable method of imposing price controls is endangering the normal profit margin. In other words, under the patriotic premise of fighting inflation, OPS regulations are strangling the economic life of many a business.

Because the trend in price controls can lead to grave situations, Safeway has taken a leading part in protesting injustices. The situation can best be spotlighted by referring to the company's semiannual report, issued to stockholders on September 6, 1951. This interim report covered the first 24 weeks of this year. It showed sales were up—\$645,902,975 as compared with \$537,993,295 in 1950. But, for that 24-week period, after adjusting for 1951 Federal income taxes, Safeway's net earnings were \$4,337,874—which was \$1,389,858 less than in 1950. This in spite of every means accomplished to tighten to the bone on operating expenses.

"The decrease in net earnings shown for the 1951 period," Safeway's president, Langan A. Warren, stated, "can be largely attributed to the imposition of price ceilings early in the year. . . . These ceilings disregard historical margins, methods, and practices, and fail to protect the retailer against price increases from his suppliers and increased wage and other operating costs."

Safeway, needless to say, is against rising food costs, and against inflation. This company's success through the years has been largely due to its constant aim to bring good quality foods to consumers at the lowest possible cost. But there is a growing tendency, among some sources in this country, to heap such labels as "self-interest" or plain "un-American" upon any firm that stands up to protest some of the decisions of the Office of Price Stabilization.

Almost all price-control regulations established by OPS impose severe profit-margin squeezes on food retailers. The trouble, at least a principal cause of the difficulty, lies in attempting to set ceilings on the 2,000 to 3,000 items sold in the average grocery store. Any attempt to set up uniform prices throughout the country, or even throughout very large regions, is ill-advised. Customarily, margins on different food items vary greatly from area to area. Cuts of meat popular in New York City, for example, may sell at discounts in Los Angeles. Prices charged in a town accessible by rail and truck are apt to be much lower than prices in another town in the mountains reached only by truck.

The point is, as mentioned above, if the ceiling on retail food items is set a cent or two too low, this cent or two is the difference between a normal profit and a substantial loss for the retailer. As an illustration: the average selling price of food items is around 30 cents. Where 30 cents may represent a normal profit of 1 percent on a dollar of sales, 29 cents would represent a loss of 2 percent per dollar of sales, and 28 cents would mean a loss to a retailer of 5 percent per dollar of sales. In other words, for a firm doing an annual business running over a billion dollars per year, as is true of Safeway, the fixing of all prices 1 cent per item too low, means a reduction in net profit of about \$30,000,000. Sounds fantastic, doesn't it?

If you are a retailer who is hurt by certain price ceilings, it isn't much consolation to be told that for the country as a whole the ceilings are fair. The ceilings may be completely unfair as far as you are concerned. Yet because the theory of price controls is aimed at checking inflation and stabilizing the Nation's economic condition, and is accompanied by patriotic slogans, one may hesitate to criticize the set-up. A favorite of price control advocates, and seriously believed by some, is the ill-considered premise that there will be substantial benefit to consumers if profit margins of retailers are reduced. This latter is political thinking. Congress never intended the power given to the President over prices be used for profit

control purposes. These are but a few of the facts that must be acknowledged if one is to know the full story about price regulations.

Price controls have created many problems in the distribution of food supplies. Retailers with the lowest ceilings have had the hardest time obtaining short items. Shortages have shown up particularly in meats. Many types of meat are short in different parts of the country. The summer shortage of lambs in the East, the current shortage of carcass beef in the Midwest, are two examples resulting from unreasonable ceiling prices. Where's the meat going—there's plenty in evidence on the hoof—if it isn't reaching these retailers? No FBI training is needed to trace the tons of meat rolling into gray or black markets. Something should be done, obviously, to revert the course of meat products from illegal channels back into legitimate supply lanes.

Thus much of the solution to this grave problem of price ceilings appears to be in the matter of supplies. At least this has proved traditionally true in the retail food business. As long as there are no critical shortages of any food items, competition between retail grocers is keen enough to keep prices in line. Anyone who has had the experience of trying to run a grocery store knows just how long you can survive in this business if your prices are not competitive?

Actually, and the facts are on record: If devotees of price controls are hoping to curb inflation by cutting into profits, they're wasting valuable time in this intensely competitive game of food retailing, where the margin of profit is measured in terms of a penny or two of every sales dollar.

Drug Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted to extend remarks, I hereby include the following editorial from a recent edition of the Springfield (Mass.) Union:

DRUG ADDICTION

Penal punishment, including the death penalty, is increasingly advocated as a deterrent to illicit narcotic traffic.

Why are we so quick to call for the blunt clubs of imprisonment and electrocution rather than sociological reasoning? Surely we can use better weapons than the instruments of brute force.

An examination of the traffic manifests the immense falsity of the penal approach. Why are there sellers of illicit narcotics? This question must rightfully be divided; why are there the "higher-up peddlers," and why the "bottom-pushers"? The "higher-up" is there for the fantastic profits. As for the pusher, the answer is more complex.

The existence of the pusher points to one of the most tragic and least understood aspects of narcotic addiction. The opiate addict becomes physically dependent on the drug; unless his body receives as great a dosage as the preceding one, an agonizing physical abstinence "syndrome" sets in.

Contrary to opinion, it is not a mental craving, but only this terrible physical necessity that motivates the petty crimes of the opiate addict. Included in these crimes is the pushing or selling of narcotics on the

bottom level, i. e., directly to his own fellow sufferer.

Thus we have the peddler who reaps the fantastic profits, and the pusher who sells to procure his own physically needed supply. Contrary to opinion, it is invariably the sick, desperate addict pusher who bears the brunt of penal punishment; within the shrewd framework of narcotics distribution the non-addict peddler is rarely caught.

As for the pusher, the city of New York and other affected large cities are pioneering and breaking into this tragic and yet vicious cycle, though with less than satisfactory results thus far. As for the peddler, we have not reasonably answered the fantastic profit incentive that essentially creates him; we must take the profits out of illegal narcotics.

England (since 1926), Denmark, Norway and Sweden are countries which have taken the profits out of illegal narcotics, which treat the addict as ill, and keep addiction amazingly low. England reports less than 400 citizens who are addicts in the entire country. Forty thousand for our country is considered a control figure, with addiction out of control today with some 40,000 in New York City alone.

Why can't we do as well as England? No reason at all. Recognized as a physical and mentally ill person, the addict is administered his drug by an accredited clinic and at the same time offered every facility for healing. This sociological approach eliminates the profits; no profits, no peddlers, no peddlers, no need for penal punishment.

Narcotics addiction is an unnatural, artificial conjuration out of the ignorance of our society, not with brute force, but with knowledge, intelligence, and compassion will we eliminate it, while in the meantime ferreting out and cracking down on the higher-up peddlers.

More Government Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with expenses mounting daily there can be no justification for the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture throwing away money.

On bid invitation 312 from the United States Department of Agriculture for the Forest Service, northern region, for a portable rock drill, the Syntron Co., of Homer City, Pa., submitted a bid of \$400. With no explanation whatsoever the United States Department of Agriculture accepted a bid of \$545. While the amount is small indeed, the principal is large and shows bureaucratic indifference to careful expenditures to the taxpayers' money.

I include a letter from the Syntron Co., a copy of their bid, and the letter showing the bid accepted by the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service:

SYNTRON Co.,

Homer City, Pa., October 10, 1951

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: We have many classic examples daily of the waste in our Government

through carelessness in purchasing and plain graft.

Of course we all have the habit of shrugging our shoulders and saying "What can we do?" One small organization can do little or nothing but pay the exorbitant taxes and hope that some day the men who are responsible for the wasteful inefficiency will be brought to task and sensible men placed at the head of our Government who will demand 100 cents in value for the dollar expended.

We are attaching photostatic copy of another classic example of inefficiency and waste.

Why any department of our Government should throw away \$145 is more than we can understand.

If the machines differed from one another greatly the purchasing agent would have a reason for paying the higher price.

Of course the Warsop was the first machine designed. It was designed and manufactured in England. Whether or not it is manufactured in the United States at the present time I cannot say, but it is an English machine in every respect, while the Syntron machine is 100 percent an American machine that is designed on the same principle by American engineers who have improved the machine, increasing the weight and the power.

Of course we may be prejudiced in our belief that the Syntron machine is much better but we are sure that there isn't \$145 more value in the Warsop machine. Of course in the next year the various departments of the Government will probably buy several hundred similar machines and \$145 lost on each machine will be enough to consider even in these days of easy Government morals and dollars.

Of course the Government loss will only be 36 1/4 percent of the value of the machine quoted at \$400.

We know that you and a large percentage of our Pennsylvania Representatives are fighting this type of carelessness as hard as you can.

We don't like to take up your time or add to your burden but pass this along to be added to that growing pile of proof of the carelessness and waste that is making it harder for our country.

Kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CHETWIN M. HURD.

(Copy to Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

Schedule

[Bid No 312- Continued]

Item No	Article	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Amount
A	Drill, rock, portable, gasoline-engine driven, complete, and in accordance with the following specifications: F. O. B. Hamilton, Mont.	1	Each..	\$100	\$400

Bidder please state the make—Syntron—and model—RD-51—of the rock drill you propose to furnish under item A.

Descriptive literature covering specifications and a detailed cut or drawing of the unit you propose to furnish must accompany your bid.

SPECIFICATIONS AND GENERAL CONDITIONS

It is in the intent of this invitation to secure a light weight portable gasoline-driven rock drill for use on trail maintenance in remote areas.

Drill furnished shall be the manufacturers' latest model.

The unit desired shall be similar and equal to the latest model of Warsop rock

drill as manufactured by Warsop Power Tools, Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa., having the following specifications:

Engine: Two-cycle gasoline.
Fuel: Gasoline-oil mixture.
Tank capacity: One-half gallon.
Ignition: Flywheel magneto and spark plug.

Speed regulation: Twist grip handle bar throttle control.

Drill speed: Approximately 2 minutes per foot in granite.

Capacity: 8 to 10 foot depth.

Engine speed: Controlled by automatic governor

Starting: Simple freewheel crank.

Weight: Approximately 80 pounds to 118 pounds.

Height: 2 to 10 inches to 37 inches

Drill size: $\frac{3}{8}$ - by $3\frac{1}{4}$ -inch hexagon—1 inch by $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches.

Lubrication: Automatic, using gasoline-oil mixture

Gasoline: Standard

Bidders should carefully read the specifications incorporated in this invitation to determine exactly what is wanted. If the specifications or general conditions are not clear, please contact promptly the issuing office for interpretation or further explanation.

UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

FOREST SERVICE,

NORTHERN REGION,

Missoula, Mont., October 2, 1951

SYNTRON CO

Homer City, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to your letter of September 28, 1951, with regard to our bid invitation 312 for a portable rock drill.

The successful bidder meeting our specifications on this invitation was the Andrews Equipment Service, Inc., at a bid price of \$545 less 1 percent, 20 days.

Thank you for your quotation and your letter of inquiry.

Very truly yours,

L. E. NOEL,
Regional Supply Officer.
By W. A. EWING,
Acting

United States Foreign Policy Fails in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the British-Egyptian controversy is further evidence that a change in foreign policy all over the world is badly needed. Mr. John C. Henry correctly sets forth the situation that prevails in the Middle East in an article that recently appeared in the Washington Evening Star. Our own national security is involved and the American people should be fully informed of the present dangers in that part of the world. The United States has no business pulling British chestnuts out of the fire in Egypt. However with Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State we can hardly expect less. I am

including Mr. Henry's article as part of my remarks:

NEW SANDSTORM OVER SUEZ CANAL—ANGLO-EGYPTIAN CONTROVERSY ONLY ONE OF SEVERAL ISSUES CAUSING STEADY DETERIORATION OF WESTERN POSITION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By John C. Henry)

Another sandstorm is really beginning to swirl in the Middle East—this time over the narrow waters of the Suez Canal.

In many respects there are close parallels between the Anglo-Egyptian controversy, involving both the Suez and the Sudan, and the several other issues which have been causing a steady deterioration of western position in a vital part of the world. Through more than a century of its history as a great world power the British Empire recognized the importance of the Middle East, and particularly of Egypt and the Suez area, as a link in its command chain around the globe. Through most of those years Britain had both prestige and power to support its policies—and even though these were not uniformly popular influences between the two World Wars they were adequate to maintain political, military, and economic dominance in the critical zones. World War II and the succeeding years have brought some changes.

Quite understandably, Egypt has been the proudest of the Middle East countries. Out of an ancient history that had its form of genuine glory the country has made substantial progress in modernizing its economy and its politics. It considers itself the leader among the Middle East nations and it is correspondingly sensitive in its relationship with foreign powers. When British tanks were driven to the very doors of King Farouk's palace early in World War II to force him to accept a government more amenable to British discipline a malignant wound that has not yet healed was inflicted upon Egyptian pride. Whether or not there was an alternative means of gaining the desired cooperation at the time is an academic question today.

While Farouk was quoted then as warning the British that they would some day regret their action it would be an oversimplification to trace all of today's troubles, either British or western, to this single incident. The overall colonial policies of both the British and the French had been effectively creating a reservoir of ill will toward European domination in the Middle East. Neither power showed a willingness to recognize the local urgings for independence and equality which are part of true sovereignty, preferring too often to speak of nationalism and xenophobia as if they were diseases which could be safely disregarded or perhaps treated by the nineteenth century prescription of a whiff of grapeshot.

In this background the United States has likewise failed to exercise a constructive influence. When the Palestine issue came to a head in the postwar years it was American policy for the most part that was imposed upon western behavior and the result was creation of a new antagonism and disillusionment of the Arab nations toward the West. On most other issues we chose to let the British exercise first responsibility.

Actually, aside from the purely military significance of the Suez defense, there is a broad ground of common interest between the west and the middle-eastern powers. Communism does not come naturally to the Moslems, despite the social unrest which fastens itself so easily upon areas of low-living standards. There are bonds of commerce and of culture between the non-Communist world and the Moslem world, stronger as they apply to Britain than to any other country of the western bloc.

The Egyptians are well aware, from history, that they cannot stand aside in any

world conflict. If such a conflict develops, or, more appropriately, if it is to change from the cold to the hot stage, it is unlikely that they would make a free choice to join with the Communist cause. For months past they have awaited invitation to join with the North Atlantic powers in some form of regional security pact and the present Four Power—American, British, French, and Turkish—deliberations at Ankara are expected to develop a framework for such participation.

While Wednesday's proposal of the Nahas government for abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty may seem badly timed and ominous to the West, it makes even more compelling the urgency for a negotiated settlement of this issue—as against a recourse to force—and the construction of a new formula of partnership which could strengthen rather than destroy the fabric of security.

"In the Darkness Before Dawn Almost Any Morning You May Hear the Roar of a B-50's 14,000 Horsepower as It Strains To Get Off the Ground With a Load of Live Practice Bombs"—Howard Norton, London Correspondent, Baltimore Morning Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I well remember how much I was impressed by a short address to this House made by VICTOR L. ANFUSO, in which he declared:

It was indeed heartening to read just how effectively our Air Force is on the forefront of the fighting lines throughout the world, readied as far as is possible for every emergency, not alone here at home, but abroad as well.

Pilots, navigators, bombardiers, air and ground crews are drilled relentlessly in their jobs.

In writing of these matters, Benjamin Welles, special London correspondent of the New York Times declared "In case of war, the United States air fleets could be in action in a mere matter of hours."

Mr. Speaker, that is what was spoken with respect to the readiness of the United States Air Force on May 10 last. In discussing the same subject to which Congressman ANFUSO addressed himself, Mr. Howard Norton, chief of the London bureau of the Baltimore Morning Sun, in writing of the United States Air Forces now in England, declared:

Here in England are the bases and the B-50 bombers are the planes that would start delivering death and destruction to the enemy within minutes if war comes.

Every Member of this House and Americans everywhere will thrill at the good news telegraphed from London with respect to the accomplishments and exploits of our B-50's: 15,000 to 30,000 feet in the skies on flights that take them the equivalent of nearly two round trips

to Moscow from their English bases, or even further.

Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of both Houses may have an opportunity of learning of how our own country here at home is defended by our Air Forces flying the sky over England, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the article written by Howard Norton of the London bureau of the Baltimore Morning Sun, entitled "GI Bombers and Their Flying Gas Stations."

That article reads as follows:

NEW RAMPARTS WE WATCH—GI BOMBERS AND THEIR FLYING GAS STATIONS

(This is the second of a series on American air bases in England. The series was completed before Mr. Norton began his present coverage of the British election campaign.)

(By Howard Norton)

LONDON—When you pass through the gates of any of the five big American bomber bases in England, you're in the war zone.

These are the bases—and the B-50 bombers here are the planes that would start delivering death and destruction to the enemy within minutes if war came.

Officially, the 45 to 50 big silver bombers and their crews that are in England now are here for 3 months of training under the strategic air command rotation program.

Actually, it amounts to 3-months' duty in America's first line of defense.

UNDER TIGHT SECURITY BLANKET

A tight security blanket covers all their movements.

Guns of the Thirty-second Antiaircraft Brigade—manned 24 hours a day—guard each of the fields.

A tight-lipped, unsmiling American security guard, with a rifle slung across his shoulder, stops you 50 feet away from any of the airplanes.

Even the commanding general has got to halt and dig out his identity card, and let the sentry read it over and compare the picture with the general's face. Otherwise, he gets no closer to the bomber.

In the darkness before dawn almost any morning you may hear the roar of a B-50's 14,000-horsepower as it strains to get off the ground with a load of live practice bombs.

When it returns—anything from 17 to 23 hours later—its bomb bays are empty, and its crew heavy-eyed with fatigue.

In the intervening hours, these American boys have fought simulated midair battles with camera guns, dueling with the best fighter pilots the Royal Air Force and the American bases can send up.

They have dropped thousands of pounds of explosives on Helgoland or possibly on targets in the marshy region of East Anglia known as the Wash.

REFUELING HIGH IN THE SKY

They have pinpointed by radar vital factories deep in the heart of one or more English cities, and theoretically destroyed them.

They have made rendezvous with other B-50's to practice formation radar attacks and formation gunnery.

They have made a solo attack on at least one strange target.

They have worked out a problem in celestial navigation.

And somewhere—15,000 to 30,000 feet in the sky—they have met a lumbering B-29 tanker plane and taken aboard possibly as much as 4,000 gallons of gasoline in a matter of minutes.

While all this is going on, they may have flown 5,000 miles—the equivalent of nearly

two round trips to Moscow from their English bases—or even farther.

It is all a deadly serious business.

But at the same time, to the crewmen, it is also something of a game.

The Strategic Air Command scores and rates its bomber wings according to their efficiency, like the teams of a baseball league.

And each wing, in turn, scores and rates its bomber crews.

At the end of each month the scores are totaled up, and the leading crews get temporary spot promotions—which mean more pay and privileges. They keep their promotions as long as they keep their proficiency.

ARRIVES STRIPPED FOR BATTLE

When a wing (45 to 50) of B-50 bombers flies to England for temporary duty it comes over stripped for battle.

All the supporting personnel—clerks, cooks, and the like—are left behind. And in their place it brings all the spare parts and equipment it would need if it had to keep going 90 days with no further contact with rear bases of supply.

All this is packed into what the Air Force calls a fly-away kit—a big aluminum container built to hold the exact number of spares which experience has shown the average B-50 will need in a 90-day period.

One kit goes into each plane. So all the crews need when they get here are a place to live and eat, runways to fly from, and shops where the maintenance work can be done.

THAT'S GENERAL JOHNSON'S JOB

To provide these and keep them running is the mission of Maj. Gen. Leon W. Johnson's Third Air Force in England.

And well over half the more than 20,000 Americans in uniform in England today are building or maintaining such bases under Johnson's command.

During their 3 months at these bases, the bomber crews live together under wartime conditions.

There is no more driving home to dinner with the family as they do at their American bases. They get to know each other intimately. Misfits are spotted and weeded out, for the sake of the team.

ENGLISH PEOPLE AND WEATHER

They get to know the English people and—more important to them—the English weather, and the kind of clothing and navigation it takes to beat it.

Mostly, they live in prefabricated huts or Nissen huts built during the war. These are all right in the summer, but can be pretty damp and miserable in wintertime.

At this moment, the United States Air Force is operating five of these bomber fields in England. All are former RAF fields made over to suit the needs of the B-50's. And all are in East Anglia.

Three of the five are being used by the rotating wings of B-50's; the fields at Bassingbourn, in Cambridgeshire; Wyton, in Huntingdonshire, and Mildenhall, in Suffolk.

FIFTEEN TO TWENTY AT EACH BASE NOW

Fifteen to twenty bombers are now stationed at each of these, though, in emergency, the bases could handle many more.

One of the biggest of the fields—Sculthorpe, in Norfolk—is being used by a squadron of RB-45 four-jet reconnaissance planes.

And the fifth, and biggest, of the group—Lakenheath, in Suffolk—was given over last month to the Second Air Refueling Squadron, a group of 20 stripped-down B-29's technically known as KB-29P tankers.

That this tanker fleet gets the biggest and best of the bases now operating reflects the importance the Air Force attaches to this relatively new type of aircraft.

Midair refueling gets top priority among training items in England.

The KB-29P looks like a flying scorpion.

An 18-foot boom juts out from its tail like a scorpion's stinger. But there is no sting left in the tanker planes. They have no guns at all, and every other weighty gadget that can be spared has been removed.

In the bomb bays, instead of bombs, are bulging nylon gasoline tanks, capable of carrying more gasoline than the Air Force would like to have published.

One of these strange-looking planes recently flew for 18 hours and still was able to transfer 2,000 gallons of gasoline to another plane somewhere along the route and keep a safe margin in its own tanks.

STAMINA OF MEN ONLY LIMIT

It is routine for them to fly 5 hours, then transfer up to 6,000 gallons, and turn around and fly 5 hours back to base.

Flying as long-distance reconnaissance planes they can stay in the air without refueling for 35 to 37 hours, or even longer depending upon their speed.

"With these flying gas stations to help us, the only limit on the distance a bomber can fly now is the stamina of the men," said one B-50 skipper.

"It's the biggest thing that's happened since the development of jet power."

MEN FROM MARYLAND THERE

Men from Maryland are scattered over every base that the Air Force has in England.

At Lakenheath, helping to keep the vital tanker fleet flying, is Corp Emory Earl Frantum, son of Mrs. Laura C. Frantum, of Annapolis.

Frantum is a reciprocating engine mechanic, and is a member of what the Air Force calls the permanent party—the group of 1,500 to 2,000 Third Air Force men who here for periods of 2 to 3 years to keep the bases running.

Lakenheath's public-information office is being run by another Marylander—Staff Sgt. John F. Shilling, of 504 Braun Avenue, Hagerstown.

Sergeant Shilling arrived in June for a 3-year tour of duty.

Pfc Samuel E. Galloway, 19, son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Galloway, of Arnold, Md., has been serving in the air police on Lakenheath base for 10 months.

A former Navy man, Galloway is now thoroughly sold on the Air Force—mainly, he says, because he gets a chance to indulge in his favorite pastime, football.

Serving with him on the Lakenheath air police force is Pfc Melvin D. Howard, 23, of Annapolis.

At Bassingbourn bomber base is Sgt. Donald C. Myers, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Henry Myers, of 31 South Franklinton Road, Baltimore.

MYERS HAS ENGLISH WIFE

An Air Force automotive supply specialist, Myers married an English girl—Rosina Pozzo, of Richmond, Surrey—after he arrived here in April 1949.

And in August their first child was born, a daughter, Shirlen.

"It's O. K. living over here when you don't have to eat off the British food ration," says Myers. "But I think my wife will be pretty happy to go to the States. You can tell the folks I may be bringing the family home next March."

Myers and his wife—like all American service people in England—have the privilege of buying their groceries and meats at the Air Force commissary at the base.

They live in an English house in Royston, a town near the base.

SHE DOESN'T NOTICE THE COLD

"You can take it from me," says Myers, "these English houses just aren't made to take any heat in the winter. But that's the nice part about having an English wife. She doesn't notice it."

Also at Bassingbourn is Pfc Robert V. Stockett, 21, an air policeman and son of Mrs. Helen Stockett, of Davisonville, Md.

At Wyton bomber base is Pfc Harry Gray, 20, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph S. Gray, of 4211 Thirty-fourth Street, Mount Rainier, Md.

Assigned as security guard to watch the B-50's at night, Gray has to spend most of his daylight hours "in the sack."

"It sure cuts into my social life," he comments.

One of the stars of the track team at Wyton is Pfc David Jackson, 19, of 515 Fourth Street, East Annapolis. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. James Jackson of that address.

JACKSON TAKES UP CRICKET

Jackson won the 880-yard run in the base track meet, but when the American team came up against the Peterborough Athletic Club "the best I could do was fourth," he says.

Jackson has taken up cricket since he came to England last November, and he now holds down a spot as fielder on the base team.

"We get licked every time we play," he grins. "But that's all right, because every time the English get up a softball team, we lick the hell out of them."

Air Mail Subsidy Separation**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, last January 1951 President Truman repeated his recommendation that the hidden airline subsidies be separated from so-called mail pay:

In addition to the nearly \$200,000,000 that will be spent in 1952 for aviation facilities and services, the Government will spend a substantial amount in subsidies to the airlines through mail payments. Federal financial assistance has been a major factor in the industry's rapid growth, and should be continued to the extent necessary for the sound development of civil aviation. The method of paying this subsidy should be changed, however, in order to provide the public with full information as to its cost. At present, the airline subsidy is merged with compensation for the cost of handling mail and included in postal expenditures. These two elements should be separated, and the subsidy portion paid by the Civil Aeronautics Board from funds appropriated specifically for that purpose. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation providing for this separation. (Extract from message of the President to the Congress transmitting United States budget for fiscal year 1952, January 15, 1951.)

Last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I have the honor to be chairman, reported out a very effective bill to separate subsidies from air-mail pay.

I urge Members of the House to read the 15-page report which accompanied the bill, House Report 3041, of the Eighty-first Congress, second session. That report will present a sound analysis of the issues involved.

Our committee bill, with amendments, passed the House unanimously but because the Senate did not act on it, prior to the expiration of the Eighty-first Congress, the House must now act again.

It is my hope that the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will stand by the sound principles in last year's committee report, and report favorably again the same strong bill which was reported last year.

I do not believe that the amended Senate version meets the standards in President Truman's recommendation. Nor does it meet the standards set forth in the recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission, of the A. F. of L. and CIO, of the taxpayer, veterans, and other public-spirited groups who have frequently advocated this reform before our committee.

This point is elaborated in an editorial, October 14, 1951, by the Baltimore Sun which I ask leave to insert in the Record at this point.

Therefore I hope that our committee will repeat its action of last year, and report favorably H. R. 508 or H. R. 190, and that the House will approve a really effective separation bill.

We would thus be adding something of almost monumental value to the statute books.

The editorial follows:

AN UNSATISFACTORY AIRLINE SUBSIDY BILL

The intent of Senate bill 436 recently passed by the Senate on voice vote was to separate airline subsidy from pay for carrying the mails in both the domestic and the international field. With mail pay and subsidy doled out at present in one conglomerate sum by the Post Office Department it is impossible for the taxpayer to discover just how his airmail dollar is divided.

The bill passed by the Senate provides that domestic subsidies be determined separately from mail pay and that they be paid separately by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The bill sets a scale of rates for domestic airmail payments to take effect next July and authorizes the CAB in future to adjust rates and standards of compensation without additional legislation. Though these standards are somewhat clouded by national defense considerations the bill does state that the mere existence of an airline certificate "shall not be deemed conclusive" justification for subsidy.

From the beginning this bill has been weak on the international side. It is worse as amended. The cost factor which serves as a guide in the fixing of domestic rates is completely ignored. The floor set is the amount paid to foreign carriers for handling the mail and the ceiling provided is the Universal Postal Union rate of \$2.86 per ton mile. This, as we have pointed out before, is over three times the rate for a luxury passenger and seven times the rate for airfreight and express.

Amendments to the bill would permit the international carriers to obtain Federal subsidy contracts for periods up to 5 years, with the carrier to return to the Government at the end of the contract one-half of any net profit for the operation in excess of 10 per-

cent of invested capital minus liberal deductions. Subsidies would be restricted to United States air lines holding certificates as mail carriers.

These amendments by Senators McMAHON and McCARRAN are the jokers in this Senate bill. Five-year contracts would dodge yearly congressional review of subsidies even though the Hoover Commission called for it. "Losses and subsidies [said the report] should be made clear each fiscal year and passed upon by Congress."

Also under these amendments the CAB could conceivably grant any number of certificated carriers, 5-year subsidy contracts. And Congress would be obligated, making the lack of annual review a most serious out in the Senate bill.

Last year the House passed a much tighter measure to achieve separation. That was the Heselton-Kennedy bill which died in the Eighty-first Congress. To properly implement the separation idea the House Interstate Commerce Committee should now adopt last year's hearings and report favorably the same Heselton-Kennedy bill (H. R. 508) which they approved last year.

Address by Hon. Dewey Short, of Missouri, at Luncheon Meeting of Kiwanis Club of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me to the Kiwanis Club of New York on Wednesday, October 3, 1951:

(The president, Dr. Arnold Treitman, introduced Mr. George E. Stringfellow.) [Applause.]

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Save your applause for the speaker. I am sure he will be worthy of it.

Our speaker today has been a Member of Congress from Missouri for almost a quarter of a century. He was educated at Boston University, Harvard University, Heidelberg University, and Oxford University. I think he comes to us with a good educational background. [Laughter.] Of course, the feeling is not unanimous on Harvard. [Laughter.] I want to say to you that he is a roaring Lion. He is a member of the Lions Club and a very good member he is.

DEWEY SHORT has carried his district in Missouri when the State has voted overwhelmingly for the opposing party. For years he was the only Republican member of the Missouri delegation. People vote not so much for the Republican Party out there or the Democratic Party, but they vote for the things that DEWEY SHORT stands for, and it is the things that DEWEY SHORT stands for that made America great. If we stand with him, we will help him keep America great, and that is our responsibility, your responsibility, and my responsibility.

DEWEY SHORT.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

Congressman SHORT. My good friend, Mr. Stringfellow, Mr. President, and members of the Kiwanis Club of New York City, it is a real pleasure and a high honor to be invited to address your splendid organization.

When I was a little boy in the backwoods of the Ozarks in southwest Missouri, I often read about the seven wonders of the world, and during the past three decades, it has been my opportunity and good fortune to have seen first hand many of these wonders of the world, but the longer I live and the more widely I travel and the more I study men and institutions, the more am I convinced that there is only one wonder left in all this world and that is the United States of America. [Applause.]

How much longer we can maintain and support this outstanding wonder of the world remains to be seen, but what is it, I ask you, that has contributed to our supremacy among the sovereign nations of this world? There are other nations much larger than ours in area, in acreage, geographically speaking much vaster, richer than we are in mineral deposits, in agricultural output, and in forest reserves. They outnumber us as much as three or four to one in population. It is much closer from New York City to Leningrad than from Leningrad to Vladivostok. There are millions of acres in Siberia that have never heard the sound of a woodman's ax. There are rich and extensive mineral deposits all over the U S S R. China, of course, outnumbers us almost three or four to one in population. But neither geography nor mere numbers of people is a correct criterion by which to judge the greatness of a nation or of a people. There is not strength in mere brute force or physical numbers.

What is it then that has made America in less than a century and three-quarters the outstanding Nation of all the world, and what has contributed to our supremacy, not only in a material way with all the physical comforts we enjoy, but with the educational opportunities, the religious freedom and with the hundred-and-one better things of life which we enjoy daily more than any other people?

Well, I think the first thing is our religious basis. The Christian religion has made America great and supreme because the architects of our country, the founding fathers, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights, were God-fearing men. They started out by saying, "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . ." It was the religious faith of Thomas Jefferson and of George Washington during those harassing and bitter days of the Revolutionary War with a ragtag army, half frozen and starved at Valley Forge. It was George Washington who fell on his knees in the snow imploring the help of divine providence, because he had nowhere else to go. Not only Jefferson and Washington, but Franklin, Madison, and other men who set up a new republic on the face of the earth were God-fearing men.

We have inherited the virtues of the Christian religion, and only those of you who have had the opportunity to visit the dark continent and the savage islands, where cannibalism is practiced and where Christianity is not known, can truly appreciate the faith of our fathers, which contributed so much to the strength of America, because it is in this spiritual strength, in these moral values and ethical ideals that America has been made great and invincible.

During the darkest days of the Civil War, when our country was being torn asunder, Lincoln fell on his knees in the White House. He once said, "Often I have been driven to my knees because I had nowhere else to go. My wisdom and the wisdom of those around me proving insufficient for the day."

The Christian religion is made up of people who believe in the dignity of the human soul, who believe in the worth of individ-

ality, who respect the personality of their neighbors. That is the thing, the fundamental thing above all else that has made America supreme, and our religious, spiritual, social, political, economic, and educational bases are so interwoven and intertwined that it is impossible to discuss one phase of our life without thinking of another.

The second thing that has made America supreme among the nations of the world is our American form of government. Along with this religious foundation, we have a political foundation, a republic, if you please, not a democracy. We have had much loose talk in recent years about democracy, but the men who wrote the Constitution, the bible of freedom and the charter of liberty, were as eager to avoid a democracy as they were a monarchy. They knew that one leads to tyranny and the other ends in anarchy. They set up a constitutional, representative democracy, or republic, and it seems strange, almost unbelievable, that less than two centuries ago, men universally believed in the divine right of kings. It wasn't until Washington, through his military genius, won our independence from the evil of a foreign rule, and our forefathers gathered at old Independence Hall in Philadelphia with young Alexander Hamilton and aged Ben Franklin, the Pinckney boys, Madison, Bell, and the rest of the signers of that immortal document that Washington refused the kingly crown and set up for the first time in the history of the world a government of, by, and for the people. In order to secure these inalienable rights hitherto unheard of, they established a government that derives all its powers from the consent of the governed.

As Washington founded that Union, Lincoln preserved it. They did not concentrate all the political power in the hands of a single individual. They did not want to concentrate all powers of Government in the hands of any group of individuals. Rather, they wanted a dual form of Government—the Federal and the States, and all powers not expressly given in the Constitution to the Federal Government are reserved to States on local level, because as Lincoln said, "As long as you keep government close to the people, it will be safe." But when you get government by remote control, when you get all governmental powers concentrated in a Federal bureaucracy in far-off Washington, when as Thomas Jefferson said, "When the Government tells the farmer when to reap and when to sow, the people will go hungry," then government becomes very, very dangerous.

There is no task too difficult for the American businessman to undertake, no battle too fierce for him to fight as long as he knows the rules of the game. But when you have a set of referees or umpires in Washington, bureaucrats who were never elected by anybody and are not responsible to anyone except the person who appointed them, who change the rules of the game at every inning, then you don't know which goal post is your own and you can't tell second base from home plate.

Our ancestors set up a republic form of government, a government of, by, and for the people. Your Government is not in Washington, D. C. It is here in New York. It is out in Missouri. It is in Oshkosh, Kokomo. It is in every little hamlet. It's in this room today. You are the Government. It is not outside somewhere. It is you, and it is exactly what you make it.

I am sorry to say that in recent years, many intelligent, successful businessmen have given too little consideration to the affairs of government and have taken too little interest in politics. They have gone

fishing on Election Day. Women have given bridge parties, tea parties. I think the citizen who does not take the time and spend the effort to study issues and candidates in an election and who does not exercise the greatest privilege ever given any man—the right of suffrage—and fails to discharge a solemn responsibility and a sacred duty by going to the polls to vote is as dangerous to his Government and as big a slacker as any soldier who deserts his general upon the field of battle. It is wonderful to live for America just as it is wonderful to die for America. And this form of government of ours, resting upon the faith of our fathers, "living still in spite of dungeon, fire, and sword," we will be true to it to death. It is that religious faith. It is this political system of democracy in a Republic where the people themselves are supreme, and you are supreme. You are bigger than the President, bigger than Congress, bigger than the Supreme Court or all three combined. The only power that can change the fundamental law of this land, which is the one guaranty of our liberty, is the power that makes it, namely, the people themselves. Only the people can change the Constitution, although by clandestine, surreptitious methods in recent years there are those who are trying to undermine and destroy the very foundation upon which this Government rests.

Yes, it is the Christian religion, along with our fundamental political philosophy, that keeps the power of the Government in the hands of the people themselves, that have made America great.

The third thing that has made us supreme among the sovereign nations of the world is our underlying fundamental economic philosophy of private enterprise and individual initiative. We have heard a lot about this "awful capitalism" in recent years. Where in the name of God would Russia have been in the Battle of Stalingrad, where would England have been in the Battle of Britain had it not been for the capitalistic system in the United States that furnished the sinews of war, not only to feed, clothe, house, and furnish the supplies and equipment for 12,000,000 men and women in our own Armed Forces on land, sea, and in the air, but furnished the weapons of war to supply and equip our allies? It was America's industrial output, our productive capacity in spite of all our strikes and stoppages of work that won World War II, and I am glad that General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, General Vandegrift, and all the other great military leaders recognize that fact. They wouldn't for one moment detract from the glory and heroism of the men who fought the bloody battles and won the victories on every continent and sea. They know as well as we know it that it was America's industrial might, our productive capacity, built up here in a new country only 175 years old, not nearly as old, not nearly as large, not nearly as populous as other countries, with a much younger civilization, that won World War II. In a century and three-quarters, with our fundamental economic philosophy of individual initiative and private enterprise, we have seen one new industry after another created and we have seen them expand between two vast oceans and from Canada to Mexico. Thank God my father and your father didn't have any Government floor under them to hold them up, and thank God they didn't have any Government ceiling over their heads to hold them down. [Applause.]

That is what has made America great. You destroy the profit motive and you cut the nerve of progress. I know a lot of people who are getting pretty tired of acting as tax collectors for Uncle Sam.

When we set up our political form of Government we had a Government of checks and balances, with a Congress, a Court, and a President, with legislative, judicial and executive powers, and it was the function of one of these branches of Government to criticize and hold in check the other two. In a century and one-half, almost three-quarters, we have grown under this political system of checks and balances to become the greatest Nation on earth, but in recent years we have become a Nation of all checks and no balances. [Applause.]

I know we have got to have certain controls even in time of peace. Government is more or less of a policeman. It regulates. It doesn't produce anything. Uncle Sam hasn't a dime and he never created a dime and he never will. The only place he can get any money is out of your hide and skin. They are taking a lot. We put the needle to you in the last Congress, but, Brother, we are throwing the harpoon into you now. The present tax bill with this tremendous debt hits you in the face, and it is going to hit harder before too long.

Now, these three things: The Christian religion, our American system of government, a republic with a division and balance of powers, along with our fundamental economic philosophy of individual initiative and private enterprise made America great. Those are the religious, political, and economic foundations of this Republic, but each one of them is being challenged today more than ever before in our history.

We fought two world wars in one generation, in three decades. We spent \$34,000,000,000 with a \$26,000,000,000 debt on our backs at the close of the first. We extended loans, gifts, and grants amounting to \$13,000,000,000 to the nations of the Old World and with the exception of Finland, not a dime was repaid, and it never will be.

When the conflict ended, after we suffered 334,000 casualties, we took care not only of our allies, fed and clothed the Belgians and others, we took care of our defeated enemies, namely, the Germans and Austrians. We fought the First World War to make the world safe for democracy. I volunteered with my brothers in arms, as many of you did, to give the "last full measure of devotion," if necessary, to make the world safe for democracy. In spite of all the money and matériel spent, in spite of all the blood that was spilled, we failed to achieve our goal or reach our objective. Instead of making the world safe for democracy, I saw as a student at Heidelberg, Berlin, and Oxford democracy die all over Europe. I saw freedom take wing and fly out the window. I saw the rise of totalitarian states, the establishment of dictatorships—Mussolini with his Fascist Party in Italy, Hitler with his Nazi Party in Germany, and Stalin following the line of Marx and Engels with his Soviet Party in Russia. In spite of all our sacrifices, we did not make the world safe for democracy. We failed.

World War II we have won at an astronomical cost. It is a staggering, incomprehensible sum—\$400,000,000,000, an amount equal to the assessed valuation of this entire Nation. We have got a debt on our backs of \$260,000,000,000. The interest on that debt alone is between five and one-half to six billion dollars. That is as much money as it cost to run this Government before World War II. We have given almost \$100,000,000,000 in loans and grants and gifts to the different countries of the world.

We suffered 1,081,000 casualties in World War II. Three hundred thousand of the finest American young men paid the supreme sacrifice. Seven hundred and fifty thousand boys came back home but are incapacitated. In my post with the Armed Services Com-

mittee, I have visited hospitals and asylums, and I have seen many of these boys with eyes blotted out and arms and legs blown off and the light gone out of their brains. Many are neurotics who will spend the remainder of their lives in hospitals, in psychopathic wards. I have seen war in action, and I have seen the result and the awful backwash of war. The repercussions of war often are as bad as war itself.

We fought World War II to respect the territorial integrities of the little countries, to guarantee to the small people in the small nations the right to determine for themselves in free, open elections without internal pressure or outside influence the kind of government which they themselves want. That is why we fought World War II. We were told so at the time, and yet before the capitulation of Japan, or the surrender of Germany, Russia reached out with her greedy paws and pulled within her orbit one little country after the other—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bessarabia, Rumania, Poland, East Prussia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Albania—and not content with that, she pointed guns at the heart of Greece, Turkey, and Iran. Only 3 or 4 years ago, when I had the pleasure of addressing the Parliament in Tehran, Russia had 15 divisions mobilized on the Azerbaijan border—the hottest spot in the world today next to Korea. It might well become another. Coming into the Pacific at the eleventh hour, after we had fought and won that conflict almost singlehandedly with help only from Australia to the extent that she could give it, Russia came in 3 or 4 days before the surrender by Hirohito to General MacArthur. What did they pick off? They picked off the northern half, the industrial half of Korea, above the thirty-eighth parallel, all of Manchuria, a territory almost twice as big as the State of Texas, rich in iron and steel deposits and great manufacturing plants at Mukden, Dairen, and Port Arthur. They seized the south half of Sakhalin, all the Kuriles, and practically all of China.

We fought two world wars, one to make the world safe for democracy, which we failed to do, and the other to guarantee the territorial integrities to the little countries and assure the small peoples in the small nations that they could choose the kind of government they wanted, only to see them gobbled up and enslaved.

Now, we are engaged in a deadly conflict, a cold war. There is dynamic divergence in Russia's political philosophy and our own. The ideologies are entirely antithetical and irreconcilable. One philosophy believes in the Christian religion, in the democratic processes of the people ruling themselves and in a free economic competitive enterprise. That is America. The other is a police state. It is the Red philosophy of Soviet Russia that believes in government by force, the OGPU, the Gestapo, a police state where they knock at your door at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. For some slight infraction of Stalin's orders, your entire family is shipped off to rot in the mines of Siberia or freeze to death in the cold, frozen north. It is a government with a firing squad, a government where there is no freedom of religion, press, or anything else; in fact it is said, "a religion under the philosophy of Marx and Engel is an opiate to the people." This is the Godless, atheistic communism of Soviet Russia.

I wish I had time to elaborate on some other points. Let me say this in closing. I have tried to point out the three things that they have contributed more than anything else to the greatness of America. I have tried to point out that we fought two world wars and in spite of all our bloodshed and

suffering and sacrifices, we failed to achieve the objective in either one, and now we find ourselves in a sad, sick, war-torn world, bankrupt not only economically and financially, bankrupt politically and, worst of all, morally.

We know, of course, that as long as there are aggressors abroad in the world, we must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. That is the reason the Congress has not hesitated to vote \$57,000,000,000 for national defense this year, but you and I know we cannot forever carry that load. Russia would not have to fire a shot or lose a man in this cold war unless we change some of our policies. We will knock ourselves out by our own profligacy. We can commit economic suicide here at home, and what Joe Stalin is hoping and wishing for is that we will bleed ourselves white, sap our strength and siphon off our wealth, scatter and dissipate our resources all over the world—Korea today, Indonesia tomorrow, and perhaps Iran next. It is a policy of divide and conquer. Through a systematic campaign of psychological penetration and subversive infiltration, she is hoping for an economic collapse in the United States, widespread unemployment, bankruptcy as a nation, and the deterioration of our currency. All this today is more dangerous, I think, than a dozen Russian divisions. Destroy the purchasing power of the dollar, absorb and confiscate the life savings of the American people, create dissatisfaction, promote unrest, divide and conquer; bleed us white and when that day arrives Russia will come in like a new football team at the end of the third quarter, when we are weary and tired, worn and grubby, and deliver the knockout blow. Abe Lincoln once said, "If this Nation is ever destroyed, it will be not from without, but from within."

You read, I read, contemplate and reflect upon your world history, the rise and fall of empires, and ancient civilizations, from Egypt under the Pharaohs, Babylon under Hammurabi, the Golden Age of Pericles in Greece under Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; imperial Rome under the mighty Caesar and Augustus down to modern Germany under the Nazis; and you will find that each civilization had the seeds of decay sown from within. It can happen here. I fear it is happening here.

It will happen here unless we have a moral renovation and a spiritual revival and unless we put the proper men in high places in our government in this age of might and materialism, when there is so much crime and corruption and communism abroad in our land, when there is so much bribery, thievery, and fraud in high places of Government. Unless we put our own house in order, unless we make ourselves strong at home, unless we learn to live within our means, unless we stop this continuous deficit-financing year after year, going more deeply and deeply in debt every month, we are headed for trouble. A nation is no different from an individual. I have never been able to spend more than I make without getting into serious difficulty. I don't think any nation can.

Before the war, we had seven and one-half billion of this "lettuce" in circulation. We have over twenty-eight billion, four times as much, now. What will your dollar buy? What will your bonds or life-insurance policies be worth?

This is your country, gentlemen. America is not going to be any better or worse than the people who live in it. Congress isn't any better or any worse than the people who elect its Members. We are simply a mirror in which America is reflected, but if ever we needed to halt long enough to take a little inventory of our present stock, not only of goods and services, but of moral and spiritual values, I think that hour is now.

It is always a pleasure to speak to Kiwanis because you are builders. You are not destroyers. You are builders. We build a great America, if we can only keep it. When Benjamin Franklin walked out of Independence Hall at the end of the signing of the Constitution, one of his friends said, "What kind of government have you given us?" The old man said, "A republic, if you can keep it." "If you can keep it."

We are building two worlds, a material world of physical comforts—the world of finance, of business, of manufacturing; the world of skyscrapers, the giant Diesel locomotives, the fast airplanes. It is a wonderful world with all its physical comforts. Let's keep it up. It is the world of science and engineering that has given us electric and atomic powers; but there is another world, gentlemen, that you as Kiwanians must build, a spiritual world of ethical concepts, of moral principles, and of religious ideals; a world of human brotherhood, of cooperation, of honesty, integrity, and fair dealing. It is a world, if you please, in which we are going to have to live and get along together, because science has annihilated space and conquered time. A short time ago, when coming back from Australia, I stopped at Honolulu and spoke to the chamber of commerce, and the next day I was back at Washington, D. C. Recently coming from Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt, I had breakfast in Bermuda, spent 4 hours and had lunch in my office in Washington, and that same evening I had dinner with my family in south-west Missouri.

So, it is a small world, and whether we like it or not, we are going to have to live together and get along.

But in the fight between these two contradictory philosophies in this cold war, remember not only by material might and physical strength can we ever win a permanent victory, but only by winning the hearts and souls of men. After all an idea is the most powerful weapon in this world. It can be a very dangerous one, if it lodges in the brain of a Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin, but it can be a glorious one when it lands in the brain of a Lincoln or an Edison or a Henry Ford, and only here in this United States with its Christian religion, hope, faith, and love, only here under our political form of Government where man is free to live his own life in his own way, only here under our competitive system of free enterprise would you ever be able to produce a Lincoln who could rise from log cabin to the Capitol. Only here is it possible for a poor mechanic to set up a workshop in a woodshed and put America on wheels and transform our whole system of modern transportation. Only here in America could a poor newsboy sell papers on the train and save dimes and nickels and work through the night, when the sluggard slept, and could invent a gadget that would reproduce the human voice and the incandescent light to light up the world. Only in this United States could you produce an Abe Lincoln, a Henry Ford, or a Thomas Edison.

I love America. I hope we can keep America and preserve the Republic which our fathers gave us.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

President TREITMAN: If anyone would like to direct a question to the Congressman, he will be willing to answer.

Mr. CLARK of Syracuse. I would like to ask our speaker if he considers this movement for universal military training a necessity to obtain the objective he just related.

Congressman SHORT. I have always opposed universal military training or peacetime conscription. I think it is totally foreign to our American traditions. I think

that every nation that has ever tried it has been led down the path to war and defeat, but as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I voted for the extension of the draft. I voted consistently for the huge appropriations for national defense. I shall continue to do so until we can develop an international police force with some strength to carry out decisions of the United Nations. I am certainly strong for adequate preparedness and national defense, but I don't want shouldered upon us in this hour of hysteria a system that I consider totally foreign to all our best traditions and interests. I am opposed to universal military training, and everybody in my district knows that. [Applause.]

Most Pressing and Immediate Steps in Navajo Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I must report that the Navajo and Hopi Indians in northern Arizona and their white friends are somewhat disappointed that the appropriation of funds to carry out their authorization for rehabilitation has fallen below those authorizations. It will be recalled that the authorization was for about \$88,000,000 to cover a 10-year period, which amount prorated would mean nearly \$9,000,000 annually for the purpose. Two annual appropriation bills have since been enacted and in each case the actual appropriation has been considerably less than the average of the authorization. Many of the Indians and many of their white friends do not understand the parliamentary procedure, probably getting the impression at first when the authorization bill was passed that it was an appropriation.

I am pleased to note that in the last supplemental appropriation bill there was an item of \$250,000 for water development on the Navajo Reservation. This was separate and apart from the rehabilitation act. As water is one of the most pressing needs of these Indians it is certainly a timely appropriation. The Arizona Senators, realizing the magnitude of that need and its urgency, attempted to get a larger appropriation and did get a larger appropriation in the other body but it was pared down in conference. We should note in passing that the Navajo tribal council has voted to use \$250,000 of their own funds for this water development. Therefore, the Federal Government in this particular appropriation is matching Indian money dollar for dollar. Perhaps that is as it should be so long as the Indians have tribal funds. They certainly are in a position to know and appreciate their pressing need for water and also how best to obtain it if it is obtainable.

Congressman MORRIS, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Indian Affairs subcom-

mittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, held hearings at Window Rock on March 24 of this year at which the Navajo tribesmen were well represented. The chairman of the tribal council and others presented their needs, the most pressing of which they indicated was water development, both for human consumption and for livestock. Of course, they also indicated a need for water for irrigation but made first mention of wells and water holes for their flocks of sheep and goats. It will be remembered that the authorization bill for rehabilitation contained a large proportion for water developments. The Indians declared at these hearings and have since reaffirmed in petitions that rehabilitation money appropriated should not be spread equally over 10 years but that larger amounts should be appropriated in the early years of the program. They requested this not only for water development but for road construction and gave logical and plausible reasons therefor.

Let no one suppose that the Indians are any the less interested in schools and hospitals because they ask for large initial appropriations for wells and roads because the recent severe drought has made water a vital necessity for them and the remoteness and vast extent of their reservation has made roads and trails almost equally vital to them. During the years that I have been on the Indian Affairs Committee I have noticed that the Navajos have increasingly stressed their need for schooling and medical care in general, but at the present time they are pin-pointing their need on water development. Right now they put that first.

Their reservation is on a high plateau. Water cannot be found just any place a deep well may be drilled. The United States Geological Survey has been called on to make a study and have been conducting a study to indicate where water may be found. Recently 20 new wells have been drilled at depths ranging from 200 to 700 feet and I am happy to say that 19 out of the 20 struck water and are now producing. It would be my guess that instead of 20 wells 200 such wells with windmill equipment ought to be provided at once. I am told by the Indian Service that a few mobile internal-combustion engines are provided, about one for every five or six windmill-pumped wells, to pump the water into tanks when the wind fails to do so.

Decision in Korea Through Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of

the House, I have often pondered on the happenings in Korea, and wondered how long it would be before our committee and the American people would come into possession of a true picture of the situation—from the morning of June 25, 1950, down to the present hour.

I have listened with great interest to dozens of expert witnesses—military as well as civilian—who appeared before our committee. I have read innumerable articles and news reports emanating from Korea by way of Tokyo—and long since concluded that, with the exception of our official and military, such expressions—well intentioned—were based upon personal observations locally made by those in Korea who had little or no knowledge of the problem as a whole.

I well remember when the action in Korea first started—that due simply to lack of communications, the news reports received from the war front merely reflected local action noted by those stationed on some local battle sector—and which, when published in the press, became headlines that contradicted one the other in editions issued at the same hour of the very day they were published here in the United States.

It is no wonder the American people were confused as to just what was happening in the first few weeks and months of the conflict in Korea. Frequently I asked myself how long it would be until a clear-cut, concise, impartial, chronological, and factual report would be made as to exactly what was and did transpire.

Mr. Speaker, there has been attributed to some of my colleagues in Congress—from the very inception of the conflict—certain recommendations and statements about tactical air that are directly in opposition to the information and advices given to the Armed Services Committee by some of the most outstanding defense officials as well as military authorities of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force in these United States.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that I found a great deal of interest in an article provocatively entitled "Air Power in Action—Korea 1950-51," written by William G. Key, distinguished author and commentator, and published in the October issue of *Pegasus*?

Mr. Speaker, there is none who will deny but that William Key's long experience in the newspaper world, his service as city editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, his experiences and the knowledge gained in service as war correspondent accredited to the United States Navy in World War II, coupled with the wealth of information acquired as associate editor of the *McGraw-Hill Aviation News*, has stamped him not alone a great American authority on aviation in general, but particularly a distinguished and impartial authority on the use of air power as a military weapon by the several armed services of these United States.

One cannot read Mr. Key's article without appreciating the thoroughness with which he did his research work and

studies in Korea, and the enormity of the fact finding he necessarily conducted to bring out the facts upon which he reported with respect to the many phases of air operation in that country.

He stolidly, disinterestedly, and convincingly recites his findings. He names names and fixes time, not so much by periods or phases as he does by the hour, or else, by the very day.

There is one inescapable conclusion. It is that air power as used in Korea is, as of this very hour, forcing the decision in the Korean war.

The truce talks have been resumed. We hear no more talk of face saving by the Chinese.

Suddenly capitulating, the Reds have given up their demand that the truce line be set at the thirty-eighth parallel. This has lifted the issue from out of the realm of the political—and thwarted their desires to again establish a North Korea and a South Korea. It has placed the matter of making our battlefield truce where our military conferees have since the first insisted that it rightfully belongs—strictly in the field of the military and without regard to political boundaries.

To my mind, there is no gainsaying the fact that this right-about-face on the part of the Chinese Communists is directly due to the smashing attacks that have been leveled against their every operation by our Far East Air Forces.

Mr. Key reports that—in the opinion of those in the Far East who were qualified to speak on the subject—

"Communist front-line troops have been eating into their capital reserves of food and ammunition as a result of the United States Air Force interdiction campaign waged during the summer months, and which has recently been even more intensified.

"Contrary to the generally accepted belief that the Reds have built up for a renewed offensive, there is evidence justifying a completely contrary assessment of their situation. This situation now is seen as being parallel to that of last fall when the North Korean Army literally disintegrated under the twin blows of Air Force interdiction attacks and the Inchon invasion."

There is no doubt but that air supremacy over Korea gave our ground troops what General MacArthur declared to be "the greatest air support that any ground force has ever received in any war in history. It saved our Army on many occasions."

Supporting the statement of the Supreme Commander of the Far East Forces was that short, concise declaration of Lt. Gen. Walton F. Walker, who stated:

"Had it not been for the Far East Air Force, there would not be an American in Korea today."

In contrast with the empirical deductions made by certain of my colleagues in talking about the need of a separate tactical air force, Key did not find that the urgency of such a need was a simple black-and-white proposition which confronted the top triumvirate of airmen of the Far East theater in their air operations in Korea.

The first of the three to whom he referred was Lt. Gen. George F. Stratemeyer, who has long held a well-balanced approach between the strategic purists and the tactical enthusiasts; and that balanced approach was one of the major factors which saved South Korea in the foul hours of July and August 1950.

The second was Maj. Gen. Earle E. Partridge, commanding general of the Fifth Air Force, and one of the most able tactical air leaders to emerge from World War II.

The third was Maj. Gen. Emmett "Rosie" O'Donnell, who had been rushed out, at Stratemeyer's request, to head the build-up of the Far East air bomber command, a top World War II bomb-group commander, and who later became one of the most vocal advocates of strategic bombing of Manchurian targets.

In the article, *Air Action over Korea in 1950-51*, Key reports that the inescapable burden of command and decision, which was later to take its unhappy toll, fell upon General Stratemeyer.

In describing Stratemeyer's action, Key bluntly states:

Stratemeyer threw away the book and then began throwing everything in his limited arsenal into support of the hard-pressed ground troops.

Mr. Speaker, few people in the United States realize the saving of life that was effected among our ground troops by having our Air Force knock out the purely strategic targets in North Korea. These targets had long been used to maintain Japanese-Manchurian troops against the Chinese and Russians. These included the finest and largest plants of their kind in the Far East and were built by the Japanese to supply their war machines, safe from the United States Air Force attacks that struck at the Japanese mainland.

From his own discoveries, Mr. Key points out that—when so-called tactical air could be spared in Korea, the Air Force went after interdiction targets—"a day—or 2 days—or a week's supply away"—but that, basically, every last ounce of air support was afforded to the desperate men hanging with their ill-protected lives onto the front lines of the Pusan perimeter—only feet or yards—and not miles—beyond.

Contrary to the general understandings Mr. Key found that fewer than 3 percent of all sorties flown in the first 3 months of conflict were against strategic targets. From a statistical chart showing 29 missions flown on June 26, 1950, to the more than 500 being flown daily in the early days of August—the uninitiated can deduce little. The fact that the 29 represented zero in the close support column, and that the 500 represented from 300 to 390 in that same column, does tell a story. The close support sorties in early August of 1950 ran up to 389. Interdiction average well under 50. Strategic from 5 to 49, with many days blank.

On the 15th of August, the ground situation was reported by MacArthur's

headquarters to be considered stabilized. The air attack ratio then turned to the more traditional airman's concepts. Ground support—even with little artillery yet in Korea—dropped to about one half—and, from a less than 50 average, interdiction jumped to triple that number—with strategic strikes going out in 60- and 70-plane missions and few blank days.

Once released from the necessities of the front, it took the Air Force strategists a little more than a month to complete the destruction—and never since repaired—of the 18 most strategic targets in North Korea. The job was considered done on September 26. To the inestimable benefit of our ground forces—since that time—our B-29's have concentrated on keeping North Korea's 20 potentially dangerous airfields out of commission—and on knocking out pinpoint targets such as railroad bridges, marshaling yards, and port installations. They also have been used in exploration of some interesting new techniques of close support bombing, using radar and heavy air-bursting fragmentation bombs.

Mr. Key points out that the men who have actually lived with this war—feel that there is real need for a clearly defined redefinition of terms in relation to strategic and tactical air.

He supports his argument by stating that—

An F-84 loaded with 1,000-pound bombs and used in a specific way becomes a strategic bomber, while a B-29, a B-50, or even the sacred B-36, loaded with antipersonnel bombs, is a tactical weapon.

He particularly points up one thing that could easily be worth more to our Nation's security than would be an additional \$10,000,000,000 in congressional appropriation to the air defenses of these United States—and that is the rapidity with which the Far East Air Force availed themselves of every moment spent in actual warfare to train its personnel in the best usage of air power in tactical, interdiction, and strategic uses.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Air Force has made a virtual classroom and research laboratory of the skies over Korea in which to school our rated airmen in every maneuver that would improve procedures or promulgate action programs that will insure to the United States, and for years to come, the greatest fighting Air Force in the world.

No time was lost in initiating this intensive study with respect to the maximum use that could be made of air power as well as of various types of jet and other planes in a modern war. This, the Air Force has done from the standpoint of reconnaissance, fighter, pursuit plane, and bombers with respect to individual flights in various formations as well as in mass action. Never have I read of any military force that so completely or more intently exploited a proving ground to increase its efficiency and decrease its costs both in dollar losses as well as in casualties.

Phase two of the air action over Korea, Mr. Key wrote, started with the inva-

sion of central Korea through the port of Inchon. Air power had already effectively isolated the battlefield and had opened the gates for the invasion and the breakout from the Pusan perimeter.

On the day on which the invasion took place, all North Korean traffic from Sinanju and Wonsan south to the perimeter was literally at a standstill. Thus, it followed that all that was left to the Communists were the back trails and the A-frames on native backs. It was a classic example of battlefield isolation possible under conditions of air supremacy, exceeding even that of the Normandy invasion.

It readily becomes apparent after reading Air Power in Action Over Korea, that a tremendous economy of lives as well as dollars can be effected by virtue of the studied findings of the air forces of the United Nations in Korea. It is my judgment that a close evaluation of the damage done the enemy by the newer uses of air power—Air Force tactics and Air Force weapons—could easily result in savings of a large part of the \$59,000,000,000 recently voted by the Congress for national defense.

No man who sits on the Armed Services Committee in either House of Congress could fail to be impressed by that short, thought-compelling report made by General Stratemeier on July 16, 1950, wherein he said:

Rockets and machine-gun fire from F-80's have blown up more tanks, trucks, and other equipment—than all other types of air attack combined.

Mr. Speaker, few ever thought of using the airplane as a weapon to kill enemy personnel with direct hits from the skies—and yet, in Korea, the statistics show that between June 26, 1950, and as of this hour, our Air Forces in Korea have not alone destroyed and damaged a total of 551 enemy aircraft of the North Korean and Chinese Communists air forces in the air, but additionally thereto have actually accounted for 133,991 enemy casualties.

It is almost impossible to believe that the aircraft of our Far East Air Forces have already flown more than 316,000 sorties, destroyed 57,000 enemy vehicles, 1,143 locomotives, 22,000 railroad cars, and 588 railroad tunnels in Korea and that, in addition, our Air Force has destroyed, as of record, a total of 2,040 bridges.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who rightfully contend that there can be no such thing as a tactical air force ever established—that what the Congress desires to establish is the implementation of a branch of the armed services called the United States Air Force—the personnel and equipment of which can be used tactically, strategically, for interdiction, reconnaissance, transportation, and for all other purposes designed to subjugate an enemy.

Mr. Speaker, in the few days which intervened between the time I received the unanimous consent of my colleagues to revise and extend these remarks in the Record and the date of this writing, on a single day I read reports that our

Air Force pilots had destroyed or damaged 36 locomotives and 289 rail cars in a series of bombing and strafing raids centered in northeast Korea.

Mr. Speaker, air power is—air power. You may use it for strategic purposes. You may use it for tactical purposes. You may use it for reconnaissance, for interdiction, for transportation, and for other purposes.

Reports which emanate from Korea disclose no man under whom the ground troops of our country did finer or harder fighting than was seen under Brig. Gen. John H. (Mike) Michaelis in the Korean war.

A GI Joe himself, things looked pretty gloomy when Lt. Col. "Mike" Michaelis took command of the Twenty-seventh Wolfhound Infantry Regiment on the shrinking Pusan beachhead last summer, but Michaelis and his troops, aided by the Air Force, won out, and it was not long before they were again chasing the Communists back across the thirty-eighth parallel.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no man more highly qualified to speak of the value of the close support that was rendered to Gen. "Mike" Michaelis' troops than the general himself.

While stating that he would like to have permanently under his charge the Twenty-seventh Air Force Fighter Group, which was doing such effective work for him, he pointed out the attending costs to the United States Army when he said:

Organic air is a luxury that the United States Army cannot afford. You lose too much flexibility for what you stand to gain. You might be having a rough time of it—too much of a rough time for your organic planes to handle—while the division next to you might be having it comparatively easy. No, like a lot of other supporting weapons, it's better to have the planes back in one Air Force pool where you can call on them as they are needed.

Mr. Speaker, without further enlargement upon Mr. Key's article, Air Force in Action—Korea 1950-51, as published in the October issue of Pegasus, in the extension of these remarks I am inserting that article into the Record.

Mr. Key's article read as follows:

Air power may well be on the verge of forcing a decision in the Korean war.

Communist front-line troops, in the view of qualified opinion in the Far East, are eating into their capital reserves on food and ammunition as a result of the United States Air Force interdiction campaign waged during the summer months, and recently intensified.

Contrary to generally accepted belief that the Reds have built up for a renewed offensive, there is evidence justifying a completely contrary assessment of their situation. This situation now is seen as being parallel to that of last fall when the North Korean army literally disintegrated under the twin blows of interdiction attacks and the Inchon invasion. This collapse forced the intervention of the Chinese Communist armies.

The relentless pressure of this summer's interdiction program—averaging 100 rail cuts a day and netting thousands of trucks and other vehicles each week—is beginning now to show results that could be the most far-reaching of the entire Korean war.

If this radical new assessment of the situation is correct—and there is weighty evidence to support it—then the Chinese forces massed in the iron triangle are existing with a virtual vacuum between their depth defense lines and their major sources of supply behind the Yalu River. Expanded enemy air activity from Manchurian bases is interpreted as a reaction, so far unsuccessful, to the punishment being inflicted by the current interdiction program. This punishment, it is felt in Tokyo, is behind enemy efforts to renew peace talks without too great loss of all-important face; and behind General Ridgway's firmness in the same discussions.

Prediction, particularly in the far-eastern theater, is risky. However, it is an educated guess that the Reds are being cornered into a convincing cease-fire negotiation or that their air reaction will necessarily have to be more violent, the latter leading to a full-scale air war that will erase the barrier to which our air forces have been disciplined at the Yalu.

In the following pages are reviewed the 15 months of air conflict which have brought United States Air Forces and its Far East Air Forces to the point that this assessment can be made. A succeeding issue will deal in detail with the Combat Cargo Command and other services which have emerged in entirely new perspective during the Korean "police action."

The Korean air war began almost simply when four YAK-9's snaked through the dun-hued ranges surrounding Seoul and jammed across South Korea's prized Kimpo Airfield. A big MATS C-54 transport came into their sights and their guns burst slugs into the American insignie far back on the ship's fuselage.

This was the morning of June 25, 1950. Rumors had reached Seoul of a North Korean attack across the thirty-eighth parallel toward Ongjin, among the first of the strange names to become so familiar to Americans in the Far East. But there had been rumors before, and no particular concern was felt by the crew of the transport, or by the American Embassy and the North Korean military advisory group for which MATS operated this supply and courier plane. It had been damaged the day before, in retrospect perhaps deliberately, when a Korean laborer had slammed a forklift into one alleron. Otherwise, it would have been on schedule and back at Tokyo's big Haneda Air Base. As it was, it stayed at Kimpo to furnish a few spare parts months later.

The attack across the parallel came at 0400 a.m. The attack on the United States transport was made just before noon. Word was flashed back to Japan, and within an hour after this word, C-54's of the Three Hundred and Seventh-fourth Troop Carrier Group, the MATS One Thousand Five Hundred and Third Air Transport Wing and a motley assortment of C-47 and C-46 administrative planes from a hodgepodge of units were on their way to Korea to evacuate American personnel—some 850. From southern Japan, F-82's of the Eighth Fighter Bomber Wing were ordered to fly cover and protect the transports. The shorter-ranged and new F-80's were put up for escort across the Sea of Japan. There was no hesitation, no evasion of responsibility. Even while more long-ranging decisions were being studied in MacArthur's Dai Ich monolithic granite tower in Tokyo and in wood-frame Blair House in Washington, orders went out from Maj. Gen. Earle E. Partridge's Fifth Air Force headquarters for protection with charged guns. The fighters were fired upon that day by North Korean fighters, but no damage was inflicted and fire was not returned since the transports did not come under attack.

The next day brought a different story. Maj. James W. Little, leading the F-82 cover

patrol for the second straight day, was forced to one of the major decisions that have come to American military men down our history and generally are met with action. Little had authority but no orders to fire on the Communists. But he didn't hesitate when, for the second time, machine-gun fire streaked into the American insignie on a C-54. He took his flight of four 82's down to the deck, guns blazing into the LA-7's making the attack on the unarmed transports. Little, who accounted for the first Red plane destroyed in the Korean war, now is a lieutenant colonel and is still on duty in Japan.

It was not until later this day of June 26 that the Far East Air Forces was ordered into a "shooting war," with instructions to attack and destroy North Korean troops and equipment south of the thirty-eighth parallel, to prevent reinforcement of invading forces, and to furnish air supply to and from the Republic of Korea while continuing evacuation of Americans.

Little's decision was recognized with the award of a Silver Star for "his willingness to make the difficult decision to fire the first shot from American guns," and for his "gallantry in action against an enemy of the United States." His attack order had been almost as succinct as McAuliffe's at Bastogne, and an equally typical Americanism: "Sic 'em, boys."

There were the days of mixed decision. Beginning a few hours after Little's order to fire, the token forces then maintained in the Far East for support of the occupation of Japan were committed to action and the strangest war of American history begun. General MacArthur's operations instruction No. 1 laid out a program of action which, again in the retrospect of 15 months of conflict, was at least overambitious. Our program of air and sea action proved futile, and in a few days ground troops were to be committed. Our Far East Air Forces did attack and destroy North Korean forces south of the thirty-eighth parallel, but it was helpless to prevent reinforcement of North Korean invading forces even as it is helpless today in preventing the floodtide of men and supplies delivered unhampered to the edge of the Yalu curtain.

Combat units available to Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer in his Far East Air Forces were scattered, and in some instances, had been low-priority groups, badly understrength for the job to be done. General Stratemeyer had the Fifth Air Force, with five fighter groups just converted from F-51 Mustangs and now equipped with F-80 Shooting Star interceptors, three F-82 all-weather squadrons, one B-26 group, and scattered other specialized squadrons. There was also a Royal Australian Air Force F-51 squadron operating under FEAF control, but not available for combat until June 30. Three of the fighter groups were in Japan, one at Clark Field in the Philippines, and another one on Okinawa were hurriedly ordered into the Japanese area. Two F-82 outfits in Japan were reinforced with the third from Okinawa. Thirty-seven F-51's in moth balls near Tokyo were pulled from storage and manned by pilots from various headquarters and service units scattered throughout Japan. Later, another 145 F-51's were shipborne to Japan—aboard the crack Essex class carrier U. S. S. *Borger*, which crossed the Pacific in record time—and formed into combat groups. The Nineteenth Bomber Group, which was under FEAF control, was ordered up from Guam to Okinawa with combat loads ready to go into action, it mounted its first mission on the twenty-eighth. The Ninety-second and Twenty-second Bomb Groups were ordered out from the States to operate under the FEAF bomber command.

The Far East Air Forces had moved and moved fast with the limited means at its beck and call.

Units in the Far East had been engaging in live firing, and were as combat-ready as possible under conditions which had trained them for an entirely different type of conflict than the one which unfolded in the next few months across the Korean peninsula. It was a new kind of war for the United States, and taught lessons that must on the one hand be heeded, and on the other, unlearned, in a major war.

The next few months were to see a desperate attempt to keep a foothold on the peninsula. Three days after the first shots had been fired by United States air units, it became obvious that the South Korean ground forces were breaking badly. The Han River line was breached and Suwon abandoned. President Truman ordered use of American infantry, drawing upon the occupation Twenty-fourth Division in Japan. First elements of the Twenty-fourth were air-lifted to the Taejon area, below beleaguered Seoul, on July 4, the first flights of the most extensive airlift operation in history. An air-ground operations center was in operation the following day at Twenty-fourth headquarters, with jeep tactical air controllers operating that day at Chonan. The T-6 Mosquitoes were flying on July 6, completing a close-support organization within 9 days of the start of the shooting war and 2 days after the first piecemeal commitment of American ground forces in the wild attempt to contain the hard-rolling North Korean sweep toward the critical port of Pusan at the southern tip of Korea.

All the traditional concepts of air war were virtually useless in this situation, and decisions had to be based on the degree of desperation of the day and the hour. The old theories of strategic and tactical considerations could find no shelf from which they could be dusted off and put to use. The shelves were shaking with the pounding of a foe rich with the taste of blood and already eager for the kill. Ground units had been committed to action not only piecemeal, but with less than 10 percent of their heavy firepower. They were fighting an action that has no successful parallel in history and their only hope of staying on the Korean peninsula was through use of air power in a role that until then had been considered unrealistic. It would have been against a major foe. Throughout the Far East, the Air Force threw away the book and began throwing everything in its limited arsenal into support of the hard-pressed ground troops.

To put the events of the next year in some form of perspective, Korea itself must be understood. It is not like any other section of the world. It often reminds people of parts of North Africa, or our own New Mexico or Arizona. But it is unique, and luckily so. It is a hard land, stretching its barren mountains to trap silt-laden waters for the meager rice paddies from which come the miserable existence of the Korean people. It is a land of harsh extremes, from stinking, steaming tropical heat in the summer months to bitter, moisture-filled cold in the winter, from all-pervading dust in the dry season to glue-like mud in the wet. There are no extremes in the poverty which lays like a chill blanket over the entire land, broken in the past only by the homes of the Japanese who dominated the land for 40 years before World War II, and by the missions and hospitals built by American religious groups in futile efforts to allay the disease that festered the land in its poverty. Ironically, these now provide many of the headquarters for war, and the poverty of the land is heart-rending.

The mountains and their lower ranges all are an almost neutral color, shading from dun to a deep khaki, where only here and there some junior-sized scrub pine relieves the monotony of their eroding slopes. Straggly dirt roads lace the valleys, patterned

against the light green of the paddies deepening to the darker green of the small vegetable patches nearby the small settlements of mud huts with their rice-straw-thatched roofs, festooned with growing melons in the summer months. The roads meander off into trails set in an exaggerated zigzag up to and along the ridge lines—the trails that were to mean encirclement and death or capture to so many of our valley-bound troops in the early days of the conflict. Here and there in a high lip of the hills will be a small rice paddy tucked away, and from an occasional lake in the uplands the paddies step in terraces down to the bottom lands.

There is an unearthly cast to many of the deserted villages north of Seoul, from which the refugees clogged the roads south. They remind the passer-by of a setting for a moon movie, the huts nesting on steep slopes by the dirt road running between high, eroded cliffs that throw an eerie light into the valley. Only here and there is a hut occupied, enough only so you know they weren't left there by a forgotten race some centuries ago. The mark of war is upon them, small arms fire often pitting their walls. Their people would be a hardy race to return at all.

In Seoul, and Taejon and Wonju—the names until last year best known in the United States to the National Geographic Society—there are the more bitter signs of conflict. Seoul in particular had been built into a modern city, one of the more progressive of the Orient under its Japanese masters, with a network of streetcar lines and clean-cut modern buildings revealing a heavy influence of Swedish architecture, softened by the Oriental love for intricately designed stonework. Today the streetcar wires hang listlessly broken in the streets over most of the city and only a few refurbished cars run along the central main streets. Shells of buildings line the sidewalks and rise lonely in the open areas, where bombs and shells laid waste a wide swath. Those modern buildings which were not left hulks have mostly been occupied by the United Nations forces. Those people who have returned to Seoul, a remigration discouraged by military authorities, have fashioned their life in remnants of back alley hovels. Some have set up little stalls in the shelter of bombed-out stores, their main stock in trade the brightly colored comforters so characteristic of Korea, about the only brightness in a drab land. Others offer the flags of the United Nations in gaudy hues foreign to the countries so honored. There is no water in the city, except that brought from the Han River by hand or by truck, little electricity, little food. But still the people of Seoul trickle back, to the concern of the military forces which must always consider the need for hasty evacuation should the front lines explode only 40 miles away.

The build-up of the Chinese Communists during the summer months has been matched in good measure by our own forces, and efforts to put the city back into working shape have stretched temporary water mains across the restored highway bridge, patched and cleared the streets, erected tent cities here and there within unit compounds, and set up spartan post exchange facilities to serve the headquarters units operating there. The only official oasis in the area is an intricately patterned Chinese temple in which a club has been set up, and to which men once in a while drive 100 miles to visit for a few brief hours. Signs everywhere warn that native liquor kills, and there have been enough fatalities to convince the troops of the message.

Beyond Seoul to the north there is left little semblance of civilization in Korea. Convoys and tanks grumble toward the lines,

with here and there a new U. N. tank trundling its heavy guns to counter the Russian T 34 tanks, a sign that we have not been neglecting the opportunity to counter the Chinese efforts to get into shape for an attack. In the lines themselves, enough probing action has been maintained by the Allied forces to force the Chinese to use up hard-won supplies and to prevent any surprise massing of break-through units. The troops are dug in, now at long last with their organic artillery, and, most important to the air war, adequate communications back through the channels needed to bring up air support promptly and effectively when necessary. Far to the east, South Korean units have been regaining the respect of their allies in a bitter campaign up through the mountain ranges, where their only source of supply is by pin-point air drops from C-119's, required almost daily in all kinds of weather.

In the back areas, training is constant and hard. Airfields are being built and old ones expanded, but even with this expansion cluttered by the number of planes they have to support in restricted space.

Through it all there is an air of confidence, and, through it all, a buttoning down for the harsh winter months ahead. Tent sides are being built up from used rocket and other supply cases, built up from cot level to roof-level against the penetration of Korean bitter cold. Quonsets are being buttressed against the cold and enemy attack with dirt and sand bags, and the few light concrete huts chinked to keep within some moderate warmth. Stoves are checked and clothing gone over, the lesson of last winter heeded and the supply depots heavy with the needed heavy gear of a frigid war.

The airfields from which the fighters, the light bombers, the fast reconnaissance ships, and the slow flare planes operate are a curious mixture. In some ways, they are reminiscent of advance fields in France in World War II, but they have their own peculiar flavor here in this Korean fantasy. Most have steel-plank runways, smoother usually than the more desirable but heavily patched concrete of rebuilt Kimoo and Suwon. They are tucked, for the most part, in the fold of hills. In bad weather they are a nightmare into which to make a let-down. Without GCA, there would be little Korean air war, for there are few days of perfect conditions and a pilot can count on at least one-third of his flying being a bad-weather operation. Few runways are long enough for the operations being conducted from them, and, with some of the later type jets, RATO take-offs are standard procedure until the runways can be lengthened to their requirements. Transports operate into and out of fields for which they were never designed. Both jets and transports are hitting high maintenance rates, with their additional burden, as a result of the beating both are, of necessity, being given. Modern earth-moving and packing equipment moved in during the summer have speeded work on the airfields far beyond the hand pace of the Korean laborers, but it is still slow going and the calculated risks of jammed fields give commanders and crews a constant qualm.

Radar and antiaircraft equipment has been brought in, in quantity, so that should our air supremacy, absolute now, be challenged, the enemy will not find his reception one of cordial welcome.

One point should be clear. The Chinese-Russian air forces marshaled behind the curtain of the Yalu River have a capability for most serious challenge to allied air supremacy, both over the front lines and back into the rear areas. Determined, he could stage his MIG's through North Korean fields into the front lines. His twin- and four-conventional-engine planes are available in quantities capable of giving the allies a

rough time all the way back to Pusan, and quite probably into Japan itself. There is no effort in this theater to hide this fact, or to gloss it over. Red raids into the Seoul, Taegu, and Suwon areas have been nuisance raids with antiquated equipment and piddling armament. They are in no sense his best effort, and a Sunday punch sits on the ground to the north.

Again, as in the larger case of Russia itself, it appears that his hand is withheld by the fear of retaliation, for there has been no mincing of the fact that a massive, or persistent air attack into or south of the front lines will unleash our own Sunday punch against Manchuria and beyond. The maps with the airfields and the cities of Manchuria and China are never hidden in the war plans rooms, but are there for anyone to see and only the details are withheld. The planes to mount the massive attacks are only 48 hours away, back in the States. The carrier task forces need only switch their deck loads and armament to sweep on this new course. Nor are other task forces long away.

These realities, and not our weight on Korean or Okinawan or Japanese bases, withhold an enemy effort to turn our air supremacy into a vicious, desperate battle for control of the skies over the Far East. In a sense, this small, second-class situation is but a reflection of the larger, primary considerations of global conflict. Seoul and its complex of field headquarters and airfields is Washington or London or Paris in the larger arena, just as Antung over the Yalu is Peiping or Moscow.

That, in general, is Korea today. It wasn't always so.

As we massed our air forces in the Far East in July of 1950 and brought the quickly mobile medium bombers from the States into action over the ready MATS routes, and built up our air supply potential over these same routes, a welter of hard decisions had to be made. Land forces were committed in desperation and couldn't live in Korea a week without relatively massive air support and supremacy to replace the artillery and supplies they didn't have and wouldn't get until more than a year had passed and the pipelines were filled. Fast carrier task forces had to be brought to action. Our fighters had to be husbanded until new shipdeck loads could be made ready and speeded from the States with the crews to handle and fly them. The retreat continued, back through Taejon, through Wonju, through Kuncheon, until, on August 3, the North Koreans stood on the hills above Taegu and lobbed mortar shells onto the city's airfield. A few more miles and the Korean police action would have been booted out of the beer hall. There, along the Nakdong River line, the North Korean advance ground finally to a halt.

By the book, there were certain things to be done. There were strategic targets in North Korea—18 to be exact—against which the strategic bombers could be sent immediately and exclusively. By the book, tactical fighters and bombers would have begun an interdiction program, taking out the bridges, railroads, and supply roads back along the line to, say in this case, Pyongyang.

There were factors here, and concepts, that date back to the infancy of the Army Air Corps. It wasn't just a black and white proposition confronting the triumvirate of top alms in the Far East theater.

Lt. Gen. Stratemeier, long one of the middle-of-the-road advocates between the strategic purists and the tactical enthusiasts. His balanced approach may be considered one of the major factors in the decisions that followed and which saved Korea in those foul hours of July and August 1950.

Maj. Gen. (now Lt. Gen.) Earle E. Partridge, then commanding general of the Fifth Air Force and one of the most able tactical air leaders to emerge from World War II,

Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, who had been rushed out, at Stratemyer's request, to head the build-up of the FEAF Bomber Command, a top World War II bomb group commander and later to be one of the most vocal advocates of strategic bombing of Manchurian targets. Significantly, he doesn't stay very far from the Far East today, although he holds no command there.

Each of the latter two may be considered to have had varying views on many of the decisions that were to be forthcoming. The concepts of each, and the training of those serving with them, had their roots back in the early thirties when the basic principles of air war today were being formulated; when new concepts were growing out of the development of the Martin B 10 and the period in which Thompson trophy and Schneider cup races were building geometrically increased speeds into fighters. Both had fought in a major war with problems more complex but less confusing than this limited and restricted war being fought across a narrow sea from their headquarters in Japan.

The inescapable burden of command and decision fell upon General Stratemyer, later to show its toll. He threw away the book, and with the full support of Partridge and O'Donnell tossed everything in the air into the battle just to keep the troops in Korea. The B-29's were used as culvert smashers. The interdiction work of his forces was concentrated on the single stage of keeping today's supplies from reaching the enemy front lines today.

Such B 29's as were not needed on the front lines themselves began the job of knocking out the purely strategic targets in North Korea, some of them the finest and largest plants of their kind in the Far East, built up by the Japanese to supply their war machine safe from the attacks that struck their homeland. They had long been used to maintain Japanese Manchurian troops against the Chinese and the Russians. They were not minor targets, by any means. When tactical air could be spared, it went after interdiction targets a day, or 2 days, or a week's supply away. Basically, however, everything went into the support of the desperate men hanging with their ill-protected lives onto the front lines of the Pusan perimeter, feet and yards rather than miles beyond him.

A note from General Stratemyer's official diary, recounting a conference with General MacArthur, points up this concentration:

"It is my opinion and unless you direct otherwise, I will operate every combat airplane in the Far East Air forces in support of ground troops against only those targets in battlefield support as suggested by Fifth Air Force advanced headquarters in conjunction with General Dean's headquarters."

Fewer than 3 percent of sorties flown in the first 3 months of conflict were against strategic targets.

From the 29 missions flown on June 26, 1950, to the more than 500 being flown daily in the early days of August can be read little. The fact that the 29 represented zero in the close support column, and the 500 represented from 300 to 390 in that same column, does tell a story. The close support sorties in early August of 1950 ran up to 389. Interdiction average well under 50, strategic, from 5 to 49, with many days blank.

On the 15th of August, the ground situation was considered by MacArthur's headquarters to be stabilized. The air attack ratio turned to the more traditional airman's concepts: Ground support (even with little artillery yet in Korea) dropped to about one-half, and, from a less than 50 average, interdiction jumped to triple that number, with strategic strikes going out in 60 and 70 plane missions and few blank days. Once released from the necessities of the front, it

took strategic air just a little more than a month to complete the destruction, never since repaired, of the 18 strategic North Korean targets. The job was considered done on September 26, and since that time the B-29's have concentrated on keeping North Korea's 20 potentially dangerous airfields out of commission, and on knocking out pin-point targets such as railroad bridges, marshalling yards and port installations. They also have been used in exploration of some interesting new techniques of close support bombing, using radar and heavy air-bursting fragmentation bombs.

There is a dangerous deduction to this early phase. It assumes that there always will be decisions as quickly and intelligently made and as loyally carried out. This phase proves that air power, if it is to maintain the world we know, must be flexible enough to meet any kind of emergency conditions, and that it cannot be built for or restricted to any one type of war. Korea may well be a second-class war; there will be other second-class wars with their inherent dangers of major war unless they are contained as successfully as this of Korea has been bottled to this date.

There is a distinct and influential school in the Far East Air Forces today the men who have lived with this war—which feels that there is need for a redefinition of terms in relation to strategic and tactical air. This school argues that you cannot define a particular airplane as strategic, another as tactical. They assert that Korea has proved this thinking illogical, that the application of an airplane in a given situation determines whether it is being used in a strategic or a tactical sense, and that the crews who fly them should be so indoctrinated. They maintain that an F-84 loaded with 1,000-pound bombs and used in a specific way, becomes a strategic bomber, while a B 29, a B-50, or even the sacred B 36 loaded with antipersonnel bombs is a tactical weapon.

While this may seem basic and perfectly simple, it did not prove so in the early Korean days when the crews of the B-29's neither understood nor liked their tactical missions until the need had been drawn out for them in fine print and blunt language by their own top commanders, who did accept it. Even today it is easily apparent in the Far East that the strategic bomber groups suffer a divided loyalty, being drawn from the strategic air command and its rigid doctrines to operate under the Far East Air Forces and its necessarily flexible approach to the use of aircraft as a weapon of opportunity or necessity.

The first period of the Korean air war ended roughly the first week in September 1950. This was just a little ahead of the first phase of the ground war. On the ground, the retreat had ended, but the enemy still was capable of crippling attack. By the first of September, the interdiction program, started as soon as pressure on the front lines eased, had knocked out 80 percent of Korean key rail and highway bridge targets.

The pattern of these strikes was designed not only to prevent supplies from reaching the front lines, but also to isolate the Inchon-Seoul area for the daring gamble of invasion that was to come in mid-September. The main supply route, rail and highway, from Antung in Manchuria down through Sinanju and Pyongyang had been badly battered, and the North Koreans then did not show the facility that the Chinese Communists now have for utilizing and repairing makeshift river crossings. The area of the east coast invasion at Wonsan had been cut off from Pyongyang, and from Chongjin to the north, primarily by naval aviation operating from carrier task forces. South of Seoul, communications had been cut along the Seoul-

Suwon-Taejon line, up which the North Koreans could move their southern forces to strike the limited invasion units.

Generally speaking, the B-29's were hitting north of the thirty-eighth, the light bombers and the fighter bombers in the south. But even in these late stages of the first period, B-29's were being drawn back and used tactically as the situation dictated. The first week of September, when the North Koreans made what was to prove their last desperate drive for the sea against the Pusan perimeter, the 29's were pulled back and operated in a 7-day close support program that saw the first "carpet bombing" effort—about which there still is disagreement. The FEAF view is that the area was too large for the number of bombs which could be dropped; that the bombers did not get a pattern over the entire area, but only patterns within the area. Intelligence estimates of the Army placed 40,000 enemy troops in the bomb area, but the impression in FEAF now is that this is high. All things considered, however, it was felt the effort was worth while, if only from the morale standpoint for the doughfoot battling valiantly on the ground.

The principal shortcomings of air and ground forces—and there should have been plenty for both—became evident during this first period. A primary cause of trouble and friction, despite recognition that air power was keeping ground troops on the peninsula, was the paucity of communications equipment, particularly from advance ground units back through command levels, that delayed or did not provide air support strikes. This situation since has had attention, but it has only been in the past few months that it has been considered fully corrected by Army and Air Force.

Adjustments had to be made to fit in the high capabilities of naval aviation, with the Korean Peninsula an ideal carrier operating theater. Carrier forces were on the scene as early as July 3. Complaints soon were heard that carrier planes were not being used to their maximum effectiveness. This was true. Carrier operations at that time had their own shortcomings, principally in that they launched a 75-plane strike at times when worth-while targets were not available for all 75 to hit while airborne. This now is controlled through the joint operations center, with naval capabilities being assigned on a preplanned basis, and with the flexibility of the carrier task forces being utilized as much as possible. Generally, carrier aviation has been concentrated on targets along the eastern Korean coast in a heavy interdiction program, with specific tasks assigned across the entire front in ground support.

The somewhat bitter Air Force-Marine close-support philosophy also clashed in these early stages, but any open friction was minimized by continuing the Marine concept of assignment of a wing of support fighters to the Marine division involved on the ground. FEAF maintains that this kept peace in the family while at times giving the First Marine Division more close support than it would have had under a centralized direction of front-line needs, and at other times giving it all that centralized control could pour into any area. The situation, of course, was ideal from the standpoint of Marine close-support doctrine, in which training is concentrated on use of air as division artillery in amphibious operations until such artillery can be brought ashore—a condition that held true in this particular campaign for the Army as well.

There was criticism in this period also from the lower echelons of the Army. While Generals Partridge and Walker flew together in dangerous reconnaissance flights over enemy lines and keyed their forces together in what will long be studied as a classic military example of exploitation of limited forces to counter enemy masses, there were claims

that the Air Force was not delivering—claims that came up from smaller units. Yet, there was more close support, quantitatively, than was ever given in the palmiest days in Europe. FEAF maintains also, and is supported by Army commanders, that close support was more effective than in Europe, the reason being that it has only been within the past few months that the Army has had the mortars and artillery it needed for the Korean situation. In these early days, it was necessary for aviation to take care of machine-gun nests which normally would be the job of mortar fire. When it was unable to spread itself thin enough to provide all the artillery support needed, it began to get the criticism of the lower units. Other elements of the criticism were inherent in the weakness of Army communications from front-line units into higher headquarters, which qualified FEAF experts maintain has only in the past few months been fully corrected—a period in which the Air Force itself has corrected weaknesses in its own communications which gave it too few radio channels for direction of operations across the entire front. An example of the problems they are talking about is the only recent establishment by the Tenth Corps of a joint fire control center coordinating artillery and air strikes, assigning each to the most effective targets. This has served to reduce the demand for air strikes and has freed many Fifth Air Force planes for interdiction strikes without reducing the effectiveness of fire power against the enemy.

Phase 2 may be said to have started with the invasion of central Korea through the port of Inchon. Air power had already effectively isolated the battlefield, and had opened the gates for the invasion and for the break-out from the Pusan perimeter. On the day of the invasion, major North Korean traffic from Sinanju and Wonsan south to the perimeter was literally at a standstill. All that was left to the Communists were the back trails and the A-frames on native backs. It was a classic example of battlefield isolation possible under conditions of air supremacy, exceeding even that of the Normandy invasion.

In this period, a new element of air entered the Korean war when the combat cargo command began its full-scale operation of supply and air evacuation under the direction of Maj Gen William H. Tunner. The full extent of this new factor is a story in itself, one which will be covered in detail in the November issue of the Pegasus. But the first few days of this operation proved that logistic mistakes or mishaps no longer need prove fatal to the success of a military operation. The extreme difficulties of the Inchon harbor tides delayed such crucial items as a pontoon bridge for the Han River, brought in speedily by use of the flexibility of the then new combat cargo command operation.

By the 3d of October, General Stratemeyer could proudly recapitulate and could afford to philosophize: more than 40,000 sorties flown between the 26th of June and the end of September; 29,000 tons of bombs delivered, and 23,000,000 rounds of ammunition; more than 1,100 tanks destroyed or damaged; more than 370 bridges down or damaged. It has cost 139 planes, 96 from enemy action, and 175 lives. It had again shown the lesson so severely taught in the last war—that control of the air is essential to the success of surface operations. . . . the only air-planes our troops saw were our own. The enemy was restricted to night movements over harassed and battered communications routes; his supply of rolling stock and vehicles was sharply curtailed; he lost most of his tanks and much of his artillery. . . .

He dealt then with a subject that was beginning to concern the top airmen—the beginning of the build-up to the north had

perhaps begun to filter through air intelligence sources. Air supremacy over Korea was quickly accomplished. Through the enemy's air force was small, it could have given our ground forces plenty of trouble, if allowed to operate unhampered. As it happened, the air battle was short and sweet. After the first few days, the enemy no longer had an air force. But I need not dwell on the fact that, had the enemy possessed a modern, effective air force, the whole picture in Korea—from the viewpoint of land, sea, and air forces—would have been vastly different. Nevertheless, we had to continue reconnoitering and sweeping his airfields for any signs of build-up of air strength. You recall the sightings and destruction of enemy aircraft as recently as last Saturday. This task of maintaining air supremacy is always the first charge on our air resources.

Less than a month later the air battles of the Yalu curtain began in earnest, and F-86 Sabrejets were rushed out from the States to counter the fast and able MIG's, getting into the border action about the middle of December.

Meanwhile, the land warfare had rolled north, extending to the Yalu on the east-central front and north of Hamhung on the east and Sinanju on the west. Our own attack had been geared to airborne supplies. The attack and the air supply columns had been screened from enemy counterthrust by sweeps of F-80's into the Sinuiju air bastion on the Yalu northwest of Sinanju, while 80's, F-51's, and B-26's pounded retreating columns. The F-80's held their own, although the MIG's were demonstrably faster, though not as well handled. The first decisive jet-to-jet air encounter in history took place on November 8 near Sinuiju, with First Lt. Russell Brown, of the Fifty-first Fighter Wing, splashing a MIG-15. The 80's held the corner until December 19, destroying or damaging more than a dozen in the critical 6 weeks before the 86's arrived.

Meanwhile, during November and the high-water mark of the ground attack northward, the success of the Fifth Air Force and the FEAF bomber command in the interdiction program was nullified by the shortened supply lines of the North Korean Army. Thoroughly disorganized and reeling in a retreat slowed only by the U N supply problem, the North Koreans nevertheless were piling back into an area from which they could be supplied in quantity and with impunity. As it turned out, they were both supplied and then reinforced by seven Chinese Army corps. United Nations troops were swept back below Seoul, and once more the Communist supply lines became exposed. The fury and impetus of the enemy drive also led them into heavy daylight movements that became meat for the grinders of fighters and light bombers. Whether through foolhardiness, or through a decision to sacrifice enormous numbers of units to maintain the pace of advance and to prevent our ground troops from digging in and slowing the onrush, the Chinese Communist armies attempted to move masses of troops along West Korean roads in daylight. Thirty-four thousand—one of the seven corps in the attack—died along the highways under the fire of machine guns, bombs, and napalm. It was a decimated Chinese Army that was finally pulled to a halt below Seoul in mid-December.

The next 6 weeks, in the period to the end of January, were virtually a duplication of the Pusan perimeter tactics of the Far East Air Forces. Enemy supply lines came under interdiction attack. B-29's screened by fighter cover and sweeps along the Yalu hammered at the northern bridges, marshaling yards and airfields. Lighter bombers and fighters rocketed, strafed, bombed, and napalmed in the Pyongyang-Wonsan-Seoul triangle, with the carrier task forces moving in to hammer the coast from Chongjin south to

Taepo-ri. The parallel became almost exact in the few days after January 1, when the Chinese attempted to get another offensive rolling toward Fusan. More than 4,000 sorties in 5 days broke the back of the attack and the stage was set for our own offensive scheduled for the end of January and launched on January 25, after a careful interdiction program had virtually isolated Chinese from reinforcement and supply.

Air power had swung into high gear in the 3 months of retreat and readvance. More than 60,000 sorties were flown, a build-up made possible by relatively small but important reinforcements of two wings of fighters, the 86's of the Fourth Fighter Wing and the F-84's of the Twenty-seventh Wing; one wing of B-26's, the reserve Four hundred and fifty-second Bomb Wing, a California outfit, and a South African squadron equipped with F-51's. Additionally, there had been some "beefing up" of existing units to bring them to war strength. This period accounted for 38 percent of the bomb tonnage in the first 8 months of warfare; two-thirds of the napalm, half the ammunition, and almost half the rockets and combat cargo.

This pace was to be maintained through the spring months up to the summer lull that followed the opening of the Kaesong armistice talks. In this period of supposed peace arrangements the Communists redoubled efforts to build up massive supplies in the Iron Triangle sector just to the north of the thirty-eighth parallel. The ground fighting lulled into patrol action, while at the same time ground troops were getting heavy artillery fire support freeing the fighters and light bombers for more far-ranging activities.

With the full agreement of the Eighth Army commander, Lt Gen James Van Fleet, the new commanding general of the Far East Air Forces following General Stratemeyer's serious heart attack of late spring, Lt Gen Otto P. Weyland, launched his forces on a major interdiction program that has chipped away at the enemy's lines of communication with a carefully programmed attack. This attack may well be one good reason for the sporadic willingness of the Communists to talk military armistice. The Communists are getting supplies through. They have become past masters at night movement, at camouflage and highway, bridge, and rail repairs. The cost in manpower is high. It is problematical whether or not they have been able to build up enough reserves to launch a full-scale offensive and maintain it, without being able to resupply themselves on the massive scale which now would be required. It further is problematical whether or not both forces have not now fashioned defense lines in depth that could lead to the trench-warfare type of stalemate that marked World War I. There is only one effective bypass to such a stalemate: airborne or seaborne assault, or both, behind enemy lines.

There are counterbalancing factors. The enemy air build-up behind the Yalu has been heavy. Early in the year, 30 MIG's were standard. Later, this became 60. Today, 120. They have other forces, as mentioned earlier, utilizing conventional planes of twin- and four-engine types. Their anti-aircraft has stepped up considerably, as mentioned. It is capable anti-aircraft fire, radar-directed in many instances and accurate enough to be costly. It is increasing all the time, as is the Red use of night fighters to counter the after-dark excursions of our Firefly missions, coupling flare-dropping C-47's and B-26's in a deadly team. Light ground fire has improved and 20- and 40-millimeter type anti-aircraft has been stepped up in the front lines and along the major supply routes.

The Reds are learning many lessons which we, unfortunately in some respects, are rapidly forgetting—our daylight, close-packed

convoys, our lack of antiaircraft discipline from the front lines back into advanced headquarters, and major supply depots, an almost luxurious close support operation and a heavy air supply that permits and minimizes logistic mistakes and shortcomings. They have learned techniques of bridge repair that draw the grudging admiration of our Corps of Engineers and the airmen who have to go back time and time again, day after day, to keep key bridge lines knocked out. We have husbanded our jets for specialized jobs and have taken advantage of the slower F-51's and B-26's which in a war against a major power would be suicide craft. We have practiced knocking out enemy airfields; they have practiced putting them back into operating condition.

Our methods of operation have become an open book to the Reds. He has kept his planes based behind the Yalu curtain and has changed only his traffic pattern to avoid climbing out on the wrong side of the river. We have measured only a few of his jets, mostly MIG types; he has tested his against the 86, the 84, the 80, the 51, and the B-29.

We have, of course, learned our own lessons. Many of them. Our confused early patterns of close support arising from new plane types and lack of nearby bases, our basic channels of calling in support, of evaluating the need for support, mutual understanding of the conditions of support and the balanced value of interdiction operations all have emerged in a perspective which did not exist on June 26, 1950. This is true to such a degree that talk of tactical-strategic strength disagreements and Air Force-Army friction back home draw a puzzled frown in the Far East. Here, at least, the Air Force and the Army have been down to see the preacher and took the Navy along as a witness.

We have been evaluating the training of our fighter pilots. The F-86 is not better than the MIG's, nor is the F-84 its equal. But the pilots are, which explains the destruction of MIG's in a 13-to-1 ratio to the end of September. But, again, conclusions are dangerous since there is a distinct feeling in the Fifth Air Force that the Red operation is largely one of training and that few of the pilots—be they Russian, Chinese or satellite—are out of first-line units.

We have been developing entirely new lessons of air supply and air mobility both for ground troops and air units; these will be of inestimable value in other theaters, particularly in Europe where the current concept of fighter use is instant ability to shift bases from one sector to another and one country to another.

Our Far East Air Forces have done well under the most difficult circumstances. As this is written, in Tokyo, the undercurrent is of cynicism about the latest "peace talk". The guns are loaded, the barrels of the anti-aircraft guns swing against the skylines. If it should be an armistice, fine. But no one expects it, really. Tomorrow's mission is still very personal.

The Facts About Our Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of public discussion about the necessity to balance our national budget. I welcome that discussion and personally share very strongly the desire of our people to avoid deficit financing at this time. That is one of

the reasons why I joined a number of my distinguished colleagues in working on the floor of the Senate toward the adoption of a tax bill, consistent with the President's recommendations, which would distribute the tax burden equitably and which would be adequate to achieve a balanced budget.

There has, however, been a great deal of discussion about Federal finances which in my judgment has not been constructive. Much of it has, in fact, been motivated by a desire for partisan political advantage and has served to confuse rather than clarify. Some of this material has included misinformation and it is with a desire to keep the record clear and present the facts that I ask unanimous consent to have certain materials prepared by me placed in the Appendix of the Record.

The material to which I refer and which in my judgment needs refuting includes a statement issued by the United States Chamber of Commerce and an article which has received wide attention and mass distribution called *In Washington It's Waste As Usual*, which appeared in the July 1951 issue of the *Reader's Digest*.

Specifically, in connection with the latter, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter and materials submitted by the Bureau of the Budget in reply to my request likewise printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1951.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of August 27, in which you requested a reply by the Bureau of the Budget to the article "In Washington It's Waste As Usual," which appeared in the July 1951 issue of the *Reader's Digest*.

I have had my staff investigate in detail the allegations made in that article. The staff analysis attached to this letter is the result of their work. The article does not analyze in any comprehensive manner the extensive operations of the Federal Government, but is primarily limited to repeating a number of old and isolated incidents of inefficient operations, many of which have long since been corrected. This has been combined with some very general charges, unsupported and often at great variance with the facts. The staff analysis demonstrates that proper investigation of facts will disprove these charges.

The following are the main charges made in the article:

Charge No. 1. The Government wastes manpower.

The only concrete evidence presented in support of this charge is the statement that "from June 30, 1950, to January 1, 1951, civilian employees were added to Government payrolls at the rate of 1,000 per day." Unaccompanied by any description of the reasons for these increases, this statement gives a misleading impression of waste in the Federal Government. The truth of the matter is that the increases in Federal personnel during the period cited in the article took place in the Department of Defense, primarily at air bases, shipyards, ordnance plants, and related military installations which were being constructed and expanded as the result of the fighting in Korea. The article fails to point out that in the very

same period the number of employees in the rest of the Federal Government actually decreased by over 20,000.

The article also erroneously states that the average Government employee works only 1,650 hours a year. The staff analysis points out that the most recent studies report the average hours worked a year by Federal employees as 1,797. This latter figure excludes many hours of unpaid overtime work.

Charge No. 2. The cost of handling small purchase orders is exorbitant.

The article reports certain figures as the cost of selected purchases. For example, it is stated that it cost \$13.39 to purchase a 50-cent magazine. The staff analysis shows that this figure has no basis in fact. It is simply arrived at by dividing the total cost of all purchasing activities in the bureau concerned by the total number of purchases made. It is as inaccurate and misleading to apply this average figure of \$13.39 to the specific purchase of a 50-cent magazine as it would be to claim that it only cost \$13.39 to purchase an involved and intricate piece of machinery costing several million dollars.

Charge No. 3. The Federal Government has increased public assistance expenditures in a period of high prosperity.

The staff analysis points out that the law requires the Federal Government to reimburse the States according to a statutory formula for their expenditures for assistance to the needy aged, blind, dependent children, and the totally disabled. Federal expenditures for public assistance have risen because the States are spending more for this program. Moreover, the Congress has recently widened the coverage of public assistance benefits. In order to reduce Federal expenditures for this program it would be necessary for the Congress to change the laws governing public assistance payments.

Charge No. 4. Agricultural programs have not been curtailed.

Contrary to the assurance in the article that we are "insured against any economizing there," the staff analysis shows that such highly desirable programs as rural electrification and farm housing have been slowed down. Moreover, since Korea, agricultural credit programs have maintained conservative credit policies.

Charge No. 5. The large public debt is the result of waste.

Through colorful and graphic presentation, the article attempts to give the reader the impression that the public debt has been caused by waste and inefficiency. As the staff analysis points out, the overwhelming portion of the debt in 1950, the last year cited in the article, was incurred during World War II. The wartime increase in the debt accounted for \$217,000,000,000 out of a total \$257,000,000,000 of debt outstanding in that year. However, the chart in the article simply indicates the level of the debt in 1939 and in 1950, omitting any reference to a war year such as the fiscal year 1946 when the debt reached the all-time high of \$270,000,000,000. For the five fiscal years since 1946, budget receipts have exceeded expenditures by a cumulative total of \$7,500,000,000.

Charge No. 6. There has been a startling increase in the peacetime spending of a few departments of the Federal Government.

Through some inaccurate figures, which the staff analysis corrects, the article attempts to show unjustified increases in peacetime spending from the fiscal years 1940 to 1950. For example, the facts show that the bulk of this increase in peacetime spending for the independent offices is in the Atomic Energy Commission, readjustment benefits and compensation and medical care for veterans of World War II, and the Selective Service System.

The revised estimate of 1952 budget expenditures stands at \$68,400,000,000, the highest level of peacetime expenditures in our history. However, the reasons for such a high

level can be readily apparent to anyone who will examine the evidence. The following table shows, by major category, the increase in Federal expenditures from 1940 to the recommendations for 1952:

Federal budget expenditures
(In billions)

	1940	1952	Percent of increase
Major national security programs	\$16	\$48.0	2,900
Veterans' services and benefits	6	49	720
Interest	11	56	460
All other	59	95	60
Total	92	204	650

Obviously, the largest increases have occurred in the programs related to past wars and the current defense effort. Expenditures for national security programs, which include the military services, foreign aid, atomic energy development, and stockpiling of critical and strategic material, and defense production and economic stabilization, have increased 2,900 percent while veterans' aid and debt interest have increased 720 percent and 450 percent respectively. During the same period, expenditures for all other functions of Government have increased only 60 percent. This increase in all other expenditures must be compared with an increase of 80 percent in the average salaries of classified Government and postal employees, 112 percent in construction costs, and 105 percent in the general level of wholesale prices.

Both the Bureau of the Budget and the appropriations committees of the Congress continually receive many proposals which, in broad generalities, advocate economy in Government. These proposals, however, are like the article in the Reader's Digest in that they seldom make any concrete recommendations, which would result in reducing specific items of expenditure.

You may be interested in the reaction of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to these attacks. In its report on the general appropriation bill for 1951, the committee stated that—

"The press and radio have constantly reported claims by various agencies and individuals that the budget can be reduced by figures ranging to several billion dollars. Certain of these agencies have gone to the trouble and expense to publish brochures outlining their programs. These recommendations have been studied with a view to using such information as might be contained therein to effect reductions in the budget. However, without exception, they are written in such general terms as to be practically useless in effecting budget reductions. They discuss large reductions in broad areas of the budget without at any point naming appropriation accounts which should be reduced or giving specific data as to programs which could be curtailed.

"It is a very simple matter to say in a speech that Government expenditures should be reduced by \$3,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 and in support of such statement to point generally at the large expenditures for national defense, foreign aid, grants to States, and so forth, but it is an entirely different matter to study the detail of the budget including cost of unavoidable services such as the postal service, and a review of outstanding commitments either by previously granted contracts, authorization or by operation of laws which result each year in fixed charges. It has been suggested that veterans' benefits be greatly reduced, but the merits of this proposal must be weighed by the legislative committees of the Congress if any attention is given it. So long as the veterans' laws remain as presently written, the Committee on Appropriations

has no choice but to recommend such amounts as are necessary to pay the benefits due. The amount appropriated is in no sense a control of expenditure and is only a judgment of the amount which will be required. None of those who advocated extensive reductions in the budget through press releases, brochures, etc., submitted any data to the Committee on Appropriations which would have been of assistance in effecting reductions. The committee was importuned from all sides for increases in appropriations and spent many days listening to the testimony of persons who desired appropriations for purposes not in the budget, but not one single witness appeared before the committee to suggest a program for reduction except in a few isolated cases where local interests opposed specific appropriations for local purposes."

The experience of the Bureau of the Budget has been very similar. There is no valid basis for assertions that vast sums of money can be saved by "eliminating waste and duplication." The big issues in Federal expenditure policy are program issues—programs which have been requested by the public and approved by the Congress. To reduce Federal operations substantially requires the major reduction in, or the elimination of, programs specifically prescribed by law.

I hope that this information, together with the attached material will serve your needs.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Director.

ANALYSIS OF CERTAIN STATEMENTS IN THE ARTICLE "IN WASHINGTON IT'S WASTE AS USUAL," WHICH APPEARED IN THE JULY 1951 ISSUE OF THE READER'S DIGEST

A THE UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The increase in the number of Federal Government employees between June 30, 1950, and January 1, 1951, is highlighted by the statement in the Reader's Digest article that civilian employees were added to Government pay rolls at the rate of 1,000 a day, and that during January the rate went up to 2,000 a day.

According to the reports of the Civil Service Commission, the net increase in Government employment during the period cited in this article was entirely related to direct operations of the Department of Defense. In fact, between June 30, 1950, and January 1, 1951, a period of rapid mobilization following the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, there was an actual decrease of 20,483 in the number of civilian Government employees excluding those in the Department of Defense. During this period the Department of Defense added 235,256 civilian employees but the increase in all agencies, including the Department of Defense, was only 214,773 employees. Approximately 63 percent of the added Defense Department employees were blue-collar workers—the type employed in arsenals and shipyards. The reduction in employment outside the Department of Defense was achieved even though there were substantial increases in defense-related activities of the civilian agencies, as, for example, the doubling of the staff of the Selective Service System.

During January 1951 the number of civilian employees increased by 60,944. Of these, 58,352 were in the Department of Defense. Approximately 63 percent of them were also blue-collar workers. The increase outside of the Department of Defense occurred principally in the Department of Justice, with smaller increases in the Treasury Department, the Panama Canal, the Selective Service System, and in defense activities of other agencies. Considering the entire 7-month period from June 30, 1950, to January 31, 1951, the number of Federal civilian employees outside the Department of Defense decreased 17,891 despite the added activities

carried on by these civilian agencies on account of the Korean hostilities and the mobilization program.

The allegation in the article that the average Government employee works 1,650 hours a year is in error. Fifty-two weeks of 40 working hours each would amount to 2,080 hours.

Until recently Government workers were allowed 208 hours of annual leave each year. Each employee is also allowed a sick leave "credit," on which he may draw in the event of illness, of 120 hours a year. Seven holidays are granted Government employees. Assuming none fall on nonworkdays this would amount to 56 hours. The minimum hours of work per year would be 1,696. However, based on recent studies, the average of hours worked a year is at least 1,797. This does not include any of the many hours of unpaid overtime work which the employees contribute.

Even though some accumulation of annual leave is permitted, employee loss of earned annual leave because of inability to take it is a common occurrence. The latest survey of Government leave practices was made by the staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This study covered the first 9 months of 1947. It revealed that during this period employees took only 78½ percent of the annual leave they had earned. Since these 9 months included the normal summer vacation period, it could logically be assumed that a smaller percentage would apply for the entire year. But, assuming this higher percentage for the entire year, the average annual leave per employee would be 163 hours instead of the 208 allowed. The same study revealed that employees took an average of 64.2 percent of the sick leave they earned, or 77 hours instead of the 120 allowed. Because of the likelihood of a holiday coming on a nonworkday the average holiday hours are 50 instead of 56. If we add to the basic 2,080 hours 7 hours for the likelihood of the extra 1½ days in the year falling on a nonworkday and subtract the average time off of 290 hours computed above, we find that the average number of hours worked each year, exclusive of unpaid overtime, is actually 1,797 instead of the 1,650 alleged in the article.

In regard to holiday practices, a 1948 survey by the National Industrial Conference Board revealed that among all private companies surveyed, the average number of holidays granted was six and three-fourths, and the average among nonmanufacturing industries was eight and one-fourth. The Government's standard is seven holidays.

In regard to the Government's sick-leave policy the Senate Appropriations Committee report states, "It was determined that this policy is roughly comparable with that of over a dozen large corporations for the first year of employment. For employment of more than a year, comparisons are more difficult, the Government using a policy of accrued leave and most private enterprises, rather than doing this, using a more liberal sick-leave allowance."

In regard to annual-leave [vacation] allowance, the Appropriation Committee's report revealed that, at the time of the survey, the Government was generally more liberal than private employers. However, there are certain other factors involved in comparing Government leave practices with those of private industry. One of these is the fact that Government employees are not granted excused leave for death in the immediate family, other emergencies, religious holidays, or personal affairs. In a 1950 study for the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, information pertaining to practices on excused leave was obtained from 37 representative companies, employing more than 600,000 office workers. All 37 companies reported that they do grant excused leave in varying degrees. Six had established yearly limits ranging from 3 to 12 days, the median being 10 days. One had a yearly maximum

of 30 days. The remaining 31 firms did not have a yearly maximum, but granted excused leave to employees at the discretion of the supervisor. In Government all such leave is charged to annual leave.

Another factor to be considered in connection with the Government's annual-leave allowance is that Government employees are not covered by social security, unemployment insurance, or any type of severance-pay provisions of the type common in industry. In the past, employees who accumulated unused annual leave looked upon this leave credit as an additional protection in case of illness extending beyond the period of eligibility for sick leave, and as a substitute for unemployment insurance to provide income for a short period of time in case of termination of employment.

Leave rights of Government employees have been recently curtailed in two respects. Annual-leave allowance has been cut from the 26 days (on which the above computations were based) to a graduated basis, and the accumulation of unused annual leave has been generally prohibited.

The claim that the "Government employee gets 6 weeks more time off annually than the non-Government worker" cannot be supported by the facts. If the non-Government employee worked a 5-day 40-hour week, received 7 holidays, 15 days of annual leave, 10 days of sick leave, and 5 days of "excused leave" each year he would be working the same number of hours per year as the average Government employee.

The other claims in regard to money and manpower savings, based on the faulty figures as to the difference between average hours worked by Government and non-Government workers, are similarly in error. Even using the faulty statistics of the article, the estimate of 100,000 additional workers who could be added to the manpower pool if Government workers worked the same hours the article claims as the industrial standard is an overestimate of 38,900.

B. PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

That portion of the article dealing with procurement is based upon the report of the Williams Subcommittee on Overstaffing of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It emphasizes the apparent low production of employees preparing purchase orders and the allegedly exorbitant average cost of making small purchases in several departments. The fallacy in the cost figures quoted is due to the fact that they are "average" figures and are arrived at by simply dividing the number of purchase transactions into the total cost of making all purchases regardless of amount and applying the result to very small purchases.

There follows excerpts from the letter of December 28, 1950, from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Williams Subcommittee on Overstaffing. Although this letter had reference only to the charges relating to the Department of the Interior, the principles enunciated would be applicable to all departments.

"I do not agree, however, that the statistics of your report fairly support the otherwise unsubstantiated finding that procurement activities throughout the headquarters of the Department are wasteful. The statistics show that the average cost was \$9.95 for making each of 38,725 purchases having a total cost of \$383,770.867. The very same statistics also show that the average amount of each purchase was approximately \$13.90 and that the average cost per purchase of \$9.95 was therefore only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the amount of the average purchase. Further, in applying the so-called average cost per purchase order in the various bureaus to specific instances of very small purchases, the report creates the erroneous impression that a cost of \$13.78 was entailed to issue a purchase order in the amount of 32 cents, and that it cost \$13.39 to purchase a

50-cent magazine. The small purchase of 50 cents did not, in fact, cost \$13.39 and the 32-cent order did not cost \$13.78. Those average costs are statistically applicable only to the average purchase. Those average costs are no more validly applicable to the small purchase than they are to a companion purchase of great complexity and involving many thousands of dollars. For example, a purchase of equipment in one of the bureaus mentioned in the report involved an order in the amount of \$31,622 and required considerable work on a relatively complex purchase. It should no more be represented that this large purchase was made at so low a cost as \$13.39, the so-called average, than that the small purchase was made at so high a cost.

"In further reference to the publicized purchase of the 50-cent magazine, it should be noted that the original purchase order of August 15 was canceled on August 28, prior to the inspection of these purchase orders by your investigational staff, and the order thereafter consolidated with .6 other small purchases dating from July 3, 1950, to September 28, 1950. A single voucher was then issued in payment of the 17 small purchases in accordance with the procedure prescribed by General Regulation 103 of the Comptroller General. Thus, this Department has been castigated by the press, as well as the report, on a matter which is not only factually in error, but which represents misuse by the report of the statistics contained in it.

"The concern expressed by the committee over the production rate of 14 purchase order per employee possibly is based on a failure to take into account that the data on purchasing personnel included not only those issuing purchase orders, a very minor procedural step, but also those otherwise engaged in the total procurement operation, including the writing of specifications, the analysis of bids, the interpretation of regulations, and the awarding of contracts. My foregoing comments on average costs applies here as well."

It is recognized to be true that in Government as well as in private industry, the cost of processing orders of small amount is disproportionately higher than that of larger orders.

In the Federal Government, a concerted effort has been made to remedy this situation. Examples of these efforts may be found in the Task Force Report of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives. This report strongly recommends an extension of the so-called petty purchase procedure whereby small procurement—up to \$50—may be accomplished by on-the-spot cash purchase. To implement this recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration are cooperating with the General Accounting Office and the Treasury Department in amending the General Accounting Office-Treasury regulations so that agencies may take advantage of this improved procedure. Other evidence of this trend for improvement may be found in General Services Administration General Regulation No. 6, dated December 27, 1950, which prescribed a simplified short form of purchase order for small transactions, Standard Form 44.

The largest area for scrutiny in the field of procurement is in the Department of Defense. President Truman, in a recent statement to military and civilian officials in connection with the budget for military functions in the fiscal year 1952, stated:

"Passage of this budget will place tremendous procurement and spending authority in the hands of the Department of Defense and the three services. The schedules call for \$34,700,000,000 in hard goods from 1952 appropriations in addition to \$27,000,000,000 already available—a total of \$61,700,000,000 for equipment for our own forces,

To this will have to be added the military construction program, and the equipment needs of our allies. Again, I repeat that this is going to place a particularly heavy management job on the entire executive branch to see that we buy wisely, buy what we need, put what we buy to good use, and do the whole job in a way that does not weaken our basic economy."

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has recently filed a report on Federal Supply Management (Military and Related Activities), a copy of which is attached. In this report, the committee makes numerous recommendations for the achievement of large economies in the field of military supply activities, which are being given careful consideration by the Department of Defense. Staff members of the Munitions Board, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office were assigned to assist the subcommittee in its work.

C. THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

With reference to the public assistance program, the Reader's Digest article stated that, "The President asks for one and a third billion dollars for public assistance programs—three times the average amount for 1943 to 1947. 'Why should this hugely augmented sum be needed for public assistance,' asks the New York Herald Tribune, 'when we are already in a period of unprecedented full employment, with severe labor scarcity in the immediate offing?'"

Federal expenditures for public assistance are determined by statutory requirement (42 U. S. C. 801-6, 801-6, 1201-6). The Federal Government is required to reimburse the States for their expenditures for public assistance according to a formula set forth in law. The determination of eligibility of recipients is within the authority of the States.

The President has repeatedly urged that the self-financed social insurance program, rather than public assistance, be made the principal vehicle for providing protection against poverty. He has expressed concern over the heavy dependence on public assistance.

In his 1951 budget message, in urging the enactment of improvements in the old-age and survivor's insurance program, he stated as follows:

"The coming year will be an extremely significant one for the Nation's social security program. The decisions of the Congress on pending legislation will determine the direction which this country will follow in providing basic protection against the major economic hazards of old age, unemployment, illness, and disability. It is my strong belief that it is a responsibility of the Government to provide this protection, and to provide it in a manner that is consistent with our ideals of independence and self-reliance—through the already established and tested principle of contributory social insurance. This was the basic philosophy of the Social Security Act, in which the major role was given to social insurance, financed mutually by employers and employees, with benefits available as a matter of right without a means test. Public assistance was given only a supplementary role to fill in the diminishing gaps in insurance protection.

"The effects of our failure in recent years to carry out this philosophy are already dramatized by the increase in the public-assistance rolls. Because the protection of social insurance is so limited and inadequate, far too many people have been forced to seek public relief. In some States, for example, half the aged people are on the relief rolls. Approximately 2,700,000 aged people and 1,500,000 dependent children now receive public assistance. By contrast, only 1,900,000 aged persons receive insurance benefits and 800,000 children and their mothers

receive survivors benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system. Average old-age insurance benefits are only \$28 a month compared with average old-age public assistance benefits of \$45."

The subsequently enacted Social Security Act amendments of 1950, which raised the level of insurance benefits will, over the future, alleviate this situation. However, it is too early for the change in law to effect reductions in the scope of operations and in the Federal expenditures for the program.

D AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

With reference to the charges concerning the Department of Agriculture, it should be noted that wherever feasible, economies have been made throughout the regular programs of the Department. Progress in very desirable programs, such as the rural electrification and telephone and farm-housing programs, has had to be slowed because of the shortage of critical materials needed for the defense effort.

The President recommended that new loan authorizations for the Rural Electrification Administration be reduced from \$297,000,000 available in 1951 to \$109,000,000 in 1952. Expenditures for the program, however, will drop off less sharply, from \$312,000,000 to \$269,000,000. This is because more than \$240,000,000 of estimated 1952 expenditures will be paid from prior year funds to meet obligations already incurred by the Government.

Since Korea, agricultural credit programs have maintained conservative credit policies in order to support the program of voluntary credit restraint by private lenders and at the same time to provide essential credit where needed to maintain a high level of agricultural production.

Serious reductions in the activities of the Department of Agriculture may imperil an adequate supply of food and fiber products necessary to meet the needs of defense and of the essential civilian economy. The programs of the Department are designed to insure a continuing high level of farm production and to achieve the best possible adjustments in farm production by protecting and conserving our soil resources and maintaining an adequate level of research activities and essential services to farmers.

I THE PUBLIC DEBT

The Reader's Digest article gives the impression that the size of the Federal debt is attributable to "waste in Washington." This is accomplished by charting the debt beneath a dramatic title and by omitting any textual reference to the debt.

Public debt figures, or a chart picturing them, provide no basis in themselves for concluding that a government is or is not wasteful. A debt is merely a means for meeting current obligations when current revenues are insufficient. Conceivably, a nation with a small debt could be more prodigal than one with a large debt.

Generally, the size of a public debt is a rough indicator of the scope of a government's activities. This is illustrated by table I. It shows that the principal increases in the debt of the United States occurred during the First World War, during the 1930's when the Federal Government sought actively to pull the Nation out of the worst depression in its history, and during the Second World War.

Missing from the Reader's Digest chart is a line for the Federal debt as of the end of fiscal year 1946. This omission tends to convey the impression that the debt as it stood at the end of 1950 resulted from a steady, decade-long increase caused by "waste in Washington." Actually, the debt was at its highest point in 1946, and has decreased by \$12,000,000,000 since the end of that fiscal year. If a line for the year 1946 had been inserted, it would have shown the 4-year drop.

A line for 1946 would also have shown that the overwhelming portion of the 1950 debt—\$217,000,000,000 out of \$257,000,000,000—was incurred during the years of the Second World War. Captions indicating the beginning and end of the war would have permitted comparison with the debt increase during World War I, whose span is pointed out in the chart. Moreover, the inclusion of a line for 1946 would have permitted the reader to conclude that if the amount of debt incurred during the World War II years were deducted from the 1950 total, the 1950 debt would have been \$28,400,000,000, \$12,000,000,000 less than 1939, all other things being equal.

Actually, the figures for the gross public debt are somewhat higher than those carried in the article. The Reader's Digest figures, purporting to represent the Federal debt, actually represent the interest-bearing debt. The relationship of the latter to the gross public debt is indicated in table I.

The article neglects to state that, for the past 5 years the Federal Government has operated at a surplus of \$7,500,000,000 (table II).

TABLE I—Gross public debt and guaranteed obligations
(In billions)

End of fiscal year	Interest-bearing	Matured debt	Non-interest-bearing	Gross public debt ¹	Guaranteed obligations	Total ²
1964	\$1.4	(³)	\$0.4	\$1.8	—	\$1.8
1969	2.2	(³)	.4	2.6	—	2.6
1974	1.7	(³)	.4	2.2	—	2.2
1984	1.2	(³)	.4	1.6	—	1.6
1994	.6	(³)	.4	1.0	—	1.0
1904	.9	(³)	.2	1.1	—	1.1
1914	1.0	(³)	.2	1.2	—	1.2
1919	25.2	(³)	.2	25.5	—	25.5
1924	21.0	(³)	.2	21.2	—	21.2
1929	16.6	\$0.1	.2	16.9	—	16.9
1939	39.9	1	.4	40.4	\$5.4	45.9
1946	268.1	4	9	269.4	5	269.9
1950	255.2	.3	1.9	257.4	(³)	257.4

¹ May not equal column totals because of rounding.

² Below \$50 million.

Note: Reader's Digest figures involve only interest-bearing debt.

TABLE II—Federal budget receipts, expenditures, and surplus or deficit
(In billions)

Fiscal year—	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (—)
1947	\$40.0	\$39.3	+.7
1948	42.2	33.8	8.4
1949	38.2	40.1	-1.9
1950	37.0	40.2	-3.2
1951	48.1	41.6	6.5
Cumulative total	265.5	198.0	+7.5

THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND ITS STATEMENT ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN JUNE

Chronically, there seems to be publicized a mass of misinformation and confusing propaganda about Federal finances in general and the United States budget in particular. This year the volume of such propaganda has probably been greater than ever before. To serve their own ends, special interest groups have intensified this perpetual barrage, apparently designed to mislead and confuse the public regarding the actual nature of the operations of our Government.

When an organization as large and influential as the United States Chamber of Commerce descends to adding to the accumulation of misinformation, it affords compelling reason to reiterate the true facts and make them more widely known.

The chamber's president, Mr. D. A. Hulcy, recently issued a statement predicting that in the closing month of the fiscal year 1951 there would be "one of the greatest scrambles in history to squander the taxpayers' money." He went on to state that "the shocking but obvious reason is that agencies want to get rid of all the money appropriated to them before the fiscal year ends, so that they will not have to return anything to the Treasury." The Nation is fortunate indeed that the facts do not bear out Mr. Hulcy's widely circulated prophecy.

He based his prediction on monthly trends of Federal expenditures for several recent years, using figures which were taken from the Daily Statement of the United States Treasury. A very brief examination of that statement for the month of June in any of the past several years shows that the obvious reason for the large increase in expenditures is that during that month the interest on a large part of the public debt falls due. Moreover, in June of 1951 expenditures for the major national security programs (such as the military functions of the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and stockpiling of strategic and critical materials) are rising steadily as the defense mobilization program accelerates. Expenditures are increasing each month as the number of men in uniform grows and as increased deliveries of supplies and equipment are made. This increase in expenditures should be a source of satisfaction to all of us. It indicates that we are becoming militarily more secure in the present troubled world situation.

It is true that total expenditures in June were higher than for any other month in the fiscal year 1951. However, when interest payments and national security expenditures are deducted from the monthly expenditures for the year, it can be seen that expenditures during the month of June, rather than representing a spending spree, were actually lower than expenditures during each of eight other months of the fiscal year. This was also the case for the fiscal year 1950.

Another charge made by the chamber was that there is "an almost unbelievable jump" in spending on the last day of June. The reasons for the large amount of expenditure on the last day of the fiscal year are readily understandable. According to the Treasury Statement for June 29, 1951 (the last business day of the month), interest on the public debt amounted to \$758,000,000 and Veterans' Administration expenditures, almost entirely pension and benefit checks to veterans, amounted to \$228,000,000. These two payments alone totaled almost \$1,000,000,000 of the \$1,255,000,000 paid out on June 29, 1951.

Veterans' pension and benefit checks are issued on the last day of each month so that the recipients can receive them as close to the due date as possible. The concentration of these expenditures on the last day of June could be avoided by neatly stretching the payments of the checks over the entire month of July. This would result in a more even distribution of Federal expenditures, but would not save the taxpayer one penny. It would, however, result in needless delays for the veterans and their beneficiaries who have been promised these benefit checks by a Government that is grateful for the sacrifices they have already made for their country. As for the interest payments, not only are so many of them required to be made in June, but specifically on the last day of the month.

In general, it is both surprising and disturbing that this study fails to take account of these very elementary facts about the composition of Government spending at the close of the fiscal year. Mr. Hulcy and his research staff have used the daily Treasury statement and have ready access to the budget document. Their unsubstantiated charges and flagrant misuse of figures, there-

fore, raise serious questions as to either their competence or their sincerity. Mr. Hulcy is described by the chamber as a bookkeeping genius.

Monthly budget expenditures, fiscal years 1950 and 1951

(In millions)

Year and month	Total budget expenditures	Interest on the public debt	Budget expenditures excluding interest on the public debt	Major national security programs	Budget expenditures excluding interest on the public debt and major national security
1950					
July	\$3,431	\$322	\$3,112	\$1,465	\$1,647
August	3,585	125	3,460	1,540	1,920
September	3,965	544	3,421	1,393	2,028
October	3,111	255	2,856	1,319	1,537
November	3,127	306	2,821	1,371	1,450
December	3,722	1,007	2,715	1,425	1,290
January	3,323	463	2,860	1,342	1,518
February	2,486	161	2,325	1,247	1,078
March	3,269	636	2,633	1,415	1,218
April	2,847	184	2,663	1,280	1,371
May	2,962	135	2,826	1,400	1,417
June	4,296	1,611	2,685	1,383	1,402
Total	40,167	5,750	34,417	16,589	17,828
1951					
July	3,013	271	2,742	1,282	1,460
August	2,515	144	2,371	1,409	972
September	3,520	646	2,874	1,345	1,529
October	3,170	229	2,941	1,064	1,277
November	3,102	141	2,961	1,795	1,166
December	3,742	968	2,774	1,825	949
January	3,808	514	3,294	2,034	1,260
February	3,211	156	3,055	2,031	1,021
March	4,068	580	3,478	2,463	1,015
April	4,007	253	3,754	2,540	1,191
May	4,517	163	4,354	2,941	1,413
June	5,970	1,567	4,413	3,395	1,018
Total	44,633	5,612	39,021	24,747	14,274

¹ Include military functions of the Defense Department, mutual defense assistance, EPC, stockpiling, AEC, atomic activities and Defense Production Act activities.

Source: Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury.

An ordinary bookkeeper might hold his job by doing no more than adding figures accurately. However, one would expect that a bookkeeping genius would know the facts behind his figures before drawing any startling conclusions from them.

They Never Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item:

THEY NEVER LEARN

According to one Wakefield independent marketman there will be no beef in Wakefield this week end, at least so far as supply from one of the big sources is concerned. Government meddling, he says, will drive the meat into the black market.

As recent news stories from various parts of the country have shown, the beef situation is rapidly going from bad to worse—due to the incredibly confused problem created by present price ceilings and price-control policies.

For a considerable period of time, the number of beef animals which the established law-abiding packers have been able to buy has been far below normal, and far below the needs of consumers as well. Moreover, live-

stock prices—which are governed by rules so complex as to confound even the experts—have reached a point where in many cases, the packers who abide by the law must operate at a loss if they operate at all.

Something of a new high in the confusion was reached in the latter part of September when the Army found it couldn't obtain in the domestic market 13,000,000 pounds of dressed beef it needs.

A number of major packers informed the Army that they would be unable to put in bids. One reason, the packers pointed out, was that they couldn't get enough beef to handle the orders of their regular customers. Another was that filling the Army's big order, under present regulations, would entail prohibitive losses. Army officials announced that they would buy beef abroad if they couldn't buy it at home.

All in all, the beef problem has presented the Nation with a practically perfect example of how price and other controls always gum up the works, hurt the consumer and the reputable business alike, and create problems far worse and far more complex than the problems they are supposed to solve. Apparently the Government just hasn't learned the economic facts of life.

"Were It Not for the Far East Air Forces There Would Not be an American in Korea Today"—Lt. Gen. Walton Walker, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of an article entitled "Analysis," written by Mark S. Watson, military correspondent of the Sun papers.

Mr. Watson is no stranger to a vast number of the Members of both Houses of Congress. For more than 30 years he has been distinguished by the competency of his military articles on the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

During the war he was in the midst of action, both in the Philippines as well as in China, and because of his broad knowledge and acquaintance with the circumstances, and the people of the Far East—after the war—he was named a member of General Wedemeyer's mission.

No stranger to international politics, Mr. Watson was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1945 because of his distinguished accomplishments in international correspondence. This recognition was based not alone on the stories he had written on the war itself—but also on the political aspects of war as they projected themselves on the screen in the last critical years of the war.

He was engaged for several years in part-time work in writing the military history of the Army, and his book Chief of Staff—concerning General Marshall—is itself considered part of the official Army history.

It was in the light of that knowledge and with that background that Mark S. Watson wrote the article entitled "Analysis." The article itself is brief,

and yet with all it exhibits and pictorializes more real factual information than I have seen written with respect to Korea for some months past.

Mr. Watson develops two points which, he says, are more than coincidental. One is with respect to the recent announcements of the Air Force fighting in Korea; the other has to do with the tremendous amount of communistic war material damaged or destroyed on the ground by our own aerial fighters and bombers since July 1, 1951—28,000 road vehicles, 210 locomotives, 6,500 boxcars, 750 bridges, and 120 railway tunnels.

Mr. Speaker, those figures are almost unbelievable. Spelled out, it means that for each 24 hours of the 80 days which have intervened since July 1, 350 Red vehicles, nearly 3 Red locomotives, and more than 81 boxcars, 9 bridges, and 1 tunnel have been damaged or destroyed.

It is indeed no wonder that the ground force commanders in Korea—as Mr. Watson reports—"are well satisfied with this toll of aerial destruction, which has weakened the enemy's power of moving troops and ammunition against our own troops."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Watson, in talking of tactical air support, states:

Dwindled enemy resistance of mountain positions of particular value is attributed to the fact that the enemy has lately had difficulty in moving larger bodies of troops into position and in supplying them with ammunition.

And certainly—

He continues—

an important reason for that pleasant situation is the battering which enemy lines have received from our tactical aviation since July 1, this year, railroad locomotives are unable to haul trains, railroad cars are short, bridges of all sorts are down, trucks and carts have been smashed, and great amounts of ammunition and other supplies which they would have carried up to the dumps are still back behind the Yalu River.

Mr. Watson in his discussion of the tactical Air Forces job points out that the Air Force has not one priority but three, any one of which may suddenly call for emphasis.

The first, he says, is to attain military domination of the air over a given area and on certain temporary occasions, absolute domination.

The second is to provide close support for our ground forces in their own operations, whether offensive or defensive. Superiority over the enemy air in this respect we still possess in Korea on a practically absolute basis. It includes continuous fire and rocketing of enemy units just in front of our own. It also prevents the enemy from doing it to us.

The third, he declares, is to isolate the battle area so as to destroy enemy trucks, bridges, and highways, as well as nearby supply dumps and rendezvous points, to the end that the enemy cannot for considerable time bring up reinforcements to withstand the attack of our ground troops.

The United States Air Force—

He continued—

has lately provided magnificent example of that sort of thing as the figures above indicate—and as our infantry's local successes have made evident.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Watson's statement is so reminiscent of that short, concise declaration of Lt. Gen. Walton Walker, United States Army, when he declared:

Had it not been for the Far East Air Force, there would not be an American in Korea today

In order that all may read this splendid analysis of the situation in Korea since the time that the truce conference first met on July 10, 1951, right down to this day—I am asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Analysis," by Mark S. Watson, military correspondent for the Sun papers

That article reads as follows:

ANALYSIS

(By Mark S. Watson)

There is more than coincidence in two recent announcements of the Air Force with regard to the fighting in Korea.

One speaks of the mounting number of Red airplanes, mainly based in the sanctuary north of the Yalu. It has been a rapid growth since midsummer. The talk is of some 1,200 Red planes altogether, of which fully a third, and perhaps a half, are jet fighters, that is to say, new Russian planes, and good ones.

This certainly is not welcome news.

The other announcement speaks of the great amount of Red materiel destroyed or damaged on the ground by our own aerial fighters and bombers since July 1—28,000 road vehicles, 210 locomotives and 6,500 box-cars, 120 railway tunnels, 750 bridges, etc.

FIGHTING REFLECTS RESULT

There is added assurance that our ground forces commanders in Korea are well satisfied with this toll of aerial destruction, which presumably has greatly weakened the enemy's power of moving troops and ammunition against our own troops.

The result is apparent in the recent fighting. United Nations forces have driven forward for several miles through mountains which previously were almost impassable. They have encountered enemy resistance at company strength rather than the battalion and regimental strength of other days.

This divided enemy resistance at mountain positions of particular value is generally attributed to the fact that the enemy has lately had difficulty in moving larger bodies of troops into position, and in supplying them with ammunition.

And certainly an important reason for that pleasant situation is the battering which enemy communications lines have received from our tactical aviation since July.

Railroad locomotives are unable to haul trains, and railroad cars are short, and bridges of all sorts are down, and trucks and carts have been smashed, and the great amounts of ammunition and other supplies which they would have carried up to the dumps are still back near the Yalu River.

INVALUABLE SUPPORT

This has been of immeasurable benefit to our own ground forces. Gen. James A. Van Fleet has been able to continue his forward movement day after day, seeking for the most readily defensible line—that is, the ridges which, in United Nations hands, will permit control of the routes which the enemy must use in any later attack.

Groundwise, we are in very much better shape than we were when the Reds unwisely broke off the truce negotiations. Two other questions present themselves, however.

1. If the Air Force's tactical units have been so successful in lending this invaluable support to our ground forces, why have they allowed the Communists to increase so alarmingly the buildup of Red air units

along the Yalu? For if at present the Reds have only 400 jet fighters there—and that is the minimum guess—it still is appreciably more jet fighters than our Far East Air Force possesses.

2. And, although in open fighting of our free-flying jets with the Red jets ours are conspicuously successful. Our fighter planes escorting the B-29 bombers on their missions do not seem to fare so well in their own combats with Red fighters.

The answer to the latter question is simple, our escorting planes have one outstanding duty—to protect the bombers and let them perform their assigned mission of bombing enemy installations, they cannot leave the bombers to engage in duels of their own.

That is why the bombing by our 29's on enemy installations has been so successful, but it also is why our escort planes, thus handicapped, have not done an outstanding job of killing enemy attackers; their first duty has limited their chance to maneuver for the second duty.

TACTICAL AIR FORCE'S JOB

The answer to the first question calls for an understanding of what a tactical air force is supposed to do. It has not one priority but three, any one of which may suddenly call for emphasis. The three outstanding missions are these:

1. To attain relative domination of the air over a given area—and on occasion a temporary but absolute domination of it. This domination makes it much easier to carry out the other two missions. Incidentally, this absolute domination of the whole Korean theater was ours until fairly recently, and may become so again.

2. To provide close support for our ground forces in their own operations, whether offensive or defensive. Superiority over the enemy air in this respect we still possess in Korea on a practically absolute basis. It includes continuous fire and rocketing of enemy units just in front of our own. It also prevents the enemy from doing it to us.

3. To isolate the battle area, that is, to destroy enemy trains and bridges and highways, as well as nearby supply dumps and rendezvous points that the enemy cannot for a considerable time bring up reinforcements to withstand our attacks. The United States Air Force has lately provided a magnificent example of that sort of thing, as the figures above indicate, and as our infantry's local successes have made evident.

SO REDS EFFECT BUILD-UP

Mission No. 3 in brief has been given top priority since mid-July and mission No. 2 has been carried out as well. But this, plus the assignment of fighter planes to escort our bombers, has fully occupied most of the tactical Air Force equipment we have in the Far East, leaving few planes at the moment for performance of mission No. 1.

As a result, the Reds have been fairly free to effect their own build-up, engaging voluntarily in so few combats that their losses have been infrequent. Their MIG 15 fleet has undoubtedly risen above 400, and until we send additional jet fighters to the Far East to reduce the enemy, we will suffer.

The size of our own comparable jet fighters—slower planes but apparently piloted by better fighters—is not officially announced, but it is well known to be very much smaller than 400.

One of these days there will be a shift in the three priorities, and possibly a concentration of all the Far East Command's available jet fighters on what is given above as mission No. 1. When that time comes, it is likely that the Reds' large numerical superiority will be considerably reduced. But that time will be determined by the current requirements in the other two missions.

It also will be determined in some measure by the speed with which we manufacture our new jet planes and send them to Korea. The present work stoppage in American aircraft plants, especially those which make jet engines and parts for them, are certainly doing nothing to speed the building up of our Far East Air Force, which very much needs jet fighters to make up the existing deficit.

Address of Hon. Reva Beck Bosone Before the National Reclamation Association Convention at Amarillo, Tex., October 18, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the splendid address given by Hon. REVA BECK BOSONE, of Utah, before the National Reclamation Association convention at Amarillo, Tex., on October 18, 1951. The address is as follows:

I bring to you the personal greetings of the President of the United States and the message that he appreciates and favors a small water-projects program.

Earlier this month it was my privilege to discuss this program with President Truman at the White House. I found him well aware of the need for such a program and definitely opposed to duplication of effort, and anxious to see a workable plan put into operation.

He appreciated the fact that the States were willing and eager to accept the responsibility of the projects, fostering them from inception to conclusion; appreciating also that the role the Government would play would be confined to that of loaning a part of the money needed to carry on the work.

Thinking in the executive branch relative to the agency which will actually handle the money transaction is not quite clear. The National Reclamation Association proposal would have the Department of the Interior pass judgment on the engineering and economic aspects of a small project and also make the loan. There is considerable hesitancy about putting the Department of the Interior into the lending business for these projects.

An alternate idea which is being explored now is to have the Department of the Interior pass upon the project and certify it to the RFC, which is a lending agency. Certification to RFC by the Interior Department would be tantamount to a directive to RFC to make the loan. There are things to be said for and against that idea, but I think it well worth exploring.

Another idea is to have the Interior Department pass judgment upon the project and certify to the Department of Agriculture which is a lending agency. Certification to Agriculture would be tantamount to a directive. The executive branch is considering it.

So I can report that executive reaction to the objectives of the program are quite favorable but that there are still many questions which will have to be considered and answered.

A great many problems have developed since representatives of the National Reclamation Association, the Department of the Interior, staff men of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and I worked on the bill which is now known as H. R. 2646, the small water projects bill or the "little fellows" reclamation bill. The problems chiefly range about methods of fitting this program into existing governmental structure. I would like to be able to say that we are over the hump on this, but I am not that optimistic.

While there has been an evidence of what some might call a jurisdictional dispute, I think the problem is much deeper. We hope and believe we can work out a solution on a plane much higher than that of jurisdictional argument.

I have given a lot of thought to this legislation. I have tried to analyze it from all angles. I have tried to pick out the items which might be controlling. Then I have analyzed each item to see just how important it might be in determining just how small projects would fit into the governmental structure. Here are some of the questions I asked myself.

How does this program fit in with existing programs in various departments?

Is the fact that some departments lend money and some do not a major point?

Does the size of the project in acreage or in dollar value mean that one department or another has a better claim on the program?

Does the number of farm units in a project offer any key?

Should rehabilitation projects be one place and new ones be in another?

How sacred is the ninety-eighth longitude?

Does farmstead water and irrigation water concepts offer a point upon which we can separate water programs?

How can small projects fit into a program of State responsibility?

How will it fit with the Hoover reports?

I can assure you that there are many things to be considered. That is why I urge the National Reclamation Association to remember that there may be jurisdictional differences, but they are based on something more than just departmental whims.

Let me point out to you what I consider some of the fundamentals of the problem.

I think we should begin by admitting the existence of conflicting legislation. The Reclamation Act was passed in 1902 and has been amended. The Water Facilities Act was passed in 1937 and amended under the title of Case-Wheeler Act in 1940. Reclamation is under the Department of the Interior and the water-facilities program is administered by the Department of Agriculture. These two acts come into direct conflict. It is true that there has been no evidence of this conflicting legislation because the respective officials of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture have been content to the existence of a "no-man's land" or neutral zone which has gone far in preventing actual collision. The \$100,000 limitation of the water-facilities program and the fact that Interior did not like to deal with projects of less than a million dollars, plus a studied effort on the part of both Federal agencies to avoid competition—these things which have kept the conflict in the legislation concealed—are more or less set aside under the terms of a small water-projects program. There is possibility of conflict there, not necessarily because of the two Federal agencies but because of the laws which establish conflicting programs. I will discuss this in more detail a little farther along in this talk.

In addition to that, we have the big soil conservation program which has been carried on by the Department of Agriculture for many years. Its work has been varied and its

field of operations has been Nation-wide. It has not been limited in its activities to the 17 Western States as have the reclamation and the water facilities programs. The National Reclamation Association should not overlook the part which the Soil Conservation Service might play in this matter.

After realizing that we have conflicting legislation, I think we should appreciate that there is evolving in this country a national water policy. This policy is much later in development than the water policy of the various Western States and in many instances it is quite different from our western way of doing things. We must understand, however, that this national policy is just in the making—that it will be a long time crystallizing, but that every bit of water legislation we pass now (and some legislation which does not pertain to water) will either help mold this national policy or will be held to the pattern of national policy.

The third thing we must appreciate is that there is a definite trend toward reorganization of the Federal departments and agencies to eliminate duplication of effort, under the Hoover reports or under some other system which will lead to efficiency and toward economy—we hope.

The fourth major item we must remember is that we who call for State rights must also be willing to accept State responsibility and that the Federal Government must be included in most of our plans but should not be expected or allowed to dominate the relationship.

Now against that background of conflicting legislation, evolution of a water policy, the trend against duplication, and the recognition of States' rights and responsibilities, we must consider our small water projects bill.

Let us revert to the reclamation, water facilities, and the soil-conservation programs. Analysis of the water facilities activities and scrutiny of the reports on the activities indicate the water facilities has two clean-cut and readily definable programs—(a) farmstead water and (b) irrigation water.

I do not think that we can have any argument about the farmstead water program being within the realm of agriculture. Farmstead water is water for the farm house, the barns, the stock. It can also include by definition the water from the irrigation system which reaches the land of the individual farmer. The utilization of farmstead water is clearly in line with the activities of the county agent and the home demonstration agent, and I think are so clearly agriculture that there is no trace of conflict.

But I think we should scrutinize carefully the entrance of the Department of Agriculture into the field of accumulating and distributing irrigation water. That is exactly what is done under the "irrigation" unit of the water facilities program. I shall not go into detail with you on this matter because I know you realize that the securing of water rights, the building of dams, the construction of distribution systems are by nature engineering rather than agriculture and, therefore, should not be confused with agriculture. The utilization of water by the farmer is agriculture. The line of demarcation is clear. Accumulating and distributing water is engineering up to the time the water goes through the measuring box of the individual farmer. Then it becomes agriculture. I believe that principle is fundamental.

Because we are in the process of making a national water policy, and because it is this very thing which will lead to jurisdictional conflict over the small water projects bill, I urge the National Reclamation Association to give some thought to the distinction between farmstead water and irrigation water.

But among the many facets of soil-conservation operations are such things as drainage

and earth moving. It is entirely possible that the soil-conservation program may be the heavy artillery for those who believe that small water projects belong in the Department of Agriculture. The issue may well be between reclamation and soil-conservation and not between reclamation and water facilities.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon NRA to take a long look at soil conservation, analyze its functions religiously and see whether or not small water projects are more closely related to that program than to reclamation. This might be a controlling point. Look into it carefully.

Here are two more things which I think you people should consider carefully. Irrigation is going east. In fact, it has gone east. More and more farmers in the rain belts are learning that it pays to have water available at the right time. It may be some time before there are any really big irrigation systems in the East, but I am positive that if a small projects bill is passed, eastern water users will soon begin to try for projects under it. I think the time has come to re-examine the 17 Western-State limitation of the Reclamation Act, at least as far as small projects are concerned. In the past you have been opposed to extending the Reclamation Act itself eastward and you may still be, but I think the small projects plan should cover the entire Nation.

Now I know when I make that recommendation that there will be those who will say, "The Bureau of Reclamation has no organization east of the Mississippi and the Soil Conservation Service has. Therefore, the Soil Conservation Service should handle these projects east of the Mississippi." I do not subscribe to that policy at all. I see no point in having a program operated by one agency on one side of the river and another agency on the other side of the river.

Another thing is the matter of the 160-acre limitation. I am not going to say anything about that except to state that the query came up in many of our informal meetings, particularly with the Bureau of the Budget. You know much better than I what the NRA policy should be on that.

So much for the relationship of reclamation to water facilities. Now let's take a look at the relationship of small projects to our national water policy.

I believe that from now on any water project constructed will first be viewed in respect to its relationship to basin-wide development. But we do not all agree on just what kind of basin development we should have.

There are those who believe that the pattern set by TVA should prevail—that it should be a federally controlled basin authority. Then there are those who believe that basin authorities should be State controlled. In only a few instances, however, will geography permit a single State to have complete physical jurisdiction over a river basin. The most notable example of this is the Central Valley of California. But the cost of developing the basin-wide Central Valley project was too great even for a rich State like California. So we must reconcile ourselves to the proposition that the cost of the project and the interstate character of most streams eliminate State control of basin projects.

We turn, then, to a third type of basin authority, that which is being developed in the Colorado River Basin. This is one in which the States, by their ability to get together and apportion the benefits of the river, have beaten the Federal Government to the punch, so to speak, and have an organization which has made itself a factor in any plan to develop the river, and which has a definite status under the laws of the respective States and of the Federal Government.

May I just state here that there may be circumstances under which the States of a

river basin may want to have a larger share in the management of the watershed of the basin, but I shall not dwell on that here.

I know that all of this talk of basin authorities may seem far afield from small water projects, but I am certain that the type of small-projects program that we have will affect the type of basin development we have.

It is entirely possible that the pattern set by the Colorado River compacts may be basic in the evolving of a water policy for the country and for the development of the various river potentialities on a basin-wide scale. The Colorado River pattern is not only one of Federal-State relationship but of State-State, State-basin, and basin-Federal relationship. State responsibility is a keystone in the Colorado River pattern. We must maintain the concept of State responsibility in the small water projects program, not only for the good of that program but also because it will help fix the concept of State responsibility in our national water policy.

I close now with the reminder to you that the President of the United States favors the objectives of the small water projects program, and with my own comment that the National Reclamation Association give serious thought to the fundamental problems involved, that you remember that America is evolving a national water policy, that you should make no compromises for expediency's sake but arrive at conclusions by objective analysis, that you consider the line of demarcation between farmstead water and irrigation water as one of the chief control points in determining the part the respective Federal agencies should play in water development; that the duplication of effort in this matter be resisted; that the concept of State responsibility be religiously adhered to, and, finally, that NRA seriously consider the proposition that the time has come, as far as small projects are concerned, at least, to extend the reclamation idea to the entire Nation.

There can be no growth, no civilization without water. It is truly our lifeblood. To guard it for our future growth and for future generations is essential. Our thinking about the utilization of water must be clear, our motives must be pure and unselfish. You of the National Reclamation Association are the leaders in all this. Your past record your present interest, our future hopes, place a tremendous burden on you for leadership. We shall depend on you.

Toughest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the *Everett (Mass.) Evening News-Gazette*:

TOUGHEST PROBLEM

Retailers face some tough problems these days. And the current squeeze on their always modest profits is just about the worst.

When Congress renewed the price-control law, it added some amendments which, it was believed, would allow retailers and all other businesses concerned to keep their pre-Korean profit margins, and to pass on the many increases in costs over which they have no control. But these amendments

lacked clarity of language and, according to OPS, they apply only to manufacturers and processors, and to new retailing regulations but not to the old ones. Thus, OPS contends, retailers can be forced to absorb many price increases.

This puts the retailer in an impossible situation. His pre-Korean profit margin was the result of years of competition in a free market. It is, for the most part, the smallest profit that will permit of good service and progressive store operation. It averages only a few cents out of each sales dollar.

Worst of all, if OPS is determined to follow a policy of profit control—and there are plenty of indications in this direction—the whole economy of the country will be threatened. That certainly was never the intent of Congress. That policy comes straight out of the Socialist ideology. It would disrupt industry and trade—and undermine the economic strength of the Nation, perhaps irreparably.

Highly Significant of What Our Top Military Leaders Are Thinking Is Expressed by Gen. Omar Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, When He States "The United States Must Win the Air War Before It Can Win a Ground and a Sea War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, noted for his predictions—under the caption of "Peace or War"—is a paragraph in the *Washington Merry-Go-Round* in which Mr. Drew Pearson states:

General Bradley, who made his fame as a foot soldier, will go all out for air power. With Admiral Fechteler, the new Chief of Naval Operations, reviving the old Navy-Air Force rivalry in a United States News interview—not cleared by his boss, Secretary Lovett—the Bradley speech is sure to make headlines.

America has probably no greater soldier or more skilled military administrator than Gen. Omar Bradley, United States Army. The "big dog" under Eisenhower, beloved and respected for his driving power and abilities, he earned the recognition of all his fellows as being a great military strategist.

Known as a good commander, he was highly respected and loved by the men in his command, and, despite his West Point origin, is nationally known to American soldiers everywhere throughout the world as the soldiers' general.

When Gen. Omar Bradley speaks, the Congress of this United States listens. All who know him recognize that his speeches are not a soldier's talk of military conquests—as much as they are those of a most advanced student of Christianity—telling of his love of peace. In every talk that he makes, one finds an air of spirituality far more suggestive of the theologian than of a great military leader and authority.

That all may read what Drew Pearson recently had to say of General Bradley—by and with the unanimous consent of my colleagues—I am extending my remarks and including therein the following short statement entitled "Peace or War?"

PEACE OR WAR?

(By Drew Pearson)

Gen. Omar Bradley, the top Chief of Staff, will make a significant speech advising the Nation on how to stay strong enough to insure peace.

In the speech, General Bradley, who made his fame as a foot soldier, will go all-out for air power. With Admiral Fechteler, the new Chief of Naval Operations, reviving the old Navy-Air Force rivalry in a United States News interview, not cleared by his boss, Secretary Lovett, the Bradley speech is sure to make headlines.

For the officer who once commanded the Army's Fort Benning Infantry School and has spent his life with ground forces plans to warn that the United States must win the air war before it can win a ground and sea war.

Bradley will say that the airplane is still the primary means of delivering the A-bomb both against cities and enemy troops; will reveal that baby A-bombs carried by fighter planes are more effective than atomic artillery; that large atomic bombs carried by B-36's are more effective than guided missiles; and will point out that air power must be planned and purchased several years in advance.

Accordingly, the Chief of Staff will favor a 143-group air force. Bradley, who is one of the most idealistic men in the Armed Forces, regretfully plans to warn the Nation that real peace with Russia isn't likely.

Socialized Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the *Malden (Mass.) Evening News*:

SOCIALIZED HOUSING

Government restrictions on private housing will result in less than a million privately constructed homes being built this year, compared to 1,300,000 in 1950. To take up some of this slack, Congress is moving to authorize the Government to erect at least 50,000 residential units of public housing. The administration wants authorization for 75,000 units. Public housing has a tax fund of \$338,000,000, out of which it can subsidize the rents of socialized housing. That has a tendency to keep rents down and to discourage investment in rental housing. At present there are 167,000 public-housing units in the United States eligible to draw subsidies. They are occupied by low-income families supposed to be unable to find satisfactory privately built dwellings. Other low-income families not in public housing help to pay the rent of those who are, through taxes. A survey has revealed that approximately 10 percent of families living in public housing are chiselers with ample incomes to afford private homes. If there ever was a

plausible argument for public housing, it is vitiated when the Government fails to kick chiselers out of these units. Public housing has become another of those typical bureaucratic operations in which the taxpayer shoulders the load of the bureaucrats' political friends.

What Practical and Valid Conclusions May Safely Be Drawn From This Report?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under October 2 date line, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLL, of California, had a news release of great interest especially to irrigation farmers of central Arizona. The Congressman's statement is based upon a report he had received from the United States Geological Survey in the nature of replies to 24 questions concerning water conditions and resources of that area in central Arizona covered by H. R. 1500. Fortunately, Congressman ENGLE extended his own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 5 and included this news release, which extension was printed in the Appendix of the Record for October 9. I say fortunately this statement was printed in the RECORD and thus given wider circulation for whatever scientific validity and practical value this United States Geological Survey report may have. It is to be earnestly hoped that the engineering information of this report is correct, is practical, and significant, and that Congressman ENGLE has drawn practical and logical conclusions therefrom. As to this latter I am in great doubt. Let us examine both the Engle news release and the United States Geological Survey report on which it is said to be based.

The first two sentences of Congressman ENGLE's release are amazing statements and are quoted as follows:

Arizona has enough water in underground storage basins at the present time to supply the farms within the proposed central Arizona project for a full century.

The United States Geological Survey recently issued a report which stated that more than 60,000,000 acre-feet of water are now stored in the underground basins of central Arizona.

These two statements are amazing statements if true in a practical and significant sense. I only hope the presence of water in that area is not like that with the Ancient Mariner: "Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink."

If we may believe there are 60,000,000 acre-feet of water easily available for practical pumping under the area covered by the central Arizona project, that, is indeed joyous news. Now, such a

quantity of water may be there, but I am worried about its availability for human use. For that matter some such quantity of water may be in the atmosphere over that area as determined by mathematical calculation going up into the stratosphere in computing the percentage of moisture or humidity. Many illustrations of the presence of water in physical or chemical combination could be given, but I think of one in which moisture is present but not available for drinking purposes.

My son, as an engineer, is engaged in the treatment of perlite ore. He grinds up this volcanic glass material and heats it properly so that it pops like popcorn. I asked him why does this ground glass material pop and expand this way under heat. He said it is because of the moisture in it. Now, there is a mountain called Picket's Post near where I live in Arizona which is composed largely of this type of rock, and accordingly, it must be that there are tons of moisture in that dry, hard volcanic rock lying there blistering under the Arizona sun. Yet I am positive that a humming bird on an August afternoon trying to get a drop to drink could not get a beak full from that rock. In other words, a whole mountain of water would be entirely unavailable to the beak of a humming bird. I can also believe that in a certain cubical content of earth material right under Phoenix, Ariz., there is a great volume of water, but that it is not necessarily available in that amount for the use of man.

Geologists speak of underground aquifers bearing water and discuss the nature of the earth mass as to its permeability and its capacity to store water. I frequently ask geologists to tell me about the underground storage capacity of certain areas and also how much water they may contain. Such is useful information, even guesses and estimates, but such is not always full and complete practical information. When we wish to know concerning an aquifer or water-bearing layer of underground storage, the first question is how much water could it hold and then how much water is actually there and available to be withdrawn through pumps, and then we want to know most what is the safe annual yield from that aquifer, depending upon the replenishability of that underground supply. If there is little or no replenishability for it, the underground supply actually present may not mean much for very long to the use of man on the surface. All of these facts must be carefully considered. I have a feeling that Congressman ENGLE, to prove that central Arizona need not import Colorado River water has given the last one—the replenishability of that supply under the Phoenix area—too little consideration.

We must carefully distinguish between storage capacity and actual storage. The rotunda and dome of this Capitol Building undoubtedly is large enough to store \$20,000,000,000 in gold, but that does not mean to say that there is now present in the rotunda and dome that amount of gold. In considering underground water

supply for human use it is highly important to ask not only how much is available to be extracted, but more particularly how much is perpetually available through renewable annual supply which may be counted as safe yield. When the statement is made that there is enough water to serve the central Arizona area for a full century that statement taxes the credulity of the farmers on that land who have so many dry wells. If such a time estimate of underground water storage is at all valid it must assume a very definite replenishment. Such replenishment of aquifers in other areas, such as the Los Angeles area of heavier precipitation might properly be counted on although the same replenishment may not be counted on for aquifers in the hot and semiarid region of central Arizona.

Congressman ENGLE later in his news release states that this report from the United States Geological Survey substantiates the testimony of California witnesses, and cites the statement of Mr. Clay Elder before our committee, as recorded on page 972 of the hearing, on H. R. 934, part II, on Friday, June 3, 1949. Mr. Elder is quoted as follows:

Beneath the central Arizona project and within a certain economic pump life of, say 200 feet and not over 150 feet long-time average, there is a ground-water reservoir still nearly filled with water in spite of years of drought and pumping. Its capacity is at least 45,000,000 acre-feet, or 50 percent greater than the total capacity created by Hoover Dam at Lake Mead.

I presided over the committee at the time that Mr. Elder made that statement in his testimony, and I noticed that I was not the only member of the committee amazed by the statement. The gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman MILES, showed his surprise and I myself could only gasp and say: "I hope the witness has good X-ray eyes." The engineer disavowed having good X-ray eyes and declared that he arrived at his conclusion that there are 45,000,000 acre-feet of water under the central Arizona project by simple mathematical calculations on available data. Similar testimony was given by another California engineer before a Senate committee. Now the fact that those men are eminent engineers would naturally lead one to give credit to their statement.

The California engineers referred to, have given long study to the South coastal basin in California which contains the Los Angeles area. One of them has given careful reports on the underground storage within definite limits in the Los Angeles area and on his eminent authority has stated definitely the storage capacity, the safe annual yield, and most such pertinent data. The pertinent data certainly includes the average annual precipitation which in that Los Angeles area lying next to the Pacific Ocean is several times greater than the semiarid region in central Arizona. Could it be that these gentlemen have carelessly applied mathematically the water-storage data pertaining to the Los Angeles area to the Phoenix area on which they have given their testimony? I have many and grave doubts,

as just indicated, concerning the availability of underground water as testified by California engineers for the distressed areas for which H. R. 1500 and S. 75 are intended to give relief.

A great fallacy into which California witnesses may have, and probably have, fallen is to get confused on theoretical underground supply based on mathematical computation of storage capacity instead of figuring accurately and positively how much water is available through replenishment by nature in safe annual yield. To illustrate:

Oil and water are both pumped from underground storage but we know that when an oil field has been discovered and estimated at, let us say, 600,000,000,000 barrels—which might be in volume about the same as the 60,000,000 acre-feet of water, which Mr. ENGLE says is under the Phoenix area—we do know that we can pump out some of that oil and then we call the field exhausted. We are told that with all of our engineering we cannot get nearly all of the oil that is known to lie in that field. We also know that once what oil is there has been pumped out it will not be replenished. Now there are certain water pockets and basins where the water has been stored through geologic ages that could be pumped until the supply would be exhausted, and that is exactly what we want to avoid doing in a land such as central Arizona where there is such slight rainfall and only very meager replenishment. Statesmanship required a careful guarding of the supply pumped from such water storage and a limitation placed on such pumping to be within the limits of safe yield. That is what Arizona is now attempting to do before it is too late. While all of this is true, the fact remains that central Arizona needs to get what water belongs to her out of the Colorado River in order to insure the State's economic future.

After all, how much does it matter as a point of right and justice, how much water is under Arizona when she asks for what rightfully belongs to her out of the Colorado River? If Mr. ENGLE had a million dollars in his home bank and \$100 in his billfold and a big bully got possession of that billfold, Mr. ENGLE would undoubtedly organize a sheriff's posse—if necessary—to repossess that billfold in spite of his large balance in the bank. Arizona likewise wants what is hers.

Valuable as the information is in this United States Geological Survey report and glad as I am to have it, I feel that it is of such a complicated and technical nature as to require careful interpretation by experts before valid conclusions may be drawn from it. This water question is far too hazardous a matter, being of very vital importance to Arizona, to jump to conclusions. This report, instead of proving that Arizona needs no water out of the Colorado River, to my mind confirms the need of it when the report is properly considered. Congressman ENGLE is entitled to use this official information just as much as he is entitled to ask for it, but I am unwilling to accept his interpretation of the report and I believe my colleagues will also view it with caution and ask for a more scientific interpretation.

Everyone Is So Unhappy Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from a constituent:

Hon. ANGLER L. GOODWIN,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN. I hope you will forgive the liberty I have taken to write you.

Everyone is so unhappy today—I mean the small unnoticed workingman. All my friends are complaining along with my husband and I—they say maybe we should write our Congressman, but they never do. I thought as we had had correspondence with you before I would make the first step.

You have always been a good Congressman for Massachusetts and I sincerely hope you were one of the men who voted against the new increase in income tax.

My husband has always worked hard every day. We have gone without lots of things in this world, just to buy a home and raise a boy and girl to be good Americans, but how can we hope to have good believing sincere children when everyone is grumbling about this and that. I think we all have a right to grumble too because all we hear is "tax on this—tax on that, send billions more to foreign countries." Why are we sending so much when we people here are really feeling the shortage of the dollar?

I am enclosing three clippings which I have found very interesting and feel are pretty awful to know what is going on.

I hope you don't think I am just a crabby cranky person and probably the only one who feels this way because I am not. If you would want to hear from all the people who are my friends and feel the same way they will write.

I am only an obscure mother with a boy and a girl whom I have taught since they were babies to love their God and country—someday maybe my son will have to fight for his country. All well and good, but please, sir, while you are in Washington, please see if you can get more men to start thinking of our boys and girls.

Stand up and speak up all the Congressmen for Americans.

Thank you for all your past courtesy.

Sincerely,

MARY M. WESTBERG

(Mrs. Clarence M. Westberg).

EVERETT, MASS.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The generosity of American taxpayers in rebuilding foreign merchant fleets should cease as of now.

Besides selling at bargain rates 1,113 surplus merchant vessels to foreign countries, United States taxpayers have financed through the Economic Cooperation Administration almost \$150,000,000 of repair work to rehabilitate merchant and fishing fleets of foreign nations. There are additional millions that have been handed over indirectly in payments to foreign shippers for hauling United States-produced ECA goods to their own countries.

In addition, we have shipped to ECA countries thousands of tons of steel plate and other material earmarked for production of other machinery, but some of which undoubtedly went into shipbuilding. Similar aid is now being extended to North Atlantic Treaty countries under the guise of making those nations strong militarily.

There is no question but that the hundreds of millions of dollars poured into foreign shipping has had a beneficial effect on the economies of the recipient nations. It has been so effective, in fact, that a number of them can now afford to use steel plate and other materials for building ships for the Soviet Union.

Denmark, for instance, is now constructing 8 trawlers for Russia; Belgium is building 5 cargo ships and 7 trawlers; Italy is constructing 2 passenger-cargo ships; Sweden 12 trawlers and 2 tankers, and the Netherlands is building 3 cargo ships, 6 tankers, 10 whalers, and 2 suction dredge hulls—all for Russia.

And just to forestall the usual denial from the State Department, copies of Shipping World are being sent to Secretary of State Dean Acheson. The publication lists the shipbuilding-for-Russia activity on the basis of data furnished by the ECA countries doing the building. This will be one time, at least, when Acheson won't be able to say he can't find any reference to it in his files, and, therefore, it isn't so.

NATO countries under the shadow of Soviet guns will be the beneficiaries of some \$6,000,000,000 more of United States taxpayer money that has been voted by Congress. We are also turning over additional fighting and cargo ships to practically any nation that steps up with its hand out. We will also send tanks, guns, and machine tools to NATO countries who plead that they do not have the steel for constructing the weapons and machines in their own countries. But they do have the steel for constructing ships for Russia. And what they are doing in effect is to take steel from United States consumers so they can collect a pile of Soviet gold.

Ever since 1946 the administration has treated foreign shippers as preferred customers. In the past 3 years alone, the ECA has shipped about 25,000,000 long tons of materials to foreign lands on foreign merchant ships. In addition, 56,000,000 tons of ECA cargoes have originated outside of the United States that have been shipped on foreign cargo vessels, at ECA expense. This is hidden aid to foreign merchant ship-lines that does not show up on the accounting sheet as direct aid.

Italy, for one, has received \$19,700,000 in direct cash to help rebuild its merchant fleet, plus steel and other material for repairing and rebuilding damaged vessels. But Italy now has enough material to build two passenger-cargo vessels for Russia.

Where Italy and the other ECA and NATO nations get the cash to build ships for the Kremlin is another interesting story. Taking Italy as an example—and it's the same story in any ECA country—it works like this:

An Italian merchant or manufacturer pays his own Italian Government for the cost of ECA materials shipped into Italy for him. The money is put in a separate fund, a so-called counterpart fund, from which Italian firms can borrow to construct ships, factories or machinery or for other worthwhile projects—and then export the goods to other countries.

Counterpart funds, naturally would not exist in the first place were it not for United States exports. So the end result is that it all comes from the pockets of United States taxpayers, and whether we like it or not, ECA and the State Department officials sit on their hands while United States money builds ships for Russia—ships that may already be hauling supplies to Chinese Communist troops in Korea.

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—It won't be a cold war for the Sovietized Chinese troops in Korea this onrushing winter. They'll be warm—snug in uniforms, socks and other garments sewn of cloth supplied them by the Japanese, because a coalition of Tokyo businessmen

and unions want to do business as usual with Red China.

Furthermore, most of these Nipponese textiles will be spun from raw American cotton bought from areas of our country which also contribute their share of dead, maimed and missing GIs.

I have before me a copy of a memorandum from Tokyo's International Trade and Industry to all Japanese businessmen, officially approving trade with our enemy. These businessmen, backed by politically powerful Nipponese unions eager to keep their people at work, may now send Red China as much chemical textiles as the Peiping government can pay for in American dollars.

At the same time, the Japanese can ship as much cotton thread, cotton cloth, staple fiber thread, staple fiber cloth, staple fiber cotton, rayon thread and rayon textiles as the Chinese can barter for with coal, salt, talc and other materials.

These other materials are the raw stuff which Japanese merchants want for low cost production—so they can compete with industries in high-wage lands across the world.

Very clever businessmen, the Japanese

Here are the actual remarks of one of their Nipponese radio commentators who plugged for business as usual with Mao Tse-tung's government—Kobashi, by name. He got on the air in Tokyo on September 21, the day the Japanese Government restrictions on Red trade were lifted, and broadcast to his listeners that

"Some persons in the Secretariat of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry consider that on this occasion restrictions on trade with Communist China should be relaxed somewhat, because Communist China wants to buy Japanese textile goods Japan expects much from the raw materials of Communist China."

He then sourly explained that, of course, there'd be complications because cotton thread and cloth are considered strategic war materials—and that much of the textiles sent to Red China will be made from American raw cotton.

Tons of this raw stuff are pouring into Japan—bought up from American brokers who have had no reason not to sell to a nation with which we made peace with such fanfare.

Restrictions on American sale of this raw United States cotton to foreign buyers were lifted by our Commerce Department on September 17. Eleven days later the Department added soft and hard cotton waste and used cotton now may, also, be exported to most countries under general license without prior application to the Office of International Trade.

However, Secretary Sawyer's experts did add that these shipments to the U. S. S. R. and its satellites and to Hong Kong and Macao, Portuguese, will continue to be restricted and require export licenses.

Now, here is what happened immediately in Japan. On September 17, the American Supreme Headquarters, which receives its advice on these nonmilitary matters from the other branches of our Government, dispatched a memorandum to the Japanese Trade Ministry saying that it will no longer be necessary for the Japanese Government to get permission from the Supreme Military Commander for the export of seven types of textiles to Communist China.

Well, 4 days later, on September 21, the Japanese Government also approved this trade with Red China—the first of many such moves, it can be predicted.

Of course, the Japanese officials restricted such items as cotton tire cord, parachute and balloon material, viscose rayon tire cord, and cotton sail cloth. For which, thanks. But what the Nipponese did immediately after that was announce that exports to Hong Kong "will no longer require emergency item import permits of the Hong Kong

government and buyers letters of guaranty as in the past."

Which means the Japanese can ship what they want of this material to the gateway to south China. From there it is only a short run by land or a swift 2-hour sail by sea to the Red factories turning out the uniforms for the troops of our enemy.

OUR CHILDREN

We like the thoughts expressed by Judge John J. Connelly of Boston juvenile court, in a recent speech, when he said that America's zeal in trying to protect the little children of foreign nations threatened by the ravages of war could result in the serious neglect of our own youngsters at home. These children, he pointed out, are just as much the victims of the disruptive forces of war and crisis as those of other countries. We call them our "most priceless possessions" and the "hope of the future," but sometimes we do not pay sufficient attention to their plight in our anxiety to see that the rest of the globe doesn't suffer. We owe it to them to make them our chief concern and offer them every possible protection in the uncertain days to come. There are some people who are more attracted to distant vistas than to what is going on about them. We must not allow our very closeness to our children to obscure their needs.

How Our Best Reclamation Project Might Have Been Killed 50 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, Bureau of Reclamation officials and certainly the congressional delegation from Arizona regard the great project in the Valley of the Sun surrounding Phoenix, Ariz., the State capital, as Uncle Sam's first and most successful reclamation project under the Federal reclamation law of 1902. It is almost ready to celebrate its golden anniversary, the Roosevelt Dam having been started in 1903, which is one of the half dozen great storage dams now serving that project. It has been a remarkably good investment of about \$25,000,000 of Uncle Sam's money, a fact well known today, but it might easily have been prognosticated another way at the turn of the century.

About the year 1900, the irrigation farmers in central Arizona who had pioneered in small reclamation projects found themselves in great distress, for a very unusual drought condition prevailed there in 1898-99, although they had had some raging floods several years previously. In 1896 the great pioneer who fathered the National Reclamation Association, George H. Maxwell, a native of California, but who spent the major part of his life in Arizona, called a national convention of like-minded citizens to meet at Phoenix, Arizona Territory, for their national meet. Maxwell did this to show that remarkable valley as an object lesson illustrating what individual efforts can do with water placed upon fertile land and also to reinforce his own idea that such great contemplated proj-

ects should be done by the national effort. The dry years before the turn of the century gave point to his contention that the flood waters must be conserved behind great dams such as he envisioned then and which are there today. Of course, the key structure was to be about 70 miles northeast of Phoenix at the junction of Salt River and Tonto Creek where a great V-shaped reservoir could be built.

The canyon walls at that point of juncture made perhaps the most ideal site in the Territory of Arizona—outside of the Grand Canyon—to locate such a storage dam. There was much discussion among the Arizona farmers just a half century ago about the benefits which would accrue from the building of a great dam at that point, but George H. Maxwell had impressed them with the need of national legislation and national engineering and national financing to get it accomplished. If the owner of the splendid site had determined on a development by an individual or corporation and had opposed in Arizona and at Washington the work being done by the newly created agency under the reclamation law of 1902, we would have had a very different story. How could such opposition have been effective? Well, using a modern technique very recently devised, it could have been done like this: Influential lobbyists and not disinterested witnesses could have come before Congress with about the following argument: "Gentlemen of Congress, they say this key dam will cost \$5,000,000. Bureaucrats always underestimate and it will probably cost four or five times as much. Undoubtedly the Government will spend not less than \$25,000,000 during the next half century. The law says that the capital investment shall be repaid, but it is interest-free money and only the principal will be repaid if at all. The dam probably will not last 50 years and even though the capital cost might be returned, think of the interest cost to the American taxpayer. Why, gentlemen, \$25,000,000 put out at 4 percent interest compounded semiannually in 50 years would amount in interest alone to nearly \$200,000,000. It is doubtful whether there is that much assessed wealth this year of 1901 in the whole political unit, the Arizona Territory. Gentlemen of Congress, do not be so foolish as to sink \$25,000,000 out in that desert and load a debt of interest cost of about \$200,000,000 over the first half century on the backs of the American taxpayers."

Well, what is the situation today? First, Roosevelt Dam is standing there today as good and more useful than when Theodore Roosevelt dedicated it in 1911. In addition to this key dam six other dams have been built to aid its highest function. It is true that the Federal Government has invested about \$25,000,000 during the 50 years just passed in this total project. The interest cost has been considerable, but it has been more than counterbalanced by the income-paying revenue arising out of the project. Although that interest cost properly computed would be less than the \$200,000,000 which the opposition might have figured. The wealth that exists based upon this project is far in excess of \$200,000,000.

even at its lowest assessment. The internal-revenue collector in Phoenix advises us that for the past several years the total Federal income tax arising out of and based upon the wealth created by the project amounts to upward of \$75,000,000 annually. We have not had a Federal income tax during all of the last 50 years, but the income-tax revenue arising out of this project during the last 3 years has more than counterbalanced the computed interest cost that might have been held up by the opposition to frighten away such Federal investments.

Cold figures cannot tell the full story. Let anyone who surveys this rich and productive valley in Arizona, including Phoenix and many surrounding towns, with their modern improvements, their civilization, and their culture, decide for himself whether this initial investment begun a half century ago and extended in feasible steps through the intervening years was a wise or foolish investment.

Give the People an Honest Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, today the preservation of the United States as a land of freedom is in the balance. The outcome depends on the vitality of the two-party political system. Historically this system has given the American people adequate opportunity to control their destiny.

The first responsibility of the party out of office is to expose the mistakes and to oppose questionable policies of the party in power. For 20 years that opposition duty has rested on the Republican Party.

Unfortunately the Republican Party has recently failed this primary responsibility. In 1940, 1944, and 1948 our presidential campaigns were like sham battles. Our issues consisted of pompous platitudes and "me-toolism"—even though those elections involved the blood and treasure of the American people.

Many people detected the humbug of those campaigns. Although the people were unable to effectively protest the failure to draw the real issues, they sensed the fact that the campaigns were without live issues.

Many people knew that the decisive factor in American affairs was the foreign policy which was involving us in trouble or war everywhere.

Many people knew that domestic policies were determined by foreign policy.

Many people saw that if the Republican Party gave them no alternative in foreign policy, the election was a sham battle, and a mockery of the two-party system.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I have never been infected by this evil germ of "me-toolism." In Congress from 1943 through 1948, I opposed the administration's blundering abroad with all the ability at my command.

For example, along with others, I drew up a constructive protest against the criminal policy of unconditional surrender. We put that protest before the Roosevelt administration. We were trying to see the war won so that permanent peace would result. Now unconditional surrender is recognized as the greatest mistake of World War II.

I voted against UNRRA because I believed it would not work out to the best interests of my country. We know now that it was an arsenal for communism.

I worked and voted against the Bretton Woods give-away of American billions. I did not think the American taxpayer could or should be forced to carry the nations of the world on his back. Events have demonstrated the failure of that scheme.

I voted against the British loan. I felt it would be used to finance and build up socialism in England. That is exactly what followed.

My vote has been steadfastly in opposition to the foreign policy—a succession of blunders that today has American boys dying in vain and futile war against the people of Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my record thus far in the Eighty-second Congress. My opposition to the deadly militarism, inflation, and socialism of the Truman administration has not been simply in words or speeches.

I have voted against the gigantic spending that threatens the financial foundations of this Republic.

In 1951 I have voted against more expenditures than any other Member of the House or Senate. It was a lonesome stand on some of those occasions. There was only one Member besides myself who voted "No" on the colossal \$57,000,000,000 military appropriation which incidentally did not include the specific Korean war funds.

Of course I worked against and voted against the 1951 tax increase that puts a cruel burden on the backs of every American who earns his own way.

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Present taxes by themselves will, if continued, destroy our liberty in a few short years. These taxes make it impossible for the average American to save enough to assure his future security. The individual who is not economically free and strong cannot preserve his political freedom. The ration card in Russia is proof of that.

I have given the people of my district an honest choice. My voice, my influence, and my vote have opposed to the limit foreign intervention, inflation, and creeping socialism.

Is Universal Military Training Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

the following broadcast over the American Forum of the Air, Sunday, September 23, 1951, by Erle Cocke, national commander of the American Legion, and myself, on the question, Is Universal Military Training Necessary?—

ANNOUNCER. Good afternoon. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air, dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides and of all issues vital to you and your country.

This afternoon the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion on the vital topic, Is Universal Military Training Necessary?

Here with us this afternoon to discuss this problem are Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, and Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee.

And now, here is your moderator, who 23 years ago founded the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. The hot and cold war in the Far East heightens the problem of keeping an adequate supply of trained military manpower ready for any emergency. A presidential commission is considering a program of universal military training as the backbone of our national preparedness.

Today the American Forum of the Air explores a few of the issues; how Congress must tackle them when the Commission plan is proposed. Do we need UMT for our national survival? Will it lead to a military control of our civilian life?

First a question for the National Commander of the American Legion, we won World War II without UMT. Why do we need it now when we are not actually fighting a global war?

Commander COCKE. It is true we are not fighting a global war yet, but it is certainly to the interest of the American public to be prepared. I think we are probably 30 years late in the passage of UMT as we stand now. We have been in Korea for some 15 months now, and we still have nothing on the credit side in terms of preparedness. You must realize we came lots closer in World War II to losing than most people realize, and the reason was because it took us so long to prepare and to give a man a chance of survival prior to the time he was used in combat.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. As much as I admire my good friend, Erle Cocke, who is one of the outstanding National Commanders of the American Legion, I cannot agree with him on the question of the necessity of universal military training. The reason I cannot accept this discarded, outworn, European system is because every nation or major country that has ever had it has been led down the road to war and defeat. Germany, Italy, and Japan had it, and look where they are today. France, by building the Maginot Line, thought that her army was impregnable, was led into a false sense of security, and universal military training and service certainly did not save Poland.

I think it is one of the most dangerous things that this country could adopt, because as the Commander has admitted, not only did we win World War II, but also World War I without universal military training, and the countries that did not have universal military training suffered far fewer casualties than those who did have it.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you feel it would be dangerous to do what the Congressman said?

Commander COCKE. Let us think back whether we won or lost now. Let us look at it from the individual point of view, particularly those who were actually in combat in world wars; had they been given a better chance of survival through being given a standard basic military training, they would have produced a better spirit of the type that took longer to produce in World War II and made it last longer. I think all people

will agree today that what this country should do is to try to invest in the future, and I know of no better investment in the youth of this Nation than to be sure he is well prepared for the conflict he may go into.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Yes, but the point is, whenever you adopt universal military training, you are adopting the old method that has been tried and that has always failed. History is on our side. To be thoroughly prepared for war is to be disposed to war. You cannot build up these instruments of power without somebody wanting to use them. I want to quote the late Jan Smuts, that elder statesman of Britain, the grand old soldier and former Prime Minister of South Africa, when he said—and some of us had the pleasure of meeting and hearing him—"while the great powers are allowed to raise conscript armies * * * it would be vain to expect the lasting preservation of world peace. If the instrument is ready for use, the occasion will arise, and the men will arise to use it. I look upon conscription as the taproot of militarism. Unless that is cut out all our labors will eventually be in vain."

The commander does know as well as I do that many of our forebears and best citizens only a few generations ago came to this new world to escape the tyranny of the old, and to get from under the heel of a militaristic despotism. We certainly could not want to establish the system which we have spent so much in treasure and blood to destroy.

Chairman GRANIK. Commander Cocke.

Commander COCKE. The Congressman is very distinguished in his representations and is an outstanding member of the House Armed Services Committee in which he hears many of these arguments pro and con daily. I tell you quite frankly the statements that Von Ribbentrop reported to Hitler in 1939—his ideas from official documents—were like this: "The United States will never be able to land in Europe because of their unpreparedness." Then General Jodel at the same time, who was chief of military operations to Hitler, made this statement: "The preparation of the United States is so insignificant that we will never have to fear them at any time." Those types of ideas I think contradict your preceding statement.

Congressman SHORT. I think they are the strongest argument for the position I maintain because in spite of that, the United States did land in two wars, because free men can always outwork, outproduce, and outfight slaves.

Commander COCKE. All right. Look at the present situation in Korea. You have been in there some 15 months, and you have lost 82,000 people. Had you had a system of basic military training, a universal structure in being any time after 1945, you probably would not have had the conflict, No. 1, No. 2, you would have had replacements prepared to go into Korea and do the job for which Americans have certainly been courageous always in the past in every war.

Chairman GRANIK. Would the existing conflict have been avoided?

Commander COCKE. Yes; I think our strength would have been at such a level that they dare not expect us to go in.

Congressman SHORT. With all the military might and power of Germany and Fascist Italy and the Tojo Japan, it did not prevent war. Mere military might will never prevent it. We should not place all of our hope and eggs in one basket or depend on might and materialism. When you adopt universal military training, the preponderant or whole emphasis is upon might and material, rather than moral force and spiritual strength.

Chairman GRANIK. Commander Cocke.

Commander COCKE. Let us put it this way. Let us be practical about it. You say when we are going to adopt UMT—You were present at the same time I was, when the bill as signed in June and became law,

Public Law 51, that actually created a system of universal military training for which there has been a Presidential commission working on it since that time.

Congressman SHORT. At that time, let us get this clear once and for all. Universal military training is not the law of this land.

Commander COCKE. Hasn't it been passed and signed?

Congressman SHORT. No, sir. It cannot become the law of this land until Congress takes positive, affirmative action. What has happened is that the American Legion, patriotic as you are, and the Defense Department, for 30 long years, have been trying to cram down the throats of the American people a system of universal military training that is wholly contrary to all of our best traditions and all of our history. The Congresses have repeatedly refused to pass universal military conscription.

Taking advantage of the hysteria of the moment, of the crisis in Korea, you tack onto an extension of the draft last April a bill, a rider that had no business being in there, and many of the Members of Congress who voted not for UMT, but for merely a commission to study and report a plan to Congress, did it with their fingers crossed, their tongues in their cheeks, and a silent hope in their brain and a prayer in their hearts that this thing would never become law. It was a cowardly act for Congress to try to pass the buck to the Executive.

Chairman GRANIK. Commander Cocke.

Commander COCKE. Speaking for the American Legion, we certainly hope your prayers are never answered, because we need a UMT program in this country, and we believe the National Security Training Commission that will report very shortly now will bring in a program that will give you what you want.

Chairman GRANIK. Would you put a limit on the UMT program, say 5 years?

Commander COCKE. The present law makes a 6-month's basic training period and 7½ years in reserve.

Congressman SHORT. It is not the present law. The gentleman is confusing the public, and the press has carried on this subtle propaganda, trying to make American people think we have UMT now. We do not have it, and we will not have it if the American people will be alert and vigilant and rise in their might and with courage express to their representatives in Congress their opposition to this foreign and discredited system.

What we did last June was to pass Senate bill 51, and the only reason that UMT was tied in with the extension of the draft, which all Members of Congress favored, we know under present conditions we had to extend the draft, we voted for these huge appropriations for defense, we are not against adequate preparedness. We are against universal military training or peacetime conscription because we think instead of making us strong, it will make us weak. But the Congress voted to set up a commission by the President to report to us within 4 months, before October 29, some plan or scheme for universal military training. We are told that it has been finished, but it has not been made public. It has not been made accessible to me. I am still in the dark. I do not know what is in the plan. But the Congress will have 45 days, particularly the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and House, to consider that plan when it is submitted, and made public, to either accept in toto, to amend in any fashion we might like, or reject altogether, and I hope we reject altogether.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you have any idea what is in the plan?

Commander COCKE. Yes, we have a good idea what is in the plan, mainly because the American Legion has been fortunate enough in its long 30-year program, to keep up with it. We have been invited to participate be-

fore that committee composed of Dr. Comp-ton, former Senator Wadsworth, Will Clayton, and General Ray McLean, as well as Admiral Kincaid.

Chairman GRANIK. Give us a preview.

Commander COCKE. Yes. We have the idea that this service of some 6 months, not to include any type of GI bill training, because we do not feel that the man who serves just 6 months is entitled for a long-range benefit, although at the time he is in the service as a veteran, he does not get veteran's status, but we do think he should be taken care of in an insurance way, and anything that occurs to him in terms of disability that that disability be protected, and handled while he is in the service.

In any case, he has a disability while going through training, he will be referred to probably the Department of Labor, because we certainly do not feel he has veteran's status, and should come to VA.

Chairman GRANIK. Is the Commission coming out with any of these thoughts?

Commander COCKE. We made our recommendation to them. We certainly hope they will follow them. We believe that will also help those that make the opposition to UMT look so bad because of its cost. We are trying to show people that \$30 a month as provided in the present Public Law 51 when UMT was passed, and that will come at a time when a man is through high school or at a time when he is 20, to give him a chance to come at a time when it least interrupts his life.

We still believe that a man when given a basic military education as he goes through high school, he gets an education, it is just as much authority in this country to give a person a chance of survival as it would to give him an education.

Chairman GRANIK. Would not a permanent UMT program make it easier for the young man to plan his life? Most are worried about being drafted now.

Congressman SHORT. Of course, the uncertainty that hangs over the youth of America, and the insecurity they feel is one of the most disturbing things they face. If you adopt UMT they will know what their plans are. They will be put in a strait-jacket even at a 6 months training, which is really too short to become effective, and then they will be subject to call for the next 7½ years, 3½ years in the ready reserve, 4 years in the stand-by reserve, or the Government will have claim on him from 18 to 26 years of age, interfering with his normal education or vocational training, and delaying his marriage and creation of a home.

Chairman GRANIK. Commander Cocke.

Commander COCKE. Don't you think the Government had the claim on a lot of people in the last 10 years on the same basis in which they left them out—

Congressman SHORT. They certainly have.

Commander COCKE. Don't you feel it is fair that it be universal and as many people share in the same responsibility of Government and defense of it?

Congressman SHORT. The Government has had that claim, and we all admit we have to run those risks and suffer these sacrifices in time of war, but I don't want it to become a permanent peacetime military policy of this Nation.

Let me ask the Commander this: He will admit that the draft is only temporary, and that this UMT is permanent.

Commander COCKE. That is correct.

Congressman SHORT. He has mentioned the cost. No one can predict with any accuracy the actual cost of this ambitious program.

Commander COCKE. I am glad you brought that out.

Congressman SHORT. But we know with a million young men becoming 18 years of age annually—

Commander COCKE. Eight hundred thousand.

Congressman SHORT Eight hundred and fifty thousand qualifying—the cost is going to be enormous. Now, then, because of that tremendous cost for UMT, it is going to weaken your Regular Military Establishment or forces in being. It will have to take money away from our armed services to train these kids for 6 months. After they are trained 6 months, put in the Reserve, and in case war should break out later, they are called back and what good would they be? They would have to go right back and take the training all over again to acquaint themselves with new weapons, because modern wars are not fought with individuals with rifles, but combat teams. The most important and hardest part of the training is that, I say it will be a waste.

Commander COCKE Wait a minute. There is one idea learning to ride a bicycle or swimming. When you once are taught to ride or swim, you know how to do it any time it comes up. That applies to basic training. A man can come back to uniform and immediately pick up military life if he has once been exposed, and brought into that type of life.

To answer your long question there just preceding in terms of benefits, I think you will find that the benefits, No. 1 is the training of the individual, No. 2, is being sure that you have a pretraining level in which you raise not only the Guard, but the Reserve, and the third idea is that that frees the Regular force so that the Regular Establishment can be utilized for the purposes for which we have already maintained an armed force, and the fourth, it gives us that trained manpower pool, personnel pool, that can be called upon. When you have the draft, you have people only listed. If you have UMT, then you will have people not only listed, but trained.

Chairman GRANIK You feel it is healthy for American boys to spend that period?

Commander COCKE Very much so, very healthy.

Congressman SHORT Mr. Granik, the question we are debating is, Is universal military training necessary? I say it is not necessary, because of the presence of the selective-service law, which is meeting all of the requirements in our present crisis. Every young man between 18 and 26 is subject to call. Even if UMT were desirable, now is no time to enact it, because if you did enact it, you would have fewer combat soldiers for active service.

Commander COCKE No. You are certainly stretching the argument on that point. We have never envisioned that UMT would ever change the present structure. Sure we need replacements in Korea. I don't know anything there that draws more attention than the statement the other day on morale, that no man that spent last winter in Korea would have to spend next winter there. If it keeps on going, you have to have trained manpower somewhere, and you yourself admitted that selective service is only temporary.

Congressman SHORT Doesn't the Commander admit that all the sponsors and advocates of UMT admit frankly that it cannot be put into effect until the present crisis is over?

Commander COCKE Yes, but there is a great deal of machinery, and you can face it. Chairman GRANIK In a moment, we will take questions from the audience.

I see Congressman ROGERS in the audience. Do you have a question, Congressman?

Congressman ROGERS My questions are addressed to Commander Cocke.

Commander, in the event that the UMT program is adopted, don't you think that the facilities of the universities and colleges should be utilized, not only in the interest of training the boys, but in the interest of economy?

I address this to you because I know how my colleague, Mr. SHORT, thinks on this be-

cause I introduced an amendment to the bill which he accepted. What do you think? Commander COCKE I think honestly everyone in this country realizes that the educational standards we have through the colleges and universities have been a great asset. If you drafted every man today under the temporary law we presently have you would find that the Armed Forces would probably send about half of them back to college anyway.

So the idea of keeping the college institutions open is an absolute necessity and UMT should certainly and can utilize their vast facilities in terms of structures already in being.

Chairman GRANIK Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT Mr. Granik, certainly I think we should make the maximum use of all existing facilities in behalf of economy, but if I remember the original plan of the American Legion, they wanted the full 4 years' training, and while they wanted to integrate universal military training with a natural normal academic education, they know it is very difficult, if not next to impossible, to do that.

You can't train men to sail a ship or to run a tank or fly a plane on a college campus. If you are going to have universal military training, it must be military or it is no good at all.

I don't want to see you try to get by through surreptitious tactics, and certainly I know you wouldn't want to do that.

Commander COCKE You are the one that is practicing it, I think.

Chairman GRANIK Gentlemen, shall we take another question?

Question My question is for Representative SHORT:

What effect would putting the emphasis upon atomic weapons, as proposed by Chairman McMAHON of the Atomic Energy Committee, have on UMT?

Congressman SHORT Well, no doubt it would have a great deal of effect, although I think you have to have air, ground, and sea forces to win a war. You have to maintain a proper balance. But because of the rapid change and unexpected changes in modern warfare, I think perhaps increasing emphasis will be placed on our Air Force and our naval arm.

Chairman GRANIK Commander Cocke.

Commander COCKE I think Korea has pointed out one thing—we still don't have push-button warfare, and you have to have ground men to occupy space.

Congressman SHORT I agree with the Commander wholeheartedly on that. The old foot soldier always will have to march in and take over and hold the ground.

Chairman GRANIK I see a lady in the audience—

Question My question is addressed to Commander Cocke.

From your travels overseas, do you believe that universal military training will give more courage to our friendly nations and help toward an honorable peace for all nations?

Commander COCKE There is no doubt of the fact that passage of UMT would greatly help to strengthen our foreign position. We have had a changing policy from time to time and people have not understood that we are going to be prepared. We have stood out to be the police force of the world, and we must have the policemen.

Chairman GRANIK Do you think it will strengthen our world position?

Congressman SHORT I think it will weaken it instead of strengthening it. I might say that I too have gadded about a great deal in Asia and Europe and Africa, and I think many of the nations and peoples of the world are afraid that we have lost the offensive to Russia in our fight for peace. What they are scared of is that we are becoming more militaristic and imperialistic and if we pass the UMT, "There you go, the

white man is trying to exploit the hordes of Asia."

Commander COCKE Haven't the American people demonstrated that is not their purpose in practically every war and conflict we have had?

Congressman SHORT Certainly from our own point of view we have, and I think in truth we have. It is not what we know we have done, it is what the world is going to think we will do.

Chairman GRANIK Gentlemen, we have another question from the audience.

Question My question is for Mr. Cocke: How might a youth benefit by the UMT program?

Commander COCKE The individual?

Question Yes.

Commander COCKE No. 1, the individual will be given a chance for survival. He will be given basic military training so when his time comes to be utilized in the defense and protection of this Nation, we will have given him the best possible education this Nation can give him in terms of military and personal survival.

Congressman SHORT On that point, I want to say this. If we are to improve the education, health, and morals of our citizens, it must start from birth, and not when boys reach the age of 18. That is too late to form habits and attitudes to continue throughout life.

If America ever reaches the point when we will have to depend on the Armed Forces to take over our sons at the age of 18 to teach them the common virtues of patriotism, honesty, and morality, then heaven have mercy upon our Republic.

There are some people, I know, who are for UMT because they would like to escape the responsibilities of parenthood.

Commander COCKE I assure you that the American Legion today in trying to have universal military training adopted is delighted that we passed it in principle through the Congress. We certainly believe that the findings of the President's Commission will come forth and clarify many of the problems you have raised.

Chairman GRANIK Gentlemen, we just have time for the summaries. Congressman SHORT, your summary.

Congressman SHORT We do not now have universal military training as a law. It is simply a report to be submitted to the Congress by a commission that has been appointed. I think that universal military training is unnecessary at this time because the draft meets all of our requirements. Even if desirable, it could not be effective, as has been stated by Mrs. Rosenberg, by Mr. Baldwin, and by General MacArthur and other well-known authorities.

I believe that taking young men of America from the church and school and the home and putting them in a segregated group at the age of 18 where the moral and spiritual surroundings are not conducive to the building of the best character is not what this country wants.

I want to agree with Dr. Hutchins, the former chancellor of the University of Chicago, now with the Ford Foundation, when he said:

"It stands to reason that though free and independent citizens make the best Army, the Army is not the best place to make free and independent citizens."

Chairman GRANIK Thank you, Congressman SHORT. Your summary, Commander Cocke.

Commander COCKE To summarize, I think everyone today fully realizes what we face in this country as well as abroad. We believe that universal military training is a chance for the individual, and I come back to that thought, as I brought out three times on this program, for the very ample reason that individuals can be made into the type of fighting force we need, but we cannot be made into that fighting force if we start

late. We have started late in every war we have ever been in. It is true we have finished every war on top. But how close can we come? Can we gamble again?

We believe in the framework of the national-defense effort built on the universal military training program as well as on a long-range reserve program that will last 7 or 8 years, so people will know why they fight and what their responsibilities in this Nation are as citizens, and as such, can more than justify themselves as citizens by their service to their Nation.

So those are the thoughts and feelings that we have and we believe that universal military training is the means by which this can best be accomplished for our Nation, and certainly it can be when this report is filed with the Congress, and I believe that the Congress will pass it regardless of what the Congressman says.

Chairman GRANT. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on Is Universal Military Training Necessary? Our speakers have been Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion and Congressman DEWEY SHORT, Republican, of Missouri.

Report to the People of the Tenth Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the Eighty-second Congress is now history. Time, in history's long perspective, will tell its true story. But—right now—American citizens are interested in its accomplishments, its aims, attempted and realized, and the parts played by its individual legislators in bringing this about. I feel that I owe my constituents an account of my stewardship. To that end I present this report.

We hear the Eighty-second Congress called the Congress of investigations, the billion-dollar-spending Congress, the Congress which abolished the penny post card. All of these epithets we acknowledge and say—the investigations produced some good, the billions spent are a bulwark against the deadliest foe humanity ever faced, and the departed penny post card went the way of the five-cent cigar in an inevitable sacrifice on the altar of a diminishing dollar. Call it what you may, I feel that history will place its accomplishments on the credit side of the ledger.

There is no reason to explain the dire situation this world faces. With all the evidence presented to us daily in our press, our radio and television, we Americans are aware of this crisis. Freedom is threatened as never before in history, for the evils undermining us are masking as good and throwing the dust of suspicion on every real good in the world. Only the alert can combat this insidious program. What the Eighty-second Congress did to challenge and to thwart this threat is the substance of my report.

The greatest emphasis in both legislation and in policy was placed on inter-

national or foreign commitments. The Eighty-first Congress, with foresight and fearlessness, committed us to world leadership in the struggle against communism. The Eighty-second Congress implemented this solemn purpose. Many Americans objected to these commitments, stressing economy and the fact that American policy had always veered toward isolationism. They held that America should try to go it alone. Despite these controversies, the bipartisan foreign policy is more intact today than one might expect. This reflects credit on the realism and the patriotism of the Eighty-second Congress.

Let us look first at the record in international affairs. The outstanding accomplishment in this field is the Mutual Security Act of 1951. It underscores the opening of a new phase in the effort of the free world to discourage Communist aggression. It marks a turning point in our struggle for peace. Following World War II Europe lay open to the vandalism of the greedy Soviet Union. Its mines and factories, its rich natural resources, the wealth of its technical skills were completely unprotected and a tempting prize for the Communists. We thwarted their evil purpose and doubtless saved Europe from being completely overwhelmed when we gave aid to Greece against the Red guerrillas, to Turkey in its stand against encroachment of the Dardanelles, to Italy, to France, and to the United Kingdom. History will emphasize the importance of our contribution to freedom when record is made of our airlift in Berlin. To complete the picture, the Marshall plan rehabilitated and brought about the recovery of Europe. Instead of being satellites under the Soviet rule, these nations are now restored to stability, both materially and, we pray, spiritually, and are contributing to the defense program while trying to maintain their prewar standard of living.

The Marshall plan was accomplished in 3 years, a year ahead of schedule. The new program, the mutual-security plan, the natural successor to the Marshall plan, provides arms and equipment for the troops in Europe. Not only are the arms and equipment supplied, but, what is more important, the materials and machinery are given so that they can produce defense material themselves. In signing this measure, President Truman pointed out:

Their contributions are as important as our own. We must never forget that we are just as dependent on the efforts of other nations as they are on ours.

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 gives realistic expression and meaning to the foreign policy of the United States. Our objective now, as it always has been, is the establishment of a just peace. That objective can only be obtained by the collective efforts of the United States and the nations of the free world. Not to go through with this program would invite global war. To refuse to assist any nation and to return to an isolationist policy and await our turn to be attacked would probably mean the end of our civilization. This cannot be the policy of a world power—a world power

which has assumed and must continue to assume the leadership of the free world.

The security of the United States and the security of the free world are interdependent. The United States, geographically, economically, and politically is more capable of survival alone than any other nation. But, for how long could it survive if the rest of the world were in the orbit of Russian domination? Does it make sense to abandon Europe and Asia or the Near East or Latin America to Soviet imperialism when we consider the strategic importance and the economic importance of these areas to the United States? Where would we get our critical materials? How could we meet the combined industrial potential of the Soviet Union and an occupied Europe? These are questions we must ask ourselves in our own fundamental self-interest. This is a question of survival, not of giveaway programs.

The total cost of our defense is large. No one with any respect for the dollar—much less billions of dollars—can deny that. Even for a country such as ours, with our annual national production now well over \$200,000,000,000, it is a figure to make one pause. Congress appropriated approximately \$57,000,000,000 for domestic defense. In the Mutual Security Act, we authorized seven billion, three hundred millions for foreign aid. These two figures interlock. The one builds up the other. The purpose of each is the security of the United States—security for American lives and homes against attack, and the security of our rights and liberties as law-abiding members of the world community.

What price freedom? The question is: Are life and freedom worth the cost? There is only one answer. The trouble is that too few Americans fully realize the seriousness of the situation, of the terrible danger that threatens our way of life. It is hard for most of us, looking over our peaceful fields, our peaceful streets, to realize just how deadly is the danger that we face. In the security program, both domestic and foreign, the United States seeks to avert another and more ghastly Pearl Harbor. It seeks to avert a world war III by rebuilding the free world, militarily, economically, and, I hope, spiritually and morally.

Incorporated in the Mutual Security Act is an amendment which I am proud to claim as mine. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was my privilege to introduce a proviso to section 101 (a) (2) of this law. On the basis of this proviso which was inserted during the mark-up of the bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee through my proposal, steps have already been taken by the executive agencies concerned to see to it that the serious surplus manpower problem in Western Europe is solved. The countries concerned, together with the United States, have formulated plans to work out this problem on a mutually satisfactory basis. Steps have also been taken to take over certain transport ships from the International Refugee Organization, which is due to wind up its activities by the end of December 1951. What are the facts

on surplus manpower in Europe? It is estimated that a minimum of three to four million workers plus the members of their families, a grand total of seven to eight million people, are available for emigration from Western Germany.

As for the willingness of countries to accept surplus manpower, Great Britain would be willing to receive from 50,000 to 100,000 people over a period of 2 to 3 years. France is able and willing to absorb about 50,000 annually over a period of 5 years. The following countries outside of Europe have declared their willingness to receive Europe's surplus manpower: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador. I understand also that some of the countries in Central America are interested in the project.

In line with our Mutual Security Act, we have another allied bill. I had the honor to serve on the special subcommittee which made a comprehensive study of the complex problem of export control. Others on this committee were the chairman, Hon. LAURIE C. BATTLE, of Alabama; Hon. OMAR BURLISON, of Texas; Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, of Illinois; and Hon. JOHN M. VORVY, of Ohio. It was the purpose of this committee to make sure that our enemies are not assisted in building up their war machine by trade from the United States and our allies. As a result of the report of this committee, H. R. 4551, called the Battle bill, was passed by the Congress. It takes into account the complexity of the problem involved and, at the same time, firmly and clearly defines the United States policy in this field. It further provides for its effective administration. By the provisions of this bill, military and economic aid is denied to any country exporting arms and strategic material to the Soviet Union or its satellites in Europe and Asia. But its mandatory nature is limited to the extent that the President has discretionary powers to suspend certain provisions. This holds in cases where enforcement would harm the security of the United States and the free world. It is mandatory that aid be denied to countries shipping weapons, ammunition, or atomic material to Soviet-dominated countries.

In keeping with the best traditions and the highest ideals of our country, the Eighty-second Congress responded to the appeal of India for aid to feed the hungry millions of that famine-ridden country. I personally joined a group of sponsors to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India. Back of my keen interest in getting aid to India were two strong motives; the one, humanitarian, and the other, practical. India turned to the west for assistance. It was our chance to help this new independent nation as, we should not forget, we were aided in the early days of our Republic. Back of the humanitarian phase, there was another side to be considered—the practical, good business, and political aspect. This aid is necessary for world peace and for the general welfare of the United States in order that this new, independent republic shall remain a free nation. It is consistent with the foreign policy

of the United States in order to create situations of strength for new independent nations, and to permit them to work out their own internal problems by democratic processes, as the United States did during the early days of our own Republic. But, to me, more important than any other condition is the fact that India is geographically important to the free world, for if India were absorbed into the orbit of Russia, it would accrue to the benefit of Russia alone, to the detriment of the free world, and particularly to that of the United States.

Let us consider the importance of India's exports to us. Manganese is a metal for which no adequate substitute has been found in the making of steel. More than 93 percent of it is imported from the Gold Coast of Africa and from India. India shipped to the United States in 1950, 585,971 tons of manganese, three-quarters of its total exports. India exports of mica to the United States in 1950 were 80 percent of its entire supply. The United States is the leading importer of Indian jute manufactures. In summary, let me emphasize that India imports from the United States were \$230,000,000 per annum and that its exports to the United States were valued at \$192,000,000. Also, let me underscore the fact that India has no trade with the Soviet Union in strategic materials and has had none since 1946. With these facts in mind, is it not patent that our friendship with India is a direct contribution to our own national security?

Now let us look at the work of the Eighty-second Congress as it directly affects our home front.

MILITARY MANPOWER ACT (PUBLIC LAW 51)

This law amends the Selective Service Act of 1948 and contains the following major provisions:

Registration age is 18 with men being eligible for induction at 18½ years of age.

The local draft board is entirely responsible and it must take all eligibles in the 19 to 26 pool before those under 19 can be inducted.

The service of inductees is 24 months and 6 years must be spent in the Reserves after the completion of active duty. The first 4 months of basic training must be given in the United States.

Deferments based on marriage status can be considered only on hardship conditions.

Deferments are also considered for dependency and for educational and occupational reasons.

Any person deferred is subject to induction until he reaches the age of 35.

Physical standards are the same as those in the Selective Service Act of 1948, although the mental standard has been lowered to 65 on general classification.

Under this law, 385,000 registrants now deferred could be inducted.

This law places a 5,000,000 ceiling on the combined strength of manpower.

Also, it provides a committee to prepare a universal military training program which must be submitted to Congress for approval or substitution. This program will be introduced when the House convenes in January. I believe

this legislation is of the most essential nature.

While on the subject of military manpower strength, mention should be made of the new Reserve program which was passed by the House on October 15, 1951, but was not acted on in the Senate. This measure, therefore, did not become law in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. It can, however, be considered by the Senate at the next session of the Eighty-second Congress. Under the provisions of this bill, reservists are divided into three groups—the Ready, Standby, and Retired Reserves. The President could call up only the Ready Reserve at will. Before issuing a call for Standby and Retired Reserves, the President would have to obtain from Congress the permissive number of such Reserves that could be summoned.

For the maintenance of our expanded Army, Navy, and Air Force for the fiscal year 1952, this Congress has appropriated the huge sum of nearly \$57,000,000,000, a record-breaking figure for any similar period when we have not been engaged in an all-out war.

We passed legislation authorizing, and providing, funds for a vastly expanded naval fleet through a \$2,700,000,000 program of ship conversion and construction, including a 57,000-ton flush-deck aircraft carrier, equipped to handle atomic bombers.

We provided a \$5,800,000,000 program for construction of new air bases and expansion of old bases, not only at home but at strategic points around the globe.

We increased the limit on expenditure of funds for building experimental-type atomic submarines and made available to the United States Maritime Board reserve funds for construction that will expand our merchant fleet.

We have increased from \$10,000,000 to \$45,000,000 the authorization for construction of access roads certified as essential to national defense.

The legislative program for promoting our great national-defense effort falls into two categories: gearing our economy to high production and building up our military manpower and machinery. The Defense Production Act is the main instrumentality for our economic and industrial mobilization.

This Congress extended to June 30, 1952, the broad, basic powers of the President to fix priorities for and to allocate defense materials and facilities to buy raw materials; guarantee and make loans for expansion of plants engaged in defense materials and facilities to buy raw materials; guarantee and make loans for expansion of plants engaged in defense work; control consumer credit, prices, wages, salaries, and rents.

Small business should share in greater proportion in the defense effort. In order to further this, we brought into being the Small Defense Plants Administration. This agency, under the President, was granted powers to make contracts with the Government for subletting to small manufacturing plants or to facilitate the channelling of contracts to them, provide technical and managerial aids, finance equipment and plants, recommend loans, and perform other help-

ful functions. A \$50,000,000 revolving fund was authorized to finance the operations of the agency.

This amended Defense Production Act did not meet head-on the problem of inflation. It was compromised by a functioning coalition of the conservative Republicans and the southern Democrats. I fear that the southern Democrats sided unquestionably with the special agricultural sectional interests which they represent, rather than recognize the welfare of all American people and in particular, those from industrial cities. They forgot to remember that the citizenry of large cities has assisted and supported legislation for the farmers through the years. They forgot, too, that the Democratic Party guided the interests of the farmers to security during the days of the depression—I refer particularly to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the soil conservation program, and rural electrification. The Republican coalition is not explainable. I am sure they could not conscientiously side with the large packers, nor agree with a sectional group for political expediency. Charles Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, a Republican of the highest integrity, endorsed this program. He supports private enterprise and aided its growth as president of General Electric. The coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats prevented roll-backs on meat and agricultural commodities. It prevented slaughtering restrictions or quotas which alone would control and prevent black-marketing.

The Defense Production Act extended the housing and rent control acts as well as the Fat and Oil Import Control Act.

There is too much relaxed curb on installment buying to properly control inflation. There must be a tightening of consumer credit. I hope that when we return for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, the coalition will recognize their mistakes in these important matters of legislation and will amend the faulty provisions. I believe that unless we curb the inflation spiral we shall not be able to control our economy. That is elementary.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

In an endeavor to place Government expenditures on a pay-as-you-go basis, the Eighty-second Congress passed a tax bill designed to raise about \$5,700,000,000 in a full year of operation at current income levels. The estimated revenue under prior law for the fiscal year 1952 is \$60,900,000,000. With the new bill in operation for part of the fiscal year this is expected to rise to \$63,700,000,000. Estimates of expenditures during fiscal year 1952 range between sixty-eight and seventy billion dollars.

Of the revenue increase for a full year of operation \$1,200,000,000 will be received from increased excise taxes, \$2,200,000,000 from increased corporate income taxes, and \$2,400,000,000 from increased individual income taxes. Of the increased individual income taxes about \$1,000,000,000 will be raised from the taxpayers with adjusted gross income below \$5,000 and about \$1,500,000,000 from taxpayers with adjusted gross income over \$5,000. For the taxpayers

below \$5,000 this amounts to about 1 percent of their adjusted gross income and above \$5,000 it amounts to about 1.8 percent of the adjusted gross income.

The increase in individual income taxes is provided by an increase of 11.75 percent of the present tax—11 percent in the first bracket—or 9 percent of the income after tax, whichever is the lower. The alternative of 9 percent which benefits higher incomes is necessary because an increase of 11.75 percent of present taxes which already range up to 87 percent would result in a tax alarmingly close to confiscation in the higher brackets. A special burden on a particular group of taxpayers was eased. These are single individuals who have the burden of supporting a child or other relative but cannot take advantage of the split income provision given to married couples. These people can compute their tax with a special surtax table which provides approximately half of the benefit of income splitting.

The corporation income tax was raised five percentage points to 52 percent. For excess-profits taxpaying corporations this will mean a marginal tax rate of 82 percent. The over-all ceiling of combined income and excess profits tax is raised from 62 to 70 percent. For both corporations and individuals the maximum tax on capital gains is raised from 25 to 26 percent.

Two important changes were made in the excess-profits tax. For any corporations with incomes less than \$300,000 a system of graduated ceiling tax rates was introduced rising from 57 to 70 percent through the first 5 years of the corporate life. The act reduced from 85 to 83 percent the proportion of the "average" base period net income to be used in finding the excess profits credit.

Certain tax exempt cooperatives were for the first time subjected to regular corporate income tax rates on that part of their income which is not distributed to patrons. In the case of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations this was moderated by allowing tax-free retention of earnings until the reserve for bad debts and the surplus together equal 12 percent of deposit liabilities.

People over 65 years of age were given an additional benefit by being allowed tax reductions for all medical expenses up to the statutory limit, not just that part of medical expenses over 5 percent of income which is applicable to other taxpayers. Individuals who realize a capital gain on the sale of a home are permitted to postpone the realization of this gain for tax purposes if the gain is reinvested in another home within 1 year of the realization.

A number of excise tax changes were made which are here, for convenience, put in terms of the effect on the retail price. The tax on distilled spirits is raised the equivalent of 26 cents a fifth on the ordinary type of whisky bottled at 85 proof. The tax on beer is raised the equivalent of about one-third of 1 cent per 12-ounce bottle. The tax on wines is also increased in such a way as to increase the retail price from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent depending upon the type of

wine. The tax on cigarettes is raised by the equivalent of 1 cent on a pack and on gasoline by the equivalent of one-half of 1 cent per gallon. The tax on the manufacturers of automobiles is raised by about 2 percent of the retail price of the car. Since most of these are taxes on the manufacturer, business firms will have additional financing costs in carrying the tax until it is reflected in the final price so the actual increases may be slightly more than these. In the case of the tax on toilet preparations certain baby products are excluded, as are sales for the use of beauty and barber shops. The tax on telegraph, radio, and cable messages is reduced from 25 to 15 percent. In the case of the admissions tax certain charitable, educational, and other activities are made exempt from the tax.

A new tax is imposed upon professional gambling equivalent to 10 percent of the amount wagered. It is further required that each professional gambler pay an occupational tax of \$50 per year and properly display a special tax stamp. The list of individuals paying this occupational tax is to be available for public inspection.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The House defeated the bill introduced by Congressman JOHN RANKIN, which provided for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negroes. This bill was definitely discriminatory.

Public Law 23, the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, provides that on and after June 27, 1950, any person in active military service—including the National Guard when on active duty for 14 days or more—shall automatically be accorded \$10,000 life insurance by the United States without cost to such person.

Public Laws 101 and 104 permit veterans of both World Wars I and II to renew their term insurance. Also permission is given for use of dividends to pay premiums on national service life-insurance policies.

Spanish-American War pensions. Public Law 108 sets a new minimum pension rate for these veterans. Also, it increases monthly benefits to Spanish-American War veterans starting November 1951, and it liberalizes the eligibility requirements for these veterans.

Public Law 187 provides for the payment of \$1,600 toward the purchase of automobiles for blinded or amputee veterans.

Public Law 142 was enacted to protect veterans buying their homes under the G.I. bill of rights. Under this law, triple damage actions are provided against sellers who demand or accept more than the appraised price of the property.

LABOR

Public Law 78 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to recruit farm laborers in Mexico and transport them to and from the United States. The workers would be assigned to reception centers in the United States where American farmers holding certificates-of-need issued by the Department of Labor could employ them. I did not support this measure, feeling as I do that it is another unfair

act on the part of agricultural interests.

Public Law 189 is the first major change in union election procedures under the Taft-Hartley Act. This new law eliminates the Taft-Hartley Act requirement for employees' elections to show that at least 30 percent desire a union shop, prior to negotiation for and National Labor Relations Board certification of a union-shop agreement.

MISCELLANEOUS

Public Law 215 tightened standards for the sale of three classes of drugs—barbiturates, those "not safe except under supervision of a licensed practitioner," and new drugs already restricted by law to experimental use.

Public Law 201 grants Federal employees a 10-percent increase in compensation except that in no case will an employee receive less than \$300 per annum nor more than \$800 per annum increase.

Public Law 204 adjusts the salaries of post office employees in that all employees in the automatic grades receive a flat increase of \$400 annually.

During the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, it was not possible to obtain consideration of my bill to restore mail delivery service to two deliveries a day. It is my intention, however, to continue to press this issue when the Congress convenes for the second session.

Public Law 233 readjusts postal rates. Under this law, existing rates on first-class mail and air mail are unchanged. Effective January 1, 1952, postal and post cards will be increased from 1 to 2 cents. The fees on special services such as special delivery, insured mail, and collect on delivery mail are increased, and provision is made granting the Postmaster General authority to set such fees in the future. This law also provides a graduated leave system for employees in the executive branch of the Government, allowing 13 days leave for employees with less than 3 years service, 20 days leave

for employees with 3 but less than 15 years service, and 26 days leave for employees with 15 or more years of service. Thirteen days sick leave per year is granted all employees, regardless of length of service. This provision is effective on January 6, 1952.

Public Law 110 requires the labeling of all furs and fur products manufactured for or introduced into commerce. Also, imported furs and fur products must be properly labeled and invoiced.

I submit this report of the action of the Eighty-second Congress of the United States of America, and underscore its aim to maintain the leadership of the free countries of the world in the struggle against totalitarianism. The report shows that this Congress met the world crisis, not by defense programs alone, but also by a constructive economic program. There is reason to hope that, with the combined effort of Government and citizenry, the ideals of America's founding fathers can be realized. These ideals insist upon equality of rights and duties under God and demand respect for the dignity of man. This can be accomplished by remembering in our daily lives the motto of our country: In God we trust.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of

Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record from the date of my last report to and including the adjournment of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

No attempt has been made to include votes on all of the numerous bills, motions, and amendments, but it does include all roll-call votes, all quorum calls, and my votes on other measures on which there was no record taken, but which I believe are of importance and concern to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin. The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 15,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It also contains information which is not obtainable from any public record but which I feel should be available to the people of my district.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purpose of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. I believe this word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which unfortunately do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. This is the fifth report of my voting and attendance record. These five reports show how I voted on 851 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on the quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent. The report follows:

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (81st Cong., 2d sess., continued)

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote
289	1950 Dec. 5	Quorum call	Present.	1850	Dec. 18	S. 3263, giving preference status in Government employment to mothers of certain deceased or totally disabled veterans. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
290	do	H. R. 9827, Excess-Profits Tax Act of 1950. On motion to recommit with instructions to increase the average earning credit and to increase the corporate surtax rate by 5 percentage points. On adoption (Defeated, 115 to 252)	Yea	do	do	S. 4229, to extend benefits of Public Law 16 of 78th Cong. (relative to rehabilitation of disabled veterans) to persons in service on or after June 27, 1950. On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
291	do	On passage (Passed, 378 to 20)	Nay	297	Dec. 20	H. R. 9706, to authorize a Federal civil-defense program. On motion to consider	Yea.
292	Dec. 7	On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption (Defeated, 153 to 224)	Yea	298	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 297 to 0.)	Yea.
293	do	On passage (Passed, 221 to 152)	Nay	299	Dec. 21	On passage (Passed, 247 to 1)	Yea.
do	Dec. 8	H. R. 9840, to exempt furlough travel of service personnel from tax on transportation. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.			Quorum call	Present
do	Dec. 11	H. R. 9194, to provide for separation of subsidy from air-mail pay. On passage. (66 to 0.)	Yea.	1851	Jan. 1	do	Present
294	Dec. 13	Quorum call	Present	301	do	do	Present
do	do	H. R. 9853, to furnish relief policy assistance to Yugoslavia. On motion to recommit with instructions to furnish aid on a loan basis similar to that provided Spain. On adoption (Defeated, 76 to 173.)	Yea.	302	do	S. 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act relating to union contracts and agreements for deductions from wages of railway employees. On question of consideration (Agreed, 286 to 45)	Nay.
295	do	On passage (Passed, 225 to 142.)	Nay.	303	do	Quorum call	Present.
296	Dec. 15	Quorum call	Present.	304	do	S. 3295 to amend Railway Labor Act. On motion to recommit with instructions.	Yea.
do	Dec. 18	H. R. 9911, to authorize the payment of gratuity indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who died in active service. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.	305	do	On adoption (Defeated, 61 to 284.)	Nay.
				306	Jan. 2	On passage. (Passed, 292 to 52.)	Present.
				do	do	Quorum call	Present.
				307	do	H. R. 5244, for the relief of Charles J. Trees. (Conference report.)	Nay.
						On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 127.)	

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6913

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote
1	1951 Jan 3	Call by States	Present.	19	1951 Mar. 19	H. R. 321, permitting use of dividends to pay premiums on national service life-insurance policies. On passage (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
2	do	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn, 231—Martin, 192.)	Martin.			H. R. 3282, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for fiscal year 1952	Yea.
3	do	H. Res. 7, providing that the rules of the House of Representatives will be the same as those of the 81st Cong.		20	Mar. 21	On amendment cutting \$22 million from the money provided for postal operations. On adoption. (Defeated, 186 to 138.)	
4	do	On previous question (Defeated, 179 to 247)	Nay			On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea
	do	On substitute repealing the 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules in bringing up legislation. On adoption (Adopted, 244 to 179)	Yea.	21	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
5	Jan 17	H. R. 1001, authorizing the construction of 500,000 tons of modern naval vessels, conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels and the construction of an aircraft carrier. On passage. (Passed, 365 to 0)	Yea.	22	Apr. 4	do	Present.
		H. R. 136, permitting gasoline consumers to deduct from taxable income State gasoline taxes levied on wholesaler and passed on to consumer. On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea	23	Apr. 5	do	Present.
6	Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.	24	Apr. 9	do	Present.
		H. Res. 77, calling upon United Nations to declare Chinese Communists aggressors in Korea On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.	25	Apr. 10	H. R. 2612, authorizing District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia On passage. (Passed, 278 to 116)	Yea.
7	Jan 23	H. R. 1724, providing for the creation of a 5-member board to renegotiate contracts that are made by certain Government agencies exercising functions in connection with the national defense On passage (Passed, 377 to 0)	Yea.	26	do	H. R. 4587, third supplemental appropriation for certain Government agencies for the remainder of fiscal year, 1951	
8	Jan. 24	H. R. 1, authorizing the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuity indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. (GI insurance bill.) On passage (Passed, 390 to 0.)	Yea.			On amendment reducing the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$750,000. On adoption (Defeated, 150 to 250)	Yea.
9	Jan 31	Quorum call	Present	27	Apr 11	On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea
10	do	H. Res. 33, creating Select Committee on Small Business On adoption (Adopted, voice vote)	Present	28	Apr 12	Quorum call	Present.
	Feb. 2	H. R. 2298, authorizing Treasury to pay interest on E bonds to investors who hold them beyond maturity date On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea	29	Apr. 13	do	Present.
	Feb. 6	H. R. 2141, extending for 2 years privilege of free transportation of gifts from members of Armed Forces abroad On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea			S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service and amending Draft Act	
11	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.			On Byrnes amendment guaranteeing right of servicemen to communicate with Members of Congress On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.
12	do	H. R. 1612, extending for 3 years the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements	Yea	30	do	On amendment to create a civilian appeal board for review of cases for certain inactive reservists. On adoption (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.
		On amendment providing for congressional notification by the President prior to any reduction of tariffs below a level determined by the Tariff Commission to be perilous to domestic industries. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 108.)	Yea	31	do	On amendment providing that reservists who have been released after serving 12 months may not be recalled for a longer period than 30 days unless a state of war has been declared to exist. On adoption (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.
		On Byrnes' amendment requiring President to withdraw trade concessions on imports from non-certain countries. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea			On amendment to allow the induction of physically disabled persons for limited service. On adoption (Defeated, voice vote)	Yea.
		On amendment providing an escape clause whereby industries injured by tariff reductions can get relief upon appeal to Tariff Commission On adoption. (Adopted, 191 to 89.)	Yea			On motion to recommit (Defeated, 121 to 292.)	Nay.
		On amendment designed to bar imports of agricultural commodities when such commodities are being supported by the U. S. Government. On adoption. (Adopted, 124 to 110.)	Yea.			On passage (Passed, 372 to 44)	Yea.
		On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea		Apr. 17	H. J. Res. 197, extending authority of President to control exports to June 30, 1953. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H. Res. 42, authorizing \$200,000 for expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities On adoption (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.				H. R. 2101, increasing to \$50,000 present maximum fine of \$5,000 for criminal violations of Sherman Antitrust Act On passage (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
Feb. 10	H. R. 2330, clarifying regulations for admission of aliens by amending Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.			Apr 18	H. R. 3790, making appropriations for Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for fiscal year 1952	
		H. R. 1090, extending time for admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizens who are members of Armed Forces On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea			On amendment to bar use of funds for propaganda and publicity purposes not already authorized by Congress. On adoption. (Adopted, 156 to 88.)	Yea.
Mar. 5	H. R. 2390, extending to 10 years the statute of limitations for prosecution of violations of passports and citizenship laws On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.				On amendment to increase by \$75 million funds provided for grants for hospital construction under the Public Health Service. On adoption. (Defeated, voice vote)	Nay.
		H. R. 2615, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, relative to peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas	Yea.	33	do	On amendment permitting covered agencies to fill only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952 On adoption (Adopted, 208 to 145)	Yea.
13	Mar. 7	On motion to recommit (Defeated, 171 to 212)	Yea.			On passage (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Nay.	34	do	Quorum call	Yea.
15	Mar. 13	do	Present.	35	Apr. 25	do	Present.
16	do	H. R. 1545, amending the Reorganization Act of 1919 to authorize emergency reorganizations. On passage (Defeated, 170 to 227)	Present.	36	Apr. 26	do	Present.
17	Mar 14	Quorum call	Nay.	37	May 1	do	Present.
18	do	H. Res. 142, rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relative to the RFC On adoption (Defeated, 200 to 197, not having received a constitutional majority of 218)	Present.	38	May 2	do	Present.
19	do	H. Res. 106, providing for the consideration of H. R. 2988, a bill to provide housing and community facilities and services in connection with national defense On adoption. (Defeated, 170 to 219)	Yea.			H. R. 3790, appropriating funds for Department of Interior for fiscal year 1952	
	Mar 19	H. R. 317, increasing limit of disability payments under national service life-insurance policies to World War II veterans from \$50 to \$100 per month. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.	39	do	On amendment deleting appropriation providing \$3,400,000 for Southeastern Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 140)	Yea.
		H. R. 319, providing for treble-damage actions against seller of property who demands or accepts more than appraised price from veteran purchasing property under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.	40	do	On amendment reducing by \$550,000 the funds for construction by the Southwestern Power Administration On adoption (Adopted, 222 to 173)	Yea.
				41	do	On amendment preventing the use of funds for developing the western Missouri project. On adoption (Adopted, 247 to 152)	Yea.
				42	do	On amendment cutting \$512 million from funds allotted for Bonneville Power Administration construction On adoption (Adopted, 225 to 167)	Yea.
				43	do	On amendment cutting \$800,000 from funds allocated for management of lands and resources and to earmark \$1,200,000 for use in soil and moisture conservation On adoption (Adopted, 249 to 148.)	Yea.
				44	do	On amendment reducing by \$10 million the fund provided the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 160)	Yea.
				45	do	On amendment preventing use of funds to construct duplicate power transmission facilities where wheeling service contracts have been entered into On adoption. (Adopted, 228 to 165.)	Yea.
				46	do	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department of Interior in 1952 with certain exceptions. On adoption. (Adopted, 224 to 160.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (82d Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote
	1951 May 2	H. R. 3750, appropriating funds for Department of Interior for fiscal year 1952—Continued On amendment prohibiting departmental use of funds for publicity or propaganda purposes not already authorized by Congress. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote) On passage of bill. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.	75	1951 June 13	Quorum call..... H. R. 4386, appropriating funds for Department of Army civil functions for fiscal year, 1952 On amendment to provide \$5 million for construction of Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway. On adoption. (Defeated, 23 to 95.) On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 170 to 165.) On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Present. Nay. Yea.
47	May 3	Quorum call	Yea.	76	..do....	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 75 to 161)	Yea.
48	..do....	H. Res. 220, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 220 to 159.)	Yea.	77	June 15	Quorum call..... H. R. 4000, permitting World War II veterans to renew their term insurance. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.	78	June 18	H. R. 3932, providing vocational rehabilitation and training for all veterans with service-connected injuries incurred after June 27, 1950. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
	do ..	H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952 On amendment prohibiting departmental use of funds for publicity or propaganda purposes not already authorized by Congress. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote.) On amendment to permit the filling of only 25 percent of the vacancies that occur in the offices and bureaus covered by the bill. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.	79	..do....	S. J. Res. 70, suspending application of certain Federal laws with respect to employment of attorney by Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. On adoption. (Defeated, 120 to 164)	Nay.
50	..do....	On amendment limiting to 5,000 the public dwelling units to be started in fiscal year 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 181 to 113.)	Yea.	80	June 20	Quorum call..... H. R. 1072, permitting World War I veterans to renew their term insurance. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Present. Yea.
51	do....	On amendment fixing the emergency fund for the President at \$1,000,000, plus certain unexpended funds from 1951. On adoption. (Adopted, 160 to 128.)	Yea.			H. R. 313, providing for construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospital facilities. On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Defeated, 62 to 71)	Yea.
5	May 7	Quorum call	Yea.			On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Nay.
5	May 9	H. R. 3576, amending the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by extending program for 6 months to Dec. 31, 1951, with no increase in number of authorizations for admission and no extension of the term of office of Displaced Persons Commission. On passage. (Passed, 312 to 63)	Yea.	81	..do....	H. R. 4233, providing or assisting in providing an automobile or making a cash payment to certain disabled veterans. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Present. Nay.
51	May 10	Quorum call	Present.			Quorum call..... H. R. 3183, increasing and extending pensions to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
55	May 15	S. J. Res. 72, extending to Korean war veterans hospital and medical benefits available to World War II veterans. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.	82	June 21	Quorum call..... H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951	Present.
	..do....	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 216 to 151.) On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.	83	June 22	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 171 to 230.) On passage. (Passed, 233 to 160)	Nay.
56	May 17	Quorum call	Absent.	84	do	Quorum call.....	Yea.
	..do....	H. R. 3096, requiring congressional approval relative to certain defense land transactions by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 312 to 68.)	Yea.	85	June 25	Quorum call.....	Present.
57	do....	H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year, 1952 On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 216 to 151.) On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.	86	..do....	H. R. 4431, extending rent control in the District of Columbia until Mar. 31, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 171 to 120)	Nay.
58	..do....	Quorum call	Present.	87	June 26	Quorum call.....	Present.
59	May 22	..do....	Present.	88	..do....	S. C. on Res. 11, reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 351 to 6.)	Yea.
60	May 23	..do....	Present.	89	June 27	Quorum call.....	Present.
61	May 24	..do....	Present.	90	do	H. R. 3283, amending the Agriculture Act of 1949 relative to recruitment of agricultural workers from foreign countries on the mainland of the Western Hemisphere. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 130)	Yea.
62	..do....	H. R. 3791, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On passage. (Passed, 293 to 94)	Nay.	91	do	Quorum call.....	Present.
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.	92	June 28	H. Res. 287, a closed rule providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills	Present.
64	..do....	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 9 to 224.)	Nay.			On ordering the previous question. (Adopted, 196 to 192)	Nay.
65	..do....	H. R. 4141, providing more effective prevention, detection and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia On motion that House resolve itself into Committee of Whole to consider bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 231 to 3)	Yea.	94	..do....	On adoption. (Adopted, 198 to 191.)	Nay.
66	..do....	Quorum call	Present.	95	..do....	H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate certain amendments to effect a 10-percent reduction in funds of departments and agencies. (Defeated, 100 to 200.)	Yea.
67	..do....	H. R. 3605, providing for a graduated system of leave for Federal officials and employees. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.	96	June 29	Quorum call.....	Present.
	..do....	H. R. 3911, providing lapel buttons for relatives of servicemen who lose their lives. On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.	97	..do....	H. Res. 294, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 278 on adoption. (Adopted, 297 to 85)	Yea.
68	June 5	Quorum call	Present.			H. J. Res. 278, extending the Defense Production Act of 1950 through July 31, 1951; the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and certain import control authority	Yea.
69	..do....	..do....	Present.	98	..do....	On amendment preventing roll-backs or the lowering of price ceilings below those on enactment date of resolution and prohibiting any new price ceilings on materials or services during the period of the temporary extension, except for the placing of price ceilings on agricultural commodities if they exceed their parity price. On adoption. (Adopted, 232 to 159)	Yea.
70	June 6	S. 872, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 256 to 82.)	Nay.			On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	..do....	H. R. 314, providing for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va. On motion to strike enacting clause. (Adopted, 223 to 117.)	Yea.	99	..do....	S. 1880, extending rent control in the District of Columbia for 1 year. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 242 to 126.)	Nay.
71	..do....	Quorum call	Present.	100	June 30	H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 256 to 12.)	Not voting. ¹
72	June 7	S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service and amending Draft Act. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 339 to 41)	Yea.				
73	..do....	Quorum call	Present.				
74	June 11	Quorum call	Present.				

¹ Absent, would have voted "yes" if present.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6915

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (82d Cong 1st sess)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote
	1951				1951		
	July 2	H. R. 1181, authorizing payment of claims arising from correction of injustices in military or naval service records. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.	134	July 26	Quorum call.	Present.
101	July 5	Quorum call.	Present.			On amendment to reduce the appropriation for the international information and educational activities of the State Department by \$15 million. On adoption. (Defeated, 136 to 167.)	Yea.
102	do	do	Present.			On amendment to limit United States assessments to all international organizations to not more than one-third of total expenses of such organizations. On adoption. (Adopted, 155 to 117.)	Yea.
103	do	do	Present.			On amendment limiting the amount of money to be used for publicity and propaganda to 75 percent of amount appropriated for such activities. On adoption. (Defeated, 154 to 154.)	Yea.
104	July 6	do	Absent.			On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to reduce appropriation for the international information and educational activities of the State Department by \$15 million. On adoption. (Defeated, 142 to 215.)	Yea.
105	July 9	do	Present.			On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
106	July 10	do	Present.			H. R. 4601, exempting uniformed members of armed services from admissions tax. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
107	July 11	do	Present.			Quorum call.	Present.
108	July 12	do	Present.			H. J. Res. 289, terminating the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany. On adoption. (Adopted, 378 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3709, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security agencies for fiscal 1952. On motion to recommit to committee on conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952 in the offices, bureaus, etc., covered by this bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 223 to 170.)	Yea.	135	do	H. Res. 335, providing for the consideration of H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Iceland.) On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 92.)	Yea.
109	do	do	Yea.			Quorum call.	Present.
		Quorum call.	Present.			S. 1717, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 294 to 80.)	Yea.
110	July 13	do	Present.			H. R. 1181, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Iceland.) On passage. (Passed, 265 to 109.)	Present.
111	July 16	do	Present.			Quorum call.	Present.
		H. R. 3460, increasing penalties for illegal traffic in narcotics. On suspension of the rules and passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.	136	July 27	H. R. 3790, making appropriations for Department of Interior for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.)	Yea.
112	do	Quorum call.	Present.			On motion to recommit to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952. (Recommitted, 180 to 170.)	Present.
113	do	do	Present.			Quorum call.	Present.
114	do	do	Present.			do	Present.
115	July 17	do	Present.			do	Present.
116	July 18	do	Present.			H. R. 4550, banning export of military items to Russia and satellites, cutting off aid to other countries making such exports. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
117	July 20	do	Present.			H. R. 1180, facilitating research and development work by armed services. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3871, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 294 to 80.)	Yea.	137	do	H. R. 1227, raising to \$50 million the limitation on construction cost of experimental submarines. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
118	do	On Andersen amendment restricting until June 30, 1953, imports of fats and oils, cheese, dairy products, peanuts and rice. On adoption. (Adopted, 266 to 147.)	Yea.			Quorum call.	Present.
119	do	On Davis (Wisconsin) amendment establishing 1 Government agency through which all claims of municipalities for materials, etc., would be channelled. On adoption. (Defeated, 164 to 251.)	Yea.	138	do	do	Present.
120	do	On Hope amendment preventing the placing of quotas on livestock slaughtering. On adoption. (Adopted, 240 to 167.)	Yea.			H. R. 5051, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year, 1952. On amendment to reduce by \$15 million the funds for preparation for sale or salvage of certain obsolete equipment. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea.
121	do	On Wolcott amendment deleting language enlarging the President's authority to acquire property including facilities and to erect plants, factories, etc., and to engage in the marketing, transportation, and storage of such critical materials necessary to national defense, but authorizing installation of additional equipment, facilities, etc., in Government-owned plants and the installation of Government-owned equipment in privately owned plants. On adoption. (Adopted, 233 to 184.)	Yea.	139	July 30	On amendment designed to secure the discharge of certain inactive or volunteer reservists who have served 12 months. On adoption. (Adopted, 122 to 102.)	Yea.
122	do	On Hardy amendment deleting authority to create new Government corporations by Executive orders. On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 167.)	Yea.	140	do	Quorum call.	Yea.
123	do	On amendment authorizing a roll back of 10 percent below the May 10, 1951, prices of agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 234 to 183.)	Yea.			do	Yea.
124	do	On Cole amendment providing a fair and equitable margin for each species of livestock processed to insure a fair profit to all segments of the industry on each species. On adoption. (Defeated, 166 to 249.)	Yea.	141	do	do	Yea.
125	do	On Davis (Georgia) amendment providing that for a period of 120 days following enactment of bill prices and wages, salaries, and other compensation shall not be raised above the levels prevailing on July 7, 1951, except that agricultural products may not be prevented from reaching parity. On adoption. (Defeated, 172 to 213.)	Nay.	142	July 31	Quorum call.	Present.
126	do	On Poage-Cole amendment to set up a formula, including parity costs, for arriving at ceiling prices for all commodities to insure a reasonable profit. On adoption. (Defeated, 181 to 234.)	Yea.			H. R. 5051, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year, 1952. On amendment to reduce by \$15 million the funds for preparation for sale or salvage of certain obsolete equipment. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea.
127	do	On amendment exempting strategic metals and minerals from ceiling prices when in short supply. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 216.)	Yea.	143	do	On amendment designed to secure the discharge of certain inactive or volunteer reservists who have served 12 months. On adoption. (Adopted, 122 to 102.)	Yea.
128	do	On adoption of amendment deleting from the bill language authorizing the licensing of and suspension of licenses of certain businesses covered by the scope of the bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 333 to 82.)	Yea.	144	do	Quorum call.	Yea.
129	do	On amendment deleting from the bill language relating to control of commodity speculation. On adoption. (Adopted, 242 to 172.)	Yea.	145	Aug 1	do	Yea.
130	do	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 117 to 299.)	Nay.	146	Aug 2	do	Yea.
131	do	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 92.)	Yea.			H. R. 4550, banning export of military items to Russia and satellites, cutting off aid to other countries making such exports. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
132	July 25	Quorum call.	Present.			H. R. 1180, facilitating research and development work by armed services. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.)	Yea.	147	Aug 8	Quorum call.	Present.
133	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. On adoption. (Adopted, 188 to 186.)	Yea.	148	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 4746, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for fiscal 1952. On amendment to cut \$21 million from funds for salary and expenses of State Department. On adoption. (Defeated, 71 to 79.)	Yea.	149	Aug 9	do	Present.
						H. R. 5051, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year, 1952. On amendment to reduce by \$15 million the funds for preparation for sale or salvage of certain obsolete equipment. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea.
						On amendment designed to secure the discharge of certain inactive or volunteer reservists who have served 12 months. On adoption. (Adopted, 122 to 102.)	Yea.
						Quorum call.	Yea.
						do	Yea.
						do	Yea.
						H. R. 4914, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations. On passage. (Passed, 353 to 5.)	Yea.
						H. Con. Res. 110, expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovakian Government. On adoption. (Adopted, 364 to 1.)	Yea.
						Quorum call.	Present.
						H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices. (Conference report.)	Yea.
						On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House provision relating to public housing. On adoption. (Defeated, 160 to 207.)	Yea.
						On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 290 to 80.)	Nay.
						Quorum call.	Present.
						S. 349, providing housing and community facilities and services in connection with the national defense. On amendment fixing the termination date of the Act as June 30, 1952 instead of June 30, 1953. On adoption. (Defeated, 184 to 184.)	Yea.
						On amendment striking out provision for acquisition of sites for development in connection with isolated defense installations. On adoption. (Defeated, 175 to 199.)	Yea.
						On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (82d Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote
162	1951 Aug. 16	Quorum call.....	Present.	193	1951 Oct. 8	H. Res. 436, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matter within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (Adopted, 384 to 15.)	Not voting. ¹
163	Aug. 17	H. R. 4194, increasing and extending pensions to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 318 to 45.)	Nay.			S. 1959, amending the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to validate union-shop elections held prior to time of taking of non-Communist oath by labor-union leaders, and to dispense with the requirement of existing law that an election be held before a labor organization and an employer may make a union-shop agreement.	
164	..do....	H. R. 3073, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.) On adoption of conference report. (Adopted voice vote.)	Yea	194	Oct. 9	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 22 to 304.)	Not voting. ²
		On motion that House concur in an amendment providing additional \$1 million for fighting spruce bark beetle infestation. (Passed, 222 to 138.)	Nay.	195	..do....	On passage. (Passed, 307 to 18.)	Not voting. ¹
		H. R. 5113, maintaining the security and promoting the foreign policy and providing for general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security (Mutual Security Act).		196	Oct. 10	Quorum call.....	Absent
		On amendment to guarantee the return to the United States for salvage or scrap purposes of material and supplies given to friendly countries. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea	197	Oct. 11	H. R. 5650, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year, 1952.	Not voting. ⁴
165	..do....	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce funds for economic aid by \$150 million. On adoption. (Recommitted, 186 to 177.)	Yea			On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to strike out funds for Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri. On adoption. (Defeated, 127 to 183.)	
166	..do....	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 101.)	Yea	198	..do....	On passage. (Passed, 301 to 10.)	Not voting. ³
167	Aug. 20	Quorum call.....	Present	199	..do....	H. R. 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for fiscal 1952. (Conference report.)	Not voting. ⁴
168	..do....	..do....	Present			On motion that House recede and agree to a revision of the language of the House bill relating to United States contributions to international organizations. On adoption. (Adopted, 200 to 126.)	
169	Aug. 21	..do....	Present	200	..do....	H. R. 5084, making appropriations to carry out provisions of Mutual Security Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 222 to 00.)	Not voting. ¹
170	Sept. 13	..do....	Present	201	Oct. 15	Quorum call.....	Absent
171	..do....	..do....	Present	202	..do....	H. R. 5411, amending Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Cong. with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas. On passage. (Passed, 257 to 55.)	Not voting. ¹
172	Sept. 14	..do....	Present			H. R. 5426, reorganizing on a uniform and equal basis all Reserve components of the armed services and fixing periods of duty required. (Armed Forces Reserve Act.) On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Not voting. ¹
173	..do....	..do....	Present	203	Oct. 16	Quorum call.....	Absent
174	..do....	H. R. 1005, providing for the free importation of haler twine. On passage. (Passed, 210 to 41.)	Yea	204	..do....	..do....	Absent
175	Sept. 18	Quorum call.....	Present	205	..do....	H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.	Not voting. ³
176	Sept. 19	..do....	Present			On adoption of conference report. (Defeated, 187 to 204.)	
		S. 1046, increasing postal rates to yield estimated \$117 million additional revenue to reduce postal deficit. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea	206	Oct. 17	Quorum call.....	Absent
177	Sept. 20	Quorum call.....	Present	207	Oct. 18	H. Res. 463, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 285, authorizing appropriation of \$95,000 for commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the U. S. Military Academy. On adoption. (Adopted, 179 to 141.)	Not voting. ⁴
178	Sept. 24	..do....	Present			Quorum call.....	Absent
179	..do....	H. R. 4419, authorizing the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ up to 15 retired members of the armed services as teachers of military science and tactics. On passage. (Passed, 238 to 53.)	Yea	208	..do....	..do....	Not voting. ⁴
180	..do....	Quorum call.....	Present	209	..do....	S. Con. Res. 36, authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 75.)	
181	Sept. 25	..do....	Absent			Quorum call.....	Present
182	..do....	S. 2006, increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and extending its life 5 years to June 30, 1958. On passage. (Passed, 239 to 69.)	Yea	210	..do....	S. 365, adjusting the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.	
183	..do....	H. Res. 429, providing for the consideration of H. R. 39, a bill for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 211-112.)	Nay.	211	..do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 339 to 7.)	Yea
		H. R. 39, providing for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Recommitted, 180 to 162.)	Yea	212	..do....	S. 622, increasing the basic rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 318 to 26.)	Yea
184	Sept. 26	H. Res. 414, authorizing investigation and study by Ways and Means Committee of overlapping and duplication of taxes. On adoption. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea	213	..do....	Quorum call.....	Present
185	Sept. 27	Quorum call.....	Present	214	..do....	H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951.	Yea
186	..do....	H. Res. 430, providing for the consideration of H. Res. 82, relating to the unification of Ireland. On adoption. (Defeated, 139 to 206.)	Nay.			On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 185 to 160.)	
187	..do....	Quorum call.....	Present	215	..do....	H. R. 3669, amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the monthly benefits paid to retired railroad employees.	Yea
188	Oct. 4	H. R. 5118, amending the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees. On suspension of the rules and passage. (Defeated, 197 to 140.)	Yea	216	Oct. 20	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 341 to 0.)	Present
189	..do....	Quorum call.....	Present			S. 1804, providing or assisting in providing an automobile or making a cash payment to certain disabled veterans.	
190	Oct. 5	..do....	Present	217	..do....	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 223 to 63.)	Nay
191	..do....	H. R. 6113, the Mutual Security Act of 1951. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 235 to 98.)	Yea			H. Con. Res. 171, providing for the sine die adjournment of the first session of the 82d Cong. On adoption. (Adopted voice vote.)	Yea
192	Oct. 8	Quorum call.....	Absent				

¹ Absent, would have voted "yea" if present.

² Absent, would have voted "nay" if present.

³ Absent, paired for.

⁴ Absent, paired against.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine

whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. Recommitment: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House

before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the

instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate, by an S. There are four main types:

First. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

Second. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

Third. H. Con. Res (S Con. Res) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Fourth. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, etc.

D. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House Resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

E Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

F. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

G. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

First. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye," then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

Second. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

Third. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as tellers, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a roll call. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Fourth. Roll calls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called, and his vote recorded. Roll calls constitute the official voting record of the House.

The results of various votes when taken by a division, tellers, or roll calls are indicated in parentheses in the record above. The "yeas" are shown first; the "nays" last.

Alert Residents of New York's Nineteenth Congressional District Show Public Opinion Favors Continuous Negotiations for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of this great House are aware of my overwhelming pride in the people of the Nineteenth Congressional District of New York because so often, in the history of this wonderful country of ours, out of the depressed economy of this area have come the strength and dedication to bring about much-needed reforms.

Ancient tenements are making way for modern housing developments, and in two of those housing projects, built and owned by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. under New York State laws, we have tenants who represent a cross section of intellectual opinion in the country, more representative than a college faculty but certainly as high in intelligence and information quotients.

This group is, as a whole, aggressively contemporary in attitudes of thought and in the physical aids to measuring those attitudes.

I am in receipt of a recent letter from Mr. Michael Tobin, 7 Stuyvesant Oval, executive secretary, T. & V. Council for Peaceful Alternatives, presenting me with the results of a poll in Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village on four important topics. Since his communication speaks for itself, I am inserting his letter and accompanying release in the Record under leave.

The matter follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am taking the liberty of writing to you and to other leaders in this community on a matter which is uppermost in all our minds today.

As you no doubt know, the T. & V. Council for Peaceful Alternatives has just concluded

a polling of the residents of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village on the question of peace. The tabulated results of this poll were very gratifying to our council since they indicated that more than 90 percent of the T. & V. residents favor continuous negotiations to explore peaceful alternatives to war. We are certain that the poll results will be equally gratifying to you and to the overwhelming majority of the residents in this area.

It is most important that the thinking of the community on this vital question be given the widest possible publicity. To this end, we have sent press releases to most metropolitan newspapers and to the community newspaper, Town and Village. We are enclosing a copy of the press release and a sample of the ballot used in the poll.

We would very much appreciate any suggestions you have to further circulate the results of the poll. We sincerely invite any other comments you may wish to make and look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL TOBIN,
Executive Secretary, T. & V. Council
for Peaceful Alternatives.

A sample polling of tenants of the Stuyvesant Town housing development on the east side of Manhattan showed a near-unanimous vote favoring continuous top-level negotiations among all the major powers to secure world peace. It was announced today by the Town and Village Council for Peaceful Alternatives which conducted the poll.

Of a total of 1,048 secret ballots cast in 25 buildings in Stuyvesant Town, at busy shopping areas and in playgrounds in the community, 1,002 favored continuous efforts to secure world peace with 23 opposed. Twenty-three had no opinion.

The poll also showed Stuyvesant Town tenants opposed to rebuilding of the German and Japanese armed forces—in each case by better than two and one-half to one, and opposing the inclusion of Communist China in discussions pertaining to far-eastern problems, by a vote of five to four.

Results of balloting on the latter three questions were as follows:

"Are you in favor of rebuilding the German armed forces?"
Yes..... 240
No..... 702
No opinion..... 106

"Are you in favor of rebuilding the Japanese armed forces?"

Yes..... 262
No..... 669
No opinion..... 117

"Do you believe that Communist China should be included in discussions pertaining to far-eastern problems?"

Yes..... 456
No..... 530
No opinion..... 62

Planned for several weeks prior to the actual balloting by the Council for Peaceful Alternatives, made up of tenants of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, the poll utilized latest scientific methods of studying public opinion. Tenants were polled in 25 of the project's 89 buildings, on alternating floors, after having been advised in advance that a poll-taker would visit them.

Three chief shopping centers and all playgrounds in and around Stuyvesant Town were also covered.

Sixty tenants of Stuyvesant Town took part in planning and conducting the poll. Sponsors and supervisors were four prominent residents of the community, including: Dr. Sol Nichtern, Dr. Leonard Rittenberg, Dr. Harry Swartz, and Mr. Norman Stunder.

Ruhr Valley of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr O'CONOR. Mr. President, believing that it serves a definite purpose to bring to the attention of our people the industrial miracles that have been achieved in various areas of the country, I ask inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an address by Col. Roy B. White, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, recently extolling the importance of the Ohio River Valley, which he termed "the Ruhr Valley of America."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr Simpson, his honor the mayor, and gentlemen, I am pleased to extend to all of you and to those who could not be with us the greetings and good wishes of our board of directors and our official family.

Only a few years ago I delivered a speech here in Huntington and tried to emphasize the importance of the Ohio River Valley. I do not believe I failed, but this evening I will try to cause you to have a greater appreciation of it, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to do so.

I will endeavor to convey my thoughts concerning the importance of this mighty "Ruhr Valley of America," and, knowing the head can absorb only as much as the seat can endure I will be brief and not burden you with endless statistics, facts, and figures.

I do hope I can picture my thoughts in words which will leave no doubt in your minds as to my intent and purpose. This is not always easy to do. As an example, recently the teachers at one of our schools were interviewing parents entering children. One young lady teacher was quite startled to have an attractive young man say to her, "I am the father of the twins you are going to have this year."

Sometimes words seem to have many meanings, but we want our presence in Huntington this evening to indicate the high regard in which we hold this community and its businessmen. Since I last addressed you here we first demonstrated our confidence in the importance of the Ohio River Valley and its unlimited potentialities as a great industrial area by the expenditure of approximately \$2,000,000 for our new bridge over the Great Kanawha. Since that time great developments have proven our confidence was well founded, and we have contributed in many other ways.

Some of you here tonight helped us to dedicate that new bridge. We saw in its use an insurance of a north and south railroad for your city and a direct link between the Great Lakes ports and the industrial areas bordering them, including the great Pittsburgh steel district on the one hand, and the great market areas to the south on the other.

You and I can look back but a few years to a time when this territory along the Ohio was just a green, peaceful valley and not the thriving, humming, industrial region it is today.

Yes, in about 10 short years, we have seen the sleepy valley of the Ohio become the humming "Ruhr Valley of America." The pioneer, I suppose, was the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co's Columbia chemical division.

These astute and far-sighted pioneers were satisfied that there were practically inexhaustible veins of rock salt a mile underground in the territory where their immense plant is now located. That great plant is now operating as the Columbia-Southern Chemical Corp.—a Pittsburgh Plate Glass subsidiary. These technical and smart gentlemen named their plant site from the treasure hidden beneath the earth. They called the site "Natrium," which means "sodium"—that commodity which we, of limited education, call "salt."

From that start in 1840, development has progressed rapidly—and especially so in the last few years.

The list of great companies located in this territory reads like a blue book of American industry. You know these names as well as I do, but I am going to review them if for no other reason than the thrill it provides in realizing that their very being, their growth, their expansion, their vital part in our way of living is a testimonial to our way of life, our own system of free enterprise.

So, let's see what American businessmen, under the old banner of freedom and free enterprise, have done as we move along the West Virginia side of the Ohio River.

After leaving Wheeling we glide past the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co's plant at Natrium, and its neighbor, Glyco Products Co.; the Calco division of American Cyanamid Co. at Willow Island, and the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. at Washington. That could be enough to revolutionize one side of any river, but there are more. The Vanadium Corp. of America and the Central Coal Co. at Graham. The former West Virginia Ordnance Works at York, which served its own vital purpose, will now provide the site for two other large industries—the proposed gun-tube plant of the Army and the Industrial Rayon Corp. And then just below Point Pleasant is the site of the projected Celanese Corp. plant.

I could mention many more, including some new ones which I am not privileged to mention by name—new plants making great investments on the West Virginia side.

And on the other side of the river, toward Zanesville, is also an array of industrial might. There is the great Union Carbide and Carbon Corp's Riverview project just below Marietta. Their bakelite and electro-metallurgical divisions are now in partial operation. Also, just above Marietta is the B. F. Goodrich plastic plant.

But not all the money is spent on new plants. Some of the veterans must keep modernizing, changing, and expanding. The Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., the Ames-Baldwin-Wyoming Co., and the Corning Glass Works at Parkersburg, the Marietta Manufacturing Co. at Baden, the Wheeling Steel Corp. and Louis Marx & Co. at Wheeling, and the Triangle Conduit Co. at Glendale, all have made or planned important expenditures in expanding facilities which long have been in production.

But you can't have hustling, thriving industries without a source of constant power, for the American power plant is the heart of American industry. Therefore, I pay just tribute to the work of the power companies in creating this great beehive of activity. I mention the American Gas & Electric Co., with its several plants—the Philip Sporn, at Graham, the Philo plant, at Philo, the Muskigum, at Relief; and its supporting Kanawha River plant, at Glasgow; also the Monongahela Power Co., with divisions at Willow Island and Rivesville.

I have said I will not burden you with statistics—but may I quote just a few startling figures. These power plants I have just mentioned represent an investment, roughly, of \$335,000,000. To this you can then add, with some degree of accuracy, another \$439,000,000 already spent and in plan-

ning for the plants I have named and have not named. This is a total of more than \$750,000,000. I have no personal way of knowing just what a stack of dollars that is—but it is a stack all right, and there is no mistake about it—and this has all been done right in this valley in less than a decade.

These industrialists are wise men; men of proven business judgment and they do not spend that kind of money without reason. Important industries of the Nation are looking to this area with every good reason. They know, as we do, that in this triangle which nature has so generously endowed, can be found those things which are so vital to successful industrial venture. Here we have the economic atmosphere and the conditions essential to profitable production. Here in this valley are all of those industrial essentials, coal, natural gas, good and plentiful water, thick veins of rock salt, lakes of salt brine, and an abundance of electric power with coal as its creator.

There is one other vital element present in this territory—an element not provided by the generous hand of nature, but by the pioneering spirit of Americans like yourselves—transportation. An adequate system of steel rails, which also provide the bulk of the essential transportation of the Nation, and without it our industries cannot survive. It is also provided with sufficient highway and water transportation to abundantly supply industrial needs and afford ample protection so necessary to encourage continued industrial growth.

We are pleased to have the privilege of serving these fine new plants. We're glad to know that they, along with us, have great confidence in the future of this part of the country. Faith in the future of America is so clearly demonstrated when industry invests such amounts of money in constructing and equipping such modern plants as these. I feel sure you all join in this confidence and faith.

As you listen to me tell you of the great possibilities of this area, I hope you get the idea that I'm a pretty good salesman for your valley. Well, I am. In fact, I feel that B. & O. people are your top salesmen. It is to our own benefit to be so, and it is our business to be so—and besides, the better off you are, the better off we are bound to be.

Acting as liaison between industry and this region of present and potential industrial greatness is a long, tedious process. The seed planted today may not bear fruit for several years. But experience has demonstrated that when some of our ringleaders have shown their faith in a particular industrial region, and have backed that faith with quite substantial investments, others follow the lead. That is happening today in this area.

But we don't oversell. We don't have to. We are very realistic in our contacts with the executives of industry. We tell all who will listen about this area by word of mouth and by advertisements in national magazines. We have something to sell many of those executives—and we believe we know 5,000 of them, through one means or another. Day in and day out we tell our story of the advantages of this mighty valley; day in and day out we keep trying to put more and more plants in the valley and on the B. & O., and thus add more payrolls in the communities which we serve and add to the traffic we haul. I want you also to know that this year new industries are being established and existing industries are being expanded quite generally over our system. Nationally, industry is expanding this year at the sizable rate of about \$23,000,000,000.

Our representatives in this territory, in addition to being part and parcel of the community, are also active salesmen for this area. Please accept my sincere thanks for the consideration you have shown them.

We work in close harmony with the great State of West Virginia, its towns, its cities, and its industries. We think it is important for us to do so, and we believe it is important to West Virginia that we do so. We have all grown up together, and we will continue to go forward together.

There are many questions troubling those of us in transportation under today's conditions. I could make another talk on this subject alone. I shall not do so.

Someone has said: "Time is but the stream I go a-fishing in." I hope your time this evening has given you as much pleasure as this occasion has given me. I leave this thought with you—What the future holds, no man knows. But with America's great productive capacity still growing, with our Nation untouched to any important degree by World War II, with more and more modern weapons, and with the spirit of our men in uniform and our people, we still have great confidence.

Should Business Week Censor the Censors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence between David Heath, attorney at law, of Dallas, Tex., and Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week, with reference to the question, Should Business Week censor the censors?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1951.

DEAR Mr. BELL: If it is the policy of your publication to ferret out the newest and latest techniques of those who are manufacturing equipment for our armed services and direct the attention of our enemies to them, you may have been unusually successful of late.

For example, in Business Week for September 22, 1951, beginning on page 78, you have an article that purports to reveal the newest and latest technique for manufacturing napalm. You give the name and location of the manufacturer, the monthly capacity, size of reserve tanks, size of mixing tanks, the fact that steam pipes around the sides of the mixing tank keep it at the right temperature, the length of time a batch is mixed, that it is mixed mechanically through metered pipe, the temperature at which it is dried, etc. There are numerous illustrations, including the interior of the drier with its spirals used to elevate the napalm and spill it out through the heated air.

I wish you would ask yourself, "Can this article direct the attention of the Communists to techniques that they are not already using?" If so, "Does it thereby enhance the likelihood that American boys may be fried with napalm produced from a Soviet factory copied after this one?"

In Business Week for September 29, 1951, on page 70 you have an illustrated article concerning a new device for making 14 turbine blades at one time. You give the name and address of the manufacturer. That the

importance of this device militarily is not lost on you is indicated in your first sentence in this article: "Turbine blades are among the biggest bottlenecks in making aircraft jet engines."

Mr. Bell, I do not wish to impugn your motives or call into question your patriotism in any way, but I do feel that you haven't been thinking. You must know that a reporter backed by the prestige of your organization will be made privy to production techniques that would be denied to a member of the staff of the Soviet Embassy if he were to ask for them.

It may be that there are technical magazines that have already gone into these particular items in far greater detail. If so, it raises the question of how on the one hand we can have the priceless advantages of freedom of speech and interchange of ideas, which promote further technological progress, and at the same time keep from showing the Russians all our latest inventions. Perhaps a distinction may be drawn in the use of the end product. For example, an improvement in drying wood would be something to numerous organizations, and the end product would not be military. Whereas, an improvement in the manufacture of napalm and of jet-engine blades can be of interest to only a handful of manufacturers who are manufacturing only direct weapons of war. In the latter instance it would seem that the public interest is not served by general publication of the information.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID HEATH.

DEAR Mr. HEATH: Your letter raises the critical question of security of information. It comes at a time when President Truman has just declared that 95 percent of the security information of the United States already has been published by American newspapers and magazines. Business Week welcomes this chance to review the facts concerning the two articles you criticize and to state its view on the broader, general problem.

With respect to the article in the September 22 issue on the latest technique for manufacturing napalm, these are the facts.

Prior to the release of this information by Ferro Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, the developer of the technique, it was cleared by that company through Army Ordnance. All the facts in Business Week's article were within the bounds of security as defined by the military.

With respect to the article on making turbine blades, these are the facts: A. V. Roe Canada, Ltd., and Modern Tool Works, Ltd., which developed this new machine, cleared the disclosure of it with the Royal Canadian Air Force. In this case, also, there was full compliance with military security.

In both these instances Business Week was reporting unclassified material. But, why, as your letter inquires, did Business Week not censor the censors? That is the same question the President raised last week.

The first answer to that is obvious: You can't have a voluntary military censorship. Only competent military authority can judge what must not be made public knowledge. But the other answer is that Business Week regards the dissemination of technical information that has been cleared through the military as a vital part of its task. It is a transmitter in the intercom system of American industry. We need, and need fast, better, cheaper, speedier ways of making war matériel. Suppression of this sort of information would merely slow down the rate at which new processes can be adopted to get arms to the defenders of the free world.

Failing to get this information out would be giving Stalin & Co. more help than his spies can get him from these published accounts.

For example, after the publication in Business Week of the article on napalm, an officer of the Chemical Procurement Division of Army Ordnance told Ferro Corp. that he was highly pleased that the story appeared. He hoped that other manufacturers of napalm would be induced to use this cheaper and speedier method that Ferro had developed.

The turbine blade case provides further support for Business Week's policy. Publication of the Canadian method got the information to American manufacturers faster than any routing as classified information through military channels would have done. Also, it made the facts available to any defense contractor who might be able to adapt the method to operations unrelated to jet engines.

Business Week supports a policy of enlightened censorship of military information. It will scrupulously abide by the rules of the game. It will publish no classified material, but it will continue to disseminate other information that can step up the tempo of our economic mobilization.

Yours sincerely,

ELLIOTT V. BELL.

"One of the World's Leading Authorities on the Far East Conflict Declares 'The United States Air Force Has Raised the Horns of a Dilemma,' Which, if Properly Exploited, Could Create an Iron Curtain Between Russia and China and Separate Those Communist Governments"—John David Griffin, Editor of the New York Enquirer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are upon the first session of the Eighty-second Congress now completing its work before adjourning. The thought of all people in the country is upon Korea.

Wondering if and when the peace talks will be concluded, they are speculating on whether or not our boys will have to face another winter of bloody war in the subzero temperatures in the hills and valleys of Korea.

The long battles raging—the casualties now taking place—in the iron triangle and on Heartbreak Ridge are daily causing heartaches everywhere in America.

For these reasons all are praying for even a glimmer of hope and for overwhelming victory over the aggressors—a victory that will bring an end to aggressive warfare for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon a wonderfully clear and altogether provocative interview, written by one of the world's leading authorities on the present-day conflict in Korea. In this interview, William Courtenay of the Kemley

Newspapers of England—after a 50,000-mile survey of American airpower—emphasized the fact that it was the work of the United States Air Force that had caused the Chinese Reds to seek the armistice following their tremendous losses in the spring campaigns of April and May.

Mr. Courtenay then went on to say:

The last thing the Russians desire to see is the destruction of the industries of Manchuria following the loss of the North Korean industrial centers. The United States Strategic Air Force flattened the latter in the first 100 days of the conflict. The Russians are dependent upon the former for their own build-up in the Far East.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues on both ends of the Capitol may have the opportunity of learning of the observations made by Mr. William Courtenay so that they may have a fuller understanding of the problem, I am including in my remarks this interview with John David Griffin, editor of the New York Enquirer, which reads as follows.

IN THE FAR EAST AND AT HOME—A 50,000-MILE SURVEY OF AMERICAN AIR POWER

(By John David Griffin, editor of the New York Enquirer)

"The last thing the Russians desire to see is the destruction of their industrial centers in Manchuria following the loss of the North Korean industries," stated William Courtenay, O. B. E., N. M., of the London Sunday Times, the Daily Graphic, and the Kemsley newspapers of England, upon his arrival from Washington at Idlewild airport yesterday.

Courtenay, who has just completed a 50,000-mile tour of United States Air Force, Navy, and Army installations throughout the country, is one of the world's leading authorities on the present-day conflict in the Far East.

Speaking of the campaign in Korea, he stressed that the work of the United States Air Force had largely caused the Chinese Reds to seek the armistice at the close of last June following their tremendous losses in the spring campaigns of April and May.

BATTLEFIELDS ISOLATED

"The power of the United States Air Force, combined with that of the Royal Australian Air Force and South Africa Air Force squadrons assigned to the United Nations forces in Korea, stepped into that 10-mile gap, caused in the first thrust at the Imjin River, and effectively isolated the battlefields to such an extent that the Chinese infantry suffered enormous losses—losses that they will be unwilling to face again."

The British writer takes the view that the United States Air Force has raised the Communist government at Moscow on the twin horns of a dilemma, one which, if properly exploited by the American and British authorities could create an iron curtain between Russia and China and, at the same time, separate these Communist governments.

"The last thing the Russians desire to see," he observed, "is the destruction of the industries of Manchuria following the loss of North Korean industrial centers. The United States Strategic Air Force flattened the latter in the first 100 days of the conflict. The Russians are dependent upon the former for their own build-up in the Far East."

CHALLENGE TO SOVIET

"But," he continued, "if they were able to bring their air units to the battle line and

aid the Chinese armies, the latter might still win a military victory, since their infantry is 4 to 1 over that of the United Nations.

"If they commence bombing the U. N. infantry and aid the Chinese armies, they will invite certain destruction of Manchurian airfields, industries, and communications, since, in such conditions, the U. N. forces would no longer possess that luxury of choice which they enjoy today.

"Since the Chinese cannot win the war without this air aid, the Russians must either provide it, and risk the destruction of the industries of Manchuria by the United States Strategic Air Forces, or deny it to their Communist allies because the protection of the Manchurian industries is a greater Russian interest than helping the Chinese armies whom they coaxed on into the Korean conflict with the promise of full air support.

"BY HOOK OR CROOK"

"This," Courtenay continued, "is their dilemma and in time the Chinese will realize they have been left on the receiving end of fire power from the United States Air Force for 18 months with no air protection from Russia, while the United Nations line has never known an air raid."

Courtenay warned that the Communists are determined to secure control of Korea by hook or crook, that there has not been a change of heart but only a change of tactics because they have failed to secure a military decision.

"The greatest danger," he professes, "will rise after the 'cease fire'. There will be pressure to 'bring the boys home'."

"It must be resisted," he said, "and we must hold a firm line for quite some time to come until North and South Korea are united and protected. The Communists plan to urge us to withdraw, as they demanded at the first armistice talk on July 10. Their purpose in having us withdraw is so that they can infiltrate into the south and take it from within—a popular Communist procedure."

Courtenay leaves for England on Tuesday to give a first hand report to the British people, as well as governmental leaders, on the striking power of the United States Air Force and other American units in the Far East.

Confusion Hurts Fortieth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the San Diego Union on Thursday, October 18, 1951. This editorial quite appropriately states the morale problem in California's Fortieth Division. The editorial follows:

CONFUSION HURTS FORTIETH

Confusion in the Pentagon seriously is impairing the morale of California boys serving in this State's Fortieth Division in Japan.

Letters from both officers and enlisted men indicate that the lack of clarity in determining the status of these National Guard men has threatened the efficiency of California's civilian soldiers.

During the last few weeks, there have been numerous statements by general officers that

these men would or would not be sent to Korea. One day they are hinted to be Korea bound. The next day a statement is issued saying they are to remain in Japan to guard security there.

Perhaps there is good reason for silence as to the combat use planned for these troops. Guardsmen could understand the security value of silence far better than constantly conflicting statements as to their status. The confusion has a bad effect at home as well as in Japan. It affects the emotional status of families throughout southern California.

Loudest complaint from the guardsmen, however, comes from conflicting statements and policies regarding their return to civilian life.

"Our officer morale, as you can imagine, is at rock bottom," one guardsman writes. "We'd like to know just what we can expect our tour of duty to be—barring a full-scale war. Are we in for 17, 21, or 24 months?"

General Marshall is reported to have told the guard officers they are in for 17 months. Ranking officers claim the term of service for both enlisted men and officers is 24 months. Some reports from the Department of Defense give the Californians indications their term is 21 months.

If policy has been made, it has not been clarified for the men involved.

Naturally all of the guardsmen would like to get home as soon as possible. They have been embittered by seeing some services discharge faster than others and by finding even in their own ranks that some will get out earlier than their buddies.

These are civilians sacrificing to serve their country. The very least that can be done for them is for the Department of Defense to clarify their status. A halt should be called to this barrage of conflicting statements.

Joint Accounting Improvement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted I am submitting herewith an exchange of letters between myself and the Comptroller General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS,

Washington, D. C. October 19, 1951.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,

Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMPTROLLER GENERAL: I have been following with considerable interest the recent developments in the audit program of the General Accounting Office, particularly the expansion of comprehensive and other agency audits at the site of operations which should lead to much more informative and useful results of audits. I understand that this program and your joint accounting improvement program are incorporated in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950.

One of the most urgent needs of the committee is timely and independent analysis of agency operations of the nature contemplated by your new program. It is therefore my

hope that this program can be developed with such need in mind. While I realize that the program has not arrived at the point where an annual audit report of each agency would be feasible, I believe much could be accomplished by annual reports wherever appropriate of significant findings of your auditors during the course of audits and other examinations, to be made available to the committee in time for the commencement of its hearings at each session of the Congress.

I would appreciate your consideration of this question, and, if you agree with the ideas expressed herein, the assignment of members of your staff to consult with the staff of the committee in working out details which would assure the committee maximum and prompt benefits of your audit operations.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of October 19, 1951, stating that one of the most urgent needs of your committee is timely analysis of agency operations of the nature contemplated by our new audit program, and expressing the hope that the program can be developed with such need in mind. Your letter expresses the belief that while the program has not arrived at the point where an annual report of each agency would be feasible, much could be accomplished by annual reports, wherever appropriate, of significant findings of our auditors during the course of audits and other examinations to be made available to the committee in time for the commencement of its hearings at each session of the Congress.

Some time ago, I became convinced that, in order to fully carry out the responsibilities of the General Accounting Office as an agency of the Congress, along with improving accounting in the Federal Government, the scope of the audit should be extended beyond the accountability for funds. To supply this need and satisfy the requirements of recent legislation, the "comprehensive audit" approach was devised. Such an audit is conducted to the extent practicable and adequate in accordance with generally accepted auditing principles and standards applicable to the audits of commercial enterprises. Its scope includes an audit of receipts, expenditures and application of public funds, the verification of assets, liabilities, proprietary accounts and operating results, and the examination of individual transactions to the extent deemed necessary in the circumstances for determining compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and decisions, with authority and responsibility to state exceptions and raise charges where necessary. An important element in this audit program is the appraisal of the methods employed in operating the accounting system and the effectiveness of internal control and related practices in the agency under audit.

The comprehensive audit has been initiated in about 20 Government agencies or major parts of agencies. In addition, site audits of certain types of expenditure and activities are being conducted at numerous points in the field.

The present approach to our audit responsibilities, and the specific authority in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950, should go far toward producing information of the type which would be helpful to your committee—information which was not readily obtain-

able under the older and more centralized audit processes previously in effect.

I am sure you will understand the results contemplated under our new program cannot be expected immediately, for several reasons. In the first place, in many cases there are not yet available in the agency under audit the kinds of books, records and accounts needed to make a full disclosure of the agency's financial operations and enable an effective and prompt audit. Improvements in audits must go hand in hand with improvements in agency accounting systems. These improvements are being worked out in the agencies on a cooperative basis with the General Accounting Office, as contemplated by the accounting provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. In the second place, a considerable length of time is required to analyze the basic legislation and operations of the agencies under audit in order to enable a determination whether programs are being carried out in the manner intended by the Congress and within other legislative requirements. Finally, the personnel of the General Accounting Office working on audits are not all of the type needed for making comprehensive audits. The rate of further expansion of the program will depend substantially upon our ability to obtain qualified personnel. This does not mean an increase in personnel. It is my hope that it will ultimately result in less personnel. It does mean a change in type of personnel.

We have also, as you know, reorganized our investigative staff, one of its important functions being to survey throughout the country selected expenditure programs particularly to test their effectiveness, from a fiscal standpoint, and their conformance with their legislative charter and the departments' representations to the Appropriations Committees and the Congress.

I will be happy to have our audit and examination program take account of the needs expressed in your letter, and to cooperate with your Committee to the fullest extent practicable in seeing to it that significant findings during the course of each year growing out of our comprehensive and site audits and other examinations of agency financial transactions and operations are made available to the Committee before commencement of the Committee hearings each year. I will be glad to have members of my staff join with the staff of your committee in working out the mechanism for accomplishing the results we both have in mind.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General
of the United States

Winning the War of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement, which I have presented personally to President Truman, covering my observations in connection with a recent mission to Europe:

Three weeks in Europe—September 27 to October 18, 1951—10 days of which were

spent at Caux, Switzerland, attending a World Assembly of Moral Re-Armament, the remaining days in West Germany, the Netherlands, England, and Scotland, impressed me with the fact that in this war of ideas—democracy versus communism—America is on the defensive. The mission to Europe showed me how the United States can help democracy take the offensive.

These observations represent my own personal views:

UNITED STATES FIRST JOINT WEST COAST SHIPPING DELEGATION INITIATES TRIP TO SEEK ANSWERS TO WORLD-WIDE PORT DIFFICULTIES

This mission to Europe originated during the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference. I brought together officials of the Pacific Maritime Association and representatives of Moral Re-Armament. Attention was directed to the settlement of serious strike difficulties covering a period of years within the National Airlines, through the application of the moral standards of Moral Re-Armament. Threatened with dismemberment by the Civil Aeronautics Board last year, National not only settled its labor difficulties but attained sufficient financial strength so that it has petitioned the CAB to reduce its air-mail subsidy, looking toward the elimination of all Federal subsidy.

Thereafter, a joint delegation of American shipowners and longshoremen flew to Europe to observe the effect of Moral Re-Armament in solving industrial disputes. The objectives were to enable these representatives of American management and labor to meet shipping and dock leaders from other countries and to develop a democratic strategy of teamwork for the ports of the world, having in mind especially the prevention of further costly disturbances on the west-coast waterfront.

Mrs. Deane and I, together with a group of men and women interested in Moral Re-Armament, accompanied the delegation at our own expense. The trip was made possible through the Pacific Maritime Association covering the expenses of the management representatives. The union men met in part their expenses, and the remainder was covered by the sacrificial giving of those of us who believe that Moral Re-Armament will unite men and nations on a plane above the conflict of party, class, or political philosophy.

SWITZERLAND: WORLD EVIDENCE OF AN ANSWER TO COMMUNISM AT THE MRA ASSEMBLY AT CAUX

During this summer 10,100 people from 88 countries, including cabinet ministers, members of 19 parliaments, and other key political, industrial, and labor leaders from many areas of the world came together at Caux to seek and to find answers to communism and industrial conflict.

Among those with whom we had an opportunity to confer at this session were the following:

Senator Paul Kalb, vice president of the French Senate.

Mr. Maurice Mercier, national secretary of the Textile Workers' Union of France.

Dr. Oskar Leimgruber, chancellor of the Swiss Confederation.

Dr. Heinrich Hellwege, German Federal Minister for Affairs of the Upper House.

Dr. Heinrich Kost, chairman of the German Coal Board.

Mr. Hubert Stein, national executive member of the German Mineworkers Union.

Mr. F. W. McNeil, president, Auckland branch, New Zealand Harbor Board Employees Union.

His Excellency Quinto Quintieri, vice president of the Italian Confederation of Industry.

Mr. Hans Bjerkholt, a founder of the Norwegian Communist Party.

Others we met included two members of the Iranian Parliament and an official from the Abadan refinery, a group of 40 from behind the iron curtain, including a former Soviet officer from the Urals, a delegation of Moslems from Soviet Turkestan, and a man who sat on the Central Committee of the Communist Party in the U S S R, and was Deputy Commissar for Forests in the Soviet Government from 1929 to 1932, plus representatives of nearly all the Soviet satellite countries.

Among those from industry were delegations of workers and management from the factories, mines, docks, and transport industries of Western Europe, from the strategic areas and industries of northern Italy, the Ruhr and Berlin, northern France, the Vosges region, and the Red Belt of Paris, every industrial area of Britain, the iron mines of Sweden, the shipyards, hydroelectric plants, and copper mines of Norway, the blast furnaces of Holland, and the machine industry of Switzerland.

There were at Caux up to the time we left 213 industrial delegations from 203 factories and mines employing 1,025,300 workers, 1,373 workers and trade-union officials, 907 Marxists, 202 Communists, 416 management representatives.

Dockers' leaders attended from 16 ports in 10 countries: Hamburg, Bremen, Genoa, Antwerp, London, Avonmouth, Liverpool, Glasgow, Auckland, Melbourne, Rouen, Copenhagen, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Rotterdam, Amsterdam.

Representing the French Federation of Textile Workers, Mr. Maurice Mercier told the assembly of the successful negotiations for wage increases of 15 to 16½ percent for the 648,000 workers in the French textile industry. These negotiations had united the Force Ouvriere, Catholic unions, and the foremen's unions, thereby thwarting an anticipated Communist effort to disrupt the industry.

Mr. Raymond R. Zimmerman, Assistant Director of the Technical Assistance Division of ECA, who came to Caux reported that he and his colleagues on a European inspection tour came upon "example after example of labor-management cooperation" in the north of France. His ECA associates said, "Zimmerman, what a wonderful combination if Moral Re-Armament and the Marshall plan could team up for a better life."

At Caux, Mr. Zimmerman said, "This has been a new experience for me, and I have got a glimpse of the potentialities of Moral Re-Armament that I never saw before. I find you not fighting communism. You are not fighting anything, but you really stand for something. You stand for change-for change in our personal lives, in our home lives, in our community, in our nation, and in the world--and this is an order that all classes can rally to. It has been of profound importance to me to be here to meet you."

Mr. A. B. Tichenor, vice president of Matson Navigation Co., a leader of the official delegation from the Pacific Maritime Association, representing 27 steamship lines and 40 stevedoring companies, stated, "On the basis of what's right instead of who's right a new era of understanding can come to the west coast maritime industry and to the world as a whole."

Representing labor, Mr. Chester Hardister of San Francisco, vice president of the 5,500 members of Local 10 of ILWU, who has one son in Korea and another in Germany, added, "For the first time I felt at Caux that there is a fighting chance to avoid a third world war through the universal ideology of Moral Re-Armament."

Personally I can say that I learned more in my time at Caux about foreign affairs than in all my previous experience. I feel that our expenditure of \$60,000,000,000 for defense this year will not do the job unless it is backed by a change in Americans which

will reflect superior moral standards and a way of life convincing to Communists, such as I found at Caux. I was impressed to hear a great many men and women, who for 10 and 20 years had been leaders in the Communist Party, tell how they had come in contact with MRA, accepted moral standards in their own lives and changed, and are now changing other Communists.

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, who presided at most of the sessions, is right in saying that anticommunism is not an effective way to master communism. "Many people are against it," Dr. Buchman said, "but they live a personal life that is for it. The true battle line in the world is not between East and West but between right and wrong. We need a superior ideology that works, so that everybody says, 'That's it.' Unless America recovers her rightful ideology, nothing but chaos awaits us. Our destiny is to obey the guidance of God and live by absolute moral standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, personally and nationally."

GERMANY: THE IDEOLOGICAL AND MORAL FACTOR IS VITAL IN THE CONSIDERATION OF EVERY ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND MILITARY QUESTION IN WESTERN GERMANY

Going to Bonn from Caux, Dr. Heinrich Hellwege, Minister for Affairs of the Upper House of the West German Federal Republic, arranged for me to see Chancellor Adenauer at his residence. The Chancellor asked me to bring his personal greetings to President Truman. He expressed a deep conviction and appreciation of what Moral Re-Armament had meant to Germany, saying it "had become a household word" in his country.

The Chancellor also wished to thank America through me for what the CARE parcels had meant to the German people, reflecting the giving of America's heart as well as economic aid. Even the ECA-built multi-million-dollar bridge over the Rhine near Cologne had not elicited the same response as the caring shown by individual Americans for the physical and moral well-being of the German people.

Our frank discussions included the serious lack of coal in Germany. The Chancellor had been without coal in his own home. The shortage was influencing the thinking of the average German miner. The feeling prevails among the miners, why produce coal and return to cold homes? I was advised by the head of the German Coal Board that not more than 1 ton of coal would be available to each German mining family this winter.

This economic factor is playing into the hands of the Soviet's ideological propaganda. Because of this and other economic hardships, Dr. Hellwege was of the opinion that the government might lose if an election were held at the present time. My observation is that another government might not be so favorable to the Western Europe defense program.

Mr. Hans Duttling, director of the Gelsenkirchen Coal Mining Co., with 82,000 employees, which produces one-fifth of the entire Ruhr output, and Mr. Paul Dikus, chairman of the works council in Duttling's mining group, gave credit to Moral Re-Armament for settling a Communist-inspired strike which threatened to tie up the entire Ruhr.

Hamburg's largest shipyard, Deutsche Werit, has a backlog of 500,000 tons on order. In this city were the homes of many of the former Communists we had met at Caux.

During my visit to Western Europe, I gained the impression from representative citizens from every strategic area that the real question is not whether the people of Western Europe will fight, but whether the United States, as initiator of NATO, will give them an idea big enough for which to fight. Few will fight Soviet materialism merely to

defend American materialism. My observations convince me that, unless America provides this idea at once, in the event of a serious emergency American youth would have to bear the brunt of any major military operation that might develop in Europe.

THE NETHERLANDS: SUBSTANTIAL POSTWAR ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION ARE ENDANGERED BY LOSS OF FOREIGN MARKETS AND ACTIVE COMMUNIST STRENGTH

In the Netherlands my visit to The Hague and the great ports of Amsterdam and Rotterdam revealed marked economic recovery, but a seeming lack of awareness of any emergency. Despite the fact that the second-place Communists polled 25.7 percent in the prosperous city of Amsterdam, very few people expressed any concern with potential Communist strength. Naturally in such a situation there was little popular evidence of readiness to support general European military operations.

Some key industrialists, like Mr. Frits Philips, of the largest electrical company in Europe, under the influence of Moral Re-Armament are furnishing a new type of industrial leadership and contradicting Stalin's caustic comment, "When did the managers ever put principles before profits?"

ENGLAND: ELECTION RESULTS WILL NOT BRING UNITY UNLESS THE SPIRIT WHICH AVERTED THE 1951 DOCK STRIKE BECOMES NATION-WIDE

We arrived in London just prior to the general election. In historic Clive House, Dr. Buchman's home in London, we met Labor, Conservative, and Liberal Party leaders. I talked personally with them and with Mr. Arthur Baker, chief of the parliamentary staff of The Times. They were agreed, in advance of the voting, that the fundamental problems, political, social, and economic, facing the country could be solved only by a national moral and spiritual awakening regardless of which party won.

These representatives of British political life, like myself, were conscious of the fact that both the Conservative and Labor Party leadership were in danger of becoming so absorbed in their own political battles that they would be blind to the strategy of anti-American, pro-Soviet efforts to take control of Britain's industrial and political leadership.

Dock leaders, who have been admitted tools of such a strategy in the past, told me in their homes how the acceptance of moral standards had clarified their loyalties. We sat in on their meeting with steamship operators, and I heard how union officials, former Communists now trained in Moral Re-Armament, had averted successfully a Communist-inspired strike last March that threatened to tie up the ports of the United Kingdom.

Britain faces great economic problems, but as a visitor I should like to pay tribute to the stride she has made in her rebuilding program, especially workers' homes, and the fact that her postwar exports now are around 175 percent of her prewar exports.

Before leaving London I had an opportunity to pay my respects to Mr. Walter Gifford, United States Ambassador, to Lord Pakenham, then First Lord of the Admiralty, and met many old friends.

SCOTLAND: POLITICAL STRIKES ARE NO LONGER A THREAT TO THE PORT OF GLASGOW, WHERE MORE SHIPS ARE UNDER CONSTRUCTION THAN IN THE WHOLE OF THE UNITED STATES

In Glasgow, Sir Patrick Dollan, wartime Lord Mayor of the city, asked me to convey messages to President Truman.

We had an opportunity to inspect the docks and shipyards, and met such union leaders as Mr. Tom Christie, chairman,

dockers branch, Scotland Transport and General Workers Union, for many years a member of the Communist Party, who had changed completely his philosophy and was now applying the principles of Moral Re-Armament in the settlement of all grievances and differences which arose between him and the ship-owners. Several years ago this port was known as Red Clydeside, but today political strikes, according to Christie, no longer are a threat to the port.

A few hours by air brought my wife and me, with the west coast shipping delegation, back to New York. There we found the docks paralyzed by a serious strike. Our experiences at Caux and on the waterfronts at Hamburg, Rotterdam, London, and Glasgow convinced us that there is an answer. As an American, I trust that this answer may be applied in time.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion I should like briefly to summarize my impressions of this most interesting and informative trip:

1. Our group was particularly appreciative of the kindness shown and services given us by our Foreign Service personnel in the various countries we visited.

2. The Moral Re-Armament Assembly center at Caux provides a unique source of world information which should be more widely recognized and used by United States officials.

3. Communists can and are being changed in such large numbers that it offers a new factor in democratic world strategy.

Evidence at Caux, strengthened and confirmed by our trip through Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, convinced me that the Soviet evaluates Moral Re-Armament correctly as a force in the free world which has launched an ideological offensive of world-wide proportions, and which I believe will master communism.

Three important instances from Germany, France, and Britain showed the results that can be expected from such a democratic counter-strategy.

(a) The stoppage of the Red-led strike in the Nordstern mine, key coal pit in the Ruhr, which blocked the Communist program of a general tie-up of German coal and steel production in November 1950;

(b) The MRA-inspired labor-management teamwork in successfully concluding wage negotiations in the giant French textile industry, in October 1951, before the Communists could launch their expected efforts to seize control; and

(c) The prevention of a general dock strike in the United Kingdom in March 1951, part of Communist strategy to cripple British economy, through the change of Scottish and London port workers' leaders.

4. A strong and friendly Western Germany is essential to the defense of free Europe.

Coming from San Francisco, where I saw signed a peace of reconciliation with Japan which established an historical precedent in the application of Christian principles to international settlements, I was struck by the lack of such a spirit in some of our relations with the new German Republic. I could not help but recall a statement made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a letter shortly before his death: "We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the lives of men and nations."

My talks with Chancellor Adenauer and other German leaders convinced me that we may have been shortsighted in our handling of certain problems. Dismantling has ended but the controls on coal and steel outputs have created hardships and impeded industrial progress in Western Germany. There are many factors involved, both political and

economic, and I do not wish to be too critical, recognizing as I do the general coal shortage throughout Europe and the special needs of France and Luxembourg for coal.

When Germany is operating under the Schuman plan, these matters will be largely under her control, but I do submit that the coal situation in Western Germany today is deserving of our further careful study and perhaps rethinking. The required exportation of approximately 6,000,000 tons of German coal each quarter and the importation by Germany at higher prices of approximately the same quantity each quarter is a cause of irritation and unrest, which is being exploited by the enemies of both our countries. The proper solution of this coal import-export problem has immediate ideological as well as economic implications for Germany and all of Western Europe.

5. The ports of the world must be kept open

The strategy of the subversive forces in every country is to paralyze shipping and thereby break the lifelines of trade which hold together the free nations. Everywhere we find attempts to promote chaos by destroying commerce through port dislocations. The results achieved by changing Communist dock leaders to an acceptance of a superior ideology in such ports as London, Glasgow, Auckland, and Rotterdam have been practical and far reaching. Strikes have been averted and goods have been kept moving.

It was the basis of confidence established through MRA between dock leaders in British and New Zealand ports which clarified the real situation and enabled Auckland ships, falsely labeled "black" by Communists, to be unloaded on their arrival in United Kingdom ports early this year.

The real cause of conflict, when political questions are recognized and eliminated, is the selfishness and resentment of both sides. When these human, as distinguished from political, problems are honestly faced and dealt with on a basis of not who is right but what is right, every difference and strike is capable of an immediate and just settlement.

Such can be the experience of our country in east coast, west coast, and Gulf ports, when ship operators and union leaders apply the lessons which the delegation I accompanied learned at Caux.

It is not economics nor politics which are involved in the world struggle of today, but basically a conflict of ideas, namely, whether the ideas of our founding fathers based on moral standards and the guidance of God shall prevail or whether they shall succumb to the ideas of a ruthless, challenging, and godless materialism.

6. Anti-Americanism is running high in Europe, but this tide can be turned by creating a new moral climate at home and abroad.

I found on my trip that America is unfortunately not highly regarded in many quarters in Europe, despite the huge amounts we have invested in economic and military programs. For example, since World War II we have appropriated \$390,000,000 for our State Department information programs. What concerns me is that it is not reaching the people we want to reach and changing their thinking.

Likewise, the House of Representatives has appropriated \$1,727,500 for the Committee on Un-American Activities, which I have supported. Yet, so far as I know, we have not changed the thinking of a single Communist.

If we are to reach the millions across the world and change Communists in their thinking and living, we in America must give a superior moral ideology which will answer the deepest needs of their hearts and homes, which will give them a valid hope for

a world of peace, plenty, and progress, and which will give each one of them a part in building that new world. But we cannot give such a moral ideology unless we live it first ourselves. Our weakness on the ideological front is related to the moral breakdown in our own country. The future depends not on what a few men decide to do in Europe, but on what a million men decide to be in America.

In summary, it seems that America has been relying on a three-dimensional defense, namely, political, economic, and military, to meet the U. S. S. R.'s four-dimensional threat. In addition to building strength on those three fronts, the Soviets have become experts in ideological warfare, the battle to capture the hearts and minds of men. Foreign Minister Vishinsky declared at a Soviet rally in East Berlin, "We shall win the next war not with atom bombs but with our superior brains, ideas, and doctrines." To meet this challenge we must implement the words of President Truman, who said, "The struggle for the minds of men is not separate and distinct from other elements of our foreign policy * * * It is as important as armed strength or economic aid."

Nehru Tells ADA India Also Seeks Survival of Freedom With Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I insert in the RECORD, under leave, a letter from Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, reassuring western liberalism that India has not faltered. On October 3 a letter to which 61 American liberals, including myself, had subscribed our names was dispatched to the Prime Minister, attempting to convey to him the doubts raised by India's seeming equivocation. Both that letter and the Prime Minister's reply are here presented for the reassurance of the American public.

Mr. JAMES LOEB, Jr.,
National Executive Secretary,
Americans for Democratic Action,
Washington, D. C.

My DEAR MR. LOEB. I have received the letter, dated October 3, signed by a number of distinguished American nationals, a copy of which you have been good enough to transmit to me through our Ambassador in Washington. I appreciate the spirit that prompted the signatories to address me as they have done.

India's foreign policy has been repeatedly explained by me in a number of speeches, including some that I delivered in the United States during my visit in the fall of 1949, a visit of which I have happy recollections. India's attitude toward aggression, from whatever quarter it may come, was explained by me in my address to the Congress of the United States of America, from which I quote the relevant passage:

"We have to meet aggression and to resist it and the force employed must be adequate to the purpose. But even when preparing to resist aggression, the ultimate objective, the objective of peace and reconciliation, must never be lost sight of, and heart and

mind must be attuned to this supreme aim, and not swayed or clouded by hatred or fear."

This remains India's position. Our policy is not neutralist but one of active endeavor to preserve and, if possible, establish peace on firm foundations. On fundamental issues, such as the liberty of the individual and the rule of law, there is no difference between India and other like-minded countries. It is only as regards the methods to be employed to achieve the purpose that you have felicitously described as "the survival of freedom with peace" that differences exist, and as I have explained at length in my public pronouncements, there is both room and justification for such differences. With the governments and peoples of the western democracies, we sincerely desire and ceaselessly work for full cooperation in the cause of liberty and peace.

Yours sincerely,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

YOUR EXCELLENCY. We, the undersigned American liberals, joined together 4 years ago to express publicly our common rejoicing that the Indian people had finally achieved their independence. We had long sympathized with the Indian struggle for nationhood. We had long looked to you, Pandit Nehru, and to the movement which you head to give moral as well as political leadership to the contemporary world, as your great teacher and comrade. Mahatma Gandhi, had previously done. We would be less than honest today if we did not confess that recent events have raised serious questions in our minds.

These questions are so grave that we cannot forbear laying them directly before you. The overriding moral question of our age, it seems to us, is the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. Freedom, it is true, remains too often still an aspiration; a free society may be defined only as a society where that aspiration has some real basis in hope and striving. But a totalitarian society must be defined as a society where that aspiration is wholly and cruelly extinguished. If the option of individual dignity is to be kept open, all men of good will must unite to check the spread of totalitarianism.

This is the moral problem of our age as we American progressives see it. We know that millions of Europeans see it in these same terms. We know that many Asians—including many Indians see it in these same terms. Yet, in this crisis which strikes at the roots of civilized survival, we are fearful that the Indian Government is following a policy which ignores this overriding issue.

We find it tragic indeed that a great people such as yours, having fought for generations, and fought successfully, for its own freedom, should now, having attained it, seem blind to the grave threat to freedom in other parts of the world.

We would make clear that we share your profound concern lest another world war should ravage the earth. The survival of freedom with peace is the supreme political problem of our times. We are confident, however, that the unity of the free nations in strength is the surest promise that war can be averted.

We appreciate too the special problems of India. We fully recognize that the form and manner of India's participation in the struggle against Soviet totalitarianism cannot be the same as that of nations in different geographical or military circumstances.

But India's present position in world affairs raises irresistible questions. Does your Government, in fact, see no moral issue between the democratic states and Soviet totalitarianism? Do you recommend your own present neutralist course to the ordi-

nary men and women of Europe and America? Or, as it sometimes appears to us, is your present course made possible by the shield raised against Soviet aggression by other nations?

Our sense of fellowship with progressive-minded Indians is as great as ever. We share with them the conviction that the present living standards of millions all over the world must be raised if freedom is to be defended, and we know that our own country must accept a major share in this responsibility. But we know, too, that this task will be impossible unless the peoples of the free world stand firm and united in opposition to Soviet aggression.

We have respected and welcomed the frankness with which you and other Indians have commented on American policy. By the same token, we feel that we would not be true to the vision of freedom we all share if we were not equally candid with others. It is in this spirit that we send this communication to you.

Following is a list of the signers of the letter to Prime Minister Nehru:

Jack Altman, vice president of United Wholesale and Retail Workers, CIO.

Ernest Angell, distinguished lawyer, national chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Paul H. Appleby, dean of the school of public administration, Syracuse University, former Under Secretary of Agriculture.

George Boldanz, vice president, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

Robert Bendiner, free lance writer, author of the Riddle of the State Department.

Andrew J. Biemiller, labor adviser to the Secretary of Interior, former Congressman from Wisconsin.

Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Dr. L. M. Birkhead, director of Friends of Democracy, Inc.

Wayne Coy, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, formerly administrative assistant to President Roosevelt.

A. Powell Davies, pastor of the All Souls Unitarian Church, Washington, D. C.

William H. Davis, distinguished attorney, former Chairman of the War Labor Board.

Emily Taft Douglas, formerly Congresswoman at Large from Illinois.

Paul Douglas, United States Senator from Illinois.

Angus Dun, Episcopal bishop, Washington, D. C.

Herman P. Eberharter, Congressman from Pennsylvania.

George Edwards, formerly president of the Common Council of the City of Detroit.

Maj. George Fielding Elliot, nationally known columnist.

Hugo Ernst, president, Hotel and Restaurant Workers, A. F. of L.

William T. Evjue, editor of the Capital Times, Madison, Wis.

George Field, director of Freedom House.

Rev. George B. Ford, Corpus Christi Church, one-time Catholic chaplain, Columbia University.

Walter K. Granger, Congressman from Utah.

Arthur Garfield Hays, distinguished attorney for American Civil Liberties Union.

Leon Henderson, former chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, former Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

Daniel W. Hoan, former mayor of Milwaukee.

Laura Z. Hobson, author of Gentlemen's Agreement.

Sal B. Hoffmann, president of the Upholstery Workers Union, A. F. of L.

E. Palmer Hoyt, editor of the Denver Post.

Hubert H. Humphrey, United States Senator from Minnesota.

Henry M. Jackson, Congressman from Washington.

Paul Kellogg, editor of Survey Graphic.

Arthur G. Klein, Congressman from New York.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, leader in the field of health insurance.

Alfred Baker Lewis, president, Union Casualty Insurance Co.

Howard Lindsay, well-known playwright and actor.

Francis McConnell, bishop of the Methodist Church.

Ralph McGill, editor, Atlanta Constitution and Journal.

B. F. McLaurin, international field organizer, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, A. F. of L.

Edgar Ansel Mowrer, foreign correspondent.

James F. Murray, United States Senator from Montana.

Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Reinhold Niebuhr, dean of Union Theological Seminary.

E. L. Parsons, Episcopal bishop, California.

Drew Pearson, newspaper columnist and radio commentator.

Ronald Reagan, president of the Screen Actors Guild, A. F. of L.

Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO.

Alex. Rose, president of the United Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union, A. F. of L.

William Scarlett, bishop of the Episcopal Church, St. Louis.

A. M. Schlesinger, professor of history at Harvard University.

A. J. Schlesinger, Jr., professor of history at Harvard University and author of the Age of Jackson and the Vital Center.

Boris Shishkin, chief economist of the American Federation of Labor.

James T. Shotwell, president emeritus, Carnegie endowment for international peace.

Lillian Smith, author of Strange Fruit and Killers of the Dream.

Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L.

Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois.

Benton J. Stong, legislative director of the National Farmers Union.

Richard L. Strout, Washington representative, Christian Science Monitor.

Robert E. Wagner, Jr., president of the Borough of Manhattan.

Arnold Zander, president of the State and County Municipal Workers Union, A. F. of L.

Max Zaritsky, former president of the United Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union, A. F. of L.

What the Kremlin Fears Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted to extend remarks, I hereby include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post:

WHAT THE KREMLIN FEARS MOST

(By Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, C. B., C. B. E., D. S. O.)

CROWBOROUGH, SUSSEX, ENGLAND.—Are not you in America somewhat blindly assuming

that the next war is going to be much like the last—a war of unconditional surrender enforced by the threat of annihilation? It would seem that you are, for you are pouring out your dollars on the production of lethal things as if you were a golden Niagara.

You are supreme at sea; you have already hundreds of warships in commission, besides great fleets in mothballs. You are supreme in the air, or soon will be, for your goal of 50,000 aircraft a year is steadily advancing. You have an army 1,000,000 strong, which in firepower and equipment is incomparably superior to any numerically equivalent Russian force. At no very distant date you will be turning out tanks at the rate of 100 a day. Probably by now you have stockpiled 1,000 atomic bombs and have in store other mass-destroying weapons quite unknown to the public. You have new types of rockets, new radar and new guided missiles; and atomic-powered artillery, nuclear-driven submarines and the hydrogen bomb are, so it would appear, not far around the corner.

You are spending on your Armed Forces more than 18 times as much as we are in Great Britain. Your industrial potential borders on the miraculous. You have, as it has well been said, "both guns and the whole cow," and the roar of your engines reverberates round the world. You are its modern Titans; soon in one brief battle you will be able to unleash the destructive energy of the whole of the last war. Nevertheless, do not forget that, in spite of their might, your classical prototypes ultimately landed themselves in Tartarus.

In assuming that the next war will primarily be a physical struggle, and that, therefore, physical force will be the open sesame of victory, are not you taking too much for granted? Out of your Volcanic lives cannot you set aside a bare half hour in which to ask yourselves the first of all military questions: What is the problem?

Apparently not, for you gaze into the Russian shop window, in which everything is decorated with the finel of propaganda, and for some inexplicable reason you shy off from boldly walking into the shop itself. Yet it is the things within it which will tell you what the problem is, and, should you spare a little thought, will suggest to you its answer.

Among other things in the window is displayed a map of the Bolshevik ideological empire. It is greater than Genghis Khan's, for it covers more than a quarter of the land surface of the globe, stretching from the Arctic Ocean to the Himalayas and the China seas and from the River Elbe to the Pacific. It includes about 33 percent of the inhabitants of the world. It also is titanic.

But were you to go into the shop itself, you would find that everything displayed in the window is a fake or a lie. For in 1917 Lenin introduced a new philosophy. He took the basic maxim of Western civilization—"The truth shall make you free"—and inverted it. Thus in the Bolshevik vocabulary every word is perverted; a lie is called the truth, and truth is denounced as a lie, police terror is called democracy, serfdom is called freedom, conquest is called liberation, subjection is called self-determination, and the Political Bureau of the Bolshevik Party is called the proletariat, in the interest of which all individual freedom and national rights are suppressed.

Why has this policy of confounding the meaning of words been adopted? The answer is: That the nations "may not understand one another's speech." It is the story of the Tower of Babel Bolshevikized.

The very name the Russian empire now bears—namely, Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics—is a lie; for the U. S. S. R. is not a union of republics as it is proclaimed to be; instead it is the compulsory serfdom of nearly 200 subjugated peoples, speaking different languages and stemming from different cultures, each one held in leash by terror. Yet in this there is nothing new, for as the pan-Slavism of Czarist Russia was but a catchword for Russian imperialism, so today communism is but the catchword for Bolshevik imperialism—the most ruthless the world has ever known.

FAILURE OF THE RUSSIAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Therefore communism is also a lie, it is but Marxian grease paint superimposed on a fundamentally unchanged historic Russian face. Though it is true that, in 1917, Lenin attempted to impose Marxist communism on Russia, by 1921 it had produced such confusion that to save himself he introduced his new economic policy. It was out of his failure and not out of his success that, under Stalin, there emerged a mixture of state capitalism and Asiatic despotism which, depending as it did on slave labor, was so inefficient that it could not compete with the so-called capitalist world—that is, with free enterprise. Therefore, in order that Bolshevism may survive, free enterprise must be destroyed. Today Marxist communism is solely for export, because it is the solvent of free enterprise, and its precipitate is chaos, the prerequisite for the establishment of a pistol-ruled (Bolshevik) world.

Except in the concentration camps, there are now no Communists in the U. S. S. R. Of its 193,000,000 inhabitants, some 3½ percent are state bureaucrats—a highly privileged class—and the remaining 96½ percent are state serfs who, unless free enterprise throughout the world is destroyed, may one day wake up to the fact that they are living under a lie, and, in consequence, liquidate their oppressors.

The crucial fact is that the Soviet Union cannot indefinitely continue to exist side by side with a system of vastly greater productivity, and how unproductive that union is may be seen in its low participation in world trade even before the upheaval of the last war. Though in 1938 the foreign trade of Finland and the Baltic States, with a combined population of under 10,000,000, amounted to \$536,000,000, with its then 170,000,000 inhabitants the foreign trade of the Soviet Union was \$74,000,000 less. Another pointer is to be found in the Berlin blockade. Why did the Kremlin impose it? The main reason was in order to prevent the Eastern Germans from seeing that Western Berlin was more prosperous than their own territory. It is its lies which so constantly dictate Soviet policy—and, in consequence, render it difficult for Western peoples of a totally different morality to understand.

The contents of the shop reveal that there is no unity within the U. S. S. R.; instead, discord both latent and active. Like the Turkish Empire of the nineteenth century, the U. S. S. R. is a mosaic of subjugated peoples. According to the 1939 Russian census, out of a total population of 170,467,186, 58 percent were Russian and 42 percent non-Russian. Also, as in the old Turkish Empire, the Kremlin is attempting to solve its problem of national assimilation by genocide—that is, by massacring and deporting the indigenous peoples of the subjugated countries as well as diluting them with those of Russian stock. The consequence is that, though discontent is normally inarticulate, it is nevertheless universal.

All refugees tell the same story: That the U. S. S. R. is seething with unrest and that behind the iron curtain everything is in ferment. Between August 1945 and August

1950, no fewer than 15,000 Russian officers and men deserted to Western Germany, and monthly around 20,000 Eastern Germans and others cross the Western German border. Another proof is the steady increase in the number of Soviet prisons. Not long ago, one of the refugees, a former director of Soviet prisons, stated that, "Whereas in 1920 there were 3,450 prisons in the Soviet Union, in 1950 the number had risen to 11,760."

Nor is the Russian Army unaffected. Since 1919 not only has its structure been shaken by contact with the west but many of its soldiers have become disillusioned. A typical case is that of Lieutenant Bystrov, who, in December 1950, deserted. Though before his desertion his first impressions of western standards were based on nothing better than prevailing conditions in Eastern Germany, they "produced on him," we read, "an enormous psychological shock," followed by a second when, on leave to his home in the Ural—a subjugated area—he compared what he had seen in Germany with the utter poverty and misery in which his relatives lived. Further, it should not be overlooked that 42 percent of Soviet Army recruits come from the subjugated peoples, and therefore inherit their discontents.

Though the Soviet Army is immensely powerful, it is no coincidence that, whenever the Kremlin has resolutely been faced up to, it has drawn in its horns. There are two reasons for this. The first is that its inmates have realized that, under present-day conditions, military occupation decides nothing—that, in fact, physical conquest is no longer a profitable affair—a question I will return to later on. The second is that they fear actual war like the plague. Not because the U. S. S. R. can easily be subdued by external force, but because war leads to internal disruption. This is a point of vital importance.

In the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5, it was not Japanese naval and military power which compelled Russia to accept the Peace of Portsmouth, it was the eruption of the revolutionary forces within her. Again, in World War I, it was not her defeat in the field which brought her to sign the ignominious Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; it was the astuteness of Lenin, who, cashing in on the ruthless treatment of the subjugated peoples by the Czarist regime, offered them liberation—fully intending, however, to resubjugate them once he had created a Bolshevik army. The result was that Czarist Russia disintegrated, 16 subjugated nations declaring themselves free and independent national states.

In World War II, no sooner did the German armies enter the Baltic States, Byelorussia—White Russia—and the Ukraine than they were acclaimed as liberators and vast numbers of Russian soldiers deserted to them. At the time, so encouraging was the German reception that Count Schulenburg, former German ambassador in Moscow, proposed that the invasion should be turned into a civil war in which the Russians themselves would help in overthrowing the Bolsheviks. He suggested that Germany should announce that she had no territorial claims; that she would agree to each conquered territory setting up its own local government, and that she would recognize these governments as her allies.

But Hitler's suicidal policy of "the complete extermination of the Ukrainian and the other East European peoples" prevailed. Instead of liberation, the destruction of the Ukrainian and other underground movements was ordered. The result was that for their self-preservation the subjugated peoples turned against the Germans.

This was the beginning of the collapse of the Third Reich, which was hastened by

Stalin's astuteness in adopting non-Bolshevik tactics, though, like Lenin, his intention was to discard them once the war was won. Had Hitler but offered the subjugated peoples freedom and self-determination, the high probability is that the U. S. S. R. would have collapsed before the end of 1941.

Besides not being able in wartime to rely on the loyalty of its subjugated peoples, the Kremlin is fearful of invading Western countries, because, should it do so, its soldiers will discover that the U. S. S. R., instead of being, as they have been brought up to believe, the most advanced country in the world, is one of its most backward, and that they are the victims of a gigantic lie. For this reason alone—though there are others—Stalin has been compelled to substitute what is called "cold" war for "hot." Its aims are: (1) To confuse the thought of Russia's adversaries by turning every argument upside down and reaping a propaganda value out of the confusion. (2) To rot her opponents internally by means of fifth columns, and discredit their democratic principles should they resort to repressive measures. (3) To compel them, by constant military threat, to expend such large sums on armaments that they will cripple their finances and undermine their economies. (4) To distract their military forces by drawing them into distant regions, such as Malaya, Indochina and Korea, in which only satellite troops are engaged.

For the Kremlin, cold war is the only type of aggressive warfare which fits Russian psychology. Its strategy is that of dissolution and not of destruction—the attack on the mind of the enemy in order to gain control over his body, and not on his body in order to influence his mind. It is not as with the Western powers, when they talk of psychological or political war, an auxiliary of actual war, but instead the real war—the decisive conflict.

In its outlook upon war, the Kremlin is far more up to date than its antagonists. It realizes that in modern industrial and scientific conditions, physical warfare is increasingly becoming mutually too destructive to be a profitable instrument of policy. As the last two World Wars have clearly shown, the victor comes off almost as badly as the vanquished, and this, politically, does not make sense.

We simply cannot ignore the fact that today cold war is increasingly ousting hot war as an instrument of policy and that unless we learn how to wage it in all its forms—political, ideological, economic, and military—so that in wartime we win over the allegiance of the enemy's masses instead of destroying them, the very means of destruction we employ will end in defeating us.

Now that we have inspected the contents of the Bolshevik shop, the question "What is the problem?" becomes clear. It is to frustrate the Kremlin's two-front strategy by adopting a two-front strategy of our own: (1) To be strong enough physically either to prevent the outbreak of war or, should war come, to be in a position to contain Russian military operations. And (2) under the cover of our physical forces, to be astute enough to wage a war of disintegration within the U. S. S. R. and its satellite countries, not only after the outbreak of war but from this very moment. Should its aim—successful counterrevolution within the U. S. S. R.—be attained without actual war, so much the better, but, war or no war, it will remain unattainable unless the war of disintegration is ultraoffensive.

Our existing solution of the problem—if "solution" it can be called—is ultradefensive because it is based on the conception of

containing communism, (1) by military action on fire-brigade lines wherever an aggression may take place, (2) by economic betterment in the Western countries in order to prevent communism from spreading, and (3) by building up what is called the Atlantic Alliance as the progenitor of a defensive Atlantic or European army.

Because it is a purely defensive policy, it leaves the initiative in the hands of the Kremlin. Worse still, it does not face up to realities. What is the use of a fire-brigade system as long as the fire raiser is left at large? Further, this dispersion of force emasculates the building up of an Atlantic Alliance, which is equally unrealistic, for it is based on regional planning involving over 50 committees, and includes France and Italy, countries with large Communist elements. As regards prevention of the spread of communism by economic improvement of the Western countries, it is excellent so far as it goes; yet it is frequently overlooked that economic betterment in itself can no more remove an ideology than filling an empty stomach can cure a deranged brain.

This confusion of defensive measures has fortified the policy of the knockout school—that the simplest way out of the tangle is to cut the Gordian knot. In other words, to rely on physical force alone. After all, have not we got the atomic bomb, and should the worst come to the worst, cannot we blow Russia to hell?

This, however, is a somewhat crude solution, for instead of curing the patient the world crisis—it knocks him on the head.

Though a sufficiency of force is the first half of the solution, the amount needed will depend as much on the moral state of the Russian peoples as on the strength of the Russian Army. The lower the first is, the weaker will the second be, and the weaker it is, the less will be the physical force required to vanquish it.

The second half of the solution centers in the unbearable Bolshevik rule, which has established a ready-made second front in every country behind the iron curtain. Wherever bolshevism is sown, antibolshevism can be reaped. For, though by terror a people can be compelled to obey their masters, they cannot be compelled to cease hating them.

Hatred is the uranium 235 of the second half, and without it its physical prototype remains purely a weapon of material destruction. And of all explosives, psychological fission is the one the Kremlin dreads most, because it glows the bottom out of its ideology. Therefore to turn the U. S. S. R. into a gigantic psychological bomb is the second half of the solution.

Thus far, this half has been almost entirely neglected by the western powers, yet it is by far the easier to arrive at, because the U. S. S. R., being ethnographically divided into Russians and non-Russians, is in consequence packed with psychological uranium.

In 1943 the representatives of the resistance movements then springing up among the conquered and subjugated peoples banded themselves together into an anti-Bolshevik block of nations—the A. B. N. Today it includes the following 25 countries—14 in the U. S. S. R. and 11 in Europe.

In the U. S. S. R.: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Estonia, Georgia, Idel-Ural—between the Volga and the Urals—Latvia, Lithuania, North Caucasia, Siberia (east and west), Tataria, Turkestan and Ukraina.

In Europe: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia and Slovenia.

The aim of the A. B. N. is the complete dissolution of the Soviet empire and the establishment of each part as a sovereign nation. The A. B. N. is, therefore, opposed to any form of Russian imperialism, whether czarist, Socialist, Democratic, Republican, or Communist. Nor will it tolerate any form of Russian federation, because it fears that whatever form it may take, it will inevitably lead to the reestablishment of a Russian hegemony.

Because in the Atlantic pact—however defective—is to be found the only potential first front against the Soviet Union, so in the A. B. N.—however lacking in organization it still is—is to be found the only potential second front. Together the two should constitute the grand strategical instrument of the Western powers, the one being as essential as the other, for neither without the other can achieve what should be the Western aim—not the containment of communism, but the complete elimination of Bolshevism, without which there can be no peace in the world.

From the value of the A. B. N. as a disruptive instrument, I will next turn to its ability economically and strategically to strangle the U. S. S. R. in another war.

The Ukraine, with a population stated to be 42,000,000, is the economic hub of the Soviet Union—this is why Hitler's aim was to wrench it from Russia. It supplies over 50 percent of the whole of Russian production, and there is no possibility of destroying the Bolshevik empire without severing the Ukraine from it. Still today a Ukrainian insurgent army, known as the U. P. A., is engaged in guerrilla war against the Kremlin.

The following percentages show the importance of the Ukraine and other subjugated countries to the over-all Soviet economy. Coal, 60 percent from the Ukraine and 9 percent from Turkestan; iron ore, 80 percent from the Ukraine and the Crimea, and 30 percent from Idel-Ural; manganese, 100 percent from Georgia and the Ukraine; copper, 40 percent from Turkestan and Caucasia, lead, 80 percent from Turkestan; zinc, 80 percent from Caucasia and the Ukraine; mercury, 100 percent from Turkestan and the Ukraine, and sulfur, 80 percent from the Ukraine, Caucasia, and Turkestan.

Almost the entire production of oil in the U. S. S. R. comes from non-Russian soil. Finally, as regards agricultural products, 33 percent of Russian wheat comes from the Ukraine and North Caucasia, 70 percent of the sugar is produced in the Ukraine, and 100 percent of the cotton is grown in Turkestan and Caucasia.

Therefore the conclusion is, should in wartime organized guerrilla war be fostered in the subjugated countries and adequately supplied by the western powers, the high probability is that the whole economy of the U. S. S. R. would collapse.

Historically Russia's strength has been based on two factors: the vast expanse of her territory and her vast manpower. This held good as long as weapon power remained simple and movements were governed by horse traction. But this is no longer the case, for weapon power has been industrialized and air power has reduced her expanse.

Communications in Russia have always been indifferent because expanse and movement are incompatibles. Even today there are no more than 57,487 miles of railroads in the U. S. S. R., whereas in Great Britain there are 19,863 and in the United States 227,000. Further, many of the Russian railroads are still single track, and because those linking the Pacific to the frontiers of Poland and Rumania pass through the subjugated Baltic States, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine,

they are open to sabotage in both peace and wartime.

In order to secure her industries—her arsenals—against air attack, Russia has adopted a policy of dispersion, but, seemingly, has overlooked that the remoteness of many of them from the more probable theaters of war permits present-day aircraft to cut them off from the latter by destroying the interlinking communications. Actually there would be no need to destroy the industrial centers themselves, for if the few main rail junctions in the U. S. S. R. are put out of action, the fewness of the railroads in most cases will render the deflection of traffic impossible.

Further still, the greater the dispersion, the more difficult does it become for the Russian air force to prevent the systematic destruction of either the industrial centers or the railroads leading to and from them. Relative to this, it should not be overlooked that, on account of climatic conditions as well as the great distances to be traveled, the replacement of railroad traction by motor transport will generally be out of the question. Also that, unlike the United States, the U. S. S. R. possesses no extensive system of pipelines for the distribution of oil and petrol.

The conclusions to be drawn from this strategical survey are: (1) That the technical equipment of Russia's fighting forces will be at its best at the opening of war, and should her railroads be paralyzed, it will rapidly deteriorate. And (2) because of this, it may be expected that, as in the past, Russia will rely on mass-manpower attacks in order to make good her technical deficiencies.

Clearly, then, adding to the demands on the Russian army within the U. S. S. R. will lead to its numerical reduction in the areas of operations, and this can be effected by the assistance of the subjugated peoples. For them, the expanse of the U. S. S. R., when coupled with outside air supply and assistance, facilitates revolt, which simultaneously will be difficult to suppress should rail communications be paralyzed. Also it should not be overlooked that a vast belt of labor and concentration camps, in which millions of slave workers are imprisoned, stretches across northern Siberia and Manchuria. The first of these areas is within transpolar air range of the United States, and the second at no great distance from Korea and Japan. All these camps are potential centers of revolt. Therefore the more the Kremlin can be compelled to garrison them the less numerous will be its troops in the areas of military operations.

When all these factors are considered, it will be seen that Russia's fighting manpower, great though it is, can as a whole no more be concentrated than can that of her opponents. Though the latter are an association of autonomous nations tending to diverge rather than to unite, the U. S. S. R., is a despotism of subjugated nations, forcibly united by terror, and inhibited by disruption. That, in fact, Russia is a giant with feet of clay, and that the more her fighting forces are dissipated on internal security, the more formidable do those of her opponents become.

I hope I have made it clear that, in order to overthrow the fire-raising colossus, the technical superiority of the western nations is not in itself enough. What they are lacking is not power to wage war, for though power may still be insufficient, there is no insuperable difficulty in rendering it sufficient. Instead, it is lack of faith in their way of life, and lack of courage in proclaiming it.

They must understand that the sword of liberty is but dead metal as long as it is

sheathed. It is because they fear to unsheathe it that they lack a positive policy concerning the nations forcibly and fraudulently incorporated into the Soviet Union. Yet without a positive policy they can never hope to exploit the seething discontent behind the iron curtain. Be it remembered that, without counting the subjugated peoples of the U. S. S. R., ten independent states of old Europe, inhabited by about 80,000,000 people, are now under Soviet domination. Of these millions and the millions more in the U. S. S. R., the vast majority are potential allies. Until the western nations openly proclaim them to be such, the sword of liberty will remain sheathed.

If the west is to gain the sympathies of the enslaved peoples, it must inspire them. To think in terms of the atomic bomb is autocratic; to think in terms of liberation is democratic, and though the atomic bomb has its uses, they must be weighed against the psychological effects they are likely to produce. To use this weapon indiscriminately is to repeat Hitler's blunder. The way in which it is used will determine whether the millions of enslaved peoples in Europe and the U. S. S. R. are to be the allies of the West or the unwilling defenders of Moscow. What they seek is liberation and not obliteration—let the western nations remember this.

Lastly, I will end with a concrete proposal. Because from past history there is no reason to suppose that a change of regime in Moscow will call a halt to the age-old urge of Russian expansion, the aim of the Western Powers should coincide with the aim of the A.B.N. This means that the Soviet Empire must be dealt with as was the Turkish—that is, split up into its component parts, each part becoming an independent country.

The first step toward achieving this end is the formation of all freedom-loving peoples on both sides of the iron curtain into a common anti-Bolshevik front. The second is the creation of a psychological-warfare general staff which will give teeth to this union. It should comprise three main branches—operations, intelligence, and supply.

The duties of the first should be to plan and organize partisan activities within all subjugated countries, and train refugees and form them into the nuclei of national armies, around which the enslaved peoples can build up their fighting forces on or after the outbreak of war.

The duties of the second should be to collect and coordinate information gathered by the underground movements; train intelligence agents for work not only behind the iron curtain but also in all countries which in wartime may be overrun by the Russians, so that guerrilla war may be organized in their rear, and by intensive propaganda keep the spirit of counterrevolution alive.

The duties of the supply branch should be to make ready on a vast scale all the requirements of guerrilla warfare; the provision of arms, ammunition, explosives, medical stores, rations, radios, and so on, as well as earmark the aircraft needed to carry them and also personnel to prearranged dropping points, so that, when the flag falls, the psychological bomb may be detonated from the Arctic shores to the Mediterranean and from the Pacific to the Elbe.

If these things are done, the western nations need have no fears. But, if they are not done, though the west may win the next war, in its winning it will reap its own destruction and may well end in Bolshevizing the world.

The Seriousness of Maliciously Vilifying and Abusing Governmental Officials Should Be Publicly Rebuked—Malfeasance on the Part of Public Officials When Proven Is a Monstrous Thing—A Free-Thinking People, However, Have Not Failed to Note That Misbranding of Accusers Must Also Be Reproved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 19, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the tax system of these United States is a voluntary system. While it might seem to some that taxes are paid under duress, nevertheless the fact is that all taxes paid under our system of government, whether Federal, State, or local, are as voluntary as are the contributions made to the American Red Cross or our local Community Chest. If ever the American people should lose faith in their public officials, that system of voluntarily supporting their government will fail.

Mr. Speaker, it is, therefore, necessary that when irregularities occur with respect to the payment or the collection of taxes, either on the part of any person or group of persons, diligent investigatory studies should be made to see whether that individual or that group has paid a proportionate share of the cost of running the Government, as laid down in the law by the representatives elected by the people to determine what the cost of Government at a specific level should be.

If there are those who disagree with what the cost of Government should be, it is not their privilege to withhold any part of the tax legally levied against them. However, it is their privilege to change the representatives whom they elected to make ascertainment and determination as to what amount of taxes should be paid by each individual or corporation.

So that, again I say, whenever wrongdoing becomes apparent, investigation should be made to determine just who is at fault.

Mr. Speaker, during the last several months, the case of the Government against certain internal revenue collectors alleged to have been guilty of malfeasance has recently given rise to another crime investigation by a committee of this House.

With respect to who should conduct the investigations now taking place, that is another matter. Of a certainty, the Congress should make investigation whenever it feels that wrong is being done, but it should make all ascertainment with a view to reaching conclusion as to how to legislate in order to prevent alleged irregularities and crime.

This, unfortunately, is not always the case. Too often investigations are started altogether on a personal or a partisan basis, and very often solely and purely for political purposes, or by those who seek personal preferment and aggrandizement—to gain public attention and further their own selfish ends.

I well remember years ago a life insurance investigation conducted by a young attorney, Charles Evans Hughes, which resulted in making him Governor of New York. Because of such a start, Mr. Hughes later distinguished himself as one of the most prominent men in the United States.

Governor Tom Dewey, another special district attorney, rode to the governorship as a result of a good press agent attached to an investigation which Mr. Dewey conducted principally on political connection with the petty numbers racket. As a result of this he attained national prominence and was several times nominated for President of the United States.

More recently, we have heard great criticism about the ethics of one of our colleagues making what were alleged to have been huge profits on a book which he published with respect to his investigation. In the meantime, the committee counsel of that investigation turned from the practice of law and became a television star. He is now on a fair way to becoming the president of the Council of New York City, with a job paying him \$25,000 a year.

Insofar as congressional investigations are concerned, to drag any citizen before a television audience, across the headlines of the daily press, or in any other manner expose him to shame, or make a public exhibition of him, for personal or political gain, whether he be a private citizen or a public official, is something that we in this body should really legislate against.

With the multiplicity of investigations that marks the current fashion of various committees in both Senate and House, it does seem that the Federal Government is not now so much a government of the administration of the law by executive departments—as it has become a government of investigation by the Congress.

As one of our colleagues in the cloak room said not long ago, if we are going to keep on increasing congressional investigations now seemingly convening all over the United States, as well as abroad, we might as well turn the Capitol and our legislative duties over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, let the FBI take over our duties and offices, while we in the House and Senate move down to Ninth and Pennsylvania Avenue, and take over the duties of the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, nearly all the efforts that have been put forth to date have been instigated merely to cast aspersion upon the names and reputations of various and sundry public officials concerned mainly with the executive department of Government. The men who have fallen prey to the name calling and the

vituperation constitute a veritable catalog of the highest officials, and more or less include every Government worker in the United States.

It just so turns out that the effort to smear up and to stink up everybody connected with the administration has not been as astutely carried out as it might have been, and the results to date have certainly been singularly unconvincing.

This approach to a political campaign has many disturbing implications, for it has already been demonstrated that there is little public interest and no other than strong political interest in what the headlines were screaming just a few months ago.

Oh, yes, there were a few indictments for perjury of the so-called 5-percenters, but when the issue was all threshed out, the Congress did little or nothing about it, because there was nothing that they should do.

When real consideration was given to the matter, it was found that the small American businessman is entitled to sell his goods to the Federal Government, that he cannot afford to keep a highly paid representative in Washington to do the job. And to what end? It was found that he pays some local salesman a commission for selling Fuller brushes and other goods, whether he sells them to a housewife on her back porch, or to some Government purchasing official in a plush office who buys millions of dollars worth of goods.

Of course, there would be prosecutions, yes, and convictions, if there was graft involved, or overpayments, or any other illegalities; but when the congressional investigators were all done with the 5 percenters, the only thing that happened was that someone named John Maragon was found guilty and went to prison for perjury.

There was a tremendous lot of bombast about irregularities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. No one on the investigators' staff ever took the time to tell you that no business concern ever got an RFC loan unless there was a sworn affidavit made by the borrower that the local bank or banks could not legally make this loan in order to keep the business in operation. Therefore, as provided by law, these borrowers made application to the RFC.

Neither did they who concerned themselves mainly with discrediting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its officials take time to tell the public that during a single year, from every State in the Union, as well as from Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, there came to the RFC 11,127 applications for business loans, that 4,559, totaling \$595,647,000 were approved, and that, pending as of December 30, 1950, there were 1,686 further loans, aggregating \$433,866,000.

To state it simply, last year about 5,000 business firms, large and small, together with thousands of employees, were saved from bankruptcy by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and without the cost of a single penny to the Govern-

ment of the United States. Moreover, the RFC has never cost the Government one cent; rather, since its inception, it has earned more than \$600,000,000 over and above all operating costs on the interest paid by borrowers on the loans which they obtained. That \$600,000,000 profit is a profit for the taxpayers of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, despite all that we heard about pastel mink coats and so-called commissions, I do not know of a single grand jury in the United States that indicted anybody for anything connected with the RFC matter, and for the simple reason that nobody ever received a single penny in commission from the RFC. Whatever was paid was paid by the borrowers, and that was their private business.

If a small businessman, or, for that matter, a big business house, needs financial assistance and furnished by the RFC, the RFC gets all their money back with interest. If the borrower paid anybody any commission, big or little, it was paid out of his own pocket, it was nobody's business to whom he paid it, unless that man was an official of the United States Government.

The RFC loaned the borrower the money. They charged them the legal rate of interest, and they got the money back from the borrowers. At no time in all of the investigations was there any intimation of any RFC official taking any graft. In one instance, somebody in St. Louis admitted that someone else had sent him an 8- or 10-pound Smithfield ham as a Christmas present, and that little incident made as much publicity as I got when one of my tenants, who makes his living running an apiary, killed a bear that had been eating his honey, and sent me the carcass of the bear. What the papers did not tell was that I sent that bear carcass to a local hospital where it was sold for the benefit of the patients.

We also heard a lot of bombast in the press about a White House stenographer—this one was called a secretary—who made the headlines for receiving a pastel or some other kind of a mink coat from some friend of her husband.

Then there was all that talk about perverts and Communists. That all seemed to revolve around oddments of political propaganda, fueled and refueled in order to keep the Nation stirred up.

The utter collapse of all of these politically inspired charges, pursued with such high-powered methods, have, in the past 18 months, on too many occasions, proven reckless and irresponsible.

The fact that they have gone with the summer sun exhibits the utter collapse of any sound or relevant charges against the statesmanship, competency, and foresight of the Truman administration.

The seriousness of maliciously vilifying and abusing governmental officials should be publicly rebuked. Malfeasance on the part of public officials when proven is a monstrous thing. A free-thinking people, however, have not

failed to note that misbranding of accusers must also be reprov'd.

The remarkable thing about a government such as ours is that we have so few rather than so many malefactors. This is especially true in view of the fact that we have so far extended the activities and services which we afford to our people.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of a southern constituency to the Congress of the United States, I and my people have had serious differences with respect to certain States' rights and other issues enunciated by President Harry Truman. But neither I nor any one of my constituents has for one single moment ever impeached the integrity of our President, for I and everyone in the First District of Alabama hold him to be a true American citizen of probity, honor, and character. While I have cast my vote against measures which he has recommended to the Congress, likewise, I have voted with him on all matters upon which my constituents and I, as their Representative, thought that he was right.

Mr. Speaker, God knows that our President has had a tough, difficult, administration; many of the vexatious problems being such as would have tried the soul of any man. I do not know how many Cabinet members, "little cabinet" members, internal-revenue collectors, Federal district attorneys, judges, port collectors, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine officers, and postmasters that the President has appointed to office. I know that the numbers must run upwards of a million or more, and when I think of the very few bad eggs that have been exposed among them, I am reminded of the fact that a few such dishonorable men are bound to creep into any body politic. I often think of the Great Master himself, and of how one of his little band of 12 became a cheat, a fraud, yes, even a traitor. Then I take heart in the small per centum of those who became a Judas Iscariot to Harry Truman. The percentage is still greatly in favor of the President, for it is but a small fraction of 1 percent compared with the percentage that turned on the Master himself.

There are real issues existing in America which all men could and should face. The situation that exists today cannot be blamed on political parties, nor can any one political party solve these problems by the application of some pat formula.

The real leaders in America sense that there is a condition existent that cannot exactly be resolved or coped with in terms of pure political philosophy or party platforms. Hence, the conservative leaders of both parties have little to say.

The demagogues, on the other hand, kick off with the premise that everyone in the opposition party is a crook. They imply that both hands of every man in public office is itchy with graft and corruption.

One fact that is crystal clear is there will be a national tragedy for both po-

litical parties and the people of these United States of ours if, in the abortive attempts to destroy the reputation and the character of our public officials and the Congress, this Nation should lose its freedom by the destruction of faith of the American people in the Government itself.

Let all hold the mirror up to truth and they will discern that they are themselves without a palliative program which can be put into operation at home or abroad—one that will today solve the problems that confront the world.

The enemies of this administration are simply making a play to take over the affairs of Government simply by asking the people to put the Democrats out and let them in. It is indisputable that the voters of the United States can be counted on to answer that sort of a plea at the polls in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the Congress, we were given to understand that, due to some alleged irregularities of conduct on the part of certain district revenue collectors in New York, St. Louis, San Francisco, and elsewhere, that one of our House committees was going into that situation with a view to reporting to us on the same.

The name of the good, beloved, respected, and trusted friend of you, sir, and of a majority of the Members of this House, the Honorable Theron Lamar Caudle, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, was in some manner injected into that discussion. Taking exception to what my colleague had stated, I pointed out that in his present capacity as Assistant Attorney General, Lamar Caudle has nothing whatever to do with United States internal revenue cases, and that he will have nothing to do with them unless it is shown by investigation that there has been a violation of the internal revenue law by failing to file or by way of the falsification of the returns in case they did file.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know Lamar Caudle, and we have been knowing him good, and for a long, long time. I am sure that you all will agree with me, sir, that when it comes down to official acts with respect to the high duties which he discharges, that friendship stops on the threshold of his office, for I have never in all my life known a man who could and does lay truth down so quickly on the line more than does Theron Lamar Caudle.

I hold it to be unspeakable conduct on the part of anybody in these United States to assassinate the character of any man, woman, or child, for, to paraphrase the Bard of Avon:

Good name in man or woman * * * is the very life of the soul * * * for he who steals my purse, steals trash—'twas mine—but now 'tis his, and it will be slave to thousands. But he who robs me of my good name, robs me of that which enriches him not—but makes me poor indeed.

And so, I repeat that it is unthinkable that men should drag the name of a Caudle through the mud and besmirch a

man whose family and kinfolk are a tradition in the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the name of Caudle and the name of Boykin have been names that have come down through the pages of history long before the Government of this Nation was established.

Both the Caudles and the Boykins entered this country by way of the Colony of Virginia, and the name of Stephen Caudle is written into the poll list of Brunswick County, Va., away back in 1748, more than a quarter of a century before they rang the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. That reference is verified in volume 26, page 26, William and Mary College.

The name of Edward Boykin, who came over from Wales, settled in the Isle of Wight County in Virginia in 1685. Mr. Speaker, that is 265 years ago, or nearly 100 years before the establishment of this Nation.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Boykins and the Caudles have been kin to one the other all of their lives, and that the Caudles were always good people, that no Caudle was ever capable or would stoop to do harm to or commit a crime against any man or any principle, or against any institution of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is no man in America more beloved, more respected by those who know him than is Theron Lamar Caudle, Assistant Attorney General of these United States.

Lamar Caudle comes from an old line of famous North Carolina jurists and lawyers, and possesses a background of experience which eminently qualifies him for his new position as assistant attorney general in charge of the criminal division in the Department of Justice.

Mr. Caudle's grandfather and father, T. L. Caudle, Sr., were learned and distinguished in the law. His father, at the time of his death, was president of the North Carolina Bar Association. His mother, Susie Gooch Caudle, now deceased, was a direct descendant of Sir William Gooch the first Governor of Virginia.

Theron Lamar Caudle was born on June 22, 1904, and reared in Wadesboro, N. C. He attended high school in Wadesboro, and was president of his class each of the 4 years. He obtained his LL. B. degree at Wake Forest College under the noted Dean N. Y. Gulley, who had also taught his father. He is a member of the Phi Kappa Alpha and the Golden Bough. He is a member of the executive committee of the North Carolina Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, I need tell few men in this House of the lovely lady he married, Miss Fairfid Monsalvatge, or of their four children, Lamar, Rose, Tommy, and Fairfid, Jr.

Lamar Caudle was named in honor of a close kinsman, the distinguished L. Q. C. Lamar, lawyer, educator, Senator, member of the Cabinet of President Cleveland, and Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Caudle has long been regarded as one of the most vigorous United States district attorneys in the country. He has served as United States attorney since 1940, when he received his appointment through the recommendation of the then Attorney General, Robert H. Jackson. Prior to his Federal appointment, Lamar Caudle had enjoyed a State-wide, general legal practice, and had served for 8 years—1932 to 1940—as solicitor of Anson County, N. C. He began the practice of law with his father, working with him from 1926 to 1929, and then joined the firm of Robinson, Caudle & Pruitt.

From the very hour he assumed the post of prosecutor of Federal law violations in western North Carolina, he has maintained a notable reputation among the legal profession, the public, and the press for his vigorous and fair conduct of trials.

Due to the heavy burden of cases in the large territory covered in that judicial district, it was divided into two sections with one office in Charlotte and another in Asheville. Mr. Caudle was in charge of both offices, and he has tried hundreds of criminal cases, along with attending to an enormous volume of civil matters engaging the court's attention.

His excellent record as an effective and considerate prosecutor came to the favorable attention of the Department of Justice in Washington, and a well-deserved promotion resulted.

He has since served as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, a position left vacant by the promotion, and upon the recommendation of the Honorable Tom C. Clark to Attorney General.

As head of the Criminal Division, Mr. Caudle had direct charge of the prosecutions of all Federal offenses. Among them were espionage, sabotage, violations of the Selective Service Act, war frauds, bank robbery, kidnapping, offenses affecting interstate commerce, election frauds, Hatch Act violations, and violations of the narcotic laws. And no man ever served in that high office has ever established a better record of public service than did he.

Any man of his profession should be proud Lamar Caudle's achievement in having prosecuted many thousands of cases before the bar of justice, and, certainly, in so doing he has made some deadly enemies.

Mr. Speaker, Lamar Caudle is not just proud of his record as a prosecutor; he is not the type that wants merely to win a case. His is the rightful desire to see that justice is done; and, as for his enemies, the Nation is proud with him for the enemies that he made.

It is altogether unfortunate that in 1945 Lamar Caudle, and as Assistant Attorney General in the discharge of his official duties, defended the action of denying the Department file to congressional review. It was in the discharge of his duty that he pointed out that the absolute secrecy required to keep avenues of investigation open on suspected persons could not properly be kept open

if the files were released. Then, too, there was the matter of affording protection to unfortunates who are named in the reports, as well as the FBI investigators who themselves would also be destroyed, were we not to follow that course of action, Mr. Caudle pointed out.

And so 7 years later again comes demand that these files be opened. I recall Mr. Caudle's having made a statement years ago that the major problem of the Department of Justice is not in gathering information, but in making legal convictions under the law. Very distinctly do I remember his telling me that, in his studied opinion, congressional investigational committees have done a real service to the Nation inasmuch as perjury, contempt charges, arising from testimony taken before a congressional hearings and FBI agents, have enabled the conviction of many Communists and other subversive groups who would not otherwise have been liable to legal action.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking of communism—or, should I say, in talking of Americanism—I know of no man in America that has given more of his time—in the evenings, Sundays, and holidays—to expounding the principles of our American institutions and exposing the danger of communism to the American way of life than does Lamar Caudle.

He and his good wife have been lavish in the expenditure of their time and their own money, traveling hither and yon, both lecturing on the subject of communism versus Americanism in all parts of the Nation.

I, too, well remember, for it seems almost yesterday, when Lamar Caudle took his first real vacation in more than 10 long, laborious years in the Federal service. Having personally spearheaded the drive to induce Italian citizens in this country to write letters to their home-folks in Italy pointing out the dangers of communism and the beauties of our own American way of life, it was only natural that he should tell me of his great joy in having at the one time his first prolonged holiday and his first European trip. He told me he was going to spend his vacation in Italy studying, as he said, the threat of the dangers of communism being openly asserted in that democratic country to overcome the forces of democracy.

Upon his return he was more than enthusiastic about his journey. He was enthused by the fact that some committee of Italians had asked him to take the place on some important committee of one of the greatest Italian-Americans that ever lived, Mr. Luigi Giannini, the founder of the Bank of Italy in California, and now the Bank of America, the second largest financial institution in the United States.

I shall never forget the refreshing love of America reflected upon Lamar Caudle's countenance as he told me of a school of communism which he had visited where he actually saw in free Italy an institution linked strongly and openly to the Kremlin in Moscow operating in a schoolhouse not far from Rome.

I remember, also, his telling me of the splendid conference he had with the Minister of Defense of Italy whose name I do not recall. More particularly do I recall his telling me of his audience with Pope Pius XII, and of how surprised he was to note the intimate knowledge of His Holiness with respect to the vexatious questions in our country, and also with respect to the various officials in the United States.

He told of Pope Pius XII's appreciation of the fight President Truman and Americans are making on all fronts to preserve the peace of the world, and of the great things that are being accomplished in this country by persons of all faiths in fighting the ungodliness taught by communism almost within the shadows of the Vatican itself.

"FRANK," he said, "you know it is a strange thing that the Catholic Church, when it chooses to select a Pope, always selects a man of matured age and judgment—might I even say, an old man—and I was indeed surprised to hear this aged prelate discuss so intimately so many things about our own country and our public officials, and especially about my own boss, Howard McGrath."

Mr. Speaker, I want to establish the fact that there is no man in these United States who, to my knowledge, has ever done a finer or a better job in what he was charged to do than has Lamar Caudle.

When Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt nominated Lamar Caudle as United States district attorney for the western district of North Carolina, that district had the lowest rating in the office of the Attorney General in Washington of any district in the United States. When he left it to come to Washington at the request of President Truman in 1945, that district vied with two others for the highest rating of any district in the country. It was purely because of his splendid work that Attorney General Tom Clark recommended to President Truman that Lamar Caudle be named the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, and it was purely because of the record which he established in the Criminal Division that caused his advancement and retention by the present Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, may I say—and in order to keep the record straight—that as Assistant Attorney General and head of the Tax Division, Lamar Caudle has no more to do with investigating the derelictions of the collectors of internal revenue than do you, sir.

The Tax Division of the Department of Justice, as headed by Lamar Caudle, has no knowledge whatever of any specific tax cases under investigation. The Tax Division of the Department of Justice has nothing whatever to do with any matter in the Bureau of Internal Revenue until it has been referred by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the Tax Division, of Justice, for prosecution.

Moreover, in his present capacity and in the office in which he has served for the last 2 years, he has no jurisdiction

over internal revenue tax cases or collections, except civil litigation, until and unless some individual or corporation breaches the law, either in failure to file, makes false return, or otherwise violates the statutes.

In that case I need not tell any Member here in this body that swift legal and just prosecution will follow, for before the bar of justice Lamar Caudle has neither friend or foe. His duty there is to his God and country.

The malefactors of the country know that when brought to a United States Tax Court that Theron Lamar Caudle, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, is the bulldog, determined prosecutor, who has never been known to swerve from the strict line of impartial prosecution.

An Open Letter to the Republican National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am appending copy of letter delivered to members of the Republican National Committee at their meeting in St. Louis on December 7, 1942. It sounds like the voice of prophesy and is just as applicable today as it was 9 years ago. Because the Republican National Committee failed to heed the advice and warning in this letter, the Republican Party has lost three national presidential elections, and is in a fair way to lose another in 1952, if its leaders fail to wake up.

PARTY MUST STAND FOR SOMETHING

To merit the confidence of the American people, the Republican Party must stand for something. It must stop trying to "work both sides of the street." It must stop pussy-footing, fence-straddling, and "me-too'ing."

It must stand four-square for the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and States' rights; and for a Government of law rather than a Government by puny, irresponsible men who would twist and construe the Constitution to conform to their alien ideologies.

REPUDIATE PSEUDO REPUBLICANS

It must repudiate the attempted leadership of left-wingers, one-worlders and New Dealers who, masquerading as Republicans, have been elected to public office as Republicans and are destroying the party from within. Internationalism is the antithesis of loyal Americanism.

The Republican Party must pledge itself to get us out and keep us out of entangling foreign alliances; and to bring an end to international boondoggling at the expense of the American taxpayers.

SOUND MONEY AND A PROTECTIVE TARIFF

It must declare for a sound redeemable currency; and for a tariff adequate to protect labor, industry, agriculture, and mining. Currency that is not redeemable is fiat-money, destined to become worthless. Free trade is possible only between nations and peoples that enjoy the same standard of living. Free trade will not bring the other 94 percent of the world's population up to our standard of living, but will drag us down to theirs.

MONEY IS MEASURE OF VALUE

Money is the measure of the value of all goods and services. Unless that measure is honest, constant, and invariable, millions of people will be cheated in the sale of their goods and services, while others will profit unjustly. Of such injustices are wars and depressions made.

THE ROAD TO PEACE AND SECURITY

The establishment of a sound, honest, dependable monetary system which will maintain and protect the solvency and integrity of the people's money and guarantee the redemption of currency at face value, on demand, will do more to prevent war, establish justice, insure economic stability, and promote peace and harmony among nations than all the United Nations, Marshall Plans, Atlantic Pacts, or point 4 programs ever devised.

Those who oppose or would delay the adoption of a sound monetary system are playing right into the hands of the Communists and international racketeers who are selling America down the river.

And a final word of warning to the leaders of the Republican Party: McCarthyism has come to mean opposition to subversives in government, and you can't laugh that off or shrug it off.

The prophetic letter referred to above, written by Paul O. Peters, editor of the Washington News Bulletin, follows:

To the Members of the Republican National Committee:

GENTLEMEN: You are assembling in St. Louis, on December 7, to choose a new chairman. The selection of a chairman is but a preliminary step that will be interpreted by the press and the public as indicative of the Republican Party's stand upon the paramount issue confronting not only the Republican Party but the Nation as a whole.

This issue is a grave one—do not be confused.

Plainly speaking, the issue is a choice on the one hand, between our own republican form of government based upon economic nationalism, States' rights, self-sufficiency, with the guaranty of the maximum enjoyment of individual liberty and freedom of initiative, or on the other hand, some polyglot form of government, semi-communistic in style, with economic internationalism as its goal and the initiative and liberties of the people curbed by some form of bureaucratic dictatorship.

The issue is not a complicated one, but is made so to appear by the skillful maneuvering of those who would betray this Nation and deliver its people up to some world supergovernment.

However complicated the fundamentals seem now, rest assured, gentlemen, the real issue will be brought into the open, and quickly.

The American people will not knowingly allow the Republic to be submerged by an overwhelming debt burden piled on by an ever-expanding bureaucracy. Neither will they knowingly allow alien-ism ideals to further displace the high and native ideals of the founding fathers.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish in the United States without a desperate struggle on the part of those who believe in government by laws and equal justice under law.

We mention no names and make no suggestions as to whom shall lead tomorrow.

Yours is a great trust and a great obligation.

You may be deceived yourself, but no man or group of men can long conceal from the people any course that is not first, last, and all the time purely American.

The Republican Party, therefore, cannot clasp to its bosom, and claim as kin, those who stand with one foot in the camp of the economic internationalists and the other foot resting on the remnants of the Constitution.

Neither can the label Republican be applied to those who reach out the hand of comradeship to the dictators of Europe, Asia, and South America, while deftly reaching into the pockets of the American taxpayers with the other.

More than 2 years ago, the party was asked to veer to the right, to say farewell to the Knoxes, the Stimsons, the Willkies.

That appeal fell on deaf ears.

On November 3, the people spoke in no uncertain terms.

The victory at the polls was not a Republican Party victory—do not be misled by the results.

It was a protest against things the American people do not want and will not have.

At the same time it was a vote of confidence in constitutional government, and the American way of life.

PAUL O. PETERS

NOVEMBER 29, 1942

Further Inquiries To Be Made of Alien Property Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement prepared by me regarding the Office of Alien Property.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WILEY ANNOUNCES FURTHER INQUIRIES TO BE MADE OF ALIEN PROPERTY OFFICE—"Is It A SUPERGRAVY TRAIN?"

(By HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

Mr. President, there are few agencies in the Federal Government today which are less well known but which are more powerful than the Office of Alien Property, a division of the United States Department of Justice. This Office carries out the authority and powers of the Federal Government concerning

blocked and vested alien property, as delegated to the Attorney General by Executive Order No. 9788, of October 14, 1946, and Executive Order No. 9899, of August 20, 1948. These orders were in turn issued under the authority of the trading-with-the-enemy law, as amended.

THE SPECIFIC ISSUE AND THE LARGER ISSUE

In recent months I have pointed to what I regarded as certain questionable aspects of the Office of Alien Property.

This whole subject was precipitated by an amendment to House Joint Resolution 289, which I had introduced in order to provide a day in court for certain individuals—American citizens—who I believe had been treated unfairly by the Federal Government. Because of the strange, obstinate resistance of the Office of Alien Property, which refused to allow such a day in court (an elementary right which I for one regard as basic to American liberty), the issue of this single case—General Dyestuff Corp.—Ernest Halbach—has come to symbolize a still vaster issue—the whole question of how the Office of Alien Property has as a whole been administered. Thus, irrespective of the ultimate outcome of the particular issue which helped to precipitate this whole discussion, I for one feel that the time is long overdue for a thorough look-see into the operations of that Office.

Yes, had the particular General Dyestuff (GDC) issue already been favorably resolved in a manner that the sponsors of the amendment proposed, that would not have basically diminished the over-all issue.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS AT STAKE

In recent months there has been a tremendous and well-justified hue and cry over maladministration in certain other governmental agencies. In some of these agencies comparatively small sums of money have been involved, and yet there have been abuses of public trust. Yet in the Office of Alien Property there is being dealt with assets valued at over \$341,000,000 as of the date of vesting. I repeat that figure—\$341,000,000. This includes \$169,000,000 in stocks, bonds, and similar interests, \$11,000,000 in patents, copyrights, and trade-marks, \$7,000,000 in real property; \$61,000,000 in personal property; \$82,000,000 in estates and trusts. Broken down statistically the assets include over 42,000 patents and 500,000 copyrights alone.

Ponder the possibilities for abuse of power implicit in those figures.

The special GDC-Halbach issue which came up involved rather sizable assets in itself.

MISINTERPRETATIONS OF GDC ISSUE

Unfortunately, there was a good deal of misinterpretation of this GDC-Halbach issue. A number of folks, particularly in the newspaper profession, folks who are well-intentioned; folks who I believe have no ax to grind, but are simply interested in serving the public welfare, (which is, of course, my only concern) swallowed the Alien Property Office's line and came to feel that the amendment to House Joint Resolution 289 was unjustified. I respect the rights of these newspaper folks—or the right of anyone—to differ with me.

I have already publicly described the facts regarding my own interest in the amendment, how it had come about; how the Foreign Relations Committee defeated my amendment, and then with Democratic and Republican sponsorship, how, introduced a revised amendment, etc.

I think that the newspapermen to whom I presented these facts were rightly satisfied that my own interest in the matter was 100 percent based on what I felt to be the rights of American citizens. I am no defender of cartels, particularly cartels which have

been instrumental in opposing the national policy and defense of our country. However, I do not believe that any American citizen, regardless of his personal background or alleged background, should be deprived of his rights.

In any event, I shall continue to press for legislative authorization for the day in court which was the whole substance of the original and revised amendment.

But my main concern must necessarily remain with the infinitely larger public issues which have now emerged to the fore. Has the Alien Property Office been administered soundly? Has that administration been faithful to the public trust?

"FINANCIAL EMPIRE BUILDING" BY INSIDERS

I respectfully submit that even the relatively few facts known thus far in answer to these questions, shed a deep cloud over parts of that office. These facts point to certain juicy and apparently unjustified appointments to directorships, to other offices, to legal counsel functions. These facts relate to the peculiar nature of certain sales—past and prospective—of alien property. They relate to what some observers have characterized as hidden plans of ambitious individuals who have been and/or are now in the Office of Alien Property—plans to build up private financial empires by inside sales of resources which are now owned in the name of the American people.

When I discussed the GDC-Halbach case, I bore in mind those facts along this line which had already come to my attention.

In the back of my mind, too, was the recollection that an Alien Property Custodian had been sent to prison after World War I because of violation of the confidence of the American people.

MANY ANONYMOUS LETTERS HAVE ARRIVED

Following my initial comments in the press on this issue, I started to receive a great deal of confirmatory data as to suspicious activities within that agency. I received letters, postal cards, visits, and phone calls, many of them from leading attorneys—of both political parties—in Washington and elsewhere. Some of the messages came anonymously, unfortunately.

I am not one who believes in placing undue credence in anonymous messages. I think that where an individual has something substantial to say, he ought to have the courage to put his name and address on it. Nevertheless, it is merely stating a simple fact when I point out that a great many leads on a great many important investigations have come from anonymous "tips."

I have sorted out from those anonymous "tips" which I have received what I regarded as worthless messages from cranks, from individuals with no substantive knowledge, but with merely perhaps some personal spite in mind. There remained a residue of messages—many from folks inside the Alien Property Office. These messages added up to what I feel to be a directive. The directive or mandate is this:

"Get the facts on the Alien Property Custodian Office for the American people. Find out what has been going on there."

For example, some of the messages have run along these lines:

"Senator WILEY, look into this particular financial arrangement as regards corporation X. You will find peculiar inside dealings. You will find names associated with that corporation (particularly its legal affairs) which will be very interesting to the American people."

Remember, the annual report of that agency for the 1950 fiscal year is more significant for what it does not tell than for what it does tell. Inside information from that agency reports that new word is being

passed down "to dispose of vested property and to get rid of it fast." Apparently the powers that be are worried about the approaching storm.

Well, no honest man has anything to worry about at any time from any quarter. Fair, legal, upright, honest sales of resources can stand any scrutiny. But individuals who have functioned in stealth, individuals who have been engaged in building financial empires for themselves and for others out of the resources of the American people—those individuals do have a lot to worry about. They are now busy covering their tracks or at least trying to do so.

NO BLANKET CRITICISM IS INTENDED

Now, I want to point out very carefully, as I have on every occasion that I have mentioned this subject, that my remarks should not and must not be construed as a blanket indictment of that whole agency or of all its employees, present or past. A great many fine Americans have served in that agency, and they have served well, carefully, conscientiously.

I have pointed out that almost any individual in a policy job in that agency would require the wisdom of Solomon in order to come to decisions which would be fair and which would not involve favoritism and special preference. However, there is another kind of individual who has been engaged in that agency, and where the shoe fits I trust that this sort of individual will put it on. He is the sort of individual who feels that his office gives him an unlimited right to build up "nest eggs" for himself and for his friends.

He knows that a great many personnel appointments must be made by that agency. A great many arrangements must be made which involve financial compensation to law firms and others. This procedure is perfectly necessary and proper. Individuals must be paid for their labor.

But based on the facts which I have learned thus far, the nature of the appointments and the compensation therefor will not stand the full light of day.

Yes, the time is overdue for a scrutiny of this agency. In my judgment there have been insufficient checks and balances over its operations, and if there is one thing that we have learned in 20 years of power of the present administration, it is that no single source of power can be trusted with such power, unchecked and unbalanced by a vigilant, alert, legislative and judicial branch, a vigilant and alert fourth estate, a vigilant and alert American people.

"GRAVY POURING DOWN CERTAIN VESTS"

From what I have learned to date of the Office of Alien Property, it has been regarded by some as a "supergravy train" in which a few selected individuals working simultaneously on the inside and on the outside could grow fat and help others grow fat on the people's assets. This has not always been the case, it is not the universal case now, but in a considerable number of instances which have already come to my attention, the gravy has been practically pouring down certain vests.

Perhaps these operations do not violate the letter of the law; that remains to be seen. But the spirit of the law, the spirit of fairness, of impartiality, of economy, the spirit of justice, have apparently been violated.

The people's resources must not be considered as gravy. The people's resources are sacred.

SOME WILL CRY, "PARTISAN POLITICS"

When I even raise this issue, Mr. President, I can anticipate the smear, "partisan politics." But no, my aim is not partisan; it is not personal; it is not vindictive; it is

factual; it is objective; it is based on the welfare of 155,000,000 Americans.

I WILL SEND FURTHER INQUIRIES TO MR. BAYNTON

Now, Mr. President, I have prepared a letter to the Honorable Harold Baynton, Administrator of the Alien Property Office. In that letter, I have asked certain simple questions. I have stated that I expected the answers back within 2 weeks, since none of the questions is so complicated as to require more time than that. I trust that the answers will be forthcoming promptly because, anticipating their receipt, I have prepared and will submit to Mr. Baynton additional questions which I feel the American people are entitled to have answered.

I repeat: my aim in submitting these inquiries is not to embarrass, not to hamstring, not to annoy. I value the American people's time too much either to waste my time or an agency's time. I am merely seeking objective facts. If the facts as brought out do not justify the messages which have come to me, and which I have briefly described, then they will speak for themselves in vindication of official policies. If, however, they do justify the reports which I have received, then I will continue to press this matter in the interest of protection of the American people.

If the answers are not soon forthcoming, or if the answers are not responsive and complete, I will go to the Senate and ask if it will permit an agency to be a law unto itself and to defy a simple, objective, urgent request for data as presented by a duly elected member of the Legislative branch, a ranking member of the committee having legal jurisdiction over that agency.

The case rests, Mr. President. The next step is that of the Alien Property Office.

The Mask and the Face of John Bull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, how well do we understand John Bull?

We are told that the British Government consists of two parts, the dignified and the efficient. Royalty and members of the cabinet are dignified. Deputy ministers and members of the civil service are efficient. The former is the mask, and the latter the face of John Bull. Both promote the interests of Great Britain.

The question is, Are the United States and John Bull acting so that neither will be hurt in the future?

As I understand the British Foreign Office, it asks two questions of every project: First, will it work? Second, will it produce a profit? To cite several examples:

Recently, Newfoundland was a British Crown Colony. It operated at a loss. Crown status was withdrawn and she confederated with Canada.

In 1945 British interests in China were substantial. Chiang Kai-shek was regarded as a financial liability. England wrote him off her books. Four years later, when the Reds were in control,

England disclosed to us, for the first time, I am told, when she had cashiered Chiang.

In 1896 Japan pushed China out of Korea and tied her up by the Treaty of Shimonoseki. England cultivated a rising star and formalized her commercial alliance with Japan in 1902.

The world was gripped in an economic depression in June of 1931. In September of that year, Japan crossed the Yalu into Manchuria. It was not profitable for the British to answer the call to arms of Secretary of State Stimson to halt Japan's aggression. A few years later, great power dams were built on the Yalu River. They fed Japan's war machine.

Until 1914, British troops in the Far East were not part of the British Army. They served the interests of the British East India Co. Perhaps this explains why Lord Clive was able to operate as unilaterally in India as he did.

Historians list trade rivalry between England and Germany as the cause of World War I. The recuperative power of Germany was revealed in World War II. It is not passing strange that John Bull, therefore, regards Russia and China as future possible allies against a nascent Germany and a rampant Japan. The gleam of a thousand years shines in John Bull's eyes.

Does John Bull tax his people fairly? How sure are we that all income raised for a national use is credited to the Exchequer?

Why does John Bull give the monopolists or the boys in the ring such free wheeling on the world market? The Singapore rubber ring priced itself out of the United States market, thanks to the synthetic-rubber program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. To what extent was the sound and fury recently raised for the abolition of the RFC generated in Singapore? To what extent will the London stranglehold on copper and tin ease up in the future?

How well do we understand John Bull?

Many British consider Americans cowboys who ride the purple sage shooting it out with rustlers.

Hollywood, take a bow. Your cowboy films are popular in England.

What will John Bull say when he learns of our great affection for Hopalong Cassidy and for the cowboy whose mask is as dignified and efficient as his face? Heigh-ho Silver?

Powerful Foes Strengthen McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

POWERFUL FOES STRENGTHEN MCCARTHY

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—A generation ago an important political leader jumped his party line, snuffed the political breeze and charged into the Bull Moose stampede of 1912, believing that he was for the great T. R. Roosevelt because of "the enemies he had made."

At this moment, the Nation's most controversial political figure, Wisconsin's Republican Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY has more powerful enemies than any man of either party in House, Senate, or any branch of the Government. And these enemies are his greatest strength.

In Washington, you will be told that Joe McCarthy is a dead political duck. Leave Washington—say for a political session such as the governors staged last week or go out where McCarthy has just made a speech as he did in Santa Fe—and the picture is reversed.

Outside of Washington, McCarthy is a symbol representing the simple declaration: "I'm against communism and sex perverts in the Government."

The enemies McCarthy has made have turned out to be his greatest political asset when he goes back to the grass roots where the votes came from.

According to the record, McCarthy's most violent publicity foes have these strange predilections in common:

1. Alger Hiss was a fine and fervent American until a Federal grand jury found him guilty and tossed him into jail for lying about his betrayal of our Government secrets.

2. Dr. Owen Lattimore is another patriotic but coarsely treated American who unfortunately has been getting the rough side of the McCarthy tongue. The same goes for Ambassador at Large Dr. Philip C. Jessup.

LINE OF THINKING IS HOT STUFF

3. The only way to save the Nation is to put General Eisenhower in the White House in 1952, preferably by a bipartisan vote. Truman thinks that General Marshall is the greatest living American. Marshall made Eisenhower F. D. R. made all of them, and Secretary of State Dean Acheson won't turn his back on Alger Hiss. Perfect.

There's no doubt that this line of thinking is really hot stuff here in the Capital at the moment. The hearty and encouraging note is that it doesn't get over back home.

What has frightened the foes of McCarthy is the political fact that McCarthy went up into adjoining Maryland in 1950, made a couple of speeches and destroyed the public career of the former Democratic Senator Millard Tydings. The votes of the Free State tossed Tydings into the political ashcan because they resented the whitewash treatment his Senate committee had given the State Department playboys and the manner in which he had perverted an ordered investigation of the State Department into a personal attack on McCarthy.

All of which brings up the effort by Connecticut's junior Senator, WILLIAM BENTON, to lead one flank of the anti-McCarthy drive on Capitol Hill. Benton already has introduced a resolution designed to get the Senate to kick McCarthy out on the grounds that the marine from Wisconsin has talked too much. Nothing will come of that.

BOWLES NOW FACES ROUGH GOING

On the contrary, Benton's former advertising partner, Chester Bowles, has faced rough going in seeking confirmation as Ambassador to somewhat pinko India. And

both BENTON and Bowles are soon to be put on the political carpet and questioned about political deals made in the last election—particularly in regard to keeping McCARTHY out of Connecticut during the campaign, and the deal made with respect to United States Senator BRIAN McMAHON and his shadow-boxing GOP opponent, Prescott Bush, of the administration's Wall Street banking firm of Brown Bros. & Harriman.

Imports it to note is the sudden shifts of political wind within 10 days in the hurricane blowing about the McCARTHY head.

In the first place, Harold Stassen, still powerful in the Midwest, although now completely out of the Presidential picture, has gone down the McCarthy line. He bluntly told the State Department that it is a liar and proved his point. That's important. Stassen still has a potent following of young, progressive Republicans in the Midwest.

Point is the fact that the foes of McCARTHY who wanted to needle the highly competent, wealthy, and personable Governor Kohler, of Wisconsin, to fight McCARTHY in the State primaries for the Senate nomination have lost their battle. The Governor has decided that he will fight with McCARTHY for reelection and never against him. That's important. A fight between the supporters of two such tough and youthful campaigners would have split the GOP in Wisconsin as it hasn't been ripped apart since the war. Democrats under Woodrow Wilson did their best to destroy the McCarthy of that era—the late United States Senator Robert La Follette.

Inflation, Politics, and Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the St. Louis Union Trust Co. Letter No. 57, October 1951:

INFLATION, POLITICS, AND PRICE CONTROLS

The debate over price controls may be characterized as a sham battle from the point of view of economics. It has little relevance to the inflation problem. It is essentially political. Inflation is an excess of monetary demand in relation to the volume of goods available for purchase. It is too many dollars trying to buy too small a supply of goods. The only way to stop inflation is to restore the balance between monetary demand and the goods available for purchase. Stopping inflation requires either an increase in the supply of goods without a corresponding increase in purchasing power until the balance is restored or a curtailment in monetary demand until it corresponds to the amount of goods available.

Price controls do not restrain inflation but, on the contrary, actually promote inflation. When prices are held down artificially, the result is to increase the demand. With monetary incomes the same, there will be a greater demand for sirloin steaks at 75 cents a pound than at \$1.50 a pound. Price controls, by keeping official prices down, increase the demand.

Changes in prices in the free market affect not only the demand for goods but also the supply. High prices encourage increased

production because they make it more profitable for producers to supply the demand. When prices are held down artificially by price controls, they tend to squeeze the profit margin of producers—often make production unprofitable—and therefore tend to decrease the supply. If price controls are not to disrupt the proper functioning of our economy, it is essential that prices be permitted to reflect increases in costs. As the London Economist points out:

"If price controls have any useful purpose at all, there is certainly no justification for prohibiting an automatic increase in prices with an increase in costs. . . . No price control would be better than inflexible price control."¹

THE TERRIBLE CAPEHART AMENDMENT

What Mr. Truman calls the terrible Capehart amendment provides that price ceilings shall reflect increases in costs. If prices do not cover costs, they will result either in curtailment of production and shortages of goods, or in diverting goods to black markets. The announcement that only 2 out of 212 meat-packing companies invited to bid on Government orders for beef for the Army, submitted bids and could supply only 190,000 pounds of beef, instead of the 13,000,000 pounds the Government wants, is a dramatic illustration of how unrealistic price ceilings disrupt the economy and create artificial shortages. The packers didn't bid because they cannot get the beef under existing price ceilings.

When price controls cut production in particular industries, they frequently create supply bottlenecks in other industries. Often the indirect loss of production is far greater than that directly affected by ill-designed price limitations. A flagrant example is found in the machine-tool industry. Our whole defense effort depends upon machine tools. The London Economist points out in its American survey:

"Some of them [machine tools] are so complex they take from 3 months to a year to build and without them a defense program is nothing more than an oratorical blueprint. The machine-tool industry is delivering goods at only one-quarter the rate attained in the last war and some manufacturers will promise no deliveries before late 1953."²

Our entire defense effort has been effectively sabotaged by ill-conceived price controls on machine tools. This the Government admits. We quote a UP dispatch from Washington of August 21, 1951:

"The Government said today that price increases granted the machine-tool industry apparently had broken a bottleneck that had been hamstringing the defense program for more than a year."³

As Barron's Weekly points out:

"Five million dollars' worth of small tungsten carbide cutting tools supports an output of \$10,000,000,000 worth of automobiles. And their relation to military items is probably about the same. Why should there be any price regulation at all on items such as these? Obviously they have not the slightest bearing on the cost of living or anything in which the Office of Price Stabilization is supposed to be interested. Just as obviously regulation can and does impede production."⁴

Just why did it take the OPS more than a year to discover that price controls in the machine-tool industry were sabotaging the

entire defense program? Was it just bureaucratic incompetence and stupidity? Whoever is responsible, however well-meaning and patriotic he may be, has given aid and comfort to the Soviet Union.

Price controls also contribute to inflation by requiring for their enforcement a small army of job holders and snoopers who otherwise might be engaged in the production of useful goods and services. Barron's Weekly reports that there were "6,700 employees now working for OPS," and that "their number is slated to quintuple."⁵

Price controls increase demand and decrease supply. This increases inflation—it does not restrain it. Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, economic research director of the United States Chamber of Commerce, says:

"A free price performs an enormously important function. When it rises, that helps to conserve scarce supplies, it stimulates greater effort at production. It encourages the use of, or the production of, substitutes. Price control, if effective, stops this automatic adjustment. Price control is an attempt to make the price tag say something which is not true. Price expresses the equilibrium between supplies and demands. Sitting on the price with the aid of law, directives, and the policeman, does nothing to improve the supply, and indeed discourages increased supply. And equally bad, price control enormously increases people's efforts to get the bargains, which control appears to promise."⁶

Price controls are useless in checking inflation, except in the case of monopoly prices. Monopoly prices are controlled prices which are higher than the prices which would be set by a free market and, therefore, can be reduced without destroying the incentive to produce. But the best way to attack monopoly prices is by means of antitrust legislation—not price controls. Our antitrust laws are a protection against monopoly prices by business. But there is no similar protection against monopoly prices in the field of agriculture, where the Government support programs often peg prices above the market. There is no such protection against monopoly prices for labor. If wages were the result of the free play of market forces, there would be no excuse for wage controls. But because wages are set by the coercive force of powerful labor monopolies, there is ample economic justification for rigid wage controls. There is a similar economic justification for doing away with farm price supports.

With these exceptions, holding prices down by price controls promotes inflation by widening the gap between too many dollars and too few goods. This truth has been demonstrated time and time again throughout history. There is nothing new about price controls. They were used by Hammurabi in Mesopotamia 2,000 years before the birth of Christ. In 301 A. D. in ancient Rome, the Emperor Diocletian issued his famous Edictum de Pretiis imposing maximum legal prices and wages.

According to Will Durant:

"The edict was until our time the most famous example of an attempt to replace economic laws by governmental decrees. Its failure was rapid and complete."⁷

The Encyclopaedia Britannica says:

"The edict was well-intended but . . . the actual effect was disastrous, and the edict soon fell into abeyance."⁸

¹ Ibid., June 25, 1951, p. 1.

² Reliance on Voluntarism Needed, Business Action, August 11, 1950, p. 2.

³ Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: Caesar and Christ (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1944), p. 643.

⁴ Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 7, p. 393.

⁵ Agenda for the Age of Inflation—II, Economist (London), August 25, 1951, p. 436.

⁶ St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 20, 1951, p. 12A.

⁷ Economist (London), July 28, 1951, p. 215.

⁸ New York Times, August 22, 1951, p. 32.

⁹ Barron's, August 13, 1951, p. 1.

PRICE CONTROLS ENFORCED BY THE GUILLOTINE

Price controls were tried in France 150 years ago during the French Revolution and, as they invariably do, failed to work. We quote from *Flat Money Inflation in France* by the late Andrew Dickson White:

"The first result of the maximum [price control laws enacted September 29, 1793] was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate necessities. Shopkeepers therefore could not sell such goods without ruin. The result was that very many went out of business and the remainder forced buyers to pay enormous charges under the very natural excuse that the seller risked his life in trading at all. That this excuse was valid is easily seen by the daily lists of those condemned to the guillotine, in which not infrequently figure the names of men charged with violating the maximum laws. Manufacturers were very generally crippled and frequently destroyed, and agriculture was terribly depressed."

In the light of history, which shows that price controls never work, that they promote inflation rather than restrain it, that they disrupt the normal workings of the economy and bring misery rather than relief, then why is it that politicians always attempt to meet inflation with price control? There are two basic reasons for this attitude of politicians. First, most people, including many politicians, not only want inflation to continue because it increases their dollar incomes but also want to avoid the higher prices which are a consequence of inflation. They have the naive belief that if incomes increase and the supply of goods does not, price controls will enable them to buy all they want at no increase in price. That is why, as the London Economist puts it, "belief in this panacea [price controls] prevents governments from getting at the cause behind the symptoms."

The second reason that politicians always attempt to meet inflation with price controls is that inflation always is the result of governmental policies and the politicians want desperately to avoid blame for the higher prices which are the consequence of their inflationary policies. To point out that inflation is a result of government policies is not to condemn every governmental action which promotes inflation. For example, our present defense program to rebuild our military power and that of our allies is highly inflationary, but it certainly is necessary to our survival. But whether the governmental policies which promote inflation are necessary, or merely represent political demagoguery or incredibly stupid blunders, as they frequently do, the causes of inflation are always found in governmental policies.

Throughout history whenever governmental policies result in unpleasant consequences, the chief aim of politicians is to find a scapegoat for their own blunders and to shift the blame to someone else. Emperors, kings, dictators, and presidents play the role of Don Quixote and tilt with windmills in an effort to divert the attention of the people from the evils of government. Such practices are as old as recorded history. In ancient Rome it was good politics to feed Christians to the lions. At that time the

creaking top-heavy Roman bureaucracy and the ever-heavier tax burden required to support it had placed intolerable burdens upon the people. A scapegoat was desperately needed, and it was sound political strategy to divert the rage of the populace to the Christians and provide the Roman mob with sadistic entertainment even more spectacular than our televised congressional investigations. Hitler's slaughter of the Jews and Roosevelt's slanders of businessmen were slick, professional twentieth century applications of the political tactics which the Roman emperors used to persecute the Christians. We are not, of course, making a moral comparison between Hitler's slaughter of the Jews and Roosevelt using the businessman as a scapegoat. Yet from the standpoint, not of morals, but of political strategy, there was no difference at all between the techniques of Hitler and Roosevelt.

It is only in terms of politics that the agitation for rigid price controls makes sense. Political advocacy of price controls is based on the same principle as feeding Christians to the lions, slaughtering German Jews, and making business a "whipping boy" for the New Deal-Fair Deal. Its principal purpose is to shift the blame for Government-induced inflation from Government to a convenient scapegoat. As the London Economist correctly observes, "Price control is clearly mere preaching at symptoms." Such "preaching" is effective political propaganda. It is a "sure-fire" political formula but has no economic significance.

Not only is the demand for rigid price controls motivated by political rather than economic considerations, but the methods used to promote price controls are largely patterned after Communist techniques. Liberal advocates of rigid price controls appeal to emotion, not to reason. They use a smoke screen of emotion to conceal the dishonesty of their arguments. This is the technique that was used when the Communist press falsely branded the Taft-Hartley Act as a slave-labor act despite the fact that it protects the rank and file of labor against coercion and exploitation by union officials. Thereafter, liberals, labor leaders, and their press propagandists adopted this false Communist slave-labor slogan as their own. The same technique is now being used to smear those opposed to price controls. For example, Drew Pearson uses the emotional falsehood that they are "against the housewife." We quote:

"No housewives were present when the Senators debated price control, but this column is able to report who was for and who was against the housewife!"

Pearson reiterated this false theme in several of his columns. This is not economic discussion—it is unashamed demagoguery. Will Lissner, a member of the New York Times staff, has an article in the July 23, 1951, issue of the Socialist New Leader, entitled "Inflation and the NAM—Partners of Stalin." Its purpose is to smear opponents of price control through the guilt-by-association technique, branding them as partners of Stalin. It is an example of:

"The propaganda strategy perfected by Charles Michelson * * * and extended by Joseph Goebbels * * * seeking to destroy the reputation of an opponent by associating him, however unfairly, with some odious quality, attitude, policy, or personalities."

Democracy cannot long endure if government by slogan is substituted for a rational

discussion of issues, and public opinion is manipulated by the propaganda techniques originated by Lenin and perfected by Michelson, Stalin, Goebbels, and Hitler. The essence of this technique is to substitute highly emotional false slogans for a rational discussion of issues. Psychologists and public relations experts refer to such tactics as "the manipulation of emotional symbols." The growing use of these tactics by liberal politicians and propagandists is a serious threat to democracy. There is no question as to the Communist origin of this technique. Joseph Stalin, in his 479-page book *Leninism*, devotes several chapters to the discussion of the tactical use of emotional slogans. He even credits the success of the Bolshevik Revolution to the selection of effective slogans.

FAIRER PROPAGANDA FOR PRICE CONTROLS

This type of smear propaganda to discredit the opponents of price controls is put out by the propagandists for price controls, notwithstanding the fact that the overwhelming majority of economists is in substantial agreement that the only effective way to fight inflation is through indirect controls—that is, budgetary, fiscal, credit, and tax control—which can exert a decisive influence upon monetary demand. Even Defense Mobilizer Wilson and the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who necessarily must defend the Administration's program, admit that the direct control, which they advocate are of minor importance as compared with indirect control. Mr. Wilson says:

"It has been correctly said that direct price and wage controls treat only the symptoms of inflation rather than its basic cause."

The President's Council of Economic Advisers says:

"There is no more important single measure for combating inflation under present circumstances than the maintenance of a balanced budget."

"Price and wage controls would be doomed unless taxation, credit controls, and savings programs hold the inflationary pressure down to manageable proportions."

The Joint Committee of Congress on the Economic Report said:

"Efforts to control prices and wages, no matter how zealously and efficiently enforced, will be futile precisely to the extent that this Nation fails to remove the inflationary steam under the boiler now."

On January 12, 1951, 405 economists representing 43 colleges and universities submitted a statement about inflation to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report which said:

"The basic cause of inflation, an excess of money demand relative to available goods, must be attacked. Only adequate fiscal and monetary measures can remove this basic cause."

The London Economist says that "holding all prices down merely guarantees that it

¹ Leninism (New York, International Publishers, 1942), pp. 9-47.

² Quoted by J. Cameron Thompson, Committee for Economic Development, Statement before U. S. Senate Finance Committee, July 10, 1951, p. 7.

³ Midyear Economic Report of the President, July, 1951, p. 14.

⁴ Ibid., p. 127.

⁵ Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Economic and Political Hazards of an Inflationary Defense Economy, February 23, 1951, p. 3.

⁶ Joint Committee on the Economic Report, General Credit Control, Debt Management, and Economic Mobilization, January 28, 1951, p. 54.

⁷ Flat Money Inflation in France (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1933), p. 41 f.

⁸ Agenda for the Age of Inflation—I, Economist (London), August 18, 1951, p. 383.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Washington Merry-Go-Round, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 26, 1951, p. 1C.

¹¹ Harry Elmer Barnes, The Struggle Against the Historical Blackout (Washington, D. C.; Human Events, Inc., 1950), p. 18.

[inflation] and its harmful distortions shall go on forever."¹

Whether inflation will be controlled, or whether we shall have further inflation, will depend primarily upon the aggregate money demand and its relation to the supply of goods. The Government policies that will have the greatest effect upon the volume of monetary demand and the supply of goods will be those concerned with the Government budget, taxes, interest rates on Government bonds, subsidized credit for housing, and the Controlled Materials Plan. If the Government wants to prevent further inflation, then a cut of eight to ten billion dollars in nondefense expenditures is urgently necessary. A tax program to be anti-inflationary should bear with great weight upon the lower income groups which in the aggregate do the bulk of the spending. The new tax bill passed by Congress, although far less objectionable than the tax proposals of the administration, does not meet this requirement. Taxing millionaires out of existence will have little or no effect upon the demand for goods. Taxing the person of small income who does the bulk of the spending will have a great effect upon the demand for goods. The excess-profits tax is an invitation to corporate extravagance, is highly inflationary, and should be repealed. The actions of Congress in easing installment credit restrictions and passing the Defense Housing Act to ease housing credit and add \$1,500,000,000 to the lending power of the FHA are distinctly inflationary. The Government should permit the interest rate to rise in order to restrain credit and to give some inducement to the public to save. Every dollar that is saved that otherwise might be spent is a dollar that doesn't go to market as monetary demand to bid prices up.

The Controlled Materials Plan announced in the latter part of July is more likely to promote inflation than to restrain it. Under this plan, our Government, instead of merely setting aside a certain portion of steel, aluminum, and copper production for military purposes, as it should do, is undertaking to allocate materials for nonmilitary production as well. The assumption that the men in Washington can perform this vast plan of allocation better than the free market is belied by experience. The CMP is an invitation to bureaucratic blunders like that which imposed unrealistic price controls on machine tools and sabotaged our defense program. As Barron's Weekly points out:

"The basic danger of the controlled-materials plan is that it puts into the hands of Government life and death powers over what every firm in the country and every industry may or may not produce."²

Congress fortunately rejected President Truman's demand that he be given authority to build and operate new plants, expand existing plants, and install new processes in private plants. It likewise rejected authority to license corporations in order to enforce price regulations. The powers that President Truman requested were essentially those set forth in the old Spence bill, which was a blueprint for totalitarian socialism. If to the powers given the Government under the controlled-materials plan were added Presidential authority to build Government steel plants and other plants to compete with private industry and authority to control business by licensing, the businessman would be completely at the mercy of Government. It would give the bureaucrats life and death power over the American economy and the economic activities of every farmer and businessman in the country.

The present malodorous RFC scandals show what happens when bureaucrats are given control of a small section of our economy—the section composed of businessmen who can't compete in the open market but depend upon Government favors for undeserved profits. If such bureaucratic control were extended to cover all business, it takes very little imagination to see what might happen.

POWER-HUNGRY BUREAUCRATS

The power-hungry bureaucrats in Washington are so well entrenched that they have become largely self-perpetuating. Administrations come and go, but bureaus go on forever. The President and Congress can create new bureaus and agencies, expand existing ones and add to their powers. But neither the President nor Congress can do much to cut down the permanent bureaucracy. Government agencies and bureaus are relatively independent of the administration and able to exert political pressure on Congress to get what they want. The principal objective of the permanent Washington bureaucracy is the aggrandizement of their own power. They are skilled in lobbying and propaganda and are using the defense emergency to promote further socialism, to get a strangle hold on the American economy, and to increase and perpetuate their own power. They constitute a totalitarian threat more dangerous than communism.

TOWNER PHELAN,

Vice President, St. Louis Union Trust Co.

Break With Reds Urged by Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News of September 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

BREAK WITH REDS URGED BY MARINES—UNITED STATES RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA TERMED "BLUNDER"—RESOLUTION IS PASSED—COPIES TO BE SENT TO TRUMAN AND ACHESON

The national convention of the Marine Corps League in a strongly worded resolution yesterday called on the United States Government to immediately break off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia.

The resolution branded as a horrible blunder America's ill-advised recognition of Russia and flatly accused the Kremlin of instigating the Korean police action.

A copy of the resolution was ordered dispatched immediately to President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House.

The resolution said United States recognition of Russia "admitted the pirate Bolsheviks to the decent society of nations and provided a false cloak of legality and respectability for Communist intrigues and aggressions."

Delegates urged citizens to "forthwith proceed to correct this grievous error and immediately take the strategic initiative away from the international Communist

outlaws" by demanding the Government's deplorable action in recognizing Soviet Russia be immediately repealed.

The resolution, authorized by Joe Probst, of Chicago, follows in full:

"Whereas our fellow marines and their brothers in the Armed Forces are being killed and wounded in appalling numbers in the Korean police action because of Communist aggression; and

"Whereas there is no doubt in the minds of all clear-thinking Americans that the root of this evil is the international Communist conspiracy spreading its cancerous growth from the Kremlin in Moscow; and

"Whereas Americans know beyond a doubt that our real enemy is communism and that communism is the same liberty-destroying scourge throughout the world and that we are now arming ourselves for invincible and decisive action; and

"Whereas we now realize our horrible blunder in attempting the hopeless task of treating with communism by our ill-advised recognition of Soviet Russia, which action admitted the pirate Bolsheviks to the decent society of nations and provided a false cloak of legality and respectability for Communist intrigues and aggressions. Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, That we forthwith proceed to correct this grievous error and immediately take the strategic initiative away from the international Communist outlaws by demanding that our Government's deplorable action in recognizing Soviet Russia be immediately repealed and that we, the Marine Corps League, gathered here in a principal shrine of American liberty, the historic city of Savannah, Ga., in our twenty-eighth national convention, call upon our Congress of the United States to provide the fundamental corrective by severing all diplomatic relations with the Union of Socialist Soviets of Russia, and that copies of this resolution be sent immediately to the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Speech in Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I should like to include the following speech by Gen. Douglas MacArthur delivered at the Cleveland Public Hall on September 6, 1951:

It is gratifying indeed to have this opportunity to address the citizens of Cleveland and the State of Ohio—a State which has contributed so abundantly to America's leadership both past and contemporary. Indeed, indications multiply that this leadership may even increase in the not too distant future.

No section of our country symbolizes more forcefully the pattern of our national progress than does this great Midwest whose fertile fields and thriving industry combine to reflect the constructive energy of our people. You have molded a standard and pattern of life known to no other nation of the world, and I pray that we will have the vision and courage and statesmanship to keep

¹ Economist (London), December 20, 1947, p. 986.

² Barron's, August 6, 1951, p. 1.

it that way --that we will preserve an America which will provide increasing, not diminishing, opportunities for human advancement.

EFFECTS OF VICTORY OVER AXIS REVIEWED

We have just passed another anniversary of the end of the war with Japan. Six years ago with a few strokes of the pen a calm descended upon the battlefields of the world and the guns grew silent. Military victory had been achieved for our cause and men turned their thoughts from the task of mass killing to the higher duty of international restoration, from destroying to rebuilding, from destruction to construction. Everywhere in the free world they lifted up their heads and hearts in thanksgiving for the advent of a peace in which ethics and morality based upon truth and justice would thereafter fashion the universal code.

Then, more than ever in the history of the modern world, a materially strong and spiritually vibrant leadership was needed to consolidate the victory into a truly enduring peace for all of the human race. America at the very apex of her military power was the logical Nation to which the world turned for such leadership. It was a crucial moment—one of the greatest opportunities ever known.

LEADERS FAIL TO SEIZ CHANCE

But our political and military leaders failed to comprehend it. Sensitive only to the expediences of the hour, they dissipated with reckless haste that predominant military power which was the key to the situation.

Our forces were rapidly and completely demobilized and the great stores of war matériel which had been accumulated were disposed of with irresponsible waste and abandon.

The world was thus left exposed and vulnerable to an international communism whose long-published plan had been to await just such a favorable opportunity to establish dominion over the free nations. The stage had perhaps been unwittingly set in secret and most unfortunate war conferences. The events which followed will cast their shadow upon history for all time.

Peoples with long traditions of human freedom progressively fell victims to a type of international brigandage and blackmail, and the so-called iron curtain descended rapidly upon large parts of Europe and Asia.

As events have unfolded, the truth has become clear.

VICTORY IS OFFSET BY RPD SUCCESS

Our great military victory has been offset, largely because of military unpreparedness, by the political successes of the Kremlin. Our diplomatic blunders increased as our senseless disarmament became a reality.

And now the disastrous cycle is completed as those same leaders who lost to the world the one great chance it has had for enduring universal peace, frantically endeavor, by arousing a frenzy of fear throughout the land, to gear anew our energies and resources, to rebuild our dissipated strength and to face again a future of total war.

Our need for adequate military defense, with world tensions as they were and are, is and should have been completely evident even before the end of the war. By what faith then can we find hope in those whose past judgments so grievously erred—who deliberately disarmed in the face of threatened communism?

Can they now be blindly trusted as they so vehemently demand to set an unerring course to our future well-being and security? There are those of us who from neither partisan affiliation nor with political purpose think not.

U N BECOMES PEACE AGENCY

At war's end the main agency for maintaining the peace became the United Nations. This organization was conceived in a common desire that the scourge of war should not again be visited upon the earth. It was dedicated to the principle that all mankind of inalienable right should live in justice and liberty and peace.

It represents perhaps the noblest effort man has yet made to evolve a universal code based upon the highest of moral precepts. It became the keystone to an arch of universal hope.

Yet in practice its efforts become increasingly doubtful of ultimate success. Its organization is inherently weak, legislatively, judicially, and executively. It lacks legislative strength because its members, not being elected but merely appointed, are not answerable directly to their people. It lacks judicial strength because there is no accepted international code of sufficient moral authority or purpose to mold and guide its decisions. It lacks executive strength because it controls no agencies of sufficient power to enforce its mandates.

FAILURE THREATENS FOR MANY REASONS

It threatens to fail if the innate selfishness of its members does not yield to universal needs, if the mechanics of its operations are not corrected to prevent the will of one nation from counterbalancing the collective will of the others; if it does not obtain acceptance by member nations of its lawful decisions, if it does not stop obstructionist tactics, even by expulsion if necessary, of its own unruly members, if regional military alliances must be organized within its membership to undertake collective security measures against threat from other members; if it allows itself to be reduced to a mere forum for meaningless and acrimonious debate, and a springboard for propaganda.

Unless a strong and dynamic sense of responsibility emerges within its ranks capable of rallying the forces of good throughout the world, of establishing a higher moral tone to its deliberations and activities, of correcting its existing institutional and mechanical weaknesses, the United Nations may well go the way of its predecessor league and perish as a force to guide civilization.

But the great moral and spiritual purpose which animated its formation—the abolition of war from the face of the earth—will always live and a way must be found to achieve that purpose. This way cannot be found, however, if nations are so blind as not to see their own weaknesses—so weak as not to correct them.

CONQUERED JAPAN IS BRIGHT SPOT

In this postwar period of general failure to attain real peace one of the bright spots has been conquered Japan. That nation and its people long boasting of many centuries of unbroken military success—a self-sufficient warrior race with a history of almost complete isolation from the rest of the world—at war's end was reduced largely to rubble with its people impoverished and broken in mind, body and spirit.

The sudden and general destruction of Japanese institutions brought about by complete defeat left a spiritual vacuum in Japanese life to be filled either by a philosophy of good, or a philosophy of evil. Fortunately for Japan and for the free world, the country was spared the dreadful consequences of a Soviet military occupation and was brought instead within the benign guidance of the American people.

Under this beneficent influence the Japanese gradually lifted themselves from the ashes of defeat and started to build a new nation—a nation dedicated to the pursuit

of new concepts and new ideals, fashioned from a blend between the best of their own ancient culture and those high precepts of ethics and morals which have been the great pillars supporting America's origin and growth.

OCCUPATION HAD CHRISTIAN PURPOSE

This oriental nation under the shadow of a continent plagued by the cruel misery of unending wars, pillage and natural disasters, proved willing and adept under the guiding hand of an occupation not conceived in a spirit of vengeance or mastery, of victor over vanquished, but committed to the Christian purpose of helping a defeated, bewildered and despairing people recreate in the East a nation largely designed in the image of the West.

New Japan was thus erected upon free institutions, somewhat similar to our own, which permitted the development of a moral base which cannot fail to favorably influence the course of events in Asia for generations to come. Discarded is the traditional intolerance of human rights, the restrictions upon human liberties, the callousness to human life, and in their place have been accepted and fused into the Japanese heart many of the Christian virtues so predominantly embodied in the American character.

An enlightened constitution has become the great charter of Japanese liberty with enabling laws which give full effect to its immutable precepts.

CALLS GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE

The government has become truly representative of the popular will, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. The principle of local autonomy has been established. This permits the balance of political power to rest with the citizen at the community level and thus serves as a constant check against the excesses of centralized authority.

The hated system of land tenure, so contributory to general unrest in Asia, has been abolished. Every farmer is now accorded the right and dignity of ownership of the land he long has tilled.

He thus reaps the full fruits which result from his toil and labors with the incentive of free enterprise to maximize his effort to achieve increasing production. Representing over a half of Japan's total population, the agriculture workers have become an invincible barrier against the advance of socialistic ideas which would relegate all to the indignity of state servitude.

Labor through the protection of modern laws has come into a new and heretofore unknown dignity and is making rapid strides along the course of a sound and healthy movement. The schools have been rid of the strictures upon academic freedom and public education is provided to all of the youth of the land.

Universal suffrage has been established and the women of Japan have assumed their rightful role in the political life of the nation. With dignity and resolution they have brought to bear upon public affairs the morality which centers in the home and are progressively asserting a strong and healthy influence upon the course of Japan's political destiny.

The courts are proceeding in their administrative and judicial roles with universally accepted principles of justice firmly implanted in the form of their procedure. The police have ceased to be masters and have become instead servants of the people with a decentralization in organization which permits exercise of their functions at the community, rather than national, level of government.

The economy of Japan has made rapid and effective advances toward the full restoration of stability and self-sufficiency and has achieved a sound basis for a frugal public administration. For the past 3 years, the national budget has been in complete balance with savings to permit substantial reductions in the tax load upon the people and corresponding raises in their living standard.

JEFFERSON'S ADVICE ON ECONOMY QUOTED

Japan's present course in the economy of public administration follows closely the pattern sagely advised by Thomas Jefferson when he warned in speaking of our own Government.

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money. We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principle of government."

If Japan continues to heed this far-sighted warning and our own leaders who pretend to be disciples of the Jeffersonian teachings continue to ignore it, the time may well come when the Japanese people will be firmly established within the protective folds of our own cherished liberties, while we ourselves shall have lost them because of the assumption of our leaders of that "patronage of money" with its consequent corruption of government against which Jefferson so clearly warned.

In such a tragic eventuality, we would be hard put to it indeed to answer the charge of our children and our children's children that we had recklessly squandered their rightful heritage of liberty, resource, and opportunity.

WITH OUR SUPPORT JAPAN CAN DEFEND ITS HOMELAND

This is but a brief outline of the new Japan which is about to be restored to a position of international dignity and equality under a peace treaty which as presently proposed, while far from flawless, embodies much of human justice and enlightenment. It is a Japan which may now assume the burden of preparing its own ground defense against predatory attack and thus in short time release our own beloved divisions for return home.

With our air and naval support, Japan can with no great difficulty defend its own homeland, which forms so vital a sector of the inland defense system buttressing freedom and peace on the Pacific. It is a Japan in which we of the free world may find an alliance which shall merit our full faith. I realize well that there are nations who fought with us to victory while suffering grievous hurt from Japanese depredation who understandably disagree in whole or in part.

It is hard for them to accept the realistic but tragic fact that in modern war the victor is also the loser. He suffers materially with the vanquished—oftentimes more than does the vanquished. Indeed, our own country in the aftermath of victory pays with a burden of accumulated debt such as to place a mortgage upon the energy and resource of many future generations.

DISTURBED OVER DRIFT TOWARD TOTALITARIAN RULE

May we not hope that eventually through wise statesmanship and Christian tolerance the scars still left in war's wake may be

finally healed and that victor and vanquished as befits the sacred cause of human freedom will be invincibly bound together in mutual preservation.

Since my return from service abroad I have enjoyed the privilege, the freedom and the opportunities of private citizenship. I have seen many new and wonderful things but some which to me create a disturbing outlook for the future. Possibly one of the most pernicious is our steady drift toward totalitarian rule with the suppression of those personal liberties which have formed the foundation stones to our political, economic, and social advance to national greatness.

Our Government now differs substantially from the design of our forefathers as laid down in the Constitution. They envisaged a federation of sovereign States with only such limited power resting in the Federal authority as became necessary to serve the common interests of all.

But under the stress of national emergencies during the past two decades, there has been a persistent and progressive centralization of power in the Federal Government with only superficial restoration to the States and the people as emergencies subsided. This drift has resulted in an increasingly dangerous paternalistic relationship between Federal Government and private citizen, with the mushrooming of agency after agency designed to control the individual.

Authority specifically reserved to the States by constitutional mandate has been ignored in the ravenous effort to further centralize the political power. Within the Federal Government itself there has been a further and dangerous centralization.

SEE TRFND TOWARD THOUGHT CONTROL

For example, the Department of State, originally established for the sole purpose of the conduct of foreign diplomacy, has become in effect a general operating agency of Government, exercising authority and influence over many facets of executive administration formerly reserved to the President or the heads of other departments. The Department of State indeed is rapidly assuming the character of a prime ministry notwithstanding that its secretary is an appointed official, neither chosen by nor answerable directly to the people.

This drift toward totalitarian rule is reflected not only in this shift toward centralized power, but as well in the violent manner in which exception is taken to the citizens' voice when raised in criticism of those who exercise the political power.

There seems to be a determination to suppress individual voice and opinion which can only be regarded as symptomatic of the beginning of a general trend toward mass thought control. Abusive language and arbitrary action, rather than calm, dispassionate and just argument, ill becomes the leadership of a great nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to a course of morality and justice. It challenges the concept of free speech and is an attempt at direct suppression through intimidation of that most vital check against the abuse of political power—public criticism.

If long countenanced by free men, it can but lead to those controls upon conviction and conscience which traditionally have formed stepping stones to dictatorial power.

The issues which today confront the Nation are clearly defined and so fundamental as to directly involve the very survival of the Republic.

Are we going to preserve the religious base to our origin, our growth, and our progress, or yield to the devious assaults of atheistic or other antireligious forces?

Are we going to maintain our present course toward state socialism with com-

munist just beyond or reverse the present trend and regain our hold upon our heritage of liberty and freedom?

Are we going to squander our limited resources to the point of our own inevitable exhaustion or adopt common-sense policies of frugality which will insure financial stability in our time and a worth-while heritage in that of our progeny?

Are we going to continue to yield personal liberties and community autonomy to the steady and inexorable centralization of all political power or restore the Republic to constitutional direction, regain our personal liberties, and reassume the individual State's primary responsibility and authority in the conduct of local affairs?

IMMUTABLE PRECEPTS OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Are we going to permit a continuing decline in public and private morality or re-establish high ethical standards as the means of regaining a diminishing faith in the integrity of our public and private institutions?

Are we going to continue to permit the pressure of alien doctrines to strongly influence the orientation of foreign and domestic policy or regain trust in our own traditions, experience, and free institutions, and the wisdom of our own people?

In short, is American life of the future to be characterized by freedom or by servitude, strength or weakness? The answer must be clear and unequivocal if we are to avoid the pitfalls toward which we are now heading with such certainty. In many respects it is not to be found in any dogma of political philosophy, but in those immutable precepts which underlie the Ten Commandments. During the 5 months since my return, I have been encouraged to believe that our citizens will not complacently tolerate further incursions against their cherished liberties and will move to correct this drift away from truly representative government.

FACES OF AMERICANS REFLECT SOUL OF LIBERTY

I have found this encouragement in the rare opportunity to search the faces of millions of my fellow countrymen. Therein I have been given understanding of the meaning of Abraham Lincoln when he said:

"To the salvation of the Union there needs but one single thing—the hearts of a people like yours. When the people rise in a mass in behalf of the liberties of the country, truly it may be said that (nothing can) prevail against them."

I have seen in the faces of the American people that to which Mr. Lincoln prophetically referred. I have clearly seen that the soul of liberty is still living and vibrant in the American heart. It is neither Democratic nor Republican but American. It will assert itself by constitutional process and with invincible force in the battle to save the Republic. The people will still rule.

In This Battle Report, Washington, Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, Tells the American People What They Can Do To Help Prevent Another World-Wide War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have stated on several occasions,

that Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, has in my opinion for more than a year past, and without a single penny of expense to the taxpayers, been televising to the American people the most authoritative information on current topics of the day that is broadcast from Washington.

Each Sunday afternoon, he has brought to the National Broadcasting Co. television network and its coaxials, Cabinet members, leaders of executive departments of Government, top-ranking officials of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, of our own Government as well as of other free governments throughout the world. These men, seated beside him in the studios of NBC, make intimate and direct report to the people of the United States on topics that are of interest to them as of that very hour.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known any man who gave so unselfishly as does Dr. Steelman of his time and energy—piled on top of his terrifically busy schedule of official duties—to combat the forces of ungodliness, communism, and aggression, that have been unloosed in this world.

In this telecast, Dr. Steelman outlines a plan in which he proposes that during the Christmas holidays there be a special series of broadcasts to free Europe and Latin America, as well as to Turkey and Israel in the Middle East. He is now arranging that Americans from many walks of life participate—churchmen of all denominations, labor and farm leaders, educators, many of our great actors, actresses, and musicians—and just plain citizens. He proposes that these broadcasts be made in 14 languages, each program to carry a message of friendship.

Mr. Speaker, here is a real, honest-to-goodness, down-to-earth proposal, in which practically every person in these United States can take part to end war for all times, and by merely writing a letter.

In closing his personal statement on this telecast, Dr. Steelman simply says:

I hope you all will be saying "Merry Christmas and Happy New Year" to millions of people in many countries, who are allied with you to prevent war.

And then continues:

Beginning tomorrow, all of my letters which are going abroad will carry the message about the Voice of America and its Yuletide program. I hope that you will join with me and will write at least one letter this week to someone in free Europe, in Latin America, in Turkey, or in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I have never sat before my television set to hear a single rendition of Battle Report—Washington without realizing the tremendous force for good that was going out over the air of the television network of the National Broadcasting Co.

This particular broadcast was of great personal interest. Dr. Steelman had as his guests the Honorable Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs of the Department of State, who discussed the problem of cutting off the vital war supplies to the Red Chinese

and all the Communist forces of aggression in Asia.

His next guest was Col. William E. Bertram of the United States Air Force—who said in part:

After arriving in Korea, I was assigned command of the Twenty-seventh Fighter Group of the Twenty-seventh Fighter Escort Wing. Sixty percent of the fighter pilots were veterans of World War II. The average age was 29—and most have wives and kids back home.

Our assigned missions included everything a fighter airplane can do. We escorted bombers. Furnished close support for ground troops. Fought air-to-air combat with the Communist air force. Maintained defense alert and carried out a consistent interdiction against enemy lines.

Colonel Bertram then went on to tell of the actual fighting as it takes place and as viewed from the inside of a United States Air Force jet plane.

The next guest was Capt. Gernard Dean, United States Army Signal Corps—who plainly and lucidly discussed research with respect to rockets—that disclose data and collect air samples of from 20 to 55 miles above the earth in order to better understand the atmosphere—and furnish information to help solve various problems of both military and civilian importance.

In addition to the foregoing speakers, Dr. Steelman brought to the television—Maj. Carl Sitter and Maj. Reginald Myers—two members of the Marine Corps—upon whom President Truman has bestowed the highest award that a grateful Nation can extend—the Congressional Medal of Honor. Accompanying the presence of these two distinguished American fighters and heroes—actual motion pictures in which these marines distinguished themselves were brought to the viewers all over America.

Mr. Speaker, I not alone want my colleagues to read this letter-writing proposal made by Dr. Steelman on this "Battle Report—Washington"—but I want to suggest that each and every one of you join with him in disseminating this Christmas and Christian message he desires to broadcast to the people of the free world.

It is for that reason that I am extending my remarks and including in this record of our proceedings in the House this script of Battle Report, Washington.

The producer-director is Ted Ayers; the assistant producer, Jean Montgomery; commentary is by David Brinkley; script by Lou Hazam, film editors are Bill Brooks and Bill McDonald; and the art work accompanying is by Joseph Ferrier.

The script is as follows:

MR. DAVID BRINKLEY. In Korea, the rocket's red glare and bombs bursting in air rock the enemy confronting this spectacular nighttime Marine barrage. As the fire of their rockets dramatically lights up the battle front, our news cameras bring you now your 60-second Battle Report, Washington.

Today on Battle Report an assistant Secretary of State tells what we are doing to keep the West's strategic supplies out of Russia's hands. Back from MIG alley in Korea, the former Air Force commander of the Twenty-seventh Fighter-Escort Group, with a first-hand report on our jets in action

there. An Army Signal Corps expert reveals some little-known facts about research now going on into the nature of the upper atmosphere of the earth—research accomplished with the help of rockets. Two Marines describe their own personal experiences in Korea that recently won them the highest award of the Nation—the prized Congressional Medal of Honor. And the assistant to the President—Dr. John R. Steelman.

So, against a world in crisis, this week as usual our guests are standing by to report on the latest developments in the battle against Soviet imperialism, but first—the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

DR. JOHN R. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Almost every day I hear people ask the question, "What can I do to help prevent another world war?" They feel helpless in a world which they believe is rushing headlong toward destruction. They sincerely want to do something, but most of the things they think about seem impractical. Of course, there are many things that every American can do and this afternoon I am going to tell you about one of them.

This year, during the holiday season, December 24 to January 1, the Voice of America will broadcast a special series of programs to all the countries of free Europe and Latin America, and, also, to Turkey and Israel in the Middle East. Famous Americans from many walks of life will participate—actors and actresses from New York and Hollywood, churchmen from all denominations, labor leaders, educators, many of our greatest musicians, farmers, and just plain citizens. Every program will carry a message of friendship. They will be broadcast in 14 languages. The spirit of Christmas—peace on earth, good will toward men will be carried by the magic of trans-Atlantic radio into many millions of homes.

Now, here is what we can do. Almost every one of us has some relative, friend, acquaintance, or business associate in free Europe—in Latin America, in Turkey, or in Israel. Maybe we have not written for a long time. Maybe our meeting was only a passing acquaintance on shipboard or on a railway train. But now is the time to look up that old address book and to write about the special programs which the Voice of America will broadcast from December 24 to January 1.

If you are a businessman and do not wish to incorporate the message into your letter, have it written on the envelope. Simply say, "Listen to the Voice of America, December 24 to January 1."

Obviously, it is important to every American that the largest possible audience be built up for these programs. The more people who hear them—the more friends we will make. You can add to this audience. You can help to make our friends and allies feel closer to us and to know we are united with them in a gigantic crusade for peace.

The messages which the Voice of America will carry will be your messages. You will be saying Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to millions of persons in many countries who are allied with you to prevent war.

Beginning tomorrow all my letters going abroad will carry the message about the Voice of America. I hope you join with me and write at least one letter this week to someone in free Europe—in Latin America—in Turkey—or in Israel.

MR. BRINKLEY. Indochina—another "border in the balance" in the free world's struggle against the Soviet's ambitions in Asia. Here Red assassins recently stabbed to death French Commissioner Jean de Raymond—the fourth high official in southeast Asia to meet such a violent end. The aroused French and Vietnam troops comb

the rice paddies to search out the killer, and blast at Red guerrillas now infiltrating French rubber and pepper plantations. The guerrillas, on the other hand, are determined to keep their communication lines open to Thailand from which they smuggle guns and ammunition. Between Indochina and Korea lies Hong Kong, shown here. Once one of the world's busiest ports, it begins to see its trade with the Chinese mainland dry up as all shipments of strategic goods to China are now banned. How are we doing in cutting off vital war supplies to the Reds in Asia? Here with an answer is the State Department's Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Willard Thorp.

Mr. WILLARD L. THORP. We all know that the major effort in Korea is being made by the foot soldiers of the United States, and other United Nations countries who have slugged it out in places like Heartbreak Ridge and by the U. N. Air Forces in their bombing and their jet sorties with the MIG's. But there are important economic steps which support the military operations. One of these is the speeding up of mobilization and defense production here at home. Another is depriving the aggressor of the things they need to wage war.

China and North Korea, like all other countries, are dependent upon the outside world for certain things they need. However, China is not a country whose needs from the outside are so essential that a complete economic embargo would stop the fighting in Korea. China's own production supplemented by the things which are being supplied by the Soviet Union makes our enemies in Korea fairly self-sufficient in meeting their military requirements. Nevertheless life is being made much more difficult for them through economic pressure, with the pinch really being felt on such items as petroleum, cotton, and transportation equipment.

Even before the war in Korea, the United States was restricting its exports to China. In 1949, when the Chinese Communists first gained control of ports on the Chinese coast, we immediately applied restrictions on highly strategic items such as were already in effect against the Soviet bloc. Then, when the North Koreans invaded South Korea, we slapped an embargo on the shipments of all items of strategic value. When the Chinese Communists intervened, United States trade with China was stopped entirely. Chinese Communist assets in this country were frozen; and our ships were forbidden to call at ports on the Chinese mainland. The progressive cutting off of trade with China meant that that country was deprived of such essential imports from us as raw cotton, chemicals, machinery, petroleum products, and metals.

Since 1949, the Western European countries and Canada have been restricting their trade in strategic materials with the Soviet Union and its satellites, and they also extended their controls to cover Communist China and North Korea. Japan, too, tightened its trade controls. The Government of Hong Kong began applying real controls in August 1951, and has progressively extended their scope and severity. Japanese and Hong Kong controls are very important, since, historically, Japan has traded actively with China, and because Hong Kong is the main transshipment point in the area.

After the Chinese intervened in the Korean war, the General Assembly of the United Nations considered economic action against the aggressors. In May, it adopted a resolution recommending that every country—not only those which are members of the United Nations—should apply an embargo on shipments to areas under control of Communist China and North Korea of

arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war. This resolution was sent to members of the United Nations and to 23 nonmembers as well. Some of them do not have any trade with China, anyway. Forty-three countries have accepted the resolution and are actively applying it. And among those 43 countries are all of the principal suppliers of strategic items to China, except, of course, the Soviet bloc countries. Naturally, the Soviet Union and its satellites rejected the resolution. In addition to controls on commodities, a number of important shipping nations have imposed controls over the use of their ships in trade with Communist China.

The United Nations embargo will be discussed at the General Assembly in Paris this month. This operation has a double value. It helps to limit the military strength of the aggressor in Korea, and it demonstrates that the free nations are willing to stand together to fight aggression both on the battlefield and in the market place.

Mr. BRINKLEY. F-84 Thunder jets take off to continue the air war in Korea. Because gun-cameras are mounted, you get now one of the most dramatic views of a battle with a Russian-built MIG yet to come out of the war. In essence, you are seated with the pilot as he roars over MIG alley sweeping the skies. He encounters the Red enemy and peels off to let him have it. In these lethal passes, you are traveling over 600 miles an hour. In a moment, you will be in position on the MIG's tail. There'll be a split second maneuver—and then the bull's eye burst as the Communist plane dives to its end.

Veteran of many an engagement like this is our next guest, who flew in the China-Burma-India theater in World War II, and has over a hundred combat missions to his credit in Korea. He returned only 2 months ago from commanding the Air Force's Twenty-seventh Fighter-Escort Group credited with inflicting casualties on 15,000 enemy troops, destroying or damaging 35 Red planes, thousands of buildings, and hundreds of railway cars. Here he is, Col. William E. Bertram.

Col. WILLIAM E. BERTRAM. Two of the most important characteristics of air power are flexibility and mobility. Flexibility means the ability to perform a variety of necessary missions when required, and mobility means the capability of doing them rapidly and wherever the need may arise. The Air Force has emphasized both of these key capabilities in its concept of the tactical air mission. I should like to illustrate.

On November 7, of last year, we returned to Bergstrom Air Force Base at Austin, Tex., having just completed the first mass transoceanic jet flight in history. We had flown 180 Republic F-84 jet fighters from Austin, Tex., to Germany, to help modernize the Air Force fighter units there.

Five days later, we received orders to take the Twenty-seventh Fighter-Escort Wing to Korea. In accord with the Strategic Air Command mobility plan, we took all the airplanes, people, and equipment, necessary to operate in combat with us. Twenty-seven days later we flew our first mission in Korea.

It was not an easy or a pleasant job. But during the 9 months the Twenty-seventh was there, we discovered several important points regarding the use of the F-84 in combat.

You may remember that there was some criticism of the Air Force in the early days of the Korean war. Doubters said that the jet airplane could not operate under combat conditions. They said it was too fast to furnish support to ground troops. It would

never be able to fly off hastily built runways. It would be too vulnerable to ground fire, antiaircraft and enemy airplanes.

Shortly after arriving in Korea, I assumed command of the Twenty-seventh Fighter Group of the Twenty-seventh Fighter-Escort Wing. I am very proud of that outfit and would like to tell you a little about our combat operations.

To begin with, we had a terrific group of pilots, crew chiefs, and other supporting personnel. Sixty percent of our pilots were veterans of World War II. We were not reckless, airborne hot-rod drivers. The average age was about twenty-nine, and most of the boys had wives and kids back home.

Our assigned missions included everything a fighter airplane can do. We escorted bombers, furnished close support for ground troops, fought air to air combat with the Communist air force. We maintained an air defense alert, and carried out a consistent interdiction campaign against enemy supply lines.

I would like to say something about interdiction. We think it is a very important part of the tactical air operation. It means using the airplane to go back of the enemy's line and knock out tanks before they can fight our infantry. It means cutting rail lines that carry the enemy's supplies. It involves hitting warehouses, vehicles, and stores of equipment before he has a chance to use them against our troops. Interdiction will never be complete, but a planned campaign means the opposition has to use a high percentage of men and equipment for supply that would otherwise be available for combat. It creates a vacuum between the front line of the enemy and his distant supply sources.

A writer for Pegasus magazine, returning from Korea last month—makes this statement: "The relentless pressure of this summer's interdiction program—averaging 100 rail cuts a day and netting thousands of trucks and other vehicles each week—is beginning now to show results that could be the most far-reaching of the entire Korean war."

My report to you would not be complete without a word about the ability of the F-84, to bring us back alive when the going was rough. We flew off runways so bumpy they felt like cobblestone streets. It seemed there was always either dust or mud. Almost every mission ran into bad weather somewhere along the way. Our airplanes were hit with small arms fire, flak, and cannon shells from MIG-15's. One pilot followed a target so low he bounced off the ground when he pulled out of his dive. But they kept coming back—and, equally important—going out to fight again.

Mr. BRINKLEY. This dazzling barrage is born of 4.5 rockets—the particular poison of a Marine Corps rocket-launching battery in Korea. They have been credited time and again with successfully preparing the way for the advance of our troops. As they continue to light the Korean sky by night, latest reports from the battlefield indicate a lull in the ground fighting. An allied tank infantry patrol seeking to probe ahead north-east of Kumsong was driven back—and on the western front the Eighth Army reported doing likewise to a Communist thrust. Not in Korea, but at White Sands, N. Mex., our scientists release giant missiles into the sky to unfathom secrets that will give our troops the best rockets that American brains can provide. One little-publicized phase of this important rocket research is research into the nature of the upper atmosphere. To tell you of its significance to all of us, we point our cameras now at one of the Signal Corps' top electronics experts—Capt. Gernard Dean.

Capt. GERNARD DEAN This week a German V-2 rocket prepared by the University of Michigan under a Signal Corps contract and two Aerobee sounding rockets instrumented by the Signal Corps were fired at White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.

Signal Corps upper atmosphere research began in 1946, with the use of the German V-2 rocket. These rockets were used for vehicles until 1948, at which time a new American-built rocket, the Aerobee, and other American rockets came into general use.

The Signal Corps program has been directed toward the complete investigation of two experiments, namely—

1. The collection of air samples above 20 miles altitude to determine whether the heavier gases diffuse downward at these altitudes.

2. The measuring of air temperature above 20 miles altitude to furnish data for a complete understanding of the general circulation of the atmosphere and additional information for long-range weather forecasting.

Last week the Signal Corps prepared three rockets for flight. The first of which was a German V-2 rocket. Imagine yourself at the White Sands Proving Grounds the day before the firing. The V-2 in preparation for more than a month, has been out at the launching site for nearly a week. Final preparations and last-minute tests are now being made. The experimental equipment in the mast of this rocket will measure air temperatures from 20 miles to about 55 miles altitude. The final preparations continued throughout the entire night prior to firing which is set for 1,300 hours Monday.

Fueling begins at 1,000 hours and arrangements proceed smoothly up to the firing four. The gantry crane which is used to reach all parts of the rocket is now moved back on its tracks and the rocket stands alone, ready for firing. The firing button is pushed from within the concrete blockhouse, 400 feet away, and the rocket motor begins to burn. Burning begins slowly and then at full thrust the rocket takes off. Meanwhile, nearby at a second launching site, the first of two Aerobees rockets is being readied for flight. Unlike the German V-2, this Aerobee is fired through a launching tower about 120 feet high.

The first Aerobee is scheduled for an evening firing. The desert will be dark at firing time but the sun will be shining on the missile after take-off. Many optical tracking instruments will be trained on the rocket during its flight. The rocket is now buttoned up, fueled, and all personnel are within the blockhouse awaiting the signal. The "bird" takes off, leaving a stream of fire behind it.

The second Aerobee is placed in the tower as soon as possible after the first firing. This second launching is identical to the first Aerobee except for the fact that it is a 2,300 m. firing. Due to the darkness more reliance must be placed on radar tracking and optical tracking of the jet flame before the rocket motor burns out.

The next morning the recovery party sets out across the desert to find and return to camp the rocket bodies. On past flights, parachute recovery has been accomplished and the essential pieces of experimental equipment brought safely to earth. Ribbon-type chutes are used on these flights to avoid excessive opening shock on the parachute when the rocket is severed and the parachute ejected.

Other rocket firings are being planned for the future. Better missiles carrying new experimental equipment will be sent skyward—in order to better understand the atmos-

phere and furnish information that will help us solve other related problems of both civilian and military importance.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Just a few days ago President Truman put aside affairs of state to bestow upon two members of the Marine Corps the highest honor a grateful Nation can pay—the Congressional Medal of Honor. These two marines are with us now, but before you hear their story let us again set the stage that led up to their acts of incredible valor as circumstances set it then. The time—a year ago this month. The place—around the Chosin Reservoir. Our troops, surging north in a victorious sweep after the Inchon landing, were already facing a bitter enemy—winter with its snow and freezing cold. Suddenly and unexpectedly they found themselves facing another—the Chinese Communists enter the war, move down from Manchuria and threaten to entrap them around the Chosin. Here is pictured the situation in which the Marines found themselves. Their base at Hagaru, at the southern tip of the reservoir, was in danger of being surrounded by the Communists. Since it lay astride the only escape route for the Fifth and Seventh Marine Regiments farther north, it felt it would spell disaster for the whole corps. South of Hagaru, and along the only road out, lay the supply line from Kotari, already under attack by the Communists. This is the setting in which our two guests, standing with me here, made marine history—Maj. Carl Sitter and Maj. Reginald Myers.

In a moment more of Battle Report and a preview of next week's program—but first here is a message you will all find of interest.

The possible shape of things to come—revealed last week in the desert of Nevada. Presaging a new epoch in warfare, the Atomic Energy Commission—with 5,000 troops participating—exploded an economy-size atom bomb in the first atomic-warfare maneuver in American military history. Note the familiar mushroom cloud dissipating itself over the simulated battlefield after the bomb was dropped by plane from an estimated 1,000 feet. Thundering its presence on Frenchman's Flat, the bomb's explosion was heard 50 miles away—and the shock wave broke windows in Las Vegas, Nev. With top brass from the armed services looking on, this sixth atomic detonation in the United States in the last 2 years was used to study the effects of the blast on field installations, battle equipment, and animals. Declared Maj. Gen. William B. Kean, commander of the Third Corps, the maneuver unit: "This first step toward military tactical employment of the nuclear weapon was most successful." Thus, with the atom's smoke, do we shape the close of this week's Battle Report.

So, until we turn our cameras upon the Nation's Capital again next Sunday to report on the battle of democracy against world communism, this is David Brinkley putting a period on your sixty-second Battle Report, Washington.

He's the Same Benton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HE'S THE SAME BENTON

Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, who has been urging the unseating of Senator JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, one of the most outspoken national solons against the Democratic administration's softness toward subversives and Red sympathizers in our Government offices, is the same national lawmaker who suggested violent and vicious punishment of Southern States whose Senators refuse to go along with advocates of civil rights and other legislation unfairly aimed at the South.

Senator BENTON, little in the limelight until his recent fiery outbursts against some of those with congressional influence who fail to join him and his allies in despicable legislative activities, isn't selling himself or his ideas to many if any citizens except those under political control or prejudice. His provocative suggestions won't reach the proverbial first base.

The blast he takes against Senator MCCARTHY, a Republican foe, is of no particular interest in the Southland except the fact that the target of his verbal explosives is bombarding BENTON and others like him because of their sorry attitudes. But the Benton suggestion to punish the South because its senatorial representatives join the other side to protect Southern principles, traditions, and rights, is of acute interest to Southern people, as very aptly reflected by the New Orleans States in this comment about the Connecticut Senator's suggestion:

"Intimidation as a means to accomplish enactment of legislation is a concept so un-American that it should never enter the head of a lawmaker."

"But such a suggestion has come from Senator BENTON who promptly aroused the ire of some of the southern Senators."

"Presiding at a meeting of the Senate Rules Committee, BENTON denounced southern-led filibusters which have blocked votes on the so-called civil rights bills in the past, and suggested that those who support the bills 'take a long look at appropriation bills affecting the Southern States.'"

"In other words, he was suggesting that unless southern Democrats quit blocking the administration's so-called civil rights program, the Senate should practice economic discrimination against the South."

"Later Senator BENTON said he meant his remarks to be part of a listing of 'all possible approaches to getting the Senate filibuster rule changed and pushing through some civil rights legislation.'"

"No matter. This approach is typical of the brand of Fair Deal liberalism we have got to know so well. There is no room for ideas other than their own, and force, rather than logic, is their chosen weapon."

Senator BENTON and any other prejudicial lawmakers can do and say all they wish about penalizing the southern people for insisting upon their rights, but all of it will prove a waste of words, time, and effort. The genuine Democrat, who represents the type of democracy which has guided the South since the founding of the Nation, will never be frightened by political threats. And, obviously, when such threats from small fry, the southern solons with proper democracy guiding them will be bothered no more than an elephant would be disturbed by a baby mosquito's bite.

Senator BENTON, if it really is worth mentioning, reportedly has business in New York,

but his voting domicile is in Connecticut, whose former Governor, Chester Bowles, appointed him in 1948-49 to fill a senatorial vacancy. In 1950 he was elected to the current term.

Radio Broadcast of Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a radio broadcast of Walter Winchell of September 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the radio broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Mr. and Mrs. United States: to the great surprise of many Americans this week the President stated that the Republicans had no issues for 1952. The Truman administration's own record contradicts the President.

If, as Mr. Truman declared on Thursday last, we must met force with force, why did his administration spend 4 years disarming the United States. For instance in 1949, President Truman declared that a super aircraft carrier was absurd. But in 1951, the administration is frantically building two of them. In 1949 the President turned down his own Commission's request for 70 air groups and said that 42 was sufficient.

But now, 2 years later, Mr. Truman's wise men discover that 96 air groups are not enough to defend the United States of America. No Republican issues for 1952? Huh. Listen to two more.

The Truman administration's Department of Justice officially states that crime is costing the Nation billions of dollars every year. But Democratic Senators have proved that the Democratic city machines are the criminals' best allies.

The President also declared that charges of communism were Republican red herring. But his own Justice Department debunked that by convicting Alger Hiss for being a liar and the 11 top Red leaders for plotting to overthrow the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is very shrewd politics for the President to declare that the Republicans have no issues for 1952, because the truth is that the great and vital issue is the Truman administration itself. From bottom to top—professional amateurs.

The Outrageous Increase of 1951 Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article:

THE OUTRAGEOUS INCREASE OF 1951 TAXES

A few days before the end of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, it be-

came alarmed and rejected the 1951 tax bill. It refused to force single persons to pay taxes of \$542 if they earned \$3,000, and \$1,052 if they earned \$5,000, and \$2,728 if they earned \$10,000. The bill walloped a \$25,000 man with \$10,940, and if he earned a million it took \$880,000 from him.

Besides this drain of an 18-percent tax on a \$3,000 income Congress knew that the taxpayer must pay indirect taxes. He pays the corporation, excise, and other business taxes whenever he buys an automobile, food, cigarettes, and all other products. This amounts possibly to another 15 percent of his income—nearly 33 percent in direct and indirect taxes—leaving \$2,000. And of the \$2,000 left, he has only about \$1,100 purchasing power compared to 1939, because the taxing and borrowing by the Government has made our dollar worth not more than 55 cents.

When Congress takes \$3,000 from the taxpayers or borrows to pay a new Government employee \$3,000 it not only reduces what they have to spend but it inflates prices. For example, a man producing 3,000 pounds of beef quits, and goes to work for the Government. Instead of producing beef he is paid \$3,000 by the Government for which he is likely to produce nothing. With this \$3,000 of taxpayers' money he competes against the man who has only \$1,500 to spend for beef and other products. Products grow scarcer, simply because fewer producers are made than spenders.

When Government spenders, dole takers, borrowers, and subsidy beneficiaries, employees, and contractors become the haves with a lot of our tax money to spend, the rest of us become the have nots. Thus the Government haves who are mostly nonproducers of essential consumable goods, run away with the beef at \$1 a pound and the eggs at 90 cents. The have nots can only spend 55 cents for the beef, or 49 cents for eggs with their 55-cent dollars. So they go without. That is inflation with its evil effects for them. The outrageous misrepresentations made by the President that inflation is caused by greedy private citizens forcing prices up is designed to shift the blame from the administration of Government where it belongs.

Government alone creates inflation. It alone can make millions of people temporarily and unnaturally prosperous, because it alone can provide them with unearned benefits. It alone can tax and force millions of others to pay those unearned benefits. Inflation always robs Peter to pay Paul. It makes Paul feel he has more money than he ever had before—all designed to induce him to vote to support the Government that does it.

It was in reality a moral collapse that Congress faced. Congress is not supposed to rob one group and give the proceeds to another. That's what inflation does. Most Congressmen realized the absurdity and the utter dishonesty involved in raising prices by taxes and borrowing, with one hand, and pretending to stop prices rising with the other, by enacting OPS legislation. They have known all the time that the only way to reduce prices is to make more people free from dependence on Government and special privileges. They would, if left on their own responsibility, produce more beef for themselves and others. Then the pounds of beef would equal the units of dollars issued to purchase it. Then there could be no inflation.

But the new tax bill takes even more people out of production and puts more of them on Government incomes, thus increasing inflation further. The effort to control prices is made even more ridiculous.

The enormity of the fraud practiced on the people is shown by the increase in the

printing of money and the borrowing at the banks (largely Government borrowing) that has jumped from \$64,099,000,000 in 1939 to \$174,200,000,000 in June 1951. There could be, of course, no such corresponding rate of increase in production to offset this new money. If it had been possible to produce a new pound of beef and other units of production for each new dollar and credit issued, there could have been no inflation or rising prices. Instead, production of meat, eggs, dairy products, and wool increased very little.

Now we come to the most devilish reason for the Government itself to bring about inflation. That is, to collect more taxes. This year's tax receipts are running \$12,000,000,000 (yes, twelve billions) ahead of last year, due largely to Government-made inflation. If you raise prices and profits 20 percent, taxes will rise about 20 percent.

So a new increase in tax rates was not necessary at all for 1951. It will raise an additional \$5,500,000,000, or a total increase of \$17,500,000,000 more than in 1950. And still they want to raise more in 1952.

That is what Communists in government are for, viz: To raise taxes and spend them and smear the opposition.

Congress, knowing all these things, stood fast for a time against the new tax bill. But it stood fast for 2 or 3 days only. The special privilege groups that are getting the unearned benefits of these taxes with the help of a thousand lobbies in Washington, forced Congress in the first place to pass special bills appropriating money to them. They got appropriations for all manner of subsidies—houses, food, health, loans, contracts, price and rent controls, domestic relief, foreign relief, etc., etc. When Congress balked they got busy and said, "You Congressmen cannot promise money to us in return for our votes, and then fail to levy taxes to make good your promises." For example, more than a cold billion dollars had been promised for unemployment relief, even in these times of so-called prosperity. In one State 8 percent of the entire population was drawing down United States Government relief checks. Some came in Cadillacs to collect their hand-outs. They were called clients of Mr. Ewing's Social Security Department, and their names were to be kept secret so no one could discover their fraud. Here are between 2 and 3 million bought votes. Add to that 2,600,000 Government employees. Multiply that by four to get the number of votes influenced by them. Add another million multiplied by four to cover the public housing tenants who must vote in appreciation of half rent and no taxes for schooling and other municipal services. Then add the population of whole States getting subsidies for growing food. All told, more than 17,000,000 people get checks annually from all the departments of government. None of them drew these checks 20 years ago except the Government employees and veterans of World War I.

This is the extent to which our own variety of socialist government is redistributing wealth. Nor can it be stopped by chasing a few Socialists and Communists out of the Government. So long as we operate the kind of Government we now operate you can be sure Communists will help operate it. What's worse, they will continue to influence our foreign policy, make deals favoring Soviet Russia and likely keep us mixed up in wars.

The only remedy is to stop socialism and communism itself. The people must form committees to appear before the legislatures of at least 32 States, requesting them to demand of Congress, as provided in the Constitution, that it amend the Constitution

by providing a limitation on the power of Congress to tax and spend for nonmilitary costs of Government. That would save seven to ten billion dollars annually, a necessity and a reasonable possibility as shown by Senator BYRD. It is a job for the people—to restate in the Constitution what they want the Federal Government to do, and confine Congress to that. Obviously, Congress won't limit itself. The people can do it, just as they have limited the State legislatures and city councils in what they can spend. As a result, not one of them has gone Socialist. Communists are no problem there simply because they have no unlimited power to tax and spend for their purposes as they have in the Federal Government.

Congress is now without the protection which our State legislatures and city councils enjoy, by the arbitrary and automatic stoppage of spending beyond a certain percentage of assessed values, or without a vote of the people. Such an amendment is now being proposed before the Congress, as follows:

“ARTICLE —

“SECTION 1. All taxes levied and collected for nonmilitary expenditures including interest on the national debt in any one year shall not exceed 5 percent of the national income for the nearest preceding calendar year for which figures are available.

“The Congress shall define, according to accepted accounting practice, what constitutes national income.”

NOTE.—That is now two hundred and fifty billions viz: the national production from farms, mines, sea, factories, and personal services excluding Government, amounts to that.

“SEC 2 To provide for the Military Establishment in peacetimes, and to delay the costs of war, the Congress shall lay and collect special war taxes.”

NOTE.—Five percent of national income would be \$12,500,000,000. That percentage has more than covered all legitimate costs of Government from the beginning.

How To Prevent War and Stop Inflation Without Cost or Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, during the past 6½ years the Truman administration has collected and spent more taxes than we collected in all the previous years of our national existence—\$4,000,000,000 more. We are staggering under the greatest national debt in all history—more than \$256,000,000,000—and we are being rushed at breakneck speed into national bankruptcy. Why?

The President says this reckless spending is necessary to achieve peace and security in a free world. Are you satisfied with that explanation? If not, ask yourself the three following questions:

First. Is peace and security the sole objective of this mad spending spree?

Second. Have the pseudo economists of the New Deal-Fair Deal made such a

mess of our economy that they must promote war and production for war to keep our economy going?

Third. Is this all part of a diabolical international conspiracy to drain away our wealth; destroy our domestic economy; reduce our standard of life to the world level; and replace our system of government with a socialistic, totalitarian state?

AN APPEAL TO REASON

Common sense dictates that the way to prevent wars and depressions and stop inflation is to eliminate the causes. Every war is, in essence, an economic war. The underlying causes of wars and depressions, booms and busts, inflation and deflation are unsound monetary and fiscal policies of government.

These causes can be eliminated in 90 days without cost to the American taxpayers, without economic disturbances of any kind, and without sacrificing the life of a single American boy in foreign wars; merely by carrying out a legislative mandate that has been on our statute books for exactly 58 years—act of Congress, November 1, 1893, section 311, United States Code Annotated, chapters 8, 28, statute 4. This mandate provides for the establishment of a sound, honest, dependable monetary system which will maintain and protect the solvency and integrity of the people's money, the solvency and integrity of the United States, and guarantee the redemption of currency at face value, on demand.

Money is sound, honest, and dependable only when backed by and redeemable in something of a universally recognized and accepted value; and since the dawn of civilization the only two material things that have been universally recognized and accepted in exchange for goods and services, and for the redemption of paper currency, are gold and/or silver at a fixed and proper ratio, based on the relative world production of these two precious metals.

THE SCARCITY OF GOLD

The panics and depressions of 1873, 1893, 1907, 1920, and 1929, and the abandonment of redemption in 1934, proved conclusively that there is not enough gold in the world to furnish monetary reserves adequate to maintain the face value of currency and insure its redemption. The best evidence that a return to the single gold standard does not offer a solution lies in the fact that we were on the single gold standard until 1934 and that this neither prevented the 1929 depression nor provided a remedy. It was war, and war only, that brought back full employment and full production in 1941, and war and rumors of war that have kept our economy going ever since. Unless we propose to continue in a war economy until we suffer total economic collapse, we must join silver with gold at fixed and proper ratio to supply adequate redeemable monetary reserves.

CAUSE OF OUR TROUBLES

Most of our troubles of the last 18 years have stemmed from the fact that, in 1933, we adopted the Laski-Keynes-

Marxist formula of a so-called managed currency and denied the American people the right of redemption. So long as the people enjoyed the right to redeem their paper currency in gold, they had an effective brake against Government waste and extravagance and irredeemable printing-press money. Denial to the people of the right to redeem their currency has been a favorite device of dictators, from time immemorial, when they wished to embark on a spending spree.

As a consequence of this unsound monetary policy, the dollar, and all fixed-dollar-value securities, including savings, pensions, and life insurance, have lost 63 percent of their value since 1933. Prices are high because dollars are cheap, and they will continue to get higher as the dollar gets cheaper. The futility of price controls, while the dollar depreciates in value, should be apparent to anyone.

It should be evident to the most naive—which in French means dumb—that there can be neither peace nor economic stability, here or elsewhere, until we adopt sound monetary and fiscal policies, and restore redeemability to our currency. Perhaps a brief recital of what has happened to our money will be helpful.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO OUR MONEY

I will endeavor to show by simple arithmetic just what has happened to our money. From 1837 to 1934, 23.22 grains of gold constituted \$1, and that was the amount of gold you could demand and receive, in suitable denominations, for every dollar of currency presented at any bank. Prior to 1934 our laws required that we back our currency with a monetary reserve of 40 percent, which for more than a century and a half had been universally recognized as the minimum reserve required to maintain currencies at face value and insure redemption on demand. Thus, it became axiomatic that currency was worth two and one-half times the reserve back of it, and whenever the monetary reserves of a country dropped below 40 percent the value of its currency fell proportionately.

Since there are 480 grains in an ounce, and 23.22 grains of gold constituted a dollar for the 97 years preceding 1934, simple division shows that this fixed the price of gold at \$20.67 per ounce.

In 1934, the amount of gold constituting \$1 was reduced to 13.71 grains—a reduction of 41 percent; and, again, simple division shows that this fixed the price of gold at \$35 per ounce.

In 1945, Public Law 84 was enacted, reducing the monetary reserves from 40 to 25 percent. This caused a depreciation of the already depreciated dollar of 37½ percent, and caused prices to advance 60 percent. But because this occurred at the time price controls were eliminated, most people blame the advance in prices to the elimination of price controls rather than to the enactment of Public Law 84. As a matter of fact, if 1945 price controls had been kept in effect after the enactment of Public Law 84, every

business in the United States would have been forced into bankruptcy.

**WHY PRICE OF OUR GOLD SHOULD BE
\$56 PER OUNCE**

From 1934 until the enactment of Public Law 84 in 1945, the amount of gold constituting a dollar was 1371 grains. By reducing this 37½ percent, we find that the dollar is equivalent to 8.57 grains, and again by simple division, we find that it requires 56 of these depreciated dollars to equal in value an ounce of gold. Therefore, the price of gold should have been advanced to \$56 per ounce. This would not increase the value of gold nor further depreciate the dollar, but would merely adjust the price of gold to the already depreciated value of the dollar. Rather than wasting our time talking about devaluation of the English pound, we can bring all foreign currencies into correct parity with the dollar simply by advancing the price of our gold to \$56 per ounce. This also would have the effect of increasing our monetary reserves to 40 percent thereby preventing further depreciation of the dollar and lessening the danger of a major depression.

SUBSIDIZING IMPORTS 60 PERCENT

But instead of raising the price of our gold to \$56 per ounce, we are permitting foreign nations to buy our gold at \$35 per ounce. This overvalues foreign currencies 60 percent and has the effect of subsidizing imports 60 percent, and discounting exports 37½ percent. This also permits foreign investors to buy our choicest industrial stocks at 37½ percent discount and sell them at a 60 premium. Small wonder that the stock market is no longer a barometer of American business and that our choicest industrial stocks are listed at 60 percent or less of their real value.

REPEATING ERRORS OF 1929

When you recall that the 1929 depression was precipitated when European banks permitted their monetary reserves to fall to 21 percent, you can appreciate the inherent danger in Public Law 84 of 1945, which not only reduced our monetary reserves to 25 percent, but left the door wide open for further reduction. And, as a consequence, our dollar is worth even less than 37 percent in foreign exchange.

For example, an American \$20 gold piece will buy three times as many French francs today as can be bought with \$20 of American currency. That is why you hear about an acute shortage of dollars in Europe because anyone fortunate enough to convert foreign currencies into American dollars can make from 60 to 75 percent on the transaction.

OBJECTIVE OF INTERNATIONAL BANKERS

It is very evident that the objective of those responsible for this situation is to drain away our wealth so that we can no longer consume the major portion of our own production. Then many of our industries will be forced to seek foreign markets. So long as the American manufacturer has a good home market,

he is not interested in foreign trade. He believes in paying good wages and good prices for raw materials because the factory worker, the miner, and the farmer are his best customers.

But once the American manufacturer is forced to seek foreign markets, wages and the prices of raw materials are merely items of cost to be kept as low as possible, and he is no longer interested in a protective tariff. Then foreign goods from slave-labor countries can flow into free-trade America to pay interest on foreign bonds, and American industry becomes a more profitable investment for the international bankers.

The statement carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 17, 1951, titled "Why Silver Is the Magic Metal," copy of which will be sent free on request, should be read in conjunction with the above.

Those who read these statements and fail to demand enactment of a sound monetary system should stop complaining about high prices, high taxes, and the fact that their sons are being drafted to fight more foreign wars.

**Resolution of Connecticut Polish Army
Veterans Association of America**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Polish Army Veterans and its auxiliaries for the department of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

**POLISH ARMY VETERANS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
DISTRICT IV, OF CONNECTICUT,
September 26, 1951.**

The Polish Army Veterans and its auxiliaries for the department of Connecticut, in convention assembled in Derby, Conn., on the 15th and 16th of September 1951, deeply disappointed that the allied victories in World Wars I and II, toward which Polish Army Veterans and their auxiliaries gave so much, have been dissipated through the short-sightedness of the leaders of the democratic nations, and regretting in particular, as Americans of Polish origin, that the country of their forefathers, Poland, was tragically sacrificed on the international political arena to gratify the greatest enemy of democracy, Soviet Russia, and regretting the tragic retreat before the Russians at Yalta and Tehran, which have today brought world-wide chaos and the uncertainty of survival before the onslaught of Russian imperialism, diabolically concealed beneath the mantle of international communism, and being cognizant that these errors and their tragic consequences have brought the world to the brink of disaster and being cognizant that action is imperative have, therefore, resolved, as follows:

1. That the United States reject as invalid the agreements at Yalta and Tehran, since these agreements lost freedom for many nations, including Poland.

2. That the United States and its democratic allies be put into a state of military readiness with utmost speed, so that their combined forces shall be ready to meet the military might of Russia, which has been readied from the day of the termination of World War II.

3. That the greatest possible financial and military aid be given Spain, Italy, and Turkey, inasmuch as these nations hold key positions in the struggle with communism.

4. That the United States immediately withdraw its recognition of the present Polish Government in Poland, because it does not represent the Polish people, but is merely the obedient pawn of Stalin, yielding to his every wish and demand.

5. That the Polish Nation be given the hope of freedom and, therefore, a greater will to resist, through the recognition by the United States of the Polish Government in Exile as the only true and legal Government of Poland, which it already is, in fact, in the eyes of Polish people.

6. That the Katyn murders and its perpetrators be brought to full light and that the responsible criminals be made to answer for the greatest single crime in world history.

WALTER MAZNICKI,

Chairman of Resolution Committee.

**Address by Telford Taylor, Administrator,
Small Defense Plants Administration**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Telford Taylor, Administrator of the new Small Defense Plants Administration, expressed the new agency's aims in an excellent speech before Smaller Business of America, Inc., in Cleveland, Ohio. Under unanimous consent, I include his address in the RECORD:

I am grateful indeed for the opportunity to be a part of this occasion and, more than that, to meet and confer with so many distinguished leaders of Cleveland business. Here, in the heart of the eastern industrial region, is a good vantage point from which to survey some of the economic problems with which the entire country, and small business in particular, is confronted.

The Small Defense Plants Administration is barely 3 weeks old, and this is only the second time that I have been able to leave Washington and visit important centers of production and procurement. I have found both of these trips extremely fruitful and hope to make many more to other parts of the country. The problems of small business are Nation-wide, and they cannot be fully understood, or dealt with, by staying behind a desk in Washington.

Now, the international situation that has given rise to these problems is familiar to all of you. Six years ago we won a decisive military victory over the Nazi-Fascist forces that threatened us and our way of life. That victory was achieved in combination with the power of the Russian and Chinese peoples, among others. When the victory

was achieved, we all looked forward to and hoped for an era of international peace and good will, and the establishment of a genuine, world-wide community of nations.

Events have rapidly proved that this is still a goal to be ardently sought, but not an immediate prospect. The Russian people are enslaved, and the Chinese flushed and confused by a wave of nationalism and revolution which has swept them into the Russian orbit. Our trusted allies of wartime are still in an early stage of economic and social convalescence. The era of good will seems far distant; for nearly a year and a half we have been engaged in Korea, and whether we call it police action or war, it is still a bitter and mortal battle.

We still cling to the hope and bend our efforts to lay the basis for lasting peace, but no man can be sure that the specter of a world war may not emerge into horrible reality, even within the life expectancy of the aged. We cherish our liberties, we revolt at the thought of becoming a garrison state, and we owe it to ourselves and our children to preserve the material and spiritual blessings of peace, restless though that peace may be. All-out mobilization for war is an ugly and destructive thing at best, so we have undertaken to pull the throttle only part way out. And, as a result, we grapple with the dislocations of a partial mobilization, without the all-consuming and simplifying solutions to the terrible equation of an all-out war.

No wonder, then, that our economy is suffering from the troubles and frustrations of split personality. And these consequences are coming down upon the head of small business with especial weight. We are living in the era of the tank, the airplane, the atomic bomb, and the guided missile. Military procurement of the means and weapons of war comes in ever more enormous and complicated bites. The demand for aluminum, copper, and steel for military purposes pinches the civilian economy acutely. The big companies swallow up both the Government contracts and the material where-withal of civilian production.

The trend is unmistakable, and there is no sign yet of a reversal. On the contrary, things are apparently going to be worse before they are better. We have just last week heard General Bradley tell us that the air program must be stepped up if the battle for defense is to be won. It seems plain that tanks and planes are going to be bigger and faster and more numerous than ever, and the impulse of procurement officers to seek out the big manufacturer, with regiments of engineers and acres of plant, is going to be stronger than ever.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In this connection, I would like to make two general observations to clarify the attitude with which I am approaching my new duties as Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration. There is nothing in the Defense Production Act, under which this agency is constituted, that says that big business is a bad thing. I have stated previously, and want to reiterate, that there is to be no "holy war" of little business against big business. In a capitalist free enterprise economy, we certainly need big business and the wonderful things that research laboratories and assembly lines can accomplish.

Therefore, and this brings me to my second general observation, it is understandable that many procurement officers and officials charged with the allocation of scarce materials tend to think first about the big companies with nationally known names. But the fact that this tendency is under-

standable does not make it right to think about them preferentially or to the exclusion of small business from its rightful share in our economy as a whole.

It is wholly understandable and natural that your 16-year-old son may want to drive the family automobile at 60 miles an hour down the main street of the town, but that does not make it a safe or sane thing for him to do. We must have women and babies and even pedestrians, or soon we will have no 16-year-old boys.

And, in similar fashion, our national economic welfare depends on the preservation of a balanced and varied economic structure. If small business is allowed to wither on the vine, before very long there will be no big business. It is the mission of the Small Defense Plants Administration, as I envisage it, to insure that our program of partial mobilization does not lead to such disastrous consequences, as well as to foster and enlarge the contribution that small business can make to the defense program.

Now, it would be idle to pretend that it is going to be an easy and simple matter to accomplish the objectives to which SDPA is dedicated, or that there are not substantial difficulties and obstacles in our path. One very real difficulty is that we have gotten off to a very late start. The Korean war has been going on for nearly a year and a half, and many of the basic decisions with respect to the mobilization program were made many months ago. The SDPA is faced with a procurement and allocation pattern which, to a large degree, has already been set. For the accomplishment of our purposes, it would have been much better if the agency had been in existence during the past year, while the defense program was taking shape.

Then, too, this late start means that we have come into existence at a moment when a very acute period is just around the corner. Only a few weeks ago NPA Administrator Manley Fleischmann said that, so far as the first and second quarters of next year are concerned, the outlook is, to use his word, "dismal." He went further, and told a group of Senators and Congressmen, members of the Small Business Committees and Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses, that: "The cuts that we have made will mean that there will be localized unemployment, loss of profits to many manufacturers of nonessential civilian goods, and the actual closing down of plants which cannot operate on the limited supplies of aluminum, copper, and steel which will be made available to them. We have hoped to hold such unhappy developments to a minimum, but there is no dodging the fact that many will be hurt." The SDPA comes face to face with these acute shortages when the agency is still a newborn infant, and wrestling with basic problems of organization and staffing.

Finally, the immediate financial resources of the SDPA are very limited. The last appropriation act traveled most of the way through Congress before the agency came into existence. Indeed, I took the oath of office only the day before Congress adjourned. As a result, the SDPA has only a small interim appropriation of \$350,000 for administrative expenses, which must see us through until, at the next session, Congress again has an opportunity to consider the question of enlarging our budget. In the meantime, we will be limited to a monthly payroll of not much more than \$60,000.

NO DEFEATISM IN SDPA ATTITUDE

I have mentioned these obstacles not by way of criticism, either of Congress or the executive branch, but only so that you will understand what we are up against. Whether our financial resources are large or

small, the mere creation of a new Government agency is not going to solve the problems of small business. And, having mentioned the difficulties, I now want to make it unmistakably clear that they do not lead to any defeatism in my own thinking or in the attitude with which the SDPA will seek to accomplish its mission. In no wise do we accept the bland assumption that high mortality rates among small businesses are a necessary concomitant of the defense effort. Any such assumption is antithetical to the national welfare. Ways and means must be found to keep business failures and closings to a minimum, not only for economic reasons, but so that these resources will not be lost to the Nation, and will continue to provide the basis for further expansion.

Accordingly, the fact that the SDPA will, at least at the outset, be a very small agency in terms of staff and budget, does not mean that we are going to fall back on a philosophy of inaction while waiting for reinforcements. It does mean, however, that we must select very carefully those areas of action in which we can be most immediately effective with a small but determined staff. We cannot afford to spread ourselves all over the lot and fritter away our energies and slender resources. The situation calls for a concentration of effort in carefully selected directions.

Now, the statute (section 714 of the Defense Production Act as amended) under which the SDPA operates contains a great many paragraphs and clauses and a long series of functions and powers. I do not think that there is any need to go through it with you section by section. In general, it may be said that our activities under the statute fall in four major spheres. These are credit, the allocation of scarce materials, Government procurement, and information.

In the credit field, our statute contains a new authorization to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans and advances to small business concerns for a wide variety of purposes. The SDPA is empowered to recommend such loans to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and a fund of \$100,000,000 is set aside from which loans can be made.

LOAN PROCEDURE WITH RFC

I have already met with Mr. Symington, the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lay the basis for the making of these loans. The staff of the SDPA has been in almost constant conference with the staff of the RFC to work out the procedural details, and in the very near future we hope to announce the consummation of a practicable working agreement so that these funds will be available for loans to small business concerns upon the basis of properly supported applications. It is my earnest hope that the procedure for obtaining such loans will be simple and expeditious, and will prove of real benefit to small business.

In the credit field, another problem has been repeatedly called to our attention for which we hope we can provide a speedy solution. In the letting of subcontracts to small businesses, many large prime contractors have been insisting upon a general right of set-off against payments to the subcontractors. This has proved a serious obstacle when subcontractors have endeavored to assign their subcontracts as collateral for bank loans. Mr. Symington and I both feel that this practice is a real obstacle to the performance of defense contracts by small business concerns, and have called this situation to the attention of the Government contracting agencies. We certainly hope that

the prime contractors will speedily abandon this practice voluntarily; if not, governmental action may be called for.

Turning to the field of procurement, the statute empowers the SDPA to enter into contracts with the procurement agencies of other Government departments, and to arrange for the performance of these contracts by letting out subcontracts to small business concerns. A revolving fund of \$50,000,000 is authorized to support these contracts, but this fund has not yet been appropriated by the Congress, and, therefore, we will not be able to take action of this type for the time being.

SPREADING OF CONTRACTS

On the other hand, there are several other things that can be done now to spread both prime contracts and subcontracts among small business concerns. As Senator Sparkman brought out in his talk here in Cleveland yesterday, the trend toward concentration of prime contracts among a relatively small circle of large manufacturing companies has not yet been checked. Munitions Board figures show that dollar volume purchases from small firms in the 1950 fiscal year amounted to 24.5 percent of the total. In 1951 dollar volume purchases from small firms amounted to 21 percent. The latest figures released by the Munitions Board, giving the statistics for the month of July, reveal that only 16 percent of dollar volume of prime contracts went to companies employing fewer than 500 employees.

Now, as I stated earlier, this concentration of prime contracts in the hands of big companies is, in part, a natural result of the character of the defense program. Heavy implements of war, such as tanks and airplanes, do not lend themselves to small scale production as readily as uniforms and rifles and C-rations. But this factor makes it all the more important that compensatory procurement policies be followed with respect to products which small business is equipped to provide. It is not the fault of small business that the military needs of the times tend to concentrate in the big concerns. It will be the fault and the misfortune of the Nation as a whole if action is not taken to prevent this concentration from working a dislocation which would be harmful and, perhaps, fatal to the national economy.

Then, too, these large contracts for heavy equipment offer extensive opportunities for the participation of small business through subcontracts. The SDPA plans to lay great stress on this aspect of the procurement problem. I have said that there is to be no declaration of war against big business. This presupposes that big business will take a farsighted and enlightened attitude, and will cooperate with the Government in distributing subcontracts as widely as possible among small business concerns. And it is in this field that the informational powers of the SDPA can be exercised to great advantage. There is a startling lack of precise information about the extent to which small business is participating in Government procurement through subcontracts, and about the methods and practices which big business is following in distributing subcontracts. It will be the earnest intention of SDPA to throw some light into this obscure situation.

There are many other ways in which the spreading of both prime and subcontracts can be promoted. The establishment of production pools of small plant facilities is a good example. During World War II, some 250 such pools received governmental clearance. They included more than 2,000 companies, employing about 140,000 workers,

and it has been estimated that they obtained over \$600,000,000 in Government contracts. At the present time, however, only five such pools have been certified by the Government and, so far as I am informed, not a single prime contract has as yet been awarded to any of the five. Time does not permit me to elaborate on this important branch of our future activities, nor to cover other problems in the procurement field with which we will be dealing.

MATERIALS ALLOCATION

The allocation of scarce materials—which, at the moment, means aluminum, copper, and steel in particular—will be an especially acute problem during the coming year. Under our basic statute, all allocation orders and priority policies must, from now on, be drawn up in consultation with the SDPA. The Governmental machinery to carry out this function is presently being devised. The SDPA will, I am sure, be given representation on the committees at the Defense Production Administration and National Production Authority, where the basic policies and directives with respect to the allocation of materials are evolved, and will present and support the legitimate claims of small business with all the vigor at its command.

To discharge all these and other functions effectively, the SDPA is going to need the advice and support of small business all over the country. Furthermore, while much can be done to aid the small-business man in Washington, I am confident that much more can be done in the major production and procurement centers throughout the country. For the time being, our budget will permit the establishment of only a very limited field organization. We cannot afford large regional offices or very many offices. A skeletal field organization is, however, vital, to keep us in touch with what is going on throughout the country, and to give small-business concerns a point of contact and assistance so that they will not have to run to Washington with all their problems. We want to be on the spot to help, and I have had many valuable suggestions from your association with respect to decentralization and regional representation.

In conclusion, I want to lay at rest the notion that it is the purpose of the new SDPA to obstruct or delay the defense program. On the contrary, its purpose is to support and strengthen defense production by expanding its resources and giving wider scope and fuller opportunity for the contribution of ideas and products that small business can make. By this very process, we can also insure that the strains and stresses of defense production do not work a fundamental dislocation of our economic structure, and throw it out of balance in a way that would soon be harmful to the defense program itself, and ultimately fatal to the national welfare.

The purposes of the Small Defense Plants Administration, are, therefore, not only in line with but an integral part of our political and economic tradition. They are highly conservative, in the best and most precise meaning of that much-abused word.

I am confident, therefore, that small-business men all over the country will welcome the new agency and support its purposes. I want to thank all of you for the invaluable advice and encouragement which you have already given, no less than for the courtesy and hospitality with which I have been received here in Cleveland.

I am sure that a relationship of this sort will go far to insure the success of our undertaking, and will benefit not only small business but the Nation as a whole.

Dedication of Memorial to the Memory of World War II Veterans at Nahant, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dedication of a memorial to World War II veterans, Nahant, Mass.:

Fellow Americans, whenever I visit a cemetery, my attention is drawn to the brave little flags that flutter in the breeze over the graves of our hero dead.

There are not many of these distinguished markers.

During life's journey, only a few are fit enough to be called upon for such devotion and sacrifice.

You and I work to support ourselves, as we must. Perhaps we labor to raise a family and to provide them with the advantages that we did not have. The only reward we ask for is to see them become a credit to themselves and to their fellowmen. And then, sooner or later, we are called from our earthly cares to sleep, like the silent ones in this sanctuary of the dead, whose spirits have become one with their Creator.

This is the pattern of life for most of us.

But what of the few who lived and died not for some personal goal, not for their families, but for all of us?

What gave these young men the faith and the courage to liberate themselves from the narrow claims of self and give up their lives in defense of the many they did not know?

I always think of this as I bow my head before the little flag over the grave of a man who died in action.

The answer does not come easily.

You and I try to imagine what we would have done in their situation. War is often waged with long-range weapons, of such velocity and destructive power, that one cannot see the enemy. Before this vast, impersonal terror, would we be able to conquer our own fears, to help and protect the men to the right and to the left of us?

Not having gone through this agony, we do not know how we would have met it.

We stand before their graves and wonder, striving to learn second-hand from their experiences.

Because we the living need their belief and their firm purpose so that we will face up to the unseen problems of our time for which there are no easy solutions.

There is no greater fear nor challenge than that of the unknown. Men and women of character do not run away from it. By going forward they make the unknown become known, and in so doing they conquer it and themselves.

A child cannot cling forever to the apron strings of its mother for then it would never grow up.

The early American pioneers did not turn back from the savage wilderness to the comforts they had left behind. They pushed ahead, fighting and overcoming great odds, finding fulfillment by using and developing their God-given abilities.

It was the same with these gallant men of Nahant who dared to live and die courageously.

In one way, we mourn their passing because they were too young to die. They wanted love and laughter and meaningful work just as you and I. We miss the contributions they would have made to the larger life of family, community, and Nation. But in another sense they accomplished more in the dedication of their youth than many others whose span of years on this earth is long, if nothing more.

They could have taken the easiest way and in saving themselves have lost the war.

Then you and I would have been secure in the grip of tyrants who would rule us with an iron hand.

The security of faceless people, the security of the living dead

You and I want food, clothing, shelter, and more of the creature comforts of life, but we want the opportunity to earn them on our own with no strings attached. By working for them in self-respect and respecting our fellowmen. Not by transferring this responsibility to an all-powerful government that will demand our minds and souls in exchange. Not by falling for the "father-knows-best" lullaby that is the theme of communism and that would, if it could, transform this world into a human zoo, fed and sheltered and put through its paces at the crack of the whip and the gun.

Only as free men and women—mature and responsible men and women compromising our differences by voluntary methods—can life have peace, progress, and dignity.

The Americans who gave up their lives in World War II fought for this chance against the resurgent barbarism that in the name of order would smother mankind in ignorance and regimentation.

They won this chance for us at great cost. The chance, not the guaranty.

What we do with this opportunity from now on is the test of our ability as a free people.

The men who rest beneath this green sod gave all. Their younger brothers are also giving their life's blood in Korea at this moment.

What are we being asked to give? Only a little more effort and a little more money, both trifling compared with their supreme sacrifice. In fact, it is unworthy to make a comparison in these terms.

We can, however, try to match their unwavering faith.

By dedicating ourselves to the practice of truth, honesty, and justice, we shall not only become better men and women, but we shall help our Government to exemplify those qualities that shall win world-wide cooperation in the effort to establish an honorable and lasting peace.

Military strength and economic strength—these we must have to protect us on our journey into the uncertain future, threatened as we are by cunning and dangerous foes.

But it is our faith that will see us through.

It is not a faith of one sect, or race, or political party, but one that believes in the dignity of Man.

No iron curtain and no twisting propaganda can forever stop its message of hope and mutual confidence from reaching all peoples. By showing to the world the better life enjoyed by those who benefit from freedom, and by offering to help the downtrodden masses in other areas of the globe to share in the spiritual and material blessings of liberty, we shall break the barriers of fear and hate and envy that divide mankind.

The men of Nahant who fought and died in World War II, were Americans first, but I believe that they also had this greater goal in mind.

So far, the genius of freedom as released in the United States has concentrated upon the development of material abundance.

Now we have the opportunity—yes, and the responsibility—to bring to others the creative secret that we have discovered for their own emancipation and for the development of a world-wide civilization.

On the front face of this memorial are the following words, etched in lasting Vermont granite:

"The citizens of Nahant in grateful memory here inscribe the names of those who come not back again."

They are gone in the flesh, but into our hands their torch has passed—lighting the way toward the better world that we must build—to vindicate their courage and devotion.

Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Johnson in the Country Lawyer column of the Northumberland Echo, Heathsville, Va.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

COUNTRY LAWYER

(By Walter Johnson)

There is much ado about what is being done by Senator JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. For long he has been demanding a clean-up in the Department of State. As a result of his demands made on the Senate floor he has been the subject of most bitter denunciation. Government officials and the liberal writers and commentators are throwing punches at MCCARTHY. Many others join in because they have not thought the matter through and they repeat what seems to them to sound good.

It is argued that MCCARTHY has proved nothing and to this it must be said that there has been no opportunity to prove anything. The Tydings committee of the Senate was charged with the duty of investigating but it turned out to be a whitewash entitled to no credit. Records in the executive branch are kept secret from Congress by order of the President.

It is also argued that Senator MCCARTHY is abusing the privilege of the Senate. The founding fathers wisely provided in the Federal Constitution for freedom of Congress by stipulating that remarks in Congress cannot be questioned elsewhere. It is hard to understand how demands that only real loyal Americans be employed in responsible public position is an abuse of privilege. Even if it were there are 95 other Senators who have the same privilege and who may well rise to debate with Senator MCCARTHY.

The fury of the attack on Senator MCCARTHY would seem to indicate that he is on the right track. It is the same fury that was directed at Congressman Martin Dies, of

Texas, some years ago when he was exposing communism. Dies was chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. When he and his associates started exposing the monster he became subject to the most violent attacks. This was so furious that he had to devote his entire attention of defending himself and this had the effect of substantially halting the work.

Dies, a Democrat, was one of the most courageous men ever to sit in Congress. Eventually his health was broken by overwork and he was driven from Congress. But he had got the work so well started that others have been able to carry on.

There are few thinking people who can conclude that our present very difficult situation was brought about by just plain bungling. It just couldn't happen that way. Even with the greatest lack of intelligence there would, with patriotic honesty, be a reasonable number of steps in the right direction. The record shows otherwise.

Despite what may be said the work of Senator MCCARTHY is of tremendous advantage to the people. The Senator is on the firing line. He is drawing the fire to himself. In so doing he has created a situation under which the committees of Congress are left comparatively free to proceed with their work quietly and efficiently. This is in sharp departure from the time when Dies had to do the work and defend himself, too.

Only recently President Truman, speaking at dedication of an American Legion office building in Washington, took occasion to level a lot of names at persons who challenge communism in government. He insisted that there are no Communists in government. In comment on the President's talk Democrat Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, said "There are none so blind as those who will not see."

We are caught in a situation which demands that only real Americans be in our State Department. Not only should they be real Americans but they should be thought to be real Americans. They, like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion. When our boys are dying by the thousands in combat with communism there can be no excuse for even a taint of communism in our Government.

If our President is so blind he will not see, then it is up to our chosen representatives in Congress assembled to do whatever is necessary in protection of our people. We may well be thankful that at this time we do have at least some men of vision and courage in the halls of Congress.

Could Eisenhower Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Lawrence R. Brown: [From the Freeman of September 24, 1951]

COULD EISENHOWER WIN?

(By Lawrence R. Brown)

(Can Eisenhower win an election on "glamour"? Lawrence Brown thinks not. In this article he relates the Eisenhower boom to

the Republican dilemma as regards the basic issue of national survival.)

The maneuvers to capture the Republican nomination for Eisenhower are reminiscent of those that so disastrously captured it for Willkie. There is the same synthetic publicity accepted as evidence of mass popularity, the same approval by the liberal and forward-looking elements of the Republican Party—that is, by the eastern suburbs—the same slightly craven despair of the professional politician who wants to win with anybody and accepts a candidate's own publicity as evidence of his political strength.

There is even a faint resemblance between the men as individuals, the same air of boyish masculinity, the same public doubt concerning their understanding of political realities, the same narrow competence inflated out of all proportion by public misunderstanding of their real responsibilities. Despite their outward air of craggy, individual strength both men have owed their fame to others. Willkie to the Wall Street group which made him a prominent lawyer, Eisenhower to the leftist faction of the Roosevelt administration which gave him his stars and his commands.

There is, however, a deeper similarity in the two candidacies. Both represent the efforts of the same faction of the Republican Party to cooperate with the foreign policy of the Democratic administration. The backers are men who profess objection to some of the domestic policies of the administration but approve its foreign policy. Their public plea, of course, is that only an internationalist and forward-looking candidate can win the election. Privately, they argue that the Republicans must nominate a popular figure, a man with glamour. The substance of their view, however, is their unwillingness to conduct a campaign on any issue at all.

They know that to exclude foreign affairs would be to exclude all real issues and merely replay 1910, 1944, and 1948. Hence their plea for a candidate with glamour. Willkie was supposed to have it. Eisenhower is said to have it. With this quality, it is argued, a candidate can get votes on his personality, not his clarity of purpose or understanding of the crisis in which his country finds itself. But the trouble with glamour is that though it may lead to popularity, which is only a fancy name for favorable publicity, it does not win elections.

Eisenhower, like Willkie, would be a natural candidate for the Democrats, but again that position has been preempted. Even more than Willkie, he is one of those candidates whose professional support is from people who are for him because they think some other people are for him. You meet many of the first, but few of the second. It might seem that so synthetic a candidacy would collapse after a little sober analysis by the professional Republican leaders. To envisage the kind of campaign Eisenhower could wage against Truman at once exposes its absurdity. Why should anybody vote for the obedient subordinate and reject his responsible superior?

HOW CAN EISENHOWER ATTACK?

Wherein can Eisenhower attack the Democratic administration? For those policies which he himself executed without a murmur? Obviously, he cannot mention foreign policy beyond the vague cooperative generalities of Willkie. Can he campaign on domestic policies only? Hardly with success. First, he is marked as a man with no experience in domestic matters. Secondly, there is no domestic question that does not promptly bring in foreign questions. Taxes, the draft, Government spending, labor pol-

icy; none of these can be separated from the foreign crises that have sometimes been the cause and always the excuse for more than a decade of domestic issues. No candidate committed to the foreign policy of the Democratic administration can do more than be petulant about domestic questions. He would have raised the same vast sums for the same foreign purposes, but somehow he would have made the taxes lighter. He would have drafted and controlled the economy for the same objectives as his opponent, but he would have done it better. It is not difficult to see who would win the American voters in that kind of campaign.

It might be supposed that the impossibility of winning with Eisenhower would gradually dampen the ardor of his more practical backers; but it almost certainly will not, for the very good reason that to win is only their secondary objective. Their primary objective, as in '40, is to continue the Democratic foreign policy. If Eisenhower can win, that will be fine. If he cannot, he will have accomplished what is to them his principal function: the occupancy of the Republican presidential nomination to be sure that no opponent of the Democratic foreign policy gets it.

This campaign within a campaign needs more attention than it gets. Its object is to prevent foreign policy from becoming an issue, and the Republican candidacy of Eisenhower is merely the certain insurance of success.

To suggest that the fate of the United States—its continuance as an independent nation or its submergence under Soviet conspiracy and ultimate conquest—hinges upon the presidential election of '52 is to evoke undesired echoes of nineteenth-century campaign oratory. It is curious that in the past, when no election result could have touched the survival of the Nation, it was the style to say that it could, while today with the Soviet colossus bestriding the earth, fashion decrees that this fact must be considered irrelevant to an American political campaign.

This is the substance of the campaign for Eisenhower. It is also the accepted view of many eastern Republicans and, for entirely different reasons, of many of the one-time isolationists of the Middle West. It is also the view of most of the press and the radio. In this view it must be assumed that both parties are equally committed to defense of the United States against Soviet attack, equally unanimous in this commitment and equally willing to employ what seems from moment to moment the best strategy of defense.

DEMOCRATS AGAINST AMERICA

The trouble with this view—which is the substance of the bipartisan foreign policy—is that the rise of the Soviet Empire cannot be separated from domestic American politics, because that empire was created not by its own might but by American domestic politics. Soviet world power did not just happen, nor could the Soviet Government have achieved it by its own efforts. That empire is the creation of the faction that for years has steadily increased in power within the Democratic Party. Despite the administration's verbal attacks on Communist aggression and its childish prosecutions of the inconsequential riffraff of the official Communist Party, this faction is still able to protect its key men in the Government and to influence the major lines of American foreign policy.

These are the men who kept British and American armies out of Eastern Germany and the Danube Basin, not as the most expeditious way of defeating Germany but in

order to give these lands to the Russians. These are the men who used lend-lease and UNRRA to increase Russia's postwar military potential. These are the men who turned over Asia to the Soviet Empire preliminary at Yalta and finally with Marshall's arms-embargo against the Chinese Nationalists. These are the men who have blocked every attempt to remove Soviet agents from key policy positions in the Government. These are the men who always oppose Communist aggression in speeches and always aid it with such of the political power of the United States as they can discreetly use for that purpose. These are the men who with another 4 years of power safely in their grasp can accomplish the final destruction of the United States before an irresistible Soviet World Empire.

The fact that the Democratic Party as a whole never had such purpose is without bearing. Within the pro-Soviet faction there were enough men, powerfully enough placed in the Government and the Democratic Party, to manage American policy in such a way that the Soviet Empire grew to be the mighty power they desired it to become. They may have thought they were serving world peace, or idealism, or the welfare of humanity, or that they were merely promoting their own political or military careers by working harmoniously with an obviously powerful element in the Roosevelt administration. Whatever their motive, they created the Soviet Empire and then disarmed the United States.

These are the facts, and any difficulty in understanding the motive of such men does not change them. It is not the motives of a prominent man of today but the commitments of an obscure, ambitious careerist of 20 years ago that are decisive. These men still control the dominant faction of the Democratic Party in all questions concerning Russia, and since the President appears to be their intellectual and moral prisoner, there is no possibility of loyal Democrats regaining control of their party.

True, the country does not know this; therefore, foreign policy seems a troublesome issue to many short-sighted Republicans who themselves have rarely thought through the process by which the United States became a groveling suppliant to Chinese and Korean agents of the Soviet empire. True, the people as a whole know only that Russia has become an immense power and that we have become weak; that ever since 1943 the Soviet empire, has grown constantly stronger and more threatening. But they also know that everything that brings politics into their daily lives—high prices, the draft, Government controls, the Korean casualties, high taxes—in one way or another always comes back to the power and menace of this immense empire and the wordy but altogether ineffective counteractions of the administration. All they know, in essence, is that something is terribly, dangerously wrong.

The problem has not yet the status of a political issue because everyone who raises it is treated as a sorehead, a publicity seeker. It is not a party issue, and until it becomes one the evidence will be rarely printed and more rarely considered. But once it becomes a party issue, the overwhelming evidence placed against the public certainly that it is not right for us to be shamefully weak and the Russians dangerously strong will make it the most powerful political issue in many generations of American politics. Nor can there be any serious doubt about the way the American public would vote on that issue.

From the mere view of party advantage the question, therefore, arises why the Republican Party does not set to work to build

this issue—the betrayal of American interests to the Soviet empire—into the central theme of its 1952 campaign. Surely, say the naive apologists for the administration, if the facts were so damning, the Republican Party would not leave this field to the scattered efforts of a few Senators and Representatives. These apologists overlook the basic fact that in the realities of American politics there is no Republican Party, and until there is a nominee for President whom self-styled Republicans must either repudiate or support, there will be none. Until then, nothing can be a party issue.

REPUBLICANS AGAINST THEMSELVES

There are also two major factions within the Republican Party, the eastern internationalists and the one-time isolationists of the Middle West. That fact explains the reluctance of most prominent Republican politicians to force the issue of foreign policy into the election of '52.

The difficulty that faces the one-time isolationists in raising this issue is not so grave as that which inhibits the eastern Republicans, but it is still a difficulty. A serious examination of the administration's pro-Soviet policies brings in question the entire policy of the United States in the recent war and even to some extent in the earlier war. It raises the question of war as an instrument of national policy, and this the one-time isolationists desire to avoid. In their hearts they object to the consequences of both wars, but instead of objecting to the political goals toward which the two wars were directed—a distressing, cold-blooded issue to raise in the emotional atmosphere of a democracy—they keep silent about their real grievance and object to war as such. Foreign wars, they see, have involved the United States in manifest disasters, and it is hard for them to credit the reality of a kind of war quite outside their experience. The United States was never before in danger, and they find it difficult to sense that it now is.

So this naturally nationalistic wing of the Republican Party are left in the quagmire of sempiternity because of their fallacious conclusion that no war can be really necessary to the life and welfare of the United States. Thus they back into approximately the same position that the eastern internationalists occupy frontally and by choice: that no war of national interest should be fought because the purpose of world politics is not national welfare and survival but collective security and international peace.

But it is primarily the eastern internationalists among the Republicans who are unable to make Democratic betrayal to Russia the central issue of the 1952 campaign. These are the Republicans of the suburbs of the large eastern cities. They are by no means all the eastern Republicans, but they are the most vocal and command the most money and the best press. They are not only fearful of a strong nationalistic policy; they would deplore it as morally wrong. They have been well trained by the past literary generation to be more than a little ashamed of their own country and acutely conscious of whether they were fully abreast of the current intellectual style. Since for many years the intellectual fashion has been not only internationalist but even covertly leftist, only a Babbitt could be so hopelessly outdated as to concern himself with gaining crude practical advantages for the United States. That the survival of a state depends on the maintenance of its advantages would be too immoral a fact for them to recognize.

Naturally these Republicans demand that the party nominate a man with internationalist views, who will accept the current

clichés of the eastern press and the slick-paper magazines about collective security and international cooperation. They cannot make a real issue of the rise of the Soviet Empire. They cannot admit to themselves that this empire is an immense power and a deadly menace. To do so would not only make nonsense of their pet international theories but establish the sound political judgment of men they have been taught to despise. It simply cannot be made respectable to expose the Soviet Empire and its American apparatus for what they really are. Too many prominent intellectual, literary, and academic figures would emerge tinged with political idiocy if not with treason. Too many eastern Republican politicians would look imbecilic for sitting on the sidelines through such a gigantic betrayal. If the truth about Hiss was hard for the eastern intelligentsia to take, the truth about the entire Soviet apparatus would be staggering.

BABBITT UP TO DATE

From these basic considerations comes the formula that the Republican candidate must appeal to the "forward-looking elements," the body of liberal opinion supposed to be attached to neither party. To do this, of course, he must be an internationalist and possess that vague but indisputable quality of intellectual respectability. He must have no part of the repute of a JOE MARTIN, a MCCARTHY, or even a TART. At the moment Eisenhower best fills the bill. The political fallacy of this opinion—which the Republican Party has accepted with known results since 1940—is not in point here, but the real meaning of the definition of the desirable candidate.

What is the practical mechanism for determining what Republican candidates could fill these specifications? Who presumes to speak for the "forward-looking elements"? Manifestly the "liberal" commentators of press and radio. Their names are familiar: Elmer Davis, Lippmann, the Alsops, Doris Flesoon, Stokes, Childs, Mellett, Pearson, Eleanor Roosevelt. Beyond these there are a few technically anonymous sources of similar views, the publicly unidentified editors of the Washington Post, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

This group is the generator of what is accepted as "liberal" and "internationalist" opinion. Certainly it does not come from such "reactionaries" and "enemies of the U. N." as Fulton Lewis, Pegler, Sokolsky, Lawrence, Sullivan, Frank Kent, the editors of the Washington Times-Herald, the New York News, Chicago Tribune, the Hearst and Scripps-Howard papers. Could these men establish a man as either a "liberal" or an "internationalist"?

These two lists contribute the bulk of the political comment reaching almost all those Americans directly reached by any political comment at all. The first interpretation of political events, the first character estimates of a man, reach public attention through these men and women. Roughly speaking there are no other important sources of political information available to the American people.

Now, since the second group listed above are considered completely reactionary, "liberal" political opinion is confined by simple mathematical elimination to the first group. They and they alone can speak for "liberalism" and the "forward-looking elements."

The question remains concerning intellectual respectability. Who can confer or withhold this label? Who has pictured Senator Vandenberg as a great statesman and Senator TART as muddled and reactionary? Who has unceasingly built up George Mar-

shall and unceasingly belittled Forrestal and Louis Johnson? The point is not whether these views of American public men are correct or erroneous, but that they are held by people who think of themselves as liberals and internationalists—including a large group of eastern Republicans. The further point is that these are precisely the estimates of public men which the first group of commentators has promulgated for many years.

These being the sources of liberal and internationalist public opinion, these being as a whole the group that proclaims who is and who is not intellectually respectable in American politics, it is obvious that, if the Republican Party wants a candidate who conforms to these specifications he must be a man generally acceptable to this group. Yet these political commentators have for nearly 20 years been almost the intellectual proprietors of the Democratic administration, thereby gaining a public importance that opposition could never have given them. For them to approve any Republican candidate except one foredoomed to defeat or certain to continue the same administration under a different party label would be well beyond the elastic limits of human nature. Even if there were no question of harmony of political objective, their mere livelihood and public prestige require them to work for the continuance of the same basic administration in Washington.

This is the nettle that the Republican Party must grasp or it will again flitter away its efforts in a senseless, foredoomed election. It cannot have a candidate who will be considered liberal and intellectually respectable unless, like Willkie, he is already a prisoner of the Democratic administration or, like Dewey, doomed by the boredom and indifference of the reactionary Republicans.

Furthermore, if the Republicans want a candidate who will please the liberal commentators, what sort of campaign can he wage? For what can he attack the administration that will not bring down their abuse upon him?

Probably he could talk about government corruption in minor offices—he could not mention the cost of the President's establishment: It is not liberal to get personal in politics except against the enemies of the Soviet Empire. Probably it would be permissible to deplore high taxes and government expenditures. He could argue for restricted free enterprise and deplore the march toward statism. But can such a campaign win an election? Obviously no one is going to get very angry about it one way or the other. No one is going to feel that it is really vital to cast his vote for the Republicans. Those who do not object to the present administration are not ignorant of these things. Reminding them of what they already know and discount will gain no votes.

Nor would this sort of campaign be of any use with those opposed to the administration. They, too, are a little cynical about political virtue. It is not for sins but for vast crimes that they detest this administration, even though they sense them rather than know them in precise detail. To go to people who are mortally worried for the life of their country, who are sick with dread at the prospect of the vague disasters that this administration seems to bring ever nearer; to go to these people with chatter about RFC scandals, the need for sound money and a free economy, or with opposition to creeping socialism, or any other superficial wordy campaign that would not shock the liberal commentators, is simply to confirm them in their despair.

THE WAY TO DEFEAT

For the Republican Party to refuse to pitch its whole campaign on the Russian policy of the United States is to insure its defeat. The vast growth of Soviet power is implicit in every problem disturbing Americans. Everyone is aware that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations had something to do with the growth of that power. Some think they deliberately aided its growth, knowingly contrary to the interests of the United States. Others think they honestly miscalculated, honestly blundered, but generally did the best they could. But everyone is aware that Soviet power has become immense. Everyone is aware that this power today is a danger. For the Republicans to ignore this danger, to fail to make it the central thesis of their campaign, is to ignore the only issue to which people will pay serious and consistent attention because it is the only issue they know is real. It is the only issue upon which the Republicans can get enthusiastic voters, and without them the election might as well be conceded.

A campaign on the pro-Soviet record of the Democratic administration would at once be labeled "dirty." It would be the McCarthyism so deplored, and so dreaded, by the Democratic high command and by every liberal commentator. This might seem on its face to recommend it to the Republicans—as it perhaps does to the bulk of the party—but it seems to terrify the pundits of eastern Republicanism. They are willing to win but not at that price. Yet that price may be the survival of their country.

Vultures Are After McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VULTURES ARE AFTER MCCARTHY

The vultures are after United States Senator Joe McCarthy, arch foe of Communist traitors, but I don't think they will get him. For one thing, Senator McCarthy is a combat veteran of World War II with a good record, and the veterans are with him judging by the frequent appearances he is asked to make before veterans' conventions and the enthusiasm with which he is greeted at those affairs. Also, the smear attack turned on McCarthy has not overcome the fact that he has focused the attention of the American public on the scummy Communist rats who have burrowed in the State Department and other sections of our Government. The American people like a fighter and Senator McCarthy is a fighter who has gotten under the skins of the people with soft spots in their hearts for the Stalin gangsters and their tools in this country.

A good many of the McCARTHY haters are the kind of people described in an article

in the September 1951 American Legion Magazine called Our New Privileged Class. This privileged class are the group who have been playing Joe Stalin's game in this country; either as outright Communists or as Communist-fronters or Communist supporters. They have been getting away with setting up a howl of outraged innocence if they are criticized, and their power has been such that they have often been able to destroy politically and financially, and sometimes even physically anyone who dared to cross them in their Communist devilment. Well, Senator Joe McCarthy has outsmarted them and so nothing will be left undone to destroy McCarthy. Eleanor Russell you can be sure is with the opposition to McCarthy. Eleanor, in my estimation has been one of the most dangerous promoters of this new privileged class. Senator McCarthy spoke in Wilkes-Barre several years ago and he made a good impression on people who heard him.

Fifteen Hundredth Anniversary of
Vartan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

O

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me:

Friends of freedom, 1,500 years is a long time to remember.

It is more than eight times the age of the United States of America.

Very, very few events in the history of this world are honored in recollection so faithfully over the centuries as the exploits of Vartan.

He must have been a remarkable man to win such immortality.

As we read the story of his life, we discover in him the rare combination of physical and spiritual strength. He had the courage of a thousand men, and his Christian faith inspired confidence in all who followed his standard.

Victory did not spoil him. Defeat never crushed him. His belief in God grew with the years of his life, helping him to overcome every pain and disappointment. He fought for the Holy Cross and for the right of his people to worship as Christians.

His faith has been handed down from generation to generation. His descendants have suffered much for their beliefs, but they have never wavered in their devotion. Their country has been occupied many times by invaders but never conquered. The tyrants have come and gone but the people remain, loyal to the religion and to their own culture. The more their faith was tested the stronger it became.

Armenians are proud of this sturdy heritage.

From the deep reservoir of their experience they draw the patience and the wisdom to outlast any man-made tyranny that may be forced upon them. They know that Stalin is mortal, that communism is worldly, and that both must inevitably waste their strength and decline before the eternal truths that they cannot destroy.

Many Armenians are captives within the Soviet Union, across from the border with Turkey. We know little of what is happening to them, but of one thing we may be sure. With all their power to close churches and imprison priests, the Communists can never stop people from silently praying for deliverance. And because they only believe in things, the Communists cannot cope with this invisible force that is greater than any power on earth. If the Reds dropped a million A-bombs, they could not erase the divine promptings of the human heart, even their own. For I suspect that there are many who call themselves Communists only for convenience, or because they must string along with a brutal regime that is in temporary control. Even in Russia, there are tens of millions ready to turn on their oppressors once they get the chance.

I am sure that the Armenians will be among the first to rebel, for they are proud of their individual manhood, and have no stomach for any system of government that would use them as machines.

It is up to us to help by getting the message of hope to all the peoples behind the iron curtain. We must follow this up by offering to share some of our knowledge and materials with them so that they will be able to improve their own lot in life once they have overthrown those who keep them in bondage.

The foreign policy of the United States today is placing too much emphasis on military alliances, supported by economic aid. These are necessary to protect ourselves, but they fall far short of the real goal.

We cannot win the confidence and support of the unhappy millions who are imprisoned in the Soviet empire, by threatening to blast them out of existence. It is useless to brag about our homes and cars and refrigerators and TV sets to people who are enslaved, starving, and restless. We must convince them that we only want peace and freedom and a world in which all can exchange goods and services for the betterment of mankind.

This is the idea that we must sell, sincerely, by showing them what they can do for themselves with initial help from us.

Just an idea?

Certainly.

But remember that every great achievement in this world began as an idea and has been animated by the idea.

Take the United States for example.

It has the highest living standards of any nation in history, maintained by a great productive system.

That, in turn, is based upon freedom of opportunity, where all the energy and skill of our people is given the chance to put ability into action.

Can you imagine what would happen to American civilization if the idea called freedom were choked off? There would be a let-down everywhere. Because people who live in the strait-jacket of a police state are afraid to put their own productive ideas to work for fear that they will be punished by getting out of line.

Here we are, a people full of ideas that we test out and change and finally put into operation, suddenly getting paralysis of the imagination at the thought of applying them to international problems.

I hope that this is only a pause in the dynamics of freedom.

As soon as Washington gets over its global stage fright and starts to beam the hope of freedom and its blessings to all the oppressed people of the world, backed up by solid offers to help them get going, we shall be on the right track at last. The counteroffensive against communism cannot be one of tanks

and planes and bombs and slaughter that would weaken and impoverish the whole world, including ourselves.

What we need is a positive type of crusade that will attract people everywhere to work for freedom by showing the practical benefits that flow from fair play.

That, fundamentally, is God's idea.

And it's time we began to practice it.

A great American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, at the beginning of the depression when many people were discouraged, assured us that: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

There is much wisdom in those words, which we of today should keep in mind.

Our young nation has weathered many storms. Now, in the prime of its manhood, it is looked to by many older and tired nations not only for military and economic leadership in defense of those values we cherish but for something far more important.

We have been successful beyond all others in controlling the forces of nature to serve our needs. But this, reflected in our material progress, has merely prepared us to meet the greatest of all problems.

Have we the faith in ourselves, the will and the democratic resourcefulness to become the builders of peace?

If we follow the design of the Divine Architect who showed us the way over 1,900 years ago we cannot fail.

The humble people all over the world are demanding it. Our Government can be the first in history to translate this human yearning into substantial fact.

That is why we remind ourselves this day of the words spoken by your countryman, Vartan, who counseled us that: "Fear is a sign of doubt; but as we have repudiated doubt long since, let fear also disappear from our hearts and minds."

We have the tools he did not have.

All we require is some of his character, the mental and moral courage to continue on, inspired by a great and creative idea.

I am sure that you, blessed with love of liberty, will help your fellow-Americans to meet the responsibility of leading the world into a happier future.

Statement of Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, To Accompany the Time Magazine Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following articles at this time: A letter to Mr. Henry Luce, publisher of *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune* magazines, and documents Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The documents which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today conclusively prove that in the name of *Time* magazine, deliberate, degenerate lying marches on.

I want to make it clear that I do not endorse all the statements made in the enclosed material. The *Time* memorandum goes far beyond anything I have

ever stated about Gustavo Duran. For example, I deleted a sizable number of lines from the *Time* memorandum because I knew of no evidence other than hearsay to justify the claims against him therein being publicly made.

I repeat, the extent of my charges against Duran was that, first, he was regional head of SIM and second, that SIM was the Communist-controlled secret police of Spain and a counterpart of the Russian GPU.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE.

Mr. HENRY R. LUCE,

*Publisher, Time, Life, and Fortune,
Time, Life, and Fortune Building,
New York, N. Y.*

DEAR MR. LUCE: I wrote, calling your attention to the fact that a feature story carried by *Time* on JOE MCCARTHY consisted of a sizable number of deliberate misstatements. As you know, prior to the writing of that story, one of your reporters accompanied me on a speaking tour through the Middle West and West. He reported back to your office that the evidence which I gave my audiences on Duran was a convincing and damning link in the picture of Communist infiltration. His report on this point apparently led the staff of *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune* to the conclusion that this story had to be discredited if the American people were to be lulled into believing, as *Life* recently stated, that "Communist infiltration of Government is no longer a legitimate worry." *Time*, thereupon, set about the task of discrediting the Duran story at all cost.

I call your attention to the Duran case not because it was the most flagrant example of lying in *Time*'s story, but rather because the complete and deliberate falsity of this phase of the story could be proven by information in your own files, and for the additional reason that *Time* uses the Duran case as exhibit 1 to show that MCCARTHY is a liar.

In your answer to my letter, you state: "Time, after examining the available evidence in this case, came to the conclusion that there was not sufficient documentation to support the charge that Duran was a Communist agent."

In view of this statement, I would suggest that if you will reread your own story on Gustavo Duran, you will find that it does not state that I call Duran a "Communist agent." Your story states that I made two principal allegations concerning Duran: (1) That Duran was regional head of the SIM, and (2) that the SIM was Communist-controlled. Your story then proceeds to ridicule both assertions and states: "Duran, never a Red, was definitely and clearly anti-Communist." Let us, therefore, view the written record of the Duran case from your own files.

On Thursday, March 13, 1947, Congressman O'Konski, of Wisconsin, had the following to say about Gustavo Duran (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 10, pages A1010-A1011):

"What I will say to you today is so fantastic that it will be difficult to believe. If I told you that a man born across the seas, migrated to the United States in May of 1940, and in February of 1943 was appointed Auxiliary Foreign Service Officer in our State Department at Habana, Cuba, was then stationed in Buenos Aires and finally returned to Washington, D. C., at a salary of \$8,000 per annum, as assistant to Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, you would

lend me a courteous ear and not forget the entire affair. Yet, this is precisely what happened. And this is precisely how the United States was knifed out of South America to make way for the Moscow stooges."

"If he were a loyal and trusted alien this might have been fine. But this particular alien is one of the world's most notorious Communists, skilled and trained in betrayal by Moscow agents during the Spanish civil war.

"Who is this notorious Communist who rose to such heights in our State Department? Who is this notorious Communist who directed Latin American relations? Who is this notorious Communist who has driven American good will out of Latin America and substituted in its place Moscow good will? He is none other than Gustavo Duran."

Subsequent to O'Konski's speech on Duran, your staff made the following report which is still in your files:

"APRIL 25, 1947.

"To: David Hulburd.

"From: Jim Shepley, Washington—R. T. E.

"Duran and * * * —I—NA—INTL—A.

"The speech of ALVIN O'KONSKI, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 10, page A1010, is based largely on material available in the files of United States investigatory agencies. The facts—i. e., dates, names, places—are correct insofar as Latin American counter-intelligence agents have been able to confirm them. Some of the material is source-rated A 1, some of it as low as C-3.

"For better understanding of the O'Konski arguments, we background the case of Gustavo Duran.

"Duran's own story of his past, which Braden accepts, hook, line and sinker, is substantially the biography O'Konski got from the State Department. He claims that he is the scion of an old and respectable Spanish family, lived most of his early life in Madrid, studied music in Paris, joined the Spanish republican army as a buck private and worked his way up to lieutenant colonel, covering himself with glory in the defense of Valencia. He commanded a division in 1937, an army corps in 1939, escaped the fascists on March 30, 1939—with the help of United States and British consular officials, married an American national in England on December 4, 1939, etc. He is according to Cuba's Bel Tan, an extremely personable guy with a wide knowledge of music, arts, etc. He also is a shrewd manager of people.

"The other Gustavo Duran, whom O'Konski describes, is, according to Duran, two other guys. He has clung tenaciously to his story of mistaken identity. Nevertheless, when the story of the 'other Gustavo Duran' began to circulate Washington, he quietly got out of the State Department. DOS claims it was a year ago and somehow the record seems to have been falsified. Actually, he left the payroll early this year.

"Beyond the story in O'Konski's speech, the files piece together a chain of movements of Gustavo Duran which seems to have enough similarity to Duran's own version to make mistaken identity unlikely.

"The record picks up Duran in the early 1920's on arrival in Madrid from the Canaries with a friend known as Nestor.

(Nine lines deleted.)

"Sometime in this period he is reputed to have come to the attention of the GPU which became interested enough in him to test him on a few practice missions. He turns up next crossing the Spanish frontier in the early 30's as the reputed representative of Paramount pictures. Some sources

indicate that by now he was a tested and 'live' agent of the GPU. DOS bio says he was employed by Paramount in Paris in 1933 and 1934, worked for a motion picture company in Madrid in 1934 and 1936.

"The file shows him crossing into Spain, however, in 1931 as a provocateur of the Spanish Republican Revolution, working on GPU orders.

"All sources, including Duran, agree that he signed up with the Republican army after the Falangist uprising. The file reports his first act in behalf of the cause was to commandeer the convent of Siervas de Maria in the old Plaza Chamberi, and convert it to a Cheka for the detention of Falangist agitators. He is reported variously to have lived at Santa Engracia, 104 or 106, and at Hermosilla, Three. He is reported to have been a leading light in the pre-civil war days in the juvenudes comunistas y socialistas.

"In August, 1936 he had a bout with typhoid but eventually got back to his job of running the political prison. He became a fast friend of Serrano Poncela, chief of the Communist-dominated Republican political police. Prieto reports in a published document from which O'Konski quotes, that he appointed Duran chief of SIM for the Madrid zone.

"There is little doubt that Gustavo was an able soldier. He grew close to the Red Brigade commanders Lister and Modesto, who are supposed to have fought World War II as general officers of the Red Army. He was a member of the General Staff which executed the brilliant withdrawals from Talavera de la Reina, Maqueda and Toledo.

"The last days of Col. Gustavo Duran, according to the file, were spent in the Red Brigade Headquarters at Taroncon. From here, following his escape, some sources say he went to Paris, then to Moscow. The DOS bio says he went to London.

(Seventeen lines deleted)

"Both Duran and * * * are considered flatly to be MVD secret agents. Remember that counter-intelligence operations do not involve proof of assumptions. They are made on a working basis for the purposes of neutralizing foreign espionage and on occasion for disseminating false information. Please in no way associate any of the information in this research with any Federal agency."

In preparing this report, your staff had full access to the attached documents, numbered 1 through 5, from intelligence files.

In addition to the above material, I call your attention to the fact that Duran (p. 1868, Tydings hearings) himself admits his membership in SIM. Prieto, Spanish Minister of Defense, also confirms this fact (p. 1547, Tydings hearings). Prieto, as well as every other authority quoted either in your files or the Army Intelligence files, confirms the fact that SIM was Communist-controlled.

With your files, Army Intelligence, and Duran confirming the fact that he was a member of SIM, all of which was known to Time, it is difficult to find any honest reason why you should ridicule my statement to that effect and use it as the prime example of McCarthy's lying.

On page 24 of your article, you state, "There are never any circumstances which justify the reckless imputation of treason or other moral guilt to individuals in or out of office," and also "Experience proves, however, that what the anti-Communist fight needs is truth, carefully arrived at and presented with all the scrupulous regard for decency and the rights of man of which the democratic world is capable." I had hoped, Mr. Luce, that you would be willing to apply the same rules to the fight against McCarthy.

In case there is any doubt in your mind as to what honest readers, who know the facts, think about Time's article, I quote the

following telegram sent to you by William Loeb, publisher, Union Leader Corp., Manchester, N. H.:

"OCTOBER 18, 1951.

"Having respect for Time and yourself heightens the shock at your McCarthy piece which for filthy innuendo outdoes anything McCarthy's worst enemies have ever accused him of doing. McCarthy just here as this paper's guest Tuesday night which makes contrast between Time article and facts all the more vivid. You are aware that Communists' No 1 target in United States is to destroy McCarthy. Perhaps a more clever job than you realize has been done to poison your mind against a man who if not the perfect champion fights effectively for a cause that we should all be interested in. This newspaper has strong editorial opinions but confines them to the editorial page and doesn't prostitute its news columns as you have done."

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

P S—If you care to do so, I shall be glad to meet with you in Washington and point out the many other deliberate and vicious misstatements made in this story.

DOCUMENT No. 1

INDALECIO PRIETO ON GUSTAVO DURAN

Indalecio Prieto, Minister for the National Defense in May 1937, encountered in his way a considerable amount of difficulties, many of which came from the tenacious infiltration of Russian Communists and their Spanish stooges into the administrative organism of the army.

Mr. Prieto gave way at last and resigned his post in the Government. The 9th of August 1938, Mr. Prieto appeared before the national committee of the Spanish Socialist Party, and made on this matter a very important report, which later was printed in Paris (Imprimerie Nouvelle-Association Ouvriere, 53 Quai de la Seine, 1939).

From this report we take the following paragraphs:

"It is true that I had some incidents with the Russians—and this part of my report might be kept secret for the time it would be convenient. The first, and perhaps the real origin of the campaign against me, arises out of the SIM.

"Certain Russian technicians proposed to me, in Valencia, the formation of a service of military investigation. I confess to have made some opposition to the project 'Why did I?' Even though I believed the service was necessary, I feared that, as it happened recently in the Direccion de Seguridad, some elements—uncontrolled by the Government—might take in hand such a delicate lever and take undue advantage of it to the prejudice of the Republic, as it happened scandalously in some cases that I need not mention. I was very much worried with the appointment of a chief of such an organization. When the question of designating local chiefs of the SIM arose, the sponsors of the project proposed to me a certain Duran for the region of Madrid. I knew that he was a Communist but, nevertheless, I appointed him. In the decree creating the SIM, which I worded myself in order to avoid the slavish way suggested in the project submitted to me, there is an article by means of which every appointment of agents of the SIM should be made exclusively by the Minister for National Defense. This was a foreseen guaranty I wanted to establish. Every agent of the SIM should be in possession of a 'carnet' with the signature, in duplicate, of the Minister himself. As soon as Duran was appointed chief of the Demarcacion del Ejercito del Centro he appointed, all by himself and without any right to do so, scores of other agents under his orders—several hundred of these were Communists, only four or five Socialists, excluding the Social-

ists provisionally appointed by the Minister of the Interior for a similar function. I found that was intolerable; and since we lacked commanding officers in the army—I noticed this lack and some deficiencies in the operations near Belchite—I ordered that all army officers who did not act in exclusively military charges, should go back to their former positions."

This was why Major Duran had to go back to his former military position. Soon afterward a Russian technician, expert on this sort of service, called on me and said:

"Question. I come to speak about the dismissal of Duran, what happened?"

"Answer. Nothing special; I am in need of commanding officers in the army and ordered him to go back to his former position."

"Question. No; you dismissed him because he has appointed some Communists as agents in Madrid."

"Answer. That is also a very good reason, since Duran has no power whatever to make such appointments."

"Question. Why couldn't he appoint agents?"

"Answer. Because, by virtue of the decree creating the S. I. M. this faculty is reserved exclusively for the minister."

I read the decree, and in presence of the evident obviousness of my assertions, my visitor added:

"Question. Duran could be entitled to make provisional appointments."

"Answer. Neither provisional nor permanent. Besides, here in Spain the provisional becomes permanent."

"Question. In any case, I come here to ask you to reinstate Major Duran as Chief of the S. I. M. in Madrid."

"Answer. I am very sorry, but I can't."

"Question. If you don't agree to the reinstatement of Duran we break all relations with you."

"Answer. I regret it, Major Duran will stay as head of a division and will not be back in the S. I. M. Your attitude is unjustified and I cannot bend to it."

"I do not consent, and my relations with the Russian technicians were, on his initiative, totally severed. After this scene in Valencia, I never saw him again."

Translated from the book titled, "How and Why I Left the Ministry of National Defense—Intrigues of the Russians in Spain."—Stenographic text of the Report given on August 9, 1938, before the National Committee of the Spanish Socialist Party, by Indalecio Prieto, Minister of the Red Government in Spain. Published in Paris, Imprimerie Nouvelle (Association Ouvriere) 53, Quai de la Seine, 1939.

DOCUMENT No. 2

[Translation]

THE TREASON OF STALIN—HOW THE WAR IN SPAIN CAME TO AN END

By J. Garcia Pradas, ex-director of the "CNT," of Madrid, introduction by Marcelino Garcia; edited by Cultura Proletaria, New York (1939)

Page 108) . . . "The Communist rebellion obliged us to change the commands, Lieutenant Colonel Ardid * * * though they called him very 'bolsheshevik' and notwithstanding that he did not fight against us, resulted dangerous in the command of the fortifications, and he was dismissed. * * * From the very different places all dubious people were fired. As to the Communist military commands, it resulted impossible to substitute all of them because the Communist Party of Spain held the greater part of the army in its hands. * * * Toral and Carton, for instance, remained in the command of their divisions of Extremadura. Clutat, Duran, Yglesias and others continued to stay on their posts of the Levante."

(NOTE.—Pradas and Garcia are two prominent Spanish Anarchists. They were the

chief editor of trade union newspaper CNT in Madrid and the secretary of the Anarchists Trade Unions. Both participated in the civil war on the side of so-called Republican army. When Colonel Sigismundo Casado made his putsch against Negrin in March 1939, the Anarchists supported him. The reason was their hate against the Communists who killed thousands of Anarchists at a presumed revolution in Barcelona (1937). The Communist "Tcheka" also kidnapped Andres Nin, the famous leader of the Anarchists in Barcelona, brought him to Madrid where he was tortured and finally disappeared. The Anarchists have after the civil war always attacked and criticized in a furious way the Communists whom they always call Stalinists. Neither Casado in his book, *The Last Days of the Spanish Republic*, nor Garcia Pradas in his *Treason of Stalin*, where they give a very detailed description of all the facts of their putsch against Negrin and where they mention everybody who was with them, never mention Duran as one of them. On the contrary the remark of Garcia Pradas above shows clearly that Duran was considered by him as a prominent Communist leader. He was not dismissed though his attitude was very doubtful, because Casado had not got enough reliable military people to replace Duran and the other Communist gang.)

DOCUMENT No. 3

[Translation]

"MEN OF LOYAL SPAIN" (HOMBRES DE LA ESPAÑA LEAL)

Aguirre, Duran, Companys, Campesino, Bergamin, del Vayo, Mijja, Robeson, Hernandez, Modesto, Candon, Pasionaria, Lister, Domingo.

By Juan Marinello and Nicolas Guillen, La Habana; Edicion "Facetas," 1942 (p. 49)

CHAT WITH THE COMMANDER DURAN

One night in Madrid I saw enter in "La Alianza de Intelectuales Antifascistas" a young man, blonde, of medium height, and distinguished manners. He wore the uniform of a commander of the people's army. The noble expression of his lively face was matched by his well-formed head. His presence was greeted by a joyful acclamation. He talked some moments to writers, painters, and people from the theater, then he sat down at the piano. In a very clean and gracious execution he started to play melodies of the old Germany. Without any pause he was playing songs from foreign countries: French, Russian, and English. Between them he played some Spanish folklores. He spent so large hours. It was 2 o'clock in the morning and the visitor without getting tired went on with his particular repertoire. He had fled from his environment into a lyrical frenzy which was growing with every moment.

When they told me the name of this musical military man I understood well his insatiable thirst. The name of Gustavo Duran told me many things. He gave me the definition of a very singular case. I know of his brave execution at the head-office division just as well as of his talent and of his artistic culture. Between the great chiefs of the Republican Army—Campesino, Lister, Modesto, Paco Galan . . . between the most beloved leaders of the work of the Spanish liberation, Duran is counted as one of the foremost. But he is distinguished from all the others by his origin, his education, his mentality. He is not as the others a man of the masses, of a humanity radically popular. He was born in a very refined atmosphere of culture, owner of a clear and perspicacious mentality. Therefore, he had since boyhood an inclination to the arts. His excellent preparation gave him wide per-

spectives. His numerous travels procured him a rare universal sense and understanding. Very Spanish with a little bit of all the different Iberian bloods—Catalan, Castellano, Canarian Islands—he exalted his particular qualities in the large years he spent in Paris. As a musician, a composer, and executive artist of pictures (movies) he never turned away from literature, nor did he lose his interest in politics. His capacities just as well as his native virtue to command took him to a delicate, difficult and magnificently refined work. The rebellion of Franco surprised him when he was directing the "doblage," that is arranging in Spanish the voices of the actors in one of the most important American movies companies. From the studio he went without delay to the barracks. In little less than 1 year this artist who did not know the difference between a brigade and a company, became the commander of a division. This man of lectures and meditation is occupying now a charge of the most grave responsibility in the Spanish hour: chief of the S. I. M. (Servicio Investigacion Militar) of the service of investigation of the people's army. He is without any doubt one of the most relevating young figures of the moment.

Very soon we became good comrades with Gustavo Duran. His visits to the Alianza became more frequent; before he sat down at the piano we talked about Cuba and Spain. One night after the dinner with the comrades was over, who were always there—Rafael Alberti, Maria Teresa Leon, Nicolas Guillen, Langston Hughes, Juan Jabas, Daniela Diaz, Antonio Aparicio, Ontanon, Rosario del Olmo, Xavier Farias—we put the chief of the division, Duran, in a real journalistic "Seige." As a good strategist he defended himself in a masterly way. At last he accepted the battle. Our dialogue was this:

MARINELLO. "I want to talk to you about your case. It seems very significant. A pure artist becomes a military chief."

DURAN. "I believe you are mistaken. I was never an artist only. Therefore, from a certain point of view my life did not suffer an important change. When you understand the intellectual work as vital as a service, the artist goes into action—the courts, the barracks, the clinic—without great spiritual commotion. He just goes on serving. . . ."

MARINELLO. "Yes. But it seems natural to me that the artist serves the revolution with the pen and not with the pistol. I don't know whether there are many artists who are commanders of divisions. . . ."

DURAN. "I don't think that that is very important. Everybody must serve the revolution as he best can. I believe that Alberti or Guillen do with their verses a work, an action just as adequate as mine. The day when . . . the revolution of Franco began, I didn't know how I should lend my help in the best way. They told me in the studio that the reactionary military men had made a rebellion. I took my leave from the actors without telling them where I would go. I presented myself to my party, the Communist, to receive orders. They gave me a strictly military assignment and a little rare one: Organize a group of motorcyclists without motor bikes. I don't know where the machines appeared, but the group was formed and was very useful. Since that time I have been going on working, fighting, and being promoted. From a private to a chief of a division. I won't deny that when they entrusted me with works of this type they knew that I had special qualities which I used before when I made a living. . . ."

MARINELLO. "But if you used so efficiently your capacities since the very first moment you need without any doubt a clear political definition which gave you such an enthusiasm that you would never recede before any type of action. . . ."

DURAN. "Sure, my evolution and my conviction were already formed. As every individual with a bourgeois background I had to suffer a large process of experience and superaction. . . . I knew the bourgeoisie in Spain. This were the people with whom we had to clash some day. They are our natural enemies. The possessing class. My repulsion for their work was turned one day into a decided attack. . . . In my movie studio where I worked 1 day a strike was declared. It seemed to me that it was my duty to join the strike. And by my condition as a director of the studio, I was considered as the responsible of the movement. We won the strike but a short time afterward I was dismissed. . . . I wasn't worried about this notice. On many other opportunities I had received tentative offers of the most important rival enterprise. It would be very easy to find another job. I offered my services. But everywhere I received pretexts and evasive answers. . . . I went to Paris. The same things happened there. . . . It was then and there that I felt myself as a worker, and that I united myself in a strong way with the proletarians of my country. Today I serve them with the arms. . . ."

NOTE—Gustavo Duran is called by Marinello "uno de los prestigiosos jefes del ejercito republicano" (one of the most renowned chiefs of the republican army). Among the names mentioned above (p. 2) are only two non-Communists (Aguirre and Companys). The others are the most famous Spanish Communists. That Duran is among them speaks for itself. Juan Marinello is a notorious Cuban Communist. He spent, together with Nicolas Guillen, who is a mulatto from Cuba, some time in Madrid in 1937. Whereas Marinello made this interview with Duran, Guillen mentions Duran at another opportunity in the same book. In "una fiesta en la Alianza" (party in the Alianza of anti-Fascist intellectuals) there was a multitude of well-known figures in the arts and letters. . . . Ernest Hemingway, the great American author, author of *Death in the Afternoon*, Langston Hughes, the great poet of the play *Mulatto*, Ivan Kolzow, the American poetress Marta Gellhorn, Duran . . . Madrid, November 1937.

Rafael Alberti, whom Duran mentions in his interview with Marinello, is a notorious Spanish Communist who lives now in exile in Buenos Aires. Alberti is also a friend of Marinello. He published in Buenos Aires in 1912 a book with all his poetries. In this book he dedicates one poem: "El Monte de El Pardo" to Gustavo Duran. This poem goes together with other poems dedicated to the "international brigades," to the Communist Spanish generals, Kleber, Lister, and Modesto. All of them serve now under other names in the Russian Army. Duran is again on this strange "list of honor" of prominent Communist leaders. Juan Marinello is also linked with the American Communist group. He published in Havana in 1941 a book, "La Libertad de Browder Es Tambien Nuestra Causa" (The Liberty of Browder Is Our Cause Too). He cooperated with the "Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder," 1133 Broadway, New York. This committee was composed among others of the Negro singer, Paul Robeson, who also spent some time in Barcelona and Madrid with the Communist gang there, Congressman Vito Marcantonio, the Negro agitator, and the Chilean Communist, Salvador Ocampo, secretary of the Confederacion de Trabajo de Chile—the Communist-dominated trade union of Chile.

Rafael Alberti, same as Marinello, are both furious anti-Yankee. Alberti published in 1936 a very vile and vicious book against the United States of America called "13 Bandas y 48 Estrellas" (13 Stripes and 48 Stars)—poems of the Caribbean Sea. And these verses are dedicated to Juan Marinello, of

Cuba. Alberti says among other sweet things:

"Negro de la mano al blanco.
Blanco de la mano al Negro.
Que Cuba no es del Cubano,
Que es del Norteamericano.
Los Yankees vienen volando
Urracas asu-carreras
Mano a mano
Contra el norteamericano."

[Translation]

"Negro give the hand to the white man,
White man give the hand to the Negro.
Cuba doesn't belong to the Cubans,
It belongs to the North Americans.
The Yankees come flying
To fill their sugar bowls
Hand in hand
Against the North Americans."

And in another poem dedicated to Mexico he says bluntly, "Contra el gringo * * * prepare tu fusil" (Against the gringo prepare your gun).

Langston Hughes who is mentioned as a comrade of Gustavo Duran in Madrid is an American Negro Communist. He was in Spain during the civil war from 1936 to 1937 as a correspondent of the "Afro-American" of Baltimore. Hughes was also in Moscow in 1933-34 where he worked for Bolshevik pictures. He is a member of the "International Workers League" and has taken a prominent part in political cases of the United States of America as for instance "The Scottsborough Negro Boys Case" and in the fight for Browder. Ernest Hemingway who appears together with Duran in the "Allanza" in Madrid, also know well the famous "Brigade 36" mentioned in the death tunnel case. Hemingway we quote—says "a famous brigade nicknamed the moles of Ussera, who took the trench of death, that dominated suburb and dug and mined their way forward until the Franco forces had to give up position on that front * * * it was good to see the moles again. I had not been with them since early December 1937 and was envious to see how their morale was." (From The Spanish War, p. 70)

Nicolas Guillen, who together with Marinello wrote the book "Hombres de la Espana Leal" is a mulatto Communist from Cuba. He too is furiously anti-Yankee. In one of his poems, "El Esclavo (slave)" he says:

"Yo hi-jo de ti y de Africa * * *
Hoy esclavo de rojos yankees
despreciativos y voraces"

[Translation]

I am son of you and Africa * * *
I am today the slave of
Red-faced Yankees who are
Disreputable and voracious.

Marinello, Alberti, and Guillen, among many others play a dominant part in the notorious Communist organization of "anti-Fascists poets, writers, painters, and artists," with its seat in Montevideo, Uruguay, which also played a very doubtful part in Argentina in 1945 when Rodolfo Ghilardi, secretary of the Argentine Communists and prominent member of the above mentioned organization, cooperated with Mr. Braden against the Argentine Government in the organization of demonstrations, strikes, and illegal actions of every kind.

DOCUMENT NO. 4

GUSTAVO DURAN—STORY OF THE DEATH TUNNEL

(Treinta y dos meses de guerra—32 months of war) by T. Blanco Nomdedeu, Director de la Patria, Madrid, 1940

"On November 6, 1937, left this house, the street of Viriato and of Dolores Espana, in Nunez de Balboa, Numero 15, Madrid, the first expedition organized by Don Ismael. There arrived a car of the Brigade 36 which

they mounted—my two sons, Laureano, 24, and Louis, 22, also the pilot aviator, Don Emilio Camps. In this car which belonged to the general staff was a captain of the medical corps who had to give the signals to the control posts and who had to explain if necessary that he took the people in this car to render service in the fortifications. Captain Cabrera (he is mentioned together with Duran as the instigator of the death tunnel crimes in the book "La Causa General") and his "pal" told the expeditionaries that they were expected at 10 o'clock p. m. at Ussera. At this time the guard of the tunnel would be changed by loyal soldiers and then they would pass through the mine to a house which was situated between the two lines, in no man's land. From there they could enter into the liberated zone (Franco) previous to the convened password.

The second expedition left in different cars on November 8

What happened then to these expeditions? We don't know it in detail. We heard through the National Radio or through Radio Verdad the convened code words, Don Pedro and his people are well, and the cat and the she cat well; those of the staircase well. How could we have any doubt?

The terrible disappointment came later when my daughter Maria Teresa was evacuated by the Embassy of Rumania. Then they learned the terrible truth. None of the expeditions had arrived at its point of destination. When my daughter spoke to Gen. Quepo de Llano the sinister plot was discovered, and you can imagine the days of anguish we passed through. But without any doubt those wicked people acted on their own and we owe it to this fact that not all of us fell into the claws of the S. I. M.

(NOTE—On p. 102 The author says that "Celestino Martin, a young student of medicine and a refugee in the Embassy at Paragay, left Madrid through the death tunnel the 14th of October 1937 with two friends; on the 18th of October the priest Serafin Sanchez of the Provincial Hospital and his three nephews disappeared. Many other persons, among them six engineers and a lawyer, all known to the unhappy owner of the pension Ventura de la Vega, fell into the trap the 29th and 31st of October. And finally dona Nicolasa, the owner of this pension with her niece Natividad, also disappeared in the death tunnel." The author says "You must consider that those bandits didn't ask money and that they frequently raised difficulties, pretending the imminent risk of being discovered by the Reds.")

DOCUMENT NO. 5

GUSTAVO DURAN

Came to Habana, via Spain, via England and the United States of America. He met in Habana the former Spanish Minister of the Interior and Police (Ministro de defensa Nacional) Indalecio Prieto. In 1940 (?)—1941 Prieto recognized Gustavo Duran as a notorious Spanish Communist who in 1936-37 was chief of the S. I. M. in Madrid and who he had to dismiss on behalf of the disobedience and of placing only Communist agents in the secret police. Prieto met Duran through the American Legation in Habana where at that time Spruille Braden was Ambassador. He asked Braden to send him a member of his Legation who knew Spanish because Prieto does not speak English. The man sent by Spruille Braden was Gustavo Duran who was recognized immediately by Prieto, his former superior in Madrid. See also statement of Indalecio Prieto in his book "Como y por que salí del Ministerio de Defensa Nacional."—Ingrigas de los Rusos en Espana, Mexico DF, 1940—Impresos y Papeles, Calle Balsas (32), Mexico DF.—Also see speech of the Honorable ALVIN O'KONSER in Congress on March 18, 1947 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 10, pp. A1010-A1014).

Editorial From the Westport (Conn.) Town Crier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Westport (Conn.) Town Crier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENTON JABS AT McCARTHY TO COVER A FUTILE RECORD

During recent weeks we have been regaled by the gyrations of our synthetic Senator WILLIAM BENTON, holding forth in the sacred Halls of Congress on any old topic that will land him on page 1 and keep his name before the electorate in preparation for the 1952 election.

It is an old formula that was perfected by the firm of Benton & Bowles, and it turned the trick in 1948 for Bowles and in 1950 for Benton. But now it is beginning to wear a bit thin. The daily dose of pontificating is being greeted with more and more yawns.

To pervert an old proverb, not one political sparrow can fall to earth without Senator BENTON noting it and commenting on it within 24 hours. This is comparatively harmless and amusing, but it is quite a different matter with BENTON's hatred of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, who is quaterbacking the drive to rid our Government of subversive elements.

Now it may be true, as some of our liberal friends claim, that McCARTHY has become a fanatic and witch burner, yet it cannot be denied that he has rendered great service in exposing some of our most dangerous Russophiles and an even greater service in arousing the general public to the danger to our governmental structure through this Red infiltration.

In return for all this McCARTHY should be kicked out of the Senate, according to BENTON, who objects violently to McCARTHY's entry into the Maryland election which brought about the defeat of Millard Tydings.

All this sound and fury has been climaxed by BENTON's challenge to McCARTHY to come into Connecticut next year and take the stump against him when he runs for reelection.

This challenge is the veriest flapdoodle, and nobody knows that any better than Senator BENTON himself, for the State Republican organization will not allow McCARTHY to enter the picture here.

It may be recalled that several attempts were made last year to bring the Wisconsin Red-buster here in behalf of the GOP nominees, Joe Talbot and Prescott Bush, but the idea was turned down by the Republican high command, which refused to allow McCARTHY to appear in Connecticut under GOP auspices.

It is true that McCARTHY made a speech in Bridgeport but this was sponsored by a group of independent women and not by the Republicans. Accordingly, it is perfectly safe for BENTON to stick his tongue out at McCARTHY and dare him to come here when he knows full well that, for some unexplained reason, the Republican State machine will not permit him to do so.

In marked contrast to McCARTHY's Red crusade, BILL BENTON's efforts in the Senate have been mainly devoted to building up BILL BENTON. He led and lost a farcical cam-

paign for the Voice of America which would have paid millions to the radio trust, and which was based on the preposterous premise that every home in Russia has a radio, and is permitted to use it.

If Senator BENTON has contributed anything to the Nation's weal in all the time he has been in Washington, it must have been so microscopic as to pass unnoticed. His McCARTHY-baiting cannot obscure a record of futility or his inability to understand the problems of the day. Connecticut, not Wisconsin, needs a change in Senators.

Farm Program Facts and Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the session of Congress which is just closing, there has been more talk about farm prices, farm income, and the cost of farm programs than in any session of Congress I can remember. This discussion has not been confined to the floor of the House but has been carried on generally in newspapers and magazines, by radio and television, and in the speeches of Government officials and others in every part of the country.

Many of the statements which have been made on this subject have been exaggerated. Some have been obviously calculated to mislead. Many have been misinformed and a still larger number have reached and supported a mistaken or distorted conclusion because they have failed to take into consideration all of the facts and figures available on the particular subject with which they were concerned.

There has been during the past year an almost frantic effort on the part of virtually every other segment of our Nation to try to saddle onto farmers the blame for high prices. In this campaign a few facts and figures have been snatched out of all context and relationship with other equally relevant facts and figures to try to prove the thesis that the farmer is the cause of inflation and that the farm price support program is a costly operation that is responsible for the high cost of food to consumers. Almost without exception statements of this kind have ignored the full facts readily available to anyone in the reports of the Department of Agriculture and other equally reliable Government agencies.

They have ignored the fact that the farm price-support program cannot possibly bring about a price for a commodity above 90 percent of parity, that the security and the orderly production made possible by support programs have been directly responsible for abundant farm production, which in many cases has kept farm commodities at relatively low prices, and the fact that the farmer has profited the least of any segment of our Nation from the economic conditions of the past few years.

Admittedly, the details of farm economics, farm and food prices, and farm-

support programs are complicated and complex. They involve many different computations and tabulations which are familiar only to experts on the subject. The real significance of statistical data relating to farm prices and farm production is not always obvious from a cursory inspection of the tabulations issued regularly by the Department of Agriculture. I am convinced that many of the erroneous conclusions which have been reached by a number of people regarding our farm program and farm prices are the result of failure to understand the material made available by the Department of Agriculture or of being given, time and again, only part of the figures relating to the subject.

In justice to the farmers of America, and in the interest of a true understanding of actual economic conditions, it seems to me that those who undertake to express an opinion on this subject should see to it that their views are based upon a study of all the available evidence and not merely upon a small and perhaps distorted portion of it. I believe that the facts and figures on our price-support programs and on the relationship of farm prices to the economy in general are their own best defenders. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to present herewith, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, a number of statistical tables relating to this subject for the information of the House. I shall make only such comment regarding each table as appears to be absolutely necessary to explain to anyone not familiar in detail with our farm programs, the meaning of the figures presented.

COMMODITY CREDIT OPERATIONS—THE BASIC SUPPORT PROGRAM

Table No. 1 is a cumulative analysis of the results of operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation from October 17, 1933, the start of the farm price support program, through August 31, 1951. The CCC is the agency of the Department of Agriculture charged with the responsibility of carrying out the price support program. Column 1 shows the various commodities which have been supported from time to time during this 18-year period. Columns 2 and 3 show the operations during the prewar period and during the time of World War II. Columns 4, 5, and 6 show the operations during the fiscal years 1950, 1951, and the first 2 months of 1952. The columns for the fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949 have been omitted in order to conserve space but are available in the monthly report of the Corporation. Column 7 indicates commodity-by-commodity the profit or loss on each item throughout the almost 18 years of operation of the price-support program.

The price-support program was established primarily to stabilize production of the great basic agricultural crops: corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. The figures in column 7 show that during its 18 years of operation, the price-support program has returned a net profit to the Government of about \$35,000,000 in the operation of these basic programs. The largest profit in this group is about \$268,000,000 on cotton. The largest loss in the basic com-

modities is \$84,000,000 on peanuts and this is due almost entirely to the cost of reconverting the peanut industry from its wartime production of this commodity for oil purposes.

NONBASIC COMMODITIES

From time to time the Commodity Credit Corporation has been required to support the price of other commodities. Its obligation to support many of these nonbasic commodities arose during World War II when, in order to secure additional production of certain commodities to meet the wartime emergency, those commodities were guaranteed price support at a high level for the duration of the war and 2 years thereafter. These are the commodities which were guaranteed support by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Steagall amendment to the Stabilization Act of 1942 and are the ones generally referred to as "Steagall commodities." Reference again to column 7 indicates that the loss on nonbasic commodities has been a little over \$1,000,000,000.

Referring to the individual nonbasic commodities, it will be noted that four hundred and seventy-eight million of this loss was incurred on potatoes, ninety-two million on wool, and one hundred and sixty-five million on eggs. Thus, out of the billion dollars which has been lost in the support of nonbasic commodities, three commodities—potatoes, eggs, and wool—have accounted for \$736,000,000 of this loss, or 71 percent of the total. The most costly of these programs, the potato program, was put into effect under the Steagall amendment and was terminated by Congress as soon as it was possible to do so after the conclusion of the war.

I want to emphasize again, as I have done frequently on the floor of the House, that it was never the intention of Congress that perishable agricultural products should be supported with a loan or purchase and storage program as a permanent part of the farm price support program. We got into the support of perishables chiefly as a wartime measure—to secure adequate production of certain foods that were found to be especially needed during the war period. Reference to column 2 of the table will show that in the almost 8 years prior to the war the total loss on the support of nonbasic commodities was only \$4,602,190 and \$4,435,579 of this amount was on naval stores, the dependable and adequate production of which is a military necessity.

During the war, however, we got into the support of perishables such as eggs and potatoes because we needed increased production. We may believe now that the designation of some of the commodities to receive high-level support may have been ill-considered and that better administration could have held down their cost. But those in charge of our food program did the best job they could—and on the whole it was a most excellent job—under difficult emergency conditions. The cost of this wartime food program should be considered as part of the cost of the war, rather than as part of the cost of the farm price-support program. Incidentally, the entire cost of our wartime

agricultural program, including the postwar adjustment to peacetime conditions, is small compared to the amount of money paid out to manufacturing industries on account of the termination of war contracts. The principle involved is exactly the same. But the entire cost of the agricultural program was less than a billion dollars, while manufacturing industries have received about \$6,500,000,000 in payments to compensate them for the termination of their wartime production contracts.

THE SUGAR PROGRAM

In addition to the support programs for basic commodities carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation, there is another—the sugar support and production program—which is administered by another branch of the Department of Agriculture but which should be considered as an integral part of our overall farm program. The sugar program has been in operation since 1934. During that period it has assured us of an ample supply of sugar at all times, has

stabilized the price at levels oftentimes below those of the world market, and has made possible the virtual elimination of tariffs on sugar. It has done this at a net profit to the Government of more than \$230,000,000, over and above all expenditures, including administrative costs.

If this program is considered as a part of our basic farm program, as it should be regarded, the result is a profit of more than \$265,000,000 on the operation of our basic agricultural program in the past 18 years.

TABLE I.—Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through Aug 31, 1951¹
[Realized gains and losses]

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30		Fiscal year 1952 through Aug. 31, 1951	Oct. 17, 1931, through Aug. 31, 1951
			1950	1951		
Price-support program¹						
Basic commodities						
Corn	\$20,078,488	\$14,330,560	\$17,189,119	\$7,18,830	\$292,805	\$52,460,545
Cotton	27,401,798	218,328,306	3,419,604	28,938,218	112,742	268,563,867
Puerto Rican		126,011				130,108
Export differential ²		27,651,960				41,361,218
Rubber barter		11,055,451				11,055,451
Peanuts			240,602,001	14,584,837	3,136,008	84,139,105
Rice			1,283,780	53,071	138,313	1,377,236
Tobacco	2,107,689	7,074,300	195,495	71,450	38,471	4,454,898
Wheat	6,199,460	11,775,173	28,384,123	19,014,932	2,048,443	70,607,335
Total	55,787,335	182,508,944	283,814,524	5,284,869	4,465,346	35,030,479
Designated nonbasic commodities						
Milk and butterfat						
Butter			4,111,861	44,216,443	3,169	48,325,135
Cheese			1,091,078	21,040,161	15,748	25,053,794
Milk, dried			11,619,145	42,707,738	833,661	57,607,712
Honey				1,499	2,907	876,466
Potatoes, Irish ³		25,197,227	75,090,315	63,137,241	2,995,544	478,233,481
Tung oil			30	213,811	599	77,750
Wool	176	15,811,163	10,755,042	142,596		92,110,300
Total	176	41,001,385	105,008,311	174,027,018	1,110,129	702,316,541
Other nonbasic commodities⁴						
Barley		40,010	2,608,930	1,700,903	29,786	5,031,749
Beans, dry edible		179,753	880,120	11,746,232	450,206	14,252,367
Custor beans		171,224				171,194
Cotton, American Egyptian		538,573		11,358		480,617
Cottonseed and products			507,728	5,506,641	300,961	5,206,861
Eggs ⁵			41,622,781	70,055,947	9,532,127	105,620,137
Flax fiber		224,002	67,464	253		397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil			3,765,096	57,520,965	2,080,668	62,187,993
Fruit, dried						
Apricots						13,368
Dates						1,297
Figs						9,304
Peaches						9,799
Prunes						8,218,008
Raisins						6,065,277
Gram sorghum		109,489	61,145	56,799	4,706	37,931,777
Grapefruit juice		137,456				1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber						21,457,479
Hops		20,201,375	498	21	2,102	954,200
Naval stores	162,046	32,161				1,389,379
Oats	4,435,549	5,907,961	449,795	1,974,111	335	2,747,529
Pean, dry edible		3,012	419,295	227,726	2,673	886,077
Peanuts		3,751				4,751
Rye	4,575	60,751	223,210	31,759	614	189,657
Seeds		118,191	774,026	295,152	189,081	475,836
Soybeans			1,764,206	139,112	3,199	4,390,064
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Island						23,830
Sweet potatoes						16,517,269
Turkeys			1,153	773		135,121
Vegetables, canned		6,888	41,158	29,185		11,070
Total	4,602,190	15,944,584	50,777,004	166,286,667	13,860,001	334,707,359
Total price support	90,389,701	125,592,975	249,229,839	345,508,554	20,435,476	1,092,074,431
Supply program¹						
Cotton and lint		1,592,551				1,876,199
Grains and seeds		23,969,000	2,981,607	729,558	263,314	75,311,774
Oils (bulk)		29,947	363,692	42,136	2,976	905,069
Tobacco		4,179,335				4,708,094
General commodities purchase ⁶			2,216,411	1,551,481	22,948	184,711,501
Processed and packaged commodities ⁷			762,611	118,459	105,833	39,024,680
Sugar, Puerto Rican raw			37,157	507		36,590
Other		3,120,517	2,041	3,185		3,414,050
Total supply program		26,650,306	2,896,615	995,713	345,071	303,219,887

¹ Allocation of losses and gains as between "Price support program" and "Supply program" for the period prior to the fiscal year 1947 was made on the basis of an analysis completed in April 1949. Since accounting records maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not provide for this segregation, it was necessary to analyze program results in detail and in some cases make an estimate of the distribution between "Price support" and "Supply" of the total operating result as shown by the accounting records. This analysis was based on all known factors concerning the operations with respect to each commodity.

² Denotes loss.

³ Includes export differential on owned or pooled cotton only. Differential on exporters' cotton included under "Commodity export program."

⁴ Includes price-support loss of \$2,820,639 on the 1943 and 1944 potato programs, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

⁵ Includes price-support loss of \$11,956,386 on the 1944 egg program, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

⁶ Includes gain of \$178,697,602 carried as "Special reserve, general commodities purchase program" as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May 1947. Also see ⁴ and ⁵.

⁷ During the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, activity under this program was reported as general supply program.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6957

TABLE I.—Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through Aug. 31, 1951—Continued

[Realized gains and losses]

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30		Fiscal year 1952 through Aug. 31, 1951	Oct. 17, 1933, through Aug. 31, 1951
			1950	1951		
Foreign purchase program *						
Cotton		\$5,439,464		\$2,617	\$23,980	\$5,922,341
Fats and oils		22,643,441	\$1,524	\$37,417		38,918,158
Foodstuffs		4,620,232	47,482	13,056	\$130	5,668,890
Other		\$274,627		20,017	22,284	\$202,135
Total foreign purchase		32,328,510	49,006	7,273	46,143	50,307,253
Commodity export program:						
Cotton		\$7,008,694	1,753	\$3,729		\$12,538,658
Wheat		\$1,200,440				\$1,210,063
Total commodity export		\$8,308,139	1,753	\$3,729		\$13,748,721
Storage facilities program		\$10,087,438	\$91,959	\$498,981	\$12,713	\$10,541,060
Accounts and notes receivable (charge-offs)		11,134	\$86,113	\$454,137	\$29,291	\$1,274,258
Total (excluding wartime consumer subsidy costs) ¹⁰	\$60,380,701	106,187,348	\$240,470,537	\$347,213,840	\$20,096,266	\$674,111,960
Wartime consumer subsidy program ¹¹		\$2,130,581,589	\$113,351	\$258,372	61,507	\$2,102,296,735
Grand total	\$60,380,701	\$1,064,304,241	\$246,583,888	\$347,472,212	\$20,134,769	\$2,776,378,695

* Denotes loss.

¹ Insofar as possible, operating results have been retroactively classified to correspond with current budgetary program. In some instances, the accounts maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not make possible a precise segregation of the results of foreign procurement operations.

¹⁰ Includes export differential on exporters' cotton only.

¹¹ Includes losses totaling \$56,230,432 on price-support commodities disposed of in accordance with Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong., 1. e., transferred to foreign as-

stance outlets at a price equal to price of a quantity of wheat having equivalent calorific value. The Corporation was reimbursed for these losses by the Secretary of the Treasury.

¹² Subsidy losses on corn for alcohol, wheat for alcohol, and wheat for feed are included on an estimated basis. For detail of subsidy costs by commodities by fiscal years, see report of financial condition and operations as of June 30, 1949.

INVENTORIES

Frequently one sees or hears reference to the tremendous inventories of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation either under its loan or purchase program. The inference is almost always that these inventories represent a dead loss to the Government—that they are vast quantities of agricultural products which have been withdrawn from the market and which are somehow going to disappear from being, with the taxpayer footing the bill for their entire cost. Reference to table II will indicate how false this assumption is.

This table shows the entire inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation on October 29, 1951—both as to those commodities which have been purchased by the Corporation to which it actually holds title, and those which are merely pledged to the Corporation to secure price-support loans. Some of the items listed do, indeed, involve very consider-

able quantities: There are actually in the ownership of the Corporation, for example, 214,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, 386,000,000 bushels of corn, 344,000,000 pounds of winter cover-crop seeds, and 144,000,000 pounds of rosin.

The assumption that these inventories represent a dead loss to the Government—or even liabilities—is far from correct, however, as a glance at the totals at the bottom of columns 3 and 7 and columns 5 and 8 will disclose. Columns 3 and 7 show the aggregate cost of and the amount of loans outstanding against CCC's entire inventory. Columns 5 and 8 are the estimated current market value of those commodities.

Reference to the table will show that the total cost of the CCC inventory, both loans and purchase items, is \$1,802,234,000. The current market value of these same commodities is \$1,846,457,000. Thus, at market prices on October 29, 1951, the inventory held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, both by out-

right purchase and as collateral for loans, is worth \$44,223,000 more than the Corporation paid for these commodities.

In the case of those commodities which have been purchased by the Corporation, the cost of administration and of storage, transportation, and processing where necessary, is included in the acquisition cost. It should also be pointed out that when I asked the Department to prepare this table for me I requested that it adopt the most conservative estimates of the present value of its inventory, particularly in the case of perishables such as dried milk, butter, and eggs, where the market is such that if the quantities held by the Corporation were to be thrown on the open market, they might be expected to affect the price. Rather than using the quoted market price for such commodities, therefore, the Department has in most cases used the actual price at which the last sizable sale from their inventory was made.

TABLE II.—Commodities in inventories and pledged for loans—Investment and estimated market values as of recent dates

Commodity	Inventories (Oct. 29, 1951)					Loans outstanding (Sept. 30, 1951) ¹		
	Estimated quantity	Approximate unit cost	Aggregate cost	Estimated current market value ²		Quantity under loan	Amount of loans	Estimated current market value of quantity under loan ³
				Per unit	Total			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Cotton, upland:			Thousands		Thousands		Thousands	Thousands
1948	8,715 bales	\$224.06	\$1,958	\$190.00	\$1,658			
1949	11,681 bales	221.00	2,566	224.00	2,594			
1950	2,937 bales	243.06	714	226.00	661			
1951				196.00		620,736 bales ¹	\$103,318	\$122,214
Butter	221,000 pounds	.65	144	.69	152			
Milk, dried	48,704,000 pounds	.156	7,549	.15	7,306			
Linseed oil	213,384,000 pounds ⁴	\$8.284	\$1,769,329	.181	38,722			
Peanuts, farmers' stock	29,000,000 pounds	.12	3,480	.087	2,499			
Honey	447,420 pounds	1.08	483	.095	43	18,774,584 pounds	1,734	1,057
Barley	18,823,000 bushels	1.37	25,787	1.31	24,658	8,619,140 bushels	9,203	11,201
Beans, dry edible	4,487,000 hundred-weight	\$6.23	\$27,926	6.36	28,537	81,813 hundredweight	613	520
Corn	386,228,000 bushels	1.56	602,516	1.64	633,414	84,880,026 bushels	117,964	138,575
Flaxseed	570,000 bushels	4.15	2,366	4.10	2,337	323,155 bushels	1,325	1,325
Grain sorghums	4,699,000 hundred-weight	\$2.23	\$10,479	2.37	11,137	863,688 hundredweight	1,766	2,022

¹ Includes loans approved, not fully processed. Cotton loans as of Oct. 28, 1951.

² In general, based upon current market prices and estimated locations and grades.

³ Calculated at estimated market value shown in column 4.

⁴ Not including 300,000,000 pounds linseed oil and 1,568,000 pounds tung oil held for the account of the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to sec. 301 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

⁵ Includes substantial carrying charges and/or processing costs.

TABLE II.—Commodities in inventories and pledged for loans—Investment and estimated market values as of recent dates—Continued

Commodity	Inventories (Oct. 29, 1951)					Loans outstanding (Sept. 30, 1951)		
	Estimated quantity	Approximate unit cost	Aggregate cost	Estimated current market value		Quantity under loan	Amount of loans	Estimated current market value of quantity under loan
				Per unit	Total			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Oats	8,491,000 bushels	\$0.97	Thousands \$8,236	\$0.80	Thousands \$6,793	5,462,523 bushels	Thousands 3,742	Thousands 4,370
Peas, dry edible	2,000 hundredweight	6.38	13	5.00	10	239,473 hundredweight		
Rice				4.71		329,192 bushels	\$1,128	\$1,128
Rye	160,000 bushels	1.46	234	1.60	256		404	527
Seeds								
Hay and pasture	5,931,000 pounds	.126 1/2	1,682	.29	1,720	3,317,069 pounds	1,436	962
Winter cover crop	343,597,000 pounds	.046- .147	17,049	.0433	11,878	1,533,900 pounds	90	66
Soybeans				2.62		109,475 bushels	243	287
Eggs, dried, 1950 ¹	139,857,000 bushels	2.19	348,244	2.35	328,664	121,170,418 bushels	254,046	284,750
Rosin	14,928,000 pounds	1.01	15,077	.40	5,971			
1948	12,816,000 pounds	.0827	1,060	.091	1,166			
1949	131,250,000 pounds ²	.0697	9,148	.094	12,338			
1951				.094		9,423,208 pounds	732	933
Turpentine								
1949	500,000 gallons ³	.4540	227	.80	400			
1951				.80		198,030 gallons	98	158
Tobacco, Wisconsin	2,263,000 pounds	.2937	665	.2671	601			
Tobacco				.4994		300,250,039 pounds	144,179	149,945
Total			1,160,683		1,126,026		641,551	720,491

¹ Oct. 1, 1951, United States average price received by farmers.

² Currently there is no price support program for eggs.

³ Of this quantity, 103,400,000 pounds withdrawn from sale.

⁴ Withdrawn from sale.

NOTE.—This report reflects operating data taken from various sources and is, in part, based on preliminary estimates. The official inventory and loans of the Corporation, as taken from its accounting records, are those contained in the monthly report of financial conditions and operations.

CCC ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

From time to time Members have asked me why the records of the Commodity Credit Corporation show relatively heavy losses in the support of some of the perishable commodities during the past two fiscal years, when prices of those commodities have been relatively good and when many of the support programs for them have been proportionately inactive. Reference again to table I will show that in 1950 the support of nonbasic commodities cost \$249,000,000 and in 1951, \$345,000,000, in spite of the fact that farm prices were increasing during part of 1950 and remained at a fairly high level during 1951.

The reason for this seeming inconsistency is that, under the accounting system used by Commodity Credit Corporation, profit or loss on commodities are charged as of the time those commodities are actually sold or disposed of, instead of against the year in which the commodities were bought. As all Members of Congress will remember, there was very considerable pressure from many sources during 1950 to dispose of the sizable quantities of perishable commodities such as dried milk, butter, eggs, cheese potatoes, and others, acquired by the Department under its price-support program. Many Members, including myself, felt that it would be better to give these food commodities away before they had deteriorated rather than to hold them indefinitely in the hope of minimizing losses of the Corporation or even perhaps making a profit on them. As a result, Congress authorized and the Department of Agriculture adopted some extraordinary means of disposing of these commodities for food purposes, with little regard to the losses involved.

The substantial losses on these commodities in the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, therefore, represent this forced liquida-

tion in which these commodities, which had been purchased in prior years as part of the price-support program, were sold substantially below cost or in many cases actually given away. It is probable that had some of these commodities been retained in storage longer they could have been disposed of at current market prices and the losses substantially minimized, as was the case with butter. The losses in 1950 and 1951 on the nonbasic commodities, therefore, do not reflect the cost of supporting those commodities during that year, but rather the loss sustained in disposing of inventories acquired under previous year's support programs.

FARM PRICES

Since the start of the war in Korea there has been a general upward movement of prices that has included practically everything the American consumer eats, wears, buys, or has done for him. During this period there has been a constant effort on the part of a great many people to try to attribute to the farmer almost the entire responsibility for the increase in cost of food and similar consumer items. Table III shows conclusively, in my opinion, that this contention is entirely without foundation. Farm prices not only have not risen as far and as fast as have other prices during the past 2 years, but they are in many cases lower today than they were in 1948. How many other prices, or wages, or pay for services, can be found which are lower today than they were in 1948?

Table III lists in column 1 33 major agricultural commodities produced in the United States. Column 2 shows the price received by farmers for each commodity on October 15, 1951. Column 3 shows the price which those same commodities brought to farmers sometime during the year 1948. Out of these 33

major commodities only 10 are bringing farmers as much now as they brought them in 1948. These 10 are cotton, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, tobacco, grapefruit, beef cattle, veal, sheep, lambs, wool.

Out of these 10 commodities which have gone up in price in the past 3 years only 3—cotton, beef cattle, and wool—are of major significance in the cost of living. The one commodity about which there has been more talk than any other, and which is undeniably of great importance to consumers—beef cattle—is up 15 percent in price over 1948.

Of the other seven commodities which are bringing farmers more today than they did in 1948, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, and grapefruit are relatively insignificant in affecting the cost of living. Veal and lambs are somewhat more important to the consumer, but sheep—which have advanced in price more than any other commodity since 1948—44.76 percent—have no significance whatever to the consumer but are actually an increased cost to the farmer, since virtually the only purchasers of mature sheep are farmers who want to produce lambs or wool.

On the other side of the balance, some of the great staple food products are substantially lower in price today than they were in 1948. Wheat, for example, is \$2.10 per bushel now compared to \$2.81 in January 1948. Potatoes are only 68 percent of their price in April 1948. Dried beans are 27 percent lower now than they were in 1948. The hullabaloo that has been raised about beef prices has obscured the fact that hogs are bringing farmers only 75 percent as high a price today as they did in September 1948. The farm price of butter is almost 10 cents a pound lower now than it was in January 1948. Chickens are 25 percent lower than they were in 1948, and the Thanksgiving turkey is

bringing farmers only 35.8 cents per pound now compared to the 51.4 cents he received in December 1948.

Whatever the answer may be as to what has caused the drastic increase in

consumer prices in the past 18 months, it is quite clear that the increase has not been caused by farmers receiving any excessive or unusually high prices for their products.

cent, can be entirely unwarranted and erroneous.

One reason why the general parity ratio is not a reliable index of the prices most farmers are receiving is that this ratio may be, and frequently is, pushed up unnaturally by a very few commodities which happen to be selling far above parity, while most of the commodities farmers have to sell are below parity. This is the case at the present time, as is shown clearly by table IV. This table shows the parity ratio for the major commodities, as published monthly by the Department of Agriculture. Data for wool, mohair, and honey are not available in time for publication simultaneously with the others.

Out of the 28 commodities for which the parity ratio is shown, only 5 were bringing farmers more than parity on October 15: cotton, sweetpotatoes, beef cattle, lambs, and veal calves. The other 23 commodities are all selling for less than parity. This does not mean necessarily that the producers of those 23 commodities are losing money on their operation. But it does mean that a general parity ratio of 105 has absolutely no significance to a farmer whose cash crop is wheat—at 87 percent of parity—or potatoes—at 76 percent of parity. The fact that beef cattle at 146, veal calves at 147, and lambs at 137 have pushed the average parity ratio up above 100 means nothing to an orchardist whose apples are selling at 66 percent of parity.

Analysis of this table, therefore, shows clearly that while parity may be a reasonably accurate yardstick of the relative purchasing power of individual farm commodities, it is not an accurate guide to the over-all price level of farm products generally, or to the prosperity of individual farmers.

TABLE IV.—Effective parity prices for farm products and average prices received as a percentage of effective parity prices, United States, Oct. 15, 1951, with comparisons

Commodity:	Average price as a percentage of parity price—Oct. 15, 1951	
	Basic commodities:	
Cotton.....	107	
Wheat.....	87	
Rice.....	84	
Corn.....	93	
Peanuts.....	79	
Designated nonbasic commodities:		
Potatoes.....	76	
Butterfat.....	88	
Milk.....	93	
Mohair.....	—	
Wool.....	—	
Honey:		
Comb.....	—	
Extracted.....	—	
Other nonbasic commodities:		
Barley.....	80	
Beans, dry edible.....	81	
Cottonseed.....	96	
Flaxseed.....	80	
Oats.....	83	
Rye.....	86	
Sorghum grain.....	73	
Soybeans.....	93	
Sweetpotatoes.....	106	
Grapefruit.....	62	
Lemons.....	55	
Oranges.....	42	

TABLE III.—Average prices received by farmers for farm products, Oct. 15, 1951, compared to highest price received in 1948

Commodity and unit	Monetary unit	Average price Oct. 15, 1951	Highest price received in 1948	
			Amount	Month
Wheat, per bushel.....	Dollars.....	2 10	2 81	January.
Rye, per bushel.....	do.....	1 52	2 47	Do.
Rice (rough), per hundredweight.....	do.....	4 71	6 98	February.
Corn, per bushel.....	do.....	1 64	2 46	January.
Oats, per bushel.....	do.....	1 19	1 27	Do.
Barley, per bushel.....	do.....	1 23	2 06	Do.
Sorghums, grain, per hundredweight.....	do.....	2 17	3 77	Do.
Cotton, per pound.....	Cents.....	36 21	35 27	May.
Cottonseed, per ton.....	Dollars.....	69 90	96 00	July.
Soybeans, per bushel.....	do.....	2 62	4 11	January.
Peanuts, per pound.....	Cents.....	10 46	10 06	November.
Flaxseed, per bushel.....	Dollars.....	3 78	6 71	January.
Potatoes, per bushel.....	do.....	1 39	2 05	April.
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel.....	do.....	2 71	2 65	August.
Beans, dry edible, per hundredweight.....	do.....	7 53	11 90	January.
Peas, dry field, per hundredweight.....	do.....	5 57	6 51	Do.
Tobacco, per pound.....	Cents.....	57 7	50 6	October.
Apples, per bushel.....	Dollars.....	1 91	2 53	December.
Grapefruit, per box ¹	do.....	1 26	1 01	August.
Oranges, per box ¹	do.....	1 55	1 96	September.
Lemons, per box ¹	do.....	1 80	3 05	Do.
Hogs, per hundredweight.....	do.....	20 30	27 40	Do.
Beef cattle, per hundredweight.....	do.....	20 00	25 20	July.
Veal calves, per hundredweight.....	do.....	32 70	26 40	Do.
Sheep, per hundredweight.....	do.....	15 20	10 50	May.
Lambs, per hundredweight.....	do.....	20 80	26 10	July.
Butter, per pound.....	Cents.....	61 4	72 0	January.
Butterfat, per pound.....	do.....	60 9	87 7	Do.
Milk, wholesale, per hundredweight.....	Dollars.....	4 86	5 13	Do.
Chickens, live, per pound.....	Cents.....	24 2	32 5	August.
Turkeys, live, per pound.....	do.....	35 8	51 4	December.
Eggs, per dozen.....	do.....	55 6	58 3	November.
Wool, per pound.....	do.....	65 9	80 7	June.

¹ Equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale.

PARITY AND FARM PRICES

The parity index, as it is applied to farm prices, is widely misunderstood and frequently misused—even by its friends. Parity is not based upon cost of production and therefore does not necessarily indicate a fair return to the farmer. It is not a measure of farm income or prosperity, since it does not take into account either the volume of production or the time at which the crop was sold. The over-all parity ratio may even be seriously misleading, since it is frequently influenced by high prices for a relatively few commodities which may be produced by only a small percentage of the Nation's farmers.

Parity was established in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as a guide for the support of the five great basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco—the support and control of which was authorized by that act. Parity payments, so-called, were limited specifically to those commodities and parity was defined as "that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the base period."

When used for the purpose for which it was intended—as a measure of the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat or a pound of cotton, compared to the base period—parity is still a relatively reliable yardstick. When it is applied to

some 170 agricultural commodities, however, its reliability as an absolute measure of the purchasing power of each commodity decreases and its chief value is that of a handy index with which to compare prices from 1 month to another or from year to year. When the parity ratios for all or a great many of these commodities are calculated together in order to give a general index of prices received by farmers, the shortcomings of this general parity ratio figure as a measure of farm purchasing power are so great that it cannot be regarded as any indication whatever of farm income or the general level of prices actually received by farmers.

This general misconception of the basic nature and purpose of the parity index is responsible for much misunderstanding of farm prices and farm programs. It is only natural for most people to assume that when the so-called general parity ratio of farm prices is at 105—as it was on October 15, 1951—or at 111—as it was on February 15, 1951—all farmers are receiving above parity for their products and must, therefore, be very prosperous. Because parity was intended as a measure of the relative purchasing power of individual farm commodities—and originally only basic farm commodities, at that—and not as a measure of the general level of farm prices, the assumption that farmers generally are receiving above parity prices for their products when the general parity ratio is above 100 per-

Commodity:	Average price as a percentage of parity price—Oct. 15, 1951
Other nonbasic commodities—Con.	
Apples.....	66
Beef cattle.....	146
Chickens, live.....	77
Eggs.....	89
Hogs.....	95
Lambs.....	137
Turkeys, live.....	89
Veal calves.....	147

There are occasions when the parity ratio for an individual commodity may not even be an accurate guide as to what farmers have actually received for that commodity. The reason for this is that the parity index does not take into consideration either the volume of production or the time at which the specific commodity has been sold. Like any other business enterprise, the income of a farm business depends not only upon the price at which its products are sold, but upon the number of units that have been sold. If farmers, individually or generally, have had a bad production year—have produced few units of their products for sale—a high parity ratio for that commodity is of little significance to them. If the parity ratio goes up after the farmer has disposed of his annual production—as is frequently the case with truck crops and seasonal fruits and vegetables—the public may get an entirely false impression of the price and income derived by the producers of those commodities. This was the case with the cotton crop of 1950. In the spring of 1951 the price of cotton reached unprecedented heights in the United States. Data published at that time indicated that farmers were getting 128 percent of parity for their cotton. As a matter of fact, however, most farmers had disposed of their cotton months before that commodity reached its highest point and therefore received considerably less than 128 percent of parity for their crop.

Another thing that should be remembered concerning the parity index is that it bears no direct relationship whatever to the cost of production and therefore does not necessarily reflect what amounts to a fair price to the farmer. The parity ratio for any commodity is determined solely by the price of that commodity at current levels compared to the base period and the price of things that farmers buy compared to that same base period. It does not take into consideration or attempt to calculate the actual current cost of producing that commodity and should not be regarded as any measure of production costs.

Even in the case of some individual commodities the parity ratio may be a misleading guide as to the price farmers are actually receiving for their products. Such a misleading situation can and does arise in the case of those commodities where several different types and grades of the product—frequently used for entirely different purposes—are lumped together in calculating the par-

ity ratio for the commodity as a whole. Specific examples of this are to be found in tobacco and beef cattle. Tobacco farmers have long known that the parity ratio for tobacco as a whole is inadequate to express the actual parity position of the many different types and grades of tobacco. The public has never been greatly concerned with this, because it has thus far been a technical problem of interest chiefly to tobacco producers.

The public has been very much interested in the parity ratio for beef cattle, however, and has been seriously misled in what it thought it knew about this parity price by the very fact that the many different types of beef cattle are grouped together in arriving at a parity ratio for beef cattle as a whole. Such a figure does not give any indication of the relative price or parity ratio of the various types and grades of beef cattle or give any indication that the types most frequently purchased by consumers are selling far below the general beef cattle parity ratio, while those types which are purchased by farmers are selling far above that ratio.

For a number of years the Department of Agriculture has been computing parity equivalent prices for the various grades and types of beef cattle. This series was discontinued at the end of 1950 when the new beef-grading system went into effect, because adequate data was not available to carry out the parity equivalent on the new grades. The last computation of this parity equivalent for the various types and grades of beef cattle was made in December 1950 and is reproduced here-with as table V.

In December 1950 beef cattle generally were listed by the Department as bringing farmers 141 percent of parity and it was on the basis of this high figure and the somewhat higher prices that occurred within the next 3 months, that the Office of Price Stabilization decided to take the unprecedented action of rolling back beef prices to pre-Korea levels.

Although beef cattle generally were calculated to be selling at 141 percent of parity in December 1950, a glance at the last column of table V shows that actually only three types of beef cattle were selling for as much as 141 percent of their parity equivalent. These were canner cows at 167 percent of parity, beef bulls at 149 percent of parity, and feeder steers at 142 percent of parity. These three types of beef animals—while being almost entirely responsible for the high parity ratio of beef cattle generally have little or no direct effect on consumer prices and the cost of living. Canner and cutter cows and beef bulls are used almost entirely for hot dogs, sausages, bologna, and similar products. Feeder steers do not enter into the consumers cost of living at all, but are part of the farmer's cost of doing business—they are the raw material he must obtain in order to pro-

duce the kind of beef consumers expect to find in their retail markets. The high price of feeder steers is an added cost to the farmer—not to the consumer.

On the other hand it will be seen that in December the parity equivalent of the grades and types of cattle which comprise the great bulk of the meat appearing in retail markets were bringing farmers not more than 126 percent of their parity equivalent. Good beef steers, which comprise the great bulk of the average consumers beef ration, were bringing farmers only 114 percent of parity, and Choice and Prime beef steers were bringing only 108 percent of their parity equivalent. It is quite clear, therefore, that the beef cattle parity ratio of 141 had very little significance to farmers and livestock men and that it was probably responsible for much misunderstanding in the minds of others.

TABLE V.—Parity price equivalent and market prices per hundredweight for selected classes and grades of beef cattle at Chicago, December 1950¹

Class and grade	December 1950		
	Parity equivalent	Average price ²	Percent of parity equivalent
Beef steers: ³			
Choice and Prime.....	\$33.48	\$36.12	108
Good.....	28.80	32.89	114
Medium.....	24.30	29.71	122
Common.....	19.98	25.10	126
Heifers, average of Good and Choice.....	26.46	33.82	123
Cows:			
Good.....	18.00	22.78	127
Canner.....	10.80	18.00	167
Beef bulls, good.....	17.82	26.48	149
Feeder steers ⁴	10.98	24.37	142
United States ⁵	19.08	—	—

¹ Parity equivalent estimates on basis of cattle price comparisons published in April 1942 price report.

² Chicago market prices are averages for the week in ending the 15th of the month.

³ Sold out of first hands from the Corn Belt.

⁴ Includes Canner and Cutter.

⁵ Average of all weights and grades.

⁶ United States average cost to packers.

FARM INCOME

Table VI shows that, rather than enjoying an increasing level of income during the past few years—as has almost every other segment of the population—farmers have received a smaller and smaller proportion of the national income.

While the income of the nonfarm population of the United States was increasing from about \$163,000,000,000 in 1947 to \$198,000,000,000 in 1950—an increase of 21.8 percent—the net income of farm operators decreased from \$17,000,000,000 in 1947 to less than \$13,000,000,000 in 1950—a decrease of 25.57 percent. During the same period the gross farm income—including farm wages, and so forth—decreased more than 4½ percent.

In 1947 gross farm income was 18.67 percent of the national income. In 1950 it was only 14.99 percent of the national income.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A6961

TABLE VI.—Farm and nonfarm income, United States, 1947-50

Item	Unit	1947	1948	1949	1950
1. Gross farm income.....	Million dollars....	34,343	34,688	32,001	32,732
2. Farm production expenses.....	do.....	17,270	18,950	18,499	20,021
3. Farm operators' realized net income.....	do.....	17,073	15,738	13,502	12,718
4. Income of nonfarm population.....	do.....	102,731	185,452	183,645	198,204
5. Percentage (line 3 of line 4).....	Percent.....	10.5	8.6	7.4	6.4
6. Total national income.....	Million dollars....	183,969	207,305	203,112	218,365
7. Income per person on farms from all sources.....	Dollars.....	812	949	774	829
8. Per capita income of nonfarm population.....	do.....	1,387	1,517	1,493	1,563

WHERE DOES THIS LEAVE THE CONSUMER?

According to the best available figures, the United States is one of only three nations in the world where agricultural production has been able to keep up with expanding population since the close of World War II. In 1951 total agricultural production in the United States is estimated at 46 percent above the 1935-39 average and per capita food consumption is up 13 percent. There can be no doubt that the stability and assurance that our farm programs provide for American agriculture have contributed substantially to our ability to increase our agricultural output in this manner.

No one will deny, of course, that new and better machinery, insecticides, fertilizers, and farming practices have also contributed greatly to our increased agricultural production, but it should be equally obvious that without some assurance that he will not produce himself into bankruptcy—and without a measure of prosperity which has permitted him to buy the new machines and take chances on new and expensive chemicals and production methods—the American farmer would have had neither the ability nor the willingness to take full advantage of the modern potentialities for increased farm production.

It must be remembered that American farmers sell the output of their labor, skill, and capital in the greatest free market remaining anywhere in the world. In virtually every other segment of our economy the producer puts a price tag on his product—a price that includes all of his labor and material

costs and some margin of profit for himself. Labor, through its union organizations and contracts, puts a price tag on its services. The farmer is the only person in the United States who must go to the market place, with his product figuratively under his arm, and ask, "What will you give me for it?"

The price he receives is not the price he puts on his own product; it may or may not reflect his actual production costs plus a profit for himself. The price of his product is the price the consumers place on it. He receives for the things he produces exactly what the consumers think those commodities are worth and are willing to pay for them. Farmers want to produce in abundance, but they have learned from bitter experience that, on this great free market where they sell their product, an oversupply of a very few bushels or pounds or dozens of any commodity—an offering at any one time of more of a commodity than the consumers want to buy at that particular time—can result in a break in the price of that commodity which will affect the whole year's crop and may result in an actual and substantial loss to the farmer on his year's operation.

There can be no question, therefore, that our agricultural price-support program, which does not guarantee farmers a fair price, which does not guarantee them a profit, but which does provide assurance that a small or temporary surplus of a commodity will not be permitted to wreck the market, has been one of the important factors in giving

farmers the assurance, the willingness, and the ability to produce abundantly.

The results of this stabilized production are readily measured in the pounds, bushels, and tons of increased agricultural output in the United States and in our steadily increasing per capita consumption of food. Not so easily measured but fully as important to the consumer and to the economic welfare of the country is the price stability which has resulted from this abundant and intelligently directed outpouring of agricultural products. No housewife who can remember as far back as World War II needs to be reminded that shortages of foods and other essential items inevitably mean skyrocketing prices, black markets, and the virtual disappearance of the short items from the shelves of legitimate retailers and from the tables of the average consumer. It does not take much of a shortage, percentage-wise, to bring about this distressing condition. By assuring constant and ample production, our farm programs have aided tremendously in preventing the outrageous price increases that always and inevitably accompany a condition of scarcity.

More significant even than the overall increase of 13 percent in per capita consumption of foods that has taken place since the years 1935-39, is the fact that our national diet has been steadily improving for the past several years. Table VII shows a revealing story. It shows that American consumers are eating more of the better, tastier, more nutritious foods and less of the foods such as cereals and potatoes which are commonly associated with a low-level diet. It will be noted that our consumption of dairy products, excluding butter, has increased 21 percent since 1939, egg consumption has increased 38 percent, canned fruits 21 percent, canned juices 247 percent, and meats, poultry, and fish 16 percent. On the other hand, consumption of flour and grain products has decreased 13 percent during the same period, potatoes and sweetpotatoes 19 percent, and dried fruits 29 percent.

TABLE VII.—Per capita consumption of foods, by major food groups, 1909-51

[Index numbers, 1935-39=100]

Year	Total food	Dairy products		Meats, poultry, fish	Eggs	Potatoes and sweetpotatoes	Beans, peas, and nuts	Fats and oils		Year	Total food	Dairy products		Meats, poultry, fish	Eggs	Potatoes and sweetpotatoes	Beans, peas, and nuts	Fats and oils	
		Including butter	Excluding butter					Including butter	Excluding butter			Including butter	Excluding butter					Including butter	Excluding butter
1909.....	99	89	85	113	97	142	62	94	88	1931.....	100	99	97	99	111	105	87	104	102
1910.....	96	86	80	113	102	144	62	94	85	1932.....	98	98	95	100	101	110	92	103	101
1911.....	97	84	78	116	110	117	59	97	89	1933.....	98	97	94	104	99	106	89	104	103
1912.....	98	82	90	112	103	132	61	91	87	1934.....	99	96	93	103	96	107	90	103	100
1913.....	96	80	89	110	101	134	58	93	90	1935.....	96	97	95	95	94	112	88	95	91
1914.....	97	88	85	108	98	119	62	97	96	1936.....	99	99	99	103	96	99	102	99	99
1915.....	97	88	85	104	104	134	58	97	95	1937.....	100	101	101	99	103	97	100	100	100
1916.....	95	89	85	106	100	108	54	97	94	1938.....	101	100	101	99	103	100	108	101	102
1917.....	95	89	89	104	94	119	68	88	85	1939.....	104	103	103	104	104	92	102	106	108
1918.....	97	94	97	108	94	129	78	91	97	1940.....	106	104	105	108	106	95	105	110	114
1919.....	98	92	92	107	101	120	68	94	96	1941.....	109	107	109	112	104	96	110	108	114
1920.....	97	94	96	105	100	115	64	88	90	1942.....	109	113	117	112	105	97	117	102	106
1921.....	95	96	96	102	100	118	66	91	89	1943.....	109	107	116	119	115	100	108	100	118
1922.....	99	97	96	105	105	120	74	97	95	1944.....	112	110	120	122	116	96	100	101	117
1923.....	101	96	94	111	109	126	74	104	103	1945.....	114	116	128	122	132	95	108	91	105
1924.....	102	98	96	111	108	112	80	103	101	1946.....	119	119	139	123	124	95	119	96	114
1925.....	100	100	98	108	106	109	88	103	101	1947.....	115	115	130	124	126	80	106	97	113
1926.....	102	101	98	107	113	98	89	103	99	1948.....	111	111	124	117	129	81	107	96	115
1927.....	101	100	98	105	114	110	94	103	100	1949.....	111	111	122	118	128	77	105	96	114
1928.....	101	100	99	102	113	113	94	105	105	1950.....	111	111	122	120	133	77	110	101	121
1929.....	103	101	101	101	112	115	95	105	107	1951.....	113	111	124	120	142	73	112	99	121
1930.....	101	100	99	101	110	100	98	104	105										

1 Preliminary.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

TABLE VII.—Per capita consumption of foods, by major food groups, 1909-51

Year	Flour and grain products	Sugar and sirups	Fruits					Vegetables			Coffee, tea, cocoa
			Fresh	Canned fruits	Canned juices	Dried	Total	Fresh	Canned	Total	
1909	137	76	89	20	13	73	75	83	50	76	74
1910	137	78	89	24	13	59	74	80	47	72	70
1911	133	80	90	25	5	73	82	75	51	70	67
1912	133	79	101	27	10	78	85	81	62	77	79
1913	134	83	86	28	8	64	73	77	65	74	68
1914	135	82	104	30	3	69	88	77	64	74	71
1915	130	79	100	38	15	87	87	80	60	76	79
1916	134	80	87	48	10	88	78	78	54	73	85
1917	135	80	86	51	8	107	78	77	63	74	96
1918	123	82	79	51	10	76	72	78	75	77	84
1919	132	97	84	64	8	118	79	79	71	78	84
1920	121	94	96	63	15	116	89	87	62	82	85
1921	117	92	81	55	8	93	74	78	57	73	85
1922	119	108	99	50	5	112	88	83	58	78	87
1923	116	96	87	60	8	95	87	80	78	78	94
1924	115	104	101	59	3	109	91	85	77	83	89
1925	113	106	92	74	5	109	86	82	84	83	81
1926	115	106	110	80	5	106	100	81	88	83	91
1927	115	106	90	83	8	107	87	89	76	86	87
1928	118	108	101	83	3	107	95	86	79	84	85
1929	116	101	100	82	8	90	93	81	89	91	89
1930	114	112	93	86	8	93	88	89	95	90	88
1931	111	103	111	74	10	81	100	92	86	90	92
1932	106	98	90	68	10	93	83	96	75	91	90
1933	102	100	87	78	13	90	83	91	75	87	93
1934	101	100	87	84	13	88	83	92	80	89	87
1935	99	100	98	90	52	102	95	98	89	96	96
1936	102	103	93	112	62	93	94	93	94	94	99
1937	99	99	102	90	116	100	101	100	101	100	95
1938	100	98	96	102	119	95	99	105	108	105	103
1939	100	101	100	107	152	109	111	104	110	105	106
1940	98	97	104	126	188	111	111	101	119	105	110
1941	100	105	107	119	222	71	112	105	127	110	114
1942	104	98	96	115	214	70	103	111	138	117	93
1943	100	91	89	84	198	102	94	104	128	109	87
1944	102	90	106	62	271	106	106	108	119	110	105
1945	105	83	107	91	281	102	111	114	151	123	111
1946	100	85	105	143	459	78	125	116	160	127	130
1947	92	101	108	121	420	73	121	108	141	115	117
1948	89	96	98	117	466	69	114	113	129	116	120
1949	88	96	94	119	397	80	110	107	134	113	124
1950	88	97	83	136	353	74	101	110	140	118	111
1951	87	98	91	128	399	60	108	108	145	117	115

1 Preliminary.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Per capita consumption of food, retail weight equivalent, weighted by average retail prices for the base period, 1935-39. Consumption for total population 1909-40, civilian only, beginning 1941.

Rather than costing the consumer more of his income, food is proportionately cheaper today than it was in 1939. According to the latest figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, if consumers were purchasing the same foods today that they purchased in 1939, they could buy those foods with 17 percent of their income, compared to the 20 percent of their income they paid for those foods in 1939. But consumers, as has been pointed out, are eating more and better food. Even so, on a per capita basis, these more and better foods of 1951 are costing consumers only 23 percent of their income compared to the 22 percent they actually spent in 1939.

All of us, as consumers, would like to see lower prices for food and the other things we buy; but few of us would want to see our wages or our income reduced. From time to time someone longs nostalgically for the 35-cent pork chops and the 20-cents-per-dozen eggs of the 1930's but I imagine that most of those same persons would be reluctant to go back to the wages or the income they were receiving at the time of those low food prices. Certainly prices of foods and everything else that the consumer buys have gone up tremendously since 1939—but so have salaries, wages, and incomes. It is time that we as consumers learn that we cannot have 1951 wages and prices on the things we want to sell and 1939 prices on the things we want to buy.

Actually, the most reliable data available from Government agencies indicates that consumers are better off today—that the purchasing power of their dollar or of an hour's labor is greater in terms of food and other necessities—than they were in 1939. Table VIII shows the average weekly earnings in several selected industries as computed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It shows that, for example, average weekly earnings of workers in all manufacturing industries have increased more than 170 percent from 1939 to August 1951. During the same period the price of food has increased 138 percent while the price of all items included in the consumers price index has increased a little less than 87 percent.

TABLE VIII.—Average weekly earnings

	1939	August 1951	Percentage increase
All manufacturing.....	\$23.86	\$64.56	170.58
Bituminous coal mining.....	23.48	75.60	216.58
Building construction.....	30.39	84.62	174.45
Auto manufacturing.....	32.91	78.98	183.91
Iron and steel (foundries).....	27.52	70.94	157.78
Textile-mill products.....	10.84	48.15	185.93
Farm workers (per day with board).....	1.30	15.00	284.61

CONSUMERS' PRICE INDEX

	1939	August 1951	Percentage increase
Food.....	95.2	227.0	138.44
All items.....	90.4	185.5	86.62

1 October 1951.

In recent years we have heard much discussion of the take-home pay of workers and the actual purchasing power of the consumer's dollar. Table IX, compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, shows that the take-home pay of workers in manufacturing industries in the United States is greater today, both in terms of actual pay and in terms of purchasing power, than it was in 1939 or even in 1948.

The last column in the table shows the net spendable average weekly earnings of a worker with three dependents in terms of 1939 dollars—in other words, in terms of how much his weekly pay check will buy today compared with 1939. It will be noted that from 1939 to December 1950 the purchasing power of his weekly take-home pay has increased 43 percent. Comparison of the figure for December 1950 with 1948 indicates that even during this period which encompasses the post-Korea rise in prices, the purchasing power of the worker's pay check has increased 9.8 percent. It should be added that since the publication of this table, preliminary data indicates that the purchasing power of the worker's pay check in July 1951 was about 7 percent above the 1948 level. It should be noted also, that the net spendable average weekly earnings used in this table represent the worker's pay after social security and income taxes have been deducted.

TABLE IX.—Gross and net spendable average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries, in current and 1939 dollars, 1939–50

Period	Gross average weekly earnings		Net spendable average weekly earnings ¹				Period	Gross average weekly earnings		Net spendable average weekly earnings ¹			
			Worker with no dependents		Worker with 3 dependents					Worker with no dependents		Worker with 3 dependents	
	Amount	Index (1939=100)	Current dollars	1939 dollars	Current dollars	1939 dollars		Amount	Index (1939=100)	Current dollars	1939 dollars	Current dollars	1939 dollars
1939 -----	\$23 86	100 0	\$23 58	\$23 58	\$23 62	\$23 62	1946- July -----	\$43 38	\$181 8	\$37.36	\$26 24	\$42 84	\$30 09
1940 -----	25 20	105 6	24 69	24 49	24 95	24 75	August -----	41 99	188 6	38 68	26 63	44 16	30 40
1941 -----	29 58	124 0	28 05	26 51	29 28	27 67	September -----	45 54	190 9	39 13	26 60	44 61	30 33
1942 -----	36 65	153 6	31 77	27 08	36 28	30 93	October -----	45 97	192 7	39 48	26 36	44 96	30 01
1943 -----	43 14	180 8	36 01	28 94	41 39	33 26	November -----	46 07	193 1	39 50	25 79	45 04	29 36
1944 -----	46 08	193.1	38 29	30 28	44 06	34 84	December -----	47 32	198 3	40 59	26 27	46 07	29 81
1945 -----	44 39	186 0	36 07	28 58	42 74	33 04	1950- January -----	56 29	247 9	48 04	28 32	54 70	32 33
1946 -----	43 82	183 7	37 72	29 88	43 20	30 78	February -----	56 37	246 1	48 00	28 01	51 70	32 42
1947 -----	49 07	209 4	42 76	36 63	48 24	30 04	March -----	56 53	246 9	49 13	29 00	54 90	32 41
1948 -----	54 14	226 9	47 43	27 43	53 17	30 75	April -----	56 93	248 6	49 46	29 18	55 23	32 58
1949 -----	51 92	230 2	48 09	29 09	53 83	31 44	May -----	57 54	241 2	49 95	29 33	55 71	32 73
1950 -----	59 33	248 7	51 09	29 54	57 21	33 08	June -----	58 85	246 6	51 03	29 80	56 86	33 21
1946- January -----	41 15	172 5	35.53	27 15	40 74	31 13	July -----	59 21	248 2	51 32	29 66	57 16	33 03
February -----	40 58	170 1	35 07	26 96	40 17	30 76	August -----	60 32	252 8	52 24	29 95	58 11	33 31
March -----	42 15	176 7	36 35	27 71	41 73	31 81	September -----	60 64	254 1	52 50	29 99	58 38	33 24
April -----	42 88	179 7	36 95	27 97	42 43	32 12	October -----	61 09	259 8	52 16	29 53	59 20	33 51
May -----	42 51	178.2	36 65	27 62	42 08	31 71	November -----	62 23	260 8	52 35	29 50	59 40	33 47
June -----	43 31	181 5	37 30	27 77	42 78	31 85	December -----	63 88	267 7	53 67	29 84	60 75	33 77

¹ Net spendable average weekly earnings represent the average gross earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries less social security and income taxes for which the specified worker is liable. These net spendable average weekly earnings are then divided by the Bureau's consumers' price index adjusted to an average 1939 base, to obtain net spendable weekly earnings in 1939 dollars.

NOTE.—Data for series based on 1939 dollars revised beginning July 1942 to conform to the Adjusted Series Consumers' Price Index.

Another measure of where the average consumer stands is to be found in the quantity of food which an hour's work will buy today, compared to previous periods. Table X shows the quantities of typical foods which could be purchased with 1 hour of factory labor at various periods in the United States. In

September 1951, for example, 1 hour's labor would purchase 10.3 pounds of bread, compared to 7.9 pounds of bread in 1939; it would purchase almost as much round steak or pork chops as it purchased in 1939, and somewhat more than the same labor would have purchased in 1929.

trade. Or is it just the case of a few shoe-shine boys trying to earn a fast dollar?

Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MCCARTHY

Within the past month or so two good reporters have gone into Wisconsin at different times to assess the chances of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY for reelection next year.

Identical conclusions were reached by Constantine Brown, syndicated Washington Evening Star columnist, and Luther A. Huston of the New York Times. MCCARTHY will win the Republican primaries in April and is a sure in.

Why, with the savage attacks against him, is he a sure in? The two reporters differ when they discuss behind-the-scenes stuff, but they come together on a point that seems to us the most important in a consideration of MCCARTHY and McCarthyism.

Mr. Brown speaks of the general admiration for MCCARTHY's "bare-knuckles fight against the Communists in government."

Mr. Huston says Wisconsin people feel "there has been entirely too much complacency on the part of the Truman administration over the situation assailed by Senator MCCARTHY and that he had done the country a service by bringing it to light."

The Times man also toured Minnesota, South Dakota, Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana. In Iowa he got to talking with the editor of the Storm Lake Pilot Tribune, a weekly with

TABLE X.—Quantity of each item that could be purchased with 1 hour of factory labor, United States, September 1951, with comparisons

Item	Unit	1929	1939	1949	September 1951
Bread, white	Pound	6 4	7 9	10 0	10 3
Round steak	do	1 2	1 8	1 6	1 5
Pork chops	do	1 5	2 1	1 9	1 9
Sliced bacon	do	1 3	2 0	2 1	2 4
Butter	do	1 0	1 9	1 9	2 0
Cheese	do	1 4	2 6	2 7	2 7
Milk, fresh (delivered)	Quart	3 9	5 1	6 7	6 9
Eggs, fresh	Dozen	1 1	1 9	2 0	1 9
Oranges	do	1 3	2 3	2 7	2 9
Potatoes	Pound	17 7	25 3	25 5	31 5
Tomatoes (canned)	No 2 can	4 4	7 4	9 2	9 0
Margarine	Pound	2 1	3 9	4 5	4 5

Bureau of Agricultural Economics
Compiled from reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Looking at our farm program as a whole, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that this program has not been costly of public funds; that it has saved consumers billions of dollars by making possible abundant production that has stabilized prices; that it is the spark plug of the production efficiency which means more and better food for American consumers; and that its stabilizing influence has been a most important factor in bringing American agriculture from the bankruptcy of the early thirties to the prosperous position it now occupies. That stability and prosperity are essential to all America—for the farmer is both the city man's food producer and his best customer.

The Committee on Agriculture does not have before it one single bill proposing repeal of any major portion of our farm program—evidence that the

program is working and that it is working to the best interest of all the people of the United States.

Gold, Opium, Diamonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, gold is flowing to India, opium from Red China, and diamonds into the United States.

I trust someone will soon reveal the significance of this triple alliance in

a circulation not quite 5,000, deep in the grass roots country.

"In our judgment," said the editor, "people are quite willing that the Wisconsin Senator shall continue to blow out the Commies. There is a deep suspicion that his allegations, perhaps demagogic at times, are not always red herrings."

So we may take it that while many people in the Midwest do not always approve McCARTHY's methods, most of them support his aims.

There is no question that at times McCARTHY's methods would perturb the Marquis of Queensberry. But when you take on Communists and fellow travelers, particularly when they are entrenched in power and muzzling happily at the Government trough, you have to fight lumber-camp style. If you don't, they murder you.

Sometimes a man is admired for the enemies he makes. We may admire McCARTHY for this, for he is feared and hated chiefly by Communists and pinks and the type of "liberal" who, paradoxically, wants more and more government power and less and less individual freedom.

We think the people of the grass roots are right in their judgment of McCARTHY. He's a fighter, and he's on the right side.

UNESCO and Our Public Schools— Women Warned on Lending Names to Red Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, if we make the mistake of assuming that communism is our only enemy, we are lost. Communism is merely one of the instruments used by the real conspirators to frighten us into surrendering our national sovereignty to a world government in which we will be hopelessly outnumbered and outvoted, just as we are now in the United Nations.

Now that the Communists are in ill repute, many of their former internationalist collaborators are repudiating them; but do not be deceived by this apparent change of face.

The threat to America is not from without. No exterior force can destroy us. America can be destroyed only from within. The United Nations, UNESCO, and the Bretton Woods monetary agreements are supplying the tools with which subversives work and the vehicles on which they are riding to power.

The pattern of the international Socialist apparatus is the thing to watch. It is skilled in propaganda and has made terrible inroads in almost every field of communication and opinion-forming mediums or organizations.

The American people have been propagandized into believing that the sole objective of the United Nations is to prevent war and promote peace and harmony among nations; but that is merely

window dressing to cover up the greatest subversive plot in history.

In a well-documented report, the American Flag Committee of Philadelphia, Pa., says:

UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is a subversive association. It is consciously furthering a campaign calculated to pervert the teaching profession in this country, and so destroy the worth and integrity of America's first bulwark of freedom—our tax-supported public schools.

Strong words. But this report, which was carried in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page A6551—is so startling that loyal, patriotic people and organizations, including the Daughters of the American Revolution, have paid for the printing of thousands of copies of this report to warn the American people of the plot to twist and pervert the minds of little children. A card to my office will bring you a free copy of this report.

UNESCO's scheme to pervert public education appears in a series of nine volumes, titled "Toward World Understanding for Kindergarten and Elementary Grade Teachers in Public Schools." These booklets are obtainable from the Columbia University Press, New York; and cheaply priced. Get them and read them.

The system of teaching advocated in these booklets is to capture the minds of little children, even in the kindergarten, to the end they shall be taught the ideal of a central world government, as over against that of our own constitutional republican form of government; that teachers shall constantly stress the opposite of the family teaching of loyalty to our American ideal and allegiance to our beautiful stars and stripes, substituting for it loyalty to the Communist world government of the United Nations and allegiance to its spider web banner.

UNESCO plans to make war upon the ideals of patriotic national devotion which it sees as infecting our children in the home and community. American history must be suppressed. The patriotic spirit in our children is to be thoroughly emasculated.

Teachers are encouraged to organize political pressure groups, and—in the manner of a trade union—to demand teachers' and children's rights. An attempt would then be made to legislate these rights, prepared in treaty form, which, with the approval of the Senate and signature of the President, would become the supreme law of the land, similar to the United Nations and the Atlantic Pact. Page the ghost of Hitler's youth movement.

UNESCO would intrude upon the sanctity of the home. Booklet VI contains samples of the type of sex education UNESCO proposes for the teaching of children between the ages of 6 and 13. A sense of propriety prohibits quoting the less modest, but here are a few of the suggested questions to be explored by the teachers: (a) Are there devices for limiting the family? (b) What are the feel-

ings of pregnant women? (c) Do parents undress before the child? (d) What is the child to be taught about where babies come from?

One cannot help but wonder if this is what the American parent wishes his children to be taught between the ages of 6 and 13 in our tax-supported public schools. If you do not, you had better investigate how much of this propaganda is already being used in your schools.

It is well to remember: We are the only country in the world which embraces the internationalist idea; all other nations are intensely nationalist; Britain and Russia most of all.

Internationalism is a conspiratorial device to destroy us. Show me an internationalist, and I will show you a potential traitor to the United States.

Appended is a news article from the Washington Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., which carries a timely warning to all patriotic American women:

WOMEN WARNED ON LENDING NAMES TO RED CAUSES—STUDENT OF PROPAGANDA TELLS GOP LEAGUE HOW COMMIES ABUSE NAIVE GROUPS

(By Vylla Poe Wilson)

American women leaders who lend their names and those of their organizations to plug organizations and movements, flavored with international socialism and such like may not know what they are doing, Mrs. Henry Deland Strack, of New Jersey, who has made an intensive study of propaganda in textbooks and in other forms, pointed out at the meeting of the District of Columbia League of Republican Women at the Mayflower yesterday.

"I prefer to believe that these women are naive—but remember Westbrook Pegler says naive is a French word for dumb," said this good looking housewife who is on a crusade against subversive propaganda.

"In regard to the General Federation of Women's Clubs," she said, "I have here a pamphlet put out by the National Conference of Christians and Jews—the organization in the forefront of the brotherhood activists, chosen by the State Department to indoctrinate German youth—which recommends for children a book by Howard Fast, who served a Federal jail sentence, and films by several of the Hollywood Ten."

FOREWORD BY EX-HEAD OF WOMAN'S FEDERATION

"This booklet, Religious Values for Youth carries a foreword by Mrs. La Felle Dickinson, then president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. And, of course, in the testimony before the Congress on world government you will find the Young Women's Christian Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the League of Women Voters putting their organizations on record in favor of world government. At the American Association of the United Nations I found the photograph of Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, as one of the radio speakers plugging their line. I prefer to believe that Mrs. Houghton, like so many of these women, is just naive, just dumb, and inclined to be meddlesome."

Mrs. Strack said that Communists never openly advocate communism in this country but carry on their propaganda for international socialism which really is not any different from communism.

"International socialism," she insisted, "will be brought about by the six Marxist abolitions—abolition of existing government of ownership of property in land, of inheritance,

of the family, of nationalism (patriotism), and of religion. Within that framework, then you can judge the program and the degree of socialism included in the program of many national organizations, the self-styled opinion-forming agencies."

STATE DEPARTMENT ACTION DEcriED

She also decried the habit of State Department and other Government departments of consulting the heads of such organizations and soon "the official administration policy is being peddled to the voters down through the State and local levels of the national organizations memberships."

"I have found," the speaker declared, "the National Education Association acting as the political arm of the new Fair Deal crowd in the public school system," she said in reporting on her investigations.

"The pattern of the international Socialist apparatus in this country and the terrible inroads it has made in almost every field of communication and opinion forming is apparent," she concluded "It is up to you Republican women to read the magazines and books that still manage to get printed which expose this process. I hope you will challenge our cultural managers as they go about obliquely performing the revolution without violence. It is really up to Republican women if you do not want this country sold down the ideological river. Time is running out. Don't let these United States go by default."

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS ALSO ARE LISTED

Besides the organizations already mentioned, others pointed out by Mrs. Strack are the National Citizens Political Action Committee, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the American Association of University Professors, the American Home Economics Association, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the National Farmers Union, the Consumers Union, Jo Davidson's Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

The speaker was introduced by Mrs. Howard Coffin, national Republican committeewoman from the District, who pointed out that there are 47,000 public-relations and opinion-forming employees on the Government payrolls telling people how to think.

Spain, the Indispensable Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Freeman magazine.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SPAIN, THE INDISPENSABLE ALLY

(By Hoffman Nickerson)

(Many people who welcomed alliance with Communist Russia on purely military grounds now oppose an alliance with Fascist Spain on political or religious grounds. Major Nickerson maintains that a Spanish alliance is as vital to the free nations today as was alliance with Soviet Russia in 1941.)

In allying itself with Spain the United States would exchange a militarily hopeless position on the continent of Europe for a very strong one.

At the bottom that is all there is to it. With the help of comparatively few American troops the chances of a successful Soviet invasion of the peninsula would be extremely small. Moreover, the country is large enough to serve as a base from which counterattacks could be launched when circumstances permitted. Finally, a strong Spain would give us a secure entrance into the Mediterranean, the great inland sea which bounds all southern Europe and nearly all northern Africa, and is an ideal theater for sea and air power.

If our present policy of stationing American troops in continental Europe can make sense at all—and that is a big if—it can do so only if centered on Spain. As it stands it is only a sham, an invitation to military disaster and an attempt to justify Government spending in order to keep Truman and Acheson in power.

It is a sham because we and our allies under the North Atlantic Treaty do not now have and are not even planning to raise armies and air forces powerful enough to hold any appreciable parts of Western Europe north of the Pyrenees against a determined Soviet attack. Only a delaying action could be fought behind the Rhine which is the only serious military obstacle now available to us. As soon as the Rhine was forced we could hold only peninsulas like Denmark and Brittany and perhaps a redoubt in the French Alps. Since these areas are too small to be militarily important, the real problem would then be to hold the Pyrenees and behind them to organize Spain and Portugal as our continental European base. Obviously this could be done more easily before rather than after the shooting has started.

These elementary facts of military life have been somewhat blurred in the public mind by the organized lying known as propaganda. The trick has been to talk about how nice it would be if we could hold the Rhine and even the Ruhr—although for a considerable time we shall not have a dog's chance of doing so.

Nevertheless, anyone who habitually reads the headlines in a first-class newspaper knows that our high command—the Pentagon, if you prefer—has long been pressing for a military understanding with Spain. If the present heads of our Defense Department thought that we had even a moderate chance of success in Western Europe without Spain, then they certainly would not oppose the strong anti-Spanish feeling of the present British and French Governments and of our own State Department. After all, the Chiefs of our armed services have not recently been conspicuous for resisting political pressure. That they have stood up in the Spanish case is good evidence that the strategic weakness of our European position without a Spanish alliance is too alarming to be overlooked. Probably it would be hard to find a group of educated, professional fighting men anywhere who, if speaking frankly and in private, would not agree.

Indeed it is an open secret that some of our most intelligent high-ranking officers privately agree with ex-President Hoover that we should plan only for hemispheric defense and wait for the Red Empire to blow up from internal strains which would increase if that Empire attempted further territorial expansion. This, however, is by the way.

OUR WEAKNESS IN EUROPE

Space permits only very brief analysis of the military weakness in our present European position. An obvious point in that of

numbers Britain's former Defense Minister Shinwell said at Ottawa recently that the U. S. S. R. has 215 divisions of which at least 70 are deployed against the west, and the Russian forces are growing in power and numbers. The Red Army is particularly strong in armored divisions. There are also about 60 satellite divisions. By contrast the much publicized Eisenhower army exists chiefly on paper. Hanson Baldwin, the distinguished military editor of the New York Times, recently wrote that if all the present North Atlantic Treaty powers except Greece and Turkey fulfil their entire military programs by the end of 1951 there may be 6 American and the equivalent of 17 West European divisions available for the vital sector between the Alps and the North Sea. Since that sector is about 400 miles wide, if we assume a full divisional strength of 15,000 each and if we calculate defensive density in an old-fashioned way, there would be less than 1 man for each 2 yards of front, including reserves. Including nondivisional combat troops, there would certainly be not much more than one man for every 2 yards. In 1914 such a front would have been as thin as tissue paper, and everyone knows that the multiplication of planes, tanks, and other present-day military instruments has greatly strengthened offense as compared with defense. Moreover, some western units might well be cut off and militarily destroyed before they could cross the Rhine.

The French hope to have five more divisions by the end of 1952. In 1940 they had more than a hundred. In the matter of tactical aviation, all military authorities seem to agree that in tactical planes we would be heavily outnumbered.

That so-called strategic, that is, long-range, bombing could prevent a westward advance by the Red army has rarely been maintained since Korea. Moreover the German generals who fought on the eastern front during World War II all say that attacks against the communications of Russian forces were not as effective as they would have been against western armies because Russian soldiers are accustomed to hard conditions and habitually lived off the country.

By destroying the bridges over the Rhine and destroying or seizing as many of the local river craft as we could, we might gain a breathing spell. It is worth remembering, however, that throughout military history river lines have almost never been long and successfully held against determined opponents who approached on a broad front. This was true over and over again in World War II. The Volga at Stalingrad is no exception, for the Germans reached it only at the tip of a deep and narrow salient.

The critical stage is seldom the original crossing; advanced elements almost always get across. Then follows a race of reinforcement, with the defender trying to wipe out the attacker's footholds and the attacker trying first to hold them and then to break out into the open. Air power and large airborne forces like those of the Soviets increase the chances of the offensive. During World War II even without airborne operations the Red army scored a series of striking successes in crossing rivers. Lt. Gen. Sir G. Le Q. Martel, who was the chief of the British military mission to the U. S. S. R. in 1943, says in his book, *Our Armored Forces*, that the Soviet military engineers were extremely skillful in organizing river crossings, building a number of bridges across the Dnieper at points where that river is 1,500 feet wide in an average of only 4 days per bridge. Some of their bridges carried tanks.

SPAIN IS DEFFENSIBLE

All told, therefore, Eisenhower's staff can hardly be planning for more than a brief stand behind the Rhine. There is no other continuous natural obstacle between the Rhine and the Pyrenees.

On the other hand, the Pyrenees are exceptionally formidable. Considerable mountain ranges are serious military obstacles because the wheeled vehicles essential to large-scale military transport can cross them only on prepared roads, caterpillar-tracked vehicles are often almost as much restricted, and even small parties of athletic and lightly burdened men on foot can cross only at comparatively few additional points. Also the few roads across a big range run for miles through thinly inhabited country where shelter and appreciable reserves of food do not exist, whereas in civilized countries great river valleys have dense populations, developed road systems, and abundant food and shelter.

The Pyrenees are almost ideally suitable for a modern defense in that the coastal strips at either end of the range are extremely narrow, and four out of the five roads which cross the mountains themselves do so close enough either to the Bay of Eusey or the Mediterranean to permit not only land planes but also carrier planes easily to join in defending them. Flying eastward from the bay, the pass of Roncesvalles is only 35 air miles from tide-water, the Somport 74, and the Poutalet 79. For 41 air miles westward from the Mediterranean coastal shelf there is no road until you come over the Cerdagne, the one pass over the chain with any breadth to it. Over the 13 miles between the Poutalet and the Cerdagne, the only road follows the difficult Port de Navia Pass.

Even if the Red invaders could force the Pyrenees, more than a thousand air miles from the Russian border, they would find their geographical difficulties only beginning, for the peninsula is crossed from sea to sea by a succession of transverse ranges.

Also, we saw at the beginning of this article that Spain commands the western entrance to the Mediterranean which with its islands is an ideal theater for sea and air power. Along that inland sea we have access to Greece, Turkey, and the oil deposits of the Near East. From its eastern end our planes can threaten the Soviets' vulnerable southern flank, the Caucasus and the Caspian oil region up the Volga. The Mediterranean is also a barrier against land invasion of north Africa.

Without a strong Spain astride the Straits of Gibraltar our organized bases in the western and southeastern Mediterranean area must be confined to Africa where we would suffer various disadvantages. East and west ground communications there are difficult north of the Sahara and nonexistent elsewhere. The north African Moslems, like their coreligionists in other regions, have been deeply offended by our policy toward Israel. Also, as General Fellers recently noted in the Freeman, we would be politically whipsawed by the necessity for taking sides between their nationalist movement and the imperialism of France and Britain.

Turning now to the human factors of Spain, the average Spaniard is conspicuously tough and brave. Although the Spanish armed forces lack much of the expensive military equipment which only the richest nations can afford on any scale, their senior officers are veterans of the long and ferocious civil war which ended only a few months before World War II began. As a result of that civil war the Spanish Government is probably more anti-Communists than any other in the world. The local Communist Party is outlawed and exists only under-

ground in hunted fragments. We may contrast France and Italy where Communists are a large and powerful minority, so that extensive sabotage is to be feared.

Even if geography and lack of military numbers did not make a ground defense of European France against a serious attack impossible, it would still be absurd to base our European policy on a country where both expert and general public opinion does not believe in the urgency of preparedness. Even those who, like the present writer, have always believed in the future resurrection of France must face the fact that not only the average Frenchman but also the French Military Intelligence Service firmly believes that the Soviets will not attack westward. If the French are correct, then our whole policy needs revision.

In Spain the political atmosphere is wholly different. General Franco and his government having seen communism in action on their own soil, fully appreciate its menace. During World War II Count Jordana, then Spanish Foreign Minister, repeatedly warned the western governments of what they might expect from Moscow, and time has proved him all too true a prophet.

THE ARGUMENTS OF PREJUDICE

To refute the usual arguments against a Spanish-American alliance it is hardly necessary to do more than state them. When it is said that Franco's officials are corrupt, we should remember that our State Department pinks said the same thing about our friend Chiang Kai-shek—for the benefit of the Chinese Reds now killing our men in Korea. If the charge against Spanish officialdom be true—and on this sinful earth a certain amount of corruption exists everywhere—then that is only an argument for adequate American supervision of what is done with whatever dollars and materials we may send.

Since most of those who complain that Franco is a dictator approve of our supporting Tito, who is not only a dictator but a Communist dictator, it is enough to quote, as W. H. Chamberlain recently did in Human Events, Our Lord's own words: "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites who strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

The real reasons why from 1945 until recently the Spanish Government was practically boycotted throughout the west have one thing in common: none of them has anything to do with either military or anti-Communist considerations. At bottom all are due to political or religious prejudices. Spain has been and is politically Roman Catholic, and in accordance with the inflexible Spanish pride and with the absolute character of Spanish thought her governments have been Roman Catholic in a rigid and uncompromising way. To many English-speaking Protestants the legal disabilities still imposed upon the negligible handful of Spanish Protestants are provocative. These disabilities strengthen the inherited Anglo-American habit of thinking about Spain in terms of the Inquisition and the Armada of 1588—neither of which is a really live political issue. During the Spanish War English Socialists of the Labor Party strongly sympathized with the anti-Nationalist side, and an appreciable number fought on that side. Atlee himself went to Spain and is said to have been photographed giving the clenched-fist Communist salute which was customary throughout the anti-Nationalist army.

For centuries France and Spain were unsympathetic rivals, and throughout the unhappy Third French Republic their traditional antagonism was exasperated because most French politicians were so anticlerical that they made it their chief business to abuse the traditional religion of both coun-

tries. Since the same French politicians naturally sympathized with Spanish Reds and Pinks, during the civil war while nationalism was winning in Spain and while the popular front was busily preparing the catastrophe of 1940, feeling on both sides of the Pyrenees ran higher than ever.

Readers may judge for themselves whether religious memories or sectarian political prejudices are more important than military necessities.

To say that our leaders should try hard to make a firm alliance with Spain does not mean that they ought to throw themselves into Franco's arms and do whatever he might suggest. Not being a fool, he might well prove a shrewd bargainer. In this article we need not consider what concessions our negotiators might reasonably ask in return for substantial American assistance.

Meanwhile Truman and Acheson have already delayed so long before beginning to make friends with the Spanish Government that we may wonder whether their \$65,000,000,000 military budget is intended to support any real defense of Western Europe. If that defense is not based upon Spain it will be worthless.

Smear Tactics Cannot Beat Senator McCarthy's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Constantine Brown.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONSTANTINE BROWN SAYS SMEAR TACTICS CANNOT BEAT SENATOR MCCARTHY'S RECORD

(What do the people of Wisconsin think of Senator McCarthy? Will he be reelected to his seat in the Senate?)

(Constantine Brown, Washington columnist, visited Wisconsin and canvassed the voters. Here are his answers to the foregoing questions.)

(By Constantine Brown)

"Do you know Joe?" "How is he doing?" "He's sure put the fear of God in those Commies in Washington." These are the questions which any visitor to Wisconsin who has a District of Columbia tag on his car is bound to hear as soon as he reaches the rural sections of the State.

According to some old timers Joe McCarthy's popularity exceeds by far that of old Bob La Follette. His bare-knuckles fight against the Communists in Government; his relentless campaign against "Red Dean" Acheson have won to his side even those who in the past wondered about their wisdom of sending an inexperienced young judge, 37 years old, to represent this farm-industrial State in the United States Senate.

Not only the Democrats, but also the liberal organizations in New York and Chicago who bitterly resent McCarthy's campaign against their favorite pinks in Washington, consider his defeat a must. They will spare neither money nor effort to eliminate him from political life in 1952.

The Republican organization in Wisconsin is in a better shape than many other States in the Middle West. McCARTHY's opponents in Wisconsin are principally the liberals in Milwaukee and Madison. Their relatively small number is compensated by loud noise and beaverlike activities.

Since denunciations by word of mouth or in print is not sufficient to defeat Joe, the master minds who had engineered the defeat of Burton K. Wheeler in Montana in 1946 and tried to apply the same methods in 1950 against Senator Pat McCARRAN in Nevada, are now trying their hand in Wisconsin.

The talk in Madison and Milwaukee is that more than \$100,000 has been sent from outside the State to beat McCARTHY in the primaries. His most embittered opponents admit that he cannot be defeated by any Democrat in the 1952 elections.

The selection of the anti-McCarthyites to fight the champ is a local politician by the name of Leonard Schmidt, a good speaker and ruthless campaigner. Although he has not filed yet he is already campaigning by using material provided for him from headquarters outside the State.

This material contains the well-known charges that McCARTHY is smearing the character of innocent people in Government without any regard for truth. Because the majority of the large local newspapers carry mostly the attacks against McCARTHY from top administration leaders such as President Truman, Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin and so forth, few, if any, know that some eight individuals charged by McCARTHY before the Tydings committee have been already removed from the Government's payroll as bad security risks.

The primaries in Wisconsin are open. All citizens can vote. And this is the strongest hope of McCARTHY's enemies to defeat him. His Republican opponent, selected by the "liberals," has already started to repeat persistently the accusations already heard over the country on the radio and in newspapers.

The appearance of Mr. Schmidt in the political arena will induce other Republican hopefuls to try their luck at the primary polls. Among those is a prosperous farmer, the former State Senator Dempsey, who has already filed. His platform is not a denunciation of McCarthyism. He says that it is high time that the State of Wisconsin be represented in the United States Senate by a real, experienced farmer.

Unless the vast amounts of money to be spent in the campaign have an effect, there is little likelihood that a smear campaign will have any success. McCARTHY's popularity is growing by leaps and bounds, particularly in the agricultural areas where everybody likes that "crazy Irishman, Joe."

The attendance at the meetings where he speaks is unprecedented in the history of this State. When he spoke on September 8, at Spring Valley, a small community of less than 700 people, he had an audience of over 2,000. He spoke the same evening at Alva, where the population does not exceed 600 inhabitants, before an audience of upwards of 2,500 citizens.

McCARTHY is not a particularly powerful orator. His magnetism and unquestionable ring of sincerity attracts the crowds and they believe him. When he spoke at Boise, Idaho, August 29, he had a greater crowd than Boise had seen even in the heydays of William Borah. Because of the rain the meeting took place in the largest auditorium in the city. Some 3,000 were packed in, and a great overflow of people were listening to his speech through loud-speakers in the streets. When he left at 1:30 a. m. there were some 700 people at the airport to bid him Godspeed.

Two days earlier, in Seattle, the largest hall had to be closed a half hour before the

speaking time because it could hold no more people. The audience had begun to arrive for the 8 o'clock speech as early as 5 in the afternoon. The overflow stood in the rain in the streets to listen.

And so everywhere on the west coast where McCARTHY appeared; in Spokane the house was sold out 3 days before the meeting, and in Portland, Oreg., the lecture hall was packed to the rafters, even though the Governor's administrative assistant expressed his disapproval at McCARTHY's appearance in that city. The Governor himself was on the platform, however.

McCARTHY's supporters in Wisconsin do not worry about his election. They know that their man can do it. But they are somewhat uneasy about the primaries not because of the smear sheets and other contraption which will appear at the psychological moment, but because sometimes money can talk louder than the best arguments.

McCarthy Will Beat Down Commies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MCCARTHY WILL BEAT DOWN COMMIES

United States Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY will not be kicked out of the United States Senate by the enemies he has developed through his fight on Communist scum in our Government. Don't be surprised if the Democrats get more hurt in the ouster attempt on McCARTHY than McCARTHY does.

All this drum beating about the defeat of ex-Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, being due to Senator JOE McCARTHY sticking his nose into a Maryland election and being unfair to the Tydings lug seems to me to be so much hogwash.

The same people who are letting off propaganda barrages about the alleged injustice of Tydings' defeat never let out a peep about New York pro-Communist fronts that have reached out into other States to support candidates sympathetic toward the Communist termites. Neither do those bleeding hearts give the people of Maryland credit for having studied the open record of Mr. Tydings as a friend of the Commies and booted him out on account of it. Isn't it true that Mr. Tydings himself once attributed his defeat to the Catholics of Maryland? Now McCARTHY is dragged in, because the pinks think they can smear him.

The drive on Senator McCARTHY is part of what has been going on among the cock-eyed liberal set since Franklin Roosevelt and his wife put the welcome mat out for the Communists. Anyone who dares turn the spotlight on people who have been friendly to the Communists is abused. General MacArthur is another who has been abused by these left-wingers. However, the same cockeyed crowd who abuse anti-Communists can find all kinds of excuses for Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, and such people,

Bogey of McCarthyism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOGEY OF MCCARTHYISM

Bleeding heart liberals in the East are getting all hot and bothered about a bogey they call McCarthyism. What is this headless horseman of politics?

In torrid terms the junior Senator from Wisconsin is accused of smearing some of the brethren by throwing scarlet paint on them. But the protest seems to betray symptoms of a deadly malady that afflicts the body politic today.

For a good many years this country has suffered from a rash of radicalism on the left. Writers and speakers outdid themselves in denouncing Republicans, reactionaries, economic royalists, employers, and every man who owned more than one automobile, as public enemies. In all those years, until Joe McCARTHY came to the fore, the whole chorus was on one side. There were no extremists on the right. Now that one has arisen who picks up the brickbats and hurls them back, not always in a Chesterfieldian manner, should not be matter for surprise and hurt feelings, particularly by anybody right of center.

Men like Herbert Hoover, Tom Girdler, Senator Taft, and Secretary Forrestal were smeared with glorious abandon and the middle-of-the-road journalists smiled tolerantly on what they said was mere exuberance of free speech. But when one man comes along and uses a similar weapon of offense against Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore, Philip Jessup, Henry Wallace, et al., cries of anguish arise. Free speech is being prostituted, we are told, and men denied their sacred right to agitate for the overthrow of republican government.

It's too much to expect that one side will continue uniformly to be gentlemen and let the other side do all the dornick flinging. The reason that capitalism and free republican government have been losing the battle of the century is that their advocates have tried to fight emotionalism with logic, demagoguery with statesmanship. They have couched their appeal to the judgment of posterity, while the roughnecks of socialism were using those raw and primitive come-ons that get votes.

Senator McCARTHY is not a man of judicial temperament—at least not that of the judge who said the other day that he was not worried over how many guilty felons escaped punishment so long as all the innocent went free. McCARTHY lacks the cold, detached philosophic mind. He is something of an extremist. But we need men like him in this mortal crisis of freedom, to balance the political teeter board that so long has been weighted down on the left. And besides, McCARTHY has been right more often than wrong. He was proved to be right about Lattimore. No one seriously doubts that he was right when he charged that the executive departments at Washington had a heavy

infiltration of Reds and homosexuals. And Philip Jessup's reply to the charges made by McCarthy and Harold Stassen is on its face a tissue of mental evasions.

Also McCarthy may be applauded for the enemies he has made, such as Drew Pearson, Senator Benton of the smelly team of Benton and Bowles, The Nation, Daily Worker, and Pravda.

The New York Times sent a veteran news analyst to Wisconsin to verify reports that McCarthy would be unseated at next year's elections. The report was that the voters of Wisconsin like McCarthy, consider him a winner, and will reelect him in 1952.

McCarthy should represent to Republicans a fighting type of politics the party has not used in a presidential election for a long time. Senator DIXSEN beat the veteran Scott Lucas in Illinois last year with a two-fisted, eye-blackening, name-calling campaign of the same type as his opponent's, only better. That is the sort of campaign, and the only sort, that Harry Truman fears for 1952. This is a time to bar no holds. For four times the New Deal-Fair Deal Socialists have won with the tactic, "The end justifies the means." That is McCarthy's tactic, and a dash of it may well be recommended as a new seasoning for Republican leaders, who for so long have lost by default.

Former Moscow Pastor Backs McCarthy and MacArthur Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Catholic Herald Citizen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FATHER BRAUN, FORMER MOSCOW PASTOR, BACKS MCCARTHY AND MACARTHUR VIEWS

GREEN BAY.—Senator McCarthy's charges that Communists have infiltrated into the Government are entirely defensible, Father Leopold Braun, A. A., told members of the Green Bay lecture forum here Sunday night. For 12 years the American pastor in charge of the Church of St. Louis in Moscow, Father Braun said:

"I happen to know some of the men named by McCarthy personally and of the existence of documentary evidence against them, and from a purely patriotic and not political point of view, the Senator's position is entirely defensible."

In the question-and-answer session, Father Braun defended General MacArthur's campaign plan in Korea. He said he believed that the war in Korea was deliberately stopped a year ago when the military objectives of MacArthur were about to be completed. But the Government thought that this would displease the U. S. S. R. and lead to world war III. "I'm sorry to say that the foreign policies of His Majesty's Government (England) had a lot to do with the stalemate in Korea."

Father Braun said that MacArthur's campaign theory in the original sense was the only way we could bring about victory in

Korea because at that time MacArthur knew that Russia would not attack.

Diplomatic relations with Russia should be continued but only on an absolute reciprocity basis, Father Braun said. "At present, all the privileges of diplomatic immunity are accorded to the U. S. S. R. while we are looked at as scum of the earth in the Soviet capital."

He said several Russian organizations operating under harmless names are nothing more than divisions of the secret police with the sole purpose of obtaining secret information in the United States.

Present curbing of Communist infiltration in Government is in contrast to the situation several years ago, Father Braun said. He pointed out that Gerhart Elsler, a known Communist, was not deported until the mass of evidence against him had reached tremendous proportions.

Prior to this time, he said, "the wife of a certain President wrote a letter to the Secretary of State asking clemency for Elsler so he could continue his work."

He also charged that an ex-President had told the FBI, "Don't touch it," when confronted with a dossier containing the damning evidence on Elsler.

The real reason the Russian people do not rebel, Father Braun said, is the ubiquitous vigilance of the secret police operating in three spheres—interior, transportation, and border. He described Russia as a "hermetically sealed" country but he expressed the belief that the people are beginning to awaken to the fact that they were not living in a paradise and they are demanding more information about the way of life outside of the country.

He described the transfer of 1,750,000 Polish people and 2,000 Spanish young people to Russia, where they were forced to accept citizenship with antedated papers. This prevented their being repatriated to their own countries, "a case of genocide worthy of U. N. attention, but try to get it on the docket," Father Braun said.

Nikolai Zarubin is now Russian Ambassador to the Court of St. James, where he was received with open arms. But this same man played a very, very black and despicable role as a diplomat while Soviet Ambassador to Ottawa, where he directed the entire atom spy ring of North and South America."

More recently, Zarubin was one of four delegates of Russia to the San Francisco Conference, where the Japanese Peace Treaty was signed, said Father Braun.

The speaker predicted that one Malenkov would succeed Stalin in fact, although Molotov may be the figurehead dictator.

Communist Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles in the Washington Star by David Lawrence on Communist infiltration in the United States Government.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OFFICIAL REPLY CALLED MISLEADING—RECORDS OF TESTIMONY MADE BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES CONTRADICT SNOW'S STATEMENT ON STATE DEPARTMENT REDS

(By David Lawrence)

To what extent have Communists and Communist sympathizers infiltrated the United States Government and particularly the State Department in recent years?

An answer to this question is attempted in a speech by Chairman Conrad E. Snow of the Loyalty Security Board of the State Department. He has made some very significant statements which unquestionably will attract the attention of congressional committees as they examine further what appears to be an official reply to various charges leveled in recent months.

The first point that strikes the eye is the argument that, even if there were Communists or sympathizers in the State Department, they did very little harm at most. Here is the exact language by Chairman Snow on this point:

"I can say confidently that there are no known Communists in Government. If there are any secret Communists—Communists who join no Communist fronts and speak no Communist sentiments—of course I cannot say, for they are not known.

"The Hiss case and the case of Judith Coplon in the Justice Department have done more harm in terms of public confidence than any harm Hiss or Coplon ever did in the delivery of classified papers. Both worked in absolute secrecy—their best friends were ignorant of their acts. Neither would have been employed by Government for a day after their acts were discovered. But a swallow does not make a summer—neither do these two cases make out an infiltration of Government by Communists."

The foregoing assertion will be challenged, and, in fact, is contradicted by records of the testimony made before congressional committees.

Thus, the declaration that Alger Hiss, for example, would never have been kept in Government employ for a day after his acts were discovered, is not borne out by the testimony given by Whittaker Chambers, a confessed Russian spy, who has told congressional committees that as early as 1939 he notified the State Department that Hiss had given him secret papers. The record shows that Hiss not only continued in the State Department for years afterward, but that he played a very important part in the preparations for and in the discussions which went on at the Yalta Conference as recently as 1945.

The statement by Chairman Snow says also:

"Since December 17, 1947, when the President's loyalty program was implemented by directive of the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, the Loyalty Security Board of the State Department has had before it over 500 cases of State Department employees who have been investigated for loyalty by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the FBI—and not one case has been found of a present Communist working in the State Department.

"Over that period eight employees have been held to be security risks, but not one of those admitted present membership in the Communist Party, nor was there evidence of present membership."

A reading of the foregoing statement by those who have not followed closely the controversy over the loyalty program would

lead to the impression that infiltration in the State Department hasn't occurred because no present Communist can be found. The strongest argument of the anti-Communist group in America has been that former Communists either stayed on in Government employ or were permitted to resign without an explanation of what harm they had done while in Government employ.

In the statement above quoted, the words "present Communist" or "present membership" were not underlined by the speaker, but there are many observers who insist that the presence of former Communists today in highly confidential posts is bad security. Chairman Snow reveals that since 1947 about 40 other employees have elected to resign during the process of investigation and adjudication of loyalty." He adds:

"What might have been found in their cases, had they gone to hearing, of course, I do not know. But this small number—less than 50 in all—out of a department of 94,000 employees—who have either been held to be security risks or who have for one reason or another desired not to face investigation, does not indicate any noticeable infiltration of Communists in Government."

What is the importance of the word "noticeable"? It will be noted that Klaus Fuchs, who was cleared through a faulty system in which the State Department shares responsibility, stole American atom-bomb secrets. Yet it can be said he is just one employee out of the thousands of employees of our own and foreign governments who have dealt with classified information in recent years. To use 50 in ratio to 94,000 is misleading in itself. Not all the 94,000 employees of the State Department have anything to do with confidential information. It is a rather small group which has access to secrets, and there is no way of knowing whether the 50 who have either been dismissed or resigned had such access. The public is entitled to information on this point as well as to information as to just what part was played by Alger Hiss and others who are admitted now to have been bad security risks.

STETTINIUS NEVER LEARNED FACTS—HOW HIGH UP IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT DID THE FBI REPORTS ON RESULTS OF EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATIONS GET?

(By David Lawrence)

What happens to information on loyalty which is communicated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the FBI—to the State Department?

This question is raised because of the statement just made by Chairman Conrad E. Snow, of the Loyalty Review Board of the Department of State, who says publicly that Alger Hiss would not have been kept in Government employ 1 day after his acts were discovered.

The same State Department spokesman on loyalty matters says that both Alger Hiss and Judith Coplon "worked in absolute secrecy—their best friends were ignorant of their acts."

But the FBI wasn't ignorant of those acts. It promptly prosecuted Judith Coplon, and it also laid before the State Department certain information about Alger Hiss which the Department officials chose to disregard.

But how high up in the Department did the FBI reports ever get? It is plain from a reading of the book by the late Edward R. Stettinius, Under Secretary of State and later Secretary of State, that he evidently did not know what the FBI reported. In his book dealing with the Yalta Conference—published in November 1949 by Doubleday & Co.—Mr Stettinius pays tribute to the work of Alger Hiss and says:

"I never heard of any questioning of Mr. Hiss' loyalty from any one inside or outside of the State Department or from the FBI during my term of service in the Department."

Mr. Stettinius became Under Secretary in September 1943 and Secretary of State in November 1944. He resigned in June 1945. That's a long period of time during which FBI information apparently never got to the Secretary of State.

It is known that in 1939 Whittaker Chambers, confessed Russian spy, went to Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, and told him about the work that Hiss had done in our Government as a Russian agent.

It is known that in the latter part of 1941 and early 1942 the FBI obtained the notes of Mr. Berle and gave the State Department whatever information it had about Alger Hiss.

It is known that in March 1945, just after the Yalta Conference—and before the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, in which Alger Hiss played an official part—the FBI transmitted to the State Department a comprehensive report about Alger Hiss that created quite a stir among some officials in the Department.

Now Chairman Snow, in his public statement, says that the chief damage done by the Alger Hiss case was in undermining the confidence of the public in the State Department, and he places as secondary the harm that Hiss did in the delivery of classified papers.

Evidently Chairman Snow has not given weight to the opportunities which Alger Hiss had to communicate directly or indirectly to the Russians what he knew of American policies and plans. For Mr. Stettinius reveals in his book that he "reviewed" with Hiss and only two other advisers certain questions for purposes of presentation to President Roosevelt at Yalta. Critics of the administration in Congress claim that America was "sold down the river" at the Yalta Conference.

Among the questions listed by Mr. Stettinius as having been reviewed by him with Alger Hiss were the treatment of Germany, the Polish question, the relations between UNRRA and the Soviet Government, the rights of American representatives on the allied control commissions for Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary; questions of oil concessions in Iran, policy in China with reference to Russian influence with the Chinese Communists, the Turkish straits question, and international trusteeships.

Chairman Snow points with pride to the record that since December 1947, "not one case has been found of a present Communist working in the State Department," and asks: "What, then, is all the shouting about?"

Yet in his own public statement Chairman Snow says that between December 1947 and today, 8 employees have been found to be security risks and about "40 other employees have elected to resign during the process of investigation and adjudication of loyalty." He adds frankly:

"What might have been found in their cases, had they gone to hearing, of course, I do not know."

The FBI furnished a file on every one of those cases. When the chairman of the loyalty board in the State Department eliminates 40 loyalty cases because they didn't go to a hearing, does that mean the background of those 40 cases was unimportant?

There is another pertinent fact on which the fullest candor is essential. How much pressure, if any, was put on the 40 loyalty cases to resign? Does the Department do its weeding out by pressure and thus maintain a perfect score, enabling it to say that "not

one case has been found of a present Communist working the State Department"?

The \$64 question, finally, is this: Although in every other important department of the United States Government disloyalty cases have been found and loyalty boards of those departments have recommended dismissals, why has the State Department never found a single disloyalty case that resulted in a formal dismissal?

Plainly Chairman Snow has chosen to give out a part of the story and only the part which in his opinion "does not indicate any noticeable infiltration of Communists in Government."

Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter printed in the New York Times of August 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEAN ACHESON DISCUSSED—BASIS OF OPPOSITION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE PRESENTED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

"In Praise of Dean Acheson" was the title you gave to a letter in the Times of August 16, written by Samuel Guy Inman. Since I am a member of the "get Acheson" crowd, an exclusive little group that appears to include four-fifths of the population, I was curious to read what Mr. Inman could find to say in his praise. But I was disappointed. The burden of the letter was that Senator McCARTHY is disgraceful and Mr. Acheson a very brilliant fellow indeed. Few facts were adduced to support either contention.

Mr. Inman, who, according to Who's Who, has been employed as a consultant by the State Department on dozens of occasions over the years, cited the following points in Mr. Acheson's favor.

1. He was well prepared for his task when he became Secretary. Granting that this was true, is it not his record since then that really matters? Many besides Senator McCARTHY feel that Secretary Acheson is the most spectacular failure in diplomacy since Neville Chamberlain. The loss of 600,000,000 people in China and Eastern Europe to Kremlin domination since the end of the war is enough to qualify him for that distinction, even though his responsibility must be shared with President Truman and General Marshall.

U N ACTION ON KOREA

2. He improved the United Nations by his brilliant strategy in getting a vote through the Security Council to send armed forces to stop the aggressor in Korea.

The brilliance of this is debatable. United States forces had already gone into Korea, so the Security Council was presented with a fait accompli. Mr. Inman says nothing about Mr. Acheson's brilliance in persuading President Truman to bypass Congress by calling the war a police action, thereby avoiding the nuisance of asking for a declaration of war as the Constitution requires.

3. The Secretary was called equally brilliant in his leadership in strengthening our relations with the free world through the Atlantic Pact, European Union, etc.

The fact that this free world has been shrinking at an alarming rate during Mr. Acheson's stewardship was not mentioned. The value of the Atlantic Pact to this country will be more apparent when and if General Eisenhower succeeds in his current mission. There will be time enough then to apportion the credit. Just what European Union Mr. Inman is referring to I do not know.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

4 Mr. Acheson is said to have improved the organization and atmosphere in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, as observed by Mr. Inman.

If it could be shown that some South Americans share this viewpoint, the observation would be more impressive.

These items were all that Mr. Inman mustered in praise of Dean Acheson. He neglected some other things for which Mr. Acheson has been praised by his admirers:

His brilliant—nay, total—diplomacy in promising Tito that we would come to his rescue if Yugoslavia were attacked by the Soviets, while gallantly refraining from asking any help from Tito if we should be attacked in Germany.

His throwd bargaining by which he secured the release of Robert Vogeler in the short time of 1 year and for the paltry ransom of \$125,000,000 worth of machinery. When asked by a reporter whether he would try to exchange the Soviet spy Gubitchev for Mr. Vogeler, Mr. Acheson coldly retorted: "We don't do things that way."

His great personal courage in refusing to resign in the face of long and clamorous bipartisan demands that he do so.

MONTGOMERY M. GREEN,

HAVRE DE GRACE, MD, August 16, 1951.

McCarthyism and Trumanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Journal-American of September 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MCCARTHYISM AND TRUMANISM

President's Truman's manifested decision to make "McCarthyism" an issue in his prospective campaign for reelection can easily prove to be his fatal political blunder.

"McCarthyism," whether one cares for it or not, is neither spontaneous nor an invention of the Wisconsin Senator.

It is, in its particular form, a vigorous protest against Communism in the New Deal—which means Communism in the United States Government.

And if the Communist infection had not existed in the New Deal, "McCarthyism"

could not have occurred as a caustic but salutary corrective.

This is not a matter of mere speculation.

The records of Congressional investigating committees, and even more of Federal criminal courts, have established the essential facts.

To cite the most notable example—

Alger Hiss, who went to Yalta with President Roosevelt, where China was betrayed, and who was Secretary General of the organization meeting of the United Nations, denied under oath any complicity in the Communist conspiracy and was indicted for perjury.

President Truman, instead of respecting the constitutional legal process, attempted to ridicule the action as a "red herring."

But Alger Hiss was convicted and sent to prison.

Did President Truman—under oath to enforce the laws—then recant his contemptuous remark?

He did not!

On the contrary, his Prime Minister, Secretary of State Acheson, unctuously and contumaciously declared that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss.

And Secretary Acheson remains in Mr. Truman's Cabinet.

Moreover, on how many occasions has Mr. Truman impeded or frustrated congressional investigations of New Deal communism by withholding from Congress reasonable access to public documents, which, no doubt, were prepared in good faith for the public security and afterward, by Presidential order, were secretly sequestered in the New Deal's padlocked files?

The most spectacular instance of McCarthyism in action and its effect upon New Deal political fortunes was that of former Senator Tydings, of Maryland.

Senator MCCARTHY had alleged that New Deal communism perverted our far-eastern policy, causing the loss of China and inviting the Korean war.

Senator Tydings conducted a New Deal investigation, the most revealing feature of which was publication of the suppressed Wedemeyer report on Korea.

The Tydings committee's report was most deservedly called a whitewash.

When, subsequently, Senator Tydings sought reelection, Senator MCCARTHY indignantly took to the stump in Maryland, and Mr. Tydings—after long and distinguished service—was defeated.

A prudent politician sitting in Mr. Truman's place might regard the Tydings episode as premonitory, even if his patriotic impulses did not compel him to respect, at least, the motives of McCarthyism.

He might conclude that this thing called McCarthyism is, in its way, an expression of loyal and offended Americanism, and that it is hardly smart politics to oppose either loyalty or Americanism.

But perhaps this is too severe an observation in President Truman's case.

It may be that Mr. Truman simply has a blind spot in his political vision when communism is concerned; or else, politicianlike, he has a weakness.

Whichever the case, it is reasonable to suspect that some of Mr. Truman's continuing advisers may be primarily to blame for his mistaken and essentially dangerous attitude of supporting communism indirectly by stubbornly and directly opposing militant anticommunism.

For militant anticommunism is the proper definition of McCarthyism.

Was the Decartelization Program Sabotaged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 20, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I insert part IV of an article which appeared in the bulletin, Prevent World War III, No. 6, November–December 1950, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, New York City, under the heading "Was the decartelization program sabotaged?" as follows:

WAS THE DECARTELIZATION PROGRAM SABOTAGED?—PART IV

IV. BOSCH FRIENDS IN HIGH PLACES—GENERAL WILSON

While the Decartelization Branch was preparing its order against Bosch, company officials were not laggard in defending their interests. They established close relationships with such people as George Erlon, economics chief of the military government in Stuttgart. Through Erlon, the Bosch people were able to learn the details of the order planned against them. They were also intimately associated with Leland Spencer, chief of the bipartite industry and commerce group. Spencer, an influential person in the determination of the steps taken by military government to revive German industry, declared that the Bosch directive would have to pass through his hands before it would be approved.

Spencer was in touch with United States businessmen who gathered material for use by the pro-Bosch officials in military government to defeat the decartelization program. In particular to water down and emasculate the Bosch order. Among the statements gathered, for instance, was one from Charles E. Wilson, former chairman of General Electric, opposing action against Bosch as detrimental to German industrial recovery. This material, gathered by Kenneth L. Meyers in the United States, was forwarded to George Erlon, Württemberg-Baden economics chief, and thus became available to Bosch for use in prosecuting its case before the various appeal boards. Other individuals on behalf of Bosch included Major General Hayes, deputy military governor, who inquired into the nature of the impending action against Bosch and lent encouragement to those who were engaged in whittling down the Bosch directive. Among the most important of these individuals was an ex general of the United States Army, Arthur Wilson.

As early as 1947, Wilson undertook an offensive against the decartelization program and the Bosch order. Ex-General Wilson, a private individual, and in no way associated with the military government, received the support for his activities from every military government official opposing the Decartelization Branch. They included the already well-known Bronson, Hawkins, Wilkinson, Spencer, and others, as well as officials in JEIA (Joint Export-Import Agency) such as George Santry, John French, and other top officers of that agency.

Wilson's actions in the interest of Bosch deserve the closest scrutiny. General Wilson

had met Bronson while the latter was in the service. He came to Germany on his own, armed with an introduction to General Clay. Although Wilson did not talk to Clay about Bosch directly, he nevertheless voiced his opposition to the entire decartelization program. He stated that his efforts on behalf of Bosch had the full support of all of Clay's top lieutenants but did not indicate whether General Clay, himself, had directly encouraged his efforts.

Wilson was vitriolic against the staff of the Decartelization Branch. He denounced their efforts to deconcentrate German industry as a reflection of their belief in the "Morgenthau plan." He argued that Bosch had already been deconcentrated as a result of war action. He disputed the findings of the Decartelization staff on the cartel and monopoly position of Bosch within Germany and justified exclusive trade and distribution practices in the name of efficiency and normal business practice. He demanded that the order against Bosch be rescinded and that the company be permitted to remain intact in the western zones with all of its subsidiaries. He declared that American taxpayers would be burdened if action against Bosch took place and stated that even the Bosch employees would suffer a decline in their standard of living. In all of these arguments, Wilson was echoing the Bosch position which Bosch officials had prepared in their reply to the order to comply with the already emasculated directive signed by Bronson.

However, Wilson's intervention in the affairs of Bosch was not the result of his deep concern for the American taxpayer. As a matter of fact, as early as April 1947, Wilson had entered into business negotiations with the Bosch firm for the exclusive distribution of Bosch products throughout the entire world. The nature of the contract between Wilson and associates and the Bosch combine will be examined in the following section. It is necessary, however, to look at the various intermediary steps undertaken by Wilson prior to the final signing of the Bosch deconcentration order, to grasp the full importance of Wilson's activities on behalf of the Bosch cartel.

General Wilson engaged in numerous conversations with the Bosch officials in the course of 1947. Through Erlon and the industry and commerce group under Leland Spencer, Wilson was informed of the pending action against Bosch. Wilson started his operations by appearing in Berlin and soliciting the support of General Hayes, Deputy Military Governor. He was supplied with an official car, an office, and a secretary. He expressed alarm at the consequences of deconcentrating Bosch to all of the top administrators of military government. He obtained the help of General Hayes with particular reference to the patent provisions of the pending Bosch order, and through General Hayes, he requested that they be changed. He engaged in numerous conferences with Bronson, Hawkins, and Wilkinson on these matters. He also spoke to a number of staff members about the Bosch order, but denied their motives and the purposes of the entire procedure. These conferences between Wilson and the Bronson-Hawkins team occurred periodically over the course of months. It will be recalled that during this period, a draft of the deconcentration order had already been prepared and submitted to Bronson without any action and that the final version accepted by Bronson had been depleted of its vital provisions.

Is it a matter of coincidence that the vital parts of the Bosch order were thrown out on Bronson's instructions at the time when Wilson was conferring with Bronson

and Hawkins? As we shall show in the next section, all of these provisions were of paramount importance in Wilson's business deal with the Bosch company.

The real motives behind Wilson's activities were made apparent when he presented Bronson and Hawkins, during one of his periodical visits to Berlin, with a copy of a draft of a contract between the so-called International Products Trading Co. of Zurich, Switzerland, and the Bosch firm, giving the former exclusive rights to sell and distribute Bosch products on the international market. Wilson requested Bronson and Hawkins to give approval of the contract which had already been, in principle, accepted by JEIA (the Joint Export-Import Agency). These conversations concerning the contract also took place before Bronson instructed staff members of Decartelization to delete or change portions of the original draft of the Bosch order and before Bronson signed the revised draft of this order.

At no time was any member of the Decartelization staff informed by Bronson that such a contract was in existence or being considered by him and Hawkins, or that an agreement had been entered into by a foreign company and a German firm which was subject to deconcentration action. At no time prior to the issuance of the approved draft on Bosch did Bronson consult the legal members of his staff as to the validity of such a contract. Its existence was in effect kept secret by Bronson and Hawkins.

Hawkins and Bronson, after making a number of minor revisions in the contract, gave their approval to the deal, and the contract was forwarded to JEIA, which gave its final approval in July 1948.

Asked to account for his relations with Wilson, Bronson subsequently grew very hazy about his conversations with him. Bronson never questioned the impropriety of a private individual, a citizen of the United States, a former general, representing the interests of a German company before an official agency of the United States Government. In any case he never informed the staff about Wilson's deal with Bosch until the contract was accidentally discovered by a member of his staff who raised the entire issue of the legality of Wilson's actions and the legality of the contract itself.

V. BACKGROUND OF THE IPTC (INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTS TRADING CO.)

It is clear, as Wilson subsequently admitted himself, that his intervention on behalf of Bosch was only motivated by his personal interest. It is also evident that Wilson's activities on behalf of Bosch bore fruit in the revisions in the Bosch order and the Hawkins-Bronson approval of his private deal with Bosch. It may explain the long delay in taking action against Bosch and the lukewarm attitude toward the contemplated action by General Clay.

We can examine, therefore, at this point, the International Products Trading Co. itself and the kind of arrangement it made with Bosch.

The IPTC is stated to have been established as a result of the initiative of two Greek businessmen by the name of the Gherstos brothers. For over 20 years they operated an agency in Greece and other countries for the distribution and sale of Bosch products. After World War II, the Gherstos brothers undertook to reestablish their international connections with Bosch. For that purpose they first approached a certain Colonel Colcaire, assistant military attaché of the United States embassy in Berne, Switzerland. They proposed to Colcaire the reestablishment of an international agency for the distribution and sale of Bosch products throughout the entire world through the

formation of a company under Swiss laws. Colcaire avidly accepted the proposal in which he would have a substantial participation without investing any money, since the Gherstos brothers agreed to supply all the capital.

During these negotiations, General Wilson, at that time vice president of the Trans-World Airlines, made his appearance. It is not clear whether he already knew the Gherstos brothers or was introduced to them by Colcaire. In any case, he agreed to participate in the establishment of the proposed company under the same conditions. Subsequently, Colcaire was eased out of the deal and Wilson became an equal partner in the new company, owning one-third of its capital stock with the money put up by the Greek businessmen. Wilson's share was to be repaid by him out of the future earnings of the new firm.

Wilson immediately took over the assignment of setting up the company and entered into negotiations with Bosch on details of the contract for the exclusive distribution and sale of their products. Wilson, as we already have seen, undertook the job of obtaining military government approval for the deal and sought to interfere in the pending deconcentration action against Bosch.

As a private individual, Wilson was clearly engaged in activities which violated military government regulations. On the other hand, is it not evident that Bronson and Hawkins, in encouraging a private business venture on the part of an American citizen, did not live up to their oath of office?

VI. THE MEANING OF THE BOSCH-IPTC CONTRACT

The contract signed by Bosch and the IPTC, and approved by JEIA in July 1948, conveyed on the IPTC exclusive rights to sell and distribute Bosch products in the international market. When its existence was finally brought out into the open through the accidental discovery by a decartelization staff member, it was characterized as illegal and in violation of British and American laws on decartelization. In addition, staff members declared the new Swiss company to be a front for Bosch and a method whereby Bosch hoped to evade military government laws on the accumulation of foreign assets by a German company and thus pile up foreign assets outside the jurisdiction of the occupational authorities.

The evidence that Bosch and Wilson had engaged in an attempt to outwit military government came from a former director of the Bosch firm who had been connected with the operations of Bosch for many years. This individual stated that, in reality, the IPTC was not a private baby of Wilson as Bronson continually asserted, but a company established after a conference between Wilson and Bosch officials in Switzerland, held in the summer of 1947. The purpose of this company was to build up Bosch's foreign assets and the capital for the enterprise came through Bosch. Its directors also were declared to be in the employ of the German firm. We have already seen that Bosch was adept in the utilization of various cloaking devices to hide its ownership of domestic or foreign companies. It is a charge which cannot, therefore, be lightly ignored. The IPTC, moreover, employed as its chief agent, a Swiss national who had been the liaison for Bosch during World War II. This person now became the general manager of the IPTC. Among his activities was the reestablishment of Bosch affiliates in Spain and Portugal, two countries with which German firms were expressly forbidden to do business under existing United States laws. While these charges that IPTC was a dummy for Bosch were expressly denied by Wilson,

it is a fact that top officials of military government never endeavored to find out whether they were true or not.

But aside from these aspects of Wilson's activities and the actual ownership of IPTC, lawyers for the decartelization staff declared the contract itself to be a violation of Law 56. The contract provided for the maintenance of international cartel agreements by requiring the IPTC to protect Bosch from any limitation on the sales of its products in any country whether that country was within or outside the agreement. The contract further bound IPTC not to deal in any competitive products, as such products would compete with Bosch regardless of price, performance or method of manufacture. IPTC was obligated to compel its subcontractors to adhere to this principle. The contract was declared to be exclusive geographically since it covered the entire world and all-inclusive since it pertained only to Bosch products.

Decartelization staff lawyers declared the contract was made and the IPTC established for the purpose of providing Bosch with an ostensibly independent company for the re-establishment of Bosch's international network of sales and distribution outlets under the control of Bosch, and intended to build up reserves of foreign exchange outside the combined zones of occupation. Under military government laws, a German company was prohibited from making and entering into such an agreement. This would be true even if the IPTC were not a front for Bosch. In substance, then, Wilson, with the support of military government officials, had sought

to evade military government regulations, and his actions were therefore clearly in violation of occupation laws.

It is certainly strange, therefore, to realize that neither Bronson nor Hawkins made any effort whatever to inquire into the nature of Wilson's activities nor to demand any information on the individuals associated with the IPTC. The casualness with which they approved an agreement clearly in violation of laws they were pledged to uphold, throws a revealing light on the whole attitude toward decartelization and on the nature of the behind-the-scenes efforts to bury decartelization, and the sabotage of their solemn obligation to carry out the laws of the United States.

We need only refer to Bronson's behavior after the discovery of the contract and the nature of Wilson's activities. Afraid of the repercussions from his high-handed manipulations in favor of Wilson and Bosch, Bronson made a gesture toward ascertaining the opinion of his legal staff. Without exception, all of the members of the staff consulted declared the contract to be a violation of Law 56 and British ordinance 78.

To add to Bronson's discomfiture, Brigadier Oxborrow, British chief of decartelization, officially denounced the contract as illegal and protested Bronson's unilateral action which Bronson explained as due to difficulties of communication between himself and the British. Subjected to such pressure, Bronson stated that perhaps he had gone "out on a limb" in this matter and had made a mistake.

In any case, Bronson agreed to have the whole case reviewed and requested staff members, in conjunction with the British, to prepare a memorandum outlining why the Bosch-IPTC contract should be nullified for dispatch to JEIA. Such a memorandum was prepared for the signature of Bronson and Oxborrow. Bronson accepted the memorandum but never signed it. Instead he hurried to Berlin for consultation with Hawkins, telling the latter that maybe they had both stuck their necks out too far. Hawkins recommended that the Legal Division of OMGUS be asked for an opinion. After due deliberation, Colonel Raymond, chief of the Legal Division of OMGUS, came forth with the answer. Raymond's advice was a masterpiece of noncommitment. After outlining the relevant sections of military government law which would prohibit Bosch from making such a contract with a foreign company, he declared that no facts had been presented by which a conclusive judgment could be made. Without approving or disapproving, the Legal Division, in effect, declared the deal to be a fait accompli.

The final nail was thus driven into the fiasco of the Bosch case. Whether action against Bosch will ever be taken remains to be seen. The final draft of the Bosch order, in any case, was so innocuous that Bosch could afford, with Wilson's approval, to submit to a deconcentrating action which, at best, would only be a pious gesture.

Will the United States have to seize Bosch for the third time?

W
2012